

LEVAN KOCHLAMAZASHVILI

Arnold Chikobava Institute of Linguistics,
Georgia
Levan.Kochlamazashvili285@hum.tsu.edu.ge

DEFINITION OF THE HUTT WORD-FORM KAŠTIBAN

As compared to other languages of Asia Minor, the Hutt literary language is distinguished by numerous orthographic violations, frequently and diversely represented in the written monuments. The given paper focuses on a similar case. In the ritual text dedicated to the construction of a palace, we find the word-form *kaštiban* in a sentence: *antaḥan kaštiban katti*¹ “the King opens the door”. Let us discuss this sentence.

The predicate of this simple sentence is a verb form *antaḥan* in which /a-/ is S3 person marker and /n-/ is OI class marker, /ta-/ is a verbal prefix and the root *ḥan-* denotes “opening”.

At a glance, the form *kaštiban* denotes a noun in the dative case. A circumfix *ka-n* can be detached from the stem², although O. Soysal notes that the final syllable [an] belongs to the following word³. The scholar offers a segmentation of the same form: *ka-stib*⁴, which proves the link with the dative case⁵.

Indeed, the syllabogram (an) is often found in Hutt texts with the function of DINGIR ideogram. This phenomenon is mostly found in connection with the word *katte* “king”. Taking this into account, the sentence is written as follows: *antaḥan kaštib Dkatti*.

Strangely enough, such a sentence seems unnatural, because its transitive object in the dative case takes part in the syntactic construction. O. Soysal fragments the form and distinguishes a prefix /ka-/. This prefix must not denote a noun in the dative. In my opinion, this misunderstanding is due to spelling. *ka* „he“ and *štib* „door“ must have been written together. If we write the sentence taking into account the above-mentioned, we will get: *antaḥan ka štib Dkatti* „he is opening the door, King“, where each member of the sentence forms a precise construction: the subject denoted by the pronoun *ka* agrees with the verb-predicate in number and person, whereas the covert indirect object, expressed by the first class prefix /n-/ in the verb, must be *Dkatti* to which the ritual text refers. Thus,

1 KUB 2.2+ KUB 48.3 III

2 cf. Kochlamazashvili 2016, 35

3 Soysal 2004, 536-37.

4 *ibid.*

5 Kochlamazashvili 2016, 34.

based on the context, the verb should be translated as “he is opening the door for you“.

From the etymological viewpoint, the word *štib* “door” is very interesting. I assume that this word is related to the Svan root *cib-* denoting a fence¹. We might have distinguished the segment /š-/ in the Hutt stem and considered it as a marker of the second class, cf. (š(a)-kil “heart“, š(a)-wat “apple“...). However, the Svan example proved that this attitude was incorrect. Even though Hutt itself can express the sound /z/, this may be attributed to some phonetic condition or orthography².

In my opinion, this root is connected to the Colchian *sib-a* „lath, lath door“, found in Megrelian by A.Kobalia³.

In the Georgian vocabulary, I found a word which is relevant with regard to the above-mentioned roots. The dialect of Kiziqi has *sip-ar-i* used in collocation სიფარი კედელი, defined by S. Menteshashvili as “a single wall”⁴.

Thus:

Hutt. *štip-* „door“

Svan. *cib-* „fence“

Colchian *sib-* „lath door“

Georgian *sip-* „single wall“

The above-mentioned correspondence reveals the following:

a) In Hutt, *št* denotes a complex sound (probably *z*), which is found in Hutt cuneiform as well, although in texts the consonants *š/t/z* are interchangeable.

b) Colchian and Georgian have a common anlaut (spirant *b*), unlike Svan (and Hutt).

c) Colchian and Svan have a common auslaut, unlike Georgian. In this context, Hutt coincides with Georgian, although in the text the word-form is written by means of VC syllabogram. Syllables of this structure do not make a distinction between voiced and voiceless consonants. In general, the sound correspondence between Hutt and Kartvelian is as follows: Hutt voiceless, Kartvelian - voiced⁵.

d) The vocal element is common for all the languages under analysis.

In my opinion, Svan has preserved the original root, and, on the chronological level of common Kartvelian parent language, the root must have been **cib-*. Hutt data support this opinion, whereas in Colchian-Georgian **ც>ს* spirantization must have taken place. The same root **cib-* has been restored by M.Chukhua on the common Kartvelian level, albeit based

1 Topuria-Kaldani 2000 (electronic version): www.ice.ge/liv/liv/svanur1.php

2 Detailed information on Hutt orthography is provided by Soysal 2004, 69-...

3 Kobalia 2010 (electronic version): www.ice.ge/liv/liv/megr.php

4 Menteshashvili 1943, 109.

5 Kochlamazashvili 2015, 167-72.

on different data¹.

The link between these roots is supported not only by the phonetic structure but by semantic closeness as well: door : fence : wall are lexemes containing the seme of limit/boundary, denoting the end of a certain space.

REFERENCES

- V. Topuria, M. Kaldani, Svan Dictionary, Tbilisi, 2000 (electronic version): www.ice.ge/liv/liv/svanur1.php
- L. Kochlamazashvili. Issues of Structure of the Hutt Language. Tbilisi, 2016
- L. Kochlamazashvili. Hutt-Kartvelian Isoglosses . "The Journal of Oriental Studies", N5, Tbilisi, 2015: pp. 167-72
- S. Menteshashvili, Qiziki Dictionary. Tbilisi, 1943
- A. Kobalia. Megrelian Dictionary. Tbilisi, 2010 (electronic version): www.ice.ge/liv/liv/megr.php
- M. Chukhua. Georgian-Circassian-Abkhazian Etymological Research. Tbilisi, 2017
- Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazkoi (KUB), N2. Berlin. 1922.
- O. Soysal, Hattischer wortschatz in hethitischer Textüberlieferung. Chicago 2004.

¹ Chukhua 2017, 467.