PART TWO

AN ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY
OF THE
HITTITE INHERITED LEXICON

INTRODUCTION

In this part I will treat the following Hittite words: (a) words that in my view have a good IE etymology; (b) words that formally look as if they could well be of IE origin but for which no IE cognates are known; (c) words for which an IE etymology has been proposed that in my view cannot be correct; and (d) words of which I found it important to show that they must be of a foreign origin.

Of each word I have cited all spellings of the forms as attested, giving attestation place if necessary and a dating. If a certain form is attested in multiple texts, I have only indicated the oldest dating. Whenever needed, I have ordered the forms and spellings chronologically, in order to describe the most original state of affairs. On the basis of this material, I have treated the etymology of each word. Apart from words, I have also included in this dictionary the nominal and verbal endings, as well as most of the verbal and some nominal suffixes. Of these I have especially concentrated on morphological changes, as well as on their etymology.

An etymological dictionary can only be written on the basis of good philological descriptions of the words in question. In the case of Hittite, such descriptions are not available for the whole lexicon. The only dictionary that comprises the whole Hittite vocabulary is Friedrich’s Hethitisches Wörterbuch (HW) that dates from 1952-1954, to which three Ergänzungshefte (1957, 1961, 1966) were added. Although this dictionary must be regarded as a milestone in

283 Although I certainly do not claim exhaustiveness for this category.
284 I am aware that this latter category is quite arbitrary.
285 Sturtevant’s A Hittite Glossary (1931, second edition 1936), Tischler’s Hethitsch-Deutsches Wörterverzeichnis (1982) and Tischler’s Hethitische Handwörterbuch (2001) are all mere glossaries: they only cite the stem of a Hittite word with its translation without giving (much) linguistic information.
Hittitology, it is nowadays outdated in some respects: it does not give examples of contexts to illustrate a word’s meaning, it cites forms in bound transcription, often disregarding plene spellings, and it does not give attestation places to all forms cited. Moreover, many more Hittite texts have been published since it appeared, which means that the dictionary is not exhaustive. Fortunately, other dictionary-projects have been started in more recent times that do meet up to the expectations of modern-day Hittitologists. Yet, these are all unfinished. Friedrich Kammenhuber’s *Hethitisches Wörterbuch. Zweite, völlig neubearbeitete Auflage auf der Grundlage der edierten hethitischen Texte* (HW²), which was initiated in 1975, so far comprises a- till ḫaššu- and gives a complete overview of attestations and an extensive semantic treatment (but note that its dating of texts does not follow the *communis opinio*). In preparation to this work Kammenhuber has published *Materialien zu einem hethitischen Thesaurus* (1973 - 1989) that treats the lemmas ẖak⁴ / akk- ‘to die’, šu (conjunction), ta (conjunction), -a- (encl. pers. pron.), eku² / aku- ‘to drink’, dẖa⁴ / d- ‘to take’, šẖkk² / šakk- ‘to know’ and ḫandae²⁷ ‘to arrange’. It contains many attestation places and a detailed semantic description. The *Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (CHD), edited by Güterbock, Hoffner and Van den Hout, first appeared in 1989 and thus far treats lẖa⁴ / l- till =šše. It gives many attestation places and a full semantic treatment, too. Two other works, which are not primarily meant as synchronic dictionaries, do provide philological information as well. Puhvel’s *Hittite Etymological Dictionary* (HED) first appeared in 1984, and up to now has been finished for the letters A - M. It gives many (often all) attestation places and examples of contexts to illustrate the semantics of a word. Tischler’s *Hethitisches etymologisch Glossar* (HEG) falls into two parts. The first part (1977-1983), dealing with the letters A - K, is a mere bibliographical work giving references to etymological treatments of the words cited. The second part (1990-), for which Tischler has received the help of Neumann and Neu, thus far treats the letters L, M, N, P, Ša and T, and gives more philological information (although still not extensively), including forms that are attested on unpublished tablets. A small contribution was Otten’s *Materialen zum hethitischen Lexikon* (1971b = StBoT 15), in which he extensively treats the words beginning with zu-.

All in all, good up-to-date philological treatments exist of the following part of the Hittite lexicon: A, E, Ḥ, I, K, L, M, N, P, Ša, T (but not as extensive as desired) and Zu. This means that the words beginning with Še - Šu, U, Ū and Za - Zi often still lack an extensive synchronic description. In my etymological treatment of the Hittite inherited lexicon, this means that for the words of the first category I often only refer to the works cited above for the synchronic treatment.
(unless I disagree, of course), whereas for words of the second category I will give much more synchronic philological information, including attestations places, contexts and semantics. Because I do not have a card-tray system at my disposal that covers all published Hittite texts, I cannot claim exhaustiveness for these treatments. Nevertheless, on the basis of many treatments of texts and words in the secondary literature and using a collection of computerized transliterations of some 3300 Hittite texts (containing ca 280,000 words)\textsuperscript{286}, which has greatly enhanced the search for forms, attestations places and contexts, I have tried to be as inclusive as possible.

Each lemma is accompanied by grammatical information (the classification of the verbal system is elaborately treated in chapter 2.2), a translation, its corresponding sumerogram and/or akkadogram (if applicable), all attested spellings known to me (which are dated when relevant: note that if a certain form is attested in texts from different periods, usually only the oldest dating is mentioned), inner-Hittite derivatives and cognates, cognates in the other Anatolian languages, a Proto-Anatolian reconstruction (if possible), cognates in the non-Anatolian Indo-European languages, a Proto-Indo-European reconstruction (if possible), and, finally, an elaborate philological and etymological discussion.

In the treatment of cognates from the other Anatolian languages, I have tried to include all attested forms, for which I have used the following sources: for Palaic, the vocabulary in Carruba 1970; for CLuwian Melchert’s \textit{Cuneiform Luwian Lexicon} (1993a); for HLuwian I have cited words as transliterated in Hawkins’ \textit{Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions} (2000); for Lycian I have used Melchert’s \textit{A Dictionary of the Lycian Language} (2004a); and for Lydian Gusmani’s \textit{Lydisches Wörterbuch} (1964).

Note that in alphabetization the sequence -uya- is regarded as -u- + -ya- + -a-, so e.g. \textit{duyna}-\textsuperscript{21} / duya- follows M\textsc{munus} /duttarijata/i- and precedes tuzzi-.

\textsuperscript{286} Kindly provided to me by prof. Tischler, for which I am very grateful.
A

-a: see aši / uni / ini

-a, -ā (all.sg.-ending)

PIE *-o

The allative answers the question ‘to where’ and is a living case in the OH and MH period only. Its ending is either -a or -ā. The difference between the two is clearly a matter of accentuation, compare a-aš-ka /rāskal/ ‘gate’, ḫa-me-eš-ḫa-an-da /HmēsHantal/, lu-li-ja /nūlia/ ‘pond’, ne-e-pl-ša /nēbisal/ ‘heaven’, šu-ḫe-ḫa /sōHal/ ‘roof’ vs. iš-ša-a /išsā/ ‘mouth’, ki-iš-ra-a /kiSrā/ ‘hand’, ta-ak-na-a /tnā/ ‘earth’ (all OS attestations). On the basis of the fact that pa-ra-a /prāl/, an original allative of the paradigm to which perun and parza belong as well, can be compared directly to Gr. πός, Skt. prá-, Lat. pró- and Goth. fra-, which all point to *pró, I assume that the allative-ending has to be reconstructed as *-o.

-a (nom.-acc.pl.n.-ending)

PIE *-eh₂

The nom.-acc.pl.-form of neuter nouns and adjectives can be formed in several ways (cf. Gertz 1982: 270ff.). First, we encounter the ending -a, which seems to originally belong in a-stem nouns (e.g. ša-a-ku-ya (OS) from šāku-ya- ‘eye’), stems in *-t- (a-ni-ja-at-ta (OS) from anijatt- ‘work, task’), stems in -nt- (e.g. a-mi-ja-an-ta (OH/MS) from amijant- ‘small’, ḫu-u-ma-an-ta (OS) from ḫumant- ‘all’) and -i- and u-stem adjectives (e.g. a-aš-ša-u-ya from āššu- /āšṣay- ‘good’, ħar-ga < *ḫarkāja from ḥarki- /ḥarkai- ‘white’, šu-up-pa (OS) < *šuppāja from
śuppi- / šuppai- ‘clean’). In stems in resonants, we see introduction of the lengthened grade (e.g. ḥarša-a-a-ar (OS) from ḥaršar / ḥaršn- ‘head’, ḥu-i-ta-a-ar (OS) from ḥuitar / ḥuin- ‘game, wild animals’, ḥa-aš-ta-a-i from ḥaštai- / ḥaštî- ‘bone’, ū-i-ta-a-ar (OS) from yātar / yītin- ‘water’). In stems in -r and -l we occasionally find an ending -i, for which see its own lemma. In the u-stem noun āštu- ‘goods, possessions’, we find a nom.-acc.pl. a-aš-šu-u which must stand for lāšol, showing /-Col/ < *-Cuh₂ (cf. § 1.4.8.2.b). Note that in other neuter u-stem nouns, we find the ending -a, e.g. ge-en-zu-u-qa (OH/NS) from genzu- ‘lap’, which clearly must be an innovation. If my interpretation of the pronominal nom.-acc.pl.n.-forms =e, a-pē-e, ke-e and ku-e as reflecting *-ih₂, showing a lowering of *-Cih₂ to /-Cel/ comparable to the lowering visible in *-Cuh₂ > /-Col/, is correct, we would expect that in neuter i-stem nouns the nom.-acc.pl.n.-ending is -e as well. Unfortunately, no nom.-acc.pl.-forms of neuter i-stem nouns are to my knowledge attested in OS or MS texts. We do find a nom.-acc.pl.n.-form par-ku-e (MH/MS), however, from the i-stem adjective parkui- / parkuyai- ‘clean’ (instead of expected parkuya < parkuyaja, which is attested as well), which may show the reality of the ending -e < *-ih₂.

As we already saw, I reconstruct the ending *Cu-u in neuter u-stem nouns as *-Cuh₂ and the ending *Ce-e in pronominal stems and possibly in parkue as *-Ci-h₂, both showing the neuter nom.-acc.pl.-ending *-h₂ as attested in the other IE languages as well (e.g. Skt. -i, Gr. -α, Lat. -ā). The Hittite ending -a must go back to *-eh₂, however, because in word-final position after consonant *-h₂ would regularly drop, cf. *mēgh₂ > Hitt. mēk ‘much, many’. This *-eh₂ is also visible in Lyc. -a, Skt. -ā, OCS -a and Goth. -a. See Prins (1997: 221f.) for a treatment of this *-eh₂.

-a (3sg.pres.midd.-ending); see -a(ri)

=a ‘and, too’; see =(j)’a

=a ‘but’; see =(m)’a

=a (enclitic pronoun) ‘he, she, it’: nom.sg.c. =aš (e.g. n=a-aš (OS), t=a-aš (OS), ñ=a-aš (OS), na-aš-m=a-aš (OS), ku-ii-ma-a-n=a-aš (OS), a-ki=aš (OS)), acc.sg.c. =an (e.g. n=a-an (OS), t=a-an (OS), ñ=a-an (OS), na-at=t=a-an (OS), tar-na-a-i=m=a-an (OS), ḥar-ga-nu-mi=a-n (NH)), nom.-acc.sg.n. =at (e.g. n=a-at (OS), t=a-at (OS), ku-i-s=a-at (OS), SIG=an-ta-ri=a-at (OS)), dat.sg. =šše, =šši (e.g. nu-u=šš-e (OS), ta-a=šš-e (OS), an-da=ma-a=šš-e (OS), nu-u=šši
(MH/MS)), nom.pl.c. =e (e.g. n=ê (OS), t=ê (OS), ñ=ê (OS), t=e-e=t-ta (OS)), =at (n=a-at (OH/MS)), acc.pl.c. =uš (n=u-uš (OS), t=u-uš (OS), ñ=u-uš (OS), par-ta-û-ni-t=u-uš (OS), na-ah-mi=uš (MH/NS)), =aš (NS), nom.-acc.pl.n. =e (n=e (OS)), =at (young), dat.pl. =šmaš (nu-u=š-ma-aš (OS), ta-a=š-ma-aš (OS), GU-n=a-a=š-ma-aš (OS), ma-a-an=ša-ma-aš (OS), nom-ma=ma-a=ša-ma-aš (OS), na-at-ta=ša-ma-aš (OS), ḫal-ki-îš=(š)ma-aš (MH/MS)).


This enclitic pronoun is part of the sentence initial particle chain and occupies the penultimate slot therein, just before the locatival enclitic particles (=a)n, (=a)p(a), =ašta, =kkan and =ššan. It is only attested in the cases nominative, accusative and dative. It is clear that nom.sg.c. =aš, acc.sg.c. =an and nom.-acc.sg.n. =at must reflect *-os, *om and *-od respectively, whereas nom.pl.c. =e, acc.pl.c. =uš and nom.-acc.pl.n. =e must reflect *-oi, *-oms and *-ih2 (for which see at kā-/ kū-/ ki-). Therewith it clearly reflects the pronominal endings as also found in apû̄ / apû. The dative-forms stand somewhat apart since they do not seem to go back to pronominal endings. Dat.sg. =šše probably reflects *-sōi which must be compared to the enclitic pers.pronouns *moi ‘to me’ and *toi ‘to thee’. Already within the OH period it is replaced by =šši in analogy to the nominal dat.-loc.sg.-ending -i. The analysis of dat.pl. =šmaš is less clear. It seems to show the dat.-loc.pl.-ending -aš attached to an element -šm- that is also visible in the enclitic possessive =šm-/ =šma- / =šme-.

Note that alleged nom.pl.c. =i in ma-a-n=i=za (KBO 6.2 iii 7 (OS)) is not necessarily linguistically real. This particle chain may have to be read ma-a-n=ê=za (so reading the sign NI as ū), with the normal nom.pl.c.-form =e.

According to Puhvel (HED 1/2: 6), there are some OH contexts in which we find acc.sg.c. =un instead of normal =an. As examples he cites ū-ku-un (KBO 8.42 obv. 7) ‘I ... him’ and mu-un-na-pal (KBO 12.63 ii 5). These forms are problematic, however. The first form is damaged and actually reads =
ű-ku-x-za, where of the damaged sign only one head of a wedge is visible. Apparently, Puhvel reads ű-kw-[u]n = uk=un, but a reading ű-kw-[uš]-za = uk=us=za is equally possible.

The context of the second form is quite broken:

KBo 12.63 ii (with additions from KBo 12.18 i 5-9)
(1) k[ũ]-[ša-a-pi-it UD-at]
(2) LUGAL-ṣe-[zī]-[jā]-[x - x - x]
(3) š=an=z=a-p[(a a-aš-šu)]
(4) šu-u-ya-a-[t-te-en]
(5) nu-u[n]-[a-p][a’ (a-aš-šu)]
(6) šu-u-ya-at-[l(e)-en]
(7) ḫu-uh-ḥa-aš=m[(i-iš a-iš)]
(8) URUZa-[(a)]l-[pa2(-)] x - x - x - x]
(9) n=a-[(an ke-er=te-et tu-uš-ga-x] x - x]

‘On the day that [he] be[comes] king, you (pl.) must fill him up with goods. You (pl.) must fill QXQQDS [D] up with goods. My grandfather […] the mouth […] the city Z[a][pa…]. Your (sg.) heart [will] please him’.

If ša-an-za-pa in line 3 is to be analysed as a sentence initial chain š=an=za=apa, then it is possible that we should interpret nu-un-na-p[a’] as containing =apa as well. Whether nun=n then is to be analysed as n=um remains unclear to me. Note that geminate -nm- would then be unexpected. All in all, I would at this point not dare to postulate a variant =un besides acc.sg.c. =an.

ā-(m) ‘to be hot’; see ā(i).ā(m) / i-

-ahh-1 (‘factitive’-suffix)

Verbs that display the suffix -ahh- are often called ‘factitive’ since they denote ‘to make x’ in which x = the noun from which they are derived. For instance, šuppi- ‘pure’ and šuppijähh-1 ‘to make pure’, neya- ‘new’ and neyahh-1 ‘to make new’, dašuγant- ‘blind’ and dašuγahh-1 ‘to make blind’, etc. It should be noted that -ahh- is a denominal suffix only: we never find verbs in -ahh- that are derived from a verbal stem. In the oldest texts, verbs in -ahh- inflect according to the hi-conjugation (3sg.pres.act. -ah-hi (OS)), but in NH times, we find mi-inflected forms like 1sg.pres.act. -ah-mi, 3sg.pres.act. -ah-zi, etc. In 1sg.pres.act.,
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the combination of the suffix -\textit{abh}- with the ending -\textit{hhi} is predominantly spelled -\textit{abhhi}. A spelling -\textit{ah\textasciitilde{h}a\textasciitilde{h}i} occurs twice only, namely [...]x-\textit{ah\textasciitilde{h}a-ah\textasciitilde{h}i} (KBo 17.25 rev. 5 (OS)) and \textit{ha-ap\textasciitilde{p}-na-ah\textasciitilde{h}a-ah\textasciitilde{h}i} (KUB 41.32 rev. 10 (OH/NS)).

The 1sg.pret.act.-form to my knowledge is always spelled -\textit{ah-hu-un}: I do not know of any spellings **-\textit{ah-ha-ah-hu-un}.

On the basis of the word equation \textit{n\textasciitilde{e}yang\textasciitilde{h}i} ‘to renew’ with Lat. nov\textasciitilde{a}re ‘to renew’ and Gr. ν\textasciitilde{ε}λλο to plough up’, it is generally thought that the suffix -\textit{ah\textasciitilde{h}}- must be of PIE origin and reflects *\textit{-eh}-. So, \textit{n\textasciitilde{e}yang\textasciitilde{h}i} < *\textit{n\textasciitilde{e}yeh}-. Why the factitives in -\textit{ah\textasciitilde{h}}- ended up in the h\textit{i}-conjugation is unclear to me. Note that they differ from normal h\textit{i}-conjugating verbs in -\textit{ah\textasciitilde{h}}- in the sense that these show an alternation -\textit{h}r/-\textit{h}hr (n\textit{\textasciitilde{e}}h\textit{r}i / n\textit{\textasciitilde{e}}h\textit{hr}i, z\textit{\textasciitilde{e}}h\textit{r}i / z\textit{\textasciitilde{e}}h\textit{hr}i), whereas factitives in -\textit{ah\textasciitilde{h}}- have geminate -\textit{h\textasciitilde{h}}- throughout, also in 3sg.pret.act. -\textit{ahhhi}. This is due to the fact that normal h\textit{i}-verbs have *\textit{\textasciitilde{h}}i in the singular, which lenites the following *\textit{\textasciitilde{h}}r, whereas the factitives have *\textit{-eh}-.

\textit{-ai} (dat.-loc.sg.-ending): see -i

\textit{\textasciitilde{a}i} / -i- (IIIa > IIIb) ‘to be hot’: 3sg.pres.midd. a-\textit{a-ri} (KUB 20.88 rev. 21 (OH/MS)), a-\textit{ri} (KBo 5.1 iii 52 (MH/NS), KBo 13.167 ii 8, iii 7 (NS), KUB 17.28 iv 39 (MH/NS), ABoT 7+ iii 42 (MH/NS), HT 1 i 49 (MH/NS), KBo 29.70 obv. 13 (MS), KBo 24.95 rev. 7 (NS)), 3pl.pres.midd. a-\textit{a-an-ta} (VBoT 58 i 24 (OH/NS)), 3sg.pret.midd. a-\textit{i-it-ta-at} (KBo 42.6 obv. 7 (NS)); part. a-\textit{a-an-t} (OS), a-\textit{an-t} (OS).

Derivatives: i\textit{nu\textasciitilde{z}i} (lb2) ‘to make hot, to fry’ (3sg.pres.act. i\textit{nu-uz-zi}, 3pl.pres.act. i\textit{nu-an-zi}, i\textit{nu-ya-an-zi}, 2pl.imp.act. i\textit{nu-ut-te-en} (OS); impf. i\textit{nu-\textasciitilde{u}u\textasciitilde{z}eke-\textit{a}-), a\textit{\textasciitilde{n}e\textasciitilde{g}ai\textasciitilde{e}} (lb2) ‘to become hot (?)’ (3pl.pres.act. a-\textit{i-\textasciitilde{g}a-\textasciitilde{an}-zi} (KUB 29.55 ii 2, KUB 29.44 ii 6, iii 5)).

PIE *\textit{\textasciitilde{h}e\textasciitilde{h}i-i-o-ri, \textit{\textasciitilde{h}i}\textit{h}i\textit{\textasciitilde{h}i-neu-}??

See HW\textsuperscript{2} A: 44f. for attestations. For a good interpretation of this verb, we should first look at its causative, \textit{invu\textasciitilde{z}i}. This causative often is cited as \textit{en\textasciitilde{u}2} as well (e.g. Puhvel HED 1/2: 11; HW\textsuperscript{2} E: 42f.), which is done only on the basis of two attestation showing a spelling e-\textit{nu-}. As I show at the lemma \textit{en\textasciitilde{u}2}, these forms are unclear regarding their interpretation and cannot be used as an argument in favour of the view that originally the causative of this verb was \textit{en\textasciitilde{u}-}, with \textit{invu-} being a reduced spelling of it. All secure forms of the causative show a spelling with i- only, including the OS attestation i-\textit{nu-ut-te-en}. Similarly, the alleged
connection with and meaning ‘to become hot’ of the once attested verb *enuma-
(q.v.) should be abandoned.

The verb shows interesting spellings with hyper-plene from OS texts onwards
(3sg.pres.midd. a-a-ri, 3pl.pres.midd. a-a-an-ta and part. a-a-an-t-), which in the
course of time are replaced by ‘normal’ plene spellings (3sg. a-ri and part. a-an-
t-). This could indicate that the original forms used to contain a hiatus, OH /lāārī/,
lāṇtal, lāānt-, which was lost in the younger period, yielding /ārī/, /āntal/ and
/lānt-/ . The fact that the causative of this verb shows a stem i- (which must be
zero-grade) highly indicates that a-a-ri reflects *āū-o-ri vel sim., in which form
the loss of intervocalic *i yielded hiatus. The assumption of a stem *āū- makes
way to a connection with the scarcely attested verb ajiśš- that then could be
interpreted as a fientive aji-āūš 2i ‘to become hot’. Another form that shows a stem
a- may be 3sg.pret.midd. a-i-it-ta-at in KBo 42.6 obv.’ (6) [...]x=mu A-mar-met
a-i-it-ta-at, if this means ‘my water was warm’. Because of this ajiūš 2 2i and
ajiit-ta-(= lāāntal ?), I have decide to cite the basic verb as *āū(i)- 3i / i- here.

The stem *āū(i)-/i-/ often is connected with Gr. aīko, aīkopu and Skt. āndāhī
‘entzundet’. These forms clearly derive from *h2eīd-3i, however, which cannot be
cognate to the Hittite forms.

In principle, Hittite middle verbs either show zero-grade in the root (e.g. tukkāri
< *tuk-ū) or e-grade (e.g. ēširi < *h1ēh3-s-o). In this case, āū- must reflect full-
grade because inu- shows the zero-grade stem. The stem āū- can only go back to a
form with e-grade if it contained either *h2 or *h3. As *h2 would have remained in
initial as well as intervocalic position (or, when in *Vh2V would have given V1V,
like tāēzzī < *teh2jēti), the root must contain *h3. As *h3 yields Hitt. h- in initial
position when preceding *e, the only possible root structure is *h1ēh3-i-. This
would mean that a-a-ri = lāāntal/ reflects *h1ēh3-i-o-ri, and inu- < *h1ēh3-i-neu-
Note that the first form shows that *Vh2jV > OH /NVV/, and not */ViV/ and that
the second form shows that *h1ēh3-i- > Hitt. i- and not */hī-. Unfortunately, this
reconstruction is based on internal evidence only. To my knowledge there are no
other IE languages that show reflexes of a root *h1ēh3-i-.

aikayartanna (adv.) ‘for one turn’: a-i-ka-yā-ar-ta-an-na (KBo 3.5 i 17, 22).

This word is a loan through Hurrian from Pre-Indic *aika- ‘one’ and *yartana-
‘turn’, compare Skt. éka- and vártana-.

aiš / īš- (n.) ‘mouth’ (Sum. KAXU, Akk. PÜ); nom.-acc.sg.n. a-i-š (OS), a-iš,
acc.sg.c.(?) KAXU-an (KBo 5.1 iv 4 (MH/NS)), gen.sg. iš-ša-aš (KUB 24.13 ii 5,
25 (MH/NS), dat.-loc.sg. iš-ši-ši, iš-ši-ši=š-ši, a-i-iš-ši (KBo 8.75, 6 (MH/NS)), all.sg. iš-ša-a=š-ša (OS), iš-ša (KBo 3.38 obv. 4 (OH/NS), KBo 13.100, 7 (NS)), instr. iš-ši-ši (KUB 31.135 obv. 11 (OH/NS), KBo 9,106 iii 3 (MH/NS)), abl. iš-ša-as (OS), iš-ša-a-as, acc.pl.c. KAXtuHILÂ-uš (KUB 14.4 ii 10 (NH)), dat.-loc.pl. iš-ša-aš (KUB 43.68 rev. 9 (NS)).

Derivatives: iššali- (n.) ‘spittle’ (nom.-acc.sg. iš-ša-al-li, erg.sg.? iš-ša-al-la-an-za (KBo 13.1 iv 3)).

Anat. cognates: CLuw. āšš- (n.) ‘mouth’ (nom.-acc.sg. a-a-šš-ša, -ant-der. nom.-acc.pl.n. a-a-šš-ša-an-ta (cf. Starke 1990: 100)), āšša- ‘to speak (?)’ (3sg.pret.act. a-aš-ša-at-ta); HLuw. āšasa- ‘to speak’ (3sg.pres.act. á-ašš-ša-ia (KARATEPE 1 §42, §48) á-sarza-ia (MARAŞ 14 §11, SULTANHAN §34), 3sg.pret.act. á-sarza-ta (TELL AHMAR 5 §11, KAYSERI §20), 2sg.imp.act. á-sar-za (ASSUR letter a §1, b §1, c §1, d §1, e §1, feg §1); part.nom.sg.c. á-sarza-mi-i-sá (KARKAMIŞ A7a §14)).

IE cognates: Skt. ās-, Av. āhr-, Lat. ās, OIr. ā ‘mouth’.

PIE *h₁eh₁-es-

See HW² A: 48f. for attestations. Although already since the beginning of Hittitology (e.g. Pedersen 1938: 47) this word is connected with Skt. ās-, Av. āhr-, Lat. ās, etc. ‘mouth’, its exact formal interpretation is unclear. It is generally assumed that ašš/ašš- originally was an s-stem and therewith would be, together with nēpiš ‘heaven’, one of the two neuter s-stems that are attested in Hittite. It is generally thought that in early PIE, neuter s-stems inflected proterodynamically and show the inflection nom.-acc.sg. *CéC-s, gen.sg. *CC-és-s, which possibly already in PIE was modified to *CéC-os, *C(e)C-és-os (cf. Schindler 1975b: 264-7). Such a paradigm would indeed fit the Hittite word for ‘heaven’: nom.-acc.sg. nēpiš, gen.sg. nēpiššaš then would show generalization of the suffix-syllable *-es of the oblique cases into the nominative (replacing *-os) and generalization of the accentuation of the nominative into the oblique cases (for a detailed treatment, see at the lemma nēpiš). For ‘mouth’, it is much more difficult to trace the attested forms back to the reconstructed paradigms.

It is commonly assumed that the word for ‘mouth’ must be reconstructed as *HeH-es-. Because of the o in Lat. āš-, it is likely that at least one of the laryngeals is *h₁. Since initial *h₁ in front of *e would yield Hitt. ā- (cf. Kloeckhorst fthc.c), we have to reconstruct *h₁eh₁-es-. From a PIE point of view, we would expect this word to show an inflection *h₁éh₁-s, *h₁h₁-és-s, later replaced by *h₁éh₁-os, *h₁(e)h₁-és-os.
The regular outcome of nom.-acc.sg. *h₁éh₂-os would be Hitt. **āš. The fact that instead we find Hitt. aiš could easily be explained by assuming a secondary generalization of the suffix-syllable *-es- out of the oblique stems, just as has happened in *néb₃-es >> *néb₄-es > Hitt. nēpiš ‘heaven’. It should be noted that this generalization must have taken place after the colouration of *e to *o due to an adjacent *h₁. This scenario would only work if the oblique cases show the form *h₁h₁-és-, but although this is the situation as expected from PIE, it is not what we find in Hittite. Forms like dat.-loc.sg. iššē, all.sg. iššā, abl. iššaz all seem to show a hysterodynamic inflection with accentuation of the ending. Some scholars, e.g. Rieken (1999a: 186), just simply assume that the preform *HH-és-V regularly yields pre-Hitt. *és-V which then with a secondary shift of accentuation becomes *es-V, in which unaccentuated *e becomes Hitt. i, but this does not explain the presence of geminate -ēś- in išš-‘. This geminate can only be explained as the product of assimilation, and in this case only *-Hs- is thinkable (cf. Melchert 1994a: 116). So the oblique cases išš-‘ can only be explained by a reconstruction *h₁h₁-s-‘, which points to a hysterodynamic paradigm.

So the situation is as follows. Of the paradigm aiš / išš- the nom.-acc.sg. can only be explained if we reconstruct a protoerodynamic paradigm *h₁éh₂-(a)s, *h₁h₁-(a)s, whereas the oblique cases išš-‘ can only be explained from a hysterodynamic paradigm *h₁éh₁-s, *h₁h₁-s-ós. It therefore may be best to quote Melchert (1994a: 115), who states that “no historical account [of aiš / išš-] satisfying to everyone yet seems possible”.

āk-‘ / akk- (IIa2) ‘to die, to be killed; to be eclipsed (of sun and moon: Sum. UG₃): 1sg.pres.act. a-ak-mi (KUB 40.33 obv. 23 (NS)), ak-mi (KUB 24.5 + 9.13 obv. 16 (NS)), 2sg.pres.act. a-ak-ti (KBo 7.14+ ii 6 (OS)), ak-ti (KUB 8.63 i 3 (NS), KUB 23.1 ii 36 (NH), KUB 36.57 iii 8 (MH/NS)), 3sg.pres.act. a-ki (OS, often), 1pl.pres.act. ak-ku-e-ni (KUB 17.1 ii 18 (NS)), ak-ku-u-e-ni (KUB 17.1 ii 24 (NS)), 2pl.pres.act. a-ak-te-ni KBo 3.23 rev. 4 (OH/NS)), 3pl.pres.act. ak-kän-zi (OS), 3sg.pret.act. a-ak-ki-š (KBo 6.2 iv 3 (OS)), a-ak-ki-[iš] (KBo 3.46 obv. 34 (OH/NS)), ak-ki-š (KBo 3.46 obv. 48 (OH/NS)), a-ki-š (KBo 3.34 ii 12 (OH/NS), KBo 3.36 obv. 18 (OH/NS)), ak-ta (KUB 5.9 obv. 26 (NS), KUB 13.3 iii 35 (OH/NS), KUB 31.121a ii 11 (NH)), ag-ga-š (VBoT 1, 24 (MH/MS)), 2pl.pret.act. a-ak-te-en (KUB 14.14 obv. 36 (NH)), 3pl.pret.act. a-ker (OS), a-ker (KBo 3.38 rev. 22 (OH/NS)), e-ker (NH), e-ke-er (NH), 1sg.imp.act. ak-kal-lu (KUB 14.1 rev. 94 (MH/MS)), 2sg.imp.act. a-ak, 3sg.imp.act. a-ku, ak-du, 2pl.imp.act. a-ak-te-en (KUB 14.1 + KBo 19.38 obv. 40 (MH/MS)), 3pl.imp.act.
ak-kân-du; part. ak-kân-t, ag-ga-an-t-, ak-ka-ra-an-t-, a-ag-ga-an-t-; impf. ak-ki-išt-ke/-a-, ak-kišt-ke/-a-, ak-ke-ešt-ke/-a-


PIE *₇h₂jok-ei, *₇h₂j-énti

See HW² A: 51f. for attestations. The original paradigm must have been *ągi-, ąkti, aki, akkueni, *akteni, akkanzi, standing for ToDevice Háki, ?ákti, ?ági, ?kueni, ?kténi, ?kán’ti. A stem -ek- is only found in 3pl.pret.act. eker, which is attested in NH texts only. This form is secondarily created besides 3pl.pres. akkanzi on the basis of analogy to 3pl.pres. ašanzi: 3pl.pret. ešer.

The alternation -k- vs. -kk- in 3sg. aki: 3pl. akkanzi must be due to lention of an original intervocalic voiceless velar due to *ō in the singular form. This points to a reconstruction *Hól’-ei, *Hól’-énti. Although all three laryngeals would be neutralized to ToDevice Há in front of *o, a reconstruction with *h₂- is not likely as this phoneme would have been preserved in the weak stem (ToDevice *hakkantzi), on the basis of which the h- probably would have been reintroduced in the strong stem (but compare aw² / u²). As both *₇h₁ and *₇h₂ would be neutralized in front of *o and would get lost before consonant (see Kloekhorst fth.c), after which the neutralized laryngeal would be reintroduced in the weak stem yielding /HK:/, we can set up a reconstruction *₇h₁jek’ for this root. The only possible cognate I have been able to find is Skt. áka- ‘pain’, Av. a₇ka- (adj.) ‘bad, evil’, (m.) ‘suffering’. If this is correct, we are dealing with a root *₇h₁jek-. Eichner (1973: 83) Unconvincingly suggests a connection with Skt. áśv-, Gr. ἄκος ‘fast, quickly’ through an intermediate meaning ‘dahingschwunden sein’.


Derivatives: (NA)akuyant (adj.) ‘covered with sea-shells’ (acc.pl.c. a-ku-ya-an-du-uš (KUB 35.84 ii 4)).

See HW² A: 53 for attestations. Since Laroche (1957a: 25-6) this word is usually translated ‘stone’ (HW²: “Stein”; Puhvel (HED 1/2: 24): “stone”), but Hoffner (1978: 245) convincingly argues for a meaning ‘sea-shell’. On the basis of the translation ‘stone’, Laroche had suggested an etymological connection with the
PIE root *h₂ekʷ- ‘sharp’, but, apart from the formal difficulties, this proposal has now become semantically implausible.

The OS attestation *a-ku-uŧušš-[a(-)]... (KBo 19.156 obv. 17) sometimes is interpreted as acc.pl. akūšš=[a(-)]... (e.g. Puhvel l.c.), but since the context in which it occurs is quite broken, its meaning or function cannot be independently determined.


PIE *h₁gʷh₁-dʰlo-

This word is attested only twice in duplicate texts:

KUB 2.13 i
(8) Ḡ TU.ḪUB a-ku-ga-al-li-it KÙ.BABBAR ya-a-tar
(9) pé-e-da-i LUGAL-uš=za QA-TI=SU a-ar-ri

‘The deaf man brings water in a silver a. The King washes his hands’,

whereas KUB 9.20, 5 has a-ku-ta-al-li-it. It is likely that the form with GA is incorrect since the sign GA (翯) can easily be explained as an error for the sign TA (𐤂𐤀) through omission of the vertical wedge. If akutalla- is the correct form, it could reflect *h₁gʷh₁-dʰlo-, containing the root *h₁gʷh₁- ‘to drink’ (see eku- / aku-) and the PIE instrument-suffix *-dʰlo- / *-dʰlo-.


According to Puhvel (HED 1/2: 29) the word is a compound of Sem. allan- (Akk. allənu, Hebr. ‘allən ‘oak’) and Hitt. ʧəru- ‘wood’ (q.v.).


Derivatives: alparama- ‘cloudiness, clouddeck’ (instr. al-pa-ra-mi-it (KBo 3.21 ii 20)).
See HW² A: 60 for attestations. All attestations of this word are in NS texts. Often, this word is connected with Lat. *albus* `white’ and Gr. ἀλβος `dull white leprosy’ as first proposed by Mudge (1931: 252). Not only formally this connection is difficult (*h₂elbʰ*o- should have given Hitt. **h₂alpa-**), semantically it is as well, as was pointed out by Puhvel (HED 1/2: 38): alpa- is predominantly associated with rain and thunder, and therefore an original meaning `whiteness’ is unlikely. The formal difficulty is resolved by some scholars through the assumption of a PIE phoneme *h₂₁, which would be a-colouring, but not giving ḳ in Hittite: *h₂elbʰ*o-. Yet, to my mind, the connection is semantically too weak to base a new PIE phoneme on. Unfortunately, I have no better IE etymology for this word. The form alpa²^HIA_ is regarded by some as a ‘collective’ in *-eh₂ besides the normal plural in *-es, which is unattested for this word.

*alpant*- (adj.) ‘?': nom.sg. al-pa-an-za (KUB 7.1 i 1, 39), a-al-pa-a-an-za (KUB 30.48, 3), nom.-acc.sg.n. al-pa-a-an (KBo 24.40 obv. 8, KBo 25.163 v 11).

See HW² A: 60f. for attestations. This adjective is used to describe a ‘child’ in KUB 7.1 i (1) ma-a-an DUMU-la-aš (2) al-pa-an-za na-aš-ma-a=š-ši=kàn ga-ra-a-ti-eš a-da-an-te-eš `if a child is a or his innards are eaten’; ibid. (39) nu ku-iš DUMU-aš al-pa-an-za na-aš-ma-a=š-ši=kàn ga-ra-a-te-eš a-da-an-te-eš (40) n=a-an tu-i-ik-ku-uš iš-ga-ah-ḫi ‘Whatever child is a or his innards are eaten, I will salve his limbs’. Twice it is used describing ‘cheese’: KBo 25.163 v (11) ... 10 GA.KIN.AG al-pa-a-a[n] (11) 10 GA.KIN.AG TUR ‘ten a. cheeses and ten small cheeses’; KBo 24.40 obv.³ (7) ... I GA[.KIN.AG] (8) al-pa-a-an GIBPES ta-an-ḫa-ri-iš-[š=a] ‘... one a. cheese, a fig and r.’. On the basis of these contexts it is not possible to determine what alpant- denotes exactly. In the case of the child, it seems to refer to the illness of the child, but such a connotation would not fit the cases where the word refers to cheese. We may have consider the possibility that we are dealing with two separate words.

If we disregard the use with ‘cheese’, Götze’s (1928: 112) assumption that *alpant- is a mere variant of alyant- ‘bewitched’ seems to make sense semantically (followed in e.g. HW² (l.c.): “behex”). Formally, this is difficult, however, as the stem for ‘bewitched’ is not alyant-, but alyamz- (q.v.).

Puhvel (HED 1/2: 39) proposes a meaning ‘swooned, weak, mild’, which he predominantly seems to have chosen on the basis of a presumed etymological tie-in with Lith. *alpti* ‘to swoon’, *alpiš* ‘weak’ etc. Although a meaning ‘swooned’ would fit the first contexts, a development to a meaning ‘mild’ (of cheese) seems far-fetched to me.
All in all, I would rather wait for more attestations of this word before speculating what its meaning could be.

_alpu- (adj.) ‘pointed’: nom.-acc.sg. _al- _pu._


See HW² A: 61 for attestations. The semantics of this word are in debate. It occurs together with _dampa-_ and it is clear that as a pair the words must denote ‘blunt’ and ‘pointed’, but it is not generally accepted which one is which. Güterbock (1988: 170), claims, after a long discussion in which the derivatives _alpuemar_ and _alpuēši_ are treated as well, that _alpu-_ must mean ‘pointed’ (and _dampa-_ therefore ‘blunt’, q.v.). This view is followed by Hamp (1989), as well, who states that _u_-adjectives always show zero-grade and that _alpu-_ therefore must be reconstructed as *lpu, which he connects with Welsh _lym_, Breton _lem_ ‘sharp’ < *lp- _s-mo_. Although Hamp’s claim that _u_-stem adjectives have zero-grade would fit for e.g. _parku- ‘high’ < *berah₂- _u_, it does not for e.g. _tēpu- ‘little’ < *dēbh₂- _u_, and therefore a reconstruction *lp- _u_ is, though possible, not obligatory.

Puhvel’s proposal to connect _alpu- with Lith. _alpis_ ‘weak’ (1975: 61) is based on a translation ‘blunt’ (following Riemschneider 1961: 25-6), and therefore cannot be maintained anymore (despite its recent revival by Rieken 1999a: 373).

The exact formation of _alpuemar_ is unclear to me.

-allu (1sg.imp.act.-ending): see _-llu_

_alyanz- (stem) ‘being bewitched, affected by sorcery’ (Sum. _UH_2).

See HW² A: 63f. for attestations. The stem of all these words seems to be *alyanz-, which is problematic because of its -z-. All etymologies that try to explain *alyanz- as a word of IE origin, treat it as if it were a participle *alyant-, but such a stem is never found (then we would expect e.g. **allyantajh- (like majandajh-, mijahjuantajh-) or **allyantqar (like majandatar, mijahuqandatar). The -z- really is inherent to the stem. It therefore is unlikely that the stem is of IE origin.

*aqimijant-* (adj.) 'small': nom.sg.c. *a-mi-ja-an-za* (KUB 17.10 i 38 (OH/MS)), *am-mi-ja-an-za* (KUB 30.16(+)) i 3 (OH/NS), KUB 45.20 ii 15 (NS), nom.-acc.sg.c. *am-me-ja-an-ta'-an* (KUB 45.20 ii 10 (NS)), nom.-acc.sg.n. *am-mi-ja-an* (KUB 43.59 i 9 (MH/NS)), *am-mi-an* (KBo 14.109, 5 (NH)), gen.sg.c. *a-mi-an-ta-aš* (Bo 2689 ii 27 (NS)), nom.pl.c. *a-mi-ja-an-te-eš* (KUB 33.66 iii 13 (OH/MS)), *am-mi-ja-an-te-eš* (KBo 20.82 iii 15 (MH?/NS)), acc.pl.c. *a-mi-ja-an-du-uš* (KBo 12.89 iii 12 (MS)), *a-am-mi-ja-an-tu-uš* (KBo 3.34 ii 28 (OH/NS)), *am-me-ja-an-du-uš* (KBo 12.112 obv. 16 (NS)), nom.-acc.pl.n. *a-mi-ja-an-ta* (KUB 17.10 i 38 (OH/MS)), *am-me-ja-an]-ta* (KUB 33.23 ii 6 (OH/NS)), dat.-loc.pl. *a-mi-ja-an-ta-aš* (KUB 32.123 iii 24 (NS)), *a-am-mi-ja-an-da-aš* (KBo 8.107, 7 (NS)).

Derivatives: **amijanteššar** (n.) 'miniature bread' (a-mi-an-te-eš-šar (KBo 45.106 rev. 9 (MS)), *a-mi-an-te-eš-šar* (KBo 47.100a obv. 5 (MS)), *a-mi-ja-an-te-eš-šar* (KBo 22.193 iv 7 (NS)), *am-mi-ja-an-te-eš-šar* (KBo 22.186 v 8 (NS)), *am-me-ja-an-[e-eš-šar] (KUB 30.32 iv 3 (NS?).

PIE *ₚₙ mh₂-i-ent-

See HW² A: 66f. for attestations. The word is spelled with single -m- as well as geminate -mm-. As all attestations with geminate -mm- are from NS texts only, whereas all MS texts have single -m- it is clear that amijant- is the original form of this word. Apparently, -m- fortitted to -mm- after the MH period (cf. § 1.4.7.1.c). The occasional spelling with a-am-mi- probably is a mixture of the two and does not necessarily imply length of the first a-. The spelling am-me-ja-an- is NS only as well and therefore does not have to be phonologically archaic.

The word is generally seen as the negated form of the participle of the verb *maɪ*- / *mi- 'to grow' (q.v.) (first suggested by Laroche 1967: 174 and Čop 1966-68: 60), which I have explained as reflecting *mh₂-oi- / *mh₂-i-, so amijant- goes back to virtual *ₚₙ-mHi-ent-. It is remarkable, however, that this is the only known
case of the *alpha privans* in Hittite. Note that the NH spelling *amnejan*- cannot be used to reconstruct an *e*-grade formation *-meHl-ent-*, on the basis of which it has been claimed that the root underlying *mai- / mi-* should be *mehii-.*

*ammuk*: see *ük / amm-

-

-an (acc.sg.c.-ending): see -n

-an (nom.-acc.sg.n.-ending of *a*-stems)

PIE *-om*

The ending of the nom.-acc.sg. of neuter *a*-stems is *-an*, which is generally seen as the regular outcome of *-om*. Compare for instance Hitt. *jugan* ‘joke’ that directly corresponds to Skt. *yugām*, Gr. *gyvōv*, Lat. *iugum*, OCS *igo*, Goth. *juk*, etc. < *iugom*.

-an (gen.pl.-ending)

PIE *-om*

The Hittite gen.pl.-ending *-an* occurs predominantly in OH texts. From MH times onwards, it is replaced by *-aš*, and subsequently fell together with the dat.-loc.pl.-ending *-aš*. The ending *-an* clearly must be compared to gen.pl.-endings like Skt. *-ām*, Gr. *-ōv*, Lat. *-um*, Lith. *-ū*, OCS *-b*, Goth. *-e*. Especially on the basis of Skt. *-ām* and Gr. *-ōv*, this ending often is reconstructed as *-ēm*. Kortlandt (1978) convincingly shows that OCS *-b*, Lith. *-ū* as well as OIr. gen.pl. *ferN* all must reflect *-om*, and cannot go back to *-ēm*. He therefore concludes that the PIE gen.pl.-ending was *-om* and that Skt. *-ām* and Gr. *-ōv* must reflect the generalized *o*-stem-variant *-o*-om. This *-om* is the direct predecessor of Hitt. *-an*.

=(a)n (encl. locatival sentence particle)

The locatival sentence particle =*an* is found in OH and MH texts only and is quite rare. Because of its rareness, it is not totally clear whether =*an* behaves like *(a)šta* and =*(a)p*(a) in the sense that its *-a*- drops after a preceding *e* or *i*. The forms *n*[n]=*e*-e=*n* (KBo 17.1 + 25.3 i 20 (OS)) and *n*[n]=*e*-e=*n* (StBoΤ 25.4 i 15 (OS)) seem to show that *-a*- indeed drops after *e*, but the form *nu-u=*š-še=*an* (KBo 6.2 iv 10 (OS), with duplicate *nu-u=*š-ši=*kān* (KBo 6.3 iv 3 (OH/NS))) shows an *-a*- that is preserved after *e*. If however, the particle =*an* behaves
parallel to =(a)šta and = (a)p(a), then it is in complementary distribution with the enclitic pronoun = an 'him', the -a- of which remains after e/i (cf. e.g. ḫar-ga-nu-
mi = an 'I destroy him' (KUB 5.1 iii 56)). Despite the uncertainty I will here cite the particle as = (a)n. When the reflexive particle = z= precedes we cannot see the difference between = (a)n and = ššan. HW^2 A: 70 even states that all cases of MH -za-an have to be interpreted as =z= šan and not as =z= an.

Besides the unclearness of the formal side, the semantic side of the particle is not very clear either. HW^2 A: 69f. suggests that = (a)n has a connotation 'inwards' ("von außen nach innen").

If the semantical range of = (a)n indeed is 'inwards', a connection with PIE *h^en 'in, to' is likely. We may also have to compare the -n in Skt. loc.sg. tásmin (p.c. prof. Kortlandt).

**anna-** (stem) ‘former, old’


In the vocabulary KBo 1.42 iii 33, we find a form an-ni-iš that glosses Akk. [IŠ-TU AN-NI-]š and Sum. GÚ.R[1,TA] ‘that one, the already mentioned one’. Since this form is only attested here, its Sprachwirklichkeit is in debate. For instance, HW^2 A: 81 suggests that an-niš is a “[g]host word, durch akkad. an-niš und heth. annišan ausgelöst”. The words annaz, annal(l)a/i- and annišan are real words, however. Apart from an occasional MS attestation, these words occur in NH texts only. According to HW^2 A: 74 and 81, annaz and annišan replace older karū ‘formerly’, and annal(l)a/i- has taken over the function of karūli: ‘former, older’. It is rightly remarked that “die unregelmäßige Flexion von a(mal(l)a/i-) spricht am ehesten fur ein L[ehn]w[ort]” (l.c.).

Melchert (1994a: 74) incorrectly connects the stem anna- with annišišat ‘today’ (see under šišišat-), and states that anna- must reflect *éno- (with “Cop’s Law”) whereas an- goes back to *óno-. Since anna- clearly denotes ‘former’ and
anišiyat means ‘today’, it is in my view impossible that anna- and ani- are etymologically connected (they have an almost opposite meaning!). See at šiyyat- for a treatment of anišiyat.

anna- (c.) ‘mother’ (Sum. AMA, Akk. UMMU): nom.sg. an-na-aš (OS), acc.sg. an-na-an (OS), gen.sg. an-na-aš, dat.-loc.sg. an-ni, all.sg. an-na, abl. an-na-az, an-na-za, nom.pl. an-ni-iš, acc.pl. an-nu-uš (OS), an-ni-uš (KBo 22.5 obv. 8 (OHNS)).

Derivatives: annijatar / annijann- (n.) ‘motherhood’ (nom.-acc.sg. an-ni-ja-tar, dat.-loc.sg. AMA-an-ni).


PAnat. *Honno-

See HW2 A: 70f. for attestations. Sporadically, we find a stem anni- in Hittite: acc.pl. annius (KBo 22.5 obv. 8) and the derivative annijatar (KUB 15.35 + KBo 2.9 i 31). Perhaps these are Luwianized forms.

The interpretation of the H Luwian form is in dispute. It is hapax in the following context: KARATEPE 1 §3 wa-mu-u DEUS-TONITRUS-hu-za-sa Â-TANA-wa/ia JRRBS MATER-na-ti-na tā-ti-ha i-zi-i-tā [wa=mū Tarhunzas Adamantlya MATER-latin tatin=ha iz qa] ‘Tarhunt made me mother and father over Adamantlya’. We see that, although the translation ‘mother’ is assured, the phonetic interpretation is uncertain. Do we have to assume that the word was anata/i-, an analogic reshaping of older *ana/i- on the basis of tata/i- ‘father’?

Nevertheless, the other Anatolian languages clearly point to a PAnat. *Honno-. It is quite likely that this word is of onomatopoetic origin.
-ānna (inf.II-suffix)
PIE *-āt̪m-o

Despite the fact that this suffix is often spelled without plene -a-, there are enough forms with plene spelling (including MS a-da-a-an-na ‘to eat’, a-ša-a-an-na ‘to sit’, ya-ga-a-an-na ‘to bite’) to suggest that its form was -ānna originally. The suffix -ānna forms an infinitive that is usually called infinitive II in order to distinguish it from infinitive I, which is formed with the suffix -yanzi. Nevertheless, to my knowledge there is no semantic difference between inf.I and inf.II. Just as the suffix -yanzi is a petrified case out of the paradigm of the verbal noun in -yur / -yan-, the suffix -ānna clearly originally must have belonged to the paradigm of the verbal noun in -āur / -ānn- (q.v.). Formally, it can hardly be anything else than an original allative. This means that -ānna must reflect *-āt̪m-o (see at -āur / -ānn- and -a for further etymology).

-anna₂⁻₁⁻ / -anni⁻ (imperfective-suffix)
PIE *CC-otn-ói-ei / *CC-otn-i-énti

In the older literature, this suffix is usually called “durative”, but this should be abandoned. According to Melchert (1998b), stems in -anna/i⁻ are used to express progressive, iterative, durative, distributive and ingressive meaning, “all of which share the feature imperfectivity” (o.c.: 414), and therefore I label this suffix as an “imperfective-suffix”. Melchert has also shown that the stems in -anna/i⁻ are functionally equivalent to stems in -ške/a⁻ and -šš(ə)⁻, and even that “synchronically they function effectively as suppletive allomorphs of a single morphem” (1998b: 414). About the distribution between the three suffixes, Melchert writes that “[a] survey shows that of stems in anmi/a- seven are complementary to -ške/a-, while another ten occur only sporadically (once or twice each) beside regular, productive -ške/a-. There are only two cases of genuine competing stems, in both of which the -anmi/a-stem has become lexicalized: namni/a- ‘to drive’ beside naiške/a-, the imperfective to nai- ‘turn, guide; send’ and walḫamni/a- ‘beat’ (frequentative) beside walḫiške/a-imperfective to walḫ- ‘strike’” (o.c.: 416). The latter statement is not true: namni⁻ / namni- must be regarded as a reduplicated formation of nai⁻⁻ / *ni- (see at nē⁻⁻) and not as a stem in -anna/i⁻, because then we should expect **mianna/i⁻; the imperfective yalḫiške/a⁻ to my knowledge only occurs in NS texts and therewith likely is a secondary creation, which means that yalḫama/i⁻ is the original imperfective to yalḫ⁻⁻. This means that we indeed must reckon with an original
complementary distribution between the suffixes -anna/i-, -ške/a- and -šš(a)-. For the scope of this book it would go too far to elaborate on the question why a certain verb chose a particular one of these three suffixes to express an imperfective meaning, but I can imagine that the answer to it would give us much more insight into the prehistory of the Hittite aspectual system.

The suffix -anna/i- originally inflects according to the mėma/i-class, which means that it shows a strong stem in -anna- besides a weak stem in -anni-, e.g. ijanmay-he, ijanmai vs. ijanmianzi. Like all other mėma/i-verbs, the verbs in -anna/i- are in younger times on the one hand taken over into the tarn(a)-class (ijanmai, ijanmanzi), and on the other into the -je/a-class (ijamianzi). Because mėma/i-verbs are polysyllabic verbs that in pre-Hittite times belonged to the dų/tianzi-class, we must assume that verbs in -anna/i- originally belonged to that class as well and that the suffix therefore in fact was *-anniای / -anni-. This is an important establishment for the etymology of this suffix.

Jasanoff (1983: 74f. and 2003: 122f.) claims that the Hittite suffix -anna/i- should be compared to the Skt. gpbhāvati-type and verbs in -anyā-, the Tocharian present suffix -bh- and the Greek verbs in -anα, for which he reconstructs a special PIE type with a stem *CC-nh2-і-. He nevertheless needs many analogical changes to account for the attested forms, which makes his theoretical juggling incredible. Oettinger (1992b) also connected Htt. -anna/i- with Skt. -anyā-, reconstructing a suffix -enjē-. This is problematic because to my knowledge -enjē- would not yield Hitt. -annija- (with geminate!), let alone end up in the mėma/i-inflection.

As I have stated, the suffix -anna/i- must go back to a pre-Hittite suffix *-annaiای / -ann- that inflects according to the dų/tianzi-class. As I have shown in Kloeckhorst fhc.a, this class reflects a structure *CC-οι- / *CC-і-. In the case of *-annaiय / -anni-, this means that we must analyse it as -annaiय / -anni-. In my view it is very likely that the element -ann- must be compared to the oblique form of the nominal suffix -itur / -im-, which forms deverbal abstract nouns and from which the inf.II-suffix -ĩnma has been derived as well. Note that the plene spelling of e.g. pid-da-a-an-ni-yu-an (KUB 14.1 obv. 74 (MH/MS)) supports this (and is inexplicable in both Jasanoff’s and Oettinger’s views). Although opinions on the preform of the suffix -itur / -im- differ (q.v. for discussion), I reconstruct *-otr Abbott / *-im-, which means that the suffix *-annaiय / -anni- goes back to *-otn-οι- / *-otn-і-.

Note that semantically, a verbal derivation from a deverbal abstract noun fits the imperfective meaning of -anna/i- perfectly. Consider the following line of derivation: the verb iškāर / iškar- ‘to stab’ (*škor- / *škr-) is the source of the
abstract noun *iškarātar / iškarām* - ‘(the act of) stabbing’ (*skr-ōṭr / *skr-ōṁt-*) from which *iškarāna/- / iškarānni- ‘to be (in the act of) stabbing’ (*skr-ōṁt-oi-/ *skr-ōṁ-t-i-*) has been derived. Similarly: the verb *laḥḥiĝ̱aʔ/*’a- ‘to go on an expedition’ (itself a denominal derivative of *laḥḥ- ‘expedition’) is the basis for an abstract noun *laḥḥiĝ̱aʔar / laḥḥiĝ̱aʔm- ‘campaign’ on the basis of which the derivative *laḥḥiĝ̱aʔamna/- / laḥḥiĝ̱aʔamni- ‘to be on a campaign’ is made. Effectively, *laḥḥiĝ̱aʔamna/- serves as the imperfective of *laḥḥiĝ̱aʔa-. Not of all verbs that use the imperfective-suffix *-aʔa/- a corresponding abstract noun in -aʔar / -aʔm- is attested, but this does not invalidate the reconstruction given here.

(MUNIS) annaneka- (c.) ‘sister by the same mother’: acc.pl. *an-na-ne-ku-uš* (OS), *an-na-ni-ku-uš*.

Clearly a compound of *anna- ‘mother’ (q.v.) and *neka- ‘sister’ (q.v.).


Derivatives: *annanuẖa*- (adj.) ‘trained(?)’ (acc.sg.c. *an-na-nu-yə-ẖa-an* (OS)), (KU8) *annanuzzı*- (c.) ‘halter(?)’ (acc.sg. *an-na-nu-μz-[i]-μn* (KBo 6.10+ ii 26), acc.pl. *an-na-nu-μz-μi-uš* (KBo 17.15 rev. 7)), *annanuzzıjan*- (adj.) ‘haltered’ (nom.sg.c. *an-na-nu-[μz-[i]-μ]-an-z* (KBo 17.40 iv 5 (OH/MS)), nom.pl.c. *an-na-nu-μz-μi-[a]-an-te-e[l]̱* (KBo 17.15 rev. 9 (OS))).

PIE *h₂n-neu-?*

See HW² A: 77f. for attestations. The verb and its derivatives are all spelled *anna-nu- and are found from OS texts onwards already.

The adjective *annanuẖa-*, if it really means ‘trained’, shows a suffix -ẖa- which is quite unique in Hittite (the only other possible instance that I know of is *parś̱uḥ̱a-*, an earthenware cup(?) (q.v.), if this word really is derived from (GIS) *parś̱u- ‘leaf, foliage’). The noun (KU8) *annanuzzı- ‘halter(?)’ probably is a normal instrumental noun in -uzzı- derived from *annanu-.*

It is quite likely that *annanu-* originally was a causative in -n-. At first sight it seems to be derived from a verb *anna-*, but such a verb is unknown in Hittite. Semantically, a connection with the verb *anije/a-²* ‘to work, to perform’ (q.v.) is
possible (*to make work’ > ‘to train, to educate’), but the formal side of this connection is difficult: how do we have to interpret the geminate -nm- and the vowel -a- in annamu-?

Although the verb anije/a- < *hyn-je/o- is consistently spelled with a single -n-, its imperfective anmiške/a- always shows geminate -nm-. In my view, this is due to the fact that an original *hyn-ske/o- gave Hitt **aške/a-, after which the -n- was reintroduced with a geminate to prevent it from dropping (a single -n- would synchronically drop in front of any consonant cluster). The causative annamu- in my view is phonologically to be interpreted as /lnnu-/ and therewith comparable to e.g. aš-ša-mu- /śNnu-/ ‘to take care of’ and ša-aš-ša-mu- /śNnu-/ ‘to make sleep’ in the sense that it shows fortition of the root-final consonant due to the following -n-. The reason that annamu- consistently is spelled with an at first sight superfluous -a- (whereas aššamu- and šaššamu- are respectively spelled aš-nu- and ša-aš-nu- as well) lies in the fact that a spelling **an-nu- would be too transparent (it would point to /ʔaNu-/).

If TochAB en- ‘to instruct’ would indeed go back to a causative formation from the root *hyn--, it would show a similar semantic development as annamu-.

(*4) ănarni-: see at inarā-

anašš(a)- (gender uncertain), lower part of the back: gen.sg. a-na-aš-ša-aš=ša-aš (KUB 35.148 iii 24).

This word occurs only once:

KUB 35.148 iii
(20) n=a-an=ši EGIS-pa iš-kiš-ša-az hu-i-ni-mi [ ]
(21) nr UR.TUR SAG.DU-i=ši an-da e-ep-mi U[R.TUR SAG.DU-aš]
(22) i-na-an li-ip-du me-li-[aš=ša-aš]
(23) i-na-an KLI.MIN [ZU]AG.UDU-aš iš-kiš-ša-ša[š=ša-aš (?)]
(24) i-na-an KLI.MIN a-na-aš-ša-aš=ša-aš i-[a-an] KLI.MIN
(25) ar-ra-aš=ša-aš i-na-an KL.MIN [ZU]x[... i-na-an KL.MIN]
(26) ge-ru-yu-aš=ša-aš i-na-an KLI.MIN [ZU]x KLI.MIN
(27) pár-aš-na-aš=ša-aš i-na-an li-[a-p-du]

‘I make it run from his back. I take in a puppy for his head and the puppy must lick away the disease of the head, the disease of his shoulders (and) [his] back likewise, the dis[ease] of his anašša-[likewise], the disease of his arse likewise, [the disease of his] x[... likewise], the disease of
his knees likewise, [the disease of his] x[... likewise] and let it li[ck away] the
disease of his paršna".

We see that anāššaš=šaš is mentioned between UzuZAG.UDU-aš iškišaš[š=šaš]
'shoulders (and) his back' and arraš=šaš 'his arse', which would indicate that it
denotes the lower part of the back.

Formally, the word anāššaš=šaš must be regarded as a gen. of either a stem
anāš- or a stem anāšša-. Note that the spelling a-na-aš-ša- (and not e.g. **an-aš-
ša-) indicates that the second -a- is a real vowel, so ḫanaSa-/ or ḫnaSa-l.

Puhvel (HED 1/2: 63f.) states that “the likely etymon is IE *omso- ‘shoulder’”,
but this is problematic for a few reasons. First, anāšša- does not mean ‘shoulder’
but clearly refers to the lower part of the back. Secondly, the formal aspects of the
etymology are quite problematic. The word for ‘shoulder’ probably was an s-stem
originally (compare Skt. ānśa- to Lat. umerus), so *h₂em-es- (*h₂- because of
TochA es, TochB ēntse). If Hittite would display a preform *h₂em-s- (thus
Puhvel (HED 1/2: 63): “Hitt. anassa- showing anaptyctic resolution of the -ms-
cluster”), we would expect Hitt. **ašš- (compare Hitt. ḫaššu- ‘king’ < *h₂ems-
u-). If Hittite would reflect a preform *h₂em-os-, then we cannot explain why
Hittite shows an -n- where the other languages display *m. As the Hittite spelling
with a-na-aš-ša- points to a real vowel -a- in ḫanaSa-/ or ḫnaSa-l, an etymology
involving the word *h₂em-es- is impossible.

anāššar / anānšn- (n.) ‘pillar’?: nom.-acc.sg. an-na-aš-šar (KUB 43.75 i 12, 20
(OH/NS)), erg.sg. an-na-aš-na-an-za (KUB 17.10 iv 9 (OH/MS)).

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 64 for attestations and discussion. He proposes to interpret
this word as a derivative of anije/a-‘d ‘to work, to carry out’ (lit. ‘creation’ >
‘establishment’), but the geminate -nm- in anāššar / anānšn- vs. the single -n- in
anije/a- is not favourable to this etymology.

(anumānna- (c.) ‘stepmother’: gen.sg. an-na-ya-an-na-aš (KUB 29.34+ iv
12); broken MUnUs an-na-q[ar...?] (621/f, 10).
Anat. cognates: CLuw. anānamann(i)- (c.) ‘stepmother’ (nom.sg. a-an-na-ya-an-
n[i-š], acc.sg. an-na-ya-an-ni-in, an-na-ya-an-ni-in).

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 65 for attestations. Note that an-na-ya-an-na-aš=ša-aš
(KUB 29.34+ iv 12 = Hitt. Laws §196) is duplicated by MUnUs an-na-ya-at’tal
-aš-ša in KBo 6.26 iii 30. The connection with CLuw. anānamann(i)- suggests,
however, that anānamanna- is the correct Hittite reading of this word.
The word clearly is a derivative in -γamma- of anna- ‘mother’ (q.v.), which view is supported by CLuw. *tāγamu*- ‘stepfather’ besides *tā/i*- ‘father’. The origin and meaning of this suffix is unclear. Compare perhaps *γib* marīγamma-, a part of the house (q.v.).

anni- ‘that, the already mentioned one’: see anna- ‘former, old’

-anji- (imperfective-suffix): see -anna- / -anni-


Derivatives: *anijatt- (C.) ‘work, task; ritual gear or garments; message’ (nom.sg.c. *a-ni-jā-az* (KUB 13.20 i 20, KUB 13.8 obv. 18), acc.sg.c. *a-ni-jā-at-ta-an* (KBo 30.39 iii 14 (OH/MS), KUB 7.41 iv 13 (MH/NS)), gen.sg. *a-ni-jā-at-ta-aš*, dat.-loc.sg. KIN-iti, abl. *a-ni-jā-at-ta-az*, coll.pl. *a-ni-jā-at-ta* (OS), *a-ni-jā-at-te* (KUB 30.80 rev. 5 (MH/MS)), *a-ni-jā-at-ti* (OH/NS), acc.pl. *a-ni-jā-ad-du-uš* (KUB 10.45 iv 45 (OH/NS)), dat.-loc.pl. *a-ni-jā-at-ta-aš*); *anijar* (n.) ‘prestation, ritual’ (nom.-acc.sg. *a-ni-u-ur* (KBo 15.19 i 18 (NS), KUB 15.29 obv. 6 (NS), KBo 19.144 i 25 (NS), KBo 20.87 i 7 (NS), KUB 9.15 iii 20 (NS), KUB 12.58 ii 31 (NS), KUB 22.40 ii 29 (NS), KUB 29.4 i 7, 15 (NH), KUB 32.123 ii 33, 47, iii 11 (NS)), *a-ni-ur* (KUB 46.38 ii 6 (NS), KUB 46.42 ii 12 (NS)), *a-ni-ūr* (KUB 19.92, 4 (OH/NS), KUB 5.6 ii 52, 59 (NS)), gen.sg. *a-ni-u-ra-aš* (KUB 35.18 i 9 (MS), KBo 21.1 i 3 (MH/NS)), *a-ni-ur-aš* (KBo 12.126+ ii 19 (NS)), dat.-loc.sg. *a-ni-u-ri* (KUB 35.54 iii 45 (MS), *a-ni-ū-ri* (KUB 5.6 iii 30 (NS)), erg.sg. *a-ni-u-ra-an-za* (KUB 41.9 iv 38 (OH/MS)), *anijauyar* (n.) ‘id.’ (nom.-
acc.sg. a-ni-ja-u-ya-ar (KBo 15.21+ i 15), erg.sg. a-ni-ja-ya-ra-an-za (KBo 10.45 iv 40 (MH/NS)), see annama².

Anat. cognates: Pal. ani-java- ‘to do, to work’ (2sg.pres.act. a-ni-i-ja-si, 3sg.pres.act. a-ji-et-ti, 1sg.pret.act. a-ni-e-e-b-ha, 2sg.imp.act. a-ni-ja); CLuw. anni- ‘to carry out, to treat’ (3sg.pres.act. a-an-ni-i-ti, a-a-an-ni-i-ti, an-ni-i-ti, 2sg.imp.act. a-ni-ja (? in broken context)).

PIE *h1-enje/o-

See HW² A: 81f. for attestations. The verb itself is consistently spelled a-ni-, whereas in its imperfective we almost consistently find an-ni-, with a geminate -nm-. The discrepancy between these two stems (with and without geminate -mn-) has led to much debate about the historical interpretation of this verb. Besides this, the IE cognates (Lat. onus ‘load, burden’ and Skt. ánas- ‘cart’) are in dispute regarding their interpretation as well.

Both Lat. onus and Skt. ánas- are neuter s-stems, so it is likely that they both go back to one pre-form. As neuter s-stems as a rule show e-grade in their stem, it is attractive to reconstruct an initial *h1. The difficulty lies in the fact that Lat. o corresponds to short a in Skt, which apparently has not been subject to Brugmann’s Law. Often, this has been explained by assuming that the root involved was *h1-enH-, the second laryngeal of which would block Brugmann’s Law in Sanskrit as it closed the syllable in which *o was found: *HonH-es-.

Lubotsky (1990), however, convincingly argued that *h1e is not subject to Brugmann’s Law in Sanskrit, and that a development *h1-en-es- > Skt. ánas- is regular.

For Hittite, the reconstructed root *h1-enH- is used by e.g. Melchert to explain the outcomes aniye/a- besides anniške/a-. In 1994a: 85 he states that a present *enH-je/o- would lose its laryngeal regularly before *i, giving aniye/a-, whereas in *enH-je-skê/ô- we would first find pretonic syncope, yielding *enHi-skê/ô-, after which *VnHV > VmV, and therefore anniške/a-. There are a few problems with Melchert’s scenario, however. Firstly, I know of no other examples of pretonic syncope, which must have been very old according to Melchert’s theory, as it must have occurred before the loss of laryngeals before *i. Secondly, I think that his proposed preforms are morphologically unlikely. Verbs in *-je/o- usually show zero-grade in the root. The same goes for imperfectives in *-skê/o-. Moreover, *-skê/o-imperfectives originally were derived from the bare root and not from the present stem, as we can see in impf. zikke/a- (*d*h1-sêkê/o-) from the present stem dai-/ti- ‘to place, to put’ (*d*h1-(o)i-).
We had better search for another solution. If we assume that the other IE languages point to a root *h₂en- (with no second laryngeal), then the usual way of deriving a *-je/-o-present of this root is by making a formation *h₂on-jé/-ó-. As I have tried to show in my article on the outcome of initial laryngeals in Anatolian (Kloekhorst fthc.c), a preconsonantal initial *h₂ would in this position merge with *h₁ in PANat., yielding Hitt. anije/a- = /tiné/á-/ by regular sound laws.

In the case of the imperfective, we would on formal grounds expect that it was formed as *h₂n-ské/-ó-. Such a form would regularly have given Hitt. **aške/a-, compare *g₃nnské/-ó- > *k₃nske/a- > kuyושke/a- (cf. Kloekhorst fthc.e). Just as kuyושke/a- was too intransparent and is replaced by kuemsiške/a- with geminate -nn- to prevent the nasal from dropping again in front of the consonant cluster, this **aške/a-, too, was too intransparent and was replaced by amnşeke/a- = /tiNské/á-/, with geminate -nn-. A similar process could be visible in annam.² to educate, to train’ (q.v.) if this verb is really an old causative of anije/a-.

The details of CLuw. omi- are unclear. Melchert (1993a: 17) states that the “geminate -nn- in the omi- form is due to “Čop’s Law”: *énýe/- > *énýi- > *éni- > omi-”. Again, a reconstruction *énje- to my mind does not fit our understanding of PIE morphology. In my view, we know too little about the practice of plene writing and gemination of resonants in CLuwian to give too much value to it.

See Rieken 1999a: 107f. for an extensive treatment of the derived noun anijatt-, where she argues that the word originally was commune and that the OS form a-ni-at=še-et (KUB 36.100 obv. 13), seemingly a nom.-acc.sg.n., must be emended to a-ni-att=tav=še-et, a coll.pl., which is quite commonly found of this word.

The noun anüür must be the regular outcome of *h₂niéur > /tiñoř (see § 1.3.9.4.f for a treatment of the spelling a-ni-u-ůr). Since this form was not recognized as a derivative in -yar anymore, the heteroclitic inflection was given up. Later on, a secondary anijatuar was created, a synchronic derivation in -yar of the stem anija-.

ānki (adv.) ‘once’ (Akk. 1=ŠU): a-an-ki (KUB 4.2 iv 36, 38).

PIE *Hoionki

The word occurs written phonetically only twice. The bulk of the attestations show 1-an-ki or akkadographically 1=ŠU. The ending -anki is also found in 2-an-ki ‘twice’ and 3-an-ki ‘thrice’ and is connected by Rosenkranz (1936: 249) with Gr. -άκτις < *-.nkis (e.g. τετράκτις ‘four times’, πεντάκτις ‘five times’ etc.), although the latter only occurs with the numerals 4+, whereas Hitt. -anki is only found in
of *a-an-ki only the a- can be regarded as the stem denoting
‘one’. Puhiel (HED 1/2: 73) proposes to interpret a-an-ki as reflecting *Hojonki;
connecting it with the root *Hoi- seen in e.g. Skt. ēka- ‘one’, Gr. ἄις ‘alone,
lonely’, etc. This seems formally as well as semantically attractive to me. The
question remains whether we should interpret this form as *Hoi-onki or *Hoi-
uki.

**anku** (adv.) ‘fully’: an-ku (OS).

See HW² A: 95 for attestations. The adverb denotes ‘fully, totally’ or similar
(HW²: “ganz und gar, unbedingt”) and occurs from OS texts onwards. The
historical interpretation is difficult. It possibly contains the enclitic element =kku
‘and’ (q.v.), but the element an- remains unclear to me.

**aŋš** (Ib > 1c1) ‘to wipe’: 3sg.pres.act. a-an-ši (KBo 30.158, 9 (MS), KBo
21.80+20.44+30.158 obv. 35 (MS), KUB 30.41 i 7 (OH/NS), KBo 30.164 iv 21
(OH/NS), KBo 11.22 iv 12 (NS), KBo 44.175, 5 (NS), IBoT 4.139 obv. 8 (NS),
etc.), a-an-ši (KUB 30.41 i 14 (OH/NS)), a-an-[aš]-zi (KBo 19.129 obv. 29
(NS)), a-an-aš-zí (KUB 8.38 iii 21 (NS)), 3pl.pres.act. a-an-ša-an-zi (KBo 11.73
rev. 18 (OH/NS), KUB 10.18 ii 31 (OH/NS), KUB 11.16 iv 10 (OH/NS), KUB
11.35 i 27 (OH/NS), KUB 25.3 iii 44 (OH/NS), KBo 4.9 ii 19, vi 23 (NS), KBo
22.189 v 13 (NS), KUB 25.16 i 29 (NS), KUB 41.52 iv’ 6 (NS), etc.), an-ša-an-zi
(KBo 20.116 rev.’ 6 (MH/NS), KBo 46.130 rev. 15 (NS), KUB 49.79 iv 4 (NS)),
a-an-ši-an-zi (VSNF 12.2 vi 8 (NS)), a-an-[n]-ši-[a]-an-ží (KUB 29.40 ii 14
(MH/MS)). a-an-[š]-i[a-an-ži] (KBo 8.49, 5 (MH/MS)), 1sg.pret.act. a-an-šu-un
(KUB 41.19 rev. 10, 11, 12, 14 (MH/NS)), an-šu-an (KUB 24.13 iii 19 (MH/NS),
KBo 35.95, 6 (NS)), 2sg.imp.act. a-an-aš (KBo 21.8 ii 4 (OH/MS), KUB 33.5 ii 7
(OH/MS), IBoT 3.141 i 14 (OH/NS)), 3sg.imp.act. a-an-aš-du (KUB 7.1 ii 68
(OH/NS)); part. a-an-ša-an-t- (6x), an-ša-an-t- (26x); impf. a-an-aš-ke/a- (KBo
21.8 ii 3 (OH/MS), KBo 19.163 i 23, iv 4 (OH/NS)), a-an-ši-ke/a- (KBo 23.23,
77 (MH/MS)), a-an-ši-iš-ke/a- (KUB 24.13 iii 16 (MH/NS)).

Derivatives: see ḫane/išš-².

Anat. cognates: CLuw. **am(ma)šša-/ am(ma)šši(t)a**- ‘to wipe’ (3pres.sg.act.
am-ma-aš-ši-ti, 3pl.pres.act. [am]-ma-aš-ši-ja-an-ti, 3sg.pret.act. am-ma-aš-ša-
ti, 3pl.pret.act. am-ma-aš-ša-an-da).

IE cognates: Gr. ἄκκο, ‘to mow, to reap’, OE mǣwan, OHG mǣwen, mǣn ‘to
mow’.

PIE *h2ōmhs₁-s-ei
Originally, this verb is inflected according to the ḫi-inflection. The mi-form a-an-
āš-zi is found in NS texts only. From the MH period onwards we find a few forms
that show a stem ǧānši/a-", which is secondarily created on the basis of 3sg. ǧānsı.
The bulk of the attestations show initial plene a. All forms that show initial an-
š- only are from NS texts and cannot be used for the determination of original
ablaut.

In 1988b, Melchert (211f.) argued that ǧānsı- is cognate with CLuw. am(ma)šš(a/i)- ‘to wipe’ and further connected these verbs with Gr. άλκω ‘to
mow, to reap’, OE māwan and OHG māwen, mēn ‘to mow’, reconstructing
*am-ħi- / *m-ēhi-. For a parallel semantical development, he refers to Hitt. ĭaṛs-
l ‘to reap, to harvest, to wipe’ (q.v.) which reflects PIE *uers- ‘to wipe’. Later on,
his seems to have abandoned the IE etymology, and states that Hitt. ǧānsı- and
CLuw. am(ma)šša/i- reflect PAnat. *öm-s-,- without reference to the other IE
words (1994a: 164). This reconstruction is problematic, however, as a sequence
*VmsV > Hitt. VššV (cf. Ŧaššau ‘king’ < *h₂ems-su-; hūsıı ‘gives birth to’ < *h₂öm-s-
ei).”

In Kloeckhorst fthc.f I have argued that the original etymological connection as
given by Melchert may make sense. Gr. άλκω ‘to mow, to reap’ and OE māwan,
OHG māwen, mēn ‘to mow’ point to a root *h₂omh₁-s- (note that Gr. άλκω must
be denotative of a noun *h₂omh₁-s-tam, cf. Schrijver 1990: 20). If this root is
cognate with the Anatolian forms, then these must show an s-extension and go
back to *h₂omh₁-s-ei (showing a similar Schwebe-ablaut as we see in e.g. tamāš-
<< *dēmeh₂-s- from the root *dēmeh₂- ‘to tame’, cf. at tamāš-s / tame/išš-). In my
opinion, this *h₂omh₁-s-ei yielded Hitt. Ĭansı by regular sound change: the initial
laryngeal was dropped on front of *o as I described in Kloeckhorst fthc.c. The
development *VmhsV > Hitt. VmsV does not contradict the forms Ŧaššau- and hūsıı
that show *VmsV > VššV.

As all ḫi-verbs, *h₂emh₁-s- must originally have shown ablaut as well. This
means that beside the singular *h₂omh₁-s-ei we expect a plural form *h₂omh₁-s-enti.
In Kloeckhorst fthc.f I have argued that this weak-stem form regularly would yield
Hitt. /Hnıs'ant'ı / (cf. *ğnh₁senti > /knišánt'ı, spelled ganišanzi ‘they recognize’),
a form that is indeed attested as part of the paradigm Ŧane/išš- ı ‘to wipe’ (q.v.). I
therefore assume that the original ablauting paradigm *h₂omhs₁-s-ei : *h₂omh₁-s-
enti regularly yielded Ĭansı : Ŧane/iššanzi, of which both stems formed their own
paradigm. On the one hand, it yielded Ĭansı, Ĭansanzi (with generalization of the
stem Ĭansı- which explains the lack of ablaut in this verb) and on the other hand we
find Ŧane/işzi, Ŧane/iššanzi (generalization of the stem Ŧane/išš-.)
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**-ant-** (part.-suffix)

PIE *-ent-

The Hitt. participle is formed with the suffix -ant-. In ablauting verbs it is attached to the zero-grade root: kunant- ‘killed’ (from kunan² / kun- ‘to kill’), appant- ‘seized’ (from app² / app- ‘to seize’), pijant- ‘given’ (from pai¹ / pi- ‘to give’), etc. Although in almost all cases the participle has a passive meaning (‘killed’, ‘seized’, ‘given’), we come accross a few cases where the participle can have an active meaning: ašant- ‘being’ (from eš² / aš- ‘to be’), akuyant- ‘drinking’ (from eku² / aku- ‘to drink’), adant- ‘eating’ and ‘eaten’ (from ed² / ad- ‘to eat’). The participles do not show ablaut and show the normal consonant-inflection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Stem Inflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.sg.c.</td>
<td>kunanza</td>
<td>/kʷnánts/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.sg.c.</td>
<td>kunantan</td>
<td>/kʷnántan/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.-acc.sg.n.</td>
<td>kunan</td>
<td>/kʷnán/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.sg.</td>
<td>kunantaš</td>
<td>/kʷnántas/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.-loc.sg.</td>
<td>kunanti</td>
<td>/kʷnánti/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that nom.-acc.sg.n. kunan /kʷnán/ must reflect older */kʷnánt/ in which word-final -t has regularly been dropped.

It is obvious that Hitt. -ant- must be etymologically cognate to the participle-suffix *-ent- as visible in many IE languages: Skt. adant- = Lat. edent- ‘eating’, Gr. τάκτης < *-ent-s ‘placing’, etc. It is remarkable, however, that in all IE languages (including Tocharian) this participle has an active meaning. This could indicate that in PIE the participle in *-ent- in principle could have both meanings (just as Hitt. adant- can denote both ‘eating’ and ‘eaten’), depending on the valencies, and that in Anatolian the passive meaning was generalized (except in the archaic cases ašant-, akuyant- and adant-), whereas in post-Anatolian PIE the active meaning was generalized.

It is remarkable that in the Luwian languages participles are formed with the etymologically unrelated suffix -mmasi-. Here we only find a remnant of the suffix *-ent-, namely in the name of the Storm-god, CLuw. ḏTarḫvant- / ḏTarḫhunt-, H Luw. ḏTarḫunt-l, Lyc. Trqqḫnt-, which is the lexicalized (active!) participle of the verb tarḫu- ‘to conquer’ (etymologically identical to Skt. tuṛvant- ‘conquering’, see at tar祖父²). On the basis of the ablaut visible in this word (CLuw. nom.sg. ḏTarḫvantya vs. oblique ḏTarḫunt-) it is clear that originally the
participle in *-ent- must have shown ablaut. The Anatolian evidence points to a paradigm nom.sg. *CC-ent-s, acc.sg. *CC-ent-m, gen.sg. *CC-nt-ös, which fits for instance the Vedic system as well, compare the paradigm of ‘being’: nom.sg. sán (< *sánt-s < *h₁s-ent-s), acc.sg. sántam (< *h₁s-ent-m), gen.sg. satás (< *h₁s-nt-ös). Nevertheless, this paradigm must have been a quite recent rebuilding within PIE from an older system *CéC-nt-s, *CC-nt-m, *CC-nt-ös, traces of which still survive in the reconstructed paradigm for ‘wind’: *h₂yēh₁-nt-s, *h₂yḥ₁-ent-m, *h₂yḥ₁-nt-ös (see at ḫuṣamant-), originally a participle of the verb *h₂yēh₁- ‘to blow’ (cf. Beekes 1985: 64-77; Kortlandt 2000).

-ant- (erg.-suffix)
PIE *-ent-

It is a well known fact that in Hittite neuter nouns cannot function as the subject of a transitive verb. If, however, a situation needed to be expressed in which a neuter noun had to function as the subject within a transitive sentence, this noun could be “animatized” with a suffix -anza. I have called this form an “ergative” throughout this book. Compare e.g. KUB 19.2 + KUB 14.14 rev. (22) nu KUR ḫa-at-ti=ja a-pa-a-aš ḫa-na-an-za ar-ḫa nam-ma zi-in-ni-[i̯] ‘Furthermore, that bloodshed has finished off the land of Ḫatti’, in which ḫananza is the animatized form of ḫēḥar / ḫaḥant- ‘bloodshed’. Although the suffix -anza in some literature is regarded as a real case-ending, it clearly is not as can be seen by the fact that forms displaying an “erg.pl.” in -anteš occur as well (compare KUB 17.27 iii (9) n=a-at=za am-me-el udd-da-na-an-te-ēš tar-[ḫu]-e-er ‘My words will conquer them’, in which uددانانتش is an “erg.pl.” of the neuter noun uddar / uددان-). This means that -anza and -anteš have to be analysed as nom.sg.c. and nom.pl.c. respectively of a suffix -ant-. Without a doubt this suffix -ant- must be equated with the suffix -ant- as found in the participle, which reflects *-ent- (q.v.).

anda postpos., prev. ‘in(to), inwards; (with)in; in addition’: an-da (OS).

Derivatives: andan (adv.) ‘(with)in, inside; in(to)’ (an-da-an (OS)).

Anat. cognates: CLuw. ānta (prev.) ‘in(to)’ (a-an-ta, a-a-an-ta, an-ta, a-an-da, an-da), andan (adv.) ‘inside?’ (an-da-an); HLuw. anta (prev., adv., postpos.) ‘(with)in, in(to)’ (a-ta, a-tā), antan ‘into’ (a-ta-na (KARKAMIŠ A31 §8), antatila/i- (adj.) ‘internal’ (nom.sg.c. a-tā-ti-li-i-sa (BABYLON 1 §11)); Lyd. ĕti-(prev.); Lyc. ēte (prev., adv.) ‘inside’.

IE cognates: OLat. endo ‘into’, Olfr. and ‘in it’, Gr. ἐνδο (adv.) ‘inside’
In OH texts the two adverbs anda and andan are distinct in use: anda has a directional function, denoting ‘into, inwards’ whereas andan functions as a locative, denoting ‘inside, within’. This indicates that originally anda and andan are all and acc. respectively (compare pară < *pro besides peran < *perom) of a noun that further is unattested in Hittite. The absence of forms with an enclitic possessive pronoun (like e.g. peran=te ‘in front of you’ or šer=šet ‘on top of it’) shows that the lexicalization as adverbs occurred earlier with anda(n) than with the other adverbs. The distinction between directional anda and locative andan becomes blurred within the Hittite period, and in the younger texts there is no semantic difference anymore between anda and andan.

From the beginning of Hittite studies onwards, anda(n) has been connected with Gr. ἐνδό ‘inside’ and OLat. endo ‘into’ and reconstructed as *h₁endo(m). Nevertheless, the OIr. cognate and ‘in it’ must reflect a zero-grade *h₁ndo(m) (McCon 1992: 26), which reconstruction formally is possible for Gr. ἐνδό and OLat. endo as well (cf. Schrijver 1991: 58-9). Within the Anatolian languages, Lyc. ἡτε ‘inside’, too, points to *h₁ndo(m) since a preform *h₁endo(m) would have yielded Lyc. **ἡτε. On the basis of the OIr. and Lyc. words I conclude that all IE forms reflect *h₁ndo(m). The absence of accentuation in Hittite (no plene vowels) is explained by the establishment that in poetic verse local adverbs and postpositions are unstressed (cf. Melchert 1998a: 485).

See Kloekhorst 2004: 42f. for an explanation of the HLuwian form.

-anta: see -anta(r)i

antaka- (gender unclear) ‘?’: dat.-loc.sg. an-ta-ki i=š-ši (KUB 11.20 i 13, KUB 45.3 iv 17), an-ta-ki-it-ti (KUB 11.25 iii 9), an-ta-ki-it-ti-i=š-ši (KUB 7.5 i 7), a[n-ta]-ki (KUB 43.62 i 2), all.sg. an-ta-a=š-ša (KUB 36.44 iv 12).

Traditionally, this word is translated as ‘chamber’, but Melchert (2003e), suggests that antaka- should rather be interpreted as ‘loins’. I must say that I do not find his line of reasoning very convincing, and would rather regard the meaning of antaka- as unclear. Both the meaning ‘chamber’ as well as ‘loins’ (through ‘intestines’) are though to have derived from anda ‘inside’ (cf. Puhvel HED 1/2: 77 for ‘chamber’ and Melchert (l.c.) for ‘loins’). Melchert even goes sofar in interpreting antaka- as anda + ki- ‘that which lies inside’. In my view, the fact that besides the normal cases all.sg. antaga and dat.-loc.sg. antaki, we also find a
Hurrian dat.-loc.-ending in the form antakitti, strongly points to a Hurrian origin of this word. I therefore remain very sceptical about the supposed connection between antaka- and anda.

antara- (adj.) ‘blue’ (Sum. ZA.GÌN): acc.sg. an-ta-ra-an (KBo 27.131 iii 7 (MH/NS)), [an-t]a-ra-an (KUB 41.1 i 5 (OH/NS)), an-da-ra-an (KUB 41.1 i 3 (OH/NS), VBoT 24 i 4 (MH/NS)), a-an-da-ra-an (VBoT 24 i 14 (MH/NS), KBo 5.2 iii 19 (MH/NS)), a-an-ta-ra-an (VBoT 24 i 23 (MH/NS)), an-da-ra-a-an (KUB 46.43, 9 (NS)).

Derivatives: antarant- (adj.) ‘blue’ (an-ta-ra-an-ta-an (KUB 24.9 i 43 (OH/NS)), [an-d]a-ra-an-da-an (KUB 24.9 i 45 (OH/NS))), antarêtṣ̌ke/a-2 (Ic6) ‘to make blue’ (an-ta-ri-iš-ke-et (KUB 24.9 i 44 (OH/NS)), an-da-ri-eš-ke-et (KUB 41.1 i 4 (OH/NS))).

IE cognates: Slav. *modrъ (Cz. modrý, Scr. módar) ‘blue’.

PIE *md̂r̄-—

This word is attested with the spellings an-ta-ra-an, a-an-ta-ra-an and an-ta-ra-a-an. Because all attestations are from NS texts, it is not possible to chronologically order these spellings and determine which one is more original.

Machek (1949: 131-2) connects this word with Slav. *modrъ ‘blue’ < *md̂r’o- (the absence of Winter’s Law points to *d̂). If this connection is justified, the Hittite word likely reflects a zero-grade *md̂r’o-. With this reconstruction in mind, it is more likely that the spelling an-ta-ra-a-an is the correct one (for unetymological plene initial a- compare e.g. a-an-ni-eš-ke-si (HKM 55 rev. 26) instead of normal an-ni-iš-ke- (to work (imperf.)). It would then reflect phonological /ndrăn/, the regular outcome of *md̂r’o-.

-anta(ri), -antat(i) (3pl.midd.- endings)


PIE *CC-ënto(ri), *CëC-nto(ri)

In the present, we find the endings -anta as well as -antari. Both endings occur in the OH period already, and there does not seem to be a distribution between the two (e.g. a-ra-an-ta (OS) besides a-ra-an-ta-ri (OS)). In the preterite we find -antati besides -antat, but here it seems that -antati is the original ending, which is being replaced by -antat from MH times onwards (compare ki-i-ša-an-ta-ti
(OS) vs. ki-śa-an-ta-at (MH/MS) or na-ah-śi-an-ta-ti (OS) vs. na-ah-śi-ja-an-ta-at (NH)), possibly because -i had become the main marker of the present tense.

The reconstruction of the PIE middle endings is a debated topic, and I will not go into details here. It is clear that -anta(ri) and -antat(i) must reflect *-ento when the verbal root is in zero-grade (e.g. aranta(ri) < *h₂-r-énto(ri)) and *-nto when the verbal root is in full grade (e.g. ešanta(ri) < *h₁-eḥ₁s-nto(ri)).

Kimball (1999: 245) cites a few examples of plene spellings in this ending (e.g. DUDDDQWD, QHHDDQWDUL, etc.), which are all attested in NS texts. In my view, these are the result of non-final syllables (cf. § 1.4.9.3: since in NH times there was no opposition between /ā/ and /a/ in these syllables anymore, the pronunciation and therefore spelling was subject to free variation.

-antaru (3pl.imp.midd.-ending)

This ending clearly is built up of the 3pl.pres.midd.-ending -antari in which the -i is replaced by the imperatival -u. See at both -anta(ri), -antat(i) and -u for further treatment.

-antat(i) (3pl.pret.midd.-ending): see -anta(ri)

-anteš (erg.pl.-ending): see -ant-

✶antijant-(c.) 'son-in-law': acc.sg. an-ti-ja-an-ta-an (KBo 3.1 ii 39), an-ti-ja-an-da-an (KBo 12.4 ii 8).

Derivatives: andaijandatar / andaijandann- (n.) 'son-in-lawship' (dat.-loc.sg. an-da-i-ja-an-da-an-ni (KUB 13.8 obv. 14)).

Puhvel (HED 1/2: 78f.) also cites a nom.pl. [✶]antianteš (KUB 26.1a, 10), of which HW² states that it had better be read [pê-r]a-an-ti-ja-an-ti-eš.

Since Balkan (1948) this word is generally interpreted as showing syncope from *anda ijan- 'who has gone inside'. As he shows, a semantic development from 'who has gone inside' to 'son-in-law' has parallels in other languages. According to Puhvel (HED 1/2: 79) this analysis is strengthened by the derivative andaijandatar 'son-in-lawship', which would show the un-syncopated form. In my view, however, the latter word could easily be a folk-etymological adaptation
to an original *antiandatar, and does not necessarily prove that *antiand- stems from *anda ijan-. Nevertheless, semantically the etymology seems possible.

-antu (3pl.imp.act.-ending): e.g. ap-pa-an-tu (OS), a-ša-an-tu (OS), pē-e-ta-an-tu (OS), ap-pa-an-du (MS), a-ša-an-du (MS), pē-dâ-an-du (MS)


PAnat. *-Vntu

PIE *CC-éntu

The 3pl.imp.act.-ending -antu is spelled -an-tu in OS texts, and -an-du in MS and NS texts. In ablauting verbs, the ending -antu goes with the weak stem. The ending must be compared with Skt. 3pl.impt.-ending -antu and reflects *-entu. Especially etymologically related pairs like Hitt. a-ša-an-tu ~ Pal. a-ša-an-du, a-šê-en-du ~ CLuw. a-ša-an-du ~ HLuw. (ā)sâ-tu ~ Skt. sântu ‘they must be’ < *h1s-éntu and Hitt. ku-na-an-du ~ Skt. ghnantu ‘they must kill’ < *gʷn-éntu are striking.

Kimball (1999: 245) cites a few examples of plene spellings in this ending (e.g. ap-pa-a-an-du), which are all attested in NS texts. In my view, these are the result of the NH merger of OH /a/ with /a/ in closed non-final syllables (cf. § 1.4.9.3): since in NH times there was no opposition between /a/ and /a/ in these syllables anymore, the pronunciation and therefore spelling was subject to free variation.

andurza (adv.) ‘inside, indoors’: an-dur-za.


PIE *h1n-dʰur-

Semantically there seems to be no difference between andurza and andurzi(a). Formally, the latter could be interpreted as andurza + =i̯a ‘and’ (pace HW² A: 123), which indicates that andurza is an adverbially used ablative of a stem andur-, which is visible in the derivative anturji(a) as well.

An etymological connection with e.g. Lat. inter ‘between’, Skt. antār ‘within’ (Couvreur 1937: 92-3), though semantically and seemingly formally attractive, does not work as Hitt. -u- would remain unexplained. A better explanation seems to be Sturtevant’s suggestion (1933: 128) to interpret this form as *h₁(e)n-dʰur- ‘indoors’. The root *dʰuer- does not occur further in Anatolian, however.


Anat. cognates: Lyd. 'antola, antola ‘statue’.

PIE nom. *h₂n-dʰuēh₂-ōs, gen.sg. *h₂n-dʰuēh₂-s-ōs

See HW² A : 109f. for attestations. In the oldest texts, the paradigm of this word is nom.sg. antuyahhaš, acc.sg. antuḫšan, gen.sg. antuḫšaš, dat.-loc.sg. antuḫši, nom.pl. antuḫšēš, acc.pl. antuḫšūs, dat.-loc.pl. antuḫšaš. In later texts, nom.sg. antuyahhaš was the source for some forms that show a stem antuyahhaš-. Besides, we find some forms that inflect according to a thematic stem antuḫša-, which is based on the oblique forms with the stem antuḫš-.

According to Eichner (1979b: 77) this word shows a similar formation as e.g. Gr. ἀνθρώπος ‘having inside’, and is to be connected with the root *dʰuH- (Skt. dhīṃa- ‘smoke’, Gr. ὄμπους ‘spirited’), so literally ‘having breath inside’. He states that the word originally must have been a hysterodynamic s-stem *-dʰuēh₂-ōs, *-dʰuēh₂-s-ōs. Rieken (1999a: 190f.) repeats this view and reconstructs *en-dʰyēh₂-ōs, with *e > a in front of *nT. Formally, a reconstruction *h₂n-dʰuēh₂-ōs is perhaps more likely (cf. anda(m) < *h₂ndō(m)).

For other attestations of the root *dʰuH- ‘smoke, breathe’ in Hittite, see tuḫḫuṣai- / tuḫḫui- and tuḫḫææ-.²

The root *dʰuH- ‘smoke, breathe’ is attested in zero-grade in all outer-Anatolian IE languages. On the basis of Hitt. antuyahhaš- / antuḫš-, we can establish that the full-grade form in fact is *dʰuēh₂-.

 anz-: see veled / anz-

-anza (3pl.pres.act.-ending): see -anzi

-anza (erg.sg.-ending): see -antā
-anzi (3pl.pres.act.-ending)


PIE *CC-énti, *-îó-nti, *-skó-nti

Although the bulk of the 3pl.pres.act.-forms show the ending -anzi, there are some rare cases where an ending -anza is attested: iš-hi-an-za (KBo 6.26 i 7 (OH/NS)), ša-ku-yâ-an-za (KUB 13.2 iii 16 (MH/NS)). Although e.g. Puhvel (HED 1/2: 398) regards these as "misspelled", in my view they represent the original form, just as the normal 3sg.pres.act.-ending -zi has a more original form -za (see at -zî).

It is generally accepted that -anzi corresponds on the one hand to the athematic primary 3pl.pres.-endings like Skt. -anti, Gr. (Dor.) -énti, OCS -ęnti, Goth. -ind, etc. < PIE *-enti, and on the other to the thematic 3pl.pres.-endings like Skt. -anti, OCS -orti, Gr. -ont, Lat. -unt, Old Fr. -ant, Goth. -and < *-o-nti. The regular outcome of *-énti and *-ónti is Hitt. l-ant' (with *ó yielding šá and not šál in internal syllables, cf. § 1.4.9.3.a) as attested in -anza cited above. Already in Pre-Hitt. times this l-ant' was secondarily changed to l-antil, spelled -anzi, taking over the -i from the other present-endings. In athematic ablauting verbs, -anzi goes with the weak stem, which is an archaicity, as is visible from Hitt. a-ša-an-zi ~ Skt. sânti ~ Gr. énti, Dor. énti ~ Goth. sind 'they are' < *h3i-énti, Hitt. ţâ-an-zi ~ Skt. yânti ~ Gr. ţân 'they go' < *h3i-énti and Hitt. ku-nâ-an-zi ~ Skt. ghnânti 'they kill' < *g3n-énti.

Kimball (1999: 245) cites a few examples of plene spellings in this ending (e.g. ap-pä-a-an-zi, a-ta-a-an-zi, etc.), which are almost all attested in NS texts. In my view, these are the result of the NH merger of OH /ã/ with /a/ in closed non-final syllables (cf. § 1.4.9.3): since in NH times there was no opposition between /ã/ and /á/ in these syllables anymore, the pronunciation and therefore spelling was subject to free variation.

=(a)p(a) (encl. locatival sentence particle): C=apa (n=a-pa (OS (besides mu=pa (KUB 35.148 iii 29 (OH/NS))), n=a-š=a-pa (OS), ma-a-n=a-pa (OS), DUMU-š=a-pa (OS), n=u-š=a-pa (OS), n=a-t=a-pa, mu=z=a-pa, t=a-pa, an-da=m=a-pa, a-ra-i-š=a-pa n=a-at=s̥a-ma-š=s=a-pa), -e/ě=pa (mu-u=š-še=pa, a-ki=pa, n=a-an=š=pa, n=a-aš=š=pa, n=a-at=š=pa, mu-u=š-š=pa, š=šep,a, š=š=pa),
Anat. cognates: Pal. C=pa, V=ppa (encl. sentence particle); CLuw. pā= (sentence initial particle), ṣpa= (encl. sentence particle); HLuw. ṣpa= (encl. sentence particle); Lyd. fa= (sentence particle); Lyc. be, pe (particle).

PAnat. *(o)bo?

The usual form of this enclitic particle is =apa (n=apa, mān=apa etc.), the first a of which drops when the preceding word ends in e or i: mu=šši=pa, nu=ššē=pa. Rarely we find only =ap (e.g. ṣ=an=a-ap (KBo 3.60 ii 3, 5, 18, iii 9), ṣ=un-uš=ap (KBo 3.60 iii 3), u-li-ḫi-eš=m=a-ap (KUB 15.31 i 6): its usage seems to be limited to two texts only (HW² A: 125f. also cites an-đ=q-a-ap (KBo 17.1 i 26) and ṣ=q-al[a] (KUB 36.99 rev. 3) but these are better read an-da=kûn and ṣ=q-a[n] or ṣ=q-])] respectively; n=ap (KUB 8.3 obv. 12) might better be read Nā-KIŠIB, cf. Oettinger 1979a: 408).

According to HW² A: 125 the particle denotes “Richtung von außen nach innen, an etwas heran”.

In the other Anatolian languages we find particles that, at least from a formal point of view, resemble Hitt. =(a)p(a). If these are cognate, then the Lycian particle =be points to PAnat. *(o)bo. Further no clear IE etymology. Within Hittite, connections with =pat (stressing particle), apā- (demonstrative pronoun) and ṣṣpa(n) (pronominal prefix) have been suggested, but these are based on formal similarity only, not on semantic grounds.

apā- / apā- (demonstrative pronoun) ‘that (one); he, she, it’ (Sum. BI): nom.sg.c. a-pa-a-aš (OS, very often), a-pa-aš (OS), acc.sg.c. a-pu-u-un (OS, very often), a-pu-un (a few times), a-pu-i-un (1x: KBo 6.2 ii 32 (OS)), a-pa-a-an (KUB 26.12 ii 27 (NH)), nom.-acc.sg.n. a-pa-a-at (OS, very often), a-pa-at-t=a (OS), gen.sg. a-pē-e-el (OS), a-pē-el (OS), a-pi-il (KBo 2.13 obv. 12 (NS), dat.-loc.sg. a-pē-da-ni (OS), a-pē-e-da-ni (MH/MS), a-pē-e-ta-ni, a-pē-ta-ni, a-pē-e-da (KUB 6.48 ii 3 (NH)), abl. a-pē-e-ez (MH/MS), a-pē-e-ez (OS), a-pē-e, instr. a-pē-et, a-pē-e-da-an-da (OS), nom.plc. a-pē-e (OS), a-pē, a-pu-uš (NH), acc.plc. a-pu-uš (OS, often), a-pu-uš (a few times), a-pu-ú-uš=ma-a-ššē (KUB 14.14 obv. 21 (NH)), nom.-acc.pln. a-pē-e (OS), gen.pl. a-pē-en-zu-an (MH/MS), a-pē-e-en-zu-an, a-pē-el, dat.-loc.pl. a-pē-e-da-aš (MH/MS), a-pē-da-aš.

Derivatives: apāšila ‘himself, herself, of one’s own’ (a-pa-a-šši-la (MH/MS)), apatta(n) (adv.) ‘there’ (a-pa-d-da (MH/MS), a-pa-d-da-an, a-pa-ta, a-pa-ta-n), apija (adv.) ‘there, then’ (a-pi-ja), apinissan (adv.) ‘thus’ (a-pi-ni-iš-ša-an (OS), a-pi-ni-eš-ša-an, a-pē-e-ni-eš-ša-an), apiniššuant- (adj.) ‘of such kind’ (a-pi-ni-iš-šu-ya-an-t- (MH/MS), a-pē-e-ni-eš-šu-ya-an-t-).
Anat. cognates: Pal. apa- (dem.pron.) ‘that one’ (acc.sg.c. =a-pa-an, a-pa-n=i=du nom.pl.c. =a-ap-i, nom.-acc.pl.n. a-pa-an-ša, =a-pa); CLuw. apū (dem.pron.) ‘that; he, she, it, they’ (nom.sg.c. a-pa-a-aš, a-pa-aš, acc.sg.c. a-pa'-a'-an (text: a-pa-an), a-pa-an, dat.-loc.sg. a-pa-a-at-ti, a-pa-ti, acc.pl.c. a-pi-in-za, a-pi-en-za, gen.adj.dat.-loc.pl. a-pa-a-aš-a-a-an-za, a-pa-a-aš-a-a-an-za, apa-a-aš-ša-an-za-an-za), apaṭi(n) (adv.) ‘thus’ (a-pa-ti-i, a-pa-ti-il[n], a-pa-ti-il[i][n]); HLuw. āpā- ‘he, she, it’ (nom.sg.c. ā-pa-sa, ā-pa-sā, pa-sa, pa-sā’), acc.sg.c. ā-bān/ ā-pa-na, pa-na-, nom.-acc.sg.n. ā-bāl/ ā-pa, dat.sg. ā-baḍi/ ā-pa-ti, ā-pa-ti-i, ā-pa-ri+i, pa-ti, pa-ti’-i, pa-ti-i’, nom.pl.c. ā-bānti/ ā-pa-zī-i, acc.pl.c. ā-bānti/ ā-pa-zi-i, nom.-acc.pl.n. ā-bāja/ ā-pa-i-ja dat.pl. ā-bānti/ ā-pa-za-za, gen.adj. ā-ba[a/-i/ ā-pa-sa/i/- vs. ā-pa-]; ṣahī (adv.) ‘there’ (ā-pa-ti, ā-pa-ri+i); Lyd. bi- (dem.pron.) ‘he’ (nom.sg.c. bi-s, dat.-loc.sg. ḫ, ḫ), bili- (adv.) ‘his’ (nom.sg.c. biš, bılı (endingless), dat.-loc.sg. bil); ebād (adv.) ‘here, there’; Lyd. ebe- (dem.) ‘this’ (nom.sg.c. ebe, acc.sg.c. ebē, ebeṁnē, ebēṁi, nom.-acc.sg.n. ebē, dat.-loc.sg. ebehi, acc.pl.c. ebeis, ebejēs, nom.-acc.pl.n. ebeja, abajja, gen.pl. ebeṁ(s), ebeṁ(?), ebēh(??), dat.-loc.pl. ebbete), eb(e)- (dem.pron.) ‘he, she, it’ (acc.sg.c. ebēnē, gen.sg. ebē, dat.-loc.pl. eb(e)te), ebei (adv.) ‘here’, eb(e)la (adv.) ‘here’, eb(e)l (adv.) ‘his’ (metathesized from eb(e)hi-), epitehe/-i, eb(e)tehe/i/- (adv.) ‘their’.

PAnat. *Hobō-

Within the tree-way demonstrative system in Hittite, apū- / apū- functions as the mediad demonstrative and can be translated ‘that (near you)’ (cf. Goedegebuure 2003). Within Anatolian, it must be compared with Pal. apa-, CLuw. apā-, HLuw. āpā-, Lyd. bi- and Lyc. ebe-, which point to a PAnat. form *Hobō-. As far as I am aware, there are no direct cognates in the other IE languages. Nevertheless, it is in my view quite logical that *Hobō- should be analysed as *Ho- + -bo-, of which I would like to connect *Ho- with the pronominal stem *h(e)- / *h(i)o- as visible in Hitt. aši / uni / ini, and *-bo- with the Hitt. deictic element =pat, which may be a cognate with IE forms that reflect *bho-. If this analysis is correct, we are probably dealing with a PAnatolian formation that was taken over into the pronominal inflection.

Some forms of this pronoun need comments. Nom.sg.c. a-pa-a-aš ~ CLuw. a-pa-a-aš point to *Hobōs and must be formally compared to ka-a-aš < *kōs. Acc.sg.c. a-pu-u-un (the one spelling a-pu-ú-un must be erratic, cf 1.3.9.4.f) represents ītabōn/ and must in my view reflect *Hobōm (cf. CLuw. a-pa‘-a‘-an, HLuw. a-pa-na, Lyc. ebē). It is comparable to ku-u-un /kōn/ < *kōm (see § 1.4.9.3.b for the development *-ōm > Hitt. -ōn/). Nom.-acc.sg.n. a-pa-a-at...
remarkable as it differs from nom.-acc.sg.n. ki-i and i-ni: while the latter forms reflect *ki and *hi, apū must go back to *Hobóí. Nevertheless, both endings must have been extant in PAnat. for all stems: Pal. kār, CLuw. zā and HLUw. zā reflect PAnat. *kōd, whereas Hitt. apiniškan can only be explained from a form *api that must reflect PAnat. *Hobi. The oblique cases show a stem ape-, sometimes extended with an element -da(n)-. Nom.pl.c. ape must reflect *Hobói (cf. ke-e < *kōi), whereas acc.pl.c. a-pu-u-uš = l'abōš/ reflects *Hobōm (see § 1.4.9.3.b). Nom.-acc.pl.n. ape at first sight seems to reflect *Hobói or *Hobéí (supported by HLUw. ā-pa-i-ia?), but this is difficult to connect to neuter plural forms in other IE languages. I would therefore want to propose that ape reflects *Hobiḥ₂, in which *-i- is lowered to Hitt. -e- due to the following *h₂ (similarly in a-aššu- u ḫaššul ‘goods’ < *-uh₂). Gen.pl. apenzan shows -nz as in gen.pl. kinzan, kuenzan and šumenzan and must be directly compared to Lyc. ebēğē. I would mechanically reconstruct *Hobēnišom, in which *-som can be compared to Skt. tēṣām ‘of those’, Lat. eōr ‘of these’, and OCS tēx ‘of those’.

For further etymology see asī / uni / ini and =pat.

āppa (adv., postpos.) ‘behind, afterwards; back, again, further’ (Sum. EGIR): a-ap-pa (OS).

Derivatives: āppan (adv.) ‘behind; after(wards)’ (a-ap-pa-an (OS)), āppanda (adv.) ‘backwards’ (a-ap-pa-an-da (KBo 17.43 i 5 (OS)), ap-pa-an-da (KBo 16.68 i 27 (OH/MS)), āppananda (adv.) ‘id.’ (a-ap-pa-an-da (KBo 17.1 + ABoT 4 i 33, iii 4 (OS), KBo 6.2 ii 10 (OS)), a-ap-pa-an-na-an-da (KBo 19.150 i 4 (OH/NS)), ap-pa-an-an-da (KBo 12.3 iii 12 (OH/NS)), appezzā (ja) - (adj.) ‘backmost, hindmost, rear’ (nom.sg.c. ap-pē-ez-zi-ja-aš =a=š-ša-an (KBo 22.2 obv. 18 (OH/MS)), ap-pē-ez-zi-ja-an (KUB 23.68 obv. 22 (MH/NS)), ap-pē-ez-zi-iš (KUB 13.20 i 3 (MH/NS)), EGIR-ez-zi-iš (KUB 14.2 ii 60 (NS)), ap-pa-ez-zi- [i-iš (Bo 7777 r.col. 6 (see StBoT 18: 41) (NS)), acc.sg.c. ap-pē-ez-zi-an (HKM 43 rev. 20 (MH/MS), IBoT 1.36 iii 51 (MH/MS)), ap-pē-ez-zi-in (NH), [a-p]e-ez-zi-an (KUB 12.66 iv 2 (NS)), nom.acc.sg.n. ap-pē-ez-zi-ja-an (KUB 43.55 ii 3 (OH/NS)), ap-pē-ez-zi (IBoT 1.36 ii 67 (MH/MS)), a-ap-pē-ez-zi (KUB 33.67 i 30 (OH/NS)), a-ap-pa-ez-zi (KUB 42.98 i 22 (NS)), gen.sg. ap-pē-ez-zi-ja-aš, dat.-loc.sg. ap-pē-ez-zi, ap-pē-ez-zi-ja-aš, abl. ap-pē-ez-zi-as, ap-pē-ez-zi-ja-as, nom.pl.c. ap-pē-ez-zi-e-eš (KBo 25.62, 9 (OS), KBo 13.119 ii 13 (NS)), acc.pl.c. ap-pē-ez-zi-uš, [a-p]e-ez-zi-uš (KUB 12.66 iv 3 (NS)), dat.-loc.pl. ap-pē-ez-zi-ja-aš; broken ap-pē-ez-zi-[i...] (KBo 16.45 rev. 3 (OS)), āppa- / āppi- (IIa5 > Ic1, Ic2) ‘to be finished, to be done’ (Akk. QATU; 3sg.prs.act. a-ap-pa-i (e.g. StBoT 25.34 obv. 22 (OS)), ap-pa-a-i, ap-pa-i, a-ap-pa-a-i (VSNF 12.11 iii 10
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(OH/NS)), \textit{ap-pi-ja-zi} (KUB 13.9 + 40.62 iii 7 (MH/NS)), 3pl.pres.act. \textit{a-ap-pi-an-zi} (e.g. KBo 25.31 ii 12 (OS)), \textit{ap-pi-an-zi} (OH/NS), \textit{ap-pi-ja-an-zi} (OH/NS)), 3sg.imp.midd. \textit{ap-pa-a-ru} (KBo 17.90 ii 15 (NS))), \textit{appasiyyatt} (c.) ‘future’ (Sum. EGIR.UD\textsuperscript{M}; nom.sg. EGIR.UD-az, gen.sg./pl. \textit{ap-pa-ši-ya-at-ta-aš} (KUB 31.81 rev. 8 (OS)), dat.-loc.sg. EGIR-pa-UD-ti, all.sg. \textit{ap-pa-ši-ya-at-ta} (KBo 7.28, 43 (OH/MS)).


PIE *\textit{h2}op-o, *\textit{h2}op-on

The plene spelling in \textit{a-ap-pa} and \textit{a-ap-pa-an} is often interpreted as denoting a long /ā/. This is not necessarily the case, however: on the basis of forms like \textit{a-ar-aš-zi} = /tʰárSt’ul/, with short /əl/, we could in principle interpret \textit{a-ap-pa} and \textit{a-ap-pa-an} as \textit{t’apa}/ and \textit{t’apan} respectively. Within Anatolian, \textit{a-ap-pa-an} has clear cognates in CLuw. \textit{āppa(n)}, HLuw. \textit{āpan} and Lyc. \textit{epn}, which reflect PANat. *\textit{tlop}-l (with -o- because of Lyc. e-). Usually, on the basis of the assumption that \textit{a-ap-pa-an} represents \textit{āpan}/n/ with long /ā/, it is assumed that we must reconstruct the preforms *(H)ōp-o and *(H)ōp-on, with accentuated *ō. This does not fit the establishment that local adverbs and postpositions are inherently unstressed (cf. Melchert 1998a: 485 and the consistent absence of plene spelling in \textit{anda}(n) and \textit{katta}(n)). Moreover, an accentuated *ō lenites a following consonant (cf. § 1.4.1), which means that *(H)p-o and *(H)p-on would have yielded Hitt. **\textit{pa} and **\textit{pan}, with sinlge -p-. I therefore interpret \textit{a-ap-pa} and \textit{a-ap-pa-an} as \textit{t’apa}/ and \textit{t’apan} respectively, which must reflect PANat. */\textit{topo}l/ and */\textit{topom}/.

From the beginning of Hittitology onwards, two views in the origin of this adverb have existed: one group of scholars connected \textit{āppa}(n) with Gr. \textit{ἀπο} < *\textit{h2}epo, another with Gr. \textit{ἐπι} < *\textit{h2}epi (see the references in Tischler HEG A-K: 41-3). On the basis of the fact that Hitt. \textit{āppa}(n) does not show an initial \textit{h}-, nowadays the former option is often rejected. Nevertheless, as I have shown in Kloekhorst fth.c.c, an initial *\textit{h2}- regularly merges with *\textit{h1}- in front of *-o-,
which means that the preform */ʔop-* formally can reflect */h₂op-* as well as */h₂op-*. So the matter can only be decided on the basis of semantics. Gr. ἀπά ἀπό ‘from, away from’ belongs with Skt. ṛṣa ‘away, off’, Lat. ab ‘from, away’ and Goth. af ‘from, away, since’ and reflects */h₂epo-*(away) from’. Semantically, a connection with ṛṣa would be possible, but is not immediately evident. Gr. ἐπι (ἐπι) ‘upon, over, on to’ belongs with Skt. ṛṣi ‘also, further, even’ and Arm. ew ‘and’, reflecting */ḥepi-*(upon, over). Semantically, a connection with Hitt. ṛṣa(n) ‘behind, back again’ is not very convincing either. There are some Greek adverbs that do fit the meaning of ṛṣa(n) perfectly, however: ὀθρο ‘behind, at the back’ and ὀντοκο ‘backwards, back again, behind’. Usually, these are regarded as showing an ablaut-variant of ἐπι, but I do not see why: semantically they stand far apart from ἐπι and formally any laryngeal in front of */-o- would yield Gr. ὀ. The -i in my view is non-probative because it must be regarded as an old case-ending.

A possible connection between Hitt. appezzi(a)- ‘backmost, hindmost’ and Skt. ἀπατε- ‘offspring’ (cf. also Lith. apačia ‘bottom’) and a possible connection between H Luw. ṛparai- ‘later, younger’, Lyc. eprei- ‘back-, rear-’ and Skt. ṛpara- ‘later, following’, which within Sanskrit clearly belong with ṛṣa ‘away, off’, may indicate that ultimately Hitt. ṛṣa(n) belongs with ὀθρο. All in all, I would connect Hitt. ṛṣa(n) with Gr. ὀθρο and ὀντοκο: if Hitt. appezzi(a)-indeed ~ Skt. ἀπατε- and H Luw. ṛparai- / Lyc. eprei- ~ Skt. ṛpara-, then we should reconstruct */h₂op-*. The adjective appezzi(a)- is predominantly spelled ap-BI-Iz-zi- and therefore often cited as appizzi(a)-. This is incorrect in view of the one OS spelling with plene -e-, ap-pé-e-ez-zi-, which determines all other spellings as ap-pé-e-ez-zi- in the oldest texts, this adjective is thematic, appizzi(a)-, whereas from MH times onwards we increasingly find i-stem forms, appizi-*. This is typical for the suffix -ezzi(a)- that is also found in e.g. ḫantezzi(a)- (where it by the way is consistently spelled with -ė-). In NS texts we occasionally find a secondary stem appaeszzi-, with introduction of the full preverb ṛṣa, once even appazzi-. Note that the almost consistent spelling without plene initial a- points to a zero-grade formation ṛṣa(z)i(i)-l. The verb ṛṣai- / ṛṣi- shows the ḫa/tiṭanzi-class inflection in the oldest texts. The NS form apiṣzi is inflected according to the -ie/a-class, which is a normal development for ḫa/tiṭanzi-class verbs. If the 3sg.imm.midd.-form appaar indeed belongs here, it would show a stem appaezzi-*, according to the very productive ḫa/neae-class inflection. The noun appaṣṣiāt- ‘future’ is a compound of ṛṣa and šiāt- ‘day’ (q.v.). Note that the absence of plene initial a- also points to a zero-grade formation ṛṣa(z)i(i)-l.
\(\text{\textnumero}\text{pala}\) (gender unclear) ‘trap, deceit’: dat.-loc.sg. \text{a-ap-pa-li} (KUB 36.106 obv. 8 (OS)), \text{ap-pa-a-li} (KBo 6.34 i 16, 35, ii 1, 12 (MH/NS)).

Derivatives: \(\text{\textnumero}pala\)-\(2\) (Ic2) ‘to entrap’ (3sg.pres.act. \text{ap-pa-la-a-ez-zi} (IBoT 1.36 i 55 (MH/MS)), 1pl.pres.act. \text{a-ap-pa-la-a-u-e-ni} (KBo 16.50 obv. 14 (MH/MS)); impf. \text{ap-pa-li-eš-ke/a}, \text{ap-pa-li-iš-ke/a}, \text{appalijalla}\)- (c.) ‘?’ (gen.sg. \text{ap-pa-li-ja-al-la-š=a} (KUB 36.110 rev. 17 (OS))).

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 95 for attestations. The noun only occurs in the expression \(\text{\textnumero}pali dā\)- ‘to mislead (someone)’ and is the source of the verb \(\text{\textnumero}pala\)-\(2\) ‘to mislead, to deceive’. The meaning of the noun \text{appalijall}- cannot be determined on the basis of the context that it occurs in. Its alleged appurtenance to \(\text{\textnumero}pala\)- is based on its formal similarity only.

The expression \(\text{\textnumero}pali dā\)- ‘to mislead’ is interpreted by e.g. Starke (1990: 317ff.) as having the literal meaning ‘to take (someone) into a trap’ and he therefore assumes that \(\text{\textnumero}pala\)- ‘trap’ is cognate with the verb \(\text{\textnumero}pala\)-\(2\) / \text{app}- ‘to take, to seize’. On the basis of the long \(ā\), which does not fit the weak stem of \(\text{\textnumero}pala\)-\(2\) / \text{app}- that is consistently spelled with a short \(a\), he assumes that we are dealing with a borrowing from a Luwian word \(*\text{\textnumero}pala\*-\text{. Although Luwian loanwords do occasionally occur in OH texts already, the fact that a verb \(*\text{\textnumero}pala\*- is not attested in Luwian makes this etymology not immediately appealing.\n
\(\text{\textnumero}U\text{zi}\) \(\text{appuzz}\)- (n.) ‘animal fat, tallow’ (Sum. \(\text{\textnumero}U\text{zi}J\) \(\text{\textnumero}\text{UDU}\): nom.-acc.sg. \text{ap-pu-uz-zi}, \text{ap-pu-zi}, a-pu-zi, gen.sg. \text{ap-pu-uz-zi-ja-aš}, erg.sg. \text{[ap-pu-uz-zi-an-za} (OS), \text{ap-}[p]u-uz-zi-ja-an-za).

See Puhvel HED A: 103-4 for attestations. Usually, words in -\(\text{u}zi\)- are derived from the zero-grade form of a verbal stem (e.g. \text{lu}zi- from \(lā\)- / \(l\)-, \text{kur}u\text{zi}- from \(kuer\)- / \(kur\)-, \text{iš}u\text{zi}- from \(išhāi\)- / \(išhi\)-, \text{tuzzi}- from \(dai\)- / \(ti\)-, etc.). In this case, we therefore should assume that we are dealing with a weak stem \text{app-}. Formally, this can only belong to the verb \(\text{\textnumero}pala\)-\(2\) / \text{app}- ‘to take, to seize’, but it is unclear how this connection would work semantically. Further unclear.

\(\text{\textnumero}ar\)-\(\text{umu}\) (IIId) ‘to stand (by), to be stationed, to remain standing; to be present, to occur’ (Sum. GUB): 1sg.pres.midd. \text{ar-ha-ri} (OS), \text{ar-ḥa-ḥa-ri}, 2sg.pres.midd. \text{ar-ta-ti}, \text{ar-ta-ri}, 3sg.pres.midd. \text{ar-ta} (OS, often), \text{a-ar-ta} (KBo 3.35 i 13 (OH/NS), KBo 3.46 obv. 45 (OH/NS), KBo 13.45, 4, KBo 30.164 iii 5 (OH/NS), KUB 8.30

Derivatives: see arnu².

IE cognates: Skt. 3sg.aor.midd. ārta ‘erhebte sich, hat sich bewegt’ (see Kümmel 2000), Gr. ἔφησα ‘erhebte sich’, Lat. orior ‘to arise, to come into existence’, Arm. էարի- ‘to rise’.

PIE *h₂r-to

See HW² A: 194f. for attestations. This verb occurs in the middle only and is therewith clearly distinct from the verb Ăr² / ar- ‘to arrive’ that occurs in the active only. The oldest spellings all show initial ar- or a-r⁰. Spellings with initial plene a-ar- are rare and occur in NS texts only and are therefore etymologically without value.

For PIE we have to distinguish two roots with the structure *Her-. The root *h₂r- means ‘to come to, to reach (to move horizontally)’ (Gr. ἔφησα ‘to go, to come’) whereas *h₁r- means ‘to rise (to move vertically)’. Because of semantic considerations Oettinger (1979a: 523f.) assumes that Hitt. ar₂(au) must derive from *h₁er-. In LIV², ar₂(au) is regarded as reflecting the root *h₁er-, however, on the basis of the presumption that initial *h₁r- should have yielded Hitt. ḫ́-. As I have shown in Kloekhorst fthc.e., the outcome of initial *h₁r is dependent on the phonetic environment: a sequence *h₁er- indeed develops into Hitt. ḫ́a- but *h₁r- regularly yields Hitt. ḫ́t-. (through PAnat. *ṛt-). In Hittite, middles either show e-grade or zero-grade in the root. Because the oldest attestations of ar₂(au) are consistently written with short a-, it is likely that it reflects a zero-grade formation *Hr-to. All in all, I reconstruct arta / aranda as *h₂r-to / *h₂r-ento.

ār² / ar- (IIa2 (> Ic2)) ‘to come (to), to arrive (at)’: 1sg.pres.act. a-ar-ḥi (OH/MS), 2sg.pres.act. a-ar-ti (MH/MS), 3sg.pres.act. a-a-ri (OS), a-ri (OS), 1pl.pres.act. e-ru-e-ni (NS), e-ru-u-e-ni (NS), er-u-e-ni (NS), 2pl.pres.act. ar-te-ni (KUB 31.101, 31 (MS)), a-ar-te-ni (KUB 23.68 obv. 25 (MH/NS)), ar-te-e-ni
(KUB 6.16+18.64 iv 3, 6 (NS)), e-er-te-ni (NH), 3pl.pres.act. a-ra-an-zi (MH/MS), a-ra-a-an-zi (NS), 1sg.pret.act. a-ar-ḫu-un (MH/MS), a-ar-ah-ḫu-un, ar-ḫu-un, ar-ah-ḫu-un, 3sg.pret.act. a-ar-ša (OS), a-ar-aš (OH/MS), ar-aš; a-ra- aš, 1pl.pret.act. ar-ū-en (KBo 16.61 obv. 4 (MS?)), e-ru-en (KUB 57.9, 12 (NS)), e-ru-u-en (KUB 21.10, 24 (NH)), e-er-u-en (KUB 31.68 obv. 3 (NS)), e-er-u-č[-en] (KUB 23.101 i 24 (NH)), 3pl.pret.act. a-re-er (OS), e-re-er (HKM 47, 55 (MH/MS)), e-re-e-er (KUB 16.74, 8 (NS)), 3sg.imp.act. a-ru (OH/NS), 2pl.imp.act. a-ar-tén (MH/MS), ar-tén (OH/NS); part. a-ra-ant-; impf. ar-aš-ke/a- (MH/NS), a-ar-aš-ke/a- (MH/NS), a-ar-aš-ke/a- (NH).

IE cognates: Gr. ἐγγυέω ‘to come, to go’, Skt. र्च्छाति ‘to go to, to go at, to attain’.

PIE *h₁ó̂r-εi, *h₁r-énti

See HW² A: 208f. for attestations. On the basis of the oldest attested forms, we can assume that the original paradigm of this verb was ěṛhi, ěṛtī, ěṛi, *aryeni, arenti, aranzí. The forms that show a stem er- are all secondary. The oldest of these forms is 3pl.pret.act. erer (MH/MS), instead of OS arer, which probably was created on the basis of an analogy to asanzí: ešer, yielding aranzí: erer. From the pl.pret.-forms it spread also to the pl.pres.-forms, yielding forms like 1pl.pres. erényi and arenti. The OS spelling a-a-ri is quite remarkable (hyperplene), but in my view denotes ‘a-a-ri ḫάṭil. The etymological connection with Gr. ἐγγυέω ‘to come, to go’ and Skt. र्च्छाति ‘to go to, to go at, to attain’, both from *h₁r-skḗ/ó-, was first suggested by Sturtevant (1927b: 165-7). This means that Hitt. reflects *h₁ór-εi, *h₁r-énti. Note that the imperfective of this verb is spelled ar-aš-ke/a- (with younger adoptions to a-ar-aš-ke/a- and once a-ar-aš-ke/a-, with introduction of the strong stem ěṛ-), but never a-ri-iš-ke/a-, which spelling is exclusively used for the imperfective of arīje/a² (q.v.). This means that the imperfective of ěṛ- / ar- was /tṛskḗ/ā̄l < *h₁r-skḗ/ó-, whereas a-ri-iš-ke/a- must represent /tṛskḗ/ā̄l < *h₁rh₁-skḗ/ó-.

ěṛr̥l / ṛarr- (IIa2 > IIaIγ, Ic1) ‘to wash’: 1sg.pres.act. a-ar-ra-ah-ḫi (KUB 57.63 i 6 (NS)), a-ra-ra-ah-ḫi (KUB 7.1 i 29 (OH/NS), KUB 23.93 iii 6 (NS)), 3sg.pres.act. a-ar-ri (OS, often), ar-ri (a few times), ar-ra-i (KUB 1.13 iv 44 (MH/NS)), a-ar-ra-i (KBo 3.5 iv 48 (MH/NS)), ar-ri-i-ax-zi (KUB 44.63 ii 10 (NS)), a-ar-ri-i-e-ez-zi (KBo 17.94 iii 24 (NS)), ar-ri-ez-zi (KUB 45.47 i 30, 33 (MS)), ar-ru-ez-zi (KBo 3.5 iii 33 (MH/NS), [ar-]ra-at-te-ni (KBo 20.108 rev. 3 (NS)), 3pl.pres.act. ar-ra-an-zi (often), a-ar-ra-an-zi (less often), ar-ru-ya-an-zi (KBo 3.5 iv 33 (MH/NS)), ar-ru-ma-an-zi (KBo 3.5 i 23ff. (MH/NS)),

IE cognates: TochA *yār- ‘to bathe’.*

PIE *h₁örh₁-êi, *h₁rh₁-ênti

See HW\(^2\) A: 224f. and Puhvel HED 1/2: 111f. for attestations. The oldest forms of this verb clearly show an ablauting stem *ārr-/arr-.* In NS texts, we find some forms that inflect according to the ταρν(α)-class (*arrai, ārrai*) and the -ie/a-class (*arrijezi, ārrijezi*). In KBo 3.5 we find a few forms that belong to a stem *arruqe/a-* (*arruqe/a-*), the origin of which is unclear.

Since Couvreur (1937: 97), Hitt. ārr- / arr- has generally been connected with TochA *yār- ‘to bathe’* (pres.-stem yānrās-), from a root *HṛH-* (second laryngeal is visible in Hitt. -rr- < *-rH- and TochA yānrās- < *Hṛ-n-ḥ*). The colour of the first laryngeal is determined by TochA *y-* which can only reflect *h₁r-*. The Tocharian word does not give information on the colour of the second laryngeal, but in my view, the Hittite word does. The fact that the original 3sg.pres.act.form is ār̥i and not ārrai (only found in NS texts) to my mind shows that the second laryngeal must have been *h₁* as well: root-final *h₂* and *h₁* would have yielded the ending *-at* (as in 3sg.pres.act. *mаллай ‘mills’ < *mḥ₂₂-ε, 3sg.pres.act. *паддай ‘digs’ < *p₂₂₂d₂₂–ε, išparrai ‘tramples’ < *sp₂₂₂₂₂₂–ε, etc., cf. § 2.2.2.2.d). I therefore reconstruct the root as *h₁rH₁r-*. Note that *-rh₁- does not get lenited by a preceding *ō*.

āra (adv.) ‘right, proper(ly)’; *a-ar-a (OS, often), a-ra* (quite rarely).

Derivatives: [\(\text{LL}^{\text{M}N}\)\(\text{US}\) arā-(c.) ‘friend’ (nom.sg. a-ra-aš, a-ra-a-aš (KUB 29.1 i 13), acc.sg. a-ra-a-an (MH/MS), a-ra-an, dat.-loc.sg. a-ri (OS), a-re-eš-si (KUB 13.20 i 33), nom.pl. a-re-eš (OS), acc.pl. a-ru-uš, a-ra-aš, dat.-loc.pl. a-ra-aš), arāgya- (adj.) ‘free (from)’ (Akk. ELLUM; nom.sg.c. a-ra-u-aš (OS), a-ra-u-ya-aš (OS), a-ra-ya-aš, nom.-acc.sg. a-ra-u-ya-an, a-ra-a-u-ya-an (OH/NS), nom.pl.c. a-ra-a-u-eš, a-ra-a-u-eš), arāyāhḥ₂ (IIb) ‘to make free, to release’
The interpretation of the Anatolian forms is for a large part determined by the interpretation of the Lycian forms. There we find two stems, namely ara- and era- (in erawazije- ‘monument’). Melchert (1992b: 50) argues that of these two stems, ara- must be original, whereas erawazije- shows e/i-umlaut due to the syllable -zi-. This is very unlikely, however, as we then would have to assume that in erawazije- the umlaut skipped two syllables, which is unparalleled in Lycian. A genuine example of e/i-umlaut in this word is visible in the gen.adj.abl.-instr. [er]ewezijehedi, which shows that erawazije- cannot be an umlauted form. Therefore, erawazije- must be the original form and arawazije- must be the a-umlauted variant of it. This also shows that ara- and avara- must be a-umlauted forms from original *era- and *erawa-.

Connecting Lyc. er- to Hitt. ar-, we have to reconstruct a PANat. stem *tor-, and not *ar- (as e.g. in Melchert 1994a: 105, 148).

Since Hrozný (1915: 28), these words have been connected with Skt. áram ‘fittingly’, rtá- ‘truth, order’, etc., which themselves are connected with Gr. ἄραπικο κό κό to join’, from a root *h2er-. If these connections are justified (and semantically they are appealing), then the Anatolian forms ultimately reflect *h2or-, which is an important argument in favour of the view that *h2 neutralizes before *o (cf. Kortlandt 2004; Kloekhorst fhlc.c).


PAnat. *?or-

IE cognates: Skt. áram ‘fittingly’, rtá- ‘truth, order’, Gr. ἄραπικο κό κό ‘to join’.

PIE *h2or-o-


PAnat. *?or-

IE cognates: Skt. áram ‘fittingly’, rtá- ‘truth, order’, Gr. ἄραπικο κό κό ‘to join’.

PIE *h2or-o-

The interpretation of the Anatolian forms is for a large part determined by the interpretation of the Lycian forms. There we find two stems, namely ara- and era- (in erawazije- ‘monument’). Melchert (1992b: 50) argues that of these two stems, ara- must be original, whereas erawazije- shows e/i-umlaut due to the syllable -zi-. This is very unlikely, however, as we then would have to assume that in erawazije- the umlaut skipped two syllables, which is unparalleled in Lycian. A genuine example of e/i-umlaut in this word is visible in the gen.adj.abl.-instr. [er]ewezijehedi, which shows that erawazije- cannot be an umlauted form. Therefore, erawazije- must be the original form and arawazije- must be the a-umlauted variant of it. This also shows that ara- and avara- must be a-umlauted forms from original *era- and *erawa-.

Connecting Lyc. er- to Hitt. ar-, we have to reconstruct a PANat. stem *?or-, and not *ar- (as e.g. in Melchert 1994a: 105, 148).

Since Hrozný (1915: 28), these words have been connected with Skt. áram ‘fittingly’, rtá- ‘truth, order’, etc., which themselves are connected with Gr. ἄραπικο κό κό ‘to join’, from a root *h2er-. If these connections are justified (and semantically they are appealing), then the Anatolian forms ultimately reflect *h2or-, which is an important argument in favour of the view that *h2 neutralizes before *o (cf. Kortlandt 2004; Kloekhorst fhlc.c).
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IE cognates: OHG *ars, Gr. ἀρκος ‘arse’.

PIE *h₁ərs- *

See HW² A: 234 for attestations. Within Hittite, we find forms from an a-stem arra-, but also a nom.sg. arriš (i-stem) and nom.sg. arruš (u-stem). Perhaps we are dealing with tabooistic alterations.

Since Friedrich (1923: 374-6), this word is generally connected with OHG *ars, Gr. ἀρκος ‘arse’ from *H₄rso-. It proves that *VrsV > Hitt. *VrrV. If OIr. *err ‘tail, end’ < *ers-G belongs to this word as well, then we are dealing with a root *h₁ers-.


PIE *h₂or-o-je/o-

The verb araie- is mi-conjugated and belongs to the ḫatrae-class. It has to be separated from araie¹ / ari- ‘to rise, to raise’ (q.v.), despite homophonic forms like 3pl.pret.act. arər̥er and 2sg.imp.act. arəği. See HW² for a correct separation between araie² (= araie²) (A: 246f.) and araie¹ (= araie¹ / ari-) (A: 244f.).

Like all ḫatrae-class verbs, araie² probably is denominate as well. Oettinger (1979a: 369) derives araie² from a noun *h₂or-eh₂- ‘Stand, aufgestanden Sein’, a derivative of the root *h₂er- ‘to rise’. This is in contradiction, however, with his view that ḫatrae-class verbs are derived from o-stems and ḳē/a-class verbs from ḫ₂-stems. I therefore would assume that araie- is derived from a noun *h₂or-o-.

 arah-: see erh- / arah- / rh-

 araie¹ / ari- (IIa4 > lc2) ‘to (a)rise, to lift; to raise’: 1sg.pres.act. a-re-eh-hi (KBo 12.103 obv. 9 (NS)), 3sg.pres.act. a-ra-a-i (OS), a-ra, a-ra-a-ez-zi (e.g. KUB 31.101 obv. 14 (MS)), a-ra-iz-zi (OH/NS), 3pl.pres.act. a-ri-ja-an-zi (KUB 2.3 i 44, ii 29), 3sg.pret.act. a-ra-iš (OS), a-ra-a-iš, a-ra-iš, a-ra-a-es (KBo 5.4 rev. 27), 3pl.pret.act. a-ra-e-er (KBo 2.2 i 49), a-ra-a-er, 2sg.imp.act. a-ra-a-i,
3sg.imp.act. a-ra-id-du; 3sg.pres.midd. a-ri-et-ta (KUB 17.28 ii 2); part. a-ra-an-ter, a-ra-a-an-t; verb.noun. a-ra-a-ya-ar.


IE cognates: Lat. orior ‘to arise, to come into existence’.

PIE *h₁r-oï/- *h₂r-i-

The verb arai- / ari- ‘to rise, to raise’ is originally ħi-conjugated and belongs to the dā/tijanzzi-class. From MS texts onwards we find mi-inflected forms as well, as if the verb inflects according to the ĥatrace-class. This verb has to be separated from the verb araê̂-d ‘to stop, to rein in; to overpower’ (q.v.) (a mi-inflected verb belonging to the ĥatrace-class) despite of the many identical forms they share (e.g. 3pl.pret.act. arār, 2sg.imp.act. arāi, etc). See for attestations and forms the lemmas arai-¹ (= arai- / ari-) and arai-² (= araê̂-2) in HW² 244f.; Puhvel (HED 1/2: 123f.) wrongly regards arai-¹ / ari- and araê̂-2 as one verb and must assume a wild mix of inflected forms within one paradigm.

Oettinger (1979a: 479) connected arai-¹ / ari- with Lat. orior ‘to arise’, from the root *h₁r̪er- ‘to rise, to move vertically’. See Kloekhorst fthc.a for my view that the dā/tijanzzi-class consists of ħi-inflected i-presents, showing a zero-grade root followed by an ablauting suffix *-oi/-i-. In the case of arai-/ari- I therefore reconstruct *h₁r̪-oï/- *h₂r-i-.

It is interesting to note that the participle of this verb shows no i-suffix: arant- instead of expected **arijant-. This may point to a situation where originally only finite forms of the verb carried an i-suffix whereas infinite forms did not (similar in dai- / ti- ‘to place, to put’ < *ḏh₁-oï- / *ḏh₂-i- besides impf. zikke/-a- < *ḏh₁-ske/o-). The verb.noun araṇyār probably shows loss of intervocalic -i-: *araṇyār < *h₁r-oi-yr.

araṣṣje/a² : see ārṣ² / arṣ-

arḥ(a): see erḥ- / araḥ- / arḥ-

-ar(i), -at(i) (3sg.midd.-endings)
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PIE *-a(-ri)

In the 3sg.midd., we find two sets of endings: pres. -a(ri), pret. -ati(i) vs. pres. -tta(ri), pret. -tat(i). Sometimes it is stated that the distribution between these endings corresponds to the distribution between mi- and hi-endings in the active, but this is incorrect. On the basis of the active inflection of a given verb, it cannot be predicted whether it will use -a(ri) / -ati(i) or -tta(ri) / -tat(i) as 3sg.midd.-ending. For instance, ḥalzija(ri), lahuṟi, ḫagāri and paḥša(ri) correspond to the hi-inflecting actives ḥalzai / ḥalzi-, ṭahu / lahu-, ḫak- / lak- and paḥš-, whereas e.g. eṣa(ri) and karša correspond to the mi-inflecting actives eṣš / aš- and karšš.

Usually, a verb is consistent in its ‘choice’ for either the ending -a(ri) / -ati(i) or -tta(ri) / -tat(i), but sometimes we encounter both (e.g. karša besides karšta or šuppəri besides šupta) and occasionally even a combination of the two (e.g. šuppattari). These are rare cases, however. For instance, the verb eš-ša(ri) ‘to seat oneself’ shows the ending -a(ri) throughout the Hittite period, whereas e.g. k̕i-ša(ri) consistently shows -tta(ri). That this does not necessarily reflect the PIE state of affairs is visible in the fact that eṣa(ri) < *h₁éh₂s-o corresponds to Skt. āste and Gr. ἀπέλθα from *h₁éh₂s-to. On the other hand, Hitt. k̕ita(ri) reflects *kēi-to just as Skt. śete and Gr. καθάλλα, whereas its CLuwian cognate zūari reflects *kēi-o just as Skt. śāye.

The endings -a(ri) / -ati(i) occur in all the middle classes. Note that in class IIIf (tukkāri-class), the ending is always spelled with a plene vowel (cf. § 2.2.3.2). This is due to accentuation, compare eṣa(ri), eṣati(i) < *h₁éh₂s-o and k̕aša(ri), k̕ašati(i) < *gēis-o to tukkāri, tukkāri < *tuk-ó and logāri < *l̕a₂-ó. In the present ending -a(ri), the distribution between forms with and without -ri seems connected with this: tukkāri-class middle always show -ri, whereas in fullgrade middles the -ri is optional. In the preterite, the distribution between -ati and -at seems chronological: compare eša-ti (OH/MS) besides eša-at (MH/NS), or du-uk-ka₃-ta-ti (MS?) besides tu-uk-ka₃-at (NH).

As we saw above, the endings -a(ri) / -ati(i) have a well-established IE cognate in Skt. -e (3sg.pres.midd.-ending), which is a variant of -te (compare śāye < *kēi-o-i besides śete < *kēi-to-i). In all other IE languages that show a reflex of the middle category, we find the ending *-to only (for which see at -tta(ri), -tat(i)). It would go too far to go into the details here of the PIE distribution between *-o and *-to.

ar(i)je(a)-² (Ic1) ‘to consult an oracle; to determine by oracle’: 1sg.pres.act. a-ri-ja-mi (MH/MS), 2sg.pres.act. a-ri-ja-ši, 3sg.pres.act. a-ri-e-ez-zi, a-ri-ja-zi,


IE cognates: Gr. ἐπέκο ‘to ask’.

PIE *hṛh₁-je/o-

Puhvel (HED 1/2: 136ff.) cites the verb as ariya-, arai-, arguing that possibly forms like 2pl.pres.act. aratteni (KUB 6.15 ii 2, broken context) belong here as well. This is improbable, however. All forms of which it can be ascertained that they mean ‘to consult an oracle; to determine by oracle’ inflect according to the -je/a-class, arīje/a², or show a stem ar- (in the participle arant-). There is no reason to assume an extra stem arai-: forms in broken contexts that show such a stem could just as well belong with araе/a² (q.v.) or arai² / ari- (q.v.).

The participle shows two different forms, viz. arant- and arijant-. According to HW² (A: 295), the original participle is arant-, showing a situation where all finite forms bear the *-ie/o-suffix, whereas the infinite forms do not (cf. the situation in e.g. karpi(ije/a)-²). The participle arijant- is a younger formation.

Houwink ten Cate (1973: 209-10) argues that arīje/a² is to be seen as a variant of arai² / ari- ‘to rise; to raise’, so literally denoting ‘to arouse the gods’. Although verbs that belong to the dūti/anzi-class indeed often show younger thematicizations inflecting according to the -je/a-class (e.g. ḫupatuḫ) beside younger ḫulzi, I do not think that semantically an equation between arai² / ari- ‘to rise, to raise’ and arīje/a² ‘to consult an oracle’ is likely.

Since Götz & Pedersen (1934: 47f.), this verb is often connected with Lat. ěqē ‘to pray’. The latter word, however, belongs with Gr. ἐπέκο ‘prayer’, which shows that the root must have been *h₂er-. For Hittite, reconstructing a root *h₂er- is difficult, as we would expect an outcome **hur- (unless we assume o-grade, but that is not likely in a *-ie/o-verb).

LIV² connects arīje/a- with Gr. ἐπέκο ‘to ask’ from a root *h₁reh₁-, which seems semantically plausible. This means that arīje/a² must reflect *h₁rh₁jē/o-, for which compare e.g. pārijanzi ‘they blow’ < *prh₁jēnti or karijant- ‘grass’ if from *gʰrh₁jēnt-.
The imperfective ariške/a- / areške/a- at first sight seems to reflect *arge+ske/avel sim., but in fact must be phonologically interpreted */Irské/á-/I, the regular outcome of */hri+h-ské/ó- (compare paripriške/a- ‘to blow (imperf.)’ /pripriské/á-/ < */pri-prh-h-ské/ó-). This explains the fact that the imperfective of arije/a-2 is consistently spelled differently from the imperfective of ār- / ar- ‘to arrive’, which is spelled ar-aš-ke/a- in the oldest texts, representing */Irské/á- < */hri+h-ské/ó-.

For arijašėsšar ‘oracle’ compare tuzzjašėššar ‘army’, which is seen as a compound of tuzzi- and ašėšar ‘gathering’. This would mean that arijašėšar literally means ‘gathering for consulting an oracle’.

arrije/a- (Ic1) ‘to be awake’: verb. noun ar-ri-ja-a-u-ya-ar (KBo 13.1 i 41).

The word is attested in a vocabulary only: KBo 13.1 i 41: (Sum.) IG.LLIB.A = (Akk.) DÁ-LA-PU = (Hitt.) ar-ri-ja-a-u-ya-ar. Akk. dalāpu means ‘to be/stay/keep awake’. Unfortunately, the Hittite word is not found in a real text, so its meaning cannot be ascertained by context.

Szemerényi (1979: 613-6) connects arrije/a- with Arm. art’own ‘watchful’ and Ofr. ar- ‘(night)watch’ (in aître ‘watch’, ro-airius ‘I have watched’) and states that if these connections are justified, ‘Hitt. arriya- is closely related to the widely attested verbs arâ, arâzi ‘rises’, ar-ḫi ‘I arrive, get (somewhere)’, ar-ḫâhari ‘I step, stand’, and, formally, may be identical with Lat. orior’ (followed by e.g. Puhvel HED 1/2: 138f.). It is problematic, however, to equate the geminate -rr- of arrijâuyâr with the consistently single spelled -r- of the verbs arâi- / arî- and ar-âa.

ark- / ark- (IIIc > IIId; IIa2) ‘to mount, to cover, to copulate’: 3sg.pres.midd. a[r]glâ (KUB 41.8 iv 29 (MH/NS)), ar-kat-ta (KBo 22.2 obv. 9, 10 (OH/MS)), 3sg.imp.midd. ar-ga-ru (KBo 10.45 iv 32 (MH/NS), KUB 41.8 iv 31 (MH/NS)); 3sg.pres.act. a-ar-ki (KBo 10.45 iv 30 (MH/NS)); part. ar-kân-ti-(OS); impf. 3sg.pres.midd. ar-ki-iš-ke-et-ta (KUB 29.1 i 30 (OH/NS)).

Derivatives: arki- (c.) ‘testicle’ (nom.pl. ar-ki-i-e-eš (KBo 17.61 rev. 15 (MH/MS)), acc.pl. [a]ki-i-eš (KUB 10.62 v 7 (OH/NS))).


PIE *hṛɡ̣-o, *h₁ōṛɡ̣-ei.
It seems that originally the verb was middle only. Only once we find an active form, 3sg.pres.act. ārkī (KBo 10.45 iv 30), which is a duplicate of 3sg.pres.midd. a[rg]a (KUB 41.8 iv 29). Nevertheless, it is remarkable that this ārkī seems to reflect o-grade, whereas all other forms reflect zero grade. If the active form was back-formed from the middle paradigm, we would have expected a short a here as well.

Puhvel (HED 1/2: 142f.) connects this verb with e.g. Gr. ἔρχομαι ‘testicle’, Av. 赀,* ‘testicle(s)’, Arm. որջ ‘male’, Lith. aržas ‘lustful’, ežīlas ‘stallion’ from a root *h₁ergʰ-. A reconstruction with *h₁- (thus also in LIV²) is based on the Lithuanian form ežīlas ‘stallion’ only: all other IE languages reflect a vowel *o. In dialectal Lithuanian, we find a form ažīlas ‘stallion’ as well, which makes it likely that ežīlas / ažīlas is subject to Rozwadowski’s change (i.e. mixing up of initial e- and a-, cf. Andersen 1996: 141; Derksen 2002; Kortlandt 2002-03). This makes Lith. ežīlas valueless for the reconstructing of the initial laryngeal. As all other IE languages seem to reflect non-apophonic *orgʰ-, we have to reconstruct *h₁ergʰ- . This is especially prompted by the equation of Av. 赀,*- and Arm. orj- i-k’ (both zero-grade formations, but note that Alb. herdhē shows *e-grade, however) with Gr. ἔρχομαι, which therefore is likely to be a zero-grade formation as well and must reflect *h₁-: *h₁ergʰ- -i-. It is likely that this is the preform that is reflected in Hitt. arki- as well, which shows that initial *h₁ disappears before *r (cf. Kloeckhorst fhhc.c).

In Hittite, middles can either reflect zero grade (e.g. tukkāri) or e-grade (e.g. ešari). Because the middle forms of the verb arκʰ- are consistently written with a short vowel, we have to assume a zero-grade formation *h₁ergʰ- o, again with loss of initial *h₁ in front of *r.

If the one active form ārkī is not a secondary backformation, but original (which could be indicated by the fact that it shows full-grade versus the zero-grade forms that are found in the middle paradigm), it reflects *h₁orgʰ- ei (o-grade as in all ʰi-verbs), and could show that initial *h₁ was lost in Hittite in front of *o as well (cf. Kloeckhorst fhhc.c).

ārkī / arκʰ- (IIa2) ‘to cut off, to divide’: 3sg.pres.act. a-ar-ki (OS), ar-ki (1467/u ii 4 (NS)), a-ar-gi (KBo 6.11 i 16), 3pl.pres.act. ar-kān-zi (OS), a-ar-kān-zi (1x, KUB 8.16+24 + 43.2 iii 14 (NS)), ar-ga-an-zi (KUB 55.39 i 5 (NS)), 3pl.pret.act. ar-ke-er (KUB 43.60 iii 20, 23); part. ar-kān-t-; inf.I ar-ku-ga-an-zi (KBo 19.142 ii 20); impf. ar-ki-š-ke/a-.
IE cognates: Lat. (h)ercōscō ‘to divide (an estate)’, (h)erctum ‘division (of inheritance)’.

PIE *h₁er’k-ei, *h₁er’k-enti

See HW² A: 300f. for attestations. The oldest forms of this verb show an ablaut between ārk- in the singular and ark- in the plural, reflecting *Hork-/*Hrk-.

According to Puhvel (HED 1/2: 141), the verb basically means ‘to mark off’ as can be seen in the following context:

KBo 11.17 ii
(12) nu=kán ma-ah-ḥa-an SILA₄ BAL-an-ti
(13) nam-m=a-an=kán ya-āp-pu-i kat-ta
(14) ḫa-at-ta-i n u e-eš-ḥar tak-ni-i
(15) kat-ta tar-na-i SILA₄=ma=kán
(16) ar-kán-zı nam-ma=kán SILA₄
(17) ḫu-u-ma-an-da-an pū-tal-ya-an-da-an
(18) mar-kán-zı

‘While he sacrifices a lamb and then perforates it along the bank, he lets the blood flow on the ground. They a. the lamb and butcher the entire lamb ‘plain’.

In this context, arkanzi stands between ḥattai ‘perforates’ and markanzi ‘butcher’, and therefore must mean something like ‘mark off’. On the basis of this meaning, Puhvel connects the verb with Gr. ἐρχαῖος ψυχμός (Hes.) ‘fence’. The latter word is found besides ἐρχαῖος ψυχμός (Hes.) ‘fence’, ἐρχαῖη φυλακή (Hes.) ‘guard’ and ἐρχχ ‘row of vines’, which, because of its alternation χκ shows that these words probably are of substratum origin.

Another proposal (Eichner 1981: 63; 1982: 21-6), viz. a connection with Lat. (h)ercōscō ‘to divide (an estate)’, (h)erctum ‘division (of inheritance)’, may make more sense if the awkward sporadic presence of h- in Latin does not point to un-IE origin. If accepted, Hitt. ārk-/*ark- and Lat. (h)er- would point to a PIE root *h₁er’k-.


Derivatives: arkuššar / arkušš- (n.) ‘prayer’ (dat.-loc.sg. ar-ku-u-e-eš-ni (KUB 6.45 iii 22), ar-ku-e-eš-ni (KUB 6.46 iii 61)).


PIE *h₁orkʷ-o-je/o-??

See HW² A: 309f. for attestations. There is some debate about the exact semantics of this verb. E.g. HW² (l.c.) translates “bieten (bitten)”; selten “sich entschuldigen (rechtfertigen)” and argues that ‘to pray’ is the original meaning. E.g. Puhvel (HED 1/2: 148f.) translates “plead, argue, rejoin, riposte, respond, explain oneself, make excuses, offer defense” and states that all instances where usually ‘to pray’ is translated, ‘to plead’ would work as well.

This debate also has consequences regarding the etymology. The verb belongs to the ḫatre-class, which consists of denominatives in *-je/o- of nouns in -o-. In this case we have to postulate a noun *arkua- < *H(o)rKʷo- which should be the source of arkuae-². The scholars that translate arkuae-² as ‘to pray’ connect it with Skt. arc- ‘to shine, to sing, to praise’. TochA yārk- ‘to worship’ < *h₂erkʷ-, implying a reconstruction *h₁(0)rKʷ-o-je/o-. Yet, the scholars that translate ‘to plead’ make a connection with Lat. arguā ‘to argue’. The interpretation of this latter word is unclear, however. Usually, Lat. arguā is seen as a denominative verb of a noun *argus, which is connected with the root for ‘white’, *h₂erg²- (e.g. Schrijver 1991: 67-8). A connection with Hitt. arkuae-, however, would imply a reconstruction *h₂erg²-o-je/o- for Hittite and *h₂erg²- for Latin. On a formal level, this etymology would only be acceptable if we assume that in Hittite an initial *h₁ is dropped in front of *o (for which see Kloekhorst ftc.c), and secondly that *-rg²- would yield -rgu- in Latin (possibly parallel to the development of *-ng²- as in Lat. ungu ‘nail’ < *h₂ng²-en-).

So from a formal point of view, both etymologies are possible, provided that *-rg²- > Lat. -rgu-. Semantically, however, I personally would favour the translation ‘to pray’ and therefore the reconstruction *h₁(0)rKʷ-o-je/o-.

The few spellings with initial plene a-ar-ku-ya- may indicate that the a- was a real vowel ʾarkʷae-l, and point to a reconstruction *h₁(0)rKʷ-o-je/o-, whereas *h₁rKʷoje/o- would have yielded ʾlarkʷae-l, which should have been spelled with ar-ku-ya- only.


PIE *h₁(o)r-mo- (?)

A reading arma- of the logograms [4]SIN, [4]EN.ZU and ITU[KAM] is suggested by the derivative armanni- ‘lunula’ and names like *Ar-ma-zi-ti = [m]Sin-ma-LU-i- (cf. HW 2 A: 313). According to Puhvel (HED 1/2: 152), the form a-ar-me-esi (KBo 23.52 ii 10, 12, 15, 17) belongs to this word as well, and he translates ‘lunulae’ (nom.pl.). HW 2 (A: 327) just states that the word denotes “Teil am Ochsengespann”, however, without giving an exact interpretation. If the form belonged to the word for ‘moon’, it would be the only attestation with plene a-. It therefore is perhaps best to leave this form aside.

The stem arma- is found in Luwian, Lycian and possibly Lydian as well. The Lycian form Arûma- at first sight seems to point to PAnat. arma- If the first a of Arûma-, which is an a-stem, is due to a-umlaut, however, and the form Erûmenêni shows the original stem, we can reconstruct PAnat. *ʔ(o)r-m-o- (or even *ʔ(o)rm-eh₂- if we take the Lycian a-stem into account).

It is not totally clear to what extent the word-group consisting of erman / arman- ‘sickness’, armae-² ‘to be pregnant’, etc. is related to the word for
‘moon’. If a semantic connection is perceivable (perhaps through seeing the moon as the ‘weaker’ celestial body), the word erman ‘sickness’ would show that we have to reconstruct an initial *h₁- *h₁(o)rmo-. Alternatively, we could with Van Windekens (1979) assume a connection with TochB yarm ‘measure’ < *h₁ermn, assuming that ‘moon’ derives from ‘measurer’ (cf. PIE *meh₁ns ‘moon’ from *meh₁- ‘to measure’). This would point to a reconstruction *h₁(ermo)= as well. Another possibility is assuming that *h₁ermn reflects *h₁(ermo)= derived from *h₁γer-= ‘to move’ (the moon as ‘traveller’).

armae² (Ic2) ‘to be pregnant’: 3sg.pres.act. ar-ma-iz-zi, ar-ma-a-iz-zi, part. ar-ma-an-t-; verb.noun.gen.sg. ar-ma-u-ya-aš (KUB 35.103 iii 10).


PIE *h₁(o)rmo-je/o- (?)

See HW² A: 323-4 and Puhvel HED 1/2: 155f. for attestations. The verb armae² inflects according to the ḫatrae-class. This class predominantly consists of denominative verbs that are derived from a-stem nouns. In this case, it is likely that armae- is derived from a noun *arma-, which also functioned as the basis for armaḫh₃. It is not fully clear whether this noun *arma- must be equated with *arma- ‘moon’ (q.v.). In addition, the connection with erman / arman- ‘sickness’ (q.v.) is unclear. If all these words belong together, we would have to reconstruct the basic noun as *h₁(ermo)- (with *h₁- on the basis of erman < *h₁ermn) and armae² as *h₁(o)rmo-je/o-?


IE cognates: Gr. ἔφοβος, ‘to make (someone) move’, Skt. ṛṇōti ‘to put in motion’.

PIE *h₂r-n(e)u- and *h₂r-n(e)u-

From a synchronic point of view, _armu_ looks like the causative of either ār- / ar- ‘to arrive’ (from PIE *h₂rer- ‘to move horizontally’) or ar- ‘to stand’ (from PIE *h₂re- ‘to move vertically’). Semantically speaking, one would favour a connection with ār-/ar- ‘to arrive, to come’, which would mean that _armu_ would go back to (virtual) *h₂r-neu-. From a historical point of view, however, the semantic as well as formal similarity with Gr. ἔφοβος ‘to make (someone) move’ and Skt. ṛṇōti ‘to make move’ makes one wonder whether _armu_ is not an inherited formation that reflects *h₂r-neu-. Formally, a development from *h₂r-neu- to Hitt. _armu_ is regular (cf. Kloeckhorst fth.c.). In my view, both scenarios are possible, and I would not be surprised if Hitt. _armu_ were a conflation of two originally separate formations, viz. *h₂r-neu- and *h₂r-neu-.

ārš^2_/ arš- (Ia4 > Ic1 > Ic2) ‘to flow’: 1sg.pres.act. ar-aš-mi (KUB 36.75+ iii 19 (OH/MS)), 3sg.pres.act. ar-aš-zi (KBo 13.31 i 8 (OH/MS), KBo 21.22 rev. 39 (OH/MS), KUB 9.3 i 10 (MS), KUB 15.34 iii 24 (MH/MS), KUB 9.6 i 19, 21, 22, 37 (MH/NS)), a-ar-aš-zi (KUB 43.58 ii 15 (MS), KBo 10.45 ii 40 (MH/NS), KUB 41.8 ii 4, iv 37 (MH/NS), KUB 8.36 ii 11 (NS), KUB 17.9 i 22 (NS), KUB 18.41 ii 10 (NS), VBoT 16 rev. 6 (NS), a-ar-zi (KBo 10.45 iv 39 (MH/NS), KUB 15.42 ii 3 (NS), ar-ši-e-ez-zi (KUB 17.10 iii 26 (OH/MS), KBo 21.41+KUB 29.7 rev. 60 (MH/MS), KUB 33.28 iii 14 (OH/NS), ar-ši-ere-e-ez-zi (KUB 33.54 ii 10 (OH/NS)), ar-ši-er-e-er-ez-zi (KUB 29.10 i 7 (OH/NS)), a-ar-aš-ši-er-e-er-ez-zi (KUB 29.10 i 11 (OH/NS)), ar-ši-er-e-er-ez-zi (KUB 29.9 i 11 (OH/NS)), a-ar-ši-er-e-er-ez-zi (KUB 33.49 ii 3 (OH/NS)), a-ar-ši-er-e-er-ez-zi (KUB 30.19 + 20 + 21 + 22 + 39.7 i 28, 29 (OH/NS), a-ar-ši-er-e-er-ez-zi (KUB 29.10 i 15 (OH/NS)), 3pl.pres.act. ar-ša-an-zi (KUB 24.8 iv 11 (OH/NS), KUB 10.72 v 3 (OH/NS), KUB 33.87 + 113 + 36.12 + 14 + 30 (NS), KUB 36.25 iv 5 (NS)), ar-ši-er-e-er-ez-zi (KUB 33.4 + IBoT 3.141 iv 5 (OH/NS)), 3sg.pret.act. a-ar-aš-ša-[a’] (KUB 17.9 i 22 (NS)), a-ar-ša-ar-
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(KUB 36.89 rev. 12 (NS)), 3pl.pret.act. ar-še-er (KUB 36.2b ii 19 (NS)), 3sg.imp.act. ar-aš-du (KBo 17.105 ii 34 (MH/NS)); 3sg.prs.midd. ar-ša-ri (KUB 34.78, 6 (MS), broken context, so meaning not assured), 3sg.imp.midd. ar-ša-ru (KBo 47.142 obv. 9 (NS), broken context, so meaning not assured); part. ar-ša-an-t- (KUB 33.41 ii 9 (OH/NS), KUB 41.4 iii 12 (MH/NS), KBo 10.47g iii 14 (NS)).


IE cognates: Skt. arṣ- ‘to stream, to flow’ (3sg.pres.act. arṣati ).

PIE *h₁ers-ti, *h₁rs-entī

See HW² A: 341f. for attestations. Originally, the verb ārš-/-arš- is a root-inflected present. From MS texts onwards, we find *-je/o-inflected forms (aršiṣezi etc.) as well as occasional forms that inflect according to the ḫatrae-class (aršiṣezi) and the tarn(a)-class (ārša). The few attestations with geminate -ṣṣ- (a-ar-aš-ṣi-ez-zi, a-ar-aš-ṣi-ja-zi, ar-aš-ša-nu-ya-an-zí) point to a phonemic /S/. The two middle forms are unclear regarding their interpretation: they are both found in broken contexts without clues for their meaning.

We find forms spelled both with and without initial plene a-. It is significant that all weak-stem forms (pres.pl. and part.) are written without a-. The strong-stem forms show both spellings. When we order the spellings chronologically, we see that the spelling ar-aš- is found mainly in OH/MS and MH/MS texts whereas the spelling a-ar-aš- is found mainly in NS texts and only once in a MS text. Although this seems to point to a situation where the spelling ar-aš- is more archaic, I think that we nevertheless have to assume that the spelling a-ar-aš- is the original one: it is unlikely that a regular paradigm showing arṣī, arṣanzi, would innovate into an ablauting paradigm ārṣī, arṣanzi.

The etymology of this verb has been clear since Sturtevant (1932b: 120). It is connected to Skt. arṣati ‘to flow’ and reconstructed as *h₁ers- (Rieken 1999a: 327 states that *h₁ers- is possible as well, but this is not true: *h₁ers- would have given **hārš-, cf. Hitt. hark² ‘to get lost’ < *h₁erg-).
Within Hittite, *ārš-/*arš- belongs to the group of verbs that show a root-structure *CeRC-. Due to the sound law *eRCC > aRCC, in combination with the fact that all the endings of the singular began with a consonant, the *e of the strong stem yielded a (Hitt. CaRC-). The weak stem, having a zero grade *CRC-, was spelled in Hittite with a as well (CaRC-), which caused, at least on the level of spelling, coinciding of the two stems. It is therefore significant that *ārš-/*arš- is the only verb belonging to this group that shows an ablaut ā : a. This problem was seen before, and different scholars have proposed different explanations. Kimball (1983: 181) seems to assume that *ārš- reflects *h₁e₂rs- and arš- < *h₁rs-, but does not explain why e.g. *kérs- did not yield **kôrš-. Melchert (1994a: 125) therefore dismisses her reconstruction and assumes that āršzi reflects a zero grade stem *fš-ti that was generalized from the plural, which, through Pre-Hitt. *ōrš-ti, yielded āršzi. Yet, this solution does not explain either why we do not find ā in other verbs of this type, e.g. **kérs-ti > **kôrš-ti > **kôršzi.

In my view, the spelling a-ar-aš-zi is best regarded not to denote a long ā, but should be read ‘a-ar-aš-zi = /lårSt’ul/, in contradistinction to ar-ša-an-zi, which was /lṛSánt’i/. So the initial plene a- was used to indicate the fact that the word contained a “real” a (which was short) that contrasted with the schwa which automatically preceded the pronunciation of the interconsonantal /l/.

The preservation of the cluster -rs- contrasts with e.g. arra- < *Horso-. If one assumes that the assimilation of *-rs- to -rr- only occurs intervocally, the preservation in ārš-/*arš- would be regular (note that this supports the view that the first a of aršanzi was not a phonological real vowel, so /lṛSánt’i/ instead of /årSánt’i/).

See Rieken (1999a: 326f.) for a treatment of arša(r)sur, which she explains as a derivative in -ur- with full reduplication, showing occasional loss of -r- due to dissimulation. As I have explained in § 1.3.9.4.f, the one spelling with the sign Û, ar-ša-a-aš-šu-û-û-î=št-sî-it (KUB 36.55 ii 20), must be a mistake instead of correct ar-ša-ar-šu-u-û-û-û-î=št-sî-it (ibid. 26).

aršanzi² / aršan- (Ia1 > Ic1) ‘to be envious, to be angry’: 2sg.pres.act. ar-ša-ne-e-ši (KBo 25.122 ii 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14 (OS)), 1sg.pret.act. ar-ša-ñi-[e]-mu-un (ABoT 65 rev. 4 (MH/MS)), 2sg.pret.act.(?) ar-ša-ñi-e-sê (ABoT 65 rev. 6 (MH/MS), error for ar-ša-ñi-e-eš?), 3sg.pret.act. ar-ša-ñi-ja-at (KUB 19.65, 14 (NH)), 3pl.pret.act. ar-ša-ñi-i-e-r (KUB 1.1+ i 31 (NH) (with gloss wedges), KBo 3.6+ i 28 (NH), KUB 1.5+ i 7 (NH)); part. nom.-acc.pl. ar-ša-ña-an-d[a] (KUB 33.9 iii 7 (OH/NS)), ar-ša-ña-an-ta (HKM 116, 32 (MH/MS)).

PIE *h₁:3rs-ne-h₁:ti / *h₁:3rs-n-h₁:-enti.

See HW² A: 344 for attestations. Usually, it is stated that all the forms are derived from a nominal stem *aršan(a):- we find aršanē-, which Watkins (1985: 244) regarded as a denominative stative in *eh₁:-, aršaniye/a- (-je/o-derivative) and arşanant-. This stem *arşan(a)- is generally connected with Skt. īrṣya- ‘angry’, īrṣyāti ‘to be angry’, Av. arṣiānt- ‘envious’, araska- ‘envy’, which must reflect *HṛH(e)s-.

Watkins (I.c.) therefore reconstructs *aršan(a)- as *h₁:3s-no-, whereas Oettinger (1979a: 355) gives *h₁:son-je-. Although the connection with the Ilr. words would be possible from a semantic point of view, the formal side of this etymology is difficult. A preform *HṛHs-no- should have given Hitt. **priśna-, spelled are/išna- (cf. paripriš/e/a- /paripriskē/ā-l < *pri-prīšskē/ō-), and *HṛHs-on- > Hitt. **prišan-, spelled are/iššan- (cf. gane/iššanzi /knišānt/i < *gīnḫišēnti). I therefore see no merit in this connection.

In my view, we have to look at the verb differently. It shows three stems: aršanē- (OS), aršaniye/a- (from MH times onwards) and aršan- (OH/NS and MH/MS). As -je/a-stems are often secondary, we are left with an original ablauting stem aršanē- / aršan-. If we compare this ablauting pair to e.g. zimm- / zimm- ‘to finish’ or ḫulle- / ḫull- ‘to smash’, it is quite obvious that aršanē- / aršan-, too, must reflect a nasal-infixed verb with root-final *h₁: *Hṛs-ne-h₁:- / *Hṛs-n-h₁:-. The root of this verb is either *Hersh₁- or *Hresh₁- (structurally like mesuH- ‘aufheben, wegnemen’ (cf. Skt. musnātī) or *h₁:eish₁- ‘kräftigen, antreiben’ (cf. Skt. īṣnātī); for both roots, see LIV²). The initial laryngeal can only be *h₁ or *h₂ as *h₂ would have yielded Hitt. ḫa- in this position. Unfortunately, I know no cognate in any other IE language.

aršiye/a-: see ġarš- / ar-ṣ-

ardu- ‘to saw’: 1pl.pres.act. ar-du-me-e-ni (KUB 36.74 iii 2); verb.noun. ar-du-mar (KBo 26.19, 10); broken ar-du[...] (KUB 33.106 iii 54; Puhvel HED 1/2: 175; 3pl.imp.act. ardu[waardu]; HW² A: 347: 1pl.pres.act. ar-du[-me-(e)-ni]).

Derivatives: URUDU ardāl(a)- (n.) ‘saw’ (nom.-acc.pl. ar-da-a-la (KUB 33.106 iii 54)).
Although all attested forms point to a stem ardu- (arduměni < *ardu-yei, ardumar < *ardu-yar), this verb is usually cited as ard- (so in Puhvel HED 1/2: 175; ard(a)- in HW2 A: 347), on the basis of the assumption that the -u- in the verb is added after false interpretation of 1pl. *ard-yei and that the plain stem ard- is still visible in the derivative ardčč(a)-. In my view the stem ardu- is primary, however, and the derivative ardčč(a)- reflects *ardyol(o)-, showing the development *-dьo- > Hitt. -da- as can be seen in e.g. id刍u < *hьeydьolуu-.

If this verb is from IE origin, it should reflect an u-present because a root-structure *HerTu-, *HreTu- or *HrTeu- is impossible in PIE. Puhvel (l.c.) connects this verb to Skt. rάdati ‘to dig, to scraie’ and Lat. rёdere ‘to gnaw’, which must reflect *Hrehьd- (cf. Schrijver 1991: 309-10). Although from a formal point of view a reconstruction *Hrhьd-u- could be possible for Hitt. ardu-, it is not very appealing.

ardu- / aray- (adj.) ‘high(?):’ acc.pl. a-ra-m[u-uš] (KUB 33.5 ii 17).


PIE *hь(o)r-u-?

Although the interpretation of most of the cited forms is not totally clear, most handbooks assume the existence of an adjective aru- / aray- that is translated as ‘high’. If this is correct, then a connection with the verb ar-wo’ ‘to stand’ is likely, which means that aru- / aray- is derived from the root *hьer- ‘to rise’. Because *hь- yields Hitt. /r/ before *о and before consonant, but is retained as h- before *e (cf. Kloekhorst fthc.c), we can reconstruct both *hьor-u- and *hьr-u-

-arу (3sg.imp.midd.-ending)


This ending is clearly derived from the 3sg.pres.midd.-ending -ari in which the ‘presentic’ -i is replaced by the imperative -u. See for further treatment at both -а(ри) and -u.
**aruna-** (c.) ‘sea’ (Sum. A.AB.BA); nom.sg. a-ru-na-aš (OS), a-a-ru-na-aš (KBo 5.3 i 59 (NH)), a-ru-na-aš (KUB 36.25 iv 6 (NS)), acc.sg. a-ru-na-an, gen.sg. a-ru-na-aš (OS), dat.sg. a-ru-ni (OS), a-ru-ú-ni (KUB 36.41 i 13 (MS)), all.sg. a-ru-na (OS), abl. a-ru-na-az (OS), a-ru-na-za, acc.pl. a-ru-nu-aš (KBo 3.41 rev. 11), gen.pl. a-ru-na-aš.

Derivatives: **arunuman-** (c.) ‘maritime’ (nom.pl. a-ru-nu-na-né-e-es (KUB 8.14 obv. 14)).

PIE *hýr-éu-no-?

The word is abundantly attested from OS texts onwards. Despite the fact that the word does not look foreign at all, there is no generally accepted etymology for it. Within Hittite, a connection with *aru- / ara- ‘high’ is possible, especially if we take into account that we find some denominatives in -u-stem words (cf. Weitenberg 1984: 281-3). If the one plene spelling a-ru-ú-ní indeed indicates that the stem was */trún-/, then aruna- must reflect *hýr-éu-no- (cf. § 1.3.9.4.f). A semantic parallel can be found in Skt. árṇa- ‘wave, flood, stream’ < *K̑ žUQR (*’ rising water’).

The adjective **arunuman-** is a derivative showing the suffix of appurtenance -um-en-/ -um-n- (q.v.).


PIE *hýorgo-ie/o-
The verb is attested from OS texts onwards and inflects according to the ḫatrae-class. This class consists of denominative verbs derived from *o-stem nouns, which means that in this case, ṣaruṛ(e) is derived from a noun *aruṣa-. Oettinger (1979a: 345) states that aruṛ(e) must be derived from a noun *aruṣa- which is identical to Gr. ḫotpā ‘prayer’. This reconstruction cannot be correct, however, as denominative verbs from nouns in -eḥ₂ of -stem nouns, Gr. DWUDH must be derived from a noun *DUX-R-STEM NOUNS, *DÜTETTINGER DWUDH 255.

Nevertheless, the connection does not have to be given up. If the noun *aruṣa- was an *o-stem (as is indicated by the fact that the verb inflects according to the ḫatrae-class), it is quite possible that it reflects *Horyo-, since o-stem words often have o-grade in the root. If we then take into account that in front of *o all three laryngeals were neutralized into *h₁ (cf. Kortlandt 2004; Kloeckhorst fthc.c.), we are able to reconstruct *h₂-oryo-, an ablaut-variant of *h₂(e)rueh₂- as seen in Gr. ḫotpā.

-aš (gen.sg.-ending)

PIE *-aš, *-s

The usual ending of gen.sg. is -aš or, when accented, -aš (compare n=qpišaš vs. taknaš). This ending is found in consonant-stems as well as diphthong-, a-, i- and u-stems. It clearly reflects PIE *-aš, which was the normal gen.sg.-ending in o-stem nouns and in hysteronymatica1y inflected consonant-stems. In Hittite, only traces are left of the protrodynamic gen.sg.-ending *-s, namely in the verbal noun suffix -yar, gen.sg. -yaš < *-yr̄ / *-yen-s and in an occasional u-stem form like *Nu-un-mu-yaš (KBo 3.34 i 16), the gen.sg. of the PN Nummu- (cf. Friedrich 1960: 27 and Kimball 1999: 221 who gives more examples of gen.sg. in -uš; against this Melchert 1984a: 53, who rather sees these cases as syncope of -qa- to -u- in final syllables).

-aš (dat.-loc.pl.-ending)

Although this ending is almost always spelled -aš, we find a few forms with plene spelling, namely pa-ta-a-aš (OS) ‘feet’ and ud-da-na-a-aš (MH/MS) ‘words’, which clearly shows that at least originally there was a difference between unaccentuated -aš and accented -aš. From the OH period onwards, -aš can also be used for the gen.pl, and in the NH period it is on its way to becoming the default plural marker, taking over the function of acc.pl.c. and nom.pl.c. as well.
Etymologically, the ending cannot be interpreted easily. Within the Anatolian languages, the Lycian dat.-loc.pl.-ending -e seems to be cognate and would point to PAnat. *-os. Note that the Luwian dat.-loc.pl.-endings, CLuw. -anza (which must be l-ant‘l on the basis of i-pa-ma-an-za-aš=ta (KBo 13.260 ii 28)) and HLuw. -a-za = l-ant‘l, seem to be an inner-Luwian innovation, built on the acc.pl.-ending *-o)ms.

In the other IE languages, the reconstruction of the dat.pl.-ending is difficult (note that loc.pl. *-su is quite clear and cannot be cognate with Hitt. -aš): Skt. -bhyas seems to point to *-bʰi, Lat. -bus can reflect *-bʰo, OLith. -mus and OCS -mē point to *-mus, which would also fit Goth. -m. It has been suggested that the forms with *-bʰ- are due to conflation with the instr.pl.-ending *-bʰi, which would mean that *-mus is more original. If Hitt. -aš and Lyc. -e indeed point to PAnat. *-os, I do not know how this form would fit into the picture. Perhaps we must analyse it as all.sg. *-o + plural *-s?

ṳššz (Ib1) ‘to remain, to stay, to be left’: 3sg.pres.act. a-aš-zī (OS, often), aś-zī (KBo 4.14 iii 43, 49 (NH)), 3pl.pres.act. a-aš-ša-an-zī (OH/MS), 3sg.pret.act. a-aš-ta, 3pl.pret.act. a-aš-še-er, a-as-še-er, 3sg.imp.act. a-aš-du; 3sg.pres.midd. a-as-ta-at (KUB 22.70 obv. 18); part. a-aš-ša-an-t- (often), aš-ša-an-t- (rare); inf.I a-aš-šu-µa-an-zī (KUB 22.70 obv. 51); impf. a-aš-ke/a-.

PIE *h₁eNs- ??

See HW² A: 366f. for attestations. The verb is almost consistently spelled with initial plene a- and a geminate -šš-. It does not show ablaut (the few forms without plene a- are to be seen as shorter spellings). It is predominantly found in the active, in which it contrasts with ŋšš-a(t), ŋššiš/a(t), ‘to be loved, to be good’ which is only found in the middle.

The etymological interpretation of this verb is difficult. Especially the fact that we find a vowel -a- in a mi-inflected verb is awkward, as mi-verbs in principle show *e-grade. Moreover, the geminate -šš- should be the result of some assimilation process.

Older connections with eš / aś- ‘to be’ and es(a) ‘to sit’ have been discarded (e.g. Puhvel HED 1/2: 189; HW² A: 369), although it is generally stated that ŋšš- as a root present hardly can be but of IE origin (Puhvel (l.c.): “Indo-European origin of such a root-verb is likely”); HW² (l.c.): “müß als primäres Vb. Ew. sein”).

The only other Hitt. mi-verb ending in -ašš- is kuwašš ‘to kiss’ (q.v.), which I reconstruct as *kuens-. This could mean that ŋšš- reflects *h₁eNs-. For the strong
stem forms this would work fine (*h₁eNs-ti > ʔaSt‘iš, spelled a-aš-z[i], but for the weak stem forms we have to reckon with analogical change (*h₁Ns-énti should regularly give **ʔint‘át’iš, spelled **an-za-an-zi], for which we could compare 3sg. ʔašši ‘to give birth’ < *h₂oms-et besides 3pl. ʔaššanzi << *h₂oms-enti that regularly should have given **ʔaššanzi. Unfortunately, I know no words in other IE languages that reflect *h₁eNs- and show similar semantics.

\[\text{āšš}^{\text{d}i}(-), \text{āšši}[-]^{\text{a-}^{\text{d}i}(-)}\] (IIb/IIIg) ‘to be loved, to be good’ (Sum. SIG₃): 3sg.pres.midd. a-aš-ša-a-rī (KUB 59.50 rev. 4 (NS)), a-aš-ši-ja-at-ta-ri (KUB 24.7 iv 37 (NS)), [a-aš-ši-]ja-at-ta-ri (KUB 24.7 i 15 (NS)), [a-aš-ši-]ja-at-ta-ri (KUB 24.7 i 44 (NS)), 3pl.pres.midd. a-aš-ša-an-ta-ri (KUB 22.126 obv. 4 (NS)), 3sg.pret.midd. a-aš-ši-ja-at-ta-at (KUB 33.121 ii 9 (NS)), 3sg.imp.midd. a-aš-ši-ja-at-ta-ru (KUB 35.254 obv.’ 5, 7 (fr.) (NS)), 3pl.imp.act. a-aš-ši-ja-an-du (KUB 41.19 i 6 (MH/NS)); part. a-aš-ši-ja-an-t- (often), aš-ši-ja-an-t- (rare); verb.noun. a-aš-ši-ja-u-ya-ar ‘favour, love’, instr. a-aš-ši-ja-u-ya-an-ni-it, a-aš-ši-ja-u-ya-an-ni-it; impf. a-aš-ši-lš-ke/-a-.

Derivatives: āšši\(j\)anu\(^{-2}\) (Ib2) ‘to make beloved(?)’ (impf. a-aš-ši-ja-\(\mu\)-aš-ke/-a- (KBo 13.55 rev. 4, KUB 31.42 ii 23)), āššι\(j\)at\(a\) / āšši\(j\)ann\(-\) (n.) ‘love’ (nom.-acc.sg. a-aš-ši-ja-tar, gen.sg. a-aš-ši-ja-an-na-aš, aš-ši-ja-na-aš (KUB 24.7 iv 19), dat.-loc.sg. a-aš-ši-ja-an-ni, instr. [a-aš-š]-ja-an-ni-it (KUB 33.64+KBo 21.60, 8)), āšši\(j\)au\(y\)ant\(-\) (c.) ‘lover’ (nom.sg. a-aš-ši-ja-u-ya-an-za-aš=m=a-aš (RS 25.421 rev. 62)), see also āšš\(u\)-.

Anat. cognates: HLuw. \(\text{LITUUS} \text{āza-} \) ‘to love’ (3sg.pres.act. ʔa-za-ti (KARATEPE 2 §2), 3sg.pret.act. \(\text{LITUUS} \text{āza-}\)ta (often), part. \(\text{LITUUS} \text{āzama/-} \) (often)), \(\text{LITUUSOCCEL} \text{āzatiwa-}, \) PN (lit. ‘beloved by the Sun(god)’), \(\text{TONITRUS-HUNA-LITUUS} \text{āza-}, \) PN (lit. ‘beloved by the Storm-god’) \(\text{1DEUS-NA-OCCEL} \text{āzama/-}, \) PN (lit. ‘beloved by the gods’).

The verb is attested with middle forms only, which makes it distinguishable from āšš\(i\) ‘to remain, to be left’ that is predominantly found with active forms. In ‘to be loved’, we find a bare stem āšš\(i\) twice only, whereas the rest of the forms and all derivatives show a stem āšši\(j\)e/-a-.

Within Hittite, it is quite clear that āšš\(i\)\(j\)e/a/- must in some way be cognate with āšš\(u\) / āšš\(a\)- ‘good, dear, favourable’, but the exact connection is unclear. According to Weitenberg (1984: 96, following Laroche apud Bader 1969: 9), it is not possible that āšš\(i\)\(j\)e/a/- is a derivative from āšš\(i\), partly because the verbal stem ‘to love’ is common Anatolian (HLuw. ʔa-za- ‘to love’). This does not seem a valid argumentation to me, however: despite the fact that Luwian does not
possess a direct cognate of Hitt. āššu-, this adjective must have existed in PAnatolian (the u-stem seems PIE), and it is therefore perfectly possible that we find verbal derivations of it in Hittite (with the suffix *-iə/o-) as well as in HLuwian (with the suffix *-skə/o-, cf. Rieken 1999a: 459). Moreover, a strong argument in favour of a nominal derivation is that middles in Hittite reflect either e-grade (ešari < *h₁éh₁-s-o) or zero grade (tukkāri < *tuk-ó), whereas āšš-hardly can be explained without assuming an o-grade. In my view, this o-grade can only be explained from a nominal origin. I therefore assume that āšš(ije)ā- is derived from the nominal stem āššu- / āšsay-, for the etymology of which see there.

-ašša- (genitival adjective-suffix)

PIE *-osio-

Although the use of a genitival adjective-suffix is especially known from the Luwian languages (CLuw. -ašša/i-, which even has fully supplanted the genitive case, HLuw. -asə/i- and Lyc. -ahe/i-), this suffix is found in Hittite as well, namely in hanzāša- ‘offspring’ < *h₂mósio-, inašša- ‘yearling’, derived from the noun ina- ‘yearling’ (q.v.), which because of its OS attestation cannot be regarded as a Luwianism, and in pedaššahḫ-¹ ‘to implace’, derived from pedašša-, itself a derivative from peda- ‘place’, which because of the -e- cannot be regarded as a Luwianism. On the basis of the fact that the -a- as found in Lyc. -ahe/i- in principle cannot reflect *o or *e, Melchert (1994a: 77) reconstructs this suffix as *-eh₂so-. On the basis of this reconstruction, he assumes that *-eh₂s-o- > Hitt. -ašša- shows that *Vh₂šV > Hitt. VššV. This is incorrect, however, as we can see from Hitt. paššari ‘protects’ < *peh₂s-o, Hitt. pašši ‘protects’ < *poh₂s-ei and especially from palahša- /plaHša/- ‘a garment’ < *pleh₂s-o- (note that this last example cannot be explained as showing a secondary retention of -h-). In my view, we should rather assume that Lyc. -ahe/i- has received its -a- in analogy to the many a-stem nouns that reflect *-eh₂-.

We should rather follow Georgiev (1967: 164; 1972: 90) in assuming that the genitival adjective suffixes Hitt. -ašša-, Luw. -ašša/i- and Lyc. -ahe/i- are derived from a pre-form *-oxio- (with Lyc. -ahe/i- then from virtual *-eh₂-sţo-), in which the intervocalic cluster *-sţ- yielded -šš-, just as in Hitt. yašše/a²- ‘to clothe’ < *uš-je/o- (see at yešš⁻¹), yašš/e/a² for a detailed treatment of this form and the development *VššV > Hitt. VššV. Etymologically, this *-oxio- may be compared with the gen.-endings Skt. -asya, Hom. -oṣa< *-osio, and, mutatis mutandis, with the Lat. suffix -arius < *-eh₂-sţio-.
aššu²: see ašnu²

aššu² / aše/iš- (Iia3) ‘to seat, to make sit; to settle; to install’: 1sg.pres.act. a-ša-aš-ḥē (KBo 3.28 ii 24 (OH/NS)), a-ša-aš-ḥi, 2sg.pres.act. a-ša-aš-ši, 3sg.pres.act. a-ša-aš-ši (OS, often), a-ša-aš-ši (NS, often), a-ša-šē (KBo 8.121, 6 (OH/NS)), 3pl.pres.act. a-šē-ša-an-zi (OH/NS, often), a-šē-e-ša-an-zi (NS, 2x), a-ši-ša-an-zi (NS, 2x), 1sg.pret.act. a-ša-aš-ḥu-un, a-ša-aš-ḥu-un (KUB 23.55 iv 7), 3sg.pret.act. a-ša-aš-ta, a-ša-[aš-ta] (KUB 14.13 i 38), a-šē-eš-ta (KBo 3.4 ii 20 (NH)), 3pl.pret.act. a-šē-eš-er (often, OH+), a-šē-šer, a-šē-eš-er (KBo 3.63 i 11 (OH/NS)), a-ša-šē-er (KBo 19.52, 4 (NS)), a-ša-šēr (KUB 23.94, 11 (NS)), e-šē-šēr (KUB 41.1 iv 9 (OH/NS)), 2pl.impract. a-šē-eš-te-[en] (KUB 1.16 ii 38 (OH/NS)), a-šē-eš-te-[en] (KBo 22.6 iv 3 (OH/NS)); 2sg.impr.med. a-šē-eš-ḥu-ut (KBo 22.6 iv 24 (OH/NS)), a-še-iš-ḥu-ut (KBo 12.1 iv 6 (OH/NS)); part. a-še-ša-an-t- (MH/MS), a-še-eš-ša-an-t-; verb.noun. a-še-šu-u-ya-ar (HT 42 rev. 7, 11); inf.1 a-še-šu-ya-an-zi; impf. a-ša-šē-ke/a- (OS), a-šē-eš-ke/a-.


PIE *h₁ʃ₃h₁ʃ₄es-i, *h₁ʃ₃-h₁ʃ₄es-ënī

See HW² A: 385f. for attestations. The verb clearly shows an ablaut between aššu² in the strong stem and aše/iš- in the weak stem and is therefore one of the few verbs that belongs to class Iia3, i.e. hi-verbs with an ablaut ǧi (also ḫamank² / ḫame/ynk-, ḫarqāl² / ḫarq/ap- and šarap² / šarap-). These verbs are generally explained as reflecting *o/e-ablaut, but I think that this is improbable. As I have explained in § 2.2.2.2.f, the spelling of the weak stem with both e and i in my view indicate that this vowel is in fact was the phoneme /i/, which in these verbs emerged in the zero grade formations.

In this case, aššu² / aše/iš- clearly must be cognate with eš-ʷʷ(ŋ) ‘to sit (down)’ (q.v.) and shows a full-reduplication. If aššu² / aše/iš- is derived from the middle stem ǧiš-, which probably goes back to *h₁ʃ₃h₁ʃ₄es-, then it is possible that aššu² / aše/iš- goes back to *h₁ʃ₃h₁ʃ₄h₁ʃ₃es-i, *h₁ʃ₃-h₁ʃ₄es-ënī. If, however, aššu² / aše/iš- is derived from the active stem, which possibly reflects *h₁ʃ₃es- / *h₁ʃ₄es-, then we can reconstruct *h₁ʃ₃h₁ʃ₄es-i, h₁ʃ₃-h₁ʃ₄es-ënī. Either way, we have to assume for
both formations that in the zero grade stem *(h₁)h₃s(h₁)h₃s- the vowel /u/ emerged to solve the heavy cluster, yielding /ʔsis-/.

The fact that the initial *(h₁) yields Hitt. /ʔ-/ (spelled a-), indicates that this verb was formed after the loss of initial prevocalic *(h₁). If it were formed before that period, I do not understand how this verb could have analogically retained its laryngeal, because there was no model within the paradigm to restore it. See at /eš-\textsuperscript{oir}/ for further etymology.

The causative is spelled /aš-eš-a-nu-\textsuperscript{-} and /aš-š-š-a-nu-, with an enigmatic extra /a-/ between the stem /aš-eš-\textsuperscript{-}/ and the suffix /-nu-. I can think of no other explanation than that this spelling is used to explicitly express the lenis character of /-š-/: /ʔsisnu-/ and not */ʔsiSnu-\textsuperscript{-}/.

\textit{aš\textsuperscript{q̄}ar / aš\textsuperscript{q̄}un-} (n.) ‘sheepfold, pen’ (Sum. MA.AZ.ZA, Akk. MA-AZ-ZU-U): nom.-acc.sg. /aš-š-a-u-ar/ (KUB 3.94 ii 15 (NS)), /aš-š-a-u-q[a-ar]/ (KUB 30.13 obv. 17 (MH/NS)), dat.-loc.sg. /aš-š-a-u-ni/ (OS), /aš-š-a-u-ni/ (KUB 13.5 ii 22 (OH/NS)), /aš-š-a-u-na-i/ (Bo 6002 obv. 7 (undat.)), abl. /aš-š-a-u-na-až/ (KUB 30.10 obv. 15 (OH/MS)), /aš-š-a-u-na-až/ (KUB 13.4 iv 59 (OH/NS), KUB 24.3 ii 12 (MH/NS)), nom.-acc.pl. /aš-š-a-u-ya/ (KBo 17.92 obv. 6 (MS)), /aš-š-a-u-ya-ar/ (KBo 10.2 i 7 (OH/NS)).

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 296f. and HW\textsuperscript{2} A: 393f. for attestations and semantics. The word denotes a sheepfold and is attested from OH texts onwards. This noun belongs to the small class of nouns in /-q̄ar/ /-q̄un-/, to which also /harš\textsuperscript{q̄}ar/ / har\textsuperscript{q̄}un- ‘tilled land’, /kar\textsuperscript{q̄}ar/ / karaun- ‘horns, antlers’, /part\textsuperscript{q̄}ar/ / partaun- ‘wing’ and /šar\textsuperscript{q̄}ar/ / šaraun- ‘storm-clouds’ belong. Although e.g. /har\textsuperscript{q̄}ar/ ‘tilled land’ clearly seems to belong with /h\textsuperscript{q̄}ar-/ ‘to till (the soil)’, the exact interpretation of the suffix /-q̄ar/ is unclear. In isolated forms like /iš-h\textsuperscript{q̄}ar/ ‘yoke-plough-set (?)’ and /muq\textsuperscript{q̄}ar/ ‘materials for an invocation ritual’, the origin is more clear (verbal nouns from /iš-h\textsuperscript{q̄}ati-/ /išh\textsuperscript{q̄}i- (so /iš\textsuperscript{q̄}ar/ < *išh\textsuperscript{q̄}i-yar/) and /muq\textsuperscript{q̄}a-/ (so /muq\textsuperscript{q̄}aetar/ from *muq\textsuperscript{q̄}ay-a-yar/), but that does not solve the problem of the other nouns. As I have argued under the lemma /kar\textsuperscript{q̄}ar/ / karaun-, we may have to compare /-q̄ar/ /-q̄un-/ to /-\textsuperscript{q̄}ar/ /-\textsuperscript{q̄}un- < *-q̄-yr / -q̄-yr- and assume that we are dealing with */-q̄-yr/ / -q̄-yr-. Puhvel (l.c.) assumes an etymological connection with /eš-\textsuperscript{-}/ / aš-‘to sit’, which would point to a reconstruction */h₁s-\textsuperscript{-}/.

\textit{aši / uni / ini} (demonstr. pron.) ‘that (one)’: nom.sg.c. /a-ši/ (OH/MS), /a-ši-š/ (NH), /u-ni-š/ (NH), /e-ni-š/ (NH), acc.sg.c. /u-ni/ (OH/MS), /a-ši/ (OH+), /u-ni-in/ (NH), nom.-acc.sg. /i-ni/ (OH/MS), /e-ni/ (OH/MS), /i-e-ni/ (KUB 1.16+ iii 40
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See Goedegebuure (2003: 106ff.) for a detailed treatment of this pronoun. She argues that aši refers to things associated with a 3rd person (‘that in the presence of him’), whereas kū is associated with the 1st person (‘this (here)’) and apū with the 2nd person (‘that (near you)’).

The oldest forms of this pronoun are aši, uni, ini and edi. These probably go back to *h₁ōs, *h₁ōm, *i, i, and *h₁e-. Note that the form uni and its derivatives (uniša, uniša, unin, unin, etc.) are consistently spelled with initial u- and never with u-. This points to tūn, < *tūn + -i, in which tūn is the regular outcome of *h₁ōm, just as ku-u-un/kōn/ goes back to *kōm (see at kū/kū/kī).

According to Goedegebuure, the nom.pl. pronoun e does not belong to this paradigm but formally it could show the same formation, viz. *h₁oi (+ -i). In MH times the form ini is changed to eni, which I regard as an example of the MH lowering of OH /i/ to NH /e/ before -n-., cf. § 1.4.8.1.d. In MH and NH times we encounter forms that are remodelled on the basis of the stems aši-, uni- and eni-, yielding forms like nom.sg. ašiš and gen.sg. unišaš.

It is quite likely that this pronoun belongs with the pronoun *h₁e-., *i- as reflected in e.g. Skt. āyām (m.), ādām (n.), āyām (f.), Lat. is (m.), id (n.), ea (f.) and Goth. is (m.), ita (n). Note, however, that in the other IE languages no stem *h₁o- can be found (e.g. Beekes 1995: 205 reconstructs nom.sg.m. *h₁e, acc.sg.m. *im, nom.-acc.sg.n. *id, nom.sg.f. *ih₂, acc.sg.f. *ih₂m, obl. *h₁e-). Perhaps the stem *h₁o- was created within Anatolian in analogy to the pronouns kū/kū/kī and apū/apū. So the virtual pre-forms nom.sg.c. *h₁os, acc.sg.c. *h₁om, nom.-acc.sg.n. *h₁i, obl. *h₁e show an adaptation of the PIE system nom.sg.c. *h₁e, acc.sg.c. *h₁im, nom.-acc.sg.n. *h₁i, obl. *h₁e under influence of the pronouns that inflect nom.sg.c. *-os, acc.sg.c. *-om, nom.-acc.sg.n. *-od. Note that nom.-acc.sg.n. *h₁i (and not *h₁i!) spread to the paradigm of kū/kū/kī.

The adverb iniššan corresponds to kīššan (once also kiniššan!) and the rare apiniššan.

āššie/a-: see ăšši/a-, ăššie/a-

Derivatives: ašišantatar (n.) ‘poverty’ (nom.-acc.sg. aš[i-ya]-an-ta-tar (KUB 21.18 iv 10)), ašišantēš- (b2) ‘to become poor’ (3sg.pres.act. aši-ši-ya-an-te-eš-zi; impf. aši-ši-ya-an-te-eš-ke/a-).


This noun and its derivatives are in Hittite consistently spelled aši-ši-ya-an-, except for nom.-acc.sg.n. aš-ši-ya-an (KUB 41.32 rev. 9), which therefore is interpreted by Melchert (1993b: 36) as a CLuwian form. See Starke (1990: 448f.) for an extensive treatment of the CLuwian word āššišiauštāttr ‘poverty’.

The old etymology of ašišant- (going back to Jucqois 1964: 87-9), interpreting it as *n-dien-ont- ‘having no god’ > ‘poor’ is based on the semantic parallel OCS ne-bogh ‘poor’. In this latter word, however, the element bogh does not refer to ‘god’ but to ‘wealth’ as in bogar ‘rich’. The semantic parallel therefore is weak. Formally the etymology has become improbable too, as we now cannot separate Hitt. ašišant- from CLuw. āššišantar-, which word cannot reflect *n-dien- because of the fact that CLuwian does not show assimilation of dentals in front of *i. In which way the words are connected remains unclear, however. A discrepancy between single -š- in Hitt. and geminate -šš- in CLuw. could be explained through Čop’s Law, but this implies a reconstruction *ēši-, which does not account for Hitt. a-.

gēka- (gender unclear) ‘gate(way)’ (Sum. KÂ(GAL)): acc.sg. aš-ka-kān (KUB 44.57, 12, KBo 24.56 ii 8), aš-ka-n=a=kān (KUB 15.24 i 6), dat.-loc.sg. aš-ki (OS, often), aš-ki, aš-ki-i (KUB 33.4 rev. 16), all.sg. aš-ka (OS), aš-ka (KUB 33.61 i 3), aš-ka, abl. aš-ka-az (OS, often), aš-ka-za, aš-ga-az, aš-ga-za, aš-ka-ra-za, dat.-loc.pl. aš-ka-aš (KUB 33.121 iii 13), aš-ga-aš (KUB 30.27 rev. 8, 15).

PIE *h₂os-ko- ??
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The word is abundantly attested from OS texts onwards. The gender cannot be determined as all relevant forms (nom.sg., nom.pl. and acc.pl.) are unattested.

According to Puhvel (HED 1/2: 215), ḡška- probably is a native Anatolian term, like so many other terms used for (parts of) buildings. Formally, however, ḡška- does not show any clear signs of foreign origin, but a good IE etymology fails nonetheless. Oettinger (p.c.), however, suggests to me that if we assume that initial *h₂ drops before *o (as I have argued in Kloekhorst (thc.c.), that ḡška- may be connected with the verb ḡaš-, ḡeš- ‘to open’, if the latter indeed reflects a root *h₂es-. In that case, we would have to reconstruct *h₂os-ko-.

ḡšma (interject.) ‘lo, behold’: a-aš-ma (OH/MS).

PIE *h₁ōs +

This word is consistently spelled a-aš-ma. It cannot be treated without taking kāšma ‘lo, behold’ into account. The latter has a variant kāša, which in my view proves that it consists of kāš + = (m)a ‘but’. Just as kāš(m)a belongs with kā- ‘this’, ḡšma must belong with a- ‘that’ (see aši / uni / ini), and go back to *h₁ōs + = (m)a.


PIE *h₁s-neu-

See HW² A: 372f. for attestations. The bulk of the attestations of ašnu-² are spelled aš-nu- or aš-ša-nu-. Only sporadically we find forms with initial plene a- (e.g. once a-aš-ša-nu-ya-an-zi (KUB 32.103 ii 15) besides 70x aš-nu-an-zi, 20x
The verb has quite a wide range of semantic usages. Most attestations seem to mean ‘to take care of (persons, gods)’. In the hippological texts ašnu- can have ‘horses’ as object and then probably means ‘to massage’ (‘*to take care of (horses)’). When ašnu- is used with an infinitive, it means ‘to be done with’, which could have developed out of ‘to have taken care of’. In rituals, it often has an object ‘cup(s)’ or ‘food’ and seems to mean ‘to deliver’, e.g.

KBo 2.4 i
(19) nu GIM-an SISKUR pī-ja-an-zi GAL\textsuperscript{HLA}=kān
(20) aš-ša-nu-ya-an-zi

‘When they give an offering, they deliver the cups’;

VSNF 12.29 i
(8) GAL DUMU\textsuperscript{MIB} É.GAL=za e-ša ṭa ḫa-l-zi-[a]
(9) GAL\textsuperscript{HLA}-uš\textsuperscript{7} aš-ša-nu-ya-an-zi
(10) ḫa-an-[a]-ez-zi pal-ši GUB-aš \textsuperscript{4}U pī-ḫa-ša-ši-[n]
(11) e-ku-zi

‘The head of the palace servants sits down and screams. They deliver the cups.

First he drinks to the p. Storm-god standing’.

I think that it is possible that this meaning has developed out of an original ‘to take care of / to have taken care of’ as well. All in all, it is likely that the original meaning of ašnu- is ‘to take care of, to have taken care of’. A similar interpretation can be found in HW\textsuperscript{2} A: 372, where we find the translation “(Lebewesen) versorgen; (Dinge/Sachen) besorgen”. Puhvel (HED 1/2: 192), cites the verb as “as(s)amu-, assiyamu-”, however, and translates “favour, keep happy, propitiate (deities or superiors), set aright (affected parties), treat gently, massage (racehorses); make good, carry out (well), bring off (cf. ‘he made good his escape’), dispose (properly), get done, be done with”. These meanings seem to be especially based on the fact that Puhvel assumes an etymological connection with āšš-\textsuperscript{a(r)}, āšši/āšša\textsuperscript{a(r)} ‘to be loved’ and āššu- / āšša- ‘good’. Not only is this connection unlikely on semantical grounds (the basic meaning of ašnu- is ‘to take care of’ and not ‘to make happy or beloved’), formally the connection does not work either (ašnu- is hardly ever spelled with initial plene a-, whereas āšš- , āššu- and their derivatives always are). The two forms of the verb āššiyanu- that Puhvel
stealthily equates with ašnu- do not belong here but indeed are derived from āšš-aini, āššija/aššiŋšš, for which see there.

There is no concensus regarding the etymological interpretation of this verb. An interpretation as a causative of āšš- ‘to sit (down)’ has been suggested (Götze 1928: 102ff.), but does not make sense semantically. A connection to āššu- ‘good’ (so Puhvel HED 1/2: 205, who compares tepnu- ‘to diminish’ from āššu- ‘small’) is difficult formally (consistent plene writing of a-aš-šu vs. the almost consistent absence of plene in aš-(ša-)mu-). HW² A: 383 therefore states “aš(ša)nu- gehört seiner Bed. nach weder zu eš- “sitzen, sich setzen” noch zu aššu- “gut”. [...] Etymol. steht aus”.

If we look at ašnu- objectively, it hardly cannot be but a causative of a verb aš(ša)-. As causatives in principle are derived of the weak stem, not only the verb āšš-aini ‘to sit down’ (with active forms eš₂ / aš-), but also the verb eš₂ / aš- ‘to be’ is, on formal grounds, a possible candidate for being the source of ašnu-, especially if we compare the causative šašmu₂ of šeš₂ / šaš- ‘to sleep’ (also spelled šaššanu-). This connection would work semantically as well: ‘to make be’ is semantically equal to ‘to take care of’ and ‘to have taken care of’. I therefore assume that ašnu- is the causative of āšš₂ / aš- ‘to be’ and that it reflects *h₂šš-neu-. See at eš₂ / aš- for further etymology. The numerous spellings with ašša- 

nu- show that this verb phonologically is to be interpreted as /ʔSnu-/.

=(a)šṭa (encl. locatival sentence particle): C=ašṭa (t=a-aš-ta (OS), pa-ra=m=a-aš-ta (OS), ḫa-a-ra-na-an=aš-ta (OS), n=a-aš-ta (OS), ma-a-n=a-aš-ta (OS), ka-lu-lu-pi-i=š-mi-t=a-aš-ta (OS)), -e/i=šṭa (t=e-e=š-ta (OS), mu-u=š-še-e=š-ta (OS), mu-u=š-ši-š=š-ta (MH/MS), n=e-e=š-ta (KBo 21.90 obv. 21 (OH/MS)).

This particle occurs in OH, MH and NH texts, but its use decreases through the time. In my corpus of OS texts (consisting of 23,000 words), =(a)šṭa occurs 74 times (= 3.2 promille), in my corpus of MH/MS texts (consisting of 18.000 words), it occurs 50+ times (2.8 promille), whereas in my NH corpus (consisting of 95,000 words), it occurs 19 times only (0.2 promille). It is clear that after the MH period, the use of this particle falls into disfavour.

In the OS and MH/MS texts, we see that the particle behaves just like =(a)pa and =(a)n, i.e. it shows the form =ašṭa when following a consonant or a word ending in u or a (which are dropped in favour of the a of =ašṭa): mān=ašṭa, t=ašṭa and n=ašṭa; but drops its first -a- when following a word ending in e or i: t=e=šṭa, mu=šši=šṭa. In NH, the latter rule is lost (e.g. le-e=aš-ta (Bronzetafel iii 31 (NH))).
The exact meaning of *(a)*šta is not fully clear. According to HW² (A: 426f.) the basic meaning is ‘out of’, contrasting with *(a)*jn and anda ‘in(to)’.

Since a similar particle is not found in the other Anatolian languages, and since there is no locative adverb that matches *(a)*šta in form and meaning, an etymology is lacking.


IE cognates: Gr. ἥξε ‘good’, Skt. sú ‘good’.

PIE *h₁ox-<sub>u</sub> -?

See HW² A: 492f. for attestations. The adjective is abundantly attested from OS texts onwards. It is almost consistently spelled a-aš-šu- or a-aš-ša-u-. When substantivized, it denotes ‘the good > goods’, which is found from OS texts onwards as well. Note that the adjective *ğıšu*- shows ablaut (ţğišu-, *ğişayu*) whereas the noun *ğıšu*- in principle does not show ablaut (like all *u*- and *i*-stem nouns), although some traces of it are still found, revealing the fact that *ğıšu*- in origin was a substantivized adjective.

An etymological connection with Gr. ἥξε ‘good’ and Skt. sú, su- ‘good’ is generally accepted, although opinions regarding the exact reconstruction differ.
Important is the question whether the noun is derived from the adjective or the stative. Watkins (1982a: 261) argued that the noun reflects a PIE stative u-stem noun *h₁ós-u, *h₁és-u, whereas the adjective goes back to a derived protorokinetic u-stem adjective *h₁és-u, *h₁es-eu-. Melchert (1994c: 300f.) takes over this view and argues that the noun *h₁ós-u yielded Hitt. *āššu, whereas the oblique *h₁és-u- yielded Hitt. *aššu- via ‘limited’ Ėop’s Law, by which an accentuated initial *e yields a with gemination of the following consonant. These forms, *āššu and *aššu- get mixed, yielding the form āššu-, which stem then was generalized in the adjective as well.

Problematic to this account, however, is the fact that in the other IE languages no u-stem nouns of this stem are found, whereas u-stem adjectives are. I therefore assume that the adjective āššu- is primary, and that the noun āššu- is a mere neuter substantiation of it. Moreover, the sound law that Melchert introduces in his 1994b-paper (‘‘änderung > aCC-’) to explain the geminate -šš- of āššu-, is designed for three words only (āššu-, ammuk and anni-), and in my view has no merit.

The biggest problem of the Hittite word is the geminate -šš-. It cannot be but the product of assimilation of some consonant to *s. If we want to save the etymological connection with Skt. sú, su- and Gr. ἐκ, which excludes reconstructions like *ans- as e.g. in Puhvel (HED 1/2: 206), the only possibility is that -šš- reflects *.hs-. This would mean that āššu- reflects *HoHs-u-. Because of the Gr. e-, the laryngeals cannot be *h₂ or *h₃, so the form must have been *h₁oh₁s-(é)u- (note that a preform *h₁oh₁s-u- would have yielded **p̄s̄u-, spelled as **a-a-ššu-). This means that a-aš-ššu- represents p̄s̄u- (cf. a-ar-aš-zi = p̄s̄u-). All in all, we must reckon with a original paradigm *h₁oh₁s-u-, *h₁h₁s-éu-s, which after generalization of the full-stem was altered to *h₁oh₁s-u-s, *h₁oh₁s-éu-s. This paradigm regularly should have yielded Hitt. **p̄s̄us/, **p̄s̄us/, which was levelled out to p̄s̄u-, spelled a-aš-ššu-. The question is, of course, what kind of formation this is. On the one hand, one could compare Gr. ἐκ ‘quick’, Skt. āśś- ‘fast’, which, if they are to be connected with *h₁e̞khus- ‘horse’ and Lat. accurpēdus ‘quick-footed’ < *HHK-u- (cf. Schrijver 1991: 77), must reflect *h₁o-h₁k-ũ-, an o-replicated u-stem adjective. In that way, Hitt. āššu- would reflect *h₁o-h₁s-ũ- besides Gr. ἐκ < *h₁es-ũ- and Skt. sú, su- < *h₁s-ũ-. On the other hand, one could wonder to what extent the Gr. epic form ἐκ ‘good’ is linguistically real. It has generally been dismissed as an epic metrically lengthened form, but I do not see why (ἐκ < is not problematic for the hexametre). If ἐκ and ἐκ are ablaut-variants, it would point to a reconstruction *h₁eh₁s-u- besides *h₁h₁s-u-. Than we could interpret Hitt. āššu- as the o-grade
variant *$h_1$oh$_3$s-u- of which the e-grade is visible in Gr. ṇóζ and the zero grade in Gr. ṇóζ and Skt. sú.

The derivative aššul- is predominantly spelled without initial plene a- which is plausibly explained by Rieken (1999a: 459f.) as due to the fact that this word was accentuated on the suffix (as visible in the few spellings aš-šu-ú-ul), leaving the initial a- unstressed and therefore short (or are we dealing with a zero-grade formation *$h_1$h$_3$s-éul here?)

In my view, it is likely that the verb aššú- aššú/aššú 'to be loved' is derived from aššú- and not the other way around (pace Puhvel HED 1/2: 205 and Weitenberg 1984: 96). If we would assume that the verb is basic, we would have a very hard time explaining both the vowel ə and the geminate -šš-.

16 aššúanni (uninf.) 'horse-trainer': stem a-aš[-ź]u-uš-a-an-ni (KUB 1.13 i 1), a-aš-šu-uš-a-an-n[ɨ] (KUB 29.44+ iii 46).

The word is used as the title of Kikkuli, the Hurrian horse-trainer: KUB 1.13 i (1) UMI-MA Ki-ik-ku-li aššú-an-ni (2) ŠA KUR Mi-it-tu-an-ni 'Thus speaks Kikkuli, the horse-trainer from Mittanni-land'. Like many horse-training terms from the Kikkuli-text, this word, too, is generally regarded to be (at least partly) of Indic origin, reflecting Ind. ašvra- 'horse'.

aššuzrīi- (n.) 'good-cup' (Sum. ZAḪUM, Akk. BIBRU): nom.-acc.sg. a-aš-šu-zér-ri (KUB 27.13 i 13 (NS)), a-aš-šu zér-ri (KUB 1.17 i 5 (OH/NS)), instr. a-aš-šu-zér-ri-it (KBO 20.67 i 18 (OH/MS)), [a-aš-šu-z]ér-ri-it (KBO 17.75 ii 58 (OH/MS?)), a-aš-šu [zér][i]-it (IBoT 2.67, 11 (NS)).

See HW² A: 541 for attestations. The word is written with and without a word space between aššu and zér-ri-, so we are clearly dealing with a univerbation of the two words, forming 'good-cup'. See both at aššu- 'good' and at zér-ri- 'cup' for further etymology.

-at (3sg.pret.midd.-ending): see -a(r)i, -a(t)i)

Derivatives: *attall*—‘fatherly, paternal’ (nom.-acc.pl. *at-ta-al-la* (KUB 33.106 iii 50)).


HLuw. *tati*- often is cited as an i-motion stem *tata/-i*- (especially on the basis of the stem *tata* in *tatal*— ‘paternal’), but dat.-loc.pl. *tá-ti-ia-za* shows that at least synchronically the word functions as an i-stem.

### -čar / -čen- (abstract-suffix)

PIE *-ōtr/*-ōtm-

The abstract-suffix -čar / -čen- can be denominal as well as deverbal. Cf. e.g. *anničar* ‘mothership’, *antuňčar* ‘mankind’, *hantezičar* ‘first position’ for the former category and e.g. *akkčar* ‘death’, *hukčar* ‘conjunction’, *uyčar* ‘inspection’ etc. for the latter category. If the abstract in -čar is derived from an ablauting noun or verb, this noun or verb shows the weak stem. The suffix is *r*/*n*-inflected: it shows nom.-acc.sg. -čar vs. oblique -čen- which must reflect *-čen-*. It must be noted that despite the fact that both -čar and -čen- are often attested without plene spelling of -a-, there are enough cases in which the plene spelling is found to suggest that in all cases we should in fact assume that we are dealing with -čar and -čen-.

In CLuwian, we find the abstract-suffix -attar / -atta(n)-, e.g. in *kuršattar / kuršatta(n)*—‘parcel of land’ < *cutting’ or *gulzattar / gulzatta(n)*—’sketch’ <
*carving*. It is clear that these suffixes must be etymologically connected. Nevertheless, it is remarkable that we find a lenis -t- = /ḍ/ in Hittite vs. a fortis -tt- = /tt/ in CLuwian. In my view, this points to the following scenario. The pre-PAnatolian form of this suffix, *-ôtr/ *-ôtn- yielded PAnat. */-ôdtl/, */-ôtnl/ (lenition of *-t- in 'intervocalic' position, but not as part of a cluster). In CLuwian, the nom.-acc.sg.-form */-ôdl/ regularly yielded ***/-âôdr/, which was at some point altered to */-âôtr/ in analogy to /-t/ as found in the oblique stem */-âtn/. In Hittite the oblique stem */-ôtnl/ assimilated to */-âNl/, however, which means that there was no model anymore on the basis of which the nom.-acc.sg.-form */-âôdrl/ could be altered. This means that e.g. appâtar/appâtm- ‘seizing’ reflects */hp-ôtr/ */hp-ôtn-. Note that Melchert 1994a: 86 reconstructs this suffix as *-ēhtr/ *-ēhtn-, probably on the basis of the fact that he does not reckon with lenition due to *-ô, as well as on the basis of a presupposed connection with the factitive-suffix -âhh- (q.v.). This latter assumption cannot be correct: not only is there no semantic connection between the factitives in -âhh- and the abstract nouns in -âtar/-âm-, the suffix -âhh- is denominal only and would not be able to account for the many deverbal formations in -âtar/-âm-. Moreover, if Lyc. tukedri ‘statue’ indeed would show a suffix -edrī that must be compared to Hitt. -âtar (Eichner 1973: 80), it would show beyond doubt that we have to reconstruct *-ôtr, since *-ēhtr- would have yielded Lyc.-a-. See at -âmma for the fact that this inf.I-suffix is the original allative within the paradigm of -âtar/-âm-, and at -âma/i- for the verbal derivative of this suffix.

-ati (3sg.pret.midd.-ending): see -a(ri), -at(i)

\( \text{au}^I / \text{u}^I \) (IIa1q) ‘to see, to look’ (Akk. AMARU): 1sg.pres.act. \( \text{u-}u\text{h-}h\text{i} \) (MH/MS), 2sg.pres.act. \( \text{u-}u\text{h-}h\text{i} \) (OS), 3sg.pres.act. \( \text{a-}u\text{s-}z\text{i} \) (OS), 1pl.pres.act. \( \text{u-}m\text{e-e-ni} \) (OS), \( \text{u-}m\text{e-ni} \) (OS), a-ú-\text{ma-ni} (VBoT 1, 12 (MH/MS)), a-ú-\text{me-n[i]} (KUB 21.38 obv. 35 (NH)), a-ú-\text{um-me-ni} (KUB 21.27+ ii 4 (NH)), a-ú-\text{um-mé-e-ni} (KUB 33.88, 16 (MH/NS)), 2pl.pres.act. \( \text{u-}t\text{e-}e\text{-}n\text{i} \) (KBO 7.14+KUB 36.100 obv. 23 (OS)), \( \text{u-}s\text{-}e\text{-}n\text{i} \) (KBO 3.28 ii 9 (OH/NS)), \( \text{a-}u\text{s-}e\text{-}n\text{i} \) (KUB 23.77, 15 (MH/MS)), \( \text{a-}u\text{t\text{-}e\text{-}n}\text{i} \) (NH), 3pl.pres.act. \( \text{u-}u\text{a-a-n-zi} \), 1sg.pret.act. \( \text{u-}u\text{h-}h\text{u-un} \) (MH/MS), 3sg.pret.act. \( \text{a-}u\text{t\text{-}a} \) (KBO 5.3 i ii 56 (NH)), 3sg.pret.act. \( \text{a-}u\text{u\text{-}a-ta} \) (KBO 3.60 i 8 (OH/NS)), 1pl.pret.act. \( \text{a-}u\text{t\text{-}e\text{-}m\text{-}e} \) (OS), \( \text{a-}u\text{t\text{-}u\text{-}m\text{-}e\text{-}e-n\text{-}n} \) (MI/MS), \( \text{a-}u\text{t\text{-}e\text{-}e-r} \) (MH/MS), \( \text{a-}u\text{t\text{-}e\text{-}r} \), 1sg.imp.act. \( \text{u-}u\text{a-a-lu} \) (KUB 14.8 rev. 42 (NH)), \( \text{u-}y\text{i\text{-}s\text{-}e-lu\text{-}u} \) (KUB 3.110, 15 (NS)), 2sg.imp.act. \( \text{a-}u\text{-}u\text{u\text{-}t} \) (MH/MS), 3sg.imp.act. \( \text{a-}u\text{u\text{-}u\text{-}t\text{-}u} \) (OH/NS), 2pl.imp.act. \( \text{a-}u\text{u\text{-}u\text{-}t\text{-}e\text{-}n} \) (MH/MS), 3pl.imp.act. \( \text{u-}u\text{a-a-}u\text{-u\text{-}a-ta-r} \) (KBO 16.59 obv. 7 (NS)), 1sg.pret.midd. \( \text{a-}u\text{u\text{-}u\text{-}u\text{-}u\text{-}a-ta-r} \).
ha-ḥa-at (KUB 31.121a ii 20 (NH)), u-ya-ah-ḥa-at (KUB 24.7 iv 34 (NS), KUB 17.31 i 18 (NS)), 3sg.pret.midd. a-uš-ta-at (KBo 14.40, 9 (NH)), a-uš-ta-t=a-an (KUB 17.10 ii 35 (OH/MS)), 3pl.pret.midd. ú-ya-an-ta-ṭ[t] (HT 21 + KUB 8.80, 10 (NH)), 1sg.imp.midd. u-ya-ah-ḥa-ru (KUB 14.14 rev. 15 (NH)), ú-ya-ah-ḥa-ru (KUB 14.14 rev. 30 (NH)), 3sg.imp.midd. u-ya-rau (KUB 36.44 iv 4 (OH/MS)), 3pl.imp.midd. u-ya-an-da-ru (KUB 21.19 iv 28 (NH)); part. ú-ya-an-t-; verb.noun. ú-ya-tar, ú-ya-tar, gen.sg. ú-ya-an-na-aš (KUB 35.246 obv. 20 (MH/MS)); inf.II ú-ya-an-na (MH/MS); impf. ú-uš-ke/a- (OS), uš-ke/a- (OS), u-uš-ke/a- (KUB 6.7 + KUB 18.58 iii 18 (NS)), uš-ki-iš-ke/a- (KBo 6.29 i 10 (NH)).


IE cognates: Skt. āvīś (adv.) ‘evidently, before the eyes’, Av. āvīś ‘id’, Gr. ἀκο ‘to perceive’, aída ‘to perceive’, Lat. audiō ‘to hear’.

PIE *h2ou-ei, *h2u-ěnti

See HW² A: 572f. for attestations. The oldest attested paradigm (OS and MS) of this verb is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>u-ub-ḫi</td>
<td>u-ub-ḫu-un</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-ut-ti</td>
<td>*autta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-uš-zi</td>
<td>a-uš-ta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uš-me-e-ni</td>
<td>a-ú-me-en</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uš-te-e-ni</td>
<td>(a-uš-tēn)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u-ya-an-zí</td>
<td>a-ú-e-er</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear that originally this verb must have been ḫi-conjugated, showing a stem au- / u- (with regular monophthongization of au- to /o/ before ḫ). Only the 3sg.-forms are aberrant, showing mi-inflected forms and a stem aušš- (similar in the verb maušš-/ maušš:, note that a stem aušš- with geminate -šš- is not actually attested thus (never intervocally), but I assume that this stem had the same shape as maušš-, which is attested with geminate -šš- in e.g. mauššer, mauššant-).
This is probably due to the fact that the expected 3sg.-forms would have been *
Hóu-ei > Hitt. **/?áue/ for the present and *Hóu-s-t > Hitt. **/?áuS/ for the
preterite. Apparently, **/?áue/ was too aberrant to be retained and analogically
remade into /?áuSt'/ = a-uš-zi on the basis of 3sg.pret. **/?áuS/. This latter form,
in its turn, was analogically altered to /?áuSta/ = a-uš-ta on the basis of 3sg.pres.
auši, and likewise 3sg.imp.act. aušdu was created. On the basis of these 3sg.-forms, the stem aušš- is used for the 3sg.pret.midd. auštat (OH/MS) as well, which
then became the basis for 1sg.pret.midd. aušhašat (NH). Note that 2pl.pres.act. auštenti (MH/MS) and 2pl.imp.act. aušten (MH/MS) do not show a
stem aušš-, however, but are just archaic forms that have to be analysed as
au-šteni and au-šten, showing the archaic 2pl.-ending -šten(i) that is characteristic
for the hi-conjugation (cf. the lemma -šten(i) and Kloekhorst fthc.d).

It has been noticed since long that 1sg.pres. and pret. are consistently spelled
u-ų-, with the sign U, whereas 3pl.pres. is spelled unità-an-zį, consistently with Ý. As I have argued in § 1.3.9.4, the spelling u-uš-įį represents /óHi/, the
regular outcome of *Hóu-h-eį, showing monophthongization of *-ou- before *h2,
whereas ų-ų-ą-an-zį represents /úánt’/, the regular outcome of *Hu-énti
(compare ‘to give’: pé-e-ę-hį /péHi/ < *h1póí-hęį vs. pi-ja-an-zį /piánt’ų/ <
*h1pi-énti). The imperfective is spelled nú-uš-ke’a- and uš-ke’a- in OS texts, both
representing /űské/a-. In my view the former spelling represents /poské/a-, the NH monophthongized outcome of the (unattested) intermediate stage **auške’a-
(compare the imperfective of ‘to give’: in OH times the form is pi-įś-ke’a- /pišké/a- <
*h1pi-ské’o- in which in MH times the full-grade stem was introduced, yielding pa-įś-ke’a- /paské/a-, which then
monophthongizes to pé-eś-ke’a- /peské/a-).

In the middle paradigm we find, apart from forms that show the stem aušš, ao(r)
, the spellings ų-ųa- besides u-ąa-. In my view, the former spelling represents
?oá-/, the expected outcome of *Hu-o-, whereas the latter spelling represents
?oas-/, in which the stem ?o-a- was analogically introduced in analogy to 1sg.
u-uš-įį and u-uš-ųa-un (quite understandably in 1sg.pret.midd. u-ųa-ųha-ą-at and 1sg.imp.midd. u-ųa-ąha-ų-
)

The verb au‘ / au- is generally etymologically connected with the Vedic hapax
form uvá that occurs in RV 10.86.7a uvá amba sulabhīke. Schmid (1958) argued
that this form should be interpreted as 1sg.pres.midd. ‘I see’, which would then
point to a root *Heu-. LIV² codified this view by reconstructing a root *H1eui-
“sehen, erblicken”. It is problematic, however, that the meaning of uvá cannot be
independently established: the translation ‘to see’ seems to be prompted
especially by etymological considerations. Furthermore, if we compare parallel
phrases like AVP 5.1.3a hā ama suhīqale, AVP 10.1.1a hā ama tejone, AVP 20.46.8a hā ama panecari, it is quite possible that uvé more likely is an interjection comparable to hā, just as Geldner (1951: 275) has interpreted it: “O weh, Mütterchen, du leicht zu kriegendes Weibchen”. I therefore will leave uvé out of consideration here.

Schmid also compared Skt. uvé and Hittite au- / u- with Skt. āvis (adv.) ‘evidently, before the eyes’ and Av. āvuis ‘id.’. These forms, which point to *Houis, clearly belong with Gr. ἀυίω ‘to perceive’ < *ávı́j < *h2euis- and Gr. ἀυίδανωμαι ‘to perceive’ < * ávı́jidanomai and Lat. audīō ‘to hear’ that both go back to *h2euis-ḍā- (note that Slav. *javě ‘manifestly, clearly’ must be a borrowing from Iranian). These forms all reflect a PIE adverb *h2euis / *h2ouis ‘before the eyes, clearly perceivingly’. If this adverb is to be analysed as *h2e/ou-is (showing the suffix *-is as in e.g. Skt. bahis ‘outside’), we seem to be dealing with a root *h2eu- for which ‘to see’ would certainly be a fitting translation. Schmid’s connection between these words and Hitt. au- / u- to my knowledge have not been repeated by anyone else, probably because *h2- does not match Hitt. û-. Although in Hittite an initial *h2 would indeed usually yield ẖ- in front of *o it regularly merges with *h1- into īl- (see Kloekhorst fth.c). This means that a paradigm *h2ōu-h2ei, *h2ou-th2e-i, *h2ōu-ei, *h2u-teîni, *h2u-stēni, *h2u-ênti would by regular sound laws yield pre-Hitt. *ṛōHei, *ṛautel, *ṛāuel, */Humēnî, */Hustēnî, */Huāntu. Because an alteration between īl- and īH- was not tolerated in Hittite, one of the consonants had to be generalized. In this case, initial īl- apparently was levelled out (compare e.g. ānṣ- < *h2omh1ṣ-, where īl spread over the paradigm as well). I believe that there is still a trace left of the outcome */Hu-ī, however, namely in the verb huške/a-ī ‘to wait for, to linger’, which in my view could go back to *h2u-skē/ô-, and therewith be a lexicalized imperfective of *h2eu- ‘to see’.


IE cognates: Gr. αὐλός ‘reed, flute’, etc.

PIE *h2oul-ī-

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 229f. for attestations. Puhvel translates this word as “milt, spleen”, but Kühne (1986) after an elaborate treatment of this word states “daß
das Wort primär ‘Kehle’ bzw. ein (blutführendes) röhrenförmiges Hohorgan des Vorderhalses bezeichnet, das im Fall des Tieropfers zum unmittelbaren Ziel des schlachtenden Eingriffs wird’ (o.c.: 114). In his view, auli- can be compared with Gr. αὐλός ‘reed, flute’ and several other words referring to hollow tube-like objects (e.g. Gr. αὐλόν ‘canal’, Lith. aūlas, Latv. aūle ‘leg of a boot, pipe in a mill’, OPr. aulis ‘shinbone’, Lith. aūlys, Russ. úlej ‘beehive < *hollow in a tree’, etc.) and he therefore reconstructs *aul-i-. Kimball (1994b: 13–4) follows this etymological connection and states that “[t]hese words cannot be derived from […] *h2eul-, since the laryngeal is not preserved in Hittite”. Although indeed *h2e- would have yielded Hitt. ḫa-, a word-initial sequence *h2o- would have yielded Hitt. ḫa-l (cf. Kloekhorst Sthc.c), and I therefore think it is perfectly in order to reconstruct Hitt. auli- as *h2ou-i-.


Derivatives: (ts) **aurijala-** (c.) ‘guard’ (nom.sg. a-ū-ri-ja-la-aš, acc.pl. a-ū-ri-ja-lu-uš), **aurijatalla-** (c.) ‘id.’ (acc.pl. a-ū-ri-ja-tal-lu-uš), see also au2/u-.

**PIE *h2ou-ri-**

See HW2 A: 631f. for attestations. This word is consistently spelled a-ū-ri- or a-ū-ya-ri-, never with -u-. It is generally seen as a derivative in -ri- (cf. e.g. ešri- ‘shape’ from eš2 aš- ‘to be’ and edri- ‘food’ from ed2 ad- ‘to eat’) of the verbal root au2/u- ‘to see’ (q.v.). These derivatives in -ri- usually take the full-grade form of the root and are of neuter gender. In the case of auri-, however, many commune forms are found vs. only one attestation that must be neuter: KUB 31.110 (8) a-ū-ri-i=š-me-et. Since this attestation is found on a NH copy of an OH text, whereas all commune forms are from MH and NH texts, and because of the fact that the other nouns in -ri- are neuter as well, I conclude that this noun originally was neuter, too, and that from the MH period onwards it was brought into the commune gender.

Besides the stem auri-, we also find a stem aunari-. Rieken (2001: 375-6) states that the stem aunari- must be primary since it occurs thus 2x in OS and is more common than a-ū-ri- in MH originals. She therefore suggests that we have to
analyse the word as *ay-ari-, showing a suffix -ari- instead of -ri-. This is unlikely: the OS attestations she adduces (a-ya-ri-ja-aš (KUB 39.49 i 9 (OS)), a-ya-ri-[a-aš] (ibid. iv 1 (OS)), both in rather broken context) are “fraglich ob zu auri-” (HW2 A: 632), and are spelled a-ya-ri-, instead of regular a-ū-ya-ri-. Moreover, in my corpus of MH originals, I was not able to find an attestation a-(ū-iya-ri- at all, but did find the spelling a-ū-ri- 6 times. In my view, this indicates that the spelling a-ū-ri- is more original than a-ū-ya-ri- (cf. Kloekhorst 2005b: 94). It is remarkable that the spelling a-ū-ri- is only found in cases where the -i- is followed by a vowel: gen.sg. a-ū-ya-ri-ja-aš, nom.pl.c. a-ū-ya-ri-e-aš. In my view this indicates that the phonological form /áurias/ in earlier times phonetically was realized as [ʔáuriəs], spelled a-ū-ri(-ja)-aš, but later on as [ʔáwrijas], spelled a-ū-ya-ri-ja-aš.

See at au- / u- for further etymology.

aušš-: see au- / u-

ayan (indecl. particle): a-ya-an (MH/MS), a-u-ya-an.

PIE *h₂ouom ?

See HW A: 635 for attestations and semantics: this particle strengthens the meaning of other adverbs like arḫa, katta, šarā. See Puhvel HED 1/2: 245 for several etymological proposals. Formally, the best one is Hrozný’s (1915: 28), who connected ayan with Lat. au- ‘off’, Lith. au- ‘away’, etc. (cf. also u-). If correct, ayan would reflect *h₂ouom. See at u- for further etymology.

auyari-: see auri-

<ā(a)z (abl-ending)

Anat. cognates: CLuw. -ati (abl-instr-ending); HLuw. -adi (abl-instr-ending); Lyc. -edī (abl-instr-ending).

PA an. *(o)ti

IE cognates: Gr. πράτι ‘to’ < *pr-óti, Cret. προπρί ‘to’ < *pr-ti and Skt. práti ‘in the direction of’ < *pr-éti.

PIE *-óti, *-ti

The ending of the ablative is attested in two different forms, namely -z and -az. The first one is primarily attested in the oldest texts and is used in certain consonant-stem nouns like nēpiš- ‘heaven’ (ne-e-pi-iš-za (OS)), šāpēh- ‘roof’ (šu-
u-uh-za (OS), per / parn- ‘house’ (Ē-er-za (OS)). In younger times, these forms are replaced by forms that show the ending -az: ne-e-pli-ša-az (OH/MS), šu-uh-ha-az (MH/NS) and pár-na-az (OH/NS). The only cases in which -z can be found in the youngest texts are petrified forms like ta-pu-uš-za, ke-az, a-pé-e-az. In other consonant-stems, we find the ending -az from the oldest texts onwards. In iš-ša-a-az (OS) of aiš / išš- ‘mouth’ and tu-ug-ga-az (OS) of tuékk- / tukkan- ‘body’ we seem to be dealing with a accentuated -ʔz that matches the fact that the stem is found in the zero-grade. In other cases, this distribution is less obvious, e.g. ḥa-ap-pa-ra-az (OS) from ḥáp-par- / ḥap-pir- ‘city’, ku-uš-ša-na-az (OS) from kuššan- / kuşn- ‘salary, fee’. In a-, i- and u-stems, the ending is always -az.

All in all, I think that we have to reckon with an original situation in which there were two variants: when unaccentuated, the ending was -z, when accentuated it was -ʔz. In a-stem nouns the ending was -a + -z > -az. Already in pre-Hittite times, this a-stem ending -az was spreading, first to i- and u-stem nouns and later to consonant-stems as well. At the beginning of the OH period, all i- and u-stem nouns bear the ending -az, whereas this is the case for only part of the consonant-stems. From the MH period, virtual all consonant-stems bear the ending -az as well.

An important clue for the etymological interpretation of the ending -(ʔ)z is the fact that when the conjunction particle =i(j)a is attached to it, it does not become *z=a as one would expect (compare e.g. ir-ma-la-an-za-š=a = irmalanz + =i(j)a, ar-pu-ya-an-za-aš-š=a = arpušanz + =i(j)a, ku-un-na-za-aš-š=a = kunnanz + =i(j)a). Already in the pre-Hittite period, this a-stem ending -az was spreading, first to i- and u-stem nouns and later to consonant-stems as well. At the beginning of the OH period, all i- and u-stem nouns bear the ending -az, whereas this is the case for only part of the consonant-stems. From the MH period, virtual all consonant-stems bear the ending -az as well.

In the other Anatolian languages, we find the abl.-instr.-ending CLuw. -ātī, HLuw. -ādi and Lyc. -ēdī, which clearly go back to PLuw. *-ōdī. Since an accentuated *ó causes lenition, this PLuw. *-ōdī can be equated with Hitt. -(ʔ)z < PAnat. *-(ō)ti. Strictly speaking, we would expect in Hittite lenition in the accentuated variant *-ōti, but in my view it is unproblematic that in analogy to the unaccentuated and therefore unlenited *-ti the *-t- was restored in *-ōti.

Within the other IE languages, there are not many clear cognates. As I have argued under parza ‘...wards’, however, it is in my view quite possible that this word is a petrified abl. *pr-ti out of the paradigm of peran, parā, and that it directly corresponds to Gr. πρόνοι ‘to’ < *pr-ōti, Cret. προτί ‘to’ < *pr-ti and Skt. prāti ‘in the direction of’ < *pr-ēti. These then would show the IE cognates to the Hitt. ending -(ʔ)z.
e ‘they’: see aši / uni / ini

-e (3sg.pres.act.-ending of the ḫi-flection): see -i

-e (voc.sg.-ending): see -i

=ex – see =a-

giše-: see gišjean-

eḫu (2sg.imp.act.) ‘come!’: e-ḫu (OS).

IE cognates: for e- see at i-: for -ḫu; Skt. áva ‘off, away’, Gr. ᵐ ‘again, towards’, Lat. au-fugiō ‘to flee (away)’, Lith. au- ‘away from, down from’, OCS u- ‘from, away’.

PIE *h₂e₁i-₃₂u

Synchronously, this word functions as the imperative for the verb ye₂ / uya- ‘to come’ (q.v.). It is generally seen as consisting of the element *h₂e₁ ‘go!’ (see for this verbal root at i₂ ‘to go’) enlarged by an element -ḫu which is to be compared with Skt. áva ‘off, away’, Gr. ᵐ ‘again, towards’ etc. < *h₂(u/o)u. The latter element is quite interesting as it hardly can be separated from the prefix u-visible in ye-/uya- ‘to come’ (< u- + *h₂e₁). In my view, it proves that the element u-must go back to *h₂[u-], in which the initial *h₂ was lost in front of *o (cf. Kloekhorst fthc.c). So, whereas e.g. unità-zi ‘he comes’ must be reconstructed as
It has been suggested that *h₂ou *h₁eiti, the imperative must have been *h₁ei *h₂ou, univerbated in Hitt. eḫu ‘come!’.

gi$t ejan- (n.) a tree (evergreen), perhaps ‘yew’: nom.-acc.sg. e-j$-a-an (OS), e-a-an (MH/NS), e-j$a (KUB 17.10 iv 27 (OH/MS)), e-j$a-na-an (KBo 37.157, 4 (NS)), gen.sg. e-j$a-na-aš (MS), e-j$a-aš (NS), dat.-loc.sg. e-j$a-ni (OH/NS), e-a-ni (MH/NS), e-j$a (OH/NS), abl. e-j$a-az (OH/MS), nom.-acc.pl. e-j$a-an (OS), e-i-e = e-i-j$a, (Bo 2689 ii 30 (NS)).

See HW$² E: 22f. and Puhvel HED 1/2: 253f. for attestations. We find forms that point to an a-stem e$j$a- as well as forms that point to an n-stem ejan-. Although a-stem forms occur in an OH/MS text already, I think that the n-stem must be more original.

The word denotes an evergreen tree with leaves as can be seen from the following context:

KUB 29.1 iv
(17) $gi*e-j$a-an
(18) ma-ah-ja-an u$k-tu-u-ri i-ja-at-ni-ja-an nu ḥu$-pa-aš-ta-nu-uš
(19) ar-ja U^-UL iš-ḫu-ya-i LUGAL-š=a MUNUS.LUGAL-š=a QA-TAM-MA
(20) i-ja-at-ni-an-te-ėš a-ša-an-du u$d-da-a-ar-r=a-a=š-ma-aš
(21) QA-TAM-MA u$k-tu-u-ri e-ėš-du

‘Just like the e. is forever (and) verdant and does not shed (its) leaves, may likewise the king and queen be healthy and may likewise their words exist forever’.

It has been suggested that ejan- denotes a yew and therefore should be cognate with Russ. iva ‘willow’, Lith. ieva ‘bird-cherry’, Latv. iēva ‘bird-cherry’, Gr. οὖν, σά, οὖν ‘service-tree’. The Balto-Slavic words reflect *h₁ēhi-ėh₂- or *h₁eH-ėh₂- (second laryngeal because of the acute intonation). The Greek forms perhaps reflect *h₁oiH-ėh₂- or *h₁oh₁i-ėh₂-. Although a preform *h₁ēhi-on- indeed would yield Hitt. ejan-, this etymology is far from assured.

ek$: see ɑk- / akk-

eka- (n. > c.) ‘cold, frost, ice’: nom.sg.n. e-k$an (KUB 13.2 iv 25 (MH/NS)), acc.sg. e-ka-an (KBo 3.41+KUB 31.4 obv. 8 (OH/NS)), e-k$an (KBo 13.18 obv. 8
(OH/NS)), e[-kán or -ga-an] (KBo 12.22, 12 (OH/NS)), nom.sg. e-ga-aš (KUB 21.18 rev. 19 (NH)), gen.sg. e-ka-aš (Bo 6980, 11 (NS)), dat.-loc.sg. e-ki (KBo 22.62 ii 24 (OS)).

Derivatives: egae-\(^2\), igae-\(^2\) (Ic2) ‘to cool down’ (3sg.pret.act. i-ga-it (VBoT 1, 27); 3sg.pres.midd. i-ga-e-et-ta (KUB 7.58 i 5), i-ga-it-ta (KUB 35.79 i 7), 3sg.imp.midd. i-ga-at-ta-ru (KUB 7.58 i 12), e-ga-at-ta-ru (KUB 7.58 i 8), e-ga-ad-da-ru (KUB 45.20 i 23)), ekuna-, ikuna- (adj.) ‘cold’ (nom.sg.c. e-ku-na-aš (KUB 1.16 ii 7, KUB 34.73, 5), acc.sg.c. i-ku-na-an (KBo 4.9 v 47), dat.-loc.sg. e-ku-ni, i-ku-ni, abl. e-ku-na-az, instr. i-ku-ni-it), ekunima- (c.) ‘cold(ess)’ (nom.sg. e-ku-ni-ma-š, dat.-loc.sg. e-ku-ni-mi), ikunész-\(^2\) (Ib2) ‘to become cold’ (3sg.pres.act. i-ku-ni-eš-zi (1214/tz, 6)), ikunahhész (Ib) ‘to make cold’ (form? i-ku-na-ahl-hu-x[...]) (KUB 39.41 i 6)), see also iknijant-.

IE cognates: OIr. aig, gen. ega ‘ice’ (*jegi-), MCorn. yeyn ‘cold’ (*jeg-n-), ON jaki ‘ice-floe’ (*jeg-(e)n-), jökull ‘glacier’.

PIE *iég-o-

See HW\(^2\) E: 27f. for attestations (but note their false citing of nom.sg.c. e-ka-aš (KUB 21.18 rev. 19), which in fact is e-ga-aš). It is not totally clear what the original gender of this word was. Once we find a neuter nom.sg. e-kán, and once a commune nom.sg. e-ga-aš, whereas the acc.sg.-form ekan is dubious. As the neuter form occurs in a MH composition and the commune form only in a NH composition, I tentatively assume that the neuter form is the more original one.

The derived verb egae-, igae- shows a plain "hatrae"-class stem. It is remarkable that the noun eka- consistently is spelled with initial e-, whereas the verb is predominantly found spelled with i-. This could be due to a shift in accent: égo- vs. *ego-jé/jó-.

See Puhvel (HED 1-2: 258) for the generally accepted view that eka- must be connected with e.g. OIr. aig, ‘ice’ and ON jaki ‘ice-floe’ from *iég-. For Hittite, this equation would mean that word-initial *i- is lost before *e.

The stem ekuna-, ikuna- may be comparable to aruna- ‘sea’ < *h3r-éw-no- and could go back to *ig-éwno- in which the full grade stem ek- was introduced later on.

ekt- (c.) ‘(hunting) net(?)’: nom.sg. e-ek-za (KBo 13.101 rev. 10 (MH/NS), KBo 17.61 obv. 17 (MH/NS), KUB 39.61 i 11 (NS), 1067/5, 5 (NS)), ek-za (KBo 3.21 ii 16 (MH/NS)), acc.sg. e-ek-ta-an (KUB 48.76 i 2 (NS), 473/h obv. 13 (NS), KUB 31.68 obv. 27 (NS, with gloss wedges)), e-ek-za-an (KBo 13.101 rev. 6
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See HW 2 E: 28-9 for attestations. We are clearly dealing with an original consonant stem ework with nom.sg. ekza = īēktās, acc.sg. ektaš and instr. ework. The accusative-form ekcan is found in NS texts only and quite obviously is a secondary formation on the basis of nom.sg. ekza. According to Hoffner (1977a: 105-7), the semi-hapax & ag-ga-ti-uš (KUB 8.56 i 12 // KBo 10.47c i 24 (fr.)) denotes ‘hunting net’ as well and because of its gloss wedges should be regarded as the Luwian cognate of Hitt. ework. This then would mean that ework reflects īérti-l < *ēkt-, showing Čop’s Law and i-Motion. Hoffner suggests a connection with Lat. iacēr, iēcē ‘to throw’ (< *h3i(e)h2-k-), but in this form the *-k- is of unknown origin and does not belong to the root. Hamp (1978) more plausibly assumes a connection with MHG jagat ‘hunt’, which is taken over by Rieken (1999a: 143f.). She assumes that we are dealing with a verbal root *iek- ‘to hunt, to catch’ (OHG jagōn ‘to hunt’), of which ework reflects a t-stem. She reconstructs a ‘holodynamic’ paradigm *iek-ō-s, *iek-ōt-m, *iek-t-es. The Hittite forms, however, speak more in favour of a hysterodynamic *iēkt-s, *iek-ōt-m, *iek-t-ōs, in which the replacement of acc.sg. *iek-ōt-m by *iek-t-m is trivial. The fact that OHG jagōd and MHG jagat reflect *iek-ōt-o- could show that nom.sg. *iek-t-s was replaced by *iek-ōt-s in pre-Germanic. Rieken implies that the Hitt. gen.sg. Ik-ta-ās should be interpreted as īktas, the direct descendent of *iek-t-ōs. This seems unlikely to me; the sign IK can be read īk as well as ek, and I therefore rather interpret the spelling IK-ta-ās as ektaš, showing the generalized fullgrade stem *iek-t-.

**eku-2 / aku-** (Ia3) ‘to drink, to drink to (+dat.), to toast (+acc)’ (Sum. NAG): 1sg.pres.act. eku-mi (IBoT 2.73, 5 (OH/MS), ABoT 32 ii 14 (MH/MS?)), KUB 33.67 iv 17 (OH/NS)), 2sg.pres.act. eu-uk-ši (KBo 22.1 rev. 28 (OS)), eku-uk-ši (KUB 1.16 iii 29 (OH/NS)), eku-ut-ši (KBo 19.112, 9 (MH/NS)), 3sg.pres.act. eku-zi (OS), eku-zi (OS), eku-uz-zi, e-ú-uk-zi (Bo 2692 v 23 (NS)), 1pl.pres.act. a-kuk-e-ni (OS), eku-ya-ni (KBo 15.26, 7 (MH/MS)), a-ku-ya-ni (Bo 5709 obv. 10 (NS)), eku-e-ni (KBo 37.1 iii 37 (NS)), 2pl.pres.act. eku-ut-te-ni (KUB 1.16 iii 34, 48 (OH/NS), KUB 13.4 i 70, iv 53 (OH/NS)), eku-te-ni (KBo 14.41 iv 17 (OH/NS)), 3pl.pres.act. a-ku-an-zi (OS, often), a-ku-ya-an-zi (OS), a-ku-u-ya-an-
zi (KUB 30.15 obv. 19 (OH/NS), KUB 20.48 vi 8, 10 (NS)), e-ku-an-zi (KBo 15.34 ii 3 (OH/NS), e-ku-ya-an-zi (KUB 20.1 ii 20 (NS)), 1sg.pret.act. e-ku-un (KUB 30.10 obv. 17 (OH/MS)), 2sg.pret.act. e-ku-ut-ta (KUB 33.96 iv 21 (NS), ?KBo 19.104, 12 (NS)), 3sg.pret.act. e-uk-ta (OS), e-ku-ut-ta (OH/NS), 1pl.pret.act. e-ku-e-en (HT 1 i 45 (MH/NS), e-ku-en (KBo 23.106 rev. 1 (NS)), 3pl.pret.act. e-ku-er, e-ku-i-e-e-r (KUB 17.10 i 20 (OH/MS)), 2sg.imp.act. e-ku, 3sg.imp.act. e-ku-ud-du (KUB 43.23 obv. 3 (OH/MS)), 2pl.imp.act. e-ku-ut-te-en (KBo 7.28 obv. 26 (OH/MS), KUB 4.1 ii 4 (MH/NS), KUB 43.23 rev. 11, 15 (OH/NS)), e-ku-te-en (KUB 33.62 iii 11 (OH/MS)), e-ku-ut-tén (KUB 13.4 ii 76 (OH/NS), KUB 13.5 ii 7 (OH/NS), KUB 17.30 iii 3 (NS), KBo 10.45 iv 12 (NS)), 3pl.imp.act. a-ku-ya-an-du (KUB 15.34 i 49 (MH/MS), KUB 43.75 obv. 16 (OH/NS), VSNF 12.98 r.col. 6 (NS)); part.gen.sg. a-ku-ya-a-tar, a-ku-ya-tar, gen.sg. a-ku-ya-an-na-aš; inf.II a-ku-an-na (OS), a-ku-ya-an-na; impf. ak-ku-uš-ke/a- (OS), a-ak-ku-uš-ke/a- (KBo 21.63 ii 10).

Derivatives: 1Lu akuttara- (c.) ‘drinker, toaster’ (nom.sg. a-ku-ut-tar-ra[-aš] (KBo 5.11 i 14), a-ku-ut-tar-aš (HT 40 obv. 3, 7, KBo 37.1 rev. 22(NS), a-ku-tar-aš (KBo 37.1 rev. 29 (NS)), acc.pl. a-ku-ut-ta-ru-uš (KUB 55.56, 12)), a-ku-ud-da-ru-uš (KUB 55.56, 11)), see akutalla-.

Anat. cognates: Pal. āju- ‘drink’ (3pl.pres.act. a-ḥu-ya-an-ti, a-ḥu-ya-a-an-ti, inf. a-ḥu-u-na); CLuw. u- ‘to drink(?)’ (2sg.pres.act. u-ut-ti-iš); HLuw. BIBERE ‘to drink’ (inf. “BIBERE”-na (ÇIFTLİK §16), inf. gen. BIBERE-u-na-sa (ASSUR letter f+g §36)).

IE cognates: TochAB yok- ‘to drink’. Lat. ĝbrians ‘drunk’, ?Gr. νηπος ‘to be sober’.

PIE *h₁egʷh*-ti, *h₁gʷh*-énti

See Kammenhuber (1977) for an extensive treatment of the inflected forms and meaning of this verb. The verb shows a strong stem eku- vs. a weak stem aku-. In OS texts we occasionally find that the strong stem is spelled e-uk-, which indicates that we are dealing with a phoneme /gʷ/ here. Also the observations that the 3sg.pret.act.-form is spelled e-ku-ut-ta (besides e-uk-ta) and not **e-ku-ut (as e.g. in ar-mu-ut), and 1sg.pret.act. e-ku-un, and not **e-ku-mu-un (as e.g. in ar-mu-mu-un) show that the -u- cannot be vocalic but must be part of the consonant. This is furthermore strengthened by 1pl.pres.act. a-ku-e-ni and 1pl.pret.act. e-ku-en instead of **a-ku-me-ni or **e-ku-me-en (as in e.g. ar-mu-me-ni and ya-ar-mu-me-en), which shows that the labialization of the phoneme /Kʷ/ did not participate in the sound law *yu > mu. It is remarkable that the imperfective is consistently spelled with geminate -kk- (ak-ku-ūš-ke/a-), whereas the normal verb shows
single -k- throughout. Apparently, the /gʷ/ was fortisit to /kʷ/ by the following -ške/-a- (note that this is not a matter of ‘devoicing’ as can be seen by e-ku-ut-ta /l̪e̞gʷta/ and a-ku-ut-ta-ra- /l̪e̞gʷtra-). I therefore phonologically interpret the stems as /l̪e̞gʷ/-l, /l̪e̞gʷ/- and /l̪kʷ/-ške/-a-.

These stems hardly can go back to anything else than a PIE root *h₁egʷʰ-. This means that the old connection with Lat. *aqua ‘water’ cannot be correct as the latter, if from IE origin, shows *h₂ekʷ-eh₂. Better comparanda are TochAB yok-‘to drink’ (Pedersen 1925: 40), Lat. ţebrius ‘drunk’ (Juret 1934) and possibly Gr. ἀλκοός to be sober (Juret 1937: 79).

The Tocharian forms seem to point to *ἄκος-, which possibly goes back to a reduplicated stem *h₁e-h₁Kʷ-. Lat. ėbrisus, too, must reflect a reduplicated form, and shows that the labiovelar was *gʰː: *h₁e-h₁gʰ-. The appurtenance of Gr. ἀλκόος to be sober’ is difficult in view of the one Doric attestation νάκο, which implies an original *ἄκος that is contradictory with *h₁e. According to Winter (1955: 173-5), Dor. νά- could be of secondary origin, however, which would make way to interpreting Gr. ἀλκόος as *n̪-gʰ-e/o- to not-drink’.

All in all, Hitt. eku/-aku- must reflect *h₁egʰː / *h₁gʰ-. The Palaic cognate shows a lenition of *gʰː to /hʷ/ (note that aḫu’a-ni- must stand for /hʷa/ní/, so *gʰː was not intervocalic), whereas in CLuwian the root *h₁egʰ- first yielded *ʔeu- which developed into /ʔu/-.

Kimball (1999: 187) cites a form 2pl.pres.act. e-ku-ya-te-ni (KUB 1.16 iii 34), but this is incorrect: the form in fact is e-ku-ut-te-ni, cf. also e-ku-ut-te-ni in ibid. 48.

*ekku- (c.) ‘horse’ (Sum. ANŠE.KUR.RA): nom.sg. ANŠE.KUR.RA-uš (KBo 17.15 rev. 9 (OS), KBo 3.34 ii 36 (OH/NS)), acc.sg. ANŠE.KUR.RA UNA-un (KBo 8.36 i 4 (OH/NS)), gen.sg. ANŠE.KUR.RA-aš (KBo 6.2+ iv 8 (OS)), acc.pl. ANŠE.KUR.RA MEŠ-uš (HT 10, 12 (NS)).

Anat. cognates: CLuw. *qšu- or *ažu- (c.) ‘horse’ (nom.sg. ANŠE.KUR.RA-uš (KUB 35.107+108 iv 7 (MS))); HLuw. *ašu- (c.) ‘horse’ (nom.sg. (?)/t̥asus/ANIMAL.EQUUS-sa (TOPADA §16), ANIMAL.EQUUS-sa (TOPADA §19), ANIMAL.EQUUS-sa (TOPADA §26), acc.sg. t̥asun/ EQUUS.ANIMAL-šu-ha=wā/i=ta (KARATEPE 1 §8 Hu.), EQUUS.ANIMAL-šu-ha=wā/i=ta (KARATEPE 1 §8 Ho.), dat.-loc.sg. t̥asunı̄/ EQUUS.ANIMAL-šu-wā/i (KARATEPE 1 §8 Ho.), EQUUS.ANIMAL-šu-wā/i (KARATEPE 1 §8 Ho.), abl.-instr. t̥asuadı̄/ EQUUS.ANIMAL-šu-wa/i-tı (TOPADA §5, §8, §10), ANIMAL.EQUUS-tı (TOPADA §23), nom.pl.(?)/t̥asuntı̄/ ANIMAL.EQUUS-zı̄a (TOPADA §21), dat.-loc.pl. t̥asuadı̄/ EQUUS.ANIMAL-šu-wa/i-za (ANDAVAL §4), ásasatala- ‘to ride on horse’ (inf.
See also Starke 1995: 119f. for an overview of attestations of these words. In Hittite, the word for ‘horse’ is only attested written with the sumerogram ANŠE.KUR.RA. The few instances of a phonetic complement (including in OS texts) point to a u-stem: nom.sg. ANŠE.KUR.RA-uš, acc.sg. ANŠE.KUR.RA.BlA-un (collectively used).

The fact that we find a u-stem in Hittite corresponds to the HUmian u-stem noun á-sű- ‘horse’. The second sign of this word, á-sű-, is rendered in Hawkins 2000 (see especially p. 35-6) as sű, although it is read by Melchert (1987a: 201-2) as zű (so á-zű-). As long as we keep in mind that this sign is the regular outcome of PIE *kû (also *kû/wa/-ni- = sű/wa/i/-ni- or zű/wa/i/-ni- ‘dog’ < *kûon-), the exact reading of this sign is not important for the interpretation of the HUmian material. I have followed Hawkins in this matter. Often this noun is cited as “ásu(wa)-”, but this is incorrect: the acc.sg.-form *taşum/ clearly points to a u-stem, whereas the -a- that is visible in abl.-instr. ANIMAL.EQUUS-va/-i-ti = *taşuad-i/ and dat.-loc.pl. EQUUS-á-sűwa/i/-za = *taşuad-i/ is an inherent part of the endings -adi and -anza.

In CLuwian, we also find a u-stem noun underlying the sumerogram ANŠE.KUR.RA: nom.sg. ANŠE.KUR.RA-uš. Several phonetically spelled words have been pinpointed as denoting ‘horse’, but the meaning of none of them can be independently determined. E.g. Melchert (1993b: 44), who reads HLuw. á-sű- as á-zű-, cites dat.-loc.pl. a-zu-ya-an-za (KBo 13.260 ii 24) as ‘horse’, but the context is too unclear to either prove or disprove this interpretation. E.g. Starke (1995: 118236), who reads HLuw. á-sű- as á-sű-, cites a-aš-[u-] (KUB 35.107+108 iv 22), a-aš-[u-] (KUB 35.102 i 7) and q-aš-šu-ut-[i-] (KUB 35.100 rev. 3) as possible broken phonetical spellings of ‘horse’, pointing to the fact that the first form is found on the same tablet as the nom.sg.-form ANŠE.KUR.RA-uš, and that all forms are found on tablets that belong to the same text group. Again the evidence is not decisive to either prove or disprove Starke’s views.

The Lycian word for ‘horse’ is usually cited as esbe-, but this is not necessarily correct as the -e- visible in abl.-instr. esbedi and gen.adj. esbehe/i- in both cases is
inherent to the ending (-edi ~ CLuw. -āti, -ehe/i- ~ CLuw. -ašša/i-). I therefore cite this noun as esb-. Starke (1995: 119) further adduces a Pisidian placename Ετεοκολομπων, which he translates as “Pferde-Dorf”, assuming that it contains an element *esu- ‘horse’.

It has often been claimed that the Luwian and Lycian words are loans from Indo-Iranian (Indic āśva- or Iran. aspa-), but as Starke (1995: 119) convincingly shows, this cannot be correct for at least the Lycian form: the Iranian name Vištāspa is borrowed into Lycian as Wisṭtasppa-, showing that esb-with its e- and -b-cannot be from an Ir. source. Moreover, Indic names like *pṛiśāva- and *pṛiśāvya- are rendered in Mitanni-Indic as Pi-ri-da-aś-śu-yyyy and Pi-ri-aš-yyyy respectively, clearly showing the thematic vowel -a-. I therefore regard all Anatolian words as inherited (but see at Lu gššušanni for a genuine borrowing from Indic).

On the basis of HLuw. ā-sū- ~ Lyc. esb- we can reconstruct a PANat. form *leku-. Taking the Hittite historical phonology into account, we would expect that the Hittite outcome of PANat. *leku- would have been **ekku-, which is the reason for me to treat these words under the lemma *ekku-.

It is of course clear that PANat. *leku-, which must reflect a preform *h₁eku-, cannot be separated from the words for ‘horse’ in the other IE languages that point to a reconstruction *h₁ekuo- (Skt. āśva-, Gr. ἑπόκοξ, Lat. equus, TochB yakwe, etc.). It is remarkable, however, that despite the fact that all non-Anatolian IE languages point to an o-stem *h₁ekuo-, the Anatolian evidence clearly points to an u-stem noun. Starke (1995: 120) therefore states that we are dealing with an “Umbildung des Stammausgangs *o-wo- -> "u-"”, but this seems very unlikely to me: there is no known phonological development in the prehistory of Anatolian that would predict that an PIE sequence *-uo- would regularly yield Anat. -u-; moreover, in view of the productivity of the o-stem inflection in Anatolian, an analogical development of PIE *h₁ekuo- to Anat. *h₁eku- is hard to defend. We must conclude that it is impossible to assume that a PIE o-stem *h₁ekuo- would have yielded an Anat. u-stem *h₁eku- and that the inverse therefore must be true. I consequently assume that the original PIE word for ‘horse’ was a u-stem *h₁eku- and that only after the splitting off of Anatolian this word was thematicized to *h₁ekuo- (a trivial development) as it is attested in all the other IE languages. We may think of an original paradigm *h₁ek-u-s, *h₁k-ēu-m, *h₁k-u-ōs, from a stem *h₁ek-u- ‘quick, swift’ as also seen in Skt. āśū- ~ Gr. ὑπόκοξ ‘quick, swift’ < *h₁o-h₁k-u-.
-ěl (pronominal gen.sg.-ending): am-ěl (OS), a-pé-ěl[-el] (OS), a-pé-ěl (MH/MS), ke-ě-el (OS), ku-ě-el (OS), tu-ě-el (OS), tu-ěl (MH/MS).

The gen.sg.-ending of pronominal stems is -ěl. Within Anatolian, the only comparable form may be Lyd. bili- ‘his’, which is derived from bi- ‘he, she, it’ (see under apĩ / apûr-). According to Kronasser (1956: 142), this ending is comparable to a Hattian suffix -el or -il that expresses apurtenance. The fact that -ěl is consistently found in pronouns only makes a borrowing less likely, however. Further unclear.

M̱ș ellipsis:: see M̱ș ellipsis-

gišelzi- (n.) ‘(pair of) scale(s)’ (Sum. GIŠ.RÍN, gišNUNUZ ZI.BA.NA, Akk. ZIB.AN[TU]): nom.-acc.sg. or pl. e-el-zi (KUB 30.10 rev. 13 (2x) (OH/MS)), e-el[(z)i] (KBo 6.26 i 52 (OH/NS)), el-zi (KBo 6.13 i 8 (OH/NS)), dat.-loc.pl. ili-zi-ja-aŝ (KUB 32.129 i 14 (NS)).

PIE *h₁el-t-ih₁??

Although formally one cannot decied whether nom.-acc. ělzi is singular or plural, HW² (E: 36) suggests that this word is plurale tantum. Semantically, this could make sense because of the fact that the word denotes a pair of scales, which is supported by the only occurrence of an oblique case of this word, dat.-loc.pl. iļtijaš.

Because of the inherent duality of this word, Puhvel (1981b: 352-3; HED 1/2: 270) assumes that the -i in fact goes back to the PIE dual ending *-ih₁. If so, then we might have to do with a root *h₁el-t- + -ih₁. He connects the word with OIr. leth, We. lēd ‘halve’, Lat. latus ‘side’, assuming that these words reflect a root *h₁let- besides the root *h₁el-t- found in Hittite. Hamp (1988) followed this suggestion, but tried to show that the indeed awkward assumption of Schwebe- ablaut is unnecessary. He derives the Celtic forms through *le'te's- < *lit- from a zero-grade form *[l]t-, which, according to Hamp, is the preform for Lat. latus as well (like magnus < *mg-no-). Problematic to this view is the fact that in Latin, a pre-form *h₁lt- would not give lat-, but probably should have given **alt- (cf. Schrijver 1990: 71). Moreover, Schrijver (1990: 486) takes the Celtic words as belonging with OIr. lethan ‘wide’ < *plth₂no- and leaves Lat. latus unconnected.

All in all, I conclude that the etymology proposed by Puhvel and extended by Hamp is unsatisfactory. I agree that if this word shows the old dual ending *-ih₁ (which is at least possible from a semantic point of view), we mechanically have
to reconstruct *h₁elt-ih₁, but I have not been able to find any convincing IE cognates that reflect this root as well.

enu(-): see aši / uni / ini

enu² (Ib2) ‘?’: 3sg.pres.act. e-*mu-z[il] (KUB 44.61 iv 20 (NS)); part. e-*mu-ya-an-da[i(-)...] (KUB 10.21 v 5 (OH/NS)).

The verb occurs only twice. The first text it occurs in is a medical text:

KUB 44.61 iv
(19) [ma-a-a]n=kān an-tu-ub-še IŠ-TU LŠA-RI=ŠU z[a²-ap-pi-ja-at-ta-ri (?)]
(20) [NUMU][n=ma-a=s-si=kān U]-UL e-eš-zì nu tap-pi-in e-*mu-z[il x x x x x]
(21) [mu=kā]š LŠA-RI=ŠU an-da zi-ik-ke-ez-zi an-da=ma [x x x x x]
(22) [x x MI]l-an hu-u-ma-an-da-an ki-it-ta-ri ki-it-ma=n=ašl x x x x x]

‘When for a man from his penis [it drips?] and he has no seed, he (the doctor) enu-s a tappi-, [xx-s, and] places his penis inside. [...] a whole night it will lay until he [is cured]’.

As the noun tappi- is a hapax legomenon of which the meaning is unknown, it is not possible to determine what the verb enu- means either. The second text describes a ritual:

KUB 10.21 v
(3) n=at x[x x x x x]
(4) pé-ra-an kat-ta=ma’ x[x x]
(5) ŠÀ.BA IÈN e-*mu-ya-an-da[i(-)...]

(6) n=a-š-ta GAL DUMUÈ.É.GAL
(7) GADA-an še-er ar-ḫa [SUD-zì?]
(8) LUGAL-uš UŠ-KI-[EN]

(9) n=a-š-ta GAL DUMUÈ.É.GAL x[x x]
(10) GÈ.BANŠUR-az ar-ḫa da-a-[i n=a-at]
(11) LUGAL-i pa-a-i LUGAL-uš 4[U]-i
(12) pār-ši-ja

‘It (...). And down for (it) [... one of which (is?) enuyant- [...]. The head of the palace servants [draws?] a cloth up high and the king bow[s]. The head of the
palae servants takes a [...] of the table and gives [it] to the king. The king breaks it [for] the Storm-god’.

This context, too, is too unclear to determine what enuyand[i][…] denotes.

Nevertheless, it has often been suggested that enu- means ‘to make warm’ (e.g. Puhvel HED 1/2: 11; HW² E: 42f.) and therefore should be equated with inu-², the causative of ə(i)-o(r) / i- ‘to be hot’ (q.v.). Although a meaning ‘to make warm’ in both cases would not be impossible, it is hardly evident either. In view of the fact that within the Hittite period a OH /i/ is lowered to NH /e/ before -n- (cf. § 1.4.8.1.d) and taking into account that both forms with e-nu- are attested in NS texts, the equation between enu-² and inu-² formally could be defended, however.

All in all, I conclude that on the basis of these contexts a meaning of the verb enu- cannot be determined and that therefore the supposed equation with inu- cannot be proven either. A connection with enuma- (q.v.) (thus Puhvel l.c.) does not make much sense.

enuma- ‘to be refreshed(?)’: 3pl.pres.midd. e-nu-ma-an-da-ri (KUB 1.13 ii 37).

The verb occurs only once, in the Kikkuli-text:

KUB 1.13 ii
(33) ma-ah-śa-an=m=a-aš ÎD-az
(34) [EGI]R-pa ū-ya-da-an-zî n=a-aš I-N4 Ė L[U]IŠ
(35) [an-d]a pé-e-hu-da-an-zi nu=š-ma-aš nam-ma
(36) [1 DUG]AL ME-E MUN 1 DUGAL ME-E DIM₄ a-ku-ya-an-na
(37) [pi-a]n-zi ma-ah-śa-an=m a e-nu-ma-an-da-ri
(38) [nam-m]a ÎD-i pé-e-hu-da-an-zî

‘When they bring them back from the river, they take them to the stable. Then, they give them one cup of salt water and one cup of malt water to drink. When they are e., they take them back to the river’.

Kammenhuber (1961a: 61) translates “sich erholen”, which indeed seems to fit the context.

This verb is of importance as it is falsely translated ‘to become hot’ by Puhvel (HED 1/2: 11), who, on the basis of this translation, connects enuma- with inu-² ‘to make hot’, the caus. of ə(i)-o(r) / i- ‘to be hot’ (q.v.).
A stem *enuma-* does not look particularly IE to me. The comparison to *ešharmnumae-*² 'to smear with blood' (see *ešhar*) as given by Puhvel (l.c.) does not help much either.


IE cognates: Skt. āpñōti ‘to reach, to gain, to take possession of’, Lat. apōscor ‘to reach, to receive, to grab, to get’, ko-ēppt ‘I have started, I have undertaken’.

PIE *h₁ép-ti/*h₂p-énti

See HW² E: 44f. for attestations. This verb is abundantly attested from the OH period onwards. Its original inflection was epmi, epši, epzi, appweni, apteni, appanzī. In the MH period the full grade stem is analogically introduced in the 1st and 2nd plural as well, giving appweni and epteni. The one attestation 1pl.pret.act. appwen is remarkable, as it is, to my knowledge, the only plural preterite form of a mi-verb to show a zero grade instead of regular full grade. Unfortunately, it is found on a NS fragment of which the period of composition is unknown, so it is impossible to decide whether we are dealing with an archaism or with a secondary form on the basis of appweni.

Already since Hrozný (1917: 170), this verb is connected with Skt. āpñōti ‘to reach, to gain, to take possession of’ (a secondary present created on the basis of the perfect āpā < *h₁e-h₁(o)p>-), Lat. apōscor ‘to reach, to receive, to grab, to get’, ko-ēppt ‘I have started, I have undertaken’ (ko-ēppt < *h₁e-h₂p- and ap- from *h₂p-, cf. Schrijver 1990: 28f.), reflecting a root *h₁ép- ‘to take, to seize’. According to Oettinger (1979a: 88), epp-/app- must reflect a Narten-inflection *h₁ép-ti, *h₁ép-ni, but this is improbable for a number of reasons. Firstly, 1sg.pret. *h₂p-m should have given Hitt. **ēpu *ēm- and not eppun *ēpu. Secondly, *h₁ép-ni should have given Hitt. **ēpa *ēnu and not appanī *ēnu. I therefore reconstruct a normal root present *h₁ép-ti, *h₂p-énti.

The verb appat(a)rije/-a- is derived from the verb noun appātar < *h₁pōtr, and shows that synchronically the final -ar here phonologically still was /-tr/, so appātar = *pātr.

See at pai/-pi- ‘to give’ for my view that that verb reflects *h₁p-(o)i-, derived from the root *h₁e-p-.

-er: see ēr- / ar-

-er (3pl.pret.act.-ending)

PIE *-ēr

The ending of 3pl.pret.act. is often cited as -er as well as -ir (compare e.g. Friedrich (1940: 36): “-ir”, vs. Friedrich (1960: 77): “-er (-ir)”. This confusion is due to the fact that the ending is usually spelled with the sign IR that can be read ir as well as er. Also signs like GIR = HA₆ (kir and ker), NIR (mir and ner) and
The 3pl.pret.act.-ending means that the 3pl.pret.act.-ending is always 290 ŠIR (šir and šer) are ambiguous. So in the cases where the ending is spelled °Ce/i-IR, we cannot tell whether we should read °Cir, °Cer or even °Cier. This unclear situation has now been solved by Melchert (1984a: 117f., 137f. and 152f.), who convincingly has shown that in almost all cases the 3pl.pret.act.-ending should be read -er throughout the Hittite period. He mentions (o.c.: 138) only one exception, namely the spelling -hi-IR, which in his view must be interpreted as /-Hir/. Since the sign HI nowadays can be read hi as well as he (compare HZL 335), we are here as well allowed to read -he-er, however, which means that the 3pl.pret.act.-ending is always -er and never -ir.

The 3pl.pret.act.-ending -er likely belongs with the Lat. 3pl.perf.-ending -ēre (< *-ēr-i), Skt. 3pl.perf. -ur (< *-r-s) and YAv. 3pl.perf. -ara (< *-r). The difference between *-ēr and *-r can be explained if we assume that reduplicated perfects had *-r (*Cē-CC-r), whereas unreduplicated perfects had *-ēr (*CC-ēr). Since in my view the Hittite hi-verbs are the reflex of PIE unreduplicated perfects, I think that *-ēr > Hitt. -er originally was found in the hi-conjugation only. Already in pre-Hittite times it spread from here to the mi-conjugation which undoubtedly must have had the 3pl.pret.-ending *-ent originally (cf. Luw. 3pl.pret.act.-ending -anta), which should regularly have yielded Hitt. **-an.

It has been claimed that besides the ending -er, we also find an ending -ar or -r. For instance, Neu (1989) cites the 3pl.pret.act.-forms ḫa-a-ni-ja-r-a-at (Bo 6472, 12 (undat.)), ḫu-ḫu-ši-ja-ar (KUB 17.10 i 37 (MS)), ša-pa-ši-ja-ar (HKM 6 rev. 7 (MH/MS)), although Neu still cites the incorrect ša-ū-ši-ja-ar of the edition (Alp 1991: 128)), da-ᵽ-[i]-š-šar (KBo 3.38 rev. 29) and pi-iš-kar (KUB 38.3 i 7). He admits that the latter two forms can be read da-ᵽ-[i]-š-šer and pi-iš-ker as well and therefore cannot be used as an argument, but he is right in claiming that hēmijar, yemijar and šapašijar are real forms. According to Neu, these forms show an ending -ar which reflects a PIE ending *-or. Since this *-or is not attested anywhere else, it must in Neu’s view be very archaic. In my view, hēmijar, yemijar and šapašijar are just the result of the MH replacement of the suffix -je- by -ja- in -je/a-verbs. Just as OH -ješi, -jezi, -jettani, etc. are replaced by MH -jaši, -jaži, -jatteni (cf. my treatment of the -je/a-class in § 2.2.2.1.o), the OH 3pl.pret.act.-form °-jer is in these forms replaced by -jar. Of course, the ending -er was restored immediately, and the normal MH and NH 3pl.pret.-form in -je/a-verbs is therefore -jer, although -jaer is occasionally attested as well (e.g. a-ni-ja-er, a-ri-ja-er, ti-ja-er). With reference to Neu’s views, CHD P: 158 argues that the forms da-lu-ug-nu-la (KUB 12.63 obv. 30) and pār-ga-nu-la (ibid. 31) should rather be read da-lu-ug-nu-ür‘ and pār-ga-nu-ür‘, and interpreted as “3pl. preterites w. a zero grade”. See Rieken 1999a: 465f., however, for a convincing
treatment of these forms in which she shows that we should not emend the forms to *dalugnr* and *pargamur*, but rather interpret *dalugnula* and *pargamula* as all.sg. of *dalugmul-* and *pargamul*-. This means that there is no evidence in Hittite for any other original 3pl.pret.act.-ending than -er.

**erh-/** araḥ-/** arḥ-**, erḥa- **(c.)** ‘line, boundary’ (Sum. ZAG): nom.sg. erḥa-aš (KUB 17.29 ii 7 (NS), KUB 19.37 ii 45 (NH)), er-ḥa-a-š (KUB 19.37 ii 33 (NH)), acc.sg. ar-ḥa-an (OS), ar-ḥa-a-an (KBo 22.1 obv. 31 (OS)), er-ḥa-an (KUB 11.23 vi 9 (NS)), gen.sg.? ar-ḥa-aš (KUB 8.124 rev. 6 (NS)), dat.-loc.sg. ar-ḥi (OS), er-ḥi (VBoT 133 obv. 9 (NS), KUB 15.34 iii 32 (MH/MS), KUB 41.17 ii 6 (NS), IBoT 4.182 obv. 6 (OH/NS), KBo 26.136 obv. 8, 14 (MS), KBo 40.170 ii 2 (NS), KUB 10.75 i 9 (OH/NS)), er-ḥe-e-š-š-š (KUB 44.56 rev. 7 (OH/NS)), all.sg. ar-ḥa (OS), abl. a-ra-aḥ-za (OS), er-ḥa-az (KBO 3.21 ii 17 (OH/NS)), acc.pl. ar-ḥu-aš (KBO 3.1 i 7, 16, 26 (OH/NS)), dat.-loc.pl. ar-ḥa-aš (KUB 36.49 iv 10 (OS)), er-ḥa-aš (IBoT 1.30, 7 (OH/NS)).

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 129f. for attestations. Because the sign IR in principle can be read as well as er, the forms that are spelled IR-h° can be interpreted as ir-h° as well as as er-h°. The absence of plene spelling (never **er-h° or i-ir-h°) makes the matter difficult to decide.

The spelling of abl. a-ra-ah-za is remarkable. The fact that this word and its derivatives are never spelled **ar-ah-za or *ar-ťa-za precludes an analysis *arťaža’ (cf. e.g. /uHt’i/ ‘he hits’ that is spelled ya-al-ah-zi as well as ya-la-ah-zi). Instead, it is inevitable that the second -a- is linguistically real. E.g. Melchert (1994a: 29, 84) is aware of this as well, but states that “/araHts/” must through anaptyxis have developed out of an original *arHts. This is improbable, since such an anaptyxis is fully absent in words with comparable clusters like pár-ha-zi, pár-ah-zi = /párHt’il ‘he chases’ or ya-al-ah-zi, ya-la-ah-zi = /uHt’il/. I therefore assume that the stem araḥ- is to be taken seriously.

If these words are of IE origin, the alternation e/irh- : araḥ- : arḥ- must reflect ablaut. It is remarkable that all OS attestations of the noun show araḥ- or araḥ-, whereas the forms with e/irh- are found in MS and NS texts only. Nevertheless, the fact that the OS attestations of the derived verb irḥae-², arḥae-² all show e/irh- indicates that the variant e/irh- must have been present in the noun as well. In my view, such an ablaut can only be interpreted in a meaningful way if we assume that we are dealing with erḥ- : araḥ- : arḥ-. I therefore have read the sign IR as er- in the forms of the noun as cited above.

An ablauting pair erḥ- : araḥ- : arḥ- is not unproblematic, however, especially in view of the sound law “**ēRhV > aRRV” as formulated by Melchert (1994a: 83) for PAAnatolian. If this sound law is correct it is impossible that a Hitt. sequence erḥ- is from IE origin. When we look at Melchert’s examples (1994a: 79-80) in favour of this development, however, we see that they all are weak or must be explained otherwise: amiške/a- < *eNH₁iskê/ö- (compare my analysis of this imperfective at aniğe/a²); malla- < *melh- (this verb is ḫi-inflected and
therefore must reflect *molh₂; tarrə- < *terh₂o- (see at tarrə₃wᵢrᵢ for an alternative account); -anna/i- < *-enh₂i- (I reconstruct this suffix as *-omt-(o)i-); harro- < *h₂erh₁o- (here the -a- is due to the preceding *h₂); tarḥu- < *terh₂u- (I rather assume that tarḥuṣu hárHʰ’tu< *hérHʰ’tu in which -a- is due to the development *eRCC > aRCC); ḫsparanzi < *spērh₃ณtii (see at ḫpēr- / ḫspar- and ḫsparra- / ḫspar- for an elaborate account of these verbs). As we see, none of the examples in favour of *erHV > aRHV can withstand scrutiny.

Another problem regarding the stem erḥa- is that *VRHV > VRRV, as is visible from e.g. mallai < *molh₂ei, ḫsparra < *sporh₂猁ei, etc. This can be solved by assuming that arḥ- reflects a zero-grade form, *CRHV, where the laryngeal regularly was retained, and on the basis of which -ḥ- was restored in erḥa-.

All in all, if this noun is of IE origin, the ablaut-variants erḥ- : arḥ- : ḥ- can only go back to *h₁erh₂₃ : *h₁ṛḥ₂₃ : ḫṛh₂₃. From an Indo-European point of view, this ablaut is only comprehensible when it is interpreted as a hysterodynamically inflecting h₂-stem *h₁er-h₂₃: nom.sg. *h₁ér-h₂₃, acc.sg. *h₁ṛ-éḥ₂₃-m, gen.sg. *h₁ṛ-h₂₃-ôṣ. Because of the regular retention of *h₂ in the gen.sg.-form *hṛh₂₃ôṣ, it was restored in the rest of the paradigm. This means that the synchronic a-stem noun arḥa-, erḥa- as attested in Hittite is a recent thematicization going back to virtual *hṛh₂₃-o- and *h₁erh₂₃-o-. This is supported by the archaic abl. a-ra-arḥ- that shows the ending *-z attached directly to the stem and reflects virtual *h₁ṛ-éḥ₂₃-ti.

The derived verb ḫrḥa-² must go back to virtual *h₁er-h₂₃-ôjets. Because pretonic *-e- yields Hitt. -i-, I have transliterated all forms of this verb with initial ḫr- in the overview above. The variant arḥa-² reflects *h₁ṛ-h₂₃-ôjets-ôṣ.

The HLuwian cognate ḫrḥa- must show ḫ- from pretonic *e- (cf. Hajnal 1995: 63) and therefore go back to *h₁er-h₂₃-ôṣ.

The reconstruction *h₁er-h₂₃ : *h₁ṛ-éḥ₂₃ : *h₁ṛ-h₂₃ is based on inner-Anatolian reasoning only. Perhaps the root *h₁er- is to be identified as the verbal root *h₁er- ‘to move horizontally’, which is also found in Hitt. ġr- / ār- ‘to arrive’ and arm-² ‘to transport’. As an outer-Anatolian cognate, often Lat. ġra ‘brim, edge, boundary’ has been mentioned (Sturtevant 1942: 48, who also, less convincingly, adduces Skt. ġrát ‘from afar, ġré ‘far’), which then could reflect *h₁ṛ-éḥ₂₃- or *h₁o-h₁ṛ-éḥ₂₃-. Kimball (1999: 166) adduces Lith. īrti “to separate” as well. Although semantically at first sight this seems attractive, the verb rather means ‘to desintegrate’, however, which is a bit further from ‘border’ than “to separate” would have been. Moreover, the acute accent points to a pre-form *HṛH-, which implies that the second laryngeal is inherent part of the root, whereas in the Hittite noun *h₂ must be the suffix.

293
erma / armn- (n.) ‘sickness, illness’ (Sum. GIG): nom.sg.c. GIG-aš (KBo 1.42 iv 5 (NS), KUB 14.15 ii 6 (NH)), acc.sg.n. e-er-ma-an (KBo 17.1 iv 2 (OS)), e-er-ma-a(n)=š-me-at (KBo 17.1 iii 11 (OS), KBo 17.3+4+KUB 20.15+KUB 43.32+39 (StBoT 25.4) iii 11 (OS)), er-ma-an (KBo 3.4 i 7 (NH), KUB 4.6 rev. 16 (NH), KUB 29.1 ii 18 (OH/NS), KUB 29.2 ii 10 (OH/NS)), er-ma-a(n)=š-ma-aš=kán (KBo 17.3 i 7 (OS)), er-ma-an (KUB 26.87, 8 (NH)), acc.sg.c. GIG-na-an (KUB 19.29 i 7 (NH)), dat.-loc.sg. er-ma-ni (KUB 8.62 i 19 (NS)), acc.sg.c. GIG-na-an (KUB 29.1 ii 18 (OH/NS), KUB 29.2 ii 10 (OH/NS)), HUPDDDQ (KBo 3.4 i 7 (NH), KUB 16.1 i 20 (NH)), acc.sg.c. GIG-niQ (KUB 1.1 i 44 (NH)), HUPDDQ (KUB 30.10 rev. 15 (OH/MS), KUB 30.11 rev. 12 (OH/MS), er-ma-la-aš (KUB 1.1 i 44 (NH)), er-ma-la-aš (KBo 3.6 i 37 (NH), KUB 18.79 obv. 7 (NS)), ermalant- (adj.) ‘sick, ill’ (nom.sg.c. er-ma-la-an-za (KBo 5.9 i 16 (NH), KUB 5.6 i 47 (NS)), ermalije/a-/a-/ermal(l)ijej/a/-a- (IIIg) ‘to be(come) ill; to afflict (with illness)’ (KUB 1.16 ii 2 (OH/NS)), 3sg.pret.midd. er-ma-li-ja-at-ta-at (KBo 3.4 i 20 (NH), KUB 3.4 i 6 (NH), KUB 16.1 i 20 (NH), KUB 16.1 i 20 (NH), KUB 3.4 i 20 (NH)), er-ma-li-at-ta-at (KBo 3.4 i 13 (NH)), er-ma-al-li-ja-at-ta-at (KBo 5.9 i 15 (NH)), part. er-ma-li-an-za (KBo 4.12 obv. 22 (NH))).


PIE *h₂érmn, *h₂رمēns

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 157f. for attestations. The noun shows neuter (erma(n)=šmet) and commune (GIG-aš) forms. The oldest attestations (OS) clearly show that originally this noun was neuter, however, whereas the commune forms are found in NS texts only. The noun itself is consistently spelled e-IR-ma-an (OS) or IR-ma-an (OS+), to be read as e-er-ma-an and er-ma-an respectively. In its derivatives, we sometimes find a stem arm- (e.g. armanijatta ‘he became ill’). Apparently on the basis of these derivatives showing a stem arm-, Puhvel (l.c.) cites this word as arma(n)-, erma(n)-, irma(n)- and states (159) that “a [is] most frequent in Old Hittite”. Although indeed in the derivatives the stem arma(n)- seems to be older than erma(n)- (armanijatta (OS) vs. ermanijattar (NH); armalaš (OH/MS) vs. ermalaš (NH); arm[alijoh]hat (OH/NS) vs. ermali[jatt] (NH)), the noun itself only shows a stem erman-, which is attested multiple times in OS texts. HW² does not treat this word nor its derivatives under arma(n)- or erma(n)-, but refers to a future lemma irm(a)n- (E: 93). Both
practises seem incorrect to me. The OS spellings e-IR-ma-an clearly show that the younger spellings IR-ma-an have to be read as *ermian. Nevertheless, the derivatives originally probably all showed a stem arma(n)-, which was altered to erma(n)- on the basis of the noun.

The fact that in the older texts we find a stem arma(n)- used for the derivatives, suggests that originally the noun itself showed ablaut as well, although such an ablaut is not attested anymore. From an IE point of view, we would expect a protero-dynamic inflection *h₁ermin, *h₁erméns.

Note that the forms that show a stem ermal- and armal- may have to be regarded as dissimilations from original erman- and arman- (cf. § 1.4.7.2.f).

Within Hittite, erman is connected with arma- ‘moon’ and armae-² ‘to be pregnant’ by e.g. Puhvel HED 1/2: 159-60, who assumes a basic meaning ‘weak’, which he further connects with OE earm ‘weak’ and ON armr ‘wretched’. This is a possibility. Melchert (1984a: 88¹⁵) suggests a relationship with Alb. jerm ‘daze, stupor, sickness, etc.’ and states that “the root is that of *h₁jer- ‘move’ in the sense of ‘be agitated’”. Another etymology was proposed by Hajnal (1999), who connects erman with Skt. anarmán- ‘without wounds’ (AV hapax, variant of anarván- ‘id.’). These latter two etymologies imply that erman is a -men-stem, which from an IE point of view is necessary anyway (cf. the absence of roots ending in *-eRR-, which precludes reconstructing a root **h₁ermin-).

eš-³ / aš- (Ia3) ‘to be (copula); to be present’: 1sg.pres.act. e-eš-mi (KBo 3.46 + KUB 26.75 obv. 3 (OH/NS), KBo 3.55 rev. 11 (OH/NS), VBoT 58 iv 3 (OH/NS), KUB 36.35 i 13 (NS), KBo 16.23 i 19 (NH)), 2sg.pres.act. e-eš-ši ((OS) but see commentary), e-eš-ti (KUB 36.98c rev. 5 (OH/NS), but see commentary), 3sg.pres.act. e-eš-za (KBo 6.2 iv 54 (OS) // e-eš-zi (KBo 6.3+ iv 53 (OH/NS))), e-eš-zi (OS, often), i-eš-zi (KUB 34.114 rev. 5 (OS)), 1pl.pres.act. e-šu-ya-ni (KUB 26.83 iii 18 (OH/NS), KUB 44.60 ii 1, 2 (fr.) (NS)), 3pl.pres.act. a-ša-an-zi (OS), 1sg.pret.act. e-šu-un (OH/NS), 2sg.pret.act. e-eš-ta (KBo 5.13 i 19 (NH)), 3sg.pret.act. e-eš-ta (OS), 1pl.pret.act. e-šu-u-en (KUB 14.3 iv 9 (NH), KUB 31.47 obv. 9 (NS)), e-šu-en (KUB 23.1 i 32 (NH)), e-eš-šu-u-en (KUB 18.24 iii 6 (NS)), 2pl.pret.act. e-eš-te-en (KUB 15.34 iv 12 (MH/MS)), 3pl.pret.act. e-eš-er (OS), e-šer (OS), 1sg.imp.act. e-eš-li-it (KUB 26.35, 6 (OH/MS?)), KUB 23.82 rev. 16 (MH/MS), KBo 5.3 iv 33 (NH)), e-eš-lu-ut (KUB 7.2 ii 23 (NS), KUB 8.35 iv 23 (NS)), a-ša-al-lu (KBo 4.14 i 43 (NH)), 2sg.imp.act. e-eš (OH/MS), 3sg.imp.act. e-eš-tu (OS), e-eš-du (MH/MS), 2pl.imp.act. e-eš-te-en (MH/MS), e-eš-tén (MH/MS), 3pl.imp.act. a-ša-an-tu (OS), a-ša-an-du (OS); part. a-ša-an-t-
Derivatives: see ašnu- and ešri-.

Anat. cognates: Pal. ăš- / aš- ‘to be’ (2sg.imp.act. a-š, 3sg.imp.act. a-ša-du, 3pl.imp.act. a-ša-an-du, a-še-en-du); CLuw. ăš- / aš- ‘to be’ (3sg.pres.act. a-ša-ti, 3sg.pret.act. a-ša-ta, 3sg.imp.act. a-ša-du, a-a-ša-[u], 3pl.imp.act. a-ša-an-du); HLUw. ăš- / s- ‘to be’ (3sg.pres.act. a-sa-ti (KARAHÖYÜK §20, §21), ASSUR letter f'g §14, §20, §22, §33, §48), 2pl.pres.act. a-sa-ta-ni (ASSUR letter e §6), 3pl.pres.act. á-sa-ta (KARKAMIŠ A5a §9), a-sa-ti (ASSUR letter b §8), 1sg.pret.act. á-sa-ha (KÖRKÜN §2, KARAHÖYÜK §10, PORSUK §5), á-sá-ha (KULULU 4 §1, §8), á-sa-ha-‘ (BOR §2), á-saq-ha (KULULU 4 §11), 3sg.pret.act. á-sa-ta (KARKAMIŞ A7 §5, CEKKE §14, ÇALAPVERDİ 1 §3), á-sa-tá (KARKAMIŞ A6 §18, ANCOZ 4 §1, AKSARAY §10), á-sa-ta-‘ (KARKAMIŞ A6 §12), sa-ta (MARAŞ 4 §8), a-sa-ta (YALBURT bl. 3 §1), sa-ta-‘ (TELL AHMAR 1 §8), sa-ta (MARAŞ 4 §8), 3pl.pret.act. a-sa-ta (KARATEPE 1 §33, ANCOZ 8 §6), a-sá-ta (KARATEPE 1 §6 Hu., §12 Hu., §27, PALANGA §2, KULULU 1 §2), a-sa-ta-‘ (KARATEPE 1 §12 Ho.), sá-ta (KARATEPE 1 §36, §40), sa-tá-‘ (KARKAMIŞ A11a §17), sa-ta, (TOPADA §3, §21), sa-ta (BOHÇA §6), sa-tá-‘ (KARKAMIŞ A11b §2), 3sg.imp.act. a-sa-tu (KARAHÖYÜK §24), á-sa-tu-u-‘ (SULTANHAN §42), sa-tu (MARAŞ 1 §7), sa-tu-‘ (SHEIZAR §7), sá-tú-‘ (MEHARDE §6), 3pl.imp.act. á-sa-tu (KULULU 6 §4), á-sa-tu-u (ANCOZ 7 §14); Lyd. 1sg.pres. -im ‘I am (?)’ (Gusmani 1971), 1sg.pres. el ‘he is (?)’; Lyd. es- / ah- ‘to be’ (3sg.pres.act. esi, 3sg.imp.act. esu), ahâma(n)- ‘existence’, ahînta- ‘property, possessions’ (old part. of ‘to be’).

PAnat. *ʔes- / *ʔ-s-

IE cognates: Skt. áśmi ‘to be’, Gr. ἦσσι ‘he is’, Lat. est ‘he is’, Goth. isti ‘he is’, etc.

PIE *h₁es-ti, *h₁s-énti

See HW² E: 93f. for attestations. The Hittite language does not express the present tense copula ‘to be’ but uses a nominal sentence instead and therefore the number of attestations of present tense forms of this verb is lower than we would have liked. Especially the situation regarding 2sg.pres.act. is poor. In OS texts, the form e-eš-ši occurs a number of times, predominantly in the formula mu-u=š-ša-an 8-in-zu ne-pli-ši e-eš-ši (in ritual texts collected in StBoT 25). For instance, Pulvel (HED 1/2: 285) translates this sentence as ‘thou art in heaven’, taking e-eš-ši as 2sg.pres.act. of eš₂ / aš- ‘to be’. Neu (1983: 39), however, states that in
this case the use of the locatival enclitic particle =šḫan indicates that e-eš-ši belongs to the active paradigm of eš-š(i) ‘to sit’ and must be translated ‘you sit in heaven’ (thus also HW2 E: 93). Nevertheless, one OS attestation of e-eš-ši remains that does not occur in this formula, viz. KUB 31.143a + VBoT 124 iii (8) [ ]x-aš-ša e-eš-ši [(n=a-an an-da-an mi-išt-ya-an-da-aš)] (cf. StBoT 25: 189).

Unfortunately, the meaning of this sentence is unclear. If, however, the broken word [ ]x-ašš=a is to be interpreted as [ ]x-ašš=a (it could hardly be anything else), and if =i(j)a functions as a sentence initial particle here, it would mean that in this case we are dealing with a form e-eš-ši that occurs without the particle =ššan and that therefore possibly could stand for ‘you are’.

A possibly more secure example of a 2sg.pres.act.-form is e-eš-ti, found in the OH?/NS text KUB 36.92c rev. (5) [ ]x EGIR-pa LUGAL-uš e-eš-ti. Because of the fact that the main story is told in the first person and deals with the military campaign of a king (cf. ibid. (2) [...]un mu=mu DINGIRMEŠ[...] ‘I [...]’(1sg.pret.) and the gods [...] me’, (3) [...] le-ep-pu-un ‘I took’, (7) KASKAL MEŠ=ŠU ga-ar-n[u-nu-un] ‘I burnt down his roads’ and (10) [...]x nu LUGAL.GAL pa-a-un ‘I, the Greatking, went’), it is in my view likely that this sentence was spoken to the author by someone else (presumably by the inhabitants of a conquered city or land), and therefore has to be translated ‘(for us?) afterwards you will be king’. Puvel (HED 1/2: 285), claiming that the form is “OHitt.”, implausibly interprets e-eš-ti as 3sg.pres.act. here, however, and also HW2 (E: 93) translates “... danach(?) ist er (oder evtl. bist du?) König”. Taking this form as 3sg.pres.act. would be very problematic, however, as it would show a very archaic non-assibilation of *i in front of i, which to my knowledge is unparalleled in Hittite.

A form that indeed is very archaic, however, is 3sg.pres.act. e-eš-za found in the OS version of the Hittite Laws, of which the meaning ‘he is’ is ascertained by its younger copy that shows e-eš-zi. This form, together with a few other forms that show an OS 3sg.pres.-ending -za, shows that the ending *-ti regularly gave Hitt. /-t/, spelled -za, which was restored into the familiar -zi on the basis of -mi, -ši, etc.

The one attestation 3sg.pres.act. i-eš-zi (KUB 34.115 rev. 5, see StBoT 26: 372) is, despite the fact that it is found in an OS text, too aberrant not to be a mistake. Note that the fact that the preceding word, ku-iš-ki, ends in -i may have been the cause of this error.

The etymology of the verb eš-z / aš- is fully clear, of course: PIE *h₁es- ‘to be’ (already Knudtzon 1902: 45 identifies e-eš-tu (VBoT 1, 7) as ‘it must be’, equating it with Gr. ἄρτι and Lat. esto). In my view, e-eš-zi, a-ša-an-zi is phonologically to be interpreted as /h₁es’ti/, /h₁es’i/ from *h₁es-ti, *h₁es-έντi. See at
eš-anah / aš- ‘to seat; to sit’ for the view that the meaning ‘to be (present)’ is a quite recent lexicalization of an original meaning ‘to sit’, still visible in the Hitt. verb eš-anah ‘to seat’ and eš-anah / aš- ‘to sit’.

See Kloekhorst (2004: 41f.) for a detailed treatment of the HLuw. verb āš- ‘to be’ and its aphaeresis.
14.1 obv. 16, 44 (MH/MS), KUB 14.3 iv 3 (NS), e-šī (KUB 14.1 obv. 19 (MH/MS)), 2pl.imp.act. e-eš-te-en (KUB 15.34 ii 16 (MH/MS), KUB 14.16 i 17 (NH)); part. a-ša-an-t- (OS), e-ša-an-t- (NH); verb.noun. a-ša-tar, a-ša-a-tar (gen.sg. a-ša-an-na-aš); inf.II a-ša-a-an-na (MH/MS), a-ša-an-na (MH/MS); impf. e-eš-ke-a- (midd.) (OS).


Anat. cognates: CLuw. īstar-dallī (adj.) ‘throne-like’ (nom.-acc.pl.n. iš-tar-da-al-la (KBo 20.75 rev. 14), see Starke 1990: 416)); HLuw. īš- ‘to be seated, to dwell’ (3sg.pres.med. SOLIUM+MI-sā-i (KARATEPE 1 §54 Hu.), SOLIUM+MI-i (KARATEPE 1 §24, ÇİFTLİK §10, ÇALAPVERDİ 2 §2), 3pl.pres.act. SOLIUM+MI-ti (KARKAMIŞ A2+3 §17e), 1sg.pret.act. SOLIUM-ha (IZGIN §2), 3sg.pret.act. SOLIUM-tā (KARAHÖYÜK §4), SOLIUM+MI-ta (KARATEPE 1 §37 Hu.), 3pl.pret.act. SOLIUM- ā-sā-ta (KARKAMIŞ A11b §10); verb.noun nom.sg. SOLIUM+MI-las-sa (KARATEPE 1 §36 Hu.), īšnu(wa)- ‘to seat, to settle’ (1sg.pret.act. SOLIUM-ī-sā-nu-hā (KARATEPE 1 §31 Ho.), SOLIUM-ī-s[ā]-mū-ha (KARATEPE 1 §47 Hu.), SOLIUM+MI-ī-sā-nu-ha (KÖRKÜN §5), SOLIUM-ī-sā-nu-wā/i-ha (MARAŞ 1 §4), SOLIUM-ī-sā-nu-wa/i-ha (KARKAMIŞ A11a §20, BOYBEYPINARI 2 §1), SOLIUM-ī-sā-nu-wa/i-ha (KARATEPE 1 §31 Hu., KARKAMIŞ A11b+c §17, KARABURÇLU line 3, GÜRÜN §3b, TELL AHMAR 2 §10), SOLIUM+MI-ī-sā-nu-wā/i-ha (KARATEPE 1 §16 Ho.), SOLIUM+MI-ī-sā-nu-wā/i-ha (KARKAMIŞ A1a §16), 3pl.pres.act. SOLIUM+MI-ī-sā-nu-wa/i-ī-ti (KARATEPE 1 §54 Ho.), 3sg.pret.act. SOLIUM-ī-sā-nu-wa/i-ta (TELL AHMAR 5 §3), 3pl.pret.act. SOLIUM-ī-sā-mī-wa/i-ta (MARAŞ 1 §3), īša- (c.) ‘seat’ (nom.sg. "MENSA SOLIUM" ā-sa-sa (KARKAMIŞ A6 §25), acc.sg. "MENSA SOLIUM" ā-sa-na (KARKAMIŞ A6 §24), "MENSA SOLIUM" ā-sa-na’ (KARKAMIŞ A6 §8), "SOLIUM" xana (HAMA 4 §5, §6), dat.-loc.sg. SOLIUM+MI-ā-sa (KARAHÖYÜK §4), SOLIUM+MI-ā-sa (HAMA 4 §8), "SOLIUM" sa (HAMA 5 §5), īstarta- (n.) ‘throne’ (nom.-acc.sg. "SOLIUM" ī-sā-tara/i-tā-za (BOYBEYPINARI 1 §1), ī-sā-tara/i-ta-za (BOYBEYPINARI 1 §5, BOYBEYPINARI 2 §5, §15), dat.-loc.sg. "SOLIUM" ī-sā-tara/i-ti-i (MARAŞ 1 §3, MARAŞ 4 §17), "SOLIUM" ī-sā-tara/i-ti-i (KARATEPE 1 §16 Ho.), "SOLIUM" ī-sā-tara/i-ti (KARATEPE 1 §16 Hu.), THRONUS ī-sā-tara/i-ti/i (IZGIN 1 §2)).
IE cognates: Skt. āste ‘to sit, to live, to settle, to abide, to continue’, āśa- (n.) ‘seat’, YAv. āś- ‘to sit’, Gr. ἱκτός ‘to sit’.

PIE *h₁ehs-o, *h₁ehs-n-to; *h₁es-ti, *h₁es-énti

See HW² E: 97f. for attestations. Already Hrozný (1919: XIII, 14) connected this verb with Gr. ἱκτός ‘to sit’ and Skt. āste ‘to sit’. These latter forms seem to reflect *h₁ehs-to, displaying a root *h₁eh₁s-. Because this structure is quite remarkable, it is generally assumed that *h₁eh₁s- must reflect an old reduplication *h₂e-h₁s- of a root *h₁es- ‘to sit’ (cf. LIV²). This root *h₁es- is identical to *h₁es- ‘to be (present)’, indicating that ‘to sit’ is a development out of the meaning ‘to be present’.

The formal interpretation of the Hittite material is quite straightforward. We find a middle stem es'-a₄(0) besides an active stem es'-a₃. Usually, the middle paradigm ēsari / ēsantari is interpreted as reflecting *h₁eh₁s-o, *h₁eh₁s-n-to. The active stem es'- a₃ is formally identical to ēs'-a₄-‘to be’ (and, as we saw above, historically as well), and therefore is best regarded as reflecting *h₁es-ti, *h₁es-énti.

In HLuwian, the verb ‘to be seated’ is predominantly written with the logogram SOLIUM. Only once we find a full phonetic form, namely 3pl.act. SOLIUMā-sa-ta. When we compare this to Hitt. a-ša-an-zi ‘they sit’, it is quite possible that HLuw. ā-sa-ta represents ḫ santé < *h₁sénto (see Kloekhorst 2004 for my view that the HLuwian sign ḫ can represent ḥl-). In the derivatives i-sā-nu-wa/i/- ‘to seat, to settle’ and i-sā-tara/i-ta- ‘throne’ we find a stem is-. The interpretation of this stem is not fully clear. At first sight it is tempting to interpret the stem is- as the strong stem variant of ās-. E.g. Hawkins & Morpurgo-Davies (1978: 107-11) therefore assume that the stem is- is the one hidden behind the logogram SOLIUM+MI, and Starke (1990: 418) subsequently interprets SOLIUM+MI-sa-i ‘he sits’ as īsā/i, which he regards as the direct cognate of Hitt. ēša. On the basis of his assumption that HLuw. -i- can reflect *-eh₁-, Starke reconstructs īsā/i as *h₁eh₁s-o. Melchert (1994a: 265) claims that *-eh₁- yields Luw. -ə, however, which would mean that Starke’s reconstruction is impossible. Because Luw. -i- can also reflect a pretonic *e (cf. e.g. HLuw. tipas- < *nebʰ es-), the stem is- could also be regarded as the outcome of the unreduplicated stem *h₁es- in pretonic position. In the verb īsmu(wa)- this is certainly possible (< virtual *h₁es-néw-), and in i-sā-tara/i-ta- probably as well (< *h₁es-tró- ?). This could mean that the relationship between the stems is- and ās- is not one of strong vs. weak, but rather one of unaccentuated vs. accented.
All in all, the phonetic form of SOLJUM+MI-sa-i cannot be deduced from the available evidence. The 3pl.pret.act.-form á-sa-ta probably reflects *h₁s-énte and the noun á-sa- ‘seat’ in my view must reflect *h₁s-o- (in which the initial preconsonantal /r/ occasionally is dropped within the HLuwian period (the so-called aphaeresis), cf. Kloekhorst 2004: 46-7). The interpretation of the other forms depends on one’s view on the outcome of *-eh₁- in Luwian. If one follows Starke in assuming that *-eh₁- > Luw. -i-, ismu(wa)- and i-sá-tara/i-ta- can reflect 
\[ *h₁eh₁-s-n(e)u- \] and \[ *h₁eh₁-s-tro- \]. If one follows Melchert in assuming that *-eh₁- > Luw. -ɘ-, one must reconstruct *h₁es-nëu- and *h₁es-tró- (or similar) respectively.

*eš (nom.pl.c.-ending)

PIE *-ei-*es

This ending is usually cited as -ëš, but this is incorrect. If we look at OS texts, we see that it is predominantly spelled °Ce-eš (e.g. la-a-le-eš, li-in-ki-ja-an-te-eš, a-ree-eš, ku-úše-eš, pal-ya-at-ta-al-le-eš, píše-në-eš, etc.). The only cases in which a plene -e- is found, is when the ending is attached to a stem in vowel (e.g. ha-à-pi-e-eš, ma-a-ri-e-eš, pal-à-a-e-eš, ap-pé-ezi-e-eš, ña-an-te-ezi-e-eš, ku-i-e-eš, ñar-ša-e-eš). In my view, the plene -e- in these cases much more likely denotes the hiatus than a long vowel. So pal-ña-a-e-eš = /pHāšēš/, ña-à-pi-e-eš = /hābìšē/, ñar-ñå-e-eš = /Hrāšēš/ etc. In cases like iš-he-e-eš (MS) and perhaps also šu-me-e-eš (MS) (but compare the OS spelling šu-me-eš!), we are probably dealing with real accented endings /tisHēš/ and /sumēš/. In younger times, we do find some spellings °Ce-e-eš (e.g. pal-ya-at-ta-al-le-e-eš, ñu-uh-he-e-eš), but these are much less common than °Ce-eš. All in all, we must conclude that the ending is to be interpreted as /-eš/, with short -e-. Nevertheless, since this ending is usually unaccentuated (except in already mentioned išhēš and šumēš), and since unaccentuated /el reflects *-ë-, we must assume that the ending -ëš reflects a preform *-ëš.

In younger times, we sometimes find spellings like °Ci-eš, °Ce-iš and °Ci-ëš, which could show that the ending is deteriorating to /-is/. From MH times onwards, we see that the nom.pl.c. can also be expressed by the original acc.pl.c.-ending -uš and even by the original dat.-loc.pl.-ending -aš.

For a detailed treatment of the prehistory of this ending, cf. Melchert 1984a: 121-2, who argues that *-ëš goes back to *-ei-es, the original nom.pl.c.-ending of -i-stems. This implies that the contraction of *eie- to *ë- must have been much earlier than the loss of intervocalic *i as described in § 1.4.8.1.a, namely before
the weakening of unaccentuated *e to a in open syllables. So for the nom.pl.c. of i- and u-stem adjectives, we must envisage the following scenario:

(1) expected PIE preform:

*CC-ei-es and *CC-eu-es

(2) generalization of word-initial stress:

*CVC-ei-es and *CVC-eu-es

(3) contraction of *-ei- to -e-:

*CVC-ees and *CVC-eu-es

(4) restoration of suffix-syllable -ei- in the i-stem adjective on the basis of e.g. acc.pl.c. *CVC-ei-us:

*CVC-ei-es and *CVC-eu-es

(5) spread of the marked nom.pl.c.-ending -es throughout the other nominal stems:

*CVC-ei-es and *CVC-eu-es

(6) weakening of postonic *e in open syllable to -a- and subsequent shortening of unaccentuated *e to e:

*CVCaeis and CVCayes

(7) loss of intervocalic *i with lengthening of the preceding vowel:

CVCæes and CVCayes

-CES-:\ (“fientive”-suffix)

PIE *-έτη-ς-\(sh\)-

The verbs in -æes- are traditionally called ‘fientives’ since they denote ‘to be ...’ or ‘to become ...’. They are often derived from adjectives, but can be derived from nouns and verbs as well. For adjectives, compare: arayæes-zi ‘to become free’ from arayant- (adj.) ‘free’; ḥarkiæes-zi ‘to become white’ from ḥarki- / ḥargai- (adj.) ‘white’; idalayæes-zi ‘to become bad’ from idalæu- / idalay- (adj.) ‘evil’; makkæes-zi ‘to become numerous’ from mek, mekki- / mekkai- (adj.) ‘numerous’ (note the zero-grade formation); miæes-zi ‘to become mild’ from miu- / miuay- ‘soft, mild’; parkæes-zi ‘to become tall’ from parku- / pargau- (adj.)
‘high’; parkušš-zi ‘to become tall’ from parku-/ pargay- (adj.) ‘high’; tepayšš-zi ‘to become little’ from tēpu- / tēpy- (adj.) ‘little’. For verbs, compare: ḫatšš-zi ‘to become dry’ from ḫar- / ḫat- ‘to dry up’; mišš-zi ‘to grow’ from mai- / mi- ‘to grow’; tukkšš-zi ‘to be important’ from tukk-ā to ‘be important’. For nouns, compare: šaknšš-zi ‘to be(come) impure’ from šakkar, zakkar / šakn- ‘excrement’.

The verbs that bear this suffix inflect according to the mi-conjugation and do not show ablaut (*ešmi, *ešti (for *ešši), *ešzi, *eššušeni, *ešteni, *eššanzi). Note the difference between tepayšš-, parkušš- and mišš-, all derived from nuclei.

According to Watkins (1973a: 71f.), the suffix -šš- must be an ‘inchoative’ in -s- of the stative suffix *-eh₁-; just as in Latin we find the inchoative suffix -scere (e.g. rubšcere ‘to become red’), which in his view reflects *-eh₁-ske/o- (the stative suffix *-eh₁- itself is also sporadically attested in Hittite: naktešti, paktešti, parkušš- and sulšešti, cf. the treatment of this class in § 2.2.2.1.1). Nevertheless, as we can see from *heh₁s-o > Hitt. eša ‘to seat’, a reconstruction *-eh₁-s- cannot explain the geminate -šš- found in -šš-. In my view, this means that we must reconstruct *-eh₁-sh₁- in which the element *-sh₁- must be compared with the imperfective-suffix -šš(a)- that reflects *-s(o)h₁-. Just as the Hittite imperfective suffixes -šš(a)- < *-s(o)h₁- and -ške/a- < *-ške/o- are functionally equal, we can now even better understand that the Hittite fientive suffix -šš- < *-eh₁-sh₁- is functionally equal to the Latin suffix -scere < *-eh₁-ske/o-.

šša- / šš-: see šša- / šš-

ešš(a)- (“imperfective”-suffix): see šš(a)-

ššari-: see ššri-

šg ššari-: see sg ššri-

šha-: see ššha-

ššahu-: see ššahu-

ešhar / išhan- (n.) ‘blood; bloodshed’ (Sum. UŠ, Akk. TAMMU); nom.-acc.sg. eš-šar (OS, often), iš-har (KBo 3.67 ii 12 (OH/NS), KUB 31.115, 12 (OH/NS), KBo 14.41 iv 3 (OH/NS), HFAC 40 obv. 7 (OH/NS), KBo 3.16 + KUB 31.1 ii
17 (OH/NS), KBo 12.8 iv 32 (OH/NS), KBo 12.91 iv 6 (MH/NS), KBo 13.131 obv. 7 (MH/NS), KUB 30.33 i 11, 18 (fr.) (MH/NS), KUB 9.34 ii 34 (NS), KBo 1.51 rev. 17 (NS), HT 1 i 37 (NS), KUB 44.63 ii 7, 8 (NS), VBoT 74, 7 (NS)), gen.sg. ʼiš-ša-na-aš (KBo 17.1 iv 8 (OS), KBo 15.10 i 1, 20, 32, ii 39 (OH?/MS)), ʼiš-ša-na-ašš (KUB 13.7 i 14 (MH/NS)), ʼiš-ša-na-ašš (KUB 17.18 ii 29 (NS)), ʼiš-ša-na-ašš (KUB 15.10 i 22, ii 17, 32 (OH?/MS), KUB 11.1 iv 19 (OH/NS), KBo 3.1+ iv 27 (OH/NS), KUB 17.34 i 2 (fr.) (OH/NS), KUB 10.45 iii 19 (MH/NS), KUB 19.67+ 1513/u i 18 (NH), KUB 30.50+ 1963/c 12f. (NS), KUB 22.38, 5f. (NS), KUB 19.2 rev. 9 (NH), KUB 14.14 + 19.1 + 19.2 rev. 9f. (NH)), e-eš-ša-na-ašš (KUB 41.8 iii 10 (MH/NS), KUB 13.9 ii 3f. (MH/MS), KUB 17.28 ii 1 (MH/NS), KUB 9.4 i 38 (MH/NS), KUB 30.35 i 1f. (MH/NS), KUB 39.102 i 1f. (MH/NS), KUB 41.8 iii 10 (MH/NS), KUB 24.52, 4 (NS), KUB 30.50+, 11 (NS)), e-eš-ša-na-an-za (KUB 41.8 ii 36 (MH/NS)), dat.-loc.sg. ʼiš-ša-ni-i (KBo 15.33 iii 31 (OH/MS), KBo 11.49 vi 18 (OH/NS), KBo 10.45 iv 26 (MH/NS), KBo 30.153 ii 6 (OH/NS), KUB 11.26 ii 11 (OH/NS), KUB 44.12 ii 13 (NS)), ʼiš-ša-ni (KUB 40.28 ii 6 (MH/MS?), KUB 55.28 ii 6 (MH/NS), KUB 9.34 ii 34 (fr.) (NS), KBo 22.52 ii 3 (NS)), ʼiš-ša-ni (KUB 45.47 iii 18 (MH/MS), KUB 10.11 vi 5 (OH/NS), KUB 43.56 iii 12 (OH/NS), KUB 41.8 iv 25 (MH/NS), KUB 44.4 + KBo 13.241 rev. 2 (NS)), erg.sg. ʼiš-ša-na-an-za (KUB 39.103 rev. 4 (MH/NS), KUB 54.1 iv 19 (NS), KUB 14.14 + 19.2 rev. 23 (NH)), e-eš-ša-na-an-za (KUB 30.34 iv 7 (MH/NS), KUB 4.1 ii 22 (MH/NS), KUB 9.4 i 38 (MH/NS)), ʼiš-ša-na-an-za (KUB 9.34 ii 46 (NS)), abl. e-eš-ša-na-az (KUB 43.58 i 47, ii 41 (MS?), KUB 16.77 iii 19 (NH), ʼiš-ša-na-az (KUB 30.33 i 10 (MH/NS), ʼiš-ša-na-az (KUB 15.42 ii 30 (NS), KUB 30.31 ii 42 (NS), KUB 41.22 iii 3f. (NS), KUB 14.14+ obv. 34 (fr.) (NH)), e-eš-ša-na-za (IBoT 1.33, 52 (NS)), e-eš-ša-na-za (KUB 19.20 rev. 9 (NH)), ʼiš-ša-na-za (KUB 39.102 i 1 (MH/NS)), instr. ʼiš-ša-an-da (KBo 17.4 iii 15 (OS), e-eš-ša-an-ta (HT 1 i 38 (NS), e-eš-ša-ni-iti (Bo 3696 i 7, 10 (NS))

Derivatives: ʼišḫanuʕan-, ʾišḫanuʕan- (adj.) ‘bloody’ (nom.sg.c. ʼiš-ša-nu-yä-an-za (KBo 13.131 iii 14 (MH/NS)), nom.-acc.pl.n. e-eš-ša-nu-yä-an-ta (HT 1 i 30 (NS), KUB 9.31 i 37 (fr.) (MH/NS), dat.-loc.sg. ʼiš-ša-nu-yä-an-ti (KUB 36.89 obv. 14, rev. 1 (NS))), ʾiššaʕant-, ʾiššaʕant- (adj.) ‘bloodied’ (nom.sg.c. e-eš-ša-aš-käm-za (KUB 7.41 obv. 15 (MH/NS), acc.sg.c. e-eš-ša-aš-ga-an-ta-an (KBo 25.127 + 147 ii 8 (OS)), acc.pl.c. ʾiš-ša-aš-käm-tu-us (KBo 17.4 ii 7 (OS)), nom.-acc.pl.n. eš-ša-aš-käm-ta (KBo 3.34 i 20 (OH/NS)), ʾiš-ša-aš-käm-ta (KBo 17.1 i 24 (OS))), ʾiššaŋuʔ-, ʾiššaŋuʔ- (ib2) ‘to make bloody; to dye blood-red’
**āshanantisa-** (n.) ‘blood-offering’ (nom.-acc.sg. ʾāshanantisantʾal ʿā-sa-ha-na-ti-sa-za (lit. a substantivized gen.adj. of a noun *āshanant(i)- ~ Hitt. ʾiššanant-, ‘that of blood’).

PAnat. *ʔēsHr, *ʔxHanōs


PIE *h₁ēsh₂-r, *h₁sh₂-en-s

See HW²  E: 115f. for attestations. The oldest attestations show that the paradigm originally was nom.-acc.sg. e-eš-ḥar, gen.sg. iš-ḥa-na-a-ḥ, dat.-loc.sg. iš-ḥa-ni-i. The spelling nom.-acc.sg. iš-ḥar is found in NS texts only. In the case of the oblique cases, the spelling e-eš-ḥa-n- is predominantly NS, too, except for one possible MS spelling e-eš-ḥa-na-az. This is either due to introduction of the vowel e- of the nom.-acc.sg.-form into the oblique cases, or due to the the NH lowering of OH ĕl to ĕl before -s- (cf. § 1.4.8.1.d). In the literature we often find reference to forms that are spelled (i-)e-eš-ḥar and (i-)e-eš-na-aš, on the basis of which occasional loss of -ḥ- in interconsonantal position is assumed. As I will show under its own lemma, the forms i-eš-ḥar and i-eš-n- cannot mean ‘blood’ and therefore should be separated. All other instances where -ḥ- is not written must be regarded as spelling errors. The form e-eš-šar (KUB 41.8 iii 9) duplicates e-eš-ḥar (KBo 10.45 iii 18) and therefore must mean ‘blood’. It contrasts with the spelling e-eš-ḥar as found on the same tablet (KUB 41.8 i 29, ii 15, 17, iii 4, iv 2, 12) and in my view therefore must be regarded as a spelling error due to the form D₁-e-eš-ḥar in the preceding line. The form e-eš-na-aš (KUB 41.8 ii 36) duplicates e-eš-ḥa-na-aš (KBo 10.45 iii 1), and therefore must mean ‘of blood’. It contrasts with the manyfold spellings e-eš-ḥa-na as found on the same tablet (KUB 41.8 ii 43, iii 5, 10, iv 25, 34) and in my view therefore must be a spelling error e-eš-ḥa-na-aš (cf. tar-šar-an-zi-pi in the same line). All in all, I only reckon with the forms ʿešar (išḥar) and išḥan- (išḥar-).

Since Ribezzo (1920: 128), ʿešar / išḥan- has generally been connected with Skt. āṣrk, asnās ‘blood’, Gr. .Exceptionally ‘blood’, etc. Opinions on the exact reconstruction differs, however. If we compare nom.-acc.sg. e-eš-ḥar to Skt. āṣrk and Gr. .Exceptionally, we can hardly reconstruct anything else than *h₁ēsh₂-r. Nevertheless, for instance Melchert (1984a: 92) reconstructs *h₁ēsh₂-r, apparently on the basis of the plene spelling e-eš-. This argument can be refuted if we compare e.g. e-eš-mi < *h₁ēšmi. Moreover, CLuw. nom.-acc.sg. ʿešar(ša) points to *h₁ēsh₂-r, as **h₁ēsh₂-r would have yielded CLuw. **išḥar (cf. Starke 1990: 559).
The reconstruction of the oblique cases is more difficult. Let us first look at the root syllable. From a PIE point of view, we expect an ablauting paradigm *h₁eshₐ-r, *h₁ʃsh₂-. In the oblique cases, the initial *h₁ would drop regularly in front of consonants in pre-Hittite times (cf. Kloekhorst fbc.c), giving an alternating paradigm *ʔesH₂-, *sH₁-. There are now three scenarios. The first one is that this situation was retained and that the initial cluster of the oblique case receives the automatic prothetic vowel i-, giving /isHₐ-, spelled iš-ḫa-. I know of no other example, however, where a pre-Hittite ablaut *ʔe- was retained (in verbs with initial *h₁-, for example, the initial laryngeal was restored, e.g. ašanți < *h₁senti), so this scenario may not be very likely. If the *h₁- was restored, we would expect that pre-Hitt. *ʔsH₁- would yield Hitt. ḫsH₁-, spelled **aš-ḫa-. This apparently was not the case. The last possibility is that not only the initial laryngeal was restored, but also the vowel of the nominative (cf. gen.sg. pahłuenaš ‘fire’ < *peh₂u-en-os << *ph₂u-en-s), giving pre-Hitt. *ʔesH₂-. This form would yield ḫisH₁- in unaccentuated position, spelled iš-ḫa-. On the basis of these considerations, I assume that the spelling iš-ḫa- of the oblique cases reflects unaccentuated *h₁esH₂-. Note that the Luwian forms cannot be used as an argument in this respect: *h₁eC₁- would yield Luw. /aC₁- and *h₁C₁- would yield Luw. aC₁-, but both outcomes are spelled the same: aC₁- in CLuwian and a-C₁- in HLuwian.

The interpretation of the suffix syllable is not easy either. The equation of Skt. asnās with Hitt. išḥānās seems to show that we have to reconstruct *h₁esH₂nós, showing zero grade in the suffix syllable and accentuated full grade in the ending. One could argue that an extra argument in favour of this view can be seen in the one attestation e-eš-na-aš (KUB 41.8 ii 36), which would be the phonetically regular outcome of **h₁esH₂nós, showing loss of *h₁ between consonants (cf. Puhvel HED 1/2: 313). This form, however, must be regarded as a scribal error and emended to e-eš-ḫa-na-aš (cf. HW² E: 117). Moreover, Skt. asnās cannot reflect *h₁esH₂nós as the latter form should regularly yield **asɪnās. It therefore is likely that Skt. asnās is a quite recent formation, taking over the word into the productive hysterodynamic inflection. The strongest argument against the view that Hitt. išḥānās reflects *h₁esH₂nós, however, is the following. If išḥānās indeed would reflect *h₁esH₂nós, it would synchronically have to be phonologically interpreted as ḫisH₁násl, showing a cluster /-shn-/l. If so, then I cannot understand why this word is consistently spelled iš-ḫa-na- and never **iš-ḫa- as e.g. pár-ḫa-zi besides pár-ḫa-zi /párHt‘ul. Moreover, the one spelling iš-ḫa-na-aš in my view shows that the -a- of the suffix syllable was real. I therefore interpret iš-ḫa-na-aš phonologically as ḫısH₁násl, which must reflect *h₁esH₂nós. This
interpretation coincides with our view that neuter r/n-stems in principle were proterodynamic in the proto-language, showing a structure *CeC-r, *CC-én-s.

All in all, I conclude that e-eš-ḫar, iš-ḫa-na-a-aš must reflect (virtual) *ḫiššar, *ḫeššenōs, from PIE *hiššar, *hiššénos. Note that the full grade suffix syllable is still visible in Lat. sanguen < *hišš₂-en-. The phenomenon that in synchronic Hittite we find a hysterodynamic accentuation of an original proterodynamic word is also found in utter / uddan- ‘word’ and (GL Gis)pattar / pattan- ‘basket’. Note that this is not the case in e.g. yātar, šišnas ‘water’ and paḫḫur, paḫḫuenaš ‘fire’ that both are original proterodynamic r/n-stems, too, but still show show accentuation on the suffix syllable in the oblique cases (luidénas/ and /paH’énas/). It cannot be coincidental that in all three words of the first group, iššaₙ-, uddan- and pattan-, the original *e of the suffix syllable has been coloured to -a- due to a preceding *ḫi₂ (*hišš₂-en-, *uḫš₂-en-, *pšθ₂-en-), whereas in šišnas and paḫḫuen- the *e remained: apparently the colouration to -a- caused an accentual shift from the suffix to the ending.

The bulk of the derivatives show spelling with iš- in the older texts, which is being replaced by ġšh- in the younger texts (possibly the result of the NH lowering of OH ġ/ to le before -š-, cf. § 1.4.8.1.d). Only the formally rather obscure ġššaškan-, iššaškan- shows a spelling e-eš-ḫa-āš-k- in OS already (besides iš-ḫa-āš-k- as well in OS, however). Note that besides the old adjective iššašyant- (attested in OS texts a few times), we find a younger iššašmuuat- in NS texts, which seems to have to be equated with CLuw. aššašyuant(t)- (note that Kimball (1999: 356) incorrectly cites iššašyuant- as a form in which -r- has been sporadically lost: the adjective is not a participle of the verb iššašmu₂t, but rather reflects *hišš₂-en-ent- ‘having blood’). On the basis of iššašyant-, however, the stem iššary- received some productivity, resulting in forms like ġššaryahh-, iššaryieske/a- (as if from a verb iššaryiye/a- or iššaryae-), and iššaryil.

cššarriškeddu : read še²-ḫur-ri-eš-ke-ed-du, see under šeḫur


PIE *hišš₂-ri-
This word must be separated from ṣirī- ‘fleece’ (q.v.), which shows commune forms as well (pace Puhvel HED 1/2: 313f.).

Just like edri- ‘food’, aurī- ‘look-out’ etc., which are derivatives in -ri- from edzi/ ad- ‘to eat’ and au-/ u- ‘to see’ respectively, ẽšri- must be a derivative of the verb ešzi/ aš- ‘to be’ (q.v.) and reconstructed as *ḥires-ri-. The spelling eš-sa-ri- points to /tēšri-/ in which the single -s- of *ḥires- has been fortitio to /S/ due to the adjacent -r-.

The suffix -ri- is of PIE date as we can see in Skt. ṭīrī- ‘sharp edge, angle’ ~ Gr. ἀκρός- ‘mountain top’ < *ʔyék-ri- (cf. Brugmann 1906: 381-4).

ṣirī- (n. > c.) ‘fleece’: nom.-acc.n. e-eš-ri (KBo 21.8 ii 6 (OH/MS), KUB 17.10 iv 2 (OH/MS), KBo 41.1b obv. 21 (MS), KUB 33.54+47 ii 17 (OH/NS), KBo 21.23 i 20 (NS), e-eš-šar-ri- (KUB 34.76 i 5 (OH/NS)), nom.sg.c. e-eš-ri- iš (KUB 32.133 i 12 (NS)), acc.sg.c. e-eš-ri-in (KUB 41.1 i 16 (OH/NS)), dat.-loc.sg. e-eš-ri (KBo 41.1b rev. 26 (MS)).

The word shows neuter as well as commune forms. As the neuter forms are more numerous and found in older texts than the commune forms, I assume that ṣirī-was neuter originally. Formally, it is homophonic with ẽšri- ‘image, statue’ (q.v.) (although the latter word is neuter only), but semantically, the two words are too different to be equated just like that (pace Puhvel HED 1/2: 313f.). I know of no convincing etymology.

edzi/ ad- (Ia3 > IIa1γ) ‘to eat’ (Sum. KÚ): 1sg.pres.act. e-et-mi (OH/NS), 2sg.pres.act. e-ež-si (KBo 22.1 obv. 28 (OS)), [e-ež-za-alš-ši (KUB 1.16 iii 19 (OH/NS)), e-ež-za-al-[r]-i] (KUB 36.13 i 3 (NS)), 3sg.pres.act. e-za-az-zi (OH/NS), e-ež-za-zi (MS), e-ež-za-az-zi (OH/NS), i-iz-za-az-zi (KBo 27.130 rev. 6 (NS)), e-ež-za-i (MH/NS), e-ež-za-a-i (MH/NS), 1pl.pres.act. a-ta-e-ni (OS), a-du-e-ni (OS), a-du-ya-ni (Bo 5709 obv. 10 (NS)), e-du-ya-a-ni (KUB 29.1 i 15 (OH/NS)), e-du-ya-a-ni (Bo 5621 i 6 (undat.)), 2pl.pres.act. [a]z-za-aš-te-e[n] (KBo 25.112 ii 2 (OS)), az-za-aš-te-ni (KUB 1.16 iii 34, 48 (OH/NS)), e-ež-za-at-ne-ni (OH/NS), ez-za-at-ne-ni (OH/NS), ez-za-te-ni (NS), 3pl.pres.act. a-da-an-zi (OS, often), a-za-an-zi (OS), a-ta-an-zi (KBo 3.60 ii 5 (OH/NS)), 1sg.pret.act. e-du-an (OH/MS), 2sg.pret.act. e-za-at-ta (KUB 33.96 iv 20 (NS)), [e-]e-za-at-ta (KUB 33.112 + 114 ii 4 (NS)), 3sg.pret.act. e-ež-za-aš-ta (HKM 19 obv. 8 (MH/MS)), e-ež-ta (KBo 32.47c iii 1 (MH/MS), KBo 3.60 ii 18 (OH/NS)), e-ež-za-aš (IBoT 1.33, 14 (NS)), ez-za-aš (KBo 13.13 i 13 (MH/NS)), 1pl.pret.act. e-du-u-en (477tu, 13 (undat.)), 3pl.pret.act. e-te-er

Derivatives: see *NINDA*edri-.

Anat. cognates: Pal. ad- ‘to eat’ (3pl.pres.act. a-ta-a-an-ti, a-da-a-an[ti], impf. 2sg.imp.act. az-zí-ki-i); CLuw. ad- / ad- (2sg.pres.act.(?) az-za-aš-ti-iš, 2/3sg.pret.act. az-za-aš-du, 2pl.imp.act. a-az-za-aš-ta-an, 3pl.imp.act. a-da-an-du, 2pl.pres.midd. az-tu-u-ya-ri, inf. a-du-na, part. a-da-am-mi-in-zí); HLUw. ad- ‘to eat’ (3sg.imp.act. EDERE-[q] [BULGARMADEN §16], 3pl.imp.act. /?adantul á-tú-tu-u (SULTANHAN §33, KAYSERI §12), a-ra/i-tu (KULULU 5 §11), EDERE-tú (KARKAMIŠ A6 §32), inf. /?aduna/ EDERE-aru-na (ÇIFTLIK §16), á-ru'-na (? TOPADA §31), part. “EDERE”-tú-mi-sa ‘eating’ (KULULU 2 §3); broken á-ta-[-... (KARKAMIŠ A13a-c §5), ádaha- (adj.) epithet of gods who have to eat something (á-ta-ha- (SULTANHAN §33, KAYSERI §12, KULULU 5 §11)).

PAnat. *hed-/ *d-


See HW² E: 128f. for attestations. The original paradigm of this verb was /?ędmi, ţédSí, ţédší, ţduení, ţdštění, ţdánt’/l/. In NS texts, we find a few forms that seem to show a stem ezz(a) that inflects according to the productive tarn(a)-class: 3sg.pres.act. ezžáši, 3sg.pret.act. ezžāš, 2sg.imp.act. ezza and 3pl.imp.act. ezzandu. Apparently, the stem ezz(a)- was reanalysed out of the forms where the original stem ed- shows assimilation due to endings beginning in t-. Puhvel (HED 1/2: 320) also mentions forms like ezzasši and azzašteni (OS!) as showing this stem, but these forms rather use intricate spellings to denote the cluster /ds(t)/: ezzäsši (besides e-ez-ši) = ţédší > *hḍed-sí, azzašteni = ţdštění < *hḍd-thjéni. It has been claimed that the HLUwian form *₃₄7₁ā-zə-i (BABYLON 1 §10) shows a similar formation as ezz(a)-, but the meaning of this form is not assured.

The etymological connection with e.g. Skt. ad-, Gr. ἔδ-, Lat. ed-, etc. ‘to eat’ was one of the keys to deciphering the Hittite language. On the basis of the long
vowels in Lith. ūsti, OCS jasti (< *ōsti) and Lat. 3sg.pres.act. ūst, it has been assumed that the PIE root *h₁ed- originally was ‘Narten-inflected’: *h₁ōd-/h₁ēd- (e.g. LIV). Oettinger (1979a: 89) therefore assumes that the Hittite paradigm is a remodelling of *h₁ēd-ti/*h₁ēd-nti, replacing **e- with a- in the plural, yielding ʔezәzi / adәnzi. This view is followed by e.g. Melchert who states (1994a: 138) that 1pl.pres.act. e-du-ya-a-ni (OH/NS), which seems to reflect a full grade stem, must be a more archaic form in spite of the numerous OS attestations a-du-e-ni and a-tu-e-ni, which show a zero grade stem. This is in contradiction to the facts. All OS attestations of this verb show that the pres.plur.-forms had zero grade in the root: aduәni, azaʔәni and adәnzi. Only in NS texts, we find that the full grade is introduced in 1pl. and 2pl., giving eduʔәni/edәni and ezzәnten, This is perfectly regular if we compare the other e/a-ablauting mi-verbs: their OS pres.pl.-forms all show zero grade roots, whereas forms with a full grade root are found from MH times onwards only, which clearly indicates that these full grade forms are secondary. There can therefore be no doubt that the original paradigm of ‘to eat’ was ʔezәzi / adәnzi, reflecting a normal root present *h₁ēd-ti/*h₁ēd-nti. Moreover, the entire concept of Narten-inflection should be abandoned (cf. De Vaan 2004). The long vowel and acute intonation found in Balto-Slavic (Lith. ēst and OCS jasti < *ēst) are due to Winter’s Law, whereas the long vowel in Lat. ēst ‘eats’ (but short in ʔdō ‘I eat’) is due to Lachmann’s Law. We therefore are dealing with a perfect exemple of a PIE root-present with *e/ē-ablaut: *h₁ēd-ti/*h₁ēd-nti.

Note that in HLuwian the ablaut seems to have been given up: 3pl.imp.act. ʔtà-∫tu-u and a+ra/i-tu show rhotization of intervocalic /d/ and therefore must be interpreted as ‘ʔadantul, which contrasts with Hitt. adanu = ‘ʔadantul.

(edri) (n.) ‘food’ (Sum. Š.Å.GAL): nom.-acc.sg. e-et-ri, nom.-acc.pl. e-et-rilH, et-rilH.


Anat. cognates: HLuw. ʔdr(ː)a- ‘to feed(?)’ (3pl.imp.act. EDER-tà-ri+i-tu (MALPINAR §7)).

PIE *h₁ēd-ri-

Just like auri- ‘lookout’ and ğәri- ‘image’ are derived from au- / u- and eš-zi / aš-, edri- ‘food’ is a derivative in -ri- from the verb ed-zi / ad- ‘to eat’ (q.v.). See at ğәri- for more information on the suffix -ri-.
euk² : see eku² / aku-

(UDCL) eyan- (n.) a kind of grain; (with det. UDÚL) soup of a kind of grain: nom.-acc.sg. e-ya-an (KBo 4.2 i 10, KBo 11.14 i 6, IBoT 3.96 i 12, FHL 4, 12), e-u-ya-an (KBo 10.34 i 23, KBo 25.161 obv. 12, KUB 24.14 i 7, KUB 29.1 iii 9, KUB 29.4 ii 51, 63, iv 17, KUB 42.97, 5, KUB 44.52, 8), gen.sg. e-u-ya-na-aš (KBo 10.34 i 13, 21 (MH/NS)), e-u-ya-aš (KBo 13.227 i 13 (OH/NS), KUB 29.6+ ii 9 (NS), KUB 7.55 obv. 6 (NS)), instr. e-u-ya-ni-ḫḫ (KUB 51.48, 14 (NS)).


PIE *iēu-on-?

See HW² E: 141 for attestations. In the oblique cases, we find forms that point to a stem eu- (gen.sg. eu-aš) and forms that point to a stem eyan- (gen.sg. eu-anaš and inst. eu-anit). Because all forms are attested in NS texts, we cannot determine on the basis of diachronical orderings which stem is the original one. Nevertheless, since it is not a normal practice that a-stem neuters secondarily take over the n-stem inflection, it seems likely to me that the n-stem inflection is more original.

The word is predominantly found in lists of edible items, which does not reveal too much about its exact meaning. In KUB 29.1 iii (9) nu še-ep-pi-it e-u-ya-an-n=a šu-uh-ḫa-er nu pa-ak-ku-uš-kān-zi ‘they have strewn šeppit and eu-ya- and crush it’ it is likely, however, that eyan-, just as šeppit- (q.v.), denotes some kind of grain. Puhvel (HED 1/2: 320) interprets the word as ‘barley’ (which cannot be ascertained, however, cf. HW² (l.c.)) and plausibly connects it with Skt. yáva- ‘grain’, Gr. ἄκαλ ‘spelt’ and Lith. jāva ‘grain’, reconstructing *iēu-. Since I regard the n-stem as more original, I would adapt this reconstruction to *iēu-on-. Because in Hittite only initial *i- drops in front of e (cf. eka- ‘ice’ < *iego-) whereas *Hiē- yields i- (cf. janzi ‘they go’ < *hıienti), we cannot reconstruct *Hieu-., which is sometimes done by scholars who assume that *Hi- > Gr. ζ.

Nevertheless, since the exact meaning of eyan- has not been established, we must regard this etymology with caution.

ezza¹ : see edz² / ad-
See HW² (H: 1) for semantics and attestations. This verb often is cited as ħai-
(e.g. Puhvel HED 3: 9) or bae- (Oettinger 1979a: 360f.), but the bulk of
the attestations point to a stem ħā-. We only once find a form that seems to show a
stem ħai- (2sg.pres.act. ħa-a-iš (KUB 26.89, 14 (NH)), but in my view this form
can easily be secondary. It is often stated that this verb inflects like lat(i)- (Puhvel
l.c., HW² l.c.), but this is not necessarily so. The verb lā¹ / l- (q.v.) must have
been ħi-inflected originally, whereas in the case of ħā- there is no indication for
this (cf. also Oettinger 1979a: 361²). In my opinion, the fact that ħā- has an
initial ħ- points to original mi-inflection as both *h₂e- and *h₁e- yields Hitt. ħa-
but *h₂o- and *h₁o- > Hitt. a- (cf. Kloekhorst fthc.c). If 2pl.pres.act. ħa-at-tēn
belongs to this paradigm (so Oettinger, but HW² states that this form hardly can
mean ‘to trust, to believe’), then we see an ablaut ħā-/ḥ-.

Formally, ħō² / ḫ- must reflect *h₂3eH-. From the few etymological proposals
(cf. Puhvel l.c.), only Benveniste’s comparison (1962: 10-11) with Lat. ōmen
would make sense formally, if we assume that one of the laryngeals of *h₂3eH-
was *h₁. Semantically, however, the connection is not without problems.

-hha (1sg.pres.midd.-ending): see -hha(ri)


See HW² ḫ: 3 for semantics and attestations. In OS texts, the stem of this word is ḫahall-, whereas in younger texts we find ṣaḥḫall-. Most derivatives show a syncopated stem ḫaḫl-. The only gloss wedged form, ṣaḥḥaluyanti, of which the meaning is not clear, is regarded by HW² ḫ: 7f. as not belonging to this group of words.

Although the word seems genuinely Hittite (OS attestations already, no aberrant case-forms or spelling variants, multiple derivatives) I know of no good IE etymology.

-ḥḥari (1sg.pres.midd.-ending): see -ḥḥa(ri)

-ḥḥaru (1sg.imp.midd.-ending): see -ḥḥaru

-ḥḥati (1sg.pret.midd.-ending): see -ḥḥati(i)

ḫai(n)k-a rubbed, ḫink-a[r] (IIIh; Ib3) ‘(act. trans.) to bestow, to offer; (act. intr.) to bow; (midd.) to bow’: 3sg.pres.midd. ḫa-ik-[a]-ri (OS) // [ḫa]-ik-[a]-ri (OH/NS), ḫa-ik-ta (OH/MS), ḫe-ek-ta (OS), ḫi-ik-ta (MS), ḫi-in-γa-ri (MH/MS), ḫi-in-kat-ta (OH/MS), 3pl.pres.midd. ḫa-in-γan-ta (OS or OH/MS), ḫa-en-γan-[a] (NS), ḫi-in-γan-ta (OH/MS), ḫi-i-in-γan-ta (NS), 3pl.pret.midd. ḫi-in-γan-ti (MH/NS), ḫi-in-γan-t-at (OH/MS); 1sg.pres.act. ḫi-ik-mi (OH/MS), ḫi-in-ik-[a]-mi (NS), [ḫi]-i-in-ga-[i] (NS), 3sg.pres.act. ḫi-ik-z ḫa-in-γan-ta (OH/MS), ḫi-in-ga-zi (MH/NS), ḫi-ik-z (1x, NS), ḫi-in-γi-ez-[i] (NS), 1pl.pres.act. ḫi-in-γa-ni (MH/NS), ḫi-in-ku-e-ni (NS), 3pl.pres.act. ḫi-in-γa-z (OH/NS), 1sg.pres.act. ḫi-in-ku-un (NH), 3sg.pres.act. ḫi-
in-kat-ta (OH/NS), [hi]-in-ik-ta (NS), hé-en-ik-ta (MH/NS), 1pl.pret.act. hi-in-ku-u-ó-en (NS), 3pl.pret.act. hi-in-ker (OH/NS), 2sg.imp.act. hi-in-ga (NH), hi-in-
[i] (NS), 3pl.imp.act. hi-in-kán-du (MH/NS); verb.noun hi-in-ku-y-ha-ar (OH/NS), hi-in-ku-u-y-a-ar (NS), gen.sg. hé-en-ku-y-a-aš (OS), ḥe-en-ku-y-a-aš (NS), hi-in-ku-y-a-aš (OH/NS); inf.I hi-in-ku-y-a-an-zí (OH/NS); impf. hi-in-ga-
aš-ke/a/- (OS), hi-in-ki-iš-ke/a/ (MS), hi-in-ki-iš-ke/a/ (MH/NS).

Derivatives: ũengur / ũengu- (n.) ‘gift, offering’ (nom.-acc.sg. hé-en-gur (OH/NS), dat.-loc.sg. hé-en-ku-ni (OH/NS), nom.-acc.pl. hi-in-ku-y-a-ri (NS)), *
*hiŋkatar / *hiŋkan- (n.) ‘gift’ (dat.-loc.sg. IGLDU₈.A-an-ni (NS)), ũingantu²1 (Ib2) ‘to make bow’ (3sg.pres.act. hi-in-ga-mu-zi (NS)). ¹¹hiŋkula- (c.) ‘offerant’ (nom.sg. hi-in-ku-la-aš (OH/NS)), see ũenkan-.

See Puhvel HED 3: 289f. and 292f. for attestations. The verbal forms that I have treated here under one lemma, are sometimes regarded as belonging to two separate verbs. For instance, Puhvel (l.c.) distinguishes “henk-, hi(n)k- ‘bestow, consign, commit, secure, assign, allot, provide, present, offer’” from “he(n)k-, hi(n)k-, hai(n)k- ‘bow (reverentially), curtsy’”. Although indeed at first sight the two meanings ‘to bestow’ and ‘to bow’ seem to differ substantially, I regard them as belonging to the same verb for the following reasons. Oettinger (1979a: 171-7) has shown that in OH texts, all active forms denote ‘to bestow’ and all middle forms ‘to bow’. Only in younger texts, we find active forms that, when intransitive, denote ‘to bow’ as well. Since in my view the meaning ‘to bow’ can be derived from ‘to bestow oneself, to offer oneself’, we can easily regard all forms as belonging to one verb. In the active, this verb was transitive and meant ‘to bestow something, to offer something’; in the middle it was intransitive / reflexive and meant ‘to bestow oneself, to offer oneself’ > ‘to bow’.

If we look at the formal side of this verb, we see that in the active paradigm we find the stems ḥik- and hink- (assuming that the spellings ḥi-in-ik-zi and hi-in-ga-
zi and the hapax ḥi-ni-ik-zi stand for /Hink’t/u/). In the older texts (MS) these show a clear distribution between ḥik-C and hink-V (compare e.g. li(n)k₂², ḡarn(n)k₂², ištarn(n)k₂², etc.). In the younger texts (NS) this distribution is given up, and we here find /Hinkmi/ and /Hinkt’i/ here as well. Only once, in a NS text, we find a form, ḥi-in-ki-ez-zi, which seems to show a stem hinkije/a²¹, according to the very productive -i’e/a-class. In the middle paradigm, the stems ḥik- and hink- are found as well, again showing ḥik-C vs. hink-V. The stem ūenk- that occasionally is found in NS texts must be regarded as the result of the NH lowering of OH /u/ to /e/ before -n- (cf. OH lengai- > NH lengai- and § 1.4.8.1.d).
Besides the stems ĥik-C, ĥink-V and ĥenk-, we occasionally find the stems ĥaink- and ĥaik- as well, which show the same distribution regarding the presence or absence of -n: ĥaik-C vs. ĥaink-V. Yet, the status of these forms is in dispute. E.g. Puhvel (o.c.: 295) regards them as “reverse spellings, a kind of spurious diphthong notation for e”.

Melchert (1994a: 144) gives an overview of the other claimed instances where an etymological -e- is spelled hypercorrectly as -ai-. The form appaizzi- instead of normal appezzi- (cited as an example of -ai- for -e- by Puhvel) is regarded by Melchert as “a morphologically renewed form based on the adverb āppa + -izzi”. The hapax a-ip-ta ‘he seized’ (KBo 5.6 i 11 (NH)) instead of normal e-ip-ta clearly is a scribal mistake of the sign A (𐤇) for the sign E (𐤋) (only two vertical strokes missing). These two examples are therefore not cogent. The third example, ma-ik-ka-r-uš ‘many’ (KUB 26.1 iii 58 (NH)) instead of expected me-ek-ka-r-uš, is regarded by Melchert as a convincing parallel of a ‘reverse spelling’ of -ai- for -e-, however, and on the basis of this sole example he as well concludes that the ‘reverse spelling’ of -e- as -ai- is a real phenomenon and that therefore the spellings ĥaik- and ĥaink- do not have to be taken seriously and should be interpreted as standing for ĥek- and ĥenk- respectively. Apart from the fact that I in principle disagree with dismissing 6 well-attested spellings, most of which occur in OS and MS texts, on the basis of one form in a NH text, I doubt the status of the form “ma-ik-ka-r-uš”. If we look closely at this form in the handcopy of KUB 26.1, 𐤇𐤇𐤒𐤁𐤇, we see that it in fact does not read ma-ik-ka-r-uš, but rather ku-ik-ka-r-uš (for the clear distinction between the signs MA and KU in the handwriting of this scribe compare e.g. the form of these signs in ibid. iii (61) 𐤇𐤋𐤊𐤇𐤋𐤇𐤊𐤇𐤇 = šu-qum-ma-aš = ma ku-i-e-eš, on the basis of which it is fully clear that the sign in line 58 should be read KU instead of MA). This means that this form does not show a ‘reverse spelling’ of -e- as -ai- at all: the spelling ku-ik-ka-r-uš can only be regarded as a (rather big) scribal mistake for correct me-ek-ka-r-uš, and not as the result of the scribe’s desire to archaize the text by ‘reversing’ an -e- to -ai- on the basis of his awareness that in older times an original *-ai- contracted to -e-. All in all, I conclude that the spellings ĥaik- and ĥaink- must be taken seriously phonetically. They show that the original stem was ĥai(n)k-. Already in OS times this ĥai(n)k- was contracted to ĥe(n)k- and slightly later on it became ĥi(n)k- on the basis of the raising of -e- in front of -nk-. In NH times, the stem ĥink- developed into ĥenk- again due to the NH lowering of OH ʔi/ to /i/ before -n-.

The original stem ĥai(n)k- should also be taken as the basis for etymological considerations. Nevertheless, most proposed etymologies are based on the idea that the basic form of this verb is ĥen-. In order to explain the -e- that is adjacent
to *h₂₂nK-. E.g Oettinger (1979a: 175f., referring to Pedersen 1938: 183f.) connects “henk-” with Gr. ἀκοφορέας ‘fate’ and OIr. écht ‘killing’ and reconstructs *h₂₂nK-. The semantic connection between Hitt. “henk-” ‘to bestow’ and Gr. ‘fate’ and Ir. ‘killing’ is explained through the “semantische Bindeglied” henkan- ‘fate, death’ (q.v.). Others have proposed a connection with Gr. ἀκοφορέας ‘to bring’, OCS nositi ‘to carry, to bear’ (e.g. Götze & Pedersen 1934: 50), which is semantically more attractive, but formally impossible as these reflect PIE *h₁nēk-.

In my view, the original stem hai(n)k- can only reflect *h₂₂eīnK-. As such, this root violates the PIE root constraints (there are no parallels of roots in *eRRC-). If this verb is of IE origin, we can only assume that it reflects a nasal-infixed stem of a root *h₂₂eiK-. Problematic, however, is the fact that the only other secure example of a nasal-infixed stem of a root *CeīK- shows the structure Ci-nin-K-: nin(n)k-² ‘to mobilize’ from the root *neik- (cf. § 2.2.4). Moreover, we would not expect a nasal-infixed in a middle paradigm. All in all, at this moment I do not see any way to convincingly connect this verb with words from other IE languages, neither to give a logical analysis of its form.

Melchert (1984a: 24th, but retracted in 1994a: 144) proposed to interpret hai(n)k- as a compound *h₁e-h₁nēk-, the second part of which should be the root underlying Gr. ἀκοφορέας ‘to bring’. As we saw above already, on the basis of OCS nositi ‘to carry’ e.a., this root must be reconstructed as *h₁nēk-, which makes Melchert’s reconstruction impossible.

\[\text{\textit{halai-} / \textit{hali-}}\] (IIa 4 > Ic 2) ‘to set in motion’: 1sg.pres.act. ḫa-la-a-mi (KBo 47.292, 3 (NS)), 2sg.pres.act. ḫa-la-a-ši (KBo 5.9 iii 9 (NH), KUB 36.46, 6 (NS)), 3sg.pres.act. ḫa-la-a-i (KUB 9.1 ii 32 (MH/NS)), 3pl.pres.act. ḫa-la-a-an zi (KUB 15.27 ii 3 (NS)), ḫa-li-en-zi (here? KBo 6.26 iv 14 (OH/NS)), 3sg.pret.act. ḫa-la-iš (KUB 24.8+ iii 11 (OH/NS)), ḫa-la-a-eš (here? KUB 36.55 ii 38 (MH/MS?)), 2pl.pret.act. ḫa-la-it-[t]eš (KUB 26.100 i 7 (MS)), 3pl.pret.act. ḫa-la-a-er (KUB 26.65 iii 5 (NS), KUB 5.25 iv 35 (NS)), ḫa-a-la-er (KUB 50.37, 14 (NS)).

IE cognates: Gr. ḫαλλω ‘to send off, to stretch forth’.

PIE \*h₂-ois-, \*h₂l-i-

See HW² ḫ: 16f. for a semantic treatment of this verb. Formally, it is attested both with forms that belong to the mi-inflexion (hatare-class) and with forms that belong to the ḫi-inflexion. Because of the fact that almost all forms are found in
NS texts (except 2pl.pret. *halaiten), it is not easy to determine to which inflection the verb belonged originally. Nevertheless, the fact that 3sg.pres. *halâ and 3sg.pret. *halâs are found in MH and OH compositions respectively, it is in my view likely that the *hi-inflection was the original one. If this is correct, then the verb must have belonged to the dâî/tijanzi-type (if it belonged to the dâî-type, it would have had a 3sg.pret. **halâ (like dâî *he took’) or **halâât (like lâât ‘he released’, which is a mi-form on the basis of the secondary stem lâî–)).

We then expect to find, next to *halai-, a stem halî-, which is possibly seen in 3pl.pres.act. halienzi (thus also Puhvel HED 3: 12, but against this HW2 Š: 16).

Puhvel (l.c.) connects this verb with Gr. ἴλλαξ ‘to send off’, which must reflect *h2î-h2î-je/o-, from a root *h2el-. For Hittite, this means that *halai- / halî- must reflect *h2î-oi- / *h2î-i- (see Kloekhorst fthc.a on the formation of the dâî/tijanzi-class verbs). Note that in this formation, the o-grade did not cause the initial laryngeal to disappear (contra Oettinger’s account (2004) of arâi < *h2roî-ei due to the ‘de Saussure Effect’).

For an original homophonic verb, see at ʰalīje/a2i.

*hallanna- / *hallanni- (IIa5) ‘to trample down, to flatten (fields and plants)’: 3pl.pres.act. hal-la-an-ni-an-zi (Bo 3267 obv. 6 (MS)); 3sg.pres.midd. hal-la-an-ni-ja-at-ta-ri (KUB 4.3 ii 9 (NS)); impf. hal-la-an-ni-eʃ-[e–] (KBo 19.112, 17 (MH/NS)).


PIE *h2elhî-?

The verb occurs a few times only, namely in the following text:

KUB 4.3 ii
(6) ﭐ.ŠÁ-ni=ma=za=ki-an-da TÛL-tar le-e DÛ-ši
(7) ma-a-an=ma=za=kân A.ŠÁ-ni=ma an-da [T]ÛL DÛ-ši
(8) nu=za=kân Derived KÛR-aš GIR=[Š]U an-da tar-na-at-ti
(9) nu A.ŠÁ-aš=ti-ši hal-la-an-ni-ja-at-ta-ri
(10) iš-tal-ki-ja-at-ta-ri

‘You must not make a well in the field. If you do make a well in the field, however, you will let in the foot of the enemy and your field will be h.-ed (and) levelled’;
as well as in Bo 3267 obv. (see Puhvel HED 3: 13) (6) יֶלֶקְו הָרָשָּׁמֵי שְׁקַי הַלְלָנְיָנֶזֶי ‘They h. the grass on his head’ and KBo 19.112 (17) [...-z]/ ar-ha ha-la-an-ni-eš-k[...] [...-z]. The last context is too broken to give a meaningful interpretation, but the first two contexts seem to indicate that, just as ištalkiše/α- in KUB 4.3 ii 10, ḫallanna/i-1 denotes the flattening or trampling down of plants and fields. Therefore, HW² H: 18 translates “zertreten(?), niedertreten(?), o. ä.” and Oettinger (1979a: 81) “niederstrecken”. Puhvel (l.c.), however, translates “lay waste, ruin, savage, ravage”, but apparently does so largely because of an etymological connection with Gr. ὀξυμολόγον ‘to destroy’.

Formally, the verb looks like an imperfective in -anna/i- of a further unattested root *ḥall-. If from IE origin, this *ḥall- could reflect *h₂₃₂₅lH- or *h₂₃₂₅lH-. As we saw, Puhvel connects this verb with Gr. ὀξυμολόγον ‘to destroy’, etc., implying a reconstruction *h₂₃₂₅lH-, which was followed by e.g. Melchert (1994a: 82). Because it is less likely to assume that an original meaning ‘to destroy’ would develop into ‘to flatten (fields and plants)’, we must assume that if this etymology is correct, the Hittite verb preserves the original meaning of *h₂₃₂₅lH- and that the meaning ‘to destroy’ as found in Greek and Latin has developed out of this.


See Puhvel HED 3: 26f. and HW² H: 30 for attestations. The word denotes a pen or corral for cows and horses, which contrasts with aššūr / aššūn- ‘pen (for sheep and goats)’ (q.v.). Puhvel translates this word as “lunar halo (in omina)” as well, but only refers to KUB 8.3 rev. (5) [... ḫ]a-a-li aš-pu-uz-za LUGAL-an  ya-ak-rī-ja-zi ku-šš-ki ‘[If [... ḫ]a-li ašpuza, someone will become rebellious to the king’ for this meaning, of which HW² (H: 30) states that it must be regarded as belonging with ḫāli- ‘night watch (as a time measurement)’. Puhvel’s etymological connection with Gr. ὀξυμολόγον ‘halo’ therefore becomes impossible.

*hɔlî- fortsetzt* (l.c.), and which, according to Rieken, also is visible in the noun ʰališša- ‘casting, overlay’. Because the noun ʰila- (q.v.) cannot reflect *hɔlɛ-ehɔr-, this etymological connection in my view falls apart.

**haliye/-a²** (lc1) ‘to kneel down’: 3sg.pres.act. ʰa-li-ja-zi (KUB 8.62 i 4 (NS), KUB 16.72, 7, 23 (NS), ʰa-li-ez-zi [KBo 13.106 i 6 (OH/NS)], ʰa-li-ez-zi (KBo 53.15, 3 (NS)), 3pl.pres.act. ʰa-[l]i-en-zi (here? KBo 6.26 iv 14 (OH/NS), ʰa-li-ja-an-zi (KUB 9.34 i 2 (NS) // IBoT 3.99, 3 (NS)), 3sg.pres.act. ʰa-li-ja-at (KBo 3.3 i 13 (NH), 3pl.pres.act. ʰa-a-li-er (KBo 3.34 iii 12 (OH/NS)), ʰa-a-li-i-er (KBo 3.4 iii 16 (NH), KBo 4.4 iv 20 (NH), KUB 19.13 i 51 (NH)); 3sg.pres.midd. ʰa-a-li-ja (KUB 10.11 ii 17 (OH/NS)), ʰa-li-ja-ri (KUB 12.11 iv 33 (MS?)), ʰa-a-li-ja-ri (KUB 20.99 ii 5 (OH/NS), KUB 28.82 i 6 (OH/NS), KBo 17.75 i 27 (OH/NS)), 3sg.pres.midd. ʰa-li-ja-at-ta-at (KUB 14.15 iv 29, 32 (NH), KUB 19.30 i 18 (NH), KBo 5.5 ii 1 (NS), KBo 10.12 i 25 (NH), KBo 10.13 i 25 (NH), KUB 33.106 iv 5 (NS), ʰa-li-at-ta-at (KUB 19.49 i 39 (NH)), 3pl.pres.midd. ʰa-a-li-ja-an-da-at (KBo 4.4 iii 47 (NH), KUB 14.15 iii 47 (NH)); part. ʰa-a-li-an-t- (KUB 29.1 i 3 (OH/NS)); verb.noun. ʰa-li-ja-tar (HKM 13 obv. 4 (MH/MS), KUB 3.95, 6 (NS)); impf. ʰa-a-li-iš-ke/-a- (KUB 5.6 ii 51 (NS)).


PIE *hɔl̬-i-ëi / *hɔl̬-i-ënti

See Puhvel HED 28f. for attestations. The bulk of the forms are attested in NS texts. They all show the -je/-a-class. Since this class is quite productive in NH times, it is not necessarily the case that this verb was -je/-a-inflected originally, however. Although the spelling ʰa-li- is the most common one, we also find a fair number of examples of plene spelling ʰa-a-li-.

In my view, the exact interpretation of this verb for a large part depends on the analysis of its derivative ʰaliḥla-² / ʰaliḥli- ‘to genuflect’. This verb, which is inflected according to the mēma/-i-class, clearly shows a reduplication /Hli-Hla/-.
As I have argued under the treatment of the mēma/i-class (see § 2.2.2.2.h) the verbs that belong to this class used to belong to the dā/tijanzi-class. In this case, ḥaliḥlā/i- therefore must go back to *ḥaliḥlai̯ / ḥaliḥlī-. In my view, we must draw two conclusions from this analysis. First, the basic verb was dā/tijanzi-inflected as well. Second, the plene spelling ḥa-a-li- cannot reflect an old situation, since there is no vowel visible in ḥaliḥlai̯/ḥaliḥlī- = /Hli-Hlai̯ / Hli-Hlī-l-. So, the verb that is attested as ḥaliqe/a̯ only must go back to an original *ḥalai̯ / *ḥali̯-

This outcome means that originally, this verb was homophonic to the verb ḥalai̯ / ḥali- ‘to set in motion’ (q.v.). This may explain the fact that in ‘to kneel down’ no specific forms of the dā/tijanzi-class have survived into the NH period: to avoid the homophony, ḥalai̯ / ḥali- ‘to kneel down’ was fully taken over into the -je/a-class, whereas ḥalai̯ / ḥali- ‘to set in motion’ was partly taken over into the ḫatrae-class.

Etymologically, also *ḥalai̯ / ḥali- ‘to kneel down’ can hardly reflect anything else than *ḥ2-l-i- / *ḥ2-l-i-. Nevertheless, I know no good comparandum. Puhvel’s attempt (l.c.) to connect it to the ‘elbow’-words like Gr. ᾠlüğüν, Lat. ulna etc. is abortive. Not only the semantics are wrong (the meaning ‘elbow’ is very consistent throughout the IE languages), the formal side is difficult as well: the elbow-words seem to reflect *Heh2l-en- or *Heh2l-en-, which does not fit *ḥ2-l-o-i- / *ḥ2-l-i-.


IE cognates: Gr. ᾠusterityν ‘to anoint, to smear’, Lat. linō, lēvi ‘to rub, to smear’.

PIE *h2Hl-o-n- ??

The word occurs in the genitive only, describing teššummi- ‘cup(?)’ and zērī- ‘cup’. A translation ‘clay(?)’ (thus HW² ḫ: 43, Puhvel HED 3: 32) is a possibility but is not ascertained. On the basis of this meaning, Puhvel (l.c.) suggests a connection with Gr. ᾠusterityν ‘to smear’ and Lat. linī ‘to smear’ that reflect a root *h2leHt (cf. LIV²; note that the -n- in these forms are from the nasal present). If this connection is justified, Hitt. ḫalīna- would reflect *h2Hl-n-o-n-.

ḥalki- (c) ‘barley; grain’ (Sum. ŠE): nom.sg. ḫal-ki-iš (MH/MS), acc.sg. ḫal-ki-in (OS), gen.sg. ḫal-ki-aš (OS), ḫal-ki-ja-aš (OS), dat.-loc.sg. ḫal-ki- (MH/MS), abl. ḫal-ki-ja-za, ḫal-ki-ja-az, instr. ḫal-ki-it (OS), nom.pl. ḫal-ki-e-ēš (MH/MS), ḫal-ki2̯-aš (MH/MS), ḫal-ki2̯-aš (NS), acc.pl. ḫal-ki-uš (MH/MS), ḫal-k2̯-aš (MH/MS), ḫal-ki-ja-aš (NS).
Derivatives: ḫalki- (c.) ‘barley-god’ (Sum. ḫISABA; nom.sg. ḫal-ki-iš (OS), ḫal-kiš, acc.sg. ḫal-ki-in (OS), ḫal-ki-en, gen.sg. ḫal-ki-aš, ḫal-ki-ja-aš, dat.-loc.sg. ḫal-ki-ja (OS), ḫal-ki-iš).

The word is abundantly attested from OS texts onwards. Within Anatolian, the Lycian form qelehi is often regarded as a cognate (e.g. Melchert 1993a: 60; 2004a: 55). This word is the nom.sg.c. of a genitival adj. of a divine name qelei—which was first equated with Hitt. ḫalki- by Neumann (1979b: 270). Neumann himself admits himself, however, that this equation is based on a slight formal similarity between the two words only, and not on semantic evidence. As I have shown in Kloekhorst fthc.c, Lyc. § DONLQ is often regarded as a cognate (e.g. Melchert 1993a: 60; (c.) § DONL (OS), is untenable). § DONLHQ d DONL, gen.sg. d K, Ñ § DONL (OS), § DONLL Ñ DD, dat.-loc.(OS), © n . ` s u p p l i e s ( f o r f e s t i v a l s ) ' ( A k k . i U K D W L D O N X H Ñ Q D D Ñ D O N X H Ñ Q L ( K U B 1 2 . 6 6 ) , § 7 8 0 ) : n o m . - ` t o b e e q u a l ' , G r . PIE * h 2 g h - é h 1 s h 1 - r / * h 2 g h - é h 1 s h 1 - n -

See HW2 §: 62f. for semantics and attestations of this word. Puhvel (HED 3: 40f.) plausibly connects ḫuluqššar with the PIE root *h2gḥ- ‘to yield, to supply’.


Derivatives: ḫaluki- / ḫalugai- (adj.) ‘message..’ (nom.sg.c. ḫa-lu-ki-[š] (HKM 75 obv. 8 (MH/MS)), nom.pl.c. ḫa-lu-ga-e-eš (KBo 14.4 i 1)), ḫa-lukat(]=[alla] (c.) ‘messenger, envoy’ (Akk. ḫTE;r-MU; nom.sg. ḫa-lu-ga-tall-a-aš, acc.sg. ḫa-lu-kat-tal-la-an, ḫa-lu-ga-tal-la-an, acc.pl. ḫa-lu-ga-tal-la-uš (MH/MS)), ḫalugganaj / ḫaluggani- (IIa5) ‘to make an announcement, to bring news’ (impf. ḫa-lu-ga-an-ni-iš-ke/a- (KUB 27.29 iii 17)), ḫalugganej- (Ic2) ‘to
bring news’ (3sg.pres.act. ḫa-lu-ga-na-iz-zi (KUB 28.4 iii 14)), ḫaluganili (adv.) ‘in messenger-fashion’ (ḫa-lu-ga-ni-li (KUB 17.16 iv 4)).

IE cognates: Goth. liugan ‘to lie’, OCS ḫgati ‘to lie’, OIr. lu(ī)ge, lugae ‘oath’.

PIE *h₂leugʰ-o-

See Puhvel HED 3: 44f. for attestations. This word is attested in OS texts already. The basic stem is ḫaluk-, with a thematic noun ḫaluka- and an i-stem adjective ḫaluki/-ḫalugai-. Two forms go back to a stem ḫalugan(a)-, namely ḫaluganili and ḫaluganaizzi.

Despite its OS attestation and perfectly normal derivations, it is difficult to etymologize ḫaluka-. Sturtevant (1932a: 8) connected ḫaluka- to Goth. liugan ‘to lie’, which further belongs with OCS ḫgati ‘to lie’ and OIr. lu(ī)ge, lugae ‘oath’. Although formally possible (we should then reconstruct *h₂leugʰ-), the semantic side of this connection is at first sight not self-evident. Nevertheless, if one compares for instance ModEng. to tell stories = ‘to lie’, then we could imagine how ‘to bring news’ and ‘to lie’ are cognate. See at ḫulukanni- ‘carriage’ for the claim that this word is a derivative.

Dercks (fthc.) suggests that the word ḫalugannum that occurs in the OAssyrian text AKT 1.14 from Kültepe (acc. pl. ḫu-lu-kā-ni in line 7 and gen.sg. ḫi-lu-kā-ni-im (with scribal error) in line 30) may be a loanword on the basis of Hitt. acc.sg. ḫalugan.

ḥaltai² / ḫalti- (IIa4 > Ic1; IIIc > IIIg) ‘to cry out, to shout, to call (trans.), to invoke, to recite’: 1sg.pres.act. ḫal-ze-ēḥ-ḥi (OS, often), ḫal-zi-ja-mi (KUB 15.23, 19 (NH)), 2sg.pres.act. ḫal-za-i-it-t[la] (KBo 17.23 obv. 2 (OS)), ḫal-za-it-ti (KUB 13.3 iv 28 (OH/NS)), ḫal-ze-eš-ti (KUB 26.88 obv. 8 (NS), KUB 31.136 ii 3 (NS)), [ḥal]-zi-ja-ši (KUB 26.12 ii 23 (NH)), [ḥal]-zi-[ja-ši] (KUB 15.1 iii 11 (NH)), ḫal-zi-ja-at-ti (KBo 5.4 rev. 26 (NH)), 3sg.pres.act. ḫal-za-a-i (OS, often), ḫal-za-i (OS, less often), 1pl.pres.act. ḫal-zi-ya-ni (KUB 17.21 iv 11 (MH/MS)), ḫal-zi-ja-ʿul-[ni] (KUB 12.50, 6 (MH/NS)), 2pl.pres.act. ḫal-zi-ja-at-te-ni (KUB 13.4 iv 17 (2x) (OH/NS)), 3pl.pres.act. ḫal-zi-an-zī (OS, often), ḫal-zi-ja-an-zī (often), 1sg.pret.act. ḫal-ze-eḥ-ḥu-un (OS, often), 2sg.pret.act. ḫal-za-[t]-la] (KUB 30.10 obv. 9 (OH/MS)), ḫal-za-it-ta (KUB 1.16 ii 60 (OH/NS)), ḫal-za-[a-][t-la] (KBo 18.28 i 3 (NS)), 3sg.pret.act. ḫal-za-i (OS, often), ḫal-za-i-i (MH/MS), ḫal-za-a-i (often), ḫal-za-a-i-i (1x), ḫal-zi-ja-at (KUB 21.16 i 18 (NH)), 1pl.pret.act. ḫal-zi-e-ul-[en] (KUB 23.77a obv. 11 (MH/MS)), ḫal-zi-ū-en (KBo 5.3 i 40 (NH)), ḫal-zi-ja-ū-en (KBo 11.1 obv. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9 (NH)), ḫal-zi-ja-ū-en (KUB 4.1 ii 2 (MH/NS)), 3pl.pret.act. ḫal-zi-i-e-er (KUB 29.1 i 25
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(OH/NS), KUB 31.68 ii 49 (fr.) (NS), ҳал-zi-e-er (KUB 18.56 iii 35 (NS), KUB 18.24 iii 22 (NS)), ҳал-zi-er (KBo 14.12 iv 33 (NH)), 2sg.imp.act. ҳал-za-i (HKM 21 rev. 21 (MH/MS), HKM 81 rev. 30 (MH/MS)), ҳал-za-i (KUB 31.115, 7 (OH/NS), KUB 13.2 iii 30 (MH/NS), KBo 18.24 i 14 (NH), KUB 6.45 iii 24 (NH), KUB 21.16 i 20 (fr.) (NH)), 3sg.imp.act. ҳал-za-a-ў (KUB 36.90 obv. 5 (NS)), ҳал-zi-ja-ad-du (KUB 56.48 i 20 (NS)), ҳал-zi-iš-a[u] (KBo 9.107 rev. 4, 9 (NS)), 2pl.imp.act. ҳал-zi-iš-tén (KBo 3.1 ii 51 (OH/NS), KUB 28.82 i 18 (OH/NS), VBoT 58 i 27, 29, 32 (OH/NS), KUB 9.11 + IBoT 3.98 i 18 (NS)), 2pl.imp.act. ҳал-zi-ja-an-du (KUB 31.68 ii 49 (fr.) (NS)), ҳал-zi-ja-at-ta-ri (KUB 26.12 iii 18 (NH)), 3sg.pres.midd. ҳал-zi-ja (OS, often), ҳал-zi-ja-ri, ҳал-zi-ri, ҳал-zi-ja-at-ta-ri (KUB 25.41 v 11 (NS), IBoT 1.29 obv. 54 (OH/NS)), ҳал-zi-ja-ta-ri (KUB 25.32 + 27.70 ii 43 (OH/NS)), 3sg.pret.midd.(?)) ҳал-zi-ja-ti (KBo 3.34 iii 13 (OH/NS)); part. ҳал-zi-ja-an-t- (MH/MS); verb.noun. ҳал-zi-ja-u-ya-ar (KBo 9.96 i 12 (NS), KUB 30.55 rev. 10 (fr.) (NS), KUB 48.119 obv. 19 (fr.) (NS), KUB 52.79 i 4 (NS)), gen.sg. ҳал-zi-ja-u-ya-aš, ҳал-zi-ja-ya-aš; inf.I ҳал-zi-ja-u-ya-an-zi (KUB 36.89 obv. 24 (fr.), rev. 6, 53 (NS), KUB 21.16 i 12 (fr.) (NH)), ҳал-zi-ja-u-an-zi (KBo 23.7 i 5 (fr.) (NS), KUB 17.65 lk. Rd. 6 (fr.) (MS), KUB 27.69, 6 (fg.) (NS)); impf. ҳал-zi-iš-ke/a-, ҳал-zi-eš-ke/a-.

Derivatives: see ҳалzišša-/ҳалzišš-.


IE cognates: Goth. lapon, ON laða, OE laðan, OHG laðon, ‘to call, to summon, to invite’.

PIE *h₂lf-o₂-, *h₂l-t-
show an ablauting *-oi/-i-suffix attached to the zero grade of the verbal root. In
the case of ḥalzai-ḥalzi- this means that it goes back to *ḥ₂lt-oi- / *ḥ₂lt-i-. The
assimilation of the root-final -i- in front of *-i- in the weak stem spread throughout
the paradigm (cf. the same principle in zai-/zi- ‘to cross’).

For the impf. ḥalzišša¹ / ḥalzišš- see at its own lemma.

ḥalzišša¹ / ḥalzišš- (IIa1γ: impf. of ḥalzai¹ / ḥalzi- ‘to cry out, to call’;
1sg.pres.act. ḥal-zi-iš-ša-ah-ḥi (MH/MS), 2sg.pres.act. ḥal-zi-iš-ša-at-ti
(MH/MS), ḥal-ze-eš-ša-at-ti (KBo 18.24 i 7 (NS)), 3sg.pres.act. ḥal-zi-iš-ša-i
(OS, often), ḥal-zi-iš-ša-a-i (OS), ḥal-ze-eš-ša-i (KUB 17.7 iii 15 (NS), KUB
36.89 obv. 24 (NS)), ḥal-zi-ša-i (KUB 10.72 ii 20 (OH/NS)), 1pl.pres.act. ḥal-ze-
eš[š-...], 2pl.pres.act. ḥal-ze-ša-at-te-ni (KBo 12.110, 8 (NS)), 3pl.pres.act.
ḥal-zi-iš-ša-an-zi (OS, often), ḥal-ze-eš-ša-an-zi (NS), ḥal-zi-ša-an-zi (KUB
17.35 iii 10 (NS), KUB 30.56 iii 8 (NS)), 2sg.pret.act. ḥal-zi-iš-ši-iš-ta (KBo 16.1
iii 11 (NH)), ḥal-ze-eš-še-eš-ta (KBo 3.4+ ii 12 (NH)), 3pl.pret.act. [ḥal]-zi-iš-ši-
er (KBo 18.66 obv. 9 (MS)), ḥal-ze-eš-šer (KBo 3.4 i 24 (NH), KBo 16.1 i 37
(NH)), 2sg.imp.act. ḥal-zi-iš-ša (KBo 20.31 obv. 6 (OS)), 3pl.imp.act. ḥal-zi-iš-
ša-an-du (KUB 33.120 ii 59, 62 (MH/NS)), ḥal-ze-eš-ša-an-du (KUB 1.16 iii 57
(OH/NS), KUB 24.8 iii 14 (OH/NS)).

PIE *ḥ₂lt-i-sóh₂t-ei / *ḥ₂lt-i-sh₂t-énti

This verb is an imperfective in -šš(a)- of the verb ḥalzai¹ / ḥalzi- ‘to cry out, to
call’ and belongs to the small group of imperfectives in -šš(a)- (next to āšš(a)-,
šš(a)- and yarršš(a)-). The oldest forms (OS and MS) are all spelled ḥal-zi-iš-,
whereas a spelling ḥal-zi-šš- occurs in NS texts only. This is due to the NH
lowering of OH āl to /el/ before -šš-, cf. § 1.4.8.1.d (similarly in āšš(a)- > āšš(a)-,
šš(a)- > šešš(a)- and yarršš(a)- > yarrēšš(a)-). See at ḥalzai-/ḥalzi- and -šš(a)-
for further etymological treatment.

ḥamank² / ḥamerink- (IIa3) ‘to tie, to betroth’: 1sg.pres.act. [h]a-ma-an-ga-ah-ḥi
(KBo 12.96 i 20 (MH/NS)), ḥa-ma-an-ga-mi (KUB 41.18 ii 12 (MS?), KUB 9.31
iii 24 (NS)), ḥa-ma-an-kǎm-mi (KBo 13.72 obv. 6 (NS)), ḥa-ma-an-ak-mi (KBo
23.113 iii 20 (NS)), [ha-me-]en-ki-mi (IBoT 3.99, 12 (NS)), 3sg.pres.act. ḥa-ma-
anki (KBo 35.94, 7, 10 (NS), KBo 40.133, 6 (NS), KUB 47.35 i 13 (NS), KBo
12.112 obv. 6, 7, 9 (NS), KBo 4.2 i 28, 31, 34, 36 (OH/NS), KBo 5.1 iv 7
(MH/NS), KUB 11.20 i 6 (OH/NS), etc.), ḥa-ma-ak-zi (KUB 24.9+JCS 24 i 47
(OH/NS)), ḥa-ma-an-ga-[zi] (KUB 4.47 obv. 19), 3pl.pres.act. ḥa-mi-in-kǎn-zi
(KUB 2.3 i 24 (OH/NS)), ḥa-me-in-kǎn-zi (KBo 39.14 i 2, 3 (OH/NS)), ḥa-ma-
This verb shows two stems, *həmank-* and *hame/ink-*. Although in the younger texts the two stems seem to be found randomly within forms (e.g. 3pl.imp.act. *həminkandu* vs. *həmankandu*), in the older texts it is clear that *həmank-* is found in the strong-stem forms, and *hame/ink-* in the weak-stem forms (cf. OS part. *həminkant-*)

The etymological connection with Gr. āγκά ‘to tie up’ and Skt. āṃhas- ‘distress’ etc. is generally accepted (cf. Puhvel HED 3: 67; Oettinger 1979a: 148) and points to a root *h₂emʰ ē*. The synchronic ablaut *a/e* is explained by many scholars as reflecting an original ablaut *o/e* (cf. especially Jasanoff 2003). In my opinion, this view is
problematic as no other IE language shows such a verbal ablaut pattern. I therefore assume that, although *hamank- indeed reflects an *o-grade form *h₂mōŋʰ-ei, the stem *hame/ink- must be the outcome of a zero grade form *h₂mīŋʰ-enti, showing the development *CNNC > CNiNC. For this latter development and a treatment of the prehistory of this nasal present, see § 2.2.4.

*hammaša- (gender unclear) ‘?’: gen.sg. ḫa-am-ma-ša-aš (KBo 10.10 iv 9).

The word occurs only once, in KBo 10.10 iv (9) Š4 É.GAL ḫa-am-ma-ša-aš ‘of the palace of *hammaša-’. Laroche (1962: 29) compares this term with É.GAL ḫu-uḫ-ḫa-aš ‘the palace of the grandfather’ (attested several times) and therefore equates *hammaša- with Luw. ḫamsa/i- ‘grandchild’ (see at ḫāšša- ‘descendant’ for full citation of the Luwian words). This interpretation is widely followed (e.g. HW Erg. 3: 13: “kleines Kind”; Puhvel HED 3: 68: “grandchild”), but HW² (H: 120) casts doubt: it is rightly argued that although the term ‘palace of the grandfather’ refers to a specific building (namely the palace of the grandfather of the present king), a term ‘palace of the grandson’ does not make much sense. HW² suggests to rather interpret *hammaša- as a personal name.

All in all, a connection between *hammaša- and the words for ‘grandson’ in the other Anatolian languages is far from assured and phonetically impossible if we compare ḫāši ‘gives birth’ < *h₁öm-s-ei, ḫaššu- ‘king’ < *h₂ems-u- and ḫanzāšša- ‘offspring’ < *h₂msósjo- (see under ḫāš / ḫaš- ‘to give birth’).

*hamenk-: see *hamank- / *hame/ink-

*hamēša- (gender uncertain) ‘spring’ (Sum. Ú.BARe, Akk. Dition): acc.sg. ḫa-mēš-ša-an (KUB 50.90, 20 (NS)), gen.sg. ḫa-me-eš-ša-aš (KUB 12.2 ii 10 (NS)), ḫa-me-iš-ša-aš (KUB 38.32 rev. 21 (NS)), ḫa-mi-eš-ša-aš (KUB 13.231 obv. 2 (NS)), dat.-loc.sg. ḫa-me-eš-ḥi (often), ḫa-am-me-iš-ḥi (KUB 59.1 iv 16 (NS)), ḫa-mi-eš-ḥi (IBoT 2.1 vi 10 (NS), KUB 33.54 13 (OH/NS), KUB 42.100 iv 23 (NS)), ḫa-mi-ša-ḥi (KUB 13.32 obv. 7 (NH), KUB 25.23 i 8, 38, iv 8 (NH), KUB 25.18 i 2 (NS)).

Derivatives: *hamēšrant- (c) ‘spring’ (nom.sg. ḫa-me-eš-ḥa-an-za (often), ḫa-me-iš-ḥa-an-za (KBo 2.7 rev. 4 (NS), KUB 7.24 obv. 11 (NS), KUB 8.6 obv. 6. 8 (OH/NS)), ḫa-mi-eš-ḥa-an-za (KBo 2.5 iii 38 (NH), KUB 60.27 rev. 12 (NS)), ḫa-mēš-ḥa-an-za (KBo 2.7 rev. 16 (NS)), ḫa-mi-iš-kān-za (KUB 38.26 rev. 1 (NS)), ḫa-mi-eš-kān-zi (KUB 38.26 rev. 19 (NS)), acc.sg. ḫa-mi-eš-ḥa-an-tam, (KUB 4.4 obv. 5 (NH), gen.sg. ḫa-me-eš-ḥa-an-da-aš (often), ḫa-me-iš-ḥa-an-
da-aš (KUB 25.2 vi 24 (OH/NS)), ḥa-mi-iš-ḥa-an-ta-aš (KUB 15.21, 14 (NS)), ḥa-mi-iš-ḥa-an-da-aš (KUB 24.1 ii 4 (NS)), ḥa-am-me-eš-ḥa-an-ta-aš (KBo 19.128 vi 33 (NS)), ḥa-am-mi-iš-ḥa-an-ta-aš (KBo 24.118 vi 7 (NS)), dat.-loc.sg. ḥa-me-eš-ḥa-an-ti (KBo 24.119 iii 12 (NS)), [ḥ]a-mi-iš-ḥa-an-ti (KBo 19.5, 5 (OH/NS)), all.sg. ḥa-me-eš-ḥa-an-da (KBo 6.2 iv 60 (OS), KBo 6.3 iv 60 (OH/NS)), abl. ḥa-me-eš-ḥa-an-da-za (KUB 56.14 iv 5 (NS)).

IE cognates: Gr. ἐκκόμισαι ‘to cut, to mow’, OHG mån, OE māwan ‘to mow’.

PIE *h2e₂h₁-sh₂-o-

See HW² H: 121f. for semantics and attestations. Despite the fact that I here have cited ḫaṃešhant- as a derivative of ḫaṃešha-, the two stems function as one word, just as zena- and zenant- ‘autumn’ and gim(m)- and gimmant- ‘winter’. The gender of the stem ḫaṃešha- cannot be determined due to the lack of gender-specific forms. It seems as if the two stems show a distribution per case: the stem ḫaṃešha- is not found in the nom.sg., whereas nom.sg. ḫaṃešhanza is found numerous times. The acc.sg. is sporadic for both stems (both attested only once). The gen.sg. is found 4 times only with the stem ḫaṃešha-, whereas numerous times with ḫaṃešhant-. The dat.sg., however, is attested only twice for ḫaṃešhant- whereas ḫaṃešhi is attested multiple times.

The oldest (OS ḥa-me-eš-ḥa-an-da) and most common spelling is ḥa-me-eš-ḥa-, whereas the alternative spellings (ḥa-me-iš-ḥa-, ḥa-mi-iš-ḥa- and ḥa-am-mi- or ḥa-am-me-) are all found in NS texts only. In one NS text we find a spelling ḫaṃeskant-, but this is not to be taken seriously phonologically.

The word denotes ‘spring’, which contrasted with the two other seasons gim(m)ant- ‘winter’ and zena(nt)- ‘autumn’. The fact that ḫaṃešhant- is written with the sumerogram Ú.BAR₄ ‘harvest’ as well, shows that this season also was the time of harvesting.

The word has received many etymological proposals, for which see Puhvel HED 3: 73f. Most of these proposals are phonetically impossible, however. For instance, Goetz’s reconstruction *Hant-yesHa- ‘front-spring’ (1951: 471), which builds on a connection with Skt. vasantā-, Gr. ἐκκόμισαι, Russ. vesná ‘spring’, would not yield Hitt. ḫaṃešha- according to our understanding of Hittite historical phonology. Moreover, the word for ‘spring’ found in the other IE languages must be reconstructed as *yesr-, *yesn-, and not as *yesh-. Similarly, Hoffner’s interpretation *ḫant-mišaša- (of mai-/mi- ‘to grow’) (1974: 15) is phonetically impossible.

In my opinion, we should rather return to Sturtevant’s proposal (1928c: 163-4) to connect ḫaṃešha- with Gr. ἐκκόμισαι, OE māwan ‘to mow’. These latter verbs
point to a root *h₂meh₂- (note that Gr. ἀμφότερος probably is derived from the noun ἀμφότερος *h₂meh₂-eh₂-, cf. Schrijver 1990: 20), which would mean that ḥāmēša- reflects *h₂meh₂-sh₂o- (see tešša- ‘dream’ and damme/iššā- ‘oppression’ for the suffix -ššā- < *š₂o-). Semantically, this etymology fits the fact that ḥāmēša- is the season in which harvest took place, as we see by the use of the sumerogram Ú.BAR₃. Puhvel (HED 3: 74) is sceptical about this etymology because in his view deriving ḥāmēša- “from a nonattested verb remains dubious”. This scepsis can be nullified by my claim that the root *h₂meh₂- is visible in the Hittite verbs ãnš₂- and ḥane/išš₂- ‘to wipe’. It is remarkable that these latter verbs show an s-extension of *h₂meh₂- besides the nominal suffix -š₂h₂- in ḥāmēša-, which reminds of the situation of ṭamāšš₂- / tame/išš₂-, which shows a verbal s-extension besides the nominal suffix -š₂h₂- visible in damme/iššā.

ḥāminkː see ḥamank₁ / ḥame/ink-

ḥamīšaː see ḥameša-

ḥan⁻¹ / ḥan- (Iia2 > Ic1) ‘to draw (liquids)’: 1sg.pres.act. ḥa-a-ni-jā-μi (KUB 30.26 i 18 (NS)), 3sg.pres.act. ḥa-a-ni (OH/MS, often), 1pl.pres.act. ḥa-a-mē-e-ni (KUB 23.27 i 27 (MS)), 3pl.pres.act. ḥa-a-na-an-zi (KUB 32.72 obv. 10 (MS), KBo 23.27 ii 30 (MS), KUB 31.57 i 25 (OH/NS), ḥa-na-an-zi (KBo 10.31 ii 14 (OH/NS), KBo 13.178, 3 (fr.) (NS)), ḥa-a-ni-ja-an-zi (KUB 23.27 iii 12 (MS), ḥa-ni-jā-an-zi (KUB 29.4 i 60 (NS)), ḥa-a-ni-[n-zi] (KUB 55.63 ii 17 (NS)), 3pl.pret.act. ḥa-ni-er-r=a-at (KUB 44.56 rev. 1 (OH?/NS)), ḥa-a-ne (KUB 54.31 obv. 8 (NS)), ḥa-ni-e-er (KUB 33.106 i 10 (NS)), ḥe-e-ni-r=a-at (KUB 33.34 i 6 (OH/NS)), ḥe-e-ni-er (KUB 33.34 i 8 (OH/NS)), ḥe-ne-er (KUB 33.34 i 7 (OH/NS)), ḥa-a-ni-ja-r=a-at (Bo 6472, 12 (undat.), 2sg.imp.act. ḥa-a-an, ḥa-a-ni, 2pl.imp.act. ḥa-an-tēn (KBo 22.127 i 1 (NS)); inf. I ḥa-nu-ya-an-zi (KUB 39.71 i 24 (NS), ḥa-nu-ma-an-zi (KUB 29.4 i 59 (NS)); inf. II ḥa-na-an-na (KUB 32.72 i 5 (MS)); impf. ḥa-ni-iš-ke/a/ (KBo 15.37 v 9 (MH/NS)), ḥa-a-ni-iš-ke/a/ (KUB 47.62, 10 (NS)), ḥa-a-ni-eš-ke/a/ (KBo 25.172 iv 6 (NS)).

Derivatives: ḫ[D]heneššar / hanešn- (n.), a vessel (nom.acc.sg. [ḥa-n]e-ēš-šar (KBo 11.41 iv 10 (NS), ḥa-ne-ēš-šar[-][] (BoT 2.93, 16 (NS)), gen.sg. [ḥa-n]e-ēš-na-eš (KBo 11.41 iv 11 (NS), ḥa-ne-ēš-n[a-aš] (BoT 2.93, 17 (NS))).

IE cognates: Gr. ἀντιλέκτος ‘bilge-water’, ?Arm. hanem ‘to draw out’.

PIE *h₂ôn-ei, *h₂n-ônti
See HW^2 H: 133f. for semantics and attestations of this verb (cited as ḫa-n-/hen-).
It shows a variety of stems, namely ḫa-n-, ḫα-n-, ḫāniyē/a- and  Ḿen-. The form 3sg.pres.act. ḫāni is the oldest and most often attested form. The forms with a stem ḫāniyē/a- are all NS and clearly built on 3sg.pres. ḫāni. As 3pl.pres.act. we find both ḫānani and ḫa-nani. Despite the fact that ḫānani is attested in MS texts, ḫa-nani in NS texts only, I think that ḫa-nani must be considered the original form, with ḫānani showing secondary introduction of the long ā from the singular. The stem Ḫen- is found in one NS text only, in the form 3pl.pres.act. ḫenier (note that Oettinger (1979a: 52) cites Ḫe-e-ni-er and Ḫe-∂-n-er as MH, but KUB 33.34 must be NS, as can be seen by e.g. young form of the sign IG in obv. 16 (compare now also Košak 2005b: 230, who dates this tablet as “jh.”). The forms with Ḫen- must be secondarily formed in analogy to ḫe-ni : e-hēr = ḫa-n, a noun as well as a verb. The form ḫē-n-er is attested in MS and KS texts only, ḫa-n as a verb, but ḫa-n as a noun in the paradigm of āk- / āk-. All in all, I reckon with an original abluting verb ḫān- / ḫa-n-.

Puvel (HED 3: 77) connects this verb with Gr. ἄνωτρ ’bail-water’ (*h₂n₄-t-lo-*) and Arm. hānam ‘to draw out’. If this connection is justified, then we must reconstruct ḫān, ḫa-nani as *h₂-n-ēt, *h₂n-ēnti. Note that *h₂ regularly would have dropped in front of *ō in the strong stem *h₂-n- (cf. Kloekhorst fn1.c), but was restored on the basis of the weak stem *h₂-n-.

A connection with the vessel DUGḫa-ne/išša- (q.v.) is difficult, despite Rieken’s attempt (1999a: 1999b: 227) to invent an IE scenario to explain ḫa-ne/išša-. Nevertheless, the sporadic NH secondary remodellings into an r/n-stem ḫaneššar / ḫanešn-, as if it were a verb.noun of ḫa-n-/hen-, shows that at that time the Hittite speakers folk-etymologically associated DUGḫa-ne/išša- with this verb.

**Ḫanna- / Ḫann** (IIaγ; IIIh) ‘to sue; to judge’; ḫanneššar ḫann(a)-‘to render judgement’: 1sg.pres.act. ḫa-an-na-ah-ḫi (KBo 19.70 ii 3 (NH)), 3sg.pres.act. ḫa-an-na-i (KUB 21.17 iii 39 (NH), ḫa-an-na-a-i (KBo 3.3 ii 3 (NH), KUB 43.35, 8 (fr.) (MS)), 2pl.pres.act. ḫa-a[a]-[a-at-te-ni?] (HKM 57 rev. 30 (MH/MS)), ḫa-an-na-[a-te-ni?] (HKM 57 rev. 31 (MH/MS)), 3pl.pres.act. ḫa-an-na-an-zi (KUB 19.20 rev. 15 (NH), StBoT 24 ii 72 (NH)), 1sg.pret.act. ḫa-an-na-mu-n (KUB 14.4 ii 9 (NH), 3sg.pret.act. ḫa-an-ni-iš[-ta] (KUB 36.19, 6 (MH/NS)), 2sg.imp.act. ḫa-an-ni (HKM 52 rev. 29 (MH/MS), KUB 13.2 ii 31, 32 (MH/NS)), ḫa-an-ne (KUB 19.14 iv 6 (NH)), 3sg.imp.act. ḫa-an-na-ū (KUB 13.2 iii 23 (MH/NS)), ḫa-an-na-a-ū (KBo 3.4 ii 14 (NH), KBo 16.1 ii 14 (NH), ABOT 48, 9 (fr.) (OH/NS)), 2pl.imp.act. ḫa-an-ni-iš-tén (HKM 60 obv. 9 (MH/MS)), ḫa-an-ni-eš-tén (KUB 54.1 ii 43 (NS)), [h]a-an-[a]-at-tén (HKM 57. rev. 23 (MH/MS)), ḫa-an-na-at-te-en (KUB 4.1 i 22, 33, 34 (MH/NS)),


IE cognates: Gr. ᾱνομα ‘to blame, to treat scornfully’.

ΠΕ *h₂ye-heten-h₂-śi, *h₂ye-hen-śi-enti

See HW² ḫ: 135f. for attestations and semantics of ḫan(a)- and ḫ: 149 for ḫanneššar. The verb is found both in active and in middle forms, without difference in meaning. It is usually assumed that the middle forms are original and that the active forms are secondarily derived (e.g. Puhvel HED 3: 82). This assumption cannot be supported by a chronological ordering of the material: we find both middle and active forms in MS texts already. Moreover, from a formal point of view it is impossible to derive the active from the middle. In the middle
we find only one stem, namely ḥanna-. If the active indeed was derived from the middle, we would expect that it would show the stem ḥanna- throughout the paradigm. The case is, however, that besides the stem ḥanna-, we also find a stem ḥamm-, namely in 2pl.imp.act. ḥanništen (MH/MS). This form cannot be a recent creation as we can see by the fact that it shows the archaic ḥi-ending -šten. This ending was the unproductive one, being replaced by the mi-ending -sten from OH times onwards already (visible in secondary ḥannatten, with introduction of the strong stem ḥanna-, which is attested in a MH/MS text as well). So, the fact that we find an ablauting stem ḥanna- / ḥamm- in the active (of which ḥamm- cannot be secondary as it is found in an archaic form) besides a non-ablauting stem ḥanna-in the middle proves that the active cannot be derived from the middle and therefore must be the primary formation. This is an important establishment for the etymology.

The active paradigm of ḥanna- / ḥamm- inflects according to the tarn(a)-class. Some of the verbs belonging to this class were explained by Oettinger (1979a: 496) as reflecting reduplicated roots ending in laryngeal: *Ce-CôH-ei : *Ce-CH-énti. For ḥanna-/ḥamm- this means that we have to reconstruct *He-HnóH-ei : *He-HnH-énti.

As an Anatolian cognate, Puhvel (HED 3: 82) adduces Lyc. qā-, which he translates as ‘to call to account, to judge (guilty), to punish’. Beside the fact that Melchert (1993a: 59; 2004a: 54) translates qā- as ‘destroy’, which would not fit the semantics of ḥanna-/ḥamm-, a formal connection between the two verb is impossible as well, since Lyc. q reflects PAnat. */Hw/ < */Hz (cf. Kloekhorst fthc.c).

Other Anatolian cognates are seen by some scholars in the HLuwian words hanijatatar- ‘evilness’ (abl.-instr. MALUS-ha-ni-a-ta-ša-tara/i-ti (KARATEPE 1 §72)), hanija- (adj.) ‘malicious’ (nom.-acc.pl.n. MALUS-hâ-ni-i-ia (KARATEPE 1 §12)), hanhaniwa- (n.) ‘wickedness’ (nom.-acc.sg.n. MALUS-ha-ha-ni-wa/i-za (TELL AHMAR 1 §20)) and the CLuwian forms hanija- ‘malicious’ (abl.-instr. hanijati) and ḥanhanija- ‘to be malicious’ (3sg.pres.act.(Hititized) ḥanhanijai) (e.g. Starke 1990: 387-8; Melchert 1993b: 51). This connection must be false as on the one hand the semantics do not fit and on the other hand the Luwian forms show single -n- vs. the geminate -nm- in Hittite.

On the IE level, Puhvel (83) proposes to connect Gr. ὀγκυάθω ‘to blame, to treat scornfully’, which has more merit. The Greek verb shows a stem ὀγκα- once (in the aorist ὀγκατο), on the basis of which Puhvel reconstructs a root *h3ynh2-. This connection is taken over by e.g. Melchert (1994a: 51) who, on the basis of his supposition that the middle inflection of ḥanna- is the primary one, reconstructs
*h₁enhex₂-o. This is incorrect in two respects. Firstly, Van de Laar (2000: 232) states that the Gr. stem ḫān- must be secondary and that the stem ḫān- points to a root *h₁enhex₂-. In my view, a root *h₁enhex₂- is possible as well, as in Greek we only find middle forms that go back to a zero grade stem *h₁enhex₂-. Secondly, we have determined that in Hittite the active inflection must be primary, which reflects *H₅e-H₅nH₅-.*H₅e-H₅nH₅-. If we apply this structure to the root *h₁enhex₂- we arrive at the reconstruction *h₁i-h₁enhex₂ei, *h₁i-h₁enhex₂-enti, which by regular sound laws yielded Hitt. ḫammāi, ḫammānzi.

In my view, the root *h₁enhex₂- is visible in PIE *h₁enhex₂-mn ‘name’ as well (see lāman) and must have originally meant ‘to call (by name)’, which on the one hand developed into Gr. ‘to call names > to treat scornfully’ and, on the other, into Hitt. ‘to call to court > to sue’.

The original form of the imperfective must have been ḫaššike/ā- as it is, next to ḫanniške/ā-, the oldest attested form and, more importantly, within the paradigm of ḫanna- / ḫan- shows such an aberrant form that it cannot have been secondarily created. In my opinion, it points to a development *h₁enhex₂-skē/ā- > /H₅qSkē/ā/.

The derivative ḫammatalyana- clearly is derived from the verb ḫam(a)-, but its exact formation is unclear. Rieken (1999a: 274) implausibly reconstructs *h₁enhex₂-e-tlo-jom. It recalls annitalyatar ‘motherhood’ that is derived from anna- ‘mother’ (q.v.).

pleado (c.) ‘grandmother’: dat.-loc.sg. ḫa-an-ni (NH), nom.pl. ḫa-an-ni-iš (NS), acc.pl. ḫa-an-ni-iš (OH/NS), gen.pl. ḫa-an-na-aš (undat.), dat.-loc.pl. ḫa-an-na-aš (OH/NS), ḫa-a-an-n[a-a-aš] (HFAC 14 obv. 4 (NS)).


IE cognates: Lat. ānus ‘old woman’, OHG ana ‘grandmother’, ano ‘grandfather’ OPr. ane ‘grandmother’, Lith. anýra ‘husband’s mother’, Arm. han ‘grandmother’. PIE *h₂enHo-

See Puhvel HED 3: 84f. and HW² ḫ: 141f. for attestations. Although the word at first sight seems to belong to the other family words that have their origin in baby-talk (anna- ‘mother’, ata- ‘father’), this word has a good IE etymology (just as Hitt. ḫūh-, ḫuḥa- ‘grandfather’ (q.v.)). Especially Arm. han and Lat. anus point to an initial *h₂-. The fact that in Hittite we find a geminate -mn- can only be explained from *-nH-.
See HW² H: 143f. for semantics and attestations. Puvel (HED 3: 86) cites this verb as ḥan(n)es(š)-, assuming that a gnominate -nu- can be seen in 2pl.imp.act. ḥa-an-ni-eš-tén (KUB 54.1 i 43). HW² (H: 153) takes this form as belonging to hama-² / ham- ‘to sue, to judge’, however: KUB 54.1 ii 42 nu=ya am-me-el=pät iš-ḥa-[a]-ru šitu-tu (34) ḥa-an-ni-eš-tén ‘Judge my tears!’ (instead of Puvel’s translation ‘wipe my tears!’).

Besides the hapax ḥanišezzi, which shows a NH -iš-ε- derivative, this verb shows two stems, viz. ḥane/išš- /Hniš- and ḥanišš- /Hniš-. Diachronically, a third stem /ušš- can be found in the paradigm of ḥanišš-² ‘to wipe’ (q.v.). As I have argued at ḥanišš-², both verbs ultimately reflect an s-extension of the PIE root *h₂meh₁- and go back to an ablauting paradigm *h₂omh₁- / *h₂meh₁-. The
regular outcome of this paradigm was quite different per form: 1sg.pres.act. *h₂ómha₂- and 2sg.pres.act. *h₂ómha₂ th₂ei should regularly have given */ʔánSi/ and */ʔánSt/; 3sg.pres.act. h₂ómha₂- yielded ʔánSi/ whereas 3pl.pres.act. *h₃mh₃Senti regularly gave /H₃Sánt/ (cf. Kloekhorst fhc.f for details). So, from one paradigm three different stems emerged, namely ʔánS/-, ʔánS- and /H₃S/-.

The stem ʔánS/- became the source of the verb ġanši, ġanšanzi (q.v.), the stem /H₃S/- became the source of the verb ġane/išzi, ġane/iššanzi whereas the stem ʔánS/- restored the initial /H/- on the basis of /H₃S/- and yielded the forms 2sg.imp.act. ġáníš and verb.noun ġáníššuŋar that usually are taken as belonging to the verb ġane/išš-².


Derivatives: **DUG** ġáníššummi (n.) a vessel (nom.-acc.sg. ča-ni-iš-ša-a-an-ni (KBo 20.3 ii 15), ča-ni-ša-an-ni (KBo 11.11 ii 6)).

See HW² H: 145f. for attestations. HW² cites two lemmas, **DUG** ġanešša- and **DUG** ġanešsar (both denoting a vessel) that I would regard as identical words, since they are used in identical contexts. In my view, the forms that show a stem ġanešsar / ġanesn- (that I have cited as a derivative of ġán-² / ġan-) are NH remodellings due to a folk-etymological connection with ġán-² / ġan- ‘to draw (water)’ (formally, ġanešsar / ġanesn- would be a verb.noun of ġán-² / ġan-).

The original word shows different stems in OS texts already, viz. commune stems ġanššur, ġanšša- and ġanešša- besides a neuter stem ġanešša. In my opinion, these alternations point to a foreign origin. Rieken’s attempt (1999a: 227) to explain ġane/išša- as an IE formation on the basis of a stem *h₂en- ‘to draw (water)’, is unconvincing.

**háníja-** (gender unknown) “’”: gen.sg. ča-a-ni-ja-aš, ča-ni-ja-aš.

335
See HW² (H: 156) for attestation places. The word only occurs in the combination hānijaš KĀ(GAL) ‘gate of ḥ’. Puhvel (HED 3: 76) argues that this gate must be a wellgate by which water flows are regulated and connects hānijaš- with ḥān- / ḥan- ‘to draw (water)’. HW² argues, however, that the hānijaš KĀ(GAL) is an ordinary gate of which an etymological connection with ḥān- / ḥan- cannot be proven.

$hānijaš$- : see ḥān- / ḥan-

$hānijaš$- : $hān/īšš-²$

$hān/īšš$- : see $hān/īšš$-²

$hānt$- (gender unclear) ‘forehead, front(age)’ (Sum. SAG.KI, Akk. PŪTUM): nom.sg. $hā-an-za$ (KUB 3.95, 13 (NS)), $hā-an-za=ti-it$ (KUB 10.96 iv 11 (NS)), $hā-an-za-a=ti-it$ (KUB 10.96 iv 14 (NS)), acc.sg. $hā-an-z[a(\ldots)]$ (KBo 8.73 ii 6 (NS)), dat.loc.sg. $hā-an-ti=i ś-ši$ (KUB 33.66 ii 19 (OH/MS)), $hā-an-di=i š-ši$ (KBo 13.31 ii 6 (OH/MS), KBo 10.23 iv 5 (OH/NS)), $hā-an-te-e=š-ši$ (KUB 32.123 + KBo 29.206 i 15 (NS)), abl. $hā-an-ta-a-az$ (KBo 17.22 iii 19 (OS)), $hā-an-ta-az$, $hā-an-da-az$, nom.pl. $hā-an-ti-īš$ (KUB 42.78 ii 18 (NS)).

Derivatives: $hānza$ (adv.) ‘in front’ ($hā-an-za$ (NS), $hā-a-an-za$ (KUB 9.28 ii 12 (MH/NS), KUB 48.118 i 17 (NH))), $hānz$an (adv.) ‘id.’ (KUB 17.21 iv 13 (MH/MS), ABoT 60 rev. 10 (MH/MS)), $handa$ (adv.) ‘for the sake of, in view of’ ($hā-an-da$ (MH/MS), $hā-an-ta$, $hā-a-an-da$ (NH)), $handaš$ (adv.) ‘for the sake of, regarding’ ($hā-an-da-aś$ (NH)), $hāntuša$- (c.) deity of the forehead (nom.sg. $\hat{h}ā-an-ta-aś-sa-aś$), $hāntušepa$- (c.) deity of the forehead (acc.sg. $\hat{h}ā-an-ta-šepa-an$ (OS), $\hat{h}ā-an-ta-še-pē-eś$ (OS), acc.pl. $\hat{h}ā-an-ta-še-pu-uš$ (OS), $hānti$ (adv.) ‘opposite, against; instead; apart’ ($hā-an-ti$ (OS), $hā-an-di$ (OS), $hā-an-ti$ (MH/MS), $hā-an-di$), $hāntiše$- (Ic²) ‘to support (?)’ (3sg.pres.act. $hā-an-ti-ja-i[z]i$, 3pl.pres.act. $hā-an-ti-ja-an-zi$, 1sg.pres.act. $hā-an-ti-ja-nu-un$, 3sg.pres.act. $hā-an-ti-ja-ii$), see also $hāntušip$. Anat. cognates: CLuw. $hāndaya(i)$- (c.) ‘supreme authority, king’ (nom.sg. $hā-an-da-ya-te-eś$), acc.sg. $hā-an-da-ya-te-en$), $hāndayaμhi$- (n.) ‘kingship’ (nom.-acc.sg. $hā-an-ta-ya-da-hi-śa$), $hāntišЯ$- (adj.) ‘first’ (nom.sg.c. $hā-an-te-li-eś$, nom.acc.sg.n. $hā-an-ti-il-za$), $hānti(i)$- ‘headband’ (nom.sg. $hā-an-ti-īš$); HLUw. $hant$- (n.) ‘face, forehead’ (dat.-loc.sg. FRON$\hat{s}$-ti-i (KARKAMIŠ A6 §20), abl.-instr. TRON$\hat{s}$-ha-ta (KARKAMIŠ A2+3 §6), nom.-acc.pl. TRON$\hat{s}$-ha-ta (KARKAMIŠ A3 §23), TRON$\hat{s}$-ha-ta (KIRÇOGLU §3), dat.-loc.pl. TRON$\hat{s}$-ha-ta-
za (TELL AHMAR 1 §17), **hanti-** (adj.) ‘first’ (nom.sg. REX-ti-sa; (TOPADA §19), abl.-instr. REX-ti-ia+ra/i (TOPADA §21) gen.adj.nom.sg. REX-ti-ia-si’s-sa (TOPADA §19), gen.adj.abl.-instr. REX-ti-ia-sas+ra/i (TOPADA §21), **hantili(i)**- (adj.) ‘first, former; first, preeminent’ (nom.sg.c. REX-li-i-sá (KARATEPE 1 §50 Ho.), FRONS-la/i/u-sá (KARATEPE 1 §50 Hu.), FRONS-la/i/u-sa (CEKKE §6a), nom.pl.c. REX-li-zi (KARATEPE 1 §26 Hu.), FRONS-la/i/u-zi (KARATEPE 1 §26 Hu.), FRONS-la/i/u-zi (PALANGA §2), FRONS-la/i/u-sa/i (TOPADA §2), **hantili** (adv.) ‘foremost’ (FRONS-la/i/u (KARKAMIŠ A11a §17)), **hanti** (adv.) ‘against’ (FRONS-ti (KARKAMIŠ A4b §3)), **FRONS-hit-** (n.) ‘preeminence’ (dat.-loc.sg. ‘FRONS’-hi-ti (KARKAMIŠ A7 §2, KARKAMIŠ A15b §14)), **hantawad(i)-** ‘king’ (nom.sg. REX-ti-i-sa, REX-ti-sa, REX-ti-sa, dat.-loc.sg. REX-ti-i, nom.pl. REX-ti-i, dat.-loc.pl. REX-ta-za, REX-tá-za), **hantawadi-** (adj.) ‘royal’ (nom.sg.c. REX-ti-sa; (TOPADA §19), abl.-instr. REX-ti-ia-ri+i (SULTANHAN §41), REX+ra/i-ti (TOPADA §5, §10), **hantawatahit-** (n.) ‘kingdom’ (nom.-acc.sg. REX-ta-hí-sá (KARATEPE 1 §73 Ho.), dat.-loc.sg.? REX-tó-tó-hi-tá (ALEPPO 2 §4), **hantawata-** ‘to be(come) king(?)’ (1sg.pret. REX-wa/i-ta-ha (BOR §8), 3sg.pret.act. REX-ta (KARABURUN §2)); Lyc. χιτατα- ‘to rule’ (3sg.pret.act. χιτατατε, χιτετετε), χιτατατα- ‘rule, kingship’ (acc.sg. χιτατατα, loc.sg. χιτατατα, χιτατατα), χιτατατατα- ‘ruler, king’ (nom.sg. χιτατατα, dat.sg. χιτατατα, abl.-instr. χιτατατατει, gen.adj. χιτατατει, χιτατατει), χιτατατατα- ‘of the ruler, royal’ (dat.-loc.pl. χιτατατατα). IE cognates: Gr. ἀντί (prep., prev.) ‘opposed, facing’, Arm. -etd “for, instead of”, Lat. ante ‘in front of’, Gr. ἀντα ‘over against, face to face’, Skt. ánti ‘before, near, facing’.

PIE *hent-

See Puhvel HED 3: 89f. for attestations. Within Hittite it is clear on the basis of e.g. dat.-loc.sg. hanti (OH/MS) and abl. hantāz (OS) that we are dealing with a stem *hant-. Nevertheless, the interpretation of the nominative- and accusative-forms are unclear. At first sight, nom.sg. hanza seems to show that we are dealing with a commune nom.sg. hant-s. This commune form then would correspond to the commune nom.pl. plantiš. Nevertheless, the forms ḥanza=tit and ḥanza=titi ‘your forehead’ bear a neuter enclitic possessive pronoun =tit. Moreover, if the accusative-form ḥa-an-zi[a(-)…] should be read as ḥanza, we rather seem to be dealing with a neuter nom.-acc.sg. ḥanza. Starke (1990: 125f.) therefore states that the nominative-accusative-forms ḥanza are rather to be interpreted as Luwian forms that show the neuter secondary ending -sa, so ḥant-sa (note that Starke still
interpreted this -sa as the neuter plural-ending, whereas nowadays it is generally assumed that -sa denotes the nom.-acc.sg.). In his view, the form SAG.KI-an (KUB 5.9 obv. 8) shows the unextended Luwian nom.-acc.sg. *hān. Rieken (1999a: 31f.) argues that this latter form could be interpreted as *hanzan as well, the regular adverbial form. Nevertheless, she agrees that the Hittite evidence is too inconclusive to decide which gender this word had originally. Since all instances of nom.-acc.sg. *hanza are found in NS texts, they could in principle indeed be Luwianisms in *sa. Note that in H-Luwian, we find nom.-acc.pl. *′RONs: ha-ta = /hanthal/, which seems to indicate that here the word is neuter.

Already since Hrozny (1917: 21) it has been generally assumed that *han-, which in the Anatolian languages still has its full nominal meaning ‘forehead’, is etymologically connected with adverbs and preverbs like Gr. ἄντι ‘opposed, facing’, Lat. ante ‘in front of’, Skt. ānti ‘before, facing’, etc. In Hittite, we see that the stem *han- has given rise to some adverbially used forms as well. E.g. *hanza ‘in front’ probably reflects *han-ent-i (and therewith is directly cognate with Gr. ἄντω and Skt. ānti) and shows that already at an early time it was not regarded as part of the paradigm of *han- ‘forehead’ anymore, since neither the *-i nor the *-ent- nor the *-ent-i was restored (as opposed to the synchronic dat.-loc.sg. *han- and its adverbialized variant *haniti). The adverbial forms *haniti (derived from the dat.-loc.sg.), *hanita (< all.sg.) and *hanitaš (< dat.-loc.pl.) are slight later lexicalizations of inflected forms of *han- ‘forehead’. The adverb *hanzan probably is a secondary formation, adding the -an from anadan, āppan, kattan, etc. to *hanza. Note that the Gr. adverb ἄντων ‘against’ has a remarkable parallel formation (both from virtual *hanentai-o). Because it is not fully clear whether *han- was commune or neuter originally, we cannot properly reconstruct a paradigm. Note that therefore Gr. ἄντω can either reflect acc.sg. *han-ent-m (if originally a commune word) or nom.-acc.pl. *hanent-h (if originally a neuter word).

*han-tae² (1c2) (trans.) to arrange (together), to prepare, to fix; to determine; (intr.) to get married; (midd.) to get fixed, to fit’ (Sum. (NÍG.)SIXÁ): 1sg.pres.act. ha-an-ta-a-mi, ha-an-da-a-mi, ha-an-da-mi, ha-a-an-da-mi (KUB 7.54 i 10 (NS)), 2sg.pres.act. ha-an-da-a-ši (MH/MS), 3sg.pres.act. ha-an-ta-а́-э́-з̣-и́ (OS), ha-an-da-a-и́-з̣-и́, ha-an-ta-и́-з̣-и́, ha-an-da-и́-з̣-и́, ha-an-te-э́-з̣-и́ (HT 1 iii 7), ha-an-da-a-i (KBo 5.2 iv 16), 1pl.pres.act. ha-an-da-a-u-ni (1691/u ii 15 (MS), cf. Puhvel HED 3: 98), 3pl.pres.act. ha-an-ta-a-an-з̣-и́, ha-an-da-a-an-з̣-и́, ha-an-ta-a-an-i, ha-an-da-a-an-i, 1sg.pret.act. ha-an-ta-a-nu-un, ha-an-da-a-nu-un, ha-an-ta-nu-un, ha-an-da-nu-un, 3sg.pret.act. ha-an-da-a-it, ha-an-


See HW² H: 163f. and Puhvel HED 3: 96f. for semantics and attestation of this verb and its derivatives. The verb inflects according to the ḫatrae-class, which mainly consists of denominal verbs ending in *-o-je/o-. For ḫantae, this seems to indicate that this verb is derived from a noun *ẖanta-. The question is whether a noun ḫant-, too, would yield a derived verb ḫantae-². There are only a few other verbs that end in -antae-. The NH verb istantae- ‘to stay put’ derives from OH istantāje/a-² (q.v.) and reflects *sthent-eh2-je/ó-. The verb ḫandandae-² ‘to show providence’ (cited here) and the verb nēkumandae-² ‘to undress oneself’ clearly
are derived from \textit{handant}- and from \textit{nekumant}–‘naked’ (q.v.) respectively. Both verbs are sporadically attested (\textit{handandae}- thrice and \textit{nekumandae}- once), however, in NS texts only, which indicates that both verbs are likely to be recent formations, created in a period in which the \textit{hatrae}-class was a very productive category. So it is questionable whether on formal grounds we are allowed to derive \textit{hantae}- (which is attested in OS texts already) from a noun \textit{hant}-.

Oettinger (1979a: 367) states that \textit{hantae}- is derived from \textit{hant}- ‘forehead, front’, but this is, apart from the formal difficulties as raised above, semantically unattractive: I do not see how ‘to arrange together’ can be derived from ‘forehead’. Puhvel (l.c.) derives \textit{handae}- from \textit{hānt}-, the participle of the verb \textit{hān}-’to believe, to trust’, arguing that occasional plene spellings \textit{ha-a-an}- point in that direction. In my corpus, I have found 430+ examples of \textit{handae}- and derivatives that show a spelling \textit{ha-an-} (of which 23 are found in OS texts) vs. only 3 plene spellings \textit{ha-a-an-}. As these latter are attested in NS texts only, they hardly can be phonologically valuable. Moreover, a semantic connection with \textit{hān}-’to trust, to believe’ is unattractive.

All in all, we have to conclude that \textit{hantae}- must have been derived from a further unattested noun \textit{*hantā}-, of which no cognates are known.

\textbf{\textit{handa}tíš-} (c.) ‘heat’: nom.sg. \textit{ha-an-da-iš} (KBo 3.23 obv. 6, rev. 9 (OH/MS)), \textit{ha-an-da-a-[iš]} (KUB 31.115, 9 (OH/NS)), dat.-loc.sg. \textit{ha-an-ta-iši} (KBo 3.22 obv. 17, 19 (OS)), \textit{[ha-a]n-da-iš-[iš]} (1554/u, 8 (NS)), \textit{ha-an-da-[iš]} (KBo 3.23 obv. 8 (OH/NS)), \textit{[ha-an-d]a-[iš]} (KUB 31.115, 11 (OH/NS)).

IE cognates: ?Ol. \textit{and}- ‘to kindle’.

PIE \textit{*h₂endʰ}–?

This word is often regarded as neuter (e.g. Puhvel HED 3: 107; HW² H: 167), but this cannot be correct as it functions as the subject of a transitive verb in the following text:

\begin{quote}
KBo 3.23 obv. (with duplicate KUB 31.115, 9f.)

5 \textit{ma-a-n[\(=a-an\)]}

6 \textit{ṭāk-ku-\(=a-an\) e-ku-ni-mi da-i} \textit{ya-la-aḥ-zi \(gi\)=a-an e-ku-ni-mi da-i}

7 \textit{ṭāk-ku-\(=a-an\) e-ku-ni-ma-aš ya-la-aḥ-zi n=\(a-an\) ha-an-da-[iš]} (8)

8 \textit{da-i}

‘When heat strikes him, you must place him in the cold. If cold strikes him, place him in the heat’.
\end{quote}
Nevertheless, the word cannot be interpreted as a diphthong stem ’hantai’- as the dat.-loc.sg. shows the stems ’hantai’- and ’handa’-. The form ’hantai’ occurs in the formula ’hantai’ mēḫuni ‘in the heat of noon’ only (ha-an-ta-i-ši me-e-[u]-ni] (KBo 3.22 obv. 17), ha-an-ta-i-ši me-e-[u]-ni] (KBo 3.22 obv. 19) and [ha-an-da-i-ši=kān me-[u]-ni] (1554/a, 8 (cf. StBoT 18: 98)), whereas ’handa’ is only attested in the above cited context. Neumann (1960: 141) assumes that ’hantai’ mēḫuni is a wrong inflection of an originally nominal sentence *hantai mēḫur ‘heat is the time = daytime’. Rieken (1999a: 220) convincingly argues that it is better to assume that just as nekūz mēḫur, *hantai mēḫur shows an original gen.sg. *hantai ‘the time of heat’. Problematic, however, is the question how to interpret this gen.sg. *hantai formally. Moreover, if the form ’handa’ represents the real dat.-loc.sg., I would not be able to explain how the stem ’handa’- is to be seen in comparison to a nom.sg. ’handa’ and a gen.sg. *hantai. According to Rieken (i.e.), the forms are all explicable if we assume an originally ablauting i-stem *hand-i-, *hand-ai-, but her line of reasoning seems unattractive to me.

Regarding the root, it has been generally accepted since Pedersen (1938: 48) that the word is to be compared with OIr. and- ‘to kindle’ and Gr. ἀνέβλεξ ‘coal’, although the latter word probably is of substratum origin. If the connection with OIr. and- is justified, however, then we must reconstruct a root *h̥ent-etiHo-.

’handa’- see ’handa(i)š-


PIE *h̥ent-etiHo-
The word shows two stems, namely ḫantezzīa- and ḫantezzi-. It is remarkable that all OS attestations belong to the stem ḫantezzīa- (nom.sg.c. ḫantezzīš, acc.sg. ḫantezzian, nom.-acc.sg.n. ḫantezzian), whereas from MH onwards we find the stem ḫantezzi- (nom.sg.c. ḫantezzīš, acc.sg.c. ḫantezzin, nom.-acc.sg.n. ḫantezzi). The stem ḫantezzi- does not show an ablauting suffix (no *ḥantezzaj-). The hapax spelling with -i- (ḥa-an-ti-zi-zi-an) is found in a text that also contains the aberrant ū-i-it ‘he came’ (cf. Melchert 1984a: 93).

The adjective clearly is derived from ḫant- ‘forehead; front’ (q.v.) with the -ezzi-a-suffix that we find in appezzi(a)- (from āppa (q.v)) as well. The suffix seems to go back to *-etiHo- (note that *-etio- probably would have given **-ezza-, cf. zāhi- / zāhū- < *tiōh-).


This word occurs several times but its meaning is not always clear. In some contexts it seems to denote a colour: KUB 29.4 i (31) SÍG SA SÍG ZA.GÍN SÍG ḫa-an-za-na-aš SÍG SIG; SÍG BABBAR da-an-zi ‘They take red wool, blue wool, ḫ. wool, yellow wool and white wool’ and Laroche (1953: 41) has argued that it means ‘black’ then. In the vocabulary KBo 1.44 + KBo 13.1 i 50 the Akkadian phrase QŬ-U ET-[T]-[Ŭ-Ṫ] ‘spider web’ is glossed by Hitt. a-u-ya-ya-aš ḫa-an-za-na-aš ‘h. of a spider’, which would mean that ḫanzana- means ‘web’ here. HW\(^2\) ḫ: 195 cites a context in which ḫGIS ḫanzana- should denote “ein Gerät”. So it is possible that we are in fact dealing with three homophonous words ḫanzana-.

The first ḫanzana-, which should mean ‘black’, has been connected with Gr. ḫοῖς ‘mud’ and Skt. ásita- ‘dark, black’ by Čop (1970: 95-6), on the basis of which e.g. Melchert (1994a: 121) reconstructs ḫms(o)no-, although in my view a reconstruction *ḥms(o)no- is equally possible. It should be noted that the etymology is far from certain, however.


PIE *ḥmsósio-

See Puhvel HED 3: 224f. and HW\(^2\) ḫ: 397f. for attestations. This word only occurs as the second part of the expression ḫāšša- ḫanzgšša- that denotes ‘further
offspring’, compare e.g. KUB 29.1 iv (2) nu DUMU.NITA\textsuperscript{MES} DUMU.MUNUS\textsuperscript{MES} ha-aš-še-eš ha-an-za-aš-še-eš ma-ak-ke-eš-ša-an-du ‘May the sons, daughters and further offspring become numerous’!

When used in the all.sg., the expression has an adverbial feeling to it and must be translated ‘down all generations’, compare e.g. KUB 21.1 i (70) kat-ta=ma am-me-el DUMU=IA DUMU.DUMU=IA ha-aš-ša ha-an-za-aš-ša pa-ah-ši ‘You must protect my son (acc.) and grandson (acc.) down all generations’. Although the plene spelling ha-an-za-aš- occurs a few times only, it must be taken seriously because it is attested in an OS and in a MS text.

In my view, it is quite obvious that hanzāšša- and ḥāšša- are etymologically cognate. For the nasal in hanzāšša-, compare Luw. hamsa/- ‘grandchild’ as cited under the lemma of ḥāšša-. Within Hittite, hanzāšša- and ḥāšša- clearly belong with the verb ḥāš\textsuperscript{−} / ḥāš- ‘to procreate’, and therefore also with ḥaššu- ‘king’.

See at the lemma of ḥāš\textsuperscript{−} / ḥāš- for a detailed treatment of these words. There I argue that hanzāšša- must reflect *h\textsuperscript{ms}šó-, the full-grade of which yielded ḥāšša-.

The second part, -ašša-, in my view must be equated with the genitival suffix -ašša- (q.v.), which means that ḥāšša- hanzāšša- literally means ‘offspring (and) the offspring thereof’. All in all, I reconstruct hanzāšša- as *h\textsuperscript{ms}šósio-.

\textit{ happ-}\textsuperscript{2} (Ia4; IIIa > IIib) ‘(act.) to join, to attach; (impers., midd.) to arrange itself, to work out’: 2sg.pres.act. ħa-ap-ti (MH/MS), 3sg.pres.act. ħa-ap-zî (OH/NS), 1sg.pres.act. ħa-ap-pu-un (MS); 3sg.pres.midd. ħa-ap-da-ri (MS?), 3sg.pres.midd. ħa-ap-da-at (MS?), ħa-ap-ta-at (NH), 3sg.imp.midd. ħa-ap-pa-ru (OS).


IE cognates: Lat. aptus ‘connected, fitting’.

\textit{ PIE *h}\textit{sep}-
See HW² H: 196f. for attestations and semantics. The oldest form is 3sg.pres.midd. *ḥapparu* (OS), which may indicate that the middle inflection was original. Puhvel (HED 3: 113-4) convincingly connects ḥapp- with Lat. *aptus* ‘connected, fitting’ and reconstructs *ḥ2ep*.


Derivatives: Ḥapa**-** (lc2) ‘to wet, to moisten’ (3sg.pres.act. Ḥa-pa-a-iz-zi, 3pl.pres.act. Ḥa-a-pa-a-an-zi; impf. Ḥa-pi-iš-ke’a-), Ḥap**ā**- (c.) ‘river land(?)’ (acc.sg. Ḥa-pa-a-ti-in (MH/MS)).

Anat. cognates: Pal. ḫɑ**m**a- (c.) ‘river’ (nom.sg. ḫa-a-ap-na-aš); CLuw. ḫap**a**- (c.) ‘river’ (nom./voc.sg. ḫa-a-pi-iš, dat.-loc.sg. ḫ-D-i, abl.-instr. ḫ-D-ī, nom.pl.(? in Hitt. context) ḫa-pa-an-zi, acc.pl. ḫ-D-in-za, dat.-loc.pl. ḫ-D-an-za), ḫap**ī**nna- (c.) ‘little river, stream’ (acc.pl. ḫa-a-pi-in-ni-in-za, ḫa-pi-in-ni-in-za); HLuw. ḫap**a**- (c.) ‘river’ (acc.sg. /hapin/ FLUMEN-pi-na (KARKAMIŠ A15b §7, §8), FLUMEN-pi-i-na (KARKAMIŠ A15b §9), FLUMEN(-)*311’(’pi-na (TELL AHMAR fr. 6, but interpretation uncertain), FLUMEN-na (IZGIN 1 §8), dat.-loc.sg. /hapi/ FLUMEN-pi-i (TELL AHMAR 5 §9), FLUMEN-pi (MARAŠ § 8 §8)), ḫapad(a)j- (c.) ‘riverland’ (nom.sg. /hapadīš/ ‘FLUMEN hā-pa’ra/i-sā (KARATEPE 1 §48 Hu.), FLUMEN-pa-r-i-sā (KARATEPE 1 §48 Hu.), /hapadīš/ FLUMEN-REGIO-tā-i-sā (HAMA 1 §3), FLUMEN-REGIO-tā-i-sā (HAMA 2 §3, HAMA 7 §3), FLUMEN-REGIO-sā (HAMA 3 §3), acc.sg. /hapadī/ FLUMEN-pa-ti-na (KARKAMIŠ A12 §6), FLUMEN-REGIO-ti-na (MARAŠ § 3), abl.-instr. /hapadi/ FLUMEN-REGIO-ia-ti-i (MARAŠ § 8 §2), acc.pl. /hapadinti/ FLUMEN-REGIO-zi (IZGIN 1 §5), dat.-loc.pl. /hapadiant/ FLUMEN-REGIO-za (IZGIN 1 §5)); Lyc. ḵ**b**a(t)i- ‘to irrigate’ (3pl.pret.act. ḵbaitāq).

PA nat. *ḥ2eb*-<br>IE cognates: OIr. aub, gen. abae, MWe. a fon ‘river’, Lat. amnis ‘stream, river’.<br>PIE *ḥ2ebh*-o-, *ḥ2ebh*-n-

See HW² H: 197f. for attestations. There, an all.sg.-form ḥa-ap-pa with geminate -pp- is cited as well (KUB 31.74 ii (9) ḥa-ap-pa an-da še-eš-te-en[ ...] ‘You must sleep inside the ḥ.’), but in my view there is no indication from the context that this word should mean ‘river’. Besides the stem ḥapa-, a few n-stem forms are mentioned as well, namely dat.-loc.sg. Ḥ-D-nil (KUB 17.8 iv 23), all.sg. Ḥ-D-an-na.
(KUB 53.14 iii 14), and the phonetically spelled forms ḥa-a-ap-pa-na (KUB 58.50 iii 2), ḥa-pa-na (Bo 6980, 7, cf. Hoffner 1971: 31f.). Although the forms that are spelled with the sumerogram ID cannot be interpreted otherwise than as ‘river’, I am not sure whether this goes for the phonetically spelled words as well. I therefore leave them out of consideration. The real n-stem forms may have to be seen as a more close cognate to Pal. ḥāpna-

The consistent spelling with single -p- in Hittite and Luwian points to IE *h₂bo-, which is confirmed by Lyc. ḥba(i)-. We therefore have to reconstruct PAnc. *h₂bo-, which cannot be connected with *h₂ep- ‘water’ as seen in Skt. āp- and OPr. ape ‘brook, small river’. We must rather connect the Anatolian form to the It.-Celt. forms (OIr. aub, gen. abae, Lat. annis ‘stream, river’), which go back to *h₂ebh₂-n-. These n-stem forms remind of Pal. ḥāpna- and Hitt. İD-n-.


IE cognates: Skt. āpas- ‘work’, Lat. opus ‘work’.

PIE *h₂ép-r-

See HW² H: 215f. for attestations. The oldest attestations (OS) of the noun ḥ̄āppar show plene spelling ḥ-a-a-ap-pār. A nom.-acc.sg. ḥa-ap-pīr is attested twice in one NS text only. Nevertheless, this stem is attested in the derived verb ḥappirae₂ (oldest attestation MH/MS) and ḥūppir(i)ja- ‘town’ (q.v.) as well, which proves that it is linguistically real (note that in ‘town’ it is attested with plene spelling of -a: ḥa-a-ap-pi-ri). The alternation between ḥapparae- and ḥaprae- and ḥapparije/a- and ḥaprije/a-, shows that the stem ḥ̄āppar is to be analysed as /Hāpr/. This means that we are dealing with two stems, /Hāpr/- and /Hūpir/- /Hāpir-. It is likely that these reflect ablaut, but the original ablaut
pattern cannot easily be established anymore. We probably should think of an r-
stem *h₁ ép-r, *h₃p-ér-s yielding the secondary stems *h₁ ép-ër and *h₁ ép-r-os,
*h₁ ép-r-i, etc. through analogy (cf. also Kimball 1987a: 186f.).

Since Sapir (1936: 179) this word is generally compared with Skt. āpas- ‘work’,
Lat. apus ‘work’ < *h₁ ép-. Reconstructing an original -r/n-stem on the basis of
hāppar besides ħappina- ‘rich’ is unnecessary (pace Rieken 1999: 315). We find
n-stem derivatives meaning ‘wealth’ in other IE languages as well (e.g. Skt.
āpna- ‘wealth’), showing that we can easily assume an independent n-stem.
Moreover, -r/n-stems are that common in Hittite that it is unattractive to assume
that an original -r/n-stem developed into a Hittite r-stem (which are much rarer).

The Lyc. form epi̇ri̇jēti is since Laroche (1958: 171-2) translated as ‘sells’ and
connected with hēppar- (and especially ħappiriej/a-). This has led to the
generally accepted view that initial *h₂- dropped in Lycian (Kimball 1987a).
Rasmussen (1992: 56-9) convincingly shows that Laroche’s translation ‘sells’ of
epi̇ri̇jēti was not based on any contextual considerations, however, but on the
formal similarity with Hitt. ħappiriej/a- only. He shows that several other
interpretations in principle are possible as well and that any conclusions based on
this form alone are therefore unreliable. As I have shown in Kloekhorst fthc.c, I
believe that *h₂- yielded Lyc. χ̔-e-, and that therefore the connection between
Hitt. hēppar- < *h₁ ep-r- and Lyc. epi̇ri̇jēti cannot be upheld anymore.

The connection with Lyd. afarı̇s (allegedly ‘sale deed’) as given by Puhvel
HED 3: 126 is far from assured.

ṁappena-: see ṡappn- / ṡappen-

ṁappina- (adj.) ‘rich’ (Sum. NÍG.TUKU); dat.-loc.sg. ṡa-ap-pi-ni (NH).

Derivatives: (LI) ṡappinant- (adj.) ‘rich (person)’ (nom.sg.c. ṡa-ap-pi-na-an-za,
gen.sg. ṡa-ap-pi-na-an-da-aš, [h]a-ap-pi-[n[a-an]-t][a-aš, dat.-loc.sg. ṡa-ap-pi-na-
ti, nom.pl.c. ṡa-ap-pi-na-an-te-ēš), ṡappinahb (LIb) ‘to enrich’ (1sg.pres.act.
ṡa-ap-pi-na-ah-ṡa-ah-li, 3sg.pres.act. ṡa-ap-pi-na-ah-[hi], 1sg.pret.act. ṡa-ap-pi-
na-ah-ṡu-an, 3pl.pret.act. ṡa-ap-pi-na-[ah-ē-er], 2sg.imp.act. ṡa-ap-pi-na-ah,
ṡa-ap-pi-na-ah-li), ṡappinas (LIb2) ‘to become rich’ (2sg.pres.act.

aṇīs ‘rich in property’.

PIE *h₁ ep-en-o-
See HW² H: 230f. for attestations. It is generally accepted that ́happina- and its derivatives are derived from the noun ́hāppar- / ́hāppir- ‘business, trade’ (see there for etymology). According to Szemerényi (1954: 275-82), Hitt. ́happinant- is to be equated with Lat. ́apulentus ‘rich’ from *h3ep-en-ont- (the latter showing dissimilation of *n-n- to -n-l-). Other n-derivatives of the stem *h3ep- are found in e.g. Skt. ́āpanas ‘possessions’.

́happina- ‘baking kiln, fire-pit’: see ́hapn- / ́happen-

́hāppir-: see ́hāppar- / ́hāppir-

́hāppirija-, ́hāppira- (c.) ‘town’ (Sum. URU): nom.sg. URU-ri-aš (KBo 10.2 i 26 (OH/NS)), URU-ri-ra-aš (MS), acc.sg. URU-ri-an (KBo 34.110 obv. 7 (OH/NS)), URU-ja-an (KUB 35.135 rev. 19 (NS)), [URU]-ja-an (KBo 6.10 iii 17 (OH/NS)), [URU]-pi-ra-an (ABoT 32 i 4 (MH/MS?)), gen.sg. ́ha-ap-pi-ri-ja-aš (KUB 51.27 obv. 11 (NS)), URU-ri-ja-aš (KUB 13.2 iii 4 (MH/NS)), URU-ja-aš (KUB 23.72+ rev. 52 (MH/MS)), [URU]-pi-ra-aš (KUB 3.62, 8 (NH?)), dat.-loc.sg. ́ha-a-ap-pi-ri (KBo 5.6 i 16 (NH)), all.sg. URU-ri-ja (VSNF 12.30 iv 4 (OH/NS), KBo 16.54 + ABoT 53, 16 (undat.), VBoT 24 ii 23 (MH/NS)), abl. URU-ri-až (NS), URU-ja-za, URU-ra-aš (KUB 60.60 l.col. 12 (NS)), nom.pl. URU (OS), acc.pl. URU-uš, gen.pl. URU-ri-ja[-an], URU-ja-an, dat.-loc.pl. URU-ri-aš.

Derivatives: *́hāppirijašeššar / ́hāppirijašeššin- (n.) ‘town-settlement’ (nom.-acc.sg. URU-ri-aše-esšar (KBo 4.4 iv 6), URU-ja-še-esšar (KBo 6.34+ iii 29), URU-ri-ja-še-esš[ar] (KUB 23.116 i 6), dat.-loc.sg. URU-ri-aše-esš-ni (VSNF 12.57 i 21), *́hāppirijant- (c.) ‘town (personified)’ (nom.sg. URU-až (KUB 41.8 iv 30)).

PIE *h3ep-er-ia-

See HW² H: 233f. for attestations. The word shows two stems, namely ́hāppirija- and *́hāppira- (URU-pira-). According to HW², ́hāppirija- is the older form, although *́hāppira- is attested in MH times already. Puhvel (HED 3: 128) assumes that ́hāppira- is a backformation on the basis of oblique forms like dat.-loc.sg. ́hāppiri.

It is generally accepted that ́hāppirija- is derived from ́hāppar- / ́hāppir- ‘business, trade’ and therefore originally probably meant ‘place of trade’. See at ́hāppar- / ́hāppir- for further etymology.

\textbf{PIE} \textit{h2ep-en-}

See HW\textsuperscript{2} ḫ: 229-30 for attestations. There the word is classified as commune, but I have not been able to find any form that specifically shows to what gender this word belongs. The two attestations with plene -e- show that in all other attestations the sign BI should be read as -pé-, which means that the stem in fact is \textit{happen-} (note that HW\textsuperscript{2} treats this word under the lemma \textit{happina-}). HW\textsuperscript{2} cites one form “mit der singulären Schreibung” \textit{ha-ap-pa-na-aš}, which they interpret as gen.sg. of “Herdefeuer”. If this interpretation is correct (and it does not seem improbable to me), it would show that we are dealing with an (originally) ablauting n-stem \textit{happen-}, \textit{hapn-} (in which I interpret \textit{ha-ap-pa-na-aš} as /Hapnas/), and not with a thematic noun \textit{happen-} (as usually cited). Herewith it becomes very probable that the word is of IE origin.

Puhvel (HED 3: 121-2) connects this word with Gr. ὀρτῶν ‘to bake’, itself probably derived from Gr. ὀρτώς ‘baked’. This would point to a root \textit{h2ep-}, which means that we have to reconstruct an original paradigm \textit{h2ep-n}, \textit{h2ep-én-s} (if the word originally was neuter) or \textit{h2ep-én-n}, \textit{h2ep-én-m}, \textit{h2ep-én-s} (if it was commune, cf. \textit{pešan-} / \textit{pešn-} / \textit{pišen-} for a similar paradigm).

\textit{hani-} (adj.) ‘secret(?):’ nom.-acc.sg.n. \textit{hap³-}pu.

\textbf{Hapax} in vocabulary KBo 1.42 ii 22, where Sum. GÚ.ZAL and Akk.琵-RI- Insets ‘secret’ are glossed with Hitt. \textit{hap'-}pu ut-tar ‘ḥ, matter’, on the basis of which we must assume that \textit{hani-} means something like ‘secret’ (cf. Weitenberg 1984: 26). To what extent this \textit{hani-} is cognate with \textit{happu-} ‘cage(?)’ is unclear. One could assume that an original *‘caged’ develops into ‘secret’. See then at \textit{hani-} ‘cage’ for further etymology.


\textbf{Derivatives:} (KtS) \textit{happutri-} (n.) ‘leather part of harness’ (nom.-acc.sg. \textit{ha-ap-pu-ut-rî}).

\textbf{PIE} \textit{h2ep-u-}
See HW\(^2\) H: 255 for attestations. The word probably means something like ‘fence, railing(s)’ or more general ‘cage’ within a pen in which cows are gathered (cf. also Puhvel HED 3: 129f.). This makes it likely that \(^{KUS}\)hapuri-, which denotes a leather part of the harness of oxen, is derived from \(\text{hapus-}\). Tischler HEG 1: 167 proposes to connect \(\text{hapus-}\) with \(\text{hap-}\) ‘to join, to attach’ (q.v.), which is widely followed. This would mean that \(\text{hapus-}\) reflects *\(h\text{ep}-u\)-. Puhvel (l.c.) compares this *-stem with Lat. \(c\text{dyna-}\) ‘binding’ < *\(c\text{opula-}\). For the possibility that \(\text{hapus-}\) ‘secret’ is derived from this \(\text{hapus-}\), see there.

**\(\text{hapuri-}\)** (c.) ‘foreskin’; acc.sg. \(\text{ha-pu-ri-in}\).

See HW\(^2\) H: 256 for attestation and context. This word is generally connected with “\(\text{hapus-}\) ‘penis’” (cf. e.g. Puhvel HED 3: 131; Rieken 1999: 206), but this has now become impossible since “\(\text{hapus-}\)”, which in fact is \(\text{h\text{ep}ir\text{a}(\text{sh})-}\), does not denote ‘penis’, but ‘shin-bone’ (cf. Kloekhorst 2005a). This leaves \(\text{hapuri-}\) without any reliable IE etymology.

**\(\text{hapus-}\)**: see \(\text{h\text{ep}ir\text{a}(\text{sh})-}\)

\(\text{h\text{ep}ir\text{a}(\text{sh})-}\) (n.) ‘shaft (of an arrow or of reed); shin-bone’: nom.-acc.sg. [\(\text{ha-}\)\(\text{pu-}\text{u}\text{-}\text{s\text{\textbar}a}-\text{\textbar}k\text{\textbar}\text{n}\)] (KUB 9.4 i 13), gen.sg. \(\text{ha-a-pu-\text{u}\text{-}\text{s\textbar{a}}-a\text{\textbar}s}\) (KUB 9.4 i 31), dat.-loc.sg. \(\text{ha-a-pu-\text{u}\text{-}\text{s\textbar{a}}-a\text{\textbar}s}\) (KUB 9.4 i 13), dat.-loc.sg. \(\text{ha-pu-\text{-}\text{s\textbar{a}}-\text{s}\text{n}\text{\textbar}i}\) (KUB 9.34 ii 34), erg.sg. \(\text{ha-pu-\text{-}\text{s\textbar{a}}-a\text{\textbar}s\text{\textbar}a}\text{-}\text{an-za}\) (KUB 7.1 ii 35), erg.sg. [\(\text{ha-a-p}\text{\textbar{u}\text{-}\text{s\textbar{a}}-an-za}\) (KUB 9.4 i 30), nom.-acc.pl. \(\text{ha-pu-sa-a\text{\textbar}s}\) (KUB 7.1 ii 35), nom.-acc.pl. \(\text{ha-a-pu-sa-a\text{-}\text{s\textbar{a}}-\text{s\textbar{a}}}\) (KUB 17.8 iv 5), nom.-acc.sg.n. \(\text{ha-pu-\text{-}\text{s\textbar{e}}-e\text{-}\text{s\textbar{a}}-s\text{\textbar{a}}}\) (KUB 7.1 ii 16).

Derivatives: \(\text{hapus\text{\textbar{e}}\text{-}\text{s\textbar{a}}-}\) (n.) ‘(arrow)shaft’ (nom.-acc.sg. or pl. \(\text{ha-pu-\text{-}\text{s\textbar{e}}-e\text{-}\text{s\textbar{a}}-s\text{\textbar{a}}}\) (KUB 7.1 ii 16)).

This word, which usually is cited as \(\text{hapus-}\), on the one hand denotes ‘shaft (of an arrow and of reed)’, and on the other hand refers to a body part that occurs in a list of body parts in the Ritual of the Old Woman. According to Alp (1957: 25), in this latter context the word means ‘penis’, a view that is generally accepted. On the basis of the meaning ‘penis’, Watkins (1982b) proposes to connect it with Gr. \(\text{e}\text{\textbar{r}\text{a}m\text{\textbar{o}}\text{\textbar{e}}}\) ‘to wed, to have sexual intercourse’, reconstructing *\(h\text{up-}\)-. As I have argued in detail in Kloekhorst 2005a, the word in fact shows a stem \(\text{h\text{ep}ir\text{a}(\text{sh})-}\) and can hardly mean ‘penis’ because the list already contains a term for ‘penis’, namely \(\text{UZ\text{\textbar{U}}R}\). Since \(\text{h\text{ep}ir\text{a}(\text{sh})-}\) is mentioned between \(\text{h\text{up}par\text{\textbar{a}t}i\text{\textbar{i}j\text{a}}-}\) ‘pelvis’ and \(\text{ta\text{\textbar{k}u}(i)-}\) ‘thigh-bone(?)’ on the one hand and G\(\text{IR}\) ‘foot’ on the other, it is in
my view much more likely that it denotes ‘shin-bone’ (cf. the translation ‘Bein’ in HW² H: 259f.). The connection between ‘shin-bone’ and ‘shaft (of arrow or reed)’ lies in the notion ‘hollow pipe’. This new interpretation nullifies Watkins’ etymology. In my opinion, ḫāpušā(ṣṣ)- hardly can be of IE origin.


See HW² H: 258-9 for attestations and semantics. The verb denotes ‘to make up for, to bring after’ and is used in contexts where neglected festivals or rituals/offerings have to be made up and in contexts where objects (mostly food products used in rituals) have to be brought after. The one Luwian inflected form and the occasional use of gloss wedges show that it probably was Luwian, too. It should be noted that although most of the forms show a single spelled -p-, HW² cites some forms with geminate -pp- as well. The appurtenance of these forms is uncertain however. E.g. 3pl.pres.act. [h]a-ap-pu-uş-ṣa-an-zi (KUB 16.2 iv 11) is attested in such a broken context, that its meaning cannot be determined independently. The form ḫa-ap-pu-ṣa-an-da-āš (KBo 6.26 iii 48), which is duplicated by ḫa-pu-ṣa-an-da-aš (KUB 13.14 i 7), modifies TÜG ‘clothe’ in an enumeration of clothes. Although a meaning ‘brought after’ is possible, it is not self-evident. The verb.noun ḫa-ap-pu-ụš-ṣu-ya-ar is attested in the vocabulary KBo 8.10 + 29.9 i 5, where Hitt. MU²-aš ḫa-ap-pu-ụš-ṣu-ya-ar (cf. MSL 15: 91) glosses Akk. uz-zu-bu ‘vernachlässigt, verkommen’ (thus in AHW, note that this meaning fits the fact that MU²-aš ḫa-ap-pu-ụš-ṣu-ya-ar is found in a paragraph together with (4) ar-ḥa da-lu-mar ‘forsaking’, (6) [y]a-aš-tuš ‘sin’ and (7) [h]a-ra-tar ‘crime’). All in all, I conclude that all the forms that can be ascertained as belonging to this lemma on semantic grounds, show a single spelling -p-. Phonologically, we therefore have to interpret this verb as /Hbus-/.

Puhvel (HED 3: 133f.) translates this verb as ‘reclaim, resume, reschedule, make up for’, stating that “the base-meaning may be ‘reclaim’”. This assumption seems predominantly inspired by Puhvel’s proposal to etymologically connect ḫa-puš- with Gr. ἐπικρά ‘to call out to, to invoke, to summon’. In my view, the basic meaning is rather ‘to take care of something in arrear’, which does not easily fit the Greek semantics. Unfortunately, I have no convincing alternative etymology to offer.
*hāra-* 'eagle': see *hār-an-* (MUŠEN)

**hāra**\(^i\) / **harr-** (Ilaγ) 'to grind, to splinter up (wood), to crush (bread), (+ arba) to destroy; (midd.) to go to waste, to go bad': 3sg.pres.act. ʰaɾ-ra-i, 1pl.pres.act. ʰaɾ-ru-y-ṇi (KUB 23.77, 50 (MH/MS)), 3pl.pres.act. ʰaɾ-ra-an-zi, ʰaɾ-ra-giatanzi (KUB 46.22 i 6 (NS)); 3sg.pres.midd. ʰaɾ-ra-at-ta-rī, 3sg.pres.midd. ʰaɾ-ra-aτ-a; part. ʰaɾ-ra-an-t-, ʰaɾ-ra-a-an-t- (KUB 9.31 i 2 (MH/NS)); inf.I ʰaɾ-rə-yaaan-zi.

Derivatives: **harranu**\(^i\) (lb2) 'id.' (3sg.pres.act. ʰaɾ-ra-nu-ut; impf. ʰaɾ-ra-nu-ush-ken/a-), see *hārs*\(^i\).

Anat. cognates: CLuw. **harr-** 'to crush(?)' (3pl.pres.act. ʰaɾ-ra-an-ta (KBo 29.34 i 6)), **harrar**- 'grindstone' (abl.-instr. ʰaɾ-ra-a-tī); HLuw. **ARIHA hara**- 'to destroy' (3sg.pres.act. ʰaradi/ ʰaɾra/i-ri+i (TOPADA §34, BULGARMADEN §13), 3pl.imp.act. ʰarantu/ ʰaɾra/-[u-][u-] (TOPADA §38), ʰaɾ-ra/i-tu (BULGARMADEN §15)).

IE cognates: Gr. ἀκύο, Lat. ară, Olr. -air, OHG erien, Lith. ariū, ąrtī, OCS orja, orati 'to plough'.

PIE *ʰə̱ród-∅, ʰə̱rhw-∅ni ?

See HW\(^2\): H 263f. for attestations. There, a 3sg.pres.act.-form ʰaɾ-ra-ra-zi is mentioned as belonging to this verb, which in my view is rather to be interpreted as a noun (see *ʰaɾraɾaζi*- for its own lemma). The verb shows a stem ʰaɾra- besides ʰarr- (in inf.I ʰaɾraɾaṇzi and 1pl.pres.act. ʰaɾraɾaṇi (although this latter form is mentioned under the lemma ʰaɾ(k)-\(^i\) in HW\(^2\) H: 280)) which determines it as belonging to the tarn(a)-class. In NS texts we occasionally find forms that inflect according to the ʰаɾаe-class (ʰаɾа₃nzi, ʰаɾа₃nτ-). The tarn(a)-class consists of verbs with the structure *(Ce)CeH-*, and of verbs with the structure *(Ce)Ch₂*- (cf. § 2.2.2.2.d, where I have argued that the colouring of the 3sg.pres.act.-ending *-ei to *-ai due to the preceding *ʰ₂ɔ was responsible for these verbs’ transition into the tarn(a)-class: cf. also *iškalal- / iškal- ‘to split’, išпараα- / išparaα- ‘to trample’, mallaα- / malla- ‘to mill’, paddaα- / padd- ‘to dig’ and sarta- / šart- ‘to wipe, to rub’). Because the first structure is unlikely for ʰаɾraα- / ʰaɾr-, we rather have to assume the second: *HerH- (note that this structure explains geminate -rr- as well). Since in *Hо́rh-ei, *Hе́rh-∅ni the initial laryngeal stands in front of either *o or *r, and since in both these positions *ʰ₁ would drop, the only possible reconstruction is with *ʰ₂. Because *ʰ₂ was dropped in front of *o as well, but not in front of *r, we have to assume that *ɣ- is
restored throughout the paradigm on the basis of the weak stem *h₂ṛH- (cf. Kloekhorst fthc.c for the outcome of the initial laryngeals). The root-final laryngeal must be *h₁ or *h₂. So formally, ḫarr- / ḫarr- can only reflect a root *h₂ṛḥ₂-.

A connection with PIE *h₂ṛḥ₂- ‘to plough’ (Gr. ἄρῳ, Lat. arō, Lith. ėrti, etc. ‘to plough’) has been proposed by Goetze & Sturtevant (1938: 70), which would formally indeed work perfectly. The semantic side of this etymology is debatable, however. If one accepts this etymology, it has to be assumed that PIE *h₂ṛḥ₂-originally meant ‘to crush’, which developed into ‘to plough’ (from ‘to crush the soil’, cf. also at ḫarš- ‘to till the soil’ < *h₂ṛḥ₂-s-) only after the splitting off of the Anatolian branch.

Puhvel (HED 3: 136) alternatively suggests a borrowing from Akk. ḫarrûu ‘to grind’, but in my opinion, the inflection of ḫarr- / ḫarr- cannot easily be explained by this assumption.

**ḫarān-**<sup>(MUŠEN)</sup> (c.) ‘eagle’ (Sum. Ā<sup>MUŠEN</sup>, Akk. ERÛ, ARE): nom.sg. ḫa-a-ra-aš (OS, often), ḫa-ra-aš (rare), ḫa-ra-a-aš (1x, KBo 12.86, 7 (NS)), acc.sg. ḫa-a-ra-na-an (OS, often), ḫa-ra-na-an (OS, less often), ḫa-ra-na-a-an (KBo 13.86 obv. 16 (OH/NS)), ḫa-a-ra-an (KUB 30.34 iv 12 (MH/NS)), ḫa-ra-an (KUB 30.35 iv 4 (MH/NS)), KUB 58.99, 6 (NS)), ḫa-ra-a-an (KBo 39.239, 3 (MS?)), gen.sg. ḫa-a-ra-na-aš (often), ḫa-ra-na-aš, ḫar-ra-na-aš (KUB 20.54 + KBo 13.122 rev. 8 (OH/NS)), dat.-loc.sg. ḫa-a-ra-ni (KBo 12.77, 12 (MS), nom.pl. ḫa-a-ra-ni-š (KUB 33.62 ii 2 (OH/MS)), ḫa-a-ra-me-š-eš (KUB 50.1 ii 12 (MS)), ḫa-ra-a-ni-š (Bo 6472, 13 (undat.)), acc.pl. ḫa-a-ra-ni-e-[š] (KUB 41.33 obv. 12 (OH/NS)) ḫa-ra-ni-ja-aš (KUB 41.32 obv. 12 (OH/NS)).

Derivatives: ḫarānili (adv.) ‘in eagle-fashion’ (ḫa-a-ra-ni-li (OH/MS)).


PIE *h₂ēr-on-

See HW<sup>2</sup> H: 265f. for attestations. This word is attested with and without the determinative MUŠEN. Usually this determinative follows the word (ḫarān-<sup>MUŠEN</sup>) but it does occur preceding the word as well (<sup>MUŠEN</sup>ẖarān-, especially often in OS texts). The original paradigm must have been nom.sg. ḫāraš, acc.sg. ḫāranan, gen.sg. ḫāraša, dat.-loc.sg. ḫārani, nom.pl. ḫāraneš. These show that
the stem was ḥāran- (the -n- of which was regularly dropped in front of the nom.sg.-ending -s-, yielding ḥāraš). Only sporadically, we find spellings with a different plene vowel (ḥarāš once, ḥaranān once). In the younger texts we find a few times an acc.sg. ḥāran (also ḥaran, ḥarān), which show a secondary thematic stem ḥāra- on the basis of a false analysis of nom.sg. ḥāraš.

Already since Mudge (1931), this word is generally connected with Goth. ara ‘eagle’, Gr. ὄππος ‘bird’, etc. Although there has been some discussion on the exact reconstruction of these words (initial *h₂r̥ or *h₃r̥-), the non-apophonic o- in my view points to a root *h₃r̥- (cf. also Kloekhorst fhc.c). Note that Lith. erėlis ‘eagle’ must show Rozwadowski’s change from *arėlis (cf. Andersen 1996: 141; Derksen 2002). The Hittite forms go back to an n-stem *h₃r̥-on- (in Hittite, we see no traces of ablaut anymore), which must be compared to other n-stem forms like Gr. ὄππος ‘bird’ and Goth. nom.pl. arans.

The possible CLuw. cognate, ḥarran(i)- (cf. Starke 1990: 76) is treated under the lemma Hitt. ḥarrani-, q.v.

See Starke (1987: 265⁰) for the convincing identification of the Lycian dynastic name Xerēli as the word for ‘eagle’ on the basis of the fact that this dynasty on its coins depicts the goddess Athena together with an eagle instead of with an owl.

ḥarrani- (c.) an oracle-bird: nom.sg. ḥār-ra-ni-iš (NS), ḥār-ra-ni-i-iš (NS), ḥar-ra-ni-eš (NS), acc.sg. ḥār-ra-ni-in (NS), ḥar-ra-ni-i-in (NS), acc.pl. [ḥar-ra]-ni-i-us (NS).

Anat. cognates: CLuw. ḥarran(i)- (c.) a bird (acc.pl. ḥar-ra-ni-en-za).

PIE *h₃r̥-on-

See HW² H: 271-2 for attestations. All attestations are written with the sign ḤAR, which can be read ḥar as well as ḥur, which makes a reading ḥarran- equally possible. The word denotes an oracle-bird, but it cannot be determined which bird is meant exactly. Because this word is found in NS texts only, and because it is found in CLuwian as well, it is possible that the word is Luwian originally. Starke (1990: 76) suggests to interpret CLuw. ḥarran- as the Luwian cognate to Hitt. ḥāran- ‘eagle’ (q.v.), explaining -rr- by Čop’s Law. The connection would fit even better if we assume that, since ḥarrani- is a commune word, the -i- is due to the i-Motion and that the stem actually was ḥarran-. If this etymology is correct (and formally I see no hindrances, pace Melchert (1994a: 235) who believes that *h₂r̥C- did not participate in Čop’s Law because of the intermediate stage *h₀C-, without offering evidence for this assumption), then we must assume that the Luwian word was not used for the eagle itself, as we can see from contexts like
Behind the river we saw the eagle and the ḫarrani-bird GUN-an. Such contexts do indicate, however, that the ḫarrani- was an eagle-like bird, which in my view could support the etymology. See for further etymology at ḫāran-

(NA) ḫararazi- (n.) ‘(upper) millstone(?)’: nom.-acc.sg. ḫa-ra-ra-zi.

See Puhvel HED 3: 140 for a treatment of this word. It is attested twice only, in a similar context. Puhvel interprets the forms as a noun denoting ‘millstone’. HW² H: 263 interprets the words as verbal forms, however, regarding them as variants of ḫarra- / ḫarr- ‘to grind’ (q.v.). This latter interpretation seems improbable to me, and I therefore follow Puhvel. He proposes to etymologically connect ḫararazi with ḫarra-/harr-, but this is difficult because of the single -r- of ḫararazi vs. geminate -rr- in ḫarra-/harr-. Moreover, the formation of ḫararazi is quite intransparent. No further etymology.

-ḥha(ri), -ḥha(t)i (1sg.midd.-endings).

In the present, the ending of 1sg.midd. has three forms, namely -ḥha, -ḥhari and -ḥhāhari (a hypothetical **-ḥhaḫa is unattested as far as I know). The latter variant, which seems to be a staple form, is attested a few times only, exclusively in NS texts. Nevertheless, it must be rather old: on the one hand it shows a lenited -ḥ- in between two unaccentuated vowels (-ḥhāhari = /-Hahari/) whereas this lenition has become unproductive in the course of Hittite (so we would have expected -ḥḥahhari = /-HaHari/ if the ending were very recent); on the other hand it corresponds exactly to the Lycian 1sg.pret.midd.-ending ḫagā as attested in ḫagā ‘I became’ (note that here we find a lenited consonant as well: ḫagā < PAnat. *-/Haha/). Perhaps -ḥḥāḥa(ri) was a marked byform of -ḥḥa(ri), which was tolerated in the official language only after the Luwian language, where it must have existed as well (but where it is unattested, unfortunately), exercised more influence on Hittite.

The original distribution between -ḥha and -ḥhari must probably have been one similar to the distribution between 3sg.pres.midd. -a vs. -aři, namely *CēC-ḥa vs. *CC-ḥāri. In OS texts we already find pār-aš-ḥa besides pār-aš-ḥa-ri, however.

In the preterite, we find four endings: -ḥhati, -ḥhati, -ḥḥahati and -ḥḥahat. The latter two forms occur also in NS texts only, but must, just as -ḥḥahari, have been older as well. The fact that we find forms with and without final -i in my view is
best explained by assuming that the original endings were -ḥati and -ḥaḥati, the -i’s of which were eliminated because -i had become the main marker of the present tense. It must be noted that such a chronological distribution cannot be supported by the attestations of this ending, however (we find e-eš-ḥa-at and pa-iš-ga-ḥa-at in OS texts already, but cf. -a(r)i, -a ti(i) and -anta(r)i, -anta(ti)).

It is quite clear that all endings have the element -ḥhu in common. According to Kortlandt (1981), who elaborately treats the endings of 1sg.midd. in several IE languages, the Skt. secondary ending -i shows that the PIE ending was *-h₂. Because in Anatolian this ending would have been regularly lost in post-consonantal position (cf. mek ‘much’ < *meğh₂), I assume that it was restored with an additional vowel that yielded Hitt. -a and Lyc. -a.

**har(k)-** (Ia4) ‘to hold, to have, to keep’: 1sg.pres.act. ḥar-mi (OS), 2sg.pres.act. ḥar-ši (OS), ḥar-ṭi (MH/NS), 3sg.pres.act. ḥar-za (KBo 9.73 obv. 12 (OS)), ḥar-zi (OS), 1pl.pres.act. ḥar-ya-ni (OS), ḥar-ṭe-ni (MH/MS), ḥar-ye-ni (NS), 2pl.pres.act. ḥar-te-ni-i (OS), ḥar-te-ni (often), ḥar-te-ni (KUB 14.12 rev. 10 (NH)), 3pl.pres.act. ḥar-kan-zi (OS), 1sg.pret.act. ḥar-ku-un (OS), 2sg.pret.act. ḥar-ta, 3sg.pret.act. ḥar-ta, ḥar-da (KBo 18.54 obv. 9), 1pl.pret.act. ḥar-un (KUB 21.14, 9), 2pl.pret.act. ḥar-ṭe-en, ḥar-tén, 3pl.pret.act. ḥar-ke-er (MH/MS), ḥar-ker, 2sg.imp.act. ḥar-ak (MH/MS), 3sg.imp.act. ḥar-du (OS), ḥar-tu (KUB 31.81 obv. 3 (OS)), 2pl.imp.act. ḥar-ṭe-en, ḥar-tén, 3pl.imp.act. ḥar-kan-du (MH/MS); 2pl.imp.midd. ḥar-tüm-ma-ti (KBo 18.27 obv. 5 (NS)).


IE cognates: Lat. arcēre ‘to shut off, to enclose, to hold off’, Gr. ὀποθετ uber ‘to ward off, to protect’.

**PIE *h₂erk-**-ti, *h₂r₃k-enti

See HW² H: 280f. for attestations: note that no infinite forms of this verb are attested. HW² cites a 1pl.pres.act.-form ḥar-ru-ya-ni, which in my view does not necessarily mean ‘to hold’: KUB 23.77 (50) ʿu-e-ša ša-ma-a-aš-pat ḥar-ru-ya-ni, which I would rather translate ‘We will crush you’ (see under ḥarrar² / ḥarrar-).

When used independently, the verb denotes ‘to hold, to have, to keep’. When used together with a neuter participle it functions as an auxiliary verb, and the whole construction denotes ‘to have ...-ed’. This construction probably developed out of sentences where ḥar(k)-² was used together with the participle of transitive
verbs in order to denote ‘to hold something ...-ed’ (e.g. \(n=a-at\) kar-pa-an ḫar-zi ‘he holds it raised’ (KBo 12.126 i 5)). That this formation evolved into something comparable to periphrastic perfects known from many European languages, is visible in the use of ḫar(k)-\(^2\) with the participle of intransitive verbs, which is attested in OS texts already (e.g. pār-ša-na-a-an ḫar-zi ‘he has crouched’ (KBo 17.15 rev. 16 (OS))).

Already since Sturtevant (1930c: 215) this verb is generally connected with Lat. arceō ‘to hold in, to hold off’ and Gr. ἁρίσκω ‘to ward off’ and reconstructed as \(*h₂er'k'-\).

In Hittite, the verb shows two stems, namely ḫar- when followed by an ending starting in a consonant (including -\(y\)-) and ḫark- when followed by an ending starting in a vowel or when no ending at all is following (2sg.imp.act. ḫar-ak = ḫark\(l\)). This distribution reminds us of the distribution of e.g. li(n)k\(^2\) ‘to swear’ (\(l_iน\(\text{ī}ν\)- vs. lik\(C\)) or kū-\(\text{ā}ṭ\)-o ‘to become’ (kūš\(\text{ī}ν\)- vs. kiš\(C\)). It is remarkable that the semi-homophonous verb ḫark\(^2\) ‘to get lost’ never loses its -\(k\)-, however. Different explanations for this situation have been given. Cowgill apud Eichner (1975a: 89-90), followed by Oettinger (1979a: 190) claims that the loss of -\(k\)- is due to ‘weariness’ in an auxiliary verb. This seems unlikely to me as ḫar(k)- is used independently often enough to preclude any ‘weariness’. Puhvel (HED 3: 156) states that the distribution is “due to paradigmatic preconsonantal generalization of the loss of \(k\) in the normal assimilation of \(*kt\) to \(t\)”. The alleged sound law \(*kt > r\) has proven to be false, however (cf. Melchert 1994a: 156).

In my view, the difference between ḫar(k)-\(^2\) ‘to hold’ and ḫark\(^2\) ‘to get lost’ can only be explained by either assuming that in pre-Hittite times both verbs underwent a sound law by which \(*-K\)- was lost in consonant clusters \(*-RKC\)-, after which ḫark\(^2\) ‘to get lost’ analogically restored the \(*-K\)- by levelling, whereas ḫar(k)-\(^2\) ‘to hold’ did not, or by assuming that the (fortis) \(*k\) reflected in ḫar(k)-\(^2\) ‘to hold’ (\(*h₂er'k'\)-) behaved differently from the (lenis) \(*g\) reflected in ḫark\(^2\) ‘to get lost’ (\(*h₂erg\)\(-\)). When we would advocate the first possibility, we would expect that no consonant clusters -\(RK\(C\)\)- are found in Hittite, unless in cases where a scenario can be envisaged according to which the -\(k\)- is restored. In my view, ḫargnau- ‘palm, sole’, which I reconstruct as \(*h₂erg-nou\)-, precludes this: all forms within its paradigm have the cluster /-rgn-/, which shows that \(*-rgn\)- did not regularly lose its \(*g\)-. This would mean that only the second possibility remains, namely assuming that \(*RK\(C\)\) behaved differently from \(*R\(g\)\(\text{θ}\)\(C\), in the sense that \(*k\) disappeared, but \(*g\(\text{θ}\)\) did not. This could have a parallel in the difference in outcome between (lenis) \(*-d\(\text{θ}\)n\)- > Hitt. -\(m\)- and (fortis) \(*-m\)- > Hitt. -\(nn\)- (cf. Puhvel 1972: 112).
All in all, I conclude that ḫar(k)₃ shows that in a cluster *RkC the fortis *k regularly was dropped, whereas this was not the case with lenis *g. See tarna₁ / turn- ‘to let (go), to allow’, ištar(k)₂ and tar(k)u₂ for similar scenarios. The latter verb may show that the development of *-RkC- to Hitt. -RC- went through an intermediate stage *-RPC-.

The noun ḫaryant- ‘keeper, caretaker’, which is quite obviously derived from ħar(k)₂ (cf. Melchert 1994a: 164), is regarded by Puhvel (HED 3: 204-5) as cognate with Lith. šėri ‘to feed’, Gr. κοπέω ‘to clean’ < *kerh₁-, of which he supposes that *k yielded ǧ through assimilation similar to the one in ħaršar / ħaršn- ‘head’ which he derives from *kerh₂sr. See for the incorrectness of the latter etymology at its own lemma.
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IE cognates: OIr. ORJDLG 'to kill, to ravage, to devastate', FRQ RLJUL 'to smite', ?Arm. KUNQHP 'to smite, to smash'.

PIE *KOUJWL, *KOUJHQWL.

See HW²: 297f. for attestations. We find two stems, namely ḫark-² and ḫarkiye/-a². Although the latter stem is only sporadically attested, its oldest form is found in a MS text already. Only once, in a NH text, we find the stem ḫarkiye² according to the very productive ḫatrae-class. The derivatives ḫarm(n)k-² and ḫarknu-² are semantically identical, both having the causative meaning ‘to destroy, to ruin’. The stem ḫarm(n)k- is found in OS texts already, whereas ḫarknu- is only found from the times of Ḥattušili III onward (cf. Puhvel HED 3: 167).

Already since Cuny (1934: 205) this verb is connected with OIr. orgaid ‘to smite, to slay’ and Arm. harkanem ‘to smite, to smash’, which go back to *havg-. For ḫark-², this means that we have to reconstruct *havg-ti, *havg-enti. In the zero grade forms, *h should regularly disappear before resonant, but was restored on the basis of the full grade *havg- where *h is retained as Hitt. ʰ- in front of *e (cf. Kloekhorst fthc.c).

See at ḫar(k)-² ‘to hold, to have’ for an account for the difference between the paradigms of ḫark-² and ḫar(k)-².

Note that the form ḫar-ni-ku-un (KBo 2.5a ii 6) may not be linguistically real. On the same tablet we find the form ḫar-ni-in-ku-un multiple times (KBo 2.5 ii 6, 7, 8, 9 (KBo 2.5 and 2.5a are indirect joins)), all written at the beginning of a line, whereas ḫar-ni-ku-un is found on the end of its line, having the signs ku and un written over the edge. In my view, this indicates that in ḫar-ni-ku-un the sign in was omitted due to lack of space.

Harganau: see ḫarganau-
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Derivatives: 

- **hargna-²** (lb2) ‘to make white’ (3sg.pret.act. ḫar-ga-nu-ut; impf. ḫar-ga-nu-ūš-ke(a-)), **harkiēza-²** (lb2) ‘to become white’ (3sg.pres.act. ḫar-ki-i-eš-zi, ḫar-ki-eš-zi, ḫar-ki-iš-zi).


PIE *h₂(erg(erg)-e)-

See HW² H: 307f. for attestations. The word shows the normal adjectival *-i-stem inflection with ablaut (ḥarki-/*hargai-). The nom.-acc.pl.n. ḫarga is contracted from *hargaja. Since Kuryłowicz (1927: 101) this word is connected with Gr. ἀργύς, Skt. ṛjṛ- ‘white’, which points to a reconstruction *ḥr̥g-i-. This *i-stem is a Caland-variant of the -ro-stem *ḥṛg-ro- seen in Greek (ἀργύς < *ḥṛg̥ with dissimilation) and Sanskrit, and is still visible in the compounds ἀργύριον ‘white-toothed’ and ṛjīśvan- ‘with fast dogs’. Note that an *-i-less form is visible in the causative ḫargnu-² ‘to make white’.

Puhvel (HED 3: 171) suggests that the logographic spelling of ‘silver’, KUB.BABBAR-ant- could stand for *ḥarkan- (*ḥṛg-ent-) and in that way could be cognate with Skt. rajatám, Lat. argentum, YAv. arṣata- and Arm. arcat ‘silver’ that reflect *ḥṛg̥-nt-ē-.

See at ḫargna- for the possibility that this word is derived from Ḫarki-.

**harkiēza-²**: see Ḫark-²


PIE *h₂ér̥g-nō(u)(-s), *ḥṛg-nōu-m, *ḥṛg-nu-ōs

See HW² H: 303f. for attestations. Note that Puhvel (HED 3: 168) cites a nom.sg.c. ḫar-ga-na-ūš, which is based on KUB 9.34 ii (32) […x=kán ḫar-ga-na-ūš-a-…], where Puhvel reads [ḥargna]š=kăn. The only trace of the sign before kán is the lower part of a vertical wedge. As this text’s duplicate, KUB 9.34 i 15, has ḫar-ga-na-ū=kán ḫar-ga-na-ū-ī, and since the trace could fit ī as well, I would rather read [ḥar-ga-na]-ʔ=kăn. The only assured commune form is nom.pl.c. ḫar-ga-na-u-ī-š=a-at, which contrasts with nom.-acc.sg.n. ḫar-ga-na-ū.
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and erg.sg. ḥar-ga-na-u-ya-an-za that points to neuterness. See at ḥarnau- / ḥarnu- for a treatment of the original gender of diphthong-stems.

Weitenberg (1984: 223-4) provided ḥarganau- with a generally accepted etymology by connecting it with Gr. ὄρεξα ‘to stretch’ and reconstructing *hṛŋ-nou-. Many scholars regarded this etymology as key evidence for the view that initial *h₁ was retained in Hittite as ḥ-. As I have argued in detail in Kloekhorst fthc.c, it can be established that initial *h₁ is lost before resonants, and that therefore this etymology cannot be upheld anymore. As an alternative I offered a connection with ḥarki- / ḥargai- ‘white’ and subsequently reconstruct *h₂erg-nū. See at ḥarki- / ḥargai- ‘white’ for further etymology.

**ḥarna-² / ḥarn-** (Ia2 > Ic1) ‘to sprinkle, to drip (trans.), to pour’: 3sg.pres.act. ḥar-ni-e-ez-zi (VBoT 58 iv 24 (OH/NS)), ḥar-ni-ja-zi (KBo 10.45 ii 15 (MH/NS)), ḥar-ni-ja-iz-zi (KBo 22.125 ii 4 (NS)), 1pl.pres.act. ḥar-na-u-e-ni (StBoT 25.137 ii 17 (OS)), 3pl.pres.act. ḥar-na-an-zi (KBo 24.46 i 6 (NS), KUB 38.32 obv. 10 (NS)), ḥar-ni-ja-an-zi (KBo 31.121 obv. 2 (NS), KUB 9.15 iii 7, 15 (NS), KUB 15.12 iv 4 (NS)), KUB 25.24 ii 8 (NS), KUB 41.30 iii 9 (NS), 3sg.imp.act. ḥa-ar-ni-ja-ad-du (KUB 56.48 i 18 (NS)); verb noun ḥar-ni-e-eš-šar (IBoT 3.1, 29 (NS)), ḥar-ni-eš-šar (IBoT 3.1, 31, 31 (NS)), ḥar-na-i-šar (KUB 58.50 iii 8, 14 (OH/NS)), ḥar-na-a-i-šar (KUB 58.50 iii 11 (OH/NS)).


** PIE *h₂r-ne-h₂₁-ti, *h₂r-n-h₂₁-enti ??

See HW² H: 315 for attestations. Because the verb is almost consistently spelled with the sign ḤAR, which can be read ḥar as well as ħur, there has been some discussion on the question whether we should read ḥarnᵊ or ħurnᵊ. The one attestation ḥa-ar-ni-ja-ad-du solves this question in favour of the reading ḥarnᵊ (cf. Neu 1983: 55²⁶). Despite this unambiguous form, many scholars still cite this verb as ħurnᵊ (e.g. Puhvel HED 3: 402f.; Oettinger 1979a: 307f., etc.), also on the basis of the form ḥu-ur-nu-ur-ya-aš (KUB 39.6 obv. 14), which then is interpreted as gen.sg. of a verbal noun *ḥurnuwar of this verb. As Neu (I.c.) rightly points out, there is not a shred of evidence that this form refers to *‘sprinkling’*: [I-NA UD.1] KAM ḥu-ur-nu-ur-ya-aš ‘on the eleventh day of ḥ.’.
I therefore follow Neu to read this verb as ə̃harn̪ (see also HW² (l.c.) for this interpretation).

The verb is difficult to interpret formally. The oldest attestation, 1pl.pres.act. ə̃harn̪a (StBoT 25.137 ii 17 (OS)), shows a stem ə̃harna- (note however that I have doubts regarding the reliability of this text: cf. the fully aberrant 1pl.pres.act.-form iš-ə̃hu-ya-ya-a-ni (ibid. 18)). In NS texts, we find the stem ə̃harn̪i-a-, but also 3pl.pres.act. ə̃harn̪anzi that seems to point to a stem ə̃harn̪. This makes it likely that we are dealing with an original verb ə̃harn̪a² / ə̃harn̪, which in the course of time was altered to ə̃harn̪i-a² (cf. ə̃hul³- / ə̃hul² for a similar development). Note that Oettinger (1979a: 151) cites this verb as ə̃hurn̪, apparently interpreting the attestation ə̃harn̪-i-e-z-zi as ”net’i̇l, but this is incorrect: it must be /Hrniet’i̇l, as -nezi would have been spelled ə̃harn̪e-(e)-ez-zi.

A mi-inflecting stem ə̃harna² / ə̃harn̪ hardly can reflect anything else than a nasal infixed stem *h₂r-ne-h₂3-ti, *h₂r-n-h₂3-enti. Unfortunately, I know of no convincing cognate.

The verb ə̃harn̪u² is cited by e.g. Puhvel (l.c.) as ə̃hurn̪uayi-, but this is unnecessary: almost all forms point to a plain stem ə̃harn̪u-. The one attestation ə̃harn̪u-ù-i-e-z-zi is probably secondary (cf. e.g. umu² ‘to decorate’ that in NS times occasionally is altered to umuayae²). The fact that ə̃harna² / ə̃harn̪ and ə̃harn̪u² do not seem to differentiate in meaning can be explained by assuming that both suffixes (the n-infix and the mu-suffix) had a transitivizing function (in this case making the intransitive root *h₂rh₂3- ‘to drip (intr.), to flow’ into transitive ‘to sprinkle, to drip (trans.), to make flow > to pour’).

ə̃harna², ə̃harn̪i/-a² (Ic² / Ic¹) ‘to stir, to churn, to ferment, to agitate, to foment’: 1sg.pres.act. ə̃harn̪-na-mi (KBo 40.272, 6 (MS)), 3sg.pret.act. ə̃harn̪-ni-et (KBo 40.272, 9 (MS)), part. nom.-acc.sg.n. ə̃harn̪-ar-na-a-an (KUB 7.1 + KBo 3.8 i 27 (OH/NS)).

Derivatives: ə̃harn̪ammar (n.) ‘yeast, ferment’ (ə̃harn̪-ar-na-am-mar (OH/NS), ə̃harn̪am-mar (MH/NS), ə̃harn̪-ar-na-am-mar (MH/NS)), ə̃harn̪amn̪i/-a² (Ic¹) ‘to stir (up), to churn, to cause to ferment, to incite’ (2sg.pres.act. ə̃harn̪am-ni-ja-ši, 3sg.pres.act. ə̃harn̪am-ni-ja-zi, ə̃harn̪am-ni-ja-az-zi, ə̃harn̪am-ni-ez-zi, 2pl.pres.act. ə̃harn̪am-ni-ja-at-[e]-ni, 3sg.pret.act. ə̃harn̪am-ni[e]-et, ə̃harn̪am-ni-et, ə̃harn̪am-ni-ja-ar, part. ə̃harn̪am-ni-ja-an-t-; impf. [ə̃harn̪]am-ni-iš-ke/-a-, ə̃harn̪am-ma-ni-iš-ke/-a-, ə̃harn̪am-ni-eš-ke/-a), ə̃harn̪amn̪iаšha- (c.) ‘stir, commotion’ (nom.sg. ə̃harn̪am-ni-ja-aš-ə̃h-ar, acc.sg. ə̃harn̪am-ni-ja-aš-ə̃h-an (MH/MS)).
See HW⁶ H: 315f. for attestations and semantics. The only two finite forms, ḫarnami and ḫarniet, which are from the same context, show two different inflections: ḫarnami points to a stem ḫarnae⁻², whereas ḫarniet shows ḫarnije/a⁻². Nevertheless, the derivatives ḫarnammar and ḫarnamniye/a⁻² seem to point to a stem *ḫarna-, which would fit ḫarnae⁻² better. To my knowledge, there is no convincing etymology.

**Ḫarnū-/Ḫarnu-** (n. > c.) ‘birthing seat’: nom.sg.c. ḫar-na-a-uš (KBo 5.1 i 44 (MH/NS)), acc.sg.c. ḫar-na-ú-un (ABoT 17 ii 9 (NS)), ḫar-na-o-in (ABoT 17 ii 15 (NS)), nom.-acc.sg.n. ḫar-na-a-ú (KBo 5.1 i 7, 12, 26, 31 (MH/NS)), ḫar-na-a-ú-y=a (KBo 5.1 i 39 (MH/NS)), gen.sg. ḫar-nu-ya-aš (ABoT 21 obv. 15 (MS)), ḫar-na-ya-aš (KUB 26.66 iii 11 (NS)), ḫar-na-a-ya-aš (KUB 21.27 ii 17 (NH)), ḫar-na-a-u-aš (KUB 21.27 iv 36 (NH)), ḫar-na-a-u-ya-aš (Bo 7953 iii 11, iii 16, KBo 8.63 rev. 3 (NS), KUB 21.27 ii 16 (NH)), ḫar-na-ya-ú-aš (MH/NS), dat.-loc.sg. ḫar-na-a-ú-i (KUB 9.22 i 33, ii 2, 40 (MS), KBo 5.1 i 25 (MH/NS), KBo 27.67 rev. 1 (NS), KBo 21.45 i 5 (NS)), ḫar-nu-u-i (KBo 17.65 rev. 1 (MS)), [ḫar-n]u-u-i=as=za (KBo 17.65 obv. 2 (MS)), ḫar-na-ú-i (NS), ḫar-na-ú-[i] (NS).

Derivatives: ḫarnušši- (adj.) ‘of the birthing seat’ (dat.-loc.pl. ḫar-nu-ya-cašši-aš (KBo 17.65 obv. 49 (MS)).

PIE *ḥyér-nōu(-s), *ḥy-r-nōu-m, *ḥy-r-nu-ōs.

See HW² H: 321f. for attestations. In the oblique cases we find the stem ḫarnau- as well as ḫarnu-, which both are attested in MS texts already. On the basis of the derivative ḫarnušši- and because ḫarnau- is much easier explained through analogy than ḫarnu-, I assume that ḫarnu- is the original form of the oblique stem. This seems to point to an original hysterodynamic paradigm ḫarnau-/ḫarnu-.

It is not fully clear what the original gender of this word was: we find both commune (nom.sg.c. ḫarnuš and acc.sg.c. ḫarnaun) and neuter (nom.-acc.sg.n. ḫarnu) forms. On the basis of the fact that this word seems to have been hysterodynamically inflected originally, I assume that it must have been commune, having an inflection *CēC-nōu, *CC-nōu-m, *CC-nu-ōs. The fact that the nom.sg.-form was asigmatic originally (*ḫarnuš) was at a certain point in Hittite not tolerated anymore: either the form was sigmatized to ḫarnuš in order to specifically mark its communeness, or the form was reinterpreted as neuter (see Weitenberg 1995 for this phenomenon).
Weitenberg (1984: 266) compares the element ḫar- with Hitt. ḫardu- ‘descendant’ (q.v.) and MUNUS ḫaryant- ‘nurse’ (q.v.). Although the latter must be regarded as a derivative of ḫar(k)- (q.v.), the connection between ḫarnā- and ḫardu- is convincing. The word ḫardu- is compared by Weitenberg with Lat. ortus ‘rise, origin, birth’. These connections were elaborated by Offisch (1995: 22ff.), who connects the element ḫar- with PIE *h₂er- ‘to start to move (forth)’ and reconstructs ḫarnāu- as *h₂er-nō-. As I have argued in Kloeckhorst fthc.c, a reconstruction *h₂er-nō would be better in view of the fact that initial *h₂er- yielded Hitt. ar-, whereas *h₂er- > ḫar-.

**udiantes :** see ḫarna-² / ḫarn-
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IE cognates: Gr. ὀρφανός, Arm. orb ‘orphan’, Lat. orbus ‘bereft of’, OIr. orb(b) ‘heir, inheritance’, Goth. arbi ‘inheritance’.

PIE *h₁er₁b₃-to.

See HW² H: 329f. and Puhvel HED 3: 176f. for collections of forms, but see Melchert fthc.a for a semantic treatment. Melchert convincingly argues that the original meaning of this verb is ‘to separate oneself and (re)associate oneself elsewhere’ (i.e. ‘to change allegiance’ when used of persons). Often, the first element of this meaning is lost, resulting in ‘to join with, to take the side of’. The oldest attestations are middle, but from the MH period onwards, the active inflection is taking over. If the verb is used transitively, it means ‘to associate (someone) with’ or (+ anda) ‘to combine, to join together’. Out of this last meaning, the derivative harpa/i- ‘heap, pile’ is formed, which itself is the origin of the denominative verb harpae- ‘to heap up’. In the oldest texts, we only find the stem harp-., whereas harpie/a- is found in NH texts only (with active as well as middle endings). These latter two stems are occasionally (both once attested) used in the sense ‘to heap up’, which must be due to confusion of the stems harp-, harpie/a- and harpae- in younger times.

Melchert convincingly argues that we should follow the etymology of Polomé (1954: 159-60), who connected harp- with PIE *h₁er₁b₃-as found in Gr. ὀρφανός ‘orphan’, OIr. orb(b) ‘heir; inheritance’ etc. Melchert explains that the original meaning of *h₁er₁b₃- must have been ‘to change membership from one group/social class to another’. This meaning was also applicable when someone’s parents died, which resulted into a shift of meaning to, on the one hand, ‘orphan’ (Gr. ὀρφανός, Arm. orb ‘orphan’: in Latin, this meaning evolved further into orbus ‘bereft of’) and, on the other, ‘heir, inheritance’ (OIr. orb(b), Goth. arbi ‘inheritance’).

For Hittite, this means that we have to reconstruct an original middle *h₁er₁b₃-to, after which the stem harp- was brought into the active as well. Note that the bulk of the attestations are spelled with single -p-, but a few times we find -pp-. In the following context,

KUB 30.36 ii

(7) nu=mu-u=š-ša-an ša-mu-eš-š=a HUR.SAGMES ḥar-ap-te-en
(8) UM-MA HUR.SAGMES le-e=ta na-a-hi ū(<-i)>e-eš=ta
(9) ḥar-ap-pu-u-e-ni

‘May you, mountains, too, ally yourselves with me. The mountains speak: “Do not fear. We will ally ourselves with you”.’
we find ḫar-ap-pu-u-e-ni with geminate -pp-. In my view, this spelling is caused by the preceding ḫar-ap-te-en, on the basis of which the scribe wrote ḫar-ap-pu-u-e-ni instead of expected ḫar-pu-u-e-ni. The geminate in impf. ḫar-ap-pl[-iš-
kan-du] (KUB 31.86 iii 6) must be compared to the geminate spelling of etymological lenis stops in e.g. akkuške/-a- (impf. of eku̯² / aku̯- ‘to drink’), lakkiške/-a- (impf. of lag̣² / to make lay down’), etc. This leaves us with only two instances of ḫar-ap-pa-an-zi, both in NS texts, which in my view cannot be regarded as phonologically relevant (pace Melchert (1994a: 153) who argues for a development *-rD- > Hitt. -rt- (i.e. geminate spelling), but see at both istsar(k)-² and parkijé/-a², the two other alleged examples of this development, for alternative solutions).

ḥārš̱d (Ilb > Ic1) ‘to till (the soil)’: 3sg.pres.act. ḫar-aš-zi (OH/NS), ḫar-ši-
l[-e]-ez-zi (NS), 3pl.pres.act. ḫar-ši-ja-a[q]-n-[z]i (NS), 3sg.pres.act. ḫa-a-ar-aš-ta (MS); inf.I ḫar-su-ya-an-[z]i (NH); impf. ḫa-aš-ke/a- (OH/NS), ḫa-ši-iš-ke/a-
(NA), ḫa-ši-šē-ke/a- (NS).

Derivatives: (ASā) ḫaṛṣ̱yār / ḫaṛṣ̱aun- (n.) ‘tilled land’ (nom.-acc.sg. ḫaṛ-ša-u-
y-ar, ḫaṛ-ša-a-u-ar, dat.-loc.sg. ḫaṛ-ša-ú-n-[i] (175bw obv. 8), dat.-loc.pl. ḫaṛ-ša-
ú-na-[a][] (KBo 6.34 ii 39 (MH/NS)), see ḫarra² / ḫarr.-.

IE cognates: Gr. ḫpard, Lat. arō, OIr. -air, OHG erien, Lith. ariū, árti, OCS orji, orati ‘to plough’.

PIE *hāṟh₁-s-e₁ / *hāṟh₁-s-énti

See HW² ḫ: 340 for attestations. Because the forms that show a stem ḫaṛṣ̱yē/-a² are found in NS texts only, it is likely that these are of a secondary origin. This verb therefore is usually cited as ḫarš̱-². The oldest attestation, 3sg.pret.act. ḫa-a-
ar-aš-ta (MS) shows a peculiar plene spelling, however. Because none of the mi-
conjugated verbs of the structure CalRC² (class I4a) ever shows plene spelling
(except in the verb ārš̱² / arš- ‘to flow’, but here the spelling a-ar-aš is used to
indicate the full-grade stem /tarS/-, cf. its lemma), it is difficult to assume that
this verb belongs to this class originally. I therefore assume that it in fact was hi-
conjugated originally: ḫārš̱ (note that in verbal stems in -š the hi-ending
3sg.pret.act. -š already in OH times has been replaced by the corresponding mi-
ending -tta, e.g. ḫa-a-aš-ta ‘she bore’ (OS)). The absence of plene spelling in the
NH forms is then due to the development OH /āCCV/ > NH /āCCV/ as described
in § 1.4.9.3.
The verb denotes ‘to till (the soil)’ and is often connected with PIE *h₂ər₇h₂- ‘to plough’ (since Goetze & Strutvant 1938: 70), assuming that we are dealing with an s-extension. When h₉ṗs₁ was still regarded as a mi-conjugated verb ḫarṣ₇, this was formally impossible as a preform *h₂er₇h₂-s-ti should have yielded Hitt.

**ḫarr-ei/iṣzi (due to the sound law *VH₁sC > /VRRisCl, cf. damme/išḫā < *demḫ₂š₂h₂-, kallišta < *kelḫ₂st(o): § 1.4.4.3). With the establishment that ḫarṣ₇ must have been ḫi-conjugated originally, the formal side is better explicable. Although it is true that if we compare the expected preform *h₂óṛh₂-s-ei to the development of *h₂óṁh₁-s-ei to Hitt. ānši ‘he wipes’ (cf. ānš₇) we must assume that *h₂óṛh₂-s-ei would yield Hitt. **āṛši, it is in my view trivial that initial *h₂-s was restored on the basis of the zero-grade stem *h₂ṛh₂-s- where it was regularly retained as ḫ- (cf. ḫān² / ḫan- ‘to draw (water)’ < *h₂ōn- / ḫ₂n- for a similar restoration). Note that the expected outcome of the zero-grade stem, e.g. 3pl. **ḫare/iššanzë < *h₂ṛh₂-s-ënti, is thus far unattested and seems to have been fully supplanted by the strong stem ḫarṣ₇. The occurrence of the NS mi-conjugated form ḫar-aš-zi and the stem ḫaršīje/a- is completely parallel to the NS forms a-an-aš-zi and ānšje/a- in the paradigm of ānš₇- ‘to wipe’.

From the fact that ḫarṣ₇- sometimes occurs together with terepp² / teripp- ‘to plough’ (q.v.) in the pair ḫūṛṣ- ... terepp- ‘to till and plough’ it is clear that ḫarṣ₇ itself does not mean ‘to plough’, but rather ‘to till the soil, to crush the land’. With this meaning it nicely corresponds to the verb ḫarr₇- / ḫarr- ‘to crush’ that also goes back to the root *h₂er₇h₂-. On the basis of these verbs, we must conclude that the original meaning of *h₂er₇h₂- must not have been ‘to plough’, as is usually assumed on the basis of the non-Anatolian IE languages (Gr. ṑρῶξ, Lat. arū, Lith. ariū, ārti, etc. ‘to plough’), but rather ‘to crush’. Yet, the Hittite expression hūṛṣ- ... terepp- ‘to till and plough’ shows that also in Anatolian there are traces of the first steps of a semantical development from ‘to crush (the land)’ to ‘to plough’.

Pulvel (HED 3: 185) assumes that ḫarṣ₇- must be a loanword, stating that “the probable source of ḫar- is Akk. ḫaršu ‘plant’, or ḫaršu ‘dig a furrow’, or WSem. ḫarš₇- ‘plough’”, but e.g. HW² (1.c.) correctly rejects this view.

For the morphological interpretation of ḫarṣ₇a-r / ḫarṣ₇a-n, see at karṣ₇a-r / karṣ₇a-n.

** ḫarṣ₇ / ḫarš₇- (n.) ‘head; person; front; beginning’ (Sum. SAG[DU]): nom.-acc.sg. ḫa-ar-ša-ar (KUB 57.83, 7), gen.sg. ḫar-ąś-ša-na-aš, ḫar-ąś-na-aš, dat.-loc.sg. ḫar-ąś-ni (OS), ḫa-ar-ąś-ni, ḫar-ąś-ni-i, ḫar-ąś-an-ni (1x), all.sg. ḫar-ąś-
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Ša-na-a, abl. ʰar-ša-na-za, ʰar-ša-an-n[a-az], instr. ʰ[ar-š]a-an-da, ʰar-ša-an-ta, nom.-acc.pl. ʰar-ša-a-ar (OS), ʰar-ša-a-ar (OS).

IE cognates: Gr. ὄρος (n.) ‘mountain’, Skt. ṛṣvā- ‘high’.

PIE *ʰyrs-r, *ʰyrs-n-os

See HW² Η: 344f. for attestations. The paradigm has to be phonologically interpreted as /HárSnl/, /HrSnás/ (the zero grade in the first syllable of the oblique cases can be deduced from spellings like ʰar-ša-ní-i /HrSní/ and ʰar-aš-ša-na-a /HrSná/).

Already since the beginning of Hittitological studies, ʰaršar / ʰaršn- has been compared with Skt. śiras, śṛṣnas ‘head’ < *kṛḥṣ-s-r, *kṛṛh₂-s-n-ōs. Although the semantic side of this etymology is attractive, the formal side is far from. Not only does *k not regularly give Hitt. ḥ, a sequence *VRHsc should yield Hitt. /VRRsc/ (cf. demh₂sh₂-ō > damme/iššā). Peters’ scenario (1980: 230) in which *k̕...h₂ > *h₂...h₂ by assimilation, after which the second laryngeal was lost by dissimilation, is too complex to be believable. The argument that the paradigms of ʰaršar / ʰaršn- and *kṛṛh₂r / kṛṛh₂sn- are too similar to be unrelated is useless since -r/- BOTTOM-stems are rather common in Hittite.

Already Goetze (1937: 492) suggested another, attractive comparison, namely with Gr. ὄρος ‘mountain’, which reflects an s-stem of the root ‘high’, *ʰyrs-er-es-, of which also Skt. ṛṣvā- ‘high’ is derived. Criticism on this etymology (e.g. Puhvel HED 3: 190) was always directed to the fact that ‘high’ was derived from the root *ʰyrs-, which cannot explain Hitt. ḥ-. In my view, it nowadays has become much clearer that we have to distinguish a root *ʰyrs- ‘to come, to arrive < *to move horizontally’ and *ʰyrs- ‘to raise, to rise < *to move vertically’ (cf. Kloekhorst fhēc.c on the outcomes of different formations with *ʰyrs- in Hittite: ar-mi(n) ‘to stand’ < *ʰyrs-tro, araï- / ara ‘to raise’ < *ʰyrs-(o)ï- vs. ḫarnau- ‘birthchair’ < *ʰyrs-er-nou- and ḫardu- ‘descendant’ < *ʰyrs-(er-tu). In this case, we therefore can safely reconstruct *ʰyrs-s-r, *ʰyrs-s-n-ōs, which should regularly yield Hitt. /HárSr/ and /HrSná/ (with restoration of initial ḥ-). See at NIND, ḫarši- / ḫaršái- ‘thickbread’ for another derivative of the stem *ʰyrs-s-.

Note that Puhvel (HED 3: 1987) interprets the syntagm ᵈU ḫar-ša-an-na-aš as ‘Storm-god of the head’, on the basis of the sumerographical writing ḫU SAG.DU. HW² (H: 357) translates ‘Wettergod des Gewitterregens’, however, and assume that ḫaršanneš is the gen.sg. of a further unattested noun *ḫaršār, which they etymologically connect with ḫaršiḫarši ‘thunderstorm’. The almost consistent spelling with geminate -mn- in ḫaršannaš (although ᵈU ḫar-ša-na-aš is attested once), indeed is quite aberrant from the oblique stem of ḫaršar / ḫaršn-
(although spellings with geminate -mn- do occur a few times), but the sumerographic writing "U SAG.DU seems to speak in favour of Puhvel’s reading (HW^2 seems to regard this attestation as a scribal mistake where a scribe had to write "U ḫaršannaš, but thought of ḫaršanaš and subsequently wrote "U SAG.DU).

NINDA ḫarši/- ḫaršai- (c.) ‘thick-bread’ (Sum. NINDA.GUR,RA): nom.sg. ḫar-ši-iš (OS), acc.sg. ḫar-ši-in (OS), gen.sg. ḫar-ša-aš (MH/MS), ḫar-ši-ja-aš, ḫar-ši-aš, dat.-loc.sg. ḫar-ša-i (OS), ḫar-ša-a-i (KBo 30.158, 10 (MS)), ḫar-ši (OH/NS), ḫar-ša-ja (MH/NS), abl. ḫar-ša-ja-az (NS), ḫar-ši-ja-az (NS), instr. ḫar-ši-itt (SBo 4 (2064/e) rev. 3 (MS)), nom.pl. ḫar-ša-eš (OS), ḫar-ša-e-eš (OS), ḫar-ša-a-eš (MS?), ḫar-ša-a-e-eš (NS), acc.pl. NINDA ḫar-ša-uš (KBo 17.4 ii 17 (fr.) (OS), KUB 7.8+ ii 11 (NS)), ḫar-ša-uš (OH/MS), ḫar-ša-a-uš (MS), ḫar-ši-uš (OH/MS), dat.-loc.pl. ḫar-ša-aš (OH/MS), ḫar-ša-ja-aš, ḫar-ši-ja-aš.


PIE *h₁ers-i-, *h₁rs-ei-

See HW^2 H: 358ff. for attestations. This word shows an ablauting stem ḫarši/- ḫaršai- which is rare for proper nouns (but cf. ḫew- / ḫe(j)au- and yeši- / yešai- for similar cases). It probably indicates that we are dealing here with a substantivized adjective. The word is clearly the phonetic rendering of the sumerogram NINDA.GUR,RA that is usually translated ‘thick-bread’. The original meaning of this word in my view likely was not ‘thick’, however, but rather ‘high’ in the sense ‘risen’. I therefore would like to propose ḫarši- / ḫaršai- to the element ḫas- as visible in ḫaršar / ḫaršn- ‘head’ that must be connected with Gr. ḫροocc ‘mountain’, Skt. ṛṣvā- ‘high’ < *h₁ers-. This means that ḫarši- / ḫaršai- reflects an originally ablauting i-stem *h₁ers-i-, *h₁rs-ei-.
The homophonic noun DUG .HeaderText- ‘jar’ probably was named after its highness as well.

גנים/a-2: see הָרֵשָׁי

HeaderText- (n.) ‘thunderstorm; jar, pithos’ (Sum. HLH): nom.sg. HeaderText-HeaderText-HeaderText-HeaderText- (OS), gen.sg. HeaderText-HeaderText-HeaderText-HeaderText-HeaderText-. This noun denotes ‘thunderstorm’ as well as ‘jar, pithos’. On the basis of this latter meaning, HeaderText-HeaderText- clearly has to be regarded as a full-reduplication of the noun DUG HeaderText- ‘jar’ (see at (NINDA)HeaderText-/HeaderText-), although it must be remarked that DUG HeaderText- is a commune word whereas HeaderText-HeaderText- is neuter. The connection between ‘thunderstorm’ and ‘jar, pithos’ may lie in the perception of the sound of thunder as resembling the sound of clashing jars.


PIE *hrytko-

See HW2 H: 378f. for attestations. Although a meaning ‘bear’ for this word cannot be proven in the strictest sense of the word, the fact that it denotes a large predator and that its outer appearance resembles the other IE words for ‘bear’ so strikingly, can leave no doubt about this interpretation, which was first given in HW: 61.

Before the apruptcy of Hittite, the word for ‘bear’ was reconstructed *hrytko-, with the PIE ‘thorn’. This has now become unnecessary as Hitt.HeaderText-HeaderText-/HeaderText-HeaderText- clearly shows that we have to reconstruct *hrytko-. With the disappearance of other cases of PIE ‘thorn’ (e.g. *gōdem- ‘earth’ that now has to be reconstructed as *d̂eḡh-m, *d̂eḡh-m- on the basis of Hitt. i̲čkan (q.v.), I do not understand why some scholars still regard the ‘thorn’ as a basic PIE phoneme (cf. the superfluous discussion in Melchert 1994a: 64).
See HW^2 H: 379f. for attestations. This word has been connected by Weitenberg (1984: 235) with Lat. ortus ‘birth’, which would point to a reconstruction *hjer-tu- (cf. Kloekhorst fthc.c). Another Hittite word in which the root *hjer- is connected with ‘giving birth’ is ḫarnāu / ḫarma- ‘birthing seat’ (q.v.).

-ḫharu (1sg.imp.midd.-ending)

The 1sg.imp.midd.-ending -ḫharu is clearly based on the 1sg.pres.midd.-ending -ḫhari in which -i was replaced by the imperatival ‘suffix’ -u. See at -ḫḫa(r)i and -u for further etymology.

ḫaruṣa- (c.) ‘road, path’: abl.pl. ḫa-ru-ya-aš (KBo 24.45 rev. 23 (MS?)

Anat. cognates: CLuw. ḫaruṣa- (c.) ‘path’ (Sum. KASKAL; nom.sg. ḫa-ru-ya-aš, acc.sg. KASKAL-an, nom.pl. KASKAL^II^A-an-zi, acc.pl. KASKAL^II^A-ya-an-za), ḫaruṣa- ‘to send(?)’ (3pl.imp.act. ḫar-ya-an-du), ḫaruṣanna/- (c.) ‘little path’ (acc.pl. ḫa-r(u-ya-an-ni-in-za)), ḫaruṣannita/- ‘to send’ (3sg.imp.act. ḫar-ya-an-ni-it-ta); HLuw. ḫarwa(n)- (c.) ‘road’ (acc.sg.(?) VIA-wa/i-na /harwan/ (KARATEPE 1 §34, İVİRIZ fr. 3 line 2), VIA-na /harwan/ or /harwanat/ (KÖTÜRKALE §3); ḫarwant- (c.) ‘road’ (acc.pl. VIA-wa/i-ta-z/i) /harwantant/i/ (TELL TAYINAT 2 fr. 6), dat.-loc.pl. VIA-wa/i-ta-za /harwantant/ (TELL TAYINAT 2 fr.7)), ḫarwantahit- (n.) ‘wayfaring’ (abl.-instr. "VIA"ha+ra/i-wa/i-ta-hi-ta(i)-ti-i /harwantahitadi/ (KARKAMIŞ A15b §21)), ḫarwan- ‘to send’ (2sg.pres.act. /harwanis/ VIA-wa/i-ni-si (ASSUR letter d §10, f §26) 2(3?)sg.pret.act. /harwanita/ VIA-wa/i-ni-ta (ASSUR letter a §7), 3sg.pret.act. /harwanita/ VIA-wa/i-ni-ta (ASSUR letter a §7), 3pl.pret.act. /harwaninta/ VIA-wa/i-ni-ta (ASSUR letter f §27), 2sg.imp.act. /harwani/ VIA-wa/i-ni (ASSUR letter d §6, §7, §9, e §25), VIA-wa/i-ni (ASSUR letter a §11, §12, b §7, §10, e §8, §10, §11, d §8, e §23, §27, f §19, §23, g §40),VIA-wa/i-ni’ (ASSUR letter a §10, e §18, §28, g §31, §35, §36, §44, §47)).

See Puhvel HED 3: 203 for the attestation. The word is hapax in a Kizzuwatnean ritual, and therefore it is likely of Luwian origin, where indeed the word ḫaruṣa- is
the normal word for ‘road, path’ (whereas in Hittite the word for ‘road, path’ is
\textit{palša-} (q.v.)). Etymologically we could think of the roots \textit{*h₂er-} ‘to join’ (roads as joining elements) or the root \textit{*h₃er-} ‘high’.

\textit{haru(ya)nae-} (Ic2) ‘to get light, to dawn’: 3sg.pres.act. \textit{ḥa-ru-y-a-n-a-i-z-zi}, \textit{ḥa-a-ru-y-a-n-a-i-z-zi}, \textit{ḥa-ru-na-[z]}, \textit{ḥa-r-y-a-n-a-i-z-zi}.

See HW² H: 382 for attestations. The verb is always used without a subject and probably means ‘it gets light’ (just as \textit{lukkatta} ‘it dawns’ is used impersonally). Formally, it inflects according to the \textit{hatrae}-class, which means that it would be derived from a noun \textit{ḥaruh(ya)nae-}. Such a noun might be attested in KUB 8.9 (OH/NS) i (5) \textit{ṭāk-ku ḥa-ru-[n-][a-]*ITU-aš} [a-...*] ‘When the moon ...-s from \textit{ḥaryana}-. It is certainly not impossible that this \textit{ḥaryana} is the source of \textit{ḥaruh(ya)nae-}, but since the meaning of \textit{ḥaryana} itself cannot be determined, further etymologizing is difficult.

HW² (l.c.) assumes a connection with \textit{ḥaryu-} ‘road, path’, assuming that \textit{ḥaryu-} literally means ‘Sich-auf-den-Weg-machen’. Puhvel (HED 3: 204) proposes a connection with Skt. \textit{ravi-} and Arm. \textit{arew} ‘sun’ that must reflect \textit{*h₂re-i-}, assuming that \textit{ḥaruh(ya)nae-} reflects \textit{*h₂ry(o)no-}.


Derivatives: see \textit{ḥāššā-}.


PIE \textit{*h₂ēh₂s-}, \textit{*h₂ēh₁s-m}, \textit{*h₂h₁s-ōs}

See HW² H: 388f. for attestations and semantics. The basic meaning of the word is ‘ash(es), dust’, but since a mixture of ashes and oil could be used as soap as well, the word is also attested in the meaning ‘soap’ (\textit{pars pro toto}). On the basis of nom.sg. \textit{ḥāšš}, we must assume that this word originally was a root noun, which was thematicized to \textit{ḥāšša-} in MH times already.

The etymological interpretation of this word has been debated. In Hittite, the plene \textit{-a-} is attested often enough to secure the reading \textit{ḥāšš-}, the long \textit{-a-} of which corresponds to Skt. \textit{āśa-} ‘ash’. In Germanic, however, we encounter a short \textit{a-}, namely in OHG \textit{essa} ‘ash’ < \textit{*ēšiðn} and Olc. (Runic) \textit{arīna} ‘ash’. Schrijver
(1991: 53-4) therefore proposes to reconstruct a root *h₂es-, the reduplication *h₂e-h₂e- of which would explain the long ā. Since Hitt. ḫāšš- cannot reflect *h₂eh₂-, however, which should have yielded **ḥāhš- (cf. pahš- < *peh₂s-), this view cannot be correct. A preform *h₂eh₂- is impossible as well, because this would have yielded **ēr- in Latin. All in all, we should reconstruct a root noun *h₂eh₂-s-. This noun probably inflected *h₂ēh₂-s-s, *h₂ēh₂-s-m, *h₂ēh₂-s-ōs. In Hittite, the full-grade stem was generalized and later on thematicized, in Sanskrit the full-grade stem was thematicized, whereas in Germanic derivations were formed on the basis of the oblique stem *h₂ḥ₂-s- > ār-. In Hittite and Latin a derivative *h₂eh₂-s-ēh₂r- ‘that of the ashes’ yielded Hitt. ḫāššā- ‘heart’ and Lat. āra ‘altar’ (see at ḫāššā-).

A verbal stem *h₂eh₁-s- ‘to dry’ is visible in Lat. ārēre ‘to dry’ and TochAB ās- ‘to dry out’. Often it is claimed that Gr. ḫō ‘to dry’ belongs here as well and reflects *ās-d-ā, but as is stated under ḫār- / ḫat-, it is rather to be regarded as reflecting *h₂d-je/o-.

A further analysis of *h₂eh₂-s as *h₂eh₁-s on the basis of Pal. ḫā- ‘to be warm’, which then is thought to reflect *h₂eh₁- (thus in LIV²), is in my view far from assured.

ḫār-/ ḫašš- (IIa2) ‘to give birth (to), to beget, to procreate’: 3sg.pres.act. ḫa-aš-i (OS, often), ḫa-aš-i (x, MS), 3pl.pres.act. ḫa-aš-a-an-z (OH/MS), 1sg.pres.act. ḫa-aš-a-hu-un (OH/MS), ḫa-aš-un (x, NS), 3sg.pres.act. ḫa-a-aš-ta (OS), ḫa-aš-ta, 3pl.pres.act. ḫa-a-aš-e (NS), ḫa-aš-i (NH), 3sg.imp.act. ḫa-aš (MH/NS), ḫa-aš-du (OH/NS); part. ḫa-aš-a-an-t-, ḫa-aš-a-an-t-; impf. ḫa-aš-ke/a- (OH/MS).


Anat. cognates: HLuw. has- ‘to beget’ (3pl.imp.act. hasantu/ na-sā-‘tu’ (KARATEPE 1 §56 Hu.), ha-sa-tū (KARATEPE 1 §56 Ho.), hasu- ‘family’ (dat.-loc.sg.(?) ha-su-‘) (KARATEPE 1 §15)).
See HW² H: 391f. for attestations. The word shows two stems, namely ḫāš- in the strong stem forms and ḫašš- in the weak stem forms. The etymology of this verb cannot be described without referring to its Hittite cognates ḫan☑āša- ‘offspring’, ḫāša- ‘descendant’ and ḫaššu- ‘king’ (for the semantic relation between ‘to procreate’ and ‘king’ see at ḫaššu-). The word ḫaššu- has a direct counterpart in ON ḥass ‘god’ < *ḫeNsu- and Skt. āsura- ‘godlike, powerful’, Av. ahu-, ahura- ‘god, lord’ < *h2Nsu-(ro-). The words ḫan☑āša- ‘offspring’ and ḫāša- ‘descendant’ are related to, among others, CLuw. ḫamsa/i- and HLuw. ḫamsa/i- ‘grandchild’. These latter forms, together with ON ḥass < *ḫeNsu-, point to a stem *h2ems-, which must be used as the basis of all these words. Nevertheless, it is not easy to determine the exact preforms of all the related forms.

As a  hi-verb, we would expect that ḫāši / ḫašzanzi reflects *h2ōms-ei / *h2ems-énti, with the o/O-grade as described in § 2.2.2.e. The long -ā- of ḫāša- ‘descendant’ seems to reflect an *ó, especially if we compare the consistently non-plene spelled adjective daššu- / daššay- ‘heavy, important’ that reflects *dens-(e)u-. Because *m- assimilates to *s- in *VmsV, the form ḫan☑āša- ‘offspring’ hardly can reflect anything else than *h2mso- (likewise Rieken 1999: 233). To sum up, we would at first sight reconstruct these words as follows:


Although the outcomes of *h2emsV > ḫaššV and h2ōmsC > ḫāšC seem certain, the other forms cannot all be phonetically regular: *h2ōmsV cannot yield both ḫāššV and ḫāšV; *h2msV cannot yield both ḫanV and ḫaššV.

In the case of *h2msV, it is in my view quite probable that the phonetically regular outcome is ḫanV. Because ḫašzanzi ‘they procreate’ is part of a verbal paradigm, it is easily understandable how the phonetic outcome of *h2msénti > *ḥanzanzi has been secondarily altered to ḫašzanzi under the influence of the full grade stem *h2ōmsC > /HāSC-/. Moreover, we could even assume that already in pre-Hittite times the full grade stem of the singular was taken over into the plural and that ḫašzanzi directly reflects *h2ems-énti.
The case of *h₂ômsV is less clear. On the one hand, one could state that the lenition visible in ḥāši ‘(s)he procreated’ is analogical to the type aki / akkanzi, iššapi / išttrappanzi, where *ó regularly lenited the following stop. This then would mean that *h₂ômsV regularly yielded ḥāššV showing that *-ms- > -ṣṣ- was not lenited by a preceding *ó. On the other hand, there is a possibility that ḥāšša- ‘descendant’ was not a thematic noun originally. The close cognate ḥanzāšša- ‘offspring’ < *ḥymštōsjo- shows a zero-grade stem, which is probably also visible in Luw. ḥamsa/i- (cf. below). This could point to an ablauting root noun. Normally, however, such a root noun would inflect *h₂ôms-s, *h₂ôms-m, *h₂ms-ôs, which does not make it easy to explain the o-grade visible in ḥāšša-. A possibility remains in assuming that this -ó- was taken over from the verb, and then we could perhaps assume that ḥāši < *h₂ómsei does show the regular development, and that *-ms- > -ṣṣ- did get lenited by a preceding *ó.

Note that an initial *h₂- would regularly drop in front of *o (so *h₂o- > Hitt. a-, cf. Kloekhorst 196c), but in these cases we can easily assume secondary restoration of *h₂- on the basis of forms with *h₂ôms- and *h₂ms-, where initial *h₂- regularly yielded Hitt. ʰ-.

A similar problem exists in the Luwian material. Here we find hams- (CLuw. ḥamša/i-, HLuw. hamsa/i- ‘grandchild’, CLuw. ḥamšukkalai/i-, HLuw. ḥamskʷala/i- ‘great-grandchild’) vs. has- (HLuw. ḥasantu/i ‘they must beget’ and hasu- ‘family’). On the basis of the Hittite development *h₂msV > ḥanzV, it seems likely to me that Luw. hams- reflects *h₂ôms-, whereas has- reflects *h₂w/ôms-. That is why I would reconstruct hamsa/i- ‘grandchild’ as *h₂ôms-o- and has- ‘to beget’ and hasu- ‘family’ as h₂ôms-o- and *h₂ôms-u- respectively. Note that CLuw. ammašša/i- ‘to wipe’ reflects *h₂ômhs- in which *-h₂- prevented assimilation of -ôs- to -ṣṣ-.

All in all, I assume that ḥāši / ḥaššanzi in one way or another goes back to *h₂ôms-ei / *h₂ôms-énti. It is unclear whether the form gen.sg. ḥa-an-ša-an-na-aš (HT 6 i 17 (NS)) is just a scribal error for ḥa-aš-ša-an-na-aš, or really reflects a trace of the original nasalization from *h₂ôms-. Because of its very late attestation the latter possibility hardly seems viable (cf. also Kimball 1999: 332).

ḥāš- / ḥašš- / ḥūš- / ḥēšš- ‘to open’ (Akk. PETŮ): 3sg.pres.act. ḥa-aš (KBo 13/35 iii 6 (OH/NS), KUB 7.41 obv. 4 (MH/NS)), ḥa-aš-zi (IBoT 3.148 iii 13 (MH/NS)), ḥe-e-esz-zi (KBo 17.94 iii 23 (NS)), 1pl.pres.act. ḥa-aš-šu-e-ni (KBo 19.156 obv. 9 (OS)), ḥa-aš-šu-u-e-ni (KBo 25.139 + KUB 35.164 rev. 1 (OS)), ḥe-e-shu-u-e-ni (KUB 50.6 + 16.41+ iii 44 (NH)), 3pl.pres.act. ḥa-aš-ša-an-zi (KBo 20.10 i 1, KBo 20.23 obv. 5 (OS), KUB 2.6 iii 21 (OH/NS), KUB 2.13 i 2
See HW² H: 394f. for attestations. There, a form impf.1sg.pres.act. ʰěši-ke-e-mi (KBo 17.3, 10) is cited, but this form does not exist. The editors probably have misread the form ʰěši-ke-e-mi = da-aš-ke-e-mi (KBo 17.3 iv 10).

This verb shows a wild variety of forms and stems. In OS texts, we find the forms ʰaššu(u)jeni, ʰaššanzi and ʰaššer. On the basis of these forms, one would conclude that we are dealing with a verb that shows a strong stem ʰašš- and a weak stem ʰašš-. In MS texts, we find the forms ʰaššanzi, ʰašša and ʰašš, which seem to point to an ablauting paradigm ʰašš- - ʰašš-. In NS texts, we find, besides the stems ʰašš-, ʰašš- and ʰašš- also forms with a stem ʰešš-. At this moment, it is impossible to determine what the original inflection was. In my view, it looks like we are dealing with a ʰi-inflecting verb ʰašš- / ʰašš- (which is homophonous to ʰašš- / ʰašš- 'to give birth to'), which was crossed with a (mi-inflecting?) stem ʰešš-. In NH times, almost only forms with the stem ʰešš- are found, on the basis of
which an analogical stem *hešt- was made. Whereas *hās-/*haš- in principle could be of IE origin, the stem *हेि- shows an e besides ḫ, which is difficult to explain from an IE perspective (unless we assume an i-diphthong, but in front of *s, such a diphthong would not have monophthongized to -े). Unfortunately, we have no convincing cognates for *हेि-/*haš- either. Formally, it should reflect *h2es- or *h2esNs-.

Within Hittite, one could think of a connection with *chestra- ‘gate’ (Oettinger, p.c.) if we assume that in *chestra- an initial laryngeal (*h2) was lost in front of *o (for which see Kloekhorst fthc.c), which was retained in *हेि-/*haš-.


IE cognates: OLat. ḫaša, Lat. āra, Osc. AASAI ‘altar’.

PIE *h2esh-eh2-

See Puhvel HED 3: 221f. for attestations. Already since Pedersen (1938: 27, 164) this word has been connected with OLat. āša, Lat. āra ‘altar’, Osc. AASAI ‘altar’. The long ā- in Latin points to *h2eH-. The second laryngeal hardly can be *h1, because we then would expect *ā- in Hittite. A preform *h2es- would have yielded **ḥaš- (cf. paḥ- < *pehš-). So Hitt. ḫašša- – OLat. āša can only reflect *h2es-eh2-. It is likely that *ḥašša- is a derivative of *ḥašš- ‘ashes’ (q.v.), which would mean that *h2es-eh2- is to be analysed as *h2es-es-es-eh2-

In PIE, *h2-es stems originally showed ablaut:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.sg.</td>
<td>*h2éh₁s-h₂</td>
<td>‘woman’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.sg.</td>
<td>*h2éh₁s-h₂-</td>
<td>*gʾ́n-h₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.sg.</td>
<td>*h2éh₁s-eh₂-</td>
<td>*gʾ́n-eh₂-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is quite likely that the paradigm of ‘hearth’ was secondarily altered to *h2éh₁s-eh₂-(*-s), *h2éh₁s-eh₂-(*-m), *h2es-eh₂-(*-o) s. On the basis of Hitt. ēša ‘seats himself’ < *h₁éh₁s-o, we can conclude that a sequence *-éh₁sV- yields Hitt. -ēšV-. We therefore must conclude that the geminate -śś- in ḫašša- is the regular outcome of
*ohša*V- and that the originally alternating paradigm of ‘hearth’, *hāšas, *hāšām, *hassās, has been normalized to hāšša-.

hāšša- (c.) ‘descendant’: nom.sg. ḫa-aš-ša-aš (NH), dat.-loc.sg. ḫa-aš-ši (1x, NH), ḫa-aš-ši-i (1x, NH), all.sg. ḫa-aš-ša (OH/MS), ḫa-aš-ša (NS), instr. ḫa-aš-še-et (1x, NS), nom.pl. ḫa-aš-še-eš (OS), ḫa-aš-še-eš (OH/NS), acc.pl. ḫa-aš-šu-uš (OH/MS), ḫa-aš-šu-uš (NH), dat.-loc.pl. ḫa-aš-ša-aš (OS).


PIE *hēms-o-

See Puvel HED 3: 224f. for attestations. The word predominantly occurs in the syntagm hāšša- ḫarzāša- that denotes ‘further offspring’ as e.g. in KUB 29.1 iv (2) nu DUMU.NITAMEŠ DUMU.MUNUSMEŠ ḫa-aš-e-eš ḫa-an-za-aš-e-eš ma-ak-ke-eš-ša-an-du ‘May the sons, daughters and further offspring become numerous!’ When used in the all.sg., this expression has an adverbial feeling to it and must be translated ‘down all generations’, compare e.g. KUB 21.1 i (70) ƙat-ta=ma am-me-el DUMU=IA DUMU.DUMU=IA ḫa-aš-ša ḫa-an-za-aš-ša pa-ah-ši ‘You must protect my son (acc.) and grandson (acc.) down all generations’. The word ḫāšša- is used separately only once, in KUB 21.27 iii (43) ƙi-in-tu-ḫi-
i-š ŠA ʿIM (44) UTU URU PÚ-na = ʾa-aš-ši-ja-an-za ḥa-aš-ša-aš ‘My Lady Zintuh, beloved descendant of the Storm-god and the Sun-goddess of Arinna, ...’.

Almost all the oldest attestations of this word (MS and OS) show plene spelling ḥa-aš-ša, whereas the spelling ḥa-aš-sa is predominantly found in NS texts. The plene spelling therefore must reflect the original situation.

The fact that ūqšša- and ūnqšša- are used as a pair is not coincidental in my view: they are etymologically related as well. The nasal in ūnqšša- must be compared to the nasal found in Luw. hamsa/i- ‘grandchild’. Within Hittite, ūqšša- and ūnqšša- obviously belong with the verb ḥašš- / ḥaš- ‘to procreate’ and therefore also with ḥaššu- ‘king’. As I have shown in detail under the lemma of ḥašš- / ḥaš- all these words go back to a root *h₂ems-. In the case of ḥašša-, we would at first sight think that it reflects *h₂óms-o-. If, however, ūqšši ‘(she) procreates’ regularly reflects *h₂óms-ṣi, it would show that the expected outcome of *h₂óms-o- would have been **h₂šša-. Moreover, since ūnqšša- must reflect *h₂ms-ṣo- and Luw. hamsa/i- probably goes back to *h₂ms-o-, it is in my view more likely that this word originally was a root noun *h₂em-s-s, *h₂em-s-m, *h₂ms-ṣ, which was later on thematicized: in Hittite, the full grade stem was used, whereas in Luw. hamsa/i- we find the zero-grade stem. This scenario implies that the *ḥ as visible in ūqšša- has been secondarily taken over from the verb ḥašš- / ḥaš-, however.

ḥaššik- (lb1) ‘to satiate oneself, to be satiated’: 3sg.pres.act. ḥa-aš-ši-ik-zl (KBo 13.94, 3 (OH/NS), KBo 41.17, 5 (NS)), ḥa-aš-ši-ṣe-ek-zl (Bo 4491, 4 (NS)), 3sg.pret.act. ḥa-aš-ši-ka-t (KBo 12.3 i 11 (OH/NS)), 3pl.pret.act. ḥa-aš-ši-ik-ke-er (KUB 17.10 i 20 (OH/MS)), 1sg.imp.act. ḥa-aš-ši-ik-lu (KUB 24.5 + 9.13 rev. 1 (NS), ḥa-aš-ši-ig-gal-lu (KUB 36.93 rev. 6 (NS)), ḥa-aš-ši-ig-gal-lu (KUB 15.14, 4 (NS)), 2sg.imp.act. ḥa-aš-ši-ik (KUB 33.87+ i 7 (NS)), 3sg.imp.act. ḥa-aš-ši-ik-du (KBo 15.10+ i 37 (OH/MS), KBo 4.1+ obv. 13, 18 (NS), 2pl.imp.act. ḥa-aš-ši-ik-ḥe (KUB 9.26 rev. 7 (NS)), ḥa-aš-ši-ik-[e-en] (KBo 22.142 i 6 (NS)), 3pl.imp.act. ḥa-aš-ši-ka-ndu (KBo 15.10+ iii 38 (OH/MS)).


See HW² ḫ: 421f. for attestations and semantic treatment. All spellings seem to point to a phonological interpretation /haŠk/. Such a verbal root is formally quite aberrant and can hardly reflect anything Indo-European. On the basis of the Palaic verb ḫaš- ‘to be satiated of drinking’ (3pl.pres.act. ḫašanti, ḫašāniti), one could assume that ḫašišākī describes some verbal extension, but this is formally difficult as well. Puhvel (I.c.) proposes a connection with Gr. ḫWHO ‘to satiate (oneself)’, aor.inf. ḫOGR. Lat. satis, Lith. sótis, which he reconstructs as *h₂es-. These words rather reflect *sēh₂- and etymologically belong with Hitt. šēh₂-(q.v.). All in all, ḫašišākī remains without a credible etymology. To what extent the homophonic fruit (tree) (GIS) ḫašišāk(a)- is cognate, is unclear.


PIE *h₂ěsthy₁-ōi, *h₂ěsthy₁-i-

See HW² ḫ: 425f. for attestations. This word shows a diphthong-stem inflection, on which see Weitenberg 1979. Within IE, we find the clear cognates Skt. āsthī, Gr. ὀξέον and Lat. os ‘bone’. Especially the neuter root noun Lat. os, in which
we would expect e-grade, shows that we are dealing with an initial *h₁-. On the basis of the aspirated stop in Skt. asth-, we seem to be dealing with a root *h₁estH-. The colour of the second laryngeal is determined as *h₁ on the basis of Gr. ὀὔτεν < *h₁est₁-i-ei-. Note that this latter form closely resembles Hitt. ḫaštūi that reflects *h₁est₁-i-ūi.

The derivative ḫaštɪlija(a)- and ḫaštɪlijatar are derived from the weak stem ḫaštī-. Note that the two forms that are spelled ḫa-aš-te- probably show the NH mixing up of the signs TE and TI (cf. Melchert 1984a: 137). The derivative ḫaštalijatar and ḫaštalēšš₂ probably reflect *ḫaštāja-. For a treatment of Ḫ叠ḫaštāti 'double-bone' < *ḫuṣom *h₁est₁-ih₁, see there.

In CLuwian, we find the stem ḫāš-, without -t-. We therefore must assume that here the original root noun *h₁ēst₁ yielded ḫāš (with regular loss of word-final -th₁, compare also Lat. os < *h₁est₁, cf. Schrijver 1991: 50). This ḫāš then was generalized throughout the paradigm, yielding e.g. abl.-instr. ḫāšati).

**hašter(a)-** (c.) 'star' (Sum. MUL, Akk. KAKKABU): nom.sg. ḫa-aš-te-er-za (NS), MUL-aš, dat.-loc.sg. MUL-i, nom.pl. MUL₃₂-aš (OS), acc.pl. MUL₃₂-aš, gen.pl. MUL₃₂-aš, dat.-loc.pl. MUL₃₂-aš.


IE cognates: Gr. ἀστερός, Arm. ast, Skt. stār-, Lat. stella 'star', Goth. stairo 'star'.

**PIE *h₁ster-**

The sumerogram MUL 'star' shows phonetic complements that point to an a-stem (nom.sg. MUL-aš). The only attested phonetic rendering of the word for 'star', which is found in a vocabulary (KBo 26.34 iv 9) where Akk. kā-aq-qa-bu 'star' is glossed by Hitt. ḫa-aš-te-er-za, seems to point to a consonant stem ḫašter-, however. This phonetic writing is supported by the place-name Ḫ叠Hašter(a)-, (but its attestations do not enable us to decide whether this is a consonant- or an a-stem), which is to be equated with Ḫ叠MUL (cf. Puhvel HED 3: 238). Although the nom.sg.-form ḫašterza is found in a NS text, it is likely that it is a more original form, whereas the a-stem forms are secondarily created on the basis of acc.sg. *hašteran, gen.sg. *hašteraš, dat.-loc.sg. *hašteri etc.

The etymological connection to Gr. ἀστερός etc. 'star' was first suggested by Forrer apud Feist (1939: 448) and is generally accepted. The exact interpretation of the word has been subject of some debate. For instance, Puhvel (l.c.) argues in favour of an interpretation *h₁estar-, whereas Watkins (1974: 13-4) reconstructs
Therefore must be the reconstruction of the Hittite word as well. Further analysis of *hyster- as an agent noun in -er- of a root *yses- is not supported by any evidence: a root *hys- is further unattested. The likeliness that hašterza reflects *hystēr-s implies that it has to be phonologically interpreted as /Hstērt/.

hašduer- (n.) 'twig(s), brushwood': nom.-acc.sg. ha-aš-du-e-er, ha-aš-du-er, abl. ha-aš-du-er-ra-za.

PIE *h₂esth₁-gʷer-?

See HW² 438 for attestations. Usually, this word is translated 'twigs, brush(wood)' (cf. e.g. Puhvel HED 3: 239), but on the basis of VSNF 12.57 i (4) [(A-NA SI U)]Zo.KUR.RA=kān ha-aš-du-er te-pu ha-aš-ṣa-ṣa-an 'A little ḥ. scraped off of the horn of a mountain goat', HW² states that hašduer more likely had "eine Grundbedeutung des Zerkleinertens, Abgerissenenen". On the basis of this meaning, HW² suggests an etymological connection with Hitt. hašhašš- 'to scrape, to shave'. This is unconvincing, however: in the above context one could just as well translate 'A little twig, scraped off of the horn of a mountain goat'. Moreover, if hašduer- derives from hašhašš-, what kind of suffix would -duer-be?

Usually, hašduer- is connected with Gr. ἄγγος 'twig, branch', Arm. ast 'twig, branch' and Goth. asts 'branch', which seem to reflect *Hosd-o-. Although semantically this connection is convincing, formally we are still dealing with an unparalleled suffix -er-.

Prof. Lubotsky (p.c.) draws my attention to the following groups of words: Skt. ādga- 'knot, sprout (of bamboo)', MP 'ag 'twig', ModP azg 'twig' that seem to reflect *Hosdgʷ- and OIr. odb 'knot', MWe. odf 'knot' that go back to *osbo-< *Hosgʷ-o-. Taken together with Gr. ἄγγος, Arm. ast and Goth. asts 'branch' < *Hosdo-, we seem to be dealing with a preform *Hosdgʷ-o- (that has undergone metathesis to *Hosdgʷ-o- in Indo-Iranian). According to Lubotsky, it is attractive to assume that this word ultimately reflects a compound, of which it is likely that the first element goes back to *h₂esth₁- 'bone' (see at hašti / hašti- 'bone' for this reconstruction). If Hittite hašduer- belongs here as well, we should reconstruct the word as *h₂esth₁-gʷer-. If the second element *gʷer- is to be identified with *gʷer- 'summit, peak' (cf. Pokorny 1959: 477-8), the compound *h₂esth₁-gʷer- may have meant something like 'boney bulge' > 'knot', 'sprout' >
‘twig, branch’. The original association with bone may still be visible in the context cited above.

Although it must be admitted that the above account is quite speculative, it is certainly not less convincing than the old interpretation of ḫaššuer-, which saw it as a derivation in -yer-(of which no other examples in Hittite exist) of a stem *Hosd- which was further analysed as *Ho-sd- ‘(place where birds) sit down’ > ‘twig’.


PIE *h₂ems-u-
attested in the Kültepe-texts. Especially pairs like 

\[ ^{a} \text{Ni-ya-} \text{-} \text{šu} \text{-} \text{šu} \text{-} \text{šar} \] and 

\[ ^{a} \text{Hi-ši-ta-} \text{-} \text{šu} \text{-} \text{šu} \]

point to the opposition between male \( \text{haššu} \) and female *\( \text{haššuššara} \). To what extent the garden vegetable \( \text{haššuššarā} \) (\( \text{haššu-uš} \text{-} \text{ša-ra-a} \text{-} \text{a} \text{-} \text{a} \)) (KUB 7.1 i 21, KUB 24.47 iv 19), \( \text{haššu-uš} \text{-} \text{ša-ra-a} \) (KBo 13.248 i 5)) is identical to the word for ‘queen’ is unclear.

The consistent single spelling of the first -\( \text{s} \)- of \( \text{haššuššarā} \) is not particularly positive for its equation with *\( \text{haššuššara} \).

Sommer (1920: 9-10) convincingly assumed that \( \text{haššu} \) is derived from \( \text{ḥāšš} \) / \( \text{ḥašš} \) ‘to give birth (to), to beget, to procreate’, which has a semantical parallel in the Germanic word for ‘king’, *\( \text{kuninga} \) that is derived from the PIE root *\( \text{ǵenhu} \) ‘to give birth to’. In outer-Anatolian languages, \( \text{ḥaššu} \) must be compared with Skt. \( \text{ásura} \) ‘godlike, powerful’, Av. \( \text{ahu-} \), \( \text{ahura-} \) ‘god’, lord’ and ON \( \text{āss} \) ‘god’. This latter word must reflect *\( \text{h₂Ns-u-} \), which determines the preform of Skt. \( \text{ásura} \) and Av. \( \text{ahu-} \) and \( \text{ahura-} \) as *\( \text{h₂Ns-u-(ro)} \). As I will show under the lemma of \( \text{ḥāšš} \) / \( \text{ḥašš} \), there is additional evidence that the root was *\( \text{h₂ems-} \) which makes it likely that \( \text{ḥaššu} \) reflects *\( \text{ḥ₂ems-u-} \).

\( \text{ḥāšš} \) / \( \text{ḥat} \) (Ila2) ‘to dry up, to become parched’: 3sg.pres.act. \( \text{ḥa-a-ti} \) (KUB 8.3 obv. 12 (OH/NS)), 3sg.pret.act. \( \text{ḥa-a-az-ta} \) (KUB 17.10 i 16, 17 (OH/MS)), \( \text{ḥa-az} \text{-} \text{za-aš-ta} \) (KUB 29.40 iv 20 (MH/MS)), \( \text{ḥa-za-aš-ta} \) (KUB 12.62 obv. 8, 9, rev. 2 (NS)), \( \text{ḥa-az} \text{-} \text{za-aš-ta} \) (KUB 12.62 obv. 17, rev. 1 (2x), 2 (NS)), 3pl.pret.act. \( \text{ḥa-a-te-er} \) (KUB 17.10 i 16, 17 (OH/MS)), 3sg.imp.act. \( \text{ḥa-a-du} \) (KUB 17.28 ii 44 (MH/NS)), \( \text{ḥa-az} \text{-} \text{za-du} \) (KUB 60.144, 6 (NS)); 3pl.pres.midd. \( \text{ḥa-a-da-an-to-rī} \) (KBo 10.7 iv 8 (OH/NS)); part. \( \text{ḥa-ta-an-t} \) (KUB 17.28 ii 43 (MH/NS)), \( \text{ḥa-da-an-t} \) (KUB 30.32 iv 7 (MS)), \( \text{ḥa-da-a-an-t} \) (KBo 23.44 i 11 (MH?/NS)), \( \text{ḥa-ta-an-t} \) (KBo 17.78 i 8 (MS), KUB 42.107 iii 8, 9 (NS), IBoT 2.93 obv. 12 (NS), KUB 29.46 i 14 (MH/MS), \( \text{ḥa-a-da-an-t} \) (KBo 21.33 i 12 (MH/MS), KUB 29.50 i 31 (MH/MS), KUB 27.16 iv 6 (NS), KUB 44.63 ii 12 (NS), IBoT 2.93 obv. 11 (NS)).

Derivatives: \( \text{ḥatāšš} \) (Ib2) ‘to become dry’ (3sg.pres.act. \( \text{ḥa-te-eš-zi} \) (KUB 45.58 iii 13 (MH/NS))), \( \text{ḥatnu} \) (Ib2) ‘to cause to dry up’ (3sg.pret.act. \( \text{ḥa-at-nu-u} \) (VBoT 58 i 8 (OH/NS)), \( \text{ḥa-da-nu-u} \) (KUB 33.89 + 36.21 iii 21 (NS))), see \( \text{ḥatantita} \).

IE cognates: Gr. *\( \text{ḵu} \) ‘to dry up’.

PIE *\( \text{h₂d-ē}, \text{h₂d-ēn̂ti} \)

See Puhvel HED 3: 247f. and Oettinger 1979a: 408 for attestations and semantics. This verb shows forms of both the \( \text{mi} \)- and the \( \text{hi} \)-conjugation. The first \( \text{ḥi}-\)
inflected form, 3sg.pres.act. ha-a-ti (KUB 8.3 obv. 12), is in dispute regarding its reading, however: KUB 8.3 obv. (12) [... k]a-a-aš-za kiša n=â'-ap ha-a-ti 'hunger will arise and it will become parched' could be read as [... k]a-a-aš-za kiša NA-KIŠIB ZÁHÂ 'hunger will arise (and) destruction of the seal' as well (cf. Oettinger l.c.). In principle, NA-KIŠIB ha-a-ti 'the seal will get dry' is possible as well, of course. The other hi-form, 3sg.imp.act. ha-a-du (KUB 17.28 ii 44), which in principle could alternatively be read ZÁH-du 'it must be destroyed', hardly can be anything else than 'to become parched':

KUB 17.29 ii

(43) ma-aš-ša-an ha-ta-an-za a-pé-el-l=a e-eš-ša-ri
(44) É=ZU QA-TAM-MA ha-a-du

'Just as the image of him as well has become parched (c. instead of n.), likewise his house must become parched'.

The form ha-a-ti is found in an OH/NS text, ha-a-du in an MH/NS text. Some of the mi-forms occur in MS texts already (e.g. 3sg.pres.act. hāxta (OH/MS), hāazzâšta (MH/MS)). At first sight this seems to point to a situation in which mi-inflection was original. Nevertheless, because of the fact that all mi-forms are 3sg.pret.act. (beside one 3sg.imp.act. hazzadu that is found in an NS text), and because it is known that hiverbs ending in -VT replace the 3sg.pret-ending -š with the mi-ending -ta quite early (cf. Oettinger l.c.), these forms cannot be used as a solid argument in favour of original mi-inflection.

Of more importance is the fact that we find a stem hāt- (hātti, hādu, hāxta) besides hat- (hâtan-), which points to an original ablauting pair hāt-/-hat-. Such an ablaut is typical for the hi-inflection. I therefore assume that this verb originally was ħi-inflected and showed a paradigm hāti, *hâtanzi. These forms can only reflect *h₂d⁰-ēi, *h₂d⁰-ēnti (cf. Oettinger 1979a: 409).

Puhev (l.c.) convincingly connects this verb with Gr. ἀχθον 'to dry up (trans.)', which he reconstructs as *h₂d-ē/o- (although *h₂d-ē/o- is possible as well).

**hātt** (IIIa > IIIg: lc1 > lb1 > IIa1γ) 'to pierce, to prick, to stab, to hit (a target), to engrave (a tablet)': 1sg.pres.midd. ha-ad-da-āḫ-ša-ri (KUB 17.28 i 6 (MH/NS)), 3sg.pres.midd. ha-at-ta-ra-ri (KBo 25.29 ii 4 (OS)), ha-at-ta (KUB 1.14 ii 11 (OH/NS), KUB 28.96, 14 (OH/NS), KUB 41.15 + 53.15 i 20, 22, 23 (NS)), ha-at-ta-ri (KBo 29.205, 11 (MS), KBo 11.14 iii 9 (OH/NS), 352/v, 4 (NS), KBo 25.30, 11 (NS)), ha-ad-da-ri (109/hu, 3 (NS)), 3pl.pres.midd. ha-at-
ta-an-ta (KBo 25.29 ii 6 (OS), KUB 58.14, 4, 6 (OH/NS), HT 1 i 36 (MH/NS)), 3sg.pret.midd. ha-at-ta-at (KBo 32.14 ii 20 (MH/MS)), ha-az-zi-ja-at-ta-at (KBo 13.111, 7 (NS)), [ha-a]z-zi-at-ta-at (KBo 13.111, 14 (NS)), 3pl.imp.midd. ha-at-ta-an-ta-ru (KBo 3.27, 9 (OH/NS)); 3sg.pres.act. ha-az-zi-ez-zi (KBo 3.34 ii 33, 34 (OH/NS)), ha-az-zi-zi (KBo 3.60 ii 14 (OH/NS)), ha-az-zi-az-zi (KUB 58.14 rev. 27 (NS)), ha-at-ta-i (KBo 11.17 ii 14 (NS), KUB 27.67 ii 48 (MH/NS)), ha-at-ta-a-i (KUB 5.12 rev. 2 (fr.), 4, 5 (fr.), 7 (fr.) (NS)), ha-ad-da-a-i (KBo 2.9 iv 17 (MH/NS)), ha-ad-da-a-i (KUB 10.63 i 20 (NS)), ha-at-zi (KUB 53.12 ii 24 (NS)), 3pl.pres.act. ha-at-ta-an-zi (ABoT 25 obv. 18 (MS), KBo 39.8 ii 32, 39 (MS), KUB 20.88 vi 7 (MS), KUB 2.13 ii 56, iii 6 (OH/NS), KUB 41.18 iii 4 (MH/NS), KUB 41.48 iv 19 (NS), KUB 9.31 iii 61 (NS), KUB 9.32 obv. 37 (NS)), ha-ad-da-an-zi (KUB 39.4 obv. 13 (OH/NS), KBo 2.3 i 43, 52 (MH/NS), KUB 55.45 ii 9 (MH/NS), KUB 9.2 i 9 (NS), KUB 29.4 iv 36 (NS), KUB 34.66 + 39.7 iii 5 (fr.) (NS), ha-at-ta-a-an-zi (KBo 15.34 ii 28 (OH/NS)), ha-at-tan-zi (KBo 4.11, 9 (NS)), ha-az-zi-an-zi (KBo 20.14 + 25.33 obv. 8 (fr.), 19 (OS), KBo 11.34 i 4 (OH/NS), KBo 20.32 iii 11 (OH/NS), KUB 43.60 iv 15 (OH/NS)), ha-az-zi-ja-an-zi (KBo 20.40 v 10 (OH/NS)), 1sg.pret.act. ha-az-zi-ja-um (KBo 7.14 + KUB 36.100 obv. 31 (OS), KUB 31.64 iii 4 (OH/NS)), ha-az-zi-et (KUB 31.64 i 18 (OH/NS)), ha-zi-et (KBo 3.36 obv. 8 (OH/NS)), ha-at-te-eš (KBO 32.13 i 16, 17 (MH/MS)), 3sg.imp.act. ha-az-zi-e-[t-u] (KBO 3.22 obv. 51 (OS)); part. ha-az-zi-an-t- (KBO 22.1, 23 (OS)), ha-at-ta-an-t-; inf.I ha-az-zi-ja-u-ar-an-zi (KUB 35.145 ii 6 (NS)); impf. ha-az-zi-iš-ke/a- (KBO 25.35 ii 5 (OS), KBO 15.33 ii 11, iii 6 (OH/MS), KBO 23.74 iii 10 (OH/MS), KUB 15.34 iv 44 (MH/MS), KBO 10.23+ iii 15 (OH/NS), KBo 40.173 iv 7 (NS), KUB 55.6 ii 10 (NS)), ha-zi-iš-ke/a- (KUB 55.31 rev. 4 (MS)), ha-az-zi-eš-ke/a- (KBO 20.85 iv 12 (NS)), ha-az-zi-i-eš-ke/a- (KUB 20.16 i 11 (MS)), ha-az-zi-ik-ke/a- (KBO 11.51 iii 7 (OH/NS), KUB 2.5 i 4 (OH/NS), KUB 10.12 iii 10 (OH/NS), KUB 20.99 ii 29 (OH/NS), KBO 24.13 iv 15 (MH/NS), ha-az-zi-ke/a- (KBO 39.127 r.col. 7 (OH/NS), KBO 4.9 i 41, 44, vi 31 (OH/NS), KUB 25.1 vi 29 (OH/NS), KBO 4.13 v 24 (OH/NS), KBO 10.25 vi 13 (OH/NS)).

Anat. cognates: Lyc. χτατ(ι)- ‘to harm, to do violence to’ (3sg.pres.act. χτατι, 3pl.pres.act. χτατιτι, 3sg.pret.act. χτατε). PAnat. *Hat-
PIE *h₂et-ο; *h₂t-ié-ti

See Puhvel HED 3: 248f. for attestations. We find active as well as middle forms that often do not differ in meaning (both transitively ‘to pierce (something/someone), to hit (someone, something)’). Occasionally, middle forms are reflexive (‘to prick oneself’). The forms that we find in OS texts are 3pl.pres.act. ḫa-az-zi-an-zi, 3sg.pret.act. ḫa-az-zi-e-et, 3sg.imp.act. ḫa-az-zi-e-e[ʃ]-ti, 3sg.pres.midd. ḫa-at-ʃa-ri and 3pl.pres.midd. ḫa-at-ta-ʃa-ta. This seems to point to an original system in which the active paradigm shows a stem ḫazzije/a- (*ḥatt-je/a-*) whereas the middle paradigm shows a stem ḫatt-. Within the middle paradigm, the stem ḫatt- was altered to ḫatta- in MH times (yielding 1sg.pres.midd. ḫaddah hari), which stem was taken over into the active paradigm as well, yielding forms like 3sg.pres.midd. ḫattai (MH/NS) and ḫattanzi (MS) (according to the tarn(a)-class). In NH times, the stem ḫazzije/a- is found in the middle paradigm as well (3sg.pret.midd. ḫazzijattat (NS)). Despite the formal difference between the active and the middle stem, there does not seem to be a semantic difference between the active and middle forms.

Within Anatolian, this verb has been compared with the H Luwian hapax ḫazi- (gerund. ha-zi-mi-na (CEKEE §15)), but the meaning of this latter verb is not ascertained (Oettinger 1979a: 346176, who first suggested this connection, translates “wir haben besiegt(?))”, whereas Hawkins 2000: 150 translates “we engrave”, which is seemingly influenced by etymological considerations). Any phonological conclusions based on this form only cannot be substantiated (cf. footnote 196). A better comparandum is HLuw. hat- ‘to write’, which I treat under the lemma of ḫatrae- ‘to write’. Together with Lyc. χτατ(ι)- ‘to harm’, these forms all point to a PAnat. root *Hat-.

From an IE point of view, PAnat. *Hat- can hardly reflect anything else than PIE *h₂et-. If Hitt. ḫazzije/a- goes back to *Ht-je/o- (in principle *-je/o- derivatives show zero grade of the root), the initial laryngeal must be *h₂ as *h₃ would disappear initially before stop (cf. Kloekhorst fthc.c). We therefore should mechanically reconstruct *h₂et-, but such a root is further unknown in other IE languages. A comparison with Arm. hata-nem ‘to pierce, to cut, to slice’ is difficult as *t should have given Arm. t’ (cf. Puhvel l.c.). Note that *h₂t-je/o- in
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principle would yield Hitt. **ḥazze/a-, but that we must reckon with restoration of the suffix -je/a- here (similarly in ɡašše/a-², which later on is restored as ɡaššiye/a-²). Possibly the remarkable spelling 3sg.pres.act. ɦa-az-ZE/i-zi (OH/NS), cited above as ɦa-ay-zi-zi is to be read as ɦa-az-ze-zi = /Htˤetʾi/-, the regular outcome of *ḥtˤ-ti-.

The -ské/a-imperfective shows different spellings. The spellings ɦa-az-zi-iške/a- and ɦa-zi-iš-ke/a- are found in OS and MS texts, and therefore at first sight seem to be the original ones. They probably represent phonological /Htˤiské/á/-.

Nevertheless, I think that the forms that show the spellings ɦa-az-zi-ik-ke/a- and ɦa-az-zi-ke/a-, which are predominantly attested in OH/NS texts and represent /Htsiké/á/-, must be more original, particularly if we compare the imperfectives zi-ik-ke/a- = ɦtsiké/á/- ‘to put’ < *dʰhtˤ-ské/ó/ and az-zi-ke/a- = ɦdtsiké/á/- ‘to eat’ < *dʰd-tsíké/ó/-.

Especially the latter one shows that ɦa-az-zi(-ik)-ke/a- = /Htsiké/á/- must be the regular reflex of the morphologically expected preform *ḥtˤ-ské/ó/-.

I therefore assume that already in OH times the phonetically regular form ɦa-az-zi-ik-ke/a- = /Htsiké/á/- < *ḥtˤ-ské/ó/- was altered to ɦa-az-zi-iš-ke/a- = /Htˤiské/á/- in analogy to the present-stem ḥazzije/a-² = /Htˤieské/á/-.

The influence of this stem is especially apparent in the MS form ɦa-az-zi-i-e-ěš-ke/a- = /Htˤieské/á/-.

-ḥhāt (1sg.pret.midd.-ending): see -ḥha(ri), -ḥḥat(i)

ḥatta-: see ḥatt-²⁰⁰, ḥazzije/a-²

=GίSNά) ḥattalla- (n.) ‘club, mace’: nom.-acc.sg. ɦa-at-tal-la-an (KUB 1.17 ii 28), ɦat-tal-la-an (KUB 38.2 ii 9), instr. ɦa-at-tal-li-it (KUB 26.25, 12), nom.-acc.pl. ɦa-at-tal-la (KUB 42.35 obv. 5).

Anat. cognates: HLuw. ²⁷⁴hatal(a)j- ‘to smite’ (1sg.pret.act. ²⁷⁴ha-ta-li-ja (KARKAMIŠ A25a §1), ²⁷⁴ha-ta-li-i-ja (KARATEPE 1 §28 Hu.), ²⁷⁴ha-ta-li-ha (KARATEPE 1 §28 Ho.), ²⁷⁴hā-ta-li-ha (KARATEPE 1 §25 Ho.), ²⁷⁴ta-li-ha (KARATEPE 1 §25 Hu.), 3pl.pret.act. ²⁷⁴ha-ta-la-i-ta (KARATEPE 1 §26 Hu.), hā-ta-la-i-ta (KARATEPE 1 §26 Ho.)).

See Puhvel HED 3: 255 for attestations. This word is likely a derivative in -alla- of the verb ḥatt-²⁰⁰, ḥazzije/a-² ‘to pierce, to hit’ (q.v.).


Pf *ḫ₂-t-al-u- ??

See Weitenberg 1984: 28f. and Puhvel HED 3: 257f. for attestations and semantics. The morphological analysis of this word is difficult. The only other word ending in -alu- is ḫdālu- ‘bad’, which seems to be an u-stem derivative of a stem *iḍālu- (≈ CLuw. adduŋal-). If we are allowed to compare ḫdālu- to ḫattalu- (but note that ḫdālu- is an adjective whereas ḫattalu- is a noun), it would mean that we have to reckon with a stem *ḥattal-. Puhvel (l.c.) compares this *ḥattal- with e.g. išḫiṣal- ‘bond, belt’ that is derived from išḫai-/išḫi- ‘to bind’ (q.v.), and assumes a derivation from ḥatt-\(^{3}\) ‘to pierce, to hit’. Although this indeed is possible, the semantic connection is not self-evident. For an etymological treatment of ḥatt- see at ḥatt-\(^{3}\), ḫazzīje/a-\(^2\).


Pf *ḥ₂-t-ent-

See Puhvel HED 3: 260f. for attestations. Synchronically, all words of this lemma seem to belong with ḥatt-\(^{3}\), ḫazzīje/a-\(^2\) ‘to pierce, to hit’. Already Sommer & Falkenstein (1938: 97-100) argued that this connection can be supported by assuming a semantic development *penetration, sharpness* > ‘intelligence, wit’ (compare Lat. scīre ‘to know’ and Hitt. šakk- \(^{2}\) / šakk- ‘to know’ from PIE *sekH- ‘to cut’). See at the lemma of ḥatt-\(^{2}\), ḫazzīje/a-\(^3\) for further etymology.

**ḥatantiya**- (gender unclear) ‘dry land’: gen.sg.(?) ḫa-ta-an-ti-ja-aš (KBo 5.7 rev. 16 (MH/MS), KUB 42.1 iii 4, 18 (NS), KUB 42.4a, 3 (NS)), ḫa-ta-an-ti-ja-aš (KUB 42.1 iii 7, 11 (NS), KUB 42.4a, 6 (NS), KUB 42.5 obv. 3 (NS)), ḫa-ta-an-ti-ja-

---

388
likely that \( \text{ha-
4029;an-ti-ja} \) (KUB 36.75 ii 22 (OH/MS), KUB 31.130 rev. 6 (OH/MS)), \( \text{ha-da-an-te-
5259;ja} \) (KBo 12.38 iii 10 (NH)).

See Puhvel HED 3: 263 for attestations and semantics. According to Puhvel, it is
likely that \( \text{hatantija} \)- is a nominal derivative of the part. \( \text{hatant-} \) of \( \text{h4029;}- \) / \( \text{hat-} \) ‘to dry up’ (q.v.). If this is correct, we must assume that the derivation took place
within Hittite (at least after the assimilation of *\( \text{ti} \) to \( \text{z} \)) as a pre-Hitt. *\( \text{h4029;}_d\text{-ent-jo-} \) regularly should have given **\( \text{hatanzija} \)-. See at \( \text{h4029;}- \) / \( \text{hat-} \) for further etymology.

\( \text{ě} \)\( \text{hattara} \)- (n.) ‘prick, awl (vel sim.)’: nom.-acc.sg. \( \text{ha-at-ta-ra-a[n]} \) (KUB 33.8 ii 14 (OH/NS)).

Derivatives: \( \text{hattarae} \)\( ^{2} \), \( \text{hattarije/\text{a-}^{\text{ord}}(i)} \) (Ic2 / IIIg) ‘to prick, to incise’
(1sg.pres.act. \( \text{ha-at-ta-ra-a-mi} \) (KUB 36.35 i 3 (NS)); 3sg.pres.midd. \( \text{ha-ad-da-ri-
4187;e-et-ta-ri} \) (KBo 10.7 iii 14 (OH/NS)), \( \text{ha-ad-da-ri-i-et-ta-ri} \) (KBo 10.7 iii 18, 22,
26 (OH/NS)); part. nom.-acc.sg.n. \( \text{ha-at-ta-ra-an} \) (OS)), \( \text{hattare\text{š}sar} \) / \( \text{hattare\text{š}n} \)-
(n.) ‘intersection, crossroad’ (nom.-acc.sg. \( \text{ha-ad-da-re-eš-\text{š}sar} \) (KUB 7.54 ii 13 (NS)),
gen.sg. \( \text{[ha-at-ta-ri-\text{š}na-aš} \) (KUB 20.2 iv 19 (OH/NS)), dat.-loc.sg. \( \text{ha-
ad-da-ri-\text{š}na-ni} \) (KUB 35.145 ii 10 (NS)), dat.-loc.pl. \( \text{ha-at-ta-re-eš-na-aš} \) (KUB
10.72 ii 8 (OH/NS), ABoT 17 iii 14 (NS), KUB 24.9 ii 37 + KBo 12.127 ii 4
(OH/NS)), \( \text{ha-at-ta-ri-\text{š}na-aš} \) (KUB 24.11 ii 16 (OH/NS)), \( \text{ha-at-re-eš-na-aš} \) (KUB
9.22 iii 20, 44 (fr.) (MS)), \( \text{[ha-at-ta-ri-\text{š}na-aš} \) (KUB 17.64, 8 (NS)).

Anat. cognates: CLuw. \( \text{h4029;\text{hattara}} \)- ‘hoe (vel sim.)’ (acc.sg. \( \text{ha-at-ta-ra-am=\text{ša-
an} \), \( \text{ha-at-ta-ra-an} \), abl.instr. \( \text{ha-at-ta-ra-a-ti} \), \( \text{ha-at-ta-ra-ti} \), \( \text{hattari(ja)} \)- ‘to hoe’ (3sg.pret.act. \( \text{ha-at-ta-ri-it-ta} \).

See Puhvel HED 3: 263 for attestations and semantics. It is tempting to see
\( \text{hattara} \)- and especially its derivative \( \text{hattarae} \)\( ^{2} \) as mere variants to \( \text{hatrae} \)\( ^{2} \) ‘to write’ and its postulated nominal origin *\( \text{hatra-} \), but the slight difference in
semantics (\( \text{hattarae} \)\( ^{2} \) denotes ‘to prick, to incise’, whereas \( \text{hatrae} \)\( ^{2} \) means ‘to
write’ only) and the consistent difference in spelling (\( \text{ha-at-ta-\text{r}^{5}} \) vs. \( \text{ha-at-\text{r}^{5}} \))
sparks against this. Puhvel (l.c.) assumes a suffix -\( \text{ara-} \) that is attached to the
verbal stem \( \text{hatt-} \) (see \( \text{hatt-\text{d}^{5}}, \text{hazzije/\text{a-}^{5}} \) ‘to pierce, to hit’), which then must be
different from the suffix -\( \text{ra-} \) as seen in \( \text{hatrae}- \). Rieken (1999a: 390) assumes a
Luwian origin of these words (cf. CLuw. \( \text{h4029;h\text{hattara}} \)-, but the OS attestation
of the part. \( \text{hattaran} \) ‘incised’ is not favourable to this view. Whatever the case,
\( \text{hattara-} \) and its derivatives ultimately derive from the verbal stem \( \text{hatt}^{\text{st}}(\text{t}) \), \( \text{hazzije/a}^{\text{z}} \), q.v. for an etymological treatment.

\(-\text{b\text{h}at(i)}\) (1sg.pret.midd.-ending); see \(-\text{b\text{h}a(ri)}, -\text{b\text{h}at(i)}\)

\( \text{hatk}^{\text{d}} \) (Ia2) ‘to shut, to close’: 3sg.pres.act. \( \text{ha-at-ki} \) (OH/NS), 1pl.pres.act. \( \text{ha-at-ku-e-ni} \) (OS), 3pl.pres.act. \( \text{ha-at-kán-zi} \) (OS); part. \( \text{ha-at-ga-an-t} \) (undat.); impf. \( \text{ha-at-ga-aš-ke/a} \) (MS), \( \text{ha-at-ki-iš-ke/a} \) (NS).

Derivatives: \( \text{hatganu}^{\text{d}} \) (lb2) ‘to make tight, to put pressure on’ (3sg.pres.act. \( \text{ha-at-ga-nu-uz-zi} \) (NH), \( \text{ha-at-ga-nu-zi} \) (NH)), \( \text{hatkešnu}^{\text{d}} \) (lb2) ‘id.’ (1sg.pres.act. \( \text{ha-at-ke-eš-nu-mi} \) (NH), 2sg.pres.act. \( \text{ha-at-ki-iš-nu-ši} \) (OH/NS), 3sg.pres.act. \( \text{ha-at-ki-iš-nu-uz-zi} \) (NH), 1sg.pret.act. \( \text{ha-at-ke-eš-nu-mu-un} \) (NH), 3sg.pres.act. \( \text{ha-at-ke-eš-mu-ut} \) (NH), 3pl.pres.act. \( \text{ha-at-ke-eš-mu-e-er} \) (NH), \( \text{ha-at-ki-eš-nu} \) (NH), \( \text{ha-at-ki-iš-ša-nu-er} \) (NH), 2sg.impfact. \( \text{ha-at-ke-eš-nu-ut} \) (NH), part. \( \text{ha-at-ke-eš-mu-ya-an-t} \), \( \text{ha-at-keš-ša-nu-an-t} \); impf. \( \text{ha-at-ki-iš-ša-nu-šu-ke/a} \), \( \text{ha-at-keš-ša-nu-uš-ke/a} \), \( \text{hatku-} / \text{hatgay-} \) (adj.) ‘tight, pressed, stressful’ (nom.sg.c. \( \text{ha-at-ku-uš} \) (MH/MS), acc.sg.c. \( \text{ha-at-ku-un} \) (NH), abl. \( \text{ha-at-ga-u-ya-az} \) (OS), nom.pl.c. \( \text{ha-at-ga-u-e-eš} \) (OH/NS)), \( \text{hatkěšš}^{\text{d}} \) (lb2) ‘to become tight’ (3sg.pres.act. \( \text{ha-at-ku-e-eš-zi} \) (NH)).

IE cognates: Gr. \( \text{ Odyssey } \) ‘to be burdened, to be depressed’, \( \text{ Odyssey } \) ‘pressure, burden’.

PIE *\( h₂d\text{g}^{\text{b}}\)-e/i / *\( h₂d\text{g}^{\text{b}}\)-énti

See Puhvel HED 3: 266f. for attestations. The verb is attested from OS texts already, and shows the \( \text{hi} \)-inflection (cf. 3sg.pres.act. \( \text{hatki} \)). Despite its awkward looking form, it functions as any normal Hittite verb: it forms a causative in -\( \text{nu-} \), \( \text{hatganu}^{\text{z}} \), it forms a fientive in -\( \text{čėš-} \), *\( \text{hatkěšš}^{\text{z}} \) as visible in \( \text{hatkešnu}^{\text{z}} \), and it forms an \( \text{u} \)-stem adjective \( \text{hatku-} / \text{hatgay-} \). The verb itself denotes ‘to shut, to close’, but its derivatives all have the connotation ‘tight, pressing’. This indicates that the verb originally meant something like ‘to press together, to squeeze’. Risch (1964: 78) etymologically connected \( \text{hatk} \)- with Gr. \( \text{ Odyssey } \) ‘to be burdened, to be depressed’ (cf. \( \text{ Odyssey } \) ‘pressure, burden’), which would mean that we have to reconstruct *\( h₂d\text{g}^{\text{b}} \). Note that the fact that neither the -\( t \)- nor the -\( k \)- in Hittite is ever spelled with a geminate (unlike e.g. \( \text{hár-ták-ka} \) ‘bear’ < *\( h₂\text{rērik-k} \)-o-) supports this etymology.

Puhvel HED 3: 417 cites a stem \( \text{hatk} \) which he equates with \( \text{hatk} \). The words that he regards as showing this stem, \( \text{hù-ut-ki-iš-na-š} \) (KUB 36.49 i 3), \( \text{hù-te-ek-ki-iš-kán-du} \) (KUB 31.100 obv. 9), \( \text{hù-u-te-ek-ki-iš-kán-du} \) (ibid. 11), are
(semi-)hapaxes the meaning of which cannot be indenpendantly determined. The form ḫuṭkišnaš occurs in a list of evil things, whereas ḫuṭekkiškandu is attested twice in a broken context. There is not a shred of evidence that they belong with ḫat-.


Anat. cognates: HLuw. ḫatura- ‘letter’ (nom.sg. ḫaturas/ ḫa-tu+ra-a-sa (ASSUR letters f+g §9), ḫa-tu-ra+ta-sa (ASSUR letter e §11), acc.sg. ḫaturan/ ḫa-tu-ra/i-na (ASSUR letter a §5, d §5, e §5, §7, §9) dat.-loc.sg? ḫa-tu+ra/i-’ (ASSUR letter e §3)), ḫat- ‘to write’ (inf. dat. ḫa-tu-ra+a (ASSUR letters often)).

PIE *h₂et-ro-jé/ó-

See Oettinger (1979a: 30f.) and Puhvel (HED 3: 269f.) for attestations (but note that Puhvel cites some wrong forms, e.g. 3sg.pres.act. “ḫa-at-ra-a-i” (KUB 8.24 iii 3), which in fact is ḫa-at-ra-a-i[z-zi]). This verb is prototypical for the so-called ḫatraez-class, which means that it shows a stem ḫaṭrē- or ḫaṭrā- besides ḫatra-. As Oettinger (1979a: 357f.) convincingly argues, the verbs of the ḫatraez-class are denominative derivations in *-je/o- of o-stem nouns that show *-o-jē- > -ae- and *-o-jō- > ŧē (see § 2.2.2.1p for a treatment of this class).

In the case of ḫatraez- itself, this means that we have to assume a basic noun *ḥatra- ‘writing’. It is likely that this *ḥatra- is derived from the verbal stem ḫaṭt-,st/ ḫazzāj-i-a-st ‘to pierce, to hit, to engrave’ (q.v. for further etymology). Compare the lemma of ḫaṭtara-, where we find a derivative ḫattaraez-,’st ‘to prick, to incise’, for the semantic and orthographic difference from ḫatraez-.

Note that in HLuwian the unextended verb ḫat- means ‘to write’ and that ḫatura- ‘letter’ is a more direct derivative of it.
\(\textbf{hatuk}^{2}\) (ib1) ‘to be terrible’ (Sum. KAL): 3sg.pres.act. \(\text{ha-tu-uk}-zi\), 3pl.pres.act. KAL-ga-an-zi.

Derivatives: \(\text{hatika-}, \text{hatuki-}\) (adj./n.) ‘terrible (deed), fearsome’ (nom.sg.c. \(\text{ha-tu-ga-}\) (KUB 33.69 iii 7 (OH/NS), KUB 59.66 iv 5 (NS)), \(\text{ha-du-ga-aš}\) (KBo 26.96, 8 (NS)), acc.sg.c. \(\text{ha-du-ga-an}\) (KBo 22.107 i 7 (MS)), nom.-acc.sg.n. \(\text{ha-tu-ga-an}\) (KUB 33.68 ii 19 (OH/NS)), \(\text{ha-tu-ū-ga-an}\) (KBo 17.6 iii 1 (OS), KBo 17.1 iii 19 (fr.), iv 2 (fr.) (OS)), \(\text{ha-du-kān}\) (KBo 20.88 iv 9 (NS)), \(\text{ha-tu-kā}(n)\text{-}=š-me-et\) (KBo 17.1 iii 12 (OS)), \(\text{ha-tu-ga-a}(n)[=š-me-et]\) (KBo 17.3 iii 12 (OS)), \(\text{ha-tu-ga}\) (KBo 13.34 iv 12 (OH/NS)), dat.-loc.sg. \(\text{ha-tu-ga}-i\) (KBo 22.6 i 27 (OH/NS)), \(\text{ha-du-ga-ja}\) (KBo 15.3, 7 (NS)), abl. \(\text{ha-tu-ga-ja-az}\) (KBo 5.6 iii 30 (NH)), KAL-ga-za (KUB 7.54 i 3, iv 11 (NS)), KAL-ga-aż (KUB 17.16 i 4 (NS)), nom.pl.c. \(\text{ha-tu-ga}-e\text{-}e\text{š}\) (KBo 4.2 ii 32 (OH/NS)), \(\text{ha-du-ga-e}\text{-}e\text{š}\) (KBo 17.105 iii 31 (MS)), acc.pl.c. \(\text{ha-tu-ka-uš}\) (KBo 17.5 ii 11 (OS)), \(\text{ha-tu-ga-uš}\) (KBo 17.4 ii 6 (OS), KBo 4.2 i 16 (OH/NS)), nom.-acc.pl.n. \(\text{ha-tu-ga}\) (KBo 3.21 i 24 (MH/NS), KBo 17.78 i 1 (MS), KBo 4.2 iii 41, iv 36 (NH), KUB 12.27, 5 (NH)), \(\text{ha-du-ga}\) (KBo 17.105 iii 6 (MS)), \(\text{ha-tu-ga-ja}\) (KUB 19.14, 11 (NH)), \(\text{hatugātar} / \text{hatugann-}\) (n.) ‘terror, awesomeness’ (nom.sg. \(\text{ha-tu-ga-a}\text{-}tar, \text{ha-tu-ga-tar, ha-du-ga-tar, ha-du-ga-an-mi}\), \(\text{hatukēšš}^{2}\) (ib2 > ic2) ‘to become terrible’ (3sg.pres.act. \(\text{ha-tu-ki-iš-zi, ha-du-ki-iš-zi, ha-tu-ki-iš-ša-iz-zi, impf. [ha-]tu-ki-iš-ke-a-}\), \(\text{hatuganna}^{2}\) (ib2) ‘to terrify’ (3pl.pres.act. \(\text{ha-tu-ga-nu-ya-an-zi}\); verb.noun gen.sg. \(\text{ha-tu-ga-nu-ya-ga-aš}\).

IE cognates: Gr. \(\text{khēkōn}\) ‘to be distraught from fear, to be terrified’, ?Skt. \(tuj\)- ‘to thrust’.

PIE \(*\text{hēug-ti} / *\text{hēug-énti}

See Puhvel HED 3: 274f. for attestations. The adjective (which sometimes seems to be used as a noun ‘terrible deed’) shows a-stem as well as i-stem forms, both from OS texts onwards (nom.-acc.sg.n. \(\text{hatūgan}\) (OS) besides acc.pl.c. \(\text{hatuka}uš\) (OS)). I have not been able to find a semantic distribution between the two (like, for instance, in \(\text{suppištuqara-}\) (adj.) besides \(\text{suppišduqari-}\) (c.)).

The most generally accepted etymology is the one first suggested by Benveniste (1937: 497), who connected \(\text{hatuka-i}\)- with Gr. \(\text{khēkōn}\) ‘to be distraught from fear, to be terrified’ < \(*\text{hēug-}\), which semantically indeed is convincing. The formal aspect of this etymology is more complicated however. If Hitt. \(\text{hatuk-}\) indeed reflects \(*\text{hēug-}\), it would mean that the initial cluster \(*\text{hē-}\) comes out as Hitt. \(\text{ha-}V\)- and not \(*\text{ha-at-}V\)-, as one could have expected. To my knowledge, there are no other examples of such an outcome in Hittite (the often-cited parallel \(\text{hapuš-}\) ‘penis’ < \(*\text{hēpus-}\) is wrong as the stem actually is \(\text{hēpiša}š(-šš)-\) (q.v.), which
denotes ‘shin-bone’ and not ‘penis’). On the contrary, forms like ḥappēssar ‘limb’ < *h₂tp-ēsr, ḥattant- ‘clever’ < *h₂t-ent- or appanzi ‘they seize’ < *h₂penti seem to show that initial clusters /Hp-/, /Ht-/ and /Tp-/ are spelled with geminate stop. Nevertheless, all these forms belong to ablauting verbs which could have caused restitution of the voiceless stop.

So, I would like to propose that in *Couvreur (1937: 147) further connected caused restitution of the voiceless stop.

`shin-bone’ and not `penis’). On the contrary, forms like šT-/ spelled `clever’ < *DW9D779šDWXN™p-/ are spelled with geminate ž393. Although at first sight this connection is semantically problematic, forms like tujyāte ‘he is put to panic’ may show that this connection is possible.

Pulvel (l.c.) dismisses the etymological connection with Gr. átōqua (without argumentation) and connects ḥatuk- with Gr. ḥōdēkqatou ‘to be wrong against, to hate’. As this word is connected with Lat. odium ‘to hate’ (from PIE *h₁ed-), it must in his view be analysed as a suffixed form *h₁ed-u- or *h₁d-u-. This does not fit the fact that Hitt. ḥatuk- clearly functions as a monosyllabic root. Moreover, if the preform were *h₁d-u-, the initial *h₁ would regularly in Hittite, namely before stop (cf. Kloekhorst fthc.c).

hāui- (c.) ‘sheep’ (Sum. UDU): nom.sg. UDU-iš, nom.pl. (?) ḥa-a-u-e-eš.

Derivatives: hauijašši- (adj.) ‘sheep-like’ (acc.sg.c. ḥa-û-i-aš-ši-in (KUB 32.1 ii 2), ḥa-û-i-ja-aš-ši-in (KUB 32.1 iii 10), undecl. ḥa-ûi-ja-aš-ši (KBo 21.42 i 11)).

Anat. cognates: Cluw. hāui- (c.) ‘sheep’ (nom.sg. ḥa-a-û-i-iš, acc.pl. UDU-ina); Hluw. hawi- (c.) ‘sheep’ (nom.sg. OVIS.ANIMAL há-wá/i-i-sá (KARATEPE 1 §48 Ho.), OVIS.ANIMAL há-wá/i-sá (KARATEPE 1 §48 Ho.), OVIS.ANIMAL há-wá/i-sá (KARATEPE 1 §48 Ho.), OVIS.ANIMAL-va/i-sa (KARATEPE 1 §48 Ho., KARKAMIŠ A11b+c §18c, §18e), OVIS-wa/i-sa (KARKAMIŠ A11b+c §18e), OVIS-sa (KARKAMIŠ A11b+c §18b), acc.sg. OVIS ha-wa/i-na (KULULU lead strips fr. 1), OVIS.ANIMAL-va/i-na (MARAŞ 11 §8), OVIS.ANIMAL-na (KARKAMIŠ A1a §31), gen.sg. OVIS.ANIMAL-va/i-si (KARATEPE 1 §55), OVIS.ANIMAL-si (KARKAMIŠ A1a §30), dat.-loc.sg. OVIS.ANIMAL ha-wa/i (AKSARAY §4a), abl.-instr. ""OVIS.ANIMAL ha-wa/i-ti (KULULU 1 §6), nom.pl. OVIS.ANIMAL-zî (SULTANHAN §29)); Lyca. χαβα- (c.) ‘sheep’ (acc.sg. χαβαδ). IE cognates: Skt. ávī- ‘sheep’, Gr. ὠκς ὄκς ‘sheep’, Lat. ovis ‘sheep’, TochB ēl̩(a)w, awi (nom.pl.) ‘ewe’.

PIE *h₁eiγi-
The word for ‘sheep’ in Hittite is predominantly written with the sumerogram UDU, which had several phonetic readings. We find the phonetically spelled UDU\textsuperscript{ijant}- (q.v.), but also an u-stem UDU-u- (nom.sg. UDU-uš (MH/MS), acc.sg. UDU-un (OS)), and some i-stem forms (nom.sg. UDU-iš (KUB 6.9, 5, 6)). These i-stem forms are likely to be read as ḫayi- as is attested in CLuw. ḫayi- and HLuw. ḫawi- ‘sheep’. A possible phonetic spelling is found in the following context, although its interpretation is far from assured:

KBo 24.26 iii

(3) [...]-h[a-a-u-e]-eš la-az-za-an-da-ti-in ḫa-aš-ta
(4) [...]-la-az-[za-an-da-ti-iš]-A-i-in-du-pi-in-zi ḫa-aš-t[a]

‘[...]-h[az] bore lazandati- [...] laz[andati] bore ḫAjindupinzu’.

Both lazandati- and ḫAjindupinzu are hapax. More securely attested is the adjective ḫayijašši- ‘sheep-like’, but this is clearly a Luwianism as we can see from the gen.adj.-suffix -ašši-.

Melchert (1993b: 66) states that in view of the a-stem as found in Lyč. χawā- ‘sheep’, the Luwian forms probably are not inherited i-stems, too, (as one would expect on the basis of the i-stem forms in the other IE languages) and that the forms with -i- are all i-motion forms. The only attested form in Lyčian (acc.sg. χawā (149, 10)) is directly preceded by acc.sg. wawā ‘cow’ and it is likely that this word has had an influence on ‘sheep’. In my view, the Luwian gen.adj. ḫayijašši- as attested in the Hittite texts, proves that the Luwian forms were really i-stem forms.

The PIE reconstruction of the word for ‘sheep’ has caused much discussion. The basic question is whether we have to reconstruct *h2ouī- or *h1eīi-. Scholars in favour of *h2ouī- point to the fact that the Tocharian forms seem to show ă- from *h2e- and that χ- in Lyčian is supposed to reflect *h2 only, and not *h1. Scholars in favour of *h1eīi- point to the fact that we would rather expect e-grade in such an i-stem word and to the absence of Brugmann’s Law in Sanskrit (cf. Lubotsky 1990).

As I have tried to show in Kloekhorst fthc.c, the argument depending on Lyč. χ- must be rejected: the assumption that *h1- > Lyč. Ə- is based on one example only (epirijeti) that is falsely interpreted (see also at ḫāppar- / ḫāppir-). I do not have the competence to judge the Tocharian material in detail but I am convinced that the *o- seen in Skt., Gr. and Lat. must reflect *h1eīi-.
As I have argued in Kloekhorst fthc.c, *h3w- probably yielded Lyc. χε- (cf. Xeṛ̌ī < *h3er-on-, see under ḫāaran- 'eagle'), which means that χεw-a- shows uumlaut from original *χewa- (which replaces original *χewi- on the basis of wawa- 'cow').

ḥazzīje/a^-[^7]: see ḫatt^-[^7], ḫazzīje/a^-[^4]

-ḥhe (3sg.pres.act.-ending of the ḫi-flection): see -ḥhi

ḥējau-: see ḫēu- / ḫē(j)au-

ḥēju-: see ḫēu- / ḫē(j)au-

NAḥekur (c.) 'rock-sanctuary': ḫē-kur, ḫē-gur.

See Puhvel HED 3: 287 for a collection of attestations. The word does not show inflected forms, cf. Weitenberg (1984: 154) who states that "[m]an hat den Eindruck, daß das Wort sich wie ein Sumerogramm verhält". Puhvel (l.c.) convincingly argued that the word probably is a loanword, ultimately from Sum. É.KUR 'mountain house', possibly through Hurrian mediation. Herewith, the alleged IE origin of this word (often reconstructed as 'acrostic' *hēḡk-ur with non-colouration of *ḡ by *h2 because of Eichner’s Law) must be rejected.

ḥēn-: see ḫēn^-[^7] / ḫan-

ḥē(n)k^-[^4], ḫē(n)k^-[^3]: see ḫai(n)k^-[^4]

ḥēnkan- (n.) 'death, doom, deadly disease, plague' (Sum. UGα): nom.-acc.sg. ḫēn-ka-an (KBo 18.151 obv. 12 (OH/MS)), ḫi-in-kān (MH/MS, often), ḫi-in-ga-an (KUB 15.34 ii 47 (MH/MS), KUB 14.8 obv. 29, rev. 9 (NH)), ḫē-en-kān (HT 1 ii 29 (NS)), ḫē-en-kān (KBo 3.28 ii 15 (OH/NS), KBo 3.46 obv. 33 (OH/NS), KBo 3.34 iii 14 (OH/NS)), gen.sg. ḫi-in-ga-na-aš (KUB 34.58 i 2 (MH/MS), KBo 3.21 ii 25 (MH/NS), KUB 14.12 obv. 8 (NH)), ḫi-in-ka-ra-aš (KBo 13.8 obv. 11 (NS)), dat.-loc.sg. ḫi-in-ga-ni (KUB 4.72 rev. 7 (OS), KUB 30.10 obv. 20 (OH/MS), KBo 3.38 rev. 21 (OH/NS), KBo 3.1 ii 28 (OH/NS), KBo 16.52 obv. 9 (NS), etc.), ḫē-en-ga-ni (KBo 22.2 rev. 5 (OH/MS)), all.sg. ḫi-in-ga-na (KUB 30.10 obv. 20 (OH/MS)), erg.sg. ḫi-in-ga-na-an-za (KUB 24.3 ii 25 (MH/NS)), abl. ḫi-in-ga-na-az (MH/MS), ḫi-in-ga-na-za (MH/MS).
See Puhvel HED 3: 296f. for attestations. Already in the oldest texts (OS and OH/MS) we find the spellings ḫi-in-k, ḫe-en-k and ḫe-en-k besides each other. Since we know that *enK- develops into -inK-, I assume that ḫenkan- is the original form.

Although this word is attested in the oldest texts already and has an impeccable n-stem inflection, its etymological interpretation is difficult. Puhvel (loc.c.) suggests a connection with Skt. nac- ‘to perish’, but this is abortive: its cognate Gr. ναῷς ‘corpse’ shows that the root was *nek-, and not *hynek- as Puhvel must assume. I would rather connect ḫenkan- with Hitt. ḫaĭ(n)k-išri, ḫi-n(k)-zi ‘to bestow (act.); to bestow oneself > to bow (midd.)’. Semantically, we should regard ḫenkan- then as an euphemistic ‘that what has been allotted to someone’ > ‘fate, death, doom’ (cf. Oettinger 1979a: 175 and Melchert 1984a: 94 for similar interpretations).

This means that the original form must have been *hainkan-, which in OH times contracted to ḫenkan- and almost immediately fell victim to the development *enK- > -inK- and subsequently became ḫıkan-. See at the lemma of ḫai(n)k-išri for further etymology.

**āt ḫeṣ- / ḫešš-** see ḫāṣ- / ḫaṣṣ-, ḫāṣ- / ḫeṣṣ-

**gaš ḫeṣša-** see gišša-

**k ḫeṣṭā, ḫeṣṭā** see gišštā, gišštā


IE cognates: ?Gr. aionáw ‘to moisten’.

PIE *ʰh₂e̞ih₁-(e)u-?

See Weitenberg 1984: 30f. and Puhvel HED 3: 301f. for attestations. The word shows many different spellings, but nevertheless it is possible to combine them all into one phonological interpretation. The oldest (OS) attestations, acc.sg. ʰe̞-e-un, nom.pl. ʰe̞-e-a-u-e-eš, ʰe̞-e-ja-u-e-eš=a clearly show that in the oldest texts we are dealing with a stem ʰe̞e(j)- followed by an ablauting suffix -u/-au-. The fact that we find the spelling ʰe̞-e-a-u- besides ʰe̞-ja-u- reminds of OS ne-e-a ‘he turns’ besides younger ne-e-ja. These latter forms reflect the situation that OH /něʔa/ develops into younger /néδ/, which then is phonetically realized as [něʔa], spelled ne-e-ja. This means that in the paradigm of ‘rain’ we have to reckon with an original OH stem /Héʔau-1/ that develops into /Héau/-, realized [Hēau-], spelled ʰe̞e-ja-u-. This means that acc.sg. ʰe̞-e-un probably represents /Héʔun/ or, already with contraction, /Héun/. From MH times onwards, the stem /Héu/- is spreading over the paradigm, yielding nom.pl. ʰe̞uš and acc.pl. ʰe̞us.

It is remarkable that this noun originally shows an ablauting suffix, which is normally only found in i- and u-stem adjectives. Either this means that ʰe̞u- / ʰe̞e(j)au- originally was an adjective that was gradually being substantivized, or it means that u-stem nouns (and subsequently i-stem nouns, compare yeši- / yešai- ‘pasture’) originally showed ablaut as well, and that ʰe̞u- / ʰe̞e(j)au- is one of the last remnants of this system.

Melchert (1994a: 102) tentatively connects this word with Gr. aionáw ‘to moisten’, which points to *ʰh₂e̞ih₁- (although it is problematic whether in *ʰh₂e̞ih₁-the yod would remain, yielding Gr. aιō). If the etymon is correct, however, we have to reconstruct nom.sg. *ʰh₂e̞ih₁-u-s, nom.pl. *ʰh₂e̞ih₁-éu-čs, which with generalization of the full grade stem would yield PAnat. */Háiʔus/, */Háiʔoučs/ that regularly developed into OH /Héʔus/, /Héʔus/.

Note that Puhvel’s unattractive scenario (I.c.: a basic stem *ʰe̞y- that became an u-stem *ʰe̞y-u-, *ʰe̞y-ay-, after which *ʰe̞yay- was dissimilated to attested ʰe̞jau-) seems to be especially based on the etymological presumption that ʰe̞u- /
hē(j)au- is cognate with Gr. ἤξε ‘to rain’ and TochAB su- ‘to rain’, which he reconstructs as *s-E₂ew-.

-ḥhi (1sg.pres.act.-ending of the ḥi-flection)

This ending denotes the 1sg.pres.act. of verbs that inflect according to the ḥi-conjugation (which is named after this ending). Actually, the original shape of this ending was -ḥhe as is still attested in OS texts (e.g. tar-na-ah-ḥé, da-a-ah-ḥé, ga-a-an-ga-ah-ḥé, me-e-ma-ah-ḥé, etc.). Nevertheless, already in OS texts we find that this ending is altered to -ḥḥi (e.g. tar-na-ah-ḥi, da-a-ah-ḥi, ga-a-an-ga-ah-ḥi, me-e-ma-ah-ḥi, etc. (all OS)), which probably is due to the fact that the element -i had developed as a specific present-marker (cf. pres. -yen vs. pret. -yen, -teni vs. -ten, etc.). In the same vein original 3sg.pres.act. -e (of the ḥi-conjugation) was altered to -i and 3sg.pres.act. -za = l-t’ (of the mi-conjugation) was altered to -zi.

From the late MH period onwards, we see that -ḥḥi is gradually being replaced by its mi-conjugation counterpart -mi. This happened predominantly in stems ending in a consonant (e.g. ḥa-ma-an-ga-mi (MS?) instead of ḥamangahḥi, ú-e-ya-ak-mi (MS?) instead of **uyakḥi, a-ak-mi (NS) instead of **ākḥi, etc.). A nice line of development is visible in ‘I plug up’: iš-ta-a-ap-ḥé (OS) > iš-ta-a-ap-ḥi (OH/MS) > iš-ta-ap-ḥi (OH/NS) > iš-tap-mi (NS). I know of only one example of this replacement in a verb ending in a vowel, namely še-eš-ḥa-mi (KUB 14.19, 10 (NS)) instead of še-eš-ḥa-ah-ḥi ‘I decide’ (see at šišha₁ / šišh). It must be noted that mi-inflecting verbs never use the ending -ḥḥi. So in the competition between -ḥḥi and -mi it is clear that -mi was the winning party.

For the etymological interpretation of -ḥhe, we must first look at the other Anatolian languages. In Luwian we find 1sg.pres.act. -yi that corresponds with Lyc. -u, but that cannot be cognate with Hitt. -ḥhe. In the preterite, we find in Luwian 1sg.pret.act. -(h)ḥa, however, which corresponds to Lyc. 1sg.pret.act. -ya. These forms point to PAnat. */-Ha/ (with an -a as visible in Lyc. -a), which indicates that Hitt. -ḥhe must go back to PAnat. */-Hai/ (note that the Hittite 1sg.pret.act.-ending of the hi-conjugation is -ḥḫun which is a conflation of PAnat. */-Hai/ with Hitt. -un, the corresponding mi-ending). This PAnat. */-Hai/ can only reflect QIE */-H₂e-i/.

The furter etymology of -ḥhe depends on ones interpretation of the hi-conjugation as a whole. In my view, it is quite clear that formally the hi-conjugation must be cognate with the category that yielded the perfect in the other IE languages. I therefore directly compare Hitt. -ḥhe that must reflect */-H₂e-
\( i \) with the 1sg.-ending of the PIE perfect that is usually reconstructed as \(^*\)-h\(_2\)e
(Skt. -\( a \), Gk. -\( \alpha \), Goth. -\( O \), etc.).

\( ^{\text{t}}\)hi\( \text{la-} \) (c.) ‘courtyard; halo’ (Sum. TÜR); nom.sg. \( \text{hi-i-la-aš} \) (KUB 2.6 iii 34 (OH/NS), KUB 8.30 rev. 19 (OH/NS), KUB 7.41 i 21 (MH/NS), KBo 4.9 i 28 (NS)), \( \text{hi-la-aš} \) (KUB 17.10 iv 10 (OH/MS), KBo 10.45 i 12 (MH/NS)), \( [\text{hi-}]l-a-aš \) (KUB 34.13 obv. 8 (NS)), acc.sg. \( \text{hi-i-la-an} \) (IBoT 1.36 i 6 (MH/MS)), \( \text{hi-la-an} \) (KBo 23.23 obv. 63 (MH/MS), KUB 27.29 i 21 (MH/NS)), gen.sg. \( \text{hi-i-la-aš} \) (IBoT 1.36 i 4 (MH/MS), KUB 20.10 iv 8 (OH/NS), KUB 9.31 i 25 (MH/NS), KUB 29.4 i 35 (NS)), \( \text{hi-e-la-aš} \) (HT 1 i 18 (NS)), dat.loc.sg. \( \text{hi-i-li} \) (KBo 25.56 iv 17 (OS), IBoT 1.36 i 9, iv 29, 32 (MH/MS), KBo 22.189 ii 12 (OH/NS), KUB 11.35 i 24 (OH/NS), KUB 33.24 i 11 (OH/NS), KUB 7.41 obv. 22 (MH/NS), KBo 4.9 v 18, 32 (NS), KUB 20.35 iii 15 (NS), KUB 36.17 + 33.107 i 5 (NS), etc.), \( \text{hi-li} \) (KUB 33.19 iii 6 (OH/NS), KBo 10.45 i 13 (MH/NS), IBoT 3.69 i 15 (NS)), all.sg. \( \text{hi-i-la} \) (KBo 25.48 iii 10 (OH/MS), KUB 21.90 obv. 14, 21 (OH/MS)), abl. \( \text{hi-i-la-az} \) (IBoT 1.36 i 74 (MH/MS)).

Derivatives: \( \text{hilae}^{\text{d}} \) (Ic2) ‘to be haloed, to have a halo’ (3sg.pres.act. \( \text{hi-la-iz-zi} \), \( \text{hi-la-a-iz-zi} \)), \( \text{hilatar} / \text{hilamm-} \) (n.) ‘yard’ (gen.sg. \( \text{hi-l-[a-a]n-na-aš} \) (KBo 6.3 iv 13 (OH/NS))), \( \text{hilammar} / \text{hilamm-} \) (n.) ‘gate building, gatehouse, portal’ (Sum. KILLAM; nom.-acc.sg. \( \text{hi-lam-mar} \) (KBo 5.2 iv 5 (MH/NS), KUB 45.12 iii 11 (MH/NS), KBo 10.45 ii 34 (MH/NS), IBoT 1.36 iv 15 (fr.) (MH/MS)), gen.sg. \( \text{hi-lam-na-aš} \), dat.loc.sg. \( \text{hi-lam-ni} \) (OS), all.sg. \( \text{hi-lam-na} \) (OS), erg.sg. \( \text{hi-lam-na-an-za} \) (KUB 17.10 iv 11 (OH/MS)), abl. \( \text{hi-lam-na-az} \) (OS)), \( ^{1\text{L}}\text{hilamin-} \) (c.) ‘courtier’ (nom.sg. \( \text{hi-lam-mi-iš} \), nom.pl. \( \text{hi-lam-mi-e-eš} \), \( ^{1\text{L}}\text{hilammatta-} \) (c.) a functionary (nom.pl. \( \text{hi-lam-ma-ti-eš} \), \( \text{hi-lam-ma-at-ti-eš} \), \( \text{hi-lam-ma-at-ti-iš} \), \( \text{hi-lam-ma-di-iš} \), \( \text{hi-lam-ma-at-ta-aš} \), \( \text{hilammili} \) (adv.) ‘in a ḫ. fashion’ (\( \text{hi-lam-mi-li} \)), \( \text{hilam(min)ni} \) (c.) ‘courtier(?)’ (nom.sg. \( \text{hi-lam-mi-in-ni-iš} \), acc.sg. \( \text{hi-lam-ni-in} \)).


See Puhvel HED 3: 305f. for attestations. Note that there a form \( \text{hi-i-e[l-]i} \) (KBo 19.145 iii 44) is cited, which is wrongly read: the form in fact is \( \text{hi-i-e\_e} \). The most common and oldest spelling is \( \text{hi-i-l°} \), although \( \text{hi-l°} \) is attested multiple times as well. A spelling \( \text{hi-e\_l°} \) is attested only once in a
NS text (HT 1 i 18), which therefore may not have much phonetic value. The original form therefore is ḫila-.

The word denotes ‘courtyard’, but in the expressions ‘ḫila- of the moon’ and ‘ḫila- of the sun’ it probably denotes ‘halo’. The word ḫilammar / ḫilamm- ‘gatehouse’ is generally seen as a derivative of ḫila- (because it denotes a portal leading to a courtyard), and Melchert (1983: 12-13) states that it shows a suffix *-mr / *-mn- (with -mn- assimilating to -mm- in ḫilammi-, ḫilammatta- and ḫilammili, on the basis of which expected *ḫilamar was altered to ḫilammar).

Note however that the phonetic resemblance to its Sumerian counterpart K.U.LAM is remarkable and that we therefore must not rule out the possibility that it is a loanword.

Within Anatolian, Hitt. ḫila- often is compared to Lyc. qa- ‘precinct’, but this is formally impossible. The Lycian sign q denotes a labialized consonant (possibly [k]) that reflects PAnat. */Hq/ (see Kloekhorst fthc.c). I would therefore rather reconstruct Lyc. qa- as *h2-u-leh2-, comparable to Gr. ὁδόν ‘courtyard, precinct’ < *h2eu-leh2-.

As an inner-Hittite comparandum, the noun ḫali- ‘pen, corral’ often is mentioned, and Rieken (1999a: 226, 246) therefore reconstructs ḫali- as *h2i- and ḫla- as *h2e-eh2- from a root *h2el- ‘to surround’ that further only is attested in the root-extension *h2elk- / *h2elk- ‘to protect’ (OE ealgian, Gr. ἀλέξω, Skt. raks- ‘to protect’). She states that in the case of ḫila- “der i-Vokalisismus der Wurzel von ḫila- als Vorstufe langes *e voraus[setzt], das in Nachbarschaft des Laryngals zunächst bewahrt und später in unbetonter Stellung zu i geschwächt wurde” (1999a: 248-9). This scenario is based on Melchert (1984a: 111ff., 135ff.) who describes a development *h₂e > Hitt. ʰi. In 1994a: 143, Melchert explicitly withdraws this development, however, and therewith the formal basis under the reconstruction of ḫila- as *h₂el- has vanished. Moreover, as I have stated in § 1.4.9.2.b, I do not believe in Eichner’s Law (i.e. the non-colouration of *e by an adjacent *h₂ or *h₁). Furthermore, reconstructing a root *h₂el- ‘to surround’ on the basis of these two Hittite words only seems unwarranted to me. All in all, I reject Rieken’s etymology.

Already early in Hittitology (e.g. Friedrich 1927: 180), it has been assumed that ḫila- should be connected with Akk. bā ṣīlānī, pointing to an areal Wanderwort.


IE cognates: Lat. *imitor* ‘to copy, to imitate’, *imāgō* ‘copy’, *aemulus* ‘rival’.

PIE *h₂im-no*

See Puhvel HED 3: 314f. for attestations. Since Neumann *apud* Oettinger (1976a: 64) this word is generally connected with Lat. *imitor* ‘to imitate’, *imāgō* ‘copy’, *aemulus* ‘rival’ from *h₂(ɔ)im-*. The geminate -mm- in Hittite must be the product of an assimilation, possibly *h₂im-no-.*

**hin-**: see *ḥān-* / *ḥan-*

**hīnik** *(ntr)* (IIIh) ‘to pour?’: 3sg.pres.midd. *ḥi-ni-ik-ta.*

In 1976, Hart was the first to separate the forms that were spelled *ḥi-ni-ik-ta* from the verb *ḥink-* (see at the lemma *ḥai(n)k* *(ntr)*, *ḥink* *(ntr)*; *ḥi(n)k* *(z)*) because of their aberrant spelling: *ḥi-ni-ik-C* vs. *ḥi-in-ik-C*. On the basis of the two contexts in which *ḥi-ni-ik-ta* occurs, namely

KBo 3.7 ii

(21) *UR.SAG* Za-li-ja-mu-u *ḥu-um-a-an-da-aš ḫa-an-[te-ez-zi-ia-aš?]
(22) ma-a-an I-NA *LRU* Ne-ri-ik *ḥē-u-ūš*
(23) *hi-ni-ik-ta nu* *LRU* Ne-ri-ik-ka-t-az
(24) [L]Ü *GIDRU* NINDA *ḥar-ši-īn pē-e-da-a-i*

‘The mountain Zalijanu was fill[rst?] of all. When in Nerik *ḫ-s* is *ḫ*-ed, the staff-bearer brings away thick-bread from Nerik’

and

KUB 34.16 iii

(3) [ ... ] x ya-an-mu-pa’aš-ta-li-eš ḫa-la-li-ez-zi
(4) [(ut-ne-ja-.) *ḥē-e-a-u-it ḫi-ni-ik-ta*

// KBo 14.61

(6) [ ... (ya-an-na-p)a-as-ta-lu-us[ ]
(7) [(ṣa-la-li-ez-z)i ut-ne-jaal( )]
(8) [(ḫē-e-a-u-it ūi-)ni-ik-[(ta)]

‘... the morningstar’ cleans ... on’ the earth (*i?*) *ḫ-s* is *ḫ*-ed with rain’
Hart assumes that ḫinik- may mean “wet, pour, deluge” and therefore proposes an etymological connection with Skt. sīncati ‘to pour’, interpreting ḫinik- as a nasal-infixed form of a root *(s)Heik- which can directly be compared to Skt. siḥ-c-. This idea has been taken over by e.g. Puhvel (HED 3: 315, reconstructing “*(s)H_ey-k’”-”) and Kimball (1999: 382, who for reasons unclear to me insists on a reconstruction with *(h)j). The preform of Skt. sīncati, which belongs with OHG sīhan ‘to filter’, seihen ‘to urinate’, SerbCS sćati ‘to urinate’ and Gaul. Sēquana ‘Seine’, must contain a *-k”, however, *seik”-, which does not fit Hitt. ḫinik-. Moreover, there is no indication for a laryngeal in any of the other languages. All in all, I reject the connection between ḫinik,“ and Skt. sīncati.

**ādū**, hā(n)kā: see ḫaini(h)n akō

**ākan-**: see ākan-


For the semantics of this word we must compare the following context:

KaBo 6.2 ii

(49) Lō ḫi-ip-pār-aš lu-az-zi kar-pi-i-ez-zi  nu Lō ḫi-ip-pa-ri ḫa-a-ap-pār le-e
(50) [k)iš-ki i-ez-zi DUMU=ŠU AŠ=iš=ŠU GES Tin=ŠU le-e ku-ši-ši yaa-šī
(51) [ku-ši] š=za Lō ḫi-ip-pa-ri ḫa-a-ap-pār i-ez-zi n=a-šī=kān ḫa-a-ap-pa-ra-az
(52) [ša-še-é] n-zi Lō ḫi-ip-pār-aš ku-it ḫa-ap-pa-ra-a-et ta-a=za a-ap-pa da-a-[i]
(53) [tuk-ka Lō] ši-ip-pār-aš ta-a-i-ez-zi šar-ni-iš-zi il NU.GÁL
(54) ... nu tu-ek-kān-za=ši-ši=pāt šar-ni-iš-zi

‘A ḫ. shall perform corvée. No-one shall do business with a ḫ.. No-one shall buy his child, his field (or) his vineyard. Whoever does do business with a ḫ. forefeits his right to the trade. Whatever the ḫ. traded, he shall give it back. When a ḫ. steals, there is no restitution. (…) His body alone shall restitute (it)’.

From this text, it is clear that hippara- is some sort of outcast that is not allowed to do any trade. Even when a hippara- has stolen, he is not supposed to perform any trading, i.e. restituting what was stolen: only his body can be used for the restitution. In a duplicate of this text, KaBo 6.4 iv 36-41, Lō hippara- is
akkadographically written \textsuperscript{LJ}A-SI-RUM, which literally means ‘locked up’. Friedrich (1959: 98) states: “Es muss sich um eine sehr unzuverlässige Gattung von Menschen handeln, die eingesperrt gehalten wurde und mit der man auch keinen Handel treiben durfte”.

Despite the difficulty regarding the semantic interpretation of this word, Güterbock (1972: 96) suggested an etymological tie-in with hāppar- / hāppir- ‘trade, business’, which was codified by Eichner (1973a: 72) who reconstructed \*hēp(o)rō- ‘Käufling’ (followed by e.g. Melchert 1994a: 76, who assumes a basic meaning ‘bought’). There is not a shred of evidence, however, that a \textsuperscript{LJ}hippara- was subject to being sold and bought. On the contrary, the fact that a \textsuperscript{LJ}hippara- could own fields or vineyards (which he is not allowed to sell) in my view indicates that he cannot be some sort of slave, but must be a free man, albeit of a very low status. This, together with the fact that it is forbidden to do business (hāppar- / hāppir-) with a \textsuperscript{LJ}hippara-, in my opinion shows that an etymological connection between hāppar- / hāppir- and \textsuperscript{LJ}hippara- is very unlikely.

\textit{hišša-} (c.) ‘carriage pole’: acc.sg. hī-iš-ša-an (KBo 13.119 iii 10 (NS)), dat.-loc.sg. hī-iš-ši (KUB 30.32 i 3 (MS), KUB 34.16 ii 7 (OH/NS), Bo 4929 v 17-20 (NS)), he-eš-ši (KBo 12.123, 15 (NS)).


PIE *h₂ih₁-s-eh₂-

See Puhvel HED 3: 318f. for attestations. Almost all attestations (including the oldest (MS) one) are spelled ḥi-iš-s̱. Only once, we find a spelling he-eš-s̱, in an NS text, which must be due to the NH lowering of OH ī/ī to /e/ before -s̱- (cf. § 1.4.8.1.d). The word denotes the pole of a cart.

Since Sommer (1949: 161) this word is generally connected with Skt. ṭā́ ‘pole, shaft’. Combined with the Hittite evidence, we must reconstruct *h₂ih₁s-ēh₂-. In other IE languages, we find e.g. Slov. ojě, gen. ojěša ‘carriage pole’, which seems to point to an s-stem *h₂eih₁₁-es- or *h₂oih₁₁-es-, dial.Russ. vojě ‘carriage pole’, Gr. οἶκος ‘handle of rudder’ and Gr. οἶχῶ ‘handle of rudder, tiller’, the preforms of which are less clear. On the basis of Gr. ὄ-, Kimball (1999: 386) reconstructs *h₁-, but this does not seem obligatory to me.

According to Dercksen (fthc.), the noun \textit{hišša-} is attested in OAssyrian texts from Kültepe as well, namely as \textit{hiššannum}. 
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\( ^{1}hištā, ^{1}hiṣṭā \) (n.) ‘mausoleum(?)’ (Sum. É.NA₄): nom.-acc.sg. ḫe-eš-ta-a (MS), gen.sg. ḫi-š-ta-a-aš (OS), ḫi-š-ta-aš (MS), ḫe-eš-ta-a-aš (MS), ḫe-eš-ta-aš (NS), ḫi-š-ta-a (OS), ḫi-š-da-a (OH/MS), ḫe-eš-ta-a (OH/MS), ḫe-eš-da-a (NS), ḫe-

eš-ti-i (OH/NS), ḫe-eš-ti-i (NS), dat.-loc.sg. ḫi-š-ti-i (OS), ḫe-eš-ti-i (OH/NS), ḫ-eš-ti-i (NS), ḫi-š-ta-a (OS), ḫi-š-da-a (OH/NS), ḫe-eš-ta-a (OH/MS), abl. ḫe-eš-ti-i (NS).


See Puhvel HED 3: 319f. for attestations. The oldest attestations (OS) are all spelled ḫi-š-ta- (MS), whereas spellings with -e- (ḫe-eš-ta- (MS), ḫe-eš-ta- (MS) occur from MH times onwards only. This must be due to the lowering of OH hi/ to NH he/ before -s- as described in § 1.4.8.1.d. The word denotes a cultic building that is connected with death-rituals and ancestor cult, but its exact function is unclear.

The sumerographic writing of this word seems to be É.NA₄ ‘house of stones’.

Since Götzze (1925: 104), ^{1}hištā, ^{1}hiṣṭā has been connected with ḫa-as-ti-ja-aš É-er ‘house of bones’ that is mentioned by Ḥattišili III (KUB 1.1 iv 75), on the basis of which an etymological connection between ^{1}hištā, ^{1}hiṣṭā and ḫaššai-

‘bone’ (q.v.) has been assumed. For instance, Eichner (1973a: 72) reconstructs *hḫeštojó- (followed by e.g. Melchert 1994a: 76), whereas Puhvel (l.c.) reconstructs *hystojo- (with anaptyctic e/i).

If we look at the paradigm of ^{1}hištā, ^{1}hiṣṭā, however, we see that it hardly shows any inflected forms. Only in the genitive we occasionally find an ending -s, but everywhere else the word remains uninflected and shows only ḫisṭā or ḫiṣṭā. In my view, this strongly indicates that this word is not genuinely Hittite, but must be a foreignism (cf. Ḧeḫ kur for a similar uninflectedness). This would fit the fact that cultic buildings often have non-IE names (e.g. ḫalenti(i)u-, ^{1}māk(kiz)i(i)u-, ^{1}karimmii-, etc.). This view was also advocated by Kammenhuber (1972: 300), who explained ḫaššišaš É-er ‘house of bones’ as a folk etymology.

\( ḫuč\-^{2} / ḫuč\) (Ia1) ‘to conjure, to treat by incantation’: 1sg.pres.act. ḫu-e-ek-mi (KBo 22.107 i 14 (MS), ḫu-ek-mi (KBo 22.107 i 11 (MS), KBo 17.61 rev. 7 (MH/NS), KUB 17.28 i 28 (MH/NS)), ḫu-uk-mi (KUB 17.28 ii 3, 8 (fr.) (MH/NS), KUB 27.134 i 20 (MS)), ḫu-uk-mi (KBo 11.19 obv. 1 (NS)), 2sg.pres.act. ḫu-ik-ši (KUB 45.21, 1 (MH/MS)), 3sg.pres.act. ḫu-e-ek-zi (OS, often), ḫu-ek-zi (OS, often), ḫu-uk-zi (KUB 44.4 + KBo 13.241 rev. 18 (NS), KUB 24.13 iii 17 (NS, KUB 7.52 + 12.58 i 57, 62, 64, ii 54 (NS), VBoT 58 iv 38
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(OH/NS), ḫu-u-uk-zi (KBo 12.112 obv. 13 (NS)), 1pl.pres.act. ḫu-e-ku-ya-ni
(KBo 15.28 obv. 7 (MH/MS)), 3pl.pres.act. ḫu-kān-zi (KBo 2.12 ii 34 (NS)), ḫu-
-u-kān-zi (MH/MS, often), 1pl.pret.act. ḫu-u-ga-u-en (KUB 18.12 obv. 13 (NS)),
3sg.imp.act. ḫu-ek-du (KUB 7.1 i 12ff. (OH/NS)); part. ḫu-u-kān-t-, ḫu-u-ga-an-
t-; verb.noun gen.sg. ḫu-u-kān-na-aš (KUB 16.47, 12 (NS)), ḫu-u-ga-an-na-aš
(KUB 18.12 obv. 7 (NS)); inf.II ḫu-u-kān-na (KUB 17.24 ii 14 (NS)); impf. ḫu-
uk-ki-iš-ke/a-, ḫu-u-uk-ki-š-ke/a-, ḫu-u-ki-iš-ke/a- (KBo 15.33 ii 28 (OH/MS)), KUB 20.48 i 5 (NS), VSNF 12.20 i 12 (NS)).

Derivatives: ḫukmai- / ḫukni- (c.) ‘conjunction’ (Akk. ŠIPTU; acc.sg.c. ḫu-uk-
ma-in (KUB 7.52 + 12.58 i 57, 62, 64 (NS), KBo 15.1 iv 40 (NS), Gurney 6, 6 (NS)), ḫu-u-uk-ma-in (KUB 27.134 i 19 (MS)), nom.-acc.sg.n. ḫu-uk-ma-i (KUB 9.34 iii 6 (NS)), gen.sg. ḫu-uk-mi-ja-aš (KUB 17. 62+63 i 13 (MS))), acc.plc. ḫu-
uk-ma-aš (KUB 27.29 i 7 (MH/NS)), ḫu-uk-ma-a-š (VBoT 58 iv 37 (OH/NS),
KUB 36.44 i 6 (OH/MS)), ḫu-u-uk-ma-a-š (KUB 14.4 iii 8 (NH)),
I ḫukmatalla- (c.) ‘conjurer’ (Sum. I ḫuk-ma-tal-[e-eš] (KUB 12.61 ii 7 (NS)), ḫugannā- / ḫuganni- (IIa5) ‘to conjure (imperf.)’ (inf.I ḫu-u-ga-an-mi-ja- ḫar-ya-an-zi (313/z rev. 6)).

IE cognates: ?Gr. ἀφέξω ‘to boast, to brag’.

PIE *h₂ueg²- or *h₁ueg²-?

See Puhvel HED 3: 323f. for attestations. As the sign IG can be read like as well as
βk, all cases where we find ḫu-IG- are, just as ḫu-e-IG-, to be interpreted as
/ahoeg/- (cf. § 1.3.9.4 for the phoneme /o/). The verb clearly shows an original
ablaut ḫuekzi / ḫukanzi and therewith is homophonic to the verb ḫuek²- / ḫuk-
‘to slaughter, to butcher’. In MH times we see that the strong stem ḫuk- is used in
1pl.pres.act. ḫuḳuḳaṇi as well (replacing original *hukyeni), which is normal in
v/∅-ablauting mi-verbs. Remarkable is the fact that the weak stem ḫuk- seems to
have become productive in NH times. This can be explained in view of the fact
that the bulk of the cases of ḫukmi and ḫuki are found in the syntagm ḫukmāin
huk- ‘to conjure a conjunction’. It is likely that here the use of the weak stem ḫuk-
in the verbal form is due to analogy to the noun ḫukmai-.

The single writing of -k- (huḳuḳaṇi, ḫukanzi, ḫukanṭ-, ḫuganna, etc.) points to
etymological *g or *g²h (or *g⁰h). Note that the imperfective is predominantly
spelled with geminate -kk-, which is due to fortition of original lenis stops before
the *-sk/o-suffix (similarly aku² / aku- ‘to drink’ with akkuśke/a-, lāk¹ / lāk- ‘to
make lie down’ with lakkiśke/a-, etc.). Mechanically, ḫuek²- / ḫuk- must go back
to a root *h₂ueg⁰h- or *h₁ueg⁰h- (the initial laryngeal must be *h₂ because *h₁
would regularly drop in this position). Nevertheless, the etymological
interpretation is difficult. Puhvel (l.c.) argues in favour of a connection with Gr. ἄφωσα 'to pray: to declare solemnly'. Although semantically this would be attractive, it cannot be correct on formal grounds. Gr. ἄφωσα belongs with Lat. voveō 'to vow', which means that we have to reconstruct a root *₇hueg₇th-, with əph- reflecting *₇hue₇th: this has the wrong velar as well as the wrong laryngeal.

Oettinger (1979a: 103) connects ἡυεκ₂ / ἡυκ- with Gr. ἄφωσ 'to boast, to brag', which could point to a root *₇hueg₇th- or *₇hue₇th-. Apart from the fact that the semantic connection is not self-evident, the formation of the Gr. verb is not unproblematic: it is probably derived from the last parts of compounds in -αφως and may therefore not represent an original verbal stem.

**حلة / ἡυκ-** (IaI) ‘to slaughter, to butcher’: 1sg.pres.act. ἡυ-εκ[-mi] (KBo 17.3 iii 14 (OS)), ἡυ-εκ-mi (KBo 17.1 i 41 (OS)), 3sg.pres.act. ἡυ-εκ-zi (KBo 20.39 1col. 12, 14, 15 (OH/MS), KUB 51.1 + 53.14 ii 11 (MS), KBo 11.45 + IBoT 3.87 ii 5 (OH/NS)), ἡυ-υε-εκ-zi (KUB 17.24 iii 3 (NS)), ἡυ-υεκ-zi (KUB 41.8 i 18 (MH/NS)), ἡυ-υεκ-zi (KBo 10.45 i 35 (MH/NS), KUB 53.12 iii 21 (NS)), 3pl.pres.act. ἡυ-κάν-zi (OS, often), ἡυ-υκάν-zi (OS, often), 3sg.pret.act. ἡυ-εκ-τα (OS), ἡυ-υεκ-τα (KBo 22.6 i 18 (OH/NS), ἡυ-εκ-τα (KBo 11.45 + IBoT 3.87 ii 17 (OH/NS)); 3pl.pres.midd. ἡυ-υκάν-ta (KUB 55.28 ii 12 (MH/NS)); part. ἡυ-γα-αν-t- (OS), ἡυ-γα-αν-t-t- (OS); verb.noun. ἡυ-υα-ταρ; inf. II ἡυ-γα-αν-na, ἡυ-υα-αν-na, ἡυ-υκά-n-a; impf. ἡυ-υεκ-ι-ις-κε/α- (MS), ἡυ-υεκ-ι-ις-κε/α- (NS), ἡυ-κι-ις-κε/α- (MS), ἡυ-υεκ-ι-ις-κε/α- (NS). Derivatives: **هةكش / هىكش-** (n) ‘slaughtering’ (nom.-acc.sg. ἡυ-κε-κς-ς, ἡυ-υε-κς-ς, ἡυ-κ-κς-ς, dat.-loc.sg. ἡυ-υε-κς-ς), see ἡυνι(η)κ².

IE cognates: OP vaj- ‘to stab’.

PIE *₇hueg₇th-

See Puhvel HED 3: 327f. for attestations. Note that Puhvel cites “1pl.pres.act. (?) ἡυ-εικ-[κ]-ην” (KBo 17.4 iii 19) (with reference to Otten & Souček 1969: 34), but I do not think that this interpretation is likely: ἡυεκ² / ἡυκ- is in all other instances consistently spelled with single -k-, which would make this form totally aberrant. Because the form is found in such a broken context that its reading or meaning cannot be ascertained, I leave it out of consideration here.

The sign IG can be read ik as well as ek and therefore all cases where we find ἡυ-IG- are, just as ἡυ-e-IG- and ἡυ-υ-e-IG-, to be interpreted as /Hoeug/- (cf. § 1.3.9.4 for the phoneme /ol/). The verb clearly shows an original ablaut ἡυεκζι /
the lenis velar before the suffix *-tas- (compare ekuti / akuti- ‘to drink and akku-sk/ə-, lâk- / lak- ‘to make lie down’ and lakkiš/a-, etc.). Mechanically, ḥwkanzi and therewith is homophonous to the verb ḥwak- / ḥu- ‘to conjugate’. The consistent spelling with single -k- points to an etymological *g or *gʰ (or *gʰ). Note that the imperfective is spelled with geminate -kk- (although spellings with single -k- occur as well: these are probably secondary) which is due to fortition of the lenis velar before the suffix *-tas- (compare ekut- / akut- ‘to drink and akku-sk/ə-, lâk- / lak- ‘to make lie down’ and lakkiš/a-, etc.). Mechanically, ḥwak- / ḥu- must go back to a root *h₂wegʰ- or *h₂wegʰ- (the initial laryngeal must be *h₂ because *h₁ would regularly drop in this position).

Strunk (1979: 254) connects ḥwak- / ḥu- with OP vaj- ‘to stab’ (1sg.pret.act. avajam), which is widely followed. Puhvel (loc.) proposes to further adduce Gr. (Ph)ó crippling. OHG wagans ‘ploughshare’, but these forms must reflect *weikʰ-, which is the wrong velar from a Hittite point of view. Eichner’s suggestion (1982: 18) to connect ḥwak- with Skt. vec- ‘to sieve’ is, apart from the semantic problems, formally impossible: Skt. vec- reflects *weik- with an -i- that is not found in Hittite as well as with a *-k- that does not fit Hitt. single -k- < *gʰ-.

**ḥuḵ.sys**: see ḥuš- / ḥuš-

**ḥuəˈtuːtʰ(ə) / ḥuəˈtuːtʰ(ə): ḥuəˈtuːtʰ(ə)-** (IIIa/b > IIIg; Ic1) ‘to draw, to pull, to pluck’ (Sum. SUD. Akk. ŠADTU): 1sg.pres.midd. ḥu-it-ta-ah-ḫa-ra (KBo 11.11 i 4 (NS)), 2sg.pres.midd. ḥu-e-ta- (KUB 17.10 iv 1, 2 (OH/MS), KUB 33.54 + 47 ii 15 (fr.) (OH/NS)), ḥu-iz-[ta] (IBoT 4.8 obv. 2 (OH/NS)), ḥu-it-ti-at-[ta] (KUB 21.19 + 1303/u ii 18 (NH)), 3sg.pres.midd. ḥu-et-ti-ja-ra (KBo 17.92, 15 (MS)), 3pl.pres.midd. ḥu-e-et-ti-an-ta (KUB 29.30 iii 6 (OS)), ḥu-et-ti-ja-an-ta (KUB 29.35 iv 15 (OS), KBo 19.152 i 6 (MS), KUB 29.37, 8 (fr.) (OH/NS)), ḥu-it-ti-an-ta (KBo 6.26 i 41 (OH/NS)), ḥu-u-it-ti-an-ta (KBo 6.26 i 42 (OH/NS)), ḥu-u-it-ti-ja-an-ta (KBo 6.26 iv 5, 21 (OH/NS)), 1sg.pres.midd. ḥu-it-ta-ah-ḫa-at (KBo 11.11 i 9 (NS)), 3sg.pres.midd. ḥu-e-ti-ja-ti (KBo 3.22, 54 (OS), KUB 26.71 i 3 (OH/NS), KUB 43.75 obv. 19 (NS)), ḥu-it-ti-et-ti (KUB 26.71 i 3 (OH/NS)), ḥu-it-ti-ja-at-ta-at (KUB 19.67 i 2 (NH)), ḥu-u-it-ti-ja-at-ta-at (KUB 1.7 i 10 (NH)), ḥu-iz-za-aš-ta-ti (KUB 43.74 obv. 11 (NS)), 3sg.imp.midd. ḥu-et-ti-ja-r (Bo 6472, 10 (undat.)); 1sg.pres.act. ḥu-u-it-ti-ja-mi (VBoT 24 iii 13, iv 10 (MH/NS)), 2sg.pres.act. ḥu-it-ti-ja-ši (KUB 7.53 iii 2, 4 (NS), KBo 5.3 ii 29 (NH), 3sg.pres.act. ḥu-et-ti-ja-zi (KUB 15.34 iii 56 (MH/MS), KBo 3.2 rev. 59 (MH/NS), KBo 3.5 iv 26 (MH/NS), KBo 21.10, 4 (MH/NS), KUB 1.13 i 45 (MH/NS), KUB 44.61 rev. 26 (fr.) (NS)), ḥu-it-ti-ja-az-zi (KUB 22.102 rev. 10 (NS), KUB 29.4 ii 21 (NS)), ḥu-u-it-ti-ja-zi (KUB 15.31 i 28 (MH/NS), KBo 8.90 ii 9 (NS)), ḥu-u-it-ti-ja-az-zi (KUB 23.1 i 18 (NS)), ḥu-it-ti-e-iz-zi (KUB 1.13 i 12
(MH/NS), ḫu-it-ja-az-zi (KUB 33.43 ii 57 (NS)), ḫu-it-ja-i (KUB 27.67 ii 17, 18, iii 21, 22 (MH/NS), KBo 5.2 iii 20 (MH/NS)), 2pl.pres.act. ḫu-u-it-ja-at-te-ni (KUB 13.5 ii 26 (OH/NS)), ḫu-u-it-ja-at-te-ni (KUB 13.6 ii 9 (OH/NS)), 3pl.pres.act. ḫu-et-ti-an-zi (KUB 15.33 ii 14 (OH/MS), KUB 29.7 + KBo 21.41 rev. 6 (MH/MS), KUB 9.3 i 17 (MS), KBo 3.2 obv. 8, 16 (MH/NS), KBo 3.5 iii 6, 13 (MH/NS), KUB 1.13 iii 59 (MH/NS), etc.), ḫu-it-ja-an-zi (less often), ḫu-u-it-ja-an-zi (KUB 2.5 i 8 (NS)), 1sg.pret.act. ḫu-et-ja-mu-un (HKM 71 rev. 28 (MH/MS)), KUB 29.7 + KBo 21.41 obv. 65 (MH/MS), KBo 2.5 iii 50 (NS), KBo 4.4 iii 32 (NH), ḫu-u-it-ja-an-zi-un (KUB 2.5 ii 3 (NS)), 3sg.pret.act. ḫu-et-ti-ja-at (KUB 17.10 i 4 (OH/MS), KUB 3.64 i 10 (OH/NS), KBo 3.66, 6 (OH/NS), KBo 19.90 + 3.53 obv. 6 (OH/NS), KBo 4.12 obv. 17 (NH), ḫu-it-ti-et (KUB 33.120 i 24 (MH/NS)), ḫu-it-ti-at (KUB 32.14 iii 10, 28 (MH/MS), Bronzetafel i 23 (NH)), ḫu-u-it-ti-ia-at (KUB 14.4 iv 15 (NH)), 1pl.pret.act. ḫu-u-it-ja-u-en (KUB 13.4 iv 72 (OH/NS)), 3pl.pret.act. ḫu-et-ti-er (KUB 29.54 iv 15 (MH/MS)), 2sg.imp.act. ḫu-et-ti (KUB 17.10 iv 3 (OH/MS), KUB 36.75 + 1226/u iii 13 (OH/MS), KUB 29.1 ii 11 (OH/NS)), ḫu-it-ti-ja (KUB 33.54 + 47 iv 17 (OH/NS)), 1sg.pret.act. ḫu-et-ti-ja-at-tén (HKM 25 obv. 14 (MH/MS)), ḫu-u-e-za-at-tén (KUB 58.77 obv. 27, 28 (NS)), 3pl.pret.act. ḫu-u-it-ja-ad-du (KUB 10.45 iv 27 (MH/NS)); part. ḫu-it-ti-an-t- (OS), ḫu-et-ti-an-t- (MH/MS); verb.noun. ḫu-it-te-eš-sar (KUB 27.67 i 19, iii 25 (MH/NS)), ḫu-it-ti-[ja-]-aš-sar (KUB 27.67 ii 20 (MH/NS)); verb.noun. ḫu-et-ti-ja-u-ar (KUB 29.7 + KBo 21.41 obv. 60, rev. 4, 16 (MH/MS)), ḫu-it-ti-ja-u-ya-ar (KUB 10.92 i 18 (NS)), gen.sg. ḫu-it-ti-ja-u-aš (KUB 29.4 ii 18 (NS)), ḫu-u-it-ti-ja-u-ya-aš (KUB 29.4 i 73 (NS), KUB 42.106 rev. 10 (NS), dat.-loc.sg. ḫu-et-ti-ja-u-ni (KUB 15.34 iv 61 (MH/MS)); inf.1 ḫu-it-ti-ja-u-ya-an-zi (KUB 21.19+ ii 20 (NS), KUB 29.4 iii 38, 49 (NS)), ḫu-it-ti-ja-u-an-zi (KUB 12.23, 20 (NS)), ḫu-u-it-ti-ja-u-ya-an-zi (KUB 15.29 iii 8 (NS)), ḫu-u-it-ti-ja-u-an-zi (KUB 15.31 i 33, ii 41, 48 (MH/NS)); impf. ḫu-it-ti-eš-ke/-a- (KUB 13. 64 obv. 12 (NS)).

PIE *hweTH-to, *huuTH-je/o-

See Puhvel HED 3: 343f. for attestations. First it should be noted that the sign IT can be read it as well as et. So the many forms that are spelled ḫu-IT-t° can stand for both ḫuett- as well as ḫuett-. There are a few forms that show plene spellings: ḫu-u-IT-tı-ja-an-zi (NS) and ḫu-u-ı-IT-tı-ja-mu-un (NS) show unambiguously /Hoit-/ whereas ḫu-e-IT-tı-an-ta (OS), ḫu-e- İz-ta (OH/MS) and ḫu-u-e-za-at-ıén (NS) show unambiguously /Hoet-/ (note that the phoneme /o/ is the automatic outcome of *u when adjacent to /H/, cf. § 1.3.4.9.f). To explain the occurrence of /Hoit-/ besides /Hoet-/, we can use the sound law as cited by Melchert (1994a: 101): *ue > Hitt. ui before dental consonants. This means that ḫuett- is the original form, and that the stem ḫuitt- is a later development. In the above overview of forms, I have chosen to cite all MS and OS attestations as ḫu-ı- and the NS attestations as ḫu-ıt-, without claiming that these readings can be proven.

We encounter active as well as middle forms, which do not seem to differ semantically: both are used transitively ‘to draw (someone / something), to draw (someone / something)’. Occasionally, a middle form is reflexive and denotes ‘to recede < *to pull oneself (away)’. Formally, we encounter three stems: ḫuettje/a-, ḫuett- and ḫuittje/a-.

The stem ḫuettje/a- is found in both active and middle forms, in early times already (3pl.pres.act. ḫuettianzi (OH/MS) and 3pl.pres.midd. ḫuettianta (OS)). The stem ḫuett- is found much less often, also in both active and middle forms (2pl.imp.act. ṣuțazzen (NS) besides 2sg.pres.midd. ḫueztta (OH/MS), 3sg.pres.midd. ḫuzaștați (NS)). It should be noted that in the active, it occurs only once (in a NS text), whereas we find several middle forms, most of which are attested in OH compositions. The stem ḫuittje/a- is found in the impf. ḫuittjama/i- only, but is attested in OS texts. Although the evidence is scanty, I think that we have to assume that, originally, the middle paradigm used the stem ḫuett- whereas in the active the stem ḫuittje/a- was used (cf. ḫatt-.dr°, ḫazzije/ar° for a similar distribution). Already in pre-Hittite times, the full grade of the middle was taken over into the active, yielding the stem ḫuettje/a- (with ḫuittje/a- surviving in the imperfective only), which stem was subsequently taken over into the middle paradigm as well. If the noun ḫuttulli- indeed is derived from this verb (which semantically is likely: a ‘strand’ is something that has been pulled out of the wool, cf. the figura etymologica in VBoT 24 iii (13) mu-u=š-Š=ki=kān ḫu-ıt-tlu-ul-lı ḫu-ıt-ti-ja-mi ‘I pluck a strand from it (viz. sheep)’), it would show another instance of the zero grade stem ḫutt-. The consistent spelling with geminate -tt- seems to point to an etymological *t-. Nevertheless, the fact that we do not find assimilation of the dental consonant...
before *-i- in the stems hùttia-/a- and hùttia-/a- show that -tt- cannot reflect *-t-
just like that. It is likely that some laryngeal stood between the dental consonant
and *-i-. As Melchert (1984a: 8816) rightly points out, a sequence *-dʰH- would
yield Hitt. -tt- as well (cf. mekki- < *megʰ2-), which means that we can
mechanically reconstruct hùtt-/hùtt- as *h2uTH- (initial *h2 because *h2 would
be lost in this position, cf. Kloekhorst fthc.c).

The etymological interpretation of this verb is in debate. Melchert (1984a: 8816)
connects hùtt- with the root that traditionally is reconstructed *uedʰ- ‘to lead’
(OIr. fedid ‘leads’, Goth. ga-widan ‘to bind’, Lith. vedū ‘to lead, to marry’, OCS
vedo ‘to lead’, YAv. vādaieiti ‘to lead’, Skt. vadhā- ‘bride’) which he now
reconstructs as *h2uedh2-. According to him, the initial laryngeal is visible in
Hom. *’h2u̯[a]d[ɔ]c, which then is proof for the second laryngeal as well. There are some flaws
in this reasoning. First, the circumflex stems Lith. vād- ‘to lead, to marry’ and
Slav. *ved- ‘to lead’ clearly point to *uedʰ- (absence of Winter’s Law points to
*Dʰ). Semantically, these must belong with OIr. fedid ‘leads’, Goth. ga-widan ‘to
bind’, YAv. vādaieiti ‘leads’ and Skt. vadhā- ‘bride’, which therefore all must go
back to *uedʰ- as well. This means that Hom. *’h2u̯[a]d[ɔ]c, which unambiguously
points to a *-d-, cannot be cognate (but rather belongs with OE weotuma ‘bride-
price’ and PSl. *vēno ‘bride-price’ that does show Winter’s Law and therefore
must reflect *-d-; the simplex form nom.-acc.pl.n. ēōc (Hom.) ‘bridal gifts’
rather points to a root with an initial *h₁-, *h₁ued-, which indicates that *’h2u̯[a]d[ɔ]c
must be a secondary remodelling of original *h₂u̯[a]d[ɔ]c < *h₁ued-no-, p.c. prof.
Kortlandt). Note that in the reflexes of *uedʰ- ‘to lead’, there are no indications
 whatsoever for an initial or root-final laryngeal.

An alternative etymology could be a connection with Skt. vadh- ‘to slay’, Gr.
ōdēo ‘to push’ that up to now are reconstructed *uedʰ₁-. If, however, Gr. ódēo
could reflect *’odēo < *h₂uedʰ₁-ē-, then we may be allowed to connect this
with hùtt- (which then would show that a sequence *-dʰ₁- yields -tt-, but
compare ka-ra-a-pi < *g³থbh₁-ei). Semantically, we should especially compare
Gr. ódēo ‘to push’ with Hitt. hùtt- ‘to pull, to draw’.

LIV² assumes that hùtt- stands isolated in IE and mechanically reconstructs
*h₂uTE-. Note however, that this is incorrect: *h₂ut-je/o- should have yielded
**’huzzija/a-.

All in all, I do not dare to take a final decision.

hùttia/-a∃: hùttia/-a
\(\text{huhh}a\)- (c.) ‘grandfather’ (Akk. ABBA ABBA, ABI ABI): nom.sg. \(\text{h}u-\text{uh-ha-aš\,}\), acc.sg. \(\text{h}u-\text{uh-ha-an\,}\), gen.sg. \(\text{h}u-\text{uh-ha-aš\,}\) (MH/MS), \(\text{h}u-\text{u-ha-aš\,}\), \(\text{h}u-\text{ha-aš\,}\) (KUB 19.5 obv. 12 (NS)), \(\text{h}u-\text{u-hi-aš\,}\) (KUB 11.10, 7 (NS)), dat.-loc.sg. \(\text{h}u-\text{uh-hi\,}\), abl. \(\text{h}u-\text{uh-ha-az\,}\), nom.pl. \(\text{h}u-\text{uh-he-eš\,}\), \(\text{h}u-\text{uh-hi-iš\,}\), \(\text{h}u-\text{uh-he-eš\,}\), dat.-loc.pl. \(\text{h}u-\text{uh-ha-aš\,}\).

Derivatives: \(\text{huhhant\,}\)- (c.) ‘(great)grandfather’ (nom.pl. \(\text{h}u-\text{uh-ha-an-te-eš\,}\), \(\text{h}u-\text{uh-ha-an-te-iš\,}\).

Anat. cognates: CLuw. \(\text{huhh}a\)- ‘grandfather’ (abl.-instr. \(\text{h}u-\text{u-ha-ti\,}\), \(\text{h}u-\text{hatala-ti\,}\)- ‘ancestral’ (nom.-acc.pl.n. \(\text{h}u-\text{ha-da-al-la\,}\), \(\text{h}u-\text{u-ha-da-al-la\,}\)); HLuw. \(\text{huhh}\,\)- (c.) ‘grandfather’ (nom.sg. /uhhas/ AVUS-ha-sá (MARAŠ 4 §9), acc.sg. /huhan/ AVUS-ha-na (MARAŠ 4 §11), dat.sg. /huha/ AVUS-ha (MARAŠ 4 §8, KARKAMIŠ A2 §4), nom.pl. /huhant'ili AVUS-ha-zi (KARABURUN §1, KARKAMIŠ A14a §5, BOHÇA §6, §10, ÇİFTLİK §3), AVUS-hu-ha-zi (KARKAMIŠ A26a §d)), \(\text{huhhant}(i)\)- (c.) ‘(great)grandfather(?)’ (acc.sg. /huhantin/ AVUS-ha-ti-na (MARAŠ 4 §11), dat.-loc.sg. /huhant/ AVUS-ha-ti (KARKAMIŠ A1a §14), nom.pl. /huhantint'ili AVUS-ha-i-i-zi (KARKAMIŠ A11b §8), dat.-loc.pl. /huhatant'ili AVUS-ha-ta-za (HAMA 4 §10)), *huhantia- (adj.) ‘of the grandfather’ (nom.-acc.pl.n. AVUS-i-ia (KARKAMIŠ A11a §8, 13)), \(\text{huhhant}(i)\)- (c.) ‘great great grandfather(?)’ (acc.sg. /huhantulin/ AVUS-ha-tu-li-i-za (MARAŠ 4 §11)); Lyc. \(\chi\text{uge\,-\,}\) ‘grandfather’ (gen.adj.nom.-acc.pl.n. \(\chi\text{ugaha\,}\).


\(\text{PIE} \text{h}_2\text{øy}_2\,\text{h}_2\), *h\text{øy}_2\text{h}_2\text{-m}, *h\text{øy}_2\text{h}_2\text{-ós}

See Puhvel HED 3: 355f. for attestations. In Hittite, this word is almost consistently spelled \(\text{h}u-\text{uh-}\text{h}VI\,\), with geminate -\text{h}3\-, whereas in CLuwian, we find \(\text{h}u-\text{u-}\text{h}VI\) and \(\text{h}u-\text{h}VI\) with single -\text{h}1-, which corresponds to Lyc. \(\chi\text{uge\,}\), the -\text{g\,-\,} of which reflects a lenited */h-l/.

Since Sturtevant (1928c: 163), these words are generally connected with Lat. avus, Arm. hav, etc. ‘grandfather’. It is clear that Lat. \(\text{a}\,-\,\) and Arm. \(\text{a}\,-\,\) must reflect *h\text{øy}_2\text{-e\,-\,} which corresponds to Hitt. \(\text{h}\,-\,\). The second -\text{h}3\- in Hittite corresponds to the acute intonation in SCR. ūjāk which points to a laryngeal. Because *h\text{öl} was lost intervocally (cf. Melchert 1987b: 23f.), it is likely that we must reconstruct *h\text{öl} here as well. All in all, we arrive at a stem *h\text{øy}_2\text{h}_2\text{-}. The question remains why Hittite shows geminate -\text{h}3\- where the Luwian languages
show single -h-. In my view, this problem can only be solved by assuming that this word originally was a root noun. If we reconstruct *h₂éu₂h₂-s, *h₂éu₂h₂-m, *h₂u₂h₂-ás, we can explain that on the one hand we find the thematicized stem *h₂éu₂h₂-o- in CLuw. ʰuḥa-, Lyc. ʰuḫe-, but also Lat. avus, Arm. haw, Goth. auo, etc., but on the other a thematicized stem *h₂u₂h₂-ó- which regularly yields Hitt. ʰuḫa- without lention of *-h-. Compare šūḫ-, šuḫa- for a similar thematicatization.

_ɦui(e)a²_: see ʰuṣai₁ / ʰui-

**ɦuíš³ / ɦuíš-** (Ia1) ‘to live; to survive’ (Sum. TI): 3sg.pres.act. ʰu-uš-zi (KBo 12.81 ii 5 (OH/NS), ʰu-i-iš-zi (KUB 6.46 iv 10 (NH)), Tl-es-zi (KUB 15.30 ii 5 (NS), KUB 57.116 obv. 18 (NS), KUB 17.12 ii 26 (NS), KUB 15.1 iii 50 (NH), KBo 23.117 rev. 14 (NS)), Tl-iš-zi (KUB 6.45 i 41 (NH)), 2pl.pres.act. ʰu-i-iš-te-ni (KUB 1.16 iii 37 (OH/NS)), 3sg.imp. ʰu-e-eš (ABOT 44 i 56 (OH/NS)); part. Tl-es-ša-an-t- (KUB 31.77 i 9 (NH)); impf. ʰu-e-eš-ke-a/ (KUB 49.1 iv 17 (NS)).


See Puhrveld HED 3: 332f. for attestations. Within the verb, we find the stems *huir- and *huš-. Weitenberg (1984: 108ff.) shows that spellings with -e- occur in young texts only, which fits our establishment that OH /i/ is lowered to NH /e/ before -s- (cf. § 1.4.8.1.d). In the derivatives of this verb, we find a third stem, namely *huš-, especially in several OS attestations of *hušyant- (besides *hušyant-). I therefore cite this lemma as *huš-.² / *huš-.

Already since Kurylowicz (1927: 102) this verb is generally derived from the PIE root *hues- as reflected in e.g. Gr. αὐξά 'to spend the night', Skt. vāsati 'to dwell', Goth. wisan 'to be'. Formally, the development of *hues- > OH huš- can be understood if we apply the sound law as formulated by Melchert (e.g. 1994a: 101), namely *e between *y and dental consonant > i (also in yitt- besides yett-).

Opponents against this etymology (e.g. Weitenberg 1984: 108f., Tischler HEG A: 265) point to the Luwian stem *huit- 'to live' (see under the lemma *huitar / *huitim-), and raise the possibility that Hitt. -s- reflects *-dī-. Apart from the fact that the sound law *-dī > Hitt. š is only ascertained for word-initial position, the connection with Luw. *huit- is difficult morphologically. We would have to assume a basic stem *hued-, of which a derivative *hued-ju- (but what kind of suffix is this *-ju-?) yielded Hitt. *huēšu-, out of which a verbal stem *huš- was back-formed. This does not seem appealing to me. Moreover, the root *huš- is attested in HLuwian as well, which cannot be explained by an assimilation of *hued-.

*huitar / *huitim- (n.) 'game, wild animals': nom.-acc.sg. [hu]-i-ta-ar (StBoT 25.19 obv. 15 (OS)), [hu]-i-ta-ar (StBoT 25.19 obv. 14 (OS)), [hu]-i-ta-ar (KBo 4.2 i 59 (OH/NS)), ĥu-u-i-tar (KUB 3.94 ii 18 (NS), KUB 8.62 i 2 (NS), etc.), ĥu-u-e-da-ar (KUB 36.67 ii 9 (NS)), gen.sg. ĥu-it-na-aš (KUB 6.45 iii 16 (NH)) // ĥu-it-ta-aš (KUB 6.46 iii 56 (NH)), [ḥu]-u-ta-aš (KUB 2.1 ii 16 (OH/NS)), ĥu-it-na-aš (KBo 11.40 ii 5 (OH/NS), KUB 33.57 ii 11 (OH/NS), KBo 25.180 rev. 10
(OH/NS)), erg.sg. ğu-it-na-an-za (KBo 9.114, 7 (OH/MS)), instr. ğu-u-it-ni-it (KUB 24.2 ii 15 (NS)), nom.-acc.pl. ğu-i-ta-a-ar (ABoT 5+ ii 17 (OS)), ğu-i-da-ar[-ar] (KBo 22.224 obv. 3 (OH/MS)), [ğu-]i-da-a-ar (KUB 8.1 iii 10 (OH/NS)), ğu-u-i-ta-a-ar (KBo 10.23 iii 9 (OH/NS), KBo 10.24 i 11 (OH/NS)).

Derivatives: ğuitaima- ‘?’ (gen.sg. ğu-i-it-na-i-ma-aṣ (KUB 44.61 rev. 17 (NS))).


IE cognates: ON vitmir ‘creature’.

PIE *h₂uēid-r/*h₂uīid-n-ōs.

See Puhvel HED 3: 352f. for attestations. Puhvel cites the word as “ḥuedar, ğuitar”, but in the overview above we can see that almost all words are spelled with -i- (note that the sign IT can be read it as well as et and therefore is non-probative), including OS ones. The only form with -e-, ğu-u-e-da-ar (KUB 36.67 ii 9) is found in a NS text and therefore may not be phonetically relevant. Puhvel cites another form with -e-, namely gen.sg. “ḥu-ū-e-da-na-as” (KUB 1.16 ii 46 (OH/NS)), but it should be noted that this form is crucially broken ([...]\u-e-et-na-aṣ ...), and that its context is not fully clear. Moreover, it would be one of the very few examples where we would find the sign HU followed by ū in Hittite (cf. § 1.3.9.4.f), and I therefore do not follow Puhvel’s restoration.

This word is remarkable because it inflects ğuitar / ğuim-, showing a cluster -tn- whereas in e.g. abstract nouns in -tār / -tūm- the cluster *-tn- assimilated to -nn-. It therefore has been claimed that the word in fact is a Luwianism. Because of the OS attestations, this seems unlikely to me. Puhvel (l.c.) ingeniously remarks that in ğuitar / ğuim- the cluster -tn- must reflect *-dn- (with *-d- as...
visible in nom.-acc.sg. ḫuītar, CLuw. ḫuītumar, ḫuītyali-, etc.) and that *-dn- did not assimilate (unlike *-m- > -nn-), as is clear from ṛumē/ ṛumi- ‘land’ (q.v.).

In Hittite, the word ḫuītar / ḫuītn- does not have cognates (apart perhaps from the unclear hapax ḫu-i-it-na-i-ma-aš), whereas in CLuwian the root ḫuīd- is wider spread, and seems to denote ‘life, to live’ (cf. e.g. ḫuītumar ‘life’, ḫuītyal(i)- ‘alive, living’). This meaning resembles the meaning of Hitt. ḫuīš- ‘to live’ a lot, and it therefore has been assumed that ḫuīd- and ḫuīš- in fact are cognate. See at ḫuīš- / ḫuš- for the problems regarding this assumption. It cannot be denied, however, that at least in HLuwian the roots hwīr- and hwīs- were synchronically connected, as is apparent from the fact that we find hwīsar / hwīsn- besides hwītar / hwītn-, both meaning ‘game, wild animals’.

Puhvel (HED 3: 355) etymologically connects ḫuītار / ḫuītn- with ON vīmīr ‘creature’, which would point to a root *h₂uēid-. For Hittite, this means that we can reconstruct a formation *h₂uēid-r / *h₂uīd-n-ūs.

**ḥuitt(ije/a)-:** see ḫuett(ije/a)-, ḫuṭtiye/a-

**ḥulla-:** see ḫulā- / ḫull-


See Puhvel HED 3: 361f. for attestations. The interpretation of gāšḥulāṭi- as ‘distaff’ is especially based on the fact that it is used in combination with gāšḥueša- ‘spindle’, e.g. in KBo 6.34 ii (42) nu TŪG Ś́ MUNUS gāšḥu-la-a-li gāšḥu-e-ša-an-n=a (43) u-da-an-zi ‘They bring a woman’s clothes, a distaff and a
spindle’. For formal reasons, it is obvious that the verb ḥulāli-‘a-‘a to entwine, to enwrap’ is derived from it, which is supported by the figura etymologica KUB 59.2 ii (8) nu=za=kan GŠ hu-la-li ḥul-la-li-ja-az-zi ‘He enwraps the distaff. Since the distaff is the staff around which the wool was wound from which a thread was spun that then was wound around the spindle, it is likely that ḥulāli is cognate with the root *hul- ‘wool’ as visible in ḥulana- ‘wool’ and ḥuliqa- ‘wool’. See under ḥulana- for further etymology.

ḥulana- (c.) ‘wool’ (Sum. SĪG): acc.sg. SĪG-an, dat.-loc.sg. ḥu-u-la-[n(i)] (KBo 3.8 iii 8), [(ḥu-u-la-)n]i (KBo 3.8 iii 26), instr. SĪG-ni-it.

Derivatives: ḥuliqa- (c.) ‘wool’ (nom.sg. ḥu-li-ja-aš).

The word for ‘wool’ is almost always spelled sumerographically with the sign SĪG. On the basis of parallel texts, two phonetic spellings have been discovered. On the one hand, the parallel texts KBo 11.10 ii (29) UDUḪL A-aš ḥu-li-ja-aš // KBo 11.72 ii (33) UDUḪLA-aš SĪG-aš ‘wool of the sheep’, show a spelling ḥuliqa-. On the other, the parallel texts KUB 26.50 i (25) KUŘ URU / SĪG-na URU lr-ha-an-ta[(-aš URU Ki-)i]g-gi-ip-ra-aš // KUB 26.43 i (31) KUR URU [i]u[Hula-na URU lr-ha-an-da-aš URU Ki-ki-ip-ra-aš, show a phonetic spelling ḥulana-. This latter reading also fits the occasional phonetic complements to SĪG: instr. SĪG-ni-it (KUB 24.10 iii 13, KUB 24.11 iii 11). A full phonetic spelling ḥulana- may be visible in the following difficult passage, if a translation ‘wool’ would be justified here.

KBo 3.8 iii
(6) pār-ti-an-za hā-a-ra-aš[MUŠEN]
(7) hā-mi-ik-ta [ša-m]a-an-ku-ūr-ya-du-aš=kān MUḪLA-aš
(8) an-da ḥu-u-la-[n(i)] ḥa-mi-ik-ta
...
(24) pār-ti-an-zi
(25) [hā-a-ra-aš]MUŠEN la-a-at-ta-at ša-ma-an-ku-ūr-ya-an-te-eš MUḪLA
(26) [(ḥu-u-la-)n]i la-a-at-ta-at

‘He bound the p. eagle, he bound the bearded snakes in h. ... He released the p. eagle, he released the bearded snakes in h.’
In CLuwian, we find a nom.sg. SÍG-la-ni-iš (KUB 25.39 iv 6) that seems to belong with Hitt. ḫulana- and then must be read as ḫulaniš.

All in all, we must assume two words for wool, namely ḫuliya- and ḫulana-. Because of their formal similarity, it is likely that both are derived from a root ḫul- ‘wool’, which then possibly also underlies ḫulāti- ‘distaff’ (q.v.) and its derivatives ḫulāi/a-z ‘to entwine’.

Since Friedrich (1961), ḫulana- has been compared with the words for ‘wool’ in the other IE languages: Skt. ārhū-, Gr. ἄρης, Lat. āna-, Goth. wulla, Lith. vilna, etc. If we leave the Anatolian forms out of consideration, these forms point to *ḥul₁-neh₂-. On the basis of Hitt. ḫulana- this reconstruction is now widely adapted to *ḫul₂neh₂-. There are some problems, however. First, the development of *ḫul₁neh₁- to Gr. ἄρης is not easy to explain. If the form vocalized as *ḥul₂neh₂-, we would in principle expect **ἡλια-​. Secondly, if Hitt. ḫulana- reflects *ḫul₂neh₂-, the -a- is unexpected. It has been claimed that ḫulana- stands for ḫHolna- (cf. Melchert 1994a: 65), but then we should rather expect a spelling **ḫul₁-na-. Thirdly, if ḫulana- and ḫuliya- together with ḫulali- point to a root ḫul- this ḫul- does not fit *ḫul₁neh₁-, which should have yielded **ḫul₁-. So, all in all, if the PIE word for ‘wool’ was *ḫul₂neh₂-, I would have rather expected Hitt. ḫuLna-, which should have been spelled either **ḫul₁-na- or **ḫul₂-la-na- but not ḫu-la-na- as attested.

Kronasser (1967: 45) rather connects ḫul- with a Hurrian noun *ḫul(a)- ‘wool’ which is only attested as a loanword in Akk. ḫul(l)anu, a piece of clothing made of wool, which is used in texts from Nuzi and Alalah.

** ḫulcapezzi / ḫul- (Ial > Ic1, Ila1γ) ‘to smash, to defeat’: 2sg.pres.act. ḫu-ul-la-šti (KUB 37.223 rev. 5 (OS)), 3sg.pres.act. ḫu-ul-le-ez-zi (KUB 29.32, 4 (OS)), ḫu-ul-le-ez-zí (KUB 29.32, 5 (OS)), ḫu-ul-le-[ez-zi] (KBo 3.22 obv. 35 (OS)), ḫu-ul-le-ez-zi (KUB 34.53 rev. 9 (MS), KUB 40.54 rev. 2 (NS), (IBoT 3.131, 5 (NS)), ḫu-ul-le-zi (KBo 20.82 ii 27 (OH/NS)), ḫu-ul-la-az-zi (KUB 37.223 obv. 4 (OS)), ḫu-ul-la-az-zi (KBo 6.26 ii 11 (OH/NS)), ḫu-ul-{(e-e-ez-zi)} (KBo 3.22 obv. 34 (OS)) // ḫu-ul-le-ez-zi KUB 36.98a obv. 5 (OH/NS)), ḫu-u-ul-li-ja-az-zi (KBo 6.26 ii 12 (OH/NS)), ḫu-ul-li-ja-az-zi (KBo 4.10 obv. 46 (NH)), ḫu-ul-la-i (KBo 6.28 rev. 29 (NH), KUB 31.59 iii 26 (NS)), ḫu-ul-la-a-i (KBo 6.29 iii 42 (NH), KUB 26.50 rev. 9 (NH)), 2pl.pres.act. [ḫu³]-la-at-te-ni (KUB 26.34 rev. 5 (NH)), 3pl.pres.act. ḫu-ul-la-az-zi (KUB 17.21 iv 19 (MH/MS), KBo 6.2 i 12 (OH/NS), KUB 35.148 iv 7 (OH/NS)), ḫu-u-ul-la-an-zi (KBo 6.5 iii 8 (OH/NS)), 1sg.pret.act. ḫu-ul-la-nu-un (KBo 3.22 obv. 11, 15 (OS), KUB 31.64 iii 10 (OH/NS), KBo 2.5 ii 11 (NH), KBo 5.8 iii 29 (NH), KUB 33.106 iv 13 (NH)),
punishments [KUB 23.21 iii 28 (MH/NS)], hu-ul-li-ja-nu-um (KBo 10.2 i 35, ii 16 (fr.) (OH/NS), KUB 23.33, 5 (OH/NS), KBo 3.6 ii 9 (NH), KUB 1.1 ii 25 (NH), KUB 14.3 i 25 (NH)), 3sg.pret.act. hu-ul-le-ets (KUB 36.99 rev. 4 (OS), KBo 3.38 obv. 15 (fr.), 31 (OH/NS), KBo 22.2 rev. 8 (OH/MS), KBo 3.1 i 29 (OH/NS), KBo 3.46 obv. 25 (OH/NS), KUB 12.26 ii 23 (NS), KUB 19.11 iv 39 (NH)), hu-ul-li-i-at (KUB 19.11 ii 39 (NH)), hu-ul-li-ja-at (KBo 2.5 + 16.17 iii 40 (NH), KBo 14.3 iv 33 (NH), KUB 14.22 i 6 (NH), KUB 19.18 i 28 (NH)), hu-ul-li-ja-at (KUB 19.8 iii 30 (NH)), hu-ul-li-iš (KBo 3.38 rev. 24 (OH/NS)), hu-ul-la-aš (Bronzetafel i 98 (NH)), 1pl.pret.act. hu-ul-lu-mē-en (KUB 23.21 obv. 29 (MH/NS)), hu-ul-lu-um-me-[en] (KBo 3.15, 6 (NS)), hu-ul-li-ja-en (KUB 23.16 iii 9 (MH/NS)), 3pl.pret.act. hu-ul-le-er (KUB 31.124 ii 12 (MH/MS), KBo 3.18 rev. 8 (OH/NS), KBo 3.38 obv. 32 (OH/NS)), hu-ul-li-er (KBo 3.16 rev. 2, 3, 4 (OH/NS)), 3sg.imp.act. hu-ul-la-ad-du (KUB 35.148 iv 8 (OH/NS)); 3pl.pres.midd. hu-ul-la-an-ta-ri (KUB 17.28 iv 45 (MH/NS)), 3sg.pret.midd. [hu-ul-]la-at-ti (KUB 3.29, 14 (OH/NS)) // hu-ul-[ul-la-at-ti] (KUB 8.41, 4 (OH/NS)), hu-ul-la-at-ta-i (KUB 14.17 ii 29 (NH)), 3sg.imp.midd. hu-la-da-ru (KBo 3.29, 15 (OH/NS), KBo 8.41, 5 (OH/NS)); part. hu-ul-la-an-t- (KUB 24.8 ii 18 (OH/NS)); impf. hu-ul-li-iš-ke/a/.


PIE *h₁u₁e₁h₁: - *h₁u₁-nɛ₁-h₁-ti, *h₁u₁-n₁-h₁-énti

See Puhvel HED 3: 363f. for attestations. In the oldest texts (OS), we often find the spelling hu-ul-LI-IZ-zi and hu-ul-LI-IT, which are ambiguous regarding their interpretation. Because the sign LI can be read li as well as le, the sign IZ can be read iz as well as ez and the sign IT can be read it as well as et, the spelling hu-ul-LI-IZ-zi could in principle be read hullizzi, hullizzzi or hullezzi, and similarly hu-ul-LI-IT as hullit, hulliet or hullet. A reading hullie- (i.e. /HOli-e/!) in my view is not likely, as there are no other examples of the stem hullie/a- in OS or MS texts (but note that in NS texts we do find hulliie/a- and the corresponding unambiguous spellings hu-ul-li-i-e-et /HOliet/). The choice between hulli- and hullie- is difficult, however. On the basis of the fact that hullie/i- seems to alternate
with *hulla-, I assume that we have to read *hulle- since an alternation e : a is better understandable than an alternation i : a.

As already mentioned, this verb shows quite a wide variety of stems. Already in OS texts, we find different stems: 3sg.pres.act. *hullezzi and 3sg.pret.act. *hullet show a stem *hulle-², whereas 2sg.pres.act. *hulliši, 3sg.pres.act. *hullazi and 1sg.pret.act. *hullanun show a stem *hulla-². A stem *hulliže/a-² is found in NS texts only, and clearly must be secondary. The same goes for the occasional *hi-inflected forms 3sg.pres.act. *hullāi. 3sg.pret.act. *hullaš and *hulliš (all based on the stems *hulla- and *hulli-). A stem *hull- is found in 1pl.pres.act. *hullumen (MH/NS), *hullume[n] (NS) and derivative *hullumar (NH), which are all from NS texts and therefore at first sight do not seem to be of much value. The interpretation of 3pl.pres.act. *hullanzi (OH/MS) is less certain. It could in principle show a stem *hulla-, but in my view, a stem *hull- is much more likely, which would give more value to the forms *hullumen and *hullumar as well. So all in all, I regard the stems *hulle-², *hulla-² and *hull- as original, but it should be noted that in OS texts the stem *hulle-² is more numerous than *hullaz-². This situation reminds of the verb *zimme² / zimm- ‘to finish’ that also occasionally shows a stem *zimna- in OS texts already. I therefore think that it is possible that *hulle-/*hulla-/*hull- should be judged similar to *zimme² / zimm-, which would mean that the original ablaut is *hulle-² / *hull- (which is the reason for me to cite this verb thus in this lemma). The stem *hulla- probably arose in analogy to stems in -jē/a- or -ške/a- where -e- alternates with -a-.

As I have argued in detail under its own lemma, *zimme² / zimm- reflects an n-infixed stem of the root *tieh₁: *ti-ne-h₁ / *ti-n-h₁. Applying this structure to *hulle-² / *hull-, we have to reconstruct *hul-ne-h₁ / *hul-n-h₁. Because the cluster *-ln- assimilates to Hitt. *-ll- (cf. Melchert 1994a: 81f.), the regular outcomes are Hitt. *hullā / *hull- (note however, that in the case of *zimme that unambiguously must have -i-, the vowel *-ē < *-eh₁ apparently was raised to -i-).

All these considerations lead to reconstructing the root as *h2uelh₁ (the initial *h₂ is obligatory because *h₁ would not have been retained as h- in this position, cf. Kloeckhorst fthc.c). Note that this reconstruction precludes a connection with *gah- ‘to hit, to strike’ (q.v.), which must reflect *yelh₂.

As cognates, one could think of OIr. *follnadar ‘to rule’ (*hul-ne-H), Lat. ualeō ‘to be powerful’ (*HulH-jē/o-) and, with a *-d²-extension, Lith. vēldu ‘to own’, Goth. waldan ‘to rule’ and OCS *vladō ‘to rule’.

*hulli-: see *hulle-² / *hull-
The word **hulija**- 'wool': see at **hu-lana**-

**hullije/a**²: see **hulle**-²/ **hull**-

**huldalae**²: see **huyantalae**²


See Puhvel HED 3: 370f. for attestations. All attestations are spelled with either **hul-li**- or **hul-li-**, but on the tablet KBo 22.181 we come across a spelling **hul-li**-twice, namely rev. 2 and 4. In my view, both forms must be regarded as copy mistakes (possible reading a squeezed **hul**+**u** (مشاركته) as **hul** (مشاركته), cf. the incorrect **ψ** instead of **GA** (مشاركته) in rev. (2) [...], which clearly must be **hul-li-ga-an-ni-ja-az** (OS), **hul-li-ga-an-ni-ja-az** (MS), **hul-li-ga-an-ni-ja-az** (OH/NS), **hul-li-ga-an-ni-ja-az** (OH/NS), **hul-li-ga-an-ni-ja-az** (OH/NS), **hul-li-ga-an-ni-ja-az** (OH/NS), **hul-li-ga-an-ni-ja-az** (OH/NS), **hul-li-ga-an-ni-ja-az** (OH/NS), **hul-li-ga-an-ni-ja-az** (OH/NS), **hul-li-ga-an-ni-ja-az** (OH/NS), **hul-li-ga-an-ni-ja-az** (OH/NS), **hul-li-ga-an-ni-it** (OH/NS).

The oldest forms of this word show an i-stem **hulukanni**-, but we encounter a-stem forms as well, from the MH period onwards already. In an OAss. text from Kültepe, AKT 1.14, we come across the forms acc. pl. **hul-li-kà-ni** and gen.sg. **hul-li-kà-ni-im**, which would seem to point to a pronunciation [hlul-]. According to Puhvel (l.c.), this speaks in favour of Laroche’s derivation (1960: 125) from **šalugà-‘message’, of which an interpretation /Hluga/- seems certain. Note that on the basis of this derivation, Laroche translates **hulukanni**- as “voiture de poste”. First it should be noted that there is no contextual evidence that **hulukanni**- has anything to do with postal services. Secondly, the OAssyrian forms cannot be equated with **hulukanni**- on semantic grounds (cf. Dercksen (fthc.), who assumes that these words are the OAssyrian adaptations of Hitt. **šaluga- (q.v.). Moreover, it is in my view hard to explain why **šaluka**- is consistently spelled with **ša** whereas **hulukanni**- is always spelled with **hul**- if both words would have the same phonetic shape, namely /Hlu°/. I therefore do
not accept this etymology. In my view, it is likely that ḥulukanni- is of a non-IE origin.


IE cognates: ?Skt. ubhá- 'both'.

PIE *h₂u-yent-?

See Puhvel HED 3: 373f. for attestations. The adjective is almost consistently spelled with plene -u-. In my files, I have found only 5 instances of a spelling ħu-ma- (of which the forms of KBo 10.45 iii 54 and KBo 18.72 l.edge 5 are written on the edge of the tablet, which makes it possible that they are reduced spellings due to lack of space) vs. 846 instances of the spellings ħu-u-ma-. This seems to point to a phonological form /Hōmant-/ . The word denotes 'every, each' but also 'whole, entire'.

An etymological interpretation of this adjective is difficult. If we analyse the word as containing the suffix -ant- (like e.g. dapiant- besides dapi- 'all, every, each'), we are left with a stem ḥ спин- . This ḥ спин- has been etymologically connected with Lat. omnis (first by Holma 1916: 54-5), but formally this connection does not work. If we analyse ḥūmant- as having a suffix *-yant-, however, we could assume that it goes back to *ḥu-yant- 'having ħu-'. Puhvel (l.c.) proposes to connect this ħu- with Skt. ubhá- 'both' and reconstructs *h₂u-yent- 'having both > having all'. Semantically as well as formally, this etymology is certainly possible. It remains awkward, however, that no other cognates of the element *h₂u- are known.
-\textit{h\text{\-}}un (1sg.pret.act.-ending of the \textit{hi}-flection)

This ending is normally spelled °C-\textit{hu}-\textit{un} and °\textit{Vh}-\textit{hu}-\textit{un}, but we encounter a spelling -\textit{hu}-\textit{u}-\textit{un} several times ([\text{a}]r-\textit{hu}-\textit{u}-\textit{un} (KBo 19.76 i 15), \textit{ḥal}-\textit{zi}-\textit{ḥu}-\textit{u}-\textit{un} (KUB 6.46 iii 62), \textit{ṣu}-\textit{up}-\textit{pi}-\textit{ja}-\textit{ḥu}-\textit{u}-\textit{un} (KBo 12.85+ i 26), \textit{da}-\textit{ḥu}-\textit{u}-\textit{un} (ibid. i 34), \textit{ta}-\textit{ra}-\textit{aḥ}-\textit{ḥu}-\textit{u}-\textit{un} (KUB 31.52 obv. 13)), which indicates that phonologically this ending was /-\textit{Hon}/. This ending belongs to the \textit{hi}-conjugation and therewith stands in contrast to the \textit{mi}-ending -(\textit{n})\textit{un}. In the younger texts we find a few original \textit{hi}-verbs in which ending -\textit{h\text{\-}}un has been replaced by the \textit{mi}-ending -(\textit{n})\textit{un}: a-an-\textit{ṣu}-\textit{un} (MH/NS) instead of **\textit{ānḥun}, \textit{ḥa}-\textit{ma}-\textit{an}-\textit{ku}-\textit{un} (MH/NS) instead of **\textit{hamankhun}, \textit{ḥa}-\textit{a}-\textit{ṣu}-\textit{un} (NS) instead of \textit{ḥa}-\textit{a}-\textit{āš}-\textit{ḥu}-\textit{un}. If \textit{la}-\textit{a}-\textit{ḥu}-\textit{un} (MS) ‘I poured’ is to be regarded as such a case as well (so instead of expected **\textit{lāḥuḥ\text{\-}}un, although we cannot rule out the possibility that this latter form regularly yielded \textit{lāḥun} anyway), then we must conclude that this development started in MH times already. It must be noted that no \textit{mi}-inflecting verb ever shows the ending -\textit{h\text{\-}}un.

If we compare the 1sg.pret.act.-endings in the other Anatolian languages, where we find Pal. -\textit{ḥ̱a}, Luw. -(\textit{h})\textit{a} and Lyc. -\textit{χα}, it is clear that we must reconstruct a PAnat. ending */-\textit{Ha}/ (with -\textit{a} because of Lyc. -\textit{a}). In Hittite, we are apparently dealing with a conflations between this PAnat. */-\textit{Ha}/ and the \textit{mi}-ending -(\textit{n})\textit{un} < °C-\textit{m}.

It should be noted that the ending -\textit{h\text{\-}}un always shows geminate -\textit{ḥ̱}-, whereas the corresponding Luwian ending shows -\textit{ḥ̱a} as well as -\textit{ḥa}, depending on whether or not the -\textit{ḥ̱h}- stood in leniting position. In Hittite, the unlenited variant was generalized.


\begin{align*}
\text{PIE} & \text{ *h}2\text{u-ne-g}^{[\text{h}]}.
\end{align*}

See Puhvel HED 3: 381 for attestations. The verb clearly belongs to the nasal infix verbs that show the element -\textit{nin}-. As with all these verbs, the original distribution is that the second -\textit{n}- drops in front of -\textit{k}C-. It is odd, however, that the OS attestation \textit{ḥu}-\textit{u}-\textit{ni}-\textit{kān-za} (KBo 6.2 i 15) does not follow this rule: the regular form \textit{ḥu}-\textit{u}-\textit{ni}-\textit{in-\textit{k}ān-za} is found in the same paragraph (KBo 6.2 i 14).
Possibly, the spelling ḥu-u-ni-kān-za was caused by lack of space (in the handcopy we can see that the last words of the sentence that it occurs in are squeezed onto the tablet to fit the line). The NS attestation ḥūnikššar does not fit the rule either, but this is probably due to the fact that the original distribution (-inkV- vs. -ikC-) was lost in NH times (cf. the paradigm of li(n)k₂̯).

The word is occasionally spelled with plene -u-, which points to a phonological interpretation /Honink-/ (with the phoneme /o/ that is the regular outcome of *u adjacent to /H/). Once, it is spelled with plene -ū-, namely ḥu-ū-ni-ik-zi (KBo 6.2 i 16 (OS)). Apart from the fact that on the same tablet the verb occurs spelled ḥu-u-ni- as well (ḫu-u-ni-kān-za and ḥu-u-ni-in-kān-za as cited above), this form is the only instance known to me in all the Hittite texts where we find a sequence ḥu-ū- (vs. 2127 cases of ḥu-u- in my text files). It is remarkable that on this same tablet we find a spelling a-pu-ū-un ‘him’ (KBo 6.2 ii 32), which is the only spelling with plene -ū- known to me instead of normal a-pu-u-un (154x in my files). Apparently, the scribe of KBo 6.2 occasionally mixed up the signs U and Ú. These spellings with plene -ū- therefore do not have any value.

The verb denotes ‘to bash (trans.)’ when active, and ‘to crack (intr.)’ when middle, and therefore seems to be derived from ḥuek₂̯ / ḥuk- ‘to slaughter, to slay’. It is remarkable, however, that ḥuni(n)k₂̯ does not have a causative meaning, as the other nasal infix verb with -nin- seem to have. See § 2.2.4 for the prehistory of this type of nasal-infixed verbs. See at the lemma of ḥuek₂̯ / ḥuk- for further etymology.

**huntarija(ı)-mrj(ı) (IIg > IIIh) ‘to break wind, to fart’: 3sg.pres.midd. ḥu-un-ta-ри-ja-it-ta (KUB 17.28 ii 8 (NS)); verb.noun ḥu-un-ta-ri-ja-u-ya-ar (KBo 1.44 + 13.1 iv 29 (NS)).


*PIE *h₂uy₁h₄-nr-je₁⁄e₁-

See Pulvel HED 3: 382f. for attestations and semantic discussion. He convincingly connects these words to ḥuṣant- ‘wind’ (q.v.), which means that we are dealing with a denominate in -arije₁⁄a₁- (cf. gimmantarije₁⁄a₁- ‘to spend the winter’, nikumandarije₁⁄a₁- ‘to denude’ (Eichner 1979a: 56)). See at ḥuṣant- for further etymology.

**hupp-**: see ḥuṣapp₁⁄a₁ / ḥupp-
hurani-: see hurani-


IE cognates: Skt. varj- 'to turn (around)', Lat. vergere 'to incline', OE wrencean 'to turn, to wring'.
PPIE */h₂ur-g-i-

See Puhvel HED 3: 399f. for attestations. Since Kronasser (1957: 121) this word is connected with Skt. varj- 'to turn (around)', which then must go back to */h₂urerg- (with initial */h₂- since */h₁ would not have been retained as h- in this position, cf. Kloekhorst fthc.c). Note that the initial laryngeal of this root is also visible in Skt. 3sg.perf.midd. vārjje (*h₂yye-h₂yrg-oī) and int. vārōrj- (*h₂yer-h₂yrg-). This means that Hitt. ḥurki- must reflect */h₂ur-g-i-.

ḥurkil- (n.) 'perversity': nom.-acc.sg. ḥu-ur-ki-il (OS), ḥu-u-ur-ki-il[f] (KBo 46.17 obv. 5 (MS)), ḥu-u-ur-ki-il (OH/NS), ḥur-ki-il (MH/NS), ḥur-ki-el (KUB 30.67, 9 (NS)), gen.sg. ḥu-ur-ki-la-aš (OH/MS), ḥur-ki-la-aš (KBo 31.121 obv. 15 (NS)), abl. ḥur-ki-la-za, & ḥu-ūr-ki-la-za.

PPIE */h₂ur-g-il-? or */h₂ur₃-il-?

See Rieken 1999a: 477f. for attestations and discussion. The word refers to sexual offences like incest and bestiality, and may therefore be translated 'perversity'. The etymological interpretation of this word has been in debate. On the one hand, scholars have connected ḥurkil- with ḥurki- 'wheel', through 'wrong' twist (see the literature in Tischler HEG 1: 302f.), but this does not seem very attractive to me semantically. On the other hand, Puhvel (l.c.) connects ḥurkil- with the root */(H)uerg₃- 'to strangle' (OE wyrgan 'to strangle', Lith. veržiu 'to tie in', OCS -vrbzo 'to bind'). This root seems to be restricted to the north-western European languages, however (unless Alb. žverdž 'to disaccustom' is connected), which does not make it an evident etymology either. Both solutions would imply that the Luwian word is borrowed from Hittite, as PAnat. lenis velars are lost in Luwian.

ḥurn- 'to hunt': see ḥuḻarn-/ hurn-

ḥurna-, hurne-, hurnje/a- 'to sprinkle': see ḥarna-/ harn-
ḥurt(a)-: see ḫuṛat₁ / ḫurt-

ḥuš-: see ḫuš₂ / ḫuš-


Derivatives: ḫuškevant- (c.) ’dawdler’ (nom.pl. ḫu-uš-ke-ya-an-te-eš).

PIE *h₂u-skē/ó- (or *h₂uUs-skē/ó-)

See Puhvel HED 3: 410 for attestations. See au¹ / u- for my suggestion that this verb reflects *h₂u-skē/ó- and therewith is a petrified imperfective of the root *h₂eu- ’to see’ that is the predecessor of au¹ / u- ’to see’. Alternatively, one could assume that it is a petrified imperfective of ḫuš₂ / ḫuš- ’to live’ and reflects *h₂uš-skē/ó- (for the semantics compare Skt. vāśayati ’to make wait’ < *h₂yos-ēje-).

-ḥḥut (2sg.imp.midd.-ending)

The exact origin of this ending is unclear. It does not match its functional correspondants like Skt. -sva, Gr. -(ο)ō, Lat. -re, etc.

ḥūda- (c./n.) ’readiness, ability to act swiftly’: nom.sg. c. ḫu-u-da-aḥ (MH/MS), ḫu-u-ta-aš (NH), nom.-acc.pl.n. ḫu-u-da (MH/NS).

Derivatives: ḫudāk (adv.) ’straightaway, immediately, suddenly’ (ḫu-da-a-ak (OS), ḫu-u-da-a-ak (MH/MS, often), ḫu-u-da-ak (often), ḫu-u-ta-a-ak).

Anat. cognates: CLuw. ḫutarlija- (c.) ’servant’ (acc.sg. ḫu-tar-li-i-ja[-an], ḫu-u-tar-la-a-an).

PIE *h₂uḥdi-a-o-

See Puhvel HED 3: 414f. for attestations. Although the adverb ḫudāk is attested far more often than the noun ḫūda-, it is likely that ḫudāk is derived from ḫūda-. The exact formation is unclear however (no other known adverbs in -k are known: the one attestation ap-pi-ja-ak (IBoT 1.19, 8) is to be emended to ap-pi-ja-ak-ku, cf. HW³ A: 185).

Puhvel (l.c.) suggests to connect these words with Gr. ἀμωξίς ‘immediately’, but this is formally impossible (Hitt. ḫ- vs. Gr. ε-). Starke (1990: 359-65)
convincingly argues for a connection with ḫuiyaj - / ḫui- 'to run, to hurry' (q.v.), which is derived from *h₂uh₃j- 'to blow (of the wind)'. In his view, ḩūda- and ḫudāk reflect *h₂uh₃d-, a formation with -d- that he compares with Lith. vėdinti 'to air, to cool' and OHG wāzan 'to blow (of the wind)'. Nevertheless, I do not know whether Starke is correct in his assumption that the CLuw. word ḫutar(ī)j-a- 'servant' is cognate as well.

ḥuttije/a-: see ḫwet- Ua/Or, ḫuttije/a- ²

ḥuayaj - / ḫui- (Iia 4 > Ic1, Ic2) 'to run, to hurry; to spread (of vegetation); (+ =kan) to escape; (+ āppan) to run behind, to back up': 1sg.pres.act. ḫu-i-iḫ-hi (KBo 11.19 obv. 14 (NS)), ḫu-u-i-ja-mi (KUB 1.1 iv 10 (NH), Bo 69/256, 5 (NH)), 2sg.pres.act. ḫu-u-i-ja-si (KUB 5.1 iii 55 (NH)), ḫu-u-e-ja-si (KUB 15.23, 9 (NH)), [ḫ]u-u-i-ja-si (KUB 48.126 i 21 (NH)), 3sg.pres.act. ḫu-ya-a-i (OS, often), ḫu-u-ya-a-i (often), ḫu-ya-i (KBo 27.42 i 24 (OH/NS)), ḫu-u-ya-i (KBo 27.42 ii 17 (OH/NS), KUB 2.3 i 43 (OH/NS), KBo 4.9 iv 14, 33 (NS)), ḫu-u-ya-iz-zī (KBo 5.9 ii 40 (NH)), ḫu-yl[a]-iz-zī (KBo 10.12+13 i 41 (NH)), ḫu-u-ja-zi (KUB 14.3 iii 51 (NH)), 1pl.pres.act. ḫu-u-i-ja-u-e-mi (KUB 23.83 obv. 5 (NS)), 3pl.pres.act. ḫu-ja-an-zi (OS, often), ḫu-u-ja-an-zi, ḫu-u-i-ja-an-zi, ḫu-u-i-an-zi (KBo 11.32 obv. 15 (OH/NS)), ḫu-u-ya-an-zi, ḫu-u-ya-ja-an-zi (KUB 57.84 iii 16 (NS), Bo 6570 ii 4 (undat.)), 1sg.pret.act. ḫu-e-ēh-ḫu-un (KUB 33.57 ii 3 (OH/NS)), ḫu-u-i-ja-nu-un (KUB 14.15 iii 44 (NH)), ḫu-ja-nu-un (KUB 19.39 ii 4 (NH)), 3sg.pret.act. ḫu-ya-iš (MH/MS, often), ḫu-u-ya-iš, ḫu-u-ya-a-iš, ḫu-ya-iš (KUB 17.10 i 13 (OH/MS)), ḫu-ya-š (KBo 2.6 iii 56 (NH)), ḫu-ya-[r] (KUB 23.72 i 17 (MH/MS)), 2pl.pret.act. [ḫu-]u-i-ja-at-tēn (KUB 36.6 i 9 (NS)), 3pl.pret.act. ḫu-ya-a-er (MH/MS), ḫu-ya-e-er (MH/MS), ḫu-u-ya-e-r, ḫu-i-e-r, ḫu-u-e-er, ḫu-u-e-iu (KUB 10.22 i 16 (OH/NS)), 3sg.imp.act. ḫu-u-ya-a-er (KUB 43.38 rev. 22 (MH/MS)); 3sg.pres.midd. ḫu-u-i-ja-at-ta(?)) (KUB 21.1 ii 65 (NH)), 2pl.pres.midd. ḫu-ja-ad-du-ma (KUB 23.72 rev. 20 (MH/MS)), 3pl.pres.midd. ḫu-ya-ja-an-da-ri (KUB 33.88, 11 (MH/NS), IBoT 2.135, 10 (fr.) (MH/NS)), ḫu-ja-an-da (KBo 8.102, 11 (NS)); part. ḫu-ja-an-t- (OS), ḫu-u-ja-an-t-, ḫu-u-i-ja-an-t-, ḫu-u-ya-ja-an-t-, ḫu-u-ya-an-t-; verb.noun gen.sg. ḫu-uni-i-ja-u-ya-aš (KUB 2.1 i 25 (OH/NS)); impf. ḫu-ya-iš-ke/a-, ḫu-u-eš-ke/a-, ḫu-eš-ke/a-, ḫu-ya-a-iš-ke/a-.

Derivatives: ḫunu-zi', ḫunu-zi (Ib1) 'to make run' (1sg.pres.act. ḫu-i-nu-mi (KBo 7.14 obv. 18 (OS), KUB 35.148 iii 20 (OH/NS)), 3sg.pres.act. ḫu-i-nu-zi (KUB 5.1 i 19 (NH)), ḫu-u-i-nu-zi (KUB 9.4 ii 12 (MH/NS)), ḫu-u-i-nu-uz-zi (KUB 29.1 i 41 (OH/NS)), ḫu-u-e-nu-uz-zi (KUB 4.47 obv. 34 (undat.)),
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1pl.pres.act. ḫu-i-nu-me-ni (VBoT 24 i 31 (MH/NS)), ḫu-i-nu-um-me-ni (KUB 17.28 i 15 (NS)), 3pl.pres.act. ḫu-i-nu-an-zi (KUB 53.14 iii 8 (MS)), ḫu-i-nu-ya-an-zi (KUB 10.91 ii 7 (OH/NS)), ḫu-u-i-nu-ya-an-zi (KUB 53.6 ii 12 (NS)), 1pl.pret.act. ḫu-u-i-nu-mu-n (HKM 89 obv. 10 (MH/MS), KUB 9.4 ii 18, 20 (MH/NS)), 3sg.pret.act. ḫu-i-nu-mu (HKM 13 obv. 10 (MH/MS), HKM 89 obv. 13 (MH/MS), KUB 14.1 obv. 63 (MH/MS)), ḫu-u-i-nu-mu (KBo 3.6 ii 32 (NH), KUB 1.1 ii 51 (NH), KBo 3.4 ii 69 (NH)), ḫu-e-mu-ů-mu (KBo 3.28, 19 (OH/NS)), 2sg.imp.act. ḫu-i-nu-mu (KBo 5.4 obv. 19, 20, 22 (NH)), ḫu-u-e-mu-mu (KBo 4.3 i 7 (NH)), ḫu-i-nu-mu (KUB 21.1 ii 66 (NH)), ḫu-u-mu-mu (KUB 21.1 ii 72 (NH)), 2pl.imp.act. ḫu-i-nu-mu-tén (HKM 41 obv. 14 (MH/MS), KUB 7.41 iv 20 (MH/MS??)), 3sg.imp.act. ḫu-i-nu-ud-du (KBo 32.14 i 46 (MS)) 3pl.imp.act. ḫu-u-e-mu-ya-an-du (KUB 40.57 i 6 (MH/NS)); verb.noun gen.sg. ḫu-u-e-mu-ma-aš (KBo 24.14 v 7 (MH/NS)); inf.I ḫu-i-ma-an-zi (KUB 15.33 iii 13 (MH/NS)); impf. ḫu-i-nu-š-ke/a-, ḫu-u-i-nu-š-ke/a-, peran ḫaššatalla- (c.) ‘head marcher, helper’ (nom.sg. ḫu-u-i-ša-tal-la-aš, acc.pl. ḫu-u-i-ša-tal-ulu-[uš], ḫu-u-i-ša-at-tal-ulu-[uš], see ḫušantalla-. Anát. cognates: CLuw. ḫušaša- ‘to run’ (1pl.pres.act. ḫu-u-u-un-ni, 3sg.pret.act. ḫu-u-i-ša-ad-da, ḫu-iššaša- ‘to run’ (3pl.pret.act. ḫu-u-ḫu-i-ša-ad-da, 2sg.imp.act. ḫu-u-ḫu-i-ša, ḫu-u-e-ḫu-u-i-ša; broken ḫu-i-ḫu-i-ša-a[n(•••)]); HLuw. ḫuša- ‘to run, to march’ (3sg.pret.act. ḫušša-aš/ *hes-šH1-ša-ta (KARKAMIŠ A6 §23), 3pl.pret.act. ḫušša-ta/ PES-šH1-ša-ta (KARKAMIŠ A11b §11)), ḫušša- ‘to run, to march’ (3sg.pret.act. ḫušša-aš/ PES-šH1-ša-ta (KARKAMIŠ A6 §9), impf.3pl.pret.midd. ḫušša-ta/ PES-šH1-ša-ta (KARKAMIŠ A11b §8)).

IE cognates: Skt. uḥā, Gr. ἄφα. Slav. *vēhjati ‘to blow (of wind)’.

PIE *h₂uh₁-ó-i-ē, *h₂uh₁-i-ēnti

See Puhvel HED 3: 419f. for attestations. The oldest attestations clearly show a ḫušša-ta- class inflection: 3sg.pres.act. ḫušša (OS) besides 3pl.pres.act. ḫušša (OS). That the weak stem is ḫu- and not ḫušša- as is often cited (e.g. Puhvel l.c.), is visible in the causative ḫušša- (and not **ḫušša-). In younger times (from MS texts onwards) we find some forms that inflect according to the ḫaššatalla-class: ḫušša-ta (NH) and ḫušša (MH/MS). In NH texts we find many forms that show the mi-inflected stem ḫušša- (usually spelled ḫu-u-i-ša-), which is common in ḫušša-ta-class verbs. The point of departure for this secondary stem is 3pl.pres.act. ḫušša that was reanalysed as ḫušša-ta.
The spelling with plene -u-, which is found often from MH times onwards, is due to the fact that an old *u generally is lowered to /o/ when adjacent to /H/. So, phonologically, this verb is to be interpreted as /Hoai-/ /Hoi-/ (cf. § 1.4.9.3.f).

Couvreur (1937: 119-120) connected łuayai / łuai- with the PIE root *h₂ueh₁- ‘to blow (of wind)’ (see also at łuayant-), which is semantically plausible (cf. ModEng. blow that can be used as ‘to move as if carried or impelled by the wind’ or ‘to go away, to leave hurriedly’ (both meanings in the Oxford English Dictionary)). As I have explained in Kloekhorst fhc.a, the verbs of the dğa/tıçanzi-class have to be analysed as formations in which the zero grade of the root is followed by an ablauting suffix *-oi-/i-. In this case, we have to reconstruct *h₂uh₁-ói- łuai, *h₂uh₁-ı-ẽti, which by regular sound law indeed would yield Hitt. łuqā, łuqanzi.

Puhvel (l.c.) objects to this etymology, stating that we do not find the syntagm **łuqanza łuqā ‘the wind blows’, but this hardly can be seen as a serious objection. He rather connects łuayai / łuai- with Skt. vay/ ‘to pursue, to seek, to strive after, to fall upon, to take hold of’. This latter verb probably reflects *ueiḥ₂-, however (see at yeḥ₂ / yah-), which cannot explain Hitt. łuayai / łuai-.

The causative łuin- occurs in NS texts as huem- as well, which is due to the lowering of OH /o/ to NH /e/ before -n (cf. § 1.4.8.1.d). The two NH attestations łu-u-umu- and łu-umu- hardly can be regarded as showing a linguistically real stem łunu-. Possibly both forms are scribal errors for łu-u-<e>-mu- and łu-<e>-mu-.

**łuanta**- (c) ‘wind’ (Sum. IM): nom.sg. łu-ua-an-za (KBo 17.62+63 iv 8 (MS?)), łu-ua-an-za (KUB 8.65, 4 (MH/NS)), gen.sg. łu-ua-an-da-aš (KUB 17.28 ii 7 (NS)), łu-ua-an-da-aš (KBo 10.37 ii 31 (OH/NS)), dat.-loc.sg. łu-ua-an-ti (VBoT 58 i 9 (OH/NS)), łu-ua-an-ti (KBo 22.6 i 27 (OH/NS)), nom.pl. łu-ua-an-te-aš (KUB 6.46 ii 49 (NH)), łu-ua-an-te-eš; (KUB 7.5 i 17 (MH/NS)), łu-ua-an-ęš (KUB 24.2 rev. 17 (NS)), acc.pl. łu-ua-an-du-aš (KUB 24.3 iii 38 (MH/NS)), łu-ua-ta-aš (KUB 28.4 obv. 20b (NS)).

Derivatives: see łuvantalae-².


**PIE** *h₂ueh₁-ent-

See Puhvel HED 3: 428 for attestations. The etymological interpretation of this word is generally accepted. It derives from the PIE root *h₂ueh₁- ‘to blow (of wind)’ and belongs with the many other words for ‘wind’ in IE languages. Hitt.
 đầyยант- can hardly reflect anything else than *h₂uh₁-ent-, which matches Gr. χείρ-, which synchronically functions as the participle of the verb ‘to blow’. The other IE languages have words that go back to the ablaut-variant *h₂ueh₁-nt-(-o): Skt. वान्त-, वात-, Lat. ventus, Goth. wânt, TochA wânte, TochB yente. This seems to point to an original paradigm *h₂ueh₁-nt-s, *h₂uh₁-ent-m, *h₂uh₁-nt-os, which must have been to original inflection of participles in *-ent, cf. at -ant-.

(4) ṣुयान्तालें, ṣुतालें (Ic2) ‘to spare’: 1sg.pret.act. ṣu-ul-da-la-a-nu-un (KUB 19.37 iii (NH)), 3sg.pret.act. [ṣu-u-y]a-an-ta-la-a-it (KUB 21.8 ii 10 (NH)), ṣu-u-ya-an-ta-la-[a-it] (KUB 21.8 ii 4 (NH)).

See Puhvel HED 3: 429 for attestations. Note that Puhvel cites [ṣu-u-u]a-an-ta la-a-it (KUB 21.8 ii 10) as if there is a space between ta and la, but on the photograph of this tablet (available through Hetkonk) we can clearly see that that is not the case: [ṣu-u-u]a-an-ta la-a-it. Nevertheless, it has been assumed that ṣuwayantu- is to be regarded as a compound of ṣuwa+antu- (see lā- / l- ‘to let go’). Eichner (1979c: 205) analysed ṣuwa as nom.-acc.pl.n. of the participle of ṣuwa‘/ hu‘- ‘to run’, so therefore ‘to let escape’. Puhvel (Ic.) suggests to interpret ṣuwa as the all.sg. of ṣuwa‘- ‘wind’, however, so ‘to set loose to the wind’. According to Puhvel, ṣuulāγun is an assimilated form of ṣu(ya)nda(nte)-. See at lā- / l-, ṣuwa‘/ hu‘- and ṣuwa- for further etymologies.


Derivatives: हुप्प- (gender unclear) ‘heap’ (dat.-loc.sg. ṣu-ua-up-pi-i=sī-śi (KUB 43.30 iii 17 (OS)), ṣu-ua-up-pē-e=sī-śi (KUB 27.29 iii 7 (MH/NS))), ṣuappae-z (Ic2) ‘to heap, to pile up’ (1sg.pres.act.? ṣu-ua-up-am-mi (KUB 33.67 iv 18 (OH/NS)), 3sg.pres.act. ṣu-up-pa-ez-zi (KUB 24.115 i 20 (MS), ṣu-up-pa-aiz-zi (KUB 59.22 ii 26, 28 (OH/NS)), ṣu-up-pa-aiz-zi (KUB 27.29 iii 8 (MH/NS), 819/u, 4 (NS)); part. ṣu-ua-up-pa-an-t- (VBoT 24 i 20 (MH/NS), KBo
10.27 iv 32 (OH/NS)), *ḫūpala- 'fish-net' (abl. *ḫu-u-pa-lə-za (KBo 6.29 ii 34 (NH)).

IE cognates: Skt. vāp- 'to strew (out), to scatter (seed)', GĀv. vīuāpaṭ 'strews apart, plunders, destroys', Goth. ubils 'evil'.

PIE *h₂uíph₁-ei, *h₂uíph₁-énti

See Melchert fīhc.c for the establishment of the semantics of this verb and the view that the noun ḫūppa- 'heap' (which is the source of ḫūppae-

See Melchert fīhc.c for the establishment of the semantics of this verb and the view that the noun ḫūppa- 'heap' (which is the source of ḫūppae-² 'to heap, to pile up') has been derived from it through a meaning 'what has been thrown (on the ground)'. Melchert also shows that synchronically we can distinguish between two homophonous verbs ḫuṣṭapp- / ḫuṣpp-, namely one that denotes 'to hurl, to throw (down) (+ acc.)' and another that means 'to be hostile towards, to do evil against (+ dat.-loc.)'. His claim that the latter verb is originally mi-conjugated and therefore formally distinct from the former which is hi-conjugated cannot be substantiated: both forms show hi-conjugated forms in the oldest texts and must be regarded formally identical. Moreover, as I have shown under its lemma, the meaning of ḫuṣṭapp-² / ḫuṣpp- 'to be hostile towards, to do evil against' can be derived from an original meaning 'to hurl, to throw (down)'. I therefore regard these two verbs as originally identical. For a treatment of its etymology, see under ḫuṣṭapp-² / ḫuṣpp- 'to be hostile towards, to do evil against'.

 <$uṣṭapp-² / ḫuṣpp-$ (IIa1q) 'to be hostile towards, to do evil against (+ dat.-loc.)':

  2sg.pres.act. ḫu-ya-ap-ti (KUB 26.1 iii 43 (NH), KUB 26.8 iii 5 (fr.) (NH)), 3sg.pres.act. ḫu-ya-ap-zi (KUB 26.43 obv. 62 (NH)), 3sg.pret.act. ḫu-u-ya-ap-piš (KUB 43.75 obv. 19 (OH/NS)), ḫu-ya-ap-ta (KUB 13.34 + 40.84 i 14 (NS)), 3pl.pret.act. ḫu-u-up-pé-er (KBo 3.34 i 3 (OH/NS)), ḫu-u-ya-ap-pé-er (KUB 1.5 i 9 (NH), KBo 3.6 i 30 (NH)); impf. ḫu-ya-ap-piš-ke(ə (KUB 21.17 i 9 (NH)).

  Derivatives: ḫuṣṭappa- (adj.) 'evil, ill, bad' (Sum. ḫuṣṭapp; nom.sg.c. ḫu-ya-ap-pa-aš (KUB 15.32 i 48 (MH/NS)), ḫuṣṭappa- (KBo 19.101, 2 (OH/NS)), acc.sg.c. ḫu-ya-ap-pa-an (KBo 3.21 ii 9 (MH/NS)), nom.-acc.sg.n. ḫu-u-ya-ap-[a-an] (KUB 1.5 i 21 (NH), dat.-loc.sg. ḫu-ya-ap-pi (KBo 15.25 obv. 34 (MH/MS), KUB 1.1 iv 12 (NH)), ḫu-u-ya-ap-pi (KUB 1.1 i 40 (NH), KUB 1.10 iii 31 (NH), etc.), nom.pl.c. ḫu-u-ya-ap-pa-eš (KUB 46.54 obv. 11 (NS)), acc.pl.c. ḫu-u-ya-ap-puš=a (KUB 24.8 i 4 (OH/NS)), ḫu-u-ya-ap-paš=a (KUB 24.8 i 3 (OH/NS)), gen.pl. ḫu-ya-ap-pa-aš (KUB 30.11 obv. 5 (OH/MS)), ḫu-u-ya-ap-pa-aš (KUB 31.127 + 36.79 i 45 (OH/NS)), ḫuṣṭappanatar / ḫuṣṭappanən- (n.) 'evilness' (nom.-acc.sg. ḫu-ya-ap-pa-na-tar (KBo 8.70, 10 (MH/MS), dat.-loc.sg. ḫu-u-ya-ap-pa-na-an-ni (KUB 36.86 obv. 4 (NS))).
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Anat. cognates: HLuw. **hwapasanu-** ‘to cause harm’ (2sg.imp.act. “**SIGILLUM**” HWI-pa-sa-nu (ASSUR letter f+g §13)).

IE cognates: Goth. *ubils* ‘evil’, Skt. *vap* - ‘to strew (out), to scatter (seed)’, GAv. *vīvaṭaj* ‘strews apart, plunders, destroys’.

PIE *h₂uóph₁-ey, *h₂uóph₁-énti

Although Puhev (HED 3: 430f.) cites only one verb “**hwapp**-” that he translates as ‘ill-treat, harrow, harass, disfigure, spoil’, Melchert (fthc.c) clearly shows that in fact we are dealing with two verbs. When transitive with an accusative-object, **hwapp**- denotes ‘to hurl, to throw (down)’; when construed with the dat.-loc., it means ‘to be hostile towards, to do evil against’. Melchert even claims that the verbs should be formally distinguished as well: “[t]he verb **hwapp**- ‘to do evil’ is an athematic *mi*-verb [...] while the other verb [...] is an originally athematic *hi*-verb”. I do not agree with him on this: the two specific *mi*-conjugated forms of **hwapp**- ‘to do evil’, 3sg.pres. *hwappzi* and 3sg.pret. *hwappta* (note that the meaning of 1sg.pres.act. *hu-u-ap-mi* (KUB 35.148 iii 42 (OH/NS)) cannot be determined), are attested in NH texts and both are forms in which the *mi*-ending has become productive (3sg.pres.-zi is spreading at the cost of its corresponding *hi*-ending -i; 3sg.pret.-ta is spreading at the cost of its corresponding *hi*-ending -š, cf. their respective lemmas). Moreover, the 3sg.pret.-form *hu-u-ya-ap-pi-iš* (KUB 43.75 obv. 19 (OH/NS)), which Melchert takes as belonging with ‘to hurl down’, makes more sense when translated as ‘did evil against’ (as Melchert himself admits as well; cf. also Hoffner 1977a: 106):

KUB 43.75 obv.

(18) ... *[LAMMA]-aš=(š)ia išMAR.GÍD.DÁičA iš-pār-ri-iš
(19) [K]UR-e *hu-u-ya-ap-pi-iš* GÍR=ŚU *hu-u-šet-ti-ja-ti* iš YA-ar-ša-mu-uš=šu-uš
(20) [t]a-al-*hi*-iš-ke-et

‘The tutelary deity trampled the wagons and did evil against the country. He drew his knife and started to chop its firewood’.

Since this form is the only form that occurs in an OH composition, it must be regarded as significant, and I therefore assume that also ‘to do evil’ originally was *hi*-conjugated: **hwapp**-² / **hupp**-.

Herewith, the verbs **hwapp**-² / **hupp**- ‘to do evil against’ and **hwapp**-¹ / **hupp**- ‘to hurl, to throw (down)’ are formally identical. I think that they semantically they can be united as well. The two meanings of **hwapp**-² / **hupp**- are clearly distributed: when transitive the verb means ‘to throw (down), to hurl’ and when
intransitive it denotes ‘to be hostile towards, to do evil against’, the patient of which is in dative-locative. This situation is completely compatible with e.g. the English verb *to throw*, for which the Oxford English Dictionary cites the following meanings: ‘(trans.) to project (anything) with a force of the nature of a jerk, from the hand or arm, so that it passes through the air or free space, to cast, hurl, fling; (intr.) to go counter, to act in opposition, to quarrel or contend with’ (compare also *to throw oneself upon* ‘to attack with violence or vigour’). Similarly for English *to fling*: ‘(trans.) to throw, cast, toss, hurl; (intr.) to make an onset or attack, to aim a stroke or blow (at)’.

We must conclude that the homophonous verbs *ḥuṣappā* / *ḥuppā* – (trans.) to hurl, to throw (down); (intr. + dat.-loc.) to be hostile towards, to do evil against’ in fact are identical and that the latter meaning has developed out of the former. Note that this development must have taken place in pre-Hittite times already, as can be seen by the derivative *ḥuṣappā* – ‘evil’ that is attested in OH compositions already. If HLuw. ḫwapasamu – ‘to cause harm’ is cognate, it would show that the semantical development had taken place at least in PAnatolian already.

Mechanically, *ḥuṣappī* / *ḥuppānzi* must go back to *h₂uşoph₁-ei / *h₂uşoph₁-enti. The initial laryngeal must be *h₂ because *h₁ would drop in this position. A root-final laryngeal is needed to explain the -pp- in *ḥuṣappī*, because a preform *h₂uşp-ei should have given **ḥuṣupī with lenition of *p due to *ó. The choice for root-final *h₁ is based on the fact that *h₂ and *h₁ would have caused the verb to inflect according to the tarn(a)-class (cf. § 2.2.2.2.d). Jurét (1942: 71) connected *ḥuṣappā* / *ḥuppā* with Goth. ubils ‘evil’, which, if correct, would show that the semantical development as described above had taken place in PIE already. Melchert (1988b: 233) further adduces Skt. vap- – ‘to strew (out), to scatter (seed)’, which would be a witness of the original meaning ‘to throw’. Note that its Avestan cognate varava ‘strews apart, plunder, destroys’, varava- ‘plundering, destroying’ shows that also in Indo-Iranian the two meanings that can be found in Hittite are attested. Note that the argumentation that *ḥuṣappā* must reflect a root *h₂uşap- with *-a- because it is mi-conjugated (thus Eichner 1988: 133; Melchert fthc.c, note 4) has now been eliminated since the *-a- in *ḥuṣappā- is perfectly explicable as the reflex of the *o-grade that is morphologically expected in a *hi-conjugated verb (cf. also note 11).


PIE *h₂uerH- ??
impossible according to PIE root constraints. It therefore might be better to assume that this verb goes back to a nasal infixed stem. This means that it could either belong to the tarn(a)-class (when ʰi-conjugated) or inflect similarly to tuyarni₁ / tuyarn- ‘to break’ and zinni₂ / zinn- ‘to finish’ (when ʰi-conjugated). The alternation ʰuγarν- besides ʰurn- then cannot be ablaut, but must be the result of different vocalizations of ʰHurn-: ʰHurnV would regularly yield ʰurnV, whereas ʰHurnC would give ʰuγarνC (cf. Kloekhorst fthc.e for this distribution).

So, all in all, if this verb is of IE origin, it can only go back to a nasal infixed stem of a root ʰh₂urH- (the initial laryngeal must be ʰh₂ because ʰh₂ would not be retained as ʰ- in this position (cf. Kloekhors fthc.Lar.)). If it were ʰi-conjugated, we would expect a paradigm **ʰurnāːi, **ʰuyarmanzi (with rootfinal ʰh₁ or ʰh₂; rootfinal ʰh₂ would yield **ʰurnahḫi). If it were mi-conjugated, we would expect **ʰurnīzi, **ʰuyarmanzi (with rootfinal ʰh₁) or **ʰurnāːzi, **ʰuyarmanzi (with rootfinal ʰh₂ or ʰh₃).

Čop (1954b: 230-3, 237) suggested an etymological connection with Lith. varyi ‘to drive, to chase’ and Latv. vert ‘to run’, but these verbs go back to *(H)uer-, and do not show a trace of a rootfinal laryngeal (absence of acute intonation).

**ʰuγαrν- / *hurt- (Ia1q > Ia1γ) ‘to curse’: 1sg.pres.act. ʰu-u-yar-ta-ah-hi (KUB 33.117 iv 8 (NS)), 3sg.pres.act. ʰur-da-a-i (KUB 9.15 ii 15 (NS)), 1sg.pret.act. ʰu-u-yar-[ta-ah-ʰu-um] (KUB 26.71 i 7 (OH/NS), ʰur-ta-ah-ʰu-un (KUB 23.45, 15 (NS)), ʰur-da-ah-ʰu-un (KUB 36.47, 5 (NS)), 3sg.pret.act. ʰu-yu-ar-za-ah-ta (KBo 32.14 ii 11 (MS), ʰu-yu-ar-ta-ah (KUB 22.70 obv. 86 (NH)), ʰur-ta-ah (KUB 22.70 obv. 8 (NH)), ʰur-zu-ah-ta (KBo 10.45 i 4 (MH/NS)), ʰur-zu-ah-ta (KUB 5.6 iv 22 (NS)), 3sg.imperf. ʰur-za-ah-du (KUB 17.27 iii 20 (MH/NS)), 3plt.imperf. ʰur-ta-an-du (KBo 6.34 iv 12 (MH/NS)); part. ʰu-u-yar-ta-an-t (KBo 32.14 ii 21, iii 5 (MS), ʰur-ta-an-t (KUB 30.45 iii 17 (NS), KUB 30.44, 13 (NS), KUB 22.70 rev. 14 (NH), KUB 14.17 ii 12 (NH)); implf. ʰu-u-zu-ke-ʰa- (KUB 39.8 ii 2 (MH/MS), KBo 32.14 ii 54, iii 43, 45, l.edge 2 (MS), ʰu-u-zu-ke-ʰa- (KBo 32.14 ii 5, 13, 46 (MS), KUB 32.113 ii 16 (fr.) (MH/MS), ʰur-zu-ke-a- (AbOT 48, 6 (OH/NS), KUB 33.120 iii 69, 70, 71 (MH/NS), KUB 36.1, 7, 9 (MH/NS), KUB 12.34 i 17 (MH/NS), KBo 1.45 ii 6
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(NS), KUB 14.4 iii 19 (NH), KBo 4.8 iii 16 (NH), KBo 18.28 obv. 6 (NH), ḫur-za-āš-ke/ā- (KUB 17.27 iii 18 (MH/NS)), ḫu-u-ya-ar-za-ke/ā- (KBo 1.45 ii 2 (NH); broken ḫu-u-ya-ar-za-ā[š(·)]... (KUB 35.92 iv 23 (NS)).


IE cognates: ?OPr. wertemmai ‘we swear’.

PIE *h₂gōrt-ei / *h₂urt-enti?

See Puhvel HED 3: 433f. for attestations. The oldest attestations, 1sg.pret.act. ḫūyar [tahhun] (OH/NS), 3sg.pret.act. ḫu-yar-zašta (MS) and impf. ḫurfake/a-(MS), clearly show that originally this verb was ḫi-conjugated and showed an ablauting pair ḫeurt-/ḥurt-. The original ablaut-pattern got blurred in younger times, however, yielding forms like 3sg.pret.act. ḫurašta, part. ḫu-yarta-tant- and impf. ḫu-yar-zaš/a-. In NH texts, we find a few forms that inflect according to the tar(a)-class: 3sg.pres.act. ḫurdāi, 3sg.pret.act. ḫurtaš, ḫu-yartas (note that Friedrich HW: 76 wrongly cites this latter stem, “ḥurta- (ḫu-yarta-)”, as the primary one).

Sturtevant (1930d: 128) connected this verb with Lat. verbum ‘word’, Lith. va’das ‘name’, OPr. wirds ‘word’, Goth. waurd ‘word’. Puhvel (i.e.) rejects this etymology because he assumes that these latter words are derived from the root visible in Gr. ἔφαξ ‘to speak’ and Hitt. yerīje/a- ‘to call, to name’: because Hitt. yerīje/a- does not show an initial laryngeal whereas Hitt. ḫuṣart/- / ḫurt- does, he claims that the connection cannot be correct. This reasoning is questionable, however, in view of the fact that Hitt. yerīje/a- must reflect *uērhet/- (because of Gr. ἔφαξ (fut.)), which is impossible for Lith. va’das that must reflect *uērd̪-o- (a preform **uērh̪o- would have yielded Lith. **várdas). So, formally, Sturtevant’s connection between ḫuṣart/- / ḫurt- and Lat. verbum etc. is still possible: it would mean that we have to reconstruct a root *h₂uerd̪-. The semantic connection between ‘to curse’ and ‘name, word’ is not very compelling, however.

Puhvel (i.e.) proposed a different etymology, namely a connection with OPr. wertemmai ‘we swear’. This connection is semantically more likely and would point to a root *h₂uert-. The absence of any other IE cognates is unpleasant, however.


IE cognates: Skt. *êti ‘to go’,* Gr. *êHê ‘to go’,* Lat. *pêre ‘to go’,* Lith. *êiti ‘to go’,* OCS *iti ‘to go’.*

PIE *Htei-*/*Hti-*
See Puhvel HED 1/2: 325f. for attestations. In the Hittite texts, we find a few traces of an active verb *i₂t̂i-² / pai- 'to go', which on the one hand is supplanted by its univerbed forms *pa*tiği² / pai- 'to go' (*h₃p*poi + *h₁e*ï-) and uye₂ / uya- 'to come' (*h₂ou + *h₁e*ï-), and on the other hand by its middle counterpart je/a₂erëti² 'to go'.

In the OH text about Zalpa we find 3pl.pres.act. janzi which must be translated 'they go' (and not 'they make' as Otten 1973: 7 translates in the edition of this text: "[sie] machen (sich auf den Weg". The imperative-forms 2sg. ṭē and 2pl. ṭēten are used throughout the Hittite period, but synchronically function as imperatives to *pa*ği² / pai-. In the Luwian languages, however, the active stem *i- to go' has not died out: it is still used, although here we find univerbed forms as well (CLuw. aq*ī*- / aq*īni*- (see under *ye₂ / uya-) and HLuw. pa- (see under *pa*ği² / pai-)).

The etymon has since Hrozný (1917: 173) been clear: PIE *h₁e*ï- 'to go'. Hitt. 3pl.pres.act. janzi is therewith a direct counterpart to e.g. Skt. yānti, Gr. ἔοι, etc. from *h₁e-*ɛnti, whereas 2sg.imp.act. ṭē / ṭēd/ generally is reconstructed *h₁i-ḍi (Gr. ἤθ, Skt. i̯t) and 2pl.imp.act. ṭēten / ṭētēn as *h₁i-ṭē (Gr. τρέ, Skt. itā).

For the formation of the "imperfective" ijan*ā*- / ijan*ē*- see at the treatment of the suffix -an*ā/-an*ē*.

-i (dat.-loc.sg.-ending)

The usual ending of dat.-loc.sg. is -i, which is found in all types of nominal stems (consonant-, i-, u- and thematic stems). Occasionally, we come across an ending -ai (la-bar-na-i (KUB 2.2 iii 9 (OH/NS)), la-bar-na-i=a (KUB 36.89 rev. 61 (OH?/NS)), ta-bar-na-i (KUB 44.60 iii 15 (NS)), a-ša-u-na-i (Bo 6002 obv. 7 (undat.)), ḫa-āš-ša-an-na-i (KBo 3.1 ii 49 (OH/NS)), [ ḫa-]aš-ša-a-i (OS), pî-du-li-ja-i (OH or MH/MS), tâk-na-i (KUB 24.9+ ii 22 (OH/NS)), ya-ap-pu-ya-i (KBo 9.106 ii 15 (MH/NS)), which CHD (L-N: 41) calls "old dat." (note that in i-stem adjectives the dat.-loc.sg.-forms in -ai, like šuppai, rather reflect */-ai*i < */-e*i-i*).

From an IE point of view, we have to reckon with a dat.sg. in */-i* (in static root nouns and proterodynamic consonant-, i- and u-stem nouns), */-e*i (in mobile root nouns and hysterodynamic consonant-, i- and u-stems) and */-ől (in o-stem nouns). It must be noted that although word-final */-i* would regularly have been lost in Hittite (cf. i-it 'go!' < */h₁i-ḍi¹), the ending */-i* was restored (which implies that the moment of loss of word-final */-i* depended on the preceding consonant).

The regular outcomes of these three PIE endings must have been *-i, */-e* and */-ai*. As we see, the former and the latter are attested as such. The second ending, */-e*i,
has been replaced by -i in pre-Hittite times already (cf. e.g. tük-ni-i /tgnûl << *d̥r̥mêi or kar-ti-i /krdûl << *krd-êi). The ending -ai is found in OH texts only, but is rare at that point already. In younger times it is fully taken over by -i as well.

-i (voc.sg.-ending): LUGAL-u-i (KBo 25.122 ii 9 (OS)), LUGAL-u-e (KUB 31.127 i 2 (OH/NS) // KUB 31.128 i 2 (OH/NS), KUB 31.127 i 15 (OH/NS) // KUB 31.129 obv. 4 (OH/NS), KUB 31.127 i 18, 22, 58 (OH/NS)) ‘O king!’; ÛTU-û-i (KUB 41.23 ii 18 (OH/NS)), ÛTU-i (KUB 30.10 rev. 10 (OH/MS), KUB 7.1 i 6, 8, 15 (OH/NS)), ÛTU-e (KUB 31.127 i 1 (OH/NS)) ‘O Sun-god!’; pe-e-ta-an-ti (KUB 31.137 ii 2 (MH/NS) ‘O place!’; šar-ku-i (KUB 31.127 i 15 (OH/NS)) ‘O eminent ...

The vocative of the singular can be expressed in different ways. Either the nom.sg.-form is used: ḥa-aš-ša-a-aš ‘O hearth!’, ÛTU-ûš ‘O Sun-god!’; or the stem-form is used: iš-ḫa-a ‘O lord!’, ne-ek-na ‘O brother!’, šar-ku ‘O eminent ...

Etymologically, it is clear that -i must be compared with the voc.sg.-‘ending’ *-e as found in the other Indo-European languages, like Gr. -e, Skt. -a, Lat. -e, OCS -e and Lith. -e. Because unaccentuated word-final *-e in principle would be dropped (cf. § 1.4.9.1.b), we must assume that in pre-Hittite the ending *-e was accentuated. Moreover, as we see from e.g. uš-ki-i ‘see’ < *Hu-skê, the raising of word-final accentuated *-ê to -i has several parallels in Hittite (cf. § 1.4.9.1.a). For an account of the prehistory of the PIE vocative-‘ending’ *-e, cf. Beekes (1985: 99f.).

-i (nom.-acc.pl.-ending)

Some neuter nouns in -r and -l as well as the noun aniâtt- show a nom.-acc.pl.-form in -i: a-ni-ja-at-ti (from aniâtt- ‘work, task’), ḥi-in-ku-ya-ri (from ḥinkur / ḥingun- ‘gift’), iš-ḫi-û-li (from ishîul ‘binding’), ku-uš-ša-ni (from kuššan / kušn- ‘salary, fee’), me-ḫur-ri (from meḫur / mêḫun- ‘time, period’), pâr-šu-ul-ûl (from paršûl ‘crumb’), etc. Most of these forms are from NH texts, but Prins (1997: 215) adduces OH ḫu-ḫu-pa-al-li to show that this ending existed in OH times as
well. Gertz (1982: 312f.) mentions the forms ķu-ru-re-e (KBo 44.10, 11 (NS)) and a-ni-ja-at-te (KBo 30.80 rev. 5 (MH/MS), which seem to show an ending -e, and points to the fact that in many of the words that are usually thought to show the ending -i, a reading with -e is possible as well because they are spelled with signs that are ambiguous regarding their vowel (e.g. ḫu-ḫu-pa-al-le, ḫi-in-ku-ya-re, ỉš-ḥi-ū-le, me-ḫur-re, pār-šu-ul-le). Nevertheless, on the basis of forms like a-ni-ja-at-ti, which unambiguously shows -i, she concludes that the ending must have been -i. She does not seem to have noticed, however, that a-ni-ja-at-te is attested in a MS text, whereas all examples of a-ni-ja-at-ti are from NS texts. So perhaps we must assume a chronological distribution: aniijatte (MS) > aniijatti (NS). The change of -e to -i likely is analogical (cf. the replacement of OH nom.-acc.pl.n. ke-e ‘these’ by its corresponding singular-form ki-i in NH times).

The prehistory of this ending is in debate. E.g. Milewski (1936: 32f.) argues that -i must reflect the PIE dual-ending *-ih₁, but Gertz (1982: 320f.) rejects this because words where a dual-ending is to be expected do not show traces of this -i.

If we are really allowed to conclude that the ending -i is the NH replacement of original -e in analogy to the fact that the function of OH ke-e ‘these’ is in NH times taken over by the singular form ki-i, then this ending -e may be compared with the ending -e as visible in ke-e ‘these’, but also in a-pé-e ‘those’, =e ‘these’ and ku-e ‘which ones’, of which I have suggested that they might show the phonetical outcome of *-Cih₂ (comparable to the fact that *-Cuh₂ is lowered to Hitt. /-Col).

-i (3sg.pres.act.-ending of the hi-flection)

In the hi-conjugation the ending of 3sg.pres.act. usually is -i, which contrasts with -zi of the mi-conjugation. Nevertheless, there are two forms from OS texts where we find an ending -e, namely in ma-az-zi ‘he resists’ and ya-ar-aš-ši ‘he wipes’, which are normally spelled ma-az-zi and ya-ar-ši respectively. We must therefore conclude that the original ending was -e, which is being replaced by -i from pre-Hittite times onwards, probably on the basis of the fact that -i has become the specific marker of present forms in Hittite.

In younger texts we see that sometimes -i is being replaced by its mi-conjugation counterpart -zi. This happens predominantly in stems ending in -š- and -š- (pa-ap-pår-ši (MH/MS) > pa-ap-pår-aš-zi (MH/MS), a-an-ši > a-an-aš-zi (NS), ya-ar-ši > ya-ar-aš-zi (NS); ma-ni-ja-aḫ-ḫi > ma-ni-ja-aḫ-zi (NH), la-a-ḫu-i > la-ḫu-az-zi (NH), za-a-ḫi > za-aḫ-zi (NS)), but occasionally occurs in stems in stops as well (ḫa-ma-an-ki > ḫa-ma-ak-zi (NS), ḫu-ya-ap-pl > ḫu-ya-ap-zi (NH)).
It should be noted that no mi-conjugation verb ever takes over the ħi-ending -i (alleged ku-er-ri ‘he cuts’ instead of normal ku-er-zi in my view is a scribal error (see at kuer-² / kur-); 3sg.pres.act. ħa-an-da-a-i (KBo 5.2 iv 16) must be a mistake, compare correct [ḫa-a]n-da-a-iz-zi in ibid. 10; 3sg.pres.act. “ḫa-at-ra-a-i” (KUB 8.24 iii 3), cited thus by Puhvel (HED 3: 269f.), is in fact ħa-at-ra-a-iz[]-zi]).

The ending -e can only reflect *-e-i or *-o-i. Because the other ħi-conjugation endings -ḥe < *-ḥe-i and **-tte < *th-e-i clearly correspond to the PIE perfect endings, I compare Hitt. -e with the PIE 3sg.perf.-ending *-e as attested in e.g. Skt. -a, Gk. -e, Goth. -O, etc.

\[=(j)a\] (enclitice conjunctive particle) ‘and, also’: CC=a, V=ja, V=e-a (OS).

Derivatives: see kui- + =\(=(j)a\) under kui- / kua-.

Anat. cognates: Pal. \(=(j)a\) ‘and’ (non-geminating), kuiš=a ‘everybody’; CLuw. =ḫa ‘and, also’, kuiš=ḫa ‘some/any(one)’; HLuw. =ha ‘and’, REL(-i)-sa-ha /kuisha/ ‘someone’; Lyd. qid=a ‘whatever’; Lyc. =ke ‘and’, ti=ke ‘someone’; Mil. =ke ‘and’.

Panat. \(=H\)

\(\text{PIE } *=h_{g}\)

This enclitic particle can be used as a clause conjunctive, but can be used on word level as well. It is always attached to the second element: \(A ... B=j\)a ‘A and B’.

When used on both elements, \(A=i\)a ... \(B=j\)a, it denotes ‘both A and B’. Formally, it shows the following distribution: if the word to which it is attached ends in a consonant, the particle turns up as =a and causes gemination of the preceding consonant (“geminating =a”), which contrasts with “non-geminating =a” ‘but’ (see \(=(m)a\)). If the preceding word ends in a vowel or is written with a logogram, the particle turns up as =ja (rarely spelled =e-a). The particle loses its vowel when a particle follows that in a vowel. Since almost all these particles start in -a, this loss is only visible in cases like šu-me-š-s=u-us (StBoT 25.4 ii 7 (OS)) = šumes + =\(=(j)a\) + =uš (otherwise we would expect šu-me-š= u-us, cf. e.g. šu-me-š=a-aš (KUB 23.77 obv. 15), šu-me-š=a-an (KUB 23.77 obv. 34)). A particular use is its attachment to the relative pronoun kuiš, which makes it a generalizing pronoun: kuišš=a ‘everyone’.

The particle has cognates in all Anatolian languages, which clearly show that we have to reconstruct a form with an initial \(\text{*=H}\) (CLuw. =ha, HLuw. =ha). This means that in Hittite an original laryngeal was lost and that \(=(j)a\) cannot be derived from a particle \(=\text{j}=\)o vel sim. (pace Puhvel HED 1/2: 8). The Lycian form
\textit{i\textbar a}^\text{\textasciitilde} (\text{c.}) \text{‘sheep’} (\text{Sum.} UDU): \text{nom.sg.} \text{\textipa{i\-ja\-an-za}}, \text{acc.sg.} \text{i\-ja\-an-ta\-an}, \text{gen.sg.} \text{\textipa{i\-ja\-an-ta\-a\textbar s}}.

\text{PIE} *h_{1}\text{ent}-

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 347f. for attestations and discussion. Since Pedersen (1938: 148), this word is generally regarded as derived from the participle of \textit{i\-\textbar a} \text{‘to go’} or \text{\textipa{j\-\textbar a\-\textbar an\(\text{\textasciitilde}\)}} \text{‘to go, to march’} and semantically comparable to Gr. π\textipa{x\textbar ov\(\text{\textasciitilde}\)} ‘sheep’, which is derived from β\textipa{\textbar ov\(\text{\textasciitilde}\)} ‘to go’. So originally it meant ‘walking (cattle)’. See at \textit{\textbar a}^\text{\textasciitilde} and \textit{\textipa{j\-\textbar a\-\textbar an\(\text{\textasciitilde}\)}} for further etymology.

\textit{i\textbar at\textbullet a}, \textit{i\textbar at\textbullet a\textbar r} / \textit{i\textbar at\textbullet n} (\text{n.}) \text{‘growth, fertility, prosperity’}: \text{nom.-acc.sg.} \text{i\-ja\-a\-ta} (KUB 12.63 rev. 29 (OH/MS)), \text{i\-ja\-a\-da} (KBo 3.7 i 18 (OH/NS)), \text{i\-ja\-ta} (KUB 2.2 iii 28 (OH/NS), KBo 12.42 rev. 4 (MH/NS), KUB 8.22 iii 3 (fr.) (NS), KUB 53.1 i 4 (NS)), \text{i\-ja\-da} (KUB 12.63 rev. 16 (OH/MS), KUB 4.4 obv. 13 (NH)), \text{i\-ja\-tar} (KUB 23.40 obv. 3 (MS), KUB 43.60 i 11 (OH/NS), KBo 11.1 obv. 15 (NH)), \text{gen.sg.} \text{\textipa{i\-ja\-at-na\-a\textbar s}} (KUB 39.7 i 11, ii 10 (OH/NS), KUB 13.33 ii 5 (NS)), \text{i\-ja\-at-na\-a\textbar s} (KUB 39.7 ii 20 (OH/NS)), \text{i\-ja\-ta\-a\textbar s} (KBo 18.133 obv. 8 (NS)), abl. \text{i\-ja\-at-na\-za} (KUB 31.71 iv 30 (NH)).

Derivatives: \textit{i\textbar at\textbar nuy\textbar a\textbar n}-(\text{adj.}) \text{‘growing, luxuriant’} (\text{nom.-acc.sg.n.} \text{i\-ja\-at-nu\-\textbar y\-a\-an} (KUB 29.7 rev. 18 (MH/MS))), \textit{i\textbar at\textbar ni\textbullet j\textbar a\textbar n}-(\text{adj.}) \text{‘growing’} (\text{nom.-acc.sg.n.} \text{i\-ja\-at-ni\-ja\-an} (KUB 29.1 iv 18 (OH/NS)), dat.-loc.pl. \text{i\-ja\-at-ni\-ja\-an-da\-a\textbar s} (KBo 6.11 i 8 (OH/NS)).
See Puhvel HED 1/2: 350f. for attestations. This word has two stems, namely *ijth₂a besides *ijta- / *ijat₂-. That the first variant is not a mere r-less variant of the second is apparent from the gen.sg. *ijtataš as visible in the expression *i-ja-ta-as me-ḫu-ri (KBo 18.133 obv. 8) ‘in the time of fertility’. Moreover, *ijth₂a is attested in an OH/MS text already, which may indicate that we rather should assume that the stem *ijta- / *i-jat₂- is a secondary rebuilding of an original stem *ijta-. This could possibly explain the remarkable retention of the cluster -tm- that contrasts with the normal oblique stem of abstracts nouns in *eq₂tar, which is *eq₂m-. Rieken (1999a: 255-6) therefore reconstructs *ijth₂a as *h₁i-e₂h₂-teh₂, ultimately from the root *h₁ei- ‘to go’, through ‘moveable wealth’, cf. Watkins (1979: 282-3).


\( \text{PIE} \) *h₁i-je/ō-

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 330f. for attestations. The bulk of the attestations show a stem *i₂a- (rarely spelled *ja-), but we find a stem *je- a few times, of which the OS attestation *e-en-ta is significant. We therefore are clearly dealing with an original thematic inflection *je₂-. This verb is middle, but compare the occasional active forms that are gathered under the lemma *i₂. The connection with the PIE root *h₁ei- was made from the beginning of Hittitology onwards, but the exact formation of this verb is in debate. In my opinion, assuming a formation *h₁i-je/ō- would explain the attested paradigm best (i.e. belonging to class IIg. cf. § 2.2.3.4). See at *paj₂ / *p₂- ‘to go’ and *ye₂ / *y₂- ‘to come’ for other verbs that go back to *h₁ei-.
jea² (lc1) ‘to do, to make’ (Sum. DÛ): 1sg.pres.act. i-ja-mi (OS, often), i-e-mi (OS, 1x), i-ja-am-mi (KUB 1.16 iii 24 (OH/NS)), 2sg.pres.act. i-e-ši (OS), i-ja-ši (MH/MS), 3sg.pres.act. i-e-ez-zi (OS, often), i-e-zi (OS), i-ez-zi (OS), ja-az-zi (KUB 36.108 obv. 12 (OS)), i-ja-az-zi, i-ja-zi, 1pl.pres.act. i-ja-u-e-ni (MH/MS), i-ja-u-ya-ni (KBo 3.8 ii 24 (OH/NS)), 2pl.pres.act. i-ja-at-te-ni (MH/MS), 3pl.pres.act. ja-an-zi (OS), i-ja-an-zi (OS, often), i-an-zi (KUB 32.130, 24 (MH/MS)), i-en-zi (MH/MS, often), i-e-en-zi, 1sg.pret.act. i-ja-mu-un (MH/MS), 2sg.pret.act. i-e-eš (KUB 23.117, 2 (OH/NS), KUB 31.110, 12 (OH/NS), KUB 36.103, 6 (OH/NS)), i-ja-aš (MH/MS), i-ja-at, 3sg.pret.act. i-e-et (OS, often), e-et (KUB 36.41 i 5 (MS)), i-ja-ar (MH/MS, often), 1pl.pret.act. i-ja-at-te-en (OH/NS), i-ja-at-tén (OH/NS), 3pl.pret.act. i-e-er (OS, often), i-ja-er (KUB 34.90, 7 (NS)), 2sg.impact. i-ja (MH/MS), 3sg.imp act. i-e-š (MH/MS), i-ja-ad-du (MH/MS), i-ad-du (MH/MS), 2pl.imp act. i-ja-at-tén (MH/MS), 3pl.imp act. i-ja-an-du (often), i-en-du (KBo 6.34 ii 48, 49 (MH/NS)); part. i-ja-an-t; verb.noun i-ja-u-ya-ar; inf.I i-ja-u-ya-an-na; impf. e-eš-ke/a- (KUB 12.63 obv. 5 (OH/MS), KBo 5.3 iii 64 (NH)), iš-ke/a- (KUB 4.1 i 15 (MH/NS)).

Derivatives: see Tšša¹ / Tšš-

Anat. cognates: CLuw. á(i)ua- ‘to do, to make’ (1sg.pres.act. a-ӰYaš, 2sg.pres.act. a-a-ja-si, 3sg.pres.act. a-ti, 1sg.pres.act. a-ša, 3sg.pres.act. a-ta, a-ta, a-ta, a-da, 3pl.pres.act. a-a-ja-am-ta, a-i-ja-an-da, 2sg.impact. a-a-ja, 3sg.impact. a-a-du, 3sg.pres.midd. a-a-ja-ri, 3sg.imp.midd. a-a-ja-ru, part. a-i-ja-am-mi-in-zi); HLuw. á(i)ua- ‘to do, to make’ (1sg.pres.act. a-wal/ a-wal-i-’ (HISARIK 1 §5), 3sg.pres.act. /?aiadi/ a-ia-ti i (SULTANHAN §25), 1sg.pres.act. a-ha (HISARIK 1 §2), 3sg.pres.act. /?ađa/ a-đa-’ (SULTANHAN §13), a-đa (SULTANHAN §45), a-ra+a (MARAŞ 2 §3), a-ra/i (?) (EĞİK §3)); Lyd. a- ‘to make?’ (3pl.pres.act. išl); Lyc. a- ‘(act.) to do, to make; (midd.) to become’ (3sg.pres.act. adi, edî, 3pl.pres.act. aitî, 1sg.pres.act. aqqa, aqqa, aqqa, 3sg.pres.act. ade, adê, ede, 3pl.pret.act. aitê, 1sg.pres.midd. aqqa; inf. òeme, òeme(i)).

PIE *HH-jéa/o-?

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 335 for attestations. Note that 3pl.pret.act. e-en-zi (Bo 2599 i 23) cited in HW (Erg. 2: 13) is incorrect: we should read i-ën-zi (KUB 56.46 i 23). The OS attestation i-ez-zi is to be read as i-ez-zi /têči/ and does not show a stem i- (pace Puhvel l.c.).

This verb inflects according to the -jéa-a-class. The oldest attestations closely reflect the PIE situation:

---
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In the OH/MH-period, we see that the stem *je- receives some productivity (yielding *jem(k) 1x in a text vs. *jiami 7x in an OS text, *jenzi and *iendu), but from the MH period onwards it is clear that the stem *ia- is winning the competition, yielding *iâşi, *iâzzi, *iâš, *iâj and *iâddu. In the Luwian languages, we find a stem *aja- that occasionally contracts to a-. This a- is the predecessor of Lyc. a-.

The etymological interpretation of this verb is quite difficult. Kronasser (1966: 74) connected *ije/a<sup>-</sup> with Lat. *iēcki 'I throw' and Gr. ἵκα 'I sent, I threw' < *iē<sup>-</sup>- (i.e. *Hieh<sub>1</sub>-), which is followed by e.g. Watkins (1969a: 71) and Melchert (1994a: 75, 129). This etymology is problematic, however. First, the semantics do not fit: we do not see how 'to do, to make' matches 'to send, to throw'. Secondly, the formal side is wrong. If the etymon really were *Hieh<sub>1</sub>-, we would expect Hitt. **<i>iē</i>- throughout the single forms. In the 1sg. of 'to make, to do', the original forms are *jiami and *jianun and not *jem(k) and **jenum. The form *jem(k) 'I make' is indeed attested, but occurs only thrice in one text (KBo 17.1 + 25.3 ii 9 (fr.), iii 21, 23 (fr.) (OS)), which makes it far less attested than *jiami, which is attested 7x in OS texts and 90x in total in my files. A form **jenum is not attested at all, which is remarkable, especially if we compare the verbs peje<sup>-</sup> / pej- 'to send away' and uje<sup>-</sup> / uj- 'to send (here)', which indeed are derived from the root *Hieh<sub>1</sub>- 'to send': they show 1sg.pret.act. pejenum (MH/MS) and ujenum (MH/MS). Together with the fact that *Hieh<sub>1</sub>- in my view would not yield Luw. aja-, I therefore reject the reconstruction that involves the root *Hieh<sub>1</sub>- (but see at peje-/pej- and uje-/uj- for real descendants of this root).

Oettinger (1979a: 349), too, rejected the connection with *Hieh<sub>1</sub>- and reconstructed, primarily on the basis of Luw. aja-, a thematic verb *hêjê-e/o-. For Hitit, he assumes that *ê- yields i- and that *hêjê-e/o- yields Hitt. ɨjâa-t. Apart from the fact that the supposed development ê > i- is incorrect (e.g. êêzî < *hêzî-ti, êêhar < *hêşêhr, etc.), Melchert (1984a: 14f.) rightly points out that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>present</th>
<th>preterite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jiâm(k)</td>
<td>jianun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jiâš</td>
<td>jiê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jiâzzi</td>
<td>jiayeun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*jiântani</td>
<td>[*jiêten]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jiânzi</td>
<td>jiêr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Hitt. i-e-ez-zi probably denotes /iêt/úl, which is supported by the OS spelling ja-an-zi /iánt/úl, and that we have to reckon with a stem /ie/a-.

In my view, the only way to connect Hitt. /ie/a-/ with Luw. aja-, is to assume a preform *HH-je/o- (note that there is no further evidence for active verbs that show a thematic vowel in Hittite). In Hittite, *HH-je/o- yielded je/a- (cf. inw- /h₃_i-neu/ (see under ā(i)-em / i-), whereas in Luwian, it yielded ḻṯa-/ (through *HH[je/o-], cf. Kloekhorst 2004 for the interpretation of the HLuwian sign á as ḻt(á)?). Unfortunately, I know of no IE cognates. See at āša-/ /āš- for a treatment of the imperfective of this verb.


This word only occurs in lists of evils, e.g. in the following contexts:

KUB 24.13 ii
(23) an-ṣu-n=a=tā=k-kán NĪ.TE-za
(24) ḤUL-lu ud-da-a-ar al-yu-an-za-tar i-e-eš-şar-r=a

‘I have wiped from your body evil words, witchcraft and ğëšar’;

KBo 19.145 iii
(7) [...] a-an-za-tar i-e-eš-şar pa-ap-ra-a-tar ...

‘..., witchcraft, ğëšar, defilement, ...’.

Often, this word is regarded as a spelling variant of ‘ğššar / ğšn-’, which is supposed to be the h-less variant of ġḥar / išḥan- ‘blood’ (e.g. Puhvel HED 1/2: 305f.). Although it is true that ġḥar / išḥan- can occur in lists of evils as well, then denoting ‘bloodshed’, there is one context in which it is clear that ğššar / ğēšn- and ġḥar / išḥan- cannot be identical:

KUB 17.18 ii
(29) [(a-pé-e)a-da-aš i-da-la-u]ja-aš ud-da-a-na-aš iš-ḥa-a-na-aš
(30) [(iš-ḥa-aš-ru-ya-aš li-in-k)]i-ja-aš ḫu-ur-ti-ja-aš
(31) [a(l-ya-an-zé-na-aš pa-ap-)]ra-an-na-aš i-e-eš-na-aš

‘... to these evil words of bloodshed, of tears, of curses, of conjurations, of sorcerors, of defilement (and) of ğššar’.
Since both ḫēšar and ēlḥar are mentioned here, they cannot be the same word.

Because the exact meaning of ḫēšar / ḫēn- cannot be determined, it is hard to etymologize it. Formally it looks like an abstract noun in ḫēšar / ḫēn- of a root i- or i/h/-. The only verbs that formally would fit are i-² `to go' / i̯e/h/²adī `to go' and i̯e/h/² `to do'. The semantic connection between one of these verbs and `something evil' is not clear, however.

**ikniant** (adj.) ‘lame’: nom.sg.c. ik-ni-ja-an-za (NS).

PIE *i-g-n-ient-*?

This word is hapax in the following context:

KUB 12.62 rev.

(7) Ú.SAL-i₃₃ si-sh-ja-am-ma ar-ta kat-ta-an=ma ta-aš-ya-an-za du-du-mi-ja-an-za
(8) a-ša-an-zì ta-aš-ya-an-za a-uš-zi le-e du-ud-du-mi-ja-an-za iš-ta-ma-aš-zi
(9) le-e ik-ni-ja-an-za pād-dui le-e

`A šišiamma stands in the meadow. Underneath it a blind and a deaf man sit. The blind man cannot see, the deaf man cannot hear and the ikniant- man cannot run'.

From this context, it is clear that ikniant- must mean something like `lame' or `paralysed'. Puhvel (HED 1-2: 354) connects the word with Hitt. eka- `ice', so originally meaning `frozen, paralysed'. If correct, we might have to compare n-stem forms like MiCorn. yeın `cold' (*i̯e-g-n-) and ON jaki `ice-floe' (*i̯e-g-n-i̯e-n-). See at eka- for further etymology.

**ikt-**: see ekt-

**mtš ̃illujaŋka-**, **mtš ̃ellijanka-** (c.) `snake, serpent': nom.sg. il-lu-ja-an-ka-āš (KBo 3.7 i 9, 11, KUB 17.5 i 9), il-lu-i-ja-an-ka-āš (KUB 36.5 ii 28, KUB 17.6 i 4 (fr.)), [il-[l]i-um-k[i]-iš] (KBo 12.83 i 7 (OH/NS)), acc.sg. il-lu-ja-an-ka-an (KUB 17.5 i 5 (fr.), 15, 17 (fr.), KBo 3.7 iii 24), il-li-įg-a[n-ka-an] (KBo 3.7 iii 31), [e]li-li-ja-an-ku-ān (KBo 26.79, 17), gen.sg. il-lu-ja-an-ka-āš (KBo 3.7 iii 7, 26), acc.pl. el-li-ja-an-ku-āš (KUB 24.7 ii 70).

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 358-9 for attestations. This word shows several different stems, namely illujaŋka-, illijaŋka-, ellijanka- and (possibly) iliunki-. To my mind, these alterations clearly point to a non-IE origin of this word. I therefore reject Katz’ attempt (1998) to explain this word as reflecting "*eel-snake", i.e. a
compound of the elements *illu- and *anka/u- of which the former is supposed to be cognate to PGerm. *āla- ‘eel’ and the latter to Lat. *anguis, Gr. ἁγκός, etc. ‘snake’.

gātišt#: see gIS elζi-

imma (adv.) ‘truly, really, indeed’: im-ma (OS).
Anat. cognates: CLuw. imma (adv.) ‘indeed’ (im-ma); HLuw. ima (adv.) ‘indeed’ (i-ma).
IE cognates: Lat. immō (particle) ‘indeed’.

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 359f. for attestations and Melchert 1985 for semantics, who states that the basic function of imma is indicating asseveration and emphasis. Goetze & Pedersen (1934: 77-9) connected imma with Lat. immō ‘indeed’. Although semantically and formally this comparison is convincing, it is not fully clear how to reconstruct these forms. Melchert (o.c.) reconstructs *id-moh₂ with nom.-acc.sg.n. *id of the demonstrative pronoun *h₁e-, *(h₂)i- but Kimball (1999: 299), pointing to the fact that *VdmV would probably have been preserved in Luwian (cf. Luw. katmarši- ~ Hitt. kammaršiğe/a-²), rather reconstructs *im-moh₂, with acc.sg.c. *im. According to her, *moh₂ may be compared with Gr. μαν < *mh₂. Within Hittite, one could consider a connection with namma ‘then, in addition’ (q.v.).

imijez/a² (ic1) ‘to mingle, to mix’: 1sg.pres.act. i-mi-ja-mi (KUB 24.14 i 4 (NS)), i-im-mi-ja-mi (KUB 24.15 obv. 10 (NS)), im-mi-ja-mi (KUB 24.14 i 10 (NS)), 2sg.pres.act. im-me-ja-si (KBo 21.20 rev. 17 (NS)), im-me-at-ti (KUB 21.5 iii 15 (NH)), 3sg.pres.act. im-mi-ja-zi (KUB 11.20 i 10 (OH/NS)), im-mi-ja-az-zi (KUB 7.1 i 27 (OH/NS), VBoT 120 ii 3 (MH/NS)), 3pl.pres.act. i-mi-ja-an-zi (KUB 14.63 iv 14 (fr.) (MH/MS), KBo 6.34 ii 22 (MH/NS), KUB 29.4 iv 26 (NS)), i-im-mi-an-zi (KUB 29.48 rev. 16 (MH/MS)), im-mi-ja-an-zi (KUB 1.11 iv 12 (MH/MS), KBo 6.34 i 32 (MH/NS)), im-mi-an-zi (KBo 3.5 + IBoT 2.136 iv 65 (MH/NS)), 1sg.pret.act. i-mi-e-nu-un (KBo 3.46 obv. 13 (OH/NS)), 1pl.pret.act. i-mi-ja-n-en (KUB 43.74 obv. 13 (NS)), 3pl.imp.act. im-mi-ja-an-du (KUB 36.12 iii 3 (NS)), 3sg.pres.midd. i-mi-ja-at-ta-ri (KUB 32.135 i 9 (fr.), iv 8 (OH/MS), im-mi-ja-ad-da-ri (KUB 29.8 ii 21 (MH/MS)), im-me-ja-ta-r[i] (KBo 18.62 rev. 10 (NS)), 3pl.pres.midd. i-[im-mi-]a-an-ta-ri (KBo 20.63 i 7 (OH/NS)), 3pl.pret.midd. im-mi-ja-an-da-at (KBO 14.50 obv. 6 (MS?)), 3pl.imp.midd. im-me-at-ta-ru (KUB 43.38 rev. 20 (NS?)); part. i-mi-ja-an-t- (KBo 21.34 ii 19, 54,
Derivatives:  

\textit{iniul-} (n.) ‘grain mix, horse feed’ (nom.-acc.sg. \textit{i-mi-ú-úl}=a-a=št-ma-as (KUB 29.41, 8 (MH/MS)), \textit{i-mi-ú-úl} (KBo 12.126 i 29 (OH/NS)), \textit{i-mi-ú-úl} (KBo 4.2 ii 33 (OH/NS), KUB 7.54 ii 17 (fr.) (NS)), \textit{i-mi-i-ú-úl} (KBo 10.37 ii 15 (OH/NS)).


PIE *\textit{im-je/o-}.

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 361f. for attestations. The verb and its derivative are spelled \textit{i-mi-}, \textit{i-im-mi-}, \textit{i-im-} and \textit{i-im-}. Of these four possibilities, the spelling \textit{i-im-} is found in NS texts only, whereas \textit{i-mi-}, \textit{i-im-mi-} and \textit{i-im-} are all attested in MS texts already. Of these spellings, \textit{i-mi-ja-at-ta-ri} (OH/MS) is the oldest one and determines that the original spelling of this verb was \textit{i-mi-}, which was altered to \textit{i-im-} through an intermediate stage \textit{i-im-mi-} (compare the spelling chronology of \textit{amijant-}: original \textit{a-mi-} changed to \textit{am-mi-} through a stage \textit{a-am-mi-}). This means that we are dealing with an original verb \textit{imije/a-²}.

Usually, this word is etymologically interpreted as *\textit{en-mei-} ‘to mix in’ (≈ Skt. \textit{mâyata} ‘to exchange’) as first suggested by Sturtevant (1933: 133, 224), cf. e.g. Puhvel (l.c.), Melchert (1994a: 101) and Rieken (1999: 463). The fact that the original spelling of this verb is with single \textit{-m} is not very favourable to this etymology, however. We would expect that *\textit{en-mei-} (or even better *\textit{en-hmēmi-}, cf. Gr. \textit{hē̂mē} ‘to exchange’) would surely yield geminate \textit{-mm-} (note that this was noticed by Rieken (o.c.: 464) as well, but she nevertheless sticks to the etymology under the totally \textit{adhoc} assumption that the OH and MH scribes did not care about writing geminates as much as their NH colleagues did). I therefore reject the etymology, also because a verbal univerbation with the element *\textit{hēm-} ‘in’ is unparalleled in Hittite.

In my view, \textit{imije/a-²} can hardly reflect anything else than *\textit{(H)im-je/o-}, derived of a root *\textit{(H)iem-}. Although I know no verbal examples of such a root (Skt. \textit{yam-} ‘to hold, to stretch out’ remains semantically far), a nominal cognate may be found in Skt. \textit{yamā́} ‘twin’ (cf. Eichner \textit{apud} Oettinger 1979a: 345), Latv. \textit{jumis}
‘two joined into a unite, things grown together, doublefruit?’, MiR. _emon_ ‘twins’ < *iem-. The original meaning of this root then must have been ‘to mingle, to unite’.

**inan-** (n.) ‘illness, ailment’ (Sum. GIG): nom.-acc.sg. _i-na-an_, gen.sg. _i-na-na-āš_, dat.-loc.sg. _i-na-ni_, dat.-loc.pl. _i-na-na-āš_.

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 365f. for attestations. The word shows an _n_-stem inflection and is semantically comparable to _ermon / armn-_ (q.v.). Mechanically, _inan-_ can hardly reflect anything else than *(H)in-on-*, but it is difficult to find IE cognates. Usually, _inan-_ is connected with Skt. _ēnas-_ ‘mischief, crime, misfortune’, GAv. _aṅnah-_ ‘crime, wrong, mischief’ (cf. Puhvel (l.c.) for references). Apart from the semantic problems (‘mischief, crime’ is quite different from ‘illness, ailment’), this is formally unattractive, however, because we then would have to reconstruct a root *(Hein-*, which is impossible according to the PIE root constraints. Moreover, no other cognates for _ēnas-_ are found outside of Indo-Iranian. I would rather derive _inan-_ from a root *(H)ien-*, but such a root is further unknown to me.

**inarā** (stem) ‘vigor’.

Derivatives: **inarā** (adv.) ‘explicitly, willfully, purposely’ (_in-na-ra-a_ (IBoT 1.36 i 48 (fr.) (MH/MS), KBo 10.45 i 46 (MH/NS), KUB 13.7 i 18 (MH/NS), KUB 31.68 rev. 44 (NS), KUB 54.1 ii 48 (NS), KUB 21.33 iv 20 (NH), KUB 26.1 i 43 (NH), KUB 26.32 i 14 (NH)), _in-na-ra=ma_ (IBoT 1.36 i 49 (MH/MS)), _in-na-ra=ya=kān_ (KUB 31.68 rev. 32 (NS)), _in-na-ra=ya=mu=kān_ (KUB 54.1 i 36 (NS), _in-na-ra=ya=aš=ma-āš_ (KUB 1.8 iv 8 (NH))), _in(n)arāhā- _(Ib) ‘to make strong, to strengthen’ (3sg.pres.act. _i-na-ra-ah-ḥi_ (KUB 36.110 rev. 12 (OS)); 1sg.pret.midd. _in-na-ra-ah-ḥa-ar_ (KUB 30.10 obv. 18, 19 (OH/MS)); verb.noun _in-na-ra-ah-ḥu-ar_ (KBo 17.60 rev. 10 (MH/MS))), **inarāqār** (n.) ‘strength’ (nom.-acc.sg. _in-na-ra-ā-[a-[u-]-a-ar_ (KUB 30.10 rev. 19 (OH/MS))), **inarāqār** (adj.) ‘strong, vigorous (deity)’ (nom.sg.c. _i-na-ra-u-an-za_ (KUB 36.110 rev. 11 (OS)), _in-na-ra-u-ya-an-za_ (KUB 17.20 ii 3 (NS), Bo 6044, 4 (undat.), KUB 55.39 iii 30 (NS), VBoT 24 i 29 (MH/NS)), acc.sg.c. _in-na-ra-u-ya-an-da-an_ (VBoT 24 ii 30 (MH/NS)), dat.-loc.sg. _in-na-ra-ya-an-ti_ (FHG 1, 19 (OH/NS), VBoT 24 ii 34 (MH/NS)), _in-na-ra-u-ya-an-ti_ (KUB 30.10 obv. 8 (OH/MS)), nom.pl.c. _in-na-ra-u-ya-an-te-eš_ (KBo 17.88 ii 22 (OH/MS), KUB 15.34 i 48 (MH/MS), HT 1 i 43, 46 (MH/NS)), _in-na-ra-ya-an-te-aš_ (HT 1 i 29 (MH/NS)), _in-na-ra-u-ya-an-ta-aš_ (KUB 9.31 i


See Puhvel HED 1/2: 366f. for attestations. In Hittite, we find several words that are derived from a stem **inařā**- or **innarā**- that have a basic meaning ‘vital strength, vigor’ (cf. Puhvel o.c.: 372). Although the bulk of the attestations are spelled with geminate -mm- (in OH/MS-texts already), the two OS attestations **inařāḥi** and **inara-y̱ an-za** show that the original spelling must have been with single -n- (cf. **amijant**- and **imije/a**- for similar distributions), which is the reason for me to cite this lemma as **inařā**-. The CLuwian counterpart of this stem is **annar-**, sometimes spelled **ānnar-**. The situation that Hitt. **inařā**- corresponds to CLuw. **ānnar**- reminds us of Hitt. **idālu~** CLuw. **adduqal**- ‘evil’, which is explained by assuming that the Hitt. word reflects *h₂edqol-*, whereas the CLuw. word goes back to *h₂édogl- (showing Cop’s Law). This means that for **inařā**~ **ānnar**-, we have to assume a difference in accentuation as well. Mechanically, we should reconstruct *h₁enor- for Hittite, and *h₂enor- for CLuwian.

Since Hrozný (1917: 74), this word is generally connected with PIE *h₂ner- ‘man’ and reconstructed as *h₁en-h₂nor-o- ‘having virility inside’ (compare for this formation **antuy̱ aḥhāš**- / **anduš**- ‘man, person’ < *‘having breath inside’). Apart from the fact that it is awkward that the root *h₂ner- is not found anywhere else in the Anatolian language group, I think that the OS spellings with single -n- strongly speak against this reconstruction, which I therefore reject. Unfortunately, I have no better alternative, however.
ini: see aši / uni / ini

inu-² caus. of ā(i)-² / i- ‘to be hot’ (q.v.)

irḥ(a)-: see erḥ- / arḥa- / arḥ-

ṭšåa-² / tšš- (IIa1γ: impf. of je/a-² ‘to do, to make’) ‘to do, to make’ (Sum. Dū- ešša-): 1sg.pres.act. [i-][s]ša-ah-hi (KUB 1.16 ii 43 (OH/NS)), iš-ša-ah-hi (HKM 21 rev. 21 (MH/MS), HKM 52 obv. 9 (MH/MS), KBo 16.97 obv. 15 (MS), KUB 27.38 i 19 (MS), KUB 7.5 ii 5, 20 (MH/NS), KBo 5.3 iv 30 (NH)), e-eš-ša-ah-hi (KUB 48.123 iv 21 (NS), KBo 4.8 iii 7 (NH), KBo 11.1 obv. 18, 22, 24, 27, 43 (NH), KUB 14.8 rev. 20 (NH), KUB 14.14 obv. 7 (NH), KUB 21.27 iv 45 (NH)), 2sg.pres.act. iš-ša-at-ti (KUB 30.10 ii 23 (OH/MS), KUB 14.1 obv. 86 (MH/MS)), KUB 26.22 ii 5 (MH/MS), KBo 5.3 i 35 (NH)), e-eš-ša-at-ti (KBo 5.13 iv 2 (NS), KBo 18.79 obv. 5, 8 (NS), KUB 2.11 rev. 6 (NH), KUB 6.41 iv 10 (NH)), 3sg.pres.act. iyš-ša-i (KBo 6.2 ii 25 (OS), KBo 22.1 rev. 32 (OS)), iš-ša-i (KUB 1.11 i 42, iii 31 (MH/MS), HKM 52 obv. 14 (MH/MS), KBo 40.140, 2 (MS?)), KBo 5.2 iv 45, 46 (MH/NS), KBo 19.44 rev. 1, 8 (NH), KBo 6.3 ii 46 (OH/NS)), iš-ša-a-i (KUB 19.43a iii 19 (NH)), e-eš-ša-i (KUB 6.5 iv 4 (OH/NS), KUB 55.5 iv 23 (OH/NS), KUB 8.69 iii 12 (NS), KUB 24.1 iv 21 (NS), KUB 42.100 iv 23 (NS), KUB 42.87 v 8, 13, 18, 23 (NS), ABoT 14 + KBo 24.118 iv 25 (NS), Kuša š/i/1.5, obv. 5 (NS), KBo 5.13 ili 24 (NH), KUB 6.41 ili 43 (NH), e-eš-ša-a-i (KBo 6.4 iv 13 (OH/NS)), e-eš-še-eš-z[i] (KUB 9.16 iv 9 (OH/NS)), 1pl.pres.act. iyš-su-ī-e-ni (KUB 23.115, 5 (MH/NS)), e-eš-šu-u-e-ni (KUB 30.27 rev. 1 (NS)), 2pl.pres.act. iyš-te-e-ni (KBo 22.1 rev. 27 (OS)), iš-te-e-ni (KBo 22.1 rev. 33 (OS)), iš-ša-at-te-ni (KBo 5.3 iv 29 (NH)), e-eš-ša-at-te-ni (KUB 13.4 i 47, ii 55 (OH/NS)), 3pl.pres.act. iyš-ša-an-zí (KBo 21.89 + KBo 8.97 iv 8 (OH/MS), KUB 31.101 obv. 11 (MS), KUB 29.1 ii 5 (OH/NS), KUB 17.28 iv 56 (NS)), e-eš-ša-an-zí (OH/NS), eš-ša-an-zí (BoT 3.148 i 69 (NS)), 1sg.pret.act. iyš-ša-ah-[šu-un] (KUB 30.10 ii 24 (OH/MS)), iš-ša-ah-ḥu-un (HKM 52 rev. 39 (MH/MS)), e-eš-ša-ah-ḥu-un (KUB 14.10 obv. 19, 24 (fr.) (NH), KUB 14.11, 13 (NH), KUB 23.105, 12 (NH), KUB 31.66 ili 18 (NH)), 3sg.pret.act. iyš-ši-ši-ta (KBo 15.10 i 14, 31, ii 14, iii 56 (OH/MS), KUB 15.13 i 35 (fr.) (NS)), e-eš-še-eš-ta (KUB 24.13 ii 9 (NH/NS), KUB 15.19 obv. 12 (NS), KBo 5.8 ii 28 (NH), KUB 15.1 ii 47 (NH), KUB 21.40 ili 11 (NH), e-eš-eš-ta (KUB 5.6 ii 14 (NS), KUB 22.7 obv. 3 (NS)), e-eš-še-iš-ta (KUB 17.27 ii 29 (MH/NS), KUB 41.19 rev. 3 (MH/NS)), e-eš-ši-eš-ta (KUB 21.33 iv 18 (NH), KUB 22.70 obv. 13, 15,
See Puhvel HED 1/2: 300f. for attestations. This verb functions as the imperfective of je/ae² ‘to do, to make’, and is one of the few imperfectives that do not show the suffix -ske/ae, but -ss(a)- (the other ones are ḫalzišša¹ / ḫalzišš-, šišša¹ / šišš- and yarrišša¹ / yarrišš-). Of these imperfectives in -ss(a)-, ḳšā-ṭšš- is important as it is the best and oldest attested one.

The verb shows a wild variety of forms, for instance in the spelling of the initial vowel. We find i-iš-š°, iš-š°, e-eš-š° and eš-š°. In OS texts we only find the spelling i-iš-š°. In MS texts, this spelling is altered to iš-š°, whereas the spellings e-eš-š° and eš-š° are found in NS texts only. The unique spelling i-e-eš-ṣer (KBo 17.105 ii 18 (MH/MS)) may be seen as a mixed spelling between MH išš- and NH ḡšš-. The development of pšš- > išš- > ḡšš- is due to the lowering of OH īl to NH īl/ before ī as described in § 1.4.8.1.d (also in e.g. ḫalzišš(a)- > ḫalzešš(a)-, ḳšš(a)- > šešš(a)-, ʰhištā > ʰḥešṭā, etc.).

The original paradigm of this verb must have been (note that the initial plane i- is not attested for every form): ḳšāḥḫi, ḳšatti, ḳšai, ḳšišni, ṭšni, ṭšansī for the present and ḳšāḥḫun, *ṭššatta, ḳššita, ḳšyen, ṭšen, ṭšer for the preterite. This means that this verb inflects according to the iarm(a)-class. The prehistory of this verb is in debate. In my view, this verb cannot be treated separately from the other imperfectives in -ss(a)-, and therefore etymologies that treat ḳša-ṭšš- as if
it were an isolated verb do not have any merit (e.g. Jasanoff 1988: 235, who
reconstructs ṭšša- as *(H)jī-(H)jih₁-s-, a reduplication of the root *(H)ieh₁-
(but note that *je/a² (q.v.) cannot reflect *Hieh₁-) followed by an “iterative”-
suffix *-s-, without explaining ḥalzišš(a)- and yarrišš(a)-). See at je/a² ‘to do,
to make’ and -sš(a) - for further etymological treatments.

-išš(a)- (“imperfective”-suffix): see -sš(a)-

išša-: see išnā-

išḥā- (c. ‘master, lord, owner; lady, mistress’ (Sum. EN, Akk. BELU, BELTU):
nom.sg. iš-ḥa-aš (OS, often), iš-ḥa-aš (OS, less often), e-eš-ḥa-aš=ší-iš (KUB
41.8 iii 21 (MH/NS)), acc.sg. iš-ḥa-a-an, voc.sg. iš-ḥa-a (OH/MS), iš-ḥa-(1x:
OH/NS), gen.sg. iš-ḥa-a-aš (OS), dat.-loc.sg. iš-ḥi-i=šš-iš (OS), iš-ḥi-e=šš-iš (KUB
41.1 ii 6, 10, 14 (OH/NS)), iš-ḥi-i (KUB 33.62 ii 18 (OH/MS), KUB 26.17 ii 5
(MH/MS)), eš-ḥé (KBo 3.34 i 25 (OH/NS)), nom.pl. iš-ḥe-e-šš (KUB 30.68 obv.
6 (MS)), iš-ḥe-šš (KBo 3.46 obv. 38 (OH/NS), dat.-loc.pl. iš-ḥa-aš (OH/NS).

Derivatives: išḥaššara- (c. ‘lady, mistress’ (Sum. GAŠAN, Akk. BELTU; dat.-
loc.sg. iš-ḥa-aš-ša-rī (KUB 33.62 ii 18 (OH/MS))), išḥaššaryant- (adj.)
’practising lordliness’ (nom.sg.c. iš-ḥa-aš-ša-ya-an-za, acc.sg.c. iš-ḥa-aš-ša-ya-
an-ta[n₂], dat.-loc.sg. iš-ḥa-aš-ša-ya-an-tī), išḥaššarytaš / išḥaššaryann- (n.)
’lordliness’ (nom.-acc.sg. iš-ḥa-aš-ša-ya-a-tar, iš-ḥa-aš-ša-ya-tar, gen.sg. iš-
ḥa-aš-ša-ya-an-na-aš, instr. iš-ḥa-aš-ša-ya-an-ni-t=a-at=kān), išḥaššaryqšš-²
(Ib2) ‘to become a lord(?)’ (broken: iš-ḥa-aš-ša-ya-e-el[s...]), išḥaššaryayḥḥ-¹
(IIb) ‘to make lordly’ (impf.3sg.imp.act. iš-ḥa-aš-ša-ya-al-ḥi-eš-kī), išhezzije/a-
² (Ic1) ‘to dominate’ (3sg.pres.act. iš-ḥe-ez-zi-ja-zi; 3sg.pret.midd. iš-ḥe-ez-zi-ta),
*išheznatar / išheznann- (n.) ‘lordship’ (dat.-loc.sg. EN-ez-na-an-ni).

IE cognates: Lat. erus ‘master’.

PIE *h₁esh₂-ó-

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 385f. for attestations. The bulk of the attestations are
spelled with a plene vowel in the second syllable: nom.sg. iš-ḥa-a-aš, acc.sg. iš-
ḥa-a-an, voc.sg. iš-ḥa-a, gen.sg. iš-ḥa-a-aš, dat.-loc.sg. iš-ḥi-i. The rare spellings
with initial e-eš-h² or eš-h⁵ are all NS and are due to the lowering of OH /i/ to NH
/e/ before -š- as described in § 1.4.8.1.d.

The etymological interpretation of this word has been in debate. Nevertheless,
Ribezzo’s suggestion (1920: 128) to connect išḥā- with Lat. erus ‘master’
remains the most attractive. This would imply a reconstruction *h₁esh₂-ó-.
Puhvel (l.c.) rejects this etymology (for unclear reasons) and rather connects isḥār- to Luw. yasḫar- (for unclear reasons) which he translates as ‘master’. As Melchert (1993b: 263) states, CLuw. yasḫa- rather denotes ‘sacralized object’, whereas the interpretation of HLuw. washa- remains unclear (nom.sg. "wa/i-sa-ha-sa (TÜNP 1 §6), acc.pl. "wa/i-sa-ha-i-za (BABYLON §2); case unclear "wa/i-sa-ha-sa (ASSUR letter f §27)). As an alternative to the connection with Lat. erus, Oettinger (1979a: 499) suggests an inner-Hittite connection with šišḫa-2 / šišḫ- ‘to ordain’, which he cites as šēsḫ(a)- and reconstrains as *se-sh₂oḫ₁-ei. For isḥār-, this would mean a reconstruction *sh₂oḫ₁-s. Although semantically not unattractive, the formal side of this alternative etymology is difficult. As I show in the lemma of šišḫa-2 / šišḫ-, this verb rather reflects *si-sh₂-oi-éi, *si-sh₂-ë-enti, a reduplicated form of isḥai-2 / isḫi- ‘to bind, to impose upon’, which makes the reconstruction with a root *sh₂oḫ₁- impossible. Moreover, the prothetic i- that arises in the initial cluster *sh₂- does not participate in the lowering of OH /i/ to NH /e/ before -s- as we see happening in isḥār- > ešḫa-.


Derivatives: išḫāru- (a) (IIg) ‘to weep’ (3sg.pret.midd. iš-ḫa-ah-ru-yas-at-ta-at; past. iš-ḫa-ah-ru-yas-an-t-).

IE cognates: Skt. āśr-, TochA nEnter, ākṛunt (nom.pl.), TochB ṅkrūna* (nom.pl.), Lith. ąšara, ąšarà ‘tear’.

PIE *s+ḫe₂k-ru? ??

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 390f. for attestations. The word is almost consistently spelled iš-ḫa-ah-ru-. The spelling e-ēš-ḫa-ah-ru- occurs twice only, and these instances are clearly due to the vicinity of the word ḫaḥar ‘blood’.

Semantically as well as formally, the word cannot be separated from the words for ‘tear’ that are found in the other IE languages, Skt. āśr-, TochA nEnter, n.pl. ākṛunt, TochB ṅkrūna*, Lith. ąšara, ąšarà ‘tear’, and, more distantly, Gr. ἀκρόν, OHG zahar, Arm. artavor, OHG trahin, Lat. lacrima ‘tear’. The exact interpretation of the words that show an initial *d is severely in debate (solutions vary widely, see the list in Puhvel (l.c.)), but the interpretation of the unextended forms as reflexes of *h₂e₂k-ru-, a derivative of the root *h₂e₂k- ‘sharp, bitter’, seems generally accepted. For Hittite, this would mean that we have to assume a
prothetic *s- (an s-mobile?, cf. śankuyai- ‘nail’ < *s-h2ŋgl-<u-<) and assimilation of *h2eh- to *h2eh-. Unfortunately, such an assimilation is further unknown in Hittite (for my rejection of alleged *kerhšr > *h2erhšr > ḫaršar ‘head’, see there). Moreover, there is evidence that the word for ‘tear’ originally was a *-ur/-gen-stem in PIE (n-stem-forms in Germanic, absence of Weise’s Law in Sanskrit), of which it is difficult to explain why it did not turn up as a -ur/-gen-stem in Hittite (like e.g. pahḫur / pahḫu(m)- ‘fire’, zona(m)kur ‘beard’), but showed the metathesis to -ru- that we know from the other IE languages. All in all, the derivation of iššaṭru- out of PIE *h2ēkr- remains quite intricate.


Derivatives: (ktS)išḥiṁan-/išḥimen- (c.) ‘string, line, cord, rope, strap’ (nom.sg. iš-ḥi-ma-a-š (KUB 17.15 rev. 11 (OS)), acc.sg. iš-ḥi-ma-na-an (KBO 20.40 v 9 (OH/NS)), [iš-ḥi-me-na-an (988/u, 7 (NS), abl. iš-ḥi-ma-na-az (KUB 36.55 ii 16 (MH/NS)), instr. iš-ḥi-μa-an-tа (KUB 17.5, 15 (OH/NS)), iš-ḥi-ma-an-da (KUB 17.28 i 31 (NS)), iš-ḥi-ma-ni-it (KUB 17.60 obv. 3 (MH/MS), nom.pl. iš-ḥi-ma-ne-eš (KUB 17.15 rev. 10 (OS))), išḥiṁar- (c.) ‘cord’ (acc.sg. iš-ḥa-ma-na-an (KUB 17.27 ii 31, 34 (MH/NS))), išḫi(e)ni- (c.) ‘(body)hair’ (nom.pl. iš-ḥi-e-ni-uš (KUB 13.4 iii 62 (OH/NS), iš-ḥi-ja-ni-uš (KUB 13.19, 5 (OH/NS))), (Tİ)išḫial- (n.) ‘bond, band, belt’ (nom.-acc.sg. iš-ḥi-ši-al, abl. iš-ḥi-ja-


IE cognates: Skt. sā-, si- ‘to bind’, Lith. sūti ‘to bind’.

PIE *ṣh₂-o-ei, *ṣh₂-i-énti

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 398f. for attestations. The oldest attestations of this verb clearly show that it inflects according to the dā/u/tiyanzi-class (iššāi, isḥianzi, both OS). Like all other dā/u/tiyanzi-class verbs, iššai / išši-, too, is taken over into the mi-conjugating -je/a-class in NH times, on the basis of the false analysis of išši- anzi as išši-a-ṇi.

Since Kurylowicz (1927: 101) this verb is generally connected with e.g. Skt. sā- ‘to bind’ and Lith. sūti ‘to bind’. The exact reconstruction of the root is difficult, however; e.g. Oettinger (1979a: 461) reconstructs a root *ṣeh₂-, LIV a root *ṣeh₂(i-) and LIV² a root *ṣeh₂-ei-. Apparently there is no consensus whether or not the -i- is integral part of the root.

In Hittite, iššāi / iššianzi must go back to *ṣḥ₂-oie, *ṣḥ₂-iénti. As I have shown in Kloekhorst ftc.h.a, most of the the dā/u/tiyanzi-class verbs go back to a structure *CC-oI-, *CC-i-, i.e. the zero-grade of the root followed by an ablauting suffix *-oi-/-i-. For iššai-išši-, this means that we either are dealing with a root *ṣḥ₂-ei- or with a root *ṣeh₂- which shows a stem *ṣḥ₂(ojI-). In my view, this question is settled by looking at the derivatives in Hittite. On the one hand we find derivatives that show išši- < *ṣḥ₂-i- (e.g. iššaman- / iššamen-, iššial-, iššiul-), but we also find derivatives that show a stem išḥ- < *ṣḥ₂- (e.g. išhamin-, išhuźni-).
These latter show that we must analyse īṣhāi-/īṣhī- as an *-oī-suffixed verb that shows a root *seh₂-.

This also fits the Sanskrit evidence. There we find the verbal forms (all in Vedic): pres. *syāti, sināti; perf. sīṣāya; aor. sāt. On the basis of aor. sāt it is clear that the root must have been *seh₂- (note that LIV² states that sāt actually belongs with another root, namely *seh₁-/i- ‘to release’; this has now become unnecessary because of the Hittite material that unambiguously shows that we can reconstruct a root *seh₂-). It is remarkable that the Skt. “perf.” sīṣāya (although usually called “perfect” is shows quite an aberrant form; reduplication with -i- and an extra -i- suffix: the normal perfect would have been *se-sōh₂-e > sasāu as attested in Classical Sanskrit) can be directly equated with Hitt. īṣhāi < *(si-)sh₂-oī-e. Just as in Hittite īṣhījezzi is a secondary form on the basis of the zero-grade *sh₂-i-enti, it is likely that Skt. syāti is secondary as well (both reflecting virtual *sh₂i-). The Skt. nasal-present sināti reflects virtual *si-nē-ḥ₂-ti and must be a backformation to the zero-grade stem *sh₂-i- that yielded *siḥ₂- through metathesis.

The stem *sh₂-oī- is also visible in Lith. sūti ‘to bind’, Skt. setār- ‘binder’, etc.

The Luwian forms, with the stem hishi-, must reflect reduplicated forms: *(s)h₂i-sh₂i- and could possibly be directly equated with Skt. sīṣāya. Note that HLuw. hishimin shows that the stem must have been hishi- and not hishija- as often stated.

Note that the derivative Gl̥ isīṣhātar does not reflect *sh₂ōṣur (thus Puvhel HED 1/2: 397-8), but just reflects *isīṣhāur < *sh₂-oī-ur, the verbal noun of īṣhāi-/īṣhī-. For the development of *-aūṣur > -a̱ur cf. e.g. šēmar ‘sullenness’ from šē-² ‘to become sullen’.


Derivatives: īṣhatlallla - (c.) ‘song, melody’ (Sum. ŚIR; acc.sg. īṣ-ḥa-ma-in (KUB 12.11 ii 31 (MS?)), īṣ-ḥa-ma-a-in (VSNF 12.118, 2 (NS)), acc.pl. īṣ-ḥa-ma-[u]š (KUB 10.7, 14 (NS)), īṣhāmatalla - (c.) ‘singer’ (Sum. ŚIR; nom.pl. īṣ-ḥa-ma-tal-le-š (KUB 17.21 ii 11, iii 19 (MH/MS)), acc.pl. īṣ-ḥa-ma-a-tal-lu-uš (KUB 31.124 ii 17 (MH/MS)), īṣ-ḥa-ma-tal-<<cli>>lu-uš (KUB 17.21 iii 5 (MH/MS)).

IE cognates: Skt. Śa-man- ‘song, hymn’.

456
PIE */sh₂m-ōi-, *sh₂m-i-enti*

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 394f. for attestations. The verb inflects according to the *dū/tijanzi*-class (the forms that show a stem *išḫami/je/-a* occur in NS texts only). As I have shown in Kloekhorst ft.h.c.a, this class consists of verbs that show a formation */CC-oi-/*CC-i-, i.e. the zero-grade of a root followed by an ablauting suffix */-oi/-i-. In § 2.2.2.2.h, I have shown that polysyllabic *dū/tijanzi*-class verbs (reduplicated verbs and univerbations with *pe- and *u-*) are secondarily taken over into the *torn(a)-*class through the intermediate *mēma*-class. This development started in pre-Hittite already. In the case of *išḥamai-/išḥami-*, this means that we have to assume that its stem was monosyllabic, so the phonological interpretation of this verb should be /sHmai- / sHmi-l (and not /isHamai-/).

Etymologically, this verb is ultimately derived from the root *seh₂- ‘to bind’ (attested in Hitt. *išḫai-* / *išḫi- (q.v.), and shows a root-extension with */m-. The formation */sh₂em-/*sh₂em- (not */seh₂m-, see below for argumentation) and the meaning ‘to sing’ must have been of PIE date already, as can be seen by Skt. *sāman- ‘song, hymn’ < */sh₂om-en-.

In Hittite, the preform */sh₂m-oi-/*sh₂m-i- should regularly have yielded **smai-/*smi- (loss of interconsonantal laryngeal), which means that a full-grade form */sh₂em-* must have been available in Hittite to make restoration of */h₂ possible. In my view, this full-grade form is visible in *išḫamai- ‘song’ < */sh₂em-oi- (which determines the root as */sh₂em-: a formation **sēh₂m-oi- should have given Hitt. **sāmai- or **sahmai- (if word-internal */h₂ was indeed retained in front of resonant, cf. the discussion at *GIs/mā ela-, *UZU mahrī/-mahrai- and *GIṣ/zahrāi-).

The alleged Greek cognate, ὀπός ‘song’ (thus Benveniste 1954: 39f.) cannot reflect */sh₂m-jo- (because */VeV- should have given Gr. *-VπV-, cf. Beekes 1972: 127) and therefore this connection must be given up.


PIE */sh₂-en- ?
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See Rieken 1999a: 283f. for attestations and semantic treatment. According to her all these forms are found in contexts referring to marriage, which would indicate that they are all related. On the basis of the supposed meaning ‘relative by marriage’ for \( i\text{š}h\text{an}i\text{t}t\text{a}r\), Rieken argues that ultimately these words must be connected with the root \(*\text{seh}2\text{-} ‘\text{to bind}’. In her view, we are dealing with a stem \(*\text{sh}2\text{-en}-\), which she further connects with \( \text{ša}h\text{han} ‘\text{feudal service’ < } \text{seh}2\text{-en} \) (q.v.). See it \( \text{iš}\text{hai}^2 / \text{iš}h\text{i}^2 \) for the basic root \(*\text{seh}2\text{-}\).

\( \text{iš}h\text{ije}^a / \text{iš}h\text{i}^2 \): see \( \text{iš}\text{hai}^2 / \text{iš}h\text{i}^2 \)

\( \text{iš}h\text{unau}^\text{-} \) (c. > n.) ‘arm, upper arm’: nom.sg.c. \( \text{iš-}\text{hu-}n\text{a-}u\text{-}u\text{-a} \) (KBo 32.14 ii 49 (MH/MS)), \( \text{iš-}\text{hu-}n\text{a-}u\text{-a} \) (KBo 32.14 rev. 44, Ledge 1 (MH/MS)), \( \text{iš-}\text{hu-}n\text{a-}u\text{-a} \) (text: \(-\text{a}, \text{KUB} 9.34 ii 25 (MH/NS)), nom.-acc.sg.n. \( \text{iš-}\text{hu-}n\text{a-}a\text{-}u=\text{š}\text{-mi-}\text{t} \) (KUB 7.58 i 11 (MH/NS)), \( \text{iš-}\text{hu-}n\text{a-}a\text{-}a\text{-a} \) (KBo 10.37 ii 32 (OH/NS)), gen.sg. \( \text{iš-}\text{hu-}n\text{a-}u\text{-a} \) (KUB 9.4 i 25 (MH/NS)), \( \text{iš-}\text{hu-}n\text{a-}u\text{-a} \) (571/u, 8 (NS)), dat.-loc.sg. \( \text{iš-}\text{hu-}n\text{a-}u\text{-i} \) (KUB 25.37 ii 8 (NS)), [\( \text{iš-}\text{u-}n\text{a-}u\text{-i} \) (KUB 55.20 + KUB 9.4 i 6), erg.sg. \( \text{iš-}\text{hu-}n\text{a-}u\text{-a-} \) (KUB 9.4 i 25), dat.-loc.pl. \( \text{iš-}\text{hu-}n\text{a-}u\text{-a-} \) (KBo 46.62 ii 7 (NS)); case? \( \text{iš-}\text{hu-}n\text{a-}u\text{-a-} \) (KUB 56.60 iv 5 (NS)).

PIE \(*\text{sh}2\text{-nu-}^\text{-}\)

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 403f. for attestations. The interpretation of this word has always largely depended on the form \( \text{iš-}\text{hu-}\text{na-}u\text{-a-} \) (KBo 10.37 ii 32). Since Larroche (1962: 31), this \( \text{iš}h\text{unau}^\text{g} \) is generally regarded cognate with Skt. \( \text{sn}\text{āvan}^\text{-}, \text{Gr. } \text{鞭χa}, \text{Lat. nervus ‘sinew’ and therefore translated as ‘sinew’ as well. An exact reconstruction of these forms was quite difficult, however (for instance, the } \text{-h} \text{ in Hittite does not match Gr. } \text{-ε-}. \text{Weitenberg (1984: 224-5) convincingly argues that besides the form } \text{iš}\text{nu}^\text{a}^\text{a} \text{, all other forms of the paradigm rather point to a stem } \text{iš}h\text{unau}^\text{a} \text{ and that these forms are better translated ‘upper arm’ and hardly can have anything to do with the ‘sinew’-words. He therefore proposes to separate the stem } \text{iš}h\text{unau}^\text{a} ‘\text{upper arm’ from the hapax } \text{iš}\text{unau}^\text{g} ‘\text{sinew’. The fact that we indeed are dealing with a stem } \text{iš}h\text{unau}^\text{-} \text{is supported by the quite recent publication of the ‘Song of Release’ (KBo 32.14 (MH/MS), see Neu 1996 = StBoT 32), in which nom.sg.c. } \text{iš}\text{unau}^\text{g} \text{ is attested several times. Although Neu (1996: 152, 191) still adheres to the old translation ‘(Arm-)Sehne’, it is in my view clear that here } \text{iš}h\text{unau}^\text{-} \text{denotes ‘upper arm’ as well. Moreover, the forms show that originally } \text{iš}h\text{unau}^\text{-} \text{was a commune noun and that the NS attestation nom.-acc.sg.n. } \text{iš}h\text{unau}=\text{šmit must be a secondary form (see also the discussion on the gender of these kind of nouns at } \text{harnau}-\).
Rieken (1999a: 360-1) follows Weitenberg in translating ʾishunau- as ‘upper arm’, but also connects the form ʾishunawar with it. She translates the context that it occurs in as follows:

KBo 10.37 ii

(32) ... mu-u=š-ši ʾiš-ḫu-na-u-ya-ar ši-ja-u-ya-ar
(33) pé-es-tén

‘Gebt ihm das Schießen des Oberarmes!’.

According to Rieken, ʾishunawar is a falsely back-formed nom.-acc.sg.n. on the basis of gen.sg. ʾishunawaš. In my view, this is not necessary: I think it is quite possible that ʾiš-ḫu-na-u-ya-ar must be regarded as a mere scribal error for ʾiš-ḫu-na-u-ya-aš, with AŠ mistakenly written as AR due to anticipation to the following ši-ja-u-ya-ar ‘shooting’. So I would suggest to read ʾiš-ḫu-na-u-ya-aš ši-ja-u-ya-ar, which indeed must mean ‘shooting of the upper arm’. Whatever interpretation one chooses to follow, it is clear that in any way the Hittite word ʾishunawar ‘sinew’ does not exist anymore. Therewith the words for ‘sinew’ in the other IE languages (Skt. snāvan-, Gr. νευρά, Lat. nervus, Arm. neard, TochB šnaura (pl.) can now safely be reconstructed as *snēh₁-ur / *snh₁-uén-.

For the etymological interpretation of ʾishunau- I follow a suggestion of Weitenberg (l.c.) who hesitatingly connects it with Hitt. ʾišyuyaš / ʾišhi- ‘to throw’ (q.v.). This would mean that ʾishunau- reflects *šh₂u-neu- and originally denotes ‘throwing-arm’. See at ʾišyuyaš / ʾišhi- for further etymology.

Note that KUB 9.34 ii 25 actually has a form ʾiš-ḫu-na-aš=ma=ḵān, but because of the many corrupt forms in these texts, I have taken the liberty to read this form as nom.sg.c. ʾiš-ḫu-na-uš¹=ma-kān, which is supported by the commune forms from KBo 32.14. The assumption that this form shows a secondary stem ʾishuna- (thus Weitenberg 1984: 457[903]) is improbable; note that Puhvel (l.c.) interprets this form as gen.sg. or pl. (implying a reading ʾiš-ḫu-na-ya-aš) despite the fact that it clearly must be nom.sg. here.

ʾishunawar: see ʾishunau-

ʾišyuyaš / ʾišhi- (Ia4 > Ia1γ, Ic2) ‘to throw, to scatter, to pour’: 1sg.pres.act. ʾiš-ḫu-uḫ-hi (KUB 31.84 iii 63 (MH/NS)), ʾiš-ḫu-ya-ah-hi (KUB 9.25 + 27.67 i 3 (2x) (MH/NS), KUB 15.11 ii 9 (NH)), 3sg.pres.act. ʾiš-ḫu-ya-a-i (e.g. KUB 32.138 ii 12 (OH/MS), IBoT 2.39 rev. 26, 27 (MH/MS), KBo 23.10 iv 22 (MS), etc.), ʾiš-
See Puhvel HED 1/2: 404f. for attestations. In StBoT 25.137 ii 18, a text that is usually dated as OS, we find a form [*š]-[*š]-[-a-]* that must be regarded as a 1pl.pres.act.-form because of the 1pl.-forms *la*-[-e-]* (ibid. 15), da-[-u-]* (ibid. 16) and *har-[-e-]* (ibid. 17) in the preceding lines. In my view, this form is so aberrant (cf. the totally unexpected plene spelling *-u-a-*) that I severely doubt the reliability of this form or even the text in which it is found (compare also *d[eš]-[-e-]* instead of expected *tum-i-ni*). I will therefore disregard this form in this discussion.
It is not easy to determine the original inflection of this verb. The oldest forms (OS and MS) are: 3sg.pres.act. ʾišḫuqā, ʾišḫuqai, 3pl.pres.act. ʾišḫuqanzi, 1sg.pres.act. ʾiš-ḫu-u-Vḫ-ḫu-un, ʾiš-ḫu-Vḫ-ḫu-un, 2sg.pres.act. ʾišḫuqāta, 3pl.pres.act. ʾišḫuqāder, 2pl.imp.act. ʾišḫuqitten, 3pl.imp.act. ʾišḫuqandu. The forms ʾišḫuqitten and ʾišḫuqāta can only belong to the dāʾīťianzi-class inflection (ʾišḫuqai- / ʾišḫu-). The forms ʾišḫuqā, ʾišḫuqanzi, ʾišḫuqār and ʾišḫuqandu can either belong to the tarn(a)-inflection, or to the dāʾīťianzi-inflection (if we assume that *ʾišḫuqanzi > ʾišḫuqanzi). In principle, the forms ʾišḫuqanzi and ʾišḫuqandu could belong to an inflection similar to that of au- / u- ‘to see’ as well (cf. ʾuqanzi ‘they see’), but because of the total absence of forms with a stem **ʾišḥa-*, this option is very unlikely. The forms 1sg.pres.act. ʾiš-ḫu-u-Vḫ-ḫu-un and ʾiš-ḫu-Vḫ-ḫu-un are multi-interpretable. The sign AH can be read ʾaḥ, ʾeḥ, ʾiḥ as well as ʾuḥ, which means that we could be dealing with ʾiš-ḫu-(u)-aḥ-ḫu-un, ʾiš-ḫu-(u)-iḥ-ḫu-un, ʾiš-ḫu-(u)-eḥ-ḫu-un or ʾiš-ḫu-(u)-uḥ-ḫu-un. If we should read ʾišḫuāḥun, the word would belong to the tarn(a)-class (cf. the NS attestation ʾišḫu-ya-aḥ-ḥi); if the forms represent ʾišḫuḥḥun or ʾišḫeḥḥun, they would belong to the dāʾīťianzi-class. I must admit, however, that in these cases we would rather have found plene spelling of the specific vowel (cf. e.g. ṣu-iḥ-iḥi ‘I run’, ṣu-eḥ-ḫu-un ‘I ran’, ʾišḫu-ya-aḥ-ḥi). Nevertheless, an analysis ʾišḫuḥḥun is quite improbable, because this form could only belong to an inflection similar to au-/u- ‘to see’ (cf. ṣḥḥun ‘I saw’), of which we already have determined that it is a very unlikely option. So, all in all, the oldest forms seem to point to either a dāʾīťianzi-class or a tarn(a)-class inflection.

Since the dāʾīťianzi-class is a closed, unproductive class within Hittite, whereas the tarn(a)-class is very productive, I assume that the dāʾīťianzi-class inflection is more archaic and consequently the original one. I therefore cite this verb as ʾišḫuqai- / ʾišḫu-, and the attestations ʾiš-ḫu-u-Vḫ-ḫu-un and ʾiš-ḫu-Vḫ-ḫu-un as ʾišḫu-u-eḥ-ḫu-un and ʾišḫu-eḥ-ḫu-un (the NS attestations ʾiš-ḫu-aḥ-ḥi may be viewed as belonging with 3sg.pres.act. ʾišḫu (see below)). The fact that the 3pl.-forms are ʾišḫuqanzi and ʾišḫuqandu, whereas e.g. ṣuqai- / ṣu- ‘to run’ has ṣuqanzi (OS) ‘they run’, in my view is explained by the difference in preforms: ʾišḫuqanzi reflects *šuqānti (see below for etymology), whereas ṣuqanzi reflects *ḥuqānti. Intervocalic -i- in *šuqānti was lost in pre-Hittite already, yielding a hiatus: OH ḫoāntʾ/i, realized as [ṣHoʾāntʾi], spelled ʾišḫu-ya-an-zī. In the case of *ḥuqānti ‘they run’, we are dealing with intervocalic *-ḫi-, which yielded -i- in that same period (OH ḫoāntʾ/i, spelled ḫu-ja-an-zī), which was lost in the NH period only (NH ḫoāntʾ/i, realized as [Hoʾāntʾi], spelled ḫu-ya-an-zī).
This means that the OH paradigm of *išhydr- / *išhr- must have been *išhehš, *išhuaitti, išhuqāi, *išhuincident, išhuqanzī. On the basis of 3sg. išhuqāi and 3pl. išhuqanzī, in younger times forms were created that inflect according to the tarn(a)-class (1sg.pres.act. išhyahḫī (MH/NS), 3sg.pret.act. išhyas (OH/NS) and verb noun gen.sg. išhyagāt (NS)). In NH times, we find some forms that inflect according to the ḫatrae-class (išhumātī (NS), išhuqant-(NS)), and some forms in which the stem *išhr- has been generalized (3sg.pres.act. išhu (NS)). For the cognate verb *suḫḫa- / suḫḫ-, see at its own lemma.

As I have shown in Kloekhorst thc.a, the Hittite dǎ/tijanzi-class consists of verbs that reflect a formation *CC-o/-i, *CC-i, i.e. the zero-grade of the root followed by an ablauting suffix *-oi/-i. In this case, the root must have been išhu-. In the course of Hittitology, different etymological proposals have been suggested (see Puhvel (l.c.) for a summary), but the best one in my view is given by Jasanoff (1978: 90\textsuperscript{11}), who connects išhuayai/išhiu- with Gr. ḥō ‘to rain’, TochAB su-/swā- ‘to rain’ < *suH-, which is now codified in LIV\textsuperscript{3}. Formally, this connection is justified by assuming that a full-grade root *shu- had a zero-grade form *šh₂u- (still visible in Hitt. išhuayai/išhiu-) that metathesized already in PIE to *suH- (Gr. ḥ-, TochAB su- and Hitt. suḫḫa- / suḫḫ- ‘to scatter, to pour’ (q.v.)). Semantically, we have to assume that the PIE root denotes ‘to pour’, which in Hittite (where išhuayai/išhiu- still means ‘to pour’ as well) developed into ‘to throw’ (cf. ModDu. gooién ‘to throw’ < *gē eu- ‘to pour’), whereas in Greek and Tocharian the meaning shifted to ‘to rain’. The full-grade *sh₂eu- may still be visible in Hitt. šuḫhu- ‘sweat’ (although its spelling with *a-u is highly aberrant, q.v.).

As said above, within Hittite, a close cognate is the verb suḫḫa- / suḫḫ- ‘to scatter, to pour’. In some cases, išhuayai- / išhu- and suḫḫa- / suḫḫ- are used interchangeably in duplicates (cf. Puhvel HED 1/2: 408), and their connection is supported by a hybrid form like šu-uḫ-ḫu-yu-i (KBo 30.115 rev\textsuperscript{7} 5). Nevertheless, the exact formal interpretation of suḫḫa- / suḫḫ- is not fully clear. See at its own lemma for a full discussion.

iškalla\textsuperscript{2} / iškall- (IiaIγ) ‘to slit, to split, to tear’: 3sg.pres.act. iš-kal-la-i (KBo 6.4 i 39 (OH/NS), iš-gal-la-i (KBo 6.4 i 37 (OH/NS)), iš-kal-la-a-i (KUB 58.81 ii’ 6 (NS)), iš-kal-la-i-iz-zi (KUB 12.58 ii 17 (NS)), 3pl.pres.act. iš-kal-la-an-zi (KUB 30.22, 8 (OH/NS)), 1sg.pret.act. iš-kal-la-ah-ḫu-un (KUB 13.35 iv 24, 31 (NS)), 2sg.imp.act. iš-kal-li (HKM 24, 51 (MH/MS), KBo 37.1 i 16 (NS)), 3sg.imp.act. iš-kal-la-ū (KUB 30.36 ii 10 (MH/NS)), 3pl.imp.act. iš-kal-la-an-du (156\textsuperscript{v}, 7 (NS)); 3sg.pres.midd. iš-kal-la-ri (KBo 6.3 i 39 (OH/NS)), iš-kal-la-a-ri (KBo
6.5 i 16, 18 (OH/NS), KBo 6.3 i 37 (OH/NS), 3sg.pret.midd. iš-kal-la-at-ta (KBo 8.37 obv. 9 (MH/NS), KUB 23.7 ii 12 (MH/NS)); part. iš-kal-la-an-t-; inf.l iš-kal-li-ja-u-an-zi (KBo 43.61 i 13 (NS)); impf. iš-kal-li-iš-ke/a-, iš-gal-li-iš-ke/a-.


IE cognates: Gr. ὄκαλλα ‘to hoe’, Lith. skėlti ‘to split’.

PIE *skólh₂3-ei, *sklh₂3-enti

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 413f. for attestations. The verb inflects according to the tarn(a)-class, i.e. iškallai, iškallanzi. Usually, tarn(a)-class verbs go back to roots that end in a laryngeal (*ChO-, *(Ce)CH-enti or *CRnH-, *CRnH-enti), but there are a few tarn(a)-class verbs that reflect the structure *CeCh₂3-. As I have shown under § 2.2.2.2.d, the 3sg.pres.-form of roots of this structure, *(Ce)Ch₂3-ei, regularly yielded *CaCai (and not **CaCi), on the basis of which these verbs were taken over into the tarn(a)-class (see harr-, ‘to grind’, išparra-, išparra- ‘to trample’, mall-, ‘to mill’, padda-, ‘to dig’ and şart-, ‘to wipe, to rub’ for the same phenomenon). In the case of iškall(a)-, this means that we have to reconstruct *sKelh₂3-. Already since Hrozný (1917: 71), this verb is connected with Gr. ὄκαλλα ‘to hoe’ and Lith. skėlti ‘to split’. Especially the latter form supports the reconstruction of the root-final laryngeal, which yielded acute accentuation in Balto-Slavic. I therefore reconstruct the root as *skelh₂3- and the Hittite formation as *skólh₂3-ei, *sklh₂3-enti (note that this latter form regularly should have yielded Hitt. **iškalḫazi, but the geminate -ll- of the singular was generalized throughout the verb).

išgap̱- / išgap̱- (IIa2) ‘? ’: 3sg.pres.act. iš-ga-a-pl (KUB 10.63 i 26).

Derivatives: išgapuzzi- (n.) a cult object (nom.-acc.sg. iš-ga-pu-uz-zi (KUB 12.8 i 16)).

This verb is hapax in the following context:

KUB 10.63 i
(17) n=L-aš-ta MUNUS.LUGAL pa-ra-a ú-ez-zi nu=kán L1 ḤAL
(18) A-NA PA-NI L4U-ma-ra-ap-ši L4A-a-pi-in ki-nu-zi
(19) n=L-aš-ta L0 AZU 1 UDU A-NA L4U-ma-ra-ap-ši ši-pa-an-ti
(20) n=a-an=kán L0 AZU A-NA L4A-a-pl kat-ta-an-da ḫa-ad-da-a-i
(21) nu=kán e-eš-ḫar A-NA GAL kat-ta tar-na-i n=a-at tâk-ni-i
Because in this context a meaning ‘fills up’ is quite possible, it has been suggested that we should not read iš-ga-a-pí, but rather iš-ta-a-pí, belonging to the verb ištqp1/ ištapp- ‘to plug up, to block’ (q.v.). Nevertheless, the attestation of išgapuzzi- in KUB 12.8 i 16 in a list of implements, between ta-pu-ul-li ZABAR ‘bronze cutter’ and ma-ar-pu-zi ZABAR ‘bronze bathing-utensil’, seems to show the reality of a verbal stem išgap-. Since nouns in -uzzi- are usually derived from the zero-grade of a verbal root (e.g. išḫuzzi- from išha1/ išhī-, kuruzzi- from kuer2 / kur-, luzzi- from lā / l₂, etc.), it is likely that išgap- reflects a zero-grade verbal root as well. If išgāpi and išgapuzzi- are related, we are dealing with an ablauting pair išgāpi1 / išgap-. Formally, this could reflect hardly anything else than a root *škēβh₂-. If however, the single -p- = -b- from išgapuzzi- has been taken over from the full-grade stem išgāp-, we could in principle assume an ablauting pair išgāp₁ / išgap-, (cf. ištqp₁ / ištapp-), which then could reflect *škēp-. Since the meaning of išgapuzzi- cannot be determined, and the meaning of išgāpi is not fully clear (although ‘to fill up’ is possible), any etymology would be too insecure. Nevertheless, a root *škēp- ‘to cover’ is available in Gr. ONEOSKOS ‘to cover’.

iškār₁ / iškar- (Iia1 > Iia1y, Ic2) ‘to sting, to stab, to pierce; to stick (to)’: 1sg.pres.act. iš-ka-a-a[r-ḥi] (KBo 17.25 rev. 6 (OS)), iš-ka-a-ar-ḥi (KBo 17.96 i 14 (MS)), iš-ka-ḥi (KUB 31.1 + KBo 3.16 ii 7 (OH/NS)), iš-ga-ra-a-mi (KUB 48.123 iv 9 (NS)), 3sg.pres.act. iš-ka-a-ri (KBo 17.13 + 25.68 rev. 11 (OS)), iš-ga-a-ri (KBo 15.10 + 20.42 iii 28 (fr.) (OH/MS), KBo 3.8, 6 (OH/NS), KBo
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11.12 i 9 (OH/NS), KUB 41.2 i 4 (fr.) (OH/NS), IBoT 2.123 i 9 (fr.) (OH/NS), KUB 12.58 ii 30 (NS)), iš-ka₇-a-ri (KBo 15.10 + 20.42 i 38 (OH/MS), VBoT 24 i 46 (MH/NS)), iš-ka₇ (KBo 12.126 i 8 (OH/NS)), iš-ga₇-ri (KBo 9.126, 5 (OH/NS)), iš-ga₇-ra₇-a-i (KUB 58.83 iii 18 (NS)), [iš-ga₇-ra₇-az-i (KUB 49.94 iii 14 (NS)), 3pl.pres.act. iš-ga₇-ra₇-an₇-zi (OS), iš-ka₇-an₇-zi, 3sg.pret.act. iš-ka₇-ar₇-ri₇-et (KUB 31.1 + KBo 3.16 ii 13 (OH/NS)), 3pl.pret.act. iš-ga₇-re₇-er (KBo 21.22 obv. 6 (OH/MS)), iš-ka₇-re₇-er (KBo 15.10 ii 2 (OH/MS)); part. iš-ga₇-ra₇-an₇-t (OS, often), iš-ka₇-ra₇-an₇-t- (OS), iš-ga₇-ra₇-an₇-t-, iš-ka₇-ra₇-an₇-t-; impf. iš-ga₇-ri₇-iš-ke₇-a-, iš-ka₇-iš-ke₇-a-, iš-ga₇-ri₇-iš-ke₇-a-. 


IE cognates: Gr. καπο to cut (off), OHG sceran ‘to cut’, OIr. scaraim ‘to sever’, Lith. skirti ‘to separate’.

PIE *skör-ei, *skr-énti

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 416f. for attestations. This verb is a textbook example of an a₇-ablauting hi-verb: iškårhi, iškårri vs. iškaramzi. In NS texts, we find forms that inflect according to the tarn(a)-class (išgarāhi) and to the ḫatrae-class (išgarāmi, išgaraiži, iškaragant). 

Already Hrozný (1919: 82) connected this verb with the root *sk₉-er- as seen in OHG sceran ‘to cut’, OIr. scaraim ‘to sever’, Lith. skirti ‘to separate’ etc. For Hittite, this means that we have to reconstruct *sk₉-er-, skr-énti. The same root (*k₉-er-) is visible in kar₇-² and kuer-² / kur- / kuwar- (q.v.).

iške₇/a-²: see iškije₇/a-²

iškije₇/a-² (Ic1 > Ic6, Ic2, Ila1γ) ‘to smear, to daub, to salve, to oil, to anoint’ (Sum. Itradeq): 1sg.pres.act. iš-ke₇-mi (KUB 29.55 i 14 (MH/MS)), iš-ga₇-a₇-mi (KBo 3.8 ii 20 (OH/NS)), iš-ga₇-a₇-ḫi (KUB 7.1 i 40 (OH/NS)), 3sg.pres.act. iš-ki₇-e₇-zi (KUB 30.19 iv 5 (OH/NS)), KBo 5.1 iii 6 (MH/NS), KBo 16.24+25 i 66 (MH/NS), KBo 19.139 ii 9, iii 8 (MH/NS), HT 1 ii 11 (MH/NS)), iš-ki₇-ja₇-zi (KUB 39.8 iv 3 (OH/NS), VBoT 120 iii 17 (MH/NS)), iš-ki₇-ja₇-iz-i (KUB 9.31 ii 36 (MH/NS), HT 1 i 38 (MH/NS)), 3pl.pres.act. iš-ki₇-ja₇-an₇-zii (KUB 29.45 i 2 (MH/MS), KBo 21.42 i 8 (NS), KUB 24.5 + 9.13 obv. 19 (NS)), iš-ki₇-an₇-zii (KBo 12.98 rev. 5 (NS)), iš-kₗ₇-an₇-zii (KUB 29.40 ii 7 (MH/MS), KUB 29.51 i 3 (MH/MS), KBo 21.34 i 22 (MH/NS), KUB 1.13 iii 9 (MH/NS), KBo 23.1 i 44, iii 34 (NS), KUB 5.14 i 16 (NS), KUB 36.90 obv. 18 (NS), KUB 42.98 i 8 (NS)),

PIE *šg(h)₁-jē/ó-

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 420f. for attestations. We find forms of different stems: īškijaz, īškijanz, īškijandu and īškijant- point to a stem īškije/ā²; īškemi, īškanz, īški and īškant- point to a stem īške/ā²; īšgāmi points to a stem īşgae/ā²; īşgahji points to a stem īşg(a)₁; īşkijazzi points to a stem īşkijae/ā². The forms īš-KI-IZ-zi, īš-KI-IR and īš-KI-IT-du are dubious regarding their interpretation: either they should be read īš-ke-ē² and belong to a stem īške/ā², or they should be read īš-ki-eé² and belong to a stem īškije/ā². Although the stems īşgae-, īşg(a)- and īşkijae- are clearly secondary (they all occur in NS texts only), it is difficult to decide which one of the remaining two stems (īške/ā- and īškije/ā-) is the more original one, since they both occur in MS texts already. On the basis of the fact that the only form that is attested in a OH/MS text is part. īškijant-. I assume that īškije/a² is more original. This has consequences for the etymological interpretation as well, of course.

Melchert (1984a: 110) connects this verb with pešš₂⁴ ‘to rub’ (q.v.) and assumes that the imperfective *ps-šē/a- would regularly yield Hitt. īške/ā-, with loss of initial p-. This etymology has now become impossible as it cannot explain the stem-form īškije/a-. Rieken (1999a: 293-4) proposes to connect īškije/a- with šākan / šakn- ‘oil, fat’ (q.v.) and assumes a preform *šg₁/₂je/a-_. This preform indeed would yield Hitt. īškije/a- as it is attested. Semantically, this connection is superior as well, in view of contexts like KUB 4.3 obv. (17) ku-uš-ša-ni-an=ma-za l-an īš-ki-ja[a zi] ‘She anoints herself with rented oil’ and KUB 27.1 iv (39) EGIR=SU=ma l-an īš-kān-zi ‘Afterwards, they use oil for anointing’, which can now be regarded as figurae etymologicæ. See at šākan / šakn- for further etymology.

at first sight seems to be comparable to ṛoṣpiš- and then would reflect an s-stem. Problematic, however, is the fact that good IE comparanda lack, let alone words that reflect an s-stem as well. The only proposed cognate is Gr. ἰχάος ‘hip(s), Hes. ἰχάος ‘loins’ (first by Ribezzo 1920: 130), but the semantic connection is in my view not very convincing. Moreover, the inner-Greek alteration ἰχά-: ἰχάος clearly points to a substratum origin. If these forms are to be regarded as cognate, however, I would rather regard them as loans from a common source than as inherited.

*iṣnā-* (c.) ‘dough’: nom.sg. iṣ-na-aš (MH/MS), iṣ-ša-na-an (MH/MS), gen.sg. iṣ-na-a-aš (OS), iṣ-na-aš (MH/MS), iṣ-ša-na-aš (MH/NS), eš-ša-na-aš (KUB 9.34 iii 26), dat.-loc.sg. iṣ-ni (NS), instr. iṣ-ni-it (MH/MS), acc.pl. iṣ-ša-a-na-aš (KUB 24.9 iii 6 (OH/NS)) // e- eš-ša-na-aš (KUB 41.1 ii 21 (OH/NS)).


IE cognates: Skt. yas- ‘to boil’, Gr. ἱχαῖο ‘to bubble, to boil, to cook’. Gr. ἱχαῖος ‘cooked, boiling, hot’, OHG jesan ‘to ferment, to foam’, TochA yās-, TochB yās- ‘to boil, to be turned on’.

PIE *iés-nó- or *iś-nó-

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 381f. for attestations. This word is predominantly spelled iš-nó as well as iš-ša-nó. The occasional NS attestations with initial e- are due to the lowering of OH /i/ to NH /e/ before -š- as described in § 1.4.8.1.d. The plene spelling in gen.sg. iš-na-a-aš indicates oxytone accentuation. All in all, this word must be phonologically interpreted as /(?i)Snā-. Puhvel reconstructs this word as *iēsnó-, derived from the root *iēs- ‘to ferment, to boil’ as especially visible in OHG jesan ‘to ferment’. Semantically, this certainly makes sense and formally it is possible as well: in *iēsnó- the initial *i- before *e would be lost, the *s before *n would be fortied and the pretonic *e would be weakened to /l/, yielding /(?i)Snā-. Another possibility is to reconstruct *iś-nó-, with the zero-grade root.

Derivatives: *išpijanu*- (Ib2) ‘to saturate’ (verb.noun *iš-pi-ja-nu-ma* (KBo 11.1 rev. 21 (NH))), *išpiši* (n.) ‘satiation(?)’ (nom.-acc.sg. *iš-pa-a-an* (KBo 8.42 obv. 6), gen.sg. *iš-pa-a-na-aš* (KUB 36.44 i 12)), *išpinjatar* (n.) ‘satiation of hunger and thirst’ (nom.-acc.sg. *iš-pi-ni-in-ga-tar* (KBo 39.66, 9 (OH/MS), KBo 30.96 iv 4 (OH/NS)).


PIE *sp̥₁-ó-ei, *sp̥₁-i-enti

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 429f. for attestations. The oldest attested forms inflect according to the dū/tijanzi-class: *işpāı, išpijanzi*. In younger times we find forms that inflect according to the ĥatrae-class (*išpāši*) and the -je/a-class (2sg.imp.act. *išpāja*, also visible in *išpijanu*-).

Since Sturtevant (1928a: 4), this verb is generally connected with Skt. *spāyate* ‘to become fat’, OE *spōnan* ‘to prosper’, OCS *spěti* ‘to succeed’, Lith. *spěti* ‘to be in time, to have plenty of time’ and Lat. *spēs* ‘hope’. In the BSL. forms as well as in Lat. *spēs*, we find a root *spēh₁-, which has received a *-je/-o-suffix in OE *spōnan < *spēh₁-je/-o-. This latter preform cannot account for Skt. *spāyate*, however, as it would not yield -ph- (note that LIV² unconvincingly reconstructs the root as *sp̥₁eh₁-). As I have shown in Kloekhorst fthc.a, the Hitt. dū/tijanzi-class reflects a structure *CC-oi-, *CC-i-, i.e. the zero-grade of the root followed by an ablauting *-oi/-i-suffix. For *işpāı, išpijanzi*, this means that we have to reconstruct *sp̥₁-ó-ei, *sp̥₁-i-enti*. Note that the preform *sp̥₁-ó-e would regularly yield Skt. *spāya*- as well.
See Rieken 1999a: 313 for an analysis of Ḗṣpiningatar as a compound of Ṛṣpi-
and nink- ‘to quench one’s thirst’ + the abstract suffix -atar. For the analysis of

iṣpant- (c.) ‘night’ (Sum. GE₆(KAM), Akk. MUŠU): nom.sg. iṣ-pa-an-za, acc.sg. iṣ-
iṣ-pa-an-ta-az, iṣ-pa-an-ta-za, iṣ-pa-an-da-az, iṣ-pa-an-da-za, acc.pl. iṣ-pa-an-ti-
uš (NH).

IE cognates: Skt. kṣāp- ‘night’, Av. xšapan- /xšafn- ‘night’.

PIE *kʰʷsp-ent-

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 431f. for attestations. Since Götz & Pedersen (1934: 60),
this word is generally connected with Skt. kṣāp- ‘night’. It then would show the
suffix *-ent-, which is well known from terms like Ḫamešḫant- (beside Ḫamešḫa-) ‘spring’,
zēnanti (besides zēana-) ‘autumn’, gmimánt- (besides gmim(m)-) ‘winter’,
etc. We therefore have to reconstruct *kʰʷsp-ent-.

iṣpant-¹ / Ḗṣpant- (IIa2 > IIa1γ) ‘to libate, to pour, to sacrifice’ (Sum. BAL):
1sg.pres.act. iṣ-pa-an-taḥ-ḫé (1x OS), iṣ-pa-an-taḥ-ḫi (3x OS), ši-pa-an-da-ah-ḫi, ši-pa-
an-ta-ah-ḫi, ši-pa-an-taḥ-ḫi, ši-ip-pa-an-taḥ-ḫi, 3sg.pres.act. ši-pa-an-ti (16x OS), iṣ-
pa-an-ti (2x OS), ši-pa-an-ti (19x OS, 750+x), iṣ-pa-an-ti (2x OS), iṣ-pa-an-di (3x OS),
ši-ip-pa-an-ti (50x), ši-ip-pa-an-da-i (1x), ši-ip-pa-an-ta-i (1x), [ši-]pa-an-da-a-i (1x), 1pl.pres.act. ši-pa-an-du-ya-ni, 3pl.pres.act. ši-pa-
na-an-ta-an-zi (OS, 12x), ši-pa-an-da-an-zi (OS, 59x), iṣ-pa-an-ta-an-zi (OS, 2x), ši-ip-
pa-an-ta-an-[zi] (1x), ši-ip-pa-an-da-an-zi (2x), ši-ip-pa-an-ta-an-zi (1x), ši-pa-
an-da-a[n-zi] (1x), 1sg.pret.act. ši-ip-pa-an-da-ah-ḫu-un (1x), ši-pa-an-da-ah-ḫu-
un (1x), ši-pa-an-taḥ-ḫu-un (1x), 3sg.pret.act. ši-pa-an-ta-aš (KBo 15.10 ii 59, 66
(OH/MS)), ši-pa-an-da-aš (KBo 15.10 ii 54, 58 (OH/MS)), ?ši-pa-an-za-[a]š-
ta (VSNF 12.59 v 6 (MH/NS)), ši-pa-an-da-za (KUB 19.37 ii 24 (NH)),
3pl.pret.act. ši-ip-pa-an-te-er (1x), ši-pa-an-te-[er] (7x), ši-ip-pa-an-te-er, part.
ši-pa-an-ta-an-t (MH/MS, 2x), ši-pa-an-da-an-t (6x), ši-ip-pa-an-ta-an-t (1x);
verb.noun ši-ip-pa-an-du-ya-ar, ši-ip-pa-an-du-u-ya-ar, gen.sg. ši-ip-pa-an-tu-
ip-pa-an-du-ya-an-zi; impf. iṣ-pa-an-zā-š-te/a/ (1x OS), ši-ip-pa-an-za-ke/a-
(13x), ši-pa-an-zā-ke/a (25x), iṣ-pa-an-za-ke/a (1x).

Derivatives: šippandanna-¹ / šippandanni- (IIa5) ‘to libate (impf.)’
(3sg.pret.act. ši-ip-pa-an-da-an-na-aš), du-šippantuča- (c.) ‘libation-vessel’
(nom.sg. ši-pa-an-du-ya-aš, acc.sg. iṣ-pa-an-tu-ya-an, iṣ-pa-an-du-ya-an, ši-ip-
This verb shows initial spellings with ši-pa-, ši-pa- and ši-ip-pa-. Although the spelling ši-ip-pa- occurs in younger texts only, the spellings ši-pa- and ši-pa- are both attested in OS texts already. The occurrence of a spelling ši-pa- besides ši-pa- (and ši-ip-pa-) is remarkable since other words with *SC- are only spelled ši-C⁰ and never ši-C⁰. Nevertheless, there seems to be no distribution between the spellings with ši-pa- and ši-pa-. I have not found a difference in meaning between ši-pant- and ši-pant-, nor have I been able to find a meaningful distribution of the spellings ši-pa- and ši-pa- within the paradigm. Assuming a phonetic distribution between ši-pa- and ši-pa- (e.g. šispV-l vs. šipC-l) does not solve anything, in view of šipant- (OS) besides šipant- (OS) < *spánd-ei vs. šipantant- (OS) besides šipantanzi- (OS) < *spándenti. According to Forssman (1994: 103), the form šipant- reflects *spé-spond- (cf. OLat. spondeō), whereas šipant- reflects the unreduplicated *spond-. Although in Hittite we have to reckon with occasional loss of reduplication (compare possibly Hitt. ₁išha₂⁽¹⁾- / ₁išh- ‘to bind’ next to CLuw. ₁išhija- ‘id.’ < *ši₂-sh₂-(o)⁻), this hypothesis cannot be proven. Moreover, we would perhaps expect a (slight) difference in meaning between the two, which to my knowledge is not extant.

The oldest forms of this verb show a clear ablaut between šipant- and šipant-. Already Hrozný himself (1915: 29) equated this verb with Gr. σπένδω, Lat. spondeō, etc., which has been generally accepted since. I therefore reconstruct *spóndeī / *spándenti.
According to Carruba (1966: 23) the noun DUG \textit{išpantuja} is based in a false analysis of the gen.sg. \textit{išpantujaš} of verb.noun \textit{išpantujar}; DUG \textit{išpantujaš} ‘vessel of libation’ > DUG \textit{išpantujaš} ‘libation-vessel’, which was interpreted as nom.sg. of a stem DUG \textit{išpantuja-}.

\textit{išpar-} / \textit{išpar-} (Ila2 > Ic1, Ila1γ(?)) ‘to spread (out), to strew’: 1sg.pres.act. \textit{iš-pa-\text{-}ar-\text{-}hi} (KUB 12.44 ii 30 (NS)), \textit{iš-pār-\text{-}ah-\text{-}hī} (KUB 7.57 i 8 (OH/NS)), 3sg.pres.act. \textit{iš-pa\text{-}a\text{-}ri} (KUB 20.46 ii 8 (OH/NS)), KBo 10.45 ii 20 (MH/NS)), \textit{iš-pa-\text{-}ri} (KBo 4.2 ii 53 (NH)), \textit{iš-pār-\text{-}ri\text{-}ez-zi} (KUB 14.1 rev. 91 (MH/MS)), \textit{iš-pār-\text{-}ri\text{-}i\text{-}e\text{-}ez-zi} (Oettinger 1979a: 266), \textit{iš-pār-\text{-}ri\text{-}ja\text{-}az-zi} (KUB 7.60 ii 10 (NS)), \textit{[iš-]}\text{-}pār-ra-a-i (Oettinger 1979a: 266), 3pl.pret.act. \textit{\textit{iš-pa\text{-}ra-an-zi} (KBo 20.27 rev. (fr.) (OS), KBo 25.31 ii 10 (OS), KUB 30.29 obv. 5 (MH/MS?)), VBoT 24 ii 32 (MH/NS), HT 1 iv 22 (NS), \textit{iš-pār-ra-an-zi} (KUB 29.45 i 14 (MH/MS), often NS), 1sg.pret.act. \textit{iš-pār-\text{-}hu-\text{-}un} (KUB 15.34 i 41, 42 (MH/MS)), \textit{iš-pār-ra\text{-}a\text{-}h\text{-}hu-\text{-}un} (KUB 7.60 ii 2 (NS)), 3pl.pret.act. \textit{iš-pār-re\text{-}er} (KBo 39.290 iii 11 (NS), KUB 33.114 iv 12 (NS)), 3sg.imp.act. \textit{iš-pa\text{-}a\text{-}ru} (Oettinger 1979a: 266), 2pl.imp.act. \textit{iš-pī\text{-}ir\text{-}te\text{-}en} (KUB 21.14 obv. 8 (MS?)); 2sg.imp.midd. \textit{iš-pār-\text{-}hu-\text{-}ut} (KUB 23.77 i 4 (MH/MS)); part. \textit{iš-pār-ra-an-t-}; \textit{verb.noun. \textit{iš-pār-\text{-}ri\text{-}ja\text{-}u\text{-}ya-ar} (KBo 14.45 v 4 (NS)); sup. \textit{iš-pār-\text{-}ru\text{-}ya-an} (KBo 14.45, 4 (NH)); inf.I \textit{iš-pār-\text{-}ru\text{-}um\text{-}ma\text{-}an-\text{-}zi} (IBoT 2.131 i 23 (NS)); impf. \textit{iš-pa\text{-}ri\text{-}eš\text{-}ke\text{-}a/-} (KUB 7.5 ii 19 (MH/NS)).

Derivatives: \textit{išparanna-} / \textit{išparanni-} (Ila5) ‘to spread (impf.)’ (3sg.pres.act. \textit{iš-pa\text{-}ra\text{-}an-na-i} (KUB 57.83 iii 5 (NS))), \textit{išparu-} (Ib2) ‘to spread, to spray, to scatter’ (1sg.pres.act. \textit{iš-pār-nu\text{-}mi}, 3sg.pres.act. \textit{iš-pār-nu\text{-}zi} (OS), \textit{iš-pār-nu\text{-}zi}, 3pl.pres.act. \textit{[iš-pār-n]\text{-}u\text{-}ya\text{-}an\text{-}zi}, 1sg.pret.act. \textit{iš-pār-nu\text{-}nu\text{-}un}, 3sg.pret.act. \textit{iš-pār-nu\text{-}ut}; impf. \textit{[iš-pār-nu\text{-}uś\text{-}ke\text{-}a/-}} (\textit{išparuzzi-} (n.) ‘rafter’ (nom.-acc.sg. or pl. \textit{iš-pa-rui\text{-}u\text{-}zi} (KUB 29.1 iii 18 (OH/NS)), \textit{iš-pār-\text{-}ru\text{-}u\text{-}zi} (KUB 40.55 + 1236/u, 16 (MH/MS))).

Anat. cognates: CLuw. \textit{parr(j)a-} ‘to apply (medicine), to smear(?)’ (3sg.pres.act. \textit{pa\text{-}ar-t\text{-}i\text{-}t\text{-}i}, 3pl.pres.act. \textit{pa\text{-}ar-t\text{-}e\text{-}t\text{-}t\text{-}i}, 3sg.pret.act. (?) \textit{pār-\text{-}ja\text{-}i\text{-}l\text{-}r} (KUB 35.111 i 2), \textit{verb.adj.nom.sg. pa\text{-}ri\text{-}j\text{-}u\text{-}ya\text{-}an\text{-}za} (KUB 12.61 i 14).

IE cognates: Gr. \textit{σπρίζω} ‘to spread (out)’.

PIE *\textit{spör-\text{-}ei}, *\textit{spr-\text{-}énti}

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 441f. and Oettinger 1979a: 266 for attestations. There is much debate on the semantics and formal interpretation of this verb. Oettinger (o.c.: 267f.) states that this verb originally means ‘treten, festtreten’ and connects it with the root *\textit{spē\text{-}H-} ‘to kick (with the foot)’ (Skt. \textit{sphur\text{-}ā\text{-}ti} etc.). He interprets \textit{iš-pār-\text{-}RI\text{-}IZ-\text{-}zi} as the most original form /\textit{i}sparr\text{-}t\text{-}i/ and reconstructs it as *\textit{sprh\text{-}t\text{-}i-}.
é-ti. All the forms that show špərī are in his view secondary formations in analogy to the semantically comparable verb škăr- / škar- ‘to prick, to stab’. The OS attestations is-qa-ra-an-zi are, in his opinion, a “Fehler”. He states that the causative šparmu- means ‘versprengen, zerstreuen’, however, and therefore should be cognate with Gr. ἐπιπάσσα ‘to spread’ < *sper- and etymologically does not belong with šprarre-. His views are followed by e.g. Melchert (1984a: 17 and, with adaptations, 1994a: 80).

In my opinion, there are some flaws in Oettinger’s theory. The assumption that the OS attestations is-qa-ra-an-zi are spelling mistakes is totally ad hoc. They are supported by several MS and NS attestations. Moreover, the semantic interpretation of the verb is incorrect. As Puhvel (l.c.) shows, the bulk of the contexts in which this verb occurs, demand a translation ‘to spread (out)’ (said of e.g. beds, cloths, leaves). Only a few forms indeed have to be translated ‘to trample’ and these I have treated under a separate lemma, šparra- / šparr- (q.v.).

Taking this criticism in mind, I would like to propose the following new interpretation. Although we find spellings with single -r- as well as with geminate -rr-, it is clear that the spelling with single -r- is more original (OS is-qa-ra-an-zi). The fact that we find geminate -rr- from MH times onwards must be compared to the situation of amijant- > ammiqand-, immie/a- > immije/a-, innara- > innara-, etc. The original inflection clearly is špərī / šparanza. The verb denotes ‘to spread (out)’ only: the forms that must be translated ‘to trample’ belong to a different verb, šprarre- / šprar-. Already in MH texts, we find a few forms that show the secondary stem šparrije/a- (is-pär-RI-IZ-zi (which is to be interpreted as is-pär-ri-ez-zi = /spaRiet’ and not as is-pär-re-ez-zi = /spaRe’), šparrijezzi, šparrijezzi, šparrijezzi). Occasionally, the verb is taken over into the tan(a)-class ([iš]parrāi, šparraž’un) and therewith becomes fully homophonic with šprar(a)- ‘to trample (with the feet)’.

The obvious cognate is Gr. ἐπιπάσσα ‘to spread’, which must reflect *sper-je’o-. For the Hittite forms, this means that we have to reconstruct *spōr-ei, *spr-énti. Note that we now do not have to reconstruct a root-final laryngeal, which has always been obligatory in the case of a connection with Skt. sphurāti ‘to kick (with the feet)’, Lith. spirti ‘to kick out (of horses)’, etc., and which was identified as *h1 by e.g. Oettinger (1979a: 270) on the basis of the interpretation of is-pär-RI-IZ-zi as /sparret’ul < *sprh1-é-ti. This solves the vexing problem of the difference between špərī and ěrī ‘he washes’: when špərī was still reconstructed as *spōrh1-ei, it was impossible to explain why it shows single -r-,
whereas ārī < *h₁ōrh₁-ei (see at ārr- / arr-) shows geminate -rr-. Now we see that the only outcome of *Vrh₁V is VṛV (which is not lenited by a preceding *ō).

If 2pl.imp.act īś-pār-te-en or īś-pē-er-te-en is a genuine form and must be interpreted /īṣperten/, it is fully aberrant within the paradigm of īśpār- / īśpar-. Perhaps its e-grade is secondarily taken over from the mi-verbs that have (secondary) e-grade in this form as well. The causative īśparnu- (attested in OS texts already) regularly reflects *spr-neu-.

According to Dercksen (fthc.) the noun īśparuzzi- ‘rafter’ is attested in OAssyrian texts from Kültepe as īśpuruzzim, which shows that the pronunciation must have been [ispruˈtɪː] at that time.

īśparra- / īśparr- (IIa1γ) ‘to trample’: 2sg.pres.act. īś-pār-ra-at-ti (KUB 21.27 iii 30 (NH)), 3pl.pres.act. īś-pār-ra-an-zi (KBo 6.34 iii 25 (MH/NS)), 1sg.pret.act. īś-pār-ra-ah-hu-un (KUB 17.27 iii 12 (MH/NS)), 3pl.imp.act. īś-pār-ra-an-du (KBo 6.34 iii 28 (MH/NS)).

IE cognates: Skt. sphuráti ‘to kick (with the foot)’, Lat. spernere ‘to push away, to dispise, to reject’, ON sperna ‘to kick out with the feet’, Lith. spīti ‘to kick out (of horses), to defy, to sting’, Arm. spārna- ‘to threaten’.

PIE *spör̩h₂₁-ai, *spr̩h₂₃-énti

The forms that I treat in this lemma are usually regarded as belonging to īśpār- / īśpar- ‘to spread (out)’. This is primarily based on the fact that both verbs are formally quite similar: especially because īśpār-/īśpar- is often spelled with geminate -rr- from MH times onwards, it shares many homophonic forms with īśparr(a)-. Moreover, on a semantic level, the verbs are often equated by assuming a semantic range ‘to trample > to scatter > to shatter > to trample’ and therefore connect the verb with PIE *sperH- ‘to kick (with the feet)’. As I have argued under the lemma of īśpār- / īśpar-, most of the forms of this verb clearly denote ‘to spread (out)’, however (cf. the context gathered in Puhvel HED 1/2: 441f.) and must be connected with Gr. οὑγία ‘to spread (out)’ < *sper-, Nevertheless, some forms remain that unambiguously denote ‘to trample’. The contexts in which they occur are the following:

KUB 21.27 iii
(29) ... nu ke-e HUL-[u-]A-UA-TÉME G[|]RME-[u-]I
(30) īś-pār-ra-at-ti
‘You will trample these evil words with (your) feet’;

KBo 6.34 iii
(24) *n.u ... ]x pa-ra-a e-ep-zi n=a-an IGIR²₃²₄⁻ya
(25) *kat-[a ḫu-ya-ap-p]a-a-i n=a-an GIR-it iš-pār-ra-an-zi
(26) mu-uš-ma-[aš kiš-an te-ez-zi ku-iš=ya=kān ku-u-uš
(27) NDWW [DINGIR¹²] šar-ri-ez-zi nu ȗ-ya-an-du a-pé-el
(28) URU-a[n DINGIR³⁴]ES URU Hat-ţi QA-TAM-MA GIR-it iš-pār-ra-an-du
(29) n=a-[at da]n-na-at-ta URU-ja-še-eš-šar i-ja-an-du

‘He takes [the figurine] and [flings] it face down and they trample it with (their) feet. And he speaks to them thus: “Who-ever breaks these oaths [of the gods], let the [god]s of Ḫatti come and likewise trample with the feet his city and let them make [it] into a [devastated] townsite!”';

KUB 17.27 iii
(10) ... 2-e=pāt UH₇-na-aš UH₇-tar pé-eš-ši-ja-mu-un
(11) [ ]x-aš=kiš še-er al-la-pa-ah-ȗ-un n=a-at an-du
(13) [n=a-at]=kān GI₄-aš kam-mar-ši-eš-ke-ed-du DUMU.LÚ.U₁₉.LU-auš=š=a-an
(14) [ku-iš] še-er ar-ȗ-ḫa i-ja-at-ta-ri mu-uš-ša-an še-er
(15) [al-[a]-ap-pa-ah-hi-šeq-eke-ed-du

‘Twice I have thrown away the sorcery of the sorcerer. I have spat on [...] and trampled it with (my) feet. Let the donkey piss on it, let the cow shit [on it]! And [whatever] human walks over it, let him [spit] on it!’.

I do not exclude, however, that more of the forms cited under the lemma išpār⁻⁄išpar- in fact belong here.

The forms that belong with this verb, išparratti, išparranzi (homophonous with išparranzi ‘they spread (out)’), išparrakhḫun and išparrandu clearly show a tamm(a)-class inflection: išparr⁻⁄išpar-. As stated above, the obvious cognates to this verb are Skt. sphurāti ‘to kick (with the feet)’, Lith. spirti ‘to kick out (of horses)’, etc. that reflect *spērH- (note that reconstructions with root-final *-h₁- are based on false interpretation of the Hittite material, e.g. Oettinger (1979a: 270) who reconstructs iš-pār-RI-IZ-zi as *sprh₁-é-ti (actually, the form means ‘to spread out’ and shows the secondary stem išparrije/a-), or Melchert (1994a: 80-1)
who reconstructs īspīrten as *sperh₁-ten with the argument that *sperh₂:ten would have yielded **iśpariten (actually, the form means ‘to spread out’ and must reflect *sper-ten*).

In Hittite, the tarn(a)-class consists of different types of verbs. On the one hand, it goes back to verbs that either reflect a structure *(Ce)CoH-, *(Ce)CH- or *(CC-no-H-, *CC-n-H-, and, on the other, verbs that go back to roots of the structure *CeCh₂₁- (see also at malla₁- / mall- ‘to mill, to grind’, padda₁- / padd- ‘to dig’ and iškalla₁- / iškall- ‘to slit, to split’): 3sg.pres.act. *CoCh₂:ei regularly yielded Hitt. CaCaï, on the basis of which the verb was taken into the tarn(a)-class (also having 3sg.pres.act. CaCaï), and not into the normal class that shows 3sg.pres.act. CaCi. For iśparra-/iśparr-, this means that it must go back to *sperh₂: - whereas *sperh₁- is impossible. This is supported by PGerm. *sperh₂:ei, *spērh₂:enti. Note that the plural-form regularly should have given **iśparhanzi, but was replaced by iśparanzi with generalization of the -rr- of the singular.

iśparrije/a⁻²: see iśpār⁻¹ / iśpar-

iśpart⁻² (Ia₁ > Ic₁, Ia₁y > Ic2) ‘to escape, to get away’: 3sg.pres.act. iś-pār-zā-zi (KUB 4.72 rev. 5 (OS)), iś-pār-za-zi (MH/MS, often), iś-pār-za-az-zi (KBo 5.4 obv. 10 (NH), KBo 4.3 iii 4 (NH), KBo 4.7 iii 30 (NH)), iś-pār-ti-i-e-ez-zi (KBo 11.14 i 20 (OH/NS)), iś-pār-za-i (KUB 6.7 iv 4 (NS), KUB 40.33 obv. 20 (NS)), iś-pār-za-a-i (KBo 12.38 ii 2 (NH)), iś-pār-za-i-z-zi (112/u, 6 (NS)), 1sg.pret.act. iś-pār-za-ah-hu-u[n] (KUB 25.21 i 14 (NH)), 2sg.pret.act. iś-pār-za-ašt-ta (KUB 19.49 i 6 (NH)), 3sg.pret.act. iś-pār-za-ašt-ta (OS, often), iś-pār-za-aš (KUB 23.93 iii 15 (NH), 3pl.pret.act. iś-pār-te-er (MH/MS), iś-pār-ze-er (KUB 1.16 ii 8 (OH/NS), KUB 1.1+ ii 14 (NH)), 3sg.imp.act. iś-pār-za-ašt-du (KBo 12.126 i 21 (OH/NS)), iś-pār-ti-ed-du (KBo 11.14 ii 21 (OH/NS)); part. iś-pār-za-an-t (KBo 6.28 obv. 15 (NH)).


PIE *sperdh⁻ti, *spṛdh⁻enti

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 447f. for attestations. The oldest (OS and MS) attestations show a mi-inflecting stem iśpart- that shows assibilation when the ending starts in a dental (iśparзи, iśparзваžь (both iśpartsʰʃ), iśparzősta (iśpartstal), iśparter). In NS texts, we find a few forms with a stem iśpartiжеzzi,
išpartieddu). The NS forms that show a stem išparza₁ / išparz (according to the tarn(a)-class: išparzai, išparzhun, išparzək, išparzer, išparzant-) are comparable to the stem ezza₁ / ezz- that is derived from the verb ed₂ / ad- ‘to eat’. The exact point of departure for these tarn(a)-class stems is unclear to me. Only once, we find a form that shows a stem išparza₁, according to the productive ḫatrae-class.

This verb is clearly cognate with Arm. sprend ‘to escape’ and Goth. spaurds, OE spyr ‘race, running-match’ and Skt. spardh- ‘to contend, to fight for’ < *sperd₂-, which must have had a basic meaning ‘to run (away) fast’.

išpartiæ/a-²: see išpart-²

išparz₁ / išparz- : see išpart-²


See Puhvel HED 1/2: 450 for attestations. He suggests a connection with Gr. ὀνάθη ‘blade’, OE spada ‘spade’ e.a., but Frisk (1960-1972: s. ὀνάθη) states that the Hitt. word should be separated from these. Formally, išpātar / išpann- looks like a abstract noun in -ātar / -ann- of a verbal root *speH- or *seP-, which are further unattested in Hittite. Rieken (1999a: 380<sup>[913]</sup>) suggests a connection with the PIE root *speh₂- ‘sharp’ (Pokorny 1959: 981-2), but this root is not verbal. Unfortunately, I know of no verbs in the other IE languages that reflect *speH- or *seP- and that would fit semantically.

išpiæ/a-²: see išpaa₁ / išpi-

ištaḥḥ-² : see ištan(h)ḥ²

ištalk.² (Ia4 > Ic2) ‘to level, to flatten’: 3sg.pres.act. iš-tal-ak-zi (KUB 24.9 ii 20 (OH/NS)), iš-tal-ga-iz-ri (KBo 4.2 i 40 (OH/NS)); 3sg.pres.midd. iš-tal-ki-ja-at-ta-ri (KUB 4.3 obv. 10 (NS)); part. iš-tal-ga-an-t- (KUB 31.86 ii 17 (MH/NS), KUB 31.89, 6 (MH/NS)); impf. iš-tal-ki-iš-ke/a- (KUB 31.100 rev. 13 (MS)).

IE cognates: Skt. (s)tarh- ‘to crush, to shatter’.

PIE *stelgʰ-ṭi, *stelgʰ-enti
See Puhvel HED 1/2: 451f. for attestations. We are dealing with an original stem *ištalk̂-, on the basis of which the secondary stems *ištalk̂je/a-² and *ištalgae-² are made. Puhvel (l.c.) suggests a tie-in with OCS postblati ‘to spread’, that belongs with Gr. σταλαί ‘to fix, to prepare’, OHG stellen ‘to arrange, to establish’ < *stel-. Semantically, this connection is not very convincing. I would rather suggest a connection with Skt. (s)tarh- ‘to crush’. Usually, this latter verb is reconstructed as *sterg²- and connected with Hitt. ištark-, but see there for my reasons to reject this etymology. I therefore rather take Skt. (s)tarh- with Hitt. ištalk- and reconstruct *stelg²- ‘to flatten, to crush’. Note that the preservation of /g/ in the cluster -lgc- is in line with the distribution as unravelled in the lemmas ḫar(k)-² and ḫark-², namely loss of lenis /k/ in *-RkC- > -RC-, but preservation of lenis /g/ in *-Rg²C- > -RkC-.

(i) išṭāman- / išṭamin- (c. > n.) ‘ear’ (Sum. GEŠTUG, Akk. UZNU); nom.sg.c. iš-ta-mi-na-aš (KBo 1.51 obv. 16, 17 (NS)), acc.sg. iš-ta-ma-na-an (KUB 24.1 i 16 (NH), KUB 24.2 obv. 14 (NH)), iš-ta-ma-na-a(n)=šša-an (KBo 6.3 i 37 (OH/NS)), iš-ta-ma-n[a(a(n)=šša-an] (KUB 14.13 i 19 (NH)), nom.acc.sg.n. GEŠTUG-an (KUB 8.83, 4 (MH/MS)), gen.sg. iš-ta-ma-na-aš (KUB 55.20 + KUB 9.4 i 4 (MH/NS)), dat.-loc.sg. iš-ta-ma-(aš)ni (KUB 55.20 + KUB 9.4 i 5 (MH/NS)), iš-d₄-ma-ni-e=šši (KBo 10.45 ii 26 (MH/NS)), instr. iš-ta-ma-an-ta (KBo 20.93, 4 (MS?)), KUB 12.21, 11 (NS)), iš-ta-mi-ni-it (KUB 33.120 ii 33 (MH/NS)), nom.pl.c. iš-ta-ma-ni-eš (KBo 13.31 ii 11 (OH/MS)), acc.pl.c. iš-ta-ma-ma-mu-š (KBo 6.3 iv 43 (OH/NS)), iš-ta-ma-ma-mu-š (Bo 3640 iii 8 (NS)).
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IE cognates: Gr. **στόμα** (n.) ‘mouth’, Av. *stama* (m.) ‘snout, maw’.

PIE *steh2-mn, *steh1-mén-s

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 452f. for attestations. The bulk of the attestations show a stem *ištəman*- (although the plene *-a* is attested only once, it is significant), but twice we find a stem *ištəma* (nom.sg. *ištəmaš*, instr. *ištəmaiš*). This indicates that originally this noun was an ablauting n-stem *ištəman*- ‘*ištəma*’. It is not fully clear what the original gender of this word was: the oldest attested forms (in MS texts) show nom.acc.sg.n. GEŠTUG-*an* (MH/MS) vs. nom.pl.c. *iš-ta-ma-ni-eš* (OH/MS). It should be noted that the CLuwian cognate, *tummant-*, is neuter.

Already Sturtevant (1928b: 123) suggested to etymologically connect Hitt. *ištəman*- with Gr. **στόμα** ‘mouth’, Av. *stama*- ‘maw’, which has been generally accepted since then, despite the difficult semantics. Although on the basis of these three words, one could reconstruct *stom-en-*, Oettinger (1982a: 235) states that CLuw. *tummant-* ‘ear’ can only be explained by reconstructing *stHm-en-. On the basis of the basis of the *-o* in Greek, the laryngeal must be determined as *h₂*. The Greek form **στόμα** in my view indicates that we have to reconstruct a neuter word (although Av. *stama*- is masculine). All in all, I would reconstruct a paradigm *steh₂mn, *steh₁mén-s. It is likely that, just as *h₂neh₂-men-* ‘name’ (which is derived from the verbal root *h₂neh₂- visible in Hitt. ḫanna- / ḫan-), *steh₂men-* has to be analysed as *steh₁-men-*, although I know of no IE words that show a verbal root *steh₂-.*

The verb *ištamašš-* shows many NS attestations with the sign DAM, of which Melchert (1991b: 126) states that in NS texts it can be read *da* as well (besides normal *dam*). This would mean that we do not have to read *iš-dam-ma-aš*- with
The verb is a clear -s-extension of the nominal stem ḯistamaₕ-, with *-ans > -ašₕ- (from virtual *stehₕmen-s-).

See Puhvel HED 1-2: 461f. for attestations. This word is fairly often attested with a plene spelling ḯis-ta-na-aₕ-n°, although such a spelling is not attested in OS texts. Puhvel (o.c.: 463) states that an etymological connection with PIE *stehₕ- ‘to stand’ is probable. Although semantically this indeed is a possibility, I would not know how to interpret the suffix -ašₕ- then, which would be unparallelled.

**iṣaṭa(n)ḥ²** (Ib3) ‘to taste, to try (food or drinks)’: 2pl.pres.act ḯiṣ-taḥ-te-e-ni (KUB 41.8 iii 31 (MH/NS)), ḯiṣ-taḥ-te-ni (KBo 10.45 iii 40 (MH/NS)), 3pl.pres.act. ḯiṣ-taḥ-ḥa-an-zi (KUB 33.89 + 36.21, 14 (NS)), 3sg.pret.act. ḯiṣ-taḥ-ta (KUB 33.84, 6 (MH/NS), KBo 3.38 obv. 5 (OH/NS)); impf. ḯiṣ-ta-ḥi-eš-ke/a- (701/z, 8 (NS)), ḯiṣ-ta-an-ḥi-iš-ke-a- (KBo 8.41, 12 (OH/NS)).


PIE *stehₕ-?*

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 463 for attestations. Most forms show a stem ḯiṣṭaḥḥ-, but impf. ḯiṣṭaḥıšket shows a stem ḯiṣṭaḥ- (note however that it is found in a broken context and that therefore its meaning is not ascertained). It therefore is likely that we are dealing with a stem ḯiṣṭa(n)ḥ-. The original distribution between ḯiṣṭaḥ- and ḯiṣṭaḥḥ- must have been ḯiṣṭaḥV- vs. ḯiṣṭaḥC- (cf. li(n)k², ni(n)k², etc. for the alternation between -n- and -O-). As we can see in other verbs of this type, this distribution gets lost in the NH period. Therefore the aberrancy of the NS form ḯiṣṭaḥhanzi (instead of expected *iṣṭaḥhanzi) is not unexpected.

Mechanically, ḯiṣṭa(n)ḥ- must go back to PIE *stehₕ-*, but I know of no convincing IE cognate. LIV² states that ḯiṣṭa(n)ḥ- is a nasal-infixed form of PIE *stehₕ- ‘to stand’ through an original meaning *(den Geschmack) feststellen’*. This does not seem very convincing to me semantically.
istántēje/-a-² (Ic3 > Ic2) ‘to stay put, to linger, to be late’: 3sg.pres.act. iš-ta-an-ta-a-i-ez-zi (OS), 1sg.pret.act. iš-ta-an-ta-mu-un (NH), 3sg.pret.act. iš-ta-an-ta-it (NH), iš-ta-an-da-a-it (NH); part. iš-ta-an-ta-an-t- (NH); verb.noun iš-ta-an-ta-ya-ar (NS).

Derivatives: īstantanu-² (Ib2) ‘to put off, to delay’ (2sg.pres.act. iš-ta-an-ta-muši (NH), 1sg.pret.act. iš-ta-an-ta-mu-mu-un (NH), impf. iš-ta-an-ta-mu-uš-ke/a- (OH/NS)).

IE cognates: Goth. standan ‘to stand’.

PIE *sth₂-ent-eh₂-iê/jê/ò-.

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 464f. for attestations. It is remarkable that almost all forms are from NH texts except 3sg.pres.act. iš-ta-an-ta-a-i-ez-zi, which is attested in an OS text. Moreover, it is remarkable that this latter form in principle seems to inflect according to the tāqē/a-class (Ic3), whereas the NH forms inflect according to the hatrae-class. Because this is exactly the situation we would expect from a phonetical point of view (cf. § 1.4.8.1.a and especially note 193), I assume that an original verb īstántēje/-a-² developed into NH īstantae-².

Already since Marstrander (1919: 132) this verb has been generally connected with PGerm. *standan ‘to stand’. This means that īstantae-² must be derived from *sth₂-ent-, the participle of *sth₂- ‘to stand’ (visible in Hitt. tije/a-² (q.v.), and goes back to virtual *sth₂-ent-eh₂-iê/jê/ò-.

īstzanan- (c.) ‘soul, spirit, mind’, pl. also ‘living things, persons’ (Sum. ZI): nom.sg. iš-ta-an-zā-āš=mi-iš (KUB 30.10 rev. 15 (OH/MS)), iš-ta-an-za-āš=ši-iš (KUB 33.5 iii 6 (OH/MS)), iš-ta-an-za-na-a(š)=ši-mi-iš (KUB 41.23 ii 19, 23 (OH/NS)), iš-ta-an-za-a(š)=š-me-et (KUB 41.23 ii 24 (OH/NS)), iš-ta-an-zā-na-a(š)=š-me-it (KUB 41.23 ii 21 (OH/NS)), ZI-an-za (KUB 13.3 iii 26 (OH/NS), KUB 33.98 + 36.8 i 17 (NS)), acc.sg. iš-ta-an-za-na-an (KUB 41.23 ii 15 (OH/NS)), iš-ta-an-za-na-(n)=ma-an (KUB 1.16 iii 26 (OH/NS)), gen.sg. iš-ta-an-zā-na-aš=ta-āš (KUB 30.10 obv. 9 (OH/MS)), iš-ta-an-za-na-aš=ša-āš (KBo 21.22 obv. 14 (OH/MS)), dat.-loc.sg. ZI-ni, abl. iš-ta-an-za-na-az (KUB 33.120 ii 2 (MH/NS)), instr. iš-ta-an-za-ni-it (KUB 17.10 ii 21 (OH/MS), KUB 33.5 iii 9 (fr.) (OH/MS), KUB 17.21 i 6 (fr.) (MH/MS)), acc.pl. [iš-ta-za-na-aš=me-es (KBo 18.151 rev. 13 (MH/MS)), iš-ta-an-za-na-aš (KBo 3.21 ii 4 (MH/NS)).

Derivatives: īştzanāšša/- (c.) deity of the soul (nom.sg. iš-ta-an-za-aš-ša-aš (KUB 20.24 iv 17), iš-ta-an-za-aš-ši-[š] (KUB 55.39 iii 27)).

PIE *sth₂-ent-i-on-.
See Puhvel HED 1/2: 468f. for attestations. The noun is clearly commune: the
forms īstanzasš=šmet and īstanzasš=šmit that show neuter -šmešit, occur in one
text only, where we find correct īstanzanasaš=šmiš as well. The oldest forms of this
noun (MS) are nom.sg. īstanzasš, gen.sg. īstanzanaš, instr. īstanzaniš, acc.pl.
īstanzanaš. This points to an n-stem inflection (cf. ḫārasš, ḫāranasš, ḫāranasš
‘eagle’), with nom.sg. īstanzasš < *īstanzanaš. In NS texts, we see two
developments. On the one hand, the nom.sg. īstanzasš is enlarged to īstanzanaš,
probably on the basis of a reanalysis of the oblique forms as showing a thematic
stem īstanzana-. On the other hand, the nom.sg. īstanzasš is (hypercorrectly?)
shortened to īstana (ZI-anza), but note that no other forms with a stem īstant-
ar found.

Melchert (2003d) shows that the suffix -anza- probably derived from -ent-i-
on-. This also has consequences for the etymology of īstanzan-. Eichner (1973a:
98) proposed a connection with PIE *psēn ‘breast’ (cf. Skt. stāna-, YAv. ḫṣāna-, 
Arm. stīn ‘breast of a woman’, Gr. ἄτριμος ἀτρίς ‘breast, heart’), which has
received support by e.g. Oettinger (1980: 59) and Melchert (1984a: 110). This
etymology is largely based on the idea that words in *-ēn=s end up in the Hitt.
-anza-class, which has its origin in the assumption that Hitt. “ṣumanza- ‘cord’”,
which belongs to this class as well, is to be equated with Gr. ἤχη ‘sinew’ <
*ṣḫu-mēn. As we can see under its own lemma, this latter word, which in fact is
(1)ṣumanzan-, means ‘(bul)rush’ and has nothing to do with Gr. ἤχη. This means
that the connection between īstanzan- and *psēn has to be given up as well.

A better etymology may therefore be Oettinger’s suggestion (1979a: 548) that
īstanzan- reflects *ṣth₂-ent-, the participle of *ṣth₂- ‘to stand’ (although
Oettinger himself later on has given up this idea in favour of Eichner’s proposal),
which is hesitatingly repeated by Melchert (2003d: 137). For a semantic parallel,
compare ModDu. verstand ‘mind, intellect, intelligence’, lit. ‘understanding’. All
in all, we can reconstruct īstanzan- as *ṣṭh₂-ent-i-on-.

īštāpᵢ / īštappᵢ (Haₙ) ‘to plug up, to block, to dam, to enclose, to shut; to
besiege’: 1sg.pres.act. īš-ta-a-ap-ḥē (KBo 17.3 iv 33 (OS), KBo 17.1 iv 37 (OS)),
īš-ta-a-ap-hi (KUB 55.3 obv. 8 (OH/MS?)), īš-ta-a-ap-ḥi (KUB 33.70 i 12
(OH/NS)), īš-tap-mi (AAA3.2, 12 (NS), KUB 15.30 i 7 (NS)), 3sg.pres.act. īš-ta-
ap- (KUB 29.30 i 17 (OS), KUB 32.137 i 27 (MH/NS), KBo 5.11 iv 14, 16
(MH/NS), KBo 30.1, 6 (fr.) (NS)), īš-da-a-pi (KUB 9.22 i 43 (MS)), īš-da-pi
(KUB 9.22 i 33 (MS)), īš-tap-pi (KUB 6.26 i 8 (OH/NS), KUB 13.15 rev. 5
(OH/NS), KUB 40.102 vi 14 (MH/NS), Bo 4876, 4 (MH/?), KBo 19.129 obv. 31
(NS), KUB 12.16 i 14 (NS)), 3pl.pres.act. īš-tap-pa-an-zi (KBo 4.2 i 8 (OH/NS),
KBo 21.34 i 61 (MH/NS)), īš-tab-ba-an-zi (IBoT 2.23, 4 (NS)), 3sg.pret.act. īš-tap-pa-aš (KUB 33.106 iii 38 (NS), KBo 3.6 iii 57 (NH), KUB 1.8 iv 12 (NH)), īš-tap-ta (KBo 6.29 ii 34 (NH)), 3pl.pret.act. īš-tap-pė-er (KBo 21.6 obv. 5 (NS)), 2sg.imp.act. īš-ta-a-pl (KUB 33.62 iii 6 (OH/MS)), 3sg.imp.act. īš-ta-a-pu (KUB 28.82 i 23 (OH/NS)), īš-tap-du (KUB 9.31 ii 38 (MH/NS)), HT 1 ii 12 (MH/NS), 3pl.imperf.act. īš-tap-pa-an-du (KUB 13.2 i 7 (MH/NS)); 3pl.pres.midd. īš-tap-pa-an-da-ri (ABoT 60 obv. 18 (MH/MS)); part. īš-tap-pa-an-t (MH/MS).


IE cognates: ?ModEng. to stuff, OHG stopfōn, ModDu. stoppen ‘to plug up, to stuff’.

PIE *stôp-ei/*stp-enti?

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 471f. for attestations. This word clearly shows an ablaut īštāp-¹ / īštapp-. The introduction of the weak stem īštapp- in the singular takes place in NH times only. Mechanically, īšiğī, īštappanzi can hardly reflect anything else than *stôp-ei, *stp-enti.

The etymological interpretation of this verb is difficult. Semantically as well as formally, it resembles ModEng. stuff, OHG stopfōn, ModDu. stoppen ‘to plug up, to stuff’. Problematic, however, is the fact that these verbs reflect PGerm. *stup-, with an -u- that does not fit Hitt. īštāp- / īštapp- from *stop-/*stp-. The only possibility to uphold this etymology, is assuming that PGerm. *stup- is a secondarily created zero-grade besides unattested *stip- and *stap- from PIE *ste/op-.. This is admittedly rather ad hoc, however, if no other cognates can be found.

īštara(k)kije/a-²: see īštar(k)-²

īštar(k)-² (Ia4 > Ic1) ‘to ail, to afflict’ (Sum. GIG): 3sg.pres.act. īš-tar-ak-zi (KBo 18.106 rev. 6 (NS), KBo 21.20 i 12 (NS), KBo 21.74 iii 3 (NS), KUB 5.6 i 46 (NS), KUB 8.36 ii 12 (fr.), 13, iii 16 (NS), KUB 1.1 i 44 (NH)), īš-tar-zi (KUB 8.38 + 44.63 iii 9 (MH/NS)), īš-yar-ki-ja-az-zi (KBo 5.4 rev. 38 (NH)), īš-tar-ak-ki-ja-zi (KBo 21.21 iii 4 (MH/NS)), 3sg.pret.act. īš-tar-ak-ta (KUB 13.35 iii 5 (NS), KUB 14.15 ii 6 (NH)), īš-tar-ki-et (KUB 19.23 rev. 12 (NS)), īš-tar-ak-ki-et
(KBo 22.100, 6 (OH/NS), KBo 5.9 i 15 (NH)), ʾiš-tar-ki-at (KBo 4.6 obv. 24 (NH)), ʾiš-tar-ak-ki-at (KBo 32.14 ii 10, 51 (MH/MS)), ʾiš-tar-ak-ki-ja-at (KUB 14.16 iii 41 (NH)); 3sg.pret.midd. ʾiš-tar-ak-ki-ja-at-ta-at (KUB 14.15 ii 13 (NH)); impf. ʾiš-tar-ki-ʾiš-keʾaʾ- (KUB 8.36 iii 20 (NS)).

Derivatives: ʾištar(n)i-ak-zi (2sg.pres.act. ʾiš-tar-ni-ik-ši, 3sg.pres.act. ʾiš-tar-ni-ik-zi (OS), ʾiš-tar-ni-ik-ta (KBo 40.272, 5), 1pl.pret.act. ʾiš-tar-ni-in-ku-en, 2sg.imp.act. ʾiš-tar-ni-ik; 3sg.pret.midd. ʾiš-tar-ni-ik-ta-at), ʾištarningal- (c.) ‘ailment, affliction’ (nom.sg. ʾiš-tar-ni-in-ga-iš, acc.sg. ʾiš-tar-ni-in-ga-in, ʾiš-tar-ni-ka-i-in).

IE cognates: Lith. teršiū ‘to befoul’, Lat. stercus (n.) ‘excrement’.

PIE *sterk-ti

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 475f. for attestations. Of this verb we find the stems ʾištark-“ and ʾištarkije/a-“. The several spellings with geminate -kk- (ʾiš-tar-ak-ki-) are significant. The verb is mostly used impersonally, e.g. KUB 13.35 iii 5 ʾiš-tar-ak-ta=yu=mu ‘it ailed me = I am sick’, but sometimes the subject of the verb is explicitly mentioned:

KUB 14.15 ii
(6) n=an i-da-lu-uš GIG-aš ʾiš-tar-ak-ta

‘A bad disease ailed him’;

KUB 5.6 i
(45) ma-an=yu DINGIRČMD UN-ši me-na-ah-ha-an-da TUKU.TUKU-an-za
(46) ʾiš-tar-ak-zi=yu=r=a-an

‘If a god is angry at a man and ails him’.

The etymological interpretation of this verb is in debate. Puhvel (l.c.) suggests a connection with Lith. sergû ‘to be ill’, TochA sàrk ‘illness’, etc. and implausibly assumes that the root *serg- received some kind of t-insertion to *sterg- > Hitt. ištark-. Eichner (1982: 16-21) suggests a connection with Skt. (s)tarh- ‘to crush’ < *stergh-. Although semantically possible, the formal side is difficult: PIE *g₇ does not match Hitt. geminate -kk- that points to an etymological fortis velar. Melchert (1994a: 153) argues that lenis stops get geminated after -r-, and that therefore ištarakk- could well be from *stergh-. The other examples of this gemination of lenis stops are quite dubious, however: the only example of parkije/a- ‘to rise, to raise’ (q.v.) < *b₇erg₇- that shows gemination is dubious.
regarding its interpretation, whereas in the paradigm of ḫarp-aś(v) / ḫarp(ije/a)-z² ‘to change sides’ (q.v.) < *h₂erbʰ- and its derivatives, we only find two examples of ḫar-ap-, both in a NS text, which therefore may not be very probative. In the case of ištark(ije/a)-z², the examples of geminate spelling are quite numerous: in fact, we find the spelling iš-tar-ak-ki- more often than iš-tar-ki-. This situation is so different from e.g. ḫark(ije/a)-z² ‘to get lost’ < *h₂erg-, which never shows a spelling **ḫar-ak-ki-, that I cannot conclude otherwise than that the geminate spelling of iš-tar-ak-ki- must be taken seriously and reflect *k.

An extra argument in favour of reconstructing a *k could be the form iš-tar-zi (KUB 8.38 + 44.63 iii 9). In the edition of this text (Burde 1974: 30), this form is emended to iš-tar-ak-zi (also Kimball 1999: 305 calls it “probably a mistake”), but that may not be necessary. If we assume that iš-tar-zi is linguistically real, it is comparable to 3sg.pres.act. ḫar-zi from the paradigm of ḫar(ka)-z² ‘to have, to hold’. As I have argued there, the loss of *-k in this form is due to the sound law *-rkC > -rC-, which does not apply for *gʰ: e.g. *h₂erg-ti > ḫar-ak-zi ‘he gets lost’. In this case, the form iš-tar-zi would show that we have to deal with a preform *sterk-ti and not *stergʰ-ti. This interpretation implies a massive analogical restoration of *-k in the forms that do show iš-tar-ak-zi and iš-tar-ak-ta (e.g. on the basis of ištarkiye/a-), however. See at tar(k)iur² for the possiblity that *-RkC > Hitt. -RC- through an intermediate stage *-R̂kC-.

All in all, I would like to propose an etymological connection with Lith. teršiū ‘to befoul’, Lat. (n.) stercus ‘excrement’ < *sterk- ‘to befoul, to pollute’. Semantically, a development ‘it befouls me’ > ‘it ails me’ > ‘I am sick’ seems probable, and formally, this connection would perfectly explain the forms with geminate -kk- as well as the one form iš-tar-zi. Moreover, this root shows different n-infixed forms (e.g. Bret. strohkk ‘excrements’, We. trwnc ‘urine’) which can be compared to the derivative ištarni(n)k² ‘to afflict, to ail’. See at ištarkiur² ‘to flatten’ for my view that Skt. (s)tarh- ‘to crush’ rather belongs with that verb and reflects *stelgʰ-.

ištarna, ištarni (adv.) ‘in the midst, between, among, within’ (Sum. ŠÅ): iš-tarna (OS), iš-tar-ni (KBU 23.101 ii 18), iš-tar-ni=iš-mi, iš-tar-ni=šum-mi (OS).

Derivatives: ištarniša- (adj.) ‘middle, central’ (nom.sg.c. iš-tar-ni-ja-aš, acc.sg. iš-tar-ni-ja-an, nom.-acc.sg.n. iš-tar-ni-ja, dat.-loc.sg. iš-tar-ni, iš-tar-ni-ja, dat.-loc.pl. iš-tar-ni-ja-aš).

IE cognates: Gr. στήριξ ‘breast, heart’.

PIE *st(o)rn-o, *st(o)rn-i
See Puhvel HED 1/2: 478f. for attestations and contexts. The basic meaning of this adverb seems to be ‘in the midst, in between, among’. The bulk of the attestations show īštarna, but īstarni does occur as well. When the adverb carries enclitic personal pronouns, it always shows the form īstarni=šmi ‘among them; mutually’, īstarni=šummi ‘between us; mutually’.

Puhvel (l.c.) compares īštarna to Lat. inter, which semantically indeed seems probable. This comparison is followed by Melchert (e.g. 1994a: 137, 168) who reconstructs *ens-ter-nē (ens-ter- besides en-ter-, like Gr. εἰκ, besides ἐν ‘in’).

Formally, this reconstruction is problematic, however, since *ens > Hitt. as (e.g. gen.sg. -as > -as; of verb.nouns in -uš,-uš). One could argue that word-initial *ens- develops differently and yields Hitt. iš-, but that does not seem likely to me (see at īšš- ‘to remain’ for my suggestion that it reflects *h₁eNs-). Furthermore, we do not find a formation *h₁en-ter- anywhere in the other IE languages, whereas *h₁en-ter- is widely attested. Moreover, Gr. εἰκ does not show an inherited s-extension of *h₁en (which is visible in Gr. ἐν as well), but is likely a secondary form in analogy to the pair εἰκ besides εἰκ (cf. Frisk 1960-1972 sub εἰκ).

I therefore reject the connection with Lat. inter and the subsequent reconstruction *h₁enstern-.

Like in other Hitt. adverbs, the two forms īštarna and īstarni seem to be a petrified allative and dative-locative, respectively, from a further unattested noun *īštarna-. Already Sturtevant (1928a: 5) compared this to Gr. στήριγμα ‘breast, heart’, assuming a semantic development ‘in the heart’ > ‘in the middle’. This explanation seems much more plausible to me and is supported by the fact that īštarna is sumerographically written with the sign ŠÂ, which literally means ‘heart’. Since Hitt. īstarn- cannot go back *stern- (which would yield **ištarn-), we should either reconstruct *stern- or *storn- here.


PIE *stu-stu-ske/o-

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 483 for attestations. The verb only occurs in broken contexts, of which it is not easy to determine the meaning:

KUB 59.44 obv.
(12) [n=]a-aš-ta ke-e-az URU-az ar-ḫa […]
(13) du-uš-ga-ra-za iš-du-uš-du-uš-k[e-…]
Puhvel (l.c.) suggests a figura etymologica with duśgaratt- ‘joy’, but this does not account for īṣdušduške/a-. Kühne (1972: 251-2) rather interprets the verb as a reduplication of īṣtu- ‘to be announced’. This might make sense semantically as well: duśgaraza īṣdušdušk[ijatta[ru] ?] ‘Joy will (or must) be announced!’ In this way it can be directly compared to CLuw. duśduma/i- ‘manifest, voucher’ < *stu-stu-mo- (see under īṣtu²). If this analysis is correct, it would show that in words that are spelled īsC-, the initial i- was not phonemic up to the (quite recent) stage in which reduplicated formations like īṣdusduške/a² were created. See at īṣtu² for further etymology.

īṣtu² (IIIf) ‘to be exposed, to get out (in the open); to be announced’:


PIE *stu-ō-ri

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 483f. for attestations. The verb primarily denotes that secrets, plots and plans are being exposed and get out in the open, but also e.g. that favour is casted over someone (KUB 30.10 rev. (19) mu=mu=ša-an še-e-er aš-šu-ul na-at-ta īṣ-du-ya-rī ‘Over me, favour has not been cast’). This makes it likely that the original meaning of this verb is ‘to be announced publicly’.

Formally, the verb inflects similarly to tukkāri, which reflects *tuk-ō-ri (i.e. middle with root in the zero-grade). Already Sturtevant (1928a: 4-5) convincingly connected īṣtu- with Gr. στεφάνα ‘announces solemnly, promises, asserts’, that reflects *stei-:. For Hittite, this means that we have to reconstruct *stu-ō-ri. Although regularly *y would disappear in this position (*Tyo > Hitt. Ta), it could easily have been restored from other forms of the paradigm (although these are unattested in Hittite). See at īṣdušduške/a² for the possibility that this verb is the reduplicated impf. of īṣtu².

-it (instr.-ending): see -t

486
idalu- / idlay- (adj.; n.) ‘bad, evil; evilness’ (Sum. HUL, Akk. MAŠKU); nom.sg. i-da-a-lu-uš, i-da-lu-uš, acc.sg. i-da-a-lu-un (MH/MS), i-da-lu-un, nom.-acc.sg.n. i-da-a-lu, i-da-lu, dat.-loc.sg. i-ta-a-la-ui (OS), i-da-a-la-u-i, i-da-la-a-u-i, i-da-la-a-u, i-ta-la-i, i-da-la-a-une, i-ta-la-i (KBo 18.151 rev. 6 (OH/MS)), all.sg. i-ta-la-ya (KBo 18.151 rev. 19 (OH/MS)), abl. i-da-la-ya-až, i-da-la-a-lu-až, erg.sg. i-da-la-la-ya-an-za, nom.pl.c. ida-la-la-eš, i-da-la-la-eš, Luwoid i-da-la-la-ya-an-zi, acc.pl. i-da-la-la-mu-uš, i-da-la-mu-uš, i-da-la-u-uš, nom.-acc.pl.n. i-da-la-la-ya, i-da-la-ya, i-da-la-lu, dat.-loc.pl. i-da-la-la-ya-aš.


See Puhvel HED 1/2: 487f. for attestations. In Hittite, we only find the stem idêl- / idêlay- (when it is adjectival: as a noun ‘evilness’ it shows the non-ablauting stem idêl- like we would expect in u-stem nouns). In Luwian, we also find the un-extended stem ādduyal- ‘evil’, besides the stem ādduyal-. Note that in HLuwian, the assumption of a stem atuwal- (with -l-) largely depends on the phonetic interpretation of the signs ta₂ and ta₂ as ha₂ (cf. Hawkins 1995: 114³), e.g. MALUS-ta₂-a-ti = /ʔatalādi/. For the one attestation MALUS-ta₂-wa³-i-ri⁺⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻ (KARATEPE 1 §20 Ho.), which shows -r- instead of -l-, cf. Kloekhorst 2004: 396³.

Because Hitt. idêl- / idêlay- clearly is a u-stem, we can compare Hitt. idêl- directly with Luw. ādduyal-. The difference between Hitt. i- and Luw. ā- points to an initial PAnat. *ʔe-. The difference between Hitt. single -t- and Luw. geminate -tt- can only be explained by reconstructing PAnat. *d and assuming Čop’s Law in Luwian, which automatically means that in Luwian the initial e was accented: *ʔéd-. In Hittite, we must assume that i- is the regular result of unaccented *ʔe-, which coincides with the fact that ā- is often spelled plene, which indicates stress. The fact that in Luwian we find -y- which is absent in Hittite, is easily explained by the sound law *Tyo > Hitt. Ta. So, all in all, Hitt. idêl- must reflect PAnat. *ʔeduyol-, whereas Luw. ādduyal- < PAnat. *ʔeduyol-. Taken the Luwian stems CLuw. adduyal- and HLuw. áduwa₁ into account, we must reconstruct a PAnat. adjective *ʔeduol- ‘evil’, which served as the basis for a noun *ʔeduo₁- ‘evilness’ that had mobile accent. This *ʔeduo₁- then was the source of the u-stem adjective idêl- / idêlay- as attested in Hittite.

If these words are of IE origin, PAnat. *ʔeduol- can only go back to PIE *h₂edu₁o₁-, which means that a connection with the root *h₂ed- ‘to hate’ (thus e.g. Hrozný 1917: 5) is impossible. Watkins (1982a: 261) states that idêl- may be a derivative from *h₂eduo₁, in his view “[t]he Indo-European prototype of the substantive ‘Evil’ […]”, comparable in shape to *seh₂yo₁ ‘sun’ and ultimately a derivative of the root *h₂ed- ‘bit (>) eat’ like the similarly formed IE *h₂édyn₁ ‘pain, mal’” (referring to Schindler 1975c, who reconstructs this noun on the basis of Arm. erk ‘labour pains’, Gr. ὀξάνη ‘pain’ and OIr. idu ‘pain’). This suggestion has been taken over by e.g. Melchert 1984a: 106.
Itar (n.) ‘way’: nom.-acc.sg. i-tar (KUB 41.8 i 20).


PIE *h₁e₁i-tr, *h₁i-i-én-s

Unfortunately, this word is attested only once. We would like to have known inflected forms of it to better judge its prehistory. Nevertheless, since Benveniste (1935: 10, 104), this word is generally connected with Lat. *iter, itineris ‘way, road’ and TochA *yīr ‘road, way’. These words point to *t, however, whereas i-tar seems to represent phonological /iːdəl/. Rieken (1999a: 374-7) proposes to assume that the original paradigm of this word was *h₁e₁i-tr, *h₁i-i-én-s, and that in the nom.-acc.sg., *t got lenited due to the preceding accentuated diphthong yielding **/iːdəl/, **/i-én-s/ after which i- was generalized throughout the paradigm, with i-tar /iːdəl/ as result.

See at Luittarni for a discussion of this alleged cognate.

Luittarni (uninfl.) ‘runner, messenger’ (Sum. Ľu KAš₄,E): acc.sg. it-ta-ra-an-ni (KUB 23.77 rev. 68 (MH/MS)); broken Lu₂MSŠ-it-[a-…]] (KUB 31.102 iv 2).

This noun is interpreted by Puhvel (HED 1/2: 494) as a Hurrian formation in -anni- on the basis of the Hurr. verb iddl- ‘to go’. Starke (1990: 500-1) opposes this interpretation, however, and states that ittarni- is a Luwian formation on the basis of a Luwian noun *ittar- ‘way’, which further is unattested, but which must be cognate to Hitt. itar ‘way’ (q.v.) (which en passant shows that the single -t- in itar must go back to *t as still reflected in the Luw. geminate -tt-). In my view, the fact that ittarni- is not inflected (acc.sg. ittarni) clearly shows that it must be a foreignism. Since Luwian words are always taken over either in their original inflection (in this case with acc.sg.-ending -in) or as a Hittitized form (also with -in), we must assume that the word is of another origin, and Hurrian provenance becomes very likely then.

Ityar (postpos. + gen.) ‘in the manner of, after the fashion of, like, as’: i-yā-ar (OH/MS).

IE cognates: Skt. iva ‘in the manner of, like, as’.

PIE *h₁i₁-yur << *h₁e₁i-yur

This postposition goes with the genitive and denotes ‘in the manner of...’. Already Hrozný (1917: 183) suggested that this word is to be regarded as a petrified verbal noun of i-opt ‘to go’, which is semantically quite plausible. This
would mean that īyas reflects *h₁i-yr, which must go back to original *h₁éī-yr with introduction of the zero-grade root from the oblique cases (*h₁i-gén-s). The semantically and formally very similar Skt. iya 'in the manner of' may reflect the old loc.sg. *h₁i-yr (also from original *h₁éi-yn with introduction of zero-grade), the latter part of which is identical to the Hitt. supine-"ending"-yan (q.v.).

ūk- (GŠ iuka-) (n.) 'yoke, pair' (Sum. ŠUDUN): nom.-acc.sg. i-ū-uk (KBo 25.72 r.col. 11 (OS)), i-ū-kán (KBo 12.22 i 11 (OH/NS), KBo 12.131 r.col. 5 (OH/NS), KUB 31.4 + KBo 3.41 obv. 7 (OH/NS)), i-ū-ga-an (KBo 13.78 obv. 2 (OH/NS), KUB 7.8 ii 8 (MH/NS)), dat.-loc.sg. i-ū-ki (KUB 13.5 ii 21 (OH/NS)).

IE cognates: Skt. yugām, Gr. ἵγιόν; Lat. iugum, Goth. juk, OCS igo ‘yoke’.

PIE *iug-o-m

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 495f. for attestations. See Rieken (1999a: 61f.) for a discussion of the OS form i-ū-uk, which shows that this word originally was a root noun and was only thematicized to iuka- within the Hittite period. This means that the other IE words that reflect *iugom, with which this word is generally equated, must show an independent thematicization. The form i-ū-uk represents /h₁ug/ and therefore must reflect *iueg (a preform *ioug would have yielded Hitt. **/*h₁og, spelled **i-ū-uk, cf. § 1.3.9.4.f).

The “adjective” iuga- ‘yearling’ (q.v.) probably still was a real gen.sg. of īk, iuka- ‘yoke, pair’ in the oldest texts.


IE cognates: see iuga- ‘yoke’

PIE *iug-o-s

See Puhvel HED 1/2: 496f. for attestations. In the oldest texts, we only find iugas and tāiugas, irregardless of the grammatical function of the noun with which they belong. This clearly indicates that originally these forms were gen.sg.-forms. The MS attestation acc.sg. i-ū-ga-an shows that from that time onwards, iuga- was regarded as a real congruating adjective (there are no attestations of tāiuga- outside the Laws). It is clear that these words belong with the noun īk, iuga-
`yoke, pair' (q.v.) in the sense that `calf of a yoke' denotes a yearling, whereas `calf of a double yoke' denotes a two-year-old. The adj. *iugašša- shows the suffix -ašša- which is comparable to the Luwian gen.adj.-suffix -ašša/i- (note that because of the OS attestation of this adjective, a Luwian origin of it is unlikely).

The element ū in *tūuga- is cognate with ūn `for a second time' (q.v.) and must reflect *dyojo- (Melchert (1994a: 168) reconstructs *dūn-iugo-, but this is improbable: dūn is an adverb that denotes `(a) second (time)', and its adverbial ending *-om is not to be expected in a compound). Since in *dyojo-iugo- the j of iugo- should regularly have been lost (in intervocalic position), it must have been restored on the basis of the simplex noun iuga- (note that *iugo- cannot have had an initial laryngeal (which one could suppose because of its retention in tūiuga-, so then < *dyojo-Hiugo-) because of Gr. ḫyôw: cf. at ḫûan- for the fact that *#j- > Gr. ζ-).
**kā- / kāt- / kī-** (demonstrative pronoun) ‘this (one)’; **kāṣ ... kāṣ** ‘the one ... the other’; **kāṣ ... kān** ‘each other’: nom.sg.c. **ka-a-aš** (OS), acc.sg.c. **ku-u-un** (OS), **ka-a-an** (1x, KUB 33.92 iii 5 (NS)), nom.-acc.sg.n. **ki-i** (OS), **ki-i-ni** (KBo 34.142 i 7 + KBo 8.55, 16 (MS?)), gen.sg. **ke-e-el** (OS), dat.-loc.sg. **ke-e-ti** (OH/MS), **ke-e-da-ni** (MH/MS), abl. **ke-e-et** (OS), **ke-e-ez** (OH/MS), **ke-e-ez-za** (MH/MS), **ke-e-za**, **ke-ez**, **ki-i-iz** (KUB 17.28 iv 4 (NS)), instr. **ke-e-da-an-da** (OH/NS), **ke-e-da** (OH/NS), nom.pl.c. **ke-e** (OS), **ki-i** (NS), **ku-u-uš** (NS), acc.pl.c. **ku-u-uš** (OS), **ku-u-uš** (KUB 14.14 rev. 13 (NH)), **ke-e** (NS), **ki-i** (NS), **ke-e-uš** (KUB 14.8 rev. 18 (NH)), nom.-acc.pl.n. **ke-e** (OS), **ki-i** (NH), gen.pl. **ki-in-zi[a]-a[n]** (KBo 6.2 iii 46 (OS)), **ki-in-za-an** (KUB 31.64 ii 42 (OH/NS)), **ke-e-en-za-an** (KUB 35.148 iv 15 (OH/NS)), **ke-e-el** (MS), dat.-loc.pl. **ke-e-da-aš** (MH/MS), **ki-i-ta-aš** (KUB 43.55 v 4 (OH/NS)).

Derivatives: **kett=a kett=a** (adv.) ‘on one hand, on the other’ (ke-e-et-t=a ke-e-et-t=a (OS)). **kā** (adv.) ‘here’ (ka-a (MH/MS)), **kān(i)** (adv.) ‘here’ (ka-a-ni (KBo 22.1 obv. 6 (OS), KBo 22.2 obv. 9 (OH/MS)), ka-a-n=a-at (KUB 41.23 ii 20 (OH/NS))), **kiššan** (adv.) ‘thus, as follows’ (ki-iš-ša-an (OS), kiš-an (NS)), **kiššan** (adv.) ‘thus, as follows’ (ki-i-ni-iš-ša-an (KUB 28.4 obv. 16b (NS))), **kiššıqați** (adj.) ‘of this kind’ (nom.-acc.sg.n. ki-iš-šu-ya-an, ki-iš-šu-an).

aśli, dat.-loc.pl. za-ašš-ta-an-za), **ziya** (interj.) ‘here, voici’ (za-a-ū-i, za-ū-i, za-a-ū-i-in, za-ū-i-in); HLuw. **zi** (dempron.) ‘this’ (nom.sg.c. hāšu/ za-a-sa, za-sa, acc.sg.c. hān/ za-a-na, za-na, za-a-C, za-i-na (KARKAMIŠ A1a §25), nom.-acc.sg.n. hāšu/ za-a, za, gen.sg. h'ašu/ za-si (KARATEPE 1 §51 Hu.), za-i-si-i (KARATEPE 1 §51 Hu.), dat.sg. h'ādi/ za-a-ti, za-a-ti-i, za-ti, za-ti-i, za-ri+i, abl.-instr. h'is/ zi-i-na, zi-na, nom.pl.c. h'ān'ti/ za-a-zī, za-zī, acc.pl.c. h'ān'ti/ za-a-zī, za-zī, nom.-acc.pl.n. h'ān/a/ za-a-ia, za-ia, dat.pl. h'ādiant/ za-a-ti-ia-za, za-ti-ia-za, za-ti-za (KULULU 5 §4)), **zin** ... **zin** (adv.) ‘on one hand, on the other’.


PIE *kō-, *kī-

Within the three-way demonstrative system in Hittite, kār / kā / kē functions as the proximate demonstrative and can be translated ‘this’ (cf. Goedegebure 2003). It is cognate to CLuw. zā, H Luw. za- and Pal. kā ‘this’. The fact that Hitt. k- corresponds to Luw. z- already proves that we are dealing with PIE *k-, which is supported by the cognates in the other IE languages as well (P Germ. *hi-, Lith. ši-, Gr. *k-).

The election of this demonstrative shows some peculiarities. Nom.sg.c. kāš ~ Luw. zāš < *kōs. Acc.sg.c. kūm is less clear, however. Benveniste (1962: 71f.) assumed that this form is a remnant of an u-stem inflection, but this is unconvincing (nowhere in IE a stem *kū- is found), also in view of H Luw. zāu and CLuw. zam-pa, that seem to reflect *kōm. As I have shown in § 1.3.9.4, the spelling ku-u-un must represent /kón/, and I therefore assume a special development of *-ôm > /-ón/ (also in apūn /pón/, unī /lónā/), that contrasts with *C-ôm > /C-ōn/ and *-om > /-an/ (cf. Melchert 1994a: 186). Nom.-acc.sg.n. kē seems to reflect *kī (this stem also in Lith. ši-, P Germ. *hi-, Gr. *k), and must be more archaic than CLuw. zā, H Luw. zā and Pal. kā that reflect *kōd (this ending also in Hitt. apūa). The i-stem is comparable to nom.-acc.sg.n. ini in the paradigm of aśi / unī / ini. Note that the hapax kūnī (also once attested in kūnšan instead of kūšan) must have the same origin as ini, namely *kī + -m + -i. Gen.sg. kēl is comparable to apēl and ēl. The exact origin of the pronominal ending -ēl is still unclear. Dat.-loc.sg. kēti, abl. ket, kez, instr. keda and dat.-loc.pl. kedaš show a stem ked- that is comparable to aped- and ed-. Sometimes it is enlarged to
kedan-: dat.-loc.sg. kedani, instr. kedanta (also apedan-, edan-). The origin of this element -ed(an)- is unclear (although -an- could reflect *C-ṇh₁- as visible in gen.pl. kinzan (see below)?). Nom.pl.c. ke must reflect *kōi, whereas acc.pl.c. kūš < *kōms (compare apūš). The interpretation of nom.-acc.pl.n. ke is less clear. One could think of an i-diphthong (*kōi or *kēi, seemingly supported by HLuw. nom.-acc.pl.n. zūša < *kē/ai-eh₂?), but it is difficult to connect these forms to neuter plural forms in other IE languages. Alternatively, one could assume that ke is the result of *kī₁h₂ in which *h₂ had a lowering effect on *i (similarly in a-aš-šu-u ʾĪthāS ‘goods’ < * -.uh₂). Note that CLuw. za-a reflects *kēh₂. Gen.pl. kinzan (with -i- instead if -e- (cf. apenzan, kuenzan, šumenzan) due to raising in as in ki-₇⁽₃⁾ and kūš₂⁽¹⁾ / kī-)? shows the ending -nzan that is also visible in the already mentioned forms. Because of Lyc. gen.pl. ebėh₂, we must conclude that this ending is of PAanat. origin. Since *VnsV can only reflect *-nHs- (whereas PAanat. *VnsV > Hitt. VššV), I reconstruct *-nHsom. The element -som may have to be compared to Skt. tēśām ‘of those’, Lat. eōrum ‘of these’, and OCS iēτω ‘of those’.


Derivatives: ¹⁶kainant- (c.) ‘id.’ (dat.-loc.sg. ka-e-na-an-ti (MH/NS)), ¹⁶kainatar / kainann- (n.) ‘in-lawship’ (dat.-loc.sg. ka-i-na-an-ni (NH), ga-i-na-an-ni (NH)).

IE cognates: Lat. cīvis ‘(fellow) citizen’, Skt. śīva ‘friendly, prosperous’.

PIE *kōi(H)-no-

See Puhvel HED 4: 12f. for attestations. On the basis of attestations like KUB 13.4 i (30) DAM = ŠU DUMUAppearance = ŠU (31) ŠEŠ = ŠU NIN = ŠU ²¹ Kas-i-na-āš MĀŠ = ŠU ‘His wife, his children, his brother, his sister, his k. (and) his family’ and KBo 3.1+ i (24) DUMUAppearance = ŠU (25) ŠEŠAppearance = ŠU ²¹ Seme = ga-e-na-āš = śi-īš LŪAppearance = ga-[a]-ś-sa-an-na-āš = ša-āš ‘His children, his brothers, his k.-s, the people of his family’, it has been generally assumed that kainā- must mean something like ‘in-law’.

For long it has been thought that PIE diphthongs unconditionally monophthongized in Hittite, which would mean that -ai- in kainā- must be of another origin. Puhvel (l.c.) therefore assumes that here -ai- must be due to the disappearance of an original laryngeal between two vowels and therefore
reconstructs *FTER-ino-, connecting it with Skt. jāmātar-, Gr. γαμπρός ‘son-in-law’. This reconstruction is formally impossible, however: we would expect an outcome **kamhina-. Kimball (1994b) closely examined the outcome of the PIE diphthongs in Hittite and concludes that a diphthong *oi is retained as Hitt. -ai- in front of dental consonants (including -n-). She therefore is able to revive (o.c.: 17-22) an old suggestion by Hrozný (1919: 100-1), who connected kaina- with the root *kei- ‘cognate, connected (vel sim.)’. This root is also reflected in Lat. cēvis ‘(fellow) citizen’ (OLat. ceiueis < *kei-qi-), Skt. śivā- ‘friendly, prosperous, beneficent’, and with root extension *keiH- in OHG hūzō ‘wedding’, Latv. sīva ‘wife, spouse’ (*keiH-uo-), Skt. sēva- ‘friendly’ etc.

kaka- (c.) ‘tooth’ (Sum. KAxUD): nom.sg. ga-ga-aš (OH/MS), ga-ga-a-aš (OH/MS), acc.pl. ga-ku-us (OH/MS).

See Puhvel HED 4: 14-5 for attestations. He connects this word with OE hōc ‘hook’. Apart from the fact that a semantic connection between ‘hook’ and ‘tooth’ is not very convincing, it is likely that the whole complex of Germanic words for ‘hook, corner’ (*ang- in OHG ange, ModEng. angle; *kank- in ON kengr ‘hook’; *xank- in ON hanki ‘handle’ MDu. hunc ‘corner’; *xaug- in ON hokinn ‘hooked’; *xčk- in Swed. hake ‘hook’, OHG haggo ‘hook’, ModEng. hook) cannot be of IE origin (cf. Beekes 1999: 1731). Therefore a connection between Hitt. kaka- and these Germanic words does not make much sense.

kalank- (Ia2) ‘to soothe, to satiate, to satisfy’: 3sg.imp.act. ka-la-an-kad-du (OH/NS); part. ka-la-an-kàn-t-, ga-la-an-kàn-t-.

Derivatives: galaktar (n.) ‘soothing substance, (opium) poppy(?)’ (nom.-acc.sg. ga-la-ak-tar (often), kal-la-ak-tar (KUB 9.27 obv. 8)), galaktaræ (Ic2) ‘to make drowsy’ (2sg.pres.act. ga-la-ak-ťa-ra-ši).


PIE *glo-n-š-eg

See Puhvel HED 4: 18f. for attestations. The only finite form of this verb, 3sg.imp.act. kalankaddu in principle points to an original mi-conjugation. Nevertheless, since this form is attested in a NS text, it may not be reliable. Because mi-verbs that end in -nk- always show i-vocalism (e.g. li(n)k-², ni(n)k-², hu(ni(n)k-², harni(n)k-², ni(ni(n)k-², etc.) it is in my view unlikely that this verb was mi-conjugated originally. The stem kalank- much better fits hỉ-inflected
verbs like känk- / kank- ‘to hang’ or ḥamank- / ḥame/ink- ‘to tie’. This is the reason that I cite this verb as kalank- (a similar reasoning in Oettinger 1979a: 149).

The verb denotes ‘to soothe’, which makes it likely that the noun galaktar, which denotes a soothing substance, possibly the poppy of opium (cf. Güterbock 1983: 162), is cognate to it.

According to Oettinger (l.c.) we should connect these words with the PIE root *gleg-,” ‘weak, soft’, which in Pokorny (1959: 401) is reconstructed on the basis of ON klokkr ‘weak’, Lith. glėžnas ‘weak, soft’ and Bulg. glēzja ‘to pamper’. Although ON klokkr indeed seems to point to a root *gleg-, Lith. glēžnas can only reflect *gleg*- because of the absence of Winter’s Law (we would expect *gleg- to have yielded Lith. **gleź-). If both forms are indeed cognate, we have to assume that the geminate -kk- in ON is due to Kluge’s Law (any stop followed by an *n (*-TN-) yields a voiceless geminate (-tt-)). In this case, this -n- is still visible in Lith. glēžnas. This means that we would have to reconstruct a root *gleg*- (note that the reconstruction *gleg- is against the root-constraints of PIE as well: two mediae in one root is impossible).

The Hittite verb kalank- shows a nasal infix, which fits the semantics as well: nasal infixes denote causativity, in this case ‘weak’ > ‘to make weak’ = ‘to soothe’. All in all, I reconstruct *glo-n-g*-tr. Note that the noun galaktar must reflect *glóg*-tr, because in *glóng*-tr the nasal would not disappear (cf. § 1.4.7.2.b).

kallar- (adj.) ‘inauspicious, unpropitious, baleful, enormous’ (Sum. NU.SIG3): acc.sg.c. kallar-a-an (KUB 24.7 iv 33), nom.-acc.sg.n. kal-la-ar (often), gal-la-ar, kal-la-ra-an (KUB 31.141 obv. 8), dat.-loc.sg. kal-la-ri, instr. kal-la-ri-it, nom.-acc.pl.n. kal-la-a-ar, kal-la-a-ra.

Derivatives: kallaratar / kallarran- (n.) ‘inauspiciousness, unfavourable response of an oracle, enormity, excess’ (dat.-loc.sg. kal-la-ra-an-ni, gal-la-ra-an-ni), kallaraṭh- (Ib) ‘to make inauspicious’ (3sg.pret.act. kal-la-ra-ah-ḥa-aš, 3sg.imp.act. NU.SIG3-ah-du), kallaresš- (Ib2) ‘to become inauspicious’ (3sg.pret.act. kal-la-re-eš-zi, 3sg.imp.act. kal-la-re-eš-du, kal-la-ri-iš-du; impf. kal-la-re-eš-ke/a-, gal-la-re-eš-ke/a-), kallaratta/i- (c.) ‘exaggerator’ (nom.sg. kal-la-ra-at-te-eš (NS)).

IE cognates: Ofr. galar ‘disease’.  
PIE *gloH-ro̞*?
See Puhvel HED 4: 20f. for attestations. We find forms that point to a stem *kallar- as well as forms that point to a stem *kallara-. According to Starke (1990: 355-9) and Rieken (1999a: 275) the stem *kallar- is to be regarded as an original noun ‘badness’, that was gradually being adjectivized and therefore thematicized to *kallara-. It is quite likely that the word is of Luwian origin: *kallar- appears a few times written with gloss wedges and most of the attested forms of *kallar- are found in a text interlarded with Luwisms. According to Rieken (1999a: 367) the nom.-acc.pl.n.-form *kal-la-a-ra(-), which seems to show a mixture of the ending -är of the Hitt. r/n-stems with the Luwian ending -a, can be used as evidence for a Luwian origin because such a phenomenon occurs in Luwisms only. Another clue may be the form *kallaratēs which Starke (1990: 358) convincingly interprets as Luwian.

Pedersen (1938: 26, 46) compared *kallar with Olr. *galar ‘disease’, which then reflects *ǵʰer < **olH-ro-. Starke rejects this etymology on the basis of his assumption that IE *ǵʰ (b) either was lost in Luwian or yielded -z-. Melchert (1994a: 255) argues that because PANat. *ǵ is preserved in Luwian before a backvowel, we may have to reconstruct PANat. *ǵallr- already, in which the *ǵ regularly was preserved.

**kalelija/a-** (Ic1) ‘to tie up, to truss’: 3sg.pret.act. ka-le-li-ẹ-et (OS), ka-le-e-li-e-et (OH/NS); part. ka-le-li-an-t (OH/NS), ka-le-li-i-a-an-t (OH/NS).

IE cognates: Gr. κάλιξ, κάλος ‘rope, line, reef’.

PIE *kʰel₁-ẹ/ě-o-

See Puhvel HED 4: 22 for attestations. Since the sign LI can be read li as well as le, all spellings have to be interpreted as kalelija/a-. According to Oettinger (1979a: 354) this verb is a derivative in -je/a- of a stem *kalel-, which he compares to shuel- ‘thread’ (see under *šu₁₁-s). Rieken (1999a: 475) takes over this analysis and argues that *kalel- shows that all il-stems go back to a PIE suffix *-el. For the etymology of *kalel- she suggests, as does Puhvel (Ic.), a connection with Gr. κόλαξ, κόλος ‘rope, line, reef’ (o.c. 481), which points to *kH₁-o-. If this connection is correct, *kalel- should reflect *kH₁₁-el- (*h₁ because *h₁₁ and *h₂ would have yielded *kH₁₁₁- in that position).

**kallašš-2 / kallišš-** (Ia2) ‘to call, to evoke, to summon’: 3pl.pres.act. ga-li-iš-a-an-zi (IBoT 2.80 vi 4 (OH/NS)), 3sg.pres.act. kal-li-iš-ta (KUB 17.5, 6 (OH/NS)), 3sg.imp.act. kal-li-iš-du (KUB 24.1 i 12 (NS), KUB 24.2 obv. 11 (NS)); inf.1 kal-
See Puhvel HED 4: 22f. for attestations. Since Larøe (1961: 29), this verb is connected with Gr. καλεῖν. Lat. calque ‘to call’ e.a., from PIE *kelh₁-s-. Although Oettinger (1979a: 197) states about kalliśś- that “die Flexion ist völlig regelmäßig”, the attestations do show traces of a paradigmatical alternation, which can be characterized by the opposition of 3sg.pret. kal-li-iš-ta vs. 3pl.pres. ga-li-iš-ša-an-zî: the geminate vs. single writing of -l- must reflect a real phonological opposition.

The details of the prehistory of this verb are in debate. Oettinger (l.c.) improbably interprets the verb as a back-formation from Hitt. kalleśtar ‘invitation’ < *kalh₁-es-tr. Kimball (1999: 412) takes kalliśś- as a derivation of a formation *kalh₁-ôh₁₁- which she compares to Umbr. kaṣ̣itu, kaṭetu, carisito which must reflect PIlal. *kal₂ōd. Since the Umbrian forms with *kal₂ probably are an inner-Italic innovation (cf. Schrijver 1990: 400), the postulation of a PIE formation *kalh₁-ôh₁₁- is incorrect.

As I have argued in Kloekhorst fthcf, 3pl.pres.act. ga-li-iš-ša-an-zi must be phonologically interpreted as /klISantity/, which in my view is the phonetic outcome of *këlh₂sénti (compare tame/išanzi < *dmeh₂sénti and kane/išanzi < *gënht₂sénti). The form 3sg.pret.act. kal-li-iš-ta in my view reflects /kålIśta/ (note the spelling with -e- in inf.1. kal-le-eš-šu-ya-an-zi), which I reconstruct as *këlht₁st (for the development of *CeRh₁C > CaRh₁Cs compare damme/išh₂ < *dmeh₂sh₂o-). Note that the colouring of *e in *këlht₁st > kalliśta besides the non-colouring of *e in genzu- ‘lap’ < *gënht₁-su- shows that *Rh₁CC > Hitt. aR₂, whereas *eRh₁CV > Hitt. eR₂.

With the reconstruction of kalliśś- as *këlht₁s- and galiśś- as *këlht₁s-, we see that kalliśś⁻² / kalliśś- goes back to a normal e/Ø-ablauting s-extended verb like tamš₂ / tame/išś- ‘to (op)press’ < *dmeh₂s- / *dmeh₂t-, etc.

The derivative kalliśṭaryana- ‘feast, party’ probably is derived from a noun *kalliśṭar- < *këlht₁s-tr- ‘invitation’ or ‘summoning’.

li-iš-šu-u-ya-an-zî (KUB 20.88 vi 22 (MS)), kal-le-eš-šu-ya-an-zî (KUB 41.8 i 22 (MH/NS)), KBo 10.45 i 38 (fr.) (MH/NS)).

Derivatives: kalliśṭaryana- (c.) ‘feast, party’ (Sum. EZEN; gen.sg. kal-li-iš-tar-ya-na-aš, dat.-loc.sg. [kal-li]-iš-tar-ya-ni, kal-le-eš-tar-ya-ni)


See Puhvel HED 4: 26f. for attestations. The noun kalmarā- denotes ‘ray (of the sun)’; (Gš) kalmi- occurs in a clear context once, where it seems to denote a piece of firewood; (Gš) kalmiš(a)na/i- (also kalmešna- and kalmiššana/i-) on the one hand denotes pieces of firewood or brands, and on the other a sort of firebolt, fired by the Storm-god with which he strikes cities. All in all, it seems that we are dealing with a stem *kalm- that denotes ‘glowing / burning long object’. Note that in my view the ‘glowing’ or ‘burning’ is a crucial part of the semantics.

The standard etymological interpretation of these words was first suggested by Laroche (1983: 309), who connects them with Gr. καλμος, ‘reed’, Lat. culmns, OHG halka, Latv. salms ‘straw’, etc., from PIE *kölh-/. Although this etymology is generally accepted, I do not see how its semantic side would work: in no other IE language we find a semantic feature of ‘glowing’ or ‘burning’, which is the clear basis of the Hittite words. I therefore reject this etymology.

In my view, the stem of these words was *kalm-, which shows the suffixes -ra- and -i- (both of IE origin) and the unclear suffix -iš(a)na/-i-. Since a root structure *Kelm- is against PIE root constraints, I believe that we are dealing with a non-IE element.

Rieken (1999a: 211-213) argues that Gš kalmuš- ‘crook, lituus’ (q.v.) is cognate to these words. This assumption is based, however, on the false translations “Holzscheit” for kalmi-, kalmatar / kalmann- and kalmiš(a)na/i-, with which she ignores the ‘burning/glowing’ aspect of these words.


See Puhvel HED 4: 28f. for attestations. The word denotes the crook with which the Hittite kings often are depicted. The origin of this word is unclear. According to Rieken (1999a: 212f.) this word is cognate with kalmarā- ‘ray’, kalmi- ‘piece
of firewood’, e.a. (see at kalmar-). As I have stated under the lemma kalmar-, this connection seems semantically unlikely to me. Puhvel (i.e.) points to the striking resemblance with Akk. gamlu(m) ‘crook, curved staff’ and plausibly suggests that Hittite borrowed this word from Akkadian or from an intermediate source.

kammarš² (Ib1) ‘to shit, to defecate, to shit on, to befoul’: 3sg.pres.act. ka-ma-raš-zi (NS), 3pl.pres.act. ga-ma-ar-ša-an-z[i] (NS); verb.noun gen.sg. [k]a-ma-ršu-ya-aš (MH/MS), erg.sg. ga-ma-ar-šu-ya-an-za (MH/MS); impf. ka-mar-ši-eš-ke/a- (NS), kam-mar-ši-eš-ke/a- (MH/NS).

Derivatives: kammaršniyeti (IIIg) ‘to befoul(?)’ (3sg.pret.midd. kam-mar-aš-ni-ja-at-ta-at (MS)), 3pl.pret.midd. [ka(m)-m]a-ra-aš-ni-ja-an-ta-at (MS)).


See Puhvel HED 4: 37f. for attestations. The verb and its derivatives are spelled with single as well as with geminate P, and both spellings are attested in MS texts already. Once, we find a Luwian form, namely katmarshiti (although in a Hittite context: the ending -tti shows its Luwian origin, however). It therefore has generally been assumed that Hitt. kam(m)arš- reflects *katmars-, with an assimilation of *-tm- comparable to *-tn- > Hitt. -mr-. Since *-tn- yields a geminate, -mr-, it might be best to assume that the spelling kammarš-, with geminate -mm-, is the original form and that the forms with single -m- show simplified spellings.

Schmidt (1980: 409) compared kammarš- < *katmars- with TochB kenmer ‘excrement’, which then would be a PIE -mer-derivation of the root *gʰed- ‘to defecate’ (Gr. ἕρός, Skt. hadat, Alb. dhijes ‘to shit, to defecate’, Av. začah- ‘arse, anus’, etc.). This view has found wide acceptance. Problematic to this etymology, however, is the fact that the existence of TochB kenmer ‘excrement’ seems to be a mirage (cf. Adams 1999: s.v.). With the disappearance of kenmer, the -mer-derivation in Anatolian would stand on its own. Another problem is the fact that, although *VtMv indeed assimilates to Hitt. VmM, the sequence *VdʰmM seems to have had a different outcome, namely VmM. If we apply this information to the clusters with -m- as well, we would expect that *VtMv should yield Hitt. VmM, but *VdʰmM > Hitt. -VmM. Although I must admit that I do not know any other examples of both of these developments, it would make the reconstruction of kammarš- < *katmars- < *gʰod-mr- less likely. All in all, I remain cautious in etymologizing this verb.
=kkan (encl. locatival sentence particle) ‘?’: nu-u=k-kán (OS), tá=k-kán (OS), n=e=kán (OS), ta=kán (OS), ta-ma-i š=a=kán (OS), etc.

IE cognates: Lat. cum ‘with’, com-, Ofr. con- ‘with’, Goth. ga-.

PIE *kom?

This particle is spelled both with and without geminate -kk- (in OS texts already, compare tá=k-kán (OS) besides ta=kán (OS)). Spellings with geminate -kk- appear in OS, MS and NS texts, however, and I therefore am convinced that we have to analyse the particle as /=kan/ (and not as /=gan/) throughout the Hittite period. The regular absence of geminate spelling in my view is due to simplified spelling, which is apparent from the fact that, apart from seven OS attestations of nu-u=k-kán, the /k/ of =kkan is never spelled with the signs AK, IK or UK. The only sign that is used is TÁK, in the cases where the particle =tta preceded =kkan. The use of only TÁK can be explained by the fact that with this single sign (which is moreover more simple than AK, IK or UK) both the particle =tta as well as the geminateness of =kkan’s /k/ could be expressed, whereas in the case of AK, IK or UK the scribe would need an ‘extra’ sign for the sole purpose of indicating the geminateness of /k/. For the sake of simplification, these signs therefore were omitted when spelling /=kan/.

In my corpus of OS texts (consisting of 23.000 words), =kkan occurs 55 times (2.4 promille), in my corpus of MH/MS texts (consisting of 18.000 words) 279 times (15.5 promille) and in my corpus of NH texts (consisting of 95.000 words) 2000+ times (22 promille). This shows that the use of =kkan has increased enormously from the MH period onwards. In NH times, it is virtually the only used locatival sentence particle (22 promille vs. =ššan (0.75 promille) and =(a)šta (0.2 promille)). This means that the semantic function of =kkan has broadened throughout Hittite times, in disfavour of the other enclitic locatival sentence particulars that Hittite originally used (=a)n, =(a)p(a), =(a)šta and =ššan). The original meaning of =kkan therefore should only be determined on the basis of OH texts. Despite several studies in this field (Carruba 1964, Josephson 1972, Boley 1989), the exact function of =kkan is still unclear (Boley, o.c.: 87: “The primary sense of -kan is a genuine enigma”).

Despite the difficulty in determining the original meaning of =kkan, many scholars have given an opinion on the origin of =kkan. The most promising in my view is Sturtevant’s (1927d: 254-7), who connected =kkan with Lat. cum, com- ‘with’, Goth. ga- ‘with’, etc. < *kom.
kanen(ije/a)-[\(^2\)] (\(lb1 > lc1\)) ‘to bow down, to crouch, to squat’: 3pl.pret.act. [\(ka'[\)]ni-ni-e-er (KUB 36.19, 11 (MH/NS)); verb.noun ka-ni-ni-ja-u-ya-ar (NS), ka-ni-ni-ja-ya-ar (NS); part. nom.sg.c. ka-ni-na-an-za (VBoT 120 ii 17 (MH/NS), KBo 12.131, 20 (OH/NS)), gen.sg. ga-ne-na-an-da-\(a\)š (KBo 17.18 ii 10 (OS)), ga-ne-na-an-\(a\)š (KBo 17.43 i 9 (OS)), nom.pl.c. ka-ni-na-an-te-\(a\)š (VBoT 120 ii 19 (MH/NS), ABoT 44 + KUB 36.79 i 33 (OH/NS)), ka-ne-na-an-te-\(a\)š (KUB 36.75 + Bo 4696 obv. 10 (OH/MS), KUB 31.134, 6 (OH/MS))).

See Puhvel HED 4: 41f. for attestations. The oldest attestations are forms of the participle ganenant- ‘bowed, in a bowing position’. Note that all OS and MS attestations are spelled with -e-, whereas the forms that are spelled -i- are from NS texts only. Verbal forms are rare. We only find verb.noun kaniniu\(\)ar in the vocabulary KBo 1.42 ii 43 passim, where it glosses Akk. gan\(\)šu ‘to bow, to bend’, and a possible 3pl.pret.act. [\(ka'[\)]ni-ni-e-er (KUB 36.19, 11), although this latter form must be regarded with caution as part of it has been added. These forms, which show a stem kanini\(\)e/a-[\(^2\)], are found in NS texts and therefore may be regarded as secondary forms.

The etymological interpretation of ganenant- ‘bowing, in a bowing position’ is quite difficult. Hrozný (1917: 78-9) interpreted it as a borrowing from Akkadian kan\(\)šu ‘to bend down, to stoop’. Neu (1972: 291-2) assumes a connection with PIE *\(\)gen-u- ‘knee’. Such a connection is followed by others: Eichner (1979a: 59\(^8\)) unconvincingly states that kanen(ije/a)- shows ‘Binnenreduplikation’ from a preform *\(\)gn\(\)je- (referring to the verb kaleli\(\)je/a-, which has to be explained otherwise, however). Rieken (1999a: 151-152) puts ganenant- ‘bowing’ on a par with ganenant- ‘thirsty’ (see at kanint-) and assumes an original meaning ‘to bow down to water thirstily’, of which she judges the tie-in with *\(\)genu- ‘knee’ as “unproblematisch”. Puhvel (l.c.) connects kanen(ije/a)- with the PIE root *knei- of which we find root extensions *knei-g\(\)\(\)h- (in Lat. c\(\)\(\)h\(\)v\(\)e\(\)g̃ ‘to close (the eyes)’, Goth. hnei\(\)wan, OE h\(\)\(\)gan ‘to bend down, to bow’) and *knei-b- (in ON hn\(\)pa ‘to be downcast’ and Lith. kn\(\)b\(\)t ‘to collapse’). Hitt. kan\(\)e- would then go back to a preform *kn(e)i-\(\)n-. All alleged cognates mentioned above rather belong to the European substrate-complex, however, so a connection to the Hittite verb is rather improbable.

In my view, only Neu’s suggestion to connect ganenant- with *\(\)genu- ‘knee’ may have some merit. We then should assume that PIE possessed a verbal root *\(\)gen- ‘to bend’, of which on the one hand the noun *\(\)gen-u- ‘knee’ was derived, and on the other a nasal-infixed verb *\(\)g\(\)né-n-ti ‘to bow’ was formed. This verb, which has not been preserved in the other IE language, was almost completely
lost in Hittite as well, apart from the participle ganenat- ‘bowing’. In NH times, when a verbal noun was necessary to gloss Akk. ganêšu ‘to bend’, an ad hoc formation kaniḫjamaḫar was secondarily created.


IE cognates: Skt. jñātī, Goth. kunnan, Lith. žinoti, Gr. γνῶσις. Lat. (g)nōscō ‘to know’.

PIE *ǵnéh₂-s-ti, *ǵnh₂-s-enti

See Puhvel HED 4: 42f. for attestations. Often, this verb is translated ‘to know’ (on the basis of etymological considerations), but this is incorrect. In Hittite, the original meaning of kane/išš- seems to be ‘to recognize’, out of which a meaning ‘to acknowledge’ develops. This latter meaning also can be used in the sense ‘to admit, to confess’ but also ‘to reward (someone)’ (i.e. ‘to acknowledge his deeds’).

The verb is attested -ne-eš-, -ni-eš- and -ni-iš-. A spelling with plene -e-, -ni-eš-, is attested in one text only (KBo 22.178 + KUB 48.109), where we find ka-ni-eš-z as well as ka-ni-eš-ša-an-zi.

Since Laroche (1961: 27) this verb is generally connected with the PIE root *ǵneh₂-, which has yielded verbs that denote ‘to know’ in the other IE languages (e.g. Skt. jñātī, Gr. γνῶσις, etc.). The -s- apparently is some extension that can be compared to e.g. the -s- in tamāšš- / tame/išš- ‘to (op)press’ (*demeh₂- + -s-), pahš-‘to protect’ (peh₂- + -s-), pāš- ‘to swallow’ (*peh₂- + -s-), etc. Although widely accepted, this etymology presents a problem: we would not expect that a sequence *-eh₂- would yield Hitt. -e-. Different solutions to this problem have been given (e.g. the reconstruction of an ablauting root *ǵnoh₂- besides *ǵneh₂-, cf. Melchert 1984a: 115), but the solution as presented by Jasanoff in his 1988-article has gained the most approval. There he compares Hitt. kane/išš- with TochA kenašást ‘du kennst dich aus’ and states that both forms must reflect *ǵneh₂-s-, in his view a ‘Narten’-inflected s-present. The fact that this formation is found in two branches to his mind means that it must be archaic.
Moreover, this etymology is seen by Jasanoff as a “major piece of evidence for the correctness of Eichner’s non-coloration rule” (1988: 236).

The Tocharian side of this theory has become problematic, however, since Hackstein (1993: 151f.) has shown that Tocharian knāna- and that it shows a completely regular morphological palatalization and s-suffix. The form therefore likely is of inner-Tocharian origin and does note have to be archaic.

In my view, the same can be said of the Hittite verb, as I have shown in Kloekhorst fthc.f. The verb is spelled -ne-eš-, -ni-eš- and -ni-iš-, which in my view prototypically points to the phoneme /h/. Since there is no difference in spelling between the singular and the plural, we are dealing with a synchronic non-ablauting paradigm /kništi/ /knisant'i/. Because mi-verbs in principle show ablaut, it is likely that in this verb one of the ablaut-stems has been generalized throughout the paradigm (note that this is silently assumed by Jasanoff as well: his reconstructed paradigm *ğnéh₂-s-ti, *ğnéh₂-s-nti should regularly have given *knāzi, *knāsanzi (if one believes in Eichner’s non-colouration rule), which means that he must assume generalization of the stem of the singular). As I have elaborately argued in l.c., the 3pl.pres.act.-form gane/išsanzi /knišant'i/ is the regular outcome of *ğnh₂-s-énti (just as tame/išsanzi /tmšant’i/ < *dmh₂-sénti and gališsanzi /klšant’/ < *kňh₂-sénti). Since in mi-verbs the zero grade in the 3pl.-form corresponds to e-grade in the 3sg.-form, I assume that the original 3sg.pres.act.-form was *ğnéh₂-s-ti, which regularly should have yielded **knāzi. Just as the original paradigm /tmâš’ti/ /tmšant’i/ is altered in NH times to /tmššt’i/ /tmšánt’i/, I believe that the original paradigm */knâšt’i/ /knšánt’i/ is altered to attested /kništ’i/ /knšánt’i/, spelled kane/išzi, kane/išsanzi.

kāṅiṅt (gender unclear) ‘thirst’; nom.sg. ka-ni-[...][KUB 3.103 obv. 6 (NS)], dat.-loc.sg. ka-a-ni-in-ti (KUB 14.16 iii 15 (NH), KUB 19.37 iii 54 (NH)), ka-ni-in-ti (KUB 14.15 iii 45, 46 (NH), KUB 33.121 i 16 (NS)).

See Puhvel HED 4: 47f. for attestations. It is difficult to judge the formal connection between kanint- ‘thirst’ and the adjective ‘thirsty’ that appears as kaniruṣant-, kaniruṣant- and ganinant- (note that the one attestation ka-ni-eš-su-ya-an-t- hardly can be anything else than a scribal error, cf. Rieken 1999a: 151). Puhvel (l.c.) assumes that kanint- is a t-stem and that the root kanen- is the basis of ganinant- and kaniruṣant-, which in his opinion displays an -r- that is the result of dissimilation. Rieken (1999a: 151-152) commends on this interpretation that an original t-stem formation *kanen-t- should have yielded Hitt. **kanant-. She therefore rather assumes that the -r- of kanint- is of a secondary origin: according to Rieken the -r- is added to an original noun *kanen- due to influence of kāšt- ‘hunger’, which would certainly fit the fact that kāšt- and kanint- ‘hunger and thirst’ often occur as a pair. Rieken further states that the adjectives ganenant- and kaniruṣant- must be compared to ešhanant- besides isḥuṣant- (see Weitenberg 1971-72: 172) and that these reflect an -r/n-stem *kane-/ *gane-. She further compares ganinant-to ganenant- ‘bowing’ (see at kanen(ije/a)-2) and states that the meanings ‘thirsty’ and ‘to bow’ “sich durch eine Bedeutungsspezialisierung von ‘sich beugen’ zu ‘sich durstig zum Trinken niederbeugen’ semantisch plausible miteinander vereinbaren [lassen]” and that the words for ‘thirst’ and ‘thirsty’ therefore etymologically belong to the same root as *gen-u- ‘knee’ (see at kanen(ije/a)-2 for the etymological connection with *gen-u-). I must admit that I do not find this connection very plausible, however. Puhvel analyses *kane- as /kne-n/ on the basis of the incorrect observation that the spelling ka-a-ni-in-t- is hapax. He implausibly reconstructs this /kne-n/ as “*knē-n−”, belonging to the root “*ken(-Ei)−” from which he also derives *kenk- as attested in Goth. huhrus ‘hunger’, Lith. keikras ‘lean’ and Gr. καύκασος ‘parched’.

Although both Rieken’s and Puhvel’s etymological treatment are unconvincing, I am not able to provide an alternative.
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IE cognates: Goth. hahan ‘to hang’, Skt. śāṅkate ‘to wave, to hesitate’, Lat. cunctor.

PIE *könk-/*kñk-énti

See Puhvel HED 4: 48f. for attestations. The oldest forms clearly show an ablaut kānk- vs. kank-. In NH texts we occasionally find inflections according to the productive tarn(a)-class (3sg.pres.act. gangai) and -ie/a-class (gankindun). The form ga-an-ga-ah-ji must be phonologically interpreted as /kānkHi/ and shows retention of -n- in front of two consonants. This seems to contradict the distribution in e.g. li(n)k- ‘to swear’, where we find lik-C vs. link-V. Perhaps the difference in treatment of -n- depends on the fact that in gāngahhi we are dealing with a preceding *o, whereas in li(n)k- we have *e (compare e.g. Lycian where the absence of a sign *i besides i (vs. ē and ā besides e and a) shows that the nasalization of the high vowel i was lost whereas it was retained on the low vowels e and a).

This verb is always used transitively, ‘to hang (something/one)’, and can also denote ‘to weigh’. The causative in -nu- therefore means ‘to have something weighed’. Already since Sturtevant (1931b: 172), kānk-/ /kank- has been connected with Goth. hahan ‘to hang (trans.)’, which has been generally accepted since. A further connection with Skt. śāṅkate ‘to hesitate’ shows that we have to reconstruct a root *kenk-. Nevertheless, the morphological interpretation of this verbs is in debate.

Hittite kānk-/ /kank- points to *könk-/*kñk- and is transitive. In Germanic, the basic formation is reflected by Goth. hahan ‘to hang (trans.)’ and OHG hăhan ‘to hang (trans.)’ that go back to *kōnk-. From this verb a secondary stative *könk-ěh- is visible in OHG hangēn ‘to hang (intr.)’, whereas a secondary ‘causative’ that virtually goes back *könk-ě- is visible in OHG hengen ‘to hang (trans.)’ (note that the meaning is identical to hāhan). In Sanskrit, we are dealing with a thematic middle śāṅkate < *kē/ónk-e-to ‘to hesitate’ < *’to hang (intr.)’, which might be equated with Lat. cunctor < *kōnk-to ‘to hesitate’ < *’to hang (intr.)’. Although I do not know how to explain the Germanic o-grade, this system appears to reflect a situation in which an intransitive middle formation *kenk-to
'to hang (intr.)' is primary, whereas the transitive Hittite ḫi-inflected verb reflects the causative *konk-eie- (compare lē̆ki 'to make lie down' < *log₂-eie-, the causative to *le₃-to 'to lie down').

Note that Jasanoff (1979: 87) adduces this verb to the group of verbs that in his view reflect a/e-ablaut, assuming *ḳônk- vs. *ḳênk-, but Melchert (1994a: 139) points out that *ḳênk- should have yielded Hitt. **kink-.

(UZI) **ganu-**: see **ganu- / ganu-


See Puhvel HED 4: 58f. for attestations. The alteration between -par- and -pir- is difficult to explain and has even led scholars to propose that the sign BAR = pār perhaps should be read pir, as well (Laroche 1968a: 782). Other have attempted to explain the alteration linguistically. For instance, Neumann (1985) analysed the word as a compound of kappi- ‘small’ and *art- ‘to gnaw’ < *reh₁d-, roh₁d-, *rh₁d-. The idea is then that kapart- reflects kappi- + ard- whereas kapirt- goes back to kappi- + *rd. The consistent single spelling of -p- in kapart- / kapirt- is not favourable to this etymology, however.

Kimball (1994a: 88) proposes to interpret -pirt- / -part- as an alternance between *b₃̣ēr-t- and b₅̣r-t-. Oettinger (1995: 44-6) elaborates this idea and derives kapart- / kapirt- from *kom-b₃̣ēr-t- / *kom-b₅̣r-t- ‘one who carries together, hoarder, packrat’. He explains the development of *kom- to ka- as “Prokris < *kom² ‘”, comparing it to Germanic *ga- < *kom². This procislo should then explain the difference in outcome between kapart- / kapirt- < *kom-b₃̣ēr-t- and kappi- / kappi- ‘small’ < *kmb₅̣r-(e)i- (q.v.).

This etymology has found wide acceptance. E.g. Rieken (1999a: 88) states that because verbal compounds derived in -t- in the other IE languages always show a zero-grade stem (e.g. Skt. deva-stūr- ‘praising the gods’, Gr. ἄνακτος ‘not knowing’ < *n-α̃nθt-, the type displayed in kapirt- / kapart- < *kom-b₃̣ēr-t- / *kom-b₅̣r-t- must show a very archaic ablaut pattern. Melchert apud Oettinger (1995: 45) even adduces a Lydian cognate, namely kabrdokid ‘steals’ < *kabrd-ya-ka-, which would show that ‘mouse’ developed into ‘thief’, a development comparable to Gr. φῶς ‘thief’ < *b₃̣ēr.

We know that many Hittite animal names are from a non-IE origin. It is in my view therefore too dangerous to assume that only the word for a rodent would display a flection type that is so archaic that it is unattested elsewhere, or a
phonetic development (“proclisis” of *kom- > ka-) that is not assuredly attested in other words. All in all, I am very sceptical regarding this etymology.

**kappi- / kappai-** (adj.) ‘small, little’ (Sum. TUR): nom.sg.c. kap-pi-iš, acc.sg.c. kap-pi-in, nom.acc.sg.n. kap-pi (OS), acc.pl.c. kap-pa-iš (KUB 12.63 obv. 31 (OH/MS)), kap-pi-ú-iš (KBo 34.47 ii 8 (MH/MS)).

Derivatives: **kappaes** (Ic2) ‘to diminish, to reduce’ (part. kap-pa-a-an-t-, kap-pa-an-t-).


PIE *kmbʰi-*(e)i-

See Puhvel HED 4: 61f. for attestations. Szemerényi (1966: 207) proposed to connect kappi- / kappai- with Av. kamna- ‘small’, which in view of its superlative kambista- ‘least’ must reflect *kmb-na-. This would then mean that Hitt. kappi- / kappai- reflects *kmbʰi-*(e)i- (with *kmbʰi- > kapp- comparable to *kmt- > katt-). Note that a reconstruction *kmbʰi-*(e)i- is impossible in view of dampu- ‘blunt’ < *tomp-u-. Puhvel (l.c.) states that Hitt. -pp- points to *p and that therefore Szemerényi’s proposal cannot be correct. A fortition of *-mb- to Hitt. -pp- is well understandable, however, and fits e.g. *-ms- > Hitt. -ss- (cf. Melchert 1994a: 162). According to Neumann (1961: 61), words like καυμβεν, κουμβοκ, καυμβον, καυμβον (gen.) καυμβον (gen.) ‘grandchild’, which are attested in Greek inscriptions from Anatolia, are derived from PAnat. *komb-(e)i-.

**kappilae-** (Ic2) ‘to pick a fight (vel sim.)’: 3pl.pret.act. kap-pi-la-a-er (NS).

Derivatives: **kappilahh₁** (Iib) ‘to get in a fight’ (3pl.pret.act. kap-pi-la-ah-he-er (NH)), **kappilali-** (adj.) ‘prone to fight, aggressive’ (nom.sg. kap-pi-la-al-li-iš, kap-pi-la-al-liš (NH)).

Anat. cognates: CLuw. kappilaza- ‘to become hostile’ (3sg.pret.act. kap-pi-la-az-za-at-ta); HLuw. *kappilala*- (c.) ‘enemy(?)’ (acc.sg. *h₂š₃₄ ka-pi-la-li-na (TELL AHMAR 1 §24), *h₂š₃₄ k[al]-pi-la-li-i-na (TELL AHMAR 1 §26)).

See Puhvel HED 4: 63f. for attestations. The etymological interpretation of this word is difficult. For instance, Puhvel (l.c.) connects it with Gr. κόσμος ‘to bend’, Lat. campus ‘field’ (from *‘bending (valley) between mountains’), arguing that the Hittite semantics must be compared to the development of Lat. campus ‘field’ to ModHG Kampf ‘war, battle’. This is rather improbable, however, since the semantic development of *‘bending’ > ‘field’ > ‘war’ is very specific and only
accounts for the word *campus: I would not dare to state that in general words that mean ‘to bend’ and ‘to pick a fight’ should be connected. Eichner (1979a: 61) rather connects Skt. šap- ‘to scold, to curse’ < *kep-, but this should have yielded Luw. **zapp-. All in all, none of the proposed etymologies are convincing.


Derivatives: **kappučēšar / kappučišn-** (n.) ‘counting, calculation’ (Sum. ŠID-ešn-; dat.-loc.sg. kap-pu-eš-ni (NS), abl. kap-pu-u-eš-na-az (MH/NS)).

See Puhvel HED 4: 66f. for attestations. The oldest attestations of this verb clearly show that the -uci-a-inflection is original. In NS texts, we also find forms that show a stem kappače-a-, according to the very productive *hatr*ae-class. Verbs in -uci-a- reflect *u-je/o- and usually are denominitive (ḫešušье/a- from Ḫešiš, Šarušье/a- from Šguru- etc.). We would therefore at first sight assume that kappače/a- is derived from a further unattested noun *kapuču-. Pisani (1953: 307-8) analysed kappače/a- as *katt(a) + puče/a-, which he connected with Lat. putāre ‘to cut, to carve’. Čop (1965: 104; 1966-8: 61) adapted this view and assumed *kom+puče/a-, which then would be comparable to Lat. computāre ‘to count’. Although seemingly attractive, the absence of other examples in Hitite of such preverbs (see at *pīš) kaptar/- kaptar- for the unlikeness of its usual interpretation *kom-ɓēr-t-), makes me quite sceptical towards this interpretation.

IE cognates: Skt. jryāyas- ‘expanse, space, flat surface’, YAv. zraiiah- ‘sea’.

PIE *g̃roi-t.s, *gr̃oi-t.m, *gr̃ei-t.s.

See Puhvel HED 4: 85f. for attestations. The interpretation of this word is difficult, also because of its different spellings. The oldest attestations, nom.sg. ka-ra-i-iz (OS) and dat.-loc.sg. ka-ra-it-ti (OS) point to a stem /krait-/. In NS texts, we mostly encounter the spellings k'ga-RI-IT- and k'ga-RI-IZ, which could in principle be read ka-ri-it- and ka-ri-iç as well as ka-re-et- and ka-re-ez. On the basis of the hapax spelling gi-RI-e-IZ-za, which unambiguously points to gi-re-e-ez-za, one could argue that all other forms must be read with the vowel -e- as well: ka-re-et- and ka-re-ez. On the other hand, it occurs more often that in NS texts occasionally an e-spelling turns up of an otherwise consistent -i- (although most of these cases can be explained by the lowering of OH /i/ to NH /e/ before -h-, -š-, -m- and -n- (cf. § 1.4.8.1.d), but this does not occur before -t-), on the basis of which one could argue that the spelling gi-re-e-ez-za has to be disregarded for etymological reasoning. All in all, we are dealing with a noun that shows an ablaut /krait-/ besides /kret-/ or /krit-/. Puhvel (l.c.) argues that the spellings with -ai- are “hypercorrect on the basis of *aître e” and assumes that the stem is /kret-/, which he compares to Skt. hrādā- ‘lake, pool’, hrādin- ‘watery’. Apart from the fact that Skt. -d- does not regularly correspond to Hitt. -t-., the spellings with -ai- cannot be ignored: as I have shown in detail under the lemma hai(n)k̑-e’srō/, there are no examples in Hittite of an ‘hypercorrect’ or ‘reverse’ spelling of etymological *-e- as -ai-.

Čop (1954a: 162) and Schindler (1972: 35) connect karaitt- to Skt. jryāyas- ‘expanse, space, flat surface’, YAv. zraiiah- ‘sea’ and reconstruct *g̃roj-t-. Rieken (1999a: 134-5) follows this connection and states that “[die] Lautungen [g̃rojt-, gret-, g̃ret-] … lassen sich unter der Annahme eines paradigmatischen Ablauts *-̃g̃e / *-oje / *-i- auf eine t-Ableitung … *g̃rojt- / *g̃roit-t / *g̃rit-t zurückführen”. This is not fully correct: the diphthong *-oi- does not monophthongize to -e- in front of *t (compare e.g. daitti < *d̩h̩i-oi-th̩e-i), and *g̃rojt-t therefore would not yield Hitt. /kret-/. If the stem /kret-/ is linguistically real, it can only reflect *g̃rei-t-.

All in all, we are dealing with the following situation. If the one spelling with plene -e- must be taken as a proof that the spellings ka-RI-IT- and ka-RI-IZ have
to be interpreted as ka-re-et- and ka-re-ez, then we are dealing with an ablauting stem /krait- / kret-/ that must reflect a static paradigm *gréi-t-s, *gréi-t-m, *gréi-t-s (cf. at nekuz for a similar static t-stem *nóg₄th-t-s, *nóg₄th-t-m, *nóg₄th-t-s ‘night’). If we disregard the spelling with plene -e- and read ka-RI-IT- and ka-RI-IZ as ka-ri-it- and ka-ri-i-, we are dealing with an ablauting stem /krait- / krit-/ that must reflect a hysterodynamic paradigm *gréi-t-s, *gréi-t-m (or *gréi-ó-t-m?), *gréi-t-ó-s. Since I would be inclined to think that the first situation is more likely, I have cited all forms in the overview above with the vowel -e-. See at e.g. šiyyat-
for the outcome of a hysterodynamic t-stem.

The root *gréi- is verbally attested in Skt. jray- ‘to expand’, which means that karaït- as well as Skt. jrayas- and Av. zraïlah- originally meant ‘fast surface, large body (of water)’.


PIE *gʰrōbh₁-ei, *gʰr₁b₁h₁-énti

See Puhvel HED 4: 72f. for attestations. The verb denotes ‘to devour, to consume’: Puhvel (o.c.: 73) rightly remarks that it differs from ed₂ / ad- ‘to eat’ in the sense that the latter verb is used for the normal eating of humans, whereas karāp₆₈ / kare/p- ‘has as natural subjects wolf, dog, horse, ruinous insect(s) or demonic deity, with the extended figurative meaning ‘consume recklessly’’. Almost all forms of this verb are spelled with single -p-. The only two attestations that show a geminate spelling -pp- are found in one context, namely ABoT 44 i 54-55, and therefore do not have much weight. Puhvel’s statement (l.c.) that the occasional spelling -pp- points to etymological *p consequently is incorrect. The form ka-ri-ip-pi-an-zi (KBo 15.10 ii 57) cited in Oettinger (1979a: 53) is unreliable: the hand copy of the text only reveals a form [ ... ]x-ri-ip-pi-an-zi, of which no clear indication exists that it should mean ‘to devour’. The oldest forms,
ka-ra-a-pi (OS) and ka-re-e-pé-er (MH/MS) point to an ablaut karāp- / karep-. It must be noted, however, that the plene spelling of -e- is absent in all other forms, so that I have chosen to cite the verb as karāp- / karep- in this lemma. Occasionally we find plene spelling of the first a, e.g. in ka-a-ra-pi. It has been claimed that this shows that this vowel was phonetically real, but in my view this form could be regarded as a corrupt spelling for ka-ra'-a'-pi. Nevertheless, such a solution is more difficult in ga-a-ri-pi-iš[...-] (KUB 4.47 obv. 6), if this form really should be regarded as a broken spelling of the imperfective of this verb. The one attestation gi-ri-pa-an-zi (KUB 43.75, 17) by contrast indicates that the first written vowel must be empty: in this form the empty vowel was copied after the following real vowel -i-, implying a phonological /krV/-.

In Sturtevant & Hahn (1951: 31), karāp- / karep- is connected with Skt. grabh- ‘to seize’, etc., but this has caused some debate. E.g. Oettinger (1979a: 421 [5]) states that “man [wird] aus semant. Gründen die heth. Entsprechung von *ghreb- ‘ergreifen’ eher in karpiie- (under *gryb-je-) ‘heben’ als in garāp-/garēp- ‘verschlingen’ suchen”. Nevertheless, the verb karpp(jie/a)- formally can hardly derive from *ghrebh-, which still leaves Sturtevant’s suggestion open as a possibility. Moreover, Oettinger’s own etymology, namely connecting karāp- / karep- with Skt. jrambh- ‘to yawn’ is semantically rather weak. Puhvel (I.c.) also objects against Sturtevant’s etymology on semantic grounds and suggests himself the rather impossible reconstruction *ghr-ēp/bh-, connecting Gr. βράντειαν ‘to eat’ and Skt. girāti ‘to devour’.

In my view, the connection between karāp- / karep- ‘to devour’ and Skt. grabh- ‘to seize’, Lith. grēbtī ‘to rob’, OCS grabitī ‘to rob’, ON grāpa ‘to seize’ is semantically possible if we assume that the original meaning of this root was ‘to seize’ (note that the Lith. and OCS meaning ‘to rob’ is an innovation as can be seen by Latv. grebt ‘to seize’). The exact reconstruction of this root has caused some debate. On the basis of Skt. grhmnāti it is clear that the structure of the root must be *ghrebhH-. Because of Winter’s Law in Balto-Slavic (cf. Kortlandt 1988: 393), the labial consonant must have been *-b-. This means that in Sanskrit, the laryngeal has caused aspiration of the preceding *b. According to LIV, this indicates that we are dealing with *h2, since it apparently is assumed that only *h2 caused aspiration in Sanskrit. Nevertheless, the comparison between the Sanskrit primary 2pl.-ending -thā and the corresponding Greek ending -τε < *-th₁e shows that *h₁ caused aspiration in Sanskrit as well. The root-final laryngeal therefore could be *h₁ as well as *h₂. According to PIE root constraints it is impossible to have two glottalized stops in one root, which means that the initial consonant must have been *g. This *g lost its aspiration in Sanskrit due to Grassmann’s
Law. All in all, we have to reconstruct the root ‘to grab’ on outer-Anatolian grounds as *gʰrebʰ₁₂-.* The fact that Hitt. karāp- / kare/ip- does not infect according to the tarn(a)-class, in my view rules out the possibility of a root-final *h₂; however. As I have shown under the lemma of malla₁ / mall- ‘to mill’, verbs of the structure *CeCh₂₃- end up in the tarn(a)-class because of 3sg.pres.act. *CoCh₂₃-ei > CaCai. This means that karāpi can only be reconstructed as *gʰrēbʰ₁₂-ei.

The verb karāp₁ / kare/ip- is one of the few ĕi-verbs that show a synchronic ablaut -ā/-ē/-i- (also ašē₁ / aš/iš-, ḥamank₁ / ḥame/ink- and šarēpᵲ / šaripᵲ: note that šēkk₁ / šekk- (often cited as šēk- / šekk-) does not belong to this group originally). This type is difficult to explain. E.g. Oettinger (1979a: 114) assumes that the -ā/-ē/-i- ablaut is analogical to the verb “šēkkᵲ / šekk-”, in which, according to him, the ablaut vowel -ē- is the regular outcome of a reduplication syllable *se-šg-. As I have shown under the lemma šēkk₁ / šekk-, Oettinger’s interpretation of this verb cannot be upheld anymore, and therewith the idea that the -ā/-ē/-i- ablaut type analogically spread out of this verb must be abandoned as well.

In 1978, Jasanoff suggested a new approach, namely assuming that the synchronic Hittite -ā/-ē/-i- ablaut is the phonetic outcome of a PIE *o/e-ablaut. In the course of time, this theory has gained many supporters and nowadays is enthusiastically applied to PIE verbal theory (most strikingly in Jasanoff 2003). The fact that a verbal ablaut *o/e is unattested in any other Indo-European language is not very favourable to Jasanoff’s theory, however. Moreover, I believe that the -ā/-ē/-i- ablaut has an inner-Hittite explanation.

As I have shown under the discussion of the verbal class IIa3 (§ 2.2.2.2.f), to which karāp- / kare/ip- belongs, I think that the e/i as found in the weak stem must be compared to šarēpᵲ / šaripᵲ ‘to sip’ and to tereppᵲ / tere/ipᵲ ‘to plough’ (from class Ia5). It is in my view significant that these are the only three verbs in Hittite that show a structure *CreCᵲ. I therefore assume that the phonetically expected outcomes of the ablauting pair *CreCᵲ / *CRCᵲ > Hitt. CreCᵲ / CaRCᵲ (when mi-conjugated) and *CRōCᵲ / *CRCᵲ > Hitt. CRōCᵲ / CaRCᵲ (when ĕi-conjugated) were too aberrant (synchronically, it looks like Schwebe-ablaut) and therefore eliminated, secondarily placing the anaptyctic vowel i/i in the zero-grade form on the place of the vowel in the full grade form. In this way, a mi-conjugating verb *CRēCᵲ / *CRCᵲ was altered to synchronic CRECᵲ / CRᵲCᵲ, whereas the ĕi-conjugating *CRōCᵲ / *CRCᵲ was altered to synchronous CRōCᵲ / CRᵲCᵲ. In both cases, the weak stem is spelled CRE/iCᵲ. With this scenario in mind, we can explain karāp₁ / kare/ip- as phonological /krāb₁ / krīb₁, the
‘regular’ secondary outcome of *gʰrólh₁ / *gʰrbh₁-. Note that in *gʰrólh₁-ei, the
*h₁ did not geminate the preceding *b.

**karaš** (n.) ‘wheat, emmer-wheat’: nom.-acc.sg. kar-aš (OH/NS), acc.sg.c. kar-ša-
an (1x, MH/NS), acc.pl.c. kar-aš-šu-uš (OH/MS).


PIE *gʰersdʰ

See Puhvel HED 4: 74-5 for attestations and semantics. The nom.-acc.sg.n.-form
kar-aš occurs many times, whereas the commune forms acc.sg.c. kar-ša-an and
acc.pl.c. kar-aš-šu-uš both are (semi-)hapax and therefore must be secondary.
Nevertheless, these forms show that the spelling kar-aš is to be phonologically
interpreted as /karɔ/. Hutter (1988: 60) first connected kar-aš with the PIE root
*gʰersdʰ ‘barley’, which was elaborated by Rieken (1999a: 63-65). According to
her. *gʰersdʰ ‘barley’ is a dental extension of the verbal root *gʰers- as found in
Skt. ḫárśate, ḫṛyātī ‘to be excited’, Lat. horreō ‘to stand up straight, to shiver’,
which in her view is a derivative of a root *gʰer- as visible in Gr. (Hes.) ἕρι
‘hedge-hog’, ὄριος < *gʰer- ‘porcupine’ and Alb. derr < *gʰer-n- ‘pig, swine’.
According to Rieken (o.c.: 64) the connection to these latter forms (*gʰer- ‘pig,
pork’) is supported by a passage in which Hitt. karaš seems to mean ‘pig’s bristle’:

KUB 17.28 i
(4) [mu=kán] ḫa-at-te-eš-ni an-da ŠAH-aš kar-aš
(5) [ar-r]a-aš ša-ak-kar da-aḥ-ḫi
(6) [kat-ta-a]n-da ŠAH.TUR ḫa-ad-da-aḥ-ḫa-ri

“In der Opfergrube nehme ich das k. eines Schwein und den Kot des
[Gesäß]es. Ich schlachte das Ferkel hinab”.

I do not think that this is the only possible interpretation of this text (note that
Puhvel (l.c.) translates “pig’s emmer[-feed?]” here), and I therefore would leave
the alleged cognates that show a root *gʰer- ‘pig’ out of consideration here.
Rieken reconstructs *gʰers or *gʰers “weil sowohl *-er- als auch *r- vor
Konsonant heth. -ar- ergeben”. I do not fully agree with her: *gʰers in my view
would have yielded **kerš. I would much rather reconstruct *gʰersdʰ: this form
would regularly yield Hitt. /karɔ/, with loss of wordfinal dental consonant after
the lowering of *-e- to -a- in front of *RCC. Moreover, semantically this
reconstruction is more appealing than Rieken’s.


PIE *ǵhrh₁-ód-

See Puhvel HED 4: 75f. for attestations. For a long time it was thought that the stem karā- was part of the paradigm ker / kard(i)- ‘heart’ (q.v.), not only because of the formal similarity, but also because both stems can be sumerographically written with the logogram ŠÂ ‘heart, inside’. Laroché (1968b: 244f.) showed that we should distinguish two words, however, namely ker / kard(i)- ‘heart’ and karā- ‘entrails’. Despite some occasional confusion (compare Puhvel, for instance, who cites under the paradigm of karā- an abl. karta on the basis of the syntagm an-na-az kar-ta-az (KUB 30.11 rev. 19, KUB 30.10 rev. 20), which he translates as ‘from mother’s womb, i.e. since birth’: it is more logical to interpret this form as belonging with ker / kart-), this division still holds.

Within the paradigm of karā-, plene spelling of -a- is common (especially in the oldest texts), and the dental consonant is consistently spelled single, which points to a phonological interpretation /krād-. Semantically, karā- can stand for the entrails themselves, but also, more metaphorically, for the inner spirit (especially in the pair karā- īštāzan- ‘entrails (and) soul’). On the basis of the following context,

KBo 22.2 obv.

(16) mu-š-ma-aš Dingir-Diš-iš ta-ma-ī-in ka-ra-a-ta-an da-i-er nu
AMA=Šu-NU

(17) [ x x -u]š ma-na-ta ga-ni-eš-zi

‘The gods placed a different karā- in/on them and (therefore) their mother does not recognize (them),

it has been claimed that karā- should mean ‘Außeres, Hülle’ (thus Rieken 1999a: 139), but this seems unnecessary to me: compare Puhvels translation “the gods
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installed another character in them, and their mother does not recognize [them]” (o.c.: 76).

Already Laroche (l.c.) connected karāt- with Gr. χορή ‘gut’, Lat. haruspex ‘person who examines the entrails of sacrificed animals’, Lith. žarnos ‘bowels’ and Skt. hirā ‘vein’, which were reconstructed by Schrijver (1991: 208) as a root *gʰ(e)hr-. If Hitt. karāt- then would show a -d-stem (compare the -d-extension in Gr. χορά), we must reconstruct *gʰr̥h₁-وذ- (note that both gʰr̥h₂-وذ- and *gʰr̥h₁-وذ- would have yielded Hitt. **karḫār-). Since in synchronic Hittite we only find the stem karāt- < *gʰr̥h₁-وذ-, the original paradigm cannot be determined (possibly *gʰér̥h₁-وذ-s, *gʰr̥h₁-وذ-m, *gʰr̥h₁-وذ-s). Note that this reconstruction implies that the synchronic analysis of karāṭ should be /kerʔd/-.

**karḫur / karaun-** (n.) ‘horn(s), antler(s)’ (Sum. SI): nom.-acc.sg. ka-ra-a-ya-ar (KUB 31.4 + KBo 3.41 obv. 15, 16, 19 (OH/NS)), dat.-loc.sg. ga-ra-u-ni (KUB 43.32 iii 1 (OS), KBo 17.4 iii 9 (OS)), ka-ra-ů-ni (Bo 2689 ii 11 (OH/NS)), instr. SI¹⁵ᵃ-an-da (KUB 43.60 i 19 (OH/NS)), nom.-acc.pl. ga-ra-a-g[a-ar] (KBo 20.110, 8 (NS)), case? ka-ra-ů-na-as (KBo 30.129 iii 4 (OH/NS)).


PIE *kʰ-ʔ-ur / *kʰ-ʔ-ur-

See Puhvel HED 4: 77.9 for attestations. This word belongs to the small group of words that end in -ḫur / -aunu: aššūr / ašaunu- ‘sheepfold’, ḫarsḫur / ḫarsaunu- ‘tilled land’, partḫur / partaun- ‘wing, feather’ and šarḫur / šaraun- ‘storm-clouds(?)’. The exact formation of these forms is not fully clear, but the nouns ḫarsḫur, a derivative from the verb ḫārš-‘to till (the soil)’, and aššūr, possibly a derivative of the verb eš-uk- / aš- ‘to seat’, clearly have to be analysed as *C(V)C-ḫur, i.e. a suffix -ḫur attached to (the zero-grade of) a root. This situation reminds of the abstract nouns in -ḫur / -ḫum- that have the structure *CC-ūtar. For karḫur this would mean that we are dealing with a root kar-.

Hilmarsso (1985) argued that karḫur must be regarded as cognate with Arm. elfew ‘horn’ and TochA kro, TochB kroʔa ‘horn, crescent (of moon)’ that seem to reflect *gʰr̥hur. This latter preform should have yielded Hitt. **krūar, however, and I therefore reject this etymology. Sommer (1941: 60) connected karḫur with PIE *ker(h)₂- ‘head, horn’ (on which see especially Nussbaum 1986), which makes much more sense. Nevertheless, there has been no concensus
on the morphology of karāyar. Some scholars analyse karāyar- (in which karā- ~ Gr. καρα ‘horned’, Lat. cervus ‘stag’), others karā- both (with karā- ~ Gr. κάρα ‘horn’). Eichner (1973a: 92) states that karāyar may reflect ‘ein Nomen *karā (mit vorheth. Schwund von auslautendem -H₂ < *kreh₂ oder *kreh₂ = (formal) gri. Κόρη)” to which a suffix “-yor/-yn- mit kollektiver Bedeutung” has been attached. This view has been taken over by e.g. Melchert (1984a: 63), Nussbaum (1986: 31-6) and Rieken (1999a: 349-50). It is problematic, however, that this reconstruction presupposes a suffixation of -yor after the loss of word-final laryngeal (normally, *-eh₂-y would yield Hitt. -ahḫur, cf. *pēḫ-ur > paḫḫur ‘fire’) and that this reconstruction cannot account for CLuw. zaryani(ya)- ‘of a horn’, in which no trace of *h₂ can be found.

In my view, there is no need to reconstruct a basis *kērh₂: as Nussbaum (1986: 1-18) has shown, we must assume for PIE a basic stem *kēr- ‘horn’, from which a ‘collective’ *kēr-h₂- ‘horn’ has been derived that serves as a basis for many derivations that denote ‘horn’ and ‘head’. So, if we assume that the suffix -āwar / -awn- can be compared to -āwar / -āmn- and reflects *-ō-yr / -ō-un-, we can safely assume that karāyar has been derived from the unextended stem *kēr-: *kēr-ō-yr.

The exact interpretation of HLuw. suran- ‘horn; plentifulness(? ’) is unclear to me. Perhaps we are dealing with a metathesis of *kruan- ~ CLuw. zaryan-.

**karett**: see karaitt- / karett-

**karāyarīṣa (adv.) ‘at daybreak, early in the morning’**


PIE *g̪reh₂-y-re-yr or *g̪reh₁-eu-re-yr

See Puhvel HED 4: 86f. for attestations. We basically find three forms of this adverb, namely ka-RI-ya-ri-ya-ar (which could be read ka-ri-ya- as well as ka- re-ya-: I will therefore further cite it as karāyarīṣa), karāyarīṣa and karā arīṣa. It denotes ‘at daybreak, early in the morning’ and therefore probably is related to the adverb karā ‘early’ (q.v.). The bulk of the attestations are attested in NS texts only. Only once, we find a MS attestation, namely karāyarīṣa. At first sight this seems to indicate that karāyarīṣa is the original form. Nevertheless,
Puhvel (l.c.) rightly points out that it is likely that the variant *karýařiyr is a reshaping on the basis of the simplex karğ and that karýařiyr therefore must be the original form. So we are dealing with an original karýařiyr ‘at daybreak, early in the morning’ that under the influence of karğ ‘early’ is reshaped to karýařiyr. Later on, this form even is reanalysed as karğ ariyar ‘at an early rising’, with ariyar, as if from ara/- / ari- ‘to rise’ (the regular verbal noun of which is araayar < *araïyar, however).

The adverb karýařiyr probably has to be analysed as a verbal noun in -yar of a further unattested verb *karlyarije/a-z (cf. genušriyar, the verbal noun of gemüşšarije/a-z (see at gemu- / gemu-)). This *karlyarije/a-z then probably is a derivation in -arije/a-z of the stem *karly- (cf. gimmersarije/a-z of gimmers-, nekumandarije/a-z of nekuman-). It is quite tempting to equate this *karly- with karğ ‘early’. This means that *karly- must be read as *karey-, and that the diphthong *eu is preserved as such in word-internal position, but got monophthongized to karğ in word-final position.

All in all, I would read ka-RI-ya-ri-ya-ar as ka-re-ya-ri-ya-ar /kreauriur/, derived from *kareyarije/a-z /kreurje/a-l, which itself is derived from *kareu-/kreu-l. See at karğ for further etymology.

**kariant**- (c.) ‘grass’: nom.sg. ka-ri-an-za (KUB 17.28 ii 42).

Derivatives: kariantašha- (c.) ‘grassland, lawn’ (dat.-loc.sg. ka-ri-an-sta-aš-ḫi (KUB 17.28 ii 36).

PIE *[q]/qʃjent- ?

This word is hapax in the following context:

KUB 17.28 ii

(33) [m]a-a-an an-tu-uš-ši LÚ TAP-PU=ŠU la-a-la-an kar-ap-zi
(34) na-aš-ma-a=š-ši-i=š-ša-an DINGIRMEŠ-uš ú-e-ri-ja-az-zi
(35) nu ki-i ŠISKUR=ŠU 1 NINDA.GUR₃ RA 1 DUGḪABḪAB GEŠTIN
(36) a-ra-âš-za ka-ri-ta-aš-ḫi pé-e-da-an-zi
(37) nu NINDA.GUR₃ RA GÜB-la-az pàr-ši-ja n=a-an da-ga-a-an
(38) da-a-i KAŠ GEŠTIN GÜB-la-az BAL-an-ti
(39) nu ki-iš-ša-an me-em-ma-i

(40) ku-iš DUMUL.LÚ[U₄,L]U-za la-a-la-an DINGIRMEŠ-na-aš
(41) pé-ra-an [k]ar-ap-ta ku-iš=mu-u=š-ša-an DINGIRMEŠ-uš
(42) EGIR-an ú-e-ri-et nu ka-aš ka-ri-an-za
(43) ma-âš-ḫa-an ḫa-ta-an-za a-pé-el-š=a e-eš-ša-ri
(44) Ê=SÚ QA-TAM-MA ḥa-a-du

‘When against a man his company ‘lifts the tongue’ or invokes the gods for him, this is the ritual. They bring one thick-bread and one jug of wine outside on the karitašta-. He breaks the thick-bread to the left and places it on the ground. He libates beer and the wine to the left. He speaks thus: “Whatever person has ‘lifted the tongue’ before the gods, whoever evoked the gods for me: just like this kariant- is dried may of him his outer appearance and his dwelling likewise wither!’.”

Puhvel HED 4: 80 interprets karianza as ‘grass’, referring to contexts where we find yelku ḥādan ‘dried grass’. On the basis of this interpretation of karianza, he translates karitašji as ‘lawn’. Although these semantic interpretation seems probable to me, I think that the connection between kariant- and karitašha- would be much more understandable if the latter form is emended to ka-ri-ian-ta-aš-ši.

Puhvel connects these words to ON gróa ‘grow’, Goth. gras ‘grass’. Lat. grāmen ‘grass’, etc., which all reflect a root *ġreh₁- (ON gróa < *ġreh₁-ie/-o-, Goth. gras < *ġ₁rh₁-s-s-, Lat. grāmen < *ġ₁rh₁-s-men-), cf. Schrijver 1991: 487). This would mean that kariant- reflects *ġ₁rh₁jent-. For the development of *Crh₁je/-o- > Hitt. Carije/a-, cf. e.g. parijanzi ‘they blow’ < *prh₁jenti.

karije/a- (IIg) ‘to be gracious towards’: 1sg.pret.midd. ka-ri-ja-ah-ḥa-ḥa-at (NH); verb.noun.gen.sg. ka-ri-ja-u qa-aš (OH/NS).

Derivatives: karijašha- (c.) ‘graciousness, mercy’ (nom.sg. ka-ri-ja-aš-ḥa-aš (NH), kari tije/a² (Ic1) ‘to be gracious towards, to be merciful to’ (ka-ari + tije/a² (NH)).

IE cognates: Skt. hāryati ‘to desire, to covet’, Gr. χαύρα ‘to rejoice at, to take pleasure in’.

PIE * śh₁r₁je/-o-

See Puhvel HED 4: 80-1 for attestations. The verb and its derivatives are predominantly attested in NH texts. Puhvel (I.c.) connects the words to the IE root *śh₁r₁- as reflected in Skt. hāryati ‘to desire, to covet’, Av. zarai- ‘aim, goal(?); Gr. χαύρα ‘to rejoice at, to take pleasure in’ (< śh₁r₁-ie/-o-), χαύρα ‘grace, favour’, but also in Lat. horior ‘to incite, to urge on’ (< śh₁r₁-e/-o-). The word kari would then be similar to Gr. χαύρα ‘grace, favour’ and reflect a petrified dative-locative.

karije/a² (Ic1) ‘to cover (someone/thing (acc.) with something (instr.)’: 3sg.pres.act. ka-ri-ez-zi (NS), ka-ri-ja-az-zi (MH/NS), ka-ri-ja-zi (NS),


PIE *skr̥-e/o-

See Puhvel HED 4: 81f. for attestations. He convincingly connects this verb etymologically to Skt. cárman-, ‘skin, hide’, Lat. corium ‘leather’, OHG skirm ‘cover, shelter’, e.a., and states that the identification of these words with the root *skr̥- ‘to cut’ must be rejected.

Rieken (1999a: 74) alternatively suggests that karije/a- is derived from IE *sker- ‘greifen, fassen, umfassen’ as reflected in Skt. hárati ‘to take, to carry (off), to bear’, Gr. ἔχειν ‘enclosure’. Formally, this is indeed possible, but the supposed semantic development from ‘*to grasp, to seize’ > ‘*to enclose’ > ‘to cover’ is less attractive.

**Karije/a-**<sup>2</sup> (Ic1) ‘to pause(?) to rest(?)’; 3sg.pres.act. ka-ri-ja-zi, 3sg.pret.act. ka-ri-i-e-et.

Derivatives: **karin-**<sup>2</sup>, **karijana-**<sup>2</sup> (Ib2) ‘to silence’ (3pl.pres.act. ka-ri-nu-an-zi (OS), ga-ri-nu-an-zi (OS), ka-ri-nu-ya-an-zi (OH/NS), 3sg.pret.act. ka-ri-ja-nu-ut (NH)).

See Puhvel HED 4: 82-3 for attestations. The interpretation of these forms is difficult. In KUB 22.25, we find the following contexts:

obv.

(25) **Ha-an-ḥa-na-az=kán ar-ḥa** **Ha-at-te-na an-da-an nu I-NA**
**URU**DU<sub>š</sub> **URU** Ka-at-r̥-ma
(26) ka-ri-ja-zi nu I-NA **URU** Pi-it-t̥ag-ga-la-ṣa-ṣa-an-da-an **URU** Pi-it-t̥ag-ga-la-ṣa-ṣa-an=ma
(27) ma-a-an GUL-ah-zi

‘Out of the city Ḥanāna, towards the city Ḥattana. In the ruins of Katruma he k.-s. Towards Pittaggalašša. When he strikes Pittaggalašša, ...’;
Von Schuler (1965: 178, 182) translates NDUL¨DQ as ‘rests’, which seems to be especially based on the latter two contexts where the following sentence starts with lukkati=ma ‘the next morning’. Another example as mentioned by Puhvel is KUB 17.10 i (34) nu=za=kân an-da ka-rį-i-e-et š=a-aš e-ša-ti, which he translates as ‘he paused and sat down’, but this translation does not do justice to both =z and anda. In my view, it cannot be excluded that in all cases we are dealing with the verb karije/aʰ² ‘to cover, to hide’. The first three contexts then should be translated ‘he hides in the ruins of Katruma’, and the latter ‘he covered himself up inside and sat down’.

More linguistically real is the causative karimu², however, which is securely attested. It usually has musical instruments or people as its object and denotes ‘to silence’. Puhvel paraphrases this as ‘to cause to stop’ and assumes a derivation from karije/aʰ² ‘to pause’, but this now has become shaky in view of the uncleanness regarding karije/aʰ² ‘to pause’. Moreover, the oldest attestations show the stem karimu-, whereas the stem karijanu- is attested once in a NH text only. In my view, this rather points to derivation of a further unattested verb *karai² / kar- (for causatives in -imu- from dą/tijanzi-class verbs compare e.g. ḫuinu² from ḫuyai¹ / ḫui-, pattimu² from patti¹ / patti- and zimu² from zai¹ / z). Further unclear.

Derivatives: 


See Puhvel HED 4: 83f. for attestations. The word denotes a cultic building, and can be translated as ‘shrine’ or sim. The word shows a number of stems, namely un-infl ecting karimmi and karimma besides an infl ecting stem karimna-. The occurrence of the attestation karāmmi is remarkable.

Some scholars have tried desperately to etymologize this word. For instance, Puhvel (l.c.) states that the ‘declension pattern’ karimmi / karimn- must be compared to Skt. āsthi- / asthi- ‘bone’ and proposes to reconstruct *ghremi : ghremn- (~ Skt. harmyam ‘stronghold’ and Lat. gremium ‘lap, recess’). Melchert (1983: 11f.) treats karimmi as a *men-extension of a stem *kari-, which he connects to karije/а-ёd ‘to cover’ (q.v.) from IE *gʰer-*, thus reconstructing *gʰer-i-men. He explains the nom.sg. karimmi as *kari-mn-i, “a neuter nom.-acc.pl. like ħalḥaltumari ‘corners’”. He does not explain, however, why *mn- assimilated in this form only and not in e.g. gen.sg. karimnaš. Moreover, he does not explain the form karāmmi.

In my view, the different stems with un-Indo-European alterations (-mn- : -mn-; -i- : -i-) clearly point to a foreign origin, just as we would expect in a word that denotes a cultic building (compare ḫišṭ, ḫiššî, ḫalent(i)u-, māk(kiz)zi(j)a- e.a.).

**karinu-²:** see at karije/а-ёd ‘to pause(?) to rest(?)’

**karitt-:** see karaitt- / karett-

**kariyariyar:** see kareṣariyar

**karp-₅:** see karp(i)c/a-²(ѓ)

**karp-²:** see karp(i)c/a-²

**karp(i)c/a-²** (IId / IIG) ‘to be angry’: 3sg.pres.midd. kar-ap-ta-ri (NH), kar-pi-ja-at-ta (NS); part. kar-pi-ja-an-t-; Luw.part. kar-pi-mi-. Derivatives: **karpēš-²** (Ib2) ‘to become angry’ (part. kar-pi-iš-ša-an-t-), karpi- (c.) ‘wrath, anger, fury’ (nom.sg. kar-pi-iš (MH/MS), acc.sg. kar-pi-in (MH/NS), dat.-loc.sg. kar-pi (NS), nom.pl. kar-pi-uš (NS)), karpiqāla- (adj.) ‘furious’ (nom.-acc.pl.n. kar-pi-ya-a-la (OH/MS)).

PIE *krp-?

See Puhvel HED 4: 98f. for attestations. Although the verb is attested a few times only, the noun *karpi-* is well-established. Tischler (HEG A-K: 515) connects *karpi-* with CLuw. *zarpa/i-* that, according to Tischler, denotes “jedenfalls ein Übel, das den Menschen befällt”. If this semantic field of *zarpa/i-* indeed is accurate, a connection with Hitt. *karpi-*, which particularly denotes ‘divine wrath’, is indeed possible. On the basis of Hitt. *karp-* and Luw. *zar-* we should reconstruct PAHitt. *krp-.

Eichner (1979a: 61) suggests to connect *karp(ije/a)-* to Lat. *increpare* ‘to shout out, to upbraid’ and Russ. *kropotâ* ‘conflict, fight’. Puhvel judges this suggestion as “mildly probable” and suggests himself as possible cognates Skt. *krpate* ‘to lament’ and Gr. *κραπάμυθος* ‘swift, impetuous’. In my view, all forms (except Gr. *κραπάμυθος*, which semantically remains far) could point to an IE root *krp-* ‘to express one’s discontent’. We should then assume, however, that the *k* of *krp-* depalatalized before *r* in Russian and Sanskrit (Weise’s Law) and yielded plain velars there. In Hittite, the zero grade of this root, *krp-*, would then have been generalized. Although this etymology is not impossible, it is not convincing either.

Derivatives: karpanu² (Ib2) ‘to pick up’ (3sg.pres.act. kar-pa-nu-zí).
Anat. cognates: Lyd. fa-korfíd ‘to undertake (vel sim.)’.

IE cognates: Lat. carpō ‘to pick, to pluck’, Gr. ἵππος ‘fruit’ (< *krp-o-), Lith. kištī ‘to shear off’, OE sceorfan ‘to bite’, Latv. šķirta ‘notch, sherd’.

PIE *krp-je/o-; *kérp-t/*krp-ént

See Puhvel HED 4: 91f. for attestations. Already in the oldest texts, we find two stems, namely kar³ besides kar-je-o. Oettinger (1979a: 345) states that of these two, kar-je-o is older than kar-: “kar-me ist jüngere Umbildung!”. Melchert (1997b: 84ff.) states that it is significant that in OS texts the stem kar-je-o is attested in the present indicative only. In his view, this is a remnant of a system in which the stem kar-je-o is used in the present indicative only, and the stem kar- everywhere else (but note that already in OS texts this system is blurred as we can see by the attestation of 3sg.pres.act. kar-ap-zí). According to Melchert, this division reflects an opposition between a root aorist *KerP- and a derived present *KrP-je/o-.

The labial consonant is spelled with a geminate -pp- that often, that we can only conclude that we are dealing with phonological /kar-1/ and /kripie/a-1. This is of importance for the etymological interpretation. For instance, Oettinger (1979a: 345) derives kar-je-o from IE *gʰrebh₁-je/o-, connecting it with Skt. grabh₁- ‘to grab’, Lith. grėbiu ‘to rob’, etc. Although semantically appealing, the formal obstacles are too large to uphold this etymology. Not only does the geminate spelling -pp- not fit etymological *b₁, the full grade *gʰrebh₁- does not correspond to the Hittite stem /kar-1 < *KerP-. Moreover, it is more likely that the PIE root *gʰrebh₁- is reflected in Hitt. karap² /kar/ ‘to devour’ (q.v.).

Already Sturtevant (1930b: 155-6; 1930c: 217) compared karp(ije/a)- with Lat. carpō ‘to pick, to pluck’ and Lith. kištī ‘to cut off’ from PIE *kerp-. Although semantically these words seem to be quite far from Hittite ‘to take (away), to take up, to lift’, there is some indication for a meaning ‘to pluck’ in Hittite as well: KUB 27.16 i (9) nam-ma GIMBAM-NAR.GIŠ kar-ap-pi-ja-an[-zí] ‘Further they pluck fruits’; KBo 4.9 v (36) ta LU.MEŠNAR.GIŠ dINANNA² kar-pa-an-zí ‘The musicians pluck the harps’ (both examples Puhvel o.c.: 94). Either we have to assume that a PIE meaning ‘to pluck’ was extended in Hittite to ‘to take (away), to take up, to lift, to pluck’, or that a PIE meaning ‘to take (away), to take up, to lift, to pluck’ remained thus in Hittite and was narrowed to ‘to pluck’ in the other Indo-European languages.

The appartenue of Lyd. fa-korfíd is semantically as well as formally possible, but does not shed any additional light to the Hittite state of affairs.
karš-²: see karš(ije/a)-²


IE cognates: ModHG harsch, ModEng. harsh.

PIE *krs(e)-

See Puhvel HED 4: 107f. for attestations. An etymological tie-in with karš(ije/a)² is likely from a formal as well as semantic point of view, which is supported by the Germanic cognates like ModHG harsch ‘harsh, rough’, ModEng. harsch < *kor-sk-. In an ablauting -i-stem adjective, we would expect ablaut in the root as well, so *kés-i-, *krs-éi-. Since *VrsV > Hitt. ŶrrV (compare arra- ‘arse’ < *Horso-), the cluster -rš- must have been generalized out of the oblique cases, *krs-éi- where it regularly was retained.
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Anat. cognates: CLuw. **karš-** ‘to cut’ (1sg.pres.act. kar-šu-i, inf. kar-šu-na, part. nom.sg.c. kar-ša-am-mi-iš), **karšattar** / **karšattn-** (n.) ‘parcel (of land), selection (of animals); block (of metal)’ (nom.-acc.sg. kar-ša-at-tar, kar-ša-tar, dat.-loc.sg. kar-ša-ad-da-ni); Lyd. **fa-karsed** ‘to cut (out)‘.


PIE *krs-je/-ó/-; *kêrs-t / *krs-ént

See Puhvel HED 4: 100f. for attestations. The most common stem of this verb is **karš-**. A stem **karšiše/a-** only occurs in 3sg.pres.act. in the Hittite Laws. This reminds of the distribution between **karp-** and **karpiše/a-** ‘to take (away)’, which reflects an old distinction between root-aorist *karp- vs. derived present *krap-je/o- (cf. Melchert 1997b: 86). In NH texts, we occasionally find forms that display a stem **karšaæz-** (karšanun and possibly karšauygar) and a stem **karš(a)-** (karšatti and possibly karšauygar), according to the highly productive ḫatrae- and tArn(a)-class respectively.

Already since Hrozny (1919: 205) this verb is commonly connected with PIE *ker- ‘to cut’. In Hittite, we apparently are dealing with an s-extension, which is also visible in TochAB kârs- ‘to know’.

The common geminate spelling of -ş- shows that we have to phonologically interpret this verb as /karS-/ krS/-l. The fortition of *s to /S/ is due to the adjacent -r- (compare keššar /KeSr/ ‘hand’ < *gʰēsr).

According to Melchert (1994a: 332), Lyd. fa-karse- reflects *kors-ěje-.

**kard-**: see [UZU]ker / card(i)-

**kartaæ-** (Ic2) ‘to cut off’ (Sum. TAR): 1sg.pret.act. kar-ta-a-nun (OH/NS); part. kar-ta-an-t-; verb.noun gen.sg. kar-ta-u-aš (NS).

IE cognates: Skt. **kart-** ‘to cut (off)’, Lith. kertiù ‘to fell, to cut down’, OCS o-črěsti ‘to cut’.

PIE *kert-
See Puhvel HED 4: 109f. for attestations. The verb is attested a few times in NS texts only. It inflects according to the ḫatrae-class.

Already Sommer *apud* Friedrich HW: 103 makes a connection with Skt. *karto-* ‘to cut’. In order to explain the Hittite inflection, one has to assume that an original Hittite stem *karto-* was secondarily taken over into the ḫatrae-class. This assumption is valid in view of the fact that the verb occurs in NS texts only, which coincides with the fact that the ḫatrae-class was highly productive in that period. Oettinger (1979a: 375) is against this assumption however, because of his conviction that stems in dentals avoid secondarily rebuilding into the ḫatrae-class. He therefore suggests that *karto-* is a derivation of a noun *kr-tō-,* *kōrt-,* which, through *(k)r-to-je/o-,* gave *karto-.* In my view, verbs like ḫantae-², ḫelltantae-², mitaē-², partae-², pīttae-², etc. clearly show that there was no problem with taking stems that end in a dental consonant over into the ḫatrae-class. I therefore assume that *karto-* is a secondary creation based on an original stem *karto-,* which is cognate with Skt. *karto-* etc. and reflects PIE *kert-.*

**kard(i)***: see *(tzu)* ker / kard(i)***

_kardimija-*/(ii)g* (IIg / Ic1) ‘to be angry’ (Sum. TUKU/.TUKU): 3sg.pres.midd. kar-di-mi-ja-at-ta-ri (MS?), kar[ti-mi-ja-]a-et-ta (MH/MS), kar-tim-mi-ja-at-ta[r]-ri (OH/NS), kar-tim-mi-ja-at-ri (OH/NS), 3sg.pres.midd. kar-tim-mi-ja-an-ta-ri (OH/?) 3sg.pret.midd. kar-di-mi-ja-et-ta-at (MS, OH/NS), kar-tim-mi-ja-at-ta-at (NS); 3sg.pres.act. kar-di-mi-ja-az-zi (MS), kar-tim-mi-ja-ez-zi (MS), 1sg.pres.act. kar-tim-mi-ja-nu-un (OH/NS); verb.noun abl. kar-di-mi-ja-u-ya-a[z] (OH/NS); impf. kar-tim-mi-iš-ke/a-.

kar-tim-mi-ja-az (NH), kar-tim-mi-ja-za (NS), acc.sg. kar-di-mi-ja-at-ta-an (OH/MS), kar-tim-mi-ja-at-ta-an (MH/NS), kar-tim-mi-at-ta-an (NS), gen.sg. kar-di-mi-ja-at-ta-š (OH/MS), dat.-loc.sg. kar-di-mi-at-ti (MS), acc.pl. kar-di-mi-ja-at-tu-uš (OS), kar-tim-mi-ja-ad-du-uš (NS)).

PIE *krd-im-je/o-

See Puhvel HED 4: 110f. for attestations. The forms that belong to this lemma are spelled in two ways: either kar-di-mi- or kar-tim-mi- (the attestations with kar-DAM-mi- in KBo 2.2 are probably to be read kar-dim-mi-, cf. HZL: 239). The chronological distribution between these spellings is as follows: in OS texts, we only find kar-di-mi-; in MS texts we mostly find kar-di-mi- and sometimes kar-tim-mi-; in NS texts we mostly find kar-tim-mi- and sometimes kar-di-mi-. In my view, this indicates that kar-di-mi- is the original spelling, which is gradually being taken over by kar-tim-mi- from MH times onwards. This is important, since we now have to interpret the single spelling of -m- as original. For the replacement of single -m- by geminate -mm-, compare e.g. imije/a- > immije/a-, amidiant- > ammijant-, etc.

The verb shows the middle as well as active inflection, both with the same meaning. Because the middle forms are more numerous, I assume that this verb was middle originally. Note that already in MS texts we find forms that show the secondary stem kardimijaee-.

Since Pedersen (1938: 40) it is generally accepted that kardimije/a- is cognate with ker / kard(i)~ ‘heart’ (compare OCS srditi se ‘to be angry’ ~ srdace ‘heart’, Lith. siirsti ‘to be angry’ ~ širdis ‘heart’ and Arm. srnim ‘to become angry’ ~ sirt ‘heart’). Nevertheless, the morphological analysis of kardimije/a- has been in debate. For instance, Pedersen (l.c.) thought that kardimije/a- was based on a participle *kartimma-. This is unlikely because this type of participle is attested in Luwian only and not in Hittite. Oettinger (1979a: 255) suggests that kardimije/a- is derived from a base kardima-, an “(i)ma-Nomen” (like lahləɬhima- ‘agitation’, tehîma- ‘thunder’, təhîma- ‘smoke’). Apart from the fact that I know of no other verbal derivatives of these nouns in -ima-, we would expect that such a derivative would end up in the ūatrae-class (so **kardimae-).

Rieken (1999a: 110-1) therefore gives a different analysis. According to her, the root *kerd- ‘heart’ served as the basis for a verb *kerd-je/o- ‘to be angry’. Of this *kerd-je/o- a -men- derivation *kerd-i-men- ‘anger’ is formed, of which another verb in *je/o- is derived: *kerd-i-mm-je/o-, which regularly yielded Hitt. kartimniijae-. Problematic, however, is the fact that the original form of this verb is kardimije/a-, with single -m-, which cannot be explained out of -*mm-.
I would like to propose a different analysis. In my view, *kardimiẹ/a-* is a compound of *kard-+ imiẹ/a-* ‘to mix’. As we saw, the original inflection of this verb is middle, and I assume that the literal meaning of this compound therefore was ‘to be mixed regarding his heart’ (cf. English ‘to have mixed feelings’). This became to denote ‘to be angry’ and because of this active meaning was taken over into the active inflection as well. For a further etymological treatment, see at ker / kard(i)- ‘heart’ and imiẹ/a-* ‘to mix’.

The causative shows three spellings. Of these, the spelling kar-tim-nu- is found in a NH text and therefore probably is secondary (compare Melchert 1997b: 90\(^1\)). The spelling kar-di-mi-nu- is attested in a MH/MS text however, and in my opinion therefore significant. It may show that originally verbs in -je/a- formed causatives in *-i-nu- (compare the causatives in -imu- that are derived from the d\(\ddot{g}\)/tijanzi-class verbs), which were later on replaced by -ja-nu- (like kar-tim-mi-ja-nu- in this case).

karu (adv.) ‘early; formerly, earlier, already; up to now’: ka-rú-ú (OS).


Anat. cognates: HLuw. ruwan (adv.) ‘formerly’ (rú-wa/i-na (KARATEPE 1 §33)).

IE cognates: ON gráandi ‘dawn’, Swed. dagen gryr ‘the day dawns’, Olc. gráır, OHG grāo ‘grey’.

PIE *\(\ddot{g}\)r\(\ddot{h}\)1-ēu or *\(\ddot{g}\)re\(\ddot{h}\)1-u

See Puhvel HED 4: 112f. for attestations. The adverb karu is consistently spelled ka-rú-ú, from OS texts onwards. This points to a phonological interpretation /krú/, which contrasts with the form a-aš-šu-u ?āSol ‘goods’ < *-uh2. Within Anatolian, we find a cognate in HLuw. ruwan ‘formerly’ (with -an probably in analogy to adverbs like anan ‘below’, antan ‘inside’, anan ‘behind’ paran ‘before’, e.a.), that shows that we must reconstruct PAnat. *\(\ddot{g}\)r-.. As I have shown
under its own lemma, the adverb *kareyarije/a-²*, which originally is a verbal noun to a verb *kareyarije/a-²*, itself a derivative in -arije/a-² from a stem *karey-*, shows that karū must show the word-final development of *karey*. All in all, we must reconstruct PAnat. *'grey*. Puhvel (i.c. with reference to Čop 1961-62: 187-197, 206-9) cites as outer-Anatolian cognates ON grýandi ‘dawn’ and Swed. *dagen gryr* ‘the day dawns’, which together with Olc. grār and OHG grāo ‘grey’ point to a u-stem *ghre₁-u-. This means that karū could go back to *ghreh₁-ū* or *ghreh₁-u-


IE cognates: OHG chrosōn, MHG krosen, Goth. kriustan, OSwed. krýsta ‘to gnash’.

**PIE *grēus-t/*grus-ent, *grus-je/o-**

See Puhvel 116f. for attestations. Almost all forms show a stem karušši(e)/a-. Only once, we find the unextended stem karū-, in 2pl.imp.act. This seems to correspond to the distribution as described in Melchert 1997b: the forms in -je/a-, which reflect the -je/o-present, are originally found in the present only, whereas the unextended forms, which reflect the root-aorist, are originally found in non-present forms (cf. karpi(e)/a-²).

Eichner (1975b: 16416) connects this verb with OSwed. krýsta ‘to gnash’ and Goth. kriustan ‘to gnash’, which reflect a root *greus-* (also attested without a dental extension in OHG chrosōn, MHG krosen ‘to gnash’), assuming that the original meaning ‘die Zähne knirschen; sich das Wort verbeifen’ developed into Hitt. ‘zu/über etwas schweigen’. Eichner himself assumed a preform *grous-je/o-*, but e.g. Rieken (1999a: 211994) adapts this to *grous-je/o-*. Both
interpretations must be incorrect because the diphthong *-ou- would not monophthongize in front of -s- (cf. aušten < *h₂ou-sten). Moreover, as we saw above, this verb likely goes back to a root-aorist and its -je/o-derived present. So structurally, we would expect an aorist *grēus-t / *grus-ônt besides a present *grus-jē-ô-. The full grade stem *grēus- would yield Hitt. krū-, whereas *grus- > Hitt. kru-. We can see that the full grade stem has been generalized because the occasional plene spelling ka-ru-â-û-ši-je/a- points to *greus-je/o-. The geminate -šš- in my view must be explained by the fact that *grusje/o-regularly yielded Hitt. /krusJe/a/-, showing the development *VššV > VššV (cf. also -ašš- < *-osjo- and yašša/- < *usje/o-). When the -je/a-suffix was restored, this yielded /krusJe/a/-, spelled karušši/e/a/- (see at yešš-<, yašša/-< for a similar scenario).

karuṣariya: see kareyariya


PIE *kért-s-꜒r / *krt-s-n-ôs?

See Puhvel HED 4: 117 for attestations. This word denotes an instrument of a weaver, probably ‘spool’ or ‘bobbin’ or similar. According to Eichner (1974: 98), this word is a fossilized concretized verbal noun *kért-s(o)jr, gen. *k(e)rt-snós ‘spin’ that should be connected with Skt. karta- ‘to spin’ and perhaps kṛṣṇā- ‘whole, entire’. The loss of -r in nom.-acc. karza is explained by him as due to “prophylaktische Dissimilation”. Neu (1982: 206), however, assumes that karza is a “durch die neutrice Endung gekennzeichneten Kollektivbegrif”. This is followed by Rienek (1999a: 391) who analyses karza as /karta/-. This would, according to her, indicate that the word was an s-stem, that must go back to *kért-s, *k(e)rt-s-n-. In my view, it is also possible to assume that karza = /karta/ goes back to a preform *kért-s< in which word-final *-r regularly was dropped after an unaccentuated *-s<, cf. § 1.4.6.2.a), the morphologically expected nom.-acc.pl.-form of an -r/ntem *kért-sr, *krt-sn-ôs.

karša, karšma (interj.) ‘look here, behold’: ka-a-ša (OS), ka-a-aš-ma (MS).


PIE *kós + = (m)a
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The interjections kāša and kāšma are identical in usage and often translated as ‘look here, lo, behold’, etc. The exact formal relationship between the two forms is unclear, however. Often it has been thought that kāšma must derive from kāša and in fact is a syncopated variant of kāša=ma (thus Puhvel HED 4: 118, followed by Melchert 1994a: 158). In my opinion, such instances of unmotivated syncopes must be regarded as unconvincing ad hoc solutions.

In this case it is of major importance to look at the chronological distribution of the forms kāša and kāšma. In OS texts, we only find ka-a-ša (100%) and never ka-a-ašma (0%). In MH/MS texts, we find ka-a-ša 89 times (86%), and ka-a-ašma 14 times (14%). In NH texts, we find ka-a-ašma 14 times (87.5%), and ka-a-ša 2 times (12.5%). This means that kāša is the original form and that kāšma is only starting to appear in MH times, taking over the position of kāša in NH times. This replacement of -a by -ma from the MH period onwards, of course immediately reminds us of the distribution between the functionally equal adversative enclitic clause conjunctives =a and =ma ‘but’: in OS texts we find C=a vs. V=ma, but this distribution has been given up from the MH period onwards: we then find C=ma as well; in NH texts, =ma has totally taken over the position of =a (see at =(m)a). Comparing these chronological distributions, I cannot conclude otherwise than that kāša should be analysed as kāš +=(m)a. The OS texts show the particle =(m)a as expected: after consonant we find the allomorph =a. In MH/MS texts, we see that the postconsonantal position is being taken over by =ma, and in NH texts the form kāš=ma is the most common one. The fact that the MH distribution kāš=ma, which is 86% : 14%, does not match the overall MH distribution between C=a : C=ma, which is 40% : 60%, may be caused by the fact that kāš=ma is by that time becoming a petrified formation that for some speakers is not longer analyzable as kāš=ma. This petrification is clear from its occasional NH occurrence, which would be unexplainable in view of the total absence of the adversative particle =a in these texts. In my view, the first part, kāš, should be equated with the nom.sg.c. kāš of the demonstrative pronoun kā- / kā- / ki- ‘this’.

All in all, the interjection kāša and kāšma must be regarded as two chronologically different realizations of the formation kāš +=(m)a. Originally, this formation must have meant ‘this then!’, which later on developed into ‘look!’, behold!’ . For further etymology, see at kā- / ki- / kā- and =(m)a.

The semantically similar interjection ḥūšma (q.v.) similarly must reflect *h1ōs + = (m)a. The interpretation of CLuw. źąyi is not fully clear. Nevertheless, the part źū- undoubtedly must be equated with the demonstrative źū- ‘this’ (see also under kā- / kā- / ki-).
kišma: see kūša


Anat. cognates: HLuw. ʷʼašṭ- ‘hunger(?)’ (abl.-instr. ʷʼašṭ-ā-sa-ta-ri+i (ASSUR letter e §10), nom./acc.pl. ʷašṭ-[i]-zi (TELL TAYINAT 2 fr.3 §ii)).

PAnat. *güšT-?

IE cognates: TochA kašt, TochB kešt ‘hunger, famine’.

PIE *gʰ₂d-yent-

See Puhvel HED 4: 121f. for attestations. The oldest texts (OS and MS) show predominantly spellings with plene -a-, which shows that the stem was kūš-. The derivatives of this noun show a stem kiš-, however. Usually, this kiš- is interpreted as reflecting *Kest-, an ablaut-variant with *e besides *Kost- as reflected in kūš-. On the basis of this assumption, e.g. Rieken (1999a: 132-3) concludes that the original paradigm of kūš- must have show *o/e-ablaut: *Kós-t-s / *Kós-t-m / *Kós-t-s. Nevertheless, it cannot be ruled out that kišt-reflects a zero-grade formation. In my opinion, it is likely that an initial sequence *Kst- would yield Hitt. /Kst-/l/, spelled kišt- (cf. § 1.4.4.4 for clusters with -k- and -s- that receive the anaptyctic vowel /i/). This analysis would morphologically fit kištuyant- < *KstT-ent- and kištant- < *Kst-ent- better.

Because of the formal similarity, it is generally assumed that the verb kišt-ōr ‘to be extinguished, to perish’ (q.v.) is cognate with kūšt-. This would mean that kišt-originally meant ‘to be starved’ or similar. Since this verb belongs to class IIIf (tukkāri-class), which goes back to zero-grade middles, it is likely that it reflects a zero-grade formation as well: *KstT-ō(rj). This is an additional argument for assuming that the stem kišt- of kištuyant- and kištant- reflects *KstT-.
The etymological interpretation of these words is difficult. Already since Friedrich (1924-25: 122), kāšt- is generally connected with TochA kašt, TochB kēst ‘hunger’ that reflect *KosT-. The combination of the Hittite and the Tocharian facts do not shed any light on the precise nature of the velar and the dental consonant. Melchert (1987a: 185) adduces HLuw. "₃⁵₄ sa-ta-, which is found in ASSUR letter e §10 COR na-hu-ti-zı=wa/i=mu ıNFANS-nı-zı ıREL-i "₃⁵₄ sa-ta-ri+i "COR ta-wa/i-sa-ta-tı=ha ısu-tı-ri+i-tı ıha+ra/i-ta-tı=ha ıPRAE-na ıARHA-* "₃⁵₄ wā/i-wa/i-ri+i-ta-tı ‘These beloved’ children of mine are nearly’ dying of "₃⁵₄ āst- and of "₃⁵₄ tawā/isa(n)ı- and of suttirī- hara/ita-’. His interpretation of ā-sa-ta- as ‘hunger’ is partly based on the interpretation of sign 460 as a combination of EDERE+MINUS, which indeed seems to fit ‘hunger’ (unfortunately, the only other attestation of this sign, nom./acc.pl. 460-[ı]-zi, is found in a broken context). If this is correct, then ā-sa-ta- would show that we are dealing with PAAn. *₃⁵₄ GosT-, since only lenis velars disappear in Luwian. Note however that Starke (1990: 186163) rather compares HLuw. ā-sa-ta- to CLuw. ašt- ‘spell, curse’, which seems to be followed by Melchert himself in 1993b: 37.

On the basis of the Tocharian verb kās- ‘to be extinguished’ (middle), which semantically is identical to Hitt. kišt ordeal ‘to be extinguished’, it has been thought that kāšt- and kišt- must show dental extensions of a root *Kes- as found in TochAB kās-. Problematic, however, is the fact that TochAS kās- goes well with Skt. jāsat ‘to be exhausted,’ Gr. ἐκάζειν ‘to extinguish’, Lith. gėsti ‘to cease to burn, to go out’, OCS ugasiti ‘to extinguish’ and Goth. qīst ‘destruction’, which all point to a root *₃⁵₄ g’es-, whereas an initial *₃⁵₄ g- is not possible for the Hittite words. In order to solve this problem, e.g. Oettinger (1976b: 129) separates the Greek and the Gothic forms, and states that the other forms could reflect *ges-. Melchert (1994a: 120) goes even further and states that “TochA kās- also requires a plain velar /ɡ/”. This last statement is not valid however: the effect of labiovelars on surrounding vowels in Tocharian is far from clear. With this *ges- as root, it is thought that Hitt. kāšt- and TochA kašt, TochB kēst reflect a t-stem-noun *₃⁵₄ gos-t- ‘hunger’.

In my view, this interpretation cannot be upheld. I do not see how it is possible that this nominal t-suffix ends up in the Hittite verb kišt ordeal. We would expect that a verbal derivative of the noun kāšt- would retain the vocalism of the noun, would show a derivational suffix (e.g. *₃⁵₄ -w/o-) and would be semantically more close to the noun (e.g. ‘to hunger out’). In my opinion, if kāšt- and kišt- are cognate (which is formally likely), they can only be regarded as showing the same root, which then must be *₃⁵₄ KesT- ‘to starve’. Note that the whole idea of deriving kāšt-
from “*ges-” ‘to extinguish’ is based on the assumption that TochA kašt, TochB kest ‘hunger’ and TochAB kās- ‘to be extinguished’ are cognate, while within Tocharian there is no indication (semantically nor formally) that these words belong together.

All in all, I assume that Hitt. kāṣt- ‘hunger’ (with derivatives kištujaat- ‘hungry’ and kištant- ‘hunger’) is related to kištō, ‘to be extinguished’ and that they reflect *KosT- and KṣT-ōrī respectively, derived from a root *KešT- ‘to starve’. If Hlw. “*ā-sa-ta- indeed denotes ‘hunger’, it would imply a PAnat. reconstruction *gōšT-. The only known outer-Anatolian cognate is TochA kašt, TochB kest ‘hunger’, which reflect *KosT-. For the PIE reconstruction, it is of importance that PAnat. *gō can reflect PIE *gō as well as *gōh. Although the attested forms do not shed any light on the nature of the PIE dental (fortis, lenis or glottalized), I think that reconstructing *d is best in view of the absence of PIE verbal roots that end in *-st- and *-sd-. (cf. LIV2; for *-sd- compare *pesd- ‘to fart’, *gōeisd- ‘to startle’, *hzeisd- ‘to honour’). If this is correct, then the initial consonant should have been *gōh- (PIE roots never contain two glottal stops). I therefore (tentatively) reconstruct a verbal root *gōhōsd- ‘to starve’, which was the basis for a root noun *gōhōsd- ‘starvation, hunger’ (Hitt. kāṣt-, TochA kašt, TochB kest), an adjective *gōhsd-uemt- ‘starving’ (Hitt. kištujaat-) and the middle verb *gōhōsd-ō ‘to be starved > to be extinguished’ (Hitt. kištō).


PIE *kmto + *kʷr-ent-

See Puhvel HED 4: 123-4 for attestations and etymology: this word undoubtedly is a compound of *katta- and *kurant-, thus originally meaning something like ‘under-cut’. See at katta and kuera.² / kur- for further etymologies.


Anat. cognates: CLuw. **gātuluzzi-** (n.) ‘threshold’ (nom.-acc.sg. kat-ta-lu-
uz-[z]l-ša).

PIE *kmto + *lut-i-

See Puhvel HED 4: 124-5 for attestations. This word has received many etymologies (see the overview in Puhvel), none of which can be judged as
evident. In my view, we should interpret this word as *katta ‘alongside’ + *luzzi-, the assibilated variant of the oblique stem *lutti- as found in the paradigm of *luttāi- / *luttī- ‘window’. Whereas in *luttāi- / *luttī-, which reflects *lut-(oj)i-, the -ti- was generalised throughout the paradigm on the basis of *luttāi, in *katta-lutta- the *ti did assimilate in front of *i (which shows that at time the word was not analyzed as *katta ‘alongside’ + *lutti- ‘window’ anymore). See at *katta and lutāi / lutti- for further etymology.

Starke (1990: 214) regards the CLuwian word, which he cites as *kattaluzzīt-, as a loanword from Hittite, which indeed is necessary to explain the -z-.

*katta* (adv., prev.) ‘downwards’, (postpos. + gen.) ‘(along) with, alongside’.

(Sum. GAM(-ta)): *kat-ta* (OS), *ka-at-ta* (KUB 20.4 vi 4 (OH/NS), KUB 20.43, 9 (OH/NS)).

Derivatives: *kattan* (adv.) ‘below, underneath’ (Sum. GAM-ān, *kat-ta-an* (OS)), *kattī* (adv. with encl. poss. pron.) ‘(along) with’ (+ 1sg.: *kat-ti-mi* (OS, often), *kat-ti=m-mi* (KBo 3.22 rev. 77 (OS)), *kat-te=mi* (KBo 3.38 rev. 21 (OH/NS)); + 2sg.: *kat-ti=ti* (MH/MS, often), *kat-ti=t-ti* (KUB 20.7, 13 (OH/NS), KUB 7.5 i 25 (MH/NS)); + 3sg.: *kat-ti=s-ši* (OS, often), *kat-ti=ši* (KUB 30.10 i 4 (OH/MS), KUB 7.5 iv 4 (MH/NS)), *kat-ti-e=š-ši* (KUB 7.41+ ii 24 (MH/NS), KUB 20.52 i 27 (MH/NS), KUB 20.83 iii 9 (NS)), *kat-te-e=š-ši* (KBo 3.38 rev. 32 (OH/NS)); + 1pl.: *kat-ti=šu-mī* (HKM 57 rev. 21 (MH/MS)), *kat-te-e=š-šum[...]* (KBo 13.110 rev. 2 (NS)); +2/3pl.: *kat-ti-i=š-mī* (OS, often), *ka-at-ti-i=š-mī* (KBo 30.36 rev. 4 (OS), *kat-ti-e=š-mī* (KBo 10.25 vi 14 (OH/NS), KBo 11.16 iv 10 (OH/NS)), *kattanda* (adv.) ‘downwards, along’ (*kat-ta-an-da* (MH/MS), *kat-ta-an-ta* (MH/MS)).

Anat. cognates: HLuw. *kata* (adv.) ‘down, under’ (INFRA-tañ, INFRA-tañ, katanta (adv.) ‘below’ (INFRA-tañ-tañ (AKSARAY §6)); Lyd. *kat-* (prev.) ‘?’,

*kar-* (prev.) ‘?’.

IE cognates: Gr. *kattā* ‘down, along, according to, against’, OIr. *cēt*, OWe. *cant* ‘with’, Lat. *cum* ‘with’, etc.

PIE *kʰm-t-*

The semantics as given above describe the OH situation as established by Starke (1977: 131-5, 181-7), namely that we must distinguish between a “locatival adverb” *kattan* ‘below, underneath’, a “terminative adverb” *katta* ‘downwards’, a “locatival postposition (+ genitive)” *katta* ‘(along) with’ and a “locatival adverb (+ enclitic personal pronouns)” *kattī* = ‘(along) with’. From the MH period onwards the distinction between *katta* and *kattan* is being given up.
Since Neu (1974a: 67) it is generally assumed that *katta, *kattan and *katti are petrified all.sg., acc.sg. and dat.-loc.sg. respectively of an original nominal stem *katt-. Already Bugge *apud Knudtzon (1902: 59) saw *katta as cognate of Gr. κατά ‘downwards’, which, together with Olfr. céz ‘with’, OWe. cant ‘with’ clearly must belong with Lat. cum ‘with’, etc. and reflect *k'mt-. Nevertheless, there has been some discussion on whether or not this etymology is correct, especially because of the absence of a reflex of the *-m- in *k'mt- > *katt-. As Melchert states (1994a: 126): “the idea the syllabic *m regularly loses its nasalization before another consonant is contradicted by *k'nta-” ‘blue’, which is derived from *md'ro-. Other examples Melchert (1994a: 125) gives for the assumption that *N keeps its nasalization are *snn- ‘to disappear, to withdraw’ > šamm- (see šamen-2 / šamn-) and *ns- ‘us’ > anz-. However, it is not imperative that a preform *k'mt- would behave similar as a sequence *#NC- (like in antara- and anz̄iš) or *CNNV (like in šamn-). On the contrary, if kappi- / kappai- ‘little’ indeed reflects *kmtb'-i-, it would show that a sequence *TNT- > Hitt. TaT (in which T = any stop), and that a development *k'mt- > Hitt. *katt- is in perfect order.

All in all, I reconstruct *k'nt(o), *k'nt(om) and *k'nt(oe) as *k'mt-o(ei). The absence of accentuation (no plene vowels) is explained by the establishment that in poetic verse local adverbs and postpositions are unstressed (cf. Melchert 1998a: 485).

kattera- (adj.) ‘lower, inferior; infernal; farther along’ (Sum. GAM-ra-):
nom.sg.c. kat-te-er-ra-aš (KUB 17.14 iv 17 (NS)), acc.sg.c. kat-te-ra-an (KBo 39.280 iii 11 (NH)), nom.-acc.sg.n. kat-te-ra (Bo 3078 ii 9 (NS), kat-te-er-ra (KBo 13.104 + Bo 6464 ii 7 (NS)), dat.-loc.sg. kat-te-ri (KBo 4.2 i 30, 35, 43 (OH/NS)), kat-te-er-ri (KBo 10.24 iv 31 (OH/NS)), kat-ti-ir-ri (KUB 26.9 i 6 (MH/NS)), kat-ti-ir-[l] (KUB 33.115 ii 6 (MH/NS)), all.sg. kat-te-ra (IBoT 1.36 iv 15 (MH/MS)), kat-te-er-ra (KUB 10.3 ii 23 (NS), KBo 6.29 ii 12 (NH), KUB 36.18 ii 18 (MH/NS)), loc.sg. kat-te-e-er (KUB 30.32 i 11 (MS) // KBo 18.190 obv. 6 (fr.) (NS)), abl. kat-te-ra-az (Bo 3617 i 7 (NS), KBo 15.24 ii 32 (MH/NS)), kat-te-er-ra-az (KBo 4.9 iv 34 (NS), KUB 210d. 2 (fr.) (NS)), kat-te-er-ra-aš (KBo 13.104 + Bo 6464 ii 3 (NS)), kat-ti-ir-ra-az (KBo 10.24 iv 20 (OH/NS)), nom.pl.c. kat-te-re-eš (KUB 34.90, 3 (NS)), kat-te-re-eš (Bo 3617 ii 9 (NS)), kat-te-er-ri-iš (KBo 13.104 + Bo 6464 ii 6 (NS)), kat-te-ri-iš (Bo 3078 ii 9 (NS)), kat-te-er-ru-iš (KUB 17.14 rev. 21 (NS)), kat-ti-ir-ru-iš (KBo 15.9 i 19 (NS)), kat-te-ra-aš (KUB 6.31 iv 6 (NS)), dat.-loc.pl. kat-te-e-ra-aš (KBo 32.19 ii 38 (MH/MS)).

PIE *ʼkmt-éro-

See e.g. Puhvel HED 4: 131f. for attestations. The two MS attestations kat-te-ra and kat-te-e-ra-as clearly show that the single spelling of *-r* is original. The fact that in NS texts we often come across the spelling *kat-te-er-r* with geminate *-rr*-, must be due to the occasional NH gemination of intervocalic resonants as described by Melchert 1994a: 165. The few forms that are spelled with the sign TI *(kat-ti-i-r)* probably are due to the NH mixing up of the signs TE and TI (cf. Melchert 1984a: 137). Moreover, the MS attestation kat-te-e-ra- with plene *e*-clearly points to a phonological interpretation *katéra-*. It is in my view evident that this word reflects *ʼkmt-éro-*, a derivative of the stem katt-, for which see katta.

**katti=-** see at katta


PIE *ʼkhyel-(*e)u-?

See Puhvel HED 4: 138f. for attestations. Although the basic noun *kattu-* is only attested once, on the basis of the derivatives kattuyae- and kattayatar we can set up an adjective *kattu-* / kattay- ‘aggrieved, inimical’. Laroche (1965: 51) compared these words to Gr. κόπος ‘spite, anger’, which is usually connected with OIr. *cath* ‘strife, battle’ *(which reflects *katu- as in the personal names Gaul.*
Catu-riges, OHG Hadu-brand), MHG hader ‘fight, struggle’ and Skt. śātru- ‘enemy’. These words point to a root *khet- (laryngeal needed to explain OIr. -a-), which would mean that Hitt. kattu- / kattay- reflects *khet-eu-. Note that this implies that CLuw. kattayatnalli- cannot be genuinely Luwian, since *k > Luw. z-, and therefore must be an adaptation of the Hittite word.


See Puhvel HED 4: 141 and Rieken 1999a: 467 for attestation. The word usually occurs with the determinative GADA and therefore must denote some cloth. Puhvel just states that this word does not have an etymology, but Rieken treats this word rather extensively. She translates the word as “Tuch zum Abtrocknen”, although she also states that “[e]ine inhaltliche Spezifizierung der Tuchbezeichnung anhand der Belege ist kaum möglich”. According to her, the word must be a derivative in -ul- (< PIE *-yll) from a verb *kazzarnu- (for the formation she compares the hapaxes dalugnu- and pargamu- (see at daluki- / dalugai- and parkije/a-2 respectively)). She states that the root kazzar- could be connected with *kšero- (Gr. ἕξον ‘fast, dry land’, Lat. serēscunt ‘they dry’; OHG serawēn ‘to become dry’). As a parallel for the development *#kš- > #k’s- she gives zakkar- /škar < *skōr. As I have argued at škkar, zakkar /šakr- the initial cluster zk- from zakkar is not phonetically regular. Moreover, under the lemma kāšt- / kišt- we see that *Kst- yields Hitt. kist- /kist-. All in all, I find Rieken’s assumption that kazzarnul- reflects *kser-irul- phonetically improbable. Moreover, since the exact meaning of this noun cannot be established, this etymology lacks any semantic background as well.

(UZL) genu- / ganu- (n. > c.) ‘knee’: nom.-acc.sg. ge-e-nu (OH/MS), ge-nu (OH/NS), acc.sg.c. ge-nu-um (KBo 20.73 i 2 (MS), KUB 9.34 iii 37 (NS)), ke-nu-um (KUB 9.34 iii 34 (NS)), ge-e-nu-ya-an (Bo 4463, 13 (NS)), gen.sg. ge-nu-ya-aš (OS), ge-e-nu-ya-aš (OH/NS), dat.-loc.sg. ge-nu-ú=š-ši (MH/NS), ge-nu-ya (NS), abl. ge-e-nu-ya-za (NH), ge-nu-ya-az (OH/NS), instr. [g]e-nu-t=a-at=kán (OS), ge-nu-ut (OH/NS), ga-nu-ut (OH/MS), nom.-acc.pl.n. ge-e-nu-ya (NH), ge-nu-ya (MH/NS), acc.pl.c. ge-e-nu-úš=šu-úš (NS), ge-nu-úš=šu-úš (NH), dat-
loc.pl. ge-nu-aš (MS), ge-e-nu-ya-aš (OH/NS), ge-nu-ya-aš (OH/NS), ka-nu-ya-aš (NS).


IE cognates: Skt. jānu-, Gr. γόνιος, TochA kanw-, Lat. genū, Goth. kniu ‘knee’.

PIE *ĝěnu-/*ґн-еw-

See Puhvel HED 4: 146f. for attestations. Already since Hrozný (1919: 184), this word is connected with the words for ‘knee’ in the other IE languages. These words show a few ablaut variants: Skt. jānu-, Gr. γόνιος, TochA kanw-, TochB keni reflect *ĝōn-u-; Lat. genū reflects *ɡén-u-; and Goth. kniu, ON knō, OE cnōw < *ґн-eu-. Because in Hittite the signs Gi and Ki can be read gi and ge and kí and ke respectively, the spellings Gi-e-nu-, Gi-mu- and Ki-mu- can all be interpreted as /kén-u- < *ɡénu-. The spellings ka-nu- and ga-nu- are sometimes interpreted as reflecting *ɡōnu-, but in my view this is not very likely. We would expect that *ó > Hitt. ā, spelled **ka-a-nu-. I therefore assume that ga-nu- and ka-nu- represent /knu- < *ɡn-(e)u-. Such a zero-grade formation is not only visible in the Germanic forms, but also in e.g. Skt. jñu- (in compounds), Av. dat.-abl.pl. žnubiu and Gr. dat.pl. γυνεκα ‘on knees’.

With these three ablaut grades attested in the IE languages, it is difficult to reconstruct a PIE paradigm. Beekes (1995: 188) states that on the basis of the e- and o-grade, we should reconstruct a static paradigm nom.-acc. *ɡónu, gen. *ɡěnu-s and that the forms that show *ɡn-eu- are secondary. Nevertheless, the Hittite forms seem to point to a paradigm *ɡěnu, *ɡěn-eu-s.

The verb kanuššarīje/a-² must be compared to e.g. nahšarije/a-² ‘to be afraid’ (*nehš-sr-je/o-) and possibly šešarije/a-² ‘to sieve’ (*sehš-sr-je/o-?), and reflects *ɡn-eu-sr-je/o- or *ɡn-u-sr-je/o- (compare Rieken 1999a: 276). The e-grade form genuššarije/a- must be secondary to the noun.

kenu-²: see kīnu-²

(1zu) genzu- (n.) ‘abdomen, lap’: nom.-acc.sg. ge-en-zu (OH/MS), ke-e-en-zu (OH/NS), ge-en-zu-u (OH/NS), ge-e[e[n-z]u (NS), gi-im-zu (1x, NH), gi-im-zu (1x, NH), abl. ge-en-zu-[ya]-az], instr. [ge]-en-zu-i-t=a-at=kán (KBo 30.30 rev.
JHQ]X 542 parts. Besides its literal meaning, it also occurs metaphorically in expressions like (OS)), nom.-acc.pl. ge-en-zu-u-ya (OH/NS), dat.-loc.pl. ge-en-zu-ya-aš (MH/MS, OH/NS).

Derivatives: *genzu/a-¹, *genzu/aed- (lc1 / lc2) ‘to treat gently, to be compassionate (towards), to be kind (to)’ (2sg.pres.act. ge-en-zu-ya-i-ši (OH/NS), ge-en-zu-ya-ši (OH/MS), 3sg.pret.act. ge-en-zu-ya-it (OH/NS), 2sg.imp.act. ge-en-zu-ya-i (NH)), *genzu/ala- (adj.) ‘kindhearted’ (nom.sg.c. ge-en-zu-ya-la-aš (NH), gi-in-zu-ya-la-aš (MH/NS)).

PIE *ğen₁-su-

See Puhvel HED 4: 154f. for attestations. The word denotes a body part, which can be identified with the lower abdomen on the basis of its place in lists of body parts. Besides its literal meaning, it also occurs metaphorically in expressions like genzu ḍa-¹ / ḍ- ‘to take pity on’, genzu ḥar(k)-a-² ‘to have fondness for’, genzu pai-¹ / pi- ‘to extend kindness’, but also in its derivatives *genzu/aed- ‘to be gentle with’ and *genzu/ala- ‘kindhearted’. The literal meaning ‘lower abdomen’ (‘area of the loins’?) and the metaphoric meaning ‘kindness’ seem to fit the PIE root *ğeh₁₃-s- ‘to beget, to procreate’ (Skt. jā̃ts- ‘to procreate, Gr. γενόμαι ‘to come into being’, Lat. nātus ‘born’, etc.; for the meaning ‘kindness’, cf. Lat. gentilis ‘gentle’, ModEng. kind). It is therefore quite generally assumed that genzu-reflects *ğen₁-su- (cf. Skt. rāṁsu- ‘enjoyable’, dhākṣu- ‘burning’, but also Hitt. tepsu- < *đe²b³-su-), but details are unclear. The biggest question is how the cluster -nz- came about, especially in comparison to the fact that *VnsV > Hitt. VššV. For instance, Eichner (1973a: 55, 86) therefore assumes that in *ğen₁-su-the laryngeal was vocalized to *genasu- and that this vocalized laryngeal only got syncopated after the assimilation of *-ns- to -š-. The secondary cluster *-ns- then yielded -nz-. Problematic however is that neither vocalization of laryngeals (cf. Melchert 1994a: 65) nor syncope of vowels is a regular phonetic development in Hittite. Rieken (1999a: 220-1) remarks that Skt. dhākṣu- is remodelled after an o-stem, while rāṁsu- goes back to an IE s-stem *rēm-e/os- (although opinions differ on this, cf. Mayrhofer 1986-2002: 2.428). In the same way genzu- then could be derived from the s-stem *ğen₁-s-e/os- (Gr. γενέω Lat. genus). According to Rieken, “[d]ie Bewahrung des Nasals vor dem Sibilanten und die Epenthese van t in genzu-, die der normalen Entwicklung widersprechen, erklären sich aus dem Bedürfnis, die Morphemgrenzen deutlich zu bewahren”. This is rather ad hoc, however. In my view, the solution is quite simple: just as *-ms- and *-mh₁s-behaved differently when in intervocalic position (*VmsV > VššV (*h₂emsu- > ḫaššu-) whereas *Vmh₁sV > VnsV (*h₂omh₁s> ≥nši)), so did -ns- and -nh₁s-
behave differently as well. The first one assimilated to -šš-, whereas *Vnh₁šV
yielded VnzV (for this outcome compare *CnsV > CanzV and *CmsV > CanzV).

The preservation of -e- is quite remarkable. Apparently, genzu- < *geh-su-
did not participate in the sound law *eRCC > aRCC, nor in the sound law *enT >
andT. This means that we have to set up the following relative chronology: (1)
*enT > andT; (2) *Vnh₁šV > VnzV; (3) *eRCC > aRCC.

(UZI) ker / kard(i)- (n.) ‘heart; center, core’ (Sum. ŠÂ, Akk. LIBBU); nom.-acc.sg.
ke-er (MH/MS, OH/NS), ge-er (MS), gen.sg. kar-ti-ja-aš (MH/MS), kar-di-ja-aš
(OH/NS), kar-di-aš (OH/NS), dat.-loc.sg. kar-di (OS), kar-ti (OS), kar-ti-i (NH),
kar-di-ja-a=i-ta=m=a-at=kân (KUB 33.68 ii 10 (OH/NS)), ke-er-ti (MH/NS),
all.sg. kar-ta (MS), kar-da (OH/NS), erg.sg. kar-di-an-za (OS or MS), abl.
karta-az (OS), instr. kar-di-it (OH/MS).

Derivatives: see šallakarta- and kardimije/a/-z.

Anat. cognates: Pal. kärt- ‘heart’ (dat.-loc.sg. ka-a-ar-ti); CLuw. UZI zârt-‘heart’
(nom.-acc.sg. za-a-ar-za, dat.-loc.sg. za-ar-tn, abl.-instr. UZI ŠÂ-tn, case?
za-ar-tna); HLuw. cor zart(i)- (n.) ‘heart’ (nom.-acc.sg. ëart=sal/ za+ra/i-za
(KULULU 5 §11), gen.sg. ëart=arias/ cor za+ra/i'-i-ia-sâ (ALEPPO 3 §1), dat.-
loc.sg. ëart=i/ za+ra/i-ti (KARABURUN §12), gen.adj.acc.sg.c. ëartasin/
za+ra/i-ta-si-na (KÖRKÜN §11), zaritja- ‘to wish’ (3sg.pres.act. ëartit/i/
za+ra/i-ti-i-i) (KARABURUN §7, §9, TELL AHMAR 2 §13, SULTANHAN
§46), 3sg.pret.act. ëartita/ cor za+ra/i-ti-i-i-ta (TELL AHMAR 1 §20).
PAnat. *kêr, *krdios, *krd-.

IE cognates: Gr. kês, Arm. sîrt, OCS sre>bce, Lith. širdis, OPr. seyr, Lat. cor,
Ofr. eride, Skt. hûrdi / hrd-, hydaya- ‘heart’
PIE *kêr, *krd-i-ös, *krd-.

See Puhvel HED 4: 189f. and Rieken 1999a: 52f. for attestations. Some forms
need comments. The nom.-acc.sg.-form is spelled with the signs KI, GI and IR
that can stand for ki and ke, gi and ge and ir and er respectively. This means that
both a phonological interpretation /kit/ and /ket/ is possible. Since this form
alternates with kard(i)-, I have chosen to read it as /ket/ because the vowel -e-
is expected in such an alternation. Besides the well-attested gen.sg. /krdias/, Rieken
(I.c.) also cites a gen.sg. kartaš on the basis of kar'-ta-as-ma in the following context:

VBoT 58 i

(12) nu Ù[HI]-an KUR. KUR[MSGU₄[HI]-A UDU[HI]-A UR.GI₄[HI]-A ŠA[H]₄[HI]-A ti-in-n[u-zí/ul]
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In the break in line 13 she reads [Ū-Û]L and concludes that we then need an
adversative =ma (so kar'-ta-aš=ma) in order to translate “Gräser, Länder, Rinder,
Schafe, Hunde (und) Schweine lähmte er, aber die Söhne des Herzens und das
Getreide lähmt er nicht”. HW² H: 54 reads [ũš]rš[T]N in the break, however,
and interprets kar'-ta-aš=ma as karta=šma, translating “Die Gräsers/Kräuter der
Länder/Landstriche, die Rinder, Schafe, Hunde (und) Schweine(n) läh[m]t sie; die
Kinder in ihrem “Herzen”, die Getreide (und) den [We]in(stock)? ... lähmt sie.”
All in all, I judge this passage as too unclear to base an otherwise unattested
gen.sg. kartaš on.

In Luwian, we find zarti(-) ‘heart’ (note that nom.-acc.sg. CLuw. zärza and
HLuw. za+ra/i-za have to be analysed as /zär-sal/, showing the secondary neuter
suffix -sa attached to a stem zart- (and not as zar + -sa, cf. yär-ša ‘water’)).
Apparently, the form that corresponds to Hitt. nom.-acc.sg. ker (we would expect
Luw. **zir) was replaced by the oblique stem. The similarity between Hitt.
gen.sg. kardijaš and HLuw. gen.sg. za+ra/i-ia-sa is remarkable and points to
PAnat. *krdios. All in all, we can reconstruct a PAnat. paradigm *kēr, *krdios,
*krd-. Already since Hrozný (1922b: 69'), Hitt. ker / kard(i)- has been connected to
other IE words for ‘heart’ like Gr. kēr, Lat. cor, etc. The nominative-accusative
must be reconstructed as *kēr on the basis of Gr. kēr, Skt. hārdi, Arm. sirt, OPr.
seyr. The PAnat. gen.sg. *krdios can be compared to i-extensions as visible in Gr.
ḳāpānī ‘heart’ and Skt. hrdaya-, Av. zarašāia-.

The interpretation of the word ke-er-ti-it-ta in KBo 3.21 iii (11) ḳLM-aš ke-er-ti-
it-ta mi-nu-an-du li-išši=ma=a=t-ta ya-ar-aš-nu-an-du has been matter of
debate. Puhvel (o.c.: 190) analyses kerti=tta and interprets kerti as a nom.-acc.sg.
variant besides ker, which, he assumes, may be “a variant reinforced by the
Hittite proliferation of i-stems in terms for body parts (e.g. arki-, ḫaṛri-, lišši-
...’). He translates the sentence in question as ‘may they soothe thy heart
[partitive apposition], and may they calm thy liver’. This interpretation is rather
ad hoc and unsatisfactory. Eichner (1979a: 45b) analyses the form as kir=ti=tta,
showing a suffixless loc.sg. kir followed by the enclitic possessive pronoun =tti.
He therefore translates ‘In deinem Herzen sollen sie dich milde stimmen, in
deiner Leber (d.h. Sinn, Gemüt) aber besänftigen!’ However, the assumption that
the second person is expressed by using two enclitic particles (the possessive
pronounal enclitic =tti- and the enclitic pronoun =tta) is not very appealing.
Neu (1980a: 31-33) analyses the form as kerti=tta and comments that kerti
should be taken as a loc.sg. that reflects *kêrd-i. This analysis, kerti=taa, certainly fits the parallel word-chain lîšši=ma=taa best. Rieken (1999a: 53) rejects Neu’s interpretation, however, because she does not believe that *kêrd-i would yield Hitt. kerti: according to her *êRC > aRC, and thus *kêrd-i > karti. The fact that *êRCV remains eRCV is clearly visible in e.g *k’êrmî > kuermî, however, and therefore Neu’s interpretation is phonetically regular as well. This means that kerti would be the regular outcome of the PIE loc.sg. *kêrd-i, whereas Hitt. dat.-loc.sg. karti goes back to the PIE dat.sg. *kêrd-êi. Note that Puhvel also cites a dat.-loc.sg. girdi on the basis of KUB 53.50 i (3) URU-aš gir-di ‘in the heart of the city’, but this is problematic in view of the fact that this would be the only instance known to me where the sign GIR has to be read phonetically.

keš2; see kîš2


PIE *gēsr-


PIE *gēs-r/*gēs-r-m/*gēs-r-ōs

See Puhvel HED 4: 160f. and Rieken 1999a: 278f. for attestations. Already since Sturtevant (1927a: 121) this word is generally connected with Gr. χείρ ‘hand’, which in view of Arm. jeēn and Skt. hāṣṭa- ‘hand’ must reflect *gēs-r. In Hittite, we find a variety of forms, of which it is not always clear how to interpret them, despite the obvious etymon. The oldest forms (OS and MS) are the following:

nom.sg. keššar, acc.sg. kiššeran, gen.sg. kišša(ra), dat.-loc.sg. kišša(r)ī, all.sg. kišrā, abl. kiš(ša)raz, instr. kiššarat/kiššarta, acc.pl. kiššeru, dat.-loc.pl. kišraš.

In younger times, we see that some forms occur that reflect a thematic stem kiššera- (nom.sg. kiššeraš (NS), gen.sg. kiššeraš (NS)) and kišša-ra- (nom.sg. kiššaraš (MS), instr. kiššarit (NS)) (see Weitenberg 1995 on the thematicization and sigmatization of original asigmatic commune nominatives). According to Rieken (i.c., following Schindler) the original paradigm of *gēs-r- must have been ‘holodynamic’, *gēs-ēr/*gēs-ēr m/*gēs-ē-s/*gēs-ē-ś, of which she states that “[d]as Hethitische setzt dieses mit den Stämmen keššar und kišša(ra)- fast lautgesetzlich fort” (o.c.: 280). This view, with which I do not agree at all, is supported by her incorrect idea that the vowel e/i in kiššer- / kiššir- is “lediglich graphischen Ursprungs”.

If nom.sg. keššar would reflect *gēs-ēr, I do not know how to explain the geminate -ēs-: I would expect an outcome **keša or even **keša (cf. § 1.4.6.2.a for the loss of wordfinal *-r after unaccentuated *-ē). In my view, the geminate of keššar can only be explained by a pre-form *gēs-r, in which *s has been fortited due to contact with -r-. With this pre-form it is an exact match with Gr. χείρ. The reconstructed acc.sg. *gēs-ēr m should have regularly yielded Hitt. **keššaran, which is not attested at all. Already in OS texts, we find kiššeran, which can either be interpreted as /kišēran/ < *gēs-ē-m for the possible development of *KsV- > Hitt. /KiSV-/ compare kqēš- / kišt- and the total absence of Hittite words that start in **kašV- < *KsV-; the geminate -ēs- must be compared to *VksV > Hitt. /NkSV/, cf. § 1.4.4.2) or as /kišēran/ < *gēs-ē-m (with /l/ going back to pre-tonic *e; note that we then should assume generalization of geminate -ēs- out of the other cases). The oldest attestations of gen.sg. kišraš and kiššaraš stand for /kišras/ < *gēs-ē-r-ōs or for /kisras/ < *gēs-ē-r-ōs (compare Gr. χειριζος < *gēs-ē-ōs). Dat.-loc.sg. kiš(ša)rī, all.sg. kišrā and abl. kiš(ša)raz stand for /kišr-ī < *gēs-ē-r-ī or /kišr-ī < *gēs-ē-r-ī. Instr. kiššarta /
kiššarat stands for /kiSt/ < *gʰs-r-t. Acc.pl. kiššaruš stands for /kiSérus/ < *gʰs-ér-ms, compare acc.sg.

All in all, in my opinion it is clear that the Hittite material points to an original hysterondynamic paradigm *gʰs-r̥s, *gʰs-ér-m, *gʰs-r̥s-os, etc. (according to the ‘fourth subtype’ as described in Beekes 1995: 175).

The Luwian forms, CLuw. īš(a)ra/i-, HLuw. istr/i-, and Lyc. ızr/i-, reflect PLuw. */iSra/i-/*ges-r̥o-, a thematicized form of PA *ges-r̥. The fact that *e yields Luw. -i- may show that it was pretonic (cf. Hajnal 1995: 63). It should be noted that the appurtenance of CLuw. īšaryja/i-, ēšarila/i- and īšarununa/i- is uncertain because of the deviant semantics (the basic meaning seems to be ‘favourable’) and the occurrence of single -i- vs. the geminate -šš- found in pīš(a)ra/i-.

**keš-t**: see kiš-t

**ketkar** (adv.) ‘at the head (of), on top’: ke-et-kar=ša-me-et (OS), ke-et-kar (OH/MS), ke-et-kar-za (OH/NS), ke-et-kar-az (MH/MS), ke-et-kar-aš (MH/MS), ke-ek-kar (NS).

IE cognates: Gr. ἑπὶ κάρ ‘head down’, ὀξὺ κάρ ‘upwards’.

PIE *kēd + *ḵrh(2)

See Puhvel HED 4: 201-2 for attestations. Since Josephson (1966: 135) this adverb is generally seen as a univerbation of *ket, the old abl/instr. case of *kā- / kā- / ki- ‘this’, followed by kar, which must be compared to Gr. ἑπὶ κάρ ‘head down’, ὀξὺ κάρ ‘upwards’, which must somehow reflect PIE *ḵrh₂ ‘head, horn’.

The interpretation of ket as an old abl/instr. is supported by the fact that in younger times -kar is replaced by the ablativeval -karz.

The interpretation of -kar ~ κάρ is difficult. Puhvel (l.c.) explains it as a suffixless locative, but safely gives no reconstruction. Rieken (1999a: 250, with reference to Nussbaum) assumes that these forms reflect *-ḵrh₂, which would be the reduced form of *ḵrh₂ in univerbation. It is difficult to judge whether a development *ḵrh₂ > Hitt. kar, Gr. κάρ is regular. In Greek, I know of no comparable instances of *-Crh₂#. Rix (1992: 75) only cites examples for the outcome of *-Cnh₂#: *ḵrh₂sn-h₂ > Gr. (Hom.) κάρτα and *gʰelh₂-mn-h₂ > Gr. (Hom.) βαλμα ‘projectile’. These forms show that we would expect that *-ḵrh₂ yielded Gr. **κάρ. In Hittite, if kar reflects *ḵrh₂, we would have to assume loss of word-final laryngeal (as does Melchert 1994a: 87).
Prins (1997: 202-3), after summing up the discussion in detail, assumes that the preforms of *ketkar and Gr. ἐρικόπ may never have had a laryngeal at all. She argues that the univerbation *-kr stems from the time that there still was a root *ker- ‘bone substance’ (of which later the extensions *ker-h2- ‘head’, *ker-no- ‘horn’ e.a. were formed). According to her, this *-kr did not receive a laryngeal at all, because “already in PIE the form *-kr in univerbated forms was fossilized”.

This assumption (although rather radical) indeed solves the formal problems of ketkar. A parallel formation of ket + abl. we find in ket(-)pantalaz (q.v.).


See Puhvel HED 4: 202-3 for attestations. The form këtpantalaz, which is attested thus several times, is clearly a univerbation of ket and pantalaz. This is not only clear from the fact that this expression is written with a word space between the two elements in MS texts, but also because of the parallel expression a-pë-et pa-an-ta-la-az ‘from that time on’. For a treatment of ket, see kâr- / kêr- / kî- ‘this’; for a treatment of pantalaz see at pantalaz.


Anat. cognates: Pal. kër- ‘to lie’ (3sg.pres.midd. kī-i-ta-ar); CLuw. čr ‘to lie’ (3sg.pres.midd. zi-ja-ar, zi-i-ja-rī); Lyc. sî- ‘to lie’ (1sg.pres.midd. sîǰēni, 3sg.pres.midd. sîǰēni, sîǰēni, 3pl.pres.midd. sîǰēni).

PAnat. *kēi-.

IE cognates: Skt. śāyé, śéte ‘to lie’, Av. sačē ‘to lie’, Gr. κέκτω / kέκτω ‘to lie’.

PIE *ḱēi-to / *ḱēi-n-to

See Puhvel HED 4: 169f. for attestations. Already since Hrozný (1917: 35) this verb is generally regarded as the cognate of Skt. śay- and Gr. κέκτω ‘to lie’, which reflect *ḱēi-. Because the Sanskrit and the Greek verb show the static inflection (Skt. 3sg. śāye, 3pl. śēre; Gr. 3sg. κέκτω, 3pl. κέκτω < *ḱēi-n-to), we
would expect that in Hittite we would find a static inflection as well. Because
normally *-ei- would monophthongize to Hitt. -ē-, Eichner (1973a: 78) assumed
that *-ei- is raised to -ē after a velar consonant (also in kīšʷ(-) / kīš- (q.v.)).
Although such a raising is generally accepted now, it still is problematic why
kitt(a)ri) shows a short -i- throughout its paradigm, especially since shortening of
long vowels in closed syllable is not usual (cf. kānkhi < kōnk-hēi). For instance,
Oettinger (1979a: 525) noticed that the Palaic form kītar, in contrast to Hitt.
kitt(a)ri), shows a long vowel -ē and a lenited stop /dl/, due to the preceding
accentuated long vowel. This means that Hittite must have reintroduced the
unlenited ending -itt(a)ri), which, according to Oettinger, caused the shortening of
the vowel. Melchert (1994a: 145) hesitates in believing this theory: he remarks
that the form yēt- 'year' < *yēt- shows a long -ē in a closed syllable and
therefore seems to contradict this. In my view, this is not necessarily true: the
plene spelling ū-i-it-tō does not have to indicate vowel length: it can be used just
to disambiguate the ambiguous sign IT that can be read it as well as et.
Nevertheless, I would like to reexamine the chronology of the development *Kei-
> kē-

As we can see, the raising of *Kei- > Kē- occurred in all Anatolian languages:
*Kei- > Pal. kē-, CLuw. zē- and Lyc. sē(i)-. This is therefore probably a Proto-Anatolian development. Eichner (1.c.) assumes that *Kej- > *kē-
(regular monophthongization of *-ei-) and that then the velar gets palatalized to *kē-, due
to which *kē- is raised, yielding *kē- in -ē. In my view, we should rather assume
*Kej- was raised to *kē- before the monophthongization of *-ei- to -ē. In the
case of ki-sté(ri), this means that PIE *kēj-tor yielded PAnat. *kējtor. This *kējtor
fell victim to lenition due to the accentuated diphthong, yielding *kējtor. This
*kējtor is the immediate preform of Pal. kētar (with monophthongization of *-ēi-
> -ē). In Pre-Hittite, the synchronically aberrant ending *-ēr is replaced by the
normal ending *-ēr (with fortis /h/), yielding *kējtor. It should be noted that /h/
was phonetically a long (geminate) consonant: [kējtor] or [kējtor]. In this form, the
triconsonantal cluster *-ēr- is simplified to -ēr- through loss of the consonantal
part of the diphthong *-ēr-, a development comparable to *kēsC > kisC, but also
*linkC > likC and harkC > harC. This simplification then yielded Hitt. kēta(ri).

Within Sanskrit, we find two separate 3sg.pres.-forms, namely śāye < *kēi-o-i
and śete < *kēi-to-i. The idea is that the ending *-o is the old static ending,
whereas -to originally belonged with the real middle. On the basis of Hitt. kēta
and Pal. kētar < *kēi-to besides CLuw. zējari and Lyc. sējēn < *kēi-o, we must
assume that Proto-Anatolian possessed both forms as well (which shows that
already in PIE there were two forms: archaic *kēi-o and renewed *kēi-to). From
the two forms, *kēi-o ‘won’ in the Luwian branch, whereas *kēi-to ‘won’ in the Palao-Lydo-Hittite branch. Note that I interpret Lyc. sīṯni, which is usually cited as 3sg., as a 3pl.-form, reflecting *kēinto > *kĭinto > Lyc. /šīte-l, spelled site- (cf. Melchert 1992a: 195 for the fact that sīṯni has a plural subject).

=kkī, =kkα: see at kui-

giem-: see gimm-

**gimm-** (c.) ‘winter’ (Sum. ŠE₁₂, Akk. KUŞSU): dat.-loc.sg. gi-im-mi (KBo 15.32 i 4 (OH/MS), KUB 13.2 iv 23 (MH/NS), KUB 22.39 iii 14 (fr.) (NS), KBo 13.169 l.col. 1 (NS)), gi-e-mi (KUB 30.37 i 9, 11 (fr.) (NS)), gi-mi (IBoT 2.66 rev. 10 (NS)).

Derivatives: **gimanjiwa₂** (Ic1) ‘to spend the winter’ (3sg.pret.act. gi-ma-ni-e-et (OH/NS), gi-ma-ni-et (OH/NS)), **gimmant-** (c.) ‘winter’ (nom.sg. gi-im-ma-an-za (MS), acc.sg. ki-im-ma-an-tan̂ (undat.), gen.sg. gi-im-ma-an-ta-āṣ (OH/NS), gi-im-ma-an-da-āṣ (MH/NS), dat.-loc.sg. gi-im-ma-an-ti (MH/NS)), **gimmantarija/wa₂** (Ic1) ‘to spend the winter’ (3pl.pres.act. ŠE₁₂-ja-an-zi (NS), 1sg.pret.act. gi-im-ma-an-ta-ra-ini (NH), gi-im-ma-an-da-ra-na-un (NH), see gimra-.

IE cognates: Skt. hēman-, Av. ziidd̪, Lat. hiems, Gr. χειμών ‘winter’ etc.

PIE *各地im-(ent)-*

See Puhvel HED 4: 143ff. for attestations. There he also cites acc.sg. [g]i-ma-an (KBo 26.132, 6), emended thus by Oettinger (1982a: 237), but as Rieken (1999a: 77) shows, this emendation is incorrect. Semantically, there is no reason the assume ‘winter’ in this context while the traces rather point to [...a]m-ma-an.

Although the basic etymon of these words has been clear since Sommer (1920: 23), namely PIE *各地im-(n-) ‘winter’, the exact interpretation of all the forms is difficult. It may be worth while to first look at the formations in the other IE languages. There we find a root noun *各地em- (Lat. hiems ‘winter’, Av. ziidd̪ < *各地iḏm), but also an n-stem *各地em-n- (Skt. hēman-, Gr. χειμών, χειμών).

In Hittite, an n-stem is assuredly attested in the verb gimanjiwa₂ ‘to spend the winter’, which reflects *各地im-n-e/to-. This makes it likely that the geminate -m- as attested in dat.-loc.sg. gi-im-mi ‘in the winter’ and gi-im-ma-an-t- ‘winter’ is the result of the assimilation of the cluster -mn-, so *各地im-n- and *各地im-n-ent-. Puhvel (o.c.: 145) objects to reconstructing gimm- as gim-n- with the consideration that in lammi ‘name (dat.-loc.sg.)’ the cluster -mn- is preserved, but
Melchert (1994a: 81) states that in principle *-mn- assimilates to -mm- unless it is part of an ablauting paradigm (like in the case of ḷāman / lamn-). This means that the original paradigm to which gimmi must have belonged (*gʰem-n, *gʰim-n-ós > Hitt. **kēman, **kinnās) has been taken over by gimmant- (*gʰim-n-ent-) at an early stage already. This is supported by the fact that OH gimmaniē/s- is replaced by NH gimmantariē/s- ‘to spend the winter’ (cf. Rieken l.c.). The -ant- derivation gimmant- must be compared to ʰamešant- beside ʰameša- ‘spring’, ʰēnant- besides ʰēna- ‘fall’ and *yittant- besides yitt- ‘year’. The fact that only dat.-loc.sg. gimmi has survived of the original n-stem paradigm resembles the situation of ʰameša- besides ʰamešant- where dat.-loc.sg. ʰameši occurs far more often than ʰamešanti.

The hapax gi-e-mi, which is attested in a NS text only, could be considered as a scribal error for gimmi. Nevertheless, Melchert (1984a: 127) discusses the possibility that gi-e-mi is an archaic form that has to be equated with Lat. hiemi ‘in the winter’ and reflects *gʰiém-i.

gimmant-: see gimm-

gimmara-: see gimra-


Anat. cognates: CLuw. im(ma)ra/i- ‘open country’ (gen.adj.-stem im-ma-ra-aš-ša, gen.adj.dat.sg. im-ma-ra-aš-šan, im-ra-aš-ša(-an)).

PAnat. *gimro-

PIE *gʰim-ro-

See Puhvel HED 4: 175f. for attestations. The occasional spellings gi-im-ma-ra- show that we should phonologically interpret this word as /kMra/-/l. Taking this together with CLuw. im(ma)ra/i-, we can reconstruct a PAnat. *gimro-.

Sturtevant (1930c: 216) suggested a connection with PIE *dʰegʰm- ‘earth’. In view of Hitt. tēkan / takn- ‘earth’ < *dʰeɡʰ-m / *dʰiɡʰ-m- and CLuw. tijamma/i- ‘earth’ < *dʰiɡʰ-em-, it is impossible to derive PAnat. *gimro- from a preform *dʰiɡʰem-ro-. Tie-ins with IE *kēi- ‘to lie’ (Jucquois 1967: 177) or *kem- ‘to
border’ (Van Windekens 1981) are contradicted by CLuw. im(ma)ra/i- that requires PIE *gʰiems-

Benveniste apud Puhvel (l.c.) rather connects gimra- to PIE *gʰiems- ‘winter’, “thus in origin a term for the wintry steppe, the inhospitable outdoors (cf. ‘out in the cold’, sub love frigido, etc.”). Although a preform *gʰim-ro- indeed would yield Hitt. /kiMra/- and CLuw. im(ma)ra/i-, and although r-extensions of *gʰiems-

are found in e.g. Arm. jmērn ‘winter’ < *gʰim-r-inos, Gr. χειμέρα ‘having in the winter’ < *gʰeim-r-ino-s, Lat. hibernate ‘winterly’ < *gʰeim-r-ino-s as well, the assumed semantic development may not be self-evident. For a further treatment of *gʰiems- see gimm- ‘winter’. 

kinæ-² (Ia2 > Ic2) ‘to (as)sort’: 3sg.pres.act. ki-na-iz-zi (OH/NS), ki-i-na-iz-zi (NS), ki-na-a-iz-zi (NS), 3pl.pres.act. ki-na-an-zi (OH/NS), 1pl.pret.act. ki-n[a-u-en] (MH/NS), 2pl.pret.act. ki-na-a-at-tén (NS); part. ki-na-an-t-, ki-na-a-an-t-, ki-

i-na-a-an-t- (OH/NS).

IE cognates: Gr. δικταίo ‘to sift’, 3pl.pres. σῶσα ‘they sift’, σῶσα ‘to sift’. PIE *ki-né-h₂-ti / *ki-n-h₂-énti?

See Puhvel HED 4: 179f. for attestations. This verb is attested in NS texts only and inflects according to the ḥatrae-class. Because the ḥatrae-class inflection was very productive in NH times, it is quite possible that in this verb this inflection is of a secondary origin. Such an assumption is necessary if one follows the etymology as offered by Puhvel (l.c.), who analyses Gr. δικταίo ‘to sift’ as *kieh₂-ʒo, 3pl.pres. σῶσα ‘they sift’ as *kieh₂-ionti and σῶσα ‘to sift’ < *kieh₂-d’, thus identifying a root *kieh₂- ‘to sift’. According to Puhvel, this root also had a nasal infixed stem *ki-ne-h₂- which ended up in Hittite as kinae-². Although this sounds appealing semantically, and is formally possible as well, I have one point of criticism. I would expect that a paradigm *ki-né-h₂-ti / *ki-n-h₂-énti would regularly yield Hitt. **kinnazı / **kinnanzi, showing an alternation -n- vs. -mn-. Such an alternation is not tolerated, and in all cases that I know of, geminate -mn-has spread throughout the paradigm (e.g. zinnanzi/zinnanzi ‘to finish’ < *zinna /

zinnanzi < *tinheh₁ti / *tinheh₁enti; suumai / šumunazi ‘to fill’ < *šunai / šumunazi < *su=no-H-eti / *su=n-H-enti). A priori, I would therefore expect to have found Hitt. **kinae-² instead of kinae-². Nevertheless, it cannot be excluded that in this case the single -n- spread throughout the paradigm at the cost of -mn-. 

An alternative interpretation could be that kinae-² is, like all original ḥatrae-

class verbs, a verbal derivative of an o-stem noun, *kina-i-e/-a-. This hypothetical
noun *kina- then could reflect *kih₂-no- (note that in this way the few plene spellings *ki-i-na- could be better explained as well).


PIE *gʰiH-neu- ?

See Puhvel HED 4: 151f. for attestations. The verb is spelled in a few different ways: *ki-nu-, *gi-nu-, *ki-i-nu-, *ki-e-nu- and *gi-e-nu-. Since the signs KI and GI in principle can be read ki and ke and gi and ge respectively, it is difficult to decide how to interpret this verb phonologically. In my view it is crucial that the forms that show *ki-i-nu- are among the oldest attestations of this verb (OH/MS and MS?), whereas the spellings *ke-e-nu- and *ge-e-nu- are attested in NS texts only. This verb therefore must originally have been /kīnu-/ or /kīnu-/ which developed to NH /kenu-/ due to the lowering of OH /u/ to NH /e/ before -n- as described in § 1.4.8.1.d.

The verb denotes ‘to open up (trans.), to break open’. Formally, it looks like an old causative in -n-, which fits the transitive meaning. This could indicate that *kīnǔ- is a derivative of a verb that denotes ‘to open up (intr.’). Although there are several IE languages in which we find words for ‘to yawn, to open up (one’s mouth)’ that are formally similar (cf. Laroche 1963: 59), an exact reconstruction is difficult to give. Lith. žioti ‘to open (one’s mouth)’ points to *gʰieḥ₂-ῦ, whereas Gr. χιόμα ‘yawn’ and χιονόκα ‘gaping mouth’ reflect *gʰ(e)ḥ₂-. On the other hand, OCS .Kindo ‘to yawn’ reflects *gʰ(e)ḥ(i)-, whereas Lat. ḥιζō to open up, to yawn’ goes back to *gʰiḥ-ske/o-, and OHD ginēn ‘to yawn’ < *gʰi-ne-h₁-.

All in all, a reconstruction *gʰiH-neu- for Hitt. kīnǔ- is possible, but far from assured.

*kīnun (adv.) ‘now’: *ki-nu-un (OS).
Derivatives: *kinuna* ‘(but) now’ (ki-nu-na (NH)), *kinuntarijal* (adv.) ‘in the present’ (ki-nu-un-tar-ri-ja-al), *kinuntarijalla-* (adj.) ‘as of now, present’ (abl. ki-nu-un-ta-ri-ja-la-za, ki-nu-un-tar-ja-la-za, ki-nu-un-tar-ri-ja-la-az).


PIE *ki-num*

The adverb *kinun* ‘now’ is abundantly attested from OS texts onwards. Already in OS texts, it is often attested with the enclitic conjunction =*(m)a* attached to it: ki-nu-n=a ‘(but) now’, showing the post-consonantal form of =*(m)a*. The distribution between C=a and V=ma is disappearing from the MH period, which is visible in the fact that from then onwards we find ki-nu-un=ma. Nevertheless, the form *kinuna* is still attested in MH as well as NH texts, showing that OH *kinun*=a was not analysed as such anymore. I therefore interpret the NH form *kinuna* synchronically as a single form denoting ‘(but) now’ (cf. attestations like ki-nu-na=ma=mu (KBo 18.29 rev. 20 (NH)), ki-nu-na=ma=ya (KBo 18.19 rev. 28 (NH))).

If we compare Hitt. *kinun* to CLuw. *nānun*, it is clear that the former must be analysed as *ki + nun*. The element *ki-* must be identified with nom.-acc.sg. *kī* ‘this’ < *kī* (see kā- / kū- / kī). The element *nun* probably reflects *num* as still is visible in the one CLuwian attestation with -m-, *nānuntarrijala*. This *num* must be compared to Gr. vōv ‘now’ and Lat. *nunc* ‘now’. This latter form is especially interesting as it derives from *num-ce < *num + *ki*. The element *num* must belong with PIE *nu* ‘now’ as visible in Skt. mū, Lith. niu, Goth. nu, etc., but also in the Hittite clause conjunctive *nu*. The CLuw. form *nānun* probable shows a reduplication *no-num.*

The derivative *kinuntarijalla-* must be compared with Hitt. *nuntarija-*(adj.) ‘swift, quick’ and CLuw. *nanuntarija-*, reflecting *num-tr-ew/o*.

*ginzu-*: see *(UZU)genzu-

*gaš* *gipeššar / gipešn-* (n.) ‘cubit, ell’, also area measure (as area measure: Sum. KUŠ, Akk. AMMATU); nom.-acc.sg. gi-pé-eš-šar (OS), ki-pé-eš-šar, gi-pé-šar (1x), gen.sg. gi-pé-eš-na-aš.
See Puhvel HED 4: 186-7 for attestations. The fact that this word contains the suffix -eššar/-ešn- as well as that it is attested in OS texts already could point to an IE origin. Puhvel (l.c.) connects it with Ved. gābhastr- ‘arm, hand’, Khot. ggoštā ‘hand(ful)’ and reconstructs *gélh₁ esr, but this does not seem immediately appealing to me. I would rather expect derivation of a root *Keib₁ or *Kiebh₁, but have not been able to find a convincing cognate.

kir: see (²I)ı ker / kard(i)-

kīš₄ / kīš- (IIa) ‘to happen, to occur, to turn out to be; (+ =z) to become’:
1sg.pres.midd. ki-iš-ḥa (OH/MS), ki-iš-ḥa-ḥa-ri (MH/NS), kiš-ḥa-ḥa-ri (NH),
2sg.pres.midd. ki-iš-ta (OH/NS), ki-iš-ta-ti (NH), 3sg.pres.midd. ki-iš-qa (OS), ki-
iš-qa-ri (OS), ki-ša, ki-ša-ri (MH/MS), ki-ša-ar-ri (2x, OH/NS), 3pl.pres.midd. ki-i-
ša-an-ta (NH), ki-ša-an-da (NS), ki-i-ša-an-ta-ri (OH/NS), ki-ša-an-ta-ri (OH/MS),
ki-ša-an-da-ri (NS), 1sg.pret.midd. ki-iš-ḥa-ti (OH/MS), ki-iš-ḥa-at (OH/MS),
ki-iš-ḥa-ḥa-at (NH), 2sg.pret.midd. ki-iš-ta-ti (OH/MS), ki-ša-at (1x, OH/?)
3sg.pret.midd. ki-iš-ta-ti (OH/MS), ki-ša-at (MS), ki-ša-ti (OH/NS),
ki-ša-at (OH/MS), 2pl.pret.midd. ki-ša-du-um-ma-ti (NH), 3pl.pret.midd. ki-i-ša-an-
ta-ti (OS), ki-ša-an-ta-ti (NS), ki-i-ša-an-ta-at (MH/MS), ki-ša-an-ta-at (NH),
ki-ša-an-da-at (NH), 2sg.imp.midd. ki-ša-ḥu (OH/NS), ki-ša-ḥu (OH/NS),
ki-ša-r (OH/MS), ki-ša-r (MH/MS, OH/NS), ki-ša-a-r (1x, MH/NS), 2pl.imp.midd. ki-iš-
a-ta-ta-at (NH); part. ki-ša-an-t- (NS).

Derivatives: kikkiš₄ (*IIa > IIIb) ‘to turn out to be, to happen (impf.)’
(3sg.pres.midd. ki-ik-ki-iš-ta-r (OH/NS), ki-ik-ki-iš-ta-r (NH), ki-ik-ki-iš-ta-r (NH),
ki-ik-ki-iš-ta-r (1x, NS), ki-ik-ki-iš-ta-r (1x, NS), 3pl.pres.midd. ki-ik-ki-iš-
a-ta (NS), 3sg.pret.midd. ki-ik-ki-iš-ta-ta (NS), ki-ik-ki-iš-ta-ta (NH),
3sg.imp.midd. ki-ik-ki-iš-ta-ta (OH/NS); sup. ki-ik-ki-iš-šu-u-ya-an (OH/NS)).

IE cognates: OHG kēran, ModHG kehren ‘to turn’.

PIE *gēis-o / *gēis-n-to

See Puhvel HED 4: 191f. for attestations. The verb is spelled both with and
without plene -i-. If we look at the occurrence of this plene -i- closely, we
immediately see a distribution: plene -i- is only attested in forms in which the
ending starts in a vowel, and never in forms in which the ending starts in a
consonant. In OS texts this distribution is absolute: we find ki-i-šV₁₀ vs. ki-iš-C₁₀.
From MH times onwards the spelling ki-šV starts to appear as well, which
becomes standard in NH texts (126 x ki-šV₁₀ vs. 2x ki-i-šV₁₀). This does not effect
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the establishment of the original distribution, however. Since the alteration $kō-V$ vs. $kiš-C$ is comparable to $link-V$ vs. *lik-C (cf. *li(n)k-$z$) and *ḥark-V vs. *ḥar-C (cf. ḥar(k)-$z$), it is evident that in $kōV$ / $kišC$ a phonological process has taken place.

Oettinger (1976b: 128-9) states that the distribution is due to “das Quantitätengesetz $τ$ > $τ$“ bei offener erster Silbe”, on the basis of which he states that “dieses sekundären Lautgesetzes erlaubt der Stammmvokalisismus keine Entscheidung zwischen idg. $e$, $i$ und $e$”. Since I do not believe that this “Quantitätengesetz” is linguistically real (see Oettinger 1979a: 447-8 where he only adduces examples that are incorrect: e.g. his “[Typische alltäthetische Beispiel] is-ta-ap-ḥē : is-ta-a-pī : iṣ-tap-pa-an-zi is in fact iṣ-ta-a-ap-ḥē (with long vowel), iṣ-ta-a-pī, iṣ-tap-pa-an-zi, where we find an ablaut between *stōp- in the singular and *stp- in the plural), I would rather assume that $kišC$ is the result of a ‘shortening’ of original *$kīC$, just as we see a ‘shortening’ in *$linkC > likC$ and *$ḥarkC > ḥarC$. With this in mind, we can now look at the proposed etymologies.

Pulvnel (l.c., with reference to Laroch 1952a: 102) favours the connection with Lat. $gerō$ ‘to carry’, for which he presumes a basic meaning ‘to bring about, to make occur’. Schrijver (1991: 18, with references to Osthoff) states that $gerō$ possibly is connected to IE *$h₂ęk- ‘to drive’, and thus reflects *$h₂ę-č-es-. This makes the connection between $kiš$- and Lat. $gerō$ improbable, for IE *$h₂ę-č-es- would have given Hitt. **$ḥakeš-. Melchert (1984a: 103) derives $kiš-$ from “*$keis-$ ‘stir, be in motion’ seen in Skt. $çeśṭati ‘stirs, moves, acts’”. He does not explain, however, why the Skt. verb is $çeśṭ-, with an extra -t-. So the root *$keis-$ does not independently exist, and I therefore find this etymology unconvincing.

Eichner (1973a: 78) compares $kiš-$ to OHG $kəran$, ModHG $kehren ‘to turn’ that reflect *$ègeis-. Semantically, this etymology is supported by e.g. Gr. πείρατα ‘to turn; to become’ < *$k$'ēl- ‘to turn’, Goth. $wairþan ‘to become, to happen’ < *$wert- ‘to turn’, but also ModEng. to $turn out to be. Because normally *$ei- would monophthongize to -ē-, Eichner assumes that *$ei-$ is raised to -ē after velars (cf. also $kīta < *$kēi-to). The question then is why do we find the distribution *$kišC vs. $kōV$. It is easy to say that *$I$ was shortened in a closed syllable, but other long vowels do not shorten in closed syllables (at least, not in the OH period: e.g. $ištāphi < *$stōp-$h₂ei$, $kānki < *$kōnk-$h₂ei$). In order to solve this, we have to look closely at the development of *$Kei- > $kī-. Eichner (l.c.) assumes that *$Kei- > *$kō- (regular monophthongization of *$-ei-) and that then the velar gets palatalized to *$kō-, due to which *$kō- is raised, yielding *$kī-. In my view, we must assume that *$Kei- was raised to *$kō- before the
monophthongization of *-ej- to -ē-. In this way, we can explain the development of *kišCC > kiCC in the same lines as *linkC > likC and *ṭarkC > ṭarC; namely as loss of a consonantal element in a triconsonantal cluster. The sequence *kišCV regularly developed into kēCV.

All in all, I believe that kīš- reflects the root *gēis- ‘to turn’. The preform *gēis-h2e yielded *kišha > kīšha, whereas the preform *gēis-o yielded *kiša > kīša.

Note that Puhsel states that the reduplicated imperfective kikkiš- should be phonologically interpreted as /kiks-/ but this is incorrect; spellings like 3pl.pret.midd. ki-ik-ki-ša-an-ta and the lack of spellings like *ki-ik-ša- or **ki-ik-ka-ša- show that we have to phonologically interpret the verb as /kikis-/ The fact the we find a geminate -kk- here does not have any bearing on the etymological interpretation of kīš-, since the reduplication can be formed quite recently.

**kiš2d** (Ib1 > lc1, lc2) ‘to comb, to card’: 3sg.pres.act. ki-ši-zi (Bo 7568, 4 (undat.)), ki-ša-a-iz-zi (KUB 12.58 ii 42 (NS)), 3pl.pres.act. ki-ša-an-zi (KUB 39.14 i 12 (OH/NS)), 3pl.pret.act. ki-ši-Ši-er (KUB 12.26 ii 6 (NS)), 3sg.impact. ki-i-ša-a-id-du (KBo 21.8 iii 14 (OH/MS)); part.nom.acc.sg.n. ki-ša-a-an (KUB 12.58 iii 3 (NS)); impf. 3pl.pret.act. ki-ši-kān-zi (KUB 12.26 ii 1 (NS)), 1sg.pret.act. ke-šē-ke-nu-um (KBo18.53, 8 (NS)).

Derivatives: **kiš(š)aunu2d** (Ib2) ‘?’ (3sg.pres.act. ki-ši-nu-uz-zi (KBo 20.73 + KUB 32.131 iv 23); impf. ki-iš-nu-ūš-ke/a- (KBo 24.51 rev. 1), ki-iš-ša-nu-ūš-ke/a- (KBo 24.51 rev. 3ff.), **šig kiš(š)a**ri- (c.) ‘skein of carded wool(?)’ (nom.sg. ki-iš-ri-ši (OH/NS), ki-iš-ša-ri-iš (NS), ki-iš-ri-eš (MH/NS), acc.sg. ki-iš-ri-in (MH/NS), kiš-ri-in (MH/NS), nom.pl. ki-iš-ša-ri-eš=a (KUB 12.63 rev. 26 (OH/MS)), ki-iš-ri-iš (MH/NS)), **kišama2i-** (adj.) ‘(garment of) carded (yarn)’ (nom.-acc.sg. ki-ša-ma, ki-ša-me (NS), nom.pl.c. ki-ša-me-eš, ki-ša-me-iš).

Anat. cognates: CLuw. kiš- ‘to comb’ (3pl.pret.act. ki-ša-an-da; part. ki-ša-am-ma/i-), ki-i-ša-am-ma/i-).


PIE *kēs-ti / *ks-štīti

See Puhsel HED 4: 157f. for attestations. There is evidence for different stems: ki-ši-zi, ki-ša-ani and ki-ša-a-an point to a stem kiš2d; ki-ša-a-iz-zi and ki-i-ša-a-id-du point to a stem kišhe2d; ki-iš-ši-er points to a stem kišši/a2d. Since both the ĥaβrae-class and the -je/o-class are very productive in younger Hittite, we can
safely assume that *kišae-² and *kiššijo/a-² (with gemination due to the following -i-?) are secondary creations and that the stem *kiš-² is the most original one. Already since Götte & Stutevant (1938: 88f.) this verb is generally connected with the PIE root *kes- ‘to comb’ that is visible in e.g. OCS česati ‘to comb’, Gr. κόμπος, ‘hairdo’, etc. Nevertheless, details are unclear, especially why Hittite shows an -i- (note that although the sign Kl in principle can be read kl as well as ke, the forms ki-šš-zi, ki-šš-ší-er (both with unambiguous -iš-) and ki-iš-a-id-du clearly point to kiš-). Normally, an *e does not raise to -i- after velars (e.g. genu < *genu-, genzu < *genh₁-su-), and we would therefore expect *kes- to develop to Hitt. **keš-. E.g. Melchert (1994a: 152) therefore reconstructs *keš-ēh₂-je/o-, in which unaccentuated *-ē- should have yielded Hitt. -i-. This preform is based on the stem *kišae-² only, which must be secondary, and cannot account for *kiš-².

I would like to propose the following solution. In PIE, the verb *kes- inflected *keš-ti / *ks-ěnti. Although it is clear that the former form should have yielded Hitt. **keši, the outcome of the latter form is not fully clear. When we compare e.g. kišt₂< *gʰsdʰ-ōri, we could expect that *KsV- would regularly yield Hitt. /kšV-/i, spelled kišV- (cf. the absence of any Hitt. words starting in kasV- < *KsV-). In this way, *ks-ěnti should regularly yield Hitt. kiša-ani /kisantʰi/ as attested. In my view, it is quite possible that the weak stem /kis-/ has spread throughout the paradigm (compare e.g. the situation in gulš-²). If this scenario is correct, we may assume that the zero-grade stem *ks- is the origin of CLuw. kiš- as well.

**kiššar(a)-: see keššar / kiššer- / kišr-

**kiššer(a)-: see keššar / kiššer- / kišr-

**kišr(a)-: see keššar / kiššer- / kišr-

kišt₂< (IIIf) ‘to perish, to be extinguished’: 3sg.pres.midd. gi-iš-ta-ri (OS), ki-iš-ta-a-ri (MS), ki-iš-ta-ri (OH/NS), 3sg.pret.midd. ki-iš-ta-a-ti (KBo 34.25, 1ff. (NS)), ki-iš-ta-ti (NH), 3sg.imp.act. ki-iš-ta-ru (MH/MS, OH/NS), ki-iš-ta-a-ru (OH/NS); part. ki-iš-ta-an-ti (NS); verb.noun ki-iš-du-mar (NS).

ki-iš-ta-nu-an-du; part. ki-iš-ta-nu-ya-an-t.; inf.1 ki-iš-ta-nu-um-ma-an-zi; impf. ki-iš-ta-nu-uš-ke/a/), see kāšt-.

Panat. *šgšd-ō

PIE *hšd-ō

See Puhvel HED 4: 167f. for attestations. This verb often has *fire* as its subject, but also *life* and *evil adversary*. Its basic meaning therefore seems to be *to cease to exist, to perish*. Within Hittite, it is likely for formal reasons that this verb is cognate with kāšt- *hunger, kūštuant-* *hungry*. This could indicate that kišt- originally meant *to be starved*. As I have argued extensively under the lemma kāšt-, the original root of these words probably was *hšd- *to starve*. Since kišt- belongs to the tukkāri-class, which goes back to zero-grade middles, I reconstruct kūštir as *hšd-ōr(i).

kītkar: see ketkar

kītpantālaž: see kētpantālaž

=kkū (encl.) *now, even, and*; =kkū ... =kkū ‘both ... and; if ... if; whether ... or’
Anat. cognates: Pal. =ku ‘and?’; CLuw. =ku (sentence initial enlictic particle) ‘and(?)’. furtermore(?)’.
IE cognates: Skt. ca ‘and’, Lat. -que ‘and’, Gr. τέ ‘and’ etc.

PIE *kʷe

See Puhvel HED 4: 203f. for an overview of attestations, e.g.

KBo 12.128

(6) nu-u=k-ku ka-ru-uš-tén nu GEŠTU-tén

‘Now be silent and listen!’;

KUB 33.24 i (with additions from KUB 33.27 obv. 7-8)

(43) le-e=ya-a=t-ta na-a-ḫi tu-ḫ-e(-el=ku ya-a)š-ta-iš
(44) úg=a-at SIGs2-zi-ja-mi Û-UL-a=k-ku tu(-el y)a-aš-ta-iš
(45) ú-g=a-at SIGs2-zi-ja-mi

‘Don’t you worry. If it is your fault, I will make it right. If it is not your fault, I will make it right (as well)’;

KUB 42.107 iii"
(10) 6 PA ŠE ZI-KU-Ū-KI ḥa-at-tar=ku
(11) zi-na-a-îl=ku šu-me-eš=ku

‘6 paršu of either zikiki-meal, ḥattar, zinčil or šumeš grain’.

The particle =kku also occurs in the forms nekku ‘not?’ (q.v.), imma=kku ‘and even, on top of it’ (see imma), apīja=kku ‘there and then’ (see apī-/ apī-) and possibly anku ‘fully’ (q.v.).

The etymon of =kku as reflecting the enclitic particle */-k*e has been widely accepted since Pisani (1952: 322). Pisani convincingly assumed that =kku reflects */kk*/ with apocope from */-k*e (contra Garett apud Melchert (1994a: 184) who interprets takku as /tak*wul/ < */tak*al/ < */tok*e).

In the Laws, we find an enclitic particle =aku, of which it is not fully clear whether we should divide it further in =/(j)a=ku (with an awkward single spelling -k-) or not:

KBo 6.2+ (OS) i (with variant and additions from KBo 6.3 i 45-46 (OH/NS))

(36) [(tāk-ku LŪ.Ú₁₀),LU-an LŪ-n=a-ku (variant: LŪ-an-n=a-ku) [(MUNUS-n=a-ku ] W D D W D)

(37) [(ta-a)]-i-ez-zi

‘If some man from Lūija steals a person from Ḥattuša, either a male or a female,...’.

Tischler HEG 1: 601 states that “LŪ-na-ku” stands for “LŪ-n-ku = Akk.sg. antulšan-ku”, but this seems hardly credible to me. Perhaps we have to assume =/(j)a=kku with lenition of -kk- in post-posttonic position.

The interpretation of the sentence initial particles =ku in Palaic and CLuwian is unclear, but a translation ‘and’ is of course quite possible. In CLuwian, =ku is often followed by =ya, by which one could be tempted to analyse it as =ku<ya < */-k*e without apocope. The fact that this is not possible is visible in sentences like

KUB 35.102 ii

(15) [a]n-ni-iś=ku=ya=ti pār-na-an-za ma-ad-du-ûl[-ya-ti]
(16) [p]a-ap-pār-ku-ya-at-ti ta-a-ti-iś=pa=ya=ti=a[-ta]
(17) [.u]n-ti-ja-ti pu-šu-ri-ja[-ti]
(18) [pa]p-ap-pa-ša-at-ti
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‘Mother cleans the house with wine, and father p.-s it with [.]x-i- (and) pišuri-‘,

where the parallel particle chains anniş=ku=ya=ti ~ tğitiš=pə=ya=ti(=ata) show that we have to analyse a separate particle =ya in both chains.


PIE *g*ēl*ţi-yan-o-

Apart from dat.-loc.sg. [k]ueluğani, which is attested in a quite broken context, the other three attestations occur in one text, namely KUB 9.1 iii 14-22. It therefore is perhaps more likely to interpret the difference in spelling between ku-e-lya-na-aš and ku-lya-ya-na-aš as a scribal error (so the latter form rather ku-e-lya-na-aš) than as an ablaut alternation kuel- vs. kul-. The meaning ‘washbasin (or similar)’ is fairly certain. Neumann’s connection (apud Tischler, 604) of this word with the PIE root **“g”el-** ‘to drip, to overflow’ (Skt. gālāti ‘to drip’, OHG quellan ‘to well’, Gr. ἔλθω ‘bath’) seems convincing. Nevertheless, Gr. (Hom.) ἑλκόνω (aor.) ‘he fell’ (cf. Rix 1992: 74) as well as Skt. galita- ‘dripped’ seem to point to a root *g*ēl*ţi-*. This would mean that kuelyana- reflects *g*ēl*ţi-yan-o- (with loss of *h1 between consonants).

**ku(e)**-² / kun- / kuya(n)- (1a3 > IIa1γ) ‘to kill, to slay, to ruin’ (Akk. D[t]KU):
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gen.sg. ku-en-nu-ma-aš (NH), ku-e-nu-ma-aš (NH); inf.I ku-en-nu-um-ma-an-zi (NS); inf.II ku-na-an-na (MH/MS), ku-na-a-an-na (OH/NS); impf. ku-aš-ke/a- (OH/MS), ku-ya-aš-ke/a- (OH/MS), ku-en-ni-eš-ke/a- (1x, NS).

IE cognates: Skt. han- / ghn- ‘to strike, to kill, to slay’, OCS ženq ‘to pursue, to hunt down’, Lith. geniù ‘id.’, Gr. ἔίξω ‘to smite’, Lat. de-fendō ‘to keep off, to defend’.

PIE *gʰénti / *gʰen-enti, *gʰen-skėó-

See Puhvel HED 4: 206f. for attestations. The oldest texts show an e/O-ablauting *mi-verb kuenzi / kunanzi. The original paradigm was kuemi, kueši, kunanzi, --, --, kunanzi ; kuenum, --, kuenta, kuenen, kunten, kuener. We see that the -n is lost in front of m, s and y. Moreover, we see that in the forms kueši, kunanzi, kuenta and kunten, where we would expect that *e > a because of the following nasal + dental consonant, the *e has been restored on the basis of the other forms of the paradigm. In NH times, we occasionally find forms that show a stem kuenna- / kuenn-, inflecting according to the productive tarn(a)-class. The gemination of -m- in these forms is due to the NH gemination of intervocalic resonants as described by Melchert 1994a: 165. The imperfective kušaške/a- is remarkable as it is the only form within the paradigm that shows a stem kuša(n)- (unless the hapax form ku-ya-an-ū-e-ni as attested on the very broken tablet KBo 39.248 obv. 4 is really to be interpreted as 1pl.pres.act. /kʰušuénili/). Because of the idea that *KʷRC regularly yields Hitt. KuRC and never **KušaRC, it is generally thought that this kušaške/a- cannot reflect *Kʷn-skė/o-, but must be the outcome of *kuen- + -skė/a-. As I have shown in detail in Kloekhorst fthc.e, the imperfective kušaške/a- can be better explained if we assume that the development *KʷRC > Hitt. KuRC is valid only when one consonant follows the resonant (so *KʷRVC), whereas in the case that two consonants follow the resonant (*KʷRCCV), we find a development to Hitt. KušaRCCV. In this way, kušaške/a- = /kʰušške/á/- shows the regular outcome of the preform *gʰn-skėó/-, the morphologically expected imperfective.

Already since Hrozný (1919: 73) the etymon has been clear: PIE *gʰen- ‘to strike; to slay, to pursue’. Especially the similarity to Skt. han- ‘to strike, to kill’ is striking: Hitt. kuenzi / kunanzi ~ Skt. hánti / ghnánti < *gʰénti / *gʰenénti.

kuenzumna- (adj.) ‘coming from where, of what origin’: nom.sg.c. ku-en-zu-um-na-aš.
This words, which occurs only twice (KBo 1.35, 7 and KUB 23.95, 9) is explained by Friedrich (1930: 152) as a derivation in -um(n)a- of the gen.pl. *kuentan from the paradigm kuir- / kuya- ‘who’ (which is unattested as such, but compare kentan from kār̥ / kār̥ / kī- ‘this’ and apentan from apēr / apēr). The element -um(n)a- then must be equated with the appurrtenent suffix -umen/-umn- (q.v.) as visible in Ḥattušum- a, Nešmen-, etc. The form *kuentan probably reflects *k˚’oij-nHas: see at kār̥ / kār̥ / kī- for a treatment of the element -nzan. See at -umen/-umn- for a treatment of this suffix.

kuer-/ kur- / kuyar- (Ia1) ‘to cut, to cut up, to cut out off, to amputate, to mutilate’: 1sg.pres.act. ku-er-mi (NH), 3sg.pres.act. ku-e-er-zī (MH/MS), ku-e-ri (OH/NS), ku-e-ri (1x, KUB 24.12 iii 19), 1pl.pres.act. ku-e-ru-e-n[i?] (MS?), 3pl.pres.act. ku-ra-an-zī (OH/MS?), 1sg.pret.act. ku-e-ru-un (NS), 3sg.pret.act. ku-e-er-ta (OH/NS), 3pl.pretact. [k]u-e-re-er (NS), 3sg.imp.act. ku-e-er-du (NS), ku-e-du (NS), 3pl.imp.act. ku-ra-an-du (NH); part. ku-ra-an-t-; inf.II ku-ra-a-an-na (MS), ku-ra-an-na (NS); impf. ku-ya-ar-aš-ke/-a- (MS), kur-aš-ke/-a- (MS), kur-ri-eš-ke/-a- (NS), ku-ra-aš-ke/-a- (NS).

Derivatives: AŠA kuera- (c.) ‘field parcel, territory, area’ (nom.sg. ku-e-ra-aš (OH/NS), ku-ra-aš (OH/NS), acc.sg. ku-e-ra-an (MH/MS), dat.-loc.sg. ku-e-ri (MH/MS), abl. ku-e-ra-az), URUDU kuruzzi- ‘cutter’ (instr. ku-ru-uz-zi-it (NS)), kuerš̄-/ kurš- (Ia1 > Iic2) ‘to cut off’ (1sg.pret.act. ku-e-er-šu-un (KBo 10.2 ii 48 (OH/NS), 2sg.pretact. kur-ša-a-i (KBo 11.1 obv. 26 (NH)), see (TU) kurššar / kureš-.


PAnat. *k”er- / *k”r-.

IE cognates: Skt. kr- ‘to make’, OIr. cruth ‘shape, form’ (< *k”r-tu), Lat. curtus ‘short’ (< *k”r-to-).

PIE *k”er-t / *k”r-ént
According to Oettinger (1979a: 119), the Hittite paradigm is built on the PIE root aorist *Aoristº. This is strange of course, in view of the fact that the un-extended stem ablauting

The interpretation of the two verbal forms that show an extra

just a root-variant of

Skt. injunctive forms
crop, to shape by cutting'. The Sanskrit reflex of this verb,
to

See Puhvel HED 4: 212f. for attestations. The verb is a perfectly regular e/O-
ablauting mi-verb. The only aberrant form is the hapax 3sg.pres.act. ku-er-ri
(KUB 24.12 iii 19), which in my view is so strange that I would rather emend it to
ku-er-zr (note that the signs RI and ZI are quite alike). The oldest form of the
imperfective is kuraške/a-, which in my view is the regular outcome of
*k'r-skê/- (cf. Kloekhorst fthc.e). The younger forms kuraške/a- and kureške/a-
are secondary rebuildings, having taken over the synchronic weak stem kur-.

Since Pedersen (1938: 128) the etymon has been clear: PIE *k”er- ‘to carve, to
crop, to shape by cutting’. The Sanskrit reflex of this verb, kr- ‘to make’, displays
a root-aorist ákar / ákrän besides a derived present kṛnati / kṛnvati. This means
that the Hittite paradigm is built on the PIE root aorist *k”ér-t / *k”r-ént (cf. the
Skt. injunctive forms kár / ’krán).

The interpretation of the two verbal forms that show an extra -s- is difficult.
According to Oettinger (1979a: 119), kueršun is “ererb aus einem sigmatischen
Aorist”. This is strange of course, in view of the fact that the un-extended stem
kuer- / kur- reflects an aorist already. Puhvel (l.c.) therefore assumes that kuerš-
just a root-variant of kuer- as e.g. karš-º is of iškär- / iškar- < *(s)ker-.

If this were the case, we would expect that *k”er-s- would yield Hitt. *kuyarš-
because of the sound law *eRCC > aRCC (note that all endings of the mi-inflection
start in a consonant originally), just as karš-º < *ker-s-. I therefore assume that
the form kueršun is an ad hoc-formation without any historicity. The form kuršã is
unclear regarding its interpretation. It is attested in KBo 11.1 obv. (26) ku-it-ma-
an=ma KUR-e aše-ša-mu-š ke-mi ku-it-ma n= a-at kur-ša a-i, which is
translated by Puhvel (l.c.) as “but while I am [re]settling the land, during that time
one keeps subdividing it”, taking kuršã as 3sg.pres.act. of a stem kurša-º / kurš-.

Starke (1990: 5361979), however, translates “Solange ich das Land besiedlen
werde, solange trenne es ab!”, taking kuršã as 2sg.imp.act. of a stem kuršae-º.

He assumes that this kuršae- is a Hittite borrowing from a Luwian verb *kurša-
which is visible in CLuw. kuršsar ‘island’.

kueršun: see kurešuana- / kueršuana-

ku- / kue- / kuwa- (interrog. pron.) ‘who?, what?’; (rel. pron.) ‘who, what’;
(indef. pron.) ‘some(one), any(one)’; kuš ... kuš ‘some ... other’; kuiš kuiš, kuiš
... kuiš, kuiš=a imma, kuiš ... imma, kuiš kuiš imma, kuiš imma kuiš, kuiš ...
imma kuiš, imma kuiš (generalizing rel. pron.) ‘who(so)ever, what(so)ever’;
nom.sg.c. ku-š (OS), acc.sg.c. ku-in (OS), nom.-acc.sg.nt. ku-it (OS), ku-i-it (rare,
OS), gen.sg. ku-e-el (OS), ku-el (OS), dat.-loc.sg. ku-e-da-ni (OS), ku-e-da-a-ni
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(1x), ku-i-e-da-ni (1x, NH), ku-i-da-ni (1x, OH/NS), abl. ku-e-ez (MH/MS), ku-e-ez-za, ku-e-ez-zi (MH/MS), ku-e-za (1x), ku-i-e-ez-za (1x), ku-e-da-za (1x), nom.pl.c. ku-i-e-eš (OS), ku-i-eš (OS), ku-e-eš, acc.pl.c. ku-i-uš (OS), ku-i-i-uš (1x, MH/MS), ku-e-uš (rare), ku-i-e-uš (1x), nom.-acc.pl.nt. ku-e (OS), ku-i-e (rare), dat.-loc.pl. ku-e-da-aš (MH/MS).

Derivatives: **kui- + =mja** (generalizing rel. pron.) 'who(so)ever, what(so)ever' (nom.sg.c. ku-i-ša (MH/MS), nom.-acc.sg.n. ku-i-ta (OS), gen.sg. ku-e-la (OS)), kui- + =kkı=kka (indef. pron.) 'some(one), any(one)' (nom.sg.c. ku-iš-ki (OS), ku-iš-ka (KBo 6.5 i 4 (OH/NS)), acc.sg.c. ku-in-ki (MH/MS), ku-i-en-ki (HKM 95, 5 (MH/MS)), nom.-acc.sg.n. ku-it-ki (OS), ku-it-ka (KUB 33.59 iiii 14 (OH/NS)), ku-it-go (KUB 7.1 ii 49 (OH/NS)), gen.sg. ku-e-el-ka (OS), ku-e-el-ka, ku-el-ka, ku-e-el-ki (1x), ku-el-ki (rare), dat.-loc.sg. ku-e-da-ni-ik-ki (OS), ku-e-da-ni-ki (rare, MH/MS), ku-i-ta-ni-ik-ki (1x), ku-e-da-ni-ik-ka (1x, OH/NS), abl. ku-e-ez-ka (NH), ku-e-ez-ga (NS), nom.pl.c. ku-i-e-š-ka (MH/MS), acc.pl.c. ku-i-uš-ga (MH/MS), nom.-acc.pl.n. ku-e-ek-ki (MH/MS), ku-e-ek-ka, ku-e-ka (NH), dat.-loc.pl. ku-e-da-aš-ka (NH), kui- + =mja (generalizing pron.) 'every(one), each' (nom.sg.c. ku-iš-ša (OS), acc.sg. ku-in-na (MH/MS), nom.-acc.sg.n. ku-it-ta (OH/MS), gen.sg. ku-e-la (OS), ku-e-el-la (OH/NS), dat.-loc.sg. ku-e-da-ni-ja (MH/MS), ku-e-ta-ni-ja (OH/NS), abl. ku-e-ez-zi-ja (NS), ku-e-ez-zi (MS)), kuiimän (rel. conj.) 'until; while', (indef. adv.) 'for some time, in the interim, meanwhile' (ku-it-ma-a-n=a-aš (OS), ku-it-ma-an (MH/MS)), kuyät (interrog. adv.) 'why?; (+ 'if') for some reason; (kuyät imma kuyät) for whatever reason' (ku-ya-a-at (OS), ku-ya-ar (MH/MS), ku-u-ya-at (1x)), kuyäkä (marked indef.) 'in some way, somehow, perhaps' (ku-ya-a-at-k[a] (OS), ku-ya-at-ka (MH/MS), ku-at-ka (1x)), kuyattan (interrog. adv.) 'where?, whither?'; (rel. conj.) 'where, whither'; (indef. adv.) 'somewhere', kuyatta kuyatta (adv.) 'in every way', kuyatta imma kuyatta 'wherever', kuyatta (imma kuyatta) šer 'wherefore, whatever for' (ku-ya-at-ta, ku-ya-at-ta-an, ku-ya-at-tan, (1x), ku-ya-ta-an (1x), ku-ya-tan, (1x)), kuyäpí(t) (interrog. adv.) 'where?, whither?, when?'; (rel. conj.) 'where, whither; when' (ku-ya-a-pi-it, ku-ya-pi-it (OS), ku-ya-a-pi (MH/MS), ku-ya-pi (MH/MS)), kuyäpikki (indef. adv.) 'somewhere, sometime, ever' (ku-ya-a-pi-ik-ki (OS), ku-ya-a-pi-ik (OS), ku-ya-ik-ki (MH/MS, often), ku-ya-pi-ki (rare), ku-u-ya-pi-ik-ki (1x), ku-ya-pi-ik-ka (rare), kuyäpitta, kuyäpipi (generalizing adv.) 'everywhere, always' (ku-ya-a-pi-it-ta (OS), ku-ya-pi-it-ta, ku-ya-pi-jæ), kuskan (interrog. adv.) 'when?'; (rel. conj.) 'when'; (indef. adv.) 'sometimes(?)'; kušan imma 'whenever' (ku-uš-ša-an (OS)), kušanka (indef. adv.) 'anytime, ever' (ku-uš-ša-an-ka, ku-uš-ša-an-ka).

PAnat. *kʷi-, *kʷo-

IE cognates: e.g. Skt. kās, kā, kātkām, OCS kšo, čšo, Gr. τὰς, τί. Lat. quis, quid, Goth. has, hō, hōa

PIE *kʷi- / *kʷe- / *kʷo-

See Puhvel HED 4: 218f. for attestation. All Anatolian languages show reflexes of the relative and indefinite pronoun *kʷi- / *kʷe- / *kʷo-, which is abundantly attested in the IE languages. Since it is not easy to reconstruct the PIE paradigms for these pronouns, and since therefore the exact relation between the stems *kʷe-, *kʷi- and *kʷo- is unclear, I will focus on the Anatolian material only.
Within the Hittite paradigm, we find the stem kui- < *k”î- (nom.sg.c. kuğuš, acc.sg.c. kuin, nom.-acc.sg.n. kuit, nom.pl.c. kuiešt, acc.pl.c. kušuš) and kue- < *k”e- (gen.sg. kužəl, dat.-log.sg. kuedani, abl. kuez, dat.-loc.pl. kuedaš). The nom.-acc.pl.n.-form kue can either reflect *k”oi or *k”ei (although this is morphologically an awkward form from a PIE point of view), or *k”i♭h2 if one assumes lowering of *i to /e/ due to the following *h2 (compare a-aš-šu-u šašSol ‘goods’ < *-uh2 in which *h2 caused lowering of *u to /o/). A stem kuyga- < *k”oi is found in kuyğā ‘why’ and kuyğapi(t) ‘where, whither’, both showing -a- < *-o- in the oldest texts (kuyğā < *k”ôd (cf. Lat. quod) and kuyğapi(t) < *k”ô-biİ). The exact interpretation of kušša ‘when’ is unclear to me. It seems to reflect *k”-som, and would therefore reflect a ‘zero-grade’ stem *k”.

In Palaic, we only find evidence for a stem kui- < *k”i-. This also goes for CLuwian, where we only find kui- < *k”i-. In HLuwian, however, we find besides REL-iı < *k”i- also forms that seem to point to a stem *k”a-l, namely nom.-acc.sg.n. REL-a-za = /k”at=a/ (which contrasts with CLuw. nom.-acc.sg.n. kui) and dat.-loc.sg. REL-a-ti = /k”adı/. If ku-ma-na ‘because’ stands for /k”man/, we would here see a ‘zero-grade’ stem *k”- as well. The Lydian stem qı- clearly reflects *k”i-. The exact interpretation of kud ‘where’ and kot ‘as’ is not fully clear to me. One of these probably reflects *k”o-. In Lycian, we find the stem ti-which, with palatalization due to *-ı- reflects *k”ı-. The adjectives kınme/i- and kınmütı(i)- do not show palatalization and therefore must reflect *k”o- or, perhaps less likely, *k”-C.

Some of the syntactic formations are found in several Anatolian languages, and sometimes even outside Anatolia. For instance, the Hittite generalizing pronoun kui- + =ıja ‘everyone’ must be etymologically cognate with CLuw. kui- + =ıha ‘someone’, HLuw. kui- + =ıha ‘someone’ and Lyc. ti- + =ıke ‘someone’ < PANat. *k”i- + *ı=ıe (see at =ıja for this reconstruction and the fact that Hitt. =ıja ~ Luw. =ıha and Lyc. =ıke), although this formation has received an indefinite meaning in the Luwian branch. The generalizing relative use of Hitt. kuš kuš ‘whoever’ is also attested in CLuwian kuš kuš and HLuwian REL-sa REL-sa ‘whoever’ and has an outer-Anatolian cognate in Lat. quisquis ‘whoever’, which points to a PIE usage (*k”is k”is).

The Hitt. formation kui- + =ıkki / =ıkaa ‘someone’ is quite interesting. The distribution between =ıkki and =ıkaa is not fully clear, but one gets the impression that originally =ıkki is used in the nominative and accusative, whereas =ıkaa is used in the oblique cases. If this is correct, then this distribution is blurred in Pre-Hittite times already, however (cf. OS kuedani=ıkki). Within Anatolian, this formation is cognate with Lyd. qı- + =ı ‘someone’ and Lyc. ti- + =ıse ‘someone’.
Especially this last form is important as it shows that we have to reconstruct the elements =kki and =kka as *=끼 and *=keyup respectively (*k because of Lyc. s). Scholars have always been tempted to equate kui- + =kki / =kka with Lat. quisque ‘whoever’, which generally is derived from *k’is-k’e. Attempts to derive Hitt. kuiški through dissimilation from *k’is-k’e (e.g. Oettinger 1983: 182, 185), who also adduces Av. ci-ca) have no merit: if *k’is-k’e would have been altered through dissimilation, we would expect *k’is-ke (with a plain velar), which is contradicted by the palatovelar that is reflected in Lyc. WLVH (< *N = LV H). If one insists on upholding the connection between Hitt. NXLãNL and Lat. TXLVTXH and Av. FLFD, one should rather assume that *=LVN = H as reflected in Latin and Avestan is a reshaped form itself, which arose out of *k’is-ke through assimilation. One could then assume that this assimilation is triggered by the formation *k’is k’is. Note that the enclitic *=ke is also visible in Lat. nunc ‘now’ < *=num-ke (cf. Hitt. kinun < *= ki-num), hic, haec, hoc (OLat. hoce < *=hod-ke) < *=o/e- + -ke.

kukkurš- / kuyakuyarš- (Ib1) ‘to cut up, to mutilate’: part. ku-kur-ša-an-t- (NS), ku-gur-ša-an-t- (NS); impf. ku-ya-ku-ya-ar-aš-ke/a- (NS), ku-ug-gur-aš-ke/a- (OH/NS), ku-uk-ku-ra-aš-ke/a- (NS), ku-uk-ru-eš-ke/a- (OH/NS); broken ku-uk-ku-ú[r-] (OS).

PIE *=k”rs-

See Puhvel HED 4: 235 for attestations. This verb seems to display a reduplication of the verb kuerš-z, for which see under kuer-ž / kur- / kuyar-. As I have argued in Kloekhorst fthc.e, the form kuyakuyaraške/a- is the regular outcome of *=k”rs-ške.o-, whereas kukkuraške/a- and kakkureške/a- are younger formations in which the synchronic weak stem has been introduced. See at kuer-ž for further etymology.

kukuš-ž (Ib1) ‘to taste’: 3sg.pres.act. ku-ku-uš[-zi?] (OS), ku-ku-uš-zi (OH/NS).


PIE *=geus-

The verb occurs twice only. The first context,

KBo 20.39 r.col.
(6) LUGAL-uš[ ... ]
(7) ku-ku-uš[-zi?] ... ]
is too broken to base any conclusion on. The second context is better preserved: it 
describes a ritual:

KUB 10.99 i
(24) \( ^{\text{14}} \) ALAM.ZU\(_9\) \( A-\text{NA} \) NINDA.GUR\(_4\) RA \(_1\) = \( \tilde{S}U \)
(25) me-ma-i ta-ya-li=ma \(_2\) = \( \tilde{S}U \) me-ma-a-[i(\tilde{t})]
(26) LUGAL ú-e-il-la-la-i ú-e-el-la[a(\tilde{t})]
(27) nu ú-e-il-la-i lu-ú-ú[i(\tilde{t})]
(28) [(ki-iš-\( \tilde{s}\))i q-an A-\( \text{NA} \) LUGAL GEŠTIN \( \text{NINDA} \) har-za-zu-un-n[a\(^{\prime}\)]
(29) \([x - x - x - x - z]i \) n=a-an ku-ku-uš-z[i

//
KBo 47.247 vi
(10) [(\( ^{\text{14}} \) ALAM.ZU\(_9\) NI)NDA.GUR\(_4\) RA \(_1\) = \( \tilde{S}U \)
(11) [(me-ma-i ta-ya-li=m)a \(_2\) = \( \tilde{S}U \) me-ma-i
(12) [(LUGAL ú-e-il-la-l)]a-i ú-e-il-la-i
(13) [(nu ú-e-il-la-i lu-)]uí-i-li ki-iš-ša-an
(14) [ANA LUGAL GEŠTIN \( \text{NINDA} \) har-za-zu-u[n\(_n\) = a\(^{\prime}\)] pa-ra-a
(15) \([x - x - x - z(i) n=a-an ku-ku-uš-z)\]

‘The clown speaks once to the thick-bread and speaks twice to the \( \text{tayal} \). The 
king \( \text{yдела-s} \) (and) \( \text{yella-s} \). He \( \text{yella-s} \) thus in Luwian. [They bring] forth wine 
and \( \text{harzazu} \)-bread to the king, and he \( \text{kуkuš-s} \) \( \text{him/i} \)’.

Watkins (2003) quite convincingly argues that a translation ‘tastes’ would fit 
the expected course of events in such rituals. He therefore compares \( \text{kуkušzi} \) with 
the PIE root *\( \text{geus} \)- ‘to taste’, and especially with the Indo-Iranian formations Skt. 
\( \text{jujuš-} \) and Av. \( \text{zίčuš-} \).

gulašš-\(^{2}\): see gulš-\(^{2}\)

gulš-\(^{2}\) (Ib1) ‘to carve, to engrave, to inscribe, to write, to decree’: 1sg.pres.act. 
gul-aš-mi (MS), 3sg.pres.act. gul-aš-zí (OH/MS), 3pl.pres.act. gul-ša-an-zí (OH/NS), 
gul-ša-an-zi (NS), 1sg.pret.act. gul-šu-un (NH), gul-šu-un (NS), 
gul-aš-še-er (NS), 3sg.imp.act. gul-aš-ğu (MH/NS), 2pl.imp.act. gul-aš-tén (MS); 
part. gul-ša-an-t-, gul-ša-an-t-; verb.noun gul-šu-u-ya-ár (NS), gul-aš-šu-ya-
ar (NS); impf. gul-aš-ke/a- (OH/NS).
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Derivatives: \textit{\textsuperscript{4}Gul\v{s}a-} (c.) ‘fate-goddess’ (nom.sg. \textit{\textsuperscript{4}Gul\-\v{s}a-a\-\v{s}}, dat.-loc.sg. \textit{\textsuperscript{4}Gul-\v{s}i}, nom.pl. \textit{\textsuperscript{4}Gul\-\v{s}e-e\-\v{s}}, acc.pl. \textit{\textsuperscript{4}Gul\-\v{s}u-u\-\v{s}}), \textit{\textsuperscript{5}Gul\v{z}i-} (c.) ‘engraving, tracing’ (acc.sg. gul\v{z}i-in (NS), nom.pl. gul\v{z}i-e\-\v{s} (MH/NS), acc.pl. gul\v{z}i-u\-\v{s} (undat.)).

Anat. cognates: Pal. \textit{\textsuperscript{6}Gul\v{z}annike\v{s}} ‘fate-goddesses’ (nom.pl. gul\-za-an-ni-ke-e\-\v{s}, dat.-loc.pl. gul\-za-an-ni-ga-a\-\v{s}); CLuw. \textit{\textsuperscript{6}Gul\v{z}ali} (n.) ‘to draw’ (part. gul\-za-a-i-ma, inf. gul\-za-a-u-na), \textit{\textsuperscript{7}Gul\v{z}a-} (c.) ‘fate, fate-goddess’ (acc.sg. \textit{\textsuperscript{7}Gul\-za-an}, gen.adj.nom.-acc.pl.n. gul\-za-a\-\v{s}-\v{s}a), \textit{\textsuperscript{8}Gul\v{z}all} (n.) ‘sketch, rough draft, wooden tablet’ (nom.-acc.sg. gul\-za-at-tar, gul\-za-tar, nom.-acc.pl. gul\-za-at-tar-ra, Hitt.abl. gul\-za-at-ta-na-az, gul\-za-da-na-za).

IE cognates: Skt. kar\v{s}a\-ti ‘to plough’, Av. kar\v{s}a\-ti ‘to draw furrows’, Gr. \textit{\textsuperscript{14}\v{X}l\v{X}ov} ‘furrow’.

\textit{\textsuperscript{9}PIE} *\textsuperscript{9}lz\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{1}}-\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{2}}nti

See Puhvel HED 4: 239f. for attestations. All forms are spelled gul\-a\-\v{s}-C\textsuperscript{o}, gul\-\v{s}V\textsuperscript{o} or gul\-a\-\v{s}-\v{s}V\textsuperscript{o}. The spellings with geminate -\v{s}- point to a phonological /\textsuperscript{2}lz\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{1}}-/l/. The verb denotes ‘to carve, to inscribe’. From it the noun gul\v{s}a- ‘what has been inscribed > fate’ has been derived, which is defied as \textit{\textsuperscript{4}Gul\v{s}a-} ‘fate-goddess’. The noun gul\v{z}i- ‘engraving’ probably is a Luwianism, showing the specific Luwian development *-lz\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{2}}- > -lz-). This Luwian noun *gul\v{z}ai- (which is borrowed as an i-stem in Hittite) underlies the CLuwian verb gul\v{z}a\-i ‘to draw’ and gul\v{z}all ‘draft, wooden tablet’.

On the IE etymon of this verb there are mainly two visions. Puhvel (l.c) supports Carruba (1966: 36) in assuming that guls\- derives from *g\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{2}}lz\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{1}}- ‘to sting’ (from a root *g\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{2}}lz\- as visible in Lith. gēlti ‘to sting’, Gr. \textit{\textsuperscript{14}\v{X}l\v{X}ų\v{N}} ‘needle’ (which in fact must reflect *g\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{2}}lz\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{1}}H- because of the acute in Lithuanian)). The main objection against this etymology is the fact that *g\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{2}}lz\ should have yielded Luw. y. Oettinger (1979a: 204), Starke (1990: 464) and Melchert (1994a: 150) all connect guls\- with PIE *\textsuperscript{9}lz\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{2}}- ‘to draw furrows’ (probibly an s-extension from *\textsuperscript{9}lz\- ‘to turn’), as seen in Skt. kars\v{s}a\-ti ‘to plough’, Av. kar\v{s}a\-ti ‘to draw furrows’, Gr. \textit{\textsuperscript{14}\v{X}l\v{X}ov} ‘furrow’. This is semantically (‘to draw furrows’ > ‘to engrave’) as well as formally much more convincing.

We would expect that *\textsuperscript{9}lz\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{2}}\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{1}}z\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{2}} / *\textsuperscript{9}lz\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{1}}-\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{2}}nti should regularly yield Hitt. **kual\v{s}\v{a} / kul\v{s}an\v{z}i, but apparently the weak stem was generalized.

\textit{kulu\v{y}ana-}: see kuel\v{y}ana-
kunna- (adj.) ‘right (hand or side); right, favourable, succesfull’ (Sum. ZAG): nom.sg.c. ZAG-š (OS), ku-un-na-š (MS), acc.sg. ZAG-an (OS), ku-un-na-an (NS), nom.-acc.sg.n. ku-un-na-an (OH/MS), ku-un-na-an (KBo 19.136 i 9 (MH/NS)) dat.-loc.sg. ku-un-ni (OS), all.sg. ku-un-ša (MS), abl. ku-un-na-az (OS), ku-u-un-na-ša (KBo 19.136 i 14 (MH/NS)), instr. ku-un-ni-t-ša (OS), ZAG-ni-it, nom.pl.c. ZAG-ni-iš (NS), acc.pl.c. ZAG-nu-uš (OH/MS), nom.-acc.pl.n. ZAG-na.

Derivatives: *kunnatar (n.) ‘rightness, success’ (nom.-acc.sg. ZAG-tar), kunnaḥb̪ (-Ib) ‘to set aright, to get it right, to succeed’ (1sg.pres.act. ZAG-ah-mi (NH), 3pl.pres.act. ZAG-na-ah-ḥa-a-an-zi (MH/NS), part. ZAG-an-t; verb.noun ku-un-na-ah-ḥu-u-ya-aš (NS); impf. ZAG-na-ah-ḥi-iš-ke/-a- (MH/NS)), kunnašši (lb2) ‘to turn out right’ (3sg.pres.act. ku-un-ni-eš-zi (MH/MS)).

PIE *kun-no-?

See Puhvel HED 4: 245f. for attestations. The etymological interpretation of these words is difficul. Duchesne-Guillemin (1947: 89-90) connected kunna- with Av. <spenta-, Lith. šveñas, OCS svetb ‘holy, sacred’, Skt. śunām ‘success(fully)’ that reflect a root *kuen-. A direct equation with Skt. śunām is impossible, however, since *kun-o- should have yielded Hitt. kuna- and not kunna- (cf. Melchert 1994a: 162). One could solve this by assuming an -no-stem *kun-no-. Melchert (l.e.) rather derives kunna- from *kuh2-no- ‘the strong one’, connecting it with Skt. śavas- ‘might’ (*kēyh2-o- and śāra- ‘hero’ (*kūh2-ro-). If this is correct, then this would show that *Vh2nV > Hitt. VmV (cf. the discussion about *Vh2RV at Gš māḫla-, UZU muḫraň-/maḫraň- and Gš zāḫraň). Both etymologies are semantically possible, but I would be inclined to follow the first one.

Note that both etymologies preclude a connection with CLuw. kumma/i-, Lyc. kume/i- ‘holy’ since *k- would have yielded Luw. z- and Lyc. s-.


PIE *gʷ n-gʷ n-u-ti-?

See Puhvel HED 4: 251f. for attestations and semantic treatment. The word NA kunkunuzzi- denotes ‘rock’ and is predominantly attested in the Song of Ullikummi, which tells about NA kunkunuzzi- ‘Ullikummi’ – ‘the Rock Ullikummi’. Because of contexts like KUB 41.ii 39 NA ku-un-ku-nu-uz-it ya-al-ah-ḥa-na-i ‘he
strikes with a *kunkunuzi-* and KUB 22.70 rev. (55) *nom-ma=at*~NA~ *ku-un-ku-nu-uz-zi-it* (56) *GUL-an-zi* ‘they strike them with a *kunkunuzzi-*’, already Carruthers (1933: 154-5) convincingly analysed *kunkunuzzi-* as a word showing the suffix -uzzi-, which is used to form implements and tools, derived from the stem *kunkun-*, a reduplication of the verb *kue(n)*~2~ / *kun-*/ *kuγan-* ‘to strike, to kill’. For the reconstruction of -uzzi- as *-u-i-*, cf. Rieken (1999a: 476). For a treatment of *kue(n)*~2~ / *kun-/ *kuγan-*, see there.

**kur-**: see kuer~2~ / *kur-*/ *kuγar-***


Derivatives: (TEG)*kureššnae~2~ (Ic2) ‘to provide with head-dress’ (part. *ku-re-eš-na-an-t-, ku-ri-iš-na-an-t- ‘coiffed’).

PIE *k*e-r-ēhšh₁-r/ -n-

See Puhvel HED 4: 262f. for attestations. Just as ḫukeššar / ḫukešn- ‘slaughter’ is derived from ḫuek~2~ / ḫu- ‘to slaughter’ and ašeššar / ašešn- ‘meeting’ from eš-~o~ / aš- ‘to sit’, so does kureššar / kureššn- belong to kuer~2~ / *kur-*/ *kuγar-* ‘to cut’ and reflects *k*e*r-ēh₁šh₁-r. The original meaning therefore must have been ‘*cut piece (of cloth) > piece of cloth’. See at kur- / *kur-*/ *kuγar-* for further etymology.


See Puhvel HED 4: 265 for attestations. According to Puhvel, this adjective describes “a foreign person, people or country in relation to a superior potentate or power” and “expresses a status of dependency without actual formal subjection or incorporation (distinct from vassaldom ...)”. The word shows forms with a stem kureššana- and a stem kueryana-, which is quite remarkable. If the word is of IE origin, it apparently shows an ablaut kuer-un- vs. kur-ey-.. Neumann (1961a: 93) analyses the word as showing a Luwian suffix -yan- ‘pertaining to’ attached to the stem kuera- ‘field’ (q.v.). He states that “[d]ie beiden Wechselformen
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können etwa verschiedene Dissimilationsprodukte eines *kuijīyana- sein*,

*(gurta- (c.) 'town, citadel, acropolis': acc.sg. gur-ta-an (NH), dat.-loc.sg. gur-ti (NH), abl. gur-da-az (NS).


See Puhvel HED 4: 275f. for attestations. Already since Benveniste (1932: 139),
gurta- has been compared with PIE *gʰr-tō- (Gr. χώρτος, 'yard', Lat. hortus 'garden') and *gʰr-dʰo- (Skt. gṛha- 'house', OCS gradh 'city' etc.). Although the formal and semantical similarity is indeed attractive, there are no known sound developments by which Hitt. -ur- can derive from either *-or- or *-r-. Because of its late attestation (NH only) and the derivative gurta-yanni- that shows a Luwian suffix -yanai-, it is quite possible that this word is a loan from Luwian. Melchert (1994a: 260) therefore assumes that gurta- is the Luwian outcome of *gʰrdo-. Nevertheless, because in Luwian the normal outcome of *CrC is also CarC, this etymology remains problematic. Kimball (1999: 250) suggests a reconstruction *gʰr-t-o-, derived from a root *gʰer- 'mountain, height' as visible in Skt. giri- 'mountain', Av. gairi- 'mountain', OCS gorā 'mountain'. These forms rather point to *gʰerH-, however.

GIŠ.HUR| kurta- (gender unclear) 'wooden tablet' (Sum. GIŠ.IJUR, Akk. GIŠ.LE-U3):
dat.-loc.sg. gur-ta (NS), abl. kurt-ta-za (NS), gur-ta-za (NS), gur-da-za (NS), dat.-loc.pl. kur-ta-aš (MS), gur-da-aš (NS).

PIE *kʰ-r-to-

See Puhvel HED 4: 276-7 for attestations. Usually, this word is translated as 'wooden tablet', but this is rejected by Puhvel (l.c.), who assumes that kurta "most probably denoted the wooden crates in which the tablets were stored, and hence be identical with the *kurta- postulated as underlying kurtal(l)i- 'crate'". This opinion is based especially upon the following context:

KUB 38.19 + IBoT 2.102 rev.

(4) ka-ru-ul[-i]-li-ja-z=as-at=kān GIŠ.IJUR gur-da-[za]
(5) ar-ḥa gul-aš-sa-an-za x[ ... ]

which Puhvel (who reads GIŠ.HUR gur-da-[za]) translates as "from an old wooden tablet from the g. it [is] recopied": according to him in this sentence the
meaning ‘wooden tablet’ is already expressed by GIŠ.HUR which means that gurda[za] cannot denote ‘wooden tablet’ either. Starke (1990: 458) translates this sentence as “Auf einer alten Holztafel (sind) sie ausgewiesen als ...”, however, taking GIŠ.HUR as a determinative of gurda[za]. As a parallel he cites KUB 42.103 iii (13) an-na-la-z=a-at=kán (14) GIŠ.HUR gul-za-da-na-za ar-ḫa gul-ša-an]-[da] “Auf einer alten Holztafel (sind) sie ausgewiesen ...”. Starke further remarks that kurt- should be derived from kuer- / kur- ‘to cut’ (q.v.), originally meaning “das Abgeschnittene” (although Starke assumes a Luwian origin, and subsequently derivation from CLuw. kuyar- ‘to cut’). This latter translation and etymological account seems attractive to me, and I therefore reconstruct *kuer-to... See at kuer- / kur- / kuyar- for further etymology.


See Puhvel HEd 4: 280f. for attestations. The word kūrur- and its derivatives are often spelled ku-u-ru-, with a plene -u-. This points to a phonological form /körər/. The neuter stem kūrur- ‘enmity, hostility’ is clearly original, from which the occasionally attested commune stem kūrura- ‘enemy’ is derived, probably
through hypostasis of the genitive kūruraš ‘(man) of enmity’ > ‘enemy’. Usually, this commune stem kūrura- is equated with the sumerogram ¹LiKUR ‘enemy’ (thus e.g. Puhvel l.c.), but all occurrences of ¹LiKUR with an unambiguous phonetic complement point to a stem in -na- (dat.-loc.sg. ¹LiKUR-ni, dat.-loc.pl. ¹LiKUR-naš, adv. ¹LiKUR-nili): we never find *¹LiKUR-ra-, which would have pointed to an equation with kūrura-. I therefore have chosen to gather all occurrences of ¹LiKUR and separate them from kūrura-. One may even ask oneself whether the stem kūr- and ¹LiKUR-na- could etymologically be connected at all.

There is only a small group of words in Hittite that end in -ur- and do not show the heteroclitic inflection -ur-/-u(e)n- (like e.g. pahḥur / pahḥuen- or māḫur / mēḫun-). Nevertheless, these are usually regarded as old *-ur/-u(e)n-stems that have lost their heteroclitic inflection (see Rieken 1999a: 319f. for a treatment of these words). In this way, it would be possible to assume that ¹LiKUR-na- goes back to the old oblique stem *kūr- or *kūr-en-.

The etymological interpretation of kūr- is difficult. The first proposal, comparing it with Skt. krūrā- ‘bloody’, etc. (Holma 1916: 66), implies an unattractive dissimilation from *krūrur. Sturtevant (1933: 119, 148, followed by e.g. Oettinger 1979a: 102 and Rieken 1999a: 320-1) rather saw kūrur- as a derivative from kur-‘ to cut’. Although semantically certainly possible (cf. Rieken l.c.), Eichner (1980: 139) points out that the reflexes of *KʷR- are never spelled ku-u-R in Hittite (cf. the total absence of e.g. a spelling **ku-u-ra-an-ziz ‘they cut’ or **ku-u-na-an-ziz ‘they kill’; the only counter-example I know of is ku-u-ut-ru-ya-a-iz-zi (KBo 6.4 iv 7 (OH/NS) if this really reflects *Kʷt-ru-, but this is strictly speaking no example of *KʷR). Therewith a reconstruction *Kʷr-ur- has become unattractive. Eichner (1973a: 75, 99) rather connects kūrur- with Skt. hvārāte ‘to deviate’, Av. zūrāh- ‘iniquity’ from *gʰyər- ‘to walk crookedly’, but these Indo-Iranian forms might better be compared with Lith. pažulnis ‘crooked, oblique’, Gr. φῆλος ‘deceitful’ and OCS zsid, ‘bad, evil’ and then must reflect *gʰuel-. Puhvel (o.c.: 286) suggests to compare kūrur- to Gr. θ(m) OS zvēr, Lith. žvēris, Lat. ferus ‘wild beast’, for which he reconstructs a PIE root *gʰyər- ‘to be savage, to rage’. However, all forms point to a root *gʰyehr- (cf. the broken tone in Latv. zvērs; Lat. ferus then must show Dybo-shortening, cf. Schrijver 1991: 337), which would mean that we have to reconstruct *gʰuhɾ-ur-. Such a form would indeed account for the plene spelling -u-, but the semantic probability remains a point of discussion.

All in all, none of the proposed etymologies surpasses the others in all respects. Nevertheless, a preform *gʰuhɾ-ur- would explain the formal facts best.
*(L)kiša- (c.) ‘daughter-in-law, bride; son-in-law’: acc.sg. ku-ušša-an (OS), nom.pl.c. ku-ušše-eš (OS).


IE cognates: Skt. jōṣ- ‘to enjoy’, Gr. γεύσκει ‘to taste’, Lat. gustā ‘to taste’, Goth. gakiusan ‘to test’, ModHG kiesen ‘to choose’.

PIE *gēus-o-?

See Puhvel HED 4: 288f. for attestations. Note that the words are consistently spelled with plene ú and never with u. This points to a phonological interpretation /kūša-/ The semantic interpretation of these words are difficult. Nevertheless, Weitenberg (1975) convincingly showed that kiša- must mean ‘son-in-law’ or ‘daughter-in-law; bride’, whereas kūšā- should mean ‘bride-price’. His etymological connection with Gr. κόκος ‘female sex-organ’ was not very convincing, however. Rieken (1999a: 258) rather reconstructs *gēus-o- ‘the chosen one’. In her view, kūšā- would be a derivation in *-teh₂-.

Although more appealing, it is a slight problem that PIE *gēus- did not mean ‘to choose’, but rather ‘to taste’ (Hitt. kükus- ‘to taste’, Skt. jōṣ- ‘to enjoy’, Gr. γεύσκει ‘to taste’, Lat. gustā ‘to taste’). Nevertheless, a semantic development to ‘to choose’ is also visible in some Germanic languages (ON kjœsa ‘to choose’, ModHG kiesen ‘to choose’).

See at kükus- for another reflex of PIE *gēus-.


IE cognates: OE hýr, OSax. hūria, MLG hure, ModDu. hùur ‘hire’.

PIE *kuh₁,₂-s-n

See Puhvel HED 4: 290f. for attestations. The word and its derivatives predominantly occur in the Hittite Laws. It is consistently spelled ku-ušša-an and ku-ušša-n, except in KBo 6.10 (a NS copy of the Hittite Laws), in which we
find the spelling ku-uš-ni, ku-uš-na-az and ku-uš-ne-az-zi. Despite their restricted occurrence, these spellings show that we are dealing with a phonological /kuSn-/ (or /koSn-/ although in that case we may have expected a spelling ku-uš-šā’). Many etymological proposals have been given (see an overview in Puhvel l.c.), the best one of which is Goetze’s suggestion (1954: 403) to connect kušsan- with OE hýr ‘hire’ from *kuHS-.

Not only formally, semantically as well this etymology seems impeccable. The laryngeal (which is needed to explain long ã in Germanic) can only be *h₁ or *h₂, since *h₃ would have yielded Hitt. -h- in front of -s-. The original paradigm probably was *kuHu₁:š₁-s-n or *kuHe₁:š₁-s-n (depending on where the full-grade vowel was located, which cannot be determined from the available evidence), *kuH₁:š₁-é₁-n-s, which was secondarily changed to *kuH₁:š₁-s-n, *kuH₁:š₁-n-ós, yielding attested kušsan, kušsan-.


Anat. cognates: CLuw. NA-kuttaššara/- ‘orthostat’ (dat.-loc.sg. ku-ut-ta-aš-ša-ra); HLuw. SCALPRUM kutasara/- (c.) ‘orthostat’ (dat.-loc.sg. SCALPRUM ku-ta-sa+r-a/i-zi (KARKAMIŠ A13d §5, KARKAMIŠ A16b), nom.pl. SCALPRUM ku-ta-sa+r-a/i-zi (KARKAMIŠ A11a §15), acc.pl. SCALPRUM ku-ta-sa+r-a/i-zi (KARKAMIŠ A11a §23, KARKAMIŠ A27e §4), SCALPRUM ku-tú-sa+r-a/i-zi (KARKAMIŠ A18e §5), SCALPRUM ku-ta-sa+r-a/i-zi-i (KARKAMIŠ A11b+c §23), dat.-loc.pl. SCALPRUM ku-ta-sa+r-a/i-za (KARKAMIŠ A11b+c §24, KARKAMIŠ A20a1 §3), kutasara- ‘to “orthostat”’ (1sg.pret.act. SCALPRUM-sa+r-a/i-ha (KARKAMIŠ A11a §16)).

IE cognates: Gr. χέφεσαρ ‘to pour’, Skt. juhoti ‘to pour, to sacrifice’.

PIE *gʰ-éu-t-s, *gʰ-út-ós

See Puhvel HED 4: 296f. for attestations. Occasionally, the umeralographically spelled word BÂD-eššar ‘fortification, stronghold’ is interpreted as *kutteššar (primarily on the basis of Luw. kuttaššara/- ‘orthostat’), but we should rather read it as šaheššar (see at šaheššar / šahešn-).

Since Kronasser (1956: 228), this word is usually regarded as an abstract noun in -t- of the PIE root *gʰ-eu- ‘to pour’ (Gr. χέφεσαρ ‘to pour’, Skt. juhoti ‘to pour, to sacrifice’ etc.). The semantic development must have been ‘‘out-pouring’ > *earthen wall’ > ‘(stone) wall’ (compare Gr. χέφεσαρ ‘embankment’). A priori, we
would expect that a commune -t-stem would show a hysterodynamic ablaut pattern, namely *gʰéu-t-s, *gʰu-ét-m, *gʰu-ét-ös. In my view, (part of) this ablaut is still visible in the Hittite opposition nom.sg. ku-ú-uz-za : gen.sg. ku-ut-ta-aš = /kûtš/ : /kutás/. The acc.sg.-form *gʰu-ét-m, which should have yielded Hitt. **kuettam, apparently was levelled out to attested kuttan.

It is not fully clear whether Luw. kuttásra/i- belongs here as well. If so, it would reflect *gʰu-ét-esr and show that PIE *gʰ remains as k- in Luwian in front of the back vowel -u- (cf. Kimball 1994c: 82).


ku-ut-ru-ya-āš (KUB 13.6 ii 27 (OH/NS), ku-ut-ru-u-aš (KUB 13.4 ii 36 (OH/NS)).


Anat. cognates: H lup. trwan(i)- (c.) ‘judge’ (nom.sg. † terrified † tarai/wai-i-ni-i-sa (EGRIKOY §3), † terrified † tarai/wai-i-ni-sa (TELL AHMAR 1 §1), † terrified † tarai/wai-i-ni-sā (MARAS 1 §1e), † terrified † tarai/wai-i-ni-sā (MARAS 1 §1a), † terrified † tarai/wai-i-ni-sa (BABYLON 1 §1, MARAS 4 §1), etc. acc.sg. IDEX-ni-i-na (IZGIN 1-2 §14), dat.-loc.sg. IDEX-ni-i (MALPINAR §2), nom.pl. IDEX-wai/i-ni-i (TELL TAYINAT 2 line 1), trwana/i- ‘justice’ (abl.-instr. USTITA tarai/wai/i-na-ti (SHEIZAR §2, AKSARAY §5), † terrified † tarai/wai/i-na-ti (MARAS 1 §7), † terrified † IUSTITA-wai/i-ni-ti (KARKAMIŠ A11a §4), † terrified † IUSTITA-ni-ti-i (KARKAMIŠ A12 §10)).

IE cognates: Skt. catvar-, TochA švar, TochB šwer, Gr. τετράκτιος, Arm. č’ork; Lat. quattuor, OIr. cetheoir, Goth. fidwor, Lith. keturi, OCS četyre, ‘four’.

PIE *kʰtru-en-
The oldest (MS) attestations of this noun are nom.sg. *kutruyaš, nom.pl. *kutruyeneš, which point to an original n-stem inflection *kutruyan-/kutruyen-. On the basis of nom.sg. *kutruyaš (< *kutruyan-s), an a-stem inflection *kutruqa- is analogically created in NH times. Note that the form in KUB 17.18 iii 6 is often cited as *ku-ut-ru-ya-ni-eš (thus e.g. Puhvel HED K: 299), but according to Oettinger (1982: 165) the photograph of the tablet also allows a reading [k]u-qua-ru-e-ni-eš, which I have taken over. The derivatives *kutruyaes-, *kutruyašar, *kutruyšar and *kutruyšar- seem to be derived from a stem *kutru-.

Since Carruthers (1933: 152) this noun is generally seen as a derivative of the PIE numeral *k’etuor- ‘four’, reflecting the zero-grade formation *k’etur that has metathesized *-ur- to -ru- (cf. Av. čaθru-dasa- ‘fourteenth’, Lat. quadrupes ‘animal walking on four feet’, Gr. τετράκολα ‘having four πόλεις’). For the semantics, we can compare Lat. testis ‘witness’ < *tristis ‘third party’, but in Hittite we are apparently dealing with a ‘fourth party’.

The formal details are not fully clear. Oettinger (1982: 164f.) treats this word extensively and argues that we are dealing with an n-stem. Because of the remarkable e-grade in the suffix in nom.pl. *kutrueneš < *k’tru-en-š, he assumes that nom.sg. *kutruyaš must have had e-grade as well and reflects *k’tru-en-s. For a long time it was thought that this was impossible in view of the idea that *-ēn+s yielded Hitt. -anza (on the basis of šumanza “binding” < *shu-mēn+s) (cf. Harðarson 1987: 118-121 for an extensive treatment) in contradistinction to *-ēn+s that yielded Hitt. -aš (haraš ‘eagle’ < *hēr-ēn+s). Since šumanza now has been identified as ‘(bul)rush’ rather than ‘binding’, its reconstruction *shu-mēn+s cannot be upheld anymore. Therewith disappears the need to assume that *-ēn+s would yield Hitt. -anza. As long as counter-evidence is lacking, I assume that *kutruyaš reflects *k’tru-en+s (compare the development of gen.sg. *-uēn-s > Hitt. -uš).

As a parallel formation Oettinger (1982: 174) mentions “hier.-luw. tri-w-an-i” ‘judge’, which he interprets as ‘third party’ ‘judge’ (with reference to Eichner). This H Luwian word is consistently spelled tara/i-wa/i-n-e. Although an interpretation /trawan/- in principle is possible, it is not imperative. We could also read /trawan-/ or even /trwan-/ . I wonder to what extent it is possible to assume that this last interpretation, /trwan/-, is the correct one, and that this word reflects *k’truw- with loss of initial *k’ in front of *-tr-, and therewith is directly congate with Hitt. *kutruyan-/kutruyen-. This interpretation has the advantage over an analysis *tr-yan-i- (as if derived from *tr- ‘three’) that we now do not have to assume a suffix -yan- which is further unknown.
Puhvel (HED K: 299f.) rejects the etymological connection with PIE *k"etuer-
because the Hitt. word for 'four' is mejit- / mejay- (q.v.). He rather assumes a
connection with Lith. *gudrēs 'wise', proposing a proto-meaning 'expert
(witness)' for *kuyan-. Although formally and semantically possible, the fact
that Lith. *gudrēs has a variant *gūdras and can easily be an inner-Lithuanian
derivative of *gudinti 'to train' is not favourable to this etymology.

*kuyan-  (c.) 'woman' (Sum. MUNUS): nom.sg. MUNUS-an-za (KUB 30.29
obv. 1 (MS?)), MUNUS-za (OS), MUNUS-na-aš (KUB 33.86 + 8.66 iii 3, 10
(MH/NrS), MUNUS-aš (KBo 4.6 obv. 15 (NH)), acc.sg. MUNUS-na-an (OS),
MUNUS-an, gen.sg. MUNUS-na-aš, MUNUS-aš, dat.-loc.sg. MUNUS-ni,
MUNUS-ni-i, nom.pl. MUNUS-MES-iš, acc.pl. MUNUS-MES-iš.

Derivatives: MUNUS-nilīi (adv.) 'in woman's way, in female fashion'
(MUNUS-nil-iš).

Anat. cognates: CLuw. yūna- (c.) 'woman' (dat.-loc.sg. ya-a-ni, dat.-loc.pl. ya-
na-an-za, ya-na-an-za, gen.adj.nom.-acc.sg.nt. [ya-a]-na-aš-za-an, [ya-n]a-a-
aš-ša-an, gen.adj.nom.plc. ya-na-aš-ši-in-zī), y(a)natt(i)- (c.) 'woman' (nom.sg.
ya-na-at-ti-iš, u-na-at-ti-iš, MUNUS-iš, acc.sg. MUNUS-in, acc.pl. MUNUS-at-
ti-in-za); HLuw. FEMINA-natt(i)- (c.) 'woman' (nom.sg. "FEMINA"-na-ti-i-sa
(SULTANHAN §47), FEMINA-na-ti-sa (BOYBEYPINARI 1 §1,
BOYBEYPINARI 2 §1), FEMINA-na-ti-sa (SHEIZAR §1), acc.sg. FEMINA-ti-
ti-na (TELL AHMAR 2 §16), dat.sg. FEMINA-ti-i (KARKAMIŠ A11a §19,
KARKAMIŠ A11b+c §34), nom.pl. FEMINA-ti-zi (KARATEPE 1 §35, HAMA
4 §3, SULTANHAN §33b), acc.pl. FEMINA-ti-zi (TİLSEVET §2); Lyd. kāna-
'wife' (nom.sg. kāna(š)=k=ay, dat.-loc.sg. kāna(-), nom.-acc.pl. kāns').

The Hittite word for 'woman' only occurs sumerographically written with the
sign MUNUS 'woman'. Attempts have been made to identify phonetically spelled
words as 'woman', but none of these have been convincing. E.g. Neu (1990)
interprets ku-in-nad-[a]-ša-an (KUB 12.60 i 24) as kaínan=šan 'his wife', but
this interpretation is not supported by the context (cf. Güterbock 1992). Carruba
(1994) draws the attention to a form dKuyanšēš as found in the following lists of
deities, which are parallels of each other:

KUB 43.30 iii

(5) [(ne-pi-ša-aš dU-aš kat-ti-i=š-š)]i=ma an-na-aš ta-ga-a-an-zi-pa-aš
(6) [dUTU-aš kat-ti-i=š]-ši=ma dMe-ez-za-la-aš
(7) [(dIN.URTA-aš kat-ti-i]=š-ši=ma dHul-ki-iš
The Storm-god of Heaven with Mother Earth beside him; the Sun-goddess with Mezzula beside her; the Fertility Deity NIN.URTA / Šu'galizaq with the Deity of the Grain beside her; the Moongod with the Deity of the Night beside her; the Deity of the Hearth with the Deity of the Courtyard beside her; the Male Deities with the Deity Mâšiq beside them; the Deity Mâšiq with the Male Deities beside her; the Deity Ūaškuqattašq̣eš with the Deity (or Deities) Kušânesē beside him.

According to Carruba, the ending -eš implies that $^4$Kušânesē is a plural form, and since the only other plural deity in this list are the $^4$Lûmes = $^4$Pîšeneš ‘Male Deities’, it is in his view likely that $^4$Kušânesē should be interpreted as the
counterpart of $^d$Pišeneš and therefore denotes the ‘Female Deities’. Although at first sight this interpretation seems attractive, there are some problems with it. First, in KBo 11.32 most of the divine names for which a sumerographic spelling is possible, are spelled sumerographically, including $^d$Pišeneš, which is written as $^d$LÚ$^\text{MES}$ here. If $^d$Kušanšiš would indeed denote ‘female deities’, we would rather have expected the spelling $^d$MUNUS$^\text{MES}$. Secondly, there is no contextual argument to be given on the basis of which one can state with certainty that $^d$Kušanšiš correspond to $^d$Pišeneš. If we look at contexts like

KUB 55.39 iii
(26) $^d$IM-aš $^d$In-na-ra-aš-miš-iš $^d$Da-ši-mi-iz
(27) $^d$Iš-ta-an-za-aš-ši-iš $^d$Ša-kú-ya-aš-ša-aš
(28) $^d$Ha-an-ta-aš-aš $^d$Iš-ta-娃娃-na-aš-aš
(29) $^d$Ki-iš-sa-ra-aš-aš-aš $^d$Ge-mi-ya-aš-aš-aš
(30) $^d$Iš-pa-an-za $^d$In-na-ya-ya-an-za
(31) $^d$Uš-ku-ya-at-ta-aš-ši-iš $^d$Kú-ya-an-ši-iš
(32) $^d$IM-aš $^d$I-na-ra-aš-mi-iš LUGAL-uš UŠ-KÉ-EN

‘The Storm-god, the Deity Innarašniš, the Deity Dašinmiz, the Deity of the Soul, the Deity of the Eye, the Deity of the Fore-head, the Deity of the Ear, the Deity of the Hand, the Deity of the Knee, the Deity of the Night, the Vigorous Deity, the Deity Uškuattaššiš, the Deity Kušanšiš, the Storm-god (and) the Deity Innarašniš. The king bows (for them)’.

or

KUB 20.24 iii
(36) $^d$LÚ DUB.SAR ḫal-za-a-i $^d$Ḫu-aš-kú-ya-at-ta-aš-ši-iš
(37) $^d$Kú-ya-an-ši-iš DUMU É.GAL LUGAL-i I NINDA.GUR₄ RA
(38) [pa-a-š LUGAL-uš pár-ší-ia] $^d$LÚ DUB.SAR ḫal-za-a-i
(39) $^d$Ḫu-aš-kú-ya-at-ta-aš-ši-iš $^d$Kú-ya-an-ši-iš
(40) [DUMU É.GAL=kán LUGAL-i I NINDA.GUR₄ RA e]-ep-zi

‘The writer screams $^d$Ḫuškuattaššiš, ‘Kušanšiš’. The palace servant gives one thick-bread to the king. The king breaks it. The writer screams $^d$Ḫuškuattaššiš, ‘Kušanšiš’. The palace servant takes the thick-bread from the king’
it is more likely that the presence of ¹Kuyanšeš in the first three texts is determined by the presence of ¹Usuḫuḫattuḫššu, and does not have anything to do with the mentioning of ¹Pišeneš.

An extra argument in favour of interpreting ¹Kuyanšeš as ‘female deities’ was put forth by Carruba in claiming that the context

KUB 2.13 ii
(51) LUGAL-uš Ė.ŠÀ-na pa-iz-zi šu-up-pi-ja-aš
(52) GIS kiš-ḫi-aš nu GIS BANŠUR pé-ra-an ti-an-zi
(53) n=a-aš-ta LUGAL-uš 1 UDU ¹Ši-ya-at-ti
(54) ¹Ku-ya-an-ša-ja ši-pa-an-ti

‘The king goes to the inner-chamber of the clean throne. They bring forth a table and the king sacrifices one sheep to the Deity of the Day (and) to ¹Kuyanšaja’

must be regarded as a parallel to

KUB 56.45 ii
(4) n=a-aš-ta 1 MÁŠ.GAL A-NA ¹Pi-iḫ-ya ¹MUNUS.LU[GAŁ]
(5) ¹Aš-ka-ša-pa ¹MIN.IMIN.BI ¹Šu-ya-li-ja-aḫ-[ti]
(6) ¹MUNUSMEŠ⁻ja ¹Ši-ya-at-ti ¹Ḫa-ša-am-me-[ti]
(7) DINGIRMEŠ URU Ka-ni-iš ¹Ḫi-ša-aš-ši ¹U.GUR
(8) ¹Za-li-ja-a ši-pa-an-ti

‘He sacrifices one billy-goat to Piru, to ¹MUNUS.LUGAL, to Aškašepa, to the Pleiads, to Šuḫalijat, to the Female Deities, to Šiḫat, to Ḥašammeli, to the gods of Kaniš, to the Deity of the Courtyard, to Nergal (and) to Zulijǎ.’

Although the latter context indeed shows the ¹MUNUSMEŠ⁻ja ‘female deities’, it can in my view not be used as proof that this word has to be equated with ¹Kuyanšaja as found in the former context.

All in all, I do not take any of the alleged phonetic spellings into account and will focus on the phonetic complements in Hittite and the evidence from the other Anatolian and Indo-European languages only.

The Hittite forms that show phonetic complements to the sumerogram MUNUS are the following: nom.sg. MUNUS-anza (OH and MH), MUNUS-naš (NS), acc.sg. MUNUS-nan, gen.sg. MUNUS-naš, dat.-loc.sg. MUNUS-ni. These
clearly show that originally we are dealing with a consonant stem in "an", which was thematicized in NH times. In CLuwian, we find a stem yănā- (dat.-loc.sg. yănī, dat.-loc.pl. yaănanza, yaănanza, gen.adj. [yănaṣṣāi-], [yaːnaṣṣāi-]) as well as a derived stem yanatti-, unatti-. In HLuwian, we find the logographically spelled FEMINA-nati-, which undoubtedly must be equated with CLuw. yanatti-, unatti-. In Lydian, we find a stem kāna-, which possibly means ‘wife’.

It is quite obvious that CLuw. yănā- and Lyd. kāna- in one way or another must be cognate to words like Gr. γυνή, Skt. jānis, gen.sg. gnās, OIr. ben, gen.sg. mná, OCS žena, etc. ‘woman’ that reflect *g"ěn-h₂; *g"n-ēh₂-s. Gusmani (1985) argues that Lyd. k- < *g" can only be explained if we assume that it precedes an *o, because normally, *g" > Lyd. q. This means that kāna- reflects *g"ōneh₂-. This reconstruction is supported by CLuw. yănā-, which seems to point to *g"ōneh₂- as well, since a preform *g"ēneh₂- would have undergone Čop’s Law and subsequently yielded **yānnā-. These considerations still do not shed much light to the Hittite forms, however, since they show that the original paradigm was athematic and that therefore a reconstruction *g"ōneh₂- is not possible.

The interpretation of the Hittite material for a large part has been based on the assumption that nom.sg. MUNUS-anza points to the “šumanza-inflection”. For instance, Oettinger (1980: 59-60) interprets MUNUS-anza as *g"enanza < *g"en-an-ōn-s, with acc.sg. MUNUS-nan or *g"enanzanu and gen.sg. MUNUS-naš as *g"enanzanuš (thus also Starke (1980: 74-86): MUNUS-anza = *g"enanza.

Hاردارسون (1987: 118-122) has a slightly different view. He introduces the idea that šumanza ‘cord, band’ must reflect *šḥu-mentions (cf. Gr. ἀρχιέρα), whereas e.g. ḫāraš reflects *ḫw-ōn-s (cf. OHG aro). He therefore interprets MUNUS-anza as /kʷaːntl/ < *g"ōnl-s, with acc.sg. MUNUS-nan = /kʷaːntañan/ and gen.sg. MUNUS-naš = /kʷaːntañas/. According to Hardarson, *g"ōn as reflected in /g"än/ must be identical to OIr. bē < *g"ěn.

Problematic, however, for these theories is the fact that the interpretation of šumanza has proven to be incorrect. This word in fact means ‘(bull)rush’ and therefore cannot be etymologically connected with Gr. ἀρχιέρα. Moreover, the basic stem probably was šumanzan-, which means that the “šumanza-inflection” nom.sg. "anza, acc.sg. "anzanu, gen.sg. "anzanaš does not exist as such.

I therefore want to propose a new look at the word for ‘woman’. If we take etymological consideration into account, and especially compare CLuw. yănā- and Lyd. kāna-, it is in my view very likely that the Hittite sumerographic spelling MUNUS-anza stands for /kʷaːntl/. The difference with ḫāraš ‘eagle’ < *ḫw-ōn-s in my view can be explained by assuming that /kʷaːntl/ does not reflect *g"en-s, but rather *g"ēnh₂+s. Just as in medial position *VnsV > VššV behaves
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differently from *VnHsV > Vnz (compare genzu < *γenh₁-su-), I think that in word-final position these clusters behaved differently as well: *Vns > Vz3 whereas *VnHs > Vnz (the difference in the vowel between *γenh₁-su- > genzu vs. *γ'enh₂-s > /k"ant\'/ is due to the difference between *h₁ and *h₂). This means that acc.sg. MUNUS-nan stands for /k\^aNan/ or /k\^eNan/ < *γ"enh₂-om and gen.sg. MUNUS-na\^s for /k\^aNa\^s/ or /k\^eNa\^s/ < *γ"enh₂-os.

Ł¹kuy\^an- / kun- (c.) ‘hound-man’ (Sum. Ł¹UR.GI'I): nom.sg. ku-ya-a\^s, acc.sg. ku-ya-na-an, gen.sg. ku-ú-na-a\^s.

Anat. cognates: HLuw. swan(i)- (c.) ‘dog’ (nom.sg. sù-wa\^/ni-i-sa (KARKAMIŚ A4a §10), sù-wa\^/ni-i-sá (KULULU 1 §11)).

IE cognates: Gr. κú\^o\'w, Skt. śvá, Arm. šun, Lith. šūd, etc. ‘dog’.

PIE *ku\^o\'n, *ku\^on-m, *ku\^on-ös

See Melchert 1989 for his excellent treatment of these words and their context. He convincingly suggests that Ł¹kuy\^an- must denote something like ‘hound-man’ and that nom.sg. ku\^a\^s, acc.sg. ku\^yanan, gen.sg. kú\^na\^s reflect PIE *ku\^on-s, *ku\^on-m, *ku\^on-ós ‘dog’ as attested also in e.g. Skt. śvá, śvá\^n, śúnas. The exact interpretation of gen.sg. ku-ú-na-a\^s has been debated, especially with regard to the plene -ú-. Melchert assumes that it reflects /kú\^nas/ with a retraction of the accent (just as in Skt. śúnas), but also leaves open the possibility that we are dealing here with a contracted *u\^na-, so kú\^na\^s < *ku\^yan\^a\^s < *ku\^on-ös. This latter scenario seems unlikely to me. In my view, the spelling with plene -ú- is used to stress the fact that it contains the phoneme /ul/, which would have been unexpected because normally the phoneme /ul/ was lowered to /ol/ in front of /ul/ from MH times onwards (cf. § 1.3.9.4.f). In /kun\^a\^s/, which regularly should have yielded **kon\^a\^s/, the /ul/ was restored in analogy to the full grade stem /ku\^an/-.

In HLuwian, the stem su\^yan(i)- reflects the generalized full grade *ku\^on-.

ku\^yar-: see kuer-² / kur-/ ku\^yar-

ku\^ya\^s\^i- (Ib1) ‘to kiss’: 3sg.pres.act. ku-ya-a\^s[-zi'] (KBo 20.37 i 1 (OS)), ku-ya-\^a\^s-z\^i, ku-ya-a\^s-z\^i (KBo 30.101 iii 12 (OH/MS)), 3pl.pres.act. ku-ya-a\^s-\^a-an-z\^i, 3sg.pret.act. ku-ya-a\^s-\^a; impf. ku-ya-a\^s-ke\'a-

Derivatives: ku\^ya\^sn\u- (Ib2) ‘to make kiss’ (3pl.pres.act. ku-ya-a\^s-n\u-an-z\^i).

IE cognates: Gr. κυνέ\'o ‘to kiss’, Skt. śvás\^iti ‘to puff, to snort’.

PIE *ku-en-s- ??
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See Puhvel HED K: 311f. for attestations. The formal as well as semantic similarity to Gr. κνεῦω ‘to kiss’ (*ku-ne-s-) and OHG kussan ‘to kiss’ is striking. Nevertheless, it is impossible that the Hittite verb is cognate to both, since Gr. κ does not regularly correspond to OHG k-. Puhvel therefore rightly remarks that it is quite possible that we are dealing with words of onomatopoeic origin instead of inherited forms (he also compares Skt. śvāsī ‘to puff, to snort’, cūšatī ‘to suck, to smack’, cūmbatī ‘to kiss’).

If Hitt. kuṣāšš- nevertheless is of inherited origin, the vowel -a- would be quite awkward since mi-verbs in principle show *e-grade. This is e.g. for LIV the reason to reconstruct kuṣašš- as PIE *kšas-, reflecting a PIE phoneme *a. Since the existence of such a phoneme is highly dubious (cf. Lubotsky 1989), we rather search for another solution.

It is often disregarded that this verb shows a consistent spelling of geminate -šš- (so kuṣašš- instead of kuṣaš- as often cited). This geminate must be the product of assimilation: one of the possible sources is *-ns-. If we combine this knowledge with the fact that a sequence *-ens yields Hitt. -aš (compare gen.sg.-ending -yaš of the verbal nouns in -yar, which reflects *-en-s), we arrive at a reconstruction *Kuens-. If this -n- is an infix, it would be comparable to the n-infix that is also present in Gr. κνεῦω < *ku-ne-s-. For the formation -en- (*Ku-en-s-) instead of -ne- compare ḥamānki ‘ties’ < *hym-ôn-g³-ēi.

If we take Hitt. kuṣašš- together with Gr. κνεῦω and Skt. śvās-, we arrive at a root *kues-, which shows a formation *ku-ne-s- in Greek and *ku-en-s- in Hittite.

*kuṣaṣu- (c.) ‘cow’ (Sum. GU₂): nom.sg. GU₄-uš (KBo 25.122 iii 14 (OS), KBo 34.70 r.col. 1 (MS), KUB 31.105, 4 (MS), KUB 24.8 + KUB 36.60 iv 27 (OH/NS), KUB 17.27 iii 13 (MH/NS), KBo 23.9 i⁷ 8 (NS), KUB 12.58 iv 8 (NS)), GU₄-aš (KBo 6.3 iii 68 (OH/NS)), acc.sg. GU₄-un (KUB 36.106 obv. 1 (OS), KBo 6.2 iii 58, iv 10 (OS), KBo 17.1 + 25.3 i 5, 41 (OS), KBo 5.2 iii 35 (MH/NS), etc.), GU₄-ol(n) (KBo 40.337 obv. i⁷ 6 (NS)), gen.sg. GU₄-aš (KBo 7.14 + KUB 36.100 rev. 10 (OS), KBo 6.2 ii 31, iv 8 (OS), etc.), dat.-loc.sg. GU₄-i, instr. GU₄-H₄-it (KBo 24.90 i 5 (NS)), acc.pl. GU₄-H₄-uš (StBoT 25.13 i 10 (OS), etc.), gen.pl. GU₄-H₄-aš.

Derivatives: GU₄-li (adv.) ‘like a cow’ (KBo 3.34 i 16 (OH/NS), KBo 22.253 rev. 2 (NS)).

Anat. cognates: CLuw. ʿuṣaṭi- (c.) ‘cow’ (nom.sg. GU₄-iš, acc.sg. GU₄-in, acc.pl. GU₄-in-za; broken ya-a-u-i- [...] (although appurtenance to ‘cow’ is far from assured)); HLuw. ʿuwaṭi- ‘cow’ (nom.sg. BOSANIMAL wa/i-wa/i-sa (KARATEPE 1 §48 Ho.), acc.sg. BOSANIMAL wa/i-wa/i=pa=wa/i=ti (MARAŞ 3
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§5), abl.-instr. "BOS_ANIMAL" wa/i-wa/i-ti-i (KULULU 1 §6), "BOS" wa/i-wa/i-ti-i (ARSLANTAŞ §6), BOS_ANIMAL -ri+i+i- (SULTANHAN §3); Lyc. wawa-, uwa-(c.) 'cow' (acc.sg. wawā, wawu, abl.-instr. uwadi, coll.pl. uwa, wawa, gen.adj.nom.sg.e. uwehi, gen.adj.dat.loc.pl. [u]wahe).

IE cognates: Skt. gav-, Gr. βοῦς, Lat. bās, Latv. gūvās, TochA ko, TochB keₐ, OHG chuo 'cow'.

PIE *gʷ'ēh₁-u-s, *gʷ'ēh₁-éu-m, *gʷ'ēh₁-u-ōs

In Hittite, the word for 'cow' is consistently written with the sumerogram GU₄, on the basis of which its full phonetic shape cannot be determined. Nevertheless, it is of importance that the bulk of the phonetic complements (which are attested in OS texts already) point to a stem in -u-: nom.sg. GU₄-uš, acc.sg. GU₄-un. The rare NS attestations nom.sg. GU₄-aš and acc.sg. GU₄-a[n] may show that this stem in younger times occasionally was thematicized. The alleged attestation nom.sg. GU₄-iš (KUB 12.58 iv 8), cited thus in HW: 275, in fact is GU₄-uš (cf. Götz & Sturtevant 1938: 20).

In the Luwian languages, we do find phonetic spellings of the word for 'cow', however. In HLuwian, we come across BOS_ANIMAL wa/i-wa/i- 'cow' and in Lycian we find wawa- 'cow'. This latter word clearly is an a-stem (cf. acc.sg. wawā). The exact interpretation of HLuw. wa/i-wa/i- is less clear because of the ambiguity of the sign wa/i that can stand for wa as well as wi. On the basis of the fact that in CLuwian we are clearly dealing with an i-Motion stem GU₄(-i)-, it is likely that the HLuwian word should be interpreted as waw(i)- as well. The fact that in Lycian this word was taken over into the a-stem class is clearly due to the fact that 'cow' refers to a female animal.

At first sight it seems obvious that the Luwian languages point to a PLuwian form *yaual(i)-, with an *-a- on the basis of Lyc. -a-, but this is not necessarily correct. Lyc. wawa- can easily show a-umlaut from older *wewa-, which means that it cannot be decided whether the PLuwian form was *yaual(i)-, *yeal(i)- or *yaul(i)-.

It is quite clear that the Luwian forms must be cognate to words for 'cow' in other IE languages like Skt. gav-, Gr. βοῦς, Lat. bās, Latv. gūvās, TochA ko, TochB keₐ, OHG chuo. Although the exact reconstruction of the word for 'cow' in PIE is still a debated issue, I reconstruct a hysteronomically inflecting u-stem *gʷ'ēh₁-u-s, *gʷ'ēh₁-éu-m, *gʷ'ēh₁-u-ōs as the most original paradigm (for the stem *gʷ'ēh₁-u- compare e.g. Kortlandt 1985: 118). Whether the oblique stem *gʷ'ēh₁-u- already in PIE times was altered to *gʷ'ēh₁-u- or *gʷ'ēh₁-éu- is of little concern here. In Anatolian, we would expect that *gʷ'ēh₁us, *gʷ'ēh₁éum yields
PAnat. *g’ō dus, *g’ō um. In Hittite, these forms would regularly yield **/k’ā us/ and **/k’ā un/ respectively, which would have been spelled as **ku-ya-a-us and **ku-ya-a-un. This is the reason for me to treat this lemma in this book under the reconstructed stem *ku-ya-. In the Luwian languages, PAnat. *g’ regularly yields ฤ, which means that, with the rise of the i-mutation, PAnat. *g’ō dus and *g’ō um yielded the PLuwian stem *yō y(i)-. In Luwian, this regularly develops into attested /yō y(i)-/, whereas in Lycian the expected outcome **wew(i)- apparently was changed to an a-stem noun *wewa-, which with a-umlaut regularly yields attested wawa-.
la-1 / l- (H1> Ic2) ‘to loosen, to release, to untie, to relieve, to remove (ailments)’ (Sum. DU3): 1sg.pres.act. la-a-mi (NH), 2sg.pres.act. la-a-si (NH), 3sg.pres.act. la-a-i (OH or MH/MS), la-a-iz-zi (MH/MS), la-a-iz-zi (MH/MS), 1pl.pres.act. la-a-u-e-ni (NH), 3pl.pres.act. la-an-zi (OS), la-a-an-zi (NH), 1sg.pret.act. la-a-mu-un (OH/NS), 2sg.pret.act. la-i-s (NH), 3sg.pret.act. la-a-it (NH), 1pl.pret.act. la-a-u-en (MH/NS), la-a-u-e-en (NH), 3pl.pret.act. la-a-er (OH/NS), la-a-er, 2sg.imp.act. la-a (OH/MS), la-a-a (MH/MS), la-a-i (OH/NS), 3sg.imp.act. la-a-ú (OH or MH/MS), la-a-ad-du (NH), 2pl.imp.act. la-a-at-te-en (MH/MS), la-a-at-tén (NH), 3pl.imp.act. la-a-an-du (Bo 6405 obv. 6 (undat.)); 3sg.pres.midd. la-a-it-ta-ri (NH), la-it-ta-ri (NH), 3sg.pret.midd. la-a-at-ta-at, la-at-ta-at (NH), 3sg.imp.midd. la-a-at-ta-ru (NH); part. la-a-an-t- (MH/MS); verb.noun la-a-u-ya-ar (NS), gen.sg. la-a-ya-aš; inf.I la-a-an-zi (MH/MS); impf. la-a-iš-ke/a- (MH/MS)

Derivatives: lūtar / lūnn- (n.) ‘release’ (nom.-acc.sg. la-a-tar (NS), dat.-loc.sg la-a-an-ni).

IE cognates: Goth. letan ‘to let’, Alb. la ‘he let’, Latv. lāju ‘to let, to allow’.

PIE * hô₁-εi, * hô₂-ênti

See CHD L-N: 1f. and Puhvel HED 5: 28f. for semantics and attestations. The verb shows forms of both the mi- and the hi-conjugation. The oldest attestations (3sg.pres.act. la-a-i and 3sg.imp.act. la-a-ú) clearly show that the hi-flection must be original. On the basis of 3sg. lū a mi-inflected lūzzi was created in MH times, on the basis of which a NH paradigm according to the hatrae-class inflection was created. The oldest plural form, 3pl.pres.act. lūnzi shows a weak stem l-, which
means that lā₁ / l- originally inflected as dā₁ / d- (thus also Oettinger 1979a: 63-7, against this Puhvel HED 5: 31).

An ablating verb lā₁-l- can only go back to a root *leh-. This root is generally compared with PIE *leh₁- ‘to let go’ as visible in Alb. la ‘he let’, Goth. letan ‘to let go’ (with *d-Erweiterung) and Latv. laļļu ‘to let, to allow’ (u-present), which means that lā₁ lanzi reflects *loh₁-ei, *lh₁-enti.

lāe₁: see lā₁ / l-

lāh₁: see lāḥ₁u / laḥu-

lāḥḥ- (c.) ‘military campaign; journey, trip, voyage’: dat.-loc.sg. la-aḥ-hi (OH or MH/MS), la-ah-hi (OH/NS, MH/MS), all.sg. la-aḥ-ha (OS), la-ah-ha (OS), abl. la-aḥ-ḥa-az (OH/MS), la-ah-ḥa-az (OH/NS), la-ah-ḥa-za (OH/NS), acc.pl. la-aḥ-ḥu-u-uṣ (OH/NS).


PIE *leh₁-
See CHD L-N: 4f. and Puhvel HED 5: 1f. for semantics and attestations. From
the attestations of the noun itself it is not fully clear whether the noun originally is
an a-stem lāḥḥa- or a root noun lāḥḥ-. The abl.-form la-aḥ-ḥa-az (OH/MS) in
principle seems to point to a thematic stem lāḥḥa- (otherwise we would expect
**lāḥza, cf. šīḥza 'roof'), but because the OH abl-ending -z is replaced by -az
from MH times onwards (cf. -āz and the replacement of OS šu-u-ha-az by
younger šu-uh-ḥa-az), this form is non-probative. The fact however, that verbal
derivative of this root is laḥḥiē/a- and not **laḥḥae- (from *laḥḥa-je/a-), in my
view strongly indicates that the noun was lāḥḥ- originally. The derivative
laḥḥiē/a- (occasionally secondarily changed into laḥḥiēae-) is predominantly
spelled with -ḥḥ-, showing spellings with single -ḥ- in texts from the time of
Ḫatuššilı III only.

An etymological connection with Gr. λαχ(Φ)ξ ‘men, troops, army, folk’ and
OIr. láech ‘warrior’ was suggested already by Sturtevant (1931a: 120) and is
generally accepted. It points to a root *leḥz- and consequently a reconstruction
*lohz-, *loź-, *loh-y- (or otherwise *leḥz-, *leḥy-, *loh-ö-s ?).

laḥḥāzan- MIŠEN (c.) a water-bird, a duck: nom.sg. la-ah-ḥa-an-za-aš (OH/NS),
[la]’a-ḥa-an-za-na-aš (NH), dat.-loc.sg. la-ḥa-an-za-ni (OH/NS), la-ah-ḥa-an-za
(OH/NS), la-ḥa-an-za (OH/NS), acc.pl. la-ah-ḥa-an-za-nu-uš (OH/NS), la-ḥa-an-
za-nu-uš (OH/NS), la-ah-ḥa-an-zu-uš (OH/NS), la-ḥa-an-zu-uš (OH/NS), la-ḥa-
an-zi-uš (OH/NS), gen.pl. la-ah-ḥa-an-za-na-aš (OH/NS), la-ḥa-an-za-na-aš
(OH/NS).

PIE *leḥz-ent-i-on- (?)

See CHD L-N: 7 for attestations. Since almost all forms are attested in one text,
KUB 39.7 // KUB 39.8, it is not possible to chronologically order the forms.
Nevertheless, if we compare the situation of e.g. ʾistanzan- (q.v.), we can assume
that the original inflection was an n-stem laḥḥāzan-, and that the forms that
show a thematic stem laḥḥāzan- (nom.sg. laḥḥāzan-naš) and the forms that
show a stem laḥḥan- (nom.sg. laḥḥan-za, acc.pl. laḥḥan-uš and even laḥḥaniuš)
are of secondary origin.

As Melchert 2003d has argued, the suffix -anzan- (also in ʾistanzan-, šumanzan-)
can hardly reflect anything else than *-ent-i-on- (verbal adjective in
-ent is the basis for an action noun -ent-i-, of which an “individualizing” noun
-ent-i-on- is derived). The identification of the root lāḥḥ- is less clear, however.
Melchert (o.c.: 136) starts from a participle *laḥḥant- ‘travelling, migrating’
implies an etymological connection with laḥḥiē/a-‘ to travel, to go on an
expedition’ (see sub lāḥy- ‘military campaign’). Because this latter word probably had an original meaning ‘to go on a military campaign’ (cf. Gr. λάχ (άμος ‘men, troops, army, folk’, Ofr. lâche ‘warrior’), I would be rather hesitant in accepting this etymology. Katz (2001: 210) interprets lāḥḥan- as derived from *s)nh-) ‘to swim’. Problematic here is that the development of *s) > Hitt. -l only occurs when there is a clear reason for nasal dissimilation (e.g. lūman < *hneymm, lammar < *nomr). In my view, a development *neh-ent- > lāḥḥan- would be unexpected. Another possibility could be a connection with the root *leh- ‘to cry out loud’ (Skt. rāvati ‘to bark’, YAAv. gāhiro, rainant- ‘crying out songs’, Lat. lāmentum ‘lament’, Arm. lam ‘to lament’, Lith. lūti ‘to bark’, OCS laijo ‘to bark’. The preform *leh-ent-i-on- could then mean ‘the quacking one’ which yielded Hitt. lāḥḥan- ‘duck’.

Anat. cognates: CLuw. lā(h)un(a)i- ‘to wash’ (1sg.pret.act. la-ḫu-ni-i-ḫa, part. la-a-ū-na-i-mi-š=, la-ū-na-i(-mi-š=)), lāḫ- ‘to pour’ (3pl.pret.act. lu-ū-ya-an-da, lu-ū-ud-ta).

PIE *lōh₂u-ei, *lh₂u-énti

In CHD, two verbs are cited, namely “lāh- ‘to pour’” and “la(h)un(wa)i-, la(h)u- ‘to pour’” (L-N: 4 and 13f. respectively). Of the verb lāh- only a few forms are cited: 1sg.pret.act. lāhun, 2sg.imp.act. lāh and 1pl.pres.act. lāhueni, lāhuoni, although of these latter forms it is stated that they could belong to lāh₂u- as well (cf. akuēni of eku² / aku-). This would mean that we have to phonologically analyse this form as /lahuénë/, showing the phoneme /h/’, for which see Kloekhorst fthc.c. In my view, the same is true for lāhun which can be compared to eku ‘I drank’ of eku² / aku- (and not **ekunun) and therefore must represent /lahu“on/. We only have to assume that it secondarily has taken the mi-ending instead of expected **lāhu₄h₂un. This would only leave 2sg.imp.act. lāh as evidence for a verbal root lāh₂-. In my opinion, it is more attractive to assume that lāh₂ belongs to lāh₂u-. We could envisage that a form /lahu“/ would lose its labialization and give /lah/ (but cf. 2sg.imp.act. eku ṭeg”/ where the labialization was retained), or even read the form as la-a-ūh /lahu“/ (compare spellings like tar-uḥ- = /tarh“-/).

The oldest forms of this verb clearly shows that the original paradigm was 3sg. lāh₂ui, 3pl. lāhu₂anzi. In NH times we find forms that inflect according to the tarn(a)-class (lāhu₂ai, lāhu₂as) and the ḫṭrae-class (lāhu₂āzzi, lāhu₂anun), but also occasionally a mi-inflected form (lāhu₂zzi, lāh₂un).

The singular stem lāhu₂- (which phonologically was /lah“-/) can only reflect a preform *lōh₂u-. We would expect that the corresponding plural stem was *lh₂u-. The latter form regularly probably should have given **lu₂- (compare mā “grows” < *mhy₂-óe-ëi), in which the -ë- of the singular was reintroduced. This explains why we find a lenited -ë- in the plural as well and not a stem *lah₂u- as we might expect when comparing verbs like āki / akmänzi etc.

Hitt. lāhu₂- is often compared to Gr. λοῖκα, λῶκος. Lat. lavō ‘to wash’ (first suggested by Sturtevant 1927a: 122). These latter verbs reflect PIE *léu₂h₂-, however, which is an impossible reconstruction for Hittite, where we would expect it to yield **li₂- (likewise if we assume laryngeal-metathesis *leh₂u-).

With the disappearance of a verb lāh₂- ‘to pour’, there is no reason to assume that lāh₂u- reflects an u-extension of a root *leu₂- (as argued e.g. by Puhvel HED 5: 23f.).
Note that the derivatives laḫḫu- and laḫḫuššar show a geminate -ḫḫ- which indicates that these words reflect e-grade: *leḫ₂u- and *leḫ₂u-ḫššar. These forms must be the source of the few NH forms within the paradigm of laḫḫu- that show a stem laḫḫu- (clearly in e.g. KUB 9.31 ii 9 where we find la-aḫ-ḫu-u-ya-ı because of la-aḫ-ḫu-u-ı in the preceding line, see laḫḫu-).

A hypothetical *laḫuzzi- is possibly attested in OA-Assyrian texts from Kültepe as luḫuzzīnum, a vessel, cf. Derksen (fthc.).


PIE *leḫ₂u-ro-

See CHD L-N: 15 and Puhvel HED 5: 13f. for attestations and semantics. The word denotes a stand, made (partly) of wood, that is placed in the vicinity of the altar. It is used to place objects upon (mostly cups and pots). Puhvel (l.c.) translates laḫhura- as ‘bench’ on the basis of a supposed connection with Russ. lavka ‘bench’ and Lith. lōva ‘bed’. This seems incorrect to me as there is no indication that the laḫhura- was used to lie upon.

Some contexts of laḫhura- show a connection with lāḫu² / laḫu- ‘to pour’, which might point to an etymological connection between the two, e.g.

KUB 9.31 ii

(8) n=a-at=ša-an GIs la-aḫ-ḫu-ri šu-uḫ-ḫa-i nu me-na-aḫ-ḫa-an-da

(9) GEŠTIN la-aḫ-ḫu-u-ya-ı

‘He scatters them (broken pieces of thick-bread) on the laḫhura- and pours wine over (them)’.

This connection with lāḫu-laḫu- (either real or folk-etymologically) might explain the occasional spellings lāḫu-.

If the connection with lāḫu-laḫu- ‘to pour’ is real, the word probably goes back to *leḫ₂u-ro- (e-grade because of the fortis -ḫḫ-). See at lāḫu² / laḫu- for further etymology.


Originally this word was neuter, as can be seen by the OS erg.pl. laḫḫurnuzian[t̪eš] and the many neuter singular forms. Only in NH times, we find commune forms being used for the plural. The one attestation laḫḫuarmuzi- is caused by the fact that phonologically this word was /laHʷnu-t'i-/ (for the phonemic status of /Hʷ/ see Kloekhorst fthc.c), in which the -r- occasionally was realized vocalically: [laHʷtu-t'i-].

Formally, the word looks like a derivative in -uzzi- of a stem laḫḫurn-, but semantically this is unlikely as -uzzi- is used for instruments and tools. Moreover, a stem laḫḫurn- is further unknown.

Puhvel’s connection (HED 5: 27f.) with laḫḫura- and lāḫu- / lāḫu- ‘to pour’ does not makes sense semantically. His comparison to the Germanic words for ‘foliage’, ModDu. loof, ModEng. leaf from P Germ. *laub- (*leh₂u-bʰ-?) may have more merit, but still leaves us with the problem of the Hittite formation. Puhvel’s claim that laḫḫuarmuzi- originally was a compound does not convince.

Gašlaḫḫuarmuzi-: see (Gaš)laḫḫurnuzzi-

lāk[-] / lak- (IIa2; IIIf) ‘(act.) to knock out (a tooth), to turn (one’s ears or eyes towards), to train (a vine); (midd.) to fall, to be felled, to be toppled’: 3sg.pres.act. la-a-ki (OS), 2sg.imp.act. la-a-ak (OH/MS); 3sg.pres.midd. la-ga-a-ri (MH/NS), la-ga-a-iti (NH), 3sg.imp.midd. la-ga-a-ru (MH/NS), la-ga-a-aru (MH/NS); part. la-ga-an-t- (OS), la-ga-a-an-t- (OH/MS); impf. la-ak-ki-šeš-kē/ia-

Derivatives: laknu-[2] (Ib2) ‘to fell, to knock over, to train (a vine)’ (2sg.pres.act. la-ak-nu-ši (NH), 3sg.pres.act. la-ak-nu-uz-zi (NH), la-ak-nu-zi (NH), 3pl.pres.act. la-ak-nu-an-zi (NH), la-ak-nu-ya-an-zi (NH), la-ak-nu-ya-an-zi (NH), 3sg.pret.act. la-ak-nu-ut (MH/MS); 2sg.imp.act. la-ak-nu-ut (NH); impf. la-ak-nu-šeš-kē/ia- (OH/MS)), līlak(k)-[2] (IIa2) ‘to fell’ (3sg.pres.act. li-la-ak-ki), lagan- (n.) ‘inclination, disposition’ (nom.-acc.sg. la-ga-a(n)=š-mi-it, gen.sg. la-ga-na-aš).

IE cognates: OCS lōžiti ‘to lay down’, Goth. lagjan ‘to lay down’.

PIE *lōgh₂-eǐ̯e-. 
See CHD (L-N: 17f.) and Puhvel (HED 5: 33f.) for attestations and contexts. The active forms of this verb occur in OH texts only, its function being taken over by laknu\(^2\) from MH times onwards. It is used in specific contexts only. When used with ‘tooth’ as object, it means ‘to knock out’. Its use with ‘eyes’ and ‘ears’ probably is an expression that is difficult to literally translate and denotes the attentively listening to and looking at someone. The use with ‘vine’ as object probably is an expression too and denotes the training of it. Note that Puhvel’s translation of the active, ‘to lie, to recline’ is based on a false interpretation of the last case (+ ‘vine’) and probably is based on etymological considerations only.

The middle forms denote the falling down of people (out of a chariot, out of bed), the being toppled of stelas and the falling of countries to the enemy.

The etymon of this verb has been clear since Sturtevant (1930c: 216-7) and generally accepted: PIE *leg\(^3\)- ‘to lie down’. The exact morphology is not very clear, however. If we want to describe the meaning of the Hitt. verb in terms of ‘to lie down’, then the active forms go back to ‘*to make lie down’, and the middle forms to ‘*to be made lie down’. Semantically as well as formally, lâğı ‘to make lie down’ resembles OCS ložiti ‘to lay down’ and Goth. lagian ‘to lay down’ that reflect a causative formation *log\(^b\)-eie-. This seems to indicate that here the causative *CoC-eie- ended up in the Hittite hi-conjugation (but see lukke-). The middle forms formally reflect *lg\(^d\)-o-, but probably are a specific Hittite formation.

Note that the impf. lâkkishe/a- shows a geminate -kk-, which reminds us of other cases of fortition in front of -skʃ/a- as e.g. akkuške/a- from eku\(^2\) / aku- ‘to drink’ or ḫukkishe/a- from ḫuek\(^2\) / ḫuk- ‘to butcher’.

See CHD L-N: 20 and Puhvel HED 5: 39 for attestations and semantics. Puhvel suggests a connection with OHG lahhan, ModHG Laken ‘sheet’ etc., but this is formally impossible as these reflect *-g-, vs. Hitt. *-k\(^u\)-. The formation of lakkuszanzi- is unclear to me. The one Luwian inflected form may point to a Luwian origin.

lala- (c.) ‘tongue, blade, speech, talk’ (Sum. (UZU)EME): nom.sg. la-la-aš (MH/MS), la-la-aš (MH/NS), acc.sg. la-la-an (OS, often), la-la-an (1x), gen.sg. la-la-aš (MH/NS), la-la-aš (1x, NH), dat.-loc.sg. la-a-li (OH or
MH/MS), abl. EME-az, EME-za, instr. la-a-li-it (OH/NS), nom.pl. la-a-le-eš (OS), acc.pl. la-a-lu-ı (OS).


PAnat. *lolo- or *lago-

See CHD L-N: 23f. and Puhvel HED 5: 40f. for attestations and semantics. Both dictionaries state that the word occasionally is attested as neuter, but this is valid for the Sumerogram EME only. It is not impossible that EME is used for another, neuter Hittite word that denotes ‘tongue’. The word is attested in Luwian as well and therefore must be of PAnatolian date. I know of no IE cognates, however. It is likely that the word is of onomatopoetic origin.

lalal(ka)u’eša- (c.) ‘ant’: nom.sg. la-la-ú-eša-aš, acc.sg. la-la-ku-eša-an, la-la-ú-eša-an, gen.pl. la-la-ú-i-ıša-aš.

Derivatives: lalal(ka)uššar / lalal(ka)uššan- (n.) ‘ant-colony, ant swarm’ (nom.-acc.sg. la-la-kı-eš-ıš, gen.sg.(?) la-la-ú-eš-na-aš, la-la-ú-i-ıš-na-aš, la-la-yı̄š-ıš-n[a-aš], [l]a-la-yı̄š-ıa-n[a-ıš].

See CHD L-N: 27 and Puhvel HED 5: 44f. for attestations. The word shows two stems, namely lalakı̄ša- besides lalayę́ša-. This can be explained if we assume that the stem lalakı̄ša- is Hittite, the /g/ of which corresponds to Luwian /g/ in lalayę́ša-.

Puhvel suggests a connection with PIE *legʰ- ‘light’ as cited in Pokorny 660-1. This root nowadays is reconstructed as *hlengʰ- ‘to move lightly’ (cf. LIV²), which, apart from the semantic unattractiveness, makes a connection with lalal(ka)ušša- unlikely. In my view, the word probably is of local origin.

According to Melchert (1994a: 171), lalal(ka)uššar must show haplology from original *lalat(ka)uššesša.

lalami- (c./n.) ‘receipt’: nom.sg.c. la-la-mı̄-ı̄š, la-la-mı̄-ı̄s, la-la-mı̄-ı̄ş, nom.-acc.pl.n. la-la-ama.

See CHD L-N: 26 for attestations. The multiple uses of gloss wedges indicate a foreign (Luwian) origin. Semantically as well as formally a connection with
CLuw. l Gdańsk ‘to take’ (see at dasi / d-) is attractive, which means that lalami- is to be seen as a Hittitized adaptation of the Luwian part. lalama/i-.

lalaye/iša-: see lala(k)ne/iša-

lālu- (n.) ‘penis’ (Akk. lašāru): nom.-acc.sg. la-a-lu.

Anat. cognates: Lyd. λάλου ‘juvenile penis’.

See CHD L-N: 28 for attestations. Puhvel (HED 5: 47) adduces a Greek hapax λάλου used by Straton of Sardes, who possibly was Lydian. The word probably originates in child language.

lalukke-² (lb2) ‘to be or become luminous’: 3sg.pret. la-lu-uk-ke-et.

Derivatives: lalukkeyant- (adj.) ‘luminous’ (nom.sg.c. la-lu-uk-ke-u-ya-an-za, nom.-acc.sg.n. la-lu-uk-(ke-u-ya-an), la-lu-ke-ya-an, nom.pl.c. la-lu-uk-ke-u-(ya)-an-te-ēš), lalukkima- (c.) ‘light source’ (Sum. ZálAG.ZA, nom.sg. la-lu-uk-ki-ma-āš, la-a-lu-ki-ma-āš (1x), acc.sg. la-lu-uk-ki-ma-an, la-a-lu-ki-ma-an (1x), dat.-loc.sg. la-lu-uk-ki-mi, nom.pl. la-lu-uk-ki-mi-īš).

See CHD L-N: 28f. and Puhvel HED 5: 48f. for attestations. Although the only verbal form la-lu-uk-KI-IT in principle could be read as la-lu-uk-ki-et, as if showing a stem lalukkie/ē², the derivative la-lu-uk-KI-ya-an-t- clearly shows that this interpretation is improbably, as verbs in -je/a- usually have a derivative in -ijayant- (cf. āššijayant-, kardimijayant-, naḥšarijayant-, piddulijayant-). This means that the verbal form must be interpreted as la-lu-uk-ke-et and its derivative as la-lu-uk-ke-ya-an-t-, both belonging to the stem lalukke-², a ‘stative’ in *-ēhu, (cf. Watkins 1973a: 76). See at lukka, for further etymology.

laluk(khe)išš-² (lb1) ‘to light up, to become luminous’: 3sg.pres.act. la-lu-uk-kišš-zi (OH/NS), la-lu-uk-ki-iš-zi (OH/NS), la-lu-ki-iš-zi (NH), la-lu-ki-eš-zi (NH), 3sg.impact. la-lu-uk-ki-eš-du (MH/MS), la-lu-uk-ki-iš-du (NH), la-lu-kiš-du (NH); part. [a-l]-lu-uk-ki-iš-ša-an-t-(MH/MS).

Derivatives: laluk(khe)išnu-² (lb1) ‘to give light to, to illuminate’ (3sg.pret.act. la-lu-uk-ki-iš-nu-ut, 3sg.impact. la-lu-uk-[i-iš-nu]-ud-du); part. la-lu-ki-iš-nu-yā-an-t-; impf. la-lu-uk-ki-eš-nu-uš-ke/a-).

PIE *lo-leuk-s- or *lo-leuk-s-
this is incorrect, as shown by Watkins (1985: 252), who argues that fientives in
-čč- never show a derived causative in -mu-. He rather analyses this verb in the
same way as nanakũš(i/e)a- ‘to be(come) dark’ (q.v.), which must reflect *no-
nog¹⁷-s or *no-nog¹⁷-s, derived from neku² (q.v.). This means that
laluk(k)e/išš- must reflect *lo-louk-s or *lo-leuk-s and that -e/i- is an anaptyctic
vowel to solve the cluster l-ksC- comparable to the one in taksš- ‘to undertake, to
unify’ (q.v.) that is spelled takke/iššC-. Note that the part. [lal]ukššant- (instead of
expected **lalukšiant-) corresponds to the younger spellings takke/iššanzi
besides OS takšanzi.

lūman / lamn- (n.) ‘name; reputation’ (Akk. ŠUMMU): nom.-acc.sg. la-a-ma-an
(OH/MS), la-a-am-ma-an(n)=-ni-it (OH/NS), la-ma-an (OH/NS), lam-an (NS),
lam-ma-an (NS), gen.sg. la-am-na-aš, lam-na-aš, dat.-loc.sg. la-am-ni, lam-ni,
loc.sg. lam-ma-an, abl. ŠUM-za, ŠUM-az, instr. lam-ni-it, nom.-acc.pl.
ŠUMMEŠšA, dat.-loc.pl. lam-na-aš.

Derivatives: lam(μa)nije/a-² (Ic1) ‘to name, to call, to summon, to assign’
(2sg.pres.act. lam-ni-ja-ši, 3sg.pres.act. lam-ni-ez-zi (MH/MS), lam-ni-e-ez-zi
(NH), lam-ni-az-zi, lam-ni-ja-zi, lam-ni-ja-az-zi, 1pl.pres.act. lam-ma-ni-i-e-e-e-
ni (MH/MS), 3pl.pres.act. lam-ni-ja-an-zi, 1sg.pret.act. lam-ni-ja-nu-an,
3sg.pret.act. lam-ni-ja-at, 1pl.pret.act. ŠUM-(u)-jen, 3pl.pret.act. lam-ni-er, lam-
ma-ni-er, lam-ni-e-er; part. lam-ni-(ja)-an-t-; impf. lam-ni-iš-ke/a-).

Anat. cognates: HLuw. alaman- (n.) ‘name’ (nom.-acc.sg. /lłamam=t'al á-taš-
ma-za, nom.-acc.pl.(?) /lłamɐ́ á-taš-ma-ni (BOYBEYPINARI 1-2 §19), á-taš-
ma-ni (TELL TAYINAT 2 fr.11)), lamn- ‘to proclaim’ (impf.3pl.pres.act.
/lamnisanti₁ /la-ma-ni-sa-ti (KARKAMIŠ A31+ §9)); Lyc. alaman- ‘name’
(nom.-acc.pl. alama).

PAnat. *ʔl̥ānn-, *ʔl̥ānn-.

IE cognates: Lat. nōmen, Skt. nāman-, Goth. namo, Gr. ὄνομα, Ofr. ainm, etc.
‘name’.

PIE *h₂néh₂ŷmn

See CHD L-N: 31f. and Puhvel HED 5: 51f. for attestations and contexts. It has
been clear since long that this word is to be connected with Lat. nōmen, Skt.
nāman-, Gr. ὄνομα etc. ‘name’, but the exact reconstruction of these words is in
debate. The difference in length between ō in Lat. nōmen and ō in Gr. ὄνομα
points to an ablauting complex *-e₂h₂- vs. *-e₂h₂-. The initial o- of Gr. ὄνομα
must be due to an initial laryngeal, but the question is which one, *h₂- or *h₂-.
Many scholars argue that we have to reconstruct an initial *h₂- on the basis of one Doric
and two Laconian inscriptions that show an element ἐνυματικος as the first part of names (assuming that ἐνυματικος shows a vowel-assimilation from *ἐνυματικος) and because of the absence of a reflex ḫ- in Anatolian. As I have argued in Kloeckhorst 1999, the absence of ḫ- in Anatolian is non-probative as initial *h3 merged with the reflex of *h in preconsonantal position in PA, and is consequently lost in Hittite, but preserved as ḫ- in HLuwian and α- in Lycian. For the non-Anatolian languages, see Beekes 1987 who convincingly argues that on the basis of Gr. ἐνυματικος, νόμιμος, ‘anonymus’ and Phr. onoman, we have to assume an initial *h3-.

The word for ‘name’ therefore has to be reconstructed as *h3nēw3mn. In my view, this word further can be analysed as *h3nēw3mn, which is a derivative of the verbal stem *h3nēw3 that is visible in Hitt. ḫanna- / ḫanni- ‘to sue’ (q.v.) and Gr. ἐνυματικος, νόμιμος ‘to call names’.

Already in PA, the preform *nēw3mn was subject to nasal dissimilation, yielding *nēw3mn (for my interpretation of HLuw. ḫ-ta3-ma- as ḫamīn- and for the reading of Lyc. alāma instead of adāma, see Kloeckhorst 2004: 39-40), which development can be compared to lammar ‘moment’ (q.v.) < *nomar.

The derived verb lam(ma)niat- (HLuw. lamati-sa-, showing aphaeresis from original *lamati-sa-) must be equated with Gr. ἐνυματικος, Goth. namjan ‘to call’ < *h3n(a)w3mn-j-ero-. Phonologically it is to be interpreted as lamīn/a/-, spelled lamiiat/-a-, which occasionally was phonyically rendered [la:mi/a-], which is expressed in the spelling lamonian/a/.

Pulvel rightly remarks that the Hitt. expression ḫman da-si 'to name (someone)' is to be equated with e.g. Skt. nāma dhā-, Av. nāmavā daadā, Gr. τίθειν ἐνυματικος, OLat. nōmen facere, all reflecting the PIE syntagm *h3nēw3mn deh3- ‘to name’.


Anat. cognates: HLuw. lam(t)ıni (adv.) ‘at the time’ (la-mi-ni-) (KARAHOYUK §1).

IE cognates: Lat. numerus ‘number, measure’.

PIE *nōm-r, n(o)m-n-ös
See CHD L-N: 36 and Puhvel HED 5: 57f. for attestations and semantics. The etymological connection with Lat. numeros ‘number, measure’ (first suggested by Duchesne-Guillemin 1947: 85) is generally accepted. This means that lammar reflects an r/n-stem *nom-r, *nom-n- besides the s-stem visible in Lat. numeros < *nom-es-, both derived from the verbal root *nem- ‘to allot’ (Gr. νέμομαι ‘to allot’, Goth. neman ‘to take’, Skt. namas- ‘worship’).

In lammar the same nasal dissimilation occurs as in lūman ‘name’ (q.v.). The geminate -mm- is caused by the adjacent r, cf. keš̄sar ‘hand’ < *g̣es-r.

lāpp-² / lapp- (Ia4) ‘to glow, to flash’: 3sg.pres.act. la-ap-zi (NH), 3sg.pret.act. la-a-ap-ta (OS), la-apa-ta (NH).


IE cognates: Gr. ἀμμό ‘to shine’ (*ląd₂-n-p-), Lith. lōpė ‘light’, Latv. lāpa ‘torch’.

PIE *leh₂p- / *l’h₂p-

See CHD L-N: 39-40, 44f. for attestations and contexts. Oettinger (1979a: 443) states that this verb originally belonged to the hi-conjugation, but there is no indication for this. On the contrary, all forms point to the mi-conjugation. Oettinger’s assumption probably is based on the ā-vocalism in the root, which is normal in hi-inflected verbs. In this verb -ā̄- reflects *eh₂-, however, and not an o-grade. The geminate -pp- is visible in the derivatives lap(pa)nu- and lappiia-. Although the weak stem of this verb is not attested itself, the causative lap(pa)nu- shows that it must have been lapp-, which contrasts with the strong stem lāpp-visible in 3sg.pret.act. lūpta.

Since Mudge (1931: 252) this verb is connected with Gr. ἀμμό ‘to shine’ and Lith. lōpė ‘light’. These forms point to a root *leh₂p- (with Gr. ἀμμό < *l’h₂-n-p-), which means that the Hitt. ablauting pair lāpp- / lapp- reflects *leh₂p- / *l’h₂p-.

The appurtenance of lappina- and its derived verb lappinae.-² is not ascertained, but possible if the words indeed denote ‘wick’ and ‘to insert a wick’ respectively (see CHD L-N: 45 for these meanings).
The interpretation of CLuw. *lappija*- is not clear, but cf. Starke’s claim (1990: 63) that it must mean ‘heat’ and therefore be connected to these Hittite words.


See CHD L-N: 40 and Puhvel HED 5: 60 for attestations and contexts. Puhvel (l.c.) mentions Lith. *lōpetā* and Russ. *lopāta* ‘spade, shovel’ as possible cognates, but these forms are rather BSI derivations of a stem visible in Lith. *lāpas* ‘leaf’.


See CHD L-N: 41ff. for attestations. Much has been said about this word, for which see the list of references in Tischler HEG T: 34f. It is clear that *labarna-* is used as a title for Hittite kings. It is also clear that *labarna-* is a personal name of one of the early kings (and some princes) of Ḫattuša (note that Starke’s argumentation (1980-83) that all attestations of *labarna-* must be interpreted as a title and not as a personal name is unconvincing). The question now is whether an original personal name has been taken over as a title (in the same way as Lat. *caesar*), or whether we are dealing with an original noun ‘ruler (vel sim.)’ that was also used as a personal name. According to CHD (L-N: 43), “[t]he distribution seems to confirm the theory that *labarna* or **tabarna** was first a PN”.

It may be instructive to look at the spelling of this word. CHD states that it “was predominantly spelled with *la*– in Hittite rituals; Ḫattic and Palaic ritual texts use only the form with *ta*–, which was taken over in a few of the Hittite rituals”. Moreover, the Hittite-Akkadian bilingual of Ḫattušili I “follows the pattern in that it spells the name of the king with *la*– in the Hittite version but with *ta*– in Akkadian”. So we seem to be dealing with a situation in which Hitt. *la-* corresponds to non-Hitt. *ta-*: The labial consonant is almost consistently spelled with the signs BA and BAR, which both are extremely rare in Hittite. Moreover, in Ḫattic texts, we come across the spelling *ta-ya₅-ar-na* (cf. Schuster 1974: 88). Already on the basis of these spelling peculiarities alone, I would conclude that
l/tabarna- must be of non-IE origin (seemingly an adaptation of something like [träfarna-]). And if we are indeed dealing with an original personal name that only secondarily came to be used as the title of the Hittite kings, the original meaning cannot be determined. All in all, I see no possible way to etymologize this word.

Recently, Melchert (2003b: 19) has tried to etymologize l/tabarna- by connecting it with the verb taparije/a-, but see there for my rejection of it.


Anat. cognates: CLuw. latpi- (c.) ‘eyelash’ (acc.sg. la-al-pi-in, la-al-pi-i-in).

See CHD L-N: 45f. and Puhvel HED 5: 62f. for attestations. The word shows different stems and both neuter and commune forms, which clearly point to a non-IE origin.


Although this verb is attested in Hittite contexts (for which see CHD L-N: 49), it shows Luwian inflected forms only. It is translated ‘to despoil, to strip’ in CHD. Puhvel (HED 5: 67) and Melchert (1993b: 126) translate ‘to break, to destroy’, however. These latter translations seem especially prompted by the idea that layarr(ija)- is the Luwian counterpart of Hitt. duşarni(2) / duşarn- ‘to break’ (q.v.) (cf. Carruba 1966: 17-8), which view is generally accepted. In my opinion, this connection is impossible, however. Hitt. duşarni-/duşarn- must reflect *d’ur-n-(e)h₁-₁, the nasal-present of a root *d’uerh₁₁, of which I do not see how it could have yielded Luw. layar-, especially with regard to the first -a-. Note that Carruba’s comparison to the au- : u- correspondence in CLuw. aqi- ~ Hitt. uya- ‘to come’ is invalid, of course. If the *d’- of *d’uerh₁₁ indeed would have yielded CLuw. l- (which is possible, cf. la- ‘to take’ < *deh₁-), we would expect an outcome **luṣarr-, and not layarr-. Melchert (1994a: 238) seems to be aware of this problem and stealthily cites the verb as l(a)yarrri-, but this is incorrect: the verb is always spelled la-ya-ar- and never **lu-ya-ar-. I therefore reject this etymology and the supposed connection between Luw. layarr(ija)- and Hitt.
duyarni-/duyarn-. Unfortunately, I have no alternative etymology to offer for layarr(īja)-.

lāyyatt- (c.?) ‘?': gen.sg. la-a-yā-at-ta-aš (OS).

The word is hapax in KBo 20.21 rev. (1) [ḥa-m]ē-eš-ḫi la-a-yā-at-ta aš me-h[u-ni] ‘in the spring, in the time of l’.

Unfortunately, I have no alternative etymology to offer for 'muddiness', but does so on the basis of a presupposed etymological connection with Lat. lutum 'mud, mire' etc. only. This is methodologically unacceptable. Melchert (1993b: 126) states that the word probably is a Luwian neuter noun in -atta-, but this seems unlikely to me because of the fact that the word is attested in an OS texts. The word would make perfectly sense as the gen.sg. of a Hitt. t-stem, cf. šiyyatt-, tarratt- etc., which would mean that we should rather look for a root *lāy- (e.g. *leh₂u- ‘to wash’, cf. spring cleaning?).

(la)lazzai- / lazī- (c.) ‘sweet flag, calamus’ (Sum. GL.DÜG.GA): nom.sg. la-aza-za-iš; broken la-z[i-...].

See CHD L-N: 49f. and Puhvel HED 5: 68 for attestations. It is generally accepted that lazzai- can be equated with Sum. GL.DÜG.GA and Akk. qanū īḇu (lit. ‘good reed’) ‘sweet flag’ (cf. Puhvel l.c. and Tischler HEG L/M: 48, but doubted in CHD l.c.). If this equation is justified, it is likely that, just as the Sumerian and Akkadian words literally mean ‘good reed’, Hitt. lazzai- as well is derived from the adj. lazzi- ‘good’ (q.v.).

lazzī- (adj.) ‘good, right’ (Sum. SIG₅, DÜG.GA): nom.sg.c. la-a-zī-iš (OS), acc.sg.c. [la'-az₃-z]i[^]a-an=n=a (KUB 29.38 i 2 (OS)).

Derivatives: lāzzījeu[^] (act.) to set straight, to prosper; (midd.) to be good, to be right, to be favourable, to get well' (1sg.pres.act. SIG₅-zī-ja-mi, 3sg.pres.act. SIG₅-es-zi, 2pl.pres.act. SIG₅-at-te-ni, 3pl.pres.act. SIG₅-an-zi; 3sg.pres.midd. la-a-az-zi-at-ta (OS), la-a-zī-at-ta, SIG₅-at-ta(-rī), 3pl.pres.midd. SIG₅-[ja-an-ta(-rī), 1sg.pret.midd. la-a-az-zi-ah-ha-at, 3sg.pret.midd. SIG₅-ta-ti, SIG₅-ja-at-ta-at, 3pl.pret.midd. SIG₅-ja-an-ta-at, 3sg.imp.midd. la-a-az-ji-at-ta-ru; part. SIG₅-ant- (= ʾāšyant-?): verb.noun la-a-zī-ja-u-ja-ar ‘wellness’; impf. SIG₅-iš-ke/[a-], *laazzīyēś[^] (ib2) ‘to become good, to get well’ (3sg.pret.act. SIG₅-es-ta, 1pl.pret.act. SIG₅-es-šu-u-en), *laazzíyēh[^] (Iib) ‘to make right, to repair, to cure; to give a favourable sign’ (1sg.pres.act. SIG₅-ah-mi, 2sg.pres.act. SIG₅-ah-ti,

Anat. cognates: HLuw. arha lada- ‘to prosper, to flourish’ (3sg.pret.act. /ladata/ /ladata/ /ladata/ §4)), WLQL § (KARATEPE 1 §4)), arha ladanu- ‘to cause to prosper’ (1sg.pret.act. la+ra/i-a-nû-ha (KARATEPE 1 §4)).

See CHD L: 50f. for attestations. The adjective ‘good’ is usually written with the sumerogram SIG₃, which is the reason that only a few attestations of lazzi- are known. Within Anatolian, it has been suggested that HLuw. lada- ‘to prosper’ may be cognate (cf. Hawkins & Morpurgo Davies 1978: 105 for identification of lada- and etymology). If this is correct, then Hitt. -z- must be the result of assibilation (*lār-i-), and HLuw. -d- must be the result of lenition (*lôr-V- ?). For outer-Anatolian, Sturtevant (1934: 270) compared lazzi- with Gr. λάξων ‘better’.
This latter form has an inner-Greek comparandum in λῆφ ‘to wish’ (so λάξων originally ‘wanted more’), however, which probably reflects *ulh₁-je/ö-/ from the root *uelh₁ as visible in Skt. var₁- ‘to choose’, Lat. volō ‘to want’, Goth. wiljan ‘to want’, etc.

le (prohibitive particle) ‘not’: le-e (OS).

PIE *leh₁

See CHD L: 55f. for a semantic treatment. There has been some debate on the origin of this particle. E.g. Hrozný (1917: 92) regarded le as a borrowing from the Semitic negation lē; Puhvel (HED 5: 77) suggested an Indo-Uralic connection with e.g. Finnish álæ; Friedrich (1936-37: 77) regarded le as the outcome of PIE *nē with dissimilation comparable to lāman ‘name’ < *h₁neh₁mn. All these are less attractive in my view.

In the other Indo-European languages, this prohibitive function is expressed by the particle *meh₁ (Skt. mà, Gr. μή, Arm. mi, TochAB mā), which is likely a petrified 2sg.imp. of a verb *meh₁- ‘to refuse’, which is still attested as such in Hitt. mimma₁² / mimm- ‘to refuse’ (q.v.). That this is possible for Hitt. le as well was already seen by Pedersen (1938: 163-4) and Sommer (1947: 65), who compared le with OHG lā ‘don’t!’. This latter verb ultimately must be cognate with the Hittite verb lā₁² / l- ‘to let, to loosen’ (q.v.), which means that le must reflect *leh₁. Prof. Melchert rightly points out to me that a convincing scenario is
still lacking that can explain how the attested syntax of the prohibitive particle, which goes together with an inflected indicative finite verb, developed out of the use of a 2sg.imp.-form.


See CHD L-N: 57f. and Puhvel HED 5: 77 for attestations. In Hittite, we find two spellings, namely LI-la- and LI-e-la-. Because the sign LI can be read as le as well as le, both spellings can be read as lela-. The Luwian forms, however, consistently are spelled li-la- or li-i-la-, which points to a stem lila-. Note that in Hittite we find a spelling li-i-la once, namely in KUB 46.38 ii 24 (NH). Because on the same line we find the Luwian inflected form li-i-la-an-ti (cf. the ending -anti), it is clear that li-i-la must be a luwianism as well. All in all, we are dealing with a Hitt. stem lela- that corresponds to Luw. lila-. If these words are cognate in the sense that they derive from a single PAAnat. form, this form must have been *lišo-.

According to Puhvel (l.c.) and Tischler (HED L/M: 56f.), these words are to be interpreted as reduplicated forms of the verb lāi / l- ‘to loosen, to release’ (q.v.). If this is correct (semantically it is possible), then we should assume that Hitt. lela- and Luw. lila- are parallel but separate formations (Pre-Hitt. *le-la- vs. Pre-Luw. *li-la-). Alternatively, we could assume a preform *leh₁-lo-, which by regular sound laws would on the one hand yield Hitt. lela- and, on the other, Luw. lila-. It may be slightly problematic, however, that the verb lā-/ l- is not attested in Luwian. For further etymology see at the lemma lāi / l-.

The formation of the verb lilare/ške/a-, which seems to be similar in meaning to lelae-², is unclear.
lelanie/a-arp$ (IIIg) ‘to infuriate’: 3sg.pres.midd. le-e-la-ni-at-ta (OS), 3sg.pret.midd. [le-e-la]-ni-e-et-ta-at (OH/MS), [le-e-l]a-ni-et-ta-at[i] (OH/MS); part. le-e-la-ni-ja-an-t- (OH/MS), le-la-ni-ja-an-t- (OH/NS).

The word is attested in OH texts only, see CHD L-N: 58f. It is likely that it is derived from a further unattested noun *lelan-. Further unclear.

lehuya$ / lehui: see lihuya$ / lilihui-


See CHD L-N: 61f. for attestations and semantics. Although the bulk of the attestations is spelled LI-li-ya-, I take the OH/MS spelling LI-le-ya- as an indication that all spellings (including LI-li-ya-ah-) are to be read le-li-ya-, and I therefore cite leliyant- and leliyahh-.

On the one hand, one could assume that leliyant- and leliyahh- are derived from an unattested stem leliy(a)-, which itself looks like the reduplication of a stem *liy(a)-. Such a stem does not look particularly IE to me. On the other hand, one could analyse the words as leli-yant- and leli-yahh- (cf. aray̥a- and arayahh- from arā- (see at arā)), which would mean that we are dealing with a stem *leli-, itself probably a reduplication of a root *li-. I know of no convincing IE cognates, however.

le(n)k$z: see li(n)k$z

lešk$ / liš$ (Ib1) ‘to pick, to gather’: 3pl.pres.act. li-iš-ša-an-zi (KBo 2.8 iii 1 (NH)); 3sg.pres.midd. li-iš-ša-ta-ri (KBo 13.24, 6 (NS)); inf.1 le-eš-šu-u-ya-an-zi (KUB 30.15 obv. 1, 7, 17 (MH/NS)).

Derivatives: lešalla- (c.) ‘gathering(?), collection(?)’ (nom.sg. le-eš-šal-la-aš).

IE cognates: Goth. lisan ‘to pick, to gather’, Lith. lėsti ‘to pick up’.

PIE *lēstH-ti?

See CHD L-N: 72 and Puhvel HED 5: 97 for attestations and contexts. Usually, this verb is equated with lēšae$ (q.v.), but I do not see why: first there is a clear
formal difference (single -š- vs. geminate -šš-) and secondly there is a semantic distinction (*lešš- / lišš- is transitive, whereas lišae- is intransitive). I have therefore chosen to separate these verbs and treat lišae- under its own lemma.

The verb *lešš- / lišš- clearly denotes ‘to pick up, to gather’ (see the contexts in CHD) and therefore hardly can be separated from Goth. *lisanan ‘to pick, to gather’ and Lith. *lesti ‘to pick up’, which reflect PIE *leś-. It is unclear, however, why we find a geminate -šš- in Hittite (cf. *šeš- ‘to sleep’ < *ses-, which is consistently spelled with single -š-). Perhaps it could show that the root in fact was *lesH-. The difference between *lešš- and lišš- may be explained due to accentuation: *lešš- vs. *leśš-.

**lešš(š)i-, lišši-** (n.) ‘liver’ (Sum. UZI NÍG, GIG, Akk. KABITTU); nom.-acc.sg. le-ešši, dat.-loc.sg. li-išši; case? le-ešši.

Derivatives: liššijala- (adj.) ‘liver-related, located in the liver(?)’ (nom.-acc.pl.n. li-išši-ja-la).

See CHD L-N: 72 for attestations. See Tischler HEG L-M: 54-5 for the several (unconvincing) IE comparisons that have been made. In my view it is likely that this word is of foreign origin, just as the practice of hepatoscopy is.

**lik-²**: see li(n)k-²

**lila-** see lela-

**lilhuya-² / lilhui-** (IIa5 > IIa1γ) ‘to pour’: 3sg.pres.act. li-il-hu-ya-i (MH/MS), le-el-hu-u-ya-i (MH/MS? le-el-hu-ya-i (MH/NS), [le-]el-hu-ya-a-i (MH/MS?), 3pl.pres.act. le-e-el-hu-an-zi (NS), 3pl.imp.act. le-el-hu-ya-an-du (OH/NS); sup. li-il-hu-ya-an (MH/MS); impf. li-il-hu-uš-ke/a- (MS).


PIE *li-lh₂u-o-i-ε, *li-lh₂u-i-enti
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See CHD L-N: 59f. and Puhvel HED 5: 81f. for attestations. The verb is spelled both with LI-il- and LI-el- (once even LI-e-el-), but the spellings with LI-il- seem to be older (all MS texts, cf. also CHD). That is why I cite this verb as lišuwa/i- here. The development of original lišuwa/i- to younger lešuwa/i- is probably due to the lowering of OH /i/ to NH /e/ before clusters containing -ḫ- (cf. § 1.4.8.1.d).

On the basis of the available evidence we cannot decide whether this verb belongs to the dū/tišanzi-class or to the mōma/i-class. As I have argued under the treatment of this latter class (see § 2.2.2.2.h), the mōma/i-class consists of original dū/tišanzi-verbs that were secondarily changed because of the fact that they are polysyllabic. In this case, I therefore assume that this verb is mōma/i-inflected as well (lišuwa⁻ / lišu⁻), although this inflection goes back to pre-Hitt. *lišuwa⁻ / lišu⁻. Note that 3pl.pres.act. *lišuwanzi (which we would expect in a mōma/i-class verb) would regularly yield lišuwanzi (cf. iššuwanzi < *iššuwanzi in the paradigm of iššuwa⁻ / iššu⁻ ‘to throw, to scatter’).

The verb clearly shows a reduplication of čaçu⁻ / čahu⁻ ‘to pour’ (q.v.). It must be quite recent as we can see by the retention of the cluster -ḫ-. It reflects virtual *li-ḫu-oi-ei / *li-ḫu-i-enti. See for the forms lišu⁻ and lešu·anten- at the lemma of čaçu⁻ / čahu⁻ itself.

lišu·anten-: see lešu·anten-


see CHD L/N: 62f. and Puhvel HED 5: 85f. for attestations. The verb seems to have three stems, namely link-, lik- and leng-, besides which CHD cites a stem linga- as well.

The stem leng- is spelled le-en- and only found in NS and NH texts. It is the regular outcome of OH link- through the lowering of OH /i/ to NH /e/ before -n- (cf. § 1.4.8.1.d).

The stem linga- cited by CHD apparently is based on the one attestation 1pl.pres.act. le-en-ga-u-en (HT 1 i 43 (MH/NS)), which in my view has little value (note that all other attestations of li-in-ga- (e.g. li-in-ga-zi and li-in-ga-nu- ) are found in front of consonants and denote /linkC-/).

The original distribution between link- and lik- is that link- is found when the stem is followed by a vowel (e.g. linkun (OS)), whereas lik- is found when a consonant follows (e.g. likzi (OS), likta (OS)). Compare for this distribution the nasal-infixed verbs (e.g. ḫarni(n)kʷ, šarni(n)kʷ), but also ḫar(k)² and kīšʷet⁰ / kīš-.

It has been suggested that li(n)k- is the nasal-present of the root visible in Lat. ligare ‘to bind’ (Hrozný 1917: 16), but this is unlikely because all Hittite nasal-infixed verbs with a root-final velar show an infix -ni(n)-.

Formally, a better alternative is a connection with Gr. ἔλεγξεν ‘to disgrace, to question’ (suggested by Sturtevant 1930c: 218), which is followed by many scholars (see the references in Tischler HEG L-M: 61, who further adduces OHG ant-lingen ‘to answer’). If this connection is justified, we must reconstruct *h₁len⁶*ti. Just as all mi-inflected verbs, this verb must have shown ablaut as well: *h₁len⁶*ti, *h₁ln⁶*enti. The development *h₁ln⁶*enti > linkanzi

IE cognates: Gr. ἔλεγξεν ‘to disgrace, to question’, OHG ant-lingen ‘to answer’.

PIE *h₁len⁶*-ti, *h₁ln⁶*-enti

See CHD L/N: 62f.
/lingant'î/ is paralleled by ḥ₃m₃n₃gʰ-enti > ḥaminkanzi (cf. ḥamank⁻ / ḥame/ink⁻). Note that initial preconsonantal *h₁ is dropped without a trace.


Derivatives: *lel(l)ipa⁻²* (Iia?7) ‘to lick (up)’ (3sg.pres.act. le-li-pa-a-i (NS), le-el-li-pa-a-i (MH/NS), Luw.3pl.pres.act. le-li-pa-an-ti; impf. le-li-pa-iš-ke/a-(MH/NS), le-li-pa-aš-ke/a-(MH/NS)).

See CHD L/N: 71 for attestations, where it is stated that “the only unambiguous exx. of lipai- are in a broken context and may prove to be of a different verb”. Nevertheless, the form 3pl.pres.act. lipānzi clearly means ‘to lick’ and shows a stem lipae- as well. The verb shows an alternation between single -p- vs. geminate -pp-. This, together with the fact that verbs for ‘to lick’ often show a structure IVP- (e.g. Lat. lambere, OE lapian, OHG laffan, Gr. ἄρτον ‘to lick’, Arm. lap’em ‘to slurp’) indicates that the verb is onomatopoetic in origin. The derivative *lel(l)ipa-* may belong to class Iia5 (and should then be cited *lel(l)ipa⁻²* / *lel(l)ip⁻²*), just as other reduplicated verbs like mēma⁻ / mēmi-, paripara⁻ / paripari-, etc.

**lišš⁻**: see lešš-

**līša⁻²** (Ic2) ‘(to clear out?)’: 3sg.pres.act. li-i-sha-iz-zi (KUB 15.31 ii 15 (MH/NS)), li-ša-iz-zi (KUB 15.32 ii 9 (MH/NS)).

Usually, these verbal forms are regarded as belonging with lešš⁻ / lišš⁻ ‘to pick up, to gather’ (q.v.), but this is improbable. Firstly, because of the formal differences (līša⁻ vs. lešš⁻ / lišš⁻), and secondly because of the fact that līša⁻ is an intransitive verb whereas lešš⁻ / lišš⁻ is transitive. I therefore propose to separate them. The verb līša⁻ occurs in one context only:

KUB 15.31 ii
(11) nu 9 a-o-pi kí-nu-an-zi
(12) ḥu-ur-da-a-ak=ma=za GIŠ AL da-a-i nu pád-da-a-i EGIS ṢU=ma=za
(13) TU-DI-IT-TUM da-a-i nu a-pé-e-ez pád-da-a-i EGIS ṢU=ma=za
(14) GIŠa-at-ta GIŠ MAR GIŠ ḥu-up-pa-ra-an-n=da-a-i nu=kán ša-ra-a
(15) li-i-sha-iz-zi nam-na=kán GEŠTIN I an-da ši-pa-an-ti NINDA SIG GIŠ=ma
(16) pár-ši-ja n=a-at a-ra-aš-za-an-da ke-e-ez ke-e-ez=zi-ja da-a-i
'They open up nine pits. Quickly he takes a pick-axe and digs. Then he takes a brooch and digs on that side. Thereupon he takes a šatta, a spade and a ḫuppara-vessel and šarā tīšae-s. Then he libates wine and oil in (it). He breaks thin-breads and places them around on all sides'.
šeggallu (NH), taruḫḫallu (NS), tepayēššallu, udallu (MS?), wēllu (NH), zammurallu (MS?) (note that in most cases the -a- can be interpreted as part of the stem or as a graphic vowel to write /"CLU/: it is phonetically real in a few NH forms only where it can be regarded as analogical to the verbs in which -a- belongs to the stem), it has the form -lit in ṣēlit (OH/MS?), talit (OH/NS), and the form -llut in ṣēltu (NS) and wēllut (NS) (the origin of -e- in the latter form is unclear to me: perhaps it represents anaptyctic /i/). It seems to me that -llut must be regarded as a conflation of -llu on the one hand and -lit on the other.

Just as in English one could say ‘let me do this’ in the function of a voluntative, I regard -llu and -lit as cognates with the verb lēkí / l- ‘to let’. The -u may be equated with the imperative -u as visible in the endings -ttu, -u, -antu, -ttaru, -aru and -antaru (see especially at -u), whereas -i may be regarded as the imperative 2sg.act.-ending -i < *-di. So we arrive at the virtual reconstructions *l(e/o)hu-u (lit. ‘he must let me...’) and *lehu-di (lit. ‘you must let me...’).


PIE *lu₂h₁₂-êh₁šή₁-r

See CHD L/N: 73-4 for attestations. The word denotes pieces of wood or shrub that are used as incense. According to Melchert (1988a: 229), these pieces probably were shavings (of cedar) and he assumes that this word shows an abstract noun in ṣēšar of the PIE root *leuh- ‘to cut (off)’ (cf. Skt. lūnāti ‘to cut (off)’).

This etymology was rejected by Puhvel (HED 5: 128f.) who implausibly assumes that ḫēššar is the Luwian variant of tuḫḫuḫššar, which he translates as ‘incense’, Apart from the fact that the meaning of tuḫḫuḫššar (q.v.) is not clear, there is no single indication that ḫēššar would be of Luwian origin.


The word only occurs in Luwoid lists of good things and is in most attestations preceded by gloss wedges. This clearly indicates that the word is Luwian. Laroche (1959: 63) translates it as ‘light’, which is followed by e.g. Puhvel (HED 5: 102) and CHD (L/N: 73), but rejected by e.g. Melchert (1993b: 128) and Tischler (HEG L/N: 64f.). It indeed seems as if Laroche based his translation
corresponds to Luw. *-k-*, assuming that Hitt. -kk- corresponds to Luw. -ky-. Unfortunately, there are no other examples of medial *k* in Luwian, so this equation can neither be proven nor disproven. Semantically, however, a translation ‘light’ does not seem very appropriate to me.

The verb luk*-a*- (IIIb > lb1) ‘to get light, to light up, to dawn’: 3sg.pres.midd. lu-uk-ta (OS), lu-uk-kat-ta (OS), lu-ug-ga-at-ta (OS), lu-uk-ka-ta (MH/NS), lu-kat-ta (NH), lu-uk-ka-ta (NH), 3sg.pret.midd. lu-uk-ta-at (OS), lu-uk-kat-ta-ti (OH/NS); 3sg.pres.act. lu-uk-zi (NH), 3sg.pret.act. lu-uk-ta (NH).

Derivatives: luk-(je/a)-² (lb1 / lcp1) ‘to set fire to’ (sg.pres.act. lu-uk-ki-ez-zi (OS), lu-uk-zi (NS), 3pl.pres.act. lu-uk-kán-zi (OH/MS), lu-kán-zi (NH, 1x), 1sg.pret.act. lu-uk-ku-un (NH), [lu-u]k-ka-r-mu-un (KBo 3.46 rev. 27 (OH/NS)), 3sg.pret.act. lu-uk-ki-et (OH/NS), 3pl.pret.act. lu-uk-ki-e-er (MH/MS), 2pl.imp.act. lu-uk-tén (NH); part. lu-uk-kán-t- (OH/MS); impf. lu-uk-ke-eš-ke/a/- (NH)), lukkeiš-² (lb1) ‘to become light’ (3sg.pres.act. lu-ki-iš-zi (NH), 3sg.pret.act. lu-uk-ke-eš-ta), lukkanu-² (lb2) ‘to make it light (?)’ (3pl.pres.act. lu-uk-ka-r-mu-ya-an-zi (NH)), see ladukxje/-a-z², laduk(x)e/išš-² and lukkatt-. IE cognates: Skt. rōcāte ‘to shine’, TochA ḥyōkāt ‘it dawns’, Arm. lowc’anem ‘to lighten’.

PIE *leuk-tō; *lēuk-t- / *luk-ent; *luk-je/-ō-

See CHD L/N: 74f. for attestations and semantics. It has been clear since long and generally accepted that these words reflect the PIE root *leuk-*. The exact formations of the different verbs is not without discussion, however.

The verb luk*-a*- ‘to dawn’ originally was middle only (all OH and MH examples are middle), showing active forms in NH texts only. It denotes ‘to get light, to dawn’ and is, according to CHD (L/N: 75-6) “confined to describing the faint but growing sunlight in the atmosphere at dawn just before the sun rises”. The form lukta (OS) must reflect *lēuk-to (or, less likely, *luk-tō?), but the interpretation of lukkatta (OS) is less clear. Is this form to be phonologically interpreted as /lukta/ or as /lukata/? In the first case, it is to be equated with lukta < *l(e)uk-to, but in the second case it must reflect *l(e)uk-o-to, which implies the existence of an older *lukka < *l(e)uk-o (cf. argatta beside arga, ḥalzijatta beside ḥalziya).

The verb that I cite as luk-(je/a)-² is active only and transitive, denoting ‘to set fire to’. It is difficult to judge this verb formally, especially because the signs KI, IT and IZ are ambiguous regarding their readings (they can be read ki or ke, it or
et and iz or ez, respectively). So a form like lu-uk-KI-Iz-zi (attested from OS to NH texts) can in principle be read as lu-uk-ki-iz-zi /lukit'i/, lu-uk-ki-ez-zi /luket'ı/ or lu-uk-ke-ez-zi /luket'ı/, pointing to a stem lukki-, lukke- or lukkie-. This goes for 3sg.pret.act. lu-uk-KI-IT (from OH/NS to NH texts) and 3pl.pret.act. lu-uk-KI-e er (once in a MH/MS text) as well. Note that Alp (1993: 366) cites a verb noun gen.sg. lu-uk-ki-u[-ya-aš ?] (Bo 69/1260, 7), which would point to a stem lukki- or lukke-. Because the tablet on which this form occurs has not been published yet, this reading cannot be verified. Moreover, the form is broken at a crucial point, and I therefore wonder whether Alp’s reading is as certain as he seems to claim: I would not be surprised if the form turned out to actually be lu-uk-ki-[a-u-ya-aš]. All in all, I will leave this form out of consideration here. The other forms of this verb seem to show a stem lukk-: 3sg.pres.act. lu-uk-zi (once in a NS text), 3pl.pres.act. lu-uk-kán-zi (OH/MS to NH), 1sg.pres.act. lu-uk-ku-un (once in a NH text), 2pl.imp.act. lu-uk-tén (once in a NS text), and part. lu-uk-kán-t- (from OS to NH texts). Note that 3pl.pret.act. lu-uk-KI-e-er, when read as lu-uk-ke-e-er could show a stem lukk- as well. The one NS attestation 1sg.pres.act. [lu-u]k-ka-mu-un (OH/NS) seems to show a stem lukkae- according to the hatrae-class inflection. Because this inflection was highly productive in the NH period, I regard this form as a secondary creation.

Oetinger (1979a: 273-7, referring to Hoffmann 1968) interprets these active laws (we would rather expect forms as belonging to an einfach thematischer Stamm NH period, I regard this form as a secondary creation. 

Watkins (1973a: 68-69) compares the verb “lukkezzi, lukkanzi” with Lat. lúcère ‘to kindle’ and reconstructs both as a causative formation *loukéjeti, *loukéjonti (followed by e.g. Melchert 1984a: 34). Although semantically this comparison and reconstruction seems attractive, there are formal problems. First it is suspect that the stem-form lukka-, which would be the regular outcome of *loukéio-, is attested in 3pl.pres.act. lukkanzi and part. lukkant- only, where -a- would have been inherent to the ending anyway (note that I regard the one NS form [lu]kkamun as non-probative, cf. above). Second, a development *loukéioni > lukkanzi is improbable in view of LÜ pattejant- ‘fugitive’ < *ṭhīсидent- and LÜ majant- ‘adult man’ < *mḥeʔent- (see the lemmas pattai- / patti- and LÜ majant- respectively). Thirdly, there are several examples where a PIE causative verb of the structure *CoC-eie- ends up in the Hitt. hı-inflection (e.g.
In my view, we must interpret the forms like lu-uk-KI-lZ-zi as showing a stem lukki-je-. In that way we would be dealing with a situation in which we find a -je/a-derived stem lukki-je/a- besides an underven stem lukk-. This resembles the situation as discussed by Melchert (1997b: 84f.) who states that some verbs (e.g. karpp(ije/a)- (q.v.)) reflect an old opposition between a root-aorist and a -je/o-derived present. In this case, we would be dealing with the reflexes of a root-aorist *lēuk-t / *luk-ént (for which compare the Skt. root-aorist form rucāná) besides a present *luk-je/o- (for which compare Arm. lowc’anem ‘to lighten’). So all in all, we are dealing with a situation in which we are dealing with an intransitive middle *lēuk-to that contrasts with the transitive active inflection that shows two stems, namely a root-aorist *lēuk-t besides a -je/o-present *luk-je-ti.

The verb lukke/iš-zd ‘to become light’ is attested a few times only, and it is difficult whether it is to be regarded as a fientive in *gēš- (lukēš-s-’), or as an s-extension comparable to laukke/iš-’d ‘to become light’ (q.v.). The form lu-ki-e-ö-s-zi (KBo 6.25 + KBo 13.35 iv 2), cited by Puhvel (HED 5: 105), seems to point to lukēš-s- but is attested in such a broken context that neither its meaning can be determined, nor whether it is the latter part of a longer word: [...]*lː]lu-ki-e-ö-s-zi (note that Puhvel cites this very same form as la]-lu-ki-e-ö-s-zi on p. 48, as if belonging to laukke/iš-).

**lukatt-** (c.) ‘dawn, next morning’; gen.sg. lu-uk-kat-ta-aš (NH), dat.-loc.sg. lu-uk-kat-ti (OH/NS, often), lu-uk-kat-ti (NS), lu-uk-kat-te (MH/NS), lu-kat-te (NH), lu-kat-ti (NH), lu-kat (NH), lu-uk-kat (NH), all.sg. lu-uk-kat-ta (OS).

**PIE *euk-ot-**

See CHD L/N: 76f. and Puhvel HED 5: 108f. for attestations. Because of the homography of lukatta ‘it dawns’ and lukkatta ‘at dawn’, it has often been suggested (e.g. Oettinger 1979a: 275-6) that they actually are to be equated and that the adverbially used lukatta ‘at dawn’ is in fact a petrified form of verbal lukkatta ‘it dawns’. This is not very likely, however. On the one hand, different cases of a nominal stem lukkat- are attested (which are difficult to explain if a verbal lukkatta were the source), but also because we then would have to assume that an adverbially used petrified 3sg.pres.midd. lukatta ‘it dawns > at dawn’ coexists with the very lively lukkatta ‘it dawns’. I therefore assume that all forms belong to a nominal stem lukatt- (note that Rieken 1999a, who devotes a whole
This lukatt- is a t-stem of lukk- ‘to dawn’ (q.v.) comparable to shiyatt- ‘day’ (q.v.). It must reflect *l(e)uk-ot-, which can be compared with Goth. liuhaþ ‘light’ < *léuk-ot-.

Note that gen.sg. lu-uk-kat-ta-aš (KUB 36.90 obv. 15) is not noticed by CHD, although they cite the specific context: lu-uk-kat-ta-aš=kan UD KAM-ti ‘on the day of the (next) dawn (i.e. tomorrow)’ (cf. Puhvel HED 5: 109).


Derivatives: see lālijaša-.

See CHD L/N: 80 and Puhvel HED 5: 111f. for attestations. Both dictionaries cite two stems, namely luli- and lulija-. See Tischler HEG L-M: 72f., however, who convincingly argues that the forms that seemingly show a stem lulija- (e.g. acc.sg. lulijan and the PN Šuppiluliuma-) are secondary formations. Note that whenever the -u- is written plene, it is done with the sign Û, and never with U. This points to a phonological interpretation /lūli-/.

There are no known cognates (apart form lulijaša- q.v.), and Tischler (1.c.) argues that we are dealing with an “einheimisches” word on the basis of the fact that a place name Šu-pi-lu-li-a is attested in the Old Assyrian texts already. This seems like false reasoning to me as some names are known from these texts built up from words that have a good PIE etymology (e.g. Šu-pi-āš-šu = Šuppiaššu-, see haššu-). Nevertheless, I agree that lūli- hardly can be of IE origin.

lūlijaša- (c.) ‘marsh, marshland’: gen.sg. lu-li-ja-aš-ḫa-aš; broken lu-ú-li-[ja-aš-ḫa(-)].

See CHD L/N: 82 for attestations. It is likely that lūlijaša- in some way is derived from lūli- ‘pond, lake’ (q.v.) but the exact formation is unclear. The suffix -ša- normally is deverbal, which could indicate that we have to assume the existence of a verb *lūlije/a². See at lūli- for further treatment.


PIE *lēh₁u-ri-s, *lēh₁u-ri-m, *l₁h₁u-rē₁-s?

See CHD L-M: 86f. for attestations. About the semantics it states: “the unifying idea seems to be ‘loss’, whether of possessions, honour or station”. The word shows many plene spellings of the -u-, for which predominantly the sign U is used. Twice, we find the sign Ū, however. Either these two instances are scribal errors, or we are dealing with traces of an original ablaut between lu-ū-ri- = lōr₁-i and lu-ū-ri- = lūr₁-i (see § 1.3.9.4.f and below). The oldest attestations show commune gender, whereas the one neuter form is attested in a NH text only.

According to Puhvel (HED 5: 123), l̄u̍ri- is to be analysed as a deverbal noun in -ri-, just as edri- ‘food’, esri- ‘shape’ etc. that are derived from ed² / ad- ‘to eat’ and eš² / aš- ‘to be’ respectively. If this is correct, we may think of a connection with the verbal root *leh₁-, which shows a u-present in e.g. Goth. lewjan ‘to betray’, Lith. liautis ‘to stop’, Ukran. livěty ‘to omit, to neglect’. Perhaps lu-ū-ri- = lōr₁-i reflects *le₂h₁u-ri-, whereas lu-u-ri- = lūr₁-i reflects *l₁h₁u-r₁-i.-

-llut (1sg.imp.act.-ending): see -llu


Derivatives: see kalataluzzi-.

IE cognates: Gr. Arc. λετοντ- ‘seeing’, Gr. λεάοσω ‘to see’.

PIE *lūt-ōi, *lūt-i-
See CHD L/N: 88f. for attestations. It states that this word is neuter in its singular forms, but commune in its plural forms, but this is strange a distribution, of course. In the singular, I indeed know of neuter forms only, which coincides with the use of the erg.sg. lutanza (*luttai-ant-) when the word functions as the subject of a transitive verb. In the plural we indeed find a few commune forms, of which especially acc.pl. luttā́u is remarkable: KUB 17.10 i (5) Gš lu-ut-ta-a-uš kam-ma-ra-a-as Iš-BAT ‘Mist seized the windows’ (OH/MS). A parallel sentence is found on the same tablet, namely ibid. iv (21) Gš lu-ut-ta-i kam-ma-ra-aš tarna-i, which CHD translates as ‘Mist let go of the window’. In my view, it would be better to assume a plural form here as well, so nom.-acc.pl.n. luttai. This could indicate that in the original, OH version of this text, the form luttā́i ‘window(s)’ was used in the first context as well, which was replaced by a less ambiguous commune form luttā́u in the MH copy. So, instead of a distribution neuter singular vs. commune plural, I would rather assume that luttā́i originally was neuter, and that commune forms (which are coincidentally found in plural forms only, cf. the absence of nom. or acc. singular forms in NH texts) make their way into the paradigm from MH times onwards.

This word has throughout the years received several etymological explanations. Sturtevant (1933: 84, 157) reconstructed *luk-to- (repeated by Puhvel HED 5: 127) from *luk- ‘to shine’ (cf. lukk-ā́ ‘to dawn’), but a cluster *-kt- does not yield Hitt. -tt- (cf. Melchert 1994a: 156). Eichner (1973a: 80) reconstructs *luH-tó- from *leuH- ‘to cut’ (Skt. lūnāti), which seems widely followed. I do not see, however, how a preform *luH-to- would yield a Hitt. diphthong-stem (Melchert’s assumption of a ‘collective’ *luH-t-ū (1984a: 59f.) does not make sense to me).

If we compare luttā́i to e.g. ḫaštā́i ‘bone’ < *h₂esth₁-oi-, ḥurtā́i ‘curse’ < *h₂urt₁-oi-, leḫuňtā́i ‘vessel for pouring’ < *le-ḫu₂-nt-oi-, šakutā́i ‘a body part, thigh?’ < *sok’t(r)(H)-oi- (?), we would expect that luttā́i is derived from a root *lutt-. Such a root is cited in LIV², namely *leu- ‘to see’ (Arc. Gr. λαύοντ-, ‘seeing’, Gr. λαύειν ‘to see’ < *leu-te/j/o-). Formally as well as semantically a connection with this root would make perfect sense. I therefore reconstruct *lut-ū́i, *lut-i-. In the oblique cases, the -i- regularly should have been assimilated due to the following -i-, but the un-assimilated variant from the nom.-acc. was generalized. See at kattaluzzi- ‘threshold’ for my idea that here we do find the assimilated variant of luttai-/ luttii-.

Note that the CLuw. form Gš lu-u-da-an-za, which often is regarded as denoting ‘window’ (e.g. Melchert 1993b: 130), is found in such a broken context that its meaning cannot be determined. The designation ‘window’ is given to it because
of a formal similarity with the Hittite word only, which is methodologically false, of course.


See CHD L/N: 73 and Puhvel HED 5: 127f. for attestations. The word denotes a topographical feature, the exact meaning of which is unclear. Puhvel assumes that it means ‘level ground, flatland’, but does so on the basis of etymological considerations only (an unprovable connection with Gr. λοφος ‘even, level, smooth’). Because of the use of the Luwian gen.adj., it is likely that this word is Luwian.


See CHD L/N: 90-1 for attestations and semantics. Although a connection with Gr. λόφος ‘release; and Lat. so-lūti-ēn ‘looseness, payment’ (suggested by R. Kellogg 1925: 46), which implies *luH-ti-, is generally accepted (e.g. Puhvel HED 5: 131, Tischler HEG L-M: 83-4), a suffix -ti- is further unknown in Hittite. I therefore rather follow Neu (1974b: 261) in analysing this word as l-uzzi-, a derivative in -uzzi- (cf. e.g. išpanduzzi-, tuszi- etc.) from l-sales / l- ‘to release’. This would mean that the word originally meant ‘(work) which releases one from one’s obligation’ (cf. Melchert 1984a: 166) and reflects *lh₁-uti-. See at l-sales / l- for further etymology.
\(=(m)a\) (enclitic clause conjunctive particle) ‘and, but’.

Anat. cognates: Pal. \(=ma\) ‘but(?)’; Lyd. \(=m(-)\) (encl. part.) ‘?’; Lyc. \(me\)

(sentence initial part.)

PIE \(=h\) and \(=mo\)

This enclitic conjunction, which has a slight adversative meaning, displays two allomorphs in the oldest texts: when the particle is attached to a word ending in a consonant, it turns up as \(=a\) that does not geminate the preceding consonant (unlike \(=a\) ‘and’ that is an allomorph of \(=(\j)a\) (q.v.)); when the particle is attached to a word ending in a vowel or to a logogram, it turns up as \(=ma\). This distribution, \(C=a\) vs. \(V=ma\), is absolute in OS texts: e.g. \(a-ap-pa=ma\) vs. \(a-ap-pa-n=a\). In MS texts, this distribution is getting blurred: the allomorph \(=ma\) is spreading in disfavour of \(=a\) and is now found after words ending in consonants as well. In my corpus of MH/MS texts, the new combination \(C=ma\) is attested 71 times (41%), whereas the original combination \(C=a\) is attested 103 times (59%). It must be remarked, however, that the high number of \(C=a\) is especially due to the (already then) petrified combinations \(kinun=a\) (23x), \(zig=a\) (21x) and others (\(ug=a, ammu=a\)). Without these, the distribution would have been somewhat like 60\% \(C=ma\) vs. 40\% \(C=a\). In NH texts, \(C=a\) is only found in the petrified combination \(kinun=a\) (which in these texts therefore is better read as one word: \(kinuna\), cf. attestations like \(ki-nu-na=ma=mu\) (KBo 18.29 rev. 20 (NH)) and \(ki-nu-na=ma=ya\) (KBo 18.19 rev. 28 (NH))) and an occasional \(zig=a\) or \(ug=a\), whereas \(=ma\) by that time is the only allomorph that is still alive.
In the case of =ma, it is clear that it loses its -a before a following vowel, e.g. 
ta-i=m=u-uš=za = tai + =ma + =uš + =z (KBo 20.32 ii 9). This is the reason 
for me to cite e.g. an-da-ma-an as an-da=m=a-an = anda + =ma + =an, or ke-
me-ma-ašt-ta as ke-e=m=a-ašt-ta = kā + =ma + =ašt. In the case of the 
allomorph =a, this loss of -a must have taken place as well. This means that there 
is no formal way of telling whether e.g. ta-ma-i-ša-an is to be analysed as tamaš 
+ =an or as tamaš + =ma + =an, or, even worse, whether pár-ta-ú-ni-tu-uš is 
to be analysed as partaunit + =uš or as partaunit + =ma + =uš. This 
‘invisibility’ of =a when followed by another particle that starts in a vowel 
probably was the major cause for the its replacement by the allomorph =ma from 
MH times onwards.

In the case of =i(a), I have argued that the two allomorphs (C=a vs. V=i(a) 
probable are different outcomes of a particle +h₁e in different phonetic 
surroundings. In the case of =ma, however, this is unlikely to be the case: I 
would not know how to explain an allomorphy C=a vs. V=ma through 
phonological processes. It therefore might be better to assume that both 
allomorphs have its own etymological origin. The allomorph =a (which is non-
geminating) can hardly reflect anything else than *=h₁o. We can imagine that 
when this particle was attached to a word ending in a vowel, it was lost at a very 
early stage. This may have been the reason that *=h₁o was replaced by another 
particle, =ma (which must reflect *=mo), in these postvocalic positions first. This 
is the situation we encounter in OS texts. When *=h₁o was lost in post-
consonantal position as well (during the OH period), it was replaced by =ma in 
this position as well.

It is quite likely that =a < *=h₁o belongs with the demonstrative aši / uni / ini 
(q.v.), just as e.g. =kki / =kka belongs with kā / kā / kī- and =kku ultimately 
belongs with kui- / kuja-. The particle =ma seems to have cognates in other 
Anatolian languages as well (especially Lyc. me (sentence initial particle) shows 
that we have to reconstruct *=(=mo), and likely belongs with the pronominal stem 
*mo- that is visible in e.g. mašiyant- (q.v.). Note that the connection between =a 
and =ma resembles e.g. the connection between Hitt. māḫan and CLuw. āḫḫa.

=ma²: see =mi- / =ma- / =me-

ma² (Ia2?) ‘to disappear’ (?): 3sg.imp.act. ma-du (OH/MS); impf. ma-aš-ke/a-
(MS).
See CHD L/N: 99 for attestations. Unfortunately, the verb is attested twice only, which makes it hard to determine what it means exactly. Nevertheless, CHD’s proposal ‘to disappear’ is attractive. On the basis of 3sg.imp.act. *madu we must conclude that the verb must have been mi-inflected. It then would belong to class Ia2 (a/0-ablauting mi-verbs). This means that if this verb is from IE origin, it must reflect *meh₂- or *meh₁-. I know of no cognates, however.

**māḥhan** (postpos., conj.) ‘like (postpos.); as, just as (conj.); how (in indirect statement or question); when, as soon as’ (Sum. GIM-an): ma-a-ah-ḥa-an (OS), ma-ah-ḥa-an (MS).

PIE *món hąent ?

This word is spelled both with and without plene -a-. The spelling ma-a-ah-ḥa-an is very common, and found from OS onwards, whereas the spelling ma-ah-ḥa-an is first attested in OH/MS texts. Semantically, māḥhan is in virtually all respects synonymous to mān (q.v.). It therefore has been claimed that mān must be the contracted form of māḥhan. Since both words are found from OS texts already and are used next to each other, this is quite unlikely.

Within Hittite, we must compare māḥhan with māḥhanda (subord. conj.) ‘just as’ (q.v.), which is also spelled māṇḥanta (OS), and even once mān ḫanda (MS) (with word space). These forms make it likely that we are dealing with petrified compounds of the element mān and the noun ḫant-'face’ (q.v.). It is then possible that māḥhan is an old endingless locative or an adverbially used nom.-acc.sg., in which the original *ḥant lost its final -t (cf. e.g. part.nom.-acc.sg. kūn < *g-ʰant) whereas māḥhanda is a variant with an original nom.-acc.pl. *ḥanda < *h₂enteh₂. As I have argued under its own lemma, mān is derived from the pronominal stem *mo- that is also visible in OIr. ma, mā ‘when’ and TochA mánt ‘how?’, TochB mānt (conj.) ‘so’.

Sometimes it is claimed that CLuw. ɕʰha ‘when, as (temporal and comparative)’ and Lyc. ɕke are cognate, but these more likely reflect *h₁om + *=h₁e (for the latter element compare at =-(j)a).

**māḥhanda** (subord. conj.) ‘just as’: ma-a-ah-ḥa-an-da (OS), ma-a-an-ḥa-an-da (OS), ma-a-an ḫa-an-da (MS), [m]a-a-ah-ḥa-an-ta (OH/MS).

See at māḥhan for a treatment.
See CHD LN: 317 for attestations. This word is predominantly attested in lists of
body parts of sacrificed animals (cattle, sheep, hams, and mules). However, it is not fully clear whether this can reflect
the PIE form *mudra,t-ō* that denotes an object made of flesh that is eaten. Because

IE cognates: *Gr. *πηχή, *Greek / *skyhē, 


(c) a body part of animals: mamga, or pl. *mudra,t-ō* or *mudra,t-ō*


(2) *mudra,t-ō* is a body part of animals: mamga, or pl. *mudra,t-ō* or *mudra,t-ō*

Nevertheless, since no convincing examples of the development *mudra,t-ō* can be found, this
reconstruction and this supposed phonetic development remain speculative.

Within *mudla-t*, the cluster -*dr-* is remarkable and of importance for the
eynological interpretation. Because it is not fully clear whether this can reflect
PIE */dr-*/ or not. Normally, we see that *dr-* disappears word internally in front
of another consonant (e.g. *dagr* - to blow, *mudr-*/ *dagr-* sign *dr-*dr-)

However, that *dr-*, does not disappear in front of resonants either. Compare *zophr-*/

custom *zophr-*/ *zophr-* sign *zophr-*. It is possible, however, that *dr-*, does not disappear in front of resonants either. Compare *zophr-*/

"c..." (branch of a grapevine; n.m.); *mudra,t-ō* (OHNNS), acc.sg. *mudra,t-ō* (OHNNS), acc.pl. *mudra,t-ō* (OHNNS).

See CHD LN: 112f. for attestations and semanatics. Often, this word is connected
with Gr. *μεθαλός* (*mēthālōs*), the "material."
of the close formal and semantic similarity it is usually regarded as identical to *muḥ(ha)raı-. Pulvel HED 6: 174f. also adduces the form ma-ḥu-ra-[i]n] (ABoT 35 ii 9) to this lemma, but because on the one hand it is not accompanied with the determinative UZU, and because, on the other, the context in which it occurs does not indicate that it must denotes a body part, I follow CHD (L-N: 318) in separating this form from maḥraen-/ muḥraı-.

The word clearly is a diphthong-stem, on which see Weitenberg (1979). If the form maḥraen really belongs with muḥraı-, the alternation maḥraı- / muḥraı- is difficult to explain from an Indo-European point of view. Nevertheless, Weitenberg (1979: 303) proposes to assume that the alternation is due to ablaut: full grade *me/oHr- yielded maḥ-, whereas zero grade *mHr- developed an anaptyctic vowel which was u-coloured because of the preceding m (for colouring of anaptyctic vowels compare e.g. §§=

Furthermore, he hesitatingly connects it with Gr. ἡμπόκ ‘thigh/bone’. If Weitenberg’s interpretation is justified, we have to reconstruct a paradigm *mēhyr-ōi-s, *mhr-ō-ı-s. If this etymology is correct, it would show retention of internal *h₂ in front of resonant, which is possibly also visible in (g)šahla ‘apple’ and (g)zhraı- ‘knocker(?)’ (for the falseness of Kimball’s only example (1999: 400) of a development -*h₂R- > -RR-, see at yannum(m)jiya-.

matį / mi- (Ia4 > Ic1; IIIf) ‘to grow (up); to thrive, to prosper; (midd.) to be born’: 3sg.pres.act. ma-a-i (OH/MS), 3pl.pres.act. ma-a-i-an-zi (OH or MH/NS), 1sg.pret.act. mi-ja-łu-an (NH), 3sg.imp.act. ma-a-ú (OS), 2pl.imp.act. ma-iš-te-en (MH/MS); 3sg pres.midd. mi-ja-ri (OH or MH/NS), mi-i-ja-ar-ı (NH), 3sg.pret.midd. mi-ja-ti (OS), 3sg.imp.midd. mi-i-ja-ru (OH/NS); part. mi-ja-an-t-ı (MH/MS), mi-ja-an-t-ı (OH/NS), mi-i-ja-an-t-ı; impf. ma-iš-ke/a- (OH or MH/MS), mi-ja-aš-ke/a- (NH).

Derivatives: miğiś- d (Ib2) ‘to grow; to be born’ (3sg.pret.act. mi-i-e-eš-zi (MH/MS), mi-e-eš-[a-]n-zi] (NH), 3sg.pret.act. mi-e-eš-ta (NH), [mi?]e-eš-ta (MS), 3sg.pret.act. mi-e-eš-du (NS), 3pl.imp.act. mi-e-eš-ša-an-du (NH); 1sg.pret.midd. mi-e-eš-ḥ-ti (MH/MS); impf. mi-i-e-eš-ke/a- (NH), miğiтар / miğițar- (n.) ‘growth, increase, proliferation, abundance’ (nom.-acc.sg. mi-ja-tar (OS), mi-ja-a-tar (MH/MS), mi-ja-ta (OH/NS), mi-i-ja-ta (NH), gen.sg. mi-ja-an-na-aš (NH), me-ja-an-na-aš (NS)), miğiţila- (adj.) ‘fruitful’ (loc.sg. mi-ja-an-ti-li), miğițanu- d (Ib2) ‘to make (branches) fruit-bearing’ (3sg.pres.act. mi-ja-nu-zi (NH), 3pl.pres.act. mi-ja-[n-]a-an-zi] (NH), see (L)majant- and (L0)jananani-.
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IE cognates: OIr. már, món, MWe. mawr ‘big’, Goth. mais, OHG mēro ‘more’.

PIE *mhr₂-ói-ei / *mhr₂-i-énti

See CHD L-N: 113f. for attestations and semantics. In its oldest forms, the verb clearly inflects according to the dāštʃijanzi-type (3sg.pres.act. māš, 3sg.imp.act. mān, 2pl.imp.act. mašten, part. mijan-). In NH times, we find a few forms showing a stem mēj/a²-, which is trivial for dāštʃijanzi-inflecting verbs. Despite the fact that all other dāštʃijanzi-verbs have good IE etymologies, the etymological interpretation of mai² / mi- has always been unclear.

Oettinger (1979a: 471) connected mai² / mi- with mēj- ‘soft’ and reconstructs a verbal root *mei₁₁₂₃- ‘to ripen’. Semantically, this is unattractive because neither Hitt. mēj- ‘soft, gentle’ nor its cognate Lat. mēlis ‘soft’ has any connotation ‘ripened’. Melchert (1984a: 46) adds a formal argument: if we would apply Oettinger’s reconstruction to the derivative ḳ¹majant- ‘adult’ (q.v.), we would have to assume a pre-form *moi₁₁₂₃-ent-, but this would probably have yielded Hitt. *mjesant-.

As I have argued extensively in Kloekhorst ftch.a, the bulk of the dāštʃijanzi-verbs reflect a structure *CC-oi- / *CC-i- (i.e. the zero-grade of a verbal root extended by an ablauting suffix -oi-/i-). In the case of mai² / mi-, this means that we should analyse it as reflecting either *Hm-oi- or *MH-oi-, derived from a root *Hem- or *meH-, respectively. Only one of the several formal possibilities is semantically likely as well, namely a comparison with OIr. már, món ‘big’ ~ MWe. mawr ‘big’ < PCl. māros (cf. Schrijver 1995: 196), which belongs with Goth. mais, OHG mēro ‘more’ < PGerm. *mēisers-, both reflecting a root *meh₂- ‘big, much’. If we apply this root-structure to mai- / mi-, we arrive at a reconstruction *mh₂-ói-ei, *mh₂-i-énti, which would regularly yield Hitt. mği, mijanzi.

For a detailed account of (¹L)majant- ‘adult’ < *mh₂-eri-ent-, see its own lemma. The Luwian forms maššāḥiti- and mashani- derive from a basic noun *masha- (cf. Starke 1990: 167f.), which may reflect *meh₂-sh₂-o- or even *mhs₂h₂-o-.

(¹L)majant- (c.) ‘young, adult man, (adj.) adult, powerful’ (Sum. ¹L)GURUŞ; nom.sg. ma-ja-an-za (OH/MS), acc.sg. ma-ja-an-ta-an (OH or MH/NS), gen.sg.?


PIE *mêr-ei-ent-

See CHD L-N: 116f. for attestations. This word and its derivatives clearly belong with the verb mai-/mi- ‘to grow’. Because a sequence -ai- cannot reflect *-oi-, which should regularly contract to -ê- (cf. e.g. ʰatrawmi < ʰyetros-jo-mi), it has often been claimed that (PIE) *majant- can only be explained by either assuming a root *meiH- (thus Oettinger 1979a: 471: *moiêr-ênt-) or a root *meH- (thus Melchert 1984a: 46: moiêr-ênt-) in which the laryngeal prevented the *-i- from dropping. I do not agree with this, however. In my view, the relationship between (PIE) *majant- and mai-/mi- must be compared to the relationship between (PIE) *patêjant- ‘fugitive’ and the verb pattai2/patti- ‘to flee’ (q.v.), which reflect *pêrêi-ênt- and *pêrêi-i- respectively. With the reconstruction of mai-/mi- (q.v.) as *mêr-o-i-/*mêr-i-, we should consequently reconstruct majant- as *mêr-ei-ênt-. Although in *pêrêi-ênt- > PAnat. *pêrêant- > Hitt. /pêrant/, realized as [pêrant-], spelled *pêt-ê(ja)-ant-/, the sequence -ê(ja)- is phonetically regular, I believe that *mêrêi-ênt- should first have given PAnat. */maiant-/, which regularly developed into Hitt. */mênt-/, spelled */ma-an-t-. In my view, it is trivial, however, that *-i- was analogically restored on the basis of the verb (thus also Kimball 1999: 367).

*maîšt- (c.) ‘glow’: nom.sg. ma-iš-za-aš/tiš (OH/MS), dat.-loc.sg. ma-iš-ti (MH/MS).

PIE *mois-t-?
See Kimball (1994b: 14-17) for a treatment of this word. It only occurs in the following contexts:

KUB 57.60 ii
(11) *mī-tu-ya-ad-du ne-pi-ša-aṣ ṣUTU-u-i
(12) ma-iš-za-aṣ-ti-iš ku-e-el mi-iš-ri-ya-an-za
(13) ḫa-ap-pār-mu-ya-aṣ-ḥi-iš ku-e-el la-lu-uk-ki-u-an-te-eš

‘Have mercy, o Sun-god, whose m. is mišriyaš-ant-, whose beams are radiant’

KBo 32.14 ii
(43) n=a-an šu-up-pi-iš-du-ya-rī-it
(44) da-iš n=a-an gul-aš-ta nu-u=š-ši-e=š-ta ma-iš-ti
(45) an-da la-a-lu-uk-ki-iš-nu-ut

‘He provides it with ornaments, ciseled it and made it beam in m.’.

Kimball assumes that the word denotes ‘sun-disc’, but Rieken (1999a: 137f.) more convincingly translates ‘Glanz, Leuchten’. Both Kimball and Rieken connect maiš- with Hitt. mišriyaš- ‘shining(?)’, which is usually connected with Skt. miṣ- ‘to blink, to open the eyes’. This does not seem very convincing semantically (‘to blink’ does not have anything to do with ‘glowing’: see also at mišriyašt- for doubts). Nevertheless, if maiš- is of IE origin, it can only reflect *mois-t-.

(sī)maɪšta- (c.) ‘fiber, flock or strand of wool’(?): acc.sg. ma-iš-ta-an.


PIE *mois-to-??

See Kimball (1994b: 14-17) for separating this word from the noun maiš- ‘glow’ (q.v.). The noun (sī)maɪšta- only occurs in the expression sīma-iš-ta-an ma-ši-ya-an-ta-an, lit. ‘as much as a (woolen) maišta-’. On the basis of the contexts where this expression is used, we can conclude that it must be metaphorical for ‘something useless’ (cf. CHD L-N: 119). CHD therefore translates maišta- as ‘fiber, flock or strand of wool’. Kimball (l.c.) suggests a connection with PIE *mois-o- ‘sheep, skin of sheep’ (Skt. meṣā- ‘ram, male sheep’, Lith. maišas ‘bag, sack’, etc.), and therefore proposes that maišta- may mean something like a bale of wool, or a fleece.
So although the precise meaning of *maišta-* is not totally clear, we know that it must refer to something of wool (because of the SÍG-determinative), and therefore Kimball’s etymology may be attractive.


Derivatives: see *mekk-*, *mekki-*/mekkai-.

PIE *mıklı₂eh₁sh₁-

See CHD L-N: 120 for attestations and semantics. The verb clearly is a fientive in -ēš- derived from *mekk-*, *mekki-*/mekkai- ‘much, many’ (q.v.). Whilst *mekk-reflects the e-grade root *męgh₂-, *makkēš-²* must reflect zero grade *mıklı₂-*. Although the sequence *mỲh₂- regularly would have yielded Hitt. /mk-1/, phonetically realized as [amk-], this was analogically changed to /mák-1/ on the basis of the full grade *mekk-*. See at *mekk-*, *mekki-*/mekkai- for further etymology of the root and at -ēš- for the history of the fientive suffix.

**makita-** (gender unknown) ‘?’: dat.-loc.pl. *ma-ki-ta-aš* (OS).

This word is hapax in the following context:

KUB 31.143 ii

(15) [nu=aš-ša-an ]8-in-zu ne-pi-šē e-eš-[šē] nu=za=kān 2-iš 8-ta-aš ki-iš-[nu-na-aš]
(16) [ak-ku-uš-ke-šē] nu-u=k-kān 2-iš 8-ta-aš ma-ki-ta-aš ak-ku-uš-ke-e-šē

(ibid. 8-9 shows the same text)

‘As an octad you remain seated in the sky. You will [drink] twice on the 8 kūšuna- and you will drink twice on the 8 makita-’ (cf. CHD L-N: 121).

The exact meaning of *makita-* cannot be determined. Tischler (HEG L/M: 97-8) suggests “ein Trinkgefäß”, but CHD (l.c.) argues that drinking from a cup is always expressed by an acc. or instr. and never by a dat.-loc, so that an interpretation ‘drinking cup’ does not really fit.
māk(ḫizzīti)ā- (gender unknown) a building in which the king and queen wash and dress themselves: gen.sg. ma-ak-ki-iz-zi-ja-aš (OS), ma-ak-zi-aš (OH/NS), all.sg. ma-ak-zi-ja (OS), abl. ma-a-ak-zi-ja-až (OS), ma-az-ki-ja-az.

See CHD L-N: 123 for attestations and semantics. Because of the different spellings (mākki-zi-, mākzi- and mazki-), the word is likely of foreign origin, just as many other words for buildings (e.g. ḫīštā / ḫīštā, ḫāšāspi-ā- / ḫālent(ī)ju-, etc.). Apparature of the word ma-aš-gaz-zi (KUB 51.33 i 14) that denotes a building, too, is uncertain (pace Popko 1986: 475). The IE etymology suggested by Puhvel HED 6: 19 (*makti- ~ Lat. mactus ‘magnified, glorified’) makes no sense.

maklant- (adj.) ‘thin, slim (of animals)’: acc.sg.c. ma-ak-la-an-ta-an (OH or MH/NS), ma-ak-la-an-da-an, nom.pl.c. ma-ak-la-an-te-es (OH/NS, MS).

Derivatives: maklātur / maklann- (n.) ‘emaciation’ (abl. ma-ak-la-an-na-az).

IE cognates: PGerm. *magrā- ‘meagre, slim’ (ON magr, OHG magar), Gr. μακρός ‘long, tall’, Lat. macer ‘meager, lean’, Gr. μήκος Dor. μάκος ‘length’ (< *mēhkos).

PIE *m(e)h₂k-lo-n-

See CHD L-N: 121-2 for attestations. Since Benveniste (1932: 140), this word is generally connected with PGerm. *magrā- ‘meagre, slim’, Gr. μακρός ‘long, tall’ and Lat. macer ‘meager, lean’ < *mēhkos- (full-grade visible in Gr. μήκος Dor. μάκος ‘length’ < *mēhkos). This means that Hitt. maklant- must reflect a formation *mēh₂k-lo-n- or *mēh₂k-lo-n-.

maknu- (Ib2) ‘to make abundant, to increase, to multiply’: 1sg.pret.act. ma-ak-nu-nu-un (OH/NS), 3sg.pret.act. ma-ak-nu-ut (KBo 32.14 i ii 15, 31 (NS)); impf. ma-ak-nu-uš-ke/a- (OH/NS), ma-a-ak-nu-uš-ke/a- (NH?).

PIE *mgh₂-neu-

See CHD L-N: 122 and Puhvel HED 6: 123 for attestations. The verb is predominantly spelled ma-ak-nu-, but we find a spelling ma-a-ak-nu- once (KUB 41.20 obv. 6). As this latter spelling is found in a very late NH text only, it may not have much value.

The verb clearly is derived from mekk-, mekki- / mekki- ‘many, much’ (q.v.), showing a zero-grade makk- vs. the e-grade of mekki- (cf. also makkišt-). This means that we have to reconstruct *mgh₂-neu-. Although the sequence *mgh₂- regularly would have yielded Hitt. /mk-/, phonetically realized as [emk-], this was
analogically changed to /mɒk-/ on the basis of the full grade mekk-. See at mekk-, mekki- / mekkai- for further etymology.


PIE *m(o)k’-jo- ??

See CHD L-N: 122-3 for attestations and semantics. Note that the form that I interpret as dat.-loc.pl. (KUB 39.35 iv (4) mu ŁSAGL[A ... ] (5) ši-pa-an-ti ma-ak-ku-ja-aš=ša-an ku-iš an-da [ ... ] ‘The cup-bearer librates [ ... ], who [ ... ] in the churns’), is marked ‘unclear’ by CHD.

Puhvel (HED 6: 20) states that makkúja- phonetically has to interpreted as [mak^nja-], which he connects with Skt. mac- ‘to pound, to grind’. If this connection is correct, we might have to reconstruct *mok’-jo-.

\[ ë mâkzi(f)a- \]: see ë mâk(kiz)zi(f)a-

**mâl** (n.) ‘mental power(? )’; nom.-acc.sg. ma-a-al (MH/NS), ma-al (NS).

Derivatives: **mâlant-** (adj.) ‘having mâl-’ (acc.sg.c. ma-a-la-an-ta-an, nom.-acc.sg.n. ma-a-la-an).


IE cognates: Gr. μελω ‘to be an object of care and thought, to care for’.

PIE *môl-

See CHD L-N: 124 and 128 for attestations and context. It is not easy to determine the exact meaning of this word. CHD describes mâl as “a quality desirable for men in combat, such as boldness, ferocity, skill”. According to Rieken (1999a: 49-51), the word denotes “Verstand, Geist, Geistesstärke”, which she deduces on the basis of the context

KUB 33.87+ i
(35) ma-al=ya=za te-pu=ja
(36) Ü-UL [ša-a]k-ki UR.SAG-tar=ma-a=š-ši 10-pa pi-ja-an

‘He knows not for himself even a little mal, but courage has been given to him tenfold’ (transl. CHD).
According to Rieken, *mal* is used here as an opposite to UR.SAG-tar ‘(physical) courage’, and therefore must denote ‘mental power’. She then connects this word with CLuw. *mēl* ‘thought, idea’ and *mal(a)i* ‘to think, to suppose’. As an IE cognate, she adduces Gr. *πελασ* ‘to be destined, to be about to’, but this is semantically unattractive. A better cognate would be Gr. *πελασ* ‘to be an object of care and thought, to care for’ (cf. also Puhvel (HED 6: 21)), which would point to a PIE root *mēl-.*

**mall-**: see malla₁ / mall-


Derivatives: (4) *malijašša*- (c.) ‘approval’ (nom.sg.? *[m]a-l[i]-ja-aš-ḫa-aš, abl. (4)*ma-li-ja-aš-ḫa-az.*

See CHD L-N: 126-7 for attestations. This verb is attested in NS and NH texts only and shows forms that inflect according to the tarn(a)-class (3sg.preteract. *mēlai, malī, 3sg.preteract. malīš*) as well as forms that inflect according to the ḫatrae-class (*malīši, mēlīši, malīt*). Since both inflections are highly productive in NH times, it cannot be decided if one of them is more original, or if they both replaced another inflection, of which no specific forms are found anymore. This unclear situation, together with the lack of a convincing IE cognate, makes etymologizing difficult.


Derivatives: see mēmal(i)-.


IE cognates: Skt. mṛṇāti ‘to crush’, Lat. molō ‘to mill’, Goth. malan ‘to mill’, Lith. mālī ‘to mill’, etc.

PIE *mōlh₃-i, *mlh₂-enti

See CHD L-N: 125-6 for attestations. Note that “3sg.pres.act.” ma-al-la-zi (VAT 7502 = VSNF 12.111 obv. 12) probably is to be read as 3pl.pres.act. ma-al-la-can-zi and that 1sg.pret.act. ma-al-la'-nu-un (HT 35 obv. 7) actually is written ma-al-ka-nu-un, of which an emendation to ma-al-la'-nu-un is not obligatory (cf. Puhvel HED 6: 30 for another interpretation). This means that there are no forms left that show a stem malla₃. The oldest texts (MS) show forms that inflect according to the tarn(a)-class (mallā, mallānzi). In younger texts, we find a few forms that inflect according to the productive -je/a-class (malliezi, mallijazzi, malliet). Note that in CHD, a stem malli- is cited as well, probably on the basis of 3sg.pres.act. ma-al-LI-IZ-zi. This form has to be read as ma-al-li-ez-zi /maLiet/i/, however, and belongs with the stem mallie/a-. Only the form malli, which is attested only once in a NS text, shows a stem mall-. Although in my view it is quite obvious that the original inflection must have been malla₃ / mall-, there has been some debate about the interpretation of the form malli. According to Tischler (HEG L/M: 102, following e.g. Melchert 1984a: 16f.) the form malli must be more original as it is a general fact that ‘athematic’ hi-verbs are being replaced by ‘thematic’ ones, like OS mālēi vs. NH māltai ‘recites’ and OS lāḥūi vs. NH lāḥuyūi ‘pours’. Although in principle this is true (the tarn(a)-class becomes highly productive), these secondary ‘thematic’ forms are found in NS texts only. This scenario then does not fit the attestation m[all]ā which is found in a OH/MS text already, whereas malli is attested only once in a NS texts. I therefore conclude that the original paradigm of this verb was mallai / mallanzi, a perfect example of the tarn(a)-class.

Since Friedrich (1922: 159), the etymological connection between Hitt. malla₃ / mall- and the other IE verbs for ‘to mill’ (Lat. molō ‘to mill’, Goth. malan ‘to mill’, Lith. mali ‘to mill’, etc.) has been generally accepted. These verbs are generally reconstructed *melh₃- (a laryngeal is necessary for Skt. mṛṇāti < *ml- nē-H-ti and Lith. mālti where the acute points to *molH-; on the basis of CLuw. mal(h)u-, the laryngeal can be determined as *h₂). This means that for Hittite we must reconstruct a paradigm *molh₃-i / *mlh₂-enti, which regularly yielded pre-Hitt. *mollai, *mlHanzi. At this stage, the stem *moll- is introduced into the plural, in order to avoid the alternation -ll- vs. -ll₃: *mollai, mollanzi. At this
point, the 3sg.pres.-ending *-ai does not match the ‘normal’ 3sg.pres.-ending of the ʰi-class, which is *-e < *-ei. In my view, this is the reason why the ending -ai in this verb is not replaced by -i as in the other ʰi-verbs, but was retained as such and ultimately merged with the ending -ai of the tArn(a)-class inflection (*⁰CoH-ei > *⁰CaI-e > *⁰Ca’I > *⁰CaI), yielding attested mallāi, on the basis of which the whole verb was taken over into the tArn(a)-class (see at ḫarr- / ḫarr- ‘to grind’, ḫskall- / ḫskall- ‘to split’, ḫsparr- / ḫspar- ‘to trample’, padda- / pad- ‘to dig’ and šART- / šART- ‘to wipe, to rub’ for similar scenarios).

The CLuw. forms show a stem mal(h)u-, mammal(h)u- (the -h- is retained when -u- is vocalic, but lost when -u- is consonantal, cf. Melchert 1988b: 215-6). It probably reflects a u-present and goes back to *m(e)lh₂-u-.

malae₂: see måla₁ / mål-

malekk(u)-² (Ia5?) verb expressing a negative consequence of illness: 1sg.pret.act. ma-le-ek-ku-un (OH/MS).

IE cognates: ?Gr. βάκτρα ‘to disable, to mislead, to damage’.

PIE *mlekw-? The verb is hapax, and its only attested form is spelled ma-LI-IG-ku-un. Since the signs LI and IG can be read ḫi and le and ik and ek respectively, this form can in principle be read ma-li-ik-ku-un as well as ma-le-ek-ku-un (and even ma-li-ek-ku-un, but this is unlikely). Since we are dealing with a mi-inflecting verb and since mi-inflecting verbs in principle show *e-grade in this form, I read the form as ma-le-ek-ku-un. It is attested in the following context:

KUB 30.10 rev.

(3) ... nu=mu ku-iš DINGIR=I A i-na-an pa-iš nu=mu ge-en-zu

(4) [da-a-â ... i-na]-ni pé-ra-an ta-re-eh-ḫu-un ma-le-ek-kî-um nu=za nam-ma U-UL
tar-uh-mi

‘May my god, who has given me the illness, [have] pity on me. [...] because of the [ill]ness I have become tired and m.-ed. I cannot succeed any longer’.

It is likely that, just as tareḫḫu-’have become tired’, malekkun, too, denotes some negative consequence of the illness.

If malekkun is of IE origin, there are two possible reconstructions: *mlekw- and *mlek-² (cf. ekun /têgʷon/ ‘I drank’ from eku-² / aku-). I only know of one other IE word that reflects one of these roots, namely Gr. βάκτρα ‘to disable, to
mislead, to damage’, which could reflect *mlik*-je/-. Usually, this word is connected with Skt. marc- ‘to damage, to hurt, to destroy’ and reconstructed as *melk*-, but if for some reason Skt. marc- cannot reflect *melk*- (e.g. because of a possible tie-in with Hitt. markiye/a- ‘to disapprove of’ (q.v.)), it is possible that the Greek verb goes back to a root *mlik*-, since all its attested forms reflect the zero-grade root *mlk*-. Semantically, we then would have to assume that in Hittite, maleku- has a passive meaning ‘to have become damaged’ when used intransitively, vs. the transitive meaning ‘to damage’ of Gr. βαλτε ρο. But this is all highly speculative of course.

*malliye/a-²*: see mall-.

*malikk(u)-²*: see malekk(u)-².


Derivatives: *maleškuess-²* (Ib2) ‘to become weak’ (3sg.pres.act. ma-le-eš-ku-eš-zi (NH)), *mališkunu-²* (Ib2) ‘to make weak’ (2pl.pres.act. ma-li-iš-ku-mu-ut-ta-ni (MH/MS), ma-li-iš-ku-mu-ut-tén (NH)).


PIE *mlh₂-sk-u-?*

See CHD L-N: 130 for attestations and semantics. The alternation between mališku- and milišku- points to an initial cluster /ml/- Furthermore, the spelling maleškuēzi may point to an interpretation /mlisku-/ containing the phoneme /l/ that is spelled e/i. An etymological connection to Gr. μκαλαςθός ‘weak, soft’ has been suggested by Pisani (1953: 309), but details are unclear. Because of Gr. πλάκ ‘weak, soft’, Skt. mltåta- ‘weak, soft’ etc., the root must be *mleḥ₂-. This root can only be connected to Hitt. mlisku-/ if we reconstruct *mlh₂-sk-. The development of *ClHsC > Hitt. ClisC is then comparable to *CrHsC > Hitt. CrisC (e.g. parprške/a- < *pri-prh₁-ske/o-). It is unclear to me what kind of suffix -SKU- is: within Hittite it is unparalleled. In the Germanic languages, we find some traces of a -SKU-suffix (Goth. un-tila-malsks ‘rash, impetuous’ and ModHG mulsch ‘weak’), but this leaves Hitt. -u- unexplained.

*malitt-*: see militt- / mallit-
mālk- / mall- (IIa2 > Ic1) ‘to spin’; āppa parza ~ ‘to unravel’: 3sg.pres.act. ma-la-ak-zi (OH/NS), ma-al-ki-i-ez-zi (KUB 58.82 ii 7 (NS)), ma-al-ki-ez-zi (NS), 3pl.pres.act. ma-al-ki-ja-an-zi (OH/NS), 1sg.pret.act. ma-al-ki-i-nu-un (HT 35 rev. 7 (NS)), 3sg.pret.act. ma-al-ki-ja-at (MH?/NS); verb.subst. ma-al-ku-u-ya[-ar] (NH), ma-al-ki-ya-ya-ar (NH).

Derivatives: malkeššar (n.) ‘spun wool (?)’ (nom.-acc.sg. [m]a-al-ke-eš-šar (OH?/NS)).

IE cognates: TochAB mālk- ‘to put together’.

PIE *mölK-ei / *mIk-énti

See CHD L-N: 131-2 for attestations and semantics. Usually this verb is interpreted as showing a stem mall- el besides malkiē/a-el. Yet one of the stem plene -a-, ma-al-ku-u-ya[-ar], is remarkable: none of the mi-conjugated verbs of the structure CaRC-2 (class I4a) ever shows plene spelling (except in the verb ērš-2 / aroš- ‘to flow’, but here the spelling a-ar-aš- is used to indicate the full-grade stem /a·arS/-, cf. its lemma) and it is therefore difficult to link the spelling ma-al-ka-el to this class. We therefore may have to assume that this verb was *hi-conjugated originally and showed a stem mālk- / mall-. The taking over into the mi-conjugation (ma-la-ak-zi) as well as the -je/a-class (malkiē/a-el) can then be regarded as trivial NH developments.

Of the several etymological proposals (for which see Tischler HED M: 108-9), the best one is by Kronasser (1957: 121), who connects mālk- / mall- with TochAB mall- ‘to put together’. Because both languages do not give any insight to the nature of the velar consonant, we can only reconstruct *molK- / *moIK-.

māld- / mald- (IIa2 > IIa1γ) ‘to recite, to make a vow’ (Akk. KARĪBU):

1sg-pres.act. ma-al-da-ah-hi (NH), ma-al-ta-ah-hi (NS), 3sg.pres.act. ma-a-al-di (OS: 5x), ma-a-al-ti (OS: 1x), ma-al-di (OS: 3x), ma-al-ti (OS: 2x), ma-al-te (OH/NS, 1x) ma-al-ta-i (NH), ma-al-da-i (NH), 1sg.pret.act. ma-al-ta-hu-un (OS), ma-al-da-ah-hu-un (OH/NS), 3sg.pret.act. ma-al-ta-ah (NH), 2sg.imp.act. ma-al-di (NH); part. ma-al-ta-an-t (MH/MS); verb.noun ma-al-du-ya-ar (MS?); inf.1 ma-al-tu-u-an-zi (NH); impf. ma-al-za-ke-a (NS), ma-al-za-aš-ke/a-

malteš(s)a)nala- (c.) ‘recipient of malteššar’ (acc.sg. ma-al-te-eš-na-la-an, ma-al-te-eš-ša-na-la-an), melteššar / meltešīn- (n.) ‘votive offering’ (nom.-acc.sg. mi-el-te-eš-šar (NH), abl. mi-el-te-eš-na-az (NH)), maldaii (adj.) ‘obliged to make a maldai?”’ (nom.sg. ma-al-ta-ta-liš (NH), acc.sg. ma-al-ta-al-li-in (NH), dat.-loc.sg. ma-al-ta-al-li (NH)).


PIE *mōldʰ-ei / *mldʰ-enti

See CHD L-N: 132ff. for attestations. The verb shows a stem māld- in the strong forms and mald- in the weak forms, going back to o-grade vs. zero-grade. The verb clearly inflects according to class Ia2 (māldi). Only in NH texts we find sporadically forms that inflect according to the tum(a)-class (maltai, maldai and possibly 3sg.pret. maldaiš). It is hard to determine whether the one attestation 3sg.pres.act. ma-al-te (IBoT 2.44, 5 (OH/NS)) shows a mixing up of the signs TE and TI (a phenomenon not unknown from NS texts, cf. Melchert 1984a: 137), or really shows the archaic 3sg.pres.act.-ending -e, which is known only sporadically (see e.g. yaršči: 3sg.pres.act. ya-ar-aš-še (OS)).

The etymology of this verb has been known since Hrozný (1919: 444), i.e. *meldʰ- (e.g. Arm. malt’em ‘to pray’, OSax. meldon ‘to tell’, Lith. meldziū ‘to pray’).

Note that if the noun melteššar is a real form (it is attested only twice in NH texts), it shows an e-grade stem *meldʰ-, which contrasts with the o-grade in the strong-stem forms (māldi < *mōldʰ-ei) and the zero-grade in the weak-stem forms (maltant- < *mldʰ-ent-).


See CHD L-N: 138 for discussion. This verb, used in a Hittite context and with a Hittite verbal ending, is likely to be regarded as Luwian, as can be seen by the use of the gloss wedges. The CLuw. counterpart is mamannya-, which is derived from CLuw. manā ‘to see’ (see at manā). Cf. Melchert (1988b: 218f.) for a detailed treatment.
man, *=man* (particle of optative, irrealis and potentialis)

Derivatives: see manka.

PIE *-mn?*

This particle is usually written with a short *a*: ma-an or ma-n=. From MS texts onwards, we occasionally find spellings with plene spelling: ma-a-an and ma-a-n=. Note that the one OS form with plene spelling cited in CHD (L-N: 139), ma-a-n[e (KBo 6.2 ii 54), should be read ma-a-am[-ma-an] = män=man.

The particle stands in sentence-initial position, either as a loose word that can bear sentence initial-particles (e.g. ma-an, ma-an=ya-a=n-na-aš, ma-n=a-an=kán) or as an enclitic that is attached to the first word of the sentence, occupying the slot between (=ija / =(m)a on the one side and =ya(r) on the other (e.g. a-ši=ma-an=ya, an-za-a-aš=ma-an=ya, a-πi-ja=ma-an=ya=mu, ka-a-aš-ti-t=a=ma-an). When used attached to the conjunction män ‘if’, it can show an assimilated form (e.g. ma-a-am=ma-an, ma-am=ma-an, but also ma-a-an=ma-an).

The particle denotes the optative (wish of the speaker), irrealis (‘would (have)’) and potentialis (‘could (have)’). According to CHD L-N: 143, the negative of man in the function of ‘wish of the speaker’ is expressed by le=man, whereas the negative in the function of ‘wish of the subject (which is not the speaker)’ is expressed by nūman, nūjan (q.v.).

The etymology of this particle is unclear. Formally, it seems to go back to *mỵ. Within Hittite, it might have some connection with män ‘if’ (q.v.). As an outer-Anatolian comparandum, one occasionally mentions the Greek modal particle ἐς, but this is usually connected with the question particles Lat. an and Goth. an.

män (conj. and postpos.) ‘(postpos.) like; (conj.) just as, as; how; if, whether; when, whenever, while’ (Sum. GIM-an, BE-an): ma-a-an (OS, often), ma-a-n= (OS, often), ma-an, ma-n=.

Anat. cognates: Pal. män (conjunction) ‘when’ (ma-a-an=tì, ma-a-n=a-aš); CLuw. män ‘if, whenever; whether ... or’ (ma-a-an, ma-a-n=, ma-an, ma-a-am=pì); HLuw. man ... man ‘whether .. or’; Lyc. μὴ ’as; so, likewise’.

PAntat. *môn?*

See CHD L-N: 143 for semantics. The word is usually spelled with plene -a- (ma-a-an, ma-a-n=), and can as such be distinguished from the modal particle man (q.v.). Occasionally, however, one finds spellings without plene -a- (ma-an, ma-n=).
Semantically, the word is virtually identical to māḥhan (q.v.), but the exact connection between the two is unclear. Both occur from OS texts onwards, so it is difficult to regard mān as a contraction of māḥhan. Moreover, the Anatolian cognates (especially Lyc. mē) seem to point to a preform *mōn. Outer-Anatolian cognates may be OIr. ma, mā ‘when’, TochA mānt ‘how?’, TochB mān (conj.) ‘so’. These forms seem to point to a pronominal stem *mo- that is visible in Hitt. = (m)a, māḥhan and maši-as well.

manāt- ‘to see’; broken: ma-na-[...] (KUB 31.76 rev. 21).
PIE *mn-eh₂-

In Hittite texts, this verb is attested only once (with gloss wedges), in a broken context. Nevertheless, it is likely to be equated with CLuw. manāta- ‘to see’. According to Melchert (1988b), this verb reflects *mn-eh₂-, a derivative of the root *men- ‘to stay’, but the semantic connection is not evident to me. See at mamana- for the reduplicated form of this verb.

māṇhanda: see māḥhanda


Derivatives: manijahha- (c.) ‘confidant’? (nom.sg. ma-ni-ja-ah-ša-ša), manijahhai- (c.) ‘administrative district; government’ (nom.sg. ma-ni-ja-ah-ša-iš (MH/NS), [ma-n]i-ja-ah-ša-a-iš (NS), acc.sg. ma-ni-ja-ah-ša-en (OH/NS), ma-ni-ja-ah-ša-i-[i]n], ma-ni-ah-ša-in, gen.sg. ma-ni-[a-ah-ša]-ja-ša-ša (OH/NS), ma-
See CHD L-N 163ff. for attestations. Although the bulk of the attestations is spelled ma-ni-ja-ah-hi-ja, we occasionally find spellings with plene -a-: ma-a-ni-ja-ah-. Since these spellings are found in three texts only (KUB 13.3 (MH/NS), KUB 13.20 (MH/NS) and KBo 17.74 (OH/MS?): note however that Koš ak D. Oettinger 1979a: 458 in an OS text, I assume that ma-ni-ja-ah is the original spelling (cf. also Oettinger l.c.), we should compare ma-ni-ja-ah-hi-iš-kat-tal-la-an).

IE cognates: Lat. manus ‘hand’, Oic. mund, OE mund, OHG munt ‘hand’, OIr. muin ‘patronage, protection’.

PIE *mn-jeh-

*maninkuṇantara* (n.) ‘shortness’ (nom.-acc.sg. *ma-ni-in-ku-ya-an-ta-tar* (NH),
*maninkuṇa*² (Ib2) ‘to bring near (?)’ (forms? *ma-ni-in-ku-ya-nu-uš*),
*maninkusē*² (Ib2) ‘to be short’ (3pl.pres.act. *ma-ni-in-ku-e-eš-ša-an-zē* (OH?/NS)).


See CHD L-N: 170ff. for attestations. The words show quite a few different spellings: *maninkuṣa-, maninkuṣa-, manikuṣa-, māṇinkuṣa-, māṇnikuṣa-, manenkuṣa-, māṇenkuṣa-,* which makes it difficult to etymologize. Duchesne-Guillemin (1947: 82f.) assumed that the element *e/inkuṣa-* must be compared to Lat. *propinquus.* Skt. *praty-yānc* < *-enku*². One could then propose to connect the element *mān(n)-* with mēni- ‘face’ (q.v.), but it still remains difficult to explain all the different spellings.

*manka* (adv.) ‘in some way, in any way’; *ma-an-ga, ma-an-ka*.

 PIE *mn-ko* ?

See CHD L-N: 175f. for the view that *manka* means ‘in some way, in any way’,
and when negated ‘in no way’. It is remarkable that often the word occurs together with *man*, the particle of optative, potentialis and irrealis (q.v.), which is strengthened by the fact that *manka* is negated by *nīmān*. CHD states: “if there is more than mere coincidence in the frequent association of *manka* with the particle *man* and the negative *numan*, there might be a hint of the optative, potential or unreal ideas in its contexts”. This then goes for the etymology as well: *manka* is likely to consist of the particle *man* followed by *=kka* as visible in e.g. *kuški / kuška*. See at *man* and *=kki /=*kka* for futher etymology.

*mant-* (c.) something harming: nom.sg. *ma-an-za*.

Anat. cognates: Lyd. *mēli-* , something negative; Lyc. *mēle-* ‘harm (or sim.)’
(acc.sg. *mēlē*).


641
The word *PDQ* is a hapax in a lexical list (KBo 1.45 obv.10), of which the Sumerian and Akkadian translations are broken off. The word follows *alqanzatar* ‘witch-craft’ and *iššali* ‘spittle’. The interpretation of *manza* as a nom.sg.c. of a stem *mant-* is indicated by the adj. *mantalli*-(adj.), which describes evil tongues (q.v.) and by *SISKUR* *mantalli-* , *SISKUR* *maltalli-* , a ritual against evil (words?). In Lycian and Lydian we also find forms that seem to go back to a form *mVnT* - and denote something negative. Rieken (1999a: 42-3) connects these words to Lat. *PHQG XP* ‘fault, error’ and OIr. *PLQG* ‘mark’ and reconstructs *PRQGV*. Note however, that we have to be careful as the exact meaning of all the Anatolian words are unknown.

*PDQWDOOL* (adj.) ‘venomous(?)’, poisonous(?)’, rancorous(?)’: acc.pl. *PDDQWDDOOLLHHã* (MH/MS), *PDDQWDDOOL* [LHHã] (NS).


See CHD L-N: 176 for attestations. This adjective is only used to describe ‘tongues’ and probably denotes a negative quality of these. The suffix -alli- seems to point to Luwian origin, which would be supported by the possibility that this adjective is to be equated with *SISKUR* *mantalli-* , *SISKUR* *maltalli-* , a ritual pertaining to rancor(ous words) (q.v.), which is of Luwian origin (cf. the gloss wedges). It is possible that these words are derivatives of a noun *mant-* that is attested as a hapax and probably denotes something harmful. See there for further etymological proposals.


Derivatives: ( SISKUR) *mantallaššammi-* (adj.) ‘designated for mantalli-rituals’ (nom.sg.c. *ma-an-tal-la-aš-ša-am-mi-iš* (NH)).

See CHD L-N: 176 for attestations. The word is usually found as *mantalli-* , but once an attestation *SISKUR* *maltalli* is found. This form may have been the result of a crossing with *maltalli- ‘obliged to make a maltešar’ and maltešar / maltešn- ‘ritual, voting offering’ (for both, see mǣld₁ / mald₁).

The *mantalli-ritual* is used against evil curses, and therefore it is possible that *SISKUR* *mantalli-* is identical to the adj. *mantalli-* (q.v.) which describes evil
tongues in a similar ritual. The word probably is of Luwian origin because of the
gloss wedges, the Luwian suffix -alli-, and the Luwian inflected form
mantallijanza. Moreover, its derivative mantallaššammi- is clearly a Luwian
formation.

If the equation with the adj. mantalli- is correct, SISKUR mantalli-, too, is possibly
derived from the noun mant- (q.v.) that denotes something evil. See there for
further etymology.

mar-: see mer² / mar-

marra- or marri- (gender unknown) ‘(sun)light’ (Akk. ȘETU): dat.-loc.sg. mar-ri.
IE cognates: Gr. μαριαίος ‘to glitter’, Μαῖαρ ‘Sirius’, Skt. mārīci- ‘particle of
light’.

PIE *merH-

See CHD L-N: 185. This word is a hapax in KBo 15.2 iv (7) [n=α-α̱=kán] mar-
ri 1G1-an-da Ú-UL l(i-ja-zi?), which is duplicated by KUB 17.31, (8) n=α-
α̱=kán A-NA ŠE-TI me-na-ah-ňa-an-da Ú-UL ... ] ‘he does not s[tep] towards
the daylight’. As no other forms are attested, we cannot determine whether
the stem of the word is marra- or marri-.

According to Tischler (HEG L/M: 135f.), this word must be connected with Gr.
μαριάιος ‘to glitter’, Μαῖαρ ‘Sirius’ and Skt. mārīci- ‘particle of light’, which
point to a root *merH-. If marri is derived from an i-stem marri-, the formal
similarity between Skt. mārī < *me/orH-ih₂- and Gr. Μαῖαρ < *merH-ih₂- is even
closer.

How this word must be regarded in view of the Hittite adv. marrī ‘rashly’ (q.v.)
is not fully clear.

(TU) marḥā- a kind of stew: acc.sg. mar-ḥa-an, mar-ḥa-a-an, dat.-loc.sg. mar-ḥi
(MH?/MS), abl. mar-ḥa-za (Bo 4414, 10).

PIE *mrḥ₂₃-ō-??

See CHD L-N: 182 for attestations. The precise meaning of the word is unclear,
but the use of the determinative TU indicates that it is some stew or cooked food.
Note that Puhvel (HED 6: 65) reads TU as UTUL ‘jar’ and therefore interprets
marḥā- as a “dish, bowl”.

Starke (1986: 161-2) connects marḥā- with marrije/aₚ₄₃ₑ’ to
soften/melt/dissolve solid objects by heating them’. Semantically, this is possible
if marḥā- indeed denotes a stew. Formally, we then would have to assume that marrije/a- shows a development *VRHV > VRRV, whereas marḥā- must reflect *mrH-ō-. At this moment, this is quite speculative, though.


See CHD L-N: 182f.: this word is hapax in the following context:

KUB 1.13 ii
(26) ḥa-aš-ši-i=ma=kăn MUN mar-[ra/i]-at-ta-ri
(27) A-NA DUG.NAM-ZI-TI=ja BULÛG AL.GAZ
(28) [ma]r-ḥa-mu-ya-am-ma-an

‘Salt is being dissolved on the hearth. Crushed malt is m. in the fermenting pot’.

CHD translates [ma]rḥaṣuamma as ‘brewed(?), which would mean that it in some way could belong with (TCU) marḥa-, a kind of stew (q.v.), and marrije/a,167) ‘to soften/melt/dissolve solid objects by heating them’ (q.v.). Formally, marḥaṣamma- looks like a Luw. part. in -mma/i- of a verb marḥanu-.

Note that in the older literature this form sometimes incorrectly is cited as [y]a-ḥa-mu-ya-am-ma-an.


See CHD L-N: 183f. for attestations. Puhvel (HED 6: 67) and Tischler (HEG L/M: 133) adduce the form ma-ra-a-i-it to this paradigm, which, if correct, would show that originally mūri- had an ablauting paradigm. CHD takes marṣīi as a separate entry, however (L-N: 181). It is unclear why abl. mūri[t]a[z] suddenly shows a -t-, but Puhvel (I.c.) calls this -t- “pronominal”, whereas Starke (1986: 162) states that it must go back to a Luwian stem mūri-. No further etymology.

marri (adv.) ‘within a glimpse(?): mar-ri (NH), mar-ri-i (1x: NH).

Derivatives: mekki marri (adv.) ‘exceedingly, very much’ (me-ek-ki mar-ri).

PIE *morH-i ?
See CHD L/N: 185 for attestations. There, the adverb is translated ‘in the heat of emotion or passion(?)’, rashly(?), impetuously(?), seemingly based partly on the assumption that *marri- has a notion of heat in it (because of a connection with *marri- ‘sunlight’ (q.v.) and *marrija/-a-
\[\text{IIg} \text{-} \text{IIIh}\] ‘to soften/melt/dissolve solid objects by heating them’). Tischler (HEG L-M: 135), too, assumes a connection with *marri- ‘sunlight’, but proposes as original meaning of *marri- ‘(schon) bei Tagesanbruch, (ganz) früh’. It is remarkable that all attestations of *marri cited in CHD occur in negated sentences ‘I did not do this *marri ...’. The connection with *marri- ‘in the sunlight’ (q.v.) seems plausible to me. Because the root of this word, *merH-, probably meant ‘to glitter, to glimpse’, I would translate *marrija- as ‘not within a glimpse’.

*marri-: see marra-

\[\text{IIg} \text{-} \text{IIIh}\] *marriyaanna- (n.) ‘railing?’: nom.-acc.sg. ma-ri-ja-ya-an-na (MH/NS), ma-

See CHD L-N: 186 for attestations. Puhvel HED 6: 71f. interprets this word as ‘railing, fence’, which does not seem improbable. The formation is further unclear. Cf. annayanna- for the suffix -yanna-. Further unclear.

*marrija/-a-
\[\text{IIg} \text{-} \text{IIIh}\] *marra/-a-
\[\text{IIg} \text{-} \text{IIIh}\] (IIIg / IIIh) ‘to melt (down), to dissolve, to stew or cook until tender; to heat up(?), to bring to a boil(?): 3sg.pres.midd. ma-ri-e-ta (OS), ma-ri-ja-at-ta-ri (NH), mar[-ra/i/-]at-ta-ri (NH), 3sg.pret.midd. mar-ra-at-

See CHD L-N: 180-1 for attestations and semantics. Most forms show a stem marrija/-, but we also find forms that show a stem marra- (marrattat and marrant-, cf. at šarr- / šarr- for a similar middle paradigm). In CHD, it is stated that the verb denotes “that heat has been applied to the object, so that it undergoes a physical change [...] from a solid state to a liquid one”. Oettinger (1979a: 279-81) translates ‘zerkleinert werden, zergehen’, however, and bases his etymological interpretation on this: *merh₂- ~ Skt. mṛṇāti ‘to crush’ (followed by e.g. LIV²). The root *merh₂- rather seems to denote ‘to crush, to quench’ (cf. Gr. μαρατνό ‘to quench’), however, whereas the Hittite verb denotes ‘to soften/melt/dissolve solid objects by heating them’. In my view, this etymology
therefore is not very probable, yet I do not have an alternative. See at $^{tu}$marḫā- for a possible inner-Hittite cognate.

mārk\(^1\)/mark- (IIa2) ‘to divide, to separate, to unravel; to distribute; to cut up, to butcher (animals)’: 1sg.pres.act. ma-a-ar-ka-aḫ-ḫti (OS), 3sg.pres.act. mar-ak-zī (MH/NS?), 2pl.pres.act. mar-ak-te-ni (MH²/NS), 3pl.pres.act. mar-kān-zī (MH/NS), 3sg.pret.act. ma-ra-ak-ta (OH/NS), 3pl.pret.act. mar-ke-e[r] (NH), mar-ke-e[er]; part. mar-kān-t-; inf.I mar-ku-ya-an-zī (KUB 53.4 iv 16 (NS)), mar-ku-an-zī (NS); impf. mar-ki-iš-ke/a-.

IE cognates: Lat. margin ‘side-line, border’, ModP marz ‘region’, Goth. marka ‘border, area’ (*morg-), Ofr. mruig ‘territory, area’, We. bro ‘country’ (*mroği-).

PIE *morg-ei, *mrog-entī

See CHD L-N: 187f. for attestations. Although mi-inflected forms are attested (marakzi and marakta), the two OS attestations of 1sg.pres.act. märkāḫḫi unambiguously point to an original ḫḫi-inflection. Moreover, the stem mārk- must reflect full-grade vs. the zero-grade found in 3pl.pres.act. markanzi. The original meaning of mārk\(^1\)/mark- seems to have been ‘to divide into parts’ (cf. CHD l.c. and Puhvel HED 6: 74).

Several etymological connections have been proposed. Sturtevant (1933: 117) was the first to connect mārk/mark- with Skt. marc- ‘to damage, to hurt, to destroy’, which implies a reconstruction *merk-. Oettinger (1979a: 425) follows this suggestion and equates Skt. marcāyatī with *mārkī < *morkei-. This equation is based on formal similarity more than on semantical grounds, as Skt. marcāyatī is a causative denoting ‘to make damage’, which does not fit mārk-/mark- ‘to divide into pieces’.

Braun (1936: 397) connects mārk-/mark- with e.g. Goth. marka ‘boundary, area’, Ofr. mruig ‘id.’, from a root *merg- (with a palatovelar on the basis of Pers. marz ‘region’, cf. Schrijver 1991: 459). These words indeed semantically fit the Hittite meaning ‘to divide into parts’ nicely. The absence of verbal forms of the root *merg- in languages other than Hittite is a bit awkward, though.

Most recently, Puhvel (l.c.) suggested a connection with Lat. merc- ‘trades’ and mercārī ‘to trade’, which he assumes to derive from ‘distribution of wares’. This does not seem very appealing to me.

I would stick with the etymology proposed by Braun, and reconstruct *mōrg-ei, *mroğ-enti. For Skt. marc-, see at markiē/a-².
**markije/a-** (Ic1) ‘(act. with =z) to disapprove of, to object to, to reject, to refuse; to forbid; (midd.) to be rejected, to be unacceptable’: 1sg.pres.act. mar-ki-ja-mi (NH), 2sg.pres.act. mar-ki-ja-ši (NH), mar-ki-ši (NH), 3sg.pres.act. mar-ki-ja-ži (NH), 2sg.pret.act. mar-ki-ja-at (NH), 3sg.pret.act. mar-ki-ja-at; 3pl.pres.midd. [mar]-ki-ja-an-ta-ri, 3pl.pret.midd. mar-ki-ja-an-da-at (NH), 3sg.imp.midd. [m]ar-ki-ja-ru (OH/NS); part. mar-ki-ja-an-t- (NH); verb.noun mar-ki-ja-u-ya-ar (NH); impf. mar-ki-ši-ke/a- (NH).

IE cognates: Skt. marc- ‘to hurt, to damage’, Lat. murcus ‘mutilated’.
PIE *mrk-je/o-

See CHD L-N: 189 for attestations and semantics. Often, this verb is seen as a derivative of mārk- / mark- ‘to divide, to separate’ (q.v.), but semantically this is not very appealing: markije/a- must rather be regarded as a separate verb.

According to Knobloch (1959: 39), followed by Oettinger (1979a: 346)), this verb belongs with Skt. marc- ‘to hurt, to damage’ and Lat. murcus ‘mutilated’. Puhvel (HED 6: 76) agrees with him and provides convincing parallels for a semantic shift of ‘to hurt, to damage’ to ‘to disapprove of’. Formally, we see a nice similarity between Skt. pres. mrtyati and Hitt. markijazi < *mrk-je-ti.


Derivatives: **markištahh-** (IIb) ‘to take someone by surprise(?)’ (1sg.pret.act. mar-ki-iš-ta-ah-hu-un, 3pl.pret.act. mar-ki-iš-ta-ah-ye-er; broken mar-kišt-ta-ah[...]).

See CHD L-N: 190 for attestations. The semantics of this verb are difficult. The verb markištæae- is poorly attested, except for the verb.noun.gen.sg. markištäušas, which occurs often as a designation of a decease or plague. CHD translates ‘death (plague?) which catches unaware(s?)’ and ‘sudden death’. Tischler (HEG L/M: 138f.), however, translates ‘Krankheit des Dahinschwindens’, but this does not make much sense to me.

Formally, all forms seem to be derive from an unattested noun *markišta-, which Rieken (1999a: 224) analyses as *m(e)o)rēš-es-to- from a root *merk- ‘to grab to seize’ (Pokorny 1959: 739). This root probably does not exist, however, as Skt. marš- ‘to touch, to handle’ must be connected with Lat. mulečēd ‘to brush, to stroke’ and reconstructed as *melk-, and all other forms cited by Pokorny as

---
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reflecting *merk*- are unconvincing without the Sanskrit support. I have no alternative etymology, however.

4Markuiyaja- *(plur.)* deities in the depth of the earth*: dat.-loc.pl. 4Mar-ku-ya-ja-aš.

Anat. cognates: CLuw. 4Maryai- *(c.)* ‘dark deities’ (dat.-loc.pl. 4Mar-ya-ja-an-za).

This word is the genuinely Hittite counterpart of CLuw. 4Maryai-, derived from the basic Luwian word marša- ‘black’ that has been borrowed into Hittite (see at maryā-). This means that we have to reconstruct a PANat. form *marq̃ aja-. See at maryā́- for further etymology.

marlant- *(adj.)* ‘dumb, foolish, idiot’ *(Sum. 4LIL)*: nom.sg.c. mar-la-a-an-za (KBo 32.14 ii 46, rev. 42 (fr.) (MS)), mar-la-an-za (NH), acc.sg.c. mar-la-an-da-an, gen.sg. 4LIL-aš.

Derivatives: marlahh- *(Iib)* ‘to make foolish(?)* (form? mar-la-aḫ-ḫa-an[… (MS)?]), marlae- ḏ *(Ic2)* ‘to become crazed, mad’ *(impf.3sg.pres.midd. [m]ar-la-ḫe-ḫa-ḫta (OS), [m]ar-li-ḫe-ḫeta (OS)), marlatar *(n.)* ‘foolishness, idiocy, stupidity’ *(nom.-acc.sg. mar-la-tar (MS)), marlišš- ḏ *(Ib2)* ‘to become foolish (?)’ *(part. mar-le-hš-a-an-t- (NH)).

See CHD L-N: 191 for attestations. All words are derived from a stem *marla-. Eichner (1975a: 81) connected this word with Gr. μορχξ ‘dumb, idiot’ under the assumption that a preform *moro-lo- could give Hitt. marla- through syncope. To my knowledge, such cases of syncope are unknown in Hittite, however. Nevertheless, a connection with Gr. μορχξ looks attractive. If we take Skt. mīrā- ‘foolish’ into account, the picture becomes more difficult, however. A connection between the Greek and the Sanskrit word would point to *mu(e)h₁-ro- (if *muḥro- indeed would yield Gr. μορχξ?), but in such a scenario, Hitt. *marla- cannot be cognate. Further unclear.

marnuṣya-: see marnuṣant-

marnuṣant- *(n. > c.)* a kind of beer: nom.-acc.sg.n. mar-nu-an (OS), mar-nu-ya-an (OH or MH/MS), mar-nu-u-ya-an (OH/NS), acc.sg.c. mar-nu-ya-an-da-an (OH/NS), gen.sg. mar-nu-ya-aš (OS), mar-nu-an-da-aš (OS), mar-nu-ya-an-da-aš (OH/NS), instr. mar-nu-an-te-it (OH/NS), mar-ni-it (KUB 55.38 ii 9 (NS)).
See CHD L-N: 193 for attestations. The bulk of the attestations shows neuter gender, whereas a commune acc.sg. is attested only twice in NS texts. I therefore assume that the word was neuter originally. The word shows two stems, namely marnuya- besides marnuyant-, which are both attested in OS texts already (gen.sg. marnuyaš vs. marnaandaš). The most likely source of this dichotomy lies in the fact that the nom.-acc.sg.-form of a stem marnuyant- is marnuqan, which is easily interpreted as belonging to a stem marnuqa-. On the basis of OAss. marnu’atum, a kind of beer, which is only attested in the Kültepe-texts and therefore likely a borrowing from Hittite (cf. Von Schuler 1969 and Dercksen fthc.), it is probable that the stem marnuyant- is more original.

Formally, marnuyant- is identical to the participle of the verb marnu-² ‘to make disappear’ (caus. of mer-² / mar- (q.v.)). The fact that this beer is sometimes referred to as being able to make evil disappear (cf. CHD l.c.), is more likely to be a folk-etymological interpretation of the name marnuyant- than an indication of a real historical connection between the two words. Further etymology is unknown.

maršant- (adj.) ‘deceitful, dishonest; unholy, unfit for sacred use’: nom.sg.c. marša-an-za (OH/NS), acc.sg.c. marša-an-ta-an (OH/NS), nom.-acc.sg.n. marša-an (MH/NS), nom.pl.c. marša-an-te-eš (NH), nom.-acc.sg.n. marša-an-da (OH or MH/NS).

Derivatives: maršah³ (IIB) ‘to desecrate; to make treacherous’ (part. marša-a-ah-ḥa-an-t (MH/MS), marša-a-ah-ḥa-an-t (NH)), maršanu-³ (IIB2) ‘to desecrate, to profane; to falsify’ (3sg.pres.act. marša-nu-zi, marša-nu-uzu-zi (MH/MS), part. marša-nu-(ya)-jan-t (NH)), marštar (n.) ‘fraud, treachery, deception’ (nom.-acc.sg. marša-a-tar (OH/NS), marša-tar (OH or MH/NS)), maršeq³ (IIB2) ‘to be/become corrupt’ (3pl.pret.act. marš-e-e-er (OS)), maršeqeq³ (IIB2) ‘to become desecrated, to become profane, to become unholy; to become corrupt, to become deceitful’ (3sg.pres.act. marš-e-e-zi (MH/NS), marš-e-e-zi (NH), 3pl.pret.act. marš-e-e-e-er (OH/NS), marš-e-e-er (NH); broken marš-e-e-ša-an(-)), maršaštarra/-, maršaštarra- (c.) ‘desecration, profanation’ (nom.sg. marša-aš-tar-rī-iš (MH/MS), marša-aš-tar-rī-eš (NH), mar-za-aš-tar-rī-iš (NH), acc.sg. marša-aš-tar-rī-in (NH), gen.sg. marša-aš-tar-ra-aš (NH), dat.-loc.sg. marša-aš-tar-rī (NH), mar-za-aš-tar-rī (NH), dat.-loc.pl. marša-aš-tar-ra-aš (NH)).

Anat. cognates: CLuw. marša- ‘treachery’ (gen.adj.nom.-acc.sg.n. < marša-aš-ša-an), maršaza- ‘?’ (case? marša-za-an); Mil. mrsx³ ‘?’.

PAnat. *mrsa-
IE cognates: Skt. mīśā (adv.) ‘invain, falsely’; Skt. marṣ- ‘to forget’, Lith. už- mištį ‘to forget’, TochAB mārs- ‘to forget’.

PIE *mrs-o-

See CHD L-N: 195f. for attestations. Note that CHD cites a Hittite adjective marša- on the basis of two forms. “Com.sg.acc.” mar-ša-an (KBo 5.2 i 4, 5) in my view is rather to be interpreted as a neuter nom.-acc.sg. from the stem maršant-. “Neut.sg.(acc.)” mar-ša (KBo 5.2 iv 64) is as such ununderstandable and therefore must be emended to mar-ša-an, in my view again a nom.-acc.sg.n. of the stem maršant-. This means that in Hittite, no stem marša- can be found. In Luwian, on the contrary, a stem marša- is visible in the form mar-ša-as-ša-ša, found in a Hittite context with gloss wedges. In CHD it is cited as “Luw. neut. sg. nom.-acc. in -ša”, but we then would rather expect *maršan=za. I therefore would emend it to mar-ša-as-ša-an, a nom.-acc.sg.n. of a gen.adj. of a stem marša-.

Despite the fact that a stem marša- is not attested as such in Hittite, all words cited here must be derived from a stem *marš- or *marša-. As we saw, this marša- is found in other Anatolian languages as well: CLuw. marša- (as we saw above); Hitt. maršaštarra/i- which, according to Starke (1990: 393ff.) must be a Hittite adaptation of a Luw. noun *maršaštar-, a derivation in -star- of marša-; Mil. mṛṣy- ‘?’ which, at least formally, can be equated with Hitt. maršaḫḫ-1.

The stem *marša- must reflect *mṛso- since a preform *mVṛso- would have given Hittite **marra- (cg. arra- ‘arse’ < *Horso-). An etymological connection with Skt. mīśā (adv.) ‘invain, falsely’ (first suggested by Burrow 1964: 76) is therefore appealing. Ultimately, these words must be derived from the verbal root *mers- ‘to forget’.

The verb maršē₂, which is only attested twice as 3pl,pret.act. mar-šē-e-er, is found in an OS and a OH/NS copy. In another NS copy of the latter text, maršē is duplicated by maršēşer, which indicates that the form maršē is not derived from a mere verb marš-. According to Watkins (1973: 74), the verbal stem therefore must have been maršē₂, showing the stative-suffix *-eh₁-

mṛyaḫḫ- (Luw. verb) ‘to blacken(?): 3sg.pret.act. mṛ-ru-ya-a-ṣṭ.


Mar-ya-i=an-za), maruṣam(m)a/i- (part.) ‘black, dark blue(?)’ (nom.sg.c. mar-ru-ṣa-me-eš, ma-ru-ṣa-mi-iš, nom.pl.n. ma-ru-ṣa-am-ma, [m]a-ru-ṣa-ma),
*maryatar* (?) ‘blackness(?)’ (dat.-loc.sg.(?) *mar-ya-ta-ni* (interpretation unsure)); HLuw. <DEU> marawana/i- <DEU> (adj.) ‘?’ (nom.sg. “DEU” *ma-ru-wá/i-wá/i-ni-sa* (KAYSERI §8)).


PIE *merg*-

See CHD L-N: 201f. for attestations. This is a difficult set of words, especially because their meanings are not fully clear. We have to start with the Luwian adjective *marušam(m)a/i-* (which is used in Hittite contexts). It was known for a long time that this word denotes a certain colour, and Güterbock (1956a: 122) remarks that in certain contexts *marušama/i-* is used as the opposite of BABBAR ‘white’ and therefore may mean ‘black’. He then connects this adjective with the hapax verb *maruyā-* (gloss wedged, so probably of Luwian origin), which he translates as ‘to blacken’. This means that we would be dealing with a Luwian stem *mary(a)-* ‘black’, which would mean that e.g. the Dingir.Meš *Maryānzi* denote ‘black deities’. Of this last term, a Hittite counterpart has been found in d*Markuyāja-*, which then might mean ‘black deity’ as well (q.v.).

If Luw. Dingir.Meš *Maryānzi* and Hitt. d*Markuyāja-* are really cognate, we have to reconstruct a PAnat. form *merg*<i>ai</i>- Lumin (1973: 298) connects this with PIE *merg*<i>+</i>- (misprinted as “*merq*<i>+</i>-”), referring to Pokorny (1959: 734). Indeed, words like OIC. *myrkr* ‘dark’, *mjorkvi* ‘darkness’, OSAx. *mirki*, OE *mierce* ‘dark’ point to a root *merg*<i>+</i>- ‘dark’. Formally, Lith. *mirgēti*, *mirgu* ‘to twinkle’ could belong here as well, but semantically this remains far.


See CHD L-N: 203 for attestations. The verb always has as its object bread that has been broken. Formally, the verb looks like a derivative of a further unattested noun *marza-*. Tischler HEG L/M: 153 (referring to Lumin) suggests a connection with Skt. *mrḍhāti* ‘to make weak, to make soft’ and Lat. *mordeō* ‘to bite’, but semantically this connection is not probable. No further etymology.

*māša* (c.) ‘locust, swarm of locusts’ (Sum. BURU₃): nom.sg. [m]a-ša-aš, acc.sg. ma-aša-an (NH), gen. ŠA BUR[U₃], acc.pl. BURU₃<sup>IPLA</sup>, gen.pl. ŠA BURU₃<sup>IPLA</sup>.
See CHD L-N: 203f. for attestations. The word has no clear etymology. A connection with Skt. math- ‘to rob’, as proposed by Tischler (HEG L/M: 153f.), is formally impossible: Skt. math- < *menth₂-, which cannot yield Hitt. māša-. On the basis of the incorrect reading of acc.sg. ma-aša-an (KUB 24.1 iii 17) as kar'-ša-an (reading ḫḫḫ = MA-A as ḫḫḫḫ = KAR), Eichner (1974: 63) wrongly reconstructs “karša” as *grsó-, derived from the root *gres- (Skt. grásate ‘to devour’).

*mašuíl(a)- ‘mouse’ (Sum. PĬŠ.TUR).

See Tischler (HEG L/M: 157f). On the basis of the phonetic spelling "Maš-ğu-i-
lu-ya- of the PN "PĬŠ.(TUR)-ya-, we must conclude that behind the sumerogram PĬŠ.(TUR) ‘mouse’, the Hittite word mašuíl(a)- has to be read. Although the name is almost always spelled with the sign MAŠ, which in principle can be read pár as well, the attestation Ma-aš-ğu-i-ša-aš (KBo 4.3 i 35) proves that we have to read Mašuíluwa-. Despite some creative attempts (for which see Tischler l.c.), the word has no credible etymology.

maši- (interrog. and indef. rel. pronoun) ‘how many, however many, however much’: acc.sg.c. maši-in (NS), nom.pl.c. maši-e-e (OH/NS), maši-i-e-eš (NH), acc.pl.c. maši-e-eš (NH), maši-i-u-ul[š], maš-e-e (NS) (with pron. inflection), dat.-loc.pl.(?) maši-ja-aš.

Derivatives: mašian (adv.) ‘as much as’ (maši-ja-an (OH/NS)), mašianki (adv.) ‘however many times’ (maši-ja-an-ki (MH/NS)), mašiand- (adv.) ‘however many times’ (dat.-loc.sg. maši-ja-an-ti, maši-ja-an-te (MH/NS), nom.pl.c. maši-ja-an-te-eš), mašiand- (adv.) ‘equal in size or amount, as much/little as, as big/small as’ (nom.sg.c. maši-ya-an-za (NH), maši-ya-an-za (1x, NH), acc.sg.c. maši-ya-an-ta-an (MH/MS), nom.-acc.sg.n. maši-ya-an, acc.pl.c. maši-ya-an-du-urši), mašian (adv.) ‘as much as, as many as, how many (times)’ (maši-ya-an (OH/MS?)), maši-ya-an (1x, undat.).

Anat. cognates: Pal. maš (adv.) ‘as much as’ (maša).

PIE *mo-s + -i

See CHD L-N: 205f. for attestations. For the interpretation of Hitt. maši- and its derivatives, the Palaeic form maš (adv.) ‘as much as’ is important, which was treated by Melchert (1984b: 34-6). He states that this forms shows that the Hittite stem maši- must be built on a petrified *maši, which must be analysed as *maš + -i, in analogy to aši ‘that’, which reflects *aš + the deictic particle -i (see at aši /
reflects a pronominal stem *h₁-o-, Melchert states that *maš reflects *mo-, a pronominal stem also visible in mān, māḥān etc. (q.v.).

țućmaššia- (c.) a garment: nom.sg. ma-aš-ši-(ja-)aš (NH), gen.sg. ma-aš-ši-ja-aš (NH).


See CHD L-N: 205f. for attestations. It is not quite clear what kind of clothing is meant, although one time a hem (TUG SISIKTUM) of a maššaṭašša- is mentioned. According to Tischler (HEG L/M: 159f.), the word could be of IE origin, and he connects it with a root *mes- 'to tie, to knot'. The cognates that he gives, e.g. OHG masc 'net', Lith. mezgū 'to knot, to tie a net', point to a root *mes-, however, which does not match Hitt. maššaṭašša-. Rabin (1963: 129) suggested that maššaṭašša- is a cultural Wanderwort (cf. Hebr. mašši 'silk' and Eg. māš (a garment)).

mau¹ / mu-, maušš₂ (IaIa) 'to fall': 1sg.pres.act. mu-uḫḫ-ḫi (OH/NS), [mu]-u-ujaḫḫ-ḫi (OH/NS), 3sg.pres.act. ma-uš-zi (OH or MH/NS), ma-a-uš-zi (1x, NH), 1sg.pret.act. mu-uḫḫ-u-un (Bo 5441, 5 (MS?)), 3sg.pret.act. ma-uš-ta (MH/NS), ma-a-uš-ta (1x, NS), 3pl.pret.act. ma-uḫḫ-er (OH/MS), ma-uš-še-er (MH/NS), 3sg.imp.act. [m]a-uš-du (NS); 2sg.pres.midd. ma-uš-ta (OH/NS), 3sg.pres.midd. ma-uš-ta-r (NH), 1sg.pres.midd. ma-uš-ḫa-ḫa-at (NH), 3sg.pres.midd. ma-uš-ta-t (NH), 3sg.imp.midd. [m]a-ḫa-ḫa-ta (NS), 3pl.imp.midd. mu-ya-an-ta-ru (KBo 32.14 ii 60, 1.Rd. 4 (MH/MS)); part. ma-uš-ša-an-t (NS); inf.I ma-uš-ši-ua-an-ta (NH); impf. ma-uš-ke/a- (MH/NS).

Derivatives: mum(m)i[e]₂ (Ic1) 'to keep falling, to crumble(?)' (3sg.pres.act. mu-ṛi-e-ez-zi (OH/MS?)), mu-um-mi-e-e-z-zi (OH or MH/NS), mu-um-mi-ja-e-z-zi (KBo 44.158 rev. 3 (NS)), 3pl.pres.act. [m]u-ći-an-zi (OH/NS); 3sg.pres.midd. mu-um-mi-e-e-ṛ-ta (MH/NS); verb.noun mu-mi-ja-tar (NS) 'collapse, fall').

IE cognates: Lat. moveō 'to move', Skt. mā-, mū- 'to move, to push'.

PIE *mōh₁-e / *muh₁-enti

See CHD L-N: 211f. and Puhvel HED 6: 101f. for attestations of mau-/mu-, and CHD L-N: 328 for attestations of mum(m)i[e]₂. The verb mau-/mu- shows three stems: mau- (3pl.pret.act. mayer, 1sg.pres.act. muḥhi, 1sg.pret.act. muḥyun), mu- (3pl.imp.midd. muq̃ntar) and maušš- (e.g. maušzi, maušta, maušker). This
immediately reminds of the situation in au- / u- ‘to see’. Note that in the case of au-/u-, the stem aušš- in OH and MH texts is only visible in 3sg.-forms, and in NH texts sporadically in other forms as well. In the case of mau-/mu-, however, the stem maušš- is more widespread, but all the instances of maušš- outside the 3sg. (3pl.pret.act. mauššer, part. mauššant-, inf.I mauššušučanzi, the middle paradigm) are found in NH texts. So basically, the verbs au-/u- and mau-/mu- show the same distribution (i.e. the stem (m)aušš- originally in 3sg.-forms only, with a generalization of the stem (m)aušš- in other parts of the paradigm in NH texts), but the spread of the stem (m)aušš- went faster in mau-/mu- than in au-/u-.

All in all, we can conclude that, in analogy to texts), but the spread of the stem (m)aušš- outside the Paradigm) (i.e. the stem (m)aušš- replaced an older *māqāi.

This verb is generally connected with PIE *m(ī)euh1-oi-ent, which means that we have to reconstruct *móuh1-ei, *mu1-enti.

The interpretation of the verb mum(m)iège/a- is quite difficult. The first thing that has to be noted is that all attestations with geminate -mm- are NH, and that spellings with single -m- are older. The original form therefore must have been mumīje/a-. The verb cannot reflect a mere reduplication of mau- / mu- as we then cannot explain the -u- of the reduplication syllable and the lack of -u- in the stem (we would expect **mumau-). It therefore is more probable that the second -m- reflects an older *y that has turned to -m- next to -u-. Yet, reconstructing a correct preform remains difficult. A formation *muhyje/o- should have given **muje/a- (cf. ḫwyjænz ‘they run’ < ḫwyje1-i-enti); a formation *muhyje/o- should have given **muje/a- (cf. *shlyje/o- ‘to push’ < ḫlyje/a-); a formation *muhyje/o- (thus Eichner 1973a: 90) should have given **muje/a- (cf. yezzi ‘he comes’ < ḫyje1-ye1i-ti); and a formation muhyje/o- should probably have given **muje/a- (cf. ujeżzi ‘he sends’ < ḫyje1-ye1i-ti). In my view, the only possible solution is assuming that mumīje/a- is a rebuilding of an original verb *mumai- / muni- that inflected according to the dāi/tiæanzi-class (note that all verbs of this class are eventually taken over in the -je/a-class). In this verb then the development *CHuV > Hitt. CumV (e.g. *dhî-weni > Hitt. tumēnī) must have taken place, which means that we must reconstruct *mih1u-ōi-oi.

maušš-: see mau- / mu-

maušš (Ia2) ‘to withstand, to resist, to offer resistance; to dare to (with inf.)’: 2sg.pres.act. ma-za-at-ti (NH), 3sg.pres.act. ma-az-zé (OS), ma-az-zí (OH/NS), ma-az-za-az-zí (OH/NS), ma-(az-)za-az-zí (OH or MH/NS), ma-an-za-az-zí (1x,
IE cognates: OE mōd ‘courage, Goth. modag ‘angry’.

PIE *mōh₂d-s-ei (?)

See CHD L-N: 213f. for attestations. There is debate on two points: what was the actual stem of this verb, and which inflection (hi or mi) did it have. These two questions are interrelated. On the basis of an attestation 3pl.pres.act. ma-[e-er] in KBo 3.13 rev. 18, for which a meaning ‘to withstand’ would fit, it has been suggested that the stem actually was mat- and that the stem maz-, which is abundantly attested, is the result of assimilation of the root-final -t- in front of endings that start in -t-. This implies that this verb was mi-conjugated, and that 3sg. *mat-ti > /matst'i/ was the basis of a generalization of the stem maz-. This is problematic in a few regards. First, CHD (l.c.) states that a reading ma-[e-er] as cited above is highly questionable in view of the traces after the sign ma. If this form would have to be read differently, the whole basis for postulating a stem mat- has vanished. Secondly, the oldest attested form of this verb is 3sg.pres.act. ma-az-zé (OS). Proponents in favour of a stem mat- and subsequently a mi-conjugation state that this form shows the ending -ze for -zi (e.g. Oettinger 1979a: 208). To my knowledge, this is unparalleled, however: the ending is always -zi (apart from a few very archaic instances of -za, the phonetic outcome of *-ti). Moreover, we would expect that /matst'i/ is spelled mazzazi (like it is in some NS texts, and compare the MS spelling e-ez-za-zi ‘he eats’ (see at ed² / ad²)). In my view, mazze is to be seen as a hi-conjugated 3sg.pres.act., showing the ending -e, which is the archaic variant of the ending -i (compare the OS attestation yarašše (see at yarš-¹) and the existence of -hhe besides less archaic -hhi). With the view that maz- originally was hi-conjugated, the idea that the stem actually was mat- has to be abandoned, too (note, however, that Tischler HEG L/M: 163 states that the stem originally must have been mat-, which was hi-conjugated, in which on the basis of 2(!)?sg.pres. *mat-ti an assibilated stem maz- spread throughout the paradigm: this is highly unlikely because 2sg.-forms are far too weak to instigate such a generalization).

All in all, I conclude that the stem was just maz-, which was a hi-inflected verb as is visible in the oldest forms (3sg.pres.act. mazze, mazzi and 2sg.pres.act. mazatti). In NH times, the verb was taken into the mi-inflection, yielding 3sg.pres.act. mazzazi. The nasal in the one attestation 3sg.pres.act. manzazzi (KUB 33.120 i 21) is unexpected and hardly can be taken seriously.
The root-final -z- /ts/ is not explicable through assimilation of original *t, so we have to assume a preform *moT(-)s-ei. Semantically, the verb has two notions: 1. ‘to withstand’, 2. ‘to dare to’. These notions can be combined by the notion ‘to have the courage’. Etymologically, a nice connection (cf. already Laroche 1965: 51f.) seems to be the one with PGerm. *mōda- ‘zeal, anger, courage’ (OE mōd ‘courage, Goth. modags ‘angry’), which, according to Oettinger (1979a: 209) reflects *me/ohdo-. This would imply that Hitt. maz- is an s-extensions as also visible in e.g. ānš- ‘to wipe’ < *h2omh₁-s-, paḥš- ‘to protect’ < *poh₂-s-, pāš- ‘to drink’ < *poh₁-s-, etc. All in all, I would reconstruct *mōh₂-d-s-ei.

'mazkiš(a)-: see ʰmā́k(k)zizi(a)-

=me-: see =mi- / =ma- / =me-

mēhur / mēhun- (n.) ‘period, time’: nom.-acc.sg. me-e-hur (OH/NS), me-ḫu-ur (NH), me-hur (NH) gen.sg. me-e-hu-na-aš (NH), me-ḫu-na-aš (MH/NS), loc.sg. me-e-hu-ni (OS), me-e-hu-u-ni (OH or MH/NS), me-ḫu-u-ni (NH), me-ḫu-ni (MH/NS), me-e-ḫu-ena-ni (1x, NS), me-eḫ-ni (1x, NS), me-e-ḫu-un-ni (1x, MS), nom.-acc.pl. me-hur-

PIE *mēh₂-ur, *mēih₂-un(o)s

See CHD L-N: 239 for attestations. There, a distinction is made between nom.-acc.sg. mēhur and adverbial mēhur. Yet it is likely that, at least historically, these forms are identical. Usually, mēhur / mēhun- is translated ‘time’.

This word is one of the most discussed words in Hittite, especially due to the fact that we find the vowel -e- adjacent to -ḫ-. The oldest etymology was put forward by Kretschmer apud Hrozný (1917: 703), who connected the word with PIE *mēh₂- ‘to measure’. Although semantically attractive, formally this connection is improbable as *h₁ does not yield Hitt. -ḫ- (Puhvel’s recent attempt (HED 6: 111) to revive the theory that -ḫ- can reflect an e-colouring laryngeal must be strongly rejected), and because a suffix -ḫur- is further unknown. The theory that *mēh₂-ur would give mēhur, in which -ḫ- is a hiatus-filler, has now generally been denied.

Another etymological account was given by Eichner (1973a). First, he rightly notes that mēhur, mēhunaš inflects differently from e.g. pahhur, pahhuenaš ‘fire’:
the latter word shows a proterodynamic paradigm (*pēḥ₂-ur, *ph₂-uǝn-s), whereas the accent in mēḥur, mēḥunaš is found on the root-syllable only and therefore is static. He then assumes that the ablaut e : Θ as found in the root-syllable of *pēḥ₂-ur, *ph₂-uǝn-s, must have been *ē : ĕ in static inflected paradigms: *CēC-ur, *CēC-un-s. As an etymological cognate for mēḥur, he proposes to interpret Lat. mātrus ‘mature’, mānus ‘good’ as reflecting a root *mēḥ₂- ‘to be the right time’. When applied to the structure cited above, he comes to the reconstruction *mēḥ₂-ur, *mēḥ₂-un(s). One of the consequences of this reconstruction is that a long *ē apparently is not coloured by the adjacent *h₂. This rule (non-colouring of long vowels by laryngeals) is since then called ‘Eichner’s Law’. Note that this etymology must assume a levelling of the ē-grade throughout the paradigm, as the phonetic outcome of *mēḥ₂-un would have been **mahīn-. Eichner’s etymology and his law has found wide acceptance.

Although Eichner’s etymology formally seems well-crafted, the semantic side is rather weak: connecting a word for ‘time’ with words for ‘good; mature’ is quite far-fetched. Moreover, the presumption that *ē is not coloured by a laryngeal in Hittite is further unfounded (see at ha(m)k ‘hope’, ēḥa-, NA, ēhek ‘reckon’, ēhkan-; LÜ, hippara-, ēhištā, sēḥur / sēhum- and κανές for other alleged instances of Eichner’s Law in Hittite). I therefore do not find this etymology probable.

All other cases in Hittite where we find a sequence -ēh-, we are dealing with original i-diphthongs: tēḥhi ‘I take’ < *dēh₁-oai-h₂ei, pēḥhi < *h₁p-oai-h₂ei. It therefore is formally quite likely that mēḥur reflects *mo/εiḥ₂-ur, derived from a root *meiḥ₂-. Semantically, the translation ‘time’ is a bit misleading. When looking at the contexts cited in CHD, we notice that all translations of mēḥur have in common that they denote a (fixed, regularly recurring) period. So mēḥur does not denote ‘time’ in its everlasting meaning, but ‘time’ as a period that is ticking away. I would therefore like to propose a connection with the IE root *meiH- ‘to disappear’ (Skt. mināti ‘to diminish’, Lat. minuō ‘to diminish’), which would point to a reconstruction *meiḥ₂-ur, *meiḥ₂-un(o)s > Hitt. mēḥur, mēḥunaš (note that no analogic levelling within the paradigm is needed). For the semantics, compare ‘minute’ from Lat. minuō ‘to diminish’.

mēḥyant- (adj.) ‘old, elderly’, (n.) ‘old man or woman, elderly person’, (pl.) ‘elders (a body with political-military, judicial and religious functions)’ (Sum. LÜŠU.GI: nom.sg.c. LÜŠU.GI-an-za (OS), nom.pl.c. LÜMESŠU.GI-eś (OS), dat.-loc.pl. LÜMESŠU.GI-aš (OS).

Derivatives: mēḥyandaš-ı, miiḥyantahh-ı (Iib) ‘to make old, to age; (midd.) to become old, to grow old’ (2sg.pret.act. LÜŠU.GI-aḥ-ta (NH);

See CHD L-N: 223f. for attestations. The basic word is only attested spelled sumerographically: ¹⁰ŠU.GI-ant-. Its derivatives are found in phonetic spellings, however, but display a variety of forms: mi-ḫu-un-ta, me-ḫu-un-ta, mi-e-ḫu-ya-an-ta, mi-ja-ḫu-un-ta and mi-ja-ḫu-an-ta. Since the oldest attestations (OS) are all spelled sumerographically, it is not possible to determine which of these spellings displays an older situation. This makes the formal analysis of these words quite difficult. Eichner (1973a: 56f.) assumes that the original form was *mîḫaḫuγuânt-, which he connects with mai² / mi- 'to grow' and reconstructs as *mih₁,₂-eh₂-yent- (followed by Oettinger 1979a: 471). Problematic for this view, however, is the fact that the proposed pre-form in fact should have yielded **mîḫaḫhûant-, with a geminate -ḥ-. Puhrvel (HED 6: 153) tries to by-pass this problem by citing the stem as “mîyahuḫuwant-”, on the basis of KUB 14.12 obv. (9) “¹³mîyah[ḥuntesz]i”, copying the reading as given in CHD L-N: 228: “¹³mi-ia-‘ah’-[ḫu-un-te-eš-z[i]”.

While looking closely at the hand-copy of this text as well as its photograph (available through Hetkonk), I have not been able to find a trace of a sign AH, however: 𒃗₃ = 𒃗₂. In fact I am sure that we can only read this form as ¹⁰mi-ja-h[lu-un-te-eš-z[i]. So the fact that -ḥ- is spelled single is real and contradicts the reconstruction given by Eichner.

In my view, the only way to explain the single -ḥ- is by assuming that the words are etymologically related to mēḫur / mēḫun- ‘period, time’. This then would mean that the original form was mēḫuγuânt-. At an early stage already this mēḫuγuânt- was reinterpreted as belonging to the verb mai² / mi- ‘to grow’ on the basis of its 1sg.-forms *me-ḫhī and *me-ḫḫu. When the verb mai² / mi- was secondarily changed to mi[e]-a² (like all dâ/iγanzi-verbs end up in the -ie/a-class), the 1sg.-forms were changed to *mija-mi and *mija-nun as well. With this change from the stem *me- into mija-, the etymologically unrelated stem mēḫuγuânt- was secondarily changed to mîḫaḫuγuânt- as well. For further etymology, see at mēḫur / mēḫun-.

mē(j)an- (c.) ‘range (of a year), extent’: gen.sg. mi-e-ni-ja-aš (OH/MS), me-e-ja-ni-(ja)-aš (MH/MS), me-e-ja-an-ni-ja-aš (NS), me-e-ni-aš (OH or MH/MS), me-
See CHD L-N: 229ff. for attestations and semantics. This word mostly occurs in a fixed combination with yitt- ‘year’: yitti mēḫan(i)iš, yitti mēḫan and yittaš mēḫanaš. The exact meaning of this construction is not totally clear but CHD translates them ‘in the course of the year’ as well as ‘annually’. An important hint for the meaning is KBo 25.5, (3) [(ku-it-ma-an)] (4) [(MU²KAM-za)] me-e-a-ri ‘Until the year reaches m.’, which is duplicated by KBo 6.26 i (32) ku-it-ma-an MU²KAM-za[a] me-e-ḫu-ri a-ri ‘Until the year reaches the time’. Here we see that mēḫani semantically must correspond to mēḫuni ‘period, time’. It therefore is likely that mēḫ(j)an- denotes something like ‘course, duration’.

One instant without ‘year’ is found in the following context:

KUB 19.37 ii

(42) ... nu=za LUGAL-uš I-NA Ė=I A
(43) [x ] LI-ÌM 5 ME 30' NAM.RA[¹LA ] ū-[ya]-te-mu-an
(45) [][u]-ya-te-er (?) mu-a=š-ša-an ir-ḫa-aš mi-ja-na-aš NU.GÂL e-[eš-ta]

‘I, the king, brought home X530 captives. But regarding the captives and livestock which the infantry and charioteers of Ḫattuša [brought in], there w[as] no boundary of (its) m.’.

Here, mēḫanaš must mean something like ‘size, extent’. So, all in all, we have to conclude that mēḫ(j)an- denotes something like ‘extent, range (of a year)’.

According to Tischler (HEG L/M: 175), another case of mejann- without ‘year’ can be found in KUB 43.74 rev. (10) nu nam-ma mi-ja-ri-išši pa-x[ ... ] (11) [ ... ] N₄G[UG an-da-an ḫu-iz-za-aš-ta-ti, which he translates as ‘Darauf an seinem m. ..... drinnen [aber?] hat sich [otos GI]as gebildet’ with the suggestion that mījani here might mean ‘on the surface’. CHD (L-N: 234), however, cites this form as a separate noun mījanissi of which the meaning cannot be determined.

Formally, the word seems to show a-stem as well as i-stem forms (gen.sg. mēḫ(j)anaš vs. mēḫ(j)anıjăš). The i-stem forms are only found in the expression yitti
mejanijaš, which is likely a secondary formation on the basis of the petrified expression yittì māḏiḫani, the loc.sg. of the stem meḏ(i)an-. Because of the alternation between meḏ(i)an- and meḏ(i)en- (in me-i-e-ni, me-e-e-ni), it is likely that we are dealing with an original n-stem (cf. also Oettinger 1982b: 173).

Etymologically, a connection with IE *meh₁- ‘to measure’ seems likely. This would mean that we have to reconstruct *meḏ₁-on-, *meḏ₁-en-. For the development of *meḏ₁-on- to Hitt. meḏ(j)an-, compare zē(j)ari ‘is cooking’ < *tieh₁-o (see zēʰ₂ / z-).

The connection with mēni- ‘face’ (first suggested by Götze 1950 and repeated by e.g. Puhvel HED 6: 112f.) does not seem attractive to me, because mēni (q.v.) does not behave as an n-stem noun.

CHD (l.c.) cites under this lemma also the instances of MUŠEN[I]A mejannašši, for which no translation is offered. Tischler (l.c.) rightly remarks: “hier läßt die Doppelschreibung des Nasals (die sich bei den temporalen Belegen nicht findet) vermuten, daß es sich um ein anderes Wort handelt, wobei miyatar ‘Wohlergehen’ auch semantisch -- im Omen! -- passend erscheint”. I therefore treat this word separately, q.v.

mejannašši “?": me-ja-an-na-ša-aš-ši.

See CHD L-N: 232 for attestations. The word occurs in the expression MUŠEN[II]A mejannašši only, e.g. KUB 5.4 ii (9) MUŠEN[II]A me-ja-an-na-ša-aš-ši (10) I-NA Ḥat-ti ta-ru-up-pa-an-ta-ru ‘the m.-birds gather in Ḥattuša’. CHD interprets mejannašši as belonging to the paradigm of mēn(i)an- ‘range, extent’ (q.v.), apparently analysing the form as mejanna=ašši. This interpretation is unlikely, however, as this word occurs in NH texts only, and the occurrence of non-geminating =a ‘but’ is unlikely in NH. Moreover, the frequent geminate spelling of -nn- contrasts with the predominantly single spelling -n- in the oblique cases of mēn(i)an- (mejanaš, mejani). The one attestation MUŠEN[II]A mi-ja-na-ša-ši (KUB 18.12 obv. 3), which is conveniently cited first in CHD, seems to be more apt to an interpretation miyanaš=ši, i.e. the gen.sg. of mejan-followed by the particle =šši ‘for him’, but the many other spellings mejannašši in my view preclude this. Tischler (HEG L/M: 175), especially on the basis of the geminate spelling -nn-, rather suggests a connection with miyatar ‘prosperity’, but this is denied by CHD on the basis of the spellings with me-. Moreover, the problem of the non-geminating =a remains. Further unknown.
**mejju-** / **mejay-** (adj.) ‘four’: nom.pl.c. mi-e-ya-aš (OH/NS), mi-e-ja-ya-aš (OH or MH/NS), acc.pl.c. mi-e-ú-uš (OH or MH/NS), 4-uš (OS), 4-as, gen.pl. mi-i-ú-ya-aš (OH/NS), dat.-loc.pl. mi-ú-ya-aš (MH/MS), 4-ta-aš (OH/NS), inst. 4-it, uncl. me-u-ya-aš.

Derivatives: **miyañiant-**, **miyañiant-** (adj.) ‘running in teams of fours(?)’ (nom.pl. mi-u-ya-ni-ia-an-ti-ši(-) (MS), mu-u-ya-nil-[ja-an-te-eš]).

Anat. cognates: CLuw. **mānya-** ‘four’ (abl.-inst. ma-a-u-ya-a-ti, ma-a-u-ya-ti), **maṣalla-** (adj.) ‘four-span(?)’ (acc.sg. ma-ya-al-li-in), **miṣallašša-** (adj.) ‘of a four-span’ (nom.-acc.pl.n. ma-a-ú-[y]a-al-la-aš-ša), **miṣali(an)ia-** ‘to hitch as a four-span’ (3pl.pret.act. ma-a-u-ya-ni-in-ta); HLuw. **miwa-** (adj.) ‘four’ (nom.-acc.pl.c. “4”-wa/i-zi (ARSLANTAS §6), 4-zi (ASSUR letter a §10, c §9, f+g §28)); Lycc. **mupmiddh-** ‘fourfold?’ (dat.-loc.pl. mupmidd).

PIE *mēi₁-u-, *mēi₂-eu-?

See CDH L-N: 308f. for attestation. Because of nom.pl.c. mejyaš, we seem to be dealing with an u-stem adjective *mejju- / mejay-. In CLuwian, we do not find evidence for a -j-, but perhaps māya- reflects *mējyo-. In HLuwian, the word is not attested in a phonetic spelling. Because of the fact that the HLuwian sign MI (miş, ṣu) is made up of four strokes, we may have to assume that the word for ‘four’ actually was *miya-. On the basis of these forms, we must reconstruct a PA Nat. *mei(e)-u- or *mei(e)-u- (if the -i- in Hitt. mejyaš can be regarded as a hiatus-filler for /mēʔauas/, cf. mejjian- < *mēi₁-on-).

Further etymologizing has proven to be difficult. It has been argued that *meju- must belong to a root *mei- ‘to diminish’ (because ‘four’ is five minus one), but this root possibly is *meih₂- (cf. at mēju- / mēh₂-un-). If PA Nat. *mei(e)-u- is a correct reconstruction, we could also assume connection with the root *mei₁- ‘to measure’ (cf. Kimball’s reconstruction (1999: 233) *meh₁₂-u-). At this point, too much is unclear to make any firm conclusions, however.

**mekk-, mekki- / mekkai-** (adj.) ‘much, many, numerous’: nom.sg.c. me-ek-ki-iš (MH/MS), acc.sg.c. me-e-ek-kān (OS), nom.-acc.sg.n. [m]e-e-ek (OS), me-ek-ki (OS), abl. me-ek-ka-ra-az (NH), nom.pl.c. me-e-ek/-ke/-e-eš (OS), me-e-k-ke-eš (OH/NS), me-e-ke-e-eš, me-e-k-ke-eš (KUB 42.29 ii 5 (NS)), me-eg-ga-eš (OH/NS), me-ek-ka-ra-eš (NH), me-ek-ka-ra-uš (NH), me-ek-ka-ra-uš (NH), me-ek-ka-ra-uš (NH), nom.-acc.pl.n. me-eg-ga-ja (NH); case? me-ek-ka-ra-ja-aš (NH).
Derivatives: **mekkajaz** (adv.) ‘on many occasions, often’ (*me-ek-ka₇-ja₇-az* (NH)), **mekki** (adv.) ‘greatly, much, in large numbers, very’ (*me-ek-ki-i* (1x, OS), *me-ek-k₇*), see makkāšš₂, maknu₂.


PIE *megʰ₂-, *megʰ₂(-e)i-

See CHD L-N: 245 for attestations. We are dealing with two stems, *mekki-* (in acc.sg.c. *mēkkān*, nom.-acc.sg. *mēk*, nom.pl.c. *mēkkāš* and acc.pl.c. *mekkuś*) and *mekki-* / *mekkai-* (nom.sg.c. *mekkīš*, nom.-acc.sg.n. *mekki*, abl. *mekkajaz*, nom.pl.c. *mekkaes*, acc.pl.c. *mekkuś* and nom.-acc.pl.n. *meggāti*). The forms that display the stem *mekki-* are only found in OH texts, whereas the bulk of the attestations of *mekki-* / *mekkai-* occur in NH texts (but note nom.-acc.sg.n. *mekki* (OS) and nom.pl.c. *mekkaes* (OH/NS)). The two attestations with single -k- are spelled with the unusual ‘broken’ spelling (*me-ek-e-eś* and *me-ek-eś*), and therefore are likely to be emended to *me-e-ek-e₁-e₁-eś* and *me-e-ek-e₁-e₁-eś*.

The connection with PIE *megʰ₂*- is generally accepted. This means that nom.-acc.sg.n. *mēk* is to be equated with Gr. **μέγας** and Skt. **मही** < *megʰ₂* (so *-CH²h* > -C). In the inflected forms, e.g. acc.pl.c. *mekkuś* < *megʰ₂-ms*, the sequence *-gh₂*- yields *k₁d*.

The derivatives *makkāšš₂* ‘to become numerous’ and *maknu₂* ‘to multiply’ (see at their respective lemma) reflect the zero-grade of the root, *megʰ₂*.

The interpretation of the stem **maja**- is strongly debated. E.g. Starke (1990: 506, followed by Puhvel HED 6: 123) assumes that this stem is Luwian (because of gen.adj. *majašša-i*), translates it as ‘much, many’ or substantivized ‘multitude’ and subsequently proposes that it is the CLuwian reflex of *mégh₂-ε₁-i*. Melchert (1993b: 145), on the other hand, states that this stem must be interpreted as a Hittite stem that belongs with *mai₁* / *mi*- ‘to grow’ and (L) **majant**- ‘adult’ and therefore means ‘young adult’.

Note that the one form “*ma-ik-ka₇-u₇s*” in KUB 26.1 iii 58, which is often seen as showing a ‘reverse’ or ‘hypercorrect’ spelling of -e₁ as -ai₁, in fact should be read *ku-ik-ka₇-u₇* and therewith can only be regarded as a (rather big) scribal error for expected *me-ek-ka₇-u₇* and not as a hypercorrect form (see at ḫai(n)k₁(asro) for the consequences of this improved reading).

**melteššar**: derivative of *m₃₇ld₁* / *m₃₇ld*- (q.v.)
memma-2 / memm-: see mimma-2 / mimm-

mēma-1 / mēmi- (IIa5 > Ic1, IIa1y) ‘to speak, to recite, to tell’ (Sum. DU11):
1sg.pres.act. me-e-ma-ah-hé (OS), me-e-ma-ah-hi (OS), me-ma-ah-hi (OH/NS),
2sg.pres.act. me-e-ma-at-ti (NH), me-ma-at-ti (NH), me-ma-ti (NH), me-em-ma-at-ti (1x, NH), 3sg.pres.act. me-e-ma-i (OS), me-e-ma-a-i (1x, OS), me-ma-i (OS), me-ma-a-i (OH/NS), me-em-ma-i (1x, NS), 1pl.pres.act. me-mi-u-e-ni (MH/NS), me-ma-u-e-ni (NH), me-mi-ja-u-e-ni, 2pl.pres.act. me-mi-š-te-ni (MH/MS), me-ma-at-te-ni (MH/MS or NS), me-ma-te-ni (NH), 3pl.pres.act. me-mi-an-zí (MH/MS), me-mi-ja-an-zí (MH/NS), me-ma-an-zí (MH/NS), 1sg.pret.act. me-ma-ah-hu-un (OH/NS, MH/MS), 2sg.pret.act. me-mi-š-ta (NH),
3sg.pret.act. me-e-mi-š-ta (MH/MS), me-mi-š-ta (OH/MS), me-mi-eš-ta (OH/NS), me-ma-š (NS), 1pl.pret.act. me-ma-u-in (NH), me-mi-ja-u-en, 2pl.pret.act. me-mi-š-tén (NH), 3pl.pret.act. me-e-mi-er (OS), me-mi-er (OH/NS), me-mi-e-er (NH), me-em-mi-er (1x, OH/NS), 1sg.imp.act. me-ma-al-lu (NH), 2g.imp.act. me-e-mi[i] (OH/MS), me-mi (OH/NS), me-ma (NH), 3sg.imp.act. me-e-ma-u-ú (MH/MS), me-e-ma-ú (OH/MS), me-ma-ú (OH or MH/NS), me-ma-ú (MH/NS), me-ma-at-tu, 2pl.imp.act. me-mi-š-tén (MH/MS), me-mi-š-te-[-en] (MH/MS), me-mi-eš-tén (OH or MH/NS), 3pl.imp.act. me-ma-an-du (KUB 14.3 i 67); 1sg.pret.midd. me-mi-ja-ah-ša-at (NH); part. me-mi-an-t- (MH/MS), me-mi-ja-an-t- (NH), me-ma-an-t- (NS); inf.I me-mi-ú-ya-an-zí (MH/MS), me-mi-ja-ya-an-zí (MH/MS), me-mi-ya-ya-an-zí (MH/MS), me-em-ma-ya-ya-an[zí] (NH); verb.noun me-mi-ja-ú-ya-ar, me-em-mu-ú-ya-ar; iter, me-e-mi-eš-ke/a- (OS), me-mi-iš-ke/a- (OH/MS), me-mi-eš-ke/a- (NS).

Derivatives: mem(i)janu-2 (lb2) ‘to have (someone) say, to recite, to make (someone) talk’ (3sg.pres.act. me-mi-ja-mu-uz-zí (NS), 2pl.pret.act. me-ma-mu-ut-te-en (OH/MS), impf.2sg.pret.act. mi-e-ma-mu-uš-gaští (OH/NS)).

PIE *mē-h₂m-o-i-e/ *mē-h₂m-i-enti ?? or *mē-moi-ei / *mē-mi-enti ??

See CHD L-N: 254 for attestations. The oldest forms show a paradigm mēmahhe, mēmati, mēmai, memüeni, memüteni, memianzi. Although these forms seems to display a distribution between mē- in the singular and mē̅- in the plural, this is a coincidental and due to the late attestation of the plural forms. For mē- in non-singular forms, compare 3pl.pret.act. me-e-mi-er (OS) and impf. me-e-mi-š-ke/a- (OS). An alternation between a stem in -a- in the singular and -i- in the plural is prototypical of the mēma/i-class. In younger Hittite (from the late MH period onwards) we see that the stem mema- is spreading throughout the paradigm, yielding tarn(a)-class inflected forms like memüenı, memattı and part.
memant-. On the other hand, we also see the occasional spreading of the stem memiyea- (memiyeçeni, memiyeçki, memiyeçinci), probably on the basis of 3pl.pres.act. memiyanzi.

As I have argued in the treatment of the mēma-/class in § 2.2.2.2.h., this class contains original polysyllabic dğitiyanzi-class verbs, which are being influenced by the tarn(a)-class from pre-Hittite times onwards. In the case of mēma/-, this means that the original paradigm must have been *mēmeхи, *mēmai, *mēmi, *mēmiyeni, *mēmišeni, *mēmiyanzi. This clearly has to be analysed as a reduplicated formation mē-m(a)i-.

As I have explained in Kloekhorst fthc.a, most dğitiyanzi-class verbs reflect a structure *CC-oii/ *CC-i, i.e. the zero grade of a verbal root extended by an ablauting suffix *(o)ii/-i-. If we apply this structure to mēma/-, it would mean that we have to analyse it as mē-m-(a)i-: mē- is the reduplication syllable, -(a)i- is the reflex of the suffix *(o)i- and -m- is the only remnant of the basic verbal root. At first sight, this situation seems comparable to maiz/ mi- 'to grow' in which m- is the only remnant of the zero grade of a root *mēh-. Nevertheless, if we would assume that in mē-m-(a)i-, -m- is the zero grade of a root *mēH-, we would expect that in a formation *mē-mH-oii-, the result of *(mH- would have been geminate -mm- (cf. mimmanzi 'they deny' < *mi-mh-tenti, zimmazi 'they finish' < *tinhtenti, etc.). If we compare the situation of zaliz/ zi- 'to cross', however, in which z- from assimilated *t- is the only remnant of the zero grade of the root *hata-, we could also assume a root *Hem- and a reconstruction *mē-Hm-(o)i-. Since *h2 and *h1 both would have coloured the -e- to -a-, the only possibility is *h1em- here. In my view, a cluster *(h1m- would after an accented vowel not yield a geminate -mm- (compare dğnut- 'stele' < *dőhni- secure, zğna- 'autumn' < *təhe- noon- and zəri- 'cup' < *tiheri-). So, if mēma/- reflects a structure *mē-m-(a)i-, the only possible reconstruction is mē-hm-(o)i-, from a root *h1em-. The only PIE root *h1em- that I am aware of, is 'to take' (Lat. emô, Lith. imû, 'to take'). Although this semantically is a possibility ('to take (the word)' > to speak'), it is not self-evident.

Another possibility is to assume that mēma/- is not an *(o)ii/-i-suffixed verb, but just reflects a root *mei- or *meiH- (as nai/ *ni- 'to turn' < *nōiH-ii/ *nhH-enti). In that case, we can either reconstruct *mē-moi- or *mē-moiH-ii. Formally, we could then think of *(mei- 'to establish' (Skt. mātīt 'to establish'). Semantically, this may be possible ('to establish' > 'to state' > 'to speak') but is not evident either.

All in all, on formal grounds the verb mēma/ mēmi-, which must go back to an older *mēmai/ mēmi- can only reflect *mē-hm-oi- or *mē-hm-i-enti from a
root *h₂em-, or *mé-moi-ei / *mé-mi-enti from a root *mei-. Semantically, neither possibilities are self-evident, however.

Etymologies that have been proposed in the past are all formally impossible. E.g. Sturtevant (1930a: 32f.) suggested a tie-in with PIE *men-, but a preform *me-mn- should have yielded Hitt. -mn- and does not explain the original dātītanzi-inflection. Hrozný (1915: 37⁴) connected mēma/- with Skt. mā/-mē- 'to bellow' and OCS māmati 'to stammer'. This latter verb likely is onomatopoetic, but the Sanskrit verb reflects a root *meH(i)-. As we saw above, a reconstruction *me-mH-oi- / *me-mH-i- would also yield a geminate -mm- in Hittite, which makes this reconstruction formally impossible.

m@mall- (n.) 'coarsely ground meal': nom.-acc.sg. me-e-ma-al (OS), me-ma-al (OS), me-em-ma-al (NH), gen.sg. me-ma-al-la-ā (MH/NS), me-ma-la-ā (OH/NS), me-em-ma-la-ā, instr. me-ma-al-li-it (OH/NS), me-ma-li-it.

PIE *mé-molh₂-

See CHD L-N: 265 for attestations. This word has already since Hrozný (1920: 47⁵) been connected with mallā-/ mall- 'to mill, to grind' (q.v. for further etymology). We therefore have to reconstruct *mé-molh₂, in which the -h₂ was lost after consonant (cf. māk < mēgh₂). The oblique cases show forms with single and with geminate -ll-. It is difficult to decide which spelling is more original, but we have to reckon with the possibility that geminate -ll- reflects *-lh₂- in e.g. gen.sg. *me-molh₂-os.

memiyan- (c.) 'word(s), speech, talk, message; deed; matter, subject' (Sum. INIM, Akk. ÂUIPA): nom.sg. me-mi-a-ā (MH/MS), me-mi-ja-a-ā (NH), me-mi-ja-a-ā (NH), acc.sg. me-mi-an (MH/MS, OH/NS), me-mi-ja-an (MH/MS), gen.sg. me-mi-ja-na-ā (NH), dat.-loc.sg. me-mi-e-ni (OH/NS), me-mi-ni (NH), me-mi-ja-ni (NH), me-mi-ja-an-ni (NH), abl. me-mi-ja-nu-az (NH), me-mi-ja-an-na-az (NH), me-mi-nu-az (NH), me-mi-az (NH), instr. me-mi-ni-it (NS), me-mi-ja-ni-it (NH), nom.pl. ÂUIPAŠ, acc.pl. me-mi-ja-nu-ā (MH/MS), me-mi-ja-nu-ā (MH/MS), me-mi-ja-ni-ē (MH/MS), me-mi-ja-an-ā (NH), gen.pl. me-mi-ja-na-ā (NH), me-mi-ja-an-na-ā (OH/NS).

PIE *mé-mi-on- or *mé-h₂m-i-on-

See CHD L-N: 268 for attestations. The acc.sg. memiṯjan occurs both with neuter and with commune concord, but CHD (l.c.) and Tischler (HEG L/M: 192f.) convincingly argue that this form must have been commune originally, and
that the cases with neuter concord are erratic. This coincides with the MH/MS attestations of commune nom.sg. memiaš and acc.pl. memišaš. Tischler further argues that nom.sg.c. memiaš and acc.sg.c. memijaš point to an a-stem memija-, but this is contradicted by the oblique cases that in the older texts all show n-stem forms: memijana-. Nevertheless, we would expect that the acc.sg. of an n-stem would have been **memijana. Puhvel (HED 6: 145) therefore argues that we are dealing with a heteroclitic paradigm: a stem memija- in nom. and acc. besides a stem memijana- in the oblique cases. This is not very convincing, however. It is best to assume that this word originally was an n-stem, but that on the basis of nom.sg. memiaš < *mé-mi-ča-s, a secondarily created acc.sg. memija supplanting unattested *memijana in MH times already.

The word is clearly derived from the verb mēna- / mēni- ‘to speak’ and is an important argument for the view that mēna/ is a rebuilding of an original *mēna- / mēni-. This means that the -i- is inherent to the stem, and not part of the suffix (as e.g. Tischler argues: he analyses the word as a stem mem- plus a -ien-/i-an-suffix). We therefore have to reconstruct *mé-mi-on-. The fact that the first -e- is never spelled plene (unlike in mēna- / mēni- ) is due to the fact that it is not attested in OS text: plene spellings are diminishing from MH times onwards. See at mēna- / mēni- for further etymology.

mēna-: see mēni-

mēnaḥanda (adv. or postpos.) ‘against, before, facing, opposite, in regard to’:
me-e-na-ah-ḥa-an-ta (OS), me-e-na-ah-ḥa-an-da (OS), me-na-ah-ḥa-an-da (OS), me-na-ḥa-an-da (1x, OS), IGI-an-da (NS).

See CHD L-N: 274f. for attestations and semantics. Despite the fact that at first sight we are tempted to assume an etymological connection with māḥan and māḥanda (q.v.), which reflect *mōn + *hant-, it is difficult to interpret the element mēna- as belonging to a pronominal stem *mo-. It is therefore better to assume that mēnaḥanda is an old compound of mēna- ‘face’ + ḫant- ‘face, forehead’. See there for further etymology.

mēnī- (n.), mēna- (n. > c.) ‘face, cheek’: nom.-acc.sg.n. me-e-ni-i=m-mi-it (OS), me-e-ni-e=s-mi-it (OH/NS). me-ne-i=s-shi-it (OH/NS), me-e-na-a=s-še-et (OH/NS), loc.sg. mi-e-ni (OH/NS), acc.pl.c. me-nu-uš (OH/NS).

Derivatives: mēnaḥanda (q.v.)
P[*mēn-ih₁, *mēn-eh₂
See CHD L-N: 289 for attestations. There, an acc.pl. minišš (KUB 52.52 rev. 7) is cited as well, but according to Rieken (1999a: 56) this word is to be read as [x]-mi-ni-u-šš, and therefore does not belong to mēnī/a-. Rieken (1999a: 56f.) argues that nom.-acc.sg. mēni reflects the old dual-ending *-ih₂ (cf. elzi-), whereas nom.-acc.sg. mēna reflects the collective-ending *-eh₂. Etymologically, she connects the word with CLuw. manā- ‘to see’ (q.v.), ultimately from the root *men- ‘to think’. Melchert (1984a: 88) rather suggests a connection with Lat. mentum ‘chin’, reconstructing a root *men- ‘to stick out, to protrude’.

meneja- (c.) a cult functionary using a bow and arrows: nom.sg. me-ne-ja-āš (OS), me-e-ni-āš (OS), me-e-ni-[a]-āš (MS), mi-ni-ja-āš (MH/NS), acc.sg. me-ne-an (OS), mi-ni-ja-an (OH/NS), gen.sg.(?) me-ne-ja-āš (OS).

See CHD L-N: 290 for attestation and the suggestion that meneja- possibly denotes a hunter. Often, the word is cited menja-, but the oldest attestations show that originally it must have been meneja-. The formal interpretation of the word is difficult. It has often been proposed that this word is connected with mēnī-, mēna- ‘face’ (q.v.). For instance, Watkins (1986: 56) translates “‘face’-man”, CHD suggests “he of the face”, whereas Tischler (HEG L/M: 198) proposes an original meaning ‘masked’, which perhaps could fit a meaning ‘hunter’. If this were correct, I would not understand, however, how the second e of meneja- has come about (note that the most OS spellings clearly show that the word is meneja- which later on became menja-). I am therefore sceptical about the etymological connections with mēnī-, mēna- ‘face’. As long as the precise function of meneja- is unclear, it is nothing more than a possibility.

mer² / mar- (1a3) ‘to disappear, to vanish’: 3sg.pres.act. me-er-zi (MH/MS), mi-ir-zi (MH/MS), 2sg.pret.act. me-er-ta (OH/MS), 3sg.pret.act. me-er-ta (OH/NS), 3pl.pret.act. me-re-er (OS), 3sg.imp.act. me-er-du (OH/NS), MH/MS, [me]-e'-er-du (OH/NS), me-er-tu₄ (OH/NS), 3pl.imp.act. ma-ra-an-du (424/2, 5, 7 (NS)); 3sg.pres.midd. mar-ta-ri (NH), mar-ta (NS), 3sg.pret.midd. me-er-ta-at (NH), 3sg.imp.midd. me-er-[a]-ru (MH/NS), 3pl.imp.midd. me-er-ra-an-[a]-ru (OH/NS), me-er-ra-an-[a]-ru (OH/NS); part. me-er-ra-an-t- (MH/NS).

Derivatives: marūyala- (adj.) ‘invisible?’ (acc.sg.c. mar-nu-ya-la-an (OH/NS)), maru³, murnu³ (lb2) ‘to cause to disappear, to dissolve’ (2sg.pres.act. [m]ar-nu-šši (NS), 1sg.pret.act. me-er-nu-nu-un, 3sg.imp.act(? me-er-n[u-ud-du]?) part. mi-ir-nu-ya-an-ıı-).
Anat. cognates: HLuw. ?marnuwa- ‘to make disappear’ (see discussion).

IE cognates: Skt. ámṛta ‘he died’, mrīyate ‘he dies’, Gr. méρtè ‘he died’ (Hes.), Arm. meṙav ‘he died’, OCS mrěti ‘to die’, Lat. morior ‘to die’.

PIE *mēr-t / *mr-ént

See CHD L-N: 295 and Puhvel HED 6: 148f. for attestations. In the oldest texts we find only active forms that show an ablating mi-inflecting stem mer-² / mar-
(e.g. merer vs. marandu), which denotes ‘to disappear, to vanish’. Middle forms are found in NS texts only and have the same meaning. Also in NS texts we find some forms that display a geminate -rr- (cf. § 1.4.6.2.b).

Since Sturtevant (1933: 135), mer-² / mar- is generally connected with PIE *mer- which is usually glossed ‘to die’. In my view, however, the Hittite meaning ‘to disappear’ must have been the original meaning, whereas the meaning ‘to die’ as found in the other IE languages only developed after the splitting off of Anatolian. It is likely that *mer- ‘to disappear’ was an euphemistic term for dying at first (cf. ModEng. euphemistic to pass away, to be gone vs. realistic to die), which later on took over the place of the original PIE word for ‘to die’, which is possibly reflected in Hitt. ḫ{k-² / akk- ‘to die’ (which is unfortunately unattested in the other IE languages). Because of the fact that in Sanskrit mar- is a root-aorist, I reconstruct an aorist *mēr-t / *mr-ént.

In HLuwian, the exact reading of the verb DELERE-nuqa- ‘to cause to disappear, to destroy’ is not known. In the fragment KARKAMIŠ A28g l. 2, we find [ ... ]³⁴ DELERE p[ā]{³}+ra/i-nu-w[a/i- ... ] (cf. Hawkins 2000: 216), which might be a full phonetic spelling. The exact reading of the sign pā is debated, however, and Melchert (1988c: 34ff.) argues that the sign should be read ma. If so, then we would have to read [ ... ]³⁴ DELERE m[a]{³}+ra/i-nu-w[a/i- ... ], which would make it possible to assume that the HLuwian verb DELERE-nuwa- actually was marnuwa- and has to be identified with Hitt. marnu² ‘to make disappear’ (cf. the discussion in Hawkins 2000: 154).

-mi (1sg-pres.act.-ending of the mi-flection)

IE cognates: Skt. -mi, Gr. -μ, Lith. -mi, OCS -mb, Goth. -m, Lat. -m.

PIE *-mi

This ending is used as the 1sg.pres.act.-ending of mi-verbs (which are named after it), and therewith semantically equal to its corresponding hi-conjugation ending -hhi. In the course of the Hittite period, the ending -mi is gradually replacing -hhi (see there for examples). I know of only one alleged form in which
an original *mi-conjugating verb would show the ṭi-ending -ḥhi, namely “pār-ku-
num-ḥi” (708/z obv. 12) as cited by Neu (1967: 165). As long as this tablet is
unpublished, I would remain quite sceptical regarding this reading and
interpretation (Neu calls the context “bruchstückhaft” so perhaps we are in fact
dealing with 3pl.pret.act. pār-ku-num-ḥe[-er]).

Etymologically, *-mi goes back to two endings. On the one hand, it directly
reflects the PIE athematic primary 1sg.-ending *-mi used in PIE root-presents (~
Skt. -mi, Gr. -μι, Lith. -mi). On the other hand, it reflects the PIE athematic
secondary ending *-m used in PIE root-aorists (~ Skt. -(a)m, Gr. -α, -v) extended
with the ‘presentic’ -i.

=mi-/ =ma- / =me- (encl.poss.pron. 1sg.) ‘my’: nom.sg.c. =mi-iš (often), =mi-eš
(1x, NS), =me-iš (1x, NS), voc.sg. =mi (OH/NS), =me (NS), =me-et (OH/NS),
=mi-it (MH/NS), acc.sg.c. =ma-an (OS), =mi-in (MH/MS), nom.-acc.sg.n. =me-
et (OS), =mi-it (OH/MS), gen.sg. =ma-aš (OS), dat.-loc.sg. =mi (OS), katu=m-
mi (OS), =mi-it (OH/NS), all.sg. =ma, pār-na=m-ma (OH/NS), abl./instr. =mi-iš
(OH/NS), nom.pl.c. =mi-iš (OH/NS), acc.pl.c. =mu-uš (OH/NS, MH/MS), nom.-
acc.pl.n. =me-et (OH/NS), =mi-ia (OH/NS), gen.pl. =ma-an (OH/NS).

PIE *=mi-, *=mo-, *=me-

See CHD L-N: 215f. for attestations. The original paradigm of this enclitic is
nom.sg.c. =miš, acc.sg.c. =man, nom.-acc.sg.n. =met, gen.sg. =maš, dat.-loc.sg.
=mi, all.sg. =ma, abl./instr. =mit, nom.pl.c. *=meš, acc.pl.c. =muš, nom.-
acc.pl.n. =met, gen.pl. =man. For the original distinction between nom.-
acc.sg./pl.n. =met vs. abl./instr. =mit see Melchert (1984a: 122-6). This
means that we are dealing with an ablauting stem =mi- / =ma- / =me-. This
vocalization can hardly reflect anything else than PIE *-i-, *-o- and *-e-, but an exact
explanation for the distribution of these vowels is still lacking (cf. also =tti-
=ttα- /=ttε- ‘your (sg.)’, =šši- / =šša- / =šše- ‘his, her, its’, =šumu- / =šumma-
=šume- ‘our’ and =šmi- / =šma- / =šme- ‘your (pl.); their’). The -m- is clearly
identical to the -m- found in =mu *(to) me’ (q.v.).

mijahū(ya)nt-: see mehūvant-

mieu² (Lb2) ‘?': 3pl.pret.act. mi-e-nu-er (KBo 14.42 obv. 11 (NH)), mi-e-nu-u-
er (KUB 19.22, 3 (NH), 3sg.imp.act. mi-e-nu-ud-du (KUB 17.12 ii 14 (NS)).
Derivatives: **mienu-** (adj.) (nom.sg.c. *mi-i-nu-uš* (KUB 17.12 ii 12 (NS)), nom.acc.sg.n. *mi-e-nu* (KUB 17.12 ii 13 (NS)), acc.pl.c. *mi-e-nu-uš* (KBo 3.28, 16 (OH/NS), KUB 31.136 ii 1 (NS)).

Often, these words are regarded as identical to *mīnu*- ‘to soften’ (see at *mīnu*-) (cf. CHD L-N: 242, Puhvel HED 6: 171). This is a bit awkward, as all attestations of which a meaning ‘to soften’ is clear are spelled *mi-i-nu-* and *mi-nu-* but not **mi-e-nu-**, whereas for all forms that are spelled *mi-e-nu*- a translation ‘to soften’ or ‘soft’ is not obligatory. For the forms *mienuer* and *mienuer* cf. CHD L-N: 291, for *mienuddu*, *mienũš* and *mienu* cf. CHD L-N: 242. A nominal *mienu-* is found in gen.sg. *mi-e-nu-ya-š* (KUB 33.103 iii 7), but the connection with the verb *mienu-* and the adj. *miens-* is unclear. See Weitenberg (1984: 42f.) for an extensive treatment of the stem *mienu-* and his rejection of the identification with *mīnu*. Note however that according to the lowering of OH /i/ to NH /e/ before -n- as described in § 1.4.8.1.d, the attestations *mi-e-nu-* formally could be regarded as the NH outcomes of original *mīnu-*.

**mīhu(ua)nt-**: see mehu(ua)nt-

**milišku-**: see mališku-
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PIE *mēl-it/*mli-it-ās

See CHD L-N: 250f. and Starke 1990: 192 for attestations. In Hittite, we find a neuter stem mili-, which possibly shows an ablaut variant mali- if the form ma-li-it-ti (Bo 3757 ii 5) is indeed to be interpreted as dat.-loc.sg. of mili-. Such an ablaut is also visible in the derivative miliitu- / malītū- ‘sweet(ness)’. The derivative miliτ(ʔ)gī3-w is predominantly spelled with single -t-, but once with -tt- as well. In CLuwian, we find a stem malli-, with geminate -ll- and single -t-, which corresponds to the rotocized /d/ that is attested in HLuwian malirīma/i- (for *malidima/i-) (cf. Starke 1990: 190-3 for a treatment of the Luwian material).

Already since Sturtevant (1933, 89) it has been clear that Hitt. miliitt- and Luw. malliit- must be cognate with Gr. μελί, μελιτος, Goth. milip, etc. ‘honey, which reflect *mēlit-. In Luwian, this form underwent Čop’s Law, which caused the geminate -ll- The fact that *i-t- > Luw. /d/-I can be explained by the fact that in *mēliτV, the *t stood between two unaccentuated vowels. In Hittite, the fact that we find forms with lenited -t- as well as unlenited -tt- implies that (in pre-Hittite times) an accentual movement was still present in this word, which is supported by the traces of ablaut. If we interpret the forms that are spelled ma-li-it-ti as /liit-i (for such a zero-grade compare Gr. βλίττο ‘to gather honey’ < *mēlit/μιλιτ), we have to reconstruct a paradigm *mēlit, *mliit-os, *mliit-ēi. In Luwian, the fullgrade-form and its accentuation have spread throughout the paradigm, yielding gen.sg. *mēltos (cf. Gr. μελιτος), in which the -t- was lenited. Although in Hittite the fullgrade form eventually spread through the paradigm as well (but note that malitti could still reflect *mliit-ēi directly), the unlenited -t- was in many cases restored.

The development of *mēlt > mili is remarkable regarding the outcome *i < *ē (especially in view of melteššar < *meld-ēšsh-). In my view, it must be the result of some kind of i-umlaut (cf. zimmizzi ‘finishes’ < *tinē̂h₂ti) (e.g. Melchert’s account (1994a: 140) to explain the -i- through analogical levelling (*mēlit- > mēli- in analogy to the adj. *mliit-) is unconvincing).

A further analysis of *mēli- / *mliit-os is difficult. If we compare this word to ᱎepitt-, a kind of grain, it may be likely that we should analyse both as *mēl-it- / *ml-it-ōs and *sēp-it- / *sp-it-ōs respectively.

**mimma- / mimma-** (II11γ) ‘to refuse, to reject’: 2sg.pres.act. mi-im-ma-at-ti (HKM 55 rev. 28 (MH/MS)), 3sg.pres.act. mi-im-ma-i (OS), me-em-ma-i (OH or
MH/NS), me-em-ma-i (OH/NS), 3pl.pres.act. mi-im-ma-an-zi (OS), me-em-ma-an-zi (OH/NS), 1sg.pret.act. me-em-ma-ah-hu-an (NS), 3sg.pret.act. mi-im-ma-aš (OH/MS), me-em-ma-aš (OH/NS), 1pl.pret.act. mi-im-mi-ú-en (MS), 3pl.pret.act. me-em-mi-er (NS), 3sg.imp.act. me-em-ma-ú (NH), 3pl.imp.act. mi-im-ma-an-du (NS); part. ?nom.-acc.sg.n. me-em-ma-an (NS); verb.noun mi-im-ma-a-u-ar (NS).

IE cognates: Gr. μή, Skt. mā, Arm. mi, TochAB mā 'do not!'.

PIE *mi-móh₁-êi, *mi-mh₂-ênti

See CHD L-N: 263 and Puhvel HED 6: 158f. for attestations. Of this verb, we find two different spellings: in older texts we find mi-im-ma-, whereas in younger texts (NH and NS) we find me-em-ma-. This is due to the NH lowering of OH /i/ to NH /e/ before -m- as described in § 1.4.8.1.d. The verb clearly belongs to the tarn(a)-class (mimmai / mimmanzi) and I therefore cite the verb as mimma₁ / mimm-. The hapax mi-im-mi-ú-en is the only form that shows a stem mimmi- and is probably corrupt.

Etymologically, this verb is since Sturtevant (1933: 133) generally seen as a cognate of PIE *men- 'to stay' (e.g. Jasanoff (2003: 128ff.) regards mimma- / mimm- as a perfect equation with Gr. μή 'to stand fast'). In my view, however, a semantic connection between ‘to refuse’ and ‘to stay’ is far from evident. Moreover, an equation with μή would mean that Hitt. mimma-/mimm- reflects a thematicized verb *mi-mm-e-o-, which is in contradiction with the fact that no other examples of thematic verbs in Anatolian can be found. I therefore reject this etymology.

Verbs that belong to the tarn(a)-class reflect, among other structures, reduplicated formations of roots that end in laryngeal: *Ce-CoH-ei, *Ce-CH-enti (cf. Oettinger 1979a: 496ff.). In the case of mimma- / mimm-, Oettinger (l.c.) plausibly suggests an etymological tie-in with the prohibitive particle *meh₁; as found in Gr. μή, Skt. mā, Arm. mi, etc. This means that mimma- / mimm- would reflect *mi-móh₁-êi, *mi-mh₂-ênti. In the singular, the phonetic outcome would have been **mimai, but the geminate of the plural (mi-mh₂-ênti > mimmanzi) was generalized throughout the paradigm (cf. e.g. zinnizzi / zinnanzi << *zinizzi / zinnanzi < *tinēh₁ti / *tính₂ênti). Prof. Melchert rightly points out to me that in order for this etymology to be acceptable a convincing scenario should be designed that can explain how the attested syntax of the prohibitive particle, which goes together with an inflected indicative finite verb, developed out of the use of a 2sg.imp.-form.

mimirra- (c.) 'mud-water, mire': acc.pl. mi-ir-mi-ir-ru-uš (OH or MH/NS).
See CHD L-N: 295: hapax in KBo 22.178 iii (7) šal-ú-i-nu-úš a-[z]-i-kán-[zi mi-ir-mi-ir-ru-úš [a]-ku-úš-ká]n-zi ‘they eat mud and drink m’. It is clear that a detestable liquid is meant, probably ‘mud-water’ or ‘mire’. CHD proposes a connection with mer-\(^{2}\) / mar- ‘to vanish’, and suggests ‘filthy drainage water, water which drains away’, but this does not seem very convincing to me. Further unclear.


Derivatives: \textit{mišri\'ah\(\acute{\text{\textsc{h}}}\)} (Iib) ‘to make \textit{mišri\'ant}’ (3pl.pret.act. mi-š-ri-ya-ah-\(\acute{\text{\textsc{h}}}\)-\textsc{eh}-\textsc{er})}, \textit{mišri\'anda} (adv.) ‘splendidly(?)’ (mi-š-ri-ya-an-da), \textit{mišri\'gar} (n.) ‘wholeness, brightness’ (nom.-acc.sg. mi-š-ri-ya-a-ta-r), \textit{mišri\'es\(\acute{\text{\textsc{s}}}\)} (Ib2) ‘to become full, to become bright (said of the moon)’ (3sg.pres.act. mi-š-ri-u-e-eš-\(\acute{\text{\textsc{z}}}\)).

See CHD L-N: 297f. for attestations and a semantical discussion. All forms are derived from a stem \textit{miš\'ri\(\acute{\text{\textsc{a}}}\)}-. Although it is clear that these words denote something good, perfect or beautiful, it is not exactly clear what the original meaning is. Generally, these words are translated ‘splendid, bright’, but an important argument against this translation may be seen in the use of the verb \textit{mišri\'es\(\acute{\text{\textsc{s}}}\)}\(^{2}\) (having the moon as subject), which functions as the opposite of \textit{tepa\'es\(\acute{\text{\textsc{s}}}\)}\(^{2}\) ‘to become small (of the moon)’. This may indicate that \textit{mišri\'es\(\acute{\text{\textsc{s}}}\)} must be translated ‘to become big, to wax’, which would imply that all words from \textit{*miš\'ri\(\acute{\text{\textsc{a}}}\)}- have an original meaning ‘big, complete, full, perfect’.

The generally accepted etymology of \textit{*miš\'ri\(\acute{\text{\textsc{a}}}\)}- is based on a translation ‘splendid, bright’: Neumann (1958: 88) connected \textit{*miš\'ri\(\acute{\text{\textsc{a}}}\)}- with the PIE root \textit{*meis}-, which he translated as ‘to shimmer’. This etymology has found wide acceptance. LIV\(^{2}\), however, translates the root \textit{*meis}- as ‘die Augen aufschlagen’ (Skt. \textit{mis\(\acute{\text{\textsc{t}}\)}}\(\acute{\text{\textsc{i}}}\) ‘opens the eyes’), which semantically would not fit ‘bright’ very well. Moreover, if \textit{*miš\'ri\(\acute{\text{\textsc{a}}}\)}- indeed did not mean ‘bright, splendid’, but ‘perfect’, a connection with \textit{*meis}- becomes impossible anyway.
Derivatives: **mūgā** (adj) ‘red; (noun) red wool’ (Sum. SA₃); nom.sg.c. mi-i-ti-iš (NH), mi-ti-e-eš (OH or MH/NS), mi-di-iš, acc.sg.c. mi-ti-in (OH/NS), mi-i-ta-an, mi-it-ta-an (MH/MS), mi-ta-an, mi-ta-a-an (MH/NS), instr. mi-it-ti-it (MS), mi-ti-it.

See CHD L-N: 301f. for attestations. In the oldest texts, only the sumerogram SA₃ is used. From MH times onwards, we find phonetic spellings of this word, which show a-stem as well as i-stem forms. Besides, there are forms with geminate -tt- and with single -t-. It is difficult to put these forms in a chronological order.

The variety of forms could point to a foreign origin of this word. Nevertheless, Čop (1958: 28-32) connects it with Slav. *mēšō ‘copper’ (*moiđ-o-). Yet the absence of other IE cognates do not speak in favour of this etymology.

The verb mūgā was translated by Catsanicos (1986: 156) as “fixer, attacher” and reconstructed as *h₂mōi-to-je/o- (followed by Kimball 1999: 274), i.e. derived from the root *h₂mei- that he reconstructs on the basis of an equation between Skt. sūmòya- ‘well-prepared’ (from the verb may- ‘to fix’) and Hitt. suhmlī-, allegedly “bien fixé” (q.v.). It is problematic, however, that a preform *h₂mōi-to- would regularly yield Hitt. **h DMAITA- (cf. *h₂meh₂sh₂o- > Hitt. ḫamešša- and *d’h₁ōiθ₂e > Hitt. daitta). Moreover, according to CHD (L-N: 304) this verb rather means ‘to tie with red wool’, which would make it a straightforward derivative of mīta-, reflecting *mīa-je/o-. For a possible connection with mūdanima- see CHD L-N: 305.

**mīti-**: see mitt(t)aj-, mīti-
i-ú-mar (MH/MS), mi-ú-mar (MH/MS), mi-ú-um-mar (MH/MS), instr. mi-ú-um-ni-it (MH/MS), **mīnu**² (lb2) ‘to make mild, to make pleasant, to heal’ (2sg.pres.act. mi-nu-ši (NH), 1sg.pret.act. mi-i-nu-ni-un (NS), 2sg.imp.act. mi-nu-ut (NS), 3pl.imp.act. mi-nu-ya-an-du (OH/NS), mi-nu-an-du; impf. mi-i-nu-š-ke/a-), **mīnumar** (n.) ‘flattery, gentleness, kindness’ (nom.-acc.sg. mi-i-nu-mar (MH/MS), mi-nu-mar (OH/NS), me-nu-mar, gen.sg. mi-nu-um-ma-aš (NH), nom.-acc.pl. mi-nu-mar汉族, mi-nu-mar-r汉族).

Anat. cognates: CLuw. **mīnu** / **mīau**- (adj.) ‘smooth’ (nom.pl.c. mi-i-ja-yi-ën-zì).


**PIE** *mīh₁-(e)u-*

See CHD L-N: 306f. for attestations of **mīnu**-, 243f. for **mīnus**², 309 for **mīnumar**, and 291 for **mīnu**². Note that CHD regards the forms spelled as mi-e-nu as belonging to the group of **mīnu**- as well, but this is not obligatory (see at mienu²). I will therefore disregard these forms here. Note that CHD incorrectly cites nom.sg. “mi-ú-ú” (KUB 39.41 obv. 17 (NS), KUB 33.38 iv 10 (OH/MS)), which in fact must be mi-ú-ú. It is clear that we are dealing with an ablauting u-stem adjective mīn- / mīnay-, with derivatives mīnu² (like tepnu² of tēpnu- / tēpny- ‘few, little’), mīnus² (fientive in -es- of the root mī-, which contrasts with e.g. tepayes² of tēpnu- and iddayes² of iddayu- / iddayy- ‘bad, evil’, but matches parkes² beside parkues² of parku- / parky- ‘high’) and mīnumar (a derivative in -yar / -yan- of the stem mīn-, showing the development *-uy > -um-).

Etymologically, mīn- has to be compared with Lat. mītis ‘soft’, Lith. mīelas ‘tender, lovely’, etc. (thus first Knobloch 1959: 38) that point to a root *mēih₁- (cf. Schrijver 1991: 240). We therefore have to reconstruct *mēih₁- / *mīh₁-eu-, which was levelled out to *mīh₁- / *mīh₁-eu- and regularly yielded OH /mīu/-, /mi?au-/ NH /māu-/, /māau-/, spelled mi-i-u², mi-i-ja-u².


See CHD L-N: 310 for attestations. The nom.-acc.pl.-form mūmūta shows that this word originally had a stem mūmūtu-. The fact that in nom.-acc.sg. the word-final -t was dropped points to a Luwian provenance of this word. Nevertheless, it is quite likely that this word represents a reduplication of the adj. mīnu- / mīnay-.
‘mild, soft’ (q.v.), which is attested in CLuwian as well. See there for further etymology.

**mu-**: see *mau- / mu-

=**mu** (encl.pers.pron. acc.-dat. 1sg.) ‘(to) me’

Anat. cognates: Pal. =**mu** ‘for / to me’; CLuw. =**mu** ‘for / to me’, =**mi** ‘for/to me(?); HLuw. =**mu** ‘for / to me’.

The enclitic particle =**mu** denotes the acc. ‘me’ as well as dat. ‘to me’ of the first singular personal pronoun ʾišk / amm- ‘I, me’ (q.v.). It is predominantly spelled with single -m-. The few cases with geminate -mm- are from NS texts only (cf. CHD L-N: 311) and may be due to the fortition of OH intervocalic /m/ to NH /M/ as described in § 1.4.7.1.c. Its -u- is elided before enclitics starting with a vowel (e.g. an-da=m=a-pa). In the other Anatolian languages, we find a particle =**mu** as well. Note that in HLuwian, too, the -u- is elided before other particles starting in a vowel (cf. Plöchl 2003: 64). The function of the CLuwian particle =**mi** is not fully clear, but Melchert (1993b: 147) states that a translation ‘for / to me’ is “[f]ar from certain, but strongly supported by context of some examples”.

Etymologically, =**mu** clearly must be compared to the PIE enclitic dat. *moi ‘to me’ (Gr. με, Skt. me, Av. mē) and acc. *mē ‘me’ (Skt. mē, Av. mē, Gr. με). The aberrant vowel -u- probably was taken over from the enclitic =**tu** ‘(to) you’ (see at =**tu** / =**tu**). See chapter 2.1 for a general background.

**uzu** *muḥ(ha)rai-**: see *uzu* mahrai- / muḥrai-


 PIE *mēuh₁-el-*?

See CHD L-N: 319 for attestations. The word occurs in lists of agricultural implements. Tischler (HEG L/M: 226) proposes to equate this word with the semerogram GšMAR ‘spade’, which, if correct, could determine this meaning for *mūl(a)-* as well.

Once we find an athematic nom.sg. *mu-ū-ı-il*, which I would interpret as neuter. The other forms show a commune thematicized stem mūla-. Although two of the thematicized forms are found in a MS text, and the one athematic form in a NS
I assume that the neuter forms are more original, partly on the basis of the similar formation as found in šāqil ‘thread’ (q.v.). This latter word is a derivative in *-il- from the root *s(i)eu*ihei- ‘to sow’, which would make it formally possible to derive mūšil(a) - from the root *m(i)eu*ihe*i- ‘to move’. As this root turned up in Hitt. māsI/- / mU- ‘to fall’ (q.v.) we could semantically think of an implement with which trees are felled (‘axe’ vel sim.?). The spellings with plene Ṽ point to a phonological interpretation /mûšil/-, which points to *mêuihe*iel- (cf. § 1.3.9.4.f).


IE cognates: Lat. mīgšere ‘to roar’, Gr. μὴγχεῖς ‘sigh’.

PIE *mōug-o-je/o-

See CHD L-N: 319f. for attestations. The verb clearly belongs to the hatrae-class, and it therefore is likely derived from a noun *mūg-ā-. The plene vowel is consistently spelled with the sign U (the one spelling with Ū, mu-ú-ga-it (KBo 3.7 i 13), must be regarded as an error, cf. § 1.3.9.4.f).

This verb is generally connected with Lat. mīgšere ‘to roar’, Gr. μὴγχεῖς ‘sigh’, for which a semantic link is provided by *gīš mūkar, an implement that makes noise to invoke the gods, ‘rattle’ (q.v.). All in all, this would mean that we have to reconstruct a root *meug- ‘to make noise (in order to invoke the gods)’ (of which
the nouns *mukēšar and *Giš mūkar could be derived directly), which formed a noun *mou₃-o- 'invocation of the gods through noise', of which a verbal derivative *mou₃-o-je-o- yielded Hitt. mīğae-² ‘to invoke’.

mīğar / mukn- (n.) implement used as a noise maker, ‘rattle’: nom.-acc.sg. mu⁻ú⁻kar (OH/NS), mu⁻kar (OH/NS, MH/MS), dat.-loc.sg. mu⁻um⁻ka⁻ni (OH/NS), abl. mu⁻uk⁻na⁻za (NH), gen.pl. mu⁻uk⁻na⁻aš (OS), mu⁻ka⁻na⁻aš (KBo 41.129 obv. 1).

See CHD L-N: 323 for attestations. The mīğar is a thing that makes noise which is used to scare of evil spirits as well as to invoke gods. According to Rieken (1999a: 308) a translation ‘rattle’ may suit the meaning. The r/n-stem seems archaic and points to an IE origin. A connection with Lat. mūgēre ‘to roar’ and Gr. μῦκος ‘sigh’ is generally accepted (cf. Rieken 1999a: 309; Puhvel HED 6: 185) and therefore the word belongs with mīğae-² ‘to invoke’ (q.v.). For mīğar / mukn- this means that we have to reconstruct *mēug-, *mug-n-ōs.

mum(m)uyai- ‘?’: mu⁻mu⁻ya⁻i (OH/NS), 4 mu⁻mu⁻ya⁻a⁻i; broken mu⁻um⁻mu⁻ya⁻a-x[.].

CHD (L-N: 329) cites the forms mentioned above under two separate lemmas, namely a verb mumuyai- ‘to fall (repeatedly)?’ and a word (4) mumuyai- (function and meaning unknown). The former is attested only once in the following context:

 KUB 33.68 ii
(3) mu⁻u⁻t⁻ta ki⁻i mu⁻ga⁻a⁻u⁻ya⁻aš ud⁻da⁻a⁻ar mu⁻um⁻mu⁻ya⁻a⁻x[.]
(4) e⁻eš⁻tu

We see that the form in question is broken: "...[CHD reads] mu⁻um⁻mu⁻ya⁻a⁻a[n?]!..." and interprets this form as a participle of a verb mumuyai⁻, which is analyzed as a reduplication of maw⁻ ‘to fall’; “May these words of invocation be falling(?) upon you”. The traces of the broken sign do not favour a reading AN, however. Puhvel (HED 6: 188) reads this word as mu⁻um⁻mu⁻ya⁻a⁻i[?] and translates “to thee may these words of invitation be an inducement”. The translation ‘inducement’ apparently is based in this context only, which in my view is nothing more than just one of the many possibilities.

The other cases of mumuyai- are very unclear: it cannot be decided whether these are nominal or verbal forms. Puhvel translates these forms as ‘inducement’
as well, but such a translation does not seem to make much sense. All in all, we certainly need more attestations of this word to give a meaningful interpretation.


IE cognates: Gr. μυτός ‘to close the eyes’.

PIE *mu-né-h₂₃-ti / *mu-n-h₂₃-énti ??

See CHD L-N: 329f. for attestations. The verb shows the *hatrae*-class inflection from the oldest texts (OH/MS) onwards. Normally, *hatrae*-class verbs are denominal derivatives of *o*-stem nouns. In this case, this would mean that *munnæe* is derived from a further unattested noun *muunna*. Oettinger (1979a: 161ff.) assumes that *munnæe*-originally was a nasal infixed verb that was taken over into the *hatrae*-class at a very early stage, however. According to him, Gr. μυτός ‘to close the eyes’ should be taken as a cognate. Although this verb is usually regarded as reflecting *meus-* on the basis of derivatives like μορτάς ‘adept, insider’, LIV² states that the -s- could be of a secondary origin and that the verb in fact reflects *meuH*- (s.v.). If we would follow this analysis and Oettinger’s interpretation of *munnæe*-, we would have to reconstruct *mu-né-h₂₃-ti, *mu-n-h₂₃-énti*, which should regularly yield Hitt. **munzi / munnazi**, after which the geminate of the plural spread throughout the paradigm, yielding munzi / munnazi. This verb then already in OH/MH times was reinterpreted as munızzi / mun̕nazi. A slight problem to this scenario is that the only other verb of which we are sure that it displays such a structure, harna² / harn- ‘to drip, to sprinkle’ < *h₂r-né-h₂₃-ti / *h₂r-n-h₂₃-énti*, does not end up in the *hatrae*-class, but in the -je/a-class (*harnige/a²*).

Other etymological proposals have no merit. Gr. ἄθνομ ‘to ward off’ (cf. Petersen 1937: 208) reflects *h₂meu-*, the *h₂* of which would not disappear in
Hittite. Skt. ṁuṣṭāti ‘to steal’ (cf. Guismani 1968: 59-60) reflects *meusH-, the -s- of which should have shown up in Hittite.


See CHD L-N: 334: hapax found in a vocabulary only, glossing Akk. NAP-PIL- LU’ ‘catterpillar’. Since the Akk. form has been emended (from NAP-PIL-DU), the meaning is not certain. CHD tentatively proposes a connection with the impf. of mu‘ / mu- ‘to fall’ (cf. e.g. târûšgala- (although with single -l-) from târûške/a-). Puhvel (HED 6: 194) proposes a connection with Lat. musca, OCS muka, Lith. musė ‘fly’.

mûtæae- (lc2) (without =z) to root, to dig in (the ground); (without =z) to remove (evils); (with =z) to neglect’: 3sg.pres.act. m[u-]a-a-iz-zi (OH or MH/NS), mu-ta-iz-zi (NH), mu-û-ta-iz-zi, 2sg.imp.act. mu-ta-a-i (NH), 3sg.imp.act. mu-û-da-id-du (NS), mu-da-id-du; part. mu-ta-a-an-t- (MH/NS).

See CHD L-N: 335f. for attestations and semantics. It is difficult to find a basic meaning out of which the different meanings of this verb could have developed. The meanings ‘to remove (evils)’ and ‘to neglect’ (with =z) both go back to ‘to keep away from’. The meaning ‘to root, to dig’ is hard to connect with these two, however, and may show that two originally separate verbs have formally fallen together.

The verb belongs to the ħatrae-class, which implies denominative derivation of a noun *mûta-. Such a noun might be visible in the words mûtamuti- ‘pig?’ and mûdan- ‘that what pigs eat’. Oettinger (1979a: 377) reconstructs this *mûta- as *muhto- from *mêuht- ‘to move’, but this is semantically as well as formally not totally satisfactory (cf. the lenited -t- = /d/ in Hittite). Other etymologies (see Tischler HEG L/M: 235f.) are not very convincing either.

mûtamuti- (c.?) an animal, ‘pig?’: acc.sg.? mu-û-ta-mu-[i-in?]; broken mu-da-mu-da[...] (KBo 35.187 iii 4).


See CHD L-N: 336f. for discussion. The word is hapax in a list of animals (KUB 7.33 obv. 6). The context of muṭamud[...] is that broken that a meaning cannot be determined. The Luwian words mutamuti- and mûdamûdalit- resemble the
Hittite forms a lot, but their meaning is unknown, so a connection is unproven. Starke (1990: 222f., on the Luwian words) argues that the place name URUŠAH.TUR-mu-da-i-mi-iš perhaps could be read as mutamutaimi-, which would imply that mūquamiti- means ‘pig’. In that case, a connection with mūqe-² ‘to root, to dig in the ground’ (q.v.) is quite plausible. At the moment, this is all very speculative. See also mūdan-.


This word is hapax in the following context:

KBo 10.37 ii

(16) A-NI UR.GI.UR.ŠAH.RE = ma mu-ū-da-na

(17) e-et-re-e=š-mi-it

‘but for dogs and pigs m. is their food’.

CHD L-N: 337 translates ‘garbage, scraps’, but this meaning does not seem to be totally correct. As the word denotes pigs-food, it probably is related with mūqe-² ‘to root’ (said of pigs), and then denotes ‘that which pigs root’. Again we see a stem mu-ū-da- (here with an n-suffix) that refers to pigs and how or what they eat (cf. mūqe-² and mūquamiti-). Further unclear.


Derivatives: mūyanu- (adj.), epithet of Storm-god (acc.sg. mu-u-ya-nu-un, dat.-loc.sg. mu-u-ya-nu), mūqattallai- (adj.) ‘awe-inspiring(?)’ (Sum. NIR.GÂL; acc.sg.n.? [mu-ya-ta-li], nom.pl.c.? mu-u-ya-at-ta-a[l-]i-iš, acc.pl.c.? mu-u-ya-at-ta-a[l-]u-uš; broken mu-ya-ta[-], etc.), mūqattallait- (n.) ‘the king’s or Storm-god’s ability to inspire awe(?)’ (gen.sg. mu-ya-ad-da-[a]-la-š, mu-ya-tal-la-[ḫi-][a]-š), mūqattallatar (n.) ‘ability to inspire awe(?)’ (nom.-acc.sg. mu-ya-tal-la-tar).

Anat. cognates: CLuw. mūqa- ‘to overpower (vel sim.)’ (3sg.pres.act. mu-u-ya-i, 3pl.pres.act. mu-u-ya-an-ti), mūqattallai- (adj.) ‘overpowering, mighty’ (abl.-instr. mu-u-ya-at-ta-[a]-la-ti), mūqattallait- (n.) ‘ability to inspire’ (see above), mu(u)atti(ta)~ (adj.) ‘having overpowering might (?)’ (nom.sg.c. [mu]-ti-ti-iš, acc.sg.c. mu-u-ya-at-ti-in); HLuw. muwa- ‘to dominate(?)’, to attack(?)’ (3sg.pres.act. mu-wa/i-i (SULTANHAN §32), mu-wa/i-ti (?), interpretation unclear: KÖYLÜTOLU YAYLA line 2), 3sg.pret.act. mu-wa/i-ta
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(SULTANHAN §44), *mu-wai-ta*, (TOPADA §29), *μwia*- (c.) ‘seed’(?)
(acc.sg. *μwai-ta-na* (KARKAMIŠ A11c §28)), *nimuwinza*- (c.) ‘child’
‘descendence’.

See CHD L-N: 314f. for attestations. The stem *mê-ê* is quite wide-spread in the
Anatolian languages, especially in names (Hitt. *Muğatali-, Lyc. Mutli*). The
precise meaning of *mê-ê* is not fully clear but CHD’s translation ‘awe-inspiring’
is probably not far from it. The connotation ‘male seed’ is perhaps found in
HLuw. *mwêta- ‘seed(?)’, and perhaps Lyc. *mwê-, if this really means
‘descendence’ < ‘male seed’ (thus Tischler HEG L/M: 240). Within Hittite, all
derived forms show Luwian suffixes, which makes it likely that the term
originally was Luwian. No clear etymology.
The ending of the acc.sg.c. of stems in vowel is -n, whereas consonant-stems show -an. It is generally agreed that this ending reflects PIE *-m. Note however, that the expected ending of consonant stems should have been **XQ < *-P (cf. the verbal ending -un of the mi-conjugated 1sg.pret.act. < *-m). This means that the consonant stems have taken over the ending of the o-stem nouns, which was *-o-m > Hitt. -an.


-n (acc.sg.c.-ending)
See CHD L-N: 338f. for attestations. There, a 3sg.pres.act. na-ḫš-zi is cited twice, but both attestations should be interpreted otherwise. KBo 23.27 iii 13 (MS) should be read [ ... GEŠTIN na-ḫš-zi-i[š] te-pu me-ma-al ‘a ḥazi of wine and a bit of meal’ (see at ḥašši-, ḥašzi- for the noun ḥazi- that denotes a measurement: this reading also in Tischler HEG N: 246). The line KBo 23.65, 9 (NS) reads as follows:

[ ... n]a-aš-m=a-aš=kán ḡaš kat-ta-lu-zi x-na-ḫš-zi (over erasure) nu [...]
since *h₂ is lost preconsonantally (*neh₂ti should have given Hitt. **nāzi). Moreover, the alternation nāh₂- / nah₂- is prototypical for ḫi-verbs (e.g. ūk₂ / akk.- hāk₂ / hašš-, yāk₂ / yakk-, etc.). The verb itself hardly can reflect anything else than a root *neh₂-: 3sg.pres.act. nāhi < *nóh₂ei, 3pl.pres.act. *náḥ₂anzi < *n₂h₂-ěnti.

Most of the derivatives show a stem nahšar-, which must reflect *neh₂sr. This stem has been plausibly connected with Olr. nár ‘noble, modest’ (which can be traced back to *neh₂sr-o-) by Götze & Pedersen (1934: 61) already. This latter word shows a semantic development ‘to fear > to be respectful > to be modest / noble’.

nahšaši: see nahši-, nahzi-

nahši-, nahzi- (c.) a measurement of capacity or weight, = 2 tarna-: nom.sg. na-ah-ḫa-ši-iš, na-ah-ši-iš, na-ah-zī-iš (MS).

See CHD L-N: 341f. for attestations. Note that KBo 23.27 iii 31 na-ah-zi-[š] should be added to it, which in CHD is read as na-ah-zi, a 3sg.pres.act.-form of nāh₂- / nah₂- (q.v.). The alternation between š and z indicates that the word is of foreign origin.

nahzi: see nahši-, nahzi-

nai: see nē² (60), nai- / *ni-

nakḫ- (adj.) ‘important, valuable; difficult, inaccesible; powerful’ (Sum. DUGUD): nom.sg.c. na-ak-ki-iš (OS), na-ak-ki-i-iš (MH/NS), na-ak-ki-eš (NH), acc.sg.c. na-ak-ki-in (OH/MS), nom.-acc.sg.n. na-ak-ki-i (MH/MS), na-ak-ki (MH/MS), dat.sg. na-ak-ki-ja (MH/MS), na-ak-ki-i, abl. na-ak-ki-ja-az (MH/MS), instr. na-ak-ki-ir, nom.pl.c. na-ak-ki-e-eš (MH/NS), acc.pl.c. na-ak-ki-uš, na-ak-[ki]-ja-aš, nom.-acc.pl.n. na-ak-ki-i, dat.-loc.pl. na-ak-ki-ja-aš.

Derivatives: nakki- (n.) ‘honour(?), importance(?), power(?), force(?’) (nom.-acc.sg. na-ak-ki (MS), instr. na-ak-ki-it (OS)), nakkijahh- (IIB) ‘to be(come) a conerence to someone, to be difficult for someone; (part.) honoured, revered’ (3sg.pret.midd. na-ak-ki-ja-ah-ta-at (NH); part. na-ak-ki-ja-ah-ḫa-an-t-), nakkijatar / nakkijann- (n.) ‘dignity, importance; esteem; power; difficulty’ (Sum. DUGUD-atar: nom.-acc.sg. na-ak-ki-ja-tar (OH/NS), dat.-loc.sg. na-ak-ki-ja-an-ni (OH/NS)), nakkē² (Ib2) ‘to be honoured, to be important; to be
difficult, to be an obstacle’ (3sg.pres.act. na-ak-ke-ez-zi, na-ak-ke-e-zí (MH?/MS?), 3pl.pres.act. na-ak-ke-ja-a[n-zí], 3sg.pret.act. na-ak-ke-e-et (OH/NS), 2pl.pret.act. na-ak-ke-e[-et-tén]; part.(?) na-ak-ke-ja-an-t-), nakkāšē₂ (ib2) ‘to become important; to become troublesome to’ (3sg.pres.act. na-ak-ke-eš-zi (OH?/NS), na-ak-ke-e-eš-zi (NH), na-ak-ki-já-aš-zi (1x, NH), 3sg.pret.act. na-ak-ke-e-eš-ta (NH), na-ak-ke-eš-ta (NH), na-ak-ki-iš-ta (NH), 2pl.pret.act. na-ak-ke-eš[t-tén]; 3sg.pret.midd. na-ak-ke-eš-ta-at (NH); part. na-ak-ke-e-eš-ša-an-t- (NH); impf. na-ak-ke-e-eš-ke/a-, na-ak-ke-eš-ke/a-, na-ak-ki-iš-ke/a-).

See CHD L-N: 364f. for attestations and semantics. It is remarkable that nakkāš- is the only i-stem adjective that does not show ablaut in the suffix. Moreover, the i-is written plene quite often, which is not the case in other i-stem adjectives. These phenomena probably are connected, but the details are unclear. CHD gives a detailed description of the semantic range of this word and its derivatives and must conclude that it denotes (1) ‘honoured, important, valuable’, (2) ‘difficult’ and (3) ‘powerful’. According to CHD, a meaning ‘heavy’ cannot be established, which is important for the etymology.

Sturtevant (1930c: 215) connected nakkāš with Hitt. nini(n)k₂ ‘to set in motion’ (q.v.), which is regarded by him as a cognate to Gr. ἐκβάλω ‘to carry’ etc. from PIE *h₁nek-. This view is widely followed, but semantically this etymology is difficult. The root *h₁nek- denotes ‘to seize, to carry’. If this were the ancestor of Hitt. nakkāš-, we would expect that this latter word received the meaning ‘important’ through a meaning ‘heavy’, which is connectible with ‘to carry’. As CHD states, a meaning ‘heavy’ cannot be established for nakkāš-, which makes this etymology semantically difficult.

The verb nakkāš₂ is regarded by Watkins (1973a: 72) as a stative in -ē < *-eh₁-

nakku- (c.) a remover of evils, a substitute: gen.pl. na-ak-ku-ya-aš (MH/MS), dat.-loc.pl. na-ak-ku-ya-aš (MH/MS).

Derivatives: ¹LDU nakkušāša/i- (c.) ‘scapegoat, carrier (to remove evils)’ (nom.sg. na-ak-ku-uš-šī-iš (MH/MS), na-ku-uš-šī-iš (NH), acc.sg. na-ak-ku-uš-šī-iš-in (MH/MS), na-ak-ku-uš-ša-an, nom.pl. na-ak-ku-uš-šī-e-eš (MH/MS), na-ak-ku-uš-šī-iš, acc.pl. na-ak-ku-uš-ši-uš, na-ak-ku-uš-ši-iš), nakkusāḥti- (n.) ‘status of a carrier or scapegoat’ (dat.-loc.sg. na-ak-ku-uš-ša-ā-hi-ti (NS); broken na-ak-ku-uš-ša-ā-hi-x[..] (MS)), nakkusatar / nakkusann- (n.) ‘status of a scapegoat or carrier’ (dat.-loc.sg. na-ak-ku-ša-an-ni (NS)), nakkusīje/a₂ (Ic1) ‘to be a scapegoat’ (3sg.pres.act. na-ak-ku-uš-šī-e-zi (MH?/NS?), na-ak-ku-uš-[šī]-e-zi (MS?), 1sg.pret.act. [na]-ak-ku-uš-ši-ja-nu-un), nakkusīšē₂ (ib2)
'to be(come) a scapegoat' (3sg.pres.midd. na-ak-ku-uš-še-eš-dqā (OH?/NS), na-ak-ku-uš-še-eš-dqā (OH?/NS)).

See CHD L-N: 374f. for attestations and semantics. On the basis of the derivatives nakkušša/i-, which is occasionally preceded by a gloss wedge and which shows the Luwian genitival adjective-suffix -šša/i-, and nakkušša/i-, which shows the Luwian suffix -a/i-, we must conclude that this whole set of words probably is of Luwian origin.

Sometimes, the OH word nakkuš- (q.v.) is connected with these words as well, but because its meaning is not fully clear and because it occurs in OS texts already, this seems neither obligatory nor likely to me. Nevertheless, on the basis of the fact that nakkuš- occasionally is interpreted as ‘damage’ and has been connected by e.g. Catsanicos (1986: 167, followed by Rieken 1999a: 202f.) with Lat. noceō ‘to damage’, noxia ‘damage’, this connection is made for the group of words treated under the present lemma as well. This seems unlikely to me: I do not see how a meaning ‘substitute, remover of evils, scapegoat’ can be cognate to a meaning ‘damage’. I therefore reject this etymology.

**nakkuš** (n.) ‘loss(?), damage(?), fault(?): nom.-acc.sg. na-ak-ku-uš (OS).

This words occurs a few times only, of which Hittite Law §98 is the only complete context:

KBo 6.2 iv (with additions from KBo 6.3 iv 52-54)

(53) tāk-ku LÚ EL-LUM Šer lu-uk-ki-ez-zi[(i Šer egi-pa u-e-t)]e ez-zi
(54) an-da-n= a Šer ri ku-ii ḫar-ak-zi LÚ U= ku GU₂= ku UD(U= ku) $q$-eš-za
na-ak-ku-uš
(55) n= a-at [šar-ni-ik]-za

‘If a free man sets fire to a house, he will rebuild the house. But what perishes inside the house -- whether there is a person or a cow or a sheep -- (is) nakkuš.

He shall replace it’.

On the basis of this context, nakkuš could be translated ‘damage’ or ‘(his) fault’ (cf. CHD L-N: 374-5). Catsanicos (1986: 167) compares nakkuš with Lat. naxa ‘damage’, especially because of the Lat. syntagm noxiam sarcire ‘to repare the damage’, which then would correspond to Hitt. nakkuš šarni(n)k₂ (see at šarni(n)k₂ for the etymological connection with Lat. sarciā). Nevertheless, as
long as the exact meaning of nakkuš is unclear, this etymology can only be provisional.

**namma** (adv.) 'then, next, after that, henceforth; once more, again; in addition, furthermore': *nam-ma* (OS).

See CHD L-N: 378 for an extensive semantic treatment of this adverb. The word is always spelled *nam-ma*, although when sentence-initial particles follow, the final *a* can be elided: *nam-m=u-uš=za=kôn* (KUB 7.1 ii 11) (but compare criticism on this reading in CHD L-N: 391). It can stand in sentence-initial position, but can also be used sentence-internally. In the latter case, the normal clause conjunctives (*nu*, *ta*, *šu*, =(*ja* or =(*ma*)) are used. This is important for the etymology.

Often, it has been suggested that *namma* reflects the conjunctive *nu* to which an unknown particle is attached (e.g. Tischler HEG N: 268). Because *namma* is just an adverb that occasionally can occupy the initial position in a sentence, this is unlikely. Others have argued that *namma* should contain the connector =(*ma*), but this is unlikely in view of OS attestations *nam-ma=ma*.

A better inner-Hittite comparandum is the adverb *imma* (q.v.). This word is generally equated with Lat. *imma*, but that does not shed much light on the etymology of *namma*.

**nana(n)kušš(ije)a**- (Ib1 / Ic1) 'to be(come) dark, obscure, gloomy': 3sg.pres.act. [*n]a-na-an-ku-uš-zi* (OH/NS), *na-na-ku-uš-zi* (OH/NS); part. *na-na-ku-uš-ši-ja-an*-.

Derivatives: *nanankuššiša*- (adj.) 'dark, obscure' (abl. [*na]-na-an-ku-uš-ši-ja-az*).

PIE *no-nogʰ*-s- or *no-negʰ*-s-

See CHD L-N: 394f. for attestations. The verb clearly belongs with *neku*- to become evening’ (q.v.) < *negʰ*- *, which means that we formally have to reconstruct *no-nogʰ*-s-(je/o)- or, with Melchert (*apud* Oettinger 1994: 328), *no-negʰ*-s-, assuming *+e* > -a- as in *tékti* > takkiši. See at *laluke/iššʰ*- for a parallel formation.

**=nnaš** (encl.pers.pron. 1pl.) ‘(to) us, our’: -C=*na-aš*, -V=*n-na-aš* (OS), -V=*na-aš* (NH).

Derivatives: see *gš* / *anz*-.
Anat. cognates: HLuw. =uz ‘us’ (e.g. ma-wa/i-za ha-sâ-tu-’ /man=wa=nt’ hasantu/ ‘much let them beget for us’ (KARATEPE 1 §56), wa/i-za’/ ni-i/ ARHA /’sâ-tu’/ wa=nt’ nîß arha santu/ ‘and do not let them miss us’ (ASSUR letter e §13)).

IE cognates: Skt. nas (encl.), GAv. nô, Lat. nôs ‘us’.

PIE *-nos

See CHD L-N: 396f. for attestations and contexts. This enclitic clearly must reflect *-nos (cf. Skt. encl.pron. nas ‘us’). It is unclear to me why the enclitic is usually spelled with geminate -mn-. See chapter 2.1 for a more elaborate treatment.

naśma (conj.) ‘either, or’: na-aš-ma (OS)

See CHD L-N: 401f. for attestations and contexts. Besides naśma, we also find the conj. naśśu ‘either, or’. The distribution between naśśu and naśma is strict: in enumerations, naśśu is used for the first term and naśma for the second: (naśśu) A naśma B ‘(either) A or B’. This makes it likely that naśma is to be seen as naśśu followed by the adversative conjunction = (m)a. This is corroborated by the fact that naśma itself is never attested with a following = (m)a. In ‘normal’ Hittite historical phonology, a development *naśśu=ma > naśma is impossible, but it is known that conjunction and particles often obide to other rules. For the etymology of naśśu see there.

naśśu (conj.) ‘or’: na-aš-šu (OS).

PIE *no-sue

See CHD L-N: 405f. for attestations and semantics. The word is consistently spelled na-aš-šu. The hapax spelling nu-ya-aš-šu (KBo 27.16 iii 6 (MH/NS)), which is cited by CHD as a full alternative form, has been explained by Otten (1979a: 275) as a wrong copying of na-aš-šu (the sign NA (u) resembles nu-ya (u)), and therefore is etymologically worthless (cf. Tischler HEG N: 281). The distribution between naśśu and naśma ‘either, or’ (q.v.) is that in enumeration naśśu accompanies the first term with naśma following (naśśu A naśma B ‘either A or B’). This indicates that naśma could be derived from naśśu through *naśśu=ma (note that na-aš-šu=ma itself is attested in Hittite as well, but this does not preclude our interpretation of naśma as *naśśu=ma).

For naśśu, many etymologies have been given (cf. the references in Tischler HEG N: 281f.), none of which was able to totally convince. In my view, we are
therefore tentatively reconstruct *no-sue (for loss of word-final *-e compare e.g. =kku < *-k'e).

\((\text{G})\) nūṭa/- (c.) ‘reed, arrow, drinking straw’ (Sum. \((\text{G}IG)\)G): nom.sg. GI-aš, acc.sg. na-a-ta-an (NS), na-ta-an, na-ti-in (1x, OH/NS), gen.sg. GI-aš, instr. na-ti-i-da (OH/NS), GI-it (OH/NS), nom.pl. GI\(\text{G}L\), acc.pl. GI\(\text{G}L\).

Derivatives: natānt- (adj.) ‘provided with a drinking straw’ (nom.pl.c. na-ta-an-te-eš (NH), κ nadosant- (adj.) ‘having reeds, reedy’ (nom.sg.c. κ na-du-ya-an-za, acc.pl.c. na-du-y[a-an-du-uš]).


PIE *nédo-o-

See CHD L-N: 406 for attestations. The bulk of the attestations show an a-stem nūṭa-, but once we find an i-stem nati-, in acc.sg. nati (OH/NS). Perhaps we have to assume that this form was influenced by Luw. *nūṭa/i-, which we have to postulate on the basis of CLuw. nūṭatta- ‘reed’.

Since Otten (1955: 392), this word is generally connected with Skt. nadā- ‘reed’ and Arm. net, -i ‘arrow’. The Skt. form reflects *nédo-, whereas the Armenian form goes back to *nedī-. The Hittite form, however, must reflect *nédo-.

natta (negation) ‘not’ (Sum. NU, Akk. Ú-UL, UL): na-at-ta (OS).

Derivatives: see nūṭi.

Anat. cognates: Pal. nf ‘not’ (ni-i), nit ‘not’ (ni-it=); CLuw. nūṭa ‘not’ (na-a-ū-ya, na-a-ywa, na-ū-ya, na-u-ya, na-yu). nūṭ (prohibitive) ‘not’ (ni-i-š, ni-iš, ne-iš, ni-i-š=); HLuw. na ‘not’ (na (AKSARAY §8, ?TÜNP 1 §7), NEG2 (often)), nūṭ (prohibitive) ‘not’ (ni-stra (ISKENDERUN §6), ni-i-sa (MARAŞ 14 §8), NEG2-sa); Lyd. ni- (prefix) ‘not’, ni-d ‘not’, nik ‘and not’, nikiṃ ‘never’; Lyd. ne ‘not’, nepe ‘not’, nipe ‘not’, ni (prohibitive) ‘not’.

See CHD L-N: 409f. for attestations and treatment. The word is clearly derived from PIE *ne ‘not’, but it is not quite clear in what way. The words found in the other Anatolian languages all could reflect *ne+, whereas Hitt. natta seemingly reflects an o-grade *no followed by a particle *to (= *to as seen in the sentence initial conjunction ta ?). It is problematic, however, that no other example of an
o-grade variant besides *ne 'not' is found in the other IE languages (Skt. nà, Lat. nē, OIr. ne-, Goth. ni, Lith. ne, OCS ne).

*nāyartanna/i (adv.) 'for nine laps': na-a-ya-ar-ta-an-na, na-ya-ar-ta-an-ni.

See CHD L-N: 421 for attestations. The word occurs in the Kikkuli-text and belongs with the other words in -yartanna (see aikayartanna, panzyartanna, śattayartanna, tierayartanna) that are clearly derived from Indic. In this case, nāyartanna must show haplology from *nayayartanna < Indic *nava-vartana 'nine rounds'.

nāyi (adv.) 'not yet': na-a-ű-i (OS), na-ű-i (OH/NS), na-a-űs (OH?/NS, MH/NS), na-űs (NH), na-u-űs (OH?/NS).

PIE *no-iou-i ?

See CHD L-N: 421f. for attestations. It is clear that, just as natta 'not', this word must be derived from PIE *ne 'not'. Eichner (1971: 40) compares OCS ne ju 'not yet' and reconstructs *nejēyi. According to regular sound changes, such a preform would not yield Hitt. nāyi, however. Moreover, OCS ju corresponds to Lith. jaũ̥ and must reflect *iou, with o-grade. If we that assume that the negation had o-grade as well (compare at natta < *no-to?), we arrive at a preform *no-iou-i, which indeed would regularly yield Hitt. nāyi. See at natta for the problems regarding reconstructing an o-grade *no, however.

nē-sip(3), nai i / *ni- (IIIa > IIIg; Ila4 > Ic1) 'to turn, to turn someone, to turn oneself, to send': 1sg.pres.midd. ne-ja-aḥ-ḫa-ri (NH), 2sg.pres.midd. ne-ja-at-ta-ti (NH), na-iš-ta-ri (NH), 3sg.pres.midd. ne-a (OS), ne-e-a (OS), ne-e-a (MH/MS), ne-i-ja (OH?/NS), ne-ja (OH/NS), ne-e-ri (MH/MS), ne-ja-ri (MH/NS), ne-ja-r (late NH), ni-ja-r (late NH), 3pl.pres.midd. ne-e-an-da (OS), ne-ja-an-ta (OH/NS), ne-e-an-ta-ri, ne-an-ta-ri (NH), ne-ja-an-ta-ri, ni-ja-an-ta-ri (late NH), 1sg.pret.midd. ne-ja-aḥ-ḫa-at (NH), 3sg.pret.midd. ne-e-a-at (MH/MS), ne-ja-at, ne-i-ja-at, ne-at (NH), ni-a-ti (OH/NS), ne-at-ta-at (NH), ne-ja-at-ta-at (NH), ne-ja-ta-at (NH), ni-ja-at-ta-at (NH), 3pl.pret.midd. ne-e-an-ta-ti (MH?/NS), ne-ja-an-ta-ti (OH/NS), ne-an-ta-at (NH), ne-ja-an-ta-at (NH), 2sg.imp.midd. na-a-iš-ḫu-ut, na-a-iš-ḫu-ut (OH/NS), ni-iš-ḫu-ut (MH/MS), [n]a-eš-ḫu-ut, na-eš-ḫu-ut (MH/NS), na-iš-ḫu-ut (NH), 3sg.imp.midd. ne-ja-a-ru (NH), ne-ja-ru (NH), ni-ja-ru (late NH), 2pl.imp.midd. na-iš-du-ma-at (MH/MS), 3pl.imp.midd. ne-ja-an-da-ru;
1sg.pres.act. ne-el-ḫi (MH/MS), ne-ja-mi (NH), 2sg.pres.act. na-i-ti (OH/NS, MH/MS), na-a-i-ti (NH), na-a-i-ti (NH), ne-ja-ši (NH), ni-ja-ši (late NH), ne-ja-at-ti (NH), ne-ja-ti (NH), 3sg.pres.act. na-a-i (OH/NS, MH/MS), ne-ja-a-zi (OH or MH/NS), 1pl.pres.act. na-i-ya-ni (MH?/MS), [n]e-ja-u-e-ni (NH), 2pl.pres.act. na-iš-te-ni (MH/MS), na-iš-ta-ni (MH/MS), 5pl.pres.act. ne-e-an-zi (OH/MS), ne-e-a-anzi (MH/MS), ne-e-ja-an-zi (OH/NS), ne-ja-an-zi (MH/MS), ne-an-zi (NH), ni-an-zi (NH), 1sg.pret.act. ne-e-el-[ḫu-un] (OS), ne-el-ḫu-un (OH/NS, MH/MS), ne-ḫu-un (NH), ne-ja-ḫu-ḫu-un, 2sg.pret.act. na-a-i-ta (MH/NS), na-a-ta (OH/MS), 3sg.pret.act. na-iš (MH/MS), na-a-i-š (OH/NS), na-a-i-ši (NH), na-a-ši (MH/NS), na-a-ši (MH/MS), na-i-ta (OH/MS), na-a-i-ta (NH), na-es-ta (NH), na-iš-ta (NH), na-ja-at (NH), 1pl.pret.act. ne-ja-u-e-en, ne-ja-u-en (NH), 3pl.pret.act. na-i-er (OH/NS), na-i-er (MH?/NS), na-e-er, ne-e-er, 2sg.imp.act. na-i (MH/MS), na-a-i (NH), 3sg.imp.act. na-a-u (MH/MS), 2pl.imp.act. na-iš-tén (MH/MS), na-a-iš-tén (OH or MH/NS), na-a-eš-tén (OH or MH/NS), ne-ja-at-tén (MH/NS), 3imp.act. ne-[j]a-an-du; part. ne-e-an-t- (OS), ne-e-an-t- (MH?/MS?), ne-a-an-t- (MH/NS), ne-e-ja-an-t- (OH/NS, MH/MS), ni-ja-an-t- (NH); verb.noun ne-ja-u-ya-ar (NH), na-i-ya-ar (OH?/early NS), gen. ne-e-u-ya-aš (MH/MS); impf. na-iš-ke/a- (MH/MS), na-iš-ke/a-, na-a-iš-ke/a- (NH), na-a-es-ke/a- (NH).


IE cognates: Skt. naq- ‘to lead’.

PIE *néih₁-² ⇧ o, *nōih₁-² ei / *nih₁-² êtesni

See CHD L-N: 347f. for attestations and an elaborate treatment of the meaning of this verb. In OS texts, we mostly find middle forms, which indicates that
originally the middle paradigm was dominant. The oldest attested forms are 3sg.pres. nēa (OS) and 3pl.pres. nēanda (OS), which probably have to be interpreted as /nēʔa/ and /nēʔanta/ (or /nēʔanta/?). These forms regularly developed into MH /néa/ and /néanta/, which were phonetically realized as [nēʔa] and [nēʔanta], spelled ne-e-ja and ne-ja-an-da. In NH times, these forms were reinterpreted as belonging to a thematic stem nēja-, which gave rise to the NH forms nejaḥhari, nejattari etc.

In the active paradigm, the singular forms are inflected according to the dāi/tijanzi-class inflection and show the stem nai- (neḥhi, naiṭti, nā). In the pl.pres.-forms we therefore would have expected to find the stem ni-, but this is unattested. In 1 and 2pl.pres.act. we find the trivial MH analogical introduction of the full-grade stem (1pl.pres.act. naiyani (MH/MS) instead of expected *niyēni; 2pl.pres.act. naišani (MH/MS) and naišteni (MH/MS) instead of expected *ništēni). In 3pl.pres.act., however, we suddenly find nēanzi (OH/MS) instead of expected **niyanzi (but note that *niyanzi is indeed attested in the derivates namma- / nami- (nammianzi (OS)), penna- / penni- (penniyanzi (OH/MS)) and ūnna- / ūnmi- (ūnmiyanzi (OH/MS))). In my view, this nēanzi must be an analogical rebuilding on the basis of 3pl.pres.midd. nēanda. In younger times, nēanzi develops into nejanzi as well. On the basis of this latter form as well as on the basis of the NH middle stem neja-, a mi-inflected active stem neja-² is spreading in NH times.

Within the middle paradigm, 2sg.imp.midd. naišḥut and 2pl.imp.midd. naišdumat are fully aberrant. Not only do they show an unexpected vocalism (nai- instead of nā-), they also contain an unclear -š-. In my view, these facts can only be explained if we assume that naišḥut and naišdumat are secondary formations in analogy to 2pl.imp.act. naišten. This latter form, which shows the regular active stem nai- followed by the regular 2pl.imp.-act.-ending of the ḫi-inflection -šen, was incorrectly reanalysed as naiš-ten as a result of the MH replacement of the ḫi-ending -šten by the mi-ending -iten (cf. Kloekhorst fthc.d). This newly analysed ‘stem’ naįš- then was reinterpreted as the specific imperative-stem and therefore transferred to the imperatives of the middle paradigm as well, replacing the original forms *nēįḥḥut and *nēδumat by naišḥut and naišdumat.

The etymological connection with Skt. nay²- ‘to lead’ was made already by Hrozný (1917: 29³) and has been generally accepted since. This means that we have to reconstruct a root *neiH-. In Hittite, middles reflect either zero or e-grade. This means that nēa, nēanda must reflect *neiH-o, *neiH-nto (old static, compare e.g. Skt. inj.midd. nayanta). On the basis of 3sg.pres.midd. *neiH-o >
Hitt. nēš(i)na we can conclude that the root-final laryngeal cannot have been */h₂*, because this consonant should have been retained as */h*- intervocally. The active stem nai- must, like all ħi-inflected verbs, reflect o-grade, which means that nēši, naiti, nāi go back to */nōiH-hzei, *nōiH-thzei, *nōiH-ei. Note that 3sg. *nōiH-ei regularly should have yielded Pre-Hitt. */nēšel/, cf. */h₂eih₂us > Hitt. hēuš 'rain'. I therefore assume that 3sg. *nōiH-ei was replaced by *nōi-ei in analogy to the 1sg.- and 2sg.-forms where */H- was interconsonantal and therefore lost at an early moment, yielding */nōi-h₂-ei and *nōi-th₂-ei. This new form, */nōi-ei, regularly yielded */nāเตl >> */nāئl > nāl, na-a-i.

The derivative nama-1 / nami- inflects according to the mēma/i-class. Melchert (1998b: 416) interprets this verb as an -anna/i-imperfective of nai-1/*ni-, but this is unlikely, as we would expect such a formation to have been */nianna/i-.. I therefore rather interpret nama/i- as a reduplication of nai-. The fact that nama/i- does not inflect according to the dū/tižaŋz-class is paralleled in the derivatives penna-1 / pemi- and ūnna-1 / ūnni- (q.v.), and is due to the pre-Hittite influence of the tarn(a)-class on polysyllabic dū/tižaŋz-class verbs (cf. the treatment of the mēma/i-class in § 2.2.2.2.h). The origin of the geminate -mn- in nama/i- (as well as in penna/i- and unnai-/i-) is unclear to me.

nēš(a)-: see nēš,², nai-1/*ni-

neka- (c.) ‘sister’ (Sum. NIN, Akk. AH₀TU): acc.sg. ne-ga-an (OH/NS), dat.sg. NIN-i=š-ši (OS), nom.pl. NI₄MES_uš (OH/NS), acc.pl. nī-ku-uš (OH/MS), nī-e-ku-uš (OH/MS), nī-ku-uš(?) (NS), dat.pl. ne-ga-aš (OH/NS).

Derivatives: NIN-tar ‘sisterhood’ (nom.-acc.sg. NIN-tar, dat.-loc.sg. NIN-nt), see annaneka- and nekna-.

PAnat. *ne'go-

See CHD L-N: 425f. for attestations. The forms spelled with the sign NI are transliterated in CHD with nē: nē-ku-uš, nē-e-ku-uš.

To my knowledge, there are no cognates in the other Anatolian languages of this word itself. Of its derivative nekna- ‘brother’ (q.v.), we do find cognates however. Mechanically, neka- must reflect PAnat. *ne'go-, but I know of no IE cognates.

Derivatives: *neknaːr / nekkann- ‘brotherhood’ (nom.-acc.sg. ŠEŠ-tar, dat.-loc.sg. ŠEŠ-an-ni), *neknaːh- (IBb) ‘to make someone a brother, to regard someone as a brother’ (1sg.pret.act. ŠEŠ-ah-h[u-w]).

Anat. cognates: CLuw. nāñī(|a)- (adj.) ‘of a brother’ (nom.-acc.sg.n. na-a-ni-ja-an, ŠEŠ-ja-an, nom.-acc.pl.n. na-a-ne-ja, abl.-instr. na-a-ni-ja-ti), nānāḥi-‘brotherhood’ (form? na-a-na-ḥ[í](-...)), nānāšri- (adj.) ‘of a sister’ (nom.-acc.sg.n. NIN-ja-an, nom.-acc.pl.n. na-a-na-aš-ri[ŋ]-ja); HLuw. nanasri- (c.) ‘sister’ (dat.pl. FEMINA na-ana-sa+ra/-za /nanasrint/- (MARAŠ 6 line 1)); Lyc. ṅone/i- ‘brother’ (nom.sg. ṅṇi, dat.-loc.pl. ṅne, nene).

PAnat. *neɣno-

See CHD L-N: 428 for attestations. In Hittite, the word is written phonetically only once, in voc.sg. nekna. On the basis of its Anatolian cognates CLuw. *nōna/i- and Lyc. nōne/i-, we can reconstruct PAnat. *neɣno-. This seems to be a derivative of the word for ‘sister’ as found in Hitt. neka- < PAnat. *neɣo-. In the Luwian languages, the word for ‘sister’ is derived from ‘brother’, however: nānāšri- < *neɣno- + aṣ̌ri-. No outer-Anatolian cognates are known.

Note that Luw. nōna- ~ Hitt. nekna- proves that in Luwian, internal *ɣ disappears before nasal.

nekku (negative adv.) ‘not?’: ne-ku (OH/MS), ni-ku (OH/MS), [ne-]ek-ku (OH/MS), ne-ek-ku, ni-ik-ku (OH or MH/NS).

IE cognates: Lat. nec, neque.

PIE *ne-ke⁴e

See CHD L-N: 432 for attestations. This adverb is used in rhetorical questions: ‘did I not...?’. Already Hahn (1936: 11012) analysed it as *ne-ke⁴e (cf. Lat. nec, neque), which is generally accepted. Eichner’s suggestion (1971: 31-34) to connect nekku with the question particle *-ne in Lat. -ne, Av. -ṇā is superfluous as these particles are identical to the negation *ne. Note that the geminate spelling -kk- shows that in this case *kʷ remained fortis (contra Melchert 1994a: 61f., who claims that intervocalic *kʷ unconditionally became “voiced” in PAnat.).

nekua (Ib1) ‘to become evening’: 3sg.pres.act. ne-ku-uz-zi (OH/NS), ne-ku-zi (MH/NS); 3sg.pres.midd. ne-ku-ut-za (NS), 3sg.pret.midd. ne-ku-ut-ta-at (NH).

Derivatives: nekuza meḫur (adv.) ‘at night, in the evening’ (ne-ku-uz (OH/NS, MH/MS), ne-ku-za (NH), ne-ku-uz-za (NH)), see nana(n)kušš(ije/a)-³.

PIE *negʰ*-; *negʰ*-t-s, *negʰ*-t-s

See CHD L-N: 432 for attestations. The verb neku² originally was active only. In NH times, middle forms were created in analogy to its opposite lukk²a ‘to become light’.

The verb neku² and the expression nekuz meḫur ‘at night, in the evening’ are generally regarded as cognate to the PIE word for ‘night’ that is usually reconstructed as *nok²ts (Lat. nox, Goth. nahts, etc.). According to Schindler (1967), the expression nekuz meḫur literally meant ‘time of night’ and shows the original gen.sg. *nek²ts. This then means that the word for ‘night’ had a static inflection: nom.sg. *nok²ts, gen.sg. *nék²ts. The fact that in Hittite the verbal root neku² is attested, indicates that *nok²ts actually was a t-stem *nok²*-t-s.

The consistent single spelling of -k- in Hittite is problematic, however: it seems to point to PAnat. *gʷ < PIE *gʷʰ. According to Melchert (1994a: 61), intervocalic *kʰ yielded PAnat. *gʷ unconditionally, but this cannot be correct in view of forms like neku < *ne-kʰe, takku < *to-kʰe, takkušš- < *dekʰ-s-, sakkuwa- ‘mud-plaster’ < *sokʷ-ôn-i-. This means that the PAnat. preform *neg²- has to be taken seriously.

In Greek, we find two stems for ‘night’, namely νυκτ- in νυξ, νυκτός ‘night’, and υχθ- in ἐνυχθος ‘nightly’, νυχθος ‘nightly’ and νυχίζω ‘to spend the night’. Although νυκτ- seems to reflect *nok²t-, νυχ- must reflect *negʰ-. I therefore conclude that the Greek stem νυχ- together with Hitt. neku- shows that the root itself must have been *negʰ-. The PIE t-stem originally must have been *negʰ*-t-s, *negʰ*-t-s, of which the latter form yielded Hitt. nekuz. Only in the separate IE languages, where the old fortis : lenis opposition was re-phonemicized as a distinction in voice, an assimilation of *negʰ*-ts to *nok²*-ts took place.

nekumant- (adj.) ‘naked’: nom.sg.c. ne-ku-ma-an-za (MH/MS), ni-ku-ma-an-za (OH/NS), ne-kum-ma-an-za (OH/NS), dat.loc.sg. ne-ku-ma-an-ṭi (OH/NS), nom.pl.c. ne-ku-ma-an-te-š (MH?), ni-ku-um-ma-an-te-š, [n]e-kum-ma-an-te-š, ne-ku-ma-an-ṭiš=a-at, nom.-acc.pl.n. ne-ku-ma-an-ta.

Derivatives: nekumantae² (Ic2) ‘to undress oneself’ (3sg.pres.act. [n]e-ku-ma-an-ta-iz-zi), nekumandarije³/a-² (Ic1) ‘to undress, to strip (someone)’ (3pl.presact. ni-ku-ma-an-da-ri-an-zi (OH/MS?)), ne-k[u-u]m-ma-an-ta-ri[-ja-an
zī], 3pl.pres.midd. *ne-ku-ma-an-ta-[i-an-ta-rī], nekmuntatar (n.) ‘destitution’ (nom.-acc.sg. *ne-ek-mu-an-ta-ta[r] (NH)).

IE cognates: Skt. nagnā-, Av. mayna- ‘naked’.

PIE *neg*-no-nt-

See CHD L-N: 433f. for attestations. The word clearly belongs with the other IE words for ‘naked’, as already noticed by Götze (1928: 120). Nevertheless, a reconstruction is difficult as the different languages point to different suffixes: *nog*-o- (d6th) in Lith. nūgas, Lat. nūdus, Goth. naq(fr). OIr. nocht; *neg*-o- in Skt. nagnā-, Av. mayna- (with dissimilation); *neg*-ro- in Arm. merk (also with (tabuistic?) dissimilation). Hitt. nekumat- seems to derive from *neg*-mo-nt-, but it is possible that it shows a dissimilation from *nekumant- < *neg*-no-nt-. In that case, it would be equatable to Skt. nagnā- and Av. mayna-.

Note that a reconstruction *neg*-yent- is impossible as a sequence *K”u- does not participate in the rules *-uy- > -mu- and *-uy- > -um- (cf. akueni < *hugwēnē).

The derivative nekmuntatar ‘destitution < *nakedness’ shows a quite aberrant form. We would expect nekumuntatar.

tenpiś- (n. (> c.)) ‘sky, heaven’ (Sum. AN, Akk. ŠAMU): nom.-acc.sg.n. ne-e-pi-iš (OS), ne-pi-iš (OS), ne-pē-eš (OH/NS), nom.sg.c. *[ne-p]iša-as (NH), AN-aš (NH), acc.sg.c. ne-piša-an (OH or MH/MS), gen.sg. ne-e-piša-as (OS), ne-piša-as (OS), ni-piša-as (OH/MS), all.sg. ne-e-piša (OS), ne-piša (OH/NS), loc.sg. ne-e-piši (MS), ne-piši (OS), ne-piš, erg.sg. ne-piša-anza (MH/MS), abl. ne-e-piša-as (OS), ne-piša-za (OS), ne-e-piša-as (OH/MS), ne-piša-as (MH/MS), ne-piša-za (OH or MH/NS), gen.pl. ne-piša-an (MH/MS).


PaAn. *nékos, *nebēsos


PIE *nébʰ-os, *nebʰ-ēs-os.
See CHD L-N: 448f. for attestations. The word is abundantly attested from OS texts onwards. Despite the fact that some commune forms are attested (nom.sg.c. nepiššaš and acc.sg.c. nepiššan), the manyfold attestation of nom.-acc.sg.n. nepišš in OS texts clearly shows that the word is neuter originally.

Already Hrozný (1919: 72) identified this word as the cognate of Skt. nábhāsa- ‘cloud’, Gr. νέπας ‘cloud’, etc. This neuter s-stem must originally have inflected protoderivationally: *něbʰ-s, *něbʰ-ē-s, which possibly already in PIE was normalized to *něbʰ-os, *něbʰ-ēs-os (cf. Schindler 1975b). In Hittite, we find the stem nēpišš-, which must reflect *něbʰ-es-, throughout the paradigm, including in nom.-acc.sg. This implies that first the stem accentuation of nom.-acc.sg. *něbʰ-os spread throughout the paradigm, changing *něbʰ-ēs-os to pre-Hitt. *něbʰesos. Afterwards, the suffix-syllable -es- was taken over into the nom.-acc.sg. as well, changing *něbʰ-os to pre-Hitt. *něbʰ-es > nēpišš as attested. Nevertheless, there are some possible traces of the original nom.-acc.sg.-form *něbʰ-os to be found in Anatolia. As Krysztat (2006: 113) convincingly shows, the deity Ni-ba-āš as attested in the Old-Assyrian Kültepe-texts was the major deity besides Anu = Hitt. anna- ‘mother’ and therefore ‘mothergod’?), and is therefore likely to be equated with šTLM, the Storm-god. This makes it very attractive to interpret Ni-ba-āš as a spelling for /nébas/ (cf. Krysztat 2006: 113) for the possibility of a reading “Nepaš”), the expected outcome of PIE *něbʰ-os. This implies that in pre-Hittite times the paradigm still was /nébas/, /nébesas/. Note that Melchert (1994a: 138) assumes that post-tonic *e in open syllable yields /l/, whereas post-tonic *e in closed syllable yields /l/. For gen.sg. nepiššaš, which seems to reflect *něbʰesos directly, he therefore must assume that the regular outcome **/nébas/ was replaced by /nébas/ on the basis of nom.-acc.sg. /nébis/ and abl. /nébis-t/ where /l/ is regular (*něbʰ-es, *něbʰ-es-t). If this scenario is correct, and if OAss. Ni-ba-āš indeed represents Hitt. /nébas/, we must assume that between the 19th-20th century BC (the period of the OAss. tablets) and the 16th century (the period of OH texts), the following developments must have taken place: (1) replacement of nom.-acc.sg. /nébas/ by *nébës in analogy to oblique cases like *nébësas/; (2) the weakening of post-tonic *e to /l/ in closed syllables and to /l/ in open syllables, yielding /nébës/ and /nébësas/; and (3) the spread of nom.-acc.sg. /nébis/ throughout the paradigm, replacing *nébësas by /nébësas/. This would show that the weakening of post-tonic *e is a very recent phenomenon.

The exact interpretation of the Luwian forms is less clear, however. Although CLuw. tappaš- shows a geminate -pp- that can only be explained through Čop’s Law and therefore must reflect *něbʰes-os-, the interpretation of HLuw. tipaš- is
difficult. It is generally thought that HLuw. -i- can only reflect */-i/ or */-e/. In this case it would then mean that tīpas- reflects *nēbʰ/os-, but such a lengthened grade is not attested anywhere else in the IE languages. Hajnal (1995: 63) therefore states that here -i- must be the outcome of pretonic short *e. This would mean that HLuw. tīpas- reflects *nēbʰės-. If this is correct, the pre-Luwian paradigm should have been *nēbʰos, *nēbʰėsos, which would indeed fit the other material.

\[\text{nešumen- / nešum-} \text{ (c.) 'man from the town of Nēša (Kaniš), Nešite': nom.pl. ne-šu-me-nē-š (OS).} \]

Derivatives: nešumnilī (adv.) ‘in the language of the Nešites (= Hittites)’ (ne-ši-[u]m-nil-ī), kanīšumnilī (adv.) ‘in the languages of the Kanišites (= Hittites)’, uru nišīli (adv.) ‘in Nešite’ (ni-ši-li), nāšili (adv.) ‘in Nešite’ (na-a-ši-li).

See CHD L-N: 454. All forms are derived from the placename Nēša, Kaniš (modern-day Kültepe). As this place was the original capital of the Hittites, the Hittites refer to themselves as nešumena- ‘Nešite’ and to their language as nišili ‘in Nešite’ or kanīšumnilī ‘in the language of the Kanišites’. The name of the town is probably proto-Hattic, showing the prefix ka- ‘in’ (so */kā-nes/ besides */néš-a/). For the appurtenance-suffix -umen- / -um- see its own lemma.

nēya- (adj.) ‘new, fresh’ (Sum. GIBIL): nom.sg.c. GIBIL-aš, acc.sg.c. GIBIL-an, nom.-acc.sg.n. ne-e-ya-an (OH/MS), ne-e-u-ya-an (OH?/NS), instr. ne-e-u-[i]r (MH/NS), ni-u-i-[i], acc.pl.c. ne-mu-uš.


IE cognates: Skt. nāva-, Gr. νέος, Lat. novus, OCS новь, ‘new’.

PIE *néva-
See CHD L-N: 455f. for attestations. Since long, the etymology has been clear: the word belongs with Skt. náva-, Gr. νέω, etc. ‘new’ and reflects *néuo-. The derivative ney̱ah़ is cognate to Lat. novēre ‘to renew’, Gr. νεύω ‘to plough up’ and reflects *neuelh-.

PIE *néuo- probably is a derivative of *nu ‘now’ (see at nu).

**ni(j)ā-**: see n̄eṣ,x(ə), nai,l / *ni-

**nik-**

**ga**ninijal- (n.) ‘cradle’: nom.-acc.sg. ni-ni-ja-al, dat.-loc.sg. ni-ni-ja-al-li, loc.pl. ni-ni-ja-la-aš.

See CHD L-N: 438 for attestations. Neumann (1961a: 85) interpreted the word as a derivative of n̄eṣ,x(ə), nai,l / *ni- ‘to turn, to send’ (q.v.), which could be possible if that verb could be used for ‘rocking’ as well. If so, then we are dealing with *ni-niḥ,x-al-.

**NINDA**ninijami- (c.) a bread or pastry: nom.sg. ni-ni-ja-mi-i, acc.sg. ni-ni-ja-mi-in.

See CHD L-N: 438 for attestations. Formally, the word looks like a Luwian participle of a verb ninija-, which formally resembles Hitt. n̄eṣ,x(ə), nai,l / *ni- ‘to turn’ (cf. CHD). Nevertheless, as long as the exact meaning of this word cannot be determined, this remains speculation.

**nin(n)ak-**

See CHD L-N: 438f. for attestations and semantics. The attested forms show a precise distribution between the stem *ninink- and *ninik-: the former is found when the ending starts in a vowel (*ninink-) whereas the latter is found when the ending starts in a consonant (*ninik-) or when no ending is found at all (*ninik#).

This distribution matches the one found in the other -nin-infixed verbs (*harni(n)k-², *hu(ni(n)k)-², *ištarni(n)k)-² and *šarni(n)k)-²), but also in e.g. *li(n)k-², *ḫar(k)-² etc.

The other -nin-infixed verbs always show the structure CR-nin-C- and are derived from verbal roots with the structure *CeRC- or *CreC- (e.g. *harni(n)k- from *ḫark-², *ištarni(n)k- from ištar(k)-²), besides *hu(ni(n)k- from *ḫuek-² / ḫuk-). A priori, we would therefore interpret *nin(n)k- as *ni-nin-K- from either *neiK- or *niK-.


They raised their thirst, to drink one’s fill; to get drunk’:

Derivatives: (d)ninga- (c) ‘drenching, cloudburst’ (Sum. ḫUR; nom.sg. ni-inga-aš, abl. ḫUR-za), (d)ningano-² (ib2) ‘to make (the ground etc.) drink to satisfaction, to drench; to make someone drunk’ (3pl.pres.act. ni-in-ga-mu-ya-an-zi (OH/MS), 1sg.pret.act. [ni]-in-ga-mu-mu-[u] (MH/NS), 1pl.pret.act. ni-in-ga-
n[u-me-en?] (NS), 3pl.pret.act. ni-in-ga-n[u-e-er?] (NH), 2sg.imp.act. ni-in-ga-nu-ut (NH), 3sg.imp.act. ni-in-ga-nu-ud-du (OH/MS); impf. ni-in-ga-nu-uš-ke/au-).

See CHD L-N: 443f. for attestation. This verb seems to inflect just as li(n)k-2d ‘to swear’, with -n- getting lost in a cluster *-nkC-. Nevertheless, the MS attestation ni-in-zi rather resembles verbs like ḥar(k)-2d, with loss of -k- in a cluster *-RkC-.

Formally, the verb can hardly reflect anything else than *nenK-, but a good etymology is lacking. Oettinger (1979a: 143) assumes that ni(n)k- is a nasal-infixed form of the root *ḫenek- ‘to hold, to take’, but this is difficult formally as well as semantically. Melchert (1994a: 165) rather analyses ni(n)k- as *nem-K- ‘*take one’s share of drink’ (Goth. niman ‘to take’, Latv. ņemē ‘to take’). Apart from the fact that assuming an extension *-K- is rather ad hoc, the semantic connection is difficult as well, since *nem- rather meant ‘to allot’ (cf. Gr. νεμω ‘to allot’).

All in all, none of the proposed etymological connections stands out as evident.

nu (clause conjunctive particle) ‘and, but’

Derivatives: see kimun, nēya- and niya.

Anat. cognates: Pal. nu (clause conjunctive particle, e.g. n=a-an, n=e), nūi ‘now’ (na-ūi); CLuw. nānu ‘now’ (na-a-mu-an, na-nu-an, na-a-nu-un-pa, na-a-nu-ū-un-pa, na-nu-pa); HLuw. awa- (clause conjunctive particle < *nū-o-??), unu(n) ‘now?’ (clause conjunctive particle, ASSUR letters).


PIE *nu

In NH texts this conjunctive particle is the semantically neutral one (as opposed to =ja- ‘and, also’ and =m(a) ‘but, and’). In OH texts, we also come across the conjunctive particles ta and šu, but it has proven difficult to establish an difference in use between nu, ta and šu. The particles ta and šu are being replaced by nu from the late OH period onwards, and already in MH texts nu is the only conjunctive that is properly used (all MH and NH instances of ta are in formulae). When nu is followed by enclitic particles that start in a vowel, the -u- of nu drops: n=aš < *nu + aš, n=an < *nu + an, etc. This is due to the same development underlying Hitt. *Ta < *Tyo (compare e.g. ṭān < *dyajom), so *nu-os > *nōs > naš, *nu-om > nōm > nan, etc. This implies that 3pl.nom. n=e goes back to *nai.
formally be equated with the Old Irish preverbs OIr. The suffix clearly is derived from PIE *-sleep' from other IE languages (as already suggested by Knudtzon 1902: 50).

Originally, it is attached to the zero-grade of the verbal root, e.g. PIE *PLT 1 to ‘sleep’. Later on, it was possible to use the full-grade stem as well, e.g. meru- (beside older marnu-) from mer- 1d / mar- ‘to disappear’. The suffix clearly is derived from PIE *-neu/-nu- (cf. the Skt. 5th present class in -no/-nu-, Gr. verbs like ΣΩΝΩΝ). In Hittite, it must have shown ablaut originally as well, which possibly is still visible in spellings like qa-aḫ- nu-ḫi 2.1 + 25.3 ii 18 (OS) and ḫu-er-esu-nu-ḫul (KBo 3.28 ii 19 (OH/NS)) < *-nēu̯-mi and *-nēu̯-t respectively, besides 1pl. -mu-me-e-ni < *mu-yēni, 2pl. -mu-ut-te-e-ni < *-nu-tēni and 3pl. -mu-ya-an-zi < *-mu-ēnti.

- nu- (causative-suffix)
PIE *CC-nēu-ti, *CC-mu-ênti

This suffix has causative/transitivizing function. It is always mi-inflected. Originally, it is attached to the zero-grade of the verbal root, e.g. šašmu- 1d ‘to make sleep’ from šeš- 1d / šaš- ‘to sleep’. Later on, it was possible to use the full-grade stem as well, e.g. meru- (beside older marnu-) from mer- 1d / mar- ‘to disappear’. The suffix clearly is derived from PIE *-neu/-nu- (cf. the Skt. 5th present class in -no/-nu-, Gr. verbs like ΣΩΝΩΝ). In Hittite, it must have shown ablaut originally as well, which possibly is still visible in spellings like qa-aḫ- nu-ḫi 2.1 + 25.3 ii 18 (OS) and ḫu-er-esu-nu-ḫul (KBo 3.28 ii 19 (OH/NS)) < *-nēu̯-mi and *-nēu̯-t respectively, besides 1pl. -mu-me-e-ni < *mu-yēni, 2pl. -mu-ut-te-e-ni < *-nu-tēni and 3pl. -mu-ya-an-zi < *-mu-ēnti.

nu-t: see nū(t)-

nukku (adv.) ‘and now’: nu-uk-ku (NH).

PIE *nu-k”e

The word is attested only once, in KBo 12.128, 6. It consists of the conjunction nu (q.v.) followed by =kku (q.v.).

ni-man, nūyan (negative particle of optative, irrealis or potentialis) ‘not want to’: nu-u-ma-an (often, OH/NS), nu-u-ma-an (1x, OH/NS), nu-u-ya-an (1x, NH), nu-u-ya-an (1x, NH).

PIE *ne-u-mon ??

See CHD L-N: 471 for attestations. This word functions as the negation of the particle of optative, irrealis or potentialis man. The plene spelling with the sign U points to a phonological interpretation /nóman/. Semantically, we would expect that ni-man reflects a univerbation of the negation *ne and the optative particle man (q.v.), but it is unclear why we find -u- (/ol/) in it. Perhaps the -u- is to be
compared with the *u in e.g. Lat. nunquam ‘never’ (thus Hahn 1942: 106), although it should be noted that *Ceum should have yielded Hitt. /Cum/ (cf. ya-ah-mu-ú-mi < *-néu-mi). The sporadic forms with -u- hardly can be anything else than hypercorrectisms, having the development *-uy- > -um- in mind.

-(n)un (1sg.pret.act.-ending of the mi-flection)

PIE *-m

This ending denotes the 1sg.pret.act. for mi-verbs. When the verb stem ends in consonant, the ending is -un, when it ends in a vowel, it is -num. Because of occasional spellings with plene U (e-ep-pu-u-un (KBo 18.31 rev. 12, KUB 1.7 iii 77, KUB 1.2+ ii 15)), we must conclude that the ending in fact was -(n)on/. It is obvious that this ending reflects the PIE secondary 1sg.-ending *-m. In Hittite, the variant -un must be the regular outcome of vocalic -m: *°C-m > Hitt. °Cun = °Con/. The variant -num shows the regular outcome of *V-m > Hitt. Vn, to which the postconsonantal variant -un is attached.

**nuntar-** ‘haste, swiftness’: gen.sg. nu-un-tar-aš (NH), nu-un-to-ra-aš (NH).


IE cognates: Lat. num, Gr. νῦν ‘now’.

704
PIE *num-tr-

See CHD L-N: 472f. for attestations. The basic stem was nuntr- as we can tell from the derivative nuntarije/ai- (in case of a stem **nuntr-, we would have expected **nuntaraii-). Occasionally, the second -n- drops, yielding nutter. There does not seem to be a distribution between nutter vs. nutter, but one could envisage that originally there was one comparable to the distribution found in e.g. li(n)k2, harn(n)k2, etc., i.e. VnCV vs. VCCV. In this case, we would perhaps expect a distribution VntrC vs. VtrV, but this cannot be supported by the material.

The fact that in CLuwian we once find a spelling with -m- (n̄umtarijala) points to original *nuntr-. Etymologically, it is quite obvious that we are dealing with *num (as found in kinun ‘now’ < *ki + num (q.v.)), followed by a suffix *-tr-. This *num clearly belongs with Lat. num, Gr. νῦν ‘now’, etc. See at kinun for further etymology.

nū(t)- (c.) ‘contentment(?), satisfaction(?): nom.sg. [nu]-ū-uš (OS or OH/MS), nu-ū-uš (OH/NS), acc.sg. nu-ū-un (MH/NS), dat.-sg. nu-ū-ti; bare stem (as interjection) nu-ū (MH/?NS), < nu-ū (MH/NS).

See CHD L-N: 476 for attestations. The word either occurs in lists of good things, always followed by ištamaššu or tummatiš-, or it occurs as an interjection (then nu-ū) in nu-ū hₐlza⁻ to call “nū”. Since tummatiš- is the Luwian correspondent to Hitt. ištamaššu, and because of the one attestation with a gloss wedge, some scholars regard nū- as a Luwian word, which would explain the dat.sg.-form nūːi: in Luwian, word-final -t- is dropped. This would mean, however, that a Luwian nū(t)- already in OH times was reshaped to Hitt. nom.sg. nūš and acc.sg. nūn. Whether or not this is probable, the exact meaning of the word cannot be determined, which makes etymologizing impossible.

nū́a (adv.) ‘still, yet’: nu-u-ya (OS), nu-u-ə (MH/MS?), nu-u-ya-ə (NH).

PIE *mu-h2e

See CHD L-N: 468f. for attestations and semantics. Already since Sturtevant (1933: 49) this word is seen as a derivative of the conjunction nu (q.v.). The particle that is attached to nu is less clear, but probably it is identical to *(j)a ‘and’ (q.v.). For semantics compare Goth. nauh, OHG noch ‘still, yet’ < *nu-k2e.

nū́an: see at nū́an
nuqaššu: see at naššu
=pa: see =apa

pahhaš-: see pahš-asr̥

pahhi- (c.) something harmful?: acc.sg. pa-aḥ-ḥi-in (MH/MS).

Hapax in KBo 16.31, 3; see CHD P: 1 for context and the conclusion that it may denote something harmful. Therefore a connection with pahhiškenuṣar, a hostile action (q.v.), could be possible. No further etymology.

pahhiškenuṣar (n.) a hostile action: nom.-acc.sg. pa-aḥ-ḥi-eš-ke-u-ya-ar.

See CHD P: 1: this word is hapax and occurs in a vocabulary only, preceded by ḫuṣaṙakeṇuṣar ‘cursing’ and followed by kurur appatūr ‘initiating hostilities’, which seems to indicate that it refers to some hostile action itself as well. Formally, it probably is a verb.noun in -ṣur of an impf. pahhiške/a- of a further unattested verb. A tie-in with pahhi-, something harmful (q.v.), is likely. No further etymology.

pahš-asr̥, pahš- (IIa; IIa2) ‘to protect, to guard, to defend; to observe (agreements), to keep (oaths), to obey (commands), to keep (a secret); (midd. with dat.) to seek protection with’ (Sum. PAP): 1sg.pres.midd. pa-aḥ-ḥa-aš-ḥa (OH/NS, MH/MS or NS), 2sg.pres.midd. pa-aḥ-ḥa-aš-ta (OH/NS), 3sg.pres.midd. pa-aḥ-ša (MH/MS or NS), pa-aḥ-ša-ri (MH/MS), 1pl.pres.midd. pa-aḥ-šu-ya-aš-ta (MH/MS), 2pl.pres.midd. pa-aḥ-ḥa-aš-du-ma (OH/NS,

alternation between *paḥs-V and *paḥhaš-C, which reminds of e.g. *takš-V besides *takš-C (see *takš-² ‘to undertake, to unify’). Apparently, in *paḥšC, the cluster received an epenthetic vowel: /paHSC⁰/. It is remarkable, however, that the causative *paḥšmu-² does not show this distribution (we would then expect *paḥ-šša-as-mu- throughout the paradigm): the oldest (OS) forms are spelled pa-ah-šša-nu-. In my view, this points to a zero-grade formation /pHSnu-/ vs. the full grade stem /pHSV/, paHšSC⁰/ as found in the basic verb.

Since Kuryłowicz (1927: 102), this verb is generally connected with Lat. pāscō ‘to herd’ and OCS pasti ‘to pasture’ and reconstructed as *peh₂-s-, an s-extension of the root *peh₂(ː)- ‘to protect’. This means that the middle paradigm goes back to *pēh₂s-o and the active paradigm to *pōh₂s-ei.

Melchert (1993b: 162) hesitantly suggests that CLuw. pa- might mean ‘to protect’ (although he states that this “meaning is a mere guess”), and that it consequently could show the unextended root *peh₂-.


Derivatives: **Dua₃⁶* paḥśural(ː)i-, Dua₃⁶* paḥśuinali-** (n.) a container for fire, embers and other things (nom.-acc.sg. pa-ah-ššu-na-al-li (OH or MH/MS), loc.sg. [pa-ah-ššu-n]a-al-li-ja (OH or MH/MS), pa-ah-ššu-na-li (OH?/NS), abl. pa-ah-ššu-na-li-ja-za (NS), pa-ah-ššu-na-li-az (OH?/MS), pa-ah-ššu-i-na-li-az (OH/NS), nom.-acc.pl. pa-ah-ššu-na-al-li (OH/NS), pa-ah-ššu-na-li (NH)), **¹⁴ paḥśurala-** (c.) ‘(fire-)tender’ (nom.sg. p[a]-ah-ššu-la-as (NH)), **¹⁶ paḥśural(a)-** (c.) an implement for tending or banking a fire (nom.sg. [p[a]-]ah-ššu-la-as (NH), abl. pa-ah-ššu-la-az (MH/NS)).

Anat. cognates: CLuw. **pāḫūr** (n.) ‘fire(?)’ (nom.-acc.sg. pa-a-ḥu-u-ur), **paṣar(i)ja-** ‘to light a fire’ (3sg.pret.act. pa-ṣa-ar-iti-ta).

IE cognates: Gr. μπ, OHG fuir, Arm. hur, Goth. fun, OPr. pamo ‘fire’.

PIE *peh₂-ur, *ph₂-u-en-s
See CHD P: 12f. for attestations. In my view, pahḥur / pahḥuenaš has to be phonologically interpreted /pâHʷr / paHʷénas/, showing the phoneme /Hʷ/ (for which see Kloekhorst fthc.c). This also explains the one NH attestation pahḥuvar, which denotes phonetic [pâHʷr].

Since Hrozný (1917 (SH): 69), this word is etymologically connected with Gr. ἀρ, OHG fuir, Arm. hur ‘fire’ etc., which means that we have to reconstruct a protoradynamic paradigm *pēh-y-ur, *pēh-u-en-s. The -n- of the oblique stem is still visible in e.g. Goth. fon, OPr. panno ‘fire’. In Hittite, the e-grade of the nom.-acc. has spread throughout the paradigm: *pēh-u-en- > pahḥu-en-.

In CLuwian, a noun pa-a-ḫu-u-ur is attested that is generally regarded as cognate to Hitt. pahḥur (cf. Starke 1990: 570f.). The word is attested in a broken context, however, so its meaning cannot be independently determined. Formally, it is difficult to explain why pâḫur shows a lenited -ḫ-. The meaning of the Luwian verb paṣarija- ‘to light a fire’ (which is attested in Hittite context) is ascertained, however. It shows loss of -ḫ- in front of -u-, which we also observe in e.g. mal(h)u- ‘to break’ (see at malla-2 / mall- ‘to mill’) and la(h)un(a)ji- ‘to wash’ (see at lāḫu- / laḫu- ‘to pour’).

an-zi, pi-ja-ya-an-zi; inf.II pi-ja-an-na (MH/NS), pi-an-na; sup. pi-i-ja-u-ya(a-an);
impf. pi-iš-ke-a- (OS), pa-iš-ke-a,, pe-e-eš-ke-a- (MH/MS), pe-eš-ke-a- (OH/NS).

Derivatives: pijanna1 / pijanni- (IIa5) ‘to give (imperf.)’ (sup. pi-ja-an-ny(a-an)), *pijar / pijan- (n.) ‘giving’ (nom.-acc.sg. SUM-tar, gen.sg. SUM-an-naš), nda pijantalli/ī ‘donated bread’ (nom.sg. pi-ja-an-ta-la-liš (OS), pi-ja-an-tal-li-[I]§) (OH/NS), acc.sg. pi-ja-an-ta-al-la-an (NS), nom.pl.? pi-ja-an-ta-al-liš (OS), acc.pl.? pi-ja-an-tal-la-aš (OH/NS)), see peppieššar and uppa-1 / uppi-.

Anat. cognates: CLuw. pai / pitiš- ‘to give’ (1pl.pres.act. pi-un-ni, 3sg.pret.act. pi-ja-at-a, pi-i-ja-at-a, 3pl.pret.act. pi-un-ta, 2sg.imp.act. pi-i-ja, 3sg.imp.act. pa-i-ī-ū, pa-i-ū, 3pl.imp.act. pi-ja-an-du), pipišša- ‘to give’ (2sg.imp.act. pi-pišša); HLuw. piiša ‘to give’(3sg.pres.act. pi-ia-i (BABYLON 1 §15, AKSARAY §7, KULULU lead strips), 1pl.pres.act. DARE-mi-na (KULULU lead strips, CEKKE §8, §9, 3pl.pres.act. pi-ia-ti (KULULU lead strip 2.18), 1sg.pret.act. pi-ia-ha (KARKAMIŠ A1a §8, §9, ANCOZ 7 §6, BABYLON 1 §3, §9), 3sg.pretact. pi-ia-ta (often), 3pl.pret.act. DARE-ta, (TOPADA §30), 3sg.imp.act. pi-ia-tu (KARATEPE 1 §51 Hu., §52 Hu., KÖRKÜN §7), pi-ia-tu-tu (ÇİFTLİK §16), pi-ia-ti (KARATEPE 1 §52 Ho., pi-ia-tū (KARATEPE 1 §51 Ho.), piaza ‘gifts(?)’ (pi-ia-za (KULULU lead strips), pipasa- ‘to present’ (1sg.pres.act. pi-pa-sa-wa-i (ALEPPO §17), 3sg.pres.act. pi-pa-sa-i (BOHCA §3), pi-pa-sa-ia (BOHCA §5, 9), 3sg.pret.act. pi-pa-sa-ta (KARKAMIŠ A23 §4, MARAŞ 1 §11), 3sg.imp.act. pi-pa-sa-tu (BOR §11)); Lyc. pije- ‘to give’ (3sg.pres.act. pije, 3pl.pres.act. pijett, 1sg.pres.act. pijayā, pijayā, 3sg.pres.act. pijete, pijetē, 3pl.pres.act. pijē, pijē, pijē), pibij(e)- ‘to give’ (3sg.pres.act. pibiti, 3pl.pres.act. pibijetē).

PAnat. *poi- / pi-

IE cognates: Hitt. *up, / app- ‘to take, seize’ (q.v.), Skt. āpnoti ‘to reach, to gain, to take possession of’, Lat. *apōcor ‘to reach, to receive, to grab, to get’, co-ēpī ‘I have started, I have undertaken’.

PIE *hp-ōi-ei / *h,p-ī-enti

See CHD P. 40f. for attestations. The oldest paradigm is pēhē, paitti, pāği, pāšeni, pīšteni, piajni. This clearly shows an ablaut pai- / pi-, and herewith this verb belongs to the dāni/tiæni-class. In one point it differs from the other dāni/tiæni-class verbs, however, namely in the fact that it shows zero-grade in the plural of the preterite as well (pehējūn, paitta, pāiği, pīʃen, *pišten, pijer, vs. e.g. daǐjen, daįšen, daįer ‘to put’). In my view, pai- / pi- reflects the older situation, whereas in all other verbs the full-grade stem was analogically introduced in the pret.pl. in the pre-Hittite period. In NH times, a thematic stem pije/æz occasionally is
found, which was created in the basis of a false analysis of \texttt{3pl.pres.act. p妖怪} (compare e.g. secondary \texttt{ŋalžie/α-2} in the paradigm of \texttt{ŋalzai- / ŋalzi- 'to shout'} (q.v.)). The stem \texttt{pe-} as found in \texttt{pešh} and \texttt{pešhun} is due to monophthongization of \texttt{pa} in front of \texttt{-h}. In NH times such a monophthongization occasionally also took place in front of \texttt{-šC-} (cf. Kimball 1999: 234), which yielded NH forms like \texttt{pešta, pešten} and \texttt{peške/α-} from older \texttt{pašta, pašten} and \texttt{paške/α-}.

Regarding its etymology, consensus seems to have been reached. The verb is generally explained as a univerbation of the preverb \texttt{pe-} (q.v.) followed by a root \texttt{*h₁ai-} or \texttt{*H_ei-}, which is connected with TochB \texttt{ai-}, TochA \texttt{e-} ‘to give’ and Gr. \texttt{ἀδύναμι} ‘to take’. For instance, Oettinger (1979a: 470) reconstructs \texttt{*poi + h₁:i-}, and Melchert (1989: 44) gives \texttt{*pe + ai-}. Yet, as I explain in Kloekhorst fthc.a, this etymology has to be rejected because it is impossible to explain how the weak stem \texttt{pi-} phonetically can be traced back to a preverb reflecting \texttt{*h₂poi-}

that is prefixed to a verbal root. As we see in the paradigm of \texttt{pa} ‘to go’, a preform \texttt{*h₂poi + *h₁jenti} yields \texttt{*pajanzi} > \texttt{pǎnzi}, and not \texttt{*pianzi}. Moreover, the absence of a counterpart with the preverb \texttt{u-} and the abundant attestation of this verb in the other Anatolian languages as well (whereas the preverb \texttt{pe-} is further scarcely attested outside Hittite), confirm my view that \texttt{paj/-pi-} cannot be a univerbated verb. As I explain in the cited article, \texttt{paj/-pi-} has to be regarded as all \texttt{dǎi/tjanzi-class verbs in the sense that they reflect a structure *CC-oi- / *CC-i-}, i.e. the zero-grade of a verbal root followed by an ablauting -\texttt{oi-/i-} suffix. For \texttt{paj/-pi-} this means that the root must be either \texttt{*PeH- or *HeP-}. The only root that semantically fits is \texttt{*h₂ep- ‘to seize, to grab’ (for which see also at epp² / app-)}, as can be seen by e.g. Alb. \texttt{ap- ‘to give’ (< *h₂op-eje-, cf. Klingenschmitt 1981: 127) and Germ. \texttt{*geb- ‘to give’ (< *ga- + *h₂ep-, cf. Kortlandt 1992: 104). I therefore reconstruct \texttt{*h₂p-oi- / *h₂p-i-}.

Note that in Luwian and in Lycian the thematicized stem \texttt{*pʃj} has been generalized, with the exception of a few CLuw. forms found in the İstanuwan hymns, viz. 3sg.imp.act. \texttt{pǎniu} < \texttt{*pɔi-}.

\textbf{paj}-² / \textbf{paj} (Ia7 > Ic2) ‘to go, to pass, to go past, to go by (of time), to flow’: 1sg.pres.act. \texttt{pa-i-mi} (OS), \texttt{pa-a-i-mi} (OH/MS), \texttt{pa-a-mi} (NH), 2sg.pres.act. \texttt{pa-i-ši} (OS), \texttt{pa-a-i-ši} (OH/NS), \texttt{pa-a-ši} (MH/NS), \texttt{pa-it-ti} (NH), 3sg.pres.act. \texttt{pa-i-ziz} (OS), \texttt{pa-i-iz-zi} (OS), \texttt{pa-a-iz-zi} (MH/MS), 1pl.pres.act. \texttt{pa-i-ya-ni} (OS), \texttt{pa-a-i-ya-ni} (OH/NS), \texttt{pa-a-ya-ni} (OH/NS), \texttt{pa-a-a-ni} (OH/NS), \texttt{pa-i-ya-ni} (OH/NS), \texttt{pa-a-a-ni} (OH/NS), \texttt{pa-a-u-e-ni} (OH/NS), \texttt{pa-a-u-e-ni} (NH), \texttt{pa-a-a-ni} (MH/NS), \texttt{pa-i-te-ni} (OS), \texttt{pa-i-te-e-ni} (MH/NS), \texttt{pa-i-ta-ni} (OH/NS), \texttt{pa-i-ta-a-ni} (MH/NS), \texttt{pa-aan-zi} (OS), \texttt{pa-an-zi} (NH), 1sg.pret.act. \texttt{pa-a-un} (OS), \texttt{pa-a-u-}
un (MH/NS), 2sg.pret.act. pa-it-ta (OH/NS), 3sg.pret.act. pa-it (OS), ba-i-it (OH/MS), pa-i-it (OH/MS), pa-a-it (MH/MS), 1pl.pret.act. pa-i-u-u-en (OH/NS), pa-a-i-u-en (OH/NS), pa-a-u-en (NH), pa-a-u-e-en (NH), 3pl.pret.act. pa-a-er (OS), pa-i-er (OH/NS), pa-er (NH), pa-a-e-er (NH), pa-e-e-er (NH), 3sg.imp.act. pa-it-tu (OS), pa-id-du (OH/NS), 2pl.imp.act. pa-it-tén (MH/NS), 3pl.imp.act. pa-an-tu (OH or MH/MS), pa-an-tu (OH/NS), pa-an-du (NS); part. pa-a-an-t- (MH/MS), pa-an-t- (NH); verb.noun pa-a-ya-ar (NH), pa-a-u-ya-ar (NH), gen.sg. pa-a-u-ya-aš (NH); inf.I pa-û-ya-a-an-zi (OS), pa-û-ya-an-zi (OH/NS), pa-a-û-ya-an-zi (OH/NS), pa-a-u-an-zi (NH); impf. pa-iš-ke/a- (OS).


PIE *hêpôî + *hêé-ti/*hêé-ti.

See CHD P. 19f. for attestations. The verb shows a number of different spellings, which have to be chronologically ordered in order to understand the inner-Hittite developments. In OS texts, we find the spellings pa-i-mi, pa-i-ši, pa-i-iz-zi / pa-izzi, pa-i-ya-ni, pa-it-te-ni (but note that pa-it-ta-ni (OH/NS) must be more archaic), pa-a-an-zi; pa-a-am, --. pa-i-it / pa-it, --. pa-a-er. With the knowledge that pañzi, paun and paer go back to *pajanzì, *pajun and *pajer, it is clear that all forms point to a stem paî (with short vowel) and paî-i-. In MS texts, the following spellings occur for the first time: pa-a-i-mi, pa-a-iz-zi, pa-a-it, showing a stem pañ with long vowel. In my view, this long ă can only be explained as the result of a contraction of paî- (compare e.g. dat.-loc.sg. ḫar-ga-a-i /Hargâ/i ‘white’ < */Hargâi/ < virtual *hêér-g-e-i-). This shows that the OS stem paî-i is linguistically real. Forms that first occur in NS texts are pa-a-mi, pa-a-ši / pa-a-ši, pa-a-ya-ni / pa-a-i-u-e-ni / pa-a-u-e-ni, pa-a-i-u-en / pa-a-u-en. These show additional examples of the stem pañ- as well as some forms that show a stem pa-e- (according to the ḫatrae-class).

All in all, I assume the following situation: in OH times, the paradigm was /päimì, pâissì, päit’tì, pâiuni, päitani, pänt’ì < *pâiant’ìl. In MH times, this changed to /päimì, päissì, päit’tì, pâiuni, päitani, pänt’ìl. In NH times forms according to the ḫatrae-class are created.

It is generally accepted that this verb must be compared with ye-² / uya- ‘to come’ and that these verbs form a pair showing univerbations of the PIE root *hêe-/ (for which see also i-² and je/a-²orti) with the preverbs pe ‘away’ and u
'hither', respectively. The exact interpretation of païi-² / pai- has been debated, however, mainly because opinions differ on the reconstruction of the preverb *pe. For instance, Melchert (1994a: 133) claims that *pe reflects *pē, assuming that in the preform *pe-hriěnți a development *-ehi- > -ai- is responsible for the stem pai-, which then spread throughout the paradigm. All alleged examples of the development *-ehi- > -ai- (Melchert 1994a: 177) are false, however: e.g. dāi ‘he takes’ is reconstructed as *dāje < *dēhjī-ei, whereas we should reconstruct *dāje < *d h₁-ōi-ei (see at dai- / ti-). I therefore reject Melchert’s reconstruction *pē. A better proposal is Eichner’s (1973: 68), who assumes that *pe goes back to *poi and that the variant pai- as seen in païi- / pai- therefore must reflect the non-monophthongized variant. Although I do not agree with the details of Eichner’s reconstruction of païi- / pai-, I do think that his interpretation of the preverb *pe- is basically correct. I therefore will work with a reconstruction *hpoi for the preverb *pe (see its own lemma for a more detailed treatment).

Univerbation is the phenomenon that two originally separate words at one point merge to become one word. It must be borne in mind that the exact moment of univerbation may differ per case. In the case of *pe(-)j̅ar(k)-² (q.v.), we see univerbation happening before our eyes in OH texts. In the case of païi-² / pai-, however, it must have happened earlier, namely before the moment of monophthongization of *hpoi to *pe. Nevertheless, it is not likely that univerbation took place at the PIE level. A preform *½ poi-hriěnți as assumed by e.g. Eichner (1973: 68), should in view of *½ h₁hriěnți > OH ʰhjanzi ‘they run’ have given OH **paianzi, with preserved intervocalic -j-, instead of attested ʰpənzi. In the case of ye-² / yga- ‘to come’ (q.v.), we see that we must assume that univerbation has taken place at the time that *h₂ou has monophthongized to *ɻul and *h₁éti / *h₁jěnți have become *ɻét’ul and *ɻánt’ul. The case of païi-² / pai- is slightly different, however. First, we must assume that *h₂poi had not yet monophthongized to *pe, but must have had its intermediate shape */paï/. Secondly, whereas in yezi / uyanzi it is clear that the verbal forms remained accentuated (*ɻul+ét’ul and /ɻul+iant’ul), the forms paiyani and paiattani show that in the case of païi-/pai- the preverb attracted the accent. If we assume univerbation at the time that we are dealing with */paï/ on the one hand and */rěni, ḍeś, yēt’i, īnën, ūtëni, īnt’u/ on the other, we arrive at the following scenario. At the moment of univerbation, the accent is fixed on the preverb */paï/: 3sg.pres. */paï-ɻet’i/, 2pl.pres. */paï-ɻiteni/, 3pl.pres. */paï-ɻant’i/, 3sg.pres. */paï-ɻet’i/. In 3pl.pres. */païant’i/, the sequence /ʌiʌ/ is simplified to /a/ because a “geminate” /-i/- does not exist in the phonemic system of that period. The next step is weakening of post-tonic *e to /i/ when in closed syllable and /a/ in open
syllable (cf. § 1.4.9.1.b): 3sg.pres. */páʔaʔʔ/; 2pl.pres. */páʔiʔaʔ/; 3sg.pret. */páʔit/ı̊/. The stem */páʔiʔ/ı̊/ of the sg.pret.- and the pl.-forms replaces the stem */páʔaʔ/ of the sg.pres.-forms, yielding */páʔit/ı̊/. The loss of intervocalic */-a-*/ which causes contraction of the adjacent vowels, as well as the subsequent simplification of */Vi-iV/* to */ViV/* yields the paradigm as attested in OH texts: */páʔiʔa/, páitani, páit/, páit/. The MH development */CaiC/* > */CaiC/* further explains the MH/NH paradigm */páʔiʔa/, páitani, páit/, páit/.

HLuw. pa- does not show a reflex of */-ʔ/ anymore. This is possibly due to a similar contraction as in Hitt. pānzi < */pajanzi/, after which a stem pa- spread throughout the paradigm.

*paknu*- (lb2) ‘to defame, to slander, to denounce’: 3pl.pret.act. pa-ak-nu-er (OH/NS), pa-ak-nu-e-er (OH/NS).

See CHD P: 58 for attestations and contexts. Its meaning cannot easily be determined, but a translation ‘to defame’ may fit. Formally, the verb looks like a causative in */-nu-/* of a root *pak-*. As causatives in */-nu-/* in principle are derived from zero-grade roots, we could be dealing here with a root *Pe(H)K/*.

Further unclear.

*pakkuš*- ‘to pound, to crack, to crush, to grind’: impf.3pl.pres.act. pa-ak-ku-uš-kān-zi (OH/NS), impf.3pl.imp.act. pa-ak-ku-uš-kān-du (OH/NS).


See CHD P: 58f. for attestations. The adjective pak(kuš)šuʔant- is cited in CHD as pakkuššuʔant- as well, which is done on the basis of one form in KBo 21.1 i 15, which CHD reads as pa-ak-ku-uš-šaʔʔ-ya-an. If we look at the handcopy of this tablet, however, we see that the damaged sign in between */uš-/* and */-ya/ hardly can be ŠA: . I therefore transliterate this form as pa-ak-ku- uš-šu-ya-an.

On the basis of the adjective pak(kuš)šuʔant-, we can infer that the verbal stem is pakkuš-. Oettinger (1979a: 212) suggests a connection with PIE */peh2g/* ‘to
become firm’ and *peh₂-k- ‘to make firm’, but this is unlikely, not only for formal reasons (where does -ušš- come from?) but also for semantic reasons: Oettinger translates the PIE root *peh₂-k- as ‘feststampfen’, but the notion ‘stampfen’ is not attested in its descendants that all denote ‘to make firm’. Oettinger apparently translates the root thus only on the basis of his connection with Hitt. pakkušš-. Janda (2000: 49-51) connects pakkušš- with *pek’- ‘to cook’ and assumes on the basis of this connection that *pek’- originally meant ‘genießbar machen’. This does not seem semantically attractive to me either. Further unclear.

*palāh₂ / *palāh- (IIa2) ‘to call(?), to summon(?): 3sg.pret.act. pa-la-a-ah-š-[a] (OH/NS), 3pl.pret.act. pa-la-a-ah-šē-er (OH/NS).

See CHD P: 60 for attestations and contexts. Both forms occur in broken context, but on the basis of KUB 32.56 obv. 6 nu ya-ar-ri pa-la-a-ah-šē-er ‘They p.-ed for help’, it is suggested in CHD that the verb might denote ‘to call, to summon’ (likewise Tischler HEG P: 388: ‘rufen, anrufen’).

Phonologically, the verb probably has to be interpreted as /plaH-l/. Because of the rootfinal -hh-, the verb is likely to have been hi-conjugated (mi-conjugated roots of the structure *Ceh₂- would have lost their *h₂ because it always stood in preconsonantal position). On the analogy of nāh₂- / naḥḥ- ‘to fear’ and zāh₂- / zāḥ- ‘to beat’, I assume that this verb was plāh₂- / praḥ- (note that the long vowel is attested in 3sg.pret.act. palāḥt(a)). Mechanically, we have to reconstruct a root *Pleh₂-, of which I know no other examples.


PIE *pleh₂-so- or *ploh₂-so-

See CHD P: 60f. for attestations. The noun and its derivatives are always spelled pa-la-aḥ-š², indicating a phonological analysis /plaHsə/. Kronasser (1966: 167) connects this word with Hitt. palhi- ‘wide, broad’ < *plh₂-i-. This means that /plaHsə/ would reflect *pleh₂-so- or *ploh₂-so- (for the retention of *h₂ in front of -s-, cf. paḥš- ‘to protect’ < *poh₂-s-). See at palhi- for further etymology.

I do not understand how Tischler (HEG P: 389) can follow Neumann (1988: 259) in assuming that palāḥša- shows thematicization of a verbal noun
*palḥiššar* (of a further unattested verb *palḥ-* ‘to protect’, which is supposed to be cognate to Gr. πελάσι ‘skin’, ON *fela* ‘to hide’ < *pelh₂-*) that first shows syncope of the second syllable and then anaptyxis in the cluster -lḥš-: the supposed developments are irregular and unlikely.

*palḥ-* '?: 3pl.pret.act. *pala-[l]-he-er* (OH/NS).

Hapax in KBo 3.1. i 34. The context is broken and there has been dispute regarding its reading. After collation, CHD P: 63 now reads [ÉR]INMES-an *pala-[l]-he-er*, however. On the basis of this context alone, the meaning of the verbal form cannot be determined. Tischler (HEG P: 392) nevertheless translates ‘schützen ’?, but does so especially on the basis of the old reading [DIN]GIRMES=an *pala-[l]-he-er* 'the gods protected him’, of which he states that, although the reading now has been improved, “die Bedeutung kann indes stimmen”. He does not seem to notice, however, that the former reading of [DIN]GIRMES has been improved as well, namely to [ÉR]INMES. Nevertheless, on the basis of the translation ‘to protect’, he suggests to connect *palḥ-* with (TÜG)palaḥša-, a garment (q.v.), and, on an IE level, with Gr. πελάσι ‘skin’, ON *fela* ‘to hide’ < *pelh-* (see at his treatment of (TÜG)palaḥša-, HEG P: 389). As I have argued at the lemma (TÜG)palaḥša-, this latter word cannot derive from a root *pelh₂-*, but reflects *pleh₂-. Moreover, a translation ‘to protect’ of *palḥ-* is based on nothing, so Tischler’s etymologization has no merit.


PIE *plh₂-(e)i-

See CHD P: 64f. for attestations. Since Benveniste (1935: 151), these words are generally connected with Lat. plānum ‘flat, smooth’, etc. that reflect *pleh₂-. For Hittite, a reconstruction *plh₂-i- is generally accepted. Melchert (1984a: 45) states that a reconstruction *pelh₂i- would have yielded **palli-, and that therefore *plh₂-i- is needed. A preform *pelh₂-i- is impossible anyway, however, as the regular full grade is *pleh₂- (Lat. plānum, Lith. plōti) and not *pelh₂- (Gr. ἀπελλάθιον ‘porridge’ is semantically far): all the forms with palh- must therefore reflect *plh₂. A genuine full-grade is found in palhašša-, a garment (q.v.) which is to be analysed as /plAHša/ < *pleh₂-so- or *ploh₂-so-. Note that the derivatives palhašši-, palhatar, palhešš-, palhaamu- all are derived from the bare root *plh₂-, not from the i-stem.

Originally, the adjective probably inflected *plēh₂-i-s, *plh₂-éi-s, of which the oblique stem was generalized.

Note that the CLuwian words are all quite disputable regarding their interpretation.

palkuijia-hi(sti) (IIIg) ‘?’: 3pl.pres.midd. pal-ku-i-ja-an-ta (OH/NS).

Hapax in KUB 29.1 iii 5. CHD P: 68 translates ‘to acclaim(?!)’, but admits that its “tentative translation is derived solely from the supposition that the verb is connected with palwai- ‘to cry out’”. Tischler (HEG P: 397-8), who cites the verb as palkuwai- (which is odd for a middle), follows CHD and suggests that 3sg.pret. pa-al-ku-uš-ta (KBo 25.123, 6 (OS)) belongs here as well. This form is hapax, too, and stands in such a broken context that its meaning cannot be determined. In my view, these suppositions are based on too little to base any conclusions on.

palkuš- ‘?’: 3sg.pret.act. pa-al-ku-uš-ta (OS).
Hapax in KBo 25.123, 6, which text is that broken that a meaning of this verb cannot be determined. See at palkuīja- for unconvincing suggestions of a connection between these two verbs.

paša- (c.) ‘road, path; campaign; journey; caravan; time (occasion)’ (Sum. KASKAL): nom.sg. KASKAL-ša-aš (OH or MH/NS), KASKAL-aš (OH/NS, MH/MS), KASKAL-iš (MH/NS), acc.sg. KASKAL-ša-an (OH/MS), KASKAL-an (OS), gen.sg. KASKAL-ša-aš (NH), KASKAL-aš (OH or MH/NS), dat.-loc.sg. pal-šē (MH/MS), pal-ši (MH/MS), KASKAL-ši (OS), all.sg. KASKAL-ša (OS), abl. KASKAL-ša-ac (MH/MS), KASKAL-za (OS), nom.pl. KASKAL-ši-iš (OH/NS), acc.pl. KASKALMS-aš (OH/NS), dat.-loc.pl. KASKAL-ša-aš, KASKALMS-aš (NH).

Derivatives: *pašiaḫḫī- (IIb) ‘to dispatch, to set on the road, to satisfy’ (1sg.pres.act. KASKAL-ši-ah-mi (NH), 3sg.pres.act. KASKAL-ah-ḫi (NH), KASKAL-ši-ah-zi (NH), 3pl.pres.act. KASKAL-ši-ah-ḫa-an-zi (NH), 1sg.pret.act. KASKAL-ši-ah-ḫ[u-un] (NH), 2 or 3sg.pret.act. KASKAL-ah-ta (NH); part. KASKAL-ah-ḫa-an-t- (NH); verb noun KASKAL-ši-ah-ḫu-ḫa-ya-ar (NH); impf. KASKAL-ḫu-ḫa-an-zi (NH); impf. KASKAL-ši-ah-ḫi-iš-ke-ḫa- (NH)), *pašijala- (c.) ‘guide(?)’ (nom.sg. KASKAL-la-aš (OH/NS)).

Anat. cognates: Lyc. tiplē ‘two times(?)’, trplē ‘three times(?)’.

IE cognates: Gr. δεῖνοκ, Lat. du-plus, OHG wzi-falt ‘twice’.

PIE *polso-or *pl-so-

See CHD P: 69f. for attestations. This word is usually written with the sumerogram KASKAL. Its phonetic reading is only indicated by a few dat.-loc.sg. spellings pal-šē that are used in the same function as KASKAL-šē. The word can be used for either ‘road’ or ‘time’ (in the sense of ‘the first time’). On the basis if the latter meaning, the Lycian words tiplē and trplē could be cognate if they indeed mean ‘two times’ and ‘three times’.

It has been assumed that paša- has cognates in HLuwian as well, but in my opinion these are dubious. KARKAMIŠ A2+3 §22 wa/i-ša-’l ku-ma-na sa-ti-’ ḫa-la-sa-ti- is translated by Hawkins (2000: 112) as “when he shall be out of the way”, assuming that pa-la-sa-ti-i is abl.-instr. to a noun pala- ‘way’ which is cognate to Hitt. palsa-. In my view, this interpretation is less likely because in HLuwian the general rule is that the verb is the last word of the sentence. This would mean that here, pa-la-sa-ti-i is to be interpreted as a verbal form. KARKAMIŠ A6 §19 wa/i-nā ara/i-la-’ū’ ḫa-ra/i-su-u “4”-su-u ḫMANUS pa-ra/i-si ’CRUS’-ta-nu-wa/i-wa/i-i is translated by Hawkins (2000: 125) as ‘I shall cause him
to stand ... three times, four times ...’, assuming that pa+ra/i-si is the dat.-loc.sg. of a noun *parsa- ‘time, turn’, which is cognate with Hitt. *paša-. In my view, pa+ra/i-si cannot mean ‘time’: the -su-suffix in *tara/i-su-u and “4”-su-u indicates ‘x times’ already, and the “MANUS”-determinative used for pa+ra/i-si is not helpful in an interpretation as ‘x times’. Moreover, HUuw. -r- does not regularly correspond to Hitt. -r-. This means that within Anatolian only the Lycian forms may be cognate.

Already Hrozný (1917: 95) connected paša- with Gr. ὄπλος and Lat. du-plus, OHG *zwifalt. If this connection is justified, we deal with a root *pel-. Hitt. paša- then reflects *pel-s-o- or *pl-s-o-.

Kimball’s suggestion (1999: 450) to connect paša- with Arm. pelem ‘hole’ and OIr. beclach ‘cleft, passage, way’ < *bel- ‘to split, cut, excavate’ is semantically weak.

(17Z) *paltana- (c.) ‘shoulder, shoulder blade’ (Sum. *ZAG(LU)); nom.sg. pal-ta-na-aš (OH/NS), acc.sg. pal-ta-na-an, gen.sg. pal-ta-na-aš, loc.sg. pal-ta-ni (MS), pal-da-ni (MS), pal-ta-ni-i (OH/NS), abl. ZAG.LU-az, nom.pl. pal-ta-nu-uš (NH), acc.pl. pal-ta-na-[aš], loc.pl. pal-ta-a-na-aš (NH).

IE cognates: Skt. prthu- ‘flat of the hand’, Gr. πλάτη ‘shoulder blade’, Mr. leitho ‘shoulder blade’.

PIE *plh₂-s-o-.

See CHD P: 79f. for attestations. This word is generally connected with Skt. prthu- ‘flat of the hand’, etc., which means that it must reflect *plh₂-s-o-.

It is unclear to me, however, what the connection is with the root *plh₂- ‘wide, broad’ (for which see palhi- and (TUG) palahša-). In principle, Hitt. *paltana- could also reflect a preform *plh₂-th₂-s-o-, but the other IE languages do not show traces of *plh₂-s-o-.

(palyle-² (1c2) ‘to cry out, to shout with joy, to cheer’: 3sg.pres.act. pal-ya-a-ez-zi (OS), pal-ya-a-iz-zi (OH/NS), pal-u-ya-a-iz-zi, pal-u-ya-iz-zi, 3pl.pres.act. pal-ya-an-zi (OS), pal-ya-a-an-zi (NH), pal-u-ya-an-zi, 3sg.pret.act. pal-ya-itt; part. pal-ya-an-t (MH/MS); impf. pal-ú-e-eš-ke/a- (OS), pal-ú-iš-ke/a- (MS), pal-ú-iš-ke/a- (NH), pal-úiš-ke/a/ (NH), pal-üiš-ke/a/.

Derivatives: (L/MNS) *palųḫ(ṭ)alal- (c.) ‘crier, a participant in festivals who cries out’ (nom.sg. pal-ya-at-tal-la-aš (OS), pal-ya-tal-la-aš (NS), pal-ya-tal-aš, pal-ya-a-at-tal-[a-aš] (OH/NS), pal-ya-a-tal-la-[aš] (NH), pal-u-ya-tal-la-aš (OH/NS), pal-lu-ya-tal-la-aš (1x), dat.sg. pal-ya-[i-ta-al]-i (OS), pal-ya-tal-li
The etymological interpretation is difficult. The noun *pal-ya- therefore rather separate assume a preform *`story', TochAB phonologically represent /palua-/ as well as /pl(ua-/. 

attested in OS texts already, I think it is unlikely that the SDO which means that it is a cry, to roar' as visible in Lat. whose meaning cannot be determined, referring to other alterations like tarku- / taru- ‘to dance’ and talakueša- / lalayeša-. These alternations are often seen as showing a distribution between Hitt. -ku- and Luw. -y- from PIE *g" - (but see at tar(k)u-² for a different interpretation of its alteration). Because pal-ya- is so well attested in OS texts already, I think it is unlikely that the -y- is of Luwian origin. I therefore rather separate palkuije/α-.

The etymological interpretation is difficult. The noun *pal-ya- can phonologically represent /palua-/ as well as /pl(?)ua-. In the first case we must assume a preform *Poluo-, in the second *Pluo- or *PlHuo-. Tischler (HEG P: 403f.) favours a connection with the PIE root *(sj)pel(H)- visible in Goth. spill ‘story’, TochAB pal- ‘to praise’, Lat. appellare ‘to talk to’, implying a reconstruction *pol-u-. Schrijver 1991: 406f. derives these IE forms from a root *pelh-, which would have yielded Hitt. **pallu-ya- < *polh-uo- or **palḫu-ya- < *plh₂-uo-, however. In my view, a better possibility would be the root *b₁lh₁-uo- ‘to cry, to roar’ as visible in Lat. fleō ‘to cry’, OHG bīðen ‘to blow’, Latv. bēžu ‘to bellow’. RussCS bīžu ‘to bellow’. We then should reconstruct a noun *b₁lh₁-uo- 'crying, roaring of which the -e/o-derivative *b₁lh₁u-jo̞- ‘to be crying’ yielded Hitt. /plʔua-/-, spelled pal-ya-².

(gIS) palza(h)ja-², (gIS) palzaša-² (c.) ‘pedestal, a flat base for statues’; nom.sg. pal-za-ха-аš (OH/MS), pal-za-а́h-а-аš (OH?/NS), pal-za-а-ha-аš, pal-za-а́h-а-аš (NH), acc.sg. pal-za-ха-an, gen.sg. pal-за-а́h-а-аš (OH?/NS), loc.sg. pal-za-ги (OH/MS), pal-за-а́h-ги (NH), pal-за-а́š-ги (NH), acc.pl. pal-за-у-аš (OS); stem pal-за-hа (OH?/NS), pal-за-а́š-га.

Derivatives: palzaḥaeh-² (1c2) ‘to stretch (a sheep, lamb, kid) out (on a flat surface)’ (3sg.pres.act. [pal-]за-ха-а́-и-zí, pal-за-ха-[и]-zí, 3pl.pres.act. pal-за-ха-an-zí).


PIE *plh₂-sh₂-ó-.
See CHD P: 86 for attestations. The different spellings point to a phonological interpretation /pltsHá-/ . Formally, the noun shows the suffix -šha- attached to a root pail- which is generally equated with *plh₂- ‘flat’ as seen in paltana- ‘shoulder’ (q.v.) as well. We therefore have to reconstruct *plh₂-sh₂š-. 

The appurtenance of Lyd. bλaso ‘socle’ (cf. Tischler HEG P: 408) is quite uncertain.


IE cognates: Skt. bahu- ‘many, much, frequent, numerous’, Arm. bazawm (adj.) ‘much’. 

PIE *dʰɐ₁ng₂-(e)u-

See CHD P: 88f. for attestations. Note that the noun pangu- ‘multitude; assembly’ must be regarded as a substantivized adjective because of the oblique stem pangau-, which contrasts with the fact that normally u-stem nouns do not show ablaut of the suffix.

There has been some debate about the etymology of these words. Polomé (1968) connected pangu- with PIE *penkw-e ‘five’ (which he derives from ‘a handful’), but this is formally unlikely: pangu- shows a u-suffix (gen.sg. pangauyaš), which cannot be explained by an etymological labiovelar. The same criticism can be uttered against Hamp’s connection with Lat. cunctus ‘totally,
every’ (1973), which word would point to a labiovelar. I therefore stick to Sturtevant’s etymology (1930c: 216), who connected panku- with Skt. bahū- ‘many, much, frequent, numerous’. This word is usually connected with GAv. ḫaṣṣah-, YaV. ḫaṣṣah- ‘thickness’, Gr. παχύς ‘thick, dense’, Latv. biezs ‘thick’ and Lat. pinguis ‘fat’ (the latter then must show secondary p- for expected *finguis), which all show a meaning ‘thick, fat’. This has caused criticism on the semantic side of the etymological connection with Hitt. panku-, but unjustified, to my mind. The semantics as found in Sanskrit (which fit the Hitt. semantics well) are not isolated, as they are comparable within Ilr. to YaV. ḫawāwāt- ‘numerous’ and outside Ilr. to Arm. bazowm (adj.) ‘much’. I rather assume that the languages showing ‘thick, fat’ show a semantic development ‘much, many’ > ‘complete, full’ > ‘thick, fat’.

Formally, Skt. bahū-, superl. bāṃhiṣṭha- has to be derived from a stem *dʰbʰ(e)n̩g²-u- (for initial *dʰ- cf. GAv. ḫaṣṣah- (Beekes 1988a: 78)). This means that the original paradigm must have been *dʰbʰéng²-u-s, *dʰbʰéng²-u-m, *dʰb²ng²-éu-s. Since the full-grade form *dʰbʰéng²-u- should have yielded Hitt. **pinku-, I assume that in Hittite the zero-grade form was generalized (just as in Skt. bahū-).

Note that the words pangarīt and pangariye/a- are derived from an unattested stem *pangara-, which reflects the Caland-variant *dʰb²ng²-ro-.

**pangur / pankun** (n.) animal body part (‘udder?’); group of related animals or persons (‘clan?’): nom.-acc.sg. pa-an-kur (OS), pa-an-gur (OH/NS), pa-aangur, gen.sg. pa-an-ku-na-aš (MH/NS), instr. pa-an-ku-ni-it (MH).

Derivatives: pankunašša- ‘one belonging to the pankur’ (dat.-loc.sg. pa-an-ku-na-aš-ši).

See CHD P: 92f. for attestations and contexts. The exact meaning of the word is not clear. On the one hand it seems to denote an external body part of (mostly female) mammals, which can be used in rituals as well (therefore perhaps ‘udder’). On the other hand it denotes a group of related people or animals. In one text it occurs in a enumeration of relationships:

KUB 13.20 i

(32) DI-NAM²LA KUR⁷² ku-e ḫa-an-ne-iš-ka-te-e-ni n=a-at SIG₅²-in ḫa-an-ni-iš-ke-e-tén n=a-at=z₂=a=k₂n a-p₂-e-e

(33) ŚA É=ŠU ŚA ŚEŠ=ŠU NIN=ŠU ḫa-aš-ša-an-na-aš-ši pa-an-ku-na-aš-ši

| ka-e-na-an-t₂ | a-ri-e=š-ši |
The law-suits of the country which you will judge, judge them well. No-one shall treat those (sc. the law-suits) of his own house, of his own brother or sister, of his own family-member(s), of his own pangur-member(s), of his own in-laws (and) of his own friend(s) for the gain of bread and beer’.

We see that members of the *pankur* are mentioned after the *haššanašša*- (relatives through birth) but before *kaenant*- (relatives by marriage). Perhaps *pankunašša*- denoted people that were ‘relatives’ because they were raised by the same foster mother. Such an interpretation would also fit the meaning ‘udder’. Note that the formal interpretation of *pankunašši* is difficult. I interpret this form as dat.-loc.sg. of a stem *pankunašša-*, which shows the (Luwian) suffix -ašša- ‘belonging to’ (cf. the similar analysis of *haššannašši* in HW^2^: 412).

Despite the fact that we are dealing with a seemingly archaic -r/n-inflection, I know of no good comparandum. Formally, *pankur* should reflect *PonK-ur* or *Ph23enK-ur*. On the basis of the old idea that *pankur* denotes both ‘clan’ and ‘milk’, Melchert (1983: 923) states that it easily could be derived from the PIE root *bʰenɡʰ*- ‘to be thick’ (which also underlies Hitt. *pangu/- pangay*), reconstructing *bʰoŋɡʰ*-ur. Because the translation ‘milk’ has to be abandoned (see explicitly CHD P: 93), this etymology cannot be upheld. If *pankur* indeed denotes ‘udder’, we could perhaps think of an etymological connection with the PIE root *pen*- ‘to feed’ (Lith. *penu* ‘to feed’, Lat. *penus* ‘food’), although the origin of the velar consonant remains unexplained then.


See CHD P: 94 for attestations. This word only occurs in the expressions *apet pantalaz* ‘from that time onwards’ and *ket pantalaz* ‘from now onwards’ (this last expression is attested without a word space as well, see *ketpantalaz*), which indicates that *pantala-* may denote ‘moment, point in time’. An etymological interpretation of *pantala-* is difficult, however. Some scholars favour an etymological connection with *pajii₃/c* / *pais*- ‘to go’ (cf. *yizzapant*- ‘old, having grown weary’ < ‘*having gone with regard to the year(s)’), but this seems semantically unlikely to me as *pantala-* seems to refer more to a fixed point in time than to long period. Puhvel (HED 4: 202-3) suggests a tie-in with Lat. *pendō* ‘to hang (on scales), to weigh’, giving as a parallel Lat. *mōmentum* < *movementum*, derived of *move*re ‘to move’. Nevertheless, it is likely that Lat.

**panzayartanna** (adv.) ‘for five rounds’: *pa-an-za-ya-ar-ta-an-na.*

See CHD P: 96. The word is only attested in the Kikkuli-text on horse-training. It is generally derived from Indic *pāṇcā-yartana*– ‘five-rounds’ < *penk-eṃ-gert-eno*. See also aika-yartanna, nayartanna, šattayartanna and tierayartanna.


See CHD P: 96 for attestations and semantics. The verb denotes an action that is performed on fermented dough and that results in loaves ready for baking. CHD suggests ‘to subdivide’ or ‘to shape’. No etymology has been suggested, but cf. *gīš*pūp- and *gīš*pūpul-.


PIE *popo-*

See CHD P: 101 for attestations. This word only occurs in the expression a-a-i *pa-ap-pl na-ah-ḥa-an-te-es e-še-er* ‘they were cautious about āi and about p.’. CHD translates ‘trouble(?) and danger(?)’, Tischler (HEG P: 425f.) translates ‘Leid und Gefahr’.

Formally, dat.-loc.sg. *pappi* could belong to a stem *papp*– as well as *pappi*–. Regarding its etymology, H. Berman *apud* Puhvel (HED 1-2: 14) connects āi *pappi* with Gr. *ὁ πόπος* (exclamation of surprise, of unbeliever). Another cognate could be Skt. *pāpā*– ‘bad, evil’ < *popo-.*

**pappan(n)ikna**– (c.) ‘brother sharing the same father, paternal brother’ (Sum. *pa-ap-pa-ŠEŠ*): nom.pl. *pa-ap-pa-ni-ik-ni-es* (OH/NS), [pa-ap-pa]n-ni-ik-ni-eš (OH/NS).

See CHD P: 97 for attestations. The word clearly is a compound of *pappa- ‘father’ and *nekna- ‘brother’ (q.v.). The word *pappa- does not occur in Hittite as such, but is related to Pal. pāpa- ‘father’. It likely is a Lallwort (just as anna- ‘mother’, atta- ‘father’). See annaneka- ‘sister of the same mother’ for a similar construction.


PIE *pœrṣ-ı, *prs-énti

See CHD P: 98f. for attestations. We find mi- as well as ḫi-inflected forms (papparši besides papparazī). Although papparši is attested 10x vs. papparši 2x, I think that the verb originally was ḫi-inflected because the mi-inflection is the productive one and because the oldest attested form, 1sg.pret.act. papaρašhiun (OH/MS), shows ḫi-inflection.

Etymologically, this verb is generally connected with TochAB pārs- ‘to sprinkle’, Skt. pṛṣant- ‘dappled’, Cz. pršetì ‘to sprinkle’, etc. and reconstructed as *pers-.

Note that intervocalic *-rs- regularly should yield -rr- (cf. arra- ‘arse’ < *Horso-), but in *porsëi > parsì it has been restored on the basis of the plural where the *-s- remained after syllabic *r. In this latter position, *s fortiori to /i/, however, which is expressed by spellings like pa-ap-pa-ar-aš-ša-an-zi /paprSánt’il/.

The CLuw. 3sg.pres.act. [pa-]ap-pa-ša-at-ti often is regarded as a cognate to Hitt. papparš- and subsequently translated ‘sprinkles’ (cf. e.g. Melchert 1993b: 165), but such an interpretation is not evident from the context.

λ pappaš- (Luw. verb) ‘to swallow’: Luw. 3sg.pres.act. λ pa-ap-pa-ša-i.
Derivatives: *(^Z) *pap(p)aššalu/i- ‘throat, esophagus(?)’ (acc.sg. pa-ap-pa-aš-ša-la-an (NH), pa-pa-aš-ša-la-an, pa-ap-pa-aš-ša-li-in (NH)).

Anat. cognates: CLuw. papašal- (n.) ‘esophagus(?)’ (nom.-acc.pl. [pa-]pa-ša-ala).

PIE *-peh₁-s-

See CHD P: 100 for attestation and context. Because of the use of gloss wedges, this verb is generally regarded as the Luwian reduplicated variant of Hitt. pašكشف / paš- ‘to swallow’. It probably is the source of CLuw. papašal- ‘esophagus(?)’, which in its turn is borrowed into Hitt. pappašalla/i- ‘throat, esophagus(?)’. See at pašكشف / paš- for further etymology.

*ppapi-*: see pappa-


IE cognates: ON får ‘danger’, OHG furina ‘crime’ Goth. fārīna ‘guilt’, etc.

PIE *po-pr-
See CHD P: 103f. for attestations. All words are derived from a stem *papr-.

If CLuw. parattu- indeed means ‘impurity’ (it denotes a bad quality) and is cognate with Hitt. papr-, it would show that we are dealing with a root *par- which is reduplicated in Hittite.

It is difficult to give an IE etymology, as there are many roots that show a form *Per-, but none has a striking semantic similarity. The only one that possibly could fit is the root ‘*per-2 E.” ‘to try, to dare, to risk; danger’ (as it is cited in Pokorny 1959: 818), which he reconstructs on the basis of ON fär ‘danger’ and OHG firina ‘crime’.

The verb papre-2 is interpreted as a stative in -eh1 by Watkins (1973: 79f.).

\[\text{ga}^\text{pāpu}-\] (c.) a wooden implement used in a bakery: acc.sg. pa-pu-u-un (NS), \[p]\d'a\text{-}a\{u\}-\d'\text{-}a\text{-}un\d'\text{-}n=a.

See CHD P: 108. The only sure attestation of this word occurs in KUB 16.34 i (14) ŠA Ė 1\text{LÉ}NINDA.DÜ.DÜ=ya=kán UR.[GI\text{-}aš] pa-it mu=ya gaš pa-pu-u-un ar-\text{ha} ḥu-ru-ta-it ‘A dog came into the bakery and knocked over(?) the p.’. On the basis of this context alone, an exact meaning cannot be determined. Other attestations might be KBo 29.70 i (28) […]p\d'a\text{-}a\{u\}-\d'\text{-}a\text{-}un\d'\text{-}n-a x[ […] and KUB 46.48 rev. (22) […]x ú-e-te-na-ac gaš pa-a-pu’[…], which could indicate that the word actually was pāpu-. Perhaps the word is cognate with gaš pāpu-l ‘bread tray(?)’ and perhaps both words belong with pāpu-, an action performed on fermented dough resulting in loaves ready for baking (q.v.).

\[\text{ga}^\text{s} \text{pāpu}-\] (gender unclear) a wooden implement for carrying or arranging loaves of freshly baked breads, ‘bread tray(?)’: dat.-loc.sg. pa-a-pu-li.

See CHD P: 108 for attestation and context. The word occurs only once, in KUB 55.43 iii 33. It possibly denotes a bread tray or similar. On the basis of the dat.-loc.sg. alone, we cannot decide whether the stem was pāpu-, pāpu-la- or pāpu-li-.

On the basis of other words in -u- (aššul-, uštul-) I cite this word as pāpu-l here. Possibly, the word belongs with gaš pāpu-., a wooden implement used in a bakery, and pāpu-, an action performed on fermented dough resulting in loaves ready for baking. No further etymology.

\[\text{parā}\] (prev. with dat.-loc. or all., +=kan) ‘out (to), forth, toward’; (prev. with dat.-loc. or all. without locatival particles) ‘forward, further, along’; (postpos. with
abl. or instr.) ‘out of, from’; (adv.) ‘furthermore, moreover, additionally, still; then, after that’: *pa-ra-a* (OS).

Derivatives: see *para-1* / *par-* ‘to appear’.


IE cognates: Gr. πρό, Skt. प्र-, Lat. prō-, Goth. *fra*.

PIE *pré*

See CHD P: 109f. for attestations and semantic treatment. This word is abundantly attested from OS onwards and consistently spelled *pa-ra-a*. Within Hittite, it clearly belongs with *peran* ‘in front of’. Both are to be regarded as petrified cases of a further unattested noun *per-*: acc.sg. *peran* (although see at *peran* for the difficulties regarding the exact interpretation of this form) besides all.sg. *parā* (cf. šēr besides šārā) and a possible abl. *parza* (q.v.). In my view, it therefore is evident that *parā* must reflect a zero grade formation /prā/. Formally as well as semantically, we must equate *parā* with Gr. πρό, Skt. प्र-, Lat. prō-, Goth. *fra*, etc. << *pré*. Note that the equation of *parā* with Gr. πρό, Lat. prō- and Skt. प्र- is a major argument in reconstructing the all.sg.-ending -a / -ā as *-o*. The Luwian forms, CLuw. *par*ā, HLuw. *pa+ra/i* = /pri/ and Lyc. *pri* seem to reflect PLuw. *pré*, which possibly reflects an old dative *pr-ei.

See at *para-1* / *par-* ‘to appear’ for the verbal derivative of *parā*.


IE cognates: Gr. ἀπορέω ‘to blow’, Skt. *prāna-‘breath’.

PIE *proh₁-

See CHD P: 130 for attestations and semantics. The word clearly belongs with *para-1* / *parai* ‘to blow’ (q.v.), which reflects *prh₁-ōjii* (cf. Gr. ἀπορέω ‘to blow’). The noun *parā*- therefore probably reflects *proh₁-s, *proh₁-m, *proh₁-s* (cf. Rieken 1999a: 23).


See CHD P: 134 for attestations. There, the verb is cited as *parai-* as if it belongs to the *dū/tijainzi*-class. As Melchert (fhc,b) showed, this is not the case, however, as can be inferred from the verb.noun gen.sg. *parannaš* instead of expected
*parijannaš. This means that *para- must belong either to the tarn(a)-class, or, perhaps better, to class IIa1p (like dắ / d-). It is generally accepted that it is a derivative of *parā, q.v. for further etymology.

**parabh-**: see parh-*

**parai² / pari-** (IIa4) ‘to blow (a horn); to blow on (a fire); to blow up, to inflate’: 1sg.pres.act. pa-re-eh-hi (NH), 3sg.pres.act. pa-ra-a-i, 1pl.pres.act. pa-ri-i-ya-ni (OS), 2pl.pres.act. pa-ra-iš-te-ni (OH/NS), 3pl.pres.act. pa-ri-ja-an-zi (OH/NS), pa-ri-an-zi (MH/NS), pa-ra-an-zi (1x, OH?/MS), 3sg.pret.act. pa-ra-iš (OH/NS), [p]a-ra-a-iš, 3pl.pret.act. pa-ri-er (OH/NS); part. pa-ri-ja-an-t- (MH/MS).


IE cognates: Gr. **μπριμία** ‘to blow’.

PIE *prh-(o)i-________

See CHD P: 133f. for attestations. The verb clearly belongs to the dắ/tijanzi-class. The only aberrant form is 3pl.pres.act. pa-ra-an-zi (KBo 21.57 ii 4), which is difficult to explain as a secondary form, because of the fact that it is attested in a MS text. Perhaps it is the archaic remnant of an i-less verb *prā- / pr- < *prh- / prh-.

In my article on pai² / pi- ‘to give’ (Kloekhorst fhc.a) I have argued that verbs of the dắ/tijanzi-class reflect a structure *CC-o-, *CC-i-, i.e. the zero-grade of the root followed by an ablauting suffix *-oi-/i-. In the case of parai² / pari-, the root etymology is generally accepted: *preh- as found in Gr. **μπριμία** ‘to blow’ (note that the appurtenance of Russ. pret ‘to sweat, to rot’ (thus e.g. LIV²) does not seem likely on semantic grounds). This means that pari-/pari- reflects *prh-oi-ei, *prh-1-i-ěnti.

The reduplicated derivative parip(ara)- / parip(pari)- shows the mēma/inflection, as can be seen by NH pariparanzi (which we would not expect in a dắ/tijanzi-class verb). This coincides with our observation that polysyllabic verbs that used to belong to the dắ/tijanzi-class were influenced by tarn(a)-class verbs.
from pre-Hittite times onwards, yielding the hybrid synchronic mēna/i-class (see at my treatment of the mēna/i-class in § 2.2.2.2h). It is interesting that it is predominantly spelled pa-ri-pa-ra/i-, whereas a spelling **pa-ri-ip-ra/i- would have been possible as well. This means that the second -a- was phonetically real: [pripara/i-]. Phonologically, we should interpret this then as /pri-para/i-/, or, more consistently, /prʔa/-i-. This shows that, just as *C Rh2jV yields Hitt. /CRHV/-, spelled CaR(ahl)hV-, the cluster *C Rh1jV yields Hitt. /CRʔV/-, spelled CaRV-.

This means that a word spelled with initial #CaRV- could in principle stand for phonological /CRV-/ < *CRV-, or for /CRʔV/- < *C Rh1jV-. On the basis of this discovery, we must phonologically interpret the simplex verb parai-1 / pari- as /prʔai/- / prʔi- < *prh₁-o/- / *prh₁-i-.

The imperfective paripriške/a/-, which reflects *pri-prh₁-skέ/ó/- (cf. zikke/a/- < *dʰiške/ó/ from dai₁ / ti- for the absence of -i- in the imperfective), shows that the regular outcome of *C Rh₁sC is /CRísC/, however, and not **/C RíísC/ or /CRíísC/.

*paru(-)neka- (c.) ‘half-brother(?)’, step-brother(?)’: acc.pl. pa-ra-a šEŠMs-uš

See CHD P: 129: hapax in KUB 26.1 iii 59, where it is mentioned next to šEŠMs ‘brothers’. For the formation, cf. pappan(n)ikna-, annamega-.


See CHD P: 135f. for attestations and semantics. In the oldest texts (OS and MS), this word is spelled with the sign PA and plene second vowel, pointing to /p(a)rănTa/ l. In younger texts (one MS and many NS texts) the bulk of the attestations show a spelling with the sign PÁR which possibly is due to the fortition of OH /ɾ/ to NH /ɾ/ as described in § 1.4.6.2.b. Sturtevant (1938b) compares paranda with Gr. πέραν + ἕ. Tischler (HEG P: 441-2) just states that it is a “Unverbierung von para ‘weiter’ + anda ‘hinein”’.


PIE *pro-r-aḥh-
Formally, the verb looks like a factitive in -ahl- of a stem parara-. Soysal (1988: 118, 125f.) convincingly compared it with the verb katterahh-` to lower`, which is a factitive in -ahl- of a stem kattera- which itself is derived from katta `down` (q.v.). This would mean that in the case of pararahh- the stem parara- is derived from parâ `in front, forth`. Semantically, we then can assume that just as katta `down` corresponds to katterahh-`to lower (*to make go down), parâ `forth` corresponds to pararahh-`to make go forth > to chase`. See at parâ for further etymology. Soysal’s suggestion that a contracted form of pararahh- yielded parh-`to chase` (q.v.) does not make much sense as such a contraction is phonetically irregular and ad hoc. Besides, parh- has a good IE etymology of its own.


See CHD P: 138-9 for attestations. The adjective is used to describe ERINMEŠ `troops`, but its meaning cannot be determined. Possibly, it is cognate with parâš̪ešš-`to disperse` (q.v.).

parâš̪ešš (lb2) `to disperse(?)`: 3sg.pres.act. pa-ra-še-eš-zi (NH), 3pl.pret.act. pa-ra-še-eš-eš-er (NH), pa-ra-a-š̪e-eš-š̪i-er (NH).

See CHD P: 140-1 for attestations. As is argued there, a translation `to disperse` would fit some of the contexts well. Formally, the verb looks like a fientive in -ešš- from a stem parâš-. It may be possible that this stem is to be identified with the one underlying the adj. parâsant- that is used to describe ERINMEŠ. Especially the fact that the verb parâš̪ešš- can have ERINMEŠ as its subject (e.g. KBo 5.8 i 22) points to an etymological connection between the two words. Some scholars (e.g. Kronasser 1966: 404) interprets parâš̪ešš- as a derivative of paṛsh- `to flee’. Although this is semantically possible, I do not see how this could work formally. I have no alternative etymology to offer, however.

Note that 3pl.pres.act. šeššir `they slept’ as cited in HW: 191 without an attestation place (see also at šeš̪- / šaš-), probably goes back to a misinterpretation of one of the 3pl.pret.-forms of this verb.

^parâš̪ha- (c.), ^parâš̪ha- (c.), ^parâš̪hi- (n.) a semiprecious stone: nom.sg.c. pa-ra-aš-ḥa-aš (MH/MS), ba-ra-aš-ḥa-aš (MH/NS), [p]a-r[u]-aš-ḥa-

See CHD P: 139 for attestations. The word is clearly of foreign origin because of the alterations. According to Albright (1945: 24), the word is the Hurrian rendering of Akk. marḫaššu-glass, which originates in Marḫaššu (also written Barašši and Parašši).

Note that the alteration parašša- : parušša- shows that we must analyse these forms as /prasha-/ and /prusha-/ This is important as it shows that a spelling par-aš-C stands for /prasC-/ which contrasts with the spelling pár-aš-C that stands for /parsC-/ or /prsC-/ (see e.g. at paršdu-).

parašdu-: see paršdu-

paraštuḫḫa-: see parštuḫḫa-

parašza : see parza

(1.6) paruḫuantu- (c.) ‘supervisor’: nom.sg. pa-ra-a ū-ya-an-za (MH?/NS), acc.sg. pa-ra-a-ū-ya-an-du-an (NH).

Derivatives: (1.6) paruḫuantaḫḫa- ‘lookout’ (acc.pl. pa-ra-a-ū-ya-tal-ḫu-š (NH)).

See CHD P: 142 and 110f. for attestations. These words clearly exist of the preverb parāš followed by forms of aṣu- / u- ‘to see’. The fact that sometimes no word space is written, indicates that synchronically they function as univerbations.

parḥ-² (Ia4 > Ila1y) ‘to chase, to pursue, to hunt; to expel; to attack; to make gallop (horses); to hasten (intr.): 1sg.pres.act. pā[r-a]ḥ-mi (NS), 2sg.pres.act. pā[r-a]ḥ-ṣi (MH/MS), 3sg.pres.act. pā[r-a]ḥ-zi (OS), pā[r-a]ḥ-zi (MH/NS), pā[r-a]ḥ-i (MH/MS), pā[r-a]ḥ-a-i (MH/MS), pā[r-a]ḥ-a-a-i (MH/MS), 3pl.pres.act. pā[r-a]ḥ-an-zi (MH/MS), pā[r-a]ḥ-an-zi (MH?/NS), 1sg.pret.act. pā[r-ḫu]-mi (NH), 3sg.pret.act. pā[r-ḫa]-mi (MH/MS, OH/NS), pā[r-ḫa]-š (NH), [p]ā[r-ḫi]-ja-ati (NH), 1pl.pret.act. pā[r-ḫu]-mi (NH), 3pl.pret.act. pā[r-ḫa]-er (OH/NS), pā[r-ḫa]-[ḫe]-er (NH), 3sg.imp.act. pā[r-ḫa]-du (OH/MS), 2pl.imp.act. pā[r-ḫa]-tēn (OH/NS), 3pl.imp.act. pā[r-ḫa]-du-an-du (NS), 3sg.pres.midd. pā[r-ḫa]-tē-ta-ri (MH/MS), 3pl.pres.midd. pā[r-ḫa]-an-ta-ter (OH), 3pl.imp.midd. pā[r-ḫa]-an-ta-ru (MH/MS); part. pā[r-ḫa]-an-t- (MH/MS, OH/NS); verb.noun pā[r-ḫu]-ya-ar
(MH/MS), pár-ḫu-u-ya-ar (MH/MS); inf. I pár-ḫu-ya-an-zi (MH/MS), pár-ah-ḫu-ya-[n-zí] (MH/MS); sup. pár-ḫu-ya-an (OH/MS); impf. pár-ḫi-iš-ke/a- (MH/MS), pár-ah-ḫi-iš-ke/a- (MH/MS), pár-ḫe-iš-ke/a- (MH/NS), pár-ḫi-eš-ke/a-.

Derivatives: parḥanna₁ / parḥanni- (IIa5) ‘to chase (imperf.)’ (3sg.presents.act. pár-ḫa-an-na-i (MH/MS)), parḥanu₂ (ib2) ‘to make gallop’ (3sg.pres.act. pár-ḫa-nu-zi (MH/MS); impf. pár-ḫa-nu-uš-ke/a- (MH/MS), pár-ḫa-ḫa-nu-uš-ke/a (MH/MS)), parhešar / parhešn- (n.) ‘haste, urgency; forced march’ (nom.acc.sg. pár-ḫe-eš-šar (OH/NS), dat.-loc.sg. pár-ḫe-eš-ni (NH), pár-ḫi-iš-ni (NH), abl. pár-ḫe-eš-n[a]-ra) (OH/NS), pár-ḫe-eš-na-za (NH), pár-ḫe-eš-na-za (NH), pár-ḫi-iš-na-za (NH), parḫuṣar (n.) a token ‘chasing across’ (nom.acc.sg. pár-ḫu-ya-ar).


IE cognates: Skt. bhār²- ‘to move rapidly to and fro, to hurry’, YAv. baržu (loc.abs.) ‘when it storms’.

PIE *bʰerh₂₃-ti, *bʰrh₂₃-énti.

See CHD P: 143f. for attestations. The bulk of the attestations (including an OS one) show mi-inflection, whereas all forms that show a tarn(a)-class inflection (parḫa-¹) are found in one text only, KBo 3.5 (MH/MS). I therefore conclude that this verb is mi-inflected originally. The alternation between the spelling pár-ah-zi and pár-ḫa-zi shows that we have to phonologically interpret this form as /párHₜˈi/. As a mi-verb, the original inflection must have been *Pérḫ₂₃-ti, *Prhr₂₃-énti. Since in the singular form the laryngeal disappears regularly between consonants, the regular Panat. outcome of this paradigm is */pár-ti / prHányi/. We see that this paradigm was levelled out differently in the Anatolian languages. In Hittite, the /-H/- of the plural form is generalized, which yields /párHti / prHányi/, spelled parḫzi, parḫanzi, whereas in Luwian the h-less singular form is generalized, yielding partı, *paranzi (if indeed 3sg.pres. paratti belongs to this verb). The CLuwian form with -ḫ- (3sg.imp.act. parḫaddu) is seen by Melchert (1993b: 167) as a possible Istanuvian dialect-form.

Regarding the outer-Anatolian etymology, different views have been put forth. Hrozný (1919: 110³) compared parḫ- to Gr. πῆξ ‘to penetrate’, which is semantically not satisfactory. Oettinger (1979a: 213f.) plausibly connects parḫ- with Skt. bhār²- ‘to move rapidly, to hurry’, which is semantically as well as formally more compelling. This means that we have to reconstruct *bʰerh₂₃-t-. 
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Often, Lat. *fervō* ‘to boil’ is seen as a cognate as well, but this verb probably reflects *bhērh₂-u* (see Schrijver 1990: 252ff.) and therefore cannot be cognate (because *-h₂-* does not yield Hitt. *ḫ̣-*).


The word occurs only once: KBo 10.33 + KBo 10.28 v (2) UZU[HÁD].DU.A *pār-ḫu-u-ya-ja-aš* ‘dried meat of the *p*.’ Tischler (HEG P: 458) connects this word with the broken form *pār-ḫu[-...],* found in an enumeration in KBo 10.36 iii (4) [UZU]AR-NA-BI MUŞEN[BL] *pār-ḫu[-...],* which has a seeming parallel in KBo 10.52, (10) [UZUL]AR-NA-BI MUŞEN[BL] KU₆[BL] *iz[-...].* This would mean that *parḫu[-...]* has to be read as KU₆[BL] ‘fish’ (thus Otten in the preface of KBo 10). CHD (P: 148) speaks against this equation, however, because KU₆ is always phonetically completed as an *u*-stem, which would not fit the form *parhūājaš.* Tischler argues that *parhūājaš* may be a derivative of the *u*-stem *parḫu-* and does not have to be the reading of KU₆ itself. If the word for ‘fish’ was *parḫu-*, Weeks (1985: 48) connects it with *parḫ-* ‘to chase’ (q.v.), because of the swiftness of fishes (*bhērh₂*-u-). Both the word *parhūājaš* as well as the broken *parḫu[-...]* are spelled with the sign *pār,* which in principle can be read *maš* as well. Then the words (*mašḫu[-...]* and *mašhūāja-) would resemble the word *mašḫuila*- ‘mouse’ (q.v.).


PIE *pri*-om

This word clearly belongs with *parā* and *peran.* Its oldest attestation is *pa-ri-ja-an,* which seems to point to /prien/. The few NS spellings with plene -a-, *pa-a-ri-ja-an,* may be non-probative. The word likely is a derivative in *-om* (note that *-m* is still visible in CLuw. *pa-ri-ja-am=ša*), attached to a stem *pri-* that is also
visible in CLuw. *par̥, HLuw. pa+r̥a/i = /pr̥/ and Lyc. pri. See at parā for further etymology.

**parkī (adj.)** ‘?’: case? pár-ki-i.

PIE *bʰr̥g̣-i- ??

This word occurs only once in KUB 8.2 rev. (11) [...x ú-e-te-[na-a]n-da-an pár-ki-i KUR-ì [...]. CHD P: 160 suggests to connect it to the group of words having *park- ‘high’ as stem (see *parki(e)/a-²). Although a translation ‘high land’ in principle is acceptable, there is no further indication for it. If the connection is justified, however, we would find here an i-stem which would match CLuw. *parraja- ‘high’.

**parki(e)/a-², park-** (Ic1; IIb > IIg) ‘to raise, to lift, to elevate, to grow (trans.); to rise, to go up, to grow (intr.); to take away, to remove’: 3sg.pres.act. pár-ki-ja-az-zi (MS), 3pl.pres.act. pár-ki-ja-an-zi (MH/MS), pár-kān-zi (NS), 1sg.pret.act. [pár]-ki-ja-nu-un (NH), 3sg.pret.act. pár-ki-ja-at (OH/MS), 2sg.imp.act. pár-ki-ja; 1sg.pres.midd.(?) pár-ak-ki-ja-äh-[ha-ri?] (NH), pár-ga-ah-[ha-ri?], 3sg.pres.midd. pár-ki-ja-ta-ri (OH?/?NS?), 3pl.pres.midd. pár-ki-ja-an-ta-ri (OH/NS), 1sg.pret.midd.(?) pár-ki-ja-ah-[ha-ха-at?] (NH), 3sg.pret.midd. pár-ki-ja-at-ta-at (MH/MS), pár-ki-ja-at, 3pl.pret.midd. pár-ki-ja-an-ta-at (MH?/NS), 3sg.imp.midd. pár-ak-ta-ru (OH/MS); part. pár-ki-ja-an-ta-; inf.1 pár-ki-ja-u-ya-an-zi (NH).

Derivatives: *parknu-² (Ib2) ‘to make high, to raise, to elevate’ (1sg.pres.act. pár-ga-nu-mi, 2sg.pres.act. pár-ga-nu-ši (NH), 3sg.pres.act. pár-ga-nu-ži, 3sg.pret.act. pár-ka-r-nu-ut (NS), pár-ak-nu-ut (MH/MS), 2sg.imp.act. [pár]-ga-nu-ut; impf. pár-ga-nu-uš-ke/a/-), *parganu- (n.) ‘elevation’ (all.sg. pár-ga-nu-la (KB 12.63+ obv. 31 (OH/MS)), *pargatar (n.) ‘height’ (nom.-acc.sg. pár-ga-tar (MH/MS)), *pargasti- ‘height’ (dat.-loc.sg. pár-ga-š-ti (NH), pár-ka-aš-ti), *parkšš-² (Ib2) ‘to become high or tall’ (3sg.pret.act. pár-ki-iš-ta (NH); impf. pár-ki-iš-ke/a/ (NH)), *parkššar / parkššin- (n.) ‘height’ (dat.-loc.sg. pár-keš-ni=t=a-at=kān or instr. pár-keš-ni=t=a-at=kān (NH)), *parkššanu-² (Ib2) ‘to raise, to make rise’ (3pl.pres.act. pár-ki-ja-mu-ya-an-zi (NH), pár-ki-[a]-mu-an-zi (NH), *parku- / *pargau- (adj.) ‘high, tall, lofty, elevated’ (nom.sg.c. pár-ku-uš (NH), nom.-acc.sg.n. pár-ku (OH/NS), pár-ku-u, dat.-loc.sg. pár-ga-u-e-i (NH), [pár-ga-u]-e (NH), pár-ga-u-i (NS), abl. pár-ga-u-az (NH), pár-ga-u-az, pár-ga-u-ya-az (NH), nom.pl.c. pár-ga-u-e-eš (NH), acc.pl.c. pár-ga-mu-uš (OH/MS), pár-ga-u-uš (NH), pár-ga-u-e-eš (NH), nom.-acc.pl.n. pár-ga-u-ya,
dat.-loc.pl. pár-ga-u-ya-aš (MH/MS), pár-ga-a-u-ya-aš (MH/NS), parkuyatar (n.) 'height' (nom.-acc.sg. pár-ku-ya-tar (MH/NS)), parkušš- (lb2) 'to become tall' (3sg.pret.act. pár-ku-išt-ta (NS), 3sg.imp.act. pár-ku-eš-du (OH/NS)), par-gayeskhe/ep- (Ic6) 'to become high or tall' (3sg.imp.midd. pár-ga-u-eš-kad-[d]a-ru).


IE cognates: Arm. barənam, aor. ebarj 'to raise', barjr 'high', Skt. barh- 'to make strong', bhānt- 'high', ToChB pārk- 'to arise', ON hjarg, berg 'mountain'.

PIE midd. *bʰergʰ-to; act. *bʰergʰ-ié/i-; adj. *bʰergʰ-(e)i-.

See CHD P: 155f. for attestations. One of the verbal forms is spelled pár-ak-ki-ja- and therefore seems to point to an etymological *k. This form is found in a broken context, however, and therefore cannot be ascertained as belonging to this verb. Although the bulk of the attestations inflect according to the -je/-a-class, there are a few unextended forms. In the oldest texts (OH/MS), we find 3sg.pret.act. parkijat vs. 3sg.imp.midd. parkatur. These forms point to an original situation in which the stem parki/-a- is used in the active only and the unextended stem park- in the middle (compare e.g. ḫwet-ḫašt ḫwišt the verb to draw, to pull’ or yešš- (adj.) 'high' as all. sg. of a noun pargamul- see Rieken 1999a: 465f. (pace the reading 3pl.pret.act. pár-ga-nu-ur' by CHD P: 158).

Sturtelvant (1930c: 216) etymologically connected this verb and its derivatives with the PIE root *bʰerɡʰ-, which is generally accepted. On the one hand, the verbal stem park- corresponds to the verbs Arm. barj- 'to raise' and ToChB pārk- 'to arise; to rise'. On the other hand, the u-stem adjective parku-/pargay- 'high' beautifully corresponds with Arm. barjr 'high' < *bʰerɡʰ-u-. So we cannot say that in Hittite either the verb or the adjective is primary in the sense that one is derived of the other as both are of PIE origin (see the discussion in e.g. Weitenberg 1984a: 84).

CLuw. paraaja- must reflect *bʰerɡʰ-ē/o- vel sim., in which *gʰ regularly is lost. For the interpretation of pár-ga-nu-la as all.sg. of a noun pargamul- see Rieken 1999a: 465f. (pace the reading 3pl.pret.act. pár-ga-nu-ur' by CHD P: 158).

Note that some of the derivatives of parku- are formally identical to derivatives of the adjective parkui- 'clean' (q.v.) (e.g. parkušš-).

parkui- / parkuyai- (adj.) 'pure; clean, clear; free of; proven innocent': nom.sg.c. pár-ku-iš (MH/MS), pár-ku-i-iš (OH/NS), pár-ku-eš (MH/MS), pár-ku-u-iš, pár-ku-u-gʰ, acc.sg.c. pár-ku-in (OS), pár-ku-i-in, pár-ku-un (1x, NS), nom.-acc.n. pár-ku-i (OH/MS), pár-ku-ū-i, pár-ku-u-i (NH), gen. pár-ku-ya-ja-aš (NS), pár-

Derivatives: parku[je]a-\textsuperscript{2} (‘act.) to make clean, to clear (up); (midd.) to be(come) pure’ (3pl.pres.act. pár-ku-ya-an-zi (MH/NS); 3sg.pres.midd. pár-ku-i-ja-ta-at (OH or MH/NS), pár-ku-i-ed-[a-at] (OH?/NS), pár-ku-ya-at-ta (NH)), ḫparkuy[a(ja)]-, a building (gen.pl. pár-ku-ya-aš (NH), dat.-loc.pl. pár-ku-ya-ja-aš (OH/NS), abl.pl. pár-ku-ya-i-ja-[a]), parkuyall\textsuperscript{1} (adj.) ‘pure?’ (nom.-acc.pl.n. pár-ku-ya-al-la), parkuyantariji\textsuperscript{2} (Ic1) ‘to be(come) pure(?)’ 1sg.pres.act.(?) pár-ku-ya-an-ta-ri-[a-mi?] (NS)), parku\j\textsuperscript{2} / parku\j\textsuperscript{1} (n.) ‘purification’ (nom.-acc.sg. pár-ku-ja-a-tar (OH/NS), gen.sg. pár-ku-ja-an-na-aš (MH/MS), pár-ku-e-an-na-aš (MH?/NS?)), ḫ/ parku(\i) ḫaššā (n.) a body part or cut of meat, ‘pure-bone’ (nom.-acc.sg. uzi pár-ku-\i ha-aš-ta-i (NH), pár-ku ḫa-aš-ta-a-i (NH)), parkuem\textsuperscript{2} (n.) ‘purification?’ (nom.-acc.sg. pár-ku-e-m[ar?]!), parkue\textsuperscript{2} (Ib2) ‘to be pure, to be clear’ or ‘to be high’ (3sg.pres.act. pár-ku-e-z-i (OH/NS), pár-ku[e]-z-i (OH/NS)), parkue\textsuperscript{2} (Ib2) ‘to be pure, to be found innocent’ (3sg.pres.act. pár-ku-e-eš-z-i (MH?!NS), pár-ku-eš-z-i (OH/NS), pár-ku-iš-z-i, 2pl.pres.act. pár-ku-eš-te-mi (MH/NS), 1sg.preter.act. pár-ku-eš-su-un (NH), pár-ku-eš-iš-un (NH), 3sg.pres.act. pár-ku-eš-ta (OS), pár-ku-iš-ta, 3sg.imp.preter.act. pár-ku-eš-tu (OH/MS), pár-ku-eš-du (MH/NS)), parkunu\textsuperscript{2} (Ib2) ‘to cleanse, to purify; to declare innocent, to justify; to castrate; to clarify’ (1sg.pres.act. pár-ku-nu-mi (MH/MS), pár-ku-nu-um-mi (OH/NS), pár-ku-nu-\textsuperscript{2} hi, 2sg.pres.act. pár-ku-nu-ši (OH/NS), 3sg.pres.act. pár-ku-nu-uzi (OS), pár-ku-nu-zi (OH/NS), 1pl.pres.act. pár-ku-nu-um-me-ni (NH), 3pl.pres.act. pár-ku-nu-ya-an-zi (MH/MS), pár-ku-nu-an-zi (NH), 1sg.pres.act. pár-ku-nu-an-zi (OH/MS), 3sg.pres.act. pár-ku-nu-ut (OH/NS), 3pl.pres.act. pár-ku-nu-er (MH/NS), pár-ku-nu-er (NH), 2sg.imp.act. pár-ku-nu-ut (OH/MS), 3sg.imp.act. pár-ku-nu-ud-du (MH/MS), 2pl.imp.act. pár-ku-nu-ut-tén (MH/NS), 3pl.imp.act. pár-ku-nu-ya-an-du (MH/NS), pár-ku-nu-an-du, 3sg.pres.midd. pár-ku-nu-ut-ta-ti (OH/NS), pár-ku-nu-ta-ti (OH or MH/NS); verb.noun pár-ku-nu-mar (OH/MS), gen.sg. pár-ku-nu-um-ma-aš (OH/NS), pár-ku-nu-ma-aš (MH/NS); part. pár-ku-nu-ya-an-t- (MH/MS); impf. pár-ku-nu-uš-ke-a/ (OH/MS)).

PAnat. *parkí/-i-.

IE cognates: OHG *furben, MHG *vürben ‘to clean’.

PIE adj. *parkó(e)-i-; pres. *parkó-e-o-.

See CHD P: 163f. for attestations. All the words cited here have the element *parku- in common. On the basis of the one attestation acc.sg.c. *parku- was primary, and that the stem *parku- was an extension in -i- of it. He compared this situation to Latin adjectives in -i-, like suavis, which are recent i-stems on the basis of PIE u-stems (*sueihu-d-i-). With the identification of the Latin -i- in these adjectives (also e.g. tenuis, brevis, etc.) as the feminine suffix *-ih2-, it was suggested that Hitt. *parkuyi- shows *-ih2- as well, a view that has often been repeated (most recently Rieken 1999a: 258). Apart from the fact that the status of the form on the basis of which this whole theory was launched is quite dubious (the “u-stem form” pár-ku-un is attested only once in a NS text; note that CHD P: 358 cites the form as “parkuin(!)”), there is not a single piece of evidence that the element *parku- originally was a u-stem: we never find forms that show **parku- or an u-less stem **park- (as e.g. in the case of the u-stem párku- / parci- ‘high’ (see at parki/ké/a: ‘to raise’)). I therefore conclude that the element *parku- ‘clean’ is not a u-stem but must be regarded as a root that shows a rootfinal labiovelar. In this way, I do not see any objection against assuming that the adjective *parkui- is a normal i-stem derived from a root /p(a)rk-/. If we compare the CLuwian words, we have to reconstruct PAnat. *P(a)rkó/-, because PAnat. *-gó- would have disappeared in Luwian. The geminate spelling -pp- in CLuw. *papparkuyat- seems to point to an initial fortis stop as well (PAnat. *p(a)rkó/-), although evidence from reduplicated syllables has to be used with caution in these matters.

To my knowledge, no convincing IE etymology has been offered, yet. I would like to propose a connection with OHG *furben ‘to clean’, MHG *vürben ‘to clean’. These verbs go back to PGerm. *furben < pre-PGerm. *furbi-o-, which can go back to *parkó-e/o/-, showing the development *kó > *p after resonant (as is visible in e.g. *yelkó- > PGerm. *wulf-, cf. Kortlandt 1997). This would show that we have to reconstruct a PIE root *parkó- (it cannot be determined whether the full grade was *parkó- or *prekó-). I therefore reconstruct Hitt. *parkui- / *parkuyat- as *parkó-e/-e/-.
Note that the verbal -je/o-formation as visible in Germanic is possibly comparable to Hitt. *parku(j)e/a₂* 'to make clean' that could reflect *prke*-je/o-.

**par**-: see per / parn-

*prüg*ada**par**na- (c.) article of textile, a tapestry: nom.sg. pār-na-aš (NH), acc.sg. pār-na-an (NH), abl. pār-na-az (OH?/NS), acc.pl. pār-nu-uš (NH).

See CHD P: 176 for attestations. The exact meaning of this word is not clear, but according to CHD it may denote something like a Turkish kilim, i.e. a lightweight carpet. Some scholars (e.g. Werner 1967: 17) suggest a connection with *per/par* 'house', assuming that TügGada**par**na- was used within the household. As Tischler (HEG P: 485) states, such a semantic connection is not contextually supported, however. No further etymology.

**par**nili (adv.) '?': pār-ni-li.

The word is hapax in KBo 29.82 + KBo 14.95 iv (5) *nu=za pār-ni-li a-da-an-zī* 'and they eat p.' The -ili-suffix suggests that the word is an adverb, but a meaning cannot be determined. CHD P: 178 suggests that the word could be a scribal error for pār-aš-ni-li 'in a squatting position' (see at parśna- 'leopard').


Derivatives: **parśnu**-d (Ib2) 'to make flee, to chase away' (3sg.pres.act. pār-aš-ša-nu-ut, 3pl.pres.act. pār-ša-nu-er (NH)).

IE cognates: Lat. festūnēre 'to hurry', We. brys 'haste', ?OCS brzĕb 'fast'.

PIE *bʰěrs-ti / *bʰereštēni

See CHD P: 179f. for attestations. On the basis of 3pl.pres.act. pār-še-er we can see that the stem is parś- and not **paras-. The occasional geminate spelling of -šš- shows that phonologically we have to interpret /parS/-.

There has been some debate on the etymology of this verb. It has been argued that parś- is a s-derivative of the verb parḥ- 'to chase' (q.v.) (e.g. Sturtevant 1933: 72, 229). This is unlikely, however. First, a preform *prh₂-s- or *perh₂-s- in my view regularly should have yielded **pris- or **parris- (cf. gane/iššanzi
/knıSántʼiš < *gnhš-senti, damme/iššā- /tuMisHā-ı < *demh₂shy₁-o-). Secondly, this scenario is unlikely on semantic grounds: parḫ- means ‘to chase, to hunt’ (i.e. ‘to make flee’), whereas parš- means ‘to flee, to escape’. This would mean that the s-suffix would have de-causativized the verb parḫ-. To my knowledge, the s-suffixed verbs in Hittite never show such a semantical development (e.g. gane/išš-z- ‘to recognize’ is derived from *gneh₁- ‘to know’; kallišš-z- / kališš- ‘to call’ from *kelh₁- ‘to call’; paḥš._a(r) ‘to protect’ from *peh₂- ‘to protect’; paš₁- ‘to swallow down’ from *peh₁- ‘to drink’).

Other scholars (e.g. Knobloch 1959: 34, followed by Oettinger 1979a: 214) connect parš-₂ to Lat. festinare ‘to hurry’. According to Schrijver (1990), this latter verb reflects *bʰ̥rs-ti+, which must also be the preform of We. brys ‘haste’. A further connection with OIr. brus ‘quickly’ (thus in e.g. Pokorny 1959: 143) is rejected by Schrijver, however. He also denies the connection with OCS brz₂ ‘fast’, etc. because he thinks that -z- cannot reflect *s. In BSI we find a variant *brz₁- (RussCS borzdo ‘fast’, Lith. burzdis ‘agile, active’) as well, however, which could regularly reflect *bʰ̥rs-d₁-. In my view, it is possible that *bʰ̥rs-o-, which regularly yielded *brz₁-, has influenced *bʰ̥rs-o- that then was altered to *brzo-. Whether or not the BSI. forms are cognate, we find a root *bʰ̥rs- ‘hurry, haste’ in Latin and Welsh, which would formally as well as semantically fit Hitt. parš-. I therefore reconstruct Hitt. parš- as *bʰ̥rs-ti / *bʰ̥rs-senti. In the zero-grade forms, the -s- is adjacent to -r-, which causes fortition, yielding /prSántʼiš/, spelled pár-aš-ša-an-zi.

paršaḥannaš : see parzaḥannaš


See CHD P: 187f. for attestations. Although all attestations of this word refer to body parts, it is difficult to determine exactly what body part is meant. In the case of the following context, it seems clear that paršmüš refers to ‘genitals’:

KUB 33.120 i
(24) n=a-an=kán ne-pi-ša-az kat-ta ḫu-it-ti-et
(25) pár-ši-mu-uš=šu-uš ya-ak-ki-iš LÚ-na-tar=še-et=kán A-NA ^4 Ku-mar-bi ŠĀ=ŠU an-da ZABAR
(26) ma-a-an ú-li-iš-ta
‘He (= Kumarbi) pulled him (= Anu) down from heaven. He bit off his p.-s and his masculinity fused with Kumarbi’s inside like copper’ (cf. CHD P: 187 for translation).

Such an interpretation does not fit for the following contexts, however:

KBo 13.34 iv
(14) ták-ku MUNUS-za ḫa-ā-ši mu-u=š-ši [ZA]G-an
(15) GEŠTU=ŠU pár-še-mu-š(i)=šu-uš
(16) [m]a-ni-in-ku-ya-an ki-[i]-r[a-r]i

‘If a woman gives birth and (of the child) his right ear lies near his p.-s’

ibid. iv
(6) ták-ku MUNUS-za ḫa-ā-ši mu-u=š[ī] GEŠTU[ši]-šU]
(7) pár-ši-ni=ši ki-ut-ta[r][i]

‘If a woman gives birth and (of the child) [his ears] lie near his p.’.

Riemschneider (1970: 36) states that the Akkadian parallels of these sentences show lētu ‘cheek’ corresponding to Hitt. paršōna-, which indicates that here paršōna-, too, denotes ‘cheek’. Often, the word pár-aš-na-aš (KUB 35.148 iii 27) is regarded as belonging here as well. Because of its aberrant form and because it clearly refers to a body part that is situated near the feet, I have treated it separately, however: see at paršna-.

According to CHD, it is best to assume for paršōna- an original meaning ‘cheek’, which developed into ‘buttocks’ (parallel in ModHG Backe ‘cheek’ > Hinterbacke ‘buttocks’), which could euphemistically be used for ‘sexual parts’ (via ‘loins’?) as well. To my mind, these steps are quite uncertain, and therefore I have chosen to translate ‘cheek(?)’; genitals here.

Often it is assumed that the verb paršnaex2 ‘to squat(?)’, to crouch(?)’ is connected with paršēna- (already Pedersen 1938: 157f.), on the basis of which a connection between paršēna- and Skt. pāṛṣṇi- ‘heel’, Gr. πτέρνη ‘heel’, Goth. fairzna ‘heel’ etc. has been assumed. In my view, this is improbable formally as well as semantically. As we saw, paršēna- does not denote ‘heel’ or any other part of the leg, and a derived verb of paršēna- would have had the form **paršēnæ-. If the verb paršēnaex- is derived from a body part, it could be of paršna- (q.v.).

Derivatives: paršijanna / paršijanni (IIa5) 'to break (impf.)' (1sg.pres.act. pár-ši-ja-an-na-ah-hi (MH/NS), 3sg.pres.act. pár-ši-ja-an-na-i (OS), pár-ši-ja-an-na-i (OH/NS), pár-ši-ja-an-na-i (MH/MS), pár-ši-ja-an-na-i (NH), 3pl.pres.act. pár-ši-ja-an-ni-an-zi (OH/NS), pár-ši-ja-an-na-an-zi (OH/NS), 3sg.pret.act. pár-ši-ja-an-ni-et (NS), 3pl.pret.act. pár-ši-ja-an-ni-er (NS); impf. pár-ši-ja-an-ni-iš-ke/a- (OH/NS), pár-ši-ja-an-ni-eš-ke/a- (NH), NINDA paralysis (c.) 'a morsel or fragment; a kind of bread' (nom.sg. pár-ša-aš (NH), acc.sg. pár-ša-an (MH/NS), pár-ša-a-an (NH), acc.pl. pár-šu-uš (OS), dat.-loc.pl. pár-ša-aš (NH), pár-ša-a-aš (NH)), paršac (Ic2) 'to break up into small pieces, to crumble' (3sg.pres.act. pár-ša-i-ez-zi (MH/MS), pár-ša-a-ez-zi (MH/MS), pár-ša-i-zi-zi (NH?), (Luw.?) pár-ša-ə-t (KUB 54.49 obv. 2), 3pl.pres.act. pár-ša-a-an-zi (OH/NS), pár-ša-an-zi (NH); part. pár-ša-a-an-t- (MH/NS)), paršnu (IIb2) 'to break up; to break open (with arṭa)' (3sg.pret.act. pár-ša-na-u-t (NS); impf. pár-ša-ša-na-uš-ke/a/- (NS)), paršešar (n.) 'crack' (nom.-acc.sg.n. pár-še-es-šar), paršil(a) (c.) 'a fragment (of bread)'

IE cognates: Gr. qágàς 'part', OE berstan, OHG brestan, ON bresta 'to burst'.

See CHD P: 180ff. for attestations. In the oldest texts this verb shows middle forms only; the active forms are found from MH times onwards. The verb shows two stems, namely parš- and paršije/α-. Note that the verb paršae-², which inflects according to the ḫatrae-class, is a derivative of the noun NINDA parša-, itself a nominal derivative of parš(ije/α)-"parši-".</p>

The etymological interpretation of this verb is not quite clear. Sturtevant (1930d: 127) gives two suggestions. The first one, a connection with Lat. pars 'part', is unlikely as this word is an inner-Latin *-ti-derivation of the verb *parere < *perh₁- 'to provide'. The second one, a connection with Gr. ἄρση 'part', may have more merit if this word reflects *bʰr̥s-o-. Kimball (1999: 239) further adduces OE berstan, OHG brestan, ON bresta ‘to burst’ < *bʰr̥s-, which means that parš(ije/α)- may reflect *bʰr̥s(ije/o)-.

paršina-: see paršēna-

paršina- (gender unclear) a body part in the vicinity of the feet, ‘heel’?: gen.sg. or pl. pár-aš-na-aš.

IE cognates: Skt. pāṛṣṇi- ‘heel’, Gr. άρση ‘heel’, Goth. fairstna ‘heel’ etc.

PIE *p(e)sr̥n-o-?

This word is hapax in the following context:

KUB 35.148 iii

(20) n=a-an=ši EGI[p]a iš-ki-ša-aš hu-i-mi [ ]
(21) m[u] UR.TUR SAG.DU-i=š-ši an-da e-ip-mi U[R.TUR SAG.DU-aš]
(22) i-na-an i-[i]-p-du me-li-ja-[aš=ša-aš]
(23) i-na-an KI.MIN UZU[ZAG.UDU-aš iš-ki-ša-aš [aš=ša-aš (?)]
(24) i-na-an KI.MIN a-na-aš-ša-aš=ša-aš i-n[a-an KI.MIN]
(25) ar-ra-aš=ša-aš i-na-an KI.MIN UZU[x][... i-na-an KI.MIN]
(26) ge-e-mu-ya-aš=ša-aš i-na-an KI.MIN UZU[x] i-na-an KI.MIN]
(27) pár-aš-na-aš=ša-aš i-na-an li-[p-du]

‘I make it run from his back. I take in a puppy for his head and the puppy must lick away the disease of the head, the disease [of his] meli- likewise, the disease of the shoulders (and) [his] back likewise, the dis[ease] of his anaša-[likewise], the disease of his arse likewise, [the disease of his] x[.. likewise].
the disease of his knees likewise, [the disease of his] x[.. likewise] and let it
li[c]k away] the disease of his paršna-.

In this list the body parts seem to be ordered top-down, which indicates that
paršna- denotes a body part located in the vicinity of the feet. Usually, this word
is equated with paršēna- ‘cheek; genitals’ (e.g. in CHD P: 187), but to my mind
the formal as well as semantic differences are too large: we should rather regard
paršēna- and paršna- as separate words.

Since Pedersen (1938: 157f.) this word is generally connected with Skt. pāṛṣṇi-
‘heel’, Gr. πέππη ‘heel’, Goth. fairzna ‘heel’ etc., on the basis of which paršna-
is often glossed as ‘heel’ (note that Pedersen and the scholars that follow him take
paršna- and paršēna- as one word). Formally this connection is possible (paršna-
would then reflect *prsn-o- or *persn-o- besides *pṛṣn-i- as reflected in Skt.
pṛṣṇi- and *persn-eh- as visible in Gr. πέππη and Goth. fairzna), but it should
be noted that semantically it cannot be assured yet. For the question whether the
verb paršnae-zī ‘to squat(?)’ is derived from this paršna-, see at its own lemma.

paršna- (c.) ‘leopard’ (Sum. PİRIG.TUR): nom.sg. pāṛ-ṣ[a-na-aš] (NS),
PİRIG.TUR-aš (OH/NS), gen.sg. pāṛ-ṣa-na-aš (OH/NS), dat.-loc.sg. ANA
PİRIG.TUR (OS), nom.pl. pāṛ-ṣa-ni-eš (OH/MS).
Derivatives: ¹¹paršna- (c.) ‘leopard-man’ (Sum. ¹¹PIRIG.TUR; nom.sg. pāṛ-
aš-na-aš (OS), acc.sg. pāṛ-aš-na-an (OH/NS), gen.sg. pāṛ-aš-na-aš (NS)),
*paršanatar (n.), quality of a leopard (nom.-acc.sg. PİRIG.TUR-tar), paršnili
(adv.) ‘in the manner of a leopard’ (pāṛ-ṣa-ni-li (OH/NS), pāṛ-aš-ni-li (NS)).
IE cognates: see at papparš-
PfE *prs-no-

See CHD P: 184f. for attestations. The different spellings pāṛ-ṣa-n, pāṛ-aš-n and
pāṛ-aš-ṣ-a-n indicate that we have to phonologically interpret these words as
/prSn/. Often, paršna- is seen as a Wanderwort (compared with e.g. Hatt. ḫapraš-
‘leopard’, OTurk. bars), but Oettinger (1986: 22) proposes to derive it from PIE
*prs-no- ‘dappled, having spots’, which is followed by Melchert (1994a: 175).
Because the verbal root *pers- is attested in Hittite (see at papparš-), I do not see
severe objections against this etymology. See at paršnae-zī ‘to squat(?)’, to
crouch(?)’ for the possibility that this verb is derived from paršna- ‘leopard’.
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PIE *prsne-je/-o-

See CHD P: 189 for attestations. The different spellings páraš-na-, páraš-na- and páraš-na- point to a phonological interpretation /prSnae-/. The exact semantics of the verb are not clear: it describes some act that is performed by functionaries in festivals. CHD states ‘that it denotes some lowering of the body is shown by KUB 25.1 vi 11-15, where a cupbearer stands up after having performed p.‘, and suggests a translation ‘to squat, to crouch’. They admit, however, that this translation is especially prompted by the etymological connection with paršna-, a body part in the vicinity of the feet (q.v.), which is generally connected with the words for ‘heel’ in the other IE languages (although CHD cites this latter word as belonging to paršźna- ‘buttocks; cheek’).

Formally, it is indeed quite clear that paršnae- (which belongs to the ħatrae-class) has to be interpreted as a derivative in -je/a- of a noun paršna-. In this way, a connection with paršna- that could mean ‘heel’ would certainly be a possibility. Another candidate is paršna- ‘leopard’, however: squatting is a typical movement of big cats. I must admit, however, that I have not been able to find a context in which paršnae- is associated with any cat-like animal. Regardless of which connection one chooses to favour, it is quite probable that paršnae- formally goes back to *prsne-je/-o-.


See CHD P: 190f. for attestations. This word is consistently spelled pár-aš- (which contrasts with the spelling pa-ra-âš- as e.g. in ¾ parašṭha- and pa-ra-s⁰ as in parašgēš-s²), which is the reason for me to follow CHD in citing this word as
paršdu-. Usually, it is translated ‘shoot, sprig’, but CHD convincingly translates ‘leaf’. This is of importance for the etymological interpretation (note that older etymologies, like Weitenberg’s (1975), who connected paršdu- with Arm. ort’ ‘vine’ and Gr. πέτρα ‘shoot, twig’, are all based on the translation ‘shoot, sprig’ and therefore have become impossible). Basing oneself on the translation ‘leaf’, one could possibly think of a connection with OE bround, -es m. ‘prick, point, lance, javelin, the first blade or spire of grass/corn, etc.’, from *bʰrsdʰ-.

parštuhha- (c.) an earthenware cup? (Sum. {DUG}GAL.GIR₄): acc.sg. pár-aš-du-uḫḫa-an (MS), instr. pár-aš-tu-uḫḫa-it (NS), acc.pl. pár-aš-tu-uḫḫa-aš (NS), broken: pár-aš-tu-uḫḫa-[a(-)] (MS).

See CHD P: 191 for attestations. This word is consistently spelled pár-aš-, which is the reason for me to follow CHD in citing this word as parštuhha- (cf. paršdu-). On the basis of alternations with {DUG}GAL GIR₄, we have to conclude that parštuhha- denotes an earthenware cup. The etymological interpretation of this word is unclear, but a formal connection with paršdu- ‘leaf’ (q.v.) seems likely. If so, we have to assume that this word shows a suffix -ḫḫa-. Such a suffix is further only attested in annamuhha- ‘trained(?)’ (see at annamu-²).


Derivatives: paršūraš EN ‘cooking chef’, paršūraš peda- ‘cooking area’.

PIE *bʰrs-ur

See CHD P: 193f. for attestations. The word denotes all kinds of cooked dishes: soups, broths, stews, meat varieties. Already Sturtevant (1933: 148) connected this word to parš(i)e/-a/- ‘to break’ (q.v.): ‘Brockengericht’. See there for further etymology.

parša: see parza

¹(ZU)parṭuṣṭ / parṭuṣun- (n.) ‘wing, feather’: nom.-acc.sg. pár-ta-u-yā-ar (OH/MS), pár-ta-a-u-yā-ar (OH or MH/MS?), pár-ta-a-u-ār (MS?), pár-ta-a-ya-ər (NS), pár-ta-yā-ar, dat.loc.sg. pár-[a-u-]nā (OH or MH/MS?), abl. pár-ta-u-na-az (KBo 8.155 ii 9 (NS)), pár-da-u-na-az (KBo 27.163, 7 (MH/NS)) pár-da-
a-u-na-za (KBo 33.188 iii14 (MH/NS)), instr. pár-ta-ú-ni-t=U-uš (KBo 17.1 i 6 (OS)), pár-ta-ú-ni-it (KUB 32.122, 6, 7 (MS?)), KUB 33.8 ii 16 (fr.), 17 (fr.) (OH/NS), pár-ta-a-ú-ni-it (KBo 4.2 i 4 (OH/NS)), KUB 15.31 i 35, ii 40 (MH/NS)), pár-ta-ú-ni-it (KUB 15.32 i 37 (MH/NS)), KBo 15.48 ii 6, 27 (MH/NS), nom.-acc.pl. [pár-t]a-a-ú-ya (OH/MS), [pá]r-ta-a-ú-ya (OH/MS), pár-ta-a-ú-ya-ar (MH/NS), dat.-loc.pl. [pár]r-ta-ú-na-aš (KUB 36.49 i 8 (OS?)), pár-ta-ú-na-aš (VBoT 125, 3 (NS)).

Derivatives: see partúni-.


PIE *prT-ó-yr / *prT-ó-un-

See CHD P: 198f. for attestations. The meaning ‘wing’ is securely attested, but some contexts are better understandable if we translate ‘feather’, which seems to indicate that partúgar could denote both. This word belongs to the small class of words in -ágar / -aun- (further ašágar / ašaun-, ḫaršágar / ḫašaun-, karaun- and šaršágar / šaraun-), which on the basis of ašágar and ḫaršágar have to be analysed as *CC-ágar. As I have argued under the lemma karaun- / karaun-, the suffix -ágar / -aun- may have to be compared with -ágar / -áun- < *-ó-tr / -ó-un-, which means that we should assume that we are dealing with *-ó-ýr / -ó-un-. For partúgar this means that we are dealing with a root part-. Within Hittite, such a root is only attested in the verb partipartiše/a2, the meaning of which is unclear, however. Nevertheless, it is quite obvious that this part- belongs with Skt. parñá- ‘wing, feather’, Lith. spáñas ‘wing’, etc. which point to *per-. This indicates that part- reflects a dental extension and that partúgar can be reconstructed *prT-ó-ýr.

The oblique case, partaun- is spelled with the sign Ú as well as with U. These spellings show a chronological distribution, namely Ú in older texts and U in younger texts. This indicates that OH /-aun-/ phonetically develops into /-aun-/ from MH times onwards (compare § 1.3.9.4.e).

partipartiše/a2 (Ic6) ‘?’: 3sg.pres.act. pár-ti-pár-ti-íš-ke-ez-zi (NS).

The word is hapax in the following context:

KUB 17.3 iii
(7) GIM-an=ma lu-uk-kat-ta nu dGiGIM.MAŠ-uš i-ya-a[r ...
(8) pár-ti-pár-ti-íš-ke-ez-zi

‘But at day-break, Gilgameš p.-s like a [...]’.
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On the basis of this context, it cannot be determined what the verb denotes. Some scholars translate ‘flies, hurries’ (e.g. Kronasser 1966: 587) on the basis of a formal similarity with partāgar / partāum- ‘wing’, but this is nothing more than a guess. No further etymology.

**parāti-** (c.) a bird: acc.pl. pār-tu-u-ni-uš (OS).

See CHD P: 200 for attestations. It is clear that the word refers to a certain kind of bird, but its exact meaning cannot be determined. Nevertheless it seems obvious that the word should be cognate with partāgar / partāum- ‘wing, feather’ (q.v.).

**NAparāša-**: see **NAparoša-**

**parza** (adv. indicating direction) ‘...-wards’; āppa parza ‘backwards, in reverse’; kattan parza ‘downwards’; parā parza ‘forwards (?)’; pār-za (often, OS), pār-aš-za (2x, MH/NS).

IE cognates: Gr. πρόντ. προν. προτί (Cret.) ‘to’, Skt. prāti ‘in the direction of’. PIE *pr-ṭi (?)

See CHD P: 196 for attestations. The spelling pār-za is the most common and attested in OS texts already. A spelling pār-aš-za is found twice only, in NS texts. Melchert (1994a: 166) attributes the alternation between pār-za and pār-aš-za to “loss of /s/ in front of /ts/”, so parāz > parz. He does not explain however, how it is possible that parza is found in OS texts already, whereas parašza is attested in NS texts only. And if we are dealing with an analogical restoration of -š-, on the basis of what? I therefore assume that parza is the original form and regard the attestations of parašza more in the line of Joseph (1984: 6f.), who suggests that parašza is a secondary formation in analogy to tapešza ‘sideward’. The one attestation pē-er-za (633/v, l.col. 4, see StBoT 15: 46) is uncertain regarding its reading and found on such a broken piece that its context cannot be reconstructed. I therefore disregard this form in this discussion.

The exact formation of parza is unclear. A connection with per / parn- ‘house’ is probably unjustified, as the abl. of this word is perza. Laroche (1970: 40) saw parza as the abl.-form that belongs to the paradigm of peran and parā (old acc. and all. respectively), which would mean that it reflects *pr-ṭi. If so, it would be comparable to Gr. πρόντ. προν. προτί (Cret.) ‘to’, Skt. prāti ‘in the direction of’. Whereas Gr. πρόντ seems to reflect *próti and Skt. prāti must reflect *práti, Cret.
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shows a zero grade formation *prī, which we have to reconstruct for Hittite as well.
If these connections are justified, they would form a major additional argument in favour of reconstructing the abl.-ending *-z as *-tī (q.v.).

Derivatives: * parzahanāššī- (adj.), defining cattle (nom.sg.c. * pār-za-b[a]-na-āš-ši-iš (NH)).

See CHD P: 201 for attestations. This word only occurs as a gen.sg. describing cattle (mostly GU₁ ‘ox’). Its exact meaning cannot be determined on the basis of the contexts in which these forms are found. Laroche (1957b: 128) suggests to analyze the word as a compound of per ‘house’ and šahhan ‘tax, feudal duty’. Apart from the fact that there is no semantic evidence to support this idea, it is formally problematic as well since the gen.sg. of šahhan is šahhanāš with geminate -h-, which contradicts the fact that parzahanāš usually shows single spelling. Nevertheless, the spellings perṣahannaš and Ė-erṣahannaš seem to fit Laroche’s analysis well, but perhaps these forms are influenced by folk-etymology. To my mind, the many different spellings of this word clearly point to a foreign origin.

Anat. cognates: CLuw. pašš- ‘to swallow’ (3sg.pres.act. pa-aš-ta, inf. pa-aš-šu-na), see * pappaša-.


PIE *poh₂-s-ei/*ph₂-senti

See CHD P: 203f. for attestations. The verb is Hittite as well as Luwian, which explains the occasional use of gloss wedges. We find forms with mi- as well as with ħi-endings (3sg.pres.act. paži besides pāši and 3sg.imp.act. pašdu besides
$p\ddot{a}\breve{u}$). Since the $mi$-inflection is the productive one, I assume that the $\breve{h}i$-inflection is original here: $p\ddot{a}h^{-}$ / $pa\ddot{s}$ -.

For 3pl.pres.act., CHD cites two attestations. The form $pa\ddot{a}-[n-z\ddot{i}]$ (KBo 34.2, 40) indeed likely means ‘they swallow’, but “$pa\ddot{s}$? (or $pi\ddot{s}$)-$\breve{a}n-z\ddot{i}$” (KUB 51.33, 4) is found in such a broken context that its meaning cannot be determined. CHD even cites this latter form twice, namely as 3pl.pres. of $p\ddot{a}h^{-}$ ‘to swallow’, and as 3pl.pres. of $pe\ddot{a}^{-}$ ‘to rub’. I therefore would leave that form out of consideration here, which means that $pa\ddot{a}-[n-z\ddot{i}]$ is the only form that we can use for our historical interpretation.

Since Sturtevant (1932b: 120) this verb is generally connected with PIE *$peh-y$- ‘to drink’ and regarded as an s-extension: *$peh-y-s$. So $p\ddot{a}hi$ / $pa\tilde{s}an\breve{z}$i reflects *$poh_{3}-s-\ddot{e}i$ / *$ph_{3}-s-\ddot{e}nti$.

In CLuwian, a reduplicated derivative is found as well, see under $pappa\ddot{a}$-.

**NINDA** $pa\tilde{s}(\ddot{a})$- (c.) a type of bread: acc.pl. $pa\ddot{a}-\ddot{sh}-u\ddot{u}$ (MH/NS), $pa\tilde{u}[/u\ddot{s}]$ (MH/NS).

See CHD P: 204. The two attestations are duplicates of each other. In a third duplicate we find NINDA $p\ddot{a}r\tilde{u}-[u\ddot{s}]$ on this spot, which could mean that $pa\ddot{a}-\ddot{sh}-u\ddot{u}$ and $pa\tilde{u}-[u\ddot{s}]$ have to be read as $p\ddot{a}r^{-}-\ddot{sh}-u\ddot{u}$ and $p\ddot{a}r^{-}-[u\ddot{s}]$ and belong to NINDA $pa\ddot{r}a$- (see at $pa\ddot{r}(i)\ddot{e}/a$- ‘to break’).

**LÜ** $pa\ddot{s}(\ddot{a})$andala- (c.) a servant in the palace kitchen, ‘taster(? ’: nom.sg. $pa\ddot{a}-\ddot{sh}a-an-da-la-a\ddot{s}$ (MH/NS), nom.pl. $pa\ddot{a}-\ddot{sh}a-an-da-li-e\ddot{s}$ (OS), gen.pl. $pa\ddot{a}-\ddot{sh}a-an-ta-f[a-a\ddot{s}]$ (OH or MH/NS).

See CHD P: 204 for attestations. Although the function of the LÜ $pa\ddot{s}andala$- is unclear, it is formally possible that the word is derived from $p\ddot{a}h^{-}$ / $pa\ddot{s}$- ‘to swallow’. Therefore, a translation ‘taster’ is often found. See $p\ddot{a}h^{-}$ / $pa\ddot{s}$- for further etymology.

$pa\ddot{s}ihae^{-}$ (Lc2) ‘to rub, to squeeze, to crush’; 3sg.pres.act. $pa\ddot{si}-\ddot{ha}-i\ddot{z}-\ddot{zi}$ (NH), $pa\ddot{si}-\ddot{ha}-a-[i\ddot{z}-\ddot{zi}]$ (NH), Luw.3sg.pres.act. $pa\ddot{si}-\ddot{ha}-a-ii$ (NH), Luw.1sg.pret.act. $pa\ddot{a}-\ddot{si}-\ddot{ha}-a-lih-\ddot{ha}$ (NH), Luw.3sg.pret.act. $pa\ddot{si}-\ddot{ha}-a-id-d[a]$ (NH), 3sg.imp.act. $pa\ddot{si}-\ddot{ha}-id-du$ (NS); 3sg.pres.midd. $pa\ddot{si}-\ddot{ha}-ta-[r]l$ (MH/NS); impf. $pa\ddot{si}-\ddot{ha}-i\ddot{s}-k\ddot{e}a$- (MH/NS).

See CHD P: 205 for attestations. The normal meaning of this verb is ‘to rub, to squeeze, to crush’, but the syntagm LÜ/GAB-($\ddot{a}$) $pa\ddot{s}ihae^{-}$ seems to denote ‘to
betray’. Because of the many Luwian inflected forms and the late attestation in the Hittite corpus, pašiḫae- probably is a Luwian verb originally. Formally, it looks as if pašiḫae- is derived from a further unattested noun *pašiḫa-. According to Starke (1990: 484), it is cognate with Hitt. peš- ‘to rub, to scrub’ (q.v.). Although semantically this would make sense, the formal consequence, namely that we have to analyse *pašiḫa- as *ps-iḫa-, is awkward since a suffix -iḫa- is further unknown.


Derivatives: \(^{(1)}\)paššilant- ‘stone, pebble’ (acc.pl. pa-aš-ši-la-an-du-uš).

See CHD P. 206f. for attestations. Most forms show a stem paššila-, but paššilu- (acc.sg. paššilun) and paššili- (dat.-loc.pl. paššiliyaš) occasionally occur as well. Already since Sturtevant (1930d: 126) the word has generally been connected with Skt. bhāṣan- ‘ash’ and Gr. ψάκσ, ‘pebble’ from *b'hēς- ‘to rub (in pieces)’. Although semantically this connection could be possible, formally it is difficult. What kind of suffix is -iḫa-? Why do we find geminate -šš-? Traditionally, paššila- is seen as belonging with paššu- (q.v.), but this has become improbable as paššu- does not mean ‘rock’. Cf. also \(^{(1)}\)paššuela-.

pāšk-\(^{1}\) / pāšk- (Ila2 > Ic1, Ic2) ‘to stick in, to fasten, to plant; to set up; to impale’: 1sg.pres.act. pa-aš-ka-ah-ḫi (NS), pa-aš-ga-mi (NS), 3sg.pres.act. pa-aš-ki (MH/MS), pa-aš-ki-ez-zí (MS), 3pl.pres.act. pa-aš-kān-zí (MS?), [p]a'-a-aš-kān-zí (KBo 29.92 ii 14 (MH/NS)), 1sg.pret.act. pa-aš-ga-[i]-hu-un?] (NH), 3sg.pret.act. pa-aš-ki-et (OH/MS?), 1pl.pret.act. pa-aš-ki-ja-u-en, 3pl.pret.act. pa-aš-ke-er (OH or MH/NS), 3sg.imp.act. pa-aš-ki-e[d]-du?; part. pa-aš-kān-t (MH/MS); verb.noun pa-aš-ga-u-ya-ar; impf. pa-aš-ke-es-ke/a- (MH/NS).

PIE *PāšK-ei, *PsK-ėnti

See CHD P. 207 for attestations. This verb shows a variety of stems, of which it is not always immediately clear how to interpret them, also because of the ambiguity of the signs KI, IZ and IT that can be read ki or ke, iz or ez and it or et, respectively. Usually, this verb is regarded as an original imperfective in -ške/a-
(e.g. Oettinger 1979a: 326-7). This could indeed ey a meaningful interpretation of the forms 1sg.pres.act. pa-áš-ga-mi, 3sg.pres.act. pa-áš-KI-Iz-zi when read as pa-áš-ke-ez-zi, 3pl.pres.act. pa-áš-kán-zi, 3sg.pres.act. pa-áš-KI-IT when read as pa-áš-ke-et, 3pl.pret.act. pa-áš-ke-er, 3sg.imp.act. pa-áš-KI-ID-du when read as pa-áš-ke-ed-du and verb.noun pa-áš-ga-u-ya-ar. Although this seems to be an impressive list, I am doubting its correctness. In my view, the 3sg.pres.act.-form pa-áš-ki, which is multiple times attested in MS texts already, it would be unexplicable when we start from an original paradigm in -ške/a-. In my view, it is so aberrant that it must reflect the oldest type. I therefore assume that this form shows that we are dealing with an original ši-inflecting verb pašk-. If the one attestation [p]aš-a-áš-kán-zi indeed belongs here (but note the doubts expressed in CHD), it would even show that we are dealing with an original ablauting stem pšők2 / pašk-. This inflection would fit the following forms: 1sg.pres.act. pa-áš-ka-al-ší = /pšókHí/, 3pl.pres.act. pa-áš-kán-zi = /psánt’I/, 1sg.pres.act. pa-áš-ga-al[-hu-un] = /pšókHon/, 3pl.pret.act. pa-áš-ke-er = /pskét/ and part. pa-áš-kán-t = /psánt-l. In my view, the forms pa-áš-KI-Iz-zi, etc. must be read as pa-áš-ke-ez-zi, showing a stem paškije/a2 (also in pa-áš-ki-et, pa-áš-ki-ja-uni and pa-áš-ki-[el-du]), which can easily be explained as a secondary formation on the basis of 3sg.pres.act. paškí. The forms pa-áš-ga-mi and pa-áš-ga-u-ya-ar show a stem paškaje2, inflecting according to the ḫatrae-class that is highly productive in NH times.

This formal analysis is important for the etymological interpretation of this verb: all etymologies that are based on the assumption that pšők2 / pašk- is a -ške/a-imperfective originally cannot be correct. This goes for Oettinger (l.c.), who reconstructs *pas-sk-, which he connects with the verb peš- ‘to rub’ (q.v.) as well as Rikov (1982: 24) and Melchert (1994a: 167) who assume that this verb reflects *pakske/a- from the PIE root *peh₂-g- ‘fest werden’ or *peh₂-k- ‘festmachen’. Formally, we can only start from a root *PesK- (for the root structure, cf. the root *mosg- ‘marrow’), showing an inflection *Pósk-‘énti. I must admit that I know of no convincing IE cognates, however.

pašk−2 (Ib1 > Ic2) ‘to reject, to ignore; to neglect; to remove’: Luw.3sg.pres.act. [pa-áš]-ku-ti (NS), 3pl.pres.act. pa-áš-ku-ya-an-zi (OH or MH/MS), 1sg.pret.act. pa-áš-ku-ya-um (NH), pa[-aš-ku-ya]-a-um (NH), pa-áš-ku-ya-nu-um (NH), 3sg.pret.act. pa-áš-ku-ta (MH/MS), pa-áš-ku-ya-it (NH), 3sg.imp.act. pa-áš-ku-tu (NS); 2sg.pres.midd. pa-áš-ku-i-it-ta (OH/NS).

Anat. cognates: HLuw. paskw- ‘to neglect’ (3sg.pres.act. /paskʷi/ pa-šù-REL-i (SULTANHAN §20)).
See CHD P: 208-9 for attestations. The original stem is pašku-, which is visible in the MS forms paškutta and paškujanzi. Especially the form 3sg.pret.act. paškutta (and not **paškut) shows that we have to phonologically interpret this stem as /pašk/-l. In NH times, the trivial transition into the ħatrae-class yielded forms like pašku_panun and paškuqait. In HLuwian, we find a verbal form pa-saś-REL-i 'neglects' which likely is to be interpreted as /pašku/i (note the hi-inflection), which would indicate that the Panat. form was *Pask"- (since *g" would have disappeared in Luwian). This is supported by the PN 1Pa-aš-ku-ya-am-mi-iš (KUB 31.59 ii 4), which formally is to be interpreted as a Luwian participle of a stem pašku(ya)-. I know of no IE cognates however.


See CHD P: 211f. for attestations. The exact meaning of this word is not clear, but CHD states that 'p. is a raised structure or area [...] on which dignitaries step or stand, and where statues can be erected'. Often we find paššu- translated as 'stone pedestal, rock', based on the formal similarity with paššila- 'stone, pebble', but CHD argues that the word hardly can denote a rock: 'if it were a rock one would expect at least once the det. NA'. This means that all traditional etymologies of this word, which presuppose a connection with paššila- 'stone, pebble', are likely to be incorrect (e.g. the equation with Skt. pāṛṣṣu- 'dust'). I do not have a good alternative, however.

\[ \text{NApaššuela-} \] (gender unclear) a stone object: dat.-loc.pl. pa-aš-šu-e-la-aš.

This word is hapax in a broken and unclear context. Only the use of the determinative NA is indicative that the word must denote a stone object. Often, the word is connected with paššu- (q.v.), but as this latter word probably did not mean 'rock', the connection is quite random. A connection with \[ \text{NApāššila-} \] 'stone, pebble' (q.v.) may seem more likely, but is hard to interpret formally. No further etymology.
=pat (enclitic particle of specification, limitation and identity) ‘the same, the aforementioned (anaphoric); likewise, as before; self; only, exclusively; in addition; rather; even; certainly’: =páṭ (OS).

IE cognates: Av. bā, bāḍ, bē, bāṭ (particles of emphasis), Arm. ba, bay (emphasizing particle), Goth. ba (cond. particle), Lith. bā ‘really, indeed’, OCS bo ‘then’.

PIE *=bʰo’d

See CHD P. 213f. for a semantic discussion. This particle is written with the sign BAD only, which in principle can be read pāṭ as well as pīt. Although in the older literature the reading =pīt sometimes can be found, nowadays this clitic is usually cited as =pāṭ. This is not a fully arbitrary choice: we know that the most common reading of the sign BAD is pāṭ and that words where it should be read pīt often are spelled with pi-it as well. Because this clitic is never spelled * =pi-it, it is likely that we should read =pāṭ here. Moreover, this reading may be supported by the form a-ki-pa-[t-š]a-an (KBo 5.3 iii 31) if this indeed denotes aki = pat = šan. Puhvel (1979a: 217) argued that the particle should be read =pē, however, which he concluded on the basis of his etymological connection with Av. bā ‘truly’ and Lith. bā ‘surely’. Note that although the reading pē for the sign BAD is common in Akkadian texts, it is as far as I know never used in Hittite texts. I therefore reject Puhvel’s view.

CHD observes that spellings like a-pi-ja-pāṭ show that the phonological form of this particle is /=bat/ (or /=bad/), with lenis -b-. This would mean that the quite common etymological connection with Lith. pāṭ (indecl. particle) ‘self, just’ that would point to a reconstruction *pot, is impossible (Pedersen 1935: 80-88 and followers).

Within Hittite, I think we can compare =pat to the second part of apāṭ ‘that (near you)’. The first part, a-, is likely to be equated with the demonstrative a- (aši / uni / ini) which means that -pāṭ is some kind of suffix, reflecting *-bʰo-. If =pat indeed is cognate to that suffix, then we can equate it with nom.-acc.sg.n. apāṭ < *h₁o-bʰōd. The clitic =pat then reflects unaccentuated *-bʰod. The suffix perhaps belongs with “*bʰe⁄o” (Pokorny 1959: 113) as reconstructed on the basis of the emphasizing particles Av. bā, bāḍ, bē, bāṭ, Arm. ba, bay, etc.

(MS), gen.pl. pa-ta-a-n=a (OS), pa-ta-a-an (OH/MS), [p]a-a-ta-an (OH/NS), dat.-loc.pl. pa-ta-a-aš (OS),


Anat. cognates: CLuw. ṝpāṭa/- ‘foot’ (abl.-instr. pa-ta-i, coll.pl. GIRMES-ta, dat.-loc.pl. pa-a-ta-an-ra, gen.adj.nom.-acc.sg.n. pa-a-ta-aš-ša-an-za); HLuw. ṝpada/- (c.) ‘foot’ (loc.sg. ḫ pes pa-ta- (SULTANHAN §6), instr. ḫ pes pa+ra/i-ri+i (ASSUR letters f+g §24), acc.pl. ḫ pes pa-ti-zi (MARAŞ 4 §13), dat.-loc.pl. ḫ pes pa-ta-za (KARATEPE 1 §22), ḫ pes pa+ra/i-za (SULTANHAN §9)); Lyč. pede/- ‘foot’ (abl.-instr. pedeši).

IE cognates: Skt. ṝpá- ‘foot’, ṝpáda- ‘foot’, Arm. ot ‘foot’, Gr. (Dor.) τάκχ; ṝpako ‘foot’, Lat. pēs, ped-is ‘foot’.

PIE ṝpōd/- /pd-/

An etymological interpretation of this word was first given by Friedrich (HW: 165), who convincingly connected it with PIE ṝpod- ‘foot’. Although this connection is generally accepted, it is not easy to interpret the Hittite forms coherently.

An overview of forms can be found in CHD P: 231f.. Note however that there is stated that in IBoT 2.109 ii 25 a nom.sg. GIR-iš can be found, but this is incorrect: the form in fact is GIR-aš. This makes nom.sg. GIR-iš as indeed attested twice on the tablet KUB 9.4 (i 14 and 33) a hapax form. According to CHD this GIR-iš is to be regarded as a Luwian form, which is possible but not obligatory: KUB 9.4 contains many scribal errors and grammatical singularities, which makes it possible that GIR-iš is just a mistaken form.

On the basis of nom.sg. GIR-aš and acc.sg. GIR-an, it is often assumed that we are dealing with an o-stem noun pata-. These forms are found in NS texts only, however. When we look at the oldest attested forms (OS and MS) of this word, we only find plural forms. If we compare acc.pl. pāṭuš with gen.pl. pāṭu and dat.-loc.pl. pāṭaš, it is hard not to interpret these forms as showing accentual mobility, and subsequently even ablaut: /pāduš/ vs. /pḏaš/ and /pḏaš/. Since ablaut is not to be expected in an o-stem noun, it is in my view likely that in the oldest stage of Hittite, this word still was a root noun, which was secondarily thematicized in NH times only (compare the development of tuekk- / tukk- to tuekka-). I therefore reconstruct acc.pl. ṝpōd-ms, gen.pl. ṝpōd-öm and dat.-loc.pl.
*pd-ás. Note that in Hittite there is no evidence for an e-grade form *ped- as is usually assumed on the basis of Lat. pēš.

The CLuwian attestations of ‘foot’ need some commentary. Melchert (1993b: 173) cites nom.sg. pa-ta-šša (KBo 29.25 iii 5-7) and pa-ta-aš (KUB 25.37 ii 28), but the interpretation of these forms are far from ascertained (note that of the first form Melchert himself does not exclude a reading pa-ta-t[i]). An erg.pl. {pa-ta-ta}n-ta is cited by Starke 1985: 226 (KUB 35.88 ii 8), but to my mind, there is no positive evidence for this addition. This leaves us only with abl.-instr. patat, coll.3 pl. G1RMEŞ-ta (interpreted by Schindler apud Watkins 1986: 60 as a dual-form), dat.-loc.pl. pāranza and gen.adj. pātašša-i-. Especially the fact that the alleged nom.sg.-forms are unascertained, leaves the way open for assuming that in CLuwian this word showed i-motion, just as we find in HLuwian (acc.pl. patinz).


Derivatives: **patteššar** / **patteš**- (n.) ‘excavation, pit, hole in the ground, breach (in wall)’ (nom.-acc.sg. pāt-te-eš-šar (MH/MS?), dat.-loc.sg. pāt-te-eš-ni (OH/NS), pāt-te-iš-ni (MH?/NS)).

IE cognates: Lat. fōdio ‘to dig’, OCS bodó ‘to stab’, Lith.bedū ‘to stick, to dig’, etc.

**PIE *ʰdʰədʰh₇-ei, *ʰdʰdʰh₇-énti**

See CHD P: 235f. for attestations. The verb and its derivative is consistently spelled with the initial sign BAD, which can be read pāt as well as pūt. CHD therefore cites this verb as “padda- (or: pidda-)” and states that its usual transcription padd(a)- is an “arbitrary” choice. This is not fully the case, however: if the verb were pidd(a)- (with a reading pūt), we would expect that at least a few times it was spelled with initial pi-it- (cf. e.g. the verb piddae⁻² “to bring, to render” that is spelled pī-da- as well as pi-id-da-). I therefore stick to the usual practice and assume that this verbs has to be read with a vowel -a-.

Since Sturtevant (1938a: 107) padd(a)- is generally connected with Lat. fōdio ‘to dig’, OCS bodó ‘to stab’, Lith. bedū ‘to stick, to dig’, etc. These latter forms all seem to go back to a root *ʰdʰedʰ-, which is problematic because PIE *dʰ
not correspond to Hitt. -tr-. Melchert (1984a: 26\textsuperscript{75}) therefore reconstructs the root as \*bʰ\textsuperscript{6}edʰ\textsuperscript{7}r-, referring to mekki- ‘much, many’ < *meğʰ\textsuperscript{3}i- that shows that *Dh\textsuperscript{2} > Hitt. -T- (followed in e.g. LIV\textsuperscript{5}). Another problem is the fact that padd(a)- inflects according to the tarn(a)-class: paddaḫi, paddāḫ, paddanzi. The tarn(a)-class mainly consists of verbs that go back to a structure *(Ce)CoH-ei, *(Ce)CH-enti, which yielded Hitt. (Ce)Cā, (Ce)Canzi. Such a reconstruction is impossible for padd(a)- however. We would rather expect that this verb would have behaved like other verbs with a root structure *CeC-, namely *CoC-ei, *CC-enti > Hitt. CāCi, CCanzi. Nevertheless, as I have argued in § 2.2.2.2.d, verbs that show a structure *CeCh\textsubscript{3}- end up in the tarn(a)-class: the 3sg.pres.-form of roots of this structure, *CōCh\textsubscript{2}-eī, regularly yielded *CaCai (and not **CaCi), on the basis of which these verbs were taken over into the tarn(a)-class (see ẖarr\textsuperscript{2} - ĥar- ‘to grind’, ʾškall\textsuperscript{2} - ʾškall- ‘to slit, to tear’, ʾisparr\textsuperscript{2} - ʾisparr- ‘to trample’, mall\textsuperscript{2} - mall- ‘to mill’ and šarta\textsuperscript{2} - šart- ‘to wipe, to rub’ for the same phenomenon). This would be an additional argument in favour of reconstructing a root \*bʰ\textsuperscript{6}edʰ\textsuperscript{7}r- and not \*bʰ\textsuperscript{6}edʰ-.
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Almost all forms of this verb and its derivatives are spelled with an initial sign BAD, which can be read pāt or pīt. Traditionally, the verb is transliterated with pīt-, which is done on the basis of two instances where we (allegedly) find pī-it- (cf. Tischler HEG P: 624). The first instance is KUB 56.46 vi 3, which is transliterated in its edition StBoT 25: 102 as (line 10) t=a-aš pī-it-ta-i [ ... ], whereas CHD cites the line as t=a-aš pī-ḫt-[a-i]. The meaning of this sentence is ascertained by the fact that it is the NS duplicate of the OS text KB o 17.43 where we find: i (6) t=a-aš BAD-da-a-i ‘he runs off’. When we look at the handcopy of KUB 56.46, however, we see that this line is rather damaged:

The word ta-aš indeed is clearly visible, but right after this word the tablet breaks off, leaving us only with traces of the lower parts of the following three signs. The traces of the first sign (vertical wedge and a winkelhaken) could indeed be the lower part of the sign BI (= pī), but could just as well be interpreted as the sign BAD (=pāt/pīt). The traces of the second sign (vertical wedge, winkelhaken and the lower part of a horizontal wedge) could indeed be read as the lower part of the sign IT, but in my view could be the lower part of the sign TA as well. The only trace of the third sign is the head of a vertical wedge, after which the tablet breaks off. This indeed could fit a sign TA, but a sign I is possible as well. So, instead of reading this passage as

\[\text{ta-aš pī-ḫt-[a-i]}\]

one could just as well argue for reading this passage as

\[\text{ta-aš pīt-[a-i]}\]

A second instance of a spelling pī-it- is found in KB o 3.34 ii (35) ni-ku-ma-anza u-qa-a-tar pī-it-ta-iz-zi, which, according to CHD (P: 354) can be translated either ‘naked he runs a review’ or ‘naked he carries water’. The form pī-it-ta-iz-zi is inflected according to the \text{ḥatrae}-class and not according to the \text{dāt}i\text{tjanzi}-class, and therefore I assume that it rather belongs with \text{pittae}-² ‘to bring, to render’ than with \text{pattai}-² / patti- (although we do find \text{ḥatrae}-class inflected
forms in the paradigm of pattai- / patti- in NH texts due to the enormous productivity of this class in that period.

In the OS text KBo 7.14 + KUB 36.100 we find obv. 27 [...]x pi-ti-nu-an ḫar-ki[ān-zi], which by some is interpreted as belonging to the verb that normally is spelled BAD-ti-nu- and therefore would indicate a reading pīt. Nevertheless, the context is that broken that its meaning cannot be independently determined, and therefore I will leave this form out of consideration (thus also CHD P: 365). Puhvel (1979a: 212) cites a form L0 pi-te-an] (KUB 40.5 ii 10), which he interprets as showing that BAD-te-an-t- has to be read as pīt-te-an-t-. Although the handwritten text indeed seems to show the sign BI = pī, CHD (P: 363) cites this form as “L0 pīt-te-an]” with the sign BAD.

All in all I conclude that there are no secure examples of this verb that are spelled with initial pīt-. This means that we only have spellings with the sign BAD. In the majority of cases in Hititite, this sign has to be read as pāt, which I therefore propose to do for this verb as well: pattai- / patti- (but note that in all the other literature this verb is cited as pittai-, pitti- or pitti=a-).

The oldest forms of this verb clearly point to the dā/i/tianzi-inflection: pattāi / pattijanzi. In younger texts we find forms that show a stem patti/e/a-related (which is common in dā/i/tianzi-verbs) and pattae (according to the ḫatrae-class which is highly productive in NH times).

Already since Sturtevant (1927c: 221) this verb is connected with Skt. pātati ‘to fly’, Gr. πεταμένα ‘to fly’, etc. The exact root-shape of these forms is unclear, however: LIV2 cites three different roots, *peth1- ‘fallen’, *peth2- ‘ausbreiten’ and *peth3- ‘(auf)fliegen’ (although the latter two probably have to be equated, see under pattar / pattan- ‘wing; feather’). As I have explained in Kloeckhorst.fthc.a, the dā/i/tianzi-class verbs have to be analysed as reflecting *CC-o/- *CC-i, i.e. the zero-grade of a root followed by an ablauting suffix *-oi/-i-. In the case of pattai-/patti-, this would mean that we have to reconstruct *pH-i-oi-ei, *pH-i-ēnti. Note that on the basis of this reconstruction as well, I phonologically interpret pāt-ta-a-i, pā-ti-ja-an-zi as /ptāl/, /ptiántl/ (so with an initial cluster /pt/-, which may explain the fact that no spellings with *pa-at- are attested).

The derivative L0 pattejant- ‘fugitive’ is interesting. Semantically, we would expect that the notion ‘fugitive’ < ‘*the one who has fled’ would be expressed by a participle, which in the case of pattai-/patti- should have been *pH-i-ent- > pattijant-. This form indeed is attested, but in the younger texts only. In the oldest texts (OS) we only find pāt-te-ja-an-t-, which implies a reconstruction *pH-ei-ent- (cf. L1 maìant- ‘adult man’ < *mh2-ei-ent- besides part. miìant- ‘grown’ <
*mh₂-i-ent*). If this analysis is correct, it would imply that reconstructing a root *peth₂* now has become impossible, as *pth₂-ei-ent* would have given *pattajant*. I therefore reconstruct *pth₁-ei-ent*.

The causative *pattimnu* is spelled *pāt-ti-nu* in the oldest texts (OS), but sometimes *pāt-te-nu* from MH times onwards. Either this is due to influence of the derivative *pattejant*, or to the confusion of the signs TE and TI in younger times (cf. Melchert 1984a: 137).

---


Derivatives: **patallīje/a-²** (Ic1) ‘to tie feet, to fetter’ (3pl.imp.act. *pa-tal-li-[a-an-du* (MH/NS)).

See CHD P: 238 and 240 for attestations. The word is probably derived from *pāt/-pat* ‘foot’ (q.v.). The connection with (G) **patallā** ‘sole of foot; fetter’ is unclear. If they belong together, *patallā* should reflect *p(o)d-lh₂o*-., whereas *patalla-* < *p(o)d-olh₂o*-.

---


Derivatives: **patallāce-²** (Ic2) ‘to fetter(?)’ (1sg.pres.act. *pa-[tal-ḥa-e-mi* (OS), part. *pa’-tal-ḥa-an-t* (NH)).


See CHD P: 238f. for attestations. Semantically, a connection with *pāt/-pat* ‘foot’ (q.v.) seems likely, but the formation nevertheless remains opaque. A cluster -lh- can only have survived if it reflects *CLh₂₁V* (whereas *VHV > VII*). Combining these arguments would lead to a reconstruction *p(o)d-lh₂o*-.. The connection between *patallā* and *patalla* ‘fetter(?)’ (q.v., with derivative **patallīje/a-²** ‘to tie feet, to fetter’) is unclear. If *patallā* reflects *p(o)d-lh₂o*-., does *patalla* then reflect *p(o)d-olh₂o*-?

---

Derivatives: **pattarpalhi-** (c.) an oracle bird, lit. ‘broad-winged’ (nom.sg. pát-tar-pal-hi-iš (NH), pát-tar-pal-hi-eš (NH), acc.sg. pát-tar-pal-hi-in (NH), pát-tar-pal-hi-en (NH), gen.sg. pát-tar-pal-hi-aš (NH), nom.pl. pát-tar-pal-hi-iš (NH), acc.pl.? pát-tar-pal-ḫu-[uš?] (NH)).


PIE *pēθ-y-r/*pēθ₂-én- or *pēθ₂(ō)r/*pēθ₂-én-

See CHD P. 240f. for attestations. The word is always spelled with the sign BAD, which in Hittite usually is to be read pāt, but in principle could be read pī/ptē as well. This is the reason for CHD to cite this word as *(UZU)* *pattar* or *(UZU)* *pittar*”, but consensus has it to read this word as *pattar*. Note that with a reading *pattar*, this word would become homophonous to *(Gī, Gīš)* *pattar, patten-* ‘basket’ (of which a reading *pat-* is ascertained because of occasional spellings with *pa-at-*). Some scholars have argued that *pattar* ‘basket’ is named after *pattar* ‘wing, feather’ because it was feather-shaped. If this is correct (but there is not a shred of evidence for such a form of the basket), it would prove that ‘wing, feather’ is to be read as *pattar* and not as *pittar*.

The word clearly belongs with the PIE root *pet(H)*- ‘to fly, to fall’, the exact form of which is dubious. LIV distinguishes three roots: *pet₁*- ‘to fall’ (Gr. πέττα, ἐπέττα ‘to fall’), *pet₂*- ‘to fly’ (Gr. πέταμι, ἐπέταμι ‘to fly’) and *pet₂*- ‘to spread out’ (Gr. πετάμιμ ‘to spread out’). In my view, it is likely that *pet₂*- ‘to fly’ and *pet₂*- ‘to spread out’ are identical, especially if ‘to spread out’ is used for ‘wings’.

The word belongs to the r/n-class, but its precise formation is unclear. If we read the sign BAD with -a-, the nom.-acc.sg. *pattar* seems best explained by assuming a proterodynamic *pōt(H)-r*. The oblique stem *pattan*- (in dat.-loc.pl. *pattanaš*) could be phonologically interpreted either as *p(a)tn-1* or as *p(a)tn-1-*. The first interpretation would fit a hysterodynamic preform *pt(H)-n-ós* best, whereas the second interpretation could reflect hysterodynamic *pt(H)-Vn-(o)s*. Normally, such hysterodynamic oblique cases have a suffix-syllable -en-, which in principle should yield Hitt. -en- (e.g. *pahhunens << *ph₂-ēn-s, *yidens << *ud-ēn-s*). If the root was *pet₂*, however, then *h₂* could be held responsible for colouring *en- to -an-: *ph₂-ēn-s >> pattanaš* (with trivial introduction of the full grade in the root and the replacement of the gen.-ending by *-os*, so virtually *peth₂-en-os*). Note that this would exclude reconstructing a root *pet- or *pet₁-. If we read the sign BAD with the vowel -e-, so *pettar / pettan-*, we would have to adopt our reconstruction to *pēθ₂(ō)r, pēθ₂-én-os.*
The other IE words for ‘feather’ or ‘wing’ show traces of an -r/n-stem, too: OHG *fedara, ON *fjôdr ‘feather’, fôðri ‘feathers’ reflect *peîr̥-; Gr. πτερόν < *pt-er-; Lat. penna < *pet-n-; Skt. pātra- ‘wing’ < peît-ṛ-ro-. Note that almost all these forms show e-grade in the root, which could perhaps be an argument for interpreting the Hittite word as pettar / pettan-.

See CHD P: 241f. for attestations. Although the usual spelling of this word is with the sign BAD (which, besides pāt can be read pīt/pēt as well), the occasional spellings with initial pa-at- (in OS texts only) clearly indicate that we have to interpret this word as pettar / pettan-. The word denotes some kind of basket (made of wicker or reed) in which all kinds of things are carried. Formally, the word seems to be homophonous with (U2) pettar / pettan- ‘feather, wing’ (if this word should not be read pettar / pettan-), which made some scholars think that the basket was feather-shaped vel sim. If this indeed is the case, this could be an argument for reading pettar ‘feather’ as pettar definitively (it is attested with the sign BAD only).

The fact that this word is (well) attested from OS times onwards, and the fact that it is an -r/n-stem makes it probable that it is an inherited word. The nom.-acc.sg. pettar seems to point to *Pōt-r. The oblique cases show two different forms, both occurring in OS texts already: dat.-loc.sg. pattani besides pattani. The first one seems to be hysterodynamic (*Pt-ṇ-i), whereas the second one proterodynamic (*Pt-ōn-i). Perhaps this situation is to be compared to šharr / išhān- and uttar / uddan- where originally proterodynamically inflected nouns show hysterodynamic accentuation in synchronic Hittite.

The root etymology is difficult. Krieken (297ff.) connects this word with the IE root *peθ₂- ‘to spread out’, but I do not understand the semantic connection. See at the lemma (U2) pettar / pettan- ‘wing, feather’ for the possibility that this word is identical to ‘basket’. Other etymologies include connections with Skt. pātra- ‘bowl, vessel’ (but this reflects *peθ₂-tro- from *peθ₂- ‘to drink’) and Gr. πτήνη ‘dish’ (difficult to judge formally). All in all, the etymology of this word is not fully clear.


See CHD P: 247f. for attestations and discussion. On the basis of the Hittite contexts, the exact meaning of **padur / paddun-** cannot be determined: it is clear that it refers to some object, and the consistent use of the determinative GIŠ indicates that that object is made of wood. In a CLuwian context, we find an abl.-instr. battunāi that glosses the sumerogram **nAGA** ‘mortar’, however. If this CLuw. battun- is to be equated with the oblique stem of Hitt. **padur / paddun-**, then a meaning ‘mortar’ for the latter word is likely as well. Moreover, it would show that the sign BAD, which can be read pāt as well as pīt and with which all the Hittite forms are spelled, should be read as pāt in this word.

Rieken (1999a: 357f.) remarks that the oxtone accentuation /patunī/ is unparalleled in Hittite -yer-/-yen-stems, and therefore assumes a Luwianism. She proposes to connect this word with peran pattunaš, a utensil for carrying (see under peran ped(du)unaš). See there for a discussion.

**pe(-)** (prev.) ‘away, thither’: see pe ẖar(k)-Z ‘to have, to hold’, peẖute-Z / peẖut-‘to lead, to bring’, peje-Z / pej- ‘to send’, penna-I / penn- ‘to drive (there)’, peššije/a-Z ‘to throw away’, peda-I / ped- ‘to take, to carry’, pați-Z / pai- ‘to go’. PIE *h₂p-ei

The preverb pe- ‘away, thither’ functions on a par with the preverb u- ‘hither’ in the sense that both can be prefixed to a verb to give it an extra semantic element of direction. The two preverbs function as opposites: peda-I / ped- ‘to bring (away)’ vs. uda-I / ud- ‘to bring (here)’ (besides the simplex dā-I / d- ‘to take’): penna-I / penni- ‘to drive away’ vs. ūma-I / ūmi- ‘to lead here’ (besides the simplex nai-I/Z / *ni- ‘to lead’).

The exact interpretation of pe- is in debate, especially because in the verb pați-Z / pai- ‘to go’ (antonym of uez / uṣa- ‘to come’ from the simplex i-Z, je/a₁luru ‘to go’) no vowel -e- can be found. According to Melchert (1994a: 133), pe- must reflect *pē, which he concludes on the basis of an equation of Hitt. peššije/a-Z with “H盧v. pa-si-ya-”. It is unclear to me, however, to which form he refers: I have not been able to find any verb pasija- (or noun, for that matter) in the HLUwian corpus (see also at peššije/a-Z). In order to explain the verb pați-Z / pai-, Melchert (1994a: 177) states that the preform *pe-h₂j-enti regularly yields
*paianzi due to the sound law *ehi > Hitt. a[i. He then assumes that the stem pa[i- has spread throughout the paradigm, replacing the full-grade stem *pe-hie-i which regularly should have given Hitt. **pē-. In my view, the development *ehi > a[j cannot be substantiated: all alleged examples of it (e.g. dāi < *da[i < *d[ehi-ei) have to be explained differently (I reconstruct dāi < *da[i as *d[h[i-ô-ei). All in all, Melchert’s reconstruction of pe- as *pē must be incorrect.

Eichner (1973a: 78) reconstructs pe- as *poi. The idea is that in isolation *poi monophthongizes to pe, but before vowels yield pai- as visible in pai-[2] / pai-. Although I do not think that Eichner’s interpretation of the latter verb is fully correct (he assumes that *poi-hiênti regularly yields *paianzi > pānzi, whereas e.g. *h2hiênti > OH ḫuianzi ‘they run’ shows that such a preform should have yielded OH **paianzi with a preserved intervocalic -i-), I do accept his idea that the -e- of pe- goes back to *-oi-. According to Eichner, *po-i is the old “i-Lokatîv” corresponding to BSL. *po (“endungsloser Lok.”) and Iran.-Gr. *po-ti (“Adverbialklaus”). Another possibility would be to connect pe- ‘away, thither’ with Gr. ἐν (en) ‘upon, over, on to’, Skt. āpi ‘also, further, even’, Arm. ew ‘and’ that reflect *h[iep-i. I therefore reconstruct pe- as *h[poi.

pe ḫar(k)-[2] (la4) ‘to have, to hold, to keep possession of; to hold ready; to present, to bring’: 3sg.pres.act. pé-e ḫar-zi (MH/MS, OH/NS), 1pl.pres.act. pé-e ḫar-û-e-ni (OH or MH/NS), 2pl.pres.act. pé-e ḫar-te-ni (OH or MH/NS), 3pl.pres.act. pé-e ḫar-kân-zi (MH/MS, OH/NS), 1sg.pret.act. pé-e ḫar-ku-un (NH), 3sg.pret.act. pé-e ḫar-ta, pé-e ḫar-da, 3pl.pret.act. pé-e ḫar-ke-er (NH), pé-e ḫar-ker (NS), 3sg.imp.act. pé-e ḫar-ţ[u] (NH), 2pl.imp.act. pé-e ḫar-tén (OH or MH/NS); part. pé-ḵar-kán (NH).

PIE *h[poi + *h[erk-

See CHD P: 253 for attestations (note that there 3sg.pret.act. pé-e ḫar-ta (often) and pé-e ḫar-da (KBo 18.54 obv. 9) are omitted). The preverb is almost consistently spelled pé-e, except in the one really univerbated form pé-ḫar-kán. Although this latter form shows that eventually the verb and preverb were univerbated, MH forms like KUB 26.17 ii (12) pé-e=pát ḫar-kân-zi show that this was not the case in older Hittite.

See at ḫar(k)-[2] and pe(-) for further etymology. According to Watkins (1970: 73) a similar formation can be found in Lat. porceā ‘to prevent, to restrain’ < *po + arceā.

PIE *hpoi-h2ou-dʰeh₁-ti/*hpoi-h2ou-dʰent₁

See CHD P; 257f. for attestations. Because of the spelling BI-e-hu-, which clearly must be read pé-e-hu-, the spelling BI-hu- must be read pé-hu- as well. The verb denotes ‘to lead, to bring (there)’ and functions as the opposite of uyate² / uyat- ‘to bring here’.

Oettinger (1979a: 125, following Watkins 1969a: 69) analyses this verb as *pē + h₂au + dē-, which seems basically correct to me. The element *h₂au is equated by Oettinger with ĥu as found in ĥu ‘come’. I agree with him, but would further equate this element with the prefix u- ‘hither’, which I reconstruct as *h₂ou. The verbal stem *te² / t- evidently goes back to PIE *dʰeh₁- ‘to put, to place’ (see at iē²). All in all, I reconstruct *hpoi-h2ou-dʰeh₁-ti/*hpoi-h2ou-dʰent₁.


Derivatives: pejanazziæ/a- (IIg) ‘to be rewarded’ (2sg.pres.midd. pé-ja-na-az-zi-at-ta, 3pl.pres.midd. [pé]-a- na-az-zi-an-da).
See CHD P: 249f. for attestations. It is not fully clear whether we are dealing with a verb *pijanae- or *pejanae-. The latter interpretation is obligatory in one form, viz. BI-e-ja-na-u-ya-an-zi, which must be read *pe-ja- = /peia-. Most other forms are spelled with BI-ja-, which normally would stand for *pi-ja-, but in principle can be read *pe-ja- as well. Two forms are spelled BI-i-ja-, which seem to point to *pi-i-ja-, but if necessary, could be read *pe-i-ja- = /peia- as well. I therefore cite this verb as *pejanae-² here.

The verb clearly belongs to the *hatrae-class, which means that it is denominative. At first sight we would assume that it is derived from a noun *pejana-, but since I know of no other examples of *hatrae-verbs that end in -anae-, I am wondering to what extent it is possible to assume that the basic noun was *pejan- (an n-stem). This latter noun would structurally be comparable to e.g. me(j)an- ‘range (of a year), extent’. At first sight, this *pejan-, which probably meant ‘reward’ or sim., seems to be connectable with pai² / pi- ‘to give’ (q.v.). If the e-vowel of *pijanae- is real, this is difficult to coincide with pai-/pi-, however. Therefore, one could perhaps better assume a connection with peje² / pej- ‘to send’ (q.v.). This would mean that *pijanae- goes back to virtual *h›po(ḫ) ›i3ih ›on ›až/ ›a-. See at peje² / pej- for further etymology.

Note that Tischler (HEG P: 611f.) cites this verb under “piyannai-/piyanniya-”, with which he means the imperfective pijanna- / pijanni- (see under pai² / pi- ‘to give’). This is incorrect: not only do the forms of the verb *pejanae- (or *pijanae- if one chooses to read it thus) specifically not fit the paradigm of pijanna/i- (for which we would expect *pijannahḫi, *pijannati, *pijannai, *pijannišeni, *pijannišati), also the single spelling of -n- makes pejanae-clearly distinct from the imperfective pijanna/i- (imperfectives in -anna/i- are consistently spelled with geminate -nn-).

peje² / pej- (Ia1 > Ic1 > Ic2) ‘to send’: 1sg.pres.act. pé-i-ja-mi (MH/MS), pé-i-e-mi (MH/NS), pé-e-i-mi (OH/NS), pé-ja-mi (NH), 2sg.pres.act. pé-i-e-ši (MH/MS), 3sg.pres.act. pé-i-e-e-zī (OS), pé-i-e-zī (OH/NS), pé-e-e-zī (MH/MS), pé-e-i-ja-zī (MH/NS), pé-e-i-ja-ḫ[ž-zī] (NS), 3pl.pres.act. pé-e-i-ja-an-zī (MH/MS?), pé-i-ja-an-zī, pé-i-e-an-zī (NS), 1sg.pres.act. pé-i-e-nu-un (MH/MS), 3sg.pres.act. pé-i-e-et (OS), 3pl.pres.act. pé-i-e-er (OS? or OH/MS?), pé-i-er (OH/NS), 2sg.imp.act. pé-i-e-ja (MH/MS), pé-i-ja (NH); 3pl.pres.midd. pé-an-da-ri (or pi-an-da-ri and then belonging to pai² / pi-?); part. pé-e-ja-an-t- (MH/MS), pé-ja-an-t- (MH/MS), pé-an-t-; inf.I pé-i-ja-u-ya-an-zi (NH), pé-ja- ›u- ›(ya)- ›an ›zi (NH); impf. pé-e-i-iš ›ke ›a- (MH/MS), pé-e-eš ›ke ›a- (MH/MS).

IE cognates: Gr. ἧμμα ‘to release, to make go, to let go’, Lat. iactō, iēci ‘to throw’.

**PIE** *h₂poiī*/*h₁:3iēh₁-ti / *h₂poiī*/*h₁:3iēh₁-enti

See CHD P: 261f. for attestations. It is difficult to decide how to read the stem. The verb is consistently spelled with an initial sign BI, which can be read *p̣i* as well as *p̣e* on the basis of spellings like BI-e-i-ja-an-zi and BI-e-i-ja-an-za, CHD chose to interpret the stem as *peie/a/-, and to read all attestations as written with *p̣e/-, which I have followed. The verb means ‘to send (there)’ and contrasts with *uiē*² / *ui/- ‘to send (here)’. Therefore, it is likely that it shows the preverb *pe-‘* (see there for its etymology), which contrasts with *u-. Since Pedersen (1938: 198) this verb is generally connected with Gr. ἧμμα ‘to release, to make go, to let go’, Lat. iactō, iēci ‘to throw’, which probably reflects *Hiēh₁r-‘* (for the first laryngeal, cf. Peters 1976: Gr. ἧμμα < *Hi-Iiēh₁r-mi-‘).

The exact interpretation of the Hittite formation is difficult. At first sight, we seem to be dealing with a -je/a-verb (pe-i-ia-mi /peiamil/ vs. pe-i-e-z-zi /peiet’ïl/), which seems to point to *pe+*Hiēh₁je/a/-. If we assume a root-present, however (which is the usual formation in unverbated verbs with *pe/-, we have to reconstr *pe+*Hiēh₁ti, *pe+*Hiēh₁enti. These latter forms should regularly yield Hitt. /peiet’ïl/, /peiant’ïl/, as is attested in the oldest texts: pe-i-e-z-zi (OS) and pe-e-i-ja-an-zi (MH/MS). Starting from such a paradigm, a development into the -je/a-class is trivial (cf. ye-² / uṣa- ‘to come’ on the basis of ye-zi / uṣ-ani-z). Note that the difference in development between pānzi ‘they go’ < *paianzi < *h₂poiī-h factura vs. peianzi < pe-*Hiēh₁enti shows that the unverbalation between pe- and *Hiēh₁r- occurred later than the unverbalation between *h₂poiī- and *h₁lei-. Within the relative chronology of Hittite, the sound law *-oi# > -e# must be placed between these two unverbalations. The initial laryngeal of *Hiēh₁r- must have been *h₁ or *h₂, since *h₂ should have left a trace (pe+*h₂iēh₁r > **pehije-‘).


PIE pê*s*noiH-ev, pê*s*niH-enti

See CHD P: 264f. for attestations. The oldest attestations (3sg.pres.act. pennaï (OS) and 1pl.pres.act. penniêeni (OS)) together with 1sg.pres.act. pennâhypí, 2sg.pres.act. pennáti and 1sg.pret.act. pennáhypîn clearly point to the mêma/i-inflection. From MH times onwards, forms are occurring that show the tarn(a)-class inflection (pennanzi and pennen). In NH times, we occasionally find a form according to the -je/a-class (pennîjąanzi). This situation is typical for mêma/i-class verbs, of which I have argued under its treatment in §2.2.2.2.h that they originally were polysyllabic dâî/tijani-class verbs that are taken over into the tarn(a)-class via the intermediate mêma/i-class. The occasional occurrence of -je/a-class forms is trivial (very common in dâî/tijani-class verbs). This means that penna-/penni- originally goes back to a dâî/tijani-class verb as well.

Within Hittite, penna- / penni- functions as the opposite of ūnma- / ūnmi- ‘to send (here), to drive (here)’, and already Sturtevant (1933: 74) regarded these verbs as the pe- and u-prefixes of the verb nai- / *ni- ‘to turn, to send’ (see under *nê*amdór), which belongs to the dâî/tijani-class. See for further etymology the lemmas of these elements themselves.

Although this etymology is generally accepted, the fact that penna- / penni-shows a geminate -mn- (just as in ūnma- / ūnni- and namma- / nnni-) is remarkable. Perhaps these univerbations and reduplication took place at a period that the initial consonants were fortis automatically.

pennie/a-²: see penna- / penni-

peppiešsar (n.) ‘shipment, consignment’: nom.-acc.sg. pêep-pi-eš-sar (MH/MS).

The word is hapax in one of the Amarna letters (VBoT 1, 28). It is spelled with BI-IB-, which can be read pi-ip- as well as pê-ep-. If we read the word as peppiešsar, it seems to be the opposite of the noun uppiešsar ‘sending, gift’ (see under uppâ/a- / uppi-) in the sense that we are dealing with a pe-/ u- pair of a
further unattested noun *pieššar. This *pieššar clearly is a derivative of pai- / pi- ‘to give’ (q.v.), which would mean that pepppieššar must reflect virtual *hi poi + *hi-p-i-éštshš1-r. Because of the fact that this word occurs in an Amarna letter only, and because we know that these letters were written by a non-Hittite scribe, it has been suggested that the form is nicht-sprachwirklich. If so, then we still have to assume that it is formed as a back-formation to uppieššar (which is clearly genuinely Hittite), which means that our etymological analysis remains the same.

per / parn- (n.) ‘house, household’ (Sum. É): nom.-acc.sg. É-er (OS), nom.sg.c. pár-na-aš (MH/NS), gen.sg. pár-na-aš (OS), dat.-loc.sg. pár-ni (OS), É-er (OS), pê-e-ri (OH/NS), all.sg. pár-na (OS), erg.sg. pár-na-an-za (OH/MS), abl. É-er-za (OS), pár-na-az (OH/NS), pár-na-za (NH), nom.-acc.pl. É-er (OH/NS), gen.pl. ÉMÉS-na-aš (NH), dat.-loc.pl. pár-na-aš (MH/MS?).


See CHD P: 273f. for attestations. Although the nom.-acc.sg. is never spelled completely phonetically (always É-er), there is little doubt that the form was /per/, as is also indicated by the secondary dat.-loc.sg. pê-er-i. The occasional
commune nom.sg. parnaš is found in NS texts only and clearly is a secondary formation. Besides gen.sg. parnaš, CHD also cites a gen.sg. per[iaš] (KUB 51.56, 4), but this reading is too uncertain (note that the handcopy of the text shows = pé-e-ri pé-e-x[...], which CHD reads as pé-e-ri pé-e-r[i-iaš], whereas e.g. Rieken (1999a: 306[47]) suggests to read pé-e-ri pé-e-r[a-an]). The abl. É-er-za /pert/ is attested in OS texts already and therefore must be archaic. The attested alteration SHU can hardly go back to anything else than an original -r/n-stem *Per-r/*Pṛ-n-.

The root-etymology is difficult. In the older literature, a borrowing from Egyptian pr ‘house’ has often been assumed, but this is unlikely because a borrowing does not explain the seemingly archaic inflection per / parn-. For a listing of other etymological proposals, see Tischler HEG P: 569f., none of which stands out regarding semantical probability.

peran (adv., prev., postpos.) ‘(local postpos.) before, in front of, in presence of; (local prev.) in front; (temporal adv.) previously, in advance; (temporal prev.) in front, first; (temporal postpos.) facing a person in future, ahead of someone; (postpos.) during the reign of (a king); (postpos.) under the supervision of; (causal postpos.) because of, from, out of’ (Akk. P.AN): pé-e-ra-an (OS), pé-i-ra-an (1x, OS), pé-ra-an (OS), pé-ra-a-an (4x, MH/MS), pé-an (abbr., MH/NS).

Anat. cognates: CLuw. parran (prev., postpos.) ‘before, in front of’ (pār-ra-an, pār-ra-a-an); HLuw. paran (adv.) ‘before, in front of’ (pa+ra/i-na, pa+ra/i-na’.
PAnat. *pérom

IE cognates: Gr. πέρυς(v) ‘moreover, on the other side’, Skt. pára- ‘farther, highest, utmost’.
PIE *pér-om

See CHD P: 291f. for attestations and semantic treatment. This word clearly belongs with parā ‘forward’ and parza ‘...-wards’ in the sense that these three adverbs probably are petrified cases of an original noun *per- (cf. the situation of šer and šarā). The exact interpretation of peran is intricate, however. In the oldest texts we find forms of peran with a poss.pron.suffix attached to it: pé-e-ra-a(n)=m-mi-it ‘in front of me’ (OS), pé-ra-an=te-et ‘in front of you’ (OH/NS), pé-e-ra-a(n)=š-še-et ‘in front of him’ (OS), pé-e-ra-a(n)=š-mi-it ‘in front of them’ (OS). The possessive consistently shows its neuter form, which indicates that, at least synchronically, peran, too, was interpreted as a neuter form. At first sight, this seems to indicate that peran belonged to an originally neuter thematic stem.
*pera-* (if the stem were athetic, we would expect a nom.-acc.sg. **per), but
such a stem cannot be reconciled with an all.sg. parā and an abl. parza, because
of the ablaut in the root (thematic stems are generally thought not to show ablaut).
Nevertheless, the form peran has Anatolian cognates, CLuw. parran and HLuw.
paran, which indicate the existence of a PANat. form *pērom already.

All in all, although the connection between peran, parā, parza and forms in
other IE languages that reflect *per- is clear, it is difficult to reconstruct an
original nominal paradigm for all the forms.


See CHD P: 311f. for attestations. This word occurs in inventories and lists only,
on the basis of which its exact meaning cannot be determined. It can be made of
stone, iron, gold, ivory and other materials. Although the texts do not point to a
specific meaning, CHD translates this word as “a utensil for carrying forward (lit.
‘that of bringing forth’).” This interpretation is fully based on the fact that the
form peran pedumaš synchronically seems to be identical to the adverb peran
‘forward’ and pedumaš, the verb.noun gen.sg. of peda- / ped- ‘to take (away)’. Nevertheless, this spelling is not the only one: we also find peran pedunāš and
peran padunaš, which do not fit such an interpretation. Melchert (1994a: 34)
ingenuously proposes that the forms with -n- show the Luwian verbal noun-suffix
-un- and that the spelling BAD-du-na-aš (which I have read as pē-du-na-aš)
should be read pād-du-na-aš, assuming that padunaš would be the Luwian
equivalent of Hitt. pedunaš. Apart from the fact that the Hitte preverb pe- to my
knowledge does not have a CLuwian counterpart, the regular correspondent of
Hitt. dā- / d- ‘to take’ is CLuw. la-. Moreover, the spelling pē-du-na-aš then
would show the Hitt. stem ped- attached to the Luwian suffix -un-, which seems
quite improbable to me.

If we look at the chronological distribution, we see that the forms with -n- are
the older ones. In my view, we therefore are dealing with an original word peran
ped(d)unaš that folk-etymologically was altered to peran pedumaš, indeed as if
the verb.noun gen.sg. of the verb peran peda- / ped-. Since the exact meaning of
this word cannot be determined, we cannot etymologize it. Nevertheless, because
of the alteration between single -d- and geminate-dd-, I would not be surprised if
this word would turn out to be of a foreign origin.

See CHD P: 312f. for attestations. This word occurs several times in OS rituals. On the basis of the contexts in which it occurs, its meaning cannot be determined. In the older literature, the word often was translated ‘bird’, but cf. CHD for the fact that this was based on arguments that have turned out to be incorrect. It therefore is impossible to etymologize this word.

pernu₂: see pirnu₂


Derivatives: NA perunant- (adj.) ‘rocky, craggy’ (nom.sg.c. pé-e-ru-na-an-[a] (NH), pé-ru-na-an-za (NH)), NA perulī(ya)- ‘?’ (3sg.pres.midd. pé-ru-lu-u-ya-ri (OH/NS)).

IE cognates: Skt. pārvata- ‘rocky, rugged; mountain’.

PIE *pér-ur / *pér-un-

See CHD P: 314f. for attestations. The oldest forms of this word show a neuter paradigm nom.-acc.sg. peru, obl. perun-. In NH times, a secondary commune stem peruna- is formed (nom.sg.c. perunaš, acc.pl.c. perunuš), which is a trivial development (cf. nom.sg.c. parnaš ‘house’ besides older neuter per / parn-). A paradigm peru / perun- can hardly go back to anything else than to an original -r/n-stem, which is the reason for me to assume that nom.-acc.sg. peru is the dissimilated variant of older *peru (compare per ‘house’ < *per-r). In this way, *peru / perun- would be a normal static -yer-/yen-stem, just as mēḥur / mēḫun- ‘period, time’ and šēḥur / šēḫun- ‘urine’.

Sommer apud Friedrich HW: 168 connected peru / perun- with Skt. pārvata- ‘rocky, mountain’, which could reflect *pēryan-to-. Semantically as well as formally (pārvata- is derived from a static -yer-/yen-stem as well) this etymology is impeccable. Often, Skt. pārvata- is further connected with Skt. pārvan- ‘joint, knot’ and Gr. *pēryr ‘end, boundary, gowl’, which taken together reflect a paradigm *pērur, *pēru(e)n-. Yet, a semantic connection
between these words and 'rock' is not particularly evident. Nevertheless, on the basis of the connection with Skt. pārvata- alone, it is already clear that Hitt. peru / perun- reflects *pēr-ur-, *pēr-un-.

The possible derivative NA-perulū(ya)- (which in principle can be read pirulū(ya)- as well) is obscure. It is hapax in VBoT 58 i (30) 'He harrows, ploughs, and irrigates the field' ḥal-ki-in-n-a (31) [ar-ḥa?] = pāt NA-pē-ru-lu-u-yā-ri 'and he even p.-s the grain'. CHD translates 'to free from (small) stones(?)' (implying peru- + lā-/l- 'to free' with some u-suffix). Oettinger (1994: 312) translates 'mit Stein mahlen'. Whatever the case, the NA₄-determinative makes it quite likely the first element, peru-, has to be equated with NA₄-peru / perun-.

The second element, -lūgari, and therewith the verb’s interpretation, remains obscure.

peš(š)-² (la3?) 'to rub, to scrub (with soap)': 3sg.pres.act. pē-eš-zi (OH or MH/NS), 3pl.pret.act. pī-iš-ši-er (NH).

See CHD P: 315 for attestations. There, a 3pl.pres.act. piš-ša-an-zi (KUB 51.33 i 4) is cited as well, but this form is found in a totally broken context without any clue for its meaning. Moreover, CHD cites the same form as a 3pl.pres.act. of pāš- 'to swallow' as well (reading it as a possible paš-ša-an-zi). We therefore should leave this form out of consideration. The form pī-iš-ši-er is difficult to judge formally: its spelling may have been influenced by the form kī-iš-ši-er ‘they combed’ that occurs in the same line.

Oettinger (1979a: 327) proposes to connect peš(š)- with Lat. pēnis, OHG fasal, MHG visel 'penis' from *pes- (cf. also Hitt. *pešan- / pešn- / pēšen- 'man'), but regarding the semantics this etymology does not seem self-evident to me. Tischler (HEG P: 581) mentions another possibility, namely a connection with PIE *bʰes- 'to chew'. This connection would only work if we assume that *bʰes- originally meant ‘zerreiben’ which on the one hand yielded ‘to chew’ and on the other ‘to rub’. Tischler himself judges this etymology as “weniger wahrscheinlich”.

Melchert (1984a: 110) connects pešš- with “iške/a-‘ to smear, to anoint’ (q.v.) under the assumption that the latter is its imperfective and reflects *ps-ske/o-. See at iškije/a-², however, for the establishment that this verb rather belongs to the -je/a-class originally, and therefore cannot reflect *ps-ske/o-.

See under pašhiae-² ‘to rub’ for the fact that it has been proposed that this verb is connected with peš(š)-².

Derivatives: pišnātar / pišnann- (n.) ‘manhood, virility; male parts’ (nom.acc.sg. pi-iš-na-tar (OH?/NS), LÚ-na-ar-[ar], gen.sg. LÚ-na-an-na-aš (OH/NS), dat.-loc.sg. pi-iš-na-an-mi-e=š-si) (MH?/NS), LÚ-an-ni (NS), nom.-acc.pl. LÚ-na-tar, *pešnili (adv.) ‘in manly way’ (LÚ-ni-li (OS)).


PIE *pēs-ōs, *pes-én-am, *pes-n-ós.

See CHD P: 324f. for attestations. The phonetically spelled forms of this word show suffix-ablaut: gen.sg. pē-eš-na-aš = /pesnas/ or, less likely, /pesnas/, nom.pl. pî-še-ne-iš = /pisénes/, acc.pl. pî-še-e-nu-uš = /pisénuš/. They must go back to hysterodynamic n-stem forms with generalized e-grade in the stem: *pes-n-ós, *pes-én-es, *pes-én-ms. Unfortunately, the nom.sg. has not been attested written phonetically, but on the basis of the OS attestation LÚ-aš, one could assume /pēsas/ < *pēs-ōrs (compare hēraš < *hēr-ōrs). So all in all, we probably are dealing with an original paradigm nom.sg. *pēs-ōn, acc.sg. *pēs-ēn, gen.sg. *pēs-n-ós, in which already in pre-Hittite times the -e- of the nominative has spread throughout the paradigm: *pesōn, *pesónom, *pesnós, etc.

Etymologically, the word has been connected with Skt. pāsas- ‘penis’, Gr. περοχ ‘penis’, Lat. pēnis ‘penis’, OHG fesel ‘seed, descendant’. Especially the formation of Lat. pēnis (i-derivative of an n-stem) may be closely connected. A further connection with Hitt. pēš-‘ to rub’ (q.v.) does not seem self-evident to me semantically.


IE cognates: Skt. asyati ‘to throw’.

PIE *hpoi + *h₁s-je/o-

See CHD P: 316f. for attestations. Almost all forms can be reconciled with a stem /peSe/a/-l. In NS texts we occasionally find a stem peššiye/a-2, according to the very productive šatra class. Together with ţi̇ši̇je/a-2 ‘to draw open (of curtains)’ it clearly forms a pair, showing the preverbs pe- and u-. There has been some debate whether the original verb stem should be equated with ši̇je/a-2 ‘to shoot’ or with šaı̇-ı̇ / şı̇-ı̇ ‘to press’ (which, because of their formal similarity have merged early and therefore are treated here under one lemma: šaı̇-ı̇ / şı̇-ı̇, ši̇je/a-2), but Kimball (1987b) has convincingly argued that we should assume an original connection with ši̇je/a-2, which she connects with Skt. asyati ‘to throw’ < *h₁s-je/o-. This means that peššiye/a-2 goes back to *hpoi + *h₁s-je/o-.

Melchert (1994a: 133) and Kimball (1999: 215, 391) cite a HLuwian verb “pa-si-ya-” (glossed by Kimball as “reject”), without attestation places, which they regard as the exact correspondent to Hitt. peššiye/a-. To my knowledge, such a
verb does not exist anywhere in the HLuwian corpus, however (perhaps they have misread the hapax form 3sg.imp.act. pa-sa-ı́a-tu-ı́-ı́-ı́ in KAYSERI §18).

pešn-- see *pešan- / pešn- / pišen-


Derivatives: pedant- (c.) ‘place’ (voc.sg. péé-ta-an-ti (MH/NS), dat.-loc.sg. péé-da-an-ti (NH)) pedaššaḥh₁ (IIb) ‘to place, to install, to deposit’ (3pl.pres.act. péé-da-aš-ša-ą́-ę́-a-n-zi (MS? or NS?), 3pl.pret.act. péé-da-aš-ša-ą́-ę́-e-er (MH/MS)).


PIE *pēdo-
peda-1/ ped- (IIa1γ) ‘to take (somewhere), to carry, to transport; to spend (time)’:


Derivatives: pipeda- ‘to carry out(?)’ (3pl.pres.midd. pi-pé-e-da-an-ta (OH or MH?).

See CHD P: 330f. for attestations. Already Sturtevant (1933: 79) connected peda- with Gr. πέδον ‘ground, floor’, which means that we must reconstruct *pédom. The HLuwian word for ‘place’ is always written with the logogram LOCUS, phonetically complemented with the sign ṭa₃ or ṭa₄. It is quite possible that these signs in fact have to be read /la/ (cf. Hawkins 1995: 114⁹), but this does not invalidate the connection (cf. Luw. la- ‘to take’ < *deh₂-). The exact interpretation of the verb LOCUS pitahaliya- is unclear. The use of the determinative LOCUS would point to a connection with ‘place’, which could indicate that pitahaliya- is the pretonic outcome of *pedo-. Nevertheless, the fact that pitahaliya- is spelled with the sign ta₅, which contrasts with ta₄₅ of LOCUS-ta₄₅-, should make us cautious.
PIE *hpoi + *doh₁-ei / *hpoi + *dh₁-enti

See CHD P: 345f. for attestations. This verb acts as the opposite of *uda₁ / ud- ‘to bring (here), to bring (over)’, which makes it clear that both verbs are derived from the verb *dā₁ / d- with the prefixes pe- and u-. See at the lemmas of pe- and dā₁ / d- for their respective etymologies. Note that the oldest texts almost consistently spell peda-/ped- with a short -a- in the strong stem forms, whereas the simplex dā₁/d- shows long -ā₁ (petahē vs. dēhē, pedatti vs. dētti, pedai vs. dā). This probably shows that the word accent was retracted unto the prefix pe-.
In later texts, the spelling of dā₁/d- becomes more influential on the spelling of peda-/ped-, yielding the spelling pé-e-da-a-i (from MS texts onwards). Note that in the plural, peda-/ped- preserves more archaic forms than dā₁/d- (1pl.pretr. pedumen vs. dāyen, 3pl.pretr. piter vs. dāer, 2pl.imp. petišten vs. dāten), but also in e.g. inf.1 pedumanzi vs. dāyanzi.

Melchert (1993b: 175) cites a CLuwian verb *padd-/~patz(a)- ‘to carry(?)’, of which only 3sg.imp.act. pār-za-du is attested, apparently assuming that this form reflects *pe-đh₁-tu. Apart from the fact that an interpretation ‘to carry’ seems to be indicated on the basis of an expected etymological connection with Hitt. peda-/ped- only, the regular Luwian correspondence to Hitt. pe-, which I reconstruct as *hpoi-, would not be pa-, but rather pą- or pī-. I therefore reject the claimed connection between CLuw. pār-za-du and Hitt. peda-/ped-.

The expression peron ped(d)unaš has been claimed to be cognate to peda-/ped-, but see for a discussion at its own lemma.

The status of the verb pipeda- is unclear. Is it really a reduplicated form (which would be unique for a pe-prefixed verb), and why does it show middle inflection? Again it must be noted that a translation ‘to carry’ is largely based on the formal similarity with peda-/ped-.

(UZU) pettar / pettan- ‘wing, feather’: see ÚZU pattar / pattan-

pijanaeš: see pejanaeš:

pijetaš: see pittaš, pijettaš-


Derivatives: pihami(m)- (adj.), epithet of the Storm-god, ‘powerful, strong’ (nom.sg.c. pī-ḥa-i-mi-iš, pī-ḥa-i-mi-iš, pī-ḥa-im-mi-iš, pī-ḥa-im-me-iš, stem pi-
The element *piḫa- is found as the first element in a few personal names and functions as the base of some adjectives. These adjectives are all clearly of Luwian origin, which indicates that *piḫa- is Luwian originally (it is further absent in Hittite). Nevertheless, the element is not found in CLuwian texts, but does occur in HLUwian texts and a Lycian name. The adj. *piḫaimmi- and *piḫammi- are to be equated with HLUw. *pihama/i- and Lyc. *Piḫma, and reflect a Luw. part. of an unattested verb *piḫa(i)-. The adj. *piḫaššašši- is to be regarded as a Luw. gen.adj. of a stem *piḫašš-, which is attested in HLUw. *piḫa-. The adj. *piḫaddašši- represents a Luw. gen.adj. of a further unattested noun *piḫaṭṭ-.

The semantics of all these words are difficult to determine. The Hittite adjective functions as epithets of the Storm-god, and could therefore have a wide range of meanings. It has been argued that *piḫaššašši- is to be equated with the epithet ḤIḪI-ašši- ‘of lightning’, but KUB 38.12 iii (18) ... ḪUḫḪI-ašši-ŠIŠI ... shows that ḪU *piḫaššašši- and ḪU ḪIḪI are not identical (cf. CHD P: 257: “The last ex. [= KUB 38.12 iiii 18-19] shows that ḪU ḪU *piḫaššašši- is not identical w. ḪU ḪIḪI(-ašši-) despite the appearance of ḪU ḪU in one text (Bronzetafel ii 16) and ḪU ḪIḪI in the par. KBo 4.10 obv. 36, and ḪU URU* in two copies of the Alakšandu treaty w. ḪU ḪIḪI in the third”) and that therefore the translation ‘of lightning’ for *piḫaššašši- cannot be ascertained. Nevertheless, Hawkins (2000: 106) sticks to the basic translation ‘lightning’ for the HLUwian words as well. This is even more pitiful, since the form “FULGUR”-há-sá (KARATEPE 1 §52), which is likely to be read /pihas-sa/ on the basis of the fact that the determinative FULGUR is used for *pihama/i- as well FULGUR *pi-ha-mi-sa (KARKAMIŠ A11b §14), is the only word that can be securely translated since
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it occurs in a bilingual: it corresponds to Phoen. ‘power, strength’. I therefore translate HLuw. *pihassassā/i-*, which was borrowed into Hitt. *pihaššašši*- denotes ‘of power, of strength’. Since the neuter s-stem *pihas-* probably functions as the abstract building of the Luw. verb *piha(i)-*, the latter can either mean ‘to be powerful, to be strong’ or ‘to become powerful, to become strong’. I choose for the latter option on the basis of the following context:

**KARKAMIŠ A11b**

§12: a-wa/i pa-ia- REGIO-ni-ia "VACUUS" ta-na-tá-ha

§13: wa/i-ta- SCALPRUM.CAPERE u-pa-ni-zi a-tá "CAPERE" u-pa-ha

§14: a-wa/i pi-i-na- REGIO-ni-ia ti FULGUR pi-ha-mi-sa SUPER+ra/i-’ PES-wa/i-i-ha

‘I destroyed these countries and brought in the trophies. And p.-ed by these countries I came up’.

In my view, ‘strengthened’ is the better translation here (note that Hawkins (2000: 103) translates ‘glorified’, which is quite strange for countries to do after they have been destroyed and looted).

The old translation ‘lightning’ has had its influence on the etymological interpretation as well. The generally accepted etymology seems to be the one of Starke (1990: 103f.) who connects *piha-* with *b^h_2_eH^2-* ‘to shine’ and reconstructs *b^h_2_ēH^2-o-*. Apart from the unappealing formation, the connection does not make sense anymore semantically. If one wants to assume IE origin, one should rather think of the roots *b^h_2_eH^2-* ‘to hit, to beat’ or *peH-* ‘to swell up’ (cf. LIV^3).

**pinta**- (n. or c.) ‘oar’: Luw.nom.-acc.sg.n. or Luw.acc.pl.c. **pi-in-ta-an-za**.

Hapax in KUB 8.50 iii 20. CHD P: 268 translates ‘oars’, which indeed is possible. The word is clearly Luwian, as can be seen by the Luwian inflection as well as the use of the gloss wedge. Weeks (1985: 161) connected the word with *bend-* ‘vorspringende Spitze’ (cf. Pokorny 1959: 96-7), but this is formally impossible, as *bend-* should have given Luw. **pant**-. Moreover, semantically the connecton is not very satisfying. No further etymology.

**pippa** / **pipp**- (I1a1y) ‘to knock down/apart/off, to tear down, to overturn, to destroy; to turn up, to throw up’: 3sg.pres.act. \( pi-ip-pa-\) (OH/MS), 3pl.pres.act. \( pi-ip-pa-an-zí \) (OS), 1sg.pret.act. \( pi-ip-pa-ah-\) (MH?/NS), 3sg.pret.act. \( pi-ip-pa-aš \) (OH/MS), \( pi-ip-pa-a-aš \) (OH or MH/NS), 3pl.pret.act. \( pi-ip-pé-er \)
(MH/MS?), 3pl.imp.act. pi-ip-pa-an-du (OH/NS); 3sg.pres.midd. pi-ip-pa-at-ta-ri (NS); part. pi-ip-pa-an-ti- (NH); verb.noun pi-ip-pu-ya-ya-ar (NH), pi-ip-pu-ya-ar (NH); inf.I pi-ip-pa-ya-an-zi (late MH/MS); impf. pi-ip-pi-iš-ke/a- (MH/MS), pi-ip-pi-iš-ke/a- (NH), pi-ip-pa-aš-ke/a-, [pi-ip-p]a-a-aš-ke/a-.

IE cognates: ?Skt. ut pīpē ‘he rises’.

PIE *pi-poh₁₁₃-εi, *pi-ph₁₁₃-enti?

See CHD P: 269f. for attestations. The verb is consistently spelled BI-IB-, which can be read pi-ip- as well as pé-ep- (or even pi-ep-). The traditional transliteration is pippa- / pipp-, however. All forms show a spelling with geminate -pp-. The only exception seems to be a 2sg.pres.act.-form λ pi-pa-at-ti (HKM 17.1 edge 6), which is cited thus by Alp (1991: 146) and CHD. When we look into the handcopy of the tablet, we see that the sign that is read as PA actually resembles GAD more, however, which would yield a reading u-pi-kat-at-ti or λ pi-kat-at-ti (which does not yield a better understandable word, I must admit). The combination of the facts that this form would be the only one to show single -p-, that it would be the only one to be preceded by a gloss wedge, that the reading PA is uncertain and that a translation ‘to overturn’ is not obligatory in the context, makes me leave this form out of consideration here.

The verb clearly belongs to the tarn(a)-class. The verbs that belong to this class go back to (reduplicated) roots that end in a laryngeal (cf. e.g. mimma- / mimm- ‘to refuse’). In this case, it means that we are dealing with a structure *Pi-PoH-, *Pi-PH- (or *Pe-PoH-, *Pe-PH-, if we decide to read the verb as peppa- / pepp-). Often this verb is etmologically connected with Skt. ut pīpē ‘he rises’, but this is semantically not self-evident. For the time being, it is the best proposal, however, because Skt. pīpē seems to reflect a root *pēH-, which would explain pippa-/pipp- as well: *pi-pōh₁₁₃-εi, *pi-ph₁₁₃-enti (or *pe-poh₁₁₃-εi, *pe-ph₁₁₃-enti).

pippešar: see peppiešar

pirešhannaš: see parzaḥannaš

pirnu² (Ib2) ‘to embezzle(?)’: 1sg.pret.act. pi-jr-nu-nu-un (NH).

Hapax in KUB 13.35 i 14: see CHD P: 313 for a treatment of its context and possible translation. CHD suggests that it could be a hearing mistake for mernu² ‘to make disappear’ (note that BI-IR-nu- can be read pé-er-nu- as well). Luraghi (1992: 159, 174) takes the verb as a denominative of per / parn- ‘house’ (q.v.).
however, suggesting that it originally means something like ‘to take to one’s own house’. Such a derivation process would be unique, however. Further unclear.

piršaḥannaš, pirzaḥannaš: see parzaḥannaš

pišen-: see *pešan-/ pešn- / pišen-


Derivatives: pittaurija- ‘(man of the) great-allotment’ (gen.sg. pi-ti-ta-ú-ri-ia-aš (NH), pi-it-ta-ú-ri-ia-aš (NH)), see pittae².


PIE *h₂p-i-teh² > “*h₂p-i-teh²”

See CHD P: 262f. for attestations. This word is spelled in a few different ways, BI-IT-ta, BI-e-IT-ta- and BI-i-e-IT-ta-. Since all spellings are from NS texts, it is not possible to order these spellings chronologically. The one spelling BI-i-e-IT-ta- clearly has to be read pi-i-e-et-ta- = /pieta-/l. This makes it possible that the forms that are spelled BI-IT-ta- have to be read pi-et-ta- = /pietta-/l as well (but see below for the possibility that these are to be read as pi-it-ta- = /pita-/l anyway). In Lycian, we find a noun pijata- ‘gift’ which is likely to be the exact correspondent to Hitt. pijetta-. The fact that in Lycian we find an a-stem is important as it shows that we have to reconstruct an *-eh²-stem.

The stem of the words clearly has to do with the verbs Hitt. pai² / pi- and Lyc. pije- ‘to give’, but details are uncertain: it depends on ones reconstruction of pai- /pi-. For instance, Rieken (1999a: 251-4) reconstructs pai- /pi- as *pe-h₂ei- and has many problems in explaining why the intervocalic *h₂ does not show up in the verb nor in pijetta-, which she regards as a derivative in *-teh² of *pe-h₂ei-.

As I have argued in Kloekhorst fhc.a (see also under the lemma pai² / pi-), I assume that pai² / pi- ‘to give’ reflects *h₂p-oí- / *h₂p-i-, and that Lyc. pije- shows a secondary thematization of it, *h₂p-je/-o-. Such a thematized stem occurs in Hittite as well, namely in the NH period, where we find forms that show a stem pije/a². I would therefore reconstruct pijetta- and Lyc. pijata- as *h₂p-je-teh² (note that in Lycian we have to assume a-umlaut from older *pijeta-).

This analysis opens up the way to assume that pijetta-, derived from the stem pije/a², is a NH innovation and that the original word was derived from the stem
pi-, and that this word therefore was *pitta- < *h₂p-i-teh₂- (compare OH šittarije/a- > NH šijattarije/a- for a similar replacement of the stem ši- by the NH stem ši̯e/a-).

All in all, I think that the attestations BI-IT-ta- must be read pi-it-ta- that stands for /pita-/ which reflects *h₂p-i-teh₂-, whereas the attestations BI-i-ET-ta- = pi-i-et-ta- and BI-i-E-IT-ta- = pi-i-e-et-ta- stand for /pieta-/ that reflect virtual *h₂p-ie-teh₂-, with the introduction of the NH stem pij/e/a- instead of the old stem pi- < *h₂p-i-.

The derivative pittauiriya- is possibly made up of pitta- and the onomastic element ura/i- ‘great’, cf. Tischler HEG P: 601.

Note that acc.pl.c.(!) pi-e-te-े=ya (KUB 5.24 ii 9) as cited by Rieken (1999a: 251) is explained by CHD P: 365 as a scribal error for pě-e-te-e=š-šì ‘to his place’.


Derivatives: **piddanna-** / **piddanni-** (IIa5) ‘id. (impf.)’ (3sg.pret.act. pîd-da-an-ni-iš (OH/NS), sup. pîd-da-a-an-ni-ya-an (MH/MS)).

**PAnat. *pît-je/a-* **

See CHD P: 355f. for attestations. The verb is often spelled with an initial sign BAD, which can be read pát as well as pít. In Akkadian, this sign often has the value pè as well, but to my knowledge, such a value is never used in Hittite. Nevertheless, in the older literature, it has been argued that in this verb we should read BAD as pè, and the verb consequently as pè-da-, because of the formally and semantically similar verb *peda- / ped- ‘to bring, to carry’ (q.v.). This has been falsified, however, by the few attestations of this verb that are spelled with initial pi-ir-. On the basis of the spellings with pi-ir-, the attestations with BAD have to be read pît-. Because of the unambiguous reading pittae-², the supposed connection with peda-¹ / ped- cannot be upheld anymore either.
This verb follows the ḫatrae-inflection, which means that it is likely derived from a noun *pitta-. An indication for the identification of this noun is the fact that pitta- not only means ‘to carry, to bring; to render, to pay’ (as given in CHD P: 355, lemma piddai- B), but also ‘to make a pitta-allotment’ (this meaning is treated in CHD P: 358 as a separate entry, piddai- C), which seems to point to a connection with pitta-, pijetta- ‘allotment’ (q.v. for etymology). Although this indeed is attractive, it must be noted that pitta-, pijetta- is reconstructed with *-teh₂- on the basis of Lyc. pijata-, whereas pittae- seems to be built on an o-stem noun (virtual *pito-jê/ô-). This means that the derivative was formed after the merger of word-final unaccentuated *-eh₂- and *-o- into Hitt. -a- (*h₂-p-i-teh₂- > *pita-, of which *pita-jê/û > pittae-).

**pittai₁ / pitti-** ‘to run; to flee’, see pattai₁ / patti-

**pittalae-²** (Ic2) ‘to abandon, to discard’: 2sg.pres.act. pid-da-la-ši (NS), 3pl.pres.act. pid-da-la-an-[i] (NH), pi-it-la-an-zi (NH), pît-ta-la-an-zi (NH), 3sg.pret.act. pid-da-la-it (NS), 3pl.pret.act. pi-it-la-a-er (NH); impf. pi-it-ta-li-
eš-ke/i-a- (NH).

See CHD P: 358 for attestations. Although many forms of this verb are written with the sign BAD, which can be read pát as well as pît, spellings with initial pi-it- show that we have to read pît- here. The verb denotes ‘to abandon, to leave behind; to disregard’. It is inflected according to the ḫatrae-class, which means that it is a derivative of a further unattested noun *pittalae-. Within Hittite, it is likely that the adj. pittalua- ‘plain (said of food products)’ (q.v.) is cognate, if we assume an original meaning ‘untouched, left alone’. This would mean that the basic stem is *pittalae-, for which I know no convincing etymology.

Puhvel (1979a: 214), followed by Rieken 1999a: 254) analyses *pittalae- as a denominative agent noun *pît-ala- of which the first part is identical with pitta-, pijetta- ‘allotment’ (q.v.), assuming an unlikely semantic development *pittalae- ‘grantor, consigner’ > *pittalae- ‘to act as a consigner, to despatch, to let go’.

Kronasser (1966: 482) suggested a connection with pattai₁ / patti- ‘to run; to flee’ (which he read as pittai-), but this assumption is primarily based on his false assumption that pittalae- originally meant ‘laufen lassen’.

**pittalua-** (adj.) ‘plain, simple, unadulterated’: nom.sg.c. pit-tal-ya-aš (MH/NS), acc.sg.c. pit-tal-ya-an (MH/NS), nom.-acc.sg.n. pit-tal-ya-an (OH?/MS), pit-tal-
û-an (MH), acc.pl.c. pit-tal-û-ĩšš̄.
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See CHD P: 358f. for attestations. We find three stems that semantically seem to be identical: *pittalya-, pittalyant- and pittalyan-* (although the last one is based on instr. *pittalyanit* only). All attestations are spelled with the sign BAD, which can be read *pât* as well as *pît*. On the basis of a likely etymological connection with *pittalae* ‘to abandon, to disregard’ (which sometimes is spelled *pî-it*), I cite this word with *pît*- as well. The adjective is used with bread, oil, stew, meat and other materials and indicates that these food products are plain in the sense that they have not been further processed. The connection between *pittalae- and pittalyan(ant)-*, which was made by Laroche (1960: 126) is semantically likely if we assume that *pittalya(ant)-* originally meant that the food products it modifies were ‘untouched’, i.e. ‘left alone’. This means that we are dealing with a stem *pittal-*, of which I know no compelling etymology.

Puhvel (1979a: 210f.) unconvincingly connects *pittalya-* with the root *pethy-* ‘to spread out’ and assumes *pethy-(y)o- ‘spread thin’, which he connects with Lat. *petillus* ‘thin, slender, meager’.

**pittar / pittan**- ‘wing, feather’: see **pattar / pattan**-

* ([UZI]) *pittara / pattara*-

* ([UZI]) *pittula / pattula*-

* ([UZI]) *pittulija / pattulija*-

* ([UZI]) *pittulijn / pattulijn*-

See CHD P: 365f. for attestations. The bulk of the attestations of the words treated here are spelled with the sign BAD, which can be read pât as well as pît. In the KIN oracle KBo 18.151 (OH/MS) we twice find a lot pi-tu-li-ja-an (rev. 10, 11), on the basis of which the words that have BAD-tu-l² are read pî-tu-l². Note that it cannot be excluded, however, that these lots, which are concrete objects that represent abstract notions of which it often is not easy to determine their meaning, have nothing to do with pî-tu-li-ja- ‘anguish’. If that is the case, we have no other positive evidence in favour of reading the sign BAD as pît.

The meanings ‘loop, knot’ (for (űs) pittula-) and ‘anguish, worry’ (for pittuliija- and derivatives) seem to be connected by the notion ‘choking, strangling’, but I have not been able to find a formally fitting cognate with such a meaning.

According to Rieken (1999a: 471-2) we have to start from a stem pittul- which she analyses as an -ül-derivative of the root *peth₂- ‘to spread out’, assuming a semantic development ‘*ausbreiten’ > ‘*Arme ausbreiten’ > ‘*umfassen’ > ‘umschlingen’. This development does not seem very appealing to me, however.

**pukk-(miş) (IIc/d) ‘to be hateful, to be repulsive, to be unpleasant’: 3sg.imp.midd. pu-ug-ga-rû (NH), pu-ug-ga-ta-rû (NH), pu-uk-ta-r[u] (NH).

Derivatives: pukkan- ‘hated, hateful, repulsive’ (nom.sg.c. pu-uk-kân-za (NH), nom.-acc.sg.n. pu-uk-kân (NH)), pukkanu₁, pukkanu₂, pukkanu (Ib2) ‘to cause (someone) to be hated, to create dissension’ (3sg.prs.act. pu-uk-ka-r-mu-zi (NH), 2pl.pres.act. [p]u-ug-ga-mu-ut-te-nî (MH?/NS); part. pu-uk-ka-r-mu-qa-an-t- (NH); verb.noun pu-uk-ku-mu-mar (NS), gen.sg. pu-uk-ka-r-mu-ma-aš (NS); impf. [pu-]uk-ka-r-mu-uš-ke/a- (MH/NS)).

See CHD P: 372f. for attestations. The verbal forms puggaru, puggataru and puktaru are all duplicates of each other. The situation is similar to the case of šupp-(miş) ‘to sleep’, which has the middle forms šûppari, šûptari and šûppatta. On the basis of the form puktaru I cite this verb as pukk-(miş). The spelling pukkanu- probably is just used to indicate the fact that -k- is geminate.

See Tischler (HEG P: 641f.) for the different etymological proposals, which I all find improbable: connections with *b'ueg₃- ‘to bend, to flee’, with Skt. pûjāti ‘to stink’, with Lith. piktas ‘bad, evil’ and with Goth. fauho ‘fox’ either have to wrong semantics or the wrong form (-kk- must reflect *-k-).

**puntarije/a₁ (lc1) ‘to be obstinate(?)’, to be stubborn(?)’: 3sg.pres.act. pu-un-tar-ri-i-e-ze-zì (NH), verb.noun pu-un-tar-ja-u-qa-ar, pu-un-tar-ja[u]-u-qa-ar].
Derivatives: **puntarrijali**- (adj.) ‘stubborn(?)’ (nom.sg.c. *pu-un-tar-ri-ja-li-iš* (NS)).

See CHD P: 377. The translation is based on KUB 24.7 ii (18) ANŠ-E-aš=ma=za GIM-an *pu-un-tar-ri-ja-li-iš zî[-î]k* (19) MUNUS.LUGAL-aš ʾIŠTAR-iš ‘You are *p* as an ass, queen Ištar’, which is supported by KUB 3.99 ii (12) ANŠ-E-aš *pu-un-ta-ri-ja[-u-ya-ar] ‘the *p* of an ass’. The meaning ‘stubborn(ness)’ seems to fit these contexts. Formally, the verb resembles *gimmantarij/ẹ* e.a. No further etymology.

**Punušš**- (ib1) ‘to ask, to question, to consult; to investigate’ (Sum. ÈN.TAR):

IE cognates: ??Gr. τήνωτα ‘to be smart’.

PIE *pneuH-s- ??

See CHD P: 377f. for attestations. All attestations show a stem *punušš*, the first *u* of which sometimes is spelled plene. In the oldest texts we find plene spelling with the sign Ú, whereas in younger texts we find the sign U. This points to an inner-Hittite development of OH /punuš/- to NH /ponuš/- (see also § 1.3.9.4.f). Because of the disyllabic stem, it is not easy to explain *punušš-* as of IE origin. Usually, however, scholars interpret the verb as /pnuu/-, regarding the first /u/ or /o/ as a silent vowel. If that were the case, we would expect a spelling **pa-nu-š-** (like e.g. *pa-ra-a* = /prā/). It must be noted, however, that there are no examples of PIE *PnV-* > Hitt. /PnV/-, spelled pa-nV-. So perhaps an initial sequence *Pnu- regularly received an anaptyctic vowel between *P* and *n*, yielding /punu/- > /ponu/- (compare e.g. *Tri-* that yielded Hitt. Teri-, whereas e.g. *trenti* yielded Hitt. /trant’i/ ta-ra-an-zi ‘they speak’, cf. teri-2* / tar-1*).
Two etymologies have been proposed. Sturtevant (1933: 229) connected *puṇuśš- with Gr. πνεύμα 'to breathe' (*pneu-), but this seems semantically quite far to me. The further connection with Gr. πεντάντα 'to be smart' may have more merit if we assume that Hitt. *puṇuśš- reflects some sort of desiderative ‘to want to be smart’ > to ask’. It must be noted, however, that other Hittite s-extensions (*gāne/išš-, ǭnš-, kallišš- / kališš-, etc.) do not show desiderative semantics. Moreover, the IE origin of the Greek word is in doubt because of forms like πεντάνκο 'to make prudent' and πεντάνα 'smart’ (an alternation πνευ-, πνα- can only be explained if we assume substratum origin). If we do chose to equate Gr. πεντάνκα with Hitt. *puṇuśš-, however, we would have to reconstruct *pneuHu-s-.


IE cognates: ?Gr. φύρα 'to mix'.

**PIE *bʰur-u-t-?**

See CHD P: 395f. for attestations. Puhvel (1994: 255) connected this word with Gr. φύρα 'to mix' (< *φύρα-?) because ‘mud’ is a mixture of water and clay. Rieken (1999a: 160f.) follows Puhvel and reconstructs *bʰur-u-t-. Although in principle this is possible, the reconstruction does not seem self-evident to me.

**puš₂** (lb1) ‘to be eclipsed(?):’ 3sg.pres.act. pu-uš-zi (OH/MS?), pu-uš-za (OH/MS?), pu-uš-zi (OH/NS).

**PIE *ph₂u-s-?**

See CHD P: 398 for attestations. The verb has the moon or the sun as its subject. Oettinger (1979a: 215) translates ‘klein werden(?)’, sich verfinsteren(?)’ on the basis of an etymological connection with PIE *ph₂eu- ‘little’ (Lat. paucus, Gr. παχύς 'small, little'), which is followed by CHD (*to be eclipsed’). Another verb that is used for eclipsing is ƛk₂ / akk- ‘to die’. Perhaps the latter is used when a total eclipse occurs, whereas puš₂ denotes a partial eclipse. The manyfold plene spellings with the sign U point to a phonological form /pos/.
The etymological connection with *ph2eu- is formally not totally satisfying. We would expect that a preform *ph2eu-s-ti would yield **paušzi. Perhaps, the zero-grade of the plural was generalized. We then have to assume that *h₂, despite the fact that it was regularly lost at one point, had a lowering effect on *u (for which see § 1.3.9.4.f), so *ph₂u-s-énti > /posánt'í/.

pūtar (n.) a hairy part of an animal’s body: nom.-acc.sg. pu-u-ut-tar (NH), broken pu-ú-u[t-... (NH).

See CHD P: 402 for attestations. The context in which this word is found indicates that it denotes a body part of an animal. The use of the determinative SÍG ‘wool’ probably indicates that this body part is hairy. Rieken (1999a: 377) proposes to connect the word with Skt. puñā- ‘erection or bristling of the hair of the body’, Gr. πυχρις ‘hair at the back, locks’ and Mtir. úl ‘beard’ and reconstructs *pěu-tr, *pu-tén- under the assumption that unlenited -t- generalized throughout the paradigm. In my view, this etymology is a bit too speculative.

putikje/akwärō (IIIg) ‘to swell (said of fermented dough and of a tumor or boil on the head)’: 3sg.pres.midd. pu-ut-ki-i-e-et-ta (MH/NS); impf. pu-ut-ki-iš-ke/a-(NH).

See CHD P: 402-3 for attestations. This verb is likely to be analysed as putk-je/a-, in which the cluster -tk- is remarkable (but cf. ḫat- ‘to shut’ and ḫatku- ‘to jump’). Tischler (HEG P: 677) therefore states that one should keep in mind that a Hittite cluster -tk- reflects PIE *-Kp-, for which he gives ḫartagga- ‘bear’ < *h₂rkbo- as an example. To my mind, the PIE mother language did not have a phoneme *p, however (ḫartagga- < *h₂rkko-). Therefore, Carruba’s reconstruction *p(e)ug-t- (1974: 152) cannot convince me. Other proposed cognates (e.g. Lith. pūsti ‘to swell’) are unconvincing either. No further etymology.

pūyae² (Ic2) ‘to pound, to grind’: 3sg.pres.act. pu-u-yay-iz-zi (NS), pu-u-yay-a-iz-zi (NH), Luw.3sg.pres.act. pu-u-ya-ti.
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IE cognates: Lat. *pavīre ‘to beat’, Gr. πακό ‘to strike, to smite’.

PIE *ph2u-

See CHD P: 368f. for attestations. The verb occurs in CLuwian as well as in Hittite, but one of the forms in Hittite context has a Luwian ending, which may indicate that the verb originally was Luwian (puya), and that it was borrowed in NH times into Hittite, where it was brought into the ḫa-rae-class. The derivatives puppūšša₂ and puššae₂ (occasionally attested with gloss wedges) show the Luwian imperfective-suffix -šša-.

Since Neumann (1967: 32) this verb is generally connected with Lat. pavīre ‘to beat’ and Gr. πακό ‘to strike, to smite’. These latter verbs are often reconstructed as *ph2u- (e.g. Schrijver 1991: 256; Van de Laar 2000: 238; note that LIV regards them as -u-presents of a root *pihe₂- ‘schlagen’, but the evidence of a root *pihe₂- is rather limited: Gr. πακό ‘to stumble’ is semantically far and TochB pyi₂-k- ‘to strike’ is connected with *b'iHiH- ‘to beat’ by Adams 1999: 408). I therefore assume that *phu₂-e/o/ > CLuw. pūya-, which was borrowed into Hitt. as pūya-. For possible derivatives, see TUG puylia-, TUG puššaimi- and puššali-.

It has been proposed that HLuw. pupula/i- ‘to inscribe’ is cognate, but Hawkins (2000: 542) now suggests that pupula/i- may rather mean ‘to answer (vel sim.)’ because of the use of the determinative LOQ. For Lyc. (p)pwy- a translation ‘to inscribe’ has been proposed on the basis of which an etymological connection with pūya- is assumed. This translation seems especially based on the supposed connection, however, and therefore does not have much merit.

TUG puylia- (n.) a garment for the leg or foot?: Luw.nom.-acc.sg.n. pu-ya-li-an-za, Hitt.nom.-acc.sg.n. pu-ya-la-ja (NH).

See CHD P: 369 for attestations and a semantic discussion. The fact that we find a Luwian inflected form as well may indicate that this word originally is Luwian. Semantically, it seems to resemble TUG puššaimi- (a kind or garment or cloth) and puššali- (a leg or foot garment). The alteration between pūya and puššati is reminiscent of the CLuw. verb pūya- ‘to pound’ and its impf. pušša- (see at puššae²). This may indicate that these words are derived from this verb. See there for etymology.

puṣṭi- (c.) ‘madder(?), (dying) powder(?): nom.sg. pu-ya-at-ti-š (NH).
The word is hapax in the vocabulary KBo 1.42 iv 46, where Hitt. *puyattiš* glosses Sum. ŠE.BE.DA and Akk. ŠI-IN-DU. As CHD P: 369f. states, the Akk. word may denote *šindu* ‘mark, paint’, but the Sum. word is further unknown. A translation ‘dyer’s madder’, as given in CHD, is prompted on the basis of a resemblance with Ugar. *pt* and Arab. *fawwatu* ‘madder’, but this could be coincidental, of course. Tischler (HEG P: 679) suggests a tie-in with the verb *pîqaš* ‘to pound, to crush’ (q.v.), assuming that the word means ‘(dying) powder’.
-š (nom.sg.c.-ending)

PIE *-s

The Hittite nom.sg.c.-ending -š of course directly reflects the PIE ending *-s. For the pre-Hittite process of sigmatization of originally asigmatic nom.sg.c.-words, see Weitenberg 1995.

-š (gen.sg.-ending): see -aš

-š (2sg.pret.act.-ending of the mi-flection)

This ending is attested in verbs that end in a vowel only: te-e-eš ’you stated’ (MH/MS), pě-e-ḥu-te-eš ’you brought’, verbs in -nu- (e.g. pa-ab-ša-nu-uš (OS), ša-al-la-nu-uš (OS)), ḫatrae-class verbs (e.g. ḫa-at-ra-a-eš, ḫa-at-ra-a-iš), -je/a-verbs (i-e-eš, ú-ya-aš), -ške/a-verbs (da-aš-ke-eš). In verbs that end in a consonant all the evidence shows that the mi-ending -š has been replaced by the corresponding ħi-ending -tta in the oldest texts already: e-ep-ta (MH/MS), ħar-ap-ta (MS), me-er-ta (OH/MS). Unfortunately no 2sg.pres.act.-forms of verbs in consonants are attested in OS texts. An occasional form like pa-ḥt-ta ’you went’ (OH/NS) shows that in NH times the replacement of -š by -tta is starting to take place in verbs that end in a vowel as well. Moreover, there is evidence that in NH times the function of the 2sg.-forms are taken over by the 3sg.-form (e.g. i-ja-at ’you made’, pě-e-ḥu-te-et ’you brought’, šu-ul-le-e-et ’you bragged’, ú-ya-te-et ’you brought’, zi-in-nil-it ’you finished’). Occasionally, we find ħi-verbs in which the 2sg.pret.act.-ending is -š instead of expected -tta (e.g. pě-e-da-aš ’you
carried’, ša-ak-ki-iš ‘you knew’, ša-an-na-aš ‘you concealed’, u-un-ni-eš ‘you carried (here)’, iš-da-aš ‘you brought (here)’). Since these are all of NS texts, they must in my view not be regarded as cases in which the original ħi-ending -tta is replaced by the mi-ending -š, but rather as formal 3sg.pret.act.-forms with the ħi-ending -š that are used in the function of 2sg.pret.act.

The etymology of the 2sg.pret.act.-ending -š of the mi-conjugation is clear: it must reflect *-s that goes back to the PIE secondary 3sg.pret.act.-ending (3sg.pret.act.-ending of the chain-flection)

This ending belongs to the ħi-conjugation and contrasts with the functionally equal mi-conjugation ending -t / -tta (q.v.). This ending is quite remarkable because whereas almost all other endings of the preterite are etymologically connected with their corresponding present ending in the sense that the present ending is identical to the preterite ending with an element -i attached to it (-mi ~ -un (< *-m), -ši ~ -si (< *-ti) ~ -t; -h-he ~ -h lun (<< *-hha), -tti (< *-tte) ~ -tta; -yeni ~ -yen, -teni ~ -tet), the ending -š is formally totally different from its corresponding 3sg.pres.act.-ending -e < *-e-i. On the basis of the parallelity mentioned, we would a priori expect an ending *-e in this form (which would then correspond to the PIE 3sg.perf.-ending *-e). Yet in a preform *CóC-e, this ending would regularly disappear (loss of word-final *-e as e.g. in *tōk’e > takku /tak’/, *nek’e > nekku /nek’/). I therefore assume that this ending was replaced by a 3sg.pret.-ending from another paradigm, namely the PIE s-aorist, which further has been totally lost in Anatolian (unless the several verbs that show an s-suffix are to be regarded as the formal descendants of the s-aorist). This ending must have been *-s-t, of which *-t was dropped (loss of word-final *-t after another consonant, cf. nom.-acc.sg.n. kuman ‘killed’ < *gʰn-i-ent). Note that only the aorist-ending was taken over, not the whole form, which is visible in the fact that the root vocalism in these forms still is *CóC-

Throughout the Hittite period, we see that the ending -š is being replaced by the mi-ending -t / -tta. In verbs ending in -š even this already happened in OH times (e.g. hā-a-aš-ta (OS) ‘she bore’ instead of expected **hāš or pa-aš-ta ‘he drank’ instead of expected **pāš). In verb ending in -t, this happened from MH times onwards (e.g. hā-a-az-ta (MS) ‘he dried’ vs. **/Hāds’). In verbs ending in other consonants, we see replacement in NS texts especially (e.g. ak-ta vs. ak-a-ki-iš, hū-ya-a-p-ta vs. hū-u-ya-ap-pi-iš, iš-tap-ta vs. iš-tap-pa-aš, ma-ni-ja-ā-h-ta vs. ma-ni-ja-ā-h-ē-iš). Occasionally we encounter an ending -sta, which seems to be a conflation between -š and -tta (e.g. a-ar-aš-ta ‘he washed’: note that the origin
of -ša in tarn(a)-class and mēma/i-class verbs, where it seems to be the original ending instead of -š, may have been different).

=šša-: see =šši- / =šša- / =šše-


PIE *-soh₁-, *-sh₁-

In the older literature, this suffix is usually called “iterative”, but this should be abandoned. According to Melchert (1998b), stems in -šš(a)- are used to express progressive, iterative, durative, distributive and imperfessive meaning, “all of which share the feature imperfectivity” (o.c.: 414), and therefore I cite this suffix as an “imperfective-suffix”. Melchert has also shown that the stems in -šš(a)- are functionally equivalent to stems in -šša- and -šša/-šša/-šša/-šše- ‘to express’ and ᵃʳᵃʳⁱˢša/-šša/-šša/-ššišš- ‘to help’, the forms with other imperfective-suffixes, e.g. iške/a/-ššišša- ‘to do, to make’, ᵃʳᵃʳⁱˢša/-šša/-ššišš- ‘to call’, ᵃʳᵃʳⁱˢša/-ššišš- ‘to express’ and ᵃʳᵃʳⁱˢša/-ššišš- ‘to help’, the forms with other imperfective-suffixes, e.g. iške/a/-ššišša- ‘to do, to make (imperf.)’, ᵃʳᵃʳⁱˢša/-ššišš- ‘to scream (imperf.)’ are clearly of secondary origin. For the scope of this book it would go too far to elaborate on the question why a certain verb chose a particular one of these three suffixes to express an imperfective meaning, but I can imagine that the answer to it would give us much more insight into the prehistory of the Hittite aspectual system.
As already mentioned, the suffix -šš(a)- is found with four verbs only and one should see their respective lemmas for full attestations (yarrisšš(a)- under the lemma yarrī- / yarrai-); I have cited under this lemma only a compilation of the oldest attested forms. Of these four verbs, yarrisšš(a)- stands quite apart, as it is attested in NH compositions only, whereas ūšš(a)-, ḥalzišš(a)- and šišš(a)- are attested from OH times onwards (with ūšš(a)- and ḥalzišš(a)- having numerous OS attestations). This may explain why ūšš(a)-, ḥalzišš(a)- and šišš(a)- are clear deverbal derivatives (of ħw[a]², ḥalzi-[i] / ḥalzi- and ši-[i] / ši- respectively), whereas yarrisšš(a)- does not have a clear origin. On the one hand one could think that it is derived from the verb yarrae-z², but this verb is itself attested three times only in NH compositions. On the other hand, one could think of the adjective yarrī- / yarrai- as its origin, but a denominal derivation with an imperfective-suffix seems unlikely to me. Therefore Starke’s suggestion (1990: 155-6) that yarrisšš(a)- is a borrowing from Luwian (where *yarrisšša- itself is unattested, but where a verb yarrīja- is found in HLuwian), may not be that unattractive. It therefore might be better to further leave yarrisšš(a)- out of consideration here.

The question is what the exact form of this suffix is. On the one hand, one could analyse the suffix as -išš(a)- (which becomes -ešš(a)- in NH times due to the lowering of OH ħl to NH ħl before -š-, cf. § 1.4.8.1.d), so ħl- isArray(a)-, ḥalz-išš(a)- and ši-išš(a)-. On the other hand, one could assume that the -i- is part of the verbal stem and that the suffix itself is only -šš(a)-, so ħl- isArray(a)-, ḥalzi-šš(a)- and ši-šš(a)-. This option has the benefit that the suffix -šš(a)- then can be directly compared to the Luwian imperfective-suffix - isArray(-) (CLuw. - isArray-, HLuw. - isArray-). I therefore will treat the suffix as -šš(a)- here.

The original inflection of the suffix is -ššaḥḥi, -ššattî, -ššaï, -ššuenî, -štenî, -ššanzi, and it therefore inflects according to the tarn(a)-class. As this class consists of roots that ended in laryngeal, this must be valid for the suffix -šš(a)- as well. We therefore must assume a preform *-soH- besides *-shH-. Since *h₂ would have yielded Hitt. -h-, the laryngeal should be either *h₁ or *h₃ (although the latter one is less likely as I know no other suffix or ending where *h₃ is found). The fact that we find a geminate -šš- can be explained by the weak stem *-sh₁H-, which would regularly yield geminate -šš-, after which this -šš- spread through the paradigm (cf. zinni² / zimm- ‘to finish’ for a similar scenario). In this way, ūšš(a)- reflects *HH-i-s(o)h₁H-, ḥalzišš(a)- < *h₂lt-i-s(o)h₁H- and šišš(a)- < *sh₁-i-s(o)h₁H-.

The IE origin of this suffix is quite unclear. E.g. Oettinger (1992a: 233) suggests a connection with the IE unreduplicated desiderative, whereas Melchert (1987a: 200) assumes a connection with the Tocharian ‘causative’ in -s-.
Personally, I would not be surprised if in the future it would turn out that this suffix, *-soh₁r/*-sh₁r, from a pre-PIE point of view has to be regarded as identical to the other imperfective-suffix, *-skē/o- (which probably is a PIE thematicization of original *-skē-). Compare e.g. the similarity in form and meaning between *(fj)a ‘and’ < *h₂je and *-kʷe ‘and’.

§ae³: see §ah₂-

§ah₂- (Iib) ‘to clog, to stuff, to fill in, to stop, to block, to plug up’: 3sg.pres.act. ša-a-ḥi (NH), 3pl.pres.act. ša-[a-a-an]-zi (MH/NS), ša-a-ḥa-an-zi, 3sg.pres.act. ša-a-[a-an]-ta (NH); 3sg.pres.midd. ša-ḥa-a-rí (MH/NS); part. ša-ḥa-an-t-, ša-a-ḥa-an-t- (MH/NS), ša-ḥa-a-an-t- (MH/NS); impf. ša-ḥi-iš-ke/-a- (NS), ša-a-ḥi-iš-ke/-a- (MH/NS), ša-a-ḥi-eš-ke/-a- (MH/NS).

Derivatives: see šaheštar / šahešn-.

IE cognates: Gr. Ṱελευθ to satiate oneself’, Skt. ásinvant- ‘unsatiable’, TochB sov- ‘to be satisfied’.

PIE *šôh₂-e’

See CHD Š: 1f. for attestations. Note that Kimball (1999: 398) cites this verb as šaḥ₂/-šôh₂- in the basis of part.nom.-acc.sg.n. “sa-a-ah-ḥa-an” (KUB 9.28 i 14), which would be the only form that shows geminate -ḥḥ-. This form does not exist, however: the handcopy clearly reads ḫḥi > ḫḥi = ša-a-ḥa-an. So, all forms of this verb are spelled with single -ḥ-. Mechanically, šah₂- can hardly reflect anything else than PIE *sêh₂-. In 3sg.pres.act., we expect that *šôh₂-e’ > šãh₂ with single -h- due to lenition after *ó (cf. āki / akkanzi, īstũpī / īstapannzi etc.). In 3pl.pres.act., we would expect that *ṣh₂-énti > *išhanzi. It is likely that this paradigm, šãh₂ / *išhanzi, was not retained thus and was levelled out to šãh₂ / išhanzi, with introduction of the singular stem in the plural.

Eichner (1973a: 69-70) translates šãh₂- as “verunreinigen, besudeln” (similarly Oettinger 1979a: 512: “verstopfen, beschmieren” and Rieken 1999a: 340: “verunreinigen, verstopfen, beschmieren, auffüllen”). These translations are incorrect: CHD clearly shows that šãh₂- does not mean ‘to pollute, to defile’ but only ‘to clog, to plug up, to stuff’. Eichner further states that šãh₂- is the basis from which Hitt. šêhur / šêhu- ‘urine’ and CLuw. šahh₂a- “Schmutz” are derived, through the meaning ‘dirty, polluted’. First it should be noted that Starke (1990: 228-9) has shown that CLuw. šahh₂a- “Schmutz” does not exist: the form that Eichner translates thus is rather to be interpreted as šahh₂an- ‘feudal service’ (see at šahh₂an-). Secondly, the fact that šãh₂- actually means ‘to clog, to plug up, to
stuff’ makes an etymological connection with šēḫur ‘urine’ semantically impossible: I do not see how these meanings can be connected (see at šēḫur / šēhr- for an alternative etymology).

In my view, we rather connect šēh-‘to stuff up, to fill’ with the PIE root *seh₂(3)- that is translated ‘to satisfy’ on the basis of Gr. ἀπονεμω ‘to satiate oneself’, Skt. āśīvant- ‘unsatiated’ and TochB soy- ‘to be satisfied’ (note that LIV² translates the root as ‘satt werden’ (intr.), whereas Hardørson (1993: 207) pleas for transitive ‘sättigen’). In my view, however, the root *seh₂- originally had the meaning ‘to stuff up, to fill’ that is still visible in Hittite. This meaning was altered to ‘to satiate’ (which is a trivial semantic development) after the splitting off of Anatolian and yielded the forms meaning ‘to satiate, to satisfy’ as found in the other IE languages (cf. Adams 1999: 703 for a similar scenario).

šaḫ-²: see ša(n)h-²

šaḫan- (n.) a kind of obligation, service or payment due from land tennants to the real owners of the land (palace, temple, community or individuals): nom.-acc.sg. ša-ah-ḫa-an (OS), gen.sg. ša-ah-ḫa-na-aš (OH/NS), dat.-loc.sg. ša-ah-ḫa-ni (MH/MS), ša-ah-ḫa-a-ni (NH), abl. ša-ah-ḫa-an-za (MH/MS), ša-ah-ḫa-na-za (MH/NS), ša-ah-ḫa-na-az (NH), instr. ša-ah-ḫa-ni-it (OH/NS, MH/MS), ša-a-ah-ḫa-ni-it, nom.-acc.pl.(?) ša-ah-ḫa-na (NH), ša-ah-ḫa-ni (OH/NS), dat.-loc.pl.(?) ša-ah-ḫa-na-aš (NH).


PIE *sēh₂n, *s(e)h₂én(o)š

See CHD Š: 7f. for attestations and semantic discussion. Rieken (1999a: 287) convincingly reconstructs this word as *sēh₂-n, assuming that, together with iškanitar ‘relative by marriage’ (q.v.), it derives from *sēh₂- ‘to bind’ (for which see at iškāi- / išē-i). This means that we are dealing with a protoderivative paradigm *sēh₂-n, *sh₂-en > pre-Hitt. sēh₂-n, *sēh₂-en-os > Hitt. šaḫan, šaḫanaš (compare *pēh₂-ur, *ph₂-uēn-s > *pēh₂ur, pēh₂uēnos > Hitt. pahḫur, pahḫuenaš ‘fire’). Kimball (1999: 396) reconstructs *sēh₂-om, but this does not explain the n-stem forms in the oblique cases.

šaḫeššar / šaḫešn- (n.) ‘fortification, stronghold’ (Sum. BÀD-eššar): nom.-acc.sg. ša-ḫe-eš-šar (OS).

See CHD Š: 9f. for attestations. The phonetically spelled forms of these words (šaheššar and šahešnae-) are not totally clear regarding their interpretation, but the meanings ‘fortification’ and ‘to fortify’ certainly would fit the contexts they occur in. The meaning of the logographically written words, BÀD-šluw. BÀD, ʰšluw., BÀD-šluw., is ascertained as ‘fortification’ and ‘to fortify’, however. Nevertheless, there has been some debate whether or not šaheššar is to be equated with BÀD-eššar (a reading *kuteššar has been proposed on the basis of HLuw. SCALPRUM.kutasara/i- and CLuw. NΛ-kuttaššara/i- ‘orthostat’ (see at kūt-)), but CHD (Š: 10) and Rieken (1999a: 13660) now state that the equation of BÀD with šaheššar / šahešn- is the only likely one.

Formally, šaheššar must be derived from šâh-² ‘to clog, to plug up, to stuff’. CHD states that “if the word is derived from the verb šâh-, whose meaning is ‘to stuff, fill, stop up, block’, an area of earthen fill (a rampart) may be meant”. It is also possible, however, that we must assume a similar semantic development as visible in īstappeššar ‘dam, enclosure’ that is derived from the verb īstâp-² / īstappep- ‘to plug up, to block, to dam, to enclose, to shut; to besiege’. See for further etymology at šâh-².

šâh-² (Ib1 > Ic2) ‘to become sullen, to become sulking, to be(come) angry; (midd. + =z) to quarrel with each other’: 3sg.pres.act. ša-a-iz-zi, 3pl.pres.act. ša-a-an-zi (OH/MS), ša-an-zi (OH/NS), 1sg.pres.act. ša-a-mu-un (OH/NS), 3sg.pres.act. ša-a-i-it (OH/MS?), ša-ii (OH/MS), ša-i-it (OH/NS), ša-a-iš (MH/NS); 3pl.pres.midd. ša-a-an-ta-ti (NH); part. ša-a-an-t- (MS?); verb noun ša-a-u-ya-ar (OH/MS), ša-a-u-ar (OH/MS?), ša-a-u-a-r (MH/NS), dat.-loc. ša-a-u-ya-ar-ri (NH).

Derivatives: ˢʰᵉˡᵃʳ (n.) ‘irritation(?)’ (nom.-acc.sg. ša-a-tar (OH/MS), ša-a-tar, see šame-).

IE cognates: Lat. saevus ‘wild, furious, ferocious’, Gr. αὐ-κόνις ‘cruel’, Goth. sair, OHG serr ‘pain’. PIE *seʰʰi-ti

See CHD Š: 13f. for attestations. This verb inflects according to the ʰatrae-class, so seemingly we are dealing with a stem šae². This class predominantly consists of verbs of denominative origin, showing a *-ie/o-derivation of o-stem nouns. In
this case, a nominal origin is not very likely, however, as we would be dealing
with a noun *so-. Since Juret (1942: 40), this verb is generally connected with
Lat. saevus 'wild', which reflects *sehši-uo- (cf. Schrijver 1990: 270, who
connects it with Gr. ἄλφα 'cruel', Goth. sair, OHG sêr 'pain'). Oettinger
(1979a: 363) reconstructs *sehši-jo-o-, but this is in conflict with his own
discovery that verbs in *-ehši-jo-o- end up in the Hittite tâš/a-class (named after
tâš/a- 'to steal' < *tehši-jo-o-) whereas šatrae-class verbs reflect *-šo-jo-o-.
Oettinger tries to disguise this discrepancy by citing the verb as "šae- (oder
šaši-)", but from the attested forms it is clear that it does not inflect according to
the tâš/a-class. Melchert (1994a: 176ff.) recognizes this problem and assumes
that complex contractions have taken place: *šašiše-jo-o- > šâaši-jo-.- His reconstruction
with *a is solely based on the knowledge that *-ehši-jo-o- would have yielded
*čâši-jo-. Apart from the methodological problem of reconstructing a phoneme *a,
it is quite problematic, in my view, that a preform *šašiše-jo-o- would yield a shorter
outcome than *tehši-jo-.

In my opinion, the etymological interpretation of this verb largely depends on
the behaviour of the cluster *-hši-. It is generally accepted that in a sequence
*-VhšiV- the laryngeal disappears (*tehši-jo-o- > tâš/a-: the seeming exceptions,
lahšiše-jo-2 (derived from lášš(a)- 'military campaign'), zahšiše-jo-2 (derived from
zahšiš- 'battle') and tuhšišat- (restored on the basis of tudišiš- 'to produce
smoke') are clearly of secondary origin). The outcome of a sequence *-VhšiC- is
less clear, however. Although one at first sight would expect Hitt. -VhšiC-, I have
not been able to find any word that unambiguously reflects -VhšiC- < *-VhšiC-
(šahšima- 'drought' and tuhšima- are derivatives in -ima- of the verbs šahš- and
tuhšae-; NINDA muššiša- (a kind of pastry) and NINDA nahiššitäi- (a bread) are of
foreign origin and zaššiš (acc.sg.) 'battle' is a NH secondary form in the
paradigm of the diphthong-stem zaššiši-: note that nouns in -ššiš- are all of
Luwian origin). This opens up the possibility that *-VhšiC- did not yield Hitt.
-VhšiC-, but, for instance, *-VšiC-. If so, then we are allowed to assume that šâzzi
reflects an athematic verbal form *shâši-ti. As a mi-inflecting root present, we
would in principle expect ablaut in the stem and therefore 3pl.pres.act. *shâši-enti,
which regularly should have yielded Hitt. iššišanzi (like iššišanzi 'they bind' <
*šâši-enti in the paradigm iššiš- / išši-). It is quite understandable, however, that
a paradigm šâzzi, iššišanzi was not retained as such and that the singular stem
šâ- was introduced into the plural. Note that this generalization of the stem šâ- must
have taken place in the period before the contraction of *VšiV to *V, since
*šâzânsi participated in it, yielding attested šânsi. This scenario demands that the
only specific šatrae-class inflected form, 1sg.pret.act. šâmu[n] (OH/NS) (instead
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of expected **šānum**, must be regarded as secondary, which is unproblematic in view of the high productivity of the ʰatrae-class inflection in NH times.

šai₁ / ši-; šiie/a.² (IIa4 > Ic1 > Ic2; Ic1 > Ic2) ‘to impress, to seal; to put on (headgear); to pitch (a tent); to prick, to sting; to propel, to shoot, to throw; (with šara) to push up, to send up; (with katta) to send down; (midd.) to squirt, to spurt, to flow; (midd.) to shoot out, to spring out; to press’: 1sg.pres.act. ši-ja-ši (NH), ši- fraught-mi (NH), 3sg.pres.act. ši-i-e-ez-zi (MH/MS), ši-i-e-zzi (NS), ši-i-e-[l], ši-ja-az-zi (NH), ši-ja-ja-iz-zi, ši-ja-ja-iz-zi (NH/NS), ši-ja-ja-iz-zi (OH/NS), ša-ari (MS), 1pl.pres.act. ši-ja-a-u-e-ni (MH?/MS?), ši-i-e-[u-e-ni?] (NH/NS), 3pl.pres.act. ši-ja-an-zi (MH/MS), 1sg.pret.act. ši-ja-nu-an (NH), ši-ja-nu-un (NH), 2sg.pret.act. ši-i-iš-tu (OH/NS), 3sg.pres.act. ši-i-i-e-et (OH/MS), ša-a-iš, ša-a-iš, ši-ja-ari (NH), ši-a-i (NH), ši-ja-ari (NH), 2pl.pret.act.(or imp.) ša-a-iš-tén, 3pl.pret.act. ši-ja-er (NH), 2sg.imp.act. ši-ja-a (OH/MS), ši-ja-a (OH/NS), ša-a-i (MH/NS), 2pl.imp.act.(or pret.) ša-a-iš-tén, še-iš-te-en (OH/NS), 3pl.imp.act. ši-i-ja-ndu (OH/NS), ši-i-ja-ndu (MH/NS), ši-i-ja-a-an-du; 3sg.pres.midd. ši-i-e-et-ta-ri (OH/NS), ši-e-et-ta, ši-ja-ri (NS), ši-ja-ri (NS), 3pl.pres.midd. ši-ja-nd-r-i, 3sg.pret.midd. ši-ja-ti (MH/MS), 3pl.pret.midd. ši-i-an-ta-at (OH/NS); verb.noun ši-i-ya-ar (OH/NS), gen.sg. ši-ja-ya-š (NH); inf.I ši-i-ya-an-zi (NH); inf.II ši-ja-an-na (NH); part. ši-ja-a-an-t (OH/MS), ši-ja-a-an-t (MH?/NS), ši-i-ja-an-t-; impf. ši-i-eš-ke/a- (OH/MS), ši-ja-š-ke/a- (OH/NS), ši-i-ja-iš-ke/a-, ši-eš-ke/a-.

Derivatives: see É šiennaš, šiissant-, Giššištattel-, *šiijtar / šiimm-, šiirclesšar / šiŘš-, šiššíšar, šišša- / šišš-, šiššíšar, šiššíšar- , šiíršar- and šišíśišar-².

PIE *sh₁-ó-i-et, *sh₁-i-énti; *h₁s-ió-nti.

See CHD Š: 15f. for attestations and semantic treatment. It is generally thought that we are dealing here with the conflation of two verbs, namely a hi-verb šai₁ / ši- ‘to press, to seal, to put on headgear’ and a mi-verb šiie/a.² ‘to throw, to shoot, to sting’ (cf. CHD Š: 21; Kimball 1987b). CHD states, however, that “unfortunately the extent and timing of such a conflation cannot be determined from the available evidence”. I therefore have followed CHD in citing all forms under one lemma. The conflation is the logical result of the fact that šai₁ / ši-, which inflects according to the důu/tíanzi-class, in younger times secondarily was taken over into the -je/a-class (in this case šiie/a.²) on the basis of the reinterpretation of 3pl.pres.act. šiie-anzi as šiija-nzi (cf. ħuui¹ / ħui- with secondary ħuue/a.², ħspai¹ / ħspi- with secondary ħspiie/a.², etc.).
According to Kimball (1987b), the verb šēj- 'to shoot' and reflects *h₁s-je/o-., whereas šaŋ- / Ši- 'to press, to seal' belongs with the verbs for 'to sow' in the other IE languages: Lat. serō, Goth. sājon, Lith. sējo, OCS sējo 'to sow' < *seh₁- (Kimball 1999: 433, followed by e.g. LIV\textsuperscript{2}). This would mean, however, that PIE *seh₁- originally meant 'to sow by pressing the seed into the ground', which, on the one hand yielded the Hittite meaning 'to press', and, on the other, the meaning 'to sow' in the rest of the IE languages. As I have shown in Kloekhorst fthc.a, the verbs of the dā/iťanzi-class reflect a structure *CC-oĭ / *CC-i-. In this case, it would mean that we have to reconstruct *š̄h₁-ōi-ei, *š̄h₁-īenti.

šākk\textsuperscript{i} / šakk- (IHa2) 'to know (about), to experience, to heed, to pay attention to, to recognize; to remember, to be expert in; to be acquainted with' (Akk. ID\textsuperscript{2}Y): 1sg.pres.act. ša-a-ak-ḫi (OH/MS), ša-a-ak-kā-ḫ[a]-ḫi (OH/MS), ša-ak-kā-ḫ[a]-ḫi (OH/NS), ša-ak-kā-ḫ[a]-ḫi (NH), 2sg.pres.act. ša-a-ak-ti (OH/MS?), ša-ak-ti (MH/MS), še-ek-ti (NH), 3sg.pres.act. ša-a-ak-ki (MH/NS), ša-ak-ki (OH/NS), 1pl.pres.act. še-ek-ku-pheti (NH), še-ek-ku-te-ni (NH), ši-ek-ku-te-ni (NH), ši-ek-ku-ŋu-te-ni (NH), 2pl.pres.act. ša-a-ak-te-ni (OS), ša-ak-te-ni (OH/NS), še-ek-te-ni (MH/NS), še-ek-te-ni (NH), 3pl.pres.act. ša[a]-kàn-zi (OH/NS), še-ek-kàn-ši (MH?/MS?), še-kàn-zi (NS), 1sg.pret.act. ša-ag-ga-ḫu- müş (NH), ša-ak-ḫu-muš (NH), 2sg.pret.act. ša-a-ak-tar- (<a>š</a>) (MH/MS), ša-ak-kiš (OH/NS), ša-ak-ša (NH), 3sg.pret.act. ša-a-ak-ṣa (NH), ša-ak-ta (NH), še-ek-ta (MH/NS), 1pl.pret.act. še-ek-ku-te-en (NH), še-ek-ku-te-en (NH), še-ek-ke-er (NH), š[e]-ek-[e]r (NH), 1sg.imp.act. še-ag-ga-al-lu (NH), ši-ag-ga-al-lu (NH), 2sg.imp.act. ša-a-ak (MH/MS), ša-ak (NH), 3sg.imp.act. ša-a-ak (MH/MS), ša-ak-du (NH), ša-a-ak-du (NH), 2pl.imp.act. š[a]-a-k-ša (NH), še-ek-té (NS), ši-ik-ša (NH), 3pl.imp.act. še-ek-kàn-du (MH/MS); part. ša-ak-kàn-t (MH/MS), še-ek-kàn-t (MH/MS), ši-ik-kàn-t-

Derivatives: see šak(k)antat(ı)ar.

IE cognates: Lat. secō 'to cut', sciō 'to know', OCS sēšti, sēkō 'to cut', PGerm. *sagō(n) 'to saw'.

PIE *sókh₁-ei, *skh₁-entī

See CHD Š: 21f. for attestations. Usually, this verb is cited as šākk- / šekk-, which is incorrect. Although a stem šekk- indeed is attested often, the oldest weak-stem form of this paradigm is 2pl.pres.act. ša-a-ak-te-ni (OS), showing a weak stem šakk-. This stem is supported by 3pl.pres.act. š[a]-kàn-zi (OH/NS) and part. ša-
ak-kānt- (MH/MS). I therefore cite this verb as śākk² / ṣakk- here. The stem śekk- is attested from MH times onwards, in weak stem forms (1pl.pres.act. śekkueni (MS?), 2pl.pres.act. šekteni (MH/NS), 3pl.pres.act. šekkanzi (MH?/MS?), 3pl.imp.act. šekkandu (MH/MS), part. šekkan- (MH/MS)), as well as in strong stem forms (2sg.pret.act. šekti (NH), 3sg.pret.act. šekta (MH/NS), 1pl.pret.act. šekkuen (NH), 3pl.pret.act. šekker (NH), 2pl.imp.act. šekten (NS)). I will first focus on the etymological interpretation of the root, and then look at the origin of the three different stems.

Regarding the root-etymology, we must take into account the fact that we find geminate -kk- throughout the paradigm, which is quite remarkable (compare e.g. ākī / akkanzi). Oettinger (1979a: 412f., following a suggestion by Benveniste 1932: 140f.) connects this verb with Lat. sāgīre ‘to have a good nose, to perceive keenly’, Goth. sokjan ‘to search’, Gr. ἅγγεια ‘to lead the way; to command, to believe’ from *sēh₂g-. He explains the geminate -kk- out of *sēh₂g- in *(se-)sōh₂g-ei. This is in contradiction with the reconstruction of sāgī- ‘sign, omen’ as *sēh₂g-ā- as well as ἅgē ‘bites’ as *tōh₂g-ei, however. The weak stem śekk-, which is taken as original by Oettinger, is explained as reflecting *(se-)sh₂g- (i.e. *se-sh₂g-eh₁-re > šekker), under the assumption that *(z)gg- > -kk-. This is not very credible, however. So, despite the fact that this etymological connection is semantically quite acceptable (pace Melchert 1994a: 69, who states that this etymology “must be rejected on semantic grounds”), its formal side is unsatisfactory.

Justus (1982: 322ff.) connects śākk/-sakk- with “*sek- ‘to cut’, which in fact must be sekH- on the basis of Lat. perf. secūr (Rix 1999: 525-6). The semantic development would be parallel to the one seen in Lat. sciō ‘to know’ < *skH-jev-o-. This etymology is widely followed (e.g. Melchert 1994a: 69; LIV²). For Hittite, this means that śākki must reflect *sōkH-ēi, in which -kh- was not lenited by the preceding *ō. The fact that śākk/-sakk- does not inflect according to the tarn(a)-class, in my view shows that the laryngeal must have been *h₁, since a preform *sōkh₁₂-ēi would have yielded Hitt. **šakkai (cf. mallai ‘mills’ < *molh₂ei, paddai ‘digs’ < *b₃d₃h₂ei, iškallai ‘splits’ < *skolh₂₁e and išparrai ‘tramples’ < *spörh₂₁e). I therefore reconstruct śākki as *sōkh₁₁-ēi.

The interpretation of the different stems found within the paradigm of this verb, has caused much debate. On the basis of the fact that most of the forms of this verb shows either a stem śākk- or a stem śekek-, it was always assumed that this verb shows an original ablaut śākk–šekek-. Such an ablaut, a’/e, is rare in the Hittite verbal system. Within the hi-verbs, it can only be found in karāp² / kar/ip- ‘to devour’, šarāp² / šarip- ‘to sip’, ḫamank² / ḫame/ink- ‘to tie’ and ašās² / aše/īš-
‘to seat’. Within the mi-verbs, we only find tame/išš- ‘to (op)press’. For the a/-ablauting hi-verbs, Jasanoff (1979: 85-6; 2003) has proposed to assume that they reflect a PIE ablaut *o/e, a special category of “he-inflecting” verbs. This view has been widely followed. In my opinion, it is incorrect, however. Nowhere in the IE languages, a verbal ablaut *o/e is attested: its only trace would be these Hittite verbs. As I have shown under their respective lemmas, the -e-grades in karāp-/kare/ip-, šarāp-/šarip-, ḫamank-/ḫame/ink- and ašē-/aše/iš- are to be explained as a secondary introduction of the anaptyctic vowel /i/ in the original zero-grade stems, just as we must assume in the case of tame/išš-.

The case of alleged šēkk-/šekk- is different, however, since we have seen that the original inflection is šēkk-/šakk-, whereas the stem šekk- is attested from MH times onwards only. This situation reminds us of the verb ār- / ar- ‘to arrive’. In this verb, the original ablaut is ār-/ar-, but from MH times onward, a stem er- is attested as well. As I have shown under its lemma, the introduction of this er- was the result of the analogy aranzí : ārer with asanzí : eser ‘to be’, after which 3pl.pret.act. ārer was altered to erer. In NH times, we see that this stem er- has spread throughout all plural forms (e.g. eruenni, erteni, ernen, eren, erir, etc.).

For šēkk-, I would like to propose the following scenario. The original paradigm must have been *sēkheı́, *sēkhı́enti (with normal *o/O-ablaut as in all other hi-inflecting verbs), which should regularly have yielded Hitt. /sēkı/, **/iskanzı/. This paradigm could not be tolerated, however: nowhere in Hittite we find an ablaut ūVC- : īC-. It therefore was altered to /sēkı/, /skanzı/, spelled šēkk-/-sakk-. An initial cluster /sk/- without an epenthetic vowel /i/- was rare in Hittite, however: the only other example I know is /səgn/ : lsgnās ‘oil’ (see under šəkan / šakn-). It therefore was eager to be replaced by something better. When in MH times a similar analogy as described above for ārer >> erer yielded 3sg.pret.act. šekker ‘they knew’, this new stem šekk- was quickly used to replace all cases of /sk/- (yielding šekkueni, šekteni, šekkanzi, šekkandu and šekkant-). In NH times, it spread to all plural forms with an original strong stem as well (yielding šekkuen and šektien). Although this stem šekk- indeed goes back to virtual *sēkhı́, the vowel -e- was secondarily introduced in analogy to mi-verbs, and not part of the original ablaut.

šägā́ı- (c.) ‘sign, omen; miracle(?); warning; feature, characteristic’ (Sum. ISKIM): nom.sg. ša-ga-š- /š- (OS), ša-ga-a-iš (MH/MS), ša-ga-iš (OH/NS), ša-ka-eš, ša'-ga-eš, acc.sg. ša-ga-in (OH/MS?), ša-ga'-a-in (OH/NS), ša-a-ga-a-in
Derivatives: šākije/a-² (Ich1) ‘to give a sign, to give an omen; to reveal; to exemplify’ (2sg.pres.act. ša-ki-iš-ši (NH), 3sg.pres.act. ša-a-ki-ez-zi (OH/MS?), ša-ki-ja-az-zi (MH/NS), ša-ki-ja-zi (MH/NS), ša-ki-ez-zi (NS), 1sg.pret.act. ša-ki-mu-ün (OH/MS), ša-ji-ja-mu-ün (NH), 3sg.pret.act. ša-ki-at, ša-a-ki-ja-at (NH); impf. ša-aki-eš-ke/a-, ša-ki-iš-ke/a-, ša-aki-iš-ke/a- (NH)), šakijahh₁ (Iib) ‘to indicate, to signal, to give a sign or an omen’ (3sg.pres.act. ša-ki-ja-ah-zi (NH), 2sg.pret.act. ISKIM-ah-ta, 3sg.pret.act. ša-ki-ja-ah-ta (NH), 3pl.pret.act. ša-ki-ja-ah-ḥe-er; 3sg.pret.midd. ISKIM-ah-ṭa-at; verb.noun ISKIM-ah-ḥu-ya-ar, gen.sg. ša-ki-ja-ah-ḥu-ya-aš), *šakiaššar / šakiašš- (n.) ‘sign, omen’ (dat.loc.sg. ša-ki-aš-ni (NS)), šakijaḫuḫant- (adj.) ‘ominous’ (nom.sg.c. ša-ki-ja-u-ya-an-za).

IE cognates: Lat. sāga ‘to have a good nose, to perceive keenly’. Goth. sokjan ‘to search’. Gr. ἔρχομαι ‘to lead the way; to command, to believe’.

PIE *seh₂g-ōi-

See CHD Š: 32f. for attestations. This word is a diphthong-stem, for which see Weitenberg 1979. These stems go back to a structure *CēC-ōis, *CC-ōi-m, *CC-i-ōs. Regarding its etymology, this word is generally connected with the root *seh₂g- ‘einer Führte nachgehen’ (thus LIV²). In the older literature, a reconstruction *sh₂g-ōis is often given, in which *h₂ is supposed to have vocalized to -a- (Eichner 1973a: 71; Oettinger 1979a: 345, 41314). Nowadays it has become clear that “[t]here is no solid evidence for “vocalization” of */h₂/ anywhere in Anatolian” (Melchert 1994a: 70).

When applying Weitenberg’s analysis of this type, we have to assume a paradigm *sēh₂g-ōi-s, *sh₂g-ōi-m, *sh₂g-i-ōs, in which generalization of the e-grade in the root is trivial: *sēh₂g-ōi-s, *sēh₂g-ōi-m, *sēh₂g-i-ōs. This should regularly have yielded Hitt. **šāgaš, šagaš, **šakijš. The assumption of e-grade in the root is supported by the occasional plene spelling ša-a-k° in the paradigm of šāgā- itself (which is the reason for me to cite this noun as šāgā- and not as šagā- as one often finds) as well as in its derivative šākije/a-².

Melchert (1994a: 69) even goes so far in assuming that šākije/a- reflects *sēh₂g-je/o- and is to be directly equated with Lat. sāgēre. In my view, inner-Hittite derivation of šākije/a- from šāgā- is more likely, however.

šākan / šaṅ- (n.) ‘oil, fat’ (Sum. Ǐ): nom.-acc.sg. ša-ga-an (pre-NS), ša-a-kān (KBo 40.69 r.col. 5 (NS)), l-an (OH/MS), gen.sg. ša-ak-na-a-aš (OS), ša-ak-na-
aš, loc.sg. ša-ak-ni (MH/MS), erg.sg. ́-an-za (NH), abl. ́-az, instr. ša-kán-da (OS), ša-kán-ta, ́-it.

Derivatives: šakniʃe/a² (lc1) ‘to anoint, to smear (with oil), to oil’ (3pl.pres.act. ša-ak-ni-ja-an-zi (NH), ́-an-zi (NH)), šaknuʌʌnt-(adj.) ‘filled with fat or oil, fatty’ (nom.sg.c. [s]a-ak-nu-yu-an-za (NH), nom.-acc.sg.n. ša-ak-nu-an (MH/MS), nom.pl.c. ša-ak-nu-yu-an-te-eš (NS), acc.pl.c. ́-an-te-eš, dat.-loc.pl. ́-nu-an-ta-aš), see iškiʃe/a².


PIE *sāgʰ²-n, *sāgʰ-n-ós

See CHD Š: 35f. for attestations. For a long time the forms with šakn- were regarded as belonging to the paradigm of šakkar, zakkar ‘excrements’, until Hoffner (1994) proved that we are dealing with a separate word šāgan / šakn- ‘oil, fat’. Although no good IE cognate is known, the inflection of this word looks so archaic that an IE origin is likely. Rieken (1999a: 294) assumes a preform *seʃgʰ-en-. Mechanically, we must reconstruct a paradigm *sāg-n, *sg-n-ós, which should regularly have given Hitt. /şāgan/, */şg₂nás/. Since an ablaut ∫VC : išC is unparalleled in Hittite, the form */şg₂nás/ probably was remade to /şg₂nas/ (cf. at şākk²- / šakk- for a similar scenario). Nevertheless, it cannot be excluded that the o-grade was introduced into the oblique cases (so /şg₂nas/). Yet the fact that we are dealing with an OS attestation šaknāš that clearly is accentuated on the ending in my view indicates that this form is to be analysed as /şg₂nas/. According to Rieken (l.c.), the verb iškiʃe/a² ‘to anoint, to oil’ must be regarded as a derivative of this noun, reflecting *šgʰ-je/o-. See there for discussion.

Oettinger (2003: 340) adduces CLuw. tā̱in- ‘oil’, which he assumes to reflect a collective *sog-ēn. Although semantically this connection is convincing, the formal side is difficult, especially with regard to the initial t- in CLuwian. Nevertheless, there are some other words in which CLuw. t- seems to correspond to Hitt. š-: CLuw. tā̱in-i- ~ Hitt. śg₂kuuya- ‘eye’ and CLuw. dqu₂ / dqu₂n- ~ Hitt. šēhur / šēh₂n- ‘urine’. It is remarkable that in all these cases we are dealing with a word in which PAnat. *g disappeared in Luwian.


See CHD Š: 40 for attestations. It is unclear whether these forms are genuinely Hittite or of Luwian origin. According to Starke (1990: 516ff.) the words are derived from *šakkant(i)-, which he interprets as an old part. of *sekh₁- ‘to cut’, for which see šakk₁ / šakk.

šākka, zakkar / šakn- (n.) ‘excrement, dung, faeces’: nom.-acc.sg. ša-ak-kar (OH/NS), za-ak-kar (OH or MH/NS), gen.sg. ša-ak-na-āš (MH/NS).


PIE *sōk-r, *sk-őr, *sk-n-ōs

See CHD Š: 41f. for attestations. Since Benveniste (1935: 9) and Sturtevant (1936: 183ff.) this noun is generally connected with Gr. οὐκόμη, oikotós ‘excrement’ (going back to an *n-stem as well) and Av. saíriia-, PGerm. *skarna-, Russ. sor ‘dung’ and Latv. sārji ‘dung’ that seem to reflect *sēk-. The interpretation of the Hittite forms is not fully clear. The form šakkar is generally thought to reflect *sōk-r (cf. Rieken 1999a: 295). From a PIE point of view, we would expect that the oblique forms belonging to *sōk-r should have had a form *sēk-ōn- (compare *sēd-ōr, *sēōn- ‘water’). This form is not attested, however. The form zakkar must reflect a “coll.” *sēk-ōr (not *sēk-ēr, compare ūṣēr < *sēd-ōr!), certainly in view of the spelling za-ōš-ga-rō /tskar/ as attested in its derivative zašgaraš (q.v.). The expected oblique form belonging to this collective is *sēk-n-ōs, which in my view is the preform of gen.sg. šaknaš (so possibly phonetic /sknās/, cf. šēkan / skn-).

The initial z- of zakkar has caused much discussion. For instance, Rieken (l.c.) follows Oettinger (1994: 326ff.) in assuming that the development of š- > z- is due to nasal anticipation, and assumes a development *sakn- > *nsakn- > *nsakn- > *tsakn-, after which zakkar was formed. This is unconvincing: the only form that contains a nasal shows initial š- (šaknaš), whereas zakkar has no nasal. I would like to propose an alternative solution. The only other case that I know of where *s- > Hitt. z- is zama(n)kur ‘beard’ < *sma(n)k-ur (note that zimm-/zimm- ‘to finish’ < *ti-n(e)-h₁-, zē- ‘to cook’ < *tiēh₁- and zēnā- ‘autumn’ < *tiēh₁-no- and
therefore do not show *s- > Hitt. z-). It is remarkable that its derivative šamankuryant- ‘bearded’ does not show initial z-. So the development *s- > z-
seems to be limited to two words only, which both are neuter and have an initial cluster *sC-. I therefore want to propose that this development is due to a false
analysis of the syntagms *tod smókur and *tod sêkr (or whatever preceding
pronoun) as *tod’smókur and *tod’sêkr respectively. This would explain why z-
is only found in the nom.-acc. of neuter words and not in their oblique cases or
derivatives. This development only took place with *sC- and not with *sV-
(hence šakkar < *sôkr).

It should be noted that nom.-acc.sg. *sôkr regularly should have yielded
**sākar (with lenition of *-k- to /g/ due to the preceding *ó, cf. *-ôtr > Hitt.
-ćar), which means that unlenited -kk- must have been restored out of the oblique
cases.

šāklāi- (c.) ‘custom, customary behavior, rule, law, requirement; rite, ceremony;
privilege, right’: nom.sg. ša-ak-la-iš (MH/MS), ša-ak-la-a-iš (MH/NS), ša-a-ak-
la-a-iš (NH), acc.sg. ša-ak-la-in (MH/MS?, OH/NS), ša-ak-la-a-in (MH/NS),
ša-ak-li-in (OH/MS?), ša-a-ak-liin=ma-an (OH/MS), dat.-loc.sg. ša-ak-la-a-i
(NH), ša-ak-la-i (NH), ša-ak-li-ja (MH/NS), gen.sg. ša-ak-la-a-aš (NH), abl.
ša-ak-la-ja-za, nom.pl. ša-ak-[a-a-eš] (NH), ša-ak-la-uš (NH), acc.pl. ša-ak-la-
uš (NH).

PIE *seh₂k-lōi-

See CHD Š: 44f. for attestations. Since Sturtevant (1933: 87), this word is
generally connected with Lat. sacer ‘sacred’ and ON sátt ‘treaty’. These words
reflect a root *s(e)h₂k- (cf. Schrijver 1991: 97), so šāklāi- must reflect *s(e)h₂k-
lōi-s. If in the root the zero-grade has generalized, then this word would show a
development *s₇h₂k- > šāk- (thus Kimball 1999: 419), but this is unlikely in view
of the fact that “[t]here is no solid evidence for “vocalization” of *h₂j anywhere
in Anatolian” (Melchert 1994a: 70). We should rather assume generalization of
the e-grade throughout the paradigm, which is strongly supported by the plene
spellings ša-a-ak- (in an OH/MS text already).

šākruyet/a’²: see šākruyet/a’²

šāktæ.² (lc2) ‘to provide sick-maintenance’: 3sg.pres.act. ša-a-ak-ta-a-ez-zi
(OS), ša-ak-ta-iz-zi (NH).

IE cognates: Ofr. socht ‘stupor’.
See CHD Š: 51f. for attestations. See Watkins (1975: 70-1) for semantics and etymology. He states that Š staring means ‘to provide sick-maintainance’ and must be denominitive from a noun *šakti- < *sokt-. He connects this noun with OIr. socht ‘stupor’, which he further compares to Skt. vi-šaktā ‘dry (cow)’, from the verb *sek- ‘to dry’. This etymology demands the assumption of a semantic development *sokt- ‘dryness’ > ‘sickness’, which may not be very appealing. Despite its semantic unattractive, this etymology is followed by Oettinger (1979a: 377) and Melchert (1994a: 93).

šakuššai- (gender undet.) a body part: dat.-loc.sg. ša-ku-š-iš-ša-i (NS).

This word occurs in one context only:

KUB 45.24 i
(9) nu-u=š-ši=i=š-ša-an ša-ku-š-a-i=š-ši ku-it ŠA SÍG [S]A₃
(10) šu-u-i-el ḥa-ma-an-(-ga)̣̄-kán nu MUNUS ŠU.GI šu-u-e[l ...]

//
KBo 33.37 rev. + IBoT 2.48
(2/3) [(nu-u=š-ši=i=ša-a)n ša-ku-[iš-š]a-i ku-ỉ(t ŠA SÍG )S(A₃ šu-u-i-el)]
(3/4) ḫ[(a’-ma-a)n-kán(-an)₃] nu MUNUS [Š]U.GI šu-u-[ỉ(-e)]l ...

‘Whatever thread of red wool is tied onto his (i.e. the client’s) šakuššai-, the Old Woman will [...] (that) thread’.

From this context, we have to conclude that šakuššai- is a body part onto which threads could be tied. The formal similarity with šašuiya- ‘eye’ has led Haas & Wegner (1988a: 326 and 1988b: 160) to translate ‘Augenpartie’, but this is rejected by CHD Š: 77. For the form šakuššit, which CHD (l.c) cites as a possible instr.-form of this word, see the lemma šakuššišje/a-². Further unclear.

šakuššije/a-² (lc1) ‘?: 3sg.pret.act.(?) ša-ku-š-iš-št-i-et (KUB 17.28 i 15)

This verb is hapax in the following context:

KUB 17.28 i
(14) ša-pi-ik-ku-ùš-ta-ùš=a URUDU-aš nu-u=š-ša-an A-ta-an-ta
(15) ša-ku-š-iš-št-i-et n=a-an še-er ḫu-i-nu-um-me-ni
There is a copper pin. It has š.-ed with water and we let it run up and hammer it down’.

On the basis of this context, the meaning of šakuššiet cannot be determined. It has been suggested to read the form as ša-ku-i=š-ši-it ‘its eye’ (i.e. of the šapikkušta-, which is then interpreted as ‘needle’), but there is no positive evidence for this. Moreover, the word for ‘eye’ is an a-stem, šākua- (q.v.), and not an i-stem. CHD Š: 77 further suggests an interpretation as instr. of the noun šakuiššai-, a body part (q.v.), but this cannot be ascertained either. I have therefore chosen to interpret this word as a verbal form (on the basis of the fact that it stands in sentence-final position), namely 3sg.pret.act. of a further unattested verb šakuššiše/a-².

šak(k)uni- (c) ‘spring, well’ (Sum. TÚL?): nom.sg. ša-ku-ni-iš (NH), gen.sg. ša-ku-ni-ja-š (MH?/NS), all.sg. ša-ku-ni-ja.

Derivatives: šakuniše/a- (Ic1) ‘to well up’ (part.nom.-acc.sg.n. ša-ku-ni-ja-an (MH/NS); impf.2sg.pres.act. ša-ku-ni-eš-ke-ši (NH)). šakku(ya)ni- (c) ‘mud plaster’ (acc.sg. ša-ku-ya-ni-in, ša-ak-ku-ni-in, ša-ku-ni-in, case? ša-ak-ku-ya-ni- f[ar...]).

PIE *sok⁴*-n-i-

See CHD Š: 58 and 77 for attestations. Note that CHD is quite inconsistent in its treatment of these words. For instance, KBo 10.45 ii (11) ša-ku-ni-ja-an (12) [ša-ra-a] da-i is translated on page 58 ‘She takes [up] mud-plaster(?)’ (as if belonging with šakku(ya)ni- ‘mud-plaster’), whereas on page 78 it is translated ‘She takes [up] well-up mud’ (as if a part.nom.-acc.sg.n. of the verb šakuniže/a- ‘to well up’). A close look at all the contexts in which the above mentioned forms occur shows that we should distinguish the following words: the noun šakuni ‘spring, well’ (but not šakuniież as cited in CHD), the noun šakkuyani-, šakkuni- ‘mud-plaster’ (but not šakuni łazienk as cited in CHD) and the participle šakunijant ‘well-up’, derived from the verb šakunije/a-. Despite the fact that šakkuyani-, šakkuni- is the only one of these words that shows spellings with geminate -kk- (besides occasional single -k-), I assume on the basis of the semantic similarity that all these words are related and that the lack of geminate spelling -kk- in the words šakuni- and šakuniże/a- is due to chance (pace Rieken 1999a: 61²).

The formal connection between šakuni- and šakuniże/a- is clear, but the relation to šakku(ya)ni- is less obvious. Schmid (1988: 314-5) proposed a connection with
śākurya- ‘eye’ (which is semantically likely in view of Akk. īnu that denotes ‘eye’ as well as ‘well’), assuming a derivation of it with the suffix *-yon-/um- (and thus explaining śakkuyni- besides śakkuni-). Rieken (l.c.) rejects this suggestion on the basis of her idea that *-yon- should have yielded Hitt. **-man- next to labiovelar. This is incorrect, however: the labial element of labiovelars does not participate in the sound law *(yo)*u > -um- (cf. akueni ‘we drink’ < *hīqoyuṇī). Nevertheless, assuming an n-suffix is formally possible as well.

All in all, we have to assume a preform *sokʷ-n-, *s(o)kʷ-ōn- ‘eye-like > well’ (or *sokʷ-un-, *s(o)kʷ-yōn- if one likes), from which i-stem derivatives on the one hand yielded *sokʷ-n-i- > śakkuni- ‘well, spring’ and *sokʷ-n-je/o- > śakuniye/a- ‘to well up’, and on the other *sokʷ-on-i- > śakkuyni- ‘mud-plaster (i.e. what has welled up)’. The fact that *kʷ was not lenited in these forms (unlike in śākurya- ‘eye’) is due to the fact that unlenited *kʷ was generalized from the oblique cases. See at śākurya- for further etymology.

śakurye/a² (Ic4) (trans.) to water (animals); (intr. with =z) to drink;

PIE *sroġºru-je/o- ?

See CHD Š: 50f. for attestations. There, this verb is cited as “śakruwai-, śakruwai-”, despite the fact that it is stated (with reference to Melchert 1997a: 132) that “śakruwe/a- ‘to water’ is a denominative verb in *-ye/o- with regular loss of intervocalic *y”.

We find spellings that show a stem šakurye/a- and šakruye/a-. Because the form šakurye/a- seems to be the older one (it is the predominant spelling in MS texts, whereas šakru- occurs in NS texts), I cite the verb as šakurye/a- here. Apparently, šakurye/a- (šaṣgºru/e/a-) was dissimilated to šakruye/a- (/šagru ye/a-) in the late MH period. This šakurye/a- is, as stated by CHD, a denominative in *-je/o- of a stem *šakru-. Melchert (1994a: 170) assumes that this stem is metathesized from *šagºur. Moreover, he assumes that “[d]issimilatory loss of *[l] is seen in *srakubectl- ‘water’ > *srakubectl- ... > *sakruye- > sarakwe-. The base noun *srakubectl (i.e. *šagºu-/*wrl) belongs to the poorly attested s(a)raku- (/šagw-l) ‘to water’” (o.c.: 169). See at šarakwe- for further etymology.
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 braziliense (n.) ‘thigh($)’; nom.-acc.pl.(?) ša-ak-ut-ta-i (OH/NS), ša-ku-ta-a-e (NS), ša-ku-ut-ta (NS).

IE cognates: ?Skt. sākthi- ‘thigh’.

PIE *sokʷ“H-?

See CHD Š: 81 for attestations. This word is attested in a list of body parts that are arranged top-down: eyes, shoulder, back, breast, heart, lungs, kidneys, auli, šakutta( ), knee, feet, hands. This means that šakutta( )- is a body part (although it does not carry the UZU-determinative) that is located above the knees, but below the auli-, which is situated below the kidneys. CHD therefore suggests ‘rump, haunches, thigh or shank’. Normier apud Kühne (1986: 103) proposes a connection with Skt. sākthi- ‘thigh’, which would formally fit and semantically certainly be possible. If this etymology is correct, we have to reconstruct *sokʷ“H-o-. The fact that we do not find geminate spelling -kk- in šakutta( )-/sakʷta( )-l may be due to chance, although the broken spelling ša-ak-ut-ta-i could in fact show that we have to read it as ša-ak-ku-ut-ta-i.}

šākuya- (n.) ‘eye’ (Sum. IGI, Akk. ŠI NU): dat.-loc.sg. IGI₁A-i, gen.sg. ŠI IGI₂M, E-NI, all.sg.(?) ša-ku-ya (OH/NS), nom.-acc.pl. ša-a-ku-ya (OS), ša-ku-ua-a (MH/MS), ša-ku-ya (OH/NS), gen.pl. ša-ku-ya-aš (OH or MH/NS), ša-ku-ya- aš, dat.-loc.pl. ša-ku-ya-aš (OH/NS), abl.pl. [ša-k]u-ya-za, instr.pl. ša-a-ku-it (OS), ša-ku-i-it (OH/MS), ša-a-ku-ya-at (MH/MS).

Derivatives: šākuyal- (n.) ‘eye-cover’ (nom.-acc.sg. [š]a²-a-ak-ku-ya-al (MS), instr. [ša-a-a]k²-ku-ya-li-it (MS), nom.-acc.pl. ša-ku-ya-a[l-l(i)]), see šākuya(e)a² and šākuvantarija(e)a².


PAhat. *sōg⁹-o-

IE cognates: PGerm. *sēw-an ‘to see’
See CHD Š: 65f. for attestations. The oldest attestations of this word is nom.-acc.pl. šākuyā (OS). The bulk of the attested forms are plural, which means that we are practically dealing with a pluralum tantum. Often, the word is written with the sumerogram IGI, but it is not clear whether IGI always stands for šākuyā. For instance, the NS spelling IGI-anda for menaḫḫanda may show that IGI was associated with meni- ‘face’ as well (q.v.). This is important for our judgement of a few cases where IGI is phonetically complemented with i-stem endings: nom.sg.c. IGIH₂-iš (MH/MS), acc.sg.c. IGIH₂-in (NS) (see CHD (l.c.) for attestations). On the basis of these forms, e.g. CHD assumes that šākuyā- was an i-stem originally, and cites the lemma as “šakui-”. Nevertheless, the appurtenance of these i-stem forms to the word that I cite as šākuyā- is unlikely, not only because all phonetically spelled forms of this word show the a-stem šākuyā-, but also because these i-stem forms are commune whereas šākuyā- shows neuter forms only. As an extra argument in favour of the assumption that ‘eye’ originally was an i-stem šākui-, the form ša-ku-iš-ši-it (KUB 17.28 i 15) is interpreted by CHD as nom.-acc.sg.n. šākui=ššit ‘its eye’. As we will see at its own lemma, this word is rather a verbal form belonging to a stem šaknišši-e/a² (q.v.). Starke (1989: 665f.) states that the forms with IGIH₂-i- should be read as Luwian tāwa/-i-, but according to CHD (Š: 67) there is no evidence for this assumption. Rieken (1999a: 61) suggests to interpret the form ša-a-ku-i (KBo 34.129, 2) as reflecting an old dual ending in *-ih₂, but the fact that it stands right before a break (ša-a-ku-[i(−)...]) makes any interpretation uncertain (according to CHD an interpretation as dat.-loc.sg. is equally possible). All in all, we have to start from a neuter noun šākuyā-, which is almost consistently attested in the plural. There is no evidence that the commune forms IGIH₂-i- should be read šakui-, and therefore I will further leave these out of consideration here.

There are two different etymological proposals for this word, both going back to Sturtevant (1927b: 163). The first one connects šākuyā- with *h₂eke²- ‘to see’, which would imply that in Hittite we are dealing with an s-mobile: *s-h₂ek²-. The second one connects šākuyā- with PGerm. *sexe²- to see’ from *sek²-. Both etymologies have their problematic sides. The assumption of an s-mobile in *s-h₂ek²- is rather awkward, although one can compare šankuyai- ‘nail’ < *s-h₂ng⁴-ur- and possibly išhahr- ‘tear’, if this reflects *s-h₂ek²-. A meaning ‘to see’ of PGerm. *sexe²- is often thought to derive through a secondary development from PIE *sek²- ‘to follow’ (< ‘to follow with the eyes’). Both etymological proposals have the problem that PIE *k²- does not seem to correspond to Hitt. single -ku-,
which rather points to *-gʷⁿ⁽ʰ⁾-. This last problem is solved differently by different scholars. For instance, Eichner (1973a: 82) assumes a lengthened grade *shₐ₂kʷ- o- that should have caused lenition. He does not explain, however, how this *g could have yielded Hitt. á since it should not have been coloured according to his own law. Moreover, assuming lengthened grade in this formation is ad hoc. Melchert (1994a: 61) states that the PIE phoneme *-kʷ- turns up as Hitt. lgʷ/ unconditionally. According to him, this is not only visible in šākuṣa- but also in nekuₜ ‘night’ < *nekₜts and tarku- besides “Luw.” taru- ‘to dance’ < *terkʷ-. As I will show at their own lemmas, nekuₜ and tar(k)u- have alternative solutions. Besides, words like šakkuṣani- ‘mud-plaster’ < *sokʷ- on-i-, tekku- ‘to show, to present’ < *dekʷ¹s-, takku ‘if, when’ < *to-kʷe and nekku ‘not’? < *ne-kʷe clearly show that in Hittite a phoneme /kʷ/ < *kʷ is available, which means that the assumption of such a general lenition of *kʷ is incorrect. Moreover, it would be very difficult to offer a phonetic explanation for a general lenition of *kʷ whereas *k, *t and *p remain unlimited in similar positions.

My solution for the lenited lgʷ/ in šākuṣa- is that we see here an example of lenition due to a preceding accentuated *ó. As I have stated in § 1.4.1, I assume that *ó lenited a following consonant, which is for instance the source of the characteristic alternation between -C- and -CC- in ḫi-verbs (e.g. áki / akkanzi). So in my view, *-ókʷo- regularly yields Hitt. -ṇkuṣa-. All in all, I would reconstruct šākuṣa- as *sókʷ-o-, and, to be more precise, nom.-acc.pl. šākuṣa as *sókʷeh₂ (from which šakuṣa/ śa-², q.v.).

The interpretation of CLuw. tāₗa/i-, HLuw. tawal/i- and Lyc. tewe- ‘eye’ is difficult. Szemerényi (1980: 26-8) connected these words with Lat. tuer ‘to look at’ (followed by Melchert 1987a: 18817 but retracted in 1994a: 274-5), and by Rieken 1999a: 6018). LIV ² states that Lat. tueor reflects a root *teuH-, which is translated “(freundlich) beachten, betrachten; schützen”. If correct, the connection with ‘eye’ would not be very attractive semantically. In my view, the formal and semantic similarity between Luw. tāₗa/i- and Hitt. šākuṣa- is too big not to attempt connecting them etymologically. The latter part of the word is no problem: Hitt. -ṇkuṣa- points to PANat. *-ōgʷ-o-, which would yield Luw. -ṭaₗa/i- as well. The initial part is more problematic, however: Luw./Lyc. t- does not regularly correspond to Hitt. š-. Yet there are a few more words in which we do find this correspondence: CLuw. tāₗₜ- ‘oil’ could possibly belong with Hitt. šākan / šakn- ‘oil’ and CLuw. dūr / dām- ‘urine’ could possibly belong with Hitt. šēḫur / šēḫun- ‘urine’. When compared to Luw. tāₗa/i- ~ Hitt. šākuṣa-, we notice that in all these cases we are dealing with a word in which PANat. *lg/ , *lg/ or *lgʷ/ is lost: tāₗₜ- < *sōgen-, dūr < *sêgʷr and tāₗa/i- < *sōgʷo-. Perhaps this
loss of */g/ was a decisive factor in the development of PAnat. *s- to pre-Luw. *t-

*sakuyāje/a- (Ic3 > Ic2) ‘to see, to look’: 3sg.pres.act. ša-ku-ya-e[=z-z]i (here?), 1sg.pres.act. ša-[k]u-ya-ja-na-uni, 3sg.pres.act. ša-ku-u-ya-i-ja-aj (OH or MH/NS), ša-ku-ya-ja-at (NH), ša-ku-ya-et, ša-ku-ya-a-[et] (MH/NS), [ša]-a-ku-ya-i-je-et, 2sg.imp. ša-ku-ya-ja (MH/NS), 2pl.imp. ša-ku-ya-at-te-en (OH or MH); verb.noun gen. ša-ku-ya-ja-u-ya-ā; impf. ša-ak-iš-ke/a/- (OH/NS), ša-ku-ček-ke/a/- (MH/MS), ša-ku-čč-ke/a- (OH or MH/NS), ša-ku-čč-ke/a-.

PIE *sok"eh2-jë/o-

See CHD Š: 55f. for attestations. This verb is generally seen as a derivative of šākuya- ‘eye’. As this noun is virtually pluralum tantum (nom.-acc.pl. šākuya < *sok"eh2), it is likely that this verb is derived from *sok"eh2 and reflects *sok"eh2-jë/o-, which explains why this verb belongs to the tāje/a-class. See for further etymology at šākuya-.


PIE *sok"ent-ri-je/o-

See CHD Š: 58f. for attestations. Oettinger (1979a: 352) derives this verb from an adjective *sakuya-‘seeing’ (cf. šākuya- ‘eye’, šākuyāje/a- ‘to see’), which would mean that šaku(yan)antarīje/a- is formally comparable to gimmantarīje/a- ‘to spend the winter’, derived from gimman- ‘winter’, and nekumandarīje/a- ‘to undress’, derived from nekumant- ‘naked’. Semantically, this connection makes sense: *to be seeing > ‘to be waiting/resting’. The causative in -nu- denotes ‘to neglect’, which must derive from *to make (someone) waiting’. On the basis of transitive šakuyantarīju- a secondary intransitive stem šaku(yan)antarīje/a- ‘to
be neglected’ was created which formally fell together with the original verb šakuyantarijē/a-2 ‘to stay, to remain’, but semantically is slightly different. For further etymology see at šakuya-.


Derivatives: sallanu-/sallai2 (Ib2) ‘to melt down (a wax figure); to flatten’ (3sg.pres.act. šal-la-nu-už-zi (NH), 2pl.imp.act. [šal-la-n]u-ut-tēn, 3pl.imp.act. šal-la-nu-ya-an-du; impf. šal-la-nu-uš-ke/ə- (MH/?NS)).

See CHD Š: 82 for attestations. We find three stems, šallā-, šallījē/a- and šallījāe-. Of these stems, šallā- is the oldest attested, whereas šallījē/a- and šallījāe- are younger secondary formations. Oettinger (1979a: 249, 355) translates “breit werden, zeraufen” and assumes a connection with šallī-/šallai- ‘big’. See there for further etymology.

šalai1 / šalī- (Ia4) ‘?’: 3pl.pres.act. ša-li-i-an-zi (KUB 59.14 rev. 1.col. 24 (OH/NS)), 3sg.pres.act. ša-la-i-šiš (KBo 3.45 obv. 11 (OH/NS)).

These forms are treated in CHD under different lemmas: ša-li-i-an-zi is cited under šallanna2 / šallannī-, but this is formally totally unlikely; ša-la-i-šiš is cited under šallai1 / šallī-, but this is formally awkward as all other forms show -ll-, and semantically unnecessary as the meaning of the other forms cannot be determined. I therefore have chosen to cite these forms in this lemma, but I am not able to prove that they are really part of the same paradigm. The contexts in which they occur run as follows:

KUB 58.14 rev. 1.col. (additions from KBo 25.175 r.col 3-4)
(21) [l]a-ki UDUHIA-uš da-an-zi
(22) [(kö)š](Ur.BA[R.R]A) ḫu-u-ma-an-te-es UDU-ja
(23) [pa'-]qa'-an-zi n=a-aš-ta UDUHIA-uš UDU-li-aq
(24) [š]a-ra-a ša-li-i-an-zi MUNUS gšGDRU
(25) [žar-]ta-ag-ga-an GI-it 1=ŠU ši-i-e-ez-zi

‘... they take the sheep. All the wolfmen go to the pen and š. the sheep upwards out of the pen. The female staff-holder shoots at a wolfman once with an arrow’.
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Out of this context it is clear that šalijanzi describes the action by which the wolfmen get the sheep out of the pen. CHD (Š: 85) translates “drag(?)” and therefore cites it under šallanna- / šallami- ‘to pull, to drag’.

KBo 3.45 obv.

(4-10) ‘We Hittites under King Muršili made the gods sick by taking and plundering Babylon’

(11) [nu ma]-a-an ša-la-i-ʾiš at-ta-aš ut-ta-p[ē-eš-ši-ja-at (?)]

‘And when he (= Mursili) š.-ed, he d[isregarded(?)] the word of his father’.

CHD translates ‘grew up’ and connects it with šalli- / šallai- ‘big’. This is not likely because of the single -l- vs. geminate -ll- in šalli-. E.g. Hoffner (1975: 56f.) translates ‘became rebellious’.

All in all, we have to conclude that šalijanzi must mean something like ‘to get/pull/drag (someone out of the water)’, whereas the meaning of šalaiš is unclear. It therefore remains unclear whether these forms belong to one verb. If so, then they show the dū/tijanzi-class inflection. Further unclear.


See CHD Š: 83 for attestations. There, the form ša-la-iš (KBo 3.45 obv. 11) is cited as well, but I have chosen to separate the forms with geminate -ll- and the forms with single -l-. The forms that belong in this lemma are all attested in contexts that are too broken to determine their meaning. Formally, a connection with šalli- / šallai- ‘big’ has been suggested, but this cannot be proven on semantic grounds. If the forms all belong together, they would show the dū/tijanzi-class inflection. Further unkown.


See CHD Š: 83f. for attestations. The word is a clear compound of šalli- / šallai- 'big' and ker / kard(i)- 'heart'. The meaning 'presumptuousness, arrogance' can be compared with ModHG Hochmut, ModDu. hooghartigheid (lit. 'high-heartedness') 'arrogance'. It is unclear to me whether the -a- in šalliarkarta- is from older -aja-, or shows a real replacement of -i- by *-o- comparable to e.g. Lith. ugnaieti 'fire-place' from ugnis 'fire'. The single spelling of -k-, which seemingly contradicts the fact that ker / kard(i)- reflects *ker / *krd-, is non-probative: the univerbation may have occurred at a time that all initial stops were lenis. See šalli- / šallai- and ker / kard(i)- for further etymology.

šallanna₁ / šallanni- (Iia5) 'to pull, to drag': 3sg.pres.act. śal-la-an-na-a-i (OH/NS), śal-la-an-na-i (MH/MS), 3pl.pres.act. śal-la-an-ni-ja-an-zi (OH/NS), [śal]la-an-ni-zi-an-zi (OH/NS); impf. śal-la-an-ni-iš-ke/a-.

See CHD Š: 85f. for attestations and semantics. There is argued that šallanna/i- must be near-synonymous with ḫuett-a(a)-, ḫuttije/a-² 'to pull, to drag', because in the Song of Release (StBoT 32) both verbs translate the same Hurrian verb. In CHD, a form šaliyanzi is cited as belonging to this verb as well, but this is formally unlikely. I treat this form under the lemma šalai₁ / šali- (q.v.)

Often, šallanna/i- is connected with the verb šalla₄/a (šallije/a₄ °) 'to melt down': e.g. Laroche (1966: 161) translates šallanna/i- as 'étirer, tirailer' and remarks that it is related to "šallai-/šalliya-" as "pai-/piya-" is to "piyonai-" (which is actually pejanae- and does not have anything to do with pai₁ / pi- 'to give'), or Oettinger (1979a: 355), who translates šallanna/i- as 'in die Breite ziehen, einschmelzen', on the basis of the meaning of šalla-, šallije/o-. These connections are semantically weak, however.

Formally, we would expect that šallanna/i- is derived from a noun *šall₄/har / šall₄m-, but a connection with šall₄/har 'greatness' (see under šalli- / šallai-) is semantically unlikely. Further unclear.

šalli- / šallai- (adj. / c.) '(adj.) big, great, large, important, full-grown, vast, principal, main; (c.) head, chief, notable' (Sum. GAL, Akk. RABÛ): nom.sg.c. šal-li-iš (OH/NS), ša-al-li-iš (OH/NS), šal-li-eš (1x, NH), nom.-acc.sg.n. šal-li (MH/NS), acc.c. šal-li-in (NH), voc.sg. GAL-li (OH/NS), gen.sg. šal-la-ja-aš, šal-la-jaš=a (MH/MS), šal-la-aš (OH/NS), all.sg.(?) šal-la (MH/MS), dat.loc.sg. šal-la-a-i (MH/MS), šal-la-i (OH/NS), šal-li (NH), abl. šal-la-ja-[z], nom.pl.c. šal-la-eš (NS), šal-li-eš (NS), šal-la-uš (OH/MS), nom.-acc.pl.n. [ša]-la-la (OH/NS), ša-al-la-ja (OH/NS), šal-la-i (NH), acc.pl.c. šal-la-a-i-uš
(NS), šal-la-mu-u[š] (NS), gen.pl. šal-la-ja-aš, dat.-loc.pl. šal-la-ja-aš (OH/NS), šal-li-ja-aš (NH).

Derivatives: šallītar / šallann- (n.) ‘greatness; kingship, rulership’ (nom.-acc.sg. šal-la-a-tar, šal-la-tar (NH), dat.-loc.sg. šal-la-an-ni (OH?/NS)), šallanu-3 (ib2) ‘to raise, to bring up; to exalt, to magnify; to.... emphatically’ (1sg.pres.act. šal-la-nu-mi (NH), 3sg.pres.act. ša-al-la-nu-zi (NH), 1sg.pret.act. šal-la-nu-nu-un (NH), 2sg.pret.act. ša-al-la-nu-uš (OH/MS), 3sg.pret.act. šal-la-nu-ut (NH), 3pl.pret.act. šal-la-nu-e-er, 2sg.imp.act. ša-al-la-nu-ut (OS), šal-la-nu-ut (MH/MS), 2pl.imp.act. ša-al-la-nu-ut-te-en (MS, OH/NS), šal-la-nu-ut-tén (MS); 3pl.pret.midd. ša-la-nu-ya-an-ti; part. ša-la-nu-ya-an-t (NH); inf.I šal-la-nu-ma-an-zi (NH), šal-la-nu-um-ma-an-zi (NH); verb.noun. šal-la-nu-mar (NS), abl.(?) šal-la-nu-mar-ra-za (NH); impf. ša-la-la-nu-uš-ke/a- (OS), šal-la-nu-uš-ke/a- (OH/NS)), šallītar-3 (ib2) ‘to become large, to grow up, to increase in size or power; to become too big, to become too difficult to resolve’ (3sg.pres.act. šal-le-eš-zi, šal-li-iš-zi, šal-le-eš-zi (NH), 3sg.pret.act. šal-le-eš-t==a-š (KB 32.14 iii 3 (MH/MS), šal-le-eš-ta (OH/NS), šal-li-iš-ta (NS), 3pl.pret.act. šal-le-eš[-šer], [ša]l-le-eš-še-er (OH?/NS?), 3sg.imp.act. šal-le-eš-du (OH/NS); impf. šal-le-eš-ke/a- (NS), šal-li-iš-ke/a- (NS)), see šallakarta- and šalla-*ar, šallīje/a-*ar.


PIE *solH-i-

See CHD Š: 92f. for attestations. Since Sturtevant (1933: 138) these words are generally connected with Lat. salvus ‘complete, intact’, Gr. ὅλος ‘whole, complete’, Skt. sárva- ‘whole, all’, etc., despite the semantic problems (Hitt. ‘big, great’ vs. ‘whole, all’ in the other IE languages). The Ofr. cognate, slán ‘complete, sane’ reflects *šH-no- (note that the colour of the laryngeal cannot be determined on the basis of this form alone), which is supported by the fact that Hitt. -ll- can go back to *-H-. This means that in Lat. salvus, Skt. sárva- and Gr. ὅλος that all seem to reflect *sol-yo-, an original laryngeal was lost due to the o-grade: *solH-yo-.

Within Hittite, we come across a noun šalḫjant-, šalḫant-, šalḫitti- (cf. CHD Š: 92) that occurs in lists of desirable states, e.g.

KUB 17.10 i

(10) 4Te-li-pi-mu-š=a ar-ḥa i-ja-an-ni-iš ḫal-ki-in 6lm-mar-ni-in
‘And Telipinu went away. He carried off grain, Immarni, šallianti-, manitti- and satisfaction’.

Goetze (1933: 135) translates it as ‘Wachstum?’, which has been taken over by Friedrich HW: 179. This translation is solely based on a presupposed connection with šall- / šallai-, however, and therefore is far from ascertained. Nevertheless, this noun is used as an argument to reconstruct šal- as *solh₂-i- or *selh₂-i-, with *-h₂-. The CLuwian form ša-al-ḫa-a-ti (KUB 35.121, 7), which is interpreted as the abl.-instr. of an adjective *salḥa/-i- ‘great, grown’ by e.g. Melchert (1993b: 186) and therewith as the Luwian counterpart of Hitt. šall- / šallai-, is found in such a broken context that its meaning cannot be independently determined. All in all, none of the forms with šall- can be surely identified as a cognate of Hitt. šall- / šallai-, which means that the colour of the laryngeal in *solH²-i- cannot be determined.

Sometimes, šall- is reconstructed as *sélH²-i- (e.g. Melchert 1994a: 51) under the assumption that *erH₂V > aRRV. As I show under the lemma erḥ- / araḥ- / arḫ-, this sound law is incorrect, which means that šall- must reflect *solH²-i-.

šalīk- (IIIa) ‘to touch, to have contact with; to approach; to intrude into, to invade, to penetrate, to violate, to have (illicit) sexual intercourse; to reach to’:

IE cognates: OIr. sligid ‘to strike (down)’, ModEng. slick, OHG slīžjan ‘to sneak’, Gr. σκίζειν ‘striking, touching superficially’.

PIE *slēged-o or *slēged-óri

See CHD Š: 100f. for attestations. In the oldest texts (OS and MS) we predominantly find middle forms. Active forms are occurring occasionally in MS.
Nevertheless, if we assume an IE origin of this verb, we can only conclude that the stem originally must have been /slig-/ (a PIE root *seliK- does not make sense). Perhaps the spellings with plene ša-a-li- show that already in OH times, a phonetic analectic vowel developed in the initial cluster sl- (so phonetic [sλig-]), but phonological /slig-/, cf. Melchert 1994a: 108, 155). When the original middle stem was taken over into the active, it was usually inflected as šalik-², but we find a stem šalika- / šalik- as well (tarn(a)-class). A few forms show a stem šalikihe/a²- (3pl.pres.midd. šalikianta (MH/MS) and inf.I šalikiuyanzi (MH/MS)). One form seems to show a stem šalink-: 3pl.pres.act. [š]a-li-in-kān-zi (KBo 29.133 iii 2). We could argue that it shows a secondary form in analogy to li(n)k-, but because the context is quite broken, I do not think that it is impossible to read the text as [...š]a li-in-kān-zi (or even [...t]a li-in-kān-zi).

Melchert (1994a: 330) tentatively suggests a connection with OIr. sligid ‘to strike (down)’ and ModEng. slick. In LIV², OIr. sligid is connected with OHG sīthhan ‘to sneak’ and Gr. λίγoυ ‘striking, touching superficially’ from a root *sleɪɡ- ‘schmieren, glatt machen’ (LIV² reconstructs a palatovelar on the basis of OCS šlązkɔ, ‘slippery’, which must reflect *sliģʰ-, however, because of the absence of Winter’s Law). Either we have to reconstruct *sleɪɡʰ-o (class IIIa, but note that we then must assume a phonetic development *leiK > 𫚭, perhaps comparable to *Kei > Kㄟ or *sliģʰ-ɔ (class IIIc).

šalk-² (Ia4 > Ic1) ‘to knead, to mix together’: 1sg.pres.act. šal-ga-mi (NH), 3sg.pres.act. ša-al-ak-zi (OS), šal-ki-ez-zi (MH/MS), 3pl.pres.act. šal-kān-zi (MH/NS), 1sg.pret.act. [š]a-al-ku-un, ša-al-ku-un(n); part. šal-kān-t-.


PIE *selk-ti, *slk-enti ?

See CHD Š: 106 for attestations. The alternation between šal-ga-mi and ša-al-ak-zi besides šal-kān-zi clearly shows that we are dealing with a stem /salk-/. Once, we find a stem šalkihe/a²- (šalkiezi). The etymological interpretation of this verb is in debate. Kimball (1994a: 80) discusses two possibilities: either a connection with Skt. stjáti ‘to set free’ from *sλiģ- (but this is semantically quite weak), or a tie-in with Gr. ἐκφεί ‘to draw, to
drag’ and TochB śalk- ‘to draw, to pull’ from *selk- (semantically better, but still not self-evident). Rieken (1999a: 316) states that a semantic connection with *selğ- is unsatisfying, and therefore connects śalk- with the root *slehíg- ‘schlaff, matt sein’ (‘’verkneten’ à trans. ‘weich machen’’). This connection is semantically hardly better (how can a clearly intransitive root suddenly be used transitively?). The formal side is unattractive as well: we would expect that *slehíg-ti, *slehíg-énti would yield Hitt. /slêgt’ti, /slgánt’ti, which could only become the attested Hittite paradigm through generalization of the weak stem. Although such generalizations are known (e.g. guštmi, gušanzī < *k"ls-), the semantic and formal problems make this etymology less convincing. I therefore stick to the connection with Gr. ἕλκειν, but must admit that a better proposal would certainly be welcome.

\( \text{sam(a)lu-} \) (n.) ‘apple (tree)’? (Sum. GISHAŠHUR: nom.-acc.sg. ša-ma-lu (OH?/NS), erg.sg. ša-ma-lu-ya-an-za (NS), abl. GISHAŠHUR-lu-ya-an-za, instr. GISHAŠHUR-it; unclear (erg.sg. or abl.) ša-am-lu-ya-an-za (OH/NS),


See CHD Š: 112f. for attestations. The equation of Hitt. šam(a)lu- with the sumerogram GISHAŠHUR is certain. The meaning of GISHAŠHUR is not fully clear, however. Usually, a translation ‘apple’ is given, but ‘apricot’ sometimes as well (cf. CHD Š: 114). The Palaic form šamḷaš is interpreted as ‘apples’ because of the formal similarity to Hitt. šam(a)lu- only.

Ivanov (1976: 160-2) tried to connect this word with the words for ‘apple’ in the other IE languages, which reflect *h₂eb-l-, assuming that an original cluster *-ml- remained as such in the Anatolian language group but yielded *-bl- in the other IE languages. Such a development is not attested anywhere else, however. The only sound that šam(a)lu- and *h₂eb-öl have in common is -l-, which is not enough to establish an etymology. Further unclear.


Derivatives: *šamanatar / šamanann- (n.) ‘foundation deposit’ (dat.-loc.sg. ša-ma-na-an-ni (NH)).
See CHD Š: 115f. for attestations. Note that HW: 180 cites a form acc.pl. šamenuš of this word, but this form occurs in a broken context (KUB 31.112, 11), and is interpreted by Oettinger (1976c: 99) as 2sg.pret.act. of šamenuš (see under šamen-² / šanm-). Spellings with geminate -mm- only occur in NS texts and therefore are probably non-probative. One of the MH/MS forms shows plene spelling of the first -a-, ša-a-ma-nu-uš, which occurs a few times more. Nevertheless, we also come across plene spellings like ša-ma-a-nu-uš, ša-ma-ma-nu-uš and ša-ma-na-a-š.

Oettinger (1979a: 366; followed by e.g. Starke 1990: 416 and Kimball 1999: 418) connected šāmāna- (which he cites as šaman- ) with the verb šamanæ-² ‘to create’, but I do not find the semantic connection very appealing. He further connects it with Arm. himm ‘fundament’ (following Laroche 1963: 76f.) that in his view must reflect *seh₁-men-, a derivative from the PIE root *seh₁- ‘to press in, to sow’ (see also at šai₁ / ši₁). He therefore reconstructs the Hittite word “šaman-” as *sh₁-men-, giving especially ša-me-nu-uš < *sh₁-mèn-ms as a key example. This is not likely because (a) šāmāna- does not show an n-stem inflection, (b) this etymology cannot explain the plene spellings ša-ma-n, and (c) ša-me-nu-uš probably does not belong to this word. Kimball states that the preform *seh₁-men- (as visible in Arm. himm) underlies the noun ši-im-ma-an-ta (KBo 1.44+ KBo 13.1 iv 32) ‘form, facial features’ and the verb “se(m)nu-i(i) / to create””. The first statement is phonetically, semantically and morphologically impossible, and the second statement is based on a wrong interpretation of the verbal forms starting in šem- (see at šamanæ-² as well as šamen-² / šamn-).

All in all, an etymological connection with Arm. himm seems formally impossible to me. The inner-Hittite connection with šamanæ-² in my view has to be given up as well, because this verb probably reflects *sm-no-jé/o-, which would not be able to account for šāmāna- in a coherent way.

šamanæ-²: see šamanæ-²

šamankuryant-: see at zama(n)kur

šame-²: see šamen-² / šamn-

šamen-² / šamn-, šemen-² / šemn- (IaI) ‘to pass by/away/off, to withdraw, to disappear; to relinquish/forfeit one’s right to’: 3sg.pres.act. še-me-en-zi (OS), ša-me-en-zi (OS), ša-me-in-z[į] (NH), ši-me-en-zi (MS?), 3pl.pres.act. ša-am-na-an-zi (OH/MS?), še-em-na-an-zi (NS), ša-me-ja-an-zi (OH/NS), 3sg.pret.act. ša-me-
en-ta (OH/NS), ša-mi-en-ta (MH/MS?), 3sg.imp.act. ša-me-en-du (OH/NS), ša-
mi-en-du (OH/NS), ša-me-ed-du (MH/MS); part. ša-am-na-an-t-.

Derivatives: šamenu-² (lb2) ‘to make (something/-one) pass by, to bypass, to
dispense with(?)’; to ignore (someone)’ (2sg.pres.act. ša-me-nu-ši (NH),
3sg.pres.act. ša-me-nu-uz-zi (OH/NS), 2pl.pres.act. ša-me-nu-ut-te-ni (NH), ša-
mı-nu-ut[-te]-ni, 3pl.pres.act. ša-mı-nu-an-zi (OH/MS?), 2sg.pret.act.(?) ša-me-
nu-uš, 3pl.pret.act. ša-mı-[nu̇*-er̄*] (OH/NS); part. ša-me-nu-an-t-).

PIE *smén-ti / smn-énti

See CHD Š: 120-1 and Oettinger (1976c) for discussions and citations. It is not
always easy to determine whether a form belongs with this verb or rather with
šamnae-² ‘to create’ (q.v.). This is the reason why the list of attestations given
here slightly differs from the lists as given by CHD and by Oettinger. For
instance, ša-am-na-an-zi (KBo 17.46, 28 (OH/MS?)) is cited in CHD (Š: 124)
under the lemma šamnae-. Oettinger (o.c.: 98) states, however: “eine auffassung
von samnanz als zu samnae- ‘gründen, schaffen’ gehörig ist nicht nur lautlich
unwahrscheinlich – zu erwarten wäre *samnanz –, sondern auch semantisch, da es
sich um eine Opferliste und nicht um ein Bauritual handelt”. The context is
difficult:

KBo 17.46 + KBo 34.2
(50) LU₅MES AN.BAR 20 [pur]-ru-uš AN.BAR šu-ųų-ḫa-an-zi[...]
(51) LU₅MES KÜ.BABBAR 20 [pur]-ru-uš KŪ.BABBAR šu-ųų-ḫa-an-zi[...]
(52) LU₅MES URUDU.DIM.DIM ša-am-na-an-zi LU₅MES [...]
(53) [x-x]-x-u-lu-ma-aš ša-me-en-zi LU₅MES[...]

‘The iron-workers(?), heap up(?), 20 [b]alls of iron, the silver-workers(?), heap
up(?), 20 [b]alls of silver, the coppersmiths šamnæz, the men [...], [...]x-ulumaš
passes by’.

Because of šamnæz in line 53 (which cannot be interpreted otherwise than as
3sg.pres.act. of šamén-), it is likely that šamnæz belongs with šamén- as well.
CHD (Š: 125), although citing šamnæz as belonging to šamnae-, states that
“possibly šamnæz- in these examples is a homonymous verb with a meaning
‘compete’”, and thus admits that a translation ‘to create’ may not be very
appropriate in this context. I therefore follow Oettinger in assuming that šamnæz
is 3pl.pres.act. of šamén-.
Another difficult form is ša-am-na-an (KBo 3.19 rev. 20), which in CHD (Š: 125) is translated as ‘created’ and therefore interpreted as belonging with šamna-. The context in which it occurs is that unclear, however, that other interpretations could be possible as well. On formal grounds, I treat it as belonging with šamen-/šamm-.

The 3pl.pres.act. še-em-na-an-zi (KBo 8.102, 8) is cited in CHD Š: 124 under the attestations of šamna-, but in the lemma itself it is stated that its interpretation is “unclear”. In my view, the context could justify an interpretation as a form of šamen-/šamm-:

KBo 8.102

(6) [ ... ]x ar-ta ya-a-tar iš-pár-nu-u[z-zi]
(7) [ ... ]-un šu-up-pi-ja-ah-ḫi 2 DUMUš G[AL]
(8) [ ... ][A]-HAR I-NIM še-em-na-an-zi š=a-a[t]
(9) [ ...

‘[...] stands up and spreads water out. [...] purifies [...]. Two palace servants pass by before the eyes [of? ...]. They [libate it [...]’.

So all in all, I think we are dealing with a verb that can be characterized by the forms šamenzi, šemenzi besides šammnazi, šemnanzi. CHD (Š: 120) states that “the vacillation of the vowel in the initial syllable suggests a pronounced *smen-”, which is also the interpretation of Oettinger, who further interprets šammnazi as *smn-enti (comparing tamenta besides damnant-). So the forms šamenzi : šammnazi are to be interpreted /smént/ : /snnánt/, whereas šemenzi : šemnanzi show occasional anaptyxis in the initial cluster: /simént/ : /simnánt/.

This verb cannot reflect anything else than *smén-ti, *smn-enti, for which I know no cognates. Oettinger (o.c.: 100) translates the verb as ‘verschwinden’ and connects it with Arm. manr ‘little’, Gr. μαρνός ‘scarce, scanty’, μόνος ‘alone’. Ofr. menb ‘little’. These words probably reflect *menH-(u-), however, and are semantically not very close: the connection is therefore unconvincing.

We find a few forms that show a stem šam– (3pl.pres.act. šamejanzi, 3sg.imp.act. šameddu) which are explained by Oettinger (o.c.: 99) as a backformation on the basis of impf. *smen-skē/o-, which according to him regularly should have become **sneske/a-. This is problematic since *sneske/o- would have given **šma(n)še/a- (which would be the outcome of *smn-skē/o-, the morphologically expected imperfective, as well, cf. *g³n-skē/o- >
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kuyaske/α-). We should rather assume an analogy to the forms *smemi, *smesi, *smeyen (cf. kuem, kuwe, kueyen from kuen- / kun-).

Oettinger (o.c.: 99) states that the verbs šamešjie/α- and šamešamie- ‘to burn (something)’ derive from an original meaning ‘to make disappear’. CHD convincingly connects these verbs with šami- ‘smoke’, however. Moreover, CHD distinguishes between a verb šame/inu- ‘to make pass by, to let someone go, to ignore (someone)’ (derived from šamen-/šamn-) and the verb šame/inu- ‘to burn (something)’ (derived from šami-, q.v.), which Oettinger interprets as belonging to one and the same verb ‘to make disappear; to burn as incense’. Melchert (1984a: 107) draws attention to the fact that in KBo 17.21+ the causative is spelled ša-mi-nu-, whereas the basical verb is spelled ša-me-en-. He explains this as a difference in accentuation: *sman-nēu- vs. *sman-; but in my view we are rather dealing with a difference between /sminu-l < *smn-nēu- (for /CminC/ < *CmnC, compare ḥame/ink- < *h2mnēḥ (see at ḥamank- / ḥame/ink-)) vs. /sman-l < *smn-.

The form ša-me-nuš (KUB 31.112, 21) is interpreted by Oettinger (o.c.: 99) as 2sg.pret.act. of šamenu-α, whereas the edition of this text (Pecchioli Daddi 1975: 108f.) analyses it as acc.pl. of the noun šama- ‘foundation’ (q.v.).

šammenant- (adj.) ‘?’: acc.pl.c. ša-am-me-na-an-du-uš (OH/NS).

This word is hapax in the following context:

KBo 10.37 ii
(9) a-ya-an ar-ḫa pær-ah-tén EMEŠUL-[/a2-mu2-uš]
(10) ša-am-me-na-an-du-uš

‘Drive away the evil tongues, which are š.’.

On the basis of this context, we cannot determine its meaning. On formal grounds it is often regarded as belonging to šamen-α / šamm- ‘to pass by’ (e.g. Oettinger 1976c, who regards this form as 3pl.imp.act. šammenandu) or to šamnæñ- ‘to create’ (e.g. CHD Š: 125). In both paradigms it would not fit, however: as a participle of šamen-/šamm- it would be the only form with a geminate -mm-, and in the paradigm of šamnæñ- it would be the only form showing an e. I therefore have chosen to treat it separately. Further unclear.

šami- ‘smoke(?)’: gen.sg. ša-mi-ja-aš (OH/NS).
Derivatives: šaminu⁻² (Ib2) ‘to burn (something)’ (3sg.pres.act. ša-mi-nu-zi (NS), 3pl.pres.act. ša-mi-nu-ya-an-zi (NH), ša-me-nu-ya-an-zi (OH/NS), impf. ša-am-mi-nu-šuš-ke/a- (MH/NS)), šamešije/a⁻², šimšije/a⁻² (Ic1) ‘(act.) to burn (something) for fumigation; (midd.) to burn for fumigation (intr.); (act.) to interrogate’ (3sg.pres.act. ši-me-ši-ja-zi (OH/NS), ša-me-ši-ez-zi, ša-mi-ši-ez-zi (OH/NS), ša-me-še-ez-zi (OH/NS), ša-mi-ši-e-ez-zi (MH/NS), 1sg.pret.act. ši-me-še-e-nu-[un] (NH), ši-mi-ši-ja-nu-un (NH), 3sg.pres.midd. ša-mi-ši-ja, ša-me-ši-i- e-it-ta; impf. ša-mi-ši-iš-ke/a-), šamešani⁻² (Ib2) ‘to burn (something) into smoke’ (3pl.pres.act. ša-me-ša-nu-an-zi).

See CHD Š: 118f. for attestations and contexts. Although the context of the hapax noun šamiššu is broken and its meaning therefore not fully clear, a translation ‘smoke’, which is based on the formal similarity with šaminu⁻² ‘to burn’, would fit. This latter verb clearly belongs with ša/i/mi/ši/ešje/a⁻² and šamešani⁻², both meaning ‘to burn’ as well, although the formal relationship is unclear. Oettinger (1979a: 346) calls “šamešje-” a “(wahrscheinlich aoristischer) s-Erweiterung”, but that is just a mere guess. Etymologically, one could think of a connection with PGerm. *smuškan ‘to smoke’ but apart from the fact that this verb stands further isolated in IE, it is not easy to formally connect it. I would rather think that these Hittite verbs are of non-IE origin.

šammace⁻² (Ic2 > Ic1) ‘to create’: 3pl.pres.act. ša-am-ma-na-a-an-zi (NS), 1sg.pret.act. [ša-]am-mi-ja-nu-un (NS), 2sg.pret.act. ša-am-ma-na-a-eš (OH/MS), 3sg.pret.act. ša-am-na-a-št (MH/NS), ša-am-na-št (NS), ša-am-mi-i-et (OH/NS), ša-am-mi-ja-at (OH/NS), 3pl.pres.act. ša-am-mi-e-r (NS), ša-am-ma-[ná-er²] (NS), [ša²-]am-mi-e-er (MH/NS); 3sg.imp.midd. ša-am-mi-ja-ta-ru (OH/NS), ša-am-mi-e-[a]-ru (OH/NS), 3pl.imp.midd. ša-[a]-m-na-ja-an-ta-ru (OH or MH/NS), ša-am-ma-mi-ja-an-ta-ru (OH/NS); part. ša-am-mi-ja-an-t-; impf. ša-am-ma-iš-ke/a-, ša-am-ma-ni-eš-ke/a-, ša-am-ni-eš-ke/a-.

IE cognates: Skt. sāṁ, GA v. hṛṣṇa, Lith. saṁ-, OCS so- ‘together’.

PIE *sm-no-je/-o-?

It is not always fully clear which forms belong to this verb, especially because of the formal similarity with šamen⁻² / šann- ‘to pass by’ (q.v.). The forms mentioned above in my view certainly belong here. CHD Š: 124f. cites the stem of this verb as “ša[m]n[i]-, šamna[en]i-ša-, šamniye/a-, šennai-”. Some of the forms that are cited are doubtful regarding their appurtenance to ‘to create’, however.
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A stem “šenmai-” is given on the basis of 3pl.pres.act. še-em-na-an-zi (KBo 8.102, 8 (MS)) only, but CHD judges this form as “uncertain” itself. I rather take this form as belonging with šamen-² / šamn- ‘to pass by’ (q.v. for a treatment of the context). A stem “šammenā-” is given on the basis of ša-am-me-na-an-du-uš (KBo 10.37 ii 10) only, which is translated as ‘created’ in CHD. This translation is not supported by the context, however, and formally šammenanduš stands quite apart from the other forms of this verb as it would be the only one to show a vowel -e-. As appurtenance to šamen-/šamn- is unlikely as well, I have treated this word under its own lemma, šammenant- (q.v.). The form ša-am-na-an-zi (KBo 17.46, 28 (OH/MS?)) is translated ‘they created’ in CHD, but with doubt. Under the lemma šamen-² / šamn- I have treated its context and argued that it rather belongs there. The form ša-am-na-an (KBo 3.19 rev. 20) is translated ‘created’ in CHD, but this is merely a possibility. Formally, it could belong to šamen-/šamn- as well (q.v.), which perhaps is more likely since the other attested participles of šamnae-, šamnije/a- show a form šamnijant-.

So all in all, we are left only with the forms as cited above. The spelling alternation between ša-am-na and ša-am-na-an probably denotes that we have to phonologically interpret šaMaN²f. We encounter two stems: šamnae-² (šammenâni, šammenâ and šamnâ) and šamnije/a-² (šamnijanun, šamnijet, šamnijat, šamnier, šamnenjêr, šamnienjaru, šamnienjaru and šamnijant-). Although the stem šamnije/a- is attested more often (but is found in NS texts only), the oldest form, šammenâ (OH/MS), shows that the stem šamnae- is more original.

Verbs that belong to the šatrae-class usually are denominatives, derived from o-stem nouns. In this case, we have to assume that a noun *šamna- has served as the basis for this verb. Unfortunately, this noun is unattested itself. If from IE origin, it could only go back to *smano- (note that *somno- would have yielded **šamma-). Perhaps we are dealing with a nominal derivative of PIE *som ‘together’ (Skt. sām, GAv. hām, Lith. samin-). If so, then we can reconstruct a semantic development *smano- ‘togetherness’ > *smono-je/o- ‘to bring together’ > ‘to create’.

šamnije/a-²: see šamnae-²

=(š)šan sentence particle indicating superposition (‘over’, ‘upon’, ‘on’ etc.); indicating contiguity or close proximity; accompanying ‘for (the benefit of)’ or ‘about, concerning’; accompanying ideas of measuring or counting; indicating
‘off, from’? (only OH): $C=\text{ša-an}$ (OS), $V=\text{š-ša-an}$ (OS, often) $V=\text{ša-an}$ (OS, less often)

$\text{PIE}^*\text{som}$

When the preceding element ends in a vowel, this sentence particle, which always occupies the last slot of an initial chain of particles, is usually spelled with geminate -šš-, but spellings with single -š- are attested as well (cf. $\text{ke-e=ša-an}$, $\text{ya-al-ša-an-zí=ša-an}$, both OS). For the semantics, see CHD Š: 126-155. There it is stated that “it would appear that $\text{šan}$ suggests or implies an unexpressed dative-locative in clauses with verbs that can or regularly do take locatives. $\text{šan}$ also occurs in clauses with expressed locatives, perhaps to reinforce them”. In my corpus of OS texts (consisting of 23,000 words), $\text{ššan}$ occurs 76 times (3.3 promille), in my corpus of MH/MS texts (consisting of 18,000 words) 48 times (2.7 promille) and in my corpus of NH texts (consisting of 95,000 words) 71 times (0.75 promille). We see that the use of $\text{ššan}$ is diminishing from MH times onwards. In NS copies of OH texts, $\text{ššan}$ is replaced by $\text{kk}anan$ or just omitted.

According to Melchert (1994a: 154), the geminate writing of $\text{ššan}$ originates in the forms where it stood in posttonic position. From there it spread to post-posttonic places (where Melchert expects lenited -š-). According to Melchert, $\text{ššan}$ is to be equated with the element $\text{škan}$ as found in $\text{kiššan}$ ‘thus’, $\text{kúškan}$ ‘when’, $\text{niššan}$ ‘thus’ and $\text{apiniššan}$ ‘thus’.

According to Eichner (1992: 46), $\text{(š)šan}$ is cognate to the adverbs Skt. $\text{súm}$, GAv. $\text{húm}$, Lith. $\text{sam-}$, OCS $\text{sp-}$, Gr. $\text{só}$, (in $\text{aóücπεόκ}$ ‘brother’) ‘together’ < $\text{*som}$, $\text{*sm}$, which ultimately must be cogante with $\text{PIE}^*\text{sem}$ ‘one’ (through the meaning ‘in one’). See at $\text{šaní-}$ ‘the same’ for a possible other descendant of $\text{PIE}^*\text{sem}$ ‘one’.

$\text{šanna}-i$ / $\text{šan}-$ (IIa1γ) ‘to hide, to conceal’: 1sg.pres.act. $\text{ša-an-na-ah-ţi}$ (OH/NS), 2sg.pres.act. $\text{ša-an-na-at-ti}$ (MH/MS), 3sg.pres.act. $\text{ša-an-na-a-i}$ (OH or MH/NS), 2pl.pres.act. $\text{ša-an-na-at-te-ni}$ (OH/NS), $\text{ša-a-na-at-te-e-ní}$ (MH/?NS), $\text{ša-an-na-at-te-e-ní}$ (NH), 3pl.pres.act. $\text{ša-an-na-zi}$ (NH), 2sg.pret.act. $\text{ša-an-na-aş}$ (NH), 3sg.pret.act. $\text{ša-an-ni-eş-ta}$ (NH), $\text{ša-an-ni-iş-ta}$ (NH), 3pl.pret.act. $\text{ša-an-ni-er}$ (NH); 3sg.pres.midd. $\text{ša-an-na-at-ta}$ (MH/NS); part. $\text{ša-an-na-at-}$; verb.noun $\text{ša-an-na-um-mar}$ (NH); impf. $\text{ša-an-na-aş-ke/a-}$ (MH/MS), $\text{ša-an-ni-iş-ke/a-}$ (NH).

Derivatives: see $\text{šannapi}$.
IE cognates: Gr. ἀνωτέρω ‘without’, Skt. sanutār ‘away, far off, aside’, Lat. sine ‘without’, Ofr. sain ‘without’ etc.

PIE *sna-nó-h₁-i₁, *sna-n-h₁-énti

See CHD Š: 156f. for attestations. The verb inflects according to the tarn(a)-class. The stem šamm- is visible in verb.noun šanummar. According to Oettinger (1979a: 159f.), šanna-šamm- must go back to a nasal infixed verb. He reconstructs *sna-n-h₂ on the basis of a connection with Gr. ἀνωτέρω ‘without’, Skt. sanutār ‘away, far off, aside’, Lat. sine ‘without’ etc., which forms he all interprets as reflecting a root *senh₂-. This interpretation is followed by e.g. CHD (Š: 158 and 159 (sub šannapí)) and Kimball (1999: 415), but the formal side is problematic: *sna-nó-h₁-i₁ would yield Hitt. **šannaḫi. This problem can be solved by Schrijver’s reconstruction of Gr. ἀνωτέρω as *snh₂-i₁ (1991: 218), on the basis of which Lat. sine < *snh₁-i₁, Ofr. sain < *snh₁-i₁ etc. For šanna-šamm-, this would mean that we have to reconstruct *sna-nó-h₁-i₁, *sna-n-h₁-énti, which would regularly yield Hitt. šannū, šamanzi. The semantic side of the etymology is convincing as well. Originally, the root *snh₂- must have meant something like ‘unavailable, away’. Like the other nasal infixed verbs in Hittite, šanna-šamm- has to be interpreted as a causative formation, so originally *‘to make unavailable, to make away’ > ‘to hide, to conceal’.

šannapí (adv.? ) ‘? ’: ša-an-na-pi ša-an-na-pi ‘scattered here and there’ (OH or MH/NS).


IE cognates: Gr. ἀνωτέρω ‘without’, Skt. sanutār ‘away, far off, aside’, Lat. sine ‘without’, Ofr. sain ‘without’ etc.

PIE *sño-h₁-i₁
See CHD Š: 158f. for attestations. The syntagm šannapi šannapi (KUB 13.4 iii 47) is hapax and probably denotes ‘scattered here and there’. In form and meaning it can be compared to e.g. kuṣapi kuṣapi ‘wherever’. Since a large part of the semantics of šannapi šannapi seems to lie in the fact that it is repeated, it is difficult to determine the exact meaning of šannapi itself. Nevertheless, it is likely that šannapi is connected with šannapili ‘empty’ and its derivatives (although this is semantically difficult to prove). On the basis of the meaning ‘empty’, CHD (Š: 159) etymologically connects šannapi and šannapili with Lat sine ‘without’, etc., which they reconstruct as *senh₂-. As I have pointed out at the lemma of šanna’ / šann- ‘to hide’, which is cognate with Lat. sine etc. as well, the reconstruction should be *senh₁-. This would mean that šannapili reflects *sonh₁-o-bli(-li). Note that inner-Hittite derivation from šanna/šann- ‘to hide’ is semantically difficult. A reconstruction *snh₁-o- is impossible because *CRh₁V yields Hitt. CaRV but not **CaRRV (cf. parai- / pari- ‘to blow’ < *prh₁-(o)-i-).


Derivatives: see ša(n)h₂-.

IE cognates: OHG sinan ‘to strive after’, Skt. san’- ‘to win, to gain’.

PIE *senh₂-ti, *snh₂-enti.
See CHD Š: 162ff. for attestations. The verb has two quite distinct meanings, namely ‘to search’ and ‘to sweep clean’. Despite some claims that we are dealing with two separate homophonic verbs (e.g. Oettinger 1979a: 182), CHD treats all attestations as belonging to one verb. It states (Š: 171) that the basic meaning of ša(n)ḥ- was ‘to seek’ and that “growing out of mng. 7 [i.e. ‘to search through’], where the accusative object is the area searched, is mng. 8 [i.e. ‘to clean, to sweep clean’] ... in which the area or object cleaned is the direct object. The idea is that the area or object cleaned is “searched” for the impurities, which are then removed”. For now I will follow this explanation, but I would certainly welcome a convincing etymological account by which can be shown that we are dealing with two etymologically distinct verbs that have phonetically fallen together in Hittite.

We find spellings with ša-an-ah-C as well as ša-an-ḫa-C, which, together with spellings ša-an-ah-ḫV, show that we are dealing with a stem /sanH-/. Besides these forms, we also find the spelling ša-ah-. In the oldest texts, the distribution between šanḫ- and šah- is that šanḫ- is found in front of vowel (šanḫ-V), whereas šah- is found in front of consonant (šah-C), which is comparable to e.g. li(n)k², ʰarni(n)k², ḫuni(n)k², etc. Already in MS texts, we find that this distribution is getting blurred (e.g. ša-an-ah-zi (MH/MS)).

Since Eichman (1973: 269ff.), ša(n)ḥ- is generally connected with OHG sinnan ‘to strive after’, Skt. san- ‘to win, to gain’, Gr. ἀναπηλτόν ‘to fulfil’ etc., which point to a root *senḫ-. This means that for Hittite we have to reconstruct *senḫ2-ti, *snḫ2-enti.

Puhvel (1979b: 299ff.) argued for a separation of ša(n)ḥ- ‘to seek, to search’ and ša(n)ḫ- ‘to clean’ because of his claim that the latter rather means ‘to flush (down), to wash, to rinse’ and is derived from the root *snḫ2- ‘to bathe, to swim’ (Lat. nārē, Skt. snāti, etc.). However, Tischler (HEG S: 825-8) shows and explicitly states that ša(n)ḥ- predominantly denotes ‘dry’ cleaning, i.e. sweeping the floor, and not ‘wet’ cleaning, as claimed by Puhvel and that therefore Puhvel’s etymological proposal must be rejected on semantic grounds.

For the possibility that ša(n)ḫu² ‘to roast’ is cognate, see there.

Derivatives: ṣānḥyu qa- (c.), a food (nom.pl. ṣā-an-ḥu-u-ya-aš (OH/NS)), ṣānḥu qa-, a food (gen.sg.(?) ṣā-an-ḥu-na-aš (NH)).

IE cognates: Gr. ἀνάφημα ‘to fulfil, to bring to an end’.

PIE *senh₂-u-ti *sneh₂-u-enti.

See CHD Š: 172f. for attestations. If the one form ṣa-ḥu-ya-an (KUB 29.1 iii 46) is linguistically real, it would show that this verb, too, shows an alternation between forms with and without -n-, like lì(n)k², ḥarnì(n)k², ṣa(n)ḥ², etc. The original distribution between this ablaut is that *CVnCV > CVnCV, whereas *CVnCC > CVCC (so loss of *-n- before two consonants). This case, then, would be an extra argument in favour of the view that the sequence -ḥu- within Hittite is not to be regarded as consonant+vowel /-Hu-/ but as a consonantal phoneme /-Hʷ-/ (cf. Kloekhorst fthc, § 1.3.5 and at tarḥu-²). Here it is necessary since in a stem /sanHu-/ the nasal would never stand before two consonants (e.g. /sanHumi/), whereas in /sanHʷ-/ this is possible (e.g. */sanHʷmi/ should regularly give /saHʷmi/). We see that, just as in ṣa(n)ḥ², already in MS texts the original distribution between /sanHʷV-/ and /saHʷC-/ has been blurred.

Eichner apud Oettinger (1979a: 367) connects ṣa(n)ḥu-² with Gr. ἀνάφημα ‘to fulfil, to bring to an end’, which is semantically likely (cf. ModEng. well done ‘thoroughly baked’, but also Hitt. zē₄₅ ‘to cook < *to be finished’ (q.v.)). The Greek verb is usually seen as an u-extension of the root *senh₂- ‘to achieve, to try to accomplish’. This latter root is the parent to Hitt. ṣa(n)ḥ² ‘to search’, which is semantically that far from ‘to roast’ that we must assume that the u-extension as visible in ṣa(n)ḥu-² is from PIE origin already and therewith directly cognate to the Greek verb (see at tarḥu-² ~ Skt. tūrvat i for a similar scenario).

ṣani- (adj.) ‘the same, one and the same’: dat.-loc.sg. ṣa-ni-ja (OS), ṣa-ni-i-ja (OH/NS), ṣa-ni-e, ṣa-ni-i (NH).


Anat. cognates: HLuw. sanawa/i- (adj./n.) ‘good/goods’ (nom.sg.c. sa-na-wa/i-sa (multiple times), nom.-acc.sg.n. sa-na-wa/i-ia (SULTANHAN §18), dat.-loc.sg. sa-na-wa/i-ia (often), abl.-instr. sa-na-wa/i+ra/i, nom.-acc.pl.c. sa-na-wa/i-izi (ASSUR letter b §9), nom.-acc.pl.n. BONUS sa-na-wa/i (KARATEPE 1 §14), sa-na-wa/i-ia (ASSUR letter g §36), BONUS sa-na-wa/i-ia (KARATEPE 1 §15 Hu.), “BONUS” sa-na-wa/i-ia (KARATEPE 1 §15 Ho.), etc.), sanawazi- (adj.) ‘good’ (acc.sg.c. sa-na-wa/i-izi-na’ (ASSUR letter d §8), sa-na-wa/i-izi-na’ (ASSUR letter e §23)), sanawastar- ‘goodness’ (abl.-instr. (”BONUS”) sa-na-wa/i-sa-tara/i-ri+i (KULULU 5 §13), sa-na-wa/i-sa-tara/i-ri+i (SULTANHAN §45)).

See CHD Š: 173f. for attestations. Eichner (1992: 45-6) assumes an etymological connection with PIE *sem ‘one’ (e.g. Gr. ἕ). Although semantically this is appealing, formally it is quite difficult. The idea is that the i-stem šani- is comparable to e.g. aši / uni / ini that reflects *h₁os+i, *h₁om+i, etc. Problematic, however, is that forms showing an inflected stem uni- are found in younger texts only, whereas the inflected stem šani- is found in an OS text already. Moreover, because *h₁om+i yields uni, šani- cannot go back to *som+i. Eichner therefore states that *san may reflect *sem “if weak stress can be assumed to here cause Hitt. a instead of e’ (l.c.).

The adjective šanezzi-, šanizzi- is peculiar as well. Usually, it is compared to the adjectives hantezzi(i)a-, appezzi(i)a-, e.a., but these all show an o-stem -ezžia-in OH and MH texts. Such a stem is unattested for šanezzi-, šanizzi-, which is remarkable. On the other hand, šanezzi-, šanizzi- does not show suffix-ablaut as is usual in normal i-stem adjectives (-i- / -ai-), with which it does fit the other adjectives in -ezžia- that do not show suffix-ablaut either when they have adapted the i-stem form -ezzi- in younger texts. Another peculiarity is the fact that we find the spelling ša-NI-IZ-zi- beside ša-NE-IZ-zi-. According to CHD (Š: 175), “given the fact that the sign NI is often read né from OH and later, an interpretation /šanezzi/ is possible for occurrences of ša-NI-IZ-zi-“. Although it does occur that NI should be read né, it is a quite restricted phenomenon. Moreover, as CHD admits, “[t]he single occurrence of ša-ni-i-iz-zi KUB 15.31 i 25 (MH/NS) would seem to require a ni reading of NI”. Perhaps we should read the forms with ša-NI-IZ-zi- as ša-ni-ez-zi-, having the stem šani- restored (compare e.g. the few attestations appazzi- instead of original appezzi(i)a-, in
which the basic noun āpper was restored). The spelling ša-NI-i-IZ-zi- could then be read ša-ni-i-ez-zi-.

All in all, although I would be tempted to follow Eichner in assuming an etymological connection with PIE *sem, the formal peculiarities are difficult to explain.

šankuyâ[i] (c.) ‘nail; a unit of linear measure’ (Sum. UMBIN): nom.sg.c. ša-an-
ku-ya-ja-aš (NH), erg.sg. ša-an-ku-ya-ja-an-za (NH), nom.pl.c. ša-an-ku-ya-i-
š=a=at (OH/MS), nom.acc.pl.n. [ša-a]n-ku-ya-a-i (pre-NS), ša-an-ku-ya-i, dat-
loc.pl. ša-an-ku-ya-ja-aš (OH/MS), gen.pl. ša-an-ku-ya-ja=aš (NH); case unclear: ša-an-ku-i-ša-at, ša-an-ku-ya-a[... (OH/MS).

Derivatives: ursdušankuyâli)i] (n.), a metal implement for care of the nails?
(nom.-acc.pl. ša-an-ku-ya-al-li (OH/NS)).

IE cognates: Lat. unguis, Gr. ὄξύς, OIr ingen, OCS nóg, Lith. nagūtis, Arm.
elungn ‘nail’, Lith. nagà ‘hoof’.

PIE *s-ŋh1ŋh2-u-ois-

See CHD Š: 180 for attestations. There it is stated that “the oldest attestation ša-
an-ku-wa-i-s(a) (OH/MS) establishes the word as common gender and its stem as šankuwaivos.” Nevertheless, we find many neuter forms as well. In an overview of the forms, CHD gives four forms that they cite as commune. The first one, nom.sg.c. ša-an-ku-ya-a[-iš] (KBo 13.31 iii 10 (OH/MS)) occurs in an ‘If of an omen...’-text:

KBo 13.31 iii
(10) tâk-ku ša-ki-aš ša-an-ku-ya-a[...]
(11) DUMU.LUGAL OGIS.GU.ZA A-BI=ŠU e-x[...].

These lines, which are quite broken, are read by Riemschneider (1970: 76) as:

(10) tâk-ku ša-ki-aš ša-an-ku-ya-a[-iš³]
(11) DUMU.LUGAL OGIS.GU.ZA A-BI=ŠU e-e[p-zi]

“(10’) Wenn der Huf (die Hufe) eines “Vorzeichens [ .....] (11’) Der Sohn des Königs wird den Thron seines Vaters ergreift[ten.]”.

Apparently, CHD took over this interpretation as a commune-form, but as we can see, this is unascertained. The second one, nom.sg.c. ša-an-ku-ya-ja-aš (KUB 9.4 i 26 (NH)), is clearly secondary and attested in a text that shows many errors (see
Beckman 1990 for an edition). Of the third one, nom.s.g.c. ša-an-ku-i-ša-at (KUB 24.13 ii 19 (MH/NS)), CHD itself states that “the form ša-an-ku-i-ša-at KUB 24.13 ii 19 is corrupt and stands for an expected abl.”: inclusion in the overview of attested forms as a nom.s.g.c. apparently was erroneous. The fourth one, nom.pl.c. ša-an-ku-ya-i-š=a-at, is found in the following context:

KUB 33.66 (OH/MS) ii

(3) ḫar-ga-na-u-i-š=a-at ka-lu-[u’-pa-aš pi-i-e-er]
(4) ka-lu-lu-pi-š=a-at ša-an-ku-ya-[a-aš pi-i-e-er]
(5) ša-an-ku-ya-i-š=a-at da-an-ku-ya-i [a-ga-an-zî-pî]
(6) pi-i-e-er

‘The soles of the feet [gave it to] the toes; the toes [gave] it to the toenails; the toenails gave it to the dark earth’.

Here, šankuyaiš indeed seems to be a genuine plural form (because of pi’er), and commune because of the ending -š. Nevertheless, because šankuyaiš is found in an enumeration (following ḫarganaš and kalulupš), it can easily be a corrupt form, as often happens in enumerations. So all in all, of the four forms that are cited by CHD as commune, only two turn out to be genuinely commune, and these forms can easily be or likely are corrupt.

The neuter forms are interpreted in CHD as “collec.nom.-acc.neut.”: [ša]nkuqū[ፖ (1x: MS) and šankuqai (2x, undat. and NS). As we see, one of them occurs in an MS text (KBo 9.127 1.col. 5, dated by CHD as “pre-NS”) and is therefore just as valuable as the (possibly corrupt) nom.pl.c. šankuqaiš (OH/MS). Additional proof for neuter gender is the attestation of an erg.sg. šankuyajanza (KUB 9.4 i 35 (NH)), which form would only be necessary if the basic word was neuter (although one must admit that in the preceding line (KUB 9.4 i 34) an unusual form kalulipanza is found, whereas kalulupa- ‘finger’ is a commune word: Beckman (1990: 50, following Puhvel 1976: 26) interprets it as ‘a set of toes’).

All in all, I conclude that it is more likely that šankuyai- originally was neuter, and that the two commune forms are of secondary origin.

The word clearly shows a diphthong stem in -ai-, on which see Weitenberg (1979). He has left šankuyai- out of the discussion, however, because of its difficult interpretation.

The etymological interpretation is difficult as well. Since Forrer apud Feist (1939: 194), it is generally connected with Lat. ungius, Gr. ὄνυξ, OIr. ingen, OCS nogþb, Lith. nagūtis ‘nail’ etc., which all point to PIE *h₁negʰ-u-, *h₂ngʰ-u- (cf.
Schrijver 1991: 62, who specifically speaks against reconstructing a form *h₁engʰ-u-). This connection does not account for the initial š- (on the basis of which e.g. Beekes (1969: 47) rejects it). Nevertheless, if we assume an s-mobile (which is admittedly quite ad hoc), then we can reconstruct *s-h₁engʰ-u-oi- which would regularly yield Hitt. šankuyai-. An s-mobile has also been suggested for išḫahr- ‘tear’ (q.v.) and šākuqa- ‘eye’ (q.v.).


See CHD Š: 204f. for attestations. The verb is attested in the Maṣat Höyük-letters only. Its derivative, ¹LEšapašalli-, is also attested in texts from Boğazköy, however. Note that Alp (1991: 21) reads HKM 6 rev. (22) ša-pa-ši-ja-ar incorrectly as ša-ú-ši-ja-ar, on the basis of which he cites this verb as šapašiye-/ šauṣiye- (e.g. Alp 1988).

The etymological interpretation of these words is difficult. The fact that the verb shows a stem šapašiye/a-, whereas the noun is derived from the unextended stem šapaš-, looks like an Indoeuropean feature. Yet the stem šapaš- is difficult to explain as an inherited root: if it is to be interpreted as /sabas-/ it can hardly be of IE origin because of the fact that it is disyllabic; if it is to be interpreted /spas-/ it cannot be inherited because *ST- would in principle yield Hitt. išT- (but see at e.g. šakk- / šakk- and šıkan / šakn- for some cases where we do find an initial cluster šT- from secondary origin). Van Brock (1962b: 115) connected šapašalli- with Lat. specītō, OHG spehōn ‘to see’ < *spek-je/o-, however, which indeed is semantically attractive. Nevertheless, the sound laws, which predict that *spek-je/o- would yield Hitt. *išpekkıye/a-, prevent us from deriving šapašiye/a- and šapašalli- from *spek(-je/o)- through the Anatolian way. Szemerényi (1976: 1069) therefore derives šapašiye/a- from *spek(-je/o)- through the Indic way: he assumes that šapašiye/a- is a borrowing from Indic/Mitanni *spač(-ja)- < *spek(-je/o)-. This is formally certainly possible: the word āśusammi- ‘horse-trainer’, which must (partly) be a borrowing from Indic/Mitanni *ačva- < *h₁evko-, shows that Indic -ć- is borrowed into Hittite as a sibilant. Semantically, a connection between šapašiye/a- and *spek(je/o)- is also attractive. Moreover, the meaning ‘to scout’ would fit the sphere of meanings of the other borrowings
from Indic/Mitanni into Asia Minor (which all have to do with horse-training and warfare). All in all, I am quite positive regarding Szemerényi’s proposal (but compare scepticism by Mayrhofer 1982: 86).

\[\text{šapikušta}-\text{: see} \text{šepikušta-}\]

\(\text{šaptamīnzu}\) (adj.) ‘sevenfold(?)’: case? ša-ap-ta-mi-en-zu (OH/NS).

\(\text{PIE} *\text{sptm-in-}H\text{su?}\)

This word is hapax in KUB 29.1 iii (2) nu GEŠTIN-an ú-da-ú 9 ša-ap-ta-mi-en-zu ‘and let him bring out wine, nine š.’. On the basis of this context, its meaning cannot be determined. Nevertheless, it has been suggested that because of the formal similarity with 8-in-zu ‘eight-fold’, it is likely that šaptam- is a numeral as well and then derived from *septm ‘seven’ (cf. Tischler HEG S: 852-3: note that on the basis of this comparison I cite ša-ap-ta-mi-en-zu as šaptamīnzu and not as šaptamenzu, which is more common in the literature). CHD Š: 208 therefore translates ‘nine sevenfold (offerings?)’.

In view of šiptam- ‘seven’ as attested in šiptamīja- ‘seven-drink’ (q.v.) and šiptamae-², which seem to reflect the Hittite outcome of PIE *septm, it has been suggested that šaptam- as found here must be the Luwian counterpart, showing *e > a. Although this is a possibility (but as far as I know -inzu is not attested in Luwian), I would not want to exclude that we are in fact dealing here with the Hittite outcome of the cardinal *sptm- showing an analogical aphaeresis of the initial i- (which we would expect as the regular prothetic vowel to solve the initial cluster *sT-), so */sptm-/* in analogy to the full-grade *septm- as visible in šiptamīja- and šiptamae- (see there for a similar account for the female name ša-ap-ta-ma-ni-kà as attested in texts from Kaniš, which probably literally means ‘seventh sister’ and reflects *sptmo-).

According to CHD (l.c.), -zu is comparable to HLUw. -su and Lyc. -su ‘x-fold’ (e.g. HLUw. ṣara/i-su-u, Lyc. trisu ‘thrice’). Note that Lyc. -s- cannot reflect a plain *s (which should have become Lyc. -h-), but should go back to *ss from older *sH or *Hs. A form *-Hsu could explain Hitt. -inzu in view of genzu- ‘lap’ < *ĝenh-su- (whereas *VnsV > Hitt. VššV). The element -in- is still unclear, but hardly can reflect anything else than *-in-. So, all in all, šaptamīnzu must reflect *sptm-in-Hsu (or *septm-in-Hsu if one insists on Luwian origin of this word).

\(\text{šar.}^\text{IIIc/d; Ic1)} \text{ to embroider(?), to sew on(?); to truss(?) / sew(?) up:} 3\text{sg.pres.act. ša-ri-ez-zi (OS),} 3\text{pl.pres.act. ša-ri-an-zi, ša-ri-ja-an-zi,}

\(\text{838}\)
See CHD Š: 257-8 for attestations and semantics. Note that CHD distinguishes
between a verb “šariya-” ‘to embroider, to truss / sew up’ and “šarai-” ‘to
unravel (?)’”, which both show a 3pl.pres.act. ša-ra-a-an-zi (KUB 48.124 obv. 14
is translated by CHD as ‘they embroider’ whereas KBo 5.1 iii 53 is translated as
‘they unravel’). I do not understand this distinction. In my view we rather
translate this context as follows:

KBo 5.1 iii
(52) ... \[\text{munus.meš} \text{ka-at-re-eš} \]
(53) TÚG-an ša-ra-a-an-zi
(54) ma-aḥ-ḫa-an=ma TÚG-an ša-ra-a-u-an-zi
(55) zi-in-na-an-zi

‘The k.-women embroider(?) a cloth. When they finish embroidering the cloth,
...’.

The oldest attestations of this verb are 3pl.pres. or pret.midd. ša-ra-an-t[al-]...]
(OS) and 3sg.pres.act. ša-ri-ez-zi (OS). In younger texts we only find active
forms, showing the stems šarije/a-² as well as šarae-² (according to the
productive šatrae-class inflection). This points to an original situation in which
we find a middle stem šar- besides an active stem šarije/a-² (cf. ŝatr-²[er] besides
šatije/a-² and ḥuett-²[er] besides ḥattije/a-²).

Despite the fact that the semantics are not fully clear, it is probable that this
verb denoted something like ‘to sew together’. Duchesne-Guillemin (1947: 78)
therefore proposed to connect it with Lat. serō and Gr. ἐξο ‘to string together’,
which makes sense semantically as well as formally. I therefore reconstruct
*šr-(t)ó-ři, *sr-je/o-.

štarr² / šarr² (IIa2 > IIa1y, Ic1) (act.) ‘to divide up, to distribute; to split, to
separate’; (midd. trans.) ‘to cross (a threshold); to pass through (a doorway); to
transgress (borders); to violate (an oath’; (midd. intr.) ‘to be divided; to split up’;

839
See CHD Š: 230f. for attestations. This verb has basically two meanings: 'to divide up, to distribute' and 'to transgress (oaths, borders, doorways)'. In the OH and MH period, active forms denote 'to divide up, to distribute', intransitive middle forms denote 'to be divided' or 'to split up (intr.)' and transitive middle forms denote 'to transgress (oaths, borders, doorways)' (for the latter, see e.g. Oettinger 1976a: 59f. and Melchert 1984a: 18). In NH times the latter category is transferred to the active inflection as well (compare e.g. KUB 36.75 + Bo 4696 (OH/MS) i (7) n=a-aš-ta ne-pi-ša-aš KÁ-uš zi-ik=pát (8) [aš-ša-mu-ya]a-an-za ʾUTU-uš šar-ra-aš-ke- et-ta 'You alone, O established Sun-god, pass through the gate of heaven' that shows an active form in its NS duplicate: KUB 31.127 + KUB 36.79 i (31) šar-ri-eš-ke-si).

CHD states the following about the formal side of this verb (based on Oettinger 1979a: 287): “The oldest texts show a root thematic class verb, mi-conjugation with diagnostic forms šarrezzi, šarranzi, šarret, šarre, šarratta, šarra/eške- [...]. All hi-conjugation forms [...] are secondary and belong to the late MH and NH periods”. This is entirely incorrect. Oettinger has based his analysis on the alleged 3sg.pret.act.-form “šarret” as found in the OS text KUB 36.106 rev. 5 (note that
Košak 2005b: 175 dates this tablet as “ah.?/mh.?”, however. Melchert (1984a: 1836) correctly states that apart from the fact that the surrounding context of these lines demands a present verb, the meaning ‘to transgress (words)’ in OH texts is expressed with middle forms. We therefore should rather read the context as follows:

KUB 36.106 rev.

(5) [ ... ke-e-êl tu[p-pi-aš ut-ta-a-ar šar-rî-qêl-ta]
(6) [n=a-an ke-e ḫi-in-ki-ja-an-te-eš ap-pa-an-tu
(7) [ ... ] n=a-aš ḫar-ak-tu

‘[Whoever] transgresses the words of [this] tablet, him must [these] oaths seize, and he must perish’.

Having eliminated the “3sg.pret.act. šarrê”, we must regard the attestations of this verb with a fresh look. In the active paradigm, we see that the oldest forms are 3sg.pret.act. šâ-a-ar-êš (OS), 3pl.pres.act. šâ-ra-an-zi (OS) and 3sg.pres.act. šâ-a-ar-rî (MH/MS). In my view, these clearly point to an original ḫî-inflecting stem šârrê / šarrê (compare ârrê / arrê ‘to wash’ for similar forms). In NS texts, we find forms that point to a stem šârrâ / šarr-, according to the tarn(a)-class, and šarrye / šarry, according to the -je/a-class. Since both the tarn(a)-class and the -je/a-class are highly productive in NH times, these secondarily created stems are fully understandable and completely in line with the fact that ârrê / arrê shows the secondary stems arrâ / arr- and arrîje / arrî in NH texts. The middle inflection shows a stem šarrye / šârrâ besides šârra / šârrî and therewith is comparable to e.g. marrîje / marrâ, marrîje / marrî ‘to dissolve’.

Kimball (1999: 414) connects this verb with Gr. ὀρχεῖ (adv., postpos. ‘up(wards), aloft (adv.); on top of, above (postpos.)’ (Sum. UGU): šâ-ra-a (OS).


Anat. cognates: CLuw. šarrī (adv., preverb, postpos., prepos.) 'above, up; for? (šar-ri, ša-ar-ri), šarrā (adv., prepos.) '(up)on, thereon' (šarr-ra, ša-ar-ra); Lyc. hri 'up; on (top)', hṛppi 'on (prev.), for (prep.)', hrzzi-h (adj.) 'upper' (acc.sg.c. hṛzzi, nom.acc.sg.n. hṛzzë; dat.-loc.sg. hṛzzi).

PAnat. *sēr̥(-i), *sr-ō

IE cognates: Gr. ἄρος 'mountain-ridge'

PIE *s₆r̥-, *sr-

This adverb is virtually consistently spelled ša-ra-a (1000+ examples in my files), whereas a spelling ša-ra occurs 3x only (cf. CHD Š: 210: ša-ra'=ma[=ya], kā-ta'=ša-ra=at=kān and ša-ra-a=m-mu). The Anatolian evidence is clear: we are dealing with an old noun, of which the endless locative *sēr yielded Hitt. šēr (q.v.), the dat.-loc. *sēr-i yielded CLuw. šarrī, and the old all. *sr-ō yielded Hitt. šarā /srāl. CLuw. šarrā must reflect *sērō. Outer-Anatolian cognates are obscure. The only suggested connection is with Gr. ἄρος 'mountain-ridge', which Heubelck (1964) reconstructed as *sr̥jōm.

See footnote 196 for the phonological implications of the equation between Hitt. šaṙæzi(ia)- and Lyc. hrzzi-h-.

šaræi.ī: see šar-, šarije/är-

šarakū (IIa2?) 'to give water to (?)': part.nom.pl.c. ša-ra-ku-ya-an-te-eš (KUB 35.148 iii 39); impf. 3pl.imp.act. ša-ra-ak-ku-uš-kān-du (KBo 3.8 ii 8), ša-ra-ak-ku-iš-kān-du (Bo 4010, 2).

PIE *srogōth-. ??
See CHD Š: 239 for attestations and contexts. We are dealing with a stem šaraku-, of which the /g/ gets fortited in front of the -štrib-suffix: šarakkuške/a- (compare akkuške/a- from eku² / aku- ‘to drink’, lakkiške/a- from lāk² / lak- ‘to make lie down’). Because of its poor attestation, we cannot decide to which conjugation this verb originally belongs. The fact that we seem to deal with /srag”-/ could point to original ţi-conjugation, however (in a mi-verb, we would expect **/sreg”-/). Mechanically, we have to reconstruct *srog⁶-th-, but I know of no possible IE cognate. See at šakurye/a- ‘to water (animals)’ for the possibility that this latter verb is derived from šaraku- and reflects *srag”-ur-je/o-.

šarran-, šarr- (c.) ‘portion, share, half part, division’: nom.sg. šar-ra-aš (NS), šar-ra-a-aš (NS), acc.sg. šar-ra-an (NS), gen.sg. šar-ra-na-aš (NS), šar-ra-aš (NS), abl. šar-ra-ar (NS), šar-ra-na-za (NS), šar-ra-an-za (NH).

PIE *serh₁-on-

See CHD Š: 229f. for attestations. This noun shows n-stem as well as a-stem nouns. Because this word is attested in NS texts only, we cannot say much on the chronological distribution between these forms. Nevertheless, it is in my view likely that the n-stem forms are more original. For a similar case compare ţišvan- ‘eagle’ that shows a stem ţišra- in NS texts.

Etymologically, it is clear that šarran- belongs with the verb šar-¹ / šarr- ‘to divide up, to distribute’. It therefore is likely that originally, šarran- inflected *serh₁-ôn-s, *srh₁-ôn-m, *srh₁-n-ôs, which was levelled out to šarran-, also under influence of the verb’s weak stem šarr-. See there for further treatment.

šarip-¹ / šarip- (IIa3) ‘to sip’: 3sg.pres.act. ša-ra-pi (KUB 27.29 iii 9 (MH/NS)), ša-ra-pi (KUB 34.97, 15 (MS?)); verb.noun gen.sg. ša-ri-pi-ya-aš (KUB 17.23 i 10, 15 (NS)), ša-ri-ya-aš (KUB 17.23 ii 43 (NS)), ša-ra-ap-ya-aš (VBoT 24 iii 17 (MH/NS)); infl. [ša-ri]-i-ya-a-an-zí (KBo 29.144, 7 (MS)), ša-ri-pi-ya-a[n-zí] (KBo 24.27, 11 (NS), KUB 27.58 i 6 (NS)), [ša-ri]-pu-ya-an-zí (KBo 14.94 iii, 22 (fr.) (NS), KBO 29.131, 3 (NS)), [ša-ri]-i-ya-an-[í] (FHL 4, r.col. 4 (NS)); impf. ša-ra-pi-eš-ki-iz-zí (KUB 34.97, 17 (MS?)).

IE cognates: Lat. sorbēô, Gr. ἴππε βάλε ‘to slurf, to swallow’, Lith. sūbīti ‘to suckle’, srębti ‘to slurp’, OCS srębat ‘to slurp’.

PIE *srōb⁶-i, *srh⁶-enti

See CHD Š: 243f. for attestations. The morphological interpretation of this verb is difficult. We find three different spellings: ša-ra-p⁰, ša-a-ra-p⁰ (2x) and ša-ri-p⁰.
On the one hand, the two forms with plene spelling ša-ara-p° seem to indicate that the first -a- is real, whereas on the other the alternation between -a- and -i- seems to point to ablaut and would show that the second -a- is a real vowel. If this verb is of IE origin, it is unlikely that the stem would contain two real vowels: /sarab-/- can hardly reflect a PIE root. I therefore want to propose to regard the two attestations ša-ara-p° as mistakes (note that they both occur on the same tablet, only two lines from each other). Perhaps they are even scribal errors for ša-ra-a-p°.

All in all, I assume that this verb is to be compared with ašeš° / ašēš°, ḥamank° / ḥame/ink°, karāp° / kare/ip°- and represents šārāp° / šare/ip°- (note that a difference between -e- and -i- is not visible since the sign RI can be read ri as well as re), and therewith is one of the few verbs that shows an ablaut -a/-e/i-.

Its root etymology has been clear since Neumann (1967: 32), who convincingly connected this verb with Lat. sorbecā, Gr. ἵππος, etc. 'to slurp, to swallow' < *srebi°/srebi°. The exact details of the reconstruction are in debate, especially with regard to the -a/-e/i-ABLaut. The usual explanation of this type is the assumption that it reflects a PIE ablaut *o/e. Since such a verbal ablaut is not attested anywhere else in the Indo-European languages, I am quite sceptical about it. In my view, we rather have to assume that Hitt. e/i in the cases of synchronic -a/-e/i-ABLaut is to be interpreted as an anaptyctic vowel /i/. In this case, the /i/ emerged in the zero-grade form of a root of the structure *CRVC°. On the basis of the full grade *CRVC°, the zero-grade *CRC° > CaRC° was too aberrant and was replaced by *CRTCA°: karāp° / kare/ip° < *g'rōb° / *g'rōb°, ḥamank° / ḥame/ink° < *hymong° / *hymong°, but also terepp° / terepp° < *trēp° / *trēp°. This means that, in this case, šārāpi / šarāpantzi represents /sra/bi/, /sri/bant'i ñ < *srobi°/i, *srobi°/iñi.

šārāyar / šaraun- (n.) 'storm-clouds(?))': nom.-acc.sg. ša-ra-a-t-ya-ar (OS), ša-ra-a-t-ya-ar (NS), erg.sg. ša-ra-a-t-ta-an-za (NH).

PIE *sr-ó-tyr / *sr-ó-tun-?

See CHD Š: 246-7 for attestations and semantic treatment. The meaning of this word cannot be ascertained, but ‘storm-clouds’ could be possible. It belongs to the small class of nouns in -t-šar- / -aun- (also ašēšar / ašēšar, ḥarṣaun- / ḥarṣaun-, karāyar / karaun- and parāyar / partaun-). As is clear from the other nouns (see their respective lemmas, ḥarṣaun under ḥurš°), this class represents *CC-ó-tyr, i.e. a derivation in *-ó-tyr of a zero-grade root (compare the abstract nouns in -t-šar- / -t-šam- that reflect *CC-ó-tr). For šārāyar this means that we are
dealing with a root šar-. Etymologically, this can only reflect *sr-, and one could therefore consider an etymological connection with the noun *ser- 'top(?)', aboveness(?)' that must underly the words šaru ‘upwards’ and šeš ‘above, on top’ (q.v.).


Derivatives: šarḥuntallī- (adj.) ‘attacking(?), posing a threat(?)’ (nom.sg.c. šar-ḥu-un-ta-al-liš (NH)).

IE cognates: Gr. πόχομαι ‘move with speed or violence’.

PIE *sṛh₂-je/o-?

See CHD Š: 252 for attestations and semantic treatment. The exact meaning is unclear, but on the basis of

KUB 24.3 ii

(45) a-ra-ah-zē-na-aš A-[N]4 KUR.KUR[I]-L stops UR.MAḪ mu-a-an šar-ḥi-iš-ke-et

‘Formerly, with the help of the Sun-goddess of Arinna, the land of Ḫatti used to continually š. the foreign countries like a lion’.

it is clear that šarḥiye/a- must certainly mean something like ‘to attack’. This is supported by

KBo 16.25 4 i + 16.24 i


‘[When it (i.e. the army) begins to join] battle, it must š. the first (rank) of [the enemy]’ (for additions and translation see CHD Š: 252).

The interpretation of the form šarḥijat (KUB 44.4 rev. 27 + KBo 13.241 rev. 15) is less clear, but in my opinion a translation ‘to attack’ may be possible as well (for an edition, see Beckman 1983: 178):

(25) a-aš-[ma]-ya-r-[a]-t u-[a]-ya-an-zi UḪ[I]-L.A-uš MUNUS MEŠ-iš
(26) ḫu-u-[a]-ya-an-da-z[ə] NA-KA-in xÉ [a’-a-i GIš tāg-an-za KLIN ši-ya-al ḫa-zī
‘She presses’ them against herself’ (o.c.: 179), but this does not seem more likely to me.

Formally, šarije/a- can hardly reflect anything else than *srh₂j-e/o-. Čop (1955a: 398) suggested a connection with Gr. ἢξοπα ‘move with speed or violence’, which could reflect *srh₂j-e/o-.

The adj. šarhuntalli- occurs in a vocabulary only, where it translates Sum. [Š]U'.ŠUR' and Akk. AL-PU ‘threatening’.


IE cognates: Arm. argand ‘womb’.

PIE *srh₂yent-??

See CHD Š: 253-4 for attestations and semantics. Note that CHD Š: 279 also cites a noun \textsuperscript{vzl}šarnanta- ‘afterbirth(?)’ (KUB 5.5 i 21, iv 13), which in my view could be regarded as mistakes for šar-ḫu‘-an-ta (the signs NA (\textsuperscript{-ş}) and ŠU (\textsuperscript{-ş}) only differ one vertical stroke vs. winkelhaken from each other).

The only credible etymology that I know of is by Čop (1955a: 403-6) who connected this word with Arm. argand ‘womb’. If the Armenian sound laws permit it, we could reconstruct *srh₂yent-.

šarije/a-: see šar-, šarije/a- a-

šarije/a-: see šarr‘- / šarr-
šarip-: see šarqāŋ / šarip-

vr+tšarriyašpa- (c.) a garment: nom.sg. šar-ri-ya-aš-pa-aš (IBoT 1.31 obv. 7 (NH)).

This word is hapax in an inventory of garments. It is clearly a compound of šarri- + yaspa- 'garment', although the interpretation of šarri- remains elusive. One could think of Hurr. šarri- 'king' or CLuw. šarri 'upper'.

šarku- / šargayu- (adj.) 'eminent, illustrious, powerful', (c.) 'an eminent person': nom.sg. šar-kū-uš (OH/NS), acc.sg.c. šar-kū-un (NS), voc.sg. šar-kū (OH/NS), šar-kū-i (OH/NS), dat.-loc.sg. šar-ga-u-i (NS), nom.pl.c. šar-ga-u-e-eš (MH/NS), šar-ga-a-u-e-eš (NS), acc.pl.c. šar-ga-mu-uš (NS), dat.-loc.pl. šar-ga-u-yu-aš.

Derivatives: šargayatar / šargayann- (n.) 'eminence' (nom.-acc.sg. šar-ga-yat-ār, š[ar]-ga-u-yat-ār (NS), šar-g[a]-ya-tar (MS), dat.-loc.sg. šar-ga-yu-an-nī (MH?/MS)), šarkiške/a-2d (lc6) 'to be eminent' (2sg.pres.act. šar-[k]i-iš-ke-ši (KUB 31.127 i 10 (OH/NS)), 3pl.pres.act. šar-kiš-kān-zi (NS)), šarkuğšeq,2 (Ib2) 'to become mighty' (3sg.pres.act. šar-ku-e-e[š-zi] (MS)).

IE cognates: TochB šar- 'to be better than', Lat. sarcūō 'to patch up, to mend'.

PIE *srk-(e)u- or *sorē-(e)u-

See CHD Š: 268f. for attestations. This adjective is often translated 'high in status' (cf. also CHD), which goes back to Juret (1942: 43) who assumed an inner-Hittite connection with šarā 'upwards' and šēr 'on top'. As we will see below, this connection cannot be correct, and šarku- / šargayu- therefore should be translated 'eminent, illustrious, powerful' without semantically linking it to 'high'. We are clearly dealing with an u-stem adjective derived from a root šark-, which probably is visible as such in the verb šarkiške/a- 'to be good' < *šark-ške/a-. Note that the editors of CHD (Š: 267) translate this verb as "to ascend", which they admit to have based "on the supposed link to šarku- 'high, eminent'". Moreover, in order to illustrate this meaning they only cite one context, KUB 24.7 iv 25-26, which is broken and therefore non-probative. The other context in which this verb occurs is much clearer (for the reading šar-[k]i-iš-ke-ši, cf. šarku-4UTU-u- 'eminent Sun-god' in ibid. i 15, 18, 58):

KUB 31.127 i
(8) ... ḫa-an-da-an-za=kān
(9) a[n-t][u]-uḫ-ša-aš tu-uk=pāṭ a-aš-šu-aš n=a-an zi-ik=pāṭ
Kronasser (1957: 123, 127) convincingly connects surpass, to be better than’. Since this latter verb is a causative and attested in the middle only (p.c. M. Peyrot), the basic meaning of this verb may be ‘to be good’ as well (so ‘to make oneself good (with regard to someone else) > ‘to surpass, to be better than’). Moreover, within Hittite we may think of a connection with the causative šarrik- ‘to compensate’ (q.v.), which then must go back to *’to make (someone) good’ (cf. ModDu. vergoeden ‘to compensate’, lit. ‘to make (someone) good’). This verb is generally connected with Lat. sargiā ‘to patch up, to mend’ < *srk-ié/ó-‘, on the basis of which we must reconstruct a root *srk-.


Derivatives: šarkuqaná- (adj.) ‘having shoes on’(?) (nom.sg.c. šar-ku-i-ya-an-za (NS)).

IE cognates: Gr. ἄµπας, ἀϐος ‘kind of shoe’.

PIE *srk*-je/a-?

See CHD Š: 271f. for attestations. This verb clearly is a -je/a-derivative of a stem *šarku- ‘shoe’, which could be the reading of the sumerogram KUŠE.SIR ‘shoe’. See CHD Š: 270, however, for the fact that there are no unambiguous phonetic complements to KUŠE.SIR to prove that it really has to be read šarku-.

The etymological interpretation of this word is difficult. Sommer & Falkenstein (1938: 86) equated *šarku- ‘shoe’ with šarku- ‘eminent’. The idea is that šarkuše/a- in fact means ‘to put (shoes) up high’ (adapted by Neumann apud Oettinger 1979a: 335 as *šarku- ‘shoe’ < *‘high shoe’). Semantically, this does not seem very attractive to me. Moreover, šarku- ‘eminent’ in fact is an u-stem šarku- / šargu-, whereas in the case of *šarku- ‘shoe’ there is no evidence at all that we are dealing with a stem *šark-u- (rather a labiovelar *sark-’). Eichner (1973b: 224) compared *šarku- with TochB serke, TochA sark ‘cycle, circle’ and Skt. sraj- ‘wreath, garland’. Apart from the semantic difficulties (‘cycle’ and
A possible alternative could be a connection with Gr. ἄρτης - 'a kind of shoe' if from *srk-'. In principle, labiovelars would yield τ, θ in front of i or e, but perhaps the suffix -ς is attached to the root ἀρτη- later (cf. χαρίς, ἄρχος 'glove', derived from χαύρ 'hand', for the same suffix).

**šarli-** (adj.) 'upper(most), superior': acc.sg.c. šar-li-in (MH/NS), nom.-acc.pl.n. šar-li-ja (MH/NS).

Derivatives: šarluc- (Ic2) 'to exalt, to praise; to let prevail; to lift off, to remove' (1sg.pres.act. šar-la-a-mi (MH/MS), 3sg.pres.act. šar-la-a-ez-zí (MH/MS), šar-la-i-zí (NS), 3pl.pres.act. šar-la-an-zi (NH), 3sg.preter. šar-la-a-et (MH/MS), šar-la-it (NS), 1pl.preter. šar-la-u-e-en (NS), š[l]a-a-u-e[n] (NS), 2sg.imp.act. šar-la-a-i (OH/NS); part. šar-la-a-an- (MH/MS), šár-la-an-t- (MS?); verb.noun gen.sg. šar-lu-ma-aš (NS), šar-lu-u-ma-aš (MH/NS); impf. šar-li-iš-ke/a/ (OH/NS), šar-li-es-ke/a/ (NH), šarlaim(mi)- (adj.) 'exalted(?)' (nom.sg.c. šar-la-i-mi-iš (NH), šar-la-im-mi-iš (NH), acc.sg.c. šar-la-i-mi-in (MS), šar-la-a-i-mi-in, šar-la-i-me-en (NS), šar-la-im-mi-in (NS), gen.sg. šar-la-i-mi-aš (MS?), šar-la-i-mi-ja-aš (NS), šar-la-im-mi-ja-aš, šar-la-a-ma-aš), šarlamiš- (n.) 'glory' (Luw.nom.-acc.sg. šar-la-i-mi-ša (MH/MS)), šarlatta- (SISKUR) šarlattašši- (n.) 'exaltation(?); praise offering' (nom.-acc.sg. šar-la-at-ta-an (NH), Luw.nom.-acc.sg. šar-la-at-ta-anza (MH/NS), dat.-loc.sg. šar-la-at-ti, gen.sg. šar-la-a-at-ta-aš (MS), šar-la-at-ta-aš (NS), nom.-acc.pl. šar-la-at-ta (MH/MS)), šarlattašši- (adj.) 'related to praise / exaltation' (nom.sg.c. šar-la-ad-da-aš-ši-iš (NH), šar-la-at-ta-aš-[i]-iš (NH), šar-la-da-aš-ši-iš (NS), acc.sg.c. šar-la-at-ta-aš-ši-in (MH/MS), [šar-la]-t-ta-aš-ši-in (MH/NS), [ša]-t-ta-aš-ši-in).

PIE *sr-li-

See CHD Š: 277-8 for attestations. The adj. šarli- and its derivatives are clearly cognate with šēr 'on to', šarā 'upwards' and therefore must reflect *sr-li-. See at šēr and šarā for further etymology.

šarnanta-: see (UZU) šarḫuqant-


IE cognates: Lat. \textit{sarcĭō} ‘to patch up, to mend’, TochB \textit{sārk-} ‘to surpass, to be better than’.

\textit{PIE \_s\_r-nēn-\_e-ti}
surpass, to be better than’. All in all, šarni(n)k- must reflect *sr-nen-k-ti. See at § 2.2.4 for a detailed account of the infix -nin-.


Derivatives: ūrDUšartal- (n.), a trowel(?), spatula(?) (nom.-acc.sg. šar-ta-al (NS)).

IE cognates: ON serôa ‘to sodomize’, MHG serten ‘to violate (women/animals)’.

PIE *sôrdʰh₂3-(*ei, *srdʰh₂3-énti

See CHD §: 290-1 for attestations. Note that it does not mention the attestations 3sg.pres.act. šar-ta-i (KBo 17.18 ii 16 (OS), KUB 36.110, 20 (OS)), whereas the attestation šar-ta-i (KBo 17.43 i 14) is dated as “OH/NS?”, which in fact should be OS (as is correctly done lower in the text). This means that the oldest attestations are 3sg.pres.act. šartai and 3pl.pres.act. šarter (both OS), which point to the tarn(a)-class inflection. In NS texts we find the trivial secondary stems šartae-2 (šartaiižzi, [šar]dʒižzi, šarteqiddu, šartauyaš), according to the ḫatræ-class and šartie-2 (šartijumun and šartier), according to the -je/a-class.

Tarn(a)-class verbs reflect roots with a root-final laryngeal, either *CoH- or *Ce-CoH-, but also *CoCh₂3- (for this latter root structure, compare malla- / mall- ‘to mill, to grind’, pada- / padd- ‘to dig’, iškalla- / iskall- ‘to slit, to split’, išparra- / ḫpar- ‘to trample’, etc.; cf. § 2.2.2.2.d). In this case, only a structure *sorTh₂3- is possible.

Melchert (2002) convincingly connects šarta- / šart- with ON serôa ‘to sodomize’, MHG serten ‘to violate (women/animals)’ (note that these verbs do not merely denote ‘to have intercourse’, as Melchert states, but denote sodomy (in ON) and violation (in MHG), p.c. Guus Kroonen), of which he assumes that it goes back to a meaning * ‘to move the surface of one object obliquely against that of another’. These latter verbs point to *serd-*, which, on the basis of the tarn(a)-class inflection in Hittite, means that we have to reconstruct PIE *srdʰh₂3-*. Note that Melchert further connection with Skt. sárdgrdi- ‘portio vaginalis’ is formally impossible as Skt. -d- does not match P Germ. *-d<*-dʰ-.

Derivatives: *(L-)*ṣardiya- (c.) ‘ally, supporter, helper’ (nom.sg. šar-di-aš (OS), šar-ti-aš (OS), šar-di-ja-aš (MS), acc.sg. šar-ti-an (OS), šar-di-a(n)=ša-an (OS), šar-di-ja-an (OH/NS)), šardi/jatar / šardi/jann- (n.) ‘alliance, help’ (nom.-acc.sg. šar-di-[i]-an, dat.-loc.sg. šar-di-ja-an-ni).

PIE *sr-ḏʰ̣h₁-i-.??

See CHD Š: 292f. for attestations. The etymological interpretation is quite uncertain. Duchesne-Guillemin (1947: 78, 90) connected these words with PIE *ser- ‘to protect’, as reflected in Gr. ṭovντα ‘they keep watch’, Av. har- ‘to beware’, hauruaīti ‘protects’, but also possibly in Lyd. sarəta- and saroka- if indeed ‘protector’ and ‘protection’ (thus Melchert 1994a: 341). If correct, then we have to assume a root-extension *ser-T- for Hittite. In view of the assimilation of the dental stops before *-i-, we could perhaps think of *sr-ḏʱʰ₁-i-.. Nevertheless, I would judge this etymology as mildly probable only.

ṣartie/a-²: see šarta-² / šart-

šāru- (n.) ‘booty, plunder’: nom.-acc.sg. ša-a-ru (NS), dat.-loc.sg. ša-a-ru-i (NH), ša-a-ru-ú-i (NH), nom.-acc.pl. ša-a-ru-ya (NS).

Derivatives: šaruqye/a-², šaruqae-² (Ic4 > Ic2) ‘to plunder, to loot (something); to take (something) as plunder’ (3sg.pret.act. ša-ru-ya-ič (MS), ša-ru-ya-a-ič (NH), ša-ru-ya-ič (MH/NS), 3pl.pret.act. ša-ru-ya-e-r (NH, ša-ru-ya-er, ša-ya-er (NH, ša-ya-er (NS)); part.nom.pl.c.ša-ru-ya-an-[i-eš] (NH); inf.I ša-a-ru-ya-u-ya-an-zi (NH), [ša]-a-ru-ya-u-ya- an-zi (NH).

IE cognates: Mfr. serb ‘theft’, We. herw ‘plundering’, Latv. sirt ‘to loot’.

PIE *sör-u-

See CHD Š: 296 and 298 for attestations. This word was connected by Duchesne-Guillemin (1947: 78) to Latv. sirt ‘to loot’, Mfr. serb ‘robbery’, to which possibly Lith. sariot ‘to devastate, to loot’ belongs. Especially Mfr. serb, which together with We. herw ‘plundering’ reflects *serŷa, seems to be closely cognate with Hitt. šāru- that we must reconstruct as *sōr-u-.

(a) šarunta/i- (c.) ‘spring, well’: acc.sg. ša-ru-un-ti-in (NH), abl. ša-ru-un-ta-az.

IE cognates: Skt. sra-, Gr. πέλα ‘to flow’.

PIE *sru-nt- ??
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See CHD Š: 299 for attestations. The use of the gloss wedge and the alteration between an _a_ - and an _i_ -stem seems to point to Luwian origin. If from IE origin, one could think of a connection with the PIE root *sreu- ‘to flow’ (Skt. srau-, Gr. ἕα, etc. ‘to flow’). Although the formation is not fully clear, we could perhaps reconstruct *sru-nt-.

**śaś-**: see śeś-² / śaś-

**śaśha-**: see śiśha-¹ / śiśh-

**śattayartana** (adv.) ‘for seven rounds’: (4) śa-at-ta-ya-ar-ta-an-na.

See CHD Š: 313. The word is only attested in the Kikkuli-text on horse-training. It is generally derived from Indic *sapta-yartana-* ‘seven-rounds’. See also aikayartana, naṭartana, panaṅgartanna and tierayartanna.


Derivatives: ściuṭištac-² (Ic2) ‘to wean’ (3sg.pres.act. ša-ū-ti-iš-ta-iṣ-ti-z[i] (NH); verb.noun gen.sg. ša-a-ū-ti-iš-ta-a-ṛ[ā] (NH)).

PIE *sō-ut-εs-t- / *sō-uet-εs-t-

See CHD Š: 318-9 for attestations and semantics. From the contexts it is clear that the ściuṭišt- is a cow younger than the one-year-old calf, and therefore must be translated ‘weanling’. The oldest attestations (OS) are spelled ša-ū-di-iš° (/saudist-/), whereas in younger texts we find ša-(a-)ū-i-ti-iš° (/śaudist-/). Rieken (1999a: 147) assumes that in OH times ściuṭišt- was syncopated to šaudišt-, of which she states: “[b]ei der Synkopierung handelt es sich aber nicht um einen konsequent durchgeführten Lautwandel”. All the parallels she adduces of forms where we find _-i_ in NH forms vs. _O_ in OH forms are found in names and a few words of foreign origin, however. Moreover, the supposition of a phonetic development that has not been consistently carried through, and even has been reversed, is against the principles of historical linguistics. In my view, if this word is from IE origin, we should rather view the difference between šaudišt- and ściuṭišt- as ablaut.
Hrozný (1917: 93) saw in šāgitišt- a compound of *som ‘one’ (see šamnae-², =šōṣan and šāni-) and *yet-es- ‘year’ (see also under yīlt-), literally meaning ‘(a cow) in its first year’, which has been widely followed. This etymology demands that we assume that this word is a t-stem: *sōm-yetates-t-. Although the disappearance of *N in front of -y- has parallels in e.g. kueyen ‘we killed’ < *gʰә-ә-n-yen or mā=ya < *mām=ya, this etymology cannot explain the form šaudišt-. Kimball (1999: 233) more cogently assumes a compound of the demonstrative pronoun *so- and *yetes-, lit. meaning ‘(a cow) of this year’. Formally, this is much more convincing: *sō-yetates-t- would by regular sound lay yield Hitt. /šāuديثt-/ (accentuated *o yields /ā/; raising of *e to /i/ between *y and *t; lenition of *t to /l/ between unaccented vowels; weakening of posttonic *e to /i/ in closed syllable), whereas a zero-grade formation *sō-utes-t- would regularly yield /šāudist-/ (the accented diphthong *ōu yields /āu/ with short /a/ in front of dental consonants; lenition of *t to /l/ after accented diphthong; weakening of posttonic *e to /i/ in closed syllables). For semantic parallels, cf. e.g. Skt. vatsa- ‘calf’ < *uet-s-o-, Goth. wiþrus, OE weþer ‘wether’ < *uet-ru-, etc.

§1šāqūtar-: see §1šāqūra-

šāgitišt-: see šaudišt-

§1šāqūtra-; §2šāqūtar- (n.) ‘horn (a musical instrument); horn (a drinking vessel)’ (Sum. SI): nom.-acc.sg. ša-a-ú-ı-it-ra-an (OS), [š]a-ú-ı-it-ra-an, ša-a-y-a-a-tar (OH/NS), ša-a-y-a-tar (NS), ša-a-y-a-tar (MH/NS), ša-a-y-a-tar (NH), ša-ú-y-a-tar (NS), ša-aú-ı-y-a-tar (MH/NS), ša-ú-y-a-tar (MH/NS), Luw.nom.acc.sg. ša-aú-ı-y-a-tar-ša (NS), gen.sg. ša-a-y-a-a-tar-ą (OS), ša-a-y-a-a-tar-aš (OS), ša-a-y-a-a-tar-aš (OS), [š]a-ú-ı-it-ra-aš (NS), abl. SI-az (NS), instr. SI-it (OH/NS), nom.-acc.pl. ša-a-ú-ı-it-ra (NS), ša-ú-ı-it-ra (NS), ša-ú-ı-it-ra (NS), ša-ú-ı-it-ra (NS).


See CHD Š: 317-8 for attestations. The word’s identification as ‘horn’ is determined by the fact that it often uses the determinative SI ‘horn’, but also can be written sumerographically with SI. Note that šāqūtra-, šāqūtar- denotes ‘horn’ as a musical instrument or a drinking vessel only. The ‘horn’ of cows and other animals is expressed by the word (§1)karčar (q.v.).
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The interpretation of this word is quite difficult. Already in OS texts, we find two stems: šāqūra- and šāqūtar-. The alteration -r-/-ār- is hard to explain from an IE point of view. Oettinger (1979b) treats this word extensively and reconstructs it as *sōuht₁-e-tro- “Instrument zum Stoßen” (derived from *seuh₁- ‘to push, to shove’ as visible in Hitt. šmē/a-‘ to push, to shove’). There are three problems regarding this etymology. (1) I do not see what ‘to push’ has to do with ‘horn’. (2) Oettinger’s explanation that the alternation between šāqūra- and šāqūra- is due to analogy with yātār ‘water’ besides yidār (pl.) (l.c.: 202) is far from compelling. Starke (1990: 400f.) argues that šāqūtar- is the Luwian form that corresponds to Hitt. šāqūra-, but this is unlikely in view of the fact that gen.sg. šāqūtarāš is found in an OS text already: Luwian loanwords are usually not found that early in Hittite texts. Nevertheless, the existence of a Luwian stem šāqatar- cannot be denied in view of the NS Luwian inflected nom.-acc.sg. šāqatarša.

Melchert (1994a: 138-9) states that the alternation between -t- and -a- is due to the different outcome of posttonic *e in Hittite, namely ħ/i in closed syllables (so šāqitrV < *sōqetdrV) and /a/ in open syllables (šāqatar < *sōqetdr). This is contradicted by šāqitiš-< *sō-getes-t-, which shows that the raising of *e to ħ between *y and a dental consonant precedes the weakening of *e to a in open syllable. (3) In the preform *souht₁etoro- we would expected monophthongization of *ou to ħ/i in front of *h₁ (cf. *souh₁₁-i-tu- > Hitt. šōtu-l, šu-ū-ū- ‘full’), so *souh₁etoro- should have yielded **sōʔetoro/ **sōʔitra-l, spelled **šu-ū-it-ra-.

All in all, Oettinger’s etymology cannot be correct. In my view, it is much more likely that we are dealing with a cultural Wanderwort.

=šše (encl.adj. 3sg. dat.) ‘for him/her/it’: V= śš-e (OS), C=šš-e (OS), V=śš-ši (OS+), C=šši (OS+), V=šši (NS).

PIE *-sōi

This enclitic pronoun denotes ‘for him/her/it’ and is in the oldest texts always spelled with geminate -šš- when this could be expressed (so after a word or another enclitic that ends in a vowel). Spellings with single -š- are found sporadically, and in NS texts only. In OS texts, we find =šše (e.g. nu-u=šš-e, ta-a=šš-e) more often than =šši, but in MS and NS texts =šše is not found anymore: we then only find =šši. This means that an original =šše is getting replaced by =šši from OH times onwards (which is the reason why I cite this lemma under =šše), probably in analogy to the dat.-loc.sg-ending -i (cf. Melchert 1984a: 94).
This enclitic pronoun is generally reconstructed as *-soi and regarded as ultimately belonging with the PIE demonstrative pronoun *sö-, *tö-. For the ending, compare encl. dat.-loc.sg. Gr. ποι ‘to me’, οὐκ ‘to you’.

=šše-: see =šši-/ =šša- / =šše-

šěhur / šěhun- (n.) ‘urine’: nom.-acc.sg. še-e-ḫu (KBo 10.45 iv 37 (MH/NS), KUB 9.28 iii 17 (MH/NS)), še-e-ḫu-ur (KBo 21.20 i 25 (NS)), še-e-ḫu-u-a-ɾ (KUB 58.90 ii 5 (NS)), [š]e-e-ḫu-u-a-ɾ [ (KUB 60.116, 11 (NS)), gen.sg. še-e-ḫu-n-a-ɾ (IBoT 1.36 i 46 (MH/MS)), ši-e-ḫu-n-a-ɾ (KUB 7.3+ i 9 (MH/NS)), dat.-loc.sg. še-e-ḫu-ni (KUB 35.132+ iii 7 (NS)), še-ḫu-ni (KBo 45.244, 2 (NS)), all.sg. še-e-ḫu-na (IBoT 1.36 i 44 (MH/MS)), še-ḫu-na (IBoT 1.36 i 45 (MH/MS)), erg.sg. še-e-ḫu-na-an-za (IBoT 1.36 i 34 (MH/MS)), instr. [š]e-e-ḫu-ni-it (KBo 12.111, 7 (NS)).

Derivatives: šeḫuriyaʔi (IC1 ‘to urinate’ (3sg.pret.act. še-e-ḫu-ri-ja-[a]t (KUB 31.71 iii 11 (NH)), impf.3sg.imp.act. še-ḫu-ri-še-ḫe-ɾd-lat (KUB 17.27 iii 12)), šeḫuriyaʔi (IC2 ‘to urinate’ (inf.1 [š]e-ḫu-ra-u-ya-an-zi (KUB 60.116, 6 (NS))), šeḫurianjyaʔant (adj.) ‘besmeared with urine’ (nom.sg.c. še-e-ḫu-ga-ni-ja-u-ya-an-za (KBo 10.37 ii 25, i 49 (OH/NS))), see dūr / dūn.-

PIE *séikʷr, *séikʷn? ??

The noun is an r/n-stem and shows the stems šeḫur besides šeḫun-. The NS attestations šeḫuɾar are to be compared to the few attestations pahḫuɾar besides pahḫur and probably show an occasional phonetic realization [šehʷr] of phonological /šehʷr/. The hapax spelling ši-e- is found in an NS text, and is probably not to be taken seriously phonetically.

The noun shows the same inflection as mēḫur / mēḫun- ‘time’. On the basis of the idea that mēḫur reflects *mēh₂-ur (but see at mēḫur / mēḫun- for an alternative etymology), Eichner (1973a: 69-70) similarly reconstructs šeḫur as *sēh₂-ur, a derivative in -ur of the root *sēh₂- “verunreinigen, beschmutzen”. This reconstruction has been widely followed (e.g. Oettinger 1979a: 512; Rieken 1999a: 340f.; Kimball 1999: 152). Nevertheless, a root *sēh₂- “verunreinigen, beschmutzen” does not occur in Hittite. The verb šēh₁-, which is translated “verunreinigen, besudeln” by Eichner (l.c.), in fact means ‘to clog, to stuff, to stop, to block, to fill in, to plug up’ and probably reflects PIE *sēh₂- ‘to stuff up’ (from which *sēh₂- ‘to satiate’), whereas CLuw. šaḫḫa-, which Eichner translates as “Schmutz” (on the basis of Laroche 1959: 83), does not exist (cf. Starke 1990:
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With the disappearance of a root *seḫ₂- ‘to pollute, to defile’ I see no reason anymore to assume that šēḫur must reflect *seḫ₂-ur.

It is quite common that words like ‘urine’ are borrowed because of tabooistic reasons (e.g. inherited ModDu. zeik ‘urine’ (*seik*)- is seen as too rude and therefore replaced by urine ‘urine’). Kortlandt (2004: 11) therefore states that šēḫur must be a loan from Semitic. In my view, the inflection of šēḫur / šēḫun- looks too IE to be borrowed from Semitic. I therefore would rather assume borrowing from another Anatolian language. For instance, a preform *seik*-r / *seik*-n-, derived from the PIE root *seik*- (OHG seihhen ‘to urinate’, SerbCS šćati ‘to piss’, Skt. siṅcati ‘to pour out, etc.’), would yield šēḫur / šēḫun- in Palaic by regular sound laws: PIE *seik*-r / *seik*-n- ‘urine’ > PAnat. *šēg*-r / *šēg*-n- > Pal. šēḫur / šēḫun- (compare āhuqanti ‘they drink’ < PAnat. *gʷanti < *h₁gʷ-enti). Although it is hard to prove, I would certainly regard borrowing from Palaic (or another Anatolian language in which PAnat. *gʷ yielded -ḫu-) as a possibility.

See at dūr / dūn- ‘urine’ for the possibility that CLuw. dūr / dūn- is derived from PAnat. *šēg*-r < *seik*-r as well.

For the interpretation of šēḫu-qanjiyant- as either *šēḫur-ganija or *šēḫun-ganiyant- cf. Rieken (1999a: 341-2).

In the handcopy of KUB 17.27 iii 12 we find the form ṜQ[R<IR<] = eš-ḪAR/ḪUR-ri-eš-ke-ê-d₄ with which often is interpreted as ešḫurrīškeddu ‘he must bleed’. Nevertheless, if we look closely at the photograph of this tablet (available through Hetkonk), we see that it actually reads ṜQ[R<IR<] = še-ḪAR/ḪUR-ri-eš-ke-ê-d₄, which means that we should read šēḫurrīškeddu ‘he must urinate’. This latter form also fits the context best:

KUB 17.27 iii

(11) ... n=a-at an-da
(12) [GIR<IR<]-it iš-pûr-ra-aḫ-hu-un n=a-at=kán ANŠE-aš še-ḫur-re-eš-ke-ê-d₄
(13) [n=a-at]=kán GUD-aš kam-mar-ši-eš-ke-ê-d₄

‘I have trampled it with my feet. May the donkey piss on it and may the cow shit on it!’.

šekk– see šakk₂- / šakk-
šeknu- / šeknay- (c./n.) ‘cloak’: acc.sg.c. še-ek-nu-un (often), še-ek-nu-un(n)-š-ša-an, ši-ik-nu-un, nom.acc.sg.n. še-ek'-nu-u=š-me-et (KBo 3.34 i 21 (OH/NS)), ši-ik-nu-u=š-ši-it (917/u + iv 11 (NS)), ši-ik-nu-u=š-še-et (KUB 53.3 v 3 (NS), KUB 53.5, 5 (NS)), gen.sg. še-ek-nu-uš (KBo 2.3 i 33 (MH/NS), še-ek-nu-ua-aš, dat.-loc.sg. še-e-ek-na-u-i=š-mi (KBo 17.36 iii 5 (OS)), še-ek-nu-i=š-ši, abl. ši-ik-nu-az, acc.pl.c. še-ek-nu-uš, ši-ik-nu-uš.

IE cognates: Skt. saj- ‘to adhere, to hang on’, Lith. segu ‘to adhere’, OIr. sén ‘safety net’.

PIE *ség-n(e)u-

See Weitnberg 1984: 227f. for semantics and attestations. The remarkable form še-ku-nu-u=š-me-et (KBo 3.34 i 21) is in my view to be regarded as a scribal error for še-ek'-nu-u=š-me-et. The only OS form, šēkenai=šmi shows plene spelling of the vowel -e- as well as full grade in the suffix syllable -nae- (cf. also ḫē(u) / ḫē(j)ay- ‘rain’).

Eichner (1979a: 424) reconstructs *sēk-nu- from the root ‘*sek-’ ‘to cut’ (actually *sekh₁-, see at šēkk₁ / šakk⁻), but Weitenberg rather follows Hrozný’s connection (1919: 76) with Lat. sagum ‘soldier’s cloak’ which points to the PIE root *seg- ‘to adhere, to hang (on)’ (cf. Skt. saj- ‘to adhere, to hang on’, Lith. segu ‘to adhere’, OIr. sén ‘safety net’). This means that we should reconstruct *sēg-n(e)u-.


IE cognates: OIr. sīl ‘seed’, Lith. pasėgys ‘seed’.

PIE *seh₁-li-

This word is firmly attested as ‘grain pile, grain storage’. If the one gen.sg.-form še-la-aš indeed belongs here, it would show the ablauting i-stem gen. in -aš <
*ajaš. This word has plausibly been compared by Oettinger (1979a: 541) followed by e.g. Kimball 1999: 146) with OIr.

\textit{sil `seed'} and Lith. \textit{pasė́jas `seed'} and reconstructed as *\textit{seh₁-li}, a derivative in *-\textit{li} from the root *\textit{seh₁} `to sow`.

\textit{šemen\textasciido1272-} / \textit{šemn-}: see \textit{šamen\textasciido1272-} / \textit{šamm-}

\textit{šena-}: see \textit{šīna-}

\textit{-šepa-}: see at \textit{taqānzepa-}


See Beckman 1983: 63-4 for attestations and semantic treatment. According to Beckman, the word “may be said to designate a long pointed metal object with a single shaft”, i.e. ‘pin’. We encounter spellings with \textit{ša-pi-}, \textit{še-pi-} and \textit{ši-pi-}, which are all found in MS texts already. This alteration in vocalism is remarkable. Melchert (1994a: 31) states that it “points unambiguously to initial /sp-/ and derivation from PIE *\textit{sp(e)ik-} is straightforward”. To my knowledge, a preform with initial *\textit{sp}- would have yielded Hitt. \textit{išp-}, however.

\textit{šepitt-} (n.) a kind of grain: nom.-acc.sg. \textit{še-ep-pi-it} (often), \textit{še-pi-it} (KBo 10.45+ iii 51, KBo 4.2 i 9), gen.sg. \textit{še-ep-pi-it-ta-aš} (OS, often), \textit{še-ep-pi-id-da-aš} (KUB 20.66 iv 6), \textit{še-ep-pi-du-aš} (StBoT 25.54 iv 5 (OS)), \textit{[še]-ep-pi-da-aš} (StBoT 25.56 iv 14 (OS)), \textit{še-ep-pi-təÇaš} (VSNF 12.56 obv. 8), instr. \textit{še-ep-pi-it-ti-it} (KBo 30.73 iv7 11), nom.-acc.pl. \textit{še-ep-pi-it-ta} (HKM 109 obv. 3, 7 (MH/MS)).

PIE *\textit{sep-it-}??

See Rieken 1999a: 158f. for a treatment of this word. She argues that the occasional OS attestations gen.sg. \textit{šeppidaš} (with single -\textit{d-}) may show lenition of *-\textit{t-} in posttonic position (*\textit{pēpitas}, whereas later on the unlenited variant (geminate -\textit{tt-}) was generalized throughout the paradigm.
Nevertheless, no good comparandum is known. Rieken’s connection with Hitt. șebe- ‘sheaf(?)’, which she reconstructs as *sēp-o-, seems unconvincing to me.

șēr (adv.) ‘above, on top’: șe-e-er (OS), șe-er (OS).

PIE *sēr

In the oldest texts we see traces of the fact that originally șēr belonged to a nominal paradigm. The attestations șe-e-er=șa-me-et (OS), șe-e-er=șe-me-et (OS) ‘above them’ and șe-e-er=și-it ‘above him’, indicate that șēr originally was nom.-acc.sg. The form șe-e-er=și-i ‘above him’ may show that șēr was dat.-loc.sg. as well. Of the noun *ser-, the old allative is visible in šarā (adv.) ‘up(wards)’ (q.v.). This latter form never has enclitic possessive pronouns, which indicates that it already earlier was seen as adverbial only. So we have to reckon with an original paradigm nom.-acc.sg. șēr, dat.-loc.sg. șēr, all.sg. šarā. I would interpret dat.-loc.sg. șēr as an endingless locative *sēr, but Melchert (1984a: 8818) rather reconstructs a loc. *sēri, in which the word-final -i regularly dropped. This *sēri then would be the direct preform of CLuw. šari as well. See at šarā for a treatment of this latter form and for further etymology of the root *ser-.

șerha- (gender unclear) an object to rinse feet with: acc.sg. șe-e-er-ḫi[(a-an)] (KBo 20.26 + KBo 25.34 ii 12 (OS) // 327/b + 330/b rev. 3), instr. șe-e-e-er-ḫi-it (KBo 17.43 i 14 (OS)), șe-e-e-er-ḫi-it (KBo 17.18 ii 16 (OS)).

This word occurs in OS ritual texts only, denoting some object with which feet are rinsed, e.g. KBo 17.43 i 14 (L).MES ALAM.ZU₂-an GĪR₂[^1] ṢU[NU] še-e-e-er-ḫi-it šar-ta-i ‘he rubs the feet of the clowns with the šerha-’. Its exact meaning cannot be determined. Usually, it was thought that this word cannot be of IE origin, because of the fact that Melchert (1994a: 83) describes a sound law *eRHV > aRRV, due to which the sequence -eRaḥa- as found in šerha- should not be possible. As I have shown under erh- / arah- / arḥ-, however, the examples in favour of this sound law should all be interpreted otherwise, which means that there is no evidence that in *eRHV the -e- would get coloured to -a-. Nevertheless, the development *VRHV > VRRV is real, which means that the sequence -VRHV in šerha- needs an additional explanation. Such an explanation could be, for instance, that we are dealing with an originally ablauting noun *serh₂₃-ₙ, *srh₂₃-ₙ; because in the zero-grade stem the laryngeal would be retained,
we could assume that it was restored in the full grade stem. So, all in all, if šerha-
is of IE origin, it formally must go back to an original ablauting root noun *
šerh₂₃, *śerh₂₃-m, *srh₂₃-ös, which was later on thematicized. I know of no
convincing IE cognate, however (but compare šarhijε/α⁺² < *srh₂ᵢ-je/o⁻).
aš-ta-az (MS), ša-aš-ta-za (MH/NS), acc.pl. ša-aš-du-uš (MH/MS), ša-a-aš-dḫa-uš (KBo 5.8 ii 28 (NH)), dat.-loc.pl. ša-aš-ta-aš (KUB 42.94 i 4 (NS)), [ša-aš-t]a-aš (KUB 29.41, 2 (MH/NS)).

IE cognates: Skt. sas- ‘to sleep’, Av. hah- ‘to sleep’.

PIE *sēs-ti, *ss-énti

This verb clearly shows an ablaut šeš-/ša-. It is consistently spelled with single -š-: a spelling with a geminate is found only once (še-eš-šu-un), in a NS text. Friedrich HW: 191 cites 3pl. pret.act. šeššir, but I have not been able to find this form. Perhaps this citation is based on a wrong interpretation of pa-ra-a-še-eš-ši-er ‘they dispersed’ (KBo 5.8 i 20, 22) (see at parāššēš-2). The impf. šeške/a-aparently was reinterpreted as a single stem as we can see by its impf. šeškiške/a-. Once we even find šeškiškiške/a-.

An etymological connection with Skt. sas- and Av. hah- ‘to sleep’ was first suggested by Mudge apud Sturtevant 1933: 89, and is generally accepted since. It means that we have to reconstruct a PIE root *ses-. The interpretation of the full grade stem is clear (*ses- regularly yielded Hitt. šēs-t'a), but the fate of the zero grade stem is less evident. In my view, we have to assume that PIE *ss- regularly yielded Hitt. šēs-t'a, which phonetically was realized [ša-š']. Likewise šaš(sa)nu- must phonologically be interpreted as šēs-nu' (with fortition of the second *s due to its contact with *n), which phonetically was realized [šaš:nu-], spelled ša-aš(-ša)-nu-.

The derived noun šašt(a)- (originally a t-stem, thematicized in NH) is extensively treated by Rieken (1999a: 129f.). It probably reflects *sōs-t's, as is possibly still visible in the plene spelling of acc.pl. šašduš.

The CLuwian forms šašša- and šaššumai- are often cited as belonging with Hitt. šēš- / šaš-. Melchert (1993b: 192), however, interprets the former as ‘release, grant’ and states of the latter: “meaning ‘beschläfe’ is mere guess and difficult formally”. CHD (Š: 310) tentatively translates šaššumai- as ‘to make (someone) sorry/contrite’.

šēš (2d) ‘to prosper, to proliferate’: see šiš 2d

šēš- (gender uncertain) body part of cow: acc.sg. še-ša-an-n=a (KBo 11.72 ii 44), še-e-ša-an (KBo 30.69 iii 17).

The word occurs twice and is rather unclear regarding its meaning. Nevertheless, the word seems to denote a body part of cows in the following context:
KBo 30.69 iii

(16) [n]u L[U]MEŠ GİŞ BANŠUR ḫa-an-te-ez-zi ti-an-zi
(17) [n]u L[UM]EŠ MUHALDIM = ma GU₃₃aš še-e-ša-an ti-an-zi
(18) [G]IM-an = ma kān [Rasur] TU₁[I]L₃₅ ta-ru-up-dar-ri
(20) [n] = a-аш-ta L[U]MEŠ MUHALDIM da-ga-an-zi-pu-us
(21) [š]a-an-ḫa-an-zi

‘The table servants step forward, and the cooks place the š. of the cow. When the soups have been finished, the cooks take a footstool(?) and the cooks sweep the earth’.

In another context it seems to be on a par with ‘feet’:

KBo 11.72 ii

(43) ny=kān kat-ta-an-ta ši-pa-an-ti UZU₃₃A=ma za-nu-[n-zi ... ]
(44) GIR₃₃A še-ša-an-n= a U₃₃L pé-eš-ši-an-zi

‘They libate downwards and they make the pieces of meat cool[k ... ]. Feet and š. they do not throw away’.

Rieken (1999a: 75) assumes a connection with (UZU)šišai- (q.v.), which she suggests to interpret as ‘paw’. This is a possibility but far from assured.

šēša₂ / šēš-: see šišša₂ / šišš-

gšš Šēš(a):- see GIS šēatar / šēšam-


IE cognates: OCS șgiatan ‘to sieve’, Lith. sijoti ‘to sieve’.

PIE *seh₁-country/ -?

For semantics, cf. the following contexts:

KUB 13.3 iii

(22) nu-u=š-ma-aš ū-yiš-te-na-aš na-ah-ḫa-an-te-eš e-eš-tén
(23) nu ū-yiš-ta-ar GIS še-ša-ru-li-it še-ša-ri-iš-ke-tén
‘You must be careful with the water. Sieve the water with a sieve’.

ibid. iii

(36) ki-ni-un=ma-a=š=ma-aš šu-me-e-eš LÚM^{ES} A.ÍL.LÁ

(37) ú-úi-te-na-aš na-ah-ḫa-an-te-eš [e-eš-tén nu ú-úi-ta-ar]

(38) GIŠ še-ša-ru-li-it še-ša-[ri-iš-ke-tén]

‘Now you, water-carriers, must be careful with the water. Sieve the water with a sieve’.

The stem to both šēšarije/a- and šēšarul- must be šešar-. I wonder to what extent these words can be connected with OCS sēši ‘to sieve’ and Lith. sijot ‘to sieve’ < *seh₁-. Regarding its formation, we could compare naḥšarije/a- ‘to be afraid’ (see under nāḥš/ < nāḥš-), which must reflect *neh₂-sr-je/o-. In the case of šēšarije/a- we therefore perhaps could reconstruct *seh₁-sr-je/o-. If this is correct, it shows that *ēh₁sr yields Hitt. -ešar, which contrasts with *-ēsr > Hitt. -eššar (e.g. *gēšr > keššar ‘hand’).


The gen.sg.-forms GIŠ še-e-ša-an-na-aš (KUB 24.1 iv 12) and GIŠ še-e-ša-na-aš (KUB 24.2 rev. 14) are duplicates of each other. The use of the determinative GIŠ and the context could indicate that the words denote ‘fruit-tree (vel sim.)’ (thus CHD L-N 237):

KUB 24.1 iv (with duplicate KUB 24.2 rev. 12ff.)

(9) A-NÁ LUGAL=ma MUNUS.LUGAL DUMU^{MEŠ}.LUG[(AL Ú A-NÁ KUR URM[H$a$]-at-ti)]

(10) TI-tar ḫa-ad-du-la-tar in-na([-ra-ya-tar MU^{KAM} GĪD.DA])

(11) EGIR.UĐ du-aš-ga-ra-at-ta-an([-n=a p)i-eš-k(i) μu$' ḫa(l-ki$i-aš])

(12) GIŠ GEŠTIN-aš GIŠ še-e-ša-an-na-aš (var. GIŠ še-e-ša-na-aš) GU_{4}[^{HI.A-aš} UD$U^{[HI.A-aš]}

(13) ŠAH-aš ANŠE.GIR.NUN.NA[^{HI.A-aš} ANŠE.KUR.RA-aš g[(i-im-ra-aš [hu-ḫa$-ni-it-i-ir])]

(14) DUMU.LŪ.U₁₉.LU-aš-š=a ŠA EGIR.UD^{ți}([' mi-ja-a-tar pi-eš-kī])

‘But grant to the king, the queen, the princes and to Ḫatti-land life, health, strength, long years in the future and happiness. And grant future growth of
grain, vines, š-s, cattle, sheep, goats, pigs, mules, horses – together with wild animals of the field – and of humans’.

On the basis of the attestation šēšanna š a stem šēšatar is cited by Friedrich HW Erg. 3: 28. This would imply that šēšanaš is to be emended to š-e-ša-an-na-aš. A stem šēšanna- cannot be excluded either, of course. If the meaning ‘fruit-tree’ is correct, it is possible that šēšatar belongs with šiš- ‘to prosper, to proliferate’ (q.v.), although the latter verb shows geminate -šš- in e.g. verb.noun šēššaujaš, whereas šēšatar is spelled with single -š-.

šēšha-² / šēšh-: see šišha-² / šišh-

šēšškar (n.) ‘negligence’: nom.-acc.sg. še-ēš-ši-š[a]r² (KUB 14.4 iii 26).

This word is hapax in the following context:

KUB 14.4 iii
(23) ma-a-an=ma I-NA KUR URU Kum-ma-an-ni=ma pa-a-un A-BU=I A I-NA ₄Ḫé-pát URU Kún-ma-an-ni
(24) EZEN ḫal-zi-ja-u-ya-aš ta-ra-a-an ḫar-ta pē-ēš-ta=m=a-an=ši na-a-ii-i
(25) n=a-aš am-mu-uk na-ak-ke-e-ēš-ta-at nu I-NA URU Ki·iz-zi-ya-at-na pa-a-un
(26) mu ki-ša-an me-mi-ēš-ke-nu-un pa-i-mi=ya=za ŠA A-BI=I A še-ēš-ši-š[a]r²
(27) ar-ḫa š[a]r²-ni-ik-mi

‘When I went to Kummanni, (it was the case that) my father had promised to Ḫepat of Kummanni a Feast of Summoning, but he had not yet given it to her, and she troubled me! I went to Kummanni and spoke thus: ‘I come to do penance for the negligence(?) of my father’.’

Although the meaning ‘negligence(?)’ seems quite certain, I know no good etymology for this word.

šēšd-²: see šišd-²

šēššfur: see šiššur

šēš (numeral) ‘one’ (Sum. 1 (DIŠ)): nom.sg.c. 1-iš (OS), 1-aš (NS), acc.sg. 1-an (OS), 1-in (HKM 47 rev. 49 (MH/MS)), ši-an (here?, NH), nom.-acc.sg.n. 1-at-t=a (KBo 17.104 ii 7), 1-e (KBo 18.172 obv. 16), gen.sg. ši-i-e-el (OH/NS), dat.-
Derivatives: ſiela- (adj.) ‘of one’ (nom.sg.c. 1-e-la-aš (KBo 1.44 + KBo 13.1 i 54 (NS)), nom.pl.c. ſi-e-le-eš (KBo 6.3 ii 16 (OH/NS)), nom.-acc.pl.n.(?) 1-e-la (KUB 45.77 i 7 (NS)).

IE cognates: Gr. nom.sg.f. ἵκα ‘one’.

PIE *siḥ₂

The stem ſi-, with the forms gen.sg. šiḫāl, dat.-loc.sg. šiḫani, abl. šiḫez and instr. šiet, was usually interpreted as a demonstrative ‘that’ or ‘this’. Goedegebuure (2006) convincingly shows that an interpretation as a pronoun does not fit the usage of these forms, however, and argues that they in fact denote ‘one’ and therefore must be regarded as the phonetic reading of the sumerogram 1 ‘one’. On the basis of a combination of the phonetic and sumerographic writings she reconstructs a paradigm nom.sg.c. */siaš/, acc.sg.c. /sian/, nom.-acc.sg.n. */siat/ and */šet/, gen.sg. /šet/, dat.-loc.sg. /šetani/, abl. /šetś/ and */šetatś/, instr. /šetś/ and */šetatś/ and assumes a basic stem šiḫa-. Although I largely agree with her reconstruction of the paradigm, I think that the interpretation of the nom.sg.c. must be adapted. Despite the fact that we do find the sumerographic writing nom.sg.c. 1-aš, which indeed would point to /siaš/, the oldest attested nom.sg.c.-form is 1-iš (OS). Goedegebuure interprets this form as belonging to an i-stem paradigm, of which she assumes that it is not necessarily identical to the a-stem forms. In my view, the absence of any other i-stem forms (note that acc.sg.c. 1-in is attested only once (HKM 47 rev. 49), which can easily be analogous to nom.sg.c. 1-iš in the preceding line (ibid. 48)) indicates that this form is not part of another paradigm but must in fact belong to this one that we have reconstructed. This is supported by the fact that nom.sg.c. 1-aš is found in younger texts only (its oldest attestation is KUB 12.19 iii 28 (OH/MS or NS): note that the OS-status of KBo 40.200 (that has 1-aš in r.col. 4) seems quite dubious to me), whereas 1-iš is found in OS and MS texts. This points to a situation in which the original nom.sg.c. of ‘one’ was /sis/, spelled 1-iš. In analogy to acc.sg.c. /sian/, nom.sg.c. /sis/ was in younger times secondarily changed to /siaš/, spelled 1-aš.

For the etymological interpretation of this numeral, Goedegebuure refers to Beekes (1988b: 81) who states that in Greek, besides the feminine ἵκα ‘one’ (*sm-ih₂), also a form ἵκα exists (Hom., supported by Lesbian, Thessalic and Boeotian material). On the basis of this latter form, he assumes that the original feminine
form of ‘one’ was *sih₂, which was altered to *sm-ih₂ in analogy to masculine
*sem ‘one’. This is further supported by e.g. the fact that Skt. dat.sg.m. tāsmai ‘to
him’ < *tō-sm-ōī (containing -sm- ‘one’) corresponds to dat.sg.f. tāsyai ‘to her’ <
*tō-sih₂-ōī (containing -sih₂- ‘one’). In Hittite, this *sih₂- is the basis for the
paradigm as attested: addition of the pronominal endings nom.sg. -s, acc.sg. -an,
gen.sg. -el, etc. yielded /sēs/, /sēan/, /sēel/, /sēdan/, etc. Note that the length of -ē
in nom.sg. /sēs/ is not independently attested, but cannot be disproven either. It is
supported by spellings like ši-i-e-el and ši-i-e-ez.

The adjective šēla-, which since Hrozný (1922a: 24-5) generally has been
translated as ‘in love’, has now by Hoffner (2006) been identified as a derivative of
the gen.sg. šēl ‘of one’.

-sī (2sg.pres.act.-ending of the mi-flection)
IE cognates: Skt. -śi, Gr. -ā, Lith. -śi, Goth. -s, Lat. -s, etc.
PIE *-sī

The ending for the 2sg.pres.act. for the mi-conjugation is -śi. Postvocally, it is
consistently spelled with single -ś-. In the OS texts, we find -śi postvocally
(e.g. úqa-śī ‘you come’, ak-ku-uš-ke-śī ‘you drink’, ar-ša-ne-e-śī ‘you are
envious’, ḫa-an-ta-a-śi ‘you arrange together’, i-e-śī ‘you make’, pa-i-śī ‘you
go’, te-śī ‘you say’) as well as after consonant (e-eš-śī ‘you sit / you are’, e-uk-śī
‘you drink’, ḫar-śī ‘you have’, pu-mu-uš-śī ‘you ask’, with fortition to /-Śī/ after
stops, cf. e-ku-uš-śi ‘you drink’, [e-ez-za-Ś]-śī ‘you eat’). In younger times, the
hi-ending -tti (q.v.) is spreading to the mi-conjugation, replacing -śi. The first
traces of this replacement are visible in MH times, where we occasionally find -tti
in verbs that end in a consonant (ṇa-ap-ti ‘you attach’, ḫar-ti ‘you have’). In NH
times, this has become the normal situation (in NH/NS texts we find for instance
15x e-ep-ti vs. 2x e-ep-śī ‘you seize’). Moreover, in NS texts we occasionally find
-tti in verbs that end in a vowel: ar-nu-at-ti ‘you settle’, im-me-at-ti ‘you mingle’
and pa-it-ti ‘you go’. These are the first signs of what probably eventually meant
the end of the ending -śi in favour of the hi-ending -tti.

Etymologically, -śi goes back to two endings. On the one hand, it directly
reflects the PIE athematic primary 2sg.-ending *-sī used in PIE root-presents (~
Skt. -śi, Gr. -ā, Lith. -śi). On the other hand, it reflects the PIE athematic
secondary ending *-s used in PIE root-aorists (~ Skt. -s, Gr. -c) extended with the
‘presentic’ -i.
See CHD Š: 324f. for an overview of attestations and spellings. From this overview, we can conclude that the oldest attestations show geminate -šš- (when this could be expressed in the spelling) and that the original inflection is nom.sg.c. =ššiš, acc.sg.c. =ššan, nom.-acc.sg.n. =ššet, gen.sg. =ššaš, dat.-loc.sg. =šši, abl.-instr. =ššut, nom.pl.c. =šššaš, acc.pl.c. =ššaš, nom.-acc.pl.n. =ššet, dat.-loc.pl. =šššaš. For the original distinction between nom.-acc.sg./pl.n. =ššet vs. abl.-instr. =ššit see Melchert 1984a: 122-6. This means that we are dealing with an ablauting stem =šši/- =šša- / =šše-. This vocalization can hardly reflect anything else than PIE *-i-, *-o- and *-e-, but an exact explanation for the distribution of these vowels is still lacking (cf. also =mi- / =ma- / =me- ‘my’, =tti- / =tta- / =tte- ‘your (sg.)’, =ššummi- / =ššuma- / =ššume- ‘our’ and =šmi- / =šma- / =šme- ‘your (pl.); their’). Etymologically, this enclitic possessive must belong with =šše, =šši (encl.pron. 3sg.dat.), and go back to *-si-, *-so- and *-se-.

šija- ‘one’: see ši-

šijammi- (n.) a certain dish prepared in a jar: nom.-acc.sg. ši-ja-am-mi (KBo 2.7 i 15, 29), ši-ja-mi (KUB 17.35 i 35).

The word occurs a few times only. Its exact meaning is unclear. Formally, it looks like a Luwian participle in -amma/i-. Further unknown.

É šijannaš ‘treasury (house of sealing)’: É ši-ja-an-na-aš.
This word denotes ‘treasury’ and is usually transliterated ši-ja-an-na-āš. Nevertheless, it is better to read Ši-ja-an-na-āš ‘house of šiṣṭār’, in which *šiṣṭār denotes ‘sealing’ and is the verbal abstract of the verb šai² / ši- ‘to seal’. See there for further etymology.

**šiṣṭa**- (n.) ‘alcoholic beverage?’: nom.-acc.pl. ši-ja-an-ta (KUB 14.3 ii 62 (NH)).

This word is hapax in the following context:

KUB 14.3 ii

(61) ... nu A-NA "Pi-ja-ma-ra-du š za-ar-ši-ja-an x[...]

(62) š za-ar-ši-ja-āš=ma l-NA KUR Ḥar-ti kiš-an ma-a-an NINDA ši-ja-an-ta

(63) ku-e-da-mi up-pa-an-zi nu-u=š-ši=kān ḤUL UL tāk-ki-iš-ša-an-zi

‘[I have given] a safeconduct to Pijamaradu. A safeconduct in Ḥatti (goes) as follows: Whenever they send bread (and) šiṣṭanta to someone, to him they will not conduct evil’.

Sommer (1932: 132) tentatively translates šiṣṭanta as ‘Rauschtrank(?).’ Formally, the word is identical to the nom.-acc.pl.n. of the participle of šai² / ši-, šiţe/a² ‘to impress; to shoot’. Semantically, however, a translation in the field of food-stuff or drinks would be better, for which we possibly could compare šiţeššar / šiţeššin- ‘beer’.

**gaššiṣṭa**- (n.) ‘spear(?)’ (Sum. GššU.I): nom.-acc.sg. ši-ja-at-tal (KUB 33.106 iii 47, iv 15, KUB 36.95 iii 8), ši-ja-tal (KUB 17.7+ iii 17, KUB 33.92 iii 12, KUB 33.95 iv 2).

Derivatives: šiṣṭalšške/a² (lc6) ‘to hunt (with a spear)’ (3sg.pres.act. ši-ja-tal-li-iš-ke-ez-zi (KUB 2.1 vi 6, 8, KBo 12.59 i 3, 6, KUB 40.107+ rev. 18), ši-ja(-at)-tal-li-iš/eš-ke-ez-zi (KBo 11.40 vi 3, 16, 19, 22, 25)).

PIE *h₁s-š-o-tlo-

See Starke (1990: 200-205) for an extensive treatment of this word, although he reads it as ši-ja-(at)-ri (the sign RI can be read ri as well as tal), which he interprets as a Hititization of a Luwian stem šiṣṭat-. See Rieken (1999a: 432n36), however, for the view that the word in fact was šiṣṭa(t)al. Within Hittite, it is clearly derived from the verb šiţe/a² ‘to shoot, to hurl’ (see at šai² / ši-; šiţe/a²) and could go back to *h₁s-š-o-tlo-, showing the instrumental suffix *-tlo-.
In the nom.-acc.sg. the ending *-tlom should have yielded Hitt. -ttal, according to the sound law *-Clom > -Cal as formulated by Melchert 1993c.

šiğattailija/a-²: see šittarije/a-²

*šiğatar / šiğann- ’spurting’: gen.sg. ši-ja-an-na-aš (KBo 5.2 i 38).

This word occurs only once, in the following context:

KBo 5.2 i
(37) NA-ZA.GÌN te-pu NA-GUG te-pu NA-AŠ.NU11, GAL te-pu
(38) ḫu-u-uš-ti-iš-s=ṣa te-pu 14 kap-pi-iš ŠE pa-ra-a ši-ja-an-na-aš
(39) GISINIG te-pu GISERIN te-pu

’a bit of lapis lazuli, a bit of carnelian, a bit of alabaster, and a bit of ḫūṣīti-
Fourteen bowls of grain that has spurted forth, a bit of tamarisk and a bit of ceder’.

It is clearly a gen.sg. of a abstract noun *šiğatar, derived from the verb šije/a-²
(see at šai² / ši-; šije/a-²). See there for further etymology.

šiğattarije/a-²: see šittarije/a-²

šije- ’one’: see ši-

šije/a-²: see šai² / ši-; šije/a-²

UZV šiešai-: see (UZV)šišai-


PIE *sh₄-i-éh,sh₄r ?

The word is well attested in OS and MS texts. Formally, it looks like a derivative in -eššar from either šai² / ši- ’to impress, to sow’ or from šije/a-² ’to shoot’. Semantically, I would prefer a connection with šai-/ši- ’to impress; to sow’
because of the fact that beer is produced from grain. If so, then šijingšar would reflect *sh-i-ēs. See at šai-/ši- for further etymology.

šijingšar (n.) ‘shooting (vel sim.)?’: nom.-acc.sg. ši-i-eš-šar (KBo 17.61 rev. 7).

PIE *h₁s-i-ēh₁sh₁r ??

Hapax in KBo 17.61 rev. (7) ne-pi-ša-ac=kān kat-ta ši-i-eš-šar ši-ja-ti ‘From heaven š. spurted down’. Formally, šijingšar is identical with šijingšar ‘beer’. Semantically, however, we rather expect a figura etymologica with šijoti, so ‘shooting (vel sim.)’. If so, then it must reflect *h₁s-i-ēh₁sh₁r. See at šiše/ša-² (under šai- / ši-; šiše/ša-²) for further etymology.

šiṣṭi- (c.) a certain hairdo(?) (Sum. GÚ.BAR): nom.sg. ši-e-et-ti-iš (KBo 1.42 iii 22).

The word only occurs once, in a vocabulary, where it glosses Sum. GÚ.BA[R]. Friedrich (HW: 192) translates ‘eine Haarracht?’. No etymology.

šimišije/ša-²: see šamišije/ša-² under šami-

šīna- (c.) ‘figurine, doll’: nom.sg. ši-i-na-aš (KUB 9.7 iii 6 (MS), KUB 17.18 ii 13 (NS), KUB 59.43 i 9 (NS)), še-e-na-aš (KUB 17.14 rev. 16, 22 (NS)), š[e-e]-n[a-aš (KUB 12.58 i 25 (NS)), acc.sg. ši-i-na-an (KBo 17.1 + 25.3 i 5, iv 18 (OS), KBo 17.3+ iv 14, 24 (OS), še-na-an (KUB 55.3 obv. 10 (OH/MS?), KUB 7.2 i 22 (NS), še-e-na-an (KBo 29.17 i 8 (NS), KUB 7.53+ i 53 (2x), iii 15 (NS), KUB 24.14 i 13, 14 (NS)), gen.sg. ši-i-na-aš (KUB 60.161 i 42 (NS)), ši-na-aš=a=kān (KUB 60.161 ii 11 (NS)), ši-e-na-aš (KUB 17.18 ii 14, iii 20 (NS), še-e-na-aš (KUB 46.46 ii 13 (NS)), dat.-loc.sg. ši-i-ni (KBo 17.1 + 25.3 iv 13 (OS), KBo 17.3+ iv 26 (OS), še-e-ni (KUB 17.14 rev. 11, 13 (NS)), nom.pl. ši-e-ni-eš (KUB 17.18 ii 10 (NS)), acc.pl. še-e-nu-uš (KUB 24.13 iii 6 (MH/NS), KUB 7.53+ i 1, 14, 16 (NS), KUB 24.14 i 11 (NS)), še-e-nu-uš (KBo 12.107 rev. 13 (MH/NS)).

Derivatives: NND śīna- (c.), bread in the shape of a figurine (nom.sg. ši-i-na-aš (ABoT 5+ iii 6 (OS)), še-e-na-aš (KBo 5.1 ii 33 (MH/NS), KUB 55.40, 4 (NS)), acc.sg. ši-i-na-an (KBo 21.34 + 1BoT 1.7 ii 16 (MH/NS), KBo 39.180+181, 7, 9, 11 (NS)), še-na-an (KBo 21.34 + 1BoT 1.7 iii 9 (MH/NS)), acc.pl. śe-e-nu-uš (KBo 39.180+181, 4 (NS), KUB 55.12 ii 2 (NS?)).
The oldest attestations (OS) of this word are spelled ši-i-n°, whereas the spellings še-e-n° and še-n° are found in NS texts only (the dating of KUB 55.3, where we find še-na-an, as MS is not fully assured) according to the lowering of OH /i/ to NH /e/ before Q as described in § 1.4.8.1.d.

The etymological interpretation of this word is unclear. Mechanically, we would expect a preform *siHno- or *d°iHno-. Unfortunately I have not been able to find cognates.

-šipa:- see at (tagänzepa-

šip(p)ant- / šip(p)ant-: see išpant- / išpant-

(URUDU)šipikšta:- see (URUDU)šepikšta

šiptamija- (n.) ‘seven-drink’ (Sum. VII-mi-ja-): nom.-acc.pl. ši-ip-ta-mi-ja (KBo 5.1 iv 35), VII-mi-ja (Bo 4951 rev. 15).

Derivatives: šiptamae-d (Ic2) ‘to seven(?)’ (3sg.pres.act. ši-ip-ta-ma-iz-zi (543/s iii 2), VII-iz-zi (KUB 51.18 obv. 10)).

IE cognates: Skt. saptá, Av. hapta, Gr. ἐπτά, Lat. septem, Goth. sibun ‘seven’.

PIE *septm-io-

The word is hapax in the following context:

KBo 5.1 iv

(34) UD-az=ma=kán iš-tar-na pa-iz-zi
(35) nu ši-ip-ta-mi-ja te-ri-ja-al-la
(36) iš-pa-an-da-an-zi

‘The day goes by. They libate seven-drink (and) three-drink’.

which has a parallel in

Bo 4951 rev. (see Burde 1974: 124f.)

(15) [...] III-ja-al-la VII-mi-ja ši-pa-an-ta-an-zi

‘[...] they libate three-drink and seven-drink’.

This proves that šiptamija- must mean ‘seven’ and must go back to *septmio-. On the form šiptamaizzi see Neu (1999).
In the texts from Kültepe we find the PN HeaderValue Ša-áp-ta-ma-ni-kà which could well originally mean ‘seventh sister’. It has been assumed that šaptama- here is to be interpreted as the Luwian outcome of *septm (with *e > Luw. a), but this is unlikely in view of the clearly Hittite element -nika- ‘sister’ (which corresponds to CLuw. *nānašra-). Perhaps this šaptama- is the outcome of the PIE cardinal *sptmo- ‘seventh’, showing a secondary aphaeresis of expected i- (which is the regular prothetic vowel in front of an initial cluster *sT-) in analogy to the full-grade forms šiptam- (compare e.g. šākan / šakn- ‘oil’ šakkar / šakn- ‘excrement’ and šākk- / šakk- ‘to know’ for similar scenario’s). See at šaptaminzu for a possibly similar case.

šēšzd (Ib1) ‘to prosper, to proliferate’: 3sg.pres.act. še-eš-zi (KBo 3.7 i 7 (OH/NS)), 3sg.imp.act. ši-iš-du (KUB 12.43, 2, 3 (OS), KBo 7.28 obv. 15, rev. 41 (OH/MS), KUB 24.2 rev. 18 (NH), še-iš-du (KUB 24.3 iii 41 (MH/NS)), ši-eš-du (VBoT 121 obv. 6 (MH/NS)), še-eš-du (KBo 3.7 i 5 (OH/NS), KUB 14.12 rev. 14 (NH), KUB 24.1 iv 17 (NH)), še-č-[eš-du] (KBO 2.32 rev. 6 (NS)), 2pl.imp.act. ši-iš-te-en (KBO 8.35 ii 15 (MH/MS)), ši-iš-[e]-en (KUB 23.78b, 11 + KUB 26.6 ii 12 (MH/MS)); verb.noun ši-iš-du-ya-ar (KUB 15.34 ii 23 (MH/MS)), gen.sg. še-iš-du-ya-a[s] (KUB 24.3 iii 39 (MH/NS)), še-eš-ša-u-ya-a[s] (KUB 24.1 iv 16 (NH)), ši-iš-ša-ya-aš (KUB 24.2 rev. 17 (NH)).

The oldest attestations of this verb (OS and MS) are spelled ši-iš-, whereas the spellings še-iš-, ši-eš-, še-eš- and še-e-eš- occur in NS texts only, which is due to the lowering of OH /u/ to NH /e/ before -š- as described in § 1.4.8.1.d.

Usually, this verb is cited as šišd- or šešd-. The assumption that -d- is part of the stem is based on the verbal noun šišduyar ‘proliferation’ (KUB 15.34 ii 23) and gen.sg. šešdua[s] (KUB 24.3 iii 39). Awkward, however, is the fact that in no other form a -d- is found (3sg.pres.act. šešzi instead of **šešzazi, 3sg.imp.act. šišdu instead of **šešzade, 2pl.imp.act. šišten instead of **šešzatten, and, perhaps more importantly, verbal noun šiššayaš, šēššayaš). The question is whether the -d- is dropped in all other forms (thus Melchert 1994a: 166, who posits a sound law *-stt- > -št-, but this does not account for šiššayaš and šēššayaš) or whether the two attestations of the verbal noun inserted a -d-. In the case of še-iš-du-ya-a[s] (KUB 24.3 iii 39) it is striking that a few lines further the 3sg.imp.act. še-iš-du (ibid. 41) is attested. In my view, it is possible that this form has influenced the verbal noun. In the case of ši-iš-du-ya-ar (KUB 15.34 ii 23) such a form is absent, but since 3sg.imp.act. šišdu is the most frequent form of this verb, it is
possible that šišduyar was secondarily created in analogy to it. If so, then we are dealing with a verb šiš-² > šeš-².

The verb practically always occurs together with māi- / mi- ‘to grow’ and therefore probably denotes ‘to prosper, to proliferate’. Carruba apud Friedrich HW Erg. 3: 28-9 proposed to interpret šišd as reflecting *sš-šd- ‘to sit’, but this is semantically unconvincing and therefore must be rejected. I know no other good etymology, however.

šišša- / šišš- (Ilaly: impf. of šai- / ši-) ‘to impress’: 2sg.pres.act. ši-iš-ša-at-ši (KUB 1.16 iii 58 (OH/NS)), 3pl.pres.act. ši-iš-ša-an-zi (KBo 10.16 i 3 (NS)), še-eš-ša-an-zi (KUB 57.79 i 40 (OH/NS)), 3pl.imperf. [ši]-iš-ša-an-du (KUB 11.1 iii 10 (MS?), ši-iš-ša-an-du (KUB 31.2+17+ iii 10 (OH/NS)), [ši]-e-eš-ša-an-du (KBo 3.1 iii 45 (OH/NS)); 3pl.pres.midd. ši-iš-ša-an-da-ri (KUB 8.22 (+) iii 17 (OH/NS)), ši-iš-ša-an-da-ri (KUB 8.22 (+) iii 1 (OH/NS)).

PIE *šh₁-i-sóh₁-el, *šh₁-i-sh₁-iénti

This verb is the imperfective in -šš(a)- of šai- / ši- ‘to press’. Like the other imperfectives in -šš(a)- (šša- / šš-, šalzišša- / šalzišš- and yarrrišša- / yarrrišš-), this verb, too, shows a phonetic development -išš(a)- > -ešš(a)-. See at šai- / ši- and -šš(a)- for further etymology.

(vzl) šišā- (n.) body part of animals (bear, lion, leopard, šiča-): nom.-acc.sg. šiša-i (KUB 9.31 i 8, KUB 29.1 ii 43, KUB 56.59 iv 6), ši-e-ša-i (KUB 29.1 ii 42),

This word occurs in two contexts only:

KUB 9.31 i (with additions from KUB 56.59 iv 4-6)
5] [x x x] x ke-e-šu-un ga-an-ga-hi nu-u=š-ši ḫu-up-pa-li ZABAR
6] [x x x] x-li-iš-ši-i Š4 KUB UR.MAḪ ṣa-ar-ṛu-ya-ja-aš
7] [iššu.GUB.S] U=mašš[ku-un-ku-uz-zi-ja-aš ḫa-az zi-ut=še-er-[r=(a)]
8] [iššu.ZA.GIN] ši-ša-i da-as-šu ḫar-tāg-ga-aš ši-ša-i
9] [x x x] x-ki=ma ša-a-ša-aš

‘[...] I hang the kelu. It has a bronze ḫuuppali. Its x-li is of the rough skin of a lion, but its stool is of basalt and its ḫazzinu is of lapis lazuli. The heavy šišā is of a bear, but the x-ki šišā is of a šiča-’;

KUB 29.1 ii
41] ... nu ki-mu-u-pi ú-da
We have to conclude that the *united*. ‘Bring the *kimpi*-box here. In the *kimpi*-box, *sumumahh*- the *šešai* of a lion (and) the *ššai* of a leopard. Hold them and unite them and make them one. Bring them to the heart of the man. May the soul and the heart of the king be united’.

We have to conclude that the *ššai* is a body part of bears, *ššai*-s, lions and leopards, but it is not totally clear what body part is referred to. Perhaps we have to assume that here ‘tails’ are meant that have to be plaited together (which would explain ‘unite them’; see also under *sumumahh*). Rieken (1999: 74) assumes that the word shows a reduplication from the root *ššai*/ *šši* ‘to press’, and suggests that the word means either ‘paw’ or ‘teeth’ (both body parts can be ‘pressing’) and reconstructs *šši-sohī*. One should always be cautious, however, when the meaning of a word is assumed on the basis of etymological considerations only.

*ššai*1 / *šših* (*IIa5 > IIa1γ*) ‘to decide, to appoint’: 1sg.pres.act. *šš-eš-ša-aḫ-ḫi* (KUB 5.20+ iii 42 (NS), KUB 15.11 iii 11 (NH), Bronzetafel ii 25 (NH)), *šš-eš-ša-mi* (KUB 14.19, 10 (NH)), 3sg.pres.act. *šš-eš-ša-a-i* (KBo 5.9 iii 6 (NH)), 3pl.pres.act. *šš-eš-ša-an-zi* (KUB 9.15 iii 19 (NS), KUB 42.91 ii 9, 21 (NS)), 3sg.pret.act. *šš-eš-ša-aš* (KUB 36.67 ii 30 (NS), KUB 33.120 ii 46 (MH/NS)), 3pl.pret.act. *šš-is-ḫe-er* (KBo 32.14 ii 36 (MH/NS)), 2sg.impact. *šš-eš-ḫi* (KBo 18.48 rev. 14 (NH)), 2pl.impact. *šš-aš-ḫa-at-tēn* (KUB 36.51 i 9 (OH/NS)); 3sg.pres.midd.? *šš-eš-ša-at-ta* (KUB 33.114 i 13 (NS), KUB 33.120 ii 36 (MH/NS)); part. nom.pl.c. *šš-eš-ša-an-te-eš* (KUB 14.19, 10 (NH)).

PIE *šš-š-ol-e, *šš-sh-š-ì-e-nì-ti

The oldest attested form of this verb, 3pl.pret.act. *šš-iš-ḫe-er* (MH/NS), has an *i*-that contrasts with the *e*- of all the other attestations, which show *šš-eš-ḥ*°. Since these forms are found in NS texts, only, it is in my view likely these are due to the lowering of OH /i/ to NH /e/ before -š- (cf. § 1.4.8.1.d) and that *šših*- therefore must have been the original stem. I therefore cite this verb as *šš-ša*/ *šših*- here. Most of the attested forms show the *tarn(a)-inflection*. Only once, we find a *mi*-inflected form *šṣ̌hani* (according to the *ḥatrae*-class inflection). Because allmost
all attestations are from NS texts, it is not necessarily the case that the tarn(a)-class inflection was the original one. We know, for instance, that mēma'i-class verbs are taken over into the tarn(a)-class from MH times onwards. It is therefore quite possible that šīša/i / šīšh- goes back to an older stem šīša/i / *šīšh- (perhaps the stem *šīšh- is still visible in 2sg.imp.act. še-es-ši (KBo 18.48 rev. 14), if this form is read correctly (cf. e.g. Hagenbuchner 1989: 8 who reads “še-es-ten”)). As I have argued under the treatment of the mēma/i-class in § 2.2.2.2.h., this class consists of polysyllabic verbs that used to belong to the dū/tijanzi-class. For *šīšh-ai- this would mean that we can assume an even older inflection *šīšhā/i / šīšh-. In my view, this stem *šīšhā/i- is to be connected with išhā/i- ‘to bind; to obligate with’ (q.v.). Not only the formal similarity is striking (*šīšhā/i-šīšh- could well show the reduplicated form of išhā/i-šīšh-), the semantic similarity is too. I therefore reconstruct šīšhā- / šīšh- through an intermediate stage *šīšhā- / šīšh- as *šīšhāi- / šīšh- < *si-sh2-oi- / *si-sh2-i-. See at išhā/i-šīšh- for further etymology.

The aberrant vocalism in šāshāttan (if this form really belongs here: the context is too broken to determine its meaning independently) is remarkable.

šēšhātu- (n.) ‘sweat’ (Akk. ZUDU): nom.-acc.sg. šī-i-šh-ā-u (KBo 3.2 obv. 26).

PIE *si-sh2-ū?

Hapax in KBo 3.2 obv. (26) ma-ah-ša-an=ma ANŠE.KUR.RA^{MEŠ al-la-ni-ja-an-zī šī-i-šh-ā-u ar-ha ú-ez-zi ‘when the horses perspire (and) sweat breaks out’.

Schmitt-Brandt (1967: 67) connected this noun with the verb išhuqi/i / išhui- ‘to throw, to pour’ that, together with šušhā/i / šušh- ‘id.’ reflects PIE *ṣheu/i- / *ṣh2- ‘to pour’ . This would mean that šēšhātu- reflects a reduplicated formation *si-sh2-ū, *si-sh2-ū-ši, which originally meant ‘outpourings’ (vel sim.). Note however that the word-final sequence ʿa-u is very remarkable. The only other instance that I know is GÎš-za-a-u ‘?’, in all other cases we find ʿa-ū. If this spelling means that we should phonologically interpret šī-i-šh-ā-u as šēšhāu/, an IE origin is very unlikely.

šēšhēt- (stem) ‘need’

Derivatives: šēšhētar / šēšhētjan- (n.) ‘need’ (instr. šī-i-šē-ja-an-mi-it (KBo 32.15 ii 4)), šēšhējan- (adj.) ‘being in need’ (nom.sg.c. [ši-i]š-ši-ja-u-an-za (KBo 32.15 ii 6)), šēšhējala- (c.) ‘needy one’ (acc.sg. šī-iš-ši-ja-la-an (KBo 32.15 ii 18)).

PIE *si-sh2-jo-
These words occur in one text only, namely KBo 32.15, which is part of the Song of Release (see StBoT 32):

KBo 32.15 ii

(4) [ ... ma-a-an 4l]M-aš ši-iš-ši-ja-(an)-ni-it dam-mi-iš-ša-a-an-za
(5) [pa-ra-a tar-nu-mar i]-ša-[š]-ya-ak-ki ma-a-an 4IM-aš
(6) [ ... ši-[š]-ši-ja-u-an-za nu ku-iš-š=a 4IM-un-ni
(7) [1 GIN KÙ(.BABBAR p)a-a(-f)]

‘[When] the Storm-god is suffering of need and asks for release: When the Storm-god is in need [of silver] everyone will give a shekel of silver to the Storm-god’:

ibid.

(18) n=a-an=kán šu-iš-nu-mé-ni 4IM-an Šši-iš-ši-ja-la-an
(19) dam-mi-iš-ši-iš-ke-ez-zi=an ku-iš Ú-UL=m=a-an i-ja-u-e-ni pa-ra-a tar-nu-mar

‘We will rescue him, the Storm-god, who is in need. Whoever keeps on damaging him, to him we will not grant release’.

All forms are derived from a stem šiššija- which I translate as ‘need’. Etymologically, this stem probably is a reduplication of the verb šai-/ši- ‘to press, to seal’, which means that we have to assume a semantic development *‘pressing’ > ‘need’. See at šai-/ši- for further etymology.

šiš(j)am(ma)- (n.) ‘? ’: nom.-acc.sg. ši-ši-ja-am-ma (KUB 12.51 i 11, KUB 12.62 rev. 7), ši-ši-a-ma (KBo 6.10+ ii 3).

This word is attested a few times only, always with the determinative GIŠ ‘wood’:

KUB 12.62 rev.

(8) a-ša-an-zi

‘In the meadow a šišjamma is standing. Under it, a blind and a deaf man are sitting’.

In the Hittite Laws we read:
KBo 6.10+ ii
(3) tāk-ku ĝāši-ši-a-ma [ku-îš-ki ta-a-i-e-ez-zi 3 GĪN KŪ.BABBAR]
(4) pa-a-i

‘When someone steals a šisīma, he must pay three shekels of silver’.

From the first context, one would be tempted to conclude that šišījam(m)ā is a tree. In the second context, it is obvious that this hardly can be the case. Apparently, the šišījam(m)ā- denotes some wooden object or device that stands in the meadow. That it must have been quite valuable is visible from the fact that the penalty for stealing a šisīma is equal to the penalty of e.g. stealing a loaded carriage. Nevertheless, it is not clear exactly what is meant. No etymology.

šišījant- (adj.) ‘sealed’: nom.-acc.sg.n. ši-iš-ši-ja-an-n=a (KUB 29.7 ii 56).
PIE *si-shj-i-ent-

This word is hapax in the following context:

KUB 29.7 ii
(56) [ke]-e ud-da-ar pār-ku-i ši-iš-ši-ja-an-n=a e-eš-tu DINGIR͡tlm=ma EN
SĪSKUR=ja a-pē-e-ez
(57) [ud-da-a]-na-az pār-ku-ya-e-eš a-ša-an-[d]u

‘May these words be pure and šiššījant- and may through those words the deity and the patient be pure!’.

Apparently, šiššījant- is comparable in meaning to parkui ‘pure, clean’. It therefore has been suggested to interpret šiššījant- as a reduplication of the verb šai¹ / ši- ‘to seal’. In this case, šiššījant- ‘sealed’ may be used in the sense ‘untouched’. For an etymological treatment, see at šai¹ / ši-.

šišd²: see šis²

šiššur (n.) ‘irrigation’: gen.sg. ši-iš-šu-û-ra-aš (KBo 6.26 iii 5 (OH/NS)), še-e-šu-ra-aš (KUB 17.8 iv 3 (NS)), še-eš-šu-ra-aš (RS 25.421 obv. 39 (undat.)).

The alteration between šišš- and šešš- can be explained if we assume that the spellings with -i- reflect the original form of these words, whereas the spellings with -e- are the NH variants according to the lowering of OH /u/ to NH /e/ before -š- as described in § 1.4.8.1.d.

See Rieken (1999a: 329f.) for an extensive treatment of this word. She connects it with šiège/a² ‘to shoot, to spurt, to flow’ (see at šai² / ši-; šiège/a²) and reconstructs *h₁si-š₃-ur, whereas the variant šiššiur is derived from the verb šiššiže/a². Alternatively we could assume that šiššur- reflects *h₁si-š₃-ié-ur in which *VsiV > Hitt. /VSV/ (cf. § 1.4.4.2). This would mean that in šiššiariže/a-the -i- has been restored. See at § 1.3.9.4.f, where I have shown that the spellings with the sign Ū, which represent /siSor-/l, must be the correct ones (compare e.g. a-ni-u-ur /?niörtl < *h₁n-š₃-e₃-ur), whereas the spelling with the sign Ū should be regarded as a scribal error.

šittar(a)- (n. > c.) sharp-pointed metal object, ‘spear-point(?)’ (not ‘solar disc!’):
nom.-acc.sg. ši-it-tar (often), ši-tar (KUB 20.92 vi 5), acc.sg.c. ši-it-ta-ra-an (KUB 30.32 i 7 (NS?)), ŠU1-ta-ra-an (KUB 36.95 iii 4 (NS)), abl. ši-it-tar-ra-za (KBo 2.1 i 35), ši-it-tar-za (KBo 2.1 i 9, ii 13, iii 14, 27, 35, iv 20), ši-it-tar-az-za (KBo 2.16 obv. 12), instr. ši-it-ta-ri(iš)-iš-it (KUB 5.7 obv. 21), nom.-acc.pl. ši-it-tar-ra (KUB 10.28 i 20, KUB 11.21a vi 10), nom.pl.c. ši-it-ta-re-eš (KUB 29.4 i 22 (NS)), acc.pl.c. ši-it-tar-aš (KUB 48.6 ii 5 (OH/NS)).

Derivatives: *BUR.SAGŠittara-, name of a mountain (stem? ši-it-ta-ra[...]) (KBo 25.162 r.col. 3)).

Anat. cognates: CLuw. šittar- (n.) ‘id.’ (nom.-acc.sg. ši-it-tar); HLUw. “FUSUS” šitar- (n.) ‘spindle’ (nom.-acc.pl. TUSUS si-tara/i (KARATEPE I §25)).

PIE *h₁s₁-je₃-te ?

See Starke 1990: 408f. for an extensive treatment of the meaning and attestations of this word. He convincingly shows that the usual translation ‘solar disc’ is not supported by the facts, and that the contexts seem to point to a meaning ‘sharp-pointed metal object, spear-point’. If the one attestation ŠU1-ta-ra-an (KUB 36.95 iii 4) can be regarded as denoting šittaran, then a meaning ‘spear-point’ is likely. Starke argues that the word is of Luwian origin, and that in Hittite we have to separate a thematic stem šittara- from athematic šittar-. The first stem is an older (MH) Hittitized loan from Luw. šittar-, whereas the latter represents real Luwianisms within the NH texts. Starke suggests a connection with šai² / ši-,
šiḡe/a⁻² ‘to shoot, to press’ and reconstructs *sēh₁-tro-. The root *sēh₁-, however, is the basis of šai⁻² / ši⁻ ‘to impress, to sow’, whereas šiḡe/a⁻² ‘to shoot’ must reflect *h₁s-je/-o- (see at šai⁻² / ši⁻; šiḡe/a⁻² for an etymological treatment). Melchert (1993b: 195) therefore assumes that šittar- is a contraction of *sijattar- ‘the shoot-thing’ and reflects *h₁s-je/-tro- (although it seems to me that *-je- would yield Luw. -i- regularly). If this etymology is correct, it would show that initial *h₁ is dropped in front of -š- in Luwian.

šittarije/a⁻² (1c1) ‘to seal’: 3sg.pres.act. ši-it-ta-ri-ez-zi (KBo 6.2+ ii 19, 24 (OS)), ši-[a-at]-a-ri-[a]-a-zi (KBo 6.3 ii 39 (OH/MS)), ši-ja-at-ta-ri-i-e-ez-zi (KBo 6.3 ii 45 (OH/NS)), ši-ja-at-tal-li-ja-az-zi (KBo 6.5 iv 3 (OH/NS)), 3sg.pret.act. ši-it-ta-ri-et (KBo 6.2+ iii 19 (OS)).

PIE *sh₁-i-tr-je/-o

The oldest attestations of this verb (in the OS version of the Hittite Laws) show the stem šittarije/a⁻² (which is the reason for me to cite this verb under the lemma šittarije/a⁻²). In the MS copies of the Laws, this stem is replaced by šijattarije/a⁻². Because the verb denotes ‘to seal’ it is likely that it is ultimately derived from the verb šai⁻² / ši⁻ ‘to impress, to seal’, probably through a noun *šiḡa(j)attar-. In the OH period this noun was *šittar-, showing the weak stem ši⁻ of šai⁻/ši⁻ (note that this weak stem originally was not **ši⁻a⁻²). When in the MH times the weak stem of šai⁻/ši⁻ is secondarily changed to šiḡe/a⁻² (on the basis of false analysis of 3pl.pres.act. ši-anzi as šiḡa-nzi), this verb, too, was altered from šittarije/a⁻² to šijattarije/a⁻². The only attestation from a NH copy of the Laws is the aberrant form ši-ja-at-tal-li-ja-az-zi which is clearly caused by misreading the sign RI/TAL of the (MS) text from which this version was copied (which perhaps was spelled **ši-[a]-at-ta-ri-[a]-az-zi ?). The confusion shows that this verb probably was not used anymore in NH times.

All in all, I would reconstruct šittarije/a⁻² as *sh₁-i-tr-je/-o-. See at šai⁻² / ši⁻ for further etymology.

šu, šīma- (c.) ‘god’ (Sum. DINGIR, Akk. ILUM): nom.sg. ši-i-ú-uš (KUB 35.93+32.117 iii 4 (OS)), ši-ú-uš, ši-uš=mi-iš (KBo 3.22 rev. 47 (OS)), DINGIR-uš (OS), DINGIR⁽¹⁾ na-aš (NH), acc.sg. ši-ú(n)=šum-[i-in] (KBo 3.22 obv. 39 (OS)), ši-ú(n)=šu[m-(mi-in)] (KBo 3.22 obv. 41 (OS)), ši-ú-na-an or ši-ú-n=a-an (KBo 17.51 i ² 8 (OS)), ši-ú-na-an (MS, NS, often), gen.sg. ši-ú-na-aš (OS, often), dat.-loc.sg. ši-ú-ni (OS, often), ši-i-ú-ni (KUB 30.10 rev. 11, 17 (OH/MS), abl. ši-ú-na-aš (KBo 10.7 ii 17, 20 (OH/NS)), instr. ši-ú-ni-it (KBo 6.28 obv. 5 (NH),
KBo 22.6 i 25 (OH/NS)), nom.pl. DINGIRMEŠ-eš (OS), ši-y-a-n-ni-eš (KBo 20.73 iv 8 (MS), KUB 35.146 iii 8 (NS)), ši-y-a-n-ni-eš (KUB 9.34 iii 45 (NS)), acc.pl. ši-mu-uš (KBo 45.3 obv. 5 (OH/NS)), [š]i-mu-uš (VSNF 12.30 iv 8 (OH/NS)), gen.pl. DINGIRMEŠ-na-an (OS), ši-ú-na-an, ši-ú-na-aš, dat.-loc.pl. ši-ú-na-aš (OS), ši-i-ú-na-aš (KUB 28.45 vi 15 (OH/NS)).

Derivatives: see šiunal(a/i)-, *ššumiyē/a-š, ššunījaḫḫ-š, ššuannant-, NINDAššuannanni-, MUNUSššuannanna-.

Anat. cognates: Pal. tiuna- (c.) 'god' (nom.sg.c. ti-ú-na-aš); Lyd. ciw- (c.) 'god' (nom.sg. ciws, acc.sg. ciwy, abl.(?) ciwad, dat.-loc.pl. ciwaw).

PIE *diēu-

In the oldest texts we find the following paradigm: nom.sg. ši-ú-uš, ši-ú-uš acc.sg. *ši-ú-un and acc.pl. ši-mu-uš. This points to a stem /sū- in and acc.pl. ši-mu-uš. This form is unattested: we only find DINGIRMEŠ-eš besides the aberrant ššuannistiš. Already in OH times, we see a proliferation of a thematic stem š-š-ú-na-š-suna-š, with acc.sg. ššuna (unless the OS attestations ši-ú-na-an (KBo 17.51 i 8) is to be interpreted ši-ú-n=a-an, cf. Neu 1983: 168š, gen.sg. ššunaš, dat.-loc. ššuni etc. in OS texts already. In NH times we even find nom.sg. DINGIRUM-naš.

The fact that we find a similar stem in Pal. tiuna- and Lyd. ciwali- 'divine' (see under ššunal(a/i)-) as well, may point to a PA Anat. stem *diēu-no-. Nevertheless, this is not necessarily the case in view of the fact that in Greek we find a similar, independent development, with nom.sg. Zéacak, acc.sg. Zéw, gen.sg. Δéox, being replaced by younger acc.sg. Zēp, gen.sg. Zēpox.

All attestations of ššuna(NA)- are spelled with ú. The few plene spellings of -i- indicate that we have to phonetically interpret the stem as /sū- in and /ššuna- in. This /ššu- is the direct outcome of *diēu-. See Rieken (1999a: 37š) on the peculiar nom.pl. ššuannistiš, who argues that the texts in which this form occurs probably were translations from Luwian texts. Formally, ššuannistiš looks like a thematicization of *ššuqar 'deity', just as the animatized form ššuannant- 'god'.

The fact that Hittite, Palai and Lydian use the same word for 'god' (Hitt. ššu(NA)-, Pal. tiuna-, Lyd. ciw-), whereas CLuwian, HLUwian and Lycian show a stem massan- (CLuw. mašṣan(i)-, HLUw. DEUS-n(i)- (= massan(i)-?) and Lyc. mahān(a)-), can be used as an argument for the dialectology of the Anatolian language branch.

(d)ššuna-: see (d)ššu-, (d)ššuna-
\(\text{šiunal(\textit{a}/\textit{i})-}\) (c.) ’divine one(?): nom.pl. \(\text{ši-ú-na-li-eš}\) (KBo 10.24 iii 14), [\(\text{ši-ú-n}\)\(\text{a}-\text{li-š}\)] (KBo 30.5 iii 4).

Anat. cognates: Lyd. \textit{ciwali}- ’divine’ (nom.sg.c. \textit{ciwalis}).

This word occurs in one context only:

\(\text{KBo 10.24 iii (with duplicate KBo 30.5)}\)

(10) \(\text{ma-a-an tî-i-e-eš-ti-eš la-ri-i-e-eš}\)

(11) \(\text{a-ru-na-aš túh-ḥa-an-da-at}\)

(12) \(\text{še-e-r=a-a=s-ša-an ne-pí-ši}\)

(13) \(\text{ši-ú-na-li-eš u-e-eš-kán-ta}\)

‘When the t.-s (and) l.-s (or the t. l.-s) of the sea produce smoke, above in heaven the divine ones(?) will be sent’.

It is likely derived from \(\text{(d)şūr-}, \text{(d)šūna-} \) ’god’ (q.v.). Note the similarity in formation to Lyd. \textit{ciwali}- ’divine’.

\(*\text{šiunjê/а-ẑ}\) (\text{Ic1}) ‘?: 3pl.imp.act. DINGIR\textit{MES}-ni-ja-an-du (KBo 23.22, 2), 3pl.pres.midd. DINGIR\textit{MES}-ni-ja-an-ta-[\(\text{ʁ}i\)] (KBo 8.77 rev. 7).


Both attestations of the verb are found in broken contexts: KBo 23.22 (2) [ ... DINGIR\textit{MES} DINGIR\textit{MES}-ni-ja-an-du [ ... ]; KBo 8.77 rev. (7) [ ... k]u-i-e-eš DINGIR\textit{MES}-ni-ja-an-ta-[\(\text{ʁ}i\] ...]]. On the basis of these attestations, we cannot determine what the verb means. The nouns \(*\text{L}\text{šiunjat-}\) and \(*\text{šiunjatar}\) are mentioned here for formal reasons only as they both seem to derive from a stem \(\text{šiunjê/а-}\). Semantically there is no clue, however, that they really belong with this verb. See at \(\text{(d)şūr-}, \text{(d)šūna-}\) ’god’ for further etymology.

\(\text{šiunjâñh-}\) (\text{Iib}) ’to be hit by a disease (through a god)’: 3sg.pres.midd. \(\text{ši-e-ú-ni-ah-ta}\) (KBo 6.26 i 22 (OH/NS)), [\(\text{ši-ú-ni-ah-ta}\) (KBo 6.10 iv 10 (OH/NS)), \(\text{ši-ú-ni-ja-ah-ta}\) (KBo 6.15, 13 (OH/NS)), 3sg.pret.midd. \(\text{ši-ú-ni-ja-ah-ḥa-ti}\) (KUB 11.1 iv 15 (OH/NS)).

The verb occurs in the middle only. Note the aberrant spelling \(\text{ši-e-ú-ni-}\) of KBo 6.26 i 22 (OH/NS). The verb is clearly derived from \(\text{(d)şūr-}, \text{(d)šūna-}\) ’god’ (q.v.), perhaps through the verb \(*\text{šiunjê/а-ẑ}\) (q.v.).
**MUNUS**

(StBoT 25.13) iv 22 (OS)), dat.-loc.sg. ši-ya-an-za-an-na-aš (KBo 16.71+ (StBoT 25.13) iv 22 (OS)), nom.sg. ši-ya-an-za-an-na (IBoT 1.29 i 58 (OH/NS)), nom.pl. ši-ya-an-za-an-ni-iš (KUB 13.2 ii 32 (MH/NS)), broken ši-ya-an-z[...| (IBoT 1.29 ii 12 (OH/NS)).

PIE *(dieu-nt-s + anna-)*

The word denotes a certain kind of priestess. In KUB 13.2, **MUNUS** šiyananníš (ii 32) alternates with the sumerographical writing **MUNUS** AMA.DINGIR (e.g. ibid. ii 27), lit. ‘mother.god’. This has led e.g. Friedrich (HW: 195) to tentatively translate šiyananna- as “Gottesmutter” (as if it consists of gen.sg. šiyanz + anna- ‘mother’). In my view, an original meaning ‘divine mother’ might be more likely, as in this way šiu(yaj)nz can be interpreted as nom.sg. of a further unknown adjective šiu(yaj)nt- ‘divine’ (which perhaps is visible in **NINDA** šiyananníni- (q.v.) as well) that is ultimately cognate with *(d)*šū-, *(d)*šūna- ‘god’ (q.v.). If this is correct, then the word must be a univerbation of original šiu(yaj)nz annaš ‘divine mother’. Note that the oldest attestation (OS) shows šiunannaš. Perhaps this shows that we have to phonologically interpret this word as /siunt’aNa/-, which was in NH times phonetically realized as [siuŋt’aNa-], spelled ši-ya-an-za-an-na-. I therefore reconstruct *(dieu-nt-s + anna-*. See at *(d)*šū-, *(d)*šūna- for further etymology.

šiyananna-: see *(d)*šū-, *(d)*šūna-

šiyananní- (c.) ‘god’: nom.sg. ši-ya-an-na-an-za (KUB 13.4 i 27 (OH/NS)).

The word occurs only once. Formally, it seems to be the erg.sg. of an abstract noun *(ši)uṭtar ‘deity*. See at *(d)*šū-, *(d)*šūna- ‘god’ for further etymology.

**NINDA** šiyananníni- (c.) a bread: nom.sg. ši-ya-an-da-an-na-an-ni-[iš] (KBo 29.115 iii 8), ši-ya-an-da-an-na-an-ni-iš (KUB 27.49 iii 7), acc.sg. ši-ya-an-da-an-na-an-ni-in (KBo 29.115 iii 3, 5, 7), ši-ya-an-ta-an-na-an-ni-in (KBo 23.87, 7); broken ši-ya-an-ta-an-na-an-ni-[i-] (KUB 17.24 ii 19)

PIE *(diu-ent-otn-)*

It is not clear what kind of bread is meant. Formally, the noun reminds of other bread-names in -anni-: **NINDA** parkušanníni-, **NINDA** armanní-, **NINDA** arma(n)tal(l)anni-. For the use of -anni- as a derivational suffix, compare
NINDA *armaanni- from arma- ‘moon’ and *ḫuppāranni- (a liquid measure) from ḫuppār- ‘bowl’. In the case of šiyanḍāmanni-, we would have to assume that it is derived from *šiyanḍanni-, which itself seems to be the oblique stem of a further unattested noun *šiyanḍātar. This *šiyanḍātar must be derived from a stem *šiyanṭ-. To what extent this *šiyanṭ- is identical to šiyanṭ- found in MUNUS šiyanzama- (a kind of priestess) (q.v.), is unclear. If so, then this *šiyanṭ- would be ultimately cognate to *(d)šīu-, *(d)šūna- ‘god’ and probably reflect *dīuent- or *diewent-.

MUNUS šiyanzama-: see MUNUS šiunzama-

(d) šqatt- (c.) ‘day’ (Sum. UD[KAM]); nom.sg. ši-i-ya-aż (KBo 17.15 rev. 19 (OS)), UD[KAM].az (KBo 25.58 ii 7 (OS)), acc.sg. UD[KAM].an, gen.sg. ši-i-ya-at-ta-aš (KBo 17.15 obv. 10 (OS)), dat.-loc. ši-ya-at-ti (KBo 3.55+ ii 3 (OH/NS), ši-ú-ya-at-te (KUB 41.23 ii 13 (OH/NS)), ši-ú-ya-at-ti (KBO 22.170, 3 (OH/NS)), loc.sg. ši-i-ya-at (KBO 25.17 i 1 (OS)), ši-ya-at (KBO 3.22 rev. 60 (OS)), ši-ya-at-at (KBO 21.49 iv 8 (OH/NS)), acc.pl. UD[HL].uš.

Derivatives: anišiyyat (adv.) ‘today(?)’ (a-ni-šī-ya-at (KBO 3.45 obv. 12 (OH/NS))).

Anat. cognates: Pal. tiqat- (c.) ‘Sun-god’ (nom.sg. ti-ja-až, dat.-loc.sg. ti-ja-až); CLuw. (d) Tiqat- (c.) ‘Sun-god’ (nom.sg. ti-ya-až, UTU(-ya)-až, UTU(-ya)-za, voc.sg.(?) ti-ya-ta, ti-ya-ta, acc.sg. UTU-an, dat.-loc.sg. UTU-ti(-i), gen.adj. ti-ya-da(a-šiši), tiqataljia- (adj.) ‘of the Sun-god’ (voc.sg. ti-ya-li-ja), tiqaiša- (adj.) ‘of the Sun-god’ (nom.-acc.pl.n. ti-ya-ri-ja); HLuw. DEUS tiqat(i)- (c.) ‘Sun-god’ (nom.sg. /tīwadsa/ DEUS SOL-wa/i-za-sa (KARKAMIŠ A6 §2), DEUS SOL-za-sa (KARKAMIŠ A17a iii), DEUS SOL-za-sa (KARATEPE 1 §73), /tiwadiš/ DEUS SOL-ti-is-sa (MALPINAR §11), DEUS SOL-sa (KARKAMIŠ A4a §13), acc.sg. /tiwadini/ DEUS SOL-wa/i-ti-is-na (TELL AHMAR 2 §6), gen.sg. /tiwadas/ SOL-tā-sa (SAMSAT fr. 1), dat.-loc.sg. /tiwadiš/ DEUS SOL-ti (KARKAMIŠ A6 §20), DEUS SOL-ti (ANCOZ 7 §4), abl-instr. /tiwadiš/ DEUS SOL-tā-ti-ta (KARKAMIŠ A15b §1)), tiwadama/i- ‘sun-blessed’ (nom.sg. /tiwadamiš/ SOL-wa/i-ra-mi-sa (CEKKE §17i), SOLwa/i+r/a/i-mi-sa (CEKKE §17a, HISARCIK 1 §1), SOLwa/i+r/a/i-mi/sa (KULULU 4 §1, §2), SOL-tā-mi-sa (BOBYEPINARI 2 §5), DEUS SOL-wa/i-tā-mi-sa (KULULU 2 §1), DEUS SOL-mi-sa (KARATEPE 1 §1), gen.sg. /tiwadam/iš/ DEUS SOL-wa/i+r/a/i-ma-sa-’ (KARKAMIŠ A18h §1), DEUS SOL-wa/i+r/a/i-ma-sa (KARKAMIŠ A5a §1), dat.-loc.sg. /tiwadam/iš/ SOLwa/i+r/a/i-ma-sa (KARKAMIŠ A5a §1), DEUS SOL-miš (KARKAMIŠ A21 §2)).

IE cognates: Skt. dyut- ‘shine’.
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PIE *dieu-ot-

See Rieken 1999a: 102f. for attestations and discussion. It is remarkable that Hittite shows a consistent geminate spelling -tt-/t-t/-, whereas in CLuwian we find a consistent single spelling -t-/d-t/-, which corresponds to the use of the sign tā (cf. Rieken fthc.) and the rhotacization in HLuwian. According to Yoshida (2000) this can be explained by assuming that the original PAncat. paradigm shows accent mobility, and that the Luwian languages generalized stem-accentuated forms (*dieu-ot-), leaving *-t/- between unaccentuated vowels causing lenition, whereas Hittite generalized the forms with unlenited -t- out of ending-stressed forms (e.g. gen.sg. *dieu-ot-ós). In view of the OS attestations nom.sg. ši-i-ya-az, gen.sg. ši-i-ya-at-ta-aš (both with plene -i-) it might be likelier to assume, however, that the stem of the nom.sg., /šuats/, generalized throughout the paradigm, taking with it not only the accentuation of the root, but also the unlenited /l/, yielding šuattāš.

It is generally accepted that šuatt- reflects a t-stem of the root *dieu- ‘sky(god)’ (cf. the Skt. t-stem dyut- ‘shine’). The original paradigm must have been *dieu-t-s, *diu-ót-m, *diu-t-ós, which was altered to Pre-PAncat. *dieu-ot-s, *diu-ót-om, *diu-ot-ós, which yielded PAncat. */diuōt/, */diuōdom/, /diuodōs/. In Hittite, the stem */diuōt-l > šuatt- was generalized, whereas in Luwian the stem */diuod-l > tiyad- was generalised. See for further etymology (a)šu-, (b)šuna-.

The hapax a-ni-ši-ya-at probably means ‘today’. E.g. Melchert (1994a: 74-5) connects ani- with the stem anna- ‘former, old’ (q.v.) and states that ani- must go back to *óno-, whereas anna- reflects *éno- (with “Çop’s Law”). In my opinion, the elements anna- ‘former, old’ and ani ‘this’ have opposite meanings and cannot be equated. It is much more likely that ani- is in some way related to the pronoun aši / uni / ini. I would rather assume that a-ni-ši-ya-at should be read év-ni-ši-ya-at, in which eni is to be equated with the NH outcome of nom.-acc.sg.n. ini.

ši|i?- / ši|a|- (adj.?) ‘sour(?)’: acc.sg.? ši-ú-i-n=a (KUB 31.110, 3 (OH/NS)), acc.(?)plc. ši-ya-e̥[s] (KBo 17.4 ii 17 (OS)).


Both forms cited are attested in broken contexts. The meaning of ši-ú-i-n=a cannot be ascertained, nor can its analysis as ši|yin + a. The attestation ši-ya-e̥-e̥[s] is more clear, although it appears in broken context: KBo 17.4 ii (17) [...
The phrase might be paralleled by NINDA.GUR₄,RA-uṣ EM-ŠÙ-TIM 'sour thick-breads' and that šīyaḵš therefore must mean 'sour'. This interpretation would mean, however, that šīyaḵš syntactically is acc.pl.c. whereas formally it is nom.pl.c. For an OS text this is quite remarkable if not unique. Starke (1987: 250) connected this word with CLuw. šiḥḫya(i)-, which he interprets as 'sour' as well. Further unclear.


This suffix is usually called “iterative”, but this should be abandoned. According to Melchert (1998b), stems in -ške/a- are used to express progressive, iterative, durative, distributive and ingressive meaning, “all of which share the feature imperfectivity” (o.c.: 414), and therefore I cite this suffix as an “imperfective-suffix”. Melchert has also shown that the stems in ÑNH are functionally equivalent to stems in ÑãD and DQQDL, and even that “synchronically they function effectively as suppletive allomorphs of a single morphem” (1998b: 414).

About the distribution between the three suffixes, Melchert writes that “[a] survey shows that of stems in DQQLD seven are complementary to ÑNH, while another ten occur only sporadically (once or twice each) beside regular, productive -ške/a-. There are only two cases of genuine competing stems, in both of which the -anni/a-stem has become lexicalized: nanni/a- ‘to drive’ beside naiške/a-, the imperfective to nai- ‘turn, guide; send’ and walḫanni/a- ‘beat’ (frequentative) beside walḫiške/a- imperfective to walḫ- ‘strike’” (o.c.: 416), but see at -anni:/ -anni- for my view on these latter two verbs.

In the overview of forms above, I have given a selection of forms from OS and MH/MS texts. In § 2.2.2.1.t, I have given a diachronic overview of the endings used with this suffix. Note that due to the rise of the anaptyctic vowel /i/ in clusters containing *s and stops, like *dʰiške/oa- > OH /tske/á-, za-aš-ke/a- > OH /tsike/á-, zi-ik-ke/a- ‘to place (impf.).’ *hspiške/oa- > Hitt. /liske/á-, ap-pi-iške/a- ‘to seize (impf.)’ and *lgiške/oa- > Hitt. /lakiskel/á-, la-ak-ki-iš-ke/a- ‘to fell (impf.).’, the suffix -ške/a- sometimes is reinterpreted as /iške/á-, yielding forms like la-ḫu-iš-ke/a- ‘to pour (impf.)’ (instead of original la-ḫu-uš-ke/a-) or as /ške/á-, yielding forms like tar-ši-ke/a- ‘to speak (impf.)’ (instead of regular tar-aš-ke/a-, cf. Kavitskaya 2001: 284).

Within Luwian, we find a verbal suffix -za- that Melchert (1987a: 198f.) interprets as an ‘iterative’-suffix and equates with Hitt. -ške/a-. His idea is then that Luw. -za- and Hitt. -ške/a- go back to PAnat. *ške/-o-, which first yielded pre-Luw. *-sza- and then was simplified to -za-. A similar scenario then could also explain the Lycian imperfective-suffix -s- (note that s is the normal Lycian outcome of PAnat. *f). If this is correct, it would imply that we are dealing with a PAnat. suffix *-ške/-o-, containing a palatovelar.
From the beginning of Hittitology, the Hittite suffix -šẹ/a- has correctly been identified with the present-suffixes Skt. -cḥa-, Av. -sa-, Gr. -οκόδο-, Arm. -c‘-, Lat. -cẹ/o-, OIr. -c-, OHG -sc-, etc. The exact reconstruction of this suffix, with *-k- or with *-k‘-, can only be decided on the basis of the satem languages and especially Indo-Iranian. In 2001, Lubotsky has elaborately argued that on the basis of the Indo-Iranian material we should conclude that at a PIE level the cluster *-sk‘- did not exist at all and that therefore the suffix should have been *-sk’e/o-, with a normal velar. This contrasts, of course, with the PAnat. reconstruction *-sk’e/o- which is required in Melchert’s scenario. Either this means that one of these scholars is incorrect, or that we should assume that at the earliest stage of PIE the cluster *-sk‘- was still available and that this suffix in fact was *-sk’e/o- and that only after the splitting off of Anatolian the cluster *-sk‘- was depalatalized to *-sk‘-, yielding the suffix *-sk’e/o- as visible in the other IE languages.

As in the other IE languages, where the suffix *-sk’e/o- always uses the zero-grade of the root (Skt. gacchati ~ Av. jasaiti ~ Gr. βάκχει < *g‘-m-sk‘e/o- ‘to be going’; Skt. prccchāti ~ Av. prasaiti ~ Arm. harch’i ~ Lat. poscō ~ OIr. arco ~ OHG forscōn < *prk-sk‘e/o- ‘to ask’), in Hittite the suffix -sk’e/a- in principle uses the zero-grade root as well, e.g. appiške’a- from epp‘- / app- ‘to seize’, uške’a- from au‘- / u‘- ‘to see’, akkuške/a- from eku‘- / aku- ‘to drink’, etc. As in the latter example, the suffix -šẹ/a- had a fortiting effect on the preceding consonant (also lakkiške’a- from lāk‘- / lag-, ḥarappiške/a- from ḥarp‘-uš‘ / Harb-l, etc.). See § 2.2.2.1.t for a more detailed overview of the distribution between the thematic vowels -e- and -a- within the Hittite period.

=šma-: see =šmi- / =šma- / =šme-

=šmaš (encl.pers.pron. acc.-dat. 2pl.) ‘(to) you (pl.)’: V=š-ma-aš (OS), C=ša-ma-aš (OS).

The form is identical to the dat.-loc.pl. of the enclitic pronoun =a- ‘he, she, it’, which is not coincidental in view of the fact that the enclitic possessive pronoun of ‘you (pl.)’ and ‘they’ is identical as well, namely =šmi- / =šma- / =šme-. It is clear that the element -šm- found in both forms must be identical, but further etymological appurtenance is unclear. The element -aš probably is identical to the dat.-loc.pl.-ending -aš (q.v.).

=šme-: see =šmi- / =šma- / =šme-
The original paradigm of this particle is nom.sg.c. =šmiš, acc.sg.c. =šman, nom.-acc.sg.n. =šmet, gen.sg. =šmaš, dat.-loc.sg. =šmi, all.sg. =šma, abl. =šmit, instr. =šmite, nom.pl.c. =šmeš, nom.-acc.pl.n. =šmet, dat.-loc.pl. =šmaš. For the original distinction between nom.-acc.sg./pl.n. =šmet vs. abl.-instr. =šmit see Melchert (1984a: 122-6). This means that we are dealing with an ablauting stem =šmi-/ =šma- / =šme-. This vocalization can hardly reflect anything else than PIE */-i, */-o/ and */-e/, but an exact explanation for the distribution of these vowels is still lacking (cf. also =ši-/ =ša- with */-my/, =ši-/ =ša- =šša- / =šše- ‘his, her, its’ and =ššiti-/ =ššima- / =ššume- ‘our’).

The characteristic element -šm- is undoubtedly cognate to -šm- found in the enclitic pronoun 2pl. and 3pl. =šmaš ‘to you (pl.); to them’ (q.v.). The exact PIE origin of this -šm- is unclear, however.

-šta (2sg.pret.act.-ending): see -š and -tta

-šta (3sg.pret.act.-ending): see -š and -š

=šta: see =(a)štä

-štani: (2pl.pres.act.-ending of the hi-flection): see -šten(i)

-šten: (2pl.imp.act.-ending of the hi-flection): see -šten(i)


IE cognates: TochA 2pl.pret.-ending *-s, TochB 2pl.pret.-ending *-s.

PIE */-su/ ??
Usually, the ending -šen(i) (which stands for 2pl.pres.act. -ššn, -štni, 2pl.pret./imp.act. -šten) is regarded as a byform of the normal -ten(i) (q.v.) that must be of secondary origin. As I have demonstrated in Kloekhorst fthc.d, the ending -šen(i) is only used with hi-inflected verbs and never with mi-inflected forms (which always have -ten(i) as its 2pl.act.-ending: note that of stems in -š- and -št- the difference between -šen(i) and -ten(i) is invisible, e.g. šasšn, ’you sleep’, azššn, ’you eat’). The hi-verbs that use the ending -šen(i) use the ending -ten(i) as well (except pai²/ pi² ‘to give’, which only uses the ending -šen(i) and never -ten(i)), clearly show that -šen(i) is the ending that is used in the oldest texts, whereas -ten(i) is used in younger texts only. As I have argued in detail in o.c., this indicates that -šen(i) must have been the original 2pl.act.-ending of the hi-inflection, whereas -ten(i) is the ending of the mi-inflection. The distribution over the forms show that -šen(i) is getting replaced by -ten(i) throughout the Hittite period. This replacement has already in pre-Hittite times taken place in hiverbs of which the stem ends in a consonant: in the oldest texts we only find remnants of -šen(i) in a few tarn(a)-class verbs (that go back to stems in a laryngeal), whereas in stems that end in -k-, -p-, -t- or resonant no forms with -šen(i) are found anymore. In hi-verbs of which the stem ends in a vowel (dći/tičanzi-class and mōna/i-class), the replacement of -šen(i) by -ten(i) first takes place in the late MH period.

In the present, we find -ššn as well as -štni (just as -yen and -yan and -teni and -ttani). Melchert (1994a: 137-8) has noticed that the variant with -a- occurs when the verb’s stem is accentuated (e.g. naištni = /nástan/). He therefore regarded the forms with -a- as the regular outcome of unaccentuated *-šteni, *-yen and *-teni.

The etymological interpretation of -šteni is difficult. Since it is quite possible that the element -ten(i) was taken over from the mi-ending -ten(i) in an earlier period already, the most important element of this ending is -s-. Since the hi-endings seem to be in one way or another connected with the PIE perfect-endings, we may have to compare this element -s- with the Tocharian 2pl.pret.-ending TochA -s, TochB -s < PToch. *-sə that can only go back to PIE *-su (the Tocharian preterite class I-V reflects the PIE perfect endings).

šu (clause conjunctive particle): šu=ya, šu=mu, š=a-aš, š=a-an, š=e, š=u-uš.

PIE *sə-
See at ta for a discussion of the OH clause conjunctive particles nu, ta and šu and their grammatical function. Weitenberg (1992) has shown that the difference in use between ta and šu is determined by the tempus of the verb: šu when the verb is preterite, ta when the verb is present. From MH times onwards, ta and šu are replaced by nu. Of the three OH particles, šu is the least attested. It should be noted that it is never attested loose: it is always accompanied by an enclitic element.

Watkins (1963) convincingly shows that Hitt. nu, ta and šu can functionally and formally be equated with the Old Irish preverbs no, to and se and that ta ~ to < *to and šu ~ se probably are related to the demonstrative pronoun *so-, *to- as attested in the other IE languages (Skt. sā, sā, tād, Gr. ὅ, ἰ το, etc.). If this is correct, we would have expected to find in Hittite **ša instead of šu. Perhaps we must assume that **ša has been influenced by nu and secondarily has taken over its -u- (note that there are only two forms that specifically point to šu, namely šu=μu (KBo 3.22 rev. 75) and šu=ya (KBo 22.2 rev. 5, 6)).

šu- ‘to fill’: see šuyê/a-żl

šū- ‘full’: see šū- / šūḥa- 

(sö)šēl-: see (sö)šēl-

šgeri- ‘?’: dat.-loc.sg.? šu-u-er-i-ja (IBot 3.148 iii 21 (MH/NS)).

This word is hapax in the following context:

IBoT 3.148 iii

(20) nam-ma a-pē-e-da-ni=pāt GEŠ-ti VI PA ZÌ.DA ZÌZ A-NA DINGIRMS

hte-ma-an-ta-qaš

(21) šu-u-er-i-ja[NINDA]zi-ti-ti I-NA É NINDA,DÜ.ĐIJ šu-un-ni-an-zi

‘Then, on that specific night, for all the gods they fill 6 parēsu wheat meal for’ šu-egri- and zitti-bread inside the bakery’.

The function and meaning of šu-u-er-i-ja is unclear.

šuh-št, šuhha- (c.) ‘(flat) roof’: acc.sg. šu-uḥ-ša-an (KUB 53.3 v 8 (NS)), dat.-loc.sg. šu-uḥ-ši (often), šu-uḥ-ši, all.sg. šu-uḥ-ša (OS), šu-u-uḥ-ša, abl. šu-u-uḥ-za (KUB 43.30 iii 18 (OS)), šu-u-uḥ-za (KBo 44.142 ii 4 (OS)), šu-uḥ-ša-az,
acc.pl. šu-uḥ-ḫu-uš (KUB 39.52+ iii 8, iii 13 (NS)), coll.pl.? [š]u-uḥ-ḫa (KUB 31.89 ii 7 (MH/NS)).

PIE *sēuh₂-s, *sēuh₂-m, *suh₂-öś?

See Boyssan-Dietrich 1987: 85f. for the semantics of this word. Usually, this word is cited as šuḥha-, but Rieken (1999a: 65f.) states that the OS attestations of abl. šu-uḥ-ža indicate that we have to reckon with an original athematic root noun šūḥh-. She assumes that only in younger times this root noun was thematicized to šūḥha-. If we look at the attested forms closely, we see that an a-stem inflection cannot be proven however: all forms could in principle belong to a root noun šūḥh- (see at the treatment of the ablative-ending -ḏāz for the observation that the allomorph -z is in younger times replaced by -az, also in consonant-stems). Nevertheless, on the basis of e.g. ḫuḫḫa-, which shows a thematicatization from an original root noun *h₂sēuh₂-, it is in my view likely that the younger forms indeed belong to a thematic noun šūḥha-.

Formally, the word can hardly reflect anything else than *sēuh₂-. In my view it is likely that we have to assume an original inflection *sēuh₂-s, *sēuh₂-m, *suh₂-öś, and that later on, on the basis of gen.sg. *suh₂-öś a thematic noun *suh₂-o > šuḥha- was created. According to Rieken (o.c.: 66) we must assume an etymological connection with the verb šuḥha⁻¹ / šuḥh- ‘to scatter’, under the assumption that “d]ie semantischen Schwierigkeiten lassen sich durch den Hinweis auf die Konstruktionsweise der anatolischen Lehmflachdächer, die durch häufiges Aufschütten von neuem Lehm in Stand gehalten wurden, überwinden”. See at šuḥha⁻¹ / šuḥh- and iššuayät⁻¹ / iššui- for further etymological treatment.

šuḥha⁻¹ / šuḥh- (IIa1γ) ‘to scatter’: 3sg.pres.act. šu-uḥ-ḫa-a-i (OH/MS) šu-uḥ-ḫa-i (OH/NS, MH/MS), šu-uḥ-ḫu-ya-i (KBo 30.115 rev.⁷ 5 (OH/NS)), 3pl.pres.act. šu-uḥ-ḫa-an-zi (OS), 1sg.pret.act. šu-uḥ-ḫa-aḫ-ḫu-un (VBoT 58 ii 6 (OH/NS), 3sg.pret.act. šu-uḥ-ḫa-aš (ABOT 44 i 53 (OH/NS)), 3pl.pret.act. šu-uḥ-ḫa-e (OS); part. šu-uḥ-ḫa-an-zi; verb noun gen.sg. šu-uḥ-ḫu-ya-aš (KUB 17.35 ii 2 (NS)), šu-uḥ-ḫa-aḫ-ḫu-un (KUB 25.23 i 37 (NS)), šu-uḥ-ḫa-aḫ-ḫu-un (KUB 25.23 iv 50 (NS), VBoT 26, 8 (NS)).

IE cognates: Gr. ἄγκο ‘to rain’, TochAB su-/swāš- ‘to rain’.

PIE *suh₂-enti?

This verb denotes ‘to scatter, to pour’ and therewith is semantically almost identical to iššuayät⁻¹ / iššui- ‘to throw, to scatter, to pour’. In some cases these two verbs are used interchangeably in duplicates (cf. Puhvel HED 1/2: 408). Not
only semantically they are very similar, formally they look alike as well. E.g. Oettinger (1979a: 503) therefore treats them together: “išḫu-ya- und šuḫ-ša-‘schütten’”. This seems to be supported by a hybrid form like šu-uḫ-ḫu-ya-i (KBo 30.115 rev.7 5). Nevertheless, the exact formal relation between the two is difficult to judge. According to Jasanoff (1978: 90), Jastrow (1979a: 503) therefore treats them together: “*šuḫ-ša-‘to pour’, the zero-grade of which already in PIE occasionally metathesized to *suḥ-y-. This *suḥ-y- is e.g. visible in Gr. ἕο ‘to rain’ and TochAB su-/swā- ‘to rain’, whereas *šuḫ- is visible in Hitt. išḫu-yai- / išḫu-i-, which belongs to the dāḫītianzi-class and therefore must reflect *šuḫ-oi- / *šuḫ-ı-. Note that the alleged reflex of the full grade stem *šuḫ-ı-. šišḫa- ‘sweat’, hardly can be of IE origin.

These considerations give rise to several scenarios for the origin of šuḥḫa-l / šuḫ-ı-, which belongs to the tarn(a)-class. On the one hand, we could assume that already in PIE a secondary root *seuḫ-ı- existed, which would be inflected in pre-Hittite as *sōuḫ-ı-, *suḥ-y-ı-. Although the plural form indeed would yield attested šuḫḫa, I would expect that *sōuḫ-ı- would give Hitt. *šuḫ-. It is problematical, however, that I do not see how a paradigm *šuḫ-/šuḫḫa would be altered to šuḥḫa-l / šuḫ-ı-. Another possibility is to assume that we have to begin with the root *šuḫ-ı-, which would in pre-Hittite inflect *šuḫ-ı-/ *šuḫ-ı-. In the plural, we could imagine that *šuḫ-ı- metathesized to *suḥ-ı- > Hitt. šuḫḫa. In the singular, *šuḫ-ı- should regularly have yielded *šuḫ-a-. We know from other verbs in -au-, however, that such a form was not tolerated (compare au- / a- that has 3sg.pres.act. auši instead of *hōu-ı-, and mu- / mu- that has 3sg.pres.act. muši instead of *mōu-ı-). We could imagine that on the basis of 3pl. šuḫḫa the singular secondarily was changed to šuḫh, as if inflecting according to the tarn(a)-class.

Although in principle I would prefer the latter scenario, I must admit that it involves some drastic secondary developments. Moreover, if the noun šuḥ-, šuḥ-ı- ‘roof’ (q.v.) indeed is etymologically connected with šuḥh-ı / šuḫh- and išḫu-yai-l / išḫu-i- it would show a Hittite reflex of the ‘secondary’ stem *seuḫ-ı-, which then would better fit the former scenario.

šuḥmlī-. šuḫpile- (adj.) ‘firm(?)’ nom.sg.c. šu-uḫ-mi-li-ıš (KBo 19.132 rev.) 11 (MH/NS), [š]u-uḫ-mi-li-ıš (KBo 10.37 iii 1 (OH/NS), [š]u-uḫ-mi-li-ı (KUB 9.28 iii 24 (MH/NS)), šu-uḫ-mi-li-ıš (KUB 43.23 rev. 13, 17 (OS), acc.sg.c.? šu-uḫ-mi-li-in (KBo 10.37 ii 33 (OH/NS)), šu-uḫ-pî-li-in (KUB 51.63 rev. 6 (NS)), dat.-loc.sg. šu-uḫ-mi-li (KBo 10.37 iii 7 (OH/NS), KUB 43.23 rev. 57 (OS)), [šu-
The adjective cited as \( \text{šu} \text{m} \text{li} \text{i} \) and translated ‘well-fixed’, a translation that goes back to Catsanicos 1986 (“bien fixé”). Let us first look at the contexts in which \( \text{šu} \text{m} \text{li} \text{i} \) is used.

It occurs a few times only and in most cases, the word is used as an adjective describing (dankui-) tagânzepa- ‘the (black) earth’:

\[
\text{KBo 10.37 iii}
\]

(6) \( \text{tak-na-aš A-NA DINGIR.MAH pár-ši-ja 1 NINDA.GUR} \text{,RA} [... ]
\]

(7) \( \text{šu-úb-mí-li GE}_\text{c-e-i KI-pi pár-ši-ja nu-x} [... ]
\]

\[
\text{KBo 13.121}
\]

(3) \( [\text{tak-na-aš A-NA DINGIR.MAH pár-ši-ja 1 [ NINDA.GUR,RA ... ]}
\]

(4) \( [\text{šu-úb-mí-li GE}_\text{c-e-i KI-pi pár-ši-ja} [... ]
\]

‘He breaks [...] of the earth for the mother goddess. One thick-bread [...] he breaks for the \( \text{šu} \text{m} \text{li} \text{i} \) black earth’;

\[
\text{KUB 43.23 rev.}
\]

(13) \( \text{šu-úb-mí-li-iš da-an-ku-iš da-ga-án-zí-p[a-áš ta-ak-na-a-aš-š=a ^{a}UTU-úš]}
\]

(14) \( \text{ú-ya-at-te-en ^{a}IM-na-aš íš-[a]n-ni nu=za e-ez-[za-at-te-en]}
\]

(15) \( \text{e-ku-ut-te-en nu še-er kat-[a] ne-e-pí-iš-za ^{a}IM-[a]š LUGAL-i [a-aš-šu]}
\]

(16) \( \text{ḫu-iš-ya-tar mi-ja-tar tar-[h]u-i-li ß \text{tu-u-ri pí-iš-ke-ê[d-du]}
\]

(17) \( \text{kat-ta-ša-ra-a=a ma ták-na-a-az šu-úb-mí-li-iš ta-ga-an-zí-p[a]-aš}
\]

(18) \( \text{ták-na-a-aš-š=a ^{a}UTU-úš A-NA LUGAL a-aš-šu ḫu-iš-ya-tar tar-ḫu-i-li}
\]

(19) \( \text{caštu-ú-ri pí-iš-ke-ê[d-du]}
\]

‘You, \( \text{šu} \text{m} \text{li} \text{i} \) black earth and Sun-goddess of the earth, must come. You, Storm-god, must come. May above, from heaven downwards, the Storm-god give to the king [goods], life, growth (and) a victorious weapon. May down, from the earth upwards the \( \text{šu} \text{m} \text{li} \text{i} \) earth and the Sun-goddess of the earth give to the king goods, life (and) a victorious weapon’;

\[
\text{KUB 43.23 rev.}
\]

(56) 3 NINDA.GUR,RA GIR, 1 GAL.GEŠTIN

(57) 1 ŠAIJ.TUR A-NA KI šu-úb-mí-li

(58) ták-na-aš ^{a}UTU-úš
‘Three thick-breads from the oven, one ‘head of the wine’ (and) one little pig for the šuḫmili- earth (and) the Sun-goddess of the earth’.

In one context, the word describes GI ‘(drinking) straw’:

KUB 9.28 iii (with dupl. KBo 19.132 rev.7 10f.)
(22) 2 DUG KU-KU-UB ŠÀ.BA 1-NA 1 DUG ḤAB ḤAB KAŠ
(23) a-ku-qa-an-na-aš pâr-šu-il šu-u-uš
(24) 1 GI [(š)u-ḫ-mi-li-iš tar-na-an-za

‘Two pitchers: in one pitcher of beer for drinking, a šuḫmili- drinking straw full of paršu-il is inserted’.

In one case, it is not fully clear what the word refers to:

KBo 10.37 ii
(33) pê-eš-tèn mu-u=š-iš šu-uḫ-mi-li-in ge-e-mu pê-eš-tèn

‘You must give [him ...] of the wind, give him courage, give him an upper arm (and/with) ability to shoot, give him a knee (and/with) šuḫmili-’.

E.g. Rieken (1999a: 361) assumes that in this context šuḫmîlin belongs with gênu and translates ‘Gebt ihm ein festes Knie!’: Problematic, however, is the fact the gênu is neuter, whereas šuḫmîlin is commune acc.sg. Catsanicos (1986: 124) assumes that in this case the word is a contraction of *šuḫmîlîjan, which in his view is the nom.-acc.sg.n. of a derived stem šuḫmîlîjant-. In note 154 of page 147, he compares this with the form šu-up-pî-in from *şuppijan, nom.-acc.sg.n. of ṣuppijan-, of which he gives an example in KBo 12.89 ii 13. In this context, however, I have not been able to find any indication that ṣuppijan refers to a neuter noun. The other examples that Catsanicos cites, appezzin beside appezzîjan and ḥantezzin beside ḥantezzîjan, are derived from stems that end in -i- as well as in -iqa- (appezzî(a)- and ḥantezzî(a)-). For šuḫmîli-, not a single indication for either a stem šuḫmîlîjâ- or a stem šuḫmîlîjant- are found, so the assumption that šuḫmîlin in this case is a nom.-acc.sg.n.-form from *šuḫmîlîjan seems doubtful to me. If in this context šuḫmîlin does not belong with gênu, it must be substantivized and mean ‘something šuḫmîli-’.

The other contexts of šuḫmîli- are broken:
All in all, we see that šuhmili- is used as an epithet of ‘the (black) earth’, describes a ‘drinking straw’ and is used as a courageous ‘object’ desired as a gift from the gods that goes together with ‘knee’, parallel to ‘upper arm (and) ability to shoot’.

Catsanicos (1986) argues that the word denotes ‘bien fixé’ and connects it with Skt. sūmāya- ‘well prepared’, reconstructing *h₁su-h₂m(e)j-. In my opinion, it seems as if Catsanicos especially prompted the translation ‘bien fixé’ on the basis of the supposed etymological connection. Although this meaning would fit for ‘drinking straw’ and ‘knee’, it is slightly odd for ‘the (black) earth’: the earth is not ‘fixed together’. I would rather translate šuhmili- as ‘firm’, which would give ‘the firm earth’, ‘a firm straw’ and ‘knee (and/with) firmness’.

One could ask oneself whether it is possible that a meaning ‘firm’ is derived from a meaning ‘well-fixed’ when it applies to objects that are not fixed at all (in this case the earth). This means that semantically, Catsanicos’ etymology is rather weak. There are also problems from the formal side. First, this šuhmili- would be the only case where we find the proclitic šu- ‘well’ in Hittite. Moreover, although I do think that word-initially *h₂mi- would yield Hitt. ḫmi- (c.f. ḫamešḥa- < *h₂meh₁-sh₂o-), the fate of word-internal *h₂m- is less clear. On the basis of mahrāt- < *meh₂roi-? and zaḥraḥāt- < *teh₂roi- one could argue that *h₂ was retained word internally in front of a resonant, but no examples of *h₂m- > ḫm- are known.

The final lethal blow to Catsanicos’ etymology, however, is the fact that a word šuhpili- is attested twice in the following context:

KUB 51.63 rev.
(6) [ ] šu-ṭḫ-p[ī]-li-in G[E₄(?)]  ]
(7) [ ] e-[ku-zi 3 NINDA.GUR₄.RA pārši-ja  ]
(8) [ ] L₅MES šu-ṭḫ-p[i-li-]  ]
If in line 6 the traces of the broken sign are correctly interpreted as GE₆, then it is very likely that šuhpilin must be regarded as identical to šuhmili- (cf. also the fact that this context looks very similar to KBo 10.37 iii 6-7 as given above). Since an alternation p/m cannot be explained from an IE point of view, the word šuhmili-, šuhpili- must be of foreign (Hurrian?) origin.

**šuhpili-** see šuhmili-, šuhpili-

(*ši₂)*šūl- (n.) ‘thread’: nom.-acc.sg. šu-ū-il (KBo 15.10+ i 7 (OH/MS), KBo 32.15 iii 1 (MS), KBo 39.8 i 31, ii 5 (MH/MS), KUB 12.51+ i 8 (MH/NS), KUB 55.49 rev. 11 (NH), KUB 17.25 i 8 (fr.), 9 (NS), KUB 17.26 i 9 (fr.) (NS)), šu-ū-i-il (KUB 7.3, 7, 13 (OH/NS)), šu-ū-el (KBo 12.126+ iii 3 (MH/NS)), šu-ū-ē-el (HT 1 iii 9 (OH/NS)), šu-ē-el (KUB 41.1 iii 13 (MH/NS), KUB 58.109 (+) IBoT 2.126 iv 32 (MH/NS), šu-ū-i-li (KUB 45.24 i 10 (MH/NS)), šu-ū-i-li (KUB 60.36. 4 (NH)), instr. šu-ū-i-li-it (KBo 10.37 i 50 (OH/NS), KBo 11.5 vi 9 (NH), dat.-loc.pl. šu-ū-i-l-aš (KUB 41.4 ii 21 (MH/NS)), šu-ī-l-aš (KUB 51.83 iii 4 (MH/NS)).

IE cognates: Lat. suēs, Skt. sātra- ‘thread’. Gr. ύπτυχον ‘thin skin, sinew’.

**PIE *sēuh₁-el-**

See Rieken 1999a: 478ff. for a full treatment of this word. She argues that the suffix was -il- originally, and not -el- which is supported by the fact that all attestations of spellings with the sign EL are NS only. Nevertheless, on p.475 she states that -il- probably arose from a PIE suffix -el- in unaccentuated position (through *CC-ēl, *CC-I-ōs > *CC-ēl, *CC-el-ōs > *CC-ēl, *CC-il-ōs > CC-il, CC-ilaš). The word clearly is derived from the PIE root *sēu₄- ‘to sew’, which is further unattested in Hittite, however (note that it has recently become clear that šum(m)anza(n) - (q.v.) does not mean ‘cord’ and therefore cannot be regarded anymore to reflect *sēu₄-). The fact that this word is spelled with plene ļ, points to a phonological /śūl-/ which points to a reconstruction *sēuh₁-el- (cf. § 1.3.9.4.f). Note that besides the PIE root *sēu₄- we also find *sēu₄- ‘to sew’ (Lith. sūtis, Skt. sāvyati, Goth. siuwan, OCS šiže ‘to sew’).

**šukšak(k)a/i-** (c.) ‘hide (of cow or horse)’: nom.sg. šu-uk-šu-uk-ki-ē (KBo 32.15 iii 2 (MH/MS)), šu-uk-šu-uk-ki-išt (KUB 29.52(+)) i 2 (MH/MS)), acc.sg. šu-uk-šu-ka-r-an (KUB 7.53+ iii 40 (NS), [sù-uk]-šu-uk-ka-r-an (KUB 33.47+54 i 15 (OH/NS), [šu-uk]-šu-ug-ga-an (25/ν, 3 (MS?)), š[ù-uk]-šu-ga-an (KUB 17.10 iv 1 (OH/MS)).


See e.g. Neu 1996: 341f. for a treatment of this word. It denotes ‘hairy skin’ of horses and cows. We find i-stem as well as a-stem forms and spellings both with geminate and single k. Formally, it is likely that this word is a reduplication. No further etymology.

\[ \text{\textit{\textsc{\textit{šullac}}}}^{\text{\textit{d}}} \text{ ‘to become arrogant’; see \textit{\textsc{\textit{šulle}}}}^{\text{\textit{d}}}} \]


IE cognates: ON \textit{svella} ‘to swell’, ModEng. \textit{swell}, Lat. \textit{psolēsē} ‘to become arrogant’

\[ \text{PIE *\textit{sulH-ehi}}^{\text{}} \]

See Melchert (2004c) for the semantics of this verb. He convincingly argues that the verb denotes ‘to become arrogant, to behave disrespectfully towards (someone)’ (pace the usual translation ‘to quarrel’). According to Melchert, this meaning derives from an original meaning ‘*to become swollen’, which is still visible in
KUB 4.4 obv.
(2) dam-me-tar-ya-an-za LUGAL-uš
(3) UR.SAG-iš ki-im-ma-an-taₙ₁
(4) ar-ma-ah-ḫa-an-ni
(5) ḫa-mi-eš-ḫa-an-taₙ₁
(6) šu-ul-la-an-ni
(7) ḫa-mi-iš-ḫa-an-da-aš=ma
(8) a-le-el a-aš-ši-ja-an-ni
(9) ḫa-an-da-aš e-eš-ša-alt-ti]

‘You, the bountiful king, the hero, make the winter for impregnation, the spring
for becoming swollen [due to the pregnancy], and the flower of spring for the
sake of love’.

The exact formal interpretation of this verb is difficult. In NS texts, we find
forms that show a stem šulliye/a² and a stem šullos². In MS texts, we find
the sign LI can be read li as well as le and the sign IT can be read it as well as et,
these latter forms can in principle be read /suLet/ or /suLiet/. The first form can
only stand for /suLisi/ or /suLesi/, however, which means that the combination of
these forms point to a stem /suLe/-.

Melchert (o.c.) connects šullos² with Lat. ìnsolèxcì ‘to become arrogant’ and
argues that we are dealing with a stative in *-eh₁: *suH₁eh₁ (also visible in the
enlarged šulìss₂). The root *suH₁ belongs with PIE *suelH₁ ‘to swell’. Note
that he on the basis of part. šullant- states that the verb must have shown an
ablauting stem šulle-/šulla- (o.c.: 96), but this is incorrect: the part. šullant- is
attested in NS texts only and therefore may well be a form derived from the NH
stem šullae², making it non-probative for establishing an ablaut for the original
stem šulle-.

šulliye/a²: see šullos²

šulpi- (c.) an oracle bird: nom.sg. šu-lu-pi-iš, šu-lu-pi-eš, acc.sg. šu-lu-pi-in.

The word denotes a bird mentioned in bird oracles. Its exact meaning cannot be
determined, and therefore no etymology.

šum- (pers.prn. 2pl.) ‘you (pl.)’: nom. šu-me-eš (OS), šu-me-e-eš (MH/MS), šu-
um-me-eš (NH), šu-um-me-iš (NH), acc.-dat. šu-ma-a-aš (OS), šu-ma-aš
Anat. cognates: CLuw. u(n)za- ‘you (pl.)’ (acc. u-za-aš, case? u-an-za); HLuw. unz- ‘you (pl.)’ (nom. u-zu’-sa (KARKAMIŠ A6 §22), u-zu’-za (ASSUR letter c §4, e §6, §16, §17), abl.-instr.(?) u-za-ri+i (ASSUR letter a §4), u-za’ra’i’ (ASSUR letter a §9)).

In OH and MH texts, the forms of this pronoun are all spelled with a single -m-. Spellings with geminate -mm- occur in NH texts only, cf. §1.4.7.1.c. The oldest forms are nom. šumeš, acc.-dat. šumāš and gen. šumenzan. The gen. šumēl occurs in NH texts only and is clearly a secondary formation, having taken over the gen.-ending -ēl from the pronominal inflection of the singular.

See chapter 2.1 for a treatment of the etymology of the personal pronouns.

=$\text{šumma-}$: see =šummi- / =šumma- / =šumme-

šumanzan- (n.) ‘(bul)rush’: nom.sg. šu-ma-an-za-an (KBo 24.3 i 4 (MH/MS)), acc.sg. šu-ma-an-za-an (KBo 24.3 i 1 (MH/MS)), (KBo 20.73 i 3 (MH/MS), KUB 7.23, 9 (NS)), šu-ma-an-za-â[n] (KBo 24.3 i 4 (MH/MS)), [šum-ma-]a-âr-zâ-na-an (KUB 39.8 iv 2 (OH/NS)), šum-ma-an[-za-na-an] (KUB 39.8 iv 6 (OH/NS)), šu-ma-an-za-n[a...] (HKM 16 rev. 23 (MH/MS)), gen.sg. šu-ma-a-an-za-â[na-š] (KBo 20.26+ i 11 (OS)), with dupl. šu-qa-qa-an-za-na-âš (KBo 30.26 rev. 1 (OH/MS)), šu-ma-an-zâ-a-âš (KBo 10.45 ii 29 (MH/NS)), dat.-loc.sg. šu-ma-an-za-ni (KBo 20.8 iv 14 (OS)), abl. šu-ma-an-za-na-âz (KBo 24.3 + KBo 47.130 i 15, 22 (MH/MS)), nom.-acc.pl. šu-ma-an-za (KBo 3.8+ iii 6, 24 (OH/NS), KUB 59.43 i 9 (OH?/NS), KBO 1.45 rev. 2 (NS), KBo 11.11 i 9 (NS)), šu-mâ-za-an (KBo 21.20 i 17 (NS)), šum-ma-an-za (KUB 12.58+ i 45 (NS), KBo 20.111, 10 (NS)), dat.-loc.pl. šu-ma-an-za-na-âš (KBo 11.11 i 2 (NS)); context broken šu-ma-an-za-ân (KBo 24.2 obv. 6 (NS)), šu-ma-an-za (KUB 35.54 i 15 (MS)), šu-m[a-...] (KBo 24.2 obv. 5 (NS)).

PIE *suh₂m-ent-i-on?

Consensus had it that this word means ‘cord, binding’ and it therefore was generally connected with Gr. ἵλιον ‘sinew’ from *suh₂mēn. Melchert (2003d), however, has shown that the Hittite word does not mean ‘cord, binding’, but rather ‘(bul)rush’. This means that the connection with Gr. ἵλιον cannot be upheld. Melchert treats many attestations of this word. Although I agree with the
semantic side of his treatment, I do not share all his grammatical interpretations. Because these are important for the formal judgement of this word, I will treat the cases where I disagree with Melchert.

Melchert cites three forms as “AnimNSg” (o.c.: 132): šummanza (KUB 12.58+ i 21, KBo 1.45 rev.’ 2) and šummanzās (KBo 10.45 ii 29). These forms have to be interpreted otherwise. KUB 12.58+ i (21) mu šum-ma-an-za ŠIG mi-i-ii-isš-a (22) [an-da ta-ru-up-pa-a]n-za is translated by Melchert (o.c.: 130) as ‘A rush and red wool are braided together’. On the basis of the fact that [taruppa]nza is nom.sg.c., Melchert apparently concludes that šummanza is nom.sg.c. too. This is not necessary: because ŠIG mēš is a commune word, it is possible that [taruppa]nza agrees with this word only and not with šummanza. Moreover, we cannot tell whether šummanza is singular or plural here. I would therefore interpret šummanza as nom.-acc.pl.n. and translate the sentence as ‘Rushes and red wool are braided together’. In the vocabulary KBo 1.45 rev.’ 2, Hitt. šu-ma-an-za glosses Akk. aš-lum ‘rush’. I do not understand why Melchert explicitly assumes that this form is nom.sg.c. In my view an interpretation as nom.-acc.sg.pl. is just as likely. KBo 10.45 ii (29) I-NA SAG.DU=ŠU=ma šu-um-ma-an-za-aš pu-ru-ši-ja[=al-la-aš ki-i][t-ta-at is translated by Melchert (o.c.: 130) as ‘but on her head was placed a bulrush as a fill[et]’, taking šummanzās as nom.sg.c. (although he admits that an interpretation as gen.sg. cannot be excluded). In my view, an interpretation as gen.sg./pl. is more likely: ‘but on her head a head[and] of bulrushes is laid’.

All in all, I arrive at a grammatical analysis of the forms as indicated in the overview above. This means that we are dealing with a neuter noun showing the following forms: nom.-acc.sg. šumzan, šum(m)anzan, gen.sg. šummanzās, dat.-loc.sg. šumzan, abl. šumzan, nom.-acc.pl. šum(m)anza, dat.-loc.pl. šumzan. Although we come across a few different types of inflection, it is clear that the n-stem šumzan- must have been original. On the basis of nom.-acc.sg. šumzan, which was ambiguous as to whether it belonged with an n-stem šumzan- or with a thematic stem šumanza-, o-stem forms like gen.sg. šummanzās and nom.-acc.pl. šumanza were secondarily created. On the other hand, on the basis of a reinterpretation of forms like šumzan and šumzan as belonging to a thematic stem šumanza-, the secondary nom.-acc.sg. šumzan was created. It should be noted that the MS texts al show single -m-, whereas geminate -mm- occurs in NS texts only, which is due to the fortition of older intervocalic /m/ to NH /M/ as described in § 1.4.7.1.c. All in all, we have to conclude that this word originally was šumzan-, a neuter n-stem.
Melchert (o.c.) argues that the element -anzan- (also visible in e.g. ḫtanzan- and ḫṭhanzan-) reflects the suffix complex *-ent-i-on-. Although I agree with him, it is unclear to me what the origin of the stem šum- would be. Formally, one could think of e.g. *šHu-ent- (perhaps *šḫu-ent- ‘swaying’, cf. MDu. swaeien ‘to sway’, Russ. svějus’ ‘to move’ < *sueh1-).

=šumme:- see =summi- /=summa- /=summe-

šumeš- (n.) a kind of grain?: nom.-acc.sg. ššu-me-eš (KUB 42.107 iii7. 11 (NS)).

This word is hapax in the following context:

KUB 42.107 iii7
(10) 6 PA ŠE ZI-KU-Ŭ-KI ḫa-at-tar=ku
(11) zi-na-a-il=ku ššu-me-eš=ku

‘6 parēṣu of zikāki-meal, either ḫattar, ṣināl or šumeš grain’.

The exact meaning of the different grain sorts cannot be determined, and therefore no etymology.

*šumeššar / šumešn- (n.) ‘big beans’ (Sum. GŪ.GAL.GAL): gen.sg. ššu-me-eš-na-aš (KBo 17.15 obv.7 14 (OS)), ššu-me-eš-na-ašš (KBo 17.40 iv 8 (OH/MS?)), ššu-me-eš-n[a-aš] (KBo 21.84 iv 6).

PIE *suH-u-éh₁isyr?

The contexts KBo 17.15 obv.7 (14) ššu-me-eš-na-aš me-e-ma-[aš] GŠ e-er-hu-it and KBo 17.40 iv (8) ššu-me-eš-na-ašš me-e-ma-[aš] GŠ MA.SÁ.AB-it are parallel to IBoT 3.1 (34) Št GŪ.GAL.GAL me-ma-al TA GŠ MA.SÁ.AB ‘meal from broad beans by the basket’, which means that šumešnaš must be equated with GŪ.GAL.GAL ‘broad beans’. Formally, šumešnaš is clearly a genitive of a noun *šumeššar.

Regarding its etymology, I would like to propose the following. If we are allowed to assume that ‘broads beans’ were broad in the sense that they were well-filled with peas, one could perhaps assume a connection with the adj. štū- / štūy- ‘filled’ (q.v.). If this connection is justified, we should reconstruct *suH-u-éh₁isyr. See at štū- / štūy- for further etymology.
This enclitic possessive pronoun functions on a par with *mi- / =ma- / =me- ‘my’, =tti- / =ttà- / =tte- ‘your (sg.)’, =šši- / =šša- / =šše ‘his, her, its’ and =šmi- / =šma- / =šme- ‘your (pl.); their’ (for which see their respective lemmas). It is rarely attested, however, and its paradigm therefore is incomplete. It is remarkable that in acc.sg.c. the oldest forms (OS and OH/MS) seem to be =šummin, whereas =šumman is attested in NS texts only (compare the opposite situation in e.g. =man (OS) vs. =min (NS) ‘my’). The one gen.sg.-form =šummiš is found in a NS copy of the Anitta-text and is likely to be corrupt (cf. Neu 1974a: 124). Perhaps the form is influenced by the unattested nom.sg.c. *=šummiš. The oldest nom.-acc.sg.n.-form is =šummet, whereas =šummit is found in a NS text (cf. Melchert 1984a: 122-6 for the distribution between -et and -it in possessive enclitic pronouns). Although the variant =šumma- is not attested thus, it can be inferred from acc.pl.c. =šummiš. The exact origin of the vowel alteration -e, -a, -e, which can hardly reflect anything else than *-i, *-o, *-e, is still unclear. The -š- of =šummi/a/e- is consistently spelled single (in iš-tar-ni=šum-mi, katt-i=šu-mi).

The other enclitic possessive pronouns are clearly etymologically related to their corresponding enclitic personal pronouns (=mu ‘me’, =tit a / =ttu ‘thee’, =ššê ‘for him/her’, =šmaš ‘to you (pl.); to them’). In the case of =šummi/a/e- this would mean that we have to assume an etymological connection with =maš ‘(to) us’ (q.v.). This is only possible if we assume that =šummi/a/e- reflects *=summi/a/e-. The prehistory of the element -šum- is unclear, however.

=šummi- / =šumma- / =šumme- (encl.poss.pron. 1pl.) ‘our’: acc.sg.c. 4ši-ú(n)=šum-m[i-in] (KBo 3.22 obv. 39 (OS)), 4ši-ú(n)=ša[m...] (KBo 3.22 obv. 41 (OS)), 4UTU=šum-mi-in (KBO 40.60 iii 56 (fr.), 69, iv 11 (fr.), 17, 25 (OH/MS), VSNF 12.30 iv 15 (OH/NS)), 4UTU=šum-ma-an (KUB 43.53 obv. 17 (OH/NS), KUB 58.111 obv. 11 (OH/NS)), nom.-acc.sg.n. ša-hē-eš-šar=šum-ma-e[t] (KUB 36.110 rev. 8 (OS)), ḫa-at-ta-tar=šum-mi-it (KUB 24.3+ ii 18 (MH/NS)), dat.UTU=šum-mi (KUB 40.60 iii 52 (fr.), 66 (OH/MS), KUB 26.71, 6 (OH/NS)), dat.-loc.sg. iš-tar-ni=šum-mi (OS), 4UTU=šum-mi (KBO 40.60 iii 52 (fr.), 66 (OH/MS)), kat-ti=šu-mi (HKM 57 rev. 21 (MH/MS)), iš-[tar-ni]=šu-um-me (KUB 26.50 + KBO 22.58 obv. 9 (NH)), acc.pl.c. ni-e-ku-š=(š)um-ma-uš (KBO 22.2 obv. 19 (OH/MS)).

PIE *-sum-ni/o/e- ??
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(KBo 19.144 i 5), šum-mi-it-ta-an-ta-an (KUB 8.51 ii 4); broken šum-mi-it-ta-anda[...]] (KBo 39.125, 3).

The meaning of the word can be determined because šummitantan (KUB 8.51 ii 4) alternates with the akkadogram ḤA-AS-İN-NU ‘axe’ (ibid. ii 6). Kimball (1999: 199) reconstructs this word as *smit-ent-, derived from a PIE root *smei- as visible in Gr. ðwθ ‘cutting knife’, Goth. aizasmīpā and OE smīp ‘blacksmith’, assuming that an epenthetic -u- has emerged in the initial cluster *sm-. Such an epenthetic vowel is not visible in e.g. šomerzi ‘he passes by’ /směnt’il < *směn-ti or šamankurant- ‘bearded’ /smankuruant-l < *smonkur-uent-. Moreover, Kimball seems to ignore the geminate -mm- (she cites the word as “šumittant-”). All in all, I reject Kimball’s etymology. Unfortunately, I am not able to offer an alternative one.

šumreške/a- (Ic6) ‘to become filled (because of a pregnancy)’: sup. šum-re-eš-ke-ya-an (KUB 24.8 + KUB 36.60 iii 7, 17), šum-r[e-eš-ke-ya-an] (KUB 19.106, 7); broken šum-re-x[..] (KBo 47.150, 2).

PIE *suH-yr

This verb occurs a few times only, all in similar contexts:

KUB 24.8 + KUB 36.60 iii
(9) m[(IT)]U.10.KAM ti-ja-at m=za DAM "Ap-pu DUMU-nita aš-ta

‘The wife of Appu became pregnant. The first month, the second month, the third month, the fourth month, the fifth month, the sixth month, the seventh month, the eighth month (and) the ninth month went by. And the tenth month set in, and the wife of Appu bore a son’.

The expression šumreškeyaan dāš clearly means ‘she became pregnant’. This indicates that the verb šumreške/a- (or šumrae- as often cited) itself does not mean ‘to become pregnant’, however. The supine + dāš-expression means ‘to begin to’, which means that šumreške/a- should have a more fiendive meaning like ‘to become thicker (because of the pregnancy)’. Etymologically, it is likely that šumreške/a- belongs with šū- ‘filled’. In that case, šumreške/a- could originally have meant ‘to become filled (of a pregnancy)’. If this is correct, we
must assume that šumreške/a- is ultimately derived from a further unattested verbal noun *šumar < *š(e)uw-ur, probable through a *-e/o-suffix (*šumrje/a-), whose imperfective is šumreške/a-.

šumumahh- (Ib) ‘to braid together(?):’ 2sg.imp.act. šu-mu-ma-ah (KUB 29.1 ii 43).

This verb occurs only once, in the following context:

KUB 29.1 ii
(41) nu ki-nu-u-pi ú-da
(42) ki-nu-pi=ma-a=sša-an an-da ŠA UR.MAḫ ši-e-ša-i
(43) pár-sša-na-aš ši-ša-i šu-mu-ma-ah n=a-at ḫar-ak
(44) n=a-at ta-ru-up n=a-at iEN i-ja n=a-at LÚ=aš ŠA=sši
(45) pē-e-da nu LUGAL-ša-aš ZI=aš kar-di-i=sši=ša
(46) ta-ru-up-ta-ru

‘Bring the kinipi-box here. In the kinipi-box, šumumahh- the šešai of a lion (and) the šišai of a leopard. Hold them and unite them and make them one. Bring them to the heart of the man. May the soul and the heart of the king be united’.

The meaning of šumumahh- depends on the meaning of še/išai (body part of an animal). Apparently, šumumahh- indicates an action by which these body parts are united and made one. One could think of ‘to braid together’ if še/išai refers to tails or similar. No etymology.

šunn- / šunn- (Ia1y > Ic1) ‘to fill’: 1sg.pres.act. šu-un-na-ab-ḫi (KUB 33.70 iii 10, 11 (OH/NS), KBo 3.38 rev. 17 (OH/NS)), 2sg.pres.act. šu-un-na-at-[i] (KUB 15.22, 14 (NS)), 3sg.pres.act. šu-un-na-i (OS, often), šu-un-na-a-i (less often), š[u]-]-ni-e-ez-zi (KBo 24.4 + IBoT 4.14 rev. 12/17 (NS), šu-un-ni-ez-zi (KBo 40.67 ii 6, iv 4 (MH/NS)), šu-un-ni-ja-zi (KUB 6.45+ iv 9, 14, 19, 24 (NH) with dupl. KUB 6.46 i 41, 46, 50, 54, 58, 62 (NH)), 1pl.pres.act. šu-un-mu-me-ni (KBo 32.15 ii 16 (MH/MS)), 2pl.pres.act. šu-un-na-at-te-ni (KUB 13.4 iv 18 (OH/NS)), 3pl.pres.act. šu-un-na-an-zi (MH/MS, often), šu-un-ni-an-zi (IBoT 3.148 iii 21, 22 (MH/NS), KUB 55.58 obv. 30, 32 (MH/NS), KUB 9.32 i 40 (NS)), šu-un-ni-ja-an-zi (KBo 15.24 ii 44 (MH/NS), IBoT 4.30 obv. 4 (fr.) (NS)), KUB 7.47 obv. 13 (fr.) (NS), KUB 20.35 iv 3 (fr.) (NH), 1sg.pret.act. šu-un-na-ab-ḫu-un (KBo 10.2 i 21, ii 23 (OH/NS)), šu-un-ni-ja-nu-n (KBo 10.2 i 37 (OH/NS)),

Derivatives: šunnunmeššar (n.) ‘filling(?)’ (nom.-acc.sg. [š]u-un-nu-un-m-ešt-šar (KUB 13.4 i 7)).


PIE *su-nó-ḥi₂-e, su-n-h₁₂-énti

The oldest attested forms of this verb clearly point to the tarn(a)-class inflection: šuun̥hi, šunattī, šunmai, šunnuneni, *sunninī, šunnanzi. In texts from NH times, we occasionally find forms that belong to a mi-inflecting stem šunije/a.² The tarn(a)-class consists of ḥi-verbs ending in laryngeal, including nasal-infixed verbs of the type CR-no-H-. In the case of šunma-šunn- it is generally accepted that it must reflect a nasal-infixed stem of the root *suH- that is visible in the adjective šūn- / šūya- ‘full’ (so causatival meaning, as we often see in nasal infixed verbs: šūn- ‘full’ > šunma-šunn- ‘*to make full > to fill’). This means that we have to reconstruct *su-nó-H-ei, *su-n-H-énti. These forms would regularly yield Hitt. **sunai, sunanzi, but the geminate of the plural was taken over into the singular, yielding attested šunmai (cf. zinniẓi, zinnanzi ‘to finish’ << *zinīzi, zinnanzi < *ti-ne-h₁-ti, *ti-n-h₁-énti). The single -n- is still visible in Pal. šūna- and CLuw. šunatrayeti(ṭ)- (-yant-derivative of an abstract noun *sunattar ‘outpouring’).

Of the root *suH-, the rootfinal laryngeal cannot be *h₂ (which would have yielded **suḫu- as u-stem adjective), but a choice between *h₁ or *h₂ cannot be made on the basis of the Hittite material (note that ħi-verbs always have o-grade and that therefore both *su-no-h₁-ei and *su-no-h₂-ei would have yielded Hitt. šunmai). Melchert (1987b: 24-5) argues that on the basis of the Palaic 3sg.pret.act. šu-ú-na-at, which in his view must reflect *su-ne-h₁-t, we have to reconstruct *h₁. I do not understand on which grounds Melchert chooses to reconstruct e-grade here, whereas o-grade is equally possible (or even more likely, because of the
close similarity between the Hittite and Palaic formation), and therefore do not follow him in this reconstruction. See at šūr- for further etymology.

**šunnazījant** (adj.) ‘brim-full’: nom.pl.c. šu-un-na-zī-an-te-[eš] (KBo 11.1 rev. 19 (NH)).

This adjective is attested only once. It seems to be derived from šunna-¹ / šun- 'to fill' (q.v.), but its exact formation is unclear.


For semantics, compare the following contexts:

KBo 32.14 iii
(9) NINDA ku-gul-la-an UR.Gl-aš UDUN-ni-ja-pé-ra-an ar-ḫa pâr-te-mu-ut
(10) pa-ra-a=an=kān ḫu-et-ti-at UDUN-ni-ja-az n=a-an=kān l-ı
(11) an-da šu-ű-ni-at ša-ak-ni-j=a-an=kān an-da
(12) šu-ű-ni-at n=a-aš=za e-ṣa-at n=a-an a-da-a-an-na da-iš

‘A dog ran off with a kugullā-bread in front of the oven, he had pulled it out of the oven and dipped it in oil. In oil he dipped it, he sat down and began eating it’.

KBo 15.36 ii
(4) [nu nam-ma 1 NINDA.GU]R₄.RA A-N₄ ₄IM U₄[R][ku]-[li]-uš-nu ₄IŠTAR
(6) [m:pu 3-SU] pâr-ši-ja-az-zi n=a-aš-ta mar-ḫi an-da šu-ű-ni-e-z-zi
(7) [še-ra-a=a=š-a-a]n SAR₂₃] ₃ A-S-RA da-a-i

‘Further he breaks one thick-bread for the Storm-god of Kuliḫšna, for Ištar and the Patron deity as well as for all gods. He breaks (it) three times in small pieces and dips (them) into the marṭha-stew and places them on top of plants on three places’.

From these examples it is clear that šuniye/a-² denotes ‘to dip’. Note that the hapax spelling šu-un-ni- is found in a NH text and therefore may not be probative:
‘He breaks three white thickbreads and one red one of it for the Storm-god of Ziplanda, and they dip them into honey and fine oil’.

Melchert (1994a: 73) reconstructs šūnijē/a- as *sūnḫ-je/o- (adapting his earlier view (1984a: 29)) that the attestations šu-ú-ni-ez-zi and šu-ú-ni-e-ez-zi can also be read /suneti/ (which is incorrect since we then would expect spellings with NE) and reflect *su-ne-h₂-ti), connecting it with šunna-/šunn- ‘to fill’. I do not see a semantical connection between ‘to dip’ and ‘to fill’, however, and follow Oettinger (1979a: 159) who states that šūnijē/a- “[f]ern bleibt” from šunna-/šunn-.

šunniē/a-²: see šunna-/šunn-

šupp-² (IIIc/d) ‘to sleep’: 3sg.pres.midd. šu-up-pa-rī (KUB 37.190 rev.’ 6’ (undat.)), šu-up-tārī (KBo 5.4 rev. 38 (NH)), [š]u-up-ta-rī (KUB 20.68 i 7 (OH/NS)), šu-up[t-a-rī (BoT 2.15 i 5 (OH/NS)), šu-up-ta-rī (KUB 4.47 obv. 3 (OH/NS)), šu-up-pa-at-ta (KUB 43.60 obv. 1 (OH/NS)), šu-up-pa-at(-at)-ta (KUB 43.60 obv. 2 (OH/NS)); 3sg.pres.act. [šu-up-z]i (KUB 4.47 obv. 5 (OH/NS)), št-up-pi-ez-zi (KUB 12.63 rev. 4 (OH/NS)), 2pl.imp.act. šu-up-tēn (KUB 39.31, 3 (OH/NS)); part. šu-up-pa-an-da-aš (KBo 43.27, 3 (NS)); inf.I šu-pu-an-zi (KUB 18.10 iv 33 (NS)); verb.noun šu-up-pu-u-ya-ar (KBo 13.2 obv. 14 (NS)).

Derivatives: see šuppariē/a-² and šuppargant-

IE cognates: Skt. svap- ‘to sleep’, Av. x’aṭ- ‘to sleep’, Lat. sēpēre ‘to fall asleep’, OE swēfan ‘to sleep’.

PIE *sup-first, *sup-tō

This verb shows active as well as middle forms with no difference in meaning (note the switch between šupplēri (KUB 4.47 obv. 3) and [šul]ptēri (ibid. 5)). The middle inflection seems to be more original because it is attested more often (note that this assumption cannot be supported by chronological evidence: all attestations are from NS texts).
The etymological interpretation is clear: the verb reflects PIE *suep- ‘to sleep’. We find forms with the ending *-o (šuppari), with *-o (šuptari) and a conflation of the two (šuppata < virtual *sup-o-to). The zero-grade stem of the middle was taken over into the active, yielding the forms [šulpí and šupten.

šuppa-: see šuppi- / šuppaj-

šupp(a)(a)- (n.) ‘cattle’: nom.-acc.sg. šu-up-pa-al (KUB 36.55 ii 30 (MH/MS?)), [š]u-up-pa-la-an (KUB 8.1 iii 13 (OH/NS)), nom.sg.c. šu-up-pa-la-aš=mi-iš (KBo 3.60 ii 1 (OH/NS)), dat.-loc.sg. šu-up-li-i=š-ši (KBo 6.34 iv 15 (MH/NS)), erg.sg. šu-up-pa-la-an-za (KUB 36.32, 5, 8 (MS?)), nom.-acc.pl. šu-up-pa-la-aš-š-še-et (KBo 6.19 i 22 (OH/NS)), gen.pl. šu-up-pa-la-an (KUB 31.127 i 43 (OH/NS)).

Derivatives: šuppalēššar / šuppalēšn- (n.) ‘?’ (dat.-loc.sg. šu-up-pa-le-e-eš[-n(i)] (KUB 31.143a + VBoT 124 iii 6 (OS) with restoration from KUB 60.20 rev. 7)).

IE cognates: ?Lat. suppus ‘walking inverted, with the head downwards’.

PIE *sup-lo-?

Despite the one commune attestation nom.sg.c. šuppalaš (found in a NS text), the word originally was neuter (nom.-acc.sg.n. šuppal (MH/MS), erg.sg. šuppalanza (MS?)). The nom.pl.c. šuppalaš as cited in HW (Erg.1: 19) is now to be read as šuppalaš(n(i)), a dat.-loc.sg. of a further unattested noun šuppalēššar.

According to Rieken (1999a: 432\textsuperscript{135}), all attestations of this word are to be interpreted as šupl- as can be seen by the one attestation dat.-loc.sg. šupl. She follows the etymology of Watkins (1973b), who connects šupp(a)(a)- with Lat. suppus ‘walking inverted, with the head downwards’ and reconstructs *sup-lo-. In my view, this etymology, though formally possible, is not self-evident semantically.

šuppajrije/a\textsuperscript{2} (Io1) ‘to sleep’: 1sg.pret.act. šu-up-pa-ri-ja-nu-un (KUB 52.91 iii 1); 1pl.pret.midd. [šu-]şup-pa-ri-ja-u-aš-ta-ti (KUB 8.48 i 1); part. šu-up-pa-ri-an-za (KBo 19.109, 9, KBo 19.111, 7), šu-up-pa-ri-ja-an-za (KUB 36.89 rev. 57).

Derivatives: see also šuppaijari and šupparyant-.


PIE *sup-r/-je/o-

This verb, which is attested a few times only, is clearly derived from a stem *šuppar- which is also found in the adjective šupparant- ‘sleepy?’ (q.v.). See Rieken 1999a: 305^1468^ for its connection with Lat. sopor ‘deep sleep’ and Gr. ὑπνός ‘truth, reality < *realistic dream’ and the -no-stems that can be found in e.g. Skt. svāpna- ‘sleep’, Lith. sūnas ‘dream’ etc. These forms point to an original heteroclitic inflection *suóp-r, *sup-n-ós. In Hittite, just as in Greek, the zero-grade was generalized, yielding *sup-r, which was used as the basis for šuppariē/a-. See at supp-‘to sleep’ for the basic stem *sup-.

šupparant- (adj.) ‘sleepy?’: nom.sg.c. šu-up-pár-ya-an-za (KBo 40.219 rev.7, KUB 60.134 obv. 1), šu-up-pár-ya-an-te-eš (KBo 24.56a ii’6); broken šu-up-pár-ya-an[... ] (HKM 91 obv. 4).

Derivatives: see also šupparant and šuppariē/a-^2^.

A meaning ‘sleepy’ is proposed by Alp 1991: 344. The stem šuppar- is also found in šuppariē/a-^2^ ‘to sleep’. See there for further etymology.

šupplakašhanallī: see at šuppiššišsar

šuppi- / šuppi- (adj.) ‘purified, sacred’: nom.sg.c. šu-up-pi-š (OS), šu-up-pi-eš (OS), acc.sg.c. šu-up-pi-in, nom.-acc.sg.n. šu-up-pi (OS), dat.-loc.sg. šu-up-pa-i (OS), šu-up-pa-ja, šu-up-pi, šu-up-pa, abl. šu-up-pa-az, šu-up-pa-za, šu-up-pa-ja-az, šu-up-pa-ja-za, instr. šu-up-pi-š, nom.pl.c. šu-up-pa-e-eš, šu-up-pi-š, acc.pl.c. šu-up-pa-š, nom.-acc.pl. šu-up-pa (OS), šu-up-pi, dat.-loc.pl. šu-up-pa-š (OS), šu-up-pa-ja-aš, šu-up-pi-ja-aš.

Derivatives: tzišuppi (n.pl.) ‘(sacrilized) meat’ (nom.-acc.pl. šu-up-pa (OS)), šuppiššišah- (Iib) ‘to purify, to sacrilize’ (1sg.pres.act. šu-up-pi-ja-ah-mi (KUB 14.15 + KBo 16.104 i17 (NH)), 3sg.pres.act. šu-up-pi-ah-ši (OS), šu-up-pi-ja-ah-ši (OS), 3pl.pres.act. šu-up-pi-ja-ah-ša-an-zi, 1sg.pret.act. šu-up-pi-ja-ah-hu-un (KUB 19.37 i17 (NH), KUB 7.60 iii 17 (NS)), šu-up-pi-ja-ah-hu-u-un (KBo 12.85+ i 25 (MH/NS)); 3sg.pret.midd. šu-up-pi-a-ah-ša-tū (OS); part. šu-up-pi-ja-ah-ša-tū; verb.noun šu-up-pi-ja-ah-šu-ya-ar; impf. šu-up-pi-(ja-)ah-šš-ke/a-, šu-up-pi-ah-šš-ke/a-), šuppiššak- (Ib2) ‘to become purified’ (3sg.pres.act. šu-up-pi-eš-zi (KUB 29.4 iv 40)), šuppiššar, šuppiššar (n.)
'purity' (dat.-loc.sg. šu-up-pi-eš-ni, šu-up-pi-iš-aš'ni (KUB 36.83 i 5), nom.-acc.pl. [š]u-up-pi-eš-ša-ra-ri (KUB 18.24, 9), [šu-up-pi]i-eš-ša-ra-ri (KUB 18.24, 5), [š][u][m][u][n][š]uppieššara- (c.) a priestess, 'purified woman' (nom.sg. šu-up-pi-eš-ša-ra-aš (KUB 9.27 + KUB 7.8 i 14, KBo 22.110, 3), šu-up-pi-iš-ša-ra-aš (KUB 33.62 iii 16 (fr.), 18), šu-up-pi-ša-ra-aš (KUB 7.5 + KUB 9.27 i 33), acc.sg. šu-up-pi-eš-ša-ra-an, dat.-loc.sg. šu-up-pi-iš-ša-ri, nom.pl. [šu-up-pi]iš-ša-ra-aš (KUB 33.32 iii 8), šu-up-pi-iš-ri-e-eš (KUB 33.62 iii 19)), uppieššaran- (adj.) 'being purified' (nom.-acc.pl.n. šu-up-pi-iš-ša-ra-an-ta (KUB 15.34 ii 31)), uppieššant- (adj.) 'purified, sacred' (acc.sg. šu-up-pi-ja-an-ta-an (KUB 27.68 i 14), nom.-acc.sg.n. šu-up-pi-ja-an (KUB 32.123 iii 38)), uppieššatar / uppieššam- (n.) 'purity' (dat.-loc.sg. šu-up-pi-ja-an-ni (KUB 8.12, 8, 10, KUB 8.14 i 13)).

Although this word is abundantly attested from OS texts onwards and has many derivatives, it does not have known cognates within the Anatolian language branch, nor in the other IE languages. In the OA Assyrian texts from Kültepe šuppı- is often used as the first element in personal names, although here we usually find šuppıja-: mŠu-pi-ah-šu = šuppı- + ḫaššu-; lŠu-pi-ah-šu-ša-ra = šuppı- + ḫaššiššara-; šu-pi-ani-kaš = šuppı- + neka-; etc.). In Hittite texts we only find mŠuppıliumıa- (= šuppı- + larith- / umen- / -umı-) and mŠuppıman / mŠuppıma- (= šuppı- + umen- / -umı-). Note that the one attestation mŠu-up-pi-lu-li-u-ma (KUB 19.10 iv 2) clearly points to a phonological interpretation /sopi/-.

Mechanically, šuppı- can hardly reflect anything else than *sup(e)i-, but this reconstruction cannot be supported by any other evidence.

šuppieššara- (adj.) ‘ornamented(?)’: nom.sg.c. šu-up-pi-iš-tu-ya-ar-aš (OS), acc.sg.c. [šu-up-pi]-š-tu-ya-ra-an (OS), instr. šu-up-pi-iš-du-ya-ri-it, nom.pl.c. šu-up-pi-iš-tu-ya-a-re-еš (OS)), acc.pl. šu-up-pi-iš-tu-ya-ru-uš (KBo 2.12 v 12 (OH/NS)).


We have to distinguish two stems: an a-stem šuppieššara- that is adjectival and an i-stem šuppieššarı- that is nominal. It is difficult to determine what the words mean exactly.
As an adjective, it is used of cups: e.g.

StBoT 12 iii
(42) LUGAL Ū MUNUS.LUGAL a-ša-an-da-a[š] a-rū-ya-an-zi GAL
[INTERN]
‘The king and queen bow while sitting and drink from the š. cup of the Storm-god’;

and of sheep:

KBo 2.12 v
(9) 1 UDU šu-up-pi-iš-tu-ya-ra-an
(10) na-at-ta ar-kān-ta-an
(11) MUNUS iš-pu-un-na-la-aš da-a-i
(12) 10 UDU HRA šu-up-pi-iš-tu-ya-ru-uš
(13) na-at-ta ar-kān-te-eš
(14) LÚ.MEŠ URU Zi-pa-la-an-da da-an-zi
‘The išpunalla-woman takes one š. sheep that has not been mounted. The men of Zippalanda take 10 š. sheep that have no been mounted’;

KBo 17.43 i
(6) 1 UDU šu-up-pi-iš-tu-ya-ar-aš I-NA DUG ÚTUL mar-ri-et-r[a]
‘One š. sheep cooks in a pot’.

As a noun, it occurs in the Hittite version of the Hurrian ‘Song of Release’ (see StBoT 32):

KBo 32.14 ii
(42) te-eš-šum-mi-in LÚ SIMUG ya-al-li-ja-an-ni la-a-hu-uš
(43) la-a-hu-š=a-an ti-iš-ša-a-it n=a-an šu-up-pi-iš-du-ya-ri-it
(44) da-iš n=a-an gul-aš-ta mu-u=š-ši-e=š-ta ma-iš-ti an-da
(45) la-a-lu-uk-ki-iš-nu-ut
‘A smith poured a cup for fame. He poured it and made it right. He provides it with š., ciseled it and made it (the š.?) beam in glow’;

ibid.
(54) nu te-eš-šum-mi-ja LÚ SIMUG
(55) ūu-ur-ta-a-in te-et ya-al-ab-du=j=a-an
(56) 4IM-aš te-eš-sum-mi-in mu-u=s=s šu-up-pi-iš-du-ya-ri-uš
(57) ar-ha ša-ak-kur-i-e-ud=du te-eš-sum-mi-iš=kán
(58) an-da a-mi-ja-ri ma-uš-du
(59) šu-up-pi-iš-du-ya-ri-i-e-eš=ma=kán an-da
(60) ÍD-i mu-ya-a-an-ta-ra

‘And the smith spoke a curse against the cup: ‘May the Storm-god strike him, the cup! May he knock off its š.-s! May the cup fall in the ditch! May its š.-s fall in the river!’.”

A translation ‘ornamented’ and ‘ornamentation’ (thus e.g. CHD Š: 79) would certainly fit the contexts that involve cups. In the case of the sheep, such a translation may be less likely, but certainly not impossible.

It is unclear whether šuppišuṣara- has anything to do with šuppi- ‘purified’ (q.v.). Such a connection is the reason for e.g. Neu (1996 = StBoT 32: 146) to translate “glänzende Applikation”. Further unknown.

šuppišašharŠAR (n.) ‘onion’ (Šum. SUM.SIKIL šAR (?)): nom.-acc.sg. šu-up-pi-ya-aš-ša (KUB 29.7+ rev. 28 (MH/MS)), š[u-up-pi-ya-aš-ša] (KUB 29.7+ rev. 27 (MH/MS)), šu-[p-pi-y]a-aš-ša (KUB 29.7+ rev. 30 (MH/MS)), gen.sg. šu-up-pi[-...] aš (KUB 29.7+ rev. 30).

Derivatives: šuppi/ajušhanalli- ‘having onions?’ (dat.-loc.pl. šu[-up-p(i-ya-aš-ša-na-al-li-ja]-aš (KBo 17.11(+)) i 11 (OS) // KBo 17.74 i 10 (OH/MS)), šu-up-pi-ya-aš-ša-na-al-li-ja-aš (KUB 34.120, 5 (OH/NS)), šu-up-qa(š)ya-aš-ša-na-al-li[-...] (KUB 11.8+9 iii 20 (NH)).

See Rieken (1999a: 312f.) for an extensive treatment of this word. It is likely that this word is to be analysed as a compound of šuppi- ‘purified’ and yašhar- ‘onion?’). The derivative šuppi/ajušhanalli- shows that yašhar- originally must have been an r/n-stem. See at both šuppi- and yašhar for further etymological treatments.

šuMa(a)-: see šupp(a)l(a)-

šušit(a)- (n.) ‘braid(?)’: nom.-acc.pl. šu-ri-ta (KBo 5.1 iv 2, ABoT 17 ii 7, KUB 5.10 i 10), šu-ú-ri-ta (KBo 5.1 iv 7).
The word šurita, which must be plural as can be seen in KUB 5.10 i (10) šu-rita·ya ṣu-e-ez-za-pa-an-ta 'the šurita have grown weary', denotes objects that are made of wool:

KBo 5.1 iii
(54) ma-ah-ḫa-an=ma TŪG-an ša-ra-a-u-an-zi
(55) zi-in-na-an-zi nu SIG SA₃ an-da

iv
(1) ta-ru-up-pa-an-zi n==a-at=ša-an A-N₄ TŪG še-er
(2) ti-an-zi šu-ri-ta=jā i-ja-an-zi nu=za¹₁₀ pa-ti-li-iš
(3) u-a-a-tar LUD.GA da-a-i n==a-at=kān pa-ra-a pē-e-da-a-i
(4) nu SILA₄ ū-e-te-ni-it kat-ta a-an-ša-an-zi KAX-an
(5) GIR=ŠU ar-ḫa a-ar-ri nam-m=a-an LUD.GA-it
(6) iš-ki-ez-zi nu=ša-an SIG SA₃ A-N₄ GIR>[]ŠU
(7) ha-ma-an-ki šu-ú-ri-ta=ma-a=š-ši-i=š-ša-an
(8) A-N₄ SAG.DU=ŠU an-da ḫu-u-la-li-ja-an-zi

‘When they finish embroidering the cloth, they wrap up the red wool and place it on top of the cloth and they make šurita. The patili- takes water and fine oil and brings it forth. They wipe the lamb with water and wash its mouth and feet. Then they anoint him with the fine oil and tie the red wool to his feet. The šurita they bind ‘to its head’.

An exact meaning of this word cannot be established. Formally, the stem could be šurita- or šurit-.

Friedrich (HW: 200) suggests that šurita is the Hurrian plural to šuri-, which he translates as “Geflecht (?)”. As the latter word denotes a part of the oracle liver, this connection is not very likely. No further etymology.

šurka/i- (c.) ‘root’: acc.sg. šu-ur-ki-in (KBo 8.130 ii 6), šur-ki-[i-in] (HT 38 obv. 8), gen.sg. šur-ki-ja-aš (KUB 33.117 i 13), nom.pl. šu-ur-ki-iš[H₁A₇] (KBo 17.22 iii 10 (OS)), acc.pl. šur-kɯ-uš (KUB 29.1 iv 16), [šu-u]r-kɯ-uš (KUB 60.113, 5), šu-ur‘-kɯ-[uš] (KUB 60.113, 6), šu-u-ur-kɯ-uš (KUB 29.1 iv 14).

Within the paradigm of this word, of which the meaning ‘root’ is well established, we find forms that belong to an i-stem (acc.sg. šurkin, gen.sg. šurkijaš) and forms that belong to an a-stem (acc.pl. šurkuš). The nom.pl. šurkiš (if correctly read, see below) is indecisive. According to Melchert (1994a: 132), Hitt. šurka/i- is connected with “Lat. surcus”, but I have not been able to find
such a word. To my knowledge, in Latin only a word *surculus* ‘twig, sprout’ exists, which the Oxford Latin Dictionary derives from *suros* ‘post, stake’. If this latter derivation is correct (and I see no reason why it should not), then a connection with Hitt. *šurka*- becomes impossible. Eichner (1973: 74) suggests a connection with ON *svir* ‘neck’, OE *swēra* ‘neck’ < *suérχio-n*-, stating that “die Bedeutungsentwicklung läuft über ‘Pfahl’”, but semantically this seems difficult to me. In my opinion, the alteration between *i*-stem and *a*-stem forms, *šurki*-/*šurka*-, could point to a foreign origin of the word.

The reading of the oldest form of this word, in KBo 17.22 iii 10 (OS), is uncertain. Neu (1980b = StBoT 25: 208) reads šu-ur-ki-*w* [I3], whereas CHD (L-N: 16) gives šu-ur-ki-*iš*-š[е-еš]. In my view, however, the whole context is to be read as:

KUB 28.8 (+) 291/s (with additions from KBo 17.22 iii 10f.)
(9) la-ba-ar-na-[a(š |šu-ur-ki-i*š*][I3]a-ru-na-aš te-e-ga-a(n)=š-še-et
(10) ú-e-mi-ja-a[n-zi la-ba-ar-na-aš (la-aḫ-ḫu-ur-n)]u-zi-ja-an-te-š=a
(11) ne-pi-iš[š=še-et x - x - x ú-e-mi-[ja-a]n-zi

‘The roots of the *labarna* will fin[d] his ground on the seas, the leafs [of the *labarna* will f]in[d [his] heaven [on the ...?]’.

We see that because of the parallelism with *lahḫurnuziantes* the word ‘roots’ should be nom.pl. as well (which means that a reading acc.pl. *šurkius* [I3] becomes impossible), and cannot have an enclitic possessive pronoun (so *šurkiš*š[е-еš] is not likely either). I would therefore suggest to read *šurkiš* [I3].

*šūtūje*/*a*-š [Ic3 > Ic2] ‘?’: 3sg.pres.act. šu-ta-a-i-ez-zi (KBo 5.2 i 61).

This word is hapax and occurs in a broken context:

KBo 5.2 i
(56) 2=ŠŪ] 7 |NA pa-aš-ši-la-an Ša-ra-a da-a-i
(57) [ ] A-NA 1 DUG A 7 |NA pa-aš-ši-la-an an-da pē-eš-ši-ja-zi
(58) [ ] A-NA 1 DUG A 7 |NA pa-aš-ši-la-an an-da
(59) [pē-eš-ši-ja-z[i ]-ni=ka=n A-NA 1 DUG ME-E
(60) [ ] pē-eš-ši-ja-az-z[i nu ŠINIG
(61) [ ] x 2 DUG A še-er šu-ta-a-i-ez-zi
‘He takes [two times] seven pebbles from the river. He throws seven pebbles into [one] jug of water, and seven pebbles into another jug of water. [...] in one jug one hundred [...] thjrows, and tamarisk [... Then] he šuţi-s the two jugs of water.’

Oettinger (1979a: 337) tentatively translates ‘vollfüllen’, which apparently is especially prompted by the formal similarity to šu- / šuay- ‘full’. This is too uncertain, however, to draw any conclusions from. Formally, the verb seems to belong to the ṭğe/α-class, which would indicate a (mechanical) reconstruction *suH-eh2-je/o-.

šu- / šuay- (adj.) ‘full’: nom.sg.c. šu-u-uš (KBo 20.8 iv 4, 6 (OS), KBo 10.23 iv y+5 (OH/NS), KUB 7.1 i 41 (OH/NS), KUB 9.28 i 13, iii 23 (MH/NS)), acc.sg.c. šu-u-un (KBo 21.72 i 13 (OH/NS), KUB 1.16 ii 58 (OH/NS), KUB 58.27 iv 10 (OH/NS), KBo 31.214, 9 (NS)), nom.-acc.sg.n. šu-u-ū (KUB 11.19 iv 22 (OH/NS), 1256/v, 7ff. (StBoT 8: 1007) (OH/NS), KBo 19.132 rev. 14 (MH/NS)), šu-u (KBo 11.12 i 5 (OH/NS), IBot 2.123, 5 (OH/NS), KBo 6.34 iii 12 (MH/NS), KUB 39.57 i 7 (NS), KUB 41.11 obv. 6 (NS)), abl.(?) šu-u-ya-u-az (KBo 38.78, 5 (MS)), acc.pl.c. šu-u-ya-mu-uš (KBo 17.1 + KBo 25.3 i 26 (OS), StBoT 25.4 i 21 (OS), KBo 17.6 ii 2 (OS)).


PIE *suH2-(o)u-

See Weitenberg 1984: 140 for attestations. This word is an u-stem adjective, as can be seen by abl. šuayaz, acc.pl. šuayamuš. So we are dealing with a root šu- followed by an ablating suffix -au- / -u-. The root is consistently spelled with plene U, which points to a phonological /so/. So e.g. acc.pl.c. šu-u-ya-mu-uš = /sōamos/ and abl. šu-u-ya-u-az = /sōauat/. In nom.-acc.sg.n. we find the remarkable form šu-u-ū. In my view, this is to be interpreted as /sōū/. The alternative spelling šu-u then must represent a contraction from this latter form to /sōu/. The spellings of nom.sg.c. šu-u-uš and acc.sg.c. šu-u-un are ambiguous: they could either stand for contracted /sōs/ and /sōn/, or for uncontracted /sōus/ and /sōun/.

Within Hittite, this adjective clearly belongs with the verb šumna-2 / šunn- ‘to fill’ which reflects *suH-no-H-, a nasal-infixed stem of the root *suH-. This means that e.g. šu-u-ya-mu-uš = /sōamos/ must reflect older */sōʔamos/ and šu-u-ū = /sōu/ < */sōʔu/. As I have shown in § 1.3.9.4.f, there are arguments that the
adjective šīur- / sīyāy- ultimately reflects *sōuh₁₃-u- / *sōuh₁₃-ou-, in which first monophthongization took place (> *sōu-/ and /sōu-/), then the intervocalic laryngeal was lost (> OH /sōu-/ and /sōau-/), after which in younger times the new diphthong /ou/ was monophthonged as well (> /sō-/). For treatment of the root *seu₅-, see at šunna₁ / šun-.

šuyā- ‘to fill’: see šuweṯ/a-d

šuṣa- ‘to push’: see šuweṯ/a-d

šuṣai- (c.) ‘rejection’ (formerly ‘bird’): nom.sg. šu-ya-iš (KBo 26.34 i 15).

This word is hapax in column i of the vocabulary KBo 26.34, of which the Sumerian and Akkadian parts are broken off. It is found in a paragraph that consists of four terms, namely (12) kar-ša-u-ya-ar ‘to cut’, (13) ya-at-kš-ya-ar ‘to jump, to flee, to fly’, (14) kap-pu-u-ya-ya-ar ‘to calculate’, and (15) šu-ya-iš. Otten and Von Soden (1968: 39-40) argued that on the basis of the Sumerian and Akkadian terms that are preserved in column ii, this paragraph can be identified as the section corresponding to Sum. HU. The Hittite part of a HU-section has also been preserved in the small fragment HT 42, where we find obv. (2) MUŠEN-eš [= HU-eš] ‘bird’, (3) ya-at-kš-ar ‘to fly’. According to Otten and Von Soden, the parallelism between these paragraphs shows that MUŠEN-eš must be equated with šu-ya-iš, which means that šu-ya-iš denotes ‘bird’. In a footnote (40f.) they suggest an etymological connection with Lat. avis and Skt. váy- ‘bird’, which has been widely accepted since, albeit with some difficulty. On the basis of the other IE languages (Lat. avis, Skt. váy-, Av. vaii-, Arm. haw ‘bird’, Gr. áινος ‘eagle’), the word for ‘bird’ must be reconstructed *h₂e₅i-s, *h₂u-éi-m, *h₂u-i-ós, but the initial *h₂- is not visible in Hittite. Moreover, the initial š- in Hittite is aberrant. Several attempts have been made to overcome these problems, e.g. by reconstructing *s-h₂u₅i- in which the *h₂ is lost due to de Saussure effect and the initial š- is an s-mobile (thus e.g. Kimball 1999: 380).

Recently, Cohen (ftbch.) has elaborately treated the vocabulary in which šu-ya-iš is attested and comes to a quite different conclusion. He convincingly shows that this text cannot be equated with HT 42 and that therefore šu-ya-iš cannot be identical to MUŠEN-eš ‘bird’. Instead, he rather interprets šu-ya-iš as a verbal noun in -ai- of the verb šuweṯ/a-d ‘to push away’ (comparing e.g. šuṣart- from šuṣart- / šurt- or linkai- from li(n)k-) and suggests that it denotes ‘rejection’. With this meaning, Cohen argues, šuṣaiš can easily be explained as the Hittite
rendering of Sum. pa-ag = HU = Akk. ezēbu ‘to abandon’ as attested in the vocabulary MSL 3, 54, line 7a.

This explanation is far more convincing than Otten and Von Soden’s one and makes more sense from a linguistic point of view. We therefore must reject the translation ‘bird’ and consequently the reconstruction *s₂-h₂-uo-. For further etymological treatment of šuyai- ‘rejection’, see at šuyē/a-² ‘to push (away)’.

šuyāje/a-³ (Ic3 > Ic2) ‘to spy’: 2sg.pres.act. šu-ya-i-e-ši (KUB 60.20 rev. 6 (OS)), 3sg.pres.act. šu-ya-i-e-zž (OS, often), šu-ya-ja-az-zi (KUB 29.28 i 9 (OS)), šu-ya-a-e-zi (KBO 12.48, 4 (OH/NS)), šu-ya-a-i-e-zi (KBO 3.1 ii 51 (OH/NS)), 3pl.pres.act.? šu-ū-ya-i-[a]n-zi] (KBO 31.117, 7 (NS)), 1sg.pret.act. šu-ya-ja-ru-un (KUB 29.1 ii 1 (OH/NS)), 3sg.pret.act. šu-ya-ia-et (KUB 17.6 i 24 (OH/NS)), šu-ya-ja-at (KBO 13.94, 9 (OH/NS)), 2sg.imp.act. šu-ū-ya-ja (KUB 29.1 i 52 (OH/NS)), KUB 41.23 ii 10 (OH/NS)), šu-ū-ya-i (KUB 41.23 ii 10 (OH/NS)), 2pl.imp.act. šu-ya-at-te[-en] (KBO 12.18 i 7 (OH/NS)).

PIE *su(H)eh₂-je/o- ??

See Oettinger 1979a: 293f. for attestations. The manyfold OS attestations of šu-ya-i-e-zzi are found in the formula par-na-aš-šē-a šu-ya-i-e-zi that is attested in the Laws. The exact meaning of this formula is not clear (in fact, it is a hotly debated topic), but formally the verbal form šu-ya-i-e-zi can hardly belong with anything else than šuyāje/a-² ‘to spy’.

This verb belongs to the tâ̄e/a-class, which consists of verbs ending in *eh₂-je/o-. Oettinger (1979a: 386) therefore reconstructs *suah₂-je/o- but does not mention any cognates. Kimball (1999: 368) reconstructs *suoh₂-i-je/o- from a root *sueh₂-i: “move quickly, turn, swing” as visible in MHG swän ‘to swing oneself’. We. chwim ‘movement, rush’ under the assumption that “[t]he semantic development would have been “turn”, i.e. “turn one’s attention to” > “look at”’: Semantically as well as formally this does not seem attractive to me, and I would therefore for the time being only mechanically reconstruct šuyâe/a- as *su(H)eh₂-je/o-.

(4) šuyāru- (adj.) ‘full, complete’: nom.-acc.sg.n. šu-ya-a-ru (OS, often), šu-ya-ru, šu-u-ya-ru (KUB 10.27 i 31 (MH/NS), KUB 36.2b ii 22 (NS)), šu-ū-ya-ru (KBO 19.144 i 12 (NS)), šu-ū-ya-ru-ū (KUB 12.29, 3 (NS)), abl. šu-ya-ru-az (KBO 19.144 i 15 (NS)), instr. šu]-ya-ru-ū-it (KBO 15.25 i 7 (MH/NS)), śu-ya-ru-it (KUB 44.50 i 10 (NS)).

PIE *suH-ōru-?

See Weitenberg 1984: 191-194 for a detailed treatment of the semantics of this word. He convincingly concludes that the word means ‘full, complete’ (and not ‘mighty, heavy’ as Puhvel 1981a suggests). The few attestations with gloss wedges could point to a non-Hittite origin. A connection with šū- / šūgay- ‘full’ (q.v.) is likely, but the formation is not fully clear. It looks as if šuyāru- reflects *suH-ōru-, but I do not know of other similar formations.

šuyāril- (gender uncertain) material to bind reed with: instr. šu-ya-ru-i-li-ii (KUB 9.28 iii 20).

The word is hapax in the following context:

KUB 9.28 iii
(18) šu-ua-an-te-es da-an-na-za ki-it-ta
(19) pó-ra-an-n=a KASKAL-ši GI-aš KÁ.GAL
(20) še-er an-da šu-ya-ru-i-li-it
(21) iš-ši-ja-an-za n=a-aš ar-ša ki-it-ta

‘The full ones, the empty one lies. In front of the road, up inside the gate, the reed is bound with šuyaril- and is layed down’.

It cannot be determined exactly what šuyaril- denotes. Formally, the word looks like a derivative of the adj. šuyaru- ‘full, complete’ (q.v.), but this does not easily give a meaningful interpretation of šuyaril-.

šūgay-: see šū- / šūgay-

šuμe/a-2 (Ic4) ‘to fill’: 1pl.pres.act. šu-ya-u-e-ni (KUB 12.63 obv. 29 (OH/MS)), 3pl.pres.act. šu-(u)-ya-an-zi (NS); part. šu-ya-an-t- (NH, often), šu-ya-an-t- (NH, often), šu-ua-an-ta-an (IBoT 1.36 ii 41 (OH/MS)); impf. 2sg.pres.act. šu-uš-ke-ši (KUB 31.143 ii 22 (OS)).

Derivatives: see šū- / šūgay-, šunna- / šum- etc.
Anat. cognates: HLUw. suwa- ‘to fill’ (1sg.pret.act. su-wa/i-ha (KARKAMIŠ A30h §3), 3sg.pret.act. su-wa/i-ta (TELL AHMAR 5 §2)).

PIE *sHu-je/o-
See Oettinger (1979a: 295) for attestations. HW (200) cites the verb as šu'yāt-, apparently on the basis of 3sg.imp. šu-ya-a-[i]-[d-du] (KUB 24.10 ii i 12 (OH/NS)), which form belongs with šu'yāa- ‘to push (away)’, however. Although Oettinger is aware of at least this possibility (1979a: 296), he cites this verb as šu'yāe-, apparently because of the fact that he believes that it is a denominative belonging to the ḫatrāe-class, derived from the participle šu'ant- ‘filled’ (o.c.: 296). Personally, however, I do not see why we cannot assume that the stem was šu'yē/a-, reflecting a *-je/o-derivative of the root *suH- ‘full’. Because a preform *suH-je/o- would regularly yield OH *šu'e/a- (cf. ḫuṣōrizi ‘they run’ < *ḫuḥi, i-émü), I assume that in this word laryngeal metathesis has taken place: *šuH-je/o- would regularly yield Hitt. šu'yē/a as is attested (note that it is thus homophonous with šu'yē/a- ‘to push’). The OS impf. šušē/a- could very nicely reflect the archaic formation *suH-skē/o- or *šuH-skē/o- (cf. Melchert 1997b: 84f, for the view that originally, *je/o-derivatives display this suffix in present-forms only, and not in non-present forms like the imperfective in -šē/a-). See šiwr- / šiwy- for further etymology.

The hapax šu-u-un-ta-an (IBoT 1.36 ii 41) shows a contraction from šu'yant-, just as ti-in-ti-eš ‘standing’, attested on the same tablet (IBoT 1.36 ii 48), which shows a contraction from tiyant-.


Derivatives: see šu'yai-.

There are three verbs that are formally quite similar: šuye/a-d ‘to push (away)’, šuye/a-d ‘to fill’ and šuṣaḷe/a-d ‘to spy’. Oettinger (1979a: 294f.) conveniently gives an overview of the paradigms and the different forms of the three verbs.

For šuye/a-d ‘to push (away)’ we see that the oldest forms show a stem šuye- besides šuṣa-. In NH times, some forms are inflected according to the highly productive hatrae-class (3sg.pres.act. šuṣaḷi, 3sg.pret.act. šuṣait and 3sg.imp.act. šuṣi[ddu]).

Oettinger (1979a: 297) convincingly connects šuye/a-d with Skt. suváti ‘to impel, to set to motion’ and reconstructs *suḥi-é-ti. For Hittite, however, no other thematic verbs are known, so despite the fact that Skt. suváti indeed reflects *suHéti I would rather reconstruct a *-ie/o-formation for Hittite. Because *suH-je/o- would have yielded OH **suje/a- (cf. ḫuṣant ‘they run’ < *ḫuṣi-é-enti), I assume that in this word laryngeal metathesis has taken place: *sHu-je/o- regularly yielded Hitt. šuye/a- as attested. The colour of the laryngeal cannot be seen in Hittite nor in Sanskrit. Note that the middle forms seem to be derived from the unextended root *sHu-: šu-ttaṭi and šu-ṭtaru besides šuṣ-attari (compare Melchert 1984a: 53101).

šuṣeri-: see šuṣeri-
-t (instr.-ending)

See Melchert 1977 for a full description of the instrumental case in Hittite. Although in NH times the only instr.-ending seems to be -it (sometimes spelled -et as well, so possibly */-it/), we find an ending -t in older texts: iš-ḥa-an-da (OS) ‘blood’ (vs. NS e-eš-ḥa-ni-it), [g]e-nu-t=a-at=kán (OS) ‘knee’, ki-iš-šar-at (OH/MS), ki-iš-šar-ta (MH/MS) ‘hand’ (vs. NS ki-iš-ša-ri-it), ū-i-ta-an-ta (OS) ‘water’ (vs. NS ū-i-te-ni-it). If we compare these to other OS instr.-forms like ḥu-u-ma-an-ti-it, ḥu-u-ma-an-te-et, [iš]-ḥar-ya-an-te-e[t], we can imagine that the original ending was *-t, and that in nouns that end in a stop an epenthetic vowel */i/ was inserted. That this ending */-it/ was spreading in pre-Hittite times already can be seen by forms like pār-ta-ū-ni-t=u-uš (OS) and [ge]-en-zu-i-t=a-at=kán (OS), possibly under influence of i-stem forms, where -it is regular (e.g. ḥal-ki-it (OS)). It should be noted that a-stem nouns show the ending -it from the oldest texts onwards (e.g. ku-un-ni-t= a (OS) of kunna-, ša-a-ki-it (OS) of šākuwa- and še-e-er-ki-it (OS) of šēr[i]-a), whereas an ending **-at would certainly have been possible.

Etymologically, it is likely that this ending is in one way or another connected with the abl.-ending -(a)z (q.v.), which can be inferred from the fact that in OH texts some pronominal stems use formal instrumentals to express ablatival function (e.g. kēṭ, apēṭ, etc.). See at -(a)z for the argumentation that this ending must reflect *(a)zi, which indicates that instr. -t goes back to *-t.

-t (pronominal nom.-acc.sg.n.-ending)

PIE *-d
This ending is occurs in e.g. nom.-acc.sg.n. [assembly ]‘that (one)’, =at ‘it’, kuit ‘what’, 1- at ‘one’ (but note that kūr- / kūt- / kī- ‘this (one)’ has nom.-acc.sg.n. kū). It is clearly identical to the pronominal nom.-acc.sg.n.-ending *-d as found in several other IE languages: e.g. Skt. tād, Av. cit, Lat. id, quid, etc.

**-t (2sg.imp.act.-ending)**

PIE *-ḍi*

This ending only occurs in i-it ‘go!’, te-e-et ‘speak!’ and the causatives in -nu-, e.g. ar-nu-ut ‘you must transport’. It is generally accepted that this ending reflects *-ḍi*, on the basis of cognates like Skt. ihi, Gr. ἰ ‘go!’, Skt. krṣuhi, Av. kṣṛṇuṣi ‘make!’, Gr. ὑπνα ‘incite!’. Note the use of the zero-grade stem: i-it ~ ihi ~ ἰ < *hij-ḍi*, ar-nu-ut ~ ὑπνα < *hjr-nu-ḍi*. This etymology shows that word-final *-i* regularly was lost in Hittite, which means that e.g. in the verbal endings of the present we must reckon with a wide-scale restoration of *-i*. Note that this suffix in principle cannot be used in favour or against the theory that a sequence *-ḍi* should have assimilated in Hittite to -š- since we possibly are dealing with loss of *-i#* before assimilation occurred at all.

**-t / -tta (3sg.pret.act.-ending of the mi-flection)**

PIE *-t*

This ending, which contrasts with the corresponding ḥi-ending -š (q.v.), shows two allomorphs. When the preceding verb stem ends in a consonant, we find -tta (e.g. e-ep-ta, e-eš-ta, e-ku-ut-ta, ya-al-ah-ta, etc.), when it ends in a vowel, we find -t (e.g. te-e-et, ar-nu-ut, zi-ke-e-et, etc.). The opinions on the interpretation of the ending -tta differ. E.g. Pedersen (1938: 98) states that e.g. e-eš-ta should be interpreted “test” and states: “die Schreibung [mit -tta] erklärt sich aus der Unmöglichkeit, mit den Mitteln der Keilschrift eine auslautende Gruppe von zwei oder drei Konsonanten auszudrücken” (thus also Kronasser 1956: 31). Oettinger believes that the vowel -a- is real here, however. He states (1979a: 9b): “Die Sprachwirklichkeit des anapytischen Vokals hinter der Endung *-t* wird durch Schreibungen wie li-in-ka-ta (niemals *li-in-ka-at*) ‘er schwor’, ḥar-ak-ta ‘er ging zugrunde’ usw. erwiesen. Sie liegt auch in e-ip-ta (niemals *e-pa-at*) ‘er ergriff’ usw. vor”, to which Melchert (1994a: 176) adds that “[t]he reality of the vowel [of -tta] is supported by the spelling e-ku-ut-ta for leg“tal ‘drank’, where **e-ku-ut would have been sufficient to spell a real **eg“tal”. An additional argument could be the fact that the instr. of ‘hand’ is spelled ki-iš-šar-at (OH/MS)
as well as ki-iš-šar-ta (MH/MS), both standing for /kiSrta/, whereas such an alternation between a spelling -ta and -at is never found in the case of the 3sg.pret.act.-ending.

All in all, we must assume that the postvocalic variant -t represents /-t/, whereas the postconsonantal variant -tta represents /-tal/. Etymologically, it is fully clear that Hitt. /-t/ must reflect the PIE secondary 3sg.-ending *-t. In postconsonantal position word-final *-t is regularly dropped (cf. e.g. nom.acc.sg.n. of stems in *-ent > Hitt. -an), which means that the forms of which the stem ends in a consonant became ending-less. In order to solve this confusing situation, the 3sg.midd.-ending *-to was taken over, which regularly yielded Hitt. /-ta/ (note that a similar scenario explains the Luwian 3sg.pret.act.-ending -tta < the middle-ending *-to and 3pl.pret.act.-ending -anta < the middle-ending *-ento, replacing *-ent that regularly yielded *-an, cf. Yoshida 1991: 369f. and Yoshida 1993).

This means that e.g. e-eš-ta ‘he was’ reflects /h₁ésta/ from virtual *h₁éš-to, replacing *h₁éš-t and that e-ku-ta-ta ‘he drank’ = /lēg’ta/ from virtual *h₁ég’št, replacing *h₁ég’št.

In NH texts we occasionally find that the original distribution between °C-ta and °V-t and °C-ta is getting blurred, e.g. pa-a-i-ta (KBo 3.7 iii 13 (OH/NS)) ‘he went’, pädda-i-ta (KBo 23.1 i 20 (NH)) ‘he ran’ (or ‘you ran’?, cf. CHD P: 353) and ya-at-ku-ut (Güterbock 1952: first tablet i 17, iii 18, third tablet i 5, iv 21 (NS)) ‘he jumped’, cf. Kimball 1999: 195.

ta (clause conjunctive particle): ta (OS), t=a-aš (OS), t=a-an (OS), ta-a=š-še (OS), etc.

Derivatives: see takku.

PIE *to-

In OH texts, we find three sentence initial conjunctive particles, nu, ta and šu, which are used, next to asyndesis, to connect sentences in a semantically neutral way (as opposed to the conjunctives =ja ‘and, also’, =ma ‘but, and’, etc., which have a specific semantic function). The exact syntactic reasons to use asyndesis on the one hand and nu, ta or šu on the other, and within that last group the choice between nu, ta or šu, are not fully clear yet. The most complete description to date is by Weitenberg (1992), who shows for instance that nu, ta and šu are obligatory in sentences that only consist of the verb and an enclitic object in order to avoid topicalization of the verb (e.g. š=uš tameššer ‘they oppressed them’, t=uš tarmaemi ‘I fasten them’ vs. **tameššer=uš and **tarmaemi=uš), and that the choice between ta and šu is governed by the
tempus of the sentence: šu when the verb is preterite, ta when the verb is present. Rieken (1999b) has analysed many OH attestations of ta and argues that this particle is used to mark the last sentence in of a piece of discourse dealing with one topic and therefore can be translated “dann”. Nevertheless, many questions regarding the distribution between no, ta and šu remain. One of the difficulties in establishing the grammar of the sentence initial conjunctive particles is the fact that the system is clearly in decline: from MH times onwards ta and šu are not part of the living speech anymore (only ta is used in MH and NH texts in some formulaic sentences), whereas asyndesis has become rare: the particle no has become the default clause conjunctive.

This unclearness regarding the synchronic use of the conjunctive particles also has a negative impact on their etymology. Nevertheless, Watkins (1963) convincingly shows that Hitt. no, ta and šu can functionally and formally be equated with the Old Irish preverbs no, to and se and that ta ~ to < *to and šu ~ se probably are related to the demonstrative pronoun *so-, *to- as attested in the other IE languages (Skt. sá, sá, tád, Gr. ἢ, το, etc.).

-ta (instr.-ending): see -t

-tta (2sg.pret.act.-ending of the ḫi-flection) PIE *-th₂e

This ending is functionally equal to its corresponding mi-conjugation ending -š. It is clear that from the earliest texts onwards, the ḫi-ending -tta is spreading at the cost of -š, first in verbs that end in a consonant: e.g. e-ep-ta (MH/MS), ḫar-ap-ta (MS), me-er-ta (OH/MS). Unfortunately no 2sg.pres.act.-forms of verbs in consonants are attested in OS texts. In NS texts, we even occasionally find that -tta is found in original miverbs in a vowel, like pa-it-ta 'you went'. In NS texts, we also encounter forms that functionally are 2sg.pret.act., but formally are identical to 3sg.pres.act. (e.g. pé-e-da-š 'you carried', ša-ak-ki-š 'you knew', ša-an-na-aš 'you concealed', u-un-mi-eš 'you carried (here)', ú-da-aš 'you brought (here)'), which may show that -tta itself is starting to get lost as well. In NS texts, we encounter half a dozen 2sg.pres.act.-forms of ḫi-verbs that show an ending -šta (a-uš-[t]a) (KBo 5.3 iii 56 (NH)), me-mi-iš-ta (KUB 15.5 iii 11 (NH)), pi-eš-ta (KBo 11.1 rev. 12 (NH)), ši-iš-ta (KBo 3.34 i 23 (OH/NS)), da-iš-ta (KUB 21.27+ i 4, 6 (NH)), ap-pi-eš-ta (KBo 8.76 rev. 4 (NS)), ya-ar-ri-iš-ši-iš-ta (KUB 31.47 obv. 13 (NH)). It is in my view not coincidental that in most of these cases these forms are formally identical to (the NH variant of) the 3sg.pret.act.-
form of these verbs (see at -ś (3sg.pret.act.-ending of the hi-conjugation) and their own lemmas). So instead of regarding these forms as showing a remarkable 2sg.-ending -stä, I just regard them as formal 3sg.-forms that are used in the function of 2sg.-forms (contra Jasanoff 2003: 119f.). See at -ś (2sg.pret.act.-ending of the mi-conjugation) for a similar phenomenon in the mi-conjugated verbs.

See at -tti (2sg.pres.act.-ending of the hi-conjugation) for etymological considerations: -ttā likely reflects the PIE 2sg.perf.-ending -th₂e as reflected in Skt. -tha, Gk. -Θα, TochB -(s)та.

=ttā: see =tti- / =ttā- / =tte-

=ttā / =ttu (encl.perspron. acc.-dat. 2sg.) ‘(to) you’

Anat. cognates: HLuw. =tu (encl.perspron. acc.-dat. 2sg.) ‘to you’ (=tu-u (ASSUR letter a §4, c §5)).

In principle the encl.perspron. of 2sg. is =ttā (e.g. nu-u=tt-ā). Sometimes, however, we find =ttu as well. The form =ttu is consistently found before =z, but occasionally in other positions as well. In the Adad-hymne, for instance, we find KBo 3.21 ii (10) li-iš-ši=ma-a=d-du ya-ar-aš-nu-an-du ‘let them assuage you in your liver!’, parallel to ibid. (12) li-iš-ši=ma-a=t-ta (13) ya-ar-aš-nu-an-du; ibid. ii (17) ik-ta-aš=ma-a=d-du-u=š-ša-an ir-ḫa-az ‘from the confines of your net; ibid. iii (3) šal-la-an-ni=ma-a=d-du-u=š-ša-a[n] ‘but ... you for greatness’. Sometimes we find =ttu in front of =kan; nu-u=d-du=kān (KUB 12.34 i 9).

Perhaps we are dealing with an original allographic pair, the distribution of which was determined by the phonetic environment. Nevertheless, the evidence is too scanty to determine this distribution. Phonetically, we could think of e.g. a basic form *tu, the -u- of which would drop in front of *o (cf. ḫn < *duojom).

In the other IE languages, the enclitic forms of 2sg. seems to be *toi for the dat.-gen. (Skt. te, Av. tā, Gr. τοῦ) and *tuē for the acc. (Skt. tvā, Av. ὑμῖν, Gr. ὑμῖν, Dor. τέ). Especially the latter form seems to fit Hitt. =ttā / =ttu, although I do not dare to give an exact reconstruction.

Derivatives: see pēdə / ped- and uđa / ud-.

Anat. cognates: Pal. unclear: 1sg.pret.act. ḏaḥḥa ‘?’, 3pl.pres.act. tenzi ‘?’, 3pl.pret.act. tāzzunta ‘?’, 2sg.imp.act. tāzzu ‘?’ (see also at dū / d-i); CLuw. ḫa- ‘to take’ (1pl.pres.act. lu-ūn-ni, lu-un-ni, 3sg.pres.act. la-a-at-ta, la-at-ta, 3sg.imp.act. la-a-ad-du, 3pl.imp.act. la-a-an-du, part. [l]a-a-im-ma-an (?)), lalā- / lalā- ‘to take’ (1sg.pres.act. la-la-a-ū-i, 2sg.pres.act. la-la-a-ti, 3sg.pres.act. la-la-a-i, la-a-la-i, la-la-i, 3pl.pres.act. la-la-an-ti, la-la-an-ti, 3sg.pret.act. la-la-a-ad-da, la-la-a-at-ta, la-la-at-ta, 2sg.imp.act. la-la-a, 3sg.imp.act. la-la-a-ad-du, 3pl.imp.act. la-la-an-du, inf. la-la-u-na), lalāma/i/ ‘itemized list, receipt’ (nom.sg. la-la-mi-ē, la-la-mi-ē, coll.pl. la-la-ma), lalatta- / (ritual) act of taking (away)’ (nom.-acc.sg. la-la-at-ta-an-za, gen.adj.abs. la-la-at-ta-aş-ti); HLuw. la(ta)-, da- ‘to take’ (2sg.pres.act. la-si (ISKENDERUN §6), 3sg.pres.act. la-i (KÖRKÜN §11), tā-i (KÖRKÜN §8, KARKAMIŞ A3 §20, KARKAMIŞ A15b, §12, BOROWSKI 3 §9, ALEPPO 2 §13, §18, KÖTÜKALE §5, BOYBEYPINARİ 1-2 §19, ANCOZ 7 §4, §9), tā-a (KARKAMIŞ A6 §27, §28, §30), 3pl.pres.act. tā-ti-i (KARKAMIŞ A11a §27), 1sg.pret.act. CAPERE(=)la-ha (MARAŞ §4 §4, §12), la-ha (MARAŞ 13 line 2, 928

IE cognates: Skt. dādāti, Av. daśāṇī, Arm. tam, Gr. δακτοῦ, OLith. duostī, Lat. dō, dāre ‘to give’, OCS dārь ‘he gave’.

PIE *dōh2-ei, *dōh2-onti

See Oettinger (1979a: 64-5), Cianelli (1978), Tischler (HEG T: 5f.) and Neu (1968: 160) for attestations. The oldest forms of this verb show a paradigm dāh3e, dātī, dāī, tumēnī, datēnī, danzī for the present and dāh3un, dātta, dās, dāyen, dātten, dāer for the preterite. Note, however that the derivatives peda(-) / ped- ‘to bring (away)’ and uda(-) / ud- ‘to bring (here)’ (formed with the prefixes pe- and u-) show forms that are more archaic, e.g. petumen and utummen vs. dāyen, petišen vs. dātten, peter and uter vs. dāer, but also petumanzi and utumanzi vs. dāyanzi and utiške/a- vs. daške/a-. All in all, I think that we have to reconstruct an original paradigm dāh3e, dātī, dāī, tumēnī, *tištēnī, danzī for the present and dāh3un, dātta, dās, *tumen, *tišten, *ter for the preterite. This means that we find a stem dā- in the singular and a stem d- in the plural (in both the present and the preterite).

It should be noted that in NH times, the paradigm has undergone some changes. We then find: daḥ3i, --, dāi, tumēni, datēnī, danzī, daḥ3un, dātta, dās, --, datten, dāer, dā, dāa, daten, dandu. These forms are completely regular according to the developments described in § 1.4.9.3: OH /aCCV/ develops into NH /aCCV/.

Already Hrozný (1915: 29) etymologically connected this verb with the PIE root *dēh2- ‘to give’. Although the semantic side of this etymology has received some criticism (but see Tischler HEG T: 7f. for an enumeration of the many scholars who have spoken in favour of a semantic development ‘to give’ > ‘to take’), the formal side has been generally accepted. The exact interpretation of this formal side has caused some debate, however. Eichner (1975a: 95f., followed by Oettinger 1979a: 500f.) assumes that this verb originally was middle (“sich etwas geben lassen”) and that 1sg.aor.midd. **daḥ3h2a** and 2sg.aor.midd. *daḥ2th3ă* regularly yielded Hitt. **daḥha** and **datta**, on the basis of which the paradigm was brought into the active and yielded daḥ3i, dātī, dāī, etc. A similar scenario is given by Melchert (1984a: 25) who states that 3sg.pres.midd. *dēh2-e/o was reinterpreted as a stem *dēh2-e/o- + zero-ending, which caused the spread of this ‘thematic’ stem in the singular, yielding *dēh2-e/o-h2eı, *dēh2e/o-th2eı, dēh2e/o-eı. These scenarios seem unattractive to me. I know of no other instance where an
original PIE middle yielded a Hittite active paradigm. The fact that the active and middle are living categories in Hittite makes it difficult to assume that an original middle did not just stay middle but was taken over into the active paradigm. Moreover, the formal sides are difficult: Eichner’s assumption that *ChVC vocalises to Hitt. CČC is unparalleled, whereas Melchert’s construct of a thematic hi-verb would be unparalleled as well (the so-called ‘thematic’ hi-verbs that are attested (the tarn(a)-class) all go back to a sequence *°CoH-/ *°CH-.

In my view, we have to take dēh-/d- at face value. It is a hi-inflecting root-present, and just as all hi-verbs it shows original *o-grade: *dōh₁-h₂ei, *dōh₁-th₂ei, *dōh₁-ei, *dh₁-gēni, *dh₁-stēni, *dh₁-ēnti. These forms regularly yield dāhhe, dēti, dāi, tumēni, *zašēni, danzi. Already in OH times, we find a spread of a secondary stem da- (on the basis of 3pl.pres.act. danzi) in e.g. 2pl.pres.act. datāni (instead of expected *zašēni, cf. *d'hiške/a- > OH /hskē/-, za-aš-ke/a-) and impf. daške/a- (instead of *zaške/a-).

**taḥḥara**: see tuḥḥara-

**uṇa ḍaḥāšṭi**: see ḍaḥāšṭi-

**taḥš-** (I1Hh) ‘to predict’: 3sg.pres.midd. to-ḥš-ṣa-at-ta-r; impf.3pl.pret.act. taḥš-ıš-ker². 

IE cognates: ?Skt. dayati ‘divides’, Gr. δαιμων ‘to divide’.

PIE *deh₂-s-?

This verb is hapax in the following context:

KUB 41.24 rev. (with additions from KUB 15.2 iv 5-9 and KBo 15.11 iv 5-10)

(1) DUB.1.KAM.NU.TIL ȘI-P[ÂT ... (ma-a)-an=(ša-an Â-NA LUGAL aq-ga-tar)]
(2) ta-ḥš-ṣa-at-ta-r [(i na-aš-m=a-at=za=kân Û a-ūṣ-zī)]
(3) na-aš-m=a-at=ši I[(Ș-TU SLMES) na-aš-m(a Ș-TU MUŠEN[II])]
(4) i-ši-ja-aḥ-ta-r [na-aš-ma-a=š-ši GIS(KIM-ıš ku-ıš-ki HUL-la-ūš)]
(5) ŠA ÜŠ pé-ra-an kl[i-ša-r]i nu (ki-i SISKUR=ȘU)]

‘First tablet. Unfinished. Conjuration[...]. When to a king death is t-ed, -- either he sees it in a dream or it is revealed to him by an entrail- or bird-oracle, or some bad sign has occurred in front of him --, (then) this is the ritual for it’.

From this context it is clear that taḥšattari must mean ‘is predicted’. A possible other form of this verb can be found in taḥš-ıš-ker², found in KBo 3.34 iii (14) ...
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(i-d)a-lu ḫe-en-kân taḫ-yāš-ker’ (the reading ker’ is ascertained by the duplicate KUB 31.38 rev. 18), if this means ‘... they predicted an evil death’.

Often, this verb is seen as a variant of takš-Š ‘to undertake, to unify’ (e.g. Kümmel 1967: 109, Oettinger 1979a: 219), but this is semantically as well as formally unlikely: in the rare cases that k alternates with ḫ, we are dealing with words of foreign origin, where an original cluster -šh- or -ḫš- occasionally becomes -šk- or -ḵš- (cf. Melchert 1994a: 170). The only case of such an alternation in an inherited word is the hapax spelling ḥa-mi-š-kân-za vs. 40+x Ḫa-meššatnt-< Ḫ2meḫ1-šh2-o-.

A better connection may be PIE *deḫ-Š ‘to allot’ (Skt. dayati, Gr. δαικτεῖν ‘to divide’). If this connection is correct we are dealing here with an s-extension *deḫ2-s- (compare paḫš-< *peh2-s-, pāš-< *peh3-s-).

tahḫuwaï/- tahḫuï: see tuḫḫuwaï/- tuḫḫuï-

dai1 / ti- (Hā4 > lC1) ‘to lay, to put, to place’: 1sg.pres.act. te-e-eḫ-hē (OS), te-e-eḫ-hē (OS), te-e-eḫ-hē (OS), te-e-eḫ-hē (OS), ti-iḫ-hē (KUB 17.28 i 28 (MH/NS), KUB 19.55+ rev. 42 (NH)), 2sg.pres.act. da-it-ti (OH/NS), ta-it-ti (KBo 3.38 obv. 24 (OH/NS)), 3sg.pres.act. da-a-i (OS), da-i (OH/NS), ti-ja-az-zi (ABoT 44 i 50 (OH/NS)), 1pl.pres.act. ti-ja-u-e-ni (KBo 3.4 iv 35, 47 (NH)), 2pl.pres.act. ti-ja-a-i-ti (KBo 8.42 rev. 1 (OS), ji-a-it-te-ni (KUB 13.6 ii 5 (NS)), 3pl.pres.act. ti-an-zi (OS), ti-ja-an-zi (OS), ti-an-ti (KUB 20.33 rev. 10 (OS)), 1sg.pret.act. te-eḫ-hu-ūn (OH/MS), ti-ja-nu-un (KUB 31.71 i 4 (NH), KUB 22.40 ii 9 (NS)), 2sg.pret.act. ta-it-ta (KUB 33.70 ii 14 (MH/NS)), da-iš-ta (KUB 21.27+ i 4, 6 (NH)), 3sg.pret.act. da-iš (OS, often), ta-iš (KUB 18.151 rev. 10, 11 (OH/MS)), da-a-iš (OH/NS), da-a-iš (KUB 15.5+ i 10 (NH), ti-ja-at (KUB 43.50 obv. 7 (NH), KUB 8.79 rev. 12 (fr.) (NS), KUB 33.118, 11 (fr.) (NS), KUB 14.14 obv. 37 (fr.) (NH)), ti-ja-at (KUB 22.40 ii 7 (NS)) 1pl.pret.act. da-iš-én (MH/MS), da-a-i-ū-én (KBo 15.10 i 32 (OH/MS)), 2pl.pret.act. da-iš-te-én (OS), 3pl.pret.act. da-a-er (OS), da-i-er (OH/MS), da-i-er (MH/MS), da-a-i-er (MH/MS), da-a-i-er (KUB 15.10 ii 30, iii 47 (OH/MS)), ti-i-e-er (KBo 3.1 i 22, 37 (OH/NS), KBo 5.8 ii 5 (NH)), 2sg.imp.act. da-i (KBo 3.23 obv. 6, 8, rev. 6 (OH/NS)), 3sg.imp.act. da-a-ū (KUB 14.3 ii 57 (NH)), 2pl.imp.act. da-iš-tēn (MH/MS), ta-iš-tēn (Bo 4222 iii 9), da-a-iš-tēn (KBo 12.18 i 3 (OH/NS), KBo 4.8 ii 17 (NH)), 3pl.imp.act. ti-an-du (MH/NS); part. ti-ja-a-an-t- (MH/MS), ti-ja-an-t-; verb.noun ti-ja-u-yā-ar (NH), gen.sg. ti-ja-u-yā-aš (NH); inf.I ti-u-ya-an-zi (KUB 26.32 i 3 (NH)), ti-ja-u-yā-
an-zi; impf. za-aš-ke/a/ (OS), zi-ke/a/ (OS), zi-ik-ke/a/ (OS), ti-iš-ke/a/ (NS), ti-es-ke/a/ (NS).

Derivatives: *tianna/- / tianni- (IIa5) ‘to lay down (impf.)’ (2sg.imp.act. ti-an-na (KUB 20.76 i 17, KBo 30.165 i 10), sup. ti-ja-an-ni-ja-a-ya-an (KUB 43.61 i-7)). *tianție/-a² (lc1) ‘to set up, to erect’ (3sg.pres.act. ti-ja-an-ți-ja-a-d[z²]-zi (HEG T: 367)), 3pl.pres.act. ti-ja-an-ți-ja-an-zi (KUB 29.1 iv 17); inf.l [ti-ja-ante-ja-ya-an-zi (HEG T: 367)), see tița/- / titi-., titmu², teșța- and tuțzi-.


PIE *dʰh₁-óí-ei l *dʰh₁-í-enti, *dʰh₁-skē/ó-

The oldest forms of this paradigm are täçihe, déatti, déäi, *tiüşeni, [i]șsteni, tianzi for the present and tehćiun, tațta, däis, daiyen, daiser, daier for the preterite. Note that the original strong stem was dai- (with short -a-), which is clearly visible in e.g. daiyen and daiș. Only in late MH times, the stem dai- was replaced by däi- on the basis of 3sg.pres.act. däg, yielding forms like dägyen and dägș in the 1sg.-forms, the stem dai- regularly monophthongized to tä- in front of -e-. In 3sg.pres.act. the preform *däij-i yielded /lädā/, spelled da-a-i (with regular loss of intervocalic -i-). Similarly in 3pl.pres.act. *däj-er, which regularly yielded lädâer, spelled da-a-er (OS). Restoration of the stem dai- yielded MS forms like da-i-e r /lädâer/, whereas later on, when the stem däi- is being generalized, forms like da-a-i-e-r /lädâer/ are found. It is often claimed that in OS there still was a difference between däer ‘they took’ and däier ‘they placed’. This view is based on KBo 22.2 (Zalpa-text) only, where we indeed find da-a-er ‘they took’ (obv. 5)
besides *da-i-er ‘they placed’ (obv. 16). Since this text has now been recognized as showing MH script and not OH script (cf. Košak 2005d: 112), the difference between *daer and daier in this text can be explained in view of the MH restoration of the stem *dai- in the paradigm of *dai-/ti-, replacing OH *daer ‘they placed’.

The original weak stem is *ti- (and not *tiia-, as often stated), which is visible in tianzi (which is *ti-anzi and not *tiia-nzi), tiandu, tianant-, tiyanzi and possibly in [t]ešteni (if this is the correct reading). Like all *dai/tianzi-class verbs, we find here as well generalization of the thematic stem *tiye/a- in younger times. Because these forms formally fell together with the verb *tiye/a- ‘to step’, it is not always easy to decide whether a form belongs here or with ‘to step’. I have cited in this paradigm only forms of *tiye/a- which are used together with the supine, as gathered by Kammenhuber 1955.

The hapax 3pl.pres.act. *ti-an-ti (KBo 20.33 rev. 10 (OS)) must be a mistake (compare correct *ti-an-zi in ibid. 7) and does not show non-assibilition of *-*ti (compare the wrong interpretation of alleged 3sg.pres.act. e-esh-ti ‘he is’ under the lemma of eš-2 / aš- ‘to be’).

Already Friedrich (1922: 169) correctly connected dai- / *ti- with the PIE root *dʰeh₁-* ‘to place, to put’ (see also at iš-2), which has been generally accepted since. Nevertheless, the exact formal prehistory of this verb has been severely debated, see Tischler HEG T: 21-3 for an extensive overview of views and reconstructions. The formal interpretation of this verb depends on one’s analysis of the *dai/tianzi-class as a whole. In the recent literature, Oettinger (1979a: 461) regarded this class as reflecting a formation *Cóh₁-i-ei, *Ch₁-i-enti (although there he assumes that dai- / *ti- has been secondarily taken over into this class, a view which he seems to have abandoned later on, cf. 2004: 401), whereas Melchert (1984: 73; 1994a: 65) reconstructs dai as *dʰeh₁-j-iei. Both reconstructions cannot be correct on formal grounds: the sequence *Vh₁jV yields OH VjV, compare OH huianzi ‘they run’ < *h₂uhiénti. As I have argued extensively in Kloekhorst forthcoming, the *dai/tianzi-class can only be explained as reflecting a formation *CC-ói-ei / *CC-i-enti, i.e. the zero-grade of a root followed by an ablauting suffix *-ói-/*-i-. For dai- / *ti- this means that we must reconstruct the following paradigm:

*dʰ₁-ói-h₂ei > róh₁hi
*dʰ₁-ói-th₂ei > daitti
*d’h₁-ói-ei > dāi
*d’h₁-ì-yêni > *tiyénti >> tiyénti
In OS texts, the imperfective is spelled za-aš-ke/a-, zi-ke/a- and zi-ik-ke/a-. In my opinion, the spelling za-aš-ke/a- must be more original and represent /tskélα-/.

Already within the OH period the anaptyctic vowel /u/ emerged in the cluster /tsk/ (cf. § 1.4.4.4), yielding /tsikélα-/ spelled zi-(ik)ke/a-. These forms are important since they must reflect *dʰh₁-ské/α- and show that originally the dā/tijanzi-class verbs did not use the element -i- in the imperfective. Note that the NS forms tiške/a- and tiške/a- are clearly secondarily built on the stem ti(e/a)-.

In the Luwian languages we find CLuw. tuja-, HLuw. tu(wa)- and Lyc. tōwε- (the appurtenance from Lyd. cu(ve)- in my view is far from assured). The generally accepted explanation of this stem *tujé/o- is given by Oettinger (1979a: 483), who assumes that this stem must be reanalysed out of “urluw. *duy拐n ‘wir setzen’”. This seems entirely ad hoc to me: the 1pl.-form is much too small a base for such an analogy. In my view, it almost seems as if we are dealing with a suffix -u- in these forms (compare e.g. Skt. dadhāu for such an u-suffix, cf. Kortlandt 1989: 111) so perhaps originally *dʰh₁-ōu-ei, *dʰh₁-u-ěnti, which was thematicized in younger times to *dʰh₁-ue/o- (compare *pije/a- ‘to give’ from original *poi-/ *pi-). The Lycian verb ta- seems to preserve the unextended root. Melchert (1994a: 67) therefore assumes that 3sg.pres.act. tadi directly reflects *dʰēh₁-ti, showing the development *-eh₁- > Lyc. -a-. Morpurgo Davies (1987: 221f.) assumes that a preform *dʰēh₁-ti should have given Lyc. **tidi, however, and she therefore proposes an intricate mixing between the roots *dʰēh₁- ‘to place’ and *deh₁- ‘to put’.


PIE *teh₁-jo-til-

See Rieken (1999a: 481) for attestations. Most forms show tajazil-, but the one attestation ta-i-IZ-zi-la-aš has to be interpreted /ṭaie’tilas/! This word is clearly a derivative in -zi- of the verb tāqe/a- ‘to steal’ (q.v.), which also explains the alteration between tajazil- and tajezil-.

See Rieken (1999a: 476) for the reconstruction of the suffix -zi- as *-ti- + *-il-. See at tāqe/a- for further etymology.

Derivatives: see tajazil.


PIE *teh₂-je/o-

See Oettinger 1979a: 396f. for attestations and treatment. The verb shows a stem tāje/a-, which has already by Hrozný (1917: 54) been compared to Skt. tāyu- ‘thief’, Gr. τὰυαο ‘to rob, etc. This means that tāje/a- must reflect *teh₂-je/o- (similar formation in Skt. stāyā́t ‘secretly’ and OCS taiti ‘to conceal’). This verb is the name-giver of the tāje/a-class, which consists of a few other verbs that go back to *-eh₂-je/o- as well.

Neumann (1961a: 64f.) claims that the Hes.-gloss τὸξαν ‘Δυδώ τον λητήν ‘thief by the Lydians’ points to a Lyd. *teju- ‘thief’, which he reconstructs as *tāju- and equates with Skt. tāyu- ‘thief’. Problematic, however, is the fact that *j should yield Lyd. d (cf. Melchert 1994b). Melchert (1988c: 39) claims that HLuw. *tā-ia-d[i] (KARKAMIŠ A24a §13) means ‘steals’, but this is rejected by Hawkins (2000: 136) because such a meaning would not fit the context. Moreover, the sign tā must be read /da/ (cf. Rieken fthc.), which does not fit *teh₂-je/o- either.

tajazil: see tajazil-

Derivatives: *taištijar* (n.) ‘?’ (nom.-acc.sg. *ta-išt-ja-ar* (KUB 59.3, 11)), see *taišzi*.

PIE *dʰoh₁-es- + *dʰh₁-o₁/-i-

**See Tischler HEG T: 28-9 for attestations. The oldest attestations belong to the mēma/i-class: tāṣṭai, dāṣṭijanje, daištijer (the forms da-išt-je-ja-an-zi (KUB 31.79 obv. 13) and da-išt-te-i-e-er (ibid. 9) probably show use of the sign TE for *ti (cf. Melchert 1984a: 137)), tūṣṭijant-. Like all mēma/i-class verbs, in younger times this verb is taken over into the tarna-class (daštanzi and daisčumanzi).**

Besides, we occasionally find forms that show a stem *taištijer*/(a*-taištijerj) and daištijae-d (daištijaezzi). As I explained under the treatment of the mēma/i-class in § 2.2.2.2.h, its verbs go back to polysyllabic dāštijanzi-class verbs. In this case, too, we therefore can reconstruct a stem *taištijer*.

Oettinger (1979a: 477) suggests that this verb is of nominal origin and reconstructs a *t*-suffixed *s*-stem: *dʰoh₁-es-*t-. This cannot easily account for the inflection, however, and has the disadvantage that we would rather expect that *dʰoh₁-es-*t-i- would show assimilation of *-t- to -z-. Rieken (1999a: 189-90) therefore adapts Oettinger’s suggestion: she accepts the explanation of dāšti as *dʰoh₁-es-* ‘which is put upon’, but suggests rather that tāištijer- is to be seen as a compound of *dʰoh₁-es-* + dait₁ / tii ‘to put a load upon’. This analysis is superior in the sense that it perfectly explains the inflection. See at dait₁ / tii- for further etymology.

**taišzi** (c.) ‘hay-barn’: acc.sg. *ta-išt-zii-in* (OS).

PIE *dʰoh₁-es-ti-

**This word is semi-hapax in §100 of the Hittite Laws:**

KBo 6.2 iv (with additions from duplicate KBo 6.3 iv 59-62)

(59) [tā(k-ku) t]a-išt-zii-in ku-išt-ki lu-uk-ki-ez-z[i] G(Ū₄)(ŠU e-eš-ti)]š-ke-ez-zl

(60) [t(=u-št=ša-an) pa-ra-a ḫa-me-eš-ḫa-an-da ar-[(nu-zi ta-išt-zii-im]

(61) [(EGIR pa) p]a-ā-i tāk-ku IN.NU DA-an-an [(NU.GAL nu ta-išt-zii-in ʔu-e-t-e)]]š-z[zi

‘If someone sets fire to a t., he will feed his (i.e. the owner’s) [cows] and will bring them to (next) spring. He will pay back the t. If there was no hay inside, he will (only) rebuild the t.’.
On the basis of this context, we must conclude that *taışzi- denotes a hay-barn in which the hay is stored with which the cows are fed during the winter.

Formally, one can hardly deny the resemblance with the verb *tājšta-/*tājšti- 'to load', but the exact connection is in debate. Some scholars who analyse *tājšta/i- as tājšt-+ reconstruct taışı- as *taışti-. This view is adapted by e.g. Melchert (1994a: 166) who reconstructs *taış-t-ti- and reckons with a rule *-stt- > -št- (and not /st'-/). These etymologies are now flawed by our reconstruction of *tājšta/i- as *d'oh₁-es- + dai₁- / ti-. Rieken (1999a: 190) reconstructs *d'oh₁-es-d'ṭ₁-ti- (assuming the same sound law as Melchert did, namely *-stt- > -št-), but this seems unlikely to me. I would prefer *d'oh₁-es-ti-, a -ti-derivative of *d'oh₁-es- 'which has been laid down' (in this case = 'hay'). For -ti-derivatives of s-stems compare e.g. Pol. długosć < *dļgostb < *dlh₁g₁-ös-ti- (cf. Rieken 1999a: 182).

tājšti-: see under juğa-

dākk₁- / dakk- (IIa2) 'to resemble': 3sg.pres.act. da-a-ak-ki (KUB 43.53 i 2ff. (OH/NS), ta-ak-ki (KBO 21.19 i 4, 5 (MH/NS), KUB 33.93 iv 31 (NS)), 3pl.pres.act. tāk-kān-zi (KBO 17.17 iv 5 (OS), KUB 43.53 i 15 (OH/NS)); 3pl.pres.midd. tāk-kān-ta-rî (KBO 22.6 i 28 (OH/NS)); verb noun? [tā]k-ku-u-ya-ar (KUB 3.110, 5 (NS)), tāk-ku-ya-ar (KUB 12.52 ii 6 (NS)).

IE cognates: Gr. ὅκί 'seems'.

PIE *dōk₁hi₁-ei, *dēk₁h₁-enti

See Tischler HEG T: 31f. for attestations. This verb clearly shows an ablaut dākk- vs. takk-. Since Laroce (1963: 71) it is generally connected with Gr. ὅκεῖ 'it seems', which is semantically as well as formally appealing. This latter verb is usually further connected with Gr. ἴκ 'to take, to accept, to receive' (with variant ἴκεῖ(AAtt.), Skt. ṭē- 'to offer, to worship', Lat. docēre 'teach' (*'to make someone take up something') < *dek-, but this seems quite unlikely to me for semantic reasons.

Within Hittite, dākkī is remarkable because it shows unlenited -kk- after ā < *ā (compare e.g. āki / akkanzi, ʾistē / īstappanzi). When we compare this to the form šākkī 'knows', of which I have argued that it must reflect *sōkh₁-ei, we see that we can reconstruct dākkī only as *dōkh₁-ei (note that *dōkh₂-ēi would have yielded Hitt. **dakkai, according to the tarn(a)-class). In the plural, takkanzi must be phonologically interpreted as /tk̚ant̚ːi/ < *dkh₁-t-enti (compare e.g. taknāši 'of the earth' /tnás/ << *d'gʰmōs).

\textbf{PIE} \textit{*d\textsuperscript{h}om + *sepa-}

The oldest (OS) attestation of this word is spelled \textit{ta-ga-a-an-zi-p}. In younger texts, the bulk of the forms is spelled \textit{da-ga-an-zi-p} or \textit{ta-ga-an-zi-p}. The spelling \textit{da-ga-zi-p} occurs a few times only in NS texts, whereas a spelling \textit{da-ga-an-zi-p} occurs only once and may not be phonetically real.

The word denotes ‘earth’ and clearly belongs with \textit{tēkan} / \textit{takn} ‘earth’ (q.v.). The distribution between the two is that \textit{tēkan} is neuter whereas \textit{tagānzepa-} is animate and can function as the ergative of \textit{tēkan} (as the subject of a transitive verb). Formally, \textit{tagānzepa-} must be analysed as showing an element \textit{tagān} (to be equated with the ending-less locative \textit{tagān} ‘on the earth’) and an element -\textit{ze/}ipa- / -\textit{se/}ipa- that seems to function as a suffix that makes female deifications of the basic word (and therefore words in -\textit{ze/}ipa- / -\textit{se/}ipa- usually show a determinative \textit{d} or \textit{f}). It is generally thought that this element -\textit{ze/}ipa- / -\textit{se/}ipa- originally was a noun that meant ‘genie’ or the like. It is clear that we find -\textit{z}- after stems in -\textit{n} (\textit{dHuriianzipa-}, \textit{dMijdanzipa-}, \textit{dŠuyanzipa-}, \textit{d} \textit{taršanzipa-}) and -\textit{s} elsewhere (\textit{dAškašepa-} (of \textit{Aška-} ‘gate’), \textit{d} \textit{Hantašepa-} (of \textit{Han-} ‘forehead’), \textit{d} \textit{Išpanzašepa-} (of \textit{išpant-} ‘night’), \textit{d} \textit{Kam(majrušepa-}). The status of the vowel is less clear since we find spellings with both -\textit{e} as well as -\textit{i}. A complicating factor is the fact that the sign \textit{ZI} can be read \textit{zi} as well as \textit{ze}. If we look at the OS spellings of this suffix, we find \textit{d} \textit{Haa-an-tašepa-p} (7x), \textit{d} \textit{Mi-ja-ta-an-zi-ep} (2x) and \textit{d} \textit{Iš-po-an-anzašepa-p} (1x) that show unambiguously -\textit{e}-, and \textit{ta-ga-a-an-ZI/}E-\textit{p} (1x), \textit{tar-ša-an-ZI/}E-\textit{p} (5x) with the ambiguous sign \textit{ZI}. Because of the total lack of unambiguous -\textit{i}-spellings in OS texts (never -\textit{ši-p})), I am inclined to read \textit{ZI} as \textit{ze} in these cases: \textit{ta-ga-a-an-ze-pa-aš} and \textit{tar-ša-an-ze-p}, which would mean that these words originally were \textit{tagānzepa-} and \textit{taršanzepa-}. In younger texts, the situation is less clear, however, since we then find spellings with -\textit{ši}- as well (\textit{Aš-ga-ši-p} besides \textit{d} \textit{Aš-ga-šepa-p}, \textit{d} \textit{Haa-an-taši-p} besides \textit{d} \textit{Haa-an-tašepa-p} and \textit{d} \textit{Kam(ma-)}-\textit{ruši-p} besides \textit{d} \textit{Kam(ma-)}-\textit{rušepa-p}) while the unambiguous -\textit{že}- is not found anymore (only \textit{d} \textit{Huu-ri-ja-an-ZI/}E-\textit{p}, \textit{d} \textit{Mi-ja-da-an-ZI/}E-\textit{p}, \textit{d} \textit{Šu-ya-an-ZI/}E-\textit{p}, \textit{da-ga-an-ZI/}E-\textit{p} and \textit{tar-ša-an-ZI/}E-\textit{p}). Melchert’s account (1984a: 342-343):
that there was a difference between -e- and -i- that was accentually governed (*ḥanta- + ṣe̱pa- vs. *dagān + sepa-) seems unlikely to me. Because of the absence of a simplex *še̱/ipa- (although one could compare the PN "Ši-ḫa-Lú-ši in CTH 81) and because its exact meaning is unclear, etymologizing is too difficult at this point.

*takkešš-_adj.: see takš-zi

taki- (adj.) ‘other, foreign(?)’; taki- ... taki- ‘the one .. the other’: dat.-loc.sg. ta-ki-i-jā (OS), ta-ki-ja (OS).

See Tischler HEG T: 38 for attestations. Usually, the word is translated ‘other’ and is therewith regarded semantically equal to *tamai- ‘other’. It is striking, however, that all examples of taki- given by Tischler belong either with URU ‘city’ or with ʿudmē ‘land’. Perhaps the difference between taki- and *tamai- is that taki- has a connotation ‘foreign’.

Kronasser (1966: 210) connects taki- with *da- ‘two’, implying a reconstruction *duo-gi- vel sim. Although this etymology seems attractive, the interpretation of the suffix -ki- is unclear. Kronasser compares it with “antaki- ‘inner room’”, but apart from the fact that the stem in fact is *antaša- (q.v.), this word is probably of Hurrian origin.

*takkišš-adj.: see takš-zi


Derivatives: see takšuyar, takšeššar, takšan, takšatar and takšul.

PIE *tékś-ti, *tks-énti

See Oettinger (1979a: 217) for attestations. The semantic interpretation of this verb is quite difficult. We find, for instance, idālu takš- ‘to treat (someone) evil’, takšul takš- ‘to conclude a peace-treaty’, KASKAL-ša takš- ‘to undertake a campaign’, É-er takš- ‘to allot a house (to someone)’, GĚŠTIN yetenit takš- ‘to mingle wine with water’. Kimball (1999: 258) states that the basic meaning of takš- must be ‘to put together’.

The oldest attested forms, takkiš[zí], takkišta, takšanzi, takšer, takšuanzi and takšiške/a- (all OS) show a distribution between takš-V vs. takšiš-C (note that -u- in takšuanzi does not count as a consonant here, whereas e.g. in ḫaryeni it does (see at ḫar(k)-)). Apparently, in the cluster *-ksC- an anaptyctic vowel /i/ (spelled e/i) emerged: /takiš/. In younger times, this anaptyctic vowel spread throughout the paradigm, yielding forms like takke/išsanzi and takkeššun. The forms that are spelled tāk-ke-e-eš- even seem to show that at one point this anaptyctic vowel received the accent: /takiš/ or even /tkiš/. Some NS forms are spelled tāg-ga-aš-C (especially found in a NH copy of the Telipinu Edict), which Tischler (HEG T: 41) interprets as another way of breaking the cluster *-ksC- with a “Hilfsvokal a” (so /takas-2/). I would rather interpret these forms as attempts to spell /taksC-1/ (without an anaptyctic vowel), which in my view is an archaizing hypercorrection: the scribe knew that takkeššanzi was the young form that had replaced older takšanzi and therefore analogically replaced correct takke/išC with /taksC-1/, spelled taggašC-.

In a mi-inflecting verb, it is quite awkward to find a vowel -a-, since all miv- verbs show a reflex of original e-grade. Melchert (1994a: 140, on the basis of Oettinger 1979a: 219) therefore hesitatingly suggests that we have to reckon with a development *Tēks-Ci > *takšCi (i.e. *-e- > -a- before two obstruents followed by a consonant). This is rejected by e.g. Watkins (1985: 253), however, who therefore must reconstruct *toKS- with an aberrant a-grade. For takšišanzi = /tksánte/ < *TKs-énti compare e.g. taknuš‘ ‘of the earth’ = /hnás/ << *džmós.

Sturtevant (1930c: 214) etymologically connects takš- with Skt. takṣ- ‘to hammer, to build’, which has been followed by many scholars who subsequently reconstruct *tekṣ-. This etymology is problematic, however, in view of the fact that Skt. takṣ- rather reflects *te-tk-, an old reduplication of the root *tek- ‘to create’. I therefore rather follow Oettinger (l.c.) who connects takš- with Lat. texō ‘to weave, to unify’ and OP ham taxša- ‘to put together’ from *teks-.
**takšan-** (n.) 'centre, joint, combination'; *takšan šqr*- ‘to put in half, to divide’; *ták-ša-an.*

Derivatives: **takšan** (adv.) ‘together’ (*ták-ša-an* (OS)).

See Tischler HEG T: 43f. for attestations and treatment. This word is clearly derived from the verb takš-². See there for further etymology.


Derivatives: **takšatn/i/-a/-** (lc1) 'to level' (3pl.imp.midd. *ták-ša-at-ni-j-a-an-taru* (KUB 15.34 ii 52 (MH/MS)); impf.2pl.imp.act. *ták-ša-at-ni-iš-ke-še*-et-tén (KUB 15.34 i 45 (MH/MS))), **takšanna- / takšanni-** (IIa5) 'to level' (impf.3sg.pret.act. *ták-ša-an-ni-iš-ke-et* (KBo 10.2 ii 5 (OH/NS))).

PIE *tks-år*

See Tischler HEG T: 45f. for attestations. Originally, *takšatar* must have been a verb.noun of *takš*-², and probably have meant ‘unification’ vel sim. Such an original meaning is not graspable anymore, but a semantic development to ‘level, plain’ is comprehensible. Note that the two verbal forms that show a stem *takšatn/i/-a/-* (both in KUB 15.34) must be of Luwian origin, showing the un-assimilation of the cluster *-m-*, which yielded regular Hittite *-nm-* in *takšannaš* and *takšanna- / takšanni-*. See takš-² for further etymology.

**takšeššar** (n.) 'combination, arrangement, settlement': nom.-acc.sg. *ták-še-eššar=še-et-t=a* (KBo 17.29 + KBo 20.1 i 6 (OS)), *ták-še-eš=še-t=a* (KBo 20.8 iv 1 (OS)), *ták-še-eš-šar=še-et* (KBo 10.28+33 v 12 (OH/NS)), *ták-še-eš-šar* (KBo 6.26 iii 8 (OH/NS)), *ták-še-eš-[šar]*/[šar] (KBo 30.82 i 14 (OH/NS)), [ták]-ši-iš-šar (VSNF 12.14 obv. 10 (OH/NS)).

PIE *tks-ēššyr*

This noun is attested in nom.-acc.sg. only. The one OS attestation *ták-še-eš=še-t=a* has caused some debate on the original form of this word. E.g. Rieken (1999a: 387-9) states that we have to reckon with an original stem *takšeš / takšešn-*'. Others (e.g. Tischler HEG T: 47) just emend the form to *ták-še-eš-šar=še-t=a* on the basis of the multiple other attestations of *ták-še-eš-šar*. The word clearly is derived from takš-², see there for further etymology.


PIE *tks-ul

This word is clearly a derivative in -ul- from the verb takš-́. The MH attestation ták-šu-ú-ul shows that just as in aššul and uššul / yaššul the accent was on the suffix. See takš-́ for further etymology.

takšuýar (n.) ‘friendship(?): nom.-acc.sg. [ták]šu-ya-ar (KUB 15.34 ii 20 (MH/MS)), ták-šu-ya-ar (Bo 3234 rev. 8 (MH/MS)).

PIE *teks-yr

See Tischler HEG T: 49 for treatment. This word only occurs inbetween Ǧšij añar ‘love’ and DINGIRMEŠ-š Ǧšij añar ‘love of the gods’ and therefore must denote a similar notion, e.g. ‘friendship’ or the like. It is clearly originally a verb.noun of the verb takš-́. See there for further etymology.

 takku (conjunction) ‘if, when’: ták-ku (OS).

PIE *to-k*e

This conjunction is used in OH times only: from MH times onwards its function is taken over by mēn. It is probably made up of the sentence initial conjunction ta and the particle =ku (see at there own lemmas), and reflects *to-k*e. Therewith it is formally identical to Gr. τότε ‘then’ and OCS takb ‘thus’. This etymology is important as it shows that *k*e yields Hitt. /kʷ/ and not /gʷ/ (pace Melchert 1994a: 61). Note that in this word the preceding *o does not lenite the following *kʷ, which shows that the *o cannot have been accentuated (see § 1.4.1 for my view that *o caused lenition of the following consonant). This coincides with Melchert’s views (1998a) that sentence initial conjunctions were inherently unstressed. I assume that in *tok*e the word-final *e was apocopated, which
means that *takuu represents /takʷu/ (contra Garrett *apud* Melchert 1994a: 184, who assumes that word-final *e* in *toku*e first was weakened to *takʷ*, after which *ʔ* was coloured to /u/ due to the preceding labiovelar, which means that *takuu = /takʷu/).


PIE dā + *lh₁-oи-еi, dā + *lh₁-i-enti.

The oldest attestations (OS) of this verb, *tālai*, *dālai*, *tālahān, tālir, dālīsten*, show that originally this verb belongs to the mēma/i-class: dāla-̂ / dāli-. As I have explained in the treatment of the mēma/i-class in § 2.2.2.2.h, this class consists of polysyllabic verbs that used to belong to the dā/tijanzi-class but are gradually being taken over into the tarn(a)-class, having the mēma/i-inflection as an intermediate stage. Also in the case of dāla/i- this is visible since we find some specific tarn(a)-class forms in younger (NS) texts: dālanzi, dālas, dālandu and dālum. That this verb originally was dā/tijanzi-inflected is visible in the fact that in younger (NS) texts we find many forms that show a stem dālije/a-̂. Once, we find a form that shows a stem dālje-a-̂ (dālaiizzi (MS)), which is built directly on the original 3sg.pres.act. dālai. So all in all, despite the wild variety of forms, we can safely conclude that originally this verb must have shown an inflection *dāla-̂ / dāli-.*

Because of the disyllabity of the stem, this verb cannot directly reflect a PIE root. Therefore, etymological proposals like Kapancjan’s connection with Arm. t’olun ‘to let, to endure’ (1931-33: 63) or Petersen’s connection with Lat. tollī ‘to bear’, Goth. buulan ‘to endure’, etc. (1937: 210) cannot be upheld anymore. Oettinger (1979a: 488, with reference to Eichner) proposes to connect dālai/i- to lāl- / l- ‘to loosen, to releave’ (q.v.), which semantically is convincing. In his view, we are dealing with a preverb dāl- < *dāl-, which is supposed to be an ablaut-variant of Lat. dē ‘from, away’, followed by lā-/l-. Problematic, however, is the fact that we have no other examples of *dāl- (or *dē- for that matter) in Anatolian. Moreover, the second part of dālai/i- cannot be directly equated with lā-/l- since
the former verb belongs to the mēma/i-class that goes back to the dēwiti/anzi-/class
< *CC-oj- / *CC-i-, whereas lā-/ reflects *lōh₁-i, *lh₁-enti. So, although I do
believe that we have to assume some kind of compound of which the second
element is cognate with lā-/ (but showing a different inflection), the exact origin
of the first element remains unclear to me. Perhaps we are dealing with a
compound like *dōh₁-lh₁-(o)-i- ‘to leave it like it was put’.

talli- (adj.) ‘pleasant(?)’: nom.pl.c. ta-al-li-eš

Derivatives: talliğêš²,² (Ib2) ‘to be pleasant(?)’ (2sg.imp. tal-li-i-e-eš; part.
da-al-lišša-an-t-).

IE cognates: OCS u-toliti ‘to soothe’, Lith. tilti ‘to become quiet’ and OIr.
tu(i)lid ‘sleeps’.

PIE *tolH-i- ?

Hapax in KUB 30.19+ iv (21) ki-i=ya-a=t-ta ta-al-li-eš a-ša-a[n-du] ‘these
(offerings) shall be t. to you’. It is quite likely that ta-al-li-eš means ‘pleasant’ or
similar here. Formally, this form can belong with an i-stem as well as an a-stem
adjective. An inner-Hittite cognate could be the verb talliğêš²,², which is found in
the following context:

VBoT 24 iii
(37) an-da=kân e-ḫu ⁴LAMMA KUS kur-ša-aš
(38) nu-u=n-na-aš=ša-an an-da mi-i-e-eš
(39) nu-u=n-na-aš=ša-an an-da tal-li-i-e-eš

‘Come inside, o tutelary deity of the k. Be kind to us! Be t. to us!’.

On the basis of this context, talliğêš²,² must be translated ‘to be pleasant’, which
would certainly fit ta-al-li-eš, and determines the latter form as an i-stem
adjective. A meaning ‘to be pleasant’ could also fit the participle dalliššant- in the
following context:

KUB 31.127 + ABoT 44 iv
(8) nu=mu DINGIR =IA da-al-lišš-[a-a]n-ti UN-šši UD KAM-HJA-uš
(9) i-da-(<da>)-la-e-eš GE uš HUL-e-eš ma-ni-in-ku-ya-an
(10) le-e tar-na-at-ti

‘O my god, may you not release bad days and bad nights in the vicinity of me,
a pleasant man!’.
According to Oettinger (1979a: 251) these words may belong with talliye/a-² ‘to pray for’, which he connects (o.c.: 346) with OCS u-toli-ti ‘to soothe’. Although I do not find the connection with talliye/a-² very appealing (see there for an alternative etymology), the connection between talli- ‘pleasant(?)’, talliğēšš- ‘to be pleasant(?)’ and OCS u-toli-ti ‘to soothe’ is in my view at least a possibility. LIV² connects OCS u-toli-ti further with Lith. ilti ‘to become quiet’ and OIr. tu(j)id ‘sleeps’ and reconstrucets *telH-. For Hittite, this may mean that we have to reconstruct *tolH-i.


IE cognates: ON telja, OE tālian ‘to tell’, Gr. ὄνομα ‘list’.

PIE *de/olH-je/o-?

See Tischler HEG T: 58f. for attestations. The verb denotes the evoking of deities. Within Hittite, this verb is sometimes connected with talli- ‘pleasant(?)’ and talliğēšš- ‘to be pleasant(?)’ (see under talli-), but this does not make sense semantically. Tischler (1979: 265) rather connects talliye/a- with ON telja, OE tālian ‘to tell’, Gr. ὄνομα ‘guile, trick’, which is semantically better. If correct, the geminate -ll- in Hittite seems to point to *-IH-. We therefore should reconstruct a root *delH-, with Hitt. talliye/a- reflecting *delH-je/o- or *dolH-je/o- (a pre-form *dIH-je/o- is impossible, cf. e.g. pārijanzi ‘they blow’ < *prhjzenti).


Derivatives: talīga (adv.) ‘long’ (ta-lu-ú-ga (OH/NS)), daluknu-² (Ib2) ‘to lengthen’ (2pl.imp.act. ta-lu-ga-mu-ú-tén (OH/MS)), daluknul- (n.) ‘lengthening’ (all.sg. da-lu-uk-mu-la (KUB 12.63+ obv. 30 (OH/MS)), dalukēšš-² (Ib2) ‘to become long’ (3sg.pres.act. da-a-lu-ke-eš-zi (OH/NS), ta-lu-keš-zi (OH/NS), da-lu-ki-iš-[z]- (OH/NS), ta-lu-ki-iš-zi (OH/NS); part. ta-lu-ki-iš-ša-an-t- (OH/NS)), dalugasta- ‘length’ (dat.-loc.sg. da-lu-ga-aš-ti, ta-lu-ga-aš-ti), see zaluknu-² and zalukēšš-².
IE cognates: Skt. dīṛgha-ı-, GAv. dar-qa-, OCS d bénéfic, Russ. долги́й, SCr. дъг, Lith. ilgas, Gr. ὀλυκός, Goth. lāggis, ON langr, Lat. longus ‘long’.

PIE *dölǘgʰ-i-

The oldest forms of this word, nom.pl.c. taluğaś, acc.pl.c. taluğāś and dat.-loc.pl. taluğaś (all OS) clearly show that it originally was an i-stem adjective (so taluğaś < *taluğaiš), despite the fact that no form with taluki- is attested. In NS texts, we find some attestations that show specific a-stem forms: nom.sg.c. GİD.ĐA-āś, acc.sg.c. taluğan (both NS), which must be analagous to oblique cases where *-aḫā- > -a- (e.g. gen.sg. *daluğāś < *dalugaiš, etc.). The one u-stem form dat.-loc.pl. daluğanuša must be regarded as a mistake (cf. Tischler HEG T: 62). The derivatives daluknu-z², dalukšši-z² and daluğati- are derived from the bare stem talug- (without -i-). See at zaluknu-z² for my view that zaluknu-z² ‘to lengthen’ and zalukšši-z² ‘to become long’ are cognate with talug-in the sense that they reflect the zero-grade stem *dług- (showing the development *#Tl > #zl-) whereas talug- goes back to *dölǘg- (cf. the occasional plene spelling da-a-šu-kʰ). The verbs dalugnu-z² and dalukšši-z² have generalized the full grade stem talug-.

Already since Hrozný (1915: 28) this word is generally regarded as cognate with the other IE words for ‘long’, although the reconstruction of one proto-form is quite difficult. Skt. dīṛgha-, GAv. dar-qa-, OCS d bénéfic, Russ. долги́й, SCr. дъг, Lith. ilgas all reflect *dhl1gʰ-o- (the laryngeal is determined as *h₁ on the basis of Gr. ἐνδεχόμενον ‘lasting long’ < *delh₁gʰ), whereas Gr. ὀλυκός must reflect *dol-i-gʰ-o- or *dolh₁gʰ-o-. Goth. laggs, ON langr, Lat. longus ‘long’ reflect *dlongʰ-o-, however (*dhl₁ongʰ-o- is possible only if one assumes that initial *d- was dropped before the vocalization of *-l- in Germaic, otherwise we would expect PGerm. *tulanga-). Hitt. taluki- then seems to reflect *dölǘgʰ-i- (note that *dohl₁ugʰ-i- is impossible since *VRh₁V > VVRV, cf. zimmazzi < *tinh₁ěnti, ʾaṭra < *h₁ʾorh₁-ei). So, all in all, for Hittite we have to reckon with a pre-form *dölǘgʰ-i- besides *dlugʰ-nēu- and *długʰ-éh₁šiši-. The exact relation between *d(o)lugʰ-, *d(e)h₁gʰ-, *d(o)ligʰ- and *dlongʰ is unclear. Perhaps we are dealing with a petrified pair (cf. ModEng. high and dry, safe and sound) of which the first element was *de/ol- and the second element has been eroded to *-gʰ- only.

For the interpretation of da-lu-uk-nu-la as all.sg. of a noun daluknu- see Rieken 1999a: 465f. (pace the reading 3pl.pret.act. da-lu-uk-nu-ûr by CHD P: 158). The noun daluğaiši- ‘length’ has been compared with Pol. długość ‘length’ < PSl. *dłgostę. If correct, it would show non-assibilation of *-ti- in a cluster *-sti- (cf. Joseph 1984: 3-4).
taluppant-: see at tarupp-2.


Derivatives: tameuman- (adj.) ‘belonging to someone else, strange, different’ (nom.acc.sg.n. ta-me-u-ma-an (OH/NS), [ta-]mi-u-ma-an (OH/NS), da-me-u-ma-an (MH/MS), da-me-u-ma-an (NS), ta-me-e-u-ma-an (Bo 6109, 4 (StBoT 17: 25)), tameumanneș3 (lb2) ‘to become different, to change (instr.)’ (3sg.pret.act. ta-me-um-me-ęš-ta (NS); part. nom.acc.sg.n. ta-me-um-mi-ų-[š-š]a-an (NS), [ta-me-u]m-mi-ęš-ša (NS))), damiummah- (IIIh) ‘to change (trans.)’ (3sg.pres.midd. da-mi-um-mah-da-ri (NS), 3sg.pret.midd. [da-mi-u]m-ma-ah-ta-at (NS)).

PIE *tmh₁-o|-/*tmh₂-e-?

This adjective shows a mixed nominal and pronominal inflection, showing a stem *tam- besides tame-: tamgūš, tamgūn, tamgū, tam̃da(ni), tam̃daz, tamaeš < *tamg̃es, tamg̃uš < *tamg̃iuš, tamgū, tam̃daš.

For etymological considerations it is important to establish whether we are dealing with /tam-/ or /tm-/. The first option seems to be required in view of the few attestation ta-a-mə and da-a-mə. Yet since these forms are found in NS texts only they may not be very probative. If however the word indeed is /tm-/, we could think of a connection with tān ‘for the second time’ < *duo-i-om (cf. e.g. Kronasser 1956: 151-2). Then we should reconstruct *dwoi-o-, *dwoi-m-, although the origin of *-m- is not fully clear to me. If we are dealing with /tm-,
however, we could perhaps think of a connection with the IE root *temh₁- ‘to cut’ (Gr. τάμων, τάπο to cut’, Lat. temnō ‘to despise’, Mlr. tammāi to cut’, etc.), compare e.g. ModEng. separate for the semantics. We should then reconstruct *tmh₁-oi-, *tmh₁-e-, which in my view formally is more appropriate.


tamāšš-d / tamešš- (la6) ‘to (op)press’ 1sg.pres.act. ta-ma-aš-mi (KUB 24.15 i 16 (NS)), ta-ma-aš-mi (KUB 24.14 i 16 (NS), KUB 36.35 i 2 (fr.), 14 (NS)), 2sg.pres.act. ta-ma-aš-ti (KBo 14.15, 4 (NH)), 3sg.pres.act. ta-ma-aš-zi (IBoT 1.36 i 34 (MH/MS)), ta-ma-aš-zi (KUB 32.9 obv. 2 (fr.) (MS), KUB 35.21 rev. 16 (fr.) (MS), KUB 13.4 iii 75 (OH/NS), KUB 12.49 i 10 (NS), KUB 58.34 iv 18 (NS), da-ma-aš-zi (KBo 4.2 i 42, 44 (OH/NS), KUB 44.61 rev. 25, 31 (MH?/NS)), Luw.? da-ma-aš-ti (KBo 5.9 ii 26 (NH), [t]a-mi-iš-z[t] (KBo 18.69 rev. 12 (MS)), da, me-eš-zi (KUB 12.2 iii 15 (NS)), 3pl.pres.act. da-me-iš-sa-[a]-zi (KUB 29.48 rev. 19 (MH/MS)), ta-me-eš-sa-an-zi (Oettinger 1979a: 122 (MH)), ta-ma-[a]-ša-an-[í] (KUB 15.34 i 44 (MH/MS)), da, ma-ša-sa-an-zi (KUB 59.34 iii 7 (NS)), 1sg.pret.act. ta-ma-aš-su-un (KUB 21.19 iii 32, 33 (NH)), da-ma-aš-su-un (KUB 3.6 ii 8 (NH), KUB 1.6 ii 17 (NH)), 3sg.pret.act. ta-ma-aš-ta (KUB 24.4 obv. 15 (OH/MS), KBO 24.11 rev. 7 (NS)), ta-ma-aš-ta (KUB 24.4 obv. 16 (OH/MS), HKM 6 obv. 6, 7 (MH/MS), KUB 26.75 obv. 8 (fr.) (OH/NS), KUB 24.3 i 26 (MH/NS), KUB 14.14 rev. 24 (NH)), da, me-eš-ta (KBo 13.68 obv. 11 (NS)), 1pl.pret.act. ta-me-eš-šu-u-en (KBo 3.60 ii 13 (OH/NS)), 3pl.pret.act. ta-me-eš-šer (KBO 22.2 rev. 12 (OH/MS)), da, mi-[i]-šeš-šer (KBo 3.38 rev. 29 (OH/NS)), ta-ma-aš-šer (KBo 3.4 ii 75 (NH), KBO 16.1 iv 33 (NH), KUB 13.34 i 36 (NS)), ta-ma-aš-śi-er (KUB 33.95 iv 9 (NS)), da, me-eš-śi-er (AT 545 ii 22 (NS)), 3sg.imp.act. ta-ma-aš-du (KUB 33.66 i 16 (OH/MS)), ta-ma-aš-du (KUB 33.93 iii 31 (NS)); 3sg.pres.midd. ta-ma-aš-ta (KUB 5.6 ii 38 (NS), da-ma-aš-ta-ri (KUB 15.29 i 12 (NS)), 3sg.pret.midd. ta-ma-aš-ta-at (KBO 4.6 obv. 25 (NH), KUB 14.10 i 8 (NH), KUB 14.12 obv. 3 (NH)); part. ta-mi-eš-śa-an-t- (KUB 12.43, 10 (OS), ta-me-eš-śa-an-t- (IBoT 1.36 iii 59 (MH/MS)), ta-me-iš-śa-an-t- (KUB 60.164 ii 10 (NS)), ta-ma-aš-śa-an-t- (KBO 3.4 + KUB 23.125 iii 51 (NH), KUB 23.70 obv. 70 (NS)), da-ma-ša-an-t- (KUB 19.29 iv 5 (NH), KUB 22.70 obv. 81 (NH), CTH 81.4 ii 20 (NH)), da, ma-ša-śa-an-t- (KUB 20.2 iv 14 (OH/NS), KUB 5.1 ii 8, iii 31 (NH), 1342/v, 5 (undat.)); verb.noun gen.sg. da-ma-aš-śu-aš (KBO 18.181 rev. 26 (NS)); inf.I ta-ma-aš-śu-ya-an-zi (IBoT 4.25 rev. 6 (OS?)); impf. da-me-eš-ke/a- (KBO 22.1 obv. 1, 19 (OS), KUB 15.32 iv 3 (OH/MS), ta-me-eš-ke/a (KBO 22.1
Derivatives: see damme/išḫā-. IE cognates: Gr. ἐκθέμω ‘to tame’, OIr. damnaim ‘to tie up’, Skt. damāvāti ‘to tame’, Lat. domāre ‘to tame’.

PIE *dmēh₂-s-ti, *dmh₂-s-enti

In OS and MS texts, this verb is consistently spelled with single -m- (ta-mē and da-mē). In NS texts we encounter numerous spellings with the sign DAM, which at first sight seem to indicate -mm-. Melchert (1991: 126) convincingly argues that in NS texts the sign DAM can be read da₃ (besides normal dam), however, and I therefore have adopted that reading here (cf. also išdamašš- ‘to hear’ under the lemma (UZI) ištāman- / ištamin-).

The oldest attestations (OS and OH/MS) of this verb are ta-ma-a-št-ta, ta-ma-ş-ta, ta-me-eš-šir, ta-ma-a-št-du, ta-mi-eš-ša-an-t-, ta-ma-a-šš-u-ya-an-zi, da-me-eš-ke/a- and ta-me-eš-ke/a-, which clearly show that we are dealing with an original ablaut tamāšš₂ / tame/išš-. This makes this verb unique in Hittite since there are no other -ā/-e/ ablauting mi-verbs. Because of its singularity, the ablaut is prone to be analogically altered, and therefore we find aberrancies already in MS texts: 3sg.pres.act. [t]amišz[ti] (MS) and 3pl.pres.act. tamolššanzi (MS). In NS texts, we can see that the original ablaut pattern is getting blurred: -a- is spreading in weak-stem forms (tamaššanzi, tamaššant- and tamaške/a-) and -e- in strong stems forms (damēšzi and damešta).

Already since Sturtevant (1932b: 119f.) this verb is generally connected with Gr. ἐκθέμω, Skt. damāvāti, etc. ‘to tame’ < *demh₂-. This means that tamāšš-/tame/išš- must show an s-extension of some kind. The exact nature of this -s- remains unclear. It has been viewed as an aorist-s- (Sturtevant l.c. and followers) or as a present-suffix comparable to the s-future of other IE languages (Pedersen 1938: 90, 95f. and followers), but no theory has won general acceptance. It is clear, however, that within Hittite tamāšš-/tame/išš- has to be compared with other s-extended verbs like kane/išš₂ ‘to recognize’, kalšš₂ / kalšš- ‘to call’, karš₂ ‘to cut’, pašš₁ / pašš- ‘to drink’, ānš₁ ‘to wipe’, ḫane/išš₂ ‘to wipe’ and paḫš₁ ‘to protect’.

Despite the fact that the etymological connection with *demh₂- is well accepted, there is no consensus on the exact interpretation of this verb. The first problem lies in the fact that tamāšš-/tame/išš- seems to reflect phonetic /tmVS-/ as if from *dmVh₂-s-, whereas the bare root has a full-grade *dmh₂-. Such a Schwebe-
ablaut is not unparalleled in s-extensions, however, compare *mleiks- from *meik-, *h2leks- from *h2elk- and h2ueks- from *h2eug- (cf. LIV² under their respective lemmas). I therefore assume that tamāšš-/tame/išš- indeed goes back to *dmVh2-s-.

The second problem lies in the reconstruction of the ablaut-pattern of the proto-forms. Because of its uniqueness within Hittite, the synchronic ablaut -ā/-e/i- cannot be of secondary origin in the sense that it is the result of a morphologic analogy: there is no model in analogy to which this ablaut could have been created and it therefore must be the result of phonetic developments. In Kloekhorst fhc.f I have extensively argued that the -e/i- of the weak stem tame/išš- must be an anaptyctic vowel /i/ that emerged in the cluster *CRHsv > CRissV (similarly in qnmh{senti > kan/e/iššanz ‘they recognize’, *h2mh{senti > han/e/iššanz ‘they wipe’ and *kmh{senti > galisšanz ‘they call’). So tame/iššanzi /tmisan’ti/ must reflect *dmh{senti (note that han/e/iššanzi < *h2mh{senti shows that *dmh{senti regularly should have yielded **tame/iššanzi: it is easy to understand how -m- is restored here on the basis of the strong stem tamāšš- where it was regular maintained, whereas the strong stem that corresponds to han/e/iššanzi underwent a development *m > n as well: *h2omh{sêzi > qnsi). Because of the O-grade in the weak stem, we would a priori assume that the strong stem had ordinary full-grade *e: *dmēh-s-ti. This form should have regularly become *tmahšzi, but because of the absence of -h- in the weak stem /tmš-/ it was removed in the singular as well, yielding tamāšzi. All in all, the precise developments must have been as follows: *dh{senti > *dmi{senti > *dmisant’i (with analogical reintroduction of -m-) in analogy to which *dmāš/ti (< *dmēh/sti) was altered to *dmāšt’i. The regular outcomes of *dmisant’i was Hitt. /tmisan’ti/, spelled tame/iššanzi, and the regular outcome of *dmāšt’i was Hitt. /tmast’i/, spelled tamāšzi. This means that tamāšzi, tame/iššanzi ultimately goes back to a paradigm *dmēh2-s-ti, *dmh2-s-ênti.

*tame(n)k² (Ib3) *(act. trans.) to affix, to attach; (midd. and act. intr.) to stick to, to join, to have an affection for: 1sg.pres.act. ta-me-ni-ik-mi (Bo 3445, 11 (MS)), 3sg.pres.act. da-mi-ni-ik-zi (KBo 17.105 iv 3 (MH/NS)), ta-me-ek-zi (KUB 23.1+i 9 (NH)), 3pl.pres.act. ta-me-ni-kân-zi (KBo 20.116 rev.’ 10 (MH/NS)), ta-mi-[n]i-kân-zi (KUB 25.48 + 44.49 ii’ 28 (MH/NS)), ta-me-en-kân-z[i] (KUB 21.34 rev. 11 (NS)), 3pl.pret.act. da-me-in-ker (VBoT 58 i 40 (OH/NS)); 3sg.pres.midd. dam-me-ek-ta-ri (KUB 21.29 iv 9 (NH)), ta-me-ek-ta-ri (KUB 7.41 i 26 (MH/NS), KUB 41.8 i 5 (MH/NS)), da-me-ek-ta-ri (KBo 10.45 i 19 (MH/NS)), 3pl.pres.midd. ta-mi-in-kân-ta-ri (KBo 15.35+33 i 4 (MH/MS)),
This verb shows a few different stems. In the middle forms, we encounter the stem tame(n)k- (showing the distribution tamek-C vs. tamep/ink-V), but in the active forms we find the stems tame(n)k- as well as tamened(n)k- (e.g. tamenkimi, daminikzi). In my view, this latter stem must be regarded as a secondary creation in analogy to the verbs of the type Carni(n)k².

Since Van Brock - Mac Gregor (1962a: 32f.), tame(n)k² is generally connected with Skt. tanakti (tāṅc-) ‘to pull together, to coagulate’ and therefore must reflect the PIE root *temk-. It is remarkable that both Sanskrit (tanak- < *tm-ne-k-) and Hittite (tamenk- < *tm-Vn-k-) show a nasal infix formation, and there has been much debate on the exact formal connection between these two (see Tischler HEG T: 78 for an overview of different opinions). See chapter 2.2.4 for my account of the prehistory of the nasal infixed verbs.
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See Otten 1973: 52 for attestations. This noun and its derivatives are almost consistently spelled with the sign DAM. Although in NS texts this sign can be read da, as well (see e.g. tamgɪssel2 / tame/ɪs- and istaman2 / istamin-), its usage in MS texts and especially the OS attestation tɛqɑm-[m]i-ɪs-hɑ-an-t- show that all attestations should be read with geminate -mm-. We find spellings with -ʃa- as well as -e- in MS texts already, which points to a phonological interpretation /daMɪsHa-/.

Already Götzte (1930: 179) connected damme/ɪʃhɑ- with the verb tamɡɪssel2 / tame/ɪs- ‘to oppress’. Although this is generally accepted, the fact that damme/ɪʃhɑ- shows geminate -mm-, whereas tamɡɪssel2 / tame/ɪs- does not, is significant. As I have shown under the lemma of tamɡɪssel2 / tame/ɪs-, this verb has to be phonologically interpreted /tmɪs-/ /tmiʃ- and goes back to *dmɪh₂-s-ti, *dmɪh₂-s-ɛnti. The noun damme/ɪʃhɑ- must be phonologically interpreted /tɑmɪʃHɑ-/ however, with a real vowel -a- between d- and -mm-. This vowel can only reflect a real PIE vowel. I therefore reconstruct *dmɪh₂-ʃhɔ-. For the development of *CeRHsC > CaRRsC compare kallista /kάLista ‘called’ < *kɛlɪhst(o).

For the suffix -ʃa- compare e.g. palzahha-, ḥameʃha-, teʃha-, etc.

dampu- (adj.) ‘blunt’: nom.-acc.n. dam-pu (OH/NS).

PIE *tomt-ū-

See Tischler HEG T: 86f. for attestations. The adj. dampu- occurs two times only, both times in contrast with alpu- (q.v.). From the contexts it is clear that one of these forms must mean ‘sharp’ and the other ‘blunt’, but for a long time it has been debated which word meant what. See now Tischler (1.c.) for an overview of the debate on the semantics and its outcome: dampu- means ‘blunt’. The most promising etymology is the one given by Popko (1974: 182) who compares it to SerbCS top ‘blunt’, Russ. tupoj ‘blunt’. This would mean that dampu- reflects *tomt-ū-.

tān (adv.) ‘for the second time, again, subordinately’: ta-a-an (OS), da-a-an (MH/MS).

Derivatives: see tā̄inga-, tā̄našti- and ¹ dujanalli-.

Anat. cognates: HLuw. twa/i- (adj.) ‘two’ (acc.pl.c. /twint’ū/ “twi-wa/i-zi (MARAŠ 4 §7), 2-z-i (ASSUR letter b §9), 2-z/a (TOPADA §19)), twisu (adv.) ‘twice’ (2-sū (TOPADA §11)); Lyc. kbi- (adj.) ‘(an)other’ (acc.sg.c. kbi, nom.-acc.sg.n. kbi, dat.-sg. kbi, nom.-acc.pl.n. kbija, gen.adj.acc.sg.c. kbiheh, gen.adj.acc.pl.c. kbihehis, gen.adj.abl.-instr. kbihehedi), kbihu (adv.) ‘twice’; Mil. ibisu (adv.) ‘twice’, tbiplē’?’.  

PAusat. *du(o)jī-


PIE *duoiōm

This adverb is attested multiple times. Once we find an attestation ta-a UD-ti ‘on the second day’ (KUB 32.123 iii 5 (NS)). It is unclear whether this is a genuine form or has to be emended to ta-a-an UD-ti. Already since Hrozný (1919: 1165), tān is connected with the PIE word for ‘two’. There is some debate on the exact formation, however. On the basis of the i-stem forms Lyc. kbi-, Mil. tbi- and HLuw. twi-, I assume that in Hittite, too, we are dealing with an original i-stem *dui-. This means that tān must reflect *duoiom, which corresponds exactly to e.g. Skt. dvavā- ‘twofold’, Gr. δὸκόξ ‘double’ etc. For the development *Tyo > Ta, cf. Melchert 1994a: 128.

Tischler (HEG T: 92) cites CLuw. dujan as a possible cognate, but its meaning cannot be determined.

gāstanau- (m.) a kind of tree: nom.-acc.pl. ta-na-a-ū.

PIE *dʰ₁n-ôu ??

This word is hapax on a landgrant: SBo 4 (2064/g) obv. 10. The fact that it denotes a tree can be deduced from the determinative GIŠ, but the text does not give a clue as to what kind of tree. Neumann (1961b: 77f.) compares the word with P Germ. *dāmā-= ‘fir(tree)’ (OHG tanma ‘fir’). If Skt. dhánus- ‘bow’ belongs here as well, then the etymon is *dʰ₁n-e-u-. If this is correct, Hitt. tanāu would reflect *dʰ₁n-ôu, formally a collective (cf. *ud-ôr ‘water (coll.).’)

**vzl. dāmhašti-** (n.) ‘double-bone’: nom.-acc.sgr. da-a-an-hā-aš-ti (NS), ta-an-ha-aš-ti (NS), da-ha-aš-ti (NS).

PIE *duioim *h₁esth₁-ih₁

The exact meaning of this word cannot be determined, but it is clear that it denotes some body part (of cows and sheep). Nevertheless, the word is clearly a compound of dār- and hašti- of which the first part is cognate with tān ‘for the second time, again’ and the second part with haštai- ‘bone’. Friedrich (HW Erg. 3: 31) therefore translates ‘Doppelknochen’. Starke (1990: 122f.) argues that -hašti- shows the old dual ending nom.-acc.n. -ih₁- (see also GIŠelzi-). See at haštäi / hašti- for the reconstruction *h₁esth₁-, which shows that the non-assimilation of -t in *h₁esth₁-ih₁ is due to the following -h₁-. See at tān and haštai-/ hašti- for further etymology.

**-tani** (2pl.pres.act.-ending of the mi-flektion): see -iten(i)


PIE *dʰ₁h₁-ni-neu-

This verb is occasionally preceded by gloss wedges (e.g. ta-ni-nu-an-zi (KUB 56.39 i 12), ta-ni-nu-ya-an-zi (ibid. ii 7, iv 27)), which together with the one Luwian inflected from (3sg.pres.act. taninutta), indicates that this verb was used in Luwian as well, or even is of Luwian origin. Formally, the verb is clearly a causative in -nu- of a stem tani- (or tānī-). In my view, this stem tānī- must be
equated with the stem ė́nī- that underlies Hitt. dānī- ‘stele’ (q.v.), CLuw. dānī- ‘id.’ and HLuw. STELE tanīsa- ‘id’. The occurrence of this noun in Luwian matches the Luwian connection of the verb tanīnu-. See at dānī- for further etymology.

**dānī**- (n.) cult object, ‘stele (?)’: nom.-acc.pl. ta-a-ni-ta (MH/NS).


PIE *d̪oh₁-ni-d-

This word is hapax in the following context:

KUB 12.59+10.76 iii

(7) ku-iš=yâ-ra=â-at ú-e-te-eš-ke-at

(8) **NA ḥu-ya-a-š** [H] A ta-a-ni-ta ki-nu-na=yâ-ra=â-at=kân

(9) ka-a-ša ta-ga-a-ri

‘Who put up the ḥuəši-stones and the ė́nīta? Look: they now have fallen’.

Because of its co-occurrence with **NA ḥuęši** [H] A, it is likely that tanī-, too, denotes some stone cultic object, possibly a stele vel sim. According to Starke (1990: 206), Hitt. tanī- is to be equated with CLuw. dānī-. He connects these words further with the “dān-Ritual”, assuming a development ‘belonging to the dān-ritual > ritual object > stele’. Problematic is the fact that the dān-ritual is not securely attested: Starke bases himself on one poorly understood line only.

If tanī- indeed means ‘stele’, then it should be connected with HLuw. STELE tanīsa- ‘stele’. The basic stem then seems to be *tānī-, which received a suffix -id- in Hittite and CLuwian, but -sa- in HLuwian. Semantically, a connection with *d̪eh₁- ‘to put, to place’ is quite likely and supported by the fact that in the context cited above the verb yeč̄- is used that goes back to *d̪eh₁-. In CLuwian, we find KUB 35.70 ii (15) [d]a-a-ni-ta du-â-un-du ‘They must put up the dānī’t-s!’, with the verb tuq̄a- ‘to put up’ that goes back to *d̪eh₁- as well. I therefore reconstruct the stem *tānī- as *d̪oh₁-ni-. For this formation (-ni-suffix with *o-grade in the root) compare OCS branb ‘fight’, Lith. barnis ‘quarrel’ < *b̄rans-.

See at tanīnu-” for the possibility that this verb is derived from the stem *tānī-.


IE cognates: ON dokkr (adj.) ‘gloomy, dark of colour’, OSax. dunkar, OHG tunkal, OFr. diuṅk(er) ‘dark’.

PIE *dʰnĝ- (e)i-

The bulk of the attestations clearly show an i-stem inflection dankui- / dankuayai- (sometimes with loss of intervocalic -i-: e.g. tankuyāš < *tankuyājaš). We only find two forms that seem to show a stem dankuia-, and these are clearly secondary.

Sturtevant (1934) proposed to interpret dankui-, just as parkui- and yarḫui-, as old u-stem adjectives that are enlarged with the feminine suffix *-ih₂-, comparable to Lat. suavis (*suēh₂du-ih₂-) etc. This view has been widely followed (e.g. most recently Rieken 1999a: 259). As I have shown under parkui- / parkuayai- ‘clean, pure’, however, this adjective reflects *prk"-i- and must be regarded as a normal i-stem. In my view, the same goes for dankui- / dankuayai- as well. Since Forrer apud Feist (1924: 130), dankui- is generally connected with the Germanic words for ‘dark’. Heidermans (1993: 146, 152, 167) shows that in Germanic we find different formations: ON dokkr, dokkr ‘dark’ < *dʰnĝ o-, OFr. diuṅk ‘dark’ < *dʰnĝ o-, OHG tunkal ‘dark’ < *dʰnĝ lo- and OSax. dunkar ‘dark’ < *dʰnĝ ro-. Yet it is clear that we are dealing with a root *dʰnĝ- . For Hittite, this means that we can safely reconstruct *dʰnĝ- (e)i-., a normal i-stem.

Sturtevant’s adduction (1933: 123f.) of Gr. δόξος ‘darkness’ and δόξος ‘dark’ < *dňoĝ- is quite interesting, but does not match the Germanic data.
If the interpretation of CLuw. *dakkui-* as ‘dark’ is correct, it shows a development PAnat. *-ne*- > Luw. -kku-.

taparije/a-² (lc1 > lc2) ‘to lead, to decide, to rule, to reign’: 2sg.pres.act. ta-pår-ri-ja-ši (KUB 21.1 i 65 (NH), KUB 26.25 ii 9, 12 (NH)), 3sg.pres.act. ta-pår-ri-ja-iz-zi (Bronzetafel ii 94, iii 73 (NH)), 1pl.pres.act. ta-pa-ri-ja-u-e-ni (KUB 2.2 ii 48 (NS)), 3pl.pres.act. ta-pa-ri-ja-an-zi (KUB 13.4 iv 9 (OH/NS)), 3sg.pretract. ta-pa-ri-ja-it (KBo 13.101 i 3, 4 (MH/NS)), 2sg.imp.act. ta-pår-ría-i (KBo 8,63 i 10 (NH), KUB 21,38 obv. 36 (NH)), 2pl.imp.act. ta-pår-ría-at-tén (KUB 46,13 iv 8 (NS)); part. ta-pår-ría-at-t- (Bronzetafel ii 36 (NH)).

Derivatives: taparija- (c.) ‘order, ruling’ (nom.sg. ta-pår-ri-aš (KUB 5.1 i 93 (NH)), acc.sg. ta-pår-ri-an (KBo 40,13 obv. 10 (NS)), [l]a-pa-ri-ja-an (KBo 18,88 rev. 17 (NH)), dat.-loc.sg. ta-pa-ri-ja (KUB 14.7 i 7, 15), ta-pår-ri ja (KUB 26.1 iii 34 (NH)), abl. ta-pår-ri-ja-az (KUB 21,19 ii 8 (NH))),


Anat. cognates: CLuw. tapar- ‘to rule, to govern’ (2sg.pres.act. ta-pår-ši, 1sg.pres.act. ta-pår-ha, da-pår-ha, 3sg.pres.act. ta-pår-ta, ta-pa-ar-ta, 3sg.imp.act. ta-pår-du, inf. ta-pa-ru-na), taparamman- (adj.) ‘ruling, governing (?)’ (nom.-acc.pl. ta-pa-ra-am-ma), taparammaḥit- (n.) ‘position of ruling, governing (?)’ (abl.-instr. ta-pa-ra-am-ma-hi-tat); Hluw. taparia- ‘authority’ (gen.?-bbariaš/LEPUS+ra/-ia-sa (KARKAMIŠ A26a 1+2, Ša, BOROWSKI 2 line 1), abl.-instr. /bbariad/, LIGNUM/ta-pa-ra-a-ti (KARKAMIŠ Stone Bowl §1), LEPUS+ra/-ia-ti-i (MARAŞ 1 §5, SULTANHAN §41, KÖRKÜN §3), ta-LEPUS+ra/-ia-ti (BOROWSKI 3 §5), LEPUS+RA/-I-ti (IZGIN 1 §9),
taparar-i-ta- ‘authority’ (acc.sg. /bara/tań/m/LEPUS+ra/-ia-ta (KARKAMIŠ A14a §4)), taparaht- (n.) ‘authority’ (nom.-acc.sg. /bara/h/m/LEPUS+pa+ra/-ia/hi (MARAŞ 4 §8)), taparija- ‘to decree’ (3sg.pres.act. /bara/t/a/ LIGNUM/CRUS/LEPUS+ra/-ia-ta (TELL AHMAR 1 §9), /bara/t/a/ LIGNUM/LEPUS+ra/-ia-ta (TELL AHMAR 1 §19)), taparijala/- (c.) ‘governor’ (nom./acc.pl. /bara/li/t/a/LEPUS+ra/-ia-li-zi (JISR EL HADID fr. 3 line 2)), taparijala- ‘to be governor’ (3sg.pres.act. /bara/li/t/a/LEPUS+ra/-ia-la-ta (KARABURUN §3)).

The Hittite verb shows forms that belong to two stems, namely taparije/a-² and taparijae-² (although it must be admitted that all forms that I regard as belonging to taparije/a-² show the stem taparija- and therewith in principle could belong with taparijae- as well). All these forms are attested in NS texts. In MH texts we
find the noun taparijalli-, a derivative in -alli- of the verbal stem taparije/a-. Note that these forms are spelled with single -r-, on the basis of which I assume that single -r- is more original than the spellings with geminate -rr- (cf. § 1.4.6.2.b and e.g. at ispär- / ispar- for a similar distribution). It is generally thought that the Hittite words are borrowings from CLuwian, where the unextended verbal stem tapar- ‘to rule, to govern’ is still found.

Throughout Hittitology, many scholars have supposed that Hitt. taparije/a- and CLuw. tapar- are cognate with labarna- / tabarna-, the title of Hittite kings (q.v.). Most recently, Melchert (2003b: 19) has expressed the assumption “that a Luwian *dabarna- was borrowed as Hittite labarna- at a prehistoric stage when Hittite no longer had initial voiced d-. The Hittite word was later (but still prehistorically) altered to tabarna- by association with the Luwian verb tapar(iy)a- ‘to rule’ after d- had also been devoiced to i- in Luwian”. Moreover, he states that these words must be cognate to MHG tapfer ‘brave’ that he reconstructs as *d$b-ro-. So all in all, Melchert assumes that an adjective *d$b-ro- yielded the nominal stem *tapar- ‘powerful’, from which not only the noun tabarna- ‘ruler’ has been derived, but also the verb taparije/a- ‘to be powerful’. On the basis of this latter verb, the Luwian verbal stem tapar- was then created due to back-formation. This scenario seems highly unlikely to me. If we look at the Anatolian material objectively, we see that the Luwian verbal stem tapar- ‘to rule’ must be the origin of all forms. Within Luwian it was the source of e.g. taparamman- ‘ruling’, taparahit- ‘authority’, taparija- ‘authority’ and taparija- ‘to decree’. This latter verb was borrowed into Hittite as taparije/a- ‘to decree, to rule’, which was the source of the noun taparija- ‘order’ and taparijalli- ‘commander’. The Luwian verbal stem tapar- is used unextendedly (taparši, taparḫa), which means that we must regard it as a root. The only way in which a Luwian verbal root tapar- could be of IE origin is by assuming that this spelling stands for /tbar-/ which reflects a root of the structure *Tb$b-er- (for an initial cluster *TP-, cf. the PIE root *d$b-eng2- ‘to make thick, to make firm’ as still visible in GAv. d$bq-, cf. at panku- / pungaw-). This contrasts with the fact that the Germanic words (which by the way seems to have a proto-meaning ‘heavy, sad’, cf. ON dapar ‘sad’, Norw. daper ‘heavy, saddened’) reflect a nominal stem in -ro-: *d$ob-ro-. An inner-Anatolian connection between tapar- ‘to rule’ and labarna- / tabarna- is fully gratuitous: the original meaning of the term tabarna- / labarna- cannot be determined because we are dealing with a personal name.

All in all, I reject the connection between tapar-, labarna- / tabarna- and the Germanic words *dapra-. If Luw. tapar- is of IE origin, it must reflect *TPer-, although I know no good cognates. Note that if tapar- indeed would reflect
*TPer-* shows a different outcome of such an initial cluster than in Hittite, where *dʰbʰng²*- (e)u- yielded panku- / pankay- ‘all, entire’, with loss of the initial dental consonant.

**dapi-** (adj.) ‘all, every, each, altogether’: acc.sg.c. da-pi-n-a (KUB 5.1 i 14, 77, ii 31, 65, 72, iii 74 (NH)), nom.-acc.sg.n. da-pi (VSNF 12.108 rev. 3 (NS), KUB 28.92 i 10 (NS)), gen.sg. da-pi-aš, dat.sg. da-pi-i (KUB 5.1 i 12, 37, 48 (NH), KBo 2.6+ ii 33, iii 2 (NH), KBo 18.142, 16 (NS)), abl. da-pi-za (KBo 2.9 i 7 (MH/NS), da-pi-da-az (KUB 12.57 iv 4 (NS)), acc.pl.c. da-pi-uš (KBo 11.14 i 24 (OH/NS), KUB 55.40, 6 (NS)), gen.pl. da-pi-aš (KUB 16.77 iii 11 (NH)), dat.-loc.pl. da-pi-aš (KUB 6.45 iii 35 (NH), KBo 25.180 rev. 10 (OH/NS), KBo 40.56 obv. 16 (NS)).


We are dealing with two stems, dapi- and dapiant-, which both denote ‘all, every, each’. Herewith they are synonymous with ḫūmant-, which is the reason that dapi(ant)- and ḫūmant- occasionally are used as duplicates of each other. It should be noted that the stem dapi- does not show ablaut in the suffix like other i-stem adjectives. Moreover, the one attestation dapidaz shows a pronominal inflection. The acc.sg.c-form da-pi-n-a as attested several times in KUB 5.1 is remarkable because in this NH composition we would not expect the use of the conjunctive =a (see at = (m)a for the chronological distribution). So perhaps we should regard the syntagm da-pi-n=a ZI-an as a petrified expression.

Of the many etymological proposals for dapi(ant)- (see the listing in Tischler HEG T: 127f.) none can be regarded as convincing.

**tapuš-** (n.) ‘side’: gen.sg. ta-pu-ša-aš (KBo 32.14 ii 29), all.sg. ta-pu-uš-ša (KBo 4.2 iii 47, KBo 39.164 r.col. 6, KUB 20.99 ii 18, KUB 31.105, 19, KUB 55.45 ii 12, KUB 55.58 obv. 16, IBoT 2.112 obv. 9, etc.), ta-pu-uš-a (KUB 1.8 iv 19 (NH), ta-pu-ša (often), da-pu-ša (KBo 5.1 i 33), endlingess loc.(?) ta-pu-uš (KBo 13.20, 7, KUB 8.30 obv. 23), abl. ta-pu-uš-za (OS, often), ta-pu-uš-za (KBo 30.58 iii 11 (OH/NS), da-pu-uš-za (KBo 2.29 i 8), ta-pu-uš-za (IBoT 2.4 i 6, KBo 34.152 iii 3).

Some of the forms cited above are used adverbially and then denote ‘besides, next to’. The word is difficult to etymologize. Some scholars assume a connection with Hitt. tāpujašš- ‘rib’, but this is unlikely. Oettinger (1979a: 553) suggests a
connection with e.g. ON staf, ‘staff’ < *steb²- and reconstructs a paradigm *(s)tēb³-yos, *(s)tēb³-us-ēs (apud Tischler HEG T: 140), which does not seem very appealing to me. Rieken (1999a: 210) assumes that tapuš- represents an s-stem extension of an original u-stem *TēP-u-,*TP-ēu-, but such an analysis does not have much merit without a good IE comparandum.

tar- ‘to speak’: see ter.² / tar-. It

tarra-una(a) (IIIh) ‘to be able; (+ inf.) to can’: 1sg.pres.midd. tar-ra-aḥ-ḥa-ri (NH), 2sg.pres.midd. tar-ra-at-ta (MH/NS), 3sg.pres.midd. tar-ra-at-ta (NH), 1sg.pret.midd. tar-ra-aḥ-ḥa-at (NH), 3sg.pret.midd. tar-ra-at-ta-at (NH), tar-ra-ad-da-at (NH); part. tar-ra-an-t- (NH).

IE cognates: Skt. tirāte, tārate ‘to overcome’, Lat. trēns ‘across, through’.

PIE *terh₂-

See Neu 1968: 167 and Oettinger 1979a: 298 for attestations. It should be noted that all forms are found in NS texts only.

Since Friedrich HW: 213 this verb is generally regarded as an inner-Hittite cognate of tārhu-² ‘to prevail, to conquer’ (q.v.), which reflects *terh₂-u- (and not unextended *terh₂- as is usually thought). Oettinger (1979a: 299) equates 3sg. tarratta with Skt. tārate, which he reconstructs as *tērḥ₂-o-to (but note that Skt. tārate must reflect *tērḥ₂-e-to). Apart from the fact that in the Rg-Veda the stem tārate is hapax, whereas tārāte < *trḥ₂-e-to is attested multiple times, the status of the Hittite ‘thematic’ middle is quite unclear. Examples like 3sg.pres.midd. yēhari besides yēhattari and 3sg.pret.midd. yēhtat besides yēhattat show that the ‘thematic vowel’ -a- could well be secondary on the basis of the 3sg.pres.-ending -ari. In the case of tarrā-una(a) this is important for establishing the phonetic developments it has undergone. If tarrā- reflects *terh₂-o-, it would show a development *erH₂V > *arHV, which would contradict the vowel -e- as found in erḥ- / araḥ- / arḥ- ‘boundary’ < *h₁erh₂- and serḥa- (an object to rinse feet with) < *serh₂-j. If the ‘thematic vowel’ in tarrā- is secondary, however, we could assume that in 1sg. *tērḥ₂-h₂-o, 2sg. *tērḥ₂-th₂-o, etc. the sound law *erCC > aRCC is responsible for the -a- in tarr-. This -a- then spread to 3sg. *tērḥ₂-o > *terra >> *tarrā, which later on served as the basis for the thematic paradigm tarrā-una.

Tischler (HEG T: 147) cites the form tar-ja-an-da-an (KUB 12.63 + 36.70 obv. 9) as participle of tarra-, but this is phonetically impossible: a preform *trḥ₂-jent- should have yielded Hitt. **tarḥijant-. Note that its translation ‘kräftig’ is based
on the supposed etymological connection with *tarra-* only and is not obligatory within the context it occurs in. The verb *tarramu-*², which sometimes is regarded as the causative of *tarra-*, is semantically unclear, and therefore an etymological connection with *tarra-* cannot be ascertained.

*tarāḥh-*²: see *tarḥu-*²


Note that some of the forms that usually are regarded as belonging here are treated under the lemma *darāješ/a-*² (q.v.). For the semantics of *tarai-² / tari-*, cf. the following contexts:

KUB 30.10 rev.
(3) *nu=mu ku-iš DINGIR=LA i-na-an pa-iš nu=mu ge-ezu
(4) [da-a ... i-n]a-ni pé-ra-an ta-re-eh-ḫu-un ma-le-ek-ḫé-un nu=za nam-*ma
U-UL tar-ul-h-mi

‘May my god, who gave me the illness, [have] pity on me. [ ... ]because of the [ill]ness I have become tired and m.-ed. I cannot succeed any longer’;

KUB 30.36 ii
(2) ... *nu kiš-an te-ez-zi
(3) ḤUR.SAGMES GALTIM pa-an-ga-u-eš TURMESTIM
(4) ḥa-a-ri-ja-š na-ak-ki-i-ja-š ku-šit ú-ya-nu-un
(5) ku-it ta-ri-ja-nu-un
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'He speaks thus: “All you mountains, great and small. Why have I come to the impassable valleys? Why have I wearied myself?'

Compare also tariğaššaš (KBo 1.42 i 19) which glosses Akk. MA-NA-AH-TUM ‘fatigue’.

The oldest form of the paradigm is ta-re-ēh-ḫu-un (OH/MS). The reading of this word is in debate because of the fact that the sign AH/UCH can be read ṣā, ēh, iḥ as well as uḥ. For instance, Tischler (HEG T: 172) reads this form as ta-ri-ah-ḫu-un on the basis of two attestations da-ri-ja-ah-ḫu-un found in NS texts, for instance in

KUB 30.35 i

(7) nu a-pád-da pa-i-ši nu ȝa[-ap-pu]-i kiš-an me-ma-at-ti
(8) ȝa-ap-pu=mi-it na-an-x[ ku]-i]3 ú-ya-mu-un ku-it
(9) da-ri-ja-ah-ḫu-u[u[n]

‘You will go there and will speak to the riverbank thus: ‘O my riverbank! [Why] did I come nan-x? Why have I wearied myself?’”.

I do not find this very attractive, however. I follow Oettinger (1979a: 475) in reading ta-re-ēh-ḫu-un, which, together with 3sg.pret.act. ta-ra-īš (KUB 36.83 i 20, 23, although it must be admitted that this context is not fully clear and that therefore the interpretation of taraiš as ‘he became tired’ is not totally ascertained), points to an original dā/iťianzi-class inflection. Like the other verbs of this class, taraiš / tariš-, too, shows secondary thematization in NH times, yielding the stem tarije/a-ž. The two forms darijaḫḫun must be compared to nejaḫḫun (a cross between nehḫun and nejanun).

As I have shown in Kloekhorst lh.c.a, the dā/iťianzi-class verbs go back to a structure *CC-(o)ji-. In the case of taraiš/tariš- this means that we are dealing with *Tr-oi- / *Tr-i-, derived from a root *Ter-. Different etymological proposals have been done, but none is convincing: an inner-Hittite connection with tarraᵲa(s)ro ‘to be able’ (thus Friedrich 1968: 37f.) is impossible as the latter verb reflects *terḫ- and *trh-oi- should have yielded Hitt. **tarḫāi-; the connection with Gr. ἀπαί “to do” (Tischler 1979: 265) < *dreh₂ is formally impossible as well; a connection with Lith. darīti ‘to do’ (Tischler l.c.) is semantically improbable as the latter verb is a causative to dérēti ‘to be fit’, which has nothing to do with ‘to weary oneself’. All in all, the etymology remains unclear.

*tarh₂: see tarḫu₂
tarhu-² (Ia4) ‘to prevail, to conquer, to be powerful, to be able; (with =z) to defeat’: 1sg.pres.act. tar-uḫ-mi (OH/MS), 2sg.pres.act. tar-uḫ-ši (KBo 21.34 + IBoT 1.7 i 64 (MH/NS)), 3sg.pres.act. ta-ru-uḫ-zī (KBo 6.2 ii 58 (OS)), tar-uḫ-zī (StBoT 25.19 obv. 12 (OS), etc.), tar-ru-uḫ-zī (KBo 20.73 iv 6 (OH/MS), KBo 22.195 iii 8 (OH/MS)), tar-ḫu-uz-zī (KUB 17.10 i 33 (OH/MS)), ta-ru-uḫ-za (KUB 43.75 rev. 9 (OH/NS)), tar-ḫu-e-zī (KBo 38.126, 10 (MS)), 1pl.pres.act. tar-aḫ-ḫu-u-e-ni (NH), 2pl.pres.act. tar-uḫ-te-ni (NH), 3pl.pres.act. tar-ru-uḫ-ḫa-an-zī (KUB 7.1 ii 9 (OH/NS)), tar-uḫ-ḫa-an-zī (NH), 1sg.pret.act. ta-ru-uḫ-ḫu-un (KBo 16.47 obv. 4 (MH/MS)), tar-ḫu-un (KUB 14.1 rev. 58 (MH/MS)), tar-aḫ-ḫu-un (NH, often), 3sg.pret.act. tar-uḫ-ta (OH/MS), 1pl.pret.act. tar-ḫu-en (KBo 3.41+ obv. 19 (OH/NS)), tar-ḫu-en (KBo 22.6 iv 12 (OH/NS)), 3pl.pret.act. tar-ḫu-e-er (KUB 23.79, 12 (MH/MS?)), tar-ḫu-er (KBo 32.14 iii 17, 32 (MS)), tar-[ḫu]-e-er (KUB 17.27 iii 9 (MH/NS)), tar-uḫ-he-e-er (NH), tar-uḫ-he-er (NH), 1sg.imp.act. tar-uḫ-ḫa-al-lu (KBo 12.58+ obv. 5 (NS)), 3sg.imp.act. tar-ḫu-du (KBo 4.2 i 54 (OH/NS)), tar-uḫ-du (MH/NS), tar-ḫu-id-du (KUB 36.75 iv 10 (MH/MS)), 3pl.imp.act. tar-uḫ-ḫa-an-du (KBo 43.273, 7 (undat.)); part. tar-ḫu-an-t- (Bo 3081 obv. 5 (MS), Bo 6109, 8 (undat.), tar-uḫ-ḫa-an-t- (NH); verb.noun gen.sg. tar-aḫ-ḫu-u-ya-aš, tar-aḫ-ḫu-aš; sup. tar-aḫ-ḫu-u-ya-an- (KBo 3.7 iii 25 (OH/NS)); impf. tar-uḫ-ḫi-êš-ke/a-, tar-uḫ-ḫi-eš-ke/a-, tar-aḫ-ḫu-êš-ke/a- (Bo 69/969 ii 2 (NS)); broken tar-ḫu-[a-... (VSNF 12.135, 5 (NS)), tar-ḫu[...] (KUB 33.66 iii 16 (OH/MS)).
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§4), /tarhuntas/ DEUSTONITRUS-hu-za-sa (KARATEPE 1 §3, KARKAMIŞ A6 §2, SULTANHAN §8, etc.), DEUSTONITRUS-hu-za-sa (KARATEPE 1 §40, §51, §73), DEUSTONITRUS-hu-u-za-sa (KULULU 1 §10), acc.sg. /tarhuntas/
DEUSTONITRUS-hu-za-na (MARAŞ 4 §3, KÜRTÜL §7, BOR §4, NİĞDE 2 line 1, KARKAMIŞ A17a §4), DEUSTONITRUS-hu-zá-na (SULTANHAN §2), DEUSTONITRUS-hu-u-zá-na-” (KULULU 1 §5), gen.sg. /tarhuntas/
DEUSTONITRUS-hu-ta-sa (KARATEPE 1 §1, ÇİFTLİK §6), DEUSTONITRUS-hu-
ta-sá (ÇİFTLİK §12, §13), dat.sg. /tarhuntı/ DEUSTONITRUS-hu-ti-i
(KARKAMIŞ A6 §20, MARAŞ 11, §8, AKSARAY §5, PALANGA §7), DEUSTONITRUS-hu-ti (BABYLON 3, BOHÇA §2, KARKAMIŞ A24a 2+3 §11), abl.-instr. /tarhuntası/ DEUSTONITRUS-hu-ta-ti
(KARKAMIŞ A15b §1), gen.adj.abl.-instr. /tarhuntasası/ DEUSTONITRUS-hu-ta-
sa-tı-i (MARAŞ 1 §5), tarhuntı- (adj.) ‘of the Storm-god’ (nom.sg.c.
DEUSTONITRUS-hu-tı-ı-sa (ÇİFTLİK §5), DEUSTONITRUS-hu-tı-ı-sá (EĞİRKÖY §1) DEUSTONITRUS-hu-tı-sá (KÜRTÜL §1)); Lyd. *tarvallı- ‘of
Tavr’ (nom.sg.c. tarvallıs); Lyc. Trqqštı- ‘Storm-god’ (nom.sg. Trqqas, Trqas,
dat.sg. Trqqštısı), Mil. Trqqštı- ‘Storm-god’ (nom.sg. Trqqız, dat.sg. Trqqštısı,
gen.adj. trqqštıasa/i-)

IE cognates: Skt. tārvati ‘to overcome, to overpower’, Av. tauruvaṇietai ‘to
overcome’.

PIE *terh₂-u-ti, *tréh₂-u-enti

The verbal forms that I have gathered here under one lemma are usually regarded
as belonging to two separate verbs, namely tarh₂- and tarḫ₂-/taruḥ₂-. Despite
the alleged formal difference, these verbs are generally regarded as semantically
identical. The existence of a stem tarḫ₂-/taruḥ₂- (for the alteration cf. eku₂- ‘to
drink’ that is spelled euk₂- as well) is assured by the spellings 3sg.pres.act. tar-
ḫ₂-uẓ-zı (OH/MS) and ta-ru-uḥ-zı (OS). The most common spelling of
3sg.pres.act. is tar-AH/UH-zı, however. The sign AH/UH (HZL 332) can in
principle be read uh, el, iḥ as well as uḥ. A choice between these readings is
usually based on the preceding sign: e.g. ta-ru-AH/UH-zı is read ta-ru-uḥ-zı on
the basis of the preceding ru; te-AH/UH-ḥı is read te-eḥ-ḥı on the basis of the
preceding te. In the case of tar-AH/UH-zı, the preceding sign does not give a clue
as to how to read the sign, however. Nevertheless, in some cases we are sure that
we must read uḥ. For instance, the OS form tar-AH/UH-zı (StBoT 25.19 obv. 12)
is duplicated by ta-ru-uḥ-zı (KBo 22.195 iii 8 (OH/MS)), which shows that we
have to read the first form as tar-uḥ-zı. In KBo 20.73 iv 6 we first find tar-
AH/UH-zi and later on, in the same line, tar-ru-uḫ-zi. This latter form confirms that the first should be read tar-uḫ-zi. A similar case is KBo 4.2 i 52 where we find tar-AH/UH-zi, whereas ibid. 54 has tar-ḥu-du, which determines the first form as tar-uḫ-zi. In addition, there is not a single piece of positive evidence for reading tar-AH/UH-zi as tar-ah-zi: spellings like **ta-ra-ah-zi or **ta-ḥa-zi lack totally (unlike e.g. ya-la-ah-zi ‘hits’ which determines the spelling ya-al-AH/UH-zi as ya-al-ah-zi or pār-ḥa-zi ‘chases’ which determines the spelling pār-AH/UH-zi as pār-ah-zi). Despite these considerations, the form tar-AH/UH-zi is generally transliterated as tar-ah-zi (e.g. Tischler (HEG T: 157) states “[e]s ist jedoch traditionell üblich, tar-AH/UH-zi als tar-ah-zi zu transliterieren”). This “tar-ah-zi” then is phonologically interpreted as /tarH-/, (Oettinger 1979a: 221).

If there indeed were a stem /tarH-/ , we would also expect that forms like 1pl.pres.act. /ta-rHt/ and **jedoch traditionell üblich, reading these are never found: we only find then is phonologically interpreted as /tarHt/ as /U/ then is phonologically interpreted as /tarHt/ as /U/ as /U/ as /U/ as /U/ and later on, in the same line, tar-ru-uḫ-zi. This latter form confirms that the first should be read tar-uḫ-zi. A similar case is KBo 4.2 i 52 where we find tar-AH/UH-zi, whereas ibid. 54 has tar-ḥu-du, which determines the first form as tar-uḫ-zi. In addition, there is not a single piece of positive evidence for reading tar-AH/UH-zi as tar-ah-zi: spellings like **ta-ra-ah-zi or **ta-ḥa-zi lack totally (unlike e.g. ya-la-ah-zi ‘hits’ which determines the spelling ya-al-AH/UH-zi as ya-al-ah-zi or pār-ḥa-zi ‘chases’ which determines the spelling pār-AH/UH-zi as pār-ah-zi). Despite these considerations, the form tar-AH/UH-zi is generally transliterated as tar-ah-zi (e.g. Tischler (HEG T: 157) states “[e]s ist jednak traditionell üblich, tar-AH/UH-zi als tar-ah-zi zu transliterieren”). This “tar-ah-zi” then is phonologically interpreted as /tarH-/, (Oettinger 1979a: 221).

If there indeed were a stem /tarH-/ , we would also expect that forms like 1pl.pres.act. /ta-rHt/ or 3pl.pres.act. /ta-rHt/ were spelled **ta-ḥa-an-zi and **ta-ḥe-er (cf. ya-al-ḥa-an-zi, ya-al-ḥe-er and pār-ḥa-an-zi, pār-ḥe-er). Yet these are never found: we only find tar-AH/UH-ḥa-an-zi (besides tar-ru-uḫ-ḥa-an-zi) and tar-AH/UH-ḥe-er (besides tar-ḥu-er and tar-ḥu-eer). The only forms within the whole paradigm that seemingly show an unambiguous stem /tarH-/ are 1sg.pret.act. tar-ḥu-un and 1pl.pret.act. tar-ḥu-u-en. However, if we compare these to 1sg.pret.act. ekun and 1pl.pret.act. ekun from ekun-3 ‘to drink’ or 1pl.pres.act. lahuuni from lāhu-‘i ‘to pour’, we see that tarḥun and tarḥuen would perfectly fit the stem tarḥu- as well.

All in all, we have to conclude that there is no positive evidence in favour of reading the spellings tar-AH/UH-zi as tar-ah-zi and interpreting these as spellings of a stem /tarH-/: all forms that are usually interpreted as showing /tarH-/ could just as well or have to be interpreted as showing the stem tarḥu- /taruḥ-. I therefore reject the existence of a stem /tarH-/ and analyse all forms as belonging with tarḥu- /taruḥ-. Subsequently I have cited all attestations with tar-AH/UH- as tar-uḫ- in the overview above.

The view that we are dealing with a stem tarḥu- /taruḥ- only is supported by etymological evidence as well. The verb denotes ‘to conquer, to prevail, to be powerful’ and has since Kuryłowicz (1927: 102) generally been connected with the PIE root *terh₂-. This unextended root, which was thought to be the predecessor of Hitt. “tarḫ-”, does not mean ‘to overpower’, however, but ‘to cross, to pass through’ only (Skt. tar- ‘to pass through’, Lat. trāns ‘past, over’). This does not fit the Hittite meaning ‘to conquer, to overpower’. Such a meaning is only attested in the u-present *terh₂-u- that denotes ‘to overpower’: Skt. tārvatī ‘to conquer, to overpower’, Av. tauruaiviti ‘to overcome’ (*trh₂-u-e/o-). So also semantically it has become clear that an analysis /tarH-/ is impossible: there
would be no way to explain its meaning ‘to conquer’ from PIE *terh₂- ‘to pass through’. The meaning ‘to conquer’ is only explicable from PIE *terh₂-u- ‘to overpower’, which is an additional argument to read all forms with tar-ÂH/UH- as tar-âb-.

The fact that we find the spelling tarhu- as well as taruhh- reminds us of the situation of eku-² besides euk-² ‘to drink’ and tarku-² besides taruk-² ‘to dance’. These latter verbs must be phonologically interpreted as /teɡʷ-/- and /tarkʷ-/, also on the basis of the forms akueni, ekun, ekuen (instead of **akumeni, **ekunun and **ekumen) and tarku³ar (instead of **tarkumar) that can only be explained by the fact that the labial feature of /gʷ/ and /kʷ/ does not participate in the sound law *-yu > -mu-. I therefore assume that the spelling variation between tarhu- and taruhh- and the forms 1sg.pret.act. tarhu₃, 1pl.pret.act. tarhu₇, sup. tarhu₅an and verb.noun gen.sg. tarhu₅aš point to a synchronic phonological interpretation /tarHʷ-/. See Kloekhorst thc.c for my view that this synchronic phoneme /Hʷ/ (which has a lenited variant /hʷ/ in lâhu₇/ lâhʷ-/) must have been a PANat. phoneme as well because of Lyc. Ṭeqqê- /trkʷnt/- < PANat. *ṭrHʷ'ent- (see also below).

One of the most important derivatives of the verb tarhu-² is the name of the Storm-god. In Hittite, this name is almost always spelled with the sumerograms ₃U and ₄ISKUR. On the basis of the OS attestation dat.-loc.sg. ₄ISKUR-un-ni (KBo 3.22 obv. 3), it is generally assumed that the underlying Hittite name was Tarḫumma-. The exact interpretation of the suffix -ma- is unclear, however. In CLuwian, we find the phonetic spellings voc.sg. ₄Tar-₃u-za and gen.adj. tar-₃u-un-ta-aš-ša/-, which, together with nom.sg. ₄U-an-za and ₄ISKUR-an-za point to an ablauting pair Tarḫuyant- / Tarhunt-_. These forms point to an original paradigm *ṭrh₂-um-empty, *ṭrh₂-um-ōs which looks like an original participle (note that this would be the only participle in -ant- in Luwian, where synchronically only participles in -mna/- can be found). The same paradigm must underly the HLuwian forms, where we find a stem Tarhunt- (nom.sg. /ṭarhunt₃, gen.sg. /ṭarhunt₃s, dat.-loc.sg. /ṭarhunt₃t) and a secondary stem Tarhunza- (nom.sg. /ṭarhunt₃as, acc.sg. /ṭarhunt₃). Cf. Eichner 1974: 28\ for the observation that CLuw. Tarḫyant- forms an exact word equation with Skt. tṛṇvant- ‘overpowering’, which is used as an epithet of Indra, Agni and Mitra. The interpretation of Lyc. and Mil. Ṭeqqê- has been in debate because of the unclear interpretation of the sign q. For instance, Starke (1990: 140f.) reads q as /k/ < *h₂ and subsequently reconstructs *ṭrh₂-um-_. As I have shown in Kloekhorst thc.c, there is no evidence at all that Lyc. q reflects *h₂ (which instead yields Lyc. χ when unlenited and g when lenited) and that an interpretation of q as /kʷ/ < *h₂u-
is the only convincing solution. Therefore, Lyc. Trqḫḫ- must reflect *trh₂uent- as well.

The CLuwian verb tatarḥ- may mean ‘to break’, cf. the following context:

KUB 9.6 iii
(25) ku-is= tar ma-al-ḥa-aš-ša-aš-ša-an-za-an EN-ja
(26) a-ad-du-ya-la a-an-ni-ti a=an DINGIRMEŠ-in-zi
(27) a-ah-ḥa na-a-ta-at-ta ta-ta-ar-ḥa-an-du
(28) ú-i-it-pa-ni-im=pa=an ú-i-da-a-in-du

‘Whoever does evil to the patient, may the gods tatarḥ- him like reed, may they yikḏi- him regarding (his) yḏpami-, and may they place him under their feet’.

It therefore is often equated with Hitt. tarḫ-². Since Hitt. tarḫ-² does not exist anymore, this equation cannot be upheld either. Semantically, a connection with ‘to conquer’ is not very appealing either. I would rather suggest a connection with Gr. τραχαίον ‘to hurt (someone)’ < *trh₂-je/o- and reconstruct tatarḥ- as *te-terḥ-. The HLuwian verb tatarḥ- is attested only in the damaged inscription BEYKÖY (see Masson 1980: 118f.):

(1) [ ] x-x
(2) EXERCITUS ku-x tā-tara/i-ḥa-tā

Masson translates ‘L’armée x ne cessait de vaincre’. Because of the broken context, the exact meaning of this inscription cannot be determined. Perhaps, tatarḥ- is to be regarded as a direct cognate to CLuw. tatarḥ-.

-ṭtari, -ṭati (2sg.midd.-ending)

The endings of the 2sg. of the middle inflection are -ṭta, -ṭtari and -ṭtati for the present and -ṭtati, -ṭtāt for the preterite. The distribution between these endings is not fully clear to me (especially between -ṭtari(ri) and -ṭtati in the present, but compare Yoshida 1987), but it is clear that the common element is -ṭta. This -ṭta clearly must be compared with 2sg.midd.-endings in the other IE languages like TochA -tār, TochB -tar, and OIr. -ther. In view of the 2sg.perf.-ending *-th₂e, these probably reflect *-th₂o.

-ṭtari, -ṭati (3sg.midd.-endings)

PIE *-to

In the 3sg.midd., we find two sets of endings: pres. -a(rı), pret. -a(tı) vs. pres. -tta(rı), pret. -ttat(ı). Sometimes it is stated that the distribution between these endings corresponds to the distribution between mi- and ḥi-endings in the active, but this is incorrect. On the basis of the active inflection of a given verb, it cannot be predicted whether it will use -a(rı) / -a(tı) or -tta(rı) / -ttat(ı) as 3sg.midd.-ending. For instance, ḥalzija(rı), laḫuṭār(ı), laqār(ı) and paḫša(rı) correspond to the ḥi-inflecting actives ḥalzai-ı / ḥalzi-, laḫu-ı / laḫu-, laḵ-ı / laḵ- and paḫš-ı, whereas e.g. eša(rı) and karša correspond to the mi-inflecting actives eš-ı / aš- and karš-ı. Usually, a verb is consistent in its ‘choice’ for either the ending -a(rı) / -a(tı) or -tta(rı) / -ttat(ı), but sometimes we encounter both (e.g. karša besides karštarı or šupparı besides šuptari) and occasionally even a combination of the two (e.g. šuppattari). These are rare cases, however. For instance, the verb eš-ı / aš- ‘to seat oneself’ shows the ending -a(rı) throughout the Hittite period, whereas e.g. kl-ı / aš- consistently shows -ttat(ı). This does not necessarily reflect the PIE state of affairs, as is visible from the fact that eša(rı) < *h₁êh₂s-o corresponds to Skt. āste and Gr. ἠτα from *h₁êh₂s-to. On the other hand, Hitt. kitta(rı) reflects *kēi-to just as Skt. šete and Gr. κεῖμαι, whereas its CLuwian cognate zērı reflects *kēi-o just as Skt. śāye.

The endings -tta(rı) / -ttat(ı) occur in all classes of the middle, except in class III (tukkārī-class). In the present, there is no clear distribution between -tta and -ttari (cf. arta besides artari, both OS). In the preterite, too, there is no clear indication of a chronological distribution between -ttatı and -ttat (unlike in older -ati vs. younger -a-tı). OS forms like kištaniattat and liktat may even indicate that the original ending was -ttar and that -ttatı was created in analogy to -ati.

As we saw above, the endings -tta(rı) / -ttat(ı) have well-established IE cognates like Skt. -te, Gr. -tō (both from *-to-ı), Lat. -tur, TochAB -tār, OIr. -thir (from *-to-r(ı)), Goth. -da, etc. The origin of the element -r- in Hitt. -ttari, Lat. -tur, TochAB -tār and OIr. -thir is still unclear.

tarije/a-ı ² ‘to become weary’: see tarai-ı / tari-

darije/a-ı (Ic1) ²: 3sg.pret.act. da-a-ri-ja-at (KUB 4.12 i 7), 1pl.pret.act. da-a-ri-ja-u-en (KUB 24.9(+) i 25); part. da-ri-ja-an-te-eš (KUB 1.8 iv 8 (NH)) // da-
Some of the forms that in my view belong here are usually regarded as belonging to tarai^{-1} / tari- `to exert oneself' (especially dārijanteš (KUB 1.1+ iv 21 with several duplicates)), while others have been translated as `to call upon a god’ (especially dārijat (KUB 4.12 i 7)) and therefore treated as cognate to ter^{-2} / tar- ‘to speak’. This is in my opinion incorrect. In the following two contexts, dārijje/a^{-2} seems to denote an action performed on an ill person in order to heal him:

KBo 4.12 i
(5) A-NA PA-NI A-BU=\[A=mu kap-pi-in DUMU-an ḤUL-lu
(6) GIG.GIG-at nu=mu=kān A-BU=\[A.A NA \[Mi-id-dan-na-A.A GAL DUB.SAR\]
(7) ŠU-i da-a-iš n=a-aš=mu=kān an-da da-a-ri-ja-at
(8) nu=mu=kān GIG-az TI-nu-u

‘When I was) a little child to my father, a bad disease struck me. My father trusted me to the hand of Middanamu, the Head of Scribes, who andā d-d me and saved me from the disease’;

KUB 24.9(+) i
(23) [\[MUNUS]\]ŠU.GI A-NA ALAM\[IL.A te-ez-zi u-ya-at-ti-en=ya iš-šu-u-en=ya ku-e nu=ya=na-š=a-[at]
(24) [EGIR]-pa pē-ešt-i-en UMA-MA DUMU.LÚ.U19.LU=ma Ū-UL=ya nam-ma ma-az-zu-u-e-ni
(25) n=a-an=ya da-a-ri-ja-u-en nu=ya i-na-[an] a-ni-ja-u-e-en nu=ya=r=a-at=za EGIR-pa
(26) [na]m=ma da-a-at-tén n=e-e=z pē-e-da-at-te-en

‘The Old Woman speaks to the figurines “Come, you who we have made, and give it back to us!”’. Then the mortal speaks “We do not dare anymore. We have d-ed him and treated the illness. Take it back and carry them away!”’.

Although it cannot be denied that a meaning ‘to call upon a god’ is possible in these context, there is no indication at all that we are here dealing with praying. Another context is less clear:

KBo 3.6 ++ iii
(60) [...] nu=za dIŠTAR GAŠAN=\[A
(61) pa-ra-a ḫa-an-da-a-tar a-[ṭi-ja=ṭa] me-ek-ki te-ek-ku-ṭu-ṣa-ma-nu-ut
(62) mu-[ṭur-ḥi-[ṭ]U-up-aṣ BE-LU[(ḥi-ka i-ek-ka)-Za pi ar-ḥa u-ṭa-a-ṭ]
(63) mu-u-ṣ-ma-aṣ 管局 GAŠAN=.LA [(U-ṭa-ṭ)i]n-na-ra-etzt u-yu-a-ṣ-ma-aṣ
dā-a-ṭi-ja-an-te-aṣ
(64) KUR.KURMEŠURUKU.BABBARIII=ma=q[(a-kāna ḥu-um)]a-an-ta管局 ISTAR A-NA
(65) EGIR-an-da ne-i-[ṭa-μu-u]n

‘And there as well My Lady Ištar let her providence show abundantly. The lords
that Urḫi-Tešup then had sent away, to them My Lady Ištar appeared in a dream:
“You are purposely ḏ! But I, Ištar, have returned all Ḩatlu-lands back to Ḩatušili’”.

Although I do not know exactly how to translate ḏ关停 here, a translation
‘exerted’ does not seem fitting to me.
All in all, the meaning of ḏ关停 cannot be ascertained, but it is clear that
appurtenance of these forms to either tarai- / tari- or ūer- / ṭar- is unlikely.

 nominate ‘cloth that has been woven three times(??)’: nom.sg. tar-ri-ja-
na-liš (KBo 18.181 obv. 14, rev. 3, 8, 22), tar-ja-na-liš (KBo 18.186 edge 4).
PIE *tri-jo-no-li- ?

On the basis of the formal connection with ḏ关停 ‘functionary of the third
rank’, it has been assumed that this word, which must denote a cloth because of
the determinative TŪG, should be interpreted as ‘cloth that has been woven three
times’ vel sim. See ḏ关停 ‘functionary of the third rank’ and teri- for further etymology.

 nominate ‘functionary of the third rank’: nom.sg. tar-ri-ja-na-al-li-iš
PIE *tri-jo-no- + -alli-

This word is hapax in the following context:

IBOT 1.36 i
(36) ḏ关停 a-pa-a-ṣ =a pa-ra-a da-me-ta-ni
(37) ḏ关停 ME-ŠE-DI te-ez-zi ḏ关停 a-pa-ṣ =a pa-ra-a ḏ关停 tar-ri-ja-na-al-li te-ez-zi
(38) ḏ关停 tar-ri-ja-na-al-li-iš =ma ḏ关停 du-ja-na-al-li te-ez-zi
'He passes it on to the other guard. That one passes it on to the one of third rank, the one of third rank passes it on to the one of second rank, and the one of second rank tells it to the Chief of ten guards'.

On the basis of this context, *tarrijonall-* can be determined as ‘functionary of the third rank’ (besides *lu* _dujianalli_- ‘functionary of the second rank’ (q.v.)), and likely contains a reflex of the PIE numeral *trei-* ‘three’. Since the word for ‘three’ in Hittite shows the stem _teri_- (q.v.), it has been assumed that *tarrijonall-* must show a Luwian variant, *lu* _WDUUL-*DQDOOL_. The idea is then that Luw. *teri-* shows geminate -rr- because of Čop’s Law and therefore must reflect PAnat. *tēri-* (which also yielded Hitt. _teri_). For the origin of this PAnat. *tēri-*, see at _teri-_.

tar(k)u-zi (Ia4) ‘to dance’: 3sg.pres.act. _tar-uk-zi_ (KBo 17.43 i 9 (OS)), _tar-ū-zi_ (KBo 30.103 obv. 6 (OH/MS)), _ta-ru[z]i_ (KBo 17.99 i 6 (OH/MS)), _tar-ku-zi_ (NH), _tar-ku-u-zi_ (NH), 3pl.pres.act. _tar-ku-an-zi_ (OS), _tar-ku-ya-an-zi_ (OS), _tar-ku-u-ya-an-zi_ (NH), 3pl.pret.act. _tar-ku-e-er_ (MH/NS); verb.noun _tar-ku-ya-ar_ (KUB 4.1 ivb 40 (MH/NS)); inf.I _tar-ku-ya-an-zl_ (KUB 7.19 obv. 8, KUB 11.34 iv 17, KBo 23.97 i 11 (NH)); impf. [ta]-ru-uš-kán-zi_ (KBo 17.36+ i 10 (OS)), _ta-ru-uš-kán-zi_ (ibid. 20 (OS)), _tar-ku-iš-ke/a-_ (OH/MS), _tar-ū-i-eš-ke/a-_ (OH/NS), _tar-ū-iš-ke/a-_ ‘to twist around’, _tar-ū-i-es-ke/a-_, _tar-ū-iš-ke/a-_ ‘to turn’, _tar-ku-eš-ke/a-_ (NH).

Derivatives: *lu* _targalal-_- (c.) ‘dancer(?)’ (nom.sg. _tar-yiš-eš-ga-la-aš_ (KUB 3.94 i 21 (NS))).

IE cognates: Lat. _torquēre_ ‘to turn’, TochB _tärk-_ ‘to twist around’, Skt. _tark-_- ‘to turn’.

PIE *tērk*′-ti / *trk*′-énti

Usually, the verbal forms cited under this lemma are treated as two separate verbs, namely _tarku-* and _taru-* 2. The stem _tarku-_, which is occasionally spelled _taruk-_ as well (cf. _eku-* ~ _euk_ ′to drink’ and _tarbu-* ~ _taruby-* ′to conquer’), has since Benveniste (1962: 125) generally been connected with TochB _tärk-_- ′to turn’ and Lat. _torquēre_ ′to turn’ and reconstructed as *terk*′-. The alteration between _tarku- and taruk-_ points to a synchronic phonological form /trk*/-l. This also explains the inf.I _tarkuani_ and verb.noun _tarkyar_, which do not show haplography from **_tarku-ya-an-zi_ and **_tarku-ya-ar_ (contra Otten 1973: 53), but are rather the result of the fact that the labial element of /k/ does not participate in the sound law *-_yu>- *-_mu_. So _tarkuani_ and _tarkyar_ can be interpreted as perfectly regular /trk*/uântʼl/ and /tärk*/war/.
The interpretation of the stem taru-² has caused much debate. In some contexts, the verb taru- clearly denotes ‘to dance’, e.g.

KUB 25.37 i

(6) [143]MUHALDIM ma-aḫ-ḥa-an tar-qi₂-eš-ke-et mu a-pa-a-aš-š=a QA-TAM-MA
(7) [tar-q]i₂-eš-ke-u-an da-a-i pé-di=já-a=š-ša-an ya-aḫ-mu-uš-ke-ez-zi

‘When the cook has danced, he as well starts to dance in the same manner. He keeps on making himself whirl on (his) place’.

Oettinger (1979a: 226) argues that taru- rather means ‘to rage’, however. This interpretation is primarily based on the in.-form tar-qa-u-qa-an-zi (KUB 12.62 obv. 11, 13), but Tischler (HEG T: 245) convincingly interprets this form as belonging to a verb tarp-qa-e₂ ‘to turn to wood; to fix, to fasten’ (see under the lemma tarpu-). Another context in which Oettinger proposes to translate ‘to rage’ is KBo 10.23 iii (3) [mu pár-ša-ni-li tar-ú-i-eš-kân]-zi] ‘sie toben wie Panther’, which contrasts with CHD’s translation ‘and they dance dressed in leopard’s skins’ (P: 186). All in all, we have to conclude that taru-² means ‘to dance’ only (cf. Melchert 1994a: 61: “there is not a shred of evidence for [translating taru- as] ‘to rage’”). Therefore, Oettinger’s etymological interpretation (1979a: 226, based on Knobloch 1959: 35 and repeated thus by Tischler o.c.: 236) of taru- as reflecting an u-extension of a root *d’er- ‘sexuell herumtoben’ (Gr. ὀρνικα ‘to leap, to mount’, which rather reflects *d’erh₂-, cf. LIV²) is unconvincing.

Having the meaning ‘to dance’, taru- strongly resembles tarku-, of course (Melchert (l.c.): “tarku- and taru- are synonymous, being used in virtually identical contexts”), which would point to an etymological connection between the two. Larroche (1958: 197) assumes that taru- is the Luwian variant of tarku-. Melchert (l.c.) follows this suggestion and assumes that PIE *k₂ unconditionally yielded PAnat. *g₂”, which on the one hand gave Hitt. -k₂-, but on the other Luw. -u-. Oettinger (1979a: 225) convincingly speaks against a Luwian origin of taru- however: “jedoch kommt – abgesehen davon, daß taru-² stets wie ein genuin heth. verbum behandelt wird (kein Glossenkeil, Ableitung ¹⁰ tarušgala-, usw.) – taru-²-²m² bereits in ah. Sprache vor und kann somit kaum luwisch sein”. Moreover, Melchert’s claim that PIE *k₂ unconditionally yielded PAnat. *g₂” in word-final position is incorrect (cf. takku < *tak’ë, nekku < *nek’ë, but also the existence of Luwian /k/ in CLuw. manakkuna/i- ‘short’, nakkuša/i- ‘scapegoat’, (pap)parkuḫa(i)- ‘to cleanse’, e.a.).
In my view, we must compare the situation of tarku-\textsuperscript{2} besides taru-\textsuperscript{2} to the verbs \textsuperscript{3}har(k)-\textsuperscript{2} ‘to have, to hold’ (\textsuperscript{3}hark- besides \textsuperscript{3}har-) and \textsuperscript{3}ištar(k)-\textsuperscript{2} ‘to ail’ (\textsuperscript{3}ištark- besides \textsuperscript{3}ištar-). Of these latter two verbs, I have argued that they show loss of \*k in a cluster \*-RkC-. The loss of \*k in this position was phonetically regular, but in the paradigm of \textsuperscript{3}ištar(k)-, \*k was largely restored on the basis of forms in which \*k was regularly retained (\*-RkV\textsuperscript{3}-), whereas in \textsuperscript{3}har(k)- the old situation was preserved because of its frequent use. In the case of the pair tarku- ~ taru- I believe we are dealing with a similar phenomenon. This view is strengthened by the fact that taru- is found with endings that start in a consonant only (-zi and -ške/a/-). If this proposal is correct, it would show that we have to reckon with the following line of events: \*\textit{terk}ii > \*\textit{tar}p\textit{il}ii > Hitt. \textit{h}ārūt\textit{u}l, spelled tar-u-zi; and \*\textit{tr}kške/a/- > \*\textit{tr}pške/a/- > OH /truske/a-l, spelled taraške/a/- (OS) (note that NH tare\textit{u}ške/a- seems to stand for /truske/a-l/, which cannot be regularly from OH /truske/a-l/. Either we must assume that the NH variant l-iske/a-l of the impf.-suffix -ške/a/- (q.v.) has been used here, or we must assume that this form stands for /truske/a-l/, which would indicate that OS taraške/a- is to be interpreted as /truske/a-l < \*\textit{tr}pške/a-). This means that in the case of \textsuperscript{3}har(k)- and \textsuperscript{3}ištar(k)- we are dealing with \*\textit{h}2erk-ii > \*\textit{har}p\textit{il}ii > Hitt. \textit{h}ār\textit{u}l, spelled ħar-zi.

Note that Oettinger (1979a: 224) cites a form 3sg.pret.act. \textit{tar-ku-ya-a-iš-ta} (KUB 24.97 i 11), but this should be read \textit{tar-ku-ya a-us-ta} ‘he looked angrily’ (see under tarku\textsuperscript{3}ant-).

tarku\textsuperscript{3}ant- (adj.) ‘looking angrily’: nom.-acc.pl.n. tar-\textit{ku-ya-an-ta}, tar-\textit{ku-ya-an-da}.

Derivatives: tarku\textsuperscript{3}a (adv.) ‘angrily’ (tar-\textit{ku-ya}), targullijau\textsuperscript{3}ar (n.) ‘furious look’ (nom.-acc.sg. tar-gul-li-ja-u-ya-ar), tarku\textsuperscript{3}aliye/a-\textsuperscript{3} (Ic1) ‘to look angrily’ (impf.1sg.preter.act. tar-\textit{ku-ya-al-li-iš-ke-nu-un}).


PIE \*\textit{terg}\textsuperscript{\(-\)}\textit{-ent-}

Since Szemérenyi (1942: 395f.) and Neumann (1971: 262) this adjective is generally connected with Lat. \textit{torvus} ‘looking grimly’ < \*\textit{terg}\textsuperscript{\(-\)}\textit{-o-}. In Hittite, we seem to be dealing with a petrified participle of a further unattested verb \*tarku- ‘to look grimly’ which reflects \*\textit{terg}\textsuperscript{\(-\)} (also in Skt. tarj- ‘to threaten’).

tarma\textsuperscript{(c)} (c.) ‘nail, peg, pin’ (Sum. Gil\textsuperscript{c}GAG): nom.sg. tar-ma-\textit{aš} (OS), abl. tar-ma-\textit{za} (here? KBo 26.94 obv. 7), acc.pl. tar-mu-\textit{uš}.


IE cognates: Gr. τόρπος ‘hole or socket in which a peg is stuck; projecting peg or pivot’.

PIE *tor-mo-

The noun *tarma- and its derivative *tarmae̯zi* are attested in OS texts already. Tischler HEG T: 185 cites a stem *tarmi- as well on the basis of two attestations, which I rather interpret as a separate word (see at *tarmi-). Many different etymologies have been proposed: see Tischler (I.c.) for an overview. In my view the best proposal is by Frisk (1960-1972: 880, 913), who connects *tarma- with Gr. τόρπος ‘peg’ (although his proposal to connect PGerm. *parma- ‘gut’ seems semantically unattractive to me). For Hittite, we can reconstruct *tormo-, but *trmo- is in principle possible as well. The derivative *tarmae- must reflect *t(o)rmo-je/o- (with ~o-je/o- as all hatrae-class verbs).

Kimball (1999: 381) assumes that the root was *terh₂- on the basis of Gr. τερπεῖν ‘bore, gimp’, which means that in *tormo- > Gr. τόρπος the ‘de Saussure-effect’ must have taken place (i.e. loss of a laryngeal after *o-grade). In Hittite, such an effect is invisible as *-h₂- would have been lost in this environment anyway.

tarmi- (c.) symptom of a disease: nom.sg. tar-mi-iš.

This word occurs twice in one text only:

KUB 8.36 iii
(1) [ma-a-an] an-tu-uš-[a-an] ḫu-šu-ya-ah-[u-ur-ti-in]
(3) nu-uḫ-ta-rri-it-ti me-mi-ja-aš=ma-aš-ši=kán [NU.GÁL]
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(4) na-aš-ma tar-mi-iš ya-al-aḥ-zi

‘When (a feeling) of burning seizes the throat of a man, or a cough convulses’ (him) and he loses his voice, or a t. strikes (him)’;

ibid.

(11) ma-a-an an-tu-yaḥ-ša-an tar-mi-iš ya-al-aḥ-zi

‘When a t. strikes a man’.

It clearly denotes a certain symptom of a disease. Therewith this word cannot be identical to tarma- ‘nail, peg, pin’ (q.v.). Further unclear.

tarma- (c.) ‘head, skull; a small measure’: nom.sg. tar-na-aš, acc.sg. tar-na-a(n)=š-ša-an, abl. tar-na-a(z)=š-ši-it, tar-na-a(z)=š-še-et, dat.-loc.pl. tar-na-a(š)=š-ma-aš.

IE cognates: TochB tarne ‘crown of the head, summit’.

PIE *trno- or *dʰrno-

Within the IE languages, TochB tarne ‘crown of the head, summit’ evidently is cognate. Van Windekens (1963: 42f.) compared this word to Skt. dṛṇa- ‘cracked’ (referring to ModHG Scheitl from scheiden ‘to split’ as a semantic parallel), but since TochB t- cannot reflect *d- (which would have yielded ts-) this comparison is formally impossible. So on the basis of the Hittite and Tocharian forms, we should reconstruct *trno- or *dʰrno-. Adams (1999: 281) adduces Yazgulmani tern ‘crown of the head’, which then would point to *t-.

tarna- / tarn- (IIa1γ > Ic2) ‘to let (go), to allow, to leave (something)’: 1sg.pres.act. tar-na-ah-ḥé (OS), tar-na-ah-ḥi (OS), 2sg.pres.act. tar-na-at-ti (MH/MS), tar-na-ši (KBo 4.2 i 25, ii 21, iii 8 (OH/NS), KUB 19.49+ i 56 (fr.), 57 (fr.) (NH)), 3sg.pres.act. tar-na-i (OS), tar-na-a-i (OS), tar-na-iz-zi (KUB 28.4 i 25b (NS)), 1pl.pres.act. tar-nu-me-ni, tar-nu-um-me-e-ni (NH), tar-nu-um-me-ni, tar-nu-um-ma-ni (KBo 2.8 i 15 (NS)), 2pl.pres.act. tar-na-at-te-ni (MH/MS), tarna-te-ni, 3pl.pres.act. tar-na-an-zi (OS), 1sg.pret.act. tar-na-aḥ-ḥu-un (OS), tarna-aḥ-ḥu-u-un (1x), 3sg.pret.act. tar-na-aš (OS), tarna-eš-ta (KUB 13.34 iv 14 (NS)), tarna-ši-ta (KUB 1.1+ iv 49 (NH)), 1pl.pret.act. tar-nu-mé-en (KBo 3.45 obv. 10 (OH/NS)), tar-nu-um-me-en, tar-nu-en (KBo 3.60 iii 7 (OH/NS)), 2pl.pret.act. tar-na-at-te-en (NH), 3pl.pret.act. tar-ni-er (MH/MS), tar-ni, 2sg.imp.act. tar-na (KUB 17.10 iii 24 (OH/MS)), tar-ni, 3sg.imp.act. tar-na-ū,
This verb is the name-giver to the ḫa-rae-class (tarnaši (NS), tarnaizzi (NS), tarnaddu (MH/MS)).

The etymological interpretation of this verb is in debate. The tarn(a)-class consists of verbs that reflect a structure *CoH-, *CH-, either reduplicated roots (*Ce-CoH-ei, *Ce-CH-enti) or nasal-infixed verbs (*CR-no-H-ei, *CR-n-H-enti). See at mall-ą / mall-, padda-ą / padd-, ḫarra-ą / ḫərr-, iskalla-ą / ḫəskall- and isparra-ą / ḫəsparr- for the view that verbs of a structure *CoCh23-ei, *ChCh23-enti end up in the tarn(a)-class as well. In the case of tarn- / tarn-, we are clearly dealing with a nasal-infixed verb of the structure *Tr-no-H-ei, *Tr-n-H-enti.

Oettinger (1979a: 155, going back to Hrozný 1919: 775) derives tarn(a)- from the root *terh- ‘to cross, to pass through’, but this is formally as well as semantically improbable. From a formal point of view, we would expect that *tr-no-h2-ei would yield Hitt. **tarnahhi and not tarnai. Oettinger’s claim that the original stem tarnahh- is still visible in the one attestation part. tarnahhant-in KBo 3.45 obv. (2) ny=qa tar-na-ah-ḥa-[a]n ẖar-zi, which he calls a “Reliktform”, must be refuted because this line is rather to be read [y]a-[q]-tar-na-ah-ḥqa-[a]n ẖar-zi ‘he has instructed’, with the participle of q̱a(tarnahh-) ‘to instruct’. From a semantic point of view this etymology is problematic because I do not see at all
how an original meaning ‘to cross, to pass through’ could develop into ‘to let (go), to allow’.

A semantically much better proposal was offered by Benveniste (1932: 142), who connected *tarn(a)- with TochAB tärk- ‘to let go, to let, to allow’, which forms a present tärnā- (TochA) ~ tärkanā- (TochB). This means that for Tocharian we have to reconstruct a root *tsärk- that shows a present-formation *tsärk-n-st- . If we want to connect these forms with Hitt. tarn(a)- , we have to assume that in the pre-form *t’särk-n-st-, the *s-st- was dropped. Such a loss is known from the verbs ḥstark(a)- , ḫstar(k)- st- and ḫ(k)a(t)- u- (q.v.), which show that a sequence *-Rk- yields Hitt. *-RC-. This applies to the fortis velars (*k, *k and *k”) but does not work for the lenis velars (*gh, *gh and *gh), cf. for instance ḫargnau- ‘palm, sole’ < *h2erg-nou-. So the velar must have been *k or *k. Because it is against PIE root constraints to have both an ‘aspirated’ and a ‘voiceless’ stop in one root, the initial dental consonant cannot have been *t-st-, but must have been *t-. The root-final laryngeal must be either *h1 or *h1, since *h2 would have left a trace (**tarnahi , cf. above). So all in all, if the Tocharian and the Hittite forms indeed are cognate, which is semantically as well as formally very probable, we have to reconstruct a root *ter’k-h13- with a present formation *tr’k-n-h13- (cf. *gh’renth2- and its present *gh’rmnt-ne-h2- > Skt. grathnāti ‘to knot’ for a similar root structure).

The imperfective shows the forms tar-ši-ke/a-(MH/MS), tar-ši-ik-ke/a-(MH/MS), tar-ni-eš-ke/a- (OH/NS), tar-ni-iš-ke/a- (NS) and tar-na-aš-ke/a-(NS). The forms taršike/a- and tarškke/a- have to be phonologically interpreted as /trške/-, taršike/a- and taršike/a- as /tnške/- and taršakte/a- as /tnškete/- Of these three, /trške/- must be the most archaic one as it is totally aberrant within the paradigm of tarn(a)-. Its archaicty is supported by the fact that it is the oldest attested form (MS texts already). In my view, it reflects the original imperfective *tr’k-h3-skē/ó- without the present-suffix -n- (compare dūyaraške/a- < *dūyṛh1-skē/ó- from the nasal present dūyarni- / dūyarn- ‘to break’ < *dūr-n(e)-h1- , or zikkke/a- < *d’h1-skē/ó- from the *-oi-present *d’h1- (oi)- > dai- / ti- ‘to put’). The phonetic development must have been *tr’h3-skē/ó- > *tr’h3-skē/ó- (loss of *k in cluster *-rkC- as discussed above), after which *tr’h3-skē/ó- regularly yielded Hitt. /trške/- (compare *pri-prh1-skē/ó- > Hitt. /priške/-, pa-ri-ip-ri-iš-ke/a- ‘to blow (impf.)’ and *h1rh1-skē/ó- > Hitt. /triskē/-, a-ri-iš-ke/a- , a-re-eš-ke/a- ‘to consult an oracle (impf.)’). Only later on, this imperfective was replaced by /tnške/- (on the basis of the weak
stem *trn?-), and later on even by /trnaske/a-/ (on the basis of the strong stem tarna-).

tarš- ‘to become dry’ or ‘to make dry’: 3pl.pres.act. tar-ša-an-zi (KBo 46.200 obv. 5 (NS)); part.nom.-acc.sg.n. tar-ša-an, part.nom.-acc.pl. tar-ša-an-ta; inf.1 tar-šu-u-ya-an-zi (KUB 55.27, 6 (NS)); verb.noun tar-še-es-sar (KUB 43.56 iii 22 (NS)).


PIE *ters-

This verb is not well attested. The only finite form, taršanzi, is attested in a broken context only. The exact meaning of tarš- is not fully clear either. Often, it is translated ‘to roast, to dry’ (e.g. Tischler HEG T: 219 “trocknen, dörren, rösten”).

The most common context in which this verb occurs is in the pair tarš an mallan ‘roasted? / dried? and milled’ (cf. CHD L-N: 126 for this translation), said of grains. In my view, a meaning ‘roasted’ is quite unlikely here: why would one roast grain before milling it? Furthermore, a meaning ‘dried’ is supported by the comparable pair hātan mallan ‘dried and milled’ (of hāt- / hāt- ‘to become dry’).

The only place where a meaning ‘roasted’ at first sight seems favourable is УЗУ tar-ša-an, attested in the quite broken context KBo 30.43 ii 11. Although one is tempted to translate ‘roasted meat’, e.g. Oettinger (1979a: 453) translates it as ‘Dörrefleisch’. Tischler (HEG T: 220) even assumes that УЗУ taršan denotes a body part and is to be separated from this verb. All in all, I conclude that taršant- means ‘dried’ only, and that there is no evidence for a meaning ‘roasted’.

Oettinger (1979a: 452f.) convincingly connects this verb with the PIE root *ters- ‘to (become) dry’. He remarks, however, that on the basis of taršant- ‘dried’ we have to assume that the basic verb was transitive and cannot directly reflect the intransitive root *ters- but must go back to the causative formation *ters-eje- ‘to make dry’ (Skt. tarṣāvati, Lat. torrēg and OHG derren ‘to dry (something)’). On the basis of his reconstruction *ters-eje-, he assumes that tarš- is ḫi-conjugated. In my view, all these reasonings are unnecessary. The part. hāt- means ‘dried’ as well (and is even used in the same contexts as taršant-) but is derived from the intransitive verb hāt- ‘to (become) dry’ (q.v.). This means that we can assume just as well that tarš- was intransitive and meant ‘to become dry’ too. If so, then it could directly reflect PIE *ters-. A choice between these two scenarios can only be based on a context in which we find a finite form
The formation of the word resembles entrance section from the real temple sanctuary: gen.sg. tar-ša-an-ze-pa-aš (OS), abl. tar-ša-an-ze-pa-az (OS), dat.sg. tar-ša-an-zí-pí, tar-ša-zí-pí (1x).

Derivatives: taršanzipa- (c.) ‘id. (deified)’ (dat.-loc.sg. tar-ša-an-zí-pí).

Although attested many times, it still is not fully clear what this word denotes.

The formation of the word resembles tagānezpa- (q.v.), which means that taršanzipa- is to be analysed as taršan- + ze/îpa-. At the lemma of tagānezpa- I have argued that the element ze/îpa- probably was -zepa- in OH times, which was altered to -zîpa- in younger times. In the overview above I therefore have cited the sign ZI as ze in the OS attestations and as zî in the younger attestations. The origin of the element taršan- is unclear. Connections with tarš- ‘to become dry’ or tarša- ‘shoot’ are semantically not very compelling. No further etymology.

taršanzipa- (c.) an object in the temple, a sort of room divider to separate the entrance section from the real temple sanctuary: gen.sg. tar-ša-an-ze-pa-aš (OS), abl. tar-ša-an-ze-pa-az (OS), dat.sg. tar-ša-an-zí-pí, tar-ša-zí-pí (1x).

Although attested many times, it still is not fully clear what this word denotes.

The word is spelled with the sign ZI that in principle can be read zî as well as ze.

The formation of the word resembles tagānezpa- (q.v.), which means that taršanzipa- is to be analysed as taršan- + ze/îpa-. At the lemma of tagānezpa- I have argued that the element ze/îpa- probably was -zepa- in OH times, which was altered to -zîpa- in younger times. In the overview above I therefore have cited the sign ZI as ze in the OS attestations and as zî in the younger attestations. The origin of the element taršan- is unclear. Connections with tarš- ‘to become dry’ or tarša- ‘shoot’ are semantically not very compelling. No further etymology.
This word was first identified as ‘wood’ and etymologically connected with PIE *dōru- by Ehelolf (1933: 7), which has since then received general acceptance. It is unclear whether the ablaut visible in Skt. dāru, drōṣ < *dōr-u, *dr-ēu-s has survived in Hittite as well. The plene spelling in ta-a-ru must reflect *dōru, but whether attestations with ta-ru- reflect a zero-grade *dōr-u cannot be determined.

The basic meaning of the Hittite word is ‘wood’, but a meaning ‘tree’ may still be visible in the word allantaru- ‘oak’, which seems to be a compound of Sem. allan- ‘oak’ and Hitt. tāru-, which then here could denote ‘tree’.

See Tischler HEG T: 244f. for an extensive treatment of the verb taryaez², which he translates “(magisch) fixieren; anpflocken”. Especially his interpretation of inf.I tar-ya-a-ya-an-zi (KUB 12.62 obv. 11, 13) is attractive (contra Oettinger 1979a: 224f., who interpreted this word as belonging with taru-, which he therefore translated ‘to rage’, cf. tar(k)u² ‘to dance’).

According to Hoffner apud Friedrich HW Erg. 3: 33, the hapax ta-a-ru-ma-ki-i [n³] (KUB 8.62 i 6), which possibly denotes a bird, is to be analyses as tāru-yaki- ‘wood-biter’ (second element derived from yāk² / yakk- ‘to bite’), cf. ‘woodpecker’.

In Luwian, we find two derivatives, CLuw. daruš- ‘statue’ and HLuw. tarut- ‘statue’ (the HLuwian nom.-acc.sg. tarusa shows the t-less nom.-acc. with the secondary ending -sa, compare words in -ahit- with nom.-acc.sg. -ahisa). Starke (1990: 428¹⁵⁵⁵) saw the hapax & tar-ya-aš-ši-iš (KBo 2.4 ii 4) as a genitival adjective in -ašša/i- of taru- but see Tischler (HEG T: 247-8) for the fact that this word must be identical to & taryanašši-, an adjective describing fruit dishes (so possibly tar-yai-na-aš-ši-iš), of which a connection with tāru- is far from ascertained.

taru²; see tar(k)u²

-taru (3sg.imp.midd.-ending).

This ending clearly is a secondary formation, replacing the -i of 3sg.pres.midd.-ending -ttari (q.v.) by the imperetival -u (q.v.).

taruḥh-zi: see tarḥu-zi

taruḫ-zi: see tar(k)u-zi

tarupp-zi (Ib1 > Ic1, Ic2) ‘to collect, to unite, to plaid together; (midd.) to collect oneself, to be finished’; 1sg.pres.act. ta-ru-up-pi-ja-mi (KBo 11.11 i 2 (NH)), 3sg.pres.act. ta-ru-up-zi (IBoT 2.96, 10 (OH/NS)), ta-ru-up-za (NH), ta-ru-up-pa-iz-zi (HT 1 ii 11 (NH)), da-ru-pa-iz-zi (KUB 9.31 ii 22 (NH)), 3pl.pres.act. ta-ru-up-pa-an-zi (IBoT 2.94 vi 13 (OH/NS), KBo 5.1 iv 1 (MH/NS)), 1sg.pret.act. ta-ru-up-pu-un (KBo 19.90 + 3.53 obv. 10 (OH/NS), KBo 3.46 + KUB 26.75 obv. 40 (OH/NS), 3sg.pret.act. ta-ru-up-ta (KUB 26.77 i 17 (OH/NS), often (NH)), ta-ru-up-pi-ja-at (KUB 27.27 ii 28 (NS)), 3pl.pret.act. da-ru-up-pé-e-[r] (KBo 22.1 obv. 2 (OS)), ta-ru-up-pé-er (often, MH/MS), 2sg.imp.act. ta-ru-up (KBo 3.23 obv. 3 (OH/NS), KUB 29.1 ii 44 (OH/NS)), da-ru-up (KUB 31.115, 7 (OH/NS)), 2pl.imp.act. ta-ru-up-tén (OH/NS); 3sg.pres.midd. ta-ru-up-ta-ri (often, NH), ta-ru-up-da-ri, ta-ru-up-ta-ri (NH), ta-ru-up-ta, ta-ru-piš-ta (KBo 11.11 i 9 (NH), for interpretation see Tischler HEG T: 240), 3pl.pres.midd. ta-ru-up-pa-an-ta-ri, 3sg.pret.midd. ta-ru-up-ta-at (MH/MS), 3pl.pret.midd. ta-ru-up-pa-an-ta-ti (MH/MS), ta-ru-up-pa-an-ta-t (NH), 3sg.pret.midd. ta-ru-up-ta-ru (KUB 29.1 ii 46 (OH/NS)), [ta-ru]-up-da-aru (NH), 3pl.pret.midd. ta-ru-up-pa-an-ta-r (NH); part. ta-ru-up-pa-an-t (MH/MS), da-ru-up-pa-an-t (MH/MS); verb.noun ta-ru-up-pu-ar (KBo 1.42 i 1 49), gen.sg. [ta-]ru-up-pu-u-ya-an-š (KUB 12.16 i 13); inf.I ta-ru-up-pu-u-a-an-z[i] (KBo 10.36 ii 11); impf. ta-ru-up-pi-es-ke/a/.

Derivatives: taruppeššar / taruppešn- (n.) ‘collection’ (nom.-acc.sg. ta-ru-up-pé-es-šar (KBo 1.42 ii 15), dat.-loc.sg. da-ru-up-pi-iš-ni (KUB 19.49 i 57)), taruppipānu-zi (Ib2) ‘to bring together, to collect’ (3sg.pres.act. da-ru-up-pi-ja-nu-zi (IBoT 2.129 ii 22)), taruppipāḥ-zi (Iib) ‘?‘ (3sg.pret.act. ta-ru-pi-ja-ah-ḥa-aš (KUB 9.11+ i 16 (OH/NS)), ta-ru-up-pi-ja-ah-ḥi-iš (KUB 9.11+ i 17 (OH/NS))), taruppah-zi (Iib) ‘?‘ (3sg.pret.act. ta-ru-up-pa-ah-ḥi-iš (Bo 3947, 13 (OH/NS))).
The etymological interpretation of this verb is quite unclear. Often, tarupp- is connected with Lat. turba ‘tumult, multitude’, Gr. τόπος ‘noise’ and ON porp ‘village’ (first proposed by Holma 1916: 36). This is not only formally improbable (*tur- vs. Hitt. *Tru-; *h vs. Hitt. *p), but semantically unlikely as well: Lat. turba means ‘multitude, large group’, but this meaning has clearly developed from ‘disorder, chaos’, which is the opposite of Hitt. tarupp- ‘to collect, to unite, to plaid together’.

Oettinger’s proposal (1979a: 229) to connect tarupp- with Gr. θορόβος ‘the confused noise of a crowded assembly’ is not convincing either: again Gr. β does not correspond to Hitt. -pp- (Oettinger’s explanation that in Hittite *b was replaced by *p in analogy to other verbs ending in -upp- is totally ad hoc), and the semantic side shows the same problems as the connection with Lat. turba.

If tarupp- is of IE origin, it can hardly reflect anything else than *Treup-. Problematic, however, is the fact that an initial sequence *TrV- in Hittite seems to yield *TerV- (e.g. teripp- > *trep-, teri- < *tri-). Perhaps this development took place in front of front vowels only (otherwise we cannot explain tarai- / tari- or taranzi ‘they speak’ < *tr-ẹnti). If so, it would mean that the epenthesis in *TrVフト took place after the monophthongization of *eu to u. So mechanically, I reconstruct tarupp- as *Treup-ti, *Trup-ẹnti. I must admit that I have not been able to find a convincing cognate, however.

Tischler (HEG T: 243) cites the form ta-ru-up-pi-en-za (KUB 42.42. i 10 (inventory)) as a participle of tarupp-. Because of the broken context, the meaning of the word cannot be determined and therefore a connection with tarupp- cannot be proven.

Otten & Siegelová (1970: 36) cite the forms ta-łu-up-pa-an-da-an and ta-łu-up-pa-an ‘plaid together’:

KUB 2.6 iv
(6) nu=za is-ḫu-uz-zi-in
(7) SIG BABBAR SIG SA₃ an-da
(8) ta-łu-up-pa-an-da-an da-a-i

‘He takes a band plaid together from white and red wool’;

KBo 11.11 iii
If these forms are really to be seen as variants of *taruppant-*, they would show an occasional development of *-r* to *-l* (cf. Melchert 1994a: 171).

The bulk of the attestations of this word occur in the Ritual of Tunnaqija: KUB 9.34 i 22ff, with dupl. KUB 9.4 i 1ff. In this ritual body parts of a ram are used to lift the sickness of the body parts of a sick person. The different body parts used are mentioned in a top-down order, which enables us to determine the (approximate) meaning of some of these body parts. In Kloekhorst 2005a, I have given a detailed treatment of this text, and suggested that the word *tašku(ī)*- might denote ‘thigh-bone’ (situated between *ššuwaššaš*—‘pelvis’ and *ššuwaššašša*—‘shin-bone’) and not ‘testicle’ as was assumed by Alp 1958. Another text in which *tašku*- is found in an enumeration is the following:

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbackslash KBo 24.55 obv.\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbackslash KBo 24.55 obv.
\item \textbackslash KBo 24.55 obv.
\item \textbackslash KBo 24.55 obv.
\item \textbackslash KBo 24.55 obv.
\item \textbackslash KBo 24.55 obv.
\item \textbackslash KBo 24.55 obv.
\end{enumerate}

The bulk of the attestations of this word occur in the Ritual of Tunnaqija: KUB 9.34 i 22ff, with dupl. KUB 9.4 i 1ff. In this ritual body parts of a ram are used to lift the sickness of the body parts of a sick person. The different body parts used are mentioned in a top-down order, which enables us to determine the (approximate) meaning of some of these body parts. In Kloekhorst 2005a, I have given a detailed treatment of this text, and suggested that the word *tašku(ī)*- might denote ‘thigh-bone’ (situated between *ššuwaššaš*—‘pelvis’ and *ššuwaššašša*—‘shin-bone’) and not ‘testicle’ as was assumed by Alp 1958. Another text in which *tašku*- is found in an enumeration is the following:

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbackslash KBo 24.55 obv.
\item \textbackslash KBo 24.55 obv.
\item \textbackslash KBo 24.55 obv.
\item \textbackslash KBo 24.55 obv.
\item \textbackslash KBo 24.55 obv.
\item \textbackslash KBo 24.55 obv.
\end{enumerate}
this strongly indicates that tašku- cannot mean 'testicle', but is likely to denote a limb from the lower half of the body. I therefore stick to my suggestion 'thigh-bone'.

The dat.-loc.sg.-form taškušajja seems to derive from an -i-stem tašku- (e.g. Weitenberg 1984a: 271), which could be the source of gen.sg. taškušaj (< *taškušajš) and dat.-loc.sg. tašku as well. The nom.sg. taškuš, however, shows a genuine u-stem tašku-. Tischler (HEG T: 255) therefore assumes that the form taškušajja is a scribal error, but if the form dašku[y]ajja (KBo 21.105 obv. 3, broken context, with Hurrian from line 4 onwards) really belongs to tašku- as well, taškušajja must be a real form. In that case one might wonder whether the three attestations of nom.sg. ta-aš-ku-uš (all in the Tunnaḫi-ritual, which is notorious for its corrupt forms) could be errors for *ta-aš-ku-uš, although this would be difficult to defend. The other Hittite word that possibly means 'thigh', daššu- / daššay- (adj.) 'strong, powerful; heavy; well-fed; difficult; important' (Sum. DUGUD, Á.GÁL): nom.sg.c. da-aš-šu-uš (often), acc.sg.c. da-aš-šu-un (KUB 30.45 iii 10), nom.-acc.sg.n. ta-aš-šu (KUB 23.72 ii 54 (MH/MS)), da-aš-šu (often), da-a-aš-šu (KBo 22.260 obv. 18 (NS)), gen.sg. [d]a[-aš-š]a-u-[q][a-aš] (KUB 2.1 iv 40), dat.-loc.sg. ta-aš-šar-u-i (KBo 3.8 iii 10), abl. da-aš-ša-ya-az, da-aš-ša-u-ya-az, nom.pl.c. da-aš-ša-u-e-[eš] (KUB 36.106 obv. 9 (OS)), da-aš-ša-u-e-eš (often), acc.pl.c. da-aš-ša-mu-uš (KBo 26.25 iv 9), da-aš-ša-uš (KUB 8.53 ii 25), nom.-acc.pl.n. da-aš-ša-u-ya (KUB 17.7 ii 18, KUB 33.98+ iii 6), da-aš-ša-ya (KUB 19.9 i 21), dat.-loc.pl. da-aš-ša-u-aš (KUB 33.84+, 6, 27)).

Derivatives: daššuyant- (adj.) 'strong' (nom.sg.c. da-aš-šu-ya-an-za (HT 1 ii 27, KBo 22.107 i 14), dašša[ma]-u-² (lb2) 'to make strong' (1sg.pres.act. da-aš-ša-mu-mi (KUB 21.36, 10), 2sg.imp.act. da-aš-ša-mu-ut (KUB 33.102 ii 6), 2pl.imp.act. [ta-aš(-ša)-n]-u-ut-ta-ni (KUB 23.72 ii 54 (MH/MS)); 2sg.imp.midd. ta-aš-ša-mu-uh-ḫu-ut (KUB 23.77+ obv. 35 (MH/MS)); part. da-aš-ša-mu-ya-an-t-, da-aš-ša-mu-ya-an-t-; verb.noun ta-aš-šu-mar; impf. da-aš-ša-mu-šu-ke/-a/-, ta-ša-mu-šu-ke/-a/-, dašš加紧² (lb2) 'to become heavy, to become pressing' (2sg.pret.act(?)) da-aš-še-e-ta (KBo 4.10 i 40), 3sg.imp.act. da-aš-ši-iš-du (KUB 43.38 rev. 28)), daššuyatar (n.) 'might(?)' (nom.-acc.sg. da-aš-šu-ya-tar (Bo 68/235 i 1)), taššije-² (lc1) 'to be heavy, to make heavy, to press' (only in derivatives taššijatatar (n.) a kind of disease (nom.-acc.sg. ta-aš-ši-iš-tar),}
**taššiqaṭar** (n.) a kind of disease (nom.-acc.sg. ta-aš-ši-ja-u-yu-ar) and taššijama-
(c.) a kind of disease (acc.sg. ta-aš-ši-ja-ma-an).

IE cognates: Skt. dāmsas- ‘miraculous power’, dāms- ‘to have miraculous power’, Gr. δώκος ‘to learn’.

PIE *de/oNs-u-

See Weitenberg 1984: 146 and Tischler HEG T: 259f. for attestations. The word clearly is a u-stem of a stem dašš-, which is found thus in dašš(a)mu-² (compare ašš(a)mu-² and šašš(a)mu-² (under the lemma šēš-² / šaš-) for a similar alternation in spelling), daššēs-² and, if this interpretation is correct, in *taššiē/a-², a further unattested verb that served as the basis for several words for diseases.

The judgement of the etymology of this word has been largely determined by one’s view on the development of the clusters *-ns- and *-ms-. For a long time it was thought that *-ns- yielded Hitt. -nz-, primarily on the basis of the interpretation of šumanza-, allegedly ‘binding’, as reflecting *suḥ₁-mēn-s. Since this word, which actually is *(O)šumanza-, now has been identified as *(bul)rush’ the etymological connection with Gr. ἴην and a reconstruction *suḥ₁mēn-s has to be given up. This means that the only good examples for the development of *ns are the following words: anzāš ‘us’ reflects *ns-ās and shows that *(C)nsV > (C)anzV; -yaš (gen.sg. -ending of verb.nouns in -yar) reflects *-yen-s and shows that *Vns# > Vš. To my knowledge, no good example for *VnsV exists (note that genzu- ‘lap’ reflects *henḥ₁-su- where the presence of a laryngeal is crucial as it blocks the assimilation). For *-ms- there are more examples. On the basis of ḥananza- ‘black’ < *ḥymsono- and ḥanžāša- ‘offspring’ < *ḥymṣōsio- we can assume that *CmsV > CanzV (cf. also Melchert 1994a: 121), whereas ḥāšṣa- ‘offspring’ < *ḥyōmo- and ḥašṣu- ‘king’ < *ḥyemsu- show a development *VmsV > VššV (note that ḡnši ‘wipes’ reflect *ḥyōmh₁šeĩ, again with a crucial laryngeal that blocks the assimilation to -šš-). Let us, with this in mind, look at the proposed etymologies for daššu-.

Kellogg (1925: 28) proposed a connection with Gr. δόξα ‘thickly wooded, hairy, shaggy’ and Lat. dūns ‘dense’ that reflect *de/ns-u-. This etymology has been criticized for its awkward semantics. An alternative etymology was put forward by Juret (1941: 51), who connected the word with Skt. dāmsas- ‘miraculous power’, which indeed seems semantically more likely. Skt. dāmsas-is generally regarded a derivative from the verb dāms- ‘to have miraculous power’, which LIV² reconstructs as *dens- ‘to become skilled’ (~ Gr. δόξον ‘to learn’), although I do not see any reason the specifically reconstruct -n-: all forms mentioned in LIV² could reflect *dens- as well. Weitenberg (1984: 146) follows
Juret’s suggestion, but is forced to reconstruct *d(o)msu-, because in his opinion *d(o)msu- should have given **danzu-. As we saw above, this latter assumption has no ground anymore, and therefore we can reconstruct both -n- as well as -m-. It must be noted that a reconstruction *dNs-u- is not possible, since this should have given **danzu-, whereas both *deNs-u- and *dNs-u- would have yielded daššu- as attested.

Starke (1990: 252f.) has argued that the hapax taššijaman, a disease, must be of Luwian origin and reflects a neuter stem taššijam(m)an, on the basis of which he claims that in Luwian a verb taššǐ- must have existed. In my view, there is not a shred of evidence that taššijaman is of Luwian origin, however: it occurs in a Hittite context, and is grammatically regular. Moreover, a stem tašš- is not found in any genuine Luwian text.


We find the spellings da-šu-ya-, ta-šu-ya- as well as ta-šu-ya-, all denoting *tasua-. The etymological interpretation has been in debate. Sturtevant (1933: 105) proposed a connection with Skt. tāmas- ‘darkness’, tāmśār ‘dark night’ and reconstructed *tms-yent-. The Skt. words, however, clearly reflect *temH- (e)s-, from a verb *temH- ‘to faint, to become dark’. Phonetically, it is quite improbable that a pre-from *tmH-s-yent- would have given Hitt. tašuynant- (we would expect **/tuSmant-/ spelled **/tuNHuynant-, cf. § 1.4.4.3). Nevertheless, the etymology has been widely followed (e.g. Kimball 1999: 328: *te/omHRynt-).
Szemerényi (1956: 77) connected the word with a root *dʰem- which is visible in Olr. deim 'black, dark', OE dimm 'dark'. This is phonetically equally problematic: a preform *dʰmsuent- probably would have given **danuṃant-, whereas *dʰe/omsyent- should have given **daššuyant-.

Melchert (1994a: 70) states: “Hitt. dɑš(u)want- ‘blind’ need not reflect *d(e)mhs-went- ‘dark’, but is better derived from *das-went- ‘lacking’, to the root of Skt. dɑsyati ‘lacks’ (for the meaning cf. Ital. orbo)”. LIV² and Mayrhofer (1986-2002: s.v.) take Skt. das- as reflecting *sɡwes(h2)- (so from Skt. jas-), however.

Rieken (1999a: 232f.) rejects all etymologies that assume an original nasal, because “wie auch immer man den tašuyant- zugrundeliegenden s-Stamm ansetzt, schwundstufig oder hochstufig, mit oder ohne Laryngal, in keine Fall ist bloßes s zu erwarten”. She follows a proposal by Juret (1940/41: 51), who connects the word with ModEng. dusk (but -sk is problematic), Lat. fuscus ‘dark brown’ and Skt. dhvāṃsatī ‘to fall to dust’, and reconstructs *dʰyoṣ-yent-. Although this preform indeed would regularly yield Hitt. tašyant- (with *Tuo > ta- like in tān < *duoim), it is problematic that Skt. dhvāṃs- goes back to *dʰuens- (also visible in PGer. *dunsta- ‘dust’), with a nasal. All in all, none of the proposed etymologies can account for tašuyant- without problems regarding the phonetic development.

-<tta> (2sg.pret.midd.-ending): see -<tta⟩(ri), -<tta⟩(i)

-<tta> (3sg.pret.midd.-ending): see -<tta⟩(ri), -<tta⟩(i)

<ttara> (Ic2) ‘? ’: 3pl.pres.act. ta-at-ta-ra-a-an-zi (KUB 9.15 iii 6 (NS)).

IE cognates: ?Lat. terŏ ‘to rub’, ?Gr. τῆξα ‘to rub’.

PIE *to-tr(h2)- ??

This verb is hapax in the following context:

KUB 9.15 iii
(5) nu=kān Ė DINGIR¹ḪT pa-ra-a ša-an-ḫa-an-zi
(6) da-ga-an-zi-pu-uš ta-at-ta-ra-a-an-zi
(7) nu Ė DINGIR¹ḪT an-dur-za a-ra-alḫ-za ḫur-ni-ja-an-zi

‘They sweep the temple and t. the earth (pl.) and they sprinkle the temple inside (and) outside’.
Because of the plene -a- in -ţni it is likely that this verb belongs to the hatrae-class. On the basis of the duplicate KBo 12.114 iii 4, where we find [K]11H\-aš tāk-ša-an-zi ‘they unify the earth (pl.)’, Tischler (HEG T: 273) assumes that \textit{tattarae}- means something like ‘to smooth (out)’.

Since the verbs of the \textit{hatrae}-class are usually derived from o-stem nouns, we would in this case have to assume that \textit{tattarae}- is derived from a further unattested noun *\textit{tattara}-. Nevertheless, because of the high productivity of the \textit{hatrae}-inflection in NH times, it is also possible that \textit{tattarae}- originally belong to another class. This assumption is necessary if one wants to follow Kapancjan’s etymology (1931-33: 24), who proposed to connect \textit{tattarae}- with Lat. \textit{terē} ‘to rub’, Gr. \textit{τείπω} ‘to rub’, which reflect *ter(\textit{h}1)- (see LIV\textsuperscript{2} for the possible *\textit{h}2-). If this is correct, then we have to reconstruct *\textit{to-tr(h)}1-.

\textit{-ttati} (2sg.pret.midd.-ending): see -ttari), -ttati)

\textit{-ttati} (3sg.pret.midd.-ending): see -ttari), -ttati)

tatrant- (adj.) ‘agitated, aggressive (cow); sharp-edged (stone)’: nom.sg.c. ta-at-ra-an-za (KUB 2.2+ ii 55), acc.sg.c. ta-at-ra-an-ta-an (IBoT 1.36 ii 65).

Derivatives: tatrat\textsuperscript{2} (IIb) ‘to incite, to stir up’ (3sg.pres.act. da-at-ra-\textit{a}h-\textit{h}i (KUB 31.103 obv. 16), 3sg.pret.act. ta-at-ra-\textit{a}h-\textit{h}a-\textit{a}š (KUB 23.11 iii 6 (MH/NS)), ta-at-ra-\textit{a}h-ta (KUB 19.9 i 24).


PIE *\textit{do-dr-ent}-?, *\textit{do-dr-eh}2-?

These words seem to be derived from a further unattested stem *\textit{tatt(a)}- (compare the situation of \textit{dašuvarant-} ‘blind’ and \textit{dašuvaḥh}1- ‘to make blind’ that are both derived from a further unattested stem *\textit{dašu}-). The meaning of the verb \textit{tatrat\textsuperscript{h}h}- is quite clear in e.g. the following context (although the form itself is rather damaged here):

\begin{verbatim}
KUB 19.9 i

23) EGH-\textit{a}z=ma KUR U\textsuperscript{4R}I-šu-pi-\textit{t}a-\textit{a}š [ku-r]u-\textit{ri-a}h-ta
24) me=\textit{kān} KUR.KUR\textsuperscript{MES} da-\textit{pi-\textit{an}-da tq-\textit{q}-r\textit{q}-\textit{a}h-[a n]u KUR.KUR\textsuperscript{MES}
     da-[\textit{pi-\textit{a}n-\textit{da}a}]
25) ku-\textit{ru-ri-a}h-\textit{he-er}
\end{verbatim}
‘From the back, the land Ishupitta became hostile and incited all the countries.
All the countries became hostile’.

Gamkrelidze & Ivanov (1984: 307 = 1995: 266) saw *tarahāḥ- as a reduplication of “tarḥ-” ‘to conquer’. This is impossible for several reasons. First, the meanings ‘to incite’ and ‘to conquer’ do not have much in common. Secondly, the verb “tarḥ-” does not exist but in fact is *tarḫu- (q.v.), which makes a connection with *tarahāḥ-, which is derived from *tar(a)-, formally impossible.

If the stem *tar(a)- is of IE origin, it can only reflect a reduplication *To-Tr-. Melchert’s connection (1984a: 33) with PIE *der- ‘to cut, to split’ (Skt. dar-, Gr. διόψω, Lith. derū, etc.) therefore is formally better. Nevertheless, we must remain cautious: the proposed semantic connection between ‘hostile, aggressive’ and ‘to cut, to split’ is nothing more than a possibility.

\[\text{IE cognates: } \text{OCS } \text{dērī } \text{‘to do, to say’, } \text{Skt. dhārī } \text{‘to put’, } \text{Gr. } \text{τύφῳ } \text{‘to put’, etc. }\]

\[\text{PIE } *\ddot{\text{d}}\text{ēh₁}-\text{ti}\]

This verb is suppletive: on the one hand we find forms that show the stem \text{iēz}- and on the other forms that show the stem \text{ter}- / \text{tar}- (see there for its own etymological treatment). Already since Hrozný (1915: 29) this verb is connected with especially OCS dētī ‘to do, to say’ < PIE *\ddot{\text{d}}\text{ēh₁}-, which has been generally accepted since.
We would expect that in Pre-Hittite this verb showed an ablaut *dʰeh₁ / *dʰh₁. This ablaut is still visible in verbs that are derived from *dʰeh₁, namely pehute² / pehut- ‘to lead (there)’, uyate² / uyat- ‘to bring (here)’ and yete² / yet- ‘to build’. If we compare forms like 3pl.pres.act. pehudanzi (OS), 3pl.pret.act. uyater (OS), 3pl.imp.act. uyadandu (MH/MS), part. yetant- (OS) and inf.I yedumanzi (MH/MS), we must assume that the original paradigm of tê also contained 1pl.pres.act. *tumõni, 3pl.pres.act. *danzi, 3pl.pret.act. *ter and 3pl.imp.act. *dan. We see that these forms are identical to the corresponding forms of the verb dê / d- ‘to take’ < *deh₁- (although 3pl.pret.act. *dh₁-ër > *ter itself was replaced by *dõh₁-ër > dêr in pre-Hittite times already: the form *ter is still visible in peter and uter, however). This probably was the reason why they were removed from the paradigm of tê and subsequently replaced by forms of the verb ter² / ter-. For 2pl.pres.act. we would expect that *dʰh₁-thê+ni yielded *têni, spelled *za-te-e-ni, (or perhaps *kêtêni, spelled *ta-at-te-e-ni as still visible in uyataten (MH/MS)). This form is replaced by tarteni, but in a NS texts, we find têni as well, probably analogically created on the basis of 2pl.pret.act. tetten < *dʰeh₁-thê+en.

=tte:- see =tti- =tt- / =tte-

têkan / takn- (n.) ‘earth’: nom.-acc.sg. te-e-kân (OS, often), te-e-ga-a(n)=š-sê-it (KBo 17.22 ii 11 (OS)), te-kân (often), gen.sg. ták-na-aš (OS, often), ták-na-aš (MH/MS), dat.-loc.sg. ták-ni-i (often), ták-ni (rare), ták-na-i (KUB 24.9+ ii 22 (OH/NS)), ending-less loc.sg. ta-ga-a-an (OS, often), ta-ga-an (OS, rare), da-a-ga-an (KUB 43.17, 6 (NH)), ta-a-ga-an (KUB 34.120, 7 (NH)), da-a-ga-a-an (KUB 40.46, 9 (NH), all.sg. ta-ak-na-a (KBo 17.1 + KBo 25.3 ii 8 (OS)), ták-na-a, ta-a-ak-na-a (KUB 29.30 iii 13 (OS)), abl. ták-na-a-az (KUB 43.23 rev. 17), ták-na-a, ták-na-az.

Derivatives: see ⁽⁰⁾tağânêpa-.

Anat. cognates: CLuw. tijammi(ɪ)- ‘earth’ (nom.sg. ti-ja-am-mi-ı̂s, ti-ja-am-me-ı̂s, acc.sg. ti-ja-am-mi-in, ti-ja-am-me-in, dat.-loc.sg. ti-ja-am-mi, erg.sg. ti-ja-am-ma-an-ti-ı̂s, gen.adj.nom.sg.c. ti-ja-am-ma-ą-śi-ı̂s, gen.adj.nom.pl.c. ti-ja-am-ma-ą-śi-in-zi); HLuw. takam- ‘earth’ (dat.-loc.sg. ḏERA' ta-ka-mi-i (SULTANHAN §39)).

PAnat. *dê-g-, *dê-em-, *dê-m-ős

IE cognates: Skt. kṣās (f.), gen.sg. jmās, Av. zam-, Gr. χθὸς (f.), TochA tkam, TochB kem, Alb. dhe, Lat. humus, OIr. dü (gen. don), Lith. žemę, OCS zemlija ‘earth’.
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It has been clear since Friedrich (1924-25: 122) that Hitt. tēkan / takn- belongs with the other IE words for ‘earth’. Details regarding the reconstruction are in debate, however. On the basis of Skt. kṣās (f.), gen.sg. jmās = Gr. χάνον (f.), the old reconstruction of ‘earth’ was *gʰdʰōm, *gʰdʰm-ős (with a PIE phoneme ‘thorn’). On the basis of Lith. žemė, OCS zeměja another ablaut-variant *gʰz̞em- can be reconstructed. With the discovery of TochA tkam, it became clear that the initial cluster was not *gʰdʰ- originally, but rather *dʰgʰ-. So we have *dʰgʰōm, *dʰgʰem- and *dʰgʰm-. With the addition of Hitt. tēkan, which must reflect *dʰe̞gʰ-, it became clear that we are not dealing with a root *dʰgʰem-, but rather with a root *dʰe̞gʰ- followed by a suffix -em-.

The next question is how to reconstruct the original paradigm. Since Schindler (1977: 31), tēkan is usually reconstructed ‘holodynamically’ as *dʰe̞gʰ-ôm, *dʰe̞gʰ-om-m, *dʰgʰ-m-ôs. In this sense it would be comparable to the word for ‘hand’, which is often reconstructed ‘holodynamically’ as well: *gʰēs-ôr, *gʰēs-or-m, *gʰs-r-ôs (cf. Rieken 1999a: 280). As I show in detail under its own lemma, the Hittite paradigm of keššar does not go back to these reconstructed forms, however. In my view, it rather shows nom.sg. keššar < *gʰēs-r (cf. Gr. χέπ < *χέλαρ < *gʰēs-r), acc.sg. kiššeran < *gʰēs-r-m and gen.sg. kišras < *gʰs-r-ôs. I therefore want to propose that we have to reconstruct a similar paradigm for ‘earth’ as well: nom.sg. *dʰe̞gʰ-m, acc.sg. *dʰe̞gʰ-êm-m, gen.sg. *dʰe̞gʰ-m-ôs.

Let us first look at the development of nominative and accusative. In Hittite, ‘earth’ is a neuter word, with nom.-acc.sg. tēkan. From the Sanskrit and Greek evidence it is clear, however, that the PIE word for ‘earth’ was feminine. In PIE, non-neuter words of the structure *CC-ÉR, *CÉC-ĒR and *CÉC-R originally where asigmatic: they did not carry the nom.-ending -s. In Hittite, however, an ending -s became obligatory for all commune words, and -s was being added to old asigmatic nominatives, e.g. ḫasterza ‘star’ < *hystēr + -s, ḫaraš ‘eagle’ < *h₂jēr-ôn + -s (cf. Weitenberg 1995). If a word did not have an ending -s, it was eventually reinterpreted in Hittite as neuter (which is the reason that diphthongs-stems (especially in -āu-) often show neuter as well as commune forms in the oldest texts already). In the case of *gʰesr we still find an asigmatic nom.sg. keššar in OH texts (which is therefore occasionally reinterpreted as neuter). The accusative-form *gʰs-r-m, which was replaced by *gʰs-r-om (regular introduction of the o-stem ending *-om in consonant-stem, replacing *-m, cf. at the lemma -an) yielded Hitt. kiššeran, on the basis of which the nominative was thematicized as well, yielding kišširaš and kiššaraš in MH times (cf. Weitenberg
In the case of ‘earth’, we find a different development, however. The PIE forms *dǵʰm, *dǵʰem regularly developed into pre-Hittite *dégm, *dǵém (with simplification of *-emm > *-em). Because the nominative did not have an ending -s and formally looked like an accusative of a consonant-stem, and because the original accusative had become intransparent, the noun was reinterpreted as a neuter and the nominative form *dégm underwent the replacement of *-m by *-om, yielding nom.-acc.sg.n. *dég-om. This *dég-om then regularly yielded Hitt. īkān, spelled tākan. It must be noted that because of the fact that this word is not an original neuter, it does not have a regular ‘ergative’: whenever it is necessary to use an animatized variant of ‘earth’ (e.g. as the subject of a transitive verb), the commune word ḫagānēpa- (q.v.) is used.

The interpretation of the oblique cases is more clear. They are predominantly spelled tāk-n₂ or ta-ak-n₂, showing plene spelling of the ending (tāk-na-a-sā, tāk-ni-i, tāk-na-a). The only spelling that shows ta-a-ak-n₂ must, despite the fact that it is attested in an OS text, be regarded as a mistake, which is supported by the fact that the vowel of that form’s ending is spelled plene as well: ta-a-ak-na-a. It is clear that taknās must go back to *dǵʰ-m-ās. Note that -m- is replaced by -n-, which must have happened in analogy to the nom.-acc.sg. *dég-om > *dég-om on the basis of which *dgmōs > *dgmós. This secondary replacement must therefore have been quite recent. Because taknās goes back to *dgmós, I phonologically interpret taknās as ḫgnās. Note that in the initial cluster ḫgn- no anaptyctic vowel has developed (compare pattai- / pattī- < *pθ₁-oi-, which must represent /ptai-/). The endingless loc.sg. tagān (of which the occasional plene spellings of the first -a- can be disregarded; e.g. da-a-ga-a-an can hardly be a phonetically real spelling) must reflect *dǵʰ-óm and therewith is formally to be equated with Gr. χχύν and, mutatis mutandis, Skt. kṣās. The reconstruction of *ḏ is necessary because *dǵʰ-óm would have yielded **tagān (cf. ḫn < *kóm ‘this (acc.sg.c.’)).

The interpretation of the Luwian words is quite difficult. On the one hand we find CLuw. ti安全管理- ‘earth’ and on the other HLuw. ta-ka-mi-i ‘on the earth’. Although it is clear that PAnat. *ǵ sometimes disappears in Luwian, the exact conditions of this loss are unclear. Certain examples of loss seem to be *ǵes-r-o- > CLuw. iššaira/i-, HLuw. ıstra/i- ‘hand’, *ǵim-ro- > CLuw. im(ma)ra/i- ‘open country’, Hitt. nekna- ~ CLuw. *nānā/i- ‘brother’, HLuw. nanasi- ‘sister’. Certain examples of retention seem to be *ǵodmr- > CLuw. katmaršita/i- ‘to defecate’, *ǵut- > CLuw. kutasra/i-, HLuw. kutasra/i- ‘orthostat’ (cf. Melchert 1994a: 254-5 for examples). Although the evidence is scanty, we seem to be dealing with loss of *ǵ before front vowels (with raising of a following *e to i,
which seems to point to a development *ǵe- > *iē- > *iī- > i-), word-internally before a consonants (or, at least, *n) and retention before back-vowels (compare Kimball 1994c). For tiṣamm(i)-, Melchert (l.c.) assumes a development Panat. *dǵēm- > *dijēm- after which Čop’s Law caused gemination of -m-: tiṣamm(i)-. Although I largely agree with this reconstruction (I believe that this indeed is the only way in explaining PAnat. *ǵesr- > iśra/i- (which shows *ǵe- > i- versus -iīa- in tiṣamm(i)-) due to absence of Čop’s Law in the latter. In my view, we have to reconstruct *ǵesro- and *dǵēmo-. That the first form yielded iśra/i- (and not ijaśra/i-) can only be explained by the fact that here we are dealing with word-initial *ǵe- (> *iē- > i-), whereas in *dǵe- > *dijē- a further development to **dijī- was blocked by the preceding d- after which *dijē- > dji-. With the interpretation of tiṣamm(i)- as reflecting *d’g’-em-, we now have evidence for this ablaut-grade in Anatolian as well, despite the fact that in Hittite it is not directly attested.

HLuw. ta-ka-mi-i is a special case. The normal HLuwian word for ‘earth’ is terra taskuira/i-. The dat.-loc.sg.-form ta-ka-mi-i, which is hapax in SULTANHAN §39, is therefore probably a petrified form of the original word for ‘earth’. Because of the fact that it shows retention of *ǵ, it cannot be equated with CLuw. tiṣamm(i)- like that. Melchert (1994a: 253) therefore reconstructs it as reflecting *dégom- (and subsequently phonologically interprets the word as ttagamui), in which Čop’s Law is supposed to have yielded geminate -gg- that did not fall victim to loss in Luwian. As I argued above, I do not believe that the paradigm of *d’g’h-m- ever contained a form *d’h’g’-om (apart from the very late pre-Hittite rebuilding from *dégm >> *dégom > @kan). In my view there are two possible interpretations. On the one hand, we can assume that ta-ka-mi-i is to be equated with Hitt. dat.-loc.sg. taknû and reflects *dgm-ēi (which would mean that we have to phonologically interpret the word as tgmû). If correct, it would show that in a cluster *dgm-, *ģ was retained in Luwian. It would also still show -m-, and be more archaic in that respect than Hitt. taknû. On the other hand, we can equate ta-ka-mi-i with Hitt. tagûn, and assume that it reflects *d’h’g’h’om + -i, with retention of PAnat. *ģ in front of back-vowel. This reconstruction would mean that ta-ka-mi-i is to be interpreted as tgmî-i.

Quite recently, Melchert proposed to interpret CLuw. inzagûn as denoting ‘things inhumated’ and reflecting “a hypostasis of a univerbated prepositional phrase *en d’h’g’h’om ‘into the earth’” (2003a: 148). According to him, the fact that *d’h’g’h’ yields CLuw. -zg- here, shows that the concept of the ‘thorn’ still has to be regarded as a PIE phenomenon, but then rather has to be interpreted as affrication
of dentals before other stops. Apart from the fact that I think that HLuw. ta-kami-i shows that *dʰgʰ- yields Luwian /g/- (if *g is not lost in front of a front-vowel), and that therefore this reconstruction formally cannot be correct, the semantic side of this interpretation is improbable as well. If we look closely at the contexts in which inzagān occurs, we see that a translation ‘inhumated’ is hardly likely:

KUB 35.54 ii (with additions from the parallels KUB 35.52 and KBo 29.2 ii)

(27) [x - x - x ]KÜ.BABBAR GUŠKIN NUM[(UN)]⅔[(1A)] ḫu-u-ma-an
(28) [(Qša-aḫ-)]ra-an Qš mu-i-la-an Qš in-ta-lu-zi
(29) [x - x - x ]Qš ti-id-du-ur-ri ka[t]-[a] ḫi-ik-zi
(30) n=a-aš-ta an-da ki-iš-ša-an me-ma-i

(31) za-a-ū-i zi-ja-ar NUMUN⅔-na [p]u-u-na-a-ta
(32) in-za-ga-a-an ya-aš-ḫa a=(a)ta [BE-]EL SÍSKUR
(33) Qš ḫa-at-ta-ra-a-ti ḫa-at-ta[=]-ti ii-ta
(34) Qš tu-ra-a-ti=pa=(a)ta tu-u-r[a-a]-r-ta
(35) a=(a)ta im-ra-aš-šav-an ḫ[IŠKUR]-u[n]-i pa-ri
(36) ta-ra-a-u-i-it-ta

‘[xxx] of gold and silver, all the seeds, a rake’, a muqila-, a shovel’, a X (and) a tiddutri he presents down, and he speaks thus: “Here lie down all the seeds, inzagān, and the sacralized objects. The ritual patient has ḫattāri-ed them with a hattara- and has tūra-ed them with a tūra-. He has delivered them to the Storm-god of the Open Country.”’.

According to Melchert, inzagān and yašha are appositions to NUMUN⅔ ‘seeds’ and he therefore translates ‘here lie down the seeds, the inhumated things, the sacralized objects’. It is quite awkward, however, to assume that although in the description of the action it has been told that objects of gold and silver, all the seeds and several agricultural implements are presented, in the words spoken after this action no reference is made to these golden and silver objects or to the agricultural implements anymore. I therefore would rather propose that yašha refers to the golden and silver objects (assuming that these are regarded as ‘sacralized objects’), whereas inzagān then must refer to the several agricultural implements. In this way, we can translate: ‘Here lie down the seeds, the tools and the sacralized objects’. The other context in which inzagān- occurs,

KBo 29.6 obv.
(25) i-in-za-ga-an-za=pa ku-ya-ti-in ša-pi-ja-im-ma-an a-ú-i-du-y=á-[aš=ta]
(26) ya-aš-ku-li-im-ma-a-ti ma-al-ḥa-aš-ša-as-ši-[iš EN-as]

‘Just as the inzagan- is šapijaimma-, may the ritual patient come away from
the sin’,
does not shed any additional light to its meaning, also because the meaning of
šapijaimma/- is unclear. Nevertheless, it does not speak against a translation
‘tool’. All in all, I conclude that there is no reason to interpret inzagan- as
‘inhumated’ and to subsequently reconstruct it as *en dīgōm.

\Urudug\šēkan  ‘pick-axe (?)’  (Sum. (\Giš\Urud\AL(?)?): case? te-e-kân (KUB
32.115 i 9).

IE cognates: Skt. téjate ‘is sharp’, OSax. stekan ‘to stab’, Gr. στεκό ‘to stab’.

PIE *tēg-o-?

Hapax in KUB 32.115 i (9) [...]p[i-īš \Urud\te-e-kân \Urud\MAR, which is
compared by Laroche (1949-50: 20f.) with instances where we find (\Giš\Urud\AL
‘pick-axe’ besides (\Giš\Urud\MAR ‘spade’ (e.g. KUB 9.3 i 7, KUB 7.41 i 5f.). He
therefore assumes that šēkan is the Hittite reading of (\Giš\Urud\AL. According to
Laroche, another attestation is found in

KUB 24.9+ ii

(18) n=ša-aš a-ra-ah-za pa-iz-zi ma-an-ni-in-ku-ya-aḫ-bī\Giš te-e-kân pád-da-a-i
(19) mu=kān a-ni-ur-aš \MINUS\A an-da da-a-i

‘She (the \MINUS\UI.GI) goes outside and in the neighbourhood she digs t. and
puts the equipment of the ritual in there’

but Tischler (HEG T: 301) plausibly argues that we should rather read šēkan
‘earth’ here, as can be seen from the duplicate 452/u where tekan is written
without the GIŠ-determinative, and that we should translate ‘she digs up earth’.
Tischler, however, gives other possible attestations of \Giš\Urud\šēkan, viz. 448/u,
(3) 1 \Urud\[e-e-kân], and KUB 12.53, (4) [\Giš\šēk]\an \Giš\MAR, but of course,
these can only function as indirect evidence. So, all in all, we are stuck with one
real attestation only, viz. KUB 32.115 i 9, which is in a broken context. This
makes the reality of the word dubious. Perhaps the word is there to be read as
šēkan ‘earth’. If \Urud\šēkan indeed means ‘pick-axe’, however, we should follow
Laroche’s proposal (l.c.) to connect tēkan with the root *(s)teig-* ‘to stab, to be sharp’, which would make sense formally as well as semantically.

tekri- (c.) ‘deposition (?)’: nom.sg. te-ek-ri-iš, dat.-loc.sg. te-ek-ri.

IE cognates: Gr. ἔκρος ‘threw away’, Khot. ḏǣš- ‘to throw’.

PIE *deīk-ri-? 

The word occurs a few times only. In the vocabularies KBo 26.20 and KBo 26.11 (duplicates of each other), of which the Sumerian and Akkadian parts have been broken off, we find te-ek-ri-iš being mentioned besides markiānu-gar ‘rejection’:

KBo 26.10 iv
(8) mar-ki-ja-u-ya-ar ‘rejection’
(9) [h]a-te-ša-an-za ‘being dried up’
(10) [r]e-ek-ri-iš
(11) [a]n-da=kān im-pa-ḫu-ya-ar ‘making a burden’
(12) [an]da=kān im-pa-ḫu-ya-ar ‘making a burden’

KBo 26.11 rev.
(6) mar-ki-ja-u-ya-ar ‘rejection’
(7) ḥa-te-eš-ša-an-za ‘being dried up’
(8) ṭe-ek-rfi-iš]

The only real context in which this word is found is the following:

KBo 5.6 iii
(14) ... IR=IA=ma=ya nu-ya-a-an pa-ra-a da-ah-hi
(15) nu=ya-r=a-an=za=kān LU[MU-TI=IA i-ja-mi te-ek-r]=ya na-ah-mi

‘I (= the queen of Egypt) do not want to take one of my subjects and make him my husband. I fear for tekri-’.

In this last context, tekri- has since Kronasser (1966: 225) generally been translated ‘Beflecken’ (see, most recently, Rieken 1999a: 211: ‘Ich furchte mich vor Beflecken’). On the basis of this translation, an etymological connection with Gr. τέκαμ ‘sign’ has been proposed (Neu apud Tischler HEG T: 302), which would point to a reconstruction *tek-ri-. In my view, a translation ‘Beflecken’ does not really make much sense. The queen states that she does not want to marry one of her own subjects out of fair for tekri-. I do not think she fears smearing of her good name, but rather that as soon as her future husband has
become the new king, she will be deposed off as queen by him. A translation ‘deposition’ would also much better fit the surrounding terms in the vocabularies (especially markiāyār ‘rejection’).

This new suggestion does not fit the etymology cited above. I would rather suggest a possible connection with the root *deik- ‘to throw away’ (Gr. ἔδοκον ‘throw away’, Khot. dēk ‘to throw’: cf. LIV\(^2\)), and reconstruct *deik-ri- ‘throwing away > deposition’. For the formation of abstracts in -ri- with the full-grade vowel, compare ešri-, edri-, auri-, etc. Note that this interpretation makes a connection with tekkuššiē/a\(^2\) impossible on semantic grounds (pace Rieken 1999a: 210-1).

tekkuššiē/a\(^2\) (1c1 > 1c2) ‘to show, to present (oneself)’: 3sg.pres.act. te-ku-uš-ši-ez-zi (KBo 25.1b, 2 (OS)), te-ek-ku-uš-ši[ez-zi] (KUB 43.38 rev. 10 (MH/MS)), te-ek-ku-uš-ši-e[ez-zi] (KUB 43.38 rev. 12 (MH/MS)), te-ek-ku-uš-ši-e-zi (KBo 23.103 i 4 (NS)), te-ek-ku-uš-ši-ja-zi (KBo 13.20, 8 (OH/NS)), te-ek-ku-uš-ši-ja-ez-zi (HKM 46 obv. 14 (MH/MS)), 1sg.pres.act. te-ek-ku-uš-ša-mi (KBo 5.3+ i 11 (NH)), 3sg.pret.act. te-ek-ku-uš-ši-e-et (KBo 3.60 i 5 (OH/NS)),


IE cognates: Av. daxš- ‘to teach’, daxšta- ‘sign’.

PIE *dekši-je/o-

The bulk of the attestations show a stem tekkuššiē/a\(^2\). Only once, we find a form that belongs with a stem tekkuššiēae\(^2\) (although in an MS text), and once we find a form that shows a stem tekkuššae\(^2\) (in an NH text), both according to the productive hatrae-class inflection. The causative is spelled te-ek-ku-uš-nu- as well as te-ek-ku-uš-ša-nu-, for which compare e.g. šaš(š)ajnu\(^3\) (under šēš\(^2\) / šaš- ‘to sleep’) and as(š)ajnu\(^3\) ‘to take care of’ (see under asnu\(^2\)).
According to Götze (1951: 471-4), tekkuššie/a- is to be compared with Av. daxš- ‘to teach’ and daxšta- ‘sign’, which would point to a root *dek"s- ‘to show’ (note that initial *d- is not possible as it is against the PIE root constraints to have an ‘aspirated’ as well as a ‘voiceless’ stop in one root). Semantically as well as formally, this etymology is very convincing. Nevertheless, Watkins (1969a: 229), proposes to see tekkušši- as an -u-derivative of tekk-, which he connects with Gr. τεκτόν ‘sign’. This thought is followed by Rieken (1999a: 210-1), who connects tekkuššiie/a- to Hitt. tekri- (q.v.) as well. As I have shown under the lemma of tekri-, which is usually translated ‘Befleckung’, but which I interpret as ‘deposition’, a connection between tekri- and *tek- is quite unlikely. For tekkuššiie/a-, a connection with *tek- would semantically work, but the formal aspect is difficult: I cannot explain why *tek-us-je/o- would yield Hitt. tekkuššiie/a- with geminate -šš-. Moreover, derivation of an -us-stem seems quite unattractive to me. I therefore stick to Götze’s proposal and reconstruct *dek"s-je/o-. For gemination of -s- in this phonetic environment, compare *no-nog*mhs-je/o- > nanakuššiie/a-d ‘to become dark’. The fact that in this word *-e- remains -e-, whereas e.g. *teks- > takš-, must be due to the fact that as an unextended mi-verb, *teks- always contained the sequence *-eKsC-, in front of which *e > a, whereas in *dek"s-je/o-, the *f did not function as a consonant and *eKsV remained eKšV.

Note that this etymology is an important argument in favour of the view that PIE *k" yielded PAnat. *k" and was not unconditionally lenited to PAnat. *g" (contra Melchert 1994a: 61).

-tenant (2pl.pret.act.- and 2pl.imp.act.-ending of the mi-flection): see -tenant

-tenant(i) (2pl.act.-ending of the mi-flection): pres.: °Vt-te-e-ni (OS), °Vt-te-ni (OS), °C-te-e-ni (OS), °C-te-ni (OS), °Vt-ta-ni (MH/MS), °C-ta-ni (MH/MS); pret./imp. °Vt-te-ey (OS), °C-te-ey (OS), °Vt-tén (MH/MS), °C-tén (MH/MS).

The normal ending of 2pl. is -tenant / -tani in the present, -tenant in the preterite and -tten in the imperative. Some verbs also use an ending -sten(i), -stani in the 2pl., and as I have shown in detail in Kloekhorst fthc.d, the distribution between -tenant(i) and -sten(i) clearly indicates that -sten(i) is the original ending of the hi-conjugation whereas -tenant(i) must have been the original ending of the mi-conjugation. Already in pre-Hittite times, the mi-ending -tenant(i) is taking over the position of -sten(i) until in NH times the ending -tenant(i) is virtually the only one left to indicate 2pl.
In the present, we find -teni as well as -tani (just as -yen and -yan and -steni and -stani). Melchert (1994a: 137-8) has noticed that the variant with -a- occurs when the verb’s stem is accentuated (e.g. uyaettani = šuadētani’). He therefore regarded the forms with -a- as the regular outcome of unaccentuated *-teni, *-yen and *-stani.

It is clear that etymologically the ending -teni must reflect the primary 2pl.-ending *-thi (Skt. -tha, Gr. -θε, OCS -te, Lith. -te, Goth. -þ) as well as the secondary 2pl.-ending *-te (Skt. -ta, Gr. -θε, OCS -te, Goth. -þ).

tepšu- / tepšau- (adj.) ‘something little; some kind of (by-product of) grain (comparable to malt) that does not yield any plant’: nom.sg.c. te-ep-šu-uš (KUB 17.10 iii 17 (OH/MS), HKM 116 ii 7 (MH/MS)).


PIE *dʰeβ⁵-su-

The word itself occurs in one context only, of which we have two variants (parallel texts, not copies):

KUB 17.10 iii

(13) ²Te-li-pi-nu-uš=ya kar-di-mi-ja-u-ya-an-za ZI=ŠU ka-ra-a-[z=še-iš]
(14) ³gaš ya-ar-ša-am-ma-aš ū-i-šu-ri-ja-ta-ti nu ka-u-uš ³gaš ya-ar-ši(a-am-ma-aš]
(15) ma-a-ah-ša-an ya-ar-nu-ú-e-er ²Te-li-pi-nu-ya-aš-s=ya kar-pi[-iš]
(16) kar-di-mi-ja-az ya-aš-tu-ul ša-a-u-ar QA-TAM-MA ya-ra-a-[mu]
(17) ma-a-ah-ša-an te-ep-šu-uš Ü-UL=an gi-im-ra pé-e-d[a-an-zl]
(18) n=a-an NUMUN-an i-ja-an-zi Ü-UL=m=a-an NINDA-an i-ja-d[a-n-zí n=a-an I-N4]
(19) Œ N₄ KISIB ti-an-zí ²Te-li-pi-nu-ya-aš-s=ya kar-pi[š kar-di-mi-ja-az]
(20) ya-aš-du-ul ša-a-u-ya-ar QA-TAM-MA te-ep-ša-u-eš-[du]

‘Telipinu was angry, his inmost self smoldered (like) firewood. Just like this firewood they burned, may the wrath, anger and rage of Telipinu likewise be burned. Just as t. They do not bring it to the field and use it as seed. They do not make it into bread and carry it into the storehouse. May the wrath, anger and rage of Telipinu likewise become t.-ed’;
HKM 116 ii

(1) [DINGIR\(^{1}\)^{13r} TUKU.TUKU-u-an-za ZI=ŠU

(2) [ka-ra]az=še-iš ya-ra-an pa-ah-ḫur la-ap-ta

(3) [nu] ki-i pa-ah-ḫur GIM-an u-i-te-ni-it

(4) [ki-iš-i]a-nu-mu-un

(5) [DINGIR\(^{1}\)^{13r} kar-pi-iš TUKU.TUKU-az

(6) [ya-aš-du-ul š]a-a-u-ya-ar QA-TAM-MA ki-iš-ta-ru

(7) [ma-a-ah-ḫa]-an te-ep-šu-aš Û-UL=an A.ŠÂ-ni

(8) [pê-e-da]-an-zi n=a-an NUMUN-an i-ja-an-zi

(9) [Û-UL=m=a-an] NINDA-an i-ja-an-zi n=a-an I-NA E^NA_KIŠIB

(10) [ti-an-zi n]=a-an=ši kar-pi-iš TUKU.TUKU-az

(11) [ya-aš-du-ul ša-a-u]-ya-ar QA-TAM-MA te-ep-ša-u-e-š[-du]

The deity was angry and his innermost self blazed (like) burning fire. Just as I extinguished this fire with water, may the wrath, anger and rage of the deity likewise be extinguished. Just as t. They do not bring it to the field and use it as seed. They do not make it into bread and carry it into the storehouse. May the wrath, anger and rage of Telipinu likewise become t.-ed'.

In 1928, when the second passage cited above was still un-excavated, Götze (1928: 72) compared the first context with

KUB 40.16+ ii (StBoT 22: 6f.)

(31) ke-e-da-ni=ma A-NA DIM₄ GIM-an ḥa-aš-ša-tar=še-et NU.GÂL

(32) Û-UL=an A.ŠÂ-ni pê-e-da-an-zi n=a-an NUMUN-an

(33) i-en-zi Û-UL=m=a-an NINDA i-en-zi

(34) n=a-an I-NA E^NA_KIŠIB ti-an-zi

‘Just as this malt has no offspring, and they do not bring it to the field and use it as seed and they do not make it into bread and carry it into the storehouse...

and proposed to read KUB 17.10 iii 16-17 as (16) [... nu ki-i DIM₄] (17) ma-a-ah-ḫa-an te-ep-šu-aš ... ‘just as this malt is t.’. On the basis of this addition, tepšu- has generally been translated as an adjective denoting ‘sterile’, ‘dry’, ‘nicht kiemfähig’. With the newly found parallel text in HKM 116 ii 7f., however, we can now see that an addition before māḥhan is incorrect: the sentence clearly starts with [māḥḫan tepšu]. In both KUB 17.10 and HKM 116, we now have to translate ‘Just as tepšu-. They do not bring it to the field and use it as seed...’.
This indicates that *tepšu*- is a noun that denotes some kind of (by-product of) grain (comparable to malt) that does not yield any plant.

The derivatives of *tepšu*- may shed some further light on its meaning. Compare the following context:

**KBo 3.34 ii**

(8) [A-aš-ga-li-ja-aš] \(\text{Hur-mi EN-aš e-eš-ta}\)
(9) ku-ja-at-t=a ku-ya-at-t=a LÜ-eš-t₁ e-eš-ta š=a-n=a-aš-ta at-ti=mi
(10) pa-ak-ma-er š=a-an ar-nu-at š=a-an \(\text{An-ku-i IR-DI}\)
(11) š=a-an \(\text{An-ku-i=páit} LÜ\) AGRIG-an i-e-et šar-ku-uš LÜ-eš-t₁ e-eš-ta
(12) a-ki-iš=m=a-aš te-ep-ša-u-qa-an-ni \(\text{Ku-zu-ru-i-i}\)
(13) ka-ak-ka₂-pu-uš ma-ra-ak-ta \(\text{An-ku-ya ka-ak-ka₂-pi-iš}\)
(14) ma-ak-la-an-te-eš

‘觔galiya was lord in Ḫumri, and what a man he was. They denounced him to my father, and he deported him and brought him to Ankûa and in Ankûa he made him a governor. He was a powerful man, but he died in t... In Kuzuruwa he butchered kakkapa’s, in Ankûa the kakkapa’s were emaciated’.

Here, *tepšauya* is often translated as ‘in poverty’. The verb *tepšamu₂* is found in the following context:

**KUB 24.3 ii**

(51) [n=a-at A-NA] \(\text{A-ri-in-na kat-ta-ya-a-tar}\)
(52) nam-ma ki-ša-a-ru nu=za DINGIR₁₂₄₈ tu-el ŠUM=KA
(53) le-e te-ep-ša-nu-ši

‘And this (hostility against Hatti) shall forthwith become a cause of revenge for the Sun-goddess of Arinna. O, goddess, do not t. your name!’,

but the duplicate KUB 24.4 + KUB 30.12 ii 9 has nu=za tu-e’-el’ (text: tu-el-e) \(\text{ŠUM=KA} \text{ le-e} \text{ te-ep-n[u-]uš-ke-ši} \) ‘do not diminish your name!’ . The verb *tepšaqëš₂* is found in

**KUB 29.11 ii**

(11) ták-ku⁴ \(\text{SIN SI ZAG=ŠÜ GAM KI-i ne-ja-an KUR-e-aš BURU₁₄-aš}\)
\(\text{te-ep-ša-u-e-eš-zi}\)

‘when the right horn of the moon is bowed downwards to the earth, the crop of the land will t.’.
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Its duplicate KUB 8.6 Vs 11 has te-pa-u-e-es-zi, however: 'the crop will diminish'.

On the basis of these contexts, we must conclude that tepšanu² means 'to diminish (trans.)', tepšaušš.² 'to diminish (intr.)', which makes it likely that the original abstract meaning of tepšu- is 'something little'. The concrete meaning 'some kind of (by-product of) grain (comparable to malt) that does not yield any plant' that we have established on the basis of the contexts cited above must have developed out of this.

Etymologically, it is in my view quite likely that tepšu- is cognate with the adjective têpu- / têpau- 'little, few'. Because this latter reflects *dēh³SU- (e)u-, we must reconstruct tepšu- as *dēh³SU-su-, showing the same nominalizing suffix *su- as visible in genzu- 'lap' < *gēnšu-su-. See at têpu- / têpau- for further etymology.

têpu- / têpau- (adj.) 'little, few': nom.sg.c te-e-pu-uš (KBo 25.23 rev. 6 (OS)), te-pu-uš (KUB 6.12 rev. 10b, KUB 8.30 obv. 21, KUB 13.20, 6), acc.sg.c. [te]-e-pu-un (KBo 21.68 i 5), te-pu-un (KUB 7.2 i 10), nom.-acc.sg.n. te-e-pu (KBo 6.2 iv 42, 46, 47 (OS)), te-pu (KBo 6.2 iv 43 (OS), etc. (often)), [t]i-e-pu (KBo 25.23 rev. 7 (OS)), z[e]-e-pu (KBo 16.71++ iii 7 (OS)), gen.sg. te-pa-u-ya-aš (KUB 2.1 ii 40), dat.-loc.sg. te-pa-u-e (KUB 33.106 ii 5), te-e-pa-u-e (KUB 43.64.5), te-pu (KBo 38.47 obv. 5), abl. te-e-pa-u-ya-az, te-pa-u-ya-az, te-pa-u-ya-za, instr. te-pa-u-i-it (KBO 23.28 i 57), te-pu-it (KBO 15.37 i 25), nom.pl.c. te-e-pa-u-e-es (KUB 14.11 ii 42), te-e-pa-u-e'-eš (KBO 6.5 iv 26), te-pa-u-eš (KUB 14.1 obv. 48), nom.-acc.pl.n. te-pa-u-ya (ABoT 56 iii 28), te-pa-u-ya (KUB 22.70 obv. 83).

This noun and its derivatives are predominantly spelled te-e-p° and te-p° (both in OS texts already). Twice, we find an aberrant spelling, namely [rı][-e-pu] (OS) and [z][-e-pu] (OS), but these can hardly be anything else than scribal errors.

This adjective, which has to be phonologically interpreted tébu- / tébau-/ has since Marstrander (1919: 150) generally been connected with Skt. dabhrá- ‘little, small, deficient’. At the same time Hrozný (1919: 146) connected Hitt. tepn̥u-² with Skt. dabhnóti ‘to deceive’, which goes back to *d̆ēbʰ-u̯-eti- (but note that GAv. d̄h̄nāo- = /dhn̥n̥a-o-/ shows the most archaic formation, namely *d̆ēbʰ-u̯-eti-). A u-stem, as in Hitt. tēpu-, is found in Skt. á-dbhumta- ‘unerring, wunderful’ (*n- d̆ēbʰ-u-to-) as well. See at tepšu- / tepšau- for a nominal derivative reflecting *d̆ēbʰ-su-.
This verb is used in suppletion with tēẑ (q.v.) and denotes ‘to speak, to state’. The distribution between the two stems is that strong-stem forms usually show the stem tē (e.g. tēmi, tēši, tēzī), whereas weak-stem forms show tar- (tarweni, tarteni, taranzi). This is probably because the expected weak stem of the verb tēẑ, *t̚-, had already early phonetically merged with the weak stem of dā / d- ‘to give’. Note that the only form in which this distribution between tēz and tar- does not apply, is 3pl.imp.act. terer, which unambiguously shows that the stem tar-belongs to an original ablauting paradigm ter- / tar-. This verb therefore should be cited as ter-z / tar- and not as tar-z as one often can find.

Already Petersen (1933: 17) connected ter- / tar- with Lith. taštį, taštį ‘to speak, to say’, Gr. tēskhó ‘will say clearly’, on the basis of which we must reconstruct a root *ter-. Oettinger (1979a: 109) proposes a reconstruction *dēr- ‘*festhalten > aussagen’, which is primarily based on his claim that the spellings with initial DA point to an etymological *d or *ē. Apart from the fact that especially in OS texts we often find spellings with the sign TA (e.g. 3x ta-ra-anzi), a connection between the spelling of the initial stop and the etymological nature of that stop has never been proven.

Note that the verb dārjēẑ that usually is translated ‘to call upon the gods’ and seen as a derivative of ter-z / tar- in fact seems to have a different meaning and therefore hardly can be cognate. I have treated it under a separate lemma. The fact that ter-z / tar- and dārjēẑ have to be separated also weakens the connection between the former verb and Luw. tātarjā- ‘to curse’, which not only semantically remains far (unless one assumes a development *‘to state with emphasis’ (vel sim.) > ‘to curse’), but formally is quite different from ter-z / tar-.
as well, also because the single spelling of -t-, which points to etymological *
*dʰi-, does not fit the reconstruction *ter-.

The imperfective shows tar-ši(-i)-ke/ke= /tršiké-lá as well as tar-ši-ke/ke= /tršiké-l. The latter form is the phonetically expected outcome of *tršiké-ó-, whereas according to Kavitskaya (2001: 284) /tršiké/ is analogical after the imperfectives zī-ke/ke= /tsiké-l/ from dai- /ti- ‘to put, to place’ and az-zī-ke/ke= /tsiké-l/ from ed- /ad- ‘to eat’, which were analysed as showing a suffix /-s/.

teraţiartanna: see tieraţiartanna


IE cognates: Gr. ίπέειν ‘to turn’, Lat. trepē ‘to turn’, Skt. trapate ‘is ashamed’.

PIE *trép-ti / *trp-énti

All forms are spelled te-RI-IP-, which in principle can be read te-ri-ip- as well as te-re-ep-. Convention has it to cite these forms as teripp-, however, although we must bear in mind that terepp- is equally possible. The basic form is the verb tere/ipp-*, from which the noun AšA tere/ippi- ‘ploughed field’ has been derived. This latter noun was the source of the verb AšA tere/ippij-a- as is visible from the use of the determinative Aša (so, tere/ippij- is not a mere -je/a-derivative of tere/ipp-*).

Hitt. tere/ipp- is quite generally connected with Gr. ίπέειν ‘to turn’, Lat. trepē ‘turns’ etc. that reflect a root *trep- (cf. e.g. Milewski 1936: 42 and Braun 1936: 391). This would mean that in *trep- an anaptyctic vowel -e- arose between t and r, a phenomenon also known from teri- ‘three’ < *tri-. Some scholars assume that this anaptyctic vowel secondarily received the accent due to which the unaccentuated *-e- weakened to -i-, /térip/-, but this is not necessarily the case: if
teri- (card.num.) ‘three’; nom.pl.c. 3-e-eš (KBo 17.58 i 5 (OS), IBoT 1.36 ii 35, iii 13 (OH/MS), KUB 15.31 i 6 (MH/NS)), 3-i-e-eš (KUB 10.55, 12 (undat.)), acc.pl.c. 3-uš (KBo 21.85 i 48 (OH/MS), KUB 9.31 i 11 (MH/NS)), nom.-acc.pl.n. 3-e (KUB 9.30 iv 7 (NS), IBoT 1.2 iii 10 (NS), 355/t r. 8 (NS), Bo 2692 v 23 (NS)), gen.pl. te-ri-ja-aš (KUB 43.60 i 9 (OH/NS)), 3-aš (IBoT 2.5 r. 5 (NS)), dat.-loc.pl. 3-ta-aš (1175/u r.col. 7 (NS)), abl.pl. 3-az (KUB 20.78 iii 6 (OH/NS), 617/p. 11 (MH/NS)).

Derivatives: teriala- (ord.num.) ‘third’ (nom.sg.c. te-ri-aš (KBo 16.49 iv 2)), terijalla- ‘three-drink(?)’ (case? te-ri-ja-al-la (KBo 5.1 iv 35) // 3-ja-al-la (Bo 4951, 15)), terijala- (c.) ‘third(?) > mediator(?)’ (nom.sg. [i]e-ri-ja-la-aš (KBo 17.1+ ii 56)), terijan (adv.) ‘at the third time’ (te-ri-ja-an-n=a (KBo 20.40 v 8), [te-ri-ja-an-n=n=a (KBo 3.18 rev. 7, KBo 27.126, 10) // 3-n=a (KBo 3.16 iii 3), 3-an (KUB 2.10 iv 33, KBo 9.79, 6, 888/z rev. 8)), *terijankiš(?) (adv.) ‘thrice’ (3-ki-š=a=a=š-ma-aš (KBo 17.1 + 25.3 i 3 (OS)), 3-iš (KBo 17.1 + 25.3 i 3 (fr.), 4, 5 (OS), StBoT 25.4 iii 45, iv 31 (OS), HT 95, 8, 9 (OS), KBo 17.74 ii 2, 8 (OH/MS?), 3=S(U (OS)).

Anat. cognates: CLuw.: see LÚ WDUDLVXX and TÚG WDUDLVXX; HLuw. t(a)risu (adv.) ‘three times’ (”tara/i-su-u (KARKAMIŠ A6 §19)); Lyc. trisîne ‘three year old(?)’; trppe (c.) ‘threetold’(?)’; Mil. trpl’d ’?’, trisu ‘thrice’.

IE cognates: Skt. trāyas, Av. tṛāiō, Gr. τρεῖς, Lat. trēs, OIr. tṛī, tri, ON þrîr, Goth. þrans (acc.pl.m.f.), Lith. tūs, OCS trėj, TochA ttre, TochB trai ‘three’, Lith. (dialectal) trisi (adv) ‘the three of them’.

PIE *trei- / *trī-; *tri-jo-
See Tischler HEG T: 320f. for attestations. Only once the numeral ‘three’ is spelled phonetically, namely as gen.sg. terijaš. On the basis of this form and derivatives, it is clear that the stem must be teri-. We therefore can assume that the paradigm (all plural forms) must have been nom.c. *terijēš, acc.c. *teriuš, nom.-acc.n. *terie, gen. terijaš, dat.-loc. *terijetaš, abl. *terijedaz.

If we compare the Hitt. stem teri- with its Luwian counterpart tarri- (attested in the noun tO¹ tarrijanalli- ‘functionary of third rank’ (q.v.) and possibly in tO¹ tarrijanali- ‘cloth that has been woven three times (??)’ (q.v.)), we have to reconstruct PAnat. *tēri- to explain the geminate -rr- in Luwian (Çop’s Law). The exact interpretation of PAnat. *tēri- is difficult, however. E.g. Eichner (1992: 69) assumes that it must go back to a PIE ablaut variant *tēri-. Because all other IE languages show a full grade *trei- only, this is not very likely, however (unless we would assume that *trei- goes back to *tr-ei- (with an *-ei-suffix), which has an ablaut variant *ter-i-: this option cannot be excluded in view of the ordinal numbers Skt. trīya-, OPr. ūrīts ‘third’ < *trti- and Lith. trėčias, OCS treti ‘third’ < *tr-eti-, which show the reality of a root *tr- without -i-). It might be better to compare teri- with the verb tereppō ‘to plough’ (q.v.) which is generally reconstructed as *trepp-. Apparently, in terepp- an -e- emerged in the initial cluster *tr-. Although not all initial cluster *Tr- show an anaptyctic vowel -e- (e.g. tarian ‘they say’ < *tr-enti, tarupp- < *Treup-(?)), we might have to conclude that in *TrVerox an anaptyctic vowel emerged between *T and -r- in pre-PAnatolian times already. This anaptyctic vowel then could receive the accent, which yielded, in the case of ‘three’, PAnat. *tēri-, which is the predecessor of Hitt. teri- and CLuw. tarri-. Note that terija- ‘third’ < *tri-jo- differs from tarijanzi ‘they become weary’ (see under tari¹ / tari-) < *dr³r-į-enti in the sense that -j- apparently did not count as a fronted vowel, whereas -i- did.

The PIE inflection of ‘three’ probably was nom. *tréi-es, acc. tréi-ms, gen. *tríom. This should regularly have yielded Hitt. **tērēš, **terejuš, **terian. I am wondering to what extent it is possible that the OS attestation 3-e-es in fact still stands for /tērēʃ/ < *trejes, with the synchronous stem teri- (out of the oblique cases) being introduced only later on, yielding secondary /teriēʃ/, spelled 3-i-e-es.

Note that HLuwian tarai-su-u ‘three times’ and Mil. trisu ‘thrice’ can be directly equated with Skt. loc.pl. tṛśu and Lith. trisu ‘the three of them < *with three (people)’.

In Lycian we find a stem tri- of which it is not fully clear whether it can reflect PAnat. *teri-. We also find a stem teri- (gen.sg. terihe) of which Melchert (1993a: 70; 2004a: 63, referring to Eichner 1993: 239ff.) states that it may mean
‘three’. He therefore translates terihe as ‘of a third (person)’. This interpretation seems to be based on etymological considerations only, however, and has the disadvantage that we then would have to assume two different outcomes of PAnat. *teri- in Lycian. I therefore reject this translation.

teripp-\(^\text{3}\): see terepp-\(^\text{2}\) / teripp-

teriške/a-\(^\text{3}\) (Ic6) ‘to insult(?)’: 3pl.pres.act. te-ri-iš[kán-zi] (KUB 17.4, 10).

This word is hapax in the following context:

KUB 17.4
(7) ... ú-i-[i̥(š-ke-u-ya-an-za)]
(8) KÚ.BABBAR-an-za an-da pár-na-a=š-ša pa-št KÚ.BABBAR-an-za
IN[IM\(^\text{3}\)-ar EGI-R-p(a an-ni-i=š-ši)]
(9) me-mi-iš-ke-u-ya-an da-a-iš pé-ra-an a-š-ki=za DUMU[i\(^\text{4}\) ku-e-da-aš]]
(10) kai-ta-an ša-az-zi-ik-ke-mu-un nu=mu te-ri-iš[kán-zi]

‘Silver went to his house crying, and began to speak the words to his mother: “The boys whom I struck down before the gate, they keep on t.-ing me”’.

Hoffner (1988: 149-51) interprets this form as a variant of taraške/a-, taršike/a-, the imperfective of ter-\(^\text{3}\) / tar- ‘to speak’. This would mean that teriškanzi here meant ‘they keep on saying (bad things) to me’. This is possible, but far from ascertained.

tešha- (c.) ‘dream, sleep’ (Sum. Ū): nom.sg. te-eš-ša-aš (KUB 13.4. iii 17 (OH/NS), KUB 30.10 rev. 18 (OH/MS), KUB 33.84, 7 (MH/NS)), ti-eš-ša-aš (KUB 15.36 obv. 12 (NH)), acc.sg. te-eš-ša-an (KUB 4.47 obv. 5 (OH/NS)), abl. te-eš-ša-az (KUB 9.22+ iii 30, 35 (MS), KUB 41.29 iii 2 (OH/NS), KUB 14.8 ii 36 (NH), KUB 22.70 obv. 17 (NH)), instr. te-eš-ši-it (KBo 17.65 rev. 18 (MS), ABoT 17 iii 6 (NS), KBO 11.1 obv. 42 (NH), KUB 14.10+ iv 17 (NH)), acc.pl. te-eš-šu-ús (KUB 24.9+ ii 23 (OH/NS), KUB 17.1 ii 15, 20 (NS), KUB 4.47 obv. 4 (OH/NS)).

Derivatives: zašhai- / zašhi- ‘dream’ (acc.sg. za-aš-ša-in (often), dat.-loc.sg. za-aš-ši-ja (often), za-aš-šé-ja (KUB 30.10 obv. 25 (MH/MS)), za-az-ši-i (KBo 4.2 iii 46 (NH), KUB 43.50 obv. 8, IBoT 2.112, 8 (fr.) (NH)), abl. za-aš-ši-ja-za (KUB 43.55 ii 1), za-aš-ši-ja-az, za-aš-šé-az (KUB 24.4+ i 12 (OH/MS)), instr. za-aš-ši-it (KBo 5.1 i 43), acc.pl. za-aš-ši-mu-us (KUB 7.5 iv 6)), tešhalli- (adj.)
'sleepy(?)' (acc.sg.c. te-eš-ḥa-al-li-in (KUB 36.35 iv 10)), tešḥaniye/a-² (Ic1) 'to appear in a dream' (3sg.pret.midd. te-eš-ḥa-ni-ja-at-ta-at (KBo 16.52, 9, KUB 21.8 ii 15 (fr.)); impf. te-eš-ḥa-ni-iš-ke/-a/ (KUB 16.55 iv 8, KBo 4.2 iii 46), te-eš-ḥa-ni-eš-ke/-a/ (KBo 16.98 ii 10)).

Anat. cognates: CLuw.: see duntarrijašša-.


PIE *dʰe₂-h₁-sh₂o- and *dʰ₁-h₁-sh₂oi-

Of the word tešḥa- ‘dream, sleep’, we find the derivatives tešḥaniye/a-² ‘to appear in a dream’ and tešḥa-li- (adj.), if the latter indeed denotes ‘sleepy’ (its meaning cannot be assuredly determined from the context). The noun zašḥai- (zaḥhai-) ‘dream’ is clearly related to tešḥa-.

We see that the one form shows a root /te-/ whereas the other has /t-/.

This alteration can only be explained by assuming a root structure *Teh₁-.

Čop (1971: 66-70) connected these words with ON dāsi ‘slow’, MHG daesic ‘dumb’ < *dʰsa- and ON dasa-sk ‘to become weary’, ModEng. daze < *dʰsa-, which he analyzed as *dʰe₂-sH₂o-,*dʰ₁-sH₂o-. Although the formal and semantic side of this comparison look convincing, it cannot be excluded that (some of) these Germanic words are of substratum origin (compare ModDu. diuzelen ‘to grow dizzy’, beduusd ‘taken aback’, bedeesd ‘timid’, with a number of vowel alternations). Oettinger (1979a: 124, without referring to Čop, so perhaps independently) similarly reconstructs *dʰe₁-sH₂o-, of which he states that it originally meant “Hineinsetzung” or “Einsagung”, which is followed by e.g. Rieken (1999a: 3811916). If correct, then zašḥai- must reflect *dʰ₁-h₁-sh₂oi- (original paradigm *CēC-ʒ(s), *CC-i-š, cf. Weitenberg 1979: 289), showing generalization of the zero grade from the oblique stem.

(tva) tēṭa(n)- (n.) ‘breast, teat’: nom.-acc.sg. te-e-ta-an (FHL 32, 10 (OH/NS)), te-e-da-an (KBo 10.9 rev. 7 8 (OH/NS)), ti-e-ta-a(n)=š-še-it (KBo 14.98 i 16 (OH/NS)), te-ta-an (KUB 35.2 (+) 4 iii 1 (NS)), all.sg. te-e-da (KBo 3.34 i 23 (OS)), abl. te-da-na-ac (KUB 35.2 (+) 4 ii 14 (NS)).


PIE *dʰeh₂-i-to-

The Hittite word shows *a*-stem (all.sg. *tēda*) as well as *n*-stem forms (abl. *tedanaaz*). Because the *a*-stem form *tēda* is attested in an OS text, we would normally assume that the *a*-stem inflection is original, but because in CLuwian we find an *n*-stem as well, *ītan*- (although Melchert 1993b: 228 states that the Luwian *n*-stem must be regarded as secondary because of the verb *tit(a)i*- ‘to suckle’ seen in *titaimma/i-*), this case may be different. Tischler (HEG) treats several isolated words that he regards as cognate as well. E.g. *ti-i-ta-ant-[x]* (KBo 29.3 i 6) is interpreted by him (HEG T: 384) as “säugend” (taken over by CHD Ș: 276), but I do not see any contextual indication for this. In KUB 5.9 i 4, Tischler (HEG T: 392) reads "ti-ti-iš-ša-al-li-in" which he translates as “Säugling, Kleinkind”. Again there is no contextual evidence for such a translation. Moreover, the handcopy of the text quite clearly shows that this form in fact should be read  

\[ ti-iš-ša-al-li-in = ti-iš-ša-al-li-in=ya \]

which cannot be separated from the verbal form \[ ti-ša-in-ta \] in ibid. 5. The verbal form *ti-it-ti-iš-ke-ez-zi* (KBo 14.98 i 16) is interpreted by Tischler (HEG T: 344) as showing the Luwian verbal stem ‘to suckle’ on the basis of GUB-lan *teta(n)=ššet* ‘her left breast’ in the preceding line. Nevertheless, the geminate *-tt-* does not fit the single *-t-* visible in Hitt. *tēza(n)-* and CLuw. *ītan*- and *titaimma/i-*., so I would rather interpret this form as belonging with *tit-ta*/ titti- ‘to install’:

KBo 14.98 i

(16) [x - x - x - x - x - b]u₂-un GUB-la-an ti-e-ta-a(n)=š-še-et

(17) [x - x - x - x - x - x - ]x DUMU.MUNUS ti-it-ti-iš-ke-ez-zi

‘[She ...] her left breast [and] installs her daughter [to it]’.

The CLuwian adjective *titaimma/i-* is only attested in the syntagm *anniš titaimmeš*, which is interpreted by Melchert (1993b: 228) as ‘nurturing mother’, but which Tischler (HEG T: 344) translates as “Mutter (und) saugendes (Kind)”, which is preferable in view of the identical Lycian noun *tideime/i-* that denotes
'son, child’. Starke (1990: 229) cites the verb underlying *tātami/* as "*titi-/tataji-", stating that "[a]uf den -ji-Stamm des Verbums weist lyk. tidime(i)- neben tideim(i)-". Although we indeed find the form tidimi once (119, 3), it can in my view not compete against the 124 times that this word is attested with the stem tideim-. Just like we come across one form spelled tidemi (68, 2), which is generally emended to tideimimi, I think that the unique and aberrant form tidimi should be emended to tideimimi. This means that in Lycian there is no evidence for a verbal stem "*titi-". Tischler (HEG T: 343) cites the verb is *titiqa- as well, referring to the form tittiškezzi. As we saw above, this form cannot belong here. All in all, the verb underlying CLuw. *tita†iima/- and Lyc. tideim/i- cannot have been *tidiqa-, but must have been PLuw. *tidei- or *tidoi-. This is important for the etymology as we will see below. The Lycian noun tidere/i- is translated 'collacteus’ in Melchert 2004a: 66, with the remark "[c]ompound of *tide- ‘teat’ + *are/i- ‘companion’.

All in all, we are dealing with a Hitt. noun tita(n)- ‘teat’ and a Luw. noun *tiyan- and verb *tide/oi- ‘to suckle’. It has been proposed that these words should be compared with e.g. Gr. τιθην, Lat. titta ‘breast’ and regarded as Mediterranean Wanderwörter (see the references in Tischler HEG T: 345), but in my view an etymological connection with the PIE root *dʰe(h)₁(i)- ‘to suck (milk)’ is more likely. As we saw above, some scholars assume a verbal stem *titiqa- and therefore reconstruct a reduplicated formation *dʰi-dʰ₁je/o- (e.g. Tischler HEG T: 343). Apart from the fact that the -je/o-suffix cannot explain the Luwian verb, the initial syllable cannot account for Hitt. tê-.

I would like to propose that Hitt. tēda- and Luw. tēa- go back to *dʰēh₁i-to- 'that which is suckled' (with lenition of *-t- due to the preceding accentuated long vowel), of which a verbal derivative *dʰe(h)₁i-to/je/o- yielded PLuw. *tidoji/-, the regular preform of CLuw. *tiyi- and Lyc. tidei-.

têh²: see *tîth."
-š- or another consonant (e.g. ḫapti ‘you join’ (MH/MS) (from ḫapp-²)), and later on also in stems ending in a vowel (e.g. [ar]nuti (NH)). Just as the older hi-ending 1sg.pres.act. -ḥhe is replaced by -ḥhi and 3sg.pres.act. -e by -i (probably on the basis of -i as found in the mi-conjugation endings -mi, -ši, -ző), it is likely that -tti is a secondary form that replaced older *-tte. Such an ending is not attested itself, however (note that 2sg.pres.act. ya-ar-ṛi-iš-ša-at-te ‘you help’ (KUB 23.1 i 35) is the NH mixing up of the signs TE and T1 (cf. Melchert 1984a: 137) instead of an archaic ending -tte). This ending -tti (or better: *-tte) is generally connected with the PIE 2sg.perf.-ending *-ṛhe (Skt. -ṛha, Gr. -οκα ‘you know’), Lat. -itur (+ *-i). This *-ṛhe regularly yielded Pre-Hitt. *-ṛta, which was enlarged by *-i (‘presentive’ -i), which regularly yielded *-tte. This *-tte eventually was replaced by -tti in analogy to the -i as found in the mi-conjugation.

=tti- / =tta- / =tte- (encl.poss. pron. 2sg.) ‘your (sg.)’: nom.sg.c. C=ti-iš (OH/MS), C=te-eš (OH/NS), accus.sg.c. C=da-an (KUB 29.1 i 16 (OH/NS), KUB 57.63 ii 21, 22 (NS)), C=ti-in (NH), nom.-acc.sg.n. ut-ne-e=r(e-et) (KBo 25.122 iii 2 (OS)), C=te-et (OH/NS), C=ti-it (OH/NS), gen.sg. C=ta-aš, dat.-loc.sg. V=ti-tti (KUB 1.16 iii 30, 31 (OH/NS), VBoT 1, 9 (MH/MS), kat-ti-i=tti (KUB 20.7, 13 (OH/NS), KUB 9.27 + KUB 7.8 i 52 (MHNS)), V=ti (kat-ti=ti (MH/MS, often), ku-uš-ša-mi=tti (KBo 1.42 i 24 (NH))), V=d-di (KUB 29.1 i 25 (OH/NS)), all.sg. V=ta (KUB 1.16 iii 72 (OH/NS)), abl.-instr. aaz=ti-it (OH/NS), aaz=te-et (OH/MS), nom.pl.c. C=te-eš (OH/NS), C=ti-iš (OH/NS), acc.pl.c. C=tu-uš (OS), dat.-loc.pl. C=ta-aš (MH/NS).

PIE *-ti-, *-to-, *-te-

The original paradigm of this possessive pronoun seems to be nom.sg.c. =ttiš, accus.sg.c. =ttaš, nom.-acc.sg.n. =ttet, gen.sg. =ttaš, dat.-loc.sg. =tti, all.sg. =tta, abl.-instr =ttii, nom.pl.c. =ttaš, acc.pl.c. =ttaš, dat.-loc.pl. =ttaš. For the original distinction between nom.-acc.sg.n. =tet and abl.-instr. =tti see Melchert 1984a: 122-6. This means that we are dealing with an ablauting stem =tti- / =tta- / =tte-.

This vocalization can hardly reflect anything else than PIE *-i-, *-o- and *-e-, but an exact explanation for the distribution of these vowels is still lacking (cf. also =mi- / =ma- / =me- ‘my’, =šši- / =šša- / =šše = ‘his, her, its’, =šumu- / =šuma- / =šume- ‘our’ and =šmi- / =šma- / =šme- ‘your (pl.); their’). Whether this particle originally had -tt- or -t- is rather obscure: we find V=ṣ(et) (um=t=et) in an OS text, and both V=ti (katti=ti) and V=tti (pippi=tti) in MS
texts. Despite the OS attestation of single -t- (but after a long accentuated vowel!), I assume that this stem originally had -tt-, just as its enclitic pronoun counterpart =ttu / =ttu ’(to) you’.

It is clear that this possessive belongs with zīk / tu- ‘you (sg.)’ < *tihi, tu- ‘and the enclitic pronoun =ttu / =ttu ’(to) you’. Direct comparison to e.g. Gr. τευκτός, Lat. tuus, Lith. tāvos (dia.), ‘your’ < *teue- and Skt. tvā-, Av. ṭū-, Gr. σός ‘your’ < *twe- is improbable as there is no trace of -u- in Hittite. So I assume that =ttu- / =ttu- is not derived from the oblique stem *teu- ‘you’, but rather from the unextended root *t-, which is still visible in nom.sg. *t-iḫ, besides obl. *t-ix- (see under zīk / tu-).

tieraqartanna (adv.) ‘for three rounds’: ti-e-ra-ya-ar-ta-an-na (KBo 3.2 obv. 65), ti-e-ru-ur-ta-an-na (KBo 3.2 lower edge 2), ti-e-ru-u-r-ta-an-na (KBo 3.5+ iii 17), ti-e-ra-u-r-ta-an’i (KBo 3.5+ ii 37), ti-e-e-ra-yar-a-r-ta-an-na (KUB 1.11+ iv 35).

This word occurs in the Kikkuli-text only (cf. Kammenhuber 1961a). It is spelled in various ways: we find tieraqartanna, tieraqārtan as well as tierurtanna. It is remarkable that all forms are spelled with ti-e-, which must stand for /tie- (compare the difference between ti-e-ez-zi ḫēt‘išl ‘stands’ and te-e-ez-zı ḫēt‘išl ‘states’). Nevertheless, this word is generally cited as tieraqartanna. The variation between -yartanna and -urtanna is remarkable as well, just as between tier- and tiera-. So it seems that these spellings stand for /tier(a)u(ə)rtanna/. The word is generally seen as an adaptation of Indic *tri-yartana ‘three-round’, just as aikayartanna ‘for one round’ (*Haika- ‘one’), panzayartanna ‘for five rounds’ (*panca- ‘five’), šatayartanna ‘for seven rounds’ (*sapa- ‘seven’) and naqayartanna ‘for nine rounds’ (*naqa- ‘nine’). The exact development of *tri- to tier(a)- is unclear to me, however.

gātiššar / tiješ- (n.) ‘forest(?)’ (Sum. GšTIR-šar (?)): nom.-acc.sg. ti-i-e-eš-šar (KUB 33.66 iii 5, KUB 31.100 rev.’ 16, KUB 13.28, 6, KUB 57.30, 9, 15), dat.-loc.sg. ti-i-e-eš-ni (706/s, v, 5), GšTIR-ni (KUB 17.10 iv 12), all.sg. GšTIR-na (KUB 29.1 i 52), dat.-loc.pl. GšTIR£Ha-na-aš (KUB 20.10 iii 12).

PIE *dʰ₁-i-eh₁ ṣh₁-r ?

See Tischler HEG T: 354 for an overview of the attestations of this word. The phonetically spelled attestations of this word are found in broken contexts only, on the basis of which its meaning cannot be independently determined.
Nevertheless, the consistent use of the determinative GIŠ ‘wood’ indicates that the word has something to do with wood. On the basis of the fact that tijēššar / tištšn- is the only word ending in -šar / -šn- that is found with the determinative GIŠ, it has been argued that we should equate it with the sumerogram GIŠ-TIR ‘forest’ that is sometimes phonetically complemented with -šar / -šn- (nom.-acc.sg. GIŠ-TIR-šar (KBo 1.53, 2), dat.-loc.sg. GIŠ-TIR-ni (KUB 17.10 iv 12)). Although circumstantial, this reasoning has gained many support and GIŠ tijēššar is quite commonly translated ‘forest’.

Formally, tijēššar looks like a deverbal in -ššar of dai- / ti- ‘to put, to place’ (see ḫuēššar ‘slaughtering’ from ḫuēk- / ḫuk- ‘to slaughter’ for the fact that -ššar takes the zero-grade of the verbal root) or tije/a- ‘to step’. Indicative may be

KUB 33.66 iii

(5) GIŠ-ti-i-eš-šar da-iš n=ā[- ... ]
(6) n=ā-as URU Li-ih-zi-na-az a-ap-pa[ pa-it?]

‘He placed(?) the forest and he[...] and he [came(?)] back from the city Līḫīna’.

Although it is quite unclear what GIŠ tijēššar dai- means, we perhaps are allowed to interpret this syntagm as a figura etymologica. If correct, it would mean that tijēššar reflects *dīš-ti-ēššar-šar-šar."

Derivatives: \textit{tiįjar} / \textit{tiįamn}- (n.) ‘?’ (dat.-loc.sg. ti-į-ą-an-mi (KBo 13.261, 6)).

Anat. cognates: CLuw. \textit{ti}- ‘to come to stand’ (3sg.pres.act. ta-a-i, 3sg.pret.act. ta-at-ta, dā-a-ad-da, 2pl.pres.midd. da-a-ad-du-ya-ar); HLuw. ta- ‘to come to stand’ (3sg.pres.act. /tai/ (BOROWSKI 1 §1), ta-i (SULTANHAN §39, HISARCIK 1 §3), CRUS-i (often), /tai/ ta-ia (KARATEPE 1 §48 Hu.), CRUS-ia (CEKKE §22, KARATEPE 1 §48 Ho.), 3sg.pret.act. CRUS-ta (IZGIN 1-2 §3), “CRUS”-ta (EURIKÖY §3), 3pl.pret.act. CRUS-ta (KARKAMIŞ A5a §5), 3sg./pl.imp.act. “CRUS”-ta-tū (GELB §5), 3pl.imp.act. “CRUS”-tu (KULULU 2 §6)); verb.noun dat.-loc.sg.? CRUS-wa/i-ra/i’ (KARKAMIŞ A5a §9)), \textit{tanu-} ‘to set up, to erect, to establish’ (1sg.pres.act. “CRUS”-ta-mu-wa/i-wa/i-i (KARKAMIŞ A6 §19), 1sg.pret.act. ta-mu-wa/i-ha (SULTANHAN §2, §10), ta-mu-wa/i-ha’ (KULULU §1, §5), CRUS-mu-wa/i-ha (KARKAMIŞ A1a §23, §26, §27), “CRUS”-mu-wa/i-ha (MARAS §4), CRUS-mu-ha (QAL’AT EL MUDIQ §3, KARKAMIŞ A31 §4), CRUS-mu-ha-á (RESTAN §3), 3pl.pret.act. CRUS-mu-wa/i-ta (KULULU 3 §6), CRUS-mu-ta (TILSENET §5), gerund CRUS-mi/wa/i-mi-i-na (SULTANHAN §3), taza- ‘to stand (impf.)’ (3sg.imp.act. “CRUS!”-ta-za-tu (KARATEPE 1 §74)).

\textit{PIE} *(s)įh₂-je/o-*

This verb inflects according to the -je/o-class and is in the OH period formally distinctly from the verb \textit{dai} / \textit{ti}- ‘to place, to put’ (q.v.), except in 3pl.pres.act. \textit{tiazi} (although the secondary form \textit{tiįjezi} only occurs in the paradigm of \textit{tįje/a}²). In younger times, the verb \textit{dai}-ti- secondarily gets thematized and starts to formally fall together with the verb \textit{tįje/a}² more and more.

From the beginning of Hittite studies it has been in debate whether \textit{tįje/a}² should go back to the PIE root *dʰêh₁- ‘to put’ or *steh₂- ‘to stand’. The former root would be possible in view of the meaning ‘to place oneself’ and the NH merger of \textit{tįje/a}² with \textit{dai} / \textit{ti}-, which clearly must reflect *dʰêh₁-.. An etymological connection with *steh₂- would much better fit the meaning ‘to step, to go stand’, however, which cannot easily be derived from an original meaning ‘to put, to place’. Moreover, Morpurgo Davies (1987) has shown that the Luwian languages possess a verb \textit{tā} that means ‘to come to stand’ and that is used in similar contexts as Hitt. \textit{tįje/a}-.. Because Luw. \textit{tā} quite obviously must reflect *(s)įh₂- (note that *(s)įh₂-ei regularly should have given Luw. **įh₁i), but probably has lost its -i- in analogy to all other forms of the paradigm where *h₂ is
dropped in preconsonantal position, yielding attested tāq, which would mean that tije/a-d ultimately goes back to *(s)ṭhe2- (for the s-mobile, compare e.g. TochAB ṣāk- ‘to be (subj. and pret.)’ < *(s)ṭeh2-). Of course, it cannot be denied that all NH forms that show the secondary stem tije/a-d instead of the original ḥi-inflected stem dai-/ti- in principle reflect a virtual *dḥe2- (for the L never existed as such in pre-Hittite times.

**tije/a-d** (Ic1) ‘to bind(?)’: 2sg.imp.act. ti-ja (KBo 3.40+ rev.¹ 13, 14, 15).

Derivatives: **tijamar / tijaman-** (n.) ‘cord, string’ (nom.-acc.sg. ti-ja-mar (KBo 17.23 obv.⁶ 6 (OS), KUB 17.28 iv 50 (MH/NS)), ti-ja-am-mar (KUB 39.71 iv 17 (NS)), instr. ti-ja-am-ma-an-da (KUB 9.28 iii 15 (MH/NS), ti-ja-am-ma-an-ta (KBo 19.132 rev.⁷ 5 (MH/NS))).

IE cognates: Gr. ἵςκω ἵςκημ ‘to bind’, Skt. ḍa-, ḍyati ‘to bind’.

PIE *dḥe2- (for the L never existed as such in pre-Hittite times.)

The interpretation of the 2sg.imp.act.-form tija found in the Soldier’s Song in the Puḫšanu-Chronicle is quite unclear:

KBo 3.40+ rev.¹

(13) mu-u-zza i-ê-[t]a-ma-i-üş-ke-aٴ-zi-ê [URU][Ne ša][a-aš][KII] TUG[LA] [URU][Ne ša-aš][KII]

TUG[LA] ti-ja-a=m-mu ti-ja

(14) mu-u=m-mu an-na-aš=ma-aš kat-ta a[r]-mu ti-ja[=-a=m-mu t]i-ja mu-u=m-mu

'He begins to sing: “The clothes of Neša, the clothes of Neša, t. me, t! Bring me down my mother’s s’, t. me, t! Bring me down my nurse’s s’, t. me, t!”'.

Formally, tija seems to belong with tije/a-d ‘to step, to go stand’ (q.v.), but this does not give a sound translation: tije/a- ‘to step’ is not transitive, which would mean that in the first line [URU]Nešaš TUG[LA] cannot be the object of tija, but rather has to be the subject. But if [URU]Nešaš TUG[LA] is subject, the number is wrong: [URU]Nešaš TUG[LA] is plural, whereas tija is singular. Moreover, a translation ‘clothes of Neša, step towards me, step!’ is at least not very probable. Often, tija has been interpreted as belonging with dai-/ti- ‘to put, to place’ and a translation ‘the clothes of Neša, put (them) on me, put!’ has been given. Although semantically better, the formal side of this interpretation is improbable. The 2sg.imp.act. of dai-/ti- is always dai, and never tija.
Melchert (1983: 14\textsuperscript{10}) therefore rather suggests a connection with the element \textit{tiqa-}, as found in \textit{tiqamar} ‘cord, string’, which would mean that \textit{tiqa} means ‘bind’: “the clothes of Neša, bind (them) on me, bind!” This noun \textit{tiqamar} was connected by Eichner (1974: 57) with Gr. \textit{ἰδρύω}, \textit{idrú} ‘to bind’, Skt. \textit{dā-} ‘to bind’ < *\textit{deh₁}-, which implies a reconstruction \*\textit{dh₁}-\textit{ié-}/\textit{í-}.


\textit{PIE} \*\textit{dʰi-dʰʰ₁-oi-ei}, \*\textit{dʰi-dʰʰ₁-i-enti}

This verb is predominantly attested with its participle, \textit{tittijant-} ‘put in, installed’. For its meaning, compare KBo 6.3 ii (37) \textit{tāk-ku LU Ḡīs[(TUUKUL ḥar-)]ak-zi LŪ IL-KI ti-it-ti-ja-an-za nu LŪ IL-KI te-ez-zi … ‘If a man who has TUKUL-obligations disappears, (and) a man who has \textit{ILKU}-obligations is assigned (in his place), and the man owing \textit{ILKU}-services declares …’ (transl. CHD Š: 3). Finite forms of this verb are rarely attested. We only find 3pl.pres.act. \textit{tittijanzi} in the broken contexts KUB 36.114, 22 and KUB 15.11 ii 31, on the basis of which its meaning cannot be assured, and a possible 3sg.pres.act. in KBo 19.162 iv (11) \textit{ma-a-an} […] (12) \textit{Ġiš-ru ti-it-ta-i ‘when […] he installs’ the wood’. If this latter form indeed belongs here, it shows that the verb does not show a stem \textit{tittij/a}-, as is often cited, but must either belong to the \textit{dā}/\textit{tiqan}-class (\textit{tittai/-} / \textit{titti}-) or to the \textit{mēma}/\textit{i}-class (\textit{titta/-} / \textit{titti-}). As I argued at the treatment of the \textit{mēma}/\textit{i}-class in § 2.2.2.2.h, the verbs of this class derive from original \textit{dā}/\textit{tiqan}-class verbs with a polysyllabic stem. I therefore assume that this verb belongs to the \textit{mēma}/\textit{i}-class as well and cite it as \textit{titta/-} / \textit{titti-}.

Semantically, \textit{titta/-titti} ‘to install, to assign’ clearly belongs with \textit{dai/-} / \textit{ti-} ‘to place, to put’. Also formally, this connection goes well, especially now we know that \textit{titta/-titti-} originally goes back to \*\textit{tittai/-} / \textit{titti-}. I therefore assume that it virtually reflects a reduplicated stem \*\textit{dʰi-dʰ₁-oi-} / \*\textit{dʰi-dʰ₁-i-}. See at \textit{dai/-} / \textit{ti-} for further etymology.

In KUB 59.47 rev. iii 10, a 3pl.pres.act. \textit{ti-it-ti-ja-an-zi} is attested, but this form is duplicated by \textit{ḫu-it-ti-ja-an-zi} ‘they pull’ in KUB 7.46 iv 7. This means that \textit{ti-it-ti-ja-an-zi} must be a scribal error (omission of the right vertical wedge of the sign \textit{Ḫu} (\*\textit{ḫū}) yields the sign \textit{Ti} (\*\textit{ṭi})), and we can transliterate it as \textit{ḫu-it-ti-ja-an-zi}. Note that Tischler (HEG T: 391) is incorrect in stating that “[w]egen der Gleichsetzung mit \textit{ḫuittiywa}- ‘ziehen’ […] wird man auch \textit{tittiwa-} als transitives
Bewegungsverb [...] auffassen”: there was no equation between these verbs: we are merely dealing with a scribal error.

**tittanu**

(tittanu**-**: see titmu**-**

(titmu**-**: (IIIe > IIa1y) ‘to thunder’: 3sg.pres.midd. ti-it-ḫa (KBO 17.11 i 9 (OS), KUB 34.123+ i 1, 28 (OH/NS)), te-e-et-ḫa (KUB 32.135 i 3, 10 (OH/MS)); 3sg.pres.act. te-et-ḫa-i (often, e.g. KUB 25.23 i 8 (NH), KBO 22.222 iii 9 (NH)), te-et-ḫa-a-i (e.g. KUB 43.73, 4 (NH)), 3sg.pret.act. te-et-ḫa-aš (KUB 43.55 v 13 (NH), te-et-ḫi-et (KUB 19.14, 11 (NH)); verb.noun gen.sg. te-e-et-ḫu-u-ya-š=a (KUB 32.135 i 8 (OH/MS)), te-et-ḫu-u-ya-aš (KUB 22.27 iv 25 (NS)); sup. te-et-ḫu-u-ya-an (KBO 42.6 obv.7 11 (NS)); impf. ti-it-ḫi-iš-ke/a- (KUB 17.10 ii 34 (OH/MS)), te-et-ḫi-iš-ke/a- (KBO 10.17 iv 10 (NH)), te-et-ḫi-eš-ke/a- (KBO 31.83 ii 3 (NS), KUB 33.106 ii 7 (NS), VBoT 73 iv 2 (NS)).


tetšima- (c.) ‘thunder’ (nom.sg. te-et-ḫi-ma-aš (KUB 7.13 obv. 18), acc.sg. te-et-ḫi-ma-an (KUB 17.35 ii 12), acc.pl. [te-etu]-ḫi-mu-uš (KUB 33.103 iii 3), [te-etu]-ḫim-mu-uš (KUB 28.5+ iii 6), nom.-acc.pl.n. te-et-ḫi-ma (KBO 17.85, 6)).

The oldest attestations of this verb are spelled ti-it-ḫe (OS and OH/MS), whereas we find te-e-et-ḫe in an OH/MS text, and te-et-ḫe in NS texts. This must be due to the lowering of OH /l/ to NH /l/ before a cluster containing -ḫ- as described in § 1.4.8.1.d. Often, this verb is cited as tetša- (e.g. Tischler HEG T: 347) or even tetša- (HW: 222), but this is incorrect. In the oldest texts (OS and MS), we find middle forms only (3sg.pres.midd. titḫa and tetša), in which -a is the ending, and not part of the stem. Only in NH times, the verb was taken over into the active, and was brought into the tarn(a) class, showing a stem tetša- / tetš-. Once, we find a form that seems to show a stem tetšiše/a- (3sg.pres.act. te-et-ḫi-et).

From an Indo-European point of view, a stem titḫ- is difficult to explain, especially because of the cluster -tḫ-, since we know that *Ch₂Y > Hitt. CV (e.g. *pīth-y-en-o > paltana). The only way to explain the cluster -tḥ- is by assuming that it was secondarily restored, but this means that we should find a scenario by
which the -h- could be restored. If from IE origin, *tiθh- could hardly reflect anything else than a reduplicated form *Tiθh₁h₂-., but because of the reduplication, we would expect that the root *θh₂h₃- shows zero-grade throughout the paradigm. Moreover, the only possible corresponding full-grade stem would be *Tiθh₁h₂h₃-, in which the laryngeal would regularly drop as well. This means that there is no scenario by which the laryngeal could have been analogically restored and that we either have to think of a foreign or of onomatopoetic origin (cf. Eg. *θm ‘thunder’).

Some scholars have proposed an etymological connection with Lat. tonāre ‘to thunder’, Skt. stan’- ‘to thunder’, but because of the reduplication, we would expect that the root *-θh₂-o-t > *etaθh(ḥ)at > ðetaθat, “mit ungewöhnliche Synkope”.

tittije/a-: see titta� / titti-


PIE *dʰi-dʰh₁-neu-
Although this verb is predominantly spelled ti-it-ta-mu-, we find spellings with ti-it-mu- as well (from OH/MS onwards), which point to a phonological interpretation /titu/. Semantically, the verb clearly belongs with dat- / ti- ‘to place, to put’ and titta- / titti- ‘to install, to assign’. I therefore reconstruct *d³i-d³ši-neu-. If titmu- is a direct derivative of titta- / titti-, it would show that the suffix -nu- in principle uses the unextended stem (in this case without the suffix *-rl). See at dat- / ti- for further etymology.

tu-: see źąk / tu-

-ttu (3sg.imp.act.-ending of the mi-flection)

Anat. cognates: Pal. -du (a-āš-du ‘he must be’); CLuw. -ddu / -du (e.g. a-ri-ja-ad-du ‘he must raise’, i-du ‘he must go’); HLUw. -tu (e.g. pi-ia-tu ‘he must give, pa-tu ‘he must go’); Lyc. -tu (qasttu ‘he must destroy’, turvetu ‘he must place’).

This ending originally belongs to the mi-inflexion only and contrasts with the corresponding hi-ending -u (q.v.). From the late MH period onwards, we see that -ttu is used with hi-verbs as well, especially when the stem ends in a consonant (e.g. ak-du instead of original a-ku ‘he must die’, ħa-āš-du instead of original ħa-ā-su ‘she must give birth’, ħa-az-za-du instead of original ħa-a-du ‘he must become parched’, etc.). The fact that in verbs ending in a vowel the ending is always spelled with geminate -tt- or -dd- points to a phonological form -tu/. It is remarkable that in OS texts, the ending is consistently spelled with the sign TU (e.g. e-eś-tu), in MH/MS texts we find spellings with TU as well as DU (compare e.g. e-eś-du (KUB 14.1+ obv. 20, rev. 14) with e-eš-tu (ibid. obv. 29, 31)) and in NH texts we only find spellings with DU.

This ending is also found in the other Anatolian languages. Note that in CLuwian, we find two variants, namely -ddu besides lenited -du, e.g. in i-du ‘he must go’ < *h₁eš-tu. This means that in Hittite we are dealing with generalization of the unlenited variant, as is the case with all verbal endings in Hittite.

Etymologically, the ending /tu/ can be compared directly with the Sanskrit 3sg.pres.imp.-ending -tu. Compare especially cases like Hitt. e-eš-tu ~ Pal. a-ēš-du ~ CLuw. a-āš-du ~ HLUw. a-ša-tu ~ Skt. āṣtu < PIE *h₁ės-tu ‘he must be’ and Hitt. e-ez-du ~ Skt. attu < *h₁eš-tu ‘he must eat’.

=ttu (encl. pers.pron.) ‘you’: see =taa / =ttu


tuekk- / tukk-, tuekka- (c./n.) ‘body, person, self; (pl.) body parts, limbs’ (Sum. NÎ.TE): nom.sg.c. NÎ.TE-aš (KBo 1.42 iv 31 (NS)), acc.sg.c. tu-ek-ka-a(n)=m-ma-an (KUB 30.10 obv. 14 (OH/MS)), nom.-acc.sg.n. tu-ê-kân (KBo 1.51 rev.11 (NS)), gen.sg. tu-ug-ga-aš (KUB 30.10 obv. 9 (OH/MS)), dat.-loc.sg. tu-ê-êki (KBo 39.8 iii 7 (MH/MS), KUB 29.7 + KBo 21.41 ii 24, 38, 48 (MH/MS), KBo 5.2 i 8 (MH/NS), KUB 7.5 iv 3 (MH/NS), KUB 17.2+ i 15 (NS)), tu-ê-kê (KUB 33.66 ii 16 (OH/MS), KUB 7.5 iv 19 (MH/NS), KUB 30.31 + 32.114 i 19 (NS)), erg.sg. tu-ê-kân-za (KBo 6.2 ii 54 (OS)), abl. [tu-ug3].a-az=(ê)-mi-it (StBoT 25.7 iv 7 (OS)), tu-ug-ga-az (KUB 17.10 iii 10 (OH/MS), KBo 26.132, 3 (OH/NS)), tu-ug-ga-za-a=(ê)-si-it (KBo 13.99 iii 13 (NS)), tu-ê-ê-ga-az (KBo 32.14 ii 1 (MH/MS), KUB 43.34, 11 (NS)), du-ê-ga-az (KBo 34.62 rev. 12 (MS)), tu-ê-ga-az (KUB 24.9 i 47 (OH/NS)), nom.pl. [tu]-ê[-ê]ke-ê-eš (KBo 15.10+ i 17 (OH/MS)), tu-ê-ê-ke-eš (KUB 34.91 i 8 (NS)), tu-ê-ê-ga-az (VBoT 58 i 24 (OH/NS)), acc.pl. tu-ê-ê-ê-ku-uš (KBo 24.1 i 17 (MH/MS), KUB 14.1+ obv. 82 (MH/MS), KUB 35.61 l.col. 4 (NS)), tu-ê-ê-kê-uš (KBo 39.8 iv 18 (MH/MS), KUB 36.55 ii 22 (MH/MS), KUB 7.55 i 7 (NS)), tu-ê-ê-ê-kê-uš (KUB 7.1 i 40 (OH/NS)), gen.pl. tu-ê-ê-ga-az (KUB 15.32 i 1 (MH/NS)), dat.-loc.pl. tu-ê-ê-ga-az (KBo 17.65 iv 44, 47 (MH?/MS), KUB 15.34 ii 28 (MH/MS)), tu-ê-ê-ga-ê=(ê)-ma-aš (KBo 32.19 iii 48 (MH/MS)), tu-ê-ê-ê-ê-ê-az (KUB 7.53 + 12.58 i 56 (NS)), tu-ê-ê-ga-aš (KBo 39.8 i 48, ii 6, 28, 36 (MH/MS), tu-ê-ê-kê-ê-az (KUB 13.20 i 30 (MH/NS)), tu-ê-ê-i-ê-ga-az (KUB 7.1 i 31 (OH/NS)).


IE cognates: Skt. *tuék-, *tuék-m, *tuk-ôs

When used in the singular, this word denotes ‘body’, but also ‘self’ (<*‘one’s body’). When used in the plural, it denotes ‘body parts, limbs’. It sometimes is duplicated by the sumerogram NÎ.TE, e.g. tu-ê-ê-ga-aš (KUB 15.32 i 1) // NÎ.TE-MEŠ-aš (KUB 15.31 i 1). The spelling tu-IG- in principle is ambiguous, since the sign IG can be read ik as well as ek. On the basis of the many spellings tu-ê-IG-, I assume that tu-IG- has to be interpreted /tuek-/. A spelling with plene -i- is found twice on one NS tablet only (tu-ê-ê-ê- and tu-ê-ê-i-ê-), and therefore can be disregarded.

We find neuter as well as commune forms. In KBo 1.51 rev. 11, Akk. [RA-MA]-NU ‘self’ is glossed by Hitt. tu-ê-kân, which can only be a neuter nom.-acc.sg. This neuter form may correspond to the occasional neuter adjectives used with NÎ.TE (e.g. NÎ.TE=ŠU hu-u-ma-an (KUB 7.16 v 14)) and is supported by the OS attestation of erg.sg. tuekkanza, which is only necessary with a neuter
On the other hand, acc.sg. tu-ek-ka-a(n)=m-ma-an (in an OH/MS text) must be regarded as commune (if it were neuter, we would expect **tuekk=k=mit). Also in the plural, we find many commune forms (nom.pl.c. tuekkëš, acc.pl.c. tuekkus, from OH/MS texts onwards), but also sometimes neuter forms (NI.TE ḥu-u-ma-an-da (KUB 7.53 + 12.58 iii 2), NI.TE^MES ḥu-u-ma-an-da (KUB 55.66 iv 4)).

The forms that show tukk- (gen.sg. tuggaš (OH/MS) and abl. tuggaz (OH/MS)) indicate that this word originally showed ablaut. Such an ablaut is unexpected in a normal o-stem word, however.

The questions regarding gender and ablaut can be solved by looking at the word’s etymology. Already since Petersen (1933: 18), it is generally connected with Skt. tvác- (f.) ‘skin’. In Sanskrit, this word is a root noun (nom.sg. tvák, acc.sg. tvácam, gen.sg. tvácas, dat.-loc.sg. tvaci), which, together with the ablaut found in Hittite, must reflect the PIE situation. I therefore reconstruct nom.sg. *tuék, acc.sg. tuék-m, gen.sg. *tuk-ös. Note that the reconstruction of the nom.-form without *s is necessary to explain the Hittite confusion about the gender. Because of the absence of the ending *s, this word was occasionally reinterpreted as neuter in Hittite, with the acc.sg. *tuék-m >> *tuék-om (replacement of acc.sg.-ending *-m by thematic *-om) > tuekk=k=an being used as its nom.-acc.sg. (cf. a similar confusion in the case of keššar ‘hand’ < nom.sg.f. *g^desr (q.v.)). Later on, on the basis of the commune forms in the plural and of the thematic acc.sg. tuekk=k=an, a new commune nominative tuekkas= was created (attested as NI.TE-aš).

A verbal use of the root *tuęk-, which must have meant ‘physical appearance’ or similar, is visible in Hitt. tukk-ö̈ ‘to be visible’ (q.v.) as well.

tuel, tuedaz: see ẓk / tu-

tuḫḫâe- (lc2) ‘to produce smoke’: 3sg.pres.act. (?) tūḫ-ḫa-a-iz-zi (KUB 17.17, 7 (MH/NS)), 2sg.pres.act. tūḫ-ḫa-a-it (KUB 33.118, 17 (NS)), 3sg.pres.act. tūḫ-ḫa-a-it (KUB 33.118, 12, 14 (fr.) (NS)); 3sg.pres.midd. tūḫ-ḫa-it-ta (KUB 7.41 i 10), 3pl.pres.midd. tūḫ-ḫa-an-da-ta (KUB 10.24 i 12), tūḫ-ḫa-an-[a]-a-it (KUB 10.5 iii 2); impf. [tūḥ]-ḫi-∅esk=ke/a-t (KUB 33.118, 11 (NS)).

Derivatives: tuḫḫima- (c.) ‘smoke’ (acc.sg. tūḫ-ḫi-ma-an (KUB 33.118, 12, 17, 20)), tuḫḫiätat- ‘smoking out(?)’ (instr. tu-∪h-ḫi-ja-at-ti-it (KUB 7.14 + KUB 36.100 i 6 (OS)).

IE cognates: Gr. Ὠąda ‘to offer’, Lat. suffō ‘to smoke’, ORuss. дут ‘to blow’, TochAB tu- ‘to light’.
PIE *\(dʰuʰ-z-o-\)iɛ/ʊ-

The verb *tuḥhae* is consistently written with the sign TA\(H\), which can be read tuḥ as well as taḥ. On the basis of tuḥ-ḥi-ja-at-iti (KBo 7.14 + KUB 36.100 i 6 (OS)), it has been assumed that we should read tuḥhae-, but it must be remarked that the connection between the words tuḥhae- and tuḥhiyatt- in principle has not been proven yet. The verb is mainly found in one text, viz.

KUB 33.118

(9) [nu? ITU] 1^KAM pa-á ITU 2^KAM ti-ja-[á ITU 3^KAM ITU 4^KAM]
(10) [ITU] 5^KAM ITU 6^KAM ITU 7^KAM ITU 8^KAM ti-ja-[at nu[^HUR.SAG]U a-r-a-ši-it-ta-aš]
(11) [tū]l-hi-eš-ke-u-ya-an ti-[a-at]

(12) [^HUR.SAG]U a-r-a-ši-it-ta-aš tūḫ-ḥa-a-it [tū]h-ḥi-ma-an x - x - x[...]
(13) [URU']-ri]*4Ka-mar-pi-iš-ta-ma[]-aš[-]\(\)a*[^HUR.SAG]U a-r-a-ši-it-ta aš-
(14) [tū]l-ha-a-it nu-u=s-ši HUR.SAG[^MES] ḥu-ti-ma-an-te-eš ü-iya-an-na
(15) [p]a-a-e[^HUR.SAG]U a-r-a-ši-it-ta HUR.SAG[^MES] ḥu-u-ma-an-te-eš
(16) [me]-mi-iš-ke-u-ya-an da-a-er[^HUR.SAG]U a-r-a-ši-it-ta [ku`]-p[a-at=ya']
(17) [tū]l-ha-a-it DUMU-an-na-za=ya=za tūḫ-ḥi-ma-an Ü-UL ša-ak-ti
(19) [AM]A-aš še-er ha-aš-ta[^HUR.SAG]U a-r-a-ši-it-ta-aš [a]-p[a]-i-aš HUR.SAG[^MES][-aš]
(20) [EG]IR-pa me-mi-ši-ke-u-ya-an da-a-ši DUMU-an-[a]-za=ya=za tūḫ-ḥi-ma-an
(22) Ü-UL=m=a-an=mu-u=s-ša-an AMA=IA še-er ha-aš-ta

'The days [went by ...]. The first month went by and the second month set in. The third month, the fourth month, the fifth month, the sixth month, the seventh month and the eighth month set in and Mount Uṣṣitta began to tuḥḥaške\(a\). Mount Uṣṣitta tuḥhae-ed. Kumari heard the tuḥḥima in the [city\']. Mount Uṣṣitta tuḥhae-ed, and all the mountains went to see. All the mountains began to say to Mount Uṣṣitta: “Mount Uṣṣitta, [wh]y did you tuḥhae-? From your childhood onwards you did not know tuḥḥima-. The Fate-goddesses did not decree it for you and your mother did not give birth to it for you”. And Mount Uṣṣitta began to reply to all the mountains: “From my childhood onwards I did not know it. The Fate-goddesses did not decree it for me, and my mother did not give birth to it for me\’\'.
Otten (KUB 33: iii) calls this text “Erzählung vom Kreißen des Berges Vāśittas”, and Friedrich (1947: 293) states that “da das Verbum tuḫḫi-[i]- am Ende der Aufzählung steht, muss es das Ende des Schwangerschafts bezeichnen und “kreissen, in die Wehen kommen” bedeuten” (this translation also in HW: 226). It should be noted, however, that in Hittite texts the period of pregnancy is always ten months, so that the eighth months’ period mentioned here cannot have to do with being pregnant. Laroche (1956: 75) connects tuḫḫæ- with the hapax noun tuḫḫi[i]- and translates the latter as ‘étouffement’ (KBo 7.14 + KUB 36.100 i 6; nu tu-uhl-ḫi-ja-at-ti-it a-ak-ti ‘you will die of t.’). He also cites KUB 24.7 i (26) nu Ê-er tuḫ-[ḫi]-ma-az-za (27) pîd-du-li-ja-az-za e-ša-an-zi ‘(les servants) soignent la maison dans l’étou[fement] et l’angoisse’ (cf. CHD P: 366: ‘and they do the house-work with gr[ōanin]g and anguish’), but it should be noted that this addition is far from assured (I will therefore leave this context out of consideration). Laroche’s translations have been taken over by Friedrich in his HW Erg. 1: 21 as ‘keuchen, Atemnot haben’. Also Oettinger (2001: 463) translates tuḫḫima- as ‘Keuchen, Atemnot’ and even cites a form tuḫḫima- in KBo 27.32, (3) tuḫ-tuḫ-ḫi-mi-eš-t[e-eš] (note that Oettinger’s interpretation of the context is incorrect: (3) […] tuḫ-tuḫ-ḫi-mi-eš-t[e-eš ...] (4) […]x nu=ya-r=a-an iš-da, m[a-aš-…] is translated by Oettinger as “(3) deine tuḫtuḫima (PL)[ (4)... hört(en)] ihn[ “, but the enclitic personal pronoun =an in line 5 cannot refer to the plural form tuḫtuḫimeš, as =an is sg. only). Perhaps tuḫtuḫima- belongs with tuḫtuḫi[e]t/a2 (q.v.).

In my view, the translations as given above are not really convincing. I would rather propose a different interpretation. In the first context cited above (KUB 33.118, 11f.), the interpretation of the noun tuḫḫima- depends on the verb ištamašta (KUB 33.118, 13). If ištamašta really means ‘heard’ here, then tuḫḫima- must denote something that can be heard. If ištamašta meant ‘heard of’, however, then tuḫḫima- could mean something else as well. In my view, it is almost impossible not to connect tuḫḫæ-2 and tuḫḫima- with some volcanic activity like smoking, spitting lava or similar: this is much more likely than assuming that mountains were crying or coughing.

The possible derivative tuḫḫi[i]- is hapax in the following context:

KBo 7.14 i

(3) [x i-it-te-en A-NA LÛ [HU]a-aš-ši te-et-te-en
(4) [x ta pa-i-mi nu me-na-ah-ḫa-an-da e-ḫu
(5) [tā-ku n]a-at-ta=ma u-yuši nu-u=t-śa ḫar-tāk-kān ma-a-an
(6) [x]-iš-ke-mi nu tu-uhl-ḫi-ja-at-ti-it a-ak-ti
'You must go [...] and speak to the man of Ḫašši: “I will go [...], come to meet me. But if you will not come, I will keep on [...]—ing you like a bear (acc.) and you will die of tuḥḫiṭṭatt—”.'

The idea of this comparison is that if the man of Ḫašši does not come to the speaker, but stays inside his city, the speaker will perform an action on him that is also used for bears that do not come out of their holes but stay inside. In my view, the verb in the lacuna therefore probably meant something like ‘to smoke out’. For tuḥḫiṭṭatt, this means that it probably denotes something related to this smoking out: ‘suffocation because of smoke’, ‘smoke-intoxication’ or perhaps more simply ‘the act of smoking out’. I therefore would propose to translate: ‘But if you will not come, I will keep on [smoking] you [out] like a bear and you will die of (this) smoking out’.

Another interesting context is:

KUB 7.41 i

(9) nu ki-iš-ša-an me-ma-i ták-na-a-ašt ṣUTU-i ki-i u[t’-tar’ ...]
(10) da-aš-ke-u-ya-ni ki-i Ė-er ku-ya-at tuḥ-ḫa-it-[a ...]
(11) ša-ra-a ne-pi-ši ku-ya-at ša-ku-eš-ke-ez-[zi]

‘He said thus: “O Sun-goddess of the Earth, we keep taking [...] this matter [...]. Why does this house tuḫḫae? Why does it(?) continually look up to heaven?”'.

CHD Š: 55 translates tuḥḫaitt[a] as ‘gasps’, but I do not see any positive clues for it. A translation ‘smokes’ is equally possible.

So, all in all, I am not satisfied with the translations ‘to cry’ or ‘to cough, to be breathless’, but would rather interpret tuḫḫae as ‘to smoke’. This makes the etymological connection with PIE *dʼueh₂- ‘to smoke’, which was uttered already by Oettinger (1979a: 373) with the assumption that the root *dʼueh₂ originally meant “hauchen”, semantically much more understandable.

Since tuḫḫae₂ belongs to the ḫatrae-class, we have to derive it from a noun *tuḫḫa-, which must go back to an o-stem noun *dʼuh₂-o- (a verbal derivative of a noun *dʼ(é)uh₂-eh₂- (thus in Oettinger (l.c.), followed by Rieken 1999a: 108) should have yielded a ṭače-a-class verb).

The noun tuḫḫima shows the suffix -ima- (so *dʼuh₂-i-mo-), on which see Oettinger 2001. Although tempting, it cannot be directly equated with PIE *dʼuh₂-mo- in Skt. dhūṁa-, Lat. fūmus, Lith. dāmaı̈, etc. ‘smoke’. For another descendant of the root *dʼueh₂-, see antuḥaḥḫaš-/ antuḥš-.
tuḥḥara- (c.) ‘?’: Luw. nom.pl. tuḥ-ḥa-ra-an-zi, Luw. acc.pl. tuḥ-ḥa-ra-an-za.

PIE *dʰuérc-o-?

This noun occurs a few times only and is clearly Luwian, as we can see by its Luwian endings. It is spelled with the sign TAₜ, which can be read WA as well as WÀ. Tradition has it to cite WA, but that seems to be an arbitrary choice. The contexts in which it occurs are the following:

KUB 35.143 ii  
(10) [n=a-aš-ta a an-da tuḥ-ḥa-r(a-an-zi)]  
(11) [(ma-al-y)a-ra-an-zi [(u-ra-)]an-ta]

//
KUB 35.145 ii  
(2) [n=a-aš-ta an-d]a tuḥ-ḥa-ra-an-zi ma-al-ya-ra-an-zi u-ra[-an-ta]

‘The t.-s and m.-s are burning’;

KUB 17.15 ii  
(8) [(n=a-aš-ta an-d)]a tuḥ-ḥa-ra-an-zi  
(9) [(ma-al-ya-ra-an-)]z]i ki-iš-ta-nu-nu-un

‘I have extinguished the t.-s and m.-s’.

Since the tu/ḥḥara-’s are clearly things that are being burned, we may ask ourselves whether there could be a connection with PIE *dʰueh- ‘to smoke’. If so, then we should read tuḥḥara-. See also tuḥhe₂.

tuḥš-epi (IIc > Ib1, Ia1γ) ‘(trans.) to cut off, to separate; (intr.) to be cut off, to be separated’: 3sg.pres.midd. tuḥ-ša (KBo 25.73 l.col. 7 (OS), KBo 30.158, 8 (OH2/MS), KBo 30.174, 20 (NS)), tuḥ-ša (KBo 30.29, 4 (OS)), tuḥ-ūh-ša (KBo 25.36 ii 7 (OS), KBo 30.77 iii 15 (OH/NS), KUB 20.59 i 17 (OH/NS), KUB 20.99 ii 3 (OH/NS), VSNF 12.12 i 7 (OH/NS), KBo 4.9 ii 22, 31 (NS), KBo 39.86 v 13 (NS), KUB 59.27 ii 7 (NS)), tuḥ-ūh-ša-ri (KUB 29.29 obv. 4, 5 (OS)), tuḥ-ša-ri (VSNF 12.10 iv 21 (OH/MS)), tuḥ-ūh-ša-ri (KBo 39.8 ii 10 (MH/MS)), tuḥ-ša-a-ri (KUB 55.28 iii 10 (fr.), 11 (MH/NS)), 3pl.pres.midd. tuḥ-ša-an-ta (KBo 6.3 ii 10 (OH/NS)), 3sg.pret.midd. tuḥ-ḥu-uš-ta-at (KBo 39.8 i 41 (MH/MS)), tuḥ-ḥu-uš-ta-ti (KBo 20.82 i 14 (OH/NS)), 3sg.imp.midd. tuḥ-ūh-ša-ru (KBo 39.8 ii 13 (MH/MS)), tuḥ-ša-ru (Bo 3097 obv. 6 (NS)); 3sg.pres.act. tuḥ-
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*uḫ-ḫu-uš-zi* (KUB 32.113 ii 15 (OH/MS)), *tuḫ-ḫu-uš-zi* (KBo 4.2 i 29, 36, 38 (NH)), *tuḫ-ša-i* (KUB 15.42 iii 18, 31 (NS)), *tuḫ-ḫu-ša-a-i* (KUB 28.105 i 7 (NS)), 3pl.pres.act. *tuḫ-ša-an-zi* (KUB 17.10 i 39 (OH/MS), KBo 6.5 iii 5 (OH/NS), KBo 6.3 iii 13 (OH/NS)), *tuḫ-ḫu-ša-an-[i]* (KBo 13.155, 7 (NS)), *tuḫ-ḫu-iš-šal-[an-zi]* (KBo 6.5 iii 9 (OH/NS)), 3sg.pret.act. *tuḫ-še-iti* (KBo 18.151 rev. 8 (OH/MS)), 1pl.pret.act. *tuḫ-šu-me-en* (KBo 15.10 ii 26 (OH/MS)), 2pl.imp.act. *tuḫ-ša-at-[i]en* (HKM 34, 9 (MH/MS)), 3pl.imp.act. *tuḫ-ḫu-ša-an-du* (KBo 39.8 i 41 (MH/MS)), *tuḫ-ḫu-ša-an-du* (HKM 31 obv. 11 (MH/MS)); part. *tuḫ-ḫu-uš-ša-an-te-eš* (KUB 8.1 iii 2 (OH/NS)), *tuḫ-ša-an-t* (KUB 15.10 ii 27, iii 9, 19 (fr.) (OH/MS)), *tuḫ-ḫu-ša-an-t* (KBo 39.8 i 48 (MH/MS), KBo 9.114, 12 (MS)); verb.noun. gen.sg. *tuḫ-su-u-ya-aš* (KUB 38.12 i 23 (NS)); inf.I *tuḫ-ḫu-šu-an-zi* (KBo 6.2 iii 21 (OS)), [tuḫ]-šu-ya-an-zi (HKM 37 obv. 14 (MH/MS)), *tuḫ-šu-ya-an-zi* (KBo 6.3 iii 24 (OH/NS)), *tuḫ-šu-ya-a[n-zi]* (KBo 6.6 i 30 (OH/NS)); inf.II *tuḫ-ša-an-na* (KUB 9.28 ii 3 (MH/NS)); impf. [tuḫ]-uḫ-hi-eš-ke/a- (KUB 44.8 + 58.22 i 15 (OH/NS)).


See Neu 1968: 175f. for an overview of attestations and a semantic treatment. Note that he does not distinguish between *tuḫš-sed* ‘to cut, to separate’ and *tuḫhuš-sed* ‘to end’ (q.v.).

The verb is spelled in quite a few different ways, of which we find the variants *tuḫ-šed*, *tuḫ-šed*, *tuḫ-ḫu-šed* and *tuḫ-ḫu-šed* in OS texts already, to which *tuḫ-ḫu-uš- and even *tuḫ-ḫu-ḫu-uš-* can be added from MS texts. The forms with *tuḫ-ḫu-šed* are often transliterated *tuḫ*-šed* as if the sign Uḫ does not have a function here. In my view, the sign Uḫ just indicates that we are dealing with a geminate -ḫḫ-, in the same way as it is expressed in the spelling *tuḫ-ḫu-uš-. The attestation of NS *tuḫ-ḫu-iš-* indicates that we probably are dealing with a stem *tuḫ*-šed-*l that in NH times occasionally was realized as [tuḫ*-šed-].

Originally, this verb probably was middle only (in contrast to the homophonic *tuḫhuš-sed* ‘to end’), but from MH times onwards it was taken over into the active as well.

Despite the fact that I have treated *tuḫhuš-sed* ‘to end’ under a separate lemma, it is clear that both verbs must derive from a same origin (for the semantics compare ModEng. cut out ‘to stop’).
Sturtevant (1928c: 161) compared Gr. δεικτικό ‘to lack, to miss’, but this is semantically as well as formally improbable (*deuh₂ς- would have given Gr. **δεικτικό). If this verb is of IE origin, it would reflect *Teuh₂ς- (but note that a final cluster -uh₂ς- is against PIE root constraints, so perhaps an s-extension *Teuh₂-s-?) or *Tueh₂ς- (with generalization of zero-grade). Unfortunately, I know of no convincing cognates.

The inner-Hittite connection with tuhḫueʃšar ‘sponge(?)’ (q.v.) is based on the many contexts where we find tuhḫueʃšar tuhš- ‘to cut the sponge’, but this probably is coincidental: semantically, a connection between ‘to cut, to separate’ and ‘sponge’ is difficult to explain.

tuhš- ² ‘to end’: see tuhḫuš-²

**tuḫšalau**

The word tūḫ-ša-la-u (HKM 34 obv. 9) cited by Alp (1991: 180, 320: ‘Ernte(?)’) and Tischler (HEG T: 414), does not exist: we should rather read tūḫ-ša-ča[t-]é [‘you must cut off’ (from tuhš-²?) (q.v.).

**tuḫtuḫhiye/a-²** (1c1) ‘to brandish(?)’: 3pl.pres.act. tūḫ-tūḫ-ḥi-ja-an-zi (KUB 30.36 iii 14).

PIE *d’euḥ₂-??

The verb is hapax in KUB 30.36 iii (13) gišTUKUL=ja-a=š-ma-aš KUS A-RI-TUM (14) EGIR-an tūḫ-tūḫ-ḥi-ja-an-zi nu te-ez-zi i-it-téni i-it-téni UH₂-əš UNMEŠ-əš ‘They t. against them the weapon behind a shield, and he says “Go, go, you bewitched people!”’. Note that in principle this form can be read tāh-tāh-ḥi-ja-an-zi as well. Tischler HEG T: 414 translates “schwingen(?))’, but this is just a possibility. Perhaps the hapax tūḫ-tūḫ-ḥi-mi-eš (or tāh-tāh-ḥi-mi-eš) in KBo 27.32.3 (see also at tuḫhae²), of which the meaning is unclear, belongs to this verb. If “schwingen” is a correct translation, we could think of a connection with PIE *d’euḥH- “rasch hin- und herbewegen, schütteln” (cf. LIV²: Skt. dhav’- ‘to shake’, ON dýja ‘to shake’, Gr. ὑδρα ‘to storm, to move fast’). The -ḥḥ- in Hittite then would point to *h₂: *d’euḥ₂-.

PIE *Déuh₂-u-éh₁sh₁-r

This word is always spelled with the sign TAH, which can be read túḥ as well as tah (so taḥhuešar is equally possible). Tradition has it to cite this word as tuḥhuešar, however, probably on the basis of the obsolete etymological connection with tūḥš (e.g. Kronasser 1966: 104, who wrongly translated tuḥš- as “sich kultisch reinigen”). The exact meaning of tuḥhuēšar is not fully clear. On the basis of a formal similarity with tuḥhuqai- / tuḥhu- ‘smoke’, it is often translated ‘incense’ (e.g. CHD P: 92), but this is not self-evident from the contexts in which this word occurs:

KUB 20.99 ii
(6) LU.MUHALDIM túḥ-ḥu-i-ᵻₚₙₜ-ᵻₚₙₜ Ṽₚₙₜ-ya-ṣi-ja EGIR-pa
(7) šu-up-pi-aḥ-hi

‘The cook cleans at the ḫuṣi-stone with a t.’;

KUB 41.40 i
(18) [UGULA [¹]LUMES] MUHALDIM GAL-it ya-a-tar ḥar-zi[i]
(19) [ᵻₚₙₜ]A-NA QA-TI LUGAL ya-a-tar pa-ra-a
(20) [ᵻₚₙₜ]tūḥ-ḥu-eš-ni-it ṼU la-ḥu-u-ya-a-i

‘The Head of the cooks holds water in a cup, and he pours water over the hand of the king three times with a t.’ (note that Tischler HEG T: 415 explains this sentence thus: “der König hält also t. in der Hand, und der Chefkoch gießt ihm Wasser darüber”);

KUB 20.59 i
(19) UGULA [¹]LUMES MUHALDIM dan-na-ra-an-da-an DUGAL
(12) ḥar=zi nu-u-š-ṣa-an ya-a-tar
(13) la-a-ḥu-u-ya-an an-da=ma=kān
(14) túḥ-ḥu-eš-šar ki-it-ta

‘The Head of the cooks holds an empty cup. Water is poured into it, and a t. is placed in it’;

KBo 4.13 ii
(7) UGULA [¹]LUMES MUHALDIM túḥ-ḥu-eš-šar LUGAL-i pa-ra-a e-ep-zi LUGAL-uṣ=kān túḥ-uh-ṣa
‘The Head of the cooks holds the t. out in front of the king. The king cuts off (from it)’;

VSNF 12.10 iv
(16) [GAL L\text{MES}] MU\text{HALDIM} iš-ta-na-ni pa-ra-a tūḫ-ḫu-eš-ni-it
(17) [š]u-up-pí-ja-ah-ḫi GAL L\text{MES} MU\text{HALDIM} tūḫ-ḫu-i-šar
(18) [A-N]š LUGAL-i-pa-ra-a e-e-p-zī LUGAL-š=kān
(19) [tūḫ]-ša-ru nu GAL L\text{MES} MU\text{HALDIM} x - x - x LUG(AL)-i=m[a]
\text{pa-ra-a}
(20) [e-]ep-zī nu-u=š-ša-an tūḫ-ḫu-iš-na-az'
(21) [ku]-i[t] tūḫ-ša-ri n=a-at x - x kar-ta da-a-i

‘The Head of the cooks cleans in front of the altar with a t. The Head of the cooks holds the t. out in front of the king. The king cuts (it). The Head of the cooks [...] and holds (it) out in front of the king. And he lays down what he cuts off of the t.’;

KUB 24.14 i
(5) nu tūḫ-ḫu-e-eš-šar ŠA UZ\text{e} pa-an-kur NA IM BABBAR
(6) kal-ši-ša-na-anšAR ta-pal-ku-uš-ta-na-anšAR
(7) ḫa-ah-ḫa-ši-it-ti-inšAR e-u-ya-an GĪŠ ḫa-aš-du-e-er
(8) ku-e-eš im-ma GĪŠ-ru-ya-aš ḫa-ah-ḫal-la-aš a-li-il
(9) nu ki-i ḫu-u-ma-an A-NA ZĪD DA ŠE iš-ni me-na-ah-ḫa-an-da
im-mi-ja-mi

‘And (I take) tuḫḫu-eššar, the udder of a nanny goat, gypsum, kalvišna-herb, tapalkuššana-herb, ḫuḫḫuššiti-herb, barley, brush-wood, (and) the blossom of whatever tree or bush, and all this I mix together with the barley meal dough’.

On the basis of these contexts, we see that tuḫḫu-eššar is used for cleaning, is especially associated with cooks, can be cut, can be used to pour water with and is used in purification substances. I therefore want to suggest that it denotes a sponge. Etymologically, a connection with tuḫḫu-ai- ‘smoke’ is possible if we assume that sponges were named after the fact that they seem to contain air (note that the root *dueh₂- from which tuḫḫu-ai- is derived can mean both ‘smoke’ and ‘breath’).

tuḫḫu-ai- see tuḫḫu-ai- / tuḫḫu-
tuḫḫuš-ä (Ib1) ‘to end’: 3sg.pres.act. tuḫ-ḫu-uš-zi (KBo 20.39 l.col. 16 (OS), KBo 15.33 iii 15, KUB 41.9 rev. 5), 3sg.pret.act. tuḫ-ḫu-uš-ta (KBo 17.11+ iv 35 (OS), KBo 24.5 ii 8, KBo 20.72+ ii 6, iii 15, KBo 7.66 ii 10, KBo 30.25 i 24, KBo 30.57 rev. 18, KBo 30.109 rev. 1, KUB 59.45, 10, VS 12.28 iv 4, KBo 17.31, 7, KBo 20.69 + 25.142 obv.’ 5, KUB 55.42, 9 , tuḫ-ḫu-uš-ta (KUB 41.26 + 20.29 iv 25), tuḫ-ḫu-iš-ta (KBo 14.101, 3, KBo 29.70 i 23, KBo 26.156 obv. 2 (fr.)), tuḫ-ḫu-e-eš-ta (KUB 57.79 iv 12).

Often, this verb is equated with tuḫš-š(ı) ‘to cut, to separate’ (e.g. Neu 1968: 175, Tischler HEG T: 411f.) and the form tuḫ-ḫu-uš-ta ‘has ended’ is then interpreted as 3sg.pres. of the middle. The fact that there is a consistent semantic difference between tuḫ-ḫu-uš-ta ‘has ended’ and 3sg.pres.midd. tuḫš-ša, tuḫš-ša ‘he cuts’ asks for a different treatment, however. Oettinger (1979a: 527) therefore distinguishes two verbs, namely tuḫš-ša ‘zu Ende sein, fertig werden’ and tuḫš-š(ı) ‘abschneiden, trennen’, both middle. In my view, we should rather interpret tuḫḫušta as 3sg. preterite of an active verb, however. My assumption is based on the corresponding present form, 3sg.pres.act. tuḫḫušzi ‘ends’ as found in the following contexts:

KBo 15.33 iii
(13) LÚ.MES MUH ALDIM=m=a-aš iš-ta-na-a-ni ḫu-kām-zi ...
(14) ... ma-aḥ-ha-an=ma
(15) Ṣ4 DINGIR lIHM uk-tu-u-ri Ṣ4 ḤAL.A ḫu-ke-eš-šar tuḫ-ḫu-uš-zi
(16) mu=ṣ(ı)a-an ma-a-an LÚ EN E TIHM ku-Ḥki A-NA DINGIR lIHM ma-al-ta-an
(17) ḥar-zi ma-a-an Ú-NU-TUM ku-Ḥki ma-a-an GU₄ UD₄
(18) mu-ṣ-ša-an Ú-NU-UT I-NA NINDA.ĒRIN MES ti-an-zi

‘The cooks butcher on the altar. (...) When the god’s regular sacrifice of the portion ends, and if the owner of the house has vowed something to the god, be it some implement or an ox or sheep, they place the implement on the soldier’s bread’;

KUB 41.9 rev.
(5) [ ... ]ma-aḥ-ha-an=ma ḫu-ke-eš-šar tuḫ-ḫu-uš-zi[ i ... ]

‘If the sacrifice ends ...’.

Moreover, the interpretation of tuḫḫušta as an active form explains the absence of **tuḫḫuštari.
On the basis of the attestations tuḫḫušṭa and tuḫḫuṣṭa, both denoting [tuH*ista], I assume that we phonologically have to interpret this verb as /tuH’s-/l. Despite the fact that I have treated tuḫḫuš-3 ‘to end’ and tuḫš-3⁰ to cut off, to separate’ separately, I do believe that it is likely that they go back to the same origin (cf. ModEng. cut out ‘to stop’). As I have stated under tuḫš-3⁰, I have not been able to find good IE comparanda.

tuḫḫuš-3⁰ ‘to cut off, to separate’: see tuḫš-3⁰


This verb is consistently spelled with single -ḫ- (e.g. Tischler’s citing (HEG T: 421) as “tuḫušiæ” is incorrect). Its CLuwian counterpart, taḫušiæ- (which is attested in Hittite texts but must be Luwian because of the ending -ḫa and the use of gloss wedges), is spelled with -a-. The alteration Hitt. tuḫš- vs. CLuw. taḫuš- may indicate that the first vowel is anaptyctic and that we are dealing with phonological /thusia/-.

It is difficult to etymologize this verb. It is generally acknowledged that laryngeals are lost after stops (e.g. paltana- < *plth₂eno-, 2sg.pret. -tta < *-th₂e), which means that a preform *th₂u- should yield Hitt. tu-. Oettinger’s connection (1979a: 326) with Skt. tāṃ ‘quietly’, which must reflect *tuHs-, implies that a preform *tuḥ₂s- yielded PAnat. *tuHs-, which was metathesized to *tHuś- after the period that *th₂V > tV. All in all, I would remain sceptical about this etymology.

tuḫḫušai- / tuḫḫu- (c.) ‘smoke’: nom.sg. tuḫ-ḫu-iš (KUB 17.10 iv 21 (OH/MS), KUB 33.36 ii 5 (OH/MS)), tuḫ-ḫu-ya-iš (KUB 5.24 ii 16 (NS)), acc.sg. tuḥ-ḫu-ı̯n (KBo 8.35 iii 6 (MH/MS)), tuḫ-ḫu-ı̯n (KBo 12.89 iii 8, 17 (MS)), tuḫ-ḫu-ya-ı̯n (KBo 10.2 iii 40 (OH/NS)), tuḫ-ḫu-ya-ı̯n (KUB 24.5+ obv. 14 (NS)), instr.? tuḥ-ḫu-ı̯n (KUB 2.4 ii 4 (OH/NS)).

PIE *dʰúeh₂-u-ó-s, *dʰuh₂-u-ó-m, *dʰuh₂-u-ó-s
T: 418) therefore concludes that
difficult to explain the forms with
found in NS texts only (but once in an OH/NS-text). For instance, Tischler (HEG
1034
The meaning ‘smoke’ is assured by the fact that in the bilingue KBo 10.1 / KBo
10.2, tūh-hu-ya-in (KBo 10.2 iii 40) corresponds to Akk. qū-ut-ra ‘smoke’ (KBo
10.1 rev. 23). All forms are written with the TAH-sign, which can be read tāh as
well as tūḥ: so a reading tūḥuwaia- as well as tuḥuwaia- is possible. Traditionally,
this word is transcribed tuḥuwaia-.

Within the paradigm, we find forms that show a stem tuḥuwi- as well as
tuḥuwaia-. The oldest attestations (MS) all show tuḥuwi-, whereas tuḥuwaia-
is found in NS texts only (but once in an OH/NS-text). For instance, Tischler (HEG
T. 418) therefore concludes that tuḥuwi- is the original form. Nevertheless, it is
difficult to explain the forms with tuḥuwaia- then: diphthong-stems are rare and
unproductive. I therefore think that it is better to regard this word as an original
diphthong-stem tuḥuwaia- / tuḥuwi- that must go back to the structure *CēC-Ḡi-s,
*CC-Ḡi-m, *CC-i-Ḡi (cf. Weitenberg 1979).

Already since Petersen (1937: 210f.), this word is generally connected with the
PIE root *dūh₂- ‘to produce smoke, to breath’. Since all other IE languages only
show reflexes of this root in the zero-grade, the only evidence for a full-grade
form is found in Hitt. anṭuyahḥaš- ‘human being’ if this indeed reflects *h₂n-
dūeh₂-os- ‘having breath inside’. This means that for tuḥuwaia- / tuḥuwi- we have
to assume a paradigm *dūeḥ₂-u-Ḡi-s, *dūh₂-u-Ḡi-m, *dūh₂-u-i-Ḡi, in which the
stems tuḥuwaia- and tuḥuwi- were generalized on the basis of the oblique cases.
The fact that between the root *dūh₂- and the suffix -Ḡi- another suffix, -u-, is
found can be compared to e.g. šēklaï- < *šēh₂k-l-Ḡi-.

\textsuperscript{1}f. \textit{dujanalli} – (c.) ‘second in rank’: nom.sg. \textit{du-jà-na-al-li-iš} (IBoT 1.36 i 39), dat.-
loc.sg. \textit{du-jà-na-al-li} (IBoT 1.36 i 38).


PIE *du-i-jo-no-
This word is hapax in the following context:

\begin{align*}
\text{IBoT 1.36 i} \quad \text{(36)} & \quad \text{a-pa-a-š=a pa-ra-a da-me-ta-ni} \\
\text{(37) } & \quad \text{ME-ŠE-DI te-ez-zi a-pa-š=a pa-ra-a tar-ri-ja-na-al-li te-ez-zi} \\
\text{(38) } & \quad \text{tar-ri-ja-na-al-li-iš=ma du-ja-na-al-li te-ez-zi} \\
\text{(39) } & \quad \text{du-ja-na-al-li-iš=ma A-NA UGULA 10 M[E]-Š[E-D]I te-ez-zi}
\end{align*}
‘He passes it on to the other guard. That one passes it on to the one of third rank, the one of third rank passes it on to the one of second rank, and the one of second rank tells it to the Chief of ten Guards’, on the basis of which *dujanalli- can be determined as ‘the one of second rank’. Because *tarrijanalli- ‘third of rank’ must be a Luwian form (in Hittite, we would expect *teriija- from *tri-jo-no- + -alli-, it is likely that *dujanalli- is Luwian, too, and reflects *dui-jo-no- + -alli- (note that a reconstruction *duio- is unlikely as we would expect that here intervocalic *-i- would disappear). See tān for other descendants of PIE *du(o)ji- ‘two’.

tuk: see ʒīk / tu-

**tukk-** (IIIi) ‘to be visible, to be seen; to be important’: 3sg.pres.midd. du-ug-ga-ari (KUB 23.72+ ii 15 (MH/MS)), du-uk-kaₐ-ari (KUB 55.43 i 4, 9, iii 1 (MH/MS), KUB 29.1 ii 10 (OH/NS), KUB 59.43 i 3 (NS)), tu-ug-ga-ari (KBo 17.65 obv. 22 2x (MS)), tu-uk-kaₐ-ari (KBo 21.74 iii 5 (NS), KBo 22.230, 7 (NS), KBo 40.369, 4 (NS), KUB 8.38 iii 6, 19 (NS)), du-uk-kaₐ-ri (KUB 29.7 + KBo 21.41 ii 45 (MH/MS), KBo 4.9 i 10 (NS), KUB 9.32 i 7 (NS), KBo 4.1+ rev. 11, 30 (NH)), du-ug-ga-ri (KUB 17.28 iii 25 (MH/NS)), tu-uk-kaₐ-ri (KBo 30.186 rev. 19 (NS), KUB 55.48 i 13 (NS)), 3pl.pres.midd. du-uk-kaₐ-an-da-ri (KBo 21.76, 14 (NS)), 3sg.pret.midd. du-uk-kaₐ-a-ri (KUB 41.18 ii 8 (MS?)), tu-uk-kaₐ-a-at (KBo 4.12 obv. 18 (NH)), tu-ug-ga-ar (KBo 5.3 ii 25 (NS)).

Derivatives: **tukk-ₐ** (IIb) ‘to become important(?)’ (3sg.pres.act. du-uk-ki-iš-zi (KUB 5.6 ii 61), tu-uk-ki-iš-zi (KUB 8.53 ii 2 // KBo 10.47c iv 28)).

IE cognates: Skt. tvāc- ‘skin’, Hitt. tuekk- / tukk-.

PIE *tuk-o-ri

This verb is consistently spelled with geminate -kk- and -gg-, never with single -k-. It is therefore unclear to me why e.g. Tischler (HEG T: 426) cites this verb as dug(g)-. It denotes ‘to be visible’, but also ‘to be important’, especially in the syntagm ÜL tukkₐrī ‘it is not important’. It is quite likely that this latter meaning developed out of the former (*‘it is not visible’ > ‘it does not have to be taken into account’).

A much cited etymology is the one given by Mudge (1931: 253) (followed by e.g Oettinger 1976b: 113), who connected the verb with *dʰeug²- ‘to be of use’. Apart from the fact that the semantic connection is rather weak, the formal side is difficult as well: *g² cannot explain the geminate -kk- in Hittite (note that
Oettinger assumes that -kk- was secondarily taken over from “rhyming” ḳakkārī ‘to be lacking’; perhaps this etymological connection is the reason for Tischler to cite dug(γ)-, suggesting that the geminate is not to be taken seriously. Schindler (1972: 36f.) connects tukk- with Hitt. tuekk(a) / tukk- ‘body’ (q.v.) and Skt. tvāc- ‘skin’, however, and postulates a root *tuek- ‘to be visible’. Formally as well as semantically this etymology is preferable (note that Oettinger’s rejection (1976b: 144) of this etymology on the basis of the presumption that etymological *tu- cannot be spelled with the sign du- in Hittite and that therefore a connection between du-uk-ka-a-ri and tu-ek-ka- is impossible, is falsified by the attestation abl. du-eg-qa-az ‘body’ (KBo 34.62 rev. 12)). We therefore have to reconstruct tukkārī as *tuk-ō +ri.

The verbal forms tukkišzi and dukkišzi are given here as belonging to a verb tukkēšš-² (following Tischler l.c.), but it must be admitted that the meaning of these forms is not quite clear from the contexts.


PIE *tuH-l-i-o-?

This word is usually spelled without a plene vowel, although we twice find a plene spelling with the sign Ū and twice a plene spelling with the sign Ū. In CLuwian, this word is almost always spelled with Ū, however, which may indicate that the Hittite spellings with Ū are to be regarded as Luwianisms. For Hittite, this would mean that we should assume that tu-u-li-ja- is the correct spelling, and that we are dealing with /toli-/. Duchesne-Guillemin (1947: 80) connected this word with the PIE root *teuH- ‘to swell’ that shows an l-extension in e.g. Lith. ūlas ‘many’, tūlē ‘mass’, OPr. tūlān ‘many’. If this connection is justified (formally as well as semantically it is possible), then we should reconstruct *tuH-l-i-o-.
-ttuma: (2pl.pres.midd.-ending): see -ttumári)

†ttumantijatt- (c.) a kind of building, ‘ear-building(??)’: dat.-loc.sg. tu-u-ma-an-ti-ja-at-šu (KUB 17.24 ii 11).

This word is hapax, and its identification as a building can be made on the basis of the use of the determinative Š only: it is unclear exactly what kind of building is meant. Because of the formal similarity, one is inclined to compare it with CLuw. tum(m)ant- ‘ear’, for which see at (LZU) ištittiman-/ištám- ‘ear’.

-ttumári, -ttumati(i) (2pl.midd.-endings)

Anat. cognates: CLuw. -d)duyar(i) (2pl.midd.pres.-ending): az-tu-u-ya-ri, ma-

In the middle paradigm we find the following endings of the 2pl.: -ttuma and -ttumári for the present and -ttumáti and -ttumát for the preterite/imperative. When attached to a stem ending in a vowel, these endings are usually spelled with geminate -tt- or -dd-: ḥamaddumati, ḥuṣadduma, ījadduma, ījađadumáti, kiddumati, šarraddumáti, paškettumáti, zaḫḫiḫaddumáti, zaḫḫiḫiḫaddumáti. The few cases with single -tt- or -dd- (e-eš-ke-du-ma-at (KUB 12.63 obv. 5), ḥa-an-na-du-ma-šu (KBo 10.45 iii 36), ḥa-an-na-du-ma-tt (KUB 41.8 iii 8), ḥa-d[ṭ-š]-i-k-du-ma-at (KBo 39.8 i 35) and šar-ka-li-i-du-ma-šu (KUB 1.16 ii 49)) in my view all should be regarded as simplified spellings. Spellings with geminate -mm- are attested in NS texts only and must be compared to the common fortition of OH /m/ to NH /M/ as described in § 1.4.7.1.c.

In the present, we find -ttuma as well as -ttumári, reminding us of e.g. 1sg.pres.midd. -ḥha besides -ḥhari, 2sg. -tta / -ttári, 3sg. -a / -ari and -ttá / -ttári, etc. Although the endings -ttuma and -ttumári are not attested often enough to really establish a distribution, it is likely that -ttuma originally was used when the verb stem was stressed, and -ttumári when the verb stem was unstressed (e.g. paškettuma (OS) /paškettomátal vs. šalikámmáti (OS) /šlikomátal). In the preterite/imperative we find -ttumáti as well as -ttumát. Because this ending is not attested in OS texts, it is not easy to establish a distribution. In MS texts, we only find -ttumáti, whereas -ttumáti is attested in NS texts only. At first sight, this seems to indicate that -ttumáti is the original form with -ttumáti being a NH creation, but on the basis of the fact that the attestations of 3sg.pret.midd. -ati and -at seem to show a distribution between older -ati and younger -at, we may
assume that such a distribution underlies *ttumat and *ttumati as well (but compare 3sg.pret.midd. -tta/i, -tta where such a distribution is absent).

Within Anatolian, we must compare these endings to the CLuwian 2pl.pres.midd.-ending -(d)huvar(i), which shows that Hitt. -tumat reflects older *-ttuare. From an IE point of view, we must compare these endings with Skt. 2pl.midd. -hve/-hjam and Gr. 2pl.midd. -σχε. These latter endings seem to reflect *-dχue (thus e.g. Beekes 1995: 241), but this is not a possible reconstruction for Hittite (cf. the -tt- = -t/- that cannot be explained by *-dχ-). Melchert (1984a: 26) reconstructs *-dhχue, which indeed would account for Hitt. -tt- as well as -um- (for *CHuve > Hitt. CumVe, cf. e.g. *dhχ-yeði > tumėni). Nevertheless, *-dhχue probably should have yielded Skt. -d(h)iva and Gr. *-σχε.


Anat. cognates: CLuw. *dūr / dūn- (n.) ‘urine’ (abl.-instr. du-ú-na-i). PIE *sēik*-r, *sēik*-n-

This word is hapax in KUB 13.4 iii 67f.: a-pē-e-da-ni=ma DINGIRMEŠ-eš za-akkar & du-ú-úr (68) a-da-an-na a-ku-ya-an-na pi-an-zi ‘To him the gods will give faeces (and) dūr for eating (and) for drinking’. In this context, it is clear that dūr must mean ‘urine’. Because of the use of the gloss wedges, it is very likely that the word is Luwian. In CLuwian contexts we find an abl.-instr. dūnati in KUB 35.102(+) ii (8) [a-ni-š=ku=ya=ti pár-na-an-zu du-ú-na-šti (9) [pa-ap-pár-]ku-ya-at-šti ‘The mother cleans the house with d.’, with additions on the basis of ibid. (15) [a-ni-š=ku=ya=ti pár-na-an-zu ma-ad-du-ul-ya-ti (16) [p]a-ap-pár-ku-ya-at-šti ‘The mother cleans the house with wine’. Although the meaning of dūnati cannot be ascertained from the context, a meaning ‘urine’ is not impossible (see Starke 1990: 569 for this interpretation). If these considerations are correct, then we are dealing with a CLuwian r/n-stem dūr / dūn- ‘urine’.

CLuw. dūr was connected with Hitt. šēhr / šehun- ‘urine’ already by Čop (1965: 100ff.), which is semantically appealing and formally only strengthened by the discovery of the oblique stem dūn-. Nevertheless, details are unclear. As I have shown under the lemma šēhr / šehun- I believe that this word was borrowed into Hittite from another Anatolian language (Palaic?) in which PIE *sēik*-r / *sēik*-n- regularly yielded šēhr / šehun-. Although the details regarding the initial consonant are not fully clear, I believe that in Luwian, a pre-from *Cēik*-r would through Panat. *Cēχ*-r and pre-Luwian *Cēχ*-r yield CLuw. Cūr. Note that in the other words where Luwian i- seems to correspond to Hitt. š-,
we are also dealing loss of a PAnat. *g in Luwian (CLuw. tūya/i- ~ Hitt. šāku-  

eye’ < *sōkʰə-, CLuw. tūm- ~ Hitt. šākan / šakn- ‘oil’ < *sākʰ(ə)-jən-). Perhaps  
this loss of PAnat. *g- caused initial *s- to yield Luw. t-.  

gīšűri- (n./c.) ‘spear, lance’ (Sum. gīššUKUR): nom.-acc.sg. tu-u-ri (OS),  

Anat. cognates: CLuw. gīšūrḫa-, stick or weapon (acc.sg. tu-u-ri-im=ša-an, tu-  
u-ri-in, du-u-ri-in, abl.-instr. tu-u-ra-a-ti, tu-u-ra-ti), tūrāhī- ‘to use the tūra/i-’  

This word is attested from OS texts onwards and consistently spelled with plene  
-u-. It denotes ‘spear, lance’. The exact meaning of the CLuwian cognate  
gīšūrḫa- is less clear, however. Its interpretation depends on a difficult passage in  
rituals, which items are buried in order to make evil disappear (see at  
tēkkan / takn- for a treatment of the word inzagān):  

KUB 35.54 ii  
(31) za-a-ū-i zi-ja-ar NUMUN^{IWA}-na [p]u-u-na-a-ta  
(32) in-za-ga-a-an ya-aš-ḫa a=(a)ta [BE-]ĒL SĪŠKUR  
(33) gīšḫa-at-ta-ra-a-ti ḫa-at-ta[r]-i-it-ta  
(34) gīš-ša-u-ra-a-ti=p=č(a)ta tu-u-r[a-a]-t-ta  
(35) a=(a)ta im-ra-aš-ša-a-an,gīšKUR-u[n]-ti pa-ri  
(36) ta-ra-a-u-i-it-ta  

‘Here lie down all the seeds, the tools and the sacralized objects. The ritual  
patient has ḫ.-ed them with a ḫ. and t.-ed them with a t. and has delivered them  
to the Storm-god of the Open Field’.  

Starke (1990: 310) translates ‘mit dem Grabstock aber hat er es eingegraben’,  
which indeed seems to make sense. This is important, as it could indicate that  
tūri- originally meant ‘stick’. On this basis, Neumann (1976: 310) connects the  
word with PIE *s/tew- ‘to strike, to hit’ (e.g. in Mīr. tīgag ‘axe’, OHG stoc  
‘stick’, Lat. tudes ‘hammer’), assuming that tūri- shows the suffix -ri- (compare  
edri- ‘food’, aurī- ‘lookout’, etc.). As we see in § 1.3.9.4.f, however, we would  
expect that *tewri- would yield Hitt. **tiuru-/-, spelled **tu-ūrri-/-, whereas  
the spelling tu-u-ri- points to ħōri-/-l. This could point to an etymological connection  
with the verb tūrije/a-/xōreja/-l ‘to harness’ that reflects *țuhrje/o-.

IE cognates: Skt. ḍhūr- ‘yoke; pole or shaft of a carriage’, Gr. ὧχος ‘pivot of a door; axle of a chariot’, TochA τώρκο ‘ox of burden, draught bull’.

PIE *dʰuhrje/-je/-.?

Most of the attestations of this verb are spelled with plene -u-: tu-u-ri-, which spelling is found in OS texts already. This points to a phonological interpretation /torie/a-. Since Sommer (1949: 162), this verb is generally connected with Skt. dhūr- ‘yoke; pole or shaft of a carriage’ (nom.sg. dhūr, acc.sg. dhuram). Mayrhofer (1986-2002: s.v.) reconstructs dhūr as *dʰyṛh₁, and connects it with Gr. ὧχος ‘pivot of a door; axle of a chariot’, which should reflect *dʰyṛh₁-jo-. In Hittite, tūrije/a- seems rather to reflect *dʰuhrje/-je/-o-, however. Perhaps we have to assume laryngeal-metathesis.

See at gāstūri- ‘spear’ for the possibility that it is cognate with tūrije/a-².

tuški(je/a)-² (lb1 > lc1, ḫa1y) ‘to be happy, to entertain (oneself), to play’:
It is difficult to establish what the original stem of this verb is. E.g. Oettinger (1979a: 326) interprets the verb as tuške/a- (probably inspired by his etymology, < *tus-skē/o-). In my view, 1sg.pret.act. tuškun and duškun prove that the stem cannot have been tuške/a-, as we then would expect **tuškemn. These forms seem to point to tušk.² only. The forms 2sg.pres.act. duškatti and dušgatti then perhaps denote /tusk̑ ti/. The derivative dušganu- hardly can be seen as belonging with a stem tuške/a-: it likely denotes /tusknu-/l. The 3sg.pres.act. duš-ŠK-IIZ-zi, which in principle can be interpreted as duš-uš-ke-ez-zi = /tusket̑ ũ/ as from a stem tuške/a-, can be read duš-uš-ki-ez-zi = /tuskiet̑ ũ/ as well, as from a stem tuškiye/a-². When we assume that the stem was tušk.² with a variant tuškiye/a-², we perhaps can interpret the stem tuškara- seen in the derivatives tuškaratt-, tuškaȓ ũar and tuškarayant- as /tuskra-/l. Note that Rieken (1999a: 116-7) interprets these words as /tuskra-/l as well, although this is in conflict with her view that the verb is tuške/a-². She therefore states that "es sich wahrscheinlich um eine Reimbildung zu *nahšara- [handelt], da -ra- nicht an thematischen Verben tritt".

The root tušk- can only reflect a preform *TusK-. All proposed etmologies, however, presuppose that tušk- is a -ške/o-derived stem. Petersen (1937: 211, widely followed, e.g. by Oettinger l.c., Rieken l.c.) connected the verb with Skt. tasyati ‘to be satisfied’ and reconstructed *tus-ske/o-. Neumann apud Tischler (HEG T: 466) connects the verb with ON þydr ‘friendly’, Goth. þup ‘das Gute’, which reflect a root *teu- ‘in freundlichem Sinne die Aufmerksamkeit
zuwenden’. In my view, these proposals cannot be correct. The verb *tuśk-* reflects a root *TšK-*, which is comparable in structure to e.g. *mesg-, *resg- and *tresk- in LIV². Unfortunately I have not been able to find cognates.

**MUNUS** dattarijata/i- (c.) a female functionary: nom.sg. du-ut-tar-ri-i-ja-ti-ś (KUB 22.40 iii 18), du-ut-tar-ja-ta-ąs (Bo 4120 r.col. 4), gen.sg. du-ut-tar-ri-ja-ti-ja-ąs (KBo 24.126 obv. 28).

Anat. cognates: HLuw. tuwaṭra/i- ‘daughter’ (acc.sg. FILIA tü-wa/i-tara/i-na (TELL AHMAR 1 §24), FILIA tü-wa/i-ta[r/a/i-na] (TELL AHMAR 1 §29), FILIA-tara/i-na (KELEKLI §2)); Lyc. kbatra- ‘daughter’ (nom.sg. kbatra, acc.sg. kbatru, dat.sg. kbatrî).

PAnat. *duegr-*, *dugtr-

IE cognates: Skt. duhitā-, Gr. ὅγκυμα. Gr. (Myc.) tu-ka-te° (in compounds), TochB tkācer, TochA cākcar, Arm. dowstr, Osc. futîr, ModHG Tochter, Lith. dukē, OCS duštî, Gaul. dugitr ‘daughter’.

PIE *d'wegh₂-tr, *d'ugh₂-tèr-m, *d'ugh₂-tr-ös

The treatment of these words must start with Lyc. kbatra-. Already in 1893, Imbert (1893: 89) identified this word as ‘daughter’. A few years later, Bugge (1901: 25) argued that kbatra- must reflect *tyutra- (cf. kbi ‘two’ < *d'ų-) and ultimately must belong with the other IE words for ‘daughter’. In 1978, Hawkins shows that in HLuwian a cognate can be found in the form of FILIA tü-wa/i-tara/i-., which he convincingly identifies as ‘daughter’.

The Hittite word for ‘daughter’ is never written phonetically. On the basis of acc.sg. DUMU.MUNUS-la-an (KBo 20.101 rev.7.3), we have to assume that it probably ended in -la- and therefore hardly can be cognate with the HLuwian and Lycian word. Nevertheless, Starke (1987) argues that some words in the Hittite texts belong with tuwaṭra/i- and kbatra-. In KUB 40.2 rev. 5 we find a well called TUL Du-ya-at-ta-ri-na-ąś, which Starke interprets as “Töchterchen” (1987: 251). Unfortunately, this meaning cannot be verified. A better candidate for a cognate could be MUNUS dattarijata/i-. This word, which is attested a few times only (see Tischler HEG T: 471f. for attestations and treatment), denotes a female functionary. Although the exact meaning is unknown and a connection with ‘daughter’ cannot be ascertained, the fact that this word denotes a female functionary (compare MUNUS šiyanzanna-, a priestess, lit. ‘divine mother’) and is formally quite similar is remarkable at least. Because of the alteration between a stem dattarjata- and dattarijati-, it is likely that we are dealing with a word of Luwian origin (note that Melchert in his CLuwian Lexicon (1993b: 238)
confidently cites this word as “duttariyata/i- ‘daughter’ (or simil.)”). So, all in all, we are dealing with HLuw. tuwatra/i- and Lyc. kbatra- that clearly mean ‘daughter’, MUNUS duttarrijata/i- (a Luwian word in Hittite contexts) that could well be cognate, and TUL Duyattarina-, the appurtenance of which is far from assured.

The etymological interpretation of these forms is quite difficult. It is generally accepted that the words for ‘daughter’ in the other IE languages all point to a preform *d'ugh2er- (Skt. duhitär-, Gr. ἔναμπρο, TochB tkācer, etc.). How to get from *d'ugh2er- to HLuw. tuwatra/i- and Lyc. kbatra- is in debate, however, especially with regard to the origin of -a-. In earlier times, it was often stated that -a- reflects the vocalized laryngeal: d'ugh2er- (or *d'ug23tr-) > *tugatr- > tuwatr- > Lyc. kbtr- (cf. most recently Kimball 1999: 388). Nowadays it has become clear that “[t]here is no solid evidence for “vocalization” of *t/τ/ anywhere in Anatolian” (Melchert 1994a: 70: alleged şaklāi- ‘custom, rite’ from *şh2k-loi- is rather to be interpreted as şāklāi- < *šeh2k-loi-).

With the elimination of *t/τ/ as a possible explanation for -a-, e.g. Melchert (1994a: 69) has to assume that in *d'ug23tr- > *dugtr- an anaptyctic vowel emerged: *dug,tr- > *dugatr-. After the loss of PANat. *g, this form then would yield Luw. tuwatr- and, later on, Lyc. kbtr- (with *t/τ- > kb-). This is not a very attractive scenario, however. If the cluster *VgrV needed anaptyxis at all, we would expect to find vocalization of *r: *VgrCV (also a sequence *VgrC was likely solved as *VgrC). Moreover, if MUNUS duttarrijata/i- indeed is cognate, it would show a Luwian form without an anaptyctic vowel before *-r-. It seems to reflect *dugt(a)riada/i- < *d'ugh23(a)r-.

In my view, we will not easily be able to explain the vowel -a- and the difference between duttarrijata/i- and tuwatra- without assuming that we are dealing with a real vowel and with ablaut. I therefore want to propose that duttarrijata/i- indeed reflects *d'ugh23er-, but that tuwatra/i- and kbatra- go back to *d'ugtr- < *dugtr- < *d'ugh23tr- (note that kbatra- must show a-umlaut from older *kbetra-; for disappearance of *g in front of consonant cf. CLuw. nāna- ~ Hitt. nekna- < *negna-).

My reconstruction implies that the PIE word for ‘daughter’ originally showed ablaut in the root: nom.sg. *d'uegh3-tr, acc.sg. *d'uegh3-erm, gen.sg. *d'uegh3-rōs. Note that this inflection is supported by the peculiar accentuation pattern as visible in Greek: nom.sg. θυνάτρο < θυνάτρο, acc.sg. θυνατέρα, gen.sg. θυνατέροκ. In Anatolian, nom.sg. *d'uegh3-tr was enlarged with *-e- and regularly yielded HLuw. tuwatra/i- and Lyc. kbatra-. On the basis of either the stem *d'ugh23er- or *d'ugh23tr- a derivative in *-i̯o- (or *-i̯e-h2-) was formed,
which functioned as the basis for Luw. *dutterjìata/i- (for the suffix -at/i-compare CLuw. ḫuṭatalla/i- ‘ancestral’, derived from *ḫuṭata/i-, besides ḫuṣa- ‘grandfather’), which was borrowed into Hittite as *MUNUSdutterjìata/i-. After the splitting off of Anatolian, nom.sg. *d’uğhżɛr was secondarily altered to *d’oghżɛr (attested thus abundantly in the other IE languages) on the basis of e.g. *phżɛr ‘father’, which is the reason that no traces of ablaut are found anymore outside of Anatolian.

**tüya** (adv.) ‘far’: tu-u-ya (NH).

Derivatives: tüyân ‘to this side’, tüyân ... tüyân ‘to this side ... to that side’ (tu-ya-a-an (OS), tu-u-ya-an (OS, 1x), du-ya-a-an, du-ya-an), tüyânta (adv.) ‘to this side’ (tu-ya-a-an-ta (KBo 25.42 1.col. 12), tu-ya-an-ta (KBo 25.41 + KBo 30.114 obv. 8)), tüyâz (adv.) ‘from afar’ (tu-u-az (OS), tu-u-ya-az (OS), tu-u-ya-za (1x)), tüyâla- (adj.) ‘far’ (nom.sg.c. tu-u-ya-[a]-aš (KBo 1.31 rev. 16), dat.-loc.sg. tu-u-ya-li (KBo 4.14 ii 57), all.sg. tu-u-ya-la (KUB 8.14 rev. 7)).


IE cognates: Skt. dīrām ‘far away’, dīrāt ‘from afar’, Gr. ḍhý ‘for a long time, far’, (Dor.) ḍâv, ḍhâv ‘for a long time, far’, Gr. ḍhôk ‘lasting long’, Lat. dūdum ‘for a long time already’.

**PIE *duehym**

Although I have cited these words under the lemma tüya, on the basis of the chronological distribution we probably should conclude that tüya, which is attested in NH texts only, was a NH analogical creation on the basis of tüyaaz and tüyan, which are both attested in OS texts. Despite the fact that tüyan ‘to this side’ and tüyaaz ‘from afar’ are semantically rather different, already Pisani (1940: 354) suggests that they belong together, which means that tüyan represents a petrified accusative, tüyaaz an old ablative and tüya an allative form.

Already Benveniste (1932: 142f.) etymologically connected tüya ‘far’ and tüyaaz ‘from afar’ with Skt. dīrām ‘far away’, dīrāt ‘from afar’, Gr. ḍhý ‘long, far’ (< *ḍh(h)ý) etc., which reflect a root *dueh-. Eichner (1978: 160g99) reconstructs tüya-as *duhj-jo-, but this is problematic in view of tüyēzzi < *tehjēti and ḫuyanzi < *ṭuḥjēnti that shows that we then would expect a form **tüa-. Although a form **tüa- would yield Hitt. tüya- in NH times, we would expect that in OS texts the intervocalic -j- still would be present (compare OS ḫuyanzi > NH ḫyanzi), which contrasts with the fact that already in OS texts we find the spelling tu-u-ya-az. Melchert (1984a: 30) has a different opinion and equates tüyân with Gr. ḍhý, which he reconstructs as *duehym. If this reconstruction is correct, it would show
a few important things. Firstly, in a sequence *Tyeh₁- the -y- was retained (unlike in a sequence *Tyo > Hitt. Ta). Second, a sequence *-eh₂m did not yield *-aḥḥan or *-aḥḥum, as one could have expected, but gave Hitt. *ān (possibly an PIE development already, sometimes referred to as ‘Stang’s Law’). Moreover, this form would show that we are dealing with an old root-noun *dueḥ₂s, *dueḥ₂m, *dueḥ₂os. In my view, the only way that we can explain the forms tīqāz and tīqā then, is assuming the following scenario. In the cases where we find *dueḥ₂C, the *h₂ is regularly lost, probably through a stage *dua?C (with neutralization of *h₂ to ? in front of consonant). In my view, we could envisage that in a paradigm where we find *dua?C besides *duʔV, the consonant *ʔ has been generalized throughout the paradigm, yielding *duʔV, which regularly developed into Hitt. tīʔəV.

The CLuwian adjective dīqāza-, which is used as an epithet of tijamm(i)- ‘earth’ and often translated as ‘wide’, is sometimes regarded as a cognate to Hitt. tīqā. Apart from the fact that a meaning ‘wide’ is unassured, the formal aspect is not easy either because of the unexplained -za- in Luwian.

tīqān: see tīqā

This verb shows forms of many different inflection classes, especially in the youngest texts, where we find forms that belong to the stems duyarnijë/ə², duyarni-², duyarnae-², duyarniæ-² and duyarna-¹ / duyarn-. It is difficult to decide which inflection is the oldest. In OS texts, we only find 3pl.pred.act. tu-yar-ni-er (or tu-yar-né-er), which does not reveal anything regarding its inflection (it can belong with tuyarnijë/-, tuyarni- and tuyarn(a)-), and the broken form 3sg.pres.act. tu-yar-a[r...]. In MS texts, we already find different stems: duyarnahì (MH/MS) and duyarnai (MH/MS) unambiguously point to the stem duyarna-¹ / duyarn-, whereas tuyarnijæzi (OH/MS) unambiguously points to a stem tuyarnijë/ə². The interpretation of 3sg.pres.act. tu/du-yar-ni-iz-zi (OH/MS) is unclear however, because of the fact that the sign ìz can be read ìz as well as ëz. So, in principle a reading ënitì as well as ënìtì is possible. On the basis of the form du-yar-ni-iz (OH/NS) and du-yar-ni-nu-un (MH/NS), which unambiguously point to ënitì and ëninou, I assume that at least a part of the MS attestations with -nì-iz-zi denotes ënitì (on the basis of 3pl.pres.act. tuyarnijæzi (OH/MS), it cannot be excluded that some attestations denote ënìtì as well). This means that we have to reckon with a stem duyarni-². The interpretation of 3pl.pres.act. tuyarnæzi (MH/MS) is unclear as well. On the one hand, one could argue that it belongs with the stem duyarna-¹ / duyarn-, but, on the
other, we could also assume that it belongs with duyarnizzi and shows an ablauting stem duyarni-² / duyarn- (compare zinni-² / zim- ‘to finish’). Out of the three stems that are visible in MS texts, duyarna-² / duyarn-, duyarni-² / duyarn- and duyarnije/a-², the stem duyarni-/duyarn- must be the original one since this type is unproductive and declining in Hittite, whereas both the tarn(a)-class as well as the -je/a-class are very productive. In this case, we can easily imagine that on the basis of 3sg.pres.act. duyarnizzi, a new 3pl.pres.act. duyarnijanzi was created, which was the source for the -je/a-class, whereas on the other hand on the basis of 3pl.pres.act. duyarnanzi a new singular stem duyarna- was created, which was the source for the tarn(a)-class inflection. All in all, I assume that the original inflection of this verb was duyarnizzi, duyarnanzi (thus also Oettinger 1979a: 151, but he wrongly cites this verb as duyarnae).

Already Goetze (1954: 403) connected this verb with Skt. dhvar- ‘to damage, to hurt’. Yet although the root-etymology is generally accepted, the exact analysis of the Hittite verb is not. Eichner (1973a: 75-6) reconstructs *duyoreje-‘, a derivative from a “Verbaladj. *dhyorno- ‘beschädigt’”. Melchert (1984a: 36) rejects this on the basis of the fact that *d’yo- should have given Hitt. **ta- and not tua-. He therefore rather reconstructs *d’yoreje-ti, *d’yorenejointi, from an e-grade noun *d’yorno-. Apart from the fact that derivatives of o-stem nouns usually show *-o-je/-o- and end up in the Hitt. ẖaræ-class, the assumed development of *d’yern- > Hitt. tuyarn- is unparalleled. In my view, *d’yernV- should have yielded Hitt. **tuernV-, compare e.g. *k’ermi > kuermi ‘I cut’.

A better approach in my view is Oettinger’s (1979a: 151), who reconstructs duyarnizzi, duyarnanzi as *d’yør-né-h₁-ti, *d’yør-n-h₁-enti (compare zinnizzi / zinnanzi ‘to finish’ < *ti-né-h₁-ti, *ti-n-h₁-enti). This reconstruction is rejected by e.g. Melchert (l.c.) on the basis of the assumption that a sequence *CuRC should always yield Hitt. CuRC, and never **CyaRC. As I show in Kloekhorst fthce, this view is incorrect. Although a sequence *CuRCV indeed regularly yields Hitt. /CuRCV/, a sequence *CuRCC (so with two consonants following the resonant) regularly yields Hitt. *CyaRCC, spelled CuyaRCC (cf. kyaške/a- < *g’ınške/-o-, kuaraske/a- < *k’rške/-o-, etc.). In this case, the regular outcomes of *d’urnēh₄ti and *d’urnējenti are **durnizzi and duyarnanzi. Apparently, the stem of the plural was generalized throughout the paradigm (similarly in zinni-² / zim-, where the geminate -m- of the plural spread over the paradigm).

The usual form of the imperfective is tuyarni/eške/a-‘, but once we find ¹J**(JHUXP) = du-yja-ar-gš-ke-ez-zi (KBo 2.3 ii 41). Unfortunately, the form is slightly damaged. E.g. Tischler (HEG T: 495) proposes to read du-yja-ar-n[i-iš]-ke-ez-zi or du-yja-ar-n[i]-<iš>-ke-ez-zi. This first reading is impossible as
the handcopy of this text clearly shows that there is no room for a sign IŠ, whereas the second reading is quite far-fetched. I would rather read du-ya-ar-qā-ke- here and assume that this form is to be compared with e.g. taraške/a- (imperfective of tarna- / tarn-) in the sense that it is derived from the unextended root *dūrḥi- and reflects *dūrhškē/ô-. Note that a sequence *CrHsC- normally yields Hitt. /CrIsC- (e.g. paripriške/a- < *pri-prhškē/o-), which means that in *dūrhškē/o- the -u- may have caused a slightly different development (perhaps *dūrhškē/o- > *dūrske/o- > Hitt. /tuarsškē/-l, spelled duyaraššēkē/a-). A similar development is visible in *(G)šyaršma- ‘piece of firewood’ (q.v.) < *urhš-smo-.

Usually, the CLuwian verb lagarr(i)-a- is regarded as cognate with duyarmi-² / duyarn-, but see its own lemma for the improbability of this.

tuzzi- (c.) ‘army, military forces; military camp’ (Sum. ERINMES): nom.sg. tu-uzu-zi-iš (KUB 23.72 + 40.10 rev. 16, 26 (MH/MS)), tu-uzu-zi-aš=mi-iš (KBo 2.5 ii 13 (NH)), acc.sg. tu-uzu-zi-in (KBo 7.14 rev. 4 (OS), etc.), gen.sg. tu-uzu-zi-aš (MH/MS), tu-uzu-zi-ja-aš, tu-zi-aš, dat.-loc.sg. [r]u-uzu-zi-ja (KUB 36.106 rev. 11 (OS), etc.), tu-zi (KBo 3.13 ii 3 (OH/NS)), abl. tu-uzu-zi-ja-az, acc.pl. tu-uzu-zi-uš (KUB 19.37 iii 10, 11), tu-zi-uš, tu-uzu-zi-aš (KBo 2.5 ii 3, iii 49 (NH)).

Derivatives: tuzzi-jant- (c.) ‘army’ (nom.sg. tu-uzu-zi-ja-an-zo (KBo 2.5+ iii 53, KUB 23.21 obv. 30 (fr.), tu-uzu-zi-az (KUB 23.11 iii 16)), tuzziże/a-² (Ic1) ‘to encamp’ (1sg.pret.act. tu-uzu-zi-ja-μu-μn (often)), tuzzišaššar (n.) ‘army(camp)(?)’ (nom.-acc.sg. tu-uzu-zi-ja-šše-šša[r] (KUB 19.7 i 5)), NINDATuzziš- (c.) ‘soldier-bread’ (Sum. NINDA,ERINMES; nom.sg. tu-uzu-zi-iš, acc.sg. tu-uzu-zi-in).

PIE *dʰh₁-uti-

The bulk of the attestations show a stem tuzzi-. Only once, we find a form that points to a stem tuzziša- namely nom.sg. tuzziš=miš (NH), which is clearly secondary.

Forrer apud Feist (1924: 130¹) connected this word with Goth. piuda ‘people’ and Gaul. Teuto-rin, which are further connected with Old. tūth ‘people, tribe’, We. tūd ‘country’, OSax. thiod, OHG diot ‘people(s)’, Lith. tauta ‘people’, Latv. tauta ‘people’, Osc. touto and Umbr. totam ‘civitatem’ < *tutā. The Hittite word cannot reflect *tutā, however, but should then go back to an i-stem *teut-i- (note that *teut-ii- (thus e.g. Pokorny 1959: 1085) is impossible, as this would yield **tuzzazi-/ ḫusṭ’i-; *teut-i- (thus Eichner apud Hoffmann 1968: 215¹) is impossible as well, cf. Melchert (1984a: 166)). There are some problems regarding this reconstruction, however. First, Benveniste (1962: 122-5) argues
that a semantic development from ‘people’ > ‘army’ > ‘camp’ is quite unlikely: the normal development is ‘camp’ > ‘army’. Secondly, the words that reflect *teutā are found in Italo-Celtic, Germanic and Baltic only, which points to an old European substratum word (the alleged cognates Sogd. *tōda ‘crowd’ and ModP *tōda ‘heap, pile’ that e.g. Schmid (1968: 10) adduces in order to show that *teutā is genuinely PIE, are unconvincing).

An alternative etymology was put forward by Carruba (1966: 23), who suggested an inner-Hittite connection with dai- / ti- ‘to put, to place’. This is followed by e.g. Melchert (1984a: 166), who points to the semantic parallel katta dai- ‘to besiege’ and convincingly reconstructs *dāh₁-uti-. For the suffix *-uti-, cf. luzzi- < *lh₁-uti-, išḫuzzi- < *šh₂-uti-, etc.

Cf. Dercksen (2004) for the fact that this word is attested in OAssyrian texts from Kültepe as well, namely as tuzzinnum ‘army’.
**u-** (preverb.) 'hither': ú-e°, ú-qa- (in ye-² / uya- 'to come'), u-i-(e-) (in uja-² / ut- 'to send (here)'), u-un-n° (in ūma- / ūmi- 'to drive (here)'), up-p° (in uppa- / uppè- 'to send (here)'), (ū-)uš-hi- (in ūšê/a-² 'to draw open (curtains)'), ú-d° (in uda- / ud- 'to bring (here)'), ú-ya-ê (in uyâte-² / uyat- 'to bring (here)').

Anat. cognates: CLuw. **au-** in ayi- 'to come' (see at ye-² / uyâ-); HLuw. **âw-** in âwa/i- 'to come' (see at ye-² / uyâ-).

IE cognates: Skt. áva 'off, away', Gr. aţ 'again, towards', Lat. a-u-fugio 'to flee (away)', Lith. au- 'away from, down from', OCS u- ‘from, away’.

PIE *h2ou*

The preverb **u-** 'hither' functions on a par with the preverb pe- 'thither' in the sense that both can be prefixed to a verb to give it an extra semantic element of direction. The two preverbs function as opposites: pāi-² / pai- 'to go' vs. ye-² / uyâ- 'to come' (besides the simplex i-², ie/a-aw(ê) 'to be on the move'), pēda- / pēd- 'to bring (away)' vs. uđa- / ud- 'to bring (here)' (besides the simplex dâa- / d- 'to take').

Since Hrozný (1917: 70¹), this preverb is generally connected with Lat. au- 'away', Gr. aţ 'towards', OCS u- 'away', Skt. áva 'off, away' etc., which reflect *h2eiu. In Hittite, a preform *h2eu should have yielded **hù, however. This is the reason for e.g. Melchert (1994a: 66) to reconstruct all forms, including the Hittite one, as *au. If we assume o-grade however, initial *h2 would merge with *h1 due to the following *e (cf. Kloeckhorst fthc.c) and *h2ou would yield Hitt. ûtu. In my view, we can in this way equate the preverb u- with the element ĕhù found in ĕhù 'come!' (q.v.) and pehute-² / pehut- 'to lead, to conduct' (q.v.), which both show
retention of *h₂ in internal, intervocalic position. So, whereas yecci ‘he comes’ reflects *h₂ou-h₁e-i-ti, its imperative eḫu ‘come!’ reflects *h₁e-i-h₂ou.

It is remarkable that we find different spellings of the preverb in the different verbs (u-uC-, u-CV, ù-uC-, ù-CV and uC-), whereas within the paradigm of each verb the spelling is fully consistent. See §§ 1.3.9.4ff. for a full treatment of this problem.

In Luwian, we find aq- in CLuw. aqi- and HLuw. òwi- ‘to come’, which show the un-monophthongized forms. Note that alleged CLuw. u- does not exist: this is based on the verb uppa-., of which an analysis u- + pa- is far from assured (cf. the discussion under uppa- / uppi- ‘to send (here)’).

-u- ‘to see’: see au- / u-

-u (3sg.imp.act.-ending of the ḥi-flection)

PIE *u

This ending denotes the 3sg.imp.act. of ḥi-verbs: e.g. a-ku ‘he must die’, a-ru ‘he must come’, ḥu-u-ya-a-ū ‘he must run’, da-a-ū ‘he must take’, etc. To my knowledge, no direct cognate of this ending exists in the other IE languages. Nevertheless, it is clear that this ending must have a connection with its corresponding mi-ending -tu, which has a cognate in Skt. -tu and reflects *-tu. One could assume that the ḥi-ending -u is the result of an inner-Hittite analogy to the mi-endings: mi-endings 3sg.pres. *-ti : 3sg.imp. *-tu = ḥi-endings 3sg.act. -i : 3sg.imp. x. Note however, that this analogy must have taken place before the assibilation of *-ti to -zi, but after the replacement of ḥi-3sg.pres.act. -e by -i. Since the latter development must be dated exactly before the oldest stage of attested Hittite (because of the two attestations of the ending -e in OH), it might become chronologically quite difficult to assume such an analogy. It therefore is better to assume that we are dealing with a PIE element *u, which could be attached to 3sg.- and 3pl.-forms in order to make them imperatives (compare Goth. 3sg.imp.act.-ending -adau < *-o-to-u for the reality of an element *u). In Hittite, this element *u was attached to 3sg.- and 3pl.-forms instead of the ‘presentic’ -i (3sg.pres.act. -i > 3sg.imp.act. -u; 3sg.pres.midd. -ari, -tari > 3sg.imp.midd. -aru, -taru; 3pl.pres.act. *-anti > 3pl.imp.act. *-antu; 3pl.pres.midd. -antarı > 3pl.imp.midd. -antaru).

Gišuęsšar: see Giš_uięssšar
There is some confusion about the spelling of this verb. Friedrich (HW) cites the verb as "ũj̃a- (ũ-i-ja-; I 4)", which seems to imply that it is generally spelled with initial ū-. Oettinger (1979a: 338) does not give an overview of the forms, but only cites a form "ũ-i-e-iz-z[ī]", without mentioning its attestation place (he probably refers to the form ĩ-i-e-ez-z[ī] (FHG 4, 11), for which see at ñL. Again it seems as if the verb is spelled with initial ū-. Kronasser (1966: 496) cites several attestations, most of which are spelled x, however. He remarks that the ratio between spellings with u- vs. ū- is about 12 : 1 (but note that the only form with ū- that he cites, 3pl.pres.act. ũi-ja-an-zī (VBoT 24 iv 37), in fact is to be read inf.1 ũi-ja-u-an-zī "to cry", cf. the lemma yai- / yī-, yīge/a-²"). Melchert (1984a: 1631) states: "My files show 168 examples of ũi(y)ya- with initial u- versus only four with ū-", which gives quite a different picture. In my text files, I found this verb 154 times, of which only one form was spelled with initial ū- vs. u- in all other cases. This one form is the aberrant form ũ-a-ja-at-té'n in KUB 14.14 ii 36 (NH, 1st Plague Prayer). A meaning 'you must send' is assured on the basis of other versions of the Plague Prayer, which have ũi-ja-at-té'n 'you must send' in this context. On the basis of the form ũe-̃i-ja-[at-té'n] 'you must send', which we find in KUB 19.1 rev. 49, which fragment is a join to KUB 14.14 (and line KUB 19.1 rev. 49 = KUB 14.14 ii 36), one could perhaps argue that it should be read ū-ė-ja-at-té'n, but either way, this form (as well as ũe-̃i-ja-[at-té'n]) is aberrant within the paradigm of ũe-² / ũi-

All other verbal forms that show an initial ū- belong to other verbs (either yai- / yī-, yīge/a-² 'to cry' (finite forms and imperfective) or ye-² / yya- 'to come' (impl. ye/ske/a-)). So, all forms of the verb ũe-² / ũi- (except ũa-ja-at-té'n) are spelled with initial u-. This spelling points to a phonological stem [ʔoie-], PIE *h₂ou + *h₂iēh₁-ti / *h₂iēh₁-énti

There is some confusion about the spelling of this verb. Friedrich (HW) cites the verb as "ũj̃a- (ũ-i-ja-; I 4)", which seems to imply that it is generally spelled with initial ū-. Oettinger (1979a: 338) does not give an overview of the forms, but only cites a form "ũ-i-e-iz-z[ī]", without mentioning its attestation place (he probably refers to the form ĩ-i-e-ez-z[ī] (FHG 4, 11), for which see at ñL. Again it seems as if the verb is spelled with initial ū-. Kronasser (1966: 496) cites several attestations, most of which are spelled x, however. He remarks that the ratio between spellings with u- vs. ū- is about 12 : 1 (but note that the only form with ū- that he cites, 3pl.pres.act. ũi-ja-an-zī (VBoT 24 iv 37), in fact is to be read inf.1 ũi-ja-u-an-zī 'to cry', cf. the lemma yai- / yī-, yīge/a-²"). Melchert (1984a: 1631) states: "My files show 168 examples of ũi(y)ya- with initial u- versus only four with ū-", which gives quite a different picture. In my text files, I found this verb 154 times, of which only one form was spelled with initial ū- vs. u- in all other cases. This one form is the aberrant form ũ-a-ja-at-té'n in KUB 14.14 ii 36 (NH, 1st Plague Prayer). A meaning 'you must send' is assured on the basis of other versions of the Plague Prayer, which have ũi-ja-at-té'n 'you must send' in this context. On the basis of the form ũe-̃i-ja-[at-té'n] 'you must send', which we find in KUB 19.1 rev. 49, which fragment is a join to KUB 14.14 (and line KUB 19.1 rev. 49 = KUB 14.14 ii 36), one could perhaps argue that it should be read ū-ė-ja-at-té'n, but either way, this form (as well as ũe-̃i-ja-[at-té'n]) is aberrant within the paradigm of ũe-² / ũi-.
whereas *yai*- / yi-, *yije/a*- to cry (spelled with *û*) rather is /luai-, ui-, uie/a- and *yje*- / uyai- to come is /lu/e/a- (see also at § 1.3.9.4.a).

The bulk of the forms show a stem *uija-, but these are found in NS texts only: the oldest forms (MH/MS) show only a stem *uje- in the singular (3sg.pres.act. *u-i-e-ez-zi, 1sg.pre.act. *u-i-e-mu-um, 3sg.pre.act. *u-i-e-etl). Just as its counterpart *peje*- / pej- ‘to send away’, I assume that this verb originally inflected *uje*- / *ui-, which was taken over into the *je/a-class in NH times only.

The verbs *uje/-ui- ‘to send (here)’ and *peje/-pej- ‘to send (away)’ clearly are compound verbs with the preverbs *u- and *pe- respectively. The second part of these verbs is generally connected with Gr. *dei-* ‘to release, to make go, to let go’ (< *h₁iiehw₁) (see at *peje*- / *pej- for details). In *uje*- / *ui- the preverb *u- *dei- was lowered to *dei- due to the following *i-.

Note that the imperfective of *uje*- / *ui- ‘to send’, which is spelled with initial *u- (u-i-eš-ke/a-, u-i-iš-ke/a-, u-e-eš-ke/a-, u-i-e-eš-ke/a-) is clearly kept distinct from the imperfective of *yje- / uyai-, which is spelled with initial *û- (û-iš-ke/a-, û-i-iš-ke/a-, û-e-eš-ke/a-). The latter represents phonological *touiskēlţá-; whereas the former forms represent *touiskēlţá- (= u-i-es-ke/a-, u-i-iš-ke/a-) and, with analogical introduction of the strong stem, *toueskē/a- (= u-i-e-eš-ke/a-).

*āk / amm- (pers. pron. 1sg.) ‘I, me’: nom.sg. *û-uk (OS), *û-k= (OS), *û-g= (OS), am-mu-uk, acc.sg. am-mu-uk (OH/MS), gen.sg. am-me-el (OS), am-mi-el, am-me-el, dat.sg. am-mu-uk (OH/MS), abl. am-me-e-da-az, am-me-e-da-za, am-me-da-za, am-me-e-ta-az, am-me-ta-az, am-mi-ta-az.


See chapter 2.1 for an elaborate treatment of these words.

**ukila**: see ūk / amm-

**uktūri-** (adj.) ‘firm, steady, constant, eternal’ (Sum. SAG.UŠ): nom.sg.c. uk-tu-u-ri-iš (often), uk-tu-ri-iš (4x), acc.sg.c. uk-tu-ri-in (1x), nom.-acc.sg.n. uk-tu-u-ri (often, OS), gen.sg. u[k]-tu-u-ri-aš, uk-tu-u-ri-ja-aš, dat.-loc.sg. uk-tu-u-ri, nom.pl.c. uk-tu-u-ri-eš (OS), uk-tu-u-ri-i-e-eš, ya-[k]-u-u-ri-iš (KUB 33.120 i 6 (NS)).


As an adjective, the word means ‘firm, steady’. When used as a noun, it seems to denote ‘cremation site’, cf. e.g.

KUB 30.15 + 39.19 obv.

uk-tu-ri-ja-aš
(11) a-ra-ah-za-an-da-aš 12 NINDA.GUR₄.RA²MEŠ GAM ti-ja-an-zi

‘Around those uktūri-’s where the deceased person is cremated, they lay down twelve thickbreads’.

Perhaps this word is a specialized meaning of a fire-proof (i.e. “eternal”) place where cremations were executed.

The bulk of the forms are written with plene *-u*: **uktūri-**. The form ṣuktūri- occurs only once in a NS text and may not have much merit. Rieken (1999a: 354) analyses the word as ṣukt-ur-, in which the morpheme -ur- would be ultimately derived from *suer-/-yen-nouns (she compares Skt. aṅg-urī- ‘finger’). Puhvel (1972: 115) connects uktūri- with Skt. ojas-, Av. aojah-, Lat. *augus- ‘strength’. The latter forms go back to a root *h₂ug-, which does not fit the Hitt. forms: a zero-grade *h₂ug- should have given Hitt. **ḥuk-. In LIV, a root *weg- ‘münter, lebhaft, kräftig werden’ is cited, which at least semantically could fit uktūri-. Nevertheless, the formation of this word would remain intransparent. Further unclear.
ulae- (Ic2) ‘to hide, to sneak away’: 1sg.pret.act. û-la-nu-un (OH/NS), 3sg.pret.act. û-la-e-d=a-aš (NH).


See Oettinger 1979a: 363 for attestations. The forms ulamun and ulae closely point to the ḫatrae-class inflection. The forms that show a stem ulêšš- and ulišš- are sometimes regarded as belonging to the paradigm of ulae-, but in my view it is best to assume a derived verb ulêšš-\textsuperscript{z} with the suffix -êšš-. The basic verb ulae- is attested in NS texts only, and since the ḫatrae-class was highly productive in NH times, it is possible that this verb did not inflect according to the ḫatrae-class originally.

Oettinger (1979a: 364) proposes a connection with Skt. lāyate ‘to hide oneself’ from a root *leiH-\textsuperscript{3}, implying that u- must be regarded as the u-prefix (q.v.). Since the prefix u- had the meaning ‘hither’, it is semantically not easy to interpret ulae- ‘to hide’ as ur+*leiH- “to hide hither”. Moreover, we would expect to find a counterpart with pe- as well, which is unattested. All in all, I am not convinced by Oettinger’s etymology.

ulkiššara-, yalkiššara- (adj.) ‘skilled, experienced, able’: nom.sg.c. ya-al-kiš-ša-ra-\textadddagger- (KBo 1.42 i 4, 5 (NS)), acc.pl. ul-ki-iš-ša-ru-uš (KUB 29.1 ii 13 (OH/NS)) // [...]-iš-ša-ru-uš (KUB 29.2 ii 5 (OH/NS))).

Derivatives: ulkiššara\textsuperscript{\textlangle-}, yalkiššara\textsuperscript{\textlangle-} (Iib) ‘to make perfectly, to depict perfectly’ (3sg.pres.act. ya-al-ki-iš-ša-ra[\textlangle-ah-\textrangle-] (KBo 6.26 iv 30 (OH/NS)) // ya-al-\textlangle-k[i-iš-ša\textrangle-\textlangle-ah-\textrangle-] (KUB 13.14 rev. 7 + KUB 13.16, 4 (OH/NS)), 3pl.pret.act. ul-ke-eš-ša-ra-\textlangle-ah-\textrangle-er (KBo 3.34 ii 32 (OH/NS))).

IE cognates: Skt. vārcas-, GAv. varṣ̣aḥ- ‘splendour’.

PIE *ulk-sro- ?

This word is spelled with initial ul-k\textadddagger as well as ya-al-k\textadddagger. E.g. Rieken (2001: 371) interprets this alteration as ablaut, but see Kloekhorst fth.b for my view that ablauting pairs yVC- / uC- were not allowed in Hittite. I would rather compare this situation to the one found in urānī, yarānī ‘burns’: as I explain under its lemma, this verb reflects PIE *urh\textadddagger-ōri, which first yielded OH /ur\textadddagger-ānī/, spelled ū- ra-a-ni, and consequently develops into MH/NH /ur\textadddagger-ānī/, spelled ya-ra-a-ni. This means that PIE *uRC- > OH /uRC-\textadddagger > MH/NH /uRC-\textadddagger. Although the
attested forms of *ulkiššara-, *yalkiššara- are all found in NS texts, the fact that the spelling *ul-k₇ is only found in OH compositions, could indicate that this word, too, shows this distribution, namely \( \text{MH/NH} /ułk-/ > \text{OH} /ulk-/ \). Hoffner (1963: 36-7) reconstructs this word as \(*yul-g₇\)esro- `having a strong hand', but this does not take into account the spellings with *ul-k₇. In my view, *ulkiššara-, *yalkiššara- is to be interpreted as *uluKIšra-/ *uluKIšra-, reflecting pre-Hitt. *ulK-sra-, showing the suffix -sra- as visible in naḫšaratt- `fear' and ganuššariye/a₂² `to kneel' as well. The root *ulK- may belong with Skt. várca-, GAv. varčah- `splendour', which could reflect *yelk-es-. If correct, we must reconstruct *ulk-sro-.

-\textit{umen/-um}- (suffix of appurtenance) `coming from ...': nom.sg. \textit{H}a-aš-šu-
\textit{um}-aš (KBo 3.27 obv. 29 (OH/NS)), \textit{H}a-at-tu-šu-ma-aš (KBo 18.151 obv. 1
(MH/MS)), \textit{Z}a-al-šu-ma-aš (KBo 3.27 obv. 28 (OH/NS)), \textit{H}a-al-šu-
ma-aš (KBo 3.27 obv. 30 (OH/NS)), \textit{Su}-tu-na-aš, acc.sg. \textit{Pu}-ru-uš-
ha-an-du-um-na-an (KBo 3.28 ii 5 (OH/NS)), gen.sg. \textit{Lu}-ū-i-um-na-aš
(OS), dat.-loc.sg. ḫe-ēš-tu-um-ni (KUB 58.50 iv 14 (OH/NS)), nom.pl.c.
\textit{Ne}-šu-me-nē-eš (OS), \textit{Ka}-a-ta-pu-u-me-nē-eš (OS), \textit{Sa}-lam-pu-u-
me-nē-eš (OS); case? \textit{H}a-at-tu-šu-ma-aš (KBo 7.14 + KUB 36.100 rev. 15
(OS)).

Anat. cognates: CLuw. -\textit{yan}i(-) in \textit{N}ušayann(i)- `of Nineveh',
ištayayann(i)- `stepfather', ānayann(i)- `stepmother', kulayann(i) `of the army';
HLuw. -\textit{wa}n(i)- in nom.sg.c. ha-ra/i-na-iwa/i-ni-i-sa\textit{URBS} `of Harran', acc.sg.c.
TONITRUS.HALPA-pa-wa/i-ni-na\textit{URBS} `of Halpa', gen.sg. \textit{Da}sar-i-ma-na-
wa/i-na-sa\textit{URBS} `of Harman', dat.-loc.sg. ha-ra/i-na-iwa/i-
ni\textit{wa/URBS} `of Harran', abl.-instr. a-si-r\textit{URBS} `of Assyria',
nom.-acc.pl.n. á-wa/i-na-wa/i-na=wa\textit{URBS} `of Awayana', dat.-loc.pl. ka-
na-pu-wa/i-na-z\textit{URBS} `of Kanup'; Lyc. -\textit{u}n\textit{i}i(-) in Pille\textit{ne}i/- `of Pinara',
\textit{T}là\textit{ne}/i- `of Tlos', Xb\textit{id}è\textit{ne}/i- `of Kaunos'; Mil. -\textit{wù}n\textit{i}- in Tun\textit{we}n\textit{n}i `of Tumnessos(?)', Xbid\textit{we}n\textit{n}i `of Kaunos'.

In most cases, this suffix denotes ethnic origin, for instance: LÚ \textit{Haššum\textit{a}s},
\textit{Nešum\textit{a}s} `the man of the city Haš\textit{a}s', \textit{Nešum\textit{a}s} `the men of the city Neša'. When
derived from other nouns, it denotes appurtenance, e.g. \textit{šiš\textit{t}ù\textit{n}\textit{a}s} `the man
t pertaining to the šiš\textit{t}ù\textit{a}, ar\textit{umu\textit{n}a}s `those of the sea'. A special case is
\textit{kure\textit{z}um\textit{n}a}- `coming from where?, of what origin?', which is derived of
\textit{kuenza}, gen.pl. of kùi/-/kùa- `who, what?'.
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According to Oettinger (1982b), the original situation probably has been

nom.sg.c.
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XPQDQ

XPQ

(note that nom.sg.c., gen.sg.

XPHQHã

XPDã

XPDQDã

then must reflect *-umēn-s). On the basis of nom.sg.c. *-umaš, the variant -umen- sometimes was altered to -uman- (apart from gen.sg. Lu-ú-î-u-ma-na-aš cited above, also nom.pl. a-ru-mu-ma-né-eš (KUB 8.14 obv. 14), etc.). The form Ḫa-at-tu-šum-ma-aš may show geminate -mm- from *-mn-. In younger times, the suffix has become thematic, -uma-, on the basis of nom.sg.c. *-umaš. Compare e.g. the name *Šuppiluliuma- lit. ‘the one of the pure well’ or Luḫištuma- ‘person pertaining to the ḫišqā’.

In Luwian, the suffix -umm(i)- has a similar meaning, which must be cognate with Lyc. -ůne/i- and Mil. -wūne/i-. These clearly show that the -m- of Hitt. -umen- must go back to *-y-. The Hittite suffix is often spelled with plene Ũ (e.g. Ka-á-ta-pu-u-mē-né-eš, Lu-ú-î-u-ma-na-aš), which indicates that we are dealing with /-omen-, -omn-/. Herewith, this suffix is phonetically comparable to e.g. tumēni ḫomēni/ ‘we take’ and tarnumēni ḫrnomēni/ ‘we release’ that go back to *dH-yēni and *trnH-yēni respectively. I therefore reconstruct the suffix -umen-/ -umm- as *-Huen- / *-Hun-. I know of no IE cognates, however.

\textbf{ummijant-} (adj.) describing ‘birds’: acc.pl.c. um-mi-ja-an-du-uš (KBo 6.14 i 9 (OH/NS)).

The adjective only occurs in §120 of the Hittite Laws:

\begin{align*}
\text{KBo 6.14 i} & \\
(9) & \text{tāk-ku um-mi-ja-an-du-uš MUŠEN}^\text{HIA} \,[\text{n-na-mu-uḫ-ḫu-uš? k(u-iš-ki)}] \\
(10) & \text{ta-a-i-e-ez-ūl}
\end{align*}

‘If someone steals trained’ ummijant-birds, ...’. On the basis of this context the meaning of ummijant- cannot be determined. The preceding paragraph deals with lu-li-ja-aš MUŠEN-in an-na-mu-uḫ-ḫa-an na-šma ka-ak-ka-pa-an an-na-mu-uḫ-ḫa-an ‘a trained’ pond-bird or a trained’ kakkapā-’, but this does not shed much light on the meaning of ummijant- either. Nevertheless, Puhvel (HED 1/2: 48) translates the word as ‘young’, assuming a connection with mįjant- ‘small’ (q.v.), the negated form of mįjant-, participle of
This translation is followed by Melchert (1994a: 160), who reconstructs *ud-mijanti- 'grown up'. In my view, this is all much too speculative.

**umije/a-**

*umije/a-** (1sg.pret.act.-ending of the *mi*-flection): see *-njun

---

**-un** / **-unu**


**PIE *h2ou + *noi₁₂-ei/*ni₁₂-enti**

In my text files, this verb is attested about 120 times with a spelling *u-un-nē*. A citation of an aberrant spelling can be found in the edition of HKM 31, where Alp (1991: 174) cites a form *ū-ni-an-du* ‘sie sollen schicken’ (rev. 19). In the handcopy of this tablet, we read = *ū-[ ]x-an-du*, however. Although the small remains of the damaged sign indeed resemble the sign NI, this reading would leave quite a gap between Ū and NI. I therefore think that the traces that Alp reads as NI form the latter part of a larger sign. Although collation is necessary, I would rather read *ū-[d]a-an-du* ‘they must bring’ here. Kronasser (1966: 597) cites 3pl.pret.act. *ū-ni-ir* (KUB 31.64 ii 39), but the context in which this form is found is too broken to determine its meaning. Hagenbuchner (1989: 223) cites KBo 18.136 rev. (17) *nu-uš* *un-na-ah-ḥi*. The handcopy of the tablet clearly shows = *u u n na a h ḥi*, however. I do not understand why Hagenbuchner emends U to UŠ: I would rather read *mu u-un-na-ah-ḥi*. Some attestations of aberrant spellings are real, however. In KBo 18.14 rev. 12, we find

---
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3sg.pres.act. un-na-i, but perhaps we are allowed to emend this to *u-un-na-i. In HT 1 ii 20, we find 3pl.pres.act. u-ni-ja-an-zi, but this is likely to be emended to u-un-mi-ja-an-zi. Taking this into account, we must conclude that all spellings of this verb show initial u-un-n°.

The verb ūmNa/i- shows the typical mēma/i-inflection (ūmNaḥhi, ūmatti, ūmNai vs. ūmNianzi). As I explain at the treatment of the mēma/i-class in § 2.2.2.2.h, verbs of this class derive from polysyllabic dūmNṭianzi-class verbs that are being influenced by the turn(a)-class from pre-Hittite times onwards.

It is generally accepted that ūmNa/i- is a compound of the preverb u- (q.v.) and nai-/ *ni- ‘to turn’ (see at nē, nai- / *ni-) and functions as the counterpart of penna-/ penni- ‘to send (there)’ (pe- + nai-/ni-). It is unclear why we find a geminate -mn- here, which we also find in penna-/ penni- and in nanna-/ nanni- (see under nē, nai- / *ni-). Perhaps the univerbations and the reduplication were formed at a time that all initial consonants were fortes. Note that the spelling with u- points to a phonological stem /pONa-/l, in which the preverb u- apparently was lowered to /pO/ due to the following -mn- (cf. § 1.3.9.4.f).

unattalla- (c.) ‘merchant’ (Sum. LÖ DAM.GĀR): acc.sg. ú-na-at-ta-al-la-an (KBo 6.2 i 6 (OS)).

This word only occurs in §5 of the Hittite Laws:

KUB 6.2 i

(3) tāk-ku LÖ DAM.GĀR ku-iš-ki ku-e-en-zi

...

(6) nu-u=z-za ú-na-at-ta-al-la-an=pāt ar-nu-uz-zi

‘If someone kills a merchant ..... He will make the merchant be transported (= let him bury)’.

Its meaning is only known because of the fact that it must refer to the LÖ DAM.GĀR ‘merchant’ mentioned in the first line.

The suffix -tallα- is used to form, among others, deverbal nomina actoris. Kronasser (1966: 176) therefore derives this noun from the verb ūmNa- / ūmN- ‘to send here, to drive here’ (q.v.). Problematic, however, is the fact that this verb is consistently spelled u-un-na-, whereas unattalla- is spelled ú-na-. I therefore would reject the connection but must admit that I do not have an alternative solution.
The meaning of this verb is difficult to determine. Laroche (1954: 48) proposed a meaning ‘to suck’, which has been taken over by Friedrich HW and Oettinger (1979a: 183), but Košak (1982: 242) explicitly states “mng. unkn., not “to suck””. The verb is consistently spelled with initial u-. The only n-less form is 3sg.pret.act. u-uh-ta, where we would expect it: unh>C > u/C (compare the distribution between likC and linkV in the paradigm of li(n)k-²). This means that in e.g. 3sg.pres.act. u-un-ha-zi and 3sg.pret.act. u-un-Vh-da the -n- was restored.

Although clear cognates are missing, Oettinger (l.c.) mechanically reconstructs *h₁3uénh₂-ti, *h₁3unh₂-énti, which would mean that the zero-grade stem spread throughout the paradigm. Note that a root *Heunh₂ would be against the PIE root constraints.

unin-² (Ib2 > Ic2) ‘to adorn, to decorate, to lay (the table)’: 1sg.pres.act. ú-nu-ya-mi (410/u, 14 (NS) (cf. StBoT 5: 184)), 3sg.pres.act. ú-nu-üz-zi (KBo 38.265 i 11 (MS), KBo 18.108 upper edge 9 (NS)), ú-nu-u[z-zi (KBo 40.46 + KBo 35.156 i1 i 4 (NS)), ú-nu-u-ya-ızz-zi (KUB 10.91 ii 16 (OH/NS)), 3pl.pres.act. ú-nu-ya-anz-zi (KBo 5.1 iv 16 (MH/NS), KUB 58.100 iiii 4, KBo 2.13 obv. 13, KUB 17.35 i 32, etc.), 3sg.pret.act. ú-nu-ut (KUB 31.143 ii 23 (OS), KBo 25.119, 3 (OS), 3pl.pret.act. ú-nu-ç-er (KBo 19.112, 6 (MH/NS), KUB 33.96 iv 16 (NS), KUB 15.36 obv. 7, 10 (NH)), ú-nu-er (KBo 39.290 iiii 10 (NS)), ú-nu-ya-a-er (KUB 36.67 ii 19 (NH), 3pl.imp.act. ú-nu-[a]-du (KUB 33.96 iv 13 + KUB 36.7a iv 50, KUB 36.25 i 4); 1sg.pres.midd. ú-nu-ya- Kı-ra (KUB 17.9 i 32 (NS)), 3sg.pres.midd. ú-nu-ud-da (KUB 4.4 ii 15 (NH)), 3sg.pres.midd. ú-nu-ut-ta-at (KUB 17.5 i 5 (OH/NS), 3pl.pret.midd. ú-nu-ya-an-ta-at (KUB 46.30, 31); part. ú-nu-ya-an-t-; inf.ú-nu-ya-an-na (KUB 17.35 i 28); impf. ú-nu-uš-ké-a- (OS).

IE cognates: Lat. *ind-uō* ‘to put on (clothes)’, Arm. *daganim* ‘to put on’, Lith. *aįti, aunu* ‘to put on (shoes)’, OCS *ob-ući* ‘to put on (shoes)’.

PIE *h₁u-nēti / *h₁u-nu-enti

Friedrich (HW: 234) cited this verb as *umu-gāi*, apparently on the basis of *ú-mu-u-ya-iż-zi* (KUB 10.91 i 16 (OH/NS)) and *ú-mu-ya-er* (KUB 36.67 ii 19 (NH)) (note that the form ‘*ú-mu-u/*-y[a-iz-zi]’*, read thus in KBo 40.46 + KBo 35.156 iii’ 4 by Haas & Wegner (1999: 190), does not exist: the handcopy clearly shows *ú-mu-u*[z-zi]*j* (cf. Grodde & Kloekhorst 2006: 188). The oldest forms of this verb, *ú-mu-uz-zi* (MS) and *ú-mu-u* (OS), clearly show that we are dealing with an original stem *unu*-2, however. The occasional forms that show a stem *unuiae*-2 (apart from *ú-mu-u-ya-iż-zi* and *ú-mu-ya-er* also *ú-mu-ya-mi*) are found in NS texts only (cf. also Oettinger 1979a: 322134) and must have been secondarily formed under the influence of the highly productive ḫātrae-class. Almost all forms are spelled with initial *ú*. A spelling with *u*- can only be found in

KUB 4.3 i

(12) *ha-me-iš-hi-a GU₂-un le-e ya-aš-ti kar-ša-an-tan,=ma=za
(13) *gal-liš-tar-ya-ni-li (le-er(-da)) da-at-ti mar-ša-an-za
(14) GU₂-uš *ha-me-iš-hi=pât SIG₂-ri i-da-lu-uš=ma=za[a]
(15) kar-ša-an-zu *gal-liš-tar-ya-ni-li u-nu-ya-ta[r]i
(16) *nu=za ú-e-kăn-ta-an TÚG-an ya-aš-ši-[a]-zi
(17) ku-uš-ša-ni-an=ma=za l-an iš-ki-[a]-zi

‘Do not buy a cow in spring (just as) you should not take a girl (in marriage) during a party. Especially in spring a cow of poor quality looks good, (just as) an ugly girl has adorned herself for the party: she wears fashionable clothes and puts on oil that has been borrowed’,

but here we are rather dealing with a scribal error, cf. the mistakes in line 13.

For the meaning ‘to decorate, to adorn’, cf. Sommer & Ėhelolf (1924: 74). According to Oettinger (I.c.), who apparently assumes that *unu-* originally is a causative in *-nu*-, this verb is to be connected with Lat. *ind-uō* ‘to put on (clothes)’. This latter verb is generally connected with Arm. *daganim* ‘to put on’, Lith. *aįti, aunu* ‘to put on (shoes)’, etc. and reconstructed as *h₂u-ew-* ‘to put on (shoes)’ (cf. e.g. LIV2, although there a root final laryngeal is reconstructed (*h₂euH*), for which I see no evidence). This connection is convincing semantically (*‘to make put on > to decorate’*), but formally it is problematic, because a preform *h₂u-neu-* should have yielded Hitt. **h₁u-nu-. This problem
can be solved by either rejecting the etymology, or by adjusting the reconstruction. I would like to propose the latter solution.

The reconstruction of the initial *h₂ is especially prompted by Arm. (h)aganim, which seems to reflect *h₂eu-. The question is of course whether a reconstruction *h₂eu- is possible as well. In Armenian, there is a sound law that *o in open syllable yields a, so *-oCV > -aCV, but this development is supposed to have been blocked when this sequence is followed by an -o- (olorm ‘pity’, olok ‘prayer’, orof ‘lamb’), or when the consonant in question is -v- (hoviv ‘shepherd’ < *h₂eu-) or a reflex of *y (loganam ‘to bathe’ < *louH-, kogi ‘butter’ < *kou-; all examples by Kortlandt 1983: 10). Although in the first two cases the retention of *o is phonetically motivated, in the second case it is not: the development of *y > g occurs very early in the Armenian chronology of sound laws, whereas the unrounding of *o in open syllables is a quite recent phenomenon. It is more probable to assume that in the case of kogi and loganam the -o- is analogical to kov ‘cow’ and *lov (where -o- is regular). This would pave the way for my view that haganim < *hoganim < *h₂eu- (whereas aganim < *ganim < *h₂ou-), and that the PIE root actually was *h₂eu-. With this reconstruction, the derivation of Hitt. unu- < *h₂u-neu- is phonetically regular (see Kloekhorst fthc.c for the development of word-initial laryngeals in Hittite).

The derivative umuṣaḥa- is spelled as ú- na-aš-h° once (KUB 12.31 ii 25), which may have to be regarded as a scribal error, copying the signs NU-UA (חא) as NA (נא) (compare the mistaken spelling nu-ya-aš-su for na-aš-šu).

úṣap² ( Ib1) ‘to come up (of the sun)’: 3sg.pres.act. u-up-zi (often), up-zi (KUB 7.1 ii 25, KUB 55.65 rev. iv 50, 643/z 1.col. 4 (see Otten 1971b: 47)), 3sg.pret.act. u-up-ta (KUB 31.147 ii 18 (MH/NS), KBo 5.8 iii 23 (NH)), up-ta (KBo 16.8 iii 27 (NH)); 3sg.pret.midd. u-up-ta-at (KUB 21.10, 13 (NH)); verb.noun gen. u-up-pu-u-ya-aš (KUB 8.21, 8).

IE cognates: OHG úf, ModDu. op ‘upon’; Skt. úpári, Gr. ὑπέρ, Lat. super, Goth. ufar ‘over’.

PIE *h₁éup-ti

When we look at the attestations of this verb as cited in Oettinger 1979a: 232, we get the impression that its spelling is quite a mess: we find forms that are spelled u-up², up° as well as ú-up°. A closer look at the attestations shows that this may not be the case, however.

If we look at the instances of ú-up-, we see that these are all rather problematic. The form 3sg.pres.act. ú-up-zi (KBo 15.34 ii 22) as cited by Oettinger is
incorrect. In the handcopy of this tablet, we see that the second sign of this word is slightly damaged: [Image]. The part that is visible, however, does not point to the sign UP, but rather to the sign IZ. We therefore should read $n=a-a-ta$ $ma-ah-\hat{a}-an$ $\hat{d}UTU-u\dot{s}h$ $\hat{u}[-e]z\dot{z}i$ ‘when the Sun-god comes’. The form 2sg.pres.act. $\hat{u}-up-\dot{s}i$ (KUB 6.45 iii 14) cited by Oettinger must be read $\hat{u}-u[a-]s\dot{hi}$ ‘you come’, as can be seen by its duplicate, KUB 6.46 ii 53, where we find $\hat{u}-ya-\dot{s}i$. The form 3sg.pres.act. $\hat{u}-up[-z\dot{z}i]$ (KUB 28.74 obv. 1) that Oettinger cites is more difficult. When we look at the handcopy of the tablet, [Image], we see that the sign following $\hat{U}$ is that damaged, that one cannot say with certainty that it must be UP. In my view, IZ is possible as well, which would give a reading $\hat{u}-e[z\dot{z}i]$. I must admit, however, that this sentence, $[m]a-a-an$ $lu-uk-kat-ta$ $\hat{d}UTU-u\dot{s}h=k\dot{a}n$ $\hat{u}-x[...]$ (KUB 28.74 obv. 1) has a seeming parallel in e.g. KBo 5.2 ii 29, where we find $ma-a-an$ $lu-uk-kat-ta$ $\hat{d}UTU-u\dot{s}h=k\dot{a}n$ $u-up-z\dot{i}$ ‘when it becomes light, the Sun-god comes up’. Nevertheless, both $\hat{u}pp^{-2}$ and $\hat{u}e^{-2}$ / $\hat{u}ya$- are used to describe the coming-up of the Sun-god (e.g. $\hat{d}UTU-u\dot{s}h$ $\hat{u}[-e]z\dot{z}i$ ‘the Sun-god comes’ in KBo 15.34 ii 22 cited above), so despite the seeming parallel, a reading $\hat{u}-e[z\dot{z}i]$ should be equally possible. I therefore conclude that there are no convincing spellings of the verb $\hat{u}pp^{-2}$ with initial $\hat{u}$.

On the contrary, the attestations cited by Oettinger with only $up$ are reliable, e.g. 3sg.pres.act. $up-z\dot{i}$ (KUB 7.1 ii 25, KUB 55.65 rev.$^3$ iv 50, 643/z 1.col. 4 (see Otten 1971b: 47), 3sg.pret.act. $up-ta$ (KBo 16.8 iii 27).

According to Oettinger (1979a: 233), the one middle form $\hat{u}ptat$, which is found in a NH text, must be analogical to the middle form $lukat$ ‘it has become bright’.

The verb.noun gen.sg. $u-up-pu-u-ya-a\dot{s}$ (KUB 8.21, 8) is important as it shows that the root-final consonant is geminate -$pp$- and not single -$p$-, which points to etymological $^p$. Oettinger reconstructs the verb as $^p_h\hat{e}up-ti$, connecting it to PIE $^*(h_j)up(o)$. The exact meaning and form of this adverb is unclear, however: Skt. $\hat{u}pa$, Gr. $\hat{u}p\dot{h}$, Lat. sub. OIr. $fo$, Goth. $uf$ all denote ‘under’, whereas OHG $\hat{u}f$; ModDu. $op$ mean ‘upon’. The latter forms seemingly belong with $^*(u)p(\epsilon)\dot{i}$ ‘over’ (Skt. $up\dot{a}ri$, Gr. $\hat{u}p\dot{h}p$, Lat. $super$, Goth. $ufar$ ‘over’), which would semantically fit Hitt. $\hat{u}pp^{-2}$ as well. All in all, I follow Oettinger in reconstructing $^p_h\hat{e}up-ti$.

$\hat{u}pp^{-2}$ / $\hat{u}pp$- (IIa5 > Ic1, IIa1y) ‘to send (here)’: 1sg.pres.act. $up-pa-ah-h\dot{j}$ (MH/MS), 2sg.pres.act. $up-pa-at-ti$ (KBo 10.12 + KBo 10.13 iii 33 (NH)), 3sg.pres.act. $up-pa-a-i$, 1pl.pres.act. $up-pi-\dot{u}-e-ni$ (KUB 17.21 iv 13 (MH/MS)), 2pl.pres.act. $up-pa-at-ne-ni$ (KUB 13.17 iv 8 (OH/NS), KUB 13.4 iv 45 (fr.) (OH/NS)), 3pl.pres.act. $up-pi-an-z\dot{i}$ (MH/MS), $up-pi-[a-an-z\dot{i}]$, $up-pa-an-z\dot{i}$ (KUB 14.3 ii 62 (NH)), 1sg.pret.act. $up-pa-ah-h\dot{u}-un$ (MH/MS), 2sg.pret.act. $up-pi-e\dot{s}-ta$
(e.g. KBo 18.76 rev. 4 (NS)), 3sg.pret.act. up-êš-ta, up-êš-ta, up-pa-a-aš (KUB 9.34 i 17), up-pa-aš (KUB 26.70, 3 (NH)), 1pl.pret.act. up-êš-ta-en (KUB 34.55 i 10 (MS), up-pa-u-e-en (MH/MS)), 3pl.pret.act. up-êš-ta, 2sg.imp.act. up-êš-tä, 3sg.imp.act. up-pa-ú, 2pl.imp.act. up-êš-tén (KUB 20.108 rev. 9 (NS)), up-êš-tén (KUB 18.2 rev. 5 (NS)); part. up-pa-an-t-: verb.noun gen. up-pa-ja-u-ya-š (IBoT 3.148 iv 23 (MH/NS)); impf. up-êš-ke/a- (MS), up-êš-ke/a-.

Derivatives: uppiêškar / uppiêšn- (n.) ‘sending, gift’ (nom.-acc.sg. up-êš-šar (often), up-pa-ja-aš-šar, up-pa-êš-šar (KBo 13.57 ledge 3 (NS), KBo 1.35, 16 (NS)), dat.-loc.sg. up-pi-êš-ši, nom.-acc.pl. up-pi-êš-šar (KUB 23.101 ii 19 (NH)), up-pi-êš-šar (KUB 23.101 ii 4 (NH), up-ja-aš-šar (KUB 33.93+ iii 29 (NH)), [up]-pi-êš-šar-r (“KUB 18.24, 5 (NS))).

PIE *h₂ou + *h₂p-oi-ei / *h₂p-i-enti

This verb is consistently spelled up-p^o (about 120 cases in my files). All alleged other spellings are dubious regarding their interpretation. Alp (1991: 294) cites a form u^₂-up^₂-p[a-ah-hu-un] (HKM 93, 4), but the traces in the hand copy of this tablet are very difficult to interpret: . Von Schuler (1957: 42) cites ú-up[p]a-ú (KUB 13.2 i 19), but this form is damaged as well: . We possibly have to read something else here, e.g. ú-d[a]-q-ú? The hapax attestation u-pi-êš-kâ[n-zi] (KUB 59.3, 11) is problematic as well: in this small fragment (19 lines) the verb pi-êš-ke/a- is attested 4 times (3x pi-êš-kâ[n-zi], 1x pi-êš-ke-er), which may be seen as an indication that the first wedge of u-pi-êš-kâ[n-zi] is just an error and that we have to read pi-êš-kâ[n-zi] here as well. All in all, I conclude that the spelling up-p^o is the only correct spelling of this verb.

This verb belongs to the mêm-a/i-class verbs (uppâhḫi vs. uppainzi). Like all mêm-a/i-class verbs, this verb, too, shows influence of the tarn(a)-class inflection from MH times onwards, yielding forms like uppanzi, uppayen and uppan-. The form uppiâuqaš shows a stem uppiâe/a-². Oettinger (1979a: 489) states that uppa- / uppi- “sicher als u ‘her’ und piê-‘geben’ [ist] zusammengesetzt”, which I support wholeheartedly. The fact that uppa/i- belongs to the mêm-a/i-class whereas pai- / pi- ‘to give’ belongs to the dêtijanzi-class is comparable to the situation of ūnna- / ūnmi ‘to drive (here)’ and penne- / pejni- ‘to drive (away)’ (both inflecting according to the mêm-a/i-class) that are derived from nai- / *ni- (dêtijanzi-class): in pre-Hittite times polysyllabic dêtijanzi-class verbs were influenced by the tarn(a)-class and yielded the synchronic mêm-a/i-class (see at the treatment of the mêm-a/i-class in § 2.2.2.2.h). See at u- and pai- for an elaborate etymological treatment of these two elements.
According to Rieken (1999a: 383f.), the derivative *uppieššar* is altered to *uppijaššar* in NH times in analogy to the forms of the verb that start to be interpreted as showing a stem *uppija-* (e.g. *uppijauwšaš*). Rieken (1999a: 390) also cites a form *u-up-pi-iš*, which is attested on a badly damaged fragment:

KBo 34.25

(4) [x - x]x-na-a-aš ša-a-ra ku iš-ta-ati šar-ya-aš x[- x]
(5) [kiš-t]a-a-ti ḫal-ḫal-ta-mi-ja-aš ša-a-ra ku iš-ta-a-[ti]
(6) [x - x]iš-ta-a-ti u-up-pi-iš ki-iš-ta-a-[ti]

‘The loot of [x-x]-nāš has perished. The x of the loot has perished. The loot of the ḫaltani- has perished. The [x] has perished. The *āppi*-has perished’.

Because of the occurrence of the word šāru ‘loot, booty’ on this fragment (note however that CHD (Š: 296) interprets šāru as “an evil force” here), and because of the formal similarity, Rieken states that “eine Deutung von *uppiš* als “Sendung, Geschenk” (= uppieššar/uppijaššar) immerhin eine gewisse Wahrscheinlichkeit [besitzt]”. Problematic, however, is the fact that this form would be the only one within the group of attestations of *uppa*- / *uppi*- and *uppieššar* that is spelled with initial *u-up-p*². I therefore would rather separate this form from *uppa/-i*.

The CLuw. verb *ūppa*- is often translated ‘to send, to bring’ and regarded as cognate with Hitt. *uppa*- / *uppi*- . In my view, a translation ‘to send, to bring’ for CLuw. *uppa*- cannot be ascertained on the basis of the contexts in which it occurs, and has probably been suggested on the basis of a formal similarity with Hitt. *uppa/-i*- only. This makes CLuw. *uppa*- etymologically valueless.


Derivatives: (LI) *upaitalla*- ‘?’ (stem? *ū-pa-ta-al-la* (KUB 56.12, 9), LÜ MEŠ *ū-pa-ta-a-l-[a(…)…] (KUB 56.12, 10)).


Although this word is attested in OS texts already, it is generally accepted that this word must be of Luwian origin. This is indicated by the occasional use of
gloss wedges as well as by the fact that the word is attested in HLuwian as upat-. Luwian stems in -it- show a nom.-acc.sg. in -i and therefore are borrowed into Hittite as -i-stems (cf. gen.sg. upatijaš). Melchert (1993b: 242) interprets the CLuwian verb ú-pa- as ‘to furnish, to grant’ and assumes that this is the basis for upat-. Starke (1990: 198), however, states that upat- is likely to be analysed as a derivative in -it-, of which the basis upat- is not yet identifiable. According to him, other borrowings are OAss. ubadinnum and Ugar. ‘ubdy ‘ territory’. 

ur-âti, yar-âti (IIIH) ‘to burn (intr.), to be burned’ (Sum. BIL): 3sg.pres.midd. ú-ra-a-ni (StBoT 25.11 i 44 (OS), StBoT 25.137 ii 3 (fr.) (OS), KBo 9.127+ i 6, 8, 29 (fr.) (MS), KUB 33.59 ii 9 (OH/NS), KBo 22.137 ii 13 (NS), KUB 32.8 iii 23 (NS), 450/u, 4 (NS)), ya-ra-a-ni (KBo 8.96 obv. 3, 5, 7 (MS), KUB 60.73 rev. 17 (MS), KBo 6.12 i 19 (OH/NS), KUB 30.15+ obv. 10 (OH/NS), KUB 33.46 i 4 (OH/NS), KUB 33.53 + FHG 2 ii 14 (OH/NS), KUB 33.67 iv 3, 4 (OH/NS), KUB 15.31 ii 2, 4, iii 59 (MH/NS), KUB 15.32 ii 20, iv 29 (MH/NS), 1321/u iii 59, iv 8 (MH/NS), KBo 39.169 i 2 (NS), KBo 39.290 iii 14 (NS), KBo 44.80, 3 (NS), KUB 7.56 ii 2 (NS), KUB 10.95 iii 4 (NS), KUB 17.12 iii 7 (NS), KUB 25.31 ii 2, 4 (NS), KUB 29.4 iii 58, iv 41 (NS), KUB 39.71 ii 18 (NS), KUB 58.83 iii 9 (NS), KBo 12.33 iii 5 (NH), etc.), ú-ya-ra-a-n[i] (1191/z obv. 11 (NS)), ya-ra-ni (KUB 33.67 iv 2 (2x) (OH/NS)), ya-ra-an-ni (KUB 30.36 iii 3 (MH/NS), KUB 58.83 iii 14 (NS)), 3pl.pres.midd. ya-ra-an-da-ri (KUB 58.83 iii 10 (NS)), 3pl.pret.midd. ya-ra-an-ta-at (KUB 39.36, 7 (OH/NS), KUB 39.39 iii 2 (OH/NS)), ya-ra-an-da-at (KUB 39.4+ obv. 19 (OH/NS), KUB 39.14 i 14, ii 11 (OH/NS), KUB 39.35 (+) 30.24 i 30, ii 5 (OH/NS), KUB 34.65, 8 (OH/NS)), 3sg.imp.midd. ú-ra-a-nu (KUB 12.28, 8 (NS)), ya-ra-a-nu (KUB 29.7+ obv. 66 (MH/MS), KUB 33.11 iii 17 (OH/NS), KUB 33.49 iii 12 (OH/NS), KUB 33.53 + FHG 2 ii 16 (OH/NS), KUB 51.30 rev. 6 (OH/NS), KBo 39.252, 3, 5 (NS), KUB 17.12 iii 5 (NS)), ya-ra-nu (KBo 38. 247 ii 6 (MS?)); part. ya-ra-an-t- (MH/MS), ya-ra-a-an-t-. 

IE cognates: Lith. virti, vērdu ‘to cook’, OCS νερετί ‘to cook’.

PIE *urh₁-ó-rí

See Neu 1968: 188f. for an extensive treatment of this verb. The 3sg.-forms *y(a)rēnī and *y(a)rēnu are unique in the sense that they show dissimilation from original *y(a)rēri and *y(a)rēru. The verb shows two stems, namely ur- (attested in OS texts already) and yar- (from MS texts onwards). Sometimes, these stems are regarded as ablaut variants (e.g. Rieken 2001: 371, who apparently regards ur- as zero grade vs. yar- as full grade). This is very unlikely, however: middles from the tukkāri-class show a zero grade root throughout the paradigm. This means that there never was a full grade form to begin with from which a full grade stem could have spread over the paradigm. Moreover, the clear chronological distribution between OH ū-ra-a-ni vs. MH/NH ya-ra-a-ni rather indicates that we are dealing with a phonetic development that took place within the Hittite period.

Since Goetze & Pedersen 1934: 74 this verb is generally connected with Lith. virti ‘to cook’ and OCS νερετί ‘to cook’. Because these latter forms show acute accent, they must reflect *uerH-, which means that for Hittite we must reconstruct *urH-ór(i). If we now compare the MH/NH form ya-ra-a-ni, which must go back to *urH-ór(i), to paipparat = /pripaʔāl< *pri-prh₁-ōi-ei, in which *h₁ must have remained as a synchronic phoneme /l/ in order to cause the *r to vocalize to lā`, we see that we must phonologically interpret ya-ra-a-ni as /uɾʔānī/. So here the laryngeal has been preserved as well (which indicates that we must reconstruct *uerh₁-, since *urh₂-ór(i) would have yielded **yarh₃-ri). The question now is, how is OH ū-ra-a-ni to be interpreted? In my view, ū-ra-a-ni represents phonological /uɾʔānī/ in which vocalization of -r- has not taken place yet. So I reckon with a development *urh₁-ór(i) > OH /uɾʔānī/ > MH/NH /uɾʔānı/. For other instances of PIE *uRC- > OH /uRC-/ > MH/NH /uʔRC-/ see e.g. at yalku- and uklisšara-, yalkisšara.-

Note that the reduplicated adj. uryarant- probably stands for /uɾraʔrant-/...
The exact interpretation of the hapax form *ya-a-ra-i* (KUB 17.27 ii 26 (MH/NS)) is unclear to me. It seems to denote something like ‘starts a fire’, cf. the translation by Haas & Wegner (1988a: 192):

KUB 17.27 ii

(25) *nu=kān*\textsuperscript{MUNUS}ŠU.GI ĝ\textsuperscript{UTU}-i IGI-an-da 3 G\textsuperscript{H A}I an-da ḫar-pa-a-iz-zi
(26) *nu GĪR ZABAR* pa-ah-ḥur-r=a ya-a-ra-i *nu=kān* ya-a-tar
(27) *NG\textsuperscript{INDA}pār-ša-an-n=a an-da pē-eš-sī-ja-az-zi *nu kū-an me-ma-i*

“Und die Beschwörerin häuft dem Sonnengott gegenüber gesondert drei gebrannte Tongeschirre auf; und einen Dolch (aus) Bronz (hält sie), und facht ein Feuer an; und Wasser und zerbröckeltes Brot wirft sie hinein und spricht in dieser Weise:”.

Yet, the formal analysis of *yārai* is rather enigmatic. Melchert (1984a: 11\textsuperscript{13}) states that *yārai* replaces original *yēri* < *yōrei*, but since we are dealing with a root *yēr*- and since *yōr*-ei should yield **yēri* (cf. Ĝēri < *ḥōr*-ei, Śēri < *sōr*-ei) this is impossible. Perhaps *yārai* is an ad hoc transitive formation on the basis of the middle *yār*-‘to be burning’ instead of normal *yarnu*-‘.

\textit{frr-}: see Ĝēr(ie/a)-

\textit{gašura-}: see \textit{Gēš}yēra-

\textit{DEG}urā- (gender unclear) a vessel?: case? *u-ra-a-aš* (KUB 11.56 v 5).

This word occurs only once, in KUB 11.56 v (5) [ ... ] 2 \textit{DUGH A}u-ra-a-aš mar-nu-ya-an ar-ta ‘... 2 u.-vessels with beer stands’. It is not clear whether we have to regard \textit{urāš} as nom.pl. here, or as dat.-loc.pl. and assume that another word, which is now lost because it stood in the broken part, was the subject of the sentence and stood near the \textit{urāš}-vessels. No clear meaning, no etymology.

Friedrich (HW Erg. 1: 22) also refers to KBo 8.72 i 7 under this lemma, but there we find \textit{GIG}û-ra-a-an, for which see \textit{GIG}yēra-.

This word denotes a bird used in bird oracles, but it is not clear exactly what kind of bird is meant. The formal similarity with \( ^{107} \text{urajanni-} \), \( ^{107} \text{urajanni-} \), a functionary (spelled with the sign U as well, and showing a similar alternation between \( \text{urija-} \) and \( \text{uraja-} \)) is striking. An equation of the two cannot be proven, however. Further unclear.

\( ^{107} \text{urajanni-} \): see \( ^{107} \text{urajanni-} \)

\( ^{107} \text{uralla-} \) (c.) ‘horse-trainer’: acc.sg. \( \text{u-ra-al-la-a} (n) \equiv \text{ša-ma-an} \) (KBo 3.34 ii 23).

Derivatives: \( ^{107} \text{urallatar / urallann-} \) (n.) ‘profession of horse-trainer’ (dat.-loc.sg. \( ^{107} \text{u-ra-al-la-an-ni} \) (KUB 31.112, 15)).

This word occurs only once, in KBo 3.34 ii (22) ... \( \text{a-pu-u-n=a} (23) \)

\( ^{107} \text{urallann} \) is too broken for a good understanding of the text. Nevertheless it is likely that this word, which must belong with an abstract noun \( ^{105} \text{urallatar} \) must denote something like ‘profession of horse-trainer’. The origin of these words is unclear.

\( ^{105} \text{uranac-} \equiv \) (Ic2) ‘to bring a fire-offering’: 3sg.pres.act. \( \text{u-ra-na-iz-zi} \) (KBo 23.112, 4), verb.noun \( \text{u-ra-na-u-ya-ar} \) (KBo 23.112, 3).

See Van den Hout 1995: 120f. for the context in which these words occur:

KBo 23.112 + KUB 49.14

(3) \([\text{mTa-at-} \text{tu-ma-ru ku-it} \equiv \text{u-ra-na-ya-ar} \text{StxSâ-at}] \)

(4) \([\text{mTa-at-} \text{ta-ru-nu} \equiv \text{u-ra-na-iz-zi}] \)

(5) \([\text{-lx ma-ya-an=ma-a-ši}=at \text{DINGIR}^{\text{146}} \text{ha-ra-tar ya-aš-tul}] \)

(6) \([\text{U-UL k} \text{u-it-ki t-gt-š} S] \text{S}] \text{UMES SIG5-ru} \text{GISÜ A-ći GÜB-an NU.SIG3} \)

‘Was [das betrifft, daß für Tattam]aru ein Brandopfer festgestellt wurde, [...]

Tat[tamaru wird ein Brandopfer darbringen [...] ... wenn du, o Gottheit, für ihn das keineswegs zum Verstoß (und) Vergehen machst, so sollen die Zeichen günstig sein; der Thron Links: ungünstig’.

Etymologically these words likely belong with \( ^{105} \text{ur}- \) ‘to burn’ (q.v.). The use of gloss wedges hardly can denote a foreign origin, because the forms are genuinely
Hittite (3sg. on -zi, verb.noun on -yar). Perhaps the words are *ad hoc*-formations and therefore marked.

\


This word is consistently spelled with initial *u-* (and never with *ū-* and is attested in OS already. It is not clear what kind of functionary it denotes exactly. It is remarkable that the word quite often is attested uninflected. This could point to a foreign origin, which may be supported by the attestation of a form *u-ra-ja-an-ni* in a CLuwian text (KBo 29.43, 6). The alternation between *uriā-* and *urařa-* may point to foreign origin as well.

The formal similarity to *urařanī*, *urařanī*<sub>Mušēn</sub>, an oracle bird, is striking, especially because this word, too, is spelled with the sign U and shows an alternation between *uriā-* and *urařa-*. Semantically, a connection cannot be proven, however. Further unclear.

*urařanī*<sub>Mušēn</sub>: see *urařanī-

**Urte(a)-** ’?: 3pl.pret.act. *u-ur-ri/ē-er* (KBo 3.60 ii 7).

The hapax attestation *u-ur-ri-er* or *u-ur-re-er* (KBo 3.60 ii 7 (OH/NS)) is generally translated as ‘they helped’ and seen as belonging to the paradigm of *yarrae*-2’ ‘to help’ (q.v.). The context runs as follows:

KBo 3.60 ii

(description of a people that attack humans and then eat them)

(6) *ma-a-an u-ē-er LÙ URIŠtu-tu-um-ma-na-aš URIŠ[u- x - x - x]

(7) URIŠ U-ka-t-a-pu-ya u-ur-ri/e-er LÙ URIŠ Šu-ū-da[KI]-š[e?]

(8) *Ka-ni-u-us URIŠ U-ka-t-a-pu-ja-aš-sh=š/a

(9) me-na-aḫ-ḫa-an-ta pa-i-[er]

Güterbock (1938: 104f.) translates this text as:

‘Als es geschah, daß der Šudaēr (und) die Stadt Zu[...] der Stadt Uqapuḫa zu Hilfe kamen, da zo[gen] ihtm(?) der Mann von Šuda, Kanu und die Stadt Uqapuḫa entgegen’.
This translation is not imperative, however: the form ūrr(i)er could just as well mean something else. I would translate as follows:

‘When they came, the Šudaean [and] Zu[...] ū-L-ed towards Ukāpu. The Man of Šuda and Kaniuš of Ukāpu went against him’.

This means that I would separate the form ūrr(i)er from the verb yarrae-².
Further unclear.

uriyantar-: see at ur-²i

Derivatives: urkiaean-² (Ic3), urkiaear-² (Ic2) ‘to track down’ (1sg.pres.act. urkiam (HW: 235), 3sg.pres.act. ur-ki-ja-ez-zi (KUB 29.30 ii 5 (OS), u-ur-ki-ez[-zi] (VBoT 114, 6 (NS))).

IE cognates: Skt. vraj- ‘to walk, to stride’.

PIE *h₁₃urg-ī-

Note that virtual all attestations of ūrki- are spelled with initial U (except ur-ki-ja-ez-zi) which points to phonological /l(?)/orgi- or l(?)/orki-. Duchesne-Guillemin (1947: 80) connected this word with Skt. vraj- ‘to walk, to stride’, which would point to a pre-form *urg-ī- (thus also e.g. Eichner 1973: 73; Melchert 1994a: 95). Although semantically this connection seems plausible, formally it is problematic. On the basis of *urh₁óri(i) > OH /ur?ānīl/, ā-ra-a-ni > MH/MH /ušālānīl/, ya-ra-a-ni ‘burns’ and *ulk‘o- > MH /ušk‘a-l/, ya-al-ka-ya- ‘bad omen’ (if this latter etymology is correct) we would expect that the preform *urg-ī- would have yielded OH **/urgi-`, **(ā-)ur-ki- > MH/NH /uorgi-`, **ya-ar-ki-. With this knowledge in mind, we would rather think that u-ur-ki- = /orKi- reflects *h₁₃UrK-i-ı, compare e.g. *h₁₃urg-ī- > Hitt. ārki- = /Horgi-` ‘wheel’. Perhaps this means that we should reconstruct the root of ūrki- and vraj- as *h₁₃ureg- as (for this structure, compare e.g. *h₂uied’- ‘to hurt (letally)’, cf. LIV² s.v.; for the development *h₁₃ure- > Skt. vra-, cf. vrajā- ‘fold, fenced area’ < *h₁₃ureq-o-). All in all, I reconstruct ūrki- as *h₁₃urg-ī- (cf. Kimball’s reconstruction ‘*(h₁)wrği-’ (1999: 247)), derived of a root *h₁₃ureg- as visible in Skt. vraj- ‘to walk, to stride’.

ūrta- (c.) a disease?: acc.pl. u-ur-tu-ūš (KUB 43.38 rev. 23).
This word occurs only once, in the following context:

KUB 43.38 rev.
(21) [ki-i=ya ku]-u SAG.DU-az nu=ya-a=š-ma-aš $\delta$Sin ya-at-ha-an-na-u
n[u=ya-a=š-ma-aš (?)]
(22) [...]a ŠA-az hu-a-ya-a-ú nu=ya-a=š-ma-aš an-du-u-ri-ja-aš [  ]x[  ]
(23) [...]a $\delta$Sin u-ur-ri-uš i-ad-du nu=ya-a=š-ma-aš=za ki-n[u-un ...]
(24) [...]aš KUR.KUR\textsuperscript{MIS} an-da $\delta$ya-an-na i-at-ta-ri

‘Regarding that what is on the head, the Moon-god must strike you. And he must run .... out of [your] heart. And in your entrails the Moongod [...] must make $u$.s. And no[w] he comes into the [....] lands to see’.

Perhaps ūrtuš means ‘diseases’. No further etymology.

-uš (acc.pl.c.-ending)
IE cognates: Skt. -as, Gr. -qς, Lat. -ēs, Goth. -uns, Lith. -is.
PIE *-oms, *-ms

This ending is used in consonant- as well as thematic stems and denotes acc.pl. of commune words. It is predominantly spelled "Cu-uš, but occasionally we find forms with plene spelling. As I have shown in § 1.3.9.4.f, we predominantly find plene spellings with the sign Ú, pointing to /-us/, in older texts, whereas spellings with the sign U, indicating /-os/, occur in younger texts. This seems to indicate that an OH acc.pl.-ending /-us/ is developing into NH /-os/. Note that an ending /-os/ occurs also in ku-u-uš /kóš/ ‘these’ and a-pu-u-uš /póš/ ‘those’, but these are spelled with the sign U throughout the Hittite period.

Often, the PIE acc.pl.-ending is reconstructed as *-ns, on the basis of e.g. Gr. -qς, Skt. -as, Goth. -uns, etc. For Hittite, a reconstruction *-ns is impossible however: it would have yielded -aš or possibly -anz, but not /-os/. On the basis of the parallelism with the 1sg.pret.act.-ending /-on/ < *-m, acc.sg.c. ku-u-un /kón/ < *kóm and acc.sg.c. a-pu-u-un /póš/ < *h₂bʰóm, it is in my view likely that the OH acc.pl.-ending /-us/ > NH /-os/ goes back to *-ms and, when thematic, to *-oms. Note that when accentuated, *Côms yielded already OH /-óš/, spelled Cu-u-uš.

ušmanije/aː²: see ušnije/aː²i

Derivatives: ušantara-^2 (?) (3sg.prs.act. u-ša-an-ta-ra-a-i (KUB 15.9 ii 4)).

The bulk of the attestations occur in one text only:

KUB 7.53 + KUB 12.58 iv

(7) nam-ma=za=kán GU₄ u-ša-an-ta-ri-in SI e-ep-zi nu me-ma-i
(8) ĠUTU BE-LI=LA ka-a-aš ma-aḫ-ḫa-an GU₄-iš u-ša-an-ta-ri-iš
(9) n=a-aš=kán u-ša-an-ta-ri ḫa-li-ja an-da nu=za=kán ḫa-a-li-et
(10) GU₄,NĪTA-it GU₄,ĀB-it šu-un-ni-eš-ke-ez-zi ka-a-ša
(11) EN.SISKUR QA-TAM-MA u-ša-an-da-ri-iš e-eš-du nu=za=kán Ė-er
(12) ḫIS-TU DUMU,NĪTA₄ MES DUMU,MUNUS₄ ḫa-aš-še-et
   ḫa-an-za-aš-ši-it [ḫar-t]u-[u-γ]a-[u][i]

‘He further takes a u. cow by the horns and says: ‘Sun-god, My Lord, behold. Just as this cow is u. and (is) in a u.-pen and she keeps filling the pen with bull-calves and cow-calves; may likewise the Lord of the Ritual be u. too, and may he fill his house with sons and daughters and progeny and brood!”.

On the basis of this text, many scholars translated ušantari- as ‘fertile, pregnant’. Starke (1990: 374f.), however, argues that the adjective, which he regards as Luwian because of the gloss wedged forms ɶ u-ša-an-da-ri-iš (KUB 58.108 iv 10, 11, 13) and the Luwian inflected nom.pl.c. u-ša-an-da-ra-i-in-zi (KUB 35.84 ii 12) and dat.-loc.pl. [w/uš-a]n-ta-ra-ja-an-za (KUB 35.84 ii 9), has the meaning ‘bringing gains, bringing blessings’ (followed by Melchert 1993b: 245-6). He also points to the fact that the word shows a stem-form ušantari- as well as ušantara-. According to Starke, ušantar(a)i- is derived from an unattested noun ušantar-, which itself goes back to a participle *ušant-, which he interprets as cognate with the H Luwian verb (BONUS)ušnu(wa)- ‘to bless’ and the noun (BONUS)wašnu- ‘good’.

uši/e/a^2: see yešiye/a^2i
**gēšji̱e/a** (Ic1) ‘to draw open (of curtains)’: 3pl.pres.act. ú-uš-ši-an-zi (KBo 25.17 i 2 (OS), KBo 17.11 i 15 (fr.) (OS), KBo 20.10 i 2 (OS)), uš-ši-a[n-zi] (KBo 17.74 iv 27 (OH/MS)), uš-ši-ja-an-zi (KUB 2.13 i 2 (OH/NS), KUB 7.25 i 2 (OH/NS), KUB 11.22 i 15 (NS), KUB 11.35 i 9 (OH/NS), KUB 2.6 iii 22 (fr.) (OH/NS), KUB 20.79 1.col. 4 (OH/NS), KUB 25.15 rev. 6, 17 (NS), KUB 25.26 i 3 (NS)), 2pl.imp.act. uš-še-et-tén (KUB 29.1 i 43, 45 (OH/NS)).

PIE *h₂sou- + *h₁š-je/o-

It is remarkable that all OS attestations are spelled with initial ú-uš-, whereas all younger attestations show uš- only. See § 1.3.9.4 for my view that this points to phonological ḫ/se/a-l. See Kimball (1987b: 165f.), for a detailed treatment of this verb. She interprets gēšji̱e/a- as the u-counterpart of pešji̱e/a- ‘to throw away, to cast’ (q.v.), and suggests that both are derived from the verb šji̱e/a**2** ‘to throw’ (see at šai̱ḻ / šir-, šji̱e/a**2**), which she reconstructs as *h₁š-je/o-*. See there for further treatment.

**ušni̱e/a** (Ic1) ‘to put up for sale’: 3sg.pres.act. uš-ni-ja-zi (KUB 13.4 ii 40 (OH/NS)), uš-ša-ni-ja-zi (KUB 13.4 ii 40 (OH/NS), KUB 13.6 + KUB 13.19+ ii 31 (OH/NS)), 2pl.pres.act. uš-ni-ja-at-te-ni (KUB 13.4 ii 72, iv 26 (OH/NS)), 1sg.pret.act. uš-ša-ni-ja-na-un (KUB 26.69 v 9 (NS), KUB 40.91 iii 14 (NS), 3sg.pret.act. uš-ša-ni-ia-at (KUB 31.76+ iii 20 (MS), KUB 13.35 iii 16 (NS)), 1pl.pres.act. uš-ša-ni-ja-u-e-en (KUB 13.4 iv 73 (OH/NS)), uš-ša-ni-ja-u-en (KUB 13.35 iii 24 (NS), KUB 40.86 rev. 9 (NS)), 3sg.imp.act. uš-ša-ni-ja-ad-du (KUB 13.4 ii 39 (OH/NS)); impf. 3sg.pres.midd. uš-ne-ša-kat-ta (KUB 29.29, 12, 15 (fr.) (OS), KBo 6.10 iii 18, 22 (OH/NS)), impf.1sg.pret.act. uš-ni-iš-ke-nu-un (KUB 31.76+ iv 14 (MS)), impf.3sg.pret.act. uš-ša-ni-iš-ke-et (KUB 21.27 i 35 (fr.), iv 40 (NH)).


PIE *us-n-je/o-

This verb denotes ‘to put up for sale’ and therewith clearly is connected with Hitt. ḫur-‘to buy’, Skt. vasnā- ‘price’, Gr. ὑπνόκ ‘price’, etc. It is spelled uš-ni- as well as uš-ša-ni- which points to phonological /uSni̱e/a-l.

Although all attested forms of this verb inflect according to the -je/o-class, Neu (1980c: 87-8) states that ušni̱e/a- must be a remodelling of an older stem *ušnæe- (according to him still visible in the OS imperfective ušnēke/a-) and that this *ušnæe- reflects *usno-je/o-, a verbal derivative of a noun *usno- ‘sale’. This
seems improbable to me: ḫatrae-class verbs are very stable throughout Hittite, and it would be unexpected that an original *ušnae-² would be transformed into ušniê/ə². I therefore think we should analyse /uSnie/ə/- at face value, namely as *¨, Lat. §

This would also explain the different ablaut-grades as found in Skt. vasnā-, Arm. gin, Lat. vēnum < *ues-no- : Gr. ὑνοκ < *yos-no- : Hitt. ušn- < *us-n-. Note that Hitt. ušniê/ə² cannot be compared directly to Skt. vasnayāti ‘to higgle’ and Gr. ὑνοχια ‘to buy’ that reflect *yosn-eje-.


Derivatives: yašṭulac-² (Ic2) ‘to offend’ (3pl.pres.act. ya-aš-du-la-an-zi (KBo 17.65 obv. 41)), yašṭulayant- ‘offense’ (abl. ya-aš-d[u]-la-ya-an-da-za (KUB 16.39 ii 11)).

PIE *usThu₂-éul

This word clearly is cognate with yašṭa-¹ / yašt- ‘to sin’ (q.v.). Although the bulk of the attestations of this word show a stem yašṭul-, the oldest ones show ušṭul-. This latter stem therefore must have been the original one. Apparently, the zero grade stem ušt- of ušṭul- was replaced by yašt- in the early MH period, probably in analogy to the full grade stem of the verb. The fact that we find an original zero-grade root in this noun implies that the suffix -ul- must have been accentuated, which is supported by the spelling ya-aš-du-ú-li, which must reflect *-éul-i. See at yašṭa-¹ / yašt- for further etymology. Note that despite the one NS commune form acc.sg.c. yašṭulin all other forms clearly indicate that the word is neuter.


PIE *h₂ou + *d₂h₁-et/*d₂h₁-enti

All attestations in my file (about 510 examples) are spelled with initial ú- and never with u-. Semantically, uda₁ / ud- is the counterpart of peda₁ / ped-. Both are a clear compound of u- ‘hither’ (*h₂ou-) and pe- ‘thither’ (*h₁po-) respectively and the verb d₂ᵃ⁄d- ‘to take’. See at their lemmas for etymology. Note that the oldest texts consistently spell uda-/ud- with a short -a- in the strong stem forms, whereas the simplex d₂ᵃ⁄d- shows long -ā- (udāḫḫi vs. dāḥhe, udai vs. dāh). This is due to the fact that uda₁ / ud- is trisyllabic (cf. the short -a- in tarna₁ / tarna-, etc.). In later texts, the spelling of d₂ᵃ⁄d- becomes more influential on the spelling of uda-/ud-, yielding the spelling ù-da-a-i. Note that the paradigm of uda-/ud- has preserved some archaic forms that have been innovated in the paradigm of d₂ᵃ⁄d-: e.g. utummen vs. dāqen, uter vs. dāer, utumanzi vs. dāqanzi. These are an important indication for the original ablaut patterns in Hittite verbs


PIE *néth₂-r, *uth₂-én-s.
It should be noted that the interpretation of the CLuwian words is far from assured. The forms and translation cited here have been taken over from Melchert (1993b: 247), but e.g. Starke (1990: 565) assumes that *utar / *utn- in fact means ‘water’. If *utar / *utn- indeed means ‘word’, it would be difficult to reconcile the single -t- of CLuwian with the geminate -tt- of Hittite. I therefore will largely ignore the CLuwian forms here.

The etymological interpretation of *utar / *uddan- has proven to be very difficult. Eichner (1980: 146) connects *utar with Skt. vād- ‘to speak’, Gr. ἀκόη ‘voice’ and reconstructs */h₂udh₂r- / */h₂udh₂n-*. The idea is that the initial */h₂- is lost in the nominative due to the o-grade (‘de Saussure effect’: */h₂udh₂r- > */yattar-*) and that absence of */h₂- then spread throughout the paradigm (*h₂udh₂n- > */h₂uttu-*) after which the nominative */yattar* is replaced by *utar* in analogy to the oblique stem. This account seems quite intricate to me. Rieken (1999a: 299-302) mechanically reconstructs */e/ʊt-r- / */e/ʊ-n-*. This would regularly yield */ūdār / ʊt-n/, and if we assume that in Hittite the fortis -t- of the oblique stems has been generalized, whereas in Luwian -d- has spread, we could account for both Hitt. *utar / *uttan- and CLuw. *utar / *utn-. Problematic, however, is that a root */eurt-* is further unattested (Rieken’s account that “man […] an den Ansatz von */hiyeq-* ‘sagen, sprechen’ [könnte] denken, zu dem */hiyeqʷ*/hiyeqʰ*, “feierlich, rühmend, prahlend sprechen” (gr. έορκεῖα, lat. vovēdī, ai. vāghāt-) im gleichen Verhältnis steht viel */hiyeqʰ-, “gehen” zu */hiyeq-* ‘ds.’. Auszugehen wäre von einem proterodynamicen Paradigma mit komplexem Suffix */hiyeqʷ-tr*/h₁u-tēns (>> */h₁u-utn-és*)” is not very compelling).

I would rather suggest a connection with the root */weth₂- ‘to speak’ that is reconstructed in LIV² on the basis of Lat. vetēr ‘to veto’, MWe. dy-wed- ‘to say’ < */ne-h₂- and Ofr. aspέna ‘testifies’ < */eks-yet-nā-ti (see already Pedersen 1938: 291 for a connection between *utar and MWe. dy-wed-). The paradigm */wēth₂r- / */wēth₂n- regularly yielded */wettar / *uttan- (cf. e.g. pattar / pattan- < */poθ₃r- / */poθ₂n-), of which it is obvious that it was replaced by *utar / *uttan- (see Kloekhorst fthc.6 for the impossibility of an ablaut yVC / uC in Hittite). The seemingly hysterodynamically inflected forms *ud-da-na-a-aš, ud-da-ni-i and ud-da-na-a-aż can be compared to ēštar / iššan- where an originally proterodynamic noun */h₁eshr₂- / */h₁eshr₂-en-) also shows hysterodynamically accented forms in Hittite (e.g. iš-ха-na-a-aš). It may not be accidental that here the suffix-vowel */e has been coloured to -a- as well.

*utnē / utnî- (n.) ‘land’ (Sum. KUR): nom.-acc.sg. *ut-ne-e (OS), *ut-ni-e, *ut-ni, gen.sg. *ut-ni-ja-aš (KUB 8.30 i 23 (OH/NS)), *ut-ne-ja-aš (KBo 3.21 i 4
(OH/NS)), dat.-loc.sg. ut-ni-ja (OS), ut-ni-i (OH/NS), ut-ne-ja, ut-ne-e-ja, ut-ne-e, abl. ut-ni-ja-az, ut-ne-e-az, nom.-acc.pl. ut-ne-e, dat.-loc.pl. KUR-e-aš.

Derivatives: utnijant- (c.) ‘people, population’ (nom.sg. ut-ni-ja-an-za (OS), KUR-e-an-za, acc.sg. ut-ni-(ja)-an-da-an (OS), dat.-loc.sg. ut-ni-ja-an-ti (OS)).


IE cognates: Arm. getin ‘ground, land’.

PIE *(h)ud-n-ē, *(h)ud-n-i-

See e.g. Neu (1974a: 113) for attestations. The oldest paradigm seems to be utnē, utnīaš. In more recent times, the stem utnē was generalized throughout the paradigm, giving e.g. utnejas and utnēaz. The dat.-loc.sg. utnīa probably is the old allative *utnī-o, whereas utnē is the old dative *utnī-ei. The inflection is very rare: the only possibly comparable form is nom.-acc.pl. ku-le-e-i ‘vacant’ (KBo 6.2 ii 47). Nom.-acc.sg. utnē is best explained as *-nē, whereas the oblique cases show *-ni-.

The identification of the stem is difficult. Often, the word is connected with Arm. getin ‘ground, land’, which probably reflects *yeden-. It is disputed whether the root *yed-, *ud- is the same as in *yod-r ‘water’ (see at yātar / yiḏān-). If Gr. οὐδῶς ‘ground’ is cognate, we perhaps have to reconstruct *h₂ud-, although it is not without controversy to assume a development *h₂yd- > Gr. οὐδέ. For a possible connection with Lyc. wedre/i- and Luw. *yadna-, cf. Melchert (1994a: 317) who states that “[b]oth the meaning of wedre/i- and the analysis of Kizzuwatna remain problematic”. It is interesting why this word show a cluster -tm- whereas normally *-tn- assimilated to -mn- (cf. the abstract nouns in -ṯār / -ṭam- < *-ṭēr / *-ṭēm-). Melchert (1994a: 161) explains this as the result of a morpheme boundary that prevented the assimilation, but Puhvel (HED 3: 353) more plausibly states that etymological *-tm- remains unassimilated and therewith contrasts with *-tn- that regularly yields -mn- (similarly in ḫudār / ḫutn-).

ŠĀRU udumeni- (n.?) a wind or direction of the wind: nom.-acc.sg.? ū-du-me-ni.

This word occurs only once, in KUB 8.34 iii (12) ŠA-A-RU ū-du-me-ni i-ja-[at-ta-r] ‘The u-wind will b[low]’ (cf. Laroche 1952b: 22). The context is too broken to determine what direction of wind is meant. Oettinger (1995: 46f.) interprets udumeni as ‘Benetze das Gesicht!’; from *uṣ- ‘to wet’, parallel to ḫaṭrawmeni- ‘Dörre das Gesicht aus!’, from ters- ‘to dry’. He cannot explain,
however, why the form is *udumeni instead of **udmeni. Moreover, the verbal root *ued- is unattested in Hittite. I would rather follow Tischler (HEG T: 153) who states that “[d]a es sich jedoch um Ausdrücke aus der Übersetzungs-literatur handelt, ist fremde Herkunft wahrscheinlicher”.

**uğa-** (c.) “?”: gen.sg. u-ya-aš (KBo 3.40+ rev. 14).

This word occurs in one difficult context only, the Soldier’s Song in the Puḫašnu-Chronicle:

KBo 3.40+ rev.¹


(14) ni- = m-mu an-na- aš = ma-aš kāt-ta ar-nu-ut ti-ja[a=m-mu] ti-ja mu-u = m-mu

u-ya-aš = ma-aš kāt-ta ar-nu-ut

(15) [t]i-ja-a = m-mu ti-ja

‘The clothes of Neša, the clothes of Neša, bind’ me, bind’! Bring me down my mother’s, bind’ me, bind’! Bring me down my u.’s’, bind’ me, bind’!’.

The exact interpretation of uğa- is unclear, despite several proposals by different scholars (e.g. ‘son’ (Hrozný 1929: 297), ‘forefather’ (Ivanov 1967: 977ff.; Watkins 1969b: 239; Oettinger 1978: 74-5, who assumes that uğa- is the Nešite variant of ‘normal’ Hittite hūḥa- ‘grandfather’ and consequently that anna- ~ ḫanna- ‘grandmother’), ‘nurse’ (Melchert 1986)).

**uğa-**: ‘to come’: see ye² / uğa-

**uğa-** ‘to see’: see au¹ / u-

**uğaňnuyar**: see yănuyar at yeň² / yâh-

vU**uýalla-**: see ^UZU) ýalla-

**uýantiyant(a)-**: see at yantai² / yanti-

**uýarkant-**: see yarkant-

**uýašta²**: see yasta¹ / yašt-
This verb shows some variety of forms, but the oldest paradigm probably inflected thus: uyatemî, uyatešši, uyatezzi, uyatummēni, uyadâźni, uyatanzi, uyatemen, *uyates, uyatat, *uyatumen, uyatatenn, uyater. This means that we are dealing with an ablauting stem uyatezu / uyat-, which is fully compatible with a derivation of *dêh₁−/ *dëh₂−. Synchronically, uyate-/uyat- seems to function as the counterpart of pehutezu / pehut- ‘to bring (there)’, which goes back to *h₃poi₃h₂ou₃dëh₁−, combining the preverbs *h₃poi₃ (Hitt. pe-) and *h₂ou₃ (Hitt. u-). The exact interpretation of uyate-/uyat- is unclear, however. It is likely that the initial u- is to be equated with the preverb u- < *h₂ou₃, but the element -ya- is unclear to me. Melchert (1994a: 134) therefore assumes that uyate-/uyat- reflects u- + *yodëi-s- ‘to lead’ that secondarily has taken over the inflection of pehute- / pehut-.

Melchert (1993b: 248) cites a CLuwian verb uyata- ‘to bring?’, which is hapax in the following context (same in iv 1-2):

KUB 35.102+103 ii

(13) i-ja-an-du=ku=ya za-aš-ši-in DUMU-an-na-aš-ši-i[n]

(14) a-an-ni-in ya-ra-al-li-in ú-ya-ta-a[n-du]

‘They must go, they must u. one’s own mother of this son’.

I would not dare to state that a translation ‘to bring’ is imperative here. Such a translation is apparently assumed on the basis of a formal similarity with Hitt. uyate-/uyat- only, which in my opinion is too small a base.
**uyiten-**: see ẏ̄ār / ẏ̄ēn-


This word, which denotes ‘grass’, is sometimes interpreted as ūḫri-, having the determinative Ū that is used with plants. Otten (1971b: 1) states that we better read ūzuḫri-, however. The word only occurs in texts about horse-training. The dat.-loc.-forms in -ti(ja) clearly indicate that the word is Hurrian.
\[=ya=\] : see \(=ya(r)\) =

\(yah\)-: see \(yeh^{2}\)/\(yah\)-

\([u]\(ohanammant\)-: read [ma]\(ohanammant\)-, q.v.

\(yahhu^{2}\): see \(yeh^{2}\)/\(yah\)-

\(ya^{1}/yi^{1}\) (Ia4 > Ic1 > Ic2) ‘to cry (out)’: 1sg.pres.act. \(ú-í-ja-mi\) (KUB 14.1 + KBo 19.38 ii 93 (MH/MS)), 3sg.pres.act. \(ya-a-i\) (KUB 14.1 + KBo 19.38 ii 91 (MH/MS)), \(ú-í-ja-ez-[z]í\) (KUB 15.34 iv 19 (MH/MS)), \(ú-í-ja-iz-zi\) (KUB 15.32 i 37 (MH/NS)), \(ú-í-e-ez-[z]í\) (FHG 4, 11 (undat.)), 3pl.pres.act. \(ú-í-ja-an-[z]í\) (KUB 15.31 i 35 (MH/NS)), 3pl.pret.act. \(ú-í-e-er\) (KUB 31.67 iv 10 (NS)); inf.I \(ú-í-ja-ú-an-zi\) (KUB 30.28 obv. 29 (NS), VBoT 24 iv 37 (MH/NS)); impf. \(ú-e-éš-ke/a-\) (3pl.pres.act. \(ú-e-éš-kán-zi\) (KUB 39.5 rev. 13 (OH/NS)), sup. \(ú-e-éš-ga-ú-an\) (KUB 17.6 i 26 (OH/NS), KBo 32.15 iii 9 (MS)), \(ú-e-éš-ke-u-an\) (KUB 19.4 + 19.45 obv. 8 (NH)), \(ú-e-éš-ke/i-ñ-ìš-u-an\) (KUB 33.106 iii 6 (NS))).

Derivatives: \(uu^{1}/yu^{1}\) (Ib5) ‘to cry’ (3sg.pres.act. \(ú-í-yu-a-i\) (KUB 14.1 + KBo 19.38 ii 92)), impf. \(ú-i-ú-i-ñ-ìš-ke/a-\) (KBo 16.72+73 i 11, 14, 18, KUB 33.119, 16), \(ú-e-u-ñ-ìš-ke/a-\) (KBo 24.5 ii 10)), \(yiññkatta\) (c.) ‘crier’ (nom.sg. \(ú-i-yiñ-ñ-ìš-kat-tal-la-aš\) (KBo 1.44 + KBo 13.1 i 40)).

The interpretation of the forms of this verb has been difficult. Friedrich (HW) cites two verbs: a \(hí\)-verb “\(yān\)” (with 3sg.pres.act. \(yān\) only) and a \(mít\)-verb “\(uīuj\)”, both ‘schreien’. Oettinger is not consistent in his treatment. The form \(yān\)
he cites (1979a: 475) as belonging to a stem “\textit{ije}^{-\text{bb}}” (i.e. belonging to the 
$\textit{dgi}$/$\textit{tijani}$-class), but he does not mention the other forms under this lemma. On
p. 73 he cites a verb “\textit{ije}^{-\text{bb}}” (also belonging to the 
$\textit{dgi}$/$\textit{tijani}$-class), but does not cite any forms. Are \textit{ije}^{-\text{bb}} and \textit{ije}^{-\text{bb}} to be seen as the same verb, and does he
also regard forms like \textit{yi\textit{jam\textit{i}}} as belonging here? Melchert (1984a: 132) is more
clear and states that \textit{y\textit{a}}\textit{\textit{a}}, \textit{yi\textit{jan\textit{z}}} are to be regarded as belonging to the 
$\textit{dgi}$/$\textit{tijani}$-class, with forms like \textit{yi\textit{jam\textit{i}}} being backformations on the basis of 3pl. \textit{yi\textit{jan\textit{z}}}.
According to him, this is indicated by the fact that 3sg.pres.act. \textit{y\textit{a}}\textit{\textit{a}} is found in the
same context as 1sg.pres.act. \textit{yi\textit{jam\textit{i}}}:

\begin{quote}
KUB 14.1 + KBo 19.38 ii
(91) a-li-ja-aš=ya Ū-UL ya-a-ı Ū-UL=ma=ya ya-a-ki Ū-UL=ma=ya iš-pår-rı-ez-zi
(92) x[ ... ]a-li-ja-an pær-ḫa-at-ta-ri ŠAH=ma=ya iš-i-ya-ı ku-ıt nu=ya ku-iš A-NA
KUR-e
(93) še-x[ ... ]x x x x [ ... ]x-ja ku-en-zi nu=ya ŧ-ı-[ug]-x=ą ŠAH-aš i-ya-ar
iš-i-ja-mi
\end{quote}

‘The \textit{ali\textit{a}}-bird does not cry, it does not bite, it does not spread (its wings). [...]’
hunts the \textit{ali\textit{a}}-bird. Why does the pig cry? Who [...] in the land [...] kills. And I
wil cry like a pig’.

I agree with Melchert: the oldest paradigm of this verb is shown by \textit{y\textit{a}}\textit{\textit{a}} / \textit{yi\textit{jan\textit{z}}},
whereas the forms that belong to the paradigms \textit{yi\textit{je}^{-a\text{bb}}} and \textit{yi\textit{ja}^{-e\text{bb}}} are younger
secondary creations.

Formally, the thematic forms \textit{yi\textit{je}^{-a\text{bb}}} resemble the forms of the verb \textit{ije}^{-e\text{bb}} / \textit{ije}^{-\text{bb}}
‘to send’ a lot, but they are consistently spelled differently: ‘to cry’ has an initial \textit{u}-,
whereas ‘to send’ shows initial \textit{u}-. Nevertheless, forms of these verbs have
occasionally been misinterpreted by scholars. For instance,

\begin{quote}
KUB 31.67 iv
(9) [ ... ]x 2 MUNDUSUḪUR.LA₂ DINGIR\textsuperscript{LM} IŠ-TU-Ē.DINGIR\textsuperscript{LM}
(10) [ ... ]x uš-i-e-er nu=ya-a=š-ma-aš=kän SAG.DU-i
(11) [ ... ]t-[ ]a-an-ta-ri
\end{quote}

is translated by Starke (1990: 430) as

‘2 Hierodulen der Gottheit schickte man aus dem Tempel [...] herauf’ (mit den
Worten): “Auf ihren Kopf sind [...] gelegt.”,

but I would prefer
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‘Two hierodules of the deity cried from out of the temple “On your/their heads
[...] are lied.”’.

The same goes for the form ū-i-e-em-tē-[i (FHG 4, 11), which is cited in Oettinger
(1979a: 338) as ‘to send’, but must mean ‘to cry’. The context it occurs in,

FHG 4

(10) [ ... ]x-[i] ū-[i]-em-tē-[i] ... ]

(11) [ ... ]x [...] = pāt ū-i-e-em-tē-[i] ... ]

must, despite its bad preservation, be compared to

KBo 15.48 ii

(5) ... muL[pal-ya-at-tal-la-aš

(6) ū-[i]-em-tē-[i] pār-ta-u-ni-it LUGAL-i me-na-aš-ha-an-da

(7) ū-[i]-em-tē-[i] x-[i] = ū-[i]-em-tē-[i] ma x = ŪU

‘The crier sprinkles water with an eagle’s feather three times toward the king
and cries out once’ (cf. CHD P: 199).

In the case of the imperfective, the spelling difference between ū- and u-
is significant as well: ū-i-em-tē-[a] means ‘to cry’ (or ‘to come’, but this is more
often spelled ū-i-i-em-tē-[a] whereas u-e-em-tē-[a] is ‘to send’. This means that the
forms should be phonologically interpreted as follows: ū-[a]-i = ū-ā/i, ū-i-ja-an-zī
= /uānt’i/ and ū-e-em-tē-[a] = /ūiskē’ā/. This contrasts with e.g. uje² / uj- ‘to send
(here)’ which is spelled u-i-ja-an-zī = /ūoiānt’i/ and u-i-em-tē-[a] = /ūoiiskē’ā/-
and u-e-em-tē-[a] = /ūoiiskē’ā/.

Etymologically, the verb is likely derived from the onomatopoetic words ū-i
‘whee!’ (KUB 55.38 ii 19) or (u)jā- ‘woe’ (in āi- (u)jā- ‘woe and pain’ (acc.sg.
a-i-in ū-ya-a-i-in (StBoT 25.4 iv 26-7, 35 (OS), StBoT 25.7 iv 5 (OS), a-i-in ya-
a-a-i-in (StBoT 25.3 iv 14 (OS), StBoT 25.7 iv 9 (OS)).

yāk- / yakk- (IIa2 > Ic1) ‘to bite’: 3sg.pres.act. ya-a-ki (OS), 3pl.pres.act. ya-a-
ka-an-zī (IBoT 1.36 i 20 (OH/MS)), 3sg.pret.act. ya-a-kiš (NS), ya-a-ka-aš (NS),
ya-a-ki-iš (MH/NS), ya-a-ki-it (NS), 1pl.pret.act. ya-a-ku-ē-en (MH/NS),
2sg.imp.act. ya-ak (undat.), ya-a-ga (NH); inf.II ya-ga-a-an-na (KUB 34.128
obv. 13 (OH/MS)), ya-ga-an-na (KUB 60.121 obv. 19 (MS)), ya-kā-n-na (KBo
8.130 ii 7 (MS)), ya-ka-a-n-na; impf. ya-a-ki-ē-em-tē-[a-] (KBo 3.40b obv. 17
(OH/NS)).
Derivatives: **NINDA** yanātaš- (n.), a kind of bread (acc.sg. ya-ga-a-ta-aš (OS), ya-ga-a-da-aš (OS), ya-ga-ta-aš (OS), ya-ga-da-aš (1x, OS), acc.sg.c. ya-ga-ta-an (OH/NS), coll. ya-ga-a-ta). **NINDA** yageššar / yagešn- (n.) a kind of bread (nom.-acc.sg. ya-ge-eš-šar (OS, often), ya-ke-eš-šar (OS), ya-ge-eš-ša (1x, OS), dat.-loc.sg. ya-ge-eš-ni (KBo 30.17, 12 (OH/NS)), see yakk-²i.


IE cognates: Gr. ἀγναφαί ‘to break’, TochAB ῥῶκ- ‘to split, to burst’.

**PIE** *uóh₂g²-ei / *uh₂g²-enti*

See Oettinger 1979a: 444f. for attestations. The oldest forms (OS and MS), ya-ak and ya-ak-kān-zi, clearly show an ablaut yāk² / yakk-, with which this verb belongs to class IIA2 (ā/a-ablauting ḫi-verbs). The alternation between -k- and -kk- is typical for this class (compare ʾāk² / akk- ‘to die’, ʾistāp² / īstapp- ‘to shut’, nāḥ² / nāḥh- ‘to fear’, e.a.). Usually, this alternation can be explained by lenition of an original fortis consonant due to the *ó* of the singular (e.g. *stóp-ei > īstābīl, *nóh₂-ei > ḫnā́hi2l). In the case of yāk² / yakk-, we would therefore at first sight assume a preform *yók-ei > yāki. Such a reconstruction is problematic in the weak stem, however: as we see at the treatment of yēkk²-i, a zero-grade *uk- in an ablauting paradigm secondarily was changed to Hitt. /uik- / ye/ikk-.

This problem is solved by the etymology provided by Kammenhuber (1961b: 47), who connected ʾāk/-yakk- with Gr. ἀγναφαί ‘to break’, which reflects *uēh₂g²-. If we apply this root structure, we arrive at a paradigm *uóh₂g²-ei / *uh₂g²-enti. In the plural, where *uḥ₂g²- should regularly have yielded Hitt. *ūkk-, an anaptyctic vowel emerged in order to avoid an ablaut uC² / uC- (see also at yēkk²-i, yētar / yētēn-). Due to the adjacent *h₂, this vowel appears as ʾ (cf. the difference between pāhāšC² = /pahhasC²/ < *peh₂šC² and takkeįḏC = /takisC²/ < *tekšC²). If we assume that *-h₂g²- assimilates to fortis -kk- in pretonic position, but yields -k- after accented vowel (compare šāgār- ‘sign, omen’ < *sēh₂gō), we arrive at a strong stem *uóh₂g²- > ʾāk- vs. a weak stem *uḥ₂g²- > *uɔh₂g²- > yakk-.

Although **NINDA** yageššar / yagešn- is generally seen as a derivative of yāk² / yakk-, it is unclear whether **NINDA** yanātaš (cf. Rieken 1999a: 196-7) is as well. The word apparently is a neuter stem yagataš-, out of which in younger Hittite a commune stem yagata- was extracted (as can be seen in the acc.sg.c. yagatan). If it is derived from this verb, then the formation is unclear (there are no other words that show a suffix -taraš-).
yakk- (IIIf) ‘to be lacking’: 3sg.pres.midd. ya-ak-ka-ri (KBo 18.79 rev. 33, HT 18, 8, KBo 4.8 ii 8, KBo 45.211, 7), ya-ag-ga-ri (KBo 4.8 ii 10), ya-a-ag-ga-ri (Bo 3375, 6), ya-ag-ga-ri (KUB 36.25 i 15, Bo 5166 rev. 5), ya-ak-ka-ri (KUB 24.8 + 36.60 i 15, ii 3, KUB 36.25 i 14, KBo 10.50 r.col. 13, KUB 42.100 iii 25), 3sg.imp.act. ya-ak-ka-ru (KUB 31.86+ i 12).

See Oettinger 1976b: 140f. for attestations. In HW (241), this verb is cited as yakkar-, probably on the basis of “Prt. Sg. 3 yaqqaš” in KUB 33.106 ii 8. Oettinger (l.c.) rather reads this context thus:

KUB 33.106 ii

(7) ... nu ma-aš-ša-an a-uš-ta

(8) nu=ša-an ku-it-ki ya-ag-ga-ri ‘but nothing is lacking for him’ i.e. ‘but he lacks nothing’. Oettinger (l.c.) supposes a connection with yakkarije/a-3 ‘to revolt against’ (q.v.), but I do not see how this connection would work semantically. A better comparandum might be yak(ki)šiše/a-3 (q.v.), which denotes ‘to be lacking’ as well.

Because of the almost consistent plene spelled ending -ārī, it is clear that yakk- belongs to the takkāri-type, of which it has been generally thought that it goes back to a structure *CC-ārī, i.e. zero-grade root followed by an accentuated ending. In the case of yakkāri, this means that yakk- reflects a zero-grade formation. The only zero-grade stem yakk- that I know of in Hittite is found in the verb yāk- ‘to bite’ that reflects PIE *ueh₂:ǵ- ‘to break’ (Gr. ὕπνοι ‘to break’). See at yāk- / yakk- for an explanation of the zero-grade yakk- << *uh₂:ǵ-. A semantic parallel is available in ModDu. onbreken ‘to be lacking’, derived from breken ‘to break’.

Oettinger (l.c.) suggests a connection with Lat. vacuus ‘empty’, which reflects *(H)uh₂k- (cf. Schrijver 1990: 307-8). Problematic, however, is that in my view a preform *uh₂k-ārī should regularly yield Hitt. **ukkārī, and that I see no way how to explain the secondary epenthetic vowel -a- without availability of a full-grade form.
yalai- (c.) ‘grain weevil’ (Sum. UH.ŠE): nom.sg. ya-ga-a-īš (KUB 4.3 obv. 5), abl. ya-ga-ja-za (KUB 46.42 iv 11), acc.pl. ya-kar-a-uš (KUB 46.38 i 4, KUB 46.42 iii 1), ya-kar-uš (KUB 46.38 i 6).

See Hoffner (1977b: 75) for attestations. He translates this word as ‘grain weevil’ and states that “the connection with wak- ‘to bite, peck’ may be only illusory (folk etymology) or genuine”. If the connection with yāk- / yakk- indeed is justified, we should reconstruct *uēh₂/q₂-oi-. See at yāk- / yakk- for further etymology.


Derivatives: yakkarēšar / yakkarēšn (n.) ‘rebellion(? )’ (abl. ya-ak-ka-eš-na-az (KBo 8.47 i 12)).

PIE *yoʔ-r-je/o- ??

Most attestations are from NH texts, but the OS attestation ya-ak-ka-ri-ja[-... (KUB 36.106 obv. 7) shows that the verb was used in OH times already. The one attestation ya-ak-ri-ja-zī (OH/NS) might indicate that we are dealing with a phonological /uakrie/i-/.

The verb denotes ‘to rebel, to revolt’, as can be seen from many contexts. One context, however, may indicate that yakkarie/a- could stand for physical revolting as well:

KUB 33.106 ii

(7) ... nu ma-aḫ-ḫa-an ḫē-bād-du-uš ḫāš-mi-šu-un a-uš-ta
(8) nu=kan ḫē-pa-du-uš šu-uh-ḫa-az kat-ta ma-uš-šu-u-ya-an-zī
   ya-aḫ-ka-ri-eš/-ke-u]-an
(9) ti-ja-at ma-n=a-aš=kān šu-uh-ḫa-az kat-ta ma-uš-ta-at n=a-an
   MUNUS.MES.SUHUR.LA₃
(10) e-ep-per n=a-an Ū-UL tar-ni-er
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‘When Ḫepat saw Tašmišu, Ḫepat began to stir’ so that she would fall down from the roof. She would have fallen down from the roof, but her servants grabbed her and did not let her go’.

Often, *yakкрiːje*/*a*- is seen as a derivative of *yakk*-‘to be lacking’ (q.v.). This seems to be based especially on the fact that in the older literature the verb *yakk*- was thought to display a root *yakkr*- (3sg.pres.midd. *yak_recent*), and because of the fact that we find a few attestations of *yakкрiːje*/*a*- spelled *ya-ak-kər-a-ri-ja-*-, a spelling that resembles the word *ya-ak-ka₁-a-ri-* ‘is lacking’. Nevertheless, a connection between *yakкрiːje*/*a*- and *yakk*- is difficult, especially semantically. I do not see how we could connect ‘to rebel against, to revolt’ with ‘to be lacking’.

E.g. Tischler (HW) translates *yakкрiːje*/*a*- with ‘Mangel leiden lassen’, but this translation seems to be based on the presupposed etymological connection with *yakk*- only. Formally, the connection is not evident either. We would have to assume that *yakкрiːje*/*a*- is a derivative in -*arje*/*a*- of the verbal root *yakk*-,

whereas to my knowledge, this suffix is only used with nouns in -*ant*, e.g. *gimmandariːje*/*a*-² ‘to spend the winter’ from *gimmant*- ‘winter’, *nekumandariːje*/*a*-² ‘to undress (someone)’ from *nekumant*- ‘naked’, *parkュanṭariːje*/*a*-² ‘to become pure’ from *parkュanṭ*- ‘pure’, while other verbs in -*arija*- are all derived from nouns in -*ar*: *ešḫariːje*/*a*-² from *ešḫar*-, *ḥahḫariːje*/*a*-² from *ḥahḫar(a)-*, ḫappariːje/*a*-² from ḫappar-*, etc.

All in all, I would conclude that *yakкрiːje*/*a*-² means ‘to stir’ > ‘to revolt against’ (and not ‘to make someone lack something’) and is derived from a noun *yakkr*- which perhaps denoted some movement (and is not derived from the verb *yakk*- ‘to be lacking’). Unfortunately, such a noun is unknown in Hittite, nor do I have an etymological suggestion for it. Formally, it could go back to *yok*-.

*yak(k)iʃiːje*/*a*-² (Ic1) ‘to be lacking’: 3sg.pres.act. *ya-ak-ši-ja-zi* (KUB 8.35 i 11 (NS), Bronzetafel ii 74 (NH)), *ya-ak-ki-ši-e-e₂-zi* (KUB 8.28 i 5 (OH/NS)), 3sg.pret.act. *ya-ak-ši-ja-aṭ* (VSNF 12.116 rev. 5, 10 (NS)); part. *ya-ak-ši-ja-ananza* (KUB 23.61 i 8 (NS)).


*PIE *yok*-?
For the semantics of this verb, cf. e.g.

Bonzetafel ii
(74) ú-uk-k=at ma-âh-âa-an mâLAMMA-an pa-âh-âa-âa-ši nu-ši=kán ma-a-an
  ya-ak-ši-ja-zi
(75) ku-št-ki n=â-a-an=kán an-da šar-ni-en-ki-ši-ke-mi

‘Just like I will protect Kurunta – every time something is lacking for him I will replace it – ...’.

Semantically, this verb is therefore quite similar to yak-āši ‘to be lacking’ (q.v.). Formally, yak(ki)šiše/a could then be a derivative in -š- of yak-k-. This plain stem yakš- is still visible in yaggašnu2i = /uaknu-l/, whereas all other forms show the NH -š/-a-extension. See at yakk-āši for further etymology.

**Yakšur** (n.) a vessel; a cubic measure; a time unit: nom.-acc.sg. ya-akšur, gen.sg.(?) y[a]kšur-ra-aš (KUB 17.28 i 27).

This word denotes a vessel that is used as a cubic measure for e.g. honey, oil, milk and wine. Moreover, it is used as a time unit (probably a water clock). Only one possibly inflected form is known, viz. gen.sg.(?) y[a]kšurraš.

Because we do not know exactly what kind of object yakšur denotes, it is difficult to etymologize it. Pisani (1982: 178) connected this word with yak(ki)šiše/a2i ‘to be lacking’, which formally is possible (cf. the stem yakš-visible in yakšnu2i), but semantically not easy to defend. According to Pisani, yak(ki)šiše/a2i ultimately is cognate with Lat. vacā ‘to be empty’, and he therefore assumes a semantic development ‘to be empty’ > ‘to be a container’. See at the lemma of yak(ki)šiše/a2i for the impossibility of a connection with Lat. vacā, however.

**Yaktūrī**: see ukktūrī-


For semantics, compare Alp (1957: 26-7), who translates this word as “‘Keule, Schenkel’ (beim Tier) und ‘Oberbein, Oberschenkel’ (beim Menschen)’. Alp
cites the word as *uyalla-* as well, based on a spelling *u-ya-al-lu-uš* in KUB 29.1 iv 9 and *ú-ya-al-la-aš* in KUB 55.53 i 11. The former attestation may rather be read (KUB 29.1 iv 9) *nu* 10 *ya-al-lu-uš* ti-an-zi ‘they put down ten *u*-s’. The latter attestation runs thus:

KUB 55.53 i
  ḥa-az-zi-la-aš[
(11) *me*-ma-al ZÍZ NINDA.IE.DÉ.A ZAG-aš *ú-ya-al-la-aš*
(12) *n=a-at A-NA DINGIR.MAH pē-ra-an ti-an-zi

‘(There are) 12 thickbreads, the heart(?) of a cub, one thickbread (of) ḫ. meal, wheat, fat-bread (and) a right *u*. They place these before the Mother-goddess’.

It indeed may show a singular spelling *ú-ya-al-la-* . If the form *ya-al-li-i-e-es* (KBo 4.1 rev. 20) belongs here as well, we see a stem *yalli-* too. The appurtenance of the word *úzú* *ú-la-* (q.v.) is unclear, however.

Alp (l.c.) proposed to analyse (^[^3]UZU) *yalla-* as a derivative in *-alla-* of the verb *uya-* ‘to come’ (see ye₂↓ / *uya-*) . This is formally quite improbable, as *uya-* is a quite recent stem which was formed out of the original paradigm ye₂↓ / *uya-* in analogy to the *-je/a-class. No further etymology.


This verb is generally translated as ‘to praise, to honour’, compare, e.g.

KUB 31.127 iii
(37) *tu-uk DINGIR[^↓] Ḫ. ya-al-la-aḥ-ḫi

‘I praise you, god’;

KUB 6.46 iv

‘the gods of the 100 mountains and rivers praise you’.

When accompanied with =z, the verb is translated ‘to boast, to brag’, e.g.

KBo 5.6 i
While he was fortifying the cities, the enemy was boasting “We will never let him come down to the city of Almina”. But when he had finished fortifying the cities, he entered Almina, but none of his enemies gave further resistance in battle against him.

The exact inflection of this verb is unclear. I will therefore cite it as yallawi-. If the form ya-li-[i]a-an-zi really belongs to this verb (which is semantically quite possible), we must assume that it is misspelled for ya-al-li-a-an-zi.

This verb probably is related with yalli- ‘pride(?)’ and yalli-jata/ylli-jann- ‘(song of) praise’. Often, yallawi- is further connected with yalluske/a-, which then is translated ‘to praise’, too. For instance, Melchert (1994a: 81-2) reconstructs “yallawi” as *yal-neh-[i] and “yallu” as *yal-neu-, but see at yalluske/a- for the problems regarding this view. Oettinger (1979a: 490-1) assumes that ‘to praise’ developed out of ‘to make strong’ and therefore connects yallawi- with Lat. valère ‘to be strong’, TochB walo ‘king’, etc. < *uelH-.

yulabh2i: see yalḥ2i

yulabbi-: see yalḥi-

yallanu2 (Ib2) ‘to erase(?):’ 3sg.pres.act. ya-al-la-nu-u[z-zí] (KUB 26.43 ii 37); part. nom.sg.c. ya-al-la-nu-an-za (KUB 34.19 iv 9).

The only clear context in which this verb is attested is

KUB 26.43 ii
(35) ki-i TUP-PU PA-NI4UURU Ha-at-ti ki-it-ta-ru n=a-at pē-an ar-ḥa [Ū-UL ku-šš-ki da-a-i]
(36) ku-šš=ma ki-i TUP-PU A-NA4UURU Ha-at-ti pē-ra-an ar-ḥa da-a-[i ... ]
(37) na-as-m=a-at ar-ḥa la-ḥu-u-ya-i na-aš-ma ŠUM-an ya-al-la-nu-ul-[z-zí] ... ]
(38) pa-ra-a pē-e-da-i n=a-an=kán4UURUKÜ.BABBAR-ti4UTUURU A-ri-in-[na ... ]
(39) Ú DINGIRMBS ḥu-u-ma-an-te-eš QA-DU NUMUN=ŠU ar-ḥa
Formally, yallānu-di looks like a causative in -nu- of a stem yalla-, but the only known verb yalla- ‘to praise’ does not fit the meaning. No further etymology.


IE cognates: Lat. vellā ‘to tear apart’, Gr. ἕλκων ‘was killed’, TochA wällāstar ‘dies’.

PIE *uēlhi-iti / *uēlhi-énti

This verb is well-attested, from OS onwards. The spellings ya-al-ah-C, ya-la-ah-C, ya-al-ḥV and ya-al-ah-ḥV all clearly point to a phonological interpretation /ualH-/l/. The spellings with u-ya- occur in one text only (KBo 16.50) and therefore can be disregarded. The exact etymological interpretation of yallā- has

\[\text{ḥar-kān-nu-}[ya-an-du]\]

‘This tablet must lay before the Storm-god of Ḥatti. [No-one shall take] it from before (the deity). Whoever does take this tablet from before the Storm-god of Ḥatti […] or will pour it away or will erase’ the name […] will bring forth, the Storm-god of Ḥatti and the Sun-goddess of Arin[na] and all the gods shall destroy him together with his offspring’.
been disturbed by the idea that it has an inner-Hittite cognate in ħulle-² / ħull- ‘to smash’. E.g. Oettinger (1979a: 264) reconstructs a root *h₂uelh₂-, of which on the one hand a thematic formation *h₂ulh₂-é-ti would be visible in ħulze in and on the other a root-present *h₂uelh₂-ti yielded yalhzı with dissimilation of the first *h₂ due to the second one. As I have argued under its own lemma, ħulle-² / ħull- is best explained as a nasal-infix formation *h₂ul-ne-h₁- of a root *h₂ulh₂-, and therefore cannot be equated with yalhzı. I rather follow LI ⁴ in reconstructing a root *uelh₂- ‘to strike’ (*-h₂- visible in Gr. ἔκλεαν ‘was killed’ < *h₁e-ulh₁-eh₁-). Note that uelh₂-ti / *ulh₂-énti in pinciple should have yielded **yalzı / **ulhəanzi. Nevertheless, on the basis of the consonantal *y of the singular, the plural form was realized *yılḥ₂-énti. This latter form regularly yielded Hitt. ḫalHánt’ı, on the basis of which the laryngeal was restored in the singular form, which then yielded /ulHı’t/.


Derivatives: LI *[yalḥı]jala- (c.) a kitchen servant (nom.sg. ya-al-ar-ḥı-ja-la-āš (KUB 13.3 ii 22)). PIE *uolh₂-i, *ulh₂-i-ōs ?

This word denotes a beverage that is used in cult and is attested from OS texts onwards. Although in principle the word could very well be of IE origin, our lack of understanding its exact meaning precludes etymologizing it. Nevertheless, one could envisage a formal connection with the verb yalḥı-² ‘to strike’. If so, then we would have to reconstruct *uolḥ₂-i, *ulh₂-i-ōs. Note however that this paradigm regularly should have yielded **yallı, **ulhıjaš. We therefore have to assume that on the one hand the consonantal *y of the nominative spread throughout the paradigm, and on the other the laryngeal of the oblique stem, yielding attested yalḥı, yalḥıjaš.


This adjective occurs twice, but in only one case the context is clear:

KUB 31.84 iii

(66) ḫar-kān-ta-āš ŞAT LŪ GÉ*SUKUL ku-iš A.SA(ILA) ta-an-na-a-at-ta=ja
(67) ku-e pî-e-et-ta n=e-e=t-ta b[ua]-a-[m]a-an GUL-aš-ša-an e-es-tu
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(70) mu-u=š-ma-aš=ša-an ú-e-tum-ma-aš ud-[a-n]i-i IG[H]A-ya ḫar-ak
(71) n=a-aš SIG,-in ú-e-da-an-Za e-eš-[u]

‘What fields there are of a TUKUL-man who has disappeared and what unoccupied pietta-allotments there are, all this must be put in writing for you. And when they give deportees, provide them quickly with a place. And the field which are ..., keep an eye on them regarding the matter of construction. It must be built well’.

The other context is broken:

HKM 77 obv.
(10) [ ... al-pa-a-aš LU KÜR ḫa-an-da-a-an
(11) [ ... ]x-zি ya-al-ḫu-u-ya-an-za

Alp (1991: 267) translates .Btn86 here as ‘geschlagen’ but this apparently is based on a false connection with .Btn7. ‘to hit’ (q.v.) only. In the first context, .Btn87 seems to refer to fields that are uncultivated and have to be built upon. The exact meaning, however, is still unclear and etymologizing therefore is useless.

yalli- (adj.) ‘shaven(?):’ nom.-acc.sg.n. ya-al-li (KBo 6.26 iii 13), nom.sg.c. ya-al-li-iš (IBoT 1.31 i 25).

This word is an adjective that describes skins. Generally, it is translated ‘shaven’, ‘depilated’ or ‘smooth’, e.g. IBoT 1.31 i (25) 1 KUŠ A.GÁ.LÁ BABBAR ya-al-li-iš LÜGUD.DA SIG ḫur-ri=kän an-da ‘one white bag of smooth leather, short, contains Hurrian wool’. No etymology.

yalli- (?) ‘pride(?):’ gen.sg. ya-al-li-ja-aš (KUB 19.13 i 48 (NH)).

This word is hapax in the following context:

KUB 19.13 i (additions and translation by Güterbock 1956b: 110)
(47) [I-NA URUT] i-mu-ḫa-la an-da-an ú-et nu URU-Ti-mu-ḫa-la-aš URU-aš
‘Then he came back [into the town of] Timuḫala. The town of Timuḫala was a place of pride [of the] Gašgæans’.

If yalli- indeed means ‘pride’, it may be the source of the derivative yallijatur / yallijann-(song of) praise’ and the verb yalla/i- ‘to praise’.

yalli- ‘thigh(bone)(?)’: see (UZU) yalla-

yallijatur / yallijann- (n.) ‘(song of) praise’: nom.-acc.sg. ya-al-li-ja-tar (KUB 21.38 obv. 48, 51 (NH), KUB 6.45 ii 48, 49 (NH), KUB 6.46 iv 17, 18 (NH)), dat.-loc.sg. ya-al-li-ja-an-ni (KBo 32.14 ii 42, iii 41 (MH/MS), KBo 32.19 iii 44 (MH/MS)).

This word probably is an abstract noun of the stem yalli-, also visible in yalli- ‘pride’ and yalla/i- ‘to praise’.


This word occurs a few times, mostly as an epithet of 4IŠTAR. In the following context it describes ‘winds’:

KUB 33.112 + KUB 36.2c iii (with additions from KUB 33.111 + HT 25, see Otten 1950: 11)
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(10) KASKAL an=ma k[(u-in)] i-ja-an-ta-ri nu KASKAL[-an ku-in^³]
(11) ū-ya-an-zi n[u-uš am-(mu-u)]k 4̈LAMA-aš ne-pi-š[(a-aš LUGAL-u)š]
(12) DINGIR[aš ḫi-in-ik-m[(i IM^b)]a-li-uš ya-al-li-ya[(-al-li-uš)]
(13) A-N4 Ḳ₂. A KASKAL-š[i me-n]a-ṭā-ṭa-an-da x[...]

‘The road that they go (and) the road [that] they come, these I, 4̈LAMA, the king of Heaven, point out to the gods. The y. winds opposite the way of Ea [brought them the words of 4̈LAMA]’ (added translation based on similar contexts).

Otten (l.c.) translates y. as “stürmisch” here. For its use as an epithet of Ištar, compare e.g. KUB 33.113 + KUB 36.12 i (20) n=a-aš=kān y[a-al-li-y]a-al-li-ja-
aš (21) ti-ja-at $^{a}$IŠTAR-iš, but especially KUB 27.1 i (29) A-NA $^{a}$IŠTAR Ė ya-al-li-ya-al-li=ma ... etc.

Besides these attestations of the adjective, Oettinger (1979a: 34) also cites a verb $^{y}$aliyalae- ‘streuen(?)’, but gives no reference to its attestation place(s). Tischler (HG: 193) cites a verb “$^{y}$aliyalalai- (II) ‘kräften’”, but does not give attestations either. Besides the translation ‘stürmisch’, we sometimes find a translation ‘strong’ as well (e.g. Tischler HG: 193). The latter meaning seems to be especially prompted by a connection with HLuw. wali- (nom.-acc.pl.n. (adv.) CRUX $^{w}a/i$-la (CEKKE §24), $^{w}a/i$-la (KULULU 5 §8)), which is translated as ‘strong’ by Starke (1990: 452), because of the connection with the CLuwian adjective niyalla/i-, which he interprets as ‘weak’. CHD (N: 459) translates niyalla/i- as ‘innocent’, however, a meaning which would fit Hawkins’ interpretation of HLuw. $^{w}a/i$-la as ‘fatally’ as well (cf. Hawkins 2000: 486). This would mean that there is no Luwian stem *$^{y}$alli- that means ‘strong’, so there is no ground anymore to translate yalliylila as ‘strong’ as well.

All in all, we can conclude that yalliylila- is an adjective describing ‘winds’ as well as ‘Ištar’. A translation ‘stürmisch’ could be possible, but perhaps ‘quick’ fits both contexts better. An etymological connection with a supposed Luwian stem *$^{y}$alli- is unassured, and semantically not likely.

$^{y}$alk(ije/a)- (Ia4 / Ic1) ‘?’: 3sg.pres.act. ya-la-ak-zi (KUB 8.3 obv. 10 (OH/NS)); 3pl.pres.midd. ya-al-ki-ja-an-da (KUB 58.30 ii 21 (MS)), 3sg.pret.midd. ya-al-ak-ta-at (KUB 49.3 obv. 8 (NS)); verb.noun. ya-al-ki-ja-u-ya-ar (KUB 7.58 i 7 (MH/NS)).

Derivatives: yalganu$^{z}$i (Ib2) ‘?’ (3sg.pres.act. ya-al-ga-uz-zi (KBo 13.31 i 11 (OH/MS)), 3sg.pret.act. ya-al-ga-ut (KUB 33.10 obv. 11 (OH/MS))).

See Neu 1968: 187f. for attestations. There he also cites yalku/y/a- for this. According to Neu, the meaning of yalk(ije/a)- can hardly be determined because most of its forms are found in broken contexts: “[n]ur yalgamut steht in einem vollständig erhaltenen Satz”:

KUB 33.10 obv.

(6) [ $^{s}$a-a-an-ta-an ku-ya-at me-ma-mu-ut-t$^{e}$-en [ ]
(7) [ (-)ni-e-gt-ta-at n=a-aš-ta TÜL-ru ši-il-m$^{q}$l- [ ]
(8) [ ] x ÏD$^{\text{Ib,LA}}$ ar-šar-šu-u-ru-uš ḫu-it-tì-[ì]-a-[ ]
(9) [ $^{s}$a-aḫ-ta n= u-ša ya-al-ga-mu-ut ya-ap-pa-mu-uš x[ ]
(10) [lu-ut-ta-]a-uš pi-ip-pa-aš Ê$^{\text{Ib,LA,TR}}$ pi-[ī]p-pa-aš [ ]
Otten (1942: 32-34) translates this as

“Warum habt ihr mich [...] zum Sprechen gebracht? (15)... nun die Quelle(n) ...[ (16) ]x, die strömenden Flüsse leitet er (ab)(?) (17) [er suchte und ...te die Wadi [ (18) [die Fenster stürzte er ein, die Häuser stürzte er ein].”

Personally, I would not dare to guess what *yalganu-* would mean in this context. Nevertheless, Oettinger (1979a: 234) glosses *yan* with “(in bestimmter Weise) schlagen, mißhandeln(?)”, without indicating how he arrives at this meaning. He admits, however, that “eine genauere semantische Untersuchung würde den hier vorgegebenen Rahmen sprengen”. His etymological proposal to connect OHG *walkan* ‘to move to and fro, to press together’ therefore does not have much value.

Kimball (1994a: 81-2), states about *yalk(u)/je/a/- that “[t]he meaning of the verb is not entirely clear, since it is preserved mostly in damaged or obscure contexts, but it seems to indicate an action with destructive, or at least unpleasant, consequences”, and in note 22: “In KBo XIII 31 in a badly damaged passage (Riens Schneider, StBoT 9 no. 15) *walganu-* occurs in what is plainly a series of unfavourable omens; cf. ēšar arṣzi “blood will flow” ib. I 8 and KUR L I KUR sakkuriatta “the enemy will prevail” ib. I 10. In KUB XXXIII 10 its object is *wappamus* “river banks”, and it refers to actions done by Telepenus in his rage: *nu=s walganut wappamus* “He w.’ed the river banks.” Nevertheless, Kimball as well states that “*walk-* is probably to be compared with Skt. *valgati* “jumps”, OE *wealcan* “roll” (NE *walk*) and OHG *walkan* id. [], which would point to an IE *welg-*”. I do not understand how she arrives at this conclusion. The semantics of *yalk(u)/je/a/- and of *yalganu-* are too unclear to base any firm conclusion on. Any etymological proposal can be based on formal similarities only, which is unconvincing. So, without more clear attestations of these verbs, no etymology can be given.

*yalkiššara-*: see *ulkššara-*

*yalku(y)u/-* (n.) something negative: acc.sg. *ya-al-ku-an* (KBo 22.2 obv. 2 (OH/MS)), *ya-al-ku-ya-an* (KBo 3.40b, 15).

IE cognates: Skt. *a-vrKay- ‘safe’.

PIE *ulk*’?-?

The word occurs twice, namely in the following contexts:
KBo 22.2 obv.

(1) [MUNUS.LUGAL] {URU}Ka-ni-ıš 30 DUMU{MES} t[EN] MU-an-ti ḫa-a-aš-ta UM-MA
̣Š[=MA]

(2) [k]-i=ya ku-it ya-al-ku-an ḫa-a-aš-ḫu-un

‘The Queen of Kaniš bore thirty sons within one year. She (speaks) thus: “What kind of y. did I give birth to?”;

KBo 3.40b+

(15) ... u-k-u-us pu-nu-uš-ke-m[i k]-i=ya? k]u-it ya-al-ku-ya-an

(16) [ ]x[ -[e]-ni UM-MA ŠU-NUN=MA ERIN{MES} [Hur-r]i(?) ut-mi-ja ut-ez-zt


On the basis of these contexts, an exact meaning cannot be determined. Otten (1973: 16) proposes a meaning “schlechtes Omen, Unheilverkündendes”.

Lehrman (1987: 16-7) suggests that urkuya- suggests with Skt. a-vrká- ‘safe’, which would point to an original adjective *urká- ‘dangerous’. His idea is then that this adjective is the source of the substantive *yulku’-a- ‘wolf’ as visible in Skt. vṛkā- and Gr. λύκος (through the same derivation process as visible in e.g. Skt. kṣṇa- ‘black antelope’ from kṣṇá- ‘black’ or Gr. Λύκος, PN, from γλαυκός ‘shining’). If this etymology is correct (but note that it semantically is weak in the sense that the meaning of urkuya- is not clear beyond any doubt), it would show that the word-initial sequence *uRC- yields Hitt. yaRC-. The examples cited in Melchert (1994a: 126-7) to claim the contrary (*uRC > Hitt. uRC-) are false: the stem ṛṛ-, which Melchert interprets as ‘help’ and derives from *wṛhi- has nothing to do with ‘help’ (cf. the lemma ṛṛr(i)a()-); the noun ṛrki- ‘track, trail’, which Melchert derives from “PA[nat.] *wṛgi-”, may in fact rather reflect *h₁3:urgi-. Moreover, a development *uRC > yaRC is visible in *urh₃-tṓr > OH/urā-r-nil, ṛ-ra-a-ni > MH/NH/hur-tā-nil, ya-ra-a-ni ‘burns’.

Note that Lehrman (1987 and 1978: 228-30) claims that PIE *yulku’-a- has an Anatolian outcome as well, namely CLuw. yalwa/i-, which he translates as ‘lion’. This translation goes back to Steinherr (1968) who argues that the sumerogram UR.MAH, which occasionally occurs in CLuwian names and carries the phonetic complements -a- and -i-, must be identified with the onomastic element yala/i-. Although Steinherr indeed shows that we find Piha-UR.MAH as well as Pihayalai and UR.MAH.LÚ as well as Uluyiziti, he is not able to give a single
text in which UR.MA and yalya/i- are used as duplicates of one another. Because piša- and -ziši are very common onomastic elements, their occurrence with both UR.MA and yalya/i- in my view is non-probative. Moreover, the fact that both onomastic elements end in -a/i- is non-probative either, because this alteration is inherent to every commune a-stem-word. Nevertheless, Lehrman (l.c.) takes the equation between yalya/i- and UR.MA ‘lion’ for granted and states that CLuw. yalya/i- ‘lion’ must be cognate with PIE *yjkw- ‘wolf’. Apart from the objections raised above, this is formally impossible as well: PIE *-kʷ- yields CLuw. /-kʷ/-, cf. CLuw. papparkųya- ‘to cleanse’ < *perkʷ- (see at parku- / parkų-ai-).


This verb is attested a few times, but mostly in damaged contexts, on the basis of which its meaning cannot be (well) determined. The only good context is

KUB 29.1 i
(24) DINGIR-na-aš=(š)-ma-aš KUR-e ḫe-e-še-er nu=mu=za LUGAL-un
(25) la-ba-ar-na-an ḫal-zi-i-e-er

(26) nu EGIR-pa ad-da-a(n)=š-ma-an 4U-an ya-al-lu-uš-ke-mi nu GIS śU LUGAL-uš
(27) 4U-ni ufreq-zi ḫe-e-ja-u-e-eš ku-it ta-aš-nu-uš-ke-er ṣal-la-nu-uš-ke-er

‘The gods have opened up the country for you, and me they have called the king, Labarna. Again I ły. the Storm-god, your father. The king wishes from the Storm-god trees that the rains have made strong and raised’.

In this context, yalluške/a- seems to denote ‘to pray to, to ask (of a deity)’. On the basis of the formal resemblance to yalla/i- ‘to praise, to honour’, yalluške/a- is often translated ‘to praise’ as well. Although in this context such a translation is possible, it is by no means ascertained. I would therefore refrain from too much etymologizing on the basis of a supposed connection between yalla/i- and yalluške/a- (unlike e.g. Melchert 1994a: 81, who derives yalla- from *yal-neh₂ and “yall-” from *yal-neu-).

Unclear is the appurtenance of the verb yalu- in the following context:
KUB 48.99

(12) da-a-er=ya tu-"i-ja-an a-az-za
(13) ya-lu-uš-ke-u-ya-an ti-i-e-er
(14) ["]I-la-li-š=ya=za ya-lu-ut-ta-[t]
(15) [u-]uk=ya-r=an ū-ya-te[=mi]

‘They took the assembly (and) azza began y.-ing. The deity Ilali was y.-ed, and I brought him here’.

yālula- (c.) ‘pupil?’: acc.pl. ya-a-lu-lu-uš (KBo 31.143 obv. 3), dat.-loc.pl. ya-a-lu-la-aš (KUB 33.66 + KBo 40.333 ii 18).

This word occurs only twice. The first context is:

KUB 33.66 + KBo 40.333 ii (for text cf. Groddek 1999: 38)
(16) A-N4 DUMUL.ĽU.ĽU=ma tu-ek-ki-i=š-shi [a]n-da-an
(17) la-lu-uk-ke-et ḫar-ša-ni-i=š-si KL.MIN ša-ku-ya-aš=ša-aš KL.MIN
(18) ya-a-lu-la-aš=ša-aš KL.MIN IG[IL]-aš ḫar-ki-[a]š da-an-ku-ya-ja-aš
(19) KL.MIN ša-an-ti-[i]=š-si KL.MIN e-ne-ra-aš=ša-aš
(20) KL.MIN la-ap-li-pa-aš=ša-[aš] KL.MIN
(21) ka-ru-u ma-a-an n=a-aš a-ap-pa
(22) QA-TAM-MA ki-ša-ru

‘To the mortal it became luminous on his body. Ditto on his head. Ditto on his eyes. Ditto on his y. Ditto on the white parts (and) black parts of (his) eyes. Ditto on his forehead. Ditto on his eyebrows. Ditto on his eyelashes. Like (he was) before, let him become again likewise!’.

The other context is broken:

KBo 31.143 obv.

(2) [ x pa-ra-a-a=š-ta pa[= ]
(3) [ x ya-a-lu-lu-uš iš-ša-a-aš[ ]
(4) [ IG[IL]-šU ū-ya-a-tar=še-et a[a- ]

In line 3 it seems as if ‘yalula-s (acc.) of the mouth’ are mentioned.

Oettinger (1976a: 30) also cites KBo 6.34+ iii (30) [ya-a-lu]-ū-la-an pa-ri-ja-an-zi, which he translates as ‘[Eine Bl]ase blasen sie auf’. It is unclear to me why Oettinger reads yālula here, apparently only because of the fact that yālula ends
in -ula-. There are many more words that end in -ula-, however, and these are just as well a candidate to be added here.

From the first context mentioned, it is clear that yālula- is a body part, situated on the face, probably paired (which is also suggested by acc.pl. in the other context). Groddek (l.c.) suggests that the word means ‘pupil’, because it is mentioned between ‘eyes’ and ‘white and dark (parts) of the eyes’. This is a possibility. No further etymology.


This word is attested in one context only:

KUB 13.35 + KUB 23.80 i
(17) mu=ya=mu I-NA KUR [\textsuperscript{\textsc{u}ru}] Ka-ra-\textsuperscript{4}Du-ni-ja-aš u-i-e-r
(18) mu=ya ku-\textit{it}-ma-an I-NA KUR [\textsuperscript{\textsc{u}ru}] Ka-ra-\textsuperscript{4}Du-ni-ja-aš pa-a-un [ ]
(19) ku-\textit{it}-ma-an=ya EGIR-pa ú-ya-nu-un mu=ya=kán EGIR-az
(20) 4 ya-al-ya-ja-al-li an-da Ū'-UL ku-iš-ki pé-eš-ši-iš-ke-et
(21) mu=ya a-pé-ez INIM-az GÜB-li-iš-šu-un
(22) ma-a-an=ma=ya IŠ-TU KUR [\textsuperscript{\textsc{u}ru}] Ka-ra-\textsuperscript{4}Du-ni-ja-aš=ma ku-ya-pi
(23) EGIR-pa ú-ya-nu-un mu=ya=mu \textsuperscript{\textsc{l}u} pa-ra-a-ú'-ya-an-da-an-n=a u-i-e-er
(24) INIM 4 ya-al-ya-ja-al-la-aš=ma=ya=kán nam-ma EGIR-an kat-ta pa-it

They sent me to Babylon. And while I went to Babylon until I came back, no-one kept throwing inside the y. from behind. Because of this case ‘I became left’. But when I at one point came back from Babylon, they sent to me also a supervisor. But the case of the y. went back down again’.

Although details are unclear, it seems that yulyajalla- refers to some kind of evil gossip. The use of gloss wedges indicates a foreign (Luwian?) origin.

-\textit{yan} (supine-suffix)

IE cognates: Skt. iva ‘in the manner of’.

PIE *-\textit{yn}

The verbal noun that ends in -\textit{yan} is traditionally called supine. This supine only occurs in the construction supine + dat-\textit{i} / ti- which denotes ‘to begin ...-ing’. It is remarkable that the supine is seldomly derived from the bare verbal stem (I only know of the examples ḥa\textit{-an-mu-}an (NS, of ḥanna-\textit{j} / ḥann-), iš-hu-u-ya-u-u\textit{[a-n]}
The supine-suffix -yan cannot be separated from the verbal noun in -yar / -yaš and the inf.I-suffix -yanı. These all point to an original substantivizing suffix *-yr / *-yen-. Within the paradigm of such a suffix, -yan can only reflect an endlingless locative *-yan (note that *-yen (reconstructed thus by e.g. Melchert 1984a: 247) should have yielded Hitt. **-yen). In my view, the form *-yen must be compared to Skt. iva ‘in the manner of’ that goes back to virtual *h₁i-yan (with generalized zero-grade stem), the locative of a verbal noun *h₁i-yr / *h₁i-yén- that is still visible in Hitt. ıyar (q.v.). Note that also in Hittite forms like i-ıš-šu-ya-an (OS, of ıšša- / ıšš-) and pi-ja-an-ni-ya-an (OS, of pijana- / pijanni-) the verbal stem shows the generalized zero-grade formation. The suffix *-un originally must have had two outcomes, namely -un after consonants and -yan after vowels. Just as in nom.-acc.sg. -yar, the postvocalic variant -yan has been generalized (from *-ské-yan and *-ammi-yan).

-yanı (1pl.pres.act.-ending); see -yen(i)

yanı-, yantae-, yantie/e/a- ‘to glow, to light’: 3sg.pres.act. ya-an-[a...] (KUB 27.68 i 5 (NS)), 3sg.pret.act. ya-an-ta-it (KUB 23.59 ii 8 (NS)), 2sg.imp.act. ya-an-ta-i (KUB 30.14 + KUB 6.45 iii 70 (NH)), [ya-a]n-ta-i (KUB 6.46 iv 38 (NH)); part. nom.sg.c. ya-an-ti-an-za (KBo 27.60, 13 (NS)), acc.sg.c. ya-an-ti-[a-an-da-a[n] (KUB 48.80 i 6 (NS)); impf. ya-an-te-es-ki-ız-ı (KUB 36.12 iii 12 (NS)).

The exact semantics of this verb and its derivatives are not easy to determine. A translation ‘glow’ seems to fit well for the following contexts:

KUB 30.14 + KUB 6.45 iii
(66) $n=a-an=si$ du-uš-ga-ra-ya-an-za pi-il-ke-elu
(67) $pi$-du-li-ja-u-ya-an-za $ma=da$ le-e pé-eš-ke-mi
(68) $mu=mu\ 'pi-\ ha-aš-ša-aš-ši$ EN=JA ar-mu-ya-la-aš-ḫa-aš
(69) $i$-ya-ar še-er ar-mu-u-ya-la-i ne-pi-ša-aš $ma=mu$
(70) $\text{4}UTU-uš$ i-ya-ar še-er ya-an-ta-a-i

‘May I give it to him gladly, may I not give it to you reluctantly. Oh, p. Storm-god, moon-shine over me like the moon-shine, glow over me like the Sun-god of heaven!’;

KUB 27.68 i
(5) $GIM-an=kān \ '4UTU AN$ ya-an-[a-…]

‘When the Sun-god of heaven starts’ glowing’;

KBo 26.60
(13) [GUŠ]KIN ya-an-ti-an-za

‘glowing gold’.

Sometimes, a translation ‘to light (of lightning)’ is needed:

KUB 36.12 iii
(8) $\ldots \ ḫa-ri-ḫa-ri=ma$ pa-ra-a
(9) $ḫal$-zi-ja-an-du ku-e-uš=kān A-NA 90 IKU-n$N_b$ pē-ru-n$[\ -iš(‘)]$
(10) $pār$-aš-ša-nu-uš-kān-zi 8 ME=ma ya-aš-ša-an-zi ḫē-e-uš
(11) $IM^\text{MES}$-uš $ḫal$-zi-ja-an-du ya-an-ti-ma-aš=$ma$ ku-iš KAL.GA-[o]l
(12) $ya-an-te-eš$-ke-ez-zi $n=a-an=kān$ še-šu-ya-aš É.ŠA-na-aš
(13) $pa-ra$-a ū-da-an-du

‘May they call forth the thunderstorm. May they call forth the rains and winds that break the rock for 90 IKU’s and cover (it) for 800 (IKU’s). The lightning that lights strongly, may they bring it in front of the sleeping room’.

The noun $yantem(m)a\ -$ denotes either the radiation of the sun or ‘lightning’. For the first meaning, cf.
KUB 26.25 ii

(8) ma-a-an ŠA 𒀭KU.PU-ŠA HUL-ŠA na-aš-ŠA DUMU 𒀭ŠU-ŠI-ŠI-[i]-u-ŠA

(9) HUL-ŠA __[DU-ŠI]-tu-pâ-rî-ja-ši a-pê-da-ni=tâ=k-kan

(10) mo-[ja]-ni LI-IM DINGIR MA-ŠI-UTU-aš ya-an-te-em-ma-aš

(11) ḫar-ni-en-kâ-n-du

“When under the Sun of heaven you command evil against Šu-ppliliuma or evil against the son of Šu-ppliliuma, at that moment may the thousand gods of the oath (and) the radiation of the Sun-god destroy you!”

The second meaning is found in e.g. KUB 7.13 obv. (18) te-et-ḫi-ma-aš ya-an-te-em-ma-aš ‘thunder (and) lightning’. Compare also

KUB 17.10 ii


(34) ti-it-ḫ[i]-š-ke-et-ta

‘Telipinu came furiously and it thundered with lightning’.

A morphological interpretation of the verb is difficult. The 3sg.pret.act-form yantait unambiguously points to the ḫatrae-class inflection. The 2sg.imp.act.-form yantai could either belong to the ḫatrae-class or to the dā.Emailanti-class inflection. The participle yantijant- could in principle show a dā.Emailanti-class inflection, but also belong to a -je/a-class inflection. Since all forms are attested in NS texts, and since both the ḫatrae- and the -je/a-class inflection are very productive in this period, we cannot determine what the original inflection of this verb was. A loose stem yant- seems to be visible in yantēsš2 and the nouns yantēma- and yantēqantema- ‘lightning’, which are a derivative with the suffix -ema-, -ima- (for which see Oettinger 2001: 463-5). The origin of this yant- is further unknown.

Sometimes it is assumed that the CLuwian adjective or noun yandaniya- is cognate (e.g. Oettinger 1979a: 381), but this is a mere guess as the meaning of CLuw. yandaniya- is unclear.

NINDA yantili- (c.) a kind of bread: nom.sg. ya-an-ti-i-li-iš (KUB 35.142 i 10).

The word occurs only once and an exact meaning cannot be determined. Starke (1990: 345) interprets the word as ‘hot’, but this is a mere guess based on a formal similarity with yant-, yantæ-, yantie/a- ‘to glow’ (q.v.). Further unclear.
yannu(m)mija- (adj. from original noun) ‘orphaned (child), widowed (woman)’: nom.sg.c. ya-an-nu-um-mi-âš (KUB 17.4, 3), ya-nu-um-mi-ja-âš (KUB 17.4, 6, 12 (fr.)), acc.sg.c. ya-an-nu-um-mi-ja-an (KUB 17.4, 2), gen.sg. ya-an-nu-mi-ja-ãš.

This word only occurs together with MUNUS ‘woman’ and DUMU ‘son’. According to Hoffner (1988: 150-1), yannummijaš MUNUS and yannummijaš DUMU denote “women and children who are without husbands and fathers either because he has died or because he has abandoned them”. It usually functions as an adjective (e.g. nom.sg.c. ya-an-nu-um-mi-âš DUMU-âš (KUB 17.4, 3), acc.sg.c. ya-an-nu-um-mi-ja-an DUMU-an (KUB 17.4, 2)), but in KUB 13.2 iii 31-2 we find ya-an-nu-mi-ja-âš MUNUS-ni, where y. does not agree with dat.-loc.sg. MUNUS-ni. This implies that yannummija- originally was a noun, ‘singlehood (vel sim.)’. The construction X + gen.sg. yannummijaš ‘X of single-hood’ was used as ‘orphaned (child), widowed (woman)’ on the basis of which yannummijaš was reinterpreted as nom.sg.c. of an adjective yannummija-.

According to Kimball (1999: 337), yannummija- is ‘obviously related to Lat vīnus ‘vain, empty’, < *hvēn-nos-, Skt. vāyati ‘disappear’ (with full-grade *hvēn-2-), Skt. īnah- ‘deficient, inferior < *hvēn-nô- [...]’; and she therefore reconstructs yannummija- as *hvēn-n- + the appurtenance-suffix -umne- + -ja- ‘being in a state of bereavement’. I must admit that I do not find this analysis as obvious as Kimball does (the appurtenance-suffix -umne- is to my knowledge only used as a real ethnocentric). On the basis of this word alone, she then assumes a development *Vhv2nV > VmnV. As I have argued under GISmā̄hla-, ∥ Vm nuhrai- / mahrai- and GIS zahrā-, these words seem to point to a development *Vhv2RV > Hitt. VhRV. Although I must admit that I have no examples of *Vhv2nV > Hitt. VhnV (but compare šahhan < *seh2-n), I do not think that the case of yannummija- is strong enough to prove the opposite.

Y Unup(p)aštâl(â)š (c.) ‘morning star(?), comet(?), falling star(?):’ nom.sg. ya-an-nu-up-pa-aš-ta-al-la-âš (KUB 29.4 ii 68), ya-an-nu-up-pa-aš-ta-al-li-âš (KUB 19.4 i 11), ya-an-nu-up-paš-ta-li-âš (KUB 34.16 iii 3), [ya-an-nu]-paš-ta-lu-âš (? KBo 14.61, 6), nom.pl. y[a-a]n-nu-up-paš-ta-lu-âš (KUB 8.16+24 ii 4).

Because of the determinative MUL, the word clearly refers to some kind of star. We find a-stem as well as i-stem forms, and possibly even a u-stem form if
Weitenberg (1984: 276) is right in interpreting [ya-an-nu-]pa-aš-ta-lu-uš (KBo 14.61, 6) as nom.sg. No further etymology.

-\textit{yanzi} (inf.I-suffix)

\textit{PIE} *-\textit{yen-ti} + -\textit{i} ?

The suffix -\textit{yanzi}, which marks inf.I, is clearly related to the verbal noun-suffix -\textit{yar} / -\textit{yaš} (q.v.) and the supine-suffix -\textit{yan} (just as the inf.II-suffix -\textit{ama} is related to the verbal noun-suffix -\textit{ḡar} / -\textit{ann}). The suffix -\textit{yar} / -\textit{yaš} reflects the substantivizing suffix *-\textit{ur} / *-\textit{yen-}, which means that -\textit{yanzi} probably reflects an old case form of this suffix. In the nominal inflection, no case ending -\textit{zi} is known, however. I am wondering to what extent it is possible to assume that -\textit{yanzi} reflects an old ablative ending *-\textit{yanz} < *-\textit{yen-ti}, to which an -\textit{i} was added in analogy to the adding of -\textit{i} to the 3sg./pl.pres.act.-ending -(an)z < *(en)\textit{ti}, which yielded -(an)\textit{zi}. As this -\textit{i} is not added to other ablatives, we must assume that at that time the infinitive was not seen as a nominal form anymore, but as a real part of the verbal paradigm.


The verb occurs often in rituals, in the expression \textsuperscript{Lu}MES\textsubscript{UR.GI}: ya-ap-pi-ja-an-\textit{zi} (e.g. KBo 4.13 vi 7) ‘the dog-men bark’. Clearly onomatopoetic, cf. ModDu. waff\textit{en} ‘to bark’.


See Weitenberg 1984: 52-4 for attestations and an extensive treatment. Note the acc.pl.-form \textit{yappamuš} which shows that this noun originally showed ablaut: \textit{\textit{yappu-} / \textit{yappay}-}. To my knowledge, the word has no good etymology.

\textit{\textit{\textit{vzu}} \textit{yappuzzi}-}
The word **UZU** ya-ap-pu-uz-zi-ja (KUB 27.1 i 39) occurs only once, and denotes 'tallow'. As the normal word for 'tallow' is **UZU** appuzzi-, which is also attested in ibid. 43, it is likely that *yappuzzija* is a scribal error. See at **UZU** appuzzi- for further etymology.

**yar**: see *ur-Di*

\[=yar(\text{r})=\] (particle of direct speech)

Anat. cognates: Pal. \[=yar=\] (particle of direct speech(?)); CLuw. \[=ya\] (sentence initial particle); HLuw. \[=wa=\] (sentence initial particle); Lyc. \[=we\] (sentence initial particle).

PAnat. \[=wor=\]

IE cognates: Gr. \[\epsilon\nu\chi \nu \text{ 'to speak'}.\]

PIE \[*\text{uerh}]-

The particle \[=u\text{r}(\text{r})=\] is used in the sentence-initial particle chain and denotes direct speech. If it is followed by a particle starting in a vowel, the form is \[=yar=\] (e.g. \[nu=ya-r=a-a\dot{s}\]). If the following particle starts in a consonant or if \[=yar(\text{r})=\] is the last particle, the \[-r\] is dropped (e.g. \[nu=ya-a=\dot{s}-\dot{s}i, nu=ya\]). It is obligatorily used in the first sentence of the direct speech, but can sometimes be omitted in the remaining sentences of the direct speech phrase. The particle can be found in most other Anatolian languages as well. Palaic \[=ya\text{r}=\] shows that the \[-r\] is real, Lyc. \[=we\] shows that we have to reconstruct PAnat. \[=yor=\]. Usually, the particle is connected with the PIE root for 'speak', \[*\text{yerh}]- as seen in Gr. \[\epsilon\nu\chi \nu\].

**-yar / -yaš** (suffix of verb.noun)

PIE \[*\text{yr} / *\text{yen-s}\]

One of the suffixes to form a deverbal abstract noun is -yar. In the oldest texts, we only find nom.-acc.sg. -yar and gen.sg. -yaš as inflected forms. Other cases (e.g. abl. as in ar-ma-ah-\text{-}hu-ya-az-za and instr. as in a-aš-si-ja-u-ni-it and a-aš-si-ja-u-ya-an-ni-it ‘with love’) are younger creations. The suffix -yar / -yaš is etymologically connected with the inf.I-suffix -yanzi (q.v.) and the supine-suffix -yan (q.v.) (just as the inf.II-suffix -anna is etymologically connected with the verbal nouns that end in -\text{\textcircled{\text{q}}}ar, -\text{\textcircled{\text{a}}}nn-). They clearly must go back to the PIE suffix \[*\text{ur} / *\text{yen}-\].

The prehistory of this suffix is quite complicated. As we can see from a-ni-u-ur ‘prestation, ritual’ = \[\text{\textcircled{\text{h}}}n\text{\textacute{\textcircled{\text{a}}}n}-i\text{\textacute{\textcircled{\text{e}}}u-ur\text{, the phonetic outcome of}\ *\text{Cé-ur was}]}}
We therefore must assume that in verbs of the structure *CC-iô-ur and *CC-skê-ur, which regularly would have yielded /CCiór/ and /CCskórl/, the suffix *-ur was restored on the basis of verbs of the structure *CéC-ur. The new forms *CC-iô-ur and *CC-skê-ur were phonemicized as *CCiéýr and *CCsêýïr. Because in postconsonantal position the suffix *-ur should yield Hitt. ʰCur, cf. *pêhýur > paþýur ‘fire’, we must assume that the variant *-ýr spread from the thematic verbs to the verbs of the structure *CéC-ur as well, yielding *CéC-ýr.

Note that this generalization only took place in the verbal noun, which is nicely visible in the fact that the synchronic verbal noun to ʰhîn-k× ‘to bestow’ is ʰhînkuýar, whereas we also find a noun ʰhenkur ‘gift’, which must be the old verbal noun that at one point was not synchronically analysed as such anymore and therefore retained its phonetically regular -ur.

The gen.sg.-ending -uas must reflect proterodynamic *-yen-s (Schindler 1975a: 8). Note that this is one of the very few traces of the gen.sg.-ending *-s in Hittite: in all other cases, the hysterodynamic ending *-os has been generalized, also in originally proterodynamic and static paradigms (e.g. paþhuenaš ‘fire’ and mëhuas ‘time’). The paradigm of these nouns originally must have shown ablaut: *CéC-ur, *CC-uén-s. The full-grade of the root was generalized, cf. šéšuýar, šéšuas ‘to sleep’. For the interpretation of inf.I-suffix -yanzi as an old abl. *-yen-ii and of the supine-suffix -yan as an old locative *-yn, see their respective lemmas.


The verb *yarašh- is attested in one context only, of which we have two versions:

**KUB 10.66 vi**

1. [x - x - x - x d] a³°-al-li-e-eš
2. (Gî) h[a-at-ta-lu-ut LÚ h[a-at-ya-e]-ja-an
3. LÚ ku-ya-na-an-n=a
4. GIRMES=ŠU-NU ú-ar-aš-ạ-ha-an-zi

with semi-duplicate

**KBo 7.48**

11. [x-al-li-e-eš Gî h[a-at-ta]-[lu-ut LÚ h[a-at-ya-e]-ja-aš]
12. [LÚ ku-ú-na-aš-ạ= a GIRMES=ŠU y[a-ar-aš-ạ-ha-an-zǐ]
‘the xalli-s yarašt- the feet of the ḫatyaja-men(man), the dog-men(man) and
the k.-men(man) with a bolt-pin’ (first text with gen.pl., second text with
acc.sg. of respect).

The verb.noun yaraštšuṣar is attested in only one context as well, of which there
are two versions:

KBo 10.28 + 33 i
(2) ya-ar-ø[š-ḫu-u-ya-ar ]x ti-an-zi
(3) ma-a-an=za LUGAL-u[š GA]LMEŠ EGIS-pa da-a-i
(4) LMEŠ UR.BAR.RA ya-ar-aš-ḫu-u-ya-ar
(5) da-li-an-zi n=e [p]ár-aš-na-an-zi

‘... they put [down] the y.. When the king takes back the cup, the wolf-men
leave the y and they squat’.

Similarly in

Bo 69/396 obv. (see Singer 1983: 8470)
(2) [ ]-zi LMEŠ UR.BAR.RA
(3) [ ] K|AxUD ya-ar-aš-ḫu-ar
(4) [ ]-zi ta pár-aš-na-a-an-zi

On the basis of these contexts, it is difficult to determine the meaning of the verb
yarašt-. Sometimes, šaršt- is equated with yaršt- ‘to wipe’ (e.g. Oettinger 1979a: 429),
but this is not supported by the facts. A meaning ‘sieg streifen ab’ (thus Oettinger
1979a: 42970) for šarštänzi is by no means ascertained. It is even unlikely, as
šaršt- apparently denotes some action executed with a bolt-pin (ḠŠ ḫattalu-). I
therefore regard a connection with šaršt- ‘to wipe’ as improbable.

(GŠ) yarašma-: see (ḠŠ) yaršma-

yaraṭara- (c.) a fruit: nom.sg. ya-ra-ya-ra-aš (KBo 10.34 i 17).

The word occurs only once, in a list of fruit. No clear meaning, no etymology.

yarḥuï- / yarḥuṣai- (adj.) ‘raw, rough; unshaven; leafy; covered with forest’:
nom.sg.c. ya-ar-ḫu-ıš, acc.sg.c. ya-ar-ḫu-in (IBoT 2.39 ii 25), nom.-acc.sg.n. ya-

Derivatives: yarḥu(ya)mu² (Ib2) ‘to plant densely’ (2sg.pret.act. ya-ar-ḥu-ya-
mu-ut (KBo 12.59 iv 5 (OH/NS)); part. ya-ar-ḥu-mu-ya-an-t- (KUB 13.24, 16 (MH/NS)); impf. ya-ar-ḥu-mu-us-ke/ar- (KBo 10.47g iii 13 (NS))), yarḥušš-ass² (Ib2) ‘?’ (3sg.imp.act. [ya²-]yar-ḥu-usiš-du (KUB 41.33 ii 8)), yarḥuššar (n.) ‘brushwood’ (nom.-acc.sg. ya-ar-ḥu-e-e[š-šar] (KUB 21.19 + 338/v + 1303/u iii 13), ya-ar-ḥu-esš-šar (KUB 3.94 i 22)).

PIE *uérh₂-uei-s, *uŕh₂-uei-s ??

The word denotes the roughness of hides and clothes, the unshavenness of sheep’s body parts, the leafiness of trees and the dense overgrowth of mountains. The derivative yarḥumus² shows that we are dealing with an i-stem of a root yarḥu- /yarH²-/. Oettinger (1979a: 549) connects this word with Gr. ἐφοκ ‘fleece’ (following Neumann 1958: 90) which he reconstructs as *uṛh₂-u-ih₂-, but this preform does not yield the Greek form by regular sound change. If yarḥu- indeed is of IE origin it cannot reflect anything else than *uṛh₂-u-(e)i-. Melchert (1984a: 13) agrees with this etymology, but states that we have to reconstruct *uṛh₂i-, as he thinks that *uṛh₂u- would lead to ur-. For the OH period, this is correct (compare OH urāni = uršāni ‘burns’ < *uṛh₂ær(i)), but in the MH period, it would regularly have yielded yarḥui- = yarHui-i (cf. MH yarāni = yaršāni). Moreover, a preform *uṛh₂-i- would have yielded Hitt. **uerrui- (cf. arḫ- / araḥ- / arḥ-). Nevertheless, if this adjective is of IE origin, we must reconstruct *uérh₂-uei-s, *uṛh₂-uei-s, in which the zero-grade stem has been generalized. Note that a PIE root *uṛh₂- is against the PIE root constraints (a cluster -Hu- in a root is unparalleled), which means that we would be dealing with an -u-extension of a root *uérh₂-.

yarḥuššu-, yarḥušt- (gender unclear) ‘?’: dat.-loc.sg. ya-ar-ḥu-uš-šu-i (IBoT 1.29 obv. 39) with dupl. ya-ar-ḥu-uš-ši-i (KBo 45.51 ii 3).

See Weitenberg 1984: 54 for attestations. The meaning of these words cannot be determined. The connection with GIS yarḥušdu- is unclear. No etymology.

cāš yarḥušdu- (n.) an object in cult: nom.-acc.sg. ya-ar-ḥu-uš-du (KUB 55.5 iv 25); broken ya-ar-ḥu-uš-dq(=)... (KUB 20.15, 6), yarḥušdu[... (Bo 5628 obv. 2).
See Weitenberg 1984: 54 for attestations. The exact meaning of this word cannot be determined. The connection with yarḫuššā-, yarḫušī- is unclear. No etymology.

yarī- / yarāi- (adj.) describing oracle bird: nom.pl.c. ya-ra-e-eš (HKM 47, 44, 46 (MH/MS), HKM 49,16 (MH/MS)).

This word occurs in two letters from Maṣat Höyük only. HKM 47 deals with bird-oracles, and yāraġš apparently refers to some kind of oracle-bird. HKM 49 is badly damaged, but this letter probably deals with bird-oracles as well. Alp (1991: 415) cites the stem as yarāi-, but perhaps an interpretation as a (substantivized?) adjective yarī- is better. No clear meaning, no etymology.


Derivatives: yarīšša-1 / yarīšš- (IIa1γ) ‘to help, to come to help’ (2sg.pres.act. ya-ar-ri-iš-ša-at-ti (KBo 5.4 rev. 45 (NH), KUB 21.5 + KBo 19.74 iii 68 (NH)), ya-ar-re-eš-ša-at-ti (KBo 5.4 rev. 46 (NH), KUB 19.6 + 21.1 + 19.73 iii 49 (NH)), ya-ar-ri-ıš-ša-at-ti (KUB 21.5 + KBo 19.74 iii 65 (NH)), ya-ar-ri-ıš-ša-at-te (KUB 23.1 ii 35 (NH)), ya-ar-ri-[e/iš]-ša-at-t[i] (KBo 10.12+13 ii 52 (NH)), 2pl.pres.act. [ya-ar]-re-eš-ša-at-te-mi (KUB 26.12 i 7 (NH)), 3pl.pres.act. ya-ar-ri-iš-ša-an-ti (KBo 5.8 i 10 (NH)), 1sg.pres.act. [ya-ar]-re-eš-ša-ah-hu-un (KBo 4.4 ii 38 (NH)), 2sg.pres.act. ya-ar-ri-iš-ši-iš-ta (KUB 31.47 ovb. 13 (NH)), 3sg.pres.act. ya-ar-ri-iš-ši-iš-ta (KBo 6.29 + KUB 21.12 ii 11 (NH)), ya-ar-re-eš-še-eš-ta (KBo 3.4 + KUB 23.125 i 37 (NH), KBo 16.1 i 56 (fr.) (NH), KUB 14.16 ii 13 (NH), KBo 5.8 i 42 (fr.) (NH)), 2sg.imp.act. ya-ar-ri-iš-ša (KBo 5.9 ii 17 (NH), KBo 4.3 ii 15 (NH)), ya-ar-re-eš-ša (KBo 5.13 iii 20 (NH), KBo 19.66 + KUB 6.41 iii 38 (NH), 3sg.imp.act. ya-ar-ri-iš-ši-iš-du (HW: 245), ya-ar-[re-eš]-ša-eš-du (ABoT 57 obv. 29 (NH)), ya-ar-[e-iš]-ša-eš-du (ibid. 32 (NH)): part. ya-ar-ri-iš-ša-an-t (KBo 5.8 i 19 (NH), ya-ar-re-eš-ša-an-t (KUB 19.36 i 14 (NH)), (u)yarā' ḫalṣāi-2 ‘to cry for help’ (u-ya-ar-ar-ẖal-za-iš (KUB 31.4 + obv. 3 (OH/NS)), with dupl. ya-ar-ar-ẖaf[...] (KBo 12.22 i 4 (OH/NS)), yararrā3- (Ic2) ‘to come to help’ (3sg.pres.act. ya-ar-ra-iz-zi (KBo 4.4 ii 26 (NH)), 3sg.pres.act. ya-ar-ra-ī (KBo 3.4 iv 17 (NH)), 2sg.imp.act. ya-ar-ra-a-i (KBo 4.4 ii 24 (NH)), yarāḫitašša- (adj.) ‘being of help’ (nom.sg.c. ya-ar-ra-hī-ta-aš-ša-aš (KUB 20.60, 7)).

PIE *uorH-i-

The stem *yarri- occurs as an adj. ‘helpful’ as well as a neuter noun ‘help(fulness)’. Suffix ablaut can be seen in gen.sg. *yaarraš (KUB 23.72 ii 19), yarras (ibid. 20) < *yarrajaš. The expression *(nu)yarra ḥalzai-2 (spelled ú-ya-a-ar-ra and ya-ar-ra) occurs in one context only (Puḫunu-chronicle: both attestations are duplicates of each other). These forms could be old allatives *yarraja > yarra. The verb *yarrae- is NH only. It seems to be based on the stem *yarr- as seen in yarra ḥalzai-, although it cannot be excluded that it is derived directly from *yarri-, as e.g. *kappa Rotation to ‘to diminish’ is derived from the adjective *kappi- / kappai- ‘little’. Often, 3pl.pret.act. *u-ur-ri-e-er (KBo 3.60 ii 7 (OH/NS)) is cited as belonging to the paradigm of yarrai- as well, but a translation ‘they helped’ is not ascertained. Its aberrant appearance (*ūrr- instead of yarr-) is hard to explain, so we rather have to regard it as a separate verb that does not belong to this stem. I therefore treat it under a separate lemma, *ūrr(i/e)a-.- The adj. *yarrahaitašša- is clearly based on the Luw. gen.adj. *yarrahaitašša/i-; itself derived of a Luwian noun *yarrahait- ‘help’. According to Starke (1990: 155-6), the verb *yarrišša- / yarrišš- is based on a Luwian impf. *yarrišša-; although that verb is not attested. It is true that within the small group of imperfectives in -šš(a)-, *yarrišš(a)- stands quite apart as it is attested in NH compositions only, whereas *šša- / Šš- ‘to do, to make’, ḥalzišša- / ḫalzišš- ‘to call’ and ššša- / ššš- ‘to impress’ are attested from OH times onwards. Whether this means that yarrišš(a)- is not a genuine Hittite formation is unclear, however.

I know of no outer-Anatolian cognates. If these words are of IE origin, the -rr- points to *-rH-. This means we are dealing with a preform *uorH-i-. See Melchert (1994a: 78) for an elaborate treatment of these words, which in my view lays too much weight on the form *ūrr(i/e).er.


This word occurs in one context only:

KBo 13.260 iii
(33) *nu EGIAR-az al-š[a-š[š]a-a-dš]
(34) *[h]a-ta-am-šši pa-ra-an=ma-a-š-šš
(35) *[g]a-ri-še-ja-aš še-li-uš a-ra-an-da
(36) [p]a-ra-a=aš ti-ja-zi
(37) [n]=a-aš=kán a-na-da a-la-al-la-a
(38) [m]a-ush-du a-ap-pa=m=a-aš ti-ja-zi
(39) [n]=a-aš=kán a-na ya-ri-ši-ja-aš
(40) [pa]-ah-hu-e-na-aš-s=a še-li
(41) [m]a-ush-ta-ru

‘Behind, the allallāt- is ḥāta-ed. But before him, piles of yarišja- are standing.

(If) he walks forward, let him fall into the alallāt-. (If) he falls backward, let
him fall into the pile of yarišja- and fire’.

On the basis of this context, it cannot be determined exactly what yarišja/iš-
means. Perhaps it is parallel to al(l)allāt- (q.v.), which possibly denotes
‘treachery’. One could think of a connection with ur-‘ to burn’ (q.v.), but this is
based on the formal similarity only.

yarite; see yerite / yerit-

yarkant- (adj.) ‘fat’: nom.sg.c. ya-ar-kān-za, acc.sg.c. ya-ar-kān-ta-an, ü-ya-ar-
k[ān-ta-an] (KBo 3.60 iii 3), nom.-acc.sg.n. ya-ar-kān, gen.sg. ya-ar-kān-ta-aš,
nom.pl.c. ya-ar-kān-te-eš, ya-ar-ga-an-te-eš, ya-ag-ga-an-te-eš, acc.pl.c. ya-ar-
kān-du-uš.

Derivatives: yarkēš; (Ib2) ‘to grow fat’ (3sg.pret.act. ya-ar-ke-eš-ta (KBo
32.14 ii 4)), yargnu; (Ib2) ‘to make fat’ (1sg.pret.act. ya-ar-ga-mu-mu-un (KBo
32.14 ii 12); impf. [ya-ar]g-a-ga-um-us[-ke/a-] (KBo 32.113, 5)).

IE cognates: Skt. ārj- ‘food, refreshment, strength’, Av. varzāiant- ‘providing
much strength’, Av. varze- ‘strength’, Gr. ὑπότιν ‘to overflow, to swell’, ὑπήρχε
‘passion, anger, fierceness’, Ofr. ferce ‘anger’.

PIE *uorh₂-ont-

Once we find a form ya-ag-ga-an-te-eš (HT 1 iii 32), which assuredly belongs to
this word, as it is a duplicate of ya-ar-kān-te-eš (KUB 9.31 iii 39) and ya-ar-ga-
an-te-eš (KUB 9.32 i 21). It is unclear whether we are dealing with a real
phonetic change (yark- > yakh-), or a mistake from the copyist (AK instead of
AR). The word is usually spelled with initial ya-, but once we find a spelling ú-
ya-, in KBo 3.60 ii 3. The derivatives yarkēš; and yargnu; show that we have
to analyse yarkant- as a stem yark- followed by the suffix -ant- which we find
more often in adjectives. For the etymology see Szemerényi (1942: 397) and Čop
(1955b: 31), who connect it with Skt. ėṛj- (f.) ‘food, refreshment, strength’ etc. from *yṛhī-ū. This means that yarkant- probably reflects *yṛhī-ont-.

yarkui- (c.) ‘anger, fury (?)’: acc.sg. ya-ar-ku-i(n)=š-ša-an (KUB 33.28, 6), & ya-ar-ku-i(n)=š-ša-an (KUB 17.10 iii 12).

PIE *y(o)rKʷ-i-

This word is attested twice.

KUB 17.10 iii
(9) ... n=a-aš-ta ⁴Te-li-pi-mi
(10) tu-ug-ga-az=še-e-et i-da-a-lu-u=š-ši-it da-a-ar-ḫu-un & uš-du'-ul=še-et
(11) da-a-ar-ḫu-un kar-pi-i(n)=š-ša-an da-a-ar-ḫu-un kar-di-ma-ta-an(n)=š-ša-an
(12) da-a-ar-ḫu-un & ya-ar-ku-u(n)=š-ša-an da-a-ar-ḫu-un ša-a-ur da-a-ar-[ḫu-un]

‘Of Telipinu, of his body, I took his evil, I took his sin, I took his wrath, I took his anger, I took his y., I took fury’.

A parallel is found in

KUB 33.28
(4) n=a-aš-ta ⁴U-n\[ ]
(5) ya-aš-du-ul=še-et da-a-[h-ḫu-un] \[ ]
(6) ya-ar-ku-i(n)=š-ša-an da-[h-ḫu-un] \[ ]

‘Of the Storm-god[...], I to[ok] his sin, [...], I to[ok] his y.,[... ]’.

It is likely that either ya-ar-ku-uš-ša-an is wrong for ya-ar-ku-iš-ša-an or the other way around. As it is easier to assume that in ya-ar-ku-uš-ša-an a vertical wedge is lost than to assume that an extra one was written in ya-ar-ku-iš-ša-an (so UŠ (żż) wrong for IŠ (żż)), I assume that the word must have originally been yarkui(n)=ššăn ‘his yarkui-’.

As the word appears in an enumeration of iḫḫu ‘evil’, ušdul ‘sin’, karpū ‘wrath’, kardīmīt- ‘anger’ and šaš̄ar ‘fury’, it is likely that it denotes something evil as well, and particularly something like ‘anger, fury, etc.’. The one attestation with gloss wedges may point to a foreign (Luwian) origin, but this is not obligatory. In the same text ušdul is gloss wedged as well, though this word is generally regarded as genuinely Hittite. I know of no cognates, but yarkui- should mechanically reflect *y(o)rKʷ-i-. 
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Derivatives: **yarpa**- (n.) ‘?’ (nom.-acc.pl. *ya-ar-pa* (KBo 4.11 obv. 13, KUB 35.133 ii 33), dat.-loc.pl. *ya-ar-pa-a* (KUB 35.133 ii 34)), **GÍDÍLM yarpašľ** (c.), a certain bowl (for washing?) (nom.sg. **GÍDÍLM ya-ar-pa-šš-šš** (KUB 12.36 + KUB 60.9 i 9, KUB 30.37 i 7)), **yarpuzu**- (n.), object used by bathing? (nom.-acc.sg. *ya-ar-pu-zi* (KUB 12.8 i 17)).

IE cognates: Lith. vešpti ‘to spin’, RussCS *yɛpsti* ‘to wash, to bathe’.

**PIE */yęp-ti/ */yerp-énti*

The spelling *ya-ar-ap-zi* besides *ya-ar-pa-zi* proves that the stem was *yarp*-. The geminate spelling -*pp* in *yarappanzi* shows that the stem was /arp/-l. A stem *yarpšľa*- (*yarpšlanzi*) is found in one MH/MS text only. It is unclear whether this is a secondary creation or an old remnant of a system in which *yarp-* reflects an old root-aorist and *yarpšľa*- a *-*je/o-derived present (see e.g. karpšje/a)-² for such a distribution). See Weitenberg (1977) for the seperation of *yarp-* ‘to wash, to bathe’ and a verb *yarpæ*-² ‘to suppress’, a derivative of *yarpa-* ‘enclosure’ (q.v.).

The verb quite clearly denotes ‘to wash, to bathe’; but Oettinger (1979a: 234) cites the interesting passage KUB 15.31 i (18) nu-šá EGRÍ-an-da (19) **GÍpa-ah-hu-ru-la-az pa-ah-hur ya-ar-pa-an-zi** (dupl. KUB 15.32 i 19-21) ‘und dann reiben sie mit dem Feuerholz Feuer’, which he uses as an argument to assume that *yarp*- originally meant ‘to rub’, which through ‘to rub clean with water’ became to denote ‘to wash, to bathe’. CHD P: 17 translates this passage as ‘Afterwards they enclose (i.e. bank?) the fire with a p.-implement’, however, and explicitly state that *yarppanzi* here does not belong with *yarp-* ‘to wash, to bathe’ but with *yarpæ*- ‘to enclose, to surround’ (see at *yarpa*). Whatever the correct interpretation, Oettinger’s proposal (1979a: 234) to connect *yarp-* with the root *yerp-* ‘to turn to and fro’ (Lith. vešpti ‘to spin’) through a semantic development ‘to rub (one’s hands)’, still remains the best etymology.

Some instances of the noun *yarpa-* are not fully clear. The contexts in which they are found show that they do not belong with *yarpa-* ‘enclosure’ (q.v.), but more likely are related to *yarp-* ‘to wash, to bathe’. The first context is
KBo 4.11 obv.
(13) DUG ÚTUL H A ti-an-zi ya-ar-pa da-an-zi
(14) n=a-at da-ga-an la-a-hu-ya-an-zi

‘They place the vessels, take y.-s and empty them on the floor’.

A similar context can be found in

KUB 35.133 ii
(33) ... nu=kán ya-ar-pa
(34) da-a-i nu ya-ar-pa-âš še-er GEŠTIN KU, ši-ip-pa-an-ti

‘He takes the y.-s and libates sweet wine over the y.-s’.

The exact meaning of yarпа- remains unclear, however.

yarпа- (n.) ‘enclosure’: dat.-loc.sg. ya-ar-pî (in yarpi tišant- ‘fenced-in, enclosed’ (KUB 13.2 iv 28)), nom.-acc.pl. ya-ar-pa (in yarpa dat-‘to enclose’),


PIE *yörP-o-

See Weitenberg 1977 for a treatment of these words. The exact stemformation of the basic word is not fully clear, but we possibly are dealing with a noun yarпа-(n.) ‘enclosure’ of which we find a nom.-acc.pl. ya-ar-pa in the expression yarpa dat- ‘(lit.) to place enclosures > to enclose’, and of which we only once find a dat.-loc.sg. ya-ar-pî in yarpi tišant- ‘put in enclosure(?)’. If this is correct, then the verbal forms yarpanu[n] and yarpiške/a- ‘to suppress, to conquer’ may be analysed as belonging to a stem yarпа̂ ĉ < *yarpa-je/a-. See at the lemma of yarp-‘to wash, to bathe’ for the discussion of 3pl.pres.act. ya-ar-pa-an-zi (KUB 15.31 i 19).

The adj. yarpalli- ‘strong, great’, which is often seen as cognate to these words, must have a different origin: see at its own lemma.
Etymologically, we have to connect Hitt. *yarpa-* to TochA wārp-, TochB ṣīrpa- ‘to surround’. Adams (1999: 587) connects these words further with Goth. wairpan ‘throw’ (but this verb reflects *uerg* -), Latin verbera ‘switches, lashes, thongs’ and Lithuanian viėbas ‘switch, rod’ (but these are semantically far). His connection with ModEng. wrap is more appealing semantically, but the formal side is difficult: if related, it would show Schwebe-ablaut *yorP*- (the -p- of wrap goes back to a PGerm. geminate *-pp*- and therefore bears no information on the possible PIE labial). We must bear in mind, however, that the word is very recent and local, so likely does not go back to an old inherited word.

This means that we are left only with Hitt. *yarpa-* and TochA wārp-, B ṣīrpa-, on the basis of which we can reconstruct a root *yorP*- only. TochA warp ‘enclosure’ shows the exact same formation as Hitt. *yarpa-*, viz. *yorP-o-.*

The verb *yarpa/ilae-* possibly means ‘to enclose’ as well. It occurs twice, but only one context is clear:

KUB 31.101 obv.

(8) ... nam-ma-a=n-na-aš
(9) ki-iš-ša-an ḥa-at-<<at>>-ra-at-tén MUŠEN[91a] ʿu-a-a=n-na-aš=kán
(10) ya-ar-pi-la-a-e-er nu=ya=kán ḫD a-pá-d-da
(11) za-i-u-en

‘You have written us thus: “The birds enclosed(?) us, and therefore we crossed the river”’.

The exact formation of the verb is unclear to me, however.

**yarpati** (adj.) ‘strong, great’; nom.sg.c. ya-ar-pa-al-liš (KUB 4.4 i 13)).

Anat. cognates: HLuw. *warpati-* ‘brave; strong, great’ (nom.sg.c. *SCALPRUM* ḫašt/laš)

La/tu wa/i+ra/i-pa-li-sa (MARAŞ 1, §1d)), *warpat/i-* ‘craft, skill, knowledge’

(acc.sg. *273wa/i+ra/i-pi-na /warpin/ (KARKAMIŠ A15b §22), gen.sg. *273wa/i+ra/i-pa-si /warpasi/ (KARKAMIŠ A3 §16), dat.-loc.sg. *273wa/i+ra/i-pi /warpili/ (KARKAMIŠ A12 §8, §12)), *warpašati-* (adj.) ‘craft-* (nom.-acc.pl.n. *273wa/i+ra/i-pa-la-li-iš* (MARAŞ 14 §3)).

This word occurs only once, in a bilingual text where it corresponds to Akk. gašru ‘strong, great’. The -alli-suffix clearly points to Luwian origin, which is supported by the attestation of the HLuw. adj. *warpati-* which is translated as ‘brave’ by Hawkins (2000, 132), but which could just as well mean ‘strong, great’. Within HLuwian, this word likely belongs with warpati- ‘skill, craft,
knowledge’ (on which see Hawkins & Morpurgo-Davies 1986: 76-7), which has no good etymology. This means that the inner-Hittite connection of *yarpalli-* with *yarpae-*² ‘to conquer, to suppress’ (see at *yarpa- ‘enclosure’) is incorrect.


This word occurs twice, in the following contexts:

KUB 24.5 ii

(11) GIM-an=ma GEₜ-za k[i-r]š-ša-ri nu=kán [ne]-pi-ši GAM-an

‘When it becomes night, he sacrifices one *y.* sheep to the Moongod under the sky’;

KUB 24.5 + KUB 9.13 i

(30) n=a-aš=kán GIM-an ar-ḫa u-ez-zi nu=za *ya-ar-a[p-zi nu]=kán* 1 UDU
    *ya-ar-pa-an-na-la-an*
(31) A-NA Ḡ/UTU ne-pi-ši kat-an ši-pa-an-ši

‘When he comes, he washes himself and sacrifices one *y.* sheep to the Sun-god under the sky’.

It apparently describes the sheep that are being sacrificed to the Moongod and the Sun-god. Perhaps the sentence *nu=za yarapzi* ‘he washes himself’ indicates some etymological connection with *yarpan(n)ala-*, but this is mere speculation. For the time being, a meaning cannot be determined, so etymologizing is useless.

*yarpi[e/a]-²*: see *yarpa-z²*

*yars²* (Ia² > Ic¹) ‘to reap, to harvest, to wipe’: 3sg.pres.act. *ya-ar-aš-e* (KUB 29.30 iii 4 (OS)), *ya-ar-ši* (KUB 29.30 iii 8 (OS), KUB 29.38 i 3 (fr.) (OS), IBoT 1.36 i 69 (MH/MS), KBo 6.11 i 7 (fr.) (OH/NS)), *ya-ar-aš-zi* (KBo 6.26 i 45 (OH/NS)), *ya-ar-še-e-ez-zi* (KBo 6.12 i 25 (OH/NS)), 3pl.pres.act. *[ya-ar-š]i²-an-zí* (KUB 29.30 ii 18 (OS)), *ya-ar-ša-an-zi* (KBo 15.10 iii 42 (OH/MS), HKM 66 rev. 37 (MH/MS)), *ya-ar-aš-ša-an-zi* (KUB 24.3 ii 8 (MH/NS)), *ya-ar-ši-ja-an-zi* (KBo 6.26 i 8 (OH/NS)), 1sg.pret.act. *ya-ar-šu-un* (KUB 33.66 iii 10 (OH/MS)), 3sg.pret.act. *ya-ar-aš-ta* (KBo 3.33 ii 17 (OH/NS)), 3pl.pret.act. *ya-ar-še-er* (KBo 3.33 iii 18 (OH/NS)), 2sg.imp.act. *ya-ar-aš* (HKM 21 rev. 15 (MH/MS)),
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IE cognates: OLat. 41.22 iv 2, KBo 23.1 i 30).

Derivatives: yarš- ‘id.’ (part. ya-yar-ša-an-t- (KUB 30.38 i 10 (NS), KUB 41.22 iv 2, KBo 23.1 i 30)).

IE cognates: OLat. vorrō ‘to wipe’, Lat. verrere ‘to wipe’, RussCS vëřši ‘to thres’h.

PIE *uōrs-ei / *urs-énti

In the oldest texts, this verb inflects according to the hi-conjugation: yaraššē, yaršī. Only later on, we find forms that are mi-inflected (yarāšī (OH/NS)). The only form that is deviant is [ya-ar-ši]-an-zi (KUB 29.30 ii 18 (OS)), which would point to a stem yaršīje/arawn. Unfortunately, the form is broken on the crucial point, and we therefore may not have to take this form into account. Note that the oldest form of this verb, 3sg.pres.act. ya-ar-šaše (OS) is very important because it shows that the original 3sg.pres.act.-ending of the hi-conjugation was -e, which was replaced by -i through analogy (see also at the lemma -i).

Already Benveniste (1932: 137) connected Hitt. yarš- with Lat. verrere ‘to wipe’, OLat. vorrō ‘id.’, RussCS vëřši ‘to thres’h that reflect a root *yers-. Note that in *uōrs-ei / *urs-énti first the consonantal *u- of the singular spread to the plural. The regular outcome of *yörse / *yrsénti then would have been **/uāRī, urSant’īl, of which the cluster /-rS/ spread throughout the paradigm. This also explains the occasional geminate spelling of -šš- in e.g. ya-ar-ašše, ya-ar-ašša-an-zi, etc.

yarš-atonj (IIIb / Ic1) ‘to lift oneself; to refresh; (ZI ‘spirit’) to lift the spirit > to reconcile, to pull oneself together’: 3sg.pres.act. ya-ar-ši-ja-az-zi (KUB 14.8 ii 28 (NH), ya-ar-ši-ja-zi (KUB 14.3 ii 67, 68 (NH), KUB 15.5+ i 15 (fr.) (NH)), 1sg.preter. ya-ar-ši-ja-uni (KUB 14.15 + KBo 16.104 ii 26 (NH)), 3sgpreter. ya-ar-ši-ja-eet (KBo 19.109, 7 (MH/NS)), 3sg.impact. ya-ar-šu-du (KUB 14.14 ii 14 (NH), ya-ar-ši-ja-ad-du (KUB 14.11 iii 38 (NH)), 3pl.impact. ya-ar-ši-ja-an-du (KUB 13.1 i 36 (MH/MS)); 3sg.pres.midd. ya-ar-šu-ta (KUB 33.62 ii 4, 5, 6 (OH/MS) // Bo 6472 ii 14, 15, 16 (OH?)), ya-ar-ši-ja-at-ta-ri (KUB 14.8 ii 34 (NH), KUB 16.7 i 36 (NS)), 2sg.imp.midd. ya-ar-ši-
ja-ah-hu-ut (KUB 9.32 i 14, 23 (NS)); part. ya-ar-ša-an-t- (IBot 3.148 iii 11 (MH/NS)).

Derivatives: *uruš(ija)nu-3d (Ib2) 'to make (someone) pull oneself together; to refresh (trans.)' (3pl.pres.act. ya-ar-ša-mu-an-zi (KUB 13.4 iv 11 (OH/NS)) // ya-ar-ši-[ja-mu-an-zī] (KUB 40.63 iv 5 (OH/NS)), 1sg.pret.act. ya-ar-shi-ja-mu-μu-an (KBo 12.38 ii 21 (NH)); part.nom.-acc.sg.n. ya-ar-ši-ja-mu-μa-an (KUB 19.23 obv. 7 (NS)).

IE cognates: Skt. vārṣman- ‘hight’, ā vṛṣásva ‘pull yourself together!’, Lith. viršūs, OCS vṛṣa ‘top, summit’.

PIE *uērs-to, *yrs-jē/ō-

Usually, this verb is translated ‘to appease oneself, to soothe’, but in my view it more likely has a meaning ‘to regain one’s strength, to refresh’, and, when used with ZI ‘spirit, soul’, ‘to lift the spirit, to reconcile, to pull oneself together, to get a grip’. Compare e.g.

IBoT 3.148 iii
(10) EN tab-ri=ya=za iš-pi-ja-an-za
(11) ni-in-kām-za e-eš nu=za EGIR-an ya-ar-ša-an-za e-eš

‘Oh lord of the tabri, be satisfied with food and drink and then be refreshed!’;

KUB 14.11 iii
(36) ... mu A-NA dU URU Ha-at-ti EN=fA
(37) Ū A-NA DINGIRMES BE-LLMES=IA ZI-an-za nam-ma
(38) ya-ar-ši-ja-ad-du nu=mu ge-en-zu nam-ma
(39) da-at-tēn mu=kān š-Š-TU KUR URU Ha-at-tī
(40) hi-in-ga-an ar-ḥa nam-ma u-i-ja-at-tēn

‘May the spirit of the Storm-god of Hatti and the gods, my lords, be lifted (= may you be reconciled)! May you take pity in me! May the plague be sent away out of the land Hatti!’;

KBo 16.32 + KUB 50.6 ii
(16) HUL-ah-t=a-aš ku-š UN-aš n=a-aš nu-u-ya ku-it TI-za nu aš-pē-(el ku-it)]
(18) a-pē-ez UL SŠxŠa-at
'Because the person who hit them is still alive and because his spirit is not (yet) lifted (he has not pulled himself together yet), it therefore was determined not to perform the mantallī-ritual';

KUB 19.23 obv.
(7) EN=LA ZI-an UL ya-ar-ši-ja-nu-ya-an ḫar-ku'-un

'I have not lifted the spirit of my master'.

A more literal meaning ‘to lift’ may be visible in the following context, which then seems to deal with levers:

KUB 33.62 ii
(4) [nu kai-te-ra-an ḫa-]a-an IM-aš=kán ya-ar-aš-ša-ra-a-az-zi-ja-an
(5) [(ḫa-a-an ma-)]a-az=kán ya-ar-aš-ta nu iš-tar-ni-ja-an
(6) [ḫa-a-an] ë(zša-a)m-ma-ša=kán ya-ar-aš-ta

‘[D]ip [the lower] and the clay will be lifted. [Dip] the upper and the māḏ will be lifted. [Dip] the middle and the šummama-nut will be lifted’

(cf. CHD L-N: 124 for this reconstruction of the text, but note that CHD’s translation of yaraštu as ‘will be refreshed(?)’ (CHD Š: 115) does not make sense).

If the OH/MS 3sg.pres.midd.-forms yaraštu from the last cited context indeed belong to this verb, it seems that we are dealing with an original opposition between a middle stem yars- against an active stem yarši(e)/a-², for which compare e.g. ḫarš(ši)², ḫazz(i)še/a-². In younger times we find the stem yarš- also in the active (3sg.imp.act. yarašdu (NH)) and yarši(e)/a- in the middle (yaršiattari (NH) and yaršišhêuti (NS)).

The etymology of this verb depends on one’s interpretation of its semantics. E.g. Melchert (1994a: 163) states that yarši(e)/a-, which he translates as ‘to soothe’, goes back to an original meaning *‘to trickle, to drip’, on the basis of which he assumes a connection with the noun yarša- that he translates as ‘rain-shower’. Rieken (1999a: 470²3113), who translates yarši(e)/a- as ‘beruhigen, besänftigen’, rejects such an etymological connection, however.

If the verb yarši(e)/a- indeed originally denotes ‘to lift (oneself)’, I would like to connect it with the root *yers- as visible in Skt. vārṣmaṇ/ ‘hight’, Lith. viršūs, OCS ḫarš, ‘top, summit’. A semantic development to ‘to lift oneself, to pull
oneself together’ is also visible in Skt. ā vṛṣṣava ‘pull yourself together!’ . All in all, I reconstruct *yarš-.i*- (i) as *uērs-to and *yarši/-a*- as *yrs-je/-ó-.

*yarša*- (c.) ‘fog, mist’: gen.sg. *ya-ar-ša-aš* (KUB 16.37 iv 5 (NS), KBo 13.245 vi 6 (NS), KUB 9.15 ii 7 (NS)), *ya-ar-ša-š=a* (KUB 9.15 ii 6 (NS)), acc.pl. *ya-ar-ša-aš* (KUB 5.1 iv 71 (NH)).

This word especially occurs in the syntagm *yarša š* ‘Storm-god of y.’, which is mostly found in broken passages:

KUB 16.37 iv
(5) [ ... ]ši-ah-ḥa-an-zí š U ya-ar-ša-aš
(6) [ ... ]ma hé-e-uš DÚ-zí

‘... they [re]veal. The Storm-god of y. [...] but [...] makes rain’;

KBo 13.245 vi
(5) ḫu-u-ma-an-da-aš te-et-ḥi-mi [ ... ]
(6) š U š U al-ša-aš ya-ar-ša-aš [ ... ]
(7) hé-e-uš ḫa-a-i

‘[...] for all in the thunder [...] for the Storm-gods of clouds and y. [...] places rains’;

KUB 9.15 ii (cf. Cohen 2002: 134f.)
(6) [ ... ] an-da ta-ma-aš-zí ya-ar-ša-š=a š[U]
(7) [ ... ] ta-ma-aš-zí n=an=kán ya-ar-ša-aš

‘[...] will oppress, and [the Storm]-god of y. will oppress [...] and [...] of y. [will [...] him’.

In one context, *yarša*- occurs without š:

KUB 5.1 iv
(71) BAD-an=ma an-za-aš KAL-i BÚN-mi ḫar-ši-ḥar-ši ya-ar-ša-aš
ḥé-[y]a-aš UL HUŠ-ḫi
(72) KARAŠššš=kán TA š[U] UL za-ah-ta-ri

‘But when he for our sake(?) does not fear the violent thunder and lightning, the y.-s and the rains and the armies are not striken by the Storm-god, [...]’.
Although all passages are either incomplete or difficult to interpret, the latter context clearly shows that *yarša-, just as KAL-i BŪN-mi ḫaršārši ‘violent thunder and lightning’ and ḥe[y]aš ‘rains’, should be regarded as a certain bad weather condition. This would of course perfectly fit the fact that it is used as an epithet of *U ‘Storm-god’.

Friedrich (1930: 35§), who translates the first context cited here as “Der Wettergott ... [...] ... macht Regengüsse” (which is not necessarily correct: the -ma before ḥēqūš could well be the conjunction =ma, which implies a new subject for this sentence), points to the formal similarity between *yarša and Skt. varṣā- ‘rain’, assuming that Hitt. *yarša- is a loanword from Indic. Laroche (1946-47: 110) translates *yarša- as “rosée”, ‘dew’ and in 1963: 62 states that it is “un mot hititite authentique” that must be cognate with Skt. varṣā- ‘rain’ and Gr. ἕρπη ‘dew’. This view has been generally accepted since then. In my view, we first should compare *yarša- within Hittite, namely to yaršula- that denotes ‘fume, vapour’. It therefore is more likely that *yarša- denotes ‘fog, mist’. Nevertheless, this does not affect the etymological connection with Skt. varṣā- ‘rain’ and Gr. ἕρπη ‘dew’ semantically. Yet, we need to discuss a few formal points.

First, there is some debate on the interpretation of the Greek forms. In the poetic language, we find the word ἕρπη ‘dew’, which in classical times is (irregularly) contracted to ἕρπε. In Hesych, we find the gloss ἕρπον τὴν ὅραμαν. Κρήτες ‘dew (Cretan)’, which resembles the unique spelling ἕρπον as found on one papyrus. On the basis of these latter two forms, often the reconstruction *h₂uērs-eh₂- is given, under the assumption that ēχ- has been assimilated to ē-. Because such assimilations are far from regular in Greek and because a spelling with initial ēχ- is found twice only, both in dubious sources, we should rather take the frequent spelling ἕρπη as original and reconstruct *h₂uērs-eh₂- (cf. also Eichner 1973: 54). In view of the development PANat. */RV-* > Hitt. /RV- as described in § 1.4.5.a, we can assume that a sequence *h₂u- would yield Hitt. ya-. (Note that scholars that reconstruct *yarša- as *h₂uors-o- must assume ‘De Saussure Effect’, i.e. loss of *h₂- in an o-grade formation.)

Secondly, intervocalic *VrsV should have yielded Hitt. /VRV/, cf. *Horso- > Hitt. ḫarRa-l, a-ar-ra- ‘arse’. The only way in explaining *yarša- then is by assuming an original ablauting root noun, e.g. *h₂uērs-s, *h₂uērs-m, *h₂yrs-ōs (cf. e.g. tuekk- / tukk-). (Note that this scenario precludes the existence of an o-grade stem, which is necessary if one reconstructs *h₂uors-o-)

All in all, we can say that the etymological connection between Hitt. *yarša- ‘fog, mist’ on the one hand and Skt. varṣā- ‘rain’ and Gr. ἕρπη ‘dew’ on the
other is semantically attractive, but that the exact reconstruction of the Hittite word is difficult.

\[\text{yarsama-: see } \text{yarsma-}\]

\[\text{yarsha-: see yarsha-}\]

\[\text{yarsijatt- (c.) 'reconciliation(?):' nom.sg.c. } [\text{y}_a\text{-}	ext{ar}-\text{s}_i\text{-ja-za (HT 42 obv. 10),}
\text{gen.sg. } \text{y}_a\text{-ar-}\text{s}_i\text{-ja-at-ta-}\text{a}\text{š (KUB 9.12 ii 5).}
\text{Derivatives: yarsijatar (n.) 'reconciliation' (nom.-acc.sg. } \text{y}_a\text{-ar-}\text{s}_i\text{-ja-}\text{ar-tar (KBo 26.34 i 18)).}
\]

See Rieken 1999a: 107 for a treatment. In the vocabulary HT 42, of which the Akkadian and Sumerian parts are broken off, we find obv. (9) \( [\text{r}_1\text{a-}\text{ri-}	ext{aš-}\text{ḫa-}\text{aš}
\text{ 'tiredness' (10) } [\text{y}_a\text{-}\text{ar-}\text{s}_i\text{-ja-za}
\text{ (11) } [\text{y}_a\text{-}\text{ar-}\text{s}_i\text{-ja-za. In the vocabulary KBo 26.34 we find i (16) SĖD-}	ext{-an-za 'calmness(?)}
\text{ (17) ta-ri-ja-}	ext{aš-}\text{ḫa-}	ext{aš 'tiredness' (18) } \text{y}_a\text{-ar-}\text{s}_i\text{-ja-tar, of which the translations are lost as well. Although we are}
\text{dealing here with another formation (stem in -}\text{atar instead of -}\text{att-), it is likely that}
\text{the words are semantically similar. Besides this, we find the following context:}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{KUB 9.12 ii} \\
(3) & \text{ṭ}{\text{U}-\text{aš IG}^{\text{II}A} = \text{Š}U \text{ 3 } TA-PAL I^{\text{N}T-T\text{IM} X} \text{ [ ... ]}} \\
(4) & \text{ša-ku-ya-ja-u-ya-}	ext{aš } n=a-\text{aš-ta} \text{ LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL š[\text{a-ku-}	ext{iš-ke-ed-du]}} \\
(5) & \text{I}^{\text{N}T-T\text{IM} \text{ y}_a\text{-ar-}\text{s}_i\text{-ja-at-ta-}\text{aš IG}^{\text{II}A} = \text{Š}U \text{ ... ]}} \\
(6) & \text{mu LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL } \text{ṭ}{\text{U}-\text{i an-da-}	ext{an } \text{y}_a\text{-a[r-ši-ja-an-te-es?]}} \\
(7) & \text{a-ša-an-du } I^{\text{N}T-T\text{IM} \text{ ma-ni-ja-}	ext{a[r-ḫi-ja-}	ext{aš?]}} \\
(8) & \text{ḥa-ne-či-}	ext{aš- IG}^{\text{II}A} = \text{Š}U
\end{align*}
\]

‘The Sun-god’s eyes are three pairs – one pair is [...] of looking; with (them) [let him look] at the king and queen. One pair are his eyes of reconciliation, let the king and queen be rec[onciled] to the Sun-god. One pair are his eyes of govern[ning] and judging’ (translation as in CHD Š: 55).

A translation ‘reconciliation’ (thus in CHD Š: 55), would fit the place in the vocabularies as well. Clearly, this word is derived from \text{yars.\text{mo}(r)\text{, yarsij(}e/\text{a-}\text{, to lift (oneself); reconcile’ (q.v.).}

\text{yarsij(a-	ext{, ‘to appease’; see yars.\text{mo}(r)\text{, yarsij(}e/\text{a-}}
\]
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There is one verbal form showing the stem \( \text{yar\text{"i}}/\text{a} \)- that does not seem to belong with either \( \text{yar\text{"i}}- \) ‘to reap, to harvest, to wipe’ or with \( \text{yar\text{"i}}-^{\text{MTR}} \), \( \text{yar\text{"i}}/\text{a}^{\text{MTR}} \) ‘to lift (oneself); to refresh’, namely the form found in the following context:

KUB 33.84 + KBo 19.109a iv (cf. Siegelová 1971: 58)

(6) \([\mu]\text{m} = \text{kån ɑ-şî-ja-}][\tau] \text{G} \text{s} \text{a-} \text{hi-} \text{i} \text{t} \text{a} \text{n}\text{G} \text{s} \text{p} \text{a} \text{r} \text{n} \text{u} \text{u} \text{l} \text{l} \text{i} \text{n} \text{n} = \text{a d} \text{a-a-ş} \text{s} \text{a-a} \text{aş} \text{A} \text{H} \text{L} \text{a-n} \text{a-aş}

(7) \[[\text{s} \text{u} \text{u} \text{n} \text{n} - \text{i} \text{a} \text{a-t} \text{m} = \text{kån A} \text{H} \text{L} \text{a-aş a}]\text{n} - \text{a-a-ş} \text{i} \text{a-} \text{a-ta} \text{r} \text{G} \text{s} \text{a} \text{hi-} \text{i} \text{s} \text{G} \text{s} \text{p} \text{a} \text{r} \text{n} \text{u} \text{u} \text{l} \text{l} \text{i} \text{y} \text{a-a-aş-i} \text{a} \text{aş}

(8) \[[\mu] \text{G} \text{i} \text{M} \text{a} \text{n} \text{M} \text{O} \text{S} \text{H} \text{e} \text{-} \text{d} \text{a} \text{m} \text{m} \text{u} \text{a} \text{n} \text{K} \text{A} \text{S} \text{i} \text{s} \text{a} \text{t} - \text{a} - \text{t} - \text{m} \text{u} = \text{k} \text{a} \text{n} [(\text{A} \text{N} \text{A} \text{M})] \text{H} \text{e} \text{-} \text{d} \text{a} \text{m} \text{m} \text{u} \text{a} - \text{h} \text{u} - \text{u} \text{i} - \text{i} - \text{t}

(9) \[[\text{ZI} \text{H} \text{L} = \text{Ş} \text{U} \text{a} - \text{n} - \text{n} - \text{i} - \text{s}] \text{t} \text{e} \text{-} \text{e} \text{-} \text{a} - \text{ş} - \text{aş e} - \text{e} - \text{p} - \text{a}

‘She (= Ištar) strewed aphrodisiac(?), šaḫi- and *parnulli*-wood into the mighty waters. And in the waters the aphrodisiac(?), šaḫi-and *parnulli*-wood yaršijet/a-d. When Ḫedammu tasted the taste of the brewage, a sweet dream seized the soul of the mighty Ḫedammu’.

CHD (P: 179) translates “in the waters (Ḫedammu) smelled the aphrodisiac(?), šaḫi-wood, and p.”., interpreting yaršijet as “smelled”. This cannot be correct. Firstly, we would have expected that *parnulli* would be in the accusative case, *parnullin* (just as in line 6), if it were the object of yaršijet. Secondly, if Ḫedammu were the subject of yaršijet, I do not see why he is not already mentioned by name in this line. The fact that Ḫedammu’s name is expressly used in line 8 indicates that he is introduced as a new topic there, which means that he cannot have been the subject to yaršijet.

In my view, it is clear that šaḫisetar, Gššaḫis and Gšparnulli are the subject of yaršijet and that this verb describes the process by which the strewing of these three objects into the waters yields the KAS (which must stand for ‘brewage’ here and not for ‘beer’), whose yaršula- intoxicates Ḫedammu. So it is not coincidental that yaršijet and yaršula- both show a root yarš-: the verb means ‘produces the yaršula-’, or ‘dissolve into yaršula-’ (cf. Siegelová’s translation “zerging”). See at yaršula- for further treatment.

In CHD Š: 178 the words ša-ni-iz-zi ya-ar-aš-ta (KUB 27.29 ii 16) are translated as “he smelled the sweet things”, again as if we are dealing with a verb
yarš- ‘to smell’. Yet the context is too broken to ascertain this interpretation, and e.g. Haas & Wegner (1988a: 135-6) translate “süß ... wegwischte”.

(yaršma- (c.) ‘(piece of) firewood’: nom.sg. yar-ar-ša-ma-aš, acc.sg. yar-ar-ša-ma-an (VSNF 12.65 i 26, KUB 7.47 obv. 4), yar-ar-ša-ma-a[n] (KUB 32.138 rev. 5), ṹ VAR-yar-ša-ma-an (KUB 32.129 rev. 3 (NS)), abl. yar-ar-ša-ma-za (KUB 26.58 obv. 11), yar-ar-ša-am-ma-za (KBo 6.29 + KUB 21.12 i 22 (NH)), acc.pl. yar-ar-ša-mu-uš (often), yar-ar-ša-ma-aš (KBo 13.131 obv. 5), yar-ar-ša-am-ma-aš (KUB 17.10 ii 14 (OH/MS)).

PIE *urh₁-smo-

This word is commonly spelled yar-ar-ša-m-, but occasionally we find a spelling with geminate -mm- (ya-ar-ša-am-m-), and once a spelling yar-ar-ša-ma-. Especially this last spelling indicates that phonetically, this word was /uarsMa-/ or /uʃrmMa-/. The spelling ṹ VAR-yar-ša-ma-an (KUB 32.129 rev. 3) is cited by HW: 247 as Ṣ VAR-yar-ša-ma-an, but this seems incorrect to me: nevertheless, because of its aberrancy (note that on the same tablet we find yar-ar- (ibid. 4)), we can disregard this spelling.

For the meaning, cf. for instance

KUB 17.10 iii
15 ma-a-ha-an yar-ar-nu-ī-e-ver Ṣ VAR-Te-li-pi-nu-ya-aš-_salary a kar-pi-[iš]
16 kar-di-mi-ja-az yar-ar-nu-ul ša-a-u-ar QA-TAM-MA yar-ra-[ni]

‘(Pieces of) firewood is broken. While they burn these pieces of firewood, the anger, rage, fury and wrath of Telipinu burns likewise’;

KUB 51.22 rev. (with additions from dupl. KUB 32.138 ii 11f.)
1 [Gš yar-ar-ša-ša-mu-uš-š=a [(ki-iš-ta-ša-ši]]
2 [(n=a-at=kān) pa-ra-a pār-ni pé-e-da-a[i] n=a-ša-ša-an]
3 [ḫa-aš-š(i)i] iš-ḫu-u-ya-a-i
4 [(n=a-ša ar-)-ha] ya-ar-mu-zī
5 [Gš] yar-ar-ša-mu-uš kar[(a)-š]-šī]
6 [n=a-ša=ša-an [DUU pA-ḫu-n[(a-)-]-iš]]
7 [I-NA] ŠA-ni PA-NI DINGIR₁닐 pé-e-da-a[i]
8 [ ḫa-aš]-šu-un-ga-ī-zīf]
9 [ ] A-NA DINGIR₁닐 pa-ra-a ŠU-ḫu-u-ya-a-i]
10 [nu Gš yar-ar-ša-mu-uš kān-ti-ša-ši]
‘And he extinguishes the pieces of firewood. He carries it out to the house, and throws them into the fire-place. He sets them alight. He cuts pieces of firewood and brings them in a pahyunalliti-container into the inner room to the deity. [He presses them and] throws them in front of the deity. [He covers(?)] the pieces of fir]ewood with wheat and speaks as follows’.

It is likely that yaršma- is connected with ur.q ‘to burn’ (especially visible in the first context). If so, it probably shows a suffix *-smo-, which is further unattested in Hittite, however (unless tarašma- ‘skull’ (q.v.) shows it as well). As I argued at ur.q, this verb reflects *urh₁-ôri, which means that yaršma- reflects *urh₁smo-. Note that a sequence *CrHSC- normally yields Hitt. /CrisC- (e.g. in paripriške/a- < *pri-prh₁-ske/o-), which means that in *urh₁smo- the *u- may have caused a slightly different development. A similar development is visible in duqaraške/a- < *dʰurh₁-ske/o- (the old imperfective of duqarni-”/duqarn- ‘to break’ (q.v.)). See at ur.q for further etymology.

yaršula- (c./n.) ‘fume, haze, vapour’: nom.sg.c. ya-ar-šu-la-aš (KBo 3.5 iv 32, KUB 7.23, 11 (fr.), KUB 12.65, 21 (fr), KUB 15.34 ii 32, KUB 24.1 i 10 // KUB 17.10 ii 7, KUB 36.44 iv 4, KUB 36.95 iii 6, FHG 2 + KUB 33.45+53, 25, VBoT 58 i 11, ), acc.sg. ya-ar-šu-la-an (KUB 24.14 i 22, KUB 33.52 iii 7, 2073/g, 3), dat-loc.sg. ya-ar-šu-li (KBo 4.13 vi 6, KUB 25.32 + KUB 27.70 iii 28, KUB 25.37 + KUB 35.131 i 42, ii 12, KUB 27.12, 5, IBoT 1.1 iii 3, 6, 13, etc.), ya-ar-šu-li-i (KUB 20.99 iii 21), ya-ar-šu-lı, (KUB 17.35 i 33, iv 32), nom.-acc.pl.n. ya-ar-šu-la (KBo 3.2 ii’ 11).

The exact interpretation of this word is debated. It often occurs in the syntagm yaršuli eku₂: 

IBoT 1.1 iv

(9) 3 BE.LU=ši me-na-ah-ḥa-an[-da]
(10) ya-ar-šu-li
(11) a-ku-ya-an-zi

(12) [LU]GAL-uš GUB-aš åU-an
(13) åUR.SAG Piš-ku-ru-nu-ya-an
(14) y[a]-ar-šu-li 1=ŠU
(15) e-ku-zi
‘The three lords opposite him drink yaršuli. While standing, the king drinks yaršuli the Storm-god and the mountain Piškurunuḫa once’;

KUB 20.99 iii
(18) LUGAL-uš=za=kân ŠU[^12] a-ar-ri n=a-aš ša-ra-a
(19) tī-e-ez zi n=a-aš PA-NI[^13] KIN 4IM
(20) pa-e-z zi m[^4] URI ša-ar-iš-ša
(21) ya-ar-šu-4-li 1=ŠU e-ku-zi

‘The king washes his hands and steps upwards and goes to the ḫuyaši-stone of the Storm-god. He drinks yaršuli the Storm-god of Šarriša once’.

A few times, yaršula- occurs together with Gtš ERIN ‘cedar wood’:

KUB 24.1 i
(11) ki-nu-na-a=ti-ta ša-ne-ez-zi-iš ū-ar-šu-la-aš
(12) Gtš ERIN-an-za 1-an-za kal-li-iš-du n=a-aš-ta EGRID-pa
(13) ḫa-ri-im-ni an-da e-ḫu

‘May the sweet y. (from/and) cedar wood and oil call you now, come back into the temple!’;

KUB 15.34 ii
(32) Gtš ERIN-aš=ma ū-ar-[u-la]-aš Gtš di INNANA-ja-ša ḫq-[i]-ja-tar[Lu] AZU-aš me-mḫ-iṯa-aš

‘Let there be on the party for the gods y. of cedar wood, the sl[r[i[king] of the Istar-instrument and the reciting of the priest’.

In HW (274), Friedrich translates this word as “Besänftigung, Beruhigung” and “Erfrischung” but adjusts this to “Tropfen; Saft; Duft” in HW Erg. 3: 36 (on the basis of Laroche 1963: 61), stating that, when used with eku₂ ‘to drink’, yaršuli means “(im Tropfen), tropfenweise”. Güterbock (1986: 212) proposes to translate yaršula- as ‘smell’, and states that “yarsuli ekuzi should be translated “he drinks in the smell” and refers to “drinking the god” only by sniffing the aroma of the wine”. This translation, ‘smell, odor’, is taken over in CHD (e.g. the third context cited here is translated in CHD Ș: 176 as ‘let the fragrant odor, (namely) the cedar and the oil summon you’). This works also fine for e.g.
KUB 24.14 i
(22) Š4 UR.GI₁₇ = ma-a-ta ya-ar-šu-la-an
(23) a-ya-an ar-ḫa pár-ḫu-un Š4 UR.GI₁₇ = ma šal-pa-aš UZU UR.GI₁₇
(24) UZU GÎR.PAD.DU UR.GI₁₇ = ja ši-mi-ši-ja-mu-un

‘I have driven away from you the odor of the dog; I have burned the dung(?) of the dog, the flesh of the dog, and the bones of the dog’ (translation: CHD Š: 107);

KBo 3.5 iv
(31) ma-aḫ-ḫa-an=m=a-aš ar-ḫa la-a-an-zī n=a-aš I-NA É LO KUŠ₂
(32) an-da pé-e-ḫu-da-an-zī ma-aḫ-ḫa-an=m=a-aš=kān ya-ar-šu-la-aš
(33) pa-ra-a pa-iz-zī n=a-aš S=ŠU ar-ru-ya-an-zī nam-m=a-aš
(34) kat-kat-ti-nu-an-zī

‘When they unharness them (the horses), they bring them into the stable. When they begin to smell (lit. When smell goes forth from them), they wash them five times and then make them shrug’ (translation: CHD P: 33);

KBo 3.2 rev.
(10) ma-aḫ-ḫa-an=m=a-aš ar-ḫa la-a-an-zī nu-u=s-ma-aš
KUŠ₂ KIR₄ TAB.ANŠE=ŠU-NU pa-ra-a Ŭ-UL
(11) da-an-zī n=a-aš kat-ta aš-nu-an-zī ya-ar-šu-la=ja-a=s-ma-aš kat-ta
pe-e-da-i

‘When they unharness them they do not take off of them their halter. They rub them down (lit. treat them), and it carries their odors down’ (cf. CHD P: 352).

In the following context (cf. Siegelová 1971: 58), a translation ‘smell, odor’ is not fully correct: KUB 33.84+ iv (8) [(nu GIM-an MUS Ḥē-dam-mu-tē) ya-ar-š]u-la-an KÂŠ is-taḥ-ta ‘When Ḫedammu tasted the y. of the brewage’. Here we seem to be dealing with ‘taste’. Another translation is also necessary in KUB 36.44 iv (4) nu ya-ar-šu-la-aš=te-eš a[m]-me-el kat-ta u-ya-ru ‘Let your (i.e. ʿUTU) y. be seen by me’. Here it is clear that we are dealing with something visible. All in all, yarsula- seems to denote the immaterial appearance of a certain object in smell, taste or “materialization”. We could think of a basic meaning ‘fume, haze, vapour’.
Within Hittite, we probably have to assume that yaɾšula- is cognate with yaɾša- 'fog, mist'. See there for etymological treatment. See also at yaɾšije/a-² "to produce yaɾšula-".

 Yan- 'to plaid together': 3pl.pres.act. ya-ar-ta-an-zi (KBo 3.2 rev.¹ 7).
 PIE *yert- 'to turn'

This verb occurs only once, in the Kikkuli-text:

KBo 3.2 rev.¹
(6) ma-aɾʃ-ḥa-an=m=a-aʃ İD-az ša-ra-a ú-ya-da-an-zi
(7) nu-u=š-ma-aʃ KUN⁸¹⁻¹=ŠU an-da ya-ar-ta-an-zi n=a-aš tu-u-ri-ja-an-zí
(8) n=a-aš ½ DANNA pê-en-na-i

‘When they lead them (the horses) up out of the river, they anda y. their tails for them and harness them. One drives them half a mile’.

It should be noticed that the third sign of the word ya-ar-ta-an-zi is slightly damaged: the second upright wedge is lost, so in principle a reading ŠA is possible as well. Nevertheless, the place of the first vertical wedge shows that we are dealing with TA, as it should have been more to the right if the sign were ŠA.

Kammenhuber (1961a: 137) translates the sentence as ‘dreht man ihnen ihre Schwänze ein’, which indeed seems to be a meaningful translation.

Etymologically, a connection with PIE *yert- 'to turn' (thus Kammenhuber o.c. 136⁴⁹) seems appealing. Problematic, however, could be the fact that all other IE languages seem to show that *yert- means 'to turn (oneself)' and is not used as a transitive verb. Yet in Hittite, the use of the preverb anda could be crucial in this regard. Kammenhuber assumes that yar- is a borrowing from Indic (just as -yartanna (q.v.), which is only found in the Kikkuli-text as well), but this cannot be decided on formal grounds: a preform *yrteni ‘they turn’ would by regular sound law give Hitt. yartanzi (vocalization of *yr- to yar- in analogy to the singular, where we would expect *yertmi to give **yartmi).

-yaɾtanna ‘for ... rounds’

This word only occurs in the Kikkuli text, as the second member of compounds aikayaɾtanna ‘for one round’, tiɾayeɾtanna ‘for three rounds’, paɾzayaɾtanna ‘for five rounds’, šataɾyartanna ‘for seven rounds’ and nʰyaɾtanna ‘for nine
rounds’ (probably haplology for *nayayartanna). All these words are borrowed from Indic. The element -yartanna corresponds to Skt. vartani- ‘road, course’.


The word occurs a few times only:

KUB 7.13 obv. (with additions from dupl. KUB 46.56 obv.7 4-7)
(18) ... EGIQ-QD-a[a=ma=y(a=r=a-)a-an]\n(19) ḫu-im-ma-aš tar-na-a-ū kat-ta-an=ma=ya-r=a-an ta-ga-an[-zi-(pa-aš)]\n(20) GIŠ.ŪR tar-na-a-ū GUNNI-aš=ya-r=a-an ya-ar-du-li-iš[-s=a’]\n(21) tar-na-a-ū GIŠ a-ra-ša-aš=ya-r=a-an GIŠ kat-ta-lu-uz[-zi]=ja t[ar-na-a-ū]

‘Then, may the ḫuimma- release [him]. May the flo[or] below (and) the roof-beam’ release him. May the hearth [and] the u. release him. May the door and the lintel re[lease] him’;

KUB 24.9+ iii (see Jakob-Rost 1972: 45-6 for transliteration)
(27) [(ma-an z)]i-in-ni-iz-zi ma-u=š-ša-an ((mu>) ya-a-tar
(28) [(I-N.Z 5 GAL GIR₄) la-a-ḫu-ya-i n=e=ta ŠA.BA A-NA GAL G[(IR₄)]
(29) [(ta-ri-ja-at)-ta-(a-r)]i-ja-an 1 GAL GIR₄ ya-ar-du-li-[(e-eš)]
(30) [(I GAL G)]IR₄ GEŠTIN ma-ah-la-aš ḫu-el-pi-ši 1 GAL GIR₄ [(aš-ḫa-ī-ū-ul)]
(31) [1 GAL GIR₄ (ir-ḫa-a-į)]t nu ku-itt=a ar-ḫa-ja šar-ra-[(i)]

‘When she is finished, she pours water in 5 clay cups. And of these, in one cup (she puts) tariattarija-, in one cup yardul’s, in one cup the young branch of a vine, in one cup ašḫušul (and) in one cup irḫat. And each one she divides separately’;

ibid.
(41) [E]GIQ-an-da=ma ya-ar-du-li-in la-ḫu-u-[a-a-i]
(42) [nu he-ez-zi ku u-an UN-an DINGIR₄ GIQ ya-ar-du-la-aš]
(43) [........-a]r a-aš-ša-an-ni an-da ḫu-u-la-li-[ja-at-tên]

‘Then she pours the yardul- and says: “O gods, you must surround this man [.....] of’ yardul- (and) in well-being!”’;

ChS I/5, Nr.7 i
(2) [ te-PU GIQ (an-tar-ṣi-la-a)]t NUMUN-an te-PU
It is difficult to establish what yarduli- denotes exactly. In KUB 24.9+ it seems to denote some kind of liquid that can be poured. In KUB 7.13, however, it appears in the pair GUNNI-āš yarduliś[š=a] ‘hearth and y.’, which in one way or another must be similar to taganzipaš GIŠ.UR ‘floor and roof-beam’ and ǧašlāšāš ǧaškattaluzziš=tā ‘door and lintel’. Moreover, in the Allaituraḫi-ritual (ChS 1/5, Nr. 7 i 3) it appears with the determinative GIŠ. It therefore is likely that yarduli- denotes some kind of plant, the juice of which could be used in magical practices. The connection with ‘hearth’, however, remains unclear. No etymology.


The manyfold usage of gloss wedges as well as the occurrence of a Luwian inflected erg.sg. yaryalanteš (note the i-Motion!) in

\[ \text{KUB 4.10 ii} \]
\[ \text{(24) da-me-da-ni-}=a=at \times ya-ar-ya-la-ni le-e pi-ja-an-zi} \]
\[ \text{(25) Še } \text{ Ul-mi-}A \text{U-up}=pāt \text{ (or } -up-p=pāt ?) \times ya-ar-ya-la-na-an-te-eš ḫa-r-du} \]

‘They shall not give it to another progeny, the progeny of (only?) Ulmiteššub must have (it?)’,

indicates that we are dealing with an origial Luwian word. Starke (1990: 480f.) argues that this word has to be read as yaryatn- (reading the sign LA (ʼš) as AT (š)), but Melchert (1993b: 261-2) speaks against this because of a possible connection with ʾUaryališa-. Moreover, Starke assumes that the paradigm originally was yaryattar, yaryatn-, but this would not fit the neuter n-stem endings that are used with the sumerogram NUMUN (e.g. nom.-acc.pl.
NUMUNHA-na). I therefore follow Melchert and interpret this word as a neuter n-stem yarqal\-an-. No etymology, however.

\textit{\textit{ya\d{r}u}n stems} (Ib > Ic1) ‘to buy’: 2sg.pres. act. \textit{ya-a\d{r}tu} (KUB 4.3 i 12 (NS)), 3sg.pres. act. \textit{ya-a\d{r}ti} (KBo 6.2 ii 45, 46, 49 (OS), KUB 29.29, 11 (OS), KUB 13.8 obv. 16 (MH/NS), VSNF 12.57 i 9 (NS), VSNF 12.127 obv. 6), \textit{ya-a\d{r}ti-zi} (often, NH), 2pl.pres. act. \textit{ya-a\d{r}ti-[l]a-at-te-}ni (KUB 13.4 ii 72 (OH/NS)) 1sg.pret. act. \textit{ya-a\d{r}ti-nu-an} (KUB 31.78 iv 8 (NS)), \textit{ya-a\d{r}ti-ja-nu-un} (KUB 7.6, 2 (NS)), 3sg.pret. act. \textit{ya-a\d{r}ti-[j]a-at} (often), 2pl.imp. act. \textit{ya-a\d{r}ti-t\-en} (KUB 23.72 rev. 36a (MH/MS)); inf.I \textit{ya-a\d{r}ti-ja-u-ya-an-zi} (KUB 31.76 ii 3 (NS)).

IE cognates: Skt. \textit{vas\textasciitilde{n}a-} ‘price’, Gr. \(\omega\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\) (n.) ‘price’, Lat. \textit{v\"elenium dare} ‘to sell’, Arm. \textit{gin} ‘price’ < *\textit{yesno-}.

PIE *\textit{u\textasciitilde{os}-e\textasciitilde{i}}/*\textit{u\textasciitilde{es}-\textasciitilde{e\textasciitilde{n}i}}

For the semantics of this verb, compare e.g.

\textit{KBo 6.26 ii} 
(27) \textit{t\'{a}k-ku} \(\text{\textsuperscript{1}\text{\textl}}}\) \textit{M\d{U}\d{S}EN.D\textsuperscript{\textasciitilde{U}}-a[n a]n-na-mu-ya-an-ta-an ku-i\d{sh}-ki ya-a\d{r}ti 
(28) 25 G\textit{\textasciitilde{I}}N K\textit{\textasciitilde{U}}.BA\textit{BBAR} pa-
(29) \textit{d\textasciitilde{a}m-pu-\textasciitilde{u}-\textasciitilde{p}-in ku-i\d{sh}-ki ya-a\d{r}ti 20 G\textit{\textasciitilde{I}}N K\textit{\textasciitilde{U}}.B\textit{BBAR} pa-

‘If someone buys a trained augur, he will pay 25 silver shekels. If someone buys an inferior man or woman, he will pay 20 silver shekels’.

The oldest forms of this verb, 3sg.pres.act. \textit{\textit{y\d{a}\d{o}s}} (OS) and 2pl.imp.act. \textit{\textit{y\d{a}s\textasciitilde{t}en}} (MH/MS), clearly shows that we are dealing with a stem \textit{y\d{a}s-} that is \(\text{\textasciitilde{h}i-}\) conjugated. Unfortunately, no weak stem forms are attested on the basis of which the ablaut of this verb can be determined. See at \textit{\textit{u\textasciitilde{s}\textasciitilde{n}\textasciitilde{e}v\textasciitilde{a}-}}2 ‘to put up for sale’, however, for an inner-Hittite cognate that reflects zero-grade. In NS texts, we find a secondary stem \textit{\textit{y\d{a}s\textasciitilde{t}e}v\textasciitilde{a}-2}, which is formed on the basis of 3sg.pres.act. \textit{\textit{y\d{a}s\textasciitilde{i}}}. Already since Götze (1928: 99\textsuperscript{2}) this verb is generally connected with Skt. \textit{vas\textasciitilde{n}a-} ‘price’, Gr. \(\omega\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\) (n.) ‘price’, Lat. \textit{v\"elenium} ‘sale’, etc. that all go back to a root \textit{\textasciitilde{u}\textasciitilde{es}-} ‘to buy’. This means that Hitt. \textit{\textit{y\d{a}s\textasciitilde{i}}} must go back to \textit{\textit{u\textasciitilde{os}-e\textasciitilde{i}}}.

\textit{\textit{ya\d{a}\d{s}\textasciitilde{s}\textasciitilde{s}}-2}; see \textit{\textit{ye\d{s}\textasciitilde{s}-m\textasciitilde{n}}} \textit{\textit{ya\d{s}\textasciitilde{s\textasciitilde{e}v-a}-2}}

\textit{\textit{ya\d{s}\textasciitilde{n}a-n}} ‘track’

The word is found in the Kikkuli-text only:

1134
When they unharness them, they wash them with warm water. Then they bring them to the river and make them immerse three times. Then they harness them and let them gallop nine rounds of the track for one mile and 80 IKU. The height of the track is six IKU, its width is four IKU. He makes (them) turn nine times around the track;

KUB 1.11 + KUB 29.57 iv
(20) nam-m=a-aš kat-kat-ti-mu-an-zi n=a-aš ar-ra-an-du-uš
(21) tu-u-ri-ja-an-zi n=a-aš ŠU 1 DANNA 20 IKU
(22) pár-ša-an-du-uš’ pa-a-an-zi ya-ša-an-na
(23) m=a-aš pár-ku-ya-tar=še-et 5 IKU DAGAL=ZO ma 3 IKU ŠU ma ja
(24) a-ra-aḫ-za-an-da=m=a-aš’ IŠ-TU 4 IKU ya-aḫ-ša-ma-a[n]
(25) ANŠE.KUR.RA=ma a-ra-aḫ-na-an-da 6=ŠU ya-aḫ-ša-an-[z][i]

‘Then they make them immerse and harness them after being washed. They go galloping for one mile and twenty IKU, on the track. Its height is five IKU, its width is three IKU and a half. It is surrounded with trees. They make the horses surround it six times’.

The word probably denotes ‘track’ or something similar. Because of its use with naṣartanna, which is an Indic word, it is likely that yašanna-, too, is of Indic origin. Kammenhuber (1961a: 138-9) even suggests that the form ya-ša-an-na-ša-ja is to be interpreted as a spelling of an Indic gen.sg. *vasannasya ‘of vasanna-’. Unfortunately, I do not know of an Indic word *vasan(n)ya- that would fit this meaning.

**yašša-**: see yašpa-

**yaššē/a-z**: see yešš-i, yaššē/a-z
**yašhar** (n.) ‘onion(?)’ (Sum. SUM\textsuperscript{SAR}(?):) nom.-acc.sg. ya-aš-ḫar (KUB 60.57, 7).

PIE *uosh₂-r/n-?

This word is hapax in the following context:

KUB 60.57

(6) [ ]x SISKUR aš-ša-nu-ya-an-zi nu x[ ]
(7) [ ]ku-e im-ma ku-e ya-aš-ḫar x[ ]
(8) [ ]ku-ītu-ma-an=kān DINGIR\textsuperscript{LAM} I-NA[ ]

‘[...] they take care of the ritual. [...] whatever yašhar [...] When the deity in [...]’.

Although on the basis of this fragmentary context a meaning for yašhar cannot be determined, it is likely that this word must be equated with yašhar as found in the compound šuppiyaššar\textsuperscript{SAR} ‘onion(?)’ (lit. ‘pure yašhar’) (q.v.). This could mean that just as šuppiyaššar corresponds to the sumerogram SUM.SIKIL\textsuperscript{SAR}, yašhar possibly corresponds to SUM\textsuperscript{SAR}.

The fact that šuppiyaššar shows a derivative šuppiyaššanallī- could indicate that yašhar, if it is correctly connected with šuppiyaššar, is r/n-inflected.

Mechanically, yašhar seems to reflect *uosh₂-r/n-, but I do not know of any cognates. Further unknown.

**yašši-** (n.) ‘(ingredients of) medicine’: nom.-acc.sg. ya-aš-ši, nom.-acc.pl. ya-aš-ši\textsuperscript{HIA}.

This word denotes ‘medicine’, or ‘ingredients of medicine’:

KBo 5.2 iv

(20) nu 1 kap-pi-in ŠE da-a-i\textsuperscript{NA} ZA.GI\textsuperscript{NA} GUG\textsuperscript{NA} AŠ.NU\textsubscript{11} GAL
(21) te-pu da-a-i ḫu-u-uš-ti-in GIŞ\textsuperscript{ERIN} GİŞ\textsuperscript{NEG} te-pu
(22) da-a-i n=a-at=ša-an A-NA\textsuperscript{DUG} ku-uš-ku-uš-šu-ul-li
(23) kat-ta ku-uš-ku-uš-zi ar-ḫa=m=a-at ši-ḫi-il-li-ja-aš
(24) ú-i-te-ni-it tar-na-i n=a-aš-ta EN SISKUR \textsuperscript{4} UTU-ja
(25) me-na-aḫ-ḫa-an-da ti-i-e-ez-zi nu ke-e ya-aš-ši
(26) ta-an-ga-ra-an-za e-ku-zī

‘He takes one bowl of barley, he takes a little lapis-lazuli, carnelian and alabaster and he takes a little ḫūšti-, cedar and tamarisk and pounds them in a mortar. He
dissolves it in purified water. The patient steps in front of the Sun-god and drinks this medicine on an empty stomach.

KBo 5.2 iv
(37) ... nu=kán¹AZU a-pé-e-ez še-er ar-ḫa
(38) la-a-ḫu-i nu DUG.GIR₄ šu-un-na-i n=a-aš-ta A-NA DUG-zA
(39) ši-ḫe-ell-li-ja-āš ya-a-tar ku-it an-da nu=za a-pé-e-ez a-ur-ri
(40) DUG.GAL=ma ku-iš šu-u-ya-an-za n=a-ār' A-NA ya-aš-ši[H₄] da-a-i
(41) nu ya-aš-ši[H₄] ku-uš-ku-uš-ša-an-zi n=a-aš=kán A-NA ¹EN.ZU
(42) me-na-āḫ-ḫa-an-da ti-i-e-ezi n=a-at a-da-an-za e-ku-zi

‘The magician pours out of it and fills the clay cup. He washes himself with the purified water that is in the vessel. He places the cup that was filled near the ingredients. They pound the ingredients and he steps opposite the Moongod. While eating, he drinks it.’

KUB 6.36 ii
(6) [ma-a-a]n=za=kán an-tu-ḫš-ša-an a-ū-li-iš e-e-p-zi
(7) [ma-a-a]n an-tu-ḫš-ša-an IG[H₄]-y[a] iš-tar[-ak-zi]
(8) [ ]x ki-i ya-aš-ši da-a-i

‘When auli- seizes a man, when the eyes of a man ail, [ ... ] he will take this medicine’.

No clear etymology.

yaššie/a³: see yāš³

yaššie/a³: see yešš₃; yašše/a³

yašku(i)- (c.) ‘offense, sin’: acc.sg. ya-aš-ku-in (KBo 24.122, 25 (NS), KUB 15.1 iii 45 (NH), KUB 18.63 i 21 (NS)), ya-aš-ku-un (KUB 18.63 iv 20 (NS)), gen.sg. ya-[aš]-kē-ḫu-ja-aš (KUB 15.6 i 16 (NS)), dat.-log.sg. ya-aš-ku-i (IBoT 2.129 obv. 26 (NS)), nom.pl.c. ya-aš-ku-i-e-eš (KUB 5.6 i 7 (NS), KUB 18.18, 3 (NS)), acc.pl.c. ya-aš-ku-uš (KUB 5.9 obv. 29 (NS)), dat.-loc.pl. ya-aš-ku-ya-aš (KBo 23.114 obv. 29, 29 (NS)), ya-aš-ku-aš (KUB 16.48 rev. 6 (NS)).

See Weitenberg 1984: 270 for attestations. This word occurs in NH and NS texts only. It shows u-stem forms (e.g. acc.sg. yašku) as well as i-stem forms (e.g. acc.sg. yaškuin), but it cannot be determined which inflection is more original. The one attestation with gloss wedge, namely *ya-aš-ku-u-i-š[a] (ABoT 56 iv 6) is interpreted by Starke (1990: 180) as a Luwian nom.-acc.sg.-form yaškui=ša of a Luwian neuter stem yaškuit-. According to Starke, the forms that show a Hitt. stem yaškui- are based on an adaptation of this Luwian word. The Hittite forms that show a u-stem yašku- are, according to Starke, borrowed from CLuw. *yašku(i)- (a commune word with i-Motion), the stem of which is still visible in CLuw. yaškui(ya)limma/-i (adj.) 'sinful'. The fact that Hitt. yašku(i)- is attested in NS texts only, supports these assumptions.

Eichner (1974: 71) suggests that CLuw. yaškuit- and *yašku(i)- are the regular outcomes of a stem *yašt- (showing a development *ty > ky), which he connects with Hitt. yašta- / yašt- 'to sin' and its derivative uštul-, yaštul- 'sin'. Although a Luwian development *ty > ky is hard to prove (cf. Melchert 1994a: 274), this suggestion may offer an attractive explanation of the semantic similarity between the Luwian and the Hittite words. Note that besides the extended stem *yašt- CLuwian also possesses the unextended stem yašta-, which is cited under the lemma yašta- / yašt-. See there, too, for an etymological treatment.

**Yašpa-** (c.) ‘clothing’ (Sum. TÚG(?)): nom.sg. ya-aš-ša-pa-aš (KBo 35.109, 6, KUB 27.28 i 7), acc.sg. ya-aš-pa-an (KBo 17.93 obv. 11 (MS), KUB 31.69 obv. 5, 6); broken ya-aš-ša-pa[...] (KBo 8.114 obv. 8).


PIE *yos-bʰo-? 

This word occurs a few times only, e.g.

KUB 31.69 obv. 5

(4) [ma-a-an-dISTARURULa-ya-za-an-ti-ja GAŠAN=IA A-NA UTUŠI I-NA K[UR
URULAr-za-u-ua] 

(5) [p-ən ḫu-u]-i-ja-st tu-el=za ya-aš-pa-an LÚ-aš i-ya-ar ya-aš-ši-[a-ši] 

(6) [MUNUS]-ja=za i-ya-ar ya-aš-ši-ja-st tu-el=za ya-aš-pa-an NÎTE-š[i ...]
'When you, Ištar of Lašanzantija, My Lady, rush forth to My Majesty in the land of Arzazu, you put on your ū. like a man, and you put (it) on like a woman. And your ū. on your body [...]';

KBo 8.114 obv.
(7) mu₄LUGAL-pāt ya-aš-ša-an-z[i ... ]
(8) ̄A-N₄'LUGAL-ma ya-aš-ša-pa[- ... ]

'They clothe Šarruma. [...] to Šarruma a yaššapa[- ... ]'.

On the basis of the contextual evidence, Goetze (1955: 50-1) suggested that yašpa- must be the word underlying the sumerogram TÚG 'clothes'.

As Goetze already noticed, the word seems to be derived from the verb yešš₄₄, yaške/a- 'to clothe'. Watkins (1969b) compares yašpa- to Lat. vespillo 'undertaker < *dresser (of dead bodies)' (cf. the fact that CLuw. yašpant- is found in a negative (funereal) context) and reconstructs *uos-po-. The several Hitt. attestations ya-aš-ša-pa- seem to point to phonological /uaŠša-/ which then must reflect *uos-b₄₄o-.

Goetze (l.c.) points to the fact that the plural form TÚG₄₄A appears with commune as well as neuter adjectives, which shows that yašpa-, although basically commune, could form a coll.pl. in -a as well.

yašta₁ / yašt- (Halyy) 'to sin, to offend': 2sg.pres.act. ya-aš-ta-at-ši (KUB 6.44 iv 32 (NH)), ya-aš-ta-ši (NH, offen), ya-aš-ta-a-ši (NH, 2x), 3sg.pres.act. [y]a-aš-ta-i (KBo 9.73 obv. 6 (OS)), ú-ya-aš-ta-i (KBo 5.28 ii 10 (OH/NS)), ya-aš-ta-i (KUB 13.8 obv. 12 (MH/NS)), ya-aš-da-a-i (KUB 23.68+ obv. 28 (MH/NS)), ya-aš-ti (KUB 1.16 + KUB 40.65 iii 60 (OH/NS)), 3pl.pres.act. ya-aš-ta-an-zi (KBo 16.47 i 8 (MH/MS)), 1sg.pret.act. ya-aš-ta-ah-hu-un (KUB 14.11 + 650/u iii 29 (NH)), ya-aš-da-hu-un (KUB 26.32 i 11 (NH/NS)), 2sg.pret.act. ya-aš-ta-at-ta (KUB 33.24 i 33 (OH/NS)), ya-aš-ta-aš (NH), 2pl.pret.act. ya-aš-ta-at-te-en (KBo 16.27 i 23 (MH/MS)), 3pl.pret.act. ya-aš-te-e-r (NH), ya-aš-ti-e-r (NH); verb.noun ya-aš-di-mar (KBO 4.14 ii 60, 64, 71); impf. ya-aš-ta-š-e-k-e/a- (KUB 23.72 obv. 36 (MH/MS)), ya-aš-te-es-ke/a- (KUB 14.11 + 650/u iii 26 (NH)).

Derivatives: yaštanu₄ (Ib2) 'to make into a sin, to regard as an offense' (3sg.pres.act. ya-aš-ta-uru-zi, 3pl.pres.act. ya-aš-ta-uru-zi, 1sg.pret.act. ya-aš-ta-uru; part. ya-aš-ta-uru-ya-an-t-), yaštahh₂ (Ib2) 'to sin, to offend' (impf. ya-aš-ta-ah-he-eš-ke/a- (KUB 36.86 obv. 8 (NS)), yašta₁ (c.) 'sin, offense' (nom.sg. ya-aš-ta-i-iš (KBO 4.3+i 33 (NH)), ya-aš-ta-iš (KUB 21.19 iii
In the oldest texts, this verb clearly inflects according to the *tarna*-class. Forms that are inflected according to the *hatrae*-class (*yāštāhi*) and the *-i*/*a*-class (*yāstier*) are found in NH texts only and are clearly secondary due to the high productivity of both the *hatrae-* and the *-i*/*a*-class in this period. Within Hittite, the noun *uštul-, yāštul-* ‘sin’ clearly is a derivative, and shows that originally this verb must have had a weak stem *ušt-.* Because Hittite did not tolerate an inner-paradigmatic alternation between *#yVC* and *#uC* (cf. Kloekhorst ftbc.b), the original paradigm *yāštā- / ušt-* was altered to *yāštā- / yāšt-* with generalization of the full-grade stem.

Verbs that belong to the *tarna*-class can go back to three different structures: *CR-no-H*, *Ce-C(r)oh-* or *CoRCh23-* (see § 2.2.2.d for these types). In the case of *yāštā-* only the latter type is applicable, which indicates that *yāštā- / ušt-* mechanically goes back to *yāṣTh23-ei / usTh23-enti.* I know of no convincing IE cognates. Catsanicos (1991) unconvincingly argues that Hitt. *yāštā-* is cognate with Gr. ãrīn ‘error, sin’ and reconstructs *h3ymst-* (followed by e.g. Melchert 1994a: 50). The latter word is more likely a verbal noun of Gr. ãrī ‘to damage’, however, which reflects *h2ṭeph2-* or *h2ṭeph2-* and may be connected with Lyc. qa- ‘to destroy’ (cf. Kloekhorst ftbc.c).

See at *yāṣku(i)-* for possible Luwian cognates.

*yāštā(r.i), yāštā(t)i* (1pl.midd.-endings): 1pl.pres.midd.: ar-*ya-aš-ta* (KUB 17.21 iv 5 (MH/MS), KBo 16.27 ii 3 (MH/MS)), u-*ya-u-ya-aš-ta-ri* (KBo 16.59 i 7 (NS)), e-*su-ya-aš-ta* (KUB 31.143 ii 36 (OS), KUB 12.66 iv 10 (OH/NS)), e-*suš-ta* (KBo 16.25 i 71 (MH/MS)), e-*suš-ya-aš-ta-i* (KBo 3.7 iv 7 (OH/NS), KUB 24.8 iv 6 (OH/NS), KUB 33.106 ii 13, 14 (NS)), i-*ja-ya-aš-ta-f(-...)* (KBo 17.48 obv. 6 (MS)), pa-*ahš-šu-ya-aš-ta* (KBo 16.27 iii 16 (MH/MS), KUB 19.25 i 13 (fr. (NH)), [ã]-li-ku-*ya-aš-ta-ti* (KBo 3.45, 9 (OH/NS)), za-*ahš-ji-a-ya-aš-ta* (KUB 31.44 ii 15 (MH/NS), 777v, 3 (fr. (NS)), za-*ahš-ji-a-u-ya-aš-ta-ti* (KBo 3.4 ii 13 (NH), KBo 12.27 iii 5 (NH), KUB 21.10, 9 (NH), KBo 14.6, 15 (NH)); 1pl.pret.midd.: ar-*ya-aš-ta-at* (KBo 16.59 obv. 14 (NS), KUB 23.115, 13 (MH/NS), 500/u, 7 (“erg.” (MS)), e-*š-su-ya-aš-ta-ti* (1490/u 14 (NS)), š-[u-]*ppa-*ri-ja-u-ya-aš-ta-ti* (KUB 8.48 i 1 (NS)).
The present-ending is found in three different forms, -yaśta, yaśtai and -yaśtari. It is clear that of these forms -yaśta is the more original one (attested in OS and MS texts), whereas -yaśtai and -yaśtari are found in NS texts only (see also Yoshida 1987 for this distribution). Note that -yaśtari is attested only once vs. 8 times -yaśtai. In the preterite, we find -yaśtat and -yaśtai. Almost all of these are found in NS texts, except possibly for ar-ya-aś-ta-at that Neu (1968: 5) cites in 500/u, 7 (MS, according to Košak 2005c: 162), but with the comment “(erg.)”. Does this mean that the whole form is added, of only a part of it?

Etymologically, this ending should be compared with Skt. -mahe, -mahi, Gr. -μη(τ)ιον, TochAB -mtār, which point to *-me(s)-dʰh₂. The -y- found in Hittite is comparable to 1pl.act. -yen(i), -yani (q.v.). This means that Hitt. -yaśta reflects (virtual) *-yos-dʰh₂ or *-yos-dʰh₂0 (with secondary -o in analogy to the other middle endings).

Yaśtul-: see uśtul-

Yaattai- (c.) ‘bird’ (Sum. MUŠEN): nom.pl. ya-at-ta-e-ēš (KBo 4.2 ii 32 (OH/NS)).

This word occurs only once, in

KBo 4.2 ii
(31) ... nu ki-[įš-ša-an me-ma-i]
(32) ku-i-e-ēš=ya ḫa-tu-ga-e-ēš ya-at-ta-e-ēš nu=ya=aš[=ša-an ... ]

‘he speaks as follows: “Whatever terrible yatattai-s (there are), them [...]”’.

Because of the occurrence of ḫatugi- MUŠENHA ‘terrible birds’ in

ibid. i
(16) nu=ya i-it-tēn ḫ[a-t]u-ga-uš MUŠENHA ki-iš-ta-mu-ut-te-en
(17) nu=ki-n ke-e NUMUNHA ma-ah-ḥa-an ki-iš-ta-ri
  kal-la-a-ra=rax(ra-ra)=kān
(18) ud-da-ar ḫa-tu-ga-uš=a MUŠENHA QA-TAM-MA ki-iš-ta-ru

‘You must go and exterminate the terrible birds. Just as these seeds are exterminated, may likewise the inauspicious words and the terrible birds be exterminated’.
Friedrich (1927: 190) suggests that *yattašš may be the phonetical spelling of MUSHEN. This suggestion is generally accepted.

Because of the diphthong-stem, it is likely that this word is inherited. Nevertheless, I do not know of any cognates.


Derivatives: see also *yida- ‘wet’.

IE cognates: Skt. udān-, Gr. θῦξις. Umbr. utur, OCS voda, Goth. wato, ON vatn, OSax. watar, OHG waŻzar ‘water’.

PIE *uód-r, ud-én-

The etymological tie-in of this word with the other IE words for ‘water’ (especially OSax. watar) was one of the keys to deciphering the Hittite language and has generally been accepted since then. The paradigm shows two stems, nom.-acc.sg. yātar besides obl. yittēn-. Since Schindler (1975a: 4-5) these stems have been explained as reflecting a static paradigm *uód-r, *uéd-n-.

See now Kloeckhorst (ftb.c), however, for my view that the PIE paradigm of ‘water’ was not static, but proterodynamic (*uód-r, *ud-én-) and that Hitt. yittēn- must be phonologically interpreted as /uīdēn-/ the phonetic outcome of *yēdēn-, which form shows an analogical restored consonantal *y- instead of expected vocalic *u- in analogy to nom.-acc. *yōdr. The basis of this analogy is the fact that alternation between initial consonantal ū and vocalic u was not tolerated in Hittite (cf. e.g. yekkō and uttar, uttan-).

**yattarije-a**-(at-) (Ilg.) ‘?': 3sg.imp.med. ya-at-ta-ri-et-ta-ru (KBo 12.96 i 15).

This verb occurs only once:

KBo 12.96 i

(14) [ma-a-a]n ŠA [Lü]Laa-an-da me-ma-i nu la-la-at-ta-ru
(15) [ma-a-a]n ŠA [Lü]Ua-at-tar-ya me-ma-i nu ya-at-ta-ri-et-ta-ru
‘If (someone) from the city Lalanda speaks, he must be i.-ed. If (someone) from Úattarú speaks, he must be y.-ed’.

From this context alone, a meaning cannot be determined. HW, Erg. 3: 36 glosses it with ‘quellen(?)’, but this meaning is based on the formal similarity with yattaru- ‘source, well’ only and has no merit. It is quite possible that we are dealing with a nonce-formation, created on the basis of the city name Úattarú.

NINDA yatarmašši- (c.) a kind of bread; acc.pl. NINDA ya-tar-na-ašši-ūš (KUB 55.54 obv. 17).

The suffix -ašši- could point to a Luwian origin. The exact meaning of this word is unclear, so no further etymology.


Derivatives: yatarnaḥḫa- ‘message, instruction’ (abl. ya-tar-na-aḫ-ḫa-az (KBo 12.85 ++ i 27 (MH/NS))).

This verb shows forms both with mi- and ūḫi-conjugation endings. Nevertheless, it is likely that just as the other verbs in -aḫḫ-, yatarnaḥḫ- was ḫi-conjugated originally. The etymology of this word is unclear. Often (e.g. Eichner 1980: 126, 14660), the verb is compared to ʿuttar / ʿuttan- ‘word, speech’, but it is difficult to reconcile the geminate spelling of ʿuttar with the single spelling of yātarnaḥḫ-. Eichner states that yatarnaḥḫ- is derived from a part. *yadarīann-, which is syncopated from *yadarienann-, itself a derivative in -nam- of a verb *yadarjē-, which is a denominative derivative of *yaddar-, the preform of ʿuttar ‘word’. This account is incorrect, for several reasons: (1) I know of no derivatives in -je/a- that show a lenited stop vs. the fortited stop of the ground word; (2) I know of no
deverbal derivatives in -nant-; and (3) I know of no syncopes of -iê-. All in all, I
see no possibility to etymologically connect yûtaranh₃ with uttär / uttian- ‘word,
speech’, although I am not able to offer an alternative solution.

yat(ar)-ru- (n.) ‘well, source’ (Sum. TÜL): nom.-acc.sg. ya-at-ta-ru (KUB 31.143a + VBoT 124 (StBoT 25: 188) iii 21 (OS), KUB 8.41 iii 14 (fr.) (OS)), ya-at-ru (KBo 40.34, 5 (MH/MS)), gen.sg. ya-at-ru-aš (KBo 8.41 ii 3 (OS)), ya-at-ta-ru-aš (KUB 31.143a + VBoT 124 ii 11 (OS), Bo 4767 (StBoT 25: 180), 4 (OS)), [ya-at-]a-ru-ya-aš (KBo 25.112 iii 8 (OS)), all.sg. ya-at-tar-ya (KBo 3.7 iv 12 (OH/NS), KUB 17.6 iv 9 (OH/NS)), dat.-loc.sg. ya-at-tar-ú-i (KBo 24.12 obv. 6 (NS)), TÜL-i (KUB 12.66 iv 15 (OH/NS)), nom.-acc.pl.(?) [ya-at-ta]-ra²-ya? (KUB 19.37 iii 54).

PIE *yot(H)-ru-

Already in OS texts, where the word is attested multiple times, we find a spelling yattaru- besides yattru-., probably indicating phonological /uatru-/.

Etymologically, it is tempting to connect this word with yûтар / yûṭēn- ‘water’ (thus e.g. Weitenberg 1984: 195), but this is impossible in view of the geminate spelling of -tt- in yattaru-, which points to an etymological *t, which contrasts with the etymological *d in yûṭar < *uōdr. One could argue that yattaru- reflects Luw. *uēd-ru- (with Çop’s Law causing geminate -tt-), but because of the abundant attestations in OS texts already, a foreign origin of this word is not likely. Moreover, *uēd- would probably have yielded CLuw. **yid- (cf. Melchert 1994a: 262). So, although I know of no IE cognates, I would reconstruct this word mechanically as *yot(H)-ru-.


PIE *ueik*-ti

This verb is attested quite often, a few times in OS texts already. It shows a stem *yatku*- throughout its forms. Only the 2sg.imp.midd.-forms *yatkahjj-, yatgaahjht* (duplicates of each other) are aberrant, but according to Neu (1968: 195), these forms are modelled after the form *uqgahjht* which precedes in the text. The 3sg.pres.midd. *ya-at-ku-it-ta* (or *ya-at-ku-et-ta*) is, according to Oettinger (1979a: 337161), a rebuilding in analogy to the -ue-class.

Oettinger (1979a: 237) convincingly suggests that *yatku-* has to be interpreted as /uatkw-/i, which is supported by 3sg.pret.act. *yatutta* (the ending -tta is used only when the stem ends in consonant whereas -i is used when the stem ends in vowel, e.g. 3sg.pret.act. *arnej*: note that the spelling *ya-at-ku-ut* occurs in the Song of Ullikummi (Güterbock 1952) only).

Čop (1955c: 69, followed by e.g. Oettinger 1979a: 237) assumes that /uatkw-/* reflects */otk*- of which the latter part is the zero-grade of the root */tek*- ‘to walk, to hurry’ (Skt. tak- etc.). Melchert (1994a: 95) reconstructs */eûtik*- , apparently assuming that */uêtik*- , too, would yield *yatk*- (similarly takš-2 ‘to undertake, to unify’ < */teks-). If so, then *yatku-* could reflect */ue-ik*- , of which the prefixed */ue-* possibly is identical to the prefix found in yete2 / yet- ‘to build’. If *yatku-* does not reflect a univerbated verb, however, we have to reckon with a root */uêtik*- , which is structurally comparable to e.g. */hzedž*- (see at ʰatk-) or */tek*- ‘to create’ (although the latter probably goes back to an old reduplication of */tek*- ‘to procreate’).

gas *yayarkima*- (c.) object in which the door-ax is fixed and turns: nom.sg. ya-ya-ar-ki-ma-aś, acc.sg. ya-ya-ar-ki-ma-an, dat.-loc.sg. ya-ya-ar-ki-mi, abl. ya-ya-ar-ki-ma-za (KUB 32.120, 3); uninfl.? ya-ya-ar-ki-ma (KUB 17.10 iv 10).

IE cognates: Gr. ἐπίργα, ἐπιργα ‘to enclose, to encompass’, Skt. vṛjāna- ‘community, enclosure of a community’.

PIE *h₁uorg*-?

This word was determined as “Türangel” by Otten (1952: 235), a translation which still often can be found. Boysan-Dietrich (1987: 128f.) shows that the word means either ‘Drehzapfen’ or ‘Drehpfanne’, however, e.g. in

KBo 21.6 obv. (with dupl. KBo 25.193 obv.3f.)
§ (1) [EGIR-a]n-da=ma-a=sa [GAŠ]ya-ya-ar-ki-ma-an Š4 IM [ ]da-a-i
(2) [n=a-an=]ši=kán A-NA SAG.DU=ŠU an-da ap-pi-iš-ke-ez-zi
(3) [MUNUS]=ŠU.GI=ma ki-iš-ša-an ḫu-uk-ki-iš-ke-ez-zi
(4) [GAŠ]ya-ya-]ar-ki-ma-aš ta-me-tar-ya-an-za EGIR-an ke-e-da-ni tar-ru-u [ ... ]
(5) [ke-]e-da-ni tar-ru-u pa-ra-a-an iš-tap-pé-er EGIR-an da-ma-[aš-šer]
(6) [ma-]ah-ba-an=ma-a=š-ša-an [GAŠ]IG [GAŠ]ya-ya-ar-ki-mi uit-e-[eš-zi i-da-a-la-uš]
(7) [U]D-aż ma-ni-in-ka-ya-an-za MU-za DINGIRMEŠ-aš kar-pi-iš pa-an-[ga-u-ya-aš
EME-aš]
(8) KASKAL-az EGIR-pa ne-[ja-ra]

‘She takes a y. of clay and holds it on his head. The Old Woman conjures as
follows. ‘The powerful’ y. [...-s] afterward tarrū for this one. They have
stopped the breath tarrū for this one. They oppressed back. Just as the door
turns in the y., let the evil day (and) the short year (and) anger of the gods turn
back from every road’”.

Boysan-Dietrich also adduces the following context, where yayarkima- is added,
however:

KBo 12.112 rev.
(11) ... nu=ya-a=š-ša-an [GAŠ]IG GIM-an
(12) [GAŠ]ya-ya-ar-ki-mi uit-e-[h]a-qi-ta DUMU-la-ša-ša-an an-ni-i=š-ši
(13) [an-da-an QA-TAM-MA] ĝ-e-ḥa-at-ta-ru

‘Just as a door turns [in a y.], [likewise] the child must turn [inside] his
mother’.

She also cites

KBo 24.71
(11) [... ša-]ra-az-zī ya-ya-ar-ki-mi kat-te-ři DINGI]RMEŠ dan-ku-i
da-ya-an-zi[pi ...]

which would indicate that there was an ‘upper’ y.

In my view, we have to interpret yayarkima- as that part of the threshold or
door-post in which the door-ax is fixed and turns. Perhaps it denotes some kind of
wooden bearing between the wooden ax and the stone threshold.

An enigmatic attestation is
**KUB 17.10 iv**

(9) ša-a-u-ar pár-na-an-z=a-at tar-na-ú ši-ta-r-n-i-ja-s=a-at an-na-aš-na-an-za
(10) tar-na-ú gãlu-ut-la-àn-z=a-at tar-na-ú ya-ya-ar-ki-ma ši-tar-ni-ja-s=a-at
(11) ḥi-la-aš tar-na-ú KÁ.GAL=at tar-na-ú ḥi-lam-na-an-z=a-at tar-na-ú

'It must go, the wrath, anger, desolation and rage of Telipinu. The house must let them go. The inner annaššar must let them go. The window must let them go. y.. The inner courtyard must let them go. The big gate must let them go. The gatehouse must let them go'.

It is remarkable that *yašarkima*, which apparently is uninflected, seems to fall outside the sentences here.

Etymologically, the word is often connected with the verb for ‘to turn’ that is reconstructed as *h₂yorg-*. (Hitt. *hurki- ‘wheel’, Skt. vṛṛṛ-). The assumption is then that the *h₂* is lost in *yašarkima-* because of the o-grade: *h₂yorg- > *yorg- > yark-. This connection is not that likely on semantic grounds, however: the *yašarkima-* did not turn itself, but the door was turning in the *yašarkima-*.

In my view, other connections are possible as well, e.g. with Gr. ἔφυ. ἔφυ ‘to enclose, to encompass’ (*h₂yorg-*): the *yašarkima-* is, of course, the object in which the door-ax is fixed. Note that a development *h₁uor-* > Hitt. *ya-* is supported by e.g. *h₁uoros-* > Hitt. *yarša-* ‘fog, mist’ (cf. § 1.4.5.a).

See Oettinger 2001 for the suffix -i-ma-.

All forms of this verb are spelled with initial Ú-. Beckman (1983: 34) cites a form *uxa-a-te incorporates (KBo 17.62+63 iv 7) that he translates as ‘come’, but the photograph of this tablet (available through Hetkonk) clearly does not support this reading: the gap between -a[te-] and [-ta] in is far too large to support this reading. Perhaps we are dealing here with a middle form of *uxa-a-te, which occasionally is spelled with initial U-. Note that the imperfective of *uxa- is spelled with initial (~UX XUX). The former represents phonological /uxaske-a/, whereas the latter represents /uxeske-a/ and, with analogical introduction of the strong stem, /uieske-a/.

Some of the forms of the paradigm of *uxa- are identical to forms of the paradigm *uxa- ‘to see’ (q.v.). The hapax ~UX (KBo 25.123, 4) with ~UX instead of normal ~UXW instead of normal ~UXW instead of normal ~UX is found in a text that contains the equally aberrant §XUX instead of normal §XUX (cf. Melchert 1984a: 93).

Synchronously, *uxa- inflects according to class ic4, verbs in -uxa- (note that the occasional spellings "uxa-a-mi and umu-a-ši may have to be regarded as inflecting according to the hatrae-class). Usually, these verbs are denominatives in *uxa- that are derived from u-stem nouns. It is clear that this is not the origin of *uxa- /uxa-, however. From a semantic point of view, it is obvious that *uxa- is the u-counterpart of *pai- ‘to go’ (q.v.). Just as this latter verb is a compound of the preverb *pe- (*hpo- and the root *hie- /uxa- must originally have been a univerbation of the preverb u- (*hpo- and the root *hie-.

Exactly when this univerbation was created is not fully clear. Apparently, it happened at the time that *h2ou had already monophthongized to /hul/. Moreover, because in hie- ‘they run’ < *h2uihieenti the cluster *hie intervocalically yielded OH -i-, we must assume that the initial laryngeal of *hieenti ‘they go’ had already been lost. So, in 3pl.pres.act. the univerbation took place between the elements */hul/ and */ianti/, which yielded pre-Hitt. */uiantil/, which regularly developed into OH */uan-ti/ spelled */u-an-zi/ in 3sg.pres.act. and 3sg.pret.act.
which were *h₁éi-ti and *h₁éi-t in PIE, we are dealing with the univerbation of the elements */tu/ and */tu₂t/ and */tu₃t/, which formed pre-Hitt. */tu₂t/ and */tu₃t/, which regularly yielded OH */uét₁t/, spelled *u-e-ez-zí and */uét₁t/, spelled *u-e-at. On the basis of */uét₁t/ : */uánt₁t/, the verb was reinterpreted as a thematic verb belonging to class Ic4, on the basis of which secondary forms like 1sg.pres.act. ú-ya-mi */tuám/ were created. Note that like in other thematic verbs, the thematic vowel -e- received some productivity in the OH period, on the basis of which the OS form ú-en-zi was created.

In Luwian, the univerbation between *h₂ou and *h₁eï- took place when the former element still contained a diphthong, so */tau/. On the basis of the fact that in CLuwian we find a stem aqi-ı, the HLuwian verb áwa'-ı, which is spelled with the ambiguous sign wai', must be read áwi- as well.

*yeb² / yah-* (Ia3; IIIa > IIIb, IIIh) ‘to turn (oneself); to patrol’: 1sg.pres.act. ú-e-e-h-mí (KBo 12.103 i 16 (NS)), 3sg.pres.act. ú-e-e-h-zí (OS, very often), úa-ah-zí (KUB 1.13 i 49 (MH/NS)), úa-ah-hu-zí (KBo 3.5 iii 4 (MH/NS)), 3pl.pres.act. úa-ha-an-zí (OS, very often), ú-e-ha-an-zí (KBo 11.1 i 33 (NH), KUB 25.37 ii 22 (NS)), 1sg.pret.act. ú-e-hu-un (KUB 23.11 ii 13 (MH/NS)), 3sg.pret.act. ú-e-e-h-ta (KUB 33.106 iii 46 (NS)), 3sg.imp.act. ú-e-ha-ad-du (KUB 12.17, 10 (NS)), 3pl.imp.act. ú-e-ha-an-du (KUB 7.1 ii 34 (OH/NS)); 1sg.pres.midd. ú-e-ha-a-h-h[a] (KUB 36.75 iii 18 (OH/MS) (cited by HW: 250 as yehahha[ri], but there is no indication for the sign RI), 3sg.pres.midd. ú-e-ha-at-ta (KBo 32.13 ii 12 (MH/MS), KUB 7.1 ii 33 (OH/NS), KUB 9.25 + 27.67 iii 5, 53, 58, iv 13 (MH/NS)), ú-e-ha-at-ta-ri (KUB 33.103 iii 6 (MH/NS), KUB 9.31+ i 2 (NS)), ú-e-e-h-ta-ri (KUB 13.4 iii 20 (OH/NS), KBo 3.3+ ii 18 (NH), KBo 4.12 rev. 11 (NH), KUB 19.41+ ii 22 (NH), KUB 21.38 obv. 31 (NH)), 3pl.pres.midd. ú-e-ha-an-ta (OS), ú-e-ha-an-ta-ri, ú-e-ha-an-da(-ri), 3sg.pres.midd. ú-e-ha-at-ta-at (KUB 4.1 i 14 (MH/NS)), ú-e-e-h-ta-at (KUB 26.1 ii 18 (NH)), 3pl.pret.midd. ú-e-ha-an-da-at (KUB 26.1 ii 18 (NH)), 3sg.pret.midd. ú-e-ha-an-da-at (KUB 32.68 ii 7 (NS)), 3sg.imp.midd. ú-e-ha-at-ta-ru (KUB 12.112 rev. 10, 13 (NS), KBo 4.6 obv. 15 (NH)), 3pl.imp.midd. ú-e-ha-an-da-ru, part.nom.sg.c. ya-ha-an-za (KUB 1.16 + KUB 40.65 iii 62), nom.-acc.sg.n. ya-ha-a-an (KBo 15.10 + KBo 20.42 ii 28); verb.noun ú-e-hu-ya-ar, gen. ú-e-hu-ya-aš; inf.II ú-e-ha-an-na (KUB 4.1 i 40, KUB 24.2 i 9); impf. ú-e-ħe-eš-ke-a/-, ú-e-ħi-iš-ke/a-.

Derivatives: yahātar / yahann-, yehātar / yehānn- (n.) ‘turning’ (gen.sg. ya-ha-an-n[a-aš] (KBo 6.29 iii 23, HKM 26 obv. 8 (MH/MS)), ú-e-ha-an-na-aš (KBo 6.28 ii 25)), yahnu² (Ib2) ‘to make turn, to turn (someone)’ (1sg.pres.act. ya-ah-nu-mi (OS), ya-ah-nu-ú-mi (OS), 2sg.pres.act. ya-ah-nu-ši, 3sg.pres.act.
The active forms of this verb show an ablaut *yeh₁* / *yah₂*. Sometimes the verb is cited as *yeh₁-*yah(h)* as well, which would imply that there are also forms with *yah₂*. This is not the case, however. The form 1pl.pres. *ya-ah-ḫu-u-e-ni* (189v, 3 = KBo 19.110, 3), cited in Oettinger 1979a: 99, has to be read as [ku-ul]ru-ya-ah-ḫu-u-e-n[i] ‘we summon as witness’ (cf. Oettinger 2002: XIX). To my knowledge, only the opaque 3sg.pres. *ya-ah-ḫu-zi* (KBo 3.25 iii 4, in the same context where ibid. iv 18 has ú-e-ḫ-h-zi) and the one attestation *ya-ah-ha-an-na* (KUB 36.80 i 7 (MH/NS), but note that the crucial signs are damaged) (versus many attestations *ya-ha-an-na*) show a geminate *ḫh*-h. These cannot nullify the dozens of attestations of *yah₂* (many in OS) that are spelled with a single -ḫ-. Consensus has it that *yeh₁* / *yah₂* reflects a Narten-inflated verb *yüeh₂* / *yeh₂*-E. E.g. Oettinger (1979a: 99) states: ‘ú-e-ih-z[i] : *ya-ah-hu-u-e-ni* […] geho auf *yeh₂-t[i] : *yah₂-yene-i* […] zurück. Schon in der älteren Sprache dringt die Lenierung des h (*ya-ha-an-zi* [...]) und später auch der e-Vokalismus (*ú-e-ha-an-zi* [...]) aus dem Sg. ein’. This is unlikely for several reasons, however. The first reason is the fact that there are virtually no forms with *yah₂*- attested. We find *yah₂* from OS onwards, which contrasts with the fact that the preform *yüeh₂* should regularly have given **yah₂*. It therefore is often stated that 3pl. *yah₂* took over the lenited -ḫ- from the singular (as also Oettinger i.c.), but this is impossible. First, the *h₂* of the singular forms *yeh₂-mi, yeh₂-si and yeh₂-ti would not get lenited as it is part of a cluster. Moreover, the *h₂* in these forms would have regularly been lost before consonant other than *s*. So the regular outcome in Hittite of a PIE Narten-paradigm of a root *yeh₂* would have been ***uêmi, **yêhsı, **uêzi, **yah²huenti, **yântenı, **yah₂hantı (if one accepts Eichner’s Law, which I reject, cf. § 1.4.9.2.b). I do not see how in this paradigm a lenited -ḫ- could have been generalized in order to yield attested *yah₂*.
Moreover, the reconstructed root *yeh₂- is based on the Hittite forms only. Reflexes of this root are unknown from any other IE language. All in all, I reject the theory that the active paradigm yeh₂- / yah- can be explained as the outcome of a Narten-inflected paradigm of a PIE root *ueh₂-.

We should rather go back to the etymology provided by Eichner (1973a: 76-7). The only way in which this verb could be regarded as of IE origin, is to start with the middle paradigm. Middle forms are attested in OS texts already, which means that the middle inflection is not necessarily derived of the active inflection. Unfortunately, it is not fully clear what the original 3sg.-form was: we find yehattari as well as yehāti (compare e.g. šuppari, šuptari and šuppattari ‘he sleeps’). On the basis of 1sg.pres.midd. yehah further and 3sg.pres.midd. yehattari it is certainly possible that the original form was *yehāti. If so, this form could in principle go back to a preform *uehih₂-o. Note that in this form the lenited /h/ would be regular. When on the basis of the middle stem *uehih₂ > Hitt. yeh- an active paradigm was created, it is in my view quite credible that in analogy to e.g. eš₂- / aš- ‘to be’ and the other e/a-ablauting mi-verbs this paradigm received a secondary ablaut yeh₂- / yah-.

If this scenario is correct, we should connect the root *uehih₂- to Skt. věti ‘to pursue, to strive after’ (compare especially vād- ‘turned to’ for the semantics), Lith. vėtė ‘to pursue’, etc. (cf. also Eichner 1973: 77 and Kimball 1999: 211). Usually, these verbs are reconstructed as reflecting a root *uehih₂-, with a *h₁ that is based on Gk. ἔκπασται ‘to pursue’ (< *ékkpāsta). The exact construction of ἔκπασται is too uncertain to draw any conclusions on, however (cf. Frisk 1960-72 s.v. who states that this verb well may have been influenced by ἔμπημο ‘to send’).

IE cognates: Skt. vaś- ‘to wish, to want, to strive after’, Av. vas- ‘id.’, Gr. ἕκκον ‘voluntary’.

PIE */uék-ti / *uék-enti

See Oettinger 1979a: 17f. for an overview of forms. Already since Hrozný (1919: 180'), this verb is generally regarded as derived from the root *uēk-, also visible in Skt. vaś-, Av. vas- ‘to wish, to want’ and Gr. ἕκκον (ἕκκον) ‘voluntary’. In his description of the leniting rules, Eichner (1973a: 81) assumed that the single -k- as visible in forms like 1sg.pret. ye'kun and 3pl.pret ye'ker must be the result of a lenition due to a preceding accentuated long vowel: *yēk-. He therefore reconstructs an acrostatic root present *yēk-ti / *yēk-nti. This view is widely followed and has been elaborated upon. For instance, Oettinger (1979a: 100) states that ū-e-ek-zī must be analysed as /e'k̪anzi/ and ū-e-ek-kān-zī as /e'kanzi/ and that the forms that are spelled ū-e-kān-zī show generalization of the lenited velar out of the singular.

Apart from the fact that the other IE languages in which the root *uēk- has been preserved do not show any traces of an acrostatic inflection (Skt. 3sg. vāṣṭi : 1pl. uṣmāsi and GAv. 3sg. vāṣṭī: 1pl. uṣmāḥī reflect an ordinary root-present *uēk-ti : *uēk-me), the occurrence of a lenited velar in the paradigm of Hitt. yēkk- is difficult to explain. In the singular forms, where *-k- allegedly has been lenited due to the preceding long vowel, *k is always part of a cluster, and clusters do not get lenited: the preforms *uēkmī, *uēkṣī, *uēktī therefore would not yield Hitt. /uēkmī/, but rather /uēk-ti/. The only form for which one could argue that *k could have undergone lenition is 1sg.pret. *uēk-m, but of exactly this form the oldest attestation is ū-e-kku-un (MH/MS) with a geminate -kk-. So I do not see how a lenited velar could have come about and spread throughout the paradigm.

If we compare the spellings ū-e-ek-kān-zī and ū-e-kān-zī, we see that the first form is the lectio difficilior and therefore must be the ‘correct’ spelling. This means that the latter form is a simplified spelling in which the sign IG has been left out. I therefore want to propose to interpret all spellings with ū-e-kV as simplified spellings for ū-e-ek-kV. This means that we are only dealing with a stem ye'kk-.

As we saw above, the other IE languages in which this verb is attested show a normal root-present *uēk-ti / *uēk-enti. The question is what this paradigm would yield in Hittite. The answer for the singular form is straightforward: PIE *uēktī would yield Hitt. /uēktī/, spelled ū-e-ek-zī, which is exactly the form we find in
the texts. The expected outcome of PIE *ukénti is more problematic, however. Taken in isolation, the phonetically regular outcome of PIE *ukénti would have been Hitt. **ukkanzi. As part of a paradigm, however, the outcome may have been different. In Hittite, we never find word-initial paradigmatical alternations: for instance, an initial consonantal ū never alternates with vocalic ū. I therefore assume that original paradigms in which a full grade *ué/oC- alternated with the zero-grade *uC- first the consonantal *ū- was generalized, yielding a zero-grade *yC-. The cluster *yC- then was solved in different ways: through the anaptyctic vowel /ū/ (spelled *ē/i-) when the following consonant was a stop (cf. also yātar / yītēn-) or through the anaptyctic vowel /s/ (spelled -a-) when the following consonant was *R, *h and *s (cf. also yēss-ām, yaššē/ār-). In the case of *ukénti, I therefore believe that on the basis of the singular stem *yēk-, the initial 3pl.pres. *ukénti was altered to *yékënti, the initial cluster of which then was solved as /uékánt’i/, spelled ū-e-(ek)-kān-zi. I must admit, however, that it cannot be excluded that in some cases the spelling ū-e-(ek)-kān-zi in fact denotes /uékant’i/, a secondary 3pl.-form in which the full-grade stem of the singular has been generalized. All in all, I assume that Hitt. yekzi / yekkanzi ultimately goes back to *uék-ti / *ukénti.

yēlkku- (n.) ‘grass, vegetation’ (Sum. [YBL]): nom.-acc.sg. ū-el-ku (often), ū-e-el-ku (often), ū-i-el-ku (KUB 30.53+ ii 7), ū-el-ku-ya-an (KBo 6.34 iv 17), dat.-loc.sg. ū-el-ku-i, ū-e-el-ku-i (KUB 27.16 i 17), all.sg. ū-el-ku-ya (KBo 17.61 rev. 19), abl. Ū-ya-az (KBo 20.19+ i 8, 12), instr. ū-el-ku-it (KBo 19.130 i 10); unclear ū-e-el-ku-ya (KUB 34.60, 9).


PIE *uēlk-u-??

This word is treated by Weitenberg (1984: 179f.), who discusses the problem regarding the semantics (‘grass’ or, more general, ‘vegetation’) and the occurrence of two stems, namely yeḷku- and nom.-acc.sg.n. yeḷkuṇa which either is from yeḷkuṇa- (n.) or yeḷkuṇant-. Eichner (1975b: 158*) connects this word with Skt. vaḷśa- ‘sprout’, OCS vlasṭa ‘hair’, Russ. vólos ‘hair’, all from *uolko-. If the Hittite word indeed is cognate, it would show *uēlk-u-.

yēlbu- (n. > c.) ‘pasture, meadow’ (Sum. Ú.SAL, Akk. USALLU): nom.sg.c. ū-e-el-lu-uś (KBo 6.34 iv 13 (MH/NS), KUB 33.41 i 3 (OH/NS)), acc.sg. ū-el-lu-un (KUB 9.4 iii 29 (MH/NS)), Ú.SAL-un (KUB 39.8 iv 6 (OH/NS)), nom.-acc.sg.n. ū-e-el-lu (KBo 5.7 rev. 1 (MH/MS), VBoT 58 i 10 (OH/NS)), ū-el-lu (KUB 17.8
See Weitenberg (1984: 181f.) for an extensive treatment of this word. We find commune as well as neuter forms. All commune forms are from NS texts, however, whereas nom.-acc.sing. ú-e-el-lu is found in a MH/MS text and, more importantly, the form ú-e-el-lu-ya[...]] (KUB 8.41 ii 16), which is possibly to be interpreted as nom.-acc.pl.n. ú-e-el-lu-ya[...] (KUB 8.41 ii 16 (OS)).

IE cognates: ?ON völfr 'meadow, pasture'.

PIE *uél₁nu-?

This verb is cited by Friedrich (HW: 252) as yemija-, yimija-, umija-. The stem yimija-, however, is found only once in *u-i-mi-ja* (KBo 6.3 iv 27), which is likely to be a spelling mistake (cf. the absence of the ending -zi). The stem umija- is found only once as well, in KUB 30.42 iv 23, which form is likely to be emended to *u-e-ri-mi-ja-an-zi*. This form therefore cannot be used as proof for an ablauting stem yem-, um-.

The verb lacks a good etymology. It has been suggested that it consists of a u-preverb attached to the root *h1em- ‘to take’ (e.g. LIV² following Melchert 1994a: 66). Semantically, however, this connection is not very appealing, and formally, we then would expect the existence of a verb *pemije- as well. Moreover, if the HLuwian verb wami- indeed means ‘to find’ (often, suggested translations of HLuwian verbs are inspired by etymological connections) and is cognate with Hitt. yemije/a-, it would provide a formal argument against a reconstruction *u + *h1em-. The only known Luwian cognate of the Hitt. preverb u- is found in HLuw. awi- ‘to come’ and CLuw. aqi- ‘id.’, showing that Hitt. u- ~ Luw. aq-. The HLuw. form wami- therefore would not fit a reconstruction *u+h1em-. We are rather dealing with a genuine PAnat. stem *yemje/o-. A structure *CeC-je/o- is remarkable in Hittite, and either reflects a verb that is derived from a noun (e.g. yešije/a-2 ‘to pasture’ from yeši- / yešai- ‘pasture’ or ṣ₃lé₄ṭere/ippije/a-2 ‘to plough’ from ṣ₃lé₄ṭere/ippi- ‘ploughed field’) or a secondary -je/a-presens of an original root aorist (e.g. yerije/a-2 ‘to call’ from yer-²). Since I know of no noun anywhere in Anatolian that could be regarded as the origin of this verb, we possibly are dealing with the latter case. Prof. Lubotsky suggests to me a connection with Skt. van- ‘to win, to usurp’, Av. van- ‘to win’ and OHG gi-winnan ‘to win, to get’, which semantically indeed is attractive. Nevertheless, these verbs are generally reconstructed as *uen-, which means that a connection is only possible if we would be able to set up a scenario through which the root-final *-m- would turn into -n- in Ilr. and Germanic.


PIE *h₁:3uénh₁-ti; h₁:3unh₁-skē/ô-.

Often, this verb is cited as yen(t)-, on the basis of the hapax 3pl.pret.act. ú-e-en-ti-er (KUB 5.9 ii 43). The meaning of this form cannot be independently determined (the context is quite broken), and in my view there is no evidence that shows that yen(t)er belongs with the other forms of yen-²/uyan-. I interpret it as a separate verb yen(t)é-².

The verb yen-²/uyan- is generally connected with Skt. van- ‘to love, to desire’ etc., from a root *uenH-. If the root-final laryngeal was *h₂ or *h₁, it would have been preserved in a paradigm *uenh₁-ti, *unh₁-enti (cf. e.g. yalzi / yalhanzi from *uélh₁ti / *uh₁:enti). I therefore reconstruct *uenh₁-

The imperfective should go back to a preform *ynH-skē/ô- (cf. Skt. vāñchati). This latter form should regularly give *(y)aššike/a- (cf. haššike/a-, impf. of hanna-/ / hann- ‘to sue’ from *h₁:3nh₁-skē/ô-), in which form the -n- was analogically restored, giving uyanške/a-. The spelling with initial ú- may indicate that we have to interpret this form phonologically as ñuanske/a-/ (cf. ú-ya-a-ter ‘inspection’ /ũâdr < *Hu-ô-ter vs. ya-a-ter ‘water’ /ũâdr < *ũôdr), which would mean that we have to reconstruct *h₁:3uenh₁- (cf. Kloekhorst ftb.c for the view that initial *h₁ merges with the reflex of *h₁ before consonants in PAnat.). An initial laryngeal would fit the Skt. perfect vāvan- < *Hye-HyōnH- perfectly.

-yeni/-yani; -yen (1pl.act.-ending)


In the present, the ending -yeni denotes 1pl.act. in the mi- as well as in the hi-conjugation. It is spelled ⁸Cu-e-ni (OS), ⁸Cu-ú-e-ni (OS), ⁸Cu-u-e-ni, ⁸V-u-e-ni (OS) and ⁸V-ú-e-ni (OS). When the verbal stem ends in -u-, the ending becomes -mōni (usually spelled -me-e-ni (OS) and -me-ni (OS), but once also -mi-ni (OS)), according to the sound law *-uy- > -um-. Also when the preceding stem consists
of *CH-, we find -mēni (e.g. tu-me-e-ni < *dhú-uēni). This is not a “Sievers-
Edgerton Variant” (Oettinger 1979a: 566; Melchert 1984a: 25), but the regular
outcome due to the development *CHuV > CumV. In the oldest texts, we
occasionally find a variant -yāni (e.g. pa-i-ya-ni (OS), ḥa-r-ya-ni (OS), ak-ku-uš-
ke-e-ya-ni (OS)). Melchert (1994a: 138) plausibly argues that -yāni in origin is
the variant of -yēni that is found when the verbal stem is accentuated and therefore
is unaccentuated itself (in these cases /páuian/, /Háruáni/ and /kʷskéuani/),
whereas -yēni is the accentuated variant (e.g. a-tu-e-ni = /ṭduēn/, a-ku-e-ni =
/ṭgʷuēn/, cf. the plene spelling in e.g. tu-me-e-ni (OS), āu-me-e-ni (OS)). On the
basis of this alternation Melchert assumes a sound law “posttonic *-e- in open
syllable > -a-” (cf. § 1.4.9.1.b).

In the preterite, the 1pl.act.-ending is -yen, which is spelled ḲCu-en (OS), ḲV-u-
en (OS), ḲV-u-en (MH/MS), ḲCu-e-en (MH/MS), ḲV-u-e-en (MH/MS), ḲCu-u-en,
ḲCu-u-en and ḲCu-u-e-en. This ending turns up as -men after stems in -u- as well,
spelled -me-en (OS) and occasionally -mē-en (OS). This ending shows no
difference in form when accentuated or not (e.g. pī-ū-en = /pīuēn/ vs. a-ū-me-en =
/ṭāumen/).

It is difficult to establish the origin of -yēni. In all other IE languages, the
1pl.act.-endings start in -m- (e.g. Skt. -mas(i), -ma, Gr. -μεν-μεκ, Lat. -mus, OCS
-mn, Lith. -me, Goth. -m, -ma). Nevertheless, the -u- of Hittite is supported by
CLuw. -unu and Lyd. -wV. It has been suggested that formally we should rather
compare -yēni with the I dualis-ending as found in some other IE languages: Skt.

ютиě/у̃ё (Ic1) ‘?’. 3pl.pret.act. āu-e-en-ti-er.

This verb is hapax in the following context:

KUB 5.9 ii

(40) n=a-aš nam-ma ya-[ x - x - x - x - x - x ] ma A+NA ḲSUBANGA Ḳ𝐾 mạch [ Ḳ] Ḳتاح[
(41) ] x-rv BA.ŪŚ nu=yaz a x [ - x - x - x - x - x ] at nu=yaz=a-aš=kān ŠA Ė Ḳ [x]
(42) [ x]-i-jat-ta nu=ya UD.KA[M x - x - x ] pi-eš-ke-er
(43) [n]a’ ḲMUNUS ḲḪ-tat EN ḲḪ Šā-e-en-ti-er

The context is too unclear to translate, and the meaning of ū-e-en-ti-er therefore
remains unclear as well. Often, it is regarded as belonging with the verb yen-’/
uyan- ‘to copulate’, but I do not see any semantical reason for it. Formally, ū-e-
en-ti-er rather seems to belong to a further unattested verb yentie/a-’.

1157
**ypep** (Ib1) ‘to weave(?)’: 3sg.pret.act. ú-e-ep-ta (NS).


IE cognates: Skt. vaabh- ‘to bind, to fetter’, Gr. òqánw ‘to weave’, Myc. e-wepe-se-so-me-na = *épe-se-so-me-na* (fut.part.) ‘which will be woven’, OHG weban ‘to weave’, TochA wāp-, TochB wāp- ‘to weave’.

**PIE** *(h)uēb*-ti?

Hapax in the following context:

KBo 42.6 obv.?

(9) [...] x-ni ú-e-pu-uš ú-e-ep-ta mn=mu TÚG-an=mi-ŋt [...]

‘[...] he yep-ed yep-s and [...] me my clothing’.

According to Neu (1998: 59[17]), it is possible that this figura etymologica has to be interpreted as “Webstücke webe er / sie” and reflects **PIE** *uēb*- ‘to weave’. This may be supported by the mentioning of TÚG ‘clothing’ in the following sentence. According to Beekes (1969: 67), the Myc. fut.part. e-wepe-se-so-me-na = *épe-se-so-me-na* points to a present *épe*- < *(h)uēb*-x-, which would show that the root in fact was *(h)uēb*-


This word denotes some kind of wooden plate on which different foods are lying. For instance,

**KUB 55.39 i**

(14) ... DUMU[MEŠ] É.GAL=ma=kán šu-uḫḫ-ḫa-az QA-DU[ Gaš] ú-e-ra-an

(15) k1 ŠUG KU-KU-UB GES.TIN=ša ú-da-an-zi[ Gaš] ú-e-ri=ma-aš-ša-an

(16) še-er 7 NINDA.HUR(sic).RA SIG me-ma-al ip-pi-ja-an-za[ Gaš] še-pa-aš=š[a[ ]

(17) [k]i-š-ta-rū n=a-a[ Gaš] AB-ja-aš pé-ra-an da-a-i

‘The palace servants bring down from the roof a yera- together with a jug of wine. Upon the yera-, 7 thin thickbreads, meal, a vine and a spoon’ are lying.

He places them in front of the window’.

1158
The two attestations ū-ra-aš are found in NS texts and may not be linguistically real. To my knowledge, no good etymology exists of this word.


Derivatives: **yerijanna)** / **yerijanni**- (IIa5) ‘id.’ (impf.2sg.pres.act. ū-e-[ri-an-ni-iš]-ki-ši (KUB 14.16 iv 21) with dupl. [ū-e-ri-a]n-[n]iš-ke-ši (KUB 14.15 + KBo 16.104 iv 49)), see also =*ya(r)= and yerîte-² / yerî-.


IE cognates: Gr. εἶχο ‘to speak’.

PIE *uérh₁-t, *urh₁-jé-ti

This verb is virtually consistantly spelled ū-e-ri- and is a clear example of the -je/a-inflection. It is remarkable, however, that we once find a participle yerant without the -je/a-suffix. Since this form is from a MH/MS text, it cannot be of secondary origin and must reflect an archaism. The fact that a stem without -je/a- is found in a participle fits well with the views of Melchert 1997b, who argues that in some verbs traces of a system still can be found in which the unextended stem is found in non-present forms and the -je/a-stem in present-forms. According to Melchert, this reflects the original opposition between an old root-aorist vs. -je/o-present (see at karp(ije)/a)-² for a more detailed treatment of this view).

According to Oettinger (1979a: 344), yerije/ae² must be connected with Gr. εἶχο ‘to speak’ and reconstructed as *yerh₁-jé/o-, a view which is generally accepted. This means that we must assume that originally we are dealing with a root-aorist *uérh₁-t / *urh₁-ent besides a -je/o-present *urh₁-jé-ti. Because of the tendency to avoid an ablaut pair ge- / u-, the full-grade was generalized throughout the paradigm of the aorist (attested as yerant-) and also taken over into the -je/o-present (*yerije/ae-). The only Anatolian cognate, Pal. 3sg.pres.act. yerır, may show that here the aorist-stem was generalized in disfavour of the -je/o-present.
Note that the impf. *yeriške/a- does not reflect *yeriške/a- vel sim., but rather /yeriské/ā-ñ, the regular outcome of *uerr̃i-ské/ā- (of course replacing original *urh₁-ské/ā-).


**PIE ***(y)eríi/eh₁- *d'eh₁- ?

First it should be noted that although the bulk of the forms of this verb are spelled ú-e-ri-, we find two OS attestations that show ya-ri- with an aberrant -a-. The one form that is spelled ú-i-ri- is attested in a NS text and can therefore be disregarded for etymological purposes. The fact that we find a stem yerite- (ú-e-ri-ri-i-[ź]i, ú-e-ri-te-eš-ta and yeritema-) besides a stem ye/ari- (ú-e-ri-i-z-za-aš-ti /yeritštši, yeritansi, ú-e-ri-ta-[an-źi] and yeridanu-) reminds of verbs like pehute-² / pehut-, uyate-² / uyat- and yete-² / yet-. These verbs all can probably be traced back to the root *d'eh₁- ‘to put’ preceded by several univerbated elements. Therefore, it is likely that ye/ari-te-² / ye/ari- also consists of ye/ari- + *d'eh₁-. This view is also advocated by Oettinger (2001: 467), who analyses the verb as *(y)eríi-dq- ‘zur Verehrung setzen’, apparently connecting the first element with yer(ije/a)-² ‘to call, to summon’ (q.v.).

If this connection is correct, I would rather suggest another semantical development, namely *to place a call > *to scream (in fear) > to fear’. If so, then the OS variant with yari- may show a zero-grade formation *yrr₁-i- besides the e-grade in yerije/a- < *uerr̃i-je/a-, in analogy to which e-grade was introduced in yerit(e)- >> yerit(e)- after the OH period.
yeš / anź- (pers.pron. 1pl.) 'we, us': nom. ú-e-eš (OS), ú-e-š=a (OS), acc. an-za-aš (OS), an-za-a-aš, gen.sg. an-ze-el (OS), an-ze-l=a (OS), an-zi-él, dat. an-za-aš, an-za-a-aš, abl. an-ze-da-az, an-zi-da-za, an-zi-e-da-za.

Derivatives: see =**(n)naš
Anat. cognates: CLuw. ánza ‘we, us’ (dat.-acc. an-za, a-an-za, an-za-aš); HLuw. anź- ‘we, us’ (nom. /ant’un‘t(‘) (a-zú’-za, a-zú’-za, a-zú’-za), gen.adj.dat.loc.sg. á-zú’-sa-na), /ant‘/ ‘our’ (nom.sg.c. a-zi-sa, abl.-instr. á-zi-ia-ši, nom.acc.pl.n. a-za-iš).
IE cognates: Skt. vayá, asmá-. Av. vaḥm, ṭhima- Goth. weis, uns- ‘we, us’, TochA waz, TochB wē ‘we’, Gr. οὗ 'us', etc.

PIE *wei-(e)s, *ns-

See chapter 2.1 for a treatment of these words.

yeš-s₂a; yašše/a₁ (IIIb > IIIg; Ic5 > Ic1, Ic2) ‘(midd. intr.) to be dressed, to be covered; (midd. + acc.) to wear (something); (act. (+ =z) + acc.) to put on (something); (act. + acc. + dat.) to put something on on someone; (act. + acc. (+ instr.) to clothe someone (with something), to cover someone or something (with something); (act. + =z) to clothe (oneself), to be dressed; (act. + anda) to cover (horses)’ 3sg.pres.midd. ú-e-eš-ta (KBo 3.41+, 2 (OH/NS), KBo 12.22 i 3 (OH/NS), KUB 9.28 i 15 (MH/NS), ú-e-š-ta (AT 454 iv 10 (NS), 3pl.pres.midd. ú-e-eš-ša-an-da (KBo 17.1 i 24 (OS)), ú-e-eš-ša-an-ta (IBoT 1.36 i 77, ii 49, 53, 58 (MH/NS), KUB 9.31 i 37 (MH/NS)), ú-e-eš-ša-c-an-ta (HT 1 i 30 (MH/NS)), ya-aš-ša-an-da (? (KBo 39.8 i 27 (MH/MS)), 1sg.pres.midd. ya-aš-ši-i-a-h-ša-ša-at (KUB 24.5+ rev. 15 (NS)), 3sg.imp.midd. ya-aš-ši-i-a-ta-ru (KUB 33.98 iii 19 (NS); 2sg.pres.act. yq-aš-ša-ši (KUB 33.54, 14 (OH/NS)), ya-aš-ša-a-ši (KUB 12.58 iii 36 (NS)), ya-aš-ši-i-a-ši (KUB 31.69 obs. 5 (fr.), 6 (NS)), 3sg.pres.act. ya-aš-še-e-[z]-zi (KBo 20.18 + KBo 25.65 rev. 3 (OS)), ya-aš-še-e-[z]-zi (KBo 13.137, 9 (OH/NS), KUB 7.53 + KUB 12.58 i 54 (NS), [ya-aš-š]e-e-[z]-zi (KUB 20.4 i 10 (OH/NS)), ya-aš-ši-e-[z]-zi (KUB 17.61 obs. 21 (MH/MS), KUB 34.76 i 2 (OH/NS), KUB 15.3 i 8 (NH), ya-aš-ši-e-[z]-zi (KUB 2.6 iv 5 (OH/NS), KBo 6.26 iv 13 (OH/NS)), ya-aš-ši-i-a-[z]-zi (KUB 4.47 obs. 18 (OH/NS), KUB 20.17 v 13 (OH/NS), KUB 20.80 iii 13 (OH/NS), KUB 11.32 + 20.17 v 23 (OH/NS), Bo 6472 ii 5 (OH/NS)), KUB 30.43 iii 21 (fr.) (NS)), ya-aš-ši-i-a-[z]-zi (KBo 10.23+ i 11 (OH/NS), KBo 13.93, 9 (NS), KBo 15.9 iv 19 (NS), KBo 20.47, 12 (NS), KUB 4.3 ii 16 (fr.) (NS), KUB 7.60 iii 8 (NS), [ya-aš-š]e-e-[z]-zi (KUB 29.57, 2 (MH/NS)), [y]a-aš-ši-i-a-[z]-zi (KBo 15.7, 13 (NS)), 1pl.pres.act. ya-aš-ša-u-e-ni (KBo 32.15 ii 12 (MS)), ya-aš-šu-u-e-ni (KUB 9.17,

Derivatives: see *vašpa*-


IE cognates: Skt. váste ‘to be clothed’, GAv. vastē ‘to be clothed’, Gr. εἶχα ‘to wear’, Goth. wasjan ‘to clothe’, Lat. vestis ‘garment’.

PIE *ués-tó, *us-jé-ti*

See Neu 1968: 193 for an overview of the middle forms, and Oettinger 1979a: 299-300 for an extensiv treatment of the semantics of this verb.

The original inflection of the middle must have been 3sg. *yešta* (OH/NS), 3pl. *yeššanda* (OS). The forms *yaššijaḥḥaḥ* and *yaššijattaru* (both NS) must be secondary rebuildings in analogy to the active stem *yaššiya*-², whereas *yaššanda*, according to Eichner (1969: 14), is influenced by CLuw. *yaššandari*.

The active paradigm shows quite a lot of different stems. The only OS form is found in 3sg. *ya-aš-še-[z-zi]* that shows a stem *yašše*-. This stem is found a few
more times in 3sg.-forms in OH/NS texts. Almost all other attestations of singular forms (from MS texts onwards) show a stem *yaššiye/a-. In the plural, the oldest forms are 1pl. *yaššaqeni (MS) and 3pl. *yaššanzi (MH/MS and OH/NS). The latter form turns up as *yaššianzi in younger texts (once in a (hippological) MH/MS-text, further in NS texts). In NS texts, we occasionally find a stem *yaššae⁴ (2sg.pres.act. *ya-aš-ša(-a)-ši, 3sg.pres.act. *yaššaizzi and possibly some of the NS instances of *yaššanzi) and *yaššiye/a⁻ (MH/NS), both according to the productive *htrae-class. The NS forms *yaššaqeni probably are back-formed on 3pl.pres.act. *yaššanzi, which was re-analysed as *yašš-anzi. The occasional usage of the e-vowel in the active (yeššanzi once in a (hippological) MH/MS-text, further only in NS texts (yeššija-)), are clearly secondary formations in analogy to the middle paradigm. All in all, we have to conclude that the oldest inflection was middle yešš-anzi besides active *yašš-e/a⁻.

Eichner shows that the middle forms virtually always denote ‘(intr.) to be dressed; (trans.) to wear (something)’. With this meaning, yešta has to be equated with Skt. váste ‘wears’, GAv. vástē ‘wears’ and Gr. ἐξητέρω, ἔπτερον ‘wears’ that reflect *uēs-to. In 3pl.pres.midd. yeššanta ~ Skt. vásate, Gr. ἀνθιάω < *uēs-pto, the *s probably was geminated due to contact with -n- (cf. keššar ‘hand’ < *gʰes-r).

The interpretation of the active forms has caused much debate, however. Eichner (l.c.: 31f.) points to the semantic correspondence between *yaššezzi, *yaššiyezi (‘he dresses someone’) and the causative building *uos-éie-ti as visible in Skt. vāsâyati ‘he clothes (someone)’. Goth wasjan ‘to dress’ and assumes that *yaššiyezi directly reflects *uos-éie-ti and *yaššianzi < *uos-éio-nti. Oettinger (1979a: 304) points to the fact that the oldest active forms are *yaššezzi, *yaššanzi and states that these cannot reflect *uos-éie/o-, but must go back to a thematic inflection *uōs-e-ti, *uos-o-nti. This solution is highly unlikely in view of the absence of any other thematic verb in Hittite. Moreover, I know no other examples in IE languages of thematic verbs with o-grade. Oettinger’s solution is therefore rightly rejected by Melchert (1984a: 31f.), who himself assumes that *yaššezzi and *yaššanzi are the regular outcomes of *uos-éie-ti and *uos-éio-nti. Although a development *-eie-ti > Hitt. -ezzi can hardly be denied (compare e.g. *u(i)es ‘we’ > Hitt. ğuš), I am not sure if *-eionti would yield Hitt. -anz. When we compare to patte(j)ant ‘fugitive’ < *pθ̣i-ei-ent- (see under pattai₂ / pattii), we would expect that *-eionti rather yields Hitt. -e(j)anži. Moreover, Melchert’s reconstructions cannot account for the geminate -sš- (as he admits himself: o.c.: 31f.), I therefore will not follow this proposal either.

When we look at other Hittite verbs that show active as well as middle forms, we see that sometimes both paradigms use the un extended root: e.g. *eš-śrō
besides ẽ-shə / aš-; nẽ-a for besides nai- / *nī-. In other cases, we find that the middle shows an unextended form, but the active is -je/o-derived: ḥuett-(jœôr) besides ḥuṭtijε/ʔa-; ḥaṭ- besides ḥazzijε/ʔa-². These last verb show a formation *CεC-(t)o besides CC-jē-ti. For the root *ues-, we could therefore expect a system in which the middle uses the unextended root, *uēs-to, whereas the active shows the -je/o-extended stem *uš-jē-ći. As I have argued in Kloekhorst ftbc.b, Hittite did not allow an alternation #MU- vs. #UC. In these cases, #UC- was analogically altered to *yC and this initial cluster then had to be solved by an epenthetic vowel. If the following consonant was a stop, the epenthetic vowel was ʰl (e.g. yiden- ‘water’ /uiden-l <<< *u-a-én-; yekezandu /uikandu <<< *uñkēntu). In this case, I think that on the basis of *yesto, *uśje/o- was altered to *uśje/o-, which was realized as /uṭi/e/a-/l. In my view, this /uṭi/e/a-/l then underwent the sound law *VsiV > VššV (for this development, cf. § 1.4.4.2 and the suffix -aška- < *-osjo-). So, in my view, *ušiți, *usiöntı first became /ušiți/, /ušiöntı/, which then regularly yielded /ušiți/, /ušiöntı/, spelled yaššezzi, yaššanzi. Already in MH times, the -je/a- suffix was restored, yielding secondary yaššijezzi, yaššijanzi.

*yeššar: see GIS *yieššar

yeši- / yešai- (c.) ‘pasture’: nom.sg. ū-ē-ši-iš (KBo 1.45 rev. 13), acc.sg. ū-ē-ši-in (KUB 29.29, 8 (OS)), KUB 7.60 ii 29 (NS), ū-ē-šē-in (KUB 7.60 ii 24 (NS)), gen.sg. ū-ē-ši-jā-aš, dat.-loc.sg. ū-ē-ša-i (KBo 12.3 iv 6 (OH/NS)), ū-ē-ši (KBo 12.73, 3 (NS)), abl. ū-ē-ši-ja-az, nom.pl. ū-ē-ša-eš (KBo 32.14 ii 27, 28 (MS)), ū-ē-ša-e-eš (KUB 17.10 i 17 (OH/MS)), acc.pl. ū-ē-ša-ū (KUB 31.64 iv 7 (OH/NS)), dat.-loc.pl. ū-ē-ši-ja-aš (KBo 32.14 ii 29 (MS)).

Derivatives: yešijε/ʔa- (IIIg) ‘to pasture (trans.); to pasture (intr.), to graze’ (1sg.pres.midd. ū-ē-ši-ja-ah-ja-ri (KBo 32.14 ii 6 (MS)), 2sg.pres.midd. ū-ē-ši-ja-at-ta (KUB 31.84 iii 56 (MH/NS)), 3sg.pres.midd. ū-ē-ši-e-ta (KBo 17.23 obv. 4 (OS)), ū-ē-ši-ja-at-ta-ri (KUB 26.19 ii 33 (MH/MS), KBo 32.14 ii 27 (MS)), 3pl.pres.midd. ū-ē-ši-ja-an-da-ri (KUB 26.19 ii 18 (MH/MS)), 3sg.pret.midd. ū-ē-še-ja-at-ta (KUB 29.1 i 33 (OH/NS)), ū-ē-ši-et-ta-at (KUB 29.1 i 32 (OH/NS)), 3sg.imp.midd. ū-ē-ši-et-ta-ru (KUB 57.63 ii 14 (NS)); 3sg.imp.act. ū-ē-še-ed-du (KUB 30.24 ii 4 (OH/NS)); verb noun gen.sg. ū-ē-ši-ja-a (KBo 9.71 + KUB 29.33 i 6 (OH/NS)), ū-i-ja-u-ya-aš (KBo 3.4 ii 72 (NH)); impf. ū-ē-še-eš-ke/a-), see also yēššara-

IE cognates: OIr. fas ‘food’ < *ues-teh2, ON vist ‘nutrition’ < *ues-tī, TochA wāṣri ‘pasture’ < *ues-ri-, Av. vāṣtra- n. ‘pasture’, vāṣtar- m. ‘herd’, Lat. vēscor ‘to feed oneself’.

1164
Friedrich (HW: 253) states that this noun actually reflects a diphthong stem *yešai- (apparently because of e.g. nom.pl. yeša₂š and acc.pl. yeša₂uš), but this is not necessary if one compares e.g. the noun ḫe[jur- / ḫejau- ‘rain’, in the paradigm of which an ablauting stem ḫejau- can be encountered as well. This means that we have to assume an ablauting paradigm *uēs-i- / *us-ēi-, in which the full grade was generalized. The verb yešiye/α-·(m) probably is a denominal derivative, which would explain the fact that we find -e-grade in the root, which we normally would not expect in -ie/o-derived verb (that go back to PIE *CC-je/-ó-). The OS attestation ú-ši-e-et-ta, if not to be emended to ú-(-e)-ši-e-et-ta, may be a last remnant of the zero-grade root uš-. The verb denotes ‘to pasture (intr.), to graze’ (cf. Neu 1968: 200f.).

The IE cognates all clearly point to a root *ues- (the long -ē- of Lat. vēscor ‘to feed oneself’ is explained by LIV² as going back to a Narten-inflection, but in my view is just analogical after ēscō ‘to eat’). Note that Eichner (1973a: 79, followed by Melchert 1984a: 107) derives yeši- from *ueis- ‘to flourish’ (Lat. vīreō ‘to flourish’), but the inner-Hittite connection with yešiye/α- ‘to pasture’ and yēṣata- ‘herd’ in my view clearly point to the root *ues- ‘to pasture, to feed’.

yešiye/æ²: see yeššæ³; yaššæ/æ²

yēṣata- (c.) ‘herd’ (Sum. ¹⁰ SIPA): nom.sg. ú-e-eš-ta-ra-aš (KUB 6.46 iii 52).

Derivatives: see also yeši- / yešai-.

IE cognates: Av. vēṣtar- ‘herd’.

PIE *ues-⟨r⟩-

This word is hapax in the following context:

KUB 6.46 iii
(52) ḪUTU ŠA-ME-Æ EN=ḪA ŠA DUMU.LÚ.U₁₉.LU-ut-ti ú-e-eš-ta-ra-aš

//

KUB 6.45 iii
(13) Ḫ[(UT)]U ŠA-ME-Æ EN=ḪA ŠA DUMU.LÚ.U₁₉.LU¹⁰ SIPA-aš

‘Sun-god of Heaven, My Lord, you are the herd of mankind’.
It clearly belongs with yeši- / yešai- ‘pasture’ (q.v.), and has a direct cognate in Av. vōštar- ‘herd’ < *ues-ter-. The Hittite form probably shows a thematicization *uēs-tro-.

**yešuriye/a-[^2]**: see yisuriye/a-[^3]


To my knowledge, this verb is only attested in one context:

KUB 17.18 ii

(10) mu GIM-an ze-en-na-an-zì nu ši-e-ni-eš kur-i-e-eš x[ ... ]
(11) ta-pu-uš-za a-še-ša-an-te-eš; n=a-aš ša-ra-a da-an-zì n=a-aš A-NA

EN.SÍSKUR]
(14) ši-e-na-aš=kân tug-pi-aš me-mi-jà-mù-uš an-da me-mi-jà-an-zì

‘When they finish, they take up the dolls that were laid down [...] on the side and they bring them to the patient. They anda y. the patient for the Sun-god of the earth. Just as it is laid down on the tablets of the dolls, they speak the words of the tablets of the dolls’.

On the basis of this context, the exact meaning of yešuyânzì cannot be determined. Formally, the form seems to belong with a stem yešuyae[^2]. Tischler (HH: 201) translates this verb as “mit Kleidern versehen(?)”, but this is clearly based on the supposed formal connection with yešš[^2]a, yašše/a-[^2] ‘to clothe’ (q.v.). In my view, such a connection cannot be proven semantically and is formally unlikely because of the single -š- in yešuyae- vs. the consistent geminate -šš- of yešš[^2]a, yašše/a-[^2].

**yet**: see yitt-

**yeda[^1]**: ‘to bring (here)’: see yedæ[^3]

**yeda[^1]**: ‘to build’: see yete[^2] / yet-

**yedæ[^2]** (Ic2 > IIa1y) ‘to bring (here)’: 1sg.pret.act. ú-i-da-a-mì (KBo 16.24+ i 10 (MH/MS), 2sg.pres.act. ú-e-da-a-ši (KUB 29.1 i 3 (OH/NS)), 3sg.pres.act. ú-i-da-
The oldest forms of this verb show that it originally inflected according to the HGDXHQL (MH/NS), 2pl.pres.act. 3pl.pres.act. XQ ~HWDDWWHHQ (KUB 30.15 i 32 (OH/NS)), 1sg.pret.act. ū-e-da-ah-hu-un (KBo 3.6 ii 10 (NH)), ū-e-da-aš (KUB 21.9 i 7 (NH), but this form perhaps belongs with yet(e) ), 2pl.imp. ū-e-ta-at-te-en (KBO 3.43 rev. 10, 11 (OH/NS)), 3sg.imp.act. ū-i-ta-ū (Oettinger 1979a: 374); part. ū-i-da-an-t-; inf.I ū-i-du-ma-an-zí (Oettinger 1979a: 374).

PIE *ued³-o-je/-o-

The oldest forms of this verb show that it originally inflected according to the *hatriae-class: 1sg.pres.act. yidőmi (MH/NS), 2sg.pres.act. yedůši (OH/NS), 3sg.pres.act. yidůzzii (OH/MS), 1pl.pres.act. yedůšení (MH/NS), 2pl.pres.act. yitateni (MH/MS) and 3pl.pres.act. yedánni (OH/NS), and I therefore cite the verb as yedae². It is almost identical in meaning to the ʰi-verb uda² / ud- 'to bring (here)' (udaḫḫi, udatti, udai, udumēni, udatteri, udanzi, q.v.), which it formally resembles as well. This explains the rise of ʰi-inflected forms within the paradigm of yedae- in NH times (e.g. 3sg.pres.act. yedai (NS), 1sg.pret.act. yedabḫun (NH), inf.I yidumanzi in analogy to udai, udabḫun and utumanzi).

Verbs that belong to the *hatriae-class are derived from *o-stem nouns. In this case, yedae² must be derived from a further unattested noun *yeda-. Oettinger (1979a: 374) connects this form to the PIE root *ued³- 'to carry', which is satisfactory from a formal as well as semantical side. We therefore have to reconstruct *yed³-o-jeto/o-. The occasional spellings with -i- are probably due to the development *yeT > yiT (cf. Melchert 1994a: 262 and § 1.4.9.1).

Derivatives: *yetumeššar / yetumešš- (n.) ‘building’ (abl. ū-e-tu₂-mi-eš-na-za (KBo 12.125, 4)).

Anat. cognates: Lyd. wic- ‘to build, to erect’ (1sg.pret. wicw), dawic- ‘to erect’ (3sg./pl.pret. dawicil).

PIE *ye₂+ dhe₁₁ / dh₁₁r-

In the older texts we find the forms yetezzi, yedanzi, yetenun, yetet, yedant-, yedumanzi, which all point to an ablauting stem yete₂ / yet-, comparable to tē₂ and especially pešute₂ / pešut-. Only in NH times (according to Oettinger 1979a: 130 from the times of Šuppiluliuma I onwards) we find forms that can be analysed as belonging to a stem yeda- / yet- (e.g. yedahḫum). These were secondarily created in analogy to the verb yede₂ ‘to bring (here)’ (which itself by that time had undergone secondary alteration to yeda- / yet- in analogy to the verb uda- / ud- ‘to bring here’) on the basis of the identical form for 3pl.pres.act., which is yedanzi in both the paradigm of yete-/yet- and yeda-.

Within Anatolian, the verb yete- / yet- has been compared with the Palaic verb yite₁- (2sg.pres.act. ú-i-te-ši and ú-i-ti-ši), whose meaning is not totally clear, however. Because this verb takes arunam ‘sea?’ as an object, a meaning ‘to build’ may not be very likely, however. A connection to Lyd. (da)wic- may have more merit, however, as this verb more clearly means ‘to build, to erect’ and could reflect *yedē₂-. If so, then we are dealing with a Panat. verb *yedē₂-.

It is very likely that *yedē₂- is the result of a univerbation of the verb *dhe₁₁r- ‘to put’ with an element *ye₂-. The origin and meaning of this element *ye₂- remain unclear, however.


PIE *ue₂-oku₂-ei
This verb clearly functions as a sort of iterative/intensive of the verb *yekk- 'to wish, to desire, to ask for'. This is especially indicated by the fact that 1sg.pret.act. *yeyakkinun (KBo 3.4 ii 11) is duplicated by the impf. *yekiškenun (KBo 16.1 iii 9).

Already in older texts we find *mi-forms besides *hi-forms (e.g. 1sg.pres.act. *yeyakmi (MS) besides 3sg.pres.act. *yeyakki (MH/NS, OH/NS)). It is nevertheless likely that the verb originally was *hi-conjugated, which would better explain the -a-vocalism (*wē-uok-e-i). Compare e.g. *āk- / akk- 'to die', which also shows *mi-inflected forms in MS texts already. In younger times we find a *mi-conjugated stem *yeyakkiš/α- as well.

It is likely that the verb was accentuated on the reduplication syllable as can be inferred from the almost consistent spelling of -e- of its vowel (whereas pretonic *e would have given -i-) and the absence of plene spelling of -a- in the root syllable.

Formally, *ue-uok-e-i looks like the PIE perfect of *uek-, but semantically, it does not function as such. The verb *yeyakk- clearly has an iterative/intensive meaning, which suggests that the reduplication was not inherited but only added in post-PIE times during the period in which the creation of the typical Anatolian reduplicated intensives was productive. Any theory in which *yeyakk- is seen as reflecting a PIE perfect (or the 3sg.pret.-form *yeyakta as reflecting a PIE pluperfect, cf. e.g. Jasanoff 2003: 36f.) has no merit.

The fact that this verb does not show ablaut is probably due to the fact that the regular outcome of expected *uē-uok- / *uē-uk- was *yeyakk- / **yēkk-, which showed an alternation that was too aberrant to be preserved. The strong stem then was generalized throughout the paradigm.

See *yekk- for further etymology.

*yez(za)pant-: see *yizzapant-

*yi (interjection) 'whee': *ū-i (e.g. KUB 55.38 ii 19).

An onomatopoeic interjection, e.g. in KUB 55.38 ii (19) *ū-i *ū-i *ḥal-z[t]-eš-ša-an-*zi 'they cry *yi *yi', which may be the source of the verb *yai- / *yi- 'to cry' (q.v.).

*yījae- 'to cry (out)': see *yai- / *yi-
\textit{yijan-} (c.) ‘wine’ (Sum. GEŠTIN, Akk. KAR\_\_NU): nom.sg. GEŠTIN-iš (KBo 6.26 i 18 (OH/NS)), acc.sg. GEŠTIN-na-an (OS), GEŠTIN-an (OS), gen.sg. yiš-ja-na-aš (KUB 56.50 ii 5), GEŠTIN-aš (OS), instr. GEŠTIN-it.

Derivatives: (d) \textit{Lūnijan-} (c.) ‘wine (deified)’ (acc.sg. ú-i-ni-ja-an-ta-an (KUB 55.56 iv 16), ú-i-ni-ja-an-da-an (KUB 25.37 iii 17, 19)).

Anat. cognates: CLuw. \textit{umija-} (adj.) ‘of wine’ (coll.pl. ú-i-ni-ja); HLUw. \textit{wijana/-, wina/-} (c.) ‘vine’ (nom.sg.c. /\textit{wianis/} \textit{VITIS}\textit{wa/i-ia-ni-sa} (SULTANHAN §7), \textit{wa/i-ia-ni-sà} (SULTANHAN §15), \textit{wa/i-ia-ni-i-sà} (SULTANHAN §23), acc.sg. /\textit{winin/} \textit{VITIS} \textit{wa/i-ni-na} (KÖRKÜN §11), case? \textit{wa/i-ia-ni-[x]-i} (KULULU I §8)).


\textit{PIE *uieh₁-on-}

This word is usually written with the sumerogram GEŠTIN, which sign can be read phonetically as \textit{yiš} as well, however. This makes it difficult to decide whether we should read the form GEŠTIN-ja-na-aš (KUB 56.50 ii 5) sumerographically or phonetically as \textit{yiš-ja-na-aš}. The latter reading is attractive in view of HLUw. \textit{wijana/-} ‘vine’. Moreover, it is likely that the sign GEŠTIN only received the phonetic value \textit{yiš} because of the fact that the ‘wine’-word started in \textit{yi-}.

See Beekes (1987) for an extensive treatment of the IE cognates of this word and for the reconstruction *\textit{uieh₁-on-o-}. Note, however, that in the oldest stages of Hittite there is no proof of a thematicized stem \textit{uieh₁-on-o-} (unlike in HLUwian), on the basis of which I assume that in Hittite we are dealing with an -\textit{n}-stem *\textit{uieh₁-on-} \textit{→ yijan-}. The nom.sg.-form GEŠTIN-iš, which is found in a NS text, could easily be influenced by the Luwian stem \textit{yijana/-}.

\textit{yije/a ṭ} ‘to cry (out)’: see \textit{yai-/ yi-}

\textit{yije/a ṭ} ‘to send (here)’: see \textit{uie-ś / uį-}

\textit{gás} \textit{uieškar} (n.) a tree or its wood: nom.-acc.sg. ú-i-eš-šar (KUB 7.37, 12).

This word occurs only once. Usually (HW Erg. 1: 22; Tischler HH: 184), it is cited as \textit{gás uieškar}, but the spelling actually points to \textit{uieškar}. The meaning cannot be determined. Formally, it could be regarded as a derivative in -\textit{škar} of \textit{yai/-}
 yi- 'to cry' (q.v.), but a meaning 'crying; cry' does not make much sense, unless we have to assume 'weeper' (cf. the weeping-willow).

ṣuṣ (a)n (c.) 'clay' (Sum. IM); gen.sg. ū-il-na-a-aš (OS), ū-ī-il-na-aš (OS), dat.-loc.sg. ū-li-ni-i (KBo 3.46 + KUB 26.75 obv. 13 (OH/NS)), IM-ni, instr. ū-i-la-ni-it (KUB 13.2 ii 15), acc.pl. ū-i-la-a-mu-aš (OS).

This word is attested in OS texts several times and shows different spellings (ū-il-n°, ū-i-il-n°, ū-li-n°, ū-i-la-n°, ū-i-la-a-n°), which are hard to explain from an IE point of view. I therefore assume that the word is of foreign origin.

yəmiye/a-²: see yemije/a-²


This word occurs only once, in KUB 9.17, (15) ... nu LÚ GȘT[IR] (16) NINDA ū-i-iš-ta-aš NINDA-an ū-un-ga-na-an-ta-an ūar-zì pal-ū-[iš]-ke-ez-zì=ja (?) 'The man of the forest holds a yunganant- bread of 'qišta- and cr[ies]' . The word can be compared to (or is a loan from) Pal. yqšaš (some kind of bread). Compare also Luw. NINDA qašatnimma/i, derived from *yıštat = /yıštan-, and Ūšašša/i. Starke (1990: 73) suggests a connection with PIE *weis- 'to turn', which would imply that yıšta- means 'circle-bread'. Although in principle possible, this assumption is not supported by any semantic evidence.

yıšuriye/a-² (İc1 > İc2; İIlg) 'act.) to press (together), to be pressing, to be difficult; to tie up, to suffocate (trans.); (midd.) to suffocate (intr.); to be tied up': 3sg.pres.act. ū-i-šu-u-ri-ez-zì (154/w, 3 (NS)), ū-i-šu-u-ri-ja-iz-zì (KBo 27.136 ii 4 (NS)), 3pl.pres.act. ū-e-šu-u-ri-ja-an-zì (KUB 9.6 iii 23 (MH/NS)); 3sg.pres.midd. ū-i-šu-u-ri-ja-at-ta-ri (KBo 32.14 ii 49 (MS)), 3sg.pret.midd. ū-e-šu-u-ri-ja-at-ta-tì (KUB 33.11 iii 9 (OH/NS)), ū-i-šu-u-ri-ja-at-ta-tì (KUB 33.46 i 11 (OH/NS)), ū-i-šu-u-ri-ja-at-ta-tì (KUB 33.15, 13 (OH/NS), KUB 33.51 ii 5 (OH/NS)), ū-i-šu-u-ri-ja-at-ta-tì (KUB 17.10 iii 14 (OH/MS)), ū-i-šu-u-ri-ja-ad-da-at (KUB 33.45 + 33.53+ ii 8 (OH/NS)), 3pl.pret.midd. ū-e-šu-u-ri-ja-an-ta-tì (KUB 33.48 i 8 (OH/NS)), ū-i-šu-u-ri-ja-an-ta-tì (KUB 33.37+39 iv 1, 2 (OH/NS)), ū-i-šu-u-ri-ja-
an-ta-ti (KUB 17.10 i 6, 7, 8 (OH/MS), KBo 14.86 + KUB 33.17 i 15 (OH/NS)), [ú-i-š]u-ri-ja-an-ta-at (KUB 33.36 ii 6 (OH/MS)), ú-i-šu-ri-an-da-at (KUB 33.36 ii 8 (OH/MS)); part. ú-i-šu-ri-ja-an-t- (KBo 31.76 l.col. 9 (OH/NS), KUB 30.65 iii 2 (NS)), ú-e-šu-ri-ja-an-t- (KBo 1.42 ii 39 (NS)); verb.noun ú-e-šu-ri-ja-u-ya- ar (KBo 1.42 ii 26 (NS)); impf. ú-i-šu-ri-eš-ke/a-, ú-i-šu-ri-iš-ke/a-


Although often cited as yešuriye/a-, the MS attestations yešuriye/a- in my view show that we have to take the spellings with -i- as more original (note that the spelling ú-e-šu- is predominantly found in the vocabulary KBo 1.42). See Carruba (1966: 50-54) for an extensive semantic treatment of this verb. He also provides a morphological analysis, namely a -je/a-derivative of a verbal noun *yisur-, of an unattested verbal root *yis- (although Carruba talks about *yèsur-). Carruba connects this root with ON višna ‘to wither’ and Lat. višco ‘to shrivel’, but that does not seem attractive to me semantically. Also Eichner’s direct comparison (1973: 77) with Slav. *vēsuro, ‘whirlwind’ < *vēisuro does not make much sense to me semantically.

yit-: see yida- ‘water’

yitt- (c.) ‘year’ (Sum. MU[KAM]: nom.sg. MU[KAM]-za, acc.sg. MU-an, gen.sg. MU[KAM]-aš, dat.-loc.sg. ú-i-it-ti (KUB 4.72 rev. 2 (OS), KUB 29.32+ iii 2 (OS)), ú-it-ti (KBo 3.22 obv. 10 (OS), KBo 3.46 obv. 14 (OH/NS), KUB 58.63 ii7 9, Bo 69/465, 1 (NH)), MU[KAM]-ti, abl. MU[KAM]-za, nom.pl. MU[KAM]-uš, acc.pl. MU[KAM]-uš, gen.pl. ú-t[-it-ta-an] (KUB 29.3, 2 (OS)), ú-it-ta-an (KUB 29.1+ i 22 (OH/NS)), ú-i-it-ta-aš (Bo 4636 iii 10f. (OH/MS)), MU[KAM]-aš, dat.-loc.pl. MU[KAM]-aš.

Derivatives: *yittanti (c.) ‘year’ (dat.-loc.sg. MU-an-ti (KBo 12.2 obv. 1 (OS)), yettandgar / yettandann (n.) ‘period of a year’ (dat.-loc.sg. ú-e-et-t[(a-an-da-an-ni)] (KBo 3.22 rev. 64 (OS)) // ú-i-da-an-da-an-ni (KUB 26.71 i 10 (OH/NS)), MU[KAM]-an-ni, *yittilli (adv.) ‘annually’ (MU-ti-li, MU[KAM]-li), see also yizz(a)mant-

Anat. cognates: CLuw. ušša/i- (c.) ‘year’ (nom.sg. MU[KAM]-iš, acc.sg. MU[KAM]-in, abl.-instr. uš-ša-a-ti, MU[KAM]-ti, MU[KAM]-ti); HLuw. usu/i- (c.) ‘year’ (acc.sg. /usin/ (ANNUS-si-na (SHEIZAR §2), ˓Annus\ ˓u-si-na (KULULU 1 §6 (2x))), dat.-loc.sg. /usi/ (e.g. ˓Annus\ u-si (KARATEPE 1 §48), Annus’si (KARKAMIŠ A11b

IE cognates: Gr. ετος, Πετος ‘year’, Lat. vetus ‘old’, Skt. vatsarâ- ‘year’

ΠΙΕ *ιυετ-

See Rieken (1999a: 25-28) for a detailed treatment of this word. On the basis of the fossilized gen.sg. ΜΕΣ-κα in the phrase ΜΕΣ-κα μελήρ ‘the time of the year’, Rieken assumes an acrostatic root noun *ιυρ-s, *ιυρ-m, *ιυετ-s, *ιετ-i. According to her, the *e-grade stem generalized throughout the paradigm. This -e- was phonetically raised to i between *y and a dental consonant (cf. Melchert 1994a: 262). The older form *ιυτ- is still visible in υι-ι-ετ(με) (a-an-da-an)- (KBo 3.22 rev. 64 (OS)) and in some forms of the derivative ιυζ(α)παντ-, *ιεζ(α)παντ- (q.v.). Although the forms with the spelling υι-ι-ετ- in principle could be read υι-ι-ετ as well the spellings with υι-ι-ετ- indicates that the vowel -i- is real.

The Luwian forms show a different formation, namely υσσαι- (in my view, HLuwian shows usai- as well, and not an i-stem as cited in Hawkins (2000: 630), which can be seen in the dat.-loc.pl. usanz instead of **υσιανζ). It is generally accepted that this form reflects *ιυτ-ο-, a thematization of the s-stem *ιυετ-os-that is found in other IE languages (Gr. ετος, Πετος ‘year’, Lat. vetus ‘old’). Hitt. yük--, however, probably reflects the old root noun.


ΠΙΕ *υετ-ο?

This word occurs a few times only:

KBo 3.8+ iii (ΟΗ/ΝΣ)

(1) šal-li-iš 𝖑แด ḥu-un-ḥu-ma-az-zi=ši-it ḥa-mi-ǐ[k-ta]
‘The great river bound its flow. And he bound the fish in the ḫ. y.. And he bound the high mountains’;

ibid.
(18) ... nu ḫu-uk-ki-iš-ke-ez-zi4Kam-ru-ši-pa-aš
(19) GAL-in ḫ=na=a-š-ta an-da ḫa-an-ti-ja-ra KU₆-an ú-i-iti
(20) ḫu-uk-ki-iš-ke-ez-zi GAL-iš ḫ=un-ḫu-ma-az=ši-it
(21) EGIR-pa la-a-at-ta-at an-da KU₆-uṣ ḫa-an-ti-ja-ra-aš la-at-ta-at

‘Kamrušēpa conjures the great river. She conjures the fish in the ḫ. y.. The great river, its flow, was released again. The fish in the ḫ.’ s was released’;

KUB 21.19 +1303/u + 338/v (+) KUB 14.7 iii (NH) (see Sürenhagen 1981: 94)
(11) ... KUR₄Ur[((Ne-ri)-i[k]
(12) ḫu-ú-da-ak=pát ka-rú-ú-i-li-aš ḫ-A₄NA LUGAL₄Mes x[...]
(13) ḫar-kán-za e-eš-ta nu KASKAL₄Mes an-da ya-ar-ḫu-e-e[š-šar e-eš-ta]
(14) nu=kán ḫUr[((Ne-ri-ik-ka)-aš URU-aš NA₄a-ku-uṣ GIM-an [yšš-ti(?)]
(15) an-da e-eš-ta nu=kán ḫal-lu-ú-ya-aš × yšš-ta-aš kar-[ta-an e-eš-ta]
(16) nu=kán ḫUr[((Ne-ri-ik-ka)-aš URU-an NA₄a₄-ku-ǔ-un GIM-[an]
(17) ḫal-lu-ya-aš yšš-ta-aš ša-ra-a ú-da-aḥ-ḫu-u[ν nu=kán KUR₄Ur[((Ne-ri-ik]
(18) A-N₄ ḫUr[((Ne-ri-ik DUMU=KA ḫa-an-da-aš še-er d[a-aḥ-ḫu-un]

‘The land of Nerik was soon gotten lost for the older kings x[...], and on the roads there was brushwood. The city of Nerik was like a pebble in the [y. (?)], and was down in the deep y.. And I lifted the city of Nerik like a pebble out of the deep y., and I took the land of Nerik, for the sake of the Storm-god of Nerik, your son’.

The forms could either belong to a stem yid- or a stem yida-. In all contexts, a meaning ‘water (vel sim.)’ would fit. This is especially the case for the first context, where we read about ‘fish in the y.’. It therefore is generally agreed that in one way or another the word has a connection to PIE *uódr ‘water’.

Kronasser (1966: 162) assumes that these words show a root noun *ued- ‘water’, a view that has been followed for many years.

Starke (1990: 568), however, states that the word is likely of Luwian origin: “Die späte Bezeugung wie insbesondere auch der Gebrauch des Glossenkeils [...]
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sprechen indessen wohl eher für k.-luw. Herkunft”. He translates the word as ‘wet’ and claims to have found the same word in genuine CLuwian as well, namely in Ú.SAL 18A₁.an-za ǘ-i-da-an-Za (KUB 35.45 ii 6), which he translates as “den feuchten Wiesen”. In his view, CLuw. ywaćda/i- (as he analyses the stem) reflects a vṛddhi-formation *uṛd-o-, derived from *uṛd-r. The reconstruction with *e apparently is given in order to explain Luw. -i-, since *e in principle yields Luw. -a-.

Rieken (1999a: 76), however, points to the fact that there are indications that an *e develops to Luw. i when between ẏ and dental consonant (as in Hittite, see Melchert 1994a: 262) and implies that a reconstruction *uṛd-o- is possible as well. She follows Starke in assuming that the Hittite forms are Luwian borrowings: “Angesichts der Beschränkung von ywaćid(a)- auf eine luw. Ausdrucksform, ein Glossenkeilwort und zwei Belege aus einem stark luwisierten Text ist luw. Herkunft sehr wahrscheinlich” (1999a: 77).

All in all, I think it is best to assume that the forms found in Hittite contexts belong to a stem ⵢida- and are borrowings from the CLuw. adjective  ypos- ‘wet’ that reflects *uṛd-o-.

่ายida- ‘to bring (here)’: see  ypos-²

่ายida- ‘to build’: see  ypos-³ / yɛt-

่ายite- ‘to build’: see  ypos-³ / yɛt-

่ายtēn-: see  yposET /  yposn-

่ายiṛiš- (n.) a disease of bone and skin’: nom.-acc.sg. ṣu-it-ri-iš (KBo 9.4 iii 39), [ú-it-ri]-iš (KBo 17.54 i 12).

This word is found in the Ritual of Tunnaqija:

KBo 9.4 iii
(35) SAG.DU-aš ḫu-u-ul-ta-ra-am-ma-an
(36) mu-ū-da-id-du  ... ḥa-aš-ti-ja-aš
(38) ... ḫa-aš-ti-ja-aš
(39) ma-a-lu-li-ja-aš ṣu-it-ri-iš-š=a KI.MIN

‘Let it remove the ḫ.-sickness of the head! .... Likewise the ụ.-sickness of bone and skin’².
It is not clear what kind of disease the word denotes.

_yiγa/-yiγi/- 'to cry (out)’: see γai/-yi-

_yizzapant-, yez(z)apant- (adj.) 'old, grown old’: nom.-acc.sg.n. ū-iz-[a-p]a-an (KUB 17.21 i 16 (MH/MS), ū-iz-za pa-a-an (KBo 1.42 iv 42 (NH)), nom.-acc.pl.n. ū-iz-za-pa-an-ta ((KUB 17.21 i 16 (MH/MS)), ū-e-ez-pa-an-ta (KUB 5.10, 5 (NH)), ū-e-ez-za-pa-an-ta (KUB 5.10, 10 (NH)).

PIE **"net-s *hipoi-hi-ent-”**

This word occurs a few times only, denoting the weariness of objects that have to be renewed: compare e.g.

KUB 17.21 i
(6) mu šu-me-eš=pāt DINGIRMEŠ DINGIRMEŠ-aš iš-ta-an-[a-n]i-it še-ek-te-n[i]
...
(14) nam-ma š[a]-me-en-za-an DINGIRMEŠ-aš ku-e ALAMIL=KU-NU ŠA

KUB 5.10 i
(2) ... mu LÚMEŠ É.DINGIRLAM pu-nu-uš-shu-u-e-en UM:MA ŠU-NU-U=M-MA
(3) BI-IB-RU GUŠKIN=ya-a=z zi-in-zo-pu-uš-ši-aši(=ya-a=z) LUNAR
da-a-i[a]-a-t
(4) EGIR-pa=ma=ua-r=a-aš na-ši-š DŪ-an-za TUG.GU.É.A İJUR-Rİ GUŠKIN=ya ku-e
(5) DINGIRLAM ya-aš-ša-an ḫar-zi mu=ya-r=a-at ū-e-ez-pa-a-an-ta GES ḫu-lu-ga-an-ni-eš=š=ya
(6) ar-ḫa du-ya-ar-na-an-za KUSNIG.BAR=ya İŠ-TU É.GALLAM pó-eš-ke-er
(7) mu=ya-r=a-at na-ši-i pi-ja-an EGEŠ-aš-ra-ḫi-ta-aš-ši-in=ya ku-ua-pi i-ja-an-zi
(8) mu=ya A-NA DINGIRLAM İŠ-TU É.GALLAM 1 KUS KÜ.BABBAR SİG SA, SİG
'We asked the men of the temple, and they said: ‘A musician has stolen golden zinzapu-shaped rhytons but he has not been making them back yet. The golden Hurrian clothes which the deity is wearing have grown old and the chariot is broken apart. They used to give the curtain from the palace but it has not been given yet. When they make an ašraḫitašši-feast, they used to give to the deity one hide, silver, red wool, blue wool and one unit of curtains from the palace. Now they have made an ašraḫitašši-feast but they have not given silver, red wool, blue wool nor curtains. The šurita-wool has grown old’.

In the vocabulary KBo 1.42 iv 42, ú-izz-za pa-a-an glosses Akk. LA-BI-RU ‘old’, showing a clear word space between yïzza and pūn. On the basis of this attestation, Güterbock (1955: 64f.) suggested that the word is a univerbation of yitt- ‘year’ (q.v.) and pûnt- ‘having gone’ (see paṭi- / pā-) and that it originally meant ‘the year has gone’. Rieken (1999a: 26) states that therefore yēʾizzā must be interpreted as the original nom.sg. of yitt- ‘year’. This interpretation is unlikely in my view, however, since an interjection of a loose sentence ‘the year has gone’ is quite ungrammatical. Moreover I cannot envisage how such an interjection would develop into an inflecting adjective.

It therefore might be better to interpret *yēʾizzā as gen.sg., univerbated with a *pûnt- that agrees with the noun it determines, so that yizzā pûnt- originally meant ‘having gone with regard to the year(s)’, which developed into ‘having gone weary’.

See for further etymology the separate lemmas yitt- ‘year’ and paṭi- / pā- ‘to go’.
-z (abl.-ending): see -(∅)z

=z (enclitic reflexive particle): =z (e.g. ta-a=z (OS), ki-i-i=z (OS), nu=mu-u=z (OS)), =z(a) (e.g. mu=a, mu-u=z-za (OS)).

Anat. cognates: Pal. =ti= (reflexive particle?); CLuw. =ti (reflexive particle); HLUw. =ti, =ri /=di/ (reflexive pron. 3sg.); Lyc. =ti (reflexive particle).

The oldest spellings of this particle are =z. From OS texts onwards, the spelling =z(a) is generalized.

The reflexive particle is found in most other Anatolian languages as well, all going back to PAnat. *=ti (HLUw. /=di/ probably shows lenition).

In Lydian, the reflexive particle is -*, which, according to Melchert (1991a: 135-142), goes back to -*soi.

In HLUwian, the form of the reflexive particle differs per person. We find =mi for the 1sg., =ti and =ri /=di/ for 2sg. and =ti, =ri /=di/ for 3sg. (the old reflexive particle from *=ti). The reflexives =mi and /=di/ are probably innovated on the basis of *=ti, combining the consonant of the enclitic pronouns =mu ‘me’ and /=di ‘you’ with the -i of *=ti.

The development *=ti > Hitt. =z /=ti/ is supported by the occasional OS spelling -za /=ti/ of the 3sg.pres.-ending < *=ti.

-zα (abl.-ending): see -(∅)z

-zα (3sg.pres.act.-ending of the mi-flection): see zi
zāḥi / zāḥ- (IIa2) ‘to hit, to beat’: 1sg.pres.act. za-āḥ-mi (KUB 43.71 rev. 3 (NS), KUB 26.91 i 8 (NS)), 3sg.pres.act. za-āḥ (KUB 6.25+ iii 7 (OH/NS), KUB 26.12 ii 16 (NH)), za-āḥ-zī (KUB 13.4 iii 38 (OH/NS)), 1pl.pres.act. za-āḥ-hu-u-e-ni (KUB 3.60 ii 17 (OH/NS)), 3pl.pres.act. za-ša-an-zi (KUB 5.7 i 32, 35 (NS)), 3sg.pret.act. za-āḥ-ta (KUB 33.110 ii 6 (MH/NS)), 3pl.pret.act. za-āḥ-še-er (KUB 17.21 iv 2f. (MH/MS)), 3sg.imp.act. za-āḥ-du (KUB 43.35, 10 (OH/MS?)), 3pl.imp.act. za-ša-an-d[u] (KUB 13.4 iii 39 (OH/NS)); 3sg.pres.midd. za-āḥ-ťa-ri (KUB 5.1 iv 72 (NH), KUB 5.18 rev. 6 (NS), KUB 50.79 obv.‘4 (NS), 3pl.pres.midd. za-ša-āḥ-ân-da (KUB 23.92 ii 14 (OH/NS)).

Derivatives: see also zāḥ̱hāi- / zāḥ-ii-, zāḥrai- and zāḥ̱hurae-.

IE cognates: Gr. οἶοι ‘sign, mark’, Gr. οἶος ‘corpse’, ὄφτως ‘grain, food’.

PIE *tiōh₂-ei / *ti₂h₂-énti?

It is not easy to determine whether this verb originally was ḫi- or mi-conjugated since we find forms of both conjugations in older texts (e.g. zāḥi (OH/NS) vs. zaḥdu (MH/MS)). Nevertheless, it is likely that the ḫi-conjugation was the older (likewise Oettinger 1979a: 446). Firstly because the mi-conjugation is the productive one and secondly because we would otherwise not be able to explain how the stem final -h- was retained, as *h₂ was regularly lost before most consonants (e.g. *Cēh₂-ti should have yielded **Cēh₂). This means that we have to reckon with an original ablaut zāḥi / zāḥ- (the stem zāḥ- is still visible in 1pl.pres.act. zaḥhuKEN and 3pl.pret. zaḥher: in younger Hittite, the lenited variant -h- from the 3sg.pres. zāḥi is spreading through the paradigm, yielding forms like 3pl.pres.act. zaḥANZI).

Phonologically, zāḥ- represents /tāḥ-/, which can go back to either *Tsōh₂- or *tiōh₂-. Oettinger (1979a: 447 with reference to Schindler) suggests a reconstruction *dš-eḥ₂- on the basis of a connection with Gr. ḪE ‘in battle’ < *das-. This is quite improbable as the a of das- requires *h₂ or a vocalized nasal.

In my view, we should rather reconstruct a root *tiēh₂- (structurally like *piēh₂- or *kieh₂-): a reconstruction *tiōh₂-ei would perfectly account for Hitt. zāḥi. The weak stem *tiēh₂-énti probably should have given **zīḥhānti, however (although zāḥhānti could be possible if we assume an intermediate stage *tiēh₂-enti, cf. zamu- ‘to make cook’ < *tiēh₂-new-), which implies that an analogical rebuilding to zāḥhānti has taken place on the basis of verbs like ḫāši / ḫaššānti, aki / akkānti, yāki / yakkānti. Janda (2005) also assumes that zāḥ- / zāḥ- reflects a root *tiēh₂- ‘to strike’ and adduces Gr. οἶοι ‘sign, mark’ < *tiēh₂-∞n “the beaten one”, Gr.
οἵα 'corpse' < *tióh₂-mn “the killed one” and σατό 'grain, food’ < *tih₂-tó- ‘threshed” as IE cognates.

**zaḫa** (n.) object of silver or gold, used in cultus: nom.-acc.pl. zaḫa (KUB 2.3 i 42, KUB 20.28 i 4, 11).

This word occurs a few times only:

KUB 2.3 i
(41) GAL ME-ŠE-DI pa-iz-zi
(42) nu LUGAL-ı ta-pu-uš-zu za-ha KU.BABBAR da-a-i

‘The head of the bodyguards goes and places silver zaḫa’s to the side of the king’;

KUB 20.28 i
(3) LUGAL-uš MUNUS.LUGAL-aš=ša a-ra-an-da
(4) GAL LU.MES.ME-ŠE-DI za-ha GUŠKIN ḫar-zi
(5) tá=k-kán an-da ii-da-a-i

‘The king and the queen stand. The head of the bodyguards holds the golden zaḫa’s and brings (them) inside’;

KUB 20.28 i
(9) [ ]-an pa-iz-zi NINDA-ha-a-li-in
(10) [ ]-aḫ-šu da-ga-a-an da-a-i
(11) [nu? GAL ME-ŠE-DI za-ha GUŠKIN ḫ-e-da-a-i
(12) [ ]-x NINDA-ha-a-ša-li-in ḫ-e-da-a-i

‘[... ] goes. The ḫūl-bread [...] he places on the ground. The head of the bodyguards brings away the golden zaḫa’s. [ ... ] places the ḫūl-bread on top’.

Apparently, the word denotes some kind of silver or golden objects which are brought and taken away by the head of the bodyguards. Possibly it is used to lay bread upon, if we are allowed to deduce that from the last cited context.

The presence of a single -ḫ-, which is difficult to explain from an IE point of view, may indicate that the word is of foreign origin.

**zaḫhāi**/zaḫhī (c.) ‘battle, war’ (Sum. MĒ): nom.sg. za-ah-ha-tē (KBo 2.5 iii 31 (NH)), acc.sg. za-ah-ha-in (KBo 3.7 iii 23 (OH/NS)), za-ah-ha-en (KBo 3.9 obv.


PIE *tieh₂-oi/- *tieh₂-i-?*

---

The noun *zahhāi*- clearly is a derivative of the verb *zāh-/zaḥ*- ‘to hit, to beat’ (q.v.). The verb *zahhiye/-a*² ‘to battle’, however, is a derivative of *zahhāi*.

The etymology of both words depends on the interpretation of *zāh/-zaḥ*, which I have reconstructed as reflecting a root *tieh₂-*. If this is correct, then *zahhāi*- reflects *tieh₂-oi*-I. We have to assume that the full-grade generalized through the paradigm, which is a common phenomena in diphthong-stems. Note that *zahhiye/a*- which reflects virtual *tieh₂-je:o*- (or *tieh₂-i-je:o-?) shows a different development than *tieh₂-je:o*- > *tāje/a*-² ‘to steal’ (q.v.).


---

This word occurs in one context only:

KUB 20.54 + KBo 13.122 vi (with additions from KUB 55.2 obv. 5 - rev. 2)
1. [DUM]U É.GAL te-e-z[(i ḫe-e-eš MUNUS[ŠU]ʃ|GI te-e-z[i ... le-e?]]
2. *ū-a-ya-at-te-ni* UM-M{[A DUMU É.GAL š]u-up-pa-ja-za=ya pIr-x[ ... UM-MA? MUNUS\$U(GI)]}
‘The palace servant says: ‘Open up!’ The Old Woman says: ‘[...] you [must not?] come’. Thus the palace servant: ‘From the pure [...]’. Thus the palace servant: ‘From the \( zah\)anetti\(\text{m} \)a\(\text{a} \) one [...]’. Thus the Old Woman: ‘From which \( zah\)anetti\(\text{m} \)a\(\text{a} \) one?’. Thus the palace servant: ‘[...] from the mother of the Sun-god’. Thus the Old Woman: ‘When the Sun-god [...] them [...]’.

The context is too unclear for me to do a suggestion about the meaning of the word. If however \( zah\)anetti\(\text{m} \)a\(\text{a} \) functions on a par with \( \text{sup} \)paja\(\text{a} \), it might have to be interpreted as an adjective. Tischler (HH: 204) translates “\( \text{Ort\(\text{l} \)e\(\text{h} \)keit} \) im Tempel, ‘Schrein’?”, but this does not seem probable to me.

\( ga\)\(\text{s} \)\( zah\)harti-: see \( ga\)\(\text{s} \)\( zah\)urti-

\( zah\)heli\(\text{t}\)(\(\text{o} \))- (n.) ‘weeds’: nom.-acc.sg. or pl. \( za\)-\( ah\)\(_{-}\)\( he\)-\( li \)(KBo 6.34+ iii 45).

This word occurs only once:

\( K\)Bo 6.34 + KUB 48.76 iii

(39) \( nu \)\( ki\(\text{s} \)\( an \) te-ez-zi ku-i\(\text{s} \)=\( ya\)\( k\)\(\text{n} \) ke-e
(40) \( li\)-\( in\)-ga-u\(\text{s} \)\( \text{s} \)ar-ri-ez-zi nu-u=\( \text{s}\)\(\text{t} \)\(\text{i} \)\( 4\)IM-a\(\text{s} \)
(41) \( \text{Gi}\)\(\text{s} \)\( ap\)\(\text{i} \)\( n \)\( ar\)-\( ha \) du-\( ya\)\( ar\)-\( na\)-\( a\)-\( i \)
(42) \( [n=\text{a}]\)-\( a\)-\( s\)-\( t\)\( a\) \( l\)\( S\)\(\text{i} \)\( T\)\( U \) IM.\( \text{S} \)U.\( \text{NIG} \)\( R\)\(\text{I} \)\( N\)\( a \) GIM-\( an \)=\( m\)\( a\)\( 1 \)\( ú\)-\( el\)-\( ku \)
(43) \( ša\)-\( r\)[\( a\)]\( a\) \( Ú\)-\( UL \) ú-ez-zi n=\( a\)-\( a\)-\( s\)-\( t\)\( a\) a-pé\(\text{e} \)\( l\)=\( a \)
(44) \( l\)\( S\)\(\text{t}\)\( U \) \( A\).\( Š\)\(\text{A} \)=\( ŠU \)\( Ž\)\(Z\)\(\text{t} \)\( a\)r \( ŠE\)\( 1\)\( M \)\( ša\)-\( ra\)-\( a \) le-e
(45) \( ú\)-\( e\)-\( z\)-\( i \) n=\( [n=\text{a}]\)-\( a\)-\( s\)-\( t\)\( a\) UGU \( za\)-\( ah\)-\( ḫe\)-\( li \) i-j\( a\)-\( ta\)-\( ru \)

‘He says thus: ‘Who will transgress these oaths, for him the Storm-god must break the plough.’. When, however, out of the oven grass does not come up, out of his field grain barley must not come up, (but) \( zah\)heli must go up’.

It is possible that \( zah\)heli means something like ‘weeds’. The word either must be interpreted as a nom.-acc.sg. of a stem \( zah\)heli-, or as a nom.-acc.pl. in -\( i \) of a stem \( zah\)heli-. 
Tischler (HH: 204) states that zah̄eli is “möglicherweise bloß Verschreibung für hah̄eli- ds.”, apparently assuming that za-ah̄-hē-li is wrong for ḫa’-ah̄-hē-li, writing ZA (†) for HA (‡). Problematic for this idea, however, is the fact that hah̄al- ‘greenery, vegetation’ (q.v.) never shows a form hah̄el-, and that the oblique cases of hah̄al- always show geminate -ll- (e.g. nom.-acc.pl. hah̄allī).

gāšzahrai- (c.) ‘knocker(??)’: acc.sg. za-ah-ra-in (KBo 6.10 ii 11 and duplicates).

PIE *tieh₂-r-oï- ??

This word occurs in one context only, namely in §126 of the Hittite Laws:

KBo 6.10 ii (with duplicates)
(11) tāk-ku l-NA KĀ É.GAL GIS za-ah-ra-in ku-iš-ki ta-i-ez-zi
(12) 6 GĪN.GĪN KŪ.BABBAR pa-a-i

‘If someone steals the zahrai- on the gate of the palace, he will pay 6 shekels of silver’.

From this context, it is not exactly clear what kind of object zahrai- refers to. Formally, one could think of a connection with the verb zāh₁- / zahh- ‘to beat, to hit’ (q.v.), which possibly could indicate that zahrai- denotes ‘knocker (on a door)’. If this is true and if zāh₁-/zahh- indeed goes back to a root *tieh₂-, zahrai- could reflect *tieh₂-r-oï-. Note that this word then would show that *Vḥ₂RV > Hitt. VḥRV (cf. also GIS māgha- and kāža muhray/-mahray-).

zah̄huræ-ā (Ic2) ‘to break, to crush’; 3sg.imp.act. za-ah̄-hur-ra-id-du (KBo 10.45 iii 38 (MH/NS), za-ah̄-hur-ra-id-du (KUB 41.8 iii 29 (MH/NS)); impf. za-ah̄-hur-ra-iš-ke-ez-zi (KUB 33.120 ii 31 (MH/NS)), za-ah̄-hur-ra-iš-ke-ez-zi (KUB 33.120 ii 31 (MH/NS)), za-ah̄-hur-ra-iš-ke-ez-zi (KUB 33.120 ii 31 (MH/NS)), za-ah̄-hur-ra-iš-ke-ez-zi (KUB 33.120 ii 31 (MH/NS)); broken: za-ah̄-hur-[a-...] (VSNF 12.131 i 4 (NS)).

PIE *tieh₂-ur-o-ja/o- ?

This verb occurs in a few contexts only. For instance,

KUB 33.93 ii
(23) ḫa-ah̄-hā[ri-in G])l-an ma-a-an ar-ḥa
    za-ah̄-ri-eṣ-ke-ed-du

‘Let him break Tašmišu off like a ḫ. reed’;
Let her not break him off like a reed’; KUB 41.8 iii (with additions from dupl. KBo 10.45)

May the earth below you become the GULÑ and may the sky above become the crusher, and may the sky(?) crush [...] therein’ (cf. CHD P: 59).

The verb clearly means ‘to break, to crush’ and seems to have a stem §DUH. The one attestation showing a stem §DUH (KUB 33.93 iii 34 = 23) may have to be emended to §DUHri-eš-ke-ed-du (a sort of haplography of HU (§R) and RI (§R)¿). The verb belongs to the hatrae-class, which are denominative verbs derived from *o-stem nouns, which indicates that zahḫurae- is built on a unattested noun *zahḫura- ‘crusher, breaker’ (cf. Rieken 1999a: 3561759). This noun easily can be seen as a derivative of the verb zahh- ‘to break, to hit’ (q.v.). If this latter verb indeed reflects a root *tieh₂-, zahḫurae- goes back to virtual *tieh₂-ur-o-je/o-.


This word clearly denotes a wooden object to sit or lie upon, as can be seen e.g. in KUB 20.11 ii (8) ... UGULA LÜMES ALAM.ZU₉ (9) GESza-hur-ti-ja e-ša ‘the head of the clowns sits down on the z.,’ or KUB 36.104 rev. (5) za-hur-ti-i=š-ši ki-it-ta ‘he lies on his z.’. Because of the fact that the word is consistently written with the sign ḤAR/ḪUR, the word could be read zahḥurti- as well. Consensus has it, however, to cite zahḥurti-.

The single spelling of -ḥ- is indicative for a foreign origin of this word, because PIE *h₂ yields fortis -ḫh- unless it stands in leniting position. One could suggests that we have to interpret the word as /shurti-/ and that the single spelling of -ḥ- is due to the fact that it is part of an initial cluster /tsh-/ in the one case where we are sure to deal with such an initial cluster, we regularly find the spelling zasḥ-,
however, namely in za-aś-ḥa-i- `dream’ /tsHai/- < *dʰḥ₂š₂oi-. This indicates that zahurti- stands for ḫahurti- (or ḫaharti-), having a real single -ḥ-, which points to a non-IE origin, in spite of its OS attestation. The fact that the word is of non-IE origin could explain the variation in gender.

zaīl / zaī ([IIa4 > Ic2) ‘to cross, to cross over’ : 2sg.pres.act. za-a-it-ti (KBo 4.3 i 19 (NH), KUB 19.53 ii 9 (MH/MS), KUB 6.41 ii 8 (NH), KBo 4.7 ii 11 (NH)), za-a-[i]-it-ti (KBo 5.13 i 31 (NH), za-a-[i]-š[i] (KUB 33.124 iv 1 (NS)), 3sg.pres.act. za-a-i (KBo 6.2 ii 31 (OS), KUB 31.81 obv. 1 (OS), KBo 6.3 ii 53 (OH/NS), KBo 6.5 iv 14 (OH/NS), KBo 8.38 obv. 7 (NS), KUB 22.29 rev. 3 (NS), KUB 36.25 i 15 (NS), KUB 21.29 ii 42 (NH)), 2pl.pres.act. zi-iš-te-e-n[i] (KUB 26.87, 11 (OH/NS)), 3pl.pres.act. za-a-an-zī (KUB 46.38 i 16 (NS)), za-an-zī (KUB 25.14 iv 13 (OH/NS)), 1sg.pret.act. [z]ē-ē-h-[h]un-un (KBo 16.10, 5 (NH)), zi-ǐh-[h]un-un (KBo 10.2 ii 18, iii 31 (OH/NS), KUB 23.21 rev. 27 (MH/NS)), 3sg.pret.act. za-a-iš (MH/MS, often), za-a-iš (KBo 12.39 i 18 (NS), KUB 14.8 rev. 11 (NH)), za-iš (HKM 46 obv. 7 (MH/MS)), za-a-it (KUB 33.106 iii 10 (NS)), 1pl.pret.act. za-i-u-en (KUB 31.101, 11 (MS)), 3pl.pret.act. za-a-er (KUB 18.24 iii 16 (NS), KUB 49.11 ii 24 (NS)), 2pl.imp.act. za-it-te-en (KUB 31.101, 7 (MS)), za-at-tēn (KUB 40.1 obv. 6 (NS)); verb noun za-a-u-[ar] (KUB 3.95, 1 (NS)); impf. za-iš-ke-a- (KUB 31.130 rev. 7 (OH/MS)), za-aš-ke-a- (KUB 33.117 obv. 10 (NS)), za-a-iš-ke-a- (KUB 33.124 iv 2 (NS), KUB 8.50 ii 10 (NS)), za-a-eš-ke-a- (KUB 12.44, 7 (NH)).

Derivatives: zīnu-3, zīnu-3 (Ib2) ‘to make cross’ ([z]-nu-uz-zī (KBo 10.11 i 7 (OH/NS)), zi-nu-e-er (KBo 3.46 i 19 (OH/NS)), zi-nu-uš-ke-ez-zī (KBo 6.3 ii 52 (OH/NS)); zi-nu-uš-ke-ez-zī (KBo 6.2+19.1 ii 30 (OS)); zi-e-nu-uš-ke-ez-zī (KBo 6.5 iv 12 (OH/NS)); za-nu-ma-an-zī (KBo 22.6 i 20 (OH/NS)), za-nu-um-ma-an-zī (KUB 23.101 iii 8 (NH)); za-i-nu- (IBoT 4.424, 3, KBo 35.227 obv. 9 (NS), KUB 1.8 iv 19 (NH); za-a-i-nu- (IBoT 4.424, 5, IBoT 3.148 iii 42 (MH/NS), KBo 10.44 obv. 19 (NS), KBo 3.6 iii 77 (NH))).

IE cognates: Skt. aṛ- ‘to wander, to roam’; Gr. ἕξ ἀρ ‘further, beyond’, Skt. áy ‘beyond, over’, Lat. er ‘and’, Goth. ih ‘and, but’ ??

PIE *h₁t-oi- *h₁t-i- ??

The oldest forms of this verb clearly belong to the dā/tižanzi-class: zāti, zāti, zišši, zehšun. In younger Hittite, we find forms that inflect according to the haatrae-class (zāši, zānsi, zait, zatten). Despite its archaic formation (the dā/tižanzi-class is a closed category and almost all verbs that inflect thus have a good IE etymology), the verb has never received a credible etymology.
The daiťanazi-class consists of two types of verbs. Firstly, we find one verb that reflects a root that ends in -i-, namely nai- / *ni- ‘to turn’ < *neiH-. The other verbs reflect a formation *CC-oï / *CC-i-, i.e. the zero-grade of a root followed by an ablauting *-oi-/i-suffix (cf. Kloeckhorst ftb.a).

In the case of zaï-zi-, this means that we are either dealing with a root zaï-ending in -i-, or with a stem zaï-. As the sound z- either reflects *Ts or an assibilated *t before *i, the possibilities in the first case are limited. If we have to reckon with a root zaï-, than it either reflects *tiei-, which is unlikely because of the two i’s, or *Tseï-, which is an impossible PIE root structure. I therefore assume that zaï-zi- goes back to an -oi-/i-suffixed formation *zaï-zi-i-.

If zaï-zi- indeed is to be analysed as zaï-zi-i-, then z-, which is phonetically [ts-], must reflect the zero-grade of the root. This means that the root could be *Tes-. Another possibility arises, however, if we look at the prehistory of ḫalzi- / ḫalzi- ‘to shout’. This verb reflects a formation *h₂lt-oï / *h₂lt-i- of which the assibilated variant of the root-final *t of the weak stem (*h₂lt-i- > ḫalzi-) was generalized throughout the paradigm. If a similar scenario could apply in the case of zaï-zi-, we can assume that it reflects a root *Het-.

When looking for roots having either the structure *Tes- or *Het-, I only found one verb within the IE languages that would be connectible to Hitt. zaï-zi- on semantic grounds, namely Skt. at- ‘to roam, to wander’.

Until now, Skt. at- is usually connected with Lat. annus and Goth. apna- ‘year’ < *h₂et-no-, implying a reconstruction *h₂et-. Such a reconstruction is impossible for Hittite, however, as h₂t- should have given **həzi-. The question is, of course, whether Skt. at- indeed is to be connected with the word for ‘year’. Semantically it is not imperative and in my view less probable than a connection with Hitt. ‘to cross (over)’.

If Skt. at- and Hitt. zaï-zi- indeed belong together, then we have to reconstruct a root *h₁3et-, which makes a connection with lat. annus and Goth. apna-impossible. I am wondering to what extent the root *h₁3et- is further connectible with the adverb *h₁eti ‘beyond, over’, the semantics of which are strikingly similar to at least the Hittite verb. If these belong together, we can reconstruct a root *h₁et- (visible in Skt. at- ‘to roam, to wonder’) of which the -oi-/i-suffixed formation (*h₁et-oï/*h₁et-i-) yielded Hitt. zaï-zi-.

The causative of this verb is attested with several stems: zim-, zamu-, zainu-, zāmu-. The stem zim- (with OS attestation) is clearly the original one, reflecting *h₁t-i-neu-. Note that in this form the -i- is retained, in contrast to zamu- ‘to make cook’ < *thy₁-neu-. The stem zainu- is clearly a younger form, built on the 3sg.pres. zāi. The one NH attestation zamu- is likely to be emended za-(i-)mu-.
zakkar: see šakkar, zakkar / šakn-


For an extensive treatment of the semantics of this word see Boysan-Dietrich 1987: 133f. She concludes that zakki- denotes a bolt that can close doors, windows but also covers of chests. It is either made of wood (GIŠ) or metal/copper (URUDU). The dat.-loc.sg. zakkītu shows a Hurrian case-ending, which indicates that the word is of Hurrian origin.

(zallā)- (gender unknown) ‘trot’: acc.sg.? za-al-la-an (KUB 9.1 i 12, 20), abl. za-al-la-az (KUB 29.40 ii 12 etc.), Luw.abl.-instr. za-al-la-ti (KBo 3.5 i 7, 12, 66).

Anat. cognates: CLuw. zallāyu (n.) ‘gait, driving’ (nom.-acc.pl. ? za-al-la-uy-a-ra (KUB 44.4+ rev. 5)).

This word occurs in hippological texts only. According to Kammenhuber (1961a: 366), the word is of Hurrian origin. She interprets zallāti as a Hurrian gloss of Hitt. pennai ‘to make trot’ and zallāzu found in the expression zallāzu uya- ‘to trot’ as the Hittite borrowing of that word. Starke (1990: 546), however, interprets the word as Luwian, and states that zallāti is the Luw. abl.-instr. of a stem zallā-, which is the source of hittitized zalla- of which we find the abl. in zallāzu uya-. Melchert (1993b: 275) follows Starke and adduces a Hitt. acc.sg. za-al-la-an (KUB 9.1 i 12, 20). The latter forms are in such broken contexts, however, that we cannot decide whether they really mean ‘trot’ there. According to Starke (1990: 544f.), the stem zallā- is found in the Luwian word zallāyu (n.) ‘gait, driving’ (attested with gloss wedge in Hittite context: KUB 44.4+ rev. 5) as well. No further etymology.

(zalhā)- (n.) vessel used in rituals: nom.-acc.sg. za-al-ḥa-a-i (e.g. IBoT 2.14 i 4), za-al-ḥa-i, abl. za-al-ḥa-ja-az, instr. za-al-ḥa-a-it, za-al-ḥa-it.

PIE *ṭh₂-ō-/??

Although this word shows the archaic diphthong-inflection, no IE etymology has been offered to date, as far as I am aware. If the connection between zaluganu- and dūluki- (see their respective lemmas) indeed proves that an initial dental was
assibilated before *l in Hittite, I am wondering to what extent we can connect zalḥāi- to the root *tleh₂- ‘to carry’. Semantically a meaning ‘carrier’ would fit well for zalḥāi-, and formally a reconstruction *th₂-ḏā- (with generalized zero-grade out of the oblique stems) would regularly yield Hitt. ʿlḥāi-ı-, spelled zalḥāi-.


Derivatives: *zalukēšš-*. (ib2) ‘to take long’ (3sg.pret.act. za-lu-ki-řš-ta (KUB 18.59 + KUB 6.9 i 13 (NS)), za-lu-keš[ta] (KUB 50.77 + KUB 49.73 r.col. 5 (NS)).

**PIE *dλugʰ*.**

The one attestation za-lu-uk-nu-za (note the very archaic 3sg.pres.-ending -za instead of -zi) proves that the stems of these verbs are zaluk-nu- and zaluk-ēšš-. It has always been noted by scholars that these verbs closely resemble daluknu² ‘to lengthen’ and dalukēšš² ‘to become long’ not only from a formal point of view, but from a semantical point of view as well. Since Larroche (1950: 41), however, the two stems dalug- and zalug- are regarded as separate forms: the former is seen as a cognate to Skt. dūrghā-; Gr. ἀσπίζειν ‘long’ etc., and the latter as a cognate to Gr. ἀρτόζον ‘to end’. This has found wide acceptance: for instance, Eichner (1973a: 85¹) reconstructs daluki- as *dλugʰ-ó- and *zaluki- as *sλh₂g₂-; Melchert (1994a: 67) similarly reconstructs *dλ-(e)ugʰ- and *sλ-(e)ug- respectively (with different enlargements).

In my view, however, the words zaluknu- and zalukēšš- are semantically that similar to daluknu- and dalukēšš- that they must be cognate in one way or another. This view was also expressed by Oettinger (1979a: 249), who explains the formal difference between the two stems as reflecting ablaut. He states that zl- reflects *dλ- whereas dal- goes back to *dol-. This is supported by the fact that the adjective daluki- shows a few plene spellings da-a-lu-, which indicate that it reflects a full grade form *dʌlug-i-, whereas the derived verbs in -nu- and -ēšš- in principle should use the zero-grade stem: *dʌlugʰ-nêu- and *dʌlugʰ-ēh₂sh₁-. If we assume that in Hittite an initial dental assibilated before *l (*#Tl- > Hitt. #zl- as in
zalhāṣi-< *th₂-či-, then *d lug-nē-u- and *d lugš-čiš₃- regularly would yield Hitt. zluku- and zlukēš-. The verbs daluknu- and dalukēšš- probably are to be interpreted as /talungnā-/ and /talugēš-/ (cf. the one attestation dā-a-lu-ke-eš-zī!), having restored the full grade of the adjective and subsequently its t-.

See at taluki- / talugai- for further etymology.

gāš zaluyani- (c.) 'plate (vel sim.):' nom.sg. [Gš][za-lūq-qā-nē-šāš] (KBo 3.34 iii 19), [Gš][za-lūq-qā-nē-šāš] (KBo 3.34 iii 22), Gš za-lūq qa-ni-iš (KBo 3.34 iii 25), dat.-loc.sg. Gš za-lū[qa-n] (KBo 3.34 iii 19)

This word occurs in one context only:

KBo 3.34 iii

(16) DUMU TURŠi [u][u]-ji[ja]a-ap-pa-an=n=âPš-im-pi-ri-ir [DUMU UB] 3-Ni-na-aš-ša
(17) ki-i kar-di-[i][a]-aš=ša-aš DUMUMŠ e-iš-e-r mu-u=š-ma-aš [Gšš] 3-U.A
(18) ki-šša ta [Gšš][bANŠ] [U]-u=š-ma-aš ki-šša

Those who sit as brothers before the father of the king, Ammuna the son from Šukija and behind (him) Pimpirit the son of Ninašša, these were the sons of his heart. A chair is placed before them. A table is placed before them. A zaluyani- is placed before them. They put ūpapāsa-'s on the zaluyani'.

It is possible that ūpapāsa- denotes 'dish' (cf. HW² H: 218), so zaluyani- probably denotes a table or plate on which the dishes are placed. No further etymology.

zama(n)kur (n.) 'beard': nom.-acc.sg. za-ma-ku (KUB 30.10 ii 8 (OH/MS), KUB 31.127 i 11 (OH/NS), za-ma-an kur (KBo 21.20 i 25 (NS), KUB 35.45 ii 33 (NS)), za-ma-an-ger (KUB 24.12 ii 21, iii 7, 34 (NS)).

Derivatives: šamankuryant- (adj.) 'bearded' (nom.pl.c. ša-ma-an-ku-ūr-ya-an-te-eš (KBo 3.8 iii 25 (NH)), acc.pl.c. ša-ma-an-ku-ūr-ya-du-uš (KBo 3.8 iii 7 (NH))).

IE cognates: Skt. śmāṣru- 'beard', Arm. mawrow-k- 'beard', Lith. smākas, smekrā 'chin', Alb. mjekær 'chin, beard'.

PIE *smōk-ur

It is remarkable that all attestations with -n- are found in NS texts (including the derivative šamankuryant-), whereas the variant za-ma-ku (attested twice, so it
cannot be disregarded as a form to be emended to *za-ma(-an-)-kur) is attested in a MH/MS and an OH/NS text. Does this indicate that the original form was *zamakur in which a nasal was inserted in NH times only? If so, then it would explain the fact that all IE cognates lack a nasal (Skt. *smaśru-, Arm. mwārow-’ ‘beard’ etc. < *smōk-ru-).

The other IE languages show a preform *smōk-ru-, whereas Hittite points to *smōk-ur (note that if *za-ma-kur is the original form, it shows lenition of *k to Hitt. single -k- due to the preceding *ó, cf. § 1.4.1). This indicates that the PIE form *smōk-ur only after the split-off of Anatolian was metathesized to *smokru.

The word zama(n)kur is consistently spelled with za-, whereas the derivative šamankuryant- is spelled with ša-. The origin of this z- has been debated. E.g. Oettinger (1994: 322) argues that we are dealing with a sporadic development of *s > z in a nasal environment. This is quite ad hoc, however, and does not explain the š- in šamankuryant-. The only other case where initial *s- ends up as Hitt. z- is in zakkar ‘faeces’, which has an oblique stem šakan- with š- (see at šakkar, zakkar / šakan-). In my view, it is remarkable that in both zama(n)kur and zakkar only the nom.-acc.sg.n.-form shows z- and not the oblique stem or derivatives. I therefore want to propose that the development *s- > z- is due to a false analysis of the syntagms *tod smōkur and *tod škőr (or whatever preceding pronoun) as *tod ’smōkur and *tod ’skőr respectively. Note that this only happened when we are dealing with *sC- (cf. šakkar < *sokr, but also e.g. šahyan ‘corvée’ < *sēhy, šākan ‘oil’ < *sāḏu, etc.).

zamna/- (unclear) ’?’: case? za-am-ni-ša-an (KBo 3.8 iii 11), za-am-na-ә (KBo 3.8 iii 29).

These words occur in the following contexts only:

KBo 3.8 iii
10. ... ú-li-pa-na-an pár-ga-u-e-i
11. ḫa-mi-ik-ta UR.MAH za-am-ni-ša-an
12. ḫa-mi-ik-ta

‘He tied the ulip- on the high (place), he tied the lion zamnišan’,

besides

ibid.
28. ... ú-li-ip-za-a(n)=š-ša-an

1191
‘He released the *ulipza-* on the high (place), he released the lion *zammaš*.’

It is not clear what case-forms the two words represent nor what they mean.


This verb is attested from MH times onwards. It clearly belongs to the ḫatrae-class, which consists of denominate verbs derived of *o*-stem nouns. In this case, the verb probably is derived from a noun *zammura*-+. A few times the verb is preceded by a gloss wedge, which can indicate a foreign origin.

A nominal stem *zammura*— is attested in CLuwian, where we find the nouns *zammurai*- and *zammuratt*-, both meaning ‘insult, slander’. It is therefore likely that the Hittite verb *zammurae*- is built on a Luwian nominal stem *zammura*— ‘insult, slander’. Further etymology of this form is unknown.

*zankila*— / *zankil*— (IIa1γ) ‘to fine, to punish’: 3sg.pres.act. za-an-ki-la-i (KBo 2.4 l.edge 4 (NS)), 3pl.pres.act. za-an-ki-la-an-zi (KUB 21.29 iii 33, KUB 23.123, 5, KUB 13.4 iv 10), 3pl.imp.act. za-an-ki-la-a-an-du (KUB 9.15 ii 22 (NS)).

Derivatives: *zankilatar* / *zankilam*-— (n.) ‘penalty, fine’ (nom.-acc.sg. za-an-ki-la-tar, dat.-loc.sg. za-an-ki-la-an-ni (KUB 5.5 iv 15), nom.-acc.pl. za-an-ki-la-tar1γ (KUB 5.6 ii 48), za-an-ki-la-tar-ri1γ (KUB 5.6 iii 34)).

PIE *shnk-i + *l(i)h₁- ??

This verb on the one hand shows the *tarm(a)-inflection in 3sg.pres.act. *zankilai* (KBo 2.4 l.edge 4 (NS)), 3sg.pres.act. za-an-ki-la-an-zi (KUB 21.29 iii 33, KUB 23.123, 5, KUB 13.4 iv 10), 3pl.imp.act. za-an-ki-la-a-an-du (KUB 9.15 ii 22 (NS)). 3pl.pres.act. *zankilanzi* can belong to both. Since both inflections are productive in NH times, we cannot decide what the original inflection was. Nevertheless, it is not likely that the ḫatrae-class inflection is original, since verbs of this class do not show secondary influence by the *tarm(a)-class. Therefore,
Oettinger’s citation (1979a: 34) of this verb as \textit{zankila\textae} is incorrect. Rieken (1999a: 480, following Eichner 1973a: 98\textsuperscript{78}) assumes that “\textit{zankila\textae}” is derived from an *-il-stem noun *\textit{zankil}-, but this is then equally incorrect.

I am wondering to what extent we can compare the inflection of \textit{zankila\textae} to lā\textsuperscript{j} / l- ‘to let go’ and assume an old univerbation of a noun *\textit{zanki} + lā\textsuperscript{j} / lanzi. Oettinger (1979a: 152\textsuperscript{80}) suggests as a root etymology a connection with Lat. \textit{sanciō} ‘to make holy, inviolable’ and \textit{sacrāmentum} ‘security, deposit’, which words probably reflect *\textit{sh}nk- and *\textit{sh}k- (cf. Schrijver 1991: 97). If this root etymology is correct, we have to interpret *\textit{zanki} as an old dat.-loc.sg. of a noun *\textit{zank}- that reflects *\textit{sh}nk-. The original meaning of the verb then may have been something like ‘to let go into security’. Nevertheless, the formal side of this etymology, namely the development of initial *s- into Hitt. z-, is highly dubious. Oettinger (l.c.) assumes that “s > z im Anlaut in Nachbarschaft von n’”, but his examples in favour of this development, \textit{zena}- and \textit{zamankur}, to which he adds \textit{zakkar}, \textit{zapnu\textsuperscript{3}}, \textit{zalugu\textsuperscript{3}} and \textit{zinn\textsuperscript{3}} / \textit{zimm} in 1994: 323-4, have to be explained otherwise (see their respective lemmas).

\textit{zanu\textsuperscript{3}} ‘to cook (trans.): see \textit{zē\textsuperscript{3}(t)} / z-

\textit{zanu\textsuperscript{3}} ‘to make cross’: see \textit{zai\textsuperscript{3}} / zi-

\textit{zappi\textae}/\textit{a\textsuperscript{3}} (Ic1) (act.) to drop, to drip; (midd.) to leak’: 3sg.pres.act. \textit{za-ap-pi-ja-zi} (KUB 9.15+39.52 iii 29, 30), 3pl.pret.act. \textit{za-ap-pi-e-er} (KUB 48.7 iii 3, 12), \textit{za-ap-pi-i-e-er} (KUB 48.7 iii 8), 3sg.pres.midd. \textit{za-ap-pi-ja-at-ta} (KBo 3.23 i 11, KUB 13.2 ii 38), \textit{za-ap-pi-ja-at-ta-ri} (KUB 31.86 ii 18, KUB 31.89 ii 7); impf. \textit{za-ap-pi-iš-ke-ez-zi} (KUB 30.10 ii 15).


Oettinger (1979a: 528) suggests to connect \textit{zappi\textae}/\textit{a\textsuperscript{3}} with ModHG \textit{Soft ‘juice’}, but this word rather belongs rather with Lat. \textit{sapiō} ‘to have taste, to know’ < *\textit{sh}Hp- (cf. Schrijver 1991: 93-4), which makes a connection with \textit{zappi\textae}/\textit{a\textsuperscript{3}} highly unlikely. Moreover, the formal side is difficult, because *s- does not normally yield Hitt. z-. Note that Oettinger (1994: 321f.) tries to fix this problem by posing a sporadic development by which initial *s- can yield Hitt. z-, namely
through “Fernassimilation durch Nasal”. In this case, z- must then have originated in the causative zapnu². All other examples that Oettinger adduces in favour of this development, zakkar, zalugnu², zamankur, zankila³ / zankil-, zena-, and zinni³ / zinn-, must be explained otherwise, however (see their respective lemmas).

Mechanically, zapplie/a- should be reconstructed as *tiap/-je/o-, which in my view could easily be onomatopoetic (cf. e.g. ModEng. drip).

α zaršija- (c.) ‘safeconduct, warranty’: acc.sg. α za-ar-ši-ja-an (KUB 14.3 ii 61), gen.sg. α za-ar-ši-ja-aš (KUB 14.3 ii 62), dat.-loc.sg. α za-ar-ši-ja (KUB 14.3 ii 64).

This word is consistently written with a gloss wedge, which points to a foreign (Luwian?) origin. No further etymology.

zarzur- (n.) ‘concoction’: nom.-acc.sg. za-ar-zu-úr (KUB 42.107 iii 13 (OH/NS)), za-ar-zu-u-úr (KUB 31.57 iv 18 (OH/NS)), za-ar-zu-ú-úr (KUB 34.89 obv. 6 (OH?/MS)), [za-α]-zu-úr (KUB 34.89 obv. 1 (OH?/MS)).

This noun is treated by Rieken (1999a: 359) who convincingly assumes that it means ‘concoction’. She argues that the word is of Luwian origin, because of the occurrence of z before dark vowels. This is not imperative however (cf. zāh³ / zah-, zalḥāi- and zaluknu²). Rieken suggests a connection with the root *kôrh² -‘to mix’ and unconvincingly reconstructs *kôrh₂-kôrh₂, with loss of the first laryngeal in o-grade form and of the second one in Auslaut, and with syllabification of *r to -ur as supposedly in Luw. gurta- < *g³rd³-o- and HLuw. zura/in- ‘horn’ < *k̪r³n-. I can offer no alternative, however.

zašhai-: see tešha-

zašgaraš / zašgarišš- (n.) ‘anus’: nom.sg. za-šaš-ga-ra-šš (KBo 17.61 rev. 14 (MH/MS)), dat.-loc.sg. za-šaš-ga-ri-iš-šš (KBo 17.61 rev. 14 (MH/MS)).

PIE *skr + *h₁e₁h₁-es-

This word clearly is a compound of zakkar ‘dung’ (see šakkar, zakkar / šakn-) and aiš- / išš- ‘mouth’ (q.v.). See there for further etymological considerations.

√ qabh zābu (n.): nom.-acc.sg. za-a-u.
This word occurs quite often in rituals and probably denotes some kind of container, vessel or plate. It is usually accompanied with the adjective KÚ.BABBAR ‘silver’ or GUŠ KIN ‘gold’. Once we find an attestation where zǎu bears the determinative GIŠ ‘wood’ (KUB 59.19 v 7; GIŠ za-a-u KÚ.BABBAR), which might indicate that in principle a zǎu is made of wood, but that in rituals silver or golden ones were used. Note that the word is consistently spelled za-u, which is remarkable. The only other instance of a spelling za-u is ši-i-iš-ḫa-u ‘sweat’ (q.v.); in all other cases we find za-û. If this spelling is to be interpreted as ḫa-û, it is likely that the word is not of IE origin.

*zaz̄hai*:- see tešha-

z̄è²(θi) / z- (IIIa) ‘to cook (intr.), to be cooked’; 3sg.pres.midd. ze-e-ja (KBo 17.36 ii 11 (OS)), zè-e-a-ri (KUB 53.11 ii 6 (MS), KBo 5.1 i 29, 36 (MH/NS), KBo 15.49 i 13 (MH/NS)), zè-e-ja-ri (KBo 8.91 i 6 (MS), KUB 32.49a iii 25, 33, 25, etc. (MH/MS)), zè-a-ri (ABoT 20+ rev. 6 (MH/MS)), zè-ia-ri (KUB 60.121 obv. 7 (MS), KUB 2.6 v 8 (OH/NS), KUB 32.128 ii 27 (MH/NS), KUB 7.4, 13 (NS)), ze-ia-ri (KUB 7.13 rev. 17 (NS)), [z]é-i-e-ri (KBo 18.201 rev. 8 (NS)), 3pl.pres.midd. zè-ia-an-ta (KBo 4.9 i 23 (NS)), 3pl.pres.act. zè-e-a-an-ta-ri (Bo 69/601 iii 4 (NS)); part. ze-e-an-t- (OS), zè-e-an-t- (OS), zè-ja-an-t-, zè-e-ja-an-t-, ze-ja-an-t-.


PIE *tiēh₁-o, *tih₁-neu-

This verb is usually cited as zeja-, zea- or zija-. This is misleading as -a- is not part of the stem but the 3sg.pres.midd.-ending. The one form [z]é-i-e-ri (KBo 18.201 rev. 8), which seems to indicate a stem zeje- besides zeja-, is to be interpreted as zè-i-ja-ri (cf. Melchert 1994a: 35). The verb is written with either the sign ZĒ or with ZI. The latter sign can also be read ze, and therefore all attestations point to a stem zè-. In the causative zanu³ (probably ḫnu-l), we find a stem z-. I therefore cite the verb as zè²(θi) / z-.

An ablaut z̄è- / z- can only be explained if we assume a ‘preform’ *zeh₁- / *zh₁-.

The origin of z- is difficult, however, and opinions differ. For instance, Oettinger (1979a: 515) reconstructs *seih₁- (Lat. sinere ‘to let’), whereas Melchert (1994a: 118) reconstructs *teih₁- (Lat. ūto ‘fire-brand’). LIV² also reconstructs *teih₁- but connects this with OIr. tinaid ‘to melt’. All reconstructions seem unlikely to
me, as I do not see how *seih₁- or *teih₁- would yield z- (Melchert’s assumption (i.e.) that *r assimilates before -ei- as well is totally ad hoc). In my view, only a preform *tieh₁- / *tieh₁- would be able to explain the outcome zē- / z- (note that *tieh₁-neu- probably phonetically became *ti₂h₁-neu-, yielding Hitt. ḫən₁-./, spelled zame-<, which contrasts with *h₁ti₂-neu- > zimu- ‘to make cross’).

Within Hittite, a connection with zinni² / zimm- ‘to stop, to finish’ is likely on formal grounds as the latter verb probably reflects *ti₂-ne₃h₁-. This could mean that the middle zē- / z- originally meant ‘to be brought to its end > to be cooked; to cook (intr.).’ If this indeed is the semantical development displayed by zē- / z-, one may wonder if connecting zē- / z- with IE words like Lat. tūto ‘fire-brand’ or OIr. tinaid ‘to melt’ makes much sense.

\[ ze(\dot{i})a- : \text{see } z\ddot{e}^{\text{er}} / z- \]

zēna- (gender unknown) ‘autumn’: gen.sg. zē-e-na-aš (KUB 38.32 rev. 21, IBoT 2.93, 8, KBo 13.248 i 13), dat.-loc.sg. zē-e-ni (often), zē-ni.


PIE *tieh₁-no-

Friedrich (HW) cites this word as commune, giving a nom.sg. zenāš. I have not been able to find this form, however: all cases of zēnaš that I could find had to be interpreted as gen.sg. Just as we find ḫamešhant- ‘spring’ beside ḫamešha- ‘id.’ and gimmant- ‘winter’ beside gim₃m- ‘id.’, we here find zēnant- beside zēna-.

Oettinger (1979a: 152⁰<) states that zēna- reflects *seno- ‘year’, showing a development *s- > z- in nasal environment. He repeats this view in 1994: 323, adducing Lyc. -sniḥ ‘year(?)’. I am rather sceptical about this etymology as I do not think that such a phonetic development can be established for Hittite. Moreover, I find it semantically unlikely that a word ‘year’ would develop into ‘autumn’.

I would rather suggest a tie-in with zē<,⁰/ z- ‘to cook < *to bring to its end’ and zinni² / zimm- ‘to stop, to finish’ and reconstruct *tieh₁-no- ‘the closing (season) > autumn’.

\[ zenna- : \text{see } zinni² / zinn- \]

\[ zenni- : \text{see } zinni² / zinn- \]

1196
-zepe-: see at\(^{(f)}\)tag ţezepa-

\textit{zēri-} (n.) ‘cup’ (Sum. \textsuperscript{DUG}\textsc{GAL}: nom.-acc.sg. ze-e-rī (KUB 17.3+ iv 31 (OS)), all.sg. ze-e-rī-ja (KBo 17.3+ iv 32, (OS)).

Derivatives: \textsuperscript{(gr}zērijalli- (n.) ‘cup-holder’ (nom.acc.sg. zē-e-rī-ja-ä-[li] (KBo 27.42 ii 29), zē-ri-ja-ä-li (KBo 4.9 v 18), z[e-r]i-ja-ä-li (KUB 10.21 ii 7), \textsuperscript{g}zē-ri-[i-ja-ä-li (?)] (KBo 21.78 ii 1)), gen.sg. zē-ri-ja-ä-li-ä (KUB 42.87 v 16), zē-ri-ja-li-ja-ä (KUB 55.54 obv. 32).

\textsc{PIE} \textsuperscript{*tiēh₁-ri-}

Although this word is attested in its phonetic form only twice (both in OS texts), its numerogram \textsuperscript{DUG}\textsc{GAL} is attested quite often. The sign ZI can be read zi as well as ze, so ZI-e-ri(-) can be interpreted as zēri- as is indicated as well by the spelling zē-ri-ja-ä-li of the derivative.

Formally, the word could be a deverbalative noun in -ri-, like ešri- ‘shape’, edri- ‘food’ and aurî- ‘lookout’ from eš\(\text{²}\) / aš- ‘to be’, ed\(\text{²}\) / ad- ‘to eat’ and au\(\text{²}\) / u- ‘to see’ respectively. In that case zēri- would be derived of the verb zē\(\text{³⁰}\) ‘to cook’, which might make sense from a semantic point of view as well: ‘the cooking cup’.

\textit{-zi} (3sg.pres.act.-ending of the \textit{mi}-flection)

Anat. cognates: Pal. \textsuperscript{9}C-\textit{ti}, \textsuperscript{9}V-\textit{ti}, \textsuperscript{9}V\textit{-ti} (3sg.pres.act.-ending); CLuw. \textsuperscript{9}C-\textit{ti}, \textsuperscript{9}V-\textit{ti}, \textsuperscript{9}V\textit{-ti} (3sg.pres.act.-ending); HLuw. -\textit{ti} = \textit{l-ti}/ or \textit{l-di}/, -\textit{ri} = \textit{l-di}/ (3sg.pres.act.-ending); Lyc. -\textit{ti}, -\textit{di} (3sg.pres.act.-ending).

\textsc{PIAnat} \textsuperscript{*-\textit{ti}}

IE cognates: Skt. -\textit{ti}, Gr. -\textit{th}, Lith. -\textit{ti}, Lat. -\textit{t}, Goth. -\textit{t}.

\textsc{PIE} \textsuperscript{*-\textit{ti}}

Although the bulk of the attestations the 3sg.pres.act.-ending of the \textit{mi}-conjugation show -\textit{zi}, we occasionally find -za as well: e-eš-za (KBo 6.2 iv 54 (OS)), ḫar-za (KBo 9.73 obv. 12 (OS), KBo 24.9 i 5 (OH/MS)), šis-tar-ni-ik-za (KBo 40.272, 5 (MS)), pu-uš-za (KBo 8.128 l.col. 3 (OH/NS), KUB 34.10, 6 (fr.), 9 (OH/NS), KBo 13.36 rev. 4 (fr.), 7, 10, 13 (fr.) (OH/MS?)), šar-k\textit{-u-ez}-za (KBo 25.196, 4 (OS); but interpretation not fully certain), [šar-ni-ik]-za (KBo 6.2 iv 55 (OS) ll šar-ni-ik-zi (KBo 6.3 iv 54)), ta-ru-uḫ-za (KUB 43.75 rev. 9 (OH/NS)), za-lu-uk-nu-za (KUB 26.17 i 9 (MH/MS)). These forms are clearly archaic and show that the original ending of the 3sg.pres.act. was -\textit{za} = \textit{l-tl}/, to
which already in pre-Hittite times an extra -i was added in analogy to -mi, -ši, -yeni and -nī. In the other Anatolian languages, we find the ending -ti/ as well as -di/, the latter being the lenited variant.

These endings clearly belong with e.g. Skt. -ti, Gr. -nThe, Lith. -ti, Lat. -t, Goth. -t, etc. < PIE *-ti.

**ziḷa**: see zë*(e−)/z-

**zi₂k / tu-** (pers. pron. 2sg.) ‘you (sg.)’: nom.sg. zi-i-ik (OS), zi-ik (OS), zi-g=a (OS), acc.sg. tu-uk (MH/MS), gen.sg. tu-e-el (OS), tu-e-l=a (OS), tu-el (MH/MS), dat.-loc.sg. tu-uk (MH/MS), abl. tu-e-da-az, tu-e-ta-az.

Derivatives: **zikila** ‘you yourself’ (zi-ki-la (MH/MS)).

Anat. cognates: Pal. Ɪ / ꞯ ‘you (sg.)’ (nom.sg. ti-i, ti-=, acc.-dat.sg. tu-ù); CLuw. Ɪ ‘you (sg.)’ (nom.sg. ti-i, ti-i=‘=ha, ti-i=’=ha); HLuw. ꞯ / ꞯ ‘you (sg.)’ (nom.sg. ti=ha=wa’i=za (ASSUR letter g §52), dat.-loc.sg. tu-u (ASSUR letter f §16), abl.-instr. tu-wa’i-ri+i (ASSUR letter f §10).

PAnat. Ɪ / ꞯ

IE cognates: Skt. tvām, acc. tvām, GA v. tva₂m, acc. ṭvām, TochB tuwe, TochA tu, Gr. ṭ, Dor. ṭó, Lat. tū, Goth. ṭu, Lith. tū, OCS tyv.

PIE Ɪ, ꞯ

See chapter 2.1 for a detailed treatment of these forms.

**zik(k)e/a⁻²**, impf. of dai- / ti- (q.v.)

**zinna**: see zinni⁻² / zinn-

**zinai₃** (n.) a food-stuff: nom.-acc.sg. zi-na-a-il (Bo 3123 iv 6 (OS), KUB 42,107 ii 11 (OH/NS)), zi-na-il (KBo 11,41 i 8 (OH/NS)), [z]i-en-na-el (IBoT 2,93 rev. 14 (OH/NS)).

See Rieken 1999a: 488f. for attestations and interpretation of this word. She convincingly argues that the word is of Hattic origin. The NS form [z]i-en-na-el may show lowering of OH /i/ to NH /e/ before -n- (cf. § 1.4.8.1.d) as well as fortition of OH intervocalic /n/ to NH /N/ (cf. § 1.4.7.2.e).

**zinakki** (c.) a plant(-product): nom.sg. zi-na-ak-ki-iš (KUB 7,53 + KUB 12,58 i 47).
The word occurs only once, in a list of ingredients for cultic matters. Its meaning is unclear and therefore no etymology.


\textbf{PIE} *\textit{ti-ne-h₁-}, *\textit{ti-n-h₁-}.

In the older texts, this verb is consistently spelled \textit{zi-in-}. Only in NH times, we find spellings with \textit{ze-en-}, which is due to the lowering of OH /i/ to NH /e/ before -\textit{n}- (cf. § 1.4.8.1.d). The older attestations show an ablaut between \textit{zinni} (\textit{zinniši, zinnizzi}) in the singular and \textit{zinn-} (\textit{zinanzzi}) in the plural. Already in OS we find that, on the basis of the analysis of \textit{zinnanzi} as \textit{zinna-nzi}, that the stem \textit{zina-} becomes productive, giving e.g. 1pl. \textit{zinayeni} (OS), instead of the more original \textit{zinnumŋəni} (although the latter form is found in a NS text only). From MH/NS onwards, we find \textit{tarm(a)}-class inflected forms like \textit{zinmahhi} and \textit{zinnqi}.

The ablaut found in the oldest forms, \textit{zinni}² / \textit{zinn-} is only explicable if we assume *\textit{Ceh₁-} / *\textit{Ch₁-} (thus Oettinger 1979a: 152). Melchert (1984a: 114) correctly remarks that despite this attractive interpretation, the verb is consistently spelled \textit{zi-in-ni-} instead of expected *\textit{zi-in-ne-}. Therefore, Melchert states that the verb cannot be cited as \textit{zimne-} (as e.g. Oettinger does) but must be rendered \textit{zinni-} “whatever the explanation of the i vocalism” (l.c.). Perhaps we are dealing with
some kind of raising of \(^*\)zimm\(\ddot{\text{z}}\)i to zimm\(\ddot{\text{i}}\) because of the phonetic environment (cf. § 1.4.9.1).

Oettinger (1979a: 152) gives two possible reconstructions for this verb, namely \(^*\)tineh\(\text{n}_1\)- and \(^*\)sineh\(\text{n}_1\)-. He favours the latter, because of a possible connection with Lat. sinere ‘to allow, to let, to permit’. I do not understand the semantic connection, however. A meaning ‘to allow, to permit’ is quite something else than ‘to stop, to finish, to be ready with’: the meanings are rather opposites. Also formally, the connection is problematic as I do not think that sineh\(\text{n}_1\) - would yield zi-: there are many Hittite words starting in ši- < \(^*\)si-<, also when containing nasals.

In my view, we therefore rather reconstruct \(^*\)tin\(\text{h}_1\)-ti, tin\(\text{h}_1\)-enti. These forms would regularly yield pre-Hitt. \(^*\)zimm\(\ddot{\text{z}}\)i / zim\(\ddot{\text{n}}\)anzi, after which the -\(\text{m}\)- of the plural was generalized throughout the paradigm and the -\(\text{z}\)- of the singular was raised to -\(\text{i}\)-.

I would suggest that the root \(^*\)tieh\(\text{n}_1\)- is the same as the one visible in z\(\ddot{\text{g}}\)a\(\text{n}\)/ z- ‘to cook (intr.), to be cooked’, which therefore must be interpreted as originally denoting ‘to be brought to its end’. This would indicate that of the root \(^*\)tieh\(\text{n}_1\)- the meaning ‘to end, to finish’ is primary, and not ‘to cook’, which makes a tie-in with OIr. tinaid ‘to melt’ (cf. at z\(\ddot{\text{g}}\)a\(\text{n}\)) less likely.

Note that in \(^*\)ti-n-eh\(\text{n}_1\)- the t is assibilated with retention of the -\(\text{i}\)- (so also zim\(\ddot{\text{z}}\)- ‘to make cross’ < \(^*\)h\(\text{i}_1\)-i-neu\(\text{n}\)-), which contrasts with zanu\(\text{z}\)- ‘to make cook’ < \(^*\)th\(\text{i}_1\)-neu\(\text{n}\)-.

\(\text{MUNUS}^\text{MUNUS}\) zint\(\dot{\text{u}}\)hi- (c.) ‘girl’ (Sum. \(\text{MUNUS}^\text{MUNUS}\) KLSIKIL): gen.sg.(?) zi-in-tu-\(\ddot{\text{h}}\)i-ja-[\(\text{a}\)?], nom.pl. zi-in-tu-\(\ddot{\text{h}}\)i-e\(-\text{e}\) (OS), zi-in-tu-\(\ddot{\text{h}}\)i-e\(\text{s}\) (OS), zi-in-tu-\(\ddot{\text{h}}\)i-i-e\(-\text{e}\), gen.pl. zi-in-tu-\(\ddot{\text{h}}\)i-ja\(\text{a}\).

According to Friedrich (HW, Erg. 3: 38), \(\text{MUNUS}^\text{MUNUS}\) zint\(\dot{\text{u}}\)hi- alternates with \(\text{MUNUS}^\text{MUNUS}\) KLSIKIL in parallel texts, which would determine its meaning as ‘girl’. The word probably is of foreign (Hattic?) origin, which can be seen by the occurrence of the single -\(\text{h}\)- which is hard to explain from an IE point of view.

\(\text{zinu}^\text{\ddot{\text{z}}}\) ‘to make cross’: see zai\(\ddot{\text{a}}\)/ zi-

\(\text{zinnuk}\) ‘?': zi-in-nu-uk (VBoT 1, 26)

This word occurs only once, in the first Arzawa-letter:

VBoT 1

1200
(25) ... iš-ta-ma-aš-šu-un
(26) zi-in-mu-uk ḫu-u-ma-an-da

‘I heard everything zimmuk’.

We know that this letter is written by an Egyptian person, which might explain the aberrantness of this form. It could perhaps be built on the verb zinni- "to be finished", and then mean something like ‘I heard that everything is finished’. This is quite speculative, though.

zipa-: see šipa-, zipa-

-zipa-: see at `tagašnea-

zipat, zipattan(n)i (uninf.) a small measure unit, especially for food: zi-pāt (OS), zi-pāt-ta-an-ni (OS), zi-pād-da-ni (OS)

The exact meaning of these words is not clear. Like many other measure units, they probably are of a foreign origin.

zizzahi- (c.) Hurrian term, denoting some ritual beverage: acc.sg. zi-iṣ-za-ḫi-in (KUB 15.1 i 17).

The word occurs in Hurrian texts quite often. Only once we find it in a Hittite text:

```
KUB 15.1 i
(15) ... ḫe-pāt=ya
(16) me-mi-iš-ke-ez-zi I[-NA] KUR[GIRU] GIDRU-ti=ya=mu
(17) zi-iṣ-za-ḫi-in i-[a-an-d]a I[-NA] KUR Mu-kiš=ma=ya=mu
(18) GEŠTIN i-ja-an-du
```

‘Ḫepat says: In Ḥatti they have to make zizzahi- for me, but in Mukiš they have to make wine for me’.

It clearly denotes some kind of beverage.

In Friedrich HW Erg. 3: 38, this form is mistakenly regarded as a variant of zizzuḫi- (vessel for wine). It clearly is of Hurrian origin.

zizzipantti-šAR (c.) a herb: nom.sg. zi-iṣ-zi-pa-an-ti-iš (KBo 13.248 i 11).
The word occurs only once in a list of herbs. Its exact meaning is unknown and therefore no etymology.

† zuḫri-: see uzuḫri-

& ẓūya- (c.) ‘bread, food’ (Sum. NINDA): nom.sg. NINDA-āš (KUB 3.105 i 2), acc.sg. zu-u-ya-an (KUB 36.5 i 4, KUB 13.4 iv 67, 71, KUB 13.4 ii 20, KUB 13.6 ii 8), zu-u-ya-an (KUB 41.25 obv. 7), gen.sg./dat.-loc.pl. zu-u-ya-āš (KUB 13.17 iv 34).

Derivatives: see ẓūya-.

See Otten (1971b: 14) for an extensive treatment. In KUB 36.5 i 4 we find KAxU-āš ẓūyan as a parallel of KUB 33.112+ iii 9 NINDA-an KAxU-i, which indicates that ẓūya- is the word behind NINDA. The almost consistent use of gloss wedges with this word indicates foreign (Luwian?) origin. Unfortunately no further etymology.

zuḥae-2 (Ic2) ‘?’: 3sg.pres.act. zu-ya-a-iz-zi (KBo 12.89 iii 8), 3sg.pret.act. zu-ya-ā-iti (KBo 12.89 iii 17).

This verb occurs twice in one context only:

KBo 12.89 iii

(8) [.]tũh-ḫu-in zu-ya-a-iz-zi
(9) [-]ti i-ya-da-ni-in-ti n=a-āš-ša Kam-ru-ši-pa-āš
(10) [ ]x a-ūš-ta i-ni=ma=ya ku-it

(11) [ ](-n)a'-uš E Zen, ṣ-an i-e-ṭt nu=ya-a=z GAL-la-mu-uš
(12) [ ]DINGIR šaš kal-[]i-iš-ta nu=ya-a=z a-mi-ja-an-du-uš DINGIR šaš-mu-uš
(13) [ ]kal-li-iš-ta [ ]x-aḫ šu-up-pa-uš Tlš[NUSEN(Ila kal-li-iš-ta

(14) [-]t[a-an Ū-UL a-āš-ta nu=ya-ṛ-a-at=za-an A-NA pa-x[..]
(15) [ ]x=kān ar-ḫa ti-ya-an-zi nu=ya-a=š-ma-aḫ ḫu-ya-an-za
(16) [ ]x-an-zi nu=ya-a=š-ma-aḫ tǔḫ-ḫu-i-iš

(17) [ ]x tǔḫ-ḫu-in zu-ya-ā-iti

‘He z.-s smoke. [...] they curse. And Kamrušipa [...] looked: ‘What is this? [...] he went to the festival and [called upon the big [gods] and [called upon] the small gods and [...] called upon the pure eagles. [...] was not there
and [.....] it. They come and the wind [....] them. They [....] and the smoke (...) them. [....] he z.-ed smoke’.

It is quite unclear what the context refers to. The only thing that is clear, is that zuyae- has tubhuyai-/tubhui- ‘smoke’ as its object. An exact meaning is beyond our grasp.

Formally, the verb belongs to the hatrae-class, which consists of denominative verbs derived from *o-stem nouns. In this case, zuyae- seems to derived from a noun *zuya-. It is unclear whether this *zuya- can be equated with (4) zīyya- ‘bread, food’ (q.v.). If so, then zuyae- should mean something like ‘to eat’ or similar, but this is highly speculative, of course.