ORBIS

Bulletin international de Documentation linguistique

EXTRAIT

Hittite *urenant-*.

Brian D. JOSEPH.

MORPHOLOGIE

Hittite *urenant-*.

The Hittite word *urenant-* is attested in two separate but parallel passages of the same ritual text (*CTH* 447, " un rituel à plusieurs divinités, KBo XI 10 = KBo XI 72) (1).

(*1*) ḫaštai-ma (*8*) [ ] warnuwanzi na-at šarā (*9*) dāi na-at paizzi ÍD-i EGIR-an tarnai (*10*) nu kiššan memai kī maḫḫan *u-ri-i-na-an* (*11*) na-at ÍD-aš pēdai...

(KBo XI 10 II 7 ff.)

' But they burn [ ] the bones, and one takes them up and goes and throws them into the river. And one speaks thus, as this (= ' the bones ') is *burned* and the river carries it (= ' them ') (off)... '

(*2*) ḫaštai warnuwanzi (*24*) namma-at šarā dāi na-at paizzi ÍD išḫu-wai nu kiššan memai (*26*) kī maḫḫan *u-ri-e-na-an-da* ḫaštai (*27*) ÍD pēdāi ...

(KBo XI 10 III 23 ff. = KBo XI 72 III 11-14)

' They burn the bones ; furthermore one takes them up, and goes and scatters them into the river, and says thus, as the river carries (off) these *burned* bones ... '

The first occurrence, in (*1*), seems clearly to be a neuter singular nominative adjectival form, and the second a neuter plural form. The clear plural form in (*2*) shows that this is an *-nt-* stem — thus it appears to be a participle, and can be connected, in its root at least, with the verb *war-* ' burn ' (intransitive).

On the basis of this root connection, OTTEN (*OLZ* 1955 : 393[4]) suggested the meaning ' burned ' (*verbrannt*), which has generally been accepted. In view of the context in which this word occurs — modifying *ḫaštai* ' bone(s) ' just after it has been said that people burn (*warnuwanzi*) the bones — this proposed meaning is not at all controversial.

(1) It is hoped that this listing of the occurrences of *urenant-* is exhaustive ; it purports to be so through 1976.

The real problem with *urenant-* concerns its morphology. Although the type of forms that *urenan* and *urenanta* represent is fairly certain, as noted above, the exact details of the morphological formation of this word are far from clear. The problems associated with this word are three-fold :

(a) From what form of *war-* is *urenant-* derived ?
(b) What is the *-e-* that occurs in *urenant-* ?
(c) Why is the root form *ur-* and not *war-* in this word ?

WATKINS (1973 : 83, fn. 7) has suggested that though one might expect the participle of *war-* to be *warant-* (which does in fact occur), the odd form of this word may somehow be related to the fact that the simplex verb has an " isolated, dissimilated (?) [from **warāri*] 3 sg. middle *warāni (urāni)*, ipv. *warānu* " (2). However, exactly what this relationship might be is not made clear, nor does this suggestion address the three specific problems indicated above.

Leaving aside for the moment the second problem of how to explain the *-e-* in *urenant-*, the following morphological analysis for this word suggests itself. If *urenant-* is a derivative in *-ant-* from the causative stem *warnu-*, then the presence of the *-n-* becomes understandable and even motivated. This derivation is strengthened by the fact that the apparent meaning of *urenant-* is passive, ' burned ', suggesting that it is more closely connected with the transitive causative stem *warnu-* than with the intransitive simplex *war-* ; participles in *-ant-* in Hittite are passive when formed from transitive stems but not when formed from intransitive stems. In particular, the participle of the intransitive simplex verb *war-* (*war-ant-*) is not passive, but rather means ' burning (intrans.) '. Deriving *urenant-* from the causative stem therefore gives a good account of the meaning and shows that the *-n-* need not involve the odd form *warāni*.

One small problem that this derivation presents, though, is that internal to Hittite, one might expect the participle of *warnu-* to have the form *warnuwant-* or even *urnuwant-* ; the absence of the *-u-* of *warnu-*, then, is somewhat problematic. Fortunately, when viewed in an Indo-European perspective, this problem has an interesting solution.

If it is assumed that *urenant-* is not a participle proper, but rather is a derived adjectival form in **-ont-*, then the absence of the *-u-* and its replacement by **-ont-* can be viewed as part of the substitutive morphological process involving *u*-adjectives, *-ont-*-adjectives, and various other

(2) It is also conceivable that the *-ni* found in *warāni* is not a dissimilation from *-ri* but rather is to be connected with the apparent verbal particle *-ni* found in Vedic 1SG subjunctives such as *bhavāni*, where the *-ni* is clearly segmentable due to the occurrence of " short " forms such as *bhavā*. The isolated Hittite word *kāni* ' behold, see here ' may also contain this particle.

formants, which has come to be called the "CALAND" system (3). The absence of the *-u-*, then, can be taken as parallel to the *-u-/*-ont-* substitution found in the Indo-European pair **bhr̥ĝh-ónt-* (Vedic *br̥h-ánt-* 'high') and **bhr̥ĝh-ú-* (Hittite *parku-* 'high'), or the Hittite-internal pair *šūš* 'full' and *šuwant-* 'full' (from **su(H)-u-* and **su(H)-ont-*, respectively) (4), among others.

This analysis presupposes that the *-nu-* causative/factitive suffix in Hittite is segmentable as *-n-u-*. However, the standard view of the origin of the Indo-European "suffix" **-neu̯-/-nu-*, that set forth by DE SAUSSURE, posits exactly that segmentation for this suffix, **-ne-u̯-/-n-u-*, with the nasal element and the **-u-* not as part of the same morpheme. Furthermore, there is some internal evidence within Hittite supporting this particular segmentation. In particular, a morphemic division *-n-u-* for the *-nu-* suffix is suggested by such pairs as the *u*-adjective *tepu-* 'little' and its corresponding causative/factitive *tepnu-* 'belittle', *miu-* 'meek' and *minu-* 'pacify', *parku-* 'high' and *parganu-* 'make high', and the like. Since these adjectives in Hittite which are part of the CALAND system form causative/factitive verbs with the suffix *-nu-*, a close morphological connection between *-nu-* verbs and the substitutive "CALAND" processes posited here in the derivation of *urenant-* can safely be inferred.

This analysis for *urenant-* allows for an explanation of a problematic word in the Hittite *Laws*, and thus finds a parallel in another Hittite formation. The word is *enant-*, which occurs in §65 *takku MAŠ.GAL e-na-an-da-an ... takku UDU.KUR.RA e-na-an-da-an kuiški dāizzi* 'if (anyone steals) an ENANT-billy-goat ... if anyone steals an ENANT-mountain-goat', and in §66 *takku MAS.GAL e-na-an-za ... ašauni ḫarpta* 'if an ENANT-billy-goat joins itself to the fold'. GOETZE translates it as 'tamed' (*ANET*, p. 192), but there is no strong evidence for this translation — FRIEDRICH (1952, s.v.) lists it with a question-mark. However, since several of the closely preceding sections (numbers 60, 61, 62) talk of people finding animals and 'removing the brand' (5), it may well be the case that *enant-* means 'branded', and is related to the causative/factitive stem *enu-* 'roast (?)' (itself apparently connected with the simplex verb *ā(i)-* 'become hot'), by the same process of substitution of **-ont-* for the **-u-* of the causative suffix, as has been proposed here for *urenant-*.

---

(3) So-named after W. CALAND, who first noticed this process in Indo-Iranian in a series of articles in 1892 and 1893 (*KZ* 31 : 256-273, especially 266-288 ; *KZ* 32 : 589-595).

(4) This analysis is assumed because of the scriptio plena writing *šu-u-uš* attested for this word, as opposed to the single writing in *šuwant-*. Technically, though, it is impossible to tell whether *-ant-* has been added to the root, replacing the *-u-* suffix, or has been added onto the *u-* adjective **su(H)-u-*.

(5) The verb used in those sections is *parkunu-* 'purify'; the translation 'remove the brand' is GOETZE's from *ANET*, p. 192.

Given this analysis for *enant-*, then, the aberrant *-e-* in *urenant-* may be due to the influence of *enant-*. Both *urenant-* and *enant-* have the same morphological analysis, being CALAND-like derivatives from their respective corresponding causative/factitive stems through the substitution of **-ont-* for the **-u-* of the causative suffix. Furthermore, both words have a similar meaning, *urenant-* 'burnt' and *enant-* 'branded' (i.e. by burning). With such similarities both in form and meaning, it is not inconceivable that an earlier form **urnant-* was remade to *urenant-* through a blend of **urnant-* with the morphologically and semantically similar word *enant-*. Such "contamination" affecting parallel formations in the same semantic sphere is well-attested in Indo-European ; compare, for instance, the clustering of *u*-stem formations for substantives meaning "sweet" or something related in Indo-European, e.g. **su̯ādu-*, Grk. γλυκύς, **medhu-*, Hittite *malittu*, the appearance of a *u*-form in a word with a meaning opposite to 'sweet', but still in the same semantic sphere, in Greek ἁλυκός 'salt', blends like Vulgar Latin *grevis* 'heavy' from earlier *gravis* because of the influence of *levis* 'light', and so forth.

All that would remain unexplained, then, for *urenant-* is why the initial syllable is *ur-* and not *war-* as might be expected. Unfortunately, this fluctuation seems to have no explanation, though it is worth pointing out that this very root shows the same unexplained *war-/ur-* alternation in various of its derivatives — beside *warāni*, there is *urāni* at KUB XXXII 8 III 23, for example, and beside the (intensive) reduplicated adjective/participle *wariwarant-* 'blazing', there is the form *uriwarant-* at KUB XVII 10 III 22. Furthermore, FRIEDRICH (1960 : 27) notes other instances of *-wa-* alternating with *-u-*, e.g. *antuḫḫas ∼ antuwaḫḫas* 'man'. Thus the problem of *war-/ur-*, though not yet accounted for, is not a problem specifically for an analysis of *urenant-* but rather is a general problem for the root *war-* and for other *-wa-* sequences in Hittite.

To sum up, then, it has been suggested that *urenant-* is derived from the causative stem *warnu-* by the substitution of **-ont-* (Hitt. *-ant-*) for the segmentable *-u-* of the causative suffix *-nu-*. This analysis helps to elucidate a troublesome word in the Hittite *Laws, enant-*, the analysis of which in turn sheds some light on the curious form this derivative of *warnu-* takes (i.e. *urenant-* not **urnant-*).

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

ANET : *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, ed. J. B. PRITCHARD, Princeton 1950.
CTH : E. LAROCHE, *Catalogue des Textes Hittites*, Paris 1971.
FRIEDRICH (1960) : *Hethitisches Elementarbuch I²*, Heidelberg, Carl Winter.
FRIEDRICH (1952) : *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg, Carl Winter.

KZ : *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indoger-
      manischen Sprachen.*
KBo : *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*, Leipzig/Berlin.
KUB : *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi*, Berlin.
Laws : J. FRIEDRICH, *Die Hethitischen Gesetze*, Leiden 1959.
OLZ : *Orientalische Literaturzeitung*, Leipzig/Berlin.
WATKINS (1973) : " ' River ' in Celtic and Indo-European ", *Ériu* 24 : 80-89.

The Ohio State University,   Brian D. JOSEPH.
Columbus, Ohio.