

Tabularia Hethaeorum

Hethitologische Beiträge
Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag

Herausgegeben von Detlev Groddek
und Marina Zorman

2007

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie

Herausgegeben von
Johann Tischler

Band 25

2007

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Hittite *ḫuḫapp-*, *ḫūppā(i)-* and *ḫuppija-*

H. Craig Melchert (Chapel Hill)

In grateful recognition of Silvin Košak's many contributions to Hittitology, especially those that have helped to advance our understanding of the primary texts, I offer him the following modest attempt at clearing up a badly muddled portion of the Hittite lexicon.

Puhvel (1991: 384-386) lists *ḫup(p)ai-* and *ḫuppija-* as alternate stems of a single verb which he glosses as 'interlace, entangle, ensnare, commingle, (make a) blend (of); (intrans.) mingle, mix'¹.

There is no compelling evidence for any of the assigned meanings listed above, and Puhvel's entry further confuses matters by failing to distinguish three entirely separate verbs: *ḫuppija-*, *ḫūppā(i)-* and *ḫuḫapp-*. The lemma *ḫuḫapp-* in Puhvel 1991: 431-432 likewise erroneously treats two homophonous verbs as one. Previous analyses have variously recognized the true sense of all four verbs, but in the absence of a coherent treatment of the entire problem complex these unfortunately have been ignored. A reassessment of all the relevant material is thus required.

Hoffner (1977: 105-106) made the first crucial contribution towards sorting out the four different verbs involved. He correctly pointed out that *ḫuḫapp-* 'to be hostile towards, do evil against' (never with preverb!) is always construed with the dative-locative², while *ḫu(ḫa)pp-* with preverbs takes objects in the accusative (see also Beckman 1983: 81). This evidence alone refutes the claim of Puhvel for a

1 Hajnal (2002: 206) uncritically accepts Puhvel's analysis and uses it as the basis for positing the PIE root 'weave' as **h₂ueb^h-* with **h₂*. With removal of the non-existent Hittite evidence there is no reason not to assume rather with Beekes (1969: 67) **h₁ueb^h-* (cf. Hajnal 2002: 204-206). The sequence KBo 42.6, 9 []x-ni[?] *uepuš uepta nu=mu TÚG-an=mit* [] may be plausibly interpreted as '[] wove textiles and [] my garment for me' (see already with due reserve Neu 1998: 59¹⁷). If this is correct, then the PIE root would be confirmed as **(h₁)ueb^h-*.

2 Unambiguously with *-šī* in KUB 26.1 III 43, *-šmaš* in KUB 26.43 obv. 62, and *ANA^m Ammi-ŠEŠ* (KUB 13.34 +, I 13-14). We must therefore likewise take instances with *-mu* '(to) me' (KUB 1.5 I 9 = KBo 3.6 I 30 and KUB 21.17 I 9) as dative. The *kuitki* in the first two passages is adverbial (Hoffner loc. cit. contra Puhvel 1991: 430). The presence of the enclitic subject pronoun also shows that the verb takes a dative-locative in KBo 3.34 I 3, despite the absence of *ANA: š=e <ANA>* ^{LÜ}NINDA.DÜ.DÜ *ḫūpper* 'And they did evil to the breadmaker' (thus with Dardano 1997: 29&73 contra Hoffner 1977: 106). A transitive verb cannot co-occur with an enclitic subject, as per Garrett (1990) following Watkins.

single verb ‘ill-treat, harrow, harass, disfigure, spoil’. What was less clear in 1977 is the fact that all diagnostic forms show that the two verbs in question also belong to different inflectional classes. The verb *ḫuḫapp-* ‘to do evil’ is an athematic *mi*-verb (pres. 3 sg. *ḫuḫapzi*, pret. 3 sg. *ḫuḫapta*), while the other verb that regularly takes the preverb *katta* is an originally athematic *ḫi*-verb that also appears as an *a*-stem with *ḫi*-inflection (pres. 1st sg. *ḫuḫappaḫḫi*, pres. 3rd sg. *ḫuḫappi/ḫuḫāppi*, *ḫuḫappāi*, pret. 3rd sg. *ḫūḫappiš*)³. It is thus only the *mi*-verb *ḫuḫapp-* ‘to do evil against’ that belongs with the Hittite adjective *ḫuḫappa-* ‘bad, evil’⁴.

In the much-discussed passage KBo 3.21 II 15-16 *liliyanza=ma=ššan ekza=teš KUR-e katta ḫūppan ḫarzi* ‘Your swift net holds the land *k. ḫ-ed*’ both the stem and the meaning of the verb are ambiguous. The participle *ḫūppan* could belong either to the transitive *ḫi*-verb *ḫuḫapp-* or to the stem *ḫūppā(i)-*. The context is compatible with a sense ‘ensnared’ (Puhvel), ‘heaped up’ (Hoffner), or ‘cast, thrown (down)’ (Goetze 1954:189). The crucial evidence showing that the true meaning of the *ḫi*-verb *ḫuḫapp-* is ‘to hurl, throw’ is the expression with accusative of person plus *šākuḫa katta ḫuḫapp-* ‘to throw down as to the eyes, face down’, as in KUB 7.46 rev. 11-12 (restored by KUB 59.47)⁵: *nu=ḫar=an DINGIR^{MES} QATAMMA [(IGI^{HI.A}-ḫa) ka]ta ḫūḫappandu* ‘Let the gods hurl him face down’⁶. As seen by Oettinger (1976: 43-45), *šākuḫa* is an “accusative of respect”. While he vainly tries to save the sense ‘to do evil to’, his own discussion shows that the real meaning is rather that an evildoer is to be cast face down on the ground (correctly Oettinger 1976: 103 “jem. aufs Antlitz werfen!”). Likewise in KBo 6.34 III 24: *n=an IGI^{HI.A}-ḫa ka[ta ḫuḫap]pāi n=an GİR-it išparranzi* ‘He throws it (the figurine) face down, and they trample it with their feet’⁷.

3 Pres. 2nd sg. *ḫuḫapti* to *ḫuḫapp-* ‘to do evil against’ (KUB 26.1 III 43, NH/NS) does not falsify the contrast, since it shows merely the frequent intrusion of the ending *-ti* into the *mi*-conjugation in Neo-Hittite: cf. *ēpti*, *ekutti*, *ḫarnikti*, etc.

4 Cognate with Gothic *ubils* ‘evil’ and other Germanic forms < **b₂up-élo-*, as per Juret (1942: 58) and Watkins (1969: 39), but the root must be posited as **b₂uap-*.

5 See already my brief discussion in Melchert 1988: 233 with note 31. The validity of my comparison with Sanskrit (*nī*) *vap-* ‘cast down’ and derivation from a PIE root **b₂uēp-* is a secondary matter that may be left open. I insist only on the sense of the attested Hittite *ḫi*-verb.

6 The duplicate IBoT 3.114 rev. 3 has *ḫūp[pandu]* with either ablaut or syncope.

7 Thus also correctly Puhvel 1984: 443! We find the same sequence in KUB 7.57 I 7-8: [*ḫatta ḫuḫappaḫḫi ... išparrāḫi* ‘I will cast down [] ... I will trample’. The collocation with *išparr-*, the surrounding very specific concrete actions, and the *ḫi*-conjugation form also induce me to assign to ‘cast (down)’ the example in KUB 43.75 obv. 18’-20’ (contra Hoffner 1977:106): ⁴LAMMA-aš=(š)ta^{GIS}MAR.GÍD.DA^{HI.A} *išparriš* [K]UR-e *ḫūḫappiš* GİR=*ŠU ḫuittijati*^{GIS} *ḫaršamuš=šuš [ḫ]alḫišket* ‘The tutelary deity trampled the wagons, laid low(?) the land, drew his knife and beat his *ḫ*’. However, I do not pretend to fully understand the passage, and I do not exclude ‘did evil against the land’ (with Hoffner). The *ḫi*-conjugation form may have been induced by the immediately preceding *išparriš*.

Unsurprisingly, this expression is extended to inanimate objects that are for some reason to be thrown upside down, as in KBo 17.88 II 8-9: *n=an=šan ištanāni peran šakuḫa katta ḫuḫappi* ‘He throws it (a sourdough bread) “face down” in front of the altar’. Likewise KBo 20.67 II 60-61 *n=an=šan*^{GI^S}*B[ANŠU]R[?]-aš ANA NINDA.GUR₄.RA[^{HI}]^A [šer I]GI^{HI.A}-*ua katta ḫuḫappi* ‘He throws it (a leavened loaf) “face down” on top of the leavened loaves of the [[?]tabl]e’⁸.*

The translation of Puhvel (1991: 430) of all of these passages as ‘disfigures downright’ is not remotely plausible, especially for the instances with bread. The description refers to the resulting physical position of the bread, as confirmed by the earlier passage in KBo 20.67 II 41-43 with the verb *dai-* ‘to place’, where no sense of ‘disfigure’ is in question: *n=an=šan ištanāni p[eran] paršijantaš*^{NINDA}*ḫar-šajaš IGI^{HI.A}-*ua ka[ta] šer dāi** ‘He puts it (a sourdough loaf) face down in front of the altar on top of the broken leavened loaves’. Compare further KBo 8.68 I 15-20: *nu=kan NINDA-an šer tianzi NINDA-an=ma [...]* *katta ijanzi ... [IGI^{HI.A} katta ijanzi ... [] katta ḫuppan[zi]* ‘They put a bread loaf on top, but they make the bread [] down ... they make [] “face down” ... [] they throw [] down’. Incomplete as it is, the context again leaves little doubt that bread and perhaps other objects are being placed in a “face down” position. The phrase *šakuḫa katta* means ‘face down, topside down, upside down’ and may be used with various verbs that result in an object being in such a position.

The presence of the preverb *katta* also suggests, though it cannot prove, that *katta ḫūppan* in KBo 3.21 II 13-14 cited above means ‘Your swift net holds the land cast down’. As we shall see below, the characteristic preverb with *ḫūppā(i)-* is rather *anda*. Since nets are cast, it is likely that despite the simple *-p-* the word *ḫūpala-* ‘fish-net’ is derived from *ḫu(ya)pp-* ‘to throw, cast, hurl’⁹.

The verb *ḫūppā(i)-* in its assured occurrences always takes as its direct object *memal* ‘groats’, as in KUB 59.22 III 25-31 (see Beckman 1983: 81): *UGULA LÚ.MEŠ MUḪALDIM memal ḫuppāizzi*^{NA₃}*ḫuḫašijaš peran III-ŠU šipanti namma ḫuppāizzi ḫašši I-ŠU šipanti*^d*Damnaššaran peran I-ŠU šipanti* ‘The chief of the cooks *ḫ*’s groats; he libates three times before the cult stone. He *ḫ*’s again; he libates once at the hearth; he libates once before the *damnaššara*-deities’. The object

8 The example in KBo 11.33 obv.¹ 4 can also safely be assigned here. Less assured but likely because of the preverb is KUB 10.63 II 8: *katta ḫuḫap[]*. Unclear to me is the sense of KUB 9.1 III 27-28: *šumeš VII DINGIR^{MEŠ} [...]* *kan pēdatten ḫūḫapten* ‘(May) you seven gods bring [] (and) *ḫ*!’ Also uncertain is KUB 28.100 obv. 12: []^{DÜG}*DILIM.GAL ḫūḫap[]*.

9 The word is attested only once in KBo 6.29 II 34 in the ablative *ḫūpalaza*, so the absence of a geminate *-pp-* need not be significant. The alleged example [*ḫ*] *uppalan* in KUB 8.1 III 13 cited by Puhvel (1991: 385) does not exist. Read rather [*š*] *uppalan tepayēšzi* ‘the cattle will become few’. (nom.-acc. sg. neuter as a collective).

is likewise *memal* in the incomplete passage 819/u, 4: *ZÍZ memal hūppāizzi* ‘h’s spelt groats’¹⁰.

The stem *hūppā(i)-* is *never* used of materials that can be in any fashion ‘interlaced’ or ‘entangled’, and we may dismiss out of hand these two meanings listed by Puhvel (1991: 384), for which he himself gives no evidence. His rendering as ‘blend’ also lacks any textual support. Such a meaning makes sense only when more than one kind of material is involved, which is never demonstrably the case with *hūppā(i)-*¹¹. Instructive in this regard is the contrast with (*anda*) *immija-*, the real Hittite verb for ‘to mix, blend, mingle’ (for a good survey of its use see Puhvel 1984: 361-365).

The correct meaning of *hūppā(i)-* is that already tentatively suggested by Hoffner (1977: 106): ‘to (make a) heap, pile up’. This verb is derived from a noun *hūppa-* (not vice versa, contra Puhvel 1991: 385). As per Hoffner, the sense ‘heap, pile’ for the noun is shown by its co-occurrence with *šuhḫa-* ‘to pour, strew (dry materials)’ in KUB 43.30 III 16-17: *memal šemeḫunan* ^{UZU}NÍG.G[IG ANA UGULA L] ^U.MES^U.ḪÚB *hūppi=šši šuhḫanz[i]* ‘they strew groats, š. and liver onto the pile [of the leader] of the deaf men’.

The meaning ‘heaps up, makes a heap of’ makes good sense for the passages with ‘groats’ cited above. Addition of the preverb *anda* gives ‘to heap together’, which fits well the occurrence in VBoT 24 II 20-21: *nu kuḫapi anda hūppanduš* NA₄^{HI.A} *ḡemijanzi* ‘where they find stones heaped together’. In KBo 10.27 IV 32, following individual libations to a dozen deities each introduced by *parā=ma*, the phrase *parā=ma anda hūppant[asʔ]* could mean ‘next (one libates) to those massed together’¹².

The passage KUB 27.29 III 7-8 strongly supports derivation of the verb *hūppā(i)-* from the noun *hūppa-*: *n=at=kan ANA EN.SISKUR hūppi=šš[i ...] nu EN.SISKUR VII-ŠU hūppāizzi* ‘She (the serving woman) [] it on/in the *hūppa-* of the ritual client. The ritual client h’s seven times.’ The lacunae in the immediately preceding and following context preclude our knowing the antecedent of the ‘it’ of line 7, and this passage thus can speak neither for nor against the suggested meaning ‘heap, pile’ and ‘to (make a) heap’¹³.

10 The object is missing in the fragmentary KBo 24.115 I 20: [... UGULA] ^{LÚ.MES}MUḪALDIM *hūppāizzi*.

11 The one putative example involving multiple materials does not exist. The new duplicate KUB 53.20 rev.⁷ 8 shows that VBoT 58 IV 33 is to be read as ... *kī hūma[n]*, with Pecchioli Daddi and Polvani 1990: 70³⁸ and Güterbock, Hoffner and van den Hout 2002: 178, contra Beckman 1983: 82 and Puhvel 1991: 384, following Laroche.

12 Or alternatively, reading *hūppanz[i]* with Hoffner and Puhvel: ‘next they mass (them) together’.

13 Puhvel (1991: 384-385) interprets the noun as ‘mix’ and the verb as ‘makes a blend’, evidently construing *šuppa*(sic!) *kuīt ḡātar* of line III 5 as a collocation of ^{UZU}*šuppa* ‘sacralized meats’ and

Likewise indecisive is the remaining instance of *ḫūppā(i)-* in KUB 33.67 IV 17-18: *kinun=za ēdmi ekumi [...]* *kinun=za ḫūpammi kinu[n ...]* ‘Now I will eat and drink [] Now I will *ḫ.* for myself ...’. Beckman (1983: 77&82) hesitantly suggests ‘I will prepare (a meal)’, but the order following ‘I will eat and drink’ argues against this. Due to the lacunae both before and after *kinun=za ḫūpammi* this example offers no help in determining the sense of *ḫūppā(i)-*¹⁴.

I take the examples with ‘groats’ and ‘stones’ as objects as sufficient grounds for accepting Hoffner’s interpretation of *ḫūppā(i)-* as ‘to (make a) heap, pile up’. Since a heap or pile may easily result from casting things down on the ground, we may take the noun *ḫūppa-* as the regular result noun from *ḫu(ū)pp-* ‘to throw, cast’. Compare *šūḫḫa-* ‘roof’ < *šūḫḫa-* ‘to pour, strew’.

We come finally to *ḫuppija-*. In treating this verb as a mere variant of *ḫūppā(i)-*, Puhvel (1991: 384-385) ignores the fact that the two verbs differ not merely in stem formation, but also in valence and context. In contrast to *ḫūppā(i)-* the verb *ḫuppija-* never takes a direct object and occurs exclusively in the context of musical performance. The key passage for determining its meaning is KUB 32.117 + KUB 35.93 + KBo 19.56 III 13’-14’ (combined text in Starke 1985: 41): *nu=za ūk^{GIS} ḫuḫupalli dā[ḫḫ]e nu ḫuppiemi*. Puhvel’s ‘I take cymbals and make a blend’ is quite impossible – a single musician playing a single instrument cannot make ‘a blend’.

As I already argued in Melchert (1988: 230-232), the verb *ḫuppija-* refers to the sound made by playing the *ḫuḫupal-* instrument: ‘I take the *ḫuḫupal* and go *ḫupp*’. The verb is imitative, formed like *ḫappija-* ‘to bark’, i.e. ‘to make the sound *ḫapp*’. Whether one takes *ḫuḫupal-* as ‘cymbals’ (Polvani: 1988) or ‘clapper’ (Melchert loc. cit.), the sound-imitative nature of the verb is quite unmistakable. The meaning ‘to make the sound *ḫupp*’ is also suitable for all other instances of the verb cited by Puhvel, none of which support a meaning ‘mingle’. Note in particular KBo 15.69 I 10-12: *nu^{LÚ.MEŠ} BALAG.DI šāuḫatar II=ŠU par[anzi] namma^{LÚ.MEŠ} BALAG.DI ḫūpiškanzi^{GIS} BALAG.DI=ma ŪL ḫalḫannijanzi* ‘The lyre-players blow the horn twice. Then the lyre-players make the sound *ḫupp*, but they do not strike the lyre’. The *namma* ‘then’ shows that the action indicated by *ḫūpiškanzi* does not blend with the blowing of the horn, while the specification that the lyre-players do not strike their instruments likewise precludes any ‘blending’ with

ḫātar ‘water’, which would then be the materials that are ‘blended’. Such a collocation would be unparalleled, however, and *šuppa ḫātar* is surely a mere copyist’s error for *šuppi ḫātar* ‘pure water, well attested in ritual contexts (e.g. KBo 17.1 I 14’).

14 The word *ḫūppanta* in KUB 11.23 V 11 could be a substantivized participle of our verb, but the collocation ‘the *ḫ.* and pot stand of the god’ argues against.

the lyre. Whether the lyre-players make the sound *hupp* by playing the *huḫupal* or merely by slapping the frame portion of their lyres cannot be determined.

In sum, we must distinguish four separate Hittite verbs:

(1) the *mi*-verb *ḫuḫapp-* ‘to do evil against’ (construed with the dative-locative);

(2) the transitive *ḫi*-verb (*katta*) *ḫuḫapp-* ‘to cast, hurl (down)’ (also with an ablauting or syncope stem *ḫūpp-*);

(3) the denominative verb (*anda*) *ḫūppā(i)-* ‘to heap (together), make a heap’, derived from *ḫuppa-* ‘heap, pile’, itself a result noun from *ḫu(ua)pp-* ‘to cast, hurl’;

(4) the sound-imitative verb *ḫuppija-* ‘to play the *huḫupal*-instrument, to make the sound *hupp*’.

References

- Beckman, Gary M.
1983 Hittite Birth Rituals (= StBoT 29). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Beekes, Robert S.P.
1969 The Development of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Greek. The Hague/Paris: Mouton.
- Dardano, Paola
1997 L'aneddoto e il racconto in età antico-hittita: la cosiddetta “Cronaca di palazzo”. Rome: Il Calamo.
- Garrett, Andrew
1990 Hittite Enclitic Subjects and Transitive Verbs. JCS 42.227-242.
- Goetze, Albrecht
1954 Review of Johannes Friedrich, Hethitisches Wörterbuch. JAOS 74. 186-190.
- Güterbock, Hans G.[†] – Hoffner, Harry A. – van den Hout, Theo P.J.
2002 The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Volume Š. Fascicle 1. Chicago: The Oriental Institute.
- Hajnal, Ivo
2002 Mykenisch *e-we-pe-se-so-me-na* und die Frage eines frühgriechischen Umlauts. In: Novalis Indogermanica. Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 80. Geburtstag (edd. Matthias Fritz & Susanne Zeilfelder), 201-213. Graz: Leykam.
- Hoffner, Harry A. Jr.
1977 Hittite Lexicographical Studies, I. In: Essays on the Ancient Near East in Memory of Jacob Joel Finkelstein (ed. Maria de Jong Ellis), 105-111. Hamden: Archon.
- Juret, Abel
1942 Vocabulaire étymologique de la langue hittite. Limoges: Bontemps.
- Melchert, H. Craig
1988 Luvian Lexical Notes. HS 101.211-243.

- Neu, Erich
1998 Hethitisch *ši-mu-uš*. HS 111.55-60.
- Oettinger, Norbert
1976 Die Militärischen Eide der Hethiter (= StBoT 22). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Pecchioli Daddi, Franca – Polvani, Anna Maria
1990 La mitologia ittita. Brescia: Paideia.
- Polvani, Anna Maria
1988 Appunti per una storia della musica culturale ittita: lo strumento *huhupal*. Hethitica 9.171-179.
- Puhvel, Jaan
1984 Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Volumes 1/2: Words beginning with A/Words beginning with E and I. Berlin/New York/Amsterdam: Mouton.
1991 Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Volume 3: Words beginning with H. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Starke, Frank
1985 Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift (= StBoT 30). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Watkins, Calvert
1969 Geschichte der Indogermanischen Verbalflexion. In: Indogermanische Grammatik (ed. J. Kuryłowicz). Band III: Formenlehre. Erster Teil. Heidelberg: Winter.

[Addendum: for the correct syntactic analysis of *šakuḫa katta ḫuḫapp-* and its separation from *ḫuḫapp-*, 'to harm' see also J. Klinger, StBoT 37, 333-335. I am grateful to D. Groddek for this reference.]