

Ablative and Instrumental in Hittite

A thesis presented

by

Harold Craig Melchert

to

The Department of Linguistics

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the subject of

Linguistics

Harvard University

Cambridge, Massachusetts

May, 1977

Acknowledgements

I welcome this opportunity to thank those whose help has contributed immeasurably to the completion of the present work.

I am indebted to the Mrs. Giles Whiting Foundation for its generous financial support in the form of a Harvard Whiting Fellowship which enabled me to devote full time during the past year to work on my thesis.

My debt to other scholars in the field is clear from the many references within the text itself. However, I would like to express publicly my special appreciation to Prof. Emmanuel Laroche, Strasbourg, without whose Catalogue a study of the present scope would have been virtually impossible. Dr. Frank Starke, Marburg, kindly provided me with portions of his dissertation in advance of its publication as StBoT 23. I owe many helpful suggestions and criticisms to Profs. Jay Jasanoff and Jochem Schindler of Harvard University, particularly on Indo-European aspects of the problems discussed. Above all, I am grateful to my teacher and advisor, Prof. Calvert Watkins of Harvard University, not only for having provided constant help and encouragement in the writing of this thesis, but also for having first introduced me to the myriad wonders of Indo-European linguistics in general and the Hittite language in particular.

H. Craig Melchert

II

Table of Contents

Chapter One. Introduction

Section 1. Goals and Organization

Section 2. The Corpus

2.1. Generalities

2.2. Dating Criteria

2.3. The Old Hittite Corpus

2.4. The Middle Hittite Corpus

2.5. Neo-Hittite Historical Texts

Section 3. Syntax of the Ablative and Instrumental -

Previous Analyses

Chapter Two. Ablative and Instrumental in Old Hittite

Section 1. Usage in Old Hittite Manuscripts

1.1. Ablative

1.2. Instrumental

Section 2. Usage in Middle and Neo-Hittite Manuscripts

2.1. Ablative

2.2. Instrumental

Section 3. Excursus: the Pronominal Ending -et/-it

Section 4. Conclusions and Unresolved Questions

Chapter Three. Ablative and Instrumental in Middle Hittite

Section 1. Usage in Middle Hittite Manuscripts

1.1. Ablative

1.2. Instrumental

III

Section 2. Usage in Neo-Hittite Manuscripts

2.1. Ablative

2.2. Instrumental

Section 3. Conclusions and Unresolved Questions

Chapter Four. Ablative and Instrumental in Neo-Hittite

Section 1. Usage in Neo-Hittite Historical Texts

1.1. Ablative

1.2. Instrumental

Section 2. Usage in Other Neo-Hittite Manuscripts

2.1. Ablative

2.2. Instrumental

Section 3. Conclusions and Unresolved Questions

Section 4. Syntax of the Ablative and Instrumental -

General Conclusions

Chapter Five. Formal Aspects of the Ablative and Instrumental

Section 1. Ablative

1.1. Ablatives in -(az)zi-ya

1.2. The Spellings -az and -za

1.3. Ablatives in -anza

1.4. Etymology of the Ending

Section 2. Instrumental

2.1. Instrumentals in -t(a)

2.2. The Spellings -it and -ēt

2.3. Etymology of the Ending

IV

Bibliography

Index 1 - Passages Quoted in Full

Index 2 - Partial Subject Index

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

VI

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

VII

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.

VIII

'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. Hrozný = 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.¹ 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-(ez)-zi, -(i)-iz-zi and -(i)-ya-(az)-zi (likewise in the preterite 3rd sing. one finds -i-e-et, -i-it and -i-ya-at). Friedrich, HE I² §14, 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.).² The relative chronology of Hittite texts has been and continues to be the subject of considerable investigation and debate.³ 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, StBoT 8(1969)1-2; Neu, StBoT 12(1970)1 and 50; Otten, StBoT 17(1973)IX; Neu, StBoT 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-ašta IŠTU É ^dInar []. 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.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 Hattusili 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).⁵ 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 compositions: 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/-et with the dative-locative singular (Houwink ten Cate, RHA 24(1966)123f). In an accompanying article Josephson, RHA 24(1966)133f, draws far-reaching conclusions based partly on this usage, but Otten, 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, Neuere Hethiterf.(1964)12f). A subsequent reexamination of Hittite tablets using the above-mentioned manuscript of the 'Zukraši text' (KBo VII 14+) as a comparandum revealed other Old Hittite manuscripts characterized by the same 'Old Hittite ductus' (see e.g. Otten-Souček, StBoT 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-eš-tu and ma-a-ah-ha-an 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 Zukraši 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 (CTH 375.1.A), a prayer of King Arnuwanda and Queen Ašmunikal. The text certainly dates from the Middle Hittite (Early Empire) period, and the sign

shapes of KUB 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 KUB 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.⁶ 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.⁷ 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):⁸

- 28. Treaty
- 131.II.B. Treaty with Sunassura
- 134.C. 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. Madduwatta

- 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 Ašhapala
- 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 archaisms 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 Kammenhuber, KZ 83(1969)269, phonetic spellings such as na-at-ta or a-ap-pa-(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 -hi conjugation spelled -hé

See Otten-Souček, StBoT 8(1969)76 with note 10. The examples cited there from KBo VIII 74+ (M.H. ms.), plus ašašhe 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-e-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-ra-an is also attested already in Old Hittite manuscripts.

3. ...-uz for the reflexive particle -za

Otten, StBoT 17(1973)31 note 58, cites nu-uz in KBo III 40,2 (N.H. ms.) and KBo XVII 36 III 11 (O.H. ms.). Compare also šu-mu-uz in KBo III 43 Vs 3 (same tablet as KBo III 40) and nu-mu-uz in KUB XXIX 3 I 5 (O.H. ms.).

4. Scriptio plena me-e- in mema-/memišk- 'say, speak' and menahhanda 'facing, toward'

Houwink ten Cate, Records 10, cites mēma- 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).⁹ For me-e- as old in both mema- and menahhanda 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 (KBQ V 3 III 31). Hrozný'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 -pát (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 -pat over -pa. In any case, the complete absence of -apa 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)81-82.

3. Nom.Pl.C. and Nom.-Acc.Pl.Nt. of the Enclitic Pronoun = -e

Compare Kammenhuber, KZ 83(1969)280, and Carruba, op. cit.

Table I (following p. 260!). The form ne-et-ta (= nu+e+ta) is used until the latest texts instead of na-at-ta (see Lee, ArOr 34(1966)22 note 29), though the latter does exist (e.g. KUB XII 17,4). Several instances of ne-et-ta in Neo-Hittite historical texts occur in the same formula 'may it be placed under an oath for you', where the -e- has singular reference.¹⁰

4. Locative singular edi, kēdi (vs. usual edani, kēdani)

The archaic character of these forms is shown by the following attestations:¹¹

edi: KUB I 16 III 41 (HAB/CTH 6); KBo III 41 Vs 12 (CTH 16); KBo VI 2 I 50 (Laws; O.H. ms.); VI 26 II 3.7, VI 13 I 13.16.17, VI 26 II 5 (i-di) (Laws; all N.H. mss.).

kēdi/kēti: 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^{LIM}-iš)

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 -še

For -še as an archaism 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. ú-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 Šaušgamuwa Treaty (KUB VIII 82+ Vs 5⁺.11; see Kühne-Otten, StBoT 16(1971) 18-19).

3. nu-uk-kán (vs. usual nu-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, StBot 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)280-281, 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 Madduwatta and Mida of Pahuwa 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-ah-ha-an (vs. usual ma-ah-ha-an)

See Carruba, ZDMG Supp. I,1(1969)236 and Table I, Houwink ten Cate, Records 10, and Kammenhuber, KZ 83(1969)268. The spelling with scriptio plena occurs in Neo-Hittite manuscripts

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-eš-tu (vs. usual e-eš-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/Išputaššu), KBo VIII 37 Rs 10 (Treaty with Kurustama) and KUB XIII 2 II 7-11, etc. (Instr. for the bel madgalti; cf. e-eš-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-a-a-a-a-an-za KUB XXIII 72 Rs 14 (Mida of Pahhuwa; M.H. ms.).

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

See Carruba, Sprache 12(1966)84 note 13, and ZDMG Supp. I,1 (1969)Table I. Examples in Neo-Hittite manuscripts include KUB I 16 II 5 (HAB), KBo III 35 I 9.10 (Palace Chronicle), KBo III 34 III 16.23 (Palace Chronicle) and KBo III 60 III 6 (CTH 17).

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

See Houwink ten Cate, Records 10, and Carruba, ZDMG Supp. I,1 (1969)242 note m.

6. še-e-er (vs. usual še-er)

Houwink ten Cate, Records 13, terms še-er 'more common' among his 'Group D' Neo-Hittite texts, implying that še-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 še-e-er ceases 'erst vor Suppiluliuma I', which agrees with my findings.

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

See Otten, StBoT 17(1973)27 and 43, and Carruba, op. cit.

Table I. Another Middle Hittite attestation besides Madduwatta Vs 34 is KUB XXIII 72 Rs 41 taršikit[te/ani] (Mida 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)šta (other than in the form na-aš-ta)

The specific combination na-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 (Ulmi-Tešub Treaty), KUB XXVI 43 Vs 60.Rs 6.21 and KUB XXVI 40 Rs 2.11 (both Tuthaliya III/IV). The two instances of -ašta in other combinations indexed by Friedrich, SV II 182, do not exist. In each case the sequence consists

of -aš+ta 'is/eos tibi'. In Middle Hittite historical texts na-aš-ta is frequent, and other combinations with -(a)šta are sparingly attested: mēn-ašta KBo XVI 27 IV 17 (Gasga Treaty of Arnuwanda) and IBoT I 36 IV 23 (Protocol of the Guard); šer-ašta KBo XVI 25 I 34 (Protocol) and nu-war-ašta ibid. IV 14; mahhan-ma-ašta IBoT I 36 IV 3 (Protocol of the Guard); uncertain is nu-uš-ma-aš-ta 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); Madduwatta shows nu-uš (KUB XIV 1 Vs 71), but apaš-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-aš (ibid. III 11) along with namma-aš (ibid. IV 12). See Otten, StBoT 11(1969)23 and 30. I merely wish to affirm here that the very presence of -uš at all points back to at least Middle Hittite.

3. Independent pronoun ša- (or ši-?)

The attested orthography points to an i-stem as set up by Friedrich, HE I²(1960)64: G.Sg. ši-i-e-el KUB I 16 II 47 (HAB), D.Sg. ši-e-ta-ni KUB XIV 1 Rs 36 (Madduwatta), Abl. ši-i-e-ez KUB IX 31 I 14 (Ritual of Zarpiya) and probably Instr. ši-e-et KBo XXII 1 Rs 29 (O.H. ms.). Note, however, that the two spellings with the writing of the -i- (implying /siyel/ 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 -iya- (e.g. KBo XVII 105 II 33 PÜ-iya-šmi for iššⁱ-šⁱmi; see ibid. II 30 correct PÜ-i-šmi). Therefore a stem ša- with oblique še- is also possible. For the archaic status of this form see Götze, Madd.(1928)137, Sommer HAB(1938)78, and Otten, StBoT 11(1969)4 and 25, with further references.

4. wēš 'we'

One still finds wēš 'we' in Middle Hittite historical texts: KUB XVII 21 IV 5.7 (Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal), KBo XVI 27 I 11 (Gasga Treaty of Arnuwanda), KBo XVI 25 I 70

(Protocol) and KBo XVI 50 Vs 11.16 (Oath of Ashapala). Neo-Hittite texts show only anzāš 'we', but the number of examples in clearly datable historical texts is admittedly very small: KBo IV 3 IV 15 (Kupanta-^dKAL), KBo XIV 12 IV 15 (DŠ fgt. 33) and KBo XI 1 Rs 15 (Prayer of Muwatalli). The value of wēš as a dating criterion is therefore limited.¹³

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

The adjectives appezziya- 'rear; last', hantezziya- 'front; first' and šarazziya- 'upper' are original ya-stems which are secondarily transferred to the i-stem class (see Sommer, HAB 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.

appezziya-

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

appizzi(y)aš IBoT I 36 II 66 (Protocol of the Guard; M.H. ms.—

cf. ibid. I 21 appizziš); KUB XXIII 68 Vs 22 (Išmerika 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 appizzi(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⁺ (HAB); KUB XXIII 72 Rs 51⁺ (Mida of Pahhuwa; M.H. ms.); KBo VI 3 II 18 (Laws; M.H. ms.[?]; cf. appizzin 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.); KUB XIII 3 III 18 (Instr. for Palace Servants; O.H. text/N.H. ms.); KUB XIII 26,5 (Protocol fgmt.; undated).¹⁵ 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 fgmt.).

versus:

N.Sg.C. appizziš IBoT 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 fgmt.; undated). EGIR-(izz)iš KBo XII 4 III 4⁺ (Telipinu Edict; N.H. ms.); KUB I 1 I 11 (= I 2 I 10 = KBo III 6 I 10; Hatt.); KUB XXIII 1 III 10⁺ (Šaušgamuwa 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 Hantitassu; O.H. text/N.H. mss.); KUB XL 51 II 4
 (undated hist. fgmt.).

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

Adverb¹⁴ 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 Ukkura; undated);

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

hantezziya-

N.Sg.C. hantezzi(y)aš KUB I 16 III 39 (HAB); KBo III 45 Vs 14⁺?
 (CTH 10); KBo XII 1 II 36 (Telipinu 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. hantezzi(y)an KBo III 1 II 10 (Telipinu 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)

hantezziš KBo III 1 II 37.38 and KUB XI 2,11 (Telipinu 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⁺ (Šaušgamuwa Treaty).

A.Sg.C. hantezzin KBo XIV 3 III 41⁺ (DŠ), KUB XXIII 77a Rs 15⁺

(Gasga Treaty; M.H. ms.)

N.-A.Sg.Nt. IGI-zi KBo III 6 II 13 = KUB I 2 II 16 (Hatt.).

šarazziya-

A.Sg.C. šarazziyan KUB XXXIII 62 II 4 (CTH 330; O.H. text/ M.H.[?] ms.).

versus:

N.Sg.C. šaraz(z)iš KBo VI 29 II 5.7 (Hattusili III on Urhi-Tešub)

N.-A.Sg.Nt. šarazzi KUB XIII 20 I 34 (Milit. Instr. of Tuthaliya;

M.H. text/N.H. ms.); KUB XIII 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 šanezzi- '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 IBOT 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 appezzi(y)an 'afterwards' remains in Neo-Hittite in the 'contracted' form appizzin.

6. 2nd Sg. Pres. ištamašši '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 ištamaš- 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, ištamašti 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 ištamašti 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/ištamašti in drawing the precise boundary between Middle Hittite and the usage of Suppiluliuma I.

7. Vocative

On the vocative in general see Laroche, Athenaeum 47(1969)173f.

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 Muwatalli and Hattusili III/Puduhepa does argue that texts with this feature go back to at least Middle Hittite. The example ^dSarrum[a] cited by Laroche, loc. cit., from KUB XV 1 II 18 (probably Puduhepa) is dubious. The autograph shows enough room to restore ^dLUGAL-m[a-aš].

II. Features rarely attested in Neo-Hittite historical texts

A. Orthography

1. Verbs in -(i)ya- spelled -i-e- or -i-iC

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: i-e-ši KBo V 3+ II 3⁺.49 (cf. II 45 iyaši)

KUB XXVI 38 III 14

i-e-zi KBo V 3 II 38⁺.III 30

i-en-zi ibid. II 8.44

[ti]-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-et l. 11

bu-ul-li-it l. 9

Mursili II:

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

bu-ul-li-e-et KUB XIV 17 III 17 (AM 98)

KBo XVI 17 III 28

ti-i-e-et KBo V 8 I 35 (AM 150)

(iš-hi-ih-hu-un KBo III 4 III 26.31, V 8 II 3)¹⁷

(ku-u-ru-ri-ih-ta KBo II 5 I 9)¹⁷

Tawannanna: ti-i-e-et 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.: bu-ul-li-it KUB XIX 11 IV 39 (DŠ fgt. 13)

(cf. hulliyat KBo XIV 3 IV 33; fgt. 15)

Kupanta-^dKAL: šu-ul-li-it KUB VI 41 I 32
a-ra-an-tal-li-en-zi KUB VI 43,6 =
a-ra-an-da-al-li-en-zi KBo IV 7 I 24 =
a-ra-an-tal-li-in-[zi] KUB VI 41 I 25

P. to Lelwani: (kap-pu-u-it KBo IV 6 Rs 15)¹⁸

Muwatalli:

Alaksandu Treaty: wa-ag-ga-ri-iz-zi KUB XXI 1 III 41
ti-en-zi KUB XXI 5 II 14

Hattusili III, Tuthaliya III/IV, Suppiluliuma II: none.¹⁹

2. ēšša- (iter. to iya- 'do, make') spelled i-iš-ša-

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 (KUB XIV 13 I 35:

iš-ši-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 e-eš-ša- in Mursili (15x plus 5x in the Plague Prayer).

3. 1st and 2nd Pl. Pres. Act. spelled -wani, -tani

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: pāiwani KBo V 3+ IV 28.29⁺

(Hukkana Treaty), [x-iškiuwani 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: ERfN.MEŠ-wa-z KBo V 4 I 19 (Targasnalli Treaty), namma-z KUB XIV 23 I 22 (DŠ, fgt. 2), waštul-ma-z KUB XIV 8 Rs 26 and kuitta-ya-wa-z KUB XIV 10 I 10 (Plague Prayers), ammuk-ma-z KUB XXXI 12la II 11 (Prayer of Mursili), LÚ SANGA-az²¹ KUB VI 45 I 18 and hūdak-ma-z ibid. I 21 (Prayer of Muwatalli), ^dUTU-ŠI-ya-z KBo II 6 I 34 (Oracle rē Arma-^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-uz-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 kūš and apūš)

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 DINGIR.MEŠ.²² Its counterpart apē 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-^dKAL (KBo IV 3 IV 35) and probably also in the Deeds of Suppiluliuma, fgt. 18 (KBo XIV 4 I 10; cf. apūš I 9).

2. Genitive in -enzan

See Sommer, HAB 77, among others. The second person plural šumenzan is still the usual form in the texts of Suppiluliuma I: Hukkana Treaty (KBo V 3+ III 32.IV 52) and Treaty with Šattiwaza (KUB XXVI 34 Rs 6). Later Neo-Hittite historical texts have only šumel.

3. Enclitic Possessive Pronouns

See among others Friedrich, HE I²(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-šši '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-mi KBo V 3+ II 15
tuzziuš-šuš KBo XIV 18,14 (?)¹⁶
- Mursili II: pi/edi-šši KBo V 9 III 4 (Duppi-Tešub §14)
KBo III 4 III 25.30 (AM 74 and 76)
KUB XV 36 Vs 5 (Aphasia of Mursili)
katti-šši KUB XXXI 33,7⁺.9⁺ (DŠ fgt. 5)
katti-šmi ibid. 5
ištarni-šummi KBo XIV 12 IV 32f (DŠ fgt. 28)
(= KUB XXXI 25,4⁺.7⁺.9⁺)
tuzziuš-miš[!] (A.Pl.) KUB XIX 37 III 10 (AM 172)
tuzziyaš-miš[!] KBo II 5 II 3 (A.Pl.).II 13 (N.Sg.).
III 24 (A.Pl.) (AM 182 and 190)
me-m[i-ya]-an-mi-it[!] KUB XIV 14 Vs 7 (1st Plague P.)
at-ta-aš[!]-mi-in KUB XIV 11 II 22 (2nd Plague P.)
- Muwatalli: at-ti-mi KBo XI 1 Vs 21 (Prayer to Tešub)
- Hattusili III: LÜ-tar-mit Hatt. II 29
- Tuthaliya III/IV: iš-tar-ni-šu-[(um-me)] KUB XXVI 43 I 19 //
KBo XXII 58 Vs 9
- Suppiluliuma II: pidi-(e)šši 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(š)-šit IBoT I 36 I 35 (in Neo-Hittite always -ši...piran) and šumenzan-pat kir-šumet KBo VIII 35 II 21 (Gasga Treaty; M.H. ms.).

4. Directive Case

On the directive case see Forrer, Meißner-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/dapuša '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)

ša-ta 'in(to) the heart': KUB VI 41 IV 24.25 and VI 44+ IV 23
(Kupanta-^dKAL §§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 (SBo II, p. 10)

KBo IV 12 Vs 32 (Hattusili III)

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

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

dameda 'elsewhere': Hatt. IV 24

<hūmma 'into a pig-sty': Hatt. IV 26²⁴

As with the enclitic possessives, most of the above examples may be explained as set phrases, but hūmma 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 suppliant is 'the king', in another 'a man', and in a third an individual named Kantuzzili (see Güterbock, 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.SUM^{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 manuscript must be judged accordingly.

One could propose another explanation for Neo-Hittite manuscripts 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 intentionally archaizing text would show merely a random scattering of archaic features. I call attention to KBo XXII 6 (šar tamhari 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 composition, 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 t 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. Güterbock. 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 acknowledgement, loc. cit.). I have also included manuscripts characterized as 'typisch alter Duktus' or 'alter Duktus' in the Vorworte to the respective volumes of KUB and KBo. Other characterizations of the ductus such as 'Altlich, Altlich wirkend, altertümlich' 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)221f.

Special abbreviations:

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

The Old Hittite Corpus

1. Anitta (J) (K) (O)
 - A. KBo III 22 = BoTU 7 O.H. (S) (K) (O)
 - 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) (O)
 - B. KBo III 38 = BoTU 13 N.H.
 - C. Bo 7858 ms.?
 - 2.A. KBo XII 18 N.H. *no?*
 - B. KBo XII 63 N.H.
 3. KUB XXIII 23 N.H.
 4. KBo XIX 92 N.H.
 5. KBo XII 19 M.H.? *no?*
4. Acts of Hattusili I
 - 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) (O)
 - D. KUB XXXVI 104 O.H. (S) (O)
 All other mss. N.H.
9. Fragments of Palace Chronicles (J) (K)
 1. KUB XXXVI 105 O.H. (O) *No?*
 5. KBo VIII 42 O.H. (S)
 Other mss. N.H.
10. Fragments on the Campaign of Mursili I against Babylon (J) (K) (O)

All mss. N.H.
11. Campaign of Mursili I against Aleppo (J) (K)
 - A. KBo III 57 = BoTU 20 N.H.
 - B. KUB XXVI 72 N.H.
12. Anatolian Campaigns of Mursili I (?) (J) (K) (O)

KUB XXXI 64(+)64a + KBo III 55 (= BoTU 18) N.H.
13. Hurrian Wars of Mursili I (?) (J) (K) (O)

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

All mss. N.H.
15. Zukraši of Aleppo (J) (K)
 - A. KBo VII 14 + KUB XXXVI 100 O.H. (S) (K)
 - B. KUB XXXVI 101 N.H.
 - C. KUB XXXVI 102 N.H.
16. Legendary Narrative: Hurrian Wars (?) (J) (K) (O)

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.

XXVI 8B+C O.H.? False

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.

XXVI 81 N.H.?

22. Fragment naming Telipinu

KUB XXI 48 N.H.

23. Fragments naming Alluwamna (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 habiru (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)

- ?3. KBo VIII 45 N.H.
- ?4. KBo VIII 131 --
- 5. KUB XXVI 35 N.H. (J) (K)
- 7. KUB XXXI 110(+)XXIII 53 N.H. (J) (K)
- 8. KUB XXXVI 27 N.H.
- 9. KUB XXXVI 45 N.H.
- 10. KUB XXXVI 107 N.H. (J) (K) O.H. ? MH ?
- ?12. KBo XIX 94 N.H.
- 13. KUB XLIII 75 N.H.

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/f = SBo I 5 = LSU 5 O.H.
- 4. 165/h = SBo I 6 = LSU 6 O.H.
- 5. 621/f = SBo I 7 = LSU 7 ms.?
- 7. 549/f = SBo I 9 = LSU 9 ms.?
- 9. 140/f = SBo I 11 = LSU 11 ms.?
- 12. 655/f = SBo I 14 = LSU 14 ms.?
- 13. 605/f = 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 (JAOS 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 + 1a + XXII 61 + 62
 - B. KUB XXIX 16 + KBo XIX 2
 - C. KUB XXIX 13
 - 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 §§101-200 (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(+)?67(+)Bo 8552 —

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

310. Šar tamhari (J) (K)

All mss. N.H.

311. Naram-Sin (J) (K)

All mss. N.H.

321. Illuyanka (K)

All mss. N.H.

322. Telipinu and the Daughter of the OceanA. KUB XII 60 N.H.B. KUB XXXIII 81 M.H. ✓323. Disappearance of the Sun (mugawar)1. KUB XXXVI 44 M.H. ?2. VBoT 58 N.H.3. KBo XIII 85 N.H.

324. Telipinu (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 N.H.
- B. KUB XXXIII 22+23 N.H.
- C. KUB XXXIII 25+26+27+29+30 + XXXVI 71 + 1216/v M.H. ?

326. The god of Queen Ašmunikal

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 Kuliwisna (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

1.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 XXXII 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. KBo XXI 67 —
14. KUB XLIII 56 N.H.
331. The Storm-god of Lihzina
 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. IBoT II 114 —
333. Anzili and Zukki
 - A. KUB XXXIII 67 N.H.
 - B. KUB XXXIII 36 —
334. ^dMAH (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) (7) M.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. (0) ✓
374. Similar Fragments to 372 and 373
 1. KUB XXXI 135 + XXX 11(+)XXXI 130 M.H. (0) ✓
 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 M.H. ✓

398. Ritual of Huwarlu

A. KBo IV 2 N.H.B. KBo IX 126 N.H.

402. Ritual of Ālli

I/J. KBo XXI 8 M.H. ✓

All other mss. N.H.

412. Ritual of Zuwi

3. KUB XII 63 + XXXVI 70 M.H. (0) (?)8.B. KBo XVII 17 O.H. (V) (N)

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] O.H. (S)B. KBo XVII 3 + 4 + XX 15 + KUB XLIII 32(+) KBo XVII 2

O.H. (S)

2. KBo XVII 5 O.H. (S)
 3. KBo XVII 6 O.H. (S)
 4. KBo XVII 7 + IBoT III 135 O.H. (S)
429. Ritual against a Curse
- All mss. N.H.
434. Rituals for ^dMAH.MEŠ and ^dGulšeš (fragments)
5. KBo XX 82 N.H.
 6. KUB XLIII 55 N.H.
443. Ritual of Absolution
- KBo XV 10 + XX 42 M.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 XLI 23 N.H.
 - B. KBo XXII 170 N.H.
 - 11.A. KUB XLI 32 N.H.
 - B. KUB XLI 33 —
 - 12.A. KUB XLIII 61 —
 - B. KUB XLIII 63 N.H.
523. Supplies (melgetu) for Festivals
- 1.A. KBo XVI 67 M.H. ?

1.B. KBo XVI 69 + XX 54 —

C. KUB XLIII 24 O.H. (V) (H)

2.A. KBo XVI 68(+)79(+) KUB XXXIV 86 M.H. (see KBo XX 55) ✓

B. KBo XVI 70 N.H.

C. KBo XVI 75 —

D. KBo XVI 76 (O.H.) (V)

3. Fragments

KBo XVI 72, 73, (80) O.H. (V)

KBo XVI 74, XX 66 —

KBo XVI 77 N.H.

531. Introduction to the enuma anu Enlil (?)

KUB XXXIV 12 —

532. Lunar Eclipses

1.A. KUB VIII 1 N.H.

B. KBo XIII 18 —

5. 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

KBo. XII 13 MH?

538. Šumma izbu

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

539. 'If a sign...'

1. KBo VI 23 —
2. KBo XIII 31 M.H. ✓

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

All mss. N.H. or indeterminate

544. Behavior of Animals

1. KUB XXXIV 22 N.H.

KBo VIII 29 MH?

547. Liver Models

- II. KUB XXXVII 223 O.H. (S)

549. Signs of the KI.GUB

b) Bilingual

KUB VIII 34 + XLIII 13 N.H.

c) Hittite

A. KBo X 7 + [HSM 3645] N.H.

B. KBo X 50 N.H.

551. KUB VII 43 MH?

552. Signs of the KAM

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. KUB X 75 N.H.

596. Fall Festivals (fragments)

1.a. KBo XXI 78 N.H.b. KUB XX 94 N.H.c. KUB XX 21 N.H.

t597. Winter Festival

All mss. N.H. or indeter.

598. Winter Festival of the Sun

All mss. N.H.

t599. Journey of ^aKAL ^{KUŠ}kuršašKUB XX 25 + X 78 N.H.604-625. AN.TAH.ŠUM^{SAR} Festival (K)616.2.B. KBo IX 140 M.H.626. Nuntariyašha 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) (H)

All other mss. N.H.

630. 'Combined' Festival of the Moon and Thunder (0)

A. KUB XXXII 135 + KBo XXI 85 + VIII 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. IBoT III 140 N.H.6. KBo XVII 75 N.H.9. KBo XX 8 O.H. (V) (H)10. KBo XX 61 —

633. Festival of 'Procreation'

IBoT I 29 N.H.

634. Great Festival of Arinna

All mss. N.H.

635. Fragments of Festivals of Ziplanda and Mt. Daha

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 M.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.DINGIRt2. KUB XX 90 N.H.5.A. KBo XX 5 O.H. (V)B. KBo XXII 195 M.H.C. KBo XXII 224 —6. KBo XX 9 O.H. (V)7. KBo XX 14 O.H. (V)12. KUB XLIII 48 N.H.13. KBo XX 33 M.H.?650. Fragments naming the SAL.MEŠ zintuheš3. KUB XX 38 N.H.t6. IBoT I 8 N.H.8. KBo VII 37 —9. KBo VIII 117 N.H.10. KBo IX 132 N.H.11. KBo XI 73 N.H.12. KBo XVII 101 —653. Fragments naming the LÚ.MEŠ UR.GI₇1. KUB X 65 —2. KUB X 66 —

654. Fragments naming the People of Kurustama

1. KBo X 9 N.H.2. KBo X 11 —3. KBo XIII 137 —4. KBo XIII 175 M.H.?

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.
- t659. 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'
t5. KUB XI 8 + 9 N.H.
662. Offerings for Local Cults
7. KUB XLIII 29 O.H. (V) (?) MH?
665. Fragments naming the LÚ.MEŠ ašušala-
1.A. KBo XX 20 + ABoT 35 + KBo XVII 36 O.H. (S) (M)
B. KBo XX 22(+)XVII 33(+)XX 6 O.H. (S)
2. KBo XVII 12, 45 O.H. (V) (M)
~~KBo XX 17 M.H.?~~
669. Large Fragments of Festivals
2.A. KUB X 21 (+)? KBo XI 16 N.H.
B. IBoT III 59 —
3.A. 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 M.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; XX 1, 11, 13, 18, 19, 25, 37, 50;

XXI 68

(KUB XXVIII 97; XLIII 28, 31, 33) + XXXIX 64 (?)

KBo XII 31, 35, XX 20? MH?

N.H. mss. (most show only ta)KBo II 37; VII 42; XI 34; XIII 152, 164, 228; XX 40, 80, 81;

XXI 72, 84

HT 45; IBoT II 87; III 2, 19, 52, 54, 57, 63KUB IX 18; 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

t675. Fragments of Festivals in the hešta

All mss. N.H. or indeter.

676. Fragments of a Purification Ceremony

t1.A. IBoT II 121 —B. KUB XXVI 21 —2. KUB XXXI 57 N.H.

678: KBo XX 23 O.H. (N)(O)

t681. Festivals of Karahna

1. KUB XXV 32 + XXVIII 70 + [1628/u] N.H.682. Festival of 'all the ^dKAL'

All mss. N.H.

685: KBo XXI 89+ MH?

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

All mss. N.H. or indeter.

732. Ritual of Hutuši

All mss. N.H. or indeter.

733. Invocations of Hattic Deities (K)

II. Hittite versions

1. KUB VIII 41 O.H. (S)
2. KUB XXXI 143 O.H. (S) (O)
3. KUB XXXI 143a + VBOT 124 O.H. (S)
4. 205/s + 451/t + 519/t] (S) (N) *KBo XXV 112*
6. KUB XLIII 27 O.H. (V) (N)
7. 428/b + 282/t] O.H. (S) (N) *KBo XXV 122*

738. Festivals of Tetešhahi

- 2.C. KBo XXI 90 M.H. ✓ + *KA 46, 26 MH?*

All other mss. N.H. or indeter. (several possibly M.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 O.H. (S)
- B. KBo XVII 42 (= A I 14-16) —
- C. KBo XVII 18 (= A I 1-14) O.H. (S) (V) (O)
- D. KBo XVII 44 + VII 35 + XVII 99 (I 10 = A I 5) *m.H. (N)* O.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.

751. KUB XXXV 165 (N) (O.H.)

752. Ritual and Myth (Palaic and Hittite)

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

M.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) (?) maybe N.H.

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) joins CTH 416 XVII 34

Unnumbered

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

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

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

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.* 3f.

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} Zalpuwa. The manuscript seems at least Middle Hittite, if not older: note the forms of URU, LI, 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 archaisms 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] š-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 š-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 -šmuš (Vs 17).

211. The fragment KUB XXVI 83 names Pala and Hass[uwa]. 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 Inandık tablet, published by Balkan (1973), definitely has Old Hittite ductus, but the text is entirely in Akkadian (unlike most of these documents).

264. Despite considerable modernization, the text still shows enough archaisms to firmly establish Old Hittite composition (all from copy A, KUB XIII 4): I 34 mān-ma-šta, II 49 LUGAL-an āška, III 19.46 kīša, III 31.IV 32.33.54 takku, III 77 ari-šši, III 81 araš-kiš, IV 9 ienzi, IV 65.75 pidi-(e)šši 'in its place/stead', IV 67 ZI-aš-šaš (pl. reference!). Compare Carruba, Or 40(1971)212 with note 5.

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 ū-wi-te-na-aš III 1 etc. and ū-wi-ta-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 appa (l. 6),

iez[zi] (1. 27), uiezzi (1. 32), mēmai (1. 12) and našma-šše-šta (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, StBoT 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 Illuyanka myth is surely Old Hittite (see Kammenhuber, ZA 66(1976)70). Along with several archaisms which are also Middle Hittite, the text shows n-e (N.Pl.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^u 7, piyet A I 16, ^dTelipinu (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 mugawar 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 VBoT 58 (323.2) and the Telipinu myth. One manuscript, KUB XLIII 25 (336.5.C), actually shows the 'typisch alten Duktus' (Riemschneider, KUB XLIII Vorw. p. V note 2). Some versions undoubtedly date from Middle Hittite (e.g. 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. 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., KUB XXXIII 2, shows older E, KI, LI, DA, IT, ŠAR, AK, AḪ, URU, DU and IK. KUB XXXIII 1 is a small fragment, but note the forms of KI, LI, AḪ and especially DA. In KUB XXXIII 3 note TAR, ŠAR, LI, E, IT, DU, IK, DA, KA, AK and ḪAR; in KUB XXXIII 5 IT, DA, LI, IK, TIM, KI, KA, AḪ and TAR; in KUB XXXIII 6(+)7 AḪ, TAR, LI, IT, KI, E, UK and DU. Both the latter manuscripts also use the newer form of E, but this variant is already Middle Hittite (see KBo XVI 47, Column V, StBoT 20). KUB XXXIII 10 has older ḪAR, AḪ, 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, AḪ, DU, URU, KA, AK and IT (1x) along with newer DA, IT, E, UK, AḪ and AZ. None of the latter argue against a Middle Hittite manuscript. KUB XLI 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, StBoT 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 ḪAR, KA, DA, IT, AḪ, 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 AH, HAR, KI and AK.

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

333.B. 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 PHG 2 the newer MAH (ll. 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 (nu, šu 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 -e (lx), acc.pl. of the same in

-uš (lx), frequent enclitic possessives, -(a)pa and ta in the combination t-uš.

370. KBo XII 81 has natta (lines 3 and 5), iet (l. 6) and probably [lū-mu (l. 5). KUB XLIII 36 is definitely an Old Hittite text: KUR-e-pa (l. 2), n-at-apa (l. 5), š-e-pa (l. 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. Oettinger, 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 Kantuzzili version see Carruba, Or 40(1971)222. Not surprisingly, it is KUB XXX 10 which preserves more archaisms: katti-ši Vs 4, natta Vs 10.13.14.16.18, tuikkam-man Vs 14, mān-man Vs 18.22; -apa Vs 20, n-e-zan Vs 25, LUGAL-an (gen.) Rs 22. KUB XXXI 127+ offers šuppalaṇn-a (gen.) I 43, katte-šši 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 AH, 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.

390. Evidence for Old Hittite composition in KUB VII 1:

I 6.15 ^dUTU-i (voc.), I 18 n-e, II 19 šuhha (dir.), II 2 iezzi, enclitic possessives passim. See also KBo III 8 II 16 n-aš-ši-pa, II 24 iyawani.

395. Evidence for Old Hittite: 1.A. II 4 ^dUTU-e EN-mit (voc.), II 22 IGI-zian, II 24 natta, II 20 išpartiyezzi, III 5 -apa, III 9 hattešna (dir.); 1.C. IV 3 n-e-zzan; 3. Vs 4.8 nu-uk-kán. KBo XX 34 is undoubtedly Middle Hittite: older UK, DA, DU, Aš, IT, LI, URU beside newer E, IT, DA (see also Neu, IF 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 ienzi, I 23 zik-wa-z, I 46 NÍ.TE-aš-šiš (A.Pl. with plural reference!), I 69.II 66 nu-wa-z, II 9 NÍ.TE-ši, III 25 wemiezi. Nevertheless, all of these together are suggestive, and kēti I 26 definitely points back to Old Hittite.

402. For the reading of the name as ^fAlli see Otten, ZA 63 (1973)81. The copy listed by Rost, TH 2(1972)10, as I (KBo XXI 8) is a Middle Hittite manuscript: see Neu, IF 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 -apa (KUB XXIV 9 III 1, XXIV 9 III 16 + KBo XII 127 III 6) and the form n-e-z (passim) both argue for Old Hittite composition. Other archaisms would fit Middle Hittite as well: I 10 pira-šmit,

hulaliezzi passim, II 12 iet, II 16 piššiezzi, III 18 piran-ti<t>.

See also D I 16 iet.

412. Numbers 2 and 3 both show several archaisms. KUB VII 57+: II 11 ug-a (subj.), III 11 -tiš, III 14 n-an-ši-pa, III 14 -šet, III 19 -šaš, III 29 nu-pa, IV 15 kēnzan. KUB XII 63+: Vs 6 tiyeddu, Vs 9 nu-za-pa, Vs 10 nu-šše, Vs 18 n-at-še-pa, Vs 27 aška. KUB XII 63+ is apparently a Middle Hittite manuscript: older TAR, E, LI, AḪ, KI, ŠAR, MAḪ, DU, KA and AK beside newer E and DU. It also has a form of ŠAR 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 (Riemschneider, KUB XLIII Vorw., compares 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.MEŠ-nan ^dUTU-i (gen. + voc.) I 16. Note also KBo XVII 17 I 6 liptu.²⁹

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

429. Archaic features: 1. A I 25 piran-šit, I 34f ma-a-an-wa-[!]at-ši-pa, II 17 ētri-šmet; 2. Vs 12 andan-za-pa, Rs 4 [n]u-šmaš-apa.

434.5. See I 8 [-u]zziet, II 23 warhueštu and above all II 24 KUR-aš-šmaš-apa.

434.6. Note III 25 piyezzi, IV 9 katti-šši and most importantly II 17 kēdi. 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)8f and 107, and Neu, IF 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 -apa (II 16.III 58) and the spelling mēma-/mēmišk- (I 19.II 13.25.55) point to an Old Hittite original. Other features are ambiguous: I 13 kē (N.Pl.C.), I 16f -šeš, II 5.13.III 51.55 māḥhan, II 7.28 ēštu. The spelling ga-a-ša I 30 etc. is worthy of note.

450-451. Archaisms: KUB XXX 18+ IV 9, XXX 25+ Rs 27⁺, XXX 27 Vs 6 ta appāi; XXX 19+ IV 13 Ū.SAL-wa (dir.; cf. dupl. Ū.SAL-un!); XXX 15 Vs 29f -ši, -šiš, XXXIX 15 IV 1 [u]rkiš-tiš; XXX 24 II 4 uṣeddu; XXXIV 65 I 8, XXXIX 14 I 15.III 4.5 n-uš; 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 ta 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'. IBoT 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 Oettinger, op. cit. 128.

457.6. See I 11 n-apa and iyatar-mit, I 12 etc. takku.

458.9. Note I 8 mēna-ššet, I 9 ēšhar-šet, I 8.11.II 4.9.15 šu-wa, I 16 teta-ššet, I 15 š-at.

458.10. A II 7 iezzi, II 19 -(š)miš, II 18.20.23 šunan (gen.); B 5 tā.

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

458.12. A Vs 8 ta, Vs 11 takšul-šet; B Vs 11.13 -šet.

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 KÜ, E, URU, KA, KI, LI, TAR and ŠAR. Due to the nature of the texts linguistic archaisms are almost nil: 1.B I 16 šuni-šmi (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 Riemschneider, StBot 9(1970)7-8.

531. The fragment shows takku passim.

532.1.A. See tiyezzi 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 mān for 'if'. Note KUB VIII 22 II 1 tiyez[zi], III 3 kīša; VIII 16 III 8 happarnuwatar-šet.

536. KUB XXIX 9 shows takku passim. See also parni-šši ibid. I 8. KBo XIII 13 offers hattešša-šet Vs 3, [^{UZ}U] šarnummi-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 EGIR-šet, XXXIV 19 I 9 mummiez[zi], IV 5 lalu-ššet and IV 8 atta-ššin. KUB VIII 83 may be Middle Hittite: older AH, IK, E and TAR. Likewise KUB XIII 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 handi-šši, IV 4 [LUGAL]-wezi-šet, IV 10 šardiyaš-šaš, takku passim. The phonetic spelling iš-ha-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 paršenuš-šuš, V 1 [šak]uwa-šet.

544.1. takku passim.

549.b. Note Vs 10 waggariezzi, Vs 14 SAG-i-šši, Vs 16 ERIN.MEŠ-miš 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-z, t-aš, t-an, t-uš. KUB I 17 III 38 has ša-an, which in view of its isolation may be an error for

ta-an. Note in addition the following: KUB XXVII 69 II 21

tiyezzi and V 20 katti-(e)šš[i]; KUB I 17 II 9 tienzi; KUB II 13

I 12 É.ŠA-na (dir.); KBo XVII 88 + XX 67 III 12⁺.26.IV 26⁺ ēštu

and IV 29 araš-taš and araš-teš. The latter manuscript is Middle Hittite: older URU, DU, LI, E, TAR, IK, 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, t-at, t-aš-kan and t-ašta. See also KUB XX 28 I 2 [t]unnan¹kišna (dir.) and KBo XI 50 V 4 katti-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 É.ŠA-na and KUB X 17 I 17 tunnakkešna (dir.) plus X 17 II 27 -ši¹...EGIR-an-šamet.

595. Archaisms: KBo XI 49 I 9 irhi-šši, 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 dunnakkišna, I 10 tiyezzi, 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-z, t-aš, t-at, ta-kkan and t-ašta. See also KUB II 6 II 8 É.ŠA-na, 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)pa, enclitic possessives with nouns and prepositions, verbs in -iezzi, the genitive with postpositions, natta, and the enclitic 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, LI 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: IBOT II 89 V 5-6 LUGAL-waš tapuša.

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, enclitic possessives and the enclitic pronouns -e and -uš. Note in particular the archaic genitive construction in KBo X 31 IV 29-31: hūmandan ^{LÚ.MEŠ} hapiyan

unuwašhuš-šmuš 'the ornaments of all the h-men'.

630. Copy A (KUB XXXII 135+) is Middle Hittite: older ZU, AH, E, TAR, LI, URU, IK, KÙ, KA, DU, IT, DA, ŠAR and AK beside newer DU. There are also several features in A pointing to an older composition: (KUB XXXII 135) I 2 māhhan, (KBo XXI 85) Iⁿ 14.15. IVⁿ 33 etc. n-uš, IVⁿ 20 tunnakkišna, IVⁿ 40 tiyezzi, IVⁿ 41 pēda-ššimet, IVⁿ 50 ienzi. Note also A I 3.10 med.-pass. tētha versus the Neo-Hittite copy B I 3 [te]thai (see Neu, StBoT 5 (1968)80 and 98). KBo XX 70+ II 10 has ta-z, which combined with the above features argues for an Old Hittite composition.

631. For the dating of the manuscripts 1.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-kkan waki (contra Neu, StBoT 12 (1970)61; corrected in Fest. Otten 240). In KUB XXXIV 120,6 = XLIV 36 II 14 note the genitive [(p)ē]tann-a. KUB XLIV 36 also has t-ašta (II 9 and 13ⁿ). IBoT III 140,1 offers u-en-z[i], but the connection with this ritual is not assured. KBo XX 61 III 5 has an instance of -apa. The other manuscripts listed under CTH 631 have been omitted, since they lack direct evidence for Old Hittite.

633. Archaisms: Vs 26 āga, Vs 35 t-aš, Vs 39 ienzi, Vs 50 parna, Vs 53 piran-šet, Rs 16.18.23.42 ta, Rs 24 ē.šā-na.

634. This text employs ta alone and in combination: t-ašta, ta-z, ta-šši, t-en. See also KUB XX 76 I 8 tienzi, IV 8 tiyezzi; KBo XI 52 I 11 [EG]IR-an-šamet and VI 20 ē.šā-na.

635. These fragments show ta in various combinations:

t-ašta, ta-kkan, ta-z, t-aš, t-at, t-uš. Note also KUB XX 96 IV 11 šunaš hanza-te[t] and IV 14 šunaš hanza-ttit; KBo XVI 49 I 12 tiyezzi; KBo XVII 100 I 6 katti-šši and I 9 tienzi.

636.1. I 6 ta-ššan, I 19 t-aš.

636.2. II 13 iezzi, II 18 tapūša, 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 piran. See also KBo XVII 40 IV 6 n-uš, IV 8 katti-šši and IV 14 tiyezzi; KBo XVII 15 Rs 7 t-uš, Rs 18 nat[ta]; KUB XLIII 30 II 16 tiezzi and katti-šši passim.

646.3. See II 9 É.ŠA-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, AḪ, IT, DA, E, IK and KA. It also contains the archaisms t-e-šta (II 6.7) and uenzi (III 12.15). For the inclusion of KUB XLIII 48 see uenzi (l. 4), pēran (l. 7) and āppan (l. 8).

650.3. Vs 3.8.12 ta-, Vs 9.19 ZAG-na (dir.), Vs 6 haršani-šmi, Vs 15 meni-(e)šmit.

650.8. Vs 6 t-uš-zan, 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-kkan, Rs 25 tiyezzi.

650.12. III 11 É.ŠA-na, III 14.IV 15 ta, III 20 [pi]ran-šet.

653.1. IV 3 t-aš tiezzi.

653.2. I 11 t-ašta, VI 5 pēda-ššit, VI 6 t-aš tiyezzi.

654. KBo X 9 has Vs 7 [pi]ra-ššet, Vs 14 n-uš, Vs 15 É.ŠA-na, Rs 9 ištanana (dir.). KBo X 11 shows n-e-ššan (I 2) and tiyizzi (I 7). In KBo XIII 137 note īD-pa (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 šunnaš parna and Vs 3.5 āppa.

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

656.3. II 7 t-uš-šta.

657. Besides I 5 ta and I 4 katti-šmi, the phrase hantezzi UD-at (I 6) deserves attention. The endless locative šiwat 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 šiwat 'on the next day' (cf. the Neo-Hittite dupl. C₃ Vs 7 UD.KAM-ti); KBo XII 18 Vs 5 (Zalpa) kuwāpit UD-at 'on the day when'; KUB 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 É.ŠA-na, VI 2 paššaš tapuša.

665. KBo XX 17 may be Middle Hittite: older ZU, E, TAR, URU, KI, 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

peššiezzi.

669.3.A. I 14 EGIR-an-šamet.

669.7. IV 11 tiye[zzi].

669.9.A. III 10 mān-apa; B III 29 É.ŠĀ-na; D VI 14 t-uš.

669.11. V 2 KĀ.GAL-na.

669.14.A. III 10 tiyezzi.

669.19. I 26 É.ŠĀ-na, I 36.V 35 t-uš.

669.20. lines 7 and 9 t-uš.

669.22.A. V 5 šu-kan, VI 12 kiššari-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 tapuša.

676.2. I 17 t-uš.

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 piran.

725. Archaisms: KUB II 2 II 39 ta, III 9 labarnai, III 17 t-[a]š, III 18 iet. 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]štappulli-šet; KUB XXVIII 82 I 1 iezzi; KUB IX 11 I 14 ta; KUB XLI 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 -uš and natta. KBo XXI 90 is a Middle Hittite manuscript: older URU, E, DA, KI, TAR, AK, HAR, ŠAR, 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 -šše (Vs 14.19). Note also the spelling qa-a-aš (Rs 52.54).

739.1. II 19.III 11 t-ašta.

739.2. line 4 takku, line 6 LUGAL-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-aš; KBo XX 39 RCol 9 t-aš. KBo XX 39 may be Middle Hittite (see Otten, KBo XX Vorw.: 'Ältlichem Duktus').

752. KBo VIII 74+ is surely Middle Hittite: older TAR, AK, LI, E, KI, URU, AḪ, DU and ZU (see also Carruba, StBoT 10,6: 'Ältlich').

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

820. For the inclusion of KBo XVI 86 see I 6 š-uš. KBo XXI 22 is a Middle Hittite manuscript: older AḪ, DU, KI, E, KA, TAR, IT, LI and AK beside newer IT. In addition to ēštu (Vs 15.17), māḫhan

(Rs 36⁺.41) and karpiyemi (Vs 18.19), it shows n-apa (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, ZDMG Supp. I,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. (0) ✓

41+131. Treaty with Sunassura (J)

II. Hittite

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

B. KUB VIII 81 + KBo XIX 39 M.H. ✓

133. Treaty of Arnuwanda with Išmerika (J)

KUB XXVI 41(+)XXIII 68 + ABOT 58 N.H. *M.H. (?)*

134. Treaty with Kurustama (J) (0)

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. (O) ✓
 B. KUB XL 36 + XXIII 78b + XXVI 6 M.H. (?)
 C. KBo XVI 29(+) KUB 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 M.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 Ašmunikal (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 Ašmunikal for the Guards of the Tombs (J)
KUB XIII 8 N.H.
257. Instructions of Arnuwanda for the hazannu (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. *maybe*

260. Instructions for the ^{LÚ.MEŠ}DUGUD (J)

All mss. N.H.

261. Instructions for the bel madgalti (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 (+) KBo XIX 58 M.H. (?)

270. Oath of Ashapala (J)

KBo XVI 50 M.H. ✓

271. Protocols of Succession (J)

All mss. M.H. ✓

275. Fragments of Protocols (or Treaties)

KUB XXXIV 58 — (J) *+ XXIV 76 MH?*KUB XXXI 103 M.H. (J) (?) *listed twice*

284. Treatise of Kikkuli

1st Tab. KUB I 13 + II 12c + KBo VIII 48+53 + KUB II 12b N.H.?2nd Tab. KBo III 5 + IBOT II 136 N.H.?3rd Tab. A. KUB I 11 + XXIX 57 N.H.?B. KUB XXIX 47 —4th Tab. KBo III 2 N.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.? *MH?*2. KUB XXIX 41 — *MH?*

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 XXIII 79 N.H.

370. Mythological Fragments

KUB XXXIV 49 M.H.?KBo XX 59 M.H. ✓

375. Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal (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 Anniwiyani

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 8f 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.3rd Version: KUB XXXIV 82 + [717/c + 731/c] M.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 ^dKAL ^{KUŠ}kuršaš1. 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 ^dMAH.MEŠ and ^dGulšeš1. 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.

448. KUB XIII 41 MH?

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 —

470. KUB XVI 35 MH?

471. Ritual of Ammihatna

A. KBo V 2 N.H.

[B. 1/a]

C. KBo XXII 136 —

D. KUB XLV 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 ^dMAH.MEŠ and ^dGulkeš from the Roads'

Mss. N.H. or indeter.

485. Same Ritual for Tešub, Hebat et al.
Mss. N.H. or indeter.
628. (H)išuwa 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 Šahhan
A. KBo XIV 89 + XX 112 —
B. KBo XX 68 M.H.
694. 11130 ~~XX~~ 48 MH?
699. Festival for Tešub 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 N.H.
3. KBo XXIII 12 M.H.
710. Festival for Ištar of Samuha
KUB XXXII 130 M.H.?
711. Autumn Festival for Ištar of Samuha
A. KBo XI 28 N.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 Taminina
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 dupaduparsa
2. KUB IX 6 + XXXV 39 N.H.
760. Ritual of the ^{SAL}SU.GI
2. KUB IX 4 N.H.
777. Ritual 'aiš Suppiyahhuwar'
1.A. IBOT 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. ✓ + HB VII 19 MH?

832. Fragments

KBo XVI 31 M.H. (J) ✓KBo XVI 45 M.H. ✓XVI 23 MH?

Notes on the Middle Hittite Corpus

28. The manuscript is Middle Hittite: see Column V of Rüster, StBoT 20(1972). The discussion of Kammenhuber, Or 39(1970)554f, including the evaluation of the enclitic pronoun -uš, must be rejected.

41+131. For the combination of these two texts into one see Meyer, MIO 1(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. Akk. (1976)71-72). For KUB VIII 81+ as a Middle Hittite manuscript see Otten apud Rüster, StBoT 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, StBoT 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.

	<u>KUB XVII 21</u>	<u>KUB XXVI 41+</u>	<u>KBo XIII 58</u>	<u>KUB XXIV 3</u>
TAR	—	newer/older	newer	older/newer
TIM	older	newer	—	older
AK	older	newer	newer	older/newer
IK	older	older/newer	newer	older
AZ	newer	newer	older	newer
ZU	—	newer	newer	newer
DU	older	newer	newer	older
KA	older	newer/older	newer	older
E	older	newer	newer	newer
DA	older	newer	newer	newer
URU	older	older/newer	newer	older
KI	older	newer	newer	newer
LI	older	older	older	older
ŠAR	older	newer	—	older
HA	older	older	older/newer	older

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 HA (with one Winkelhaken) strongly suggests that we have a 13th-century manuscript (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, KI, 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, AH, KA, ŠAR, DU, IK and AZ beside newer E and DU. KUB XL 36+: older LI, AH, DU, URU, HAR, IT, E, ŠAR, TAR, KA and IK beside newer DU. KBo XVI 29+: older AH, HAR, 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 Laroche 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 uk^m Tuthali[yaš...]. 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: ammug-a-kan^m A[rnuwanda-]. 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: Vs 8 tapaššiyet, Rs 6 aršanieše.

200. The manuscript is Middle Hittite: older KA, Aḫ, E, IK, LI, AK, IK and URU beside newer E. Note also Vs 5 māḫhan.

209. KBo XII 62 is probably Middle Hittite: older AK, DU, E, UK and KA. Note the spelling māḫhan (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, KÜ, 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, Aḫ, DA, DU, IT, E and HAR 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.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 ištamaštani; KBo XIX 58, 11 [šume]nzan, 5 [išt]amaštani, 6 [te]kkuššanuttani. 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. KUB XXXI 103 is a Middle Hittite manuscript, according to Güterbock 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, Hipp. 316-317, cannot be upheld. In particular, her criteria for dating the 'third' training text (CTH 286) to the 13th century are invalid. As to the first, the spread of verbal stems in -iya-, see Carruba, Or 40(1971)219-220. Note also that KBo VI 2, the oldest version of the Laws, already has 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)ye- (> -iya-) must have begun quite early in Hittite, and the presence of deverbative stems in -iya- does not establish a text as late. Kammenhuber's second criterion, the writing of two preverbs 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 ienzi.

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-eš-ša-i. The Kikkuli text does preserve some older features: KUB I 13 I 12 huittiezzi, KBo III 5 IV 28 tūriezi, and tiye(z)zi passim; KUB I 11 IV 23 parkuwatar-šet, KBo III 2 Rs 26 pargatar-šet and palhatar-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 LIKUB XXIX 40: older ŠAR, IK, DA, IT, AḪ, E, TAR, KA beside
newer DUKUB XXIX 46+: older DA, IT, TIM, LI, AḪ, TAR, E and IKKUB XXIX 52+: older E, TIM, IT, TAR, DA, IK, AḪ and ŠAR
beside newer DUKUB XXIX 51+: older TIM, DA, AḪ, IT, IK, E and LI beside
newer DUKUB XXIX 50: older IK, ŠAR, LI, DA, TAR, E and IT beside
newer E and DUKBo VIII 52+: older TAR, DA, E, ŠAR, IK and KA beside newer
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 -aš 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-aš/n-uš. 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-aš/n-uš is necessarily later than one which shows only n-uš.

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: daššuš-a-šši

^dAnuš DINGIR.MEŠ-aš hantezziyaš-šmeš piran-še[t]/ arta '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 hantezziyaš and the enclitic possessive with piran.

I suggest that the text also contains two instances of the rare particle -an. The clearer is I 18-19: 9-ti-an MU-ti ^dAnuš/ Kumarbi menahhanta zabhain paiš 'in the ninth year Anu gave battle against Kumarbi'. The sequence 9-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 cooccurs 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 9-ti-an^{II} in I 12, versus Eichner, Anat. Zahlw. 56: 9?-ti-ma?. The number 9 is assured by the 9 MU.HI.A-aš in both I 12 and 18.

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 consideration 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 ^dMukišanu KUB XII 65 III 18, ^dKumarbi KUB XXXIII 109+94 I 5 and išhā-mi KBo XIX 112,9; n-uš KUB VIII 67 IV 12 and nahmi-uš KUB VIII 65 I 33; ŠU-ši KUB XXXIII 109+ I 3 and ^{GIŠ}ŠU.A-ši KUB XII 65 III 13; ^{GIŠ}ŠU.A-z-ašta KUB XXXIII 84+ IV 26.

351.2. See uštu II 12f and hattatar-šamit II 41f. The manuscript may be Middle Hittite: older E, TAR, LI, DU, IK, AK and ŠAR beside newer KI (1x).

364. Archaisms: KUB XXXIII 91 I 6 IGI.HI.A-wa-šet; KUB XXXVI 18 II 7 KUBABBAR-anti (voc.), II 8 ug-an-ta (subj.), II 9 attaš-š[īš]; KUB XVII 4,4 KUBABBAR-ya (voc.), 8 parna-šša.

365. Note Vs 11 kīšati and Rs 11 [k]īša, Vs 15 attaš-šiš and Rs 15 ienzi. See also the reference to the SISKUR ŠA ^{ID}Māla performed by karuiliēš LUGAL.MEŠ in the Annals of Mursili: KUB XIV 8 Vs 9f.

370. KUB XXXIV 49 has walahtani (Vs 3) and is probably a

Middle Hittite manuscript: older AH, E, KI, URU, KA, IK and LI.
In KBo XX 59 note kīšat (l. 19) and the older forms of LI, E, DA, KA, IT, KÙ 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 ^dAlawaimi (voc.), II 34 hūlaliyezzi, III 37 katti-šši, III 67 parna āppa.

393. VBoT 24 offers ienzi I 8.IV 27, paiwani I 33, and most significantly in IV 2: kē-z (nom. pl. comm. plus particle -za).

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

400-401. Archaisms: KUB XXX 35 I 8 wappu-mit¹ (voc.); XXX 34 III 7 apē (nom. pl. comm.), III 10 wetena (dir.), III 14 peššit, and IV 10-12.24 n-uš; XXX 36 II 8.13 wēš.

403. In KUB XXXIII 70 note the following forms: III 11 n-uš, III 13 āppa wappuwa (dir.), III 14 ginuwaš-taš, III 18 iet, III 19 iezi. The spelling taitta (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 parna, I 11 kinuwaš-šaš, I 25 katti-tti, II 12 išši-šši, IV 3 tuekki-šši, IV 3.4.9 katti-šši.

415. KBo XV 24 II 15 and 29 have partauwar-še[t] and -šit. KUB XXXII 137 II 19 offers [] -i-e-ez-zi and II 2.19⁺ pētanti (vocative of the animate stem pēdant- from pēda- 'place'; cf. II 8).

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

426. Archaisms: KUB VII 58 I 6 LÚ-natar-tet, I 7 zahhaiš-(š)miš, I 11 išhunāu-šmet, I 10 karūššiddu (= KUB XLV 20 I 24 karuššieddu); KUB XLV 20 I 10.11 uddār-tet; KUB XVII 28 IV 56 ienzi.

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 šēr, Vs 18 nu-še-šta, Vs 22 ginuwaš-šaš, Rs 5 ieddu, Rs 14 zašgari-šši.

433. KUB XXXVI 83, listed here as number 2 by Laroche, makes no mention of the ^dKAL 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 ēška, II 3 šūniezzi, II 4 ienzi, II 28 iezzi, II 30 PŪ-i-šmi, II 33 PŪ-ia¹-šmi, II 40 peššiezzi, II 41 KaxU-i-šmi, III 31 tiendu; KBo XX 107 II 23 piyewen, III 21 parna, IV 7 tienzi. KBo XX 107+ may be Middle Hittite: older AK, KI, 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 -šet, II 33 UH_x-naš uddār-šet, II 35-36 GÜB-la, ZAG-na (dir.); KUB XXXIII 76,8 miyēštu, 21 ēšt[u].

435.1. II 8 -šemet, II 13 šuhha (dir.), II 24 iezzi, II 25 tiyet, II 17.28.34 ^dUTU-i (voc.), II 17.34 išha (voc.).

442. The text is Middle Hittite or older (all citations from copy A): I 14 pūriyaš-šaš, I 17 ipulli-šet, I 21.22 piran-šet, pira(š)-šet, II 7.15.IV 19 happina (dir.), IV 7 tuikki-šši, IV 14 šer-šet.

446. Archaisms: KUB VII 41 I 3 uttar-šet, I 10 daškiuwani, I 16 aniyet, IV 11 gimr[a] (dir.), IV 13 pira-šmit (= B IV 46 piran-mit¹); B I 52 uttar-tet, II 19.20 n-uš, II 24 katti-(e)šši, III 26 ^dApi (voc.); C II 2 ^{GIŠ}ŠU.A-za-te[t], II 41 ienzi; E Vs 5 a-ni-e-az¹-zi, Rs 7 n-e-z. The last form points to Old Hittite, but its antecedent is singular (apāt wātar), 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.³² 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, StBoT 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 KUB VII 41, which was the starting point of this discussion. KUB XLIII 29, which has 'alten Duktus' according to Riemschneider, KUB 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 KUB 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 ŠAR 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, LAM 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 ŠAR is shown to occur consistently in isolation among older signs.

447. In copy A note II 22 uiēš, in copy B III 26 uiēš, III 12 īD-pa and III 15 kīšaru. A II 32 may have a genitive in -an: UZU ginuwa(š)-šan.

458.2. II 48 pēdi-(e)šši, II 56 ^dUTU-i (voc.), II 56.57 šā-ta, III 23.24.36 ienzi, III 27.29 iškiša (dir.).

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

471. In A note I 8 tuēkki-šši, I 40 pēdi-šši, II 5.III 19.23 iēzzi, IV 25.28.42 tiyēzzi, IV 4.5 n-uš (latter = D III 13), IV 45.46 iššai; see also D III 8 [šiyēzzi, III 12 iezi.

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

480. The text attests the spellings ēštu (Vs 6.Rs 56) and māhhan (10x vs. mahhan 1x). See also tiyezi (Vs 1.48), ienzi (8x),

tuekki-šši (Rs 38.48), aršiezzi (Rs 51). The manuscript is undoubtedly Middle Hittite: older E, AK, AḪ, KI, ḪAR, DU, ŠAR, TAR, IK, ZU, KÙ 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 tiyezz[i], II 13-15.37⁺.IV 33⁺ šumenzan, IV 31 huiittiyanniškiuwani, IV 32 n-uš; PHG 4,11 uiezz[i]; (484) KUB XV 31 I 12.21.II 35.69 ienzi, I 15.II 11.44.III 58 tienzi, I 41 šumenzan, III 28.54.IV 10⁺ tiyezzi; XV 32 I 44 šumenzan, I 50 huiittiyaneškiuwani, I 51 talleškiuwani and mukišgaweni, I 52 pešgaweni, III 13 iezzi, IV 37 ienzi; (485) IBoT III 148 III 13 šubha (dir.). KUB XV 31 I 6 also has an apparent instance of the particle -apa in the rare spelling -ap (see Haas-Wilhelm, AOATS 3 (1974)170). This is the only occurrence of -apa in the Kizzuwatnian rituals, and other Old Hittite features are equally rare or lacking entirely. I therefore consider the single instance of -apa too slim a basis for attributing this text to Old Hittite. See the discussion below under CTH 628.

KUB XV 34 is probably a Middle Hittite manuscript: older KI, TAR, LI, ŠAR, 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 piran-šit; KUB XXV 49 II 31

ienz[i]; VBoT 116,13 ien[zi]. This is also the only text with Kizzuwatnian connections which shows the conjunction ta:

KUB XXXII 128 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 indisputably 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)išwa 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 Zidanza 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 Šumenzan survived into early Neo-Hittite (Suppiluliuma I). Third, given that the Hittites could adapt a hymn to the male Sun-god (CTH 372) into one for the Sun-goddess of Arinna (CTH 376), it is quite possible that texts like the Hišuwā 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 n-uš IV 10 and 17.

662.6. Note I 7 pattiyata-šēet, I 10 ienzi-m-uš, I 15 iezzi, I 17.19 ienzi. The manuscript may be Middle Hittite: older AK, E, LI, KI, URU, IK, KA, KÜ and ŠAR. Kammenhuber, Or 39(1970)560, argues that this text goes back to Old Hittite. This is quite possible, but neither the enclitic possessive nor the -uš is certain proof for Old Hittite.

683.1. For a transliteration of this text see Otten, Fest. Friedrich(1959)351f. See I 10 n-uš and LkRd 7 [i]lenzi.

693. Copy A shows tiyezzi I 21, n-uš-kan I 5, and iezi 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 piran-šit, II 18.24 ienzi, II 28 n-uš, III 40⁺.41⁺.IV 11 ienteš.

701. KBo XXI 33 + KUB 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 šēr(a)-ššan, IV 30-31.33 hantezziya UD-at (see above Sec. 2.3 under CTH 657), IV 31 šunnit; KUB XXXII 49 III 8 partauwar-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 appa, IV 15 šēr(a)-ššan, IV 22 piššiyezzi.

710. The arguments of Danmanville, RHA 59(1956)40-41, for attributing this text to Mursili 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 piyemi, Vs 13.28.30 katti-mi, Rs 19 iemi, Rs 22.23 Eppa, Rs 26 SISKUR.SISKUR-az (particle -za), LdRd 33 n-uš. Since the Hittite word for 'bird' appears to be common gender, the kē of LdRd 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, ŠAR, E, LI and AḪ beside newer DU and AḪ.

711-716. Several of these texts show isolated examples of ta, but no other Old Hittite features are present in the Ištār 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-ašta.

712. A I 37.IV 45 ta, III 9.10.16 t-ašta.

713. Archaisms: A I 3.IV 19 šēr, I 4 hantezziyaš (nom. sg.),
I 3.IV 20 iezzi; B III 4 peššizzi.

714.2. V 3 ta-ššan, V 7 kalutiyezzi.

716. KBo II 9 I 29 has an instance of n-uš. See also KBo
XXI 48 Vs 9 appa, Vs 15 araš-taš.

757. Note HT 1 I 29 katti-ti-ma-tta; KUB IX 31 I 6
[ištappu]lli-ššit, I 7 hazziu[l]-šet, I 14 šiyez; KUB XXXV 10
I 9 hariezz[i].

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

760.2. I 22 ĠR-an (gen.), III 14 URU-an (gen.), III 37
Ni.TE-aš-taš. The text could go back to Old Hittite.

777. Archaisms: IBoT II 39 Rs 23.31 iezzi; KUB XXIX 8 I 7
tiyezzi, I 1 māhhan, I 53 ti-i-e-azⁱ-zi, II 9.11 šiyezzi; KBo
XXI 24 IV 12 waššiezzi, KUB XXXII 29 I 2 ienzi, I 15 tiyezzi.

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

780. KUB XXXIV 13 offers these archaic forms: III 9 tiyezi,
III 8 ZAG-na (dir.), III 11 paddani-ši, III 15 n-an-ši-pa. KBo
XII 85 II 20 has Ni.TE-i-šši (with pl. reference!). Note also

KUB XXVII 29 I 27 šamešiezzi. KBo XXIII 23 contains several more examples: Vs 24.28 tiyezzi, Vs 29 šehuriezzi[i], Rs 58 šeknui-šši, Rs 59 id-a, Rs 62 āška. The isolated occurrence of -apa in a Hurro-Hittite text presents the same problem as the two instances of ta in the Hišuwā 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: ABOT 49 Vs 6 [w]ōš and B Rs 10 a-aš-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.), KUB XVII 21 I 11 (CTH 375; M.H. text and ms.), XXIII 77,53 (Gasga Treaty; M.H. text and ms.), XIV 1 Vs 49f (Madduwatta) 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 tamēt[a]. 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-aš nakki-šet, but this archaic genitive construction is also attested in Middle Hittite. The relevance of the rare spellings ta-a-aš and ta-aš (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 [š]arniktu and Rs 8 pēra--šša[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-aš-tiš.

341. The text contains a couple of vocatives: KUB VIII 62 IV 11 ^dUllu and VIII 48 I 3 [š]EŠ-ni-mi.

343. One finds a few enclitic possessives and vocatives:

KUB XXXVI 2 III 42 ^dNara ŠEŠ-[m]i, XXXIII 114 I 2 ŠEŠ-ni-mi,
XXXIII 112 IV 12 [udd]ār-mit.

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

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

361. KUB XXXIII 121 II 11 has EGIR-an-šet.

370. In KUB XXXIV 63 one should consider line 15 [lanni-šmi and line 7 DINGIR.MEŠ-nan DUMU.MEŠ (gen. in --an?).

385.2 and 4. KUB XXIV 6 has apē (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-za. 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 araš-šaš, III 10.16 ienzi.

449. Several of these fragments show linguistic archaisms, but none are compelling evidence for an older composition: KUB XII 50,7 šēri-šet, 12 pidi-šši; KUB XXXIX 99 Vs 16 šumenzan; XXXIX 101 I 9 happina (dir.), II 11 paršিয়েzzi; IBot II 125 II 7 hāriezzi; KBo XVII 94 III 21 karizzi, III 24 ārriyezzi; XVII 95 II 6.10 iezzi, III 6 tiyezzi.

456.6. KBo XXI 14: Vs 26 hubbiš-šeš, Rs x i-iz-zi.

457.1 and 3. KUB XVII 8 shows kappuwizzi (IV 2), nepiša (IV 7.19), tiyet (IV 20); KUB XII 43,4 has šumenzan.

461. In KUB XLIV 61 note the spelling antuhše (IV 7.19).
KBo XXI 74,12 offers tiyezzi, and KBo XXI 17,6 wemiyezzi.

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

479.1. Note I 8 ienzi, I 19 tuikki-šši, I 4.47.50 apē (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-šši, Vs 11 peššizzi. Note the 'mixed' spelling in the
duplicate KUB XLIV 59 Rs 8: i-en-an-zi.

493. Oettinger, StBoT 22(1976)93, declares the text Neo-
Hittite, but šumenzan (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-ta-ri (Rs 23
and 24) may also be relevant for dating the text and/or manuscript.

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

647.5. In KUB XX 88 note not only tiyezzi (I 13) but also
the phonetic spelling kišširan (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^{LIM}-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 Muwatalli 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 SAL AMA.DINGIR LIM
- 378. Plague Prayers
- 379. Prayer to All the Gods
- 380. Prayer to Lelwani
- 486. Aphasia of Mursili

Muwatalli

- 76. Treaty with Alaksandu
- 171. Letter of Muwatalli to Adadnirari I
- 381. Prayer to ^dU viḫassassi
- 382. 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 Mittannamuwa
- 88. Decree concerning the ^{NA4}ḫekur Pirwa
- 89. Decree concerning Tiliura
- 90. Fragments concerning Nerik
- 96. Declaration of KAL ^dU-assa

- 97. Treaty with KAL of ^dU-assa
- 98. Fragment naming Bentešina and Egypt
- 176. Letter of Puduhepa to the King of Alasiya
- 224. Royal Grant of Hattusili III to GAL-^dIŠKUR
- 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 Šaušgatti³⁴
- 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-aḫ-iddina et al.
- 225. Royal Grant to Sahurunuwa
- 255. Instructions for the ^{LÚ.MEŠ}SAG

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 30³⁵
- 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: mān-aš lahhaz-ma EGIR-pa uizzi '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 ablative 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 GE -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 instrumental in Donum nat. Sohrijnen(1929)367-68, in particular the relationship of the two cases to each other. The discussion was prompted by examples like the following:

Āarhuwantaz-šet 'from its belly' (Laws §90)

kallarit uddanaz huišnuddu 'shall preserve from the harmful word' (KBo IV 2 I 60)

kuēz ^{GIŠ₂} SUDUN-it tūriyanteš 'the yoke with which they are yoked' (KUB II 2 II 11-12)

kēt id-az // kēz id-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, *-šez) is attested.

2. On the other hand, in the relative pronoun kui- and the demonstrative kā- 'this' the ablative in -z 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/-et from an IE ablative in *-ēd, -az(a) from an IE ablative in *-ōd. 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, AM(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: etez ANA^m Pittapara 'in that direction, toward Pittapara' (see below p. 358). Sommer, HAB(1938)199f, presented further examples of ablatives functioning as instrumentals (including whole phrases, not just pronominal forms like kuēz 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 ablatives like hantezziyaz 'in front' with a substantive in the dative: e.g. ANA KÁ.GAL^{TI} hantezziyaz '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 parkui- 'pure, free from ___') and the ablative of cause (e.g. šullannaz '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 išpantaz 'at night'. The instrumental expresses means or instrument. 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 kiššaraz harzi and kunniš kiššarta 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 discussion, 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}harharan GĚSTIN-it 'a h.-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.

¹My data base comprises KUB through Volume XLVI, KBo through Volume XXIII, ABoT, IBoT, 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.

²The terms Old, Middle and Neo-Hittite are used here as express equivalents of the German Alt-, Mittel- and Junghethitisch as defined by Neu, StBoT 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).

³See among others Carruba, ZDMG Supp. I,1(1969)226-49; Kammenhuber, Or 38(1969)548-52 and KZ 83(1969)256-89; Otten, StBoT 11(1969); Houwink ten Cate, Records(1970); Kammenhuber, Or 39(1970)547-67, MSS 28(1970)51-69 and 29(1971)75-109; Kühne-Otten, StBoT 16(1971); Carruba, Or 40(1971)208-23.

⁴Compare 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.

⁵In 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.

⁶Compare the remarks of Carruba, Or 40(1971)210: 'Texte, die nicht "historisch" in engerem Sinn sind, habe ich nur dann gelegentlich 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 verwendet 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 Güterbock, 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.

⁷I 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 archaisms 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. I,1(1969)235, orthographic features such as scriptio 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 w and y has been cited as an archaic orthographic feature (see among others Neu-Rüster, StBoT 21(1975) 10). But me-mi-an is a common spelling for the acc. sg. of 'word' at all times, and the stem dapi(ya)- '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, CTH (1971), with the

revisions and additions of RHA 30(1972)[1975].

⁹Houwink ten Cate's citation, loc. cit., of me-e-ma-ú from KUB XXIV 4+ (his 283C) is misleading, since the actual spelling, KUB XXIV 4 Vs 11, is me-e-ma-a-ú, 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.

¹⁰Thus 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-Tešub Treaty (KBo IV 10 Rs 12) and the Alaksandu Treaty (KUB XXI 1+ III 74). In KBo IV 14 III 52 (Suppiluliuma II) -e- is functioning as nom. pl. comm. . In both functions the usual Neo-Hittite form is -at.

¹¹Kammenhuber, HdO 214 and 310f, states that the pronominal forms in -edi are late, but she offers no evidence for this claim. Nor does Otten, RHA 67(1960)124. The example a-pi-e-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, StBoT 18(1974)71f with note 106.

¹²Houwink ten Cate, op. cit. 9, states explicitly that his 'Group D' includes only the 'greater compositions' after the time of Suppiluliuma 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.

¹³Kammenhuber, KZ 83(1969)275, claims to have found wēš 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 wēš. The discussion of wēš seems an appropriate place to speak of the use of other independent personal pronouns, especially uk 'I' and ammuk 'me' (dat. and acc.). The use of the first person singular pronoun is crucial to Kammenhuber'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 Kammenhuber'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 ammuk in favor of uk. Kammenhuber 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 ammuk compare the use of both šumeš and šumaš 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, indisputable archaisms. No text has been dated to Old or Middle Hittite solely on the basis of uk 'I'.

¹⁴All 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.

¹⁵KUB XIII 4 IV 21 has ap-zi-an, which looks like a compromise of ap-pi-iz-zi-an and EGIR-zi-an, which is attested in IV 20.

¹⁶If 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.

¹⁷Since one could choose to read -ah- instead of -ih-, these examples are uncertain.

¹⁸As shown by examples like the third plural kappuenzi

(KBo VI 2 IV 20; Laws/O.H. ms.), the verb listed by Friedrich, HWb 99, as kappuwai- originally had a stem kappu(y)e-, which is probably still reflected in spellings like kappuizzi.

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

²⁰Houwink ten Cate, Records 17, cites aumani 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, StBoT 11(1969)34).

²¹I interpret LÚ SANGA-az as containing the particle -za (rather than as a nominative singular of šakkunniyant-) because of the context: LÚ SANGA-az kuedaš '(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.

²²The 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 kūš: Manapa-Datta IV 44, KUB XXI 1+ IV 33⁺ (Alaksandu), KBo IV 10 Rs 9.14 (Ulmi-Tešub).

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

²⁴Given 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. hūmmi (KUB XXXV 148 III 42) is not marked by a Glossenkeil.

²⁵For 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.

²⁶Obviously, 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 AH and HAR, 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'.

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

²⁸The use of the term d^{UTU}ŠI '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 d^{UTU}-mit 'my sun'.

²⁹Kammenhuber, Or 41(1972)293, makes the startling assertion that KBo XVII 17 is 'mit Sicherheit jung-hethitisch' 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, HAB 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 jung-hethitisch' are also indubitably Old Hittite: KBo XVII 24 (N.B. I 7 ta-kkan), XVII 32 (Vs 10 [n]atta, Vs 16 parna-ma, Vs 21 ēstu), XVII 36 (II 6 pēran tiyinzi, III 3 āppa, III 7 nu-kkan, III 8 hašša (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-rituale 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?

³⁰This 'mixed' spelling with both -va- and -e- 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-ve-(az)-zi. See below p. 107 on iš-eš-ša-i.

³¹Kammenhuber, MSS 28(1970)59, argues that the bel madgalti text can be no earlier than the era of Hattusili III because of the use of the sign KUR in the value MAD/T (see also Arier 81f and Hipp. 17 with note 65a). However, the very restriction of the value MAD/T to the word madgalti makes this feature unsuited for dating purposes, since it has effectively no distribution to test.

³²In the case of KI and ŠAR, '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).

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

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

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

³⁶However, 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) hila^Nmnaz-pat/ [^{A4}pērunaš paiwani

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

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

- (2) [DING]IR.DIDLI-š-a DUMU.MEŠ-uš A.AB.BA-az/ šarā dāir

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

KBo VI 2 II 51-52 (Laws/HG §48):

- (3) [kui]š-za ^{LÚ}hippari happar izzi n-aš-kan hāpparaz/ [šame]nzi

'Whoever concludes a transaction with a h-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.² More examples of each of these types are attested in Old Hittite manuscripts:³

Intransitive Motion Verbs:

pāi- 'go': KBo XX 8 Vs 9 arkīwaz.

uwa- 'come': KBo III 22 Vs 5⁺ URU-az, VII 14 Vs 15⁺ URU halpaz,
 ibid. Rs 3⁺ URU hattuaz, XVII 15 Vs 19 É mākziwaz.

Transitive Motion Verbs:

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

nēda- 'carry': KBo III 22 Vs 40⁺ [^{UR}U] nēšaz, ibid. Vs 42⁺
 [(^J)^{RU} z] alpuwaz.

dā- 'take': KBo VI 2 II 44 ^{GIŠ} BANŠUR-az, XVII 1 I 18-19⁺
iššaz-mit, ibid. II 24 kiššar[az-(net)], ibid. II 25
halmaššuittaz hašš[az], XVII 7 + IBoT III 135 IV 6-7
^{GIŠ} SÚ.A-kaz-mit [-mlit kartaz-mit / [tug] gaz-mit,⁴
 XX 12 I 17 [(^h)] halentiwaz.

taya- 'steal': KBo VI 2 I 42.45 IŠTU KUR Lūwaz.

uda- 'bring': KBo III 22 Rs 58⁺ KASKAL-z-a,⁵ XXII 1 Vs 13 É-az.

uwate- 'bring': KUB XLIII 23 Vs 5-6 tamētaz/ KUR-az.

Verbs Expressing Separation:

šamen- 'part, withdraw': KUB XXIX 29 Vs 7 kuššanaz (+ -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/CTH 820):

nu šer katt[a] nēpišza ^dI[ŠKUR]-aš LUGAL-i [āššu] / hūiswatar

(4) miyatar tar[h]uili ^{GIŠ} tūri niški[ddu] / katta-šarā-ma taknāz

šuhmiliš taranzip[a]š/ takmašš-a ^dUTU-uš ANA LUGAL ēššu
huišwatar tarhuili/ ^{GIŠ}tūri niškiddu

'Down from heaven above may the Storm-god give the king wealth, life, increase and a mighty weapon, but up from the earth below may the nurturing (?) Earth and the Sun-goddess of earth give the king wealth, life, etc..'⁶

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 pāi- 'give' to be any different from one with uda- 'bring' or the other transitive motion verbs listed above. Compare also the following:

KBo VI 2 II 40 (Laws/HC §47):

(5) luzzi natta karniyizzi IŠTU É ABI-ŠU-[(ma ka)rpianzi]

'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, HE I² § 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:

KEo III 22 Rs 78-79 (Anitta/StBoT 18,14):

- (6) mān tunnakišna-ma paizzi ap[(āš-a)]/ pēram-mit kunnaz ešari

'But when he goes into the inner room, that one will sit before me on the right.'⁷

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.

SEo I 4 = LSU 4 = 2064/g Vs 14-16 (Landgrant/MIO 6,362):

10 ka<punu> 12^{!!} IKU A.ŠA ŠA 5 [LÚ.MEŠ GIŠ^{GIŠ} TUKUL]/ NA⁴huwašiaz

- (7) anda NIDDI āpa-ma 10 kapunu 12 IKU A.[ŠA]/ NA⁴huwašiaz

arabza NIDDI[N]

'We have taken 10 k. and 12 I. of land belonging to five _____men inside of the huwaši-stone, but in return (āpa) we have given 10 k. and 12 I. of land outside of the h-stone.'

I follow Riemschneider, MIO 6(1958)362, note 147, in reading NIDDI[N] in line 16, but I cannot accept his translation 'from

the h-stone', *ibid.* 363 with note 152. His version requires among other things translating arahza MIDDIN as 'wir haben herausgenommen'. The verb nadānu means 'give', not 'take'. Furthermore, anda and arahza are in opposition along with the verbs NILQI and MIDDIN. 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 puwaši-stone' agrees with the second suggestion of Güterbock, *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. pašši tapuša 'to the side of the hearth'. One might ask why the present passage does not have ^{NA4}puwaši(va) anda/arahza. The reason is that the latter would mean '(physically) inside/outside the h-stone'. In our passage the ablative ^{NA4}puwašiaz shows that 'inside' and 'outside' are defined in reference to some other point, presumably the city mentioned previously. Thus 'inside from the h-stone' means in the direction toward the city, and 'outside from the h-stone' in the direction away from it. The same expression is repeated a few lines later in Vs 18-20.

KBo VI 2 I 49-50 (Laws/EG §22):

(8) takku kēt īD-az 2 GĪ KUBABBAR nēi/ takku edi īD-az nu-šše

3 GÍN KUBABBAR dāi

'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 kēz id-az. The form and function of kēt 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/M.H. ms.): GIŠ³ RAŠŠUR-i kēz kēzzi-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: baššaš/pašši tanuša '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:

^{NA4}puwašiaz arāza 'outside of (= beyond) the puwaši-stone' (as viewed from the city X).

KUB XLIII 30 II 6-7 (CTH 645/StBoT 13,25):

(9) [^{LÚ.M}₂ES³ MUḪALDIN išbanduzziaššaruš edi taršanzipaz/[...]pēdanzi

'The cooks 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 edi ÍD-az 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.É.GAL niddēi LUGAL-waš tanuša/ AN.BAR-aš[?] [... -š/tlaš
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 tanuša zikkizzi '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) utnē hūmāda ^{URU}Zalpuaz anda arunaz[...]

'All the lands from Zalp(uw)a-on-the-Sea [].'

Whatever verb is to be restored, the presence of 'all lands' as either subject or object makes a verb of motion 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). My translation is based on the premise that (anda) arunaz is in apposition to ^{URU}Zalpuaz and specifies it. It is likely that there was some need for such specification because of the nearly homophonous city Zalpa(h) on the Euphrates.⁸ Compare also

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

(13) ^{URU}Zalpaaz arunaza ehu IŠTU TÚL ^{URU}Nerik tuedaz aššivandaz
ehu ^{URU}Lihšinaza IŠTU ^{HURSAG}Lihšinaz[a]ehu

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

Otten, StBoT 17(1973)20, translates 'aus dem Meere (von) Zalpa... von deinem Berge Lihzina (beim) Orte Lihzina', but this ignores the parallelism of each phrase. In the one unambiguous case the modifiers tuedaz aššivandaz follow the modified IŠTU TÚL ^{URU}Nerik.

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 KBo III 22 Vs 31-32 (Anitta/StBoT 18,12): []^{URU} Zālnuaš ar[(un)aš...]/[...^{URU} Zālnua]š arunaš[]. 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. Perlative Ablative

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

KBo VIII 42 Vs 2 (Palace Chronicle/CTH 9):

(14) [...^{GI}]^{š^u} luttanza ūškizzi '...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.

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

(15) ne-pi-iš-za-aš-ta ^dIŠKUR-unni āššuš ēšta

'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 nepišz(a), Neu tries to save the expected genitive nepišaš by assuming first an underlying nepišaš-aš-šta, then a syncope to nepišš-aš-šta and a development of z [ts] due to the sequence of four dental spirants (/nebiss-as-sta/ > /nebists-as-sta/). The syncope is ad hoc, and the phonetic development has no exact parallels in Hittite. On the other hand, if we keep the ablative nepišz(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 ablatival 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 nepišaš ^dU/^dISKUR.⁹

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

[nu ^mPi]thānaš attāš-maš ānan šaniya witti/ [h]ullanzan

(16) hullanun ^dUTU-az utnē/ [kuit k]uit-nat araiš n-uš

hūmanduš-p[at h]u[llanu]n

'And after my father Pitḫana 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 88, 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, ZDMG 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 ^dUTU-az elaborates on this event. The ablative is used with arai- '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 nahḫant- in the following passage:

KUB XIII 4 III 43-44 (Instr. for Priests/Sturt. Chrest. 158):

- (17) nu-za halluwayaza mekki nabhanteš ēšten/š anda-[m]a-za
pahhunašš-a uddanī mekki nabhantes ēšten

'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 arai- '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 (Anitta/StBoT 18,12):

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

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

Neu, StBoT 18(1974)25, reads tup-pi-wa-a[z] in the Neo-Hittite duplicate, KUB XXXVI 98a Vs 4, against the tup-pi-wa-a[š] of Otten, MDOG 76(1938)44, note 5, and interprets the traces before INA 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 tuppiwa[z] 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 tuppiyaz 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 šēi- and p. 395 sub ḫatrāi-). 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) š-an išpanti/ nakkit dāḫhun

'And I took it (Hattusa) in the night by storm.'

KBo XXII 2 Vs 2 (Zalpa/StBoT 17,6):

(20) tuppuš šakanda šunnaš

'She filled the containers with dung.'

KBo XX 8 Rs 6 (R. of the Storm/CTH 631):

(21) [...]/ šemē["]nit šūš '[]full of/filled with š.'

KBo XX 8 Vs 11 (R. of the Storm/CTH 631):

(22) nu-zza 2-at 2-at kiššarta ḫa[rkanzi]

'Two by two they h[old] each other by the hand.'

The literal meaning of nakki- is of course 'heavy'; on the function of nakkit in the Anitta text see Neu, StBoT 18(1974)64. While šū- is formally an adjective, it functions in Hittite as the past participle of šunna- '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: šemēnaš ḫūpparaš šūš 'a full bowl of š.'. See also p. 254f below.

The restoration ha[rkanzi] 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 ēp- and har(k)-.

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/ap-mi 'I ____': KBo XVII 1 IV 18-19 šalwinit/x-x-x-itt-a.

ašeš- 'seat': KBo XVII 1 I 6 partaunit.

ēp- 'take; hold': EUB XXVIII 97 II 9 kiššarta.

hazziya- 'hit, strike': EUB XXXVI 100 Vs 15 ^{GIŠ} SUKUR.ZABAR-it.

hulaliya- 'wrap': KBo XVII 3 IV 23 gāpinit.

karp- 'lift': KBo XVII 43 I 7 mārāit.¹¹

mārk- 'divide': KBo XVII 3 IV 30 kalulupizmit (/kalulupit-smid/)

hahhāllit.

šarta(i)- '?': KBo XVII 43 I 14 šērhit.¹¹

šū- 'filled with, full of': KBo XVII 1 I 26.II 22⁺ tarlipit.

šunna- 'fill': KBo VI 2 IV 50.52 halkit, XVII 4 III 17⁺ GEŠTIN-ta.

dā- 'take': KBo III 22 Vs 6⁺ nakkit, XVII 3 IV 27-28 hāhhalit.

walḫ- 'strike': KBo XVII 43 I 12 ^{KUŠ} sarazzit.

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(1867)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) [LUG]AL ^{URU} Kuššara URU-az katta [p]angarit u[e/it]

'The King of Kussar came down from the city with mass(ed troops).'

Neu, StBoT 18(1974)11, translates pangarit as 'mit Gewalt', but he himself, *ibid.* 64, gives the basic meaning of *pangar- as 'crowd, mass'. This is confirmed by the later cliché (ERÍN.MEŠ) ^{LÚ} KUR pangarit BA.ÚŠ (DŠ passim) which means 'The (troops of the) enemy died en masse', not 'died with violence'. In this usage pangarit 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 pangarit 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 gaṇéna (RV 9.96.17), which is termed a 'sociatif interne' by Haudry, BSL 65(1970)52. One may choose to translate literally 'the Maruts with a host/multitude', but it is clear from the overall use of gaṇá- with the Maruts that the 'host' is the Maruts themselves, and a more accurate if freer translation would be 'the Maruts in a host' or even 'en masse'. In the same way, then, the original use of pangarit in Hittite with a collective like ERÍN.IEŠ would have been comitative, with internal reference: 'the troops with a mass', i.e. 'the troops en masse' or 'a mass of troops'. Delbrück, Verbal. Syn.(1893)237, terms such instrumentals 'distributive' and offers examples from Avestan, Balto-Slavic and Germanic. Note especially Lith. jiẽ mĩrẽ šimtaĩs/pulkaĩs 'They died by the hundreds/in droves'.

KBo VII 14 Vs 5-6 (Zukraši/EDOG 86,61 trl.):

- (24) nu-tta hartassan m̄an/ [x-x]-x-iškimi nu tuhhiyattit ẽkti
 'I will [] you like a bear(?), and you will die with a cry of pain.'

The instrumental tuhhiyattit expresses not the cause or means of death, but rather an attendant circumstance. Laroche, BSL 52 (1956)75, translates 'périras d'étouffement', interpreting the instrumental as expressing means. However, he offers no solid

evidence that the verb tubhai- means 'choke, suffocate'. On the contrary, various passages argue that the verb expresses a sound. In KUB XXXIII 118,12f the tubhuwar 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), tubhandat is paired with ueškanta, which should be taken as the iterative of wivai- 'scream' (contra Neu, loc. cit.). In KUB VII 41 I 10, where kī Ê-ir kuwat tubhaitta 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 tubhivattit 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) kalulupizmid-ašta išcaranda dēi (i.e. /kalulupit-smid/)

'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" (weg)'. 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 kalulupizmit in an ablative 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 8,83). 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 kalulupizmit with the participle išgaranda: '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 kalulupizmit išgaranda 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'

(imniya-). Whether the alternate usage of the instrumental and dative-locative with takš- and imniya- 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 išgar- '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 (pangarit) 'comitative' or 'sociative' (Delbrück, Vergl. Syn. 234f), the second (tubbiyattit) an 'instrumental of attendant circumstance' or the like (ibid. 238f), and the third (kalulupizmit išgaranda) '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, Vergl. 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/StBoT 8,20):

(26) [DU(KU).É.GAL LUGAL-aš SAL.LUGAL-ašš-a iššazmit
 (/issats-smid/) lālan AN.BAR-aš/ [d]āi

'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 kišsar[az-(met)], XVII 7 + IBoT III 135 IV 6-7 ^{GIŠ}SU.A-kaz-mit [-mit kartaz-mit / [tuc]kaz-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 ablatives from the pronominal stems apa- '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 ka- 'this': KBo XX 2,5 []-an kīz 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/kiz (based on later usage), we find instead the form kēt:

KBo VI 2 I 49 (Laws/ HG §22):

(27) takku kēt īd-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 kēz.

- KBo XVII 1 III 25-27 (R. for King and Queen/StBoT 8,32):
- (28) 1 KÁŠ.GAL-r[(i)]/ [(carauni-š)]i murivaleš gancanteš kē[(tt-a)]/
[(ga)rauni-š]i murivaleš gancanteš
- '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):
- (29) EGIR-ŠU ^{LÚ} menevaš iētta kētt-a kētt-a G[(I-an)]/ puittiannēi
tarnai-ma-an natta
- 'The m.-nan walks behind and aims the arrow to one side and
 the other, but he does not let it go.'

One could also translate EGIR-ŠU as 'thereafter' (thus Neu, StBoT 12(1970)38).

As already seen, kēt 'on this side' may also be contrasted with edi 'there, on that side':

- KBo XVII 15 Vs 14-16 (CTH 645):
- [(UGULA ^{LÚ.IEŠ} LÚALDIH)]/ haššēš katta kēt arta 6 hurnai ^{SAR}

- (30) parzi [(^{LÜ} pēšta)]/ paššāš katta edi narānān parzi 6 hurnai^{SAR}
parzi

'The overseer of the cooks stands below the hearth on this side (and) holds six. h. plants. The pēšta-man squats below the hearth on that side (and) holds six h. plants.'

It is doubtful whether the deictic force of kēt and edi 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 kēt...kētt-a and kēt...edi see the instances in Sec. 2.1 below where kēz fills the slot of kēt.

IV. Problematic Cases

KBo XX 3 Rs 9-10 (F. of the KI.LAM/CTH 627):

- (31) ...1/2 ^{NINDA} ZI.HAR.HAR 20-iš/[...^{NINDA} h-leḫarēt 70-iš
ištananaš tianti!'

'They place on the sacrificial tables...half a "twentieth"
 ____-loaf along with(?) x number of "seventieth" kaḫari-
 loaves.'

On the meaning and form of the numerals 20-iš and 70-iš see
 Eichner, Anat. Zahlw. 57-58. The only plausible interpretation
 I can find for the instrumental kaḫarēt is accompaniment. For
 this use of the instrumental in a list of objects compare exx.
 (119), (161) and (218) pp. 246, 302 and 334 below. The broken
 context leaves this explanation uncertain. The same form

NIIDA kaḫarēt/kaḫarit occurs elsewhere in the same text: KBo XX 3
Vs 14.Rs 11.14⁺, XX 4 IV 10, XX 7 Rs 8.¹²

KBo XVII 17 I 8f (R. of Zuwi/CTH 412):

[...] laḫlit-at-[k]an d[ḫu.../...]x-ḡanit-at-kan [d]ḫu
(32) [...] ^{UZU} ḫR-nit-at-kan [d]ḫu [.../...]ḫarḫuwantit-[a]t-kan
[d]ḫu

For the connection with other parts of the Zuwi text see lintu
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 (Protocol/Uncatalogued):

kāša-tta-wa utniya paitteni nu ṢA ^{LÚ} MAŠDA/ ešpar-šet natta
(33) ṣanḫiškatteni ^{LÚ.MEŠ} NAŠIŠIDITI-ŠU natta punuštēni/ ta

LŮ happinandaś iṣṭeni/ parna-śśa paīśi ēzśi eulśi
niyanazzi-a-tta/ LŮ aśiwandan-a śi-e-et da-a-la[?]-ti/
DIN-ŠU natta punuśśi

'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, HWb 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 śi-e-et is based on this view of the overall context. I have ventured the reading da-a-la-ti instead of the da-a-at-ti 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 da-a-la-at-ti for 'you abandon', but this seems to be the sense demanded by the context. One could keep dātti and interpret LŮ aśiwandan 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 ši-e-et is as the instrumental of the pronoun ša-: '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/CTH 820; M.H. ms.):

bāš nu kuēz uwaši šunpaz-wa uwami/ nu-wa kuēz šunpaz

(34) zaḥanittennaz-wa/ nu-wa kuēz zaḥanittennaz ^dUTU-waš-wa
ē-az/ nu-wa kuēz ^dUTU-az...

'Open!--Where do you come from?--I come from a sacred (place).--
From what sacred (place)?--From a shrine.¹³--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 kuēl

^dUTU-waš É-az 'from the house of which Sun-god?'.
 (35) KUE XIII 4 I 64-65 (Instr. for Priests/Sturt. Chrest. 150):

kuš-wa-kan tuēl DINGIR^{LIM}-az NINDA haršivas/ [DUGⁱ]špandusziaz
dāš

'Whoever has taken from your divine leavened bread and
 wine-ration.'

In view of the genitive tuēl, one may wonder with Götze, Lg 11 (1935)269-70, whether DINGIR^{LIM}-az 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').¹⁴ Thus it seems safer to assume that the ablative in cases like the present one expresses separation with dā- 'take', as elsewhere.

KBo XIX 161 I 20-21 (Festival of Teteššabi/CTH 738):
 (36) LÚ^{GIŠ} BAŠŠUR NINDA.KUR₄.RA^{GIŠ} BAŠŠUR-az NIN.DINGIR-i/ [p]āi
 'The serving-man hands/gives one leavened loaf from the table
 to the NIN.DINGIR(-priestess).'

At first glance we seem to have an ablative of separation with pāi- 'give', which is not impossible (cf. p. 150 above). However, the same text in I 17-18 and 23 has GIŠ^{BAŠŠUR}-az dāi '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/CTH 591):

(37) LÚ ^{GIŠ} BANŠUR 1 NIIDA.KUR .RA INŠA/ Ēškaza udai

'The serving-man brings one leavened sourdough loaf from outside.'

The ablative Ēškaz, literally 'from the gate', is often used as an adverb meaning 'outside' (cf. Latin forīs). But in the common ritual phrase Ēškaz udai the ablatival force is preserved, judging from all unambiguous cases. In the present instance compare III 20: n-an-kan parā pēdai 'And he carries it (the loaf) out'.

KUB XIII 4 IV 59-60 (Instr. for Priests/Sturt. Chrest. 166):

(38) n-at-šan balivaz ašcaunaz neḫḫan karšan/ n-at-kan DINGIR.IES-aš
QATAIIA anda arnuwandu

'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 Sturtevant, 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 II 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:

ar- 'arrive': KUB II 7 I 14-15 ^{URU}šarluwaz (+ arḫa and -kan),
XX 4 VI 4-5 ḫilamnaz (+ katta).

arāi- 'arise': KUB II 3 II 28-29 lūliwaz,¹⁵ XXIV 8 I 38
^{GIŠ}KA-az (+ -ḫa), XLI 29 III 1-2 šanišziwaz tešḫaz.

arš- 'flow': KBo XXI 22 Rs 39 (M.H. ms.) [1]ūliwaz, KUB XXIX 10
I 6.10 KaxU-az (+ parā and -kan).

išpart- 'escape': KBo XI 14 II 20 ^{KA4}ARÀ-za, II 21 KaxU-za
(+ -kan), XIII 126 I 21 ^{GIŠ}KAK-az.

ivennai- 'walk, march': KUR XXXIII 36 II 4 (= XXXIII 67 I 32)
[(IS)PU E.ŠÀ taninamaz].

mauš- 'fall': KUB VIII 22 II 3 (and elsewhere) nevišza (+ katta
and -ašta).

pāi- 'go':

without preverb: KBo X 2 I 17 ^{URU}Waršuwaz, I 18 ^{URU}Ikakalaz
(and simil. elsewhere), XVI 49 I 5 KÁ.GAL-az (+ -šta),
KUB VII 25 I 12-13 ^Eḫalentuwaz.

with andan: KBo XI 43 I 26 ^{URU}Taḫarnaza.

with arḫa: KUB XLIII 2 II 7 [KU]R-waz.

with katta: KBo VII 42 III 6 (and elsewhere) KÁ.GAL-az
(+ -kan).

with šarā: KUB XXIX 1 I 39 kēz KUR-eaz.

tiya- 'step':

with katta: KBo II 37, 2.4-5 ^{GIŠ}DAG-az, KUB X 17 I 27-28

(and elsewhere) ^{GIŠ}huluganaz (+ -kan), X 18 I 6.16-17

(and elsewhere) ^{GIŠ}GIGIR-az (+ -ašta).

with parā: KBo X 23 II 24 KÁ-az (+ -ašta).

ūp- 'rise': KUB XXXI 127+ I 39 nepišaz (+ šarā and -ašta).

uwa- 'come':

without preverb: KBo XXI 78 I 8 (and often) ^Ehalenturaz
(+ -kan), KUB XII 60 I 20 arunaz, XXV 14 VI 3 [1]abba, etc.

with anda: KUB XX 19 III 6 arabza.

with āpa: KBo X 2 I 41 ^{URU}ulmaza, III 1 I 8.18 labbaz
(+ -apa), KUB XVII 6 I 25 gimraz.

with appan šarā: KBo IV 2 II 28 aš-x-az.¹⁶

with arba: KBo III 60 III 10 ^{URU}hubayenaz, KUB XLIII 55
IV 10-11 anēz pētaz (+ -kan), etc.

with katta: KBo XVII 74+ I 28 (and often) ^{GIŠ}pulu(gan)nialz,
XXI 78 I 3 ^{GIŠ}GIGIR-az (+ -kan), KUB X 28 I 1-2 ^{GIŠ}DAG-za
(+ -šan), etc.

watku- 'jump': KUB XXXIV 22 I 5+ ^{GIŠ}PISĀN-az (+ parē; the verb
is restorable from I 3 and 8).

web- 'turn': KUB XL 5 (+ KBo XXII 4) II 4 KASKAL-az (+ āpa).

Transitive Motion Verbs:

arnu- 'move, carry': KBo X 23 V 9-10 KÁ.GAL-az (+ katta and -ašta).

han- 'draw (liquid)': KUB X 11 V 9-11 ^{DUG}išna[nt]uzziaz (+ šarā
and -ašta).

huittiya- 'pull, draw': KUB XIII 4 IV 71 KaxU-az (+ parā and -kan),

XXXVI 75 III 12 (M.H. ms.) arušaz¹⁷ (+ šarā and -ašta).

karp- 'lift': KUB X 11 V 1-3 ^{DUG} haršiyallaz (+ šarā), VII 1 I 35

wetenazza (+ -kan), XXIV 10 II 25-28 (= XLI 1 III 8-11 =

JCS 24,37 III 1f) kēz...kēz...SAG.DU-za...šaštaza.

peššiya- 'throw': KUB XI 1 IV 18 ē-irza (+ parā and -šta).

pēda- 'carry': KBo III 7 II 23 ^{URU} Meriocaz, XI 32 Vs 16 šuphaza

(+ katta), KUB XIII 4 III 33 luliyaza.

pittenu- 'cause to disappear, remove': KUB XIII 6 II 13

IGI.HI.A-az (+ parā).

piya- 'send': KBo IV 2 I 14 nepišaz.

dā- 'take':

without preverb: KBo VII 28 Vs 44 (M.H. ms.) idēlawaz

(+ -kan), XX 67 I 12 (M.H. ms.) (and elsewhere) ^{GIŠ} BAN[Š]UR-az,

KUB XVII 10 III 10 (M.H. ms.) tuggaz-šet (+ -ašta), XXIV 9

I 45 hūmandaz tuggaz, IBoT II 94 VI 12 karzanaz, etc.

with ēpa: KUB VII 1 II 4 haššaz.

with arḫa: KUB II 13 I 60.III 15 (and elsewhere) ^{GIŠ} BANŠUR-az

(+ -ašta), X 18 VI 6-8 ^{GIŠ} DAG-az (+ -ašta).

with katta: KUB XIII 4 IV 69 ^{GIŠ} ištananz (+ -šta).

with kattan: KBo XV 33 III 2 ištanēnaz (+ -ašta).

with kattan arḫa: KUB XX 78 IV 8 ^{NINDA} ziopulaššaz,

XXIV 11 II 27-28 ^{GIŠ} NÁ-az.

with šer arḫa: KUB XI 23 V 7-8 SAG.DU-az (+ -kan).

taya- 'steal': KBo VI 3 I 45 (M.H. ms.?) ^{URU} Hattušaz,
 VI 10 II 22⁺ šamamaz, VI 11 I 12 taṣṣaliyandaza ^{GIŠ} SAR.GEŠTIN,
 ibid. I 18 huššelliyaz, KUE XXIX 21,3 lūliyaz.

uda- 'bring':

āškaz udai: KBo X 28 II 11, XVII 75 III 30⁺ (M.H. ms.), and
 more than 50x.

without preverb: KBo XVII 74 II 38 (M.H. ms.) šiunaš É-az,
KUE XXXIII 62 III 8 āšgazzi-ya, XXIX 1 I 24 arunaza, etc.

with katta: KUE VII 1 II 31 šuhḫa ¹⁸.

with parā: KUE XXX 19 I 6 and XXX 25+ Vs 10 É-irza (+ -ašta),
 XXX 19 I 61 ^{GIŠ} ZA.LAM.GAR-az (+ -ašta).

uwate- 'bring': Bo 6483,7⁺ (RHA 77,174) ^{URU} Haššuwaza, KBo XII 19
 I 2 (M.H. ms.?) ^{URU} Lihzīnaz.

Verbs of Separation:

Ērk- 'cut (off)': KBo VI 11 I 16 amivaraza (= KUE XXIX 23,12
^{GIŠ} PA₅-az). ¹⁹

karš- 'cut': KUE XXX 10 Vs 15 (M.H. ms.) ḫēliaz...ašēunaz
 (+ āpva and -ašta).

kuer- 'cut': KBo XI 14 III 33 ḫappešnaza ḫuma[ntaz((a))] (+ -ašta).

šamen- 'part (with)': KBo VI 4 IV 39 ḫapparraz, KUE XI 1 IV 18
šarranaza (+ -kan). ²⁰

tarna- 'release': KBo III 34 II 19 IŠTU É.EN.KU.UN (+ -ašta),
 III 45 Vs 10 [utn]ēaz.

tuhš- 'cut': KBo X 37 I 40 []-az (+ arḫa), KUE XXIV 11 II 31⁺
^{GIŠ} NÁ-az (+ -ašta).

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:

halzēi-: KUF XXXVI 44 I[?] 7 (K.E. ms.) [nepiš]az.
kalleš-: KUB XVII 5 I 6 ḫattešnaz" (+ šarē and -ašta).²¹

The ablative is used with verbs meaning 'purify' or 'preserve' to express separation from some evil:

huišnu- 'make live > preserve': KBo IV 2 I 60 uddanaz (modified by the instrumental kallarit; see below p. 255).

parku(i)ya- 'purify oneself': KBo XXII 6 I 6 tešḫaz (+ -apa[?]),
KUB XXIV 8 I 31 û-az (see Neu, StBoT 5(1968)138-139).

parkunu- 'purify': VBoT III 18⁺ alwanzešnaza ḫurtivazi-ya.

Closely related is the use with paḫš- 'protect':

KUB I 16 III 72-73 (HAB 16-17):
 (39) nu-mu taḡḡa[niya-ti/ta]/ taknaz paḫ[š]i
 = ina irtī-ki ina eršetim uḡri-nni

'Protect me on your breast from the earth!'

Sommer, HAB 198-199, argues that the ablative taknaz 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 naṣāru 'protect from X' see von Soden, AHW sub naṣāru 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 nabḥant- '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:

aruwāi- 'bow': KUB XX 90 IV 12 ašešnaza (subject is DUMU.É.GAL).

auš- 'see': KBo XIII 106 I 15-16 nepišaz, KUB XVII 6 I 19-20

GIS_{luttanza} (+ arḫa and -ašta). See pp. 208-209 below.

hink- 'give, offer': KBo XI 73 Vs 5-6 ^{URU}Durmittaz (cf. below p. 384 sub pāi- 'give').

huek- 'conjure': KUB VII 1 II 21-23 nepišaza (+ šer katta)...

dankuwaz taknāz (+ kattera¹). 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.

šakuwaya- 'look': KBo XIX 102,2 and KUB XXIV 8 I 41⁺ [(n)enīšaz (+ katta and -kan)].

gank- 'hang': KUB XI 20 I 8 (and elsewhere) ^{GIS}BAIŠUR-az,
XVII 10 IV 28 (M.H. ms.) (and elsewhere) ^{GIS}eyaz (+ -kan).

šuwaya- 'look': KUB XVII 6 I 23-24 ^{GIS}lutt[anza] (+ arḫa).

See pp. 208-209.

Unlike other 'adverbs' such as arahza '(from) outside', the form tūwaz always keeps its ablative force of 'from afar'.

It is used with various predicates, especially in the ritual with QATAI dēi/zikkizzi '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, HWb 231 with references).

Compare KUB II 5 I 34-36:

(40) UGULA LÚ.MEŠ MUHALDIM 3 TAPAL GIŠ kišdun/ hašši taruša LUGAL-i/
tūwaz parā ēpi/ [LU]GAL-uš QATAM dāi

'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 I 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 tūwaz:

with QATAM dāi-/zikk-: KBo XIX 93 I 15, II 5 II 9-10 (+ -kan), XI 30 I 14 (+ -šan), and often.

other: KBo XIX 161 I 15-16 arwaizzi, ABoT 13 VI 15 parē ēpi.

Another set phrase in ritual use is GIŠ AB-az arḫa 'away from the window'. This expression occurs with various predicates, but the position of arḫa directly behind the ablative is fixed. This strongly suggests that the ablative here is 'governed' by arḫa which is functioning as a postposition. However, in other occurrences of the ablative with arḫa, 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 arḫa. It is therefore difficult to prove beyond all doubt the postpositional status of arḫa in GIŠ AB-az arḫa. Examples (with various spellings of GIŠ AB-az):

with šipanti 'libates': KBo XX 61 III 46-47, XXI 85 I 12

(M.H. ms.), KUB II 13 I 47-48.III 19-20.

with dāi- 'place': KUB II 8 II 27-28 (supply verb from II 31).

with GIŠ₂ 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]i-na-kan TUPPA^{HI.A} ISTU GIŠ₂ LE'E/ arḫa anivawen

'We copied these (clay) tablets from wooden tablets.'

The presence of arḫa 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 tunniaz aniya- 'write down by means of a tablet' which shows an instrumental use of the ablative (see below p. 394).

KUB XXXI 127+ IV 24-25 (Prayer to the Sun-god/ CTH 372):

(42) [nu][?] karū maḫḫan annaza ŠA-za ḫaššanza ešun/ [nu-m]u-kan
DIINGIR-YA āppa anūn ZI-an anda tāi

'As I was once born from inside (my) mother, put that soul back into me, oh my god.'

This example shows what Friedrich, HE I²(1960)123, terms 'partitive apposition' (also 'badal' or skhéma kath' hólon kai méros): annaza ŠA-za 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: takru LÚ.ULU^{LU}-aš ELLU^{LU}-aš QASSU našma GÎR-ŠU kuiški tuwa[rnizzi] 'If someone breaks the hand or foot of a free man...'. Version B substitutes LÚ.ULU^{LU}-an ELLU^{LU}. 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 (Laws/HG §90):

(43) n-ašta î-an šarpuwantaz-šet [KA]R-izzi

'And he "fishes out" the fat from its belly.'

The duplicate KBo VI 7,13 has dāi '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 (wemizzi), 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.

VBoT 95 I 5 (AN.TAH.ŠUM^{SAR} Festival/CTH 608):

(44) LUGAL-uš-za-kan ^{URU} Matilaza arḥ[a itar[?]] ēnzi

'The king sets out/takes his [way[?]] from Matila.'

The tentative restoration of itar is based on KUB XLI 8 I 20-21:

itar...daškiizzi. Compare for the use of -za also Bo 6483,10

KASKAL-an-zan...dē[ir] (-zan = -za+šan). The difference between

dā- and ēn- makes the restoration less than certain, but 'takes his way' seems to fit the context better than any other object.

Whatever object is supplied, arḥa ēn- can hardly be functioning as a unit 'take away', so it is likely that arḥa 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:

KBo IV 2 II 35 (R. of Huwarlu/Sprache 8,93):

(45) ...ANA DINGIR^{LIM} KASKAL-ši arḥa artaru

'...let him step out of the god's way.'

KUB I 17 IV 18-19 (Monthly Festival/CTH 591):

(46) ...ginuwaš/ GAD-an danzi

'...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 Teteššabi/CTH 738):

(47) n-an-kan ^{GIŠ}ZA.LAM.GAR-aš/ parā udai

'And he carries it out of the tent.'

For ^{GIŠ}ZA.LAM.GAR as pl. tantum compare KUB XXXVI 35 I 7.

KUB XXXIV 66 + XXXIX 7 III 1 (Funeral Rites/HTR 40):

(48) n-ašta ALAM ^{GIŠ}kurakkiya parkiyan[zi]

'They raise the figure from the kurakki.'

Otten, HTR 41, translates 'auf das kurakki', but the presence of -ašta 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 kurakki 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):

- (49) irma-šmaš-kan dābhun kardi-šmi-ya-at-kan dābhu[n]/
[(arša)hi-šmi-ya-at-kan dābhun]

'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-Souček, 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 irma(n). The Hittite means of expressing 'das in eurem Herzen' would be a free-standing genitive kardaš-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 pantala-. While there are no attestations thus far in Old

Hittite manuscripts, the use of kit instead of the ablative kēz/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) KUE XI 6 II 13 kinuna kizza UD-az 'Now from this day (on)'. The latter probably represents the Neo-Hittite equivalent of kitpantelaz.

A similar function is attested in KUB XXXI 127+ II 24-25: [(DUM)]U-annaza...UL šagaabhi '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 kartaz in an essentially temporal function:

KUB XXXI 127+ III 27-29 (Sun Hymn/ CTH 372):

(50) mān-mu-kan annaz kartaza DINGIR-YA [(inan)]/ gulašta ug-a-za
appa ^{SAL} BHŠI UL kuššana/ punuššun

'As for me, I never asked the seeress whether my god had ordained sickness for me from my mother's womb.'⁷

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 M.H. ms.) with UL ēššu for inan. In view of these examples, a temporal sense is also more likely in the omen text, KBo VI 25+ XIII 35 III 5-6: takku SAL-[za h]āši nu annaz-vat/ Šā-az [a]iē arha hāši 'If a woman gives birth, and (the child) opens its

mouth right from the mother's womb' (i.e. 'from the moment of birth'). The use of annaz kartaz 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 šullannaz 'as the result of a quarrel' in the Hittite Laws: §2 (KBo VI 3 I 4) and restorable in §1 (KBo VI 3 I 1) with kuenzi, §127 (KBo VI 10 II 17) with tayēzzi; also in the later version KBo VI 4 I 6 with kuenzi and ibid. I 14.16 with dašuwabhi. KUB XIII 4 IV 28 has: maklann[a]z-war-aš BA.ÜŠ '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 arḫa). 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 ēšzi. 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/CTH 591):

GAL IEŠEDI NIIDA taparwa šun/ LUGAL-i tarkumivaizzi/
 (51) NIIDA taparwa šuš-wa U-aš NIIDA haršiš/ šer-wa-kan UDU.NITÁ-az
3-az/ [^U] ZU UR-az

'The chief body-guard translates the taparwašu-bread for the king: "The t.-bread is the leavened bread of the Storm-god; on top (are) the penis(es) from three rams."'

Eichner, Anat. Zahlw. 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 t.-bread is covered with ram-penises, but as the examples cited by Eichner himself show, the Hittite phrase for this action is: -šan l ^{UZU} UR šer dāi 'places one penis on (it)' (KUB II 10 IV 21.29-30 etc.). If one transforms this sentence into a passive, one arrives at -šan ^{UZU} UR šer kitta 'the penis is placed on (it)'. There is no evidence for an active sentence 'he covers the t.-bread with the penis', and thus Eichner's

passive equivalent is fictitious.²² I have no objection to supplying kitta instead of ēšzi 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 ^{UZU}UR-az as a nominative singular (from a dental stem) see KUB I 16 III 40 [^{UZU}UR-dan and probably also ABOT 47 Vs 11 UR-tuš. ^{UZU}UR-az is also nominative in IBOT 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: [^{NINDA}t]aparwa₂šuš ŠA UDU.[MITÁ...]/ [še]r 3-aš ^{UZU}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. StBOT 8,66). 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 60 I 8-10,12-15 (CTH 457):

kuit-a/ [ter]ippiaz-ma n-at NIM.LAL.MEŠ udandu/ [n]-at-<šam>
pidi-šši tiandu...takku arunaz-ma n-at lahanza/ udau

(52) n-at-šam pēdi-šši dāu/ takku ID-az-ma n-at puwalaš udau/

n-at-šan pēdi-šši dāu § kuit-a nepišaz-ma n-at tapakaliya/
haraš^{KUŠEN} 'IZ-DU-UD'?? udau

'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 h. 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 uizzi '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 tapušza 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:

KUB XXXI 127+ I 65-67 (Sun Hymn/CTH 372):

- (53) [[nu]] ^dBuneneš-a-[tt]a ^{LÚ}SUKKAL-KA / ZAG-az-tit iyatta
^d[(Mišar)ušš-a-tt[a]] / ^{LÚ}SUKKAL-KA GÜB-laz-tet [ilyatta]

'But Bunene walks as your vizier on your right, and Misaru 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 ZAG-az-tet...hui-vanteš...GÜB-laz-ma-tta huiy[a]nteš, where 'to your left' is expressed by the ethical dative -ta 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. KUB XXXVI 75 II 4 (M.H. ms.), which is parallel to KUB XXXI 127 I 65, shows at least that the ethical dative was not originally required: ^dBunene SUKKAL-KA kun[(naz-tet)...]. Note also KUB XXVIII 98 III 4-5: kunnaz / [LUGAL]-waš taruša-šit 'to the right, beside the king'.

KBo XX 34 Vs 6-7 (R. of Hantitassu/CTH 395):

- (54) 3 HINDA.KUR ₄.RA / [kiz] l^{EN} kiz l^{EN} [klizzi-ya l^{EN} parši[yand]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 kēz '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'/CTH 661):

(55) kēdaš-na ^{GIŠ}BAŠSUR.HI.A-aš/ hūmandaš andurza/ kuttaz 1 ^{GIŠ}BAŠSUR
AD.K[ID]/ ū ^{GIŠ}BAŠSUR.HI.A TUR^{TIN}/ šuppiwaššanalli[ēš']

'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 andurza '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 anda(n). Note also the directional use of kuttaz.

The attestations of kunnaz, GÜB-laz, tapuša 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.):

šuppaš KBo IV 9 I 17-18, bašši KBo XXI 85 IV^H 39 (M.H. ms.) etc.

KASKAL-ši KUB XXIV 9 II 35, LUGAL-i KBo XX 67 III 20 (M.H. ms.)

and often, ^{GIŠ}BAŠSUR-i KUB X 3 II 26-27 etc., ištanani

KBo XI 49 I 15 etc., KĀ.GAL-aš KUB II 6 V 34-35, šuppai
LÚ SANGA KBo X 23 IV 6-7⁺, GIŠ AB KBo XVII 75 I 29, GIŠ DAG-ti
KUB X 21 I 20, ^dIŠKUR-ni KUB XXXII 117+ Rs^u 11.

GÜB-laz 'on/to the left of ___' (with preceding dat.-loc.):

NINDA šaramnaš KUB XLI 44 I 14, šuppaš KBo IV 9 I 17-18,
hašši KUB XXXIII 40 I 9, KASKAL-ši KUB XXIV 9 II 37,
GIŠ BANŠUR-i KUB XI 24 VI 4-5, ANA DUMU.Ē.GAL KUB X 17
 II 23-24 etc., ištānani KBo XI 49 I 16 etc., LUGAL-i
KBo IV 9 IV 24 etc..

ZAG-az...GÜB-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..

tapušza 'beside ___' (with preceding gen. or dat.-loc.):

with genitives (complete): haššaš KUB X 11 VI 2, LUGAL-(w)aš
KBo XX 33 Rs 7 (M.H. ms.?) and IBOT II 89 V 5-6,
[halmaššu]ittaš KBo XVII 74+ I 36 (M.H. ms.).

with dat.-loc.: hašši KUB II 5 I 34.V 8 etc. (over 30x),
GIŠ AB-ya KUB XXVII 69 IV 4-5 etc., ^dGIŠ INANNA.HI.A KUB I 17
 III 38-39 etc., ANA NINDA.KUR RA KBo XX 67 III 21 (M.H. ms.),
LÚ.MEŠ MUHALDIK-aš KBo XXI 85 IV^u 37 (M.H. ms.), LUGAL-i
KUB X 17 II 25 etc., halmaššuitti KBo XXI 85 IV^u 40 (M.H. ms.)
 etc., ^dGIŠ BANŠUR-i KBo XIX 161 I 16 etc., pattešni KUB XXIV 9
 II 26.

kēz...kēzzi-ya 'on one side...on the other':

hašši/GUNNI-i KUB XXXIX 7 II 60.III 56-57.60 etc., ^dGIŠ BANŠUR-i

KUE II 13 I 23-24, absolutely KBo XX 34 Rs 10-11⁺ (M.H. ms.),²³

XI 32 Vs 29, etc..

hantezziyaz 'in front of ___':

hašši KUE II 4 III 18-19 etc., absolutely KBo XIX 128 I 7.

katterraz 'below ___':

^dhalkiaš āski KBo X 24 IV 20-21.

āškaz...andurza 'outside...inside':

These are used adverbially, in expressed or unexpressed opposition to each other. See KBo XXI 85 I²⁰f, IV 3 V 26f, KUE 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, StBoT 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:

KUE XXX 15+ Vs 26-28 (Funeral Rites/HTR 68):

(56) nu ^{SAL}SU.GI ^{GIŠ}NUN[UZ] ZIBANA/ [dā]i nu-ššan 1-ē<d>az KUBABBAR
GUŠKIN NA .HI.A-ya hūmanduš dāi/ [1]-ēdaz-ma-ššan šalwinan dāi

'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 (Waagschale)' and 'in die andere', citing Friedrich, ArOr 6(1934)370, and Sommer, HAB 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 -šan. 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:

- KUB II 5 V 3-7 (AN.TAH.ŠUR^{SAR} Festival/CTH 612):
- (57) nu GAL ^{LÚ}MEŠEDI/ ^{LÚ}SILÀ.ŠU.DU₃.LIŠ.A-wa iškišaz/ EGIR-wa
ivattari! / IGI.HI.A-wa-šma-at-kan LUGAL-i-pat/ andan neventeš

'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')

- KUB XLIII 55 II 10-13 (CTH 434):
- (58) n-at-kan anēz/ pētaz arpa uwanzi/ EGIR-az-kan ŪL kuiški/ aušzi
 'They come away from that place, and no one looks back.'

- KBo IV 9 VI 6-12 (AN.TAH.ŠUR^{SAR} Festival/CTH 612):
- ta mān DUMU.MEŠ.É.GAL kuēzzi! / paršnān ḥarkanzi n-at apizze/
 (59) peššiyazi n-at DUMU.MEŠ.É.GAL/ danzi mān-wa ^{LÚ}MEŠ_{MEŠEDI}/

kuēssi[!] pašnān harkanzi/ n-at apizza peššivazi/ n-at
LÚ.MEŠ MEŠEDI danzi

'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: KUE XX 76 I 21f, X 21 III 20f, XI 16 III 5-10. KUE XXV 1 II 2f shows an interesting variation: n-at mān/ ANA LÚ.MEŠ MEŠEDI and[a]n p[ešše]yazi...

'He either throws it among the bodyguards...'. The same construction is used with the corresponding DULU.MEŠ.É.GAL.

This example confirms that the ablative apizza 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 huinu-:

KUE XXXIII 67 I 27-31 (Anzili and Zukki/RHA 77,136 trs.):
GÜB-lan-za KUŠ E.SIR ZAG-naz [šarkutta ZAG-an-za-ma KUŠ E.SIR]/
 (60) GÜB-laz šarkutta TÚG-za x[...]/ TÚG.DINGIR LIM -vaš^{II} -za-kan
2 TUDITTI HI.A EGIR-[(va paškit)]/ nu-šši[!] TÚG pūpiki apizzi

[(piran huinut)]/ hantezci-ma-za appizziaz [(huinut)]

'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 h-cloth to the front, while she moved the front one to the rear.'

For the restorations see KUB XXXIII 36 II 1f. The reading TÚC-an-ši-wa-za-kan of Otten apud Laroche, loc. cit., is syntactically impossible. Neither the accusative TÚC-an, the enclitic -ši nor the particle -wa- fits the context. The -aš- after -wa- is clear in the autograph, and a dative-locative is needed. I cannot suggest what specific word underlies TÚC.DINGIR^{LII}, but the assumption of a u-stem (probably plurale tantum) seems unobjectionable. Friedrich, HWb 71, takes huinu- as the causative to huwēi- 'run'. This meaning fits the military usage (AM passim): nu-za ERÍN.MEŠ vīran huinut '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 appizziaz as 'to the rear'. Compare also KBo XIII 86 Vs 4-5, where the expression for switching the shoes is ZAG-az h[ui]nut... GŪ[B-laz huinu[t] 'transferred [the left shoe] to the right... and [the right shoe] to the left'. KUB XXXV 148 III 14 has in a ritual context n-an-ši-pa EGIR-pa iškišaz huinumi '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-za KUŠ E.SIR-a]n GÜB-li šarku[(wa)it] '...put [his right shoe] on the left (foot)'.

The ablative also expresses direction toward in the omen text KUE VIII 17 II 5-7 and 8-10 (Signs of the Sun/RHA 15,16):

(61) takku ^dUTU-uš hilaizzi [(n-ašta ^dUTU-uš)]/ kuēz nēdaz
pai[(škittari nu anēz)]/ arḫa parkivan ŠA LUGAL KU(R MAR.TU^{KI}
šagaiš)]...takku ^dUTU-uš hilaizzi n[(u hilaš ^dUTU-aš)]/ZAG-az
arḫa parkivan šall[(iš)].../ KUR-e anda kišari

'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 hila- is literally 'enclosure, courtyard'. Its use to mean the 'halo' or 'aureole' of the sun and moon is a calque on Akkadian tarbašu (see Laroche, REA 15(1957)16-17, who also recognizes the function of the ablatives).

We have already seen appeziaz 'backward, to the rear'. It is also used in a spatial sense in KPo X 2 I 24 (Hatt. I Annals/StClOr 14,46), where the Hurrians attack Hatti while the king is off on a campaign elsewhere: EGIR-azvaza-ma-mu-kan ^{LÚ}KUR

ŠA ^{URU} HURRI KUR-e anda uit 'But behind me the Hurrian enemy entered the land'. Friedrich, Hw 26, also lists a temporal use of annezziaz 'afterwards', but the only possible instances in Old Hittite texts are unclear: KUR 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 (Laws/EG §162):

takku PA₅-an EGIR-an arha kuiški nāi l GÍN KUBABBAR/ pāi
 (62) takku PA₅-an EGIR-issiaz kuiški/ [šarā nāi] (scil. šēr dāi)
t-at arputta takku kattann-a/ dāi n-aš anēl
 'If someone diverts a canal ~~backward~~, 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 šēr dāi of the duplicate KBo VI 15,7, which forms a natural pair with kattan dāi. 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-izsiaz 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 šarā nāi 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 ablatives of direction deserve brief mention. KUB I 16 III 14 (HAB 12) has [ḫipḫun kētt-a ^{URU} ḫattuṣaz/[...]. 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^u 7-8 (CTH 16) has the earliest instance of anzitaz ḫūwāi '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, HWb 3. Brg. 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/StBoT 8,26 and 38) shows only kitkar: KBo XVII 1 II 27-28 and IV 21 LUGAL-aš SAL.LUGAL-ašš-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-an kitkar-ši<t> haddanzi '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 Āllī/TH 2,40):

(63) GIŠ NÁ-aš kitkarza ME-i 2 DUG [LIŠ.GAL]/ GIŠ NÁ-aš kēz kēzzi-ya [ME-i]

'He places [] at the head of the bed, and two [saucers] on either side of the bed.'

FHG 13 II 29 (R. of Kuwanni/CTH 474):

(64) n-at-ši šašti kitkarza teppi

'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 tapušza 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 IŠTU SAG.DU-ŠU). Thus the resemblance to kit-pantalaz 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, RHA 24(1966)135, note 9, to Greek kar in epi kár (Hom.) and anákar (Hippoc.) and taken as an ending-less locative (< *kerh₂ with the regular loss of final *-h₂).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) [] ^dUTU-uš-[(kan ^{GIS}_{lutt})anza anda tarnai
 (= KUB XLVI 52 Vs 2 []-uš-kan ^{GIS}_{AE-az} anda [])

'The Sun-god slips in (?) through the window.'

From what follows one would expect rather ^dUTU-un: '(Someone) lets the Sun-god in through the window'. However, piran arha tarna- is used intransitively to mean 'give way before, retreat' (e.g. KUB XIV 1 Vs 62). An intransitive use of anda tarnai is thus possible. In any case the restoration of the ablative seems certain, and the presence of anda 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 22

(Funeral Rites/HTR 36):

(66) nanna-aš-kan ^{GIŠ}AB-az andan 2-Š[U appanzi]

'Next they hold them (the labbanza-birds) in through the window twice.'

The verb is restorable from the next line. Otten, HTR 37, translates 'vom Fenster', but if the motion were viewed as starting from the window, we would surely have arḫa: cf. the examples above p. 185. It is possible, however, that the perlocative 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 ziga-a-war-ašta ^{GIŠ}luttanza/ arḫa autt[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}lutt[anza]/ arḫa šuwayit (ibid. I 23-24), which Laroche, RHA 77,68, note 21, in fact translates as 'regarda par la 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 (Šar tanhari/BOG 101,19):

- (67) ^dEN.LÍL-aš-ma ANA ^mMurdahhi LUGAL KUR ^{URU}Purušhanda tešhaz
pait

'Enlil went to Murdahhi, King of Purushanda, 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):

- (68) LUGAL-uš TUŠ-aš ^dIŠTAR GAL-az/ 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/StClOr 14,54):

- (69) n-aš IZI-az kattan [lukkun]

'I burned them down with fire.'

For the verb compare KUE XIV 1 Rs 54: kattan lukkēr. 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}pūriyaz
(+ piran katta).

arra- 'wash': KUB VII 1 I 33 kuēzza wetenaz (+ -za), XXX 19 I 9
a[r-x-a]z.

au- 'see': KBo III 1 II 47 tuppi-az (but see also p. 406).

eku- 'drink': KUB XX 42 V 15 SI-az (with gods as direct object).

ēp- 'hold': KBo XIII 217 IV 7 ^{DUG}kuravaz (+ anda), KUB X 40 IV 11-12
zalhavaz (+ šer). See below p. 243f on the corresponding
use of the instrumental.

har(k)- 'hold': KUB XXXIV 69 Vs 10 ^{GIŠ}erhuvaz, IBoT III 59,5-7
kiššaraz.

išk- 'anoint': KBo XX 34 Vs 8⁺ (M.H. ms.) (ī-it) kueza,
XI 32 Vs 23 ī-za.

kannā- '?': KUB XLIII 56 II 13 anēz (cf. instr. ibid. II 11).

kariya- 'cover': KBo XV 33 II 32 []x-eaz? ISTU GAD DINGIR^{LIM},
KUB XXXIX 2 I 5 [G]AD-az.

ki- 'be placed' (see Neu, StBoT 5,87): KUB XXXII 111,7 pūriyaz.

kuen- 'kill': KUB XXXIV 21 II 5 za[h]liyaz.

lahhuwai- 'pour': KBo XI 32 Vs 9 ^{GIŠ}tepaza, XIII 217 III 3-4⁺.
^{GIŠ}pūriyaz.²⁵

pāi- 'give': KUB II 7 I 7-8 GUB-laz kiššaraz, XIII 4 III 66

paprandaza (+ adanna = 'gives to eat with an impure (utensil)').

pāi- 'go': KBo X 20 I 17 ^{GIŠ}GIGIR-az (+ šarā), KUB XXX 39 Vs 16
^{GIŠ}hulucannaz (+ šarā; 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.III 32 ^{DUG}išpandu(w)az

(1st with god as dir. obj., 2nd without), KUB XXVII 69

III 8-10 zahayaz (with GEŠTIN as dir. obj.), II 13 III 12-13

GAL-az (with gods as dir. obj.).

šūniya- 'plunge into, implant':²⁶ KBo XXI 67 IV 5 kuēz, XI 32 Vs 9
GIŠ_{tepa}za.

dā- 'take': KBo XII 8 IV 28 šU-za,²⁷ KUB X 4 I 6-7 GAD-az
(+ arḫa).

dāi- 'place': KUB VII 1 III 34 GIŠ_{pū}riaz (+ katta), XIII 4
I 46-47 IŠTU GUD.HI.A UDU.HI.A...pūmandaza (+ šarā),²⁸
VBoT 58 IV 36 DUG_{pahhuna}liaz.

tetha- 'thunder': KUB XVII 10 II 33-34 (M.H. ms.) uwantiwantaz
(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_{tuhup}ziaz (+ anda),
KUB II 5 II 28-29 GIŠ_{BANSUR}-az (+ anda), IBoT III 1,58-59
GIŠ_{dehuppazivaza} (+ anda).²⁹

uwa- 'come': KUB X 17 I 22-23 GIŠ_{huluga}naz (+ šarā).

weḫnu- 'whirl, brandish': KBo XIII 106 I 7 MĀŠ.GAL-za, KUB II 7
I 9-10 GUB-laz kiššaraz (+ -za and šer arḫa), IBoT III 52,3-5
wetenazzi-ya. On these examples see below p. 234.

waršanu- 'soothe': KUB XXXI 127+ IV 22 w[e]tenaz (see p. 256).
below for the full citation).

weriya- 'call': KUB XI 1 IV 17 KAxU-az.

VIII. Ablative of Accompaniment

The only occurrence of this usage in a copy of an Old Hittite

text is KUB XIII 4 I 37-38 (Instr. for Priests/Sturt. Chrest. 148):

(70) n-an-kan [pu(m)andaz/ bi(ar)hi(-)zi

'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 GADU DAI-SU DULU.IES-SU... barninkandu 'may (the gods) destroy (him) along with his wife and children' (see e.g. KBo XVI 25 I 16 and passim). The Akkadian gadu may stand for either an ablative or instrumental in Hittite, but the comitative function is clear in any case. See also below p. 309.

IX. Ablative of Respect

This use of the ablative is already recognized, though not named, by Kümmel, StBoT 3(1967)120-121, who gives several examples, including KBo IV 2 II 9-10 (R. of Huwarlu/Sprache 8,92):

(71) nu ka[š UR.TUR]/ ^{UZU}UR-za šalliš ŠÀ-SU-wa šalli

'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 ^{UZU}UR-za could be a nominative singular (thus Kronasser, Sarache 8(1962)93 and 105), but this does not fit the context. Among other things, the -ŠU 'his' of the next sentence requires an antecedent.

I believe another slightly different example of this use of the ablative is attested in KUE XIII 4 I 57-58 (Instr. for Priests/Sturt. Chrest. 150):

(72) nu-šmaš ki šarrumaš uttar/ SAG.DU-az GAI-an kittaru

'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 GAI-an ki- compare KBo XVI 50 Vs 20-21 (K.H. ms.) linkiya-maš-ot/ [k]attan kittaru 'Let it be put under an oath for us' and many other instances (see Otten, StBoT 11 (1969)13 with note 3 and StBoT 16(1971)36). Given the frequency of this collocation in legal contexts, it is not inconceivable that kattan kittaru could convey the entire meaning even with the deletion of linkiya. An accidental omission of linkiya is also possible. Construing SAG.DU-az directly with kattan kittaru is very awkward. One would expect rather SAG.DU-i. The ablative SAG.DU-az 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/RHA 77,72 trs.):

- (73) nu Ēpa parĒ-pat III ^{URU} Tanipiya / A.ŠĀ kueraš LUGAL-waz niranza

'Afterwards a piece of land was donated by the king in
Tanipiya.'

For Ēpa as 'afterwards' see KBo III 1 I 29.III 32. The duplicate to our passage, KUB XVII 6 IV 18, has Ēpan, 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 KI.GUB/CTH 549):

- (74) apāš / LUGAL-uš DUMU.KEŠ-ŠU ši[u]nas kunāna / tarante[š]

'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 šiunaz marks the agent with either reading.

XI. Ablative of Comparison

This usage of the ablative is attested just once:

KUB XLIII 53 I 19f (R. of Zuwi/CTH 412; see HAB 219-220):

- ēššari-šett-a ēššari GAL-li SAG.DU-SÚ ANA SAG.DU-Š[U GAL-li] /
...[kap]ru-šet-ašta kapruaz GAL-li mieli-ššet-a / [mi]eliaš
(75) GAL-li iškiš-(š)et-ašta iškiši GAL-li / [paltan]aš-šiš^u-ašta
paltanī šalliš...

'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 kapruaz, 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 I² §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 -ašta. The particle can hardly be expressing physical separation in this context. Carruba, Or 33 (1964)416, argues that in the Anitta passage KBo III 22 Vs 2-3 (see ex. (15) above p. 157), the sense of -ašta is separative in the sense of isolating one thing from a group. Among all mankind Pitḫana was singled out (-ašta) as dear to the Storm-god. I.e., 'He was dear to the Storm-god from heaven (above all others)'. Perhaps the use of -ašta in comparisons expresses a similar nuance: 'His back stands out (-ašta) as large among backs' = 'compared to others'. Whether or not this is the correct explanation for the presence of -ašta in this context, I find it likely that the presence of the particle calls forth the ablative kapruaz, 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 išpantaz 'at night', annal(1)az 'formerly'. Neu, StBoT 18 (1974)58, points out that išpantaz is not yet attested in Old Hittite manuscripts, which have instead išpanti 'in the night'. On the other hand, išpanti is lacking in Neo-Hittite historical texts, except in the pair UD-ti GE₆-ti '(by) day and night'. While this distribution suggests a replacement of išpanti by išpantaz, several examples show that the ablative and locative forms are not wholly equivalent.

The locative išpanti expresses the time at which something takes place, and it may be specified by various modifiers: IBoT I 29 Rs 50 [an]ēdani GE₆-ti '(in) that night', IBo IV 2 I 26 kēti GE₆-ti 'in this night'. The locative is also used distributively: KUB XIII 4 III 12-13 GE₆-ti GE₆-ti 'night after night, every night' (also KUB XXXIX 61 I 6 išpanti išpanti). 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:

KUB VII 1 II 18-19 (R. of Wattiti/Sprache 7,149):

(76) n-at išpantaz šarē šuḫḫa pēdai

'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/Sprache 8,90):

- (77) [n]-aš ANA LUGAL SAL.LUGAL ^{GIŠ}MA-aš katta išpantaz tianzi

'They place them under the bed of the king and queen for the night.'

ibid. I 24-26

- (78) nu-wa-kan UD.KAK-az mahhan/ damsin antuššan parnaš anda UL
tarnaši/ kēti-ma-wa-kan GE₆-anti kallar uttar anda lē tarnatti

'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 išpantaz 'by night, at night, nights' is roughly the same as that of kutti '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 (CTH 647):

- (79) mahhan-ma ŠA ^dU šupna huesā[w]az / nu ŠA ^dZababa šupna
QATAIMA/ tianzi

'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) šupa/ huišawaz/ niyandasszi-wa/ tianzi

'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-at-za ZI-azza-ma hawwiraizzi n-at-ši SAG.DU-aš azzatar

'But if he sells it for himself (-za) on his own authority,
it is a capital crime for him.'

The instrumental ZI-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. 236f).

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) ^{GIŠ} PISAN-aš GIK-an āpa parza ŪL aršiezzzi

'As the drainpipe does not flow backwards...'

The form parza always occurs with āpa, and the combination seems to mean no more than 'backwards' (see also KUB VII 1 II 14 and p. 409 below). The form parza 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 (KI.LAM Festival/CTH 627):

- (83) [nu-uš[?]]-ša-an ANA NÍG.G[(UL)]/ kuēz pēdaz [---]/ ^dU anda iyanza/
n-an LUGAL-i anda nā[i]/ LUGAL-uš-^{GIŠ}an pulucanni/ eša

With the restoration from the duplicate, KUB XX 91,6-7, the context is virtually complete, but the sense is obscure, and I forgo any attempt at translation.

The ablative iškišaz is twice attested with karp- 'lift':

KBo XV 33 III 33-35 (CTH 330; H.H. ms.):

- (84) nu IŠTU HURSAG^{GIŠ} Sidduwa/ kuit^{GIŠ} eyan [(uda)azi n-at IŠTU
[(^{TUG}TA)HAPŠI iškišaz karapzi

'The evergreen which they bring from Mt. Sidduwa he lifts on his back (?) with a taḫapši-cloth.'

KBo XII 126 I 12-15 (R. of Alīī/TH 2,22):

- kāša/ alwanzineš antuḫšiš nu kūn UKU-an mān LÚ-iš iyan
(85) ḫa[rzil]/ [n]-at kāša iškišaz karpan ḫarzi n-e-za EGIR-na
dāu^{II}/ [n]-at iškišaz karpan ḫarzi^I (scil. ḫardu[?])

'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 iškišaz as 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 iškišaz karpan harzi 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:

KUB I 16 II 62 (HAB 8):

(86) ut-ni-ya-an-za-aš-ta lē-pat kuiški memai

'Let no locale speak to you.'

The opening sequence is to be interpreted with Sommer, HAB 106, as /udniyants-ta/ (cf. the preceding lines). udniyanza is a

nominative singular in apposition to kuiški (cf. Kupanta-^dKAL KBo IV 3 IV 35-36 mēn anē-na kuiški 'if any of those...'). For the spelling compare KBo IV 7+ II 7 ke-e-ez-za-aš-ta /kets-ta/ = KBo V 13 I 29 kēzza-tta.

KUB I 16 III 71 (HAB 16):

(87) SIG₅-an-[za-mu a-ar-ri] = Akk. damqiš mesi-enni 'Wash me well.'

Sommer reconstructs a Hittite adverb SIG₅-anza 'well' after the Akkadian, citing KUB XVI 9 II 6: [IŠT]U GEŠFIN SIG₅-anza EGIR-pa šunnanzi. 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 SIG₅-u-an-za of the oracle texts is quite uncertain.

For the HAB passage one could also think of SIG₅-an = lazziyan, nom.-acc. sg. neuter participle of lazziya-, which has been taken as the base for the later SIG₅-in 'well' (lazzin < lazziyan like apnezzin < apnezzian). A proleptic accusative SIG₅-an-[ta-an-mu] is also possible: 'wash me good' i.e. 'clean'.

KBo III 1 II 50-51 (Telipinu Edict/Sturt. Chrest. 190):

kuiš ŠEŠ.ŠEŠ-na NIN.MEŠ-na ištarna idālu iyazi nu LUGAL-waš/
(88) haraššanā^{!!} šuwāvēzzi nu tuliyan halzišten mēn-awa uttar-šet
paizzi/ nu SAG.DU-naz šarnikdu

'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(1928)20). This view is based on the reading har-aš-ša-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 šuwai- 'push, shove' is wholly ad hoc, and the genitive LUGAL-waš 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 Hrozný and the transliteration of Forrer, BoTU 2.43, a reading har-aš-ša-na-a 'toward the head' is perfectly in order in line 51. Second, the spelling šuwāyēzzi proves that the verb here is šuwaya- 'look', not šuwai- 'push'.³⁰ For šuwaya- 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 uttar-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 tuliyan halzišten takes up the preceding relative clause rather awkwardly. One wonders if nu has been inserted erroneously, and the original had tuliya-an halzišten 'call him into the assembly'. This would give a regular relative sentence. For a clear case of an excrescent nu see KUB XXXI 127+ I 65 p. 196 above.

KBo III 1 II 45 (Telipinu Edict/Sturt. Chrest. 190):

(89) ba-aš-ša-an-na-ša-an-na-kan lē kuinki kuenti ŪL SIG₅-in

'Do not kill anyone of (your) family. It is not proper.'

One could delete the ša and take haššannanza 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:

haššannaš-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.

KUB XXXIII 68 II 7-8 (CTH 332/RHA 77,128 trs.; M.H. ms.):

(90) nu ^{GIŠ} MA maḥḥan andurza LIM NURUM-an harzi/ zig-a ŠĀ-it āššu
ud-da-a-na-za' (scil. uddār) 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-za as a copying error for -ar, the ablative of the text is simply impossible both syntactically and contextually. Based on the overall context and especially on II 12 ēššu uddār, one must read ud-da-a-ar¹¹ in II 8 as well.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. Perlative 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 perlative 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 Neo-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) [(uwa)hi kīdanda pattonit ekan utiškimi ta zaḫḫiškimi/
[(tē^u)] udnē ḫarnikmi kīdanda natīd-a t-an karda-šma šal[(ikti[!]?)]

'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 ta-za, but -za with ḫarnink- would to my knowledge be unique.

The spelling ta-a for ta is common in copies (cf. KUB XXV 1 VI 37, XXV 2 I 13 etc.). KBo XIII 78 Vs 10 has ša-a-li-ik-[]-ti, with the -ti spaced far to the right at the end of a paragraph. One could insert a [-ta-], but šaliktati could only be read as a third person if a preterite, and a past tense does not fit the context.

One would expect šzliga 'It--(the arrow) will plunge into their hearts' (for the directive with šalik- 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 (Oettinger, StBoT 22(1976)40, note 78), but natīd plus 'non-geminating' -a (Neu, StBoT 18(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 kēdanna pattaniuš and in Vs 9 kēdanna GI-it. The -uš for -it in pattaniuš can be explained as a copying error, but it is obvious that the scribe did not understand the function of kēdanda at all.

KBo III 13 Rs 4 (Naram-Sin/ZA 44,70):

(92) [-alli GIR-an GIR-it anda warpanu[n]]

'I (moving) on foot enclosed [it/them] as in a [].'

The verb warpanun cannot be from warp- 'wash', which is athematic.

Nor does 'wash' fit the context. Instead we have a denominative warpa(i)- 'enclose' from the noun warpa, known from the phrase warpa dēi- 'set a hedge around, surround'. The verb anda warpāi- is also attested in KBo III 21 II 18-19: UL pittuliantan-ma anda warniškiši 'you surround (even) the dauntless'.

KBo XV 33 III 11-12 (CTH 330; M.H. ms.):

(93) nu-ššan ^{LÚ}EN.Š^ŠŠ^ŠŠ ŠA UDU.ŠIR/ ŠA GUD.MAH-ya auliya GÍR.ZAFAR-it
QATAM dēi

'The master of the house lays his hand on the auli 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 auli. Perhaps a similar construction is present in a broken context in KUB XXVII 69 II 11-13 with an ablative of means:

(94) nu-šš[an]?...t]apišanaz GEŠTIN ANA ^{DUG}LIŠ.GAL-ni/ pūrin dēi

'He puts his lip to the saucer with (?) a tapišana of wine.'

That is, his lip touches the t., which in turn touches the saucer.

KUB XXXV 148 III 36 (R. of Zuwi/CTH 412):

(95) UR.BAR.RA kiššarta ēpten UR.MAH ganut ēpten

'Seize the wolf by the paw, seize the lion by the knee.'

VBoT 111 III 3f (R. of Zuwi/CTH 412):

GĪR.MEŠ-ŠU-war-aš app[an]za/ nu-war-aš išhia[n]z[a ŪL[?]]/

(96) iyannizi IŠTU [ŠĀ-ŠU-war-aš appa[nza...]/ appanza 8[!]

UZU
UR-war-aš appanza

'He is seized by his feet. He is bound and can[not] walk.

He is seized by his heart...He is seized [by his ____]. He is
seized by his eight (scil. nine) members.'

Based on the first passage and the presence of one IŠTU, all the body parts in the second passage should probably be taken as instrumentals. For the omission of IŠTU compare KBo XI 12 I 5 EME.HI.A šū versus the duplicate KBo XII 126 I 4-5 IŠTU EME IM/ [(šū)] 'full of clay tongues'. However, accusatives of respect are also possible: cf. KBo III 8+ III 6f (Kronasser, Sprache 7(1962) 161, and Neu, StBoT 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 kiššarta ēr- and kiššarta har(k)- are ambiguous, and the reference of 'hand' must be determined from the context.

KUB XXX 24 III 38-41 (Funeral Rites/HTR 64):

[n]u mān LŪ-iš akkan<za> nu-ššan šeliya/ [a]nda ŠA ^{GIŠ}_{IFBI}

(97) ALAM gulšanzi mān SAL-za-ma/ akkanza nu-ššan ZĪZ-aš šeliya/
anda IŠTU ^{GIŠ}_{IFBI}.

'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 ISTU 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 ALAM gulšanzi 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'.

KUB XXXIV 16 III 4 (Signs of the Moon/CTH 533):

(98) [udneva]...hēawit hinkta

'In the land [] will be bowed down by rain.'

Neu, StEoT 5(1968)55, note 2, finds this passage problematic, but if we take the middle hinkta 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.ŠUM^{SAR} Festival/CTH 612):

(99) LUGAL-uš IGI.HI.A-it iyazi / LÚ.MEŠ SU.I-kan dašanzipuš šanšanzi

'The king makes (a sign) with his eyes, and the barbers sweep the floor.'

KBo IV 9 IV 21

(100) GAL LEŠEDI GIŠ SUKUR-it ivazi

'The chief bodyguard makes (a sign) with his spear.'

The expression 'signal with' using iya- '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["] 31 (M.H. ms.): GIŠ SUKUR-it iškita[bhi] 'gives a signal with a spear'.

KUB XXX 39 Rs 9 (AN.TAH.ŠUM^{SAR} Festival/CTH 604):

(101) ariyan-na-at DINGIR^{LIM}-it

'It is inquired about through the god.'

The verb ariya- 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, StBoT 5,13). Since the subject is always human, one can hardly take DINGIR^{LIM}-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 (AN.TAH.ŠUM^{SAR} Festival/CTH 609):

(102) EGIR-ŠU UGULA ^{LÚ} MUHALDIM memalit AŠRI^{HI.A} irpaizzi/ EGIR-ŠU
TA KAŠ GEŠTIN tawalit AŠRI^{HI.A} irpaizzi

'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 tawal(-drink).'

The precise meaning of this very common usage is made clear by a passage like KUB II 8 II 22f, where 'they make the rounds of the places' with AN.TAH.ŠUM^{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..

KUB XLI 40 I 18-20 (CTH 669):

(103) [UGULA?] ^{LÚ.MEŠ} MUHALDIM GAL-it wātar hara[i]/ [t]a ANA QATI
LUGAL wātar parā/ [l]abbuešnit 3-ŠU lahūwai

'[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 lahuwai- which indicates the utensil with which something is poured. Other instances of both the instrumental and ablative with lahuwai- 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 šipand- '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 lahuwai- is not always certain: see note 25 above.

IBoT III 52,3-5 (CTH 670):

(104) [t]-an ^{LÚ} AZU IŠTU ^{MUŠEN} KURRI / [^{HA4} pluštīt wetenazzi-wa /
[wa] hnuzi

'The physician "brandishes" him (the king) with the H-bird, with hust- and with water.'

The meaning of this odd-looking sentence is revealed by passages like KBo XVII 1 II 20-21 (R. for King and Queen/StPoT 8,26):

(105) ^{MUŠEN} haran[an] ERIN.MEŠ-an[n]-a LUGAL-a[š] SAL.LUGAL-ašš-a
še[(r-šemet)]/ wahnūmeni

'We whirl the eagle and the (figures of the) troops over the king and queen.'

The combination šer (arha) wahnū- 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 wahnu-
 ==> Person (Acc.) + Object (Instr.) + wahnu-

The same transformation appears to be possible with arahganda wahnu-: see 103/p V 34 (StBoT 12,70). See the discussion of eku- and šipand- immediately following for a similar transformation.

The syntax of eku- 'drink' and šipand- '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:

Liquid (Acc.) + God's Name (Dat.) + Vessel (Instr.) + eku-/šipand-
 'drinks/libates x with y for/to z'

Examples of the full structure are rare, but they do exist:

KUB II 13 I 43-44 (Monthly Festival/CTH 591):

(106) GEŠTIN-ann-a tapišaniš GIR₄ / kēdaš DINGIR.1EŠ-aš šipanti

'And he libates wine for these gods with a t. of burnt-clay.'

Another example is KBo XV 33 II 30-31 (M.H. ms.), where the vessel is in the ablative instead of the instrumental. Normally, one or more of the possible elements is deleted:

KBo XIII 164 IV 12 (CTH 670):

(107) [m]ahhan ^{LÚ} SANGA IŠTU GAL ANA DINGIR ^{LIM} šipanti

'When the priest libates to the god with a cup.'

KBo XVII 74 III 25-26 (Storm Ritual/StPoT 12,26; H.H. ms.):

(108) LUGAL-uš [SA]L.LUGAL-š-a ašandaš aruwanzi CAL ^dIŠKUR
 [^{Sup}pišduwarit/ akuanzi

'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 arḫa wahnu-:
 Liquid (Acc.) + God's Name (Dat.) + Vessel (Instr.) + eku-/šipand-
 ==> God's Name (Acc.) + Liquid (Instr.) + Vessel (Instr.) + eku-/
šipand-

Again the full structure is rare, but attested:

KBo XX 64 Vs 7 (Storm Ritual/CTH 631):

(109) [^dUTU/^dIŠKUR] ŠAMÉ šipanduit KUBABBAR GEŠTIN-it šipanti

'He libates (to) the Sun/Storm-god of heaven with wine with
 a ^{silver}libation-vessel.'

The restoration of a divine name before ŠAMÉ 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):

(110) LUGAL SAL.LUGAL TUŠ-aš ^dZababa IŠTU BIERI UR.MAH/ 4 arantet
akuwanzi

'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...]/ ekuzi 'He drinks (to) him with a standing
bu[11(-rhyton)]'.

KBo XI 16 IV 14-15 (CTH 669):

(111) LUGAL SAL.LUGAL TUŠ-aš ^dTa-x[...]/ tawalit akuanzi

'The king and queen, seated, drink (to) Ta-[] with tawal.'

Viewed in its proper context, as a part of the overall usage of
eku- (and šipand-), 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 šipand-. Besides

entering into the basic structure given above, šipand- 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.) + šipand-
'consecrate x with y for/to Z'

Again the full structure is rare:

KUB XLIII 56 III 6-7 (CTH 330):

(112) n-ašta SAL.LUGAL ŠAH ^dUdnivantaš [---]/ IŠTU ^{DUG}KUKUB KAŠ
šipanti

'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-kan tūruppan GESTIN-it šipanti

'He consecrates the t. with wine.'

Whatever the precise meaning of tūruppa-, it is cooked (ibid. II 23), so the use of šipant- is clear (contra Szabó, TH 1,81). The verb šipand- 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 šipand-, 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:

anš- 'wipe': KBo III 8 II 33 IŠTU LAL-it (+ arpa).

arra- 'wash': KBo XXI 57 III 8 [wit]enit.

arnu- 'move, carry': KUB XXXIII 8 II 16 [n]artaunit.

ašeš- 'seat': KUB XXXIV 66 + XXXIX 7 III 2-3 IŠTU ^{GIŠ}GU.ZA.

ēp- 'take; hold': KUB XXXI 127+ I 51 kiššarta ('by the hand'),

XXXV 148 III 36 IGI.WI.A-wait ('by the eyes'), II 10 IV 18.26

ŠU-it, KBo III 13 Rs 14 ŠU-mit, XX 67 III 31⁺ ŠU-it (+ katta);

KUB II 6 II 10 zalhait (+ parā), Bo 2708 I 7-8 (StBoT 12,75 =

KUB XI 30 + XLIV 14 IV 30-31) ^{GIŠ}zalwanit (+ parā).

ēd- 'eat': KUB XXIX 1 I 15 zanzikit.

habhariya- 'rake' (?): KUB XXIV 10 III 11 habharit.

hališšiya- 'line, plate': KBo III 43 Rs 14⁺ GUŠKIN-it, KUB XXVI 71,7
apēdanda.

halzāi- 'call': KBo XI 32 Vs 30 SUM-it, Rs 59 [lam]nit, XIX 128

IV 5 lamnit.

han- 'draw' (liquid): IBoT II 14 Vs 10 zalhait (+ -ašta).

hanešš- 'plaster': KBo XXI 22 Rs 42 arzilit.

har(k)- 'hold': KBo XVII 40 IV 8 ^{GIŠ}MA.SÁ.AB-it, KUB II 7 I 3

GÜB-lit ki[ššarit], XXXIII 68 III 11 (M.H. ms.) kiššarta,

XVII 10 II 19f (and often) šā-it.

hark- 'perish': KUB XVII 10 I 18.30⁺ (M.H. ms.) kištantit.

hazziya- 'strike': KBo III 36 Vs 8 GI-it.

hūrāi- '?': KUB XXIX 1 III 39 [ku]nnanit.

innarāi- 'be vigorous': KUB XXX 10 Vs 18.19 (M.H. ms.) uddanta.

irbāi- '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 69+ Vs 16-17.20, XXXIV 70 I 17, XLI 53 V 8, HT 26,9-10, IBOT II 4 Vs 3⁺, III 1,57-58.64-65.

išbuzziya- 'gird': Bo 2721 III 8r (ZA 63,79) IŠTU TAHAḤŠI.

išk- 'anoint': KBo XX 34 Vs 8⁺ (M.H. ms.) ī-it, XXI 22 Rs 43 (M.H. ms.) AN.BAR.

iškar- 'prick, pierce': KBo III 16+ II 6.12 išpannit.

išpar- 'trample': KUB XVII 27 III 12 [GİR.MEŠ-i]t.

iya- 'make (a sign)': KBo XI 52 V 5 (and often) IGI.HI.A-it, KUB X 21 I 24 IŠTU ^{GIŠ} ŠUKUR.

kalēliya- 'bind' (?): KUB XVII 5 I 15 išhimanta.

kannā(i)- '?': KUB XLIII 56 II 11 [š]alwanit (cf. ibid. II 13 with ablative).

karan- 'devour': KBo XII 4 III 6 [^U] ^{ZU} KAXU-it.

kariya- 'cover': KUB II 13 I 16.49.56.II 15 (and often) GAD-it (+ -ašta/-kan).

hištanu- 'extinguish': KBo IV 2 I 12 (and elsewhere) wetenit.

kuer- 'cut': KBo III 16 II 7.13 ^{URUDU} tapulliannitt-a...

^{URUDU} tapulliyannit, ³³ IPoT III 1,88 GĪR-it.

gulš- 'inscribe': KBo XX 34 Vs 12 (M.H. ms.) (and elsewhere)

šiyēššanit.

lazziya- 'get well': KUB XXX 10 Vs 18.19 (M.H. ms.) uddanta.

mald- 'swear an oath': IPoT II 101 V 14 []x-it, KBo XI 10 VI 13

TA GEŠTIN.

mena- 'speak': KUB XXXI 127+ I 43 (= XXXI 135+ Vs. 11 M.H. ms.)

iššit.

ninganu- 'make drunk': KUB XXXIII 5 III 10 šiyēššnit.

pāi- 'give': KUB II 7 I 6 GÜB-lit ŠU-it.

pēi- 'go': KBo XIX 128 I 3-4 (and elsewhere) ^{GIŠ} GIGIR-it...

^{GIŠ} bulugannit.

papparš- 'sprinkle': KBo XIII 164 I 6 w<e>tenit, KUB XVII 10 II 29

(M.H. ms.) Ī.DÜG.GA-it.

penna- 'drive': KUB X 3 I 10 ANŠE.KUR.RA-it (+ šarā).

pēda- 'carry': KUB II 13 I 8 akugallit, X 3 I 31-32 IŠTU būppar!

GUŠKIN, XXV 1 II 18⁺ h[u]p̄rit GUŠKIN.

šakkuriya- '?': KBo X 2 II 19 GĪR.HI.A-i[t] (+ arpa).

šartāi- '?': KBo III 8 II 19 BAPPĪR-it (cf. ibid. II 32).

šeš(a)riya- 'sift, strain' (?): KUB XIII 3 III 23 ^{GIŠ} šešarulit.

šiya- 'shoot': KBo X 37 II 8⁺ ^{GIŠ} BAW-it GI-it.

šū- 'full, filled with': KBo X 23 IV 5 (and often) GEŠTIN-it,

- XXI 72 I 13 marnuantet, XV 33 II 15 (M.H. ms.) ZID.DA-it, etc.
- šunna- 'fill': KBo XVII 75 I 61 (and often) GEŠTIN-it, X 2 I 20-21
aššawit (+ šarā), III 38 Rs 16-17 ^{GIŠ}intaluzzit, etc.
- šuppiyahh- 'purify': KBo XIX 128 I 31 (and often) tuhhuešnit.
- šuwai- 'push': KUB XXIV 10 III 12 [^{GIŠ}]inteluzzit.
- dā- 'take': KUB VII 1 II 4 išpannit (+ appa).
- tamaš- '(op)press': KUB XXXI 103,14 ERIN.MEŠ-it.
- tarh- 'conquer': KBo III 1 I 6⁺.16.26.II 42 kuttanit.
- tarna- 'let go': KBo X 2 I 43 IZI-it (+ kattan).³⁴
- unuwai- 'adorn': KUB XXX 19+ I 11-12 IŠTU GEŠTIN...mūrinit...
mūrinit.
- ušk- 'see' (iter.): KUB XX 92 VI 12 SIG₅-it IGI.HI.A-it.
- walḥ- 'hit': KUB XLI 27 IV 10 ^{NA₄}tahuppaštaīt, KBo XX 76+ I 14
tuhuppuššit,³⁵ KUB XLIII 60 I 17-21 gaddušnit (?) šappuit...
SI.HI.A-["]anda tittittet...išḥabruit, etc..
- warnu- 'burn': KUB VIII 25 I 9 IZI-it.
- warp- 'wash': KBo XXI 8 III 11 (M.H. ms.) ŠEXFAG-it.
- waššiya- 'clothe': KBo IV 9 V 19 GAD-it (= KBo XIV 35 I 12
kariyanta).
- wete- 'build': KBo XXI 22 Rs 37.42 (M.H. ms.) NA₄-ta...kunnanit.
- zāi- 'cross': KBo X 2 III 32 GIR.MEŠ-it.
- zankilai- 'fine, penalize': KUB XIII 4 IV 10 IŠTU GUD...10 UDU-ya.
- zanu- 'cook': KBo XXI 85 I ["]16 (M.H. ms.) (and often) ḥanpinit,
X 37 IV 7 (and often) I[Z]I-it, XX 64 Vs 11 (and elsewhere)
^{[DU]^G}TU₇-it.

A special problem is posed by the use of išgaruḫit in ritual texts. A typical example is KUB I 17 II 31-34 (Monthly Festival/CTH 591):

(114) LUGAL-uš TUS-aš ^dIŠKUR/ ^dIŠKUR ^{URU}Z[i]ppalada/ IŠTU BIBRI
GUD GUŠKIN/ ekuzi išgaruḫit/ šer ēpzi

'The king, seated, drinks (to) the Storm-god and the Storm-god of Ziplanda with a gold bull rhyton...'

The phrase išgaruḫit šer ēpzi 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 1 V 20-21 (AN.TAH.ŠUM^{SAR} Festival/CTH 612): LÚ SILÀ.ŠU.DU₈.A išgaruḫi[t]/ GEŠTIN-it šer l-ŠU ēp[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 išgaruḫ- (to the king or other celebrant)'. However, the instrumental GEŠTIN-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: išgaruḫit šannapilit/ 2-ŠU šer ēpzi. Compare also ibid. V 15-16 išgaruḫit šannapilit/ anda ēpzi with a different preverb. The cupbearer can hardly be offering wine with an empty vessel.

The key to understanding išgaruḫit šer ēpzi is KUB I 17 I 6-8:

(Monthly Festival/CTH 591):

(115) LUGAL-uš ħunpari šivanti/ išgaruḫit šer ēpzi/ GEŠTIN-an-kan
lahūwān

'The king libates into a bowl. He (the cupbearer) holds (it)
 up with an išgaruḫ. The wine is poured into (it).'

For pouring a libation into a bowl see KBo XVII 74 III 9f (Neu, StBoT 12, 24f). Compare also KBo XI 28 II 9 (and passim): ...akuwanzi išgaruḫi-kan lahūwan and KUB X 99 I 14-17. In our formula the cupbearer holds up the bowl by means of an išgaruḫ-vessel. The use of the išgaruḫ to support the bowl explains why the former is usually empty, although according to examples like 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 išgaruḫit GEŠTIN-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 išgaruḫit šer ēpzi, and Hittite ritual practice is very highly developed. If the usual derivation of išgaruḫ- from išgar- 'stick' and its interpretation as a pointed vessel which may be stuck in the ground are correct, it also makes sense that the išgaruḫ- is the usual vessel used for supporting another. It is not, however, the only one: cf. VEoT 3 VI 4.17 [^{LÜ}]SILÀ.ŠU.DU₉.A-aš

zalhait šer ēpzi 'the cupbearer holds (it) up with a zalhai-'.

Here also belongs the instance with an ablative, KUB X 40 IV 11-12:

zalhayaz šer ēpzi. Compare also KUB XLIV 37 IV 4-5:

(116) LUGAL SAL.LUGAL TUŠ-aš ^dZababa [akuwanzi]/ išgaruḫi-kan
UL lābūwa[n]

'The king and queen, seated, drink (to) Zababa. It is not poured into an išgaruḫ.'

Before leaving the matter of išgaruḫit, I must also cite the following variant:

KUB II 3 I 27-29 (KI.LAM Festival/CTH 627):

(117) LUGAL-uš ḫuppari šipanti SAL.LUG[AL]-ma UL/ išgaruḫ RI[Q]U
anda ēpzi

'The king libates into a bowl, but the queen (does) not. He (the cupbearer) holds an empty išgaruḫ 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 išgaruḫ, despite the use of the accusative instead of the instrumental. We have already seen the use of anda instead of šer. For anda meaning 'up to/against' compare KUB XXXV 148 III 14: n-an-ši-na anda ZAG-az ēomi '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) LÚ^{NAR} GIŠ^{huzinarit} / SÎR^{RU}

'The singer sings to the accompaniment of a huncinara.'

Similar are KUB XI 35 V 11 GIŠ^{huhupalit} SÎR^{RU} and KBo XI 30 VI 17

GI^{RU} GÍD-it SÎR^{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^{arkammi galgaltūri} / walḥanniškanzi /

SÎR^{RU}-sa ŪL 'They beat the arkammi and the g., but they do not sing'. Friedrich's meaning '(Instrument) spielen' for SÎR^{RU},

HWb 292, is to be stricken (cf. Güterbock, CAD sub zamēru 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):

[A]NA LÚ [B]EL É^{TIM} SAL BELTI É^{TIM} DUMU.NITA.MEŠ DUMU.SAL.MEŠ-aš /

(119) aššuli TI-anni innarauwanni hattulanni / NU.WI.A GÍD.DA

EGIR.UD^{MI} DINGIR.MEŠ-naš aššiuunit DINGIR.MEŠ-naš miūmni

<tarne/pāi> / kardimiyattan-ma arha tarne

'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 kardimiyattan-ma, 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/HC §190):

(120) talku-ššan akantit TI[?]-anzi LÚ[(-ma SAI^{TU} UL harētar)]

'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 GEDIM-it (see Güterbock, 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 tianzi 'they step', and 'step together with' > 'consort with' cannot be excluded. But

given TI-anza as a spelling for huišwanza two lines later in KBo VI 26 III 31, I wonder if we should understand TI-anzi = huišwanzi instead. The translation 'live with' sounds like an egregious Anglicism (huiš- 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 akant- '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 AlI/TH 2,22):

(121) n-an haššannit dāu

'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.):

(122) [x-x-t/š]alit abhati š-at ŪL dabhun ZAG-nit-a/ [ŪL] abhati
n-aa da[h]un DINGIR.IEŠ-an uddēr n-e-zzan [.../...]šubhahhun

'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 Ū-UL) are those of Laroche, RHA 77(1965)85. Note that these are based on a new collation of the original (ibid. 81). Neu, StBoT 5(1968)3, ventures UH₄-hati as an error for UH₄-hati = alwanzabhati 'was bewitched'. Besides the necessity of assuming an error, this interpretation has two further points against it: (1) when a stem in -abb- is written with an ideogram, one typically finds either no trace of the stem or the full -abb-, 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 kēt is another matter).

On the other hand, abhati as first singular preterite middle to ā- 'be warm/hot' is quite regular (for the lack of scriptio plena see Neu, StBoT 5(1968)1). For the sense of the passage compare in the same text I 24: [k]āša-wa ammel tuegaš-meš a-a-an-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 ^dMAH, but the idea is the same. The malady is brought on by the disappearance of the Sun-god. My restoration of ŪL in IV 5 is based on the following understanding of the context. The 'heat' afflicted the left hand of the ^dMAH, so she could not pick up the gods' words, but her right hand was not

affected (H.B. ZAG-nit-a with non-geminating -a), 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 GÜB, but either TA or ŠA, 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 tamhari/DOG 101,19):

(123) ^{GIS}TUKUL.HI.A-iš-wa-tt[a]/ šunit pivateš

'Weapons (have been) given to you by the god.'

KBo X 20 II 39 (AN.TAH.ŠUL^{SAR} Festival/CTH 604):

(124) IŠTU DINGIR^{LIM} kiššan hantaittat

'Thus (it) was determined/ordained by the god.'

The only reason for doubt about the second example is the fact that handai- in the middle is used to mean 'is determined oracularly by means of X' (see p. 232 above on ariya- and Neu, 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 kēz is usually used for 'on/toward this side', but a couple of instances of the instrumental kēt are attested (cf. above p. 169 f):

KUB XXXII 117+ Rs¹¹ 12-13 (Palaic Hymn and Ritual/CTH 752):

(125) išt[an]anaš kitt-a kētt-a/ dāi

'...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 (M.H. ms.) tuggaz-šet, XXVIII 98 III 5 [LUGAL]-waš tapuša-šit, XXXI 127+ I 59 ZAG-az-tet, ibid. I 65-67 ZAG-az-tit...GÜB-laz-tet (// XXXVI 75 II 2f (M.H. ms.) and KBo XXII 75,1f), KBo VI 3 IV 28 (M.H. ms.?) šarpuwantaz-šet.

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 pangarit maušzi 'will fall en masse'.

The subject is missing, but a collective is more likely than a

singular. On the probable development of the adverb panfarit 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 (ištanzanit), literally 'by/with the soul/mind'. One set of examples consists of ZI-it alone in prohibitions: KUB XXXI 115,13 ARĀH-an ZI-nit lē[], XXXI 103,20 [Z]I-it haluki lē[], ibid. 24 apāš-a ZI-it lē[]. 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-azza 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) mān šekrantit-ma ZI-it parē dāi

'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 (Kantuezili/ANET³ 400 trl.):

(127) [(kinun-a)]-nu-za ammel DINGIR-YA ŠĀ-ŠU ZI-ŠU hūmantet kardit
kīnuddu

'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 'innards' (as opposed to tuekka- 'the visible body; (pl.) limbs'.³⁷ One could interpret hūmantet kardit as an accompanying object: 'together with his whole heart', but the phrase seems rather to describe manner: 'whole-heartedly' (Goetze, AIET³ 400 translates 'freely').

Old Hittite mythical texts show yet another use of ZI-it:

KUB XVII 10 II 23-24 (Telipinu/RHA 77,93; E.H. ms.):

(128) BULÜG BAPFIR ZI-it māḫḫan takšant[a(ri)] ū ša^d Telipinu/ ZI-ka
ša DURU.LÜ.ULÜ^{LU}.IEŠ uddanaš CATAḪA takšanza ē[štu]

'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; E.H. ms.):

(129) nu BULÜG BAPFIR-š-a/ [māḫḫa(n iš)tan]zanit takšandari nu-šmaš/
[ištanza-š]iš garaz-šiš l-iš kišari

'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 'im 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

(AN.TAH.ŠUM^{SAR} Festival/CTH 612):

(130) ta ^{LÚ}SILÀ.ŠU.DU_o.LIŠ.A GAL KUBABBAR/ GEŠTIN-it LUGAL-i vāi

'The cupbearer gives a silver cup with wine to the king.'

See also KUB XXV 1 VI 4 [GAL] GUŠKIN GEŠTIN-it, XI 34 III 7-8

2 ^{DUG}tah₂[]/ tāwalit, and probably also KBo III 34 II 1-2

^{DUG}harḥarān GE[ŠTIN]-it, where the duplicate KBo III 36 Vs 11 has

^{DUG}harḥarān GEŠTIN 'a h. of wine'. Since this use is confined to vessels and liquids, derivation from X Y-it šūwant- '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 šūwant-.

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 18-19 (Hatt. I Annals/StClOr 14,52):

(131) n-aš-ken šahhanit luzzit/ arawahhun

'I freed them from š. and l.'

KUB XIII 4 II 16 (Instr. for Priests/Sturt. Chrest. 152):

(132) [KAxU-it parā SUD-atteni

'you pull from (the god's) mouth....'

The duplicate KUE XIII 5 II 26 also has an instrumental, but compare KUE XIII 4 IV 71 KAMU-az...nare būittirawen.

KBo IV 2 I 59-60 (R. of Huwarlu/Sprache 8,91):

(133) LUGAL SAL.LUGAL kī-wa/ É-ir kās halkiś kallarit uddanaz
QATAMMA būišnuddu

'May this grain so preserve the king and queen and this house from the malicious word.'

KUB XXXIII 34 Vs 3 probably has another instance: iššit-wa-šši-kan
SAHAR.HI.A-uš d[a-] '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).

IX. Problematic Cases

Several instances of the instrumental remain problematic in their interpretation, despite a reasonably complete context:

KUB XXXIII 52 II 7 (Inars/RMA 77,148):

(134) š-an nahta ^{GIŠ} ŠUKUR-it GÍR-it dāš

'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.

KUB XXXI 127+XXXVI 79a IV 21-23 (Sun Hymn/CTH 372):

[nu-u]t-te hi-i nu-[k]i-[i]š-na-(ras.)-aš/ ud-d[a-a-ar

(135) DI]NGIR-YA e-ku^{!?}-na-aš ú-e-te-na-as/ ma-a[h-h]a-an ŠÀ-it
wa-ar-ša-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-aš in line 22, and Laroche, BSL 58(1963) 61-62, takes na-aš as the beginning of a new sentence: 'qu'il fasse suinter son coeur comme par de l'eau'. This is impossible syntactically (ŠÀ-it cannot be a direct object) and out of place contextually. It also fails to account for the plural [warš]anuwandu in the duplicate KBo 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 mukišnaš compare KBo III 1 II 47: kī-wa ēšnaš uttar. For waršanu- 'soothe' see the Hymn to Adad, KBo III 21 III 12-13 (and passim): ^dIŠKUR-aš kir-tit[ta] minuandu lišši-na-tta/ warašnuandu '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 ŠÀ-it, which may be interpreted as an instrumental of respect. The reading and interpretation of e-ku-na-aš are quite uncertain.

A form of ekuna- 'cold, cool' fits the context, but ekunaš wetenaz is difficult. One expects ekunaz wetenaz. Perhaps one may compare KBo XX 107+XXIII 50 III 26 arāḫzenaš hūmantaz KUR-yaz 'from all the surrounding lands'. The plural waršanuwandu in the duplicate would in this interpretation be either a constructio ad sensum with uddēr or point to an animatized uddananteš as subject, which would be quite in order.

Other difficult passages with the instrumental are bound up with problems of vocabulary. KBo IV 2 I 4 has [...ša] ā^{MUSEN} partāunit anda š[a]kuškanzi, which is hard to explain with either šakuwawa- 'see, look' or šakuwa- 'store up'. KBo XIX 128 IV 7 shows te-pu-ut-ti-it which looks like an instrumental adverb, but both form and meaning are unclear. In KUB XII 63+ Vs 16 we find malulit etaryandan 'x-ed with/by flesh(?)'. The function of the instrumental depends on the interpretation of etaryandan which to my knowledge is hapax. KBo XI 36 V¹⁰ has another instance of NINDA¹⁰ kaḫarit, 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 kēt in kēt īD-az and -šet in šarpuwantaz-šet as instrumentals standing for ablatives in pronouns which had not yet developed ablatival forms. This may be termed the 'traditional' view (at least for the enclitic possessives), as set forth by Friedrich, HE I²(1960) §218c, and Kammenhuber, H&O 205. This interpretation has been challenged by Friedrich himself, Fest. Eilers (1967)72-73, and by Houwink ten Cate, RHA 24(1966)123-132. Friedrich cites several examples of enclitic possessives in -et/-it with cases other than the ablative and instrumental:

Vocative: 38

KBo III 34 I 22 (Palace Chronicle/CTH 8):

URUA ^mŠarmaššu ^dUTU-met... 'Thus (spoke) S.: "Your Majesty...".'

KBo XI 14 II 4 (R. of Hantitassu/CTH 395):

^dUTU-ue EN-mit '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 (Naram-Sin/ZA 44,272):

[lx-ante paltani-mit 'on/to my _____ shoulder'

Friedrich also recalls the use of possessives in -et/-it with the neuter nom.-acc. plural (e.g. šakuwa-šmet 'their eyes') and

combinations like apran-net 'behind me', piran-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/CTH 9):

kišširi-mi[t] 'in my hand'

KUB XXXI 110 II 8 (CTH 39):

auri-šmit 'in their/your watchtower'

Houwink also points to kēt īD-az and on the basis of the opposite member edi īD-az argues for a locative function in kēt. Also of importance is kuwāpit, an extended form of kuwapi 'where'. Note especially KBo XII 18 Vs 5 kuwāpit UD-at 'on the day when'. Houwink identifies this ending -t (/d/) with the stem formative in oblique pronominal forms like apēd-ani and ammēd-az. He concludes that the adverbial ending -d was once an all-purpose local marker, with locative, ablative and instrumental functions. In a following article Josephson, RHA 24(1966)133f, discusses the prehistory of this adverbial ending -d 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) kēt/kit in kēt ID-as and kitkar.
- (3) Enclitic possessives in -it/-et with postpositions.
- (4) kuwapit.

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):

Ūk-wa 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 XLI 23 II 21.24 (CTH 458):

išta(n)zanaš-(š)nit karazza-(š)mišš-a 'their soul and their insides'

Compare *ibid.* II 23 correct ištanzanaš-(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, -šit, -šmit 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 KBo XXII 6 (Šar tamhari/IDCG 101,19f) lead to the same conclusion. In KBo XXII 6 IV 14 and 20 we find šilanni-šet/šit, but in I 10 uddani-mit is used where the context demands uddār-šet! 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 šakuwa-šnet and šarḫuwantaz-šet, the rules for which were unknown to the Neo-Hittite scribe, the latter could easily have inferred that the possessive in -et/-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 ḫD-az 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 ḫD-az, 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

ablative. The replacement of kēt by kēz in the directional function confirms that kēt is standing for an ablative. This is further supported by kitpantalaz 'from this moment on', where the function of kit is unarguably ablatival. Since the distribution of kēt versus kēz shows that kēt is the older form, we are justified in equating the ablatival use of kēt 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 kēt in the phrase kēt id-az have supported their contention by pointing to the contrasting edi id-az (see Houwink ten Cate, op. cit. 126, Josephson, op. cit. 133, Neu, StBoT 18(1974)71, note 107, and already Sommer, HAB 142). However, a close look at the use of edi shows that it never means 'there, in that place'.⁴⁰ In all but one of its attestations, edi is used non-attributively, but in none of these examples is its function locative! In one case it must be interpreted ablativally, in the others it may be:

KUB XXXI 4 + KBo III 41 Vs 13 (CTH 16):

(136) HURSAG-an tarmaemi t-ašta edi natta nēari

'I nail down the mountain, and it does not budge from its place.' (lit. 'turn from there')

KBo VI 26 II 3-8 (Laws/HG §171):

takru annaš^{II} TUG-SU DUBU.NITA-ēi edi nēi nu-za-kan

- (137) DUMU.ŠU parā/ šūizzi mān DUMU-ŠU EGIR-ōanda uizzi/
ta GIŠ IG-ŠU dāi ta idi nāi GIŠ iškiššana-ššit/ GIŠ hūpuulli-ššit
dāi/ ta edi nāi t-uš EGIR-pa dēi/ nu-za DUMU.NITA-ŠU EGIR-pa
DUMU-ŠU iēzzi

'If a mother turns around her garment in the face of her son, she throws her son out (of the house). If ^{the} ~~her~~ son returns, takes her door and turns it around, ~~and~~ takes her i. and h. and turns them around, and puts them back (in their place), then she makes her son again her son.'

KUB I 16 III 41 (HAB 12):

- (138) [udlār-šet ŪL DUMU.ŠU edi nāir

'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 edi + nāi- 'turn'. In the first case both the ablative function (place from which) and the sense 'from its accustomed/proper place' are clear for edi. 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 HAB is not clear, and the sentence may not be

complete as given. Again, however, the sense 'turn from their proper place' seems appropriate for edi nāi-.⁴¹ The use of a formal dative-locative edi 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 edi in an ablative function may be regarded as suppletive, like that of kēt for kēz. Since edi in edi ID-az is functioning as an ablative, it offers no support for a locative interpretation of kēt.⁴²

Josephson, RHA 24(1966)135, and Jasanoff, MSS 31(1972)125-126, cite kitkar(za) as an example of the 'adverbial' use of kēt. 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 kēt is that of an ablative, not a locative. In sum, there is no positive evidence that kēt functions as anything but an ablative.

The use of enclitic possessives in -et/-it with postpositions like appan and pēran may also be explained without recourse to a general adverbial ending -(e)t. Neu, StBoT 18(1974)68-69, interprets appan, pēran and kattan as old accusatives of direction from a-stem

substantives. Thus LUGAL-waš pēran would originally have been '(zur) Vorder(seite) des Königs (hin)', and pēran-šet would have been the regular corresponding pronominal form. Eventually, the substantival force of pēran, 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 pēran 'beim König vorn'. Thus according to Neu's analysis, pēran etc. were never genuine postpositions.

This explanation is not without difficulties. First of all, as noted by Josephson, op. cit. 134, the substantival origin of forms like pēran, annan and kattan is unproven. In the case of at least annan 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-waš pēran to LUGAL-i pēran 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/StBoT 8,26):

NUŠEN pēranan L[UGAL-aš SAL.LUGAL-ašš]-a šēr-šamet 3-[(ŠU)]/

(139) DUMU.É.GAL wahnu[zi u]g-a-šmaš-šan ERÍN.MEŠ-an šē[(r)]/

3-ŠU wahnūmi

'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) šer-šmet-a [GÍR ZABAR kitta

'A bronze dagger is placed over them.'

ibid. II 19-20 (StBoT 8,26):

(141) [ERÍH.İEŠ]-ti-ma-ššan šer GÍR ZAP[(AR)]/ kitta

'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 piran and KBo XXII 2 Vs 13-14 karti-šmi piran.

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 preverbs 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: tapušza 'to the side of, beside', originally the ablative of a noun tapu(wa)š- 'rib, side,

flank'. As already described, tapušza appears to be used with both the genitive and dative-locative in Old Hittite manuscripts: KBo XX 12 I 1 LUGAL-waš tapušza but KBo XVII 43 IV 3 [x]-x-ni tapušza.

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 tapušza or LUGAL-i tapušza 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):

	Nom.-Acc. Ft.	Adverb	Instr.-Abl.
-et	15	9	2
-it	0	2	8

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:

	Nom.-Acc. It.	Adverbs
-et	16	0
-it	1	3

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 pēran, apnan, kattan and šēr are formally comparable to neuters like ērnan and *pēr (ē-ir), 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 tanuša.⁴⁴ I do not insist on either this explanation of the type pēran-šet or the account of Neu. 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)t.

As to the form kuwanit, 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 kuwanit appear to be interchangeable. Note the example of Houwink ten Cate, op. cit. 127: KUB VII 5 I 15 kuwapit-za imma kuwapi 'wherever you may be'. Beside the above mentioned kuwanit UD-at (KBo XII 18 Vs 5) stands kuwapi UD-at (KUB XIII 3 II 14). This makes the status of kuwanit rather different from that of kēt,

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 nit 'not', an extended form of ni 'not'. This case does seem comparable to that of kuwapi: kuwapit. 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; kēt does have local force, but it is always ablative; the use of possessives in -et/-it with adverbs like pēran admits of several explanations; the -t of kuwapit has not been shown to have any local force.

In arguing positively for the interpretation of kēt 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 kēt being replaced by kēz, 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 kēt/kit 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 perlocative 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 overlap, 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 ablative 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

¹All 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.

²Since 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.

³This 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.

⁴In all these cases read /-ats-smid/ 'from their...'.

⁵The 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-z-a, i.e. palšaz + non-geminating -a: 'but from the road/campaign' (see Chap. 5, note 4).

⁶The interpretation of šuhmili- as 'nurturing' (lit. 'suckling') is based on the apparent equation of ^{GI}šuhmiliš 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 šuhmili- would be 'that which suckles', and šuhmiliš daganzipaš would represent the Hittite

equivalent of Lat. alma terra (e.g. Lucr. 2.992). One may analyze šuhmili- as *suh₂-m-ili- (< IE *seuh₂- 'suck') with the adjectival suffix -ili- (cf. Hattuš-ili-, karu-ili-). The -m- could reflect a *suh₂mo- 'suckling' parallel to the *almo- 'nourishing' of almus.

⁷This 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.

⁸Attested as URU Za-al-pa in KBo X 2 I 9 (// KBo X 1 Vs 4 URU Za-al-ba-ar'). See Otten, StBoT 17(1973)59 with references.

⁹As 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 nepišza. However, the following sentence n-ašta ^dIŠKUR-unni mān āššuš ēšta 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.

¹⁰I 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.

¹¹The meaning of mārā(i)- and šērha/i- is unknown to me, but the instrumental function seems reasonably certain.

¹²Hoffner, Alimenta Heth. 167, lists a stem kaḫaret- separate from kaḫari-. While this possibility cannot be excluded, setting up

an additional stem kaḥaret- 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 kaḥari- is well attested in a variety of cases (see Hoffner, op. cit. 166).

¹³The translation of zaḥanittenna- is based on the context. Since karimna- is usually translated 'temple', I have chosen 'shrine'.

¹⁴There 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-aš/ [K]AŠ-išnāš a[tu]leni akueni 'We eat of the ____ and drink of the beer'. The second is KUB XVII 5 I 11 (Illuyanka/RHA 77,67): n-ašta ^{DUG} palḥan ḥūmandan ek[uer] 'They drank (some) of all the p.-vessels'. For the interpretation of palḥan as /palḥayan/, 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 palḥi- is spelled palḥaš (for /palḥayas/).

¹⁵Despite the form of the verb (a-ri-ya-an-zi), the context demands arai- 'arise, stand up', not ariya- 'inquire by oracle'.

¹⁶The traces in the autograph forbid aš-g/ka-az. I cannot restore the lexical item, but the function of the ablative is surely separative.

¹⁷Despite the single r, arušaz is probably to be related to the adverb arrūša (see Friedrich, HWb 34). The sense remains obscure.

¹⁸For the emendation see already Kronasser, Sprache 7(1961) 150 and 152.

¹⁹Friedrich, 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).

²⁰The interpretation of šarranaza (dupl. šarraz) as 'nach oben' by Eisele(1970)51 must be due to a lapsus.

²¹KUB XVII 5 clearly has ha-an¹-te-eš-na-az, but the duplicate XVII 6 I 1 has correctly ha-at-[te-eš-na-az].

²²I am also aware of no examples of either kariya- or waššiya- with šer. In KUB XI 13 V 11f cited by Eichner, loc. cit., the šer has nothing directly to do with waššuwar waššuwanzi. Read: 'On top are three ram-penises as a cover to cover (it)'.

²³The ki-ma of Rs 10 is to be emended to ki-iz".

²⁴Forssman, Glotta 45(1967)1f, denies the reality of Homeric epi kár 'headlong', but I find his explanation less than compelling.

²⁵There are unambiguous cases of both an instrumental of means and an ablative of 'place from which' with lahuwai- 'pour' and eku- 'drink'. Since the ablative is also used to express means, the interpretation of many instances of ablative + lahuwai-/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.

²⁶On the verb šūniya- (to be separated from šunna- 'fill') see Laroche, RHA 31(1973)[1976]91f.

²⁷This passage is roughly parallel to the Telipinu Edict II 29-30, but a reading of KBo XII 8 IV 28 ŠU-za-ma-aš dappun as kiššaraz-šmaš... '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.

²⁸šarā dāi- here means 'serve up'. For the incongruence of n-aš...šarā tiyanta! UL ēššatteni '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.

²⁹Otten, StBoT 13,15, translates the first example as 'vom tuhupzi 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. ^Etuppaz), 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..

³⁰In older manuscripts the 3rd sg. pres. of šuwa(i)- 'push' is consistently spelled šu-ú-(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 šu-ú-i-iz-zi, although the manuscript is late. On the other hand, the Old Hittite manuscript KBo VI 2 writes consistently (20x) parna-šše-ya šu-wa-i-iz-zi, i.e. /suwayitsi/. This means that the literal meaning of this much-discussed formula must be 'He looks to(ward) his house'. Note again the directive with šuwaya- 'look'. While šuwaya- (older šuwaye-) is a ya-stem, the original inflection of šuwa(i)- 'push' was probably like that of hulla-/hulli- 'fight' (see Neu, StBoT 18(1974)73f). Only later do both fall together as šuwāizzi.

³¹GI-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, hu-u-uš-za-x (KBo XI 14 I 19) is a nom. sg. to the dental stem hušt- (Neu, StBoT 5,150, note 5).

³²Synchronically, 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 šipand- 'libate, sacrifice' (cf. the use of

Vedic yáj- 'sacrifice'). Since eku- 'drink' also occurred in ritual contexts with a dative of the god honored and accusative of the liquid drunk (parallel to šipand- in the same pattern), the alternate construction with instrumental of liquid and accusative of the god was generalized from šipand- to eku- (and other verbs expressing a ritual action).

³³It is not easy to reconcile these two forms. Perhaps one may start with a noun tapulliyammar (oblique tapulliyamn-) and assume opposite assimilations of -mn- to -mm- and -nn-.

³⁴For a full discussion of this peculiar phrase see my forthcoming article in JNES.

³⁵Despite the variations in spelling, ta-hu-up-pa-aš-ta-/da- and tu-hu-up-pu-uš-ša-/ši- must be the same word.

³⁶In §75 of the Laws, Version A (KBo VI 2 IV 3) reads INA QATI DINGIR^{LIM}-war-aš ēkkiš '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.

³⁷tuēkka- is related to the verb tukk- 'be visible' (see Schindler, BSL 67(1972)36-37).

³⁸One should add KUB XXXIII 106 IV 9-10 piran arha It DUMU-mit

'Go away ahead (of me), my son!' (see p. 125 above).

³⁹See also KUB XXXVI 55 II 20 and 26: aršāššūri-ššit... aršaršūri-ššit.

⁴⁰Neu'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/et], not ke-e-[ti]. Here as elsewhere edi means 'on that side' versus kēt/kēz 'on this side'.

⁴¹The only other occurrence of edi in a complete context which is known to me is in §56 of the Laws (KBo XXII 62+VI 2 III 21):
edi BĀD-ni LUGAL-aš KASKAL-š-a takšuanzi ^{GIŠ}SAR.GEŠTIN-aš
tuphušuanzi ŠA ^{LÚ}URUDU.NAGAR ŪL kuiški arawaš. We almost certainly have a pair of double dative constructions with the infinitive, but the meaning of edi in paragraph-initial position is unclear to me. It is surely to be taken with BĀD-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'.

⁴²Jochem Schindler has reminded me that Skt. ádhi as an adverb also has both ablative and locative meanings (see Grassmann sub voce). Skt. ádhi and Hitt. edi can be derived from a common preform *e-dhi (pronominal stem *e- + locative *-dhi as in Grk. póthi 'where'). One may further speculate whether edi and kēdi (with -di < *-dhi) were the point of entry of the -d- into the oblique stem

of the Hittite pronouns. That is, given that -i is the unmarked dative-locative singular ending in the language, edi and kēdi were reanalyzed as ed-i and kēd-i, and the stems ed- and kēd- were used to build other local cases of the pronoun (e.g., the directive kēda, which replaced the original directive represented by kā 'here, hither').

⁴³It is interesting to observe (with Otten-Souček, StBoT 8,85) that those instances with the dative-locative have -šan, while those with the genitive do not.

⁴⁴In a similar fashion, the dative-locative forms ištarni-šmi, katti-šši, etc. could have been modeled on a genuine substantival form: pēdi-šši, 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):

(142) n-ašta ^{GIŠ} MA ištappešnaš PA₅-aš ištappešn[a]z/ parā ID-kan
anda pē[dai]

'The canal of the harbor carries the ship out of the harbor into the river.'

Both parā and anda look very much like postpositions here. Note the differing particle use with each.

KUB XXIX 8 IV 38-39 (R. of aiš šuppiyahhuwar/CTH 777):

(143) ANA DINGIR ^{LIM} -va-at-kan INA ^{URU} Zithara/ INA EBUR KaxU-az
parā aniyawen

'We wrote it (the ritual) down in Zithara 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 Vs 40-41 (R. of Samuha/CTH 480):

(144) EGIR-ŠU-ma DINGIR^{LUM} nakkuwaš li[nkiy]aš KAxU-az ITTI UNUT
SAL.LUGAL ŠA BA.BA.ZA išnit/ SÍG alitt-a arḫa aniyazzi

'Afterwards he cures the god of the mouth of the curse with respect to the queen's utensils with B.-dough and a wool ___ before the ritual substitutes (?).'

The same sentence is repeated, *ibid.* Vs 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 Kümmel, *StBoT* 3(1967)146f). The grammatical function at least is assured by the variant nakkuwaš piran in Vs 24.25 and elsewhere in our text. For (arḫa) aniya- as 'cure (of)' with a separative ablative see also below p. 306.

KUB XXIX 7 Vs 1-2 (R. of Samuha/CTH 480):

(145) nu hūdak/ DINGIR^{LUM} IŠTU ŠA LUGAL hūmandaš hūrdiyaš uddanī
gangatāizzi

'And at once he treats the god with the g.-plant from the king in the matter of all curses.'

ibid. Vs 7-10

EGIR-ŠU-ma DINGIR^{LUM} IŠTU LUGAL^{RI} ANA UNUT SAL.LUGAL menabḫanda
(146) hūmandaš hūrdiyaš/ uddanī gangatāizzi EGIR-ŠU-ma DINGIR^{LUM} IŠTU
UNUT SAL.LUGAL ANA LUGAL^{RI} menabḫanda/ gangatāizzi EGIR-ŠU-ma

DINGIR^{LUM} IŠTU LUGAL ANA U[NU]T SAL.LUGAL menapḥanda takšan/
[ga]ngatāizzi

'Then he g's the god from the king toward the utensils of the queen in the matter of all curses. Then he g's the god from the utensils of the queen toward the king. Then he g'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^{SAR} IŠTU [LUG]AL parā apeniššan ēpzi 'He holds out the g.-plant from the king in the same way'. The denominative verb gangatāi- thus means 'treat with a g.-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: IŠTU LUGAL UNUT SAL.LUGAL-ya takšan ganga-
tāizzi 'g's from the king and the utensils of the queen together'. Note the writing IŠTU ŠA LUGAL in line 2 to express 'from the king'. The insertion of ŠA is an apparent attempt to mark the IŠTU 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 7f above, the difference between IŠTU ŠA and IŠTU is not consistently maintained.

Other examples of the ablative of separation in Middle Hittite manuscripts are:

Intransitive Motion Verbs:

huwai- 'run': KBo XVI 24 I 23-24 [t]uzziaz.

iya- 'go, walk': KUB XVII 21 II 10-12 kuēz (+ arḥa and -kan).

neya- 'turn (int.)': KUB XXIII 77, 91⁺ lahḥaz (+ appa).

pāi- 'go': KBo XIX 39 + KUB VIII 81 II 2-3⁺. III 10-11 tamedaz

KUR-yaz (2nd + appa), *ibid.* II 11-12. III 9-10. ^{URU} Hattušaz

(+ -ašta/-kan), etc..

uwa- 'come': KBo VIII 35 III 16 ^{U^{RU}} [Hattu]šaz, XIX 39 + KUB VIII 81

III 15 tamedaz KUR-az, etc..

Transitive Motion Verbs:

huittiya- 'pull, draw': KBo XX 107 + XXIII 50 II 10-13⁺ arahzenaš

KUR.KUR.MEŠ-az etc., XXI 41 Vs 64-65 apēz hurdiya[z] (+ arḥa

and -kan), *ibid.* Rs 6 paḥḥuenaz (+ arḥa), etc..

karp- 'lift, raise': IBoT I 36 I 67 GAL-yaz KÁ.GAL-az.

mugāi- 'implore': KBo XX 107 + XXIII 50 II 10-13 arahzenaš

KUR.KUR.MEŠ-az, etc., KUB XV 34 IV 30-31 nepišaz.

nanna- 'drive': KUB XVII 21 II 19 kuēz (+ arḥa and -kan).¹

parḥ- 'chase': KUB XIV 1 Vs 1 KUR-yaz (+ arḥa).

pēda- 'carry': IBoT I 36 I 53 lušteniyaz (+ katta and -ašta).

pidda- 'deliver': KUB XVII 21 II 13.17 kuēz (+ arḥa and -kan).

šuwa- 'push': KBo XVI 25 I 68 KUR-yaz (+ arḥa).

dā- 'take': KBo XXI 33 I 14.18.28.III 6 ^{DUG} ahrūšhiyaz (+ šarā and -kan/-ašta), etc..

talliya- 'entreat': KUB XV 34 IV 30-31 nepišaz.

uppa- 'bring': KUB XVII 21 IV 9-10 ^{URU} ḥattušaz.

Verbs of Separation:

kuer- 'cut': KUB XIII 1 I 13 URU-az (+ katta).

šarra- 'divide': KBo V 7 Rs 25 apēz (+ -ašta; cf. *ibid.* Rs 21).

tuḫš- 'cut': KUB XXXII 115 I 39 arunaz (+ -kan).

Others:

barnink- 'destroy': KBo XIX 58,10⁺ [dankuwayaz dag] anzipaz (+ arḥa).

huišnu- 'preserve': KUB XIV 1 Vs 4 ḥing[a]naz (+ -kan), *ibid.* Vs 10 IŠTU GÍR (+ arḥa and -kan).

ištamaš- 'hear (of)': KUB XIV 1 Vs 24⁺ kuēz KUR-yaz (+ arḥa and -kan).

iya- 'make': KUB XXIX 7 Rs 39 ištappešnaz (+ -kan).

gangatāi- 'treat with a g.-plant': KUB XXIX 7 Vs 11 etc. (7x) apēz uddānaz.

parkui- 'pure, free of': KBo XVI 47 Vs 14.Rs 23 linki(y)az, KUB XXIX 7 Vs 5 etc. (8x) apēz uddānaz.²

As in Old Hittite one also finds isolated use of the dative-locative to express separation:

KUB XXXII 115 I 46 (R. of Mastigga/MIO 1,350):

(147) [(nu-šm)hš-kan tuhš[(a)h ēštu tuiggaš anidaš [(UD.KAM-aš)]
EME.HI.A

'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) nu 2^{NA4}paššiluš IŠTU KASKAL-ši' K[Á.GÎ]R-ya dāi

'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]edaz[?] nakkiš

'For what reason is [the custom] important?'

IBOT I 36 I 58-59 (Protocol of the Guard/MIO 11,180):

(150) nu^{LÚ} NI.DU₉ punuššanzi nu^{GIŠ} SUKUR.HI.A/ apāš naḫšaraz[!] (scil. naḫšarattaz) uškiizzi

'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 (šaklai-). The usual form of the interrogative ablative is kuēz, but kuedaz 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 naḥšaraz is surely an error for an ablative naḥšarattaz (or an ablative to the stem *naḥšar-).

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/Ist. Mitt. 17,56):

(151) [n]-uš ^dUTU ^{ŠI}kēzza zabhiyami zik-uš apizza zabhiya

'I, His Majesty, will attack them from/on this side; you attack them from/on that side.'

KUB XIV 1 Rs 57 (Madduwatta/Madd. 32):

'It (the land of Hapalla) is on the side of His Majesty.'

IBoT I 36 I 10-11,16-19 (Protocol of the Guard/MIO 11,174):

nu ^Ebalentūwaza kuiš andurza kuzza nu 12 LŪ.MEŠ_{MEŠEDI/} aranta
 ...āškaz-ma kuiš kuzza nu-ššan LŪ.MEŠ_{SUKUR.GUŠKIN} anda aranta/
 (153) 1 LŪ_{MEŠEDI-ma} kēz IŠTU LŪ_{MEŠEDI} kuttaz KÁ-aš maninkuwan/ arta
kēz-ma IŠTU LŪ.MEŠ_{SUKUR.GUŠKIN} kuttaz 1 LŪ_{SUKUR.GUŠKIN/} KÁ-aš
 manninkuwan 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, GÜB-laz, tapušza and kēz...kēz(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):

(154) n-ašta anda-ya ŪL kuinki tarnai parā-ya-kan ŪL kuinki tarna[i]/
n-[at]-kan parā ŠA LÚ M[ĒŠ]EDI É hīlaz uiškandari

'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 (^hpalenduwaz), 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, I.60-63 (MIO 11,180):

LÚ.MEŠ MEŠEDI-ma-kan DUMU.MEŠ.É.GAL^{TIM} GAL-yaz KÁ.GAL-az katta
UL paiškanda/ n-at-kan lušdaniyaz katta paiš[kand]a nu l
 (155) LÚ MEŠEDI kuiš šarkantin/ widaizzi UGULA DUMU.MEŠ-x-x kuin
par[ā p]liyēškiizzi nu-kan GAL-yaz katta/ apāš paiškitta
BELUTIM-ya-kan UGULA LIM-ya GAL-yaz katta paiškanta

'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):

ANA GAL.GEŠTIN kiššan hatreškizzi ANA KUR ^{URU} Hapalla-wa-tta
 (156) KUR [?] -eaz tiyami zig-a-wa-mu-kan awan arha [tarna]/ nu-wa-kan
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 l-e-az, which Götze, Madd. 27, understands as l-e-<da>-az, interpreting -tta...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 arha [tarna] (restorable from Rs 26) or the sentence nu-wa-kan It etc.. One would expect paiweni...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 ištarna arḫa pāi- (+ acc.) 'pass through'. For the expression awan arḫa tarna- 'let (pass) through' see KUB XXVI 12 II 20, where it is used of a fugitive. In the present passage Madduwatta asks the Hittite general to let him pass through his sphere of control and to give his blessing to Madduwatta to do what he likes with Hapalla. I grant that the emendation to KUR-eaz 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, Madduwatta 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 perlocative 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:

ēp- 'take; hold': KUB XXXII 115+ IV 21 GAL-az našma pupparaz
(+ parā),³ IBoT II 39 Vs 52 GÜB-laz ŠU-az, ibid. Vs 55 ZAG-az
ŠU-az (+ šarā).

har(k)- 'hold': KBo XXIII 12 I 11 GÜB-laz (scil. ŠU-az), KUB XXIX 7
Vs 20.28+ GIŠ ERIN-az.

baššiganu- 'satisfy': KBo XIV 63 IV 12 witenaz.

bulaliya- 'wrap': KUB XXIX 7 Rs 28 hurpaštaz (+ anda).

lahuwai- 'pour': IBoT II 39 Rs 19 DUG gazzidaz (+ arḫa and -kan).⁴

maršabḫ- 'falsify' (?): KUB XXIX 8 I 39-40 kuēz imma kuēz uddanaz.

mema- 'speak': KUB XXIX 7 Vs 3-4.23.50-51+ KAxU-az (+ anda and -kan).

šuppiyabḫ- 'purify': KUB XXXII 49a II 12 wetenaz.

dā- 'take': KBo XXI 33 I 17-18 GÜB-laz kišraz...kunnaz kišraz
(1st + -za, 2nd + šarā and -kan), KUB XXXII 49a II 20-21
GÜB-laz...kunnaz (2nd + šarā and -kan), XV 34 I 31 tallāyaz
Ū IŠTU Ū.DÜG.G[A] (+ šarā).⁵

weriya- 'call': KUB XXIX 7 Vs 15 KAxU-az.⁶

VII. Adverbial Ablatives

Aside from the technical term zallaz '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/CTH 480):

(157) namma UD.KAM-az UL kuitki [ienzi]/ nekuzza mehur-ma a[p]ēdani-
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 attāš nepišanz[a] EGIR-an tarna

'Let them go, oh Father Heaven.'

Haas and Wilhelm, AOATS 3(1974)205, translate 'vom 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 nepišanza as part of the addressee. attaš nepišanza is functionally equivalent to Zeû páter.

In KUB XXIX 7 Rs 29, the form idalauwanzi-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. /paprannantsts-a/ (see Friedrich, HE I² §25b). In the case of idalauwanzi-ya, the form of the ablative ending which occurs before -a/-ya '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 idalawatar and the nom. sg. of the animatizing ant-stem idalawant- (< idalu-) were both idalawanza (/idalawants/). For the ablative ending -anza 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. Perlative 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 kāštit.

aniya- 'treat': KUB XXIX 7 (+ KBo XXI 41) Vs 39f (7x) išnit
^{sfg} alitt-a (+ arḫa; see p. 285 above for complete context).

arra- 'wash': KBo XXIII 23 Vs 30 widanta, KUB XXIX 50 IV 18⁺
ikunit wit[enit], XXIX 43 Rs 7⁺ and XXIX 40 II 4-5⁺ āntet
witenit, ibid. II 13 witenit (+ -za), ibid. IV 8 āntet.

ēp- 'hold': KUB XXIX 43 Rs 12⁺, XXIX 40 III 4f (8x) ^{GIŠ} ḫupparit
 (+ parā).

ḫalzai- 'call': KUB XV 34 III 9.50 lamnit (+ -ašta).

ḫuittiya- 'pull, draw': KUB XXIX 40 III 32⁺ kiššerit (+ parā).

irḫai- 'make the rounds of': KUB XV 34 IV 25-26⁺.40 zēāntit.

išpar- 'spread': KUB XV 34 I 41 ^{TUG} kurešnit.

gulš- 'inscribe': KUB XV 34 IV 56-57 IŠTU ^{GIŠ} LI.U.⁷

mema- 'speak': KUB XXXII 115+ I 44⁺ KAxU-it EME-it.

papparš- 'sprinkle': KUB XV 34 II 26 Ī.DUG.GA-<it> ⁸.

šipand- 'sacrifice': KUB XXIX 7 Rs 63 UZU zēyantit, XXXII 49a

III 14-15 IŠTU UZU zanuantit (see p. 328 below).

šū- 'full of': KUB XV 34 I 14-15 [I]ŠTU GEŠTIN LĀL Ī.DÜG.GA
anda ĩmmiyantit.

šunna- 'fill': KUB XV 34 III 25 witenit, XXXII 115+ II 29-30

GEŠTIN-it Ī SERDUM pattalwanit LĀL.

tamaš- 'press': KUB XXXI 103,14 ERĪN.MEŠ-it.

dammešhai- 'oppress': KUB XVII 21 I 24-25 šaḥhanit luzzit.

tarḥ- 'conquer': KBo XVI 47 Vs 4 ḥanmet¹nit, KUB XIII 27 Rs 23⁺
ḥaštīt (+ -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 GĪR-it.

wahnu- 'brandish': KUB XXIX 8 II 6-8 IŠTU A^{MU}[^{SEN}...]ḥapupit
ḥuštitt-a MAŠ.TUR[?][...]. Object is EN SISKUR.SISKUR; see
p. 234 above for the syntax.

warkant- 'fat(tened)': KUB XXXII 115+ II 45-46 Ū-it ḥalkit.

warnu- 'burn': KUB XV 34 IV 49 pahhuen[i]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 (Madduwatta/Madd. 12):

(159) namm[a-a]t IŠTU ERIN.MEŠ 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) tuwarnattaru-war-at/ ^{DUG} hupuwaya KAxU-it [(E)]ME-it

'It, the h-vessel, shall break along with the mouth and tongue.'

KBo XX 107 I 9-12 (R. for ^dKAL KUS^š kuršaš/CTH 433):

(161) [...]x-an ^{UZU} išhunāun/ [...]it innarauwannit/ [...EGI]R.UD ^{MI}
tarḫuilt/ [^{GIŠ} TUKUL-it?...pie]šdu

'Let him g[ive...] 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) parkuwaēš-wa-šmaš [(na)]hma ēšten 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 parkui-: '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 kitpandalaz '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 kēt does not occur in any other ablative uses in Middle Hittite.

V. Adverbial Instrumentals

Aside from the well-established pangarit 'en masse' (KUB XXXI 105,18, XIV 1 Vs 45 and ABOT 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 kīnuan harz[i]

'Or (if) anyone has opened a granary on his own.'

KUB XIV 1 Vs 20 (Madduwatta/Madd. 6):

(164) namma-ma-wa-[az] parā tamāin hapātin tamai KUR-e ZI-[il]t
lē [ēš]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 1 Vs 32f (6x), XXXI 103,20⁺.24 and IBoT 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 šumeš-pat DINGIR.MEŠ DINGIR.MEŠ-aš ištanza[n]it šekten[i]

'You yourselves know it, oh gods, with your divine mind(s).'

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 (lx)
- IV. Pronominal Instrumental for the Ablative (kitpantalez)
- V. Adverbial Instrumentals (pangarit, 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:

VBoT 24 I 22-24 (R. of Anniwiyani/Sturt. Chrest. 106):

(166) n-ašta ANA EN SISKUR.SISKUR/ būmandazi-ya SÍG āntaran SÍG
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 incommodi* 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.

KUB VII 41 I 1-2 (R. for the Underworld Gods/ZA 54,116):

(167) [m]ān É-ir ēšḫanaš papran[naš]/ kurkurimaš linkiyaš parkunu-
wa[nzi]

'When they cleanse a house of blood, defilement, ___ and oath.'

Since ēšḫar '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 parkunu- p. 182 above). This competing use of the genitive

and the ablative is also attested with arḥa aniya- 'cure of':

KUB XXX 35 I 1-2 (R. of Irriya/CTH 400):

(168) [(nu)] mān URU-an iṣḥanaš/ linkiyaš pangauwaš lalaš aniyami

= KUB XXXIX 102 I 1-2

nu mān URU-an iṣḥanaza/ linkiyaza pangauwaza EME-za aniyami

'When I cure a city of blood, oath (and) the tongue of everyone.'

For p. lalaš 'tongue of everyone' (= 'common gossip' or the like), compare KUB XXX 36 II 14 etc. pangauwaš EME-an. The ablative pangauwaza is an example of 'case attraction' or 'partitive apposition'.

KUB XV 31 IV 38-40 (Drawing ^dMAḥ etc./CTH 484):

(169) kī-ma-kan tuppi/ ANA ^dUTU-ŠI KaxU-az parā/ ^mGIŠ PA.DINGIR-^{LIM}iš
aniyat

'Hattusili wrote down this tablet out of the mouth of His Majesty.'

On this idiom compare ex. (143) p. 284 above.

HT 1 I 44 (R. of Zarpiya/CTH 757):

(170) n-ašta IŠTU ^{UZU}NIḠ.GIG hūišawaz wākuēn

'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:

arš- 'flow': KBo X 45 IV 39, XVII 105 II 34.IV 2⁺, KUB VII 41 I 29 (// XLI 8 I 8), IX 6 I 20-21.

huiellai- 'escape' (?): KUB XXXIII 120 I 21-22 kiššarazza-šit (+ arḥa and -ašta).

iya- 'go, walk': KUB XXVII 29 II 18 KaxU-az (+ parā).

pāi- 'go': KUB XLI 8 II 8-9 ^{URU}Ninuaz (+ -ašta).

šēi-/šiya- 'spurt': KBo XVII 61 Rs 7 nepišaz (+ katta and -kan).¹⁰

tiya- 'step': KBo XVII 105 III 31 KASKAL-az (+ arḥa and -kan).

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:

arnu- 'bring, carry': KBo XXI 34 II 11-12 ^{URU}Lahuwazzantiaz (+ arḥa and -ašta), IBoT III 148 III 43 A.ŠÀ A.GÀR-az

(+ arḫa and -kan), Bo 2393+5138 I 21-22 ^{URU}Hattušaz (+ katta and -kan; see Otten, Fest. Friedrich 353).

huittiya- 'pull, draw': KBo II 9 IV 15.19.21, XIII 109 II 2-3, XIII 126 III 13, KUB XV 31 I 2.III 49.64-65.IV 37-38, XXVII 67 II 16.III 20, XXXII 50 Vs 1, XXXIII 120 I 24, IBoT III 148 I 40.II 52.III 57.IV 16.

peššiya- 'throw': KBo X 45 I 28 šubḫaz (+ katta and -ašta).

pēda- 'carry': IBoT III 148 III 27 URU-az (+ arḫa and -kan).

šuwa- 'push': KUB IV 1 II 13 KUR-az, *ibid.* II 17-18 A.ŠA kuerazzi-ya...IŠTU ^{GIŠ} SAR.GEŠTIN.HI.A-ŠUNU (both + arḫa; 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, FHG 12 + KBo XXI 28 II 24-25.

tittanu- '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, KUB I 13 II 33-34.40-41⁺.45-46.LRd 1, XXXIII 109+ I 16.

Verbs of Separation:

lā- 'loose': VBoT 120 III 2-4 išhiyalaz...alwanzahhaz (+ arḥa and -kan), KUB XXVII 29 (+ VBoT 120) I 2⁺ idem.

tarna- 'let go': KBo X 45 I 41 taknaz (+ šarā and -ašta).

Others:

anš- 'wipe': KUB XXIV 13 II 14-30 (various body parts; + -kan).

arra- 'wash': KBo X 45 IV 37 URU-az (+ -kan).

išḫuwai- 'pour': KBo V 2 II 19 šaramnaz (+ arḥa).

lahuwai- 'pour': KBo V 2 IV 37-38 apēz (+ šer arḥa and -kan).⁴

mema- 'speak': KUB XII 11 IV 19-20.24-25 ^{GIŠ}ZA.LAM.GAR-az (+ parā and -kan).

parkueš- '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.

šallanai- 'draw' (?): KBo XIX 109+ IV 13 taknaza.¹¹

šupḥa- 'pour': KBo V 2 II 19-20 šarāmnaz (+ šer and -kan).

tūwaz 'from a distance': KUB XIII 20 I 25 hatrāmi, XXV 49 II 1.16⁺
and XXXII 65 II 20-21 QATAM dāi-/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 madgalti/Dienstanw. 45):

(171) n-at kuttas̄ awan ar̄a 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.HI.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 ^{DUG} aḫruš̄hi ^{GIŠ} ERIN šarā dāi

'But with his right hand he picks up the cedarwood from the
a.-vessel.'

For the last example compare the much more common construction with the ablative (p. 288 sub dā-). 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 tuhš- 'cut off'.

II. Ablative of 'time from which'

KBo XII 85 II 11 presents DUMU-annazza '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, GÜB-laz, hantezziyaz 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):

(174) [n]u MĀŠ.GAL-an warnuwanzi šūrašūrann-a/ [p]a[r]iyanzi nu
tezzi kī-(y)ašta mahhan/ [MĀŠ.G]AL šūrašūrašš-a kattan taknaza
pāir/ kī-kan ŠA^{URU} Hatti inan ēšhar NIŠ DINGIR^{LIM}/ pangauwaš
EME-aš QATAMMA GAM-anda 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):

(175) šumeš-a-kan karuwilieš DINGIR.MEŠ kuē[z]/ uwaten n-ašta kattan
apēz [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 competing case usage:

KUB XVII 27 II 37-41 (CTH 434):

(176) nu ^{SAL}SU.GI ŠU.SAR dāi n-at GÜB-la lāi/ ZAG-na-ya-at lāi
nu kiššan memāi UH₄-naš [ŠU.SAR²]/ mān ZAG-za taruppiyat
ug-at EGIR-[pa ZAG-za]/ lāiškimi mēn-at GÜB-laz-ma
tarupp[iyat]/ [mā]n-at EGIR-pa GÜB-laza lā[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 GÜB-la and the ablative GÜB-laza with lā- 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):
 (177) anzidaza tiēr DINGIR.MEŠ/ anzidazza memir/ LUGAL.MEŠ anzidaz
nuntarnut/ pankuš

'The gods came over to our side, the kings spoke on our behalf, everyone hastened to our side.'

Compare KUB XLV 20 II 13f.

KUB XII 12 VI 6-8 (Hišuwā Festival/CTH 628):

(178) namma mān SAL.LUGAL aḫiya/ nu IŠTU ŠA^d Liluri adanna wēkzi
 '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 GI dāi nu ŠA^d U^{GIŠ} ŠU.A kuēz artari/ nu GI.HI.A ANA
GIŠ^d ŠU.A hantezziyaz piran/ KĀ.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 artari 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 huprušhi in front of which stands the throne of the Storm-god.

Thus while he is lined up with the throne, the huprušhi is actually between him and the throne. The redundancy of hantezziyaz piran is

not limited to ablative adverbs. Compare KBo V 1 III 18-19:

iškiša-šmaš EGIR-an.

KBo XVII 105 III 24-25 (R. for ^dKAL ^{KUŠ}kuršaš/CTH 433):

(180) nu-kan KASKAL-az ZAG-az/ ^{GIŠ}labhurnuzi dagan dāi

'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-ši 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 appizziaz 'behind' meaning 'secretly' (cf. ex. (62) p. 204 above):

KBo V 1 I 41-42 (Papanikri/Pap. 4*):

(181) mān-wa AMA-KA našma ABU-KA appizziaz/ kuitki waštanuwan
barkanzi

'If your mother or father have secretly (?) let some sin take place...'

Sommer-Ehelolf, Pap. 5*, read appizziaz 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' (zašhit), I suggest that appizziaz 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 ablatives deserve brief mention.

KBo II 9 IV 28 has n-at IGI-ziaz dammaiš ēpi 'Someone else grasps it in front' (cf. katteraz ēpi 'grasps (from) below' KBo IV 9 IV 34-35, KUB XXV 17 I 9-10 and KUB X 3 II 23). VBoT 120 II 23 shows aušten-mu ^{UZU} GAB-az, literally 'Look toward my chest', i.e. 'Face me!'. KBo V 2 III 26-28 offers the variant ZAG-aš kuiš huprušbiš...GÜB-laz-ma kuiš huprušbiš 'the h. which is right... but the h. which is on the left'. One normally finds ZAG-az... GÜB-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 KBo XVII 60 offers the older kitkar 'at the head (of)': Vs 4 kitkar GİR.MEŠ-az tapuša, 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.

IBoT III 148 III 15-16 (Drawing Tešub, Hebat et al./CTH 485):
 (182) GIŠ AB-yaš-ma anda paneššanzi nu-kan an[d]an? / GAM-anda UL
kuēzqa peššiyaz[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 (CTH 401):

- (183) n-ašta antuhšuš/ kuēzza KÁ.GAL.HI.A-az katta kunanna/ peḥudanzi
apūš-kan apēz katta pidatti

'The gate through which they carry people to be killed--
 through that 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) [īD-za takn]aza GAM-an šarā eḥ[u] (simil. KUB XII 65 III 8)

'Come up via the river and the earth below.'

ibid. II 7-8

- (185) [n-aš-k]an īD-za taknaza GAM-an arḥa [(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-kan taknaš īD-ašš-a KASKAL-an GAM-an arḥa [iyat]

'He took the path of the river and the earth below.'

ibid. III 11-12

- (187) n-aš-kan ANA^d Kumarbi šarḥulaz taknaza GIŠ^d ŠU.A-i-[šši]/

kattan šarā 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 šarhula-, 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 ^dMAH et al./CTH 484):

(188) nu-kan kī ḥandēuwar karuwiliyaz tuppiāz/ ienzi

'They make these arrangements according to the old tablet(s).'

Since the instrumental tuppit 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

(189) nu-kan EGIR-anda/ ^{GIS} pahhurulaz pahhur warnpanzi nu pahhur/
warnuanzi

'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 warpāi- 'enclose' (see above p. 228f).

Other examples:

anš- 'wipe': KUB XLI 19 Rs 12 ZÍD.DA-az[?], ibid. Rs 13-14 būriyaz
(both + -kan, 2nd + arḥa).

arra- '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 (MIO 1,369).

ašeš- 'set': KUB XXXII 128 II 13-14 ^{GIS} irḥūiyaz (+ -šan).

eku- 'drink': HT 1 I 45 l-za ^{GI} A.DA.GUR-az (+ -kan).⁴

ēp- 'hold; grasp': KUB IX 6 I 9.15-16, XXIV 13 III 14, XXXII 43
I 2-3, XXXIII 115 III 13.

huittiya- 'draw, pull': KBo II 9 IV 12 IŠTU ^{NINDA} hazzizitaza
(+ šarā).

ištapp- 'stop up': IBoT III 148 III 29⁺.50-52 kizza IŠTU KUBABBAR
GUŠKIN NINDA.KUR₄ .RA-ya (+ -kan).

karp- 'lift': KUB XV 39 II 27 [IŠT]U EME.HI.A-ŠU ('by his tongues').

kištanu- 'extinguish': KBo XV 48 III 5-6 apēz (+ -ašta).

laḫuwai- 'pour': KBo XV 69 I 13⁺.20-21, KUB IX 6 I 17, XL 97

III 19.⁴

papparš- 'sprinkle': KBo VIII 155 II 8-9 A^M-UŠEN -aš] partaunaz

(+ arḫa), XXI 34 II 29-30 witenaz(zi).

šah- 'be polluted': KUB XIII 2 II 23 wetenaza.

šai- 'press, seal': KUB XIII 2 III 21-22 tuppiaz.

šipand- 'libate': KBo XX 114 II 7⁺.16-17, XV 69 I 19.Rs 14⁺

(2nd = KBo XV 59 III 4-5 with instr.), XV 37 III 32-33.38⁺,

XV 68 IV 1-2⁺.5-6⁺, KUB XXV 42 II 9, XXV 48 IV 6-7⁺.12-13,

XXV 49 II 8.11⁺.III 15⁺.

šiššiuriya- 'irrigate': KUB XXXI 84 III 54-55 wetenaza.

šunna- 'fill': KBo XX 114 II 19.V 8-9.10-11, XV 49 I 8⁺, XXI 34

I 12-13.34-35, KUB XL 102 V 3⁺.VI 15-16, VBoT 89 IV 15.

šuppiyaḫ- 'purify': KUB XXV 42 III 2-3 + KBo XV 47 III 16-17

wetenaz, KBo XXI 34 III 2 witenaz (+ arḫa).

šū- 'full of': KBo XII 96 I 10-11 ḫalwamnaz.

dā- 'take': KBo XI 10 III 14-15, XI 72 III 32⁺, XIX 136 I 13-15.

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.

dāi- 'place': KUB XXIV 13 I 20 ^{GIŠ}pūriyaz (+ -šan), XXVII 16

I 32-33 apēz-pat IŠTU ^{DUG}GİR.KAN, HT 1 I 24-25 ^{GIŠ}pūriyaz

(+ piran katta; 2x).

dammešhāi- 'oppress': KBo II 9 I 39 (= KBo XXI 48 Vs 10-11)

kizza aggannaz, KUB XXXVI 83 I 14⁺ kuēz.

tarh- 'conquer': KUB XXXVI 55 II 16 išhimanaz (+ -za).

wahnu- 'brandish': KBo XV 48 II 2-3.24-25 apēzza (GIŠ zupparit)

(object is LUGAL-un; see p. 234 above for the syntax).

weriya- 'call': KUB XXXII 137 II 9 KAxU-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):

[nul-kan GAL-in arunan ^dKu[ma]rbiyaza ē-irza IŠTU ^{GIŠ?} x[...]]/

(190) [a]rkammiyaza [galgaltur]iyaza ZABAR û IŠTU BIBRI ^{HI.A} ZABAR/

[p]arā uwat[er]

'And they brought the great sea out of Kumarbi's house accompanied by __, arkammi and galgalturi of bronze and by rhyta of bronze.'

KUB XXXII 128 I 30-32 (Hišuwā Festival/CTH 628):

(191) wātarr-a/ ^{GIŠ} ERIN-az DINGIR ^{LIM} ni menaḫhanda SAL tapriyaš/

lāḫūwai

'The t.-woman pours out the water along with the cedarwood toward the god.'

For the interpretation of ^{GIŠ}ERIN-az compare ibid. I 33 wātar
^{GIŠ}ERIN-ya. Similar is KBo XV 48 III 25-26:

(192) nu-ššan wātar ^{GIŠ}ERIN-az LUGAL-i/ ŠU.HI.A-aš laḫūwai

'He pours the water with the cedarwood on the king's hands.'

Compare ibid. III 18-19: LÚ SANGA GAL A dāi/ anda-ma-kan ^{GIŠ}ERIN
kitta 'The priest takes a cup of water—in it lies/is placed
cedarwood.'

KBo XXI 34 I 63-64 (CTH 699):

(193) nu-wa-mu-za QADU ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ ^{GIŠ}GIGIR.MEŠ/ kuēz tarahši
UMMA LUGAL-MA tarahmi-du-za l-aš"

"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 qadu correctly to mean 'together with', and in view of similar uses with ERIN.MEŠ (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):

hantaz-at-kan 12 galulupaš/ ē[š]tu GÍD.DA-ašti-ma-at 1 gipeššar

(194) 4 šēkann-a ēštu/ [(GÍŠ^{ma})-]x handaz 3 galulupaš ēštu
GÍD.DA-ašti-ma-at/ [(1 gipeššar)] ēštu

'Let it (the firewood) be 12 fingers across the front, but in length let it be 1 g. and 4 š.. 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 hanza: the ablative expresses 'with respect to (its) front'. Although a dative-locative is formally possible, the corresponding GÍD.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-šmaš-šan/ hūmadaz IGI.HI.A harak

'Keep your eye on them in all respects.'

KUB XXIX 44 III 8 (Horse Training Text/Hipp. 162):

(196) nu ANŠE.KUR.RA kuiš tuēggaz EGIR-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 mališku- is not assured.

VIII. Adverbial Ablatives

All examples are of adverbs of time. Most common is GE₆-az/ išpantaz '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-anza. This solitary example may be an error or an instance of the ablative -anza outside an r/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-a]z in contrast to išpandaz of the next line. KUB XIII 2 III 2 offers karuliyaz 'formerly'. In contrast to the unspecified išpantaz 'at night' note the dative-locative apēdani GE₆-ti 'in that night' in KUB XVII 28 III 22 and IBoT 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 (Hišuwā Festival/CTH 628):

(197) nu-kan ANA 1^{UZU} KARŠI? GUD UZU UDU/ hūmandaz happešnaza anda
unhanzi

KBo XV 37 III 50-52 (Hišuwā Festival/CTH 628):

(198) EGIR-ŠU-ma 2^{GIŠ} garkar INBI/ ŠA NINDA? LĀL hūmantaza/ tarnaza
handān

KUB IX 31 I 14-15 (R. of Zarpiya/CTH 757):

(199) pirann-a hantezziyaz IN[(A K)A^{GIS} KAK ŠENNUR? šiyēz/ walaḥzi

KUB IX 4 II 29-30 (R. of the "Old Woman"/CTH 760):

(200) n-aš-za uizzi EGIR-pa parašza/ šešzi

This example apparently offers a variant of EGIR-pa parza 'backwards' (see p. 219f above), but its use with šeš- 'sleep' is not clear to me.

KUB XXXI 86 II 11 (Instr. for the bel madgalti/Dienstanw. 43):

(201) [...]wetinanza-ma šarā ŪL arnuzi

See von Schuler, Dienstanw. 53, ad loc..

KUB IX 28 I 23, III 18 (Ritual for Seven Gods/CTH 442):

(202) 1^{NINDA} tannaza kittā...šūwanteš dannaza kittā

The duplicate to III 18, KBo XIX 132 Rs 5, has [dann]anza, and it is by no means assured that t/dannaza is an ablative. Friedrich, HWb 209, lists it hesitantly under ^{NINDA}dannaš-, but the latter appears to be a neuter s-stem. In the presence of šūwanteš '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] tuzziyaz/ EGIR-pa ^{GIŠ} TIR ISBAT

'The army retreated to the woods.'

For the idiom -za āppa ēp- + 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) ēšpananza linkiyaz should also be interpreted as nominatives.

KUB VII 58 I 11-12 (R. for a Defeated Army/CTH 426):

(204) išḫunau-šmit GI-za ^{URU} Alminalašnaš/ 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 Ekza išparranza. Syntactically, an ablative (of means) is easier: 'trampled with the heel'. Formally, however, an ablative Ekza 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 -z(a) to be preserved (see Chap. 5, Sec. 1.2). I therefore prefer to read 'a/the trampling heel', with a nom. sg. Ekza (/ikts/) and an active participle from a transitive verb. The latter is unusual, but not impossible (cf.

šekkanti 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 madgalti/Dienstanw. 48):
 (205) arnuwalaš-a-kan kuiš KUR-ya anda arzananza nu-šši-šan/ išpuešnit
NUMUN.HI.A-it GUD UDU IGI.HI.A ḫarak

'But the deportee who is settled (?) in the land—watch out for him with ____, seed, cattle and sheep.'

For IGI.HI.A ḫark- '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):
 (206) āšma-tta armahhun^d IŠKUR-nit nakkit/ dān-ma-tta armahhun
^{1D} Aran[z]ahit ŪL mazzuwaš/ 3-ann-a-tta armahhun nakkit^d Tašm[i]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 Anniwiyanni/CTH 393):
 (207) uškanzi-ma IŠTU MUŠEN nu kuwapi MUŠEN.HI.A/ SIG₅-ahhanzi

'They take a look with bird(s), and if the birds turn out favorably....'

KBo V 1 III 22 (Papanikri/Pap. 10*):

(208) nu DINGIR.MEŠ IŠTU NINDA SIG kalutezzi

'He 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 SAL¹.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 wahnu- (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. 8*):

(210) nu addaš DINGIR.MEŠ-aš zeyantit^U I-it šipandanzi

'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 IŠTU GAL,
ibid. IV 36-37 ^{GIŠ} GANNUM-it.

arra- '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.

ariya- 'inquire about': KUB XV 31 II 8 DINGIR.MEŠ-it.

arš- '?': KBo XVII 60 Vs 3 išhimanit (cf. KUB XXXI 147 II 27?).¹²

au- 'see': KBo XI 72 III 31 SIG₅-antet IGI.HI.A-it (+ anda and
-kan), KUB XLI 8 III 20 IŠTU ^{GIŠ} NUNUZ ZIBANA (+ IGI-anda
and -ašta = 'inspect').

eku- 'give to drink' (?): KBo III 5 IV 18-19 wetenit.¹³

hanešš- 'plaster': KUB XIII 2 II 14-15 nēwit wilanit.

har(k)- 'hold': KBo X 45 II 28, XIII 167 II 12, KUB XII 11 III 7f,
VBoT 24 I 27.

henganu- 'make bow down': KUB VIII 66 + XXXIII 86 III 7-8 meminit
(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⁺.

bulaliya- 'wrap': KUB XII 34 I 5 ^{UZU}1.UDU-it (+ anda).

burnai- 'sprinkle': KBo X 45 II 15 î-it LÂL-it.

išpai- 'bind': KBo XV 48 II 13 ^{SIG}alit SA₅ (+ anda), KUB IX 28

III 14-15.20-21 tiyamanda "...šuwaruilit (2nd + anda),

VBoT 24 III 32-33 ^{SIG}huddullit (+ anda).

išpuzziya- 'gird': KBo XII 96 I 18 šapparit (+ -kan).

išk- 'anoint': KBo V 1 IV 5-6, XV 37 I 24-25, KUB XXXIII 88 Rs 10

(// IBoT II 135 I 8), HT 1 I 38.

išpai- 'satisfy': KBo III 5 I 28 wetenit.

išpar- 'trample': KBo VI 34 III 25.28.30-31⁺ GÎR-it.

kalute- 'make the rounds of': KUB XXVII 16 IV 23 IŠTU NINDA.SIG.MEŠ.

gapaliya- '?': KBo XI 72 III 45 [...] huišwannitt-a.

kariya- 'cover': KBo III 21 II 20 [] x-mit...alparamit-tit (+ -kan).

karš- 'cut (off)': KBo X 45 I 17 (= KUB VII 41 I 25) ^{URUDU}ateššit.

katkattinu- '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

Āntet wetenit.

malla- 'grind': KBo VI 34 II 21, X 45 III 3 IŠTU ^{NA₄}ARÂ.

mema- 'speak': KUB XII 34 I 7-8 KAXU-it EME-it.

miyanu- 'cause to flourish': KUB X 27 I 25-26 huelpit IŠTU INBI,

XXVII 16 I 12-13 IŠTU ^{GIŠ}x[]...[h]huelpit GEŠTIN-it

^{GIŠ}HAŠHUR-it.

papparš- 'sprinkle': KBo XV 48 II 6-7.27-28 Ā ^{MUSEN}-aš partaunit.

paprahb- 'defile': KUB XXXIII 120 II 33 ištamanit.

patalhai- 'line': KUB XXXI 86 II 12 IŠTU NA₄.HI.A (+ šarā).

patalliya- 'fetter' (?): KBo VI 34 I 23-24 (= KUB XL 13 Vs 7)

pata[(llit)].

šanpuwai- 'roast': KBo XVII 105 III 2-3 pahhunit.

šipand- '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, XLI 8 III 2-4¹⁴.

šū- 'full of': KBo V 2 IV 36-37, VI 34 III 13¹¹ (see Oettinger,

StBoT 22,39f), XII 96 I 9-10, XXI 34 II 5, KUB IX 28 I 12,

XIII 2 III 40, XXVII 1 IV 47-48.

šunna- 'fill': KBo II 3 II 37-38, II 9 IV 10, KUB VII 38 Vs 4.9,

XII 11 IV 3-4, XXVII 1 III 15, XXXII 74 III 12-13, XL 102

VI 7-9, XLI 8 II 42.

šuppiyahb- 'purify': KUB XLV 32 III 10 wetenit.

dā- 'take': KUB XXIV 13 II 7 ēššarit.

tarb- 'conquer': KUB XXVI 19 II 35 hannešnit.

tarna- 'let go': KBo V 2 IV 23-24 šihilliyaš witenit (+ arha),

XVII 105 IV 13 GÍR-it (+ šer). Here tarna- = 'let flow'.

wahnu- 'brandish; encircle': KBo V 1 II 56-III 1 IŠTU MUŠEN,

XV 48 II 2-3.24-25 (apēzza) ^{GIŠ}zuoparit; KUB XXXI 84 II 2

[^{UR}]^{UDU}heyawallit ^{GIŠ}mariyawannit (+ anda).

walḫ- 'strike': KUB IX 28 II 14, XVII 4,11, XLI 8 II 39, 282/t +

428/t Rs 3-4 (StBoT 2,33).

warkant- 'fat(tened)': KBo II 3 I 57-58 ú-it halkit.

warp- 'wash': KBo XV 25 Vs 7-8 wappuwaš [IM-it šu]waruwitt-a

VBoT 120 III 7 wetenit.

wiya- 'send': KUB XV 31 I 35 ša ^{MUSEN} partāunit.

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, FHG 12 (II) 13.

zeya- 'cook (int.)': KUB XXVII 1 III 19 ^{DUG} TU₇-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 Išmerika/WdO 5,194):

(211) []/ IŠTU LÚ.MEŠ kuenten 'Kill ___ together with the men.'

ibid. Vs 27

[nu] apāt É-ir LÚ.MEŠ-it aku

'Let that house die/be killed together with (its) men.'

KUB XXVI 29 + XXXI 55 Vs 15 (Treaty with Ura/ZA 57,

(212) ERÍN.MEŠ-it niniktumat

'Mobilize with your troops.'

KUB I 13 II 56 (Kikkuli/Hipp. 62):

(213) nu-šmaš 1 ŠADU memal IN.NU.DA-it menahhanda immiyandan pianzi

'They give them one measure of meal mixed with straw.'

KBo III 5 I 56 also has IŠTU IN.NU.DA immiyan, but in II 18 it shows ITTI IN.NU.DA immiyanzi, where the Akkadian itti marks a dative-locative in Hittite. Likewise we find KUB XLV 58 III 14-15: ANA GIŠ/ m[en]ahhan[d]a immeyanzi. Compare also:

KBo VI 34 II 22 (Milit. Oath/StBoT 22,10):

(214) n-at witenit imiyanzi 'They mix it with water.'

KBo XV 37 IV 46-47 (Hišuwā Festival/CTH 628):

(215) namma-at witenit/ takšanzi

'They put it (the wine) together with water.'

Compare ibid. IV 49 GEŠTIN takšan 'mixed (i.e. watered) wine'.

KUB XXV 48 IV 22-23 (Hišuwā Festival/CTH 628):

(216) GIŠ.d INANNA-it [galga]lt[u]ritt-a udanzi

'They bring...to the accompaniment of the Ištar-instrument and the g. .'

KBo X 45 IV 48-49 (R. for Underworld Gods/CTH 446):

(217) nu ANA 3 GUNNI.MEŠ QADU NINDA.SIG.MEŠ GIŠ ERIN/ î LÂL warnuzi

'On three hearths they burn cedarwood, oil and honey along with flat bread.'

KUB XL 13 Rs 8-9 (Milit. Oath/StBot 22,16):

(218) [k]uiš-wa-kan kūš NIŠ DINGIR.MEŠ šarrai/ [n-an QADU DAM-Š]U
DUMU.MEŠ-ŠU pankunit/ [((kē)) NIŠ DINGIR.MEŠ...harninkandu]

'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.HI.A-it [harn]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 Allaiturahi/CTH 780):

(219) ēššarit-at-kan dandu parkešnit-at-kan/ andan ēšdu palḥesnit-
a<ṭ>-kan anda ēšdu alwanzinaš kuit HUL-lu uttar ēššešta

'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 ERÍN.MEŠ.HI.A IŠTU ^{LÚ}KÚR hullantari

'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, XLI 8 II 2 ^{GIŠ}SÚ.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 LÚ EGIR-an 3 LÚ.MEŠ piškatteni ANA 1 GUD-ya [...]/
IŠTU 1 UDU 3 UDU-pat pištēni

'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/MIO 1,360):

(222) ^dUTU-i k[(ē)ša-wa-šmaš [(n)akkuššiš KaxU-i[t] / 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 §83

(KBo VI 2 IV 20): ANA 2 ŠAH.TUR 1 PA ŠE pāi 'He gives a measure of grain for (every) two piglets'. The function of EGIR-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 pangarit 'en masse' (KUB XXVI 29 + XXXI 55 Vs 15), we are dealing here again with various uses of ZI-it (ištanzanit). 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 Tuthaliya/CTH 258):

(223) LUGAL-waš ARAH-[an P]ANI ZI-ŠU lē kuiški kinuzzi

'Let no one open the king's granary on his own authority.'

PANI ZI-ŠU, 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-ŠU dāi. 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-ŠU 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 ^dKumarbiš-za bat<ta>tar ZI-ni pian d[(aš)kizzi] 'Kumarbi takes wisdom for himself before his mind'. Copy B has ZI-ni kattan 'with his mind'. The same variation is found in A I 9 versus B I 9. The dative-locative plus kattan is an alternate means to express 'together with', while ZI-ni piran is the Hittite for PANI ZI-ŠU. According to the above facts, ZI-it would have the same origin as the other common adverb pangarit, 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 šakuwaššarit 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 šakuwaššar- has never been satisfactorily pinned down, as is clear from the definitions in Friedrich, HWb 178: 'richtig, vollständig, unversehrt; vollwertig; dem Sachverhalt angemessen; aufrichtig; gesetzmäßig, legal; legitim; loyal'. The phrase šakuwaššarit 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, PD 72). For the equation of this phrase with šakuwaššarit ZI-it see Freydank, MIO 7(1960)374. Since šakuwaššarit ZI-it means 'with (one's) entire mind' > 'whole-heartedly, single-mindedly', we should return to Friedrich's earlier interpretation of šakuwaššar- as 'full, complete, whole', SV I 90f.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 šihillaš witeni<t>

'fourteen water-vessels with water of purification'

ibid. III 47

(225) ^{DUG}GAL šihilliyašš-a witenit harzi

'And he holds a cup with water of purification.'

Compare *ibid.* IV 36-37 DUG-iš...witenit šūwanza 'a cup filled with water'. KBo XXIII 15 IV 11 has GAI^{AM} GEŠTIN-it 'a cup with wine'. Like the other examples, these cases may be accounted for by deletion of šūwant- '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/Hipp. 84):

(226) mahhan-ma-aš[!] witenit arḫa 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/CTH 780):

(227) anšun-a-[ta-kka]n alwanzatar iššaš ḫalukit/ SAG.DU-aš[?]

[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 (Hišwa Festival/CTH 628):

(228) nu-šši-kan GAL GIR₄ kiššarī GEŠTIN-it/ anda šunnai n-ašta ANA
EN SISKUR.SISKUR/ GAL GIR₄ LU AZU kiššarit arḫa dāi

'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 šarāmnit katta zikkiddu 'sets down from above' (cf. šarāmnaz p. 309 sub išpuwai- and šupḫa-). KUB XXXIII 120 has various forms of 'come forth/up' with instrumentals expressing 'place from which': II 1-2 t[arn]aššitt-a, II 27 KAXU-it, II 38 tarnaššit. KUB XXVII 67 I 19-21 and III 25-27 employs arḫa ḫuittiya- 'draw away (from)' with various instrumentals: SAG.DU-it ŠU.MEŠ-it...GIR.MEŠ-it [ḫū]mantet UZU UR-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 (pangarit, ZI-it)
- VIII. Adnominal Instrumental
- IX. Instrumental of Separation

Note that the instance of agentive use is written with I^xSTU 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 ablatives 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 išpantaz '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. 335f).

NOTES

¹In KUB XVII 21 II 20-25 eighteen cities appear in the ablative, in apposition to the kuēz of lines II 11.13.17.19 (see sub iya-, pidda- and nanna-).

²KUB XV 34 II 5 has IŠTU KUR ^{LÚ}KUR idālawaz papran[naz...]. The missing verb appears in the parallel KUB XIII 29,12 as ar-ḥa 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.

³The Neo-Hittite parallel KBo II 3 IV 1-2 inserts the verb dāi, 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'.

⁴This example could also be interpreted as an ablative of separation. See the discussion above, Chap. 2, note 25.

⁵The direct object appears to be SIG SA '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'.

⁶Rost, MIO 1(1953)364, restores KUB XXXII 115+ IV 5 as GÎR.HI.A-a[(z)...laknuwan(zi)] '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 laknu-.

⁷Despite the lack of arḥa, one could also interpret this

passage as 'inscribed (i.e. copied) from wooden tablets', with an ablative. See ex. (41) p. 186 above.

⁸The text has SĪG.SA₅-it Ī.DÙG.GA papparašzi, but the phonetic complement surely belongs with Ī.DÙG.GA: 'sprinkles the red wool with fine oil'.

⁹The text reads šumeš-an-za haštīt ŪL [tarahteni] 'You cannot conquer him/it with steadfastness (lit. bone)'. The restoration is not assured, but -za makes tarḥ- very likely. If haštai- is 'defensive strength' versus kuttar 'offensive strength' (see p. below), it also makes sense to say that one cannot conquer someone with defense.

¹⁰The sentence reads nepišaz-kan katta ši-i-e-eš-šar šiyati. I have kept the sense 'spurt (forth)' for med.-pass. šiya- (with Neu, StBoT 5,144), but the writing here and elsewhere of 'beer' with ši-i-e- argues that it should be read /siyessar/ and be analyzed as an abstract in -eššar of šāi-/šiya- 'press', thus originally 'pressing'. It therefore seems possible to me that šiyati here is a passive 'was pressed'.

¹¹The (incomplete) sentence is [...]pēdan taknaz šallannai (subject presumably Hedammu). Siegelová, StBoT 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. pēdan is not. Given that the monster is the subject, the sense is surely 'pulls the ground [up/away] from the earth'.

¹²KBo XVII 60 Vs 3 reads n-at iṣḫimanit ārašmi. The verb clearly is transitive, which eliminates arš- 'flow'. The same transitive verb arš- may be attested in KUB XXXI 147 II 27.
[]-KA-it aršanza ēšdu.

¹³It is very doubtful that the meaning 'give to drink' should be assumed for eku- in Hittite on the basis of this single example from the Kikkuli text. The horse-training texts otherwise use akuwanna pāi- or šakruwa- (see Kammenhuber, Hipp. sub eku-).

¹⁴Line 2 reads weteni šipanti, but this should be emended to weteni<t> after line 4 and other parallels.

¹⁵KUB XXXIII 120 II 48 reads ZI-it-war-an anda tarupta. The meaning of the sentence as a whole and hence of 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 paḥši

'Protect me from everything.'

KUB I 1 I 46 (Autobiography of Hattusili/Hatt. 10):

(230) DINGIR^{LUM}-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^d IŠTAR-pat GAŠAN-YA hūmandaza palapšan šer harta

'Ištar my lady held over me a shield against everything.'

KUB XXI 37 Vs 10 (Rē Urhi-Tešub/CTH 85):

(232) katta-ma DUMU.NITA.MEŠ [^d]UTU^{ŠI} paḥḥašten DUMU.NAM.ULU^{LU}-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/StBoT 1,20):

4 UDU.NITÁ tukkanziyaš/ ŠA EZENxŠE lilaš EGIR-pa ADDIN 3

(233) MÁŠ.GAL 2 UDU.NITÁ ANA DUG^{II}.GA₅.BUR annanumaš/ SANGA-ešnaza
nāwi EGIR-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, StBoT 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):

nu-mu EN-YA/ [U]R.TUR GIM-an apel iš-ga-šu^{II}-u-wa-an-ta-za
 (234) SAHAR-wa-za 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 išgašūwantaza

as /skaswantats/ and interpret it as *skas- 'dung' plus the possessive suffix -want. The form *skas- (< *skōs for *sēkōs) represents the collective of an s-stem to the same root as sakkar. For the form of *skōs compare Avestan vačā 'words' (from a virtual *nek^uōs) 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. ūts-a- 'spring' with Hitt. wātar. The presence of the possessive apel 'his (own)' supports the interpretation of išgašūwantaza 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) [(piran par) Ē-va-zzi apūn G[(Ē-a)h] IŠTU SAI^{TI} [(tešhaš)]

'And (all through) the night before he abstained from a woman.'

The interpretation of tešhaš as a verb meaning 'withheld himself' receives some support from the participle tišhanteš 'wary of' (?) in KUB XXI 42 + XXVI 12 IV 35 (see Goetze, JCS 13(1959)68). Friedrich'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 edaza (+ arḫa and -kan; 'get away').

huwai- 'run': KBo X 12 III 21 ^{URU}Haddušaza, III 4 II 68-69

^{URU}Purandaza (+ katta and -kan).

iya- 'walk': KBo IV 14 II 67-68 ^{URU}Aštataz (+ arḫa and -kan).

lahhiya- 'campaign': KUB XXI 5 III 19-20 [(ani)]_z KUR-eaz naššu

^{URU}Karkišaz ^{URU}Māšaz ^{URU}Iu[(goaz)] ^{URU}[(^{RU}Wa)]kšiallaz, ibid.

III 22-23 kēz KUR-az, ibid. III 24 ^{URU}Hattušaz.

ninink- 'mobilize': KBo V 8 II 11 ^{URU}Gašgaz.

pāi- 'go': KUB XIX 11 I 11 [^{URU}Samuḫa]_z (+ arḫa and -kan),

XIX 13 I 42 [^{URU}Tūma]nnaz (+ šarā and -kan), ibid. II 31

KUR ^{URU}Harranaz.

parš- 'flee': KBo VI 29 II 19 ^{URU}Naraššantiyaza (+ arḫa and -kan).

piddai- 'run': KBo IV 14 III 47 ^{GIŠ}GIGIR-za (+ katta and -kan),

ibid. III 48-49 É.ŠÀ-za (+ parā and -kan).

tiya- 'step': KBo IV 14 II 45 KASKAL-za (+ arḫa and -kan),

KUB XXXI 15,2 (= XXI 29 II 11) [^{GIŠ}]GIGIR-az (+ katta and -kan), XXI 19 II 14 KASKAL-az (+ arḫa and -kan).

unna- 'drive': KBo IV 14 II 9 ^{URU}Nihiryaza (+ arḫa and -kan).

uwa- 'come': KBo III 4 II 7 ^{URU}Palḫuiššaz (+ appa), ibid. II 54

arunaz (+ arḫa and -kan), ibid. II 58 ^{URU}Purandaza (+ katta

and -kan), ibid. IV 22 [^{URU}Kizzu]watnaz (+ šarā), XI 1 Rs 15-16

KAXU-az (+ -kan), KUB VI 45 I 30-31 UKU-az KAXU-az (= VI 46

I 31-32 antuhšaš KAxU-az), ibid. III 13-14 arunaz (+ šarā and -kan), XIX 11 IV 40 apēz (+ āppa), XXI 27 IV 7 KAxU-az (+ -kan), XXIII 50,8 [^{URU}Wašuga]nnaz, XXVI 1 II 17⁺ KAxU-az.
watku- 'jump': KBo V 3 III 50 KASKAL-az (+ arḥa and -ašta).

Transitive Motion Verbs:

arnu- 'move': KBo XIX 53 III 5 šarammenaz.
huinu- 'move, shift': KBo III 4 II 69 šaramnaz (+ piran and -za).
huittiya- 'pull, draw': KBo XVI 17 III 18-19 ^{URU}Maraššaz (+ arḥa and -kan).
nāi- 'lead': KUB XXVI 84 II 5 ^{URU}Samuḥaz (+ parā and -kan).
ninink- 'raise, remove': KBo V 3+ IV 56-57 dankuwavaz...[takn]az (+ šer arḥa and -kan).
parkiyanu- 'raise': KBo I 28 Rs 3-4 ^{GIŠ}ŠU.A-az.
peššiya- 'throw': KUB XXI 19 IV 24 apiz (+ arḥa).
dā- 'take': KBo II 6 III 28-29 ŠA-za (+ -za and -kan), KUB I 1 I 43.50-51.58 hūmandaz (+ -za and -kan), VI 45 III 28 annaz, XIV 14+ Rs 50 [N]f.TE-az (+ -kan), XXI 15 I 11-12⁺ ^{URU}U-aššaz (+ šarā), ibid. IV 14-15 ŠU-az (+ arḥa and -kan), XXXI 20 III 3 + KBo XVI 36 III 5 A-az (+ šarā and -kan).
uiya- 'send': KBo IV 4 II 25 ^{URU}Kannuwaraz (+ kattan arḥa), KUB XIV 12 Rs 4⁺ ŠA-az (+ arḥa and -kan), XIV 14+ Rs 49-50⁺ idem, XIV 13+ IV 17-18⁺.41⁺ KUR-ēaz.
uda- 'bring': KBo II 5 III 30 URU-az (+ katta and -kan), KUB XXI 17

III 12 ^{URU} Hattušaza (+ katta and -kan).

uwate- 'bring': KBo IV 10 Vs 14 apizzi-ya (+ āppa), KUB XIX 20

Vs 3⁺ [^U]^{RU?} Alziyaz (+ āppa).

watkunu- 'cause to jump' > 'chase': KBo III 3 I 10-11 KUR-eaz

(+ arḫa and -kan), IV 7 I 4 idem, KUB XIV 15 IV 23 idem.

Other:

arawapḫ- 'free': KBo VI 28 Rs 27 dapiza (+ -kan), VI 29+ III 20-26

š[apḫ]anaza [l]uzziyaza etc., KUB XXVI 43 Rs 8⁺ šapḫanaz

luzziya[z], ibid. Rs 10-13 [šapḫanaz] luzziyaz etc. (+ ašta)

(= XXVI 50 Rs 35 = KBo XXII 60 Rs 6-8), KUB XXVI 58 Vs 8f

šapḫanaz luzziyaz etc..

au- 'see': KBo V 3 III 55 ^{GIŠ} AB-az (+ arḫa and -kan), XXII 40 +

XIX 44 Rs 42 tūwaz, KUB XIV 20 I 6.8⁺ idem.

balzai- 'call': KUB VI 45 III 23-24 nepišaz KI-az etc..

harganu- 'destroy': KBo VI 28 Rs 41 dankuwayaza taknaza (+ -kan).

harnink- 'destroy': KUB XXI 18 Rs 15-16 dan[kuwaya]zza dagan[zipaz]

(+ arḫa and -kan), XIX 49 IV 39 idem, XXI 1 IV 36-37 d. taknaz.

huišnu- 'preserve': KBo IV 6 Vs 16-17. Rs 22 kēz GIG-za, IV 12

Vs 8.10 GIG-az.

iya- 'write down, copy': KBo IV 2 IV 45 annalaz IŠTU ^{GIŠ} LI.U₅.

gulš- 'inscribe': KBo IV 2 IV 42-43 annalaz IŠTU ^{GIŠ} LI.U₅.

kunk- '?': KUB XIV 10+ IV 19-20 ^{GIŠ} šarpaz (+ -kan).¹

parkui- 'pure, free from': KBo V 3 IV 32-33 apēz linkiyaz.

šeš- 'sleep, rest': KUB XIX 13 I 34-38 apēz (3x).²

zaḥ- 'strike': KUB XXVI 12 II 14-16 IŠTU KUR ^{URU} Azzi KUR
^{URU} Gašga IŠTU KUR ^{URU} Luqaā (+ anda; object is ZAG 'border').

Neo-Hittite historical texts also present a few instances of the dative-locative in a separative function:

KUB I 1 II 52-53 (Autobiography of Hattusili/Hatt. 20):

(236) namma-kan DINGIR.MEŠ ^{URU} Hatti GEDIM.HI.A-ya pidi ninikta n-aš
^{INA} ^{URU.d} U-ašša katta 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):

(237) n-an-kan kūš NIŠ DINGIR.MEŠ danku(wa)i taknī šer arḥa
harninkandu

'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-wa kēdaš [AN]A MAMIT GAM-an arḥa arḥaharu

'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 KUB XIV 8 Vs 30-31 (Plague Prayer of Mursili/CTH 378):

(239) nu-kan INA ŠÀ KUR Hatti apēzza UD.KAM-az akkiškittari

'There has been dying in the land of Hatti since that day.'

Similar are KUB XIV 8 Vs 11 IŠTU UD.KAM-az ABI-YA 'since the day(s) of my father', XIV 13+ I 48 IŠTU UD^{UM} URU Mizri 'since the day of Egypt', XXI 29 I 11-12 IŠTU UD.KAM^m Hantili 'since the day of Hantili', XXVI 1 IV 35 kēzza... UD.KAM-za arḫa 'from this day (on)'.

It should be noted that neither kitpantalaz nor apit pantalaz occurs in a securely Neo-Hittite text. The corresponding phrases kēz/apēz UD-az have probably replaced them. In the Hukkana Treaty § (KBo XIX 44 + XXII 40 Rs 46) kēz alone may be used to mean 'from now on':

(240) kēz-ma-kan INA É.GAL^{LIM} -YA šarā iyattari

'(When) from now on you go up to my palace...'

Compare *ibid.* Rs 48 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:

KBo V 9 I 19-20 (Duppi-Tešub/SV I 10-12):

(241) [n]u tuk mahhan-ma ^dUTU^{ŠI}/ IŠTU AWAT ABI-[K]A EGIR-an šaḥhun

'But as I, His Majesty, looked after you according to the word of your father.'

KUB XIX 49 I 12-13 (Manapa-Datta/

(242) nu-tta LÚ.M[EŠ ^{URU}Karkiša]/ anzid[a]z memiyanaz PAP-nu[ir]

'The men of Karkisa protected you according to our word/at our behest.'

See also ibid. I 17⁺.18⁺.23⁺ and KUB XXI 1 I 71-72.

KBo VI 29 I 18-20 (Rē Urhi-Tešub/CTH 85):

(243) nu-za apūnn-a/ AŠŠUM DAM^{UTTİM} marri ŪL daḥhun/ IŠTU INIM
DINGIR^{LİM}-za-an daḥhun

'And I did not take her in marriage for personal gain (?).

I took her at the behest of the god.'

See also Hatt. III 61 apēzza 'for that reason'.

Several other examples are also definitely causal:

KUB XXVI 32 I 11-12 (Oath of a Scribe/RA 47,74):

(244) ^dUTU^{ŠI}-ma EN-YA <kuwayataza/ šallanumarrazza šakuwaššarit
ZI-it PAP-aḥḥat

'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):

(246) šumeš-ma-šmaš-<aš> kuēz memiyanaz EGIR-an šanḫeškattēni/
nu-šmaš-<aš> šumel ZI-az/ arḫa daškattēni

'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 daškattēni '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 (Hukkana Treaty/SV II 126):

(247) apēz-kan uddanaz arḫa akkiškanzi

'For that reason they die.'

KUB XIV 14+ Vs 34-36 (Plague Prayer/CTH 378):

nu-kan ABU-YA IŠTU ŠA^m Duthaliya išḫana[z akta ANA ABI-YA-za]/
 (248) kuēš DUMU.MEŠ LUGAL BELU^{MEŠ} UGULA LÚ.MEŠ LIM^{LÚ.MEŠ} DUGUD anda

kišandat nu a[pušš-a anēz] memiyanaz 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 (Tawannanna Affair/CTH 70):

(249) nu-kan DAM-YA apellaz BA.ÚŠ

'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 baššannaš-šan 'one of his family' (acc.) (see Friedrich, HE I² §212). Literally, apellaz is 'as a result of that of hers'.

A few other possible instances of ablatives 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, 11-12 (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 (Rē Urhi-Tešub/CTH 85):

(250) nu hūman-pat ammētaz tiyat

'The whole (country) came over to my side.'

Compare *ibid.* II 15 n-at-mu 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-^dKAL/SV I 122):

(251) EGIR-ann-a-šši lē tiyaši IŠTU ŠA ^dUTU^{ŠI} ma[hhan] artati nu
IŠTU ŠA ^dUTU^{ŠI}-pat [[EGIR-an]] arhut

'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 I 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:

KBo V 8 I 39 (Annals of Mursili/AM 150):

(252) nu KARAS.HI.A šāruī tamēdaz pān ēšta

'The army had gone elsewhere for booty.'

ibid. III 18-19 (Annals of Mursili/AM 156):

(253) nu-za-kan IGI.HI.A-wa etez ANA ^mPittipara neyahhat

'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:

KUB XIV 4 II 5-8 (Tawannanna Affair/CTH 70):

(254) apāt-ma/ ^{URU}Šanharaz hūinut apāt-ma ^{URU}Hattuši hū[m]anti/
antuššanni parē pešta nu-kan EGIR-an ŪL kuitki/ dēliša

'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 tawannanna 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-^dKAL/SV I 113):
kēzza-tta ^{URU}Maddunnaššaza BĀD KARAŠ ŠA ^mDuthaliya ZAG-aš ēšdu
 (255) kēz-ma-tta ŠA ^{URU}Wiyana-wanda ^dILLAT.HI.A ZAG-aš ēšdu nu-kan
INA ^{URU}Aura pariya lē zāitti kēz-ma-tta <(IŠTU)> ^{īD}Aštarpā
KUR ^{URU}Kuwaliya <(ZAG-aš)> ēšdu nu-tta apāt KUR ^{TAN}ēšdu

'On this side toward Maddunassa let the fortified camp of Tuthaliya be your boundary. On this side let the outposts (?) of Wiyana-wanda be your boundary, and do not cross over into Aura. On this side toward the river Astarpa 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 (āššanza) 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) IŠTU MÁŠ SAL^{TI}-ma-aš ŠA LUGAL KUR URU_{Hat[(ti)]}

'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 tuedaz IŠTU ŠA ^dUTU URU_{TÚL-na} [--]/ ZAG-išzi

'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 anatt-a ANA KUR URU_{Hatti} [udabhun n-at u]k ammedaz
ašašhu[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) kī-ma AWATE^{MEŠ} ŪL kuitk[i] l-edaz l-edaz IŠTU KUR URU_{Hatti-at}

'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. Perlative 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 IŠTU ^{GIŠ} TUKUL...UD-azza.

arra- 'wash': KBo IV 2 IV 31-32 IŠTU ^{URUDU} DU₁₀xA kuiēzza (+ -za and -kan).

ariya- 'inquire about': KUB XIV 8 Vs 32 IŠTU DINGIR ^{LIM}.

ašnu- 'provide with': KBo IV 6 Vs 14 hūmandaz (+ -kan).

au- 'see': KBo IV 6 Vs 22 ū-az.

eku- 'drink': KBo IV 2 IV 29-30 IŠTU GAL kuēzza (+ -kan).

ēp- 'seize, grasp': KBo II 5 I 14 MA.MŪ-az, IV 4 II 62 ERĪN.MEŠ
ašandulaz, KUB XIX 8 III 31⁺ idem, XIV 16 III 9.17 idem,

KBo IV 7 I 58 ŠU-az, KUB I 1 I 21 ŠU-za.

eš- 'sit; occupy': KBo III 4 III 58 GEŠPÚ-az (+ -za).

ed- 'eat': KBo IV 2 IV 28-29 IŠTU ^{GIŠ} BANŠUR kuēzza (+ -za and -kan).

har(k)- 'hold': KUB I 1 I 39.46.II 64 ŠU-za.

hark- 'perish': KUB XXI 19 II 8-9⁺ tappariyaz.³

haštaleš- 'become heroic, emboldened': KBo IV 14 II 68 ^{GIŠ} TUKUL-za.

hatkešnu- 'besiege': KBo V 9 III 23-24 zahhiyaza (+ anda).

hatrai- 'write': KBo V 6 III 51-52 tuppiyaz (+ āppa), KUB XIV 4
IV 30 idem, XXI 38 Vs 20 TUPPA-za.

huittiya- 'pull, draw': KUB XIV 4 II 14-15 NINDA.KUR₄.RA-az
^{DUG} išpa[nduzziyazzi-ya[?]].

išhuwai- 'pour': KBo IV 14 II 6 weraza (+ anda and -kan).

ištapp- 'stop up; trap': KBo VI 29 II 33-34 hūpalaza (+ āppa).

kartimmiyanu- 'anger': KUB III 119 Vs 9 (= XXI 49 Vs 7) [UL]
kuēzōa.

katterrahḥ- 'humiliate, cause to be defeated': KUB I 9 III 8

DI-ešnaz.

lā- 'loosen, relieve': KBo II 6 I 38 kēz INIM-za, ibid. III 47-48.
64-65 apēz m[e]minaza.

mema- 'speak': KUB XIV 8 Rs 36 tešpaz, XXI 17 II 9 Ū-za.

parḥ- 'gallop': KUB XXXI 20 + KBo XVI 36 III 12-13 IŠTU 1 ^{GIŠ} GIGIR.

parkueš- 'become pure': KUB I 1 I 39 DINGIR ^{LIM} -za.

pehute- 'carry (off)': KBo IV 14 II 50 GEŠPÚ-az (cf. ibid. II 76
GEŠPÚ-ahh- + acc. 'force').

šallakartahh- 'treat highhandedly' (?): KUB XXI 19 I 17-18
kuēzga memiyanaz.

šarazzeš- 'be victorious': KBo IV 14 IV 59 DI-za.

šarazzi- 'upper > victorious': KBo VI 29 II 4-5.6-7 DI-ešnaza.

šarazziyahh- 'cause to be victorious': KUB I 1 III 23 = XIX 67
 I 15 [(DI-ešn)az.

šarnink- 'make restitution': KUB XIV 14+ Rs 24-25 IŠTU É^{TI}-YA
šarnikzilaz maškanna[z], XIV 8 Rs 32 h[in]ganaz, XXI 19 II 15
IŠTU SAG.D[U-Š]U.

šipand- 'sacrifice': KBo II 6 III 21 SISKUR mantaliyaza.

šunna- 'fill': KUB XIX 67 I 9 alwanzešnaza.

dā- 'take': KBo III 4 IV 39-40 zahhiyaza (+ katta and -kan),
 IV 4 IV 12.28-29 idem, III 3 I 5 GEŠPÚ-az (+ arha and -kan),
 IV 10 Rs 19 GEŠPÚ-za (+ -kan).

dāi- 'place': KBo V 9 Rs 18.20 hannešnaz...IŠTU DINI (+ -kan
 and KASKAL-ši = 'put on the (right) path').

tamaš- '(op)press': KBo V 9 II 25-26 uddānaza (+ anda), KUB XIV 14+
 Vs 8-9.Rs 12⁺.35⁺ hin<ga>naz, XIV 10+ I 7-8 idem, XIV 12 Vs 7⁺
idem, Bo 2628+ I 16 (StBoT 1,30) idem.

dammešhai- 'oppress': KUB XIV 14+ Vs 38-39.Rs 33 hinganaz.

tarh- 'conquer': KUB XIV 14+ Vs 40⁺ NÍ.TE-az (+ -za), XIV 10+
 I 16-18 ŠÀ-az...NÍ.TE-az (+ -za).

tišša- 'set in motion' (?): Bo 2628+ I 17 IŠTU LÚ (StBot 1,30).

unuwa- 'adorn': KUB XII 27 + XLIII 50 Rs 34-35 apizza [u]našhaz!

(= XII 31 Rs 24 apēz unuwašhaz).

wašta- 'sin': KBo III 3 II 28-29 apiz INIM-az.

wemiya- 'find': KUB XIV 8 Rs 42-43⁺ ariyašešnaza, XIV 13+ I 51-52.

54-55.IV 24-25⁺ idem, KBo XI 1 Vs 21-22.41 [GIŠ].HUR.HI.A

gulzattanazzi-[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 hannišnanza DI-eššar/ EGIR-pa pēhutet

'She (Ištar) checked the lawsuit with a lawsuit.'

Literally, EGIR-pa pēhutet 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 pēhutet 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 (Rē Barga/BoSt 3,140):

(261) nu-war-an IŠTU NAM.RA.MEŠ āššuwazza-ya šarā dahhi

'I shall take it (the city) up along with deportees and goods.'

KUB XXI 1 IV 33 (Alaksandu Treaty/SV II 80):

(262) nu-tta...IŠTU SAG.DU-KA...arḫa harninkandu

'Let them destroy you along with your person (lit. head).'

Similar examples are KBo XVI 23 I 10, KUB 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:

KUB VI 45+ I 18-19 (Prayer of Muwatalli/CTH 381):

(263) ŠA KUR ^{URU}Hatti-mu-kan/ EN ^{UTTA}hūmandaz kuiēš memišten

'You who ascribed to me the lordship of Hatti in every respect.'

KBo IV 12 Vs 25 (Rē Middannamuwa/CTH 87):

(264) ammug-ma IŠTU INIM ^mMiddannamūwa UL-pat karuššīyanun

'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 SAG/

Dienstanw. 26):

(265) [n]u [Š]A LÚ.MEŠ MUIRTUM/ kuēloa šapḫanaz HUL-luwešzi

'(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/CTH 176):

(266) nu-wa-šši GIM-an LÚ.MEŠ TENE EGIR-[and]a pāir nu-war-at
EGIR-pa IŠTU 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/Stefanini 43):

(267) kāšš-a-mu kuiš LÚ KUR LÚ KUR Aššur arēnza IŠTU MU.KAM.HI.A
GÍD.DA arḫa-ma-kan ištantait

'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 IŠTU. 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):

(268) kinuna ammuk^m NIR.GÁL LUGAL-uš tuedaz/ [IŠ]TU^d U niḫaššašši
šallanuwanza arkuweškimi

'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.MEŠ ariyair n-at DINGIR.MEŠ-azzi-ya [ḫandai]ttat

'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 IŠTU: 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_c-az 'at night', karuwiliyaz and annaz 'formerly' and EGIR-az 'afterwards'. One also finds the ablative equivalent of instrumental adverbs: ZI-za 'on one's own authority' (KBo V 9 III 28, III 3 III 11.24 and IV 14 IV 70), šakuwaššaraza ZI-za 'whole-heartedly' (KBo IV 14 I 44⁺ 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):
 (270) ANA DINGIR.MEŠ-za menahhanda KUR.KUR.HI.A ^{URU} Hatti/šarraz
ŠA ^d URU Nerik ^d URU Zippalanda DUMU-KA nakkiyanni handa datta

'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.'

KBo III 6 II 21-22 (Autobiography of Hattusili/Hatt. 16):
 (271) ERÍN.MEŠ-ma-mu ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ tepawaz paiš nu-za ERÍN.MEŠ
NARĀRU ŠA KUR^{TI} tepawaza GAM-an ēppūn

'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 tepawaz see KBo V 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 meqgay[az], which is probably used in the same way.

KUB XXI 27 IV 35-36 (Prayer of Puduhepa/CTH 384):

(272) harnāwaš-za kuit SAL-za/ ANA DINGIR^{LIM} EN-YA šer SAG.DU-za
šarninkan harmi

'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 rē Arma-^dU/CTH 569):

(273) DUMU.DUMU-ŠU-va tamedaza/ kaniššanzi

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) šullannaza-war-a(t)?-tu-za/ KAR-at

Stefanini, loc. cit., reads šullannaza waratuza KAR-at, but he cannot offer any satisfactory meaning for a word waratuza.

In KBo III 4 II 31-32 guršauwananza 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: IGI.HI.A-it 'with the eyes' and Û-it/tešhit 'through a dream':

KBo IV 8 II 11.19 IGI.HI.A-it uškiZZi, XI 1 Vs 11.15.17⁺.28.30 takšulit IGI.HI.A-it anda au, ibid. Vs 39⁺.Rs 18⁺ aššawīt IGI.HI.A-it anda au.

KBo VI 29 I 20 Û-it henikta, XI 1 Vs 42 tešhit parkunut, KUB I 1 I 12-13 Û-it^m NIR.GÁL-in ŠEŠ-YA uivat, ibid. I 37 Û-it memišta, XIV 10+ IV 16-17 and XIV 8 Rs 42 tešhit aušdu/uwallu.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 GIŠ⁺TUKUL-it tarḫ- '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 rē Tiliura/CTH 89):

ašešanut-ma-an apēl IŠTU NAM.RA GIŠ⁺TUKUL tarahhantit 'He settled

it with his deportees conquered by arms'. While tarabḫantit goes with ašeš-, it is likely that the instrumental was influenced by the unwritten ^{GIŠ}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 āššawit šarā šunneš '...filled up with goods.'

Compare the Annals of Hattusili I, KBo X 2 I 20-21.

KBo V 8 I 24 (Annals of Mursili/AM 148):

(276) nu-šmaš-kan namma UD.KAM-az GEŠPÚ-it EGIR-panda ŪL pāun

'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 ^{<III> d}IŠTAR-A.A-an ŠU-ta ASBAT

'I took you, Sausgamuwa, by the hand.'

KUB XIV 8 Vs 25 (Plague Prayer) has hannešnit šarlā[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 wahnumanzi,

which is an error for IZI-it warnumanzi 'they burn with fire'.

The form haštit, 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, Widerstandskraft', i.e. defensive strength as opposed to offensive strength, which is GEŠPÚ-it (see KUB XIII 27 Rs 23 above p. 301 with note 9). Like haštai-, (^{UZU})GEŠPÚ 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 GEŠPÚ is kuttar 'shoulder, upper arm'. See especially kuttanit 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/SV II 116):

(279) nu-mu-ššan mān ERÍN.MEŠ-it ANŠE.KUR.RA.[HI].A-it lammar
UL ārti

'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 IŠTU GUD.HI.A UDU.HI.A āššuitt-a šarā dahḫun

'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 IŠTU. 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 IŠTU, 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 re the ^{NA4}hekur Pirwa/CTH 88):
 (281) ŠA LUGAL ^{URU}Kušsar ^{DINGIR}šunit k[aniššan]daš NUMUN-aš
 '...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}-ū-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 ERIN.MEŠ ^{LÚ} KUR pangarit BA.ÚŠ 'the enemy troops died en masse'; also KUB XIX 9 IV 14 (Hattusili III) and KBo XII 38 III 12-13⁺ (Suppiluliuma II).

šakuwaššarit ZI-it 'whole-heartedly': KBo X 12 II 22-24.29⁺.43⁺.51⁺ (= Akkadian KUB III 7+ Vs 20 ina kul libbi-šu) (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).

šekkantit 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).⁶

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):
 (282) mān-za ["] HUL-za MUŠEN-az ^{LÚ} MUŠEN.DU-it našma ŠA GEDIM kuiški
NINDA-an [...]

'If one has performed an augury with an evil bird, or someone has [] the bread of a dead man...'

Taking ^{LÚ}MUSEN.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 ^{LÚ}AGRIG-ḫi-iš for maniyahḫiḫiḫi 'managed'.

The other examples to be discussed here all involve the form l-e-et-ta:

KUB XXI 37 Vs 17 (Rē Urhi-Tešub/CTH 85):

(283) n-ašta UKÙ.MEŠ-tar l-ētta nehḫun HUL-aḫḫun [UL kuinki?]

'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 ^{LÚ.MEŠ}SAG/Dienstanw. 25):

(284) nu KUR.KUR.HI.A/ BA[L d]apianda l-ētta naiškitten

'You led all the rebellious lands even as one.'

KBo III 4 III 33 (Annals of Mursili/AM 76):

(285) n-aš anda l-ētta 60000 6 LIM NAM.RA ēšta

'And it (the booty) numbered 66,000 deportees in one (fell swoop).'

Eichner, Anat. Zahlw. 7, correctly analyzes l-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 nāi- 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 IŠTU X neya- 'turn to someone's side, join forces with' is attested only as such: i.e., intransitively with a 'reflexive middle' of nāi-. There is no direct evidence for a transitive IŠTU X nāi- '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 LÚ^{LUM} har[akta] 'The man perished even for seeing (the king's wife) from afar'. In all the passages where l-etta 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-ētta 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):

(286) iyanun-ma-at-kan damēdaz/ IŠTU KaxU p[ar]ā/ [a]mmuk-ma-za-k[an
ZI-za UL [kui]tki dah[hun]

'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 memiyanaz (see p. 354f).

KUB XXIX 4 I 3-4 (Transfer of the DINGIR.GE₆/Kronasser, Umsiedlung 6):

(287) mān apēz IŠTU É DINGIR.GE₆ parā tamai É DINGIR.GE₆/ wetezzi

'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 ^{URU}X-an ^{URU}Y-az + Preverb + lahiyazi/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-ma-za-kan/ ^{URU}Neriqqaz arḥa ariyami

'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) [^dUTU] GAŠAN-YA HUL-uwaza ^{KUŠ}ARITUM pian 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. erim.ḥuš = anantu/StBoT 7,20):

ayānu k[ui]zza

(290) ayanieš kue[d]aza

ištu ayanieš nu k[ued]aza

(= 1651/u 9-11 kuēz(((za)))...kuedaza...nu k[u]eza?)

The Akkadian forms are essentially isofunctional, and there is surely no functional difference between kuēz(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 tethešnaza (+ katta and -kan).

ar- 'stand (up)': KBo XVIII 28 I 10 kuēz (+ -kan).

arai- 'arise': KUB XXXIII 106 II 28 [^{GIS}ŠU.A-az (+ šarā).

arš- 'flow': KUB XVII 9 I 21-22 šuppayaza [IGI.HI].A-waza (+ parā and -kan).

huwai- 'run': KUB XXXIV 77 Vs 4 nepišza.

išpart- 'escape': KUB IV 72 Rs 4-5 hatgauwaz pētaž (+ -ašta).

iya- 'go, walk': KUB XIV 3 IV 38 KaxU-za (+ -kan).

iyannai- 'walk, march': KUB XXXIII 98 I 11-12 ^{URU}Urkišaz URU-az (+ arḫa and -kan).

mauš- 'fall': KUB VIII 36 III 9-10 ^G[^{IŠ}GIG]IR-az (+ katta and -kan).

neya- 'turn (int.)': KBo XXI 6 Vs 8⁺ KASKAL-az (+ āpna).

pāi- 'go': VBoT 68 II 15.III 1-2 ^{URU}Arinnaz... ^{URU}Hattušaz.

tiya- 'step': KUB XVII 12 II 17 KASKAL-za (+ arḫa and -kan).

unna- 'drive': KUB IX 34 III 28 ^{URU}Lantaz.

uwa- 'come': KUB XIV 3 IV 45-54 KaxU-za.

watku- 'spring': KUB XXXIII 93 III 17-18 NÍ.TE-az (+ arḫa).

Transitive Motion Verbs:

arnu- 'move': KBo XIII 62 Vs 17 warcawayaz (+ arḥa and -kan).

huittiya- 'pull, draw': KUB XXX 65 II 3 KASKAL-az.

ninink- 'raise, remove': KUB XXX 56 III 15 pēdaz (+ -kan).

narḥ- 'chase': KUB XXVI 87,5 [Ē]? GAL-az (+ katta).

palšiaḥḥ- (KASKAL-šiaḥḥ-) 'put on the road, ship': KBo II 11 Rs 10
URU KUBABBAR-za (+ katta and -kan).

peššiya- 'throw': KBo XII 123,7 šūḥḥaz.

pēda- 'carry': KUB XXXI 79 Vs 4-5 URU Patte[y]arigaza.

šakuniya- 'boil, bubble': KUB XII 58 I 12-13 GE₆-az KI-az (+ šarā
 and -kan; subject 'fountain', object 'clay, mud').

šuwa- 'push, drive': KUB XXIV 14 I 19-20 SAG.DU-az (+ awan arḥa
 and -kan).

dā- 'take': KUB XXXIII 114 I 20.23 ŠU-za (+ arḥa and -kan).

tittanu- 'move': KUB V 24 I 45-46 aniz pēdaz (+ arḥa).

unna- 'drive': KBo XXIII 106 Vs 6-8 URU KUBABBAR-az (+ āppa).

uppa- 'bring': KBo XVII 65 Vs 39 apēz.

uda- 'bring': KUB IV 8 Vs 11-12 annaz[a-pa]tšĀ-taza (+ katta
 and -ašta).

uwate- 'bring, carry': KBo XI 17 II 8-10 nepišaza taknaza īD-za
HURSAG-za hūmandaza (+ āppa).

watkunu- 'make jump > chase': KUB V 3 I 47-48 URU KUBABBAR-za
 (+ -kan).

Verbs of Separation:

karš- 'cut': KUB XXIV 3+ II 11-12 h[āliyaz] ašaunaz kuēz (+ -kan).

lā- 'loosen, release': KUB XXXVI 39 II 9-11 haratnaza wašd[ulaz...]
/HUL-az memiyan[az] (+ arḥa).

šamen- 'withdraw': KUB XXXI 59 Vs 27 [šarr]az (+ -kan).

šarra- 'divide': KUB XII 58 III 8-11 IŠTU 12 ^{UZU}UR (+ awan arḥa).

tarna- 'let go': KUB XXXV 92+ Rs 20-21 ^{DUG}TU₇-az (+ parā).

Others:

au- 'see': KUB XXIV 7 II 54⁺.III 28⁺ AN-za (+ katta and -kan).

eku- 'drink': KUB XXV 37 I 27-28 apiz (+ arḥa and -kan).⁷

halzai- 'call': KUB XXXVI 89 Vs 1-2 ^{URU}Neraza ^{URU}Lallaza (+ andan).

handai- 'arrange': KBo XVIII 104,5-6 ^{URU}Hattušaz (+ katta and -kan).

pē har(k)- 'deliver': IBoT II 129,12 ^{URU}Nahitaza.

hatrai- 'write': KUB XXII 70 Vs 16 ^{URU}x-ruliaz (+ appa).

ḥeyawannai- 'rain': KUB IV 5 Vs 13-14 nepišaza.⁸

ḥuek- 'conjure': KUB XXV 37 IV 28-29 kuēz ANA ! ^{GIŠ}ZA.LAM.GAR.HI.A
 (+ -kan).

ḥueš- 'live, survive': KUB XV 1 III 50 GIG-za.

išḫuwai- 'pour': KUB XXXIII 93 III 24 [nepiš]az (+ katta and -kan).

gank- 'hang': KBo XV 9 IV 7 GÚ-az (+ katta).

gulš- 'inscribe': KUB XLII 103 III 13-14 annalaza GIŠ.HUR gulza-
danaza (+ arḥa and -kan; cf. pp. 186 and 351 sub iya- and gulš-).

kurur ēš- 'be hostile': KUB XIV 3 IV 4-5 damedaza KUR-eza...

ammetaza KUR-eza.

lahuwai- 'pour': KUB XXV 37 I 25f šarāzziyaz [^{GIŠ} huhupal]az
(+ arhaya and -ašta).

mema- 'speak': KUB XXX 28 Rs 8-9 šuh[h]az (+ kattanda and -kan).

paḥšnu- 'protect': KUB IX 15 III 8.13-14 zappiyaz (object šuhhuš).

pāi- 'give': KUB XII 2 II 9 etc. IŠTU URU^{LIM} (cf. ibid. IV 9
LÚ.MEŠ URU^{LIM} peškanzi).

parkui- 'pure, free from': KUB XXXV 92+ Rs 18-19⁺ lenkiaz
[huh]artaz.

parkunu- 'purify': KUB XII 58 IV 2-3 paprannanza.

šakiyab- 'give an omen': KUB XXXVI 93 Rs 9 šepiḥḥaza.

šakuwaya- 'look': KUB XXXIII 92 + XXXVI 10 III 18 nepiḥḥaz
(+ [katta] and -kan).

šapiya- 'peel' > 'clean': KUB XII 58 IV 2-3 paprannanza.

šeš- 'rest': KUB X 95 III 13-14⁺ hūmandaza.

talliya- 'entreat': KUB VII 60 III 5-6 KASKAL-az.

tarup- 'unite': KUB XVI 41 III 14 ē-irza (+ parā and -kan; see
Neu, StBot 5,171).

waggariya- (BAL-) 'mutiny, rebel': KUB VI 39 Rs 6 apizza (+ 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, XIV 47 III 16. See also the apparently mixed construction under huek- p. 383.

II. Ablative of 'time from which'

In addition to further instances of kit/apit pantalaz, we find another example of DUMU-annaza 'from childhood': KUB XXXIII 118,17 and 20-21. KUB IV 47 Vs 26 offers IŠTU ERĒB ^dUTU 'from the setting of the sun', and KBo XVII 65 Rs 43-44 attests the expression [a]pēz ITU-za arha 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 Muwalanni/CTH 703):

(291) SISKUR halalaza-kan arha 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 hē- '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 arḥa:

KUB V 24 I 24-26 (Mixed Oracles/CTH 577):

nu mān ^dUTU ka-u-ri-i? ANA SAL.LUGAL kēz-pat memiaz/ kar-
 (292) piššanza namma-ma-za DINGIR^{LUM} ANA SAL.LUGAL kē[z-ka]n/
UKU.MEŠ-az arḥa ŪL kuitki karpiššanza

'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...arḥa as 'except, besides' is confirmed
 by lines I 34-35 which has kēz-kan INIM-za arḥa 'except for this
 reason'. The unusual position of -kan is due to the fact that
 it forms a special collocation with arḥa, 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/CTH 188):

kuēzza-wa-kan ŪL ḥandari nu-kan BÂD kuit ištarna EGARU-ma kuiš
 (293) 4 šēkan kuiš 3 šēkan kēzza-ma-kan epureššar l-edaza ANA HIRITI
[kattand]a? pait nu-naš-kan apizza ŪL ḥandari

'Why has it not succeeded?--Because within the fortress (there

are) wall(s), one of four š., one of three š.. 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 l-edaza 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 HIRITI, then the interpretation of l-edaza is open to several possibilities. For l-edaza as 'all at once, at a single stroke' see the discussion of l-ēta above p. 376f.

IV. Perlative 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 Nerik/CTH 673):

(294) n-aš-kan ^{GIŠ} AB-za anda paizzi

'He goes in through the window.'

KUB XII 51 I 16-17 (CTH 790):

(295) n-ašta EN SISKUR/ [K]Á-az anda uizzi

'The master of the sacrifice comes in through the []gate.'

KUB V 1 I 48-49 (Oracles on Royal Campaigns/CTH 561):

(296) HUL-uwaz-aš-kan GÍG.GAL-ya/ ištarna arḥa uit

'It came through the evil and the great sickness.'

That GĠG.GAL is also ablative is confirmed by *ibid.* II 57 and IV 75: TA GĠG.GAL-ya. The accusative is more common with ištarna arha 'through': see p. 294.

V. Ablative of Direction

Most of the additional examples of this type merely provide further instances of ZAG-az, GÜB-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 tapuša 'beside the hearth'. There is also a solitary occurrence of šarāzziyaz 'above' with a dative: KBo XXIII 27 II 34-35 ANA ^{ID} Maraššanti...šarāzziyaz 'above the Marassanta River', i.e. above the point where the 'Red River' flows into the Marassanta (see *ibid.* II 29-31). KUB XXXVIII 38 Vs 11 and 16 offer GAM-raza KUBABBAR GAR.RA 'covered with silver below', where katterraza virtually equals kattan. The following passages also deserve mention:

KUB XLV 26 II 6-9 (CTH 790) (= KBo XXIII 43 II 3-5 =

IBoT II 46,6-10):

n-ašta EN SISKUR ^{DUG} palhi arraz and[(a)]/ paizzi parā-ma-aš-kan
(297) ←pūr[(iy)]az [(uizzi)]/ kuitman-kan EN SISKUR ^{DUG} [(palhan)]/
iš[(ta)]rna arha 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 arpa, because the latter implies traversal ('across', 'through'), not 'between'. For palhan as palhayan, gen. pl. of palhi-, see Chap. 2, note 14.

KUB XXX 31 + XXXII 114 I 12-13 (R. of Kizzuwatna/CTH 479):

URU
(298) Kizzuwatni-ma-kan DINGIR.MEŠ-aš iššahru/ IŠTU ŠA LUGAL
uddanaš EN.MEŠ danzi

'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.

IBoT II 80 I 7-8 has NINDA.KUR₄.RA IM[ŠA] ZAG.GAR.RA-ni ZAG-az/
šer dāi. The presence of šer 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 ištanāni GUB-laz dāi 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 ZI-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 šallayaz/ [k]uiš piran uiyanza

'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-ya pēdanzi n-at šuppayaza ḥarkanzi

'They bring also the the implements of the king and keep them pure.'

KBo IV 1 Vs 31 ('Bauritual'/CTH 413):

(301) DINGIR.MEŠ LÚ.MEŠ-war-at LÚ NAGAR-az weter

'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 ^{LÚ}NAGAR-az as nominative singular. Nevertheless, a t-stem for an occupation is distinctly unlikely, and -az is a rare (though attested) spelling for an ant-stem nom. sg.. An ablative expressing 'in the guise of' is therefore a very likely possibility.

We have already seen the expression (^{UZU})šuppa huišawaz zēyantaz(zi-ya) dēi- '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 šuppa huešu zeyan tiyanzi 'they serve raw and cooked pure meat'. There is also another difficult expression involving zeyantaz:

KBo XXI 37 Vs 8 (R. of Kizzuwatna/CTH 479):

(302) [m]aḫḫan-ma-ššan zeyandaza 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) aḫḫann-a ^{UZU}ī zēari 'And when the fat is cooked...'

KBo XIX 142 II 25-26 (F. for Ištar of Mt. Amanu/CTH 721):

(304) aḫḫann-a ^{UZU}nīg.gig ^{UZU}ša uzu.udu-ya ḫūman zēyari

'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-šsan mahhan ^{UZU₁} ari

Neu, StBoT 5,1, interprets the latter as 'When the fat is hot...', reading the verb as a form of ā- '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 a-a-ri, with the usual scriptio plena for this verb. However, the ratio of a-ri to a-a-ri is still surprising if the verb is 'be hot'. A more serious problem is the consistent presence of the local particle -šsan. It does not occur with 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 -šsan would have with a verb 'be hot' in any case. On the other hand, -šsan 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 zēyantaz 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 akkišk- 'die': KUB VII 54

I 3.IV 10-11 and XVII 16 I 4-5.

VIII. Ablative of Means

Only two further instances of this very common usage need special comment:

KUB XXX 26 I 1-2 (Rituals of Zelliya/CTH 783):

(306) mān UKÙ-ān/^d Išharaz GIG-zi

'If a person becomes ill through Išhara.'

Literally, the sentence reads something like 'If it befalls a person with Išhara'. 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 Išhara'.

KUB XXII 70 Vs 55 (The God of Arusna/CTH 566):

(307) nu DINGIR^{LIM}-ma ^{TÚG} termaz-ma kuitki 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 IŠTU SISKUR-pat šanhiškiši

'If you the god seek atonement only by a sacrifice'. This sentence is repeated without zankilatar. One may therefore supply zanki-latar 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 hinganaz... zahhiya[z].

aniya- 'write down': IBoT I 31 Vs 14 tuppiaz.⁹

anš- 'wipe': KUB VIII 38 + XLIV 63 III 20-21 āndaz A-az (+ arha).

arra- 'wash': HT 1 IV 10 apiz.

ariya- 'inquire about': KUB V 6 II 64.IV 7 IŠTU DINGIR^{LIM}...

IŠTU KUŠ.

ašeš- 'seat': KUB XXXIX 97 Vs 3.16 ^{NINDA} zipvinnaz (?).

ašnu- 'equip, outfit': KUB XLI 11 Rs 23-24 iwaruwaza IŠTU KUBABBAR
GUŠKIN [...] za (+ -kan).

au- 'see': KUB XL 1 Vs 12.Rs 23⁺ IGI.HI.A-za.

eku- 'drink': KUB XVI 83 Vs 33 [I]ŠTU GAL 1-edaza.

elaniya- 'fill up': KUB VII 53 II 9-10 kēz paprannaz (+ -šan).

ēp- 'grasp': KUB VIII 51 IIIⁿ 4 ŠU-az.

ēd- 'eat': KBo XIII 64 Vs 19 apiz (+ -kan).

hališšiya- 'plate, coat': KUB XIII 35+ II 34-35 apē[z].

halzai- 'call': KBo II 4 I 25-26 ^{GIŠ} muknaza (+ andan).

han- 'draw (liquid)': KBo XX 41,9 ^{DUG} haršialliaz.

bandai- 'determine': KUB VI 4 III 9 (and often) ariyašeššanaza,

XXII 70 Vs 58 ^{TÚG} termaz (i.e. by giving a t-cloth).

har(k)- 'hold, keep': KBo XII 128,11 išhiulaza.

hark- 'perish': KUB V 3 I 10.35 apiz (+ arha).

hattara- 'stab':¹⁰ KUB XXXVI 35 I 3 [ammedaza G]IR?.TUR-az

(for ammedaza cf. ibid. I 14).

hatrai- 'write': VBoT 2,12-13 tuppiaz.

hatukeš- 'become frightful': KUB XXX 43 III 17-19 DINGIR.MEŠ-za
našma kuēzza imma kuēz [ud]danaz.

haššunḡai- '?': Bo 2309 II 16f (StBoT 19,33) GIŠ erhuyaz (+ -kan).

išḡai- 'bind': KUB XII 58 I 26 ^{UZU}i-yaz (+ anda).

išk(iya)- 'anoint': KUB XXX 43 III 21-22 armahḡuwazza waššiyaza.

iya- 'write down': KUB VII 53 II 6-7 tuppiza.

gangadāi- 'treat with a g.-plant': KUB XXIX 4 II 37 IŠTU KUBABBAR
gangati[y]azi-ya.

kariya- 'cover': KUB XXXIX 23 Vs 7 [^{TUG}k]ušešidaza.

kiš- 'be done, happen': KUB XXII 70 Vs 32.70 apēz.

kiššai- 'comb': KUB XII 58 II 41-42 kuēzziya IŠTU ^{GIŠ}GA.ZUM.

kuer- 'cut': KUB XXXIII 106 III 53 kuēz (+ arḡa).

lā- 'loosen, relieve': KUB XVI 77 II 65⁺.III 24 apizza INIM-za.

lazziya- (SIG₅-) 'be favorable': KUB XLIV 61 I 10.17⁺.IV 23 apiz.

mališkueš- 'become weak': KBo XIII 76 Vs 14 apizza.

maniyahḡ- 'manage': IBoT I 30 Vs 6 ŠU-az (+ -šan).

maršanū- 'falsify' (?): KUB XVI 39 II 11-12 IŠTU GUD UDU
wašdulawandaza [UL ku]ēzqa.

mema- 'speak': RS 25.421 Ro 9-10⁺.30-31 IZKIM-az.

pāi- 'give': KUB XXII 70 Vs 56 IŠTU GUŠKIN NA₄ ^{TUG}termazzi-[y]a
(scil. zankilatar?).

- pāi- 'go': KUB XXXVI 67 II 28 IŠTU ^{GIŠ}KUN₅ (+ šer and -kan).
- papparš- 'sprinkle': KBo XXII 108 II 8-9 šehiliyaz A-nit¹.
- pašihai- 'crush': KUB XLIV 63 II 14 ŠU-az¹¹ (+ anda).
- punuš- 'interrogate': KUB XL 1 Vs 31 kēzza tuppiaz (+ katta).
- šai- 'seal': KUB XXXIII 106 III 52 apiz (+ šappa).
- šanḥ- 'scour': KUB XXV 37 III 21 wetenaz (+ arḥa and -kan).
- šaniya- 'peel' > 'clean': KUB XII 58 I 8 apēz.
- šarra- 'ruin': KUB VII 53+ I 6 paprannaš uddananza (+ arḥa).
- šarnink- 'make restitution': KUB XIII 35+ II 40 parnaza.
- šiya- 'shoot':¹¹ KUB VII 54 III 22-23 kēzza IŠTU ^{GIŠ}U.TAG.GA.
- šū- 'full': RS 25.421 Ro 29 ME.LAM-az.
- šunna- 'fill': KBo XXI 1 II 5-6 IŠTU KAŠ GEŠTIN tawalaz walahhiyaz.
- šupniyahḥ- 'purify': KUB XXX 31+ IV 39-40 šehelliyaz witenaz.
- dā- 'take': KUB XXXIII 96 I 13 ŠU-za.
- dāi- 'place': KUB XXIX 4 III 22 ^{GIŠ}tuppaz (+ katta and -šan).
- tamaš- 'press': KUB XXXVI 35 I 2 [ammitaz] memiyanaz (for ammitaz see ibid. I 13).
- taninu- 'put in order': KUB XLII 91 III 12-13 ^{GIŠ}BANŠUR-za.
- tiyannai- '?': KUB VII 53 II 9-10 kēz paprannaz (+ -šan).
- tūriya- 'yoke': KBo IV 1 Rs 11-12 kuēz (^{GIŠ}[ŠUDU]N-it).
- unuwa- 'adorn': KBo II 1 I 35.II 13-14 etc. šittar(a)za UD.ŠAR-za.
- uwa- 'come': KUB XIV 3 I 61-62 ^{GIŠ}MÁ-za (+ arḥa and -kan).
- uwate- 'carry (off)': KUB XIV 3 III 12-13 GEŠPÚ-za (+ -kan).
- walḥ- 'strike': KUB XXXVI 87 III 12-13 ariyašešnaza (+ -kan).

warp- 'wash': KBo IX 115 Vs 12-13 še[helli]yaz IŠT[U A.HI.A]

waršiya- 'calm down': KUB XXVI 43 Vs 7.17 kēzza...apizza.

watarnahh- 'command': KBo XVIII 91,7 [K]AxU-az.

wek- 'ask for, demand': KUB XXII 70 Vs 13.17 û-az...tešhaz.

wemiya- 'find': KUB XLII 100 III 26.IV 9 tuppi(ya)za.

zanu- 'cook' (tr.): KUB XLIV 63 II 13 A-az IŠTU ["] PIŠÂN ZABAR.

GÛB-leš- 'turn out unfavorably': KUB XIII 35+ I 21 apiz INIM-az.

NU.SIG₅- 'be unfavorable': KUB V 1 III 8.44 kuēzza...apizza.

SIG₅-eš- 'turn out favorably': KUB V 1 I 18 apizza (+ -kan).

ŠE₁₂-nu- 'pacify': KUB V 1 I 93.95 apizza.

VIII. Ablative of Accompaniment

The remaining Neo-Hittite manuscripts offer several more examples of an ablative 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 XLI 17 II 14-15 (R. against Epidemic in the Army/CTH 424):

(308) kāša-wa tuk ANA DINGIR ^{LIM} menahhanda IŠTU UDU/ uwanun

'Behold, I came toward you, the god, with a sheep.'

KUB V 6 III 24 (Liver Omens/CTH 570):

(309) kuitman-kan ^m PIŠ.TUR-aš ^m Zaparti-ŠEŠ-š-a IŠTU SISKUR aranzi

'As soon as Mašūiluwa and Zaparti-ŠEŠ-a arrive with the sacrifice.'

KBo II 2 II 45-46 (Mixed Oracles/CTH 577):

(310) nu-tta-kkan ariyašešnaza/ 2-an nāwi pāiweni

'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 [ari]yašešnaza 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) ^dIŠTAR-iš-ma-kan AN-az/ UR.SAG-annaz arha u[(it)]

'Ištar came away from heaven with heroism/heroically.'

KUB IX 15 II 11-12 (CTH 456):

(312) nu ANA LÚ.MEŠ URU^{LIM}/ maliyašhaz memāu n-an-kan maliyašhaz
KASKAL-ši tiyandu

'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 ḫalwamnaz anniškanzi É-ir-ma

kuit/ [a]nniškanzi n-at duškarattazza/ anniškanzi

'The task which they perform, they perform with laughter (?).

The house which they build, they build with joy.'

Compare *ibid.* I 27 pidduliyazza eššanzi '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 1 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):

(314) mān-ma-šmaš DINGIR.MEŠ ^{URU}KUBABBAR-an URU-an ŠA ^{d U}URU Halap
ANA ^dUTU ^{ŠI}SAL.LUGAL ŠE₁₂-wanzi/ [d]apiaz tak<š>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 ták-an to ták-<ša>-an and the interpretation are confirmed by KUB XVI 47,11 []x KASKAL-an hūmandaz 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 ^{TÚG}NÍG.LAN.MEŠ QADU ^{TÚG}ŠA.GA.DÙ [and]a DIB-anta

1 IMITTU AN.BAR [... GA]R.RA SUM-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 ^{TÚG}NÍG.LAM.MEŠ, 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 appant-.

IX. Ablative of Respect

One type of ablative of respect is that with predicate adjectives:

KBo XV 1 I 16-17 (R. of Pulisa/StBoT 3,112):

(316) IŠTU SAG.DU-ŠU-wa kā[š šalli]iš / ^{UZU}ŠA-za-wa kāš šalliš
ÚR-azza-ya-wa kā[š šalli]š

'This one is large with respect to his head, heart and penis.'

KUB IX 32 Vs 20-21 (R. of Ašhella/CTH 394):

(317) nu-war-at IŠTU ^{UZU}NÍG.GIG / ^{UZU}ŠA Ū IŠTU ^{UZU}ÚR mekki warganteš

'They are fat with respect to their liver, heart and penis.'

The duplicate KUB XLI 18 III 11-12 has for the last item Û
IŠTU ^{UZU}Û 'and with respect to their flesh/fat'. Therefore one
 should perhaps take ^{UZU}ÛR 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:

KUB VIII 75 III 2-5 ('Feldertexte'/ArOr 27,14):

- (318) IŠTU GÍD.DA 1 ME 80 KI.MIN/ 2^{NU} GÍD.DA-ya-šši 1 ME 80 KI.MIN/
IŠTU DAGAL-ma-aš 1 ME 20 KI.MIN/ 2^{NU} DAGAL-ya-šši 1 ME 20 KI.MIN
 'It is 180 gipeššar in length, and it has a second length of
 180 g.. It is 120 g. in width, and it has a second width of
 120 g..'

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:

KUB V 3 I 17-18 (On the Winter Stay of the King/CTH 563):

- (319) mān-ma ANA ^dUTU-ŠI IŠTU HITTI ANŠE.KUR.RA/ ÛL kuitki 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 BAL 'concerning a mutiny', *ibid.* II 6 ^dINANNA-za 'concerning
 Ištar', *ibid.* II 11-12 IZI-za 'concerning fire', XVIII 12 Vs 5

UG₆-za KALAG.GA-za GIG-za 'concerning a plague (and) violent disease'. Unal, 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 - HCM). See also KUB V 2 Vs 2f and XVIII 12 Vs. 31f.

KUB VIII 75 IV 8-9 ('Feldertexte'/ArOr 27,20):

(320) 1 A.ŠÀ ŠA ZAG ANA LÚ.MEŠ ^{URU} Hatiša IGI-anda/ IŠTU NUMUN-ma-aš
ŪL tikkuššanuanza

'One boundary field facing the men of Hatisa. But as to its yield (lit. seed) it is not recorded (lit. shown).'

The sense of tekkuššanu- here is confirmed by the variant in

KUB VIII 78 VI 12-13: NUMUN ANA 3 A.ŠÀ-ni/ ŪL tekkuššanuan '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 188):

(321) ŠÀ ERÍN.MEŠ šarikuwa-ya-kan/ Ū ŠÀ ERÍN.MEŠ UKUŠ hattulannaza/
kuit mahhan

'And how is it among the š-troops and the ----troops with respect to health?'

For kuit mahhan 'how is it, how do things stand?' see *ibid.* Vs 4.

KUB XXII 38 I 3-5 (Lecanomancy/RA 52,150-151):

(322) mān-ma-kan tuk/ ANA DINGIR^{LIM} tamēdaz ŪL kuitki daliyan/ nu
TŪL aldannieš SIG₅-ru

'But if you, the god, have nothing left with respect to
 anything else, let the altanni 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: mān kī-oat namma-ma tamai NU.GÁL kuit DINU MUŠEN HURRI
SIG₅-ru SIG₅ 'But if (it is) only this, and there is no other
 further matter (of dispute), let the H-bird be favorable. (It is)
 favorable'.

Finally, there is KBo XVIII 144,9-10: hūmantaza hūman SIG₅-in
 'Everything is fine in every respect'. The phrase hūmantaz hūman
 recurs in KUB V 24 I 58 and is also found in KUB VI 9 II 4 in the
 form dapiān dapiza.

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 rē Campaigns in Gasga/CTH 561):

(323) nu DINGIR.MEŠ-za kī-ma malān

'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.LUGAL-ya-wa-kan kuit apēz IŠTU DINGIR^{LIM} BA.ÚŠ

'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 rē Campaigns in Gasga/CTH 561):

(325) IŠTU ^{SAL}SU.GI ^{IR}TUM QATAMMA--pat

'The request by the "old woman" is the same.'

ibid. IV 72

(326) KARAŠ.HI.A-kan TA ^dU UL zahtari

'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 ^dU-aš KUR-e zāhi '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:

KUB XXXII 123 II 33-35 (Rituals of Ištanuwa/CTH 772):

(327) ŠA 1 NAM.LÚ.ULU^{LU}-ma-aš MELOI-SÚ § mēn LUGAL-ma SAL.LUGAL
aniyanzi/ nu hūman IŠTU 2 tān danzi

'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 tān 'twice' is an uninflected adverb, it is not clear what the addition of IŠTU 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: multō acrius 'much more sharply/ more sharply by much'). Thus the IŠTU would reflect a meaning '(more) by twice', hence 'twice as much'.

Other cases permit more than one interpretation of the
 ablative:

KUB XLI 17 I 23-24 (Ritual against Epidemic in the Army/

CTH 424):

(328) nu kuēl[1]a IŠTU ^{GIŠ} ZA.LAM.GAR QATAMMA/ iyanzi

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-at-za-kan haddanaz/ arḫa aušten/ n-at išḫiulaza harten/ n-at
 (329) šā-it šikten/ n-at tuliya za pun[u]šten/ n-at GIŠ.HUR-za aušten/
nu a[nd]a da<r>unten? / n-at-za-kan šumēdaza/ 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 ablatives here as expressing means. This seems certain for at least išḫiulaza and is quite in order for the rest. However, the arḫa with haddanaz raises the question of whether several of the ablatives express 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 wemiya-).

In some instances the difficulty lies in the lexical interpre-

tation of the ablative or of the accompanying verb: KUB XXIII 13 Vs 4 wašdazza? išhunabhuēn, XXXIX 57 I 9 A-az arha unha[nzi], XXVIII 6 Vs 9b nu NIG.LAM pittaz ziki[z]zi and KBo XVII 65 Vs 3 kunzigannahitaz šanh[anzi]. Vocabulary also forms part of the problem in KUB XLVI 42 III 2-4:

nu-kan l KIN šakuwaššareza arha dāi UNUTE^{III.A}-ma-kan hūman/
 (330) zazkirilaza dammelaza arha šakuwaššarahhi/ mān l KIN GAL-ma
n-[at-?]-ka)n <zazkirilaza arha šakuwaššarahhi

It would seem that the denominative verb arha šakuwassarahh- means the same as šakuwaššaraz arha dā- '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 SIG₅-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 aššuwaz, but its syntactic function is not clear to me (Ünal, RHA 31(1973)[1976]44, renders SIG₅-za as 'aus dem Günstigen', thus an ablative of separation). 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 TÚL-na kuēzza NU.SIG₅ edaza ŠA LÚ KÚR 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):

(332) DINGIR.MEŠ-za kuit malān URU Nerica(n)-kan karapzi nu EGIR-pa
URU Piqainariša/ uizzi

'Because it is approved by the gods, he rises (?) from Nerik and comes back to Piqainarisa.'

See also *ibid.* III 28-29. The context seems to call for an intransitive (or reflexive) use of karp- '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 Nerica(n) karapzi. Should we read URU Nerica(n)-za-kan in III 23 and 28?

KUB XXVII 49 III 13-15 (Festival witaššiyaš/CTH 692):

(333) nu BELTI É^{TI} LÚ.MEŠ EN.MEŠ DINGIR.MEŠ piyanāizzi/ kuin-za-kan
imma kuēz! duškizzi/ UŠKENNU n-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 kuēz 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) EZEN-ŠU hazziwiyaza duškarattē[?] tarrāuwan[za]

KUB XVI 16 Rs 15 (Liver Omens/CTH 570):

(335) nu-wa ANA DINGIR^{LIM} KU-na waštanuwandaza pešgaweni

KUB XXXI 79 Vs 13 (CTH 214):

(336) [han]tezzi palši-ya ^{GIŠ} MÁ.TUR[?] ^{URU} Arziyaza daišteyanzi

KUB XXIV 7 IV 49f (Story of the Fisherman and His Wife/

CTH 363):

(337) SAL-aš ZI-anza haddanza tapariyaza-ma/ [p]arā karšan harzi

In connection with the phrase EGIR-pa parza 'backwards' one should note the variant EGIR-pa parašza (KUB IX 39 I 4) and also KUB XLII 78 II 8: 1^{EN} AŠ.ME GUŠKIN NA₄ katta 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-pa. Finally, there is the form

SAL.MEŠ³ hazgaraiyaza, which occurs in various spellings in KBo 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.GE₆/Kronasser, Umsiedlung 6):

(338) nu-kan kuitman wetummanzi hūmantazzi-ya ašnuzi

'While one finishes with the construction and everything...'

Kronasser, loc. cit., translates hūmandazzi-ya as an adverb 'ganz und gar', but this ignores the connective -ya 'and', 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 I² §§270-273 with references). We are dealing with

an original heteroclit *-uer-/-uen- substantive. Kronasser, VLFH 133, derives -wanzi from -wan plus a t-enlargement plus locative -i. Other evidence for such a 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 -z-. On the other hand, -wanzi < *-wanti is perfectly regular. The preservation of the final i in all environments (versus the regular ablative -az: -azzi-ya) is surprising, but this is part of a general problem concerning the outcome of final *-ti (see p. 473 below). One may either take the -wan- of the ablative *-wanti as the oblique stem -wan which underlies genitive -waš (< *-wans) or as the endingless locative of the supine in -wan (cf. pirza, nenišza and ablatives in -anza pp. 448-450 below).

Functionally, the infinitives in -wanzi would have originated in phrases with the verbs zinna- 'cease', ašnu- 'finish' and the like. An original iyawanzi zinna- '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 -wanzi versus -anna is surely secondary. Palaic ahūna 'to drink' and Luvian -ūna (aduna 'eat' etc.) show that the -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:

aniya- 'treat': KUB XV 42 II 18 ^{SIG}alit.

arra- 'wash': KUB VII 53 II 21-22.25 GEŠTIN-it...wetenit.

arš- '?': KBo X 47g III 14 lappinit (cf. p. 329 sub arš- with note).

au- 'see': KUB XXXIII 106 I 24 IGI.HI.A-it.

eku- 'drink': KBo II 14 III 10-11 etc. (4x) SI-it, XVI 100,4⁺.6⁺

IŠTU BIBRI auwauwāit.

ēp- 'grasp; hold': KUB XXX 28 Rs 12 ŠU.HI.A-it; KBo XXII 244,6

tapišanit (+ šer; see p. 243f).

hališšiya- 'plate, coat': KBo XXIII 52 II 10-11.15-16 etc.

KUBABBAR-it.

halzai- 'call': KBo V 11 I 7 lamnit.

har(k)- 'hold': KBo XI 11 I 3 kiššarta.

haššungai- '?': KBo XIX 141,6 (= XI 19 Vs 13) ZAG-it GÜB-litt-a

ki[(ššarit)].

hazziya- 'strike': KBo XXII 42 Vs 14⁺ GI-it.

- hulaliya- 'wrap': KBo XIII 163 Vs 3-5 []TI-annit ha[ttulann]it
 []DUMU.MEŠ DUMU.SAL.MEŠ haššit ha[n]zaššit.
- irhai- 'make the rounds of': KBo II 29 Vs 15-17 memallit.
- išhai- 'bind': KUB XVII 12 III 17-18 ^{SÍG}pittulit.
- išiyahh- 'reveal, signal': KUB V 11 IV 49-50 Ū-it.
- ištamaš- 'hear': KUB XII 21,11⁺ ištamanta.
- iya- 'make': KBo XIV 116 IV 4 IŠTU ^{DUG}TU₇.
- kappuwa- 'care for': KUB XXXIII 121 II 7 ^{NINDA}haršit išcanduzzi<t>.
- karp- 'lift': KBo XXI 47 III 6 SAG.DU-it.
- kuer- 'cut': KUB XXXIII 106 III 42 ^{URUDU}kuruzzit (+ arha).
- māi- 'flourish': KUB XXIV 6 Vs 4⁺ [hal]kit GEŠTIN-it.
- memā- 'speak': KBo XVI 56,11 EME-it, KUB V 11 I 5 Ū-it.
- mugai- 'entreat': KUB XXIV 2 Vs 12 ^{NINDA}haršit ^{DUG}išpanduzzit.
- ninganu- 'make drunk': KBo XIII 101 Vs 29⁺ tawalit walhit.
- papparš- 'sprinkle': KUB VII 2 I 22 A-it, XLIV 50 I 10 šūwaruit.
- parkunu- 'purify': KUB VII 53 IV 2-3.6 tuēl ŠU-it...IM-it.
- pašihai- 'crush': KUB XXXIII 93 III 22 GĪR-it (+ anda).
- pēda- 'carry': KBo XI 38 I 14-15 hupparit GUŠKIN.
- šakk- 'know': KBo XII 128,5 ŠĀ-it.
- šap(iya)- 'peel' > 'clean': KUB VII 53 IV 2-3.6 tuēl ŠU-it...IM-it.
- šipand- 'libate': KUB VII 60 III 9-11 tapišanit GEŠTIN (+ -kan).
- šiya- 'shoot': KUB XLV 49 IV 4-5 ^{GIŠ}kalmišnit (ibid. IV 5-6 has
 an acc. ^{GIŠ}kalmišniuš?; or is -ni-uš an error for -ni-it?).
- šu- 'full of': RS 25.421 Ro 37.39 dammetarwantit...āššuit.

šunna- 'fill': KBo XII 70 Rs¹¹ 39 halkit.

šuppiyahh- 'purify': KBo XXIII 1 II 4-5 šehelliyaš wetenit.

šūd- '?': KBo XIX 130 I 10 welkuit.

dā- 'take': KUB XLI 4 II 18 ^{TUG} kurešnit.

tarh- 'conquer': KBo XXII 73 I 9⁺ ^{GIŠ} TUKUL-it.

tarmai- 'nail, fasten': KUB XII 44 III 8-9 ^{GIŠ} hataalkišnit

(+ katta and -šan).

tarna- 'let go': KBo I 35,8 uddanit anda tarnumar = Akk. surrû?¹³

tiya- 'step (on)': KBo VII 12,15 GĪR-it.

tūriya- 'yoke': KUB II 2 II 11-12 kuēz ^{GIŠ} SUDUN-it.

uiya- 'send': KUB XV 30 II 2-3 û-it.

unuwa- 'adorn': IBoT III 100,3 GURUN-it.

wahnu- 'brandish': KUB XVII 23 II 11 ^{GIŠ} tīpit (+ šer arḫa 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).

walḫ- 'strike': KUB XXII 70 Rs 56-57 ^{NA4} kunkunuzzit.

wek- 'ask for': KUB XV 5 III 51.IV 18.34 û-it.

wemiya- 'find': KBo XVII 65 Rs 46 KAXU-it (cf. KUB XLII 100 III 26).

wete- 'build': KUB XL 61,7 + XIII 28,11 tuzit!

wezz- 'strike':¹⁴ KUB IV 8 Vs 9 SI.HI.A-it.

zaḫ- 'strike': KUB XVII 12 III 19-20 ^{SĜ} pittūlit.

zanu- 'cook' (tr.): KBo XIII 101 Vs 10 IZI-it.

zapnu- 'let trickle, dribble': KBo XXI 23 I 22 IŠTU ^{GIŠ} ERIN (+ šer and -šan).

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 Palliya/CTH 475):

(339) maphan-ma-at šehelliyaš witenit/ EGIR-pa uwanzi

'But when they come back with the water of purification...'

The same expression occurs with a singular subject in KBo IX 119A I 10-11.

There are also further examples of an accompanying object with the direct object of a transitive verb. In KUB XLI 48 IV 23-24 we find: ^{UZU}NIŠ.G.[(GIG)]/ ^{UZU}ŠA ^{UZU}UR-it zanuwanzi[i] 'they cook the liver and heart together with the penis'. In view of the frequent collocation happenit zanuwanzi 'they cook with an open flame', one might wonder if the scribe here misheard happenit as happešnit 'member, penis'. However, KUB XXXII 123 III 50-51 has ^{UZU}ZAG.UD[U]? / happišnit zanuwan 'the shoulder (is) cooked with the penis', so the usage is probably real.

KUB XXIV 2 Rs 14-16 (Prayer to Telipinu/CTH 377):

[nu-šmaš ha]lkiyaš ^{GIŠ}GEŠTIN-aš ^{GIŠ}šēšanaš GUD.HI.A-aš

UDU.HI.A-aš NAŠ.HI.A-[aš]/ [(ŠAH-aš ANŠE.GIR).NUN.NA.HI.A-aš
 (340) ANŠE-aš["] gimraš hūitnit/ [(DUMU.LÚ.ULU^{LU}-ašš-a ŠA EG)IR.UD^{MI}
 miyātar 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 EGIR.UD^{MI} miyātar 'future abundance', and to our mind a smoother sentence would have been produced by a genitive gimraš hūitnaš '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):
 (341) PA₅-aš-ma-aš GIM-an (ras.) n-aš-kan t/daluppiyaš dammetar-
 want[ilt]/ A.MEŠ-ar anda piddaizzi

'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 pangarit: '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):

(342) mān-ma ANA ^dUTU ŠI ŠU-aš waštulit/ UL kuitki LUL-weni nu
KUŠ.MEŠ SIG₅-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 pahšanuwan ēš[du[?]]

'[Let] it be protected by the king.'

V. Pronominal Instrumental Used for the Ablative

Neo-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⁺ apit pantalaz 'from that time on', KUB XXXVI 91

Rs 3⁺ and KBo XIX 145 III 45⁺ kitpantalaz 'from this time on',
KBo XIII 99 Rs 13 tuggaza-ššit and KUB XLIII 34,11 tuēggaz-šit
 'from his body'.

VI. Adverbial Instrumentals

Aside from more attestations of pangarit 'en masse', GĪR-it
 'on foot' and šakuwaššarit ZI-it 'whole-heartedly', the remaining
 Neo-Hittite manuscripts offer only the adverb DU_o-it:

KUB VI 17 II 3 (Oracles/CTH 582):

(344) mān ^{LÚ} KUR ANA ERÍN.MEŠ MÈ-pat zabhiya DU_o-it tiy[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/DU_o-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 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 DU_o-it is also
 attested with GUL-ar (walḫuwar) 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 šūwant- '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 'S^a'/CTH 299):

(345) liḫmu = iṣuwanit wātar 'water (mixed) with dirt' (?)

On this line see Laroche, RHA 24(1966)161, with references. The Akkadian is hapax, but on the basis of the Hittite has been reasonably related to luḫummû/luḫmû 'mud' (see CAD under liḫmu).

KUB VII 13 Vs 37 (CTH 456):

(346) nu-za LÚ ^dU TÚG^{TUM} IŠTU SISSIKTI waš[šivazi]

'The man of the Storm-god puts on a garment with a hem.'

The phrase marked with IŠTU 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 šūwant- 'full'. This does not exclude a similar derivation, namely by deletion of a participle such as ašnuwant- 'provided with'.

VIII. Instrumental of Separation

ABoT 17 III 5-6 (Birth Ritual/CTH 477):

(347) nu SAL punušzi nu mān [...]/ tešhit 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 parkui-, but also by KUB XXIV 8 I 31 (p. 182 above sub parkuiya-).

IX. Problematic Cases

Two further cases of the instrumental are less than certain in their interpretation:

KBo XVII 78 I 8-9 (Storm Ritual/CTH 631):

(348) EGIR-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-et. 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. KBo XV 31 I 4.8 MĀŠ.GAL markantan.

KBo XVIII 133 Vs 6-7 (Letters re Oracles/CTH 581):

(349) [nu]-za BELI-NI ŠA EZEN MU.KAM ITU-mit? / 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-mit 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 pangarit and ZI-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. ā dextrā 'on the right' and other parallels already cited by Sturtevant, Lg 8(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 edi 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 pangarit '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 warnu- 'burn with fire') or at least be shown to have older models (see p. 372 on ex. (275) aššawit šarā šunneš '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-ú-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 'promiscuously' 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 (CTH 501f), the bulk of which have been independently dated by others to the reign of Tuthaliya III/IV (see Laroche, 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 ZAG-za/GÜB-za (ŠU-za) parzi. The only exception is KUB XXX 37 I 5-6 (CTH 516), which has ZAG-nit kišširit...GÜB-lit kišširit. But this manuscript, while Neo-Hittite, shows a markedly older ductus than the other inventory texts (see e.g. its use of older LI, SAG and above all KÜ versus the consistent later forms of the inventory texts in KUB 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 šittaraza UD.SAR-za unuwant- '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 ablative 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' šahhanaz luzziyaz arawahh- 'free from š. and l.' to šahhanit luzzit arawahh- and so forth. Again this is similar to what happened with enclitic possessives, where -šet was incorrectly generalized from šakuwa-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 ZI-za for ZI-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 kitpantalaz '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 šullannaz '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 nepišza-(šta ^dIŠKUR-unni) 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...GE₆-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) šiuunit pīyanteš 'given by the god', it is highly unlikely that šiuunit is a neologism inserted by the Neo-Hittite copyist, who would surely have substituted DINGIR^{LIM}-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, Vergl. 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,¹⁶ 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

¹The full sentence reads: nu-kan ^{URUDU} ZI.KIN.BAR-aš ^{GIŠ} šarpaz kunkūeni. The same obscure expression occurs in the Prayer of Mursili to the Sun-goddess of Arinna (CTH 376) KUB XXIV 3 II 23 = XXIV 4,13, where the presence of the particle -ašta instead of -kan suggests that the ablative expresses separation. See on this passage Gurney, AAA 27(1940)90-92 and Goetze, KlF 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} šarpa- 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 šarpa', a proverbial expression roughly equal to 'we will move heaven and earth' (to make things right again).

²The 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.

³One could also interpret this example as an ablative of cause: 'at my command/as a result of my order(s)'.

⁴This sentence reads in full: ISTU ^dU pihaššašši-wa-za kanišš[anza šalla]nuwan[(za)] mimmameišš-a. Eichner, Sprache 21 (1975)105, emends -ša to -ta and reads MI-IM-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 MIMMA without any further specification is used as hūmantaz is also unlikely. Finally, the -za would be unusual with a verb miešta 'prospered'. Instead we should take the text as given and understand mimmameišš-a (dupl. memmamišš[-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.

⁵In 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 zašhiya '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.

⁶In KBo XIX 44b,6-7 (Hukkana Treaty §26) ZI-it appears to be used as an ablative of means: [(našm)h kiššuwa(n utta)r...z]ikila ZI-i[t (ē)loši/ [(našm)h-at ieši]¹¹ 'Or if you yourself conceive (lit. take) such a thing with your mind or (actually) do it'.

⁷The 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 lahuwai- see Chap. 2, note 25.

⁸The entire sentence reads: nu nepišaza iy[ata] hūman heyawani[škit]. I see no way to determine with certainty whether iyata hūman is the subject of an intransitive verb or the object of a transitive verb with an impersonal subject.

⁹Hittite could also say 'write on a tablet' with a dative-locative. See for example KUB XXVII 68 IV 3-6: kēdani-ššan ANA TUPPI...KIN-anteš.

¹⁰This verb may be identical to hattrāi- 'write'

¹¹I list the stem as šiya- because it is not clear to me that šiya- 'shoot' is necessarily the same verb as šāi-/šiya- 'press, seal'.

¹²In KUB XII 44 III 7 antūwaphza is functioning as a nom. sg.. It is probably an error for antūwaphaš. However, it is also possible that it indirectly reflects an original animate s-stem:

N.Sg. *antūwahš

A.Sg. *antūwahšan

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 antūwah(h)- and a paradigm:

N.Sg. *antūwahh-š

A.Sg. *antūwahh-an

Based on the accusative antūwahhan (taken as antūwahha-n) one could then make the attested nominative antūwahhaš.

The second possibility was to remake the nom. sg. as antūwahza 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 (antuhša-š after antuhša-n). This entire analysis is admittedly speculative, but it does attempt to account for the competing stems antūwahha- and antuhša-. antūwahš- would be highly peculiar as an Indo-European animate s-stem, but the word could well be a borrowing.

¹³Von Soden, AHW 1063, defines surrû(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'.

¹⁴This verb is listed by Friedrich, HWb 256, as uiyida- and uizza- and equated with doubts to ueda- 'bring'. The basic meaning is rather 'strike' as in KUB IV 8 Vs 9 where the Storm-god strikes the recalcitrant man with his 'horns'. One can account for the forms wizzai and wiuidai by assuming an original athematic *we/id-. The original third sing. pres. would have been *wezzazzi (/wetstsi/) for which compare ezzazzi to ed- 'eat'. The attested third sing. pres. wezzai is a hi-conjugation form based on the stem wezz- abstracted from wezzazzi (cf. ezzai to ed-). For the reduplicated hi-conjugation third sing. wiuidai to an athematic *wezzazzi compare wewakki beside wekzi to wek- 'demand'. The root *wed- is Indo-European *udh- 'strike' (Skt. vadhati etc.). In the Targasnalli Treaty II 29.36.41 both wiuidai 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. ōthéō 'push, urge' from the same root.

¹⁵Delbrück, 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 ak- 'die', which also serves as the passive of kuen- '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.

¹⁶See e.g. Latv. naudu mīt 'exchange for money' and the use of Lat. mūtō 'exchange' with the ablative or the preposition cum. Thieme, ZDMG 95(1941)86 with references, cites Pali nimināti '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 -za (on this alternation see Sec. 1.2 below). However, before the enclitic -a/-ya 'and', the ablative ending regularly appears as -azzi-: e.g., KUB XXXIII 62 III 8 āšgazzi-ya 'and outside'.

One also finds a similar extended form of the pronominal ending -ēz: e.g., KUB XX 24 III 4f 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 kuišša 'every' (formally equal to Latin cuisque):¹

Nom.Sg.C. kuišša

Acc.Sg.C. kuinna

Acc.Pl.C. kuiušša

Nom.-Acc.Sg.Nt. kuitta

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:

hūmandazzi-ya KUB XIX 11 IV 32 (AM), XXVI 1 I 27 (Tuthaliya III/IV)

kunannazzi-ya KBo XIX 76 IV 2 (Mursili)

gulzattanazzi-[y]a KBo XI 1 Vs 21 (Mursili)

tamētazzi-ya KUB XIV 8 Rs 41 (Mursili; prayer)

DINGIR.MEŠ-azzi-ya KBo IV 6 Vs 26 (Muwatalli; prayer)

NÍG.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 kēzzi-ya in the phrase kēz kēzzi-ya could be explained as a retention of an older form in a fixed phrase, but the other examples establish -(az)zi-ya as a living part of Neo-Hittite grammar. I also know of no cases of -azza or -ēzza which require an interpretation 'and', i.e. an analysis -azz-a/-ezz-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 -Vz and -za (see Sec. 1.2 below).

In addition to regular -(az)zi- before -ya, 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 kuēzzi is an error for kuēzziya 'every'. However, KBo ^{IV 9 VI} XX 77 IV-6 and 10 have kuēzzi correlated with apēz, so that the former cannot mean 'every'. KBo IV 2 III 14 shows kēzzi, but the context is too broken to decide whether this is an error for kēzzi-ya or a spelling variant of kēz. In KUB XIV 17 II 12 kēzzi-ma-kan the context is also incomplete, but the presence of -ma- makes it unlikely that kēzzi stands for kēzzi-ya. 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 -ya 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

Old Hittite Manuscripts

	Consonant__	Vowel__	Ideogram__
-AZ	7	19	9
-ZA	2	0	0 ⁴

Middle and Neo-Hittite Mss. of Old Hittite Texts

-AZ	54	341	148
-ZA	13	87	34

Middle Hittite Mss. of Middle Hittite Texts

-AZ	26	85	35
-ZA	0	2	2

Neo-Hittite Mss. of Middle Hittite Texts

	Consonant	Vowel	Ideogram
-AZ	68	199	120
-ZA	2	87	31

Neo-Hittite Historical Texts through Muwatalli

-AZ	49	82	50
-ZA	0	35	13

Neo-Hittite Historical Texts from Hattusili III on

-AZ	16	26	13
-ZA	0	61	47

In Old Hittite -az and -za are very nearly in complementary distribution. In Old Hittite manuscripts the only ablative in -za is nepišza, 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. nepišza is also found twice in Neo-Hittite copies of Old Hittite texts. In later copies of Old Hittite texts one finds É-irza (/Pirts/) six times as the ablative of pir/parn- 'house'. The same form occurs twice more in Neo-Hittite copies of Middle Hittite texts and nine times in undatable texts. Neither nepišza nor É-irza is found in Neo-Hittite historical texts. It therefore seems safe to assume that É-irza as well as nepišza 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 tapuša 'beside', arahza '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 attestations from Old Hittite manuscripts listed above are: halmašuittaz (KBo XVII 1 II 39), hēpparaz (KBo VI 2 II 51), hīlamnaz (KBo XVII 4 III 45), iššaz (KBo XVII 1 I 18), kartaz (KBo XVII 7 + IBoT III 135,6), kušš(a)naz (KUB XXIX 29 Vs 7) and taknāz (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 hēpparaz from Ē-irza or iššaz from nepišza. One must reckon with the spread of -az in Old Hittite in any case, for Ē-az (parnaz) is already attested in KBo XXII 1 Vs 13, an Old Hittite manuscript. Aside from nepišza, Ē-irza and the adverbs mentioned above, the only ablatives in -za from consonant stems are parza in EGIR-pa parza (also a frozen form, if it is an ablative at all) and kitkarza, 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. mss.) versus annaza ŠA-za 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 Muwatalli 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 IBoT II 131 which has five instances of -az (beside apizza 1x). 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 -azza, and the pronominal ablative ending -ēz/-īz may appear as -ēzza/-izza. The spellings in -Vzza are not attested in Old Hittite manuscripts. -ē/izza occurs six times in Middle Hittite manuscripts, 26 times in Neo-Hittite copies of older texts, and 36 times in Neo-Hittite historical texts. -azza 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, CGr(1933)196a, and by Jasanoff, MSS 31(1972)123, a high percentage of the examples are from r/n-stems, and both Stefanini, AGI 44(1959)7-8, and Jasanoff, 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:

GIŠ_{luttanza} KBo VIII 42 Vs 2 (O.H. ms.); KUB XVII 6 I 19 and
XXXIII 70 II 2⁺ (both N.H. mss.).

GIŠ_{luttianza} KBo XXI 92 I 11 (N.H. ms.).

Other examples cited for Old Hittite are uncertain or false:

GÍR-anza (KBo III 38 Vs 30) is in a broken context; utniyanz(aš)-
(KUB I 16 II 62) is certainly nom. sg. comm. (see p. 221 above);
SIG₅-an[za] (KUB I 16 III 17, restored by Sommer) is possible but

by no means secure (see p. 222 above); haššannanza (KUB XI 1 IV 24) can be interpreted either as an ablative or as a nom. sg. comm. (the haššannaz 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:

išpananza KUB XXXIX 102 I 1 (N.H. ms.).

GE₆-anza (išpantanza) 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 nevišanza, 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:

hannišnanza KUB XIX 67 I 5

For the interpretation of this passage see above p. 364.

Undatable Texts:

buitnanza KBo IX 114,7

GIŠ₁ luwešnanza KUB XXXIX 71 II 44 (precedes arh[a])

paprannanza KUB XII 58 IV 2.26

tuppi(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-va KUB XXIV 14 I 13

SIG₅-anza KUB XVI 9 II 6

GIŠ₂TUKUL-anza VBoT 25 I 5.11 (cf. I 12 GIŠ₂TUKUL-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 -aza where he assumed that the -a was a particle of some sort. The artificiality of this explanation of the -z was criticized by Sturtevant, Lg 8(1932)1f. (see already JAOS 47(1927)181f). Sturtevant proposed instead that the -z represented IE (more precisely IH) *-ts, the zero-grade of *-tos, an adverbial ending with ablatival function (Skt. mukhatāh '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, HdO 303). The lack of enthusiasm has stemmed from misgivings about such an IE zero-grade as *-ts from *-tos (Kammenhuber, loc. cit.).

Kronasser, VLFH 101f, raises an even more serious objection from the Hittite side: the forms in -(az)zi-ya, which point unambiguously to an ending *-(a)ti. After a misplaced comparison with Tocharian genitives in -ntse (based on his unjustified assumption of -anzi as the basic ending), Kronasser also adduces the most obvious comparanda: Luvian -ti (more properly -ati) and Lycian -di (i.e. -edi/-adi), which have the combined functions of the Hittite ablative and instrumental (see Laroche, DLL 136, for the Luvian and Neumann, HdO 385, for the Lycian, each with

references). Kronasser further compares Greek -thi (e.g. pothi 'where'). As he himself points out, the locative 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 -(az)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 -z(i) 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 assibilate before vocalic i. Kronasser, VLFH 178 and 208, equates Hittite 2nd sing. inv. it 'go!' with Greek ithi 'idem'. He attributes the loss of final -i to the influence of ed 'eat', ep 'take' etc.. This is probably unnecessary,⁶ and the equation of Grk. -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. š /s/ before i: šiu- 'god' < *diēu-. šiwatt- 'day' could be from either *diēuot- or *diuot-. 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. pret. ending is attested as -te/-tē or -de/-dē: ade/adē 'he made' but pijete/pijetē 'he gave' (see Neumann, HdO 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(zi) with Luvian -(a)ti and Lycian -(e)di/- (a)di, pointing to a Common Anatolian *a)ti (on the original form of the ending see below).

Comparanda outside Anatolian are hard to find. Greek -thi in póthi 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, -uē and -ē (see Jensen, Altarm. Gram. 51). The ending -u may be regularly derived from *-uti (compare heru 'last year' < *peruti). Both -uē and -ē reflect the

spread of the productive ablative ending -ē, which may be explained from *-eti (cf. 3rd sing. pres. ber-ē 'he carries' < *bhereti).⁷ 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 nepišza by parnaz and nepišaz 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 -ē is in some cases added to the locative (e.g. teli 'place', loc. telwoj, abl. telwojē). Jasanoff, MSS 31(1972) 123f, argues that Hitt. pirza and nepišza 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 -ē (< *-eti) to locatives reflects the same process with *-ti at an earlier stage of Armenian.

The ablative *-ti recalls locative *-dhi (Grk. póthi etc.) and the multifunctional *-bhi (Grk. -phi). Locative *-dhi stands beside *-dhe (Greek -the, both locative and ablative) and *-dhen (Grk. -then, ablative). See on these forms Schwyzler, 1.627 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 -z(i), and the enclitic possessives disappeared as a category without ever forming ablatives. By late Neo-Hittite the ablative in -z(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 Palaic, but the corpus is too miniscule 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 nepišza and the adverbs araḥza and tapuṣza 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-aš, *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 wetenaš etc. for a very long time and when it was replaced, it was with the productive ending weten-it, not with a *weten-anda).

Jasanoff, MSS 31(1972)123f, accounts for -anza by first suggesting that the ablatives Ē-irza (pirza) and nepišza are built on endingless locatives. A loc. sg. nepiš appears to be attested in KUB XXXIII 111,8. It is true of course that nepiš- is also the basic stem, so nepišza is inconclusive. The paradigm of *pir/parna- '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 Ē-ri, 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. šiwat šiwat 'daily' and especially dagan 'on the ground' vs. oblique takn-. Jasanoff sees the ending -anza as originating in the abstracts in -atar (oblique -ann-), where ablative *-ti was added to an endingless locative *papratan. The regular result of *papatanti was *papatanza, which was remade to paprannanza after the other oblique cases. The ending -anza then spread to other r/n-stems and a few other nouns.

The pronominal ending -ēz(zi) (less often -iz(zi)) 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 -ēz(zi) 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 -ēd-: kēd-z(i) > kēz(zi). 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 kēz replaces kēt, 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. mukhatāh 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/-ēt (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, IF 43(1925)316f. The claim of Kammenhuber, HdO 303, that -t(a) is an archaism is confirmed by the distribution of the ending (see also Neu, KZ 86(1973)293 on ganut). 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.)

išhimanta KUB XVII 5 I 15 (N.H. ms.)

ganūt KUB XII 63+ Vs 26 (N.H. ms.)

kiššarta 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.).

kišarta KUB XXXI 127+ I 51 (N.H. ms.)

kiššarat 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]antá = KBo XIII 78 Vs 8.9 kēdanna¹; all N.H. mss.)

šakanda KBo XXII 2 Vs 2 (O.H. ms.)

uddanta KUB XXX 10 Vs 18.19 (M.H. ms.)

widanda KUB XLIII 63 Vs 4 and wedanda KUB XIII 4 III 47 (N.H. mss.)

NA₄-ta (perunta) KBo XXI 22 Rs 37 (M.H. ms. versus the N.H.

parallel KBo XII 98 I 4 NA₄-it)

GEŠTIN-ta (wiyanta) KBo XVII 4 III 17 (O.H. ms.)

SI.HI.A^{II}-anda (garaunta) KUB XLIII 60 I 19 (N.H. ms.)

Middle Hittite

ēšanta HT 1 I 38 (N.H. ms.)

kiššarta KBo VIII 35 III 7 (M.H. ms.) and keššarta KBo X 45 II 28

(N.H. ms.). NB kiššerit KUB XXIX 40 III 32 (N.H. ms.).

šāku[w]at KUB XXIII 72 Rs 15 (M.H. ms.). Cf. *ibid.* Vs 19 šākuit.

tiyammanda KUB IX 28 III 14 = tiyam[m]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.), wedanda KUB IX 28 I 12

(N.H. ms.) and widan<da> KBo VI 34 III 13 (N.H. ms.; for the

emendation see Oettinger, StBoT 22(1976)39).

Neo-Hittite:

ŠU-ta (kiššarta) KUB XXIII 1 II 1 (Šaušgamuwa Treaty)

Undatable Texts (all N.H. mss.):

apēdanda KUB XXXIX 101 II 15

išhimanta KUB XVII 28 I 15

ištamanta KUB XII 21,11

[k]ēdanta KUB XXXIII 118,7

kiššarta KBo XI 11 I 3, XXIII 52 III 11.17; KUB IX 1 II 27,

XXIV 6 Vs 15, XXX 29 I 7⁺, XXXII 123 III 11. See also

ŠU-šarta KBo XII 109,15.

uttanta KUB XLIII 46,8

wedanda KUB XXXIX 101 II 14 = IBOT II 125 II 4. See also A-tanta?

KUB XVII 28 I 15.

ZI-ta (ištanzanta?) KUB XXXVI 88 Rs 9 (this example is uncertain)

The total attestations show that the ending -t(a) is not limited to names for body parts (Ehelolf, loc. cit., and Friedrich, HE I² §61). All but two cases, however, are from r- or n-stems. The exceptions are ganut 'by the knee' and šākuwat 'with the eyes'. In the case of 'eye' three forms are attested: šākuwat, šākuit (also KBo XXIII 92 II 15 and 83/e I 7; see Otten, OLZ 60(1965)546) and šākuwait (e.g. KUB XXXV 148 III 36 IGI.HI.A-wait). In the last form the nt. pl. šākuwa has been treated as the stem, to which the ending -it has been added. In šākuit the a of the stem has been deleted before the instrumental ending as is usual for an a-stem: lala- 'tongue', instr. lalit. In šākuwat the ending -t has been added to a šākuwa- which could be either the real stem šākuwa- or once again the nt. pl. šākuwa.⁸

The spelling kiššarat confirms that the vowel of -t(a) is

merely graphic. One is to read /kissard/, /wedand/ etc.. Oettinger, StBoT 22(1976)40, note 78, explains the instrumental wedanda /wedand/ 'with water' and the pronominal forms kēdanda and apēdanda after the r/n-stem instrumentals like uddanta and tiyammanta, venturing that -anda was falsely abstracted as a unitary ending. None of this is necessary. The original paradigm of 'water' was acrostatic: nom.-acc. *uódr/ oblique *uédn-.⁹ An instrumental *uédn-t would give regularly wedanda /wedand/. The pronominal stems may be most simply analyzed as kēd-an-t(a) and apēd-an-t(a) with the same -an- as in kēd-an-i and apēd-an-i (for the segmentation compare older kēd-i and see Neu, StBoT 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 n-stems at the time of their formation. On the misunderstanding of the form kēdanda 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-da (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-geminating particle -a (see above p. 228 and also Neu, StBoT 18,71). Similarly, sentence initial ú-e-ši-da (SBo I 6 Rs 3) may be analyzed as wešid-a 'but with the pasture'.

The form ganut 'by the knee' with its archaic ablaut¹⁰ 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 ēśhantet (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: ēśhan+t (cf. ēśhanta) + -et. On the diachronic implications of the ending -t(a) see Sec. 2.3 below.

Section 2.2. The Spellings -it and -ēt

The instrumental ending appears as both -it and -ēt. 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 -ēt 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:

	O.H. Mss.	Other O.H.	M.H. Mss.	Other M.H.	N.H. Hist.
-IT	30	351	91	207	98
-ET	9	13	5	29	4

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-et. There are no occurrences in Old Hittite manuscripts, but hūmantet occurs three times in Middle Hittite manuscripts, along with a-a-an-te-et (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 zeyantet, and one each of šekkantet, arantet and tittittet. Of the 60 cases of -et listed above, 38 represent -te-et. 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 hūmantit (KUB XXXVI 106 Vs 3) and tuhhiyattit (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 ši-e-et (1x). Later manuscripts of Old Hittite texts provide seven more instances of ki-e-et versus one ki-it-(ta). ki-e-et occurs once in a Middle Hittite manuscript, and in Neo-Hittite historical texts l-e-et-ta is attested three times (versus perhaps l-it-ta in KUB XLV 77 I 13, but the latter is uncertain). Between them, kēt, šēt and l-ētta 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 kēt, šēt and l-ētta 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 kēt, šēt and l-ētta are all from pronominal stems (for the pronominal inflection of 'one' see Friedrich, HWb 301, and Eichner, Anat. Zahlw. 2). Several possible explanations present themselves for pronominal -ēt 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, MDOG 56(1915)24, already derives Hittite -it from IE *-ēd, comparing forms like Latin rected 'properly, rightly' (see also Donum nat. Schrijnen(1929)368). This explanation of Hittite -it has won general acceptance (see Sturtevant, CGr §197a, Pedersen, Hitt. 25, and Kronasser, VLFH 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/.¹¹ An /-iT/ plus 'and' would have produced /-iTī-ya/ (leaving aside the problem of assibilation). As discussed above in Sec. 1.4, the Hittite correspondent of Luvian -ati, Lycian -edi/-adi is the ablative -(a)z(zi).

Kronasser, VLFH 103f, and Stefanini, AGI 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 -d of the thematic ablative *-ēd was extended in Hittite to other stem classes, producing ganu-t, halki-t, zabhai-t, kiššart(a) and ēšhan-t(a). Both compare the similar spread of the ablative -d in Latin

(praidad, magistratud) and Younger Avestan (nəraṭ). 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 *-ēd (beside *-ōd) 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 *-ēd not only spread to all stem classes, but also eliminated the IE instrumental in *-ē/-ō, taking over all its functions. In turn, the ablative-instrumental in *-ēd 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/-ēt (as in kēt) can be shown to have an ablative function in Hittite. As we have seen, the use of kēt and the appearance of instrumental enclitic possessives with nouns in the ablative (šarḫuwantaz-šet) appear to attest an ablative use of -it/-ēt. Formally, nominal -it < *-ēd is also unobjectionable (see below). Thus from the Hittite point of view, the traditional etymology of instrumental -it from an original thematic ablative *-ēd is quite attractive.

Unfortunately, there are serious, even insurmountable problems with the assumed Indo-European preform *-ēd. Stang, Vergl. Gram. 44, observes that the gen.(-abl.) sg. of Baltic o-stems (Lith. diēvo, Latv. dieva) points to *-ēd. This ending cannot be derived from IE *-ōd, since IE *-ō yields Lith.-Latv. -uo-/-u- (cf. Lith. instr. dievū, dat. diėvui). Therefore, Stang (after Endzelin) derives Baltic *-ēd from *-o-ad (*-oh₂ed). This preform also explains the fact that the Vedic ablative ending -āt is occasionally disyllabic (see Wackernagel, AiGr I 49, II 95). The latter cannot be accounted for by an ending -Vh_xd. The same conclusion about Baltic *-ēd was already reached by Mahlow, Die langen vocale(1879)161 (see the reference in Schmidt, Fest. Böhrtlingk(1888)101). One may derive both Baltic *-ēd and the *-ōd found elsewhere from *-oh₂ed, assuming different outcomes of the contraction of -oa-. Alternatively, one may assume an *-eh₂ed beside *-oh₂ed, the former giving *-ēd, the latter *-ōd. The form *-eh₂ed would also account for the palatalization in Skt. paścāt '(from) behind'. The above system allows no place for an IE ablative *-ēd.

The antiquity of the Latin adverbs in -ēd (rected, facilumed) is also debatable. Ernout, Morph. Hist. 48, summarily dismisses these forms as analogical after -ōd (at the point when the distinction between instrumental -ō and ablative -ōd was being lost). For a more detailed and reasoned account of the adverbs

in -ēd as secondary creations from old instrumentals see Schmidt, Fest. Böhrling 100f. It is important to note that the function of the Latin forms in -ēd is essentially instrumental, not ablative (rected means 'rightly, properly', not 'on the right/ from the right'). Thus the likelihood of an IE ablative *-ēd 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 dakṣiṇit, attested in RV 5.36.4:

prá savyéna maghavan yaṁsi rāyāh

prá dakṣiṇīd dharivo mā 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 prá dakṣiṇīd yaṁsi and take dakṣiṇit as functioning parallel to the instrumental savyéna. Unhappily, the status of dakṣiṇit is clouded by the occurrence (6x in the Rigveda) of a compound pradakṣiṇit.

Grassmann in his dictionary and Geldner in his translation render pradakṣiṇit as 'on/to/from the right'. More precisely, according to Grassmann, the adverb pradakṣiṇit 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 (dakṣiṇā). 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 prá, and a connection with the compound pradaksinīt is unavoidable. The question is: is prá daksinīt merely a word play based on the pre-existing pradaksinīt (whatever the meaning of the latter), or is prá daksinīt a genuine collocation with an old instrumental daksinīt and pradaksinīt a univagation 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/-t.

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 -ēt has more than one possible source. Hittite i can of course represent IE *i, but *ē > i also appears possible. Benveniste, Origines 42, derives the Hittite abstract suffix -zil from IE *-tēl, comparing Latin tūtēla, sūtēla etc.. In the Old Hittite manuscript of the Laws, KBo VI 2, tayazzil 'theft' (1x) and šarnikzil 'restitution' (3x) are spelled -zi-il. In nepiš-

'heaven' (< *nebhes-), IE *e also appears as Hittite i. The conditioning for IE *ẽ > Hitt. i is by no means settled, but one may note that in both the abstracts in -zil and in nepiš- the Hittite accent was almost certainly not on the i. On the other hand, in the best examples for IE *ẽ > Hitt. e the Hittite accent was probably on the e: ēšzi 'he is', genu 'knee', kuenzi 'he kills' etc. (*e); mēhur 'time' and similar nouns, tēzzi 'he says' and inchoatives in -ēš- (*ẽ). Thus the nominal instrumental ending -it, which was surely not accented, could represent *-et or *-ēt as well as *-it.

The pronominal instrumentals kēt, šēt 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. kē 'these' < *ḱoi, O.H. uēzzi '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

¹The forms with single š listed by Friedrich, HE I² §126, are not forms of kuišša 'every', but represent rather kuiš plus non-geminating -a, which functions as an indefinite relative 'whoever'.

²Neu, StBoT 18,62 note 85, cites Bo 5003 paršuraz-ya-kan // KUB X 51 RCol 10 paršurazzi-ya-kan. 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 -Vzzi-ya (cf. KBo X 2 I 24 EGIR-azyaza from a stem appazziya-).

³In 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.

⁴KASKAL-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-azzi-ya, may be dismissed, since it is only geminating -a/-ya 'and' which calls forth the ablative in -(az)zi.

⁵This is certain for tapušza, originally the ablative of the s-stem tapu(wa)š- 'rib, flank' (Friedrich, HWb 212), and for arahza 'outside', originally the ablative of irh-/arh- 'boundary' (attested as an a-stem irha-/arha-). The prehistory of andurza is less clear, and it cannot be excluded that andurza represents

an adverb *andur (cf. Lith. kuf 'where?') remade after arahza (like kitkarza from kitkar). Sturtevant, CGr 5196d, cites an ablative šehunza to šēhur 'urine', but I have not found this form in the published corpus.

⁶In the first place, one can think of irregular loss of a final vowel in an imperative form: cf. the Latin imperatives dīc and dūc. 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 -za: [ē]šza (KBo VI 2 IV 54; O.H. ms.), harza (KBo IX 73 Vs 12; O.H. ms.), taruḫza (KUB XLIII 75 Rs 9; O.H. text/N.H. ms.), kappuwanza (KUB XIII 29 II 32; M.H. text/N.H. ms.) and šakuwanza (KUB XIII 2 III 16; M.H. text/N.H. ms.). The same development may be seen in hanza 'in front' < *h₂e/onti ~ Grk. antī, Lat. ante. The dative-locative hanti is a renewed form based on the stem hant- preserved in handa, handan and handaš. 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 parā-va-zzi apūn GE₆--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 -ya-zzi apūn 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 assibilation 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 -ya 'and') and in the reflexive particle. In the present indicative of the verb -zi and -anzi would have tended to be generalized on the basis of the rest of the paradigm: -mi, -ši, -teni, -weni. For reasons which are not clear, the infinitive in -wanzi, 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 īt < *idhi is not necessarily an irregular development, even if we are unable to describe the relevant conditioning.

⁷One could also derive the ablative -u from *-utos (via *-uwos), but -ē requires a front vowel. An *-etos would surely have given *-ewos > *-ew (cf. the 3rd sg. aorist middle -aw < *-ato).

⁸I assume that the stem of 'eye' was šakuwa-, but the nt. pl. šakuwa and the instrumental šakuit would also be regular from a

stem šaku-. In the latter case one would have to explain both šakuwait and šakuwat as built on the nt. pl..

⁹See on this paradigm Schindler, BSL 70(1975)5f.

¹⁰Neu, op. cit. 291, also cites the dat.-loc. pl. ganuwaš. Phonologically, one can derive the stem ganu- from either *ḡonu- or *ḡnu-. Neu leans toward *ḡnu-, which seems more likely in an oblique stem (cf. also Schindler, BSL 70(1975)5 and 7).

¹¹The 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 partaunit-uš (KBo XVII 1 I 6), compare also 3rd sing. pret. verb forms followed by enclitic pronouns, such as pa-i-ta-aš /paid-as/ (KUB XXVIII 4 II 22). The fact that Hittite can distinguish between ug-a 'but I' and ugg-a '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.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AAA: Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology. Liverpool.
- ABOT: K. Balkan, Ankara arkeoloji müzesinde bulunan Boğazköy tabletleri. Istanbul 1948.
- AfO: Archiv für Orientforschung. Berlin and Graz.
- AGI: Archivio glottologico italiano. Rome and Turin.
- AM: see Götze, AM.
- ANET³: Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament (edit. J. Pritchard), 3rd edition. Princeton 1969.
- AO: Der Alte Orient. Leipzig.
- AOATS: Alter Orient und Altes Testament; Sonderreihe. Neukirchen-Vluyn 1971f.
- ArOr: Archiv Orientalní. Prague.
- Athenaeum: Athenaeum. Pavia.
- Balkan (1973): Anadolu medeniyetlerini araştırma vakfi yayınları, 1. Ankara 1973.
- Benveniste, Origines: E. Benveniste, Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen. Paris 1935.
- BoSt: Boğazköi-Studien. Leipzig 1916f.
- BSL: Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris. Paris.
- CAD: The Chicago Assyrian Dictionary. Chicago 1956f.
- Carruba, StBot 2: O. Carruba, Das Beschwörungsritual für die Göttin Wišurijanza (StBot 2). Wiesbaden 1966.
- Carruba, StBot 10: O. Carruba, Das Palaische. Texte, Grammatik, Lexikon (StBot 10). Wiesbaden 1970.

Delbrück, ALI: B. Delbrück, Ablativ Localis Instrumentalis.

Berlin 1867.

Delbrück, Vergl. Syn.: B. Delbrück, Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen. Strassburg 1893.

Dienstanw.: see von Schuler, Dienstanw..

Donum nat. Schrijnen: Donum natalicium Schrijnen. Nijmegen-Utrecht 1929.

DŠ: see Güterbock, DŠ.

Durham, Stud. Boğaz. Akk.: J. Durham, Studies in Boğazköy Akkadian (Harvard University dissertation [ms.]). Cambridge 1976.

Eichner, Anat. Zahlw.: H. Eichner, 'Die Anatolischen Zahlwörter' (to appear; cited from ms.).

Eisele (1970): W. Eisele, Der Telipinu Erlass. Munich 1970.

Ernout, Morph. Hist.: A. Ernout, Morphologie historique du latin. Paris 1945.

Fest. Böhrlingk: Festgruß an Otto von Böhrlingk zum Doktorjubiläum. Stuttgart 1888.

Fest. Eilers: Festschrift für Wilhelm Eilers (ed. G. Wiessner). Wiesbaden 1967.

Fest. Friedrich: Festschrift Johannes Friedrich (ed. R. von Kienle et al.). Heidelberg 1959.

Fest. Otten: Festschrift Heinrich Otten (edd. E. Neu and C. Rüster). Wiesbaden 1973.

FHG: E. Laroche, Fragments hittites de Genève, in RA 45(1951)131-138, 184-194; RA 46(1952)42-50.

- Forrer, BoTU: E. Forrer, Die Boghazköi-Texte in Umschrift
(WVDOG 41-42). Leipzig 1922-26.
- Friedrich, HE I²: J. Friedrich, Hethitisches Elementarbuch.
Erster Teil. Grammatik, 2nd edit. . Heidelberg 1960.
- Friedrich, HG: J. Friedrich, Die hethitischen Gesetze. Leiden 1959.
- Friedrich, HWb: J. Friedrich, Hethitisches Wörterbuch. Heidelberg
1952-54.
- Friedrich, HWb Erg. 1-3: J. Friedrich, Hethitisches Wörterbuch.
Ergänzungshefte 1-3. Heidelberg 1957, 1961, 1966.
- Friedrich, SV I/II: J. Friedrich, Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches
in hethitischer Sprache (MVAeG 31/1 and 34/1). Leipzig 1926
and 1930.
- Glotta: Glotta. Zeitschrift für griechische und lateinische
Sprache. Göttingen.
- Götze, AM: A. Götze, Die Annalen des Muršiliš (MVAeG 38). Leipzig
1933.
- Götze, Hatt.: A. Götze, Hattušiliš. Der Bericht über seine
Thronbesteigung nebst den Paralleltexten (MVAeG 29/3).
Leipzig 1925.
- Götze, Madd.: A. Götze, Madduwattaš (MVAeG 32/1). Leipzig 1928.
- Götze, Neue Br.: A. Götze, Neue Bruchstücke zum großen Text des
Hattušiliš und den Paralleltexten (MVAeG 34/2). Leipzig 1930.
- Goetze, Tunn.: A. Goetze, The Hittite Ritual of Tunnawi (American
Oriental Series Vol. 14). New Haven 1938.

- Götze-Pedersen, Murs. Sprachl.: A. Götze and H. Pedersen, Mursilis Sprachlähmung. Copenhagen 1934.
- Güterbock, DŠ: H.G. Güterbock, 'The Deeds of Suppiluliuma as Told by His Son, Mursili II', JCS 10(1956)41f, 75, 107f.
- Güterbock, SBo I/II: H.G. Güterbock, Siegel aus Boğazköy (AfO Beihefte 5 and 7). Berlin 1940 and 1942.
- Haas-Wilhelm, AOATS 3: V. Haas and G. Wilhelm, Hurritische und luwische Riten aus Kizzuwatna (AOATS 3). Neukirchen-Vluyn 1974.
- HAB: see Sommer-Falkenstein, HAB.
- Hatt.: see Götze, Hatt..
- HG: see Friedrich, HG.
- Hipp.: see Kammenhuber, Hipp..
- Houwink ten Cate, Records: Ph. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, The Records of the Early Hittite Empire. Istanbul 1970.
- Hrozný, Code Hittite: B. Hrozný, Code hittite provenant de l'Asie Mineure. Paris 1922.
- Hrozný, SH: B. Hrozný, Die Sprache der Hethiter. Leipzig 1917.
- HT: L. King, Hittite Texts in the Cuneiform Character from Tablets in the British Museum. London 1920.
- HTR: see Otten, HTR.
- IBoT: H. Bozkart, M. Çiğ, H.G. Güterbock, Istanbul arkeoloji müzelerinde bulunan Boğazköy tabletlerinden seçme metinler. I-III. Istanbul 1944, 1947, 1954.

IF: Indogermanische Forschungen. Strassburg.

Ist. Mitt.: Istanbuler Mitteilungen. Istanbul.

Jakob-Rost, TH 2: L. Jakob-Rost, Das Ritual der Malli aus Arzawa gegen Behexung (TH 2). Heidelberg 1972.

JAOS: Journal of the American Oriental Society. Baltimore.

JCS: Journal of Cuneiform Studies. New Haven.

Jensen, Altarm. Gram.: H. Jensen, Altarmenische Grammatik. Heidelberg 1959.

JKF: Jahrbuch für Kleinasiatische Forschung. Heidelberg 1950-53.

JNES: Journal of Near Eastern Studies. Chicago.

Josephson, Sent. Part.: F. Josephson, The Function of the Sentence Particles in Old and Middle Hittite. Uppsala 1972.

Kammenhuber, Arier: A. Kammenhuber, Die Arier im Vorderen Orient. Heidelberg 1968.

Kammenhuber, HdO: A. Kammenhuber, 'Hethitisch, Palaisch, Luwisch und Hieroglyphenluwisch', in Handbuch der Orientalistik. 1e Abt., 2er Band, 1er-2er Abschnitt, Lfg. 2. Leiden 1969.

Kammenhuber, Hipp.: A. Kammenhuber, Hippologia Hethitica. Wiesbaden 1961.

KBo: Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi I-XXIII (WVDOG 30,36,68,69,70,72, 73,77,78,79,80,82,83,84,85,86,89,90,92). Leipzig, Berlin 1916f.

KlF: Kleinasiatische Forschungen. Bd. I. Weimar 1930.

Kratylos: Kratylos. Wiesbaden.

Kronasser, EHS: H. Kronasser, Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache.

Wiesbaden 1966.

Kronasser, Umsiedlung: H. Kronasser, Die Umsiedlung der Schwarzen Gottheit (SbÖAW, Phil.-Hist. Kl. 241/3). Vienna 1963.

Kronasser, VLFH: H. Kronasser, Vergleichende Laut- und Formenlehre des hethitischen. Heidelberg 1956.

KUB: Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi I-XLVI. Berlin 1921f.

Kühne-Otten, StBoT 16: C. Kühne and H. Otten, Der Šaušgamuwa-Vertrag (StBoT 16). Wiesbaden 1971.

Kümmel, StBoT 3: H. Kümmel, Ersatzrituale für den hethitischen König (StBoT 3). Wiesbaden 1967.

Laroche, GTH: E. Laroche, Catalogue des textes hittites. Paris 1971.

Laroche, DLL: E. Laroche, Dictionnaire de la langue louvite. Paris 1959.

Lg: Language. Baltimore.

LSU: K. Riemschneider, 'Die hethitischen Landschenkungsurkunden', MIO 6(1958)321-381.

Madd.: see Götze, Madd..

Mahlow, Die langen vocale: G. Mahlow, Die langen vocalen a, e, o in den europäischen sprachen. Berlin 1879.

MDOG: Mitteilungen der Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft. Berlin.

Meillet-Vendryes: A. Meillet and J. Vendryes, Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques, 4th edit.. Paris 1968.

- Meißner-Fest.: Altorientalische Studien Bruno Meißner zum
sechzigsten Geburtstag gewidmet. Leipzig 1928-29.
- MIO: Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung. Berlin.
- MSS: Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft. Munich.
- Neu, StBot 5: E. Neu, Interpretation der hethitischen medio-
passiven Verbalformen (StBot 5). Wiesbaden 1968.
- Neu, StBot 6: E. Neu, Das hethitische Mediopassiv und seine
indogermanische Grundlagen (StBot 6). Wiesbaden 1968.
- Neu, StBot 12: E. Neu, Ein althethitisches Gewitterritual (StBot 12).
 Wiesbaden 1970.
- Neu, StBot 18: E. Neu, Der Anitta-Text (StBot 18). Wiesbaden 1974.
- Neu-Rüster, StBot 21: E. Neu and C. Rüster, Hethitische Keilschrift-
PalHographie II (StBot 21). Wiesbaden 1975.
- Neumann, HdO: G. Neumann, 'Lykisch', in Handbuch der Orientalistik.
 1e Abt., 2er Band, 1er-2er Abschnitt, Lfg. 2. Leiden 1969.
- Oettinger, StBot 22: Die Militärischen Eide der Hethiter
(StBot 22). Wiesbaden 1976.
- OLZ: Orientalistische Literaturzeitung. Berlin and Leipzig.
- Or: Orientalia. Nova Series. Rome.
- Oriens: Oriens. Leiden.
- Otten, HTR: H. Otten, Hethitische Totenrituale. Berlin 1958.
- Otten, StBot 11: H. Otten, Sprachliche Stellung und Datierung des
Madduwatta-Textes (StBot 11). Wiesbaden 1969.

Otten, StBot 13: H. Otten, Ein hethitisches Festritual (StBot 13).

Wiesbaden 1971.

Otten, StBot 17: H. Otten, Eine althethitische Erzählung um die Stadt Zalpa (StBot 17). Wiesbaden 1973.

Otten-Souček, StBot 8: H. Otten and V. Souček, Ein althethitisches Ritual für das Königspaar (StBot 8). Wiesbaden 1969.

Pap.: see Sommer-Ehelolf, Pap..

PD: see Weidner, PD.

Pedersen, Hitt.: H. Pedersen, Hittitisch und die anderen indoeuropäischen Sprachen, 2nd edit.. Copenhagen 1948.

RA: Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale. Paris.

RHA: Revue hittite et asianique. Paris.

Riemschneider, StBot 9: K. Riemschneider, Babylonische Geburtsomina in hethitischer Übersetzung (StBot 9). Wiesbaden 1970.

RS: Ras Shamra.

Rüster, StBot 20: C. Rüster, Hethitische Keilschrift-Paläographie (StBot 20). Wiesbaden 1972.

SBo I/II: see Güterbock, SBo.

von Schuler, Dienstanw.: E. von Schuler, Hethitische Dienst-anweisungen (AfO Beiheft 10). Graz 1957.

Schwyzler: E. Schwyzler, Griechische Grammatik. Munich 1934f.

Siegelová, StBot 14: J. Siegelová, Appu-Märchen und Hedammu-Mythus (StBot 14). Wiesbaden 1971.

von Soden, AHw: W. von Soden, Akkadisches Handwörterbuch. Wiesbaden 1965f.

- Sommer, AU: F. Sommer, Die Ahhijavā-Urkunden (Abh. d. Bayr. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-Hist. Abt., NF 9). Munich 1934.
- Sommer-Ehelolf, Pap.: F. Sommer and H. Ehelolf, Das hethitische Ritual des Papanikri von Komana (BoSt 10). Leipzig 1924.
- Sommer-Falkenstein, HAB: F. Sommer and A. Falkenstein, Die hethitisch-akkadische Bilingue des Hattušili I (Labarna II) (Abh. d. Bayr. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-Hist. Abt., NF 16). Munich 1938.
- Stang, Vergl. Gram.: C. Stang, Vergleichende Grammatik der Baltischen Sprachen. Oslo 1966.
- Starke, StBoT 23: F. Starke, Die Funktion der dimensionalen Kasus und Adverbien im Althethitischen (StBoT 23). Wiesbaden 1971.
- StBoT: Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten. Wiesbaden 1965f.
- StClOr: Studi Classici e Orientali. Pisa.
- Stefanini: R. Stefanini, 'KBo IV 14 = VAT 13049', Atti d. Accad. Naz. d. lincei. Rendiconti. Cl. d. scienze morali etc. 20(1965)39-79.
- Sturtevant, CGr: E. Sturtevant, Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language. Philadelphia 1933.
- Sturt(evant), Chrest.: E. Sturtevant and G. Bechtel, A Hittite Chrestomathy. Philadelphia 1935.
- Szabó, TH 1: G. Szabó, Ein hethitisches Entschönungsritual... (TH 1). Heidelberg 1971.
- TH: Texte der Hethiter. Heidelberg 1971f.

TPS: Transactions of the Philological Society. London.

Ugaritica: Ugaritica (Publications de la Mission Archéologique de Ras Shamra, publications définitives, vol. IIIf = Institut Français d'Archéologie de Beyrouth, Bibliothèque archéologique et historique, vol. XXXIf). Paris.

VBoT: A Götze, Verstreute Boghazköi-Texte. Marburg 1930.

Wackernagel, Ai. Gr.: J. Wackernagel, Altindische Grammatik. Göttingen 1896f.

WdO: Die Welt des Orients. Göttingen.

Weidner, PD: E. Weidner, Politische Dokumente aus Kleinasien (BoSt 8). Leipzig 1923.

WVDOG: Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft. Leipzig and Berlin.

ZA: Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete. Berlin.

ZDMG: Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft. Wiesbaden and Leipzig.

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 1 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)

- KBo III 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)
- KBo IV 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)
- KBo V 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)
- KBo VI 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)

- 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)

- KBo XVII 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)
3 I 14 (25)
4 III 13-14 (1)
15 Vs 14-16 (30)
17 I 8f (32)
43 I 10 (29), 43 IV 3 (11)
74 III 25-26 (108)
78 I 8-9 (348)
105 III 24-25 (180)
- KBo XVIII 54 Vs 4-6 (321), 54 Rs 21-LRd 1 (293)
133 Vs 6-7 (349)
- KBo XIX 44 + XXII 40 Rs 46 (240)
142 II 25-26 (304)
161 I 20-21 (36)
- KBo XX 3 Rs 9-10 (31)
8 Vs 11 (22), 8 Rs 6 (21)
12 I 1-2 (10)
34 Vs 6-7 (54)
64 Vs 7 (109)
107 I 9-12 (161)
- KBo XXI 22 Vs 22-25 (34)

- 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)

- KUB VI 45+ I 18-19 (263), 45+ III 32-33 (268)
- KUB VII 1 II 18-19 (76)
13 Vs 37 (346)
20 Vs 10-11 (339)
41 I 1-2 (167), 41 IV 22-23 (175)
58 I 11-12 (204), 58 I 13f (177)
- KUB VIII 17 II 5-7, 8-10 (61)
75 III 2-5 (318), 75 IV 8-9 (320)
80, 15 (275)
- KUB IX 4 II 29-30 (200)
15 II 10-11 (299), 15 II 11-12 (312)
28 I 23, III 18 (202)
31 I 14-15 (199)
32 Vs 20-21 (317)
- KUB X 89 I 20-21 (110)
- KUB XI 9 III 16-20 (55)
21 IV 6-9 (80)
32 IV 2-3 (47)
- KUB XII 11 IV 3-5 (228)
12 VI 6-8 (178)
51 I 16-17 (295)
65 III 10 (186), 65 III 11-12 (187)
- KUB XIII 1 IV 7 (163)
2 II 6f (194), 2 II 17 (171), 2 III 34-35 (195)

- 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 25f (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)

- KUB XXI 5 III 49 (256)
19 I 8-9 (257), 19 I 11-13 (270)
27 IV 35-36 (272)
37 Vs 10 (232), 37 Vs 17 (283)
38 Rs 8 (266)
- KUB XXII 25 Vs 19-20 (288)
38 I 3-5 (322)
52 Vs 6 (331)
70 Vs 45 (324), 70 Vs 55 (307)
- KUB XXIII 1 II 1 (278)
11 III 16-17 (203)
68 Vs 26-27 (211)
72 Rs 52 (149)
- KUB XXIV 2 Rs 14-16 (340)
7 I 16-19 (313), 7 IV 49f (337)
10 II 22-24 (63)
13 II 7-9 (219), 13 II 25-27 (227)
- KUB XXV 48 IV 22-23 (216)
- KUB XXVI 12 + XXI 42 III 14-15 (265)
19 II 27-28 (221)
29 + XXXI 55 Vs 15 (212)
32 I 7-8 (234), 32 I 11-12 (244)
69 VII 11-13 (315)

- KUB XXVII 49 III 13-15 (333)
68 I 8 (294)
69 II 11-13 (94)
- KUB XXIX 4 I 3-4 (287), 4 I 5 (338)
7 Vs 1-2 (145), 7 Vs 7-10 (146), 7 Vs 40-41 (144)
7 Rs 42-43 (142)
8 IV 38-39 (143)
34,11 (120)
44 III 8 (196)
- KUB XXX 10 Vs 24.27 (127)
15+ Vs 26-28 (56)
24 II 9-10 (118), 24 III 38-41 (97)
26 I 1-2 (306)
31 + XXXII 114 I 12-13 (298)
34 IV 20-22 (183), 34 IV 25-29 (174)
35 I 1-2 (168)
39 Rs 9 (101)
40 I 16-18 (197)
- KUB XXXI 4 + KBo III 41 Vs 8-9 (91), 4 + KBo III 41 Vs 13 (136)
53+ Vs 8-10 (233)
66 III 20-23 (286)
79 Vs 13 (336)
86 II 11 (201)
127+ I 65-67 (53), 127+ III 27-29 (50), 127+ IV 21-23
(135), 127+ IV 24-25 (42)

- KUB XXXII 115+ I 46 (147), 115+ II 24 (162), 115+ III 34-35 (160)
 117+ Rsⁿ 12-13 (125)
 123 II 33-35 (327)
 128 I 30-32 (191)
- KUB XXXIII 5 III 8-10 (129)
 52 II 7 (134)
 54 II 10 (82)
 62 II 8-11 (119)
 67 I 27-31 (60)
 68 II 7-8 (90)
 70 II 2 (65)
 109+ I 16-18 (190)
 120 I 31-33 (206)
 122 II 5 (184), 122 II 7-8 (185)
- KUB XXXIV 16 III 4 (98)
 66 + XXXIX 7 III 1 (48)
- KUB XXXV 148 III 36 (95)
- KUB XXXVI 12 + XXXIII 113 I 17-18 (311)
 90,31f (13)
- KUB XXXIX 7 II 22 (66)
 102 I 1-2 (168)
- KUB XL 13 Rs 8-9 (218)
- KUB XLI 17 I 23-24 (328), 17 II 14-15 (308)
 40 I 18-20 (103)

<u>KUB</u> XLIII	<u>23 Rs 15-19 (4)</u>
	<u>30 II 6-7 (9)</u>
	53 I 19f (75)
	55 II 10-13 (58), 55 V 2-3 (41)
	56 III 6-7 (112)
	60 I 8-10,12-15 (52)
<u>KUB</u> XLIV	37 IV 4-5 (116)
<u>KUB</u> XLV	26 II 6-9 (297)
<u>KUB</u> XLVI	42 III 2-4 (330)
<u>ABoT</u>	17 III 5-6 (347)
<u>IBoT</u> I	36 I 10-11,16-19 (153), 36 I 58-59 (150), 36 I 60-63 (155), 36 I 73-74 (154)
<u>IBoT</u> II	46,6-10 (297)
<u>IBoT</u> III	1,50-51 (102), 52,3-5 (104) 148 III 15-16 (182)
<u>VBoT</u>	24 I 22-24 (166), 24 II 24-25 (207) 58 IV 4-6 (122) 95 I 5 (44) 111 III 3f (96)
<u>FHG</u>	13 II 29 (64)
<u>HT</u>	1 I 44 (170), 1 I 49 (305)
<u>RS</u>	25.421 Ro 44-46 (341)

Index 2 - Partial Subject Index

Ablative Case:

Form: in -anza 448f, in -az vs. -za 443f, in -azzi-(va) 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

appa, appan 23

appa parza 219-220, 409

apē (nom. pl. comm.) 35-36

appezziya- 27-29

arḫa: as a postposition (?) 185, 188; as 'except' 386

Armenian ablative ending -ē 453f

-ašta 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

-enzan 36

ēšša-/išša- 34

ēštu 23

edi 20, 263-265

Genitive Case: Partitive 277, note 14

Separation (?) 306

with postpositions 22, 265f

hantezziya- 29-30

-hé 18

huešawaz zeyandaz(zi-ya) dāi- 218-219

Infinitives in -wanzi 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

išgaruhit (šer ēpzi) 243f

ištamašši 31

ištanzanit (ZI-it) 252f, 303-304, 336-337

kē (nom. pl. comm.) 35-36

kēt 263f, 270-271

kēdi 20

kīša- 'become' 23

kitkar(za) 205f

kuwapit 269-270

Latin adverbs in -ed 466f

Luvian -ati 452f

Lycian -adi/-edi 452f

māḫhan 22

mēma- 18-19

mēnaḫhanda 18-19

natta 21

nu-uk-kān 21

parna-šše-ya šuwayizzi 280, note 30

pēran 18

Reflexive Particle 18, 35

ša- (or ši-?) 26

šakuwaššarit ZI-it 337-338

šarazziya- 30

-še 20

šēr 24

šipand- 'libate; sacrifice' with the instrumental 235f

šu 19

ta 19, 42-43, 119

takku 22

-tani 34-35

taršik(k)- 24

-uš (acc. pl. comm. of the enclitic pron.) 25

Verbs in -iya-/-ie- 1, 32-34

Vocative Case 31-32

wahmu- 'whirl, brandish' with the instrumental 234-235

-wani 34-35

wēš 26-27

zeyandaz ari 391-392

l-ētta 376-378