

The Old Hittite Genitive Plural ending *-an**

PETRA GOEDEGEBUURE



1 Overview

Kloekhorst (2017) has recently reassessed the distribution and use of the Old Hittite genitive in *-an*, which was replaced by *-as̄* in the later stages of the language. Taken as plural in *GHL* 73, but as both singular and plural in *HW*² (e.g., H:204, 439), Kloekhorst now provides arguments for the latter view.¹ Since the ending *-as̄* is likewise attested in the singular and plural already in Old Hittite, he argues that the difference between *-an* and *-as̄* can no longer be one of number. Instead, specificity controls the choice between the two: forms in *-an* have nonspecific referents, those in *-as̄* specific ones. Unfortunately, the majority of instances adduced by Kloekhorst are either not genitives at all but singular accusatives (ÍD-*an* ‘river’, *aruman* ‘sea’; see §2.1), or still need to be interpreted as genitive plurals (*utniyandan*; see §2.2). With the removal of these instances from the data set on which Kloekhorst has based his semantic analysis, we are left with the seemingly singular form LUGAL-*an* only.

Both *-as̄* and *-an* can be shown to have specific and nonspecific referents (§2.3). The use of *-an* with grammatically singular nouns is indeed governed by semantics, but of a different type than Kloekhorst assumes. The ending *-an* is attested with singular collectives, but only when individual members of the collective need to be invoked (§3.1). In other words, it is used in reference to the sum of the individual members of the collective, and that makes it a regular distributive plural ending, and not a collective ending (*pace* Laroche 1965:40). The other category that is seemingly singular consists of logograms that are logographically unmarked for plural but still have Hittite plural endings (§3.2). This is an orthographic peculiarity that requires further research, but contextually it is clear that the referents are plural. However, with respect to the genitive LUGAL-*an*, Kloekhorst has made the important observation that its referent is always nonspecific. This nonspecificity is, however, conveyed

*This research was assisted by an ACLS Fellowship from the American Council of Learned Societies. My thanks go to Theo van den Hout and the editors for their helpful suggestions and corrections. Any remaining mistakes and imprecisions are my responsibility.

¹For a historical overview of the study of the genitive in *-an*, see Kloekhorst 2017:385–7.

Petra Goedegebuure

not by *-an*, but by the spelling with a logogram without logographic plural marking. LUGAL-*an* represents a nonspecific plural ‘of kings > royal’ (§4).

Plural *-an* has a much wider distribution than plural *-as̄*, confirming that plural *-as̄* is an inner-Hittite innovation (§5). Based on this and the rejection of specificity as relevant for the coding of the genitive, we should reject Kloekhorst’s (2017:398) suggestion that the distinction in number between **-e/os* and **-om* is an innovation of the non-Anatolian Indo-European languages, and return to PIE sg. **-e/os* and pl. **-om*.

It is with great pleasure that I offer this contribution on Hittite nominal morphology as a token of appreciation to the honorand, who has done so much for the reconstruction of Indo-European and Anatolian verbal morphology.

2

2.1 *tapuša* and the path accusative

Kloekhorst (2017:388–91) provides two syntagms that occur with the ending *-an* that are both governed by the local adverb *tapuša* ‘alongside’: *ÍD-an tapuša* ‘alongside a river’ (e.g., KBo 32.14 ii 26, MH/MS),² and *arunan tapuša* ‘alongside a sea’ (KUB 17.7 ii 11, MH/NS). While I agree with his contextual analysis, which conclusively shows that in each context (when sufficiently preserved) these forms are singulars, I reject the classification of *ÍD-an* and *arunan* as genitives.

The use of *tapuša* with the accusative has barely received attention. Laroche (1970:30) briefly mentioned that *tapuša* governs the accusative, but this observation was not given due attention in *GHL* nor in *HEG T/D*. *HEG (T/D:138–40)* does not list any noun governed by *tapuša(a)* that is unambiguously accusative, while *GHL* 248 analyzes the accusative in *arunan tapuša* (*nu-za-kan arunan tapuša* (12) [*iyanniyanun*] ‘[I went] to the side of the sea’ KUB 17.7 ii 11–2) as an accusative of direction. Kloekhorst (2017:391) justifiably expresses doubts about the use of such an accusative in contexts without directional motion verbs, and therefore concludes that forms like *ÍD-an tapuša* and *arunan tapuša* contain “a genitive form in *-an* that has a singular reference.” But expressing direction is not the only dimensional function of the accusative.³ Brosch (2014:88) seems to have been the only one to observe that *tapuša* may govern the accusative of extent (his *Akkusativ der Erstreckung*) in a stative state of affairs, but only exemplifies this with one example, *ÍD-an tapuša* (KBo 32.14 ii 26).

²*ÍD-an* as gen.pl. was already tentatively suggested by Neu (1996:128), followed by *HW²* H:204 (but compare *HW²* H:200, with correct classification of *ÍD-an* as acc.sg.), although Neu also allowed for the singular accusative. The latter is in fact correct, even though Neu seemed to prefer the genitive plural option. Kloekhorst (2017:389) assumes that Neu’s (1996:79) translation of ‘(des Flusses³)’ implies that Neu believed *ÍD-an* could also be a genitive singular. I, on the other hand, believe that this translation reflects Neu’s alternative analysis as accusative singular (“Das Syntagma **hapan tapuša* könnte den alten Genitiv ‘Pluralis’ auf *-an*, aber auch mit E. Laroche (RHA XXVIII, 1970, 30; vgl. KUB XIX 9 I 16) den Akkusativ Singularis enthalten,” 1996:128).

³For an overview of the dimensional uses of the accusative see *GHL* 248–9, with further references.

The Old Hittite Genitive Plural ending -an

By contrast to *tapuša*, *tapuša* never controls the genitive, only the accusative of extent or the dative-locative.⁴ Of the 85 instances of *tapuša(a)* known to me, not one occurs with a noun ending in gen. sg. *-aš*, while nine end in *-an*. In three more cases *tapuša* governs a logogram without further case-marking. I take those as accusatives as well. Eight of these twelve instances occur in Neo-Hittite compositions. Unfortunately, none of these nouns are *u-* or *i-*stems, otherwise we would have been able to easily disambiguate between the accusatives in *-un* and *-in* and the genitive in *-an*. However, the fact that the genitive in *-an* was only productive in OH and was fully replaced by *-aš* in NH, combined with the fact that local adverbs only governed the genitive in OH, makes it very unlikely that (1) in NH the genitive would have been preserved with one local adverb when with all other local adverbs the genitive was replaced with the dative-locative, and (2) that it was not just the genitive, but the old form of the genitive. What could save this analysis is to understand *ÍD-an tapuša* and *arunan tapuša* as frozen expressions, nonspecific ‘riverside’ and ‘seaside’, respectively, which is exactly how Kloekhorst translates them. However, example (1) renders this impossible:

- (1) KUB 19.9 i 16' (NH, CTH 83, Ḫattušili III)⁵

^{id} *Māla-n=ma-kan* *kuit* *tapuša* *ēš-ta*
M.river-ACC.S.C=but-PTCL what:NOM.-ACC.S.N alongside be-3S.NPST
‘What was alongside **the river Mala**,’

This is not a frozen expression, but a newly formed syntagm with a name. Clearly, the syntagm with *tapuša* was productive in NH, and that excludes analyzing NH *-an* forms as relics of the OH genitive.

2.2 *utniyandan*

The word *utniyant-* represents two different lexemes. One is the substantivized possessive *-ant-* adjective ‘having the land > population’, the other the individuated form of *utne* ‘land’ (Goedegebuure 2018:84; *pace* Kloekhorst 2017:391, who explicitly rejects the meaning ‘land’). The individuated form is also attested as plural ([*aralyz*]eniēš *utnēanteš* [*l*]ūmanteš ‘all neighboring lands’ KUB 24.4 + KUB 30.12 rev. 7, MH/MS, CTH 376). That means that if *utniyandan* is the genitive of individuated *utniyant-* ‘land’, it could very well be plural. In the context of the Anitta text this is, in my view, the best solution:

- (2) KBo 3.22 obv. 25–6 (OH/OS, CTH 1)

Whoever becomes king after me: let [n]o one [out of] Ne[ša] r[e]settle the

⁴I will conduct a separate study of *tapuša(a)* in preparation for the T volume of the *Chicago Hittite Dictionary*.

⁵For the glosses, see the Leipzig Glossing Rules (<https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php>). In bound transcription ‘-’ denotes a clitic boundary, ‘-’ a morpheme boundary, and ‘-’ the boundary between a logogram and syllabogram.

Petra Goedegebuure

cities of [. . .], [. . .]x-na and Ḫarkiuna: [Only?] Ne[ša] shall be(come) p[op]ulous.⁶

nu *apa-š* *utniand-an būm[and-an]* (26) L[UGAL-*u-š*]
 CONN that.ONE-NOM.S.C land-GEN.PL all-GEN.PL king-NOM.S.C
ēš-tu
 be-3S.IMP
 ‘And *he* (and no one else) shall be k[ing] of a[ll] the lands’.

‘All the lands’ refers to the lands belonging to the conquered and destroyed cities mentioned earlier. Anitta prohibits any future king from repopulating the conquered cities, so that only the king of Neša will be able to control all their lands. An alternative would be to take *utniyandan* as the populations of the different conquered territories, which still makes it a plural. The lot oracle KBo 18.151 rev. 15 (OH/OS, CTH 827) also contains *utniyant-* ‘land’ with a plural *-an*: *utniyatan uštul taš* ‘it (i.e., evil) took the sin(s) of the lands’; compare KUR.KUR.ḪI.A-*aš wastul*^{HLA} ‘the sins of the lands’ in KBo 11.1 obv. 12 (NH, CTH 382, Muwatalli II).⁷

I follow Kloekhorst (2017:392) with respect to *utniyandan lāluš* ‘the tongues (= spells, slanders) of the population’ (KBo 17.1 i 11); see further §3.1.3.

2.3 Specificity versus number

Kloekhorst (2017:394–5) argues that the difference between genitives in *-aš* and *-an* is based on specificity, not number. Genitives in *-an* would have nonspecific referents, while those in *-aš* would have specific referents. Nonspecific referents are not identifiable by either speaker or addressee, and might not even exist. Such referents cannot be resumed in the next sentence unless accompanied by modals:

- (3) If you see a raccoon, run! #It is dangerous./It may be dangerous.

Specific indefinites are uniquely identifiable by the speaker only, and allow resumption without modals:

- (4) Yesterday I saw a raccoon. It looked dangerous.

Specific definites are identifiable by both speaker and addressee:

- (5) Yesterday I saw the raccoon. It indeed looked dangerous.

The degree of identifiability and anaphoric resumption in nonmodal contexts are therefore excellent means to establish whether *-an-* and *aš-*genitives are nonspecific and specific, respectively.

⁶For this passage, with new readings, see Goedegebuure 2007:306.

⁷There are two more OS instances of *udniantan* that belong with ‘land’ (because of the equivalence with Hattian *wur* ‘land’), but the contexts do not provide clues about the number, and the expressions themselves are unclear as well: *udniantan*^{GIS}*bat[(ta)lu²]* ‘the wooden bar of the land(s)’ (KBo 17.22 iii 16’, OH/OS, CTH 736) and *[utn]eandan*^{GIS}*arimpaš* ‘the *arimpa*-object of the land(s)’ (KUB 12.43:6’, OH/OS, CTH 457).

The Old Hittite Genitive Plural ending -an

Kloekhorst (2017:394–5) translates a couple of *-an* genitives as nonspecific. For example, *patān*^{GIS}GÌR.GUB is indeed better translated with nonspecific ‘footstool’ rather than ‘stool for some specific feet’, and it is also very unlikely that LUGAL-*an* *āška-* would refer to the gate of a specific king or specific set of kings. Yet there are also many genitives in *-an* that must be understood as specific:⁸

- (6) KBo 3.22 rev. 55–6 (OH/OS, CTH 1, Anitta), with dupl. KUB 26.71 obv. 4’–5’ (NS)

I built fortifications (URU.DIDLI) in Neša.

URU-*iy-an* ā[p(pa)n] (s6) nepiš-*aš* ^dIM-*n-aš*
 city-GEN.PL behind heaven-GEN.S Stormgod-GEN.S
 É-*er* U É ^dŠiu[*-šu(mmin ABNI)*]
 house:NOM.-ACC.N.S and house deity =our:ACC.S.C build:1S.PST

‘Behind **the fortifications** I built a temple for the Stormgod of Heaven and a temple for Our Deity’.

The genitive URU-*iyān* resumes plural URU.DIDLI, and is therefore definite and specific. URU.DIDLI itself should be considered specific indefinite, known to Anitta but not yet known to the addressees.

- (7) KBo 17.43 i 14’ (OH/OS, CTH 649), with dupl. KBo 17.99 i 5’ (MS)
 He hits the performers (^{LÚ.MEŠ}ALAN.ZU₉-*uš*) §

[(^{LÚ}*bartag*)]*a-š* ^{LÚ.MEŠ}ALAN.ZU₉-*an* GÌR.ĪI.A=ŠUNU šērḫ-*i*
 bear.man-NOM.S.C performers-GEN.PL feet-their š.-INST
šarta-i
 wipe-3S.NPST

‘The bear-man wipes the feet of **the performers** with š.’

In (7) the referent of the genitive ^{LÚ.MEŠ}ALAN.ZU₉-*an* occurs in the immediately preceding clause. The speaker of the text is committed to the existence of the referent, as in (6), and there is no reason to assume that the bear-man only wipes the feet of some unidentifiable performers. If a plural resumes a previously mentioned plural without further modification, the plural has become definite and includes the whole set of referents of the first plural, not just an unidentifiable subset. The same applies to the next examples:

- (8) KBo 20.12 i 2–4 (OH/OS, CTH 631)
 When the Stormgod thunders, a palace attendant comes running and [...] the/an iron [...] alongside the king.

⁸The examples in this section, with the exception of (9), are not listed in Laroche 1965 nor in *GHL* 73.

Petra Goedegebuure

[t]=aš pai-zzi LÚ.MEŠ MEŠEDI-an pēran (3) tīē[-zzi]
 CONN=he go-3S.NPST bodyguard-GEN.PL before step-3S.NPST
 DUM]U.MEŠ LUGAL pā-nzi LÚ.MEŠ MEŠEDI-an āppan (4)
 sons king go-3PL.NPST bodyguard-GEN.PL behind
 tie-n[zi]
 step-3PL.NPST

‘He goes and ste[ps] in front of the bodyguards. [.] princ[es] go and step behind the bodyguards’.

- (9) KBo 25.112 iii 11’-2’ (OH/OS, CTH 733)
 ‘Mercy, Daḫatenuī! To mankind you are Daḫattenuiti, but among the gods you (are) the Mother of the Springs, Queen. . . §
 ‘Mercy, Tašimmeti! To mankind you are Tašimmeti,

DINGIR.MEŠ~n-an-a [i]štarra (12’) [. . . DINGIR-u-š
 gods-GEN.PL=but among
 MUN]US.LU[GAL~a-š] zīk
 deity-NOM.S.C queen-NOM.S.C you:NOM.S
 ‘but among the gods you (are) [the deity of. . .], Queen’.

On the other hand, the Hittite laws provide many examples of genitives in -aš that must be considered nonspecific. In the group of laws discussing the prices of livestock, the individual livestock can only be nonspecific indefinite. In (10), the author of the laws cannot possibly have had one uniquely identifiable animal in mind for which he set the price. Instead, the law applies to any such, hence nonspecific, animal:

- (10) KUB 29.29:11’-3’ (CTH 292, OH/OS), with dupl. KBo 6.26 ii 31-3 (NS)
 The price of one full-grown cow is seven shekels of silver.

[(1 GU₄ APIN.LÁ 1 GU⁴ÁB)] iuga[š]š-a[n] (12’)⁹ [(5 GÍN
 1 ox plow 1 cow yearling-GEN.PL 5 shekel
 KÙ.BABBAR ŠIM-ŠUNU)]¹⁰ [(ŠA 1 GU₄ šawitišt-aš)] ⁴ [(GÍN
 silver price=their of 1 ox weanling³-GEN.S 4 shekel
 KÙ.BABB)]AR (13’) [(pā-i)]
 silver give-3S.NPST

‘The price (lit. their price) of (any) one yearling plow ox (and) (any) one cow is five shekels of silver. (One) gives four shekels of silver (as the price) of (any) one weaned calf’.

⁹Line 39 in the joint count (Hoffner 1997:141).

¹⁰Hoffner (1997:142) transliterated ŠIM-ŠUNU *mu*, but because we are dealing with two animals we would have expected ŠUNU (compare KBo 6.26 ii 37: ŠA 2 SILA₄ 1 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR ŠIM-ŠUNU). Also, a connective is unexpected in a list like this; compare KBo 6.26 iii 16-9, with four clauses with the verb *pāi* joined in asyndeton. Hoffner’s transliteration therefore needs to be adjusted to ŠIM-ŠUNU.

The Old Hittite Genitive Plural ending -an

Ex. (10) also shows that *-an* is used for a nonspecific plural referent. The use of *-as̄* for a nonspecific singular and *-an* for a nonspecific plural in (10) provides further proof that the contrast between the two is not based on specificity but on number.

Both *-as̄* and *-an* occur with nonspecific referents in the cooccurring noun phrases *patān*^{G18} GĪR.GUB ‘stool for the feet = footstool’ and *genuwas̄* GADA.ĪI.A ‘cloths for the knee(s) = knee-cloths’ (KBo 20.8 i 18’–9’ (OS), KBo 20.12 i 10 (OS), ABoT 1.9 + KBo 17.74 i 9 (OH/OS² or MS), KBo 20.61 + KBo 31.183 + KBo 34.185 i 9, 11 (OH/MS)). It would not make sense to consider feet nonspecific but knee(s) specific. Not only that, the consistent use of *-an* with *pata-* and *-as̄* with *genu-* also argues against *-as̄* as the innovated plural genitive. Why always retain *-an* for *pata-* but always innovate with *genu-*? However we understand *genuwas̄* GADA (cloth for one knee? lap cloth?) with nonspecific ‘knee’, it has to be singular.¹¹

3 The genitives in *-an*

As reinforced in the previous section, *-an* is plural and *-as̄* is originally singular. Yet there are indeed *-an* genitives that look singular, such as LUGAL-*an* instead of unattested LUGAL.MEŠ-*an*, or that are based on singular collective nouns, such as *šuppalan* ‘of the livestock’. I discuss collectives in §3.1, and the seemingly singular individual nouns in §3.2.

Several attestations need to be excluded from the discussion. There are a few forms that are booked in the dictionaries as genitive singulars but that need to be read or interpreted differently. *HW²* H:398 lists *ḫa-a-as̄-ša-an* in KBo 25.127 + 147 + iii 20 as genitive singular, but this is an accusative singular.¹² Also, it is highly unlikely that we should read a genitive in *-an* in NH KUB 33.93 iv 29’ [*ne-pi-ša-*]an^d UTU-*um* ‘the Sungod of Heaven’ (so *CHD* L–N:448). Rieken (2009) emends to *ne-pi-ša-*]as̄ in view of the duplicate KUB 36.10:12’ [*n*]e-pi-ša-as̄^d UTU-[*un*] and [*ne-pi-ša-*]as̄^d UTU-*us̄* in KUB 33.93 + KUB 36.7a iii 31’.¹³ The possessive clitic *-man* in KUB 1.16 iii 40 (OH/NS) is an acc.sg.; the possessive in *ibid.* 62 is vocative *-ma* (both so already Laroche 1965:38; *pace* *CHD* L–N:216).

3.1 Singular collective nouns with distributive plural *-an*

Collective singulars can be conceived of as semantically plural (*GHL* 240, Kloekhorst 2017:392 n. 10) and may therefore trigger plural morphology. This is the case when

¹¹This also implies that nonspecific *andubšas̄* in *andubšas̄ ḫaršār(r-a)* ‘human heads’ (KBo 17.1 + ABoT 1.4a i 23’) is singular. The heads are held by two demonic deities, which means that each deity holds one human head, not multiple. Likewise, the king and queen always have one *genuwas̄* GADA each. If *genuwas̄* is singular, then it is likely that *andubšas̄* is singular as well.

¹²LUGAL-*s[=a]* *natta* (20) *aruwaizz[=i ta³-kka]n ḫāššan pēran dā[i]* (21) *t-as̄-šta parā paizzi* ‘But the king does not bow. He (i.e., an official) takes the brazier in front, and he goes out’. For discussion and more examples, see Tjerkstra 1999:125–6.

¹³Another option is to read [ŠA] AN^d UTU-*um*, given AN-*as̄*^d UTU-*us̄* in KUB 33.96 (+ KUB 33.93) iv 45’.

Petra Goedegebuure

the individual items that form the collective need to be evoked. The context will then allow paraphrasing the collective as ‘the members of the collective’.

3.1.1 *haššannan ištarna* ‘among the family members’

In OH the local adverb *ištarna* ‘among, in the middle’ governs the plural genitive (GHL 298; see examples in HED E-I:478). That does not mean that plural *-an* on a singular collective noun such as *haššatar* ‘family’ always denotes ‘of the families’. As (11) shows, in the presence of *kuiš* ‘who’ and *ištarna* ‘among’, *-an* denotes the plural of family *member*. This use of the distributive or count plural *-an* is part of a wider phenomenon of using common gender endings when accessing the members within a neuter set or collective (Goedegebuure 2018:99).

- (11) KUB 11.1 iv 23’–4’ (OH/MS², CTH 19, Telipinu), with dupl. KBo 3.67 iv 11’–2’ (NS)

[(*kui-*)]š-za *haššann-an*¹⁴ *ištarna alwanzatar*
 who-NOM.S.C=REFL family-GEN.PL among sorcery:NOM-ACC.S.N
šakk-i *šum-eš-an* (24’) [(*ḫ*)]ašš[(*an*)]n-anza ep-ten
 know-3S.NPST you-NOM.PL=him family-IND.NOM.S.C¹⁵ seize-2PL.IMP
 ‘Who among **the family (members)** knows sorcery, *you*, the family, must seize him (and bring him to the gate of the palace)’.

Singular *-aš* is used elsewhere in this text to express collective ‘of the family’ (*šallaš-pat haššannaš ešḫar* ‘bloodshed of the Great Family’, KBo 3.1 ii 31).

3.1.2 *šuppalan* ‘of the livestock’

In the Prayer to the Sungod, the author praises the Sungod for arbitrating the case of the dog, the pig, and the man with whom the gods are angry. As far as the author is concerned, this is a general truth, which means that ‘the case of the dog’ etc. in fact applies to all members of the class of dogs. ŠA UR.GI₇ [Š]A ŠAH ‘of the dog, of the pig’ are still singular, because typically a case only applies to a single entity. This immediately leads to problems when the noun is a collective. In (12), the context requires that the Sungod arbitrates individual cases of the individual members of the livestock, but this cannot be expressed as *šuppalaš ḫanešša(r)*, because that would mean arbitration of the case of *all* the livestock as a collective (in a type of class-action lawsuit). As with *haššatar*, the only way to show that a collective has individual members is to use the ending appropriate for individual nouns, which in this case is the distributive plural *-an*:

¹⁴KBo 3.67 iv 11’: *ḫa-aš-ša-an-na*. The dat.-loc. ending *-a* occurs only with *i-* and *ai-*stems (Frantíková 2016), therefore emend *ḫa-aš-ša-an-na* to *ḫa-aš-ša-an-na(-an)* (pace HED H:215).

¹⁵KBo 3.67 iv 12’: abl. *ḫa-aš-ša-an-na-az*, so perhaps translate ‘you must take him from the family’.

The Old Hittite Genitive Plural ending -an

- (12) KBo 34.22 + KUB 30.II + KUB 31.135 obv. II'-2' (CTH 374, OH/MS)

(II') § *nu* ŠA UR.GI₇ [Š]A ŠAH *ḫanneššar* *zik*[=pat³]
 CONN of dog of pig case:NOM.-ACC.S.N you:NOM.S-only
ḫa]nna-ttar[*i*] (12) § *šuppal-ann-a* *ḫannešša*
 arbitrate-2S.NPST.MID livestock-GEN.PL=also case:NOM.-ACC.S.N
išš-it *kui*-[*ē*]^š UL *memi-šk-anz*[*i*]
 mouth-INST who-NOM.PL.C not speak-ITER-3PL.NPST

‘[Only³] you, (O Sungod,) arbitrate the case of the dog (and) the pig. § Also, the case(s) of the members of the livestock, who (pl.) do not speak with the mouth, (that/those too you arbitrate)’.

The plural relative *kuiēš* and the plural verb of course reinforce the semantic plurality of the collective. It is even possible that *ḫannešša* is a plural itself (compare sg. *paprātar*, pl. *paprāta* ‘impurity’, *GHL* 46), which would be an additional argument for taking *-an* as a distributive plural.

3.1.3 *utniyandan* ‘of the population’

During one act of a ritual for the removal of evil influences, the king and queen each sit with an iron tongue in their mouth, representing the slander of the *utniyant-*. While a palace attendant removes the tongues from the royal couple, the ritual practitioner speaks as follows:

- (13) KBo 17.I i II' (CTH 416, OH/OS)

[*k*]āšata-šmaš-kan *utniyand-an* *lāl-uš* *dāḫḫ-u*[*n*]
 hereby=you:DAT.PL=PTCL population-GEN.PL tongue-ACC.PL.C take-IS.PST
 ‘I have hereby taken from you the tongues (= slanders) of the population/members of the population’.

It is not inconceivable that an *utniyant-* as ‘land’ has tongues (so Laroche 1965:36, “langues des pays”). A land may act as a stand-in for the governing class: for example, it can rise in rebellion (*utne*, KBo 3.22 obv. II) or attack (*utneanteš*, KUB 24.4 + KUB 30.12 rev. 7). Yet given the similarity in meaning with the post-OH phrase *pangauwaš lala-* ‘slander of the multitude’ (*CHD* L-N:24), I rather take *utniyant-* here as ‘population’. Since the slander is produced by individual members of the population, not the population as a single body, the use of the distributive plural *-an* is warranted to reflect this plurality within the collective.

3.2 Singular logograms in *-an*

The majority of cases of individual nouns in *-an* can be unequivocally determined to be plural, either because of the presence of the Sumerographic plural marker MEŠ

Petra Goedegebuure

or the cooccurrence with the plural possessive pronoun *-šma/i-*. We also have seen how singular collectives take *-an* in order to pluralize over the members of the collective. However, there still remain a couple of logographically written individual nouns that are attested with *-an* but that are otherwise not marked for plural. One of those, LUGAL-(w)*an*, is always written without MEŠ. Given this consistent behavior, the question is whether the absence of a plural marker is meaningful and, if so, in what way. Kloekhorst has convincingly argued that LUGAL-(w)*an* as opposed to LUGAL-(w)*aš* never refers to a specific king, arguing that *-an* is nonspecific and *-aš* is specific. But as I have shown above, specificity does not control the choice between *-aš* and *-an*, only number.

The context in which LUGAL-(w)*an* needs to be assessed is that not all singular logograms have singular referents. The absence of a logographic plural marker on plural nouns, though unusual, does occur. A highly random and very small sample of such cases follows here (the topic requires further study). With DINGIR: DINGIR-*uš* (acc.pl.) *ēppir* ‘they seized (the) deities’ KUB 36.99 rev.¹ 4’ (OH/OS, CTH 2). With KUR: *namma-šta* KUR-*eašš-a* (dat.-loc.pl.) *anda pāū[n]* ‘Next, I also entered countries (which...)’ KUB 23.II iii 22 (MH/NS, CTH 142). Also see, e.g., KUB 36.89 rev. 4.

The absence of a plural marker on logographically written words in *-an* therefore does not automatically imply that the referent is singular. In each of the following cases, the context forces a plural reading:¹⁶

- (14) KBo 3.46 obv. 39’–40’ (OH/NS, CTH 13, Muršili I), with dupl. KBo 19.90 + KBo 3.53 obv. 9’–11’

[^{URU}Lakkurišš-*i-ma* 3 LLM ÉRIN.MEŠ^{LÚ.})]MEŠ^{LÚ.}hapir-iš LÚ-*ann-a*
L.-LOC.S=but 3 thousand soldiers h.-NOM.PL.C man-GEN.PL=and
ARAD.MEŠ (40’) [(hapr-ant-eš LUGAL-u-š kui)-u(š
servants heap-PTC-NOM.PL.C king-NOM.S.C who-ACC.PL.C
t)]arupp-un
assemble-IS.PST

‘But the 3000 troops, a combination of *hapiru*-men and servants of freemen, that I, the king, had assembled in the city of Lakkurišša’

Clearly, the servants are servants of multiple freemen, not one.

- (15) KBo 17.15 obv. 12’ (OH/OS², CTH 645), with dupl. KBo 17.40 iv 6’ (MS)

¹⁶*nu-war-an* ⁴UTU-*i* DINGIR-LIM-*an aršanut* ‘he (the Stormgod) diverted it (the river) towards the Sungod(dess) of the gods’ (KUB 36.89 rev. 13, NH, CTH 671) needs to be discounted. ‘Sungod(dess) of the gods’ is usually expressed as *šuman* ⁴UTU (Laroche 1965:34, CHD Š:481). The awkward construction ⁴UTU-*i* DINGIR-LIM-*an* was probably a futile attempt by the scribe at archaic language.

The Old Hittite Genitive Plural ending -an

n-us **NA₄-an** *parn-aš* *hīlamm-i*
 CONN=them stone-GEN.PL house-GEN.S gate.building-LOC.S
 É[(RIN.MEŠ-*az* *handā*)*i-zzi*]
 soldier:NOM.S.C arrange-3S.NPST
 ‘A soldier arranges them in the gate building of the mausoleum’ (lit. ‘house of stones’)

NA₄-*an per/parna-* is the reading behind É.NA₄ (Groddek 2001:214). NA₄ certainly represents multiple stones, despite the spelling É.NA₄ instead of É.NA₄.MEŠ.

Finally, for URU-*iyān āppan* ‘behind the fortifications’ KBo 3.22 rev. 55 (OH/OS, CTH 1, Anitta), see example (6) for discussion.

Thus far, we have seen that *-an* marks plurals of individual nouns (here and in §2.3) and of the individual members in a singular collective (§3.1), but never singular individuals. This makes it highly unlikely that LUGAL-(*w*)*an* would suddenly be singular ‘of a/the king’. However, Kloekhorst’s introduction of nonspecificity in my view provides the solution that allows us to reconcile the singular logogram with the plural Hittite ending.

4 LUGAL-*an*, nonspecific plural ‘of kings’, ‘royal’

While plural logograms are sometimes written without logographic plural markers, it is significant that the expressions LUGAL-*an aška-* and LUGAL-(*w*)*an per/parna-* are always written without MEŠ (for attestations, see Laroche 1965:36–37). This in fact matches the fully Sumerographic versions, which are KÁ.LUGAL and É.LUGAL,¹⁷ never *KÁ.LUGAL.MEŠ or *É.LUGAL.MEŠ. The lack of MEŠ in LUGAL-(*w*)*an* is in my view a scribal phenomenon, reflecting the singular writing in É.LUGAL/KÁ.LUGAL, just as NA₄-*an per/parna-* is a partially syllabic writing of É.NA₄ (see example (15)). That we are indeed dealing with a Sumerographic convention is supported by the alternation DUMU.MEŠ-*an parna* (OS, KBo 17.1 iv 11) ~ É.DUMU.MEŠ-*an* (OS, KBo 17.1 iv 13), where the preservation of MEŠ in DUMU.MEŠ-*an parna* corresponds to the presence of MEŠ in É.DUMU.MEŠ. What is far more interesting is that the Hittites read the unmarked dependent logograms in É.LUGAL, KÁ.LUGAL, and É.NA₄ as plurals.

Syntagms like É.LUGAL, KÁ.LUGAL, and É.NA₄ pattern with, for example, É.GU₄ ‘house for bovines > cattle barn’ (in, e.g., KUB 17.10 iv 23, OH/MS, CTH 324). É.GU₄ is obviously not a dwelling for one bovine. The multiple bovines for which the dwelling is intended are typically unidentifiable by speaker and addressee, and that makes the referent of GU₄ semantically a *nonspecific plural*. We have to conclude that in Hittite nonspecific plurals may be represented by singular logograms (although not all singular logograms with plural ending are nonspecific, as in exam-

¹⁷LUGAL-(*w*)*an per/parna-* may also alternate with É.GAL, as in KBo 6.2 i 58.

Petra Goedegebuure

ple (6)).¹⁸ In such a situation, translations like ‘cattle barn’ and ‘stone house’ are to be preferred over ‘dwelling for bovines’ or ‘house of stones’.

Based on this observation, the expressions LUGAL-*an aška-* and LUGAL-(*w*)*an per/parna-* should be understood as ‘gate of kings, kings’ gate > royal gate’ and ‘house for kings > royal palace’. LUGAL-*an* is a *nonspecific* plural genitive, just as NA₄-*an* and LÚ-*an* above have to be nonspecific (it is ‘slaves of (some) freemen’, not ‘slaves of #the freemen’). A nonspecific reading also works well for KBo 17.15 rev.³ 15’, despite Kloekhorst’s objections (2017:388):

(16) KBo 17.15 rev.³ 5’ (CTH 645, OH/OS)

[1 ANŠE.KUR.RA-*u-š kūrka*]a-š-šiss-*a* GE₆ LUGAL-*an*
 1 horse-NOM.S.C foal-NOM.S.C=his=and black king-gen.pl
 LÚ.MEŠ³*kurka*[*l-aš*?]¹⁹
k.man-DAT.PL

‘One black horse and its foal [for] the **royal** fo[al-handler]s (??)’.
 ([One cow, one calf], black, one black sheep, one black lamb for the [.].
 [He] give[s] ropes, *l.s.*, halters to the [. . .] *tarsipiala*-men.)

In short, Hittite scribes employed a graphic phenomenon, the writing of single logograms with Hittite plural endings, to mark nonspecific plural genitives, something that could not be formally expressed in Hittite. Whether this scribal practice was mainly restricted to nonspecific dependent nouns or was applied more widely is a topic for further study.

5 The plurals -*an* and -*aš*

There is no semantic difference between plural -*aš* and plural -*an*. Plural -*aš* is simply an innovation in OH, sometimes even alternating with -*an* plurals in the same text, namely the Invocation texts (DINGIR.MEŠ-*nan ištarna*²⁰ ‘among the gods’ versus DINGIR.MEŠ-*naš ištarna*²¹). The alternation *wattaruwan*²² *annaš* ‘mother of the springs’ (KBo 25.112 iii 8’) ~ *wattaruwaš annaš* (KUB 31.143a ii 11’), where *wattaruwaš*

¹⁸In some cases, a singular logogram that takes Hittite plural endings represents a collective. For example, KÁ.GAL ‘gate’ is a *plurale tantum*, but it was also considered a non-count noun (i.e., a collective), as shown by the use of 1-NUTIM (KUB 58.83 ii 21) and TAPAL (KUB 58.83 ii 17).

¹⁹Kloekhorst (2017:388) takes LUGAL-*an* LÚ.MEŠ as the complete noun phrase, but this ignores the immediately following signs *kur-ka*[. . .]. This passage contains three sets of people who receive something: the LÚ.MEŠ³*kurka*[. . .], which I tentatively restore *ad hoc* as a hapax LÚ.MEŠ³*kurka*[*las*?]²¹ ‘foal-handler’ in view of the preceding *kūrka*- ‘foal’; a second group that receives livestock (rev.³ 16’); and finally the LÚ.MEŠ³*tarsipiala-*, who receive objects to bind the animals (rev.³ 17’).

²⁰KBo 25.112 iii 11’; KUB 31.143 (+ 143a) ii 6, 13, 20, 26, 30, 34, iii 7’; KUB 31.(143 +) 143a ii 4’.

²¹KBo 25.112 ii 12’, 19’; (KUB 31.143 +) VBoT 124 iii 12’.

²²Per photo collation (hethiter.net/: PhotArch B0140d). Neu (1980:192) read *ša*, thus *wattaruwaš-a* with the conjunction -*a/ma*. This is grammatically highly unlikely mid-sentence. Delayed -*a/ma* only occurs in very specific contexts (Sideltsev and Molina 2015), and this is not one of them.

The Old Hittite Genitive Plural ending -an

is necessarily a gen.pl. (not sg., *pace* Neu 1983:213!), proves that plural *-an* and *-as̄* alternate in this text group. This makes it more likely that *-an* in DINGIR.MEŠ-*an ištarna* was replaced by a gen.pl. *-as̄* and not a dat.pl. *-as̄*, as might have been the case in combination with *ištarna*.²³

In OS texts, *-an* occurs more frequently (34×) than plural *-as̄* (17×)²⁴ and has the widest distribution (historical narratives, oracles, laws, rituals, festivals, invocations), whereas *-as̄* only alternates with *-an* in one cluster of texts (5×, Hattian-Hittite invocation texts, CTH 733). *-as̄* is the only genitive plural in KUB 8.41 (CTH 733, 8×), ABoT 1.35 + i 11 (CTH 665), and KBo 25.24 +²⁵ and KBo 20.7 +²⁶ (CTH 635, 3×). Had *-an* and *-as̄* both been inherited as plurals from Proto-Anatolian, we would not have seen such a limited distribution for OS *-as̄* based on genre, namely its presence mainly in two clusters of festival texts versus complete absence in historical, oracle, law, and most festival texts and rituals.

Abbreviations

CHD = Güterbock, Hans G., Harry A. Hoffner Jr., and Theo P. J. van den Hout (eds.). 1983–. *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

GHL = Hoffner, Harry A. Jr., and H. Craig Melchert. 2008. *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Part 1, *Reference Grammar*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

HED = Puhvel, Jaan. 1984–. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

HEG = Tischler, Johann. 1983–2016. *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.

HW² = Friedrich, Johannes, and Annelies Kammenhuber. 1975–. *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*. 2nd ed. Heidelberg: Winter.

References

Brosch, Cyril. 2014. *Untersuchungen zur hethitischen Raumgrammatik*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Frantíková, Dita. 2016. “The problem of the *-a* ending in the Hittite dative/locative.” *Indogermanische Forschungen* 121:187–98.

²³As Neu (1983:228 w. n. 3) assumed, following Starke 1977:189.

²⁴Two additional instances are either gen.pl. or dat.-loc.pl. (^{LU}.MEŠ⁵ *hapias̄ pēran* KBo 25.31 ii 17'; KÁ-*as̄ pēran* KBo 25.68 + KBo 17.13 rev. 10). *luttias̄ (peran)* in KBo 25.36 iii 5' is a dat.-loc.pl. (*pace* Neu 1983:110) in view of the dat.-loc.pl. *luttias̄* in ibid. iii 7' and the fact that in this text local adverbs govern the dative-locative, not the genitive.

²⁵KBo 25.24 (+ KBo 20.3 ++) obv. 12' ([UDU.]ḪI.A-*as̄ šuppa* ‘meat cuts of (the) sheep’); KBo 20.3 iii 3' (*ištananaš (pēran)* ‘in front of the altars’, in view of the dat.-loc.pl. *ištananaš* in ibid. iii 10'). In the latter text local adverbs still control the genitive, hence *karlas̄ (peran)* ‘in front of the rung(s)’ (ibid. iii 15') and ^{DUG}*palbas̄ (katta)* ‘besides the storage vessel(s)’ (ibid. iii 4') are either gen. sg. or pl. I did not include them in the counts.

²⁶KBo 20.7 + rev. 11' (*tuppas̄ parna* ‘to the depot (lit. house of containers)').

Petra Goedegebuure

- Goedegebuure, Petra. 2007. “‘Let only Neša become populous!’, and more: Philological notes on Old Hittite.” In *Tabularia Hethaeorum: Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Detlev Groddek and Marina Zorman, 305–12. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- . 2018. “The packagers *-ant-* and *-a-*, and the origin of split-ergativity in Hittite (and Lycian).” In *Proceedings of the 29th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, ed. David M. Goldstein, Stephanie W. Jamison, and Brent Vine (eds.), 77–115. Bremen: Hempen.
- Görke, Susanne. 2010. *Das Ritual der Aštu (CTH 490): Rekonstruktion und Tradition eines hurritisch-hethitischen Rituals aus Boğazköy/Hattuša*. Leiden: Brill.
- Groddek, Detlev. 2001. “‘Mausoleum’ (É.NA₄) und ‘Totentempel’ (É_hištā) im Hethitischen.” *Ugarit-Forschungen* 33:213–8.
- Hoffner, Harry A., Jr. 1997. *The Laws of the Hittites: A Critical Edition*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2017. “The Hittite genitive ending *-ān*.” In *Usque ad Radices: Indo-European Studies in Honour of Birgit Anette Olsen*, ed. Bjarne Simmelkjær Sandgaard Hansen, Adam Hyllested, Anders Richardt Jørgensen, Guus Kroonen, Jenny Helena Larsson, Benedicte Nielsen Whitehead, Thomas Olander, and Tobias Mosbæk Søborg, 385–400. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum.
- Laroche, Emmanuel. 1965. “Études de linguistique anatolienne I.” *Revue hittite et asianique* 23:33–54.
- . 1970. “Études de linguistique anatolienne III.” *Revue hittite et asianique* 28:22–71.
- Neu, Erich. 1980. *Althethitische Ritualtexte in Umschrift*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- . 1983. *Glossar zu den althethitischen Ritualtexten*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- . 1996. *Das hurritische Epos der Freilassung I: Untersuchungen zu einem hurritisch-hethitischen Textensemble aus Hattuša*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Rieken, Elisabeth. 2009. hethiter.net/: CTH 345.I.1 (TX 2009-08-31, TRde 2009-08-29).
- Sideltsev, Andrej, and Maria Molina. 2015. “Enclitic *-(m)a* ‘but’, clause architecture and the prosody of focus in Hittite.” *Indogermanische Forschungen* 120:209–53.
- Starke, Frank. 1977. *Die Funktionen der dimensionalen Kasus und Adverbien im Althethitischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Tjerkstra, Françoise A. 1999. *Principles of the Relation between Local Adverb, Verb and Sentence Particle*. Groningen: Styx.