REVUE HITTITE ET ASIANIQUE

TOME XXXI
1973

HITTITE ḫašša- ḫanzašša-

The Hittite expression ḫašša- ḫanzašša- is usually interpreted as ‘grandson and great-grandson’ or ‘grandchild and great-grandchild’ (see Friedrich, HWH 62, with doubts). Forrer first assigned it this meaning (2 BoTU 22 and Meißner-Fest. I, 32). Friedrich, SV II, 36-7, supports this view, claiming that at least ḫašša-‘grandchild’ is certain, based on KUB XXI 27 III 43-IV 8. According to lines IV 4-5 the Storm-god and the Sun-goddess of Arinna are the grand-parents of the goddess Zintuhi: "IM-tu ṣuḫḫi (ANA) ḪUṣ牒-as ẍuḫuḫa-anni." In II 43 Zintuhi is ŠA "IM ḪUṣ牒-as ḪUṣ牒-anni yxa šakšiyanu ḫašša-‘the beloved grandchild of the Storm-god and the Sun-goddess of Arinna’. Since Zintuhi itself is the Hattic word for ‘granddaughter’ (see Laroche, JCS 1, 199 and Recherches 40), the sense of the passage seems beyond doubt. However, Goetze, ArOr 2, 162-3, does not find the above compelling evidence for interpreting ḫašša- as ‘grandchild’. He suggests that the term may have a more general sense which is also applicable to the specific relationship of grandparents and grandchildren. One reason for such a supposition is the combination ‘DUMU-Ya DUMU-YA ḫašša ḫanzašša’ (KUB XXVI 1 I 5:15, etc.). Since DUMU-DUMU already means ‘grandson’, it is unlikely that ḫašša has that meaning (an objection repeated by Kronasser, Elym. 157). On the other hand, Goetze’s suggestion of ‘voll- und nebenehrende Nachkommenschaft’ for ḫašša ḫanzašša is contradicted by KUB XV 34 II 17-18: ‘uḫ qaṭta tarmattu ḪA-LUGAL.SAL.LUGAL... DUMU-asar DUMU-NITADDU DUMU-SAL’āš ḫaššuḫ ḫanzaššuḫ’/‘Bestow upon the king and queen... progeny, sons and daughters, b- b-’. Both ḫašša- and ḫanzašša- thus refer to ‘legitimate’ offspring of the king by the queen, and the latter cannot mean ‘offspring of the king by his secondary wives’. This example also speaks against the interpretation ‘Kind und Keget’ ‘kith and kin’ (Friedrich, SV 1, 166 and Kronas-
children. Be that as it may, a more important question is: why would the children be excluded from such a formula? These are obviously minor difficulties, but they are not the only ones. Perhaps the most important passage for understanding the usage of ḫ-ḫ is that of the treaty of Muwattali with his vassal Alakandu (CTH 76), § 6 and 7 (cited after Friedrich, SV II, 56):  

A I 66 katta DUMU-YA DUMU. DUMU-YA ḫaṣa ḫaṣa[iš]a apān-pāṭ  
69 paḫāna; zik Alakanduš uTUŠ aššū ṭaši  
70 katta-ma ammel DUMU-YA DUMU. DUMU-YA ḫaṣa ḫaṣaša ṭaši  
73 74 (ẖaṣa) ḫaṣaša šešu DUMU-an isal; DUMU-WAšk.YA  
76 ḫaṣaša šaššu; DUMU, DUMU-WAšk.YA  
78 (apān) šanṭari-pāṭ  
80 [ma maa katta DUMU-KA DUMU. DUMU-WAšk.KA kušša]  

B II 10  
11 [Alakanduš] uTUŠ šaššu katta-ya DUMU-WAšk.KA ḫaṣaša  
12 ḫaṣašaša DUMU-WAšk.UTUŠ ḫaṣašaša AŠŠUM BELUTIM paššādaru  

A I 8  
9 [nnu kinī manaḫḫ uTUš 9] kā [... ] šiḫunā;  
11 ḫaṣašašaša šiḫunāša šiḫunāša USPA šaššu šuššu;  
11 DUMU-WAšk.KA [Ḫašašašašaša DUMU-WAšk.KA] UTUŠ ((pāṭ))  
12 [katta] AŠŠUM BELUTIM pAššaša šuššu  

Disregarding for a moment the possessives and the shifts between singular and plural, we can reduce all the expressions referring to descendants in the above passage to a few basic types:  

DUMU DUMU DUMU  
DUMU DUMU b-. b-  
(lines A 174, 80)  
(DUMU 68, 70)  
(DUMU 11-12, A II 11)  
(A 174)  
(A II 10)  

1. This table is not intended to be a complete list of occurrences, but it does include all case forms of which I have knowledge.

2. The reading apān-pāṭ is based on Otten's new collation of the text. See M10 5, 57.
If one interprets bh- as 'grandson(s) and great-grandson(s)', the passage is peculiar in several respects: (1) the order of bh-DUMU; (2) the sudden shift in who is included—sometimes the first and second descending generations, sometimes the second and third, sometimes all three—the shift sometimes occurring within a single sentence (e.g. line 74); (3) the previously mentioned redundancy in DUMU DUMU. DUMU ḫašša-ḫanzašša-. Where 'grandson' seems to occur twice.

These problems become even more acute when we compare the welter of forms we have just seen with the very consistent reference to descendants typical of most Hittite treaties and protocols. For example, in the Akkadian versions of Hittite treaties the standard expression is mār ă mār ăr 'sons and grandsons': see the treaty of Suppiululiuma with Mattanusa V s 65; Rs 71; 73-4 (Weidner, PD 18, 34); Mattanusa-Suppiululiuma Rs 56, 60 (PD 52, 56); Suppiululiuma-Tette Rs IV 51 (PD 68); and Mursili-Talmasirruma Rs 15-16 (PD 88). There is no mention of mār mār mār 'great-grandsons'. Similarly, in documents of Hittite the following curses and blessings refer to DUMU“₆” or to DUMU“₇” DUMU DUMU“₇” (KUB XIII 11, 1, XII 9 I I 7, XXI 29 IV 5, KB X VI 25 1 I 6, VIII 35 II 19), but nowhere do they speak of DUMU“₆” DUMU DUMU“₆”. The third descending generation simply does not have a place in these formulas.

Already in the face of this we might suspect that the variety of forms in the Alaksandu treaty is illusory, that all five expressions listed above mean nothing more than 'son(s) and grandson(s). However, there is much more direct evidence that this is the case. KUB II 2 is a bilingual text in Hittite and Hittite. Lines III 30-32 read as follows:

30-31 (Hittite) katašša palu lepinu pala leziix-x-itu
32 (Hittite) ANA SAL. [UGAL DUMU“₆” DUMU DUMU“₇” ḫašša-ḫanzašša-] piantu

Laroche has shown (JCS 1, 199) that le-pina le-pai-zinta (KUB XXIV 14 IV 15-16) equates to DUMU“₇” DUMU DUMU“₇” and restores ži-in-ša 'grandson' in the present passage as well (see also Laroche, RA 41, 92). Note, however, that here the Hittite has not simply DUMU“₆” DUMU DUMU“₆”, but 'DUMU DUMU.“₆” DUMU DUMU.”₆” DUMU DUMU.”₆” (Hittite ḫašša-ḫanzašša-). This entire phrase corresponds to 'sons and grandsons' in Hittite. This instance is admittedly based on a restoration, but there is other evidence for the equation.

The instructions for palace officials (LÜ₆”₆”SAG) include the following oaths:

KUB XXI 1 I (von Schuler, Dienstag. 9-9)
3 [UΤU₆”₆” wa-ASSUM EN·"]
4 [pahwešwa kattu-ma-wa DUMU“₆” “UΤU₆” “pahwešwa”]
5 ḫašša-ḫanzašša ASSUM EN·” [pahwešwa]
15 ASSUM EN·” kattu ḫašša h[a][a][a]b[a][a]
16 NUMUN (Tubalšiya-pit pahšaštin)

KUB XXI 4’IV (Dienstag. 28)
19 [UΤU₆”₆” pit ASSUM EN·” GAM·wa-B DUMU“₆” “SU DUMU“₆” “SU PAP·šašin

There can be no doubt that these oaths are three versions of one and the same formula. In each case the officials are to protect the sovereign authority of the Hittite king and his descendants. The latter are referred to as DUMU“₆” “UΤU₆” ḫašša-ḫanzašša-, ḫašša-ḫanzašša NUMUN and DUMU“₆” ASSUM EN·” “ȘIT”. Once again the phrases containing bh-bh equate to one which clearly means 'sons and grandsons'.

Thus in all the clear cases we have mār mār or DUMU“₆” DUMU DUMU“₆”. Never is there any reference to 'great-grandsons'. Furthermore, there are instances where the phrases containing bh-bh are parallel to DUMU“₆” DUMU DUMU“₆”. We must conclude that either (1) just in those cases where they use bh-bh the Hittites arbitrarily alternate the references to descendants, even within a single sentence, or (2) all the variants found in the Alaksandu treaty are equivalent—they all somehow mean 'sons and grandsons'.

I submit that the second alternative is correct, and that the variants are due to the fact that the Hittites had two means of expressing 'sons and grandsons'; or DUMU“₆” DUMU DUMU“₆” (Hittite ḫašša-ḫanzašša-)

The forms ḫašša- and ūanzašša mean 'offspring (of the first generation)' and 'offspring of the second generation' respectively.
As such, they may stand alone as 'sons and grandchildren' or, in apposition to DUMU₂₃. The coexistence of DUMU₂₃ DUMU₂₃ and banâ-hazanâsha is hardly surprising. Greek shows not only koiós and kaïnôs, but also pònos and ùpónos. Likewise, Latin has (j)ungius and prĭgnitus alongside fītius and nēpos (for prĭgnitus as 'grandson' see p. 54). The further proposal that b- b- may stand in apposition to DUMU₂₃ is unparalleled in Greek and Latin and requires some explanation. This collocation is possible because Hititite has a single word meaning 'male', i.e. both 'boy' and 'son'. Compare 'nāshu-bi' (lit. 'man masculine') called him son (HAB II 4) and 'DUMU₂₃-baš mab/'of my son' (HAB III 62) with the usage in the annals of Yurusli: KUB XII 29 IV 16 'zik- ma-wa-za DUMU₂₃ (or TUR₂₃) nu-wa-UL kuži kuški/"You are a boy; you know nothing"; KBO III 4 I 23-4 'sēra-nâshul-wa-mu-za KUR KUR kur küš DUMU₂₃-LAN-TUR₂₃ lanšakîr nu-wa- ma-wa-za topnâški/"The surrounding enemy lands who called me "boy" and belittled me (see also HAB 82 and KUB VII 1 I 10). DUMU₂₃- (in the meaning 'boy' better translated TUR₂₃- is also used adjectively to mean 'young, small'; KUB IX 32 Vs 39 'GIR TUR₂₃ (ya)'/s small dagger' and KBO XII 14 I 5 'AMAR-un-maš TUR₂₃ (n) man/"my (?) young cat" (the use of the possessive is not entirely clear, but TUR₂₃- is surely being used adjectively). The semantics are close enough. The adjective 'young, small' is substantivised to 'child, boy' (cf. German Junge). Then like 'boy' in colloquial English ('my boy Bill', etc.), it may also be used as a kinship term. Thus an expression DUMU₂₃- (or banâ-hazanâsha) children, offspring of the first and second generation' is not unnatural, since DUMU₂₃ does not inherently mean 'son'. It will only be restricted to the latter sense when specified by a possessive or paired with DUMU₂₃ behind which undoubtedly lies the real Hititite word for 'grandson', the equivalent of nepás. In view of the fact that it has both banâ- and banâ- 'grandfather' and 'grandmother', we have some right to expect that Hititite have specific terms for both 'grandson' (nepás) and 'granddaughter' (nepitā). We might guess them to be of the 'Latvian' variety like askus- and annus-, bâjus- and ùnus-, but given the diversity of formation in kinship

HITTITE \textit{haša}–\textit{hanzaša}– as referring to the first and second descending generations we can now explain the difficult passages noted previously. KUB XXIX I 1 IV 2 'DUMU₂₃ NITA₂₃ DUMU₂₃ SAI₂₃ hašaša' now means 'male and female children, offspring of the second generation', i.e. 'grandsons and granddaughters', a natural group. Since the same text at I 11-12 refers to the 'grandchildren' of the king (DUMU₂₃), we conclude that the grandchildren play some particular role in this ritual and that we have no reason nor right to emend by inserting tališ. Lines IV 25-6 of the same text now read 'may the children and grandchildren so nourish the king and queen'. This formula now fits the pattern of the others we have seen. The sashes for palace officials (see p. 61) are now properly equivalent: KUB XXVI I I 3-5 'We will protect His Majesty in regard to sovereignty and we will protect in regard to sovereignty the sons of His Majesty down to the first and second generation'. Lines 15-16: 'Protect in regard to sovereignty the descendants of Tuthaliya down to the first and second generation', KUB XXI 42 IV 19: "[Protect] His Majesty in regard to sovereignty and later protect his sons and grandsons'. For a justification of the syntax of the translations see below, p. 67. KUB XV 34 II 17-18 (see p. 57) now reads 'Bêšam upon the king and queen, progeny, male and female children, offspring of the first and second generation' = 'sons and daughters, grandsons and granddaughters'. Turning finally to the Alaksandu treaty, we can now naturally equate to the unambiguous DUMU₂₃ DUMU₂₃ the types b- b-, DUMU₂₃ TUR₂₃ and b- b- DUMU₂₃ (for the order of the last see p. 68). But the form DUMU₂₃ DUMU₂₃ b- b- remains a problem. By the new interpretation it should mean 'sons and grandsons, offspring of the first and second generation', even more redundant than before. Nevertheless, we have seen that the entire phrase functions just like DUMU₂₃ DUMU₂₃
or ὃς-b. It does in fact mean *more than 'sons and grandsons'. The redundancy appears to be due to a conflation of the two parallel alternatives, DUM.NI[43] and DUMU[44] and DUMU[45] ἡλίας-

hansāna, with the ambiguous DUMU[46] as the source of the confusion.

The reinterpretation of ἡλίας- and hansāna- as 'offspring of the first and second generation' has interesting consequences for their etymologies. Mięwaki, L'hitt. 32, proposes that hansāna-

consists of hanzāna-'first-born', for the latter, Goetz already suggests, Arke 2, 163, that derivation from ἡλίας-'give birth' seems unavoidable (both are approved by Kronasser, Elmg., 157, 165). Nevertheless, with the old interpretation the latter etymology seems to lead nowhere, being without obvious parallels, and that of hansāna- has been questioned (Pederesen, Hitt. 34 and Meissner, LG 15, 188-99). But if ἡλίας- means *offspring*, in particular of the first generation, child(ren), it is parallel to Greek γόνα in both formation and function. Just as γόνα is an action noun form gen- 'beget', so ἡλίας- is formed from ἡλίας- 'give birth'. Whether ἡλίας- retains the original action sense like γόνα, which means 'begetting' as child(ren), or as 'offspring', we cannot tell. Another use of γόνα, however, namely its application to offsprings of any generation, thus 'descendant, scion', can help explain the Zintuhi passage quoted at the beginning of this discussion in the iliad 13.449-53 Idomeous addresses Diolobon: *όφρα ἅδας Ζήδης γόνας έσορθίδι hikkan, hsí pr'k'k'k Minidnā tēkē Kρēti cpouy, pr'k'k'k tēkē d'v tēkē b'k'k'k anāmūnā Deukalānā, Deukalān d'emē tēkē pōleṣ andreisēn anākata Kρēti eure'litē* Having called himself a γόνας of Zeus, Idomeous then proceeds to give his genealogy, showing his ἀδήλιαν, ἐκλείστηκε and ἀναμφίανος, which is parallel etymology for pragnāna, which it turns from the third, to the second, generation, the relationship with hansāna- to hansāna- is the same as that of *hansāna- to pragnāna-*. For the latter used as *son* and *grandson*, see Cicero, Tusc. 3, 12, 26: 'Tantalo pragnatus, Pelope natum' [Atreus] grandson of Tantalus, son of Pelops.' Similar, but with a different preposition, is Greek ἀγγονός 'grandson' < ἀγονω. The reinterpretation of ἀγονω- as referring to the first and second generations thus not only better explains their usage in Hittite, but also removes them from their isolation and shows that they are similar in form and function to corresponding terms in Latin and Greek. There remains, however, the case form ἀγγονω- which seems morphologically and, as we shall see, syntactically anomalous. Some have taken the ending -ā as a remnant of the IE dual ending -ā, comparing the combination ἀγονω­hansāna to the type of Sanskrit Mitakhandā (Sturtevint, Cā 160, Pedersen, Hitt. 34 and Kronasser, Elmg. 156-7). In pṛgīna- 'bear, father', a virtual synonym of pīga-. The less common pīgīna- 'grandson' from pīgīna- 'one' is clearly modeled on vector's 'great-grandfather' from *pīga- 'grandfather', where the use of pre to designate the next preceding generation is logically justified. Similarly, English 'grandson' is patterned after 'grandfather'. Thus the direct comparison of pīgīna- to pṛgīna- is oversimplified; i.e., it produces a Hittite form like 'pānatāḥ'great-grandfather' to serve as the model for hansāna-. I know of no such form, but this is not unduly disturbing, for specific references to great-grandparents are going to be quite rare, and even when they occur, the Hittite reading may be hidden behind a Subhārāni or Akkadian form.

This is the usual etymology for γόνα, as opposed to ἡλίας 'descendant' (in general) < ἦλιας-<. However, the two forms are frequently confused, and it is not impossible that they both represent αὐτός-<. On the other hand, this is not the only possible interpretation of hansāna-. Prof. Lachish has suggested to me in correspondence that it may be related instead to Luvian *hanheanus* 'grandson'. An Akkadian *hanheaus* composition seems with regular syncope *hanheaus, whose Hittite form, anaman, which was added the definites preserve-si. That the latter was added only to the second member of the system (with which it later became fused) reflects the *compositional* nature of hansāna- in Luvian. It is by no means certain, however, that ἦλιας- was to be a component (a ː ἦλιας- which in Luvian would be *hanheaus*<. We find, e.g., RUB XXXVI 110, 15-16 'basal-basal fākāt tūkūtā:tēlā lišākāl-hansānā-lātēb'. The house of the laborer is one of joy for his sons and grandsons'. This example tends to show that although they were linked in an apostatic collocation, ἦλιας- and ἦ ταί with their 'ākāyanas, in all cases that the aetym of the possessive might be attached to both members. It is only for the adjective kind possessive in late Hittite, a fixed form outside the paradigm, that use of the possessive would be excluded. Another point is that Luvian *hanheanus* is used in illsions and thus forms part of the system of 'specific terms for father' , 'son', etc. I do not wish to insist on the distinction between 'general' and 'specific' kinship terms, but in view of the usage of ἦλιας- in Hittite I find it unlikely that Luvian would have taken one of the base and inserted it into the series of 'familial' terms (i.e., 'father', *son<, 'brother', etc. In view of these considerations I do not at present see any compelling reason for choosing between the alternatives *hanheaus*< or *hanhepeus*<.6 Similar,
doings, Sturtvetz claims that the Hittite form functions only as a nominative or accusative, which is what one would expect it to be from IE *-es. Friedrich, *Elam* I, 59, also lists *bašša šanzadiša* as nominative and accusative, but as an anomalous singular.

There are at least three cases, however, where the form cannot be functioning as a nominative or accusative. One is the Alaksandu treaty. A II I-30 (see p. 59): "niška [Alaksandu] šaška šanšadi šiššu [UPPA] kišan iya." What is the function of š- in this sentence? It cannot be part of the subject (the verb is singular, agreeing with A); it cannot be the object, which is TUPPA. Another example is KUB XXX 19+20 IV 3-4 (see Otten, **HTR** 44): "nu-wa-za-kān ANA D[UMU=x]-ša andaša šašu ši tuel [LUGAL=ša] katta bašša [šanšadi uk]šišša šišša [dul ] šišša. Otten, **HTR** 45, renders 'for your grandsons and greatgrandsons', which makes some sense syntactically, but not as a nominative or accusative. Furthermore, we would really expect a dativus in this case. Finally, there is KBo VI 29 III 41-3: 'kuš-ma ŠA DUMU-YA [DUMU] DUMU-YA bašša šanšaša *SANGA* šA laššar dēša Samuha bēša. He challenges my son's, my grandson's, my great-grandson's priesthood of the Ishtar of Samuha...'

The solution to this predicament is that *bašša šanšadiša* is a relic of the Old Hittite directive in -es, preserved in a set phrase which has been essentially utilizing a form of the first and second 'generations'. For the directive case see Forrer, **Meinl-Forrer**, III, 313, and Laroche, **RHA** 28, 221. For the preservation of *bašša šanšadiša* in 'classical' Hittite one may compare karašiušitu, formally the directive of *karašiušitu* 'antiquity', but functionally a virtual adverb meaning 'to (its) former state' as before. The form occurs in VBoT 121, 7, a relatively late text: 27 ([ku KUR

7. The paradigm fragments VBBoT 121 and KUB XXIV 4+5 XIX 12 are both copies of a portion of the hymn and prayer of Mursili II to the trilingual goddess of Arziuma (CTH 376). Since the latter text is a composite of various materials, this does not prove that the two fragments are also of the 'classical Hittite' period, and KUB XXIV 4+5 XIX 12 shows several characteristics of older texts (see Caroza, **ZDMG**, Supp. 1, 231). The doctrine of VBoT 121, however, is clearly not that of Old Hittite, and one may note its substitution of "NUMKAN" (see 8) for "NUMKAN" in I 51 of KUB XXV 4.5

**HITTITE BAŠŠA- HANZAZŠA.**

"[Hatli] k'arašiušitu kis[u]," my land the land of Hattu became as it was before. The phrase 'to the first and second generation' is reminiscent of Biblical usage, such as Ex. 20:5 'visiting the sins of the fathers upon the children, to the third and fourth generation', rendered in the Septuagint as 'βασιλεία τιτάρκες γενειας'. One may also compare the Athenian law code's provision for inheritance 'mēkhtē anepisbu paidōn 'to (as far as) the children of cousins'. Further support for interpreting *bašša šanšadiša* as a directive lies in the fact that most of the time it cooccurs with *katta*, an adverb which is likewise an old directive (see Laroche, **RHA** 28, 40 and 47). The function of *katta* in contexts such as the Alaksandu treaty and the oaths for the LīmušAG has caused translators some embarrassment. Friedrich, **ZA** (NF) I, 173-4, argues that it means 'later, subsequently', but by the time of his *Staatsverträge*, he is not so sure and translates it 'entprechend' or 'correspondingly'. Both 'thereafter' and 'likewise' are termed 'conventional' translations by von Schuler, **Dionyus** 17. I believe we can make a motivated choice between the alternatives 'later, subsequently' and 'correspondingly, likewise'. First of all, as Friedrich points out, SV I, 34, there are cases where 'correspondingly' will not work, because there is no prior reference to which the sentence with *katta* may be said to 'correspond'. He offers as an example KBo V I 24: 'nu katta INA KUR [šA] Amurri apāš LUGAL=šiššu [šA] may be (your heir) later be king in Amurru'. On the other hand, there is always reference in these contexts (i.e., in treaties) to future time, sometimes explicitly marked by zidigga 'in the future' (e.g., Alaks. A I 73, see p. 56). The use of adverbs of place to refer to time is a widespread phenomenon, and such a use of *katta* would be parallel to that of its Greek cognate κατό 'downward'; later or Latin infra 'below'; later. Hittite *katta* thus is 'down (into the future), later'. It is tempting to translate *katta* in conjunction with *bašša šanšadiša* as simply 'down to the first and second generation', and I have done so, believing that it does accurately reflect the sense. Nevertheless, one must not conclude from this translation that *katta bašša šanšadiša* is a syntactic unit, which is contradicted by the word order in many instances (e.g. Alaks. A II 11-12, p. 59). If we take *bašša šanšadiša* as an adverb 'to the first and second generation' and *katta* as 'down (in time), later', we can satisfactorily explain the function of this form in all its occurrences.
KUB XXX 19-20 IV 3-4 reads: ‘Be good to your children! Your kingdom has lasted (or shall last) down to the first and second generation’. KBo VI 29 III 41-3 is: ‘Whoever challenges my son’s and my grandson’s priesthood of Ishtar of Samuha to the first and second generation...’, with the same redundancy seen in the Alkasandu treaty. We may now at last make sense of the latter text (see p. 59):

A I 68 My son and grandson will protect him (your heir) down to 69 the first and second generation... May you, Alkasandu, kindly protect His Majesty, 70 and may you protect down to the first and second generation my son and grandson. Since elsewhere we find ‘DUMUₕₐₛₐₜ DUMU DUMUₜₗₜₜₜ šaššu šanaššu’ which is clearly redundant, the use of šaššu- is probably redundant here as well. However, since the other sentences in this text show a balance between subject and predicate (each mentioning two generations), it is also possible to take the adverb šaššu šanaššu as referring to the subject Alkasandu (cf. A II 9-10).

A I 73 In the future 74 my sons and grandsons will protect your son down to 75 the first and second generation.

Since šaššu šanaššu is an adverb, not part of a series with DUMU-an, it is free to precede the latter. Note that now both subject and predicate refer to the first and second generations, as elsewhere.

A I 80 Or if someone rebels against your son or grandsons...

B II 10 May you 11 Alkasandu protect His Majesty, and may your sons down to 12 protect the sons of His Majesty to the first and second generation in regard to sovereignty.

A II 8 Now as I, His Majesty, have made [ ] 9 these treaty tables, may you Alkasandu 10 carry out these treaty tables as follows, to the first and second generation: 11 May your sons protect down to the first and second generation 12 the sons of His Majesty in regard to sovereignty.

The syntax of lines 9-10 is now normal, since šaššu- is an adverb, not part of the subject. The interpretation of šaššu šanaššu as ‘to the first and second generation’ may also be applied to the treaty with Kupanta-šaššu [Kal 11, D 35-7 and § 4, C 11-12 (SV I, 118 and 122) and to that with Hukkana, IV 8-10 (SV II, 130).

We have seen that in the oaths for palace officials the phrases with šaššu- are equivalent to ‘DUMUₜₗₜₜₜ DUMU DUMUₜₗₜₜₜ’ in meaning. There are even a couple of cases where ‘DUMUₜₗₜₜₜ DUMU DUMUₜₜₜₜ’ may actually be standing for the adverb šaššu šanaššu. In the treaty between Tutaliya and Saškal-muwâ of Amurrû the oath of protection reads (KUB XXIII I II 9-10): ṅu ṣALUₚₚₜₜₜ ASSUM ENₜₜₜₜ ṣabši katta-ya DUMUₜₗₜₜₜ DUMU DUMUₜₜₜₜ NUMUN SA ṣUTUₜₜₜₜ ASSUM ENₜₜₜₜ ṣabši. Compare this to the oath for the LUNₜₗₜₜₜ AGS seen earlier (KUB XXVI I I 15-16): ‘ASSUM ENₜₜₜₜ katta šaššu ša(šanaššu) NUMUN ‘Tutaliya ṣabši(ši)’. We have in entirely comparable context:

katta-ya DUMUₜₗₜₜₜ DUMU DUMUₜₜₜₜ NUMUN katta šaššu šanaššu NUMUN

Since we find instances of katta without the adverb šaššu šanaššu (e.g. Alaks. A I 80), it is possible that ‘DUMUₜₗₜₜₜ DUMU DUMUₜₜₜₜ’ is also a direct object here, along with NUMUN ‘descendants’, but the parallel with šaššu šanaššu NUMUN’ is striking. There should at least be no doubt of the equivalence in meaning of šaššu šanaššu and DUMU DUMU DUMU. Another possible instance of DUMU DUMU DUMU for šaššu šanaššu is KUB XXVI 24 IV 3-11:

3 4 ‘Arumwanda LUGAL GAL ANA SAG. DU [/ 5 SAL LUGAL Ĉ ANA SAG. D(U) ‘τυχαλιαγ(ς) DUMU LUGAL) 6 katta DUMUₜₜₜₜₜ⋅SU DUMU DUMUₜₜₜₜₜ.ŚU ANA SAG. DU [ DUMUₜₜₜₜₜ LUGAL (7) 7 katta DUMUₜₜₜₜₜ DUMU DUMUₜₜₜₜₜ DUMUₜₜₜₜₜ.[SU] ner x-x-x-x-x -x-x-x-x-x 8 wed-a-za kâša UGULA LIM 9ḫUGUŠ SUMU DUGUD SA ER[IMₜₜₜₜ] 9ḫummaa QA DU DUMUₜₜₜₜₜ[DUMU DUMUₜₜₜₜₜ] 10 QA DU KUR-NI linkiyati TUPPU zabar ša(tenezi) 11 [týjawen...
The sense of the missing verb in the first sentence is something like 'we are pledged to, bound by an oath to', though just what verb is to be restored with ūṣer is unclear. It is the appearance of kattu in the midst of an apparent coordinate series that is surprising. Note also that the preposition ANA is missing only before DUMU₄₆ and DUMU.DUMU₄₆. Is this a coincidence? Both the presence of kattu and the absence of ANA would be normal if DUMU₄₆ DUMU.DUMU₄₆ stood here for the adverb ḫašša ḫansašša. Likewise in the second sentence kattu appears unexpectedly, and the preposition QADU is repeated unnecessarily if the nouns are all in the same case. But if 'kattu DUMU. DUMU₄₆[N[NI] stood for 'kattu ḫansašša', thus 'with our wives and our children down to the second generation (and) with our land', then the second QADU would be necessary to resume the dativocative of DAM₄₆ and DUMU₄₆. On the other hand, the use of possessives with DUMU₄₆ and DUMU.DUMU₄₆ would be surprising, since we never find 'ḫašša- in ḫansašša-ša. Whether or not 'DUMU₄₆ DUMU.DUMU₄₆' is standing here for the adverb ḫašša ḫansašša, the appearance of kattu does reinforce the equation of ḫašša- ḫansašša- to DUMU DUMU. DUMU in general meaning.

In summary, then, Hittite ḫašša-, formed from ḫaš- 'give birth' like Greek γόνος from γεν-, means 'offspring', in particular 'offspring of the first generation, children'. It is usually paired with ḫansašša- 'offspring of the second generation, grandchildren', their formal and functional relationship being that of Latin (γ)νάτωs and (γ)ραγνάτωs. The case form ḫašša ḫansašša is a relic of the Old Hittite directive case, functioning as an adverb: 'to the first and second generation'. Usually it is reinforced by the adverb kattu 'down (into the future), later'. This interpretation of these forms not only rationalizes the references to descendants in documents like the Alalahdu treaty, bringing them into line with standard Hittite practice, but also solves several unexplained syntactic problems. Furthermore, it normalizes the inflection of ḫašša- ḫansašša- and shows their derivation to be similar to that of corresponding terms in Greek and Latin.
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