

Ellueššar, lalakueššar, šuppaleššar: Collective animal nouns in -eššar in Hittite¹

Virna Fagiolo
Università per Stranieri di Siena ✉ 

<https://dx.doi.org/10.5209/cfcg.98159>

Recibido: 27 de septiembre de 2024 • Aceptado: 12 de octubre de 2024

Abstract: This paper details an analysis of the derivational process in Hittite of collective nouns for animals characterized by the suffix -eššar, which is one of the Hittite heteroclitic suffixes in -r/-n- together with -(a)tar and -war (-mar). As well as deriving action and abstract nouns from verbs and adjectives, this suffix also seems to give rise to some collectives from nouns. In particular, the three collective formations *lalakueššar* ‘colony of ants, anthill’ < *lalakueša*- ‘ant’, *šuppaleššar* ‘livestock, animal fence’ < *šuppal(a)*- ‘animal’ and the uncertain *ellueššar* < *illu*-, usually presented in relation to the etymology of Hitt. *illuyanka*-, were taken into consideration. The purpose of the analysis is, firstly, to investigate how these collective formations in -eššar fit the framework of collective nouns offered by the other Indo-European languages, and, secondly, to examine the relationship between collective and place nouns using a comparative approach, since the collective formations in -eššar also seem to develop a locative meaning.

Keywords: Indo-European linguistics; Hittite language; Collective nouns; Derivational morphology.

^{ES} *Ellueššar, lalakueššar, šuppaleššar:* Sustantivos colectivos de animales en -eššar en hitita

Resumen: Este trabajo realiza un análisis de la derivación en hitita de los sustantivos colectivos de animales caracterizados por el sufijo -eššar, que es uno de los sufijos heteroclíticos hititas en -r/-n-, junto con -(a)tar y -war (-mar). Además de derivar nombres de acción y abstractos a partir de verbos y adjetivos, este sufijo parece originar también unos colectivos a partir de sustantivos. En particular, se consideran aquí las tres formaciones colectivas: *lalakueššar* ‘colonia de hormigas, hormiguero’ < *lalakueša*- ‘hormiga’; *šuppaleššar* ‘ganado, corral de animales’ < *šuppal(a)*- ‘animal’; y el incierto *ellueššar* < *illu*-, usualmente presentado en relación con la etimología del hitita *illuyanka*-. De hecho, el propósito del análisis es, por un lado, investigar cómo estas formaciones colectivas en -eššar encajan en el marco de los sustantivos colectivos ofrecidos por otras lenguas indoeuropeas. Por otro lado, la segunda sección de la investigación está dedicada a la relación entre sustantivos colectivos y de lugar –siempre desde un enfoque comparativo–, ya que estas formaciones colectivas en -eššar parecen desarrollar también un significado locativo.

¹ I would like to thank Paola Dardano, Marianna Pozza and Rita Francia for having read a preliminary version of the paper.

As a part of the Progetto PRIN 2022 *Non-finite verbal forms in ancient Indo-European languages: diachronic, synchronic and cross-linguistic perspectives* (Prot. 2022RSTTAZ, CUP E53D23008980006), Principal Investigator Paola Dardano.

Palabras clave: lingüística indoeuropea; lengua hitita; sustantivos colectivos; morfología derivativa.

Summary: 1. Introduction. The definition of “collective”. 1.1. Indo-European collective. 2. The case study: animal collective nouns in -eššar in Hittite. 2.1. *lalakueššar* ‘swarm of ants, anthill’ < *lalakueša*- ‘ant’. 2.2. *šuppaleššar* ‘livestock, animal fence’ < *šupp(a)*- ‘(domestic) animal’. 2.3. *ellueššar* < *illu*- (?). 3. Remarks on the formation of collectives in -eššar. 4. Concluding remarks.

How to cite: Fagiolo, V (2025). *Ellueššar, lalakueššar, šuppaleššar*: Collective animal nouns in -eššar in Hittite. *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica (Estudios Griegos e Indoeuropeos)*, 35, 9-21.

1. Introduction. The definition of “collective”

One of the main problems encountered when dealing with the category of nominal number is what the label “collective noun” means. As Dedè (2013: 46) points out, the term “collective” has been widely used by scholars over the years, often being applied to different types of nouns. Very often, in fact, behind the concept of “collective” there is only a vague reference to the idea of multiplicity.²

In this regard, Gil (1996: 66 ff.) provides a summary of the main interpretations of “collective” as a concept indicating (1) mass nouns whose meaning refers to a homogeneous mass indivisible into subunits (e.g., Engl. *water, gold, saliva*),³ (2) nouns that designate set varieties as opposed to individual varieties (e.g., Engl. *colleagues, brothers, friends*),⁴ (3) non-additive nouns indicating a set of entities, whose meaning is not given by the sum of the objects, but by their relationships (e.g., Engl. *collection, family, commission*).⁵ Of these three types of nouns, the label “collective” is preferably applied to the group of non-additive nouns and partly to mass nouns. The main difference between non-additive nouns and mass nouns is that non-additive nouns are countable,⁶ i.e., describable from a semantic point of view as [+ bounded] [+ internal structure], while mass nouns are [- bounded] [- internal structure].⁷

In this study, “collective” nouns are intended to designate non-additive nouns: more specifically, this convention refers to the now predominant meaning of “collective noun” as a noun, typically singular, indicating a plurality.⁸ Within this category, Nussbaum (2014: 282) distinguishes between finite collectives (e.g., Engl. *herd, population*) and non-finite collectives (e.g., *cutlery, humanity*), and between non-derived collectives (e.g., Engl. *group, family*) and derived collectives (e.g., *plumage, machinery*). However, Gardelle (2019: 63) emphasizes that it seems necessary to make a further differentiation within the group of collective nouns, such as the one used by Borillo (1997: 113 ff.), between (1) nouns that are collective by definition, grouped

² Cf. Gardelle (2019: 3 ff.).

³ Cf. Goodman (1966: 54).

⁴ Among others, cf. Vendler (1967: 70 ff.), Dik (1972: 208 ff.), Wierzbicka (1980: 260 ff.), Winter (2002: 494 ff.).

⁵ E.g. Palmer (1976: 77 ff.), Allan (1980: 550), Corbett (2000: 119), Matasović (2005: 108), Gaeta (2020: 15).

⁶ There is a reference to the property of “countability” (it. “denumerabilità”) for which «I nomi denumerabili possono essere flessi al plurale» (Bianchi 2012: 85) and, thus, «Fra i nomi comuni denumerabili, i nomi collettivi (ad es. commissione, gruppo...), anche quando sintatticamente singolari, sembrano rimandare a una pluralità di eventi».

⁷ Dedè (2013: 51).

⁸ Cf. Gil (1996: 68): «The use of the term ‘collective’ to denote a singular form with possible plural meaning recurs as a leitmotif alongside other, purely semantic usages of the term»; Schwarzschild (1996: 36 ff.): «A collective noun is defined in the NED [New English Dictionary by Murray, Bradley, Craigie. Oxf. 1884] as ‘a substantive which (in the singular) denotes a collection or number of individuals.’ We may accept this definition»; Depraetere (2003: 86): «A collective noun is a morphologically singular noun with multiple reference that is compatible with a plural verb»; Nussbaum (2014: 281): «This term [collective] will be reserved for items that are syntactic ± morphological singulars that make reference to a multiplicity»; Birkenes & Sommer (2015: 184): «Collective nouns are morphologically singular but semantically both singular and plural may thus trigger plural agreement».

into (a) only collective nouns (e.g., *group*) and (b) deverbal nouns that acquire a collective meaning by metonymy (e.g., *association*), and (2) nouns that acquire the value of collective through re-categorization rules, whereby these nouns are re-categorized as collectives on the basis of the context (e.g. *Mozambican football*, *the whole street*).

1.1. Indo-European collective

Similarly, the Indo-European collective has been the focus of numerous studies since the early days of Indo-European studies. Particularly since Schmidt (1889),⁹ there have been multiple studies addressing the connection between the feminine gender, the abstract, the collective, and the plural neuter.¹⁰ Regarding the collective, the two main open questions are: firstly, whether the plural neuter attested in individual Indo-European languages continues an original category of the collective; and, secondly, whether the Indo-European feminine gender developed from collective nouns.

Dedè (2013: 49) argues that considerable discussion has taken place regarding the nature of the grammatical category of the collective which can be reconstructed for PIE, proposing alternatives such as (1) a collective as an inflectional category, and (2) a collective as a derivational lexical category. However, nowadays, the prevailing belief leans towards the collective as a formation developed in PIE through derivational processes, as suggested, for example, by the inability to reconstruct collective endings in the Indo-European verbal system.¹¹ It remains clear, however, that in the Indo-European languages there were multiple morphological processes through which collectives could be derived.

In addition to the reference to the nominal gender system, the analysis of the Indo-European collective is also a crucial point within the framework of the nominal number discussed by Belardi (1950: 207 ff.). Belardi distinguishes between “collective” nouns and “quantitative” nouns: unlike the latter, “collective” nouns are characterized by the features of juxtaposition¹² or synthesis,¹³ appearing in the singular when the representation of the whole predominates (“synthetic collective”), and in the plural when the representation of the parts predominates (“analytical collective”). The other two typical features of nouns mentioned in this study, which are regarded incompatible with the definition of “collective”, are those defined by Belardi as the sum and the individual.¹⁴ Therefore, Belardi proposes to add to the opposition of singularity-plurality in the Indo-European nominal number system a second, less widespread opposition, *i.e.* quantitative-collective.

2. The case study: animal collective nouns in -eššar in Hittite

This study provides an overview of the formation of collective animal nouns in Hittite using the suffix -eššar, which is one of the three heteroclitic suffixes in -r/-n- in Hittite, along with -(a)tar and

⁹ Neri & Schuhmann (2014: 2) observe that part of Schmidt's theory was already contained in Meier's work (1846), according to which the common ancestor of the Semitic and Indo-European language families was characterized by a two-gender system consisting of masculine and neuter. Consequently, the feminine gender would have originated later from the neuter, while the Indo-European plural neuter would have developed from singular abstract nouns.

¹⁰ Cf. Eichner (1985), Hardarson (1987), Tichy (1993), Fritz (1998), Ledo-Lemos (2003), Luraghi (2009a, 2009b, 2011), Melchert (2011), Hartmann (2014), Nussbaum (2014).

¹¹ Cf. Matasović (2005: 109).

¹² «Possiamo definire giustapposizione analitica l'insieme (entità non monadica) noeticamente distinto attraverso un dato significativo –che non è enumerabile aritmeticamente nei suoi componenti, pur supponendoli» (Belardi 1950: 207).

¹³ «[Possiamo definire] sintesi l'entità monadica, che, oltre a non permettere l'enumerazione dei componenti, inesistenti per definizione, non comporta moltiplicabilità, mancando la determinazione del quantum moltiplicabile» (*ibidem*).

¹⁴ «Definiamo somma l'entità nella quale si può predicare la quantità numerica degli elementi costitutivi; individuo l'entità caratterizzata dall'unicità e dalla moltiplicabilità» (*ibidem*).

-war (-mar).¹⁵ As noted in Hoffner & Melchert (2008: 58) among other studies,¹⁶ as well as forming action nouns¹⁷ from verbs, and abstract and concrete nouns¹⁸ from adjectives, the suffix -eššar also gives rise to «a few collectives from nouns». Specifically, three collective animal nouns are examined: *lalakueššar* 'swarm of ants, anthill' < *lalakueša*- 'ant', *šuppaleššar* 'livestock, animal enclosure' < *šuppal(a)*- 'animal', and the debated *ellueššar* < *illu*-¹⁹, usually analyzed together with the etymology of Hittite *illuyanka*-. This choice is driven by the observation of Gardelle (2019: 75 ff.) that collective animal nouns, which she categorizes into subgroups of collective-only nouns (e.g., Engl. *herd*, *covey*, *horde*) and nouns with a collective sense (e.g., Engl. *pride*, *species*, *fauna*), are rarely mentioned in linguistic research.

The aim of this research is to analyze these three nouns on the basis of the traits of collective nouns outlined here and to place them within the presented theoretical framework. Additionally, I aim to delineate the characteristics of these derivatives in -eššar compared to other morphological processes for forming collective nouns in Hittite. Indeed, in the Hittite language, there are some examples where the plural is realized as a collective, and this kind of plural can be characterized by an -a ending, an -i ending, or the plural determiner ^{H.A.20}. In the analysis of *ellueššar*, an alternative interpretation of the noun from those previously is also given.

2.1. *lalakueššar* 'swarm of ants, anthill' < *lalakueša*- 'ant'

The first noun that seems to fall into this category of collectives in -eššar is *lalakueššar*, derived from *lalakueša*- 'ant':²¹ the term *lalakueššar* – a haplological form of **lalakuešeššar* (Melchert, 1994: 171, among others)²² – is generally translated as 'Ameisenschwarm' (Neumann 1958: 88), 'fourmilière' (Laroche 1961: 85), 'colony of ants' (Collins 1989: 245), 'ant swarm' (Melchert 1994: 171), 'ant-colony, ant invasion' (HED L: 45), 'Ameisenschwarm' (HEG L-M: 22), 'a swarm or colony of ants' (CHD L-N: 7), 'ant-colony, ant swarm' (EDHIL: 516) and defined as a collective formation.²³ Below, the five attestations of the noun are reported:

- [1] ABoT 38, 3-4 (NH, CTH 670)]-ši *la-la-ku-e-eš-šar* u-iz-zi (4)]x *ḫu-uk-ki-iš-ki-mi* '(If a swarm of ants come, [...] I conjure (as follows))'.
- [2] KUB 55.67 (+) I 3 (NH, CTH 404) *la-la-ú-eš-na-aš* AMA-aš GUD-uš 'Cow, mother of the swarm of ants'.

¹⁵ For a description of these suffixes from a morphological and semantic point of view cf. Hoffner & Melchert (2008: 57 ff., 126 ff.), Kammenhuber (1954: 44 ff., 245 ff., 404 ff.; 1955: 345 ff.), Kronasser (1966: 287 ff.), Rieken (1999: 290 ff.), Zeifelder (2001a: 730 ff., 2001b: 250 ff.), Lühr (2008: 19 ff., 44 ff., 53 ff., 85 ff.), Fagiolo (2023).

¹⁶ Cf. Laroche (1961: 84): «En hittite, le suffixe -eššar/-ešna- s'ajoute à des radicaux verbaux ou nominaux. Dans l'un et l'autre cas, le dérivé désigne une collectivité d'êtres ou d'objets caractérisée par l'action verbale ou par le substantif.»; Kronasser (1966: 290): «Da sich weiterhin bei Abstrakta auch kollektive Bedeutungen ergeben können (*Menschheit* u.a.), werden auch Kollektiva mit -eššar gebildet (*alaleššar* u.a.); Neumann (1988: 259): «Andernteils läßt sich bei einigen der denominalen Bildungen eine kollektive Bedeutung erkennen»; Rieken (1999: 383): «Die denominalen Ableitungen mittels -eššar/-ešna- gleichen indessen semantisch den Bildungen auf -atar, denn sie „sagen gegenständlich das aus, was in der Bedeutung des Adjektivs liegt“, benennen eine Eigenschaft oder ein Kollektivum des zugrundeliegenden substantivischen Begriffs»; Zeifelder (2001b: 253): «Betrachtet man nun aber die denominalen Bildungen, so stellt man fest, daß hier eine weitere Untergliederung notwendig ist. Denn die Ableitungen von Substantiven von Substantiven sind durchgängig Kollektiva, während die Ableitungen von Adjektiven ebenso durchgängig Abstrakta darstellen»; Lühr (2008: 55): «Das Hethitische besitzt zwei Suffixe zur Bildung denominaler Kollektiva, diese sind das Suffix -atar und das Suffix -eššar. [...] Ab der mittelhethitischen Zeitstufe belegt sind die Ableitungen auf -eššar».

¹⁷ The distinction between *nomina actionis* and *nomina rei actae* within action nouns is not taken into account here.

¹⁸ On the concrete value of nouns in -eššar see Kammenhuber (1954: 403 ff.).

¹⁹ It should be noted that in Hittite it is common to find a vowel alternation between -e- and -i-, see Hoffner & Melchert (2008: 26 ff.).

²⁰ Cf. Eichner (1985: 149 ff.), Neu (1992: 202 ff.), Prins (1997), Boley (1999), Melchert (2000: 62 ff.).

²¹ 'ant, emmet' (HED L: 44), 'Ameise' (HEG L-M: 21), 'ant' (CHD L-N: 27), 'ant' (EDHIL: 516).

²² Neumann (1958: 88), Kronasser (1966: 104), Berman (1977: 235), Zeifelder (2001b: 253).

²³ Güterbock (1952: 37), Neumann (1958: 88), Hoffner (1974: 91), Melchert (1994: 171), Haas (2003: 494), HED (L: 45), HEG (L-M: 22).

- [3] KUB 3.94 II 26 (NH, CTH 306) É¹.KISIM₅xGÍR! = KI-ŠI-IB = KÚL-BA'-AB'-TU = **la-la-wi₅-iš-na-aš** '(a member) of a swarm of ants'.²⁴
- [4] KUB 43.59 + KUB 9.39 I 2-3 (LNH, CTH 543) [n]u-za šal-ú-i-na-aš pu-ru-ut (3) **la-la-ú-i-iš-na-aš** pu-ru-ut wa-ap-[pu]-wa-aš IM-an (4) NUMUN^{Hil.A} hu-u-ma-an-da MUNU₅ [BAPPIR] '(There is) soil of the šalwina-, soil of the anthill, clay of the riverbank, all kinds of seeds, malt and wort'.
- [5] KUB 58.109 IV 6'-7' (NH, CTH 780) [...w]a-ap-pu-wa-aš IM-a[n] (7') [...**la-la-u-i-iš-ša-na-a[š]** 'Cla[y] of the [r]iverbank [...of the a]nthill'.

Even if the *lalakueša*- ant in Hittite texts plays the dual role of being a threat to the harvest and a symbol of industriousness,²⁵ all instances of the term *lalakueššar* –except for example [3], which belongs to a multilingual lexical list– are taken from Hittite magical ritual texts, in which the *lalakueššar* is seen as a malignant entity.²⁶ As Haas (2003: 494 ff.) notes, in the Anatolian world ants were among the animals involved in the practice of *omina*: example [1], which along with example [5] constitutes an example of a ritual performed by the evoker MUNUSŠU.GI 'sorceress (old woman)' against adversities,²⁷ is an excerpt from a Hurrian-Hittite ritual directed against the swarm of ants, for which the sorceress must find a remedy. Example [2] is taken from the "pulling from the earth" (*taknaz dā*-) ritual of Maštigga, in which the woman addresses this 'cow, mother of the ant swarm'²⁸ to release the soul of the patient involved in the ritual. This would indeed be a ritual in which ants and spiders are drawn out of their dens in the underworld, where the patient's soul seems to already reside,²⁹ and they are placed under the cow dung.³⁰ Example [4] is an excerpt from the Šehuzzi ritual,³¹ in which there appears to be a reference to the anthill – understood as the nest of ants – and to the ants' ability to handle the earth.³² In this passage there seems to have been a semantic shift through metonymy, whereby *lalakueššar* could have changed its meaning from 'swarm of ants' to 'anthill', as it refers to a pile of earth accumulated by a *šalwini*- bird.³³

2.2. *šuppaleššar* 'livestock, animal fence' < *šupp(a)*- '(domestic) animal'

The interpretation of the collective *šuppaleššar* is more complex, as the meaning of the noun *šupp(a)*- from which it derives is uncertain; *šupp(a)*- is a noun attested from the Old Hittite period (OH), and its main interpretations are 'domesticated animals' (Laroche 1947: 192), 'ein Stück Vieh' (Kronasser 1966: 324, 331, 342), 'les animaux des champs' (Archi 1988: 28), 'livestock' (Collins 1989: 13), 'beast' (Archi 2002: 9), 'Tier, Vieh' (HEG Š/2: 1179), 'livestock' (CHD Š: 614), 'cattle' (EDHIL: 788). As can be seen from these interpretations, there is a fluctuation between an individual meaning of 'animal' and a collective meaning of 'livestock'. However, if this collective meaning of 'livestock' for *šupp(a)*- was accepted, it would not explain, on the one hand, the collective formation *šuppaleššar* analyzed here, and on the other hand, the collective plural *šuppala* attested

²⁴ The Sumerian term É¹.KISIM₅xGÍR and the Akkadian term *kulbābtu* both mean 'ant'; however, as noted in CHD (L: 27), the genitive *lalawišnaš*, whose reading is likely but not certain, of the collective noun would mean 'a unit of the ant swarm', i.e., 'an ant'. Based on a study of KUB 3.94, Hoffner (1974: 91) observes that the Hittite scribe may not have fully understood the columns containing the Sumerian and Akkadian terms.

²⁵ Collins (1989: 245).

²⁶ Güterbock (1952: 37).

²⁷ About these rituals see Haas & Wegner (1988).

²⁸ Cf. Torri (1998). In the duplicate Bo 2738 I 17, it is possible to read *akuwaš* AMA-aš GU₄-uš 'mother cow of spiders', see Collins (1989: 249), Puhvel (2002: 28). For the Maštigga ritual, see Miller (2004: 11ff.).

²⁹ For the role of the patient in this ritual, see Hutter (1998: 86).

³⁰ Haas (2003: 495).

³¹ Haas (2003: 176, 179), Mouton (2010: 118).

³² Collins (1989: 248).

³³ Cf. CHD (Š: 109).

in KBo 6.26 I 22, 26.³⁴ Therefore, I am inclined to give *šuppala* an individual interpretation of 'domestic animal'.³⁵

The collective derivative *šuppaleššar* is more difficult to interpret, and is generally understood as 'livestock pen?' (Hoffmann 1984: 135), 'livestock, cattle enclosure' (*HED* Š/2: 1179), 'stall' (Steitler 2017: 278), 'animal kingdom (?)', 'cattle pen (?)' or GN? [geographical name?] (*CHD* Š: 616). This noun is attested only in a passage from the Old Hittite period excerpted from invocations to Hattic deities:

- [6] VBoT 124 + KUB 31.143a III 3-6 (OS, CTH 733) [*ta-an-du-ki-iš-ni*^dUT]U?-uš zi-[*k* DINGIR^{MES}-(*na-na iš-tar-na*)...] (4) [...M]UNUS.LUGAL-aš^{URU}Ha[*aš-ka-ḫa-aš-ki-wa-x*]... (5) [...an-(da)]*le-e šu-wa*[-*i-e-ši tak-na-aš*^dUTU-uš a-uš-zī] (6) [...] **šū-up-pa-le-e-eš**[(*ni le-e šu-wa-i-e-ši*)]³⁶ '[To mankind] yo[u] are the S[ungoddess(?)]. But among [the god]s [you are...], [q]ueen. [At(?)] the town of Ḫaškahāškiwa(-)[...] do not look at [...], the Sungoddess of the Earth will see you. [...] Do not look at the animal kingdom/cattle pen (?)'

The passage reported in [6] is part of a very important text, where a distinction is made between the language of the humans and the language of the gods, pertaining to a cult originating in the region of Zalpa. In this text, the movements of the prince (DUMU) are described in various locations, invoking the local deities each time.³⁷ The invocation *šuppalešni le-šūwaieši* 'do not look at the livestock/animal enclosure' is therefore directed towards the Earth Sun goddess (*taknaš*^dUTU).³⁸ The fragmentary nature of the passage does not allow us to say much about the dative *šuppalešni* of the collective *šuppaleššar*, except that, as suggested by translations of the text so far,³⁹ there may have been a metonymic semantic shift from a collective noun denoting livestock to a noun denoting an animal fence, i.e., the place where livestock is contained. This semantic shift to a place noun seems plausible, especially considering that it is not uncommon for the verb *šūwaye-* 'to look',⁴⁰ on which the dative *šuppalešni* depends, to be constructed with allative or dative-locative indicating place nouns,⁴¹ as could well be the case with the animal enclosure here.

2.3. *ellueššar* < *illu-* (?)

While it seems possible to outline a more or less likely meaning of collective or place nouns in the case of *lalakueššar* and *šuppaleššar*, the situation with the noun *ellueššar* is much more complex, as the interpretation of the element *illu-* from which it derives has always been uncertain. Below I report the only passage where this noun is integrally attested:

³⁴ *ták-ku šu-up-pa-la-aš-še-et ku-e-el-qa ši-e-ú-ni-ah-ta* (23) *ta-at pār-ku-nu-zi na-at ar-ḫa pé-en-na-a-i* (24) *i-šu-wa-na-al-li-ma-kan i-šu-wa-an da-a-i* (25) *a-ri-iš-ši-ma-at Ū-UL te-ez-zi*^U*a-ra-aš-ša* (26) *U-UL ša-ak-ki šu-up-pa-la-aš-še-et pé-en-na-a-i* (27) *na-at a-ki šar-ni-ik-zi-il* 'If anyone's animals are smitten (with disease) by a god, and (the owner) performs a purification ritual upon them, and drives them back home, and he puts the mud (?) (used in the ritual) on the mud pile (?), but doesn't tell his colleague, so that the colleague – not knowing – drives his own animals there, and they die, there will be compensation' (KBo 6.26 I 22-27).

³⁵ Collins (1989: 14), also echoed in *CHD* (Š: 14), argues that there is no etymological connection between *šupp(a)-* and the adjective *šuppi-* 'sacred, pure' – a connection that was previously thought to interpret *šupp(a)-* as designating wild animals – and that there can be no doubt that *šupp(a)-* designates domestic animals.

³⁶ See dupl. KUB 60.20, 3-6 (OH/NS).

³⁷ Cf. Popko (2003: 73), Steitler (2017: 271).

³⁸ For a portrayal of the Sun Goddess of the Earth see Torri (1999: 89 ff.).

³⁹ 'Treibe nicht in die Viehhürde (?)' (Hoffmann 1984: 135), 'Do not look to the stall' (Steitler 2017: 278), 'Treibe [...] nicht in den Viehpferch!' (*HEG* Š/2: 1179), 'Do not look at the animal kingdom/cattle pen (?)' (*CHD* Š: 616). Only Neu (1983: 358) assumes that it is a city name and supposes a^{URU} determinative preceding the dative *šuppalešni*, but this interpretation is considered questionable by Del Monte (1992: 148).

⁴⁰ 'spähen, nachschauen; überprüfen, kontrollieren' (*HEG* Š/2), '(intrans.) to look (at), to look for compensation (in OH legal idioms), (trans.) to regard (favorably)' (*CHD* Š: 539).

⁴¹ Cf. KUB 29.1, 51-52 (NH, CTH 414) *ma-a-an pa-a-i-ši-ma* (52) *nu ú-li-li-ya* ^{GIŠ}TIR-na *šu-ú-wa-ya* 'When you go, look at the vegetation and forest', and also the expression *parna=šše=a šūwaye-* 'to look into (= have recourse to) the estate (of the offender) for it (the damages or compensation)', e.g. KBo 6.2 I 3, 41, IV 18. On this verbal reagency cf. *CHD* (Š: 540-1).

- [7] KBo 31.91 III 11-14 (NH, CTH 458) [*par-ga-u-*]wa-az HUR.SAG^{MEŠ}-az *ḫal-lu-u-wa-az* [*ḫa-ar-ri-ya-az* (12) [*ḫal*]-lu-u-wa-az *ḫu-un-ḫu-eš-na-az* *ḫal-lu-u-[wa-az* (13) [*ḫal*]-lu-u-wa-az *al-tan-na-az* *ḫal-lu-u-wa-az* [(14) [*na*]-na-an-ku-uš-ši-ya-az **el-lu-eš-na-az** ['From the [hi]gh mountains, from the deep [valleys], from the deep waves, from the deep [...], from the deep fountains, from the deep [...], from the dark **ellueššar**'.⁴²

This example is a fragment from the text of an evocation ritual (CTH 458), in which the places where a god would have disappeared are mentioned.⁴³ A major interpretative problem of the passage is precisely the expression *nanankuššiyaz elluešnaz* 'from the dark *ellueššar*', as the noun *ellueššar* has been translated in various ways such as 'Geröllfeld (??)' (Haas 1970: 162), 'snakepit, snake hole' (Watkins 1985: 255)⁴⁴, 'Geröllfeld (?)/cave (?)' (Kassian 2000: 102), 'Schlangenloch' (Brosch 2010: 285), 'Drachenhöhle' (Oettinger 2010: 193), 'Geröllfeld (?)' (HW2 II: 36), 'Geröllfeld (?)', 'Schlangenloch (?)' (HH: 41). Starting from Watkins (1985: 255), scholars have been convinced⁴⁵ that the term *ellueššar* is connected to the Hittite ^{MUŠ}*illuyanka-* 'fish-serpent' – composed of *illu-* 'fish' + *-anka-* 'serpent'⁴⁶ – so the element *illu-* of *illuyanka-* would be the same from which *ellueššar* derives, presumably designating the lair of the beings called *illuyankaš*. New developments in the etymology of *illuyanka-* could provide additional insights for interpreting *ellueššar*.

Indeed, firstly Katz (1998: 326) interpreted the noun *illuyanka-* as a compound of *illu-* 'eel' and *-anka-* 'serpent' meaning 'eel-serpent',⁴⁷ and this theory was supported by Oettinger (2010a: 193), who assumed a semantic shift of *illu-* from 'eel' to 'serpent' and finally to 'dragon'.⁴⁸ On the basis of this, Fagiolo (2022) formulated the hypothesis according to which the element *illu-* could have a generic meaning of 'fish' based on a comparison with Greek ἔλλυες / ἑλλός 'fish'⁴⁹ and the Germanic lexical family Eng. *eel*, OHG *al*, Ger. *Aal*, ON *all* 'eel'.⁵⁰

Starting from the proposed meaning of 'fish' for the element *illu-* and from the hypothesis that *illu-* might be the Hittite word for 'fish', usually indicated by the Sumerogram KU₆, it can be suggested that *ellueššar* is another derivative in *-eššar* originating from an animal noun. From the passage quoted in [7], there seem to be no doubts that it refers to a place noun, so it can be assumed that *ellueššar* could originally have a collective meaning such as 'school of fish'⁵¹ – as one would expect from the suffixation in *-eššar-* which, in the same way as *lalakueššar* and *suppaleššar*, would have undergone a semantic change through metonymy, transforming it into a noun indicating a place like 'fish den'.

From a linguistic perspective, this new interpretation of 'fish den' might be reinforced by the fact that, as observed by Haas (1970: 162) and others,⁵² it can be assumed that the corrupted form ^{NA4}*el-lu-e* in KBo 14.20 II 18 should also be reconstructed as *ellueššar*, where the determinative ^{NA4} 'stone',⁵³ normally used for mineral nouns, would indicate the stony nature of the referent of this noun, a condition that would be compatible with the fact that fish dens are typically rocks in

⁴² F. Fuscagni (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 458.22 (Expl. A, 03.09.2013).

⁴³ Haas (1970: 162), Watkins (1985: 255).

⁴⁴ Watkins' translation is also taken by Ünal (1990: 356).

⁴⁵ Ünal (1990: 356), Katz (1998: 324), Brosch (2010: 285), Oettinger (2010: 193).

⁴⁶ For this interpretation of the noun *illuyanka-* see Fagiolo (2022).

⁴⁷ «'snake-eel': Lat. *angui(i)-il(l)a* ~ Gk. ἔγχι-ελυς; 'eel-snake': Hitt. *illuy-ankaš*, etc. ~ Gk. Ἐλλερ(ο)-οφι- (?)» (Katz 1998: 326).

⁴⁸ «Also ist für das Hethitische **ḫelH-u-* oder **ḫelH-u-* und für das germanische Wort **ḫelHo-* zu rekonstruieren. Was die Semantik betrifft, so dürfte sich dieses **ḫelHu-* in Anatolischen von ‚Aal‘ über ‚Schlange‘ zu ‚Drachen‘ entwickelt haben» (Oettinger 2010: 193).

⁴⁹ Cf. Hsch. s.v. ἔλλυες («ζῷα ἐν τῷ Ἐσμαράγδῳ ποταμῷ»), LSJ s.v. ἔλλοψ («epith. of fish. [...] also ἔλλοπος, ἑλλός, [...] fish, in general, [...] an unknown sea-fish»).

⁵⁰ It is indeed supposed that there was a semantic narrowing from 'fish' to 'eel'.

⁵¹ Neumann (1988: 259) cites the name *ellueššar* as an example of how place names in Hittite can develop from collective nouns.

⁵² Watkins (1985: 255), HW2 (II: 36).

⁵³ „Stein“, vor Steinnamen' (HZL: 383), 'Stein (auch ZÁ gelesen; akk. *abnu*) (HW: 287), 'Stein (heth. ^{NA4}*aku-*, ^{NA4}*peru-* n., ^{NA4}*peruna-* c.) (auch als Determinativ)' (HH: 403).

water. At the same time, this interpretation of 'fish den' could be in accordance with the adjective *nanankušši(ya)*- 'dark, obscured, gloomy'⁵⁴ that accompanies *ellueššar*, since, in light of what suggested by Watkins (1985: 255) that «the epithet *nanankušši*- and the determinative point to a dark, stony, 'chthonic' place where a divinity can vanish», it is easy to imagine a stony fish den whose entrance appears dark from the outside. The fact that *ellueššar* is a noun related to an aquatic rather than a terrestrial environment might also be confirmed by the coordination and sequential relationship it establishes with the nouns *hunhuneššar* 'wave'⁵⁵ and also, maybe, with *altanni*- 'spring',⁵⁶ even if a spring does not necessarily imply a marine setting.

On the basis of these observations, *ellueššar* might be a noun in -*eššar* meaning 'fish den' – with a possible original collective meaning of 'school of fish' – which could constitute a rocky and dark place, in line with the aquatic setting of the passage, and which could serve as a hiding place for the deities along with the other places mentioned in the example [7].

3. Remarks on the formation of collectives in -*eššar*

In light of the analysis of the three nouns *ellueššar*, *lalakueššar* and *šuppaleššar*, it is possible to offer some preliminary observations, subject to expansion with future studies, on the formation of collective nouns in -*eššar* in Hittite, considering the theoretical framework outlined for collective formations in Indo-European languages. In particular, it should be noted that the suffix -*eššar* primarily functions to derive abstract nouns from nominal and adjectival bases, but typologically it is very common for an abstract suffix to develop a collective meaning,⁵⁷ since «that abstract and collective are neighboring concepts is certainly not a new idea»⁵⁸ and «extension of abstract nouns to collective is also known from several languages»:⁵⁹ this phenomenon falls within the range of shifts from abstract to concrete, to the extent that nouns suffixed with -*eššar* show a greater tendency to concretize compared to derivatives with other heteroclititic suffixes.⁶⁰ Additionally, from the examples analyzed here, it appears that the collective value can undergo a further shift in meaning to become a place noun.⁶¹ This tendency might be confirmed by the fact that, as Zeilfelder (2001b: 254) observes, in Hittite there is a number of place nouns ending in -*ešna* and -*šša/-ušša*, which could be derivatives from the oblique case of collective nouns in -*eššar*, but the issue would require more in-depth studies to be thoroughly addressed.⁶²

On the basis of the theoretical framework outlined for collective nouns in Indo-European languages (cf. *supra*), collective formations in -*eššar* could be classified as "finite" and derived collectives. It should be emphasized that, since these are collective formations developed metonymically from an initial abstract meaning, collectives in *eššar* would fall into the category of nouns with collective sense, distinct from collective-only nouns.⁶³ These collective formations in -*eššar* thus complement the other morphological processes through which the collective category

⁵⁴ 'dark, darkened, tenebrous' (HED N: 60), 'dunkel' (HEG N: 274), 'dark, obscure, gloomy' (CHD L-N: 395).

⁵⁵ 'Woge' (HEG A-K: 286), 'Wassermasse, Gewässer, Wasserflut, Welle, Woge' (HW2: 721).

⁵⁶ 'source, spring; pool, basin, tank' (HED A E I: 41), 'Quelle; Wasserbassin; Brunnen' (HEG A-K: 20), 'Quelle (mit Oberlauf des Flusses, z.T. künstl. gestaut); Wasserbassin; Brunnen (?)' (HW2 I: 62).

⁵⁷ Cf. Gaide (1989: 225ff.), Ledo-Lemos (2003: 123ff.), Luraghi (2009a: 117ff.), Luraghi (2009b: 6ff.), Luraghi (2011: 437).

⁵⁸ Luraghi (2009b: 6).

⁵⁹ Luraghi (2009a: 117).

⁶⁰ In this regard, Friedrich (1960: 38) includes -*eššar* among the abstract suffixes, but specifies that it is «oft ziemlich konkret», while Neumann (1988: 259) argues that «Solange wir über die Herkunft des Suffixes nichts Sicheres aussagen können, ist es vorsichtiger, anhand der Kontexte festzustellen, daß es sich bei den betr. Substantiva überwiegend um Bezeichnungen für Konkrete handelt.» Cf. also Götze (1928: 62-3), Zeilfelder (2001b: 251).

⁶¹ Cf. also Neumann (1988: 259), according to whom «Solche Kollektivbezeichnungen können der Natur der Sache nach leicht zu Geländebezeichnungen werden, diese wiederum zu Ortsnamen.»

⁶² For an overview of place nouns in -*ešna* and -*šša/-ušša* and their connection to the suffix -*eššar*, see Forrer (1938: 180), Laroche (1961: 84ff.), and Neumann (1988).

⁶³ Cf. Gardelle (2019: 67).

is realized in Hittite. Lastly, it is interesting to note that in the case of *šuppala(a)-*, both the collective noun *šuppaleššar* and the collective plural *šuppala* are attested. It should be investigated whether any semantic differences can be identified between these two different types of collectives. On the basis of the data analyzed so far, the collective *šuppaleššar* might be interpreted as a “synthetic” collective, where the representation of the whole prevails, as suggested by the original abstract value of the term, while the collective plural *šuppala* might be analyzed as an “analytic” collective, where the representation of the parts prevails (cf. *supra*).

4. Concluding remarks

In this study, I conducted an analysis of the three nouns *ellueššar* ‘fish den, snakepit (orig. school of fish?)’, *lalakueššar* ‘swarm of ants, anthill’, and *šuppaleššar* ‘livestock, animal pen’, derived through the heteroclite suffix *-eššar*, in relation to the framework provided by collectives in the Indo-European linguistic family. I observed that, starting from this abstract suffix, it is possible to derive nouns that develop a collective meaning, which in turn can give rise to place nouns through metonymy. In particular, an attempt was made to offer a new interpretation of the noun *ellueššar*, which is usually related by scholars to Hitt. *illuyanka-*, but whose meaning has always been debated due to the issues presented by the etymology of *illuyanka-*.

At this point, the question that naturally arises, and which deserves further investigation in future research, is whether this development of collective nouns in Hittite, through the abstract suffix *-eššar*, is a phenomenon regulated by some semantic restriction of the nominal base of derivation, or if it is a generalized development of *-eššar* from abstract to collective suffix. At the same time, it would be meaningful to compare the derivatives through this suffix with the collective formations developed by the other heteroclite suffix *-(a)tar*. Finally, it will be possible to examine any semantic and/or morphological differences between the collective formations in *-eššar* and the Hittite plural collectives in *-a*, *-i*, and ^{HL.A}.

Abbreviations

ABoT = BALKAN, K. (1948) (ed.), *Ankara Arkeoloji Muzesinde bulunan Bogazkoy tabletler*, Istanbul, Milli Egitim Basimevi.

Bo = *Inventory number of Boğazköy tablets 1906-1912*.

CHD = GÜTERBOCK, H.G. & HOFFNER, H.A., (1980-) (eds.), *The Hittite dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, Chicago, The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

EDHIL = KLOEKHORST, A. (2008), *Etymological dictionary of the Hittite inherited lexicon*, Leiden-Boston, Brill.

HED = PUHVEL, J. (1984-), *Hittite etymological dictionary*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.

HEG = TISCHLER, J. (1977-2016), *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*, Innsbruck, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

HH = TISCHLER, J. (2001), *Hethitisches Handwörterbuch. Mit dem Wortschatz der Nachbarsprachen*, Innsbruck, Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.

HW = FRIEDRICH, J. (1954), *Hethitisches Wörterbuch. Kurzgefasste kritische Sammlung der Deutungen hethitischer Wörter*, Heidelberg, Winter.

HW2 = FRIEDRICH, F., KAMMENHUBER, A. & HOFFMANN, I. (1975-) (eds.), *Hethitisches Wörterbuch. Zweite, völlig neubearbeitete Auflage auf der Grundlage der edierten hethitischen Texte*, Heidelberg, Winter.

HZL = RÜSTER, CH. & NEU, E. (1989), *Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon. Inventar und Interpretation der Keilschriftzeichen aus den Boğazköy-Texten*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.

KBo = *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi* (1916-), Leipzig-Berlin, J.C. Hinrichs.

KUB = *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi* (1921-1990), Berlin, Vorderasiatische Abteilung der Staatlichen Museen.

VBoT = GÖTZE, A. (1930), *Verstreute Boghazkoi-texte*, Marburg, Lahn.

References

ALLAN, K. (1980), «Nouns and countability», *Language*, LVI: 541-567.

- ARCHI, A. (1988), «Société des hommes et société des animaux», in F. Imparati (ed.), *Studi di storia e di filologia anatolica dedicati a Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli*, Firenze-Elite: 25-37.
- ARCHI, A. (2002), «Ea and the Beast. A Song Related to the Kumarpi Cycle», in P. Taracha (ed.) *Silva Anatolica. Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, Warsaw, Agade: 1-10.
- BELARDI, W. (1950), «La questione del numero nominale», *Ricerche linguistiche*, I: 204-233.
- BERMAN, H. (1977), «Greek -σαι: Hittite -asha-», *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen* 91: 231-239.
- BIANCHI, V. (2012), *Semantica: dalle parole alle frasi*, Roma, Carocci.
- BIRKENES, M.B. & SOMMER, F. (2015), «The agreement of collective nouns in the history of Ancient Greek and German», in C. Gianollo, A. Jäger & D. Penka (eds.), *Language change at the syntax-semantics interface*, Berlin, Mouton De Gruyter: 183-222.
- BOLEY, J. (1999), Review of Prins (1997), *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 56: 694-697.
- BORILLO, A. (1997), «Statut et Mode d'Interprétation des Noms Collectifs», in C. Guimier (ed.), *Co-texte et calcul du sens. Actes de la table ronde tenue à Caen, 23 février 1996*, Caen, University de Caen: 105-119.
- BROSCH, C. (2010), Nominalkomposita und komponierende Ableitungen im Hethitischen, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 37: 263-301. <https://doi.org/10.1524/aof.2010.0023>
- COLLINS, B.J. (1989), *The Representation of Wild Animals in Hittite Texts*, Ann Arbor, University Microfilms International.
- CORBETT, G.G. (2000), *Number*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- DEDÉ, F. (2013), *I nomi greci in -απ e -ωπ: eteroclisi e classi nominali*, Roma, Il Calamo.
- DEL MONTE, G.F. (1992), *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte. Supplement*, Wiesbaden, L. Reichert.
- DEPRAETERE, I. (2003), «On verbal concord with collective nouns in British English», *English Language and Linguistics* 7: 85-127. doi:10.1017/S1360674303211047
- DIK, S.C. (1972), *Coordination, Its Implications for the Theory of General Linguistics*, Amsterdam, North-Holland.
- EICHNER, H. (1985), «Das Problem des Ansatzes eines urindogermanischen Numerus 'Kollektiv' ('Komprehensiv')», in B. Schlerath & V. Rittner (eds.), *Grammatische Kategorien. Funktion und Geschichte. Akten der VII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft*, Innsbruck, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck: 255-264.
- FAGIOLO, V. (2022), «*Illuyankaš*, snakes and eels: new suggestions about the name of the Hittite serpent *Illuyankaš*», in R. Dan, Francia, R. & M.-C. Trémouille (eds.), *Studia Hethitica, Hurritica et Urartaica*, Vol. 1, Roma, Ismeo: 119-132.
- FAGIOLO, V. (2023), *I suffissi ittiti -(ā)tar, -eššar, -war (-mar): uno studio sincronico e diacronico sulla derivazione nominale eteroclita*, Tesi di dottorato, Dipartimento di Filosofia, Comunicazione e Spettacolo, Università degli Studi Roma Tre e Sapienza Università di Roma.
- FORRER, E. (1938), «Quelle und Brunnen in Alt-Vorderasien», *Glotta* 26: 178-202.
- FRIEDRICH, J. (1960), *Hethitisches Elementarbuch*, Vol. 1, Heidelberg, Winter.
- FRITZ, M. (1998), «Die urindogermanischen s-Stämme und die Genese des dritten Genus.», in W. Meid (ed.), *Sprache und Kultur der Indogermanen. X. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin, 20.-25. Februar 1983*, Innsbruck, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck: 134-169.
- GAETA, L. (2020), «Collective/Abstract in Morphology», in *Oxford research encyclopedia, Linguistics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press: 1-23. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.594>
- GAIDE, F. (1989) «Les dérivés synchroniques dénominaux collectifs en latin», *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes* 63: 221-228.
- GARDELLE, L. (2019), *Semantic plurality: English collective nouns and other ways of denoting pluralities of entities*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.349>

- GIL, D. (1996), «Maltese 'collective nouns': A typological perspective», *Rivista di Linguistica* 8: pp. 53-87.
- GÖTZE, A. (1928), *Madduwattaš*, Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs.
- GOODMAN, N. (1966), *The structure of appearance*, Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill.
- GÜTERBOCK, H.G. (1952), «The Song of Ullikummi. Revised Text of the Hittite Version of a Hurrian Myth (Continued)», *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 6: 8-42.
- HAAS, V. (1970), *Der Kult von Nerik: ein Beitrag zur hethitischen Religionsgeschichte*, Roma, Päpstliches Bibelinstitut.
- HAAS, V. (2003), *Materia Magica et Medica Hethitica: ein Beitrag zur Heilkunde im Alten Orient*, Berlin-New York, Walter de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110925258>
- HAAS, V., I. WEGNER (1988), *Die Rituale der Beschwörerinnen* ^{SALŠU.GI}, Roma, Multigrafica editrice.
- HARDARSON, J.A. (1987), «Zum urindogermanischen Kollektivum», *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 48: 71-113.
- HARTMANN, M. (2014), «Numerus, Numeralität, Kollektivität und Kollektivum», in C. Brosch & A. Payne (eds.), *Na-wa/i-VIR.ZI/A MAGNUS.SCRIBA. Festschrift für Helmut Nowicki zum 70. Geburtstag*. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz: 95-106.
- HOFFMAN, I. (1984), *Der Erlass Telipinus*, Heidelberg, C. Winter.
- HOFFNER, H.A. (1974), *Alimenta Hethaeorum. Food Production in Hittite Asia Minor*, New Haven, American Oriental Society.
- HOFFNER, H.A., & MELCHERT, H.C. (2008), *A grammar of the Hittite language*, Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781646023066>
- HUTTER, M. (2008), «Magie und Religion im Tunnawiya-Ritual, KBo XXI 1 - KUB IX 34 - KBo XXI 6», in 34. *Uluslararası Assriyoloji Kongresi: Istanbul, 6-10 Temmuz 1987: Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler*, Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- KAMMENHUBER, A. (1954), «Studien zum hethitischen Infinitivsystem», *MIO* 2: 44-77, 245-265, 403-444.
- KAMMENHUBER, A. (1955), «Studien zum hethitischen Infinitivsystem», *MIO* 3: 31-57, 345-377.
- KASSIAN, A.S. (2000), *Two middle Hittite rituals: mentioning Ziplantawija, sister of the Hittite king Tuthaliya 2/1*, Moscow, Paleograph.
- KATZ, J.T. (1998), «How to be a Dragon in Indo-European: Hittite *illuyankaš* and its Linguistic and Cultural Congeners in Latin, Greek and Germanic», in J. Jasanoff, H.C. Melchert & L. Oliver (eds.), *Mírcurad: studies in honor of Calvert Watkins*, Innsbruck, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität: 317-334.
- KRONASSER, H. (1966), *Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- LAROCHE, E. (1947), «Hittite Deities and Their Epithets», in *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 1: 187-216.
- LAROCHE, E. (1961), «Études de toponymie anatolienne», *Revue hittite et asianique* 19: 57-98.
- LEDO-LEMONS, F.J. (2003), *Feminine Genus. A Study on the Origins of the Indo-European Feminine Grammatical Gender*, München, Lincom.
- LÜHR, R. (2008), *Nominale Wortbildung des Indogermanischen in Grundzügen: die Wortbildungsmuster ausgewählter indogermanischer Einzelsprachen*, Hamburg, Kovač.
- LURAGHI, S. (2009a), «Indo-European Nominal Classification: From Abstract to Feminine», in S.W. Jamison, H.C. Melchert & B. Vine (eds.), *Proceedings of the 20th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, Los Angeles, October 31-November 1, 2008*, Bremen, Hempen Verlag: 115-131.
- LURAGHI, S. (2009b), «The origin of the feminine gender in PIE: an old problem in a new perspective», in V. Bubenik, J. Hewson & S. Rose (eds.), *Grammatical Change in Indo-European Languages. Papers presented at the workshop on Indo-European Linguistics at the XVIIIth International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Montreal, 2007*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, John Benjamins: 3-13. <https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.305.04lur>
- LURAGHI, S. (2011), «The origin of the Proto-Indo-European gender system: typological considerations», *Folia linguistica: Acta Societatis Linguistica Europaeae* 45: 435-463. <https://doi.org/10.1515/flin.2011.016>

- MATASOVIĆ, R. (2005), «Collective in Proto-Indo-European», in K. Jones Bley, M.E. Huld, A. Della Volpe & M. Robbins Dexter (eds.), *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, Washington, Institut for the Study of Man: 107-121.
- MEIER, E. (1846), *Die Bildung und Bedeutung des Plurals in den semitischen und indogermanischen Sprachen, nebst einer Einleitung über den Bau der semitischen Verbalstämme*, Mannheim, Friedrich Bassermann.
- MELCHERT, H.C. (1994), *Anatolian historical phonology*, Amsterdam-Atlanta, Rodopi.
- MELCHERT, H.C. (2000), «Tocharian Plurals in -nt- and Related Phenomena», *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 9: 53-75.
- MELCHERT, H.C. (2011), «The PIE Collective Plural and the “τὰ ζῶα τρέχει rule”», in T. Krisch & T. Lindner (eds.), *Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog Akten der 13. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 21. bis 27. September 2008 in Salzburg*, Wiesbaden, Reichert Verlag: 395-400.
- MILLER, J.L. (2004), *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- MOUTON, A. (2010), «Sorcellerie Hittite», *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 60: 105-125.
- NERI, S. & SCHUHMAN, R. (2014) (eds.), *Studies on the Collective and Feminine in Indo-European from a Diachronic and Typological Perspective*, Leiden-Boston, Brill: 273-306.
- NEU, E. (1983), *Glossar zu den althethitischen Ritualtexten (StBoT 26)*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- NEU, E. (1992), «Zum Kollektivum im Hethitischen», in Carruba, O. (eds.) *Per una grammatica ittita*. Pavia, Iuculano: 197-212.
- NEUMANN, G. (1958) «Hethitische Etymologien 1-2», *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen* 75: 87-90.
- NEUMANN, G. (1988) «Die hethitisch-luwischen Ortsnamen auf -issa- und -ussa-», in E. Neu & Ch. Rüster (eds.), *Documentum Asiae minoris antiquae. Festschrift für Heinrich Otten zum 75. Geburtstag*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz: 255-261.
- NUSSBAUM, A.J (2014), «Feminine, abstract, collective, neuter plural: some remarks on each», in S. Neri & R. Schuhmann (2014): 273-306. 10.1163/9789004264953_012
- ÖETTINGER, N. (2010), «Nochmals hethitisch *illuyanka*- und lateinisch *anguis* ‘Schlange’», in J. Klinger, E. Rieken & Ch. Rüster (eds.) *Investigationes Anatolicae: Gedenkschrift für Erich Neu*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz: 189-195.
- PALMER, F.R. (1976), *Semantics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- POPKO, M. (2003), «Zum Tempel der Sonnengöttin von Arinna in Hattuša», *Altorientalische Forschungen* 30: 11-17.
- PRINS, A. (1997), *Hittite neuter singular - neuter plural: some evidence for a connection*, Leiden, Research school CNWS. School of Asian, African and American studies.
- PUHVEL, J. (2002), *Epilecta Indoeuropaea. Opuscula selecta annis 1978-2001 excusa imprimis ad res Anatolicas attinentia*, Innsbruck, Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- RIEKEN, E. (1999), *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- SCHMIDT, J. (1889), *Die Pluralbildungen der indogermanischen Neutra*, Weimar, H. Bohlau.
- SCHWARZSCHILD, R. (1996), *Pluralities*, Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- STEITLER, C.W. (2017), *The solar deities of Bronze Age Anatolia: studies in texts of the early Hittite kingdom (StBoT 62)*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- TICHY, E. (1993), «Kollektiva, Genus femininum und relative Chronologie in Indogermanischen», *Historische Sprachforschung* 106: 1-19.
- TORRI, G. (1998), «Ittita “Bove, madre del brulicare di formiche”. Alcune osservazioni sul rituale di Maštigga (KUB LVIII 79)», *SEL* 15: 69-76.
- TORRI, G. (1999), *Lelwani: il culto di una dea ittita*, Roma, Università degli Studi di Roma La Sapienza - Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità - Missione Archeologica Italiana in Siria, Sezione Vicino Oriente.

- ÜNAL, A. (1990), «Review of Tischler, J. (1982) *Hethitisch-deutsches Wörterverzeichnis Mit einem semasiologischen Index*, Innsbruck, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität», *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 49: 355-360.
- VENDLER, Z. (1967), *Linguistics in Philosophy*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- WATKINS, C. (1985), «Hittite and Indo-European Studies 2», *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 45: 245-255.
- WIERZBICKA, A. (1980), *Lingua Mentalis. The Semantics of Natural Language*, Sydney, Academic Press.
- WINTER, Y. (2002), «Atoms and Sets: A Characterization of Semantic Number», *Linguistics Inquiry* 33: 493-505.
- ZEILFELDER, S. (2001a), «Zur Indikativität hethitischer Abstrakta», in G. Wilhelm (ed.), *Akten des 4. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie, Würzburg 4.-8. Oktober 1999*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz: 730-738.
- ZEILFELDER, S. (2001b), *Archaismus und Ausgliederung: Studien zur sprachlichen Stellung des Hethitischen*, Heidelberg, Winter.