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Abbreviations and Symbols

A. = accusative
abl. = ablative
acc. = accusative
act. = active
c(omm). = common (gender)
dat. = dative
instr. = instrumental or instructions
loc. = locative
LRd = linker Rand
med.-pass. = medio-passive
M.H. = Middle Hittite
ms(s). = manuscript(s)
N.H. = Neo-Hittite
nom. = nominative
nt. = neuter
O.H. = Old Hittite
P. = protocol
pl. = plural
pres. = present
pret. = preterite
RCol = right column
Ro = Recto
Rs = Rückseite
s(in)g. = singular

t = late copy of Old Hittite text containing the conjunction ta
(see pp. 42-43)

Vo = Verso

voc. = vocative

Vorw. = Vorwort(e)

Vs = Vorderseite

+ (on the line) indicates a join between fragments of a tablet.
+ (superscript) indicates that a given linguistic form or passage
is partially restored.

!! indicates that a linguistic form, line reference or column number
has been emended.

! marks an unexpected linguistic form or spelling as it is attested
in the manuscript.

// = parallel to

|-- indicates in the listing of the corpus that the age of a manu-
script is indeterminate.

[ ] in the listing of the corpus indicates an unpublished manu-
script to which I have not had access.

[ ] in a transcription encloses an element which is restored.

[( ] encloses an element which is restored on the basis of a dupli-
cate text.

[[( )]] encloses a restoration which is possible, but not absolutely
required by the space and context.

[[]] encloses an element which is to be deleted from a manuscript.

< > encloses an element which is to be added to a manuscript.

[---] indicates that the missing portion of a tablet probably contains no writing.
'Une des tâches les plus nécessaires de la grammaire hittite serait une description détaillée des cas, de leur emploi et de leur valeur respective, et surtout dans les phrases qui semblent admettre un cas ou un autre en fonction identique. C'est seulement, par exemple, un relevé exhaustif des exemples de l'ablatif et de l'instrumental qui permettra de délimiter leur domaine propre et d'apprécier les emplois où ils paraissent interchangeables. Dans les catégories communes à certains des cas, il y aura intérêt à distinguer exactement les conditions qui entraînent soit l'un soit l'autre dans des expressions qui à première vue sont semblables.'

E. Benveniste, *Symb. Hрози* = *ArOr* 17/1(1949)44
Chapter One - Introduction

Section 1. Goals and Organization

The principal aim of this study is to partially fill the need expressed in the quotation above: to describe in detail the use of the ablative and instrumental in Hittite, based on an exhaustive survey of the published cuneiform corpus. I will also take the opportunity provided by the data collection to review certain formal aspects of the two cases. Finally, implications of the preceding analysis for the proposed etymologies of the case endings will be briefly examined.

My organization of the material is based on the premise that a comprehensive description of any aspect of Hittite grammar must take into account the various periods from which we have documents attested. Any analysis which fails to distinguish successive synchronic stages of the Hittite language runs the risk of miscomprehending the true relationship between various linguistic features. For example, the present third singular of verbs in -iya- is spelled variously -i-e-(ex)-si, -(i)-iz-si and -(i)-ya-(ex)-si (likewise in the preterite 3rd sing. one finds -i-e-st, -i-it and -i-ya-at). Friedrich, HE 1^2^ 514, assumes a contraction of -iya- to -e/-i-. However, Carruba, Kratylos 7 (1961) 157f, has shown that the chronological distribution of the spellings leads us to assume rather a development of /-(i)ye/ to /-(i)ya/. Whether we are dealing with a phonological or analogical
development is not yet clear, but the methodological point remains: we must distinguish successive chronological periods in Hittite in order to correctly comprehend a given problem and reach a satisfactory solution.

The analysis which follows is therefore both synchronic and diachronic. The use of the ablative and instrumental is first described for each successive synchronic stage of Hittite, then the results are compared in a search for diachronic trends. For purposes of the present study, I recognize the threefold division of the Hittite corpus into Old Hittite (ca. 1570-1450 B.C.), Middle Hittite (ca. 1450-1380 B.C.) and Neo-Hittite (ca. 1380-1220 B.C.).

The relative chronology of Hittite texts has been and continues to be the subject of considerable investigation and debate. Details of the dating criteria used here are discussed below in Section 2.

In dividing the corpus chronologically, we must make a clear distinction between a text (a given composition) and a manuscript (the particular tablet or tablets on which a text is inscribed). This step is necessary because we have not only original compositions from each of the three periods above, but also Middle Hittite manuscripts of Old Hittite texts, and Neo-Hittite manuscripts of both Old and Middle Hittite texts. The crucial role of Old Hittite manuscripts in determining the features of Old Hittite grammar is well established: see Otten-Souček, StroT 8(1969)1-2; Neu, StroT 12 (1970)1 and 50; Otten, StroT 17(1973)IX; Neu, StroT 18(1974)IX,1f.
Starke, StBoT 23 (to appear), actually limits the Old Hittite corpus to only those texts attested in Old Hittite manuscripts. Such a procedure is not merely overly restrictive, but invalid. It falsely implies that all discrepancies we observe between the linguistic usage in Old Hittite manuscripts and that in later copies of Old Hittite texts are to be attributed to the copying scribes: a copyist may introduce the usage of his own era or misunderstand and subsequently misuse forms of the older language. At least two further possibilities present themselves. First, our direct documentation for Old Hittite (in the form of Old Hittite manuscripts) is quite fragmentary. We must therefore reckon with the very real possibility that a particular linguistic feature which existed in Old Hittite does not happen to occur in the Old Hittite manuscripts available to us, but is attested indirectly in later manuscripts.

Second, there are differences in linguistic usage even among the texts in Old Hittite manuscripts. For example, in the 'Ritual for the King and Queen' (CTH 416), the sentence particle -(a)šta and the ablative case are in complementary distribution: when the notion of separation is expressed by one, the other is consistently absent (see Otten-Souček, StBoT 8(1969)83). But this feature is not universal in Old Hittite: cf. KUB XLIII 28 II 5 (O.H. ms.) n-akta šTU  deleteUserInput [ ]. Thus we should not leap to the conclusion that any usage observed in later copies which is
inconsistent with that in Old Hittite manuscripts is necessarily a neologism or an error. We must first check to see if the relevant feature is in fact typical of later Hittite usage. If it is not, we may then ask if it is the result of interference between the older linguistic system of the original text and that of the copyist. If the answer is again negative, then we may cautiously attribute the feature to Old Hittite, making explicit the fact that our conclusion is based on indirect evidence.\textsuperscript{4} I do not question the primacy of Old Hittite manuscripts in establishing the grammar of Old Hittite, but much information on the older language can also be obtained from later copies. One need only recall that Sommer in his commentary on the Testament of Kattusili I described many salient features of Old Hittite without being aware of the difference between older and later manuscripts (see HAB(1938)206-07 and passim).

The task of determining both Old Hittite texts and manuscripts has received considerable attention, but the equally important matter of defining the Neo-Hittite corpus has been relatively neglected. It is true that the bulk of Hittite manuscripts are Neo-Hittite, without obvious archaisms, but this does not justify our treating all of them as Neo-Hittite texts. Many texts, especially those concerning rituals, festivals or oracular practice, are not datable on external, non-linguistic grounds. The fact that their language is apparently Neo-Hittite does not guarantee that we
are dealing with Neo-Hittite compositions. Several assuredly 
Old Hittite texts exist only in thoroughly modernized copies 
(e.g. the Hittite version of the 'Acts' of Hattusili I, KBo X 2 
and duplicates). Thus if we are faced with a text in a Neo-
Hittite manuscript which cannot be dated on the basis of the 
contents, we cannot be sure whether we are looking at a revised 
version of an older text or an original Neo-Hittite text.

For this reason I find it not only proper but in fact 
necessary to give special status within Neo-Hittite to Neo-Hittite 
historical texts, analogous to that of Old Hittite manuscripts 
within Old Hittite. By historical texts I mean not only annals 
and treaties, but also letters, landgrants and other texts tied to 
specific persons or events which may be dated on non-linguistic 
grounds. The importance of these texts for linguistic purposes 
is that we can be sure that they are genuine Neo-Hittite compo-
sitions: the Annals of Mursili or the Autobiography of Hattusili III 
cannot have been written before the fact. Therefore, just as we 
base our description of Old Hittite primarily on texts in Old 
Hittite manuscripts, we should likewise take the Neo-Hittite 
historical texts as the starting point for our study of Neo-Hittite. 
Once again, this does not mean the exclusion of other texts, but 
securely datable Neo-Hittite historical texts should be given 
primacy.

The same principle applies to Middle Hittite. A Middle
Hittite manuscript of a ritual text may just as well be a copy of an Old Hittite text as a Neo-Hittite manuscript (for several real examples see Section 2.3 below). Theoretically, we should therefore also give special status within Middle Hittite to historical texts. This step is at present impractical for several reasons. First, our total documentation for Middle Hittite is relatively small. Subdividing this corpus risks reducing the number of examples of certain features to the point that useful generalizations are difficult, if not impossible. Second, the dating of Middle Hittite historical texts is by no means as secure as that of Neo-Hittite historical texts. In fact, the respective boundaries between Old and Middle Hittite and Middle and Neo-Hittite are not yet settled, and the attribution of some historical texts to the Middle Hittite period is still disputed.

In describing the use of the ablative and instrumental, I have therefore made no special distinction between genres in Middle Hittite texts. If a ritual or other text in a Middle Hittite manuscript shows no clearly Old Hittite linguistic features, I have treated the document as a Middle Hittite text. However, it must be remembered that our knowledge of both Old and Middle Hittite is incomplete, and the linguistic criteria for distinguishing the two older periods are still few and tentative. Thus some of the texts listed below as Middle Hittite may turn out upon
further investigation to be Old Hittite (whatever the age of the manuscripts).

The distinction between original texts and copies of various periods is not only important for the sake of giving special status to the originals. It is also very useful to know that a given manuscript is a copy. I insisted earlier that copies may preserve features of an older linguistic system, but this does not deny the fact that copies are subject to the mixing of linguistic systems: that of the original model and that of the copying scribe. Linguistic variation within a copy is thus of a fundamentally different sort from that in an original text. As noted above, the copyist may also misunderstand and misuse forms of the older language. Therefore if we find that a particular feature is attested only in manuscripts which are copies of older texts, the possibility exists that the feature is linguistically unreal, having belonged neither to the language of the original text nor to that of the copyist. I cite as an example the use of the enclitic possessive in -it/-at with the dative-locative singular (Houwink ten Cate, *EME* 24(1966)123f). In an accompanying article Josephson, *EME* 24(1966)133f, draws far-reaching conclusions based partly on this usage, but Osten, *StBoT* 17(1973)55, points out that it is not attested in original texts, but only in copies. A reexamination of all relevant facts shows that this alleged feature is merely a misuse of the enclitic possessive (for details see below Chap. 2,
Sec. 3, p. 259f). Because of such examples, I have included in the Old and Middle Hittite corpus many manuscripts which are too modernized or too fragmentary to be useful in establishing the older stages of the language. The mere fact that these manuscripts are copies justifies their being listed as such.

The considerations discussed above have dictated the order in which facts are presented. I will first describe the use of the ablative and instrumental in Old Hittite manuscripts (A). The scope of the investigation will then be expanded to include Old Hittite texts attested in Middle or Neo-Hittite manuscripts (A'). Any differences between the results of A and A' will be noted and set aside (A''). The usage of Middle Hittite texts will be described according to the same principle, first that of Middle Hittite manuscripts (B), then that of Neo-Hittite copies (B'). Once again, the differences between B and B' will be reserved for further study (B''). Within Neo-Hittite, primacy will be given to the usage of historical texts (C), followed by that of the remaining Neo-Hittite manuscripts (C'). Differences between C and C' (C'') will be compared with the usage of Old and Middle Hittite (A and B). Any features of C'' which may be explained on the basis of A and B will be eliminated, since they could represent the retention of older usage in heretofore unidentified copies. Remaining features of C'' will be added to those of C to give the total usage of Neo-Hittite. In a similar fashion the residue of our study of Old and
Middle Hittite (A" and B") will be compared with later usage. Any features which may be attributed to the influence of the later language will be eliminated. Those features which may not be so explained will tentatively be added to A and B to give the total usage of Old and Middle Hittite. Finally, the respective usage of Old, Middle and Neo-Hittite thus arrived at will be compared in an attempt to trace the diachronic development of the use of the ablative and instrumental within the historical period of Hittite. In order to carry out this program, we must first treat in some detail the complex problem of dating Hittite texts and manuscripts.
Section 2. The Corpus

2.1. Generalities

Already in the beginning of Hittite studies it was recognized that not all the Boğazköy texts come from the same historical era. Forrer, BotU (1922-26), distinguished with remarkable accuracy Old Hittite examples among the historical texts, and as already mentioned, Sommer, HAB(1938)206-07 and passim, pointed out many of the essential features demarcating the Old Hittite language.

In 1952 the discovery of a fragmentary historical text (KBo VII 14) in an Old Hittite archaeological stratum brought the realization that Old Hittite tablets are typically characterized by a set of external features collectively labeled 'ductus'. The concept of ductus includes the spacing of signs, the degree of word division, the width of column dividers, the point on the tablet where writing begins, and above all the shapes of the cuneiform signs (see Otten, Neues Hethiterf. (1964)12f). A subsequent reexamination of Hittite tablets using the above-mentioned manuscript of the 'Zukrasi text' (KBo VII 14+) as a comparandum revealed other Old Hittite manuscripts characterized by the same 'Old Hittite ductus' (see e.g. Otten-Souček, SBoT 8(1969)1,42f).

Thus the dating of Hittite tablets on the basis of ductus ultimately rests on independent archaeological evidence (unlike other criteria such as orthography and grammatical features).
I have therefore used only ductus in dating Hittite manuscripts. While certain features of orthography may also ultimately prove to be useful in dating manuscripts, all examples of which I am presently aware are valid only in dating texts (on specific instances such as e-e₃-tu and na-a-ah-₃-₃ see Sec. 2.2).

Since ductus includes not only the shapes of the signs used but also other external properties of the tablets, only an actual physical examination of the tablets themselves can produce an authoritative statement on the age of a manuscript. For this reason I have characterized no manuscript as Old Hittite on my own authority, but have merely compiled as complete a list as possible from secondary sources which rest on autopsies of the tablets. For details see Sec. 2.3 below.

The case of Middle Hittite is more complicated. In the first place, there exists at present no archaeologically datable 'benchmark' manuscript corresponding to KBo VII 14+ of the Zikrani text for Old Hittite. We must therefore fall back on historical criteria as an independent basis for dating the text we take as the starting point for comparison. Since a Middle Hittite text may exist in a Neo-Hittite copy, we must then look for a manuscript which is markedly different in ductus from known Neo-Hittite manuscripts. A good candidate is KUB XVII 21 (CTRL 375.1.A), a prayer of King Arnuwanda and Queen Aššunâkal. The text certainly dates from the Middle Hittite (Early Empire) period, and the sign
shapes of KUR XVII 21 are markedly different from those of assuredly Neo-Hittite manuscripts (see Rüster, StBoT 20(1972) Column VI versus Columns IX-XI). Furthermore, the sign shapes are not merely different from those of Neo-Hittite manuscripts, but different in the direction we would predict: i.e., they more closely resemble the sign shapes of Old Hittite manuscripts.

Taking KUR XVII 21 as a starting point, we may next look at the manuscripts of other historical texts attributed to the Middle Hittite period for examples of the same ductus. This process has already begun (see Otten apud Rüster, StBoT 20(1972)X), and on the basis of the core of Middle Hittite manuscripts thus arrived at, several Middle Hittite manuscripts from other genres of texts have been discovered (see the specific citations in Sec. 2.4 below). However, work on Middle Hittite manuscripts is far less advanced than that on Old Hittite, and references in available secondary literature are still few. I have therefore ventured to characterize some manuscripts as Middle Hittite based on my own examination of the ductus as reflected in the published autographs. The reader may test the results for himself based on the same autographs and the comparative tables of Rüster, StBoT 20(1972), and Neu-Rüster, StBoT 21(1975).

The limitations of working only from the autographs, without inspection of the tablets or even (in most cases) photographs, are all too obvious. Nevertheless, the importance of distinguishing
Middle Hittite manuscripts from Neo-Hittite copies of Middle Hittite texts justifies the attempt, even if the results are inevitably far from perfect. Not surprisingly, the differences between a Middle Hittite manuscript and a late Neo-Hittite manuscript (13th century) are usually quite clear. On the other hand, deciding whether a given manuscript belongs to late Middle Hittite or to the early Neo-Hittite period (Suppiluliuma I) is often exceedingly difficult. Furthermore, since only a few signs show marked changes, a final decision about smaller fragments is usually impossible. I have not hesitated to use the question mark freely to express my doubts about many cases. For obvious reasons, I have also tried to err on the side of caution: the number of Middle Hittite manuscripts is almost certainly higher, not lower, than that indicated here. One further point: given the unavoidable limitations of my method, I have taken Middle Hittite ductus as a necessary, but not sufficient criterion for designating a manuscript as Middle Hittite. In addition, some linguistic or other evidence has been required that the text is Middle Hittite. That is, I have first determined according to historical, linguistic and orthographic criteria that a text is Middle Hittite, then decided on the basis of the ductus (alone) that a given manuscript of that text is Middle Hittite.

While manuscripts are dated here solely on the basis of ductus, I have employed orthographic, linguistic and non-linguistic
(chiefly historical) criteria to date texts. The use of all these factors in dating Hittite texts has ample precedent, and in the case of non-linguistic criteria I have made no original contributions. An attempt has been made to reexamine proposed orthographic and linguistic criteria and to suggest a few others. In testing putative 'archaisms' which are to serve as evidence for an Old or Middle Hittite text, I have made use of a principle stated earlier (Sec. 1, p. 5): our primary source for the Neo-Hittite language should be Neo-Hittite historical texts. These are our only sure evidence for the current usage of the Neo-Hittite period. In other genres we may be dealing with older texts which have been copied or reused and modernized to varying degrees. It is the Neo-Hittite historical texts which we should use in judging the usefulness of various archaisms as dating criteria.

The Neo-Hittite historical texts listed below in Sec. 2.5 have been repeatedly surveyed with regard to proposed orthographic and linguistic archaisms. The results are summarized below in Sec. 2.2. Since the statements are cast in a negative form (a particular feature does not occur or rarely occurs in the given corpus), two points should be stressed. First, the corpus used for Neo-Hittite includes the Annals of Mursili II, the Deeds of Suppiluliuma I, the Autobiography of Hattusili III and several long and relatively well preserved treaties. The size of the corpus makes it unlikely that any feature is absent merely by
chance. Second, all the features discussed are present in Old Hittite historical texts; thus their absence in the Neo-Hittite corpus used cannot be explained on the basis of the genre of the texts.

Middle Hittite historical texts (in Middle Hittite mss.) have likewise been surveyed in an attempt to establish criteria for distinguishing Old from Middle Hittite. However, as already mentioned above, Middle Hittite historical texts are few, and those attested in Middle Hittite manuscripts still fewer. Distributional statements based on this limited corpus must therefore be viewed as provisional pending further study. The phrase 'Middle Hittite historical texts' as used in Sec. 2.2 below refers to the following texts, all in Middle Hittite manuscripts (for details see the full Middle Hittite corpus in Sec. 2.4):

28. Treaty
29. Treaty with Sunassura
34. Treaty with Kurustama
137. Treaty of Arnuwanda with the Gasga
138.1-2, Gasga Treaty
139.A-C, Gasga Treaty
140.2.A, Gasga Treaty
142.2.B, Annals of Tuthaliya
146. Mida of Pahhuwa
147. Madduwalta
199. Letter from Tarhuntissa to Palla
200. Letter to the King
212. KBo XVI 46 (Treaty Fragment)
223. Landgrant of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal
251.A. Protocol
259.D. Military Instructions of Tuthaliya
261.3. Instructions for the bel madgalti
262. Protocol of the Guard
270. Oath of Asšapala
271. Protocol of the Royal Succession
375.1.A. Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal

In order to make the corpus as large as possible, I have included several protocols and a prayer which are to all appearances Middle Hittite compositions. However, there are proven cases of prayers which incorporate passages from older compositions, and protocols need not be tied to a specific era. Attestations from these texts must therefore be regarded with caution (see note 6 above).

Rather than characterize the various archaism as 'sure' or 'supplementary' (cf. Kammenhuber, KZ 83(1969)268-69,280), I have merely grouped the features according to their distribution in Middle and Neo-Hittite historical texts. In attributing a text to Old or Middle Hittite, I have naturally given more weight to archaic features which are entirely absent in later texts, but the
distribution of a particular feature and subsequently the importance assigned to it are subject to change upon further investigation. As noted earlier, the distinction between Old and Middle Hittite is still not entirely clear. Hence the designation of one set of features as 'evidence for Old or Middle Hittite composition'. In agreement with Kammnhuber, KZ 83(1969)269, phonetic spellings such as na-at-ta or a-ap-ps-(an) have been considered less probative than other features. Furthermore, since our knowledge of Hittite grammar is far more advanced than our understanding of orthographic practices, I have attached more importance to grammatical than to orthographic features (given a similar distribution).
2.2. Dating Criteria

2.2.1. Evidence for Old Hittite composition

I. Features not attested in Middle or Neo-Hittite historical texts

A. Orthography

1. First sg. pres. act. of the -ḫi conjugation spelled -ḫē
   
   See Otten-Souček, STBoT 8(1969)76 with note 10. The examples cited there from KBo VIII 74+ (N.H. ms.), plus aṣšaḫe in KBo III 28 II 24 (N.H. ms.) cited by Kronasser, EHS 370, show that the spelling is not restricted to Old Hittite manuscripts.

2. pi-š-ra-an 'before' (vs. usual pi-ra-an)
   
   See Neu, STBoT 18(1974)38 with notes 6 and 11. Examples from both Old Hittite and later manuscripts are common. The spelling pi-š-ra-an is also attested already in Old Hittite manuscripts.

3. ...-uš for the reflexive particle -za
   
   Otten, STBoT 17(1973)31 note 58, cites nu-uš in KBo III 40,2 (N.H. ms.) and KBo XVII 36 III 11 (O.H. ms.). Compare also aššaunuš in KBo III 43 Vs 3 (same tablet as KBo III 40) and nu-šumuš in KUB XXIX 3 I 5 (O.H. ms.).

4. Scriptio plena me-e- in mema-/memišk- 'say, speak' and menakhhanda 'facing, toward'
   
   Houwink ten Cate, Records 10, cites mema- for Middle as well as Old Hittite, but both of his examples (CTH 373 and 443)
show other features reflecting Old Hittite originals (see details below in Sec. 2.3). For me-e- as old in both mema- and menabhanda see Carruba, ZDMG Supp. I,1(1969)236.

B. Grammar

1. Conjunctions ku and ta

Compare among others Kammenhuber, KZ 83(1969)280.

2. Sentence particles -(a)pa and -an

There is one possible instance of -(a)pa in a Neo-Hittite historical text, the well-known a-ki-pa(-) of the Hukkana Treaty §29 (KBo V 3 III 31). Hrozně's autograph shows traces of another sign behind pa, and Ehelolf proposed that the line contained a unique spelling pa-at of the emphasizing particle -pât (see Friedrich, SV II 170). No other examples of the spelling pa-at have been discovered, but Hart, TPS(1971)99f, argues plausibly from parallel passages that the context strongly favors -pât over -pa. In any case, the complete absence of -spa in Middle Hittite historical texts (and with a single exception also in the Kizzuwatnian rituals CTH 471-500) suggests that the particle had already fallen into disuse by the Middle Hittite period (thus also Carruba, ZDMG Supp. I,1 (1969)236). On the very rare particle -an see Otten-Souček, StBoT 8(1969)61-62.


Table I (following p. 260). The form nā-ē-ta (＝ nu-ē-ta) is used until the latest texts instead of nē-ē-ta (see Lee, ArOr 34(1966)22 note 29), though the latter does exist (e.g. KUB XII 17,4). Several instances of nē-ē-ta in Neo-Hittite historical texts occur in the same formula 'may it be placed under an oath for you', where the -ē- has singular reference.

4. Locative singular ēdi, kōdi (vs. usual adani, kōdani)

The archaic character of these forms is shown by the following attestations:

ēdi: KUB I 16 III 41 (HAB/CTH 6); KBO III 41 Vs 12 (CTH 16);
KBO VI 2 I 50 (Laws; QH. ms.); VI 26 II 3,7, VI 13 I 13,16,17,
VI 26 II 5 (i-di) (Laws; all N.H. ms.).

kōdi/kōdī: KUB XLIII 23 Vs 4 (CTH 820; O.H. ms.); XXXIII 65
III 3*, XXXII 138,4 (both CTH 330).

5. Nom.Sg. DINGIR-uš 'god' (vs. usual DINGIR-IM-re)

See the discussion of Neu, StBoT 18(1974)120 with references.

II. Features rarely attested in Middle or Neo-Hittite historical texts

A. Orthography

1. Dat.Sg. of the enclitic pronoun spelled -ēe

For -ēe as an archaisms see Carruba-Souček-Sternemann, ArOr 33 (1965)16, and Otten-Souček, StBoT 8(1969)56. The spelling does occur rarely in Middle Hittite historical texts:

KUB VIII 81 III 4 (Sunassura Treaty; cf. ibid. II 10);
KUB XXVI 17 II 9 (Milit. Instr. of Tuthaliya); and KBo XVI 25 III 13 (Protocol; text not absolutely datable as M.H.).

2. na-at-ta 'not' (vs. U-UL)

The phonetic spelling is attested in Middle Hittite historical texts: KUB XL 28,3 (Treaty with Kurustama) and KUB XXXVI 113, 10 (Protocol of Succession; could be based on an older model). In Neo-Hittite historical texts na-at-ta is found once in the Annals of Mursili (KBo V 8 I 21) and twice in the Šašágammar Treaty (KUB VIII 82+ Vs 5+11; see Kühne-Otten, StBot 16(1971) 18-19).

3. mu-uk-kán (vs. usual mu-kán)

On this spelling as an archaism see already Sommer, HAB 114 and 176. The only occurrence in a Middle Hittite historical text is in KUB XXXVI 114,6,9 (Protocol of Succession). Since this text could represent the reworking of an older composition, perhaps this feature belongs under I.A.

B. Grammar

1. Genitive in -an

On this ending in general see Laroche, RHA 76(1965)33f. For its status as an archaism see Friedrich, HE I2(1960)45, among others. The only attestation from a Middle Hittite historical text is KBo XVI 25 I 70 (Protocol). The possibility cannot be excluded that this Middle Hittite manuscript was copied from an Old Hittite original. Thus one could also choose to list
this feature under I.B. above.

2. Genitive with postpositions (instead of dative-locative)
   See Neu, *StBCT* 12(1970)59f. Once again the only example I have found in a Middle Hittite historical text stems from a text which is not absolutely datable: *KUB* XXXIV 40,14 (Protocol of Succession).

3. *takku 'if'*
   See Kammenhuber, *KZ* 83(1969)260-281, among others. The form occurs once in *KUB* XIII 9 II 16, a Neo-Hittite manuscript of the Instructions of Tuthaliya, so far as we know a Middle Hittite composition. Nevertheless, the consistent absence of *takku* elsewhere in Middle Hittite historical texts, especially in longer texts such as Madduwa and Mida of Pabhuwa makes its presence a rather strong argument for Old Hittite composition.

2.2.2. Evidence for Middle or Old Hittite Composition

I. Features not attested in Neo-Hittite historical texts

A. Orthography

1. *ma-a-ha-an* (vs. usual *ma-ah-ka-an*)
of Old or Middle Hittite texts: e.g. KUB XXXIII 34 Rs 4 (CTH 332), KUB XXXV 147 Rs 9 (Ritual of Zuwi). It is therefore only a criterion for the age of a text, not a manuscript.

2. e-š-tu (vs. usual e-š-du)

See Carruba, op. cit. 235 and Table I, and Otten, StBoT 11 (1969)5f,11. Once again this spelling is valid only for dating texts, not manuscripts. Occurrences in Neo-Hittite manuscripts include: KUB XXXI 81 Vs 5 (Treaty w/Išputabšu), KBo VIII 37 Rs 10 (Treaty with Kurustama) and KUB XIII 2 II 7-11, etc. (Instr. for the bel madgalti; cf. e-š-du ibid. II 36,III 15).

3. ak- 'die' spelled with a stem a-ak-

See Otten, StBoT 11(1969)12, and Carruba, op. cit. Table I.

In addition to the examples cited by Otten note the spelling a-ag-ša-a-an-za KUB XXXIII 72 Rs 14 (Kida of Pahhuwa; M.H. ms.).

4. a-an-pa-(an) (vs. usual EGIR-pa/EGIR-(pa)-an)


5. kiš- 'become' spelled with a stem ki-i-ša (vs. ki-ša-)

6. ḫe-e-er (vs. usual ḫe-er)

Houwink ten Cate, Recorda 13, terms ḫe-er 'more common' among his 'Group D' Neo-Hittite texts, implying that ḫe-e-er also occurs, but I have found no examples of the latter among Neo-Hittite historical texts.¹² Carruba, op. cit. 236, states that the use of ḫe-e-er ceases 'erst vor Suppiluliuma I', which agrees with my findings.

7. Iterative of tar- 'say' spelled taršik(k)- (vs. taršik-)

See Otten, SIBOT 17(1973)27 and 43, and Carruba, op. cit. Table I. Another Middle Hittite attestation besides Madduwatta V 34 is KUB XXIII 72 Rs 41 taršikt[te/ani] (Hida of Pahhuwa). It should be repeated here that the occurrences of taršik(k)- include several in Neo-Hittite copies of older texts.

B. Grammar

1. Sentence particle -(a)ēta (other than in the form ne-aš-ta)

The specific combination ne-aš-ta occurs infrequently in Neo-Hittite historical texts down to Tuthaliya III/IV: KBo V 3 II 12.III 50 (Hukkana Treaty), KUB XIX 37 II 35 (AM 170), Hatt. II 55, KUB XXVI 58 Vs 21 (also Hattusili III), KBo IV 10 Vs 33 (Ulimi-TeSub Treaty), KUB XXVI 43 Vs 60.Rs 6.21 and KUB XXVI 40 Rs 2.11 (both Tuthaliya III/IV). The two instances of -ēta in other combinations indexed by Friedrich, SV II 182, do not exist. In each case the sequence consists
of -ašta 'is/eos tibi'. In Middle Hittite historical texts na-aš-ša is frequent, and other combinations with -(a)šta are sparingly attested; mān-ašta KBo XVI 27 IV 17 (Sanga Treaty of Arnuwanda) and IBoT I 36 IV 23 (Protocol of the Guard); ber-ašša KBo XVI 25 I 34 (Protocol) and nu-war-ašša ibid. IV 14; mahan-na-ašša IBoT I 36 IV 3 (Protocol of the Guard); uncertain is nu-uš-ma-šš-ša KUB XXIII 12 III 8 (Annals of Tuthaliya). Further study of -(a)šta (especially in relation to -kan), with careful attention to the age of both texts and manuscripts will perhaps permit further refinement in the use of this particle as a dating criterion.

2. Acc.Pl.C. of the Enclitic Pronoun = -uš (vs. -aš)

The form -uš does not occur in Neo-Hittite historical texts as defined in Sec. 2.5. The very misleading conclusions of Kammenhuber, KZ 83(1969)268 and 282, are due to her failure to base Neo-Hittite usage primarily on undisputed Neo-Hittite historical texts (see Carruba, Or 40(1971)218, and also the discussion above in Sec. 1, pp. 4-5, and Sec. 2.1, note 6). More work is needed on the precise distribution of -uš and -aš in Middle Hittite; e.g., KBo XVI 47 (Treaty) has only -uš, in the combination nu-uš and elsewhere (Vs 9 zik-uš, Vs 10 mān-uš); Madāwatta shows nu-uš (KUB XIV 1 Vs 71), but anaš-aš (ibid. Rs 49) and nu-war-aš (ibid. Vs 70); but the Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal has both nu-uš (KUB XVII 21
I 27,III 7) and na-ēē (ibid. III 11) along with namma-ēē (ibid. IV 12). See Otten, S²ret 11(1969)23 and 30. I merely wish to affirm here that the very presence of -ēē at all points back to at least Middle Hittite.

3. Independent pronoun ēē- (or ēē-?)

The attested orthography points to an i-stem as set up by Friedrich, HB 1²(1960)64; C.Sg. ū-i-ēē KUB I 16 II 47 (Hadduvatta), Abl. ū-i-ēē KUB IX 31 I 14 (Ritual of Zarpiya) and probably Instr. ū-i-ēē KUB XXII 1 Rs 29 (O.H. ms.). Note, however, that the two spellings with the writing of the -i- (implying /siyəl/ and /siyets/) are from Neo-Hittite manuscripts, while the two older attestations may be interpreted as /sedani/ and /sed/. There are proven cases of a false resolution of an older e/i into a sequence -iyn- (e.g. KBo XVII 105 II 33 Pēiyn-ēēi for iēē-iēēi; see ibid. II 30 correct Pêi-i-ēēi). Therefore a stem ēē- with oblique ēē- is also possible. For the archaic status of this form see Götze, Mdd.(1928)137, Sommer HAR(1938)78, and Otten, S²ret 11(1969)4 and 25, with further references.

4. ūēē 'we'

One still finds ūēē 'we' in Middle Hittite historical texts:
KUB XVII 21 IV 5,7 (Prayer of Arnuwanda and Âšmunikal),
KBo XVI 27 I 11 (Gasga Treaty of Arnuwanda), KBo XVI 25 I 70
(Protocol) and KBo XVI 50 Vs 11.16 (Oath of Asḫapala). Neo-Hittite texts show only anazša 'we', but the number of examples in clearly datable historical texts is admittedly very small: KBo IV 3 IV 15 (Kupanta-kAL), KBo XIV 12 IV 15 (Dš fgt. 33) and KBo XI 1 Rs 15 (Prayer of Muwatalli). The value of anazša as a dating criterion is therefore limited.\textsuperscript{13}

5. Adjectives in -(ez)ziya- (vs. later -ezzi-)

The adjectives appesziya- 'rear; last', hanatzziya- 'front; first' and sarazziya- 'upper' are original ya-stems which are secondarily transferred to the i-stem class (see Sommer, KAB 158). While this fact is generally recognized, the value of ya-stem forms as a dating criterion does not appear to have been appreciated. A detailed survey of the attested forms therefore seems useful. Naturally, only the Nom. and Acc.Sg.C. and the N.-A.Sg.Nt. are capable of showing the difference between ya- and i-stems. The following summary is meant to be complete only for historical texts; examples from other genres are selected.

appesziya-

N.Sg.C. EGIR-šš KUB XII 63 Vs 6 (R. of Zuwi; O.H. text/N.H. ms.)

appizzi(y)šš IBoT I 36 II 66 (Protocol of the Guard; M.H. ms.-cf. ibid. I 21 appizzišš); KUB XXII 68 Vs 22 (İšmerika Treaty; M.H. text/N.H. ms.)

A.Sg.C. appizzian IBoT I 36 III 51 (P. of the Guard; M.H. ms.)
N.-A.Sg.Nt. 14 appiṣzi(y)an KBo III 22 Vs 41 Rs 46 (Anitta; O.H. ms.); KBo III 7 III 15 (Illuyanka; O.H. text/N.H. ms.);
KBo III 1 I 21 (Telipinu Edict; O.H. text/N.H. ms.); KBo III 38 Vs 7 (Zalpa; O.H. text/N.H. ms.); KUB I 16 II 29+ (MAR);
KUB XXIII 72 Rs 51+ (Mida of Pahhuwa; M.H. ms.); KBo VI 3 II 18 (Laws; M.H. ms.?; cf. appiṣzi ibid. II 12); KBo XIII 45, 7+ (Palace Chronicle; N.H. ms.); KUB XIII 7 I 9.10.19 and XIII 9 III 17 (Instr. of Tuthaliya; M.H. text/N.H. mss.);
EGIR-(piz)zi(y)an KUB XXIX 31,11+ (Laws; N.H. ms.); KBo VI 4 IV 7.10 (Laws; late version); KUB XIII 3 III 7 (Instr. for Palace Servants); KUB XIII 4 III 82,IV 20,30,45 with duplicates KUB XIII 5 III 49, XIII 17 IV 8 (Instr. for Priests; all N.H. mss.); KBo XVIII 48 Rs 11 (Letter; undated); KBo XVI 52 Rs 10+ (undated ḭgmt.).

versus:
N.Sg.C. appiṣzi TBoT I 36 I 21 (P. of the Guard; cf. above);
KUB XIII 7 I 22+ (Instr. of Tuthaliya; N.H. ms.); KUB XIII 20 I 3 (Milit. Instr. of Tuthaliya; M.H. text/N.H. ms.);
KUB XXXVI 91 Rs 7 (Prayer ḭgmt.; undated).
EGIR-(iṣzi) KBo XII 4 III 4+ (Telipinu Edict; N.H. ms.);
KUB I 1 I 11 (= I 2 I 10 = KBo III 6 I 10; Ḥatt.); KUB XXIII 1 III 10+ (Ṣauṣgamaṭwa Treaty); KUB XIV 3 II 60 (Tawagalawa
Letter; KBo IV 14 III 68 (Supp. II); KBo XIII 1 IV 5
(Vocab.; N.H. ms.); KBo XI 14 II 22 = KBo XIII 145 II 7
(R. of Hanitassu; O.H. text/N.H. ms.); KUB XL 51 II 4
(undated hist. fgmt.).

A.Sg.C. appizzin KBo V 3 I 2 (Hukkana Treaty)

Adverb
14 appizzin KBo VI 3 II 12 (Laws; M.H. ms.?; cf. above)

EGIR-zin KBo IV 14 III 71 (Supp. II).

N.-A.Sg.Nt. appizzi KUB XXXIII 67 I 30 (CTH 333; O.H. text/ N.H.
ms.); IBot I 36 III 70 (P. of the Guard; M.H. ms.)

EGIR-zi KUB XIII 35 I 30 (Affair of UKKUNUS; undated);

KUB XXIII 71 Rs 2 (undated hist. fgmt.).

hantezzya-

N.Sg.C. hantezz(y)aš KUB I 16 III 39 (HAB); KBo XIII 45 Vs 14?

(CTH 10); KBo XIII 1 II 36 (Telipimu Edict; N.H. ms.); KBo
XVI 25 I 13. 21. 66* (Protocol; M.H. ms.); KBo VI 3 II 6
(Laws; M.H. ms.?); IBot I 36 II 64 (P. of the Guard; M.H.
ms.); KBo III 20 I 4+ (Naram-Sin; N.H. ms.); KUB XXXIII 120
I 9 (Theogony; M.H. text/N.H. ms.).

A.Sg.C. hantezz(y)an KBo III 1 II 10 (Telipimu Edict; N.H. ms.);

KBo III 7 II 18+ (ILLUYANKA; N.H. ms.); KBo XVI 24 I 15

(Protocol; M.H. ms.).

versus:

N.Sg.C. IGI-ziš KBo VI 5 II 12 (Laws; N.H. ms.); KUB XXVI 79 I 15

(AM 98)

hantezziaš KBo III 1 II 37. 38 and KUB XI 2,11 (Telipimu Edict;
N.H. ms.—cf. above); KBo IV 4 II 4+ and KUB XIX 29 IV 8 (AM 112 and 16); KUB XXIII 1 III 11+ (Śauṣaṇaṣuwa Treaty).
A.Sg.C. hanteszin KBo XIV 3 III 41+ (DŚ), KUB XXIII 77a Rs 15+ (Gasga Treaty; M.H. ms.)
N.-A.Sg.Nt. IGI-zit KBo III 6 II 13 = KUB I 2 II 16 (Hatt.).
Barazziya—
A.Sg.C. Barəzziyan KUB XXXIII 62 II 4 (CTH 330; O.H. text/ M.H.? ms.).

versus:
N.Sg.C. Baraz(z)ī KBo VI 29 II 5.7 (Hattusili III on Urhi-Tešub)
N.-A.Sg.Nt. Barazzi KUB XXIII 20 I 34 (Milit. Instr. of Tuthaliya; M.H. text/ N.H. ms.); KUB XXIII 2 III 27 (Instr. for the bel madgalti; M.H. text/ N.H. ms.); KBo VI 29 II 11 (Hattusili III on Urhi-Tešub)

The adjective hanezzi—'first-class, fine', which is usually reckoned as a member of this group, shows only i-stem forms to my knowledge, but none are attested earlier than Middle Hittite.

While more data would obviously be desirable, the picture which emerges from the above survey is unambiguous. The Old Hittite forms are those in -ya-, while Neo-Hittite historical texts show only forms of the i-stems. This shift apparently took place in Middle Hittite, judging from texts like IDoT I 36, which has both ya- and i-stems. Middle and Neo-Hittite copies of Old Hittite texts predictably show a mixture of the two inflections.
The adverb *annezi(y)*en 'afterwards' remains in Neo-Hittite in the 'contracted' form *appizzin*.

6. 2nd Sg. Pres. *ištamaḫši* 'you hear' vs. later *ištamašti*

On the spread of the ending -ti at the expense of -ši see Friedrich, *HE* I²(1960)78. The change took place in different verbs at different times. Part of the interest in the case of *ištamaḫši* lies in the fact that the change here may have occurred between Middle Hittite and the earliest period of Neo-Hittite (Suppiluliuma I). The form *ištamašši* is found in *KBo* VII 28 vs 9.10 and *KBo* VIII 92 vs 5.6 (Prayer to the Sun-goddess of Earth; O.H. text/M.H. ms.) and also crucially in *KUB* XXXVI 127 vs 14 (Sunassura Treaty; M.H. text/N.H. ms.). On the other hand, *ištamašši* is already the only form in the Hukkana Treaty of Suppiluliuma I (5x) and the only form in other Neo-Hittite historical texts (25x including duplicates). With so few cases from older texts, one cannot exclude the possibility that *ištamašši* already existed in Middle Hittite alongside *ištamašši*. This would not affect the validity of the -ši form as an archaism, but it would of course destroy the usefulness of the opposition *ištamašši/ištamašši* in drawing the precise boundary between Middle Hittite and the usage of Suppiluliuma I.

7. Vocative

Contexts which call for the vocative are rare in historical texts such as annals and treaties. Most of the attested examples are from prayers and mythological texts. For this reason the absence of vocatives in our very limited Middle Hittite historical corpus does not yet justify the conclusion that the vocative was limited to Old Hittite, although this may well turn out to be true. On the other hand, the absence of the vocative in the prayers of Huwatalli and Hattusili III/ Puduhepa does argue that texts with this feature go back to at least Middle Hittite. The example ḫarrum[a] cited by Leroche, loc. cit., from KUB XV 1 II 16 (probably Puduhepa) is dubious. The autograph shows enough room to restore ḫ[u]gal-ḥ[a-s]₃.

II. Features rarely attested in Neo-Hittite historical texts

A. Orthography

1. Verbs in -(i)ya- spelled -i-₃- or -i-1₃

On this feature see Carruba, Kratylos 7(1962)157, ArOr 33 (1965)13f, and Sprache 12(1966)79f, as well as Houwink ten Cate, Records 16, with references. The older spellings occur often enough in Neo-Hittite historical texts to make this feature alone insufficient to mark a text as Old or Middle Hittite. Nevertheless, the progressive disappearance of the older spellings within Neo-Hittite confirms their archaic character.
Suppiluliuma I:

Hukkana Treaty: 1-e-ši KBo V 3+ II 3'[.49 (cf. II 45 iyaši)

KUB XXVI 36 III 14

1-e-zi KBo V 3 II 30

i-e-zi ibid. II 8.44

[i]i-e-ez-zi ibid. II 26

i-e-ed-du ibid. II 38

pi-i-e-mi ibid. II 78.79

i-e-mi KUB XXVI 38 III 16

KBo XIV 18 (?)16 i-e-š i. 11

i-e-ul-li-it i. 9

Mursili II:

Annals: hu-ul-li-i-e-š KUB XIV 15 I 29 (AM 38)

hu-ul-li-e-š KUB XIV 17 XII 17 (AM 98)

KBo XVI 17 III 28

ti-i-e-š KBo V 8 I 35 (AM 150)

(ie-hi-ih-hu-un KBo III 4 III 26, V 8 II 3)17

(ku-u-ru-ri-ih-ta KBo II 5 I 9)17

Tawannanna: ti-i-e-š KUB XIV 4 II 12

Duppi-Tešub: ti-i-e-ez-zi KBo V 9 III 13

2nd Plague P.: i-e-ez-zi KUB XIV 8 Rs 27 (2x)

(kap-pu-u-iz-zi KUB XIV 8 Rs 28)18

Deeds of Supp.: hu-ul-li-it KUB XIX 11 IV 39 (PG fgt. 13)

(cf. hulliyat KBo XIV 3 IV 33; fgt. 15)
Kupanta-\textsuperscript{d}KAL: \textit{šu-\textit{ul-li-it} KUB VI 41 I 32}
\textit{a-ra-an-tal-li-en-zi KUB VI 43,6} =
\textit{a-ra-an-\textit{da-al-li-en-zi KBo IV 7 I 24} =}
\textit{a-ra-an-tal-li-in-[zi] KUB VI 41 I 25}

P. to Lelwani: (\textit{kap-pu-ul-it KBo IV 6 Rs 15})^{18}

Muwatalli:

Alaksandu Treaty: \textit{wa-as-ga-\textit{ri-is-zi KUB XXI I III 41}}
\textit{ti-en-zi KUB XXI 5 II 14}

Hattusili III, Tuthaliya III/IV, Suppiluliuma II: none.\textsuperscript{19}

2. \textit{E\textit{a}š-} (iter. to \textit{\textit{u}ya-} 'do, make') spelled \textit{i-\textit{iš-\textit{ha-}}}

See Houwink ten Cate, Records 10-11. The older spelling is
found in the Hukkana Treaty (6x including duplicates) and once
in the Plague Prayer of Mursili (\textit{KUB XIV 13 I 357};
\textit{iš-\textit{ki-iš-[ta]}). Whether or not it is valid to explain this
example in terms of 'stilistische Topoi' (Carruba, ZDMG
Supp. I,1(1969)246-47), it is clear that this single instance
in a prayer is not a probative counterexample to the usual
spelling \textit{e-aš-\textit{ka-}} in Mursili (15x plus 5x in the Plague
Prayer).


See Houwink ten Cate, Records 8 and 16-17, with references.
Since the linguistic status of these endings is not yet clear,
I list them provisionally under orthographic features. The
only occurrences in Neo-Hittite historical texts are from the
period of Suppiluliuma I: p暗示 KBo V 3+ IV 28.29

(Bukkana Treaty), [ ]x暗示 KUB XXVI 57 I 11 (Oath). 20

4. Reflexive particle -za spelled -(a)z

This spelling occurs frequently enough in Neo-Hittite historical texts so that it is useful as a dating criterion only in combination with other features. It is found most often in the Treaty of Mursili with Kupanta-dKal (5x). The remaining instances are: ERFin, MES-za KBo V 4 I 19 (Tergasnalli Treaty), namma-z KUB XIV 23 I 22 (DS, fgt. 2), waštul-ma-z KUB XIV 8 Rs 26 and kuitta-ya-wa-z KUB XIV 10 I 10 (Plague Prayers), annuk-ma-z KUB XXII 12 I 11 (Prayer of Mursili), LÚ SANGA-za KUB VI 45 I 18 and hûdak-za II 11 (Prayer of Nusatalli), dIPU-ya-z KBo II 6 I 34 (Oracle ro Azma-dU; Hattusili III or later). The spelling -(a)z goes of course with that in -(u)z cited above in Sec. 2.2.1 under I.A.3.

There was a tendency in Old Hittite to write -Vz after a word ending in a vowel and -za after a consonant, but compare nu-us-za KBo XXII 2 Vs 12.13.17 (O.H. ms.) and Otten, StBoT 17 (1973)31 note 58. The spelling -(a)z after -a lasted much longer than other cases of -Vz and is thus a much weaker dating criterion.

B. Grammar

1. Nom.Pl.C. kē and apē (vs. later kūs and apūs)

See Houwink ten Cate, Records 14-15. The form kē as Nom.Pl.C.
is attested in Neo-Hittite only in the Hukkana Treaty (5x) and in the Manapa-Datta Treaty (KUB XIX 49 IV 35), in all cases modifying *NIŠ DINGIŠ. MEŠ.* It's counterpart *apā* is attested not only in the Hukkana Treaty (KBo V 3 III 27 = KBo XIX 44 Rs 16), but also in the Treaty with Kupanta-ḫAL (KBo IV 3 IV 35) and probably also in the Deeds of Suppi- luliuma, fgt. 18 (KBo XIV 4 I 10; cf. spūš I 9).

2. Genitive in -ensan
See Sommer, ḪAB 77, among others. The second person plural *sumensan* is still the usual form in the texts of Suppi luliuma I: Hukkana Treaty (KBo V 3+ III 32. IV 52) and Treaty with Šattiwasa (KUB XXVI 34 Rs 6). Later Neo-Hittite historical texts have only *sumel*.

3. Enclitic Possessive Pronouns
See among others Friedrich, HE I^2^ (1960) 64-65. Many of the isolated examples of enclitic possessives in Neo-Hittite historical texts may be regarded as 'set phrases': e.g., *pēdi-šē* 'in its place' comes to mean 'on the spot'. Other cases may be made to fit this explanation only arbitrarily. Nevertheless, the errors in the use of enclitic possessives in both Neo-Hittite originals and copies of older texts confirm that these forms were no longer part of ordinary Neo-Hittite usage. Therefore while one or two isolated enclitic possessives do not alone prove that a given text is old, a cluster of such
forms is a strong argument for Old or Middle Hittite composition. The following list is intended to be complete for the Neo-Hittite corpus defined in Sec. 2.5:

Suppiluliuma I: katti-\(\text{mi}\) \(\text{KBo V 3+ II 15}\)
\(\text{tuzziuš-\(\text{mi}\)\(\text{sh}\)}\) \(\text{KBo XIV 18,14 (\(?\))}\)\)

Mursili II: \(\text{pi/edi-\(\text{ki}\)}\) \(\text{KBo V 9 III 4 (Duppi-Tešub §14)}\)
\(\text{KBo III 4 III 25.30 (AM 74 and 76)}\)
\(\text{KUB XV 36 Vs 5 (Aphasia of Mursili)}\)
\(\text{katti-\(\text{ki}\)}\) \(\text{KUB XXXI 33,7\(^+\).9\(^+\)}}\) (\(\text{D3 fgt. 5}\))
\(\text{katti-\(\text{ki}\)}\) \(\text{ibid. 5}\)
\(\text{i\(\text{ktarni-\(\text{nummi}\)}}\) \(\text{KBo XIV 12 IV 32f (\(\text{D3 fgt. 28}\)}}\)
\(\text{= KUB XXXI 25,4\(^+\).7\(^+\).9\(^+\)}}\)
\(\text{tuzziuš-\(\text{mi}\)\(\text{t}\)}\) (A.Pl.) \(\text{KUB XIX 37 III 10 (AM 172)}\)
\(\text{tuzziyāš-\(\text{mi}\)\(\text{t}\)}\) \(\text{KBo II 5 II 3 (A.Pl.).II 13 (N.Sg.)}\)
\(\text{III 24 (A.Pl.) (AM 182 and 190)}\)
\(\text{me-[\(\text{i-va}\)-\(\text{an-\(\text{mi-\(\text{t}\)}\)}}\) \(\text{KUB XIV 14 Vs 7 (1st Plague P.\)}}\)
\(\text{at-ta-as\(\text{-mi-\(\text{in}\)}}\) \(\text{KUB XIV 11 II 22 (2nd Plague P.\)}}\)

Muwatalli: at-ti-\(\text{mi}\) \(\text{KBo XI 1 Vs 21 (Prayer to Tešub)}\)

Hattusili III: li-ta-mi Hatt. II 29

Tuthaliya III/IV: ies-ta-\(\text{mi-\(\text{su-\(\text{sum-me\)}}\)}}\) \(\text{KUB XXVI 43 I 19//}\)
\(\text{KBo XXII 58 Vs 9}\)

Suppiluliuma II: pidi-(\(\text{e}\))\(\text{ki}\) \(\text{KBo XII 38 I 7 (Conquest of Alasiya)}\)

In Middle Hittite the use of enclitic possessives seems to have been still quite viable. Note in particular these
examples: *pira(s)*—*šit IRBT I 36 I 35* (in Neo-Hittite
always -ši...piran) and *humensan-pat kir-šumet KBo VIII 35
II 21 (Gasga Treaty; M.H. ms.).

4. Directive Case

On the directive case see Forrer, *Meisner-Fest.* (1928)31f,
and Laroche, *RHA* 28(1970)22f. For its use as a dating
criterion see Houwink ten Cate, *Records* 22-23. A handful
of examples are found in Neo-Hittite historical texts: 23

*t/damušt* 'aside': KBo XIV 13 II 16 and KUB XIX 18 IV 17 (Dš)
KBo IV 2 III 47 (Aphasia of Mursili)
KBo III 6 III 66 = KUB I 8 IV 19 (Hatt.)
KBo XVI 36 III 11 and KUB XIX 9 I 16 (also
Hattusili III)

šā-ta 'in(to) the heart': KUB VI 41 IV 24.25 and VI 44+ IV 23
(Kupanta—*KAL §§21-22)
KUB VI 45 IV 46 (Prayer of Muwatalli)
KUB XIV 7 IV 8 and XXI 19 IV 22
(Prayer of Hattusili III)
544/f Vs 4 (*KBo* II, p. 10)
KBo IV 12 Vs 32 (Hattusili III)

karuilivatta 'as before' (< 'into a former state'):

KUB XIV 12 Vs 11?.Rs 14 (Plague Prayer of
Mursili)

dameda 'elsewhere': Hatt. IV 24
<hümma 'into a pig-sty': Hatt. IV 26²⁴

As with the enclitic possessives, most of the above examples may be explained as set phrases, but hümma hardly fits this pattern. Therefore the directive case is another archaism which is useful as a dating criterion only in conjunction with other features.
2.3. The Old Hittite Corpus

The following list includes all texts for which there is solid evidence for original composition in Old Hittite. Aside from historical data, such evidence consists of the archaic orthographic and linguistic features discussed above in Sec. 2.2.

Most of the texts listed below exist only in Neo-Hittite (less often Middle Hittite) manuscripts. The claim of original Old Hittite composition does not preclude considerable revision of these texts in the versions we have. Such revision may include not only modernization of the spelling and language, but also interpolations or changes designed to make an already existing text applicable to a specific purpose. Houwink ten Cate, Records 29f, discusses several examples where the existence of both older and later copies of the same text allows us to see the process of orthographic and linguistic modernization. See also Carruba, ZDMG Supp. I, 1(1969)239f. For the application of an older text to various specific purposes, see the different versions of the great hymn and prayer to the Sun-god, which exists in three versions. In one the supplicant is 'the king', in another 'a man', and in a third an individual named Kantuzzili (see Gütterbeck, JAOS 78 (1958)242f).

Festival and ritual texts may undergo similar revision. For example, KUB XXV 18 describes the 33rd and 34th days of the AN.TAH.SUN SAR Festival, which is certainly an Old Hittite text.
But **KUB XXV 18 I 1** and **III 7-10** show that this version dates from
the reign of Tuthaliya III/IV. The mere insertion of his name
(I 1) and the provision for an extra offering (III 7-10) do not
make this text a Neo-Hittite composition in any real sense, since
most of the provisions of the festival undoubtedly remain the same.
Naturally, we must be cautious about drawing conclusions for Old
Hittite on the basis of such a text, but this holds for any later
copy of an Old Hittite text. Copies vary widely in the degree to
which they preserve archaisms, and the usefulness of each manu-
script must be judged accordingly.

One could propose another explanation for Neo-Hittite manu-
scripts which show a handful of scattered archaisms: these
represent original Neo-Hittite compositions with conscious
archaizing in imitation of older models. I have tentatively
rejected this possibility for two reasons. First, the beginning
of significant Hurrian influence on Hittite has been dated at about
1400 B.C. (Kammenhuber, **KZ** 83(1969)263 with ref.). As already
noted by Kammenhuber, op. cit. 261, Old Hittite linguistic features
are conspicuously lacking in the Kizzuwatnian rituals (now **CTH** 471-
500) and in Hurro-Hittite texts. A survey based on the criteria
of Sec. 2.2 has turned up very few exceptions (see **CTH** 483, 628,
711-714 and 780 below in Sec. 2.4). If there was a Neo-Hittite
practice of composing new ritual texts with conscious archaizing,
it is very surprising to find so few traces of it in the above set
of texts which have been dated to late Middle Hittite and Neo-
Hittite on independent grounds.

Second, it may be seriously questioned whether an inten-
tionally archaizing text would show merely a random scattering
of archaic features. I call attention to KBo XXII 6 (Kar tangible
fragment; edited by Güterbock, MDOG 101(1969)14-26). As pointed
out by Güterbock, op. cit. 26, the number of errors in the use of
the enclitic possessives is startling. These can hardly all be
explained as ordinary copying errors, but must be attributed with
Güterbock to a conscious attempt to employ an archaic feature which
is no longer fully understood. It is true that in this case we
are dealing with a copy of an Old Hittite text, not a new composi-
tion, but the point remains. Intentional archaizing by a Neo-
Hittite scribe should result in a persistent but imperfect use of
one or more features, not in a few scattered relics. In order to
prove 'archaizing', one would need to show a persistent use of
archaisms in a text whose late composition is independently
established by its contents (which means more than just the name
of a late king). Since we have incontrovertible cases of reuse
and modernization of older texts, according to the principle of
economy I prefer to explain all texts with sure but scattered
archaisms in this way, until the need is shown to do otherwise.

The numerous festival fragments containing examples of the
conjunction *ta* but no other apparent archaisms call for special
comment. Given the complete absence of ta not only in Middle and Neo-Hittite historical texts, but also in the Kizzuwatnian rituals, I have taken its use as a strong criterion for Old Hittite composition. Nevertheless, assigning a text to Old Hittite on the basis of a single feature is perilous, and those texts which are attributed to Old Hittite based on ta alone have been specially marked in the following list with a † preceding the CTH number.

There have been two previous published summaries of the Old Hittite corpus: Kammenhuber, KZ 83(1969)259f, and Josephson, Sent. Part. 41f, the latter using the Old Hittite corpus established for the Chicago Computer Project under the direction of Prof. H.G. Gütberbock. Laroche, whose Catalogue des textes hittites (CTH) is the basis for the numbering system below, also distinguishes Old Hittite historical texts (numbers 1-39). In the case of generally acknowledged Old Hittite texts, I have not thought it necessary to repeat all the evidence previously adduced. The evidence for attributing other texts to Old Hittite is presented in notes following the list of the corpus, again using the numbers of Laroche, CTH.

As previously observed, the designation of manuscripts as Old Hittite is based entirely on secondary sources. Chief among these is the list of Old Hittite manuscripts in Starke, StBoT 23 (to appear), kindly made available to me by the author. Kammenhuber,
KZ 83(1969)259f, also lists Old Hittite manuscripts, based on
autopsies of the tablets by Otten and Güterbock (see her acknow-
ledgement, loc. cit.). I have also included manuscripts charac-
terized as 'typisch alter Duktus' or 'alter Duktus' in the Vorworte
to the respective volumes of KUB and KBa. Other characterizations
of the ductus such as 'ällich, ältlich wirkend, alttümlich' etc.
have not been considered sufficient to establish a manuscript as
Old Hittite.

In distinguishing Middle Hittite manuscripts, I have relied
not only upon scattered references in the secondary literature,
but also upon a personal inspection of the ductus as reflected in
the published autographs (see the discussion above in Sec. 2.1).
For the differences between 'older' and 'newer' sign variants
see Rüster, StBoT 20(1972), Neu-Rüster, StBoT 21(1973), and their
article in Fest. Otten(1973)22lf.

Special abbreviations:

(J) = Josephson, Sent. Part. 41f
(K) = Kammhuber, KZ 83(1969)259f
(S) = Starke, StBoT 23(to appear)
(V) = Vorworte to the respective volumes of KUB and KBa
(O) = Oettinger, MSS 34(1976)121f25
The Old Hittite Corpus

1. Anitta (J) (K) (0)
   A. KBo III 22 = BotU 7 O.H. (S) (K) (0)
   B. KUB XXVI 71 (= BotU 30) I 1-19 N.H.
   C. KUB XXXVI 98(+98a+)98b N.H.

2. Fragments naming Anum-Herwa and Zalpa (J) (K)
   1. KBo XII 3 N.H.
   2. KUB XXXVI 99 O.H. (S)

3. Zalpa (J) (K)
   1.A. KBo XXII 2 O.H. (S) (0)
   B. KBo III 38 = BotU 13 N.H.
   C. Bo 7858 ms.?
   2.A. KBo XII 18 N.H. m/s?
   B. KBo XII 63 N.H.
   3. KUB XXIII 23 N.H.
   4. KBo XIX 92 N.H.
   5. KBo XII 19 N.H.? n°?

   II. Hittite version: all mss. N.H.

5. Edict of Hattusili I (J) (K)
   KBo III 27 = BotU 103 N.H.

6. Testament of Hattusili I (J) (K)
   KUB I 16 (= BotU 8) + XL 65 N.H.
8. Palace Chronicle \((J) (K) (0)\)
   D. \textit{KUB XXXVI} 104 O.H. \((S) (0)\)
   All other mss. N.H.

9. Fragments of Palace Chronicles \((J) (K)\)
   1. \textit{KUB XXXVI} 105 O.H. \((0) \text{ ?}\)
   5. \textit{KBo VIII} 42 O.H. \((S)\)
   Other mss. N.H.

10. Fragments on the Campaign of Mursili I against Babylon \((J) (K) (0)\)
    All mss. N.H.

11. Campaign of Mursili I against Aleppo \((J) (K)\)
    A. \textit{KBo III} 57 = \textit{BoTU} 20 N.H.
    B. \textit{KUB XXVI} 72 N.H.

12. Anatolian Campaigns of Mursili I \((?) (J) (K) (0)\)
    \textit{KUB XXXI} 64+64a + \textit{KBo III} 55 (= \textit{BoTU} 18) N.H.

13. Hurrian Wars of Mursili I \((?) (J) (K) (0)\)
    All mss. N.H.

14. Fragments on Wars in Syria \((J) (K)\)
    All mss. N.H.

15. Zukrābī of Aleppo \((J) (K)\)
    A. \textit{KBo VII} 14 + \textit{KUB XXXVI} 100 O.H. \((S) (K)\)
    B. \textit{KUB XXXVI} 101 N.H.
    C. \textit{KUB XXXVI} 102 N.H.

16. Legendary Narrative: Hurrian Wars \((?) (J) (K) (0)\)
    All mss. N.H.
17. Fragments on Hurrian Wars (J) (K)
   All mss. N.H.

18. Chronicle of the Reign of Ammuna (J) (K)
   All mss. N.H.

19. Edict of Telipinu (J) (K) (O)
   All mss. N.H.

20. Campaign of Telipinu against Lahha (J) (K)
   A. KBo XII 8 N.H.
   B. KBo XII 9 N.H.

21. Treaty of Telipinu with Išputahšu (J) (K)
   II. Hittite version: all mss. N.H. 

22. Fragment naming Telipinu
   KUB XXI 48 N.H.

23. Fragments naming Alluwanne (J) (K)
   All mss. N.H.

24. Fragments naming Pimpira (J) (K)
   All mss. N.H.

25. Treaty of Zidanza with Pilliya (J) (K)
   KUB XXXVI 108 O.H. (S) (K)

27. Treaty (?) with the ḫabīru (J) (K)
   KBo IX 73(+) KUB XXXVI 106 O.H. (S) (K)

39. Fragments in Old Hittite
   1. KBo III 24 = BotU 10α N.H. (J) (K)
   2. KBo III 44 = BotU 15 N.H. (J) (K)
211. Fragments of Annals

14. KUB XXVI 83 N.H. (J)

221. Landgrants of Huzziya (J) (K)

1. VAT 7436 = SBo I 2 O.H.

2. KBo VIII 26 = LSU 19 O.H.

222. Landgrants (J) (K)

1. VAT 7463 = SBo I 3 = LSU 3 O.H. (K)

2. 2064/g = SBo I 4 = LSU 4 O.H. (K)

3. 275/£ = SBo I 5 = LSU 5 O.H.

4. 165/h = SBo I 6 = LSU 6 O.H.

5. 621/£ = SBo I 7 = LSU 7 ms.?

7. 549/£ = SBo I 9 = LSU 9 ms.?

9. 140/£ = SBo I 11 = LSU 11 ms.?

12. 655/£ = SBo I 14 = LSU 14 ms.?

13. 605/£ = SBo I 15 = LSU 15 ms.?
17. KBo VIII 27 = LSU 20
18. KBo VIII 28 = LSU 21
19. KBo IX 72 = LSU 22
23. Bo 6964 = LSU 26 ms.
24. Bo 9131 = LSU 27 ms.
25. Tarsus 1 (JACOS 59,2f) = LSU 28

264. Instructions for Priests and Temple Servants
All mss. N.H.

265. Instructions for Palace Servants
KUB XIII 3 N.H.

275. Fragments of Protocols
KUB XXXVI 109 M.H. (J) (K) (?)
KUB XLIII 35 O.H. (V) (?) M.H.
KUB XXXI 103 M.H.

291. Laws §§1-100 (J) (K)
I. Versions on a single tablet
a. Old Hittite
   A. KBo VI 2 + XIX 1 + la + XXII 61 + 62
   B. KUB XXIX 16 + KBo XIX 2
   C. KUB XXIX 13
   \[ \{(S) (K) \]

b. Later redactions
   A. KBo VI 3 + XXII 63 M.H.
   B. KUB XXVI 56 M.H.

II. Versions on two tablets: all mss. N.H. or indeterminate
III. Revised version

KBo VI 4 N.H.

292. Laws §5101-200 (J) (K)

I. Versions on a single tablet

A. KUB XXIX 25(+)28(+)29+30(+)32(+)35+36 O.H. (S) (K)

B. KUB XXIX 21+22+23 N.H.

C. KUB XXIX 26(+)27 —

D. KUB XXIX 34+37 N.H.

E. KBo XIV 66(+)767(+)Bo 8552 —

II. Versions on two tablets: all mss. N.H. or indeterminate

310. Šar tamhārī (J) (K)

All mss. N.H.

311. Naram-Sin (J) (K)

All mss. N.H.

321. Illuyanka (K)

All mss. N.H.

322. Talipimu and the Daughter of the Ocean

A. KUB XII 60 N.H.

B. KUB XXXIII 81 N.H. √

323. Disappearance of the Sun (mugawar)

1. KUB XXXVI 44 M.H. ²

2. VBoT 58 N.H.

3. KBo XIII 85 N.H.
324. Telipimu (mugawar) (K)

I.A. **KUB XVII 10 M.H. (0)** √
B. **KUB XXXIII 2 M.H.** √
C. **KUB XXXIII 1 M.H.**
D. **KUB XXXIII 3 M.H.** √

II.A. **KUB XXXIII 4 + IBoT III 141 N.H.**
B. **KUB XXXIII 5 M.H.** √
C. **KUB XXXIII 6(+7 M.H.)** √
D. **KUB XXXIII 8 N.H.**

III.A. **KUB XXXIII 9 N.H.**
B. **KUB XXXIII 10 M.H.** √

Fragments:
1. **KUB XXXIII 12 N.H.**
2. **KUB XXXIII 11 N.H.**
3. **KUB XXXIII 14 M.H. (?)**

325. The Storm-god (mugawar)

A. **KUB XXXIII 24(+28 M.H.**
B. **KUB XXXIII 22+23 N.H.**
C. **KUB XXXIII 25+26+27+29+30 + XXXVI 71 + 1216/v N.H. ?

326. The god of Queen Akmunikal

All mss. N.H.

327. The god of Queen Harapsili

All mss. N.H. or indeterminate

328. The god of the scribe Pirwa

1. **KBo XIII 86 N.H.**
2. **KUB XXXIII 32 N.H.**

329. The Storm-god of Kuliwisma (mugawar and ritual)

1st Tablet

1. **KBo XV 32 M.H.**
2. **KBo XV 31**

2nd Tablet

**KBo XIV 86 + KUB XXXIII 17 + KBo IX 109 N.H.**

330. Fragments of the preceding

A. **KBo XV 33 + 35 M.H.**
   B. **KUB XII 10 M.H.?**
   C. **KUB XII 9**
2. **KBo XV 36 + XXI 61 M.H.?**

3. A. **KBo XV 34 N.H.**
   B. **KUB XII 19 N.H.**
   C. **KBo XXI 63**
4. **KUB XXXI 138 N.H.**
5. **KUB XXXIII 62 M.H.?**
6. **KBo XXI 59**
7. **KUB XXXIII 64 + KBo XXI 60 N.H.**
8. **KUB XXXIII 65 N.H.**
9. **KBo XV 38**
10. **KBo XXI 55**
11. **KBo XXI 57**
12. **KBo XXI 58**
13. KUB XXXI 67 —
14. KUB XLIII 56 N.H.

331. The Storm-god of Lihsina
   1. KUB XXXIII 66 M.H.?
   2. KUB XXXIV 91 —

332. The Storm-god (fragments)
   1. KUB XXXIII 33 N.H.
   2. KUB XXXIII 34 N.H.
   3. KUB XXXIII 68 M.H.
   4. KUB XXXIII 79 N.H.
   5. TBoT II 114 —

333. Anzili and Zulki
   A. KUB XXXIII 67 N.H.
   B. KUB XXXIII 36 —

334. d-MaA (mugawar)
   All mss. N.H. or indeterminate

335. Fragments of mugawar and myth
   All mss. N.H. or indeterminate

336. Myth of Inara
   1. A. KUB XXXIII 55 N.H.
       B. KUB XXXIII 52 N.H.
       C. KUB XXXIII 56 N.H.
   2. KUB XXXIII 59 M.H. (0)
   3. KUB XXXIII 57 N.H.
   4. KUB XXXIII 58 N.H.
5.A. **KUB** XXXIII 60 N.H.

B. **KUB** XXXIII 61 --

C. **KUB** XLIII 25 O.H. (V) (? N.H.

6.A. **KUB** XXXVI 51 --

B. **KUB** XXXIII 63 N.H.

337. Fragments naming Pirwa

1. Bo 6483 N.H. (J)

360. The Story of Appu

All mss. N.H.

370. Mythological Fragments

   **KBo** XII 81 N.H.

   **KUB** XLIII 36 N.H.

371. Prayer to the Sun-goddess of the Earth (J)

   **KBo** VII 28 + VIII 92 M.H. √

372. Hymn and Prayer to the Sun-god

All mss. N.H.

373. Prayer of Kantuzzili

   **KUB** XXX 10 M.H. (O) √

374. Similar Fragments to 372 and 373

1. **KUB** XXXI 135 + XXXI 11(+)XXXI 130 M.H. (O) √

2.A. **KUB** XXXVI 75 M.H. √

   B. **KBo** XXII 75 --

390. Rituals of Ayatarsa et al.

   All mss. N.H. or indeterminate
395. Ritual of Hantitassu
   1.A. **KBo XI 14 N.H.**
   B. **KBo XIII 145 N.H.**
   C. **KUB XLIII 57(+)KBo XVIII 174 N.H.**

2. **KBo XVII 104(+)2029/g (for Attā) N.H.**
3. **KBo XX 34 N.H. ✓

398. Ritual of Huwarlu
   A. **KBo IV 2 N.H.**
   B. **KBo IX 126 N.H.**

402. Ritual of **Alli**
   1/J. **KBo XXI 8 M.H. ✓
   All other mss. N.H.

412. Ritual of **Zuwi**
   3. **KUB XII 63 + XXXVI 70 N.H. (0) (?)
   8.B. **KBo XVII 17 O.H. (V) (I)
   All other mss. N.H. or indeterminate

414. Consecration of a Temple ('Bauritual') (K) (0)
   A. **KUB XXIX 1 N.H.**
   B. **KUB XXIX 3 O.H. (S) (K)
   C. **KUB XXIX 2 N.H.**
   D. **HT 38 II N.H.**

416. Ritual for the King and Queen (J) (K) (0)
   1.A. **KBo XVII 1 + [1417/c + 1444/c] 0.H. (S)
   B. **KBo XVII 3 + 4 + XX 15 + KUB XLIII 32(+)KBo XVII 2
   0.H. (S)
2. KBo XVII 5 0.H. (S)
3. KBo XVII 6 0.H. (S)
4. KBo XVII 7 + IBot III 135 0.H. (S)

429. Ritual against a Curse
All mss. N.H.

434. Rituals for dMEN, MEŠ and dGulēš (fragments)
5. KBo XX 82 N.H.
6. KUB XLIII 55 N.H.

443. Ritual of Absolution
KBo XV 10 + XX 42 N.H. ✓

450. Royal Funeral Rites
All mss. N.H.

457. Conjurations and Myths
6. KUB XLIII 60 N.H.

458. Fragments of Conjurations
9. KBo XIV 98 N.H.
10.A. KUB XII 23 N.H.
   B. KBo XXII 170 N.H.
11.A. KUB XII 32 N.H.
   B. KUB XII 33 —
12.A. KUB XLIII 61 —
   B. KUB XLIII 63 N.H.

523. Supplies (melqetu) for Festivals
1.A. KBo XVI 67 N.H. ?
1.B. \text{kbo} XVI 69 + XX 54

C. \text{kub} XLIII 24 O.H. (V) [N]

2.A. \text{kbo} XVI 68(+79(+)} \text{kub} XXXIV 86 N.H. (see \text{kbo} XX 55) √

B. \text{kbo} XVI 70 N.H.

C. \text{kbo} XVI 75 —

D. \text{kbo} XVI 76 [O.H. (V)

3. Fragments

\text{kbo} XVI 72, 73, (80) O.H. (V)

\text{kbo} XVI 74, XX 66 —

\text{kbo} XVI 77 N.H.

531. Introduction to the \text{enmu amu Enilil (?)

\text{kub} XXXIV 12 —

532. Lunar Eclipses

1.A. \text{kub} VIII 1 N.H.

B. \text{kbo} XIII 18 —

5. \text{kub} XXIX 9 IV N.H.

533. Signs of the Moon

All mss. N.H.

534. Signs of the Sun

All mss. N.H. or indeterminate

535. Signs of the stars

All mss. N.H. or indeterminate

536. Physical portents

All mss. N.H. or indeterminate
538. \textit{Summa isbu}

1. \textit{KUB VIII} 83 M.H.?
2. \textit{KUB XXXIV} 18 N.H.
3. \textit{KUB XXXIV} 19 N.H.
4. \textit{KUB XXXIV} 20 —
5. \textit{KUB XLIII} 7 N.H.?

539. 'If a sign...'

1. \textit{KBo VI} 23 —
2. \textit{KBo XIII} 31 M.H. ✓

540. 'If a woman gives birth...'

All mss. N.H. or indeterminate

544. Behavior of Animals

1. \textit{KUB XXXIV} 22 N.H.

547. Liver Models

II. \textit{KUB XXXVII} 223 O.H. (S)

549. Signs of the \textit{KI.GUB}

b) Bilingual

\textit{KUB VIII} 34 + \textit{XLIII} 13 N.H.

c) Hittite

A. \textit{KBo X} 7 + [HSM 3645] N.H.
B. \textit{KBo X} 50 N.H.

552. Signs of the \textit{KAM}

\textit{KUB IV} 1 III 15f N.H.
591. Monthly Festival
   4.A. KBO XVII 88 + XX 67 M.H. (?)  
   All other mss. N.H. or indeterminate

592. Spring Festival at Ziplanda
   All mss. N.H.

594. Spring Festival at Tippuwa
   All mss. N.H. or indeter.

595. Spring Festivals (fragments)
   1.A. KBO XI 49 N.H.
   B. KUR X 75 N.H.

596. Fall Festivals (fragments)
   1.a. KBO XXI 78 N.H.
   b. KUR XX 94 N.H.
   c. KUR XX 21 N.H.

597. Winter Festival
   All mss. N.H. or indeter.

598. Winter Festival of the Sun
   All mss. N.H.

599. Journey of \( ^d \)KAL KUŠ KURTAK
   KUR XX 25 + X 78 N.H.

604-625. AN.TAH.SUMSAR Festival (K)
   616.2.B. KBO IX 140 M.H.

626. Nuntariyaša Festival
   All mss. N.H.
627. Festival of the KI.LAM (K)

17. KBO XVII 14 + XX 4+16+24(+)+3+[742/c] + KBO XVI 71 O.H. (S)

19. KBO XX 2, 7, 21 O.H. (V) (V)

All other mss. N.H.

630. 'Combined' Festival of the Moon and Thunder (O)

A. KUB XXXII 135 + KBO XXI 85 + VII 109 M.H.
B. KBO XX 63 N.H.
C. KBO XX 70 + XXI 88 N.H.

631. Ritual/Festival of the Storm

1.A. ABoT 9 + KBO XVII 74 + XXI 25 M.H.

B. KBO XX 12(+)+XVII 11(+)KUB XLIII 26 O.H. (S)

2.A. KUB XXXIV 120 N.H.

B. KUB XLIV 36 —

5. TBoT III 140 N.H.

6. KBO XVII 75 N.H.

9. KBO XX 8 O.H. (V) (V)

10. KBO XX 61 —

633. Festival of 'Procreation'

TBoT I 29 N.H.

634. Great Festival of Arinna

All mss. N.H.

635. Fragments of Festivals of Ziplanda and Mt. Baha

All mss. N.H. or indeter.
636. Festival of Saressa
   1. **KUB** VII 25 N.H.
   2. **KUB** XX 9 N.H.

645. Fragments of Festivals for Chthonic Deities
   t1. **KBo** XI 32 N.H.
   t2. **KUB** XX 24 N.H.
   6.A. **KBo** XVII 40 N.H.?  
       B. **KBo** XVII 15 O.H. (S) (V)  
       C. **KBo** XX 125 —
   7. **KUB** XLIII 30 O.H. (S) (V)

646. Fragments of Festivals performed by the Queen
   3. **KUB** X 97 —

t647. Festivals performed by a Prince
   1. **KUB** XX 7 —
   3. **KUB** XX 80 N.H.
   4. **KUB** XX 81 —
   6. **KUB** XXV 36 —
   7. **KUB** XXVIII 90 N.H.
   9. **HT** 17 —
   13.A. **KBo** XI 45 N.H.
       B. **IBoT** III 87 —

t648. Fragments of Festivals performed by a 'son'
   1. **KUB** II 14 —
   4. **KBo** XIV 80 N.H.
649. Fragments of Festivals naming the NIN.DINGIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KUB XX 90 N.H.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>KBO XX 5 O.H. (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>KBO XXII 195 M.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5C</td>
<td>KBO XXII 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>KBO XX 9 O.H. (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>KBO XX 14 O.H. (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>KUB XLIII 48 N.H.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

650. Fragments naming the SAL.MES.zintubab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KUB XX 38 N.H.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6T</td>
<td>TRoT I 8 N.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>KBO VII 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>KBO VIII 117 N.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>KBO IX 132 N.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>KBO XI 73 N.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>KBO XVII 101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

653. Fragments naming the LUG.BAB.UR.GI7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KUB X 65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>KUB X 66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

654. Fragments naming the People of Kurustana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KBO X 9 N.H.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>KBO X 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>KBO XIII 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>KBO XIII 175 M.H.?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
655. Fragments naming Hantili
All mss. N.H. or indeter.

656. 'Mixed' Festivals
3. KBo XI 25 N.H.

657. Cultic Journey from Hattusa to Arinna
KUB XXV 28 N.H.

659. Festival of Coronation (?)
1. KUB X 45 N.H.
2. KUB IX 10 N.H.

660. Offerings to Royal Images
3. KUB X 11 N.H.

661. The 'Kings' Lists'
5. KUB XI 8 + 9 N.H.

662. Offerings for Local Cults
7. KUB XLIII 29 O.H. (V) (?) M.H.?

665. Fragments naming the LÚ.MES. aššušala-
1A. KBo XX 20 + ABot 35 + KBo XVII 36 O.H. (S) (N)
2. KBo XX 22(+X) VII 33(+)X 6 O.H. (S)

669. Large Fragments of Festivals
2A. KUB X 21 (+)? KBo XI 16 N.H.

3A. KUB X 54 + XI 16 N.H.
B. KBo XI 37 N.H.
7. KUB XI 17 N.H.

9.A. KUB XI 20 N.H.
B. KUB XI 25 N.H.
C. KUB X 87 —
D. IBOT II 94 N.H.
E. IBOT II 96 N.H.

11. KUB XI 26 (+)? X 62 N.H.

14.A. KUB XX 46 —
B. IBOT III 60 N.H.

t15. KUB XX 67 + IBOT II 77 + [IM 63682] —

t16. KUB XXV 5 N.H.

t17. KUB XXV 8 N.H.

t18. KUB XXV 17 N.H.

19. KUB XXX 41 —

20.A. KUB XXXII 82 —
B. IBOT II 79 —

22.A. VBOT 3 N.H.
B. KUB XX 11 —
C. KUB X 40 N.H.
D. IBOT II 74 N.H.

24.A. ABOT 5 + KBO XVII 9 O.H. (K) (V)
B. KUB XXXIV 94 —

30. KBO XX 10 O.H. (S) (V)

31. KBO XVII 46 (+) XX 33 N.H.? 

t32. KUB XLI 40 N.H.
670. Fragments of Festivals

O.H. mss. (see the respective Vorworte)
KBo XVI 84, XVII 8, 16, 28, 30, 49; XXI 11, 13, 18, 19, 25, 37, 76;
XXI 68 (KUB XXVIII 97; XLII 28, 31, 33) + XXXIX 64 (?)

N.H. mss. (most show only ta)
KBo II 37; VII 42; XI 34; XIII 152, 164, 216; XX 40, 80, 81;
XXI 72, 84

HT 45; IBoT II 87; III 2, 19, 52, 54, 57, 63
KUB IX 16; X 4, 8, 15, 22, 43, 61, 67, 73, 90; XX 5, 10, 18, 19, 43, 61, 87;
XXXIV 72; XXXIX 64; XLI 38, 46

675. Fragments of Festivals in the ḫešta

All mss. N.H. or indeter.

676. Fragments of a Purification Ceremony

1. A. IBoT II 121 —

2. KUB XXVI 21 —

2. KUB XXXI 57 N.H.

681. Festivals of Karahna

1. KUB XXV 32 + XXVIII 70 + [1628/u] N.H.

682. Festival of 'all the d-kal'

All mss. N.H.

725. Bilingual Ritual for the Installation of a New Door-bolt

All mss. N.H. or indeter.

732. Ritual of Htušši

All mss. N.H. or indeter.
733. Invocations of Hattic Deities (K)

II. Hittite versions

1. **KUB VIII 41** 0.H. (S)

2. **KUB XXI 143** 0.H. (S) (O)

3. **KUB XXXI 143a + VBoT 124** 0.H. (S)

   [4. 205/s + 451/t + 519/t] (S) (N) KBV XXXI 112

   [6. **KUB XLIII 27** 0.H. (V) (N)]

   [7. 428/b + 282/t] 0.H. (S) (N) KBV XXXI 128

738. Festivals of Teteššabi

2.C. **KBo XXI 90** N.H. + 46/26 M.H.

All other mss. N.H. or indeter. (several possibly N.H.)

739. Festivals of Tuhumiyara

1. **KUB XII 8** N.H.

2. **KUB XXVIII 79** —

744. Fragments containing Hattic

   t1.C. **KUB XXVIII 95** N.H.

   t2. **KUB XXVIII 45** N.H.

   t6. **KUB XXVIII 91** N.H.

   t7.B. **KUB XXVIII 94** N.H.

   t8. **KUB XXVIII 98** N.H.

   t9. **KUB XXVIII 101** (+) X 69 N.H.

18.A. **KBo XVII 43** 0.H. (S)

   B. **KBo XVII 42** (= A I 14-16) —

   C. **KBo XVII 18** (= A I 1-14) 0.H. (S) (V) (O)

   D. **KBo XVII 44 + VII 35 + XVII 99** (I 10 = A I 5) 0.H. (S)
19. KBo XVII 50 O.H. (V) (N)

750. Festival of Zaparwa

8. KBo XVII 35 O.H. (V) (N)

11. KBo XX 39 M.H.

All other mss. N.H.

25. KBo XXXV 164 O.H. (N)

752. Ritual and Myth (Palaic and Hittite)

1.A. KBo VIII 74 + KUB XXXII 117 + KBo XIX 156 + KUB XXXV 93 N.H.

B. KBo XVII 25(+)KUB XXXV 164 O.H. (S)(N)

820. Blessings for the Labarna

1. KUB XXXVI 110 O.H. (S)

2. KBo XVI 86 N.H.

3. KUB XLIII 23 O.H. (V) (?) moyke t M M

4. KBo XXI 22 M.H. (O) ✓

5. KUB XX 54 + KBo XIII 122 N.H. (// 4. Vs 22f)

6. KBo XII 98 N.H.

832. Fragments

KBo XVII 26, 27 O.H. (V)

KUB XLIII 39 O.H. (V) j O H 4 4

Unnumbered

KBo XXII 1 O.H. (S) (V)

Uncatalogued Fragments from KUB XLIV-XLVI, KBo XXII-XXIII

(All N.H. mss. showing only te)

KUB XLIV 9,13,30; XLVI 2,3,8,9,10,11,18,68

KBo XXII 157,158,175,194,196; XXIII 59,92
Notes on the Old Hittite Corpus

1. On the language of the Anitta text see Neu, StBoT 18 (1974) passim; on the manuscripts see ibid. 31.

2. Oettinger's designation of KBo XII 3 as a copy of a Middle Hittite text, op. cit. 122, must be a misprint. There is no good reason to doubt that the text is Old Hittite.

3. On text number 1 see Otten, StBoT 17(1973). For my addition of KBo XII 19 as number 5, see there line 4: INA KUR URU ZAMWN. The manuscript seems at least Middle Hittite, if not older: note the forms of URU, II, AZ, IT and TA.26 See also the note of Otten, KBo XII Vorwort: 'alte Schrift'.

4. This text was excluded from the Old Hittite corpus of the Chicago Computer Project (see Josephson, Sent. Part. 41), and the antiquity of the Hittite version has been repeatedly challenged (see Güterbock, JAOS 84(1964)108, and Kammenhuber, KZ 83(1969)265). On the sparse but indisputable linguistic archaism in the text see Carruba, ZDMG Supp. I,1(1969)231-234.27 For further textual arguments for an Old Hittite original see my article to appear in JNES.

5. Kammenhuber, KZ 83(1969)260, lists KBo III 27 as being in old ductus, but this must be due to a misunderstanding. Starke, op. cit., does not include it, and the published autograph shows unmistakably newer forms of TAR (line 10), URU (line 28) and KA (passim).

9. Kammenhuber, loc. cit., also lists number 6 (KBo III 28) as
an Old Hittite manuscript, but it is not included in Starke's list, and the autograph shows newer AK (1. 8), URU (1. 5) and KA (1. 13).

22. On this fragment see Laroche, CTH(1971)6, note 2.

39. Evidence for Old Hittite in numbers 3 and 4 is suggestive, but not certain. KBo VIII 45 has the enclitic possessive -mit/-met (lines 5 and 8), [ -u]8-ki-e-nu-un (1. 6) and natta (1. 9). KBo VIII 131,3 shows [ ]x-enzi natta. In number 8 (KUB XXXVI 27) see e-e-pa (1. 2) and the enclitic possessives (passim). For number 9 (KUB XXXVI 45) note atta-man (1. 4) and takku (1. 6). Laroche's listing of number 11 (KBo XIX 93) is apparently based on the personal name Huzziya, but this name also occurs in the Neo-Hittite treaty with Ulmi-Tešub (KBo IV 10 Rs 29). I find no linguistic evidence for Old Hittite. In number 12 (KBo XIX 94) note the apparent 3rd pl. pret. med.-pass. [ -e]n-ta-at-ti (1. 3), and see Otten, KBo XIX Vorwort. KUB XLIII 75 has ta and the enclitic possessive -Emu3 (Vs 17).

211. The fragment KUB XXVI 83 names Pala and Hass[ua]. The former occurs primarily in Old Hittite texts, the latter to my knowledge exclusively so.

215. Josephson, loc. cit., includes the fragment KUB XXIII 49. The only linguistic evidence appears to be hubbi-mi (1. 6), which by itself is insufficient to prove Old Hittite composition. In the absence of strong contextual arguments the fragment has been excluded here.

221-222. In listing the Old Hittite landgrant texts I have
followed Josephson. For a recent discussion of the manuscripts see Otten, MDOG 103(1971)62f. The İnandık tablet, published by Balkan (1973), definitely has Old Hittite ductus, but the text is entirely in Akkadian (unlike most of these documents).


265. Archaisms are few, but solid: takku III 18,43+ and the directive ha-pa-a III 29,32 (phonetic spelling!). Noteworthy too are kuwapi UD-at II 14 (see below ad CTH 657) and the spellings ti-wi-te-šš III 1 etc. and ti-wi-te-ar III 23. The subject of a river ordeal also suggests Old Hittite. Laroche, Fest. Otten 185f, names four texts which describe a river ordeal: KBo VIII 42 (CTH 9, O.H. ms.), KBo III 28 (CTH 9; N.H. ms.), KBo XVIII 66 (Letter fragment, undated), 28 and the present text.

275. The content of KUB XXXVI 109 is comparable to that of the texts listed below under CTH 271 (Sec. 2.4), a fact which raises further doubts about their originality. The manuscript KUB XXXVI 109 is at least Middle Hittite, if not older: note the forms of E, KA, IK, DA, IT, LI, TAR, DU and URU. KUB XXXI 103 shows ḫppa (1. 6),
iez[zi] (1. 27), uiezzu (1. 32), mōmai (1. 12) and nešma-kēša-itsa (1. 31). The last two features suggest Old Hittite composition, but do not establish it beyond all doubt. For the age of the manuscript see Güterbock apud Houwink ten Cate, Records 4, and note the forms of E, KA, IK, DA, IT, LI, TAR, DU and URU.

291–292. On the establishment of the text see the references in Laroche, CTH(1971)43. A complete review of the ductus of the manuscripts is still lacking. The designation of KBo VI 3+ as Middle Hittite is based on Neu, SBT 18(1974)71 note 107. KUB XXVI 56 has the older form of ZU, AZ and most significantly of DA and IT, but the size of the fragment leaves room for doubt.

321. Oettinger, op. cit. 121, marks KBo III 7 as a later copy of a Middle Hittite text, but the Illyanka myth is surely Old Hittite (see Kammenhuber, ZA 66(1976)70). Along with several archaism which are also Middle Hittite, the text shows n-e (N.PI.C.) in KUB XVII 5 II 12.13 and -apa in KBo III 7 III 29.

322. Strictly speaking, the existing linguistic evidence points only as far back as Middle Hittite: aruna A I 11 and B I ḫ 7, ḫiyet A I 16, ḫTelipimu (voc.) A I 9. However, the contents are very similar to those of CTH 323, and the text undoubtedly belongs to the Old Hittite genre combining the myth of a god who has disappeared and the mugavarr by which he is induced to return. For KUB XXXIII 81 as Middle Hittite see the forms of the signs DA, IT, E, ZU, AK, KI and LI.
323-336. All of these texts constitute variations on the same theme: the disappearance of a deity out of anger (or through the actions of someone else), the invocation of the deity to return, and the ritual by which he or she is induced to return. Several versions show unmistakable Old Hittite characteristics: see especially \textit{VBO\textup{T}} 58 (323.2) and the Telipinu myth. One manuscript, \textit{KUB XLIII} 25 (336.5.6), actually shows the 'typisch alten Duktus' (Riemschneider, \textit{KUB XLIII Vorw. p. V} note 2). Some versions undoubtedly date from Middle Hittite (e.g. \textit{CTH} 326 which names Queen Ašmunikal), but the insertion of a particular personal name does not make the text a genuine Middle Hittite composition. The following remarks on individual versions are restricted to a discussion of the manuscripts.

323. \textit{KUB XXXVI} 44 has the older forms of E, URU, LI, AK, IK, TAR and KA and is likely Middle Hittite.

324. Manuscript I.B., \textit{KUB XXXIII} 2, shows older E, KT, LI, DA, IT, ŠAR, AK, Aŷ, URU, DU and IK. \textit{KUB XXXIII} 1 is a small fragment, but note the forms of KT, LI, Aŷ and especially DA. In \textit{KUB XXXIII} 3 note TAR, ŠAR, LI, E, IT, DU, IK, DA, KA, AK and ŠAR; in \textit{KUB XXXIII} 5 IT, DA, LI, IK, TIM, KT, KA, Aŷ and TAR; in \textit{KUB XXXIII} 6(+7) Aŷ, TAR, LI, IT, KT, E, UK and DU. Both the latter manuscripts also use the newer form of E, but this variant is already Middle Hittite (see \textit{KBo XVI} 47, Column V, \textit{StBo\textup{T} 20}). \textit{KUB XXXIII} 10 has older ŠAR, Aŷ, IT, E, LI, UK, AZ, ŠAR, TIM, IK.
and DU along with newer IT, DA, E and AZ. The fragment KUB XXXIII 14 shows older DA, IT, KI, LI, KA and E.

325. Copy C: older E, IT, DA, KI, AK, TAR, AZ, IK and ZU along with newer E. For the join 1216/v see Otten, ZA 63(1973)87.

329. KBo XV 32: older TIM, URU, LI, TAR, E, ŠAR, KI and DA. KBo XV 31 has older KI, URU, LI, E and AK along with newer E and TIM and is possibly Middle Hittite as well.

330.1.A. KBo XV 33+35: older TIM, LI, ŠAR, TAR, KÙ, IK, AZ, AÙ, DU, URU, KA, AK and IT (lx) along with newer DA, IT, E, UK, AÙ and AZ. None of the latter argue against a Middle Hittite manuscript. KUB XII 10 is probably also Middle Hittite: older E, TIM, LI, DU, KI, DA, KA, IT and URU beside newer TIM and DA. It is not clear to me whether the newer form of TIM (Rüster, StRest 20, no. 9, Columns VII and X) may be ascribed to Middle Hittite. Its presence in several manuscripts which otherwise show exclusively older sign variants strongly suggests that it may. Among such manuscripts under CTH 330 are KBo XV 36+: older LI, ŠAR, URU, E, DU, KA and KI beside newer TIM; KBo XXI 63: older KÙ, DU, AK, URU, LI and newer TIM; KUB XXXIII 62: older LI, E, TAR, URU, KA, DU, IK, KI and AK beside newer TIM and DU. KBo XXI 57 could well be Middle Hittite: older LI, URU, TAR, KA and E.

331. KUB XXXIII 66 is almost surely Middle Hittite: older ŠAR, KA, DA, IT, AÙ, URU, IK, KI, UK, DU, ŠAR, TAR, AZ beside newer E and KI. Based on the autograph, KUB VIII 81 also has the newer
form of KI (with an extra-long last horizontal). This manuscript is Middle Hittite according to Otten apud Rüster, StBoT 20, X. It is also possible that KUB XXXIV 91 is Middle Hittite: older Aḫ, ḪAR, KI and AK.

332.3. KUB XXXIII 68: older IK, LI, KI, KA, AK, E, TAR, DU, AZ, IK and ṢAR beside newer E.

333.E. KUB XXXIII 36 could be Middle Hittite: older LI, E, TAR and DU.

334.2.A. KUB XXXIII 45+ is marked as Middle Hittite by Oettinger, op. cit. 138, but the autograph of XXXIII 53 shows a clear newer TAR (l. 16), and that of FHG 2 the newer MAṯ (l. 6, 21).

337.1. This text has been published in cuneiform by Otten, JKF 2(1951)69, and transliterated by Laroche, RHA 77(1965)174-175. Besides the directive karta (l. 3), note the mention of Hassuwa (l. 7) and compare the remarks on CTH 211 above. The use of a- as a conjunction and the lack of any other conjunctions (mu, ḫu or ta) is probably archaic, but this is difficult to prove. To my knowledge only one other text uses a- as a conjunction in a Hittite context: Bo 1391, which is even more fragmentary and difficult than Bo 6483 (see CTH 768.3 below). I hope to discuss the use of a- as a conjunction (in Hittite) elsewhere.

360. For linguistic archaisms in the text see Siegelová, StBoT 14(1971)26-27. They include use of the directive, nom.-acc. pl. nt. of the enclitic pronoun in -a (lx), acc.pl. of the same in
-uš (1x), frequent enclitic possessives, -(a)pa and ta in the combination t-uš.

370. KBo XII 81 has natta (lines 3 and 5), āet (1. 6) and probably [ ḫu-mu (1. 5). KUB XLIII 36 is definitely an Old Hittite text: KUR-e-pa (1. 2), n-st-spa (1. 5), š-e-pa (1. 6).

371. Designated as Old Hittite also by Laroche, CTH(1971)64. The manuscript is surely Middle Hittite: older KA, E, DU, LI, AK, AZ, IK, ZU and TAR beside newer DU.

372-374. Gettinger, MSS 34(1976)128, marks KUB XXXI 127 (CTH 372) as a copy of an Old Hittite text, but KUB XXX 10 (CTH 373) as a Middle Hittite original. However, the two texts are different versions of the same composition, and it is inconsistent to take the Neo-Hittite version as indirect evidence for Old Hittite, while treating the Middle Hittite version as a new composition. On the position of the Kantuuzzili version see Carruba, Or 40(1971)222.

Not surprisingly, it is KUB XXX 10 which preserves more archaisms: katti-hi Vs 4, natta Vs 10.13.14.16.18, ūkkam-man Vs 14, mām-man Vs 18.22; -spa Vs 20, n-e-zan Vs 25, LUGAL-an (gen.) Rs 22. KUB XXXI 127+ offers šuppalam-a (gen.) I 43, katte-hāi II 13; TI-tar-ma-pa II 43 and several enclitic possessives.

KUB XXX 10 is a Middle Hittite manuscript (see Otten apud Rüster, StBoT 20,X). So are two of the fragments under 374: KUB XXXI 135+ has older Aḫ, ZU, E, LI, KA, AZ, URU, TAR, IK, UK, and AK beside newer E; KUB XXXVI 75 has older IK, UK, AZ, E, IT,
DA, AK, KA and TAR beside newer DU.

I 6.15 dUTU-ī (voc.), I 18 n-e, II 19 kubha (dir.), II 2 iezzi, 
enclitic possessives passim. See also KBo III 8 II 16 n-ǝs-ši-ya, 
II 24 iyawani.

395. Evidence for Old Hittite: I.A. II 4 dUTU-e EN-mit (voc.), 
II 22 IGZ-ian, II 24 natta, II 20 ḫārtiyezzi, III 5 an-a, III 9 
ḫatšana (dir.); I.C. IV 3 n-e-azzan; 3. Vs 4.8 nu-uk-kān. KBo XX 34 
is undoubtedly Middle Hittite: older UK, DA, DU, Aḫ, IT, LI, URU 
beside newer E, IT, DA (see also Neu, TR 79(1974)[1975]258).

398. The text has been thoroughly modernized, and most of the 
criteria for Old Hittite are not compelling (all citations from 
copy A): I 3.22 iezzi, I 23 zik-wa-zi, I 46 NI TE-ši-baš (A.PL. with 
plural reference!), I 69.II 66 nu-wa-zi, II 9 NI TE-bi, III 25 
wemici. Nevertheless, all of these together are suggestive, and 
keti I 26 definitely points back to Old Hittite.

402. For the reading of the name as šAllu see Otten, ZA 63 
(1973)81. The copy listed by Rost, TR 2(1972)10, as I (KBo XXI 8) 
is a Middle Hittite manuscript: see Neu, TR 79(1974)[1975]267-268 
(his siglum J). Rost, op. cit. 93, incorrectly dates the text after 
1400. Neu, op. cit. 269-270, declares the text Middle Hittite, but 
the use of an-pa (KUB XXIV 9 III 1, XXIV 9 III 16 + KBo XII 127 III 6) 
and the form n-e-ź (passim) both argue for Old Hittite composition. 
Other archaism would fit Middle Hittite as well: I 10 pira-šmit,
hulalezsi passim, II 12 iet, II 16 pniiezzi, III 18 piren-tiec.
See also D I 16 iet.

412. Numbers 2 and 3 both show several archaisms. KUB VII 57: II 11 ukg-e (subj.), III 11 -tih, III 14 n-an-em-pa,
III 14 -set, III 19 -nañ, III 29 nu-pa, IV 15 këñzan. KUB XII 63: Vs 6 tiyeddú, Vs 9 nu-za-pa, Vs 10 nu-ñeq, Vs 18 n-at-ñeq-pa,
Vs 27 iiñka. KUB XII 63 is apparently a Middle Hittite manuscript: older TAR, E, LI, AJ, KT, SÁR, MAJ, DU, KA and AK beside newer E
and DU. It also has a form of SÁR with two verticals, but see the discussion below on KUB VII 41 (CTH 446). The connection of number
8 with this ritual is not assured (Piemandt, KUB XLIII Vorw.,
comparis KUB VII 1 (CTH 390) instead). However, besides the ductus
of KBo XVII 17, there are indisputable Old Hittite linguistic
features in KUB XLIII 53: -apa and enclitic possessives passim
and DINGIR.HÉK-non duñu-i (gen. + voc.) I 16. Note also KBo XVII 17
I 6 liptu.29

416. The sigla are after Starke, loc. cit.

ma-a-en-wa-at-ñ-pa, II 17 Etri-emet; 2. Vs 12 andan-za-pa,
Rs 4 [n]u-ñmañ-apa.

434.5. See I 8 [ -ulaziet, II 23 warbues tu and above all
II 24 KUR-ñ-ñmañ-apa.

434.6. Note III 25 piyesszi, IV 9 katti-ñëi and most importantly
II 17 këdi. Fragments 1 and 2 of CTH 434 could also be Old Hittite,
but the attested archaisms assure only Middle Hittite (see Sec. 2.4).

443. Based on the mention of King Tuthaliya and Queen Nikalmati as celebrants (I 18-19), this text has been called Middle Hittite: Szabó, TH 1(1971)89 and 107, and Neu, TFP 79 (1974)257. But use of the ritual by a particular royal couple does not prove that it was originally written for them (cf. Carruba, Or 40(1971)210). The use of -ana (II 16.III 58) and the spelling mēsē-/mēnišk- (I 19.II 13.25.55) point to an Old Hittite original. Other features are ambiguous: I 13.3.5 (N.Pl.C.), I 16.2 =ēš, II 5.13.III 51.55 mēban, II 7.28 šatšu. The spelling qa-a-ša I 30 etc. is worthy of note.

450-451. Archaisms: KUB XXX 16+ IV 9, XXX 25+ Rs 27†, XXX 27 Vs 6 ṭa appH; XXX 19+ IV 13 ū.SAL-wa (dir.; cf. dupl. ū.SAL-um!); XXX 15 Vs 29f -ē, -ēās, XXXIX 15 IV 1 [u]rkiš-tiš; XXX 24 II 4 ušeddu; XXXIV 65 I 8, XXXIX 14 I 15.III 4.5 n-ūš; XXXIX 9 Vs 2 DINGIR-uš (N.Sg.). The sum of these features is sufficient to date the composition back to at least Middle Hittite. The presence of ṭa and DINGIR-uš argues for Old Hittite, although the force of the former is diminished by its restriction to the set phrase 'it is finished'. IBcT II 130, listed by Laroche as number III.23, is the colophon of another text dealing with the death of the king (see Otten, HTR 92-93). It also uses the old N.Sg. DINGIR-uš (Rs 2) and is marked as a copy of an Old Hittite text by Göttinger, op. cit. 128.
457.6. See I 11 n-apa and iyatar-mit, I 12 etc. takku.

458.9. Note I 8 mēn-ēbet, I 9 ūbar-ēêt, I 8.11.II 4.9.15
ku-war, I 16 tota-ēbet, I 15 k-ēt.

458.10. A II 7 iezi, II 19 -(k)miû, II 18.20.23 miuman
(gen.); B 5 iû.

458.11. A Vs 6 udiyâb-šmaš-apa, B Rs 4 pira-šmi[t].


523. KBo XVI 67 appears to be Middle Hittite: older KI,
IT, DA, ŠAR, LI and URU. KBo XVI 68+ probably is as well: older
Kû, E, URU, KA, KI, LI, TAR and ŠAR. Due to the nature of the texts
linguistic archaisms are almost nil; 1.B I 16 miumi-kmi (also
2.A III 22 = C 3).

531-560. It is likely that most, if not all, the Hittite
translations of Babylonian omen literature were made already in
Old Hittite and subsequently modernized in the process of recopying.
However, this cannot be proven for all cases, and only texts
showing some linguistic evidence for Old Hittite have been included
here. The chief criterion is the use of takku 'if', but other
archaisms also occur. On the dating of the 'birth omens' in
particular see Riemenschneider, StBct 9(1970)7-8.

531. The fragment shows takku passim.

532.1.A. See tiyezi Vs 12, Rs 5 and n-apa Rs 10.

532.5. takku passim.

533. All texts have takku. In KUB VIII 9 it alternates with
mēn.
534. takku passim.

535. One finds both takku and mën for 'if'. Note KUB VIII 22 II 1 tiyezi[i], III 3 k[i]ša; VIII 16 III 8 happarmuwat-[šet].

536. KUB XXIX 9 shows takku passim. See also parmi-[ši] ibid. I 8. KBo XIII 13 offers ḫattešša-[šet] Vs 3, [UZ]U[marmummi]-šši Vs 12, natta Rs 13. The latter manuscript could be Middle Hittite (see Otten apud Riemschneider, StBoT 9,8).

538. One finds takku passim. Note also KUB XXXIV 18 II 12 andurza-[šet] and III 5 KEIR-[šet], XXXIV 19 I 9 mummies[i], IV 5 lalu-[šet] and IV 8 atta-[šša]. KUB VIII 83 may be Middle Hittite: older AB, IK, E and TAR. Likewise KUB XLIII 7: older IT, KI, TAR, AK and IK (on the latter see Otten apud Riemschneider, StBoT 9,8).

539. KBo XIII 31 appears to be Middle Hittite: older KI, LI, E, AK, ŠAR, DU and ZU (see again Otten, loc. cit.). The manuscript contains several archaisms as well: II 6 barda-šši, IV 4 [LUGAL]-wezi-[šet], IV 10 šardiyaḫ-šaš, takku passim. The phonetic spelling in-ba-a-an III 9 is also noteworthy.

540. Besides frequent takku, note also the enclitic possessives in KBo XIII 34: IV 7 paršini-[ši], IV 15 paršenuḫ-[šuš], V 1 [šak]uwa-[šet].

544. takku passim.

549.b. Note Vs 10 waggarezi[i], Vs 14 SAG-1-[šši], Vs 16 ERIN.MES-šši and takku passim.
549.c. Copy A has takku passim.

552. takku passim.

591. The various copies of the text show more than two dozen instances of ta, alone and combined with various enclitics: ta-kkan, ta-ššan, t-ašta, ta-zā, t-aš, t-an, t-uš. KUB I 17 III 38 has ka-an, which in view of its isolation may be an error for ta-an. Note in addition the following: KUB XXVII 69 II 21 tivezzi and V 20 kattı-(e)šš[i]; KUB I 17 II 9 tienzi; KUB II 13 I 12 šša-na (dir.); KBO XVII 83 + XX 67 III 12*; 26* IV 26* šštu and IV 29 araaš-šă and araaš-teš. The latter manuscript is Middle Hittite: older URU, DU, LI, E, TAR, IX, KI, KA and AK.

592. The conjunction ta occurs more than a dozen times, alone (in the spelling ta-a) and in various combinations: ta-za, ta-kkan, ta-at, t-aš-kan and t-ašta. See also KUB XX 28 I 2 [tumnanškišša (dir.) and KBO XI 50 V 4 kattı-šši.

594. One finds ta alone and in the combinations ta-ššan (2x) and t-aš-kan (1x). Note also KUB X 18 VI 10 šša-na and KUB X 17 I 17 tumnakšša (dir.) plus X 17 II 27 šši!...EGIR-an-ššamet.

595. Archaisms: KBO XI 49 I 9 irhi-bbi, I 12 ta-ššan, I 13,19 t-aš, VI 2 t-ašta and VI 15 ta; KUB X 75 I 12 t-aš.

596. KBO XXI 78 offers I 7 dumnakšša, I 10 tivezzi, I 13,14 ta, I 17 III 14 t-aš and III 5 t-ašta.

597. The only archaism is ta, but it should be noted that it is combined freely: KUB XI 35 I 11 ta-za, I 14,III 16,17 t-aš,
I 17 II 13 t-at, I 23.24 ta-kkan.

598. Again note ta alone and in combination: ta-ž, t-eš, t-at, ta-kkan and t-ašta. See also KUR II 6 II 8 Š.ša-nsa, II 36.40.III 10 tivezzi and IV 5 waššiezzi.

604-625. Archaisms in this extensive text are too numerous to be listed individually here. Not unexpectedly, ta alone and in combination is the most frequently attested feature throughout the various manuscripts. However, one also finds directives, -a(n)pa, enolitic possessives with nouns and prepositions, verbs in -iezzi, the genitive with postpositions, natta, and the enolitic pronominal forms -e and -uš. The greatest concentration of archaic features is found in the manuscripts under CTH 612 (16th day). The manuscript KBo XIX 140 (CTH 616.2.B) appears to be Middle Hittite; older Zu, E, UrU, Ka, Da, Ik, II and TaR.

626. Archaisms include the frequent and free use of ta, directives, the spellings tivezzi/tienzi, ištarni-šmi and one example of the genitive with a postposition: DBo.T II 89 V 5-6 LUGAL-waš tapušza.

627. Even without the Old Hittite manuscripts under numbers 17 and 19, there are enough archaic features to establish this text as Old Hittite: ta in various combinations, verbs in -iezzi/-enzi, directives, genitives with postpositions, enolitic possessives and the enolitic pronouns -e and -uš. Note in particular the archaic genitive construction in KBo X 31 IV 29-31: hümmandan LÚ.MEŠ hapiyan.
unuwaḫḫuš-šumu 'the ornaments of all the ḫ-men'.

630. Copy A (KUB XXXII 135+) is Middle Hittite: older ūḫ, AḪ, E, TAR, LI, URU, İK, KU, KA, DU, İT, DA, ŠAR and AK beside newer DU. There are also several features in A pointing to an older composition: (KUB XXXII 135) I 2 meḫḫa, (KBO XXI 85) I 14.15, IV 33 etc. u-ūḫ, IV 20 tunnakkiša, IV 40 tiyezzi, IV 41 pōda-ḫkimet, IV 50 ienzi. Note also A I 3.10 med.-pass. tēḫa versus the Neo-Hittite copy B I 3 [ta]thai (see Neu, StBoT 5 (1968) 80 and 98). KBO XX 70+ II 10 has ta-2, which combined with the above features argues for an Old Hittite composition.

631. For the dating of the manuscripts I A (KBO XVII 74+) and 6 (KBO XVII 75) see Neu-Rüster, Fest. Otten 235f. KBO XVII 75 does contain an instance of ta: IV 41 ta-ikkan ūḫi (contra Neu, StBoT 12 (1970) 61; corrected in Fest. Otten 240). In KUB XXXIV 120, 6 = XLIV 36 II 14 note the genitive (p)ḫann-a. KUB XLIV 36 also has t-āšta (II 9 and 13). StBoT III 140, 1 offers u-en-š[i], but the connection with this ritual is not assured. KBO XX 61 III 5 has an instance of -ana. The other manuscripts listed under CTH 631 have been omitted, since they lack direct evidence for Old Hittite.


634. This text employs ta alone and in combination: t-āšta, ta-2, ta-ši, t-en. See also KUB XX 76 I 8 tiņzi, IV 8 tiyezzi; KBO XI 52 I 11 [IE]R-an-šamet and VI 20 E. ša-ša.
635. These fragments show ta in various combinations:
tašta, ta-ken, ta-z, taš, ta-t, taš. Note also KUB XX 96 IV 11
kiunša henza-te[t] and IV 14 kiunša henza-ttit; KBO XVI 49 I 12
tiyezzi; KBO XVII 100 I 6 katti-šši and I 9 tiyezzi.

636.1. I 6 taškan, I 19 taša.

636.2. II 13 iezzi, II 18 tepša, III 19 tiyezzi.

645. KBO XVII 40 could be Middle Hittite; note E, TAR, ZU,
šar, ki, kuš and uru. Texts 5, 6 and 7 all show the construction of
a genitive with pıran. See also KBO XVII 40 IV 6 n-šš, IV 8
katti-šši and IV 14 tiyezzi; KBO XVII 15 Rs 7 t-šš, Rs 18 nati[ta];
KUB XLIII 30 II 16 tiyezzi and katti-šši passim.

646.3. See II 9 šša-na, III 7 ta.

647. The instances of ta include various combinations.

649. KBO XXII 195 is surely Middle Hittite; older TAR, LI,
ak, šar, uru, ašš, IT, DA, E, IK and KA. It also contains the
archaismu t-ešša (II 6.7) and uenzi (III 12.15). For the inclusion
of KUB XLIII 48 see uenzi (1. 4), pıran (1. 7) and apkpan (1. 8).

650.3. Vs 3. 8. 12 ta-, Vs 9. 19 zag-na (dir.), Vs 6 haršeni-šmi,
Vs 15 meni-(e)emit.

650.8. Vs 6 t-uš-can, Vs 8 appa.

650.9. II 5. 6. III 4 ta-, VI 7 n-uš.

650.10. III 5 ta, III 7 iezzi, IV 7. 18 ta-.

650.11. Vs 21 t-ašta, Rs 22 ta-ken, Rs 25 tiyezzi.

653.1. IV 3 t-aš tizzi.

653.2. I 11 t-ašta, VI 5 nubs-ēsit, VI 6 t-aš tizzi.

654. KBo X 9 has Vs 7 [pi]-ra-ēket, Vs 14 n-uḫ, Vs 15 ti-ša-na, Rs 9 ēštaina (dir.). KBo X 11 shows n-o-ēšan (I 2) and tizzi (I 7). In KBo XIII 137 note ēš-na (l. 6) and pēran (lines 5 and 10). KBo XIII 175 may be Middle Hittite; older URU, AZ, LI and ŠAR (see also Otten, KBo XIII Vorwort: 'alte Schrift'). See there Vs 5 kišnaš parma and Vs 3,5 ēppa.

655. Aside from the name Nantili, see KBo III 63 I 4 natta and II 9 ēppa.

656.3. II 7 t-uḫ-ēšta.

657. Besides I 5 ta and I 4 katti-ēmi, the phrase kantezi UD-at (I 6) deserves attention. The endlesslocative kiwat is usually restricted to the phrase UD-at UD-at 'daily, every day'. The only exceptions I have found are all in Old Hittite texts; KBo III 22 Rs 60 (Anitta) šaniya kiwat 'on the next day' (cf. the Neo-Hittite dupl. C 3 Vs 7 UD.KAM-ti); KBo XII 18 Vs 5 (Zalpa) kuwāpit UD-at 'on the day when'; KUR XIII 3 II 14 kuwapi UD-at 'idem'. In the latter two kuwapi(t) is virtually attributive.

660.3. II 17,18 ta, IV 26 ti-ša-na, VI 2 šašaš tapuša.

665. KBo XX 17 may be Middle Hittite; older ZU, E, TAR, URU, XI, LI and KA (see also Otten, KBo XX Vorw.: 'Alterem Duktus').

669. The conjunction ta is common in these fragments. Only other archaisms are cited separately below.
669.2. A. II 19 tar-kum-mi-ya-e'ez-zi,30 II 23, 25, 27

669.3. A. I 14 BUR-an-šamet.

669.7. IV 11 tiye[azzi].

669.9. A. III 10 mën-aqa; B III 29 šiš-na; D VI 14 t-ūk.

669.11. V 2 KAGAL-na.


669.20. lines 7 and 9 t-ūk.

669.22. A. V 5 šu-kan, VI 12 Kiššarī-šmi.

669.24. A. IV 2 uenzi, IV 9 t-e-šta.

669.31. KBo XVII 46, 23 uenzi, 24 n-e tiyenzi; KBo XX 33 Rs 7 LUGAL-aš tapušza.

676.2. I 17 t-ūk.

682. The version we have dates from the era of Tuthaliya III/IV (see texts 2 and 3 passim). It has been thoroughly modernized, but note KUB XL 107 I 11, 27 t-aš, XLIV 16 II 8 t-at and KBo XII 59 I 12 LUGAL-waš piren.

725. Archaisms: KUB II 2 II 39 ta, III 9 labarna, III 17 t-[a]š, III 18 išat. Note also the absence of final r in III 28 iyata and III 29 tamēta.

732. Archaisms: KBo XIII 106 I 6 t-aš, I 10 udni-šet, I 19 ta, I 20 (= B I 20) [t]-an, I 23[i]šupulli-šet; KUB XXVIII 82 I 1 ieszi; KUB IX 11 I 14 ta; KUB XII 7 I 10, 14 t-aš and enclitic
possessives passim; KUB XXVIII 102 IV 27 ta-za.

738. The archaisms in this set of texts are too numerous
to list individually. They include free use of ta, a high
frequency of -(a)pa, directives, the enclitic pronouns -e and
-nan and nata. KBo XXI 90 is a Middle Hittite manuscript: older
URU, E, DA, KI, TAR, AK, ḪAR, ṢAR, IT and ZU beside newer DA, E
and IT (see also Otten, KBo XXI Vorw. VI note 14). In addition
to the archaisms already mentioned, this manuscript also shows the
particle -an (Vs 7 and Rs 45) and the enclitic dative -e (Vs 14.19). Note also the spelling na-a-aa (Rs 52.54).

739.1. II 19.III 11 t-sata.

739.2. line 4 takku, line 6 MUGAL-wan (gen.).

750. Aside from the one Old Hittite manuscript, direct
evidence for Old Hittite consists of a few scattered instances of
ta: KUB XLI 26 + XX 29 I 9 ta, IV 14 t-an, IV 21.23 t-aa;
KBo XX 39 RCol 9 t-aa. KBo XX 39 may be Middle Hittite (see Otten,
KBo XX Vorw.: 'Altlichen Duktus').

752. KBo VIII 74+ is surely Middle Hittite: older TAR, AK,
LI, E, KI, URU, AṜ, DU and ZU (see also Carruba, StBot 10,6: Alt-
llich').

768.3. On this fragment included by Josephson see under CTH 337.

820. For the inclusion of KBo XVI 86 see I 6 Ṣ-uu. KBo XXI 22
is a Middle Hittite manuscript: older AṜ, DU, KI, E, KA, TAR, IT,
LI and AK beside newer IT. In addition to Ṣatu (Vs 15.17), mephan
(Rs 36.41) and karpiremi (Vs 18.19), it shows n-sapa (Rs 46) and several enclitic possessives. KBo XII 98 I 2 has ta.
2.4. The Middle Hittite Corpus

The format and abbreviations used here are the same as those in the preceding section (see pp. 43-44). As acknowledged by Josephson, *Sent. Part.* 41, many of the Middle Hittite texts in his list are already adduced by Houwink ten Cate, *Records* (1970), and Carruba, *ZiHG* Supp. 1,1 (1969) 226–249. Once again, relevant dating criteria and questions of the manuscripts are discussed in the notes which follow the corpus proper. The point already made above also bears repeating: the line between Old and Middle Hittite is not yet sharply drawn, and several of the texts given here as Middle Hittite may prove ultimately to be Old Hittite in origin.

The Middle Hittite Corpus

28. Treaty (J)

*Kbo* XVI 47 M.H. (O) ✓

41+131. Treaty with Sunassura (J)

II. Hittite

A. *KUB* XXXVI 127 N.H. *mH (?)

B. *KUB* VIII 81 + *Kbo* XIX 39 M.H. ✓

133. Treaty of Arnuwanda with İšmerika (J)

*KUB* XXVI 41(+)XXIII 68 + *ABoT* 58 N.H. *mH (?)

134. Treaty with Kurustama (J) (O)

A. *Kbo* VIII 37 N.H.
134. B. KUB XXIII 7 N.H.
   C. KUB XL 28 M.H. ✔

137. Treaty of Arnuwanda with Gasga (J)
   KBo XVI 27 M.H. ✔

138. Gasga Treaty (J)
   1. KUB XXIII 77a(+)XIII 27 + XXIII 77 + XXVI 40 M.H. ✔
   2. KUB XXXI 105 M.H. ✔

139. Gasga Treaty (J)
   A. KBo VIII 35 M.H. (0) ✔
   B. KUB XL 36 + XXIII 78b + XXVI 6 N.H. (?)
   C. KBo XVI 29(+)KUR XXXI 104 M.H. (?)

140. Fragments of Gasga Treaties
   1. KUB XXVI 19 N.H. (J)
   2.A. KUB XXVI 20 M.H. (J) (?)
        B. KUB XL 14 N.H.
   3. KUB XL 21 —

142. Annals of Tuthaliya (J)
   1. KUB XXIII 27 N.H.
   2.A. KUB XXIII 11 N.H.
        B. KUB XXIII 12 M.H. ✔
   ?3. KUB XXIII 16 —

143. Annals of Arnuwanda (J)
   1. KUB XXIII 21 N.H.
   ?2. KUB XXIII 116 N.H.
144. Treaty of Arnuwanda with Ura (J)  
*KUB XXVI 29 + XXXI 55 N.H.*

146. Mida of Pahhuwa (J)  
*KUB XXIII 72 + XL 10 N.H. (0)*

147. Madduwatta (J)  
*KUB XIV 1 + KBo XIX 38 M.H. (0)*

199. Letter from Tarhuntissa to Palla  
*ABoT 65 M.H.*

200. Letter to the King  
*ABoT 60 M.H. (0)*

209. Fragments of Letters  
*KBo XII 62 M.H. (0)*

212. Treaty Fragments  
*KBo XVI 46 M.H.*

223. Landgrant of Arnuwanda and Aśmunikal (J)  
*KBo V 7 M.H.*

251. Protocol for ___ (J)  
A. *KBo XVI 24(+)25 M.H. (0)*
B. *KBo XVI 102 N.H.*

252. Instructions of Aśmunikal for the Guards of the Tombs (J)  
*KUB XIII 8 N.H.*

257. Instructions of Arnuwanda for the *hazamu* (J)  
All mss. N.H.

258. Instructions of Tuthaliya (J)  
1. *KUB XL 62 + XIII 9 N.H.*
258. 2. KUB XIII 7 N.H.

259. Military Instructions of Tuthaliya (J)

1st Tablet  KUB XXVI 11 N.H.

2nd Tablet A. KUB XIII 20 N.H.

B. KUB XIII 21 + [655/u] —

C. KUB XXXI 107 N.H.

D. KUB XXVI 17 M.H. šułyba

260. Instructions for the Lū. Mesdagud (J)

All mss. N.H.

261. Instructions for the bel madgali (J)

1.A. KUB XL 60 + XIII 2 + XXXI 84 N.H.

B. KUB XXXI 85 N.H.

C. KUB XXXI 89 N.H.

D. KUB XXXI 91+90 N.H.

2. KUB XL 58 + XXXI 86 + XL 78 (+) XIII 25 + [1203/u] N.H.

3. KUB XIII 1(+) XXXI 87 + 88 + XL 56(+55) M.H.

4. KUB XXXI 108 N.H.

5. KUB XIII 24, XL 57 N.H.

262. Protocol of the Guard

IBot I 36 M.H. √

268. Protocol Fragment

KUB XXI 47 + XXIII 82 (+) KRO XIX 58 M.H. ²

270. Oath of Asšapala (J)

KRO XVI 50 M.H. √
271. Protocols of Succession (J)

All mss. M.H. √

275. Fragments of Protocols (or Treaties)

KUB XXXIV 58 — (J)

KUB XXXI 103 M.H. (J) (?) [hidest chance]

284. Treatise of Kikkuli

1st Tab. KUB I 13 + II 12c + KBo VIII 48+53 + KUB II 12b M.H.?  

2nd Tab. KBo III 5 + IBoT II 136 M.H.?  

3rd Tab. A. KUB I 11 + XXIX 57 M.H.?  

B. KUB XXIX 47 —

4th Tab. KBo III 2 M.H.  

5th Tab. KUB II 12a —

285. Horse Training Treatise with Ritual Introduction

1. KUB XXIX 55 + KBo VIII 50 + KUB XXIX 48 + 44 ms.?  

2. KUB XXIX 41 —

286. Horse Training Treatise

1st Tab. KUB XXIX 45(+)43 M.H.  

2nd Tab. KUB XXIX 40 M.H.  

3rd Tab. KUB XXIX 46 + 53 (+) 42 M.H.  

4th Tab. KUB XXIX 52(+)49 + KBo XIV 62 + VIII 51 M.H.  

5th Tab. KUB XXIX 51 + KBo VIII 49 (+) XVI 92 M.H.  

6th Tab. KUB XXIX 50 M.H.  

7th Tab. KBo VIII 52 + XIV 63(+)63a M.H.?  

287. Horse Training Fragments

KUB XXIX 54 M.H.?
313. Hymn to Adad
   KBo III 21 N.H.

344. Theogony
   A. KUB XXXIII 120+119 + XXXVI 31 + Bo 4301 N.H.
   B. KUB XXXVI 1 N.H.

348. Hedammu
   All mss. N.H.

351. Fragments naming Ea
   2. KUB XXXVI 55 M.H.?  

364. The Story of 'Silver'
   All mss. N.H.

365. Ritual and Myth of the River Mala
   KUB XXII 79 N.H.

370. Mythological Fragments
   KUB XXXIV 49 M.H.?  
   KBo XX 59 N.H. √

375. Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ahmunikal (J)
   1.A. KUB XVII 21+ M.H. √
   B. KUB XXXI 124 (+)? XXXI 72 — m.H. ?
   C. KUB XXIII 115 + XXIII 17 + XXXI 117 N.H.
   [D. Bo 8617]
   [E. Bo 2525]
   F. KUB XXXI 123 —
   2. KBo XII 132 N.H.
391. Ritual of Ambazzi
   1. KUB IX 25 + XXVII 67 N.H.
   2. KBo XIII 109 N.H.

393. Ritual of Anniwyani
   A. VBoT 24 N.H.
   B. KBo XII 104 N.H.

396. Ritual of Hatiya
   Mss. N.H. or indeter.

400-401. Ritual of Iriya and Analogous Fragments
   All mss. N.H.

403. Rituals of Mallidunna
   3.A. KUB XXXIII 70 III 8ff N.H.
   B. KUB XLVI 52 —

404. Ritual of Mastigga (J)
   1st Version: A. KBo II 3 N.H.
                B. KUB XII 34+ N.H.
                C. VBoT 18 —
   2nd Version: A. KUB XXXII 115+ M.H. (?)
                B. KBo IX 106 + VIII 75 N.H.

405. Ritual of Mastigga concerning a Crime
   KBo XII 107 N.H.

406. Ritual of Paskuwatti
   KUB IX 27 + VII 5 + VII 8 N.H.
415. 'Bauritual''
   A. KBo XV 24 + KUB XXXII 137 N.H.
   B. KBo XIII 114 N.H.

422. Ritual on an Enemy Frontier
   A. KUB IV 1 I-III 14 N.H.
   B. KUB XXXI 146 N.H.

426. Ritual for a Defeated Army
   All mss. N.H. or indeter.

427. Military Oath (0)
   Mss. N.H. or indeter.

430. Rituals of Childbirth
   3. KBo XVII 60, 61 —

433. Ritual for $\text{KAL KUS}_{\text{kurseš}}$
   1. KBo XII 96 N.H.
   3.A. KBo XX 107 + XXIII 50 M.H.?
      B. KBo XXIII 51 —
   4. KBo XVII 105 N.H.
      KUB VII 38, KBo VIII 59 —

434. Fragments of Rituals for the $\text{MAH.MES}$ and $\text{Gulšeš}$
   1. KUB XVII 27 N.H.
   2. KUB XXXIII 76 N.H.

435. Rituals for the Sun-god
   1. KUB XXXI 147 N.H.

442. Ritual for Seven Deities
   A. KUB IX 28 N.H.
442. B. KBo XIX 132 —

446. Ritual for the Gods of the Underworld
All mss. N.H.

447. Ritual for the Sun-goddess of Earth and Others
A. KBo XI 10 N.H.
B. KBo XI 72 + XX 92 N.H.

458. Fragments of Conjurations
2. KUB XVII 28 II 33–III 17, III 18–IV 44 N.H.

459. Fragments of mugawar
6. KBo XIII 204 —

471. Ritual of Ammihatna
A. KBo V 2 N.H.
[B. 1/a]
C. KBo XXII 136 —
D. KUB XLIV 12 N.H.

476. Ritual of Papanikri
KBo V 1 N.H.

480. Ritual of Samuha
KUB XXIX 7 + KBo XXI 41 M.H.

483. Ritual of 'Drawing the Gods from the Roads'
A. KUB XV 34 M.H.?
All other mss. N.H. or indeter.

484. Ritual of 'Drawing the šMAH, šMEŠ and šGulheš from the Roads'
Mss. N.H. or indeter.
485. Same Ritual for Teshub, Hebat et al.
Mss. N.H. or indeter.

628. (H)isuwa Festival
All mss. N.H. or indeter.

640. Fragments of Festivals for Luvian Deities
1. KUB XVII 33(+)XII 42 —

640. Fragments of Festivals for Luvian Deities
1. KUB XVII 33(+)XII 42 —

662. Offerings for Local Cults
6. KBo XVI 78 M.H.?

683. Renewal of the 'fleece' of the gods Kal
1. Bo 2393 + 5138 ms.?  

693. Festival of Zabband
A. KBo XIV 89 + XX 112 —
B. KBo XX 68 M.H.

699. Festival for Teshub and Hebat of Lawazantiya
KBo XXI 34 + IBOT I 7 N.H.

701. Libation for the Throne of Hebat
1. A. KBo XXI 33 + KUB XXXII 49 M.H.
B. KBo XXIII 44 M.H.
3. KBo XXIII 12 M.H.

710. Festival for Istar of Samuha
KUB XXXII 130 M.H.?

711. Autumn Festival for Istar of Samuha
A. KBo XI 28 M.H.
711. B. KUB XX 26 N.H.

712. Festival of Ištar of Samuha
All mss. N.H. or indeter.

713. Ritual for Ištar of Tamininga
A. KUB XII 5 —
B. KUB XLV 32 N.H.

714. Festival of Ištar of Niniveh
2. KUB X 27 N.H.

716. Ritual and Prayer for Ištar of Niniveh
Mss. N.H. or indeter.

757. Ritual of Zarpiya
Mss. N.H. or indeter.

759. Ritual duqadupašarā
2. KUB IX 6 + XXXV 39 N.H.

760. Ritual of the SALSULGI
2. KUB IX 4 N.H.

777. Ritual 'ain ḫuppiyahuwār'
1.A. TBT II 39 M.H.?
2.A. KUB XXIX 8 M.H.
8. KUB XXXII 19 + KBo XV 73 M.H.?

780. Ritual of Allaiturahi
2.C. KBo XXIII 23 M.H. (V) √
4. KUB XLV 21 ,M.H. (V) (?)
Other mss. N.H. or indeterminate
822. Words of Merchants
   A.  ABOT 49
   B.  KBo XII 42

827. Oracle
   KBo XVIII 151 M.H.  
   KB 19

832. Fragments
   KBo XVI 31 M.H. (J)  
   KBo XVI 45 M.H.  
   KB 27

Notes on the Middle Hittite Corpus

28. The manuscript is Middle Hittite; see Column V of Rüster, ABOT 20(1972). The discussion of Kammhuber, OR 39(1970)554f, including the evaluation of the enclitic pronoun -uk, must be rejected.

41+131. For the combination of these two texts into one see Meyer, MJ 40(1953)121f, and Goetze, JCS 11(1957)71-72. There is independent linguistic evidence to suggest that the Akkadian version of the Sunassura Treaty also dates from the era before Suppiluliuma I (see Durham, Stud. Boğaz. Ass. 1976)71-72. For KUB VIII 81+ as a Middle Hittite manuscript see Otten apud Rüster, ABOT 20(1972)X.

133. Both this manuscript and KBo XIII 58 (see below CTH 257.1.A) are offered as specimens of Middle Hittite in Rüster, ABOT 20 (see respectively Columns VII and VIII). However, Otten in his introduction, ibid. IX, raises the possibility that these
manuscripts are later copies, and a reconsideration of the sign shapes used confirms it. The following table compares the variants of these two manuscripts with those of an established Middle Hittite manuscript, **KUB XVII 21** (Rüster, **StBoT** 20, Column VI) and an established Neo-Hittite manuscript **KUB XXIV 3** (Neu-Rüster, **StBoT** 21, Column II). For the procedure see **StBoT** 21 passim.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>KUB XVII 21</strong></th>
<th><strong>KUB XXVI 41</strong></th>
<th><strong>KBo XIII 58</strong></th>
<th><strong>KUB XXIV 3</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>newer/older</td>
<td>newer</td>
<td>older/newer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIM</td>
<td>older</td>
<td>newer</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>older</td>
<td>newer</td>
<td>newer</td>
<td>older/newer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IK</td>
<td>older</td>
<td>older/newer</td>
<td>newer</td>
<td>older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>newer</td>
<td>newer</td>
<td>older</td>
<td>newer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZU</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>newer</td>
<td>newer</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU</td>
<td>older</td>
<td>newer</td>
<td>newer</td>
<td>older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KA</td>
<td>older</td>
<td>newer/older</td>
<td>newer</td>
<td>older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>older</td>
<td>newer</td>
<td>newer</td>
<td>newer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>older</td>
<td>newer</td>
<td>newer</td>
<td>newer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URU</td>
<td>older</td>
<td>older/newer</td>
<td>newer</td>
<td>older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KI</td>
<td>older</td>
<td>newer</td>
<td>newer</td>
<td>newer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>older</td>
<td>older</td>
<td>older</td>
<td>older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŠAR</td>
<td>older</td>
<td>newer</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŪA</td>
<td>older</td>
<td>older/newer</td>
<td>older</td>
<td>older</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The status of **KBo XIII 58** is quite clear. Its use of the older form of LI means little, since this variant persists into
the latest texts (see e.g. StBoT 20, Column XI). The older form
of AZ may reflect the assumed Middle Hittite archetype (cf. StBoT 21
Column X and p. 10). Otherwise, KBo XIII 58 uses consistently the
newer variants, and the appearance of the newer JA (with one
Winkelhaken) strongly suggests that we have a 13th-century manu-
script (cf. StBoT 20, Columns X and XI, and StBoT 21, Column IV and
p. 6). As for KUB XXVI 41+, it does use some older sign variants,
but crucially it shows more of the newer variants than KUB XXIV 3,
which is firmly datable as Neo-Hittite by its mention of Mursili II.
If we are to maintain any useful distinction between Middle and
Neo-Hittite manuscripts, we must conclude that KUB XXVI 41+ is a
Neo-Hittite copy.

134. KUB XL 28 is probably a Middle Hittite manuscript;
older AH, LI, E and IK. Note also the spelling na-at-ta in line 3.
The size of the fragment precludes certainty.

137. For the Middle Hittite manuscript note the following
forms: older URU, LI, E, KA, IK, ŠAR, KT, DU, IT, AZ, TAR and DA
beside newer IT, DA, E and DU. See also Houwink ten Cate, Records 48.
On the date of the text see also Kammenhuber, Or 39(1970)552.

138. Both manuscripts are Middle Hittite. KUB XXIII 77+:
older LI, KA, DU, DA, URU, E, IT, ZU, TAR, IK, TIM, AK, UK and AZ
beside newer DU. KUB XXXI 105: older URU, IT, E, DA, TAR, ZU and
KA beside newer E.

139. All three copies are Middle Hittite. KBo VIII 35; see
Otten apud Rüster, StBot 20,X, and note older E, TAR, URU, LI, AK, Aḫ, KA, ŠAR, DU, IK and AZ beside newer E and DU. KUB XL 36+: older LI, Aḫ, DU, URU, ḪAR, IT, E, ŠAR, TAR, KA and IK beside newer DU. KBo XVI 29+: older Aḫ, ḪAR, LI, URU, E, TAR, DU, KA, AZ and ŠAR beside newer DU. On this text see also Kammenhuber, Or 39 (1970)552.

140.2.A. Note older IT, URU, TAR, DA, IK and LI.

142. I have excluded KBo XII 35 listed here by Leroche and KUB XXIII 36 + XXXI 35 attributed to this text by Houwink ten Cate, Records 80, and by others. These texts lack linguistic criteria, and the arguments based on the very meager contents are not compelling. I have tentatively included KUB XXIII 16 (after Houwink ten Cate, loc. cit.), since III 13 does contain ḫk mTuthali[yah...].

For the age of the manuscripts XXIII 11 and 12 see Otten apud Rüster, StBot 20,X. Oettinger, op. cit. 137, marks XXIII 11 as a 'late' Middle Hittite original, but the newer forms of LI and URU (passim) alone make this impossible.

143. I have tentatively added KUB XXIII 116 with Houwink ten Cate, Records 80, on the basis of I 11: ammuqa-kan mAl[rnwdana-]. Obviously, this mention of the name is not unambiguous. I find insufficient the evidence for Houwink ten Cate's other additions.

146. For the Middle Hittite manuscript see Otten apud Rüster, StBot 20,X.

147. The manuscript is Middle Hittite; see Otten, ibid.
199. On this text see Houwink ten Cate, *Records* 75 with note 120. The manuscript is surely Middle Hittite: older TAR, UK, E, DU, DA, IT, KA, AZ, URU and IK. Note also the following forms: Vš 8 *tappaššiyet*, Rs 6 *ăršaniese*.

200. The manuscript is Middle Hittite: older KA, AJ, E, IK, LI, AK, IK and URU beside newer E. Note also Vš 5 *mēbhan*.

209. *KBo* XII 62 is probably Middle Hittite: older AK, DU, E, UK and KA. Note the spelling *mēbhan* (Rs 7.10).

212. *KBo* XVI 46 is a Middle Hittite manuscript: Otten apud Rüster, *StBoT* 20, X.

223. The manuscript is probably Middle Hittite: older DU, ŠAR, E, KA, LI, URU, KÙ, AZ, AK, TIM and TAR beside newer UK and AZ.

251. The manuscript *KBo* XVI 24(+25) is Middle Hittite: see Otten, *KBo* XVI Vorwort, and Houwink ten Cate, *Records* 48.

257. For my designation of *KBo* XIII 58 as a Neo-Hittite manuscript see above p. 100f under *CTH* 133.

259. I have added *KUB* XXVI 17 (Laroche *CTH* 261.5) as copy D, following Houwink ten Cate, *Records* 6 and 81. The manuscript is Middle Hittite: older TAR, AJ, DA, DU, IT, E and ŠAR beside newer E. This confirms Houwink ten Cate's characterization of this manuscript as the 'archaic version' of this text.

261. For the age of *KUB* XIII 1+ note the following: older LI, ZU, DU, ŠAR, URU, TAR, TIM and AK beside newer E and DU. Again this result agrees with that of Houwink ten Cate, *Records* 82, based
on linguistic criteria, except for KUB XL 57, which is a Neo-Hittite manuscript.\footnote{31}

262. For the age of the manuscript note older TAR, E, DA, IT, ŠAR, Aḫ, KA, AK, DU and KI beside newer KI (lx: III 9). See also the reference to the text as Middle Hittite by Singer, ZA 65, 87.

268. The text shows these archaisms: KUB XXI 47 I 20 \textit{ištamaštani; Keo XIX 58, 11 \textit{[Kume]nzan, 5 \textit{ištamaštani, 6 \textit{[te]kušamuttani}. The manuscript may be Middle Hittite: older E, TAR, URU, IK, DU, LI and AK beside newer KI.

270. Note older KI, Aḫ, E, URU, AZ, AK, DU, DA and LI beside newer DA and E.

271. All manuscripts are Middle Hittite according to Houwink ten Cate, Records 48. This seems sure for KUB XXXIV 40 and XXXVI 113, 114 and 116. The other fragments have too few characteristic signs to permit certainty.

275. \textit{KUB XXXI 103} is a Middle Hittite manuscript, according to Götterbock apud Houwink ten Cate, Records 49. KUB XXXIV 58 may be as well: note older ZU, E, TAR, IK and LI.

284-287. The dating of these texts to Neo-Hittite by Kammenhuber, \textit{Hipp.} 316-317, cannot be upheld. In particular, her criteria for dating the 'third' training text (\textit{CTH} 286) to the 13th century are invalid. As to the first, the spread of verbal stems in \textit{-iya-}, see Carruba, Or 40(1971)219-220. Note also that Keo VI 2, the oldest version of the Laws, already has \textit{kar-pi-i-iz-zi} (II 39.40.48)
versus the athematic kar-ap-zi of KUB XXIX 1 II 30 and elsewhere. Thus the spread of -(i)ya- (> -iya-) must have begun quite early in Hittite, and the presence of deverbal stems in -iya- does not establish a text as late. Kammenhuber's second criterion, the writing of two proverbs as a single word, proves nothing unless parallels are offered showing the distribution of this phenomenon. Most importantly, her third criterion, the form -uš as the acc. pl. comm. of the enclitic pronoun is not attested in any securely datable Neo-Hittite historical text (see above Sec. 2.2.2, p. 25). Therefore, far from establishing late Neo-Hittite composition, the exclusive use of -uš in the 'third' training text (CTH 286) and the alternation of n-aš and n-uš in the 'second' (CTH 285) argue that these are Middle Hittite texts. Note also in CTH 286 KUB XXIX 43 III 6 iššan[zi] and KBO XIV 63 II 9.60 ienzī.

On the other hand, the consistent use of acc. pl. comm. -aš in the enclitic pronoun in the Kikkuli text does not require us to assume that this text was composed later than the other horse-training texts, pace Kammenhuber, Or 38(1969)552. Her argumentation on this point fails entirely to distinguish between texts and manuscripts. The same holds for the discussion of Carruba, Or 40 (1971)219, who dates the three horse-training texts in reverse order on the basis of the use of enclitic -uš/-aš. It is entirely possible that the Kikkuli text is an older composition than the other two, but that it is attested only in later, already modernized
manuscripts. In fact, in KBo III 5+ IV 46 the mixed spelling iš-eš-ša-i looks very much like a compromise between the older spelling iš-ša-i of a (Middle Hittite) archetype and the Neo-Hittite spelling e-ša-ša-i. The Kikkuli text does preserve some older features: KUB I 13 I 12 huittizzzi, KBo III 5 IV 28 türizzi, and tiye(z)zi passim; KUB I 11 IV 23 parkuwat-šet, KBo III 2 Rs 26 parzatar-šet and palḥatar-šet; KUB I 11 I 42.III 31' iššai.

An inspection of the sign variants in the manuscripts of the three horse-training texts confirms that the Kikkuli manuscripts are later than those of the 'third' text (CTH 286). The position of the 'second' text (CTH 285) is less clear.

Kikkuli:

1st Tab. (KUB I 13+): older KI, IK, LI, URU, E, Aḫ, TAR, AK, DU and ZU (1x) beside newer ZU, Aḫ, DU

2nd Tab. (KBo III 5+): older TAR, Aḫ, E, IK, KA, DU, ZU, LI beside newer ZU, E and DU

3rd Tab. A. (KUB I 11): older TAR, Aḫ, IK, E, URU, KA, DU beside newer Aḫ, DU and ZU

B. (KUB XXIX 47): older DU, ZU, Aḫ (fragmentary)

4th Tab. (KBo III 2): older E, ZU, IK, TAR and KA beside newer ZU, E, AK and DU

5th Tab. (KUB II 12a): too fragmentary

'Second' Text with Ritual Introduction

1. KUB XXIX 55+: older LI, Aḫ, ŠAR, E, TAR, IK, DU beside newer E and DU
2. **KUB XXIX 41:** older E, Aḫ, TAR (fragmentary)

'Third' Text

**KUB XXIX 45+:** older Aḫ, IK, ŠAR, DA, IT, TAR, E and LI

**KUB XXIX 40:** older ŠAR, IK, DA, IT, Aḫ, E, TAR, KA beside newer DU

**KUB XXIX 46+:** older DA, IT, TIM, LI, Aḫ, TAR, E and IK

**KUB XXIX 52+:** older E, TIM, IT, TAR, DA, IK, Aḫ and ŠAR beside newer DU

**KUB XXIX 51+:** older TIM, DA, Aḫ, IT, IK, E and LI beside newer DU

**KUB XXIX 50:** older IK, ŠAR, LI, DA, TAR, E and IT beside newer E and DU

**KBo VIII 52+:** older TAR, DA, E, ŠAR, IK and KA beside never DA and IT

The ductus of the manuscripts of 286 is clearly Middle Hittite (except for perhaps **KBo VIII 52+:**). Note especially the marked forms of DA and IT. The ductus of the Kikkuli manuscripts is certainly later, though many older variants are used. The newer form of ZU (and in Tab. 4 of AK) argues against Middle Hittite, and the consistent use of the enclitic -aŋ as acc. pl. comm. also points to early Neo-Hittite. However, attribution of these manuscripts to late Middle Hittite cannot be excluded pending further study of Middle Hittite ductus in general and the tablets of this text in particular. I insist here only that the Kikkuli manuscripts
are relatively later than those of the 'third' horse-training text.

The ductus of the principal manuscript of the 'second' text is consistent with the middle position assigned to the text by Kammenhuber and with the alternation n-eš/n-ûš. However, the relative age of the manuscript proves nothing about the order of composition of the texts. Furthermore, it would be rash at present to claim that a manuscript with n-eš/n-ûš is necessarily later than one which shows only n-ûš.

In summary, then, the training texts 285 and 286 are on the basis of linguistic criteria definitely Middle Hittite compositions. Accepting in the absence of counterarguments Kammenhuber's conclusion that the Kikkuli treatise is the first of the series, I have also treated it as Middle Hittite, although the linguistic features in the attested version would also be compatible with the era of Suppiluliuma I. The manuscripts of CTH 286 are definitely Middle Hittite, those of CTH 285 probably so. The Kikkuli manuscripts are either late Middle Hittite or early Neo-Hittite.

313. The text shows a frequent, if sometimes faulty use of enclitic possessives and in III 25 the directive dušgaranna. The phonetic spelling iš-hi-i (III 13f) is also noteworthy. This Hittite translation may well date from Old Hittite, as indicated by Oettinger, op. cit. 122 and 127.

344. This text uses enclitic possessives frequently and for the most part correctly. Note in particular I 9-10: daššu-ā-ûši
dAnuš DINIR.MES-eš ḫantezziyākī-šmeš piḫan-ḫe[t]/ ars ‘But the mighty Anu, foremost of the gods, stands before him’. Besides the archaic genitive construction noun+noun+enclitic possessive, this line contains the nominative singular ḫantezziyākī and the enclitic possessive with piḫan.

I suggest that the text also contains two instances of the rare particle -an. The clearer is I 18-19: 2-ti-an MU-ti dAnuš/
dKumarbi menahbanta zaḫhain pātē ‘in the ninth year Anu gave battle against Kumarbi’. The sequence 2-ti-an consists of the dat.-loc. sg. of an ordinal in -ant- plus the particle -an. This particle has a definite functional (and probably also etymological) connection with anda ‘in(to)’. It occurs with anda in six of its occurrences in the Ritual for the King and Queen (see sub -an in the index of Otten-Souček, StBoT 8), and in the other two passages with complete contexts (I 20.22) the notion of ‘in’ is clearly present. The occurrence of -an in §78 of the Laws (KBo VI 2 IV 10) is also accompanied by anda, as is that in KBo XXI 90 Rs 45. It is therefore reasonable that -an would be used with the locative ‘in the ninth year’. Based on the clear instance in I 18, one may also read 2-ti-an in I 12, versus Eichner, Anat. Zahlw. 56: 2-ti-ma? . The number 2 is assured by the 2 MU.ḪI.A-šē in both I 12 and 13.

I have listed the particle -an above as a feature of Old Hittite (Sec. 2.2.1, p. 19), but it is rare even in Old Hittite texts, and its absence in our limited Middle Hittite historical
corpus could be due to chance. I therefore hesitate to ascribe
the present text to Old Hittite based solely on the occurrence
of -an. The other archaic features cited above are compatible
with Middle Hittite composition. There is the further considera-
tion that no other mythological text with Hurrian connections
shows any clearly Old Hittite features. It therefore seems
prudent to assign the Theogony to Middle Hittite for the present.

348. The existing manuscripts of the text show enough
scattered archaisms to establish composition in Middle Hittite:
vocatives dHukūšamu KUB XII 65 III 18, dKumarbi KUB XXXIII 109+94
I 5 and 1ēsha-mi KBo XIX 112,9; 5-nū KUB VIII 67 IV 12 and nahmu-ūš
KUB VIII 65 I 33; šu-ši KUB XXXIII 109+ I 3 and GİŞŠu,ša-ši
KUB XII 65 III 13; GİŞŠu,ša-šašta KUB XXXIII 84+ IV 26.

351.2. See Eštu II 12f and ḫattatar-šamit II 41f. The manu-
script may be Middle Hittite; older E, TAR, LI, DU, IK, AK and
šAR beside newer KI (lx).

364. Archaism: KUB XXXIII 91 I 6 IGI,šI A-wa-šet;
KUB XXXVI 18 II 7 KUBARRBAR-anti (voc.), II 8 ug-an-ta (subj.),
II 9 attaš-H[16], KUB XVII 4,4 KUBARRBAR-ya (voc.?), 8 pamašša.

365. Note Vs 11 kāšati and Rs 11 [k-T]ša, Vs 15 attaš-hiš
and Rs 15 ienzi. See also the reference to the SISKUR ŠA ïd-Maša
performed by karutilša LUGAL.MEŠ in the Annals of Mursili:
KUB XIV 8 Vs 9f.

370. KUB XXXIV 49 has walaštani (Vs 3) and is probably a
Middle Hittite manuscript: older AH, E, KI, URU, KA, IK and LI.
In KBo XX 59 note kT∅at (l. 19) and the older forms of LI, E, DA, KA, IT, KU and IK.

375. For the sign variants of KUB XVII 21 see Rüster, StBoT 20, Column VI.

391. Archaisms (all from KUB IX 25+): II 9 hūrtallienzi, II 41 dAlawaini (voc.), II 34 hūlalivæzi, III 37 katti-ši, III 67 parna šqua.

393. VBoT 24 offers iënzi I 8.IV 27, paiwani I 33, and most significantly in IV 2: k∅-∅ (nom. pl. comm. plus particle -∅a).

396. On the age of the text see Carruba, StBoT 2(1966)56.

400-401. Archaisms: KUB XXX 35 I 8 wappu-miṭ (voc.);
XXX 34 III 7 an∅ (nom. pl. comm.), III 10 wetsæ (dir.), III 14 pešsit, and IV 10-12.24 p-∅∅; XXX 36 II 8.13 p∅∅.

403. In KUB XXXII 70 note the following forms: III 11 n∅∅, III 13 ēppa wappuwa (dir.), III 14 ginuwaš-taš, III 18 i∅∅, III 19 i∅∅. The spelling tsattta (III 14) is also noteworthy.

404. On the age of this text see Carruba, StBoT 2(1966)32, and Kammenhuber, ZA 57(1965)200f. The sign shapes of KUB XXXII 115+ argue that it is a Middle Hittite manuscript: older E, TAR, AK, IK, LI, DA, IT, KA beside newer DU. KUB XXXIV 82+ is probably Middle Hittite as well: older IT, DA, TAR, E and IK beside newer DU and E. These manuscripts reflect different versions of the text from that represented by the Neo-Hittite copies KBo II 3 and
KUB XII 34+. Therefore the fact that they are Middle Hittite does
not contradict the findings of Houwink ten Cate, Records 36-37.
The original composition of the text could well go back to Old
Hittite.

405. Besides the name of the author, Mastigga of CTH 404,
note Rs 10 n-uš.

406. See VII 5 II 4 parma, I 11 kinuwaš-šaš, I 25 katti-tti,
II 12 înši-šši, IV 3 tueki-šši, IV 3.4.9 katti-šši.

415. KBo XV 24 II 15 and 29 have partauwar-šet[t] and -šit.
KUB XXXII 137 II 19 offers [ ]-i-s-az-si and II 2.19+ pęšanti
(vocative of the animate stem pęšant- from pęš- ‘place’; cf. II 8).

422. See in copy A I 17 apenanz, I 32.33 šumenzan, I 36.38
uktūri-šši and I 36 karpuwiddu. The occasion of the ritual is an
invasion by the Gaaga people, which would also accord well with
Middle Hittite composition.

426. Archaisms: KUB VII 58 I 6 nū-natar-tet, I 7 zabbaiš-
(š)miš, I 11 ihhumāu-met, I 10 karušiddu (= KUB XLV 20 I 24
karušieddu); KUB XLV 20 I 10.11 uddAR-tet; KUB XVII 28 IV 56 šenzi.

427. On the age of this text see Oettinger, StBoT 22(1976)95f.

430.3. Archaisms: KBo XVII 60 Rs 12 uttar-šet; XVII 61
Vs 9.18 šer, Vs 18 nu-šaš-šta, Vs 22 ginuwaš-šaš, Rs 5 šeddu,
Rs 14 sašgar-lišši.

433. KUB XXXVI 83, listed here as number 2 by Laroche, makes
no mention of the d KAL KUŠ kuršaš and by its own colophon belongs
instead to a 'ritual of the river'. In the other manuscripts note the following archaisms: KBo XVII 105 II 2 𒂗𒆠, II 3 𒆠𒃤𒊏𒂗𒂗𒄥, II 4 .mul II 28 𒆠𒃤𒊏, II 30 𒆠𒄷𒂗, II 33 𒆠𒄷𒂗, II 40 𒃤𒊏, II 41 𒆠𒄷𒂗, III 31 𒆠𒂗 III 23 𒆠𒄷𒂗, III 21 𒆠𒄷𒂗, IV 7 .mul. KBo XX 107+ may be Middle Hittite: older AK, KT, LI, TAR, DU, E, KA, IK, URU.

434.1-2. These texts could well be Old Hittite in origin: cf. 434.5-6 under Old Hittite in Sec. 2.3 above. The attested archaisms in 1 and 2 establish only Middle Hittite composition:

KUB XVII 27 II 3.10 𒆠, II 33 ŠUB-nam udder-šēt, II 35-36 GUR-ia, ZAG-na (dir.); KUB XXXIII 76,8 miyvētu, 21 ĝātlu.

435.1. II 8 𒆠, II 13 KUB-ia (dir.), II 24 inši, II 25 𒆠, II 17.28.34 dURU-šēt (voc.), II 17.34 𒆠 (voc.).

442. The text is Middle Hittite or older (all citations from copy A): I 14 p tên-eš, I 17 inulli-šēt, I 21.22 piren-šēt, pira(s)-šēt, II 7.15.IV 19 hannina (dir.), IV 7 tukki-šē, IV 14 Ǝr-šēt.

446. Archaisms: KUB VII 41 I 3 uttar-šēt, I 10 daškiuwani, I 16 , IV 11 gur[a] (dir.), IV 13 pira-šēm (= B IV 46 piren-mišt); B I 52 uttar-šēt, II 19.20 n-um, II 24 katti-(e)šē, III 26 d-šē (voc.); C II 2 GİŠ datum, II 41 inši, E Vs 5 ș-ni-e-ag-zā, Rs 7 n-e-g. The last form points to Old Hittite, but its antecedent is singular (epāt nētar), which raises some doubt as to the reality of the neuter plural -e-. The text shows
strong Hurrian influence, and I prefer not to ascribe such a
text to Old Hittite on the basis of a single occurrence of one
feature. See the discussion under CTH 628 below.

KUB VII 41 provides a good example of the problems which still
exist in distinguishing a Middle Hittite manuscript from one of the
early Neo-Hittite period. Neu-Rüster, Fest. Otten 225, date this
manuscript to ca. 1400, i.e. late Middle Hittite. However, it shows
among several older sign variants only the newer forms of E, KI and
ŠAR. This raises the vexing question of just how many newer
variants (and which ones) we may observe in a manuscript and still
safely attribute it to Middle Hittite. Obviously, this complex
issue cannot be fully treated here, but one possible approach to
its solution may be offered.

As justly emphasized by Neu, SiBoT 21,4-5, the terms 'older'
and 'newer' applied to sign variants are relative. We do not have
a means of dating absolutely the introduction of a new sign shape.
However, it seems clear that the newer forms of different signs
were introduced at different times, until eventually several signs
had newer variants available for use beside the older. It is
unlikely that a scribe writing at this point would use all older
variants except for a single sign. One expects several newer sign
variants used together. Therefore if we find that the newer
variant of a particular sign consistently occurs in manuscripts
which otherwise show only older sign shapes (especially highly
marked forms like DA and IT), then we may suppose with some probability that in this case the newer form was introduced at a relatively early date. One may readily notice in the notes above in both this and the preceding section the number of manuscripts which show only older variants except for the signs E and DU. This is for me a strong indication that the newer forms of these signs were already present in Middle Hittite. The case of KI is not as clear to me, and I have qualified manuscripts with the newer form of this sign as 'probably' or 'likely' Middle Hittite.

As for ŠAR, a variant with two verticals does occur in manuscripts which otherwise show exclusively older sign shapes. However, it is not the same form as that of KUR VII 41, which was the starting point of this discussion. KUR XLIII 29, which has 'alten Duktus' according to Riemschneider, KUR XLIII Vorwort, shows ŠAR with two verticals in III 11. However, note that the first vertical is markedly shorter than the second. This same variant is also in KUR XXIV 4 (Neu-Rüster, StBoT 21, Column 1), a manuscript which may well be Middle Hittite, based on the other sign shapes used (see the discussion in StBoT 21, 3-5). The reason for stressing the shorter first vertical is this: several other signs with two vertical strokes have older variants where the first vertical is shorter and newer ones where it is even with the second. This development may be seen in URU and LAM, and the change in E is essentially the same, except that the second vertical is double
(see the development of these signs in the columns of StBoT 20).

It is therefore reasonable that among the variants of SAR with
two verticals, that in which the first vertical is shorter is the
oldest, and further that it was introduced at a relatively early
date when the corresponding forms of URU, IAM and E were current.

To my knowledge only this variant with two verticals occurs in
isolation among older signs. The variant in KUB VII 41 with two
equally tall verticals is always accompanied by other newer sign
shapes. For this reason I choose to consider KUB VII 41 an early
Neo-Hittite manuscript until its variant of SAR is shown to occur
consistently in isolation among older signs.

447. In copy A note II 22 uišš, in copy D III 26 uišš,
III 12 įd-pa and III 15 kišarû. A II 32 may have a genitive in
-ant: UZU giniwa(ā)-kan.

458.2. II 48 pēdi-(-e)š̄i, II 56 dUTU-1 (voc.), II 56.57
ša-ta, III 23.24.36 iensi, III 27.29 iškiša (dir.).

459. KBo XIII 204 has dUTU-1 (voc.) (1. 6) and n-uš (1. 8).

471. In A note I 8 tuęški-šāši, I 40 pēdi-šāši, II 5. III 19.23
šēšši; IV 25.28.42 tiyēšši, IV 4.5 n-uš (latter = D III 13),
IV 45.46 iššai; see also D III 8 [ }tiyēšši, III 12 ięzi.

476. This text has been thoroughly modernized, but note
II 16 n-uš and III 2 ārnam (dir.).

480. The text attests the spellings šēšu (Vs 6. Rs 56) and
mēhšun (10x vs. mēhšun 1x). See also tiyēši (Vs 1.48), iensi (8x),"
tuekki-ši (Rs 38.48), aršiezi (Rs 51). The manuscript is undoubtedly Middle Hittite: older E, AK, AY, KI, ṢAR, DU, ṢAR, TAR, IK, ZU, KU and URU beside newer DU.

483-485. This set of texts, particularly number 484, shows enough archaic features to establish Middle Hittite composition:

(483) KUB XV 34 I 21.22 ienzi, I 43 tiyezi[i], II 13-15.37⁺ IV 33⁺ šunenaz, IV 31 quittiyanıškiuwani, IV 32 n-uš; FNB 4,11 uiezi[i];

(484) KUB XV 31 I 12,21.II 35.69 ienzi, I 15.II 11,44.III 58 tiensi, I 41 šunenaz, III 28,54.IV 10⁺ tiyezi; XV 32 I 44 šunenaz, I 50 quittiyanıškiuwani, I 51 taškiuwani and mukiğaweni, I 52 mukiğaweni, III 13 iezi, IV 37 ienzi; (485) ḫot III 148 III 13 kuḫḫa (dir.). KUB XV 31 I 6 also has an apparent instance of the particle -spa in the rare spelling -sp (see Heas-Wilhelm, AOATS 3 (1974)170). This is the only occurrence of -spa in the Kizzuwatnian rituals, and other Old Hittite features are equally rare or lacking entirely. I therefore consider the single instance of -spa too slim a basis for attributing this text to Old Hittite. See the discussion below under GTH 628.

KUB XV 34 is probably a Middle Hittite manuscript: older KI, TAR, LI, ṢAR, KA, DU, URU, ZU, AK, E and IK beside newer E and DU.

628. This festival of Kizzuwatnian origin is attested only in Neo-Hittite manuscripts and shows only a handful of archaisms:

KUB XXXII 128 II 24 = KBo XV 49 I 11 ienzi; KBo XV 37 II 58 n-uš, III 4 ienzi; KBo XV 68 III 10.14.IV 7 piṟan-šiṭ; KUB XXV 49 II 31
iens[i]; VBoT 116,13 ien[zi]. This is also the only text with
Kizzuwatnian connections which shows the conjunction ta;
KUP XXXII 126 II 13 t-an, KBo XV 37 II 46 ta. In other cases with
equally few attestations of ta, I have listed the texts in the
Old Hittite corpus, and it may legitimately be asked why I have
treated this text differently. The complete absence of ta in
Middle Hittite historical texts and the Kizzuwatnian rituals (CTH
471-500) seems to me sufficient to establish ta as a criterion for
Old Hittite. On the other hand, the general absence of all indis-
putably Old Hittite features in the Kizzuwatnian rituals and the
Hurro-Hittite texts (CTH 774f) supports Kammenhuber's conclusion
that the beginning of significant Hurrian influence on Hittite dates
from the Early Empire (i.e. Middle Hittite).

The appearance of ta in the (H)iuwa Festival and the isolated
occurrences of -apa in CTH 484 and 780 are genuine exceptions and
need explanation, but they do not in my view justify abandoning the
generalizations concerning Old Hittite and the beginning of Hurrian
influence. The exceptions are open to several quite different
explanations. First, we have a treaty between the Hittite king
Zidenza and Pilliya of Kizzuwatna which dates from Old Hittite times.
Thus some Hurrian influence at an early date cannot be ruled out.
Second, it is unlikely that all Old Hittite linguistic features
disappeared at the same time. Several Old Hittite features like ta
or -apa may have lasted into early Middle Hittite, just as forms
like \textit{Amunenam} survived into early Neo-Hittite (Suppiluliuma I).

Third, given that the Hittites could adapt a hymn to the male Sun-god (\textit{CTH} 372) into one for the Sun-goddess of Arinna (\textit{CTH} 376), it is quite possible that texts like the \textit{Hittwa} Festival represent a fusion of new material with portions of Old Hittite compositions.

Fourth, there is the possibility of archaizing in new compositions. This explanation was rejected above as unproven, but it may not yet be permanently ruled out. Until a choice between these various explanations can be made, I prefer to make the weaker claim of Middle Hittite composition for all texts whose status is in doubt.

640.1. See \textit{n-uš} IV 10 and 17.

662.6. Note I 7 \textit{pattivata} -\textit{mišet}, I 10 \textit{ienzi} -\textit{m-uš}, I 15 \textit{ienzi}, I 17.19 \textit{ienzi}. The manuscript may be Middle Hittite: older AK, E, LI, KI, URU, IK, KA, KÙ and ŠAR. Kammerhuber, \textit{Os} 39(1970)560, argues that this text goes back to Old Hittite. This is quite possible, but neither the enclitic possessive nor the \textit{-uš} is certain proof for Old Hittite.

683.1. For a transliteration of this text see Otten, \textit{Fest. Friedrich}(1959)351f. See I 10 \textit{n-uš} and LKrD 7 [\textit{ienzi}.

693. Copy A shows \textit{tiyezi} I 21, \textit{n-uš} -\textit{ken} I 5, and \textit{ienzi} IV 13. Copy B is likely a Middle Hittite manuscript: older DA, IT, LI, KA, AK, URU, E beside newer DA.

699. Archaisms: I 34 \textit{piran-mit}, II 18, 24 \textit{ienzi}, II 28 \textit{n-uš}, III 40\textsuperscript{+}, 41\textsuperscript{+} IV 11 \textit{ienteš}.
701. *KBo* XXI 33 + *KUR* XXXII 49 is a Middle Hittite manuscript: older DA, E, KA, TAR, LI, KI, URU, Aḫ, IK, AK. It also shows several linguistic archaisms: *KBo* XXI 33 III 7 piššiyezzi, IV 9.18 ḫēr(a)-ṣān, IV 30-31.33 hantessiya UD-at (see above Sec. 2.3 under CTH 657), IV 31 hunnit; *KUR* XXXII 49 III 8 partāwar-šet. *KBo* XXIII 12 appears to be a Middle Hittite manuscript as well: older KI, E, ḪAR, URU, DA, LI, KA, Aḫ and TAR. Note also I 9 ṢAN, IV 15 ḫēr(a)-ṣān, IV 22 piššiyezzi.

710. The arguments of Danmanville, *RHA* 59(1956)40-41, for attributing this text to Muršili II are in her own words 'présomptions...de valeurs inégales' and carry little weight. On the other hand, the language of the text is clearly Middle Hittite: Vs 8 iezzi, Vs 12 pivyem, Vs 13.28.30 katti-mi, Rs 19 iem, Rs 22.23 ṣan, Rs 26 SISKUR-SISKUR-za (particle -za), LdNd 33 n-ša. Since the Hittite word for 'bird' appears to be common gender, the kē of LdNd 35 is also nom. pl. comm. The manuscript may be Middle Hittite as well, but there are too few characteristic signs to be sure: older URU, KI, ḪAR, E, LI and Aḫ beside newer DU and Aḫ.

711-716. Several of these texts show isolated examples of to, but no other Old Hittite features are present in the Ištar cult, and Hurrian influence is strong (see especially CTH 712). Once again this state of affairs has led me to assign these texts provisionally to Middle Hittite. See above under CTH 628.

711. B VI 6 t-ektē.


714.2. V 3 ta-šan, V 7 kalutiyezišti.

716. KBo II 9 I 29 has an instance of n-uš. See also KBo XXI 48 Vs 9 ḫppe, Vs 15 arab-teš.

757. Note HT I I 29 katti-ti-na-tta; KUR IX 31 I 6
[ištappu]li-ḫšiti, I 7 ḫazzu[1]-uššet, I 14 šivezi; KUB XXXV 10 I 9 haricziš[i].

759.2. III 22 n-uš, IV 12 kiššari-šši.

760.2. I 22 ġiš-an (gen.), III 14 URI-an (gen.), III 37 Nī.TE-šš-teš. The text could go back to Old Hittite.

777. Archaisms: ḤBoT II 39 Rs 23.31 icszi; KUR XXIX 8 I 7 tiyeziš, I 1 ḫāšhan, I 53 ti-i-ez-zi; II 9.11 šiveziš; KBo XXI 24 IV 12 waššeziš, KUB XXXII 29 I 2 ienzi, I 15 tiyeziš.

Several manuscripts may be Middle Hittite. The likeliest candidate is KUB XXIX 8: older LI, AḪ, KT, DA, E, AK, URI, IK, TAR, KÙ, IT and KA beside newer E, DU, DA and IT. ḤBoT II 39 shows older E, AK, LI, ŠAR, ZU, DU, KT and KA beside newer DU. In KUB XXXII 19+ we find older ŠAR, E, LI, TAR, ZU, IK, AḪ, DU, URI and KT beside newer DU.

780. KUR XXXIV 13 offers these archaic forms: III 9 tiyeziš, III 8 ZAG-na (dir.?), III 11 paddani-ži, III 15 n-an-ši-pa. KBo XII 85 II 20 has Nī.TE-šš-šš (with pl. reference!). Note also
KUR XXVII 29 I 27 šamašzi. KBo XXIII 23 contains several more examples: Vs 24.28 tiyazz, Vs 29 šuriezza[a], Rs 58 šeru-zi, Rs 59 ša-a, Rs 62 šakka. The isolated occurrence of -apa in a Hurro-Hittite text presents the same problem as the two instances of ta in the Hikuwa Festival (see under CTH 628 above). Again I view this example as a genuine exception to the restriction of apa to Old Hittite texts, and pending a satisfactory explanation I have listed the text as Middle Hittite.

822. Josephson includes KBo XII 42 in the Old Hittite corpus, but I fail to find compelling evidence for Old Hittite. Several features are suggestive of an older text: ABO 49 Vs 6 [y] arma and B Rs 10 a-ša-šu-u point to at least Middle Hittite (for the latter spelling with scriptio plena in both syllables compare KBo VII 28 Vs 11 (CTH 371; O.H. text/M.H. ms.), KUR XVII 21 I 11 (CTH 375; M.H. text and ms.), XXIII 77,53 (Gaaga Treaty; M.H. text and ms.), XIV 1 Vs 49f (Madduvatta) and XXVI 17 II 12 (Milit. Instr. of Tuthaliya; M.H. text and ms.). Note also the lack of final -r in B Rs 4 A Vs 7 iyata tame[i]. In sum, the text is definitely older than Neo-Hittite. Whether or not it is Old Hittite is not yet clear.

827. Kammenhuber, ZA 66(1976)69, includes this text among 'Old Hittite originals', but it is not present in Starke's list and is marked by Oettinger as Middle Hittite. There are also no linguistic features which prove Old Hittite composition. Vs 3 and 6
show LUGAL-nā nakkī-met, but this archaic genitive construction is also attested in Middle Hittite. The relevance of the rare spellings ta-š-a and ta-sa (Vs 3.5.6) for dating purposes is not yet established. For all these reasons I have listed the text as Middle Hittite.

832. KBo XVI 31 and 45 are Middle Hittite manuscripts: cf. Otten, KBo XVI Vorwort, and for the former also Houwink ten Cate, Records 48. In KBo XVI 45 note Vs 14 [k]arniktu and Rs 8 pēra-nā-sa[m], mit).

In addition to those texts listed above, several others may be considered for inclusion in the Old or Middle Hittite corpus on the basis of the contents, traces of archaic language, or ductus. In no case, however, do the criteria seem to me sufficient at present to warrant definite attribution to the older periods of the language. Again the texts are listed by CTH number.

233.4. KBo XVI 65 may be a Middle Hittite manuscript.

236.1. KUB XXVI 62 + XIX 17 is probably a Middle Hittite manuscript. Neither of the above lists shows any linguistic archaisms.

295.5 and 6. Both manuscripts may be Middle Hittite.

316. KBo XII 70 Vs 35 has atti-me (voc.?), and KUB IV 3 Vs 9 A.ŠA-ak-tiš.

343. One finds a few enclitic possessives and vocatives:
KUB XXXVI 2 III 42 ḫ̄aššu ŠES-[mi], XXXII 114 I 2 ŠES-ni-mī,
XXXIII 112 IV 12 [udd]ār-mī.

345. In addition to several vocatives of proper names, the
form DUM[LI]-mit (KUB XXXIII 106 IV 10) is also most easily taken as
a vocative (contra Gütberock, JCS 6(1952)29 and 42).

347. Note KUB XXXVI 74 III 6.7 EN-š-šši and III 8 EN-mī (voc.).

361. KUB XXXII 121 II 11 has EGI-š-an-et.

370. In KUB XXXIV 63 one should consider line 15 [ ]anni-šši
and line 7 DINGIR,MEŠ-nun DUMU,MEŠ (gen. in -an?).

385.2 and 4. KUB XXIV 6 has ani (nom. pl. comm.) in Rs 7
and ŠUMENZAN in Rs 12. KUB XXXIV 55 II 3 has ŠUMENZAN. These
features date these texts no later than Suppiluliuma I, perhaps
earlier.

419. KUB XXIV 5 Vs 17 has n-e-zi. The nt. pl. nom.-acc. -e
of the enclitic pronoun is an Old Hittite feature, but the complete
lack of any other archaisms in the text raises doubts about its age.

444. See KBO XIII 119 II 10 LÚ,MEŠ arš-šaḫ, III 10.16 jenzi.

449. Several of these fragments show linguistic archaisms,
but none are compelling evidence for an older composition: KUB
XII 50,7 )basi-šet, 12 pidi-šši; KUB XXXIX 99 Vs 16 ŠUMENZAN;
XXXIX 101 I 9 bappina (dir.), II 11 pariyyezzi; DET II 125 II 7
bāriyyezzi; KBO XVII 94 III 21 karīzzii, III 24 āriyyezzi; XVII 95
II 6.10 āezzi, III 6 tiyyezzi.
456.6. KBo XXI 14: Vs 26 hubibi-išša, Rs x i-iz-zi.

457.1 and 3. KUR XVII 8 shows kampwizzë (IV 2), nepas (IV 7.19), tiyet (IV 20); KUB XII 43,4 has ēmenzan.

461. In KUR XLIV 61 note the spelling antuha (IV 7.19). KBo XXI 74,12 offers tiyezziz, and KBo XXI 17,6 nemiyezziz.

478. There is one instance of ētš in KBo XVII 63 Rs 7. The spelling a-eš-šu-u (ibid. Rs 9.12.13) may also be significant (cf. under GTH 822 above).

479.1. Note I 8 ienzi, I 19 tuikki-kši, I 447.50 aeš (nom. pl. comm.).

479.2. KBo XXI 37 may be a Middle Hittite manuscript, but I have found no linguistic archaisms.

489. KBo XVII 65 could well be a Middle Hittite manuscript, but the only linguistic criteria are weak: Vs 37.45,53.Rs 22 ienzi, Rs 26 katti-kši, Vs 11 peḫkizziz. Note the 'mixed' spelling in the duplicate KUB XLIV 59 Rs 8: i-em-an-zzi.

493. Oettinger, StBoT 22(1976)93, declares the text Neo-Hittite, but ēmenzan (Rs 3.14.15.30) dates the text no later than Suppiluliuma I, and the sign shapes of KUB XLIII 38 are also mostly the older variants. The spellings i-ad-du and i-at-te-ri (Rs 23 and 24) may also be relevant for dating the text and/or manuscript.

646.4. KUB XXXII 87 Rs 9: ērpa. KUB XXXII 108 Rs 3: iezzi.

647.5. In KUB XX 88 note not only tiyezziz (I 13) but also the phonetic spelling kikširan (I 7).
669-670. Further study of the contents and phraseology of these fragments will undoubtedly justify the inclusion of many more in the Old Hittite corpus.

671. KUB XXXVI 89 Rs 13 has DINGIR-AN (gen.).

726-745. Several fragments containing only Hattic have Old Hittite ductus: see Otten-Souček, StBoT 8(1969)43 note 3. It is also probable, though not certain, that the entire Hattic layer of ritual and myth in Hittite texts may be attributed to Old Hittite; cf. Kammenhuber, KZ 83(1969)261.

764. The ductus of both the Hittite and Luvian versions appears to be Middle Hittite (note especially the forms of DA and IT in both). The theme of the neglected god is also reminiscent of those attested in Old Hittite contexts. However, in the absence of any linguistic archaisms in the existing Hittite portions I hesitate to ascribe the text to the older language.

821. Oettinger, MSS 34(1976)131, marks IBot I 30 as a copy of an Old Hittite text, but there are no linguistic archaisms. The use of the term labarna- is certainly highly suggestive, but it does occur in the treaty of Muwatalli with Alaksandu (KUB XXI 1 IV 39), so this single vocabulary item seems to me less than compelling evidence for Old Hittite.
Section 2.5. Neo-Hittite Historical Texts

The list which follows contains those Neo-Hittite texts which are the basis for the distributional statements concerning dating criteria given above in Sec. 2.2. The term 'historical texts' is applied here not only to annals and treaties, but also to land-grants, oracles and other documents whose composition in Neo-Hittite is assured by the mention of specific persons or events. In order to make the sampling as large as possible (especially for certain kings like Kuwatalli and Tuthaliya III/IV), I have included some prayers and instructions, but data from these texts must be viewed with caution, since in these genres the possibility exists of incorporation of portions of older compositions.

Undoubtedly this corpus could be expanded, but for present purposes it has been restricted to only those texts whose attribution to Neo-Hittite (if not always to a specific ruler) is a matter of consensus. A few Neo-Hittite historical texts listed by Laroche (e.g., CTH 43 and 122) have been omitted not out of any particular doubt about their authorship, but because their fragmentary preservation makes them useless for statements about linguistic features.

Neo-Hittite Historical Texts

Suppiluliuma I:
71. On the Affair of the SALAMA.DINGIR.LIM
72. Plague Prayers
73. Prayer to All the Gods
74. Prayer to Lelwani
75. Aphasia of Mursili

M Cuando
76. Treaty with Alaksandu
77. Letter of Cuando to Adadnirari I
78. Prayer to dU pibassassi
79. Prayer to Tešub of Kummanni

Hattusili III
81. Autobiography
82. Fragments of Annals (?)
83. On the Campaigns of Suppiluliuma I
84. On the Deeds of Suppiluliuma I and Mursili II
85. Concerning Urḫi-Tešub
86. Brief against Arma-Datta
87. Decree on behalf of Mittamnamuwa
88. Decree concerning the NAałekur Pirwa
89. Decree concerning Tiliura
90. Fragments concerning NERIK
91. Declaration of KAL dU-assa
97. Treaty with KAL of Ḫu-ansa
98. Fragment naming Bentešina and Egypt
176. Letter of Puduhepa to the King of Alasiya
224. Royal Grant of Hattusili III to GAL-ḪISKUR
383. Prayer of Hattusili and Puduhepa to the Sun-goddess of Arinna
384. Prayer of Puduhepa to the Sun-goddess of Arinna
569. Oracles concerning Arma-Datta and Šaušgatti
585. Vow of Puduhepa

Tuthaliya III/IV

105. Treaty with Šaušgamuwa
106. Treaty with Ulmi-Tešub
177. Letters of Tuthaliya to Tukulti-Ninurta I
178. Letters of Tuthaliya to Baba-šš-iddina et al.
225. Royal Grant to Sahuruunuwa
255. Instructions for the LÜ.ḪAS.GAŠ

Suppiluliuma II

121. Conquest of Alasiya
123. Treaty (KBO IV 14+)
124. Oath of a Scribe
125. Treaty/Protocol (KUB XXVI 33)
126. Fragments: 2. KUB XXVI 25 4. KBO XII 30
256. Protocol (ABOT 56)
Section 3. Syntax of the Ablative and Instrumental – Previous Analyses

Having established our corpus to the best of our present ability, we may now turn to the specific problem of the ablative and instrumental. In his initial report on the decipherment of Hittite, *MDOG* 56(1915)24, Hrozný defined the function of the nominal ending -it/-et as ablative/instrumental, that of -az as locative. He retained these definitions in his monograph *Die Sprache der Hethiter* (1917), and they were still reflected in his translations in *BoSt* 3 (1919). See for example his translation (p. 96) of the Telipinu Edict I 8: man-aš labasz-nu EGIR-pa uuzzi 'Als er auf einen Feldzug fortgeht'. Hrozný's designation of -it/-et as ablative as well as instrumental may well have been influenced by etymological considerations, as implied by Bork in his review of *BoSt* 3, *OLZ* 23(1920)64. All of the examples of -it/-et treated by Hrozný in the works cited show an instrumental function.

Bork, loc. cit., and Sommer, *ZA* 33(1921)94f, were the first to criticize the interpretation of -az as a locative marker and to argue for a basic ablatival function instead. Bork cited several examples from *BoSt* 3 and correctly rendered the Telipinu example above: 'When he returns from a campaign'. He also pointed out the adverbial use in GE₆-az 'at night'. Sommer characteristically offered a detailed, virtually exhaustive survey of the attested
forms in -az, showing conclusively that in spatial references the 
ending expressed 'place from which', not 'place where'. Hrozný 
accepted this revision in the corrections to his Code hittite 
(1922)158 (see already the Korrekturzusatz in SH(1917)63 note 3). 
In separate survey articles of the same year Friedrich, ZDMG 76 
(1922)160, and Forrer, ZDMG 76(1922)205, both defined the function 
of -az as ablative and that of -it as instrumental (the former 
with reference to Bork and Sommer). At this point the basic 
functions of -az and -it could be regarded as established. 

Hrozný again took up the question of the ablative and instru-
mental in Donum nat. Schrijven(1929)367-68, in particular the 
relationship of the two cases to each other. The discussion was 
prompted by examples like the following:

Karhuwantaz-ät 'from its belly' (Laws §90)

cellarit uddanz huišnuddu 'shall preserve from the harmful 
word' (KBo IV 2 I 60)

kuvš GISUJ-IT THURIVANTEK 'the yoke with which they are 
yoked' (KUB II 2 II 11-12)

kêt İD-az // KEZ İD-az 'on this side of the river' (Laws §22)

From such cases Hrozný drew three generalizations:

1. The enclitic possessive pronoun has only an instrumental 
form in -it/-et which may also be used in an ablative function. 
No formal ablative of the enclitic possessive (such as *-tez, 
*-*ez) is attested.
2. On the other hand, in the relative pronoun kui- and the demonstrative kā- 'this' the ablative in -ā is the usual form for both ablative and instrumental. The form kēt is to be regarded as exceptional.

3. In the adjective the instrumental ending -it can function occasionally as an ablative.

Hrozný reached the general conclusion that there is no sharp formal distinction between the ablative and instrumental in Hittite, and that both case forms—albeit only exceptionally—are used 'promiscuously' to express the meaning of either. He viewed this situation as reflecting the origin of the endings: -it/-ēt from an IE ablative in *-ā, -az(a) from an IE ablative in *-ēd. The two endings were secondarily (and incompletely) differentiated in Hittite as instrumental and ablative.

Other brief discussions of the function of the ablative and instrumental are found in connection with specific passages. Gütze, An(1933)260-61, argued that the ablative could express not only direction from, but also occasionally direction toward, as in KBo V 8 III 18: ṣez ANA mPittanara 'in that direction, toward Pittanara' (see below p. 358). Sommer, Jah(1938)199f, presented further examples of ablatives functioning as instrumentals (including whole phrases, not just pronominal forms like kuszh cited by Hrozný). He also cited, ibid. 219-220, the one example of an ablative of comparison thus far attested. Goetze, Tunn.(1938)89-90, with note
352, collected instances of the construction of ablative like
htežziyaz 'in front' with a substantive in the dative: e.g.
AvA KÁ.GAL.II htežziyaz 'in front of the gate' (VBoT 24 I 37).36

Friedrich, HE I1(1940)70-71 (§§225-229), summarized the uses
of the ablative and instrumental as follows. The basic function
of the ablative is to express the starting point of a motion (place
from which). Closely related are the ablative of separation (e.g.
with ḫarkul- 'pure, free from _') and the ablative of cause
(e.g. ḫullammaz 'as the result of a quarrel'). The same basic
meaning probably underlies the 'adverbial' ablatives like kunnaz
'on the right' (< 'from the right'), kēz 'on this side' and
iḫpantaz 'at night'. The instrumental expresses means or instru-
ment. There are also instances of ablatives with instrumental
function. In fact, in certain usages the two cases appear to be
equivalent: e.g. both kunnaz kišēraž harzi and kunnit kišērta
harzi mean 'holds with the right hand'. Furthermore, a noun in
the ablative takes the instrumental form of the enclitic possessive.
An ablative of comparison also exists in Hittite (p. 72, §233).

The same account with no substantive changes may be found in
Friedrich, HE I2(1960)125-126 (§§214-218). Kammenhuber's discus-
sion, Hdo 205-206, reiterates the same basic functions for the
ablative. She raises the possibility that the instrumental use of
the ablative is a secondary development, while maintaining that the
use of the instrumental enclitic possessive with a noun in the
ablative is an archaism. Examples are presented showing that the instrumental of means may be used with animate nouns, and the important comitative use of the instrumental ('together with') is given its due. Kammenhuber also cites an apparent adnominal use of the instrumental: DUG.barharan GESTIN-it 'a l.-vessel with wine'.

Such is the situation which called forth the remarks of Benveniste quoted at the beginning of this study: both the ablative and instrumental show uses expected of them, but in addition there is an apparent overlapping of functions the extent and conditioning of which are unclear. The solution to this problem is one of the aims of the following investigation.
My data base comprises KUB through Volume XLVI, KBo through Volume XXIII, ABot, JBOT, VBOT and the other smaller collections listed in Laroche, CTH (1971). In addition I have cited a few passages quoted in the secondary literature which have not yet been published in cuneiform.

1 The terms Old, Middle and Neo-Hittite are used here as express equivalents of the German Alt-, Mittel- and Jungheithitisch as defined by Neu, SiBoT 21 (1975) VII, and by others. These three periods, including Middle Hittite, refer to stages of the language, and their use implies no claims concerning historico-political developments (cf. Laroche, CTH (1971) 1-2).

Nor does the present acceptance of the threefold division above preclude the distinguishing of further discrete stages or the adjustment of boundaries should subsequent investigation warrant it. As noted by Kammenhuber, KZ 83 (1969) 262, the Middle Hittite period as defined is quite short. On the other hand, it is clear that the Hittite language did not remain entirely unchanged from the reign of Suppiluliuma I to that of Suppiluliuma II. In particular, the language of documents attributed to Suppiluliuma I agrees in some features with Middle Hittite, not with later Neo-Hittite. However, a rigorous subdivision of Neo-Hittite into smaller periods seems premature, so long as we cannot assign Neo-Hittite non-historical texts to specific periods with any precision (recent refinements in paleographic analysis, as reflected for
example in Neu-Rüster, StBot 21 (1975), apply directly only to
dating manuscripts, not texts).

Kammenhuber, Or 38(1969)548-52 and KZ 83(1969)256-89; Otten,
StBot 11 (1969); Houwink ten Cate, Records (1970); Kammenhuber,
Otten, StBot 16 (1971); Carruba, Or 40(1971)208-23.

4 Compare the remarks of Neu, StBot 18 (1974) 2, on the question
of which forms attested only in the later copies of the Anitta
text may be restored in the Old Hittite manuscript. See also the
discussion of a specific example, ibid. 70f.

5 In fact, this text has been so modernized that some have
taken the Hittite version as a Neo-Hittite translation of the
Akkadian (e.g. Güterbock, JAOS 84(1964)108, and with doubts
Kammenhuber, KZ 83(1969)265). On the handful of archaisms
pointing to an Old Hittite original see Carruba, ZDMG Supp. I,1
(1969)231-34 and Sec. 2.3 below.

6 Compare the remarks of Carruba, Or 40(1971)210: "Texte,
die nicht "historisch" in engerem Sinn sind, habe ich nur dann
gleichtzeitig herangezogen, wenn sie sicher datierbar waren, und
dabei Rituale, Gebete u. dgl. so weit wie möglich ausgeschlossen,
da sie ihrer Natur wegen immer wieder verwendbar sind und ver-
wendet wurden und oft eine lange Tradition hinter sich haben".

Archaisms in non-historical texts (and in disputed historical
texts) may not be cited as evidence for 'archaizing' in late Neo-Hittite. The uncritical mixing of Neo-Hittite historical texts and other texts in Neo-Hittite manuscripts destroys the validity of discussions like that of Kammenhuber, *KZ* 83(1969)256-89. Her statement there (p. 289, note 86) that nearly a hundred relatively well-preserved texts exist from the era of Hattusili III is true only if one includes many non-historical texts, but these cannot be used as primary evidence for Neo-Hittite. The segregation of Neo-Hittite historical texts does not deny the possibility that they are influenced by older models (Kammenhuber, *op. cit.* 271-72, note 46). Such influence may be the source of those archaisms which do occur in Neo-Hittite historical texts. However, this influence is quite a different thing from the copying of an older text or the combination of portions of an older text with newly composed sections. An example of the latter process is the Prayer of Mursili II to the Sun-goddess of Arinna, which uses portions of an older hymn and prayer to the male Sun-god (see Gütterbock, *JAOS* 78(1958)244f). Such a hybrid text cannot be used as primary evidence for the language of either Old or Neo-Hittite. It is only after we have established the grammar of Old, Middle and Neo-Hittite on the basis of other texts that we can attempt to sort out the various layers of a text like the above-cited prayer. See further Sec. 2.3 below.

I have attempted to take into account all important archaisms
which have been proposed as dating criteria, but no claim is made to exhaustiveness in this regard. I became aware of the relevance of certain features only after reading much of the corpus, and there were limitations on the number of archaism whose distribution I could check in Middle and Neo-Hittite historical texts. In the notes on the Old and Middle Hittite corpus, possible additional criteria are often pointed out as 'noteworthy'. Further study is needed to show whether these (and other) features are useful for dating texts.

As already stressed by Carruba, *ZDMG* Supp. 1,1(1969)235, orthographic features such as scriptic plena, spellings with -t- (vs. -d-), or phonetic spellings (vs. logograms) are only useful as dating criteria when applied to specific words or morphemes. It is the lack of such an application to specific cases that has caused me to omit certain features here. For example, the non-indication of the glides ū and ū has been cited as an archaic orthographic feature (see among others Neu-Rüster, *StBoT* 21(1975) 10). But me-mi-en is a common spelling for the acc. sg. of 'word' at all times, and the stem ḫēpī(γ)-'all' is virtually always written without use of the YA sign. Therefore the non-indication of glides will have to be studied word by word before it is of real use as a dating criterion.

8 Unless otherwise noted, in this and other lists of texts the numbers and sigla are those of Laroche, *OTH* (1971), with the
revisions and additions of RHA 30(1972)[1975].

9 Houwink ten Cate's citation, loc. cit., of me-ä-me-ä from KUR XXIV 4v (his 2830) is misleading, since the actual spelling, KUR XXIV 4 vs 11, is me-ä-me-a-ä, with scriptio plena in both syllables, a unique spelling to my knowledge. As pointed out above (Sec. 2.1, note 6), this text has connections going back to Old Hittite.

10 Thus the Hukkana Treaty §§17 and 28 (KBo V 3 II 50.III 24), Manapa-Datta Treaty I 61 and the Šaušgamuwa Treaty II 37. The form also has a neuter singular antecedent in the Ulmi-Tešhe Treaty (KBo IV 10 Rs 12) and the Alaksandu Treaty (KUB XXI 1+ III 74). In KBo IV 14 III 52 (Suppilliuma II) -ä- is functioning as nom. pl. comm. In both functions the usual Neo-Hittite form is -at.

11 Kamenhuber, H30 214 and 310f, states that the pronominal forms in -edi are late, but he offers no evidence for this claim. Nor does Otten, RHA 67(1960)124. The example a-πi-s-ti-i which he cites from KUB IX 19,7 is from an undatable fragment and offers no evidence for or against the antiquity of -edi. For a correct evaluation of -edi vs. -edani see Neu, SMT 18(1974)71f with note 106.

12 Houwink ten Cate, op. cit. 9, states explicitly that his 'Group D' includes only the 'greater compositions' after the time of Suppilliuma I, such as Mursili's Annals and 'Deeds', the 'Apology' of Hattusili, the treaties edited by Friedrich and
various prayers. This has the very desirable effect of limiting the discussion to historical texts, but his corpus is necessarily less complete than that listed in Sec. 2.5 below.

13 Kammenshuber, KZ 83(1969)275, claims to have found wēk in the Annals of Mursili, KBo XVI 8 II 35f, but she gives no exact line reference, and in repeated readings I have found no trace of wēk. The discussion of wēk seems an appropriate place to speak of the use of other independent personal pronouns, especially uk 'I' and ammu'k 'me' (dat. and acc.). The use of the first person singular pronoun is crucial to Kammenshuber's concept of 'archaizing' in late Neo-Hittite texts (KZ 83(1969)262 and elsewhere), because once non-historical and disputed historical texts are removed, the use of uk as 'I' is the only remaining evidence for such 'archaizing'. However, by Kammenshuber's own account (op. cit. 272f), uk is also used as 'me' (dat. and acc.) in texts of Muwatalli and in KBo IV 14 II 80 (probably Suppiluliuma II, definitely 13th-century). The use of uk as 'I' therefore is not valid evidence for 'archaizing', because we must reckon with the possibility that some Neo-Hittite speakers leveled the difference between uk and ammu'k in favor of uk. Kammenshuber herself lays great stress on the need to admit dialectal (or idiolectal) differences in one synchronic system (op. cit. 280). For a parallel to the opposite levelings to uk and ammu'k compare the use of both ūnēk and ūnēk in Neo-Hittite for all cases of the second person plural pronoun.
Obviously, the appearance of *uk* in Neo-Hittite, both 'correctly' as 'I' and as 'me' makes it a very weak dating criterion. If we find *uk* 'I' in a small fragment, we have no way of knowing whether this represents Old/Middle Hittite or a Neo-Hittite dialect which has generalized *uk*. For this reason *uk* 'I' is not included here as a dating criterion. Its appearance in specific texts is cited, but only in connection with other, indissoluble archaisms. No text has been dated to Old or Middle Hittite solely on the basis of *uk* 'I'.

All examples listed of the nom.-acc. sg. neuter are used adverbially. This adverb remains in Neo-Hittite in the 'contracted' form *appizzin*, while the productive nom.-acc. sg. neuter is the i-stem form *appizzi*.

*KUB XIII 4 IV 21* has *a-p-zi-an*, which looks like a compromise of *a-pi-iz-zi-an* and *EMIR-zi-an*, which is attested in IV 20.

If this fragment belongs to the Deeds of Suppiluliuma, the *uk* 'I' of lines 14-15 and other archaisms suggest that it is part of a version by Suppiluliuma himself (as proposed for *KBo XIX 49+51 and 53*). Houwink ten Cate, *Records* 80, instead assigns this fragment (= 97/c) to the Annals of Arnuwanda. No final decision seems possible at present.

Since one could choose to read *-ah-* instead of *-ih-*, these examples are uncertain.

As shown by examples like the third plural *kappuensi*
(KBo VI 2 IV 20; Laws/O.H. ms.), the verb listed by Friedrich, Hüb 99, as kappuwañ originally had a stem kappu(y)e-, which is probably still reflected in spellings like kappuñzi.

19 The form ku-ru-ri-e-eh-ku-an-zì Hatt. III 76 (thus Götze) is dubious. Judging from the autograph, -[y]e-eh- is equally possible.

20 Houwink ten Cate, Records 17, cites sumani from the first Arzawa letter (VBoT 1), a text which dates from the first half of the 14th century, i.e. from either late Middle Hittite or the period of Suppiluliuma I (see Otten, SBoT 11(1969)34).

21 I interpret LÚ SANGA-az as containing the particle -za (rather than as a nominative singular of ḫakum-yanì-) because of the context: LÚ SANGA-az kuedañ '(you) to whom I am priest'. The nominal sentence with first person subject requires -za in Neo-Hittite (see Hoffner, JNES 28(1969)225f). What form underlying LÚ SANGA calls forth the spelling -az is unclear.

22 The listing of these examples as neuter nom.-acc. plural in Friedrich, SV II 190, is erroneous, as shown by the later examples of the phrase with kūñ: Manapa-Datta IV 44, KUB XXI l+ IV 33+ (Alaksandu), KBo IV 10 Rs 9.14 (Ulmi-Tešub).

23 Houwink ten Cate, loc. cit., also lists Ệñadba (AM passim), but this form may also be interpreted as nom.-acc. pl. neuter (or rather a collective).

24 Given the rarity of the directive in Neo-Hittite, one may
wonder whether the 'Glossenkeil' here marks an unusual Hittite form rather than a foreign word. The dat.-loc. sg. ḫummi (KUB XXXV 146 III 42) is not marked by a Glossenkeil.

25 For Oettinger's list of abbreviations see there p. 142.

An inherent defect of his method of citation is the lack of provision for Middle Hittite copies of Old Hittite texts. Thus he marks such clearly Old Hittite texts as KUB XVII 10 (Telipinu) as Middle Hittite originals. Since this is a general feature of his system, I have not felt it necessary to repeat this fact for each individual case below.

26 Obviously, not only the presence of older sign shapes but also the absence of newer variants is crucial in showing that a manuscript is relatively old. The lack of any mention of newer variants in the following discussions of manuscripts should be taken as a claim that a given manuscript contains none. In the case of some signs like .UR and .UR, the newer variants are already Middle Hittite (see Rüster, StBoT 20, Column VI), and in these instances I have mentioned the newer variants only when they cooccur with the older. In the case of DA and IT, two variants occur already in Old Hittite: one in which the first two horizontals are 'indented' (ibid. Column I), one in which the three horizontals are even with one another (ibid. Column III). The former appears to be used only through Middle Hittite, the latter is attested into the latest texts. The terms 'marked' and 'unmarked' would probably be more appropriate
in this instance, but for convenience the 'indented' form is here referred to as 'older', and the other more common form as 'newer'.

27 Not all of the archaisms cited by Carruba have proven to be equally valid. The relevance of the spelling me-mi-e-ni is uncertain, and the occurrences of -nita are in the combination na-az-ta (see above p. 24). However, the sequence š-an(-)natt (KBo X 2 1 4) and n-ue (KBo X 3,13) are together already sufficient to establish Old Hittite, leaving aside considerations of style and content.

28 The use of the term ḌUṬUŠI 'my sun' to refer to the Hittite king does not necessarily prove that this letter dates from the Empire (pace Laroche, loc. cit.). We know nothing about the form of address in Old Hittite letters, and in the Old Hittite Palace Chronicle KBo III 34 I 22 the king is already addressed as ḌUṬU-mit 'my sun'.

29 Kamm enhuber, Or 41(1972)293, makes the startling assertion that KBo XVII 17 is 'mit Sicherheit junghethitisch' and uses this alleged example to attack the validity of ductus for dating Hittite manuscripts. However, as already pointed out by Otten, KBo XVII Vorwort, KBo XVII 17 is a duplicate to Bo 3263+ (now = KUB XLIII 53), which has long been available in a partial transliteration by Sommer, ḤAB 219-220. The Old Hittite features of this text are indisputable, although KUB XLIII 53 is a Neo-Hittite manuscript.
Far from disproving the validity of the Old Hittite ductus, 'KBo XVII 17 tends rather to confirm it.

Several other manuscripts from 'KBo XVII cited by Kammenhuber, loc. cit., as 'mit Sicherheit jungheithitisch' are also indubitably Old Hittite: 'KBo XVII 24 (N.B. I 7 ta-kkañ), XVII 32 (Vs 10 [n]atta, Vs 16 parma-ma, Vs 21 cAtu), XVII 36 (II 6 p̱eran tiyinzi, III 3 Kappa, III 7 nu-kkan, III 8 haṣṣa (dir.), III 10 n-e). Cases such as these raise serious questions about the basis for the assertion (ibid.): 'Außerdem wurden auch noch im 13. Jhd. (vor allem unter Hattusili III. und seinem Sohn Tuthaliya IV.) Fest-ritusale nach dem alten hatt-heth. Schema konzipiert'. Is this claim based on examples like those we have just seen, or is there independent evidence for Neo-Hittite composition of rituals using the old Hattic-Hittite pantheon?

30 This 'mixed' spelling with both -va- and -a- is another example of a compromise between older and newer variants, in this case tar-kum-mi-(i)-e-ez-zi and tar-kum-mi-va-(az)-zi. See below p. 107 on i²-ek-ea-i.

31 Kammenhuber, NSS 28(1970)59, argues that the hel madgalti text can be no earlier than the era of Hattusili III because of the use of the sign KUR in the value MÁD/T (see also Arler 81f and Hipp. 17 with note 65a). However, the very restriction of the value MÁD/T to the word madgalti makes this feature unsuited for dating purposes, since it has effectively no distribution to test.
32 In the case of K1 and 5AR, 'newer' refers here to the variants of Rüster, StBoT 20, Column VII. Each of these signs has a further even newer variant which occurs in very late manuscripts (see Neu-Rüster, StBoT 21, Column IV, which shows both the 'newer' and 'newest' variants).

33 The existing Hittite version of this treaty is probably a later copy; see Kühne-Otten, StBoT 16(1971)37, note 65 and 40, note 76.

34 The mention of Arma-Datta gives only a terminus post quem. The specific attribution to Hattusili III is tentative.

35 For the placement of this fragment here note especially the expression in II 5-6: -ta...sagata / irmis ᵇ₇du 'may death be a bourn for you' (cf. KBo IV 14 passim).

36 However, Goetze's implication (note 354) that the dative may sometimes follow the ablative is false. In all the examples he cites for the order ablative—dative, the dative is in reality dependent on another ablative 'adverb' which follows it and functions as a postposition.
Chapter Two - Ablative and Instrumental in Old Hittite

Section 1.1. Usage of the Ablative in Old Hittite Manuscripts

I. Ablative of Separation ('place from which')

The most common use of the ablative in Hittite is to express separation from a place, an object or (rarely) a person. A few examples will suffice to illustrate this usage in Old Hittite manuscripts (for an example with a person see ex. (16) p. 158):

KBo XVII 4 III 13-14 (R. for the King and Queen/StBot 8, 34):^1

(1) *hilamaz-pat/[^N]Aperyunaš paiwani

'From that very gate(-house)...we go to the rocks.'

KBo XXII 2 Vs 4-5 (Zalpa/StBot 17, 6):

(2) *[DIM][TR.DID][L]Lš-[š]-a ḪUR.MEŠ-[uš] A.[AB].BA-[š]/ šarrĕ dēir

'But the gods picked up the boys out of the sea.'

KBo VI 2 II 51-52 (Laws/HG §49):


'Whoever concludes a transaction with a šš-man shall withdraw from the transaction.'

The above examples show an ablative expressing separation with an intransitive motion verb, a transitive motion verb, and the verb šamen- 'part (int.), withdraw', which includes the notion of separation as one of its semantic features. More examples of each of these types are attested in Old Hittite manuscripts:^3
Intransitive Motion Verbs:

peī- 'go':  KBo XX 8 Vs 9 arkūnas.

uwa- 'come':  KBo III 22 Vs 5+ URU-as, VII 14 Vs 15+ URU Halpaz,
            ibid. Rs 3+ URU Nattuwa, XVII 15 Vs 19 Ēšašiwaaz.

Transitive Motion Verbs:

buwittive- 'pull, draw':  KBo III 22 Rs 54 [URU-ria]a.

pēda- 'carry':  KBo III 22 Vs 40+ [UR] Iḡaz, ibid. Vs 42+ [I][UR] Zalpuzas.

dē- 'take':  KBo VI 2 II 44 GISH INAS-ṣaz, XVII 1 I 18-19+
           Iḡaz-mit, ibid. II 24 kikār[as-(met)], ibid. II 25
           ʼalmēgbittas  ḫaš̄[aš], XVII 7 + IBOT III 135 IV 6-7
           GISH GinA-keš-mit [        −]lit kartez-mit/ [tur]ceza-mit, 4
           XX 12 I 17 [Ī]klevišas.

tave- 'steal':  KBo VI 2 I 42.45 ʾESCO KUR LAVas.

uwa- 'bring':  KBo III 22 Rs 58+ KASKAL-az, 5 XXII 1 Vs 13  Ē-az.

uwete- 'bring':  KUB XLIII 23 Vs 5-6 tamētas/ KUR-az.

Verbs Expressing Separation:

šamen- 'part, withdraw':  KUB XXIX 29 Vs 7 kuššanas (+-kan).

There are also instances in Hittite of an ablative expressing 'place from which' with verbs which do not normally take such a specification in English:

KUB XLIII 23 Rs 15-19 (Blessings for the King/GTI 820):
    nu šer matt[a] nēniša dšk̄ur-as LУCAL-i  [āšu]/ huišwatār
    (4) mivater tar[p]uuli GISH šūri niški[i][du]/ katta-šar-ṣa tamwaṣ
It must be emphasized that I cite this example separately only because it is somewhat unusual from our point of view. There is no evidence to suggest that the Hittite speaker felt an ablative with pEE- 'give' to be any different from one with uDa- 'bring' or the other transitive motion verbs listed above. Compare also the following:

EHo VI 2 II 40 (Laws/HG § 47):

(5) luzzi natta kerpirissi ISTU E ABÊ-ŠU-[ma ka]rpiensi

'He does not perform luzzi (himself), but they perform (it) from the house of his father.'

For the special sense of the verb compare the surrounding context and § XXXVIII of the later version.

II. Ablative of Direction

This use of the ablative is often called simply 'adverbial' (e.g. Friedrich, HG I 2 § 215), and Sommer, HAB (1938) 142, terms it 'locative'. But as the examples below will illustrate, the ablative does not express absolute location ('place where'), but
rather the position of something in relation to something else, i.e., its direction. There are only a few attestations of this type of ablative in Old Hittite manuscripts, and each is in some way important enough to warrant citation of the complete context:

KBo III 22 Rs 78-79 (Anitta/StBot 16,14):
(6) mēn tunnakidna-me naizzi ap(ik-a)/ pēran-sit kunnaz ešeri
   'But when he goes into the inner room, that one will sit before me on the right.'

Grammatically, kunnaz 'on/to the right' is being used absolutely; it has no 'object' or noun dependent on it. Semantically, however, the point of reference clearly is 'me' (the king). Note that the ablative does not actually specify a location. The man in question could be sitting in any number of places, provided he is in front and to the right of the king.

SÉo I 4 = LSU 4 = 2064/3 Vs 14-16 (Landegrant/LIO 6,362):
10 kepurnu 12 ŠIK A.ŠA SA 5 [LÚ.MES GİŞ TUKUL]/ NA4 puwašiax
(7) anda MILTI āsra-ma 10 kepurnu 12 ŠIK A.[ŠA]/ NA4 puwašiax
    arabiša MIDDIM
    'We have taken 10 k. and 12 1. of land belonging to five
    —men inside of the puwaši-stone, but in return (āsra) we
    have given 10 k. and 12 1. of land outside of the p-stone.'

I follow Riemschneider, LIO 6(1958)362, note 147, in reading MIDDIM in line 16, but I cannot accept his translation 'from
the ḫ-stone', ibid. 363 with note 152. His version requires among other things translating ḍeréza HIDDIN as 'vir haben herausgenommen'. The verb nedēnu means 'give', not 'take'. Furthermore, anda and ḍeréza are in opposition along with the verbs NÎLQ and NĪDDIN. I therefore take the sense of the passage to be that the king took by eminent domain a parcel of land which he wanted and in compensation gave the owners an equal amount somewhere else. The translation 'inside of' and 'outside of the ḫuwašt-stone' agrees with the second suggestion of Gütterbock, SBO I(1940)50, but the English version is ambiguous and requires further explanation.

We have already mentioned in the introduction (p. 135) the construction of ablative 'adverbs' with nouns in the dative: e.g. ḫabī ṭawṣa 'to the side of the hearth'. One might ask why the present passage does not have ḫuwašt(va) anda/ḍeréza. The reason is that the latter would mean '(physically) inside/outside the ḫ-stone'. In our passage the ablative ḫuwašt shows that 'inside' and 'outside' are defined in reference to some other point, presumably the city mentioned previously. Thus 'inside from the ḫ-stone' means in the direction toward the city, and 'outside from the ḫ-stone' in the direction away from it. The same expression is repeated a few lines later in Vs 18-20.

KHO VI 2 I 49-50 (Laws/RG §22):

(6) teka kēṭ ḫd-az 2 ġīn KUBABBAR naēt/ teka edī ḫd-az nu-ēme
'If on this side of the river, he gives two shekels of silver.
If on that side of the river, he gives three shekels of silver.'

The later duplicate KBo VI 3 I 57 (M.H. ms.) has ḫaš ḫaš-az. The form and function of ḫaš will be discussed below in Sections 1.2 and 3. The important point to be made here is this: as in the previous example, the ablative 'from the river' indicates that 'on this side' and 'on that side' are defined in relation to some other unexpressed point of reference, in this case presumably the land of Hatti. Compare the different construction with the dative KUB II 13 I 23-24 (O.H. text/II. H. ms.): GIS EATUR-i ḫaš ḫaš-zi-ya 'on this and that side of the table'. The latter means in effect 'on one side of the table and on the other', without reference to any other point. In general, when a directional ablative is construed with a preceding dative (or genitive in Old Hittite), the latter is the sole point of reference for defining the direction expressed by the ablative: ḫaššaḫ/ḫašši taraḫša 'to the side of/beside the hearth'. When the directional ablative is accompanied by another ablative, the direction expressed is also defined in terms of another, unexpressed reference point: MA4puwašša erakša 'outside of (= beyond) the puwašši-stone' (as viewed from the city X).

KUB XLIII 30 II 6-7 (CTh 645/StBot 13,25):

(9) [LUN] EŠ HULALIM ikipenduziaškarš um taršansinaz/[...]

edensi
'The cocks carry the libation vessels to that side of/
   beyond the stage(?).'

In this case the fragmentary context makes it impossible to
determine the unexpressed point of reference which defines
'beyond the stage'. The interest of this passage lies in the
fact that it shows the well-known egi ḫaṣ to be not an isolated
idiom, but merely one example of a well-defined mode of expression.

KBo XX 12 I 1-2 (R. of the Storm/StBoT 12,10):

(10) DUMU.GAL niddēi LU.OL-kaš tepušza/ AḪ.BAḪ-šaš [ ... ḫaš]
     paizzi

 'The palace official runs and goes to the [ ]s of iron (?)
   beside the king.'

For the readings and sense of this passage see Neu, StBoT 12
(1970)10-11 and 36. This is the only example in an Old Hittite
manuscript of a directional ablative with a preceding genitive
(instead of a dative). Several more examples of the genitive
are found in later copies of Old Hittite texts (see Sec. 2.1 below).

KBo XVII 43 IV 3 (CTh 743):

(11) [x]-x-ni tepušza zıkkızzi 'places beside the _'

I am unable to restore the first word, but the ending makes it
likely that the construction with the dative and following ablative
already existed in Old Hittite (as it did for ordinary 'post-
positions'; see Sec. 3 below). An Akkadian genitive is also possible, but much less likely.

**KBo III 22 Vs 38 (Anitta/StBot 18,12):**

(12) **unīu bīmenda URU Zalpuzaz anda arunaz[...]**

'All the lands from Zalp(u)n on-the-Sea [ ].'

Whatever verb is to be restored, the presence of 'all lands' as either subject or object makes a verb of notion unlikely. The ablatives therefore probably express not separation, but direction (with Nesa as the unexpressed point of reference):

'all the lands (stretching) from Zalpa-on-the-Sea' (to Nesa).

Ky translation is based on the premise that (anda) arunaz is in opposition to **URU Zalpuzaz** and specifies it. It is likely that there was some need for such specification because of the nearly homophonous city Zalpap[ ] on the Euphrates. 8 Compare also

**KUB XXXVI 90,31ff (N.H. ms./text ?):**

**URU Zalpaz arunaz ehu ISTU TŪL URU Nērik tuedaz aḫšiyandaz ehu URU Liḫšina[za ISTU YURSAG Liḫšina[za ]ahu**

'Come from Zalpa-on-the-Sea, from your beloved spring of Nērik, from Liḫšina by Mt. Liḫšina.'

Otten, StBot 17(1973)20, translates 'aus dem Meere (von) Zalpa... von deinem Berge Liḫšina (beim) Orte Liḫšina', but this ignores the parallelism of each phrase. In the one unambiguous case the modifiers **tuedaz aḫšiyandaz** follow the modified **ISTU TŪL URU** Nērik.
This suggests that the other phrases are built in the same fashion, with the cities specified by further geographical information standing in apposition to them. Compare further KGIII 22 Vs 31-32 (Anitta/StBoT 18,12): [ ] URU\(\frac{\text{Elmus}}{\text{a}}\) arf(un)a\(\frac{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\) / ... URU \(\frac{\text{Elmus}}{\text{a}}\) aruna\(\frac{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\) [. The passage is too incomplete to be certain, but we probably have an instance of apposition in the genitive: 'of Zalpa-on-the-Sea'.

III. Permissive Ablative

There is only one example for this type of ablative in an Old Hittite manuscript:

KGIII VIII 42 Vs 2 (Palace Chronicle/OTH 9):

(14) [ ... GI\(\frac{\text{Gya}}{\text{u}}\) lluttense \(\frac{\text{Gya}}{\text{u}}\) ekizzi '... looks through the window.'

In this fragmentary context a translation 'from/out of the window' would be equally possible. For a justification of the interpretation 'through the window' see Sec. 2.1 below.

IV. Problematic Cases

Under this rubric are collected various examples of the ablative case whose interpretation is for some reason a matter of doubt.

KGIII III 22 Vs 2 (Anitta/StBoT 18,10):

(15) ne-\(\frac{\text{ni}-\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)-sa-\(\frac{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)-ta d\(\frac{\text{ISKUR}}{\text{u}}\)-unni \(\frac{\text{E\=a}}{\text{s}}\) ë\(\frac{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\) ë\(\frac{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\) ë\(\frac{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)
'He was dear to the Storm-god from heaven.'

On this well-known crux see Neu, StBot 18(1974)47f, with references. Having found no contextual support for an ablative nemišaš(a), Neu tries to save the expected genitive nemišašš by assuming first an underlying nemišašš-ax-šta, then a syncope to nemišš-ax-šta and a development of š [ts] due to the sequence of four dental spirants (/nebiss-ax-šta/ > /nebista-ax-šta/). The syncope is ad hoc, and the phonetic development has no exact parallels in Hittite. On the other hand, if we keep the ablative nemišaš(a), it can hardly express anything except 'origin', given the structure of the sentence. Ablatives of origin (cf. English 'a man from the East') are extremely rare in Hittite, but a couple of examples do appear to exist (see Sec. 2.1 below, p. 192f). The very sparse evidence for this usage is reason for caution, but the ablativeal interpretation of the Anitta passage does have the advantage of fitting what is actually found in the text. I cannot, however, answer the question of why the ablative is used in this single instance, while everywhere else, in the Anitta text and elsewhere, we always find the genitive nemiššš d'/šKUR.9

KBo III 22 Vs 10-12 (Anitta/StBot 18,10):

[ nu m-Piltânas-attâš-maḫ ārman ensiya witti/ [h]ullânanan
(16) hullânanun d'UTU-az utnê/ [kuit k]uit- net araiš n-uk
hûmanduš-p[et h]ul[l]amul[.n]
'And after my father Pitāna in the same year I put down a revolt: whatever land(s) rose up (seceded) from the Sun-god, I defeated them all.'

Neu, *StBoT* 18(1974)11 and 62-63, translates 'Welches Land auch immer sich erhob, sie alle schlug ich mit (Hilfe von) Šiu'. However, the 'proleptic' position of the ablative (under this interpretation) is at best peculiar, and more importantly there are no solid examples for an instrumental ablative in Old Hittite manuscripts, expressing either means or accompaniment. As pointed out by Neu, op. cit. 63, note 68, there are also no parallels anywhere in Hittite for a geographical interpretation: 'in the direction of the sun' = 'in the east/south'.

I have followed the interpretation suggested by Carruba, *ZKG* Supp. I,1(1969)232, which fits both the context and the overall usage of the ablative in Old Hittite.¹⁰ Neu himself agrees that the preceding sentence refers to the defeat of a rebellion. In the above interpretation, the sentence with ḫətu-la elaborates on this event. The ablative is used with aššai-'rise up' in this case instead of a dative, because with the latter the unmarked reading of the sentence would be: 'Whatever (enemy) lands rose up against the Sun-god'. The ablative expresses unambiguously the secession or breaking away of the rebellious lands. For a similarly subtle distinction between ablative and dative compare the differing usages with nabbant- in the following passage:

nu-za balluגרaza neki neḥbaṭes Šeten/s en[a]-[a]e-za
neḥbuenešš-a uddant neki neḥbaṭas Šeten

'Be very much afraid of a quarrel. In addition be very
cautious in the matter of fire as well.'

In the first sentence the ablative marks something which is to
be avoided; in the second the dative merely expresses that in
respect to which the officials are to be circumspect (see
already Sturtevant, Chrest. 173). In the same way, the dative
with akī- 'rise up' merely indicates who is affected by the
action of the verb, while the ablative implies separation, i.e.,
in a political context, secession.

KBo III 22 Vs 33 (Amita/StBoT 18,12):

(18) kē ud-d[a?-]a?-ar? [tup-pi-re-a]z TNA KA.GAL-YA x[

'These words with/from a tablet in my gate...' 

Neu, StBoT 18(1974)25, reads tup-pi-re-a[z] in the Neo-Hittite
duplicate, KUB XXXVI 98a Vs 4, against the tup-pi-re-a[ʔ] of
Otten, NBOG 76(1936)44, note 5, and interprets the traces before
TNA in KBo III 22 Vs 33 as -az as well. However, judging from the
autographs and the photo of KUB XXXVI 98a (StBoT 18, Tafel II),
neither ablative is assured. For is the relationship between the
two copies entirely clear, since what follows tuppiya[ʔ] in
KUB XXXVI 98a is not I-NA, and Neu's suggested A-NA is not
certain. The importance of this passage is that an ablative
sumuylaz in this context would likely have an instrumental
function with a verb meaning 'write' or 'inscribe' (see the
examples cited by Neu, op. cit. 26, and below p. 319 sub ḫēi-
and p. 395 sub ḫatārāi̯). However, as already noted, there are
no examples in complete contexts of ablatives with an instrumental
function in Old Hittite manuscripts. In view of the broken
context and uncertain readings, the above passage from the Anitta
text is not a serious counterexample to this observation.

In summary, then, Old Hittite manuscripts definitely show
two uses of the ablative:

I. Ablative of Separation

II. Ablative of Direction

Less certain are:

III. Perlative Ablative

IV. Ablative of Origin
Section 1.2. Usage of the Instrumental in Old Hittite Manuscripts

I. Instrumental of Means

The most common use of the instrumental is to express the means or instrument by which an action is accomplished:

**KBo III 22 Rs 47-48 (Anitta/StBoT 18,12):**
(19) ʾan iḫpentī/*naḫkit ḏēḫṣun
'And I took it (Hattusa) in the night by storm.'

**KBo XXII 2 Vs 2 (Zalpa/StBoT 17,6):**
(20) tuṣuṣ šaṣkaḥ ṣūnaṣ
'She filled the containers with [dung].'

**KBo XX 8 Rs 6 (R. of the Storm/CTH 631):**
(21) [...]/ ṣenēhit ṣūṣ ' [ ]full of/filled with ṣ.'

**KBo XX 8 Vs 11 (R. of the Storm/CTH 631):**
(22) nu-zza 2-āt 2-āt kisṭarte ḫa[rrkenzi]
'Two by two they h[old] each other by the hand.'

The literal meaning of nakki- is of course 'heavy'; on the function of ṣaḫkit in the Anitta text see Feu, StBoT 18(1974)64. While ṣaḫ- is formally an adjective, it functions in Hittite as the past participle of ṣunna- 'fill' and like the verb takes an instrumental of the material with which a container is filled. Compare the different construction in the same text, KBo XX 8 Rs 4:

*šemēnaṣ ḫüppareṣ ṣuṣ 'a full bowl of ṣ.*. See also p. 254f below.
The restoration ba[rkansî] in KBo XX 8 vs 11 seems to me quite safe. The presence of -za and the lack of an overt object imposes the interpretation 'hold (someone) by the hand' rather than 'hold in/with (one's own) hand'. The instrumental is used in Hittite with body parts to express both the point at which someone is seized or held and the part of the body with which one seizes or holds something: see below pp. 229-230 and also 239 sub ṣen- and ḫer(x)-.

The instrumental may occur with almost any verb, given a suitable context, and no subcategorization seems useful. Even the limited attestations of Old Hittite manuscripts show considerable variety:³

**a-ra-un/aap-ni 'I _____':** KBo XVII 1 IV 18-19 ḫalummit/x-x-x-itt-a.

**āčē₃- 'scoon':** KBo XVII 1 I 6 parrasumit.

**ēn- 'take; hold':** KUB XVIII 97 II 9 ḫiḫšarṭa.

**hēxiza- 'hit; strike':** KUB XXXVII 100 Vs 15 GISA SUXUR.ZABAR-it.

**bulsala- 'wrap':** KBo XVII 3 IV 23 ḫumnit.

**karp- 'lift':** KBo XVII 43 I 7årakṣ.¹¹

**mērk- 'divide':** KBo XVII 3 IV 30 kalulumumก (kalulupit-smid/)

**phabet-**

**şaṭa(i)- '?:** KBo XVII 43 I 14 ḫerḥit.¹¹

**ēr- 'filled with, full of':** KBo XVII 1 I 26.II 22 tarəlhipit.

**ḫuna- 'fill':** KBo VI 2 IV 50.52 ḫalkit, XVII 4 III 17 GESTIR-ka.

**dē- 'take':** KBo III 22 Vs 6 ḫalkit, XVII 3 IV 27-28 ḫerḥit.
walk- 'strike': KBo XVII 43 I 12 KUS̄ezzit.

II. Instrumental of Accompaniment (Sociative or Comitative Instrumental)

In addition to denoting means, the instrumental in Hittite is employed to express accompaniment in the broadest sense: the conjoining of persons, objects or events in space or time (cf. Delbrück, AlI(1967)50f). The three examples of this usage in Old Hittite manuscripts show three very different aspects of this fundamental notion.

KBo III 22 Vs 5 (Anitta/StBoT 18,10):

(23) [KUGAL] URU Kukāre URU-an katta [p]ancerit u[e/it]

'The King of Kusar came down from the city with mass(ed troops).'

Neu, StBoT 18(1974)11, translates pancerit as 'mit Gewalt', but he himself, ibid. 64, gives the basic meaning of *pancer- as 'crowd, mass'. This is confirmed by the later cliché (ERIN,MEŠ) LÚ KUR pancerit BA,UŠ (ME passim) which means 'The (troops of the) enemy died en masse', not 'died with violence'. In this usage pancerit may be interpreted as an adverb 'en masse, in great numbers', but it does not make sense to say that 'the king came en masse'.

I therefore believe that the original use of pancerit was comitative: '(together) with a crowd, mass'. The development
of the adverb 'en masse' from an original comitative use is not difficult. Compare the Sanskrit phrase marúto gánána (RV 9.96.17), which is termed a 'sociatif interne' by Haudry, BSL 65(1970)52. One may choose to translate literally 'the Haruts with a host/multitude', but it is clear from the overall use of gánána with the Haruts that the 'host' is the Haruts themselves, and a more accurate if freer translation would be 'the Haruts in a host' or even 'en masse'. In the same way, then, the original use of maascarit in Hittite with a collective like ERÍN, LýS would have been comitative, with internal reference: 'the troops with a mass', i.e. 'the troops en masse' or 'a mass of troops'. Delbrück, Verzl. Syn.(1893)237, terms such instrumentals 'distributive' and offers examples from Avestan, Balto-Slavic and Germanic. Note especially Lith. jič mirė šimtai/pulkaĩa 'They died by the hundreds/in droves'.

KTo VII 14 Vs 5-6 (Zukrāši/ΑΧΟ 86,61 trl.):

(24) nu-tte šertessan mën/[x-x]-x-iškini nu tubhiavaitit ėkți 'I will [ ] you like a bear(?), and you will die with a cry of pain.'

The instrumental tubhiavaitit expresses not the cause or means of death, but rather an attendant circumstance. Laroche, BSL 52 (1956)75, translates 'périvas d'étouffement', interpreting the instrumental as expressing means. However, he offers no solid
evidence that the verb *tubhāt* means 'choke, suffocate'. On the contrary, various passages argue that the verb expresses a sound. In *KUR* XXIII 118,12f the *tubhāt* of Mt. Wasitta in giving birth attracts the attention of the other mountains, who come running to see what is the matter. In *KBo* X 24 III 11f (cited by Neu, *StBoT* 5,174), *tubhāt* is paired with *nakanta*, which should be taken as the iterative of *vīza-* 'scream' (contra Neu, loc. cit.). In *KUR* VII 41 I 10, where *ktā*-*ir* *kuwat tubhāt* is followed by 'why does [it] look up to heaven?', a natural translation is also 'why does this house cry out in pain?'. I therefore prefer to take *tubhāt* as 'with a cry of pain'. If one insists on 'gasping', the reference is still to the sound made, not the effect of choking.

*KBo* XVII 3 I 14 (R. for King and Queen/*StBoT* 8,20):

(25) *kalulupizīmid-āta išcaranda ṝṝi* (i.e. */kalulupišīmid/*)

'And he takes (away) the things fastened to their fingers.'

Otten-Souček, *StBoT* 8(1969)21, translate this sentence as

'Und (zwar) nimmt er mit ihren Fingern das "Festgesteckte" (ves)'. But it is clear from the context that 'the things fastened' (*išcaranda*) are being removed from the fingers of the king and queen, just as in the preceding sentence the tongues of iron are removed from their mouths. Therefore 'with their fingers' makes no sense either as expressing means or accompaniment.
On the other hand, there are two arguments against taking the instrumental *kalulunizmit* in an ablativeal sense 'from their fingers'. First, there are no solid cases of instrumentals expressing separation in Old Hittite manuscripts, and the total number in Hittite is small. Second, as already mentioned above, p. 3, this ritual text shows the following syntactic feature: when the notion of separation is expressed by the particle *-ašta*, the ablative case is absent, and vice-versa (see Otten-Souček, StBoT 6,83). Since our sentence shows *-ašta*, it would run counter to the above rule to have an instrumental standing for an ablative and expressing separation.

The solution to this problem is to construe the instrumental *kalulunizmit* with the participle *išzesrande*: 'fastened to/on/around their fingers'. This proposal may seem surprising at first sight, but we must be careful not to impose the patterns of English on Hittite. The fact that we cannot say 'fastened with their fingers' in English does not argue against *kalulunizmit išzesrande* in Hittite. Compare the situation of Hittite *takš-*, 'fasten, put together' and *immiya-*, 'mix; blend' which are construed with both the dative-locative and the instrumental (see ex. (128) p. 253 and exx. (213)-(215) p. 333 below). The choice of preposition in English depends not on the Hittite case, but on the English verb: 'fasten to' but 'put together with' (*takš-*) and 'mix with' but either 'blend with' or 'blend into'
(inniva-). Whether the alternate usage of the instrumental and dative-locative with talk- and inniva- indicates different actions or merely different views of the same action is hard to determine. I insist only that the proposed construction of an instrumental with iškar- 'fasten' fits plausibly into a known Hittite pattern with verbs expressing 'putting together'.

One could choose to list each of the three examples just treated separately, labeling the first (mancarit) 'comitative' or 'sociative' (Delbrück, Vercl. Syn. 234f), the second (tubhiwattit) an 'instrumental of attendant circumstance' or the like (ibid. 238f), and the third (kaluwumitt iškaranda) 'instrumental with verbs of joining' (ibid. 246f). I have put them together because the underlying function of the instrumental is the same in all: to indicate conjoining or juxtaposition (see Delbrück, Vercl. Syn. 231).

III. Pronominal Instrumental Used for the Ablative

As already pointed out in Chapter 1, p. 133, no formal ablative of the enclitic possessive pronouns is attested. A noun in the ablative takes an enclitic possessive in the instrumental:

KBo XVII 1 I 18-19 (R. for King and Queen/StDot 8,20):

\[\text{DU} \text{[EU] E.GAL LUGAL-à} \text{ SAL.LUGAL-à E.E E} \text{iškarit}\]
(26)

(/issats-àmid/) \[\text{Elan AUL.FAR-à} \text{[d]Ei}\]
'The palace official takes the tongue of iron from the mouth(s) of the king and queen.'

The other examples in Old Hittite manuscripts come from the same ritual: **KBo XVII 1 II 24 kiššar[az-(met)], XVII 7 + np[ot III 135 IV 6-7 G]išu.A-kaz-mit [ -m]it kartaz-mit/ [tuc]raz-mit (all to be read /-smid/ 'their'). The interpretation of these pronominal forms as instrumentals has been challenged (see Carruba, **RHA** 24(1966)123f, and Josephson, ibid. 133f). For a full discussion of this point see Section 3 below.

In Old Hittite manuscripts there are no attestations of ablative from the pronominal stems an= 'that' or kui- 'who, which', but this could be due to chance. On the other hand, there is also only a single instance of an ablative from kā- 'this': **KBo XX 2,5** [ k-za 1 t[a/-TA- ]. Theoretically, the broken context would permit a reading kī/-z, with the old postvocalic spelling -z of the particle -za (see above p. 33). However, the presence of the number '1' suggests the common pattern kēz + number...kēzzi-ya + number 'so many on this side... so many on the other'. The ablative is therefore probably real. In all other places in Old Hittite manuscripts where we would expect the ablative kēz/kīz (based on later usage), we find instead the form kēt:

**KBo VI 2 I 49** (*Laws* / **HG** §22):
(27) **ta**kku kēt ḫa-az... 'If on this side of the river...'
For the full citation and a discussion of the syntax see above p. 153. The important point here is that the later copy KBo VI 3 I 57 (M.H. ms. ?) has an ablative kēt.

KBo XVII 1 III 25-27 (R. for King and Queen/StBot 8,32):

1 LĀŠ.GAL-(i)/(sarauni-zi) murivalek ụancaša kētt-(i-a)/
(ka)rauni-zi li murivalek ụancaša

'On the horn of one he-goat are hung grape-shaped loaves (?), and also on the other side grape-shaped loaves (?) are hung on his horn.'

The form kētt-a (kēt plus -a 'and') is fully preserved in KUB XLIII 32 III 2 which joins KBo XVII 3. Despite the lack of an overt kēt in the first clause, the meaning of kētt-a is 'and on the other/opposite side', as in the following example:

KBo XVII 43 I 10 (CTH 744):

ECIR-SU Lū mercuša jētt-a kētt-a G[(I-an)/ huittiannei
termai-na-an natta

'The man walks behind and aims the arrow to one side and the other, but he does not let it go.'

One could also translate ECIR-SU as 'thereafter' (thus Neu, StBot 12(1970)38).

As already seen, kēt 'on this side' may also be contrasted with eda 'there, on that side':

KBo XVII 15 Vs 14-16 (CTH 645):

[šušušu Lū-[I]ŠE LULALDII/ kaššušu šatta kēt erta š burnašAR
The overseer of the cooks stands below the hearth on this side (and) holds six š. plants. The ḥēṭa-man squats below the hearth on that side (and) holds six š. plants.

It is doubtful whether the deictic force of ḥēṭ and ʿedi should be taken seriously in this example. As in English, 'on this side and that' may come to mean 'on one side and the other'. For more examples of the type ḥēṭ...ḥēṭ-ʿedi and ḥēṭ...ʿedi see the instances in Sec. 2.1 below where ʿēz fills the slot of ḥēṭ.

IV. Problematic Cases

KBo XX 3 Rs 9-10 (F. of the Kt.LAM/GTH 627):

(...1/2) HINDA ʿÉL.HAR.HAR 20-īb/I ... HINDA ḫēbarēt 70-īb

...ihanūnas šianti!

'They place on the sacrificial tables...half a "twentieth" _-loaf along with(?) x number of "seventieth" ḫēbarē- leaves.'

On the meaning and form of the numerals 20-īb and 70-īb see Eichner, Anat. Zahlen. 57-58. The only plausible interpretation I can find for the instrumental ḫēbarēt is accompaniment. For this use of the instrumental in a list of objects compare e.g. (119), (161) and (218) pp. 246, 302 and 334 below. The broken context leaves this explanation uncertain. The same form
kabarit occurs elsewhere in the same text: KEo XX 3
Vs 14. Rs 11.14*, XX 4 IV 10, XX 7 Rs e.12

KBo XVII 17 I 8f (R. of Zuwi/OT II 412):

 [...]lawlit-ät-[k]am d[mu.../...]-x-sanit-ät-ken [däu]
(32) [.../... UZU]r-nit-ät-ken [däu] [.../...][évuentit-[ät]-ken
[däu]

For the connection with other parts of the Zuwi text see liuntu
in I 6 and compare KUB XXXV 148 III 18f. In a magic ritual one
might well expect a meaning 'let him/it (the animal or figurine)
take it (the evil, sickness, etc.) from the ... (body parts)'.
This would represent a use of the instrumental to express
separation, a unique example in Old Hittite manuscripts. However,
in sympathetic magic one can also imagine 'let him/it take it
with (his)...(body parts)'. That is, the ritual substitute is
to take the sickness from the body of the victim with the
corresponding parts of his own body (cf. ex. (219) p. 334).
Since the broken context permits either interpretation, this
passage does not constitute a counterexample to the statement
that no instances of the instrumental case expressing separation
are attested in Old Hittite manuscripts.

KBo XXII 1 Rs 24-30 (Protocoll/Uncatalogued):

kēke-tta-we utniva paitemi nu ša lū. MAŠDA/ ššār-šet natta
(33) šenhiškatteni lū. MES̄ NAŠIŞLIṬI-ŠU natta punušteni/ ta
Behold, you go into the country, but you do not seek the blood of the poor man, you do not interrogate his bearers. (Instead) you do (the bidding) of the rich man. You go to his house, you eat and drink, and he rewards you. But you thereby abandon (?) the poor man. You do not investigate his case.'

The phrase 'seek someone's blood' means of course 'avenge someone', not 'seek someone's death' (see Friedrich, HMB 182). As I understand it, those being addressed are accused of failing in their duty to investigate the death of a poor man. Instead they consort with the rich man and occupy themselves with his affairs, completely forgetting the poor man. My interpretation of the sentence with निे-एत is based on this view of the overall context. I have ventured the reading दा-ए-ला-ति instead of the दा-ए-स्र-ति suggested by the autograph, because I can make no sense of 'but you take the poor man'. I readily admit that one would expect rather the spelling दा-ए-ला-ए-ति for 'you abandon', but this seems to be the sense demanded by the context. One could keep दाति and interpret लु आशिवंदन as a genitive: 'you take (the things) of the poor', but the 'poor man' is singular elsewhere in this passage. Besides, the officials do not seem to be accused of
cheating the poor man, but rather of neglecting him. Whether one reads 'you abandon the poor man' or 'you "take" the poor man' (with a nuance unknown to us), the most likely interpretation of ḫim-e-ēt is as the instrumental of the pronoun ḫe:- 'by that, thereby'. That is, through consorting with the rich man, the officials act to the detriment of the poor man.

Old Hittite manuscripts thus show three basic uses of the instrumental:

I. Instrumental of Means

II. Instrumental of Accompaniment

III. Pronominal Instrumental Used for the Ablative
Section 2.1. Usage of the Ablative in Middle and Neo-Hittite Manuscripts of Old Hittite Texts

I. Ablative of Separation

As in Old Hittite manuscripts, the ablative is commonly used in later copies to express separation with intransitive and transitive motion verbs and with verbs implying separation. No further examples of this usage really seem necessary, but the following instances are of interest for other reasons:

KBo XXI 22 Vs 22-25 (Blessings for the King/OTH 820; M.H. ms.):

طب nu kūz uwaši šuppaš-wa uwam'/ nu-ša kūz šuppaš
(34) šapannennaš-wa/ nu-ša kūz šapannennaš .dropout UTU-šaš-wa
ás/  nu-ša kūz dropout UTU-as...

'Open!—Where do you come from?—I come from a sacred (place).—From what sacred (place)?—From a shrine. From which shrine?—From the house of the Sun-god.—From which Sun-god?'

This passage contains one of the rare instances of the ablative expressing separation from an animate being (cf. Anitta Vs 11 discussed above p. 158f). While this example is undoubtedly influenced by the preceding ablatives, it would be incorrect to say that it is determined by them. If there were a constraint against a (semantically) animate noun occurring in the ablative, the stylistic pattern would have been as well served by kuš₁
'from the house of which Sun-god?'.

KUR XIII 4 I 64-65 (Instr. for Priests/Sturt. Chrest. 150):

(35) ḫušš-ua-ken tuél DINGIR-LU as ṣIBA barbīyas/[DUG] kuqandussias dāš

'Whoever has taken from your divine leavened bread and wine-ration.'

In view of the genitive tuél, one may wonder with Götze, La 11 (1935) 269-70, whether DINGIR-LU as represents an adjective, rather than an instance of 'case attraction' or 'badal' construction (but see also below p. 187). One could interpret the ablative here as partitive: 'whoever has taken some of your...'. However, there are no examples in Hittite where an ablative must be taken as partitive (e.g. with 'eat' or 'drink'). Thus it seems safer to assume that the ablative in cases like the present one expresses separation with dē- 'take', as elsewhere.

KBo XIX 161 I 20-21 (Festival of Tetešpabi/OTH 738):

(36) LŪ GĪŠ KANŠUR ṢIBA.KUR.RA GĪŠ KANŠUR-az XIN.DINGIR-i/ [p]ēi

'The serving-man hands/gives one leavened loaf from the table to the XIN.DINGIR(-priestess).'

At first glance we seem to have an ablative of separation with pēi- 'give', which is not impossible (cf. p. 150 above). However, the same text in I 17-18 and 23 has GĪŠ DAVŠUR-az dāši 'takes from the table' in the same context, and it is likely that in line 20
the dāi has simply been omitted by mistake.

KUB XX 78 III 16-17 (Monthly Festival/OATH 591):

(37) LUG.GIŠ. CAŠKUR 1 NITDA.KUR RNA Nī8a/ AŠKADU udai

'The serving-man brings one leavened sourdough loaf from outside.'

The ablative AŠKADU, literally 'from the gate', is often used as an adverb meaning 'outside' (cf. Latin forīs). But in the common ritual phrase AŠKADU udai the ablative force is preserved, judging from all unambiguous cases. In the present instance compare III 20: n-an-šen narā nēdai 'And he carries it (the loaf) out'.

KUB XVII 4 IV 59-60 (Instr. for Priests/Sturt. Chrest. 166):

(38) n-at-šen halivas āšunas nekhēn karšen/ n-at-šen DINIR.ISP-šā
     QATALLA anda armawardu

'As they have been cut out from the corral and sheepfold, so let them bring them (the animals) to the gods.'

This passage has nothing to do with castration (contra Sturtevent, loc. cit.). Just as in English one 'cuts out' an animal from a herd, so in Hittite karš- 'cut' is used to mean 'segregate' or 'select' an animal, especially for ritual use. Compare KUB XXX 10 Vs 15 and XXIV 3 11-12 and see Gurney, AAA 27(1940)86f. The point of the passage is that no one is to substitute an inferior animal while the animals are being moved.
Many more examples of the ablative expressing separation are available of all types:

**Intransitive Motion Verbs:**

ex- 'arrive': KUB II 7 I 14-15 URU.nītarumaz (+ arba and -kan),

XX 4 VI 4-5 ḫilmnaz (+ katta).

arē- 'arise': KUB II 3 II 28-29 ḫilmaz, 15 XXIV 8 I 38

GIŠ.la-az (+ -wa), XLI 29 III 1-2 ṣanisqīnas teṣēnaz.

arē- 'flow': KBo XXI 22 Ra 39 (K.H. ms.) [1]118i7z, KUB XXIX 10

I 6.10 KAKU-az (+ norē and -kan).

iṣept- 'escape': KBo XI 14 II 20 TACU.dē, II 21 KARU-az

(+ -kan), XIII 126 I 21 GIŠ.KAK-az.

iveqqi- 'walk, march': KUR XXXIII 36 II 4 (= XXXIII 67 I 32)


maqq- 'fall': KUR VIII 22 II 3 (and elsewhere) nemiṣqa (+ katta

and -eṭe).

nēē- 'go':

without preverb: KBo X 2 I 17 URU.narāwaz, I 18 URU.Takalaz

(and simil. elsewhere), XVI 49 I 5 KĀ.GAL-az (+ -ēṭa),

KUB VII 25 I 12-13 ḫalentuwaz.

with arba: KBo XI 43 I 26 URU.Takurnaz.

with arba: KUB XLIII 2 II 7 [KUR rez]

with katta: KBo VII 42 III 6 (and elsewhere) KĀ.GAL-az

(+ -kan).

with karē: KUB XXIX 1 I 39 Kēz KUR-eqaz.
tīva- 'step':

with ketta: KB 37 II 37 24–5 GIS DAG-az, KUB X 17 I 27–28
(and elsewhere) GIS ḫulūu-anes (+ -kan), X 18 I 6,16–17
(and elsewhere) GIS GICIR-az (+ -ašta).

with Nerē: KB X 23 II 24 KĀ-az (+ -ašta).

ûp- 'rise': KUB XXX I 127 I 39 nepišas (+ šerē and -ašta).

uwa- 'come':

without preverb: KB X 22 I 8 (and often) ḫalantūnas
(+ -kan), KUB XII 60 I 20 arunnas, XXV 14 VI 3 [l]ābbaz, etc.

with anā: KUB XX I 19 III 6 ertas.

with ēpē: KB X 2 I 41 ṢU:lčes, III 1 I 8,16 lābbaz
(+ -epē), KUB XVII 6 I 25 ēmpes.

with ēnum šarē: KB IV 2 II 28 ēs-x-az. 16

with ēre: KB III 60 III 10 URU ḫubānas, KUB XLIII 55
IV 10–11 ēre[ē] uōezz (+ -kan), etc.

with ketta: KB X 47 I 74 I 28 (and often) GIS ḫulū[nes]nānas,
XXI 78 I 3 GIS GICIR-az (+ -kan), KUB X 26 I 2–2 GIS DAG-az
(+ -kan), etc.

watku- 'jump': KUB XXXIV 22 I 5 GIS PISH-az (+ Nerē; the verb
is restorable from I 3 and 8).

veb- 'turn': KUB XL 5 (+ KB X 22 II 4) II 4 KASKAL-az (+ ēpē).

Transitive Motion Verbs:

arun- 'move, carry': KB X 23 V 9–10 KĀGAL-az (+ katta and -ašta).

ḫan- 'draw (liquid)': KUB X 11 V 9–11 DUG ūpa[n]lu[zzes]az (+ šarē
and -ašta).
huitite- 'pull, draw': KUB XIII 4 IV 71 KAḪU-az (+ ĠARā and -kan), XXXVI 75 III 12 (K.H. ms.) arābu₂₃ (+ ĠARā and -štā).

karp- 'lift': KUB X I 1 V 1-3 DUG-barš uses (+ ĠARā), VII 1 I 35 vētenaṣṣa (+ -kan), XXIV 10 II 25-28 (= XLI 1 III 8-11 = JCS 24, 37 III 12) ḫēṣ... ḫēṣ... ŠAG.DU-az... šaštāṣa.

pešṣiya- 'throw': KUB XI 1 IV 18 Š-irēza (+ ĠARā and -štā).

pēde- 'carry': KBO III 7 II 23 URU-neriṣṣaṣ, XI 32 VS 16 kubbaṣa (+ katta), KUB XIII 4 III 33 luliṣṣaṣa.

piṭteṣan- 'cause to disappear, remove': KUB XIII 6 II 13 IGI-ḪI-az (- ĠARā).

piya- 'send': KBO IV 2 I 14 neṣṣaṣ.

dē- 'take':

without preverb: KBO VII 28 VS 44 (K.H. ms.) idēlaṣṣuṣṣ az (+ -kan), XX 67 I 12 (K.H. ms.) (and elsewhere) GIS ḫARŠUR-az, KUB XVII 10 III 10 (K.H. ms.) tussaṣ-štā (+ -štā), XXIV 9 I 45 hūmannaṣ tuṣṣaṣ, INDA XII 94 VI 12 karṣāṣaṣ, etc.

with ĠARā: KUB VII 1 II 4 ḫaštāṣaṣ.

with ĠARā: KUB II 13 I 60. III 15 (and elsewhere) GIS ḫARŠUR-az (+ -štā), X 18 VI 6-8 GIS ḫARŠUR-az (+ -štā).


with kattan arba: KUB XX 78 IV 8 NINDA zippulašṣaṣ, XXIV 11 II 27-28 GİŠ ĠAR-az.

with ĠARā: KUB XI 23 V 7-8 SAG.DU-az (+ -kan)
teya- 'steel': KBo VI 3 I 45 (K.H. ms.) URU Jattušaz.
VI 10 II 22+ šešanez, VI 11 I 12 tešatliyanza GIS SAR.GEŠIK,
ibid. I 18 huišelīyz, KUB XXIX 21,3 lūliyaž.

uda- 'bring':
āškaz udei: KBo X 28 II 11, XVII 75 III 30+ (K.H. ms.), and
more than 50x.
without preverb: KBo XVII 74 II 38 (K.H. ms.) šiunaš š-az,
KUB XXXII 62 III 6 SARS-zi-ya, XXIX 1 I 24 arunaž, etc.
with kattu: KUB VII 1 II 31 šubkš<>. 18
with par: KUB XXX 19 I 6 and XXX 25+ Vs 10 Š-irza (+ -aštə),
XXX 19 I 61 GIS ŽA.LAM.GAR-az (+ -aštə).

uvata- 'bring': Bo 6483,7+ (KUB 77,174) URU Jatšumaz, KBo XII 19
I 2 (K.H. ms.) URU Lihžínez.

Verbs of Separation:

Erki- 'cut (off)': KBo VI 11 I 16 amivaraza (= KUB XXIX 23,12
GIS PA-az). 19

karba- 'cut': KUB XXX 10 Vs 15 (K.H. ms.) šešial...ashaunaz
(+ šauna and -aštə).

kuer- 'cut': KBo XI 14 III 33 šapšašana huma[nts(e)] (+ -aštə).
šen- 'part (with)': KBo VI 4 IV 39 šapparras, KUB XI 1 IV 18
šarranaša (+ -kan). 20

ter- 'release': KBo III 34 II 19 IŠTU Ž.BU.KU.UN (+ -aštə),
III 45 Vs 10 [utu]šaž.

tugba- 'cut': KBo X 37 I 40 [ ]-aš (+ ašta), KUB XXIV 11 II 31+
GIS ŽA-az (+ -aštə).
Later copies of Old Hittite texts also show many examples of ablatives expressing 'place from which' or separation which do not fit the types above. Some may be grouped into subcategories, some stand by themselves.

The ablative may be used with verbs meaning 'call' to indicate the place from which someone is summoned:

ḫalaḫ-: KUR XXXVI 44 17 (U.R. vs.) [neniḫ]az.
kalak-: KUR XVII 5 I 6 ḫutešnaza’ (+ ḫara and -xta).\footnote{21}

The ablative is used with verbs meaning 'purify' or 'preserve' to express separation from some evil:

ḫuḫšnu- 'make live > preserve': KBo IV 2 I 60 udаназ (modified by the instrumental kallerit; see below p. 255).

parksu(i)y- 'purify oneself': KBo XXII 6 I 6 teкbas (+ -rap'),
KUR XXIV 8 I 31 ū-kaz (see Neu, StBot 5(1968)138-139).

parkumu- 'purify': VBoT III III 18+ alwanešnaza ḫurtivazi-ya.

Closely related is the use with Ṽabḫ- 'protect':

KUR I 16 III 72-73 (HAB 16-17):

nu-nu tersa[niva/-ti/te]/ teknaš Ṽab[š]i
(39) = ina irti-ki ina ergetim usri-šni

'Protect me on your breast from the earth!'

Sommer, \textit{HAB} 198-199, argues that the ablative teknaš is being used to express means. The unsuitability of this interpretation is clear from the awkwardness of his own translation: 'Und an
deinem Busen birg mich in der Erde!". He also offers no support from either Mesopotamian or Indo-European culture for the rather odd concept that burial in the earth was considered protection from the elements. A much less strained interpretation is that the king wishes to be protected from the earth (i.e. death and burial) in the embrace of his favorite concubine, who is being addressed in this plea (thus already Götze, ZA 34(1922)183). Sommer's objection that such a wish is impossible to fulfill is beside the point. We are dealing with the anguished cry of a sick man who is afraid of death, not someone coolly giving instructions for a burial service (cf. among other things the plaintive 'do not forget/forsake me' in III 65 and 69). Sommer's claim that *ina* cannot mean 'from' in the corresponding Akkadian is also false: for *ina X naḫāru* 'protect from X' see von Soden, ANw sub *naḫāru* 8. It must be remembered also that the Akkadian is a translation of the Hittite. There are thus no grammatical obstacles to the interpretation 'protect from' which is called for by the context.

The use of the ablative with *naḫānt-* 'afraid' in KUB XIII 4 III 43 falls into the same semantic sphere (for the full citation and syntax see p. 160 above).

The ablative is also employed to indicate 'place from which' with verbs which do not imply motion:

*arwūḫī* - 'bow': KUB XX 90 IV 12 ḫe₂naza (subject is ḫU.R₂.GAL).
aub- 'see': KBo XIII 106 I 15-16 nepiṣaz, KUB XVII 6 I 19-20 
GIš luttense (+ arba and -aša). See pp. 208-209 below.

bink- 'give, offer': KBo XI 73 V 5-6 URU Durrātaz (cf. below 
p. 384 sub pēi- 'give').

buek- 'conjure': KUB VII 1 II 21-23 nepiṣazes (+ šer katta)...
dankwaz taknāz (+ kattera'). Unlike the examples with 
'call' cited on p. 182, in this instance the ablative marks 
the position of the subject, not that of the object.

bakuwa- 'look': KBo XIX 102, 2 and KUB XXIV 8 I 41+ [u]enipāz 
(+ katta and -kan).

rank- 'hang': KUB XI 20 I 8 (and elsewhere) GIš BA-a-SUR-az,
    XVII 10 IV 26 (M. H. ms.) (and elsewhere) GIš eyaaz (+ -kan).


See pp. 208-209.

Unlike other 'adverbs' such as aršaša '(from) outside', the 
form tuwaš always keeps its ablative force of 'from afar'.

It is used with various predicates, especially in the ritual 
with QATAK dēzi/sikkisī 'puts (his) hand (on)'. The phrase 
'puts his hand on X from afar' apparently means that the subject 
(usually the king) performs the symbolic act of placing his hand 
on an object which is in fact some distance away beyond his 
actual reach (see already Friedrich, KUB 231 with references).

Compare KUB II 5 I 34-36:
The overseer of the cooks holds out to the king from a distance three pairs of ___ beside the hearth. The king puts his hand (on them).

In line 28f the king is seated with a cloth on his knees, so it is unlikely that he actually physically touches the objects in I 34. Instances of tüwaz:

- with תודא dēi-/sikk-: KBo XIX 93 I 15, II 5 II 9-10 (+ -ken), XI 30 I 14 (+ -šen), and often.
- other: KBo XIX 161 I 15-16 erucizzi, ABoT 13 VI 15 nere ḫuṣi.

Another set phrase in ritual use is גלעב az arba 'away from the window'. This expression occurs with various predicates, but the position of arba directly behind the ablative is fixed. This strongly suggests that the ablative here is 'governed' by arba which is functioning as a postposition. However, in other occurrences of the ablative with arba, the position of the latter seems quite free, and we have already seen that the ablative expressing 'place from which' may occur with many different verbs without arba. It is therefore difficult to prove beyond all doubt the postpositional status of arba in גלעב az arba. Examples (with various spellings of גלעב az):

- with šipant 'libates': KBo XX 61 III 46-47, XXI 85 I 12
with dêri- 'place': KUB II 8 II 27-28 (supply verb from II 31).  
with GIS₃ SUKUR ivazi 'moves/signals with a spear': KUB XI 26 V 16-17 (cf. below p. 232).

Finally, there are several interesting occurrences of the ablative meaning 'place from which' that do not fit easily under any rubric. Once again, it should be stressed that these are cited separately because they show the flexibility of this usage of the ablative. Their separate treatment does not imply any special grammatical status within Hittite.

KUB XLIII 55 V 2-3 (CTH 434):
(41) [k]I₃-na-kan TUPPAHI₄ A IŠTU GIS₃E=E/ arhu anıvenen
   'We copied these (clay) tablets from wooden tablets.'

The presence of arhu and the contrast between the two types of tablets makes it clear that the ablative here is indicating 'place from which'. This example should not be confused with the expression tunning anıva- 'write down by means of a tablet' which shows an instrumental use of the ablative (see below p. 394).

KUB XXI 127+ IV 24-25 (Prayer to the Sun-god/ CTH 372):
(42) [nu]² karu nakkhen amma(a) sa-za paššana išu/[nu-m]u-ken
    DINKIR-YA ënum anıun 21-an ena tæli
    'As I was once born from inside (my) mother, put that soul back into me, oh my god.'
This example shows what Friedrich, \( HE I^2(1960)123 \), terms 'partitive apposition' (also 'badal' or eπίγενε καθ' ἡλέν καὶ μέρος): \( ηλέν \) is literally 'from (my) mother, from (her) insides', where the second noun is semantically part of the first. This construction is attested in Hittite with various cases (see Friedrich, loc. cit.). In the Hittite Laws, the later copy B (\( KBo VI 3 \)) regularly shows such a double accusative where the Old Hittite manuscript A has a genitive. For example, \$11 in A reads: \( taldu \ LŪ.ULU\L^{LU} \-e \ ELLU\-e \ CASSU \-na \ GĪR-ŠU \-ku \tuwa[(mizzi)] \ 'If someone breaks the hand or foot of a free man...' \). Version B substitutes \( LŪ.ULU\L^{LU} \-an \ ELLU\). Paragraphs 12-14 show the same change from genitive to accusative. This suggests that the use of the partitive apposition developed after Old Hittite, and all examples with the ablative are in later manuscripts. Note, however, the probable apposition (non-partitive!) in Anitta Vs 31-32 and 38 (see pp. 156-157 above).

\[ KBo VI 3 \ IV 28 (\text{Laws/\( HC \) \$90}): \]

(43) \( n-\text{aįta} \ 1-an \ šarbuwantae-\-et [\text{KA}R-\text{izzi} \]

'And he "fishes out" the fat from its belly.'

The duplicate \( KBo VI 7,13 \) has \( dēi \ 'takes', which would be quite regular. However, the ending -izzi demands some other verb, and the traces in the autograph fit Friedrich's proposed KAR-izzi (\( nemizzi \), literally 'finds'. Hittite is able to combine in a
single phrase the act of finding the (sheep-)fat and removing it. Our difficulty in translating this adequately is merely a problem of English.

\textbf{UBot 95 I 5 (AH.	extsuperscript{SER} URU.SAR Festival/OTH 608)}:

(44) \texttt{LUGAL-úz-ze-ken URU. Hetilaza erp[ e iter?] E façai}

'The king sets out/takes his [way?] from Hetila.'

The tentative restoration of \textit{iter} is based on \texttt{KUR XLI 8 I 20-21}:
\texttt{iter...fàkkizzäi}. Compare for the use of \texttt{ze} also Bo 6483,10
\texttt{KASKAL-en-zen...fà[ir] (-zen = -ze+išen). The difference between}
\texttt{dê-} and \texttt{š[i]n- makes the restoration less than certain, but 'takes}
his way' seems to fit the context better than any other object.
Whatever object is supplied, \texttt{arka š[i]n-} can hardly be functioning
as a unit 'take away', so it is likely that \texttt{arka} is here a post-
position (see p. 185 above).

Before leaving the use of the ablative to express separation
or 'place from which', the occasional use of the dative-locative
in the same function must be mentioned. A full treatment of this
problem would require a complete survey of the dative-locative as
well as the ablative. All I can do here is point out the existence
of the dative-locative type:

\texttt{KBo IV 2 II 35 (R. of Huwarlu/Bmrache 8,93)}:

(45) \texttt{...ANA DINGIR-LIM KASKAL-ši arka ertraru}

'...let him step out of the god's way.'
KUB I 17 IV 18-19 (Monthly Festival/OTH 591):

(46) ...gīnuwa/ GAD-en dānsi

'...they take the cloth from the knees.'

The same phrase is also attested in KBo XX 67 II 65.

KUB XI 32 IV 2-3 (Festival of Tetešpabi/OTH 738):

(47) n-en-ken GIŠ ŽA.LAN.GAR-aš/ para ušši

'And he carries it out of the tent.'

For GIŠ ŽA.LAN.GAR as pl. tantum compare KUB XXXVI 35 I 7.

KUB XXXIV 66 + XXXIX 7 III 1 (Funeral Rites/HTR 40):

(48) n-sāta ALI GIŠ ŽA.LAN.GAR kurakkīye perkivan[zi]

'They raise the figure from the kurakkī.'

Otten, HTR 41, translates 'auf das kurakkī', but the presence of

-sāta suggests separation, and the next sentence reads 'They seat
it (the figure) by means of a gold-covered throne in the center
(of the room)'. Since the kurakkī is part of the house (see

Otten, HTR 135), it seems more likely that the figure is raised
from it and seated in the middle of the room.

These examples of the dative-locative with a separative

function are by no means exhaustive, but merely illustrative.

It is important to note that this usage is already attested at

least once in an Old Hittite manuscript (KBo XVII 1 I 12-13/

StBoT 8,18):
irme-šmaš-kan dēbun kardi-šmi-va-at-kan dēbun [n]/

(49) [harka]šmi-šmi-va-at-kan dēbun

'I have taken the sickness from you. I have both taken it from your heart(s) and taken it from your head(s).'

The translation of Otten-Soucek, StBoT 8,19, is entirely ad hoc: 'sowohl das in eurem Herzen habe ich genommen, als auch das in eurem Kopf habe ich genommen'. The pronoun -at is clearly anaphoric, resuming irme(n). The Hittite means of expressing 'das in eurem Herzen' would be a free-standing genitive karteš-šmaš '(that) of your heart'. For another example of this function of the dative-locative in Old Hittite see the discussion of edi below in Sec. 3, p. 263. A full analysis of this use of the dative-locative and its distribution vis-à-vis the ablative in the separative function is beyond the scope of the present study. All I can do here is to affirm the existence of the dative-locative type at all stages of Hittite.

II. Ablative of 'time from which'

This use of the ablative is merely the separative function of the ablative applied to time instead of space. The most common example is the expression kitpantalaz 'from this time (on)'. It is usually written as one word, but it obviously consists of the instrumental kit plus the ablative of an otherwise unattested noun pentala-. While there are no attestations thus far in Old
Hittite manuscripts, the use of kit instead of the ablative kēs/kiz assures that the expression is Old Hittite (see further below Sec. 3, p. 263). Attestations: KBo III 1 II 34.III 70+ and KUB XI 1 IV 5.15+ (the latter with kinuna 'now'). Compare in the same text (Edict of Telipinu) KUB XI 6 II 13 kinuna kizza UD-az 'Now from this day (on)'. The latter probably represents the Neo-Hittite equivalent of kitmantalaz.

A similar function is attested in KUB XXXI 127+ II 24-25: [DU]U-annez... IT karsabbi 'Have I not known since childhood?'. The same expression is found in the Middle Hittite manuscript KUB XXX 10 Vs 10. The Sun-god prayer also uses annaz kartzeg in an essentially temporal function:

KUB XXXI 127+ III 27-29 (Sun Hymn/ CTH 372):

mēn-mu-kan annaz kartzeg DINGIR-VA [(inen)]/ gulašša ur-aa-sa ēnpu SAL.EALI UL kuškana/ murušun

'As for me, I never asked the seeress whether my god had ordained sickness for me from my mother's womb.'

This phrase is also in the Middle Hittite manuscript KUB XXX 10 Rs 20 as well as in the parallel KUB XXXI 135+ Rs 19 (also K.H. ms.) with UL EŠšu for inen. In view of these examples, a temporal sense is also more likely in the omen text, KBo VI 25+ XIII 35 III 5-6: tekku SAL-[ze š]ābi nu annaz-pat/ ŠA-as [a]IT arpa šābi 'If a woman gives birth, and (the child) opens its
nouth right from the mother's womb' (i.e. 'from the moment of
birth'). The use of annaz Baxter shows just easily the
transfer from space to time may be accomplished.

III. Ablative of Cause

As already noted by Friedrich, this usage is also closely
related to the basic ablative function of marking 'place from
which' or 'source'. The best-known example is Bollanno 'as the
result of a quarrel' in the Hittite Laws: §2 (Ko VI 3 I 4)
and restorable in §1 (Ko VI 3 I I) with kuenci, §127 (Ko VI 10
II 17) with tavazzi; also in the later version ko VI 4 I 6 with
kuenci and ibid. I 14.16 with dohurabi. KUD XIII 4 IV 28 has:
meklom [la] tarr-at P.A.ûš 'he died from emaciation'. In this
instance one could also say 'He died through/ was killed by
emaciation'. It is quite likely that such examples were the
avenue by which the ablative of means was introduced (see below
pp.

IV. Ablative of Origin

One could argue that in many of the cases cited above under
'ablative of separation' the ablative marks the starting point
or 'source'. However, in all those examples the ablative may be
said to depend in some sense on the verb of the sentence (or in
a few instances perhaps on a postposition arha). In the two
passages I am about to discuss there is no overt verb, and it is doubtful that any specific verb may be 'understood', except the copula 𒈩. In fact, if the first example is genuine, it points to an adnominal use of the ablative which is fundamentally different from the ablative of separation seen earlier.

KUB XX 78 III 3-7 (Monthly Festival/OTH 591):

GAL 𒈨𒈺𒈠 MUNA ṭanaṟaƙeƙun/ LUGAL-1 tarkumaitasszi/
(51) MUNA ṭanaṟaƙeƙuƙ-wa ƙ-aƙ MUNA berkiƙ/ šer-ƙeƙ-kan UDU,ITTA-as ƙ-aƙ/ [U] UR-az

"The chief body-guard translates the ṭanaṟaƙu-bread for the king: "The ƙ.-bread is the leavened bread of the Storm-god; on top (are) the penis(es) from three rams."

Eichner, Anat. Zehlw. 30, interprets all the forms in -az as instrumental ablatives, supplying a verb: 'Oben ist es mit drei Schafbockphallen (bedeckt/zu bedecken)'. Formally this is quite possible, but it will not work syntactically. It is quite true that the ƙ.-bread is covered with ram-penis-es, but as the examples cited by Eichner himself show, the Hittite phrase for this action is: -zan l UZU UR šer dži 'places one penis on (it)'

(KUB II 10 IV 21.29-30 etc.). If one transforms this sentence into a passive, one arrives at -zan UZU UR šer kitta 'the penis is placed on (it)'. There is no evidence for an active sentence 'he covers the ƙ.-bread with the penis', and thus Eichner's
passive equivalent is fictitious.22 I have no objection to supplying kitta instead of ėzi in our passage, but the ablative is still dependent on the noun, not the verb: 'On top (are placed) the penis(es) from three rams'. For the interpretation of ÚZU UR-az as a nominative singular (from a dental stem) see KUB I 16 III 40 [ÚZU UR]R-đan and probably also ABOT 47 Vs 11 ÚR-tuš. ÚZU UR-az is also nominative in BEOT II 5 Rs 4-5, where the syntax is the same as in our example, except that we find a genitive instead of an ablative: ḤINDA tišarwa ašš ŠA UDU [ḪIABA...]/ ḪEĮr 3-āš UR-az 'the t.-bread of a ram... on top (are) the penis(es) of three'. The distributive use of the singular ('the penis of/from three') is well-attested and non-problematic (see e.g. ŞEOT S,66). The alternate construction with the genitive tends to confirm the interpretation of the ablative as expressing origin. As already noted, this usage of the ablative is of interest for the difficult passage in Anitta Vs 3 (see above p. 157f).

The second possible example of an ablative of origin is slightly different:

KUB XLIII 61 I 8-10,12-15 (ŠTH 457):

Kuit-a/ [ter]ippies-ne n-at NIH.LAL.ES ūdēnu/ [n]-at-ţan
Pidi-šši tiandu... takku arunas-me n-at lapansa/ ūdē
(52) n-at-ţen pēdi-šši dēu/ takku ūD-az-me n-at ḫwalaš ūdēu/
n-at-šan nüdi-ši dāu § kuit-a nepišas-ne n-at teapkaliya/
ḥaraš KUSERR ḪIZ-DU-UDI?? uṣau

'But whatever is from the field, let the bees bring it and put it in its place... but if it is from the sea, let the l. bring it and put it in its place; but if it is from the river, let the r. bring it and put it in its place. But whatever is from heaven, let the t. eagle ___ bring it.'

Despite problems of unknown vocabulary, the basic sense seems clear: that which belongs to a certain locale is to be brought and put in its proper place by the appropriate living thing. There seems to be no justification for supplying some verb of motion, such as uṣṣu 'comes'. Based on the phrase 'bring and put in its place', the things in question are not 'coming from' the places indicated by the ablatives. Instead, they are somewhere else and are being brought back to their proper milieu. Thus the ablatives are indicating place of origin. The essential difference between this passage and that of KUR XX 78 (ex. 51) is that here the ablatives are part of the predicate of nominal sentences: 'Whatever (is) from the field'. The copula has been deleted, as often.

V. Ablative of Direction

As in Old Hittite manuscripts, ablatives like kunnaz and tamūza are used in later copies absolutely and with accompanying
nouns and pronouns to indicate relative position or direction. I cite in full only a few noteworthy examples:

\[\text{KUB XXXI 127+ I 65-67 (Sun Hyman/CTH 372):}\]

\[\text{[u:] \text{d} \\text{Buneneš-a-[tt]a} \\text{LU} \\text{SUKKAL-KA/ ZAG-as-tit ivatta} \\
\text{[u:] \text{d} \\text{[u:]Ker] \\text{a-tt[a]}/ \\text{LU} \\text{SUKKAL-KA GUB-laz-tet [i]vatta}\]

'But Bunene walks as your vizier on your right, and Kisaru walks as your vizier on your right.'

Just as in other functions, when a directional ablative takes a possessive, the latter is instrumental in form. Compare in the same text I 59-61 \text{ZAG-as-tet...hui-vanteš...GUB-laz-me-tta hui[v[a]nteš}, where 'to your left' is expressed by the ethical dative - to alone. The latter construction is of course the only form in Neo-Hittite, which no longer uses enclitic possessives. Without examples in Old Hittite manuscripts, we cannot know whether Old Hittite could have the ethical dative alongside the enclitic possessive, and if so, whether deletion of the latter was permitted. \text{KUB XXXVI 75 II 4 (H.H. ms.),} which is parallel to \text{KUB XXXI 127 I 65}, shows at least that the ethical dative was not originally required: \text{[d} \\text{Bunene SUKKAL-KA kuni[zaz-tet]}...]. Note also \text{KUB XXVIII 98 III 4-5: kurnaz/ [LUGAL]-waš tawušza-tit 'to the right, beside the king'}.

\[\text{KRO XX 34 Vs 6-7 (R. of Bentitassu/CTH 395):}\]

\[\text{3 HINDA.KUR-pa-RA/ [kiz] 1EN kiz 1EN [k]izzi-ya 1EN perši[vand]a?}\]
'They break (?) three leavened loaves: one on one side, one on another side, and one one on another side.'

This example shows that the deictic force of kēs 'on this side' can be reduced to the point that it marks any direction from a given object.

KUB XI 9 III 16-20 ("Kings' Lists"/OTH 661):

(55) kōdaš-za GIS BANSir.UT.A-gē/ hūmendoš endūra/ kuttzu 1 GIS BANSir
AD.KUB/ GIS BANSir.UT.A TUR-ŠI/ humpašatnalli[el?]'

'Inside all these tables toward the wall is one wicker-table and small tables for garlic (?)'.

This passage is one of the very rare examples of endūra 'inside' with a preceding dative-locative, so common with other ablative 'adverbs'. It is no doubt not an accident that 'inside' here means 'surrounded by', not 'contained in'. The latter sense is presumably expressed in Hittite by a simple dative-locative plus enda(n). Note also the directional use of kuttzu.

The attestations of kunnaz, GUB-laš, tanuša etc. are quite numerous, and a complete list would have little purpose. The following summary is meant to give a representative sampling:

ZAG-az (kunnaz) 'on/to the right of —' (with preceding dat.-loc.):

Kunnaz KBo IV 9 I 17-18, kēšuš KBo XXI 85 IV 9 (H.H. ms.) etc.
KASKAL-ši KUB XXIV 9 II 35, LUGAL-i KBo XX 67 III 20 (H.H. ms.)
and often, GIS BANSir-i KUB X 3 II 26-27 etc., iştənani
KBo XI 49 I 15 etc., KÁ.GAL-aš KUB II 6 V 34-35, Šunnûs
Lú SAGA KBo X 23 IV 6-7+, GIš AB KBo XVII 75 I 29, GIš DAG-ti
KUB X 21 I 20, ḫšKUR-ni KUB XXXII 117+ Rs’11.

GÚB-laz 'on/to the left of ___' (with preceding dat.-loc.):
HIN.A šámanšu KUB XLI 44 I 14, Šunnûs KBo IV 9 I 17-18,
ḫaššu KUB XXXIII 40 I 9, KASKAL-ḫu KUB XXIV 9 II 37,
GIš BANŠUR-i KUB XI 24 VI 4-5, ANA DURU.Z.GAL KUB X 17
II 23-24 etc., ḥššašu KBo XI 49 I 16 etc., LI 유KAL-i
KBo IV 9 IV 24 etc.

ZIG-az...GÚB-laz 'on the right...on the left' (absolutely):
KBo IV 2 III 4, KUB XXX 41 III 14-20-21, XXV 13 I 8-9+, etc.

šamšuša 'beside ___' (with preceding gen. or dat.-loc.):
with genitives (complete): ḫaššušu KUB X 11 VI 2, LI 유KAL-(w)uš
KBo XX 33 Rs 7 (M.H. ms.) and TBoT II 89 V 5-6,
[halmaššu]ittaš KBo XVII 74+ I 36 (M.H. ms.).
with dat.-loc.: ḫaššu KUB II 5 I 34.V 8 etc. (over 30x),
GIš AB-ya KUB XXVII 69 IV 4-5 etc., GIš.d ŠUAnna.HI.A KUB I 17
III 38-39 etc., ANA HIN.A.KUR.qa RA KBo XX 67 III 21 (M.H. ms.),
Lú.KEŠ LUGAL-ššu KBO XXI 85 IV 37 (M.H. ms.), LI 유KAL-i
KUB X 17 II 25 etc., halmaššuittu KBO XXI 85 IV 40 (M.H. ms.)
etc., GIš BANŠUR-i KBo XIX 161 I 16 etc., ḥššašu KUB XXIV 9
II 26.

kēz...kēzzi-ya 'on one side...on the other':
ḫaššu/GURUK-ı KUB XXXIX 7 II 60.III 56-57,60 etc., GIš BANŠUR-i
KUB II 13 I 23–24, absolutely KBo XX 34 Rs 10–11+ (x.H. ms.), 23 Xi 32 Vs 29, etc.

hentezivas 'in front of_

h̄ašši KUB II 4 III 16–19 etc., absolutely KBo XIX 128 I 7.

katteraz 'below _'

ûalkiaš êški KBo X 24 IV 20–21.

ûêkas...andurza 'outside...inside':

These are used adverbially, in expressed or unexpressed opposition to each other. See KBo XXI 85 I "20f, IV 3 V 26f,

KUB XI 35 IV 5f, etc.

As already argued by Götze, Ak 220–221, the ablative may express direction toward, as well as direction from. It is important to note, however, that the ablative does not express the attainment of a goal, which distinguishes it from the directive (or better with Starke, StRoF 23, 'terminative') of Old Hittite and from the dative-locative of later Hittite. The importance of this difference may be seen from the following example, which has been misunderstood:

KUB XXX 15+ Vs 26–28 (Funeral Rites/HTR 68):

GUSKHUN NA × ūL.A-VE ūNUMIÆT Æti/ [1]–E>az-MA-ESAN ŠALVIANÆN Æti

'The "old woman" takes a scales, and she places in (it) on one side the silver, gold and all the precious stones. But
on the other side she places in (it) the š."

Otten, HTR 69, translates 'in die eine (Waagehale)' and 'in die andere', citing Friedrich, AEOr 6(1934)370, and Sommer, ZAB 142, for the use of the ablative to mark a goal. But nowhere does the ablative express the actual attainment of a goal. In this example, the sense 'into (it)' is conveyed, as often, by the particle -šen. The ablatives merely mark relative position 'on one side...on the other', as we have already seen.

Genuine examples of the ablative expressing direction toward look somewhat different:

(57) KUB II 5 V 3-7 (AN.TAH.ŠUL.SAR Festival/CTH 612):
    mu CAL LUGŠERDI/ LUGŠIL.A-ŠU.DU₃.LIŠ.A-va iškišaz/ EGIR-na
    ivatti! / IGI.HI.A-va-šna-st-kan LUGAL-i-pat/ andan nevantoš
    'The chief bodyguard and the cupbearer walk backwards. Their eyes are still turned toward the king.' (lit. 'they as to their eyes are still turned toward the king')

(58) KUB XLIII 55 II 10-13 (CTH 434):
    n-at-kan arās/ nātas arha uwanzi/ EGIR-as-kan UL kuikki/ ašzi
    'They come away from that place, and no one looks back.'

(59) KBo IV 9 VI 6-12 (AN.TAH.ŠUL.SAR Festival/CTH 612):
    TE MĀN DURU.ESŠ.GAL kuēzzi! / paršmān ṣarkanzi n-at aši蔚来
    DENGŠI n-at DURU.ESŠ.GAL/ данши ман-ва LUGŠERDI/
'He either throws it toward the side on which the palace officials are squatting, and they take it, or he throws it toward the side on which the bodyguards are squatting, and they take it.'

This description recurs several times: KUB XX 76 I 21f, X 21 III 20f, XI 16 III 5-10. KUB XXV 1 11 II 2f shows an interesting variation: n-at mën/ LÜ MEŠ.E.SEDI and[an] n[eške]yazi...

'He either throws it among the bodyguards...'. The same construction is used with the corresponding DURU.MES.E.GAL.

This example confirms that the ablative euisse in the other variant expresses direction toward. It does not, however, imply that the ablative of direction and the dative-locative expressing goal are equivalent or 'competing' constructions. It shows merely that Hittite, like English, has alternate means of expressing the same idea.

The ablative marking direction toward is also attested with the difficult verb huimu-:

KUB XXXIII 67 I 27-31 (Amzili and Zucki/EHA 77,136 trs.):

GÜB-lez-za KUŠ.E.SIR ZAG-naz [ēarkutta ZAG-en-za-ma KUŠ.E.SIR]

(60) GÜB-lez ēarkutta TÜG-za x[...]/ TÜG.DINGIR-LIM-za-ken

2 TUDITTI.HI A EGIR-[ke pačkiš]/ nu-ši! TÜG, Buiki Empizi
'She put on her left shoe on the right, while she put on her right shoe on the left... On her divine robes (?) she fastened the two breast-ornaments in back. She moved her rear k-cloth to the front, while she moved the front one to the rear.'

For the restorations see KUB XXXIII 36 II 1f. The reading TUG-an-ši-wa-sa-kar of Otten apud Laroche, loc. cit., is syntactically impossible. Neither the accusative TUG-an, the enclitic -ši nor the particle -wa- fits the context. The -ši- after -wa- is clear in the autograph, and a dative-locative is needed. I cannot suggest what specific word underlies TUG-DINGIR-LLL, but the assumption of a u-stem (probably plurale tantum) seems unobjectionable. Friedrich, HFB 71, takes buinu- as the causative to bušši- 'run'. This meaning fits the military usage (AM passim): mu-wa ER.RI.LAŠ piran buinu 'Have your troops run before (you)'. In other passages such as ours, a more generalized meaning 'move (tr.), transfer' is possible, if not assured (see also below p.358f). This leads to an interpretation of appizzi- as 'to the rear'. Compare also KBo XIII 86 Vs 4-5, where the expression for switching the shoes is ZAG-na buinu... GULR-laža buinu(t) 'transferred [the left shoe] to the right... and [the right shoe] to the left'. KUR XXXV 148 III 14 has in a ritual context n-anši-pa ECIR-pa iškiša buinum 'I move it (the
dog) back behind him'. Before leaving this group of examples, we should also note that KUB XXXIII 17 I 2 shows \[zag-an-e
KUš.SIR-a\nŠUB-\dot{\text{l}}i šarku(\text{w}a\text{j}it) \ldots \text{put [his right shoe] on the left (foot)\}.'

The ablative also expresses direction toward in the omen text KUB VIII 17 II 5-7 and 8-10 (Signs of the Sun/RHA 15,16):

\text{tekku }{\text{d}}\text{UTU-\dot{\text{u}}\text{š}} \text{bilēszi }\text{[(r-pēta }{\text{d}}\text{UTU-\dot{\text{u}}\text{š})]/ ma\text{\ddot{e}s re\ddot{a}n}}

\text{pail(\text{š}k\ddot{a}t\ddot{a}t\ddot{a} \text{nu a}tr\ddot{a}r)/ ar\ddot{e}s parki\ddot{a}n }\text{̄A} \text{LU\ddot{a}L KU\ddot{a}R }\text{U\ddot{a}R }\text{TU} \text{\dot{\ddot{a}}}}

\text{pēzi\ddot{a}r/}\text{tekku }{\text{d}}\text{UTU-\dot{\text{u}}\text{š}} \text{bilēszi }\text{n_re \text{bilek }{\text{d}}\text{UTU-\dot{\text{u}}\text{š}}]/zag-e

\text{ar\ddot{e}s parki\ddot{a}n }\text{t\ddot{a}}\text{ll(i)\ddot{a}} \ldots / \text{KUR-e an\ddot{e}s ki\ddot{s}iri}

'If the Sun-god is surrounded by a halo, and it is raised in the direction in which the Sun-god goes, it is a sign of the King of Amurru...If the Sun-god is surrounded by a halo, and the halo of the Sun-god! is raised to the right, a great [ ] will arise in the land.'

Hittite \text{piša} is literally 'enclosure, courtyard'. Its use to mean the 'halo' or 'aureole' of the sun and moon is a calque on Akkadian \text{tarba} (see Laroche, RHA 15(1957)16-17, who also recognizes the function of the ablatives).

We have already seen \text{appazazi} 'backward, to the rear'. It is also used in a spatial sense in \text{KBo} X 2 I 24 (Hatt. I Annals/StCl\text{\ddot{a}}r 14,46), where the Hurrians attack Hatti while the king is off on a campaign elsewhere: \text{KUR-\text{a}ya\ddot{a}z-e-nu-ka\ddot{a}n }\text{L\ddot{u}r}
SA URU 'URU KUR-a unde uit 'But behind me the Hurrian enemy entered the land'. Friedrich, *HTh* 26, also lists a temporal use of apozees 'afterwards', but the only possible instances in Old Hittite texts are unclear: KBU XXX 15+ Vs 52, X 21 I 9.IV 5 and KBo X 20 III 9. Yet another meaning is given by Friedrich, loc. cit., without a specific attestation: 'hinten herum, heimlich'. I believe that this meaning, derived from 'behind (one's) back', may account for a difficult passage in the Hittite Laws:

**KBo VI 26 I 18-21 (Laus/HG §162):**

*takku* PA-an EGIR-an erhe huški nēi 1 GIN KUHABBAR/ nēi

(62) *takku* PA-an EGIR-issiq huški/ [gerē nēi] (scil. *ēr dēi*)

*i-at amnutu takku kattann-ra/ dēi n-ēh amūl*

'If someone diverts a canal *backwards*, he gives one shekel of silver. If someone secretly takes (water from) a canal above, it (the matter) becomes difficult (i.e. actionable). If he takes (it) below, it (the canal, resp. the water) belongs to him.'

First of all, one should take the reading *ēr dēi* of the duplicate KBo VI 15,7, which forms a natural pair with *kattan dēi*. We have two contrasting possibilities, each of which has different legal consequences. My understanding of the situation is this: if someone takes water from an irrigation canal *above* the point at
which another property owner takes his water, this obviously is to the latter's detriment, and the act is grounds for a dispute. On the other hand, if the water is taken below that point, it is of no concern to that particular user, and the one who takes it may keep it. I do not see what a literal spatial use of EGIR-ississ would mean in this context, but a meaning 'behind one's back' > 'in secret' fits well. One cannot secretly divert an entire canal, but one can certainly steal water from one on the sly. The Larrā niī of KBo VI 26 is to be laid to the copyist, who mistakenly related the clause to the preceding sentence with which it has no direct connection.

Two more instances of ablative of direction deserve brief mention. KUB I 16 III 14 (WAR 12) has [ ]pibbun ĕtti-a URU Hattuas/[...]. The broken context precludes certainty, but the most likely interpretation is 'and on this side, toward Hattusa', perhaps specifying the location of a land-grant (cf. the surrounding context). KBo III 40 Rs 7-8 (CTR 16) has the earliest instance of anzitas hūwāi 'runs beside us/on our side' (cf. below pp. 291, 357f). However, since we are dealing with a Neo-Hittite manuscript, we cannot immediately assume the phrase for Old Hittite.

The adverb kitkar(za) 'at the head (of)' calls for a treatment of its own. For the meaning see Friedrich, KBo 3. Erg. 20, with references. The first point to be made is that the ablative form
kitkarza is not attested in Old Hittite manuscripts. The 'Ritual for the King and Queen' (CTH 416/ST 3, 26 and 38) shows only kitkar: KBo XVII 1 II 27-28 and IV 21 LUGAL-aš SALLUGAL-aš-a kitkar-šamet 'at the head of the king and queen'. Note the genitive construction. kitkar is also attested occasionally in later copies: KUB XXX 16+ I 9 n-en kitkar-ši<š> haddani 'They slaughter it (the ox) at his head'. More common is kitkarza, with or without a preceding dative-locative:

KUB XXIV 10 II 22-24 (R. of ALLI/TH 2,40):

(63) GIS Nā-eš kitkarza ke-i 2 DUG [LIṢ GAL]/ GIS Nā-eš kēz kēzzi-ya [ke-i]

'He places [ ] at the head of the bed, and two [saucers] on either side of the bed.'

PHC 13 II 29 (R. of Kuwanni/CTH 474):

(64) n-at-ši šašṭi kitkarza tebḥi

'And I place it at the head of his bed.'

For further attestations see Otten, HTR 125-126. The distribution of kitkar versus kitkarza and the occurrence of both with ablative adverbs like kēz...kēzzi-ya and tanubza makes it clear that the original form was kitkar. It was remade into kitkarza in imitation of the genuine ablatives with which it was commonly used (see also IBoT I 29 Rs 51 𒈗𒈬 SAG.DU-ŠU). Thus the resemblance to kit-pentelaz is superficial, as already noted by Otten, loc. cit..
We may account for the form and function of kitkar as follows. First, kitkar(za) is attested with kēz...kēzzi-ya.

We have also seen that kēz may be used to indicate more than two directions (see ex. (54) p. 196 above). We may therefore suppose that it was also possible to say 'on this side, at the head... on this side (on the left)... on this side (on the right)'.

We know further that in the oldest Hittite 'on this side' was expressed not by kēz, but by kēt. Therefore an appositional phrase kēt X 'on this side, at the head' is perfectly in order.

We thus arrive at a meaning 'at the head' for kar alone. This may be compared with Josephson, RKA 24(1966)135, note 9, to Greek kar in epi kár (Nom.) and anákar (Hippoc.) and taken as an endingless locative (<*kerh₂ with the regular loss of final -*₃h₂).²⁴

There is an alternative derivation. Hittite shows the use of a nom.-acc. singular neuter in a locative function: the neuter noun lammar 'hour' regularly functions as an adverb 'at once', and lammar lammar (KUB XXI 27 III 46-47) means 'hourly' (cf. UD-ti UD-ti 'daily'). One may therefore start with a nom.-acc. sg. *kerh₂ 'head' functioning as a locative. In either case, the adverb kitkar is an early univerbation of kēt kar 'on this side, (at) the head'. If kar is an old nom.-acc. singular, the use of the enclitic possessive in -et/-it could be old, but it is more likely that kitkar-šet was modeled on tapuša-šet after kitkar was fixed as an adverb/postposition. See further Sec. 3 below.
VI. Perlative Ablative

The key example for this usage in Old Hittite texts is

KUB XXXIII 70 II 2 (CTH 335/RHA 77,161 trs.):

(65) [*] 𒐩𒐩-𒉌-𒰠𒊏𒐨 lúttanne arda tarna

(= KUB XLVI 52 Vs 2 [*] 𒉌-𒰠 ṣe GIS₅ 𒊏-𒐨 arda [ I])

'The Sun-god slips in (?) through the window.'

From what follows one would expect rather 𒐩-šu: 'Someone')
lets the Sun-god in through the window'. However, píram arda
tarna- is used intrinsively to mean 'give way before, retreat'
(e.g. KUB XIV 1 Vs 62). An intrasitive use of arda tarna- is
thus possible. In any case the restoration of the ablative seems
certain, and the presence of arda precludes an interpretation
'lets out of the window'. Accepting the sense 'through the
window', one might propose that this is merely a use of the
ablative to express means, which is well attested in later copies
of Old Hittite texts (see VII immediately following). Against
this proposal is the fact that nowhere in Hittite does one find
an instrumental of 'window', 'door', 'gate' or the like expressing
passage through an opening. On the other hand, we do have in
Middle Hittite other examples of ablatives meaning 'through'
(see below Chap. 3, p. 292). Thus this use of the ablative is
not restricted to 'window'. Another instance of the perlative
ablative which does involve 'window' is KUB XXXIX 7 II 2?
(Funeral Rites/HTR 36):

(66) namma-ge-ken GIš Abd-az enden 2-š[U amanzi]

'They held them (the labbanas-birds) inside the window twice.'

The verb is restorable from the next line. Often, HTR 37, translates 'vom Fenster!', but if the motion were viewed as starting from the window, we would surely have erba: cf. the examples above p. 185. It is possible, however, that the perative use of the ablative with 'window' did originally develop from an ablative expressing 'place from which': in a sentence like KUB XVII 6 I 19-20 zig-e-war-ašte GIš littenza/ erba aut[i], it is a short step from 'You will look out from the window' to 'You will look out through the window'. The same goes for GIš littenza/ erba šusvat (ibid. I 23-24), which Leroche, RHIA 77,68, note 21, in fact translates as 'regards par le fenêtre'. Once the interpretation 'through' had been made for these cases, it could be generalized to instances like those we have seen with anda + verb, where the sense 'place from which' is not possible.

VII. Ablative of Means

Middle and Neo-Hittite copies of Old Hittite texts show many indisputable instances of the ablative expressing means:
KBo XXII 6 I 22 (šer tarḫari/IDOG 101,19):

\[ \text{idnu Ili-ak-na ANNA } \text{nurdahhi LUGAL KUR URU Puruṣānda tekhez } \]

"Enlil went to Purduhhi, King of Puruṣānda, in a dream."

See the discussion of the corresponding use of the instrumental, Chap. 4, note 5.

KUB II 13 VI 13-14 and passim (Monthly Festival/CTH 591):

\[ \text{LUGAL-uk TUŠ-ak } \text{đISTAR GAL-æz/1-ŠU ekuzi } \]

"The king, seated, toasts Ištar once with a cup."

On this much-discussed use of eku- 'drink' see again the corresponding section on the instrumental p. 235 below.

KBo X 2 III 39 (Hatt. I Annals/StClpr 14,54):

\[ \text{n-æ} \text{IZI-az kattan [lukkun] } \]

"I burned them down with fire."

For the verb compare KUB XIV 1 Rs 54: kattan lukkär. The instrumental IZI-it is of course common.

Similar examples are attested with many different verbs:

ar- 'be placed' (see Neu, StBoT 5,7): KBo XVII 75 I 31 Giš puriyaz (+ piran katta).

erra- 'wash': KUB VII 1 I 33 kušzaz vetenaz (+ -az), XXX 19 I 9 e[r-x-a]z.
au- 'see': KBo III 1 II 47 tumuicz (but see also p. 406).

eku- 'drink': KUB XX 42 V 15 ši-ez (with gods as direct object).

ēm- 'hold': KBo XIII 217 IV 7 DUG kurezag (+ anda), KUB X 40 IV 11-12
zalhavaz (+ ☞er). See below p. 243f on the corresponding
use of the instrumental.

bar(k)- 'hold': KUB XXXIV 69 Vs 10 GIS ērbhavaz, IBoT III 59,5-7
kiššaraz.

īšk- 'anoint': KBo XX 34 Vs 8+ (N.H. ms.) (↓it) kueza,
XI 32 Vs 23 Š-za.

kanna- 'i?': KUB XLIII 56 II 13 apēs (cf. instr. ibid. II 11).

kariva- 'cover': KBo XV 33 II 32 [ ḻx-ez? IŠTU GAD DINGIR-
KUB XXXIX 2 I 5 [GAD]-ez.

kere placdö (see Nou, StBoT 5,87): KUB XXII 111,7 pūrivan.

kuen- 'kill': KUB XXXIV 21 II 5 zalhliyaz.

lēhhuwai- 'pour': KBo XI 32 Vs 9 GIS tevaza, XIII 217 III 3-4+
GIS pūrivan. 25

pē-i- 'give': KUB II 7 I 7-8 GUB-laz kiššaraz, XIII 4 III 66
(prepandaz (+ adanna = 'gives to eat with an impure (utensil)).

pēi- 'go': KBo X 20 I 17 GIS GISIR-az (+ šērē), KUB XX 39 Vs 16
GIS pūrivanaz (+ šērē; cf. the instr. ibid. Vs 13).

šarnink- 'make restitution': KBo III 1 II 52f SAG.DU-(n)az.

šipand- 'libate (to)': KBo XV 33 II 30,32 DUG īšpandu(w)az
(1st with god as dir. obj., 2nd without), KUB XXVII 69
III 8-10 zalhavaz (with GES/TIN as dir. obj.), II 13 III 12-13
GAL-ez (with gods as dir. obj.).

šūniva- 'plunge into, implant': KBO XXI 67 IV 5 kuēz, XI 32 Vs 9
GIš tenesz.

dā- 'take': KBO XII 8 IV 28 ŠU-se, KUB X 4 I 6-7 GAL-ez
(+ arba).

dāi- 'place': KUB VII 1 III 34 GIš pūriaz (+ katta), XIII 4
I 46-47 IšTU GUD-EI.A UDU-IJ.A...kūsandaza (+ šarrā),
VBoT 58 IV 36 DUG dekunnaliats.

tētē- 'thunder': KUB XVII 10 II 33-34 (M.H. ms.) uwanxiantaz
(thus Neu, STBoT 5,173, 'mit dem Blitzstrahl'; 'thunders
from the lightning-bolt' also seems possible).

uda- 'bring': KBO XIX 126 V 34-35 GIš jubunziats (+ anda),
KUB II 5 II 28-29 GIš AMSUR-ez (+ anda), IBoT III 1,58-59
GIš dekunnaziatsa (+ anda).

uwa- 'come': KUB X 17 I 22-23 GIš buluganzaz (+ ūrē).

wehnu- 'whirl, brandish': KBO XIII 106 I 7 GIš GAL-ez, KUB II 7
I 9-10 GŪB-ez kūšeareaz (+ za and šer arba), IBoT III 52,3-5
vetēnazi-za. On these examples see below p. 234.

warēnu- 'soothe': KUB XXXI 127+ IV 22 u[el] tenesz (see p. 256).
below for the full citation).

weriwa- 'call': KUB XI 1 IV 17 KAXU-ez.

VIII. Ablative of Accompaniment

The only occurrence of this usage in a copy of an Old Hittite

(70) n-énu-kan [pu(m)]andaz/ yangi[hi][i][k]i

'He destroys him (along) with everything.'

The assumption of an adverbial use 'in all respects, completely' (Sturtevant ad loc.) is unnecessary and unjustified. In view of the other cases where the ablative functions like an instrumental, it is easier to assume a comitative sense here. 'Everything' refers to 'wife, children' etc. mentioned in the preceding sentence. Compare the common CADU DAY-ŠU DUR.UTU-ŠU...

Hamminkandu 'may (the gods) destroy (him) along with his wife and children' (see e.g. KBo XVI 25 I 16 and passim). The Akkadian cadu may stand for either an ablative or instrumental in Hittite, but the comitative function is clear in any case. See also below p. 209.

IX. Ablative of Respect

This use of the ablative is already recognized, though not named, by Kümmel, Stürtz 3(1967)120-121, who gives several examples, including KBo IV 2 II 9-10 (R. of Huwari/Syrnache 8,92):

(71) nu KÁ [š UR.TUR] / UVU UR-še Kalliḫ šA-ŠU-še Kalli

'This [pup] is large as to his penis. His heart is large.'

For the restoration UR.TUR see Kümmel, loc. cit., note 13. It is
true that formally \textit{UZU.UR-za} could be a nominative singular (thus Kronasser, \textit{Sprache} 8(1962)93 and 105), but this does not fit the context. Among other things, the \textit{SU 'his'} of the next sentence requires an antecedent.

I believe another slightly different example of this use of the ablative is attested in \textit{KUB XIII} 4 I 57-58 (Instr. for Priests/Sturt. Chrest. 150):

(72) \textit{nu-taŋa ki Karrumak utter/ SAG.DU-ez GAL-en kitteru}

'May this matter of dividing up be put under (an oath) for you with respect to your head(s).' (i.e. 'be a capital crime!')

For the interpretation of \textit{GAL-en ki-} compare \textit{Ehru XVI} 50 Vs 20-21 (i.e. ms.) \textit{linkiva-taŋa-at/ [1]kitten kitteru} 'Let it be put under an oath for us' and many other instances (see Otten, \textit{StBoT} 11 (1969)13 with note 3 and \textit{StBoT} 16(1971)36). Given the frequency of this collocation in legal contexts, it is not inconceivable that \textit{kitten kitteru} could convey the entire meaning even with the deletion of \textit{linkiva}. An accidental omission of \textit{linkiva} is also possible. Construing \textit{SAG.DU-ez} directly with \textit{kitten kitteru} is very awkward. One would expect rather \textit{SAG.DU-i}. The ablative \textit{SAG.DU-ez} instead specifies the application of the oath.

X. Ablative of Agent

Later copies of Old Hittite texts show two clear examples of this usage:
KBo III 7 IV 22-23 (Illuyanka/EIA 77-72 trs.):

(73) mu Ezna nart-eat IIIA URU.Tanipiyu/ Aššu kueraš LUGAL-waz sinnamu

'Afterwards a piece of land was donated by the king in Tanipiyu.'

For Ezna as 'afterwards' see KBo III 1 I 29. III 32. The duplicate to our passage, KUB XVII 6 IV 18, has Ezanu, which may be the correct form. The function of LUGAL-waz is clear in any case.

KBo X 7 II 16-18 (Signs of the VII.CUB/OTU 549):

(74) aṣšaši/ LUGAL-uṣ MUŠAŠŠU ša[i][u] nas kumannu/ taranteššu

'That king (and) his sons are ordained by a god to be killed.'

One could also understand 'ordained to be killed by a god', but šinnamu marks the agent with either reading.

XI. Ablative of Comparison

This usage of the ablative is attested just once:

KUB XLIII 53 I 12? (R. of Zuri/OTU 412; see FAB 219-220):

Eššari-šett-a Eššari GAL-li SAG.DU-su Aššu SAG.DU-ššU GAL-li/

...[kap]ruššet-ešša kasrass GAL-li miššet-ša [mi]ššet-ša

(75) GAL-li iššiš-(e)šša iššuš GAL-li [paltan]šš-eššešša

paltanšš šallıš...

'His stature is larger than (ordinary) stature. His head is larger than (an ordinary) head. His throat (?) is larger than (an ordinary) throat etc.'
The overall context assures the comparative sense of the ablative kāṃruṇaḥ, but its isolation among dative-locatives in the same function is surprising. The dative-locative is attested elsewhere in a comparative function (see Friedrich, HE 1² §222), while this use of the ablative, as already noted, is hapax. One may observe that not only the ablative, but also several of the dative-locatives are accompanied by -aṁta. The particle can hardly be expressing physical separation in this context. Carruba, Or 33 (1964)416, argues that in the Anitta passage KRo III 22 Vs 2-3 (see ex. (15) above p. 157), the sense of -aṁta is separative in the sense of isolating one thing from a group. Among all mankind Pithana was singled out (-aṁta) as dear to the Storm-god. I.e., 'He was dear to the Storm-god from heaven (above all others)'. Perhaps the use of -aṁta in comparisons expresses a similar nuance: 'His back stands out (-aṁta) as large among backs' = 'compared to others'. Whether or not this is the correct explanation for the presence of -aṁta in this context, I find it likely that the presence of the particle calls forth the ablative kāṃruṇaḥ, which by its isolation is marked as secondary at best, if it is not a pure nonce usage.

XII. Adverbial Ablatives

I have grouped under this rubric uses of the ablative whose meaning seems clear, but whose function does not fit in any obvious
way into the categories discussed above.

One frequent use of the ablative is in time expressions like İŞpantaz 'at night', ənna(l)am 'formerly'. Neu, StBot 18 (1974)58, points out that İŞpantaz is not yet attested in Old Hittite manuscripts, which have instead İŞpantı 'in the night'. On the other hand, İŞpantı is lacking in Neo-Hittite historical texts, except in the pair UD-ti GE-ti '(by) day and night'. While this distribution suggests a replacement of İŞpantı by İŞpantaz, several examples show that the ablative and locative forms are not wholly equivalent.

The locative İŞpantı expresses the time at which something takes place, and it may be specified by various modifiers:

\[\text{IBoT I 29 Rs 50 } [\text{sp}]\text{avigate GE-ti 'in that night', IBoT IV 2 I 26 } \text{kūt} \text{GE-ti 'in this night'. The locative is also used distributively: KUB XIII 4 III 12-13 GE-ti GE-ti 'night after night, every night' (also KUB XXXIX 61 I 6 İŞpantı İŞpantı). The sense of the ablative is much less specific, and it may not be modified or 'reduplicated'. Besides meaning 'during the night' or 'nights', the ablative is also used to mean 'for the night', referring to an action taken in preparation for the night:}

\[\text{KUB VII 1 II 18-19 (R. of Wattiti/Sorache 7,49)}:

\[\text{(76) n-at İŞpantaz hārā ṣugbā pūdai}

'And he carries it up onto the roof for the night.'\]
Compare ibid. II 27 išpanti 'in the night', which expresses
(after the fact) the time at which an action took place.

KBo IV 2 I 21 (R. of Huwarlu/Spreche 8,90):

(77) [n]-aš aAu A LuGAL SA-LuGAL Giš, iša-ša katta išpantes tiazi

'They place them under the bed of the king and queen for
the night.'

ibid. I 24-26

nu-wa-kan UD.KAL-az meḫban/ darašen marnaš anda Ul

tarmatu/ kēti-ma-wa-kan GE-ani kallu ṣatar anda le tarmatu

'As you do not let a stranger into the house during the day,
do not let in the evil word (during) this night.'

In the last example the ablative is general: cf. English 'days'
or German tags. The locative refers to a specific night.

The lack of specificity in the ablative usage suggests that
it is the temporal analog of the ablative of direction: the
relationship of išpanti 'in the night' to išpantes 'by night,
at night, nights' is roughly the same as that of kuttu 'on the
wall' to kuttaz 'toward/along the wall'.

Ritual texts show another apparent adverbial use of the
ablative:

KBo XI 45 IV 4-6 (GTH 647):

meḫban-me Ša d U ṣunu hušša[w]aš / nu Ša d Zababa ṣunna

(79) QATUMA / tiazi
'As (they serve) the pure (meat) of the Storm-god raw, so also they serve the pure (meat) of Zababa.'

KUB XI 21 IV 6-9 (CTH 669):

(80) ḫūnpa/ ḫuḫana/ ḫirandaṣṣi-ye/ tiṃṣi

'They serve the pure (meat) raw and cooked.'

The ablatives obviously express the manner or form in which the meat is served, but the relationship of this usage to other functions of the ablative we have seen is not clear to me.

A final adverbial use of the ablative is found in KUB XIII 4 II 45 (Instr. for Priests/Sturt. Chrest. 154):

(81) mān-āt-sa ẓi-azza-μa ḫaṃpirāissi n-at-ṣi SAG.DU-āk ērātar

'But if he sells it for himself (-ṣa) on his own authority, it is a capital crime for him.'

The instrumental ẓi-it is far more common in the sense 'on one's own, by oneself', and it is there that the origin of this usage should be sought (see below p. 234f).

XIII. Problematic Cases

A few instances of the ablative are problematic in interpretation, despite a complete context:

KUB XXXIII 54 II 10 (CTH 334/RHA 77,139 trs.):

(82) Gūrā ḫīṣu-āk GTI-ṣen ḫuṣa ērṣa ērṣa UL arṣīqżzi
'As the drainpipe does not flow backwards...'

The form perza always occurs with ṭum, and the combination seems to mean no more than 'backwards' (see also KUR VII 1 II 14 and p. 409 below). The form perza could be interpreted as a directional ablative from a nominal stem par-, but I cannot suggest a meaning or connections within or outside Hittite.

KBo X 24 IV 1-6 (KT.LA8: Festival/OTH 627):

(83) [nu-uš?]-ka-an NUI GIG.GIššu/ iū(as) (ūčas) [---]/ d uranda ivanqa/
     n-um LUGAL-i anda nā[i]/ LUGAL-uk-šan G(j)Išu, (ūčas)/ (ūča

With the restoration from the duplicate, KUR XX 91,6-7, the context is virtually complete, but the sense is obscure, and I forgo any attempt at translation.

The ablative ikkišaz is twice attested with karpa- 'lift':

KBo XV 33 III 33-35 (OTH 230; H.H. ms.):

(84) nu IMMU HURSMEGG Sidduwa/ kunit G(s)Išu (ūčas) n-āt IŠIG
     I ŚUKU ŠTA HAPŠI ikkišaz karanci

'The evergreen which they bring from Mt. Sidduwa he lifts on his back (?) with a teheši-cloth.'

KBo XII 126 I 12-15 (R. of ALLA/OTH 2,22):

(85) kēša/ alwansineš antuššuš nu kūn UKU-an mān LÚ-1š iyan
     [n]-at kēša ikkišaz karanc karanci n-e-za EGIR-na
     dūš/ [n]-at ikkišaz karanc karanci (soi. ṭardu?)
'Behold (here are) persons (figurines) who cast spells. If a man has made this person—behold (the latter) has it (the spell) loaded on his back—(then) let him (the man) take it back and have it loaded on his back.'

Neither of the above translations is assured. I have interpreted 𒈗𒈺 to be an ablative of means, literally 'with (his) back', because the other possibility, a directional ablative, does not make sense in the context. One could read 'lifts from behind', i.e. 'lifts by grasping from behind', but it is hard to see how an evergreen tree could have a 'front' and 'back'. 'Lifts backwards' also has little to recommend it in either passage. Jakob-Rost, TH 2,23, also understands 𒈗𒈺 as 'hält mit dem Rücken hoch gehoben', although her overall interpretation of the text differs somewhat from mine.

XIV. Non-Examples

Several forms for which an ablative has been suggested are of dubious existence or represent something else:

**KUR I 16 II 62 (HAB 8):**

(86) ut-ni-ya-an-sa-a3-ta lē-rt4 ḫuški memši

'Let no locale speak to you.'

The opening sequence is to be interpreted with Sommer, HAB 106, as /udniyants-ta/ (cf. the preceding lines). udniyansa is a
nominate singular in apposition to kuiôka (cf. Kupanta-kAL
KBo IV 3 IV 35-36 mën anô-ma kuiôka 'if any of those...'). For
the spelling compare KBo IV 7+ II 7 ke-e-zo-za-at-te /kets-ta/ =
KBo V 13 I 29 kēsza-tta.

KUB I 16 III 71 (HAB 16):
(87) SIG-en-[za-mu e-ar-ri] = Akk. danâgē mesi-enni 'Wash me well.'

Sommer reconstructs a Hittite adverb SIG-enza 'well' after the
Akkadian, citing KUB XVI 9 II 6: [ēST]U GES DING SIG-enza EGIR-da
Munnenzi. But this example can just as well be understood as
'refill with good wine', since an ablative of means is well
attested. As Sommer himself observes, the interpretation of
SIG-en-za of the oracle texts is quite uncertain.

For the HAB passage one could also think of SIG-en =
lazziyen, nom.-acc. sg. neuter participle of lazziva-, which has
been taken as the base for the later SIG-in 'well' (lazzin <
lazziyen like apnezzin < apnezzian). A proleptic accusative
SIG-en-[ta-ar-mu] is also possible: 'wash me goed' i.e. 'clean'.

KBo III 1 II 50-51 (Telipinu Edict/Sturt. Chrest. 190):
kuiô kaôp.aš-na III.aš-ne inta-rena idêlu iyasi nu LUGAL-vaš/
(88) ūraôkân'û kusuyêzzi nu tuliyan halûotton mën-one uttar-šet
poïzzi/ nu SAG.DU-neẓ bernikdu

'Whoever does evil among his brothers and sisters and sets his
sights on the king's head/person—call an assembly—if his
speech fails him (?), let him pay with his head.'

The established interpretation of this passage is that the subject is the king, and the provision for his possible execution has been used as the basis for conclusions about the nature of the kingship in Old Hittite times (see e.g. Götze, AO 27/2(1926)20). This view is based on the reading har-ak-ka-na-za in line 51 and a translation of the relevant sentence as 'he shall pay with his royal head' or the like. This translation of ḫuwa-ion- 'push, shove' is wholly ad hoc, and the genitive LUGAL-za is extremely awkward if the king is the subject. Furthermore, the idea of 'shall pay with his head' is already expressed in line 52 with an imperative and a well-established idiom.

A solution to these problems may be achieved as follows. First, based on both the autograph of Hrozny and the transliteration of Forrer, BoTU 2.43, a reading har-ak-ka-na-a 'toward the head' is perfectly in order in line 51. Second, the spelling ḫuwēɔζzi proves that the verb here is ḫuwa-ion- 'look', not ḫuwa-ion- 'push'. For ḫuwēɔ with a directive compare KUB XXIX 1 I 52. Third, the subject of the sentence is not the king, but 'a prince': cf. lines II 55 and 59. The passage now makes sense: if any prince does mischief among his brothers and sisters, or 'looks toward the head of the king' (with evil intent), then he is brought to trial. The exact meaning of utter-šet paizzi is uncertain, but it clearly
implies guilt. I suggest as a possibility 'his speech goes', i.e. 'words fails him'. The accused stands silent, without excuse. As the text stands, nu tulivam balzištən takes up the preceding relative clause rather awkwardly. One wonders if nu has been inserted erroneously, and the original had tuliva-en balzištən 'call him into the assembly'. This would give a regular relative sentence. For a clear case of an excrescent nu see KUB XXI 127+ I 65 p. 196 above.

KBo III 1 II 45 (Telipinu Edict/Sturt. Chrest. 190):
(89) ha-ak-ha-an-na-ka-an la kuinki kuenti ÜL SIG-in
'Do not kill anyone of (your) family. It is not proper.'

One could delete the ha and take ḫaššannaš as an ablative:
'Do not kill anyone from the family'. However, as already pointed out, there is no solid evidence for a partitive ablative in Hittite. It is easier to keep the reading of the text:
ḫaššannaš-an-za- 'of the family+him+reflexive'. For -za with kuen- cf. ibid. II 7. The sense is 'kill for your own purposes or gain'. For proleptic -an compare KBo III 28 II 19.

KUR XXXIII 68 II 7-8 (CTH 332/RHA 77,128 tras.; M.H. ms.):
(90) nu GIŠ IIA nebban andurse LIM NURUN-an hezzi/ sia-sa ša-it aššu ud-da-2-na-za! (scil. uddér) harak
'As the fig holds a thousand seeds inside, may you hold the good words in (lit. with) your heart.'
Despite the difficulty of explaining -na-sa as a copying error for -er, the ablative of the text is simply impossible both syntactically and contextually. Based on the overall context and especially on II 12 ḫēsu uddēr, one must read ud-da-a-er in II 8 as well.\textsuperscript{31}

The uses of the ablative in Middle and Neo-Hittite copies of Old Hittite texts may be summarized as follows:

I. Ablative of Separation
II. Ablative of 'time from which'
III. Ablative of Cause
IV. Ablative of Origin
V. Ablative of Direction
VI. Perlathe Ablative
VII. Ablative of Means
VIII. Ablative of Accompaniment
IX. Ablative of Respect
X. Ablative of Agent
XI. Ablative of Comparison
XII. Adverbial Ablatives

We have seen that the ablatives of separation and direction are well attested in Old Hittite manuscripts, and examples of the ablative of origin and the perlathe use probably also exist. The ablatives of 'time from which' and cause may be viewed as special cases of the ablative of separation. Direct evidence for the
remaining uses in Old Hittite is lacking, and before we attribute any to Old Hittite, we must look at the usage of Middle and Proto-Hittite texts.
Section 2.2. Usage of the Instrumental in Middle and Neo-Hittite Manuscripts of Old Hittite Texts

I. Instrumental of Means

As one might expect, by far the most common use of the instrumental in Middle and Neo-Hittite copies of Old Hittite texts is to express the means or instrument by which something is accomplished. Since this usage is so commonplace, I cite in full only those occurrences which are of special interest for some reason or other.

KUB XXXI 4 + KBo III 41 Vs 8-9 (CTH 16/ ZA 55,158):

(91) [Kwam] [ki]danda pattenit ekan uti'kimi te gaq'ikimi/
[(tə'q)] udnē karnikmi kirdanda nat'id-a t-an kerdə-šma šallu[kti! ? ]
'I shall come and bring ice in this basket. I will fight and destroy the land(s) with this very arrow. You (?) will plunge into their hearts.'

The autograph of the duplicate KBo XIII 78 Vs 8 appears to have te-ša, but -ša with karniki- would to my knowledge be unique.

The spelling te-a for te is common in copies (cf. KUB XXV 1 VI 37, XXV 2 I 13 etc.). KBo XIII 78 Vs 10 has še-a-li-ik[-]ti, with the -ti spaced far to the right at the end of a paragraph. One could insert a [-te-], but šeliktati could only be read as a third person if a preterite, and a past tense does not fit the context.
One would expect ḫiliki 'It-(the arrow) will plunge into their hearts' (for the directive with ḫiliki- see the examples in Neu, StBoT 5,148). If we take the duplicate seriously, we must conclude that the speaker suddenly addresses the arrow. Given the stylistics of this remarkable text, such a dramatic turn is not impossible.

The sequence na-ti-i-da is not an instrumental in -ta (Gettinger, StBoT 22(1976)40, note 78), but nati̇ plus 'non-gominating' -a (Neu, StBoT 16(1974)71). As I plan to show elsewhere, the particle -a (like its later replacement -ma) is not inherently adversative ('but'), but emphasizing, or rather topicalizing. Here it reinforces the effect of extra-position: 'with this (very) arrow (which I am holding)'. It is interesting that the copyist of KBo XIII 78 had considerable difficulty with the instrumentals of this passage. He writes in Vs 8 kādana pattaniuḳ and in Vs 9 kādana GI-it. The -uŋ for -it in pattaniuḳ can be explained as a copying error, but it is obvious that the scribe did not understand the function of kādana at all.

KBo III 13 Rs 4 (Naram-Sin/ZA 44,70):
(92) [ -a]lli GI-[en GI]-it anda varanu[n]

'I (moving) on foot enclosed [it/them] as in a [ ]'.

The verb varanu cannot be from var- 'wash', which is athematic.
Nor does 'wash' fit the context. Instead we have a denominative
verb(i) - 'enclose' from the noun wurde, known from the phrase
wurta dāni - 'set a hedge around, surround'. The verb anda wurth-
is also attested in KBo III 21 II 18-19: ŪL pittulianun-me
anda wurthkili 'you surround (even) the dauntless'.

KBo XV 33 III 11-12 (CTH 330; M.h. ms.):

\[\text{nu-tshan LUGUŠTAM ŠA UDUŠIR/ ŠA GUP.NAM-za suliva GUR.ZARAR-it}\]
\[\text{CATAN dāni}\]

'The master of the house lays his hand on the sulī of the
ram and the bull with a bronze knife.'

One assumes that the meaning of this peculiar phraseology is
that the man holds the knife in his hand and applies the knife
to the sulī. Perhaps a similar construction is present in a
broken context in KUB XXVII 69 II 11-13 with an ablative of means:

\[\text{nu-úš[en]...t}l)anišnaza GESHTIN ANA DUG.LIŠGAL-ni/ pūrin dāni\]

'He puts his lip to the saucer with (?) a tēnīšane of wine.'

That is, his lip touches the tē, which in turn touches the saucer.

KUB XXXV 148 III 36 (R. of Zuwir/CTH 412):

\[\text{UR.BAR.RA ḫiššartā Epten UR.NAH šanut Epten}\]

'Seize the wolf by the paw, seize the lion by the knee.'
Based on the first passage and the presence of one \textit{Ištu}, all the body parts in the second passage should probably be taken as instrumentals. For the omission of \textit{Ištu} compare \textit{KBo XI 12 I 5 Enlil Ištu, E 7} versus the duplicate \textit{KBo XII 126 I 4-5 Ištu Eke III/ [kum]} 'full of clay tongues'. However, accusatives of respect are also possible: cf. \textit{KBo III 8+ III 6f} (Kronasser, \textit{Schrage 7(1962)} 161, and Neu, \textit{StEtoT 5(1968)38}). In any case, the two passages together show that the instrumental of a body part like 'hand' may indicate not only that with which one seizes something, but also that by which one seizes someone. Thus by themselves \textit{kiššar\textsubscript{e}p-} and \textit{kiššar\textsubscript{u}par(k)}- are ambiguous, and the reference of 'hand' must be determined from the context.

\textit{Kub XXX 24 III 38-41 (Funeral Rites/Etr 64)}:
\[\text{[n]u mān lū-ša alkant<se> nu-kēm ṣalīya/ [a]nda ṣa GIŠ INL I}\]
(97) \textit{ALAK sulšenzi mān SAL-ze-ma/ akkansa nu-kēm IZ-āt ṣalīya/ anda Ištu GIŠ INL I}. 
'If a man has died, they outline a likeness of fruit in a pile of grain. But if a woman has died (they outline a likeness) with fruit in a pile of spelt.'

Technically, the ḫūtu may be standing for either instrumental or ablative, but that is not the interest of this passage, which lies rather in the alternative expressions for the same idea. In the first instance one outlines 'a likeness of fruit' with a genitive of material. In the second, where the predicate ilam gülḫensi has been 'gapped', one outlines the likeness 'with fruit', either an instrumental or ablative of means. Once again, we must recognize that Hittite, like other languages, has genuinely alternate means of expressing the same thing. It would be ridiculous to speak here of 'case overlap' or 'syncretism'.

**KUR XXXIV 16 III 4 (Signs of the Moon/OTH 533):**

(98) [udineva]...[gawit kınkta

'In the land [ ] will be bowed down by rain.'

Neu, *StEt* 5(1968)55, note 2, finds this passage problematic, but if we take the middle kınkta in a passive sense (cf. kitta 'be placed'), we can arrive at a reasonable sense. A likely subject is 'grain (fields)', but after a heavy rain almost everything could be said to be 'bowed down'.

**KBo IV 9 VI 14-15 (AN.TAH.ŠUR.SAR Festival/OTH 612):**

(99) [lugal-uk igt.ha-it ivazi] / [lu.meš šu.1-kan ñazanzuš šanhensi]
'The king makes (a sign) with his eyes, and the barbers sweep the floor.'

KBo IV 9 IV 21

(100) GAL LÊSÈDI GILÈ SUKUR-it ivazi

'The chief bodyguard makes (a sign) with his spear.'

The expression 'signal with' using ivaz- 'do, make' plus an instrumental is well attested with both 'eyes' and 'spear'. Whether we are dealing with ellipsis or a genuine objectless construction is not clear. The sense is assured by KBo XXI 85 IV 21 (M.H. ms.): GILÈ SUKUR-it iškita[ppi] 'gives a signal with a spear'.

KUB XXX 39 Rs 9 (AN.TAU.SUL.SAR Festival/CTH 504):

(101) arīza- me-at DINÇIR-it

'It is inquired about through the god.'

The verb arīza- means 'to inquire about by oracular means', with the mode of inquiry often specified by an instrumental or ablative (see e.g. KUB V 6 II 44 cited by Neu, StEsT 5,13). Since the subject is always human, one can hardly take DINÇIR-it as an agent: 'It was inquired about by the god'. The instrumental rather indicates the means of inquiry in its most general form: the matter was inquired about by consulting a god. The specific oracular means is not specified. Similarly in English one may say 'I inquired about my future through a fortune-teller', without
mentioning a crystal ball, tarot cards, etc.

IBOT III 1,50-51 (AH.TAH.SAR Festival/OTH 609):
EGIR-ŠU UGULA LÚ. BURALDIḪ memalit ASRIḪ.Ḫ irbeizi/S EGIS-ŠU
(102)
TA KAS CHEنتائج tænalit ASRIḪ.Ḫ irbeizi

'Afterwards the overseer of the cooks makes the rounds of the places with meal. Afterwards he makes the rounds of the places with beer, wine and tæna(=drink).'

The precise meaning of this very common usage is made clear by a passage like KUR II 8 II 22f, where 'they make the rounds of the places' with AH.TAH.SAR and various foods. That is (II 25f), they offer these things once each to the sacrificial table, the hearth, the throne, the window, etc.

KUR XLI 40 I 18-20 (OTH 669):
[UŠ]ULA / LÚ.KES.BURALDIḪ GAL-it wær [bar][i] / [+]a AḪA GARI
(103)
LUGAL wær barâ / [1]labušnit 3-ŠU labuštâ

'[The overseer (?)] of the cooks holds water in (lit. with) a cup, and he pours out water on the king's hands three times with a ladle (or simil.).'

I cite this passage separately, because it is an unambiguous example of an instrumental with labuštâ—which indicates the utensil with which something is poured. Other instances of both the instrumental and ablative with labuštâ—indicate the vessel from which
something is poured. However, it is not necessary to assume that in the latter use the instrumental indicates 'place from which' from the point of view of Hittite. The overall usage of verbs such as eku- 'drink' and šinsid- 'libate' may be most easily explained by assuming that Hittite viewed the vessel as the means by which one drinks, libates or pours (see further below p. 235f). The interpretation of ablatives with eku- and lebuwa- is not always certain; see note 25 above.

(Epo) III 52,3-5 (CTH 670):

[ti]-an ‹lu AZU ITTIU MUSENMUŠRI/ [HA₂₃šuštit qetensazi-va/ (104)
[wa]nusi

'The physician "brandishes" him (the king) with the H-bird, with dusk- and with water.'

The meaning of this odd-looking sentence is revealed by passages like EBo XVII 1 II 20-21 (R. for King and Queen/STpoT 8,26):

MUSBN zaran[an] ERTI₂₃₂₃-šin[n]-a LUGAL-ši[ś] SAI₂₃ LUGAL-šE₂₃-a (105)
[še₂₃-[r-šenet]]/ wahnunemni

'We whirl the eagle and the (figures of the) troops over the king and queen.'

The combination šer (arba) wahn- is used frequently in rituals to indicate that something is brandished with a circular motion over the head of someone. Example (104) represents a syntactic
transformation of this expression:

Object (Acc.) + Person (Gen.→ Dat.-Loc.) + šer arpa wēnhu-
⇒ Person (Acc.) + Object (Instr.) + wēnhu-

The same transformation appears to be possible with erehanda wēnhu-: see 103/p 4 (štE₂O 12,70). See the discussion of ek- and šimu- immediately following for a similar transformation.

The syntax of ek- 'drink' and šimu- 'libate' in ritual contexts at first glance appears to be quite variable, if not capricious. In order to make sense of this usage, we must begin with the following basic sentence structure:

Liqui ḫ (loc.) + God's Name (Dat.) + Vessel (Instr.) + ek- /šimu-
'drinks/libates x with y for/to z.'

Examples of the full structure are rare, but they do exist:

KUS II 13 I 43-44 (Monthly Festival/CHT 591):
(106) Gššr[a]-šu-IMP tanišanit GIR₂ / ḫdaš DINGIR.IEŠ-añ šinanti

'And he libates wine for these gods with a t. of burnt-clay.'

Another example is Ḡbo XV 33 II 30-31 (K.H. ms.), where the vessel is in the ablative instead of the instrumental. Normally, one or more of the possible elements is deleted:

Ḡbo XIII 164 IV 12 (CHT 670):
(107) [ml]ššb[a] SAKHA ḫSTU GAL ANA DINGIR.LIM šinanti
'When the priest libates to the god with a cup.'

(108) LUGAL-úk [SA]L. LUGAL-š-a ašandaš aruwanzi GAL dškur
[LUN]piššumerit/ ekuwanzi

'The king and queen bow (while) seated and drink with/from the shining (?) cup of the Storm-god.'

One may translate idiomatically in English 'from the cup', but the function of the instrumental in Hittite is means, as in the other examples.

To complicate matters, the basic structure given above is subject to a transformation similar to that for šer arba wahanu:

Liquid (Acc.) + God's Name (Dat.) + Vessel (Instr.) + eku-/šinand-

God's Name (Acc.) + Liquid (Instr.) + Vessel (Instr.) + eku-/šinand-

Again the full structure is rare, but attested:

(109) [dškur] šamë šinanduit KURABBAR ĠEŠAN-it šinizaniti

'He libates (to) the Sun/Storm-god of heaven with wine with libation-vessel.'

The restoration of a divine name before šamë in this context is virtually certain. This structure is more common with one of the two instrumentals deleted:
KUB X 89 I 20-21 (Monthly Festival/ CTH 591):

LUGAL SAL.LUGAL TUŠ-ak dZababa ISTU BIERT UR.AH/ 4 arantet akwanzi

(110)

'The king and queen, seated, drink (to) Zababa with a lion rhyton standing on (all) fours (?)'.

Compare for the meaning of 4 arantet perhaps KUB XLIV 47 V 3-4:

n-an tiantet GU[D...] / ekusi 'He drinks (to) him with a standing bu[11(-rhyton)]'.

KBo XI 16 IV 14-15 (CTH 669):

(111) LUGAL SAL.LUGAL TUŠ-ak dTa-x[...] / tavalit akwanzi

'The king and queen, seated, drink (to) Ta-[ ] with taval.'

Viewed in its proper context, as a part of the overall usage of eku- (and Kipand-), the collocation dX eku-, over which so much ink has been spilt, becomes a non-problem (see most recently the discussion of Rosenkranz, Fest.-Otten(1973)283f, with refs.).

dX eku- does not mean 'drink a god!' any more than LUGAL-un wabnu- means 'brandish the king'. Both of these expressions are merely syntactic transformations of basic structures with a dative of person. If one wishes to preserve the Hittite surface structure dX eku-, then 'toast dX' is a reasonable translation, although 'toast' is not wholly appropriate to the religious context of the ritual. 32

One more point must be made about the verb Kipand-. Besides
entering into the basic structure given above, šinand- may also be construed with an accusative indicating the animal or other object which is consecrated by pouring a liquid over it:

Object (Acc.) + God's Name (Dat.) + Liquid (Instr.) + šinand- 'consecrate x with y for/to Z'

Again the full structure is rare:

KUB XLIII 56 III 6-7 (CTH 330):

(112) n-pâte šailiqal šak dūrîyantaš [-1] / ištû dūk KUkûd KAR šipenti

'The queen consecrates a pig to the country-gods (?) with a pitcher of beer.'

This example offers the slight variation that the vessel is mentioned. Another occurrence deletes the dative:

KBo XV 10 II 7 (R. of Absolution/TH 1,80):

(113) nu-xan tûrûpan GESâT-î šipenti

'He consecrates the i. with wine.'

Whatever the precise meaning of tûrûpan-, it is cooked (ibid. II 23), so the use of šinant- is clear (contra Szabó, TH 1,81). The verb šinand- with an animal or similar object comes to mean 'sacrifice' in general, but this is a secondary development, as is clear from passages like KUB XX 87 I 5f, where the bull is still alive after the action of šinand-, which must mean 'consecrate'
(by pouring wine or another liquid over it).

As already observed, the instrumental of means may occur with almost any verb. The following verbs are attested in Middle and Neo-Hittite copies of Old Hittite texts:

\textit{anē} - 'wipe': KBo III 8 II 33 \textit{Ištu} Lāl-it ( + arba).
\textit{arru} - 'wash': KBo XXI 57 III 8 [mit]enit.
\textit{armu} - 'move, carry': KUR XXXII 2 II 16 [p]artaunit.
\textit{ašēk} - 'seat': KUB XXXIV 66 + XXXIX 7 III 2-3 \textit{Ištu} Gīš \textit{Gu.Za}.
\textit{ēp} - 'teke; hold': KUB XXII 1 127+ I 51 kiššarte ('by the hand'),
    XXXIV 148 III 36 \textit{Igi.Hi.}await ('by the eyes'), II 10 IV 18.28
    \textit{šu-it}, KBo III 13 Rs 14 \textit{šu-mit}, XX 67 III 31+ \textit{šu-it} ( + kätte);
    KUB II 6 II 10 zelbeit (+ para), Bo 2708 I 7-8 (StDot 12,75 =
    KUB XI 30 + XLIV 14 IV 30-31) Gīš zelwanit (+ para).
\textit{ēd} - 'eat': KUB XXIX 1 I 15 zanzikit.
\textit{bapbarina} - 'rake' (?): KUB XXIV 10 III 11 bapbarit.
\textit{bališšiva} - 'line, plate': KBo III 43 Rs 14+ GUSKIN-it, KUB XXVI 71,7
    unšanda.
\textit{buzāi} - 'call': KBo XI 32 Vs 30 \textit{šu-}it, Rs 59 [lan]nit, XIX 128
    IV 5 lannit.
\textit{ban} - 'draw' (liquid): IBot II 14 Vs 10 zelheit ( + -ašta).
\textit{banešša} - 'plaster': KBo XXI 22 Rs 42 arzilit.
\textit{barr} - 'hold': KBo XVII 40 IV 8 Gīš \textit{ka}ṣa\textit{ab}-it, KUB II 7 I 3
    GUS-lit ki[ššarit], XXXIII 68 III 11 (K.H. ms.) kiššarte,
    XVII 10 II 19? (and often) ša-it.
burk- 'perish': KUB XVII 10 I 18.30 (H.H. ms.) kištantit.

bazziva- 'strike': KBO III 16 Vs 8 Gil-it.

būrai- '?': KUB XXIX 1 III 39 [ku]manit.

innarāt- 'be vigorous': KUB XXX 10 Vs 18.19 (H.H. ms.) uddenta.

ir empleado- 'make the rounds of': Virtually any ritual substance may be used with this verb, and a list would be repetitive. I merely refer the reader to the following attestations:

KBO IV 13 II 26. III 18-20, X 37 I 50, XXI 72 I 9, KUB II 8 I 34-35, II 22-23, XI 18 II 15 III 13, XI 26 II 3-4, XI 30 V 9, XX 70 I 9-10, XXV 18 III 38 IV 33, XXXIV 694 Vs 16-17.20, XXXIV 70 I 17, XII 53 V 8, NT 26.9-10, TROT II 4 Vs 3, III 1,57-58, 64-65.

iḥussar- 'sir': Bo 272 I III 82 (DA 63.72) IŞTU PAHARIŠTI.

išš- 'anoint': KBO XX 34 Vs 8 (H.H. ms.) 1-it, XXI 22 Rs 43 (H.H. ms.) ANBAR.

iškar- 'prick, pierce': KBO III 16 II 6.12 išpamit.

išpar- 'trample': KUB XVII 27 III 12 [GIR].LEŠ-it.

išpar- 'make (a sign)': KBO XI 52 V 5 (and often) IGI.Š.1.A-it.

KUB X 21 I 24 IŞTU GİR SUKUR.

kalēmīš- 'bind': KUB XVIII 5 I 15 išpiminta.

kaš(a)- '?': KUB XLI 56 II 11 [š]alvanit (cf. ibid. II 13 with ablative).

kašna- 'devour': KBO XII 4 III 6 [U]ZU-AXU-it.

kariva- 'cover': KUB II 13 I 16.49.56. II 15 (and often) GAD-it (+ -eš/ -ken).
kištanu- 'extinguish': KBo IV 2 I 12 (and elsewhere) vetenit.

kur- 'cut': KBo III 16 II 7-13 URUDU šumullisarrit-a...

URUDU šumullisarrit, 33 ITO T III 1,88 GIR-it.

ğulḫ- 'inscribe': KBo XX 34 Vs 12 (M.H. ms.) (and elsewhere)

ŠIRŠIT-ENIT.

lasziya- 'get well': KUB XXX 10 Vs 18,19 (M.H. ms.) uddanta.

mal- 'swear an oath': IBO T II 101 V 14 [x-it, KBo XI 10 VI 13

TA GEŠTIN.

nena- 'speak': KUB XXXI 127+ I 43 (= XXXI 135+ Vs 11 M.H. ms.)

iš-it.

ningenu- 'make drunk': KUB XXXIII 5 III 10 ŠIRŠIT.

nāti- 'give': KUB II 7 I 6 GIŠ-LIŠ-ŠIRŠIT.

ušu- 'go': KBo XIX 120 I 3-4 (and elsewhere) GIŠ GIR-it...

GIŠ šulūqarrit.

nanparḫ- 'sprinkle': KBo XIII 164 I 6 N<OA-TERIT, KUB XVII 10 II 29

(M.H. ms.) I.DUG.GA-it.

nenna- 'drive': KUB X 3 I 10 ANŠE.KUR.RA-it (+ šarrā).

pēdan- 'carry': KUB II 13 I 8 akurallit, X 3 I 31-32 IŠTU šurrar

GUŠKIN, XXV I 11 18+ šulūrit GUŠKIN.

ēkkurīna- '?': KBo X 2 II 19 GIŠ+W.A-it[t] (+ arba).

šertē- '?': KBo III 8 II 19 RAPPIT (cf. ibid. II 32).

šek(a)riya- 'sift, strain' (?): KUB XIII 3 III 23 GIŠ šarrulit.

šiva- 'shoot': KBo X 37 II 8+ GIŠ BAR-IT GI-it.

ŠU- 'full, filled with': KBo X 23 IV 5 (and often) GEŠTIN-it,
XXI 72 I 13 marnuqiet, XV 33 II 15 (K.H. ms.) ZID,DA-it, etc.  
kuwa-'fill': KBO XVII 75 I 61 (and often) GESFIN-it, X 2 I 20-21  
aššašit (+ hara), III 38 Rs 16-17 GIS intaluzhit, etc.  
šurubub- 'purify': KBO XIX 128 I 31 (and often) tubhhešnit.  
šuwei- 'push': KUB XXIV 10 III 12 GIS intaluzit.  
đa- 'take': KUB VII 1 II 4 išpaštit (+ ēnna).  
tenat- '(op)press': KUB XXXI 103,14 ERIN,ES-it.  
tarp- 'conquer': KBO III I 6,16,26 II 42 kutenit.  
terat- 'let go': KBO X 2 I 43 IZI-it (+ katten).34  
ummu- 'adorn': KUB XXX 19+ I 11-12 IŠTU GESIRIN...purinit...  
murinit.  
ušk- 'see' (iter.): KUB XX 92 VI 12 SIG,IT IGI,HA-it.  
wali- 'hit': KUB XII 27 IV 10 HAD tubhuppaštit, KBO XX 76+ I 14  
tubhuppaštit,35 KUB XLIII 60 I 17-21 gaddusnit (?) šarunrit...  
SL,HI,HA-šanda tittitit...iššaprait, etc.  
warm- 'burn': KUB VIII 25 I 9 IZI-it.  
warp- 'wash': KBO XXI 8 III 11 (K.H. ms.) ŠEŠAG-it.  
vašīya- 'clothe': KBO IV 9 V 19 GAD-it (= KBO XIV 35 I 12  
karivānta).  
vetu- 'build': KBO XXI 22 Rs 37-42 (K.H. ms.) NA-...kunanit.  
šī- 'cross': KBO X 2 III 32 GIB,IES-it.  
zankilai- 'fine, penalize': KUB XIII 4 IV 10 IŠTU GUD...10 UDU-va.  
zam- 'cook': KBO XXI 85 I 16 (K.H. ms.) (and often) hapsinit,  
X 37 IV 7 (and often) I[2]IT-it, XX 64 Vs 11 (and elsewhere)  
[DU]G[DU]-it.
A special problem is posed by the use of *iškarubit* in ritual texts. A typical example is KUB I 17 II 31-34 (Monthly Festival/CTH 591):

\[
\text{LUGAL-ur ŠU-ŠU d.ŠKUR/ d.ŠKUR URU d[I]paššu/ IŠTI DUBRI (114)}
\]

*UG SILIN/ claus iškarubit/ šer Ėnzi*

'The king, seated, drinks (to) the Storm-god and the Storm-god of Ziplanda with a gold bull rhyton...'

The phrase *iškarubit šer Ėnzi* raises several problems: first, who is the subject? Second, what is the unexpressed direct object, or are we dealing with an objectless sentence? Third, what is the meaning of *šer* in this context?

The answer to the first question is clear from passages like KUB XXV I V 20-21 (AN.ŠI.ŠI.ŠI.ŠI Festival/CTH 612): *LUG ŠI.ŠI.ŠI.ŠI.ŠI.*

*iškarubit[t]/ GESTIN-it šer l-ŠU dO[zi].* Since our formula usually occurs in conjunction with drinking (to) a god, and the subject is the 'cupbearer', one might think that the sense is roughly 'he (the cupbearer) offers (the wine) with an *iškarub*- (to the king or other celebrant)'. However, the instrumental GESTIN-it in the fuller variant is difficult to explain. An even greater problem for this interpretation is posed by cases like KUB XXX 41 V 4-5: *iškarubit šammûpit/ 2-ŠU šer Ėnzi.* Compare also ibid. V 15-16 *iškarubit šammûpit/ enda Ėnzi* with a different preverb. The cupbearer can hardly be offering wine with an empty vessel.

The key to understanding *iškarubit šer Ėnzi* is KUB I 17 I 6-8:
(Monthly Festival/CTH 591):

\textbf{Lukal-uš} \textit{kumari/} \textit{šer-énsi/} GESHTIN-an-ken \textit{lêhûnum}

'The king libates into a bowl. He (the cupbearer) holds (it) up with an \textit{išgarub}. The wine is poured into (it).'

For pouring a libation into a bowl see \textbf{KBo XVII} 74 III 9f. (Neu, \textbf{StBoT} 12, 24f). Compare also \textbf{KBo XI} 28 II 9 (and passim): ...\textit{akumansı išgarubi-ken lêhûnum} and \textbf{KUB} X 99 I 14-17. In our formula the cupbearer holds up the bowl by means of an \textit{išgarub}-vessel. The use of the \textit{išgarub} to support the bowl explains why the former is usually empty, although according to examples like \textbf{KUB} XXV 1 V 20-21 cited above, it could also be (filled) with wine (on the apparent adnominal use of the instrumental in cases like \textit{išgarubit GESHTIN-it} see below p. 254f). I readily grant that the entire procedure outlined seems inordinately complex. One does not libate onto the ground, but into a bowl. The latter may be held up by another container, which may be either empty or filled with liquid.

Nevertheless, this seems to be the sense demanded by the overall use of \textit{išgarubit šer-énsi}, and Hittite ritual practice is very highly developed. If the usual derivation of \textit{išgarub}- from \textit{iškar}- 'stick' and its interpretation as a pointed vessel which may be stuck in the ground are correct, it also makes sense that the \textit{išgarub}- is the usual vessel used for supporting another. It is not, however, the only one: \textit{cf. VEpT} 3 VI 4.17 [\textbf{LU}]SILÂŠU.DI.U.A-ŁA
zelbêit êr êpzi 'the cupbearer holds (it) up with a zelbêit'.
Here also belongs the instance with an ablative, KUB X 40 IV 11-12:
zalhavaz êr êpzi. Compare also KUB XLIV 37 IV 4-5:

\[
\text{LUKAL SAL LUKAL TUG-ak } \text{Zaba } [\text{akuwazi}] / \text{išgarub-kan}
\]
\[
\text{UL lEH-Du[system]}
\]
'The king and queen, seated, drink (to) Zabata. It is not
poured into an išgarub.'

Before leaving the matter of išgarubit, I must also cite
the following variant:

KUB II 3 I 27-29 (KL.LAH Festival/CTh 627):

\[
\text{LUKAL-ak ku} \text{ppuri ki} \text{inzi SAL LUG[AL]-me UL/ išgarub RI[U]}
\]
\[
\text{anda } ūnzi
\]
'The king libates into a bowl, but the queen (does) not. He
(the cupbearer) holds an empty išgarub up to (the bowl).'

In view of the other examples we have seen, I interpret this
passage also to mean that the cupbearer supports the bowl with
the empty išgarub, despite the use of the accusative instead of
the instrumental. We have already seen the use of anda instead
of ūn. For anda meaning 'up to/against' compare KUB XXXV 148
III 14: n-an-ši-na anda ZAG-šu ūnzi 'I hold it (the puppy) up to
him (the victim) on the right'.

II. Instrumental of Accompaniment

We have seen above in Sec. 1.2 that the instrumental may express accompaniment in various guises. A few more examples are available in Middle and Neo-Hittite manuscripts of Old Hittite texts.

One set of examples deals with musical accompaniment:

KUB XXX 24 II 9-10 (Funeral Rites/HTR 60):

(118) ŁU MĀR GIŠ ḫunzinarit/ SĪR RU

'The singer sings to the accompaniment of a ḫunzinaris.'

Similar are KUB XI 35 V 11 GIŠ ḫuhupalit SĪR RU and KBo XI 30 VI 17 GI GĪD-īt SĪR RU]. Evidence that these examples mean 'sing accompanied by X' and not 'perform with/play X' is furnished by KBo X 24 IV 16-18: GIŠ arkanamī παλελτείρι/ παλκαναικαν/ SĪR RU-ns ÜL 'They beat the arkanamī and the π., but they do not sing'. Friedrich's meaning '(Instrument) spielen' for SĪR RU,

Hwb 292, is to be stricken (cf. Gütterbock, CAD sub samēnu 4).

One or more of a series of objects of a transitive verb may stand in the instrumental:

KUB XXXIII 62 II 8-11 (CTh 330):

(119) aššuli TI-anī imnaraqunni ḫattulanni/ NU.A TIA GĪD DA

EGIR.UM DIQIR.MES-naš ḫ Serious DIQIR.MES-naš mitummit
<terne/PÉI>/ kerdinivatten-me arba terne

'To the master and mistress of the house and the sons and daughters give/send amid prosperity, life, vigor and health long future years along with the love and favor of the gods. But let go of (your) anger.'

The restoration of the verb is based not only on the contrast with kerdinivatten-me, but also on the same text II 17-20, where at the end of the same list of blessings there is room only for a positive imperative verb, not the added phrase about releasing anger. There is considerable freedom as to which of a set of objects are expressed as directive objects in the accusative and which as 'accompanying' objects in the instrumental. See below pp. 302, 333-334.

A different case is $190$ of the Laws:

KUB XXIX 34,11 (Laws/HG $190$):

(120) taldru-šan akkantit T?-enzi LÚ(-me SÁN-TUN UL harēter)

'If they live/coexist with a dead person—(provided it is) a man and a woman—there is no offense.'

The duplicate KBo VI 26 III 29 apparently has GEDIN-it (see Guterbock, JCS 15,72). The general sense of necrophilia seems clear, and the instrumental is surely comitative. The difficulty lies in the verb. The usual reading is tiarzi 'they step', and 'step together with' > 'consort with' cannot be excluded. But
given ḫī-enza as a spelling for huišwenzə two lines later in KBo VI 26 III 31, I wonder if we should understand ḫī-enza = huišwenzə instead. The translation 'live with' sounds like an egregious Anglicism (huiX- does not mean 'dwell'), but it is not necessary to impute this sense to the verb here either. The meaning 'be alive', in direct contrast to akkent- 'dead', fits just as well. In fact, the distinction between 'dead' and 'alive' seems to be the only unifying factor between the two halves of this paragraph.

Finally, there is KBo XII 126 I 20 (R. of ḪIT/TH 2,22):

(121) n-an baššannit dēu

'Let it (the evil spell) take him/her along with his/her family.'

III. Instrumental of Respect

We have seen above several examples of ablatives of respect. I believe there is one example in an Old Hittite text of the instrumental in the same function:

VBoT 58 IV 4-6 (Disappearance of the Sun/RHA 77,85 trs.):

[x-x-t/š]alit abhæti ḫ-et UL dehbun ZIG-nit-e/ [UL] abhæti n-anu da[bb]an DELGIR.ES-an uddær n-e-zzæn [.../...]kubhebbun

'I was hot in my left (hand), so I did not take them. But in my right (hand) I was [not] hot, so I did take them, the words
of the gods, and I sprinkled them on [ ]'.

The readings (but not the restoration of ḫ-UL) are those of Laroche, RHA 77(1965)85. Note that these are based on a new collation of the original (ibid. 81). Keu, StBot 5(1968)3, ventures UL-bati as an error for ḫ-UL-bati = alwansabbati 'was bewitched'. Besides the necessity of assuming an error, this interpretation has two further points against it: (1) when a stem in -ahh- is written with an ideogram, one typically finds either no trace of the stem or the full -ahh-, not just -h-; (2) the interpretation of the instrumentals as indicating direction 'to the left/right' is without parallels for nouns and adjectives (the case of ḫ- is another matter).

On the other hand, sabbati as first singular preterite middle to ẖ- 'be warm/hot' is quite regular (for the lack of scriptio plena see Keu, StBot 5(1968)1). For the sense of the passage compare in the same text I 24: [kh]āt-ta-wa ammel tueesāt-mes a-a-en-ta 'Look, my limbs are hot'. It is true that the speakers are different in the two instances: in the first the Storm-god, in the second the d+WAN, but the idea is the same. The malady is brought on by the disappearance of the Sun-god. By restoration of UL in IV 5 is based on the following understanding of the context. The 'heat' afflicted the left hand of the d+WAN, so she could not pick up the gods' words, but her right hand was not
affected (i.e., ZAG-nit-e with non-syllabic -e), so she could use that hand. The instrumentals specify the part of the body involved; literally 'with respect to the left/right hand'.

Note in passing that according to both the autograph and Laroche's collation the sign before -li-it is not GUL, but either TA or SA, which would give us one more syllable of the word for 'left'.

IV. Instrumental of Agent

Neo-Hittite copies of Old Hittite texts offer one certain and one likely example of an instrumental indicating the agent:

**KBo XXII 6 I 24-25 (Šar tempari/İBOG 101,19):**

(123) GIS.TUKUL.ḪA-iE-va-t[i]/kiunit pivanteš

'Weapons (have been) given to you by the god.'

**KBo X 20 II 39 (AN.TAH.ŠUL sar Festival/İBH 604):**

(124) KIŠI.DUḪAM-LIH kišen hanttattat

'Thus (it) was determined/ordained by the god.'

The only reason for doubt about the second example is the fact that hant-ta in the middle is used to mean 'is determined oracularly by means of X' (see p. 232 above on ariva- and Knu, StBoT 5(1968) 42). Therefore one could also read the instrumental as expressing means: 'It was thus determined through (consulting) the god'.36
V. Pronominal Instrumental Used for the Ablative

In Middle and Neo-Hittite copies of Old Hittite texts the ablative ἀπο is usually used for 'on/toward this side', but a couple of instances of the instrumental ἐπι are attested (cf. above p. 169 ff):

KUB XXXII 117+ Rs II 12-13 (Palaic Hymn and Ritual/UTH 752):
(125) ἐπ[α]|πι ἐπι a ἐπι/ dEI

'...places on both this and the other side of the sacrificial tables.'

See also p. 205 above on KUB I 16 III 14.

One also finds a few more examples of the instrumental enclitic possessive with nouns in the ablative: KUB XVII 10 III 10 (N.H. ms.) tuqras-ἐπι, XXVIII 98 III 5 [LUGAL]-wāš tapušas-ἀπι, XXXI 127+ I 59 ZAG-as-ἀπι, ibid. I 65-67 ZAG-as-ἀπι...GUR-las-ἀπι (//XXVI 75 II 2f (N.H. ms.) and KBO XXII 75,1f), KBO VI 3 IV 28 (N.H. ms.?) ἀρμυρων-ἀπι.

VI. Adverbial Instrumentals

Once again, I use 'adverbial' as a cover term for uses of the instrumental whose meaning is clear, but whose relationship to the functions described above is less so.

KUB XXXIV 17 Rs 7 has pendingit maus̄i 'will fall en masse'.

The subject is missing, but a collective is more likely than a
singular. On the probable development of the adverb nanzanit from a comitative use of the instrumental see above pp. 164-165.

Most of the remaining instances of 'adverbial' use of the instrumental involve ZI-it (jētansanit), literally 'by/with the soul/mind'. One set of examples consists of ZI-it alone in prohibitions: KUB XXXI 115,13 ARÂ-EN ZI-it 181, XXXI 103,20 [ZI-it baluki 181, ibid. 24 arâ-EM ZI-it 181]. Unfortunately, all of these occurrences are fragmentary, but later examples (see p. 303) show that the sense is: 'on one's own (authority), autonomously'. See also the instance of an ablative ZI-zemâ in the same meaning (p. 219 above). For an indication that this usage is derived from an original comitative use see below p. 336.

Somewhat different is ZI-it with a qualifying adjective:

KUB XIII 4 III 78 (Instr. for Priests/Sturt. Chrest. 160-162);
(126) men šekrantit-ta ZI-it nere däi

'But if he postpones it (the washing) with a knowing mind...'

Here the instrumental expresses manner: 'knowingly'. A similar interpretation fits KUB XXX 10 Vs 24,27 (Kantussili/ANET 3 400 trl.):

[(šinun-e)-nu-se ammel DINGIR-YA ŠÀ-ŠÜ ZI-ŠÜ hûmantet kardit]
(127) 
KInnaddu

'But now let my god open his body and soul to me with all his heart.'
ŠA is here surely standing for karat(t)-, which properly is 'inwards' (as opposed to tukku- 'the visible body; (pl.) limbs'. One could interpret humentet kardit as an accompanying object: 'together with his whole heart', but the phrase seems rather to describe manner: 'whole-heartedly' (Gootze, ANET 400 translates 'freely').

Old Hittite mythical texts show yet another use of ŠI-it:

KUB XVII 10 II 23-24 (Telipinu/RHA 77,93; K.H. ms.):

BULUC BAPPIR ŠI-it mekkun takšant[ar(ri)] ŠA Telipinu/ ŠI-[JA

(128)

ŠA DULU.LUL.LU ḫIRŠ uδdanaš CATANTA takšanza ŠA[stu]

'As the malt and "beer-spice" are joined in their "soul", so too may your, Telipinu's, soul be joined to the words of men.'

KUB XXXIII 5 III 8-10 (Telipinu/RHA 77,102; K.H. ms.):

mu BULUC BAPPIR-ŠI-[e] / [mekka(n iš)ten]zanit takšendari nu-šmeš/

(129)

[ištanzaniš] caraz-šiš l-iš kisari

'As the malt and "beer-spice" are joined in their "soul", and their "soul" and body become one.'

Neu, StBoT 5(1968)161, quite properly translates ištanzanit here as 'in Wesen'. The instrumental answers the question 'how?', but one could argue for various functions: means, respect or manner.
VII. Adnominal Instrumental

The clearest example of this usage is KUB II 5 V 2-3
(AU.TAH.SAR Festival/CTH 612):

(130) ta LÍ SIIÀ.SU.DU₃.LI₃.A GAL KUBABBAR/GEŠTIN-it LUGAL-i be₁

'The cupbearer gives a silver cup with wine to the king.'

See also KUB XXV 1 VI 4 [GAL] GUŠTIN GEŠTIN-it, XI 34 III 7-8
2 DUG tabal₁/ tāuwalit, and probably also KBo III 34 II 1-2
DUG herberen GEŠTIN-it, where the duplicate KBo III 36 Vs 11 has
DUG herberen GEštin 'a h₃ of wine'. Since this use is confined to
vessels and liquids, derivation from X Y-it EMwanti- 'an X filled
with Y' is certain diachronically, and very likely synchronically
as well. There do seem to be enough cases to show that the usage
is a syntactic reality, not merely an accidental omission of EMwanti-.

VIII. Instrumental of Separation

Middle and Neo-Hittite copies of Old Hittite texts show a
handful of instances where the instrumental marks separation:

KBo X 2 III 16-19 (Hatt. I Annals/StClor 14, 52):

(131) n-ax-ken šabašnit luzzi₂t/ arawahḥun

'I freed them from h₃ and l₁.'

KUB XIII 4 II 16 (Instr. for Priests/Sturt. Chrest. 152):

(132) [ ]KAŠU-it pārm SUD-attenn
'you pull from (the god's) mouth...'

The duplicate \textit{KUB} XIII 5 II 26 also has an instrumental, but compare \textit{KUB} XIII 4 IV 71 \textit{Kur-er...pari \textit{litiraxen}.}

\textit{FBo} IV 2 I 59-60 (R. of Huwarlu/Surache 8,91):
\textit{Lugal sala sala/ \textit{c-ir \textit{h}alki\textit{x} ballarit uddanez}
\textit{Qatanna} bu\textit{u-nuddu}

'May this grain so preserve the king and queen and this house from the malicious word.'

\textit{KUB} XXIII 34 Vs 3 probably has another instance: \textit{Ishit-er-\textit{bi}-\textit{kan}}
\textit{Savar.la-\textit{u}-\textit{da-\textit{q}-}} 'take/took the dust from his mouth'. It seems proper to point out in passing that the three larger manuscripts showing this usage are all thoroughly modernized versions of old texts (see the descriptions in Chap. 1, Sec. 2.3 above).

\textbf{IX. Problematic Cases}

Several instances of the instrumental remain problematic in their interpretation, despite a reasonably complete context:

\textit{KUB} XXIII 52 II 7 (Inara/\textit{IKA} 77,148):
\textit{\textit{E-an nhta} Gis\textit{ukr-it gir-it dem}}

'He took fright at him (and) took (up) (?) his spear and knife.'

The context suggests that the subject picked up his weapons to defend himself. Why we have an instrumental instead of an
accusative I cannot say.

\[ \text{KUB XXI 127+XXXVI 79a IV 21-23 (Sun Hymn/CTE 372):} \]
\[ [\text{mu-ut-te hi-i mu-[ki]-[i]-[i]-n][a]-[ro]-[ro].-s/] \text{ud-[a-e-ar} \]
\[ (135) \text{DILILUR-YA e-lu-na-[a]-[a]-te-na-za/ na-[a]-[a]-[a]-en ŠAl-it} \]
\[ na-ar-[a]-nu-ud-du \]

'May these words of the supplication, oh my god, soothe you in your heart as with cool (?) water.'

The autograph has e-x na-[a]- in line 22, and Laroche, BSL 58(1963) 61-62, takes na- as the beginning of a new sentence: 'qu'il fasse suinter son coeur comme par de l'eau'. This is impossible syntactically (ŠAl-it cannot be a direct object) and out of place contextually. It also fails to account for the plural [warš]namu\(\text{nu}\) in the duplicate K\(\text{Bo XIV 74 IV 1}\) (unknown to Laroche).

The alternate interpretation offered above is an attempt to make some sense out of the signs in the autograph in the context of a prayer. For the position of the genitive mukša\(\text{na}\) compare K\(\text{Bo III I II 47:} \) ki-[a]-Ušna\(\text{a}\) utter. For warš\(\text{nu}\)- 'soothe' see the Hymn to Adad, K\(\text{Bo III 21 III 12-13}\) (and passim): \(\text{Iššur-eš} \)
\[ \text{kir-tit[t]a] minu\text{ndu lišši-ma-cta/ warašnu\text{ndo} u\text{t} 'Let them pacify your, the Storm-god's, heart, but let them soothe your liver'.} \]

In our passage, instead of 'heart' as the direct object, we find ŠAl-it, which may be interpreted as an instrumental of respect.

The reading and interpretation of e-ku-na- are quite uncertain.
A form of ḫunu- 'cold, cool' fits the context, but ḫunu- veṭeno is difficult. One expects ḫunu- veṭenaz. Perhaps one may compare ḫBo XX 107+XIII 50 III 26 ḫraḥzenk ḫaṃatαι KUR-yez 'from all the surrounding lands'. The plural ḫrubānuwanda in the duplicate would in this interpretation be either a constructio ad sensum with ḫudē or point to an animatised ḫuddantez as subject, which would be quite in order.

Other difficult passages with the instrumental are bound up with problems of vocabulary. ḫBo IV 2 I 4 has [ ... ḫ ] 4 MUŠEN ḫartāmīn ḫa ḫalūkwa, which is hard to explain with either ḫakurava- 'see, look' or ḫakurva- 'store up'. ḫBo XIX 128 IV 7 shows ḫe-nu-ut-ti-it which looks like an instrumental adverb, but both form and meaning are unclear. In KUR XII 63+ Vs 16 we find melulit ḫetervendan 'x-ed with/by flesh(?). The function of the instrumental depends on the interpretation of ḫetervendan which to my knowledge is hapax. ḫBo XI 36 V 10 has another instance of ḫINDA ḫekharit, on which see p. 171 above.

The usage of the instrumental in Middle and Neo-Hittite manuscripts of Old Hittite texts may be summarized as follows:

I. Instrumental of Means

II. Instrumental of Accompaniment

III. Instrumental of Respect

IV. Instrumental of Agent

V. Pronominal Instrumental Used for the Ablative
VI. Adverbial Instrumentals

VII. Adnominal Instrumental

VIII. Instrumental of Separation

Of these uses only three are attested in Old Hittite manuscripts: instrumental of means, instrumental of accompaniment and the pronominal instrumental used for the ablative. Attribution of the others to Old Hittite must await an examination of the instrumental in later texts.
Section 3. Excursus—The Pronominal Ending -et/-it

In Sections 1 and 2 above I have interpreted forms like ket in ket ID-az and -set in karhwentaz-set as instrumentals standing for ablatives in pronouns which had not yet developed ablative forms. This may be termed the 'traditional' view (at least for the enclitic possessives), as set forth by Friedrich, HE I²(1960) §218c, and Kamenhuber, HAO 205. This interpretation has been challenged by Friedrich himself, Fest. Eilers (1967)72-73, and by Houwink ten Cate, NIA 24(1966)123-132. Friedrich cites several examples of enclitic possessives in -et/-it with cases other than the ablative and instrumental:

Vocative:

KBo III 34 I 22 (Palace Chronicle/CTH 8):

URU. "Karmasšu, du.UU-PT! . 'Thus (spoke) S.: "Your Majesty..."'

KBo XI 14 II 4 (R. of Hantitashu/CTH 395):

d.UU-UM EN-nit 'Sun-god, my lord'

Dative-Locative:

KBo X 2 I 45,III 10 (Hatt. I Annals/StClor 14,46 and 52):

URU. Hattuši URU-ri-mit 'to Hattusa, my city'

KBo III 13 Rs 15 (Harran-Sin/ZA 44,272):

[ ]x-ante beltanibli-mit 'on/to my ___ shoulder'

Friedrich also recalls the use of possessives in -et/-it with the neuter nom.-acc. plural (e.g. ELEKUŠU-ŠET 'their eyes') and
combinations like *umpy-an-net 'behind me', niran-tet 'before you'. He concludes that we have an 'uninflected' form in -t which is used without regard to gender, number and case.

Houwink ten Cate cites only examples of -et/-it with the dative-locative, adding a couple of passages omitted by Friedrich: 39

KBo III 29 I 5 (Palace Chronicle/OTH 9):
kišširi-mi[t] 'in my hand'

KUB XXXI 110 II 8 (OTH 39):
msur-šnāt 'in their/your watchtower'

Houwink also points to kēt 16-az and on the basis of the opposite member edī 16-as argues for a locative function in kēt. Also of importance is kumānit, an extended form of kumāni 'where'. Note especially KBo XII 18 Vs 5 kumānit UD-at 'on the day when'. Houwink identifies this ending -t (/d/) with the stem formative in oblique pronominal forms like amēk-anī and amēk-as. He concludes that the adverbial ending -ā was once an all-purpose local marker, with locatival, ablative and instrumental functions. In a following article Josephson, RHA 24(1966)133f, discusses the prehistory of this adverbial ending -ā at some length. Several of the points he raises will be discussed shortly.

The evidence for a 'local adverbial' ending -et/-it (originally -t) breaks down into four groups:

(1) The use of enclitic possessives in -et/-it with various cases, not just the ablative and instrumental.
(2) köt/kit in köt ID-on and kitkar.
(3) Enclitic possessives in -it/-et with postpositions.
(4) kuwenit.

The validity of these four types of evidence will now be discussed in the given order.

The use of enclitic possessives in -et/-it with cases like the dative-locative is inadmissible as evidence for an adverbial ending -(e)t. As already observed by Otten, StBoT 17(1973)55, the indiscriminate use of possessives in -et/-it is confined to late copies of Old Hittite texts. It is not found in Old Hittite manuscripts. Furthermore, the use of possessives in -et/-it is not limited to the dative-locative and vocative:

**KBo III 38 Rs 31 (Zalpa/StBoT 17,12):**

Ik-za LUGAL-uš-(š)met 'I shall be your king.'

Compare the duplicate **KBo XXII 2 Rs 15 (O.H. ms.): LUGAL-uš-(š)miš.**

**KUB XII 23 II 21.24 (CTh 458):**

išt(a)nənaš-(š):it karazam-(š)miš-a 'their soul and their insides'

Compare ibid. II 23 correct ištənənaš-(š)miš.

The example from the Zalpa text is especially instructive:

the Old Hittite manuscript has the correct form of the possessive, while the later copy has mistakenly substituted the form in -et.
Everything points to the conclusion of Otten, loc. cit.: 'Man hat den Eindruck, daß hier -mit, -hit, -mitt als Possessiva verwandt worden sind zu einer Zeit, wo dieses enklitische Pronomen in seiner Flexion nicht mehr sprachlebendig war'. The gross errors in the use of the enclitic possessives in ḫīt XXII 6 (Sar. tanbāri/ ḫīt 101,15f) lead to the same conclusion. In ḫīt XXII 6 IV 14 and 20 we find 𒂵𒂵𒂵-et/sit, but in I 10 udderhi-mit is used where the context demands udder-het! While the same text shows other errors with the enclitic possessives, it is true that most often it is the form in -et/-it which is substituted for the correct form. This is probably not an accident. On the basis of correct Old Hittite usages like 𒂦𒂵𒂵-net and 𒂵𒂵𒂵𒂵𒂵-ṣet, the rules for which were unknown to the Neo Hittite scribe, the latter could easily have inferred that the possessive in -ot/-it was indeed an all-purpose form employable with any case. Nothing suggests, however, that this all-purpose use existed in Old Hittite (or for that matter in the living usage of Neo-Hittite).

The second piece of evidence cited for an adverbial ending -(e)t with a local function is kēt in both kēt ḫēt-as and kitkar.

The first point to be made is that kēt never means 'here, in this place' in a true locative sense (this function is filled by kā). In phrases like kēt ḫēt-as, kēt does not indicate absolute location, but rather relative position or direction (see above p. 154). The latter function is always expressed in the Hittite noun by the
ablati ve. The replacement of ket by kes in the directional
function confirms that ket is standing for an ablative. This
is further supported by kitmatelaz 'from this moment on', where
the function of ket is unarguably ablatival. Since the distri-
bution of ket versus kes shows that ket is the older form, we
are justified in equating the ablatival use of ket with the use
of enclitic possessives in -et/-it with nouns in the ablative;
the instrumental is used suppletively for the ablative where no
ablative form exists.

All those who have attributed a locative function to ket
in the phrase ket in az have supported their contention by pointing
to the contrasting eda in az (see Houwink ten Cate, op. cit. 126,
Josephson, op. cit. 133, see, SIEBA 16(1974)71, note 107, and
already Sommer, UB 142). However, a close look at the use of
eda shows that it never means 'there, in that place'. In all
but one of its attestations, eda is used non-attributively, but
in none of these examples is its function locative! In one case
it must be interpreted ablatively, in the others it may be:

KUB XXXI 4 + KBo III 41 Vc 13 (CTH 16):

(136) HURSAG-an tarmaen i-aata eda natta neari

'I nail down the mountain, and it does not budge from its
place.' (lit. 'turn from there')

KBo VI 26 II 3-8 (Laws/KG §171):

takru anna'" TUG-SE DULI.HTA-zi eda nei mu-za-kan
'If a mother turns around her garment in the face of her son, she throws her son out (of the house). If her son returns, takes her door and turns it around, and turns them around and puts them back (in their place), then she makes her son again her son.'

KUB I 16 III 41 (باب 12):

(138) [عدلکار-کت بیل دانال-شی ژی ناير]

'Did not his sons turn his words from their place?' (i.e. 'twist, falsify')

One notices at once that in all these examples we have ژی + ناير- 'turn'. In the first case both the ablative function (place from which) and the sense 'from its accustomed/proper place' are clear for ژی. This meaning is also apt for the paragraph from the Laws. The mother symbolizes her rejection of her son by turning her dress from its usual place, i.e. by turning it around so that the back is in front and vice-versa. If the son wishes to regain his status, he must undo the symbolic act by taking various parts of the house and turning them around. The overall context of the passage from باب is not clear, and the sentence may not be
complete as given. Again, however, the sense 'turn from their proper place' seems appropriate for edı nakt-. The use of a formal dative-locative edı to express place from which is not startling, when we recall the other examples of the dative-locative in the same function (see p. 188f). Since there are no instances of the ablative etez in Old Hittite, the use of edı in an ablative function may be regarded as suppletive, like that of köt for kéz. Since edı in edı fn-az is functioning as an ablative, it offers no support for a locatival interpretation of köt.

Josephson, RHA 24(1966)135, and Jasnow, NKS 31(1972)125-126, cite kitkar(za) as an example of the 'adverbial' use of köt. But neither explains the function of an adverb from the pronoun 'this' in a combination which means 'at the head of _'. On the other hand, if kit is interpreted in a directional sense 'on this side (at the head)' as opposed to 'on this side (on the right)' and 'on this side (on the left)', then the appearance of kit in kitkar is natural (see above p. 205f). Once again, the function of köt is that of an ablative, not a locative. In sum, there is no positive evidence that köt functions as anything but an ablative.

The use of enclitic possessives in -ät/-it with postpositions like apa:n and noren may also be explained without recourse to a general adverbial ending -(e)t. Neu, STHET 18(1974)68-69, interprets apa:n, noren and katten as old accusatives of direction from a-stem.
substantives. Thus LUGAL-waḫ nēran would originally have been '(zur) Vorderseite des Königs (hin)', and nēran-tet would have been the regular corresponding pronominal form. Eventually, the substantive force of nēran, etc. was lost, and a sort of 'Gliederungsverschiebung' took place, the genitive collocation being replaced by an apposition of noun in the dative-locative and adverb: LUGAL-i nēran 'beim König vorn'. Thus according to Neu's analysis, nēran etc. were never genuine postpositions.

This explanation is not without difficulties. First of all, as noted by Josephson, op. cit. 134, the substantive origin of forms like nēran, āppan and kattan is unproven. In the case of at least āppan and kattan the interpretation as accusatives of direction is also problematic, since they seem to be essentially locative in function. Finally, the change from LUGAL-waḫ nēran to LUGAL-i nēran is not well motivated.

There is an alternative solution. In the first place, the construction of a dative-locative and an adverb seems to have existed already in Old Hittite beside that with a genitive:

KBo XVII 1 II 16-18 (R. for King and Queen/stab 8, 26):

\[\text{NUSU.NI-} \text{nēren N[UGAL-sê]AL,N[UGAL-esê]-a Kêr-kamet i-[GÜ]}\]

(139) DÜÜ. E.GAL waḫnu[zi u]la-a-kamal-ḫan ERHU.PES-an li[i]

\[\text{i-}\text{SU waḫnu[i]}\]

'The palace official brandishes the eagle over the king and
queen three times, but I brandish the troops over them three times.'

ibid. I 31 (StBoT 8,20):

(140) ḫēr-šmet-a [G]IR ZABAR kitte
'A bronze dagger is placed over them.'

ibid. II 19-20 (StBoT 8,26):

(141) [ḪEŠIŠ]-ti-ma-tēšan ḫēr GĪR ZABAR V/ kitte
'A bronze dagger is placed over the troops.'

These examples show that the genitive and dative-locative constructions are both possible with nouns and pronouns.43

For other examples of the dative-locative type in Old Hittite manuscripts see KBo XVII 28,10 LUGAL-i piren and KBo XXII 2 vs 13-14 karti-šmi piren.

Neu's explanation assumes that of the two types that with the genitive is older. However, evidence both within Hittite and in other old Indo-European languages suggests that the forms which develop into proverbs and pre- and postpositions were originally adverbs which were not strictly 'construed' with either nouns or verbs. Let us assume for the moment that the 'construction' with the dative-locative is the older. What then is the source for the genitive type?

There is one example of a 'postposition' with the genitive which is clearly of substantival origin: tennušma 'to the side of, beside', originally the ablative of a noun tennu(wa)š- 'rib, side,
flank'. As already described, tanušza appears to be used with both the genitive and dative-locative in Old Hittite manuscripts: KBo XX 12 I 1 LUGAL-waš tanušza but KBo XVII 48 IV 3 [x]-x-ni tanušza.

In this case the genitive construction is surely older: 'to the side of the king'. However, when this expression became a set phrase 'beside the king', it could be assimilated to the already existing pattern LUGAL-i pēran 'before the king' (lit. probably 'in front, with respect to the king'). Once either LUGAL-waš tanušza or LUGAL-i tanušza was possible, the genitive type could spread to the preverbs: LUGAL-waš pēran and correspondingly pēran-šet. One objection to this explanation could be the orthography of the -et/-it endings in the Old Hittite manuscripts of the Ritual for the King and Queen (see Otten-Souček, StBoT 8(1969)72):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nom.-Acc.</th>
<th>Adverb</th>
<th>Instr.-Abl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-et</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-it</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These statistics argue that the ending of the nom.-acc. neuter and that of the instrumental are distinct (one more argument against a general adverbial ending -et/it!). They also suggest that the form used with adverbs is that of the nom.-acc. neuter, which supports Neu's interpretation. However, if one extends the scope of inquiry to other Old Hittite manuscripts, the picture is slightly
different:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nom.-Acc. Nt.</th>
<th>Adverbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-et</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-it</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The spelling -et is confirmed as normal for the nom.-acc. neuter, but the spelling with adverbs is less clear. Unfortunately, there are no further examples of the instrumental. Since nēran, nēru, kattōn and nēr are formally comparable to neutron like ēran and "nēr (s-in), the use of -et as well as -it with adverbs would not be surprising even if the genitive usage was modeled after that with ablatives like tamūza. I do not insist on either this explanation of the type nēran-ēket or the account of ënu. However, both of these analyses seem at least as well motivated as the assumption that the usage of possessives in -et/-it with adverbs reflects a local adverbial ending -(e)št.

As to the form kuwapit, there is no disputing its locative function: it means 'where, when'. However, the base from which it is derived, kuwapi, already means 'where, when'. In fact, kuwapi and kuwapit appear to be interchangeable. Note the example of Houwink ten Cate, op. cit. 127: KUB VII 5 I 15 kuwapit-an imma kuwapi 'wherever you may be'. Beside the above mentioned kuwapit UD-at (KUB XII 18 Vs 5) stands kuwapi UD-at (KUB XIII 3 II 14).

This makes the status of kuwapit rather different from that of ket,
where according to the 'local adverb' explanation, it is the -t which marks the form as locative. Houwink ten Cate, op. cit. 125, mentions Palaic nít 'not', an extended form of ni 'not'. This case does seem comparable to that of kuwanit. There is no evidence, however, that the -t in these forms has any local force.

In sum, the evidence for a 'local' adverbial ending -(e)t will not stand close scrutiny. The use of possessives in -et/-it with the dative-locative, vocative, etc. is linguistically unreal; kêt does have local force, but it is always ablatival; the use of possessives in -et/-it with adverbs like pêran adris of several explanations; the -t of kuwanit has not been shown to have any local force.

In arguing positively for the interpretation of kêt and the possessives in -et/-it with nouns in the ablative as instrumentals, I must necessarily anticipate the conclusions of the study of later texts. As will be shown below, during the historical period of Hittite the ablative gradually spread at the expense of the instrumental, eventually taking over all functions of the latter. By late Neo-Hittite, the status of the instrumental is comparable to that of the enclitic possessive pronouns. Therefore when we see kêt being replaced by kéz, it is reasonable to assume that we are seeing part of the same overall process of replacement of the instrumental by the ablative. Furthermore, while kêt/kêt is not attested
with an instrumental function (only the longer form kēdanda), apit is so used in KUB XIV 13 I 49 (Plague Prayer of Mursili). Since the instrumental in Neo-Hittite is a moribund category, and the ablative is the productive usage to express means, the use of apit in this function can hardly be an innovation. The lack of both kit and apit in Old Hittite texts to express means is not unduly disturbing. We have effectively only two instances each of the longer forms kēdanda and apēdanda.
Section 4. Conclusions and Unresolved Questions

Final conclusions about the use of the ablative and instrumental in Old Hittite must await an examination of later texts, but several facts are already clear from the preceding survey. First, it is striking that in Old Hittite manuscripts there is no functional overlap between ablative and instrumental. The ablative is used to express separation and direction. The sparsely attested perative ablative and ablative of origin may also be derived from the basic sense of the ablative: place from which. The instrumental in Old Hittite manuscripts expresses means and accompaniment. The use of the instrumental for the ablative in pronouns is not a matter of functional overlay, but of formal suppletion. The use of edi shows that not only the instrumental but also the dative-locative may stand for the ablative in stems which do not have ablativeal forms.

When we turn to later copies of Old Hittite texts, we do indeed find both the ablative and instrumental in the same function. The ablative is used in essentially instrumental functions (means, accompaniment), and the instrumental is found expressing separation. It is noteworthy, however, that the ablative of means is far more common than the instrumental of separation. We have attested both instrumental and ablative of 'respect' and both cases marking the agent of a passive verb. It cannot be determined on the basis of Old Hittite texts to which case these usages properly belong. For
the answer to this question and others we must turn to Middle and Neo-Hittite texts.
NOTES

1 All passages quoted in full are cited after the cuneiform edition. In addition, I have given the conventional title of the text, if one exists, or an English version of the rubric in Laroche, CTH. This is followed by a reference to a translation and/or transcription in those cases where I am aware that one is available.

Since the primary interest here is in syntax, I have according to common practice used a 'broad' transcription for most examples, the hyphen indicating a morpheme boundary. Such a transcription inevitably involves a certain degree of interpretation, most notably in the treatment of graphic i and u as vowels or glides and in the reading of sequences -Ci-e- as /Ce/ or /Ciye/. These choices do not affect the issues treated here (unless specially noted), but the reader is asked not to draw conclusions about other matters based on the spellings given here without checking the actual attestations.

2 Since the ablative of separation is extremely common, it has seemed useful to subdivide the attestations into several large classes. The grouping according to intransitive and transitive motion verbs and verbs of separation does not purport to be the only possible means of subcategorization, and one could debate the assignment of individual verbs to the above classes. Nor do I mean
to imply that the ablative necessarily 'depends on' the verbs listed. The ablative of separation in Hittite may be used with virtually any predicate, given an appropriate context. Nevertheless, the ablative of separation is most frequent with certain semantic classes of verbs, and it seems a natural procedure to organize the material according to these classes.

3 This and other lists of attestations for Old Hittite manuscripts are intended to be complete. I have listed accompanying preverbs and sentence particles, but only in those instances where they are actually attested in the manuscripts. I have made no attempt to restore either preverbs or particles. The reader is therefore warned not to draw immediate conclusions from the absence of either preverb or particle in a specific passage, without looking to see if the context is complete.

4 In all these cases read */ats-ṣmīd/ 'from their...'.

5 The spelling -za for the ablative ending is attested nowhere else in Old Hittite manuscripts (see Chap. 5, Sec. 1.2). I thus interpret KASKAL-za as KASKAL-ṣ-z, i.e. paliṣaz + non-geminative -ṣ; 'but from the road/campaign' (see Chap. 5, note 4).

6 The interpretation of ḥubmili- as 'nurturing' (lit. 'suckling') is based on the apparent equation of GI ḥubmiliš and GI A.DA.GUR 'drinking straw' (cf. KUB IX 28 III 24 = KBO XIX 132 Rs 11 with HT 1 I 37f). The basic meaning of ḥubmili- would be 'that which suckles', and ḥubmiliš daganzipaš would represent the Hittite
equivalent of Lat. *alma terra* (e.g. Lucr. 2.992). One may analyze Šubmili- as *suh₂-m-ili- (< IE *seuh₂- 'suck') with the adjectival suffix -ili- (cf. Hattuš-ili-, karu-ili-). The -a- could reflect a *suh₂-na- 'suckling' parallel to the *almo- 'nourishing' of almus.  

7 This is one of several examples which show that the original function of non-geminating -a was emphasizing, or better topicalizing, not adversative. The adversative sense developed from the frequent use of -a to mark a change of subject. See p. 228.  

8 Attested as URU Za-al-na in KBo X 2 I 9 ([KBo X 1 Vs 4 URU Za-al-ba-ar']). See Otten, StBoT 17(1973)59 with references.  

9 As already noted above, p. 3, the ablative can occur with -ašta in Old Hittite, so the presence of -ašta here cannot be used as an argument against an ablative ncpiňa. However, the following sentence n-ašta dŠKUR-unni mān ḪŠšuš ašta confirms that the particle -ašta here has nothing to do with the ablative or the notion of separation. On the possible function of -ašta in this passage see Carruba, Or 33(1964)416 and p. 216 below.  

10 I also follow Carruba, loc. cit., in interpreting this passage (and KBo X 2 I 50.II 52) as identifying the Sun-god and the Hittite king.  

11 The meaning of märā(i)- and šērpa/i- is unknown to me, but the instrumental function seems reasonably certain.  

12 Hoffner, Alimenta Heth. 167, lists a stem kabaret- separate from kabari-. While this possibility cannot be excluded, setting up
an additional stem kaharet- on the present evidence seems essentially a non-solution. It is particularly suspicious that one finds no other forms of the supposed dental stem, while kahari- is well attested in a variety of cases (see Hoffner, op. cit. 166).

13 The translation of zabanittena- is based on the context. Since karima- is usually translated 'temple', I have chosen 'shrine'.

14 There are two examples of a partitive genitive with 'drink', one with a liquid, one with a vessel. The first is KBo XVII 1 IV 5-6 (O.H. ms./StBot 8,36): x-x-x-āš/ [K]ᾲ̄š-išnāš a[tulen]i akueni 'We eat of the ___ and drink of the beer'. The second is KUB XVII 5 I 11 (Illuyanka/RHA 77,67): n-ašta DU3 palhan hūmandan ek[uer] 'They drank (some) of all the p.-vessels'. For the interpretation of palhan as /palhayan/, gen. pl. to palḥi-, see KBo III 7 I 16-18, where Inara prepares one palḥi- of wine, one of marnuwan and one of walḥi, and the dat.-loc. pl. of palḥī- is spelled palḥæ (for /palhayas/).

15 Despite the form of the verb (a-ri-ya-an-zi), the context demands arai- 'arise, stand up', not ariya- 'inquire by oracle'.

16 The traces in the autograph forbid aš-g/ka-az. I cannot restore the lexical item, but the function of the ablative is surely separative.

17 Despite the single ḫ, aruḥaz is probably to be related to the adverb erruṣa (see Friedrich, RWD 34). The sense remains obscure.
For the emendation see already Kronasser, *Sprache* 7(1961)
150 and 152.

19. Friedrich, *HG* 109, interprets this ablative as expressing
means: 'Wenn jemand durch einen Kanal eine Obst(pflanzung) zer-
teilt'. This is quite possible in a Neo-Hittite manuscript of an
Old Hittite text, but it seems more likely to me that someone would
attempt to cut off an orchard from its water supply. For the latter
interpretation see already Güterbock, *JCS* 15(1961)70 (accepted also
by Hoffner, *Alimenta* Heth. 22).

20. The interpretation of ḫarranaza (dupl. ḫarraz) as 'nach oben'
by Eisele(1970)51 must be due to a lapsus.

21. KUB XVII 5 clearly has ḫa-an-te-eš-na-az, but the duplicate
XVII 6 II 1 has correctly ḫa-at-[te-eš-na-az].

22. I am also aware of no examples of either kariva- or waḥšiya-
with ʾer. In KUB XI 13 V 11f cited by Eichner, loc. cit., the ʾer
has nothing directly to do with waḥšawar waḥšuwanzi. Read: 'On
top are three ram-penises as a cover to cover (it)'.

23. The ki-na of Rs 10 is to be emended to ki-iz.

24. Forsman, *Glotta* 45(1967)1f, denies the reality of Homeric
cpt kár 'headlong', but I find his explanation less than compelling.

25. There are unambiguous cases of both an instrumental of means
and an ablative of 'place from which' with labuwai- 'pour' and eku-
'drink'. Since the ablative is also used to express means, the
interpretation of many instances of ablative + labuwai-/eku-
depends on one's understanding of the ritual objects and actions involved. In some cases there is no objective difference between 'drink with' and 'drink from' or 'pour with' and 'pour from', and it is impossible to know how the Hittite speaker interpreted the ablative.


27. This passage is roughly parallel to the Telipinu Edict II 29-30, but a reading of KBo XII 8 IV 28 ūn-za-ma-aš dāḫḫu as kiššaraz-usā... 'eis ex manibus', i.e. 'I took from their hands', leaves no place for a direct object. Therefore one should probably translate 'but (-ma) I seized them (-aš) with (my) hand' with a hostile sense.

28. sarē dāī- here means 'serve up'. For the incongruence of n-aš...sarē tiyanta! ūl ēḫḫateni 'You do not perform them (the festivals) served up with...', compare ibid. I 49-50, where the nt. pl. refers ambiguously to either the festivals or the offerings.

29. Otten, StBoT 13,15, translates the first example as 'vom tubunzi herein', and a separative interpretation is quite possible for all of these occurrences. However, to my knowledge one never finds uda- plus an unambiguous location (e.g. ḫuppaz), specifying the place from which ritual materials are brought. Such information does not seem to be relevant. I therefore find it more likely that the materials are carried in 'by means of a table', etc.
In older manuscripts the 3rd sg. pres. of ḫuwa(ī)- 'push' is consistently spelled ṣu-ū-(e)-iz-zi. This includes all the passages in the Laws where the meaning 'push, drive' is certain: §43 (KBo VI 3 II 52), §95 (KBo VI 2 IV 48) and §99 (KBo VI 3 IV 58). In §171 (KBo VI 26 II 4) we also find the spelling ṣu-ū-i-iz-zi, although the manuscript is late. On the other hand, the Old Hittite manuscript KBo VI 2 writes consistently (20x) parna-ēme-ye ṣu-wa-i-iz-zi, i.e. /swayitsi/. This means that the literal meaning of this much-discussed formula must be 'He looks to(ward) his house'. Note again the directive with ṣuwa(ya)- 'look'. While ṣuwaya(--) (older ḫuwaya-- ) is a ya-stem, the original inflection of ḫuwa(ī)- 'push' was probably like that of buλa- /bulλi- 'fight' (see Neu, StBoT 10(1974)73f). Only later do both fall together as ḫuwa(izzi).

GI-az (KUB XVII 10 II 31) is a nom. sg. (see Neu's translation, StBoT 5,41). Since there is no reason to suppose an animatizing ant-stem, this implies a dental stem *nad- beside nada- (see also p. 325). Similarly, ḫu-u-ūṣ-a-x (KBo XI 14 I 19) is a nom. sg. to the dental stem huḥat- (Neu, StBoT 5,150, note 5).

Synchronically, one may take the construction with a dative of recipient as basic and derive the instrumental type by a transformation, for each of the verbs under discussion. Diachronically, it seems most reasonable to assume that both constructions were originally possible for ḫipand- 'libate, sacrifice' (cf. the use of
Vedic vak- 'sacrifice'). Since eku- 'drink' also occurred in ritual contexts with a dative of the god honored and accusative of the liquid drunk (parallel to sipand- in the same pattern), the alternate construction with instrumental of liquid and accusative of the god was generalized from sipand- to eku- (and other verbs expressing a ritual action).

33 It is not easy to reconcile these two forms. Perhaps one may start with a noun tapulliyammar (oblique tapulliyamm-) and assume opposite assimilations of -mn- to -mm- and -nn-.

34 For a full discussion of this peculiar phrase see my forthcoming article in JNES.

35 Despite the variations in spelling, ta-ku-up-pu-aš-ta-/da- and tu-ku-up-pu-uš-ša-/ši- must be the same word.

36 In §75 of the Laws, Version A (KBo VI 2 IV 3) reads INA QATI DINGIR- war-aš Ékkiš 'It was killed/died through the hand of a god'. Version B (KBo VI 3 III 75) substitutes IŠTU DINGIR- LIM war-aš... 'It was killed by a god/died through a god'. The equivalence of the two constructions is noteworthy, but it is doubtful that one should attach too much importance to the fact that one is replaced by the other. On the status of the instrumental of agent in Old Hittite see below p. 429.

37 tuekka- is related to the verb tukk- 'be visible' (see Schindler, BSL 67(1972)36-37.

38 One should add KUB XXXIII 106 IV 9-10 piraš arha ḫt DUMU-mit
'Go away ahead (of me), my son!' (see p. 125 above).

39 See also KUB XXXVI 55 II 20 and 26: aršāššūri-šēti...

arššūri-šēti.

40 Neu’s interpretation and restoration of 205/s+ II 5’ (StBoT 18,71) is unsupported. According to his notation, the duplicate gives only ke-e-[, which on the basis of all parallels should be restored ke-e-[ez/st], not ke-e-[-ti]. Here as elsewhere edā means ‘on that side’ versus ke/ke2 ‘on this side’.

41 The only other occurrence of edā in a complete context which is known to me is in §56 of the Laws (KBo XXII 62+VI 2 III 21): edā BÂD-ni LUGAL-aḫ KASKAL-ê-a takšuanzi GIS Sar.geštin-aḫ tukkušuanzi ša Lû URUDU.NAGAR ūl kudki arawaš. We almost certainly have a pair of double dative constructions with the infinitive, but the meaning of edā in paragraph-initial position is unclear to me. It is surely to be taken with BÂD-ni ‘fortification’, but it can hardly be anaphoric (‘that fortification’), since no fortification has previously been mentioned. In any case, there seems no basis here for a meaning ‘there, in that place’.

42 Jochem Schindler has reminded me that Skt. ādhi as an adverb also has both ablative and locative meanings (see Grassmann sub voce). Skt. ādhi and Hitt. edā can be derived from a common preform *e-dhi (pronominal stem *e- + locative *-dhi as in Grk. pōthi ‘where’). One may further speculate whether edā and kōdi (with -di < *-dhi) were the point of entry of the -d- into the oblique stem
of the Hittite pronouns. That is, given that -1 is the unmarked
dative-locative singular ending in the language, Ṗdi and ṛedi
were reanalyzed as Ṗdi-i and ṛedi-i, and the stems Ṗdi- and ṛedi-
were used to build other local cases of the pronoun (e.g., the
directive ṛedā, which replaced the original directive represented
by ṛā 'here, hither').

It is interesting to observe (with Otten-Souček, StBoT 8,85)
that those instances with the dative-locative have Ṛarı, while
those with the genitive do not.

In a similar fashion, the dative-locative forms ṕtarni-Ńmi,
kattti-ši, etc. could have been modeled on a genuine substantival
form: ṕedi-ši, originally 'in its place', then 'in place of it'.
Chapter Three - Ablative and Instrumental in Middle Hittite

Section 1.1. Usage of the Ablative in Middle Hittite Manuscripts

I. Ablative of Separation ('place from which')

In Middle Hittite texts the principal function of the ablative remains the same: to express separation or the place from which an action is viewed as beginning. This usage needs no further illustration, and I cite in full only passages of some special interest.

**KUB XXIX 7 Rs 42-43 (R. of Samuha/CTH 480):**

\(n-ašt\)aGIš\(\underline{\text{A}}\) ištappešn\(\underline{\text{a}}\)\(\text{a}\) PA\(-\text{a}\) ištappešn[\(\text{a}\)]\(\text{a}\)\(\text{a}\) / par\(\underline{\text{a}}\) \(\text{ɪd}-\text{kan}\)

\(\text{anda pē[dae]}\)

'The canal of the harbor carries the ship out of the harbor into the river.'

Both par\(\underline{\text{a}}\) and anda look very much like postpositions here. Note the differing particle use with each.

**KUB XXIX 8 IV 38-39 (R. of aiš ſuppiyaḫḫuwar/CTH 777):**

\(\text{ANA DINGIR-LIM}\) va\(\text{-at-kan}\) INA URU Zitḫara/ INA EBUR KAXU-az

par\(\underline{\text{a}}\) aniyawen

'We wrote it (the ritual) down in Zitḫara in the autumn out of the mouth of the god.' (i.e. from dictation)

For this idiom compare **KUB XV 31 IV 38-40** (ex. (169) p. 306 below).
KUB XXIX 7 Vš 40-41 (R. of Samuha/CTR 480):

EGIR-SU-MA DINGIR LUM nakkuwaš li[kīyi]laš KARU-az ITTI UNUT
SAL.LUGAL ŠA BA.BA.ZA ḫiḫnit/ SĪG alitt-a arḫa aniyazi

"Afterwards he cures the god of the mouth of the curse with respect to the queen's utensils with Bi.-dough and a wool before the ritual substitutes (?)'.

The same sentence is repeated, ibid. Vš 41-42. The form nakkuwaš is difficult. I have tentatively identified it as the dat.-loc. pl. of nakku-, the base of the Luvian nakkušši- 'ritual substitute' (see Kümml, StBOT 3(1967)146f). The grammatical function at least is assured by the variant nakkuwaš piran in Vš 24.25 and elsewhere in our text. For (arḫa) aniy-a as 'cure (of)' with a separative ablative see also below p. 306.

KUB XXIX 7 Vš 1-2 (R. of Samuha/CTR 480):

nu ṭūdak/ DINGIR LUM īštu ŠA LUGAL ḫūmandaš ḫūrdiyaš uddani
(145) gangatāizzī

"And at once he treats the god with the g.-plant from the king in the matter of all curses."

ibid. Vš 7-10

EGIR-SU-MA <DINGIR LUM> īštu LUGAL BI ANA UNUT SAL.LUGAL menēḫbanda
(146) ḫūmandaš ḫūrdiyaš/ uddani gangatāizzī EGI-
SUNI LUGAL ANA LUGAL BI menēḫbanda/ gangatāizzī EGI-
SUNI LUGAL ANA LUGAL BI
Then he ḍ's the god from the king toward the utensils of the queen in the matter of all curses. Then he ḍ's the god from the utensils of the queen toward the king. Then he ḍ's the god together from the king toward the utensils of the queen (and vice-versa).

While the precise nature of the gangati-plant is unclear, the basic meaning of the above passage is revealed by variants like that in line 13: gangati ṢAR ĪSTU [LUGAL] parē apenišan ēpdī 'He holds out the ḍ.-plant from the king in the same way'. The denominative verb gangatēzi- thus means 'treat with a ḍ.-plant (by holding it out toward someone)'. The plant is first held out from the position of the king, then from the position of the queen's utensils (she herself is apparently not present), then from both positions at the same time. That this is the meaning of the elliptical expression of lines 9-10 is clear from line 16: ĪSTU LUGAL UNUT SAL.LUGAL-ya takšan gangatēziṣzi 'ḡ's from the king and the utensils of the queen together'.

Note the writing ĪSTU ṢA LUGAL in line 2 to express 'from the king'. The insertion of ṢA is an apparent attempt to mark the ĪSTU as expressing 'place from which' or direction (as opposed to means or agent), when the noun is an animate being. We shall see further examples below, but as is obvious from lines Vs ṢA above, the difference between ĪSTU ṢA and ĪSTU is not consistently maintained.
Other examples of the ablative of separation in Middle Hittite manuscripts are:

Intransitive Motion Verbs:


iyana- 'go, walk': KUB XVII 21 II 10-12 kuēz (+ arḫa and -kan).

neya- 'turn (int.)': KUB XXIII 77,91+ lēbḫaz (+ āppa).

pāi- 'go': KBo XIX 39 + KUB VIII 81 II 2-3+ III 10-11 tamedaz

KUR-yaṣ (2nd + āppa), ibid. II 11-12 III 9-10. URU Ḫattušaz

(+ -aṣta/-kan), etc..

uwa- 'come': KBo VIII 35 III 16 u[RU Ḫattušaz, XIX 39 + KUB VIII 81

III 15 tamedaz KUR-az, etc.

Transitive Motion Verbs:

ḫuviša- 'pull, draw': KBo XX 107 + XXIII 50 II 10-13+ arḫaṣanaš

KUR.KUR.MES-az etc., XXI 41 Vs 64-65 apēz ḫurdiya[z] (+ arḫa

and -kan), ibid. Rs 6 pēḫuennaz (+ arḫa), etc.

karp- 'lift, raise': IBot I 36 I 67 GAL-yaṣ KĀ.GAL-az.

muṣa- 'implore': KBo XX 107 + XXIII 50 II 10-13 arḫaṣanaš

KUR.KUR.MES-az, etc., KUB XV 34 IV 30-31 nepišaš.

nanna- 'drive': KUB XVII 21 II 19 kuēz (+ arḫa and -kan).

parra- 'chase': KUB XIV 1 Vs 1 KUR-yaṣ (+ arḫa).

peḏa- 'carry': IBot I 36 I 53 luḫšetiyaz (+ kita and -aṣta).

pidda- 'deliver': KUB XVII 21 II 13.17 kuēz (+ arḫa and -kan).
Šuwe- 'push': KBo XVI 25 I 68 KUR-vas (+ arba).

dä- 'take': KBo XXI 33 I 14.18.28.III 6 DUG aḫruššiyaz (+ Šara and -kan/-ašta), etc.

talliya- 'entreat': KUB XV 34 IV 30-31 nepišaz.

tupā- 'bring': KUB XVII 21 IV 9-10 URU šat-tušaz.

Verbs of Separation:

kuer- 'cut': KUB XIII 1 I 13 URU-az (+ katta).

šara- 'divide': KBo V 7 Rs 25 ašez (+ -ašta; cf. ibid. Rs 21).

tubā- 'cut': KUB XXXII 115 I 39 arunaz (+ -kan).

Others:

barnink- 'destroy': KBo XIX 58,10+[dankuvavaz dez]enzipaz (+ arba).

būšmu- 'preserve': KUB XIV 1 Vs 4 ḫing[a]naza (+ -kan), ibid. Vs 10

IŠTU GIR (+ arba and -kan).

ištameh- 'hear (of)': KUB XIV 1 Vs 24+ kuš KUR-vas (+ arba and -kan).

iyā- 'make': KUB XXIX 7 Rs 39 ištappanaz (+ -kan).

gangatāi- 'treat with a g.-plant': KUB XXIX 7 Vs 11 etc. (7x)

ašez uddānuaz.

parkui- 'pure, free of': KBo XVI 47 Vs 14.Rs 23 linki(y)ez,

KUB XXIX 7 Vs 5 etc. (8x) ašez uddānuaz.

As in Old Hittite one also finds isolated use of the dative-locative to express separation:
KUB XXXII 115 i 46 (R. of Matigga/MTG 1,350):

(147)

'And may the tongues of those days be cut off from your limbs.'

KUB XV 34 I 36 seems to show a compromise between the alternate constructions with the ablative and the dative-locative:

(148) mu 2 NA-paššiliš IŠTU KASKAL-ši 'K[Š].GIL-va deš{'

'He takes two pebbles from the road and the side-road.'

II. Ablative of 'time from which'

The fixed phrase kitpandalaz 'from this moment (on)' is attested in Middle Hittite historical texts: KBO XVI 25 I 41 and XVI 27 I 23

III. Ablative of Cause

Middle Hittite manuscripts show two probable instances of this usage, although neither is problem-free:

KUB XXIII 72 Rs 52 (Mida of Pahhuwa/AAA 28,38 trl.):

(149) [...]ku]ledaz? nakkiš

'For what reason is [the custom] important?'

DoT I 36 I 58-59 (Protocol of the Guard/MTG 11,180):

nu lu NI.DU₃ punuššanzi nu GIŠ₃ Sukur.UJ₃A/ apāš naḫšaraz (scil. naḫšarattaz) uškizzi
'They interrogate the doorkeeper, and he will (always) see the spears out of fear.'

Example (149) is part of a request for 'intelligence' about a city, including any important customs (šaklaš). The usual form of the interrogative ablative is kuššu, but kušdaz is attested in the lexical text KBo I 44+ XIII 1 IV 41-43 (see StBoT 7(1968)20 and p. 380 below).

In example (150) we are dealing with the case of a doorkeeper who fails to see one of the bodyguard carry his spear out through the gate (a prohibited act). The obvious sense of the sentence above is that the guilty doorkeeper is given a thorough 'grilling', so that in the future he will always (note the -šk- form) notice the spears. The nominative nahšaraz is surely an error for an ablative nahšarattaz (or an ablative to the stem *nahšar-)

IV. Ablative of Direction

Like the ablative of separation, the ablative of direction is quite common, and I mention here only examples which are noteworthy or which have been misinterpreted.

KBo XVI 47 Vs 9 (Treaty/Inst. Mitt. 17,56):

(151) [n]-uš d UTU ŠšI közza zaḫḫiyami zik-uš aḫpizza zaḫḫiya

'I, His Majesty, will attack them from/on this side; you attack them from/on that side.'
See also ibid. Vs 11-12. This example shows clearly the transition from the ablative of separation ('place from which') to the ablative of direction (position relative to something else). Either interpretation fits the present passage equally well.

KUB XIV 1 Rs 57 (Madduwalla/Madd. 32):

(152) nu-war-at IŠTU 𒄠添加剂 𒈧zi.

'It (the land of Hapalla) is on the side of His Majesty.'

In terms of manuscripts, this is the earliest attestation of the ablative of direction used to express 'on the side of' in the abstract sense. It is quite common in Neo-Hittite (see below p. 357f). We have already seen anzitaz huwai- 'run beside us/on our side' (p. 205 above), but the occurrence is in a Neo-Hittite manuscript. The development of the meaning 'on the side of' is shown by passages like KUB XXIX 8 I 4f, where the reference is still to physical location: nu IŠTU ša 𒄠添加剂 kiuš GUNNu.MESNúmero harrpanteš ...

...menahbanda-ma IŠTU ša 𒄠添加剂 Jebat... 'which hearths are set up on the side of the Storm-god...but opposite on the side of Hebat...'.


nu 𒄠添加剂 palentuwasa kuiš andurse kuzza nu 12 LÚ.MES.Number MEŠEDI/ aranta...
...
...

...škaz-ma kuiš kuzza nu-ššan LÚ.MES.Number Sukur.GUŠKIN ende aranta/

(153) 1 LÚ.MEŠEDI-ma kēz IŠTU LÚ.MEŠEDI kuttaz KĀ-as maninkuwan/ arta kēz-ma IŠTU LÚ.MEŠ.Number Sukur.GUŠKIN kuttaz 1 LÚ.Sukur.Guškin/ KĀ-as maninkuwan arta
'The wall which is inside toward the palace—(by it) stand 12 bodyguards...but the wall which is toward the gate—(by it) stand the men-of-the-gold-spear. But one bodyguard stands on one side toward the wall of the bodyguards near the gate, while one man-of-the-gold-spear stands on the other side toward the wall of the men-of-the-gold-spear near the gate.'

A thorough treatment of this fascinating text would require a lengthy discussion of Hittite architecture and cannot be attempted here. I cite the above passage to show that a correct understanding of the text must include recognition of ablatives like those above as ablatives of direction.

It would serve little to cite further examples of ZAG-az, GUB-laz, tapušza and kéz...kéz(zi-ya). It should be expressly pointed out that Middle Hittite texts employ these forms either absolutely or with a preceding dative-locative, never with the genitive.

V. Perlative Ablative

The most important source for this usage in Middle Hittite is again the Protocol of the Guard, IBoT I 36. The clearest example is I 73-74 (MIO 11,180):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{n-ašta anda-ve ūl kuinki tarmat parā-ya-ken ūl kuinki tarna[i]/} \\
\text{n-[at]-kan parā SA LŪ['ES]EDI ūl HILAZ uškandari}
\end{align*}
\]
'He neither lets anyone in nor lets anyone out. They come out through the courtyard of the bodyguard.'

This sentence is part of the instructions concerning an excursion of the king. Before the king comes out of the palace, various functionaries come out and form the first part of the royal procession. The point of the lines above is that no one is to come out the door which the king uses, but are to come out through the courtyard of the bodyguard instead. The latter is not the starting-point of the action, and a translation 'come out from the courtyard of the bodyguard', while quite proper grammatically, misrepresents the true meaning of the phrase. Similar is the usage in the same text, 1.60-63 (MIO 11.180):

LÜ.MEŠ.É.BEŠEDIM-MA-KAN DUMU.MEŠ.É.GALTIM GAL-YAZ KÁ.GAL-ÅZ KATTA

UL PAŠKANDA/ N-AT-KAN LUŠDANIYAZ KATTA PAŠ[KANDA]A NU 1

(155) LÜ.MEŠ.É.BEŠEDI KUIŠ Šerkantin/ WIDAISSI UGULA DUMU.MEŠ-X-X KUIN

PAR[Ä P]IYEŠKIZZI NU-KAN GAL-YAZ KATTA/ AP[Ä] PAŠKATTA

BELLUTIM-YA-KAN UGULA LIM-YA GAL-YAZ KATTA PAŠKANTA.

'But the bodyguards and the palace officials shall not go down through the main gate. They shall go down through the side-door. The one bodyguard who brings the š., whom the chief palace-official (?) sends out, he shall go down through the main (gate), and the lords and leaders of a thousand shall go down through the main (gate).'
Once again, the interpretation 'go down from the main gate' is grammatically possible, but contextually out of place. The point of the passage is to specify which functionaries in their comings and goings from the palace have the right to use the main gate. The gate is not the starting point of the movement, but merely a point of passage.

I suggest that we have the same usage in a difficult sentence of the Madduwatta text:

KUB XIV 1 Rs 25f (Madduwatta:Madd. 26):

\[\text{ANA GAL.GEŠTIN kiššan hatreškizzi ANA KUR URU Hapalla-wa-itta}\]

\[\text{(156) KUR-ez tiyami zig-a-mu-kan awan arba [tarna]/nu-wa-kan}\]

\[\text{It KUR URU Hapalla-wa-kan kueni našma-war-at arnut}\]

'He writes to the "chief-of-the-wine" as follows: "I will go against the land of Hapalla through your country (?). You let me pass (with the words): 'Go and slay the land of Hapalla or carry it off!'".'

The manuscript has a clear 1-e-az, which Götze, Madd. 27, understands as 1-e-<dr>-az, interpreting -ita...l-eaz as 'mit dir in eins', i.e. 'mit dir zusammen'. Madduwatta is suggesting a joint expedition against Hapalla. This interpretation of the ablative is ad hoc and fails to account for either awan arba [tarna] (restorable from Rs 26) or the sentence nu-wa-kan It etc. One would expect paiwendi...kuennumeni etc. 'Let us go and slay etc.'.
We have rather another example of the common situation in which one belligerent seeks permission to attack another by passing through the territory of a third party. Allies of the Hittite king were expected to let him pass through their territory on the way to attack someone else, but to deny passage to his enemies (see KBo V 8 I 27f, AM 148, V 4 Rs 47 (Targ. 68) and KUB XXI 1 III 52.69 (Alakš. 74f). The usual term for such an action is inšerne ėrba pēi- (+ acc.) 'pass through'. For the expression awan ėrba tarna-. 'let (pass) through', see KUB XXVI 12 II 20, where it is used of a fugitive. In the present passage Madduwalla asks the Hittite general to let him pass through his sphere of control and to give his blessing to Madduwalla to do what he likes with Hapalla. I grant that the emendation to KUB-ćaź is more difficult than that to l-edaz, and perhaps it is unnecessary. One could keep l-edaz and read: 'I will go against Hapalla through you alone'. That is, Madduwalla is stressing that he does not want to lead his army through the heart of Hittite territory, but merely through the corner of it under the general's command. In any case, I am convinced that we have a permissive ablative expressing passage through.

VI. Ablative of Means

As observed above, Old Hittite manuscripts of Old Hittite texts show no examples of the ablative expressing means. In Middle
Hittite manuscripts of Old Hittite texts a few examples turned up (see p. 210f). In Middle Hittite manuscripts of Middle Hittite texts the ablative of means is well attested, although the number of attestations is somewhat less than that of the instrumental in the same function. None of the examples show anything remarkable, and the following list will serve to illustrate the range of usage:

ep- 'take; hold': KUB XXXII 115+ IV 21 GAI-az našma huppaz + parā,3 IBOT II 39 Vs 52 GUR-laz ŠU-az, ibid. Vs 55 ZAG-az ŠU-az (+ Šarrā).

har(k)- 'hold': KBO XXIII 12 I 11 GUR-laz (scil. ŠU-az), KUB XXIX 7 Vs 20,28+ GIS ERIN-az.

baššaganu- 'satiate': KBO XIV 63 IV 12 witenaz.

bulaliya- 'wrap': KUB XXIX 7 Rs 28 purpaštaz (+ anda).

labuwa- 'pour': IBOT II 39 Rs 19 DUG gazzidaz (+ arhe and -kan).4

maršaḫḫ- 'falsify'? (?): KUB XXIX 8 I 39-40 kuša imma kuša uddanaz.

memā- 'speak': KUB XXIX 7 Vs 3-4, 23, 50-51+ KAXU-az (+ anda and -kan).

 SUPPIVAḪḪ- 'purify': KUB XXXII 49a II 12 vetenas.

dā- 'take!': KBO XXI 33 I 17-18 GUR-laz kišraz...kunnaz kišraz (1st + -za, 2nd + Šarrā and -kan), KUB XXXII 49a II 20-21 GUR-laz...kunnaz (2nd + Šarrā and -kan), XV 34 I 31 tellāyaz Š KSTU 1.DUG C[A] (+ Šarrā).5

wериya- 'call!': KUB XXIX 7 Vs 15 KAXU-az.6
VII. Adverbial Ablatives

Aside from the technical term zalaz 'at a trot' in the horse-training texts (see Kammenhuber, *Hipp. index*), Middle Hittite manuscripts show only UD.(KAM)-az 'during the day': *KUB* XIII 1 I 20, *IBoT* I 36 I 19 and *KBo* XXI 41 Vs 75. The last instance is of interest for its contrast of the ablative and dative-locative (see discussion above p. 217f):

*KBo* XXI 41 Vs 75-Rs 1 (R. of Samuha/OTH 480):

(157) namma UD.KAM-az UL kuitki [iensi]/ nekuzza nebur-me a[p]êdani-
pat UD-ti [ ]

'They do nothing further during the day. But at nightfall on that same day...'

VIII. Non-Examples

Middle Hittite manuscripts present a couple more instances of forms in -anz(a) which must not be taken as ablatives. The context in both argues for nominatives of 'animatizing' ant-stems instead:

*KUB* XV 34 IV 31 (R. of Drawing the Gods.../AOATS 3,204):

(158) n-uš attaš nepišanz[a] EGIR-an tarna

'Let them go, oh Father Heaven.'

Haas and Wilhelm, *AOATS* 3(1974)205, translate 'von Himmel' here, but this is certainly the lectio difficilior. The -anza ending for
the ablative is attested nowhere else with nepiš-. It is also
easier contextually to take nepišansa as part of the addressee.
attaš nepišansa is functionally equivalent to ẓeū pāter.

In KUB XXIX 7 Rs 29, the form idalauwanzī-ya must be taken as
the nom. sg. of an ant-stem, since the 'evil' is part of the subject
coordinate with 'oath', 'curse' and 'defilement' (thus Goetze,
ANET3 346). The last item shows the proper spelling of a nom. sg.
in /-ants/ plus -a 'and': pa-ap-ra-an-na-a[n-z]a-aš-ša, i.e.
/papramantsts-a/ (see Friedrich, NE 12 §25b). In the case of
idalauwanzī-ya, the form of the ablative ending which occurs before
-aya 'and' has been incorrectly generalized to the nom. sg.
environment. This was possible because in environments other than
before 'and', both the ablative of the abstract idalawater and the
nom. sg. of the animatizing ant-stem idalawant- (< idalu-) were
both idalawanza (/idalawants/). For the ablative ending -ansa
see below Chap. 5, Sec. 1.3.

The uses of the ablative in Middle Hittite manuscripts of
Middle Hittite texts are thus:

I. Ablative of Separation
II. Ablative of 'time from which'
III. Ablative of Cause
IV. Ablative of Direction
V. Permissive Ablative
VI. Ablative of Means

VII. Adverbial Ablatives (Time)
Section 1.2. Usage of the Instrumental in Middle Hittite Manuscripts

I. Instrumental of Means

The unmarked use of the instrumental in Middle Hittite is predictably to express means or instrument. None of the examples in Middle Hittite manuscripts are unusual, and a list of the occurrences will suffice to show the range of usage:

ak- 'die': KUB XIV 1 Vs 12 kāšit.

aninya 'treat': KUB XXIX 7 (+ KBo XXI 41) Vs 39f (7x) içnit SiG alitt-a (+ arba; see p. 285 above for complete context).

arr- 'wash': KBo XXIII 23 Vs 30 wīdanta, KUB XXIX 50 IV 18+ ikunit witenit, XXIX 43 Rs 7+ and XXIX 40 II 4-5+ āntet witenit, ibid. II 13 witenit (+ -za), ibid. IV 8 āntet.

b- 'hold': KUB XXIX 43 Rs 12+, XXIX 40 III 4f (8x) GIŠ kūpparit (+ parā).

balzai 'call': KUB XV 34 III 9.50 lamnit (+ -ašta).

buittia- 'pull, draw': KUB XXIX 40 III 32+ kīšerit (+ parā).

ibēi- 'make the rounds of': KUB XV 34 IV 25-26+ 40 zēašit.

išpar- 'spread': KUB XV 34 I 41 TŪG kūpsnit.

gulš- 'inscribe': KUB XV 34 IV 56-57 IŠTU GIŠ LI.U.7

mena- 'speak': KUB XXXII 115+ I 44+ KAXU-it EME-it.

pepparē- 'sprinkle': KUB XV 34 II 26 I.DŪG.GA-IT.
šipand- 'sacrifice': KUB XXIX 7 Rs 63 UZU zēvantit, XXXII 49a
III 14-15 İŠTU UZU zanuantit (see p. 328 below).

EN- 'full of': KUB XV 34 I 14-15 IŠTU GEŠTIN LĀL İ.DOĞ.GA
anda Immivanit.

šurna- 'fill': KUB XV 34 III 25 witenit, XXXII 115+ II 29-30
GEŠTIN-it İ SERDUM pattalwanit LĀL.

tamaḫ- 'press': KUB XXXI 103,14 ERİM.KES-it.

dammešhai- 'oppress': KUB XVII 21 I 24-25 šappanit lizzit.

tarḫ- 'conquer': KBo XVI 47 Vs.4 hannot'mnit, KUB XIII 27 Rs 23+
ḫastit (+ -za) 9

dukk- 'be seen, be visible': KUB XXIII 72 Rs 15 šaku[w]at (+ -kan;
see Neu, StBot 5,178).

duwarnai- 'break': KUB XXXII 115+ IV 14 GİR-it.

waḫnu- 'brandish': KUB XXIX 8 II 6-8 İŠTU [MÚ ŞEN ...
luḫtitt-e MĀŠ.TUR? [...] Object is EN SISKUR.SISKUR; see
p. 234 above for the syntax.

warkant- 'fat(tened)': KUB XXXII 115+ II 45-46 U-it balkit.

warnu- 'burn': KUB XV 34 IV 49 pahnu[tt-a]:

waššiya- 'clothe': KUB XXIX 40 II 14+ TUG-it.

II. Instrumental of Accompaniment

The few instances of this usage in Middle Hittite manuscripts
fit into patterns already observed, but the rarity of the type
justifies citing all of them:
KUB XIV 1 Vs 45 (Madduwa/KAAD. 12):

(159) nam[s-e-s]t IŠTU ERIN.ŠES pa[ng]arit ninik[tat]

'Then it mobilized with its troops en masse.'

KUB XXXII 115+ III 34-35 (R. of Mastigga/MIO 1,360):

(160) tuwannatru-wa[r-ar-][ DUG. ḫurwaya KAXU-it [E]ME-it

'It, the ḫ-vessel, shall break along with the mouth and tongue.'

KBo XX 107 I 9-12 (R. for ḫAL KUKŠ, kurša/CTH 433):

[...]x-en ḫišunE(un)/[...]it innarauwannit/ [...]EGII R,UDšš[MI

(161) tarḫulit/ [G]IS[TUKUL-it? ...pie]šdu

'Let him [give...] sinew (along with)[ ] vigor...and a mighty future [weapon?].'

For the type of (161) compare KUB XXXIII 62 II 8-11 (ex. (119) p. 246 above).

III. Instrumental of Respect

I suggest that we have attested one instance of this usage in a Middle Hittite manuscript:

KUB XXXII 115+ II 24 (R. of Mastigga/MIO 1,354):

(162) ṗarkuwaš-kaš-[maš] [na]jama šaten KAXU-it EME-it

'Be pure again with respect to your mouth and tongue.'

Since the entire ritual centers on the removal of (evil) 'mouths and tongues', one could also interpret the instrumental as expressing separation with ṗarkuš-: 'be pure/free of the (evil)
mOUTHS AND TONGUES'. WHILE THIS POSSIBILITY CANNOT BE ENTIRELY EXCLUDED, IT WOULD BE THE ONLY CASE OF AN INSTRUMENTAL OF SEPARATION IN A MIDDLE HITTITE MANUSCRIPT, AND THE TYPE IS NOT COMMON EVEN IN NEO-HITTITE COPIES (SEE BELOW P. 339f).

IV. PRONOMINAL INSTRUMENTAL USED FOR THE ABLATIVE

AS NOTED ABOVE, THE FIXED PHRASE KİTPENDALAZ 'FROM THIS MOMENT (ON)' IS ATTESTED TWICE IN MIDDLE HITTITE COMPOSITIONS: KBO XVI 25 I 41 AND XVI 27 I 23. ON THE OTHER HAND, IT IS IMPORTANT TO POINT OUT THAT KİT DOES NOT OCCUR IN ANY OTHER ABLATIVAL USES IN MIDDLE HITTITE.

V. ADVERBIAL INSTRUMENTALS

ASIDE FROM THE WELL-ESTABLISHED PANÇARIT 'EN MASSE' (KUB XXXI 105,18, XIV 1 VS 45 AND ABO'T 60 VS 23), MIDDLE HITTITE MANUSCRIPTS ALSO SHOW SEVERAL Instances of ZI-it 'ON ONE'S OWN (AUTHORITY)'.

KUB XIII 1 IV 7 (INSTR. FOR THE BEL MADGALTI/DIENSTANW. 62):

(163) [našma] ARAH KUIŠKI ZI-it KINUAN ğARZ[i]

'OR (IF) ANYONE HAS OPENED A GRANARY ON HIS OWN'.

KUB XIV 1 VS 20 (MADÜWATTA/MADD. 6):

(164) NAMMA-MA-WA-[AE] PARrä TAMÄIN ḫAPĀTIN TAMAI KUR-e ZI-[i]t

lē [s]tari
'Furthermore, do not (reach) out (and) occupy another river valley (?) or another land on your own.'

See also KUB XIII 27 Rs 5-6.13, XXIII 77, 88, XIV I Vs 32f (6x), XXX I 103, 20/.24 and Ḫot I 36 I 32.33.47. There is also one instance where ištanzanit is modified:

KUB XVII 21 I 6 (Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal/CTH 375): (165) nu ūmeš-pat DINGIR.MEŠ DINGIR.MEŠ-ēk ištanza[n]it Ḫekten[i]

'You yourselves know it, oh gods, with your divine mind(s).'</n

In this example ištanzanit may be taken as expressing means. For a possible analysis of simple ZI-it see p. 336 below.

In summary, then, the instrumental in Middle Hittite manuscripts of Middle Hittite texts shows the following uses:

I. Instrumental of Means
II. Instrumental of Accompaniment
III. Instrumental of Respect (1x)
IV. Pronominal Instrumental for the Ablative (kitpentalaz)
V. Adverbial Instrumentals (panzerit, ZI-it)

It should be repeated that the single example of the instrumental of respect is not beyond question.
Section 2.1. Usage of the Ablative in Neo-Hittite Manuscripts

I. Ablative of Separation

Once again for this most common use of the ablative I cite in full only examples of special interest:


\[ n-ašta ANA EN SISKUR, SISKUR/ šumendazi-ya SİG ĕntaren SİG \]

midann-a/ arḫa tuḫšanzi

'And they cut off the blue and red wool from the master of the sacrifice and from everything.'

Note the coordination of a dativus in commodi with a person and an ablative of separation with an inanimate object. This may be considered the 'normal' pattern, but we have seen the ablative with persons and the dative-locative with things.

**KUR** VII 41 I 1-2 (R. for the Underworld Gods/ZA 54, 116):

\[ mun-ir ĕšineš pepran[neš]/ kurkurimaš linkiyeš perkumu-\]

wa[nzi]

'When they cleanse a house of blood, defilement, ... and oath.'

Since ĕšare 'blood' is singulare tantum, an interpretation of these forms in -aš as dative-locative plurals is excluded. They must be taken as genitive singulars expressing separation (cf. the ablative with perkumu- p. 182 above). This competing use of the genitive
and the ablative is also attested with *repa aniya-* 'cure of':

\[
\text{KUB XXX 35 I 1-2 (R. of Irriya/CTH 400):}
\]

\[
(168) \ [\text{[nu]} \ m\text{m} \ \text{URU-an išhanaz̄/ linikyaẑ pangaunu𝑧̄ lalā ti aniyamīta} \\
\text{nu mən URU-an išhanaza/ linikyaẑa pengaunuža EME-za aniyamīta} \\
\text{When I cure a city of blood, oath (and) the tongue of everyone.'}
\]

For p. lalāž 'tongue of everyone' (= 'common gossip' or the like), compare KUB XXX 36 II 14 etc. pengaunuža EME-en. The ablative pengaunuža is an example of 'case attraction' or 'partitive apposition'.

\[
\text{KUB XV 31 IV 36-40 (Drawing } \text{d\text{MAH} etc.}/\text{CTH 484):}
\]

\[
(169) \ \text{kū̄-ma-kan turpi/ ANA } \text{d\text{UTU}̄̄̄̄ KAXU-az пере/ } \text{m\text{GIG} PA.DINGIR LIM-1̄̄̄̄̄̄} \text{aniyat}
\]

'Hattusili wrote down this tablet out of the mouth of His Majesty.'

On this idiom compare ex. (143) p. 284 above.

\[
\text{HT 1 I 44 (R. of Zarpiya/CTH 757):}
\]

\[
(170) \ \text{n-əšta } \text{IŠTU UZU N\text{G.GIG} hūīnuwaz wəkūn̄}
\]

'We took a bite out of the raw liver (?).'

This example has the appearance of a partitive, but it is illusory. As the next sentence 'we drank from one straw' shows, the point of
the passage is not that they ate some of the meat but rather that it was the raw meat from which they ate.

Since numerous examples of the ablative of separation have already been presented, in the following list attestations with common verbs are merely cited, not quoted:

**Intransitive Motion Verbs:**

*er-š- 'flow': KBo X 45 IV 39, XVII 105 II 34.IV 2⁺, KUB VII 41 I 29 (// XII 8 I 8), IX 6 I 20-21.

*ḫuieša- 'escape' (?): KUB XXXIII 120 I 21-22 kišša-ra-za-ša-šiš* (+ arba and -ašta).

*iya- 'go, walk': KUB XXVII 29 II 18 kašša-az (+ baga).

*pēši- 'go': KUB XII 8 II 8-9 URU Ninuaz (1 ašta).

*šaši/-šiṣiya- 'spurt': KBo XVII 61 Rs 7 nepišas (+ katta and -ken).*

*tīva- 'step': KBo XVII 105 III 31 kaskal-az (+ arba and -ken).

*uwa- 'come': KBo III 2 LRd 4, III 5 I 59-60, III 21 II 17-18, X 45 II 25, XIX 109+ IV 11-12 (// XIX 111,10), KUB I 11 II 40, I 13 LRd 3, VII 41 IV 22, X 76+ III 8, XIII 2 III 39, XXIII 11 II 27-28, XXXIII 120 II 2-3.33-34.75⁺.84, XXXVI 55 II 40.III 9, Bo 6404 + KUB XXXIII 84 IV 16.

**Transitive Motion Verbs:**

*anu- 'bring, carry': KBo XXI 34 II 11-12 URU Laḫuwašanziaž* (+ arba and -ašta), IBoT III 148 III 43 Ašša A.GAR-az
(+ arba and -kan), Bo 2393+5138 I 21-22 URU-HATTUŠAS (+ katta and -kan; see Otten, Fest. Friedrich 353).


peššiya- 'throw': KBo X 45 I 28 SHUBBAS (+ katta and -ašta).

pēda- 'carry': IBoT III 148 III 27 URU-az (+ arba and -kan).

šuwa- 'push': KUB IV 1 II 13 KUR-az, ibid. II 17-18 A.SAR.GERASAH-VA...IŠTURŠI SAR.GERASAH-NAŠURU (both + arba; 1st + -ašta).

dā- 'take': KBo V 2 I 56, XI 10 III 7, XVII 105 II 28-29, XIX 136 I 14f, XX 128,15, XXI 28 I 3+; XXIII 15 II 23-24.III 8-9,24-25, XXIII 45 I 6-7, KUB IX 4 IV 23, IX 6 + XXXV 39 IV 15+16-17+, XII 12 V 2-3, XXVII 1 III 9, XXVII 16 III 5+IV 20-21, XXVII 29 I 4-5, XXXII 42 I 5, XXXII 43 I 3, XLI 8 II 25, PIB 12 + KBo XXI 28 II 24-25.

titturnu- 'move': KUB XXIX 44 III 17 WETENAZA (+ -kan), XXIX 48 Rs 14+ idem.

uiya- 'send': KBo X 45 I 52 TAKNAZA.

uda- 'bring': KBo XXI 34 I 9-10.31-32, KUB XLI 8 II 6.III 2, VBoT 24 III 26-27.

uwate- 'bring': KBo III 2 Vs 33. Rs 4-5.6.43, III 5 III 25, KUR I 13 II 33-34.40-41+45-46.Lld 1, XXXIII 109+ I 16.
Verbs of Separation:

lē- 'loose':  VBoT 120 III 2-4  ištivalaz...alwanzabbaz (+ arba and -kan), KUB XXVII 29 (+ VBoT 120) I 2+ idem.

tarna- 'let go':  KBo X 45 I 41 taknaza (+ ērē and -ēta).

Others:

anē- 'wipe':  KUB XIV 13 II 14-30 (various body parts; + -kan).

arrē- 'wash':  KBo X 45 IV 37 URU-az (+ -kan).

ištūwaï- 'pour':  KBo V 2 II 19 šarāmnaaz (+ arba).

labēwaï- 'pour':  KBo V 2 IV 37-38 apēz (+ ērē arba and -kan). 4

mēna- 'speak':  KUB XII 11 IV 19-20.24-25 GIS₇₂₇ ZAM.GAR-az (+ para and -kan).

parkēnek- 'become pure':  KBo XIII 109 II 11-13 hurkilaza

paprannaza mulatnaza.

parkunu- 'purify':  KBo X 45 IV 13-14, KUB XXIV 13 II 3, XXVII 67 II 30+ III 33.

šallanaï- 'draw' (?):  KBo XIX 109+ IV 13 taknaza. 11

šubhaï- 'pour':  KBo V 2 II 19-20 šarāmnaz (+ ērē and -kan).

tūwaï 'from a distance':  KUB XIII 20 I 25 hatrāmē, XXV 49 II 1.16+ and XXXII 65 II 20-21 QATAM dēi-/zikk- (see above p. 184).

Neo-Hittite manuscripts of Middle Hittite texts also show further examples of the dative-locative expressing separation:
KUB XIII 2 II 17 (Instr. for the bel madgaltil/dienstanz, 45):

(171) n-at kuitaš awan arba daškandu

'Let them take it (the crumbling plaster) off the walls.'

KBo XI 72 II 41 (R. for Underworld Gods/CTH 447):

(172) [nu-k]an ANA 3 UDU-ŠI.A šuppa danzi

'They take pure meat from three sheep.'

KBo XXIII 15 I 5-6 (Libation to Hebat's Throne/CTH 701):

(173) ZAG-az-ma-kan/ [Š]U-az DUGšardušhi GIŠ ERIN šara dăši

'But with his right hand he picks up the cedarwood from the
s.-vessel.'

For the last example compare the much more common construction with
the ablative (p. 288 sub dıš-). KUB XII 34 I 9-10 is a Neo-Hittite
parallel to KUB XXXII 115 I 46 (ex. (147) p. 289 above) and offers
the same dative-locative construction with tuḫš- 'cut off'.

II. Ablative of 'time from which'

KBo XII 85 II 11 presents DUMU-anazza 'from childhood', which
despite the broken context is surely being used as it is in
KUB XXXI 127+ II 24 (see p. 191 above).

III. Ablative of Direction

In addition to many instances of ZAG-az, GŬE-laz, banteziyaz
etc., used absolutely and with a preceding dative-locative, Neo-
Hittite manuscripts of Middle Hittite texts show several interesting examples of ablatives of direction. Three of these offer further evidence that the ablative expresses direction toward as well as direction from:

KUB XXX 34 IV 25-29 (CTH 401):

[ŋ]u MĀŠ.GAL-ën waruwanzi Kūraḫrann-a/ [pla[r]iyanzi mu
tezzi kī-(y)ašte mehan/ [MĀŠ.GAL Kūraḫranna-ka kattan taknaza
pašir/ kī-kan SA URU Hatti inen ṭēbar NIS DINGIR LIM/ pangauwaš
ENE-za QATAMMA GAM-enda taknaza paidd[u]

'They burn the goat and bury the š-bird. He says: "As these,
the goat and the š-bird have gone down to the earth, so may
these, the sickness, blood, oath and common gossip of Hatti
go down to the earth.'

KUB VII 41 IV 22-23 (R. for Underworld Gods/ZA 54,140):

Șumeš-za-ken karwilieš DINGIR.MEŠ ku[za]/ uwatēn n-ašte kattan
aŋz [itten]

'You ancient gods [go] down whence you came.'

The gods which have been summoned up from the earth for the ritual
are sent down again at its conclusion (for the restoration and
interpretation see already Otten, ZA 54(1961)141, note 270).

The remaining example seems to be a genuine instance of com-
peting case usage:
KUB XVII 27 II 37-41 (CTH 434):
nu SALUr SU.GI SU.SAR dēm n-at GUb-la lēi/ ZAG-ne-ya-at lēi
nu kiššan memāi UH₄-naš [SU.SAR?]/ mēn ZAG-za taruppiyat
(176)
ug-at EGIR-[pa ZAG-za]/ lēiškimi mēn-at GUb-laz-ma
taruppiyat/ [māḫ-at EGIR-pa GUb-laza lē[iškimi]

"The "old woman" takes a braided rope. She unties it to the
left and to the right and speaks as follows: "If the [rope
(or spell?)] of the sorcerer has been braided to the right,
I untie it back to the right. But if it has been braided to
the left, I untie it back to the left."

One could restore something else after UH₄-naš, but this would not
affect the overall sense. I interpret taruppiyat as third sing.
pret. middle of a stem taruppiya- (cf. for the ending neyat etc.,
Neu, StBoT 6,28, and for the voice KUB XXIX 7+ Rs 44f cited by
Neu, StBoT 5,170). The interest of this passage lies in the use of
both the directive GUb-la and the ablative GUb-laza with lē- to
mean 'untie/loosen to the left'. We seem to have a real case of
functional overlap, but note that it is in the sense of direction
toward, not attainment of a goal.

There are also more examples of the abstract sense 'on the
side of/on behalf of':

KUB VII 58 I 13f (R. for a Defeated Army/CTH 426):
ënzdaza tīr DIN Gir.MES/ enzdaza memir/ IUGAL.MES ansidaz
(177)
nuntarnut/ pankūš
'The gods came over to our side, the kings spoke on our behalf, everyone hastened to our side.'

Compare KUB XLIV 20 II 13ff.

KUB XII 12 VI 6-8 (Ḫišuwā Festival/CTH 628):

(178) namma mān SAL.LUGAL ariya/ nu Ištu ša d′Liluri adanna wēkši

'Further, if the queen is there, she asks for (food) to eat on behalf of Liluri.'

There are also two further occurrences showing the subtle spatial relationships the ablative can convey:

KBo V 2 III 17-19 (R. of Ammihatna/CTH 471):

(179) nu 2 Gil dəi nu ša d′ Šū.ŠA kuēz artarī/ nu Gil.HL.A ANA Šū.ŠA pantezziyaz piran/ Kī.GAL iēzzi

'He takes two reeds and makes the reeds (into) a gate in front of the throne of the Storm-god in line with which he is standing.'

kuēz artarī cannot mean 'from which he rises', since there is no indication that anyone sits on the throne of the Storm-god (such an act would scarcely be permissible). According to lines II 48 and 55-56, the master of the sacrifice is standing behind the first hupruḫi in front of which stands the throne of the Storm-god.

Thus while he is lined up with the throne, the hupruḫi is actually between him and the throne. The redundancy of pantezziyaz piran is
not limited to ablative adverbs. Compare KBo V 1 II 18-19:

\[ \text{iḫkiša-šmaḫ ECIR-an.} \]

KBo XVII 105 III 24-25 (R. for \( d^\text{KAL} \) \( \text{KUS} \) kuršaš/CTH 433):

(180) nu-kan KASKAL-az ZAG-az/ GIŠ labburnuzi dagan d3i

'He places foliage (?) on the ground off the path to the right.'

For a simple 'to the right of the path' one would expect KASKAL-zi ZAG-az. Since the point of the ritual is to lure the unfriendly Pleiades off the path (see III 30f), the ablative KASKAL-az probably is used to underline that the objects are to be placed at some distance from the path.

There is also another likely instance of appizziaq 'behind' meaning 'secretly' (cf. ex. (62) p. 204 above):

KBo V 1 I 41-42 (Papanikri/Pan. 4*):

\[ \text{mēn-za AMA-ŠA naška ABU-ŠA appizziaq/ kuīkti waštanuwan} \]
\[ \text{herkanzi} \]

'If your mother or father have secretly (?) let some sin take place...'

Sommer-Ehelolf, Pan. 5*, read appizziaq as 'Letzten Endes (?)', but this seems to add little meaning in the context. Since the next sentence refers to the god having allowed a sin to happen 'through a dream' (zašbît), I suggest that appizziaq here again has the meaning 'behind one's back' > 'secretly'. The pregnant
woman is to be absolved even from unknown sins.

A few more directional ablative deserve brief mention.

\textit{KBo II 9 IV 28} has \textit{n-at IGI-zia\textordmasculine} \textit{dammai} \\ \textit{êzi} 'Someone else grasps it in front' (cf. \textit{ketieregê} \textit{êzi} 'grasps (from) below' \textit{KBo IV 9 IV 34-35, KUB XXV 17 I 9-10 and KUB X 3 II 23}). \textit{VBoT II 20 II 23} shows \textit{ku\textordmasculine} \textit{sten-mu} \textit{UZ\textordmasculine} \textit{GAB-asz}, literally 'Look toward my chest', i.e. 'Face me!'. \textit{KBo V 2 III 26-28} offers the variant \textit{ZAG-a\textordmasculine} \textit{ku\textordmasculine} \textit{hupru\textordmasculine} \textit{bishi...GUB-laz-ma ku\textordmasculine} \textit{hupru\textordmasculine} \textit{bishi} 'the \textordmasculine} which is right... but the \textordmasculine} which is on the left'. One normally finds \textit{ZAG-asz...GUB-laz}, but the predicate adjective is perfectly grammatical, and it is more likely a permissible variant than an error. It should also be noted that \textit{KBo XVII 60} offers the older \textit{kitkar 'at the head (of)'}. \textit{Vs 4 kitkar GİR.\textordmasculine} \textit{M9-asz tepu\textordmasculine}, \textit{Vs 8 ANA DUMU kitkar}.

IV. Perlative Ablative

Neo-Hittite manuscripts of Middle Hittite texts contain several more instances which help to establish this usage.

\textit{VBoT III 148 III 15-16} (Drawing Te\textordmasculine}ub, Hebat et al./\textit{OTH 485}):

\textit{GİŞ AB-yaz-ma anda hene\textordmasculine} \textit{hanzi nu-kan an\textordmasculine} \textit{dan?/ GAN-anda ÜL ku\textordmasculine} \textit{zga pe\textordmasculine} \textit{tivas[i]}

'But they plaster in the windows, and they do not throw (anything) down in(?) through any of them.'
KUB XXX 34 IV 20-22 (OTH 401):

(183) n-ašta antukšuš/ kūzze KÁ.GAL.ḪI.A-as katta kunanne/ peḫudansi
        apūš-kan apūš katta pidatti

'The gate through which they carry people to be killed—
through that which you will carry them.'

As in the other examples with 'gate', a reading 'from the gate'
is grammatically possible, but unsuited to the context. The gate
is not the starting point of the action—if the addressee were
standing by the gate mentioned, it is unlikely that he would think
of using any other, and the instruction would be pointless. The
starting point is somewhere within the walls, and the instruction
tells which gate one should go through.

KUB XXXIII 122 II 5 (Hedammu/StBot 14,50):

(184) [İD-za taknaza GAM-an šarāḫ eḫ[u]] (simil. KUB XII 65 III 8)
     'Come up via the river and the earth below.'

Ibid. II 7-8

(185) [n-aš-kaḫ]en İD-za taknaza GAM-an arba [KASKAL-an iyat]]
     'He made his way via the river and the earth below.'

KUB XII 65 III 10 (Hedammu/StBot 14,50):

(186) n-aš-kaḫ taknaḫ İD-ašš-e KASKAL-an GAM-an arba [iyat]
     'He took the path of the river and the earth below.'

Ibid. III 11-12

(187) n-aš-kaḫ ANA ḫ Kumarbi šarpulaz taknaza GISŠU.A-i-[ešši]/
kattan šarrī uit

'He came up under Kumarbi's throne via a pillar (?) out of the earth.'

The subject of (184) is the sea, who is to come up to Kumarbi by a subterranean route so as not to be seen by the other gods. The subject of (185) is Mukisanu, who is sent by Kumarbi by the same route to deliver the message to the sea. (186) and (187) describe the journey of the sea to Kumarbi's palace. In (184) and (186) the sea is the starting point, in (185) Kumarbi's palace: the river and the earth indicate the route traveled, not place from which. In (187) the journey through the earth has been completed, and it is viewed as the place from which the sea rises into view via a šarrūla-, probably a pillar or column which begins below ground.

V. Ablative of Means

The ablative of means is quite widespread in Neo-Hittite manuscripts of Middle Hittite texts, although it is still slightly outnumbered by the instrumental in this function. A few examples are worthy of special note:

*KUB XV 31 I 11-12 (Drawing d/MAH et al./CTH 484):*

(186) nu-kan kî šarrūla- karuwiliyaz tuppiaz/ iensi

'They make these arrangements according to the old tablet(s)!'
Since the instrumental tuvvit is never attested, one could also choose to interpret the ablative here as indicating the source of information (see p. 406 below).

ibid. I 18-20

nu-kan BOIR-ends/ GIG$pahurules pahhur werpansz nu pahhur/
warnuanszi

'Afterwards they enclose the fire with a fire-screen (?) and burn the fire.'

Since 'washing' the fire makes little sense, I wonder if we have here another instance of warpåši- 'enclose' (see above p. 228f).

Other examples:

enš- 'wipe': KUB XLI 19 Rs 12 ZİD-DA-ax?, ibid. Rs 13-14 ĵûšiyaz
(both + -kan, 2nd + ārba).

arrä- 'wash': KBo X 45 IV 38, V 2 IV 39, KUB IX 6 I 2, XXVII 16
I 24, VBoT 120 III 6, 1698/c, 7f (MTI 1,369).

ašeš- 'set': KUB XXXII 128 II 13-14 GIG$irîšiyaz (+ -kan).

eku- 'drink': HT I 1 45 1-za Gİ$A-DA.CUR-ax (+ -kan).4

Ep- 'hold; grasp': KUB IX 6 I 9.15-16, XXIV 13 III 14, XXXII 43

buštîyaš- 'draw, pull': KBo II 9 IV 12 ISTU NINDA $azzisitaza
(+ ārba).

ištappa- 'stop up': TBoT III 148 III 29+.50-52 kizza ISTU KUBABBAR
GUŞKIN NINDA,KUR-RA-ya (+ -kan).
karp- 'lift': KUB XV 39 II 27 [IŠT]U ERE.NI.A-ŠU ('by his tongues').
kištanu- 'extinguish': KBO XV 48 III 5-6 apēz (+ ašta).
laḫuwaši- 'pour': KBO XV 69 I 13+20-21, KUB IX 6 I 17, XL 97 III 19.4
papparēš- 'sprinkle': KBO VIII 155 II 8-9 ašUŠ[EN-aš] pertamaz (+ arba), XXI 34 II 29-30 witenaz (zi).
Šep- 'be polluted': KUB XIII 2 II 23 witenaz.
šipand- 'libate': KBO XX 114 II 7+16-17, XV 69 I 19.14+
(2nd = KBO XV 59 III 4-5 with instr.), XV 37 III 32-33,36+,
XV 68 IV 1-2+5-6+, KUB XXV 42 II 9, XV 48 IV 6-7+,12-13,
XXV 49 II 8,11+.III 15+.
šiššiuriša- 'irrigate': KUB XXIII 84 III 54-55 witenaz.
šunna- 'fill': KBO XX 114 II 19.V 8-9.10-11, XV 49 I 8+, XXI 34
šuppašaš- 'purify': KUB XXV 42 III 2-3 + KBO XV 47 III 16-17
witenaz, KBO XXI 34 III 2 witenaz (+ arba).
šu- 'full of': KBO XII 96 I 10-11 halwannaz.
IV 17-18, XX 128,14-15, XXII 165,11, XXIII 15 I 5-6,
KUB XXXII 43 I 2-3, IX 6 I 10-11.
dāš- 'place': KUB XXIV 13 I 20 GIS šūriyaz (+ šan), XXVII 16
I 32-33 apēz-pät IŠTU DUG.GIR.KAN, HT 1 I 24-25 GIS šūriyaz
(+ piran katta; 2x).
dammeḫāi- 'oppress': KBo II 9 I 39 (= KBo XXI 48 Vs 10-11)

tarb- 'conquer': KUB XXXVI 55 II 16 iṣḫiṣmanaz (+ -za).

wabnu- 'brandish': KBo XV 48 II 2-3, 24-25 apēsza (GIS supparišt)
(object is LUGAL-un; see p. 234 above for the syntax).

weriya- 'call': KUB XXXII 137 II 9 KÂXU-az (+ -kan).

zanu- 'cook': VBoT 24 IV 25 IZI-az.

VI. Ablative of Accompaniment

This usage is sparingly attested in Neo-Hittite manuscripts of Middle Hittite texts.

KUB XXXIII 109+ I 16-18 (Hedammu/StBoT 14, 38):

[nu]-kan GAL-in arumān dKu[mal]rbivaza Ė-irze IŠTU GIS? x[...]/

(190) [a]rkammiyaza [galgaltur]iyaza ZABAR ū IŠTU BIBRI HI-A ZABAR/

[p]läiḫu uwaṭ[er]

'And they brought the great sea out of Kumarbi's house accompanied by , arka minha and galgaltur of bronze and by rhyta of bronze.'

KUB XXXII 128 I 30-32 (Hiḫuwa Festival/CTH 628):

waterr-ā GIS ERIN-az DINCIŘ-LIN-ni meneḫ banda SAL tapriyaḵ/

lāḫüwai

'The t.-woman pours out the water along with the cedarwood toward the god.'
For the interpretation of =contextefd> compare ibid. III 33 wētar  
<contextefd>

Similar is KBo XV 48 III 25-26:

\[(192) \text{nu-Šan wētar } \text{E}n\text{IN-az LUGAL-i/ ŠU.HI.A-az laḫūwai} \]

'He pours the water with the cedarwood on the king's hands.'

Compare ibid. III 18-19: LÚŠANKA GAL A dāī/ anda-ma-kan  
<contextefd> 

kitta 'The priest takes a cup of water—in it lies/is placed 
<contextefd> cedarwood.'

KBo XXI 34 I 63-64 (CTH 699):

\[(193) \text{nu-wa-mu-ze QADU ANŠE.KUR.RA.MES } \text{GIGIR.MES/ kuḫz tarabši} \]

\[\text{UNMA LUGAL-NA tarabši-du-za laš} \]

"Accompanied by what horses and chariots will you conquer me?"

—Says the king: "I will conquer you alone."

The ablative here could of course be interpreted as expressing 
means. However, the Hittites for the most part use Akkadian qēdu 
correctly to mean 'together with', and in view of similar uses 
with  (see ex. (159) p. 302 above) it seems safest to 
assume that accompaniment is also intended here.

VII. Ablative of Respect

Three examples of this usage may be cited from Neo-Hittite 
manuscripts of Middle Hittite texts:
KUB XIII 2 II 6f (Instr. for the bel madgalti/Dienstanw. 44):
\[\text{hantaz-at-kan} 12 \text{ galulu}a\tilde{\text{a}}/ \tilde{\text{E}}\tilde{\text{I}}\tilde{\text{J}} \tilde{\text{I}} \tilde{\text{U}} \tilde{\text{I}} \tilde{\text{T}} \tilde{\text{I}} \tilde{\text{I}} \text{ G}\text{I}\tilde{\text{D}}.\text{DA-ašti-ma-at} 1 \text{ gipeškar} (194) 4 \text{ ḫekann-a Eštu/} \tilde{\text{S}} \tilde{\text{I}} \tilde{\text{M}} \tilde{\text{A}}-\text{ Ix hantaz 3 galulu}a\tilde{\text{a}} \text{ Eštu G}\text{I}\tilde{\text{D}}.\text{DA-ašti-ma-at/} [1 \text{ gipeškar}] \text{ Eštu}
\]
'Let it (the firewood) be 12 fingers across the front, but in length let it be 1 g. and 4 ḫ. Let the ___ wood be three fingers across the front, but 1 g. in length.'

Note that hantaz is not simply 'in front', which would be ḫanza; the ablative expresses 'with respect to (its) front'. Although a dative-locative is formally possible, the corresponding G\text{I}\tilde{\text{D}}.\text{DA-ašti} is most likely an accusative of respect (cf. e.g. KBo XII 96 I 10-11, IBoT III 148 III 29.50-52).

KUB XIII 2 III 34-35 (Instr. for the bel madgalti/Dienstanw. 48):
(195) nu-ṣmaš-šan/ ḫūmadaz IGI-HI.A ḫarak

'Keep your eye on them in all respects.'

KUB XXIX 44 III 8 (Horse Training Text/Hipp. 162):
(196) nu \text{ANŠE.KUR.RA} kuš tuṣṣarr\text{AEGIR-pa} [mališkuš?]

'A horse which is weak in body afterwards.'

For the restoration see Kammenhuber, Hipp. 162-163 with note a. Her grammatical interpretation of the ablative is surely correct, even if the specific lexical item mališkuš is not assured.

VIII. Adverbial Ablatives
All examples are of adverbs of time. Most common is GE₆-az/įšpantaz 'at night': KUB XXIII 11 II 22, I 11 III 9, VII 5 II 19, KBo III 2 Rs 38 and XVII 105 II 16. KUB I 11 IV 45 (Kikkuli) has the spelling GE₆-enza. This solitary example may be an error or an instance of the ablative -enza outside an √n-stem (see Chap. 5 Sec. 1.3). It is highly doubtful that it represents an adverbial use of the nominative. KBo XVII 105 II 15 may show [UD-az in contrast to įšpandaz of the next line. KUB XIII 2 III 2 offers karuliyaț 'formerly'. In contrast to the unspecified įšpantaz 'at night' note the dative-locative epēdani GE₆-ti 'in that night' in KUB XVII 28 III 22 and Lidet III 148 III 20 (see the discussion above pp. 217-218).

IX. Problematic Cases

Several instances of the ablative in Neo-Hittite manuscripts of Middle Hittite texts are problematic in their interpretation despite a complete context. I present them here without an attempt at translation:

KUB XXX 40 I 16-18 (Ḫišuwu Festival/CTH 628):

ru-kan ANA 1 UZU 1 KARŞI? GUD UZU UDU/ pımendaz įkpressnaze enda
(197)

unuḫanti

KBo XV 37 III 50-52 (Ḫišuwu Festival/CTH 628):

EGIR-ŠU-me 2 GIS garkar İNE/ ŠA MINDA-LÀL pımantaza/ tarmaza
(198)

handan
KUB IX 31 I 14-15 (R. of Zarpiya/CTH 757):
KUB IX 4 II 29-30 (R. of the "Old Woman"/CTH 760):
(200) n-ē-za uizzz EGI-[R-pa paraēza/ keēzi

This example apparently offers a variant of EGI-[R-pa paraēza 'backwards' (see p. 219f above), but its use with keē- 'sleep' is not clear to me.

KUB XXXI 86 II 11 (Instr. for the bel madgalti/Dienstang. 43):
(201) [...]etinanwa ma šara ŪL arnuzi

See von Schuler, Dienstang. 53, ad loc...

KUB IX 28 I 23, III 18 (Ritual for Seven Gods/CTH 442):
(202) 1 NINDAṭannaza kitta...[Ewanteš dannaza kitta

The duplicate to III 18, KBo XIX 132 Rs 5, has [dam]nanna, and it is by no means assured that t/dannaza is an ablative. Friedrich, HUB 209, lists it hesitantly under NINDA dannuš-, but the latter appears to be a neuter s-stem. In the presence of Ewanteš 'full' one is led to think of a stem dannant- 'empty, hollow', but this does not explain the syntax of the second sentence.

X. Non-Examples

A couple more instances of nouns in -az should be taken as nominatives of animatizing ant-stems:
KUB XXIII 11 III 16-17 (Annals of Tuthaliya/CTH 142):

(203) [nu-za] tussiyaz/ EGIR-za GIŠ TIR ISBAT

'The army retreated to the woods.'

For the idiom -za ėupa ėn- + Acc. 'retreat to/take refuge in'
compare KUB VI 45 III 40, where the bird takes refuge in his nest,
and also KBo III 4 II 34, V 8 II 24 and KUB XIV 15 III 34f, all in
the Annals of Mursili. In KUB XXX 34 IV 7-8 (= XXXIX 103 Rs 4)
ēšbananza linkiyaz should also be interpreted as nominatives.

KUB VII 58 I 11-12 (R. for a Defeated Army/CTH 426):

(204) išbunau-šmit GI-za URU Alminālašnaš/ kittaru

'Let the city of A. be stationed as their bow and arrow.' (??)

This sentence is peculiar under any interpretation. In view of the
nominative GI-az (KUB XVII 10 II 31), I find a nominative GI-za
more plausible than any interpretation with an ablative. Similar
is KBo XVII 61 Vs 17: [...]x ūkza išparranza. Syntactically, an
ablative (of means) is easier: 'trampled with the heel'. Formally,
however, an ablative ūkza would have to represent a consonant stem
ikt- plus -za (like nepiš-za). The position after a two-stop cluster
seems an unlikely place for the very rare ending -za(a) to be preserved
(see Chap. 5, Sec. 1.2). I therefore prefer to read 'a/the trampling
heel', with a nom. sg. ūkza (/ikts/) and an active participle from
a transitive verb. The latter is unusual, but not impossible (cf.
šekkantit ZI-it 'with a knowing mind' (ex. (126) p. 252 above).

In summary, Neo-Hittite manuscripts of Middle Hittite texts show the following uses of the ablative:

I. Ablative of Separation

II. Ablative of 'time from which'

III. Ablative of Direction

IV. Perlative Ablative

V. Ablative of Means

VI. Ablative of Accompaniment

VII. Ablative of Respect

VIII. Adverbial Ablatives (Time)
Section 2.2. Usage of the Instrumental in Neo-Hittite Manuscripts

I. Instrumental of Means

The instrumental of means is well attested in Neo-Hittite manuscripts of Middle Hittite texts. Noteworthy examples include the following:

KUB XIII 2 III 36-37 (Instr. for the bel maššalti/Dienstanw. 46):

arnuwaleš-a-ken kuiš KUR-ya anda arzanane nu-šši-šan/ išhuesnit NUMUN.ḪI.A-it GUD UDU IĞI.ḪI.A parak

(205) 'But the deportee who is settled (?) in the land—watch out for him with ___, seed, cattle and sheep.'

For IĞI.ḪI.A parak—'keep one's eyes on' > 'watch out for' see also ex. (195) p. 322 above.

KUB XXXIII 120 I 31-33 (Theogony/Athenaeum 31,112):

ēšma-tte armahḫun ʾišKUR-nit nakkit/ dēn-ma-tte armahḫun
(206) ʾIr Aran[zi]hīt īl mezuwaš/ ʾa-nu-a-tta armahḫun nakkit ʾTaš[mil]t

'First I impregnated you with the weighty Storm-god; second with the irresistible Tigris; and third with Tasmi(su).'

This example shows that Hittite had no constraint against employing the instrumental of means with animate beings, when the need arose.

VBOT 24 II 24-25 (R. of Anniviyan/i CTH 393):

(207) uškanzi-ma ĪSTU MUŠEN nu kuwapi MUŠENḪI.A/ SIGuations
'They take a look with bird(s), and if the birds turn cut favorably...'

KBo V 1 III 22 (Papanikri/Pap. 10*):

(208) nu DINGIR.MEŠ JŠTU NINDA SIG kalutezzi

'We makes the rounds of the gods with flat bread.'

Line III 39 of the same text shows an alternate construction:

(209) nu EGIR-anda NINDA.SIG.HI.A DINGIR.MEŠ-aŠ SAL."MEŠ kalutezzi

'After that he offers the flat bread by turns to the goddesses.'

These two variants may be related by the same sort of transformation we have seen with eku-, šipand- and waḫnu- (see above p. 234f):

Object (acc.) + God (dat.) + kalute-

⇒ God (acc.) + Object (instr.) + kalute-

As noted earlier in the discussion of eku- and šipand-, the full structure of sentences with these verbs is not usually present, one or more elements being omitted. In view of this fact and the existence of two basic structures for šipand- (p. 238), it is not surprising that we occasionally find a compromise between the alternatives Object (acc.) + God (dat.) and God (acc.) + Object (instr.).

KBo V 1 III 3-4 (Papanikri/Pap. 6*):

(210) nu addaŠ DINGIR.MEŠ-aŠ zeyantit ḫUŠ .it šipandæni
'They sacrifice to the paternal gods with cooked sheepfat.'

The instrumental of means is attested with the following verbs (once again attestations with common verbs are merely listed, not quoted):

*anš- 'wipe': KBo V 1 IV 4, XX 116 Rs 5-6, KUB XXIV 13 II 11-13.
*ar- 'be set up' (see Neu, StBot 5,7): KBo V 2 III 43 ḫšTU GAL, ibid. IV 36-37 GIŠ GANNUM-īt.
*arrā- 'wash': KBo III 2 Vs 4-5f (8x), III 5 I 33f (5x), V 2 III 59, KUB I 11 I 25-26f (5x), I 13 III 17-18+iV 44.
*ašša- 'inquire about': KUB XV 31 II 8 DINIR, MÉŠ-īt.
*arš- '?': KBo XVII 60 Vs 3 iššimnēnit (cf. KUB XXXI 147 II 27?).
*au- 'see': KBo XI 72 III 31 SIG-entot ḫšTU IGI • A-ī it (+ anda and -ken), KUB XII 8 III 20 ḫšTU GIŠ MUNUZ ZIBANA (+ IGI-anda and -ašša = 'inspect').
*ekšu- 'give to drink' (?): KBo III 5 IV 18-19 wesentit.
*panešš- 'plaster': KUB XIII 2 II 14-15 newit wilenit.
*par(k)- 'hold': KBo X 45 II 28, XIII 167 II 12, KUB XII 11 III 7f, VBoT 24 I 27.
*bēnganu- 'make bow down': KUB VIII 66 + XXXIII 86 III 7-8 memīnit
(thus with Neu, StBot 5,33; Siegelová, StBot 14,58, reads
*ninganu- 'cause to lift up' (??).

*huittiya- 'pull, draw': KBo III 2 Rs 58, III 5 I 72 II 19-20.30,
KUB XV 31 I 33-34.II 39-41+, XXXII 127 Rs 6.
בּוּלוּלַיָּה - '_wrap': KUB XII 34 I 5 UZU, UDU-it (+ anda).
בָּרְנַי - 'sprinkle': KBo X 45 II 15 ū-IT LĀL-it.
יִבְּפָי - 'bind': KBo XV 48 II 13 SIG alit SA₃ (+ anda), KUB IX 28 III 14-15, 20-21 tiyammanda...šuwarušīt (2nd + anda),
VBoT 24 III'32-33 SIG buddullūt (+ anda).
יִבָּצַי - 'gird': KBo XII 96 I 18 šapparit (+-kan).
יִסָק - 'anoint': KBo V 1 IV 5-6, XV 37 I 24-25, KUB XXXIII 88 Rs 10
//VBoT II 135 I 8), HT 1 I 38.
יִבָּפָי - 'satiate': KBo III 5 I 28 wetenit.
יִסָּר - 'trample': KBo VI 34 III 25, 28-30+ GĪR-it.
קלוּת - 'make the rounds of': KUB XXVII 16 IV 23 IŠTU NINDA.SIG.MB₂,
סָגָלַיָּה - '?': KBo XI 72 III 45 [ ...]huišwamitt-a.
כָּרִי - 'cover': KBo III 21 II 20 [ ]-nit...šaram-an-it-it (+-kan).
כָּרַס - 'cut (off)': KBo X 45 I 17 (= KUB VII 41 I 25) URUDU atēššit.
קטקטָת - 'make tremble' (?): KBo III 5 I 49-50f, III 2 Rs 40.
Lrd 3, KUB I 11 III 13 wetenit, KUB I 13 III 32*, 51-52
אנת על wetenit.
מָלָה - 'grind': KBo VI 34 II 21, X 45 III 3 IŠTU NAAR₂.
מֵנוֹ- 'speak': KUB XII 34 I 7-8 KĀXU-it EME-it.
מוֹיָנָו - 'cause to flourish': KUB X 27 I 25-26 šuelpit IŠTU INBI.
XXVII 16 I 12-13 IŠTU GIŠ x[ ...]šuelpit GĒŠIN-it
GIŠ, HĀŠUR-it.
פָּפַָרָה - 'sprinkle': KBo XV 48 II 6-7, 27-28 A MUŠEN-aš partaumit.
papraḫḫ- 'defile': KUB XXXIII 120 II 33 ištemenit.
palṭalḥai- 'line': KUB XXX 86 II 12 ḪU 12 twenty-I.A (+ 3arē). palṭalliyat- 'fetter' (?): KBo VI 34 I 23-24 (= KUB XL 13 Vs 7) palṭalḥ[lit]. šanbuwaš- 'roast': KBo XVII 105 III 2-3 pahḥun[bi]t. šip[and]- 'libate; sacrifice': KBo V 1 I 26-27, 28-29, 36-37, III 3-4, V 2 I 49, XV 59 III 4-5, XV 68 III 7-8, 11-12, KUB XXXII 128 I 13-14, XXVII 1 IV 47-48, XXXIII 120 II 72, XI 8 III 2-4. šuš- 'full of': KBo V 2 IV 36-37, VI 34 III 13 (see Oettinger, StBo 22, 39f.), XII 96 I 9-10, XXI 34 II 5, KUB IX 28 I 12, XIII 2 I II 40, XXVII 1 IV 47-48. šunnaš- 'fill': KBo II 3 II 37-38, II 9 IV 10, KUB VII 38 Vs 4, XII II IV 3-4, XXVIII 1 III 15, XXXII 74 III 12-13, XL 102 VI 7-9, XI 8 II 42. šuppiyalt- 'purify': KUB XLV 32 III 30 wetenn[it]. ḫē- 'take': KUB XXIV 13 II 7 šēšarit. tarḫ- 'conquer': KUB XXVI 19 II 35 hannaš[mit]. tarnaš- 'let go': KBo V 2 IV 23-24 šišillaš wittenit (+ arba), XVII 105 IV 13 Gir-it (+ šer). Here tarnaš- = 'let flow'. waḫnum- 'brandish; encircle': KBo V 1 II 56-III 1 ḪU 1 MUS[EN, XV 48 II 2-3, 24-25 (apesza) GIS sumarit; KUB XXXI 84 II 2 UNE][U]<[UDU beya-wal]lit GIS mariyawannit (+ anda). waḫu- 'strike': KUB IX 28 II 14, XVII 4, 11, XII 8 II 39, 282/t + 428/t Rs 3-4 (StBo 2, 33).
warkant- 'fat(tened)': KBo II 3 I 57-58 ū-it halkit.

warp- 'wash': KBo XV 25 Vs 7-8 wanduwaš [IM-it šu]waruwitt-a

VBoT 120 III 7 wetenit.

wiya- 'send': KUB XV 31 I 35 ša A MUŠEN partāniti.

zanu- 'cook (tr.)': KBo X 45 III 48, XI 72 II 42, XIII 114 III 6, XIII 167 II 7. III 6, XV 25 Rs 6⁺, XIX 132 Vs 1, XXVII 16 III 22. 25, XXVII 67 III 55-56, XXXII 128 II 25 (= KBo XV 49 I 11)¹⁴, VBoT 24 II 37. 40, PHG 12 (II) 14.

zeya- 'cook (int.)': KUB XXVII 1 III 19 DUGTUš-it.

II. Instrumental of Accompaniment

Neo-Hittite manuscripts of Middle Hittite texts contain further examples of the three types of instrumental of accompaniment we have seen before: comitative use with persons, attendant circumstance and use with verbs of 'putting together':

KUB XXIII 68 Vs 26 (Treaty with Ḫārmaḫa/ḪOC 5, 194):

(211) [ ]/ ISTU LŪ.MEŠ kuenten 'Kill together with the men.'

ibid. Vs 27

[nu] apnt 磹-ir LŪ MEŠ-it aku

'Let that house die/be killed together with (its) men.'

KUB XXVI 29 + XXXI 55 Vs 15 (Treaty with Uša/ZA 57,

(212) ERIN.MEŠ-it niniktumat

'Mobilize with your troops.'
KUB I 13 II 56 (Kikkuli/Hipp. 62):

(213) nu-mişašt 1 §ADU memel IN,NU,DA–it menaḫḫanda immiyan dan pianzi

'They give them one measure of meal mixed with straw.'

KBo III 5 I 56 also has İŠTU IN,NU,DA immiyan, but in II 18 it shows İTTI IN,NU,DA immiyanzi, where the Akkadian itti marks a dative-locative in Hittite. Likewise we find KUB XLV 58 III 14-15:

ANA GİŞ/ [men]ẹḫḫan[d]a immezanzi. Compare also:

Kbo VI 34 II 22 (Milit. Oath/StBoT 22,10):

(214) n-še witenit immiyansı 'They mix it with water.'

Kbo XV 37 IV 46-47 (Hišuwa Festival/OTH 628):

(215) namma-šat witenit/ takšansı

'They put it (the wine) together with water.'

Compare ibid. IV 49 GEŠIMN takšan 'mixed (i.e. watered) wine'.

KUB XXV 48 IV 22-23 (Hišuwa Festival/OTH 628):

(216) GİŞ.d,ANANNA-it [galgal]t[u]ritt-i uδanzi

'They bring...to the accompaniment of the İštar-instrument and the g..'

KBo X 45 IV 48-49 (R. for Underworld Gods/OTH 446):

(217) nu ANA 3 GUHUN.ŠEŠ §ADU NINDA.SIG.ŠEŠ GİŞ,ERIN/ [ILAL] warnuži

'On three hearths they burn cedarwood, oil and honey along with flat bread.'
KUB XL 13 Rs 8-9 (Milit. Oath/StBot 22,16):

\[ \text{[K]uš-wa-kan kūš NIS DINGIR.MES šerrai/ [n-an QADU DAM-ŠU DUMU.MES-ŠU pankunit/}]
\[(216) \text{[((kūš NIS DINGIR.MES...)[paminkkandu])}]

'Whoever breaks these oaths, let the(se) gods of the oath destroy him along with his wife, children and (entire) clan.'

Similar to the last example is KUB XXVI 19 II 44-45 huitnit HURSAG.JI.A-it [pam]inkandu 'let them destroy...along with the wild animals and the mountains'. KBo II 3 II 42-43 is a Neo-Hittite duplicate to KUB XXXII 115+ III 34-35 (see ex. (160) p. 302).

III. Instrumental of Respect

There is one solid example of this usage among the Neo-Hittite manuscripts of Middle Hittite texts:

KUB XXIV 13 II 7-9 (R. of Alleiturahi/CTH 780):

\[ \text{ēškarit-at-kan dandu parkešnit-at-kan/ andan ēšdu palbesnit-}
\[(219) \text{aš-kan anda ēšdu alwanzinaš kuit HUL-šu uttar ēššēta}

'Let them take it with their (full) stature. Let it be in (them) in their height, let it be in (them) in their breadth—the evil word which the sorcerer made.'

'They' refers here to the figurines mentioned in III 11. While the first instrumental expresses means, the others specify the extent to which the evil is to reside in the figurines. KUB XII 34
I 36-37 is a Neo-Hittite duplicate to KUB XXXII 115+ II 24 (ex. (162) p. 302).

IV. Instrumental of Agent

One additional example of this usage is provided by KUB XVII 28 IV 45 (R. for a Defeated Army/CTH 426):

(220) mān ERĪN.MEŠ.HT.Ā IŠTU LŪ KŪR pillantari

'If the troops are defeated by the enemy.'

V. Pronominal Instrumental Used for the Ablative

As noted above, kēt is not attested in Middle Hittite texts outside the phrase kitpandalaz. Neo-Hittite manuscripts offer a couple more examples of the instrumental enclitic possessive with nouns in the ablative: KUB XXXIII 120 I 21 kiššarazza-šit, XII 8 II 2 GIŠΣU.A-za-te[t].

VI. Instrumental of Exchange or Substitution

This usage of the instrumental, which we have not seen previously, is exemplified by the following two passages:

KUB XXVI 19 II 27-28 (Gasga Treaty/CTH 140):

(221) ANA 1 LŪ EGIR-an 3 LŪ.MEŠ piškattenni ANA 1 GUD-va [...]/IŠTU 1 UDU 3 UDU-pat pišteni
'You will give three men for one man, and [you will give three cows] for one cow. In place of one sheep you will likewise give three sheep.'

KBo II 3 II 50-51 (R. of Mastigga/MT 1,360):

(222) $\text{dUTU-i} \text{k}(\text{i})\text{Sa-wa-šmaš} \ (m)\text{akkūššiš} \text{KA}x\text{U-i[t]}/ \text{EME"-itt-a}$

'Behold, oh Sun-god, here is a ritual substitute for their mouth and tongue.'

The simple dative is also attested in this function: Laws §63

(KBo VI 2 IV 20): $\text{ANA 2 ṢAH.TUR 1 PA ŠE pāi}$ 'He gives a measure of grain for (every) two piglets'. The function of EGISR-an in the first passage above is therefore uncertain. It may be simply an adverb 'afterwards'.

VII. Adverbial Instrumentals

Aside from one more instance of panguñit 'en masse' (KUB XXVI 29 + XXXI 55 Vs 15), we are dealing here again with various uses of ZI-it (ištanzæt). KUB XXVI 19 II 12f shows three more instances of ZI-it meaning 'on one's own (authority)'. Perhaps a clue to the literal meaning of this idiom is to be found in the variant of KUB XIII 9 III 7 (Instr. of Tutḫaliya/CTh 258):

(223) $\text{LUGAL-waš ARÅH-[an P]ANTI ZI-ŠU 1'E kuiški kiuszzi}$

'Let no one open the king's granary on his own authority.'
PANI ZI-SU, which literally means 'before his mind', is clearly equivalent to ZI-it in a similar context in KUB XIII 1 IV.7 (see ex. (163) p. 303 above). Compare also KUB XIII 9 IV 4-5: [I]ŠTU ZI-KUNU-ma-šmaš / [...]x EN GIŠ TUKUL-ma PANI ZI-SU dâi. Despite the broken context one may reasonably understand something like 'Do not take ... on your own authority ... but if a "master of the weapon" takes ... on his own authority ...'. The equivalence of ZI-it and PANI ZI-SU suggests that the instrumental originally had the function of a 'sociatif interne' (see pp. 164-165 above); i.e. '(in consultation) with one's mind'. This is confirmed by Ullikummi I 5 (JCS 5,146), where copy A has ḫašakirib-za ḫet-te-tar ZI-ni píra-d [aškazzai] 'Kumarbi takes wisdom for himself before his mind'. Copy B has ZI-ni katte-ta 'with his mind'. The same variation is found in A I 9 versus B I 9. The dative-locative plus katte-ta is an alternate means to express 'together with', while ZI-ni píra-d is the Hittite for PANI ZI-SU. According to the above facts, ZI-it would have the same origin as the other common adverb pangašarit, both deriving from a comitative use of the instrumental.

The other expressions where ZI-it is variously modified (such as šekkantit ZI-it 'with a knowing mind') could be explained in the same way, but for these an original instrumental of means is also possible. This applies as well to hakuwakkarit ZI-it, which is first attested in a Neo-Hittite manuscript of a Middle Hittite text: KUB XIII 20 I 8-9,21.29.
The meaning of ḫakwāššar- has never been satisfactorily pinned down, as is clear from the definitions in Friedrich, Ḣwb 178: 'richtig, vollständig, unversehrt; vollwertig; dem Sachverhalt angemessen; aufrichtig; gesetzmäßig, legal; legitim; loyal'. The phrase ḫakwāššarit ZI-it is usually rendered as something like 'with a loyal mind', but in the Neo-Hittite Treaty with Aziru of Amurru the Akkadian equivalent is ina kul libbi-šu 'with (one's) entire heart' (KUB III 7+ Vs 20, FD 72). For the equation of this phrase with ḫakwāššarit ZI-it see Freydank, MIO 7(1960)374. Since ḫakwāššarit ZI-it means 'with (one's) entire mind' > 'whole-heartedly, single-mindedly', we should return to Friedrich's earlier interpretation of ḫakwāššar- as 'full, complete, whole', SV I 90r.¹⁵

VIII. Adnominal Instrumental

The additional examples of this usage confirm its secondary character:

KBo V 2 I 20 (R. of Ammihatna/CTH 471):
(224) 14 DUG ME šibillaš witeni<

'fourteen water-vessels with water of purification'

ibid. III 47

(225) DUG GAL šibilliveš-e witenit barzi

'And he holds a cup with water of purification.'
Compare ibid. IV 36-37 DUG-iš... witenit ħūwansa 'a cup filled with water'. KBo XXIII 15 IV 11 has GALAH GESTIN-it 'a cup with wine'. Like the other examples, these cases may be accounted for by deletion of ħūwant- 'full' (perhaps by a synchronic rule).

IX. Instrumental of Separation

Neo-Hittite manuscripts of Middle Hittite texts contain more examples of this usage than copies of Old Hittite texts, but they are still not numerous:

KBo III 5 I 55 (Kikkuli/Hirp. 84):

(226) mahhan-ma-aš' witenit arba uwanzi

'When they come away from the water.'

This is the only such use of an instrumental in all the horse training texts. Otherwise ablative and instrumental are consistently distinguished in these texts.

KUB XXIV 13 II 25-27 (R. of Allaiturahi/OTH 780):

ašun-a-[s.-kka]n alwanzater iššaš halukit/ SAG.DU-aš?

(227) []rešnit SAG.DU-aš tēdanit/ IGI.HI.A-aš X-X-X-it

'I wiped the evil spell from the message of your mouth, from the _ of your head, from the hair of your head and from the _ of your eyes.'
KUB XII 11 IV 3-5 (Ḫišuwā Festival/CTH 628):

nu-šši-ken GAL GIR₄ kiššarit GEŠTIN-it/ enda šunnei n-ašša ANA (228)
EN SISKUR,SISKUR/ GAL GIR₄ LUG kiššarit arpa ďaš

'He fills the cup of burnt clay in his hand with wine, and the physician takes the burnt-clay cup out of the hand of the master of the sacrifice.'

Strictly speaking, one could interpret kiššarit as 'takes with (his own) hand', but in view of the preceding sentence this reading seems forced.

KUB XIII 2 II 12 has šarāmniš katta zikkiddu 'sets down from above' (cf. šarāmnaz p. 309 sub ḫišuwā- and šuppa-). KUB XXXIII 120 has various forms of 'come forth/up' with instrumentals expressing 'place from which': II 1-2 t[ar]naḫšitt-a, II 27 KARU-it, II 38 tarnaḫšit. KUB XXVII 67 I 19-21 and III 25-27 employs arpa ṣuṣittiya- 'draw away (from)' with various instrumentals: SAG.DU-it ŠU.MES-it...GIR.MES-it [hū]mantet UZUR-it.

Neo-Hittite copies of Middle Hittite texts thus show the following uses of the instrumental:

I. Instrumental of Means
II. Instrumental of Accompaniment
III. Instrumental of Respect
IV. Instrumental of Agent
V. Pronominal Instrumental Used for the Ablative
VI. Instrumental of Exchange

VII. Adverbial Instrumentals (\textit{pangarit, ZI-it})

VIII. Adnominal Instrumental

IX. Instrumental of Separation

Note that the instance of agentive use is written with \textit{ISTU} and thus could represent an ablative instead.
Section 3. Conclusions and Unresolved Questions

If we compare the uses of the ablative in Middle Hittite manuscripts of Middle Hittite texts (pp. 298–299) with those in Old Hittite manuscripts (p. 161), we notice several additional uses in Middle Hittite as against Old Hittite. As already noted, however, the ablative of 'time from which' and cause may be viewed as special cases of the basic ablative of separation ('place from which'). More significant is the fact that the ablative of means, which is not attested in Old Hittite manuscripts, is firmly established for Middle Hittite. It should also be pointed out that ablative adverbs of time such as ḫamantaz 'at night' are thus far not attested before Middle Hittite.

By contrast, there are no marked changes in the use of the instrumental from Old to Middle Hittite (cf. pp. 174 and 304). The one example of an instrumental of respect in Middle Hittite versus none in Old Hittite manuscripts is obviously too slim a basis for drawing conclusions about the age of this usage. It should be repeated that the use of the pronominal instrumental for the ablative is thus far restricted in Middle Hittite texts to the set phrase kitpantalaz.

The evaluation of the usage in Neo-Hittite copies of Middle Hittite texts must be postponed until the Neo-Hittite historical texts are examined. The only use not seen previously is the instrumental of 'exchange' or substitution (see p. 335ff).
NOTES

1. In *KUR XVII* 21 II 20-25 eighteen cities appear in the ablative, in apposition to the *kūz* of lines II 11.13.17.19 (see sub *ive-* , *pidda-* and *nanna-* ).

2. *KUB XV* 34 II 5 has *IŠU KUR LŪ KUR idḫaluwaš vapran[na...].* The missing verb appears in the parallel *KUB XIII* 29,12 as *ar-ke ta-aš-at-ten.* The form clearly is 2nd pl. imperative, and the sense is 'save, preserve' or the like, but the root is unknown to me.

3. The Neo-Hittite parallel *KBo II* 3 IV 1-2 inserts the verb *dēi,* so that instead of 'holds out water with a cup or bowl', the sentence reads: 'takes water with a cup or bowl and holds it out'.

4. This example could also be interpreted as an ablative of separation. See the discussion above, Chap. 2, note 25.

5. The direct object appears to be *SIC SA₂* 'red wool' from the preceding line. One could also understand the ablatives as expressing accompaniment: 'picks up the red wool along with the perfume and fine oil'.

6. Rost, *MTO* 1(1953)364, restores *KUR XXXII* 115+ IV 5 as *GİR.HI.A-zi(z)...lāknuwan(z)i*] 'they knock over with their feet'. The basic sense is certainly correct, but the parallel *KBo II* 3 III 24 has *[x-x]-zi,* with too little room for a form of *lāknu-.*

7. Despite the lack of *ar-ke,* one could also interpret this
passage as 'inscribed (i.e. copied) from wooden tablets', with an ablative. See ex. (41) p. 186 above.

8 The text has SU.GI-SA-it 1.DUG.GA papparašši, but the phonetic complement surely belongs with 1.DUG.GA: 'sprinkles the red wool with fine oil'.

9 The text reads ḫunuš-an-za ḫuššī ḫL [taraššeni] 'You cannot conquer him/it with steadfastness (lit. bone)'. The restoration is not assured, but -za makes tarḫ- very likely. If ḫuššai- is 'defensive strength' versus kuttar 'offensive strength' (see p. below), it also makes sense to say that one cannot conquer someone with defense.

10 The sentence reads nepiaš-kan katta ši-i-e-eš-šar šiyati. I have kept the sense 'spurt (forth)' for med.-pass. šiya- (with Neu, STBCT 5,144), but the writing here and elsewhere of 'beer' with ši-i-e- argues that it should be read /šiyessar/ and be analyzed as an abstract in eššar of šaš-šiya- 'press', thus originally 'pressing'. It therefore seems possible to me that šiyati here is a passive 'was pressed'.

11 The (incomplete) sentence is [...]pūdan taknas šallannai (subject presumably Hedammu). Siegelová, STBCT 14(1971)61, takes šallannai as 'draws, pulls' (after Laroche, Ugaritica V, 781,783). This is possible, but her 'an der Stelle' for nom.-acc. pūdan is not. Given that the monster is the subject, the sense is surely 'pulls the ground [up/away] from the earth'.
12\textsuperscript{KBo} XVII 60 Vs 3 reads \textit{n-at iššimaniš aršmi}. The verb clearly is transitive, which eliminates \textit{arš}- 'flow'. The same transitive verb \textit{arš}- may be attested in \textsuperscript{KUB} XXXI 147 II 27 \textsuperscript{[ ]-KA-it aršanza ḫɪdu}.

It is very doubtful that the meaning 'give to drink' should be assumed for \textit{eku}- in Hittite on the basis of this single example from the Kikkuli text. The horse-training texts otherwise use \textit{ekuwa Ṝīi-} or \textit{ṣakruwa-} (see Kammnhuber, Hipp. sub \textit{eku}-).

Line 2 reads \textit{weteni Ṝipanti}, but this should be emended to \textit{weteniṭ} after line 4 and other parallels.

15\textsuperscript{KUB} XXXIII 120 II 48 reads \textit{ZI-it-war-an anda tarupta}. The meaning of the sentence as a whole and hence of \textit{ZI-it} in particular is not clear to me.
Chapter Four - Ablative and Instrumental in Neo-Hittite

Section 1.1. Usage of the Ablative in Neo-Hittite Historical Texts

I. Ablative of Separation ('place from which')

This use of the ablative in Neo-Hittite offers little that we have not seen already in older texts. A few important collocations and difficult passages deserve individual attention:

KBo V 3 II 22 (Hukkana Treaty/SV II 116):

(229) nu-mu-ššan hūmandaz paḫši

'Protect me from everything.'

KUB I 1 I 46 (Autobiography of Hattusili/Hatt. 10):

(230) DINGIR-šša mu GAŠAN-YA hūmandaza-pat šu-za harta

'The goddess my lady held me (safe) from everything with her hand.'

ibid. I 57-58 (Hatt. 12):

(231) nu-mu EŠTAR-pat GAŠAN-YA hūmandaza palabšan šer harta

'Ištar my lady held over me a shield against everything.'

KUB XXI 37 Vs 10 (RE Urhi-Testai/CTH 85):

(232) JATTDUŠŠA-roššašTEN DUMU.NAM.ULU-za

'And later protect the sons of His Majesty from mankind.'

The translation of hūmandaz as 'in jeder Hinsicht' (Friedrich, SV II 117) is needlessly vague, if not inaccurate. The ablative with 'protect' and similar predicates expresses that from which someone is protected.
KUB XXXI 53+ Vs.8-10 (Vow of Puduhepa/StBo 1,20):

4 UDU.NITÁ tukkanizawāš ŠA Ezenxše lilaš EGIY-PA ADDIN 3

(233) NAG.GAL 2 UDU.NITÁ ANA DUG.GA-.BUR annumuašš SANGA-ešana
nawi EGIY-PA <ADDIN>

Four male sheep of the lila-festival I have given back.

Three he-goats and two male sheep trained for the potter's
wheel (I have) not yet (given) back from the temple service.'

Otten-Souček, StBo 1,21, supply 'to be' in the last sentence:

'(sind) noch nicht vom Tempeldienst zurück'. Both the surrounding
context and the use of the ablative elsewhere suggest rather that
one should supply 'I gave' from the preceding sentence. The second
ADDIN has either been 'gapped' or accidentally omitted (in
paragraph-final position it would have stood far to the right).

KUB XXVI 32 I 7-8 (Oath of a Scribe/RA 47,74):

(234) <SAHAR-wáza Šallanut

'My lord raised me up like a pup from its own dung-filled dust.'

Laroche, RA 47(1953)74-75, reads x-iš-wa-za. Despite the slight
scratch after the first Winkelhaken, I believe it is best to assume
that nothing is missing. The Winkelhaken is a 'Glossenkeil' calling
attention to an unusual form, as elsewhere. My reading <SAHAR-waza
requires that 'dust' be a u-stem. To my knowledge there is no
other evidence for or against this assumption. I read iš-gaš-šwantaza
as /skaswantats/ and interpret it as *skas- 'dung' plus the possessive suffix -want. The form *skas- (*skōs for *skōs) represents the collective of an s-stem to the same root as sakkar. For the form of *skōs compare Avestan vādā 'words' (from a virtual *nekōs) and for the root vocalism the collective to the r/n-stem Greek skōr. For an s-stem beside an r/n-stem compare Skt. āta- 'spring' with Hitt. wātar. The presence of the possessive apol 'his (own)' supports the interpretation of ḫaḫwuntaza as 'dung-filled'. While one can think of many epithets for 'dust', there are few which make it the dog's own.

KBo IV 2 III 58-59 (Aphasia of Mursili/Murs. Sprachl. 6):
(235) [qiran par]E-wa-zai asūn G(iz-a)h Išt-salTI (tešbaš)

'And (all through) the night before he abstained from a woman.'

The interpretation of tešbaš as a verb meaning 'withheld himself' receives some support from the participle tiḫanteš 'wary of' (?) in KUB XXI 42 + XXVI 12 IV 35 (see Goetze, JCS 13(1959)68). Fried- rich's '(es war) Beischlaf mit einem Weibe' does not fit the context (the king precisely is purifying himself for a ritual) and is awkward syntactically (what would be the function of -za (-zzi) in a nominal sentence with the third person?).

Other examples of the ablative of separation in Neo-Hittite historical texts:
Intransitive Motion Verbs:

ar- 'arrive': KBo IV 14 III 34 šaža (+ arba and -kan; 'get away').

ują- 'run': KBo X 12 III 21 URU ḫaddušaza, III 4 II 68-69

URU Purandaza (+ katta and -kan).

iya- 'walk': KBo IV 14 II 67-68 URU Aṣṭataz (+ arba and -kan).

lehiya- 'campaign': KUB XXI 5 III 19-20 [ari]k URU-eaz naššu

URU Karkiṣaz URU Našaz URU Lu(yaz) U URU Wēšia[la], ibid.

III 22-23 kēz KUR-eaz, ibid. III 24 URU Kettuṣaz.

ninink- 'mobilize': KBo V 8 II 11 URU Gašaz.

pē- 'go': KUB XIX 11 I 11 [URU Samuḥa]z (+ arba and -kan),

XIX 13 I 42 [URU Tumal]mnaz (+ šarā and -kan), ibid. II 31

KUR URU Harranaz.

parē- 'flee': KBo VI 29 II 19 URU Marāṣṣantiyaza (+ arba and -kan).

piddai- 'run': KBo IV 14 III 47 GIS GIGIR-za (+ katta and -kan),

ibid. III 48-49 E.ŠA-za (+ parē and -kan).

tiya- 'step': KBo IV 14 II 45 KASKAL-za (+ arba and -kan),

KUB XXXI 15,2 (= XXI 29 II 11) [GIS] GIGIR-za (+ katta and -kan), XXI 19 II 14 KASKAL-az (+ arba and -kan).

unna- 'drive': KBo IV 14 II 9 URU Niḫiryaζa (+ arba and -kan).

uwe- 'come': KBo III 4 II 7 URU Palbuš̄az (+ āpra), ibid. II 54

arunaz (+ arba and -kan), ibid. II 58 URU Purandaza (+ katta and -kan), ibid. IV 22 [URU Kizzu]wataζaz (+ šarā), XI 1 Rs 15-16

KAXU-az (+ -kan), KUB VI 45 I 30-31 UKU-az KAXU-az (= VI 46
I 31-32 antupšaḫ KAXU-az), ibid. III 13-14 arunaz (+</šarr and -kan), XIX 11 IV 40 epēz (+ ēppa), XXI 27 IV 7 KAXU-az (+ -kan), XXIII 50,8 [URU. Našugu]mæaz, XXVI 1 II 17+ KAXU-az.

watku- 'jump': KBo V 3 III 50 KASKAL-az (+ arba and -šta).

Transitive Notion Verbs:

arunu- 'move': KBo XIX 53 III 5 šarammenaz.

buinu- 'move, shift': KBo III 4 II 69 šarammenaz (+ piran and -za).

buittiyā- 'pull, draw': KBo XVI 17 III 18-19 URU. Masaššaz (+ arba and -kan).

nāš- 'lead': KUB XXVI 84 II 5 URU. Samuḫaz (+ parā and -kan).

ninink- 'raise, remove': KBo V 3+ IV 56-57 đanku-awaz...[tekn]az (+ ker arba and -kan).

parkiyana- 'raise': KBo I 28 Rs 3-4 GIŠ. SŪ. A-az.

peštiya- 'throw': KUB XXI 19 IV 24 apēz (+ arba).


uiva- 'send': KBo IV 4 II 25 URU. Kannuwaraz (+</kattan arba),

KUB XIV 12 Rs 4+ šA-az (+</ša and -kan), XIV 14+ Rs 49-50+ idem, XIV 13+ IV 17-18+ .41+ KUR-šašaz.

uda- 'bring': KBo II 5 III 30 URU-az (+</katta and -kan), KUB XXI 17
III 12 **URU** [Ammuša] (+ katta and -kan).

**uwate** - 'bring': KBo IV 10 Vs 14 aṣiṣi-ya (+ āwe), KUB XIX 20 Vs 3' *URU* ̄Alṣiyaz (+ āpa).

**watknun** - 'cause to jump' > 'chase': KBo III 3 I 10–11 KUR-eaz (+ arba and -kan), IV 7 I 4 idem, KUB XIV 15 IV 23 idem.

**Other:**

**erawak** - 'free': KBo VI 28 Rs 27 aṣiṣa (+ -kan), VI 29+ III 20–26 *ṣapp* enaza [1] aṣiṣiṣa etc., KUB XXVI 43 Rs 8+ ṣeḫḫenaz [aṣiṣiya]a, ibid. Rs 10–13 [ṣeḫḫenaz] aṣiṣiya etc. (+ ašta) (= XXVI 50 Rs 35 = KBo XXII 60 Rs 6–8), KUB XXVI 58 Vs 8f ṣeḫḫenaz aṣiṣiya etc.

**awan** - 'see': KBo V 3 III 55 GIŠ AR-az (+ arba and -kan), XXII 40 : XIX 44 Rs 42 tūwaz, KUB XIV 20 I 6.8+ idem.

**balzai** - 'call': KUB VI 45 III 23–24 nepiṣaz KI-az etc.

**barganu** - 'destroy': KBo VI 28 Rs 41 daṃkwawaza ṣaṣkaṣa (+ -kan).

**barnink** - 'destroy': KUB XXI 18 Rs 15–16 daṃkwawaza ṣaṣkaṣa (aṣiṣiya) (+ arba and -kan), XIX 49 IV 39 idem, XXI 1 IV 36–37 d. ṣaṣkaṣa.

**huinšu** - 'preserve': KBo IV 6 Vs 16–17. Rs 22 kēs GIŠ-az, IV 12 Vs 8.10 GIŠ-az.

**iya** - 'write down, copy': KBo IV 2 IV 2 45 annaṣaz Iṣṭu GIŠ LI.U.2

**gulš** - 'inscribe': KBo IV 2 IV 42–43 annaṣaz Iṣṭu GIŠ LI.U.2

**kunk** - '*!': KUB XIV 10+ IV 19–20 GIŠ aṣarṣa (+ -ken).1

**parku** - 'pure, free from': KBo V 3 IV 32–33 aṣa l民企as.
šēš- 'sleep, rest': KUR XIX 13 I 34-38 apēz (3x).²

zab- 'strike': KUB XXVI 12 II 14-16 IŠTU KUR URU Ażzi KUR

URU Gašša IŠTU KUR URU Luqā (± anda; object is ZAG 'border').

Neo-Hittite historical texts also present a few instances of the dative-locative in a separative function:

KUR I 1 II 52-53 (Autobiography of Hattusili/Hatt. 20):

namma-kan DINGIR.MEŠ URU Hatti GEDIM.HI.A-ya pidi ninikta n-aš

(236) INA URU.d U-ašša katša pēdaš

'Furthermore he removed the gods of Hatti and the manes from the spot and carried them down to Dattassa.'

KBo IV 10 Rs 14.19 (Treaty w/ Ulmi-Tešub/CTh 106):

n-an-kan kūš NIŠ DINGIR.MEŠ denku(wa)i takši šer arha

(237) barninkandu

'Let these oaths obliterate him from the dark earth.'

The dative-locative is not due to the presence of šer: cf. under ninink- p. 350 above.

KBo IV 14 III 6 (Treaty/Stefanini 44):

(238) nu-va kēdaš [ÅN]A HAMIT CAM-an arha arhaheru

'May I be exempted from these oaths.' (lit. 'stand out from under')

II. Ablative of 'time from which'
All clear instances of this usage in Neo-Hittite involve the word 'day'. Typical is KUR XIV 8 Vs 30–31 (Plague Prayer of Mursili/CTH 378):

(239) nu-kan INA šA KUR Hatti apēza UD.KAM-az akiškittari

'There has been dying in the land of Hatti since that day.'

Similar are KUR XIV 8 Vs 11 IŠTU UD.KAM-az ABI-YA 'since the day(s) of my father', XIV 13+ 1 48 IŠTU UD-UM URU MIZRI 'since the day of Egypt', XXI 29 I 11-12 IŠTU UD.KAM in Hantili 'since the day of Hantili', XXVI 1 IV 35 kēsha...UD.KAM-az arba 'from this day (on)'.

It should be noted that neither kitpatalaz nor apit pantalesz occurs in a securely Neo-Hittite text. The corresponding phrases kēš/apēš UD-az have probably replaced them. In the Hukkana Treaty § (KBo XIX 44 + XXII 40 Rs 46) kēš alone may be used to mean 'from now on':

(240) kēš-ma-kan INA É,GAL—YA Karū iyattari

'(When) from now on you go up to my palace...'.

Compare ibid. Rs 46 Karū 'formerly'.

III. Ablative of Cause

This usage is well attested in Neo-Hittite historical texts, although in some cases the line between 'cause' and 'means' is not easy to determine. One clear set of examples involves an action
taken by one party at the instigation of someone else:

\[\text{KBo V 9 I 19-20 (Duppi-Tešub/SV I 10-12):}\]

(241) \[n\text{u } tuk \text{ mahan-na } \text{d} \text{UTUŠI/ IŠTU AWAT ABL-[K]A EGI\text{R-an dakhun}\]

'But as I, His Majesty, looked after you according to the word of your father.'

\[\text{KUB XIX 49 I 12-13 (Nanapa-Datta/}\]

(242) \[nu-tta \text{ LI.M[EŠ] URU Karkiša/ anzi}[a]z nemiyanaa PAP-nu[ir]\]

'The men of Karkisa protected you according to our word/at our behest.'

See also ibid. I 17,18,23 and \text{KUB XXI} l I 71-72.

\[\text{KBo VI 29 I 18-20 (Rō Urhi-Tešub/CUTH 85):}\]

(243) \[nu-za anûmm-a/ \text{ASSUM DAM-UTTIM} \text{narri UL dakhun/ IŠTU INIM DINGIR-LUM-za-an dakhun}\]

'And I did not take her in marriage for personal gain (?). I took her at the behest of the god.'

See also Ḫatt. III 61 apēzza 'for that reason'.

Several other examples are also definitely causal:

\[\text{KUB XXVI} 32 I 11-12 (Oath of a Scribe/RA 47,74):}\]

(244) \[\text{d} \text{UTUŠI-ma EN-YA} <\text{kuwayataza/ Šallanumarraza šakuwašarit} \text{ZI-it PAP-ahḥat}\]

'I have protected His Majesty, my lord, whole-heartedly out of fear and because of (his) raising (me) up.'
KBo IV 14 II 15 (Treaty/Stefanini 40):

(245) nu-tta-kkan ammel kuwayataza parā neyaru

'Let him turn away from you out of fear of me.'

For the meaning of kuwayata- see Laroche, DLL 58.

KBo III 3 III 10-12 (Syrian Affairs/BoSt 3,148):

šumeš-ma-šmaš-<aš> kuēz memiyanaz FGTR-en Šenheškatteni/
(246) nu-šmaš-<aš> šumeš zi-az/ arba daškatteni

'For what reason do you pursue them for yourselves and take them away for yourselves on your own authority?'

For the reading and interpretation compare ibid. III 24-25:
šumeš-ma-aš.za zi-az kuwat daškatteni 'why do you take them for yourselves on your own authority?'. The phrase kuēz memiyanaz is virtually equivalent to kuwat: cf. Latin quam ob rem.

In view of the above cases, one should also probably take the following examples with ak- 'die' as expressing cause, although an ablative of means is quite possible:

KBo V 3 III 38-39 (Akkana Treaty/BV II 126):

(247) apēz-kan uddanaz arba akkiškanzi

'For that reason they die.'

KUB XIV 14+ Vs 34-36 (Plague Prayer/CH 378):

nu-kan ABU-YA ISTU ŠA 'Duthaliya išhānas[as akta ANA ABI-YA-za]/
(248) kuēz DUHU.MEŠ LUĞAL ELLU.MEŠ Ugula LÜ.MEŠ LIM LÜ.MEŠ DUGUD anda
kišandat nu a[pūš-a apēz] memianaz ekir

'My father died because of the blood of Tuthaliya, and the princes, lords, leaders of a "thousand" and __ who joined my father, they too died because of that matter.'

For similar expressions compare ibid. Vs 36-37, KUB XIV 8 Rs 38 and 41, and XIV 10+ IV 17-18.

KUB XIV 4 IV 23 (Tawannama Affair/CTH 70):

(249) nu-kan DAM-YA apellaṣ BA.ŪŠ

'My wife died as a result of her (actions).'

The ablative formed from a pronominal genitive is unique, but functionally it may be compared to a hypostasized genitive like baššanneš-ša 'one of his family' (acc.) (see Friedrich, HE 12 §212). Literally, apellaṣ is 'as a result of that of hers'.

A few other possible instances of ablative of cause in Neo-Hittite are uncertain because of an incomplete context.

Güterbock, DŠ 60, interprets kēzza of KUB XIX 12 II 8 as 'for this reason', correlated with the kuit 'because' of the preceding line. A similar interpretation is likely for kēzza of KUB XIX 64, II-12 (Hatt. III 40). Compare the same sentence in KBo VI 29 I 34 with kuit.

IV. Ablative of Direction

While the instances of this usage in Neo-Hittite historical
texts offer no surprises, they do show a further development of
some of the subtypes we have already seen. One of these is the
use of the ablative to express 'on someone's side' in the sense
of 'allied with';

KBo VI 29 II 17 (R̂ Urihi-Tešub/CTH 85):
(250) nu būman-pa tammētāz tiyāt
'The whole (country) came over to my side.'

Compare ibid. II 15 n-at-nu EGIR-an tiēr, lit. 'they stepped behind
me', i.e. 'they came over to my side'. The equivalence of the
two expressions is confirmed by KBo V 13 II 7-8 (Treaty w/
Kupanta-[KAL/SV I 122):

EGIR-ann-a-ški lē tiyašī IŠTU ŠA d.UTUŠI ma[ih]i artāt na
(251) IŠTU ŠA d.UTU-pat [EGIR-an] arput
'Do not go over to his side. As you have stood on the side of
His Majesty, continue (-pat) to stand on the side of His
Majesty.'

In the last clause the scribe has conflated the two expressions.
In the duplicate KUB VI 44+ IV 26-27 the second EGIR-an correctly
is omitted. Other examples of the ablative in this usage are
KBo IV 3 IV 17, KUB III 1 IV 10-11, XIV 15 IV 17, XIV 17 III 18-19,
XXI 5 III 39-40 and XXI 37 Vs 16.

Neo-Hittite historical texts also contain further examples
of the ablative expressing direction toward:

\[ \text{KBo V 8 I 39 (Annals of Mursili/AM 150):} \]

(252) \( \text{nu KARÅŠ.HI.A šärui tamûdez pûn ğêête} \)

'The army had gone elsewhere for booty.'

ibid. III 18-19 (Annals of Mursili/AM 156):

(253) \( \text{nu-zâ-kan IÇI.HI.A-wa etez ANA m̄ Pittipara reyêbbat} \)

'I turned my eyes toward that side, toward Pittipara.'

(lit. 'I turned myself with respect to the eyes')

On the sense of the ablative see already Götze, AM 260-261. For further examples see KBo IV 4 II 7 and KBo XVI 36 II 4-9 + KUB XXXI 20 II 1-4.

I suggest that the following passage also shows an ablative marking direction toward:

\[ \text{KUB XIV 4 II 5-8 (Tawannama Affair/CH 70):} \]

(254) \( \text{apåt-ma/ URU Sanharaš pûinut apåt-ma URU Hattuši ū̄[m]anti/ antubšanni parâ rešta nu-kan EGIR-an UL kuitki/ dêlište} \)

'She (re)moved part (of the goods) to Sanhara, part she gave away to the population in Hattusa; she left nothing behind.'

Why one has an ablative rather than a dative-locative (expressing goal) is not entirely clear. Since the accusation is that the tawannama dissipated the royal family's wealth, perhaps the ablative has a derogatory nuance: she did not even see to it
that the goods reached Sanhara, but merely sent them off in the general direction, not caring where they ended up.

The ablative of direction is also used to define the boundaries of a state:

KBo V 13 I 29-32 (Treaty w/ Kupanta-

kūza-tta URU Maddunnašaza BĀD KARAŠ ŠA mDuthaliya ZAG-aš ėdēu
kēz-ma-tta ŠA URU Wiyanawanda dILLAT HI. A ZAG-aš ėdēu nu-kan
(255) INA URU Aura pariva lē zētti kēz-ma-tta <(ISTU)> īD Ąstarpa
KUR URU Kuwaliya <(ZAG-aš)> ėdēu nu-tta apēt KUR šaša ėdēu

'On this side toward Maddunassa let the fortified camp of Tuthaliya be your boundary. On this side let the outposts (?) of Wiyanawanda be your boundary, and do not cross over intoAura. On this side toward the river Ąstarpa let the land of Kuwaliya be your boundary. Let that country be yours.'

Similar, more fully developed passages are KUB XIX 37 II 20-34 and KBo IV 10 Vs 16-32. The basic pattern is: in the direction of city/country X (ablative) let geographical feature Y be your boundary, sometimes with the further specification that feature Y is reserved for (ēšanza) country X. It is as if one defined the boundaries of Switzerland as: 'in the direction of Germany let Basel be the boundary, in the direction of France let Geneva be the boundary, in the direction of Liechtenstein let Vaduz be the boundary, but Vaduz is reserved for Liechtenstein, etc. etc.'

Other instances of the ablative of direction show the great
flexibility of this usage:

KUB XXI 5 III 49 (Alaksandu Treaty/SV II 72):
(256) ḍŠTU ṯAŠ SA[T]-ma-aḫ ŠA LUGAL KUR URU ḫat[i]ṭi]

'On his mother's side (lit. on the side of the family of the female) he is (of the lineage) of the King of Hatti.'

KUB XXI 19 I 8-9 (Prayer of Hattusili and Puduhepa/CTH 383):
(257) n-aš tuedez ḍŠTU ŠA dUTU URU TŪL-na [--]/ ZAG-iḫzi

'And he becomes right with you, the Sun-goddess of Arinna.'

Compare the English expression 'get right with God'.

KUB XIX 20 Vs 12-13 (Letter of Suppiluliuma I/CTH 154):
(258) nu-za apatt-a ANA KUR URU ḫatti [tudukbus n-at u]k ammedez
ašš[u]n]

'Also that (population) I brought to Hatti and settled by me.'

Here the ablative has approximately the force of 'chez moi'.

KUB XXI 1 III 76-77 (Alaksandu Treaty/SV II 76):
(259) kI-ma AWA[T]-MEŠ ĠUL kuīt[i] l-едак l-едак ḍŠTU KUR URU ḫatti-āt

'These words are not at all from one side and from the other; they are from the side of Hatti.'

That is, the treaty is not a matter between equals, but a dictate of the Hittite king.
Naturally there are also further examples of kēz, ZAG-az, GÜB-az, EGIR-az and so forth, with and without a preceding dative-locative.

V. Perative Ablative

The only occurrence of this use in Neo-Hittite historical texts is in a broken context: KUB XXVI 1 II 60 kuit luttiyaza anda [ ] 'which in through the window...'. Compare the similar expressions pp. 208-209 above.

VI. Ablative of Means

The ablative is used freely in Neo-Hittite historical texts to express means, showing considerable variety in both the nouns employed and the cooccurring verbs:

ak- 'die, be killed': KUB I 1 IV 45-46 İSTU GİŚ TUKUL...UD-azza.
arr- 'wash': KBo IV 2 IV 31-32 İSTU URUDU DU 10-10 kuēzza (+ -za and -kan).
arr- 'inquire about': KUB XIV 8 Vs 32 İSTU DINIGIR-LIM.
äsnu- 'provide with': KBo IV 6 Vs 14 ḫumendaz (+ -kan).
au- 'see': KBo IV 6 Vs 22 Ḫ-az.
eku- 'drink': KBo IV 2 IV 29-30 İSTU GAL kuēzza (+ -kan).
ep- 'seize, grasp': KBo II 5 I 14 MA.MŪ-az, IV 4 II 62 ERĪN.MEŚ
ašandulaz, KUB XIX 8 III 31+ idem, XIV 16 III 9.17 idem,
KBo IV 7 I 58 šu-az, KUR I 1 I 21 šu-za.
eš- 'sit; occupy': KBo III 4 III 58 gešpu-az (+ -za).
ed- 'eat': KBo IV 2 IV 28-29 Iṣtu giš banšur kuēza (+ -za and -kan).
ḫar(k)- 'hold': KUB I 1 I 39.45.11 64 šu-za.
ḫar-k- 'perish': KUB XXI 19 II 8-9+ tāmmarīyzā.3
ḫaṭaleš- 'become heroic, emboldened': KBo IV 14 II 68 giš tukul-za.
ḫaṭūnu- 'besiege': KBo V 9 III 23-24 zaḥaṭīyazā (+ anda).
ḫaṭrai- 'write': KBo V 6 III 51-52 tuwaṭīyaz (+ ēppa), KUR XIV 4 IV 30 idem, XXI 38 Vs 20 tuppā-za.
ḫuṭitiya- 'pull, draw': KUB XIV 4 II 14-15 ninda,kur₄,ra-az
DUG īšpa[iŋduzziyazzi-ya?].
ḫubuwai- 'pour': KBo IV 14 II 6 weṭaza (+ andā and -kan).
iḫṭapp- 'stop up; trap': KBo VI 29 II 33-34 ĕunālāza (+ ēppa).
ḫariṭmīyanyu- 'anger': KUB III 119 Vs 9 (= XXI 49 Vs 7) [ūl] kuēza.
ḫaterrajh- 'humiliate, cause to be defeated': KUB I 9 III 8 DI-ešnu-za.
la- 'loosen, relieve': KBo II 5 I 38 kēz iNIM-za, ibid. III 47-48.
64-65 apēz n[e]minaza.
mēmē- 'speak': KUB XIV 8 Rs 36 tešpāz, XXI 17 II 9 ū-za.
par- 'gallop': KUB XXI 20 + KBo XVI 36 III 12-13 Iṣtu 1 giš gigir.
par-k-šē 'become pure': KUB I 1 I 39 dingir-LIM-za.
nepute- 'carry (off)': KBo IV 14 II 50 GEŠPÚ-az (cf. ibid. II 76 GEŠPÚ-ak- + acc. 'force').

šallakartabh- 'treat highhandedly'. (?): KUB XXI 19 I 17-18 kuēza nemiyanas.

šarazsek- 'be victorious': KBo IV 14 IV 59 DI-za.

šarazzi- 'upper > victorious': KBo VI 29 II 4-5,6-7 DI-ešnaza.

šarazzivabh- 'cause to be victorious': KUR I 1 III 23 = XIX 67 I 15 (DI-ešn)hz.

šarnink- 'make restitution': KUB XIV 14+ Rs 24-25 IŠTU ETT-YA
šarnikzilaz maškanna[s], XIV 8 Rs 32 b[ir]ganaz, XXI 19 II 15 IŠTU SAG.D[U-Š]U.

šipend- 'sacrifice': KBo II 6 III 21 SISKUR mantaliyasa.

šunna- 'till': KUB XIX 67 1 9 alawanzešnaza.

dē- 'take': KBo III 4 IV 39-40 sahpiyaza (+ katta and -kan),
IV 4 IV 12.28-29 idem, III 3 I 5 GEŠPÚ-az (+ arba and -kan),
IV 10 Rs 19 GEŠPÚ-ze (+ -kan).

dēi- 'place': KBo V 9 Rs 18.20 ānnešnazu...IŠTU DNI (+ -kan
and KASKAL-ši = 'put on the (right) path').

tamaš- '(op)press': KBo V 9 II 25-26 uđēnaza (+ anda), KUB XIV 14+
Vs 8-9, Rs 12⁺.35⁺ hin<sa>ganaz, XIV 10+ I 7-8 idem, XIV 12 Vs 7⁺
idem, Bo 2628+ I 16 (STBOT 1,30) idem.

damnešpni- 'oppress': KUB XIV 14+ Vs 38-39, Rs 33 hin<sa>ganaz.

tark- 'conquer': KUB XIV 14+ Vs 40⁺ NI.TE-az (+ -za), XIV 10+
I 16-18 ša-az...NI.TE-az (+ -za).
tišša- 'set in motion' (?): Bo 2628+ I 17 ʾūṭu ῖ (StBoT 1,30).

unuwa- 'adorn': KUB XII 27 + XLIII 50 Rs 34-35 aπίζα [u]naḫḫaz

(= XII 31 Rs 24 aπίζ unuwaḫḫaz).

wašta- 'sin': KBo III 3 II 28-29 aπίz INIM-az.

wemīya- 'find': KUB XIV 8 Rs 42-43+ ariyašeḫnaza, XIV 13+ I 51-52.

54-55.IV 24-25+ idem, KBo XI 1 Vs 21-22.41 [G]IŠ.ḪUR.ḪI.A

gulzatannazi-[y]a (but on the last example see also below p. 406).

One example of an ablative of means deserves individual comment:

KUB XIX 67 I 5-6 (Autobiography of Hattusili/Neue Br. 16):

(260) [n]u ḫannīšnaza DI-eškar/ EGIR-pa ṗeḫtet

'She (Ištar) checked the lawsuit with a lawsuit.'

Literally, EGIR-pa ṗeḫtet is 'carried back', but the context demands some special sense. My understanding is this: Arma-Datta had instigated a lawsuit against Hattusili. The latter, with the help of Ištar, retorted by charging Arma-Datta and family with witchcraft, who were caught with evidence of same and convicted (ibid. I 6-10). This effectively ended the case against Hattusili. Hattusili naturally credits this happy turn of events to Ištar, but whether Arma-Datta was really guilty of witchcraft or the victim of evidence 'planted' by Hattusili's agents we shall likely never know. EGIR-pa ṗeḫtet means either 'checked/retarded' or 'retorted to'.
VII. Ablative of Accompaniment

All examples of this usage in Neo-Hittite historical texts are with transitive verbs, the ablative expressing an object which receives the action of the verb along with the direct object:

KBO III 3 I 21-22 (RÉ Barga/BoSt 3,140):
(261) nu-war-an İSTU NAM.RA.MES šēšuwazza-ya šara dahhi.
'I shall take it (the city) up along with deportees and goods.'

KUR XXI 1 IV 33 (Alaksandu Treaty/AV II 80):
(262) mu-tta...İSTU SAG.DU-KA...erpa barninkendu
'Let them destroy you along with your person (lit. head).'

Similar examples are KBO XVI 23 I 10, KUR XIX 11 IV 31-33, XIX 18 I 15-16 and XXVI 43 Vs 6-7 (= KBO XXII 55 Vs 7-8).

VIII. Ablative of Respect

This usage is sparingly attested in Neo-Hittite historical texts:

KUR VI 45+ I 18-19 (Prayer of Huwatalli/CTH 381):
(263) ṢA KUR URU Hatti-mu-kan/ EN UTTA hūmandaz kušš memišten
'You who ascribed to me the lordship of Hatti in every respect.'

KBO IV 12 Vs 25 (RÉ Middannamua/CTH 87):
(264) ammuš-na İSTU LITM Ṣiddannamūwa UL-pat karuššivanun
'But still I did not keep silent about the affair of M.'
KUB XXVI 12 + XXI 42 III 14-15 (Instr. for the LÚ.MEŠ\textsubscript{SAG}/
Dienstanw. 26):
(265) [n]u [Š]A LÚ.MEŠ\textsubscript{NUIRTUM} kuêlu šaḫšaṣaz HUL-xlwešši
'(If) trouble arises over the feudal service (?) of some
of (his) subjects.'

My translation and interpretation of the ablative follows that of
Goetze, JCS 13(1959)68.

KUB XXI 38 Rs 8 (Letter of Puduhepa/ČTH 176):
(266) nu-wa-šši GIM-an LÚ.MEŠ\textsubscript{TEME} EGIR-[and]a nair nu-war-at
EGIR-da ĢŠTU IKU arantat
'As the messengers went after him, they stood an ___ behind
(him).'

In this instance the ablative is used where one would expect an
accusative of extent: cf. the use of IKU in IBoT I 36 II 5f.
The ablative also seems to have encroached on the accusative in
expressing extent in time:

KBo IV 14 II 66-67 (Treaty/Stefenini 43):
KŠŠ-a-mu kuiš LÚ KUR LÚ KUR AŠšur arēnza ĢŠTU MU.KAM.ḪI.A
(267) GĪD.ÁA arba-ša-kan ištentaït
'And this Assyrian enemy who had risen against me has delayed/
held off through long years.'

See also KUB XV 17+ I 3-5 (Vow of Puduhepa/StBoT 1,16).
IX. Ablative of Agent

The agent with a passive verb is typically expressed in Neo-Hittite with ʾIŠTU. Since the latter can stand for either an instrumental or ablative, these examples cannot be assigned to either case with certainty. I cite in full here only those which are marked as ablatives:

*KUB VI 45 III 32-33 (Prayer of Muwatalli/CTH 381):*

kinuna ammuk ʾMIR.GÁL LUGAL-uš tuedaz/ ʾIŠTU dU piheššašši
šallenuwanza arkuwešši

(268)

'Now I, King Muwatalli, pray, having been raised up by you, the Storm-god P...'

*KBo IV 6 Vs 26-27 (Prayer to Lelwani/CTH 380):*

(269) nu DINGIR.MES ariyair n-at DINGIR.MES-azzi-ya [handai]tat

'They inquired of the gods, and it was determined by the gods.'

As noted earlier, it cannot be excluded that the latter instance represents an ablative of means: 'it was determined through (consulting) the gods'.

Since the passive construction with an expressed agent is not overly frequent, I list here the other instances in Neo-Hittite historical texts with ʾIŠTU: *KBo IV 2 IV 34, IV 12 Vs 8-9, V 8 I 22 (see Neu, StBoT 5,168), KUB VI 45 III 74-75⁴, XIV 8 Vs 15-16.17.33.34, XIX 11 I 12.IV 12-13, XXXI 121+ III 18-19, 301/c II 11 (= XXVI 84 II 7; DŠ 64).
X. Adverbial Ablatives

Various adverbs of time which we have seen previously also occur in Neo-Hittite historical texts: UD.KAM-az 'during the day', GE-az 'at night', karuwiliyaš and amnAz 'formerly' and EGIR-az 'afterwards'. One also finds the ablative equivalent of instrumental adverbs: ZI-za 'on one's own authority' (KB 9 III 28, III 3 III 11.24 and IV 14 IV 70), šakwasašaraša ZI-za 'whole-heartedly' (KB 14 IV 41 and ABoT 56 I 23+).

In addition there are several new adverbial uses:

KUB XXI 19 I 11-13 (Prayer of Hattusili and Puduhepa/CTH 383):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ANA DINGIR.MEŠ-za menahbanda KUR.KUR.HI.A URU Şatti/ Šarraz ŠA } & \text{UURU Nerik } \text{UURU Zippalanda DUMU-CA nakkiyanni banda datta} \\
\end{align*}
\]

'Among the gods you took as your portion the lands of Hatti according to the importance of your son, the Storm-god of Nerik and Ziplanda.'

KB 9 III 6 II 21-22 (Autobiography of Hattusili/Hatt. 16):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ERİN.MEŠ-ma-mu AMEŠ.KUR.RA.MEŠ tepawaž peik nu-za ERİN.MEŠ } & \text{NARĀRU ŠA KUR-TI tepawaž GAM-an ŠpūN} \\
\end{align*}
\]

'But he gave me infantry and cavalry in small numbers, and I took with me auxiliary troops of the country in small numbers.'

For other examples of tepawaž see KB 8 I 1-2, II 29-30 and KUB XXVI 43 Vs 6-7 and 10. In the latter text the duplicate
KBo XXII 57 Vs 2 has megagay[az], which is probably used in the same way.

*KUB XXI 27 IV 35-36 (Prayer of Puduhepa/CTH 384):*

\(\text{harnāwa}:\text{za kuit} \text{SAL-za/ ANA DINGIR}^{\text{LIM}} \text{EN-YA Šer SAC.DU-za}^{(272)} \text{Šarrninkan Šermi}^{(272)}\)

"Because I am a woman of the birthing-stool, I have personally made restitution to the goddess on behalf of my lord."

Since Puduhepa is alive and well, an interpretation 'made restitution with my head' is excluded. The same expression occurs in the text in II 17-18.

XI. Problematic Cases

A few instances of the ablative are uncertain in their interpretation:

*KBo II 6 I 36-37 (Oracle re Arma-}^dU/CTH 569):*

\((273) \text{DUNU.DUNU-ŠU-ya tamedasa/ kaniššanz}i^{(273)}\)

Since this action is designed to placate the spirit of the deceased grandfather, it must have a favorable connotation, perhaps 'honor/distinguish in some other way'. Either an ablative of means or respect would fit this meaning.

*KBo IV 14 III 26-27 (Treaty/Stefanini 45):*

\((274) \text{sullannaza-war-a(t)}^2 \text{-tu-za/ KAR-at}^{(274)}\)
Stefanini, loc. cit., reads ḫullannaza varatusa KAR-ṣt, but he cannot offer any satisfactory meaning for a word varatusa.

In KBo III 4 II 31-32 guršauwanaña may be an ablative (Götze, AM 216 suggests 'by boat'), but this is quite uncertain. See Friedrich, HWb 119, for other proposals.

Neo-Hittite historical texts thus show the following uses of the ablative:

I. Ablative of Separation

II. Ablative of 'time from which'

III. Ablative of Cause

IV. Ablative of Direction

V. Perlative Ablative

VI. Ablative of Means

VII. Ablative of Accompaniment

VIII. Ablative of Respect

IX. Ablative of Agent

X. Adverbial Ablatives
Section 1.2. Usage of the Instrumental in Neo-Hittite Historical Texts

I. Instrumental of Means

The use of the instrumental to express means is considerably restricted in Neo-Hittite historical texts, in comparison with both its use in earlier texts and the use of the ablative in the same function (see Sec. 1.1 above). The majority of attestations involve just two words: İGI.HI.A-it 'with the eyes' and Ü-it/teḫšit 'through a dream'.


KBo VI 29 I 20 Ü-it henikta, XI 1 Vs 42 teḫšit nérkunut, KUB I I 12-13 Ü-it *MIR.GAL-in ŠES-YA uivat, ibid. I 37 Ü-it mēništa, XIV 10+ IV 16-17 and XIV 8 Rs 42 teḫšit aušdu/ušalu.5

While some of these examples are from prayers, others are from historical texts in the strict sense.

Another recurring expression with an instrumental of means is GIS TUKUL-it tarp- 'conquer with a weapon/by arms': KBo VI 28 Rs 16, KUB XXI 37 Vs 39* and XXIII 92 Vs 6. Into the same sphere falls also KUB XXI 29 I 15-16 (Decree rū Tiliura/OTH 89):
akšanut-ma-an apuł İSTU NAM.RA GIS TUKUL tarabhantit 'He settled
it with his deportees conquered by arms'. While terahbentit goes with ašš-, it is likely that the instrumental was influenced by the unwritten GÎŠ TUKUL-it which goes with tarḫ-.

There are also a few other scattered uses of the instrumental of means:

KUB VIII 80,15 (Treaty of Šattiwaza w/Supp. I/CTh 52):
(275) [ ]x ESṣawit šarā sunneš '...filled up with goods.'

Compare the Annals of Hattusili I, KBO X 2 I 20–21.

KBO V 8 I 24 (Annals of Mursili/AN 148):
(276) nu-šmaš-ken namna UD.KAM-az GEŠPU-it EGIR-panda UL pEun
'I no longer pursued them with might during the day.'

KUB XIV 13+ I 49–50 (Plague Prayer/CTh 378):
(277) nu apit pank[u]/ KUR URU Hatti akkiškittari
'Through that (plague) the entire land of Hatti is dying.'

KUB XXIII 1 II 1 (Šaušgamuwa Treaty/StBoT 16,8):
(278) tuk<š> IŠTAR-A.A-an ŠU-ta ASBAT
'I took you, Saushgamuwa, by the hand.'

KUB XIV 8 Vs 25 (Plague Prayer) has hannešnit šarša[it]
'raised up by a judgment', i.e. 'awarded the victory in a judgment'.

Kbo IV 2 III 50 (Aphasia of Mursili) reads IZI-it wahunansi,
which is an error for IZI-it warnumansi 'they burn with fire'.
The form haššit, literally 'with bone', also deserves mention. It occurs in a broken context in the Annals of Mursili, KUB XXXI 10,4 (AM 76) and XIX 37 II 6 (AM 166). Sommer, AU 181f, proposes that in a military context it means 'mit Standhaftigkeit, Widerstands-
kraft', i.e. defensive strength as opposed to offensive strength, which is Gešpu-it (see KUB XIII 27 Rs 23 above p. 301 with note 9). Like haššai=, (UZU)Gešpu is in its literal meaning a body part, and Sommer, loc. cit., suggests either 'arm' or 'fist'. While there are no exact parallels, I raise the possibility that the Hittite for Gešpu is kutter 'shoulder, upper arm'. See especially Kuttani tarḫ- 'conquer by force/with might' in the Telipinu Edict (see above p. 242 under tarḫ-).

II. Instrumental of Accompaniment

This use of the instrumental is attested unambiguously in Neo-Hittite historical texts only for the time of Suppiluliuma I:

KBo V 3 II 28 (Hukkana Treaty/ŠV II 116):

(279) nu-mu-ḫšañ mān ERIN.MEŠ-it ANŠE.KUR.RA.[HI]-A-it lammar ÜL ARTI

'If you do not reach me at once along with your infantry and cavalry.'

KUB XIX 20 Vs 10 (Letter of Supp. I/CTH 154):

(280) [n-at İŠTU GUD.HI.A UDU.HI.A Ḫušitt-a šarā dakhun

'I took it up along with its cattle, sheep and goods.'
Expressions similar to the latter can be found frequently in the Annals of Mursili and elsewhere spelled with ISTU. These examples cannot be shown to be instrumentals since the ablative is also attested in this function (see Sec. 1.1 above).

III. Instrumental of Agent

As discussed above in Sec. 1.1, most instances of the agent with a passive verb in Neo-Hittite are marked by ISTU, which may conceal either an instrumental or ablative. There is only one clear case of an instrumental in this usage:

KBo VI 28 Vs 4-5 (Decree rē the NA₄hekur Pirwa/CTh 88):
(281) ša Lugal URU Kušsar DINGIR šiunit k[aniššan]daš NUMUM-ša
‘...of the seed of the King of Kussar distinguished by the god.’

On the interpretation of this passage see most recently Otten, ZA 61(1972)233f. It should be pointed out that the phonetic writing of 'god' is unique in Neo-Hittite, even if one reads DINGIR-LIM-š-ni-it (Neu, StBoT 18,122 note 291).

IV. Adverbial Instrumentals

The remaining instances of the instrumental case in Neo-Hittite historical texts are in adverbial uses which we have already seen in older texts:
pangarit 'en masse': Deeds of Suppiluliuma passim, especially in the cliché ERTÉN.KUR LÚ PANGARIT BA LÚŠ 'the enemy troops died en masse'; also KUB XIX 9 IV 14 (Hattusili III) and KBo XII 38 III 12-13⁺ (Suppiluliuma II).

Ekuwaššarit ZI-it 'whole-heartedly': KBo X 12 II 22-24.29⁺.43⁺.51⁺ (= Akkadian KUB III 7+ Vs 20 ina kul libbi-ba) (Aziru Treaty);
V 4 Rs 29.36.41, V 9 II 3⁺, XXII 39 II 15⁺ (Mursili II);
KUB XXIII 1 II 35.IV 21-22⁺, XXVI 12 III 26⁺ (Tuthaliya III/IV); KBo XII 30 II 2-4, KUB XXVI 32 I 11-12, XL 38,3⁺ and ABot 56 I 25⁺ (Suppiluliuma II).

Eškantit ZI-it 'with knowing mind': KUB XXI 37 Vs 52⁺ (Hattusili III), XXVI 12 II 15-16 (Tuthaliya III/IV).

ZI-it 'on one's own': KBo V 3 III 39-40 and XIX 44b,6⁺ (both Hukkana Treaty).

GIR-it 'on foot': Deeds of Suppiluliuma (KBo XII 26 IV 3) and Annals of Mursili (KUB XIV 16 III 12-14, XIX 37 II 7, XIX 39 II 4-5).

V. Problematic Cases

One apparent example of an instrumental should probably be read as a verb instead:

KBo XI 1 Rs 9 (Prayer of Muwatalli/CTH 382);
man-za HUL-za MUSAN-az IN MUSAN.DU-it našma šA GEDIM kušški
(282)
NINDA-er [...]

...
'If one has performed an augury with an evil bird, or someone has [ ] the bread of a dead man...'

Taking LÙ.MUŠEN.DÙ-it as a verb is admittedly ad hoc, but I see no way to construe the passage with an instrumental regardless of what verb one restores after NINDA-an. By breaking the line into two clauses we obtain normal syntax. For the spelling of a verb with a Sumerogram which properly is a noun compare KBo III 36 Vs 10 LÙ.AGRIG-pi-i₃ for maniyahhi₃ 'managed'.

The other examples to be discussed here all involve the form 1-e-et-ta:

KUB XXI 37 Vs 17 (Re Urhi-Tešub/CTH 85):
(283) n-a₂ta UKU.MES₃-tar l-ēta nekbu₂ YUL-apbu₂ [UL kuink₃?]
'I led the population even as one (i.e. treated them equally).
I did [not] mistreat [anyone].'

KUB XXI 42 II 5-6 (Instr. for the LÙ.MES_{SAC/dienstank.} 25):
(284) nu KUR.KUR.IL.A/ BA[L d]apianda l-ēta nai₃kitten
'You led all the rebellious lands even as one.'

KBo III 4 III 33 (Annals of Mursili/AM 76):
(285) n-a₂š anda l-ēta 60000 6 LIM NAM.RA ēšta
'And it (the booty) numbered 66,000 deportees in one (fell swoop).'

Eichner, Anat. Zahlw. 7, correctly analyzes 1-e-et-ta as an instrumental plus the geminating particle -a 'and' (see already Hrozný,
BoSt. 3, 202 note 2). However, Eichner's interpretation of the instrumental plus nēi- as 'auf eine Seite lenken' cannot be supported. First of all, as the attestations given above show, the only Hittite case forms attested in the usage 'join someone's side' are ablative (see pp. 205, 291 and 357). Furthermore, only the ablative is attested in any similar usage (except Old Hittite kēt, which cannot be summoned here). In addition, the expression ĠSTU X nēya- 'turn to someone's side, join forces with' is attested only as such: i.e., intransitively with a 'reflexive middle' of nēi-. There is no direct evidence for a transitive ĠSTU X nēi- 'turn (someone) to someone's side'.

As already suggested by Götze, AM 222, in the first passage above the basic sense is 'treated equally'. There is nothing about changing anyone's allegiance. All the attestations can be derived from a basic instrumental of means: 'with one (blow), at one stroke'. This sense is still quite clear in the last example (285). In the other instances the instrumental of means has become a virtual adverb: 'as one, identically'. The function of the -a is best taken here as emphasizing: 'even'. For this meaning compare KBo XIX 44 + XXII 40 Rs 42: nu tūwaz uwanna-ya šer lu₄₄ LUM ₄₄ har[akta] 'The man perished even for seeing (the king's wife) from afar'. In all the passages where l–ētta is used, the speaker is insisting on the 'singleness' of the action, anticipating incredulity on the part of the hearer: remarkably, Mursili captured 66,000 prisoners
all at once. Whether one cares to believe him or not, Hattusili III treated everyone evenhandedly. Finally, Tuthaliya III/IV is assigning the addressees total responsibility for the revolt, even if they insist on denying it. For a possible instance of an ablative l-edaz used similarly to l-ëtta see pp. 386-387 below.

The use of the instrumental in Neo-Hittite texts may be summarized as follows:

I. Instrumental of Means

II. Instrumental of Accompaniment

III. Instrumental of Agent (once!)

IV. Adverbial Instrumentals
Section 2.1. Usage of the Ablative in Other Neo-Hittite Manuscripts

I. Ablative of Separation

The basic separative function of the ablative has been more than amply illustrated in the preceding sections. From the remaining Neo-Hittite manuscripts I quote in full only instances which show something new or which support previous interpretations based on a handful of attestations.

**KUB XXXI 66 III 20-23** (Deposition (?)/CTH 297):

\[\text{iyanun-ma-at-kan damēdaz/ īSTU KARU p[ar]ē/ [a]mūk-ma-za-ka[an]}
\[žI-za ḫ[û][kui̯ṯki da[hu]n]\

'I did it out of another('s) mouth; I took nothing for myself on my own authority.'

This expression comes very close to the ablative of cause with *meniyanaz* (see p. 354f).

**KUB XXIX 4 I 3-4** (Transfer of the *DINGIR.GE* /Kronasser, Umsiedlung 6):

\[\text{man apēz īSTU E DINGIR.GE, parā tamai E DINGIR.GE/ vetezzi}
\]

'When (going) forth from the house of the 'Black God' one builds another house of the 'Black God'...'

See also ibid. I 60-61. Here again Hittite manages with the help of a preverb/postposition plus the ablative to incorporate in a
single clause the idea of motion plus a subsequent action (cf.
ex. (43) p. 187 above and Chap. 4, note 2). Similar is the
construction URU₂-X-an URU₂-Y-az + Preverb + lehiyazi/RA-zi in
KUB V I I 55.71-72.78-79 etc.: 'Going up/away from city Y, he
strikes city X.'

KUB XXII 25 Vs 19-20 ('Itineraries'/CTH 562):
(288) parā-na-za-kan/ URU₂ Nerioqaz arbe arivami
'I consult an oracle out from Nerik.' (also Vs 32)

That is, the king, having reached Nerik, then consults an oracle
to see which route he should take from there.

KUB IV 22,10 (CTH 590):
(289) [d₄₂] GAŠAN-YA HUL-uwaza KU₃ ARITUM pišn DIB-ti
'You, the Sun-goddess my lady, hold in front of [me?] your
shield against evil.'

KBo I 44 + XIII 1 IV 41-43 (Vocab. eri₃₄.łu₃₂ = anantu/StBoT 7,20):

(290) avānu k[u]i[z]aa

i₄tu avanie₃₄ nu k[u]e[d]a₂za

(= 16₅₁/u 9-11 ku₃₂([za])...ku₂dzaza...nu k[u]e₂za?)

The Akkadian forms are essentially isofunctional, and there is
surely no functional difference between ku₃₂(za) and kuedaz either.
The Hittite scribe, faced with formally different Akkadian expres-
sions, merely used the variants at his disposal so as to match each Akkadian form with a Hittite correspondent.

For brevity's sake, the following list contains only one example per verb, the purpose being merely to confirm the use of the ablative of separation with the verb:

Intransitive Motion Verbs:

ar- 'arrive': KUB XXXIII 106 IV 21-22 tētēšnaza (+ katta and -kan).

ar- 'stand (up)': KBo XVIII 28 I 10 kūz (+ -kan).


būwa- 'run': KUB XXXIV 77 Vs 4 nenēza.

išpart- 'escape': KUB IV 72 Rs 4-5 šatguwaš pētaz (+ -ašta).

iwa- 'go, walk': KUB XIV 3 IV 38 KAXU-za (+ -kan).

iyannai- 'walk, march': KUB XXXIII 98 I 11-12 URU Utēkišaz URU-az (+ arba and -kan).


neva- 'turn (int.)': KBo XXI 6 Vs 8+ KASKAL-az (+ ḫarba).

pēši- 'go': VBoT 68 II 15.III 1-2 URU Arinnaz... URU Hattušaz.

tiya- 'step': KUB XVII 12 II 17 KASKAL-az (+ arba and -kan).

unna- 'drive': KUB IX 34 III 28 URU Lantaz.

uwa- 'come': KUB XIV 3 IV 45-54 KAXU-za.

wētwē- 'spring': KUB XXXIII 93 III 17-18 NĪ.TE-az (+ arba).
Transitive Motion Verbs:

armu- 'move': KBo XIII 62 Vs 17 warcawayez (+ arba and -kan).

buitiya- 'pull, draw': KUB XXX 65 II 3 KASKAL-az.

ninink- 'raise, remove': KUB XXX 56 III 15 pēdez (+ -kan).

parb- 'chase': KUB XXVI 87,5 [3]. GAL-az (+ katta).

palāhāh- (KASKAL-śihāh-) 'put on the road, ship': KBo II 11 Rs 10 URU KUBABBAR-za (+ katta and -kan).

pešīya- 'throw': KBo XII 123,7 ṣubāz.

āda- 'carry': KUB XXXI 79 Vs 4-5 URU Pattellaraigaza.

šakuniya- 'boil, bubble': KUB XII 58 I 12-13 GE-az KI-az (+ šarā and -kan; subject 'fountain', object 'clay, mud').

šuwa- 'push, drive': KUB XXIV 14 I 19-20 SAG.DU-az (+ ašan arba and -kan).

dā- 'take': KUB XXXIII 114 I 20.23 šu-za (+ arba and -kan).

titamu- 'move': KUB V 24 I 45-46 aπiz pēdez (arba).

unna- 'drive': KBo XXIII 106 Vs 6-8 URU KUBABBAR-za (+ ārpa).

uppa- 'bring': KBo XVII 65 Vs 39 ežēz.

udā- 'bring': KUB IV 8 Vs 11-12 annaz[a-pa]tā-ta (katta and -āta).

uwate- 'bring, carry': KBo XI 17 II 8-10 nepišza taknaza ēd-za HURSAG-za ūmandaza (+ ērpa).

watkum- 'make jump > chase': KUB V 3 I 47-48 URU KUBABBAR-za (+ -kan).
Verbs of Separation:

karē- 'cut': KUB XXIV 3+ II 11-12 k[śliya]g ašwunaz kuēz (+ -kan).

lā- 'loosen, release': KUB XXXVI 39 II 9-11 baretnaz wād[ulaz...]

/gul-/az memiiyan[az] (+ arba).

šamēn- 'withdraw': KUB XXXI 59 Vs 27 šarr[a]z (+ -kan).

šarra- 'divide': KUB XII 58 III 8-11 štu 12 uzul UR (+ awan arba).

tarna- 'let go': KUB XXXV 92+ Rs 20-21 ugiū duq₁₉-az (+ para).

Others:

au- 'see': KUB XXIV 7 II 54+III 28+ an-za (+ katta and -kan).

eku- 'drink': KUB XXV 37 I 27-28 apis (+ arba and -kan).

helzai- 'call': KUB XXXVI 89 Vs 1-2 uru kērara URU Lallaza (+ endan).

hentai- 'arrange': KBo XVIII 104, 5-6 URU Gattušaz (+ katta and -kan).

duh bar(k)- 'deliver': TBOT II 129, 12 URU Napitaza.

hē Rai- 'write': KUB XXII 70 Vs 16 uru x-ruliaz (+ ērpa).

he wawi- 'rain': KUB IV 5 Vs 13-14 nepišaza.

buek- 'conjure': KUB XXV 37 IV 28-29 kuēz ANI! GIS ZA.LAM.GAR.HI.A (+ -kan).

buek- 'live, survive': KUB XV I III 50 GIS-za.

išhāwai- 'pour': KUB XXXIII 93 III 24 [nepiš]az (+ katta and -kan).

ganka- 'hang': KBo XV 9 IV 7 Gū-az (+ ketta).

gulē- 'inscribe': KUB XIII 103 III 13-14 amulaza GIS.KUR gula-denaza (+ arba and -kan; cf. pp. 186 and 351 sub iya- and gulē-).
kurur š-- 'be hostile': KUB XIV 3 IV 4-5 damadaza KUR-ēra...

ametazā KUR-ēra.

labuwa- 'pour': KUB XXV 37 I 25f šarāzziyaz [GIS, šuḫupal]az
(+ arēwa' and -ašta).

mema- 'speak': KUB XXX 28 Rs 8-9 šub[pl]az (+ kartanda and -kan).

pešu- 'protect': KUB IX 15 III 8.13-14 sappiyaz (object šuḫpuš).

pēi- 'give': KUB XII 2 II 9 etc. TSTU URU-LIM (cf. ibid. IV 9
LIM,MEŠ URU-LIM peškanzi).

parcui- 'pure, free from': KUB XXXV 92+ Rs 18-19* lenciyaz
[šuwa]artaz.

parcuni- 'purify': KUB XII 58 IV 2-3 paprannanza.
šekiyah- 'give some': KUB XXXI 99 Rs 9 nepišaz.
šakuyaya- 'look': KUB XXXIII 92 + XXXVI 10 III 18 nepišaz
(+ [šata] and -kan).

šapiya- 'peel' > 'clean': KUB XII 58 IV 2-3 paprannanza.
šeš- 'rest': KUB X 95 III 13-14* šumandaza.

talliya- 'entreat': KUB VII 60 III 5-6 KASKAL-az.
teru- 'unite': KUB XVI 41 III 14 š-irza (+ parā and -kan; see
Ncu, STBoT 5,171).

waggariya- (BAl-) 'mutiny, rebel': KUB VI 39 Rs 6 avizza (+ šarā).

Further examples of the dative-locative expressing separation
are also attested. No additional quotations seem necessary. The
interested reader may consult the following passages: KBo XXIII 34
I 6 (versus ibid. I 13 with the ablative!), KUB IX 15 II 22-23,
XVII 28 I 16-18, XXXV 133 II 22, XXXVI 2 III 38, XXXVI 12 III 12-13, XLIV 47 III 16. See also the apparently mixed construction under ḫuek—p. 383.

II. Ablative of 'time from which'

In addition to further instances of kit/apit pantalaz, we find another example of DURU-ennaza 'from childhood': KUB XXXIII 118,17 and 20-21. KUB IV 47 Vs 26 offers IŠTU EREB ḫunu 'from the setting of the sun', and KBo XVII 65 Rs 43-44 attests the expression [a]lāz ITU-ze arba kappuš[kanzi] 'they count from that month' (see ibid. Vs 53 = KUB XLIV 59 Rs 4-5). Note also the following:

KBo XI 5 VI 20 (Ritual of Nuvalanni/CTH 703):

(291) SISKUR balalaza-kan arba UD.5.KAM QATI

'The fifth day from the h-sacrifice is finished.'

III. Ablative of Cause

The additional examples of this usage furnish no surprises. The ablative is used several times with the verb ḫar—'believe' to express the reason for belief or disbelief: KUB VIII 79 Rs 5, XIX 23 Rs 9, and XXVI 92,15-16. The ablative of cause is also common with kartimmiyawant—'angry' and similar words, particularly to express the reason for divine wrath: KBo XII 116 Rs 3-4, KUB V 22,36, V 24 I 19 and VIII 71,12. One instance of the latter
type is interesting for its use of arba:

*KUB V 24 I 24-26 (Mixed Oracles/OTH 577)*:

\[\text{nu} \text{man} \text{UPU ka-u-ri-i} \text{ANA SAL.LUGAL kez-pat memias/ kar-}\]

(292) \text{pišžane namma-ma-za DINGIR-LUM ANA SAL.LUGAL kez-ka}n/ \text{UKU.MES-az arba UL kuitki karpišžane}

'If the Sun-god ___ is angry at the queen only for this reason, and the god is not angry at the queen except on account of these people.'

For the reference to 'these people' as the cause of the god's anger see ibid. I 18-19. The presence of -kan in line 25 and the interpretation of -kan...arba as 'except, besides' is confirmed by lines I 34-35 which has kez-kan INIM-za arba 'except for this reason'. The unusual position of -kan is due to the fact that it forms a special collocation with arba, rather than modifying the sense of the sentence predicate.

One more example of an ablative of cause deserves citation because it may contain an unusual adverbial ablative as well:

*KBo XVIII 54 Rs 21-LRd 1 (Letter of Kassu/OTH 188)*:

\[\text{kuŠža-wa-kan UL hāndari nu-kan BĀD kuit īštarna EGARU-ma kuiš}\]

(293) \text{4 Šeken kuiš 3 Šeken kezža-ma-kan epurēšar 1-edaze ANA HIRITI}\n
[kattanda]a? pait nu-naŜ-kan apizza UL hāndari

'Why has it not succeeded?—Because within the fortress (there
are) wall(s), one of four א, one of three א. For this reason the attack went down into the ditch/moat in one (fell swoop). For that reason we have not succeeded."

On this passage see also Neu, StBoT 5,41. My interpretation of לֶדָזָא is not assured, because it depends on the restoration [kattand]a (or something similar), while the length of the lacuna is uncertain. If there is room to restore a separate predicate after הִרִית, then the interpretation of לֶדָזָא is open to several possibilities. For לֶדָזָא as 'all at once, at a single stroke' see the discussion of לֶזֶת above p. 376f.

IV. Perlicative Ablative

Since this usage is not exceedingly frequent, I cite here the three additional pieces of evidence for it:

KUB XXVII 68 I 8 (Restitution of the Gods of Merik/OTH 673):
(294) n-aš-kan GIS AB-za anda paizzi
'He goes in through the window.'

KUB XII 51 I 16-17 (OTH 790):
(295) n-ašta EN SISKUR/ [ K]A-azu anda uizzi
'The master of the sacrifice comes in through the [ ]gate.'

KUB V 1 I 48-49 (Oracles on Royal Campaigns/OTH 561):
(296) HUL-uwaz-aš-kan GIS GAL-ve/ išfarna arha uit
'It came through the evil and the great sickness.'
That GIG.GAL is also ablative is confirmed by ibid. II 57 and IV 75: TA GIG.GAL-ya. The accusative is more common with ištarna arba 'through': see p. 294.

V. Ablative of Direction

Most of the additional examples of this type merely provide further instances of ZAG-az, GUB-laz and other by now familiar expressions. Since the construction of andurza 'within, inside' with a preceding dative is very rare, it is worth noting two more occurrences: KUB VII 2 I 16 and XX 45 I 17,19,IV 9.15+ GUNNI-ši/hašši andurza. The latter is opposed in the text to hašši tanušza 'beside the hearth'. There is also a solitary occurrence of barāziyaz 'above' with a dative: KBo XXIII 27 II 34-35 ANA İD Harāššanti... barāziyaz 'above the Harassanta River', i.e. above the point where the 'Red River' flows into the Harassanta (see ibid. II 29-31). KUB XXXVIII 38 Vs 11 and 16 offer GAM-raza KUBABBAR GAR,RA 'covered with silver below', where kettarraza virtually equals kattan. The following passages also deserve mention:

KUB XIV 26 II 6-9 (OTH 790) (= KBo XXIII 43 II 3-5 = IBot II 46,6-10):

n-āšta EN SISKUR DUG palši Arraz and[a]/ paizzi barē-ma-sē-kan
(297) mūr[iy]az [uizzi]/ kuitman-kan EN SISKUR DUG[palšan]/ i[š][ta]rna arba iyatt[ari]
'The master of the sacrifice goes in on the rear side of the p.-vessel, but he comes out on the lip/spout side. While the master of the sacrifice is walking between the p.-vessels...'

For the genitive with ištarna compare KBo III 27 Vs 10. We do not have the accusative with ištarna arba, because the latter implies traversal ('across, through'), not 'between'. For palban as palbayan, gen. pl. of palbi-, see Chap. 2, note 14.

KUB XXX 31 + XXXII 114 I 12-13 (R. of Kizzuwatna/CTH 479):

(298)

Kizzuwatni-me-kan DINGIR.MES-eš išshešu/ İSPU ŞA LUGAL
uddanaš EN.MES dazi

'But in Kizzuwatna the masters of the affair take away the tears of the gods on behalf of the king.'

Here we have a fully abstract use of the directional ablative:
'toward/by someone' > 'on the side of someone' > 'on behalf of someone'.

Finally, it should be pointed out explicitly that the sequence of a dative-locative plus an ablative 'adverb' is often ambiguous. TBoT II 80 I 7-8 has NINDA.KUR.₄ RA IM[ŞA] ZAG.GAR.RA-ni ZAG-e₂/Şer dāi. The presence of Şer imposes an interpretation 'He puts a sourdough loaf on the sacrificial table on the right'. That is, he puts it on the right side of the table. In view of this sentence we may assume that in line I 12 ištanaši KUB-la₂ dāl also means 'puts on the s. table on the left'. However, if we did not have
the preceding sentence with šer, we could just as well read 'to the left of the s. table'. In the case of a table it seems reasonable that objects are to be placed on it, not beside it. With other ritual paraphernalia the decision is not always so easy. Both possibilities—'on X, to the left/right' and 'to the left/right of X'—must be kept in mind.

VI. Adverbial Ablatives

There is no need to cite further examples of time adverbs such as UD-az or GE₆-az or the common ET-az 'on one's own'. However, the remaining Neo-Hittite manuscripts also contain other adverbial ablatives not attested previously:

KUB IX 15 II 10-11 (CTH 456):

(299) nu šallavaz/ [k]uiš piran uivanza

'The one who is sent ahead as the great one (i.e. in charge).'

KUB V 6 III 20-21 (Liver Omens/CTH 570):

(300) UNUT LUGAL-va pēdanzi n-at šampazara harkanzi

'They bring also the the implements of the king and keep them pure.'

KBo IV l Vs 31 ('Bauritual'/CTH 413):

(301) DINÇIR,NEŠ LUN,NEŠ-war-at LŪ NAGAR-az vēter

'The male gods built it as the carpenter(s).'

This example is not unambiguous, since to my knowledge one could
without contradiction posit a dental stem for 'carpenter' in Hittite and take LŪ NACAR-az as nominative singular. Nevertheless, a t-stem for an occupation is distinctly unlikely, and -az is a rare (though attested) spelling for an ani-stem nom. sg. An ablative expressing 'in the guise of' is therefore a very likely possibility.

We have already seen the expression (UZU) ḫurpa bişewez zevantaz(zi-ya) dīt- 'place/serve pure meat in raw and cooked form'. Along with several more attestations of the ablative in this usage, Neo-Hittite ritual manuscripts also provide (once!) the accusative one might expect: KUB XXV 23 IV 53 ḫurpa bišew tīvañaz 'they serve raw and cooked pure meat'. There is also another difficult expression involving zevantaz:

XBo XXI 37 Vs 8 (R. of Kizzuwatna/CTH 479):
(302) [m]abdat-ma-bān zeyandaz ari

This phrase or a variant of it occurs more than once: see also KBo XIV 27 Rs 13, XXI 37 Rs 9, KUB XLV 52 Vs 15, XLVI 47 Rs 11+.
The basic meaning of the phrase is clear from the following:

KBo V 1 I 36 (Papanikri/Pap. 4#):
(303) mebann-a UZU zēari 'And when the fat is cooked...

KBo XIX 142 II 25-26 (P. for Istar of Mt. Amanu/CTH 721):
(304) mebann-a UZU NIG.GIG UZU ŠA UZU.UDU-ya būman zēvari
'And when the liver, heart and all the meat of the sheep are cooked.'
One must also compare the following:

HT 1 I 49 (Ritual of Zarpiya/CTH 757):
(305) nu-

Neu, StBol 5,1, interprets the latter as 'When the fat is hot...', reading the verb as a form of $\mathfrak{E}$- 'be hot'. Besides the context, he finds support for this interpretation in KUB XX 88 Rs 21, where in a similar expression the verb is spelled $\mathfrak{a}$-a-ri, with the usual scriptio plena for this verb. However, the ratio of a-ri to $\mathfrak{a}$-a-ri is still surprising if the verb is 'be hot'. A more serious problem is the consistent presence of the local particle -\$\mathfrak{n}$an. It does not occur with $\mathfrak{a}$- 'be hot' outside the type under discussion. Admittedly, the finite verb is sparsely attested, but it is hard to see what function a particle like -\$\mathfrak{n}$an would have with a verb 'be hot' in any case. On the other hand, -\$\mathfrak{n}$an is attested with ar- 'arrive, reach': e.g. KBo V 3 II 28.

Therefore one must consider the possibility that we have a specialized use of ar- 'arrive' in the examples cited above: 'When the fat "arrives"', i.e. 'when it is done'. The ablative ëavantaz merely makes this sense explicit: 'when it reaches the state of being cooked'.

Before leaving adverbial ablatives, mention should be made of KALAG.GA-az/-za 'strongly, violently', thus 'heavily, in large numbers', used twice of the verb akkižk- 'die': KUB VII 54
I 3.IV 10-11 and XVII 16 I 4-5.

VII. Ablative of Means

Only two further instances of this very common usage need special comment:

**KUB XXX 26 I 1-2** (Rituals of Zelliya/OTH 783):

(306) mān UKU-ān/ dīšara GIG-zi

'If a person becomes ill through dīšara.'

Literally, the sentence reads something like 'If it befalls a person with dīšara'. Since the example is isolated and there is no similar attestation with an instrumental, one could also choose to interpret the ablative as expressing the cause or source of the illness: 'becomes ill from dīšara'.

**KUB XXII 70 Vs 55** (The God of Arusma/OTH 566):

(307) nu DINGIR-LUM Tūg termaz-na kuitti šanahta

'The god sought some (atonement) by means of a t.-cloth.'

The meaning of this peculiar-looking sentence is shown by ibid. Rs 41-42: mān DINGIR-LUM zankilatar İSTU SISKUR-ēt šanpiškiši

'If you the god seek atonement only by a sacrifice'. This sentence is repeated without zankilatar. One may therefore supply zankilatar in Vs 55 as well.
In listing other examples of the ablative of means, I again cite only one passage per verb:

**ak— 'die':** KUB XLIII 77 Vs 11-12 ḫinçasaz...zabbiya[z].

**aniya— 'write down':** IBoT I 31 Vs 14 tuppiaz.9

**anib— 'wipe':** KUB VIII 38 + XLIV 63 III 20-21 Ḫandaz A-az (+ arpa).

**arra— 'wash':** HT 1 IV 10 apiz.

**ariya— 'inquire about':** KUB V 6 II 64.IV 7 ḫtu digir LIM ḫtu KUŠ.

**ašē— 'seat':** KUB XXXIX 97 Vs 3.16 ḫinda zippinnaz (?)

**ašnu— 'equip, outfit':** KUB XLI 11 Rs 23-24 ḫaruwaža ḫtu KUBABBAR GUSKIN [...];za (+ -kan).

**aśu— 'see':** KUB XL 1 Vs 12 Rs 23+ ḫI.[H]I.A-az.

**ašu— 'drink':** KUB XVI 83 Vs 33 III ḫtu GAL 1-edaza.

**elaniya— 'fill up':** KUB VII 53 II 9-10 ḫez papretnaz (+ -ṣen).

**ēp— 'grasp':** KUB VIII 51 III 4 ḫu-az.

**ēd— 'eat':** KBo XIII 64 Vs 19 apiz (+ -kan).

**balīšiya— 'plate, coat':** KUB XIII 35+ II 34-35 ap[ez].

**balzai— 'call':** KBo II 4 I 25-26 GIṢ muḳnaṣa (+ endan).

**ban— 'draw (liquid)':** KBo XX 41,9 DUG ḫarṣialliaż.

**bandai— 'determine':** KUB VI 4 III 9 (and often) ariyašeḳšanaza, XXII 70 Vs 58 TUG termaz (i.e. by giving a t-cloth).

**ba(r)k— 'hold, keep':** KBo XII 128,11 iṣhiulaza.

**ba(rk)— 'perish':** KUB V 3 I 10.35 apiz (+ arpa).
battara- 'stab': KUB XXXVI 35 I 3 [ammu.dâza G]IR? TUR-az
(for ammu.dâza cf. ibid. I 14).

battrai- 'write': VBO'T 2,12-13 tupriaz.

batukeh- 'become frightful': KUB XXXI 17-19 DINGIR.MES-za
našma kušza Imme kuš [ud]ânez.

bašnunai- '?': Bo 2309 II 16f (StBot 19,33) GIś thrûvaz (+ -kan).
išhai- 'bind': KUB XII 58 I 26 UZU-1-vas (+ anda).
išk(iya)- 'anoint': KUB XXX IV 21-22 armâhkuâzza wašiâvâza.
iya- 'write down': KUB VII 53 II 6-7 tuppîza.
gangadi- 'treat with a g.-plant': KUB XXIX 4 II 37 ĪSTU KUABBAR
gangati(y)azi-va.

kariya- 'cover': KUB XXXIX 23 Vs 7 [TŪG] kûškidâza.
kiš- 'be done, happen': KUB XXII 70 Vs 32-70 apûz.
kiššai- 'comb': KUB XII 58 II 41-42 kušziya ĪSTU GA.ZUM.
kuer- 'cut': KUB XXXIII 106 III 53 kuš (+ arba).
lâ- 'loosen, relieve': KUB XVI 77 II 65+ III 24 apîzza ININ-za.
lazziya- (SIG; -) 'be favorable': KUB XLIV 6 I 10.17+ IV 23 apîza.
malîškueš- 'become weak': KBo XIII 76 Vs 14 apîza.
mâniyâh- 'manage': IBo'T I 30 Vs 6 ŠU-az (+ -šan).
mâršamu- 'falsify' (?): KUB XVI 39 II 11-12 ĪSTU GUD UDU
wašdulawandâza [UL kušza].

memâ- 'speak': RS 25.421 Ro 9-10+ 30-31 IZKIN-az.
pâi- 'give': KUB XXII 70 Vs 56 ĪSTU GUŠKIN NA TŪG
(terrazi-[y])
(scil. zankilatar?).
pāi- 'go': KUB XXXVI 67 II 28 IŠTU GIŠ KUN₂ (+ šer and -kan).
pepparē- 'sprinkle': KBO XXI 108 II 8-9 šehiliyaz A-ni₄.
bašibai- 'crush': KUB XLIV 63 II 14 ŠU-az” (+ anda).
nunuš- 'interrogate': KUB XL 1 Vs 31 kēzza tuppaz (+ katta).
šai- 'seal': KUB XXXIII 106 III 52 apiz (+ ēppa).
šanb- 'scour': KUB XXV 37 III 21 wetenaz (+ arba and -kan).
šuliya- 'peel' > 'clean': KUB XII 58 I 8 apē₂.
šarra- 'ruin': KUB VII 53+ I 6 peprannaz udēzanaza (+ arba).
šarnink- 'make restitution': KUB XIII 35+ II 40 varnaza.
šiya- 'shoot': KUB VII 54 III 22-23 kēzza IŠTU GIŠ TAG.GA.
šū- 'full': RS 25 421 Ro 29 Iš.TĀM.az.
šurra- 'fill': KBO XXI 1 II 5-6 IŠTU KAS GESŠIN tawalaš walepāhuyaz.
šuppiyaḥ- 'purify': KUB XXX 31+ IV 39-40 šepeliyaz witenaz.
dā- 'take': KUB XXXIII 96 I 13 ŠU-za.
dāai- 'place': KUB XXIX 4 III 22 GIŠ tuppaz (+ katta and -kan).
taninu- 'put in order': KUB XLII 91 III 12-13 GIŠ BANŠUR-za.
tivannai- '?': KUB VII 53 II 9-10 kēš peprannaz (+ -kan).
tūriya- 'yoke': KBO IV 1 Rs 11-12 kuēz (GIŠ [SUDU]N-it).
unuwa- 'adorn': KBO II 1 I 35 II 13-14 etc. šettar(a)za UD.ŠAR-za.
unuwa- 'come': KUB XIV 3 I 61-62 GIŠ MA-za (+ arba and -kan).
uwatē- 'carry (off)': KUB XIV 3 III 12-13 GESPŪ-za (+ -kan).
wakā- 'strike': KUB XXXVI 87 III 12-13 arivašēnaza (+ -kan).
warpa- 'wash': KBo IX 115 Vs 12-13 Be[he]ll[a]ya ISTU A.HI.A
waršiya- 'calm down': KUB XXVI 43 Vs 7.17 kezza...aniza.
watarnab- 'command': KBo XVIII 91,7 [K]axU-az.
wek- 'ask for, demand': KUB XXII 70 Vs 13.17 Û-az...tehaz.
wešiya- 'find': KUB XLII 100 III 26.IV 9 tuSpi(ye)za.
zenu- 'cook' (tr.): KUB XLIV 63 II 13 A-az ISTU PIŠAN ZABAR.
GUB-leš- 'turn out unfavorably': KUB XIII 35+ I 21 apiz INIM-az.
NU.SIG-y- 'be unfavorable': KUB V I III 8.44 kezza...apiza.
SIG-y-eš- 'turn out favorably': KUB V I I 18 apiza (+-kan).
šE₂-mu- 'pacify': KUB V I I 93,95 apiza.

VIII. Ablative of Accompaniment

The remaining Neo-Hittite manuscripts offer several more examples of an ablatve of accompaniment with the direct object of a transitive verb (for the type see Sec. 1.1 above): KUB VI 50 II 13-14, XXIV 12 II 25-28 and XXVI 69 VI 7-9. In addition there are several instances of an ablative with an intransitive motion verb whose sense is very close to that of a transitive motion verb plus direct object: 'come with X' = 'bring X'. Examples:

KUB XI 17 II 14-15 (R. against Epidemic in the Army/CTH 424):
(308) kezza-we tuk ANA DINGIR.LIM menahanda ISTU UDU/ wenum
'Behold, I came toward you, the god, with a sheep.'

KUB V 6 III 24 (Liver Omens/CTH 570):
(309) kušman-kan mPIŠ.TUR-aš mZePARTI-ŠEŠ-Š-a ISTU SISKUR aranzi
'As soon as Maššuiluwa and Zaparti-ŠEŠ-a arrive with the sacrifice.'

KBo II 2 II 45-46 (Mixed Oracles/CTH 577):

(310) nu-tta-kken arinyašnaza/ 2-an nawi pāweni

'We together (?) have not yet approached you with an inquiry.'

In view of the cases with takšan below, one could theoretically take the ablative with 2-an: 'together with an inquiry'. This makes little sense, and the same expression is attested without 2-an: KUB V 25 IV 16 [arinyašnaza pāwen]. I therefore have grouped this case with the other examples with intransitive motion verbs.

Other ablatives express attendant circumstance, functioning virtually as adverbs:

KUB XXXVI 12 + XXXIII 113 I 17-18 (Ullikummi/JCS 6,10):

(311) dIŠAR-īš-ma-kan AN-az/ UR.SAG-annaz erha ut[il]

'Ištar came away from heaven with heroism/heroically.'

KUB IX 15 II 11-12 (CTH 456):

nu ANA LÚ.MES URU-LIM/ maliyaššaz menāu n-an-kan maliyaššaz
KASKAL-Ši tīvandu

'Let him speak to the men of the city with cordiality (?). Let them put him on the road with cordiality (?).' 

KUB XXIV 7 I 16-19 (Ritual and Hymn for Ištar/CTH 717):

(313) nu KIN-an kuit anniškanzi/ [n-a]t ḫalwannaz anniškanzi Ș-ir-ma
kuit/ [9]nininanzi n-at duškarattaza/ annišk anzi

'The task which they perform, they perform with laughter (?).
The house which they build, they build with joy.'

Compare ibid. I 27 pidduliyazzu enctype 'they perform with fear/
constraint'. Note also parhešnaz 'with haste, hastily' in KUB IX 15
II 9 and KBo XVIII 54 Vs 8. The dative-locative parhešni is
attested in a similar function: e.g. KUB V I I 71.

Finally, there is another piece of evidence for the ablative
of accompaniment with takš-, specifically takšan:

KUB XVIII 12 Vs 4-5 (Oracles re the Storm-god of Aleppo/
CTh 564):

mūr-na-šaš DINGIR.MES URU KUBABBAR an URU-an šA d. URU galap
(314)
ANA d.UTUŠI SAL.LUGAL šE12-wanzi/ [d]apīaz takš-an malān harteni

'If you, the gods, have approved Hattusa, the city of the
Storm-god of Aleppo, for the winter-stay of the king and queen,
together with everything (else) . . .'

The emendation of takš-an to takš-eš-an and the interpretation are
confirmed by KUB XVI 47,11 [ ]x KASKAL-an humandez takšan malān[ ].

We also have attested what appears to be the Hittite idiom for
'including':

KUB XXVI 69 VII 11-13 (Law Case/StBot 4,46):

(315) nu-wa-šši TŪG. MĪG.LAN. MES QADU TŪG. SA.GA.DU [and] a DIB-anta
1 IMITTU AN.BAR [...] GA]R.BA SUN-un
'I gave him festive garments including a cloth-girdle (and)
one spear/lance of iron inlaid with [ ].'

Literally, the phrase is 'festive garments grasped in with a
girdle' (cf. German 'inbegriffen'). Werner, StBoT 4,47, also
takes anda DIB-anta as 'including', but applies it to the following
object, the lance. This is unlikely for two reasons. First, the
ending -anta is a nom.-acc. pl. neuter, which agrees with the
plural or collective TÜG, NIG.LAM.MES, not with the singular 1
IMITTU AN.BAR. Second, the word order favors taking anda DIB-anta
with what precedes. The Hittite construction for 'X including Y'
is thus X + Y (instr./abl.) + anda apparent-

IX. Ablative of Respect

One type of ablative of respect is that with predicate adjectives:

KBo XV 1 I 16-17 (R. of Pulissa/StBoT 3,112):

ISTU SAG.DU-SU-va kā[ ] šalliš/ UZU SÀ-za-va kā[ ] šalliš
ŪR-azza-va-va kā[ ] šalliš
'This one is large with respect to his head, heart and penis.'

KUB IX 32 Vs 20-21 (R. of Ašpella/OTH 394):

(317) nu-war-at ISTU UZU NIG.GIC/ UZU SÀ Ŭ ISTU UZU ŪR mekkī warrantēš
'They are fat with respect to their liver, heart and penis.'
The duplicate KUB XLI 18 III 11-12 has for the last item 𒂊𒆠 and with respect to their flesh/fat'. Therefore one should perhaps take UZU UR here in the more general sense 'member(s)/limb(s)'. On this type see KÜMMEL, STBOT 3,121.

The ablative of respect is also used with measurements:

KUR VIII 75 III 2-5 ('Feldertexte'/ArOr 27,14):

(318) 𒂊𒆠 ŠG.DA 𒈨 80 𒌋.MIN/ 𒂊𒆠 ŠG.DA-ya-EŠI 芝加 80 𒌋.MIN/
𒂊𒆠 DAGAL-ma-aš 芝加 20 𒌋.MIN/ 𒂊𒆠 DAGAL-ya-EŠI 芝加 20 𒌋.MIN

'It is 180 𒂊𒆠 in length, and it has a second length of 180 𒂊. It is 120 𒂊 in width, and it has a second width of 120 𒂊.'

Throughout the 'Feldertexte' the ablative is common in this usage. In each case where a second length and width is specified, the alternate possessive construction is used.

The ablative of respect is also attested with verbs:

KUR V 3 I 17-18 (On the Winter Stay of the King/CTH 563):

(319) 𒂊-ma 𒂊-ma 𒀜 NIŠI 𒂊-SUMMI ANŠE.KUR.RA/ UL kuški LUL-weni

'But if we are not lying to His Majesty with respect to a lack of horses...'

The same expression recurs with various objects: KUB V 4 I 30 TA BAB 'concerning a mutiny', ibid. II 6 𒀜INANNA-za 'concerning IŠtar', ibid. II 11-12 IZI-za 'concerning fire', XVIII 12 Vs 5
UG₃-za KALAG,GA-za GIG-za 'concerning a plague (and) violent disease'. transl. RHA 31(1973)[1976]45, note f, calls this use an ablative of means, but she translates (p. 44): 'hinsichtlich einer Seuche (und) einer heftigen Krankheit' (emphasis mine – HOM). See also KUB V 2 Vs 2f and XVIII 12 Vs 3lf.

KUB VIII 75 IV 8-9 ('Feldertexte'/ArOr 27,20):

1 A.ŠA ŠA ZAC ANA LÚ.MES URU HATIŠA IGI-enda/ ĪSTU NULUN-na-eš ÜL tikkuššamunaša

'One boundary field facing the men of Hatissu. But as to its yield (lit. seed) it is not recorded (lit. shown).'

The sense of tekkuššamun - here is confirmed by the variant in KUB VIII 78 VI 12-13: NUMUN ANA 3 A.ŠA-ki/ ÜL tekkuššamunaš 'the seed/yield for three fields is not shown/recorded'.

Two further examples of the ablative of respect do not fit under any specific rubric:

KBO XVIII 54 Vs 4-6 (Letter of Kassu/CTH 186):

ŠA ERIN.MES Ṣarikuwa-va-kan/ ŠA ERIN.MES UKUŠ Ṣattulannaša/

kuit mabban

'And how is it among the Ṣ-troops and the ___-troops with respect to health?'

For kuit mabban 'how is it, how do things stand?' see ibid. Vs 4.
KUB XXII 38 I 3–5 (Lecanomancy/RA 52,150–151):

\(\text{mân-ma-kan tuk/ ANA DINGIR LIM tamêdaz ÚL kuitki dalîyan/ nu TUL aldanniga SIG}_5-\text{ru}\)

'But if you, the god, have nothing left with respect to anything else, let the \text{al}tamni be favorable.'

My understanding of this passage (which differs radically from that of Laroche, loc. cit.) is that the god is being asked whether he has any further reason for being angry. Such an inquiry is commonplace in oracle texts. Compare the formulation of KUB V 10 I 14: \(\text{mân ki-ut namma-ma tasei NU.GÁL kuit DINU MUŠEN HURRI SIG}_5-\text{ru SIG}_5\) 'But if (it is) only this, and there is no other further matter (of dispute), let the \text{H}-bird be favorable. (It is) favorable'.

Finally, there is KBo XVIII 144,9–10: \(\text{hùmentaza hùman SIG}_5-\text{in}\) 'Everything is fine in every respect'. The phrase \text{hùmentaza hùman} recurs in KUB V 24 I 58 and is also found in KUB VI 9 II 4 in the form \text{dapiša dapiša}.

X. Ablative of Agent

Oracle texts provide a couple more examples of the ablative expressing the agent with a passive verb:

KUB V 1 III 28 (Oracles re Campaigns in Gasga/OTH 561):

\(\text{nu DINGIR.MES-za kî-na nalan}\)
'This has been approved by the gods.'

The same sentence recurs ibid. I 27 and III 23.

KUB XXII 70 Vs 45 (The God of Arusna/CTH 566):

(324) SAL.JUGAL-ye-wa-kan kuit aN.EZ ISTU DINRUM BA-U6

'And because the queen was killed by that god.'

Two examples written ideographically are also worth mentioning:

KUB V 1 IV 44.51 etc. (Oracles ré Campaigns in Gasga/CTH 561):

(325) ISTU SAL.SU.GI TR-TUM QATANNA-pat

'The request by the "old woman" is the same.'

ibid. IV 72

(326) KARAŠ.HA-kan TA d U L zaptari

'The camp will not be struck by the Storm-god.'

For the last example we have what is very nearly the active counterpart: KBo VI 25+ III 7 d U-ša KUR-e zābi 'The Storm-god will strike the country'.

XI. Problematic Cases

There remains a residue of cases where the interpretation of an ablative is in some way problematic. In some instances the basic meaning is clear, while the precise syntax is less certain:
"But it (the preceding list) is the material for one person. If the king and queen perform (the ritual) together, they take twice as much of everything."

Since the 'twice' is an uninflected adverb, it is not clear what the addition of means in formal terms. Functionally, the ablative (or instrumental) is perhaps most easily taken as expressing extent (cf. ex. (266) above p. 366). We do not know how Hittite expressed 'X is so many feet taller than Y' or the like, but it would not be surprising to find the measure in the ablative or instrumental (compare the 'ablative of degree of difference' in Latin: — much more sharply/more sharply by much'). Thus the would reflect a meaning '(more) by twice', hence 'twice as much'.

Other cases permit more than one interpretation of the ablative:

A reading 'They do the same with the tent of each one' is possible,
but I know of no exact parallels in Hittite for this English-sounding expression. In view of other examples we have seen, a spatial interpretation is also possible: "They do the same thing (starting) from the tent of each one". However, one might expect at least a local particle if not a preverb to mark this function with a verb like iya- which has no local sense by itself (see ex. (287) p. 379 and note 2 above).

KBo XII 128,9-17 (CTH 389):

\[ n\text{-at-za-kan haddenaz/ arba aușten/ n-at išpiulaza harten/ n-at (329) ša-it šikten/ n-at tuliyaza pun[u]šten/ n-at GIŠ-HUR-za aușten/ nu a[n]dla d<\text{r}>utent?/ n-at-za-kan šumādazu/ x-x-MEŠ-za šekten. \]

"See it with your own wisdom. Keep it by prescription. Know it with your heart. Investigate it by an assembly. See it by means of a tablet. Join together (?) . Know it by your __.""

I have translated all the ablative here as expressing means. This seems certain for at least išpiulaza and is quite in order for the rest. However, the arba with haddenaz raises the question of whether several of the ablative expresses the source of information: "See it out of your own wisdom... learn of it from the assembly... see it from the tablet". If the latter interpretation is permitted here, it must also be considered for other examples (see p. 211 sub au-, ex. (188) p. 317 and p. 364 sub wemīye-).

In some instances the difficulty lies in the lexical interpre-
tation of the ablative or of the accompanying verb: KUB XXIII 13
Vs 4 wašdazzaʾ ʾiḫunabbHEN, XXXIX 57 I 9 ʾa-az arḫa ʾunha[enzi],
XXVIII 6 Vs 9b nu NIG.1AH pittaš ziki[l]zi and KFo XVII 65 Vs 3
kunzigerahitaz ŠEH[enzi]. Vocabulary also forms part of the
problem in KUB XLVI 42 III 2-4:

nu-kan 1 KIN šakuwaššarakza arḫa dāʾ UNUNUBΔ-ma-kan ḫaMAN/
(330) zasakirileza dammelaš arḫa šekuwaššarakihU mān 1 KIN GAL-me
n-[at]-kān zasakirileza arḫa šakuwaššarakhi

It would seem that the denominative verb arḫa šekuwaššarakihU means
the same as šakuwaššarakza arḫa dāʾ 'fully (?) take away', but the
overall sense is obscure.

The use of the ablative in oracle texts, like other aspects
of this genre, is often less than crystal-clear. The form SIG₃-az/
-za occurs very frequently, especially in reference to the flight
of birds: e.g. KBo XV 28 Vs 6.8, KUB XVIII 12 Vs 9f. KUB XVIII 5
I 8.21 confirms that the word is to be read asšuwaz, but its
syntactic function is not clear to me (Ünal, RHA 31(1973)[1976]44,
renders SIG₃-za as 'aus dem Günstigen', thus an ablative of separa-
tion). Even more difficult is the form TUŠ-za (KUB XVIII 12 Vs 19f
and often in the behavior of birds of augury). See the discussion
of Ünal, op. cit. 39 and passim.

Equally obscure is the following passage:
KUB XXII 52 Vs 6 (Liver Omens/CTH 570):
(331) URU TUL-NA KURU zwe NU.SIG₅ edeza ŠA LÚ KUR HARZI NU.SIG₅-du

Compare ibid. Vs 8.11.Rs 3-4.

Other passages appear to be comprehensible, but present some feature which raises doubts about their solution:

KUB V.1 III 23-24 (Oracles re Campaigns in Gasga/CTH 561):
DINGIR.MEŠ-za kuit malēn URU NERI.GA.ZA-kan karazzi nu EGIR-da
(332) URU PIGAIN.NARIA/ uizzi

'Because it is approved by the gods, he rises (?) from Nerik and comes back to Pīgai.narīsa.'

See also ibid. III 28-29. The context seems to call for an intransitive (or reflexive) use of karu- 'raise': 'raise oneself > rise, stir'. Unfortunately, the issue is clouded by the occurrence in the same text I 70f of the same phrase with an accusative: nu-za-kan GIM-an URU NERI.GA.NAN karazzi. Should we read URU NERI.GA(n)-za-kan in III 23 and 28?

KUB XXVII 49 III 13-15 (Festival witešiyeš/CTH 692):
nu BEITTI LÚ.MEŠ EN.MEŠ DINGIR.MEŠ pixnāizzzi/ kuin-za-kan
(333) IMMA KUŠZ! duškizzi/ USKENNU na-at-za daškanzi

'The mistress of the house rewards the "masters of the gods" (with) whatever she rejoices in. They bow and accept it.'

In a phrase kui- imma kui- one expects both forms of kui- to agree
in case. Perhaps the mixed phrase kuin...imma kūḫē is due to the fact that dušk- 'rejoice (in)' may be construed with either the accusative or instrumental/ablative. Compare for the instrumental KBo XVIII 133 Vs 6-7 (p. 421 below). For the accusative see KUB XIV 7 IV 14 and XXIX 1 III 4.

The following examples I merely cite for the sake of completeness without comment or an attempt at translation:

KBo II 7 Rs 23 (Inventory/CTH 505):

(334) EŠEN-ŠU ẖazziyawa duškeratta? tarrauwan[ažā]

KUB XVI 16 Rs 15 (Liver Omens/CTH 570):

(335) nu-wa ḤNA DINGIR-LIM KU-na vaštantuanda na yešgaweni

KUB XXXI 79 Vs 13 (CTH 214):

(336) [kan]teszi palti-ya GIŠ MA.TUR? URU Arzivasa deštevanzi

KUB XXIV 7 IV 49f (Story of the Fisherman and His Wife/

CTH 363):

(337) SAI-aš ZZ-anza ḫaddanza taparyaza-ma/ [pl]ērā karšan barzi

In connection with the phrase EGIR-pe parza 'backwards'
one should note the variant EGIR-pe parāža (KUB IX 39 I 4) and also KUB XLII 78 II 8: 1EN AŠ-MA GUŠKIN MA₄ katte parz[a?...]

'one sun-disc of gold and precious stones...'. If the reading pār-z[a] in the latter passage is correct, it is the only instance of parza other than with EGIR-pe. Finally, there is the form
SAL.MESAZZARAYAZA, which occurs in various spellings in KEQ II 13 vs 10.11.19.Rs 3 and in KUB XVII 35 I 33-34 and passim. Despite its form, I see nothing about its use to suggest that it is an ablative. The word is probably foreign, but this does not of itself explain the ending. 12

XII. Infinitives in -wanzi.

The motivation for discussing this infinitive ending in the present context is the following passage:

KUB XXIX 4 I 5 (Transfer of the DINGIR.ÇE₃/Kronasser, Umsiedlung 6):

(338) nu-ken kuitmen wetumwanzi hımantazzi-ya ašnuzi

'While one finishes with the construction and everything...'

Kronasser, loc. cit., translates hımantazzi-ya as an adverb 'ganz und gar', but this ignores the connective -ya 'end', which must be taken seriously, judging from all other cases where the longer form of the ablative in -azzi is attested (see below Chap. 5, Sec. 1.1). This means that the text coordinates an infinitive in -wanzi and an ablative, raising the question of whether the former is originally an ablative as well.

It is clear that the infinitive in -wanzi is to be related to the verbal noun in -war (gen. -waš) and the 'supine' in -wan (Friedrich, HE I ² §§270-273 with references). We are dealing with
an original heteroclite \*-\textit{ver-}/\*\textit{ver-} substantive. Kronasser, 
\textit{VILF} 133, derives \textit{-wanzi} from \textit{-wan} plus a \textit{t-} enlargement plus 
locative \textit{-i}. Other evidence for such a \textit{t-} enlargement in Hittite 
is lacking, and it is ad hoc to assume it just in the locative 
in order to explain the presence of the \textit{-e-}. On the other hand, 
\textit{-wanzi} \textless \*\textit{-wanti} is perfectly regular. The preservation of the 
final \textit{i} in all environments (versus the regular ablative \textit{-ez:} 
\textit{-azzi-va}) is surprising, but this is part of a general problem 
concerning the outcome of final \*\textit{ti} (see p. 473 below). One may 
either take the \textit{-wan-} of the ablative \*\textit{-wanti} as the oblique stem 
\textit{-wan} which underlies genitive \textit{-was} (< \*\textit{-wans}) or as the endingless 
locative of the supine in \textit{-wan} (cf. \textit{pirza}, \textit{neri}ža and ablatives 
in \textit{-anra} pp. 448–450 below).

Functionally, the infinitives in \textit{-wanzi} would have originated 
in phrases with the verbs \textit{zimna-} 'cease', \textit{ašu-} 'finish' and the 
like. An original \textit{jerwanzi} \textit{zimna-} 'cease from doing' (verbal noun 
in the ablative + verb) developed into 'cease to do' (infinitive 
+ verb) and was then generalized to all infinitival uses. The 
attested Hittite opposition of \textit{-wanzi} versus \textit{-anra} is surely 
secondary. Palaic \textit{ašunu} 'to drink' and Luvian \textit{āna} (\textit{eduna} 'eat' etc.) 
show that the \textit{-war} paradigm also once possessed a directive which 
functioned as an infinitive.
Section 2.2. Usage of the Instrumental in Other Neo-Hittite Manuscripts

I. Instrumental of Means

No further examples of this usage need be quoted in full. The purpose of the following list is once again to attest the use of the instrumental of means with various verbs, not to give an exhaustive survey of examples:

aniva- 'treat': KUB XV 42 II 18 Sīg alit.
arr- 'wash': KUB VII 53 II 21-22.25 GEŠTIM-it...wetenit.
ař- '?': KBo X 47g III 14 labūnit (cf. p. 329 sub arr- with note).
a‘ū- 'see': KUB XXXIII 106 I 24 IGI.HI.A-it.
ēku- 'drink': KBo II 14 III 10-11 etc. (4x) SII-it, XVI 100,4+6+
               ŠTU BIBRI auuauuū-it.
ēn- 'grasp; hold': KUB XXX 28 Rs 12 SII.HI.A-it; KBo XXII 244,6
               tapašanit (+ ker; see p. 243f).
ḥališšiya- 'plate, coat': KBo XXIII 52 II 10-11.15-16 etc.
               KUBABBAR-it.
ḥalzai- 'call': KBo V 11 I 7 lamnit.
her(K)- 'hold': KBo XI 11 I 3 kīšarta.
baššunṣai- '?': KBo XIX 141,6 (= XI 19 Vs 13) ZAG-it GUB-litter-
               kī(kīšarit).
ḥaṣṣai- 'strike': KBo XXII 42 Vs 14+ GII-it.
hulaliya- 'wrap': KBo XIII 163 Vs 3-5 [ ]TI-annit ha[ttulann]it
[ ]DUMU.NES DUMU.SAL.NES haššit ha[n]saššit.
iršai- 'make the rounds of': KBo II 29 Vs 15-17 memallit.
iššai- 'bind': KUB XVII 12 III 17-18 SIG pittulit.
iššiyyahh- 'reveal, signal': KUB V 11 IV 49-50 Ū-it.
iššiyyaš- 'hear': KUB XII 21,11 iššamanta.
inya- 'make': KBo XIV 116 IV 4 IŠTU DUG.TU,7.
kappuwa- 'care for': KUB XXXIII 121 II 7 NINDA [heršit išranduzzi]<5>
karp- 'lift': KBo XXI 47 III 6 SAG.DU-it.
kuer- 'cut': KUB XXXIII 106 III 42 URUDU Kuruzzit (+ arha).
mī- 'flourish': KUB XXIV 6 Vs 4+ [haš]kit GESṬIN-it.
meme- 'speak': KBo XVI 56,11 EMUR-it, KUB V 11 I 5 Ū-it.
musai- 'entreat': KUB XXIV 2 Vs 12 NINDA [heršit DUG] išpanduszit.
ninadamu- 'make drunk': KBo XIII 101 Vs 29+ tawalit walhit.
papparš- 'sprinkle': KUB VII 2 I 22 A-it, XLIV 50 I 10 Šūwarit.
parumu- 'purify': KUB VII 53 IV 2-3.6 tuš šU-it...IN-it.
pasišai- 'crush': KUB XXXIII 93 III 22 GĪR-it (+ anda).
pēda- 'carry': KBo XI 38 I 14-15 uppainit GUŠKIN.
žakk- 'know': KBo XII 128,5 ŠI-it.
šap(iya)- 'peel' > 'clean': KUB VII 53 IV 2-3.6 tuš šU-it...IN-it.
šipaddī- 'libate': KUB VII 60 III 9-11 taḫšanit GESṬIN (+ -kan).
šīva- 'shoot': KUB XIV 49 IV 4-5 GIŠ kalmišnit (ibid. IV 5-6 has an acc. GIŠ kalmišniš?; or is -ni-uš an error for -ni-it?).
šu- 'full of': RS 25,421 Ro 37.39 dammetarwantit...EŠU-IT.
Šūna- 'fill': KBo XII 70 Rs II 39 ḫalkit.
Šuqiyyắb- 'purify': KBo XXII 1 II 4-5 ⸪shellały sıwetinit.
Śūd- ' ł ': KBo XIX 130 I 10 ḫalkit.
Da- 'take': KUB XLI 4 II 18 Tūg kurešnit.
Tarḥ- 'conquer': KBo XXII 73 I 9 Gīš TUKUL-it.
Tarmai- 'nail, fasten': KUB XII 44 III 8-9 Gīš hātalkišnit
(+ katta and -ṣan).
Tarna- 'let go': KBo I 35,8 uddanıt anda tarpumur = Akk. surū'.
Tiya- 'step (on)': KBo VII 12,15 Gīr-it.
Tūriya- 'yoke': KUB II 2 II 11-12 kuē Gīš SUDUK-it.
Uluw- 'send': KUB XV 30 II 2-3 Ū-it.
Unuwa- 'adorn': EUR III 100,3 GURUK-it.
Wahnut- 'brandish': KUB XVII 23 II 11 Gīš tipit (+ šer arba and -kan;
cf. KBo XXII 108 II 6-9, XXIII 1 II 2-3 and KUB XXX 31 +
XXXII 114 IV 36-39 and see p. 234 above).
Walp- 'strike': KUB XXII 70 Rs 56-57 NA4 kunkunuṣṣaṭit.
Wek- 'ask for': KUB XV 5 III 51,IV 18,34 Ū-it.
Wemiyə- 'find': KBo XVII 65 Rs 46 KAXU-it (cf. KUB XLII 100 III 26).
Wete- 'build': KUB XL 61,7 + XIII 28,11 tudži.
Wezz- 'strike': KUB IV 8 Vs 9 ST.HTA-it.
Zab- 'strike': KUB XVII 12 III 19-20 SÎG pittūlīṭ.
Zanu- 'cook' (tr.): KBo XIII 101 Vs 10 IZI-it.
Zapnut- 'let trickle, dribble': KBo XXI 23 I 22 IṣTU Gīš ERIN (+ šer
and -ṣan).
II. Instrumental of Accompaniment

Several additional instances of this usage fit patterns we have already seen. KUB X 30,5 and XXIX 4 III 62-63 refer to musical accompaniment. There is also another case of an instrumental with an intransitive motion verb virtually equivalent to a transitive verb:

KUB VII 20 Vs 10-11 (R. of Palliye/CTH 475):
339 mappen-ma-at ḫeṛlliyaq  witenit/  ḫGI[GIR]-pa  uwanzi

'But when they come back with the water of purification...'

The same expression occurs with a singular subject in KBo IX 119A 1 10-11.

There are also further examples of an accompanying object with the direct object of a transitive verb. In KUB XII 48 IV 23-24 we find: UZU[NIG][GIG]/ UZU[N] A UZU[ ] ḫGI[GIR]-it  zanuwanz[i]

'they cook the liver and heart together with the penis'. In view of the frequent collocation ḫappenit zanuwanz[i] 'they cook with an open flame', one might wonder if the scribe here misheard ḫappenit as ḫappenit 'member, penis'. However, KUB XXXII 123 III 50-51 has UZU[ZAC.UD[U]?/ ḫappenit zanuwanz 'the shoulder (is) cooked with the penis', so the usage is probably real.

KUB XXIV 2 Rs 14-16 (Prayer to Telipimu/CTH 377):
[nu-šmaš  ḫallkivaš  GIŠ GES[N]-aš  GIŠ  ḫešanaš  GUD-HI.A-aš]
UDU.HI.A-aš MĀŠ.HI.A-[aš]/[SAH-aš ANše.GIR], NUN.MA.HI.A-aš
(340) ANše-aš, sinraš būtnit/[(DUMU.LU.LI.aš-a ša EGR.UP.MI]
mivātar piški

'Give them future abundance of grain, vines, __, cattle, sheep, goats, pigs, mules, donkeys together with beasts of the field and of men.'

I have quoted this passage in full because it shows that the option of putting one of a series of objects into the instrumental could be exercised even in the middle of a coordinate series. All of the genitives above depend on ša EGR.UP.MI mivātar 'future abundance', and to our mind a smoother sentence would have been produced by a genitive sinraš būtneš 'of beasts of the field'. The Hittite writer could certainly have said this had he wished, but chose instead to view 'beasts of the field' as a pendant to the other objects.

RS 25.421 Vo 44-46 ('Signalement lyrique'/Ugaritica V,774):

PAr-aš-ma-aš GIN-an (ras.) n-aš-kan t/daluppiyaš dammetar-
want[i]t/ A.MES-ar anda bīdaizzī

'She is like a canal. She brings into the fields (?) water together with abundance.'

For dammetarwant as a substantive compare ibid. Ro 37. One could also interpret dammetarwantit in the fashion of panerit: 'water in abundance' (cf. Laroche, op. cit. 775, 'des eaux à flots').
III. Instrumental of Respect

The instrumental is attested with the verb LUL- 'lie' to express that with respect to which the lie is told:

*KUB* V 3 I 3-4 (Oracles re the Winter Stay of the King/CTH 563):

\[
\text{mān-ma AHA ĉUŠ ŠU-aš waštulit/ UL kuitki LUL-weni.ru}
\]

(342) *KUR.BEŠ SIG-ru*

'But if we are not at all lying to His Majesty about a sin of the hand, let the liver omens be favorable.'

The same phrase occurs ibid. II 24-25. For the ablative in the same usage see above 'Sec. 2.1 pp. 401-402.

IV. Instrumental of Agent

There is one further example of an instrumental of agent:

*KBo* V 11 I 24 (Instr. of the Doorkeeper/CTH 263):

(343) *LUGAL-it pahḫanuwan ĝ[i?]*

'[Let] it be protected by the king.'

V. Pronominal Instrumental Used for the Ablative

Nico-Hittite manuscripts of texts whose date of composition cannot be fixed contain a few more instances of an instrumental from a pronominal stem functioning as an ablative: *KUB* XXXIII 118,24 and XL 110 Vs 6* anit pantalaz 'from that time on', *KUR* XXXVI 91
Rs 3* and KBo XIX 145 III 45* kitvantalsa 'from this time on',
KBo XIII 99 Rs 13 tugaza-šit and KUB XLIII 34,11 tugaza-šit
'from his body'.

VI. Adverbial Instrumentals

Aside from more attestations of pangarit 'en masse', GİR-it
'on foot' and šakiwašarit ZI-it 'whole-heartedly', the remaining
Neo-Hittite manuscripts offer only the adverb DU₃-it:

KUB VI 17 II 3 (Oracles/CTH 582):
(344) mēn LÚ KUR ANA ERÍN.MEŠ LE-pat zabbiva DU₃-it tiv[azi]
'If the enemy enters into battle against (our) troops with
abandon.'

Presumably we have here an adverbial instrumental karšit standing
for the more common karši/DU₃-ši 'unreservedly, without holding
back' (see e.g. KUB XXIII 72 Rs 40 also of fighting and KUB XIX
26 I 16 of speaking). The adverb karši 'unreservedly' is the
nom.-acc. sg. neuter of the adjective karši-, which is also used
to mean 'mere' (see KBo III 1 II 29 // XII I 8 IV 30 'I made them
mere plowman'). The literal meaning of the word was perhaps
'bare', from which one can easily derive 'mere' (cf. German 'bloß')
as well as 'frank, unreserved'. The instrumental DU₃-it is also
attested with 'GUL-ar (walhuwar) in the vocabulary KBo I 42 III 1.
The Akkadian is missing, but the meaning is surely once again
'striking with abandon, without holding back'.

VII. Adnominal Instrumental

In *IBot* II 91 III 4-7 we find twice GAL ME-it 'a vessel with water'. As in similar examples cited earlier, this expression is derived diachronically (and perhaps synchronically) by the deletion of "want- 'full'. There are, however, two instances of an adnominal instrumental which do not involve a vessel and a liquid:

*KBo* I 45 Rs II 3 (Vocabulary 'Sâ'/*CTh* 299):

(345) libmu = ihuwanit wêtar 'water (mixed) with dirt' (?)

On this line see Laroche, *EBA* 24(1966)161, with references. The Akkadian is hapax, but on the basis of the Hittite has been reasonably related to luhummu/luhmû 'mud' (see *CAD* under libmu).

*KUB* VII 13 Vs 37 (*CTh* 456):

(346) mu-za lu d u TUG-TUM ISTU SISSIKTI wa[šivazi]

'The man of the Storm-god puts on a garment with a hem.'

The phrase marked with ISTU could of course also be an ablative in Hittite. The point here is that we have on the surface an adnominal instrumental/ablative which is not derived by deletion of "want- 'full'. This does not exclude a similar derivation, namely by deletion of a participle such as anhuwant- 'provided with'.
VIII. Instrumental of Separation

ABOUT 17 III 5-6 (Birth Ritual/CTH 477):

(347) nu SAL punušzi nu mān [...] tešbi' parkuiš

'They interrogate the woman, and when she is free of sleep

[ ]...'

The interpretation 'free of, purified from' is suggested not only by other examples with parkuiš, but also by KUB XXIV 8 I 31 (p. 182 above sub parkuiša-).

IX. Problematic Cases

Two further cases of the instrumental are less than certain in their interpretation:

KHO XVII 78 I 8-9 (Storm Ritual/CTH 631):

(348) ERIR-an-ma-šši MĀŠ.GAL/ [mar-ká]n-te-et anniškanzi

'Afterwards he performs (it) for him with a cut up goat.'

Both the available space and first partial sign favor the reading [mar-ká]n-te-ct. However, the above interpretation requires an unexpressed object 'it' (the ritual) and a reading of MĀŠ.GAL as IŠTU MĀŠ.GAL. Both of these are quite possible, but neither is assured. For a 'cut up goat' cf. KHO XV 31 I 4.8 MĀŠ.GAL markantan.
KBo XVIII 133 Vs 6-7 (Letters re Oracles/CTH 581):

(349) [mul]e₂ BELI-MI ṢA EZEN NU.KAH ITU-mi²/ duškiškiddu

'May our lord rejoice in the month of the yearly festival.'

While an instrumental with the verb dušk- 'rejoice (in)' is not startling, this example would be unique (for a possible ablative in the same function see ex. (333) p. 408 above). The reading ITU-mi₂ is also not completely without question: the MI is over an erasure and there is considerable space between it and the following IT. Perhaps the erasure and rewriting here reflect an uncertainty as to the proper case usage as in ex. (333). The dative-locative is also attested with dušk- in KUB XLV 20 II 12.
Section 3. Conclusions and Unresolved Questions

The most striking feature of the Neo-Hittite use of the ablative and instrumental is the reduction in the use of the instrumental vis-à-vis older texts. The instrumental of means is restricted to a handful of lexical items; there are no sure examples of the instrumental of accompaniment after Suppiluliuma I; and the instrumental of agent is attested just once. Otherwise, the instrumental is represented in Neo-Hittite historical texts only by adverbs such as pencarit and ıt-it.

On the other hand, the ablative is attested in its full range of functions in Neo-Hittite historical texts. Note in particular that the ablative of means is found from a wide variety of lexical items, in sharp contrast to the instrumental of means.

The uses of the remaining Neo-Hittite manuscripts offer no surprises. Both ablative and instrumental show all the various functions attested in datable texts. On the question of how many of these may be assumed for Neo-Hittite see the section immediately following.
Section 4. Syntax of the Ablative and Instrumental — General

Conclusions

In establishing the usage of the ablative and instrumental for the various periods of Hittite, we must begin with the evidence of securely datable documents: i.e., the results of Sections 1.1 and 1.2 in Chapters 2 through 4 above. While some details remain clouded, the overall picture which emerges from this material is quite clear.

In Old Hittite manuscripts there is no functional overlap of the ablative and instrumental. The ablative expresses separation ('place from which'). Other uses (perlative, directional) may be easily derived from the basic separative function: on the perlative see p. 209 above; for the ablative of direction compare Lat. a dextra 'on the right' and other parallels already cited by Sturtevant, Lg 3(1932)3, and by Neu, StBoT 18(1974)64. The instrumental in Old Hittite indicates the means by which an action is accomplished or the notion of accompaniment in various guises. Synchronically, the use of instrumentals of pronominal stems in an ablative function is a matter of formal suppletion, with these instrumentals taking the place of ablatives which did not exist in the oldest attested period of Hittite. This suppletion is paralleled by the use of the dative-locative eki to mean 'from there'.
When we turn to Neo-Hittite historical texts, we find that the instrumental is a moribund grammatical category. Aside from adverbs like pengerit 'en masse', use of the instrumental in late Hittite texts is very sparse. Furthermore, most Neo-Hittite examples of the instrumental can either be explained as set phrases (IGI.HI.A-it au- 'see with the eyes', IZI-it warrnu- 'burn with fire') or at least be shown to have older models (see p. 372 on ex. (275) ḫašawit šarē tunneš 'filled up with goods'). The solitary agentive use (ex. (281) p. 374) is already suspect of being copied from or modeled on an older text because of the spelling (DINGIR)ši-š-ni-it, which is not ordinary Neo-Hittite orthography. Not every instrumental in Neo-Hittite may be unequivocally explained as a retention of an older form, but the status of the instrumental in Neo-Hittite is entirely analogous to that of the enclitic possessive pronouns (see above p. 36f).

On the other hand, the ablative is used freely in Neo-Hittite historical texts not only in the functions proper to it (separation and derived uses), but also in the basically instrumental functions (means and accompaniment). This state of affairs requires a modification of the view that the ablative and instrumental are used 'prorniscuously' in Hittite in the function of either. We conclude rather that during the passage from Old to Neo-Hittite the ablative gradually replaces the instrumental in all functions. By the latest texts the instrumental is no longer a living category.
This claim based on historical texts is supported by the usage of the inventories of cult objects \(\text{CTH 501 f}\), the bulk of which have been independently dated by others to the reign of Tuthaliya III/IV (see Laroche, \textit{CTH} p. 87 with references). A common expression in these texts is 'holds with the right/left hand', for which one expects either an instrumental or ablative of means. One finds over thirty attestations of \(\text{ZAG-za/GUB-za (ŠU-za) harzi}\). The only exception is \text{KUR XXX 37 I 5-6 (CTH 516)}, which has \(\text{ZAG-nit kižširit...GUB-lit kižširit}\). But this manuscript, while Neo-Hittite, shows a markedly older ductus than the other inventory texts (see e.g. its use of older II, SAG and above all KU versus the consistent later forms of the inventory texts in \text{KUR XXXVIII}). Therefore this text probably does not belong with the others, and the instrumental is only an apparent exception. The inventories also show consistently ablatives of means in the recurring phrase \(\text{kitaruza UD.SAR-za unuwaunt-} 'adorned with a sun-disc and half-moon'. Thus in the reign of Tuthaliya III/IV the productive usage to express means is the ablative, which agrees with the evidence of Neo-Hittite historical texts presented earlier.

As we would predict, the use of the ablative and instrumental in Middle Hittite texts (M.H. mss.) shows a transition from the situation in Old Hittite to that in Neo-Hittite. The ablative of means is well attested, but the instrumental is still more common in this function, while thus far no examples of the ablative of
accompaniment are attested in Middle Hittite manuscripts.

Original texts of all three periods of Hittite show one more very important feature: they lack any sure examples of the instrumental of separation, i.e. the instrumental used in the basic ablativeal function. The instrumental of separation is quite infrequent (see pp. 254f, 339f and 420). All examples are in Neo-Hittite manuscripts, and all but one are in proven copies of older texts. This distribution strongly suggests that this usage is linguistically unreal. The occasional use of the instrumental to express separation in copies would represent a false generalization by scribes who on the basis of their own kunnaz kišširaz 'with the right hand' versus older kunnit kišširit (or kiššarta) 'archaized' šaḫhanaz lużziyaz arawaḫḫ- 'free from š. and l.' to šaḫhanit lużzi arawaḫḫ- and so forth. Again this is similar to what happened with enclitic possessives, where -šet was incorrectly generalized from šaḫkuwa-šet and šarhuwantaz-šet to EN-mit (voc.) and URU-ri-mit.

The instrumental of separation should therefore be eliminated from the usage of all three periods of Hittite. When we turn to the other uses attested in later copies of old texts, we may also arrive at immediate and definite conclusions for the well-attested uses. Since the ablative of means and accompaniment are productive in Neo-Hittite, their appearance in Neo-Hittite copies of Old Hittite texts may be explained as the result of modernization, and
these uses may not be assumed for Old Hittite. The same holds for the ablative of accompaniment in Neo-Hittite copies of Middle Hittite texts. The use of *ti-za* for *ti-it‘on one’s own’ is also to be taken as reflecting the later spread of the ablative. The reality of the ablative of comparison is questionable (see p. 216), and I prefer not to attribute it to Old Hittite or any other stage of the language.

As already observed above, the use of the ablative to express ‘time from which‘ and cause may be viewed as special cases of the basic ablative of separation (‘place from which‘). Furthermore, the appearance of *kit* in *kitpantalez‘from this time (on)‘ assures that the temporal usage of the ablative is old, even if the attestations are all in copies of Old Hittite texts. It is also hard to imagine what would have stood in the Old Hittite manuscript of the Laws except *sullanna‘as the result of a quarrel‘, as attested in the later (M.H.? ) manuscript. Therefore I posit the ablatives of ‘time from which‘ and cause for Old Hittite, albeit on the basis of indirect evidence.

Whatever one thinks of *nepiḫza-(hta ḫSKUR-uni)* of the Anitta text (ex. (15) p. 157), the ablative of ‘origin‘ is also merely a facet of the basic ablative function ‘place from which‘. Since the only other examples of this usage (p. 193f) are from Old Hittite texts (in later copies), there seems no reason to deny
this type for Old Hittite. The importance one attaches to this conclusion depends on the depth of one's belief in the examples proposed for this very rare usage.

The Old Hittite status of ablative adverbs of time like išpantaz 'at night' or annaz 'formerly' is less certain. As stated above on p. 217, the chronological distribution of išpanti 'in the night' and išpantaz 'at night' suggests that the ablative spread at the expense of the dative-locative. As I have tried to show, however, the dative-locative and ablative were (at least originally) not equivalent. In particular, the use of išpantaz to mean 'for the night' (ex. (77) p. 218) and the contrast of UD.KAM-az 'during the day' with kēti...GE-ti 'in this night' (ex. (78) p. 218) do not look to me like neologisms. I find it hard to believe that išpantaz and UD.KAM-az were substituted for an original išpanti and UD.KAM-ti in these passages. I therefore assume adverbs like išpantaz and annaz for Old Hittite, but this attribution cannot be made with certainty.

The decision is still more difficult with uses which are sparsely attested with both instrumental and ablative. I refer here to the ablative/instrumental of respect and of agent. Neither case is yet attested in either of these functions in Old Hittite manuscripts, and in Middle Hittite texts (M.H. mss.) there is only one less than certain example of the instrumental of respect.
(ex. (162) p. 302). In Neo-Hittite historical texts there is one example of the instrumental of agent (ex. (281) p. 374, but see p. 424!) and only two of the corresponding ablative (p. 367). The ablative of respect is somewhat better attested in Neo-Hittite, but not common (p. 365f). All other examples are in copies of older texts or in undatable texts.

I see no other basis for a decision as to which case is original in these functions than the overall development established above. That is, given (1) that the two cases compete in these uses, and (2) that in all clear instances the ablative spreads at the expense of the instrumental, we should expect that the ablative replaced the instrumental here as well. To put this in concrete terms, all evidence points to the fact that the ablative was the productive Neo-Hittite usage in all the functions under discussion. Therefore, when we find in a Neo-Hittite copy (ex. (123) p. 250) ḫunit pivanteš 'given by the god', it is highly unlikely that ḫunit is a neologism inserted by the Neo-Hittite copyist, who would surely have substituted DINIRLM-az/za. The same reasoning may be applied to the instrumental of respect (ex. (122) p. 248). The attribution of these uses to the instrumental on internal Hittite evidence is also supported from the side of Indo-European. See Delbrück, Verzl. Syn. 268 for the instrumental marking the agent of a passive verb, and ibid. 272 for the instrumental of respect.¹⁵
The adverbial instrumentals *pangarit* and *zi-it* developed from original instrumentals of accompaniment (see pp. 164f and 336f). The adnominal use of the instrumental is clearly secondary. Whether or not one attributes it to the older language is of little consequence, but once again, since the instrumental is disappearing by Neo-Hittite, this usage is also likely to date from Old Hittite. Finally, there is the instrumental of 'exchange' or 'substitution', for which there is scant evidence in Neo-Hittite manuscripts of Middle Hittite texts (exx. (221) and (222) p. 335). While there are parallels for such a use of the instrumental in other Indo-European languages, I find the Hittite evidence, like that for the ablative of comparison, too marginal to attribute the use to any stage of Hittite (note that in the syntactically clear example it cooccurs with the dative, which is well established in this function).

The usage of the instrumental and ablative in the successive stages of Hittite may thus be summarized as follows (parentheses indicate that the usage is marginal, brackets that the attribution to a specific period is based on indirect evidence):
Old Hittite

Ablative                      Instrumental

I. Separation                     I. Means
[II. 'time from which']          II. Accompaniment
[III. Cause]                     [III. Respect]
(IV. Origin)                    [IV. Agent]
V. Direction                     V. Pronominal for Ablative
VI. Perlative                    [VI. Adnominal]
[VII. Adverbial (time)]

Middle Hittite

I. Separation                     I. Means
II. 'time from which'             II. Accompaniment
III. Cause                        III. Respect
IV. Direction                    [IV. Agent]
V. Perlative                     (V. Pronominal for Ablative)
VI. Adverbial (time)              [VI. Adnominal]
VII. Means                       VII. Adverbial

Neo-Hittite

I. Separation                     (I. Means)
II. 'time from which'             (II. Accompaniment)
III. Cause                        (III. Agent)
IV. Direction                     IV. Adverbial
V. Perlative
VI. Adverbial (various)
Neo-Hittite (continued)

Ablative

VII. Means

VIII. Accompaniment

IX. Respect

X. Agent
NOTES

1 The full sentence reads: nu-kan URUDU ZI.KIN.BAR-aš

GIŠ kārpāz kunkūni. The same obscure expression occurs in
the Prayer of Nursili to the Sun-goddess of Arinna (CTH 376)
KUB XXIV 3 II 23 = XXIV 4,13, where the presence of the particle
-āša instead of -kan suggests that the ablative expresses
separation. See on this passage Gurney, AAA 27(1940)90-92 and
Goetze, KIF 1,234. The URUDU ZI.KIN.BAR-aš are 'copper (hair-)pins'
or the like. The verb kunk- in at least two places (KUB XXIV 7
IV 39 and XXXIII 93 III 24) seems to mean 'fondle' or 'bounce
(playfully)', said of a father and his child. GIŠ kārpā- is very
difficult: it is ranked with chairs and footstools, it can be
made of wood or leather, and it can belong to a plowed field.
As Gurney concludes, the context demands a sense like 'we will
make amends' (when we find out what the sin was). In view of the
ablative and the meaning of kunk-, perhaps the sense is 'we will
shake (loose) the copper pins from the kārpa', a proverbial expres-
sion roughly equal to 'we will move heaven and earth' (to make
things right again).

2 The ablative here does not express 'rest from' (as in 'rest
from labor'). The sense is 'from here (city X) he (went and)
rested in city Y'. As elsewhere, Hittite can convey motion from
with the ablative alone without an overt verb of motion.
One could also interpret this example as an ablative of cause: 'at my command/as a result of my order(s)'.

This sentence reads in full: İšTU u niššašši-wa-za kanissu-anza šalla/myvan-[za] mimmanešš-a. Eichner, Sprache 21 (1975)105, emends -za to -ta and reads MI-IN-MA me-iš-ta 'prospered in every respect'. This must be rejected on all counts. It requires not only an emendation of ŠA to TA but also insertion of a word boundary between MA and ME which is not in the manuscript. Worse, neither of the forms thus produced is regular in this context. The spelling me-iš-ta for mi-eš-ta 'prospered' would be unique not only for this verb but to my knowledge for the entire class of inchoatives in -ieš-. That MI-MA without any further specification is used as būmantaz is also unlikely. Finally, the -za would be unusual with a verb nišša 'prospered'; instead we should take the text as given and understand mimmanešš-a (dupl. memmanides[a]) as a Luvian participle in -mi- coordinated with the two preceding participles: 'I (have been) honored, raised up and ___-ed by the Storm-god p.' The -za marks the nominal sentence with a first-person, as per the rule of Hoffner, JNES 28(1969)225f.

In the cases cited here, the Hittites viewed dreams as the means by which something was accomplished, especially the means by which divine will was revealed, parallel to various kinds of divination. One also finds zašbiya 'in a dream', agreeing with our
conception of the dream as the place where something takes place. See for example KUB XV 1 II 45-47, XV 3 I 17, XV 5 II 46.

6 In KBo XIX 44b.6-7 (Hukkana Treaty §26) ZI-it appears to be used as an ablative of means: ([naḥm]a kiššuwa[na utta]r...z)ikile ZI-i[t (E)šši/ ([naḥm]a-at išši "'Or if you yourself conceive (lit. take) such a thing with your mind or (actually) do it'.

7 The presence of arha makes it difficult not to take this example as an ablative of separation: 'drink from'. For the problem of ambiguity with the ablative and eku- or laḫuwa- see Chap. 2, note 25.

8 The entire sentence reads: nu nevišaza iva[ata] hūman ṣayawani[škit]. I see no way to determine with certainty whether iva hūman is the subject of an intransitive verb or the object of a transitive verb with an impersonal subject.

9 Hittite could also say 'write on a tablet' with a dative-locative. See for example KUB XXVII 68 IV 3-6: kēdani-ēšan ANA TUPPI...KIN-anteš.

10 This verb may be identical to ṣatā- 'write'

11 I list the stem as šiva- because it is not clear to me that šiva- 'shoot' is necessarily the same verb as ŠEŠ-šiva- 'press, seal'.

12 In KUB XII 44 III 7 antūwaḥaa is functioning as a nom. sg. It is probably an error for antūwaḥaš. However, it is also possible that it indirectly reflects an original animate s-stem:
N. Sg. *antūwaḫš
A. Sg. *antūwaḫš-en

Since Hittite eliminates all animate consonant stems except those in a dental stop, such a paradigm would have been remade. One possibility was to reanalyze the final *s of the nominative as the nom. sg. ending, leading to a new stem antūwaḫ(p)- and a paradigm:

N. Sg. *antūwaḫš-š
A. Sg. *antūwaḫš-an

Based on the accusative antūwaḫš-en (taken as antūwaḫša-*) one could then make the attested nominative antūwaḫša.

The second possibility was to remake the nom. sg. as antūwaḫša with the productive ending of animate consonant stems (cf. perhaps hašterza 'star' where the original nominative was asigmatic). Again the nominative could also be remade after the accusative reanalyzed as an a-stem (antūbaša-š after antūbaša-*)

This entire analysis is admittedly speculative, but it does attempt to account for the competing stems antūwaḫša- and antūbaša-. antūwaḫš- would be highly peculiar as an Indo-European animate s-stem, but the word could well be a borrowing.

13 Von Soden, AHv 1063, defines surūḏ(m) as 'überprüfen'.

If one applies this meaning to the context of a doorkeeper or
sentry, one can interpret the Hittite reasonably as 'letting in
by a (pass-) word'.

14 This verb is listed by Friedrich, HUB 256, as viwida-
and vizza- and equated with doubts to yeda- 'bring'. The basic
meaning is rather 'strike' as in KUR IV 8 Vs 9 where the Storm-god
strikes the recalcitrant man with his 'horns'. One can account
for the forms wizzai and viwidai by assuming an original athematic
*we/Id-. The original third sing. pres. would have been *wezzazzi
(/we/stsi/) for which compare ezzi to ad- 'eat'. The attested
third sing. pres. wezzai is a hi-conjugation form based on the
stem wezz- abstracted from wezzazzi (cf. ezzi to ed-). For the
reduplicated hi-conjugation third sing. viwidai to an athematic
*wezzazzi compare newaki beside wekz to wok- 'demand'. The
root *wed- is Indo-European *ucdh- 'strike' (Skt. vadhati etc.).
In the Targasnalli Treaty II 29.36.41 both wividai and wizzai
are used impersonally: 'wenn es dich nicht dringt' (i.e. freely
'if the spirit doesn't move you'). Compare for the semantics
Grk. ἕθος 'push, urge' from the same root.

15 Delbrück, loc. cit., traces the origin of the instrumental
of agent from the instrumental of means. One can easily envision
such a development in Hittite, considering such facts as the use
of the instrumental and ablative with the verb ek- 'die', which
also serves as the passive of kuan- 'kill'. See Chap. 2 note 36,
pp. 355-356, p. 361 sub ak- and ex. (277) p. 372. The expressed agent with a passive verb seems comparatively rare in the Rigveda and in Homer as well as in Old Hittite. Therefore one cannot exclude the possibility that the use of the instrumental to mark the agent of a passive verb is a parallel but independent development in the older IE languages.

16 See e.g. Latv. naudu mit 'exchange for money' and the use of Lat. mutō 'exchange' with the ablative or the preposition cum. Thieme, ZDMG 95(1941)86 with references, cites Pali niminiṭi 'exchange for' (with the instrumental).
Chapter Five - Formal Aspects of the Ablative and Instrumental

Section 1. The Ablative

Section 1.1. Ablatives in -(az)zi-ya

The ablative normally ends in -z [ts], spelled either -az or -az (on this alternation see Sec. 1.2 below). However, before the enclitic -e/-ya 'and', the ablative ending regularly appears as -ezzi-: e.g., KUB XXXIII 62 III 8 šāgazzi-ya 'and outside'. One also finds a similar extended form of the pronominal ending -ez: e.g., KUB XX 24 III 41 kēz kēzzi-ya 'on one side and on the other'. The enclitic connective 'and' regularly has the form -ya after vowels and -a after consonants, in which case it geminates the preceding consonant (see Houwink ten Cate, Fest. Otten 119f).

The alternation of geminating -a and -ya may be seen within a single paradigm, that of kuižša 'every' (formally equal to Latin quisque):¹

Nom. Sg. C. kuižša
Acc. Sg. C. kuinna
Nom.-Acc. Sg. Nt. turtta
Gen. Sg. kuēlla
Dat.-Loc. Sg. kuedani-ya
Abl. kuēzziya
Comparing *kuitta*, *kuedaniya* and *kuēzziya*, we may conclude that the ablative ending in *-zi* is reasonably old. Otherwise, a *kuēz* plus geminating *-a* would have given *kuēzza* as the ablative of 'every'.

There are no examples of *-(az)zi-ya* in Old Hittite manuscripts, but this is surely due to chance. There are no contexts in Old Hittite manuscripts where one expects *-azzi-ya* and finds something else. Spellings like *andurza-ya* 'and inside' (IBot III 1,4) are found only in later manuscripts and are very rare at all times.

On the other hand, *-(az)zi-* continues to be regular before *-ya* 'and' into Neo-Hittite, as shown by the following attestations in Neo-Hittite historical texts:

*būmandazzi-ya* KUB XIX 11 IV 32 (AM), XXVI 1 I 27 (Tuthaliya III/IV)
*kunannezi-ya* KBo XIX 76 IV 2 (Mursili)
*galzattennzip[.]la* KBo XI 1 Vs 21 (Mursili)
*temēzzi-ya* KUB XIV 8 Rs 41 (Mursili; prayer)
*DINGIR.MES-azzi-ya* KBo IV 6 Vs 26 (Muwatalli; prayer)
*NIG.GA-zi-ya* KBo XVI 23 I 10 (Mursili)
*apēzzi-ya* KUB XIX 29 IV 14 (Mursili), KBo IV 10 Vs 14 (Tuthaliya III/IV)
*kēzzi-ya* KUB XIX 20 Vs 10 (Supp. I), XIV 14+ Vs 29 (Mursili; prayer), XXXIV 25,6 (Mursili), KBo XIV 20 III 13 (Mursili), VI 28 Vs 24 (Hattusili III)
The form kézzi-va in the phrase kéz kézzi-va could be explained as a retention of an older form in a fixed phrase, but the other examples establish -(az)zi-va as a living part of Neo-Hittite grammar. I also know of no cases of -azza or -ezza which require an interpretation 'and', i.e. an analysis -azza/-ezza-a with -a 'and' added to an ending in -z. The spellings -azza and -ezza are relatively infrequent and are not attested in Old Hittite manuscripts. Since the addition of -za is non-functional, the endings -azza/-ezza are best taken as conflations of the alternatives -za and -sa (see Sec. 1.2 below).

In addition to regular -(az)zi- before -va, one also finds a handful of examples of ablatives in -zi in other environments. In KUB XV 34 III 43 and KBo XI 72 II 45 kuézzi is an error for kuézzi-ya 'every'. However, KBo XX 77 IV 6 and 10 have kuézzi correlated with anéz, so that the former cannot mean 'every'. KBo IV 2 III 14 shows kézzi, but the context is too broken to decide whether this is an error for kézzi-va or a spelling variant of kéz. In KUB XIV 17 II 12 kézzi-me-ken the context is also incomplete, but the presence of -ma- makes it unlikely that kézzi stands for kézzi-va. The rarity of these other forms in -zi makes it impossible to determine whether they represent a secondary extension of -zi from its usual position before -va or reflect an original wider distribution of -zi. The complete lack of any examples from substantives argues for the former.
In sum, then, the regular form of the ablative ending before -ya 'and' is -(az)zi at all stages of the language. Solid evidence for a wider distribution of this ending is lacking.²
Section 1.2. The Spellings -az and -za.

A cursory glance at Hittite texts shows that the ablative ending is spelled both -az and -(a)za, apparently without any functional difference. A thorough survey of the attestations indeed confirms that the two spellings have no functional significance, but their chronological distribution turns out to be of interest for other reasons. One reasonable hypothesis is that the difference between -az and -za originally depended on the shape of the preceding stem. In surveying the attested forms I therefore distinguished three environments: after vocalic stems, after consonant stems and after ideograms. The results are as follows:³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonant</th>
<th>Vowel</th>
<th>Ideogram</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-AZ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ZA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Old Hittite Manuscripts

Middle and Neo-Hittite Mss. of Old Hittite Texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonant</th>
<th>Vowel</th>
<th>Ideogram</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-AZ</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ZA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Middle Hittite Mss. of Middle Hittite Texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonant</th>
<th>Vowel</th>
<th>Ideogram</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-AZ</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ZA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Neo-Hittite Mss. of Middle Hittite Texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonant</th>
<th>Vowel</th>
<th>Ideogram</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-AZ</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ZA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Neo-Hittite Historical Texts through Muwatalli

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonant</th>
<th>Vowel</th>
<th>Ideogram</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-AZ</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ZA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Neo-Hittite Historical Texts from Hattusili III on

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonant</th>
<th>Vowel</th>
<th>Ideogram</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-AZ</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ZA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Old Hittite -az and -za are very nearly in complementary distribution. In Old Hittite manuscripts the only ablative in -za is nepiḫḫa, which occurs twice: KBo III 22 Vs 2 (Anitta) where its status has been doubted and KUB XLIII 23 Rs 15 where its syntactic function is clear. nepiḫḫa is also found twice in Neo-Hittite copies of Old Hittite texts. In later copies of Old Hittite texts one finds Ṝ-irza (/pira/) six times as the ablative of pir/pare 'house'. The same form occurs twice more in Neo-Hittite copies of Middle Hittite texts and nine times in undatable texts. Neither nepiḫḫa nor Ṛ-irza is found in Neo-Hittite historical texts. It therefore seems safe to assume that Ṛ-irza as well as nepiḫḫa is old, and one may venture the hypothesis that originally the ending -z(a) (with an empty vowel) was
restricted to consonant stems. This suggestion is supported by
the adverbs tamûza 'beside', arapza 'outside' and andurza
'inside' which are originally ablative case forms.\(^5\)

If -z(a) was the original form of the ablative after
consonant stems, it is clear that -az had already begun to
replace it in this environment in Old Hittite. The seven attesta-
tions from Old Hittite manuscripts listed above are: halmaûittaz
(KBo XVII 1 II 39), kêpparağ (KBo VI 2 II 51), hilamağ (KBo XVII 4
III 45), iššaz (KBo XVII 1 I 18), kartaz (KBo XVII 7 + IBoT III
135,6), kuš(a)naz (KUB XXIX 29 Vs 7) and taknaz (KUB XLIII 23
Rs 17). In those examples where the stem ends in a consonant
cluster or a dental stop, the appearance of -az instead of -z(a)
may be phonologically motivated, but it is difficult to find any
phonological conditioning to distinguish kêpparağ from Ü-ırsa
or iššaz from nepibșa. One must reckon with the spread of -az
in Old Hittite in any case, for Ü-az (parnaș) is already attested
in KBo XXII 1 Vs 13, an Old Hittite manuscript. Aside from
nepibșa, Ü-ırsa and the adverbs mentioned above, the only ablatives
in -za from consonant stems are parža in EGİR-na parža (also a
frozen form, if it is an ablative at all) and kitkarzaz, which is
a secondary creation from kitkar on the model of other ablative
adverbs (see p. 205f above).

While -za disappears as the ablative ending of consonant
stems, it becomes increasingly frequent as the ending of the
ablative after ideograms and after stems ending in a vowel. In particular, the ending -az gives way to -aza (most of the instances of -za after vowels listed above represent -aza, although forms such as dapiza and tuppiza are found). The process of replacement is clear from several instances where we have both older and later manuscripts of the same text. For example, the Old Hittite manuscript of the Anitta text, KBo III 22 Vs 38, has URU za-al-pu-az versus the Neo-Hittite duplicate KUB XXXVI 98a Vs 8 which shows URU za-al-pu-u-wa-za. Compare also annaz kartaz in KUB XXX 10 Rs 20 and XXXI 135+ Rs 19 (M.H. ms.) versus annaza 5A-se in KUB XXXI 127+ IV 24 (N.H. ms.). This change in orthography is parallel to that in the reflexive particle, which in Old Hittite is usually -z after vowels and -za after consonants (see above pp. 18 and 35).

As noted above, the spelling -az for the reflexive particle continues into Neo-Hittite, although all but one of the examples in historical texts are before Hattusili III.

In the case of the ablative ending, there is a very dramatic shift in the ratio of -az to -za between the texts of Mursili II and Huwatalli and those of Hattusili III. The proportions are in fact nearly reversed. This means that the difference between -az and -(a)za is of some use as a dating criterion in cases where we have enough examples of ablatives to provide meaningful statistics. For example, the inventories of cult objects (CTH 504f) are generally attributed to the reign of Tuthaliya III/IV (see Laroche, CTH p. 87
with references). This is now supported for the bulk of these
texts by the statistics for the ablative ending which show 98
examples of -za and 17 of -az. The one exception is HBoP II 131
which has five instances of -az (beside apizza 11). The Tawagalawa
Letter, KUB XIV 3, has nine ablatives in -za to one in -az,
arguing that at least the manuscript dates from Hattusili III or
later. The oracle text KUB XVIII 12 + XXII 15 has 18 examples of
-za to two of -az and must also belong to the period of Hattusili
III and after.

There are also instances of the ablative ending spelled
-azzza, and the pronominal ablative ending -az/-iz may appear as
-azzza/-izza. The spellings in -Vzza are not attested in Old
Hittite manuscripts. -z/iszza occurs six times in Middle Hittite
manuscripts, 26 times in Neo-Hittite copies of older texts, and
36 times in Neo-Hittite historical texts. -azzza remains relatively
rare, occurring a dozen times in later copies of Old Hittite texts
and five times in Neo-Hittite historical texts. As already pointed
out, I know of no instances which require that the -Vzza ending
be interpreted as -Vz plus geminating -a 'and'. Given its rarity
and lack of functional significance, the -Vzza spelling may best be
interpreted as a conflation of the two common spellings -az and -za
which compete with one another through most of the history of Hittite.
Section 1.3. Ablatives in -anza.

There are several indisputable examples of ablatives ending in -anza. As already noted by Sturtevant, CCR (1933) 196a, and by Jasenoff, NSS 31 (1972) 123, a high percentage of the examples are from r/h-stems, and both Stefanini, AGI 44 (1959) 7-8, and Jasenoff, loc. cit., explain the origin of the ending -anza on the basis of the heteroclite paradigm (see further below in Sec. 1.4). It is often very difficult to distinguish an ablative in -anza from the nominative singular of an 'animatizing' ant-stem (see Benveniste, BSL 57 (1962) 44f). Many individual instances have already been mentioned in the syntax chapters above. Since several of the forms cited in the secondary literature as ablatives in -anza are either doubtful or definitely nominative singulars of ant-stems, it seems useful to give an exhaustive list of secure ablatives:

Old Hittite:

GIŠ₃ Luttanza KBo VIII 42 Vs 2 (O.H. ms.); KUB XVII 6 I 19 and
   XXXIII 70 II 2⁺ (both N.H. mss.).
GIŠ₅ Luttanza KBo XXI 92 I 11 (N.H. ms.).

Other examples cited for Old Hittite are uncertain or false:
GI'R-anza (KBo III 38 Vs 30) is in a broken context; utniyana(aš)-
(KUB I 16 II 62) is certainly nom. sg. comm. (see p. 221 above);
SIG₃-an[za] (KUB I 16 III 17, restored by Sommer) is possible but
by no means secure (see p. 222 above); ḫaṣṣannanza (KUB XI 1 IV 24) can be interpreted either as an ablative or as a nom. sg. comm. (the ḫaṣṣannanza of the duplicate KBo III 67 IV 12 is not a compelling argument for an ablative, since nom. sg. /-ants/ is also occasionally written -az).

Middle Hittite:

i Españanza KUB XXXIX 102 I 1 (N.H. ms.).

GE-anza (i Españanza) KUB I 11 IV 45 (N.H. ms.).

wetinanza in KUB XXXI 86 II 11 is also probably an ablative expressing means, but the meaning of the sentence is not at all clear (see ex. (201) p. 324 above). The oft-quoted nepiñana, KUB XV 34 IV 31, at least may be and in my view must be taken as a nom. sg. comm. (see ex. (158) p. 297 above).

Neo-Hittite:

ḫanniṭanza KUB XIX 67 I 5

For the interpretation of this passage see above p. 364.

Undatable Texts:

buṭīanza KBo IX 114, 7
GIS-Luṭešanza KUB XXXIX 71 II 44 (precedes arḫ[a])

paprannanza KUB XII 58 IV 2.26
tupoi(y)anza KUB XL 88 IV 5 and ABoT 14 III 9
uddananza KUB VII 53 I 6 and XII 58 IV 27 (same text)
GUB-anzi-wa KUB XXIV 14 I 13
SICK-anza KUB XVI 9 II 6
GIŠ TUkUL-anza VBoT 25 I 5.11 (cf. I 12 GIŠ TUkUL-anza damenza?)

In sum, there are a dozen solid examples of -anza as an ablative ending, half of which are derived from r/n-stems.
Section 1.4. Etymology of the Ablative Ending

As already mentioned above in Chapter 1, Section 3, Hrozný derived the Hittite ablative ending -az(a) from IE *-ōd, attributing the assibilation to the form in -azə where he assumed that the -ə was a particle of some sort. The artificiality of this explanation of the -ə was criticized by Sturtevant, *Lg* 8(1932)1f. (see already *JAC* 47(1927)181f). Sturtevant proposed instead that the -ə represented IE (more precisely IH) *-tə, the zero-grade of *-təs, an adverbial ending with ablative function (Skt. mukhath 'from the mouth', Lat. funditus 'from the bottom' etc.). This derivation has been widely albeit unenthusiastically accepted (e.g. by Pedersen, *Hitt. 25*, and Kammenhuber, *Hö 303*). The lack of enthusiasm has stemmed from misgivings about such an IE zero-grade as *-təs from *-təs (Kammenhuber, loc. cit.).

Kronasser, *VFPH* 101f, raises an even more serious objection from the Hittite side: the forms in -(az)zi-va, which point unambiguously to an ending *-(a)ti. After a misplaced comparison with Tocharian genitives in -ntse (based on his unjustified assumption of -enzi as the basic ending), Kronasser also adduces the most obvious comparanda: Luvian -ti (more properly -ati) and Lycian -di (i.e. -ədi/-ədi), which have the combined functions of the Hittite ablative and instrumental (see Laroche, *DIL* 136, for the Luvian and Neumann, *Hö 385*, for the Lycian, each with
references). Kronasser further compares Greek -thi (e.g., ἐόθη 'where'). As he himself points out, the locativus function of the latter does not pose a serious difficulty, but Hittite -zi from IE *-dhi is problematic.

Leaving aside Greek -thi for the moment, let us face the problem of equating the -(ez)zi of Hittite with Luvian -ati and Lycian -edi/-adi. The latter seem to point to an IE voiced stop *d or *dh, while Hittite -z argues for *t. The problem reduces to this: if we assume *-dhi/*-di, we must show evidence for Hittite -zi from this source; if we posit *-ti, we must account for the single stop in the Luvian and more importantly the voiced stop in Lycian.

I know of no evidence for IE *dhi > Hitt. zi. On the other hand, there is some reason to believe that IE *dh did not assimilate before vocalic i. Kronasser, Valh 178 and 208, equates Hittite 2nd sing. inv. It 'go!' with Greek ἵθι 'idem'. He attributes the loss of final -i to the influence of ἐδ 'cat', ἔπ 'take' etc. This is probably unnecessary, and the equation of Crk. -thi and Hitt. -t (< IE *-dhi) is attractive. If the equation made above (p. 282) of Hitt. edi and Skt. adhi is correct, this would furnish a second example of IE *dh > Hitt. d before i. As for IE *d, we know that it became Hitt. a/s/ before i: šiu- 'god' < *dšu-. šiwa-t- 'day' could be from either *diu- or *diu-ot-. In the latter case it would show IE *d > Hitt. /s/ before vocalic i.
I know of no more certain evidence for IE *d before vocalic i.
In sum, the case for Hittite -z(i) from IE *dhi or *di is not good.

On the other hand, there is a parallel for Lycian d from IE *t in a desinence. The Lycian 3rd sing. pres. ending appears as both -ti and -di: tubidi/tubeiti 'he punishes'. Likewise the 3rd sing. prot. ending is attested as -te/-tē or -de/-dē: ade/adē 'he made' but pijete/pijete 'he gave' (see Neumann, Ḥd p. 388-389).

It is true that the ablative-instrumental ending always has d, while the verb ending has both t and d. This difference may reflect differing accentual patterns in the noun and verb (accent being a likely conditioning factor of the alternation -ti/-di).

However they are to be accounted for, the verbal endings -di and -de/-dē show the possibility of Lycian d from IE *t in a desinence. I therefore accept the equation of the Hittite ablative in -(a)z(i) with Luvian -(a)ti and Lycian -(e)di/-(e)di, pointing to a Common Anatolian *(e)ti (on the original form of the ending see below).

Comparanda outside Anatolian are hard to find. Greek -thi in pōthi is excluded by the evidence for IE *dhi > Hitt. d(i) given above. Jochem Schindler has suggested to me that the Armenian ablative may also be explained from *-ti. Armenian u-stems show three ablative endings: -u, -wē and -s (see Jensen, Altarm. Gram. 51). The ending -u may be regularly derived from *-uti (compare heru 'last year' < *peruti). Both -wē and -s reflect the
spread of the productive ablative ending -e, which may be explained from *-sti (cf. 3rd sing. pres. ber-ē 'he carries' < *bheresti). One must assume that *-e-ti originated in the thematic stems and spread elsewhere at the expense of *-ti (cf. the replacement of pirza and nepiṣza by pirmaz and nepiṣaz in Hittite). The attested ablative -oy of the -o-stems (which is also the ending of the genitive and dative singular) is probably the genitive *-osio, but -oy < *-oti also appears possible.

In weighing the equation of the Armenian and Anatolian ablative endings, one should also note that the productive Armenian ending -e is in some cases added to the locative (e.g. tedi 'place', loc. telwo, abl. telwos). Jasanoff, MSS 31(1972) 123f, argues that Hitt. pirza and nepiṣza are based on endingless locatives (see p. 456 below). He already cites the Armenian as a typological parallel, but one may wonder whether the addition of -e (< *-oti) to locatives reflects the same process with *-ti at an earlier stage of Armenian.

The ablative *-ti recalls locative *-dhi (Grk. pōthi etc.) and the multifunctional *-bhi (Grk. -phi). Locative *-dhi stands beside *-dhe (Greek -the, both locatival and ablativeal) and *-dhen (Grk. -then, ablativeal). See on these forms Schwizer, l.627 with note 4. One also finds the *-bh- of *-bhi without the -i: Lat. -bus, Oscan -fs < *-bhos. In the same way, one may rank ablative *-ti alongside *-tos, although we cannot recover the morphological system which governs such alternations.
In Sanskrit the adverbial ablative ending -tas proliferates, eventually becoming the productive ablative ending in Middle Indic. The distribution of Anatolian *-ti suggests a similar development. In the oldest attested stage of Hittite the pronouns did not yet have forms in -p(i), and the enclitic possessives disappeared as a category without ever forming ablatives. By late Neo-Hittite the ablative in -p(i) had nearly ousted the instrumental. In the later attested Luvian and Lycian this process is complete. One may also note that the *-ti ending has not yet appeared in Palaeo, but the corpus is too minuscule to attach much importance to this fact. Nevertheless, the evidence of Hittite suggests that the status of the *-ti ending as a full-fledged ablative case marker is not old.

The synchronic ablatives pirza and nepi̇za and the adverbs arahza and tapu̇za argue that the original form of the ablative ending was simply *-ti. The form *-ati must have originated in the thematic nouns where a was originally the final vowel of the stem. Later *-ati spread at the expense of *-ti, just as the instrumental -it replaced -t (see below Sec. 2.3). The infinitive in -wanzi also points to *-ti (see p. 411 above). Simple *-ti is also needed to explain the ablative ending in -anza.

As pointed out above in Sec. 1.3, the distribution of -anza suggests that it originated in the r/n-stems. One can produce a sequence -anza by adding *-ti directly to the oblique stem: uttar, uddan-āb, *uddan-ti > *uddanza. But the attested form is
not *uddanza, but uddananza, and it is not immediately apparent how or why the latter would have replaced the former (the instrumental wedanda coexisted with genitive wedenä etc. for a very long time and when it was replaced, it was with the productive ending weden-it, not with a *wed-enda).

Jasanoff, MSS 31(1972)123f, accounts for -anza by first suggesting that the ablatives *pir-a (pirza) and nepišza are built on endingless locatives. A loc. sg. nepiš appears to be attested in KUB XXIII 111,8. It is true of course that nepiš- is also the basic stem, so nepišza is inconclusive. The paradigm of *pir/parn- 'house' is also problematic, but it is highly suggestive that the only oblique case besides the ablative to show the stem *pir- is the dative-locative *pir-i, which may be analyzed as an endingless locative renewed with the locative ending -i (versus regular parni with the oblique stem parn-).

We do know that Hittite had endingless locatives: cf. kiuat kiuat 'daily' and especially dagan 'on the ground' vs. oblique takn-. Jasanoff sees the ending -anza as originating in the abstracts in -estar (oblique enn-), where ablative *-ti was added to an endingless locative *papratän. The regular result of *papratanti was *papratanza, which was remade to paprenanza after the other oblique cases. The ending -anza then spread to other r/h-stems and a few other nouns.

The pronominal ending -ez(siz) (less often -iz(siz)) is a
product of historical times, originating in late Old Hittite or early Middle Hittite (there is one apparent example of kiz in an Old Hittite manuscript; see p. 169). At the point when -\(\tilde{z}z(\tilde{z})\) was formed, the ablative ending was already \(-z(i)\), not *-ti. It therefore seems simplest to assume that \(-z(i)\) was added to the oblique pronominal stems in \(-\ddash\ddash\): k\(\ddash\ddash\)d-z(i) > k\(\ddash\ddash\)z(\(\ddash\ddash\)). I can point to no parallels for \(-dz > -z(z)\), but I see no reason to expect any other result from such a sequence in Old Hittite. Alternatively, since k\(\ddash\ddash\)z replaces k\(\ddash\ddash\)t, one could assume that the instrumental ending -t is replaced directly by the ablative -z(i).

In summary, I see the Hittite ablative in -(a)z(zi) as originating in an IE adverbial ending *-ti comparable to the *-tos of Skt. mukhatah etc. This *-ti may also be the source of the Armenian ablative. The form *-ati, originally proper to the thematic stems, was eventually generalized to all stem classes. In late Common Anatolian the ending *-(a)ti became the productive ablative ending. Within the history of Hittite it also took over the functions of the instrumental, a development which appears to be complete in the attested stages of Luvian and Lycian.
Section 2.1. Instrumentals in -t(a)

The normal ending of the instrumental is -it/-ti (see Sec. 2.2 below). However, there is also evidence for an instrumental ending -t (spelled -ta after consonants, -t after vowels). The ending -ta is first discussed by Ehelolf, TP 43(1925)316f. The claim of Kammhuber, KdO 303, that -t(a) is an archaism is confirmed by the distribution of the ending (see also Neu, KZ 86(1973)293 on ġamut). The following list is intended to be complete for published texts:

Old Hittite:

apēdanda KUB XXVI 71,7 and apēdanta XXXI 110,4 (N.H. mss.)
išhanda KBo XVII 4 III 15 (O.H. ms.)
ižbinanta KUB XVII 5 I 15 (N.H. ms.)
ḡanūt KUB XII 63+ Vs 26 (N.H. ms.)
kiškarte KBo XX 8 Vs 11 and KUB XXVIII 97 II 9 (O.H. mss.);
KUB XXXIII 68 III 11 (M.H. ms.), XII 63+ Vs 26,31 (N.H. ms.).
kiškarta KUB XXXI 127+ I 51 (N.H. ms.)
kiškarat KBo XXI 90 Vs 24 (M.H. ms.)
kīdanda KUB XXXI 4 + KBo III 41 Vs 8.9 (= KBo XII 22 I 12
[k]ē[t]anta = KBo XIII 78 Vs 8.9 kādana; all N.H. mss.)
šakanda KBo XXII 2 Vs 2 (O.H. ms.)
uddanta KUB XXX 10 Vs 18.19 (N.H. ms.).
widanda KUB XLIII 63 Vs 4 and vedanda KUB XIII 4 III 47 (N.H. mss.)

NA₄-te (perunta) KBo XXI 22 Rs 37 (M.H. ms. versus the N.H. parallel KBo XII 98 I 4 NA₄-it)

GEŠTIN-te (vivanta) KBo XVII 4 III 17 (O.H. ms.)

SI.ÅI.A-anda (saraunta) KUB XLIII 60 I 19 (N.H. ms.)

Middle Hittite:

Féšanta HT 1 I 38 (N.H. ms.)

kišārta KBo VIII 35 III 7 (M.H. ms.) and kešārta KBo x 45 II 28 (N.H. ms.). NB kišērit KUB XXIX 40 III 32 (N.H. ms.).

šāku[w]lat KUB XXIII 72 Rs 15 (N.H. ms.). Cf. ibid. Vs 19 šākuit.

tiwmēندaka KUB IX 28 III 14 = tiwm[4]anta KBo XIX 132 Rs 5 (both N.H. mss.)

uddanda KBo VIII 37 Rs 5 (N.H. ms.)

widanta KBo XXIII 23 Vs 30 (M.H. ms.), vedanda KUB IX 28 I 12 (N.H. ms.) and widanda KBo VI 34 III 13 (N.H. ms.; for the emendation see Oettinger, StBoT 22(1976)39).

Neo-Hittite:

ŠU-te (kišārta) KUB XXIII 1 II 1 (Šaušgamuwa Treaty)

Undatable Texts (all N.H. mss.):

spēndanda KUB XXXIX 101 II 15

išpimanta KUB XVII 28 I 15
The total attestations show that the ending -t(a) is not limited to names for body parts (Ehelolf, loc. cit., and Friedrich, HE 1² §61). All but two cases, however, are from r- or n-stems. The exceptions are ganut 'by the knee' and Ṝekuwat 'with the eyes'. In the case of 'eye' three forms are attested: Ṝekuwat, Ṝekuit (also KBo XXIII 92 II 15 and 83/e I 7; see Otten, OLZ 60(1965)546) and Ṝekuwait (e.g. KUR XXXV 148 III 36 ICI.MI.A-wait). In the last form the nt. pl. Ṝakuwa has been treated as the stem, to which the ending -it has been added. In Ṝekuit the of the stem has been deleted before the instrumental ending as is usual for an a-stem: "lala- 'tongue', instr. lalit. In Ṝekuwat the ending -it has been added to a Ṝakuwa— which could be either the real stem Ṝakuwa—or once again the nt. pl. Ṝakuwa.

The spelling kiššarat confirms that the vowel of -t(a) is
merely graphic. One is to read /kissard/, /wedand/ etc. Oettinger, SitzBot 22(1976)40, note 78, explains the instrumental wedanda /wedand/ 'with water' and the pronominal forms kadanda and apēdana after the r/h-stem instrumentals like uddanta and tiyammente, venturing that -anda was falsely abstracted as a unitary ending. None of this is necessary. The original paradigm of 'water' was acrostatic: nom.-acc. *uūdr/ oblique *uūdr-. 9 An instrumental *uūdr-t would give regularly wedanda /wedand/. The pronominal stems may be most simply analyzed as kad-an-t(a) and apē-an-t(a) with the same -an- as in kad-an-i and apē-an-i (for the segmentation compare older kēd-i and see Neu, SitzBot 18(1974)71). As stems ending in a nasal, kēdan- and apēdan-naturally took the ending -t, which was regular for at least r- and h-stems at the time of their formation. On the misunderstanding of the form kadanda by Neo-Hittite scribes see Otten, ZA 62(1955)103.

The spelling -t(a) with an empty vowel naturally occurs only after consonants. na-ti-i-de (KUB XXXI 4 + KBo III 41 Vs 9), cited by Oettinger, loc. cit., is to be read natīd-a, i.e. natīd 'with the reed' plus non-geminative particle -a (see above p. 228 and also Neu, SitzBot 18,71). Similarly, sentence initial u-e-bi-da (SBo I 6 Rs 3) may be analyzed as wēsid-a 'but with the pasture'.

The form ganut 'by the knee' with its archaic ablaut 10 argues that -t could originally be added to stems other than those in final r or n. Stefanini, AGI 44(1959)5-6, suggests that -t, not
-it/-ēt, was the original form of the instrumental ending after i-, u- and all consonant stems (except those in dental stops). Later the ending -it/-ēt replaced -t in all environments, last of all after r and n. In this connection one should note =localhost (1041/c IV 1) cited by Neu, StBoT 5,79. Despite the obscure context, we surely have a form of the word for 'blood'. The ending -tet apparently contains the instrumental ending twice:  localhost (cf.  localhost) + -et. On the diachronic implications of the ending -t(a) see Sec. 2.3 below.
Section 2.2. The Spellings -it and -et

The instrumental ending appears as both -it and -et. In surveying the distribution of these spellings, I distinguished four environments: i-stems, other vocalic stems, consonant stems and ideograms. Since it turns out that the spelling -et is extremely rare in all environments and is not at all conditioned by the preceding stem, I merely distinguish chronological distribution in the following summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-IT</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ET</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The spellings with e are not only very rare, but mostly fall into two well-defined classes. First, the instrumental ending of dental stems is often written -te-ct. There are no occurrences in Old Hittite manuscripts, but hūmantet occurs three times in Middle Hittite manuscripts, along with a-ə-an-te-ct (3x in the horse-training texts). In Neo-Hittite manuscripts (texts of various periods) one finds an additional case of hūmantet, 21 of āntet (always thus in the horse-training texts), two of SIG₅-antet, four of zevantet, and one each of ḫekkantet, arantet and tittittet. Of the 60 cases of -et listed above, 38 represent -te-ct. While the cuneiform syllabary possesses distinct signs for TE and TI,
it is hard to believe that the -e- of -te-et has any phonetic significance. Note in particular that in Old Hittite manuscripts one finds only šumantit (KUB XXXVI 106 Vs 3) and tuppivattit (KBo VII 14 Vs 6).

The other large class of -et spellings is rather different. In Old Hittite manuscripts one finds ki-e-et (7x) along with ki-e-et (1x). Later manuscripts of Old Hittite texts provide seven more instances of ki-e-et versus one ki-it-(te). ki-e-et occurs once in a Middle Hittite manuscript, and in Neo-Hittite historical texts l-e-et-te is attested three times (versus perhaps l-it-te in KUB XLV 77 I 13, but the latter is uncertain). Between them, kêt, kêt and l-ötta account for 19 of the remaining 22 examples of -et in datable texts. There is no question that the e spelling is in some sense real, since it is written with the E sign, and occurs in Old Hittite manuscripts. Furthermore, in these forms the spelling -it is very rare.

Assuming the correctness of the interpretations of kêt, kêt and l-ötta as instrumentals (see the syntax chapters above), we need to account for the rather consistent spelling of these as -e-et versus the -it of other instrumentals. One may note first of all that kêt, kêt and l-ötta are all from pronominal stems (for the pronominal inflection of 'one' see Friedrich, NVB 301, and Eichner, Anat. Zahlw. 2). Several possible explanations present themselves for pronominal -êt versus nominal -it. The choice between these alternatives depends on one's etymology of
the instrumental ending itself, on which see Section 2.3 immediately following.
Section 2.3. Etymology of the Instrumental Ending

Hrozný, *HDOC* 56(1915)24, already derives Hittite *-it* from IE *-*ēd, comparing forms like Latin recte 'properly, rightly' (see also Donum nat. Schrijver (1929)368). This explanation of Hittite *-it* has won general acceptance (see Sturtevant, *CGr* 6197a, Pedersen, *Hitt.* 25, and Kronasser, *VLPH* 103), although Kammenhuber, *Hdo* 303, weighs an equation with Luvian -ati and Lycian -edi/-adi instead. The latter tends to be excluded by the form -itt- of the instrumental before -a 'and'. As shown by the paradigm of kuišša 'every' (see p. 439), the allomorph -a 'and' (which geminates the preceding consonant) is found after words ending in a consonant. The instrumental -itt-a thus argues that the instrumental ended in a consonant: */-iT/.* An */-iT/ plus 'and' would have produced */-iT-ye/ (leaving aside the problem of assimilation). As discussed above in Sec. 1.4, the Hittite correspondent of Luvian -ati, Lycian -edi/-adi is the ablative -(e)z(ə).

Kronasser, *VLPH* 103f, and Stefanini, *AGT* 44(1959)1f, both accept Hittite *-it* < IE *-*ēd, but also occupy themselves with the origin of the instrumental ending -t(a). Each arrives at the same conclusion, namely that the final -ā of the thematic ablative *-*ēd was extended in Hittite to other stem classes, producing *ganu-t, halki-t, zahasi-t, kibšart(a)* and *ēpan-t(a).* Both compare the similar spread of the ablative -a in Latin...
(praïdæ, magistratud) and Younger Avestan (nara). As Stefanini points out, the form -t was not suitable for stems in -t or -nt, and here -it was favored instead. Eventually, -it replaced -t in all stem classes, last of all in stems in -r and -n.

This explanation of Hittite instrumental -it from an Indo-European thematic ablative *-Ed (beside *-Ed) presupposes certain functional realignments, as observed by Pedersen, Hitt. 25.

The simplest account of the Hittite facts according to this line of reasoning runs as follows. Between Indo-European and some stage of Common Anatolian, the thematic ablative in *-Ed not only spread to all stem classes, but also eliminated the IE instrumental in *-â/-â, taking over all its functions. In turn, the ablative-instrumental in *-Ed yielded to the productive Anatolian ablative in *-(a)ti, first in its ablative functions, eventually in its instrumental functions as well. As Pedersen stresses, this scenario gains considerably in plausibility if the ending -it/-ât (as in kêt) can be shown to have an ablative function in Hittite. As we have seen, the use of kêt and the appearance of instrumental enclitic possessives with nouns in the ablative (marhuwantazâet) appear to attest an ablative use of -it/-ât. Formally, nominal -it < *-Ed is also unobjectionable (see below).

Thus from the Hittite point of view, the traditional etymology of instrumental -it from an original thematic ablative *-Ed is quite attractive.
Unfortunately, there are serious, even insurmountable problems with the assumed Indo-European preform *-ėd. Stang, *Vergl. Gram. 44, observes that the gen.(-abl.) sg. of Baltic o-stems (Lith. dievo, Latv. dieva) points to *-ėd. This ending cannot be derived from IE *-ėd, since IE *-o yields Lith.-Latv. -uo-/u- (cf. Lith. instr. dievą, dat. dievų). Therefore, Stang (after Endzelin) derives Baltic *-ėd from *-e-ėd (*-oh₂ed). This preform also explains the fact that the Vedic ablative ending *-et is occasionally disyllabic (see Wackernagel, *Abh. I 49, II 95).

The latter cannot be accounted for by an ending *-u. The same conclusion about Baltic *-ėd was already reached by Mahlow, *Die langen vocale* (1879) 161 (see the reference in Schmidt, *Fest. Düxlinck* (1888) 101). One may derive both Baltic *-ėd and the *-ėd found elsewhere from *-o-ėd, assuming different outcomes of the contraction of -o-. Alternatively, one may assume an *-oh₂ed beside *-o-ėd, the former giving *-ėd, the latter *-ėd. The form *-oh₂ed would also account for the palatalization in Skt. pāṣēt 'from' behind'. The above system allows no place for an IE ablative *-ėd.

The antiquity of the Latin adverbs in -ėd (rected, facilumed) is also debatable. Ernout, *Morph. Hist.* 48, summarily dismisses these forms as analogical after -ėd (at the point when the distinction between instrumental -o and ablative -ėd was being lost). For a more detailed and reasoned account of the adverbs
in -ōd as secondary creations from old instrumentals see Schmidt, Fest. Düntlingk 100f. It is important to note that the function of the Latin forms in -ōd is essentially instrumental, not ablativeval (rected means 'rightly, properly', not 'on the right/from the right'). Thus the likelihood of an IE ablative *-ōd is very small, and we must look elsewhere for a source of Hittite -it/-t.

Jochem Schindler has called my attention to the Vedic form daksinīt, attested in RV 5.36.4:

pra savvēna mahēvan vaśi rāyāḥ
pra daksinīd dharivo mē vi venah

'Dispense riches with your left hand, oh generous one, dis(pense them) with your right hand. Do not turn away, oh driver of the chestnut horses.'

In this passage it is clear that we should understand pra daksinīd vaśi and take daksinīt as functioning parallel to the instrumental savvēna. Unhappily, the status of daksinīt is clouded by the occurrence (6x in the Rigveda) of a compound pradeaksinīt. Grassmann in his dictionary and Geldner in his translation render pradeaksinīt as 'on/to/from the right'. More precisely, according to Grassmann, the adverb pradeaksinīt indicates that a worshipper stations himself so that the object of worship is to his right.

For the basic idea compare RV 10.17.9, where the 'fathers' approach the sacrifice on the right (daksīnā). This interpretation of
pradaksinīt fits most of the occurrences tolerably well, but it by no means imposes itself.

It cannot be an accident that our single instance of daksinīt is preceded by pra, and a connection with the compound pradaksinīt is unavoidable. The question is: is pra daksinīt merely a word play based on the pre-existing pradaksinīt (whatever the meaning of the latter), or is pra daksinīt a genuine collocation with an old instrumental daksinīt and pradaksinīt a univerbation of this phrase? In the latter case one would hope to find some trace of an instrumental function in the compound pradaksinīt. As with the interpretation 'on the right', a reading such as 'with the right hand forward/extended' is possible for some instances of pradaksinīt, but I find no sure evidence for such a meaning. Therefore at present I see no way to affirm the reality of the instrumental daksinīt, which would furnish a comparandum for Hittite instrumental -it/-i.

In the absence of any sure comparanda, all that can be claimed with certainty about the Hittite instrumental is that it ended in a dental stop. The vowel of both nominal -it and pronominal -et has more than one possible source. Hittite i can of course represent IE *i, but *e > i also appears possible. Benveniste, Origines 42, derives the Hittite abstract suffix -zil from IE *-tel, comparing Latin tūtēla, sūtēla etc. In the Old Hittite manuscript of the Laws, KBo VI 2, tayazzil 'theft' (1x) and harnikzil 'restitution' (3x) are spelled -zi-il. In nepiš-
'heaven' (< *nebhes-), IE *e also appears as Hittite i. The conditioning for IE *e > Hitt. i is by no means settled, but one may note that in both the abstracts in -sil and in nepi- the Hittite accent was almost certainly not on the i. On the other hand, in the best examples for IE *e > Hitt. e the Hittite accent was probably on the e: ežzi 'he is', genu 'knee', kuenzi 'he kills' etc. (*e); mēnur 'time' and similar nouns, tēszi 'he says' and inchoatives in -ēs- (*ē). Thus the nominal instrumental ending -it, which was surely not accented, could represent *-et or *-ēt as well as *-it.

The pronominal instrumentals kēt, Ṽet and l-ētta, where the accent likely did fall on the e, could be analyzed as *kē-t etc.

In the pronouns, however, one must also reckon with a stem in *-ei or *-oi plus -t (cf. Grk. keithi 'there' or Skt. instr. tēna etc.). Either *ei or *oi would also yield Hittite e (cf. N.Pl.C. ke 'these' < *foi, O.H. uēszi 'he comes' < *u-eiti).

Given the wide range of possible sources for the vowels in -it and -ēt, it is impossible to determine (1) whether -it/-ēt are to be derived from the same or different sources; (2) whether either vowel represents part of the original ending or both are part of the stem. All that we may affirm at present is that the Hittite instrumental morpheme ended in a dental stop.
NOTES

1 The forms with single a listed by Friedrich, HE I 2 §126, are not forms of kuišša 'every', but represent rather kuiš plus non-geminating -a, which functions as an indefinite relative 'whoever'.

2 Neu, StBoT 18,62 note 85, cites Bo 5003 paršuraz-va-kan // KUB X 51 RCol 10 paršurazzi-va-ker. KUB XXXIII 7 III 57 has kēz-ya. These examples of -Vz-ya are the only ones known to me, and they are either outright errors or result from syncope of -Vzi-ya (cf. KBo X 2 I 24 PGIR-ezyaza from a stem epæzziya-).

3 In post-Old Hittite manuscripts, the ending -az tends to be replaced by -aza after all stems. Many of the examples of -za listed under Vowel represent this -aza.

4 KASKAL-za in KBo III 22 Rs 58 (Anitta) should be taken as KASKAL-z + non-geminating -a 'but' (thus Neu, StBoT 18,62 note 85). The putative objection cited by Neu, that one would expect KASKAL-azı-ya, may be dismissed, since it is only geminating -a/-ya 'and' which calls forth the ablative in -(az)zi.

5 This is certain for tapušza, originally the ablative of the s-stem tapu(\(\text{wa}\))\(^{-}\) 'rib, flank' (Friedrich, Hûb 212), and for arâbza 'outside', originally the ablative of irh-/-arh- 'boundary' (attested as an s-stem irha-/arha-). The prehistory of andurza is less clear, and it cannot be excluded that andurza represents
an adverb *endur (cf. Lith. kuv 'where?') remade after arabza (like kitkarza from kitkar). Sturtevant, CGr §196d, cites an ablative šekunza to šobur 'urine', but I have not found this form in the published corpus.

6. In the first place, one can think of irregular loss of a final vowel in an imperative form: cf. the Latin imperatives dic and duç. There is also the general problem of the loss of final -i, at least after z. The regular phonological outcome of *-ti is -z (spelled -Vz/-Cza). Compare the occasional pres. act. verbs in -ma: [e]kza (KBo VI 2 IV 54; O.H. ms.), kara (KBo IX 73 Vs 12; O.H. ms.), taruba (KUB XLIII 75 Rs 9; O.H. text/N.H. ms.), kapruvaz (KUB XIII 29 II 32; N.H. text/N.H. ms.) and šekuvaz (KUB XIII 2 III 16; M.H. text/N.H. ms.). The same development may be seen in hanza 'in front' < *h2e/anti ~ Grk. enti, Lat. ante. The dative-locative šanti is a renewed form based on the stem šanti- preserved in banda, bandan and bandaš. Compare also the reflexive particle -z(a) from *-ti (= Luvian, Lycian and Palaic -ti; see Carruba, StBoT 10,74 with references).

In one instance, however, the reflexive particle also appears as -zi: KBo IV 2 III 58 (ex. (235) above p. 348) piran paruš-va-zi evun GEš-an etc.. One may note that this occurrence is before a vowel in the next word. It seems unlikely that a full syllabic form -zi would be present just once in all of Hittite
in a Neo-Hittite text. On the other hand, Kronasser, *VLFH* 101, already suggests that the ablative *(a)z* was really pronounced */(a)tsy/*. One could therefore read */yazazipun* as */yatsy-abun/*, assuming that in both the ablative and reflexive particle the final glide in */tsy/* is not normally reflected in the spelling.

To go one step further, we might assume that after assimilation of *-ti* to *-zi*, there was a stage at which */-zi+C-/* stood alongside */-tsy+V-/*. Of these 'sandhi variants', the prevocalic */tsy/* was generalized in the ablative (except before */va/ 'and') and in the reflexive particle. In the present indicative of the verb *-zi* and *-ensi* would have tended to be generalized on the basis of the rest of the paradigm: *-mi, -bi, -teni, -weni*. For reasons which are not clear, the infinitive in */ensi*, no longer felt as an ablative, also generalized the pre-consonantal variant.

Whether or not this is the correct explanation of */z* versus */-zi*, the appearance of both */z* and */-zi* from *-ti* shows that it < */idhi* is not necessarily an irregular development, even if we are unable to describe the relevant conditioning.

One could also derive the ablative */u* from */utos* (via */-uwos*), but */e* requires a front vowel. An */-tos* would surely have given */-wos > -cw* (cf. the 3rd sg. aorist middle */av < */-ato*).

I assume that the stem of 'eye' was */akuwa-*, but the nt. pl. */akuwa* and the instrumental */akuit* would also be regular from a
stem ękū-. In the latter case one would have to explain both ękuwait and ękuwat as built on the nt. pl.

9 See on this paradigm Schindler, BSL 70(1975)5f.

10 Neu, op. cit. 291, also cites the dat.-loc. pl. gēnuwaš.

Phonologically, one can derive the stem gēnu- from either *pronu- or *Ἀnu-. Neu leans toward *Ἀnu-, which seems more likely in an oblique stem (cf. also Schindler, BSL 70(1975)5 and 7).

11 The quality of final stops in Indo-European probably depended on the nature of the initial phoneme in the following word (see Meillet-Vendryes 146). What evidence is available suggests that Hittite generalized -d (like Latin; see Meillet-Vendryes 147). Besides sequences with instrumentals like waš-ta-šuš-um (KBO XVII 1 I 6), compare also 3rd sing. pret. verb forms followed by enclitic pronouns, such as pa-i-ta-šaš/paš-as/ (KUB XXVIII 4 II 22). The fact that Hittite can distinguish between ug-a 'but I' and uγ-γ 'and I' also implies that final stops in Hittite were voiced' (or more cautiously, that they were identical to those stops written singly between vowels which generally reflect Indo-European voiced stops). It is thus immaterial which dental stop one sets up for the instrumental ending.
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Index 1 — Passages Quoted in Full

All examples quoted in full have been numbered consecutively from (1) through (349). It is these numbers which have been used in the following index. To facilitate finding a particular passage, note also the following distribution:

Chapter 2: Examples (1) — (141)
Chapter 3: Examples (142) — (228)
Chapter 4: Examples (229) — (349)

Manuscripts in old ductus have been underlined.

KBo I 44 + XIII I IV 41-43 (290)
     45 Rs III 3 (345)
KBo II 2 II 45-46 (310)
     3 II 50-51 (222)
     6 I 36-37 (273)
     7 Rs 23 (334)
KBo III 1 II 45 (89), 1 II 50-51 (88)
     3 I 21-22 (261), 3 III 10-12 (246)
     4 III 33 (285)
     5 I 55 (226)
     6 II 21-22 (271)
     7 IV 22-23 (73)
     13 Rs 4 (92)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KBo</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>22 Vs 2 (15), 22 Vs 5 (23), 22 Vs 10-12 (16), 22 Vs 33 (18), 22 Vs 38 (12), 22 Rs 47-48 (19), 22 Rs 78-79 (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KBo</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1 Vs 31 (301) 2 I 21 (77), 2 I 24-26 (78), 2 I 59-60 (133), 2 II 9-10' (71), 2 II 35 (45), 2 III 58-59 (235) 6 Vs 26-27 (269) 9 IV 21 (100), 9 VI 6-12 (59), 9 VI 14-15 (99) 10 Rs 14.19 (237) 12 Vs 25 (264) 14 II 15 (245), 14 II 66-67 (267), 14 III 6 (238) 14 III 26-27 (274)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>1 I 36 (303), 1 I 41-42 (181), 1 III 3-4 (210), 1 III 22 (208), 1 III 39 (209) 2 I 20 (224), 2 III 17-19 (179), 2 III 47 (225) 3 II 22 (229), 3 II 28 (279), 3 III 38-39 (247) 8 I 24 (276), 8 I 39 (252), 8 III 18-19 (253) 9 I 19-20 (241), 11 I 24 (343) 13 I 29-32 (255), 13 II 7-8 (251)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>2 I 49-50 (8), 2 II 40 (5), 2 II 51-52 (3) 3 IV 28 (43) 26 I 18-21 (62), 26 II 3-8 (137) 28 Vs 4-5 (281)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KBo VI 29 I 18-20 (243), 29 II 17 (250)
34 II 22 (214)

KBo VII 14 Vs 5-6 (24)

KBo VIII 42 Vs 2 (14)

KBo X 2 III 18-19 (131), 2 III 39 (69)
7 II 16-18 (74)
20 II 39 (124)
24 IV 1-6 (83)
45 IV 48-49 (217)

KBo XI 1 Rs 9 (282)
5 VI 20 (291)
16 IV 14-15 (111)
45 IV 4-6 (79)
72 II 41 (172)

KBo XII 126 I 12-15 (85), 126 I 20 (121)
128, 9-17 (329)

KBo XIII 164 IV 12 (107)

KBo XV 1 I 16-17 (316)
10 II 7 (113)
33 III 11-12 (93), 33 III 33-35 (84)
37 III 50-52 (198), 37 IV 46-47 (215)
48 III 25-26 (192)

KBo XVI 47 Vs 9 (151)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KBo</th>
<th>XVII</th>
<th>1 I 12-13 (49), 1 I 18-19 (26), 1 I 31 (140), 1 II 16-18 (139), 1 II 19-20 (141), 1 II 20-21 (105), 1 III 25-27 (28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 I 14 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 III 13-14 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 Vs 14-16 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17 I 8 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43 I 10 (29), 43 IV 3 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74 III 25-26 (108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78 I 8-9 (348)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105 III 24-25 (180)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo</td>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>54 Vs 4-6 (321), 54 Rs 21-IRd 1 (293)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>133 Vs 6-7 (349)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo</td>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>44 + XXII 40 Rs 46 (240)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>142 II 25-26 (304)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>161 I 20-21 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>3 Rs 9-10 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 Vs 11 (22), 8 Rs 6 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 I 1-2 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34 Vs 6-7 (54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64 Vs 7 (109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107 I 9-12 (161)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo</td>
<td>XXI</td>
<td>22 Vs 22-25 (34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KBo XXI 34 I 63-64 (193)
37 Vs 8 (302)
41 Vs 75-Rs 1 (157)
KBo XXII 1 Rs 24-30 (33)
2 Vs 2 (20), 2 Vs 4-5 (2)
6 I 22 (67), 6 I 24-25 (123)
KBo XXIII 15 I 5-6 (173)
43 II 3-5 (297)
KUB I 1 I 46 (230), 1 I 57-58 (231), 1 II 52-53 (236)
13 II 56 (213)
16 II 62 (86), 16 III 41 (138), 16 III 71 (87)
16 III 72-73 (39)
17 I 6-8 (115), 17 II 31-34 (114), 17 IV 18-19 (46)
KUB II 3 I 27-29 (117)
5 I 34-36 (40), 5 V 2-3 (130), 5 V 3-7 (57)
13 I 43-44 (106), 13 VI 13-14 (68)
KUB IV 22,10 (289)
KUB V 1 I 48-49 (296), 1 III 23-24 (332), 1 III 28 (323), 1 IV 44,51 (325), 1 IV 72 (326)
3 I 3-4 (342), 3 I 17-18 (319)
6 III 20-21 (300), 6 III 24 (309)
24 I 24-26 (292)
KUB VI 17 II 3 (344)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KUB</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>45+ I 18-19 (263), 45+ III 32-33 (268)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>1 II 18-19 (76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 Vs 37 (346)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 Vs 10-11 (339)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41 I 1-2 (167), 41 IV 22-23 (175)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58 I 11-12 (204), 58 I 13f (177)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>17 II 5-7,8-10 (61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75 III 2-5 (318), 75 IV 8-9 (320)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80,15 (275)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>4 II 29-30 (200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 II 10-11 (299), 15 II 11-12 (312)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28 I 23,III 18 (202)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31 I 14-15 (199)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32 Vs 20-21 (317)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>89 I 20-21 (110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>9 III 16-20 (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21 IV 6-9 (80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32 IV 2-3 (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>11 IV 3-5 (228)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 VI 6-8 (178)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51 I 16-17 (295)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65 III 10 (186), 65 III 11-12 (187)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1 IV 7 (163)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 II 6f (194), 2 II 17 (171), 2 III 34-35 (195)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KUB XIII 2 III 36-37 (205)
4 I 37-38 (70), 4 I 57-58 (72), 4 I 64-65 (35),
4 II 16 (132), 4 II 45 (81), 4 III 43-44 (17),
4 III 78 (126), 4 IV 59-60 (38)
9 III 7 (223)

KUB XIV 1 Vs 20 (164), 1 Vs 45 (159), 1 Rs 25r (156),
1 Rs 57 (152)
4 II 5-8 (254), 4 IV 23 (249)
8 Vs 30-31 (239)
13+ I 49-50 (277)
14+ Vs 34-36 (248)

KUB XV 31 I 11-12 (188), 31 I 18-20 (189), 31 IV 38-40 (169)
34 I 36 (148), 34 IV 31 (158)

KUB XVI 16 Rs 15 (335)

KUB XVII 10 II 23-24 (128)
21 I 6 (165)
27 II 37-41 (176)
28 IV 45 (220)

KUB XVIII 12 Vs 4-5 (314)

KUB XIX 20 Vs 10 (280), 20 Vs 12-13 (258)
49 I 12-13 (242)
67 I 5-6 (260)

KUB XX 78 III 3-7 (51), 78 III 16-17 (37)

KUB XXI 1 III 76-77 (259), 1 IV 33 (262)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KUB</th>
<th>XXI</th>
<th>5 III 49 (256)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19 I 8-9 (257), 19 I 11-13 (270)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27 IV 35-36 (272)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37 Vs 10 (232), 37 Vs 17 (283)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38 Rs 8 (266)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB</td>
<td>XXII</td>
<td>25 Vs 19-20 (288)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38 I 3-5 (322)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52 Vs 6 (331)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70 Vs 45 (324), 70 Vs 55 (307)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB</td>
<td>XXIII</td>
<td>1 II 1 (278)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 III 16-17 (203)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68 Vs 26-27 (211)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72 Rs 52 (149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB</td>
<td>XXIV</td>
<td>2 Rs 14-16 (340)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 I 16-19 (313), 7 IV 49f (337)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 II 22-24 (63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 II 7-9 (219), 13 II 25-27 (227)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB</td>
<td>XXV</td>
<td>48 IV 22-23 (216)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB</td>
<td>XXVI</td>
<td>12 + XXI 42 III 14-15 (265)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19 II 27-28 (221)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29 + XXXI 55 Vs 15 (212)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32 I 7-8 (234), 32 I 11-12 (244)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69 VII 11-13 (315)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB XXVII</td>
<td>49 III 13-15 (333)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68 I 8 (294)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69 II 11-13 (94)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB XXIX</td>
<td>4 I 3-4 (287), 4 I 5 (338)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Vs 1-2 (145), 7 Vs 7-10 (146), 7 Vs 40-41 (144)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Rs 42-43 (142)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 IV 38-39 (143)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34,11 (120)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44 III 8 (196)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB XXX</td>
<td>10 Vs 24.27 (127)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15+ Vs 26-28 (56)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 II 9-10 (118), 24 III 38-41 (97)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 I 1-2 (306)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 + XXXII 114 I 12-13 (298)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34 IV 20-22 (183), 34 IV 25-29 (174)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 I 1-2 (168)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39 Rs 9 (101)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 I 16-18 (197)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB XXXI</td>
<td>4 + KBo III 41 Vs 8-9 (91), 4 + KBo III 41 Vs 13 (136)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53+ Vs 8-10 (233)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66 III 20-23 (286)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79 Vs 13 (336)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86 II 11 (201)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>127+ I 65-67 (53), 127+ III 27-29 (50), 127+ IV 21-23 (135), 127+ IV 24-25 (42)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB XXXII</td>
<td>115+ I 46 (147), 115+ II 24 (162), 115+ III 34-35 (160)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>117+ Rs 12-13 (125)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>123 II 33-35 (327)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>128 I 30-32 (191)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB XXXIII</td>
<td>5 III 8-10 (129)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52 II 7 (134)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54 II 10 (82)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62 II 8-11 (119)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67 I 27-31 (60)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68 II 7-8 (90)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70 II 2 (65)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>109+ I 16-18 (190)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120 I 31-33 (206)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>122 II 5 (184), 122 II 7-8 (185)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB XXXIV</td>
<td>16 III 4 (98)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66 + XXXIX 7 III 1 (48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB XXXV</td>
<td>148 III 36 (95)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB XXXVI</td>
<td>12 + XXXIII 113 I 17-18 (311)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90, 31f (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB XXXIX</td>
<td>7 II 22 (66)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102 I 1-2 (168)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB XL</td>
<td>13 Rs 8-9 (218)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KÜB XLII</td>
<td>17 I 23-24 (328), 17 II 14-15 (308)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 I 18-20 (103)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KUB XLIII 23 Rs 15–19 (4)
30 II 6–7 (9)
53 I 19t (75)
55 II 10–13 (58), 55 V 2–3 (41)
56 III 6–7 (112)
60 I 8–10, 12–15 (52)

KUB XLIV 37 IV 4–5 (116)

KUB XLV 26 II 6–9 (297)

KUB XLVI 42 III 2–4 (330)

ABot 17 III 5–6 (347)

IBot I 36 I 10–11, 16–19 (153), 36 I 58–59 (150), 36 I 60–63 (155), 36 I 73–74 (154)

IBot II 46, 6–10 (297)

IBot III 1, 50–51 (102),
52, 3–5 (104)
148 III 15–16 (182)

VBot 24 I 22–24 (166), 24 II 24–25 (207)
58 IV 4–6 (122)
95 I 5 (44)
111 III 3f (96)

EHC 13 II 29 (64)

HT 1 I 44 (170), 1 I 49 (305)

RS 25, 421 Ro 44–46 (341)
Ablative Case:

Form: in -anza 448f, in -az vs. -za 443f, in -azzi-(ya) 439f

Function:

Accompaniment 212f, 320f, 365, 397f
Adverbial (Time) 217-218, 297, 323
Agent 214f, 367, 403-404
Cause 192, 289-290, 353f, 385f
Comparison 215f
Direction 151f, 195f, 290f, 310f, 356f, 388f
Means 209f, 295f, 317f, 361f, 393f
Origin 192f
Perlative 157, 208f, 292f, 315f, 361, 387-388
Respect 213f, 321f, 365-366, 400f
Separation 149f, 175f, 284f, 305f, 346f, 379f
'Time from which' 190f, 289, 310, 353, 385

Ek- 'die' 23
-an (sent. particle) 19, 110
-an (genitive) 21
-apa 19, 118
äppa, äppan 23
äppa parza 219-220, 409
apē (nom. pl. comm.) 35-36
appezzia- 27-29
arba: as a postposition (?) 185, 188; as 'except' 386
Armenian ablative ending -է 453f

-անտա 24-25

Dative-Locative expressing separation 188f, 289f, 310, 352

DINGIR-uš (nom. sg.) 20

Directive Case 38-39

-e (N.Pl.C./N.-A.Pl.Nt.) 19-20

eku- 'drink' with the instrumental 235f

Enclitic Possessives 36-38, 259f

-անզան 36

ենքա/-ինքա  34

ենիտո 23

edi 20, 263-265

Genitive Case: Partitive 277, note 14

Separation (?) 306

with postpositions 22, 265f

հանցազիան- 29-30

-բե 18

huээăas sevandaz(si-ya) dăi- 218-219

Infinitives in -wansı 410-411

Instrumental Case:

Form: in -it vs. -et 463f, in -t(a) 458

Function:

Accompaniment 164f, 246f, 301f, 332f, 373, 415f
Adnominal 254, 338, 419
Agent 250, 335, 374, 417
Exchange/Substitution 335-336
Means 162f, 227f, 300f, 327f, 371f, 412f
Pronominal for the Ablative 168f, 251, 303, 335, 417
Respect 248f, 302, 334, 417
Separation 254-255, 339-340, 420

pišgarubit (šer šepi) 243f
pištanšši 31
pištanšanit (21-it) 252f, 303-304, 336-337
ké (nom. pl. comm.) 35-36
kēt 263f, 270-271
kēdi 20
kēša- 'become' 23
kitkar(ga) 205f
kuwapit 269-270
Latin adverbs in -ad 466f
Luvian -ati 452f
Lycian -edi/-edi 452f
mabban 22
mēma- 18-19
mēnah banda 18-19
natta 21
nu-uk-kân 21
parna-šše-ya šuwayissi 280, note 30
pēran 18
Reflexive Particle 18, 35
la- (or ści-?) 26
Bakuwaśarit ZI-it 337-338
Bhārāzzīya- 30
-sē 20
ār 24
Kīpand- 'libate; sacrifice' with the instrumental 235f
śu 19
ta 19, 42-43, 119
takku 22
-tani 34-35
tarēk(ī)- 24
-uḥ (acc. pl. comm. of the enclitic pron.) 25
Verbs in -iya-/-ie- 1, 32-34
Vocative Case 31-32
Wehm- 'whirl, brandish' with the instrumental 234-235
-wani 34-35
weś 26-27
zeyanday arī 391-392
l-śeta 376-378