

# Palaic *fulāsinanza*: One Anatolian Suffix, Two Possible Explanations\*

Miguel Valério  
*New University of Lisbon*

The aim of the following article is to discuss two possible interpretations for the Palaic word *fulāsinanza* while shedding new light on the obscure fragment where it occurs, which seems to be the remainder of an invocation to the god Hilanzifa. The word *fulāsina-* denotes a kind of ritual bread but its most startling feature is its suffix *-ant-s* which could be either a cognate of ergative case markers in other Indo-European Anatolian languages (Hittite, Luvian and Lycian) or a denominal adjective built on *-ant-*.

## Introduction

Of the three Indo-European Anatolian languages written in the cuneiform script during the Bronze Age, Hittite, Luvian and Palaic, the last is the most poorly understood, being attested in only a dozen fragmentary ritual texts from the archives of Boğazköy (Melchert 2008: 40). One unexplained Palaic fragment is the joint KBo 19.152 + 27.77 Vs.II 7-10:

	Transliteration	Normalization
7.	nu-ú-ku <sup>d</sup> Hi-i-la-an-zi-w[a <sub>a</sub> -?	<i>nū=ku</i> <sup>d</sup> <i>Hilanzif</i> [ <i>a</i> -?
8.	wu <sub>i</sub> -la-a-š[i-]na-an-za x[	<i>fulāsinanza</i> x[
9.	ú-i-iš-ta ša-x[	<i>wista sa-x</i> [
10.	ú-i-iš-ta[ (-)	<i>wista</i> [(-)

Albeit extremely damaged, this small excerpt can with all security be classified as an instance of Palaic due to the occurrence of 1) the typical introductory formula *nū=ku* (with *scriptio plena*); 2) of the special *wV<sub>v</sub>*-signs reflecting a fricative

---

\*I am greatly indebted to Craig Melchert (University of California in Los Angeles), who first heard of the idea here presented and encouraged the writing of this article. I am also thankful for the suggestions, references, corrections and comments made by the latter scholar and Ilya Yakubovich (University of Chicago). The views expressed here are nevertheless my sole responsibility.

/f/ (occasionally represented by graphic *p*-) that does not exist in Hittite and Luvian and is utilized for Hattic loanwords like *fulāsina*- ‘(a kind of) bread’<sup>1</sup> (see Carruba 1970: 39-40 and Melchert 1994: 195); and 3) the divine name Hilanzifa itself<sup>2</sup>.

What I wish to bring forward and analyze here is the occurrence in the excerpt of *fulāsinanza*, a derived form of *fulāsina*-. This form is striking because of its special ending *-anza*, unattested elsewhere in Palaic. Since this language did not assibilate *\*ti* into /ts/ (cf. 3Pl. Pres. *-ānti* < *\*-énti* in *ahuwānti* ‘they drink’), *-anza* must be the outcome of /-Vnts/ and cannot represent the ablative case. As a result, two possible explanations emerge: *-anza* may be a direct cognate of the Hittite ergative marker *-anza* /-ants/ (pl. *-antesš*) < *-ant-* as well as of Luvian *-antis* (pl. *-antinzi*) and Lycian *-ēti* (pl.); alternatively, *fulāsinanza* could be a denominal adjective in *-ant-*.

### I. An “animating” suffix?

Let us start by exploring the first possibility. In Hittite, Luvian and Lycian the ergative case marker is added to a grammatically neuter noun in those situations where the latter acts as subject of a transitive verb, as inferred from these Hittite examples (see Melchert forthcoming, after Garrett 1990):

- (1) *kāsa=kan kī tuppī kuedani UD-ti parā nehun*  
‘On the day in which I sent you this tablet’
- (2) *mahhan=ta kās tuppianza anda wemiyazzi*  
‘When this tablet reaches you’

<sup>1</sup>The broken <sup>NINDA</sup>*pul[a...]* may be an instance of *fulāsina* in Hittite (CHD, P: 374). While the latter is usually taken to be a type of bread (coexisting with other words modified by NINDA), the Chicago Hittite Dictionary cites Laroche, RHA XIII/57:76f and Kammenhuber, OLZ 50:364 n. 1, according to whom this is the actual Hattic word for ‘bread’. Thus <sup>NINDA</sup>*zippulasni* has been interpreted as ‘thick bread’, possibly a Hattic endocentric compound with *\*zip-* ‘thick’ modifying the head *\*fulasni*. On this topic see also more recently Soysal (2004: 303).

<sup>2</sup>*Hilanzifa* matches a category of Hittite nouns (often theonyms) ending in *-sepa-* ~ *-zipa-* (see Laroche 1947: 67f), seen in compounds like *daganzipa-* ‘earth’ (< *tekan* ~ *dagan* ‘earth’), <sup>d</sup>*Hantasepa* (< *hant-* ‘forehead’), <sup>d</sup>*Išpanzašepa* (< *išpant-* ‘night’), <sup>d</sup>*Miyantanzipa* (< *miyata-* ‘fruitfulness’, <sup>(d)</sup>*askasepa* (< *aska* ‘gate’), and *tarsanzipa-* ‘platform’ (Hoffner Jr. and Melchert 2008: 61-62). As seen in these examples, the variant *-zipa-* is due to the emergence of *z* after sonorant *n* (< *n+sepa*) (see Melchert 1994: 194).

Regarding Palaic, the poor state of preservation of the fragment in question makes it impossible to know what the verb and its relationship to *fulāsinanza* was. One likely possibility is that the bread was meant to ‘feed’ the god i.e. *fulāsinanza* is the subject of a transitive verb and Hilanzifa the object. Its ending *-anza* could certainly be the ergative case marker, but since it has been long demonstrated (see Laroche 1962, Garrett 1990 and Melchert forthcoming) that in Hittite, Luvian and Lycian only neuter nouns can take the ergative case, this hypothesis would be contradicted by the fact that *fulāsina-* is an animate noun. Noteworthy to this respect is the following text:

- (3) KUB 25.165 Obv. 15 (Invocation to Zaparfa) (Carruba 1970: 14)  
*kuisa tū fu[la]sinās kārti a=ti=apan azziki*  
 ‘Whichever bread pleases you, eat that one!’

If we follow Carruba’s translation, we wind up with *fulāsina-* acting as subject of a transitive verb but with no marker at all. I, however, follow Melchert (1984: 29) in translating the passage as ‘Whichever *w.*-bread is to your liking, eat that one!’ I view Palaic *kārti* not as a 3Sg. Pres. verb but as a noun matching Hittite *karti* ‘heart (dat.-loc.)’; if *kārti* were indeed a verbal form one would be left with a verbal root *kār-* after segmentation of the 3Sg Pres. ending *-ti* (cf. *wer-ti* ‘he calls’). An unlikely verb meaning ‘to please’ formed from *\*kārd-* ‘heart’ (typologically, this would be unparalleled in Anatolian; and one may compare Latin *crēdere* ‘to trust, believe’ a verb derived from the same PIE root but with different semantics) expectedly would originate *\*kārtti* with gemination. On the other hand, the use of a noun meaning ‘heart’ as ‘desire, wish’ is a common metaphor, suitably attested in Hittite:

- (4) KBo 3.7 i.25-26 (Tale of the Storm-god and Illuyanka)  
*ma=wa katti=ti ses-m[i nu=w]a uwami / kardiyas=tas iyami*  
 ‘If I may sleep with you, I will come (and) fulfil your desire (lit. that of your heart).’

Inevitably, the interpretation of (3) here followed also needs to account for the Palaic independent personal pronoun *tū* (dat.-acc.). Hittite once again yields important typological parallels of the use of the dative to mark possession:

- (5) KUB 1.1 i 59-60  
 LÚ.KÚR.ME.EŠ=*mu=kán* <sup>LÚ.ME.EŠ</sup> *arsanatalus* <sup>d</sup>IŠTAR GAŠAN=YA  
 ŠU-*i dāis*  
 ‘Ishtar My Lady put the enemies (and) enviers into my hand.’
- (6) KBo 4.12 Ro 6-7  
*nu=mu=kán ABU=YA ANA* <sup>m</sup>*Middanna-A.A GAL DUB.SAR.MEŠ*  
 ŠU-*i dāis*  
 ‘My father put me into the hand of Middannamuwa, the Chief Scribe.’

In both these instances Hittite makes use of the dative together with the common phrase ŠU-*i dāis* ‘put in the hand’. The first example shows an enclitic personal pronoun and the second a full noun phrase. We can be assured that an accented personal pronoun could also be used in this way. Similarly, in German one may find the following formulation: *Es liegt mir am Herzen* ‘It pleases me’ (lit. ‘It pleases to me on the heart’). More analogous to Palaic is the Russian construction *Это мне по сердцу* ‘This to me on the heart’ without a finite verb. Hence I find it reasonable to translate Palaic *kuisa tū fu[la]sinās kār̄ti* as ‘Whichever bread (is) to you in the heart’ i.e. ‘Whichever bread pleases you’. For similar constructions with a possessive dative and an absent verb ‘to be’ one may compare yet again Hittite:

- (7) KUB 21.38 i 15  
 ANA ŠEŠ-YA NU.ĜÁL *kuitki*  
 ‘My brother has nothing’ (lit. ‘To my brother [there is] not something’)

I hope this brief discussion has shed new light on the Palaic passage in question, demonstrating at the same time that in (3) *fulāsinas* is not the subject of a transitive verb. Regarding our main argument, it remains nonetheless problematic that the word is an animate noun while elsewhere in Anatolian, as mentioned above, only inanimate nouns take the ergative suffix.

Incidentally, according to the present prevailing view this limitation is probably not original. In the Anatolian languages exhibiting this feature we find compelling evidence from “irregular” formations that end up contradicting the “ergative rule”, i.e. the restriction of Hittite and Luvian ergative markers to neuter nouns. Thus Hittite *linkiyantes*, the personified oath-

deities, derive their designation from animate *lingāi-* ‘oath’ (see Melchert forthcoming) and Luvian has the form *tiyammantis*, despite the fact that *tiyamm(i)-* ‘earth’ is of animate gender<sup>3</sup>.

Melchert (forthcoming) demonstrated that Hittite neuter nouns taking the ergative case remain neuter, contesting earlier assertions that the suffix in question shifted those nouns into animate forms. But while refuting claims that *-ant-* animates, personifies or imbeds with “active force” in those instances where it is attached to inanimate nouns, he admits that in the few occasional exceptions cited above it does animate/personify semantically a given animate noun, predominantly in ritual invocations or mythological narratives (what he calls “genuine personification”)<sup>4</sup>. Since *fūlāsinanza* – an animate noun with an inanimate referent (bread) – appears in such a text, we might be witnessing a similar construction.

Taking Palaic *-anza* as cognate of the Hittite, Luvian and Lycian ergative (and “animatizing”) suffix would increase the weight of arguments against Garrett’s (1990: 271-277) derivation of it from an ablative-instrumental in *\*-anti*. Were the latter true, the Palaic ending would be precisely *\*\*-anti* rather than *-anza*, since we have seen that this language did not assibilate *\*i*. Moreover, Garrett’s reconstruction had the advantage of accounting for Luvian *-anti-s* (pl. *-anti-nzi*), but the latter could well have been a secondary formation from *\*-ant-* as proven by Luvian words like *walanti-/ulanti- ~ walant-/ulant* ‘dead’, a participial adjective in *-ant-* (see Melchert 1993: 250). Lycian *-ēti* from *\*ant-s* is also regular: cf. the personal name *Masauwēti* < *\*mansa-want-* ‘connected with gods’ (Hajnal 1995: 245).

<sup>3</sup>However, *tiyammantis* may have been created for stylistic purposes under the influence of *tappisantis* (< *tappis* ‘heaven’, a neuter noun) in KUB 9.6+ ii 14-15 (Starke *KLtU*: 112-113): *as=sa=ti ilhadu tappasantis / tiyammantis tāin=ti=(y)ata aiyaru / malli=ti=(y)ata aiyaru* ‘Let heaven (and) earth wash their own mouth(s); let them become oil, let them become honey’.

<sup>4</sup>That the attribution of the *ant-* suffix was not primordially restricted to inanimate nouns (if not used solely with the animate gender) is betrayed by the fact that Hittite (for the sake of example; the situation is the same in C. Luvian) *-anza* /ants/ and *-antes* are inevitably the product of the addition of animate nominative endings *-s* (sg.) and *-es* (pl.) to the suffix *-ant-*. This matter cannot, however, be pursued here and must remain the subject of further studies.

## II. A denominal adjective?

The second possible explanation argues that *fulāsinanza* is the nom. sg. of a denominal adjective built with *-ant-*, in a manner cognate with the formation of Hittite *kaninant-* ‘thirsty’ < *kanint-* ‘thirst’, *nadānt-* ‘having a drinking-straw’ < *nāda-* ‘reed, drinking-straw’, *perunant* ‘rocky’ < *peruna-* ‘rock’ (see Friedrich 1960: §48b 1 and Garrett 1990: 267 with reference to Oettinger 1981).

This hypothesis is more advantageous than the first one in that it is not just formally acceptable but also supportable by contextual evidence. There is in fact one other Palaic text that may shed light on the badly damaged KBo 19.152 + 27.77 Vs.II 7-10: the Invocation to the Sun-god. Its relevant part is preserved in two fragments that complement each other, KUB 35.165 Obv. 21-24 and KUB 32.17 11<sup>3</sup>-13<sup>3</sup>:

21. = I. [(nu-ku)] pa-aš-hu-ul-la-ša-aš ti-[ia-]az ta-ba-ar-ni LUGAL-i  
pa-a-pa-az-ku-ar ti-i
22. = II [(a-an-na-)]az-ku-ar ti-i iš-ka[ n]u-uš-ši-ia-am-pí ti-i a-ri nu-uš-  
ši-ia-am-pí ti-i
23. = III [(a-ru-u-)]na-am-pí ti-i ú-i-te-ši [x?]a-an-ta-na-an ti-i ú-i-te-ši
24. = IV [(ki-i-a)]t [(wu-u-ú-l)]a-ši-ni-ke-eš wa-šu-ki-ni-eš ši-mi-ya-a-aš  
ki-i-tar<sup>5</sup>
- “Now, *Fashullassas Tiyaz*, to *tabarna* the king you are indeed  
the father (and) the mother.  
Anoint him, and exalt him now!  
You will both see/build him high (and) see/build him  
strong<sup>3</sup>.  
Here lie the delicacies(?) made/consisting of bread (and)  
the *šimīya*.
11. = V wa-a-šu ú-iš-ta-aš ša-a[(m-lu-wa-aš wu-u-la-ši-na-aš ki-i-ta-ar)]
12. = VI [(w)]a-a-šu ú-iš-ta-aš ma-l[(i-ta-an-na-aš wu-u-la-ši-na-aš ki-i-ta-  
ar)]
13. = VII [(ku)]-i-ša t]u-ú wu-u-la-ši-n[(a-aš ka-a-ar-ti a-ti-a-pa-an az-zi-  
ki-i)]
- The goodies, the *wista*-(bread) (and) the apple bread are  
laid out,  
The goodies, the *wista*-(bread) (and) the honey-bread are  
laid out.  
Whichever bread pleases your heart, eat that one!

The translation presented is based on the recent reanalysis of earlier studies (Carruba 1972: 29-30; Starke 1990:

<sup>5</sup>KUB 35.165 reads [(*ki-i-a*)]t [(*wu-u-ú-l*)]a-ši-ni-ke-eš wa-šu-ki-ni-eš ši-mi-ya-a-aš *ki-i-tar* KL.MIN, where the final KL.MIN = ‘ditto’ substitutes the typical description of offerings that follows.

73) on the Invocation by Yakubovich (2005: 107-122). This is not of significance for what I wish to advocate here since, as Yakubovich himself observed in his work, the last four lines represent a formula typical of Palaic invocatory texts, containing the description of the offering of various breads prepared for the ritual meal, and there has been a consensus over their general meaning since Carruba. It is precisely those four lines, apart from the introductory ones, that I wish to compare to our fragment:

Invocation(?) to Hilanzifa	Invocation to the Sun-god
7. <i>nū=ku</i> <sup>d</sup> <i>Hilanzif</i> [ <i>a</i> ?	I. <i>nu=ku Fashullasas Tiyaz (...)</i>
8. <i>fulāsinanza</i> x[	V. <i>kiyat fūlasinikes wasukiniyes simiyās kītar</i>
9. <i>wista sa-x</i> [	VI. <i>wāsu wistas samluwas fulasinas kītar</i>
10. <i>wista</i> [(-)	VII. <i>wāsu wistas malidannas fulasinas kītar</i>

Once we observe that the fragment appears to be an invocation to Hilanzifa and that in compositions of this nature the descriptions of offerings follow a conventional order, it seems reasonable to equate *fulāsinanza* to *fūlasinikes*. The latter form was rendered by Carruba (1972: 30) as ‘brotlichen’ and by Starke (1990: 73) as “Gebäckartiges” (as suggested in the translation above) – these scholars regarded the word as plural. Indeed *fūlasinikes* seems to be an adjective qualifying *wasukiniyes*, a presumable noun. In analyzing it, Carruba posited an adjective suffix *\*-ika-*, cognate to Greek *-iko-*, whereas Melchert proposed *-ik-* (cp. Latin *-ex* [eks] / *-icis*, e.g. in *uertex* ~ *uortex* ‘whirl, eddy; top’) and noted that *\*-iko-* could well be built on it (see Melchert 1984: 37, fn. 31, with references). This takes us back to the idea of *fulāsinanza* as a denominal adjective in *-ant-* because in that case its meaning would be precisely ‘having/containing *f*.-bread’, i.e. it could name something made of *f*.-bread.<sup>6</sup>

There are, however, some problems to this solution. The nouns referring to the different types of bread do occur in the same order in both texts but the verses in the broken text do

<sup>6</sup>There is in Hittite the collective divine name <sup>d</sup>*Ilaliyantes*, certainly related to C. Luvian <sup>d</sup>*Ilalis* (sg.) and to Palaic <sup>d</sup>*Ilaliyantikes* (see Carruba 1970: 57; Melchert 1993: 87). The latter demonstrates that Palaic used *-ant-* and *-ik-* with the same adjectival function, adding more sense to the equation *fulāsinanza* ~ *fūlasinikes*.

not exhibit at their beginning the exact same words found in its counterpart – namely the deictic *kiyat* and the presumed noun *wāsu*. Furthermore, *wista* does not seem to agree in case with *wistas*, the form found in other texts. Of course, the reasons for these differences might become clearer only if we possessed the broken part of the fragment.

Ultimately, the idea of *fulāsinanza* as an “animated” or “personified” form, while morphologically possible, would require a context in which that particular kind of bread would be performing an action, e.g. feeding the god Hilanzifa, thus justifying that grammatical construction. But even though consumption is the ultimate purpose of these ritualistic offerings, the fact is that in no other Palaic liturgical text we find such a formula. On the contrary, the fixed and stereotypical nature of the lists of ritual meals in invocations favors the second interpretation and the comparison above shows that once we put the Hilanzifa fragment side by side with one of those lists the result is a good match in the order of the different types of ceremonial pastry.

It is, however, still possible that Palaic had a suffix cognate with the ergative and “animating” markers in its sister languages. Subsequent investigation is needed and I thus offer the thoughts and conclusions of this brief discussion to specialists in Indo-European Anatolian languages.

#### References:

Alp, Sedat

- 1991 *Hethitische Keilschrifttafeln aus Maşat-Höyük* (Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu, TTKYayın VI/ 34), Ankara.

Carruba, Onofrio

- 1970 *Das Palaische: Texte, Grammatik, Lexicon*. StBoT 10. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.  
1972 *Beiträge zum Palaischen*. Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut.

Friedrich, Johannes

- 1960 *Hethitisches Elementarbuch I*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Garrett, Andrew

- 1990 The origins of NP Split Ergativity. *Language* 66, 261-296.

Hajnal, Ivo

- 1995 *Der lykische Vokalismus*. Graz: Leykem.

*The Journal of Indo-European Studies*



- Hoffner Jr., Harry A., and Melchert, Craig H.  
 2008 *A grammar of the Hittite language. Languages of the Ancient Near East*, vol. 1, Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.
- Laroche, Emmanuel  
 1947 *Recherches sur les noms des dieux hittites* (= RHA VII 1947). Paris : Maisonneuve.  
 1962 Un 'ergative' indo-européen d'Asie Mineure. *BSL* 57, 23-43.
- Melchert, Craig H.  
 1984 Notes on Palaic. *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 98, 22-43.  
 1993 *Cuneiform Luwian Lexicon*, Chapel Hill, NC: Self-published.  
 1994 *Anatolian Historical Phonology*, Amsterdam: Rodopi.  
 2008 Palaic. In: Roger D. Woodward (ed.). *The Ancient Languages of Asia Minor*. Cambridge: University Press, 40-45.  
 Forthcoming. The problem of the Ergative Case in Hittite. In: M. Mazoyer & M. Fruty (eds.) *Variations, concurrence et evolution des cas dans divers domaines linguistiques*.
- Oettinger, Norbert  
 1981 Hethitisch *ganenant* 'gebeugt, durstig'. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 40, 143-153.
- Soysal, Oğuz.  
 2004 *Hattischer Wortschatz in hethitischer Textüberlieferung*. Brill: Leiden/Boston.
- Starke, Frank  
 1990 *Untersuchungen zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*. StBoT 31, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Yakubovich, Ilya  
 2005 Were Hittite kings divinely anointed? *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 5, 107-137.