

# 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' (so Friedrich, *HWb* 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 5. According to lines IV 4-5 the Storm-god and the Sun-goddess of Arinna are the grand-parents of the goddess Zintuhi: 'ḫIM-ni tuel ḫuḫḫi [ANA ḫ]UTU ḫUTUL-na tuel ḫanni'. In III 43 Zintuhi is 'ŠA ḫIM ḫUTU ḫUTUL-na-ya aššiyanza ḫaššaš'/'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.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, *Etym.* 157). On the other hand, Goetze's suggestion of 'voll- und nebenbürtige Nachkommenschaft' for *ḫašša ḫanzašša* is contradicted by KUB XV 34 II 17-18: 'nu katta tarnatien ANA LUGAL SAL.LUGAL...DUMU-latar DUMU.NITA<sup>mes</sup> DUMU.SAL<sup>mes</sup> ḫaššuš ḫanzaššuš'/'Bestow upon the king and queen... progeny, sons and daughters, ḫ-ḫ-'. 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 Kegel'/'kith and kin' (Friedrich, *SV* I, 166 and Kronas-

ser, *Etym.* 157), because both these expressions imply 'family, household' in the broadest sense, not just progeny. Most scholars have interpreted h-h- as 'grandchild(ren) and great-grandchild(ren)', following Forrer and Friedrich, though sometimes the translation is marked as doubtful (see e.g. Otten, *HTR* 45, von Schuler, *Dienstanw.* 8-9, Zuntz, *Scorgiuri* 511 and even Goetze, *Tunn.* 23).

The combination *haša-hanzaša-* also exhibits apparent morphological peculiarities. The following case forms are attested:<sup>1</sup>

(N. Sg.)	haššaš	KUB XXI 27 III 43)
A. Sg.	hašša hanzaššan (?)	KUB XXI 12, 14 (b. context)
D.-L. Sg.	hašši hanzašši	KUB XXVI 43 Rs 60, 66
N. Pl.	haššeš hanzaššeš	KUB XXIX I IV 25-6
A. Pl.	haššuš hanzaššuš	KUB XV 34 II 18, XV 32 I 58
	haššaš hanzaššaš	KUB XV 31 I 56
D.-L. Pl.	haššaš hanzaššaš	KUB XXXVI 110, 15-16
Inst.	haššet hanzaššit	KUB XII 58 IV 12
N.-A. Dual(?)	hašša hanzašša	KUB XXVI I 15, 15

The A. Sg. *hašša hanzaššan*, if real, is reminiscent of the form *buḫḫa ḫanniš* 'grandfather and grandmother', where the first member is apparently uninflected. For the 'dual' form see below.

There is ample reason for the doubt sometimes attached to the translation 'grandchild and great-grandchild' for h-h-. In fact, I believe this interpretation faces serious difficulties. For example, in the 'Bauritual' (CTH 414) we find the following (KUB XXIX I IV 2): 'DUMU.NITA<sup>MES</sup> DUMU.SAL<sup>MES</sup> hanzaššeš makeššandu'. A grouping 'sons, daughters (and) great-grandchildren' is highly improbable. Why is the second generation skipped? One could suppose that *haššeš* has been omitted by accident, but we have no independent grounds for such an emendation. In the same text lines IV 25-6 we meet with LUGAL-un SAL.LUGAL-un!-na haššeš hanzaššeš anda QATAMMA aršiyandu/'May the h- and h- so nourish the king and queen'. Even given the oft expressed wish of the Hittite kings for long life, it seems unrealistic for a ritual meant for general use to expect them to be alive to be nourished by great-grand-

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.

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 h-h- is that of the treaty of Muwatalli with his vassal Alaksandu (CTH 76), § 6 and 7 (cited after Friedrich, *SV* II, 56-7):

A I 68 katta DUMU-YA DUMU.DUMU-YA hašša hanza[šša] apūn-pát<sup>2</sup>

69 paḫšanzi zik 'Alakšanduš 'UTUš<sup>1</sup> aššuli paḫši

70 katta-ma ammel DUMU-YA DUMU.DUMU-YA hašša hanzašša paḫši

73 [(hašš)]a hanzašša tuel DUMU-an ammel DUMU<sup>MES</sup>-YA wakka [(riyazi)]

74 [(hašš)]a hanzašša tuel DUMU-an ammel DUMU<sup>MES</sup>-YA wakka [(riyazi)]

75 [paḫḫaš] šantari-pát

80 [na(šma katta DUMU-KA DUMU.DUMU<sup>MES</sup>-KA kuiški)] wakka [(riyazi)]

B II 10

11 ['Alakšand]uš 'UTUš<sup>1</sup> paḫši katta-ya DUMU<sup>MES</sup>-KA hašša

12 [hanzašša DUMU<sup>MES</sup> 'UTU]š<sup>1</sup> hašša hanzašša AŠŠUM BELUTIM paḫšandaru

A II 8 [(nu kinun maḫḫan 'UTUš<sup>1</sup>) ki ...] išḫiulaš

9 [(TUPPA DŪ-nun nu zikka 'Alakša)]nduš

10 [hašša ḫanz(ašša išḫiulaš T)]UPPA kišan iya

11 [nu DUMU<sup>MES</sup>-K(A hašša hanzašša DUMU<sup>M</sup>)]<sup>ES</sup> 'UTUš<sup>1</sup> [(pát)]

12 [(katta) AŠŠUM BELUTI(M paḫša)]ntaru

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 (lines A I 74, 80)

DUMU DUMU.DUMU h-h- (A I 68, 70)

DUMU h-h- (B II 11-12, A II 11)

h-h- DUMU (A I 74)

h-h- (A II 10)

2. The reading *apūn-pát* is based on Otten's new collation of the text, see *MIO* 5, 27.

If one interprets *h-h* as 'grandson(s) and great-grandson(s)', the passage is peculiar in several respects:<sup>3</sup> (1) the order of *h-h-DUMU*; (2) the sudden shifts 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 *ḥašša ḥanzašša*', 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 *mārē ū mār mārē* 'sons and grandsons': see the treaty of Suppilulima with Mattiwaza Vs 63, Rs 71, 73-4 (Weidner, PD 18, 34); Mattiwaza-Suppilulima Rs 36, 60 (PD 52, 56); Suppilulima-Tette Rs IV 51 (PD 68); and Mursili-Talmisarruma Rs 15-16 (PD 88). There is no mention of *mār mār mārē* 'great-grandsons'. Similarly, in documents in Hittite the formulaic curses and blessings refer to *DUMU* or to *DUMU*. [DUMU]MES *DUMU*. *DUMU* (KUB XIII 4 I 36, XIII 9 II 7, XXI 29 IV 5, KBo XVI 25 I 16f, VIII 35 II 18), but nowhere do they speak of *DUMU.DUMU.DUMU*. 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 Hattic and Hittite. Lines III 30-32 read as follows:

30-31 (Hattic) kataḥaš pala lepinu pala lezi[x-x-x]tu  
32 (Hittite) ANA SAL.L[UGAL DUMU]MES DUMU.[DU]JMU MES  
*ḥaššuš [ḥanz]a[š]šu[š] piandu*

Laroche has shown (JCS 1, 199) that *le-pinu le-pazi-zintu* (KUB XXIV 14 IV 15-16) equates to *DUMU* *DUMU*. *DUMU*. *DUMU* and restores *zi[-in]-tu* 'grandson' in the present passage as well (see also Laroche, RA 41, 92). Note, however, that here the Hittite has not simply 'DUMU *DUMU*. *DUMU*', but 'DUMU

MES DUMU.DUMU *ḥaššuš ḥanzaššuš*'. This entire phrase corresponds to 'sons and grandsons' in Hattic. This instance is admittedly based on a restoration, but there is other evidence for the equation.

The instructions for palace officials (LÚMES SAG) include the following oaths:

KUB XXVI 1 I (von Schuler, *Dienstanw.* 8-9)

3 <sup>p</sup>UTUŠI-wa [AŠŠUM EN<sup>UTTI</sup>]

4 [paḥšweni katta-ma-wa DUMU<sup>MES</sup> [<sup>p</sup>UTUŠI]

5 ḥašša ḥanzašša AŠŠUM EN<sup>UTTI</sup> [paḥšweni]

15 AŠŠUM EN<sup>UTTI</sup> katta ḥašša ḥ(a)nz(a)šš(a)

16 NUMUN 'Tuḥaliya-pát paḥaš(tin)

KUB XXI 42 IV (*Dienstanw.* 28)

19 <sup>p</sup>UTUŠI-pát AŠŠUM EN<sup>UTTI</sup> GAM-wa-ši DUMU<sup>MES</sup>-ŠU DU-  
MU.DUMU<sup>MES</sup>-ŠU PAP-aštin

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<sup>MES</sup> <sup>p</sup>UTUŠI ḥašša ḥanzašša', 'ḥašša ḥanzašša NUMUN' and 'DUMU<sup>MES</sup>-ŠU DUMU.DUMU<sup>MES</sup>-ŠU'. Once again the phrases containing *h-h* equate to one which clearly means 'sons and grandsons'.

Thus in all the clear cases we have *mār mārē* or *DUMU* *DUMU* *DUMU*. *DUMU*. Never is there any reference to 'great-grandsons'. Furthermore, there are instances where the phrases containing *h-h* are parallel to *DUMU* *DUMU*. *DUMU*. We must conclude that either (1) just in those cases where they use *h-h* 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':

DUMU<sup>MES</sup> DUMU.DUMU<sup>MES</sup>  
or (DUMU<sup>MES</sup>) ḥašša- ḥanzašša-

The forms *ḥašša-* and *ḥanzašša-* mean 'offspring (of the first generation)' and 'offspring of the second generation' respectively.

3. A fact noted but not explained by Kronasser, *Etyim.* 157.

As such, they may stand alone as 'sons and grandsons'/'children and grandchildren', or in apposition to *DUMU*<sub>mes</sub>. The coexistence of *DUMU*<sub>mes</sub> *DUMU.DUMU*<sub>mes</sub> and *ḥašša-ḥanzašša-* is hardly surprising. Greek shows not only *huiós* and *huiônós*, but also *gónos* and *éggonos*. Likewise, Latin has (*g*)*nātus* and *prōgnātus* alongside *filius* and *nepōs* (for *prōgnātus* as 'grandson' see p. 64). The further proposal that *ḥ-ḥ-* may stand in apposition to *DUMU*<sub>mes</sub> is unparalleled in Greek and Latin and requires some explanation. This collocation is possible because Hittite had a single word meaning '(male) child', i.e. both 'boy' and 'son'. Compare 'na-an *DUMU-la(n)-man ḥalziḥhun*/'I called him my son' (*HAB* II 4) and '*DUMU-la(š)-maš*/'of my son' (*HAB* III 62) with the usage in the annals of Mursili: *KUB* XII 29 IV 16 'zik-ma-wa-za *DUMU-aš* (or *TUR-aš*) nu-wa *UL* kuitki šakti/'You are a boy; you know nothing'; *KBo* III 4 I 23-4 'arāḫzenaš-wa-mu-za *KUR.KUR* *ḷKÜR* kuitš *DUMU-lan* (*TUR-lan*) ḥalzeššir nu-wa-mu-za tepnuškir/'The surrounding enemy lands who called me "boy" and belittled me' (see also *HAB* 32 and *KUB* VII 1 I 1f). *DUMU-la-* (in the meaning 'boy' better transcribed *TUR-la-*) is also used adjectivally to mean 'young, small': *KUB* IX 32 Vs 39 'GIR *TUR-li*-(ya)'/a small dagger' and *KBo* XI 14 II 5 'AMAR-un-man *TUR-la(n)-man*/'my (?) young calf' (the use of the possessive is not entirely clear, but *TUR-la-* is surely being used adjectivally). The semantics are clear enough. The adjective 'young, small' is substantivized 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.<sup>4</sup> Thus an expression '*DUMU-la-* *ḥašša-ḥanzašša-*'/(male) children, offspring of the first and second generation' is not unnatural, since *DUMU-la-* does not inherently mean 'son'. It will only be restricted to the latter sense when specified by a possessive or paired with *DUMU.DUMU*, behind which undoubtedly lies the real Hittite word for 'grandson', the equivalent of *nepōs*. In view of the fact that it has both *ḥubba-* and *ḥanna-* 'grandfather' and 'grandmother', we have some right to expect that Hittite have specific terms for both 'grandson' (*nepōs*) and 'granddaughter' (*neptis*). We might guess them to be of the 'Lallwort' variety like *atta-* and *anna-*, *ḥubba-* and *ḥanna-*, but given the diversity of formation in kinship

4. The same is true of English 'girl' as well, of course.

terms among Indo-European languages, such a prediction is hazardous at best. In any case, there is no difficulty in supposing that Hittite had both specific and general terms designating children and grand-children, as did Latin and Greek. The idea that *ḥašša-* and *ḥanzašša-* are the general, inclusive terms is supported by the fact that they almost always occur together and usually in the plural. In other words, they are generally employed when one wishes to refer to the children and grandchildren collectively.

By interpreting *ḥašša-* and *ḥanzašša-* as referring to the first and second descending generations we can now explain the difficult passages noted previously. *KUB* XXIX 1 IV 2 '*DUMU.NITA* *mes* *DUMU.SAL* *mes* *ḥanzaššes*' now means 'male and female children, offspring of the second generation', i.e. 'grandsons and granddaughters', a natural group. Since the same text at II 11-12 refers to the 'grandchildren' of the king (*DUMU.DUMU*<sub>mes</sub>), we conclude that the grandchildren play some particular role in this ritual and that we have no reason nor right to emend by inserting *ḥaššes*. 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 oaths for palace officials (see p. 61) are now properly equivalent: *KUB* XXVI 1 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 'Bestow 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 *DUMU DUMU.DUMU* the types *b-b-*, *DUMU b-b-* and *b-b-DUMU* (for the order of the last see p. 68). But the form *DUMU DUMU.DUMU 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 *DUMU DUMU.DUMU*.

or *h-* *h-*. It does in fact mean no more than 'sons and grandsons'. The redundancy appears to be due to a conflation of the two proper alternatives, *DUMU*<sup>MES</sup> *DUMU* and *DUMU*<sup>MES</sup> *hašša-hanzaša*, with the ambiguous *DUMU*<sup>MES</sup> as the source of the confusion.

The reinterpretation of *hašša-* and *hanzaša-* as 'offspring of the first and second generation' has interesting consequences for their etymologies. Milewski, *L'hitt.* 32, proposes that *hanzaša-* consists of *hanz(a)* 'in front' + *hašša-*. As for the latter, Goetze already suggests, *ArOr* 2, 163, that derivation from *haš-* 'give birth' seems unavoidable (both are approved by Kronasser, *Etyim.* 157, 165). Nevertheless, with the old interpretation the latter etymology seems to lead nowhere, being without obvious parallels, and that of *hanzaša-* has been questioned (Pedersen, *Hitt.* 34 and Mezger, *Lg* 15, 188-9). But if *hašša-* means 'offspring', in particular 'offspring of the first generation, child(ren)', it is parallel to Greek *gónos* in both formation and function. Just as *gónos* is an action noun form *gen-* 'beget', so *hašša-* is formed from *haš-* 'give birth'. Whether *hašša-* retains the original action sense like *gónos*, which means 'begetting' as well as 'offspring', we cannot tell. Another use of *gónos*, however, namely its application to offspring 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 Idomeneus addresses Diiphobus: 'óphra idéi hotoš Zēnòš gónos enthád' hikánō, hòš próton Minōna téke Krétēi epíouron. Mínoš d'au téketh' huíon amúmona Deukalíōna, Deukalíōn d'emē tíkte poléss' ándressin ánakta Krétēi en eurelēi'. Having called himself a *gónos* of Zeus, Idomeneus then proceeds to give his genealogy, showing himself to be in fact Zeus's great-grandson. In the same way, then, Zintuhi, although the granddaughter of the Storm-god and the Sun-goddess of Arinna, may be referred to as their 'áššiyanza haššáš'/'beloved offspring/descendant'. As for *hanzaša-*, since it in turn refers not to the third, but to the second generation, the relationship of *hašša-* to *hanzaša-* is the same as that of (*g*)*nátus* to *prōgnátus*. For the latter used as 'son' and 'grandson' see Cicero, *Tusc.* 3, 12, 26: 'Tantaló prognátus, Pelope nátus'/'(Atréus) grandson of Tantalus, son of Pelops'.<sup>5</sup> Similar,

5. Latin *prōgnátus* usually means 'descendant' in general, without reference to a specific generation. In this usage it is analyzable as the past participle of the verb

but with a different preposition, is Greek *éggonos* 'grandson' <*en*+*gónos*.<sup>6</sup>

The reinterpretation of *h-* *h-* 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 *hašša hanzaša*, which seems morphologically and, as we shall see, syntactically anomalous. Some have taken the ending *-a* as a remnant of the IE dual ending *\*-ō*, comparing the combination *hašša hanzaša* to the type of Sanskrit *Mitrávrūnā* (Sturtevant, *CGr* 165, Pedersen, *Hitt.* 34 and Kronasser, *Etyim.* 156-7). In

*prōgignō* 'bear, engender', a virtual synonym of *gignō*. The less common *prōgnátus* 'grandson' from (*g*)*nátus* 'son' is clearly modeled on *proavus* 'great-grandfather' from *avus* 'grandfather', where the use of *prō* to designate the nextpreceding generation is logically justified. Similarly, English 'grandson' is patterned after 'grandfather'. Thus the direct comparison of *hanzaša-* to *prōgnátus* is oversimplified; i.e., it predicts a Hittite form like *\*hanzuphaš* 'great-grandfather' to serve as the model for *hanzašaša*. 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 Sumerian or Akkadian form.

6. This is the usual etymology for *éggonos*, as opposed to *ékgonos* 'descendant' (in general) <*ek*+*gonos*. However, the two forms are frequently confused, and it is not impossible that they both represent *ek*+*gonos*.

On the other hand, this is not the only possible interpretation of *hanzaša-*. Prof. Laroche has suggested to me in correspondence that it may be related instead to Luvian *hamasa-* 'grandson'. An Anatolian *\*hamasa-* in composition became with regular syncope *\*hamsa-*, whence Hittite *hanza-*, to which was added the directive possessive *-ša*. That the latter was added only to the second member of the syntagm (with which it later became fused) reflects the 'composite' nature of *hašša hanzaša*. It is by no means certain, however, that *h-* *h-* was felt to be a compound (the A. Sg. *hašša hanzašan* is questionable). We find, e.g., KUB XXXVI 110, 15-16 'labarnaš E-ir-šet tuškarataš haššáš-šaš hanzašáš-šaš'/'The house of the Labarna is (one) of joy for his sons and grandsons'. This example tends to show that although they were linked in an asyndetic collocation, *h-* and *h-* were still independently inflected words, each capable of taking the possessive. I would therefore expect at the time the expression was formed *\*hašša-ša hanza-ša*, with *-ša* attached to both members. It is only for the adverb *hašša hanzaša* in late Hittite, a fixed form outside the paradigm, that use of the possessive would be excluded. Another point is that Luvian *hamasa-* is used in filiations and thus forms part of the system of 'specific' terms for 'father', 'son', etc. I do not wish to insist overmuch on the distinction between 'general' and 'specific' kinship terms, but in view of the usage of *h-* *h-* in Hittite I find it unlikely that Luvian would have taken one of the pair and inserted it into the series of 'familiar' terms like *tati-* 'father', *nani* (*ga-*) 'brother', etc. In view of these considerations I do not at present see any compelling reason for choosing between the alternatives *hanz(a)*+*hašša-* and *ham(a)ša*+*ša*.

doing so, Sturtevant claims that the Hittite form functions only as a nominative or accusative, which is what one would expect were it from IE \*-ō. Friedrich, *Elem.*<sup>2</sup> I, 59, also lists *ḫašša ḫanzašša* 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 9-10 (see p. 59): 'nu zikka 'Alaksanduš [ḫašša ḫanz(ašša išḫulaš T)]UPPA kišan iya'. What is the function of ḫ-ḫ- 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-kán ANA D[(UMUMÉS-KA anda)]n äššuš eš tuel [(LUGAL-UTTA)] katta ḫašša [(ḫanzašša uk)]tūri ešta' (dupl. has *ēšdu*). Otten, *HTR* 45, renders 'for your grandsons and great-grandsons', which makes some sense syntactically, but not as a nominative or accusative. Furthermore, we would really expect a dative-locative *ḫaššaš ḫanzaššaš* in this meaning. Finally there is KBo VI 29 III 41-3: 'kuš-ma ŠA DUMU-YA [DUMU.DUMU-YA ḫašša] ḫanzašša ḫSANGA-UTTA ŠA PISTAR ḫuŠsamuha ḫullai'/'Whoever challenges my sons's, my grandsons's, (my) ḫ-ḫ- ('s) priesthood of Ishtar of Samuha...'. If *ḫašša ḫanzašša* is coordinate with 'son' and 'grandson', it must be functioning here as a genitive! It is certainly not nominative or accusative.

The solution to this predicament is that *ḫašša ḫanzašša* is a relic of the Old Hittite directive in -a, preserved in a set phrase which has become essentially an adverb: 'to the first and second generation'. For the directive case see Forrer, *Meißner-Fest.* I, 31f, and Laroche, *RHA* 28, 22f. For the preservation of *ḫašša ḫanzašša* in 'classical' Hittite one may compare *karuiliyatta*, formally the directive of *karuiliyatt-* 'antiquity', but functionally a virtual adverb meaning 'to (its) former state'/'as before'. The form occurs in VBoT 121, 7, a relatively late text: '[(nu KUR

7. The parallel fragments VBoT 121 and KUB XXIV 4+XXX 12 are both copies of a portion of the hymn and prayer of Mursili II to the Sun-goddess of Arinna (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+XXX 12 shows several characteristics of older texts (see Carruba, *ZDMG*, Supp. 1, 242 f.). The ductus of VBoT 121, however, is clearly not that of Old Hittite, and one may note its substitution of ḫUTUL-na' (line 8) for 'ḫuḫArinna' in Rs 21 of KUB XXIV 4.

ḫuḫHatti k]aruiliyatta kiša[ru]/'May the land of Hatti become 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 'heōs tritēs kai tetártēs geneās', One may also compare the Athenian law code's provision for inheritance 'mékhri anepsiōn paidōn'/'to (as far as) the children of cousins'.

Further support for interpreting *ḫašša ḫanzašša* 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 LUGAL-UTTA has caused translators some embarrassment. Friedrich, *ZA* (NF) 1, 173-4, argues that it means 'later, subsequently', but by the time of his *Staatsverträge*, he is not so sure and translates it 'entsprechend'/'correspondingly'. Both 'thereafter' and 'likewise' are termed 'conventional' translations by von Schuler, *Dienstauw.* 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 9 I 24: 'nu katta INA KUR ḫuḫAmurri apāš LUGAL-uš ēšdu'/'May he (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 *zilaiya* 'in the future' (e.g., Alaks. A I 73, see p. 59). 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 *kátō* 'down(ward); later' or Latin *infra* 'below; later'. Hittite *katta* thus is 'down (into the future), later'. It is tempting to translate *katta* in conjunction with *ḫašša ḫanzašša* 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 ḫašša ḫanzašša* is a syntactic unit, which is contradicted by the word order in many instances (e.g. Alaks. II 11-12, p. 59). If we take *ḫašša ḫanzašša* 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 Alaksandu 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, Alaksandu,  
kindly protect His Majesty,  
70 and may you protect down to the first and second  
generation my son and grandson.

Since elsewhere we find 'DUMUMÉS DUMU.DUMUMÉS haššuš  
hanzaššuš' which is clearly redundant, the use of *h-ḥ-* 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 adverbial  
*hašša hanzašša* as referring to the subject Alaksandu (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 *hašša hanzašša* 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 Alaksandu protect His Majesty, and may your sons down  
to the first and second generation  
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 tablets, may you Alaksandu

10 carry out these treaty tablets 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 *h-ḥ-* is an adverb,  
not part of the subject. The interpretation of *hašša hanzašša*  
as 'to the first and second generation' may also be applied to the  
treaty with Kupanta-<sup>p</sup>Kal § 11, D 35-7 and § 14, 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 *h-ḥ-* are equivalent to 'DUMUMÉS DUMU.DUMUMÉS' in  
meaning. There are even a couple of cases where 'DUMUMÉS  
DUMU.DUMUMÉS' may actually be standing for the adverb  
*hašša hanzašša*. In the treaty between Tuthaliya and Šauška-  
muwa of Amurru the oath of protection reads (KUB XXIII I II  
9-10): 'nu <sup>p</sup>UTUŠI AŠŠUM ENŪRI paḥši katta-ya DUMUMÉS  
DUMU.DUMUMÉS NUMUN ŠA <sup>p</sup>UTUŠI AŠŠUM ENŪRI paḥši'.  
Compare this to the oath for the LŪMESŠAG seen earlier (KUB  
XXVI I 15-16): 'AŠŠUM ENŪRI katta hašša ha(nzašša) NUMUN  
'Tuthaliya paḥaš(tin)'. We have in entirely comparable contexts:

katta-ya DUMUMÉS DUMU.DUMUMÉS NUMUN  
katta hašša hanzašša NUMUN

Since we find instances of *katta* without the adverb *hašša hanzašša*  
(e.g. Alaks. A I 80), it is possible that 'DUMUMÉS DUMU.DUMUMÉS'  
is also a direct object here, along with *NUMUN* 'descendants',  
but the parallel with 'hašša hanzašša NUMUN' is striking. There  
should at least be no doubt of the equivalence in meaning of  
*hašša-hanzašša-* and *DUMU DUMU.DUMU*.

Another possible instance of *DUMU DUMU.DUMU* for  
*hašša hanzašša* is KUB XXVI 24 IV 3-11:

- 3 ...[ANA]  
4 'Arnuwanda LUGAL.GAL ANA SAG.DU.[ ]  
5 SAL.LUGAL Ū ANA SAG.D[U T]uthaliya DUMU.LUGAL]  
6 katta DUMUMÉS-ŠU DUMU.DUMUMÉS-ŠU ANA SAG.DU  
[DUMUMÉS LUGAL (?)]  
7 katta DUMUMÉS-ŠUNU DUMU.DUMUMÉS-ŠUNU šer x-x-x-x  
8 weš-a-za kāša UGULA LIM <sup>10</sup>DUGUD ŠA ER[IN]<sup>[MÉS]</sup>  
9 ḥūmanza QADU DAMMÉS-NI DUMUMÉS-NI katta DUMU.  
DUMUMÉS-[NI]  
10 QADU KUR-NI limkiyaš TUPPU ZABAR ḥa[ntezzi]  
11 [iy]awen...

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 *šer* is unclear. It is the appearance of *katta* in the midst of an apparent coordinate series that is surprising. Note also that the preposition *ANA* is missing only before *DUMU<sub>MES</sub>* and *DUMU.DUMU<sub>MES</sub>*. Is this a coincidence? Both the presence of *katta* and the absence of *ANA* would be normal if *DUMU<sub>MES</sub>* *DUMU.DUMU<sub>MES</sub>* stood here for the adverb *ḥašša ḥanzašša*. Likewise in the second sentence *katta* appears unexpectedly, and the preposition *QADU* is repeated unnecessarily if the nouns are all in the same case. But if 'katta *DUMU.DUMU<sub>MES</sub>*-[*NI*]' stood for 'katta *ḥanzašša*', 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 dative-locative of *DAM<sub>MES</sub>* and *DUMU<sub>MES</sub>*. On the other hand, the use of possessives with *DUMU<sub>MES</sub>* and *DUMU.DUMU<sub>MES</sub>* would be surprising, since we never find \**ḥašša-ša ḥanzašša-ša*. Whether or not 'DUMU<sub>MES</sub> *DUMU.DUMU<sub>MES</sub>*' is standing here for the adverb *ḥašša ḥanzašša*, the appearance of *katta* does reinforce the equation of *ḥašša-ḥanzašša*- to *DUMU DUMU.DUMU* in general meaning.

In summary, then, Hittite *ḥašša-*, formed from *ḥaš-* 'give birth' like Greek *gónos* from *gen-*, means 'offspring', in particular 'offspring of the first generation, children'. It is usually paired with *ḥanzašša-* 'offspring of the second generation, grandchildren', their formal and functional relationship being that of Latin (*g*)*nātus* and *prōgnātus*. The case form *ḥašša ḥanzašša* 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 *katta* 'down (into the future), later'. This interpretation of these forms not only rationalizes the references to descendants in documents like the Alaksandu treaty, bringing them into line with standard Hittite practice, but also solves several unexplained syntactic problems. Furthermore, it normalizes the inflection of *ḥašša-ḥanzašša-* and shows their derivation to be similar to that of corresponding terms in Greek and Latin.

March 1974.

H. CRAIG MELCHERT  
Cambridge, Mass.