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Hittite urenam-

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

(1) "iset mi 3 sg. middle w I ar 'burn' (transitive); on the basis of this root connection, Ozyres (OLZ 1955: 393) suggested the meaning 'burnt' (because), which has generally been accepted. In view of the context in which this word occurs — modifying hattu 'beaten' — after it has been said that people burn the objects presented (waramwazi) the bones — this proposed meaning is not at all controversial."

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

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

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

Watkins (1973: 85, fn. 7) has suggested that though one might expect the participle of war- to be warum- (which does in fact occur), the odd form of this word may somehow be related to the fact that the simplex verb has an "isolated, dissimilated" form [warum] 3 sg. middle wardni (arba), ipm. warni (2). However, exactly what this relationship might be is not made clear, nor does this suggestion address the specific problems indicated above.

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

One small problem that this derivation presents, though, is that internal to Hittite, one might expect the participle of warum- to have the form waramwazi; the absence of the -a of warum, then, is somewhat problematic. Fortunately, when viewed in an Indo-European perspective, this problem has an interesting solution.

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

(2) It is also conceivable that the -at- found in wardni is not a dissimilation from -at- rather is to be connected with the apparent verbal particle -at- found in Vedic SGO subjunctives such as bhudati, where the -at- is clearly segmentable due to the occurrence of "short" forms such as bhavat. The isolated Hittite word kahu 'behold, see here' may also contain this particle.
formants, which has come to be called the "CALAND" system (3). The absence of the *-u- then, can be taken as parallel to the *-u-/ *-ont- substitution found in the Indo-European pair *bhello-/ *-ont- ('high') and *blāu-/ *-ont- (Hittite parku-/ 'high'), or the Hittite-internal pair *blāu-/ *blāu-/ *blāu- 'full' [full] and *blāu-/ *blāu-/ *blāu- 'full' (from *blāu- / *blāu- / *blāu- ont-), respectively (4), among others.

This analysis presumes that the *nu- causative/factive suffix in Hittite is segmentable as *nu-. However, the standard view of the origin of the Indo-European "suffix *nepu-/ *nu-," that set forth by DE SAULNIER, postulates exactly that segmentation for this suffix, *nepu-/ *nu- with the nasal element and the *-u- not as part of the same morpheme. Furthermore, there is some internal evidence within Hittite supporting this particular segmentation. In a particular, a morphemic division *nu- for the *nu-suffix is suggested by such pairs as the *-adjetive tēpu- 'little' and its corresponding causative/factive repmu- 'bellete', miu- 'meek' and minu- 'pactly', parku- 'high' and pargasmu- 'make high', and the like. Since these adjectives in Hittite which are part of the CALAND system form causative/factive verbs with the suffix *nu-, a close morphological connection between *nu- verbs and the substitutive "CALAND" processes posited here in the derivation of unrentan- can safely be inferred.

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

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

(4) This analysis is assumed because of the scriptio plena writing ḫu-af attest- ed for this word, as opposed to the single writing in ḫu-. Technically, though, it is impossible to tell whether ant- has been added to the root, replacing the *u- suffix, or has been added onto the *-u- adjective *sul- ḫu-.

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