New approaches on Anatolian linguistics

José-Virgilio García Trabazo, Ignasi-Xavier Adiego, Mariona Vernet, Bartomeu Obrador-Cursach, Susana Soler (eds.)



New approaches on Anatolian linguistics

BARCINO MONOGRAPHICA ORIENTALIA
Volum 22

2023

Coberta:

New approaches on Anatolian linguistics

José-Virgilio García Trabazo, Ignasi-Xavier Adiego, Mariona Vernet, Bartomeu Obrador-Cursach, Susana Soler (eds.)

Table of Contents

Foreword..... 9
José Virgilio García Trabazo

A new Lycian ruler..... 13
Ignasi-Xavier Adiego

Updated corpus of the Lycian coins from Kandyba..... 31
Manuela Anelli

The grammatical function of Lycian enclitic -ti *in the light of Greek sources*.... 49
Birgit Christiansen

The wood for the trees: on Lydian laqriša *and Aramaic* drḥt..... 65
Diego Corral Valera – Bartomeu Obrador-Cursach

A new Sidetic coin legend: revisiting an unnoticed specimen from the Gazipaşa hoard 77
Gem Ferrer Pérez

Hittite tarai-ḫḫi, dariia-mi *'to become weary, to weary oneself, exert oneself', Greek τείρο/ε-, Latin* tero/e-..... 97
José Luis García Ramón

New interpretations in Lydian phonology..... 115
Alwin Kloekhorst

Again on the Xanthos Pillar hãtahe. Between combinatory analysis and Greek epigraphic interference..... 135
Elena Martínez Rodríguez

The Syntax of Universal Quantifiers in Luwic (and Hittite)..... 151
H. Craig Melchert

hi-*Konjugation und imperfektiver Aspekt im Luwischen und Hethitischen*..... 175
Norbert Oettinger

The Anatolian glosses in the Akkadian medical texts from Boğazköy and the sociolinguistic situation of the late imperial Ḫattuša..... 183
Valerio Pisaniello – Federico Giusfredi

Luwian /w/ *and* ⟨p⟩*: Second Thoughts*..... 201
Elisabeth Rieken

Some terms for the funerary monuments of Lycia in the Classical period 2: ñtipa..... 217
Martin Seyer – Mariona Vernet

Egyptian in Carian transmission: Towards a better understanding of Carian vocalism..... 241
Zsolt Simon

A Lycian-Greek bilingual funerary Inscription from Tlos..... 253
Recai Tekoğlu – Taner Korkut

Drive for power and the Indo-European source of Luwian muwa-..... 265
Miguel Valério

The theonym 'King of Kaunos' revisited: A comparative analysis from epigraphic sources..... 293
Mariona Vernet

Changing colour as pollution in Hittite and Luwian incantations: From metaphor to semantic shift..... 317
Ilya Yakubovich

Word Index..... 335

Citation Index..... 353

The Syntax of Universal Quantifiers in Luwic (and Hittite)

H. Craig Melchert
Carrboro NC

§ 1. *Introduction*

This study was stimulated by several of the key findings of Bauer (2020). First, the distribution of Luwian *pūnata*/*i*- and *tanima*/*i*- is temporally, not functionally determined (2020: 55). Second, in some languages a different attributive word order of universal quantifiers marks a functional difference: per some descriptions, in Ancient Greek the order definite article + παντ- has an intensifying force 'absolutely all' (ibid.). Third, in Iron Age Luwian preposed attributive singular *tanima*/*i*- is distributive 'every', while postposed marks totality: 'whole, entire' (2020: 56). Fourth, the dominant (though not universal) diachronic pattern is that universal quantifiers begin as marking totality and acquire or shift to universal value in the sense 'all' and may become distributives (2020: 60–61). Bauer's study is in multiple ways illuminating but misses certain key points about the syntax in both Luwian and Hittite. These will be the focus of what follows.

§ 2. *Syntax of Hittite proportional quantifiers*

Originally, these stood in "partitive apposition" as a quantifying *noun* (Hoffner-Melchert 2008: 272, §17.90):

(1) KBo 5.2 i 37–38 (CTH 471; Ritual of Ammihatna, MH/NS)

^{NA4}ZA.GÍN *tepu…ḫūštiššʾa tepu* 'lapis lazuli, a little…and *ḫušti*-material (NSgC!), a little'

(2) KBo 6.2 ii 46 (CTH 291; Laws, OH/OS)

takku A.ŠÀ-*nʾa mekkī wāši* 'But if he buys a field, a large portion of it…'

Barcino. Monographica Orientalia 22 – Series Anatolica et Indogermanica 4 (2023) (ISBN: 978-84-9168-937-9)

The word ‘field’ is common gender in the Laws (Hoffner 1997: 311). For the syntax see Melchert apud Watkins (1982: 259[24]). Cf. HKM 24: 54–55 (MH/MS), KBo 2.3 ii 8 (MH/NS), etc.

The next stage is a postposed attributive adjective (this remains dominant, perhaps exclusive, for *tēpu-*): Ì.DÙG.GA *tepu* ‘a little fine oil’ (passim in ritual texts), *IŠTU* Ì.DÙG.GA *tepuit* ‘with a little fine oil’ (KBo 25.37 i 25, pre-NH/NS), *ANA* SI.Ḫ.A=*ŠU alpuemar tepu* ‘a little of the point from his horns’ (KBo 11.14 i 13, OH/NS), LÀL *tepu* ‘a little honey’ (KUB 35.57 i 10, pre-NH/NS), ^{UZU}NÍG.GIG *kuran tepu* ‘a little cut liver’ (KUB 11.24 i 6.11.15, ?/NS), SÍG ZA.GÌN SÍG SA_5 *tepu* ‘a little blue (and) red wool (KBo 39.8 i 8, MH/MS), $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$NINDA.GUR_4.RA-*uš* $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$*išpantuzziyaliuš tēpawēš* ‘few bread-makers and libation servers’ (KUB 14.8 Vo 19; NH), etc.[1] This syntax is also well attested for *mekk(i)-* : ŠAḪ.TUR.Ḫ.A *mekkuš…mūriuš mekkuš* ‘many piglets…many grape clusters’ (KUB 43.23 Vo 20–23; OH/MS); ^{GIŠ}GIGIR *mekkan* ‘many chariots’ (KUB 36.98b Vo 11; OH/NS).

The final stage for at least *mekk(i)-* is a preposed attributive adjective:

(3) KUB 29.1 i 16 (CTH 414; OH/NS)
LUGAL-*e=mu* DINGIR.MEŠ *mekkuš* MU.KAM.Ḫ.A-*uš maniyaḫḫer*
‘The gods allotted me, the king, many years.’

The original appositional syntax is expected, since the basic sense of the two adjectives is ‘small’ and ‘large’. For *tēpu-* see *tēpu pēdan* ‘small place’ (euphemism for the grave?), *CHD* P 339–340, and *nu utnē tepu ēšta* ‘the land was small’ (KUB 11.1 i 4; OH/NS), and *tepnu-* ‘to belittle, diminish’. The source of *mēkk(i)-* is manifestly **meĝh₂-* ‘large, great’.

§ 3. *Syntax of Luwian universal quantifiers*

The point of the preceding excursus is that there is evidence that the earliest syntax of Luwian universal quantifiers is that of appositional quantifying nouns:

§ 3.1. CLuwian
We find one clear example of appositional syntax:

1. Such apposition easily shades into “depictive” or even “predicatival” use (cf. Rieken 2017: 393–400), and *kuitta parā tēpu* ‘a little bit of each’ becomes a fixed phrase. See for examples *CHD* P: 127–128 (also with variants *kuišša* and *kuwapitta*).

(4) KUB 35.54 ii 12–16 (CTH 758.1; MH/NS)

āppa ādd[*uwal≠za*] *utar≠ša* EN SÍSKUR DINGIR.MEŠ-*za* [*parran niš* <*awiti*>] *imrašša* ^{d}IŠKUR-*aššanza* [*ḫalliš≠ša*] *pā ānda pūna zāš* [*taluppiš*] *lāladdu*

'May the evil matter not <come> back before the gods of the ritual client as the contamination of the Storm-god of the Open Country! Let this [piece of dough] absorb all (of it)!'

For my restoration of <*awiti*> cf. ibid. ii 39–41. Yakubovich-Mouton (forthcoming), interpret the first clause very differently, but agree that the referent of the two noun phrases is the same, thus as in Hittite example (2) above, a singular noun is quantified with a collective quantifier.[2]

Otherwise, we find a derived inflected adjective *pūnat(i)-*, both preposed and postposed as an attributive and also predicatival:

(5) KUB 35.107 iii 7 (CTH 764.1; MH/MS)

DINGIR.MEŠ-*inzi pūnatinzi*[!] (text *za*) 3[?]-*šu taršiya*[*nta*]

'All the gods *t*-ed three[?] times'.

(6) KUB 35.133 iii 12–14 (CTH 665; OH/NS)

zawi≠du≠t[*i*[?] *-a*]*t*/*n*-*ta* LUGAL KUR ^{URU}*Ḫatti* ^{URU}*Ḫattuš*[*aš≠ḫa p*]*ūnateš* § *anza pīya*…

'Here the King of the Land of H. and entire H. have [ ]ed for you. Give us…'

(7) KUB 35.54 ii 31(CTH 758.1; MH/NS)

zāwi ziyar NUMUN.ḪI.A-*na* [*p*]*ūnāta*

'Here lie/are placed all (kinds of) seeds'.[3]

(8) KUB 35.69:6–7 (CTH 762.1.4; MH/MS)

[*pā pu*]*natinzi malḫašša*[*šši*]*nzi* EN-*zi* DINGIR.MEŠ-*inzi* /…]x-*an mannau-wallāi*[*mminzi ašandu*]

'[So let] *all* the [gods] of the ritual [client be r]e[?]invigorated!' (While let the ritual client be [in]vigorated with oil [and honey]!)[4]

(9) KUB 9.6+35.39 ii 25–26 (CTH 759.1; pre-NH/NS)

nānum≠pa≠mmaš wāšuwaššanza ḫalalannuššandu pūnati[*nzi* DINGIR.MEŠ-*inzi*]

'Now let *all* [the gods] purify their goods/good things!' (Let them wash out their mouths with oil and honey!")[5]

2. For *ḫalliš-* as 'defilement, contamination' and not 'illness, affliction' see Yakubovich in this volume.

3. The parallel text KBo 29.2+KUB 35.52 ii 9 shows the same order.

4. The restorations follow Mouton-Yakubovich (forthcoming). For the translation see below.

(10) KUB 35.54 ii 24–26 (CTH 758.1; MH/NS)

[...-(*ta*)]*liš* [(EN SÍSKUR *tarpāššaš*) *za*]*mmanta* [(*malḫa*<*š*>*ša a*)]*nta zāš* [*p*]*ūnata ariyaddu*

'[Here is (or similar) the]…*tali* ritual substitute of the ritual client. Let this one carry within the accursed/harmful ritual offerings, in their entirety!'

The use of *anda* is unexpected (one expects *arḫa* 'away' or *parī* 'forth, out'). I take it as expressing that the substitute should absorb the bad things and then carry them away. Cf. (4).

One's first impression is that the varying order of attributive *pūnat*(*i*)- (three postposed and two, likely three, preposed) merely shows the same transition as seen with Hittite *mēkk*(*i*)- from a postposed position inherited from its base *pūna*- to the more standard preposed position of an attributive adjective. However, notice that the preposed examples are all in imperative sentences requesting action from deities vs. one postposed in a mythical narrative and two in clauses describing ritual actions. If all we had was the CLuwian evidence, this could be due to chance and meaningless, but the Empire Luwian facts suggest otherwise.

§ 3.2. Empire Luwian

The universal quantifier in Empire Luwian texts is written exclusively with L430 = OMNIS$_2$, which has a phonetic reading /pu/ or more accurately /po/: see Hawkins (1995: 25&106).[6] Appositional syntax with a *noun* /po:na/ is not excluded for some of the cases without phonetic complements, but without positive evidence, all of them must be taken as an *adjective* /po:na:di-/ (with the respective parts of speech thus, pace Bauer-Simon 2019: eDiana ID 727). Both examples that do have phonetic complements are clearly the adjective:

(11) EMİRGAZİ altars (Empire)

§15 **a-wa/i-ti-i(a)* OMNIS$_2$-*ti-sa* PRAE-*i(a)* X 'Everyone shall X himself forth'.

5. Restoration with Mouton-Yakubovich (forthcoming) against Starke (1985: 114). Cp. also likely KUB 32.79:5.

6. This value certainly is derived from *pūna*- by acrophony. My reading of the vowel as /o/ is based on the consistent spelling *pu-u-na*(-) in CLuwian with the <u> sign, which in CLuwian indicates a vowel lower than ordinary /u/ spelled with <ú>. See for Hittite Rieken (2005) and Kloekhorst (2008: 35–60= and for CLuwian (and inferentially for HLuwian) Melchert (2010a) and Rieken (2016). However, this point obviously is irrelevant for the syntax. All that is crucial is that the use of OMNIS$_2$ excludes that the Empire Luwian represents *tanima*/*i*-.

Compare Hawkins (1995: 89 and 96), but the presence of the reflexive /≠di/ precludes a verb 'to go'. Note the assured distributive sense in a common gender singular acting alone as the subject.[7] This reading is also possible in KARADAĞ 1 §1.

(12) YALBURT (Tuthaliya IV)
block 7, §1 (sic!)
a-wa/i ni-pi+ra/i(REGIO) *430-*sa*$_5$ *tu-pi* 'And I struck the entire land Nipira'.

The noun /waddaniya-/ 'land' is neuter, so one must read neuter nominative-accusative singular /po:na≠sa/ with particle (contra Bauer-Simon eDiana ID 727). An appositional noun would not have the postposed particle in Empire Luwian.

Other examples are: SÜDBURG §1&6 *HATTI* REGIO OMNIS$_2$ (N-ASg/PlN), ibid. §3 DEUS OMNIS$_2$ (NPlC), ibid. §5 CAPUT.VIR *HATTI* REGIO OMNIS$_2$ (APlC); YALBURT block 16 §2a REGIO OMNIS$_2$ (N-APlN); KARADAĞ 1 §1 DEUS-*ní* OMNIS$_2$ (DSg), ibid. §2 REGIO OMNIS$_2$ (N-APlN); KIZILDAĞ 4 §2a DEUS-*na* OMNIS$_2$ (GSg/Pl), ibid. §2b REGIO OMNIS$_2$ (N-APlN), ibid. §3 (TERRA)*ta-sà-kw*[*a/i+ra/i*] *430 (N-ASg/Pl).[8] Inevitably, in texts of the Empire period (especially SÜDBURG!), my grammatical assignment of some examples in terms of gender, number, and case differs from that of others, but fortunately that matters not for our immediate purposes. What is crucial is that due to the nature of the texts all twelve Empire HLuwian examples are securely in narrative contexts. The total figures are now: fifteen postposed, all narrative or descriptive; three preposed, all in imperative clauses. This distribution *suggests* a possible functional contrast. Preposed *ḫūmant-* in Hittite manifestly has an intensifying effect similar to the marked order in Greek (see Appendix 1 for the evidence). The overwhelming preponderance of occurrences in therapeutic rituals of Hurro-Luwian background (62 of 95 examples per the count of Rieken 2014) strongly suggests a Luwian origin, supporting a similar analysis of the usage of CLuwian and Empire Luwian *pūnati-*: direct appeals to the gods for assistance in the context of crises call forth heightened rhetoric and an insistence that 'all' means 'absolutely all' without exception or omission.

7. See, however, Sideltsev-Yakubovich (2016: 87–89) for compelling evidence of /k^{w}isxa/ as a distributive universal quantifier in Iron Age Luwian and CLuwian, thus likely also in Empire Luwian. Such a competing expression is hardly surprising in view of Hittite *kuišša* beside *ḫūmant-* and *dapi*(*ant*)- also used as 'each, every'.

8. The alleged example DEUS OMNIS$_2$+*RA/I* (NPlC) with an unexpected postposed quantifier in a curse formula in TORBALI-KARAKÜYÜ (Oreshko 2013: 375–377) is non-existent. See Müller-Karpe (2019: 310–311).

§ 4. *The syntax of Luwo-Hittite* dapi(d)-, dapiant-

Contra Kimball (2016) (with totally illicit emendations) and Bauer (2020: 60), Oettinger (2006: 1329–1332) has shown beyond doubt that the Hittite universal quantifier *dapi*(*d*)-, *dapiant*- (sic!) is a loanword from Luwian, despite no evidence (yet) for it in Luwian texts (compare the situation of the distal deictic *anni*-, for which see Goedegebuure 2014: 211–219). First, it shows a stem in -*it*- in abl. *dapidaz*, nom.-acc. pl. neut. *dapida*, gen. pl. *dapidaš* and dat.-loc. pl. *dapitaš*. Second, with a possible single exception out of more than eighty examples, it and its extension *dapiyant*- *never* show the expected intervocalic yod in an *i*-stem before endings with initial vowel, and the alternative ablative is *dapiz*(*a*) as well as *dapiaz*. One must agree with Oettinger that the stem is a fixed *dapi*- to which Hittite endings are added (for other examples of this in Hittite see Rieken 2004: 533–536, citing also Neu): acc. sg. comm. *dapi-an*, dat.-loc. sg. *dapi-i* (*dapī*), nom. pl. comm. *dapi-eš*, acc. pl. comm. *dapi-uš*, nom.-acc. pl. *da-pí-ya* (where a spelling †*da-pí-a* would have been disfavored), dat.-loc. pl. *dapi-aš*. As per Oettinger, it is likely not accidental that for nom. sg. comm. we find only the extended stem *dapianz(a)*, but nom. pl. comm., acc. pl. comm., nom.-acc. pl. neut., dat.-loc. pl., and ablative occur, and nom.-acc. sg. neut. *dapian* could belong here, although it naturally may be the matching form of *dapiyant*-.[9]

The attested syntax in Hittite context entirely matches that of native Hittite *ḫūmant*-. In attributive use it is normally postposed as 'entire, whole', 'all', and even 'each': GE$_6$-*an dapian* 'the entire night' (KUB 23.59 ii 2, NH), NINDA SIG$_5$-*uwa dapida* 'all the good breads' (KBo 12.38 i 4, NH), LÚ.MEŠ *Gašga*$^{\text{HI.A}}$ …*dapianteš* 'all the Kaskaeans' (KUB 5.1 iii 61–62, NH), KUR.KUR.MEŠ (*Ḫurri*) *dapianda* 'all the (Hurrian) lands' (KUB 19.9 i 11&24, NH), $^{\text{d}}$*Gulši dapī* 'for each Fate-goddess' (KUB 5.1 i 48, NH). Note also an extraposed, effectively depictive example:

(13) KUB 6.45 iii 35 (CTH 381.A; prayer of Muwattalli, NH)
nu=mu=kan DINGIR.MEŠ-*aš uwayanut dapiaš*
'Make me worthy of pity to the gods, in their entirety!'

But it may also be preposed, and all but one of the complete contexts support an intensive reading:

9. Since New Hittite has no non-geminating clitic *=a* and the sense calls for 'and', we must emend *da-pí-na* (all 7x in KUB 5.1!) to *da-pí-<an>-n=a*.

(14) KBo 11.14 i 24 (CTH 395; Ritual of Hantitassu, OH/NS)

(The Sun-god held a feast,) *nu=za dapiuš* DINGIR.MEŠ-*u*[*š*] *ḫalz*[*āi*]*š* [*nu=z*]*a ḫūmandan* DUMU.LÚ.U[$_{19}$.L]U-*an ḫalz*[*ā*]*i*[*š*] 'and he invited *all* the gods, and he invited *every* human'.

The reason for the emphasis even in a narrative context is that at least once the Sun-god did *not* invite all the gods, with disastrous results: see Steitler (2017: 388–389). See also KBo 2.9 i 7 (CTH 716, pre-NH/NS) *dapiza* KUR-*eza eḫu* 'Come from *every* land!' in the midst of more than thirty clauses with 'Come from the Land X!'. One example from the cult inventories also fits an all-inclusive reading:

(15) KBo ii 13 Vo 7 (CTH 528, NH)

1 *PA* ZÌ.DA 1 ^{DUG}KA.GAG *ištanani dapiaš* DINGIR.MEŠ-*aš*

'One *PARISU*-measure of flour and one KA.GAG vessel (of beer) for *all* the gods'.

This follows the sacrificing of sheep to five named deities and offering to them of the sacralized meats. So, it is reasonable to underscore that the further offerings are not to omit any of those named. For the context see Cammarosano (2018: 224–225). However, based on *ANA* DINGIR.MEŠ *dapiaš* of the duplicate KBo ii 13 Ro 25 and other similar passages, the preposed *dapiaš ANA* DINGIR.MEŠ of KBo 2.7 Vo 28 is a lapsus, due to confusion with contexts like (15).

In the KIN-oracles, the manipulation of the 'entire soul' is without exception expressed with preposed *dapian* and *dapī* (contrast the examples from the oracular inquiry KUB 5.1 cited above with normal postposed syntax!):

(16) KBo 2.2 i 19–20 (CTH 577.1; NH)

nu KIN SIG$_5$-*ru* DINGIR-*LUM dapian* ZI-*an* ME-*aš n=an=za=an=kan karpi* ME-*iš* NU.SIG$_5$

'Let the sign be favorable. The god took the *entire* soul and put it in anger. Unfavorable.'

(17) KUB 5.5 ii 24–25 (CTH 578; NH)

INA UD.2.KAM ^{d}DAG GUB-*eš parnaš āššu* ME-*aš nu=kan* DINGIR-*LIM-ni dapī* ZI-*ni*

'On the second day the throne arose and took the good of the house. To the deity's *entire* soul.'

As discussed in Appendix 1, the claim that preposing of Hittite *ḫūmant-* is normal with body parts is false.[10]

10. The broken context and uncertain vocabulary of KUB 31.136 ii 1 leaves the status of *dapiaš* KUR-*eaš* indeterminate (see Rieken *et al*. 2015 with refs.). One can say only that the appearance in a

§ 5. *Origin of the attested attributive syntax of Luwo-Hittite* dapi(t)-

The Luwian origin of *dapi*(*t*)- I find undeniable, but -*it*- is a Luwian *noun* suffix, and every other instance of such a loanword into Hittite is a noun, as expected. We have seen that evidence for appositional syntax with a noun quantifier is scarce for *pūna*- beside the attributive adjective *pūnat*(*i*)-. To suppose such syntax with a noun **dapit*- when there is no trace of the word at all in a Luwian context seems beyond credibility. How are we to account for the *attested* attributive use in Hittite context?

The rather better attested attributive use of *pūnat*(*i*)- suggests the possibility of a derived adjective with possessive **-o*-: **dapida*/*i*- 'aggregate'. This would explain directly the Hittite forms *dapida*, *dapidaz*, and gen./dat.-loc. pl. *dapid*/*taš*. We would predict in the other direct cases **dapitiš*, **dapitin*, etc. But an *adjective* in lenited -*idi*/*a*- would have been unusual, if not unique (and also peculiar in being postposed). Thus, the Hittites might have adapted it like an *it*-stem noun, whence *dapieš*, *dapiuš*, secondary *dapi*(*y*)*a*, *dapī*, *dapiz*(*a*). Compare ^{GIŠ}*erḫwi*, ^{GIŠ}*ērḫuyaz* to ^{GIŠ}*ērḫwit*- 'basket'. But even if we allow ourselves this hypothesis, there remains a serious problem: acc. sg. comm. *dapian* is unexplained, and the total absence of a nom. sg. comm. is suspect. What would have blocked **dapiš*, **dapin*? Hittite often adapted Luwian neuter *it*-stems as common gender *i*-stems: compare *āpiš*, *āpin* 'sacrificial pit' or *zakkiš*, *zakkin* 'latch'. The ablative *dapiz*(*a*) beside *dapiaz* like ^{GIŠ}*ērḫuyaz* or *āpiyaz* is also strange.

The overall attestation of *dapi*- suggests an alternative. There are actually only four, at most five, examples of *dapit*- vs. at least 20 examples of *dapi*- plus 63 in oracular inquiries.[11] Furthermore, the few examples that are in NS copies of assured OH compositions show *dapi*-: *dapiaš* (KUB 12.66 iv 18′, Illuyanka), *dapiuš* KBo 11.14 i 24 cited as (14) above, and above all *dapi* (KUB 28.92 i 10′), to be

direct plea to a god is not unexpected, as already noted for Luwian examples and argued in full in Appendix 1 for Hittite.

11. KBo 12.38 i 4 *dapida* (Suppiluliuma II, late NH), beside *dapiya* ibid. i 14, KUB 36.18 ii 11 *dapidaš* (Song of Silver, MH/NS), KUB 31.146:3′ *dapitaš* (pre-NH/NS) vs. *ḫūmandaš* in the duplicate KUB 4.1 i 19, KUB 12.57 ii 4 *dapidaz* (ritual fragment, pre-NH/NS). I also find the traces on the photo of KUB 33.96 i 3′ (Ullikummi, MH/NS) more compatible with *da-pí-t*[*a-az*] than the tentative *da-pí-y*[*a-aš*] previously assumed, which would be a unique unexpected spelling with a hiatus-filling yod, but certainty is impossible. The revised figures for *dapi*- vs. the previous handout reflects incorporation of several more oracular inquiries into the data base and a more careful review of the other examples. Broken contexts leave four instances indeterminate.

treated in detail momentarily.[12] This suggests that the stem *dapit-* is a *Hittite* creation, based on the pattern of *it*-stem nouns adapted into Hittite, with alternating stems in *-it-* and *-i-*, including those adapted as neuters. *If* Luwian syntax for **dapi-* was with a postposed collective noun **dapī* (arguably even still *[tabiɣ] < **dhab-ih*$_2$), then with Oettinger, loc. cit., Hittite converted it to an adjective by adding endings to an invariant base. Lack of yod may reflect a resulting hiatus when vocalic endings were added, and *[tabiɣ-s], *[tabiɣ-n] with a consonantal ending would have been problematic and were thus avoided by employing *dapianz*(*a*) and *dapian*.

As just presented, such a scenario is extremely speculative, requiring that the borrowing was very early, indeed prehistoric, and assuming appositional syntax for which there is no apparent basis, as already stated above. However, a reexamination of the OH/NS fragment KUB 28.92 alters the situation. First of all, there can be no doubt that it is an OH composition, and likely a quite archaic one. Lines i 5′ and 7′ contain Hattian incantations (see Soysal 2004: 380, 577, 653–654 with refs.). Line i 3′ introduces a scribe (DUB.SAR), a wood tablet scribe (DUB.SAR.GIŠ) and the 'man of the Storm-god' (LÚ ^{d}10). In the next line the latter summons in the god, surely the Storm-god, and most commentators have taken the following Hattian *ašā* ^{URU}*Nerikil* of i 5′ as 'Come, one of Nerik!' or similar. Line i 6′ refers to 'words of summoning in and drawing/alluring',[13] and most crucially for our purposes line i 9′ clearly reads *Ù* INIM.MEŠ *talliyawaš ŠA* ^{d}*Zaḫal*[*iqqa*] 'while/but/also the words of drawing/alluring Z.'[14]

This means that the following line i 10′ *dapi* DUB.SAR *memāi* cannot possibly mean 'speaks to every scribe', as I had mistakenly recorded it. Nor can it mean that the 'man of the Storm-god' speaks 'die ganze Tafel' (contra Haas 1970: 302): DUB.SAR is 'scribe', not 'tablet'. Rather, just as the man of the Storm-god did the summoning in of the Storm-god of Nerik, it is the scribe who accompanies him (per line i 3′) who performs the task of drawing/alluring the deity *Zaḫali*/*uqqa*. Contrary to widespread belief, *Ù* in OH as a *sentence connective* regularly corre-

12. For the Ritual of Hantitassu as an OH composition see Miller (2004: 450–451) and Steitler (2017: 200, n. 635 with refs. and 235).

13. For this sense of *talliye*/*a-* see the arguments in Melchert (2010b: 228–231), upholding Laroche and Hoffner against all others. Contra Haas (1970: 302), one must restore *andan ḫalziyawaš talliya*[*waš*(*-ša*)]. The latter refers to a parallel action.

14. See van Gessel (1998: 566), after Haas (1970: 302), for this as a variant of ^{d}*Zaḫaluqqa*. See Haas (1970: 300–301) for the closely related KUB 27.68 i 1–13 where the 'summoning in' of ^{d}10 ^{URU}*Zaḫaluqqa* is described in some detail. For the close association of this deity named after the homonymous city with the Storm-god of Nerik see Haas (1994: 597 and 600–601).

sponds to Hittite non-geminating contrastive *≠a*/*ma* (see Rieken 2000: 414–417).[15] Furthermore, it is made clear by the following lines that inducing the named deities to return to their temples is a joint operation. This means we must construe lines i 9′–10′ as 'While the scribe speaks all the words of drawing/alluring Z.' or alternatively 'The scribe recites also all the words of drawing/alluring Z.'

One must emphasize that the written word order of *Ù* INIM.MEŠ *talliyawaš ŠA* ^{d}*Zaḫal*[*iqqa*] is entirely due to the head noun being written with an uncomplemented Sumerogram and tells us nothing of how these are to be construed syntactically with *dapi*. The underlying Hittite word order is securely **Zaḫaliqqaš talliyawaš uddār*/*memiyanuš dapi memāi*. If we could assume a *figura etymologica*, we would have direct evidence for the hypothetical appositional syntax with *dapi-*. Unfortunately, we cannot safely make such an assumption. While most instances of the "content accusative" in Hittite are in fact *figurae etymologicae*, there are a handful of exceptions, one of which is: *nu≠tta kāša* LÚ.NAM.U$_{19}$.LU ÌR*≠KA uttar memai* 'Look here, a human, your servant, is speaking a word to you' KUB 31.127+ABoT 1.44 i 56 (pre-NH/NS). We must therefore choose the more conservative analysis of *dapi* as a postposed attributive nom.-acc. pl. neut. agreeing with *uddār*.

This finding is nevertheless far from trivial. It confirms first of all that *dapit-* is indeed a late and quite marginal secondary Hittite creation, MH at best and quite possibly only NH/NS (thus correctly already Oettinger 2006: 1331). We also learn that the oldest nom.-acc. pl. neut. form of Hittite *dapi-* had a zero case ending, so that the *dapi*(*y*)*a* of KBo12.38 i 24 is also an innovation comparable to nom.-acc. pl. neut. *karuwiliya* for older *karuwili* 'old, former' or *parkuwa(ya)* for *parkui* 'pure'. It is pointless to speculate on the significance (or not) of *dapi* without plene spelling in a NS copy. The total absence of plene spellings of the Hittite *a*-stem nom.-acc. pl. neut. (except under the accent) suggests that the expected variant **-ā*< **-aḫ* < **-eh$_2$* had disappeared before attested Hittite. But we simply have no way to determine the OH state of affairs for the corresponding high-vowel endings: are substantivized and lexicalized *āššū* 'goods, property' (i.e., *a-aš-šu-u* = [a:sso:] < **-uh$_2$* via **-oḫ*) and the *mekkī* 'a lot' cited in (2) above < **-ih$_2$* via **-iḫ* exceptional and the formal merger of nom.-acc. sg. neut. *-i* and *-u* with the nom.-acc. pl.

15. Her findings can be confirmed with further examples from OH/OS: KBo 3.22 Ro 7 (Anitta), KBo 22.1 Vo 7, 12, 14, 15 (Zalpa), KBo 6.2 ii 31, 60 (Laws). This is not to deny that *Ù* can also occasionally stand for geminating *≠a*/*ya*, the expanding focus particle (KBo 6.2 iv 20), which would also be appropriate for our context. What it cannot represent is mere 'and'.

neut. seen in MH/MS already the productive OH pattern? Or were the plurals still distinctive [o:] and [i:]?[16]

The point is entirely irrelevant for the question of [tabi] or [tabi:] as the nom.-acc. pl. neut. of 'all', because we are not facing a word that results from regular prehistoric developments in a native Hittite vocable, but with the *adaptation* of a Luwian borrowing. There is no doubt that Hittite speakers could pronounce a final *-ḫ*, but what was acceptable in a noun referring to a concrete object, surely a non-IE loanword (the vessel name *išqaru*/*iḫ*-) and unavoidable in the imv. 2nd sg. of factitive verbs in *-aḫḫ-* would not have been suitable for an attributive *i*-stem quantifying adjective. I assume that the Luwian noun had the approximate shape *[tabiɣ] < virtual **dhab-ih*$_2$, because the first part of the Luwian abstract suffix *-āḫit-* has the same source *-*aḫ* < **-éh*$_2$# as that in Hittite **miyaḫ-* (see Eichner 1973: 60). Which the Hittites treated as medial *-ḫ-* just like their own. Unsurprisingly, they reshaped the quantifying adjective as an *i*-stem matching *mekki-*. However, their failure in the entire history of Hittite ever to insert a yod in forms of *dapia-* suggests that when the adaptation took place the Luwian word did *not* end in just a vowel, long or short. While one must set the 60+ examples in NH oracular inquiries apart in order not to distort the statistics for *dapi-* vs. *dapit-*, it remains striking that these texts, the overwhelming majority of which belong to Hattusili III and Tuthaliya IV, thus late NH, still have no variant †*dapiya-* (I must insist that the spelling of nom.-acc. pl. neut. *da-pí-ya* is specially conditioned to avoid †*da-pí-a*). While certainty is not possible, I find it hard to believe that several generations of speakers could so consistently maintain a mere hiatus. One must seriously entertain that they adapted *[tabiɣV] to [tabiʔV], with a hiatus-filling glottal stop, which arguably may exist in their native *a-a-an-t*^{o} 'warm' [a:ʔant-] < *(*h*$_1$)*áyont-* and in *a-a-pí-*(*t*)- 'sacrificial pit', a Wanderwort borrowed via Luwian that may well represent [aʔabi(d)-].

Be that as it may, a nom.-acc. pl. neut. [tabi(:)ʔ] or if one prefers merely [tabi(:)X] with no overt case ending, matching nom.-acc. pl. neut. *mekki/ī*, *karuwili/*ī*, etc. would have made a suitable "pivot" form (*Scharnierform*) for secondary inflection of a fixed stem [tabi(ʔ/X)-] with vocalic endings as we descriptively find it in

16. See on these endings Watkins (1982). Presumably, the "short" high vowels were phonetically shorter than the "short" low vowel, allowing for the contrast with the lengthened variant to survive somewhat longer. But how much longer is unknowable. For the intermediate stage with a final "lenited" *-*Vḫ*# see Eichner (1973: 59–60) on Hittite *miyaḫ*(*u*)*want-* 'grown (up)' reflecting an abstract **miyaḫ* < **mih*$_{1/3}$*-éh*$_2$# (his claim about the final consonant is unaffected by subsequent debate about the root etymology).

Hittite. The absence of nom. sg. comm. **tapiš* and acc. sg. comm. **tapin* may well be accidental, but one may at least be suspicious that they are lacking because whatever element was present in the Auslaut of the Luwian ending made *[tabiX-s] and *[tabiX-n] problematic.[17]

§ 6. *Conclusions*

I have relegated discussion of etymological details to Appendix 2, but I conclude that most, arguably all, Luwic universal quantifiers support the generalization that the most typical origin is in expressions for totality based on notions of 'mass' or 'fullness': Luwian *pūnati*-and **dapi*-, and Lycian *huwedri*-. Likewise Hittite *panku*- 'whole, all', to the extent that it functions as a quantifier. Hittite *ḫūmant*- most plausibly reflects a depictive participle 'taken together', hence 'aggregate', which also accounts for its functionally unmarked position after its head noun. As per Bauer (2020: 60), the distributive use of *pūnati*-, *dapi*(*ant*)-, and *ḫūmant*- that competes with augmented forms of the relative-interrogative pronoun reflects secondary developments. As is often the case, in attempting to answer some questions my treatment here raises others. To use the standard cliché, I hope to have at least significantly advanced "the state of the question" regarding the overall topic of Anatolian universal quantifiers—and to have shown that there are even more demonstrable contact effects between Hittite and Luwian in this area of grammar than previously supposed.

§ 7. *Appendix 1: the syntax of Hittite* ḫūmant-

Per Rieken (2014: 165–166) Hittite preposed attributive *ḫūmant*- is overwhelmingly attested in therapeutic rituals and other religious contexts. Since the former are almost entirely from the Hurro-Luwian sphere, she attributes the construction to foreign influence, but concedes that all plausible candidates for such influence have *postposed* word order. A simple contact explanation is thus implausible. I suggest rather a genre effect. Luwian origin remains likely, if not strictly provable. Therapeutic rituals and prayers are by nature *dialogic*, where one might well expect heightened rhetoric. When one is asking the gods for assistance or ensuring that a ritual action has the desired effect, one takes no chances on being

17. Whereas the only other case ending with an initial consonant, the ablative [t^{s}], had sufficient phonetic strength to cause the Luwian element to be deleted or ignored, hence the variant *dapiz*(*a*).

misunderstood—including underscoring that nothing be omitted. I submit that the Luwo-Hittite preposing has the same *intensifying* effect as the Ancient Greek order cited by Bauer (see §1 above). Crucial for my claim is that the *normal* order is *postposed* in therapeutic rituals of Hurro-Luwian background just as in all other genres:

(18) KBo 11.14 i 4–5 (CTH 395 Ritual of Hantitassu of Hurma; OH/NS)
INA 1 NI[NDA].ÉRIN].MEŠ-*ma≠šša*n *šer* NUMUN.ḪI.A *ḫūman šuḫḫai*
'But on the one soldier's bread he pours every (kind of) seed'.
(19) KBo 11.14 ii 7
nu ḫūman NUMUN *dā* 'Take *every* (kind of) seed!'

The postposed order is standard in ritual texts when 'all (kinds of) seeds' are introduced or referred to as part of the *materiae magicae*: cf. *kī* NUMUN.ḪI.A *ḫūmanta* 'all these seeds' KBo 4.2 i 10–11 (CTH 398 Ritual of Huwarlu, MH/NS) and ibid. i 62, NUMUN.ḪI.A *ḫūman* (KBo 10.45 iii 50 (CTH 446 Ritual for the Infernal Deities, MH/NS), etc. It cannot be coincidence that the only exception known to me from the entire corpus is (19), where the Sun-god is being implored to take every seed (along with other ritual materials) and give back the ritual client in return. The same contrast between postposed order in description of the ritual action and preposed in imperatival clauses holds for other expressions (see Bawanypeck 2005: 108 and 112):

(20) KBo 20.107+23.51+34.46+23.50 ii 9–13 (CTH 433.3.A Ritual for the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag; MH/NS)
kāša ^{d}LAMMA ^{KUŠ}*kuršan araḫzenaš* KUR.KUR.MEŠ-*az ḫūmandaz* ḪUR.SAG.MEŠ-*az ḫāriyaz* ÍD.MEŠ-*az ḫantiyaššaz* PÚ.MEŠ-*az wēlluwaz* [*arḫa talli*]*škewen mukiškewen*
'Look here, we have dr[awn/allured away] (and) induced the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag from all surrounding lands, from the mountains, valleys, rivers, shallows, springs, meadows.'
(21) KBo 20.107+23.51+34.46+23.50 iii 26–28
n≠ašta araḫzenaš ḫūmantaz KUR-*yaz* ḪUR.SAG.MEŠ-*az ḫariyaz* ÍD.MEŠ-*az ḫantiya<š>šaz* PÚ.MEŠ<-*az*> *wēlluwaz arḫa eḫu*
'Come away from *every* surrounding land, from the mountains, valleys, rivers, shallows, springs, meadows!'

One also predictably finds such insistence when an imperatival clause with 'all, every' is summarizing a long set of clauses with named places:

(22) KUB 36.90 (Vo) 29–39 (CTH 386; NH, but likely with pre-NH model)

[*arḫ*]*a* $^{\text{ÍD}}$*Mar*[*aššant*]*aza* ℜ[*m*]*azumazuwan*[*t*]*aza wappuwaza eḫu*…(11 clauses of GNN-*az eḫu*) *ḫūmand*[*az* K]UR.KUR.MEŠ-*za eḫu*

'Come away from the M. River, from its highly resistant bank…(11 more 'come from X!'), come from absolutely all the lands!' (without exception!)

For the reading and interpretation of the first clause see Poetto (2020). This passage with *ḫūmant-* echos that referred to above with *dapi-* : KBo 2.9 i 7 (CTH 716, pre-NH/NS) *dapiza* KUR-*eza eḫu* 'Come from *every* land!', likewise summarizing a long list of place names, to assure that nowhere is inadvertently missed, even if it is not named in the long list.

Contra Hoffner-Melchert (2008: 272, §17.7) body parts *per se* are not exceptional. As shown by examples cited there, the functionally "unmarked" order is postposed (cf. already on this point Rieken 2014: 165–166). See in a description of ritual action (Bawanypeck 2005: 26–27):

(23) KBo 4.2 41–42 (CTH 398, Ritual of Huwarlu, MH/NS)

n=an=šan ANA LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL NÍ.TE-*aš=šaš ḫūmantaš anda damašzi*

'And s/he presses it (a ball of soapwort ashes) against all the body parts of the king and queen'.

Likewise in a prose passage from an instructions text: [N]Í.TE=*ŠU ḫūman* GIM-*an* 'like his entire person' (KUB 26.8 ii 3, CTH 255, Instructions of Tuthaliya IV). It is again the heightened rhetoric of a prayer or a performative or imperatival clause in a ritual that conditions preposing:

(24) KUB 30.10 Ro 24 (CTH 373; [prayer of Kantuzzili; pre-NH/MS) (repeated Ro 27–28)

[(*kinun=a*)]*=mu=za ammel* DINGIR=*YA* ŠÀ=*ŠU* ZI=*ŠU ḫūmantet kardit kīnuddu*

'But now let my god open his insides and soul to me with his *entire* heart!' (hold nothing back!)

(25) KUB 24.9 i 45 (CTH 402 Ritual of Allī; MH/NS)

kinuna=šši=kan kā[*ša and*]*arandan* UD-*an ḫūmandaz tueggaz daškem*[*i*]

'I am now removing the "blue day" from his *entire* body.' (not missing any spot!)

(26) KUB 27.67 iii 25–27 (CTH 391.1 Ritual of Ambazzi, MH/NS)

arḫa=šmaš=kan idālu ḫuitteš ḫuitti[*ya*] SAG.DU.MEŠ-*it* ŠU.MEŠ-*it* GÌR.MEŠ-*it ḫūmanti*[*t*] $^{\text{UZU}}$ÚR-*it*

'Pull away from them the evil pulling, from their heads, hands, feet, from *every* member!'

Similarly ibid. ii 20–21 (see Christiansen 2006: 42 and 50).

References to 'all the gods' are legion in Hittite, and in most contexts the order is with postposed *ḫūmant-*, notably in the frequent topos 'all the gods ran before' (consistently DINGIR.MEŠ *ḫūmanteš* in a dozen NH attestations) and in lists of gods as treaty witnesses or in prayers. Once again it is the affective context of imperatival clauses (actually requests when addressed to deities) that leads to preposing:

(27) KUB 27.67 ii 68–69 (CTH 391.1 Ritual of Ambazzi, MH/NS)
[*ammug≠a/nu≠mu*]*≠kan ḫūmandaš* DINGIR.MEŠ-*aš* [*peran*] *āššu memiški*
'Speak good for [me] before absolutely all the gods!'

Likewise, ibid. iii 66 and iv 14, but it is important to note that, as with all rhetorical devices, it is up to the speaker/writer to choose to use it. Compare ibid. iv 39 with the normal order (see for the passages Christiansen 2006: 48–49, 54–57 and 60–61). While this could be a mere lapsus, there are enough other exceptions *in this direction* that I see no reason to doubt that this merely reflects the inherent optionality of the "marked" variant.[18]

In weighing the matter of whether the preposed use of *ḫūmant-* for emphasis or contrast is due to Luwian influence it is important to acknowledge that it is attested in OH festival texts. The only example in OH/OS does not have enough context to motivate the usage: […]*wilānuš ḫūmandaš* DINGIR.MEŠ-*aš arḫa dā*[*w*]*eni* 'We take away the [ ]clays from *all* the gods' (KBo 8.74+ ii 16, CTH 752, OH/OS). Elsewhere, however, context does provide motivation: […*≠m*]*a ḫūmandāš* DINGIR.MEŠ-*aš paršiya* 'but breaks [ ] for *all* the gods' (in contrast with bread offerings to just Hebat and Šarruma) (KUB 46.47 Vo 25, CTH 698, pre-NH/NS), and 12 NINDA SIG *ANA* ^{d}*Pairra* ZAG-*aš* GÙB-*laš Ù ANA ŠA* ^{d}10 *ḫūmanti kalūti* KAŠ*≠ya ḫūmanti kalūti peran šipandanzi* '12 flat breads for Pairra of the right and left and for the Storm-god's *entire* circle, and they also libate beer for the *entire* circle (KBo 14.142+ i 17–19, CTH 698, pre-NH/NS)—this follows offerings of one flat bread each to more than 20 named individual deities of the Storm-god of Aleppo's circle, but once again one does not risk having omitted anyone. However, one should acknowledge the regular order ibid. i 30 in a similar summarizing context. Important also is *ḫūmandan* $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$*ḫapiyan unuwašḫuš≠(s)muš* KÙ.BABBAR-*aš* GUŠKIN-*aš* 'the silver and gold ornaments of *all* the *ḫ*.-men' (KBo 10.31 iv 29–32, CTH 627.5.a.1.A, OH/NS). First, the archaic gen. pl. ending in *-an* and use of the "split genitive" construction assure that this

18. For one more instance of preposing in an imperatival clause in what is likely a mythological context see *ḫūmandāš* DINGIRMEŠ-*aš ḫatugan ēštu* "Let [ ] be frightful for *all* the gods!" (CTH 351.1.A Fragment naming Ea, pre-NH/NS).

reflects an OH model. Second, use of preposing with the uniquely Hittite split genitive implies that such preposing is already in OH thoroughly integrated into Hittite grammar. In view of what I regard as sure evidence for *dapi-* already in OH, I do not see this as an obstacle to supposing Luwian origin. As emphasized by Rieken, use of preposing outside of religious contexts is sparse.

Having expressed more than once skepticism of claims that unusual plene spellings in Hittite represent "emphatic" prosody (in terms of a syntactically conditioned accent and vowel lengthening), I present the following with some reservation. All the more so in that the distributional facts are far less clearcut than they are for the effects of preposing just presented. Nevertheless, there are enough parallels and overlap to be suggestive, so the point seems worth raising for consideration. I am referring to MH/MS, MH/NS and NH spellings of the gen. and dat.-loc. pl. as *ḫūmandāš* and (less commonly) of the dat.-loc. sg. as *ḫūmantī*. Kloekhorst (2014: 314–315, 457–458 and 535) has suggested that these spellings (vs. rare but attested nom.-acc. sg. neut. *ḫūmān* (MS) and once nom. sg. comm. *ḫūmānza* (OH?/NS) as reflecting a paradigm with at least original mobile accent: on the second syllable of the stem in the nominative and accusative and on the ending in the non-direct cases. This cannot be in principle excluded, but the lack of plene spellings in the ending in non-direct forms in OH/OS and most MH/MS texts makes such an archaism appearing in MH or NH suspect. A reexamination of the examples suggests an alternative analysis. It seems prudent to begin with the clearest cases and then move to those of less certain interpretation. It is striking that the only two instances of *ḫūmandāš* in NH non-ritual texts are in imperative clauses:

(28) KBo 1.28 Vo 9–12 (CTH 57; recognition of Piyassili, NH)

n=aš ANA ^{d}10 NIR.GÁL EN=*YA* ^{d}UTU ^{URU}PÚ-*na* GAŠAN=*YA ANA* DINGIR.MEŠ=*a ḫūmandāš* ^{LÚ}DI=*ŠU ēšdu*

'Let him be an opponent at law for the mighty Storm-god, My Lord, and the Sun-goddess of Arinna, My Lady, and absolutely all the gods!' (curse formula!)

(29) KBo 5.4 Vo 12 (CTH 67; treaty with Targasnalli, NH)

[*nu=šmaš*]=*at ḫūmandāš kūrur ašandu* "Let them be enemies for you *all*!"

In this treaty with Targasnalli, the context is focused entirely on how he, Kupanta-Kuruntiya, and Manapa-Tarhunta should absolutely be united as one: see Beckman (1996: 67) for the context. Insistence on 'all' is thus entirely in order. The same applies to the solitary example of *ḫūmantī* in a NH composition:

(30) KBo 4.4 iv 12–13 (CTH 61; AM, NH)

[*nu*]=*kan* ^{URU}*Aripšān zaḫḫiyaz katta*$^{!}$ (text *Ú-UL*) *daḫḫun* [*n*]=*an* ^{URU}*Ḫattuši ḫūmantī šāruwi maniyaḫḫun*

'And I captured A. through battle, and I handed it over to *all* H. for plunder,' (and the infantry and chariotry found much belonging to the citadel along with deportees, cattle, and sheep.)

To appreciate the force of the contrast I claim here, one must be familiar with Mursili II's standard practice upon capturing a city: namely, that he took all or much of the booty for himself, and the rest typically went to *commanders* of the infantry and chariotry (KBo 3.4 i 33–34, 45–46, ii 41–44, iii 35–38, iii 55–57, iv 31, iv 40–43, etc.). Turning it over to all the Hittite troops was a highly unusual act of generosity.

Also instructive is the contrast in our examples from MH/MS:

(31) HKM 49:4–5 (CTH 188; Maşat letter, MH/MS)

MAḪAR DUMU.MUNUS.MEŠ *ḫūmandaš* [*ḫ*]*ūman* SIG$_5$-*in*

'Everything is fine with all the daughters'.

(32) KUB 29.7 Ro 1–2 (CTH 48; Ritual of Samuha, MH/MS)

nu ḫūdāk DINGIR-*LUM IŠTU ŠA* LUGAL *ḫūmandāš ḫūrdiyaš uddanī gangatāizzi*

'She at once performs the *g*.-plant treatment on the god from the side of the king in the matter of *all* the curses'. (and ibid. Ro 7, 43, 49, 51)

(33) KUB 15.32+ ii 17–18 & 23–24 (CTH 484.1, evocatio via paths, MH/NS)

nu 1 MUŠEN *ḫūmandāš āpiyaš enumaššiya itkalziya šipanti*

'and he consecrates one bird to *all* of the sacrificial pits for e. and i.'

Whereas the prosaic report of the letter uses the regular unemphatic postposed word order with normal spelling, the two Kizzuwatna rituals show preposing and the special *ḫūmandāš* variant. With all due caution one is tempted to think that this is rhetorical overkill combining the borrowed practice of preposing for emphasis or contrast with a rarer but ostensibly native Hittite special emphatic intonation. See also the example cited above in note 18.[19]

What imposes caution is that the evidence for emphasis or contrast in the use of the latter is in some instances more suggestive than compelling. For example, it appears in the plague prayers of Mursili II, but not in the context of a direct appeal:

(34) KUB 14.10 i 19–24 (CTH 378.II "2nd" plague prayer of Mursili II, NH)

19. While it does not show preposing, the example in KBo 39.8 ii 35–37 (CTH 404.1.I.A, Ritual of Mastigga, MH/MS) does meet the expectation of being in a performative clause: (They drive in a black sheep, and the practitioner holds it over them and says as follows:) SAG.<DU>.HI.A-*a*(*š*)*=šmaš tueggaš ḫūmandāš tarpalliš* UDU GE$_6$ 'The black sheep is the ritual substitute for *all* the body parts of your persons'.

namma=za EZEN$_4$.HI.A*=ya kuwapi ēššaḫḫun nu ANA* DINGIR.MEŠ *ḫūmandāš peran*

[(EG)]IR-*pa iyaḫḫat* 1-*EN* É.DINGIR-*LIM=kan ŪL teḫḫun nu=za ḫingani šer ANA* DINGIR.MEŠ *ḫūmandāš ārkūwar* [*ēš*]*šaḫḫun*

'Further, whenever I also celebrated festivals, I busied myself (lit. went back and forth) before *all* the gods. I did not single out one temple. I repeatedly made a plea to *all* the gods on account of the plague.'

Given the force of the inserted comment, whose sense must be 'to put first, treat preferentially' or the like, one may make a case for emphatic 'absolutely all', but one is unavoidably extending the bounds for its use beyond what we have presented above. In other instances the best one can say is that the contexts are *compatible* with an emphatic or contrastive reading, but at once concede that were it not for the examples presented above, one would not on independent grounds think of such: KUB 1.17 iii 41, 24.12 ii 6, 30.31 iii 25, and IBoT 1.36 i 34. There is also the issue of why such alleged special emphatic intonation is limited to the dat.-loc. sg. and the gen. and dat.-loc. plural. The following example gives pause:

(35) KBo 19.128 iv 4′–10′ (CTH 625; AN.DAḪ.ŠUM^{SAR} Festival, OH/NS)

n=ašta DINGIR.MEŠ *ḫūmanduš lamnit ḫalzāi* 'he (the king) calls all the gods by name' (§then he crumbles a little bit off the front of the warm bread and sweet bread,) *nu=ššan* DINGIR.MEŠ-*aš ḫūmandāš* EGIR-*pa ANA* ^{UZU}NÍG.GIG.ḪI.A *šer zikkezzi* 'and puts (them) back on the livers for *all* the gods'.

One fails to see why the all-inclusiveness is insisted upon only in the second case and not the first. I am confident of the emphatic, contrastive, "intensifying" force of preposed *ḫūmant-*. Luwian influence seems likely, but not absolutely assured. The interpretation of *ḫūmantī* and *ḫūmandāš* as showing an "emphatic intonation" with a similar force must remain *sub iudice*.

§ 8. *Appendix 2: etymologies of Luwic and Hittite universal quantifiers*

8. 1. CLuwian *pu-u-na-* is most likely collective plural of a *no*-adjective. A preform **bhuh$_{2/3}$-no-* with Yakubovich apud Rieken (2016) permits the expected zero grade (since the laryngeal would lower **u* to [o]), but the sense is more likely 'grown thick, massive, strong', whence **bhuh$_{2/3}$-néh$_2$* 'mass, sum, total' and **bhuh$_{2/3}$-néh$_2$-to-* 'whole'. Similarly, Sasseville (2019 eDiAna ID 726), but the suffix is with Yakubovich possessive **-to-*, since no suitable suffix **-d-* exists. Merger of thematic and consonant stems by "*i*-mutation" reshaped **pūnāda/i-* to **pūnād*(*i*)- by analogy to the type of *ḫūḫat*(*i*)- with "individuating" **-ti-*. An *o*-grade noun **Pou(H)-no-* is not excluded, but **pu-no-* (Opfermann 2019 eDiAna ID

726) could give only †*pu-ú-na-*. Against the standard view, *Puna-* in compound names may be the adjective 'massive, strong', hence *Punamuwa(ti)-* 'having mass(ive) strength', *Punawašu-* 'having mass(ive) wealth'.[20] Compare the full semantic range of reflexes of **teuH-*: Lat. *tōtus* 'whole' < **teuH-to-* (or sim.) 'having mass' (not 'stuffed'!), Gmc. 'thousand' < **tuh$_2$s-ont-* 'big, swollen' (or similar), & various words for 'strong', including in Anatolian.

8.2. The correct root etymology of Luwian **dapi-* is **dheb-* with Sturtevant (1934: 266) & Kimball (2016: 167), but the sense of virtual **dhobi-* was rather 'compact(ed)', hence **dhob-ih$_2$* 'mass, sum, totality' (cf. Hittite *panku-* < **bhn̥ĝh-ú-* (= Greek παχύς 'thick, dense', etc.). With Kimball, the root is that of *taparna-* < virtual **dobh-ro-no-* 'powerful'. Attested CLuwian *tāba*/*i-* may or may not mean 'firm' and reflect a base **dhob-o-*. For the range of senses 'dense; firm; powerful', also 'competent' see the reflexes of Germanic **dapra-* in Heidermanns (1993: 146–147).

8.3. Lycian *huwedri-* likely is an **-iyo-* adjective 'of fullness, totality' < virtual **séuh$_3$-o-tr̥/-tn-* 'fullness, filling' attested in CLuwian *šu-ú-wa-tar*/*šu-ú-wa-at-n*^{o}. An accented *e*-grade root is needed to explain both [su:-] and the "lenited" *-t-*. A zero grade **suh$_3$-* would lead to Luwian †*šu-u-*, and it is uneconomical to separate the Lycian and the CLuwian. There is *no* evidence for *-tt-* in the latter, pace Starke (1990: 465–469).

8.4. Despite unjustified doubts, the etymology by Kimball (2007: 200–212) of Hitt. *ḫūmant-* from a depictive participle **h$_2$u-h$_1$m-ónt-* 'taken together', thus 'aggregated, in aggregate' is highly plausible. It is in particular supported by the Hittite recreation *anda appant-* 'idem', as in *kē* ^{TÚG}NÍG.LÁM.MEŠ *anda appanda* 'these festive garments, taken together/*in toto*' (KUB 12.31 Vo 16 & duplicates, CTH 486, NH).[21] See also 2 *TAPAL* ^{TÚG}NÍG.LÁM.MEŠ *anda appanda* 2 ^{TÚG}*šašd*[*u*]*š QADU* ^{TÚG}NÍG.BÀR *QADU* ^{TÚG}GUZ.ZA.ḪI.A *QADU* TÚG.ḪI.A *Ù QADU* GADA.ḪI.A *anda ap*[*p*]*antes* 'two sets of festive garments, all together, two bed rolls, with a blanket, coverlet(?), garments, cloths, all together' (KUB 32.129+KBo 39.33 i 4–5, CTH 474, Ritual of Kuwanni, ?/NS). A satisfying ety-

20. There are too many alternative ways of accounting for the morphology of the extended Lycian reflexes of **pūne*/*a-* to make rehearsing of them here useful.

21. See correctly 'diese Prachtgewänder, alles zusammen' (Görke 2015, §4 66) and likewise ibid. §4 52).

mology for *tani*(*m*)*ma*/*i*-, barely attested in CLuwian, but the only universal quantifier thus far in Iron Age Luwian remains to be found. The likely prehistories of the others in Luwic and Hittite suggest that we should look either for still another adjective based on a noun for 'mass' or similar, or for a depictive participle. Odds would seem to favor the former.

§ 9. *References*

BAUER, A. 2020. "All, many, some and more: Non-Numerical quantification in Anatolian", in: L. Repanšek, H. Bichlmeier and V. Sadovski (eds.), *vácāṁsi miśrā́ kṛṇavāmahai. Proceedings of the international conference of the Society for Indo-European Studies and IWoBA XII, Ljubljana 4–7 June 2019, celebrating one hundred years of comparative Indo-European linguistics at the University of Ljubljana*. Hamburg: Baar-Verlag, 49–65.

BAWANYPECK, D. 2005. *Die Rituale der Auguren*. Heidelberg: Winter.

BECKMAN, G. 1996. *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

CAMMAROSANO, M. 2018. *Hittite Local* Cults. Atlanta: SBL Press.

CHD = H. G.† GÜTERBOCK, H. A. JR.† HOFFNER and T. P. J. VAN DEN HOUT (eds.). 1980–. *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

CHRISTIANSEN, B. 2006. *Die Ritualtradition der Ambazzi. Eine philologische Bearbeitung und entstehungsgeschichtliche Analyse der Ritualtexte CTH 591, CTH 429 und CTH 465*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

eDiAna = O. HACKSTEIN, J. MILLER, E. RIEKEN and I. YAKUBOVICH (eds.). 2019. *eDiAna – Digital Philological-Etymological Dictionary of the Minor Ancient Anatolian Corpus Languages*. Online: http://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php (consulted 2/3/2022).

EICHNER, H. 1973. "Die Etymologie von heth. mehur", *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 31, 53–107.

VAN GESSEL, B. H. L. 1998. *Onomasticon of the Hittite Pantheon*. Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill

GOEDEGEBUURE, P. 2014. *The Hittite Demonstratives. Studies in Deixis, Topics and* Focus. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

GÖRKE, S. 2015. "Muršilis Sprachlähmung (CTH 486)". In: S. Görke (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 486 (TX 15.12.2015, TRde 17.07.2015), consulted 9/14/2022.

HAAS, V. 1970. *Der Kult von Nerik. Ein Beitrag zur hethitischen Religionsgeschichte*. Rome: Papstliches Bibelinstitut.

HAAS, V. 1994. *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*. Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill.

HAWKINS, J. D. 1995. *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa (SÜDBURG)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

HEIDERMANNS, F. 1993. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der germanischen Primäradjektive*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

HOFFNER, H. A. JR. 1997. *The Laws of the Hittites: A Critical Edition*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

HOFFNER, H. A. JR. and MELCHERT, H. C. 2008. *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Part 1: Reference Grammar. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

KIMBALL, S. 2007. "Hittite *ḫūmant-* 'all, entire, each'". In: A. Nussbaum (ed.), *Verba Docenti. Studies in historical and Indo-European linguistics presented to Jay H. Jasanoff by students, colleagues, and Friends*. Ann Arbor/New York: Beech Stave Press, 201–212.

KIMBALL, S. 2016. "Hittite *dapi-* 'all, whole, each'". In: D. Gunkel *et al*. (eds.), *Sahasram Ati Sravas. Indo-Iranian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of Stephanie W. Jamison*. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press, 159–169.

KLOEKHORST, A. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

KLOEKHORST, A. 2014. *Accent in Hittite. A Study in Plene Spelling, Consonant Gradation, Clitics, and Metrics*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

MELCHERT, H. C. 2010a. "The Verbal Prefix "u-" and <u> vs. <ú> Spellings in Anatolian Cuneiform". Paper presented at the Twenty-Ninth East Coast Indo-European Conference, Cornell University, Ithaca NY, June 19, 2010.

MELCHERT, H. C. 2010b. "Hittite *talliye/a-* 'to draw, allure'". In: Y. Cohen, A. Gilan and J. L. Miller (eds.), *Pax Hethitica. Studies on the Hittites and their Neighbors in Honour of Itamar Singer*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 226–232.

MILLER, J. L. 2004. *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

MÜLLER-KARPE, A. 2019. "Herodot und die Hethiter. Die Reliefs von Karabel und Karakuyu-Torbalı", *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* 151, 295–321.

OETTINGER, N. 2006. "Pronominaladjektive in frühen indogermanischen Sprachen". In: R. Bombi *et al*. (eds.), *Studi linguistici in honore di Roberto Gusmani*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 1327–1335.

ORESHKO, R. 2013. "Hieroglyphic Inscriptions of Western Anatolia: Long Arm of the Empire or Vernacular Traditions(s)?". In: A. Mouton, I. Rutherford and

I. Yakubovich (eds.), *Luwian Identities. Culture, Language and Religion between Anatolia and the* Aegean. Leiden: Brill, 345–420.

POETTO, M. 2020. "Hittite *"tu(?)zumazuwant-"*?*", *N.A.B.U.* 2020/2, 142–145.

RIEKEN, E. 2000. "Die Partikeln *-a, -i̯a, -ma* im Althethitischen und das Akkadogramm *ÙL*". In: M. Ofitsch and C. Zinko (eds.), *125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz. Festband anläßlich 125jährigen Bestehens der Forschungsrichtung "Indogermanistik" an der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz*. Graz: Leykam, 411–419.

RIEKEN, E. 2004. "Merkwürdige Kasusformen im Hethitischen". In: D. Groddek and S. Rößle (eds.), *Šarnikzel. Hethitologische Studien zum Gedenken an Emil Orgetorix Forrer*. Dresden: Technische Universitat Dresden, 533–543.

RIEKEN, E. 2005. "Zur Wiedergabe von hethitisch /o/". In: G. Meiser and O. Hackstein (eds.), *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel. Akten der XI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 17.–32. September 2000, Halle an der Saale*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 537–549.

RIEKEN, E. 2014. "Sprachliche Merkmale religiöser Textsorten im Hethitischen", *Die Welt des Orients* 44, 162–173.

RIEKEN, E. 2016. "Word-internal Plene Spelling in Kizzuwatna Luwian: With a Focus on <i> and <u> vs. <ú>", Paper presented at the Thirty-Fifth East Coast Indo-European Conference, University of Georgia, Athens GA, June 6, 2016.

RIEKEN, E. 2017. "Das hethitische Partizip: zur Schnittstelle zwischen Syntax und Semantik". In: C. Le Feuvre, D. Petit, and G.-J. Pinault (eds.), *Verbal Adjectives and Participles in Indo-European Languages*. Bremen: Hempen Verlag, 391–403.

RIEKEN, E., *et al*. 2015. "CTH 386.2 - Gebet an den Wettergott von Nerik". In: E. Rieken *et al*. (eds.), hethiter.net/: CTH 386.2 (TRde 2015-06-10), consulted 9/13/2022.

SIDELTSEV, A. and YAKUBOVICH I. 2016. "The Origin of Lycian Indefinite Pronouns and Its Phonological Implications", *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 70, 75–124.

SOYSAL, O. 2004. *Hattischer Wortschatz in hethitischer Textüberlieferung*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

STARKE, F. 1985. *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

STARKE, F. 1990. *Untersuchung zu der Stammbildung der keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

STEITLER, C. W. 2017. *The Solar Deities of Bronze Age Anatolian. Studies in Texts of the Early Hittite Kingdom*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

STURTEVANT, E. H. 1934. "Adjectival *i*-stems in Hittite and Indo-European", *Language* 10, 266–273.

WATKINS, C. 1982. "Notes on the Plural Formations of the Hittite Neuters". In: Erich Neu (ed.), *Investigationes Philologicae et Comparativae. Gedenkschrift Heinz Kronasser*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 250–262.

YAKUBOVICH, I., and MOUTON, A. (Forthcoming). *Luwili: Luwian Religious Discourse Between Anatolia and Syria*.