The Old Hittite Genitive Plural ending -an*

PETRA GOEDEGEBUURE

1 Overview

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

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

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

1 For a historical overview of the study of the genitive in -an, see Kloekhorst 2017:385–7.
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not by -an, but by the spelling with a logogram without logographic plural marking. LUGAL-an represents a nonspecific plural ‘of kings > royal’ (§4).

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

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

2

2.1 tapuša and the path accusative

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

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

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

3For an overview of the dimensional uses of the accusative see GHL 248–9, with further references.
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By contrast to tapuša, tapuša never controls the genitive, only the accusative of extent or the dative-locative. Of the 85 instances of tapuš(a) known to me, not one occurs with a noun ending in gen. sg. -aš, while nine end in -an. In three more cases tapuša governs a logogram without further case-marking. I take those as accusatives as well. Eight of these twelve instances occur in Neo-Hittite compositions. Unfortunately, none of these nouns are u- or i-stems, otherwise we would have been able to easily disambiguate between the accusatives in -un and -in and the genitive in -an. However, the fact that the genitive in -an was only productive in OH and was fully replaced by -aš in NH, combined with the fact that local adverbs only governed the genitive in OH, makes it very unlikely that (1) in NH the genitive would have been preserved with one local adverb when with all other local adverbs the genitive was replaced with the dative-locative, and (2) that it was not just the genitive, but the old form of the genitive. What could save this analysis is to understand ID-an tapuša and arunan tapuša as frozen expressions, nonspecific ‘riverside’ and ‘seaside’, respectively, which is exactly how Kloekhorst translates them. However, example (1) renders this impossible:

(1) KUB 19.9 i 16’ (NH, CTH 83, Hattušili III)

'in Mala-n-ma-kan kuit tapuša ėš-ta

M.river-ACC.SG-but-PTCL what:nom.-ACC.SG alongside be-3s.NPST

‘What was alongside the river Mala,‘

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

2.2 utniyandan

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

(2) KBo 3.22 obv. 25–6 (OH/OS, CTH 1)

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

---

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

†For the glosses, see the Leipzig Glossing Rules (https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php). In bound transcription ‘¬’ denotes a clitic boundary, ‘¬’ a morpheme boundary, and ‘¬’ the boundary between a logogram and syllabogram.
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cities of [. . .], [. . .]x-na and Ḥarkiuna: [Only?] Neša shall be(come) p[op]ulous.6

be-3S.IMP
‘And he (and no one else) shall be king of all the lands’.

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

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

2.3 Specificity versus number

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

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

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

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

Specific definites are identifiable by both speaker and addressee:

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

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

---

6For this passage, with new readings, see Goedegebuure 2007:306.
7There are two more OS instances of ubbiyantan that belong with ‘land’ (because of the equivalence with Hattian wur ‘land’), but the contexts do not provide clues about the number, and the expressions themselves are unclear as well: ubbiyantan ušiš[ta]šu ‘the wooden bar of the land(s)’ (KBo 17.22 iii 16′, OH/OS, CTH 756) and [utniyandan ošarimpaš ‘the arimpa-object of the land(s)’ (KUB 12.43:6′, OH/OS, CTH 457).
Kloekhorst (2017:394–5) translates a couple of -an genitives as nonspecific. For example, *patan* GIS GÌR.GUB is indeed better translated with nonspecific ‘footstool’ rather than ‘stool for some specific feet’, and it is also very unlikely that LUGAL-an āška- would refer to the gate of a specific king or specific set of kings. Yet there are also many genitives in -an that must be understood as specific:

(6) KBo 3.22 rev. 55–6 (OH/OS, CTH i, Anitta), with dupl. KUB 26.71 obv. 4′–5′ (NS)
I built fortifications (URU.DIDLI) in Neša.

URU-iy-an â[pa]n] (36) nepiš-aš 4IM-n-aš
city-gen.pl behind heaven-gen.pl Stormgod-gen.pl
É-er U É ši[A]m(mín ABN)]
house:nom.-acc.n.9s and house deity:our:acc.s.c build:1s.pst

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

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

(7) KBo 17.43 i 14′ (OH/OS, CTH 649), with dupl. KBo 17.99 i 5′ (MS)
He hits the performers (LÚ.MEŠ ALAN.ZU-uš) §

[(LÚ h˘artag)]a-š LÚ.MEŠ ALAN.ZU-an GİR.HI.A:ŠUNU šipḫ-i
bear.man-nom.s.c performers-gen.pl feet-their š.-inst
šarta-i
wipe:3s.npst

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

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

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

The examples in this section, with the exception of (9), are not listed in Laroche 1965 nor in GHL 73.
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[\[\text{[1]}\] a\(\text{̓} \) pai-zi\(\text{̓} \) LÜ.MEŠ MEŠEDI-an pēran (3) tie-zi\(\text{̓} \) ...........

CONN-he go-38.NPST bodyguard-GEN.PL before step-38.NPST
DUM]U.MEŠ LUGAL.pā-nzi LÜ.MEŠ MEŠEDI-an āppan (4)
sons king go-3PL.NPST bodyguard-GEN.PL behind
tie-n[zi]

step-3PL.NPST
‘He goes and step[ps] in front of the bodyguards. [ . . . . . . . . . . . . princes go and step behind the bodyguards’.

(9) KBo 25.112 iii 11’–2’ (OH/OS, CTH 733)

“Mercy, Dah˘atenu˘ıt! To mankind you are Dah˘attenuiti, but among the gods you (are) the Mother of the Springs, Queen. . . . §

“Mercy, Tašimmeti! To mankind you are Tašimmeti,

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

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

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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[([1 GU}_4 \text{ APIN.LÁ 1 } \text{ GÍN AB})]} & \text{ iuga([i])[}a[n] (12’)\text{ ([}5 \text{ GÍN}\]
1 ox plow 1 cow yearling-GEN.PL 5 shekel
KUB.BABBAR ŠIM-ŠUNU)\text{][}5\text{ ([}5 \text{ GÍN silver price-their of 1 ox weanling-GEN.S 4 shekel}
KUB.BABB)\text{][}AR (13’)\text{ ([pā-i]}
\text{silver give-38.NPST}
\end{align*}
\]

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

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

**Hoffner (1997:142) transliterated ŠI-IM-ŠU nu, but because we are dealing with two animals we would have expected ŠUNU (compare KBo 6.26 ii 37: ŠA 2 SILA 1 GÍN KUB.BABBAR ŠI-IM-ŠUNU). Also, a connective is unexpected in a list like this; compare KBo 6.26 iii 16–9, with four clauses with the verb pai joined in asyndeton. Hoffner’s transliteration therefore needs to be adjusted to ŠI-IM-ŠUNU.
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Ex. (10) also shows that -an is used for a nonspecific plural referent. The use of -aš for a nonspecific singular and -an for a nonspecific plural in (10) provides further proof that the contrast between the two is not based on specificity but on number.

Both -aš and -an occur with nonspecific referents in the cooccurring noun phrases patan aš GIR.GUB ‘stool for the feet = footstool’ and genuwaš GADA.HLA ‘cloths for the knee(s) = knee-cloths’ (KBo 20.8 i 18’–19’ (OS), KBo 20.12 i 10 (OS), ABoT 1.9 + KBo 17.74 i 9 (OH/OS or MS), KBo 20.61 + KBo 31.183 + KBo 34.185 i 9, 11 (OH/MS)). It would not make sense to consider feet nonspecific but knee(s) specific. Not only that, the consistent use of -an with pata- and -aš with genu- also argues against -aš as the innovated plural genitive. Why always retain -an for pata- but always innovate with genu-? However we understand genuwaš GADA (cloth for one knee? lap cloth?) with nonspecific ‘knee’, it has to be singular.11

3 The genitives in -an

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

Several attestations need to be excluded from the discussion. There are a few forms that are booked in the dictionaries as genitive singulars but that need to be read or interpreted differently. HW3 H: 398 lists ha-a-aš-ša-an in KBo 23.127 + 147 + iii 20 as genitive singular, but this is an accusative singular.12 Also, it is highly unlikely that we should read a genitive in -an in NH KUB 33.93 iv 29’ [ne-pi-ša-]an 4UTU-un ‘the Sungod of Heaven’ (so CHD L–N:448). Rieken (2009) emends to ne-pi-ša-]aš in view of the duplicate KUB 36.10:12 [n]e-pi-ša-aš 4UTU-[un] and [ne-pi-ša-]aš 4UTU-an in KUB 33.93 + KUB 36.7a iii 31’.13 The possessive clitic -man in KUB 1.16 iii 40 (OH/NS) is an acc.sg.; the possessive in ibid. 62 is vocative -ma (both so already Laroche 1965:38; pace CHD L–N:216).

3.1 Singular collective nouns with distributive plural -an

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

---

11This also implies that nonspecific andublaš in andublaš huršar(r-a) ‘human heads’ (KBo 17.1 + ABoT 1.43 i 35’) is singular. The heads are held by two demonic deities, which means that each deity holds one human head, not multiple. Likewise, the king and queen always have one genuwaš GADA each. If genuwaš is singular, then it is likely that andublaš is singular as well.

12LUGAL-[a] natta (20) arumuz[zi it ašk̲ušaw̲u šaž l̲ašu muš̲u p̲ašu d̲a][i] (21) t-ašša pari pašaiz[zi ‘But the king does not bow. He (i.e., an official) takes the brazier in front, and he goes out’. For discussion and more examples, see Tjerkstra 1999:125–6.

13Another option is to read [Šu] AN 4UTU-an, given AN-aš 4UTU-aš in KUB 33.96 (+ KUB 33.93) iv 45’.
the individual items that form the collective need to be evoked. The context will then allow paraphrasing the collective as ‘the members of the collective’.

3.1.1 *bašannan ištarna* ‘among the family members’

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

(11) KUB 11.1 iv 23′–4′ (OH/MS', CTH 19, Telipinu), with dupl. KBo 3.67 iv 11′–2′ (NS)

[\((kui-)\)za \*bašann-an*\textsuperscript{14} *ištarna alwanzatar*

who-NOM.S.C-REFL family-GEN.PL among sorcery:Nom-ACC.S.N

šakk-i šum-es-an (24′) ((\(b\))aš[\(a\)](an))n-anza ep-ten

know-3.S.NPT you-NOM.PL-him family-IND Nom.S.C\textsuperscript{15} seize-2.PL.IMP

‘Who among the family (members) knows sorcery, you, the family, must seize him (and bring him to the gate of the palace)’.

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

3.1.2 *šuppalan* ‘of the livestock’

In the Prayer to the Sungod, the author praises the Sungod for arbitrating the case of the dog, the pig, and the man with whom the gods are angry. As far as the author is concerned, this is a general truth, which means that ‘the case of the dog’ etc. in fact applies to all members of the class of dogs. ŠA UR.GI\textsuperscript{4} [Š]4 ŠAĦ ‘of the dog, of the pig’ are still singular, because typically a case only applies to a single entity. This immediately leads to problems when the noun is a collective. In (12), the context requires that the Sungod arbitrates individual cases of the individual members of the livestock, but this cannot be expressed as *šuppalaš h˘anešša(r)*, because that would mean arbitration of the case of *all* the livestock as a collective (in a type of class-action lawsuit). As with *bašiatar*, the only way to show that a collective has individual members is to use the ending appropriate for individual nouns, which in this case is the distributive plural *-an*:

\textsuperscript{14}KBo 3.67 iv 11′: *la-aš-la-an-na*. The dat.-loc. ending *-a* occurs only with *-i* and *-ai*-stems (Frantíková 2016), therefore emend *la-aš-la-an-na* to *la-aš-la-an-na<-an>* (pace HED H:215).

\textsuperscript{15}KBo 3.67 iv 12′: abl. *la-aš-la-an-na-az*, so perhaps translate ‘you must take him from the family’.
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(12) KBo 34.22 + KUB 30.11 + KUB 31.135 obv. 11'-2' (CTH 374, OH/MS)

(11') § nu ŠÁ UR.GL-ŠÁH hannesšar zik[pat']
CONN of dog of pig case:nom.-acc.s.n you:nom.s-only

ha]ma-tar[i]  (12) § šuppal-ann-a hannesša
arbitrate-2s.npst.mid livestock-gen.pl also case:nom.-acc.s.n

išš-it kui-[tš] UL memi-ik-anz[i]
mouth-inst who:nom.pl.c not speak-iter-3pl.npst

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

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

3.1.3 utniyandan ‘of the population’

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

(13) KBo 17.1 i 11' (CTH 416, OH/OS)

[k]āšata-smāš-kan utniyand-an lāš-uš dābh-u[n]l[
herby:-you:dat.pl-ptcl population-gen.pl tongue-acc.pl.c take-is.pst

‘I have hereby taken from you the tongues ( = slanders) of the population/members of the population’.

It is not inconceivable that an utniyand-. as ‘land’ has tongues (so Laroche 1965:36, “langues des pays”). A land may act as a stand-in for the governing class: for example, it can rise in rebellion (utne, KBo 3.22 obv. 11) or attack (utneanteš, KUB 24.4 + KUB 30.12 rev. 7). Yet given the similarity in meaning with the post-OH phrase pangauwaš lala- ‘slander of the multitude’ (CHD L-N:24), I rather take utniyant- here as ‘population’. Since the slander is produced by individual members of the population, not the population as a single body, the use of the distributive plural -an is warranted to reflect this plurality within the collective.

3.2 Singular logograms in -an

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

The context in which LUGAL-(w)an needs to be assessed is that not all singular logograms have singular referents. The absence of a logographic plural marker on plural nouns, though unusual, does occur. A highly random and very small sample of such cases follows here (the topic requires further study). With DINGIR: DINGIR-uš (acc.pl.) ėppir ‘they seized (the) deities’ KUB 36.99 rev. 1′ (OH/OS, CTH 2).

With KUR: nannaša KUR-ēšš-a (dat.-loc.pl.) anda padišu ‘Next, I also entered countries (which . . . )’ KUB 23.11 iii 22 (MH/NS, CTH 142). Also see, e.g., KUB 36.89 rev. 4.

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

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

[[(UR)Lakkurišš-ša 3 LIM ÉRIN.MEŠ LÚ-ann-a]
  L.-LOC.S-but 3 thousand soldiers b.-Nom.Pl.C man-gen.Pl. and
ARAD.MEŠ (40′) [(heap-ant-es] LUGAL-uš kui-uš
i) arupp-un
  assemble-18.pst

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

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

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

16 nu-war-an ‘UTU-i DINGIR-LIM-an arianut ‘he (the Stormgod) diverted it (the river) towards the Sungod(dess) of the gods’ (KUB 36.89 rev. 13, NH, CTH 671) needs to be discounted. ‘Sungod(dess) of the gods’ is usually expressed as šiunan ‘UTU (Laroche 1965:34, CHD S:481). The awkward construction ‘UTU-i DINGIR-LIM-an was probably a futile attempt by the scribe at archaic language.
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n-usi   NA₄-an  parn-ai  hilarn-i
CONN:them stone-GEN.PL house-GEN.S gate.building-LOC.S
É[(RIN.MEŠ-az handâ)i-zi]
soldier:NOM.S.C arrange-3S.NPST

‘A soldier arranges them in the gate building of the mausoleum’ (lit. ‘house of stones’)

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

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

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

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

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

Syntagms like É.LUGAL, KÁ.LUGAL₄, and É.NA₄ pattern with, for example, É.GU₄ ‘house for bovines > cattle barn’ (in, e.g., KUB 17.10 iv 23, OH/MS, CTH 324). É.GU₄ is obviously not a dwelling for one bovine. The multiple bovines for which the dwelling is intended are typically unidentifiable by speaker and addressee, and that makes the referent of GU₄ semantically a nonspecific plural. We have to conclude that in Hittite nonspecific plurals may be represented by singular logograms (although not all singular logograms with plural ending are nonspecific, as in exam-

LUGAL-(w)an per/parna- may also alternate with É.GAL, as in KBo 6.2 i 58.
There is no semantic difference between plural -aš and plural -an. Plural -aš is simply an innovation in OH, sometimes even alternating with -an plurals in the same text, namely the Invocation texts (DINGIR.MEŠ-nan ištarna... ‘among the gods’ versus DINGIR.MEŠ-naš ištarna'(w)). The alternation wattaruwaš... annaš ‘mother of the springs’ (KBo 25.112 iii 8') ~ wattaruwaš annaš (KUB 31.143a 4 11'), where wattaruwaš... annaš...}

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

5 The plurals -an and -aš

There is no semantic difference between plural -aš and plural -an. Plural -aš is simply an innovation in OH, sometimes even alternating with -an plurals in the same text, namely the Invocation texts (DINGIR.MEŠ-nan ištarna... ‘among the gods’ versus DINGIR.MEŠ-naš ištarna'(w)). The alternation wattaruwaš... annaš ‘mother of the springs’ (KBo 25.112 iii 8') ~ wattaruwaš annaš (KUB 31.143a 4 11'), where wattaruwaš...
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is necessarily a gen.pl. (not sg., pace Neu 1983:213!), proves that plural -an and -aš alternate in this text group. This makes it more likely that -an in DINGIR.MEŠ-an ištarna was replaced by a gen.pl. -aš and not a dat.pl. -aš, as might have been the case in combination with ištarna.33

In OS texts, -an occurs more frequently (14 ×) than plural -aš (17 ×)34 and has the widest distribution (historical narratives, oracles, laws, rituals, festivals, invocations), whereas -aš only alternates with -an in one cluster of texts (5 ×, Hattian-Hittite invocation texts, CTH 733). -aš is the only genitive plural in KUB 8.41 (CTH 733, 8 ×), ABoT 1.35 + i 11 (CTH 665), and KBo 25.24 +35 and KBo 20.7 +16 (CTH 635, 3 ×). Had -aš and -aš both been inherited as plurals from Proto-Anatolian, we would not have seen such a limited distribution for OS -aš based on genre, namely its presence mainly in two clusters of festival texts versus complete absence in historical, oracle, law, and most festival texts and rituals.
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33As Neu (1983:228 w. n. 3) assumed, following Starke 1977:180.

34Two additional instances are either gen.pl. or dat.-loc.pl. (loخي hiplaš KBo 25.41 iii 17′; KA-al pižaš KBo 25.68 + KBo 17.13 rev. 10). luṭtiš (pešaš) in KBo 25.36 iii ūš is a dat.-loc.pl. (pace Neu 1983:110) in view of the dat.-loc.pl. luṭtiš in ibid. iii ūš and the fact that in this text local adverbs govern the dative-locative, not the genitive.

35KBo 25.24 (+ KBo 20.3 +++) obv. 12′ [(UDU) ḫA-al luṭpaš ‘meat cuts of (the) sheep’); KBo 20.3 iii ūš (ištananaš (pešaš) ‘in front of the altars’, in view of the dat.-loc.pl. ištananaš in ibid. iii 10′). In the latter text local adverbs still control the genitive, hence karšiš (pešaš) ‘in front of the rungs’ (ibid. iii ūš) and 嫕определен (Ḫatqaš) ‘besides the storage vessel(s)’ (ibid. iii 4′) are either gen. sg. or pl. I did not include them in the counts.

36KBo 20.7 + rev. 11′ (tuppal pešaš ‘to the depot (lit. house of containers)’).
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