

HOOFDARTIKELEN

“SOUL” AND “STELE” IN HITTITE AND LUWIAN

Federico GIUSFREDI
University of Verona,
March 2016

ABSTRACT

In this paper¹), I will examine a group of words connected to the semantic areas of “stele” (or “altar”) and “soul” in Luwian and Hittite, and investigate the possible etymological connections. It will be argued that they go back to the Indo-European root, **steh*₂-, “to stand/make stand”, while for others a different root (**d^heh*₁-, “to put, place”) needs to be assumed.

1. Introduction

Luwian was an Indo-European (or Indo-Hittite) language of the Ancient Anatolian family; it was related to Palaic and Hittite, and, more closely, to languages such as Lycian and Carian, which are generally referred to as belonging to the “Luvic” sub-group. The exact taxonomy of the Ancient Anatolian group is not entirely clear (for instance, the exact relationship of Lydian to the other members is still partly obscure).²)

The documents written in Luwian were recorded using two different writing systems; the cuneiform script in the 2nd millennium BCE and the Anatolian hieroglyphic script in both the 2nd and the 1st millennia BCE³). The interactions between the Luwian and Hittite language during the Bronze Age were strong and frequent, and Luwian became the second official language of the Hittite Empire during the 13th century BCE if not earlier⁴). In the present paper, I will refer to the Luwian language known from the cuneiform documentation as “Cuneiform Luwian” and to the idiom

¹) A first version of the present paper was originally presented at the workshop “The ritual sphere in the Ancient and Early Mediaeval East: texts, practices and institutions in a comparative linguistic and historical perspective”, Verona, 17-18 March 2016, organized by P. Cotticelli-Kurras and V. Sadovski. I wish to thank G. Borghi, P. Cotticelli-Kurras and H.C. Melchert for their precious advices. However, the responsibility for the contents of the present article belongs entirely to the author.

²) The internal filiation of Luwian is quite complex. Yakubovich (2010) showed that *at least* three Bronze Age varieties existed. We have documents written in Kizzuwatna-Luwian, short passages written in Istanuwa-Luwian, and Hieroglyphic texts from Hattusha written in Empire-Luwian. He also demonstrated that the variety of Luwian that survived into the Iron Age derived from Empire Luwian. These distinctions are important in order to understand the history of the Anatolian languages, but they play no crucial role as far as the present paper is concerned. Cf. in general Yakubovich, 2010; for a critical assessment of this hypothesis, see also Hawkins, 2013.

³) For an overview, cf. Hawkins, 2003.

⁴) For a detailed study on the Luwian/Hittite interactions and their reflexes on both languages, cf. Yakubovich, 2010, Chapter V. Cf. also the discussions by Van den Hout, 2006; and Melchert, 2005, who maintained a cautious attitude regarding the idea that Luwian may have replaced Hittite in some spheres of administration: «There are some hints in our bureaucratic documents from Hattusha of a chronological replacement of Hittite by Luwian, or perhaps more accurately of growing Luwian competition with Hittite.» The problem is too complex to be discussed in detail in the present article.

from the hieroglyphic documents as “Hieroglyphic Luwian”: such a general and simplified distinction is sufficient for the purposes of the present work.

The aforementioned strong interaction with Hittite, along with the genetic contiguity of the two languages, is the reason why the comparison between Hittite and Luwian is one of the most powerful tools for linguistic investigation on the Anatolian branch of Indo-European. Nevertheless, the two languages were certainly not identical to each other with respect to syntax, morphosyntax or lexicon. Therefore, the identification of common patterns and common traits can provide new important insights. In the next sections, I will concentrate on a group of words attested in Luwian, related to the culturally relevant semantic fields of “soul” (Luwian *tani*-) and “stele” or “altar” (Luwian *t/danit*-, *tanisa*, *tasa* and the hapax *tah(h)a*-), and investigate whether, and how, they may or may not have etymologically matched their mutually related Hittite counterparts (*istanzan*- and *istanana*- respectively).

2. The Luwian words for “soul” and “stele”

The Luwian words that I am taking into consideration are attested in both the Cuneiform and the Hieroglyphic sources. They all share similar onsets, namely *ta*-^o and *tan*-^o, although the individual derivations need to be discussed more in detail. They include the following words:

1. Cuneiform words:

- a. *da-a-an*, unknown meaning, very uncertain.
- b. *t/danit*-, n., “stele (vel sim.)”, several attestations in Luwian (and in Hittite context)
- c. ^f*Daniti*(*ya*)-, c., “(woman) of the stele/altar”, a few attestations in a couple of similar contexts, in which it was used as a personal name⁵).

2. Hieroglyphic words:

- a. *tanisa*- (*tanit-sa*), identical to Cun. Luw. *t/danit*-, apparently with the same meaning (and accompanied by the determinative STELE)
- b. (FEMINA.PURUS.INFRA)*taniti*-, c. hapax legomenon in Hieroglyphic Luwian, as I will show it is the Iron Age continuation of Cun. Luw. ^f*Danitiya*-, although the semantics will require a separate discussion (see below, →2.5).
- c. *tasa*-, n., occasionally accompanied by the determinative PODIUM, it probably indicated a block or stone installation of some sort.
- d. *tah(h)a*-, hapax legomenon occurring without determinatives, as I will show probably indicated a stone pedestal or support.
- e. *tani*-, c., “soul, person”, existence debated (cf. Melchert, 2010).

2.1 Cuneiform Luwian *da-a-an*

The word *da-a-an* has been presented as a hapax legomenon occurring only in the Puriyanni ritual KUB 35, 57 i 5.⁷)

⁵) Cf. Ünal, 2003, 380f., on the female member of the Hittite royal family named *Daniti* and mentioned in votive texts dating back to the reign of Tudhaliya IV.

⁶) For analysis of this form see below 2.3.

⁷) There are two other uncertain occurrences in HT 58 and KBo. 29, 32 ii 4, but even if they actually belong here, they would be hardly useful, as they appear in obscure and very fragmentary contexts.

SISKUR *da-a-an halzissanzi*
“They call/shout the ritual *d*.”

If *da-a-an* were indeed a substantive, then it would be the direct object of *halzissai-*, which can be translated with “to call”, but probably German “rufen” is a better match, as it can also mean “to call out” or simply “to shout”.

The idea that it may be the name of a ritual was proposed by Starke (1990, 260), but given the context and the different possible meanings of the verb *halzissai-*, this is quite speculative to say the least. If neuter, and if actually a substantive, its stem could match *dan-* or *da-*; if communis, the stem must have been *da-*. In any case, formally *da-a-an* could go back to either *T-V-H* or *sT-V-H*; so far, with loss of pre-consonantic laryngeals h_2 and h_3 , and unconditioned loss of h_1 , all of the following roots can be formal candidates: $*d^heh_1-$ “to put, place”; $*deh_3-$ “to take”; $*steh_2-$ “to stand/make stand”. Note that in Luwian the group *sT-* was systematically simplified in *t-* (Melchert, 1994, §10.1.6.1.4⁸).

It is, however, important to notice that no compelling reason exists to dismiss the hypothesis that the word was in fact Hittite, and that it was not a substantive, but rather the adverb *tan*, “twice”: as far as I see, the context encourages this interpretation, especially since *halzissai-* is an iterative stem and may indicate a reiterated action⁹). Since no more light can be cast on this enigmatic word, it is better to leave it out of consideration here.

2.2 Cuneiform Luwian *t/danit-*

The existence of a Luwian word *t/danit-* indicating a stele or a similar stone installation is, to my knowledge, universally accepted. An occurrence in Luwian context can be found in the fragment (of the “Great Ritual” *salli aniur?*) KUB 35, 70 ii 12ff. (I have rendered the Hittite parts of the text in italics in the translation to distinguish them from the Luwian ones)¹⁰):

[*d*]a-a-ni-i-ta-ya x[(13) M]JUNUS.ŠU.GI-ma ša-[(14)
hu-u-uk-zi-ma [*ki-iš-ša-an*] [*d*]a-a-ni-ta du-ú-un-du na-x[
“And the *d*. [...] The Old Lady [...] but she con-
jures as follows: ‘May they put (down) a *d*.’”

The word *t/danit-*, however, also occurs in Hittite context, in one single case. The text is the fragment KUB 12, 59+ iii 7f.¹¹):

ku-iš-wa-ra-at úe-te-es-ke-et ^{NA4}*hu-wa-a-šit*^{HLA} *ta-a-ni-ta*
“who set up the *huwasi* (and the)[?] *t*.”

This occurrence leads Kloekhorst (2008, s.v. *danit-*) to assume that a word *danit-* also existed in Hittite. He concludes that the word was directly inherited from Indo-European, and he states that the Hittite word *danit-*:

«should be connected with HLuw. ^{STELE}*tanisa-* ‘stele’. The basic stem then seems to be $*tāni-$, which received a suffix *-id-* in Hittite and CLuwian, but *-sa-* in HLuwian. Semantically, a connection with $*d^heh_1-$ ‘to put, to place’ is quite likely and supported by the fact that in the context cited above, the verb *uetē-* is used, which goes back to $*d^heh_1-$ »

However, the fact that the verb employed goes back to a certain root does not imply that its nominal argument is likely to derive from the same root as well (especially since *t/danit-* is not a derived form of the verb). A connection of the word “stele” to the root “to put, place” (and thus, also, “depose”, “dedicate”), however, would not need to be supported by the semantics of the verb *uete-*, “to build”. Furthermore, this tells us nothing about the language the substantive belongs to. Given that *t/danit-* in Hittite context is a hapax, the occurrence in KUB 12, 59 is in my opinion better explained as a Luwian loan: *stelae* (e.g. ^{NA4}*huwasi-*) and altars(?) (^{NA4}*istanana-*) are mentioned quite frequently in the Hittite texts, so it would be rather strange for a religious or ritual *terminus technicus* like *t/danit-* to occur only once in the preserved corpus. Moreover, given the uncommon post-verbal position of the direct object in the quoted passage of this text, it is possible that the addition of *ta-a-ni-ta* was not a loan, but that it was, in fact, a gloss by a Luwian scribe, added right after the Hittite almost synonymic word ^{NA4}*huwasi*.¹²) All in all, there is no compelling reason to assume that an inherited Hittite word *t/danit-* ever existed.

2.3 Hieroglyphic Luwian *tanisa* (< *tanit-sa*)

The Hieroglyphic Luwian word *tanisa* corresponds to Cuneiform Luwian *tanit-*, with the addition of a suffix *-sa*. The *-sa* suffix was a marker added to neuter nouns (cf. Jasanoff, 2010a). When it followed a nasal or a liquid, which was frequently the case, it was realized as an affricate and graphically rendered with a *za*-sign. In the Iron Age Hieroglyphic texts, the *-sa* element of the direct cases was reanalysed as part of the theme of this word. In this very case, this suffix was apparently reanalysed as part of the root, which maintained the neuter gender. The inflection of dative singular in MEHARDE, §6, shows that the word was no longer inflected as a dental stem¹³):

za-a-ti (STELE)*ta-ni-si*
“to this stele”

Neuter gender declension is confirmed by the forms in nominative-accusative, which take a further *-za* neuter marker, as for instance MEHARDE, §7, an occurrence with well-preserved context that semantically confirms the meaning “stele (vel sim.)”:

za-pa-[*wa/i*] (STELE)*ta-ni-sà-za kwal-i-i-sa* LOCUS-*lali-za*
SA₄-ni-ti
“Who shall remove this stele...” (followed by curse)

Apart from the morphological evolution from Cuneiform Luwian *t/danit-* to Hieroglyphic Luwian *tanisa*, the match is almost perfect, and supported by the apparently identical semantics of the two words. Note that the meaning of *tanisa* in the Hieroglyphic texts is certain, because the inscriptions of SHEIZAR and MEHARDE use this word to refer to their epigraphic supports, so it is actually possible to see what a *tanisa* looked like (see Figure 1).

Furthermore, this meaning is also supported by the presence of the logogram STELE, used as a determinative, which is also employed for another Luwian word belonging to the

⁸) Alternatively, it has been suggested that the very *s-* in $*steh_2-$ was in fact a mobile *s-*, for instance by Jasanoff, 2010b, in order to explain some problematic outcomes outside of proper Luwian.

⁹) But cf. Starke, 1990, 206; Melchert, 1993, s.v.

¹⁰) For transcription see Starke, 1985, 183ff.

¹¹) For transcription, translation and commentary see Miller, 2004, 98f.

¹²) Postverbal objects were fairly frequent in Cuneiform Luwian, but much less so in Hittite, which may be a hint that the scribe was, in fact, Luwian.

¹³) Text in Hawkins, 2000, 415ff.; plates 224-225.



Figure 1: The front and sides of the MEHARDE Stele, from Hawkins, 2000, Plate 225

same semantic field, *wanit*-¹⁴). In general, *tanisa* can be confidently interpreted as the Iron Age continuant of the Cuneiform Luwian noun.

2.4. Cuneiform Luwian ^fDaniti(ya)-

The cuneiform occurrences of *t/daniti(ya)-* appear in very few (and mostly broken) contexts (rather similar to each other, e.g. KUB 56, 19 ii 15f., cf. Starke, 1990, 206f. with fn. 677); in some attestations, it may have been a personal name (cf. Ünal, 2003), probably derived from a title used for women. Note, however, that since for feminine names and titles the same determinative ^fMUNUS is used, it is difficult or at times impossible to tell the name and the title apart). An example in a decently preserved (although syntactically elliptic) context is provided by the text KUB 40, 2 ro. 40:

A-NA ^fMUNUS Da-a-ni-ti IŠ-TU A.ŠÀ A.GÀR KISLAḤ
 GIŠKIRI₆ pi-i-i[a-an]
 “To Daniti/the *d.* from/with the garden, the aisle and the threshing floor (it is) given.”

¹⁴) On the inflection of Luw. *wanit*- cf. Melchert, 2004, 472. Note that in those cases in which the logogram STELE is not complemented, e.g. the Bronze age Emirgazi altars, it is impossible to establish which word the logogram represented. However, the shape of the Meharde and Sheizar *t/danisa*'s is quite different from the one of the stone altars found in Boğazköy.

Formally, the term seems to be easily analysed as the substantivization of a genitival adjective in *-iya-*, which regularly contracts in *-i-*, from the noun *t/danit-*, “stele (vel sim.)”, and the meaning should therefore be “(woman) of the *t/danit-*” (cf. Melchert, 1993, s.v.). This noun had an Iron Age continuant, (FEMINA.PURUS.INFRA)*taniti-*, that may have had a slightly different semantics:

2.5 Hieroglyphic Luwian (FEMINA.PURUS.INFRA)*taniti-*

Since the full form of the word *t/danit-* in the Iron Age was *tanisa*, the Hieroglyphic title *taniti-*, built on the dental stem, must be a direct continuation of Cuneiform Luwian *t/daniti(ya)-* and not a similar new formation, which would have been based on *tanisa* instead. Regarding Iron Age *taniti-*, two observations are important.

First of all, the context in which it is used in the Iron Age makes it clear that, at least in this case, the noun is a title and not a personal name (TELL AHMAR 1, §24)¹⁵):

[á-mi-pa-wa/i]-mi-i-tu-’ (“*314”)ka-pi-la-li-na (FILIA)tú-wa/i-tarali-na (FEMINA.PURUS.INFRA)ta-ni-ti-na i-zi-i-wa/i-i
 “And I will make the/my enemy’s daughter a *t.* to him (= the god)”

This fact does not represent a conflict with the Bronze Age attestations as the boundaries between the categories of professional titles and personal names are all but impervious.

The second observation is of cultural relevance: in this late occurrence, the term seems to be used with a derogatory nuance, meaning that the kind of (probably religious) service a *taniti*-woman had to perform was servile in nature, and undesired, at least for the daughter of the enemy. Given the fact that the Daniti mentioned in the Hittite texts of the Bronze Age was, in fact, a princess, it seems possible that a slightly pejorative change of status had occurred at a given point.

However, it is important to bear in mind that the fact that the *taniti*-condition was considered undesirable for the daughter of an enemy does not mean that the term itself had a general negative semantics. For the Iron Age occurrence, a standard tentative translation “hierodule(?)” has been frequently proposed in the literature¹⁶), but there is no detailed information regarding the duties a woman bearing this title had to perform¹⁷).

2.6 Hieroglyphic Luwian *tasa-*

The word *tasa-* is sporadically attested, but it does occur with the determinative PODIUM, which it shares with another rare word, *hummati-*. While the meaning of (PODIUM)*hummati-* seems to relate to some sort of area or precinct in which statues were settled (KARKEMIŠ A11b+c, §17), the occurrences of *tasa* point to a sacred stone installation that was worshipped and that, apparently, was not supposed to be removed (KARKEMIŠ A6, §28)¹⁸):

ta-sà-pa-wa/i-’ ta-si NEG₃ CUM-ni ARHA CAPERE-ia
 “Or shall take away/replace(?) a stele from/for a stele”

¹⁵) Text in Hawkins, 2000, 239ff.; plates 99-100.

¹⁶) Cf. Hawkins, 2000, 243; Giusfredi, 2010, 124.

¹⁷) Melchert (pers. comm.) made me aware that, since the determinative FEMINA.PURUS.INFRA probably referred to the female virginity, making the daughter of the enemy a *t.* meant preventing her from marrying and having children.

¹⁸) Cf. Hawkins, 2000, 125.

Furthermore, *tasa* seems to have also indicated frontier stelae, which possibly suggests a wider semantic field, although the exact separation of words in Cekke §15 is still partly unclear¹⁹):

a-wali FINES-ha+ra/i-ya(-)ta-sa ha-zi-mi-na
“Frontier stelae (are) to be carved.”

The other possible occurrences of *tasa* in KARKEMIŠ A1a §§19-20 are uncertain: given their semantics that suggests an area rather than a (frontier) stele, the forms “PODIUM”(-) *ta-ti* are in my opinion much better analysed as instances of the ablative *hummatati* (“from the *h.*-precinct/area”).

2.7 Hieroglyphic Luwian tah(h)a-

There is another word in Hieroglyphic Luwian, that indicated some kind of stone installation: Hieroglyphic Luwian *tah(h)a-* (*ta-ha-*). It is a hapax legomenon, still its meaning can be understood from the context of occurrence, which is rather peculiar. The word appears in the last line (§3) of the Stone Bowl from Karkemish, where it seems to refer to some kind of material object on which something was put²⁰):

za-ti-<palha>-wali ta-ha (PONERE)tu-wali-ha
“I put (it) on this altar(?)”

Unfortunately, no determinative is employed in this unique attestation: if the word were preceded by the logogram STELE, or STATUA, or CAELUM, its identification with – respectively – a stone installation, a statue or a bowl would have been immediate. In the first line of this very inscription (§1), the stone bowl itself is referred to with the word (*522) *huri-*:

*za-ha-wali (*522)hu-ri+i-na (DEUS)ku+AVIS-pa-pa-si-na*
EGO ¹*Ya+ra/i-ri+i-sa* (“PURUS”) *ku-ma-ni-ha*
“This *h.* of the Goddess Kubaba I, Yariris, have made sacred.”

Therefore, even though (*522) *huri-* is a hapax, too, it seems quite safe to assume, from the general context of the votive text, that *tah(h)a-* in §3 was in fact the noun indicating the base-element (or foot) on which the body of the bowl was located. It must be noted that the part of the installation that is preserved and carries the inscription is the *tah(h)a*, while the *huri-*, that was located on top of it, is lost (cf. Hawkins, 2000, Vol. III, Plate 47).

2.8 Hieroglyphic Luwian tani-

The last Luwian word to be discussed is *tani-*, a common gender substantive whose very existence has been debated. Originally, a single word for “soul” was recognized in the Luwian documentation²¹). It was the noun *atar/atn-*, interpreted as a heteroclit stem, and meaning “person, self, body, soul”. After the studies by Van den Hout (2002) and Yakubovich (2002), it was possible to distinguish between *atra/i-* (*ali*-theme), and a series of occurrences in which the hieroglyphic logogram and determinative COR is followed by the phonetic complement *-ni-*. The meaning of *atra/i-* is “person, body, self” (and possibly also soul), and it was

¹⁹) Cf. Hawkins, 2000, 145.

²⁰) Text in Hawkins, 2000, 149ff.; plate 47.

²¹) For instance in the corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian published by Hawkins, 2000. Note that Hawkins, 2015, dismisses once again the existence of *tani-*, originally hypothesized by Van den Hout (2002). None of his argumentations, however, go beyond the critical assessment by Melchert I discuss below.

grammaticalized in Iron Age Luwian into an orthotonic reflexive pronoun. Its etymology is likely connected with Greek ἤτορ, “thorax, chest, heart”²²).

As for the COR-*ni-* occurrences, Van den Hout (2002) proposed the form *tani-*, which is indeed syllabically written in the Assur Letter F+G. Melchert (2010) cast doubts on the very existence of this word, stating that:

«One problem (...) is that the putative Luwian */tan(i)-/* cannot easily be derived from a **stan-* and then compared with a Hittite **ištan-*. Whatever its ultimate root etymology, Hittite *ištanza(n)-* can hardly be based on an n-stem **ištan-*.»

While it is true that a stem **stan-* would make Hittite *istanzan* hardly analyzable, I see no compelling reason to exclude that the very same Indo-European root **steh₂-* led to two different Anatolian words for “soul”, following two different morphogenetic paths. I will discuss the details in section →5, after having discussed the possible Hittite cognate. For now let us just note the existence of a Hieroglyphic Luwian word *tani-* meaning “soul”. For the semantics, one can consider the quite compelling context of the occurrence in KULULU 4, §9²³):

wali-mu-ta DEUS-ni-zi-i (LITUUS)á-za-mi-na COR-ni-na
a-ta tu-wali-mi-na-
“Into me the Gods put a loving/beloved(?) soul”

Other occurrences show that the meaning “soul” and a meaning “person” were probably close to each other (TELL AHMAR 2, §7)²⁴):

NEG₂-*a-pa-wali mi-i-* COR-*ni-i kwali-i-sa* MALUS-*wali-za-*
CUM(?)*-ni* < (“COR”(?))>*za+ra/i-ti-ti-i*
“Or who(ever) wishes evil (things) for my soul/person”

Morphologically, *tani-* is an *i*-stem common gender noun, as proved for instance by the form of the inflected accusative singular COR-*ni-(i)-na* (e.g. KULULU 4, §9, JSR-EL-ADID 4, §3).

3. The comparable Hittite words

3.1 Hittite istanana-

The Hittite lexicon offers a candidate for comparison with the aforementioned Luwian words *t/danit-* and *tanisa*. Hitt. *istanana-* is a common gender substantive indicating something similar to an “altar(?)”. It was usually introduced by the determinatives NA₄, or GIŠ, generally preceding the nouns of objects/tools made in stone or wood, and the corresponding Sumerogram was ZAG.GAR.RA. The word is more likely to have indicated a flat-topped installation than a vertical stele, and this can be deduced from the occurrences in which objects or offerings were placed on the upper surface of the *istanana*-altar, e.g. KBo. 19, 128 ii 29f.²⁵):

²²) Cf. Yakubovich, 2002, 197, for further discussion.

²³) Text in Hawkins, 2000, 445ff.; plates 246-247.

²⁴) Text in Hawkins, 2000, 227ff.; plates 91-92.

²⁵) Cf. Puhvel, 1984, 462, for a collection of occurrences with *-san dai-/tiya-* “to put something onto something”. The slaughtering of sacrificial animals also took place near altars, but the contexts do not clarify whether this action was performed *on* the altar or in front of it; cf. HW², Band III, p. 628a.

na-at-sa-an is-ta-na-ni A-NA DINGIR^{LM} EGIR-pa da-a-ai
 “And it puts it back on²⁶) the *i*. for the Gods.”

From this point of view, it is clear that *istanana-* is not the exact Hittite translation of Luwian *t/danit-*, which was, in fact, the term that the texts of the MEHARDE and SHEIZAR inscriptions use to indicate their own epigraphic supports (vertical stele with no apparent flat top, see Figure 1).

Etymologically, *istanana-* must go back to **steh₂-*, as has already been proposed by several scholars²⁷); however, the problem lies in the second part of the word. Puhvel’s (1984, 463) suggestion of a nominal formant **-no-* does not solve the problem of how the string *°-nana-* was generated, unless a two-step suffixation occurred. I share Kloekhorst’s caution (2008, s.v. *ištanāna-*) regarding the possibility of solving this problem; however, the first part probably goes back to a zero-grade **sth₂-*, which perhaps was first expanded in an adjectival(?) **sth₂-nó-*²⁸); subsequently, a neuter substantive in *-n-* was built on this very stem, and it was eventually thematized as an *a*-stem. This reconstruction is tentative, but it would explain the position of the accent on the syllable that quite regularly presents a *scriptio plena* in Hittite (e.g. dative locative *is-ta-na-a-ni* and ablative *is-ta-na-a-na-az*; cf. Kloekhorst, 2008, s.v.).

3.2. Hittite *istanzan*

The Hittite word *istanzan-*, corresponding to the sumero-graphic writing ZI, means “soul”, and it also has the derived abstract meaning “will”. These meanings of *istanzan-* have been extensively investigated by A. Kammenhuber (1964, 1965), who described and explored the semantic field of the word. Etymologically, it has been analyzed by Melchert (2003b) and Kloekhorst (2008, s.v.) as going back to the same root **steh₂-* as *istanana-*, although in this case the morphogenesis seems to be at least partly clear, and based on the addition of the morpheme-chain **(e)nt-i-on*, which would be common to a few Hittite words ending in *°-anza-* at the nominative, but using *°-anzan-* as stem for the other cases (e.g. genitive *istanzanas* “of the soul”). According to Frotscher (2013, 301), among the words ascribed by Melchert to this category, two go back to *-nt-* participial forms: one is *istanzan*, the other is *lahhanzan* (so already in Melchert, 2003b).

For the purpose of the present study, the exact morphogenesis of *istanzan-* and of the other *-anzan-* words is not particularly relevant, provided that the root for this stem can be quite positively identified with **steh₂-*. As already mentioned, in section →5 I will try to defend the idea that the same root was at the origin of Luw. *tani-*, “soul”, as well.

4. **steh₂-* and **d^h(e)h₁-* as bases for Hittite and Luwian “altar” and “stele”

4.1 The root **steh₂-*, “to stand/make stand”

Deriving the Hittite word *istanana-*, “altar (vel sim.)”, from **steh₂-* seems the only reasonable solution, even though

²⁶) For the meaning of *-san ... dai-/tiya-* “to put something onto something”, cf. *Chicago Hittite Dictionary*, Vol. Š/I, s.v. *-šan*; also Brosch, 2014, in pc. pp. 125ff.

²⁷) Puhvel, 1984, 463; Kloekhorst, 2008, s.v., with reference to previous literature.

²⁸) I wish to thank Prof. Melchert (*pers. comm.*) for suggesting me that a viable intermediate step **sth₂-(e)nó-* for a tentative derivation may have been adjectival.

the second part of the word is still difficult to analyze. Maintaining the possible derivation sketched above, I will reduce the amount of speculation by limiting my reconstruction to a Proto-Anatolian stage:

Hitt. *istanana-* < PA **stā(-)NA(-)NA-*

In Luwian, among the words that I have collected and that indicated some kind of stone installation, at least one, *tah(h)a-*, needs to go back to the same root **steh₂-*. The fricative *h*, which judging from the Luwian hieroglyphic writing may have been either a fortis (*hh*) or a lenis (*h*), must have belonged to the root. In fact, none of the known nominal formants of the Luwian language can have produced this form. As a consequence, it seems reasonable to assume that the form should go back to something like:

(s)T(V)h_x

However, *h_x* must have been a laryngeal that was preserved word-internally. This excludes *h₁*, which would disappear, and thus the root **d^heh₁-* must also be ruled out. As a consequence, the most probable reconstruction must contain *h₂*. The etymological reconstruction suggests a *tómos*-type noun (*CōC-o-*), thus the fricative, according to the standard sound laws of Luwian, would be a fortis, which is assumed to be the regular continuant of *h₂* after a short accented vowel:

Luw. *tahha* < IE **stóh₂-o-*

However, a different theory on the consonant gradation of Anatolian has been recently proposed (see Kloekhorst, 2014, pp. 543-598), suggesting that PIE short accented /o/ may have become systematically long before the Proto-Anatolian phase. If this were the case, then the fricative in *tah(h)a* would be a lenis instead.

4.2 The root **d^heh₁-*, “to put, place”

Regarding the Luwian words *t/danit-* and *tanisa*, as we have seen, Kloekhorst’s idea that a Hitt. cognate *danit-* existed should probably be dismissed. As for *t/daniti(ya)-*, as previously shown, the form was built in Luwian, and borrowed into Hittite, before the development of Hieroglyphic Luwian *tanisa*, as an *-iya*-adjective directly on the dental stem.

On the other hand, Luwian *tasa* is likely related, and cognates do exist in other Anatolian (and Luvic) languages, namely Lycian *θθē* and Lydian *tašēv*, indicating an “altar” and a “votive object” respectively (Eichner, 1983; Melchert, 1997). Melchert (l.c.) connected these forms with an Anatolian adjective **tāna-* “sanctified”, that now needs to be marked as reconstructed, as the occurrence in the Emirgazi altars (§25) has proven to be a ghostword (J.D. Hawkins, *pers. comm.*). Whether the proto-form **tāna-* is to be reconstructed can be debated; however, it is certain that neither Hieroglyphic Luwian *tasa*, nor the aforementioned Lycian and Lydian forms, are easily derived with a root **steh₂-*, because the loss of *h₂* would be unexpected. Thus, the best candidate root is still **d^heh₁-*, and I propose the following derivations from an o-grade²⁹):

²⁹) Still, for a formally and semantically comparable derivation from a zero-grade root **d^hh₁-s-no-*, cf. Latin *fanum* “(dedicated) temple, sanctuary” (Wodtko et al. 2008, s.v. **d^heh₁*).

Cun. Luw. *tanit-* < **d^hoh₁-s-n-id-* ³⁰
 Hier. Luw. *tanisa* < *tanit-sa*
 Hier. Luw. *tasa* < **d^hoh₁-s-o-*

5. **steh₂*- as base for Hittite and Luwian “soul”

As already noted, Melchert (2003), followed by a detailed discussion by Kloekhorst (2008, s.v.), suggested an etymology for the Hittite word *istanzan-* that goes back to **steh₂*-, whereas Eichner (1973), followed by Oettinger (1980) and Frotscher (2013, fn. 312), also compared isoglosses that include Sanskrit. *stāna-*, Avestan *fštāna-*, and Armenian *stin* “breast” (which he makes go back to a proto-form **p-sten-*). I will maintain Melchert’s and Kloekhorst’s reconstruction, and follow Kloekhorst in assuming a zero-grade base:

Hitt. *istanzan-* < IE **steh₂-ent-i-on-*

As for the Luwian counterpart, *tani-*, as previously stated Melchert correctly observed that PA **stan-* would not be able to produce Hittite *istanzan-*. However, my hypothesis is that the word was derived from the same Indo-European root, zero-grade **sth₂*-, but following a different morphogenetic path, and namely:

Luw. *tani-* < IE **sth₂-(é)n-o-*

The genesis of the common gender substantive *tani-* may go back to an *a*-stem noun that eventually underwent *i*-mutation³¹).

6. Conclusion

In Hittite, the root **steh₂*- is attested in a word meaning “altar”, *istanana-*, as well as in a word meaning “soul”, *istanzan-*. The morphological paths by which they were built were different, and so must be the paths that led to a semantic specialization into two very different areas of the Hittite lexicon. The semantic path leading from the Indo-European root to the “altar” is quite intuitive; the one leading to the lexical field of the “soul” much less so. Kloekhorst (2008, s.v. *istanzan-*), however, very convincingly compares the **steh₂*-element in the Germanic words for “mind, intellect” (for instance Dutch and German *Verstand*), for which a semantic contiguity to the words for “soul” and “mind” can be postulated.

As for Luwian, I argued that the word *t/danit-* was genuinely Luwian and it was probably not part of the Hittite inherited lexicon. However, both the Luwian word *t/danit-* (with its derivate *tanitiya-* and its continuant *tanisa*) and the Luwian word *tasa* need to go back to a different root, **d^heh₁-*, that may motivate the reconstruction of the adjective **tāna-* proposed by Melchert (1997), even though such adjective is currently unattested. In this respect, it is important to stress that the existence of such an adjective is not necessary for the derivations proposed in this article, because the semantic contiguity of **d^heh₁-* “to put, place” and a stone installation is immediate.

Finally, I have shown that the hapax legomenon *tah(h)a-*, attested in the text of the KARKEMIŠ Stone Bowl, and

probably indicating an altar or pedestal, was very likely a cognate to Hitt. *istanana-*, thus going back to **steh₂*-.

References

- Brosch, C. 2014. *Untersuchungen zur hethitischen Raumgrammatik*, Berlin.
- Chicago Hittite Dictionary = *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, 1989-, Chicago.
- Eichner, H. 1973. “Die Etymologie von heth. *mehur*”, in *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 31: 53-107.
- Eichner, H. 1983. “Etymologische Beiträge zum Lykischen der Trilingue vom Letoon bei Xanthos”, in *Orientalia* 52: 48-66.
- Frotscher, M. 2013. *DAS HETHITISCHE -ANT-PARTIZIP UND SEINE INDOGERMANISCHEN GRUNDLAGEN – Semantik, Morphologie, Syntax*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Verona, 2014.
- Giusfredi, F. 2010. *Sources for a Socio-Economic History of the Neo-Hittite States*, Heidelberg.
- Hawkins, J.D. 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic-Luwian Inscriptions, Part I, Inscriptions of the Iron age*, Berlin/New York.
- Hawkins, J.D. 2003. Chapter “Script and Texts”. In H.C. Melchert, ed., *The Luwians*, Leiden-Boston: 128-169.
- Hawkins, J.D. 2013. “A New Look at the Luwian Language”, in *Kadmos* 52: 1-18.
- Hawkins, J.D. 2015. “The soul in the stele?”, in A. Archi, ed., *Tradition and Innovation in the Ancient Near East, Proceedings of the 57th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Rome, 4-8 July 2011*, Rome: 49-56.
- HW² = *Hethitisches Wörterbuch, Zweite, völlig neubearbeitete Auflage auf der Grundlage der edierten hethitischen Texte*, 1975-, Heidelberg.
- Jasanoff, J. 2010a. “The Luwian “case” in *-šal/za-*”, in R. Kim, N. Oettinger, E. Rieken, M. Weiss, eds., *Ex Anatolia Lux: Anatolian and Indo-European studies in Honor of H. Craig Melchert*, Ann Arbor: 167-179.
- Jasanoff, J. 2010b. “Lycian *stati* ‘stands’”, in J. Klinger, E. Rieken, and Ch. Rüster, eds., *Investigationes Anatolicae: Gedenkschrift für Erich Neu*, Harrassowitz: 143-152.
- Kammenhuber, A. 1964. “Die hethitischen Vorstellungen von Seele und Leib, Herz und Leibesinnerem, Kopf und Person – 1”, in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 56: 150-212.
- Kammenhuber, A. 1965. “Die hethitischen Vorstellungen von Seele und Leib, Herz und Leibesinnerem, Kopf und Person – 2”, in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 57: 177-222.
- Kloekhorst, A. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden.
- Kloekhorst, A. 2014. *Accent in Hittite A Study in Plene Spelling, Consonant Gradation, Clitics, and Metrics*, Wiesbaden.
- Melchert, H.C. 1984. *Studies in Hittite Historical Phonology*. Göttingen.
- Melchert, H.C. 1993. *Cuneiform Luwian Lexicon*, Chapel Hill.
- Melchert, H.C. 1994. *Anatolian Historical Phonology*, Amsterdam/Atlanta.
- Melchert, H.C. 1997. “Luwian /tāna/ ‘sanctified, inviolable’” in *Historische Sprachforschung* 100: 47-51.
- Melchert, H.C. 2003a. “Language”, in H.C. Melchert, ed., *The Luwians*, Brill, Leiden/Boston, pp. 170-210.
- Melchert, H.C. 2003b. “Hittite nominal stems in *-anzan-*”, in E. Tichy et al., eds., *Indogermanisches Nomen. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft / Society for I-E Studies / Société des Études Indo-Européennes. Freiburg 19. bis 21. September 2001*, Bremen: 129-139.
- Melchert, H.C. 2004. “The inflection of some irregular Luwian neuter nouns”, in D. Groddek and S. Röble, eds., *Šarnikziel. Hethitologische Studien zum Gedenken an Emil Orgetorix Forrer*, Dresden: 471-475.
- Melchert, H.C. 2005. “The Problem of Luwian Influence of Hittite”, in G. Meiser and O. Hackstein, eds., *Sprachkontakt und*

³⁰) Note that the loss of prenasal /s/ seems to be systematic in Luwian; cf. Melchert, 1994, 268.

³¹) On the well-established phenomenon of the Luwian *i*-mutation cf. Starke, 1990: 59-61; Melchert, 2003a, 187-188.

- Sprachwandel. Akten der XI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 17.–23. September 2000, Halle an der Saale*, Reichert, Wiesbaden: 445–59.
- Melchert, H.C. 2010. “Remarks on the Kuttamuwa inscription”, in *Kubaba 1*: 4–11.
- Miller, J.L. 2004. *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals*, Wiesbaden.
- Oettinger, N. 1980. “Die n-Stämme des Hethitischen und ihre indogermanischen Ausgangspunkte”, in *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 94: 44–64.
- Puhvel, J. 1984. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, Volumes 1 and 2, Words beginning with A–E, I, Berlin/New York.
- Starke, F. 1985. *Die Keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift*, Wiesbaden.
- Starke, F. 1990. *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des Keilschrift-Luwischen Nomens*, Wiesbaden.
- Ünal, A. 2003. “Word Play in Hittite Literature?”, in G.M. Beckman, R.H. Beal R.H., G. McMahon, eds., *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, Winona Lake: 377–388.
- Van den Hout, Th.P.J. 2002. “‘Self’, ‘soul’ and ‘portrait’ in Hieroglyphic Luwian”, in P. Taracha, ed., *Silva anatolica: Anatolian studies presented to Maciej Popko on the occasion of his 65th birthday*, Warsaw: 171–186.
- Van den Hout, Th.P.J. 2006. “Institutions, Vernaculars, Publics: the Case of Second-Millennium Anatolia”, in S. Sanders, ed., *Margins of Writing, Origins of Cultures*. Chicago: 217–56.
- Wodtko, D., Irslinger, B., Schneider, C. 2008. *Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexikon*, Heidelberg.
- Yakubovich, I. 2002. “Nugae luviae”, review article to Hawkins, 2000, in V. Shevoroshkin and P. Sidwell, eds., *Anatolian Languages*, AHL Studies in the Science and History of Language 6, Canberra: Association for the History of Language: 189–209.
- Yakubovich, I. 2010. *Sociolinguistics of the Luwian Language*, Leiden.
- Yakubovich, I./ Boroday, S. 2014. Корпусные методы дешифровки анатолийских иероглифов, in *Journal of Language Relationship* 11: 39–61.