

JACQUELINE BOLEY

THE HITTITE PARTICLE
-z / -za

UNIVERSITA' DI ROMA - LA SAPIENZA
DIP. DI STUDI ORIENTALI N° 43
BIBLIOTECA

INV.

13294

INNSBRUCK 1993

- ZA Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete,
Leipzig/Berlin.
- Zalpa H. Otten, *Eine althethitische Erzählung um die Stadt
Zalpa* (StBoT 17).

INNSBRUCKER BEITRÄGE ZUR SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT

Hethitisch und kleinasiatische Sprachen

- 20: Johann Tischler, *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*. Mit Beiträgen von Günter Neumann und (ab Teil II) Erich Neu. Fortsetzungswerk voraussichtlich in 15 Lieferungen = 3 Teilbänden. 1977 ff. Erschienen sind bisher: Lieferung 1-4 (= Teil I): A-K. 1983. XXXVIII, 702 S. (mit Einbanddecke). öS 1.440.-. ISBN 3-85124-537-7; Lieferung 5-6: L-M. 1990. VI, 244 S. öS 720.-. ISBN 3-85124-605-5; Lieferung 7: N. 1992. II, 111 S. öS 360.-. ISBN 3-85124-631-4; Lieferung 8: T/1. IV, 170 S. öS 560.-. ISBN 3-85124-629-2; Lieferung 9: T/2. IV, 158 S. öS 520.-. ISBN 3-85124-642-X. Lieferung 10: T/3 in Vorbereitung.
- 25: *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch. Vergleichende Studien zur historischen Grammatik und zur dialektgeographischen Stellung der indogermanischen Sprachgruppe Altkleinasiens*. Herausgegeben von Erich Neu und Wolfgang Meid. 1979. 311 S. öS 1.120.-. ISBN 3-85124-542-3.
- 35: Jaan Puhvel, *ANALECTA INDOEUROPAEA. Delectus Operum Minorum Plerumque Anglice Aliquando Francogallice Editorum Annos 1952-1977 Complectens*. 1981. 419 S., Portrait. öS 1.400.-. ISBN 3-85124-563-6.
- 37: Johann Tischler, *Das hethitische Gebet der Gassulijawija. Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. 1981. VI, 85 S. öS 280.-. ISBN 3-85124-565-2.
- 39: Johann Tischler, *Hethitisch-deutsches Wörterverzeichnis. Mit einem semasiologischen Index*. 1982. 153 S. öS 360.-. ISBN 3-85124-567-9. Nur noch wenige Exemplare. Erweiterte Neuauflage in Vorbereitung.
- 44: Jacqueline Boley, *The Hittite hark-Construction*. 1984. 112 S. öS 480.-. ISBN 3-85124-576-8.

Die *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft* werden gefördert von der Kultur-
 abteilung des Amtes der Tiroler Landesregierung.

ISBN 3-85124-644-6

1993

INNSBRUCKER BEITRÄGE ZUR SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT

Herausgeber: Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Meid

Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck
 A-6020 Innsbruck, Innrain 52

Druck: AKAPRINT Budapest. 9321090

Die Druckvorlage wurde vom Autor zur Verfügung gestellt

Bestell- und Auslieferungsadresse:

IBS-Vertrieb, A-6020 Innsbruck, Elisabethstraße 11

Table of Contents

<u>Foreword</u>	7
<u>Chapter 1: Introduction</u>	
a) The form of the particle	9
b) Previous scholarship	11
c) Middle forms with -za	18
d) The Texts	29
<u>Chapter 2: Verbs with -za</u>	
1) <i>es-</i> "be"	32
2) <i>kis-</i>	49
3) <i>da-</i>	55
4) <i>es-</i> "sit"	73
5) <i>iya-</i>	77
6) <i>mema-</i> and <i>verba dicendi</i>	92
7) <i>aus-</i>	106
8) <i>tarna-</i>	120
9) verbs of bringing	123
10) verbs of motion	129
11) <i>rai-</i>	132
12) <i>dai-</i>	137
13) <i>sarra-</i>	143
14) <i>pai-</i>	146
15) <i>ilaliya-</i> and states of mind	151
16) bodily functions	158
17) miscellaneous	169
<u>Chapter 3: Comments and Conclusions</u>	
§3a: Old Hittite	180
§3b: Middle and Late Hittite	189
§3c: Background and Overview	200
§3d: Conclusions	209

- Lee, D.J.N. "The Hittite Particle *-kan* and Others", *ArchOr* 34, 1966.
- Madd. A. Goetze, *Madduwattas* (MVAG 32.1), Leipzig 1927.
- Mast. L. Rost, "Ein hethitisches Ritual gegen Familienzweist", *MIO* 1, 1953.
- Mat. *Materialien zu einem hethitischen Thesaurus*, Heidelberg 1973-.
- Meid, W.-Neu E. *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch* (IBS 25), 1979.
- Meriggi, P. 1) *Hieroglyphisch-hethitisches Glossar*, Wiesbaden 1962.
2) *Manuale di eteo geroglifico* Pt. 2, Vol. 2, 3, 4, Rome 1966.
- MIO Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung, Berlin.
- Murs. P.P. A. Goetze, 'Pestgebete des Mursilis', *Kleinasiatische Forschungen* I.2, 1927.
- Murs. Sp. A. Goetze-H. Pedersen, *Mursilis Sprachlähmung*, (Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, hist.-filol. Meddelelser XXI, 1), Copenhagen 1934.
- Neu, E. 1) *Interpretation der hethitischen mediopassiven Verbalformen* (StBoT 5), 1968.
2) *Das hethitische Mediopassiv und seine indogermanischen Grundlagen* (StBoT 6), 1968.
3) *Althethitische Ritualtexte in Umschrift* (StBoT 25), 1980.

- (Neu, E.) 4) *Glossar zu den althethitischen Ritualtexten* (StBoT 26), 1983.
5) *Studien zum endungslosen "Lokativ" des Hethitischen* (IBS, Vorträge und Kleinere Schriften 23), Innsbruck 1980.
See also Anittas.
- Neu, E.-Rüster, C. 1) "Zur Datierung hethitischer Texte", Festschrift H. Otten, Wiesbaden 1973.
2) *Hethitische Keilschrift-Paläographie II*, (StBoT 21), 1975.
- Ob. Instructions for Eunuchs. See B.-M.
- Otten, H. 1) *Hethitische Totenrituale* (HTR), Berlin 1958.
2) *Luwische Texte in Umschrift* (LTU), Berlin 1953.
3) "Überlieferungen des Telipinu-Mythus", MVAG 46.1 1942.
4) *Die Bronzetafel aus Boghazköi: Ein Staatsvertrag Tudhaliyas IV* (StBoT Beiheft 1), Wiesbaden 1988.
See also B.U., StBoT 1, 16, 24.
- Pedersen, H. *Hethitisch und die anderen indoeuropäischen Sprachen*, Copenhagen 1938.
- PHO Instruktion für Prinzen, 'Herren' und 'Obere'. See B.-M.
- Prob. S. Heinhold-Krahmer et. al., *Probleme der Text-datierung in der Hethitologie*, (TdH 9), Heidelberg 1979.
- Puhvel, J. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, Mouton Publishers, Berlin/New York, 1984.
- RHA *Revue hittite et asianique*, Paris.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

§1a The form of the particle

Traditionally, Hittitologists have normally written the particle as *-za*, when discussing it, though the alternative *-z* is not unknown. It has of course always been well established, however, that the particle takes the form *-z*, mostly postvocally, but also in syntagms such as *-za-an* for **-z(a)-san* and *-za-ta* for **-z(a)-(a)sa*.

(F₂ott²)
Kühne has contributed a very thorough and illuminating study of the forms the particle takes, concluding that there was a shift from the sign AZ to the sign ZA, to represent the particle, from OH to LH. *-za* would therefore, as in fact many scholars believe, simply be a graphic representation of *-z*. He attempts to coordinate this with the writing of the ablative ending, but the correlation is uneven.

Melchert (IF 85, 1980) in an article on the form of the word "son" in Hittite, concludes that it must have begun with a vowel, because in Old Hittite *nu-zza* is the preferred writing before the ideogram; he found that when the following word was written phonetically, the spelling *nu-zza* preceded a word beginning with a vowel. However, the attestations are extremely meagre; and he mentions a case of *nu-zza 2-at 2-at* (KBo XX 8 Vs 11), which does

- Anniw. Ritual of Anniwiyani, in E. Sturtevant-G. Bechtel, *A Hittite Chrestomathy*, Philadelphia 1935, p. 106-126.
Also contains Instructions for Temple Officials (T.O.) (as well as editions of Hatt. and Tel.E.).
- AO Archiv Orientalní.
- Archi, A. "L'humanité des Hittites" in *Florilegium Anatolicum: mélanges offerts à Emmanuel Laroche*, Paris 1979.
- AU F. Sommer, *Die Ahhijava-Urkunden* (Abh. d. Bayr. Akad. d. Wiss. NF 6), München 1934 (contains the Tawagalawas Letter).
- Beckman, G. *Hittite Birth Rituals* (StBoT 29), 1983.
- B.-M. *BEL MADGALTI* -Instructions, in E. von Schuler, *Hethitische Dienstanweisungen* (AfO Beih. 10), Graz 1957. Also contains Ob. and PHO.
- Boley, J. 1) *The Hittite hark-Construction* (IBS 44), Innsbruck 1984.
2) "Notes on Hittite Place Word Syntax", *Hethitica* VI, 1985.
3) "Hittite and Indo-European Place Word Syntax", *Die Sprache* 31.2, 1985.
4) *The Sentence Particles and the Place Words in Old and Middle Hittite* (IBS 60), Innsbruck 1989.
5) "The Hittite Periphrastic Constructions", in *Studi di grammatica ittita*, ed.s O. Carruba, S. Luraghi, (*Studia Mediterranea* 7), in press.
6) "The 'Local' Sentence Particles in Hittite", in *Studi di grammatica ittita*, ed.s O. Carruba, S. Luraghi, (*Studia Mediterranea* 7), in press.

- B.U. H. Otten, "Eine Beschwörung der Unterirdischen aus Boghazköi", *ZA* 54, 1961.
- Carruba, O. 1) "Hethitisch - (a)sta, - (a)pa und die anderen 'Ortsbezugspartikeln'", *Orientalia* NF 33, 1964.
2) *Die satzeinleitenden Partikeln in den indogermanischen Sprachen Anatoliens*, Rome, Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1969 (*Incunabula Graeca* XXXII).
3) "Di nuove e vecchie particelle anatoliche", *SMEA* XII, 1970.
4) "Die anatolischen Partikel der Satzeinleitung", in *Grammatische Kategorien, Funktion und Geschichte* (Proceedings of the 7th Congress of the Indogermanische Gesellschaft, 1983), Wiesbaden 1985.
See also StBoT 2.
- CHD *Chicago Hittite Dictionary*, Chicago 1980-.
- DS H. Güterbock, "The Deeds of Suppiluliumas", *JCS* 10, 1956.
- Fs Meriggi *Studia mediterranea Piero Meriggi dicata*, O. Carruba ed., Pavia 1979.
- Friedrich, J. 1) *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg 1952.
2) *Hethitisches Elementarbuch* I. Teil, Heidelberg 1960.
See also Laws, SV.
- Goetze, A. 1) "Über die Partikeln -za, -kan und -san der hethitischen Satzverbindung", *AO* V, Prague 1933.
2) "The Hittite Particle -kan", *JAOS* 70, 1950.
3) "Postposition and Preverb in Hittite", *JCS* 17, 1963.
See also AM, Hatt., Madd., Murs. P.P., Murs.Sp., Tunn.

I would like to transcribe his examples in §241-2:

For §241:

- da-* mit *-za* "an sich nehmen, für sich nehmen", ohne *-za* "etwas zu einem bestimmten Zweck nehmen, verwenden".
peda- mit *-za* "mit sich fortnehmen", ohne *-za* "fortschaffen".
es- mit *-za* "sich setzen", ohne *-za* "sitzen".
kis- mit *-za* "zu etwas werden", ohne *-za* "geschehen".
tarh- mit *-za* "jemand besiegen", ohne *-za* "siegen" oder "können".
aus- mit *-za* "an sich sehen (erleben); einsehen", auch "träumen", ohne *-za* "etwas an einem anderen sehen".

For §242: *ilaliya-*, *malai-*, *markiya-*, *dusk-*, *UL mema-*, *arkuwar iya-*. These are of course only examples of the many verbs with which *-za* is obligatory.

§1b.2 Carruba's first analysis of *-za* was that it represents a "Bewegung zum oder am Subjekt" (1, p. 430). However, in Chapter 2 of 2), he modifies this. First of all, he discusses the etymology of the particle, with evidence culled also from the other Anatolian languages. He concludes that it was originally a demonstrative pronoun, largely on the basis of its placement in the particle string at the beginning of the clause in Hittite's sister languages. He then remarks:

"Nach den obigen Bemerkungen, wonach wahrscheinlich alle Hinweise für *-z/-ti* auf ein Demonstrativum hindeuten, wird es immer deutlicher, daß die bisher angenommenen Funktionen als perfektivierende Partikel und als Reflexivum nicht in ihrer vollen Breite stimmen, zumindest nicht unspränglich". (He refers to the fact that Goetze (ArchOr V (1933) 3-16) began by thinking of *-za* as indicating 'die Perfektivierung der Handlung', but that this theory had many problems and had been abandoned, among others by Goetze himself, in favor of taking *-za* as reflexive).

Carruba then goes on to treat various examples in which *-za* cannot be analyzed as having a reflexive meaning. These are q.s 91 (the *tissatwa* clause), as well as HAB III 24-5 (cited under q. 188), 174, 198, 212, 233+241, 284 (with reference to q. 202), the passage from the Song of Ulikummi cited under q. 247, and:

man-wa-za É-ir andurza haniesteni nu-wa MU.KAM^{HI}A GÍD.DA haniesteni assu haniesteni mann-at arahza-ma haniesteni nu nahsarattan haniesten nu ishassarwatar haniesten
 "If you plaster the house inside, you plaster in long years and good. If you plaster outside, plaster in fear and dignity" (XXIX 1 III 31-3).

On the basis of this evidence, he rejects his earlier notion that *-za* represents 'Bewegung', since e.g. *-za memai-* 'speak' has no connection with movement, and because of the Nominalsätze mentioned above. To delve a little deeper into the exact nuance of *-za*, he then cites q. 107 (III 25-6), the examples of *memiskiwan dai-* from Ulikummi discussed under q. 192, the passage from the Soldier's Oath quoted under q. 317, and q. 435.

He ends with the following comments:

"Die Art des Bezugs ist also nicht auf das Verbum bzw. auf die adverbialen (lokalen oder zeitlichen) Bestimmungen des Verbums, wie bei *-kan*, *-san*, *-asta*, *-apa*, sondern auf das Subjekt gerichtet: es muss also auf irgendeine Weise die physische oder geistige Sphäre des Handelnden bzw. des Subjektes durch die Handlung oder durch den Gedanken berührt werden, damit die Partikel *-z(a)* gebraucht wird. Die Partikel scheint also in der Tat ursprünglich ein Demonstrativum gewesen zu sein, das nach den Konjunktionen, und vor den übrigen Verhältnispartikeln, den Subjektbezug, soweit wichtig, herausstellte.

Dass *-z(a)* somit zum Ausdruck der Reflexivität gebraucht werden könnte, ist leicht zu verstehen. Ebenso, daß seine Anwendung mit der Zeit immer breiter wurde. Die Gründe hierfür mögen darin liegen, dass das alte idg. **swe*, **swoi* im Heth. entwe-

(SV Huqq) I 14-16

I 22-6

I 27-30

II 14-19

II 28-9

II 32-3

II 36-7

III 9

III 10ff.

III 17, 20, 23

III 27, 63-4

III 33

III 37-8

III 44

III 59-60

III 65

IV 37ff.

IV 47-9

SV Kup §5 D I 40-1

§7 C I 12-13

§9 C I 33

§9 C I 33-4

§10 C I 36

§10 D II 19

§13 C II 5-6

§15 C II 21

§15 C II 22-3

§16 C III 1-3

§18 D III 49

§18 D III 49-50

§18 D III 52

§18 D III 55-6

§18 D III 59-60

§18 D III 60

§19 D IV 4

§20 D IV 9-13

§21 D IV 18-19 = §22 E IV 21-2

under q. 263

q. 106

q. 226

q. 248

q. 285

under q. 109

q. 152

under q. 207

under q. 285

under q. 209

under q. 117

under q. 118

q. 359

q. 255

under q. 118

under q. 117

under q. 285

q. 51

q. 252

under q. 109

under q. 25

under q. 136

under q. 136

under q. 25

under q. 78

under q. 311

q. 422

under q. 291

under q. 319

q. 224

q. 74

under q. 319

q. 224

under q. 78

q. 292

q. 249

q. 319

(SV Kup) §21 D IV 24-5

§22 E IV 24

SV Man I 16-17, 55-6

I 54-7

I 65ff.

SV Targ Vs 17

Vs 24-6

Vs 29

Vs 44-5, 46

Rs 9

Rs 22-3

Rs 38

Rs 40

TdH I I 37

II 8-10

III 37-8

III 38

III 50

TdH 2 I 9-10

I 18-19

II 20

II 23

IV 11

IV 32

Tel.E. I 6, 16, 26

I 31-2, II 9-10

I 63-4, II 4

I 68, II 7, 45

II 5-6

II 13

II 36ff.

II 42-3

II 43-4

II 46, 50

IV 19-20

IV 33-4

IV 31

q. 273

under q. 273

under q. 271

q. 418

under q. 359

over q. 77

q. 249

q. 319

above q. 222

q. 52

q. 345

q. 28

under q. 357

q.s 101, 364

q. 184

under q. 364

under q. 101

under q. 394

under q. 130

q. 383, §3c

§2.17 (*walh-*)§2.17 (*walh-*)

over q. 383

over q. 383

§2.3c.3

§2.3a.2

§2.2a

§2.17 (*kuen-*), §3b.7b

§3b.7b

§2.1a

§2.2a

§2.3c.3

q. 375

§3b.7b

§2.2e

under q. 331

§2.7a

case in point is the verb *es-* 'to sit (down)'. As Neu explains it, this verb began as a simple middle (*contra* HW²: see §2.4a), with both stative and transformative use. But the transformative meaning moved over to the active sector and in the process acquired *-za*. The stative meaning 'to sit' stayed a middle, and is not found with *-za*. This change in category for the transformative *es-* took place in MH.

Neu (2) divides the middles into Zustands-, Vorgangs- and Tätigkeitsmedia. About the last, he remarks (p. 106 ff.): "Eine stattliche Anzahl der direkt-reflexiven Medialformen (i.e., those in which *-za* would correspond to an accusative) ist noch zusätzlich durch die Reflexivpartikel *-za* oder (wie med. *hassik-*) durch das Reflexivpronomen gekennzeichnet. Insbesondere sind es Verben, die mit der Pflege des menschlichen Körpers zu tun haben: *arra-* "waschen" (doch s. *warp-*), *parkunu-* "reinigen", *suppiyahh-* "reinigen"; *wassiya-* "anziehen", *unuwai-* "schmucken"; *arsiya-* "hegen, pflegen"; *hassik-* "sich sättigen", *nink-* "sich satt trinken". Bei med. *suppiyahh-* sind es gerade die altheth. Belege, die ohne *-za* stehen (Mat. 158). Mehrfach entspricht der med. Form + *-za* die akt. Form + *-za* (vgl. *arra-*, *suppiyahh-*, *unuwai-*, *wassiya-*, *hassik-*, *nink-*); auch med. *warp-* (ohne *-za*) hat seine Entsprechung im Aktiv + *-za*.

Zur Kennzeichnung des reflexiven Tätigkeitsmediums gegenüber dem Zustands- oder Vorgangsmedium steht *-za* z. B. bei *es-* "sich setzen" (ohne *-za* "sitzen"), *arsiya-* "sich pflegen" (ohne *-za* "gedeihen"), *munnai-* "sich verbergen" (ohne *-za* "unsichtbar sein/werden, entschwinden") oder *was(s)-/ues(s)-/wassiya-* "sich (be)kleiden" (ohne *-za* oder Reflexivpronomen "gekleidet sein").

Gegenüber dem direkt-reflexiven Medium nimmt sich das indirekt-reflexive oder "dativische" Medium sehr ärmlich aus.

Das Hethitische kennt zwar eine Reihe transitiver med. Formen, doch war auf Grund von aktivischen Parallel- oder Duplikatstellen in vielen Fällen wahrscheinlich zu machen, daß diese med. Formen wie transitive Aktiva empfunden wurden. Ja,

es ließ sich sogar wiederholt sehr eindeutig feststellen, daß eine Neigung bestanden hat, diese gewiß sehr alten transitiven med. Formen durch aktivische zu ersetzen.

In diesem Zusammenhang von Deponentien zu sprechen, verbietet das Vorhandensein gleichbedeutender akt. Formen. Verfrüht wäre es, ein solches Verbum Deponens zu nennen, das bisher allein durch eben diese transitive med. Formen bezeugt ist. Manche dieser Formen haben *-za* bei sich. In einem solchen Falle läßt es sich nicht ausmachen, ob die betreffende med. Formen medial empfunden wurde und *-za* lediglich ein diese Diathese unterstreichender Zusatz ist oder ob der med. Form keine medial Diathese anhaftete, so daß *-za* hinzutreten mußte, um das auszudrücken, wofür z.B. im Griechischen allein die mediale Form genügte. Soweit ich sehe, steht in den Fällen, wo in einem hethitischen Satz bei med. Verben (Prädikat) indirekt-reflexive Diathese vorliegt (oder vorzuliegen scheint), die Reflexivpartikel *-za*. Der medialen Wendung gr. λούεσθαι τὰς χεῖρας scheint im Hethitischen eine aktive (!) Wendung mit *-za* zu entsprechen. (Wenn das reflexive Possessivpronomen steht, fehlt *-za* bisweilen).

The verbs in this category which he cites as taking *-za* are:

aus- "sehen" (Med. = Akt.)

med. (trans.) *-za usk-* "sich (vor jem.) vorsehen, sich hüten"

nai- "lenken, (herbei)leiten" (Med. = Akt.).

In der Wendung med. *-za IGI^{HI}.A-wa nai- (neya-)* "seine Augen richten auf" ist IGI^{HI}.A "Augen" (trotz der guten transitiven Wiedergabe im Deutschen) nicht Objekt, sondern wir hätten wörtlich zu übersetzen: "Sich wenden (in bezug auf) die eigenen (*-za*) Augen"; vgl. *namma-an-kan IGI^{HI}.A-wa ANA KUR LUKUR andan neyanzi* "Dann wendet man ihn, (nämlich) die Augen dem Feindesland zu", d.h. "man richtet seine Augen auf das feindliche Land" (vgl. Mat. 125 Anm. 14).

palkuiya- "?"

was(s)-/ues(s)-/wassiya- "sich (*-za*/Reflexivpronomen) etwas anziehen" (Med. = Akt.).

(Laws) §53

§55

§74

§80

II §59

Madd Vs 13

Vs 13-4, 27-8, 43

Vs 14-17

Vs 15

Vs 17-18

Vs 19

Vs 20, Rs 34

Vs 20-1

Vs 26

Vs 44

Vs 46-8

Vs 52

Vs 60

Vs 61-3

Vs 64-5

Rs 15-16

Rs 18

Rs 20-2

Rs 22-4

Rs 25-8

Rs 32-3

Rs 40

Rs 44-5

Rs 54

Rs 89-90

Maṣat 75/43 l. 4-10

75/45 l. 13-14

75/104 l. 5-7

Mast A l 32-3

l 32-5

l 42-4

I 43, III 38

II 1-3

q. 331, under q. 88

q.s 34, 145

under q. 88

under q. 88

q. 332

q. 146

under q. 148

q. 315

under q. 35

q.s 42, 200

q. 132

under q. 133

q. 35

under q. 42

q. 133

q. 399

under q. 399

under q. 298

q.s 282, 400

q. 297

under q. 35

q. 402

q. 148

q. 279

q. 270

q. 325

under q. 35

q. 36

q. 298

q. 11

q.s 306, 317

q. 93

under q. 269

under q. 433

q.s 183, 365

q. 91

under q. 198

q. 203

(Mast) II 18-20

II 46-9

III 42-3

III 44 = B II 54

III 49

IV 6-8

IV 17-18

IV 23-5

IV 28-31

B III 2-5

Bo 6342 x+7

Mitas Vs 7

Vs 34

Vs 36

Vs 38

Vs 40

Rs 2

Rs 2-4

Rs 12

Rs 13-14

Rs 16-17

Rs 21

Rs 22

Rs 24-6

Rs 29-30

Rs 35'

Rs 55-6

Rs 57-8

Murs. P.P. I (XIV 14+) §1 l. 6

§1 l. 6-7, §8 Rs 28

Vs 46(-7)

Rs 7-14

Rs 11

Rs 19-21

Rs 30, 38

Murs P.P. II (XIV 8+) §1 l 6

§2 l. 1

q. 366

q. 229

q. 92

under q. 95

under q. 95

q. 186

q. 198

q. 377

under q. 235

q. 73

under q. 95

under q. 37

q. 269

under q. 94

q. 199

q. 37

under q.s 94, 148

under q. 320

q. 300

under q. 300

under q. 399

under q. 37

q. 268

q. 38

under q. 402

q. 355

q. 95

q. 356

under q. 180

under q. 180

§2.17 (*sanh-*)

under q. 351

§2.5c.2

q. 351

over q. 255

q. 126

§2.5c.2

However the similar verb *kartimmes-* does not seem to take the particle; cf. in late LH:

- (4) *nu-kan man DUTU URU^{arinna} [GAŠAN?-Y]A ANA [MUNU]^Sdanuhepa ser TUKU.TUKU-ista kuitki*
 "If the Sungoddess of Arinna my mistress got mad at all about Danuhepa" (XXI 19 II 10-11).

The participle *kartimmiyanuwant-* appears without particle, but the adjective *kartimmiyawant-*, with *es-* "be" understood, takes *-za*, as a rule. See the two side by side, KBo II 6 II 51-4:

- (5) *man EME ŠA MUNUS D^IŠTAR-atti TI-andas kuitman-as TI-anza esta nu apiya kuit arrahhanniskit GIDIM-ya-kan kuit TUKU.TUKU-nuanza namma-ma-za GIDIM tamedani memiyani ser UL kuitki TUKU.TUKU-uanza*

"if the tongue of the live Sausgatti, when she was alive, because she a.-ed there, and her spirit was angered; (if) further you the spirit are not angry about anything else . . ."

HW² suggests 'fluchen, verwünschen' for *arrahhaniya-*.

See also passim in this text for the adjective, both with and without particle. Note e.g. III 6-9: the above passage is virtually repeated, but the adjective appears in three clauses. It does not have *-za* in the first case, but it does, as above, in the second and third clauses. One may therefore conclude that it is not that the participle does not take the particle, but rather that any form in that position would not have *-za*. In fact, the first occurrence probably describes the subject from the outside, in the third person. But just before the oracle is actually taken, the text usually addresses the deity, or the spirit who is being investigated, directly in the second person: it poses the question "is this what you want?" or "are you angry about this?" or similar. See §2.1d for comments on this.

The adjective is the normal formula in the oracle texts, and is regularly accompanied by the particle: see e.g. XXII 70 Vs 4-5 and passim; also V 1 II 23; V 7 passim (e.g. q. 179). V 6 I 45 has no particle in this phrase, but it represents a third person:

LÚMEŠ URU^{astata} kuit uwater nas ŠA DINGIR^{LIM} saklai punussir nu memir man-wa DINGIR^{LIM} UKÛ-si menahhanda TUKU.TUKU-anza istarkzi-war-an "because they brought the men of Astata, they investigated the covenant of the deity and said, 'if the deity is angry with a person, (s)he becomes sick. . .'" (V 6 I 44-6).

Other verbs of becoming angry occasionally have the particle: cf. *sa-* in a copied MH text:

- (6) *nu-za ser nepis sait kattan-ma-za tekan sait*
 "above the sky was angry, below the earth was angry" (B.U. I 56-7 9 (C)).

See also XVII 10 I 22 (Telipinus myth): *sait-war-as-za nu-wa-z human assu petas* "he got mad and took all good with him".

With an accusative object: XXXI 127+ I 46-7.

XV 32 I 46 (C) has *man-wa-za santes* "If you are angry . . .". Also with a reciprocal meaning: cf. q. 10 below.

halihlai-

- (7) *nat-san hassi halihliiyandari*
 "they kneel at the altar" (XXIX 1 IV 1 (copied early text)).

Active: *nu-tta halihliskimi nu duddu hal[zihihi]* "I kneel to you and beg for mercy" (XXVI 86 III 2-3 (Murs.P.P. II)).

But with *-za*:

- (8) *nu]-za ammu halihliskimi MUNUS.LUGAL[] nu-za MUNUS^lalantiwashas-ma halih[iskizzi nu]-za ues halihliskiwni*

"I kneel, the queen [], L. kneels, we kneel" (203/f l. 6-8).
 There is a copied OH example of this verb with *-za*, in a transitive use: LUGAL-un-wa-z mekki halihlatti "you are always kneeling to the king (i.e. 'you fawn on him')" (KBo III 34 II 21).

The middle *haliya-*, with the same meaning, generally does not take *-za* (neither does *hink-*):

- (9) *nas-mu uit GIRMES-as kattan haliyattat*
 "she knelt down at my feet" (XIV 15 IV 28-9 (AM p. 70), and passim, AM).

- (AM) XIV 16 I 18-19
 II 11
 II 15
 XIV 15//16 III 26-7
 III 35
 III 50-2
 IV 39-40
 XIV 15 IV 18
 IV 28-9
 XIX 29 I 10
 IV 8-9
 IV 16
- Anittas Rs 52
 Rs 60ff., 66
- Anniw I 30-1
 II 18
 IV 27
- Appu (XXIV 8+) I 19-20
 I 24-5, II 10-11
 I 25-6
 I 30
 I 35
 I 40, 43, II 11-12
 II 1
 II 5
 II 7-8
 II 13-14
 III 7, 17
 III 10, 18-19
 III 11
 III 13, 19
 III 14-15
 IV 5-6
 IV 6-7
 IV 8ff.
 IV 13ff.
 IV 21-2
- §2.6c.6
 under q. 48
 q. 244
 q. 53
 q. 329
 under q. 287
 q. 109
 q. 78
 q. 9
 under q. 62
 q. 260
 q. 258
 §2.11a
 §3b.7b
 under q. 283, §3d
 §3d
 §2.16.3b
 q. 342
 under q. 299
 under q. 29
 under q. 29
 §2.5b.1
 under q. 299
 §2.5b.1
 §2.5b.1
 under q. 29
 §2.5b.1
 under q. 390
 under q. 101
 under q. 32
 under q. 322
 q. 105
 under q. 335
 §2.5b.1
 §2.5b.1
 under q. 132
 under q. 335

- AU Taw I 8-13
 I 19-20
 I 20-1
 I 69-70
 II 3
 II 7-8
 II 65-6
 II 71-2
 II 76
 III 11-12
- B.-M. A I 13-14
 I 14-15
 I 20
 I 22-6
 III 25-8
 IV 13-20
 IV 14-22
- B.-M. B III 60-3
- B.T. II 22-30
 II 31-4
 II 33-4
 II 41
 II 47-9
 II 55-6
 II 84-93
 III 71-4
 IV 16-19
 IV 21-4
- B.U. I 16
 I 25-6
 I 56-7
 III 18
 III 19-20
 IV 12
 IV 30-3
 IV 34-5
 IV 52-3
- q. 221
 under q. 271
 under q. 78
 under q. 221
 §2.15.3
 §2.15.3
 §2.5c.6
 q. 134
 under q. 134
 under q. 320
 q. 233
 q. 241
 under q. 42
 q. 235
 q. 107
 q. 404, under q. 235
 q. 97
 q. 187
 under q. 211
 q. 70
 q. 428
 under q. 60
 q. 71
 under q. 71
 q.s 63, 117, 327
 q. 217
 q. 216
 q. 112
 under q. 1
 q. 13
 q. 6
 under q. 232
 under q. 232
 under q. 394
 q. 390
 under q. 173
 q. 283

inu-

(19) *nas-za inuskittari* (KBo XIII 119 I 7 (prob. MH)).

"it makes itself hot(?)".

See the discussion of *kis-* with the particle, §2.2.

karus(siya)-

See §2.6c.5 below.

kis- and kikkis-

See §2.2 below.

kunk-

(20) *nat-za-kan sasas mahhan kunkiskantari*

"they rise up like s.s" (XXIX 1 III 43-4 (copied early text)).

(21) *GIŠippiyas kapnuesni assaues puries ta-ssan kaluesnies kitta lamni-ya-as seszi tas-za kunnikunkiskitta*
 "on a k. of an i.-plant lie good lips; k.-plants lie on top. They lie for a time, and then rise slowly up" (KBo X 24 III 6-10 (copied early text)).

The subject here seems plural; the verbs are however singular. The sense of the verb is not entirely established.

mugai-

(22) *nu-za DUTU URUari[nna-y]a? zikila mukeskihhu[t*
 "Sungoddess of A., let yourself be worshipped!" (XXIV 3 III 13 (Prayer of Mursilis II)).

See under q. 222 for an active form of this verb.

munnai-

Neu translates this verb "unsichtbar sein/werden, entschwinden" without *-za*; "sich verbergen" with *-za*. But he mentions only one example with the particle:

(23) *nas-za munnaittat* (XXXIII 120 I 38).

Without particle: *nas munnaittat* of an oracle-bird, XVIII 5 I 27, and similar passages.

nai-

Neu (1) p. 121-6. See §2.11 below.

nink-

(24)

[*man-ma L*]ÚŠU.GI-tarr-a kardi-tti nu-za ninkihh[ut
 "if old age is getting to you, get drunk!" (HAB III 31 (C)).
 See §2.15.4 for active forms with *-za*.

pahs-

Neu notes that *-za* is used when the subject protects his own property.

In the MH Sunassura treaty, we find the following fragmented passage:

(25) *man-as-za UL-ma ŠA DUTUŠI kisa nu-za KUR-YA ANA [LUKUR? menah]handa pahhasa ANA DUTUŠI-ma hatraizzi nu ERÍNMEŠ ANŠE.KUR.RAHIA [] natta uizzi*
man-za AŠŠUM ERÍNMEŠ ANŠE.KUR.RAHIA-ma handa
 "if he doesn't become of My Sun's side, I will protect my land against the [enemy?]. (If?) he writes to My Sun, and the troops and cavalry [] do not come, if it is on account of the troops and cavalry, (let it lie under the oath)." (XXXVI 127 Vs 4-6).
 See also *nu-za KUR-[Z]U pahs-* "protects his land" (Vs 8).
 In the active: *nu-za LUGAL ass-a utne-met É-ir-mett-a pahhasmi*
 "I, the king, protect my land and my house" (XXIX 1 I 18-19 (copied early text)).

But note *nu-za É.DINGIRLIM pahsaru*, T.O. III 14 (copied MH?). The active does not have the particle in this text on III 17, 35, but cf. III 25-6 with particle. There is also the interesting locution: *nu-za pahhuenas uddani mekki-pat marri pahsanuwantes estin* "be very protective of the matter of the fire", III 54; also II 80-1; but this may follow the behavior of *es-* 'be' rather than of *pahs-*.

The LH SV Kup §9 C 33 (the object is a pronoun); §10 D 19 have the active with *-za*, which indicates that the object (the lands which K. has been given) belongs to the subject. Note also the possible *nu-wa-sma[s pahs]anuwante MEŠ est[en* "be protective of yourselves!" (SV Dup §9 II 11). See e.g. q. 54 for an example of this verb without particle.

XXX 28 Rs 2	under q. 199
XXX 29 I 5-6	q. 130
XXX 36 II 8	§2.15.3
XXX 42 IV 3-4'	q. 348
XXXI 42 III 7-9	under q. 207
XXXI 66 II 12	§2.15.3
II 14-18	q. 251
IV 10-16	q. 419
XXXI 71 III 2-4	q. 135
XXXI 115 I 12	§2.17 (<i>sanh-</i>)
XXXI 127+ I 7, 20, 21, 24	under q. 46
I 46-7	under q. 6
II 16	under q. 172
II 16-26	under q. 46
II 23-26	under q. 239
II 51-59	under q.s 192, 238
II 61-9	under q. 124
III 2-4	under q. 72
III 5-12	under q. 413
XXXI 143 (StBoT 25 #110) II 8-9 = 15-16	§2.16.3a
II 23	q. 373
XXXIII 8 III 21	§3a.2
XXXIII 24 I 43	§2.15.3
XXXIII 62 III 10-11	q. 368
XXXIII 68 II 6	q. 18
XXXIII 70 II 14-III 1	q. 202
XXXIII 86 III 3	under q. 38
XXXIII 108 II 13	§2.15.3
XXXIII 113 I 9'	§1c (<i>ep-</i>)
XXXIII 115 III 13	§1c (<i>ep-</i>)
XXXIII 118 I 24	under q. 30
XXXIII 120 I 27	under q. 307
I 27, 29, 30	under q. 31
I 28-9	q. 32
I 38	q. 23
II 4	under q. 189
XXXIV 24+ IV 16-17, IV 20-2	q. 414

(XXXIV 24+) IV 31-2, 38-9	under q. 427
IV 35-6	q. 427
XXXIV 27+ IV 22'	under q. 122
IV 30-1'	under q. 122
XXXIV 45+ (StBoT 4) Vs 11	under q. 48
Vs 15	under q. 401
XXXIV 116+ V 6	under q. 332
XXXVI 35 I 10	under q. 30
I 11	q. 3
I 12-13	under q. 50
XXXVI 44 IV 14	q. 33
XXXVI 67 II 17'	under q. 398
II 24'	q. 29
II 29-30'	under q. 211
XXXVI 89 Rs 49-50	under q. 164
XXXVI 110 (StBoT 25 #140) Rs 5-7	under q. 391
Rs 8-12	q. 316
XXXVI 127 Vs 4-6	q. 25
Vs 8	under q. 25
XXXVIII 37 (StBoT 4) III 10-12, 18	under q. 178
III 14	under q. 169
XXXIX 6 III 14-15	over q. 84
XL 1 Vs 24-6	§2.17 (<i>watarnah-</i>)
Vs 30-1	under q. 413
XL 33 Vs 7-8	§2.6c.6
Vs 12-13	§2.6c.6
XL 106 III 3-4	under q. 421
XLI 11 Rs 26-7	under q. 424
XLI 17: see IX 31.	
XLIII 23 Rs 10-11	§2.16.3a
Rs 14-15	§2.16.3a
Rs 19-22	§2.5a
XLIII 55 II 1-2	q. 254
II 3-5	under q. 254
XLIII 57 IV 3	§2.11b
IV 4-6	§2.11b
IV 22	§2.11b

(32) ANA PANI ŠÀ-KA-wa-z duskiskitta LÚ-natar-mit-wa
kuit pasta le-wa-z duskiskitta PANI ŠÀ-KA

"You are happy in your heart because you have swallowed my
manhood. Do not be happy in your heart!" (XXXIII 120 I 28-9).

We find the active verb in Appu III 11 (copied early MH), in
a transitive meaning. The active also begins to be used in the same
meaning as the older middle. See q. 359 from the Huqqanas treaty,
with *dusk-* in the same meaning as the middles above. The particle
is not always present, however: cf. e.g. VI 45 III 61 (probably: the
passage is a little broken). But then, the phrase there seems to be
'my soul rejoiced within me'; perhaps it seemed that there was no
concrete subject for *-za* to refer to. Cf. e.g. XXIII 101 II 11: *man-za*
ŠEŠ-YA *duskiskit* 'my brother would have rejoiced'.

For a transitive active form of this verb, also with *-za*, from a
copied early text, see above under *palkuiya-*. Another example is
XIV 7 IV 13-14 (Hattusilis and Puduhepa): the text mentions that
when a lord raises a father and mother's child, the latter do not get
to provide him nursing *UL-ma-an-za-an-kan duskiyazi* 'neither do
they gladden him'.

The active locution *para dusk-* 'be gracious' takes *-za* in VI 46
IV 32.

unuwai-

See §2.16 below.

wallu-

(33) *walluskiddumat-wa-za*

"you were ever worshipped (or 'be worshipped!')" (XXXVI 44 IV
14 (copied OH)).

See also XLVIII 99 I. 13: *Dilalis-wa-za waluttat*.

was-

See §2.16 below.

§1d The Texts

In Boley 4), we gave a list of Old and Middle Hittite texts on
which the study was based. For the reasons given there, we
deemed it necessary to use primarily material that was not of
uncertain or disputed date. Nevertheless, we used disputed data to
supplement the basic material derived from the core list of texts.

In this study, more of the copied material from OH is
perhaps cited than was deemed safe for Boley 4): *-za* may not
have been so much at risk for misinterpretation or arbitrary
inclusion by scribes from later periods, because its use is not so
extremely different in OH and in the later material, as it appeared
was the case for the OH local particles. Nevertheless, we must still
enjoin caution in the use of the copied OH texts: there is no way
of knowing how accurate they are. The MH material is treated
pretty much as it was in Boley 4). Note that the term 'early'
designates texts whose date is uncertain, but which stem either
from (late) OH or early MH.

For this study of *-za*, we also wished to treat Late Hittite. The
LH material obviously does not usually have the problem of later
copies. It seemed sensible to start with a corpus of securely dated
LH texts, and supplement it from other sources when this
provided new information not contained in our base list.

The core list of LH texts is therefore as follows:

Suppiluliumas I:

Huqqanas Treaty (ed. SV)

Mursilis II:

KBo V 6: Deeds of Suppiluliumas (ed. Güterbock)

Treaties with Targasnallis, Kupanta-DLAMA, Duppitesub,

Manapa-DU (ed. SV)

The Annals (ed. Goetze)

KBo IV 6 (Prayer to Lelwani for Gassulawiya)

- (XIV 4) *III 16-18*
III 23-9
 XIV 7 *I 16-17*
IV 13-14
 XIV 15//16: *see AM.*
 XIV 17 *II 29*
 XV 5 *I 15*
 XV 31 *I 33 (= 32 I 34-5), III 48* §3b.2
 XV 32 *I 40-2*
I 46
I 46-52
 XV 34 *I 48-9*
I 49, III 41-2
I 49-50, II 1-2, 39
I 50-2
II 15-16
II 33-4
III 35
IV 32-3
 XVI 16 *I 28*
 XVI 34 *I 8*
 XVII 5: *see Illuyanka.*
 XVII 6+: *see Illuyanka.*
 XVII 9 *I 17-18*
I 21
I 32 = 410/u 1. 14
 XVII 10+ *I 8-9*
I 14-15
I 19-20
I 22
II 32
II 35
IV 24-5
 XVII 14 *Rs 19-20 (StBoT 3)*
 XVII 21+ *I 6-8; I 1-13; I 4-18*
I 24-7
III 1-3
- q. 164
 q. 352
 q. 85
 under q. 32
 q. 53
 q. 16
 §2.15.2
 under q. 41
 under q. 6
 under q. 196
 under q. 368
 under q. 368
 under q. 307
 q. 41
 q. 131
 under q. 41
 q. 343
 q. 299
 q. 434, §3c
 q. 434
 under q. 400
 under q. 400
 q. 374
 q. 201
 under q. 390
 q. 367
 under q. 6
 §3a.2
 q. 230
 q. 284
 q. 432
 q. 236
 q. 149
 q. 335

- (XVII 21+) *III 4-7*
IV 11-14
IV 15-17
IV 15-19
 XVII 24 *III 14-16*
 XVII 28 *II 60*
IV 45
 XVIII 5 *I 27*
 XIX 5 *Vs 13*
 XIX 29: *see AM.*
 XIX 41 *II 11-13*
 XIX 67 *I 6-8*
 XXI 19 *I 13-14*
I 15-23
I 20ff.
II 10-11
IV 6, 20-2
 XXI 27 *I 3-6*
I 11-13
II 3-4
II 7
III 43-7
IV 35-6
IV 39-40
 XXI 29 *I 12-13*
III 29, IV 4
IV 8-9
 XXII 70 *Vs 4-5*
Vs 8
Vs 9
Vs 12-15
Vs 22
Vs 36-7
Vs 37-8
Vs 41
Vs 41-2
Vs 61-2
Vs 74-5
- under q. 335
 q.s 104, 193, 433
 q. 334
 q. 220
 under q. 398
 q. 17
 q. 15
 under q. 23
 under q. 11
 under q. 419
 under q. 320
 under q. 180
 q. 62
 under q. 85
 q. 4
 under q. 273
 q. 322
 §2.5c.6
 under q. 250
 under q. 169
 q. 250
 q. 354
 q. 358
 under q.s 139, 142
 under q. 345
 q. 12
 under q. 5
 q. 113
 q. 387
 q. 176
 under q. 176
 q. 265
 q. 266
 under q. 253
 over q. 254
 under q. 267
 q. 225

CHAPTER 2

Verbs with *-za*

§2.1 *es-* 'to be'

In the following discussion, we will include also phrases in which the verb is understood. See Hoffner JNES 28, p. 225 ff. for a roster of examples of this verb with *-za* (most of which we quote).

§2.1a In original Old Hittite, *es-* is not attested with *-za*, even in phrases in which later Hittite would probably include the particle. In copies of older texts, this "rule" does not always hold: the Telipinus Edict contributes *pandu-wa-z asandu* 'let them go and be/live (in the houses they are given)', II 13.

An example of an original OH text is:

(34) *man DUMUMEŠ URU_{hatti} LÚMEŠ ILKI uer ANA ABI LU-GAL aruwanzi nu tarskanzi kusan-nas-za natta kuiski iezzi nu-wa-nnas-za mimmanzi LÚMEŠ ILKI-wa sumes*
 "When Hittite feudal workers came and they bow to the king's father and say: noone will give us our recompense, and they refuse us (saying) 'you're feudal workers' . . ." (Laws A(+B) §55).

§2.1b MH

§2.1b.1 In MH, however, *-za* (or in the above case often *-smas* for the second person plural) would normally appear in phrases of this kind.

(35) *nu-wa-tta [KUR HUR.SA]_G zippasla ZAG-as esdu nu-wa-za am[mel] IR_{TUM} es ERÍN_{MEŠ}._{HI}.A-KA-ya-wa ammel ERÍN_{MEŠ}._{HI}.A asandu*

"let the land of Z. be your border, and be my servant, let your troops be my troops" (Madd Vs 20-1).

Similar with *es-* and *-za*, Rs 15-16 (the phrase are rather broken). As can be seen, the first and third phrases are without *-za*, while the middle clause has it. Another example of this general meaning:

ammel-wa-z esten nu-wa-za-kan [ŠA DUTUŠ_I KUR.KUR_{TI}]_M esdumat KUR URU_{hatti}-ma-wa walhien
 "'be mine, and settle the l[ands of My Sun?]; strike Hatti!" (Madd Rs 40).

See also Vs 15.

In the first person:

(36) *ka]sa-wa-z kedas ANA KUR.KUR_{TIM} [] uskisgatallass-a uk*
 "Behold I am the [x] and the warder for these lands" (Madd Rs 44-5).

"Being witness" takes the particle already in the early Zarpiya ritual, IX 31 II 4 = HT 1 I 57 (C) (*esten*). But note KBo VIII 35 II 13: *nat kedani linkiya kutruenies asandu* "let them be witnesses to this oath!". "Being of the oath", i.e. a vassal, has *-za* in the Ismerikka Treaty, XXIII 68 + ABOT 58 Rs 7, *nu-za kusa sumes LÚMEŠ KUR URU_{ismirika} humantes IT[_{TI} DUTUŠ_I i][_n]kiyas-sas*
 "Behold, all you men of I. are of the oath with My Sun (i.e. bound by oath to My Sun)".

In the following quote, we find two parallel phrases, one with *-za*, one without:

(37) *nu-war-as LÚ-is esta uga-wa-z UL imma LÚ-as nu-war-as UL pihhi*
 "He was a man, am I not also a man?: I will not give them" (Mitas Vs 40).

Note Mitas Vs 7: *nu-war-as-mu, LÚKUR-YA*; Rs 21: *nu kuīs ANA^{*} DUTUŠ_I[_I] kurur ANA LÚMEŠ URU_{pahhuwa-ya-at} kurur asandu*
 "Whoever is enemy to My Sun, let them be enemy also to the men of P."; and

(38) *nu_{man} LÚMEŠ URU_{pahh[uwa ke uddar]} ienzi nat ANA DUTUŠ_I IR_{MEŠ} man LÚMEŠ URU_{pahhuwa-ma ke uddar} UL ienzi na[t] ANA BELUTIM zammuranzi nu kurur appanzi*

- KBo XV 52 V 14 §2.15.3
 KBo XVI 25 I 9 under q. 107
 I 30-4 q. 232
 I 68 under q. 282
 KBo XVI 50 I 9-13 q. 228
 KBo XVI 59 Vs 15 (StBoT 4) under q. 59
 Vs 15-16 under q. 59
 Rs 4 under q. 222
 KBo XVI 71+ (StBoT 25 #13) II 9-10 §2.3a.2
 KBo XVII 9+ (StBoT 25 #12) III 21 §2.16.3a
 KBo XVII 22 (StBoT 25 #124) III 5-7 under q. 87
 KBo XVII 32 Vs 5 §2.1b.2
 Vs 8 under q. 38
 KBo XVII 36+ (StBoT 25 #54) III 10-13 q. 392
 KBo XVII 61 Rs 5 under q. 73
 KBo XVII 62+63 I 14', 18' under q. 400
 KBo XVII 65 Vs 8-9 q. 177
 Rs 26-7 q. 376
 KBo XVII 69 I 13' under q. 310
 KBo XVII 105 II 30 under q. 185
 II 32-4 q. 185
 II 34-6 q. 197
 KBo XX 8 Vs 11 §1a
 KBo XX 10+ (StBoT 25 #59) II 8 under q. 371
 KBo XX 34 (Hantitassu)
 Vs 8-10 q. 410
 Rs 7-9 q. 45
 KBo XX 82 II 18-20 §2.11a
 KBo XXI 33 I 17-22 q. 96
 I 19-20 q. 403
 KBo XXII 1 I 28 q. 391
 KBo XXIII 119 I 8-9 q. 379
 KBo XXIV 126 Rs 3, 15 under q. 181
 Rs 9 under q. 181
 KBo XXV 31 (StBoT 25 #31) II 12 §2.3a.2
 KBo XXV 40 (StBoT 25 #40) I 6' §2.3a.2
 KBo XXVII 203 V 5 under q. 363
 KUB I 14 II 8-12 = XXVIII 96 I 11-15 q. 14

- IV 3 I & II 16'-17' // R.S. 22.439 III 10'-11' under q. 378
 II 6-9 q. 272
 IV 4 II 15 under q. 374
 IV 47 I 3 under q. 28
 V 1 I 32-3 under q. 363
 I 53 q. 129
 I 78 under q. 129
 I 99-101 q. 363
 II 23 under q. 5
 III 37 q. 313
 III 48 under q. 253
 III 53-5 q.s 123, 309
 III 56 under q. 293
 III 74 q. 321
 III 79-80 under q. 313
 IV 63 under q. 111
 IV 83-4 q. 293
 V 6 I 22-3 under q. 169
 I 32 under q. 181
 I 44-6 under q. 5
 II 52 under q. 169
 III 8 under q. 179, §2.15.2
 III 9-10 q. 274
 III 14 under q. 274
 III 17 q. 275
 III 18-19 under q. 69
 III 26-7 q. 339
 V 7 Vs 22-3 q. 179
 Rs 21-2 §2.5c.2
 VI 34 I 5-6 under q. 84
 VI 45 I 35 = 46 I 36 under q. 209
 III 18-19, 33 under q. 180
 III 28 = 46 III 68 under q. 168
 III 40-2 = VI 46 IV 9-11 q. 122
 III 48-52 = 46 IV 17-21 q. 267
 III 61 under q. 32
 IV 52-3 q. 323

- (44) zik-za LÚ^UHAZANNU [haliyas udda]ni mekki nahhanza
es
"You, city overseer, be greatly fearing in the matter of the watch"
(XXVI 9 I 2-3).

An ambiguous case:

- (45) nu-smas aruisgazi maskisgazi nu-us-ma-si-kan
QATAMMA miyaues esten
"he bows and makes presents to you; be equally benign to him!"
(Hantitassu (KBo XX 34) Rs 7-9).

It is not clear how to resolve *nu-us-ma-si-kan*. CHD (p. 210) prefers to take the *-ma-* as a scribal error, and to read simply *nu-ssi-kan*. But it would be possible to take the string as representing *nu-sma<s>-si-kan*, a very unusual construction to be sure, with two datives. In this latter case, the *-smas* would be the surrogate of *-za*. An objection to this suggestion is that *-smas* in this function naturally would be out of place, since one would expect *-za* or its surrogate to follow the enclitic pronouns. We have cases in which *-za* precedes the accusative pronoun, as e.g. in Tunn. I 3, quoted under q. 196, and q.s 117 (*man-za-an*) and 271; in q. 182 we find *nasma-za-at*. There are also cases of *-za* followed by a nominative, as in q. 224. I am not aware of any in which *-za* precedes a dative, but in any case there is no reason to suppose that a dative pronoun occurring in lieu of *-za* need copy the latter's behavior to the letter.

Many participles appear with or without *es-* throughout later Hittite. Some examples with particle are q.s 152 (*linganuwanza*), 302 (*panza*), 343 (*piyantes*). However, we also find cases in which the particle is not included. See e.g. q.s 153 (*linganuwantes*), 187, 245 (*huyan*), 303 (*panza*). Note also the adjectives, such as *irmalianza*, both with and without particle, q.s 67, 69 below, and TUKU.TUKU-*uanza* of q. 5. See §2.1d for comments.

§2.1b.4 A case where an inanimate subject takes *-za*:

- (46) amme[l] DINGIR-YA kuit-mu-za AMA-YA hasta nu-mu
ammel DINGIR-YA sallanus nu-mu-ssa[n laman-mit] ishiessa-
mitt-a zik-pat DINGIR-YA nu-mu-kan assauas antuhsas anda

- zik-pat [DINGIR-YA] harapta innarauwanti-ma-mu pedi
iyauwa zik-pat DINGIR-YA maniyahta [] ammel DINGIR-
YA I¹kantuzilin tuggas-ta<s> istanzanas-tas IR-KA halzait((-)
] nu-za DUMU-annaz kuit ŠA DINGIR-YA duddumar
nat-kan sakhi nat [kanismi ?]

"My god, since my mother bore me, you, my god, raised me up. You are [my name] and my bond, my god; you included me among the good men, and gave me doings in a powerful position. You, [my god], called K. as servant of your body and spirit. What the grace of my god (has been) since my childhood, I know and [acknowledge] it" (XXX 10 Vs 6-10).

See XXXI 127 II 16-26, which is similar. Q. 25 has a partially similar example. Note that in the clause *nu-mu-ssa[n laman-mit] ishiessa-mitt-a zik pat DINGIR-YA, -san* seems to take precedence over *-za*.

XXXI 127+ I 7, 20, 21, 24, etc., has the equivalent of the expressions with *-za* in the LH q. 55 below, but they are without particle.

§2.1c LH

§2.1c.1 We find the usage has not changed much:

- (47) n[a]sm[a]-s[m]as ŠEŠ DUTUŠI hassanza na[sm]a DU[MU]
MUNUS NAPTARTI kuiski apat memai ammuqq-a-wa-za UL
DUMU EN-KA nu-wa ammuk PAP-astin

"Or (if) a legitimate brother of My Sun or the son of a secondary wife says this: 'Am I not a son of your lord? Support me (as king)!'" (PHO I 22-5).

- (48) kuitman-ma-za DUMU-as esun nu-za KUR.KUR
LÚKUR^{LIM} kue tarhiskinun nat TUPPU hanti DÜ-mi nat PANI
DINGIR^{LIM} tehhi

"The lands of the enemy which I conquered as a child, I will write them up separately in a tablet and set it before the goddess" (Hatt. I 73-4).

See also q.s 61 ff. below.

¶ 2 d "to fear":

wa-ti-i REL-sa za-na GOD-ni-na REL-sà-i

"whoever fears this deity" (Sultanhan §17).

Any similarity with the use of *-za* with *nah-* in Hittite? See §2.15.3.

Cf. Karatepe §33-4, without particle:

á-pa-ta-za-pa-wa-ta "EARTH"-da-ta-za-há<<-pa-wa>>

REL-ia REL+i-sa-ta ANTLER-wa-na á-sa-ta // HEAD-ti-sa-wa+ra

REL-i-ta-na REL+i-sà-i-ia ROAD-wa-na (FOOT₂) i-u-na

"the things which earlier were feared in those places, wherever a person feared to travel the road".

¶ 2 e Miscellaneous:

Sultanhan §6: *wa-ti-i pá+ra/i-wa-li-sa-' (FOOT) pa-ta ARHA-' la+ra-ta*

Topada §11 has *-ti*, apparently referring to a first person, but the phrase is obscure. §13 has *-mu*, apparently with the same verb (*zi-na-ha-su-314/-sa-ha*). §19 has *wa-mi-tà tu₄-pa-sa₆-ti wa-sū-ha*. See also §22, with *-mu* (the verb is *tà-tà-na-ha*), and §26, with *-ti* and a third person.

Text Citations

Text No.s in *Italics* are transcribed and usually translated. Others are cited without being quoted.

KBo I 30 Vs 7	under q. 265
KBo I 42 I 39	under q. 101
KBo I 44+ IV 27	under q. 413
KBo II 2 II 30-1	under q. 122
KBo II 5: <i>see AM.</i>	
KBo II 6 II 51-4	q. 5
III 6-9	under q. 5
IV 12-14	q. 425
KBo III 4: <i>see AM.</i>	
KBo III 7 (+) XVII 5: <i>see Illuyanka.</i>	
KBo III 16 Rs 8	under q. 380
Rs 11	under q. 380
KBo III 34 II 21	under q. 8
KBo III 40 I 3	q. 31
a+b I 13	under q. 191
KBo III 57+ Vs 10-11	§2.17 (<i>sanh-</i>)
KBo III 63+ I 10	under q. 380.
I 13-14	q. 1
KBo IV 4: <i>see AM.</i>	
KBo IV 6 Vs 16, Rs 21-2	under q. 308
Vs 21-2	under q. 253
Rs 12-13	under q. 384
Rs 13-14/18-20	§2.9c.3
KBo IV 8 II 11-12, 20	under q. 396
II 16-17	q. 320
III 7	under q. 170

Note however the alternation in another Mursilis' prayer: D^{telipinus sarkus nakkis} DINGIR-us zik, (XXIV 2 Vs 3; duplicate XXIV 1 I 3 with minor variations), but virtually the same phrase with particle, Vs 15. (Note also -ta . . . eszi 'you have', several times, XXIV 1+ I 25ff., XXIV 2 I 15ff.).

An LH counterpart to the MH q. 46 above is q. 267. See however without particle, q. 214.

§2.1c.2 This section is devoted to alternations between the first and third persons.

Two interesting passages without particle:

(56) nu ara<h>zenas KUR.KUR LUKÚR kissan memir
ABU-ŠU-wa-ssi kuis LUGAL KURhatti esta nu-war-as
UR.SAG-is LUGAL-us esta nu-wa-za KUR.KURMEŠ LUKÚR
tarhan harta nu-war-as-za DINGIR^{LIM}-is DÙ-at DUMU-ŠU-ma-
wa-ssi-za-kan kuis ANA GIŠGUZA ABI-ŠU esat nu-wa
apass-a karu LUKALA-anza esta nu-war-an irmaliattat nu-
wa-za apass-a DINGIR^{LIM}-is kisat

"The foreign enemy countries said thus: 'His father who was king of Hatti, he was a hero king, and he had the enemy countries under control, and he died. His son who sat on the throne of his father, he was once a warrior too, but he became sick and he too died'" (AM p. 16-18, KBo III 4 I 9-13).

(57) nahhuwas-ma-mu kuis LUGAL-us esta
nas-mu-kan nahta kururi^{HI.A}-ma-mu kue esta nat-za
tarhun ANA KUR.KUR^{HI.A} URUhatti-ma-za-kan ZAG^{HI.A} ANA
ZAG^{HI.A} anda dakhun

"The king who was my subject, he feared me; (the lands) which were my enemies, I defeated them. I added borders on borders to the lands of Hatti (i.e. I annexed a lot of territory)" (Hatt. IV 55-8).

Also e.g. KBo IV 14 II 31-2: nasma-tta karu ku[es] linkiyas UKUMES-us esir.

But with particle:

(58) nasma-za kues ENMEŠ DUMUMEŠ LUGAL-ya
nu-za ŠA MAMETI le kuiski kuedani[kki] kisari [k]uis-ma-za
ŠA MAMETI kued[an]i[kki] kisari nat GAM-an NIŠ DINGIR^{LIM}
GAR-ru

"(You) who are lords and sons of My Sun, let noone become vassal to anyone (clsc); whoever becomes vassal to anyone else, let it lie under the oath" (PHO III 3-6).

We note that this q. is parallel to a second person plural:

(59) [namm]a²-smas sumes kues LUMESŠAG

"You who are nobles/eunuchs of My Sun . . ." (PHO IV 33).

We note a possible example from this text of a second person plural without particle: nu summas BELU^{HI.A} apas-ma [k]uwa¹qa kuiski memai "ihr (seid) aber jene "Herren" - (wenn) jemand etwa sagt . . ." (von Schuler's translation, PHO I 13-14). But the syntax seems rather confused, and the passage could mean something like 'if any of you lords says thus' or even 'if anyone says thus to you lords': the sense seems to be that if any of the people targeted in this particular instruction (who are usually addressed as 'lords') supports any but direct descendants of the king, it lies under the oath. In I 8, however, -za definitely is not present, with (es-): nasma-ssi summes [ku]es MÁŠ.LUGAL "you who are of the royal family"; also III 24. On the other hand, -za (or -smas) turns up on I 4, III 3 (q. 58), IV 33 (q. 59).

In the minutes of the courtcases of StBoT 4 (p. 54), we find the phrase: nu-wa-za ammuk idalus (KBo XVI 59 Vs 15); -za is however not present in nu-wa¹ sar[rupsenna]¹ tuisas idalus (Vs 15-16).

In the following we find two parallel phrases, one with, the other without -za:

(60) nu-za ammuk ÌR DINGIR^{LIM} apass-a ÌR DINGIR^{LIM} esdu
"I am the servant of the deity; let him too be the servant of the deity" (Hatt. IV 78-9). See also B.T. II 41.

¶ 1 d Some idioms:

XXXV 114 III 11: [a]-wa-ti TUG-an warita. Anything to do with 'put on, wear'?

The verb *aya-* (Hittite *iya-*):

See ¶ 1b above for an example with *-ti*, of uncertain nuance. In the following, however, we find an idiom apparently also occurring in Hittite:

URU₁taurisizzas washazzas DLAMA-as DUTU-ti dati tarkummi[ta] DUTU-wa-ti (?) EZEN₄-in a-a-ta a-wa-ti zare[yanza IDH₁.A-inza] awa-ti alinza HUR.SAGH₁.A-tinza KIMIN

"DLAMA lord of T. announced to his father Sungod: 'O Sungod, (the Stormgod?) has made a banquet, further he has [invited?] the fast (?) [rivers], and the high mountains'" (XXXV 107 III 10-12).

The parallelism between the Hittite and Luwian uses of the particle is shown by KBo IX 127+ I 13 ff.: [nu-za? DL]AMA URU₁taurisa ANA D[UTU] ABI-ŠU t[arkummiyawanz]i tiet [DIŠKU]R-as-wa-z EZEN₄-an <i>et [nu-wa]-za DINGIR[MES-us halza]is ...

See also §2.5b.3, and q. 367 from the Telipinus Myth. ...

Passages that are difficult to translate:

XXXII 8+ IV 25-7: ta]rmis-ti-ta taparu [t]atariamman assiwant[atar] herun zila apatin nis manati

"let the peg in future not speak (??) taparu, curse, poverty, forsworn oath". It is not clear what function *-ti* has, especially since the meaning of the verb is uncertain.

XXV 39 IV 3-4: (2 LÚMEŠ GAL-ŠUNU SİR^{RU}) warhitantis-ti dakkuis tarimaniya hassidari.

¶ 2 Hieroglyphic Luwian

The most salient innovation in Hieroglyphic is the invention of a "reflexive" pronoun *-mi*, which alternates both with *-ti* and in some cases with *-mu* itself.

¶ 2 a "to be":

ME-wa-mi Ika-tú-wa/i-sa (JUDGE) tara-wa-ni-sa
"I am Katuwas, tarwanis" (Kargamis A 11a §1).

Something similar is a common exordium in Hieroglyphic texts.

Bokça §1 has ME-mi ku+ra/i-ti-i-sa; Sultanhan, Hamath III B, Kululu II, Cekke and Restan have something similar.

Kargamis A 2+3 §1 has ME Ika-tu-wa/i-sa, without particle.

wa-mu-u ku-ma-na HOUSE-na-sa CHILD-ni-sa
á-sa-há-'

"When I was palace servant (DUMU.É.GAL)" (Bor §2).

The third person does normally take the particle. See e.g. Kargamis A 2+3 §14, §19; A 7 (most of the clauses); Karatepe §6, §12, §20 (both á-ta á-sa-ta with -ta = -kan, no -ti), §27, §40; Bokça §6: 'those who were my fathers and grandfathers'; etc. Cf. however Maras IV §9:

wa-ti-ia-ta NEG₂-à-ha tá-ti-i-sa NEG₂-à-ha
GRANDFATHER-ha-sá sá-ta

"neither my father nor my grandfather were (there (-ta)?)".

The phrase immediately preceding is difficult. The clause immediately following, §10, has -mi(-ta) with the verb sá-à-ha, which one surmises is a form of 'to be': "(my father and grandfather were not, but) I, H., son of Muwatallis, etc., was". §11 possibly confirms this: it probably says that the writer improved his ancestors' reputation:

"Sausga my mistress saved me from everything/one. If sometimes I am sick, even as a sick man I see the favor of the goddess. In everything the goddess my mistress has me by the hand. And I, because I was a favored man, and because I walked in favor before the gods, I never did an evil thing (after the fashion) of mortal men." (Hatt. I 43-50).

See also

(67) *tuk-[m]a [i]starkkit nu irmalliyattat [nu]-za man irmalanzas-a esta DUTUŠI-ma-[t]ta [ANA] AŠAR ABI-KA tittanunun-pat*

"you caught something and became sick, and even though you were sick, My Sun established you in the place of your father" (SV Dup §7* D I 14-17).

But compare

(68) *I middannamuwas-ma IŠTU ABI-YA kanessanza UKÙ-as esta*

"M. was a favored man of my father" (KBo IV 12 Vs 8-9)

and

(69) *I middan^{an}namuwas-ma karu irmalianza esta*

"M. was already sick" (KBo IV 12 Vs 22).

As a further example without particle, cf. *alwanzahhanza* twice in a similar use in V 6 III 18-19. Hatt. IV 88-9 contributes the third person equivalent of the MH q. 44 above: *nas-kan ŠÀ DINGIRMEŠ ANA DIŠTAR URU samuha nahhanza esdu* "among the gods, let him be fearing of Sausga of Samuha".

Note also the Muwatallis (?) text XXIII 102 I 13-15: *[t]uk-ma ŠEŠ-tar kuwatta ser [h]atrami zik-za-kan ammuqq-a 1-edani AMA-ni hassantes* "why do I write brotherhood (to you)?: you and I were born of the same mother". Contrast *nu-kan UL assiyantes kues*, I 11 (q. 429): even though there is an aura of reciprocity about the phrase, *-za* is not present. In XXVI 88 Vs 7, we find: *DUMU-YA-mu assiyanza kuit* "because my son is dear to me".

§2.1c.3 In the following two examples, one sees the use of *-nas*, corresponding to *-za* for the first person plural, used to indicated reciprocity: that both subjects loved and swore to each other:

(70) *uk-ma I tuthaliyas LUGAL.GAL kuitman LUGAL-izziyahhat-pat nauī uk-ma I DLAMA-ann-a DINGIRLUM annisan-pat assuwanni anda arnut nu-nnas annisan-pat nakkes assaues esuen nu-nnas lenkiyas esuen I-as-wa 1-an pahsaru*

"When I, T. the Great King, did not yet reign, already of old a god brought me and K. together in love, and we were dear to each other and we were sworn to each other: 'let each protect the other'" (B.T. II 31-4).

(71) *nu-nnas ABU-YA-ya lenqanut anzass-a-nnas hanti lenkiyas UKÙ-us esuen nu-mu I DLAMA-as pahhasta*

"My father also put us under oath (to each other), but we were already sworn to each other, and K. protected me" (B.T. II 47-9).

Also similar II 55-6.

§2.1d A few observations:

We have here seen *-za*, and its surrogates *-smas* and *-nas*, used in various ways, from MH on:

1) in some apparently standard phrases: being "someone's servant or vassal"; being "king (in a place)"; being "a child", being "son to the king"; being "a noble"; being some sort of "functionary or priest". The particle furthermore is found in the phrases: be "a man (?)", be "near", and so forth.

2) in a reciprocal use, that is, in the meaning "to each other".

-za is much less common with the third person than with the first and second. To be more specific, the first persons are rarely found without *-za* (or the appropriate dative pronoun for the plural) in any phrases. The second person plural appears to take *-za* as regularly. The second person singular is normally accompanied by *-za* in the imperative, and sometimes in the indicative; there appears to have been an increase in the use of the

This still **does** not encourage taking *-za* as concrete in function. There are no phrases in the text in which a literal use of the particle would be appropriate, so we really have no basis for a judgment. The two particles that appear, *-asta* and *-san*, appear to have a well-developed abstract use: *-san* occurs in a broken passage, but *-asta* clearly is not literal. Note, by the way, that the MH original XLV 47 is a fairly long text, but no example of *-za* is present in the part available to us).

I think we must at least consider the possibility that *-za* began life with a predominantly abstract function. This actually does not rule out Carruba's derivation of the particle: it just would have begun its tendency towards "reflexive" use as an "ethical dative", a scenario which indeed seems to fit the evidence we have. One might object that it is likely, or at least what we would expect, that it **must** have had a literal function at some time prior to that. All we **probably** should say is that we cannot trace *-za* back to such a time. And therefore we must entertain the possibility that the reflexive use of *-za*'s ancestor, if it was indeed a dative pronoun, **began** as part of its use as an "ethical dative".

At any rate, the Hittite treatment of the particles in general **demonstrates** that one can speak of a basic underlying mental system or attitude governing language change as a whole. If one element exhibits an alteration, it is very likely, perhaps even to be assumed, that the same sort of rearrangement of values will take place in **other** aspects of the language. The mentality of the speakers **influences** the way they talk, and how they talk influences the **mentality** of the speakers. This is shown in the modern languages themselves: for instance, the different interpretations of *-za nah-*, depending on the scholar's mother tongue, are a case in point (§2.15.3). One sees things according to one's language habits.

Why MH, and apparently also late LH, were drawn to a more literal outlook is of course not known to us: it may be that the

political situation favored it or that cultural innovations at the time promoted it. But it seems a fact that the language changed in a unified manner, and took on those particular general characteristics which can be seen in detail in specific features such as the particles, and the attendant syntactic constructions. Since these happen to be fundamental to the language, one may indeed speak of a master mental plan underlying the changes which occurred in Hittite. In this it is no different from any other language. It is quite reasonable to look at other Hittite linguistic features, as for instance at the verbs, for further evidence of the same mental attitudes at work.

the inanimate third persons: the particle is probably included for "emphasis" in those cases, probably to underline the current importance of the subject and his/its existence. A general statement, for instance, that someone in his lifetime was a hero, does not qualify for *-za*, even if this is viewed as an important, inherent or basic quality.

I would suggest that the function of *-za* is to indicate that the subject is engaged in the activity of "being" whatever he is at that juncture, as opposed to a general descriptive statement of what he is, or was, or could be, over a period of time. This is a natural consequence of emphasizing the subject with respect to the verb: a sense of an active involvement of the subject in the verbal content is bound to creep in. It is unlikely to be a primary sense of the particle, however. This is a very subtle nuance, and very difficult to detect, if we are correct. But when the same phrase appears now with, now without particle, apparently with intention, it is clear that we are dealing with a delicate shade of expression.

It seems that *-za* does express an active involvement on the part of the subject in whatever situation he happens to be in. Obviously some of the states he can have no control over, such as being a child. Nevertheless, he is actively going through the phase, doing things in a particular way as a consequence of being in that state. If this analysis is correct, it would make it easier to explain why the first person regularly appears with the particle, the second almost as regularly, and the third rarely. A first person narration almost always throws the subject into the position of doing whatever happens to be occurring, because he is actively living it. The second person is often seen as having the same relative control over his condition, especially with imperatives: he has actively to go through being My Sun's vassal, or king someplace, and so forth. The third person, however, is much more likely to be described from the outside, with the narrator, rather than the subject himself, as the reference point. An outside observer naturally sees the subject more readily as simply being a certain thing or in a certain condition, without any interest in how it affects him (the subject), or what his active part in it was.

We shall test out with other verbs whether or not there seems to be any truth in these suppositions.

§2.2 *kis-* 'to become' has a partially parallel use to *es-*: (*kis-* and *kikkis-* are discussed in Neu (1) p. 89-98).

§2.2a QH

We have no extant examples of *kis-* with *-za* in Old Hittite. In the copied Telipinus Edict, even the expression DINGIR^{LIM}-*is kis-* does not have particle (I 63-4 (*kikkis-*), II 4). See also II 36ff. for other phrases with *kis-/kikkis-*.

§2.2b MH

(72) *nu-mu É-YA inani piran pittuliyas É-ir kisat*
nu-mu pittuliyai piran istanzas-mis tamatta pedi zappiskizzi
nu MU-ti meniyas armalas mahhan nu-za ukk-a QATAMMA
kishat kinuna-mu-ssan inan pittuliyass-a makkesta nat
siuni-mi tuk memiskimi

"my house, because of the sickness, has become a house of misery, and because of the misery, my spirit is leaking to another place. As a man (who) is sick throughout the year, I too have become thus: now the sickness and misery have multiplied on me, and I am telling it to you, my god." (XXX 10 Rs 14-17).

See XXXI 127+ III 2-4 (parallel just to 16-19, poss. to 15).

The alternation between *kis-* with and without particle in this quote is very interesting. Obviously the distinction in meaning Friedrich suggests for *kis-* with and without particle (see §1b.1 above) is not quite fine-tuned enough. In this q., in fact, both occurrences seem to mean "become", but only one has the particle. The one with the verb in the first person, to be precise.

(73) *kas-wa IM-as mahhan «mahhan» wappui EGIR-pa UL*
paizzi kappani-ya-wa harkieszi UL nu-war-at-za damai
NUMUN-an UL kisari ...

"as this mud is not going back to the bank again, and cardomum does not become white or become another seed ..." (Mast. III 2-5). Here is a nice example of *kis-* with particle in the third person.

fact, this behavior of *hark-* requires a treatment on its own; it is not my purpose to go into the matter in this work.

Finally, it nevertheless could be argued that by the end of Hittite (even by early LH) the speakers had drawn the analogy and did consider *-za* to have an accusative function. It might seem even likely, given the apparent linguistic climate at the time. But XVI 16 (q. 434 above) is a late LH text, and still has *-smas* with *warpanzi*. In fact, in that text too, despite its late date, we still find a precise parallelism drawn between the "accusative" and "dative" uses of the particle: the whole phrase reads *warpanzi-ma-wa-smas UL TÚG^{HIA}-ya-wa-smas-kan UL arha arranzi* "they do not wash themselves, nor do they clean out their clothing". Nothing seems to have changed much from the early Hittite of q. 14.

I would suggest, however, that the scene has been set for changes in the function of *-za*, by the end of LH, and that we in fact can see the beginning of the transformation, in the "literal dative" examples from that period. The examples from e.g. Anniwiyaniš, or even the text of q. 378, may represent the infancy of this trend.

For the "accusative" sense of *-za*, consider e.g. the locution *-za IGI^{HIA}-wa nai-* (q.s 310-311) in both the middle, and the active which is parallel to *-an IGI^{HIA}-wa nai-*. It seems in fact, from q. 310, and the various MH locutions describing 'turning (intransitive)', that this latter sense was generally expressed, at least until Mursilis II, with the middle, and that the use of the active in the phrase was a secondary development. We do not have an example of the plain transitive use *-an IGI^{HIA}-wa nai-* with a middle; it is legitimate to suppose that it was not used in this meaning. There were differences made, in short, between the subject-oriented phrase, expressed with the middle and only secondarily with the active, and the purely transitive locution that did not take *-za*, and had no connection to the middle. *-za* and *-an*

are in fact not quite parallel yet, though the (putative) increasing use of the active in phrases of this kind in late LH, with *-za*, might in time have led to a perception of *-za* as the equivalent of *-an*. I am not clear that such a revaluation of *-za* had happened yet, by the end of LH (it doesn't seem that it had, from the behavior of the verbs of body care), but if not, one may surmise that it was on the way.

The apparently backwards progression, from the abstract to the concrete, in the use of *-za* in fact raises some interesting questions about the development of Hittite as a language, as well as thoughts on the nature of language change. Take the local particles of OH, covered in Boley 4), Chapter 2. The less specific or less literal use of *-za* which appears to be the norm in OH fits in quite well with the general structure of the language at that time, as for instance the function of the OH particles shows. We take the use of *-asta* as an example: the other particles have a similar behavior.

-asta is found in a 'comparative' sense (Boley 4) q. 71), in phrases like *tusta sara tumeni* (Boley 4) q. 9), and in the expression 'draw the curtain', which in Boley 4) q. 101 has the particle, but in a very similar passage from another text does not. The particle seems, in these and other cases (e.g. Boley 4) q. 94), simply to reinforce or complement the sense of the verb or some other element in the clause, and could be, and in fact is, often omitted. It was apparently in the process of developing an idiom with the simple *da-* which had repercussions in later Hittite, but it still had a tendency not to be bound into regular expressions, and to be included to express a subtle nuance.

Progressing into MH, we find that the behavior and development of *-za* and of the local particles is also very similar. For the latter, it appeared that the burden of expressing local concepts was shifted to the postposition/preverbs (the place words or PWs, as we dubbed them), and the particles themselves were gradually phased out in favor of the generalization of *-kan* (see Bo-

nu kisan mematteni kuin-wa-nnas imma sara dummeni
nu-wa-nnas apas UL imma DUMU EN-ENI...

"If an evil ever befalls the king, the king has many brothers, and you do as follows: (you go to someone else) and say thus 'whomever we take to ourselves (to be king), is not that one the son of our lord?'..." (Ob. I 17-23).

Again, the distinction made by Friedrich does not appear to hold here: *kisari* has *-za*, but apparently means "happens". The same is true of the following two q.s:

(80) man UD.KAM ABI-ŠU AMA-ŠU kuedanikki GÍD.DA-as
nu-za kuit GIM-an kisari nu apat kuiski memai
lenganut-wa-mu kuis nu-wa karu halliya uehtat nu-war-at
UL namma kuitki nu-wa-za ke INIMMEŠ kedani mehuni para
namma memahhi

"if someone's father and mother's life is long, and something ever happens, and someone says this: 'the person who put me under oath is dead (???), so that doesn't matter any more: let me tell these things at this time'" (Ob. III 14-22).

Also PHO IV 14-15.

(81) nu-mu DIŠTAR GAŠAN-YA EGIR-an tiyat nu-mu
memiskit GIM-an kisat-ya-za nu-za DIŠTAR GAŠAN-YA para
handandatar apiya-ya mekki tekkussanut

"And Sausga my mistress supported me, and as she told me, so it turned out, and there also she showed great favor (to me)" (Hatt. IV 16-19).

In the meaning "become":

(82) nasma-za kues ENMEŠ DUMUMEŠ LUGAL-ya nu-za ŠA
MAMETI le kuiski kuedani[kki] kisari [k]uis-ma-za ŠA MAMETI
kued[an][kki] kisari nat GAM-an NIŠ DINGIRLIM GAR-ru

"(You) who are lords and sons of My Sun, let noone become vassal to anyone (else); whoever becomes vassal to anyone else, let it lie under the oath" (PHO III 3-6).

(83) nu-za DUMU.LUGAL esun nu-za GAL MEŠEDI kishahat
GAL MEŠEDI-ma-za LUGAL URU^{hakpissa} kishahat LUGAL

URU^{hakpis}-ma-za LUGAL.GAL namma kishahat

"I was a prince, and I became head of the MEŠEDI; from head of the M. I became king of Hakpis; from king of Hakpis, I became Great King" (Hatt. IV 41-3).

See also Hatt. III 12-13.

-za DINGIRLIM-is *kis-* is a very common phrase. However, in the *sallis wastais* texts, the expression occurs several times, both with and without particle. Contrast e.g. XXX 16+ I 1-2: man URU^{hattusi} *sallis wastais kisari nassu-za* LUGAL-us nasma MUNUS.LUGAL-as DINGIRLIM-is *kisari* with I 6: DINGIRLIM-is-ma-as kuedani UD-ti *kisari* "when a great sin occurs in Hattusas. (i.e.) either a king or a queen becomes a god"/"on the day that (s)he becomes a god". (Note in passing the lack of *-za* with *kis-* in man URU^{hattusi} *sallis wastais kisari*). See also XXXIX 6 III 14-15 for an example without particle. If these are truly MH texts (or at least antedate late LH, though they are in late script), one might wish to see the use without particle as a feature of the earlier language. At any rate, by Mursilis II the particle was apparently a regular inclusion (see e.g. q. 127). Cf. then from late LH:

(84) mahhan-ma-za ABU-YA ^{Imursilis} DINGIRLIM-is kisat
ŠEŠ-YA-ma-za-kan INIR.GAL-is ANA GIŠGU.ZA ABI-ŠU esat
ammuk-ma-za ANA PANI ŠEŠ-YA EN KARAŠ kishahat

"when my father died, my brother sat himself on the throne of his father and I became commander of the army before my brother" (Hatt. I 22-4).

We note VI 34 I. 5-6: man-ma ANA DUTUŠI uwatar GIM-a[n
]nas-za EGIR-pa QATAMMA nuntaras DÜ-ri["if as the coming"
was [swift] for My Sun, he will come back equally swiftly".

§2.2d Comments:

kis- appears to occur with *-za* much more regularly than *es-*. It seems clear that *-za* originally called attention to the transformation indicated by *kis-*: it in fact usually seems to signal a radical visceral change, in terms of the subject. Obviously, therefore the first phrase with *kis-* in q. 72 above does not indic-

We are left with the question as to whether the particle with *iskizzi* was already viewed as literal, that is, grammatically the exact reflexive equivalent of an anaphoric pronoun.

We then find the particle "governed" by, or at least connected with, PWs, as in q. 283 (the copied B.U.). In Anniwiyani, a copied late MH or perhaps early LH text (B.U. is probably slightly older than Anniwiyani), we find *nu-za KASKAL-an EGIR-an tarmanzi* "they peg the road behind them" (II 18). Compare the syntax in *pirann-a-za UR.TUR ... huinumeni* "we drive the puppy before us" (I 30-1).

The bulk of the literal dative examples, mentioned under §3c.2a above, range from early to late LH. This is not fortuitous: LH represents the flowering of the PW + V combinations that resemble our slang, a lot of them phrasal verbs, that is, expressions which require a noun phrase in an oblique case to complete them. For example, *piran katta dai* in its literal use means 'set down before (someone/thing)'; obviously without a dative the expression makes no sense. The PW + V syntagm may have then been extended to a metaphorical meaning 'take under advisement, investigate', but it still requires a dative. It is natural therefore that the pronouns should occur in connection with these expressions with greater frequency, and *-za* seems to parallel them.

But it is peculiar that the "literal dative" examples of *-za*, certainly the early ones, should be so few, in comparison with the enormous variety and number of verbs that take *-za* in some version of an "ethical dative" sense (category b) above). One begins to wonder whether one is isolating something that is not there. One becomes increasingly uncomfortable when it turns out that most of these "literal dative" examples could conceivably be analyzed as having some version of the "ethical dative" function themselves.

We determined *-za* was literal in the examples in §3c.2a mainly because there were alternations between our particle and an enclitic anaphoric pronoun. Of course, it is necessary to consider what the function of that corresponding anaphoric pronoun is. The verbs of category a) are phrasal verbs, where the pronoun is part of the initial cluster, usually separated from the 'compound' verb at the end of the clause. Can we say the pronoun is strictly speaking governed by the postposition/preverb?

As discussed in Boley 2) §C.2, D.2, basing ourselves on the syntax, we found that the enclitic pronouns had a certain degree of autonomy in such "compound verbs". A comparison with the behavior of the full NP dative suggests that a separated dative was not strictly speaking "governed" by the PW of the compound, but rather stood in some looser relation to the whole phrasal verb (see Boley 2), especially the very interesting MH q. 66, and the whole behavior of the phrasal verbs in LH, §D.2). This analysis is reinforced by the fact that we naturally have many examples of a full NP dative governed by a PW, but only a very few analogous cases with an enclitic dative pronoun (see e.g. Boley 2) q. 62). Our particle must have an even looser relation with the PWs: no such cases are documented at all with *-za*, to my knowledge. I think it is fairly clear that *-za*'s base use is not that of a 'literal' dative. It is however probably beginning to take on as literal a function with the LH phrasal verbs, as the enclitic anaphoric pronouns with which it alternates.

As for the "accusative" use of *-za*, note that *-za iskizzi* occurs in the same passage as the middle *nas-za arskitta* "he washes himself". Apparently the verbs of washing, which are of the same category as *isk-* above, were still in the transition stage of coupling *-za* with the middle (see §3a.2-3 above for more discussion of this), at this early stage of MH.

The sense of a long-term or permanent appropriation turns up mainly in the Laws, though cf. also (probably):

KBo XVII 22 III 5-7 (StBoT 25 #124): // *nu-za labarnas LUGAL-us utn[e(-)] talugaus das nu la[arna-] talugaes palhaes as[antu]*

"L. the king took the long [x-s?? from?] the land and let them (?) be long and broad for (?) L."

In the OH version A of Tablet 1 of the Laws (KBo VI 2), there is considerable variation. Note for instance:

(88) [t]akku LÚ.U₁₉.LU-as SAG.DU-ZU kuiski hunikzi karu 6 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR piskir huninkanza 3 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR dai ANA É.GAL 3 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR da<s>ker kinuna LUGAL-us ŠA É.GAL^{LIM} pessit nu-za hunikanza-pat 3 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR dai "If someone wounds a person's head, they used to give 6 shekels of silver: the wounded person takes 3 shekels of silver, they used to take 3 shekels of silver into the palace. Now the king has abolished (the portion) of the palace, and the wounded person takes 3 shekels of silver" (Laws A+ §9).

Note §80, with two cases of "take" in the sense of a long-term appropriation: A does not have the particle at all, but B has it in one case. The reverse occurs in §43: A and the copy C have -za, but B doesn't.

B itself shows variation in §74 (a paragraph not represented in A): it shows two examples of *da-* with particle, but one, with the same meaning, without. Cf. the end of that paragraph: *ammel-pat-wa-za GUD-un dahhi GUD-ŠU dai* "(if the owner of the ox says thus:) 'I just am taking my ox (back)', he takes his ox". It is interesting that the -za in the first clause might refer to *ammel*, i.e. the subject might be using -za to indicate a personal relationship between himself and elements in the clause; on the other hand, one could adduce the same rationale for including it in the second clause, but -za is not present. The fact that the same basic sense can be expressed with or without -za reminds one of the Italian (*me*) *lo porto via*, which we discuss under q. 293 and in §3c.1. -za seems to be on the same level as the Italian pronoun.

A further has the particle in §21 and §23, but not in §53 (bis).

Without particle, in two meanings: 'appropriate, take permanently' and 'take to wife':

(89) takku ĪR-as GÉME-an dai nu-za [DUMUMEŠ ien]z[i(i)] man É-ŠUNU sar[(ranzi)] assu-smet hanti h[anti?] sarr[(a)]nzi mekkus [DUMUMEŠ GÉME-as dai] Û 1 DUMUAM ĪR-as dai

"If a slave takes a slave girl and they have children; if they divide the house (i.e. separate (?)), they divide their goods equally (?); the slave girl takes most of the children; the slave takes one child" (Laws A §"33").

Similar, A §"32a", also very broken; the restorations are made up.

But cf. in the copied Laws:

takku LÚ-as ELLUM GÉME-ass-a selies nat andq aranzi nan-za ANA DAM-ŠU dai nu-za É-ir Û DUMUMEŠ ienzi appizziann-at-kan nassu idalauessanzi nasma-at-kan harpantari nu-za É-ir taksan sarranzi DUMUMEŠ-az LÚ-as dai 1 DUMUAM MUNUS-za dai

"if a free man and a slave are x and they come to an agreement (?) and he takes her to wife and they make a house and children, finally (however) either they fight or they come to an agreement and split the house, the man takes the children, the woman takes one child" (Laws §31).

See also e.g. the copied §32-3.

-za *da-* in this sense of "take to wife" probably turns up in the (original OH) Zalpa narrative:]-us-za neku^S-summus daskeuen[i "[x] we are taking our sisters (to wife)!" (Zalpa Vs 19). Whether the particle is present because the objects are relatives of the subject, or because of *da-*, is not certain. But probably the verb calls forth the particle: note Vs 16-17 (quoted in §2.7a), where the mother is undoubtedly not recognizing her sons; [hante]zzias DUMUMEŠ niku^S-smus natta ganessir "the older sons did not recognize their sisters" (Vs 18) (-za is probably not present); and UMMANI-san uemiyauen "we have found our mother" (Vs 14), without particle (however one takes (-)san: either as the particle -san or, with Starke (ZA 69 (1979), 51⁸), as *su-an. This last is actually a nice suggestion, although it would require reading (-)san as detached from UMMANI, which does not seem to be the way it is written on the tablet; see also KBo XXII 2).

particle. Cf. also *tagganiya-ta-mu-za-pa* and [a ep "[take?] me to your bosom", of HAB III 72. We note that the particle is always an optional inclusion in these cases, and could be taken out without disturbing the sense or syntax of the passage.

As for the latter, contrast the use of *pai-* 'give' in q.s 190 and 341. The verb *kanes-* does not take the particle in q. 341, even though the text is undoubtedly stating that the mother did not recognize her own sons. See also the passages from the Zalpa narrative quoted under q. 89; further the comments on *kuen-* in the copied Telipinus Edict, §2.17. In particular, on I 68, Ammunas kills his father Zidantas, without *-za*. The injunction not to kill your own family has *-za* on II 45, but on II 7, someone kills someone *else's* family, with *-za*. The discussions of doing evil to brothers and sisters (II 46, 50), and Zuru's 'sending' (*piet*) of his own son to do something (II 5-6), do not take particle. It is of interest that Anittas has not one example of *-za*, even though the text speaks of someone leaving his country (Rs 66), Anittas himself bringing booty back to "his city" Nesa (Rs 60 ff.), and so forth.

We have some examples of *-za* simply marking the subject's relationship with personal things mentioned in the clause, from copied early texts like Illuyanka, but it is hard to know how accurately they reflect true OH usage. Cf. at any rate:

(435) *zigg-a-war-asta* GIŠ *luttanza arha le autt[i] maⁿ-war-asta arha-ma autti nu-wa-za* DAM-KA DUMUMES³-KA *autti*

"You, don't look out of the window! If you look out, you will see your wife and children" (XVII 6+ I 19-22). See e.g. also *-za[n?]* ... É-ir *uetet*, I 14-15: the particle is probably there only because Inaras is building his own house.

-za tends to form more regular expressions with many verbs, as time goes on. In many of these cases, the verb without *-za* appears to mean something different from the verb with *-za*: the nuance provided by the particle has crystallized into a new meaning for the verb. In fact, we can see that particular meanings favor the use of *-za*, no matter what verb is used to express them. Though of course there is no iron consistency in the use of the particle.

Examples are:

in the nuance of 'possession, control': *da-* 'appropriate' (q.s 92, 96, 97, 110 ff.); *tarh-* (§2.3c.3), which allegedly means 'be able to' without particle, 'conquer' with it, but there is variation; *es-* 'sit' in the meaning 'occupy'; in the nuances 'check' and 'acknowledge': *aus-* 'watch (out), check', and the similar *kappuwai-* et al. (§2.7b.3, q. 248ff.); *aus-*, *sek-* and the MH *kanes-* 'acknowledge' (q.s 237, 252, 255, 262ff.); (*para/pariyan*) *mema-*, other verbs of 'telling, witnessing' like *kutruwah-* (q. 208ff., 227), and their opposite *karus(siya)-* (§2.6c.5); *-za aus-* with dreams (q. 253ff.) and *halzai-* in the meaning 'call (someone by a name)' (q.s 197ff., 213ff.); "make vows, prayers"; "perform festivals" (*arkuwar*, etc., *iya-*, *mald-*, etc. (§2.5c.2, 5, 6; q. 196 ff.)).

Some of the expressions appear to have acquired *-za* permanently. Examples: *has-* 'bear (children)' (§2.5c.3); *mimma-*, which in OH (q.s 190, 191) apparently had the particle in the meaning 'reject (someone)', but not in 'refuse (to do something)' (exactly the opposite use to *rifiutare/rifiutarsi*, *weigern/sich weigern!*), is not usually found without particle in later Hittite. Neither is the similar locution *UL mema-*.

c) Verbs with which we perceive an accusative use of the particle. The principal group of verbs in this class are those relating to care of the body or one's person in general (§2.16).

Note also *-za* with *hark-* in q. 102 ff.; the possibly OH *walh-* (q. 14); *zikk-* 'attack, set on' (q. 317); and the frequency with which the idioms 'begin (to do)' take *-za*, with *zikk-*, etc. (q.s 232, 318), *ep-* (under q. 122 and q. 243), and even *dai-* itself in MH (q. 228). These last also suggest an accusative use of the particle, at least in our interpretation of their rationale (i.e. through the meaning 'set oneself (to doing something)'). But q. 317 has an accusative object, which renders this analysis difficult. See also q. 319.

noone shall 'let him forth'. If he with his wives and children has appropriated something, they 'let him forth'" (XIII 9 II 3-8 (C)). The *hark*-form with *-za* also turns up on IV 7. Note that *wastas* apparently takes the particle. We assume this is because the grammatical subject of the clause is a body part of the subject of the entire passage. See in fact Mitas Vs 36: *nu¹ mitas mekki kuit wasiaskit* "because M. repeatedly sinned greatly", and Rs 2.

Mitas contributes a case of *daya-* 'steal' with particle in a similar use to what we have seen for *da-* above:

(95) *nu-za KASKAL-si EGIR-an LÚ MUNUS DUMU.NITA DUMU.MUNUS ÌR GÉME GUD UDU... le kuiski dayazzi*
 "on the road let noone steal a man, woman, man-/woman-child, servant, maidservant, cattle, sheep, etc." (Mitas Rs 55-6).

These phrases with *-za da-* are extremely common, and occur in all kinds of texts. There is still some fluctuation at this period, though by Madduwattas the use with particle appears to have stabilized. In Mast. A III 44, *-za* appears with *da-*. B II 54 doesn't have the particle; however it may have it in another phrase of this kind immediately following. It appears that Bo 6342 x+7 has a similar phrase with a particle, where A does not (III 49).

The following passage also will show that at this stage of Hittite, perhaps in archaizing rituals (the date and provenance of this text is not clear), the appropriation indicated by *-za da-* could still be short:

(96) *nu-za LÚAZU GÜB-laz kisraz MUŠEN.GAL dai kunnaza-ma-as-[kan?/-za?] kisraz DUGahrushiyaz GIŠERIN sara dai nasta Ì.GIŠ ANA DUGGAL ME anda zapnuzi... nu-ssan GIŠERIN katta ANA DUGG[AL ME] dai nu-za DUGGAL ME sara dai nu watar ANA DINGIR^{LIM} menahhanda lahui*
 "the magician takes a rooster with his left hand; with his right hand he takes the cedar up from the *a.*; he dribbles wood oil into the pitcher of water, etc., and he puts the cedar down on the pitcher of water and picks up the pitcher of water and pours water before the deity" (KBo XXI 33 I 17-22 (C?)).

We have passages in the MH original IBoT I 36 in which the LÚMEŠMEŠEDI or GIŠGIDRU-wantes take spears, or staves, *only* for the duration of the ritual - this action is described by *-za da-*. See e.g. II 31, III 43, 50. The same applies to *ep-* in q. 98 below

The particle appears also with the *hark*-form of the verb:

(97) *nassu dammishan kuiski kuitki harzi nasma-za dan kuiski kuitki harzi nasma-za happiran kuiski kuitki harzi nasma ARÀH kuiski kinuwan harzi nasma-za-kan GUD LUGAL kuiski kuran harzi nasma-kan ARÀH^{HI.A} kuiski sara adan harzi nu-za GIŠHUR^{HI.A} GÜB-las-ma harninkan harzi nat-za EGIR-an kappui // nasma-kan ANA SAG.GÉME.ÌRMES kuiski kuitki arha dan harzi nan auwariyas EN-as epdu*
 "if someone has damaged anything, or someone has taken anything or someone has sold anything, or someone has broken open a granary, or someone has killed an ox of the king, or someone has eaten up the granaries or evilly destroyed documents, take note of him. Or if someone has taken something away from the servants, let the lord of the watch take him" (B.-M. IV A i4-22).
 Note that 'take away from', namely *-kan arha da-*, as evidenced by l. 21 above, does not take *-za*.

§2.3b.2 With *ep-*:

(98) *nu LUGAL-us man GIŠGIGIR uekzi LÚMEŠEDI-ma GIŠGU.ZA pedai [] nat dai nu-za LUGAL-us GIŠGIGIR epzi*
 "When the king requires the chariot, a bodyguard brings the throne and sets it and the king takes the chariot" (IBoT I 36 III 55-6).

See also passim in the Tunnawi ritual, e.g. IV 7: *namma-za-kan² GUD usantarin SI epzi* "she takes the fertile cow by the horn".

The MH equivalent of the OH q.s in §2.3a.2 above:

(99) *nast[a LÚMEŠ MEŠED]I... para uwanzi nu-za LÚMEŠMEŠEDI ŠA LÚMEŠEDI^{Ehili} petan appanzi*
 "the bodyguards come out (again) and take their place in the courtyard of the bodyguards" (IBoT I 36 I 8-9).
 Possibly *-za* is included here also because the bodyguards are in their own court.

represent states or rather processes of mind. In Italian we also find that a lot of these verbs relate to body functions, such as *addormentarsi*, *svegliarsi*, etc., concepts for which German tends to use an intransitive verb. This can in fact apply to processes of mind too: cf. e.g. Italian *pentirsi*, German *bereuen*, and *spaventarsi*, discussed below.

The matter becomes considerably more complicated. For instance, *svegliare* and *rallegrare/freuen* are plain transitive verbs, but when the reflexive pronoun is added to them, they cannot really be said to conform to the use we mentioned above, where the object of the verb just happens to be the subject. In fact, the reflexive sense is not literal: the subject is not waking or cheering himself. This pairing of simple transitive verbs with intransitive reflexive verbs is not as common in German as in Italian: German tends to be like English and to express intransitive and transitive senses with the same verb (though sometimes differentiating between a strong verb for the intransitive sense and a weak verb for the transitive use). See e.g. *erschrecken*, discussed below.

Consider also the transitive *battere* 'beat, *prügeln*'. We have seen the reciprocal *battersi*, but the same reflexive verb can also mean just 'fight, go to battle'. *spaventare* means 'scare (someone)', *spaventarsi* means 'take fright'. Cf. *innamorarsi*, German *sich verlieben*, and hosts of other verbs. If the reflexive sense were literal, one would expect that *battersi* would mean 'fight oneself', *spaventarsi* 'scare oneself', *innamorarsi* 'fall in love with oneself' or 'make oneself in love'. This is patently absurd. We already mentioned, in connection with Hittite *armahh-* (§2.16.2), that *ingravidare*, a simple transitive verb, means 'make (a woman) pregnant'; *ingravidarsi* means 'become pregnant'. Obviously this expression could not possibly be taken literally: by no stretch of the imagination can the woman be managing this feat on herself! Even English, which is generally depressingly literal about its reflexive pronouns, has a locution like *enjoy oneself*. Of course, early English had quite a number of reflexive expressions, but they

have been eliminated: *I fear me*, *I repent me*, *I bethink me*, and so forth.

It is clear that the reflexive pronoun is being used as a tool to express concepts that in fact are in the province of the ancient middles. When a given process works on or in the subject, the reflexive pronoun is used to mark the fact, and its sense is not to be taken literally.

Apart from the 'literal' use of the particle outlined in the beginning of this section, in these surrogate middles the inclusion of the pronouns is clearly not haphazard. There are apparently different categories of verbs for which the reflexive pronouns are appropriate. One is mental states or processes, documented briefly above. Another relates to processes of the body, for which we also gave a few examples. Yet a third, represented above by *battersi*, includes simple activities, in which however the verb focusses on the subject rather than on his environment. These usually involve some mental effort on the part of the subject. For instance, the pair *rifiutare/rifiutarsi* is a case in point. Both involve action, choice, decision on the part of the subject. But with the transitive verb the object claims equal attention with the subject: the verb essentially represents an interaction between them. The reflexive verb, on the other hand, highlights the verbal content solely in terms of the subject, and thus intensifies our appreciation of his activity, intent, mental effort, or what have you, in the choice and action that he takes.

In Italian, in fact, the pronouns are basically associated with verbs that involve some transformation or activity in the subject. Indeed, with the simple inclusion of a reflexive pronoun, one can signal the difference between a stative and a transformative meaning. Consider e.g. *la macchina è rotta* as against *la macchina si è rotta*. Another instance: *aver paura* or *temere* are stative equivalents of *spaventarsi*, and they are without pronoun. (Of course, no mental condition is entirely stative). German, however, has roughly the opposite: *sich fürchten* for *temere/aver paura*, but

relative. As can be seen, in fact, in q. 106, the subject takes *-za*, but My Sun in a parallel phrase does not. In q. 107, the lord does not rate *-za*, but when the same phrase is applied to a brother, *-za* appears.

(106) *nu-za man tuel mahhan ANA SAG.DU-KA . . . genzu harsi ŠUHĪ.A-us-za arahzanda harsi nu man ANA SAG.DU DUTUŠI . . . gimzu QATAMMA UL harsi ŠUHĪ.A-KA-ya-mu arahzanda QATAMMA UL harsi pirann-a-tta ŠA DUTUŠI UL wahnawan harzi*

"if as you have care for your own head . . . and hold your hands around (it), if you do not have care in the same way for the head of the king . . . and do not also hold your hands around me, and the (affairs) of the king have not 'turned' before you" (SV Huqq I 22-6).

(107) *ANA BELI-ma-at-san le iezzi ANA ŠEŠ-ya-at-zan . . . le iyazi masgann-a-za le kuiski dai DINAM sarazzi katterahhi le katterra sarazyahi le kuit handan apat issa*
 "let him not do (a case) for his lord; let him not do it for his brother, etc.. Let noone take bribes (?). Let him not lower the upper (i.e. righteous) case; let him not raise the lower one. What is right, do that!" (B.-M. A III 25-8).

Note that in Boley 4), l. 26 was parsed by me as containing *masgannaz-a*. In view of the usual use of *da-* with *-za*, the above reading is undoubtedly correct. See in fact also *nu-za maskan da[i]* (KBo XVI 25 I 9 (20: Rizzi-Mellini)).

§2.3c LH

We find that the LH use is essentially the same as that in MH:

§2.3c.1 Without particle:

(108) *GIM-an-ma-kan ŠEŠ-YA ĪNIR.GÁL-is uttar katta austa nu-mu-kan HUL-lu uttar katta UL kuitki asta nu-mu EGIR-pa das nu-mu-kan KARAŠ ANŠE.KUR.RAMES ŠA KUR URUhatti ŠU-i dais*

"When my brother M. looked into the matter and there was no trace of an evil thing in me whatsoever, he took me back and put the army and cavalry of Hatti in my hand" (Hatt. I 61-4).

(109) *nu-wa-tta ABU-YA sara das nu-wa-du-za LÚHATANU iyat*

"My father took you up and made you his son-in-law" (AM p. 72, XIV 15//16 IV 39-40).

This is very common: see e.g. q.s 53, 178, etc.

There is clearly the same rationale for the presence of *-za* in the idiom 'make (someone) a son-in-law' as in (*-za*) *da-* with the meaning 'take to wife' (q. 117). See also under q. 117, q. 118.

But with *-za*:

-za sara dan hark- has the particle in SV Kup §7 C 12-13: its sense telescopes the two expressions in the above passage.

In SV Huqq, however, the idiom has the meaning 'undertake':

nasma-mu-za man LÚ URUhatti namma kuiski idalu menahhanda sara dai

"or if some Hittite undertakes evil in my regard" (SV Huqq II 32-3).

Note the difference (cf. also Werner (StBoT 4 p. 16 n.13)) between the simple *daskinun* and *-za dasganun* in the following:

(110) *KUŠKA.TAB.ANŠE-wa-za . . . LIBIR.RAMES dasganun URUDUISPARDU . . . GIBILMES kuw[api?] udanzi nu-wa GIBILMES ŠA LUGAL saklai da[sk]inun LIBIR.RAMES-ma-wa-mu masiwan ZI-anza nu-wa-za apenissan dasganun*

"I appropriated (for my own use) old asses' halters, etc.; the new bits, etc., that came in, I accepted the new ones of the king according to the custom. But the old ones, as far as I wished, I took" (XIII 35+ I 39-44 (StBoT 4 p. 6)).

This use of *da-* with *-za* is very frequent in the StBoT 4 texts; however, we find cases in which *-za* is omitted: e.g. XIII 35+ IV 6 (p. 12), XIII 33 II 10 (p. 34). Note also the alternation between *taya-* 'steal' with *-za*, Bo 5503 Rs 8-9 (StBoT 4 p. 30), but without *-za*, XIII 33 II 18-20 (StBoT 4 p. 34).

See also *-za anda da-* in q. 57.

the Hittite reflexive pronoun, and the Italian equivalent in *ingravidare/ingravidarsi*.

ed- and *aku-* take the particle quite regularly after OH.

Note finally the alternation e.g. between the two examples of *hullai-*, q.s 15, 16, both LH. It is clear that *-za* does not mark a difference in idiom with this verb. Again, the particle seems to contribute a heightened sense of the subject's involvement, or the effect of the verbal content on the subject.

With all these verbs, to conclude, *-za* seems to indicate not exactly reflexivity, but rather that the subject has some active interest, or makes an active effort or exercise of will, in connection with the verbal content. This can lead to regular phrases with the particle and certain verbs, which we interpret as special idioms of a completely different meaning from the simplex, but it is not clear that the Hittites saw the matter always as quite so black and white. See e.g. §3b.1 above on *-za* with *aus-* and *sek-* in later Hittite.

§3b.4 It is of interest to consider briefly the use of the dative personal pronouns in place of *-za* (one assumes they are not accusatives because of the third persons). To my knowledge, *-mu* is never substituted for *-za*. *-ta* appears once in a while, particularly in imperatives, and, I believe, mainly in (early) MH texts. *-si* is rare. *-nas* and *-smas* (2nd pl.) are the most common, at least from MH on. *-smas* (3rd pl.) occurs in MH (q. 434, under q. 372, over q. 383, e.g.); it seems to become reasonably frequent in late LH.

We note that there are a number of phrases in which *-za* alternates with the personal pronoun:

(430) *gassiyannas-wa-nnas IRMES esuen kinun-ma-wa-tu-za UL IRMES*

"we were voluntary vassals; now we are your vassals no (longer)" (XXIII 1 I 31-2 (the late LH Sausgamuwa Treaty, StBoT 16)).

This alternation occurs regardless of the fact that the pronoun has the function roughly of an "ethical" dative.

With *-za*:

(431) *kasa apedani uddani pidi kus tarpallies karu arandari nu-wa-za kus sikten apus-wa-za namma le sekten*
"behold, for that matter these substitutes have already been provided in his(?) place: recognize these, don't recognize those" (VII 10 I 1-5).

With *-smas*:

(432) *nu-mu kas TI-anza PUH-SU pidi ar[taru] nu-smas UGU-zius DINGIRMES kun sekten*

"let (?) this living substitute stand in for me: you, upper gods, acknowledge this one" (XVII 14 Rs 19-20 (StBoT 3 p. 58)).

Cf. also the alternation between *-za* and *-smas ed-/aku-* of the copied early q. 393, and the probably late LH passage quoted under q. 398.

In some cases, one might consider that *-za* is preferred because the reflexive sense is parallel to an accusative:

(433) *LUMES UR[U(g)]asga-ma halziwani nu-smas NIG.BAHIA piueni namma-as linganumani ANA DISKUR URUnerik-wa [ku]it SISKUR uppiueni nu-wa-z hanzan sumes harten nu-[w]ar-at KASKAL-si le kuiski walhzi*

"we call the Gasgans, and give them gifts, and swear them in: 'the ritual which we are sending to the Stormgod of Nerik, hold yourselves apart (?) and let noone strike it on the road'" (XVII 21+ IV 11-14).

But consider: *apidani-wa-smas-kan UD-ti kuit ha[ss]ikkidumat*
"on the day that you satisfied yourselves (i.e. 'let it all hang out') ...'" (Mast A I 32-3).

Note also the alternation between

(434) *warpanzi-ma-wa-smas UL / warpanzi-ma-wa-az UL*
"they do not wash themselves" (XVI 16 I 28/XVI 34 I 8). with NS

The Hittites do not seem to make a distinction between what we see as an accusative and dative use of *-za*. If they had, we would perhaps expect **warpanzi-us* rather than *warpanzi-...-smas*.

-za vs.
nas -smas
Vakub. 1060f-nt,
420 707bko
nas & smas.
tta u-33i
u2 601520c.

treass in everything held her aegis over me and saved me from everything. She put my enemies, etc., into my hand and I finished them off" (Hatt. I 39-41, 43-50, 57-60).

It is hard to see *-za* here as indicating anything except the goddess's active interest in the proceedings. It is fairly clear that *-za* is not really part of a standard idiom, since it can be omitted with no prejudice to the sense.

The phrase "take to wife":

(117) ANA TUPPI RIKILTİ ŠA ABI-YA-ya-kan kuit kisan
 iyan MUNUS.LUGAL-wa-tta kuin MUNUSTUM DAM-anni pai
 nu-wa INA KUR DU-tassa LUGAL-iznani apel DUMU-ŠU dai
 nu TUPPU RIKILTİ kuwapi ier apun-ma-za MUNUS-an
 I DLAMA-as ANA PANI ABI-YA datta-pat naui kinun-
 ma-za apun MUNUS-an I DLAMA-as man dai man-
 za-an UL dai nu apas memiyas UL dattari kuin-za imma
 DUMU-an I DLAMA malaizzi man-as apel ŠA MUNUSTI
 DUMU-as man-as tamel kuelqa MUNUS-as DUMU-as nu kuis
 DUMU-as ANA I DLAMA ZI-anza kuin-za DUMU-an I DLAMA-as
 malaizzi nu INA KUR URU DU-tassa LUGAL-iznani apun titta-
 nuddu

"Because it is written thus on the treaty tablet of my father: 'whatever woman the queen gives you to wife, make that woman's son king in T.'. But when they made the treaty tablet, K. had not yet taken that woman before my father. Now, whether or not K. takes that woman, that word does not apply: whichever son K. prefers, whether he is son of that woman or of some other woman, whichever son is of a liking to K., whichever son he prefers, let him put that one in as king in T." (B.T. II 84-93).

See also e.g. Hatt. II 84-5.

The equivalent expression with *hark-* 'have to wife' has *-za* in SV Huqq III 27, 63-4. Note also DAM-an-ma-an-za le iyasi "Do not make her your wife" (III 65). DS has the analogous phrase for a woman, namely 'make (a man) one's husband':

(118) man-wa-mu 1-an DUMU-KA paisti man-war-as-mu
 LUMUTI-YA ki [sa]ri IR-YA-ma-wa nuwan para dahhi nu-war-
 an-za-kan LUMUTI-YA iyami

"If you give me one of your sons, he would become my husband. I will not promote one of my servants. I will make him (i.e. Suppiluliumas' son) my husband" (KBo V 6+ III 12-15, DS p. 94). See also IV 6-7.

Huqq (III 33 and passim) also seems to use *-za da-* of (incestuous) sexual relations (see q. 359), though on III 59-60 the particle does not seem to be present.

§2.3c.2 With *ep-*:

See q. 113 above, and the following:

(119) nu-mu ŠEŠ-YA INIR.GÁL-is uiyat INA
 URU pattiyariga-ma kattan dais ERÍNMEŠ-ma-mu
 ANŠE.KUR.RAMEŠ tepawaz pais nu-za ERÍNMEŠ NARARU ŠA
 KUR^{TI} tepawaz GAM-an eppun

"My brother M. sent me; he established me in P., but he gave me few troops and cavalry, so I took along a few relief troops of the country" (Hatt. II 20-2).

As can be seen, English (and German, with *mitbringen*) can translate this adequately without recourse to a locution "along with me". This seems the thrust of *-za*: it is clearly dealing with a compound verb *kattan ep-*, and it does not necessarily have to be taken as a concrete reflexive pronoun in connection with the phrasal verb, but just as indicating that the subject is involved, without being literal. A literal "reflexive" meaning is hard to establish with examples such as this.

Note also

(120) nu-kan kuit kuenir kuit-ma-za-kan anda eppir
 "they killed some of them and brought some in" (KBo V 6+ I 21 (DS p. 91)).

See also *-za anda da-* of q. 57.

We find an interesting idiom with this verb:

(121) nu-za-kan HUR.ŠAGarinnanda eppir
 "they took refuge in Mt. Arinnanda" (AM p. 52, KBo III 4 II 34).

This is a common expression also with *appa*, but *-za* is not always included. Consider the following alternation:

The use of *-za* with the other verbs in MH and LH partially parallels what we have seen for *es-* 'be' and *kis-*; the particle however does not appear to stand in for the pronouns with any verb but *es-*.

It is of interest to observe the form which this use takes:

1) With *da-*, the apparent delicate nuance which we find in OH continues through MH, (cf. under q. 96, where the subjects take spears/staves, with *-za*, for the duration of the ritual), and into LH (q. 111). We seem to find what we have analyzed as the "ethical dative" nuance of OH still in late LH: see q. 116.

However we find that the sense of 'take possession of, appropriate', where the possession lasts, has been strengthened. In fact, it seems to become the most common use of *-za da-* as Hittite progresses. The expression 'take to wife', which represents of course a decisive and lasting 'taking', regularly takes the particle.

-za sara da- occurs in two meanings: 'take up' (analogous to the above use) and 'undertake' (see under q. 109).

ep- still occurs with particle in the phrase 'take (one's place)'; *hark-* still occurs, at least in MH, with the particle not only in the sense 'hold (a place)', but also in the expression 'hold oneself (in a place)', that is, the particle appears to parallel an accusative (q.s 103, 104); see however §3d (Conclusions).

tarh- and other such verbs similar to *da-* also take particle, very regularly. This use may go back to OH: the Telipinus Edict, which unfortunately exists only in a late copy, has one example of *tarh-* with particle (against 3 without!).

2) *es-* 'sit' is not attested with particle in OH, either in the stative meaning 'sit', nor in the transformative use 'sit down, seat (oneself)'. The latter use, however, acquires the particle in MH, and becomes a reasonably regular part of the phrase. A by-meaning 'settle (in a country)' also takes the particle.

The transitive 'occupy (lands, e.g.)' and all the transitive locutions meaning 'settle (a land, etc.)', regardless of verb, appear with *-za*, though not with absolute regularity. Note that the mere building of a city does not call forth the particle; however, when

the mere building of a city does not call forth the particle; however, when someone builds himself a house, *-za* or its surrogate does appear (q. 161).

3) *iya-* 'make, do' adds one idiom to its roster in MH: 'make (someone) of one's oath (i.e. a vassal)'. Most of the locutions involving making someone one's servant, vassal, etc. take the particle. However it is of interest that the middle of *IR-ahh-* (which in the active transitive 'subject' does appear with particle), 'yield (to someone)', does not take the particle (q. 150). Neither does *linganu-* (except in one case in AM, q. 151), but then it means simply 'make to swear'. Though sometimes it does seem to mean 'make to swear allegiance (to the subject)', even though *-za* is not present.

The phrase 'make (someone) one's son-in-law/wife, husband' takes *-za*; we also find 'bear (children)' with *-nas* in place of the particle, in Hattusilis' Apology.

Finally, the various locutions with *iya-* connected with performing rituals, prayers, worship for gods, making vows, and the like, take the particle as a rule. This seems to apply e.g. to the simple verbs *sipant-* and *mald-* as well: without *-za* they mean simply 'sacrifice, libate' and 'recite (incantations, ritual sayings, etc.)', respectively.

4) The *verba dicendi* expand their OH use.

It becomes unusual to find *mimma-* without particle. *halzai-* takes *-za* in the same phrases as in OH. The most important addition to the idioms involving *-za* and these verbs is the use of the particle in the expressions 'confess; bear witness; tattle, broadcast; delegate (sometimes)'. That is, in cases in which the subject exercises his will, in connection with his speech. This category includes also *tarna-*, which however is treated under its own heading, §2.8.2.

The opposite to the *verba dicendi*, namely 'keep, become silent', *karus(siya)-*, also takes the particle when someone is actively hiding or ignoring something, but not when the mere physical act of being silent is described.

5) *aus-* 'see' takes the particle when the effect of the verbal content on the subject is stressed (q.s 229, 231, 244, 245 and §2.7b.4). It does not take particle under normal circumstances.

(127) *nu ara<h>zenas KUR.KUR LUKUR kissan memir
ABU-ŠU-wa-ssi kuis LUGAL KUR hattī esta nu-war-as
UR.SAG-is LUGAL-us esta nu-wa-za KUR.KURMEŠ LUKUR
tarhan harta nu-war-as-za DINGIR^{LIM}-is DÙ-at
DUMU-ŠU-ma-wa-ssi-za-kan kuis ANA GIŠGU.ZA ABI-ŠU esat
nu-wa apass-a karu LUKALA-anza esta nu-war-an irmaliattat
nu-wa-za apass-a DINGIR^{LIM}-is kisat*

"The foreign enemy countries said thus: 'His father who was king of Hatti, he was a hero king, and he had the enemy countries under control, and he died. His son who sat on the throne of his father, he was once a warrior too, but he became sick and he too died'" (AM p. 16-18, KBo III 4 I 9-13).
tarhun with -za, I 28-29.

(128) *nu-za mahhan HUR.SAG arinnandan tarhun namma
EGIR-pa INA IDastarpa uwanun nu-za BAD KARAŠ INA
IDastarpa wahnunun nu-za EZEN₄ MU^{TI} apiya iyanun*

"After I took Mt. A., I went back to the river A., and I 'turned' a fortress on the river A., and I performed the monthly festival there" (AM p. 58-60, KBo III 4 II 46-8).

There are obviously gray areas in the use of -za with this verb: in SV Dup §4 I 16, we find *nu-za lah[hiya]wanzi UL namma iarheskit* "he was not able to go to battle". But cf. §14 D III 4-5: *kun-wa memiyan UL tarhmi nu-war-an UL DU-mi* "I can't manage this thing, and I won't do it".

karp-
(129) *GIM-an-za-kan DUTUŠI URUneriqqan karpzi*
"when My Sun raises (?) Nerik" (V 1 I 53 and passim (no -za, I 78)).

§2.4 *es-* 'sit'

§2.4a This verb is not attested with particle in OH. HW² finds that the active is used for the non-transformative 'sit', the middle for the transformative 'sit down, seat oneself'.

§2.4b MH

In the transformative root meaning "sit down", beginning in MH we find -za attached to the expression. See Neu 1) p. 25-31 for details:

(130) *DUMU-as-san kuwapi katta mauszi [nu]-zan
MUNUS-za GIŠkuppisnas ser esa*

"When the child begins to fall (i.e. to be born), the woman seats herself on the stools" (XXX 29 I. 5-6).

There is in fact a tendency to use -san with or in place of -za. HW² (Bd. 2, Lief. 9-10 p. 103) believes that -za was not usually present with middle and active *es-* in either a transformative or a non-transformative sense in MH or LH. The problem is that most of the examples come from festivals, where the speech seems contaminated by OH models. See e.g. TdH 2 I 9-10 (C), with -za, in a transformative sense.

This verb can appear also in the active:

(131) *nu-zan katta sumenzan parkuwai SIG₅-anti
misr[iwanti] | GIŠŠU.A esten*

"sit down on your clean, good, beautiful throne" (XV 34 II 15-16 (C)).

es- is also used often transitively to mean 'occupy (a country, etc.)'. It occurs with -za in these cases:

(132) *[k]asa-wa-ta KUR HUR.SAG zippasla AD[DIN] nu-wa-za?^{*}
apun-pat esi*

"Lo, I have given you the land of Mt. Z.: settle that (land)!" (Madd Vs 19).

In the copied Appu IV 13ff., we find: *DUTU-us-za
URUUD.KIB.NUN.ME-an es[zi D]30-as-ma-za URUkuzinan es[zi ...*
"the Sungod lives in Sippar, the Moongod lives in Kuzina, etc."

or 'knowing' often takes the particle as well, if the nuance of personal involvement is warranted. The Hittites probably saw no hard-and-fast line between the meanings which to us appear so obviously distinguished from one another; see e.g. the comments on q.s 236 (which shows the same phenomenon for the meaning 'check'), 252.

Further, even in expressions most regularly incorporating *-za*, we generally find cases in which the particle is not included, particularly in LH (the MH examples of this phenomenon are at least sometimes likely perhaps to indicate that the usage was still in a state of flux, so we will not list them). See e.g. the alternations mentioned under q. 55 and in §2.1d; q.s 110 with comments; 116; 121ff. (the idiom 'take refuge' with *ep-*); 139; §2.5c.2 (particularly q. 169ff.); q.s 176; 178-9; §2.5c.6; 205/207; 218-221 (*tepnu-/tepawah-*); 249 (both versions); 253 with comments; 274/275; 305 with comments; 307ff.; 311 (possibly); 337/338; 351ff. (*sarnink-*), particularly q.s 353-4 (with comments); 356 ff.; the behavior of *malai-* discussed in §2.15.2; q.s 364 ff.

The Hittites in fact allowed much more variation than would be possible e.g. with the reflexive pronouns in Romance and German: reflexive verbs in the modern languages cannot drop their pronoun, as a rule. All these facts lead to the conclusion that *-za* is often not as integral to the sense of the particular expression, as we think: *-za* may be used to influence the verb, and to mark it in a particular meaning, but the verb alone could apparently often (even usually?), convey the sense by itself.

Nevertheless, *-za* has developed more of a central function in the language than it appears to have had in OH, though we seem to see the beginnings of such a use already in OH. It is of interest that particular meanings, such as 'appropriate', 'recognize', 'acknowledge', 'check, keep an eye on', 'bear witness', and so on, as a rule take *-za*, regardless of what verb is involved; see also q. 235 with comments. Certain expressions of later Hittite are not found without particle, as *-za has-*; see also the discussion of *-za*

da-, *halzai-* and *mimma-*, e.g., in §2.6c.3. Note finally §3a.3 above on the use of *-za* with middles. The surmised ancient use of simple middles to express reflexivity/orientation to the subject seem to have been reduced in MH, in favor of the use of *-za* with active forms, at least with verbs concretely connected with the subject, like those relating to body care.

§3b.2 There was some change in the use of *-za* from MH to LH, but given the relatively small corpus we have to work with, it is hard to document subtle changes of this kind. For instance, there is always the possibility that a given expression was used both in MH and in LH, but we just don't happen to have texts with that feature from both periods. In other words, we can't necessarily draw the conclusion that if we haven't seen it, it didn't exist.

In the copied Appu text, we find *-za* used with *pai-* 'give' (q. 342) in a way that does not seem to recur in any other text. Since the nuance of the particle seems subtle, that is, more in conformity with OH use than with later more regularized expressions, it is possible to conclude that this is an MH feature that died out. But of course it is not certain. In fact, note the use of *handai-* in a late LH ritual, which may appear similar. À propos of Appu, we note that the substitution of *-san* for *-za*, or perhaps the suppression of *-za* when *-san* is included, seems an MH feature: cf. e.g. the comments on *ses-* in Appu, under q. 29, and §2.7b.4.

The idiom 'begin' to do something, with *dai-/zikk-/tisk-* and the infinitive, takes *-za* in some earlier examples (see q.s 228, 232, 318). This seems to become less frequent in LH, in favor of *dai-* or *tiya-* and the supine, generally of the *sk-*suffixed verb, without particle. We still find the infinitive construction in Mursilis' Annals (KBo IV 4 III 63-4, AM p. 132), but even in that text the usual construction is that with *dai-* or *tiya-*. A similar locution with *-za ep-* and the infinitive however survived to late LH: it is first documented in MH (cf. e.g. XLVII 36 Vs 13: *nu-za sipanduwanzi epzi*; in late MH, with the infinitive *huittiyauanzi*, XV

With -za:

(140) GIM-an-ma uit ŠEŠ-YA kuwapi INA KUR^{mizri} pait
nu-za KUR.KURMEŠ^{kie ke} EGIR-pa asesanunun nu
KARAŠ ANŠE.KUR.RAMEŠ^{kel ŠA} KUR^{TI} ANA ŠEŠ-YA lahhi INA
KUR URU^{mizri} kattan pehutenun

"when my brother went to Egypt, these lands which I had resettled, I brought the troops and cavalry of this land to my brother on the campaign in Egypt" (Hatt. II 69-72; also II 66-7).
But cf. q. 218, without particle.

(141) nu DUMU ŠEŠ-[Y]A ID LAMA sara dahhun nu-za
ŠEŠ-YA INIR.GÁL-is ku[it] AŠRU URU DU-assan parnawaiskit
nan apiya pidi LUGAL-iznanni tittanunun
"I took up the son of my brother, K., and the place of Tarhuntassa which my brother had settled, I made him king in that place" (Hatt. IV 62-4).

The simple "build (a city)" however does not:

(142) nu-mu ŠEŠ-YA INIR.GÁL-is EGIR-anda uit nu
URU^{anziliyan} URU^{tapiqqann-a} uetet nas arha-pat pait
maninkuwann-as-mu UL-pat uit ERINMEŠ^{ya-za} ANŠE.KUR.
RAMEŠ ŠA KUR URU^{hatti} [kuit]man piran huinut nan arha
pehutet

"My brother M. came after me and built A. and T. and just went off: he didn't come near me. When he had rallied the troops and cavalry of Hatti, he took them away." (Hatt. II 48-51).

Also XXI 29 I 12-13.

See comments in §2.3b.2.

§2.5 iya-

§2.5a OH

Normally the simple meaning 'make; do' does not take the particle.

See under q. 73 for a copied example of -za iya-. We possibly find -za in OH also in "to make (i.e. produce) children":

(143) takku IR-as GÊME-an dai nu-za [DUMUMEŠ^{ien|z|(i)}
man É-ŠUNU sar[(ranzi)] assu-smet hanti h[anti?] sarr[(a)]nzi
mekkus [DUMUMEŠ^{GÊME-as dai}] Û 1 DUMU^{AM} IR-as dai

"If a slave takes a slave girl and they have children; if they divide the house (i.e. separate (?)), they divide their goods equally (?); the slave girl takes most of the children; the slave takes one child" (Laws A §"33").

Similar, A §"32a", both are very broken and the restorations are made up.

The verb *has-* 'bear (children)' has a similar use, though the participle is included only once in a while in OH, apparently in circumstances where the subject's involvement with the verbal content is stressed. When the simple fact of bearing is related, the particle is not present:

[MUNUS.LUGA]L URU^{kanis} 30 DUMUMEŠ^{1EN} MU-anti
hasta UMMA ŠIMA [k]i-wa kuit walkuan hashun

"the queen of Kanesh bore 30 sons in one year. Thus she said, 'what is this monstrosity (?) that I have borne?'" (Zalpa Vs 1-2).

Zalpa Vs 4-6: man MU^{HI.A} istarna pair nu M[MUNUS.LUGA]L
namma 30 MUNUS.DUMU hasta

"After years went by, the queen again bore 30 daughters".

Both with and without particle:

Zalpa Vs 11-13: UMMA DUMUMEŠ^{ues-a} kuwapit aumen nu
MUNUS-z[a?] DUMU x [h]asi nu-za anzas 1-ŠU hasta
UMMA LUMEŠ URULIM^{asma} (?) anze[l MUNUS]LUGAL
URU^{kanis} 30 MUNUS.DUMU 1-ŠU hasta

"Thus (said) the sons: 'wherever we have seen, a woman bears (one?) child (at a time), but (our mother) bore us all at once'. Thus

warput and so forth (q.s 380 ff.). We find simple middles of this kind in later Hittite as well: cf. e.g. *uwahhat* of §2.7c.3 (contrasting it with the same verb with *-za*, q. 255); *IR-ahhut*, q. 150; *zah(hiya)-*, q. 332; *hink-* and *haliya-*, q. 9, and so forth.

In the case of *suppiyahhut*, and the other verbs relating to the care of one's person, the OH middles essentially take *-za* as reinforcement: the particle is not necessary.

Reinforcement of what, though? Certainly *-za* underscores the relation of the verbal content to the subject. However, one may conclude, on the basis of the evidence, that *-za* emphasizes the active personal involvement of the subject in the action. That is, it is an active particle, even with the middle. Its behavior with *es-* 'sit' is quite interesting, in this regard. We have mentioned that this verb acquires the particle in MH: specifically in the meanings that later developed an active morphology.

One may surmise that at the end of OH, certainly by early MH, there was a transition period in the method used to express reflexivity/orientation to the subject. Verbs which had originally been employed in the middle alone, when such a sense was required, but had not only some element of action in their verbal content which the middle form underplayed, but also a specific and concrete reference to the subject's person or mental condition, acquired *-za* as a reinforcement. We therefore see many layers in the use of the middle vs. *-za*. There are

- 1) the stative middles, like *ki-*, which never take *-za*;
- 2) middles denoting activities, such as *zah(hiya)-*, *hink-* and *haliya-*, *sarra-*, which however do not appear with *-za*. These seem usually to have active counterparts, which however also do not take *-za*, as a rule (see under q. 8 for a possible exception, with *haliya-*. The reduplicated *halihlai-* takes the particle, q. 8. *sarra-* takes the particle in specific meanings).

The subject is apparently not perceived as actively influenced by the verbal content, but, presumably, simply as performing the action. But that action is subject-oriented, of course, which prompts

the very occasional use of the particle, e.g. with *haliya-*, and the creation of active counterparts like *halihlai-*, which also can take the particle.

3) the middles that are so actively subject-oriented they take on or switch to active morphology and acquire *-za* in the process (the verbs of body care, and *es-* 'sit'). As we have mentioned several times, however, there are however some lingering middles that appear with *-za* in this category: cf. e.g. q.s 309, 311ff., 386. *es-* 'sit' of course regularly has middle forms to the end of Hittite. *-za* is used with *es-* to distinguish between transitive vs. intransitive use. Another possible instance: we wondered (§2.6b) whether the active *-za aus-* (q. 229) was an MH version of the older *austat* (q. 230).

The construction with middle and *-za* apparently lasted only a short time: it was replaced by the active with *-za* in most cases already in MH. Yet we still find middles with *-za* in this capacity as late as q. 309, 386, that is, very late: apparently it did not entirely die out. But basically, with the verbs of category 3) mentioned above, the burden of expressing the reflexivity, or more accurately, the orientation to the subject, was shifted from the verb to the particle. This transition is most clearly seen with the expression of the care of the body (§2.16), specifically because the subject's person was in literal discussion with those verbs. With the verbs of category 2), by contrast, the orientation to the subject was understood, that is, it was no longer overt, in the active forms, and probably eventually was lost.

§3a.4 The same transition probably applied also to reciprocity, though there was more choice open to the Hittites in expressing this concept. Since the middle in this use is common to the rest of IE, and *-za* is not, it is legitimate to assume that Hittite also employed its middle regularly in this fashion. We find it in fact in OH in the copied q.s 333 (but note the peculiarity that the active *idalaues-* in the OH original q. 331 already has the particle. It was clearly an option by that time, but was not necessary to the sense). We find the simple middle then in LH (*zahhiya-*, for instance, is in

Note also *linganu-* without *-za*, q.s 71, 79, 104 (from both MH and LH). A lone example with the particle:

(151) *namma-an-za-an ANA SAG.DU-SU ser anzass-a [ANA DUMU]MEŠ-ŠU ser linganut*

"he made him swear allegiance to himself and to us his [sons]" (KBo IV 4 IV 59-60 (AM p. 140)).

For the full context, see q. 158.

One might wish to explain the lack of *-za* in q.s 71 and 104 by asserting that the subject does not make the object swear allegiance to him personally. This does not work however for q. 79: the thrust is clearly the same as the above q. 151.

The participle has *-za* in the following:

(152) *ammuk-wa-za l[i]nganuwanza nu-wa UL kuitki memahhi*

"(If you hear of any evil against the king, and don't tell me of it, and say thus): 'I am under oath and I will not say anything'" (SV Huqq II 36-7).

See also KBo IV 14 II 46-7: *allalla pawanzi-wa-za UGU linqanuwanza ki-ma-wa-za UL linqanuwanza* "I am sworn on the matter of defection; on this however I am not sworn"; XIII 35 I 30-1 (StBoT 4 p. 4): *nu-wa-za apeda[n]i-ya memini ishi[ul]lah-hanza* "I am bound by oath on that matter".

But cf. Murs.P.P. II §4 (p. 208) l. 1-2:

(153) *namma-at IŠTU DIM URUhatti li[n]ganuwantes nu LÚMEŠ URUhatti kuit LÚMEŠ URUmizri-ya IŠTU DIM URUhatti linganuwantes esir*

"they were bound by oath by the Stormgod of Hatti; and since the Hittites and the Egyptians were bound by oath by the Stormgod of Hatti..."

This use of the particle with the participles seems to follow the pattern we have seen for the verb *es-* 'be'. See §2.1d.

§2.5b.3 To return to *iya-*:

See q. 367 for a copied early example of *-za iya-* from the Telipinus myth, in the expression "make an EZEN₄ (a banquet, in this case)". We find the same idiom in the equally early Illuyanka myth, KBo III 7 I 14; cf. also KBo IX 127+, quoted under the parallel Luwian passage in the Appendix (§1d). But cf. *nu* EZEN₄ *purulliyas iyanzi*, I 7-8. The duplicates differ: XVII 5 leaves the particle out in another passage (I 7), but XVII 6 I 2 has the *-za*. There clearly was variation possible in the use of the particle at this stage of Hittite. T.O. III 41-2 has *iya-* without particle, of performing an EZEN₄. But cf. VII 5 I 19, IV 11 (C), of 'doing' a deity, with *-za*.

See also §2.7b.4, for examples of *-za iya-*, from the same text as VII 5, in the phrases 'make (someone one's personal deity)' and 'make (someone recipient of one's offerings)'. We note that the later meaning is expressed with *-san* rather than *-za* in VII 5 itself.

This text also has occurrences of *-za (DUMU)MEŠ iya-*, e.g. VII 8 II 9.

In XXVI 19 II 12, we probably find the equivalent of the OH q. 144 (the clause with *-za*); the verb is missing, however.

§2.5c LH

§2.5c.1 As usual, the meaning 'make' or 'do' does not comport the particle:

(154) *mann-a-za ŠA DUTUŠI HUL-lu k[u²wa]pi kisari ANA DUTUŠI-ma ŠEŠMEŠ meqqaes [n]u apat kuwatqa iyatteni... nu kisan mematteni kuin-wa-nnas imma sara dummeni nu-wa-nnas apas UL imma DUMU EN-ENI...*

"If an evil ever befalls the king, the king has many brothers, and you do as follows: (you go to someone else) and say thus "whomever we take to ourselves (to be king), is not that one the son of our lord?" (Ob. I 17-23).

10) We find "reflexive" use with *unuwai-* (q. 373). Probably the verb is a middle imperative, but if it is active, the particle parallels an accusative, the only such occurrence in OH.

In OH, to summarize, we find the particle with the functions of "reflexivity", reciprocity, and reference to relatives or bodily functions of the subject mentioned in the clause, though this last occurs only in special cases. The "reflexive" use never seems to parallel an accusative, though, due to the queer form of the verb, we can't determine for certain that it did not in q. 373: we tend however to think that *unut* is a middle. Cf. also the copied OH q. 277: the language seems somewhat revamped in that passage. In original OH, certainly, the particle is used in the nature of an "ethical" dative. It is a little hard to determine, given the fragmentary nature of the evidence, but it would appear that there are two levels in the use of *-za* already in OH: namely,

- 1) the particle is a standard inclusion to express "reflexive" sense (always indirect reflexive); or
- 2) it is optional and is included as the bearer rather of a nuance, which either would be understood from the context anyway (*idalaues-*), or underlines some aspect of the situation with reference to the subject (*has-* and probably (DUMUMES) *iya-*, *pai-*, *ep-*, *sarra-*). It can signal a particular meaning/nuance in a verb (as with *mimma-* or *halzai-*; and possibly *ed-/aku-*)

It is a matter of conjecture whether an "accusative" use of *-za* was really present in OH, as the copied texts (see q.s 14 (possibly OH), 277) might seem to indicate: see §3d (Conclusions) for discussion.

It is hard to determine which of these options applies to *da-* with *-za*, but it would seem there is a general tendency in OH toward option 2). In fact, we find that even in the "reflexive" use of option 1), there are no cases in which the particle could not be removed without prejudice to the sense of the passage; in other words, *-za* is really an "ethical" dative and not a necessary inclusion, even in those cases.

There are many cases in which the particle is included only occasionally, with a verb. In later Hittite it usually is included to point up a connection between the subject and some other element of the clause, such as his family, his body parts, his possessions, etc. But in OH we are much more likely to find that the particle signals merely a more intensive involvement of the subject with his action. This appears more clearly sometimes in the copied texts: we assume they are accurate, in some of these cases at least, because the behavior of *-za* does not seem to conform to later usage. Cf. e.g. the passage from the Telipinus Edict cited in §2.1a, the quote under q. 8 and q. 375.

§3a.2 The particle appears to be primarily an active particle. In original OH we find it with only one middle (q. 373, if the form of the verb is correctly interpreted). Some of the copied OH texts have passages in which a middle is accompanied by *-za*. One can never be sure, of course, whether the particle is the inclusion of the scribe, to whom the expression may have looked peculiar without *-za*.

The relation of *-za* to the middle is of course of paramount interest. As mentioned in the introduction, one wonders why *-za* was necessary, given the strength of the middle in Hittite. Neu (see §1b.6 above) mentions that there was a tendency as Hittite progressed to substitute active forms for the middle in verbs of action. This might lead us to suppose that *-za* was included with these verbs to provide some middle nuance of subject-orientation, which the new active forms lacked.

The middles that appear with particle in original or copied OH texts, or texts of an early date are: *arskitta/arrahhut*, *hatta*, *impanaitta*, *kunkiskitta*, *munnaittat*, *ninkihhut*, *palkuiyanta*, (*sazkitta*), *duskiskitta*, *unut/unuwattat*, *walluskiddumat/walluttat*, *uesta*.

In MH the middle *pahs-* is found with the particle; the middle *nai-* appears in particular phrases (q. 307 ff.); and *kis-* and *es-* 'sit'

!!!
+ *-za* suff. *jahhuti*
(os, shes)

act.

"my wife would have [become] a spy on the queen and did some evil; why did the queen do that matter back to [my wife] as a sin?" (assuming that there is no verb in the break).

Note XXXVI 89 Rs 49-50:

si|unias-ma-za KUR-eas¹ labarnan LUGAL-un piran
LÚmaniyahatallan DÙ-at andan-kan SIG₅-tit IGI-it au labarnan
LUGAL-un

"in the lands of x you made L. the king ruler before (?): look at L. the king (etc.) with a benign eye".

The position of *piran* makes it difficult to believe that the PW even refers to *-za* (as per CHD p. 169, which actually takes *piran* as governing *-za*, I believe; *si|unias-* is also restored by them). One wonders if Labarnas' title is *piran maniyahatallas*, but it does not take that form anywhere else, apparently.

§2.5c.2 A special idiom with *-za iya-* is 'perform (a ritual, or cult service for a deity)':

Without particle: AM p. 188-90, KBo II 5 III 39-45 (ter). Also the participle in V 7 Rs 21-2: *ŠA MUNUSAMA.DINGIR^{LIM}-wa EZEN₄*
UL iyanzu.

But with particle: Mursilis' P.P. II §2 l. 1 (p. 206); probably P.P. I (p. 172, Rs 11), and the following:

(165) *nu ANA ŠA DUTU URUarinna-pat GAŠAN-YA*
SAG.UŠ-as ANA EZEN₄HIA EGIR-an tiyanun nas-za iyanun

"I took care of the established festivals of my mistress the Sungoddess of Arinna, and performed them" (AM p. 20, KBo III 4 I 21-2).

(166) *nu-za mahhan HUR.SAGarinnandan tarhun namma*
EGIR-pa INA IDastarpa uwanun nu-za BAD KARAŠ INA
IDastarpa wahnunun nu-za EZEN₄MUT^I apiya iyanun

"After I took Mt. A., I went back to the river A., and I 'turned' a fortress on the river A., and I performed the yearly festival there" (AM p. 58-60, KBo III 4 II 46-8).

Since I am not clear on what it means to "turn" a fortress, it is difficult to assess the impact of *-za* in the clause with *wahnun*.

(167) *nu INA URU^{harrana} andan paun nu-mu KARAŠ INA*
URU^{harrana} anda aras nu-za ANA KARAŠ uwatar apiya
iyannun

"I went to H., and the army overtook me in H., and I performed the 'going to the army' there" (AM p. 126, KBo IV 4 III 26-8). Note the frequent *-za UGU appatar iya-* in LH rituals such as XXIV 5 + IX 13 (StBoT 3). Also *n|u-za INA URU^{talpa} ANA ERIN^{MES} ANŠE.KUR.RAMES^{uwa}[tar] iyat* "he performed the going to the troops and cavalry in Talpa" (KBo V 6 II 28-9, DS p. 93).

An interesting passage, both with and without particle:

(168) *nu SISKUR ŠA ID[mala] iyallu nat-kan asnullu*
iyami-ya-at-za kuedani uddani hingani ser
 "Let me do the ritual of the river Mala, and let me provide for it: why do I do it? because of the plague" (Murs.P.P. II §8 p. 214 l. 5-6).

In VI 45 III 28 = 46 III 68, we find *nu-mu-za ABU-YA DÙ-at/iyat*. I am not sure what this idiom means, unless Mursilis did temple services for Muwatallis: the text specifies in the clause immediately preceding this one that Mursilis was a priest to the Sungoddess of Arinna and to all the gods. Cf. however *-za essa-* of q. 249ff. (actually once without particle, too): the verb seems to mean 'treat'. Note also:

Without particle (probably):
 (169) *kinuna-za kuitman KURTAM asesanuskimi . . . nu*
kuitman KURTAM annalli EGIR-pa tiyazi DINGIRMES^{KURTI}-y[a
an]nisan mahhan essir nu-smas pedan QATAMMA EGIR-pa
appanzi kuitman-ma KUR-e asesanuskimi kuitman-at kursai
Š[A DINGIRM]ES^{ma} ishiul EGIR-anda kuit uemiskimi nat
essahhi-pat

"Now whatever country I settle, as the old (state of the) country comes back, as the gods of the land used to be of old, so they take their place again. When I settle a country, when it x-s, whatever treaty of the gods I find, I will perform it" (KBo XI 1 Vs 24-7).

TI-nu-

(422) *nu kissan mematti it-wa-z ZI-an kuwapikki TI-nut*
 "And you say thus, 'Go, keep yourself alive somewhere!' (you are breaking the oath)" (SV Kup §15 C II 22-3).

walh-

In q. 14 above, -za with this verb seems to have simple "reflexive" sense.

Note however *nu-za* GIŠKAKHI.A *walhzi* "knocks pegs in" of TdH 2 II 20 (C). This is parallel to *nat tarmanun* "I have pegged them", II 23. The particle does not appear to have a literal reflexive sense.

watarnah-

See q. 389 for an example without particle.

With particle, see q. 419 above. In XL 1 Vs 24-6, we find the following impenetrable passage:

*nu-mu-za ammel LÚMEŠ arus le namma para
 kanissuwanzi x[] markiskiwanzī-ya-mu-za malawanzi ri-za
 le hap[d??]anzi awan UGU-mu-za le damme[u?]mman
 watarnaheskanzi*

It is conceivable that the last clause means something like 'let them not install another/a foreigner (?) (in command) over me'.

uemiya-

In Murs.P.P. II §5 l. 2 (p. 210) we find:

(423) *nu-za mahhan eni DUPPA ŠA KUR URU^{mizri} piran
 uemīyanun nat IŠTU DINGIR^{LIM} ariyanun*
 "when I found this tablet about Egypt before me (=za?), I had an oracle question put to the deity about it".

Cf. then the late LH ritual of Ashella:

(424) *kinuna-war-at-kan kasa IŠT[U x?] kus UDU.ŠIRHI.A
 MUNUS^{TUM}-ya arha uter nu-war-at-za[x?] uemiyazzi
 nu-wa-za ki idalu UG₆-an apas KUR-eanza dau*

"(the evil which was amidst the army), now behold these rams and woman have taken it away from [our land/army?], and it will 'find itself' (? See below for a more plausible suggestion): let that (enemy) land take this evil plague!" (IX 31 III 51-4).

If there was a subject, such as 'the enemy', 'whoever' or similar, in the break before the verb, it would make a difference to the sense. Cf. XLI 11 Rs 26-7: *nu-za kuis kas UDU-un KAR-zi [h]aratar wastul apas dau* "this man who finds the sheep, let that one take the abomination and sin; (let the celebrant be clean of that matter)". It is likely there was a -za in the clause with *dau* as well. We surmise that q. 424 is analogous to this passage.

In the oracle text KBo II 6, we find:

(425) *ÁMUŠEN^{-ma-kan} EGIR GAM KU.UŠ uit nu-za GAM
 hastapin GUN.LIŠ IKŠUD nat anda erir nat 2-an arha pair*
 "an eagle came low down behind and found a *h*-bird down on the bank side (?), and they met and went off in mid air" (KBo II 6 IV 12-14).

See also under q. 89 (OH), and q. 100 (MH), for examples of *uemiya*- without particle.

"My father Mursilis sired us four children; I was the youngest of all." (Hatt. I 9-11).

§2.5c.4 To return to our 'offerings' with *-za*, note *essa-*, both with and without particle:

(176) MUNUS.LUGAL-*wa-za* KILILU GUŠKIN INA É NA₄hekur DLAMA *essesta* nu-war-at ANA MUNU[S.L]UGAL DINGIRLIM URU₂arusna Û-az IR-ta MUNUS.LUGAL-*ma-war-at* UL *pesta* nu-war-at INA É LÚŠÀ.TAM *katta!* *dais[t]a* MUNUS.LUGAL-*ma-wa* ANA DINGIRLIM URU₂arusna 2 GILIM! KÙ.BABBAR *tamai* *pidi-ssi* *essesta*

"The queen dedicated a gold crown in the mausoleum: the deity of Arusna asked it of the queen in a dream, but the queen didn't give it, she deposited it in the chamberlain's house; the queen however gave the deity of A. two other silver crowns in its place" (XXII 70 Vs 12-15).

Again without particle, Vs 22.

§2.5c.5 We note that *sipant-* has *-za*, apparently in the meaning 'perform a ritual/offerings' (its root meaning is 'sacrifice, libate'):

MH

In KBo XII 96 IV 24, we find *nu-za paimi* DUTU-un [si]pantahhi, contrasting with IV 17: *namma* KAŠ EGIR-*anta* 3-ŠU *sipantanzi*. Apparently the simple libation of beer does not comport *-za*.

From possibly copied MH:

(177) *nu-za-kan* [(MUNUS É).Š(À *anda* zu)]rkiya *sipanti*
"the woman makes the z. offerings in the house" (IX 22+ II 15-16, Beckman p. 90-1)
and

nu-za mala-pat sipanti namma-za uziya zurki[ya]
sipan[ti]

"performs the *mala*-offering; performs also the *u.* and *z.* offerings" (KBo XVII 65 Vs 8-9, Beckman p. 132).

LH

(178) *nu-mu* ABU-YA DUMU-*an* *sara* *das* *nu-mu* ANA DINGIRLIM IR-*anni* *pesta* *nu-za* ANA DINGIRLIM LÚsankunniyanza BAL-*ahhun* *nu-za-kan* ANA ŠU DİŠTAR GAŠAN-YA 𐎶 *lulu* *uhhun*

"And my father took me, a little boy, up and gave me into the service of the goddess and I sacrificed as priest to the goddess and I saw prosperity in the hand of Sausga my mistress" (Hatt. I 17-20).

Also e.g. StBoT 4 p. 56, XXXVIII 37 III 10-12, 18, of an AS.ME ('disk') and an ALAM respectively.

But without particle:

(179) *ki* *kuit* *namma* NU.SIG 5-*ta* *nu-kan* ANA DINGIRLIM-*ya* *kuit* *istantan* *sippanter* *nu-za* DINGIRLUM *apadda* *kuitki* *ser* TUKU.TUKU-*uwanza*

"This that (the omens) were bad again, because they sacrificed late to the deity, (if) you, deity, are a little angry about that . . ." (V 7 Vs 22-3).

V 6 III 8 has *ki* *kuit* DINGIRMEŠ *zawalliyas sippanzakanzi*.

§2.5c.6 The phrase *arkuwar iya-* appears to have the particle as a general rule. See e.g. SV Dup D III 3-4; XXIV I IV 19-21 (*essa-*); passim Murs.P.P. II (*essa-*); VI 45 = 46 passim; AU Taw II 65-6; XXI 27 I 11-13 and passim; and *nu-za arkuwar kisan* DU-*zi*, XXIV 5 + IX 13 Rs 3 (StBoT 3 p. 12).

Some exceptions, however:

(180) *nas* EGIR-*pa* [GI]SKIMHIA MAMETI *paizzi* [n]as ANA NAM.RU *arkuwar kisan* DÜ-*zi*

"he goes after the oath's portents and makes prayer to the prisoner thus" (KBo XV 7 l. 13-14' (StBoT 3 p. 36)).
Note also XXI 19 i 13-14.

arkuwai- does not take particle: cf. e.g. Murs. P.P. I §1 Vs 6 (p. 164), right next to *-za arkuwar essahhi* (Vs 6-7), Rs 28, probably (p. 174); VI 45 III 18-19, 33, etc. The last two are *sk-*suffixed forms.

See also e.g. KBo V 6+ II 26 (DS p. 93).

But no particle with the middle:

(412) *nu kururi^{HI.A} kuit meggaya nininkan esta*
 "the many enemies who had reared themselves" (AM p. 154, KBo V 8 II 35-6).

See also, without *-za*, the quote from Mastigga under q. 235, and q. 369.

punus-

For OH (copied), we have *nu-za pankun EGIR-pa punuski* "ask the Council!", from HAB III 61.

In MH:

(413) *ispanti-mu-ssan sasti-mi sanezzis teshas natta epzi*
nu-mu-ssan ser assul natta isduwari kinuna-ma-pa
 [DINGIR-Y]A innara[w]ar ð D LAMA anda turiya
man-mu-kan annaz-ma kartaz [DINGIR-Y]A inan GUL-asta
ug-at-za appa MUNUSEN.SI-ta natta kussanka punussun
 "at night sweet sleep doesn't take me in my bed; peace doesn't
 come over me: now, my god, yoke up strength and D LAMA. If my
 god inflicted a sickness on me from my mother's womb, I did not
 ask it at all of your sybil" (XXX 10 Rs 18-21).

See XXXI 127+ III 5-12. Also XXX 10 Rs 10: *DUTU-i isha-mi kasa-z*
kan-is DINGIR-YA x x punuss[un "behold, I have interrogated
 my deity".

Normally *punus-*, and for instance the similar verb *uek-*, do not take the particle. But cf. also the vocabulary KBo I 44+ IV 27: *uttar-za kuis pun[u]sk[i]zzi*. This recalls the use of *-za* with *aus-* and *kappuwai-*. The late LH XL 1 provides: *nu-mu-za kedani [memini?]* *kezza tuppiazza katta [pu]nussandu* "let them interrogate me on this matter from this tablet" (XL 1 Vs 30-1).

uek- occurs with *-nas* on DS p. 98: *man-wa-nnas [an]zel BELI uekiskiuen* "would we ask for a lord for ourselves?" (XXXIV 24+ IV 16-17).

But the particle is missing on IV 20-2:

(414) *nu-wa DUMU BELI-NI INA KUR URU^{mizri} [A]ŠŠUM*
LUGAL-UTTİM uekiskiueni ANA MUNUSTI BELDI-NI-ma-war-an
AŠŠUM [L]U MUDI-ŠU uekiskiueni

"we are asking for a son of our lord to be king in Egypt, we are asking for him for the wife of our lord, to be her husband".
 The subjects are a direct beneficiary of the entire action in the first example; they are not in the second.

sanh-

This verb does not often occur with particle. However, in copied OH we find: *nu-za ŠA ABI-ŠU [eshar EG]IR-an sanhta* "he sought (revenge) for the blood of his father" (KBo III 57+ Vs 10-11). It is fairly clear the particle is present because the subject's father is in question: cf. without particle e.g. XXXI 115 l. 12 (old language), and Murs. P.P. I §5 Vs 46(-7: the beginning of the second clause is in the break).

For MH, cf. e.g. XIII 7 I 17 (C): *nu-za apas kattawatar sanhti* "that one seeks vengeance".

In LH:

(415) *kues-ma-z sumenzan É^{HI.A}.DINGIRMEŠ-KUNU arha*
warnummanzi ilaliskanzi kies-ma BIBRI^{HI.A} . . . danna
sanhiskanzi kies-[ma?] A.ŠÀ A.GÀR-KUNU . . . dannatahhuwanzi
[sanhiska]nzi kies-smas-za LÚMEŠ APIN.LAL . . . danna
sanhiskanzi

"(the enemy lands) which want to burn your temples, who try to take your vessels, etc., who try to lay waste your fields, etc., who try to take your farmers, etc." (XXIV 2 = XXIV 1 Rs 5-10).

The similar text XXIV 3+ III 1-8 has a parallel passage. In the *dannatahhuwanzi* clause, III 4-6, it has *kies-smas-za*. It is very possible that that is to be restored in XXIV 2 as well.
 In the Song of Ulikummi, Tablet I, we find variation between A I 7 = B I 6, in the phrase *nu(B: -za) DU-ni IGI-anda idalawatar san[hiskizzi* "he looks for evil against the Stormgod".

§2.6 *memai-*, *halzai-* and relatives (*verba dicendi*)

§2.6a OH

There are a couple of idioms which are already original to OH. First, "to call (someone) by a particular name":

(188) LUGAL-i-mu man[(iyahhaen G1Š hulugannen)]
D halmassuiz ar[(unaza udas annas-mas KUR-e)] heser
nu-mu-z LUGAL-unn-a [(labarnan halzier)].

"The Throne brought me, the king, realm and chariot from the sea; they opened the land of my mother and called me King Labarnas" (XXIX 3 I 3-5 = XXIX 1 I 23-5 (StBoT 25 #1)).

See also HAB III 24-5 (C): *apas-mu-za attan* | *UL halzai* | *ug-an-za DUMU.MUNUS^T UL halzihhi* "She doesn't call me father, I don't call her daughter".

When someone is speaking to himself, we find *-za*:

(189) *nu-za DUMU.NITAMEŠ karti-smi piran memir* . . .

"and the sons spoke before their hearts (i.e. thought to themselves) . . ." (Zaipa Vs 13-14).

But note the copied early XXXIII 120 II 4: *DA.GILIM-as-kan INIM^H.A-ar* [. . .] *ŠA-si memiskiwan d[ai]s*.

The verb *mimma-* in the sense 'refuse' usually takes *-za*, but not always:

(190) *takku DUMU.MUNUS LÚ-ni taranza . . . takku(w)-an attas annass-a tamedani LÚ-ni pianzi nu attas annass-a sarninkanzi // takku attass-a annas mimmai nan-si-kan tuhsanta*

"if a girl is betrothed to a man . . . If the father and mother give her to someone else, they give restitution. If they refuse, they separate her from him" (Laws §28a-c (not in A)).

Note C III 4: *nan-za-an pitte[nuzz]i kuis*.

(191) *takku LÚ-sa DUMU.MUNUS nau dai nan-za mimmai kusata-ma kuit piddait nas-kan samenzi*

"If the man has not yet taken a girl and he refuses her, he forfeits the bride-price which he brought" (Laws §30 (not in A)).

We note that *ishamaiskizzi* occurs with *-za* in the copied KBo III 40 a+b 1. 13. The song in question is a kind of incantation in poetry.

§2.6b MH

§2.6b.1

Without particle:

For *mema-*, the innumerable *nasta/-kan (anda) kissan memai* in rituals may attest to the fact that in normal circumstances the verb does not take *-za*. See also, with *te-*:

(192) *kinun* | *a-mu-za ammel* DINGIR-YA ŠÀ-ŠU ZI-ŠU
humant[e]t kardit kinuddu nu-mu wasdul-mit [ted]du
ne-za-an ganesmi nassu-mu DINGIR-YA zasheya memau
nu-mu-za DINGIR-YA ŠÀ-ŠU kinuddu [nu-mu wasd]ul-mit
teddu ne-za-an ganesmi nasma-mu MUNUSEN.SI memau
[nasma-mu? ŠA?] DUTU LÚ-AZU IŠTU UZUN(G.GIG memau
nu-mu-za DINGIR-YA humanter kōiJit [ŠÀ-ŠU ZI ŠU
kiru]ddu nu-mu wasdul-mit teddu ne-za-an ganesmi

"Now, let my god open his heart and spirit with all his heart to me: let him [tell] me my sin and I will acknowledge it. Either let my god tell me in a dream: let my god open his heart to me, let him tell me my sin, and I will acknowledge it. Or let a sybil tell me (or) a magician (of?) the Sungod speak (it) from the entrails: let my god open [his heart?] to me with all his heart and let him tell me my sin and I will acknowledge it" (XXX 10 Vs 24-8).

See XXXI 127 II 51-59.

As can be seen, however, *ganes-* with the meaning 'acknowledge' does take *-za* (We take *-za-an* to represent *-zan < *-za-san*).

However, we find a rather erratic inclusion of *-za* with *memiskiwan dai-* in the copied Appu myth: the Stormgod speaks to his vizier, with *-za*, on II 13-14, as does one brother to another on IV 6-7. But in further exchanges between the brothers, IV 8ff., the *-za* appears to be absent, as it is when Appu speaks to his wife, I 35, and to the Stormgod, II 1, and the Stormgod answers, II 5.

Without particle:

(400) A[BI DUT]UŠI¹-ma mahhan IŠME nasta I¹kisnapilin
ERÍNMEŠ ... ANA I¹attarsiya menahhanta zahhiya para nais
nu [z]ik I¹madduwattas namma I¹attarissiyā UL mazzasta
nu-ssi piran arha tarnas nu-ddu-za uit I¹kisnapilis
an?-x-x IŠTU KUR URU¹hatti huinut I¹kisnapilis-a ANA
I¹attarissiya menahhanta zahhiya pait

"but when My Sun's father heard, he sent K. and troops, etc., forth to battle against A. You, M., did not resist A., and cleared out from before (him), and K. came and brought x out of Hatti for you and further went to battle with A." (Madd Vs 61-3).

alalamniya-

We find this verb with -za in XVII 9 I 17-18 (Gurparanzahu, probably LH). It is parallel to *ueskizzi* of I 21, which however does not have the particle. In the copied (?) MH KBo XVII 62+63 I 14', 18', we find MUNUS-za-ma-z kuwapi uiuiskiwan d[ai] / [k]uitman-ma-z [MUNU]S-za nuwa uiuiskizz[i]. See also XXXIII 119 + 120 IV 17'. These last expressions seem to refer generally to women screaming in labor.

ariya-

(401) LUGAL-us-ma kues gimrius lahheskit nu masies
gimrius lahhiyan harzi istarna-kan kues MU^HI.A pantes
kuitman-za DINGIR^{LIM} iyazi nu-za apedas gimras ser SISKUR
ambassin ... ariyanzi

"the fields which the king campaigned, however many fields he has campaigned, in the years that have gone by since he did the deity, they put an oracle question about the *ambassi*-ritual on those fields" (XXVII I 7-11; also I 24-7, but without particle I 29-30).

See also nu-w[ar-at-za uwaueni taksan arha ariyaueni "let us go and put an oracle question off together" (XXXIV 45+ Vs 15, StBoT 4 p. 50).

Usually this verb does not have particle (see e.g. q. 423).

esharnu-

(402) nu-war-an huda]k walh nu-wa-za QATEMEŠ-KA zik
hudak esharnut

"strike [him immediately]; bloody your hands immediately" (Madd Rs 18).

See also e.g. Mitas Rs 29-30 (bis). The object is a body part of the subject; hence the inclusion of -za.

irhai-

KBo XXI 33+ I 19-20 has the impenetrable:

(403) nu-za ŠA D¹hebat katkisa irhāizzi

This phrase fits into q. 96.

kuen- and related verbs:

kuen- normally does not take -za. The verb turns up several times in the Telipinus Edict, mostly without -za, but twice it does have the particle, II 7, 45. The passage on II 7 and those without particle are parallel; no relatives seem involved. II 45 has the particle possibly because the object is family to the subject; on the other hand, cf. I 68, where someone kills his father, without -za.

T.O., of whatever date, seems to like *kuen-* with -za: cf. II 20, IV 26, 64. The subjects are killing the animals to eat them, so one may perceive a certain nuance of a dative of advantage in the inclusion of the particle. In the first passage in particular, the writer is worried that the temple personnel are going to substitute skinny cattle for the good cattle reserved for the deity, in order to appropriate the latter for their own use. He intones a long litany of purposes that they might steal the cattle for, all with -za: putting them to the yoke, taking cattle or sheep into their personal folds, killing them (presumably to eat), selling them, and so forth.

In MH (?), we find cases of both *kuen-* and *harnink-* with -za:
(404) [m]aniyahhiya-ta-kkan kue É.GAL^{LIM}.H^I.A.TIM ?
[and]a nasta EGIR-an arha punuski nassu dammishan
kuiski kuitki harzi nasma-za dan kuiski kuitki harzi nasma-za
happiran kuiski kuitki harzi nasma ARÀH kuiski kinuwan harzi
nasma-za-kan GUD LUGAL kuiski kunan harzi nasma-kan

[(nu MUNUSŠ)]U.GI DUTU-as uelku dai nat-za tiwariya
halzissai
 "the old woman takes a Sungod-plant and calls it *tiwariya*" (Mast
 A IV 17-18).
 See also I 43, III 38, and q. 237 from the Tunnawi ritual.

To "call on the name of one's father" also takes -za:
 (199) nu-za-kan ABU-ŠU ŠUM-an *halzais*
 "he called on the name of his father" (Mitas Vs 38).
 But cf. e.g. XLVII 36 Vs 19, where simply saying the name of a god
 does not take the particle: *nasta hantezzi palsi Dnupatik ŠUM-ŠU*
tez[zi] "says for the first time the name of Nupatik". In the *sallis*
wastais texts (assuming they are this early), we find
 GIDIM-[m]a-kan ŠUM-an *halzai* "calls the name of the dead person"
 (XXX 15+ Vs 29); see also XXX 28 Rs 2 (with *halzissai*).

-za *halzai*- is used in the copied q. 367 of a simple 'calling':
 the Sungod invites (-za *halzais*) 1000 gods to a banquet. In the
 Yozgat text (VBoT 58) I 27ff., we find: *itten-wa Dwhoever-an*
halzisten, several times. I know that the temptation is to consider
 that *za* has a very literal meaning '(called) to himself' in q. 367.
 There is no question that the Sungod is overtly stated to be
 involved with the verbal content in that passage, by the inclusion
 of -za, and this is apparently not the case in Yozgat. But, quite
 frankly, the literal interpretation seems quite pedestrian,
 compared with the very subtle use of -za we have seen, especially
 with the verbs of saying. The fact is that one could find that
 rationale for the particle in half a hundred places, where the
 Hittites do not use it. Note the similar use of -za *para halzai*- in
 Mursilis II's q. 215.

§2.6b.3 MH *mimma*- continues to appear with -za:
 (200) ABI DUTUŠI-ma tuk ANA Imadduwatta kissann-a
memiskit ehu-wa-za INA KUR HUR.SAG[hari]yati eshut
nu-[wa]-za ANA KUR URUhatti-ya manninkuwan Imadduwattas-
a-z KUR HUR.SAGhariyati asanna mimmas
 "My Sun's father said thus to you, M., 'come!, settle in the land of
 Mt. H.; you also will be close to Hatti!' But M. refused to settle the
 land of Mt. H." (Madd Vs 17-18).

Note the following interesting passages:
 (201) UDU-us-za SILÁ-ZU *mimmas* GUD-ma AMAR-ŠU
mimmas
 "the sheep rejects her lamb, the cow her calf" (XVII 10+ I 8-9,
 Telipinus myth).
 The opposite is:
 (202) nu-za UDU-us mahhan SILÁ-an *kaneszi* [GUD-us-za
mah]han AMAR-ŠU *kanesⁱ²zi annas annas [mahhan]*
 DUMU-ŠUNU *kanessanzi zig-a* DUTU-us [LUGAL MUNUS].LUGAL
 ... QA[TAMMA] *kanessan ha[rk]*
 "As a sheep acknowledges her lamb, as a cow acknowledges her
 calf, as a father and mother acknowledge their child, so you,
 Sungod, acknowledge the king and queen, etc." (XXXIII 70 II
 14-III 1).
 For another parallel idiom with *penniya*-, see q. 284 below.

§2.6b.4 It is of interest to note the behavior of *hurzak*- 'curse':
 (203) nu MUNUSŠU.GI *kissan memai kui[(t-wa-za-kan)] kuit*
istarna hurzakitten kin[(una-wa)] apus hurtaus EMEHIA
 DUTU-us GÜB-la [(wahnuddu)]
 "the old woman says thus: 'whatever you cursed one another, let
 the Sungod turn those curses and tongues to the left (i.e. to no
 good)'" (Mast A II 1-3).
 The particle obviously has a reciprocal meaning *here*; *istarna*
 seems to echo it.

§2.6c LH

§2.6c.1 Without particle:

(204) n[a]sm[a]-s[m]as ŠEŠ DUTUŠI *hassanza na[sm]a DU[MU]*
 MUNUSNAPTARTI *kuiski apat memai ammuqq-a-wa-za UL*
 DUMU EN-KA nu-wa *ammuk PAP-astin*
 "Or (if) a legitimate brother of My Sun or the son of a secondary
 wife says this: 'Am I not a son of your lord? Support me (as king)!'"
 (PHO I 22-5).

With particle: nu-za mahhan kun memian ZI-ni EGIR-pa *kissan*
 AQBI "when I had spoken this word back to my mind" (AM p. 118,

See XXXVI 110 (StBoT 25 #140) Rs 5-7: Both verbs without *-za* (at least, we suspect no *-za* with *adue[ni]*: the beginning of the phrase is broken), as well as an *sk*-suffixed form of *aku-*. Again a general or habitual action is being described.

In StBoT 8 we find *a[tu]eni akueni*, IV 6, possibly preceded by *-nas*, though the passage is somewhat damaged. On III 15 the phrase occurs again; unfortunately the beginning is broken off, and we don't know if the particle was present.

In StBoT 12, LUGAL-*us* 2-*e* *ekuzi* occurs several times (e.g. III 8), as well as some variant of GAL D^IŠKUR (or of some other god) *suppisduwarit akuanzi* "they drink from the shining beaker of the god" (e.g. III 42). These phrases are frequent in descriptions of rituals: see e.g. the KI.LAM festival (also with a transitive version, e.g. StBoT 25 #12 III 21), and StBoT 25 passim. See also StBoT 12 IV 33-4: LUGAL-*us* *esa suwaru kue* GAL H^I.A *akkuskizzi ta ape-pat ekuzi* "the king sits; the beakers which he usually drinks full (?), he drinks those". Similar IV 41-2.

Note XXXI 143 II 8-9 = 15-6 (StBoT 25 #110), apparently both with and without particle: *nu-ssan]8-inzu nepisi es[s]i nu-za-kan 2-is 8-tas kistunas [akkuskis]i nu-kkan 2-is 8-tas makitas akkuskesi*

Noone really seems to have figured out what this passage is getting at, and obviously it is not clear that *aku-* is in the break.

But definitely with particle:

XLIII 23 Rs 10-11: *parnas URU-as LIM DINGIRMEŠ uwat[ten . . .] nu-za ezten ekutten* "the thousand gods of house and city, come, eat and drink!". Also Rs 14-15.

(392) *ne hassas katta¹ esanta nu-s[(-)] 2 GIŠBANŠUR 2 NINDA tianzi nuz at[anzi]akuwanzi LÚME.EŠasusaless-a[pera-sm]it atanzi akuanz[i]/*

"They sit by the hearth and they put 2 tables and 2 breads, and they eat and drink; the *a*.-men eat and drink before them" (KBo XVII 36 + (StBoT 25 #54) III 10-13).

An interesting example, showing the difference between *-za eku-* and *asta eku-*, comes from the copied early Illuyanka myth:

(393) *nu-za eter ekue[r] nasta DUG palhan humandan ek[uer] ne-za ninker*

"They ate and drank: they drank off a whole *p*.-vessel, and they were sated" (XVII 5 I 10-12).

§2.16.3b MH

The distinction just made for OH seems to be a bit blurred in later Hittite. *-za* is in fact included reasonably regularly, though it is not obligatory:

(394) . . . *IŠTU É.GA-ya 1 NAMANDU [GA.KU₇ uwatezzi nu ANA L]ÚMEŠMEŠEDITIM pai nat-za atanzi*

" . . . and from the milk-house he brings a measure of [sweet milk (?)] and gives it to the bodyguards and they eat it" (IBoT I 36 IV 38-9).

Note however the early MH TdH 1 III 50: *nu kiss]an memai ais EME-as gagas sumes azzikiten*. We find several imperatives without *-za* in two copied texts: the Zarpiya ritual, IX 31 (I 41 = HT I I 34, II 2-3 = HT I I 55-6; see also HT I I 55 = IX 31 II 1 (br.)), and the prayer KBo VII 28+ passim. All but Zarpiya I 41 are *-sk*-suffixed forms. These are all very early MH texts: some are even thought to be OH. On the other hand, the slightly later B.U. IV 12 (C) has virtually the same phrase as Zarpiya I 41, but with *-za* (and with *ekutten*).

Note that XXIX 1 I 15 has *nu-za-kan zapzikit eduwani* "we will drink out of the glass".

(395) *NINDA-an-za uemianun nan-za AHITI-YA natta kuwapikki edun watar-ma-z uemiya<nun> nat AHITI-YA UL kuwapikki ekun*

"(If) I found a bread, I did not eat it at all secretly; if I found water, I did not drink it at all secretly." (XXX 10 Vs 16-17).

HW² (Bd. 2, Lief. 9-10, p. 131) remarks that this is the earliest dated use of transitive *ed-* with *-za*.

Cf. however

(211) DU . . . halziyauen nu-ssi haratar wastull-a piran tar[naueni (probably more likely tar[ueni?)] . . . nu ŠA DU TUKU.TUKU-an piran laueni

"We have called the Stormgod, and confess/speak the offense and sin before him, . . . and we dispel the anger of the Stormgod" (KBo XI 1 Vs 1-3).

We note that *sešhai*- 'designate' appears regularly with *-za*: cf. e.g.
 ANA I D LAMA-ma . . . ABU-YA kuit pesta DUTUŠI-
 ya-ssi kuit pihhun nastā apus arkammus . . . UL appanzi
 kinuna-za man DUTUŠI ŠA GUD UDUHI.A kuitki AŠRU
 sešhahhi kuis-ma-an-kan ŠA DINGIRMEŠ hazziui HI.A epzi nu
 ANA DINGIRMEŠ URUDU-tassa MU-tili 2 ME GUD . . . peskiwan
 tiyanzi man-si AŠRU-ma UL kuitki pihhi nu MU-tili
 URU hattusas ariyattaza 2 ME GUD . . . ANA DINGIRMEŠ URU
 DU-tassa peskandu

"what my father and I, My Sun, have given Kurunta, they shall not take tribute (for the gods) from it. Now if My Sun designates some place for cattle and sheep, whoever takes on his share of the cult offerings to the gods, they shall begin to give yearly 200 head of cattle, etc., to the gods of T. If I don't give him a place, let them give yearly 200 head of cattle to the gods of T. from the treasury of Hattusas." (B.T. II 22-30).

Also probably the Gurparanzahu text XXXVI 67 II 29-30'.

§2.6c.2 *-za halzai*- still means "to call (someone/thing) by a particular name":

(212) ANA DUTUŠI-wa memiskimi nu-wa-mu UL isdammaszi nu-wa-za zik assus halziyattari DUTUŠI-ma-wa-kan HUL-uanni GAM maniyah n[a]t GAM-an NIŠ DINGIRLIM GAR-ru

"(and he says thus:) 'I speak to My Sun, but he doesn't listen; you are considered dear (to him), give My Sun over to evil', let it lie under the oath" (PHO III 16-20).

(213) arahzenas-wa-mu-za KUR.KUR LÚKUR kues DUMU-lan halzessir nu-wa-mu-za tepnuskir

"the foreign enemy countries who called me child and made light of me" (AM p. 20-2, KBo III 4 I 23-4).

Again similar II 12-13.

KBo XV 2 B Rs 3 (StBoT 3 p. 60): nan-za-an LUGAL-un UL kuiski halzai.

But simply calling someone's name still does not appear with *-za*:

(214) nu-mu ki IGI-zi LÚ-tar-mit DIŠTAR-mu-kan GAŠAN-YA IGI-zi palsi ŠUM-an kedani KASKAL-si halzais

"this was my first deed of manhood; Sausga my mistress called my name for the first time on this campaign" (Hatt II 29-30).

In KBo VIII 32 Vs 1-8 (StBoT 4 p. 58), we find *nu-wa-za-kan* asi LUDUB.SAR.GIŠ[] EGIR-*anda halzais* "that wood-scribe called after [] (him)". But note e.g. the MH KBo XII 96 I 11: *nu aliyani EGIR-anda le kuiski palwai* "let noone p. after the a-bird". *palwai*- is probably a *verbum dicendi* of some kind.

-za para halzai- is used of calling an assembly.

(215) nu mahhan ABU-YA enissan IŠME [n]u-za LÚMEŠ [GA]LT¹ memiyani para halzais

"When my father heard this, he called all the nobles forth (to council)" (KBo V 6 III 17 (DS p. 94)).

This is actually similar to the copied early q. 367 without *para*.

§2.6c.3 *tepnu*- occurs without particle when the topic is reducing borders or power:

(216) kuis-ma kedani KUR-e ANA I D LAMA uwai pedai nat-si-kan arha dai nasma-at-kan katta ANA NUMUN I D LAMA arha dai nasma-ssi ZAG anda tepnuzi nasma-ssi piyan kuit harmi nu-ssi-kan arha kuitki dai

"Whoever gives grief to Kurunta in this land, and takes it away from him, or in future takes it away from the seed of K., or encroaches on his border, or takes away what I have given him" (B.T. IV 16-19).

This is possibly copied OH, but the presence of EGIR-*anda* makes it clear that the language has been revamped. See -*za parkunu-* in the active, without reflexive sense, from the Tel.E., q. 375.

With and without -*za*:

(381) INA [KASKAL]^{NI}-*za uitenaz arrahhun ŠA ZUNNI uetenit warput*

"I have washed myself in the water on the way; wash yourself in the water of the rain!" (VBoT 120 III 6'-7' (Allaiturahi, MH)).

Since the first clause has the particle, and there is no sentence connective, it is possible that -*za* was understood to carry over into the second clause, even though the verbs and clauses are not parallel. On the other hand, it probably is a hold-over from an earlier time when the middle would not have taken the particle, and would have represented the reflexive sense by itself. The two *suppiyahhut* quoted under q. 380 above would be another example of the same variation in the use of the particle.

(382) *nu-za senan [I]M-[as] warpuwanzi kattan GÌRMEŠ-as dai nu-za ser warpzi*

"she puts the clay figure down at her feet for washing, and washes it above (up?)" (Tunn. II 63-5).

This is most unusual: it really does seem from the context that she is not washing herself, despite the particle, but rather the figure. Maybe the EN.SÍSKUR, not the MUNUSŠU.GI, is the subject of both clauses: the paragraph starts with *nasta EN.SÍSKUR warpuwanzi paizzi* (II 61), and the old woman might just be providing the image and combs. The other occurrences of verbs of washing with -*za* (e.g. *arri* of II 21-2) conform to the usual patterns.

Cf. *nu-smas ŠE+NÁG-anzi* in the copied (M)alli Ritual (TdH 2) IV 11 (but -*za warpzi*, IV 32). As for dressing:

(383) *ishuzis-at-si esdu [ne]-iz ishuziddu KUŠE.SIR-ma-at-si esdu nat-za sarkuddu*

"let it be a girdle for him and let him gird himself with it!; let it be a shoe for him and let him put it on!" (TdH 2 I 18-19 (C)).

§2.16c LH

§2.16c.1 When the verb is in the infinitive, the particle does not appear:

XXIV 5 + IX 13 Vs 27' (StBoT 3 p. 10): *namma LUGAL-us EGIR-anda warpuwanzi pai[zz]i*

But: *nas-kan GIM-an arha uizzi nu-za war[pzi]*, Vs 30'.

§2.16c.2 Dressing someone else does not take the particle:

(384) *nu-za-kan NÍTE-ŠU TUGNÍG.LÁMMES arha dai nat ANA LÚ wassiyanzi*

"takes the clothes off his body and dresses the man with it" (KBo XV 1 I 10-11 (StBoT 3 p. 112)).

KBo XV 2+ B Vs 6'-8' (StBoT 3 p. 56): *nu-kan senan GIŠŠI ... kittari nu-ssi [NUTI]^M TUG LU]GAL-UTTI wassianzi*

"a wooden image lies and they dress it with one robe of the king". See also XXIV 5+ Vs 21 (p. 10), KBo IV 6 Rs 12-13, etc.

However, dressing yourself, or stripping yourself naked, does:

(385) *LUGAL-us-ma-za arha [n]ikumantqizzi nas-kan [k]atta uizzi nu-za warpzi TUGNÍG.LÁMMES-ya-za damma[i] w]assiyaizzi*

"the king strips himself and goes down and washes, and puts on other clothes" (KBo XV 7 I. 11-13' (StBoT 3 p. 36)).

(386) *nu-wa-za[D]INGIRMEŠ-as wassiyahhahat*
"I have dressed myself for the gods (of the underworld?)" (XXIV 5 + IX 13 Rs 15 (StBoT 3 p. 12)).

was- 'dress oneself, put on', occurs without particle passim in the KILAM festival (e.g. KBo X 23+22 I 11). But since the text is based on OH originals or models, it is hard to know whether this still was a possible idiom in LH. -*za* is certainly the norm. Note that in Tunn. I 54, Goetze by oversight left out -*za* with *wassezzi*.

On the other hand, "have on", represented by various locutions, does not normally take the particle. See q. 186 for an MH example. An exception is the late LH:

(387) *DUMU MUNUS[am]matallas-a-za kuit TUGMEŠ ŠA ŠU AMA-ŠU wassan harzi*

and it became stronger as Hittite developed. With some verbs, such as *da-*, the particle was the only tool available to express particular meanings, and naturally with these it is most regular in the appropriate context. *-za halzai-*, e.g., in the idiom 'call by a name' is also very regular, probably for a similar reason. *mimma-* then (see below) always appears with particle; no particular meaning is being marked. Essentially, *-za* seems to have represented a nuance, which for various reasons could become a central part of the verbal phrase. Nevertheless, as a nuance, with most verbs it could still occasionally be left out, without real prejudice to the sense.

§2.6c.4 As can be seen from the last q., *mimma-*, and the new *UL mema-*, continue to have the particle. For the latter, see also e.g. SV Targ Vs 44-5 (probably), 46; and the following:

(222) [n]an-za-an KUR-anza UL memai nu kisan tezzi NUMUN-war-as DU[MU LUGAL esdu D]UTUŠI-ma-za UL memahhi "(If) the land rejects him (for lordship), and says thus 'let him be of the seed and the son of the king', My Sun will reject (this)" (SV Alak. A I 67-8' (§6)).

For the former, see e.g. q. 252 below and KBo XVI 59 (StBoT 4 p. 54) Rs 4.

§2.6c.5 It is of interest to see whether the opposite meaning to 'say', namely 'keep silent' has a similar usage:

karus(siya)- and related concepts (with particle):

MH

(223) kuis-zan kedas LUGAL-was uddanas karussiyazi nas-za nassu LUaras-sis munnasi nu-ssi maskan pai "who is silent about these matters of the king and either hides (something) as a comrade and/or (someone?) gives him a bribe" (XIII 9 III 12-14).

LH

(224) namma-za-as-kan EGIR-*anda* memiyani ser karussiyattat "he kept silent about the matter" (SV Kup D §18 49-50; also 59-60; Alak II 83, 87-8, etc.).

(225) INIM MUNUS.LUGAL MUNUS^{tawannanna} UKUMEŠ-us kues katta walhanzi ANA DUTUŠI IŠPUR DUTUŠI-ma-za-kan ser karussiyat nu IQBI le-wa-mu kuitki mematteni "The matter of the queen, the Tawananna, the men whom they strike down, she wrote to My Sun about them, but My Sun kept silent about it (i.e. ignored it) and said 'don't tell me anything'" (XXII 70 Vs 74-5).

The active doesn't take *-za* when it means physically to keep silence or become silent: cf. *nu-kku karusten nu GESTU-ten* "be quiet and listen!" (KBo XII 128 l. 6).

Similar concepts also do not necessarily take the particle (but notice *kutruwah-* 'witness' with *-za*, q. 227):

From early LH:

(226) nasma-kan man DUTUŠI kuedani anda idalu istamasti nat-mu-kan man sannatti nat-mu UL mematti apunn-a-mu antuhsan UL tekkussanusi nan anda imma munnasi "or if you hear some evil relating to My Sun in someone, and you hide it from me and don't tell me, and don't point out that man to me and conceal him, (let the oath gods take you, or similar)" (SV Huqq I 27-30).

Note that in T.O. IV 19 (date?), we find *-za anda sanna-*, apparently because the subject is concealing part of the harvest from the god's fields, and appropriating it. See q. 223 above for *-za munnasi*, possibly because the object is a friend of the subject.

From late LH:

(227) nan le sannatti memian nu-za-kan DUTUŠI piran kutruwah "do not hide the matter: be witness before My Sun" (Ob. IV 14-15).

§2.6c.6 *istamas-* by the way does not usually take the particle:

(228) anda-ma-z-kan man LUKUR-qs kuwapi walhuw[a]nzi dai uess-a istamassuwani nu ANA LUBEL <MAD>KALTI memiyan hudak udummeni

It is probable that *-za* here goes with *nikzi*, though the passage right before ŠÂ É.DINGIR^{LIM} is so broken that the first sentence could easily have ended and a new one begun, in the break. It is also uncertain whether *niniktari* comes from *ninink-* or from *nink-* (everyone except Sturtevant takes it from the former). If it came from the latter, it would be interesting that the active form takes the particle, but the middle doesn't. We have an example of *nink-* in the middle, with *-za*, from the copied OH HAB III 31: *nu-za ninkihh[ut* (q. 24). But actually, even if *nikzi* and *niniktari* come from different verbs, they raise interesting questions about the relative territories of the middle and the active forms with *-za*: the thrust of the two forms might seem to us to be very similar. See §3a.2-3 for some discussion.

In late LH, we find this verb with particle:

(370) *nu-wa-za-kan tuk* DUTU ANE^E *uwanna hassi[klu*
"Let me satisfy myself with seeing you, Sungod of Heaven" (XXIV 5 + IX 13 Rs 17-18 (StBoT 3 p. 12)).

§2.16 Bodily functions:

§2.16a OH

§2.16a.1 Verbs of washing:

Without particle, twice, in OH (with an object, however):

- OS (371) LUGAL-us 3-ŠU *ais-set arri*
"the king washes his mouth three times" (StBoT 8 I 15; also 16-17 with the queen).
Since the object is a body part, according to later Hittite rules one would have expected the particle. But, as can be seen, it is not present in OH. See the plain transitive use in *ta* LUGAL-un *suppiakhi* 'he purifies the king', KBo XX 10+ (StBoT 25 #59) II 8.

OS *-za suppiakhati* (SBo 25, #112, 2a)

§2.16a.2 OH *uesta/uessanta* have no *-za* in the stative meaning 'have on'. But from a copied text, in a transformative use (?):

(372) *antuwahhas-si* [TÚG.G]Ú.È.A GÜN.A *uesta*
"a man puts/has on a colored shirt" (KBo XII 22+ I 2-3 (C)).

This passage is very broken in all the duplicates: I am not sure the beginning of the sentence belongs with the latter part. We find the same use, with *-smas*, in the MH IBoT I 36 II 49, 53, 57-8. There is however no reason to take the verb there as meaning anything but 'have on': the passage is describing the people as they take part in the procession, and seems to concentrate simply on their condition at the time. Q. 372 is probably to be interpreted in the same way, if it truly represents one clause.

§2.16a.3 *unuwai-* 'adorn' takes the particle in a reflexive use: OS
(373) *unut-wa-z*

'adorn yourself!' (XXXI 143 (StBoT 25 # 110) II 23).

unut has been seen as a 3rd s. active preterite, though Neu (StBoT 25 p. 186 fn. 619) suggests that it might be an active imperative, on the lines of the causative verbs in *-nu-*. I think it might be best to take it as a middle imperative, perhaps a shortened form of **unuhut*: note the similar formation *warput*, in q. 381 below; compare also *Dinarass-a-z unuttat* (XVII 5 I 4-5 (Illuyanka)). We find this construction also in the Gurparanzahu myth:

(374) *ammuqq-a-za unuwahhari*
"I too adorn myself" (XVII 9 I 32 (Gurparanzahu myth) = 410/u I. 14 with Act. *nu-za unuwami*). Also IV 4 II 15.

§2.16a.4 The copied Telipinus Edict has an interesting passage:
(375) *kissann-a le tesi arha-wa parkunummi parkunusi-ma-za UL kuit* (TdH 11 adds: *-<ki>*) *nu-za anda imma hatkisinusi*

"(whoever is king after me, let him keep the land united and the enemies subjected), do not say thus: 'I am cleaning out', but you do not clean at all, (but rather) you keep on oppressing: (do not kill any of your family)" (Tel.E. II 43-4 (C)).

The precise meaning of *parkunu-* here is obscure; however, for our purposes, *arha parkunu-*, without particle, is apparently parallel to *-za parkunu-*. It is hard to see the particle as reflexive.

"The matter of the rations shall henceforth be a bond. [When?] they raise (troops? or rations?) for a campaign, let the head of a thousand and the LUDUGUD inspect the rations and meal of (the troops). Whoever [take]s his ration and does not begin to distribute it, you do [not] know the bond of campaigning; something is broken, in this matter"(??) (KBo XVI 25 I 30-4 (41-5: Rizzi-Mellini).

This is Rizzi-Mellini's restoration of the passage; she translates the last phrase 'in qualche modo c'è trasgressione'. CHD 3.1, p. 8 restores [ishi]ul in l. 34.

This expression does not always occur with -za: note the alternation in the copied B.U. between III 18 (with -za) and III 19-20 (without). We might mention that kappuwai- and a couple of similar verbs, which have a meaning parallel to that of this locution, usually take -za:

An example without -za, possibly in the simple meaning "count":

(233) auriyas-a-ssi kuis ERINMES nan kappuwaiddu nas-za [GU]L-assan hardu

"The troops of the watch that he has, let him count them and keep them written down" (B.-M. A I 13-14).

For LH:

(234) man-kan taknas-ma DUTU-i HUL-lu KAXU-az uizzi pidi-ma-as kuitki kappuizzi

"If evil comes out of the mouth of the Sungoddess of earth (or 'to the Sungoddess of earth), and she calculates something (as restitution) in its place" (VII 10 I 7-9).

With particle (MH):

(235) URUDIDLI.HIA BÀD-kan kues maniyahhiya anda nu-za hurupan EGIR-an kappuwan harkandu hantezzies-ma [ku]es MADGALATI URUDIDLI.HIA LUKUR-san kuedas [hud]a k arskizz[i m]ahhan apedas URUDIDLI.HIA-as [auwar]iyas EN-as
x x x x

"The fortresses which are in the administrative area, let them have them counted (and x-ed?). The first posts and the cities into which the enemy arrives very quickly, etc." (B.-M. A I 22-6).

See also IV 13-20.

The fact that -za applies to two parallel verbs indicates that it is the general sense of the verbs which calls forth the particle.

kuwapi-wa karuiles LUGALMES EGIR-pa uwanzi
nu-wa-z KUR-e saklinn-a EGIR-an kappuwanzi ki-y[(a-w)]a
NA4KIŠIB apiyaku ninikta[r]u

"when the ancient kings return and check on the land and the bond, then let also this seal be taken off" (Mast A IV 28-31).

The particle appears also with the hark-form:

(236) k[ar]u-za sumenzan É.DINGIRMES-K[UN]U EGIR-an anzel
[iwa]r UL kuiski kappuwan harta // ... nu-za sumenzan ŠA
[DINGIRMES] assu ... anzel iwar EGIR-an UL kuiski kappuwan
harta // namma s[u]menzan DINGIRMES-as kue
ALAMHIA-KUNU ŠA KÙ.BABBAR GUŠKIN ... nat anzel iwar
EGIR-pa UL kuiski newahha[n hart]a

"formerly no-one kept your temples checked like us; ... and no-one kept your, the gods', goods checked like us; further your images of gold and silver ... no-one kept them renewed like us" (XVII 21+ I 6-8; 11-13; 14(...)-17-18; E. von Schuler, *Die Kaskäer*, p. 152ff.).

For LH, cf. -za kappuwai-, KBo XV 2 C "Vs" 5-20' (StBoT 3 p. 58-60).

There is obviously a fine line between the two proposed meanings for this verb, depending on whether the particle is present; it is not surprising if we find what appears to us as confusion. Note also

nu-za uttar kuwatqa kuitki markiyami [-ka]n?
mehur istarna paizzi zik-ma kisan [mem]atti
LUGAL-us-wa-mu-za UL ŠID-it nu-wa kedas [ANA] MAMIT
GAM-an arha arhaharu nat le DÜ-si

"(if) I refuse/repudiate a word at some time and time passes and you say, 'The king did not set me up (for that)/check on me, so let me be out from under these oaths': don't do that!" (KBo IV 14 III 3-6).

[ANA] MAMIT could be interpreted as [QATAM]MA-pat, in which case the translation would be 'let me be thus out from under these things', but I am not sure what that would mean, or even if it is grammatical. CHD p. 189 translates the first clause as a question 'would I for any reason repudiate any word?'.
.

why it is necessary. 'When I saw them (the articles), I got scared about (it) (*ser*)' is in fact a very plausible rendering in the context.

There are many examples, mostly from LH, though a number may be from copied MH, of *nah-* in both intransitive and transitive use, without the particle. Mursilis II remarks that when he heard the thunder that caused his speech impediment, *nu nahun* (Murs. Sp. Vs 3). In the myth XXXIII 108 II 13, Mt. Pisaisa found that Ishtar was very angry with him *nas nahta*. XXXI 66 II 12 has the passage: GIM-an-ma-nnas-kan HUL-uwa AWATEMES istarni-summi uehtat nu apedani mehuni nahun "when evil words began to go about us among them, I was afraid at that time", and he goes on to complain that his father didn't take care of him when the people did him violence (see q. 251 for the passage immediately following). In AU Taw II 3, the possibility is considered that Tawagalawas will say *kunannas?-wa? nahh?un*. On II 7-8, we find the Great King's answer: *kunannas-ma-as memini kuedani nahta* "The business of being killed of which he was afraid", (spilling blood is not proper in Hatti)". (??; the passage is very messy at the end, but Sommer makes a question out of it: 'is spilling blood proper in Hatti? certainly not!').

In these last cases certainly, it is hard to consider that the subject was not fearing 'for himself', but the particle is not included (in fact most of the modern languages would probably not spell the reflexive sense out either, in a case like that). And so forth.

One wonders whether an insistence on clearly separate meanings for the verb, namely something like 'fear; worry', without particle, 'fear for oneself' with particle, might end up an exercise in hair-splitting. A modern analysis of *-za* as strictly reflexive is bound to be conditioned by what we are used to in our mother tongues, namely (usually) the current European languages. It is revealing, in fact, that CHD, which is based on English, is the one to insist on the strict reflexive interpretation, while German speakers like Friedrich automatically translate *le-ta nahi*, for instance, as 'fürchte dich nicht!', as if the Hittite pronoun were pre-

cisely on the level of its German counterpart. This latter interpretation may be more accurate, in actual fact, but there is no question that the linguistic background of a scholar has a certain tendency to influence his/her analysis of foreign tongues. I plead guilty myself too, of course - it is almost impossible to avoid this pitfall all the time, but the effort must naturally be made. (Actually, the linguistic base does not necessarily have a bad effect: for instance, Carruba's sensitivity to the nuances of the Hittite particles may perhaps have been fine-tuned by familiarity with the Romance Italian). As regards *-za* with *nah-*, given the present state of the reflexive pronouns, in English, it would in any case be impossible to render a more subtle nuance in a translation in that language.

The question hinges on what the reflexive use is employed for in the first place: does it always represent a concrete reference to the subject, or is it simply a tool for highlighting the subject's relation to the verbal content, without necessarily specifying the exact nature of that relation? We note that all the cases with particle or personal pronoun in its place are first or second persons; see above, §2.1d for some comment on this phenomenon.

It is possible to consider that *-za nah-* in LH is the transformative version of the simple *nah-*. That is, with particle, the verb means 'become afraid, take fright', without particle, 'be afraid'. The attestations are a little meagre; however, it is interesting that most of the earlier occurrences of *nah-* without particle seem to indicate a meaning 'be afraid', while the middle, and later active, *nahsariya-* is used for 'become afraid' (though the latter is attested rarely, apparently, after Mursilis II). The examples of *nah-* with particle are all from late LH, that is, they arise after the apparent decline of *nahsariya-*. It would not be surprising to find that *-za nah-* was coined to take the latter's place; in fact, the loss created a void which could not be left empty, and it would stand to reason that a new locution would spring up. In two of the examples of *nah-* with particle, a meaning 'take fright, become scared' is suggested by the context, though q. 363 above does not seem quite to fit into this pattern.

§2.7c LH

§2.7c.1 With *aus-*, we still find that in most cases, the verb does not take the particle:

(242) GIM-an-ma-kan ŠEŠ-YA INIR.GÁL-is *uttar katta austa*
nu-mu-kan HUL-lu uttar katta UL kuitki asta nu-mu EGIR-pa
das

"When my brother M. looked into the matter and there was no trace of an evil thing in me whatsoever, he took me back" (Hatt. I 61-3).

(243) GIM-an-ma-mu-kan I D30-DU-as DUMU Izida ŠA
 DIŠTAR GAŠAN-YA Ū ŠA ŠEŠ-YA-ya *assul austa . . . nu-mu-za*
alwanzahhūwanzi namma QADŪ [DAM-ŠU . . .] eppir
 "When Armatarhundās, son of Z., saw the love of Sausga my mistress and my brother for me, . . . they started to bewitch me, with [his wife, etc. (?)]" (Hatt. II 74-8).
 Note *ep-* and the infinitive, with particle.

But when the focus is on the subject's perception, or when the object seen has a direct effect on the subject, -za does appear:

(244) m]ahhan-ma-an-za-an-kan EGIR-pa *uhhun*
 "When I saw him" (AM p. 42, XIV 16 II 15).

(245) *nu-za kasma au DU NIR.GÁL-mu BELI-YA mahhan*
piran huiyanza
 "Now see/acknowledge, how the mighty Stormgod my lord runs before me (i.e. protects me) . . ." (AM p. 148, KBo V 8+ I 12-13).

(246) *nu-mu ABU-YA DUMU-an sara das nu-mu ANA*
DINGIRLIM IR-anni pesta nu-za ANA DINGIRLIM
LU sankunniyanza BAL-ahhun nu-za-kan ANA ŠU DIŠTAR
GAŠAN-YA LULU uhhun

"And my father took me up and gave me into the service of the goddess and I sacrificed as priest to the goddess and I saw prosperity in the hand of Sausga my mistress" (Hatt. I 17-20).

(247) DIŠTAR-mu-za-kan GAŠAN-YA *humandaza-pat daskit*
man-mu istarkzi kuwapi nu-za-kan irmalas-pat ŠA DINGIRLIM
handandatar ser uskinun DINGIRLUM-mu GAŠAN-YA
humandaza-pat ŠU-za harta

"Sausga my mistress saved me from everything/one. If sometimes I am sick, even as a sick man I would see the favor of the goddess. In everything the goddess my mistress had me by the hand" (Hatt. I 43-6).

Also *nu-za ŠA DIŠTAR para handandatar apiya-ya mekki*
uhhun, Hatt. IV 23-4.

We note the Song of Ulikummi, with its alternation between -kan *sakuwai-* and -za *sakuwai-*:

nu-kan DUTU-us nepisaz [katta s]akuwait nu-za
Dullikummin sakuiskizzi Dullik[ummis-a-za (?)] nepisan
DUTU-un sakuiskizzi

"The Sungod looked down from heaven and saw U.; U. saw the Sungod of Heaven" (Tablet I IV 33-4).

In the Huqqanas Treaty, we find the following special idiom, -za (*katta(n)*) *aus-*:

(248)] DUTUŠI-kan *kuwapi ANA KARAS anda nu man ANA*
 [] *warri zahhiya paimi zig-a-mu katti-mi harran []*
nasma ANA KUR LUKUR-ma nasma ANA URU LUKUR []
zig-a-ru-za kattān nu-mu-za man apiya-[y]a []
LU uskisgatallas nu-zan man ANA DUTUŠI ser SAG.DU-KA-pat
ser autti

"[If] My Sun is among his army and I go to help in battle [], and you [] destroyed with me, or to a land or city of the enemy, and you are with me and if you are also my [] look-out there and if you look to My Sun (as) to your own person . . ." (SV Huqq II 14-19).

The syntax of this passage is somewhat telescoped: perhaps the scribe forgot a *mahhan* in the last clause? An alternative interpretation: 'if you watch over your person for the sake of My Sun', i.e. you keep yourself safe, to be able to be of service to the king. We might assume that the -za appears because the subject is regarding his own head/person, but the locution is probably allied

But with particle:

(354) *harnawas-za kuit MUNUS-za ANA DINGIR^{LIM} EN-ya ser* [SAG².D]U-za *sarninkan harmi*

"As a childbearing woman/midwife what I have restored to the deity my lord of my own person(?)" (XXI 27 IV 35-6).

If one wishes to see -za as indicating that the person is doing the restoration from his own stores, XIII 35+ II 40, 44 (StBoT 4 p. 8) will demonstrate that this is not so. The StBoT 4 texts do not show an example of this verb with -za.

See also §2.9c.3.

Contrast the following from MH:

(355) *hap²]piran nu-kan apatt-a IŠTU KUR-[ŠU] appa wasten nai para pisten*

"[s]old (?); buy that too back from his land and give it out (i.e. here)" (Mitas Rs 35' (it's written upside down)).

(356) *ANA LÚKUR-ma-an-za []... para le kuedanikki happiratteni*

"do not sell him out to any enemy" (Mitas Rs 57-8).

See also q. 97, from the MH original *B.-M.* text, and, from the copied MH (?) T.O.:

(357) *para-pat-za ussanayaddu ussanayazi-ma-at-za kuwapi nat harwasi pidi le ussanayazi*

"Let him sell it out; where is he to sell it? let him not sell it in a secret place" (T.O. II 46-7 (C)).

There is a fair amount of variation with this verb: we find it with particle again on II 79, but without, IV 26. *happiraizzi* appears with particle three times on II 52-5. Cf. also *wasiya-* with particle, II 48-9, 79; XIII 8 Vs 16-17 (C) (*wasi*).

In the early LH SV Targ Rs 40, we have another example of this expression with particle.

In LH we find:

(358) *nu-za apiz[?] SA]G.DU-an ZI-ŠÚ-ya ussaniskit*
"he has put his head and spirit on the line (lit.: 'sold')" (XXI 27 IV 39-40).

See also XIII 35+ III 16 (StBoT 4 p. 10), and passim in StBoT 4 (e.g. with -*nnas*, XIII 35+ III 23-4), with *para* and *arha*. But without particle, XXVI 69 V 8-9 (StBoT 4 p. 44).

§2.15 *ilaliya-* and various verbs indicating states of mind.

§2.15.1 *ilaliya-* usually takes -za:

(359) *nu-za ezatten ekutten dus[k]iskiten danna-ma-za le ilaliyasi*

"(If one of your sisters or other female relatives comes to you, give her food and drink): eat, drink and be merry, but don't desire to sleep with her!" (SV Huqq III 37-8).

See also (not in an amorous vein) SV Man I 65ff, and q.s 155, 415.

A possible example without particle (I tend to think however that the reading in the parentheses is correct, especially since the -as would be hard to explain otherwise. See e.g. V 1 passim for parallels):

(360) *AŠŠUM EN-UTTI DUTUŠI pahhastin . . . tamai-ma-as*
(or *tamai-<s>mas?*) EN-UTTA le *ilaliyatteni [ku]is-ma-za ilaliyazi*
"Protect My Sun for lordship . . . do not desire another('s) lordship: whoever desires (that), (let it lie under the oath)" (PHO I 36-9).

(361) *nasma ki kuit LÚMEŠ URUhatti essanzi [nu-z]a ŠA DUTUŠI EN-manni EGIR-an arha tamel UKÙ-as EN-UTTA ilaliyazi nat GAM NIŠ DINGIR^{LIM} kittaru*
"or this thing that the Hittites do (all the time, namely,) they (lit.: he) desire the rule of another man, instead of My Sun's rule, let it lie under the oath" (Ob. IV 3-6).

See also PHO I 20-1.

fact XXII 70 Vs 41-2, for instance, without particle, though someone is speaking in a dream):

(254) *zashiya-za assulas memian memisten nu DINGIRMEŠ-YA apun assulas memian iyatten*

"you spoke a word of peace in a dream: my gods, perform that word of peace!" (XLIII 55 II 1-2).

The rest of the passage, II 3-5, reads: *nu-za-kan appizziyan ŠUM-an le wahnutteni nu! LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL DUMUMEŠ.LUGAL-ya assuli pahhasten nas TI-an hattulahhann-a harten* "do not 'turn' (i.e. ruin) their name in future: protect the king, queen and princes in peace, and keep them alive and well!".

§2.7c.3 The middle, in the meaning "be visible, appear, show oneself" usually does not take the particle, throughout Hittite: see e.g. *nu-kan DUTU-i-ma uwahhat* "I appeared/showed myself to the Sungod" (XXIV 7 IV 34). This happens to be an MH text, but cf. Murs.P.P. I p. 176 (Rs 30, 38), also KBo XV 2 Rs 17+ (StBoT 3 p. 62), etc.

But:

(255) *ŠA É.GAL.LIM-ya-za MUNUSTUM mekki usgahhu:*
"be very careful with a woman of the palace!" (Huqq III 44 & passim).

Suppiluliumas, in this treaty, seems very nervous about the amorous habits of Huqqanas, and warns him of all kinds of sins of the flesh that were apparently not considered sins in Huqqanas' country. For our purposes, apparently a sense 'watch out', i.e. 'take active steps to protect/watch yourself', comports a particle.

§2.7c.4 *tekkus(sa)nu-* can take *-za* (compare the MH q. 240 above, with *sakinu-*):

(256) *nu-za DU EN-YA para handandatar maḥhan . . .] tetkusnut*

"As the Weathergod my lord showed his favor" (AM p. 122, KBo IV 4 II 76-7, also similar Murs.P.P. II p. 218, XIV 11 IV 19).

But cf. q.s 226 and 263, from the Huqqanas Treaty; also *tekkusses-*

from KBo IV 12 Vs 12. The expression with particle may be rendered 'put forth one's might, show one's intentions', or the equivalent, while without particle it may mean simply 'present, show; bring to someone's attention' or similar.

(257) *nu-mu DIŠTAR GAŠAN-YA EGIR-an tiyat nu-mu memiskit GIM-an kisct-ya-za nu-za DIŠTAR GAŠAN-YA para handandatar apiya-ya mekki tekkussanut*

"And Sausga my mistress supported me, and as she told me, so it turned out, and there also Sausga my mistress showed great favor (to me)" (Hatt. IV 16-19).

§2.7c.5 In LH, we still find variations in the use of *-za* with *sek-*: The simple "know" still appears to have no particle:

(258) *zik-ma-wa-za DUMU-as nu-wa UL kuitki sakti*
"you're a kid and you don't know anything" (AM p. 18, XIX 29 IV 16).

(259) *[nas]ma-kan ŠA DUTUŠI HUL-lu ŠEŠ DUTUŠI kuiski . . . kuedanikki GAM an harzi nat sakki kedani-ma-za-kan [AN]A NIŠ DINGIRLIM pariyan UL memai*

"or (if) a brother of My Sun plots evil against My Sun with someone, and he knows and doesn't tell it, in the face of the oath, (let it lie under the oath)" (PHO I 27-31).

But with *-za*:

(260) *ANA PANI ABI-ŠU-wa ERÍNMEŠ . . . [ma]niyahhiskit ŠA ABI-ŠU-ya-wa-za ishiul IDI*

"(your older brother) managed the troops before his father, and he knew his father's counsel(?)" (AM p. 16-18, XIX 29 IV 8-9).

One suspects that *-za* is present only because the topic has something to do with the subject's father.

(261) *nu-za-[ka]n sakta kuiski kuinki*

"(Whatever woman of the king, whether a MUNUS.SUHUR.LAL or free), (if) someone has relations with any (such woman) . . ." (Ob. IV 32).

§2.14 *pai-* only has the particle in a few phrases:

§2.14a *QH*

(341) *nu AMA-ŠUNU [-u]s? naṭta ganeszi nu-za DUMU.MUNUSMEŠ-ŠA ANA DUMU.NITAMEŠ-ŠA pais*

"Their mother does not recognize [her sons?], and gave her daughters to her sons (to wife)" (Zalpa Vs 16-17).

In this case, it is hard to see *-za* as anything but an ethical dative, indicating that the subject's relatives are involved. See in fact the late LH q. 327, with this same expression, without *-za*. Q. 158 furthermore has no *-za* even though the subject is giving his daughter in marriage to someone.

§2.14b *MH*

(342) *nu-za kuiss-a DUMU.NITA-li N[INDA]-an UZUṽ-ya pai [kui]s-ma-za DUMU.NITA-li akuwanna pai*

"one gives the child bread and fat, another gives him to drink" (Appu I 19-20 (C)).

This is an unusual expression. One might be tempted to take it as an MH idiom. But cf. *-za handai-* from the LH Ashella ritual, with apparently a similar meaning:

nu kues kues ENMEŠ.[KAR]AŠ huma[nt]es nu-za humanza UDU.ŠIR han[da]izzi

"whoever all the generals are, each provides a prize ram" (IX 31 III 17-18 = HT 1 III 5-7).

(343) *man-za DINGIRMEŠ LÚMEŠ GIŠERIN-as ANA TÚLMEŠ piyantes*

"if the male gods of the cedar are given to the springs" (XV 34 III 35 (C)).

This probably conforms to the use of *es-* 'be' rather than to that of *pai-*. See Goetze's comments on the gods of the cedar, Hatt. p. 108 (KBo VI 29+ I 31).

From copied MH(?), we have examples of *piyauen* with *-za* and with *-nas*, T.O. IV 49, 72-3, but without particle IV 50-1. The subject is giving certain temple objects to himself. When people connected with him are involved, the particle does not appear. But since that clause follows directly on one with the particle, it may have been considered unnecessary to repeat it.

§2.14c *LH*

§2.14c.1 It might appear that the sense of *-za* is "einander", in the following:

(344) *nas DINGIRMEŠ MAMITI eḫpir nu-za ŠEŠ-as ŠEŠ-an kattan peskit [LÚar]as-ma-za LÚaran kattan peskit*
 "(They broke the oath), and the gods of the oath took them, and brother betrayed brother, friend betrayed friend" (AM p. 192, KBo II 5 IV 15-17).

But see SV Targ Rs 23:

(345) *nu-mu haṭrasi ERÍNMEŠ-wa-mu ANŠE.KUR.RAMEŠ uppi nu-tta ERÍNMEŠ ANŠE.KUR.RAMEŠ uppahhi zig-an aṇda ANA LÚKÚR UL pehutesi nan-za-an ANA LÚKÚR kuwatka kattan pesti*

"(If) you write to me: 'send me troops and cavalry', and I send you them but you do not lead them against the enemy, but rather hand them over to the enemy" (SV Targ Rs 22-3).

Also XXI 29 III 29, possibly IV 4. This expression may turn up in Ashella, HT 1 IV 3.

The particle seems to be part of the verbal expression, though it may seem to us that it reinforces the reciprocal sense.

§2.14c.2 In the sense, "give as a substitute, replace", the particle appears:

(346) *nu-wa-za kasa{ } tarpallius pidi SUM-ihhun nu-wa-za kus da*

"I have given scapegoats in my place: take them" (XXIV 5+ IX 13 Vs 10' (StBoT 3 p. 8)).

(347) *nu-wa-za [] DINGIRMEŠ-as wassiyahhahat tarpallin-za pihhu[n nu-w]a-smas apus datten*

Cf. also *kanessan hark-*, parallel to *assu hark-*, Hatt I 29; also I 67, IV 60. In KBo IV 12 Vs 11, 16, we find *kanesta* in the same sense of 'favor', 'honor', without particle.

XXII 70 Vs 61-2 has a different slant, but still no particle: *eni-ma kuit MUNUS.LUGAL UKUMES-sus katta GUL-antes ANA DUTUŠI IŠPUR DUTUŠI-ma-kan memian menahhanda kanista nu kissan IQBI le-wa-mu kuitki mematteni*

"This matter that the queen wrote to My Sun about the beaten-down men, and My Sun glossed the matter over (? : what about *menahhanda*?), and said thus: 'don't tell me anything'".

§2.8 *tarna-*

This verb seems to take *-za* principally in two cases:

1) when the narration involves letting someone into or out of one's territory, as in the following quotes:

MH

(268) ŠA LUKUR-ma-za-kan LUT[E]MI INA KÁ-ŠUNU UL *tarnanzi*

"they do not let a messenger of the enemy in their gate" (Mitas Rs 22).

(269) *nu-za-kan URU-ri sara apun tarnai*

"lets that one up to the city" (Mitas Vs 34).

Note that in Mašat 75/104 l. 5-7, e.g., when a city is simply mentioned, *-za* is not included: 1 ME ERINMEŠ GIBIL-wa-kan INA URUgasipura sara *tarnahhun*.

One can see from the following quote that *-za* is not obligatory:

(270) ANA GAL.GEŠTIN-ma kissan hatreskizi ANA KUR URUhapalla-wa-tta 1-eaz tiyami zig-a-wa-mu-kan awan arha [tarna] nu-wa-kan it KUR URUhapalla-wa-kan kueni nasma-war-at arnut mahhan-ma-an-za-kan GAL.GEŠTIN awan arha tarnas namma-man-si EGIR-an KASKALMEŠ.TIM [IŠBAT] man-an-kan EGIR-anta walhta nu-ssi kedani uddani Iantahittas-pat . . . Imazlauwass-a . . . hantitiyatalles[sir]

"he wrote thus to the Chief of Wine: 'I will go by myself for you to H.; you, let me out and go and destroy H., or bring it (to Hattusas)'. But when the Chief of Wine let him out, he would have taken the road behind him, and would have struck him from behind, and in this matter A. and M. distinguished themselves (as true vassals) for him" (Mašd Rs 25-8).

The copied T.O. has *anda tarna-* both with and without particle, showing how *-za* could be used to make a distinction between meanings: *nan-kan anda tarnat[teni]*, II 15, with the meaning 'substitute, put in instead of', contrasted with II 16, 19: *nasma-an-za-an-kan hali / nasma-za-kan UDU asauni anda tarnatteni*, which conforms to the use of q. 268 above.

LH

One assumes that the same rationale is in play in the following passage:

(271) *nasma-kan wasdulas UKU-as EGIR-pa anda uizzi nan-za-an-kan anda tarnati nasma-za-an-kan awan arha tarnatti nas damedani KUR-ŠA LUKUR paizzi nan-kan kus DINGIRMES arha harninkandu*

"Or (if) a criminal comes back into (the country) and you let him in, or you let him out and he goes to the enemy land, let these gods destroy him" (PHO II 18-22).

See also SV Man I 16-17 (*anda tarna-*); 55-6 (*arha [tarn]a-*), q. 418 below; AU Taw I 19-20.

(272) A.ŠÀ-ni-ma-za-kan anda TUL-tar le DÜ-si man-ma-za-kan A.ŠÀ-ni-[ma?] anda TUL DÜ-si nu-za-kan LUKUR-as GIR-[Š]U an[da] tarnatti nu A.ŠÀ-as-tis hallanniyattari

"don't make a fountain in your field. If you make a fountain in your field, you will let the enemy's foot into your (domain), and your field will be overrun" (IV 3 II 6-9).

A metaphorical version is

(273) *nu-tta kas memias ŠÀ-ta tarnummas esdu nan-za-an-kan apedani UD-ti ŠÀ-ta tarna*

(327) ANA TUPPI RIKILTÍ ŠA ABI-YA-ya-kan kuit kissan iyan MUNUS.LUGAL-wa-tta kuin MUNUS^{TUM} DAM-anni pai nu-wa INA KUR DU-tassa LUGAL-iznani apel DUMU-ŠU dai nu TUPPU RIKILTÍ kuwapi ier apun-ma-za MUNUS-an I DLAMA-as ANA PANI ABI-YA datta-pat naui kinun-ma-za apun MUNUS-an I DLAMA-as man dai man-za-an UL dai nu apas memiyas UL dattari kuin-za imma DUMU-an I DLAMA malaizzi man-as apel ŠA MUNUS^{TI} DUMU-as man-as tamel kuelqa MUNUS-as DUMU-as nu kuis DUMU-as ANA I DLAMA ZI-anza kuin-za DUMU-an I DLAMA-as malaizzi nu INA KUR URU DU-tassa LUGAL-iznani apun tittanuddu

"Because it is written thus on the treaty tablet of my father: 'whatever princess I give (!) you to wife, make that woman's son king in T.'. But when they made the treaty tablet, K. had not yet taken that woman before my father. Now, whether or not K. takes that woman, that word does not apply: whichever son K. prefers, whether he is son of that woman or of some other woman, whichever son is of a liking to K., whichever son he prefers, let him put that one in as king in T." (B.T. II 84-93).

(328) nu DUMU ŠEŠ-Š-YA I DLAMA-an sara dahhun nu-za ŠEŠ-YA INIR.GAL-is ku[it] AŠRU URU DU-assan parnawaiskit nan apiya pidi LUGAL-iznanni tittanunun

"I took up the son of my brother, K., and the place of Tarhuntassa which my brother had settled, I made him king in that place" (Hatt. IV 62-4).

But with the particle:

(329) nu-za I LUGAL-DSIN-an LUGAL URU kargamis ŠEŠ-YA x [tapa]riyan tittanunun

"I put my brother H., the king of Kargamis, in as ruler" (AM p. 54, XIV 15/16 III 35).

Apparently a brother rates -za, but a nephew does not. See e.g. -za with pai- 'give' in OH (q. 341), presumably included to underline the fact that the subject was giving her daughters to her own sons to wife. But see q. 158 with no -za, even though the subject is also

giving his daughter in marriage. The decision to include the particle seems to be a matter of the taste of the writer, though it may be that the relation has to be overtly specified in the same clause, for -za to be included.

§2.13 sarra-

§2.13a OH

Apparently sarra- in the meaning 'divide, split up' had not yet acquired -za as steady company in OH, though the combination is attested:

(330) takku IR-as GÉME-an dai nu-za [DUMUMEŠ ien]z[(i)] man É-ŠUNU sar[(ranzi)] assu-smet hanti h[anti?] sarr[(a)]nzi mekkus [DUMUMEŠ GÉME-as dai] ū 1 DUMUAM IR-as dai

"If a slave takes a slave girl and they have children; if they divide the house (i.e. separate (?)), they divide their goods equally (?); the slave girl takes most of the children; the slave takes one child" (Laws A §"33").

Similar, A §"32a", both are very broken and the restorations are made up.

(331) takku LÚ GIŠTUKUL ū LÚ HA.LA-ŠU taksan asanzi man-i-za it[(alauessanzi)] taz É-ZUNU sarranzi takku gimmaras-sas 10 SA[(G.DU 7 SAG.DU LÚ GIŠTUKUL dai)] ū 3 SAG.DU LÚ HA.LA-ŠU dai GUD.HI.A ... [(QATAMMA)] sarranzi takku NÍG.BA LUGAL TUPPI kuiski (D adds: harzi) man-za (D: -zan) A.ŠA.HI.A-na k[(aruilin)] sarranzi

"If a farmer and his partner are in partnership and they fall out and divide the house (i.e. separate?), if there are 10 slaves in the fields, the farmer takes 7 and the partner 3, and they divide the cattle, etc. in the same manner. If someone has a deed of the king on tablet, and they divide the old field..." (Laws A §53).

See also (the copied) Tel.E. IV 33-4: nu uizzi apedani UKÙ-si (É-ri-ssi)-pat idalauessi "it will go hard for this man('s house)".

not take it and didn't give it over to My Sun; M. took it for himself" (Madd Rs 22-4).

Cf. the very usual *nat-kan para pedanzi* or similar, in the following quote:

(280) *nu 12 LÚMEŠ MEŠĒDI aramu GIŠŠUKUR^{HI.A}-ya harkanzi man 12 LÚMEŠ MEŠĒDI-ma sara UL arta nassu KASKAL-an kuiski peyanza nasma INA É-ŠU kuiski taranza GIŠŠUKUR^{HI.A}-ma makkeszi nu-kan kue GIŠŠUKUR^{HI.A} aszi nat-kan para pedanzi nat ITTI LÚMEŠNIDUH^{ti} tianzi*

"12 bodyguards stand and hold spears. If 12 bodyguards are not available, either (because) someone has been sent on a mission or released to his house, and the spears are too many, the spears which remain, they take them forth and put them with the porters" (IBoT I 36 I 10-15).

In one place, however, we find *-za* included:

(281) *nu man-at LUGAL-us-ma lamnizzi nan-za para ped[anzi] } man LULUM nar za ZI-it para UL pe[danzi]*
"if the king calls for it (?), they bring it/him forward . . . if it is a man, they don't bring him forward on their hook" (IBoT I 36 I 30-2).

The context is broken, and it is difficult to determine why *-za* has been included here. But it is unusual, and probably had some specific rationale.

Cf. also

(282) *A[BI DUT]UŠI-ma mahhan IŠME nasta I¹kisnapilin ERÍNMEŠ . . . ANA I¹attarsiya menahhanta zahhiya para nais nu [z]ik I¹madduwattas namma I¹attarissiyā UL mazzasta nu-ssi piran arha tarnas nu-ddu-za uit I¹kisnapilis an²-x-x IŠTU KUR URU hatti huinut I¹kisnapilis-a ANA I¹attarissiya menahhanta zahhiya pait*

"but when My Sun's father heard, he sent K. and troops, etc., forth to battle against A. You, M., did not resist A., and cleared out from before (him), and K. came and brought x out of Hatti for you and further went to battle with A." (Madd Vs 61-3).

In KBo XVI 25 I 68 (79: Rizzi-Mellini), we find *nan-za-an KUR-yaz arha suit* "he drove him out of his land". Unfortunately the context is rather broken, but we assume that the subject drove *someone* out of his (the subject's) territory.

B.U. IV 52-3 (C) contributes a case of *piran huinu-* with particle:

(283) *nu-za parnas eshar . . . piran huinutten*
"drive out from before you the blood of the house, etc.".

The particle might seem to be governed by *piran*. See also the even more literal-looking Anniwianis I 30-1, mentioned in §3d (Conclusions).

§2.9b.2 From the Telipinus myth, we have an inclusion of *-za* because relatives are involved:

(284) *nu-za annas DUMU-ŠU pennista UDU-us SILÁ-ZU pennista GUD-us AMAR-ŠU pennista*

"The mother led/readmitted her child, the sheep led her lamb, the cow led her calf" (XVII 10+ IV 24-5 (C)).

Note that XII 60 I 18 (Telipinus and the daughter of Ocean) contributes a probable case of *-za pehutet* in the sense of "taking to wife".

§2.9c LH

From early LH:

(285) *nu-mu-ssan man ERÍNMEŠ-it ANŠE.KUR.RA[^{HI.A}]A-it lammar UL arti nu-za-an (-zan?) para imma huittiyasi*

"(If My Sun undertakes some war, and I write to you) and if you do not arrive immediately to me with troops and cavalry and you, 'draw him forward' (i.e. favor him)" (SV Huqq II 28-9).

Friedrich translates 'und (ihn) gar noch begünstigt' for the last clause. (See also q. 118 with *para da-* without particle in a similar meaning). *para huittiya-* turns up later in the *hark-form*, III 10 ff., also with *-za* (no *-an*), and seems to have this meaning. Cf. however a passage similar to q. 285, IV 37 ff., where the verb in the position of *para huittiyasi* is *p[ara] samnut[te]ni* (also with *-za-an*) 'you let them go'. It is possible that in the above passage *para huittiya-* means 'you drive him from you' (?).

"behold, I, My Sun's father, saved you, M., from A.'s dagger; belong to My Sun's father and Hatti! (I gave you the land of Mt. Zippasla and you, M., be in the land of Mt. Z.): hold your back (?) back in the land of Mt. Z.'" (Madd Vs 14-17).

Note a similar phrase *-za* with *lagan hark-* in the OH original XXXVI 110 (StBoT 25 #140):

(316) // [l] *abarnas* LUGAL URU^h*hatti sahesar-summe[t] estu nu-za-pa utniyanza humanza iski-smet anda URU^hhattusa lagan hard[u]/-z[i] // labarnas* LUGAL-us *inarauanza nu-sse-pa utniyanza humanza anda inarahhi*

"Let Labarnas king of Hatti be your security (?), and let the whole land have its back inclined towards Hattusas. L. the king is strong, and the whole country is strong on him' (or 'gives him strength') (XXXVI 110 (StBoT 25 #140) Rs 8-12).

In VII 5 II 12 (C), we find *nat-za-kan issi-ssi dai* "he puts it in his mouth". Obviously *-za* is the "reflexive" equivalent of an anaphoric pronoun: contrast e.g. the original MH XLV 47 I 42-3 (Boley 2) q. 46): [n]u-smas-kan LU^AAZU INA QATI-Š[UN]U anda GIS^EERIN dai "the seer puts the cedar into their hands". It is noteworthy, however, that both the particle and the pronoun here are in the nature of an "ethical dative".

With particle, in the meaning 'set on, attack':

(317) LU^KKUR-za-kan mahhan URU^hkasasan . . . zikkizzi nat AŠME // nasta apas LU^KKUR kuwapi naiskittari nu-mu hatreski

"I am aware of the way the enemy is attacking K. Wherever that enemy turns, write to me" (Mašat 75/43 l. 4-10).

See also the copied Soldier's Oath: *nu-zan ANA KUR URU^hhatti LU^KKUR-li IGI^HLA-wa dai*

"(whoever) sets his eyes in a hostile way on Hatti . . ." (KBo VI 34+ I 23-4, 42-3, II 12-13 (C)).

I think the following passage also belongs here:

(318) takku ANA KI.GUB SAG.DU-ŠU p [iran] haddariettari anzel-za-kan ERIN^MMEŠ-an ERIN^MMEŠ.KUR walhuwanzi zikkizzi

"if the head of the KI.GUB is pierced in front, the enemy troops will begin attacking our troops" (KBo X 7 III 13-16 (C?)).

Also IV 1-3. The text has some early forms, like *takku*, but a use of *-kan* and *-asta* that does not seem to reflect true OH practice. I would judge it to be at least MH in later copy.

-za probably goes with *zikkizzi* and not with *walh-*: the latter is in fact not found with *-za* as a general rule (see e.g. q. 104). Note also q. 232, with *piyanna*; the copied possibly MH T.O. III 27. URU^hhattusan-za-kan zammurawanzi kuiski tiskizzi. This construction is close to the supine with the simple *dai-*, which does not normally take the particle. See q. 228, however, for an MH example of *dai-* and the infinitive with *-za*.

§2.12c LH

From early LH:

(319) DUTUŠI-wa-ddu-za-kan idalauanni kissan kissann-a zikkizzi

"My Sun is fixing to harm you thus and thus" (SV Kup §21 D IV 18-19 = §22 E IV 21-2 = Targ Vs 29 (no *idalauanni*) = Alak III 18-19).

-du- could be a dative or an accusative; in the former case, *-za* might be seen as having an accusative function. The syntax is not clear, but probably the thrust is "My Sun is setting you (acc.) to evil". Compare the MH q. 317. See also *man-za-kan ANA DUTUŠI kuiski HUL menahhanda zikkizzi* "if someone plots evil against My Sun" (SV Kup §18 D III 55-6; also III 49).

piran katta dai-

(320) nu-za DINGIRMEŠ ki DINAM *piran katta daisten nat punusten*

"you gods took this case under advisement and investigated it" (KBo IV 8 II 16-17).

AU Taw III 11-12 has *nu-za ŠEŠ-YA BELUMEŠ piran GAM da[i]*, which Sommer translates "und du, mein Bruder, verhöre die Führer!".

This verb appears several times in the State Treaties: cf. e.g. SV Kup §16 C III 1-3 and passim; also q. 142 above. Apparently the version with *-za* indicates that the subject is commanding his troops himself: cf. in fact

(292) ERÍN^{MEŠ}-ma ANŠE.KUR.RA^{MEŠ}-ya ANA I^{EN} LÚGAL-KA
piran huenut

"send your troops and cavalry with one of your nobles!" (SV Kup §19 D IV 4).


§2.9c.6 An interesting alternation:

(293) DUTU^{ŠI}-za DINGIR^{MEŠ}-tar ŠA HUR.SAG^{haharwa}
KASKAL-ahzi zilann-a-kan ŠA URUGIDRU-ti DINGIR^{MEŠ}-tar
KASKAL-ahzi

"My Sun sets the god's statue of Mt. Haharwa on its way; then he sets the god's statue of Hatti on its way" (V 1 IV 83-4).

Note *ne-za arha udai*, XXIV 5 + IX 13 Vs 17 (StBoT 3 p. 8), in a very broken context, and *arha-za A.A-an udahhi* of the equally late LH V 1 III 56. The sense seems comparable to the above examples, although one is reminded of the possible Italian translation *se lo porta via*, in which the *se* could just indicate a vague personal involvement of the subject in his action, without the strict sense of property which we find in q. 288 above. See also a comparable usage with the verbs of motion.

The following passage is translated differently by everyone that treats it:

(294) nu ammuk-ma GIM-an nakkesta nu-mu-za hanti
kuwapikki esta UL-mu-za GAM-an esta URU^{nihirya-za-kan} UL
1-as arha unnahhun uit-mu-kan namma kuwapi LÚKUR
KUR.KUR^{hurri} arha ME-as URU^{alatarme-za-kan} UL 1-as
EGIR-an esun nu-za man apenissuwan mehur  kuwa-
yammanza namma DÛ-ri

"When I was in trouble, you were somewhere else: you were not with me. Did I not take Nihirya away all by myself, when the Hurrian enemy came and took (it) away from me again? did I not succour Alatarma all by myself? If ever such a fearful time occurs again, (. . . die for the king!)" (KBo IV 14 II 7-12).

It is conceivable that URU^{nihirya-za-kan} represents rather URU^{nihirya-za-kan} and that the phrase should be rendered 'did I not go away by myself from N.?' (I have unfortunately not been able to find Stefanini's edition of the text, so I do not know how it handles this passage). Otten MDOG 94 p. 5, prefers this interpretation and translates 'Bin ich aus der Stadt N. nicht allein davongefahren?'. What is strange is that on III 7 the king mentions that his vassal *was* concerned for him on the road to Nihirya. Otten also takes KUR.KUR^{hurri} as the object in the next clause; he believes the LÚKUR of that clause is Assur. The third clause he renders 'war ich in der Stadt A. nicht völlig verlassen?'.

§2.10 The verbs of motion

The particle occurs with these verbs only in a few limited phrases.

§2.10b MH

Without particle:

(295) man sarkantis-ma aria ANA LÚ^{MEŠEDI}-ma . . .
[DI]NU nas-kan sarkantin piran arha UL paizzi EGIR-an
arha-as-kan paizzi nu-za arahza kuis harzi nas paizzi
apedani kattan tiyazzi

"if the s. stands and there is a trial of a bodyguard, he does not go off before the s., he goes off behind (it); who(ever) holds himself outside, he goes and steps with that one" (IBoT I 36 III 31-4).

(296) nas paizzi GIŠ^{huluganni} LÚ^{ŠUKUR}[GUŠKIN?] GIŠ^{DUBBIN}
kattan tiyazzi

"the man of the golden spear goes and steps alongside the wheel"
(IBoT I 36 II 13-14).

But see also *nat-za* . . . kattan iyannianzi, II 18-19, where the meaning contributed by *-za* is "einander".

(297) nu I^{attarissiyas} ANA [I^m]adduwatta [] x-neat
nas-za arha INA KUR-ŠU pait nu I^{madduwattan} namma
tan pedassahhir

without particle are merely descriptive. But it is a fine point. It is interesting that the third person does not seem to appear with particle while the second persons (imperatives at that) take *-za*, even if erratically.

In the Hantitassu ritual, we find: (the king takes something) *ne-zzan INA GÚ-ŠU nai* "and 'turns' them on his neck" (XLIII 57 IV 3). Note *-za* and *-san*, the latter probably marking the act of putting (something) on a body, the former specifying that it is the subject's body. In this ritual we also find the locution *-zan huganta nai-*, doubtless with the same meaning, since this is the formula pronounced by the *uddanas EN-as* to accompany the action of IV 3: *zik-zan mahhan INA UD.9.KAM huiswantas hukanta naitta tuqq-a DINGIRMES humantes-pat halziyandu* "as you 'turned' on yourself the killed offerings of living things on the ninth day, let all the gods call you!" (XLIII 57 IV 4-6). The ritual ends with *nu-za-kan LUGAL-us huganta nai*, IV 22; probably the same phrase reappears on IV 13 with *neyan harzi*, but the beginning of the clause is broken. CHD signals the occurrence of this verb with *-za* in XII 51 I 22, translating 'put on', but the passage is odd: *EGIR-ŠU-ma-za 2 HAR.ŠU.HI.A 2 HAR.GIRMES nai [] Ū ANA 2 GIRMES anda nai* "then he 'turns' two bracelets and two anklets on himself . . . and 'turns' [x] onto his feet".

§2.11c LH

Without particle:

(308) *A.ŠÀ A.GÀR-ma-kan . . . miyatar neyari*
"in the fields, etc., there is abundance" (KBo XI 1 Vs 25).

I am not clear that *neyari* here is intransitive, as it seems to be taken by most scholars (Neu, StBoT 5 p. 123, is in fact the only exception). We find an interesting use also in IX 4 III 32 (a *MUNUSŠU.GI* ritual); the sense of the verb (which is transitive) seems somewhat similar to *neyari* in q. 308: *uellun mutaizzi nasta artartin neyari HUR.SAG-an mutaizzi nasta watar neyari* "(the piglet) uproots the meadow and he/it 'turns' the *a.*-plant; he uproots the mountain and he/it 'turns' water" (IX 4 III 29-32). Unless the meaning in q. 308 is that the subject itself produced the

object, in some fashion, it is hard to understand why the verb is a middle.

In KBo IV 6 Vs 16, Rs 21-2, of Mursilis II, and in the late LH Ashella ritual, the MH phrase of q. 307 appears without particle: cf. e.g. *nu-war-as-kan anda(n) assuli neyaru* (IX 31 IV 25 = HT 1 IV 28-9 = XLI 17 IV 14-15').

But with particle:

(309) *GIM-an-ma-mu-za DU URUnerik SAG.DU DINGIRLIM-is duwan para GIM-an SAG.KI-za harta kinuna-ya QATAMMA kedani-za-kan LÍL-ri kuwaten imma kuwaten neyahhari nu-mu pian huiyasi*

"As you were helpful to me up till now, Weathergod of Nerik, chief god, now (let it be) the same: wherever I turn on this battlefield, run before me" (V 1 III 53-5).

IGIHI.A-wa nai- (active and middle) appears generally with *-za* in the meaning 'I turned towards (x)'.
In the middle:

(310) *nu-za-kan IGIHI.A-wa etez ANA I pittapara neyahhat*
"I turned my eyes to this side of P. (i.e. I did not go directly at him, but to surprise him, came from the other side)" (AM p. 156, KBo V 8 III 18-19).

See also SV Dup D I 32-3. The ritual KBo XVII 69 I. 13 has a similar phrase; it may be originally MH, though definitely of late LH copy.

In the active, both with and without particle:

(311) *nu KARAŠ ANŠE.KUR.RAMES ŠA KUR URUhatti humandan ammuk taparha nu-mu-za ŠEŠ-YA INIR.GÁL-is para uiskit nu-mu DIŠTAR GAŠAN-YA GIM-an karessan harta nu-za-kan IGIHI.A-wa kuwattan ANA KUR LUKÚR andan naiskinun nu-mu-kan IGIHI.A-wa LUKÚR EGIR-pa UL kuiski nais nu-za KUR.KURMES LUKÚR tarhiskinun*

"I commanded the whole army and cavalry of Hatti, and my brother M. sent me out (to battle). And as Sausga, my mistress, favored me, whenever I turned my eyes to the land of an enemy,

Apparently in the meaning 'defect', cf. *arha tiya-* with *-za*:
 (305) LÚMES URU^{hupisna-wa-mu-za kuwapi arha tier}
nu-wa-mu-kan uier nu-wa-za Inanayan ginuwa eppun
le-wa-mu-kan katta uiyanzi

"When the men of H. defected from me, they sent me (away), and I took N. by the knees (saying): 'let them not send me down!'" (XXVI 69 VII 6-10, StBoT 4 p. 46).

For an example of this expression without *-za*, however, see the passage from SV Kup, quoted under q. 78.

§2.11 *nai-*

nai- is a very complex verb, and it is not possible to discuss here all its occurrences without particle (see CHD for the use of *nai-* in general). We shall limit ourselves to its appearances with *-za*, with occasional references to cases in which it has no particle, for purposes of comparison, when this seems appropriate.

§2.11a OH

For purposes of comparison with later locutions, note Anittas Rs 52: URU^{salatiwara meni-mmet neh[hun} "I turned my face towards S.". KBo XX 82 II 18-20 has *arhalanda neyanza (es)* twice, without particle. Since this is an OH text in late copy, it is likely that the form has been remodeled from **naishut*, or something similar, which probably would not have taken *-za*. See in fact the MH usage below, q. 307 ff.

§2.11b MH

This verb often occurs with *-za* in middle forms (see Neu 1) p. 121 ff.).

Without particle:

(306) LÚKÚR-^{za-kan mahhan URUkasasan . . . zikkizzi nat}
 AŠME // *nasta apas LÚKÚR kuwapi naiskittari nu-mu*
hatreski

"I am aware of the way the enemy is attacking K. Wherever that enemy turns, write to me" (Mašat 75/43 l. 4-10).

See also IBoT I 36 III 63: *man GIŠhulugannaza-ma neari* "when he turns from the chariot".

nai- in the middle without particle usually refers to physical turning, such as in a dance.

Both with and without particle:

(307) *nu-za-kan DINGIRLUM DIM-wa KUR-KA andan nais-*
hut INA KUR URUhatti-ma-wa-kan anda assuli naishut
 "god, Stormgod, be turned into your land, and be turned in peace towards Hattī" (HT I II 39-41 = IX 3i III 5-7, Ritual of Uhhamuwa (C)).

See also XXXIII 120 I 27 (*neyat*; copied OH?/MH), with particle. But in XV 34 I 49-50, II 1-2. 39 and passim, we find *nasta . . . anda (assuli) naisten/naisdumat*. The copied X 72 II 18, V 17 has *nu-ssi-kan anda assuli naishut* (in the second example the *-is-* has been omitted from the imperative). Note also the LH passage from the Ashella ritual, under q. 308 below.

See XLI 17 II 16-17: *nu-wa-za-kan EGIR-pa naishut ANA KURTIYA-ma-wa-kan anda le uwasi*
 "turn back! do not come into my land!".

The ritual is trying to convince a deity responsible for a plague to go back where he came from.

See CHD p. 353 for some more examples of *nai-* with and without *-za* in similar phrases.

The particle might seem to indicate that the subject has some active involvement, or intention, in his action, whereas the phrases

"A. x-ed to M., and he went off (back, home) to his country, and they made M. a vassal again" (Madd Vs 64-5).

Presumably *-za* is called forth because the subject is going back to his own land. However, this does not seem the likely rationale for the particle in the following:

(298) *nat-za arha pair URU marasan [URU-an] kattan lukker*
"they went off and burned M." (Madd Rs 54).

lukkiya- and *warnu-* normally don't use the particle; we find *warnu-* once with particle:

MUŠEN^HI.A-*ma-za kissan warnut*

"He (i.e. My Sun) burnt (for himself, presumably) the birds thus" (Murs. Sp. Vs 31 (broken context before, list of birds after)).

The simple *warnu-* appears on Rs 37: the subjects are not doing the sacrifice for themselves. The same question raised for *nah-* in §2.15.3 below, applies here as well. *-za* in q. 298 may refer to *arha pai-*. The particle however is not always included: in the phrase cf. *-kan . . . arha uit* of Madd Vs 60, with apparently a similar meaning. See also the LH q. 303 and the material under it.

In the following the particle seems to be present because the subject is going to his own temple:

(299) *nu-zan EGIR-pa [sum]enzan ANA É.DINGIR^{LIM}-KUN[U] uwatten*

"Come back to your temple!" (XV 34 IV 32-3 (C), and passim in various states of breakage).

Note also that *-za* appears with *iyannis* in the Appu myth only when the person is going to his own house: compare e.g. I 24-5, II 10-11, with I 40, 43, II 11-12.

The following passage is interesting because of the next q. below, which has the particle:

(300) *nas kuwapi panza na[s-s]an kuedani URU-ri EGIR-an*
"wherever he is gone, and whatever city he is behind (i.e. in)" (Mitas Rs 12).

See also *anda panza*, Rs 13-14.

§2.10c LH

Both with and without particle?:

(301) *nu-za-kan man nakkis D telipinus ser nepisi*
DINGIR^{MES}-*as istarna man aruni nasma ANA HUR.SAGMES*
wahanna panza nasma-za INA KUR LUKÚR zahhiya panza

"If, exalted Telipinus, you are in heaven among the gods, or if you are gone wandering to the sea or to the mountains, or you are gone into the enemy land to battle" (XXIV 2 = XXIV 1 Vs 7-9).

It is not clear to me that the first *panza* does not cover everything before it, in which case it would also have the particle. The passage would be translated thus then: "If you are gone up to heaven among the gods, if to the sea or the mountains on a wander, or you are gone to battle in the enemy land". One must consider that though this and the preceding MH q. 300 contain forms of *pai-*, they are probably conforming to the use with *es-* 'be'.

Note also the following:

(302) *man-kan MU^HI.A-^{ma} kues istarna pantes nu*
LUGAL-*us lahhi UL kuwapikki panza nu SISKUR UL kuitki*
eszi

"If some years go by and the king is not gone on campaign, there is no ritual" (XXVII 1 I 20-2, and passim).

With particle:

(303) *nu-za-kan [UR]ULIM arha [pais]gattari*
"he goes off to the city" (XXIV 5 + IX 13 Vs 24' (StBoT 3 p. 10)).

In the ritual of Ashella, we find *nat-za arha uwanzi* alternating with *n[a]t arha uwanzi*, IX 31 IV 11-12, 40/26-7 (the HT 1 copy (IV 4-5, 17, 30) always has *-za*). The two expressions seem parallel.

In KBo VI 29, we find:

(304) *nu-wa-nnas ehu ANA DU EN-YA Û ANA DIŠTAR*
URU^{samuha} GAŠAN-YA DI-esni tiyaueni

"come, let us go to judgment to the Stormgod my lord and to Sausga of Samuha my mistress" (KBo VI 29 II 2-4).
See q. 50 for surrounding text.

the enemy did not turn his eyes back to me and I conquered the lands of the enemy" (Hatt. I 65-9).

Note Neu's interpretation, transcribed in §1b.5 above, of the grammar of this phrase. CHD p. 351 actually translates the second clause as "none of the enemy could turn my eyes back". It calls *-mu* a 'dative of possession', which in my view assumes a rigid, quite un-Hittite, view of grammar (it in fact doesn't really fit any of the very old IE languages). That is, assuming it is a dative at all and not an accusative. We note, in this regard, the passage quoted by Neu, and the phrase from SV Kup §15 C 21: (if someone flees from me to you and you take care of him) *nasma-an-kan IGI.HI.A-wa HUR.SAG-i naitti* "or you turn his eyes towards the mountains" (see q. 422 to complete passage).

At any rate, the translation of CHD is an interesting suggestion. If it is correct, it would seem however that the emphasis has shifted, in both clauses, from the subject to the object, and that Neu's analysis of the grammar may no longer hold in late LH. That this may in fact be the case is suggested by the presence of the active in the clause with *-za*, which may now be on a grammatical level with *-mu*, of whatever case. The parallelism between an accusative, like *-an* in the two passages cited, and *-za* might be taken as evidence that *-za* is indeed to be taken as having 'direct-reflexive' sense, at this period. See §3d (Conclusions) for some discussion.

A common expression, with particle:

(312) *ammuk-ma LUGAL-UTTA D IŠTAR GAŠAN-YA annisan-pat kuit memiskit nu apedani, mehuni D IŠTAR GAŠAN-YA ANA DAM-YA Û-at ANA LÚMUDI-KA-wa ammuk piran huiyami nu-wa-za-kan URUKÜ.BABBAR-as humanza IŠTU ŠA LÚMUDI-KA neyari*

"Because Sausga my mistress had intended me for the kingship from of old, at that time she appeared to my wife in a dream, (saying): 'I run before your husband, so all of Hatti will turn to the side of your husband'" (Hatt. IV 7-11).

An interesting allied expression, however, without *-za*:

(313) *nu-ssi-kan KUR.KURMES-ma GAM-an neyari*

"Will the lands defect from him?" (V 1 III 37).

This appears to be a late LH idiom: see also KBo IV 14 II 53-6 (a treaty of Suppiluliumas II) among other texts of that period. KBo IV 14 III 28, etc., and V 1 III 79-80 have the same expression, but without *GAM-an*, a version of the idiom which is also popular.

A peculiar expression is:

(314) *zik-ma-za-kan ZI-ni GAM-an galgalturi anda le niyasi nu-za ZI-ni GAM-an halwatiya le DÜ-si*

"Do not 'turn in' the cymbal in your heart (i.e. do not rejoice)! do not make protest in your heart!" (KBo IV 14 III 30-1).

CHD takes *-za* as a direct accusative depending on *niyasi*, but given the repetition *-za (...)* *ZI-ni GAM-an*, and no possible way to see *-za* as depending on the verb in the second clause, it is probably wiser to take the particle as a general reference to the subject's psychic make-up, represented by *ZI-ni*. CHD reports that Stefanini (AANL 20 p. 45) translates "tu nel (tuo) animo il τῦμπανον non suonare!". The only cavil I have with this translation is that there should not be parentheses around *tuo*, which is in fact as close to a translation of *-za* as one can manage in many a modern language. Actually, Italian could get a little closer, with a translation "tu non suonarti (-za) nell'animo il τῦμπανον!".

We note that *ueh-* does not seem to appear with particle, at any stage of Hittite.

§2.12 *dai-*

§2.12b *MH*

(315) *kasa-wa-kan ABI DUTUŠI [tuk] Imadduwattan [IŠTU GÍR] Iattarsiya huisnunun nu-wa-za ŠA ABI DUTUŠI Û ŠA KUR URUhatti es . . . nu-wa-za-kan iskisa(?) appa INA KUR [HUR.SA]Gzippasla tiyan hark*

See also XXVI 88 Rs 6: *nu-mu-za ŠEŠ-YA piran arha le uiyas* [i "my brother, do not send me away from before you".

§2.9c.1 It appears that the expression "send (someone) out (as a messenger)" comports -za:

(286) *summas-ma kues LÚMEŠSAG nu-za para kuinki kuedanikki uiyami apas-ma-an SIG₅-ahhi apas-ma KAxU-is duwarnai nu-ssi INIMMEŠ LUGAL para memai nat GAM NIŠ DINGIRLIM* [GAR-ru]

"You who are nobles/eunuchs, (if) I send someone to someone (a neighboring king, e.g.) on a mission, and that one treats him well, so the ambassador breaks his silence and tells him things of the king, let it lie under the oath" (Ob. III 61-6).

See also IV 20-1, KBo IV 14 III 72-3, and q. 311.

§2.9c.2 "Bringing (booty) home (i.e. to one's own land)" takes -za:

(287) *nu-za DUTUŠI¹ kuin NAM.RA INA É.LUGAL uwatenun nas 1 x 10000 5 LIM 5 x 100 NAM.RA esta URUKÙ.BABBAR-as-ma-za ENMEŠ ... kuin NAM.RAMES uwatet nu-ssan kappuwar NU.GÁL esta namma-kan NAM.RAMES URUKÙ.BABBAR-si para nehhun nas arha uwater*

"the prisoners whom I, My Sun, brought into the palace were 15,500. The prisoners whom the lords, etc., of Hatti brought, there is no counting them. I sent the prisoners on to Hatti and they took them off/home" (AM p. 56, KBo III 4 II 41-5; parallel XIV 15//16 III 50-2. Fairly frequent in KBo III 4).

See also KBo V 6+ III 42 (DS p. 94).

(288) *nu-za KUR URU arzawa tarhun nu-za kuit URUKÙ.BABBAR-si arha uđahhun kuit-ma-za-kan pidi-ssl IR-nahhun nu-smas-kan ERÍNMEŠ isihhun*

"I conquered Arzawa: some (prisoners) I took off to Hattusas; some I subjected as they stood and made them troops" (AM p. 76, KBo III 4 III 29-31).

In the late LH XIII 35+ II 27 (StBoT 4 p. 8), we find *nu-war-as-za INA É-YA pennahhun* "I brought them to my house".

§2.9c.3 "Send (*uppa-*) as a substitute (probably: all that is left of the presumed **tarpallin* is *]-lin*)" has -za, while a simple 'sending' in the same text does not: see KBo IV 6 Rs 13-14/18-20. Note the similarity between the first citation and the OH q. 278.

§2.9c.4 The following is interesting:

(289) *nasma DUTUŠI¹ k]uedanikki kuinki [memian awan? katt]a memahhi nan-za-an-kan piran [wal?]hmi le-war-an-za-an kuedanikki [para] mematti nan-za-an kuitman apel [UD-za?] arha pedai apas-ma-an-za-an [par]a memai nat-si-ya-at [GAM] NIŠ DINGIRLIM kittaru*
 "[If My Sun assigns some matter to someone, and I impress (?) on him: 'do not tell anyone about it, until its [day?] takes it away (i.e., until it is no longer current (?))', and he tells it, let it lie under the oath" (Ob. §8 I 56-62).

We note a similar expression in the copied Telipinus myth (without *arha*), quoted under q. 6. This use is very similar to -za *da-*.

§2.9c.5 In the following quotes, the relation of the verbal content to the subject is clearly marked by -za:

(290) *KARAS¹-ma-ssi UL kuitki kattan esta nu-za-kan HUR.SAGMES-as anda sasduš essesta antuhsatarr-a-za-kan kuit tepawaz anda [h]uittiyan harta*

"There was no army with him. He made himself hideaways in the mountains and the little group which he had rallied around himself. . ." (AM p. 154, KBo V 8 II 27-30).

piran huinu-:

(291) *nu-mu ŠEŠ-YA INIR.GÁL-is EGIR-anda uit nu URU anziliyan URU tapiqqann-a uetet nas arha-pat pait² maninkuwann-as-mu UL-pat uit ERÍNMEŠ-ya-za ANŠE.KUR. RAMES ŠA KUR URU hatti [kuit]man piran huinut nan arha pehutet*

"My brother M. came after me and built A. and T. and just went off: he didn't come near me. The troops and cavalry of Hatti he rallied (?) and took away." (Hatt. II 48-51).

In Hatt. NBr. p. 16 III 18-19 (XIX 67 I 6-8), however, we find this verb, but with an anaphoric pronoun, and the apparent meaning 'put to someone's charge': *nu-kan ANA I^{arma}-DU . . . alwanzatar uemir nat-si-ya-at piran katta tier* "They found witchcraft on Armatarhundas (and his family), and put it to his charge". This use seems also to turn up in the MH Mitas:

nu-smas ŠAPAL NIŠ DINGIR^{LIM} ki]ssan daiuen kasa I^{mitas} wasta[skit? ŠAPAL NIŠ DINGIR^{LIM}-ma] kue uddar tiya[n e]sta apas-at-kan humanta sarras nu ANA I^m[ita] piran katta tehun

"We put you under the oath thus. Behold Mitas sinned; the things which were put [under the oath], he broke them all, and I have put [this] to Mitas' charge" (Mitas Rs 2-4).

Various idioms in late LH:

(321) *LUKÚR-za ZAG-tar . . . ME-as nan-za-an-kan taksuli ME-is*

"the enemy took rightness . . . and put it on peace" (V 1 III 74).

This comes from a late LH oracle text and is somewhat opaque.

-za ŠUM-an dai-:

(322) *DUTU URUTÚL-na-za GAŠAN-YA KUR-eas humandas MUNUS.LUGAL-as [zik?] nu-za-kan INA KUR URU^{hatti} DUTU URUTÚL-na ŠUM-an dais[ta] namma-ma-za kuit KUR-e GIŠERIN-as iyat nu-za-kan D^{hebat} ŠUM-an daista*

"In Hatti you called yourself (lit.: 'gave yourself the name') Sungoddess of Arinna; further, because you made the land of cedars, you called yourself Hebat" (XXI 27 I 3-6).

We translate this expression here, and list it in §3c.2a, as if -za is to be taken completely literally: we note the equivalent with the simple anaphoric pronoun e.g. in Appu III 13, 19. But one is reminded of the Romance locutions *s'appeler*, *chiamarsi*, *llamarse*, and so forth, which contrast with the simple transitive verb, and yet do not have the corresponding strict reflexive meaning 'I call myself', but rather a sense 'I am called', 'my name

is'. From the context of q. 322 it is not clear which is meant, but the literal interpretation seems a little strange, especially since the whole passage looks like a standard opening invocation, where one normally lists simple attributes of the deity, like names. Since however we can't be positive how the Hittites viewed the matter, it is best to play it safe and take -za literally, for purposes of argument.

arkuwar dai- takes -za:

(323) *EGIR-ŠU-ma 3 NINDA.KUR₄.RA.UD ANA DINGIR.MU-NUSMEŠ KUR-eas humandas parsiya arkuwar-za kuedas dais* "Then he crumbles 3 daily thick breads to the female deities of all countries, for whom he set the prayer" (VI 45 IV 52-3)

In the sense 'set as a substitute for oneself':

(324) *nu-wa-za kasa GU[D.MAH^L]U^U tarpallin tehun* "Behold, I have installed a prize bull and a man as substitute" (KBo XV 7 I. 7-8 (StBoT 3 p. 36)).

§2.12d A related verb is *tittanu-*:

MH

(325) *nu namma MAHAR DUTU ŠI argamuss-a [u]tumpanzi UL tarnai nus-za apas daskit ŠA DUTUŠI-ya-kan ANŠE.KUR.RA^{HIA} k[uit apiya] esta [nu]-za apel ANŠE.KUR.RA^{HIA}.ŠU ANA GIŠA[PIN?] i]itnuskit* "he does not allow (them) to bring tribute before My Sun; he himself took it and the horses belonging to My Sun, his horses he put to the plough (?)" (Madd Rs 32-3).

LH

Without particle:

(326) *sallanunun-war-an kuit amruk . . . kinuna-ya-war-an karpmi nu-war-an ANA DUTU URUTÚL-na ASSUM LUSANGA-UTTİM tittanumi ziqqa-wa-mu-za DIŠTAR parassin iya* "Because I have raised him, now I am taking him and setting him in the priesthood of the Sungoddess of Arinna; you make me, Sausga, your patron" (Hatt. IV 11-12, 14-16).

"This word is to be taken to heart: take it to heart on that day!" (SV Kup §21 D 24-5; also probably similar §22 E 24).

We find the same phrase, complete with *-za*, in the late LH XXI 19 IV 20-2. IV 6 has *sai* in place of *tarna* in a similar phrase.

2) when the expression means 'confess, acknowledge', or something similar:

Without particle:

(274) *nu man* ¹PIŠ.TUR-*as* *kuitki* PANI DINGIR^{LIM} EME-*an* *arha* *tarnan* *harzi* *nu* IGI-*zi* TEMES ...

"If Mashu¹iluw^{as} has 'let off' any tongue (i.e. curse) before the deity, let the omens first" (V 6 III 9-10).

See also III 14.

In III 17, however, the same action is described without *arha* and with *-za*:

(275) *nu* GAM *ariskir* *nu-za-kan* *hurtaus* *meqqaus* *tarnas* *nat* IŠTU TUPPI *anir* ...

"they put further/final oracle question, and (it resulted that) he let (off) many curses, and they put it on tablet" (V 6 III 17).

(276) *nu* *kikkistari* QATAMMA ŠA ABU-ŠU-*kan* *wastul* ANA DUMU-ŠU *ari* *nu-kan* *ammuqā-a* ŠA ABI-YA *wastul* *aras* *nat-za-kan* *kasa* ANA DIM URU^{hatti} EN-YA ... *piran* *tarnan* *harmi* *eszi-ya-at* *iyauen-at* *nu-za-kan* ŠA ABI-YA *kuit* *wastul* *tarnan* *harmi* *nu* ANA DIM URU^{hatti} ... ZI-*anza* *namma* *warsiyaddu*

"it happens thus: the sin of the father comes down to the son; and to me the sin of my father has come down; and behold, I have confessed/confess it before the Stormgod of Hatti my lord ... : it is (true), we did it. Because I have confessed/confess the sin of my father, let the Stormgod's anger be calmed" (Murs. P.P. II §9).

Contrast the use of the preterite in the same phrase:

nu-mu-kan *apiya-ya* DIM URU^{hatti} EN-YA *piran* *tiyauanzi* *handaittat* *nu-za-kan* *kas[a* ANA PANI DIM *was]tul* *tarnahhun* *eszi-ya-at* *iyauenn-[at*

"then also it was established by oracle for me to step before the Stormgod of Hatti my lord, and behold I confessed the sin before the Stormgod: it is (so), we did it" (Murs. P.P. II §6).

3) Note KBo X 2 I 42-3 (the copied Acts of Hattusilis I):

(277) *nu-za* KUR URU^{sallahsuwas} IZI-*it* *apasila* *kattan* *tarnas* "the land of S. 'let itself down' by fire (i.e. burned itself down)".

§2.9 Verbs of bringing:

§2.9a OH

arnu- occurs once with particle in the Laws, apparently in the meaning 'give restitution (for someone/thing)':

(278) *takku* LUDAM.GAR *kuiski* *kuenzi* ... *takku* INA KUR URU^{luwiya} ... I ME MA.NA KÜ.BABBAR *pai* *assu-sett-a* *sarnikzi* *nasma* INA KUR URU^{hatti} *nu-zza* *unattallan-pat* *arnuzi*

"if someone kills a merchant ... if it is in Luwiya, he gives a hundred (!) minas of silver and replaces his goods; or (if it is) in Hatti, he brings only the merchant (i.e. he gives restitution only for the merchant?)" (Laws A §5).

Usually this expression does not show the particle: cf. e.g. §4, §76 in version A, and in the copies §2, §3.

See also q. 90 above for a similar use of *anda pedai*.

This use is strongly akin to the meaning 'substitute', which we discuss below, §2.14c.2.

§2.9b MH

§2.9b.1 When the "bringing" does not involve the subject, *arnu-* does not take *-za*:

(279) [KUR] URU^{hapalla-wa-kan} *nassu* *kuemi* *nasma-war-at* QADU NAM.RAHIA ... *arnumi* [nat ANA] DUTUŠI *para* *pihhi* *namma-ma-kan* KUR URU^{hapalla} *kuenta-ya* UL *epta-ya-at* UL *nat* ANA DUTUŠI *para* U[L *paitta*] *nat-za* I^{madduwattas} *das* "either I will destroy H., or I will bring it with the prisoners, etc., and hand it over to My Sun". However, he did not destroy it, he did

Note the variation in the construction with and without *-za* with *idalauēs-*. In the passage from the Laws *-za* seems to have a reciprocal meaning, which it lacks in Tel. E.

We note that *zah(hiya)-* is used in a reciprocal sense, without *-za*; in the copied Laws:

(332) *takku LÚ^{MES} zahhanda ta 1[?]-as aki 1 SAG.DU pai*
 "if men fight and one dies, (the other) gives one head (as restitution)" (Laws II §59 (C)).

zahhiya- is regularly used without particle in a reciprocal sense throughout Hittite: cf. e.g. the copied MH XXXIV 116+ V 6, and Mursilis' Annals, KBo III 4 II 13 (p. 46).

With *sarra-* in the copied Laws:

(333) *takku LÚ-as ELLUM GÉME-ass-a selies nat anda*
aranzi nan-za ANA DAM-ŠU dai nu-za É-ir Ū DUMUMES
ienzi appizziann-at-kan nassu idalauessanzi nasma-at-kan
harpantari nu-za É-ir taksan sarranzi DUMUMES-az LÚ-as dai
1 DUMUAM MUNUS-za dai

"if a free man and a slave are x and they come to an agreement (?) and he takes her to wife and they make a house and children, (but) finally either they fight or they join and split the house, the man takes the children, the woman takes one child" (Laws §31).

§2.13b MH

"Breaking (an oath e.g.)" does not take the particle:

(334) *nu-za uwanzi NÍG.B[A]^{MES} danzi namma linkanzi*
mahhan-ma-at E[GI]R-pa aranzi nasta lingaus sarranzi . . .

"and they come and take the gifts and swear. When however they arrive then/(back?) and break the oaths. . . ." (XVII 21+ IV 15-17).

But "splitting up (booty)" does:

(335) *nu-za KÙ.BABBAR . . . TÚG^{HI.A}-KUNU sarue[(r)] nat-za*
arha sarri[(r)]

"they plundered your silver . . . and your clothes and divided them up" (XVII 21+ III 1-3).

arha sarri- also with *-za*, III 4-7. *saruwai-*, one may note in passing, is probably similar in use to *da-*.

See also Appu IV 5-6: *ues|-a-wa-za sarrauēni nu-wa-nnas a|rhayan e|suwastati* "we'll split (our goods) and settle apart". Cf. also *-za sarriyawan dair*, IV 21-2: the text then gives the specifics of the division.

Note *kars-*, without particle:

(336) *GUD-u[n]-asta haliaz appa UL kussanka karsun*
UDU-un-asta asaunaz EGIR-pa KI.MIN

"I did not cut a cow back from its stall; nor a sheep from its byre" (XXX 10 Vs 15).

Note that Lebrun transliterates GUD.APIN.LAL-*ta* and UDU-*un* NI.TA in place of GUD-*u[n]-asta* and UDU-*un-asta*.

§2.13c LH

sarra- with *-za* in the meaning "split up (from each other)":

(337) *nu-kan I^{u h h a}-LÚ-is aruni anda BA.UG₆*
DUMUMES-ŠUNU-ma-za arha sarrandat

"U. died in the sea; his sons then split up" (AM p. 60, KBo III 4 II 52-3).

But note, without particle:

(338) *namma LUKÚR ispandaza anda ari namma-as arha*
sarrattari

"then the enemy comes in in the night and splits up" (KBo V 6 I 22-3 (DS)).

In the late LH oracle text V 6, we find:

(339) *nu uwanzi DINGIR^{LUM} DUTUŠ^I-ya dan EGIR-pa*
aniyanzi ANA DUTU[Š]^I-ya-kan DINGIR^{LUM} apiya tarnanzi
arha-ya-za-an-kan apiya sarriyazi

"They come and do the deity and My Sun over again; they let the deity with My Sun there, then he (?) splits him off" (V 6 III 26-7). Probably *sarriyazi* should be *sarriya<n>zi* 'they split'.

In the usual meaning 'split up (an inheritance, or similar)':

(340) *I^sahuranuwas-za GAL NA.KAD ANA DUMU MES-ŠU É-ZU*
kisan sar[ras]

"S., head of the shepherds, divided his house among his sons in this fashion" (XXVI 43+ Vs 4).

This deals with pretty intimate knowing. However, the Laws have a passage dealing with knowledge of this kind, and *-za* does not seem to be present. One may surmise that the inclusion of *-za* is a feature of LH.

Some German editions give "sich merken" as a translation for *-za sek-*. Sometimes the sense of the locution seems to be "acknowledge", a meaning which, as we have seen, no matter what verb is involved, usually takes *-za*:

(262) *kasa apedani uddani pidi kus tarpallies karu arandari nu-wa-za kus sikten apus-wa-za namma le sekteni*
 "behold, for that matter these substitutes have already been provided in his(?) place: recognize these, don't recognize those" (VII 10 I 1-5).

What is the difference between 'know' and 'acknowledge' or "sich merken", except that the subject has volition, that is, an active role, in the second case? Note also

(263) *nu-za zik I^huqqanas DUTUŠI-pat AŠŠUM BELUTIM sak DUMU-YA-ya kuin DUTUŠI temi kun-wa-za humanza sakdu nan-kan istarna tekkussami nu-za zikk-a I^huqqanas apun sa[k]*

"you, H., recognize My Sun for lordship. And my son whom I, My Sun, name (saying): 'Everyone recognize this one!' and I present him among you, you too, H., recognize that one!" (SV Huqq I 8-11). Cf. I 14-16: *namma-ma-za damain BELAM kues-as kuis [antuhsas/LÚ-as] ANA DUTUŠI EGIR-an arha le kuinki sakti DUTUŠI-i[n] sak* "do not recognize any other lord, whoever he may be, behind My Sun's back; recognize My Sun!".

Cf. the treaty of Aziras with Suppiluliumas I, KBo X 12 III 24-5: (if a fugitive from Hatti comes in to you, you are not to say:) *[ammuk]-wa-za išhiulas lenkiyas [le?] kuitki saqqahhi* "Let(?) me know/acknowledge nothing of a treaty or an oath".

See also the next section.

With *-smas*:

(264) *nu-mu kas TI-anza PUH-ŠU pidi ar[taru] nu-smas UGU-zius DINGIR^{MEŠ} kun sekten*

"let (?) this living substitute stand in for me: you, upper gods, acknowledge this one" (KBo XV 2 + XVII 14 Rs 19-20 (StBoT 3 p. 58)).

On the other hand, does it have the meaning 'acknowledge' in the following example?

(265) *ANA I^hpalla-wa kuit ammuks peskinun nu-war-at-za DINGIR^{LIM} sak*

"what I gave to P., you, deity, know! (imperative)" (XXII 70 Vs 36-7).

The meaning could conceivably be something like "acknowledge", but it seems unlikely. In the vocabulary KBo I 30, of uncertain date, we find *uttani-za kuis arkuwar natta sak[k]i* (Vs 7). The Hittite scribe seems to have mistranslated the Sumerian/Akkadian, but for our purposes, it is of interest that he has rendered the Akkadian *i-du-u*, which he undoubtedly took to mean 'know', by *-za ... sakki*.

XXII 70 has examples of *sek-* without particle. An instance is:

(266) *LÚMES TAPPIHI.A I^hpalla-ma punussuen nu memir apun-wa memian UL sekkueni*

"We interrogated the companions of P., and they said, 'we know nothing of that matter'" (XXII 70 Vs 37-8).

kanes- itself has no particle in the following (in fact, *kanes-* does not seem to occur with particle, or in the meaning 'recognize/acknowledge', any more in LH):

(267) *nu-za kuell walliyatar UL-za ŠA DU pihassassi EN-YA walliyatar nu man DINGIR^{LAM} nasma- DUMU.LÚ.U₁₉.LU(B:UT)^{TI} auszi nu kissan memai handan-wa DU pihassassis EN-YA nepisas LUGAL-us UKÙ-an kanista nu-war-an 𐎶 kulanitta*

"Whose is the glory? Is it not of the Weathergod *cpihassassi* my lord? If a god or a man sees (it), he will say thus: 'verily the Weathergod *pihassassi* my lord king of Heaven has favored (this) man and has honored (?) him'" (VI 45 III 48-52 = 46 IV 17-21).

"I have dressed for? the gods; I have given a substitute: take them!" (XXIV 5 + IX 13 Rs 15-16 (StBoT 3 p. 12)).

It is not always present when there is an express dedicatee, however; cf. with particle *q*. 351 below; but without particle:
(348) *man LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL . . . taknas DUTU-i tarpalliyas pianzi*

"when the king and queen ... give substitutes to the Sungoddess of Earth" (XXX 42 IV 3-4' (Bibliography)).

Also XXIV 5 + IX 13 Vs 33-4 (StBoT 3 p. 10).

(349) *maman-wa ki UŠ-an ŠA KUR LÚKUR kuiski DINGIRLIM LÚ DÚ-at nu-wa-ssi k[as]a LÚ unuwantan ANA LÚ PUHI-ŠU pihhun*

"if some male god of the enemy country has wrought this epidemic, behold I have given him an adorned man as substitute" (KBo XV 1 I 14-16 (StBoT 3 p. 112)).

Similar with *-ita* "to you", I 35-6.

The sense "give as restitution, replacement, substitute" has *-za* erratically from MH (actually we have an OH case of *arnu-* in a similar use with *-za*, q. 278 above):

sarnink-:

For an example of this verb without particle in original OH, see q. 278.

From the copied Laws:

(350) *takku DUMU.MUNUS LÚ-ni taranza tamais-an pittenuzzi kussan pittenuzzi-ma nu hantezziyas LÚ-as kuit kuit pesta ta-sse sarnikzi* (C II 13: *nat-za sarnenkan[z]i*)
attass-a annas UL sarninka[nzi] // takku(w)-an attas annass-a tamedani LÚ-ni pianzi nu attas annass-a sarninkanzi // takku attass-a annas mimmai nan-si-kan tuhsanta

"if a girl is betrothed to a man and another marries her and brings the bride-price, whatever the first man gave (as bride-price), he restores (it) to him, the father and mother do not restore (it). If the father and mother give her to someone else, they give restitution.

If they refuse, they separate her from him" (Laws §28a-c (not in A)).

Both versions come from MH copies of the Laws. But notice e.g. XIII 9 III 10 without particle: *nu ARÀH-an LÚMES URULIM sarninkanzi* "the men of the city restore the silo".

LH

With and without particle:

(351) *nu-za kasa ANA KURTI hingani ser sumes ANA DINGIRMES [ENHI]-A-YA parkan peskimi sarnikzileskimi nu-smas parkan [sarni]kzell-a sarninkeskimi*

"behold, because of the plague I give you, gods my lords, offerings and restitutions for the land, and I restore you offerings and restitution" (Murs. P.P. I (XIV 14+ Rs 19-21, p. 174)).

Goetze restores <*kuit*> in the second clause. *sarnink-* appears without particle several times in this text, Rs 7-14.

(352) *ABU-YA ANA D hebat URU[kumm]anni EN₄ halziyawas taran harta pesta-ma-an-si nawi nas amruk nakkestai nu INA URU kizzuwatna pa[u]n nu kissan memiskinun paimi-wa-za ŠA ABU-YA [] arha [sa]rnikmi [nu-z]a amruk D hebat URU kumman[ni] ANA x-[Y]A DAM-YA . . . tallisk[i]nun mukisikinun*

"My father had promised the festival of the calling to Hebat of K., but he hadn't given it yet, and this bothered me, so I went to Kizzuwatna and said thus: 'I will go and give restitution for my father's [promise?]' and I prayed and invoked Hebat of K. for my . . . wife, etc." (XIV 4 III 23-9).

In late LH:

Without particle:

(353) *ki ÉTUM hinganaza tamassan nat punusmi nat-(kan) anda sa[r]nik[mi]*

"This house is oppressed by sickness and I ask (about) it and give restitution for it" (StBoT 1 (p. 30) III 16-17). See also III 23, etc.

with the use of *-za aus-* in the meaning 'watch over, keep an eye on'. In fact, *-za (katta(n)) aus-* in this meaning seems the norm, or at least a current expression, in LH:

(249) *namma-za zik I¹targassanallis tuel Z[I-an t]uel É-KA tuell-a LU¹AMA.A.AT-kan mahhan uskisi DUTU^{SI}-ya-tta kuin ERÍN^{MES} a[sand]ulin katta daliyanun nan-za-an kattan QATAMMA uski nai? lului[ski] nan SIG₅-in essa*

"As you regard your person, house and household, the relief troops which My Sun left with you, regard them in the same way: sustain them and treat them well" (SV Targ Vs 24-6).

The relation of the subject to his own person, possessions, etc., might seem clearly the rationale for the particle in Vs 24-5. The reason for the particle in the second part of the passage, which is parallel, is however not so clear. In fact, 'regard' as a translation does not fit; 'watch over, take care of' would be more appropriate. Actually, an almost literal rendering 'oversee' fits the case. Compare in fact Kup §20 D IV 9-13:

namma-za zik I¹kupanta-D¹LA¹MA-as tuel ZI-an tuel É-KA tuel LU¹AMA.A.TU-KA mahhan essatti DUTU^{SI}-ya-tta kuin ERÍN^{MES} asandulan kattan daliyanun nan-za-an katta QATAMMA uski nan luluwiski nan-za-an SIG₅-in essa idalawahti-ma-an le kuitki

It is clear that *-za (katta(n)) usk-* is parallel to *(-za) essa-*, which seems to mean 'treat', and *luluwai-* 'sustain'.

Note also, in late LH:

(250) *D¹zintuhis GAŠAN-YA ŠA DIM DUTU URUTÚL-na-ya assiyanza hassas ANA DIM-za Ū ANA DUTU URUTÚL-na UZUGAB-as TUDITTUM nu-ddu-za lammar lammar katta uskanzi*

"Zintuhis my mistress, beloved granddaughter of the Stormgod and of the Sungoddess of Arinna, you are (*-za*) the breast jewel of the Stormgod and of the Sungoddess of Arinna, and they watch over you always" (XXI 27 III 43-7).

On II 3-4, we find: *nu-nnas sumel ŠA DINGIR^{MES} ishiul [hazz]iwi QATAMMA katta aummeni* "we watch over your, the gods', treaties thus".

(251) *ABU-YA-wa-mu kedani mehuni UL uskizzi UKÜ^{MES}-anza-wa-mu ku[i]t GEŠPÚ-ahta nu-wa-mu-za ABU-YA apedan[i u]ddani UL kattan auszi ABU-YA-mu-za piran UL kuiski markiyat*

"(and I said thus:) 'my father does not watch me at this time; the people who did me violence, my father did not look after me in that matter'; noone criticized my father before me" (XXXI 66 II 14-18).

In the meaning 'acknowledge, recognize':

(252) *IPİŠ.TUR-as-ma-za-kan wasdul kuit uskizzi nu-mu-za-kan namma D[UTU^{SI}] mimmas nas-mu piran arha piddais*

"(I heard of Mashuiluwa's sin and wrote to him: 'come to me!'); but because M. recognized his sin, he refused me and ran from before me" (SV Kup §5 D 40-1).

Of course, this categorization begs the question: can we genuinely so clearly distinguish this use of *-za aus-* from that of q.s 244ff.?

§2.7c.2 Seeing in a dream usually comports *-za*: cf. e.g. Murs.P.P. II p. 218, §11 l. 3, 5; and

(253) *ma[n]-san ANA LUGAL aggatar tahsattari nasma-at-za-kan Ū-za auszi*

"when death is predicted(?) for the king, or he sees it in a dream . . ." (KBo XV 2 F Rs 5-6', Colophon (StBoT 3 p. 70)).

ki kuit ŠA DINGIRLIM URU¹arusna namma zilas DÜ-at nu-za-kan MUNUS.LUGAL kuit [MA.]MU-an austa

"This matter that the oracle sign of the deity of A. turned up again, (is it) because the queen saw a dream?" (XXII 70 Vs 41).

Also V 1 III 48.

But cf. KBo IV 6 Vs 21-2, without particle.

We might mention that *mema-* probably takes *-za* in the following passage not because dreams are involved, but because a solemn word or vow of some kind is made (see also q. 196 above; cf. in

(362) *kuis-ma-kan* ^Δ *ziladuwa* NUMUN *Ihattusili*
 MUNUS *pu^hduhepa* ANA *DIŠTAR* *IR-anni arha dai ŠA*
Ēgarupahiyas-za ezzan . . . ŠA DIŠTAR URU^hsamuha ilaliyazi . . .
 "Whoever in future takes the seed of H. and P. away from the
 service of Sausga or desires the food of the g.-house of Sausga of
 Samuha, (let him end badly)" (Hatt. IV 81-3).
 The implication of *-za*, "desire for oneself" is clear in all these
 cases.

§2.15.2 As for verbs of the same type, we have already seen
dusk- and *kartimmiya-* (under *halanza-*) in §1c. *warsiya-* turns up
 with particle in the late LH XV 5 I 15: *nu-war-as-za-kan anda*
[w]arsiyazi. For an example without particle, see q. 276. Note that
(menahhanda) taksulai- in HT 1 II 28, 30 = IX 31 II 55-6, 57-8
(Uhamuwa ritual) does not appear with particle.

We note in passing that *malai-* apparently always occurs with
-za, except in the participle (which presumably follows the
 patterns of *es-* 'be' rather than of *malai-*). Cf. however the
 inevitable exception, an *sk-* suffixed form: *para-ma UL maleskizi* (V
 6 III 8). One suspects that the inclusion of *-za* has to do with the
 meaning of the verb, which deals with thought processes that
 intimately involve the subject. The antonym *markiya-* usually
 takes *-za* as well, though CHD isolates a meaning "forbid" for
markiya- without *-za*. They give however only one example of this
 alleged use: Ob. IV 24.

§2.15.3 Another important verb is *nah-*:

In copied *QH* and *MH* we find the famous *le-(wa)-ta nahi* 'be not
 afraid!', XXXIII 24 I 43 with duplicates, and XXX 36 II 8. These are
 the only attestations of this usage. Cf. e.g. *LUGAL-us-wa le nahti* of
 the possibly MH KBo XV 52 V 14, and a similar expression in Hatt.
 I 38, and the LH Gilgamesh text VIII 51 II 14-15, with duplicate.
 These are virtually indistinguishable from the above examples
 with particle (or *-ta* in this case). One may therefore conclude that
 the inclusion of the particle in the expression is a feature of early
 Hittite.

LH

(363) UGU *sesuwar kuit* ŠA HUR.SAG *kaharwa DUGUD-an*
 UGU-kan ER[*NMEŠ* *kuit U*]L-za *kuitki nahmi . . . // UGU-kan*
kuit sesmi ANA SAG.DU DUTUSI SIG₅-in UL-si *kuitki*
 HUŠ-ueni SIG₅-ru

"because it is difficult to sleep on Mt. H., and [because?] the troops
 are up there, I will not fear at all. . . Because I will sleep up there,
 is it well for My Sun?: are we not to fear for him at all?" (V 1 I
 99-101; for the second part see also I 32-3).

CHD (p. 340), following Güterbock Fs Kraus, reinterprets the
 ideogram (taken as LUL before) as HUŠ 'fear', connecting it with
nah- on the strength of KBo XXVII 203 V 5. in which only
nahhueni is preserved, with the parallel text XLV 79 Vs 5-6,
 where part of the rest of the restoration is preserved, but not the
 verb. XLIV 4 Rs 7 has HUŠ-riyaddat *ueritesta* in parallel use.
 See also XLVIII 125 II 9 and XIII 35 II 33 (StBoT 4 p. 8) for *-za*
nah-.

One can see that there is a temptation to take *-za* above as
 contrasting with *-si*, according to the alternation in q. 363 itself,
 and to attribute to it, therefore, a reflexive meaning 'for myself'. It
 is hard to know if this is accurate. XLVIII 125 is rather broken and
 hard to understand; however, the queen is told in a dream about
 someone else's knee ailment; then a mouse, with some connection
 to a puppy, runs 'all the way up behind', possibly symbolizing pain
 in someone's (her own?) knees, though it is not clear.
 Unfortunately the text breaks off just as the queen begins to
 discuss the matter; it might have clarified the text a little to hear
 specifically what she had to say. It is possible that the mouse et al.
 are omens of a sickness, as of the knees, but even so it is hard to
 believe she would fear 'for herself' on such grounds: it is more
 natural that she would simply be saying 'I got scared'. In XIII 35
 II 33, the speaker found certain articles damaged and remarks:
GIM-an-ma-war-at uhhu[n] nu-wa-za-kan ser nahu, and covers
 the deed up (incidentally, borrowing gold from one's mother
 appears without *-za*, in the next clause). An interpretation of *-za*
nah- as 'fear for oneself' is theoretically possible, but one wonders

§2.7b.3 Verbs with the meaning 'acknowledge' seem now to take -za:

-za aus- from the Tunnawi ritual (not of certain date, but no earlier than late MH):

(237) nu-za-kan apas antuhsas papratar uskizzi nu-za apas antuhsas nassu LÚ-as nasma MUNUS-za paprannas SISKUR kissan sipanti ŠA ÍD-at-za SISKUR halzissanzi

"(if the celebrant is having trouble, either because his/her children keep dying, or (s)he is having sexual trouble, or miscarriages), and (s)he acknowledges/recognizes (that the cause is) uncleanness, that person, whether man or woman, celebrates thus the ritual of uncleanness - they call it the ritual of the river" (Tunn. I 7-9).

Note for instance also kanes- appearing now with the particle:

(238) kinun]a-mu-za ammel DINGIR-YA ŠÀ-ŠU ZI-ŠU humantet kardit kinuddu nu-mu wasdul-mit [ted]du ne-za-an ganesmi nassu-mu DINGIR-YA zasheya memau nu-mu-za DINGIR-YA ŠÀ-ŠU kinuddu [nu-mu wasd]ul-mit teddu ne-za-an ganesmi nasma-mu MUNUSEN.SI memau [nasma-mu ŠA?] DUTU LÚAZU IŠTU UZU NÍG.GIG memau nu-mu-za DINGIR-YA humantet kardit [ŠÀ-ŠU ZI-ŠU kinu]ddu nu-mu wasdul-mit teddu ne-za-an ganesmi

"Now, let my god open his heart and spirit with all his heart to me: let him [tell] me my sin and I will acknowledge it. Either let my god tell me in a dream: let my god open his heart to me, let him tell me my sin, and I will acknowledge it. Or let a sybil tell me (or) a magician (of?) the Sungod speak (it) from the entrails: let my god open [his heart?] to me with all his heart and let him tell me my sin and I will acknowledge it" (XXX 10 Vs 24-8).

See XXXI 127 II 51-59. Note also q. 202.

This ushers in the subject of sek-, a verb which seems also to mean 'acknowledge' with -za, but not regularly. The verb "know" in fact seems erratic with respect to -za, and indeed the other particles. But normally it does not appear to have -za:

(239) nu-za DUMU-annaz kuit ŠA DINGIR-YA duddumar nat-kan sakhi nat [kanismi ?]

"What the grace of my god (has been) since my childhood, I know and [acknowledge] it" (XXX 10 Vs 10). See XXXI 127 II 23-26, which is similar.

But "to make known" in the same text has -za:

(240) ku[i]t-a imma meshati nu-za-[t]a ŠA DINGIR-YA duddumar hattata humanta sakinun

"since I was born, I have made known the grace and understanding of my god" (XXX 10 Vs 11).

This follows the pattern of the *verba dicendi*.

Cf. furthermore -za with sek- itself:

(241) nu-za-kan LÚMESDUGUD 2¹ pedan ... pidi sakki
"He knows officials of the second rank, etc., in a place" (B.-M. A 1 14-15).

This q. follows directly on q. 233 above. There probably is an overtone of 'check, have counted' to this use of -za. Contrast q. 232: neither the sense 'check' nor a meaning 'acknowledge' seems quite appropriate for -za sek- there.

Note however VII 8 II 14-15 (C): nu-ddu-za kasa kas antuwahhas UL sekta kinuna-tta kasa EGIR-an sahta "behold, this man did not acknowledge you; now he has sought you out/looked after you".

§2.7b.4 We note also, for purposes of comparison with later Hittite, that (para) tekkusnu- does not take particle on VII 5 IV 7-8: man-si DINGIRLUM [] IGIH.A-wa para tekkusnuskizz[i] "if the deity appears to him (lit.: shows his eyes to him)". But in VII 8 III 10 (from the same tablet), we find -za tekkusnu-:

nu-za zik DINGIRLUM DINGIRLIM-lar tekkusnut //
nu-wa-du-za nakkiyatar ausdu nu-wa-du-za DINGIRLUM ŠA
SAG.DU-ŠU iyazzi nu-du-za maltesnalaⁿ-(Š)U? iyazi

"You, deity, show your godly might. Let him see your greatness and he will make you his personal deity and will make you recipient of his offerings" (VII 8 III 10-14).

VII 5 has nu-ddu-ssan maltessanalan iyazi, I 22.

It is further of interest that all the examples of *-za nah-* are absolute, that is, they are not accompanied by any object, direct or indirect, but refer solely to the subject (unless with CHD one takes *kuitki* as object, in q. 363). Perhaps the pronoun is marking this use. I am not sure that this matter can be resolved. We might mention that the stative *wassisk-* apparently starts to take *-za* in very late Hittite, quite a new development (see q. 387-8 below). Perhaps with *nah-* we are seeing evidence of a similar extension of *-za*'s use in late LH.

Note that in Hieroglyphic 'fear' is used once with *-ti*, without there being any connotation of 'for oneself':

wa-ti-i REL-sa za-na GOD-ni-na REL-sà-i

"whoever fears this deity" (Sultanhan §17).

See Appendix §2d.

§2.15.4 *-za hassik-* 'satisfy oneself, be satisfied', in the active:

(364) [*nu-z*]a *hassus hanzassus karpdu nu-za-kan KUR-e hassikdu*

"let him raise himself descendants and let the land satisfy itself" (T'DH I 1.37).

Also probably III 37-8, in broken passage.

In the middle, with *-smas*:

(365) *apidani-wa-smas-kan UD-ti kuit ha[ss]ikkidumat kinuna-wa-smas-kan kasa apidas UD-as EME^{HI}.A Dandaliyas IŠTU GÍR kar[st]a nan-kan hassi [pe]ssiyazzi*

"on the day that you satisfied yourselves (i.e. 'let it all hang out?'), now D.A. has cut the tongues of those days off you with a knife', and she throws it on the hearth" (Mast A I 32-5).

But this text omits the particle with the active:

(366) *hassikkitten kuedani [(UD-ti nu-wa kasa)] apel UD-as EME^{HI}.A-es kinuna-war-as k[(asa addas)] DUTU-us tarmait nas-kan hassi [(dai)]*

"on the day you were satisfied, behold the tongues of that day: now behold the father, the Sungod, has pegged them' and she puts them on the hearth" (Mast A II 18-20).

See also:

(367) *GAL-is-za DUTU-us EZEN⁴-an iet nu-za I LIM DINGIR^{MEŠ} halzais eter ne UL ispier ekuier-ma ne-za UL hassikkir*

"The great Sungod made a feast and invited 1000 gods; they ate, but they were not full; they drank, but they were not satisfied" (XVII 10 I 19-20: Telipinus myth).

Observe *ispiya-* and *nink-* (which might be included under the verbs concerning body functions (§2.16 below)):

(368) *ŠA DIM URU^{kuliuisna} DINGIR.LÚ^{MEŠ} sumes ezzasten nu-za ispitten ekutten-ma nu-za nikten*

"Male gods of the Stormgod of K., you eat, and be full! Drink and be sated!" (XXXIII 62 III 10-11).

These verbs seem usually to take the particle: see also e.g. the copied XV 34 I 49 (C) (*not-za ispiyandu ninkandu*), III 41-2 (*nu-smas EGIR-an []-ya ispiyantes ninkani[es] asandu*). (Note that *ed-* and *ake-* don't appear to take the particle, in this text: cf. e.g. I 48-9). However, cf. the Uhamuwa ritual in late copy (of animals, however: maybe that makes a difference, or perhaps it is following the behavior of *es-* 'be'): *nu-wa ki ŠA.GAL^{HI}.A ezzandu nu-war-at ispiyantes asandu* "let (the horses) eat this fodder and let them be full" (HT 1 II 36-8 = IX 31 III 2-3).

Perhaps at an earlier stage (the Telipinus myth has a fair amount of archaic language) *-za* was not always, or perhaps even usually, included.

These passages forms an interesting contrast with the following, from copied MH (?):

(369) *and[a]-ma-za [n]am[m]a sumes LÚ^{MEŠ}SANGA... ŠA É.DINGIR^{LIM}... kuiski nikzi nas-kan man ŠA É.DINGIR^{LIM} niniktari nu hal[l]uwain iyazi*

"Then one of you priests (might) get drunk in the temple; if he gets excited/drunk in the temple and starts a fight..." (T.O. III 35-8 (C)).

"if the enemy begins to strike somewhere, and we hear (about it), we will bring word immediately to the head of the watch" (KBo XVI 50 I. 9-13).

But cf. *pariyan istamas-*:

LU URU^{assur}-ma-za-kan mahhan pariyan istamaszi
[ŠA KUR URU^{hatti-wa}] ERINMEŠ ... uit nas namma UL uit

"When the Assyrians heard: 'the troops of Hatti have come', they didn't come back" (AM p. 28, XIV 16 I 18-19).

In late LH: *man-wa-kan ANA ŠEŠ-YA-za ŠA DUTUŠI*
HUL-lu [△] *zamurai KAxU-i GEŠTU-asmi* "if I hear any evil revolt against My Sun in the mouth of my brother" (XL 33 Vs 12-13).

On Vs 7-8, the same phrase appears, but *-za* is not present, presumably because no brother is involved.

§2.7 *aus-* and related concepts

§2.7a OH

There is no case of *-za* with *aus-* attested in OH. For the purposes of the discussion later on of later Hittite, I would like to cite the following:

Zalpa Vs 16-17: *nu AMA-ŠUNU* [*-u*s? *natta ganeszi*
nu-za DUMU.MUNUSMEŠ-ŠA ANA DUMU.NITAMEŠ-ŠA pais

"their mother does not recognize [her sons?] and gave her daughters to her sons to wife".

See also under q. 89.

Also Tel.E. IV 31, with *-za*: *kuis-za hassanan istarna alwanzatar sakki* "whoever knows of witchcraft within the royal family".

kappuwai- turns up in the copied OH Yozgat (VBoT 58) with *-za*: *kappuwatten-ma-wa-za UL kuitki* "you did not check anything!" (I 19).

§2.7b MH

§2.7b.1 *aus-* with *-za* in the meaning 'see':

(229) *nu-wa-z* [(*kas GIM-an*)] *nepis UL auszi*
appa-ma-wa-z-kan [(*ŠAH.TURHIA*)] *UL auszi nu kus-a BEL*
SISKUR ida[(laues)] hurtaus QATAMMA le uw[(an)]zi
"as this (suckling pig) does not see the sky and will not see the other piglets hereafter/again, let the evil curses likewise not see these celebrants" (Mast A II 46-9).

It is hard not to see *-za* as drawing attention to the very central role that personally, actively seeing things like the sky plays in being alive. At any rate, the passage seems intent on indicating that the little piglet will not be able to use his eyes at all (i.e. *-za* would emphasize the verbal content, as it pertains to its effect on the subject), because he will be dead. The nuance is apparently not present in the third clause, since the particle is not present there. See also §2.7b.4.

An extremely interesting example, without *-za*, comes from XVII 10 II 35 (Telipinus myth), with *aus-* in the middle:

(230) *austat-an Dkamrusepas*
"K. saw him".

One wonders how much difference there is between this middle and the use of *-za* with the active *aus-*: is it possible that q. 229 represents an MH way of saying what *austat* expressed in OH?

In VII 5 IV 2-3 (C), we find *-za aus-* of seeing in a dream:
(231) *nu-za-kan man DINGIRLUM zashiya tuekki-ssi auszi* "if he sees the deity in the flesh in a dream".
Also IV 6: *nu-za-kan zashimus kues uskizz[i]*.

§2.7b.2 The idiom *-za aus-*, meaning "oversee, check":

(232) *ŠJA NINDA.ERINMEŠ* *uttar ki¹ipandalaz ishiul est[u*
man? ERINMEŠ *lahha nininkanzi nu-za-ta LUUGULA LIM*
LU DUGUD-s[a? AN]A NINDA.ERINMEŠ-ŠU HIDA[-Š]U
menahhanda ausdu kuis-za NINDA.ERINMEŠ-ŠU-ma [epz]i
nu-za-kan UL [pi]yanna zikkizzi lahhiyauwas-za [uttar U]L
imma sek[te]ni ser-asta kuitki sarran

§2.16b MH

Washing oneself appears usually to comport the participle:

ms (376) *m[ahh]an-ma* ITU.8.KAM *tiyaz[i] nasta ma[hhan UD.2].KAM assanzi nu-za MUNUS-za warpzi*

"When the eighth month comes, when there are two days left, the woman washes herself" (KBo XVII 65 Rs 26-7, Beckman p. 140).

When the subject washes one of his own body parts, the particle is now included. Cf.

(377) *nu-za-kan 2 BEL SISKUR watar INA SAG.DU-ŠUNU sara lahuwanzi ŠUH.A-ya-za-kan IGI.HI.A arranzi*

"(the old woman holds out water to the celebrants) and they pour the water on their heads and wash their hands and eyes" (Mast. A IV 23-5).

HW² has an exhaustive discussion of the use of *-za* in similar phrases, at different stages of Hittite, under *arra-*. Cf. also the opposite *ans-* 'dry', with a similar use; also *paprah-* with *-za*, of polluting one's body, from Kantuzzilis, under q. 395.

An earlier text, the archaic copied IX 28 IV 5-7, has the middle, as well as *-za isk-* in the active:

(378) *nas-za arsi(ik-)-ta watar DINGIRMEŠ-as esriya kuit kittati // nat dai nat-san tuikki-ssi lahuwai nu-za I.DUG.GA iskizzi*

"he washes himself several times; the water which was lying on the image of the gods, he takes it and pours it on his limbs and anoints himself with fine oil/perfume".

HW² (Bd. 1, p. 225) notes interplay between *arra-* and *ars-* 'flow', in the unusual form *arskitta*. Assuming of course that that is what this form is: the last *ta* is clearly separated, by a large space, from *arsikit*. Since the other verb in the paragraph is *kittati*, a preterite, it would be possible to consider that the scribe made a bundle of two preterites (translation of the active **arsikit*: 'he washed himself repeatedly'), which would help us understand why there is a paragraph line after *kittati*, as it does not seem to fit the sense. The main arguments against this are that this text does not use *ta* as a sentence connective, and that the whole phrase with a preter-

ite makes very little sense in the context: the phrase immediately preceding this specifies that the person goes into the tent, from what follows evidently to wash and anoint himself. Perhaps the scribe who copied the text couldn't understand what form *arsikitta* was and split it wrong (the last refuge of modern scholarship!).

For *-za isk-*, note also the late LH *kussanian-ma-za I-an iskiya[zi]* "anoints him-/herself with rented oil" (IV 3 II 16'). The Akkadian (I 16-17') is supplemented from R.S. 22.439 III 10-11':]-x šamnu ĩābu ĩubuttatu [a]lp[a (?) lemna(?)] šu(?)-t[e(?)]-i]p (?) (see Ugaritica V p. 279). The Akkadian does not appear to have a reflexive verb; if the Hittite also refers to a head of cattle, it would be odd to have him anointing himself, and we would have to see *-za* as having another function. The phrase might however refer to the woman, like *-za . . . wassiya[zi]* of the previous clause.

With both the active and the middle:

(379) *man-za EN.SISKUR arri nu MUNUSŠU.G[I // ŠA KASKAL^{NI}-za A-az arrahhut* NS?

"When the offerant washes himself, the old woman [says]: wash yourself with the water of the journey!" (KBo ~~XXIII~~ 119 1.3-9).

See also LIX 66 II 7-8, 11-12.

As can be seen, the active and middle *-za arra-* are used in a similar fashion.

The same alternations occur with other verbs of cleaning: NS

(380) *nu-za [D]U suppiyahhut* The same in OS

"Stormgod, purify yourself!" (KBo XV 30 III 5).

I am not clear that *nu-za [D]U* is really present: the passage before *suppiyahhut* is very damaged. What could be *nu-za* might be read simply as *ta*: only the lower portion of the sign(s) is there, if that. Certainly I cannot see the diagonal of *nu*; and only the bottom half of the presumed *-za* is visible. Cf. at any rate *it suppiyahhut*, KBo III 16 Rs 8 (copied OH). See also *suppiyahhati*, Rs 11.

[URU *kalas[ma]az EGIR-anda parkunuttati* NS?
"K. purified itself afterwards" (KBo III 63 I 10' (C)).

(217) *kuis-ma-kan ANA NUMUN¹DLAMA ŠA KUR URUDU-tassa LUGAL-iznatar arha dai nasma-at tepnuzi nasma-at harganna taparriyaizzi nasma-ssi ABU-YA DUTUŠI-ya kuit piyan harueni nu-ssi-kan arha kuitki dai* . . .

"Whoever takes the kingship of Tarhuntassa away from the seed of K., or reduces it, or conspires to overthrow it, or takes away anything which my father and I have given him . . . (let the Sungoddess of Arinna and the Stormgod of Hatti take the kingship of Hatti away from him)" (B.T. III 71-4).

Possibly this is the sense in the following passage as well:

(218) *nu-mu-kan LUMES¹MU.IR.TU₄.TI humantes arha das KUR.KURMES¹-ya kue dannatta amruk EGIR-pa asesanunun nu-mu-kan ape-ya humanda arha das nu-mu tepnut URU¹hakpissan-ma-mu-kan IŠTU INIM DINGIR¹LIM arha UL das ANA DU URU¹nerikk-a-za k[uit] LUSANGA esun nan-mu-kan apezza arha UL das*

"He took all my subjects from me, and the empty lands which I had resettled, he took those also, and reduced/humiliated me. But he did not take Hakis, on the word of the goddess, and because I was priest of the Stormgod of Nerik, he did not take it from me for that reason" (Hatt. III 57-61).

In XXIV 3 II 52-3 = XXIV 4 + XXX 13 II 9, we find:

(219) *nu-za DINGIR¹LUM¹ uel ŠUM-KA le* (not in B) *tepsanusi* (B: *tepnuskisi*)

"do not/you, deity, belittle, reduce your own name!".

The particle might be present because the object is connected with the subject, but we can't be sure: see below.

But in the meaning "humiliate, make light of", *tepnu-* seems to take the particle: see q. 213 above, and the following MH text:

(220) *nu-za uwanzi NIG.B[A]¹MES danzi namma linkanzi mahhan-ma-at E[G¹]R-pa aranzi nasta lingaus sarranzi nu-za sumenzan ŠA DINGIR¹MES¹ memiyanus tepnuwanzi nu ŠA DIŠKUR linkiyas NA4KIŠIB arha hullanzi*

"and they come and take the gifts and swear. When however they arrive back (?) and break the oaths, and belittle your, the gods', words and break the seal of the oath of the Stormgod" (XVII 21+ IV 15-19).

On the other hand, cf. *tepawah-* without particle:

(221) *nu-ssi LUTARTENU uiyanun it-war-an-za-an-k[a]n ANA GIŠGIGIR GAM-an tittanut nu-war-an uwati . . . nu-za UL mem[as] . . . nu-ssi-za EGIR-an UL memas nan ANA PANI KUR.KURMES¹ tepawahta!*

"I sent him the crown prince: 'go, set him in the chariot with you and bring him (to me)', and he refused . . . he refused him and humiliated him before the nations" (AU Taw I 8-13).

Note -za (*kattan?*) *tittanu-* in a similar phrase, I 69-70.

It is easy to say that -za *tepnu-* simply means something other than the simple *tepnu-*, and that it is sufficient to translate it with a different expression in order to capture the difference in nuance between the two locutions. But the two uses of *tepnu-* are obviously very close in meaning, two sides, one might say, of the same coin. The only difference in fact between the two *tepnu-*s is that in one, there is malice on the part of the subject, that is, he has injected himself into the verbal content, in, understandably, a nasty way. In other words, it is impossible to know how far the Hittites separated the two locutions in their minds: whether for them they represented two completely separate ideas, or whether -za was regarded as simply providing a shade of meaning.

The lack of the particle in q. 218 of Hattusilis above is interesting in this regard. First of all, we can never be sure that scribal error is not involved. It may be that *tepnu-* in the sense of "humiliate" always had -za, and the scribe was just absent-minded in this passage. But we have seen enough variation in the inclusion of -za with other phrases to conclude that the particle often could be omitted, without prejudice to the sense of the particular passage. Cf. in fact also *tepawah-* of q. 221 above, without -za. There certainly was a strong tendency to use the particle regularly,

"because the son of A. has his mother's clothes on" (XXII 70 Vs 9). With *was|siskit*, Rs 31. -za is desirable because the subject is wearing his mother's clothes, but apparently it is not required: XXII 70 Vs 77-8: ¹*palliliss-a kuit INA É.GAL^{LIM} sara iyattat TÚGMEŠ^{ma} ŠA ŠU AMA-ŠU wassan harta*

In the very late LH XXVI 25 II 6-7, however, there is no reason of this kind for including -za:

(388) TÚG-an-za GIM-an []wassiskisi ke-ya-za MAMITHI.A QATAMMA wassiski

"as you wear a robe, wear likewise these oaths".

An example without particle:

(389) nu TÚGNÍG.LÁMMEŠ kue apedani UD-ti wassan harkun

"the clothes which I wore that day" (Murs. Sp. Rs 24).

Consider also:

namma MUNUS^{amma}tallann-a kuit IŠTU É.GAL^{LIM} watar[n]ahhir TÚGHI.A-wa kue zik w[assiskisi nu-]war-at ANA DUMU-KA le peskisi

"Then because they warned A. out of the palace: 'the clothes which you wear, do not give them to your son' (XXII 70 Rs 35).

Probably a better restoration would be w[assiskisi. At any rate, apparently "wearing" clothes does not usually involve the particle. -za appears normally only to designate the act of dressing. Q. 388 may however represent a shift in the use of -za with the expression 'have on', at the very end of Hittite.

§2.16.2 We would like to mention *armahh-*, a verb which without -za means 'get someone pregnant'; with -za 'become pregnant'. This precisely parallels the behavior of Italian *ingravidare/ingravidarsi*:

(390) UDU.A.LUM UDU.SÍG+MUNUS-ya arga nu-za armahhi kass-a-za URU-az parnanzass-a UDU.A.LUM DÜ-ru nu LÍL-ri GE₆-in KI-an argaru nu-za eshar papratar wastul GE₆-is KI-as armahhu[ddu

"a woolly ram mounts a female wool sheep and she becomes preg-

nant; let this city and house become the woolly ram, let it mount the dark earth in the field and let the dark earth become pregnant with blood-deeds, uncleanness and sin!" (B.U. 1v 30-3 (C)).

See e.g. also XVII 10 I 14-15 and *passim* (Telipinus myth) alongside -za has-.

The copied Appu has *sumreskiwan dais* (which has a meaning similar to *armahh-* with -za), with particle, III 17; on III 7, the beginning of the phrase is broken off. It is of course not clear that the particle goes with the main verb, rather than with *dai-*, but the sense of the verb encourages our taking it as parallel to the intransitive *armahh-* also in syntax.

§2.16.3 The verbs *ed-* and *aku-* fit into this category: also *karib + za* (KUB 4.47 vs. 6)

§2.16.3a OH

Despite the few attestations in OH, one may conclude that when a simple specific action of eating and drinking is described, the particle is very likely to be included. After all, it is an activity which most nearly concerns the subject. When however the venue of the consumption is specified, or the narration involves eating or drinking from something specific, or the action of eating or drinking is general, the attention is not focused apparently on the activity as it pertains to the subject, but rather on these other aspects of the situation, and the particle is not included. This is a rough estimate of the meanings involved with the particle and this verb: obviously anything as delicate as this nuance will encourage variation in the use of the particle. But basically, it seems, the act of eating is expressed with -za. In these other cases, the passage is interested in the basic verbal content, not the actual process of eating, and -za is omitted. It would definitely appear that -za is not interested in bald fact.

Without particle:

(391) parna-ssa paisi ezsi euksi piyanazzi-a-tta

"(you do not investigate the problems of the poor man, but you do those of the rich man:) you go to his house, you eat and drink and he gives you gifts . . ." (KBo XXII 1 l. 28).

KBo IV 4 II 49). Mursilis is threshing out arguments in order to make a decision.

In late LH we find several other idioms with -za:

(205) *nasma* DUTUŠI k|uedanikki kuinki [memian awan? katt]a memahhi nan-za-an-kan piran [wal?]hmi le-war-an-za-an kuedanikki [para] mematti nan-za-an kuitman apel [UD-za?] arha pedai apas-ma-an-za-an [par]a memai nat-si-ya-at [GAM] NIŠ DINGIRLIM kittaru

"[If My Sun assigns some matter to someone, and I impress (?) on him: 'do not tell anyone about it, until its [day?] takes it away (i.e., until it is no longer current (?))', and he tells it, let it lie under the oath" (Ob. §8 I 56-62).

As can be seen, *awan katta mema-* does not take the particle (but see below, q. 207), but *para mema-* does. Compare also:

(206) *man* UD.KAM ABI-ŠU AMA-ŠU kuedanikki GID.DA-as nu-za kuit GIM-an kisari nu apat kuiski memai lenganut-wa-mu kuis nu-wa karu halliya uehtat nu-war-at UL namma kuitki nu-wa-za ke INIM MEŠ kedani mehuni para namma memahhi nu... kuitman apel UD.KAM-za kuitman-as aki ŠA DUTUŠI-ma kuit NI.TE-ŠU... nat-za para le kuiski kuedanikki memai

"if someone's father and mother's life is long, and something ever happens, and someone says this: 'the person who put me under oath is dead (???)', so that doesn't matter any more: let me tell these things at this time'; while he is alive until he dies, (anything concerning) the person of the king, etc., he shall tell it to noone" (Ob. III 14-25).

Also PHO IV 14-15.

Actually, *awan katta mema-* can appear occasionally with -za:

(207)]ŠA ŠEŠMEŠ DUTUŠI hassantes nasma DUMU MUNUSNA[PTA]RT[I me]mian GÜB-tar kuiski DÜ-an MUD nasma BAL [na]sma kuin memian GÜB-an awan GAM tardi [na]sma-za DUMU.LUGAL kuiski GÜB-an uttar ANA LUSAG [aw]an GAM memai nasma-tta karu-ya [iy]an harzi ANA LUGAL-ma-at UL mematteni ... ŠAPAL MAMITUM

"(if) one of My Sun's legitimate brothers, or the son of a secondary wife does/has done an evil deed, blood or revolt, or entrusts an evil thing, or the son of the king entrusts an evil thing to a functionary or already has done it, and you don't tell the king ... (it lies) under the oath" (PHO IV 23-8, 32).
-za ... awan GAM memai, also IV 10-11. This may also occur in the early LH SV Huqq III 9, but the verb is missing. Actually, the expression occurs also in XXXI 42 III 7-9, a text of Arnuwandas I in late copy, if the language has not been modernized.

Apparently *pariyan mema-* also takes -za:

(208) [nas]ma-kan ŠA DUTUŠI HUL-lu ŠEŠ DUTUŠI kuiski kuedanikki GAM-an harzi nat sakki kedani-ma-za-kan [AN]A NIS DINGIRLIM pariyan UL memai

"or (if) a brother of My Sun plots evil against My Sun with someone, and he knows it and doesn't tell it, in the face of the oath, (let it lie under the oath)" (PHO I 27-31).

(209) I GAL.DU-as-za-ka[n AN]A PANI DINGIRLIM pariyan ki IQBI
"Uratarhundass said this (under oath) before the deity" (XIII 35+ I 35).

It seems, in fact, that the concept of confessing or broadcasting, being a witness to something in general, takes -za. (An exception might be *appa mema-* of SV Huqq III 17, 20, 23, but the sense of the verb is uncertain: it may mean rather 'reverse, unsay'. Note also that *tarkummai-* 'announce' does not take the particle: cf. e.g. VI 45 I 35 = 46 I 36). We note for instance *sakinun* of q. 240, and the following:

(210) *nan le sannatti memian nu-za-kan DUTUŠI piran kutruwah*
"do not hide the matter: be witness before My Sun" (Ob. IV 14-15).

See also the use of *tarna-* with -za, q.s 275 ff.

But note Vs 13-14:

siuni-mi-ma-mu kuit suppi adanna natta ara nat UL
kussanka edun nu-za tukka⁽ⁿ⁾-mman natta paprahhun
"the pure things of my deity which it is not lawful for me to eat, I
did not eat them at all; I did not pollute my body".

The Instructions for Temple Officials and the ritual of
Anniwianis have many examples of (*arha*) *ed-*, *aku-* and *ezza-*,
but only one has the particle (Anniw. IV 27).

§2.16.3c

LH

(396) IŠTU GIŠBANŠUR-ma-za-kan kuezza azzikkinun IŠTU
GAL-ya-kan kuezza akkuskinun sastiyaz-za-kan (or
sastiyazz-a-kan or sasti-ya-zza-kan?: a very unusual spelling)
kuedani seskeskinun IŠTU URUDU₁₀xA-ya-za-kan kuezza
arreskinun kuitta-ya imma UNUTUM anda ueriyān esta nu UL
kuitki dattat IŠTU DINGIRLIM QATAMMA SIxSA-at

"The table from which I ate, the cup from which I drank, the bed
on which I slept, the basin with which I washed, whatever vessel
was mentioned, it was not (to be) used (any more): thus was it
established by the deity" (Murs. Sp. Rs 16-21).

For *ses-* see §1c.

Note the repetition NINDA-ann-a-z TI-annas azzikkizzi
/TI-annas-a-za NINDA-an azzikkizzi 'she eats the bread of life',
KBo IV 8 II 11-12, 20.

(397) LUGAL-uss-a-za UD-tili azzikkizzi nu waganda seni
UD-tili pe harkanzi [pe?]-ma-at kuwapi harkanzi nat UL
kuiski auszi anda-[]-at-za-kan kariskanzi nat PANI seni
tiskanzi

"the king eats daily and daily provides the image with tidbits.
When he offers them, no-one (is to) see them, they cover them up
and put them in front of the image" (KBo XV 9 + XVII 14 + (StBoT 3
p. 56) C "Rs" 10'-13').

The ritual of Ashella has, as an invocation to the deity who has
made the plague,

(398) nu(-wa) apas DINGIRLUM azzikkiddu akkuskiddu-
(-y[a])

"let that deity eat and drink!" (HT 1 IV 25-6 = IX 31 IV 21-2 = XLI
17 IV 12').

But in the description of what the celebrants do in the ritual itself,
nu-za adanzi akuwanzi, IV 26, 39 (just *adanzi*) = HT 1 IV 29 = XLI
17 IV 15'. The Gurparanzahu myth, XXXVI 67 II 17' (probably LH),
has *eter-smas ekuir*. In general -za is included erratically in the
rituals and festivals: see HW² (Bd. 2, Lief. 9-10 p. 129ff.) for some
more detail.

Note also e.g. XVII 24 III (14-)16: (nu-kan uizzi apat GAL
DINGIRLIM KAŠ ANA MUNUS_{el}huitra EN.SISKUR-ya katta lahui)
nat-kan arha NAG-anzi "he comes and pours that beaker of beer of
the god down for the e.-woman and the celebrant and they drink it
off".

§2.17 Miscellaneous

Verbs of clearing out:

MH

With particle:

(399) nu ERÍNMEŠ KUR URU_{arzaw}[a] ANA I_{mad}[duwatta
zahhiya??] pair nasta ERÍNMEŠ I_{madduwatta} [h]umantan-pat
arha haspir . . . KA]RAŠ-za-kan kues tepaues i[spar]ter
apat-ma-kan human a[rha h]aspir-pat

"the troops of Arzawa went (to battle??) against M. and they
destroyed all the army of M. . . . the few of the army which
escaped, they destroyed it all." (Madd Vs 46-8).

See Vs 52: same as end of this quote.

Mitas Rs 16-17 however has *ispart-* apparently without particle.

Note that in the Kumarbi texts, gods speak to their viziers, but *-za* is not included: the particle appears only in the phrases with *PANI ZI-ŠU* (the subject's *ZI*). Compare also the frequent phrase *D^{kumarbis}-za hattatar ZI-ni pian daskizzi / nu-za D^{kumarbis} ZI-ni kattan/pian hattatar NA4NUNUZ man isgariskizzi* "K. takes wisdom into his mind / sticks wisdom on his mind like a bead" (Tablet I I 5, 9, etc.).

§2.6b.2 For *halzai*:

Without particle:

(193) *LÚMEŠ UR[U(g)]asga-ma halziwani nu-smas NÍG.BA^{HIA} piueni namma-as linganumani ANA DÍŠKUR URU^{nerik-wa} [ku]it SÍŠKUR uppiueni nu-wa-z hanzan sumes harten nu-[w]ar-at KASKAL-si le kuiski walhzi*

"we call the Gasgans, and give them gifts, and swear them in: 'the ritual which we are sending to the Stormgod of Nerik, hold yourselves apart (?) and let noone strike it on the road'" (XVII 21+ IV 11-14).

(194) *LÚMEŠURU^{hahha-ma} EGIR-an K[Á.GAL??] ara]nta nu SÍR^{RU} mahhan-ma-sta LÚMEŠALAM.KaxUD E^{hilamm[a]}r [KÁ.GAL?]-as anda aranzi nu aha halzianzi LÚ^{kitas-ma} [nam]ma UL halzai*

"the men of Hahha stand behind (in?) the gate(?) and sing; when the performers arrive in the gatehouse of the main gate, they cry 'aha!'; the *kitas*-priest does not cry." (IBoT I 36 IV 2-5).

III 74-5 is very similar to I. 3-4 above, with *-asta* (*aranzi* restored).

lamniya:-

(195) *nu man-at LÚUGAL-us-ma lamnizzi nan-za para ped[anzi] man LÚLUM nan-za ZI-it para UL pe[danzi]*
"if the king calls for it (?), they bring it/him forward . . . if it is a man, they don't bring him forward on their hook" (IBoT I 36 I 30-2).

But cf. from T.O. (of indeterminate date):

(196) *namma-smas PANI DINGIRLIM memian [me]misten*
"pronounce this word before the god" (T.O. I 63-4).

This refers to a solemn curse, and is probably parallel to the use of *-za* in the sense of 'make a vow, prayer' etc., which we find in the expressions discussed in §2.5c.6 above. See also the behavior of *hurzak*-, §2.6b.4 below, and *mema*- in q. 254; note also Tunn I 3: *nasma-za-an-kan tamais kuiski papranni ser halzian harzi* "or someone else has called on him/named(?) him for uncleanness".

Note *-za* . . . *talliya-/mugai*- of q. 352 from Mursilis II; also e.g. VII 5 I 23 (copied MH, probably). But VII 8 II 20, of the same tablet as VII 5, does not have the particle with *mukesk*-, in a very similar phrase. The third piece of the text, IX 27 Vs 5, has *nan INA UD.3.KAM mugami* (see also VII 5 II 20-1). Cf. also the (copied) MH XV 32 I 46-52 (*mugai*- three times, *talliya*- twice), etc. The two examples with *-za* are both in the first person. In VII 5 the phrase is part of a solemn invocation (Pissuwattis is invoking the deity for the celebrant, not for herself). Mursilis is invoking the goddess for his wife, which may possibly be the reason for the presence of *-za*, but it is not certain.

The MH KBo XVII 105 II 34-6 (C?) has however no particle in an analogous phrase:

(197) *man LÚMUŠEN.DÙ kuiski PANI DINGIRLIM idalu uttar memian harzi nasma-at-kan kardiminuwan kuiski harzi*
"if some augur has spoken evil before the deity or someone has gotten it angry".

The following are good examples of *-za halzai*- in the meaning "to give a particular name (to someone/thing)". It contrasts with the simple verb in the first:

(198) *nasta I DUMU.É.GAL É^{halentuwa}z, para uizzi nu hattili tahaya halzai tahayan-ma-za hattili LÚŠU.I halzissanzi*
"(When the king goes outside), one palace servant comes out of the h-house and calls *tahaya* in Hattian; they call a barber a *tahaya* in Hattian" (IBoT I 36 I 64-6).

See also III 39-40 with *-za*.

ARÀH^{HI.A} kuiski sara adan harzi nu-za GIŠ.HUR^{HI.A}
GÜB-las-ma harninkan harzi nat-za EGIR-an kappui

"The palaces, etc., which are in your jurisdiction, check up on them, whether someone has damaged anything, or someone has taken anything or someone has sold anything, or someone has broken open a granary, or someone has killed an ox of the king, or someone has eaten up the granaries or has destroyed a document unlawfully, make a note of it" (B.-M. A IV 13-20).

An example without -za is in q. 271. Note that T.O. has *nassu-wa-za duwarneskit*, IV 28. It is not clear what the translation is, whether the subject (a head of cattle) is breaking things, as Sturtevant translates, or itself (i.e. injuring itself?). So -za's function is difficult to determine.

In the following quote from Mursilis' Annals, the particle appears, apparently because the subject murdered his father:

(405) nu-za INÍG.BA-DU-as Iaitakkiman ABU-ŠU kuenta
"N. killed his father A." (AM p. 112, KBo IV 4 II 6).

See also II 11: nu-wa-za-kan DUMU-ŠU ABU-ŠU kuendu; probably the same on II 12, with a brother. Also with -za-kan (same story) p. 120, II 65-6.

An LH, apparently related expression, *kattan arha zenna-*, also appears with -za:

(406) nu-mu DIŠTAR-pat GAŠAN-YA humandaza palahsan
ser harta humandaza-pat-mu-kan daskit LÚKURMES-mu-kan .
... DIŠTAR GAŠAN-YA ŠU-i dais nas-za kattan arha zennahhun

"Sausga my mistress in everything held her aegis over me and saved me from everything. She put my enemies, etc., in my hand and I finished them off" (Hatt. I 57-60).

(407) namma-mu-kan DIŠTAR GAŠAN-YA LÚMES^{arsanattalus}
... ŠU-i dais nu kues IŠTU GIŠTUKUL ekir kues-ma UD.KAM-za
ekir nas-za humantes-pat GAM-an arha zennahhun

"Then Sausga my mistress put my detractors in my hand, some (of whom) died by the sword, some died of old age, and I defeated them all" (Hatt. IV 43-7).

la-

Without particle:

(408) DU . . . halziyauen nu-ssi haratar wastull-a piran
tar[naweni (more likely tar[ueni?)] . . . nu ŠA DU TUKU.TUKU-an
piran laueni

"We have called the Stormgod, and confess/speak the offense and sin before him, . . . and we dispel the anger of the Stormgod" (KBo XI 1 Vs 1-3).

The phrases with *halziyauen* and *piran laueni* are repeated several times, with each individual god.

But with particle:

(409) nu-za KUR.KUR^{HI.A}-as wastul^{HI.A} mahhan EGIR-pa
lami . . . nat DU EN-YA istamasdu

"as I release the sins of the countries, (and make this prayer), let the Stormgod hear it" (KBo XI 1 Vs 12-13).

lahuwai-

In Hantitassu, we find:

(410) nuz-kan apun [DU G^{ku}]purnin pa[r]a lahuwanzi
apunn-a arha tuwarniyanzi

"They pour that h.-vessel out from/for(?) themselves, and they break that one" (KBo XX 34 Vs 8-10).

In Yozgat (VBoT 58) IV 5-6 (copied OH), we find *ne-zzan* [] *suhhahhun*, in quite a broken context; however, the general sense seems to be that the person is taking the words of the gods and pouring them on (-za + -san) himself (?).

Note also -za-kan . . . sara lahuwanzi of q. 377, of pouring on oneself.

lak-

See q. 316.

ninink-

(411) namma URU^{palhuissaz} EGIR-pa INA URU^{KÜ.BABBAR-ti}
uwanun nu-za ERÍN^{MES} . . . nininkun

"I came from P. back to Hattusas and raised troops" (AM p. 44, KBo III 4 II 7-8).

The verb *mald-* takes the particle in the meaning 'make a vow', according to CHD; an example is

(181) ANA D^{lel}wani-za-kan GAŠAN-YA AŠŠUM BALAT SAG.DU
DUTUŠI ser maldahhun

"I made a vow to Lelwani my mistress for the life of My Sun" (StBoT 1 I 2-3).

Cf. also V 6 I 32. By itself *mald-* means 'recite' (that is, it falls into the category of the *verba dicendi*). In KBo XXIV 126 Rs 9, *maldai* has -ssi in place of -za; -za however appears regularly in the same phrase in Rs 3 and 15.

§2.5c.7 Probably the following use of *iya-* with -za is also akin to the phrases 'perform rituals/vows' etc.:

(182) nasma-za ki MAMETUM seknus pippuwar kuiski iyazi
nasma-za-at arha aniyazi GAM NIŠ DINGIR^{LIM} GAR-ru

"Or (if) someone twists this oath or does away with it, let it lie under the oath" (Ob. IV 46-8).

-za truly seems to be present to signal the mere involvement, psychological or otherwise, of the subject. We note that *arha pessiya-* occurs in the MH Mastigga text with -za (q. 186), in a similar context; usually the verb, with or without *arha*, does not have the particle:

(183) apidani-wa-smas-kan UD-ti kuit ha[ss]ikkidumat
kinuna-wa-smas-kan kasa apidas UD-as EME^{HI}A Dandaliyas
IŠTU GİR kar[si]a nan-kan hassi [pe]ssiyazzi

"on the day that you satisfied yourselves (i.e. 'let it all hang out?'), now D^A. has cut the tongues of those days off you with a knife', and she throws it on the hearth" (Mast A I 32-5).

(184) nu k[i]ssan memai ais EME-as gagas
qasa-smas-kan parkuin . . . UDU-un sipantahhun nu idalu arha
namma pessiyaten

"and he speaks thus: 'mouth, tongue, g. , behold I have sacrificed a clean . . . sheep to you, so throw evil away again'" (TdH 1 II 8-10).

(185) idalun kardimiyattan sawar arha namma pissiyaten
nu-smas-kan puiya-[?]smi NINDA.Ī.E.DÉ.A namma kittaru
na-smas-kan KA^xU-az para Ī-an arsdū

"throw out evil anger and wrath, and let the oil-bread rest for you on your *pui* (?), and let the oil flow out of your mouth" (KBo XVII 105 II 32-4).

puiyasmi NINDA.Ī.E.DÉ.A could both be datives; they could also conceivably be the subject. But see II 30: ANA LÚMEŠ MUŠEN.DU-ya-kan NINDA.Ī.E.DÉ.A *pui-[?]smi dai* which probably boils down to "puts the oil bread on the(ir) *pui* off/for the augurs".

But with -za, when the subjects are throwing away their clothes to rid themselves of their pollution:

(186) nu TUGNÍG.LÁM-MEŠ kue wassan harkanzi nat-za arha
pessiyanzi nat-za MUNUSŠU.GI dai
"the clothes which they have on, they throw them away, and the old woman takes them" (Mast A IV 6-8).

Note the similarity in use of the particle in -za EGIR-pa siezzi/siyaizzi 'throws behind (?) her (or 'back from her?')', Tunn III 43, 53-4.

We may as well mention the following: it seems a clear case of -za picking up on *ammel-mi*:

(187) (ANA NAM.R)A^{HI}.A-ma kuwapi NUMUN^{HI}.A
anniskanzi nu awarias EN-as [hum]andass-a IGI^{HI}.A-ŠU ser
huyanzen estu man kisan-ma [kui]ski memai NUMUN-wa-mu
pai nu-war-at-za-kan ammel A.ŠĀ-ni-mi [an]da aniyami
"When they give seed to the prisoners, let the eyes of the head of the watch and everyone be on (things). If someone says thus: 'give me seed and I will plant it in my field' . . ." (B.-M. B III 60-3 (C)).

suwa-

(416) *ais-za-kan* Ì-it [s]uwanza es UZU *hurhurta-ma-za-kan*
halwamnaz suwanza es
"mouth, be filled with oil! throat, be filled with laughter!" (KBo XII
96 I 9-10).

Neu, in a review of HW² (IF 81 ('76), 304), corrects this interpretation, espoused by HW² and also by Rosenkranz (Orientalia 33 ('64) 240ff.): he suggests that *ais* (and *hurhurta*, one assumes) are internal accusatives. He cites various other examples of this use of *ais* in particular. It is an attractive suggestion.

In the Tunnawi ritual, we find:

(417) DUTU BELI-YA *kas mahhan* GUD-us *usantaris nas-kan*
usantari haliya anda nu-za-kan hali<<t>> GUD.NITA-it GUD.AB-it
sunneskizzi kasa EN.SISKUR QATAMMA *usandaris esdu*
nu-za-kan É-ir IŠTU DUMU.NITAMEŠ DUMU.MUNUSMEŠ ...
QATAMMA *sunniddu*

"Sungod my lord, as this cow is fertile and is in a fertile pen, and fills the pen with bulls and cows, behold, let the celebrant be likewise fertile and let him/her fill his/her house with sons and daughters, etc." (Tunn. IV 8-13).

daia-

Mursilis' Annals contributes: *nu-za-kan UNUTUM ser dalahhun*
"and left the provisions up there" (AM p. 156, KBo V 8 III 12).

Cf.:

(418) 1-*an-za-kan* UKÙ-*an anda le dal* [iya]si IŠTU KUR-KA-
ya-za-kan arha le kuinki [tarn]asi *nan-kan INA ŠANI KUR^{II}*
[p]arranda le ta[rna]si

"(If prisoners come to you, send them to me): do not leave one man (-*za* = in your domain?); don't let any one out of your land, and don't send them on to another land" (SV Man I 54-7).

We note that in SV Alak A I 76-7' (§6), *anda daliya-* occurs without particle, apparently in the sense 'leave someone in the lurch'.

We note also:

(419) ABU-YA-*ya-za-kan kuit* INIM ANŠE.KUR.RA MEŠ EGIR-*pa*
wařarnahta ANŠE.KUR.RA-*wa-kan le kuinki daliyanzi* IN U.
GIŠKIRI₆-*is-ma-za-kan* ANŠE.KUR.RA *mawallin talista ammak-*
ma-an UL saqqahhun

"As my father instructed about the matter of the horses/chariots, 'do not leave behind any horse', N. left an *m*-horse; I didn't know it" (XXXI 66 IV 10-16).

katta(n) daliya- occurs without -*za* in q. 249 (both versions). In KBo XIV 21 *passim*, *katta daliya-* seems to mean 'omit, leave out'. Cf. then with -*za*:

nu EGIR-*pa-UD-[t]i* [kuw]api Iapimardas aki LUGAL-
UTTA-ŠU-*ma-za-kan ... ANA IİR-DU-up* DUMU-ŠU *katta talisdu*
"when in future A. dies, let him leave (in heredity) to IİR-DU his son his kingship, etc." (XIX 41 II 11-13).

tamas-

Usually this verb does not take the particle. However, cf.:

(420) *man-an-za-kan sehunanza-pat tamaszi*

"when urination presses him" (IBoT I 36 I 33-4).

(Cf. same construction, I 43, with the bladder *gamarsuwanza*).

Here the subject is obviously being bothered by one of his own body parts: -*za* is understandable under these circumstances.

However, it is less penetrable in the following:

(421) *nu-za-kan* Éhal[int]uwas I Éhilan EGIR-*pa tamessanzi*
nasta sanhanzi

"they shut off one court of the *h*-house and clean it" (IBoT I 36 I 5-6).

Is it their court?

In LH, we find: *nu-za-kan* GIŠTIR URU[] GÜB-*la dammaszi* "a wood presses the city X on the left (?)" (XL 106 III 3-4).

tepaues-

Usually *nu* MU.KAM-*za ser tepauessanza* doesn't have a particle. But. cf. AM p. 124, KBo IV 4 III 23, 24; KBo III 4 IV 22).

essir might look like the past tense of *essa-* rather than of *es-* "to be" (though it has the plene *e-*, which might suggest *es-*). This would be an instance of *essa-* in this meaning without *-za*. The clause would then read: "as they worshipped the gods in the past, so they take the places back for them (the gods)". See also Murs. Sp. Rs 32, *essa-* without *-za* in the sense "do a ritual"; XXIV 1 II 7-8; and the late LH XXI 27 II 7. Also V 6 I 22-3 (*essa-*) and *passim* (*aniya-*). The objects range from EZEN₄/*aniur* (II 52) to the deities themselves. See under q. 171 for an example of the latter. The Mursilis Plague Prayers I and II (XIV 14+, XIV 8+), however, have the particle regularly, both in this phrase and with *arkuwar iya-/essa-* (§2.5c.6 below): see e.g. XIV 8+ Vs 7, 8 (§2, p. 206). Also KBo V 6+ II 14 (DS p. 92), and, for late LH, XXXVIII 37 III[?] 14, StBoT 4 p. 56 (with *-smas(-san)* in place of *-za*).

With particle:

(170) *nu-za* DINGIR^{LUM} *iyanu[n]* *nu-za* DUMU.MUNUS
Ipentipsarri LUSANGA MUNUS *puduhepan* ISTU INIM
 DINGIR^{LIM} DAM-anni *dahhun* . . . [nu-nn]as DINGIR^{LUM} SA
 LU^{MUDI} DA[M-*ass-a*] *assiyatar pesta nu-nnas* DUMU.NITAMES
 DUMU.MUNUSMES *iyauen*

"I worshipped the goddess and married P., the daughter of P. the priest, on the word of the goddess . . . and she gave us the love of a husband and wife and we produced sons and daughters" (Hatt. II 82-III 4).

See also KBo IV 8 III 7: *nu-za* DINGIR^{MES} *essahhi*.

Note *-za sara iya-* in the meaning 'raise, exalt (deities)':

(171) *nu humanza sullet nu-za-kan* DINGIR^{MES} *sara UL*
iyanzi nasta NIS DINGIR^{MES} *sarr[ier?]* (XXX 12 Vs 18: *sarrantati*)
 "All (the lands around) mutinied and they do not honor the gods and they broke the oaths" (XXIV 3+ II 28-9).

§2.5c.3 *has-*

In q. 170 above, note the pronoun *-nas*, presumably the substitute for *-za* with the first person plural, in the phrase *nu-nnas* DUMU.NITAMES DUMU.MUNUSMES *iyauen*, a throwback to OH (see q. 143). It might be of interest, in this regard, to pause for a moment to see how *has-* 'to bear (children)' has evolved:

MH

From MH on, the verb appears to have *-za* regularly:

(172) *amme[l]* DINGIR-YA *kuit-mu-za* AMA-YA *hasta nu-mu*
ammel DINGIR-YA *sallanus*

"My god, since my mother bore me, you, my god, raised me" (XXX 10 Vs 6).

See XXXI 127 II 16-, which is similar.

(173) *nu-kan man linga[us]* *sarradduma nu-za* GUD^{HI.A}.
 KUNU UDU^{HI.A}.KUNU *anduhses le has[san[?]z]i nu-s[m[?]]as-kan*
 NIS DINGIR^{MES} DUMU^{HI.A}.KUNU *andan kardi-smi-pat*
a]zzi[k]kandu

"if you break the oaths, let your cattle and sheep and people not bear (children) and let the oath gods eat your children in your heart (i.e. guts)" (KBo VIII 35 II 22-4).

Note the copied B.U. IV 34-5 with two examples of *has-*: one of the copies omits *-za* in one case only, which probably means that it was an oversight of the scribe. But in the Soldier's Oath, we find still an alternation between *has-* with and without *-za*:

(174) *nu-za* DAM^{MES}.SU DUMU.NITA DUMU.MUNUS [*le h*]asi
 . . . GUD^{HI.A}.SU UDU^{HI.A}.SU AMAR SILA *le hasi*
 "let his wives not bear sons and daughters . . . let his cattle and sheep not bear calves and lambs" (KBo VI 34 II 38-41).
 It is possible that there still was variation in the use of the particle with this verb in MH.

LH

(175) ABU-YA-a-nnas-za *I*mursilis 4 DUMU^{MES} . . . *hasta*
nu-za humandas-pat EGIR-izzis DUMU-as *esun*

CHAPTER 3

Comments and Conclusions

§ 3 a OH

§ 3 a.1 We find the following uses of -za in original OH:

1) *da-* takes the particle when there is a nuance of 'take possession, control of', generally for a short period of time, either for a specific purpose (q. 87 ff.) or, less likely, because the object belongs to the subject (q. 87 itself). Particularly in the Laws, the particle can be used in cases of permanent appropriation, though this function is not yet standardized: the particle is often not included.

The phrase 'take to wife' has the particle only in one original OH passage, cited under q. 89. Most examples with this meaning do not occur with -za.

ep- is attested with particle, sporadically, only in the phrase 'take one's place'. Analogously, *hark-* occurs with particle in the phrase 'hold one's place'. See § 2.3 a.2.

turiya- occurs with -za once, where someone takes possession of an ox for the purposes of plowing with it.

2) *iya-* 'make, do' occurs twice with particle: in the phrase 'produce [children]' (q. 143); and in the expressions of q.s 144 (both with and without -za in precisely the same phrase), 145, apparently idioms which does not survive OH.

The verb for bearing children, *has-*, also occurs rarely with the particle, once under unusual circumstances (Zalpa Vs 11-14 under q. 143): the speakers are probably drawing attention to the excep-

tional nature of the deed, since the lady in question gave birth to thirty children at one go. Within the same text the verb occurs several more times, but without particle.

3) *mema-* occurs once with -za in the phrase -za *karti-smi piran memir* (q. 189), in other words in a reflexive use, or perhaps more accurately as reinforcement of a reflexive use.

halzai- takes the particle in the idiom 'call someone by a particular name' (q. 188).

mimma- appears to take the particle in the sense 'refuse, reject (someone)' (q. 191). The sense 'refuse (to do something)' does not appear to take the particle (q. 190).

4) *sarra-* can be used with particle in the sense 'split up, divide (an inheritance or community property)', but the particle is not necessary (q.s 330-1).

5) *idalauēs-* occurs with the particle in a reciprocal sense 'fall out with each other' (q. 331). But the copied Laws has another passage in which the particle is not included, though the sense is the same (q. 333).

6) *arnu-* occurs once with -za in a meaning akin to 'give restitution for' (q. 278). Usually the expression occurs without particle. *sarnink-* (q. 350, e.g.) does not take the particle.

7) *lak-* takes the particle in q. 316. The object is a body part of the subject.

8) *pai-* 'give' takes the particle only in one unusual phrase (q. 341): the subject gives her daughters to her own sons to wife. -za probably is underlining the relationship between subject and object.

9) *ed-* and *aku-* seem to take the particle only when the simple specific action of eating or drinking is described (q.s 391 ff.).

(155) *nasma ki kuit LÚMEŠ URU^{hatti} essanzi [nu-z]a ŠA DUTUŠI EN-manni EGIR-an arha tamel UKÙ-as EN-UTTA ilaliyazi nat GAM NIŠ DINGIR^{LIM} kittaru*

"or this thing that the Hittites do (all the time, namely,) they (lit.: he) desire the rule of another man, instead of My Sun's rule, let it lie under the oath" (Ob. IV 3-6).

See also PHO I 20-1.

But with particle, when the subject has direct involvement with the verbal content:

(156) *nu-wa-nnas-za ÌR-anni da nu-wa-nnas-za ERÍNMEŠ ... iya*

"(Our lord,) take us into (your) service and make us your troops" (AM p. 128-130, KBo IV 4 III 48-9).

(157) *nu-wa-nnas-za ERÍNMEŠ ANŠE.KUR.RAHI.A iya ... nan-za-an ERÍNMEŠ ANŠE.KUR.R[AH].A] iyanun*

"make us your troops and cavalry' ... and I made them my troops and cavalry" (AM p. 136, KBo IV 4 IV 23/27).

See also q. 314: -za is present apparently because the subject is communing with himself (his ZI is explicitly mentioned in both clauses).

The phrase 'making (someone) your son-in-law' takes -za; see q. 109 above and the following:

(158) *nan-za-an ABU-YA [LÚH]ATANA iyat nu-ssi MUNUS^{muwattin} DUMU.MUNUS-ZU NIN-YA [ANA] DAM-UTTI-ŠU pais namma-an-za-an ANA SAG.DU-ŠU ser anzass-a [ANA DUMU]MEŠ-ŠU ser linganut nan-za-an lingayas ÌR^{DU} iyat*

"My father made him his son-in-law: he gave him Muwattis his daughter and my sister to wife, and swore him to fealty towards his person and ours, his [sons], and made him an oath-vassal" (AM p. 140, KBo IV 4 IV 57-60).

The same works for 'make (someone) your wife/husband': see under q. 117 and q. 118.

However, simply making something Hittite again does not take -za: (159) *nu-za¹ pihhuniyas kuit KUR URU^{istitina} tan harta nat EGIR-pa uetenun nat EGIR-pa ŠA KUR URU^{hatti} KUR-e iyanun*

"Because P. had held I., I built it again and made it Hittite land again" (AM p. 94, KBo III 4 III 90-2).

(160) *nu-mu-kan ŠEŠ-YA kue ke KUR.KURMEŠ dannatta ŠU-i dais ... nu-za ke KUR.KURMEŠ dannatta IŠTU NÍTE-YA EGIR-pa asesanunun nat EGIR-pa URU^{hattusan} iyanun*

"The empty lands which my brother put into my hand ... I resettled these empty lands with my own resources and made them Hittite again" (Hatt. II 63-4, 66-8).

Note *essa-* with -nas in a use strongly recalling the ethical dative:

(161) *nu ANA [DINGIR]LIM QADU ÉTI-YA [pah]ashahat nu-nnas É-ir kuit essuen nu-nnas-kan DINGIR^{LUM} anda artat*

"I was protected by the deity along with my house and whatever house we built ourselves, the deity stood inside (it) for us" (Hatt. III 5-7).

Here -za is almost the equivalent of the locution "your":

(162) *sallanunun-war-an kuit ammuk kinuna-ya-war-an karpmi nu-war-an ANA DUTU URU^{TÚL-na} AŠŠUM LUSANGA-UTTİM tittanumi ziqqa-wa-mu-za DIŠTAR parassin iya*

"Because I have raised him, now I am taking him and setting him in the priesthood of the Sungoddess of Arinna; you, make me, Sausga, your patron" (Hatt. IV 11-12, 14-16).

Some special phrases:

In Mursilis II's XIV 4 III 12, we find

(163) *nasma-at-za DINU kuitki iya[t*
"or made it into a case of some kind".

The context is a bit broken. Contrast the simple *iyat* on III 16-18: (164) *man-ma-za DAM-YA ANA MUNUS.LUGAL isiyahhiskat-tallas [kisat] nu idalu kuitki iyat MUNUS.LUGAL apun memian ANA D[AM-YA?] EGIR-pa wastul kuwat iyat*

regularly take the particle from MH to the end of Hittite. We also find *handaittat* of q. 11. We note that *pahs-*, *nai-*, and *es-* have active counterparts that can also use *-za* as the middles do.

The LH forms come roughly half from Mursilis II's time: *hul-lattat*, *karussiyattat*, *mukeskihhut*, *sarrandat*, *suptari*; *usgahhut* (Suppiluliumas I, actually); and half from late LH: *appandat*, *halanzatta* (Neu 1) p. 34 fn. 1 takes this to be an active form), *halziyattari*, *hannantati* and *santati*, *iyahhat*, *neyahhari/neyari*, etc., *unuwahhari*, and *wassiyahhat*.

The OH/early forms fall into various categories:

- 1) with *arskitta/arrahhut* and similar verbs, *hatta*, *unut/unuwattati*, *uesta*, and possibly *munnaittat* (many from copies), the particle makes a direct reference to the subject of the clause: we would analyze them as indirect/direct-reflexive, but this may be simplistic. See §3d (Conclusions) for some discussion.
- 2) states of mind: *impanaitta*, *duskiskitta*.
- 3) subject-oriented processes: *ninkihhut*, *kunkiskitta* (assuming we have the right meaning for this last).
- 4) the particle with *wattuskiddumat/walluttat* seems to be an "ethical" dative (the verbal form has the sense of a passive). *palkuiyanta* and *sazkitta* has not been deciphered.

One important observation is in order. The middles in category 1) and *nink-* and *dusk-*, after OH begin to appear in the active, with the particle. The middle is in fact phased out in most of these phrases. We note for instance that the late Hittite *unuwahhari* alternates with *unuwami* in a duplicate. Usually by this time the middle would not be used at all, or extremely rarely.

Neu mentions that most of the middles appearing with *-za* are 'direct-reflexive' middles, which become active, with particle, in later Hittite. *munnai-* and *wallu-* do not appear in the middle at all except in a few apparently early passages (*munnai-* occurs in the middle, without *-za*, in the Anniwiyani ritual, which is probably late MH, or perhaps early LH); *impanaitta* and *kunk-* are not attested in later Hittite.

By contrast, the late LH middles are either reciprocal: *appandat*, *hannantati*, *santati*; *media tantum* (*es-* (only half a dependent, of course; it has become partly active too), *iya-*, *kis-*); passive (*halziyattari*), in a special idiom that seems to require *-za*, whatever the mode of the verb; or *nai-*, which appears in special phrases. There are occasional forms like *unuwahhari*, *wassiyahhat*, that stand out startlingly among the flood of the corresponding active forms usual at the time. (We tend to see no difference between the active and middle at this period. But these very unusual middles, and the fact that e.g. *mema-* (according to CHD p. 261) occurs twice in the middle, in all of extant Hittite, makes it clear that some difference must have been felt, at least sometimes. Neu (1) p. 116) suggests that *memiyahhat* might be a 'statisches Medium zur Intensivierung').

The forms from Mursilis II are clearly not the same in character (my impression is that Mursilis II represents some kind of turning point in the development of the middle): *sarrandat* is reciprocal, but *sarrantati* of q. 165 (which may very well date from an earlier prototype for Mursilis' prayer) alternates with an active form; *hullattat* and *mukeskihhut* are passives; and *karussiyattat* and *suptari*, and the slightly earlier *usgahhut*, refer to subject-oriented actions. We find the active *karussiyat* in the late LH q. 225, with the same meaning as Mursilis' middle form. Note the comments on *nahsariya-* and *nah-*, §3b.2 below. Clearly there has been an evolution in the use not only of *-za* with middles, but in the use of the middle itself, from OH to LH. Neu notes that *handahhut* of XVII 10 II 32 is resolved into *handanza es* in XXXIII 8 III 21.

§3a.3 The particle is probably an optional inclusion with most of the OH/early middle forms. In fact, one may surmise that the "reflexive" (I am going to call it *subject-oriented* from now on) and reciprocal senses were most regularly expressed by the simple middle (or by adjunct phrases indicating the same concept), in ancient Hittite. Witness, for instance, the behavior of *suppiyahhut*,

the men of the city: 'Once our queen of K. bore 30 daughters at one time'".

(For *aumen*, see KBo XXII 2, which clearly shows an -ú- where the edition transcribes -ru-; also HW² I 576a).

In XLIII 23 Rs 19-22:

nu-za 1 ŠAH mahhan ŠAH.TURHI.A mekkus haskizzi
kell-az ŠA GIŠKIRI₆.G[ESTIN] 1-ass-a GIŠmahlas ŠAH-as iwar
murius mekkus [h]askiddu

"as one pig bears many piglets, let one vine-shoot of this vineyard like the pig bear many grapes".

To return to *iya-*, in the following paragraphs, the same phrase appears both with and without *-za*:

(144) LUhipparas luzzi karpizzi nu LUhippari happar le
[ku]iski izzi DUMU-ŠU... le kuiski wasi [kui]s-za LUhippari
happar izzi nas-kan happaraz [same]nzi

"A *hippar* gives feudal service; let noone make a *happar* with a *hippar*, let noone buy his child, etc. Whoever makes a *happar* with a *hippar*, he forfeits the *happar*" (Laws A §48).

(145) man DUMUMEŠ URUhatti LUMEŠ ILKI uer ANA ABI
LUGAL aruwa[nzi (nu tar)]sikanzi kušan-nas-za natta kuiski
iez[(zi nu-wa-n)]nas-za mimmanzi LUMEŠ ILKI-wa sumes

"When Hittite feudal workers came and they bow to the king's father and say: noone will give us our recompense, and they refuse us (saying) 'you're feudal workers'..." (Laws A+ §55).

B has simply *kusann-a UL kuiski iezzi*.

This is apparently a case where OH used *-za* to make some distinction which was lost in later Hittite.

§2.5b MH

§2.5b.1 The particle is included when the phrase refers to 'making something/one one's own' in some way:

(146) namma-z uit ABI DUTUŠI tuk Imadduwattan
linkiyas-sas iet

"Then My Sun's father made you, M., of his oath (i.e. his vassal)" (Madd. Vs 13).

Note a similar rationale for *-za iya-* in q.s 109, 158: to make someone your son-in-law also involves *-za*.

§2.5b.2 We might as well go into all the different constructions regarding oaths:

(147) nu-za linkiya taksulas uttar kattan QATAMMA-pat
daier LÚERINMEŠ kattan daier

"they put the matter of peace under the oath; they put the troops under (the oath)" (KBo VIII 35 II 31).

Also probably II 28-9, II 33-5, III 5. This works also for entities like cities:

(148) nu-za KUR URUarzawa human das na[t]KUR
URUhapalla-ma-z li[n]kiya kattan kissan zikkas KUR
URUhapalla-ma-z Imadduwattas li[n]kiya kattan]kissan zikkat

"(M. broke the oath to My Sun's father) and took possession of all A. You had put the land of H. so under the oath; M. put it thus under the oath" (Madd Rs 20-2).

Note e.g. the LH XIII 35 I 10 (StBoT 4 p. 4): *nu-za-kan linkiya anda kisan pedas* (also probably similar, IV 20-1). But Madd Vs 13-4, 27-8, 43, Mitas Rs 2 have the above phrase with *dai-*, without particle (for the passage from Mitas, see under q. 320).

İR-ahh- 'subject (to oneself)' usually takes *-za*, though see AM p. 138, KBo IV 4 IV 36-7 for an example without particle:

(149) namma ŠA DINGIRMEŠ SAG.GÉME.İRMEŠ-KUNU...
sahhanit luzzit dammishiskir [(nu-za sume)]nzan ŠA
DINGIRMEŠ İRMEŠ-KUNU... d[(askirr-a)] nus-za
İR-nahhiskir GÉME-ahhis[(kir)]

"they burdened your, the gods', servants with feudal service, and took your, the gods', servants and enslaved them" (XVII 21+ I 24-7).

The middle, however, doesn't appear to take *-za*: cf. e.g.

(150) QADU ÉTI-wa-mu İR-ahhut

"yield to me, with your house!" (Hatt. III 5).

See also KBo IV 4 II 8 (AM p. 112). Neu 1 (p. 71) cites two more examples of this use, both without *-za*.

fact not found with *-za*; see q. 332). With *appandat* of Kumarbi (see §1c), there is variation: the particle is included, but not always.

But compare:

(426) *nu apell-a tuzzin dāsuwa[hhandu] namma-as
duddumiyahhandu nu LUar[as] LUaran le auszi kass-a le
[kun] isdammaszi*

"Let them blind that one's army; let them further deafen them! Let one not see the other; let this one not see [this one]" (KBo IV 34+ I 25-8: Soldier's Oath (copied MH)).

(427) *[k]aruiliyaz-a-wa-kan URUhattusas [UR]Umizrass-a
istarni-summi assiyantes*

"Of old Hattusas and Egypt were on loving terms with each other" (XXXIV 24+ IV 35-6; also 31-2, 38-9 (DS)).

See also e.g. q. 203 (with both *-za* and *istarna*).

As can be seen, the early language had various other ways of handling the expression of reciprocity without *-za*. The various expressions last till the end of Hittite, apparently: cf. e.g. from the Bronze Tablet:

(428) *nu-nnas annisan-pat nakkes assaues esuen nu-nnas
lenkiyas esuen 1-as-wa 1-an pahsaru*

"We were dear to each other and we were sworn to each other: 'let each protect the other'" (B.T. II 33-4).

In the following quote, from late LH, there are three different ways of indicating or implying reciprocity, not one with *-za*:

(429) *ŠEŠ-tar-ta kuedani memini hatrami ŠEŠ-tar kuis
kuedani hatreskizzi nu-kan UL assiyantes kues nu 1-as
1-edani ŠEŠ-tar hatreskizzi*

"Why should I write brotherhood to you? This one writes brotherhood to that one: even people who do not love each other, one writes brotherhood to the other" (XXIII 102 I 9-12).

See under q. 69 for the continuation of this passage.

§3b MH and LH

§3b.1 It is well known that MH represents a turning point in the history of the Hittite language. In previous works (see Boley 1), 2), 4)), we have established that in MH there was a radical change in many aspects of Hittite, as opposed to OH, and that this change determined the shape of the language down to the end of the available texts. The "local" sentence particles, the use and syntax of the place words (PWs = preverb/postpositions), the *hark*-forms, and so forth, all expanded and changed their functions in MH. In particular, the other sentence particles, as well as the PWs, become very frequent and regular when particular usages are present. This tendency increases as Hittite progresses.

Similarly, we find that *-za* has widened its use and is more frequent and regular as the language progresses from MH to LH. Its basic nuance, however, is less altered than we have documented for the other sentence particles. But there are many new idioms, as contrasted with OH, and apparently a tendency to use the particle to express particular concepts, where the same locution without particle would apparently mean something else.

Nevertheless, the demarcation lines between the meanings of a verb with or without *-za* are very often not as clear as we would perhaps like to find them. See e.g. the whole section on *aus*- and related concepts, §2.7. Many would, I believe, like clearly to isolate a meaning 'acknowledge', 'recognize', for instance, for *-za aus*- and *-za sek*-. But we find that this is not quite the case: the verbs with particle do not really have a clearly defined meaning as opposed to the simplex (which we perhaps expect, by a rigid analysis, to have no other function than expressing the simple verbal content). Contrast for instance q.s 237, 252, 262, 263 with q.s 229, 244ff., 265 and the passage quoted under q. 263. Rather, *-za* is included in cases where the subject is actively involved. This certainly very often, perhaps usually, boils down to our 'acknowledge', 'recognize', but it does not fit our rigid specifications to the letter, and indeed we find that simple 'seeing'

The verb is always broken or missing. The accusative, which ought to signal a transitive verb, or a verb of motion, would be somewhat strange with *es-* 'be', as Siegelová takes it. See HW² Bd.2, Lief. 9-10 p. 101-2 for some discussion.

With *para*:

(133) *nam[ma]-ma-wa-z pa²ra tamai KUR-e ... le esta[ri*
 "further, do not settle another land" (Madd Vs 44).

Also Vs 20, Rs 34.

§2.4c LH

Without particle:

(134) *nu-ssi kas LUKARTAPPU pidi-si esaru*
 "let the K. sit in his place" (AU Taw II 71-2; also 76).

For an example with particle, see q.s 82, 127. One might object that the particle is included because the subject is sitting on his father's throne. But cf. e.g.

(135) *nu-za MUNUS.LUGAL katta ishahat nu taskupiskiwan tiyanun*

"I, the queen, sat down and began to cry" (XXXI 71 III 2-4).

Neu 1) p. 27 has other examples with *-za*, which likewise do not have this problem.

The verb *ases-*, in the meaning "sit", can occur with particle:

(136) *]namma LUGAL-us kueda[s] kueda[s] ANA ASRI^{HI}.A aseskattari nu-za apa[s as]eskattari*
 "wherever the king (usually) sits, that one ... sits" (KBo XV 2 B+ Rs 27-9 (StBoT 3 p. 62)).

It is obviously not clear whether *-za* is in the break at the beginning. If it isn't, the first *aseskattari*, without *-za*, could represent the non-transformative verb, and the second, with *-za*, the transformative one. Given the Hittites' predilection for repetition, however, one wonders if this would be accurate. Then again, both clauses may have had the particle.

In the meaning 'settle' (?), we find this verb both with and without particle in SV Kup §9 33-4.

The simple verb *es-* occurs in SV Kup §10 C 36, apparently in the meaning 'occupy, take over'. See the middle with *-za* in this sense, e.g. KBo V 8 II 13, 18 (AM p. 152). The particle also occurs with the *hark*-form of *es-* in this transitive meaning 'occupy':

(137) *MU-anni-ma INA KUR URU^ziharriya paun nu-za ANA PANI ABI ABI-YA kuis URU gasgas HUR.SAG^{tarikarimun} GEŠPÚ-az esat namma-as-za URUKÙ.BABBAR-si hargas kisat nu uer URUKÙ.BABBAR-san GUL-hir nan mekki dammeshair nu DUTUŠI paun nu-za HUR.SAG^{tarikarimun} kuis URU gasgas esan harta nan GUL-un*

"the next year I went into the land of Z.; the Gasgan city which had taken Mt. T. by force at the time of my grandfather became a peril for Hattusas, and they came and smote H., and they oppressed it greatly; I, My Sun, went and the Gasgan city which was holding Mt. T., I smote it" (AM p. 80, KBo III 4 III 57-61).

"To be settled (somewhere)":

(138) *esari-ma-at-za INA URUMUL-ra*

"they (?) are settled in Astira (?)" (StBoT I III 14 (p. 32)).

Other phrases "to settle, populate (a land, etc.)" use *-za* erratically:

Both with and without *-za*:

(139) *kinuna-za kuitman KURTAM asesanus kimi ... nu kuitman KURTAM annalli EGIR-pa tiyazi DINGIRMEŠ KUR^{TI}-y[a an]nisan mahhan essir nu-smas pedan QATAMMA EGIR-pa appanzi kuitman-ma KUR-e asesanus kimi kuitman-at. kursai Š[A DINGIR^M]EŠ-ma ishiul EGIR-anda kuit uemiskimi nat essahhi-pat*

"Now whatever country I settle, as the old (state of the) country comes back, as the gods of the land used to be of old, so they take their place again (or 'As they used of old to worship the gods, so they take back the place for them (the gods)'). When I settle a country, when it x-s, whatever treaty of the gods I find, I will perform it" (KBo XI 1 Vs 24-7).

Cf., without particle, also XXI 29 I 12-13 (bis).

31 I 33 (= 32 I 34-5), III 48 (C)). We then find it in Mursilis II's DS, and it continues into late LH (see under q. 122 and q. 243).

Note the contrast between the usage of *es-* 'be' with the second person singular in the MH XXXI 127+ (mentioned under q. 46), and the early LH q. 55, which has *-za* in the same expressions. There is still variation at that time (Mursilis II), as the material cited below q. 55 shows. At the end of Hittite it is apparently the second plural pronoun which is erratic with respect to *-za*. *kis-* seems to take *-za* more regularly as Hittite progresses. Finally, note the use of *-za* with *ep-*, *walh-* and *warp-* (?) in MH and in the Tunnawi ritual, mentioned in connection with q.s 98, 382, under *walh-* (§2.17). These uses of *-za* certainly do not seem to represent the norm in later LH; they look perhaps like a hold-over from OH, if the behavior of *parkunu-* in the copied q. 375 is any indication.

As for LH, it appears that certain locutions (apart from whether they included *-za* or not) were new at that time. Examples with particle are: *arkuwar iya-* (§2.5c.6), *malai-*, *markiya-*, *katan pai-* (q. 344), etc. This does not necessarily mean, though, that the nuance of *-za* had changed: the particle may simply be included with new expressions that were perceived as analogous to the old ones with which *-za* was familiar.

Some interesting changes occurred with *nah-* (§2.15.3) and *wassisk-*. It is possible that *-za nah-* has taken over from the middle *nahsariya-*, which until Mursilis II was apparently the standard way to express the concept 'become afraid' (as opposed to *nah-* 'be afraid', primarily). In some Mursilis texts, we also find the active *nahsariya-*, in the same use, but then the verb, in either mode, seems to lose currency. The occurrences of *nah-* with *-za* are all later than Mursilis, and at least two of them encourage an interpretation of the syntagm as meaning 'become afraid'. So it is possible to consider that *-za nah-* is a late LH creation to express the concept represented by *nahsariya-* in earlier times. But there are few examples, so that it is difficult to assess the function of the particle.

As for *wassisk-*, it is notable that this verb occurs with particle in the Suppiluliumas II text XXVI 25 (q. 388). This extension of *-za* may indicate a spread and change in its use, at the very end of Hittite. Before this time, *-za* had been included with a locution signifying 'have on' only briefly in MH: with *uesta/uessanta*, to be exact, which was an OH expression and was being phased out at the time, in favor of *wassan hark-* without particle. It seems that *-za* represented an attempt to fit the older expression into a transition period; the usage was finally discarded. A similar phenomenon may have been underway with *wassisk-* in late LH, or *-za* itself may have been altering its use.

On the matter of global change in the use of *-za*, over the history of Hittite, see §3d (Conclusions). This topic covers also the question of whether the particle has accusative and dative reflexive uses; see also §3b.4, §3c.2a, c.

§3b.3 Specifics of the usage of *-za* in later Hittite:

To begin with, we find *es-* 'be' and *kis-* with particle in MH, and in phrases which in OH do not seem to have comported a particle. *-za* has become a surrogate with *es-* for the first singular and both second personal pronouns, by LH, and is employed regularly with the first person plural. (Its use with *zik* apparently increases as Hittite progresses; with the second person plural in late LH we find that *-za* is omitted if *sumes* or its equivalent is present). It appears rarely with the animate third persons; it does however regularly accompany inanimate subjects, if the sense calls for it. See §2d for some further discussion.

With *kis-*, the particle appears to express a specific radical visceral change in the subject. This sense can also be appropriate with 'happenings', if the writer wishes to draw attention to the importance or radical nature of the occurrence.

(122) MUŠEN-as-z[aʔ] GIŠ^{taptappan} EGIR-pa epzi nas TI-iszi uk-[m]a-za-[ka]n DU pihassassin EN-YA EGIR-pa AZBAT nu-[mu TI]-nut

"a bird takes refuge in his nest and he lives; I have taken refuge with the Weathergod of Pihassi and he keeps me alive" (VI 45 III 40-2).

Contrast the duplicate VI 46 IV 9-11: the first phrase with *appa epzi* has -za, but the second has only -kan. Other attestations with -za come from the Ahhiyawa text XXIII 13 Vs 5, and the oracle text KBo II 2 II 30-1. Passages without -za are X 48 I 5 and probably KBo XI 43 I 28 from the nuntarriyashas festival, and KBo III 4 IV 37 (AM p. 132).

A possible case of *appa ep-* with the simple meaning 'take back (their places)' (and -smas in place of -za) is q. 169.

Cf. *man-za-kan antuhsan aul*les [ku]it pedan epzi "if the a. takes a person in any place (in his body)", VIII 36 III 14-15; also similar II 6.

It is interesting that for the idiom 'begin (to do something)', which is normally rendered by *dai-* and the supine, DS prefers *ep-*, the infinitive, and -za. Cf. e.g. KBo V 6 I 9: *nu-za pait URUalminan uetummanzi IZBAT*. The simple *uete-* does not take the particle: cf. e.g. I 13 (the phrase relates to the same city); also q. 159. Note further *nu-za URUtuwanuwan zahhiyawanzi epzi*, XXXIV 27+ IV 22' (DS p. 76), also 30-1'. *zahhiya-* is not found with the particle. We document various similar locutions, q.s 228, 232, 243, 318.

A case of *hark-* with particle:

(123) GIM-an-ma-mu-za DU URUnerik SAG.DU DINGIRLIM-is duwan para GIM-an SAG.KI-za harta kinuna-ya QATAMMA kedani-za-kan LIL-ri kuwaten imma kuwaten neyahhari nu-mu pian huiyasi

"if you, Stormgod of Nerik, head god, as up to now you have held me in front (i.e. promoted, helped me), wherever I turn in this field, you will run before me" (V 1 III 53-5).

§2.3c.3 It is interesting to compare *tarh-* and related verbs, which behave very much like *da-* with particle.

tarh- seems regularly to take -za, though this is not universal, particularly in early texts: the copied Telipinus Edict has three examples of *tarhan hark-* without particle (I 6, 16, 26) against one with (II 42-3). We also have a couple of later examples of this verb in the meaning 'be able to, manage', without particle (see q. 125, and under q. 128).

MH

(124) [DUTU-us humandas uestara]s zik nu-ita humantiya halukas-tis [sanizzis nu-mu-ssan kuis sius-mis s]a et nu-mu-ssan arha paskutta appa-ya-mu-za [apas-pat kappuiddu nu-mu h]uisnuddu nu-mu kuis DINGIR-YA inan pa [i]s nu-mu genzu [namma daddu siu]ni (CHD p. 130: ina]ni) piran tarihhun kulik[k]un nu-za namma UL tarhmi

"You, Sungod, are the shepherd of all, and your message is sweet to all: my god who has become angry with me, and has abandoned me, let him count me back, and let him save me. The god who has given me the sickness, let him take pity on me. Before the god(?) I have made an appeal (or before the sickness I have toiled) and x-ed, and I still do not conquer (it)." (XXX 10 Rs 1-4). See XXXI 127 II 61-9: more or less exactly the same.

LH

Without particle:

(125) nu ABU-YA kuit tarh[ta] nat EGIR-pa iyat kuit-ma UL tarh[ta] nat UL EGIR-pa iyat
"what my father could he replaced, what he couldn't he did not replace" (Murs.P.P. p. 244, XIV 13 I 41-3).

But note with particle:

(126) ammuk-ma-z Š À-az lahlahhiman UL tarhmi NÍ.TE-az-ma-za pittuliyā namma UL tarhmi
"I cannot conquer the pain in my heart, I cannot conquer the fear in my body" (Murs.P.P. II p. 206, XIV 10 I 6).

The locutions 'check, keep an eye on', whether with *aus-*, *kappuwai-*, or the like, take *-za*. *aus-*, *sek-* and *kane-* have the particle in a meaning 'acknowledge' (a sense which naturally implies some active mental involvement on the part of the subject, as opposed to the simple meaning 'know, see'). See above, §3b.1, for some discussion. We note that *kane-* did not apparently take the particle in OH (§2.7a). *sek-* with *-za(-kan)* also is used of sexual intercourse (q. 261). *tekkusanu-* and *sakinu-* 'show, make known', have a parallel use to the *verba dicendi* meaning 'broadcast', namely, they can have the particle.

6) The verbs of bringing and of motion have a roughly parallel use: The phrase 'send (someone) as a messenger' has acquired *-za*. Bringing booty home, or back to one's own land, and the taking of troops with or to oneself, entails *-za*.

With both the verbs of bringing and of motion, there seems to be a special idiom with *-za arha*, that begins in MH, if our reading of q.s 297-8 is correct. It is hard to determine exactly the nuance, or to express it accurately in modern English. But we compare it in §2.9c.9 (under q. 293) to the Italian *se lo porta via* (or the equivalent for a verb of motion), where *se* merely represents the subject's interest and activity in connection with the verbal content (something like an "ethical" dative), and is not reflexive in a strict sense.

In q. 296 *kattan iyanniya-* occurs with *-za* in a reciprocal use. *nai-* (§2.11) is in a class with the verbs of motion. It is found with the particle mostly in the middle, apparently in cases where the subject has some volition or intent in the action, as 'turning' to favor someone, to take sides with someone, or to speak to someone, or to pay attention, often of a bellicose nature (e.g. to another country). The simple *nai-* in the middle refers to physical turning, or spinning as in a dance, to growing/turning up (transitive or intransitive), and, in late LH, it is used as an idiom to express defecting from someone.

7) *dai-* (§2.12) occurs with particle in MH in the following uses: 'hold (a body part(?)) set (against something)';

"attack, set on". The related idiom 'begin to do (something)', with *dai-*, has the particle more often in MH than later (in this idiom *dai-* itself does not take the particle often: one finds the latter with *zikk-* and *tisk-*). See q.s 228, 232, 318. But with *ep-*, etc. (under q. 122, q. 243), we find that the particle is regularly included. In LH, *-za dai-* occurs in the sense 'present as a substitute for oneself' (q. 324). This use occurs also with *pai-* 'give' (q. 346). Note the OH *arnu-* (q. 278), with *-za*. With *sarnink-* *-za* is erratic: generally it is not present, but see q.s 350 ff. The related *tittanu-* occurs only once with particle, when a brother of the subject is involved in the sentence.

8) *sarra-* (§2.13) still takes the particle in the sense 'split up (goods, booty, and the like)'. *-za* is also attested in a reciprocal sense with this verb, but it appears that it was not strictly necessary. Then again, the example we quote without particle is early LH (q. 337): perhaps the particle was not quite regular in this use yet.

9) Verbs indicating states of mind are very prone to taking the particle: in fact it is all but obligatory with them. Some of these are *ilaliya-*, *malai-*, and its opposite *markiya-*, *dusk-* and *hassik-*. *nah-* takes *-za* sometimes, but is generally found without particle.

10) Verbs pertaining to the care of the body have *-za*, in many cases:

Verbs of washing take the particle when the subject washes himself, both in the active and in the middle. However, we have some early middle examples in which the *-za* is not included (under q. 380, q. 382).

"Dressing oneself" comports the particle; 'dressing someone else' or 'having on' does not, unless one happens to have on the clothes of a relative (q. 387). Some late texts, probably based (incorrectly?) on old models, have *was-* 'dress' without particle (see under q. 386). Note also the behavior of *armahh-* 'become pregnant' with particle, 'make pregnant' without. We noted the parallel between this use of

It is still possible, in LH, to find *-za da-* used for short appropriations, in the manner we have seen in OH and MH:

(111) LUGAL-us-za GÍR ZABAR dai nu-[kan] UZU_{walan} hastai UZU_{ekdu} awan arha kui[rz]i

"The king takes a bronze dagger and cuts off the thigh, bones and shank" (XXVII 1 III 20-1 (Hattusilis III)).

Note the very frequent *-za ME-as/-ir*, e.g. of V 1, a late LH oracle text. The particle is not always present: for instance, when it is combined with the verb GUB-is/-ir, as e.g. on V 1 IV 63, it follows directly, without sentence connective and without particle. We note that *-za* is as a rule replaced by *-(s)mas* in the third plural, but not by *-si* in the singular.

A good example of the use of *-za da-*, as opposed to *-kan arha da-*, is:

(112) nu DUTUŠI kuit ANA I DLAMA ... pihhun ZAGHIA-i-ssi kues tehun nas-kan zilatiya ANA NUMUN I DLAMA arha le kuiski dai LUGAL-us-at-za le dai ANA DUMU-ŠU-at le pai

"what I, My Sun, have given to K. and the boundaries which I have set for him, let noone from now on take them away from the seed of K. Let the king (himself) not take them; let him not give them to his son" (B.T. IV 21-4).

However, the two senses can be combined in the same clause:

(113) MUNUS_{ammāt[al]las-a-za-kan} kuit DINGIRLIM IGIHIA-wa epta

"Because A. stole the eyes from the god" (XXII 70 Vs 8, and *passim*).

(114) nu-wa-nnas-za IR-anni da nu-wa-nnas-za ERINMEŠ .. iya

"(Our lord,) take us into (your) service and make us your troops" (AM p. 128-130, KBo IV 4 III 48-9).

With *-nas* in place of *-za*:

(115) mann-a-za ŠA DUTUŠI HUL-lu k[u²wa]pi kisari ANA DUTUŠI-ma ŠEŠMEŠ meqqaes [n]u apat kuwatqa iyatteni ... nu kisan mematteni kuin-wa-nnas imma sara dummeni nu-wa-nnas apas UL imma DUMU EN-ENI ...

"If an evil ever befalls the king, the king has many brothers, and (if) you do as follows: (you go to someone other than the direct royal line) and say thus "whomever we take to ourselves (to be king), is not that one the son of our lord?" (Ob. I 17-23). Note the difference in nuance between *-nnas* ... *sara dummeni* and the simple *sara dai* of q. 109 above. The subject in the latter is not personally involved in the action: he merely performs it.

An interesting phrase, three times repeated, from Hattusilis' Apology:

(116) nu-mu DINGIRLUM kuit GAŠAN-YA SU-za harta nu-mu huwappi DINGIRLIM-ni huwappi hannesni para UL kuwapikki tarnas ... DIŠTAR-mu-za-kan GAŠAN-YA humandaza-pat daskit man-mu istarkzi kuwapi nu-za-kan irmalas-pat ŠA DINGIRLIM handandatar ser uskinun DINGIRLUM-mu GAŠAN-YA humandaza-pat ŠU-za harta ammuk-ma-za para handanza kuit UKÜ-as esun ANA PANI DINGIRMEŠ kuit para handandanni iyahhat ŠA DUMU.NAM.LÜ.U₁₉.LU-UTTI HUL-lu ulla UL kuwapikki iyanun DINGIRLUM-mu-za-kan GAŠAN-YA humandaza-pat daskisi ...nu-mu DIŠTAR-pat GAŠAN-YA humandaza palahsan ser harta humandaza-pat-mu-kan daskit LÜKÜRMEŠ-mu-kan ... DIŠTAR GAŠAN-YA ŠU-i dais nas-za kattan arha zennahhun

"Because the goddess my mistress had me by the hand, she did not turn me over to the evil deity and the evil trial ... Sausga my mistress saved me from everything/one. If sometimes I am sick, even as a sick man I see the favor of the goddess. In everything the goddess my mistress has me by the hand. And I, because I was a favored man, and because I walked in favor before the gods, I never did an evil thing (after the fashion) of mortal men. You, goddess, my mistress, save me from everything. Sausga my mis-

One might object that the accusative pronoun would clearly refer to others, not to the subject, and that the dative was used because it is ungrammatical, which would signal loudly that it is being used for an ulterior purpose. (This sounds like a very odd argument, now I've enunciated it!) But one might just as easily consider it highly unlikely, if the Hittites felt strongly that the reflexive sense paralleled an accusative, that they would have expressed it with a dative. They probably would at least have eliminated use of the dative and stuck with *-za* alone, in the "accusative" cases. It seems clear that *-za* is analogous to the dative pronoun, no matter how its function appears to us.

§3c Background and Overview

§3c.1 It may be of interest to examine very briefly the use of the reflexive pronouns in Italian and German, as representatives of the Romance and Germanic branches of IE. These two have an outwardly similar approach to reflexivity, but there are subtle differences. First of all, though both differentiate between an accusative and a dative use of the reflexive pronoun, in German this distinction is kept more concrete, because the 1st and 2nd singular pronouns have separate forms for accusative and dative. In Italian, by contrast, the dative and accusative of the enclitic/proclitic pronouns are the same in outward form: this encourages a certain indefiniteness in the thrust of the pronoun, in many cases.

In Italian, a clearly accusative reflexive pronoun occurs in *vestirsi* 'dress oneself', comparable to *sich kleiden* in German. This use is common with verbs relating to the care of the body (*lavarsi*, *pettinarsi*, etc.), but it is quite common with other sorts of verbs as well (cf. e.g. *presentarsi* (a qualcuno), German *sich vorstellen*, etc.). The verbs are simply transitive, and their use with the pronoun merely signals that the verbal content applies, on this occasion, to the subject, and not, as usual, to an outside object.

A dative pronoun also usually occurs with transitive verbs: *darsi* (e.g. *un contegno*), *permettersi/concedersi* (e.g. *un lusso*), and similar. The German equivalent might be *sich* (etwas) *gönnen*. There are verbs, like *imporsi*, which have both an accusative and a dative use of the pronoun. In fact, this applies also to the verbs of body care mentioned above: one can say *mi lavo le mani*, etc.

The pronoun also can have the thrust of an "ethical" dative: *godersi la vita*, *prendersela*, etc. Often the pronoun is optional in these phrases: for instance, there is not much difference in substance between *me la prendo* and *la prendo*: the reflexive pronoun just shows the subject's interest in the affair. We mentioned the similar locution *se lo porta via*, under q. 293. English speakers might be tempted to translate *me* or *se* here as "for myself/for himself"; this would not be accurate, however. Compare in fact the locutions *se le inventa proprio tutte* or *se le sogna proprio tutte*: you might say this of the author of a sensational novel or a soap opera who comes up with the most extravagant plots to keep his public's interest, but it would not be possible to analyze *se* in these phrases as meaning that he invents or imagines the wild ideas 'for himself'. The pronoun simply marks the subject's involvement in the verbal content, in this case his volition or mental effort, or similar. This is a wide-spread use of the reflexive pronoun in Italian.

There is of course a reciprocal use of the pronouns: *battersi*, *amarsi*, *volersi bene*. These last two show that the pronoun still can have an accusative or a dative thrust, depending on the type of verb it occurs with. German has similar constructions, but usually includes some form of *einander* to reinforce the reciprocal sense.

Consider however the case of *vergognarsi*, *lamentarsi*, *arrabbiarsi*, *rallegrarsi*, German *sich schämen*, *sich klagen*, *sich ärgern*, *sich freuen*, etc. How is one to classify these pronouns? To be sure, in German they are grammatically clear accusatives; but in Italian? The only way to find out what the case is is to trace the history of the expression back to Vulgar Latin. These verbs tend to

(100) *ISTU DUMU MEŠ.É.GAL TIM_{ma} GAL DUMU MEŠ.É.GAL arta EGIR-ann-a-ssi 2 DUMU MEŠ.É.GAL aranta nat 3-es mahhan-ma sarkantin arha tarnanzi nu-za GAL MEŠEDI petan-pat harzi 2 BELUTI-ma-ssi kues EGIR-an aranta ... nat EGIR-pa panzi nu EGIR-pa LÚ MEŠ MEŠEDI uemianzi*
 "the head of the palace servants stands off from the palace servants; behind him stand 2 palace servants. When they three remove the *s.*, the head of the bodyguards keeps his place; the two lords who stand behind him go back and find the bodyguards again" (IBoT I 36 III 12-16).

The following quote shows *-za* with *karp-*:

(101) [*nu-z*]a hassus hanzassus karpdu nu-za-kan KUR-e hassikdu

"let him 'raise' himself descendants and let the land satisfy itself" (TdH I 1 37).

Also III 38, in broken context.

Cf. also the copied Appu III 10, 18-19: MUNUSUMMEDA-as-za DUMU.NITA-an karpta "the nurse 'lifted' the child (and put it on Appu's knees)". This appears to be a technical expression for 'raising' a child at birth: cf. the vocabulary KBo I 42 I 39: UMMEDA-za kuis DUMU-an karpan (Beckman, StBoT 29 p. 49, thinks that *-za* here is just the phonetic complement to the noun). The Sumerian and Akkadian equivalents are unfortunately broken off. Note the Italian *levatrice*, the German *Heb-amme*, etc., for "midwife": one might wonder if *-za karp-* has something to do with the actual delivery. However, Latin *tollere* is used of the father's 'raising' a child at birth, to acknowledge it as part of the family.

In the following passages, *hark-* appears with the particle, ostensibly with the 'accusative' sense:

(102) *man sarkantis-ma arta ANA LÚ MEŠEDI-ma ... [DI]NU nas-kan sarkantin piran arha UL paizzi EGIR-an arha-as-kan paizzi nu-za arahza kuis harzi nas paizzi apedani kattan tiyazzi*

"if the *s.* stands and there is a trial of a bodyguard, he does not go off before the *s.*, he goes off behind (it); who(ever) holds himself outside, he goes and steps with that one" (IBoT I 36 III 31-4).

(103) *arahziya-z kuis LÚ MEŠEDI harzi mahhan-ma sarkantin tamain uwatezzi nu ANA GAL MEŠEDI kues 2 BELUTI EGIR-an aranta nat sarkanti andurza tapusa iyanta arahza-ma-z kuis LÚ MEŠEDI harzi nasta mahhan sarkantin ANA LÚ MEŠ MEŠEDUTIM handanzi apas-a-kan sarkantin EGIR-an arha paizzi nas sarkanti arahza ZAG-az iyannai*

"the bodyguard who holds (himself) outside, when he brings another *s.*, the 2 lords who are standing behind the head of the bodyguards, they march inside around the *s.* The bodyguard who is holding (himself) outside, when they arrange the *s.* with the bodyguards, he goes off behind the *s.* and marches outside on the right of the *s.*" (IBoT I 36 III 16-22).

See also *arahzeza-z 1-as harzi*, III 8.

(104) *LÚ MEŠ UR[U(g)]asga-ma halziwani nu-smas NÍG. BA_{HI}.A piueni namma-as linganumani ANA DIŠKUR URU_{nerik}-wa [ku]it SÍSKUR uppiueni nu-wa-z hanzan sumes harten nu-[w]ar-at KASKAL-si le kuiski walhzi*

"we call the Gasgans, and give them gifts, and swear them in: 'the ritual which we are sending to the Stormgod of Nerik, hold yourselves apart (?) and let noone strike it on the road'" (XVII 21+ IV 11-14).

Not *-smas* here, but *-za*. See §3b.5 below.

But *-za hark-* has a sense more in keeping with what we have seen above for *-za da-*, in the peculiar passage:

(105) *kuwapi-si atta[s]-m[i]s DINGIR MEŠ-as NÍG.SI.SÁ-an, KASKAL-an U[L eppir] nu-za LÚ HUL-lu KASKAL-an harkir*
 "Since my father's gods did not take(?) the good road for him, and held the road of the evil man, (let his name be [Evil])!" (Appu III 14-15).

-za hark- means 'reserve'?

§2.3b.3 The following examples are very interesting. It would appear that *-za* is included not only when the subject himself is concerned with the action, but also when he is dealing with a close

Also in the copied Laws:

(90) *takku LÚ-as DAM-ŠU dai nan ANA É-ŠU pehutezzi iwaru-sset-az anda pedai takku MUNUS-za apiya aki nu LÚ-as assu-set warnuanzi iwaru-[se]t-az LÚ-as dai*

"if a man takes a wife and brings her to his house, he brings her dowry in. If the wife dies there, and they burn the goods of the husband, he takes the dowry" (Laws §27 (not in A)).

Note that *-z anda pedai* essentially has the same meaning as *-z dai*.

For purposes of comparison with later Hittite, *daya-* 'steal' occurs many times in the Laws, never with particle. It is interesting that *turiya-*, which normally does not take *-za*, appears once with the particle (§71; it is not preserved in A, but may have occurred in the break). A person has found an ox, and is allowed by the elders to take it himself, for plowing. *-za turizzi* therefore telescopes *-za da-* and *turiya-* into one expression.

§2.3a.2 It is of interest to compare the use of *-za* with *ep-*:

KBo XXV 31 II 12 (StBoT 25 #31): *ta AŠAR-ŠUNU appanzi* "they take their place".

But: KBo XXV 40 (StBoT 25 #40) l. 6': *t]az AŠAR-ŠUNU [appanzi StBoT 12 I 12: DUMUMEŠ.É.GAL appā [tienz]i taz pē[d]aⁿ-smet appanzi*

Parallel phrases with *hark-*:

StBoT 12 I 4: *DUMUMEŠ.É.GAL pēdaⁿ-smet harkanzi*

KBo XVI 71+ II 9-10 (StBoT 25 #13): // *[p]angus ŠA ERÍNMEŠ tarnattallas(-)x [t]az uttar-set harzi*

In the copied Telipinus Edict, we find *-za* (DAM-anni) *hark-*, twice (I 31-2, II 9-10).

Note:

takku LÚ GIŠ[TUKUL har]kzi LÚ ILKI tittianza nu LÚ ILKI tezzi ki GIŠTUKUL[-li]-met ki-ma sahhaⁿ-mit nu-za ŠA LÚ GIŠTUKUL A.ŠAH[LA] anda siy[att]ariyazi GIŠTUKUL-li-ya harzi sahhan-a iss[ai] takku GIŠTUKUL[-ma] mimmai...

"if a farmer (?) dies and an underling (??) is associated (with him) (??), and the underling says 'this is my farm, this is my feudal land', and obtains legal title to the farmer's fields, he holds the farm and does the feudal service. If however he refuses the farm..." (Laws A §40).

Similar §41: the phrase *GIŠTUKUL-li harzi* is preceded by *nu-za* in C, and *nu* in B.

§2.3b MH

§2.3b.1 Without particle:

(91) *nu SÍG BABBAR SÍG GE₆ dai nasta appuzzi anda hulaliz[i] nat-za tissatwa halzai nat ANA 2 BEL SÍSKUR [(ser)] epzi nu kissan memai*

"she takes white and black wool and winds tallow into (it) and calls it *tissatwa* and holds it over the two celebrants and says thus" (Mast A I 42-4).

There are of course many instances of this use without particle.

But with particle:

(92) *nu-kan UDU sipan[(t)]i NINDA.KUR₄.RA-ya [(parsiya GEŠTIN-ya sipanti)] UDU-ma-kan UL [] kunanzi nan-za MUNUSŠU.G[(I)-pa(t dai)]*

"she sacrifices the sheep and crumbles a thick bread and libates wine but they do not kill the sheep; the old woman takes him (i.e. as her fee)" (Mast A III 42-3).

See also Mašat 75/45 l.13-14:

(93) *man UL-ma nu-za apel wastul zik datti*

"If you don't do this, you take his sin upon yourself";

and, with the *hark-* form:

(94) *man eshanass-a kuiski sarnikzil piyan harzi nu-za-ta⁹ SAG.DU-ZU wasta<s> nassu A.ŠĀLAM nasma LÚ.U₁₉.LU nasta para UL kuiski tarnai man-as-za QADU DAMMEŠ.ŠU DUMUMEŠ.ŠU dan harzi nan-si-sta para tarnai*

"If someone has given restitution for a blood-deed and his head sinned (i.e. it was premeditated murder), either a field or a person,

However, given the caselessness of *-za* and its constant parallelism with the "ethical" dative, even in these cases, it is legitimate to consider that these verbs represent simply a subclass of d) below. See below, §3d (Conclusions), for further discussion of this question.

Despite the easy translations with accusative pronoun into the modern languages, finally, it is probably not possible to see *hassik-* and the similar verbs with *-za* (§2.15.4) as having literal reflexive sense: they must be included in category f) below.

d) Transitive verbs which become intransitive with the inclusion of *-za*. Example: *armahh-* (§2.16.2).

e) Verbs which have both stative and transformative use, and employ *-za* to mark the latter of the pair. The most salient example is *es-* 'sit' after OH; see also *uesta* of q. 372 (though it is not clear that the sense is transformative), and perhaps *sup-* and *ses-* of §1c. One might desire to include the LH *nah-* in this group, but the use of *-za* with this verb is not clear (see §2.15.3).

This category might seem exactly the opposite of c) above. The common thread linking them is that the use with *-za* indicates some direct bearing exclusively on the subject, with an active sense of transformation.

f) Verbs relating to processes of mind, which take the particle apparently to emphasize their essentially middle character, whether they are actually middles or active. Some of these may be 'stative' like *aver paura/temere* discussed above (*nah-* itself is a good case in point: it does not take the particle often). But with processes of mind there is always an element of activity or transformation in the verbal content. See §2.15.

We noted a category of reflexive verbs in Italian that express activities, but from the point of view of the subject. These could

evidently be expressed by the simple middle, at some stage of Hittite: cf. e.g. *haliya-* or *zahhiya-*, as well as *austat* (q. 230). We mentioned the possibility that the active *-za aus-* of q. 229 represented a later rendering of the sense of an OH middle like *austat*.

§3d Conclusions

We chose this particular order in §3c.2 above, to list the categories of the use of *-za*, because it represents what we expect in language change. The usual assumption, in fact, is that change progresses from the concrete to the abstract. We would, in short, take it for granted that *-za* started out as a dative, with specific reference to the subject, that it then moved into an abstract "ethical" dative sense, and probably only as a last development acquired an "accusative" use. This is how the Romance languages, for instance, developed their reflexive pronouns, with the slight difference that the accusative reflexive pronoun was present from the beginning.

What may be surprising about Hittite is that we find the progression is completely the opposite. The earliest examples of *-za* are basically all from category b) of §3c.2 (the "ethical" dative). The particle then progressed to what we analyze as the "literal dative" use (category a) and the "literal "accusative" use (category c)), apparently roughly at the same time.

However, there is some question about whether we are correct in ascribing to *-za* a use as a "literal dative/accusative":

The earliest use of the literal dative sense (or what appears such to us) is at the time of q. 378 (the copied archaic IX 28): *nu-za Ḫ.DUG.GA iskizzi* "anoints himself with perfume". (Despite the above translation, Ḫ.DUG.GA is not to be taken as an instrumental. A more literal translation, though it is not quite appropriate to the sense, might be 'smears perfume on himself').

ate as important a change as the second: the effect of a transformation on a house is less dramatic, if you will, than on a person, and a first person, at that. On the other hand, a seed changing into something completely different is a radical transformation (see q. 73), and one which the old woman wants to emphasize, as it relates to the analogous radical change she wants to bring about in her clients by her magic.

This approach also applies to what we perceive as the meaning 'happen' in *kis-*. When attention is to be drawn to the outcome of the occurrence, or the change is radical, *-za* is appropriate.

The particle apparently became a more regular inclusion with *kis-* as Hittite progressed. Nevertheless, it still seems to have retained the same function as in origin, as the following late LH quote without *-za* will show:

(85) *man-kan uit ŠA É.LUGAL DINU ŠA MUNUS dan[uhepa] ŠA MUNUSAMA.DINGIR LIM-ka kisat*

"when it came to pass that the trial of Danuhepa, your mother of the god, took place in the palace" (XIV 7 I 16-17).

Similar the parallel/duplicate XXI 19 I 20ff.

§2.2e More on *kikkis-*:

In the copied OH Tel. E. we find: *kuit-za ienzi-ma [... nat-sm?] as kikkistari* "what(ever) they do works out for them (?)" (Tel.E. IV 19-20).

This passage is very broken. It may be that the particle was not employed yet with the verb at all, at the time of this text.

Neu mentions that this verb takes *-za* in the meaning "Vorzeichen geschehen" (oracles). This appears to be a late LH idiom:

(86) *eni-za kuit IZKIM HIA HUL HIA INA URU kummahi kikkistat nu-za apatten kuit EGIR-an HUL DÜ-at kinun-ma-za namma kuit IZKIM HIA H[UL] HIA kikkistari ŠA SAG.DU DUTUŠI HUL isehhiskanzi*

"because these evil omens happened in K. and because evil installed itself there, now that evil omens happen again, does it bode evil for My Sun?" (IBoT I 33 l. 1-4).

§2.3 *da-*

The verb *da-* occurs with *-za* basically only in two cases: 1) when the sense is "appropriate, take possession of", even if the possession is of short duration (as Hittite progresses, it seems the possession gets more and more final). *-za da-* is frequent in later Hittite, in the phrase 'take (a woman) to wife'; and 2) when the subject or relatives of the subject are personally involved in the situation.

§2.3a OH

§2.3a.1 Without particle (just a couple of examples):

Zalpa Vs 4-6: DINGIR DIDLI-sa DUMUMES-us A.AB.BA-az sara dair sus sallanuskir // man MU HIA istarna pair nu M[UNUS.LUGA]L namma 30 MUNUS.DUMU hasta

"the gods picked the sons out of the sea and raised them. When years had gone by, the queen again bore 30 daughters".

StBoT 12 II 35: LÚ GISBANŠUR suppaz GISBANŠUR-az 2 tu[n]ingas NINDA harsaus dai

"the table-man takes 2 t.-breads from the clean table".

The particle can be included to indicate both a short-term and a long-term appropriation. The former is the nuance found in most texts (that is, *-za da-* just indicates that the objects are being taken for a specific short time, e.g. for ritual purposes):

(87) *m]an lukkatta-ma tapa hassanzi KUŠ NÍG.BÀR-an ussia[nz]i LUGAL-us-za aniyatta-set dai LUGAL-us arahza paizzi*

"when it dawns, they open up and draw the curtain. The king takes his paraphernalia; the king goes outside" (StBoT 12 I 31-33).

Again prob. II 28 and

LÚ GIS TUKUL DUG tessummin appa epzi LU[GAL-i] maniyahhi NINDA wagatas 2-ahhi ... LÚ GIS TUKUL aruwaizzi ta[z] dai LUGAL-us appa Ehalentiu paizzi

"the farmer takes back the t-vessel; he gives the king 2 bites of bread ... The farmer bows and takes (them); the king goes back to the h-house" (StBoT 12 II 30-33).

KBo VIII 74+ (StBoT 25 #137) III 13: // nu-za uk GIS hupalli da[hh]e.

The verbs of body care, like *warp-* (which we had relegated to category c) (the "accusative") above), were however already firmly active with particle, by the time of the copied TdH 2 (see q. 383), that is, by mid MH. Keep in mind that if the verb were not active, we would not speak of an "accusative" use of the particle *-za*, at least not in OH or MH. This substitution of the active for the middle happened quite quickly, apparently, since we find no trace of it in OH, and yet it was all but completed by the middle of MH. We find isolated examples of middles like *unuwahhari* and *wassiyahhahat* in late LH.

✓ { The transition middle → middle with *-za* → active with *-za* was so natural and swift a progression, that it strains credulity to suppose that *-za* would have had the time to undergo such a momentous transformation as a shift from a pure "ethical dative" use to the function of a strictly grammatical accusative, by mid MH. The whole process in fact shows no sign of revolution.

Furthermore, the earliest documented "accusative" sense of *-za* is to be found apparently already in OH, in *-za walk-* of q. 14, parallel to a "dative" use of *-za*, or perhaps in *-za kattan tarna-* of q. 277. (Unfortunately these texts are copies: KBo X 2 (q. 277) shows signs of revamped language, and it is not certain what the date of the original of q. 14 was). The Telipinus Edict provides an example of the active *-za parkunu-*, but it is exactly parallel to *arha parkunu-* without particle (q. 375).

If these are genuine OH expressions, they are actually additional arguments against taking the verbs of category c) above as using *-za* to represent an accusative, certainly at least in the beginning. It is virtually impossible to conceive that a particle such as *-za*, which to the end of Hittite was compared with datives, and seems to have begun with an "ethical" dative sense, would have developed a literal accusative use *before* firmly establishing a literal dative one, as the evidence might suggest if q.s 14 and 277 truly represent an "accusative" sense in OH. Even if one considers

that the two literal uses developed almost simultaneously, this would itself be a little difficult to swallow.

In actual fact, in the copied MH TdH 2 we find *nu-smas ŠE+NAG-anzi*, alternating with *-za warpzi* (cited over q. 383). The particle was obviously not being regarded as an accusative. It genuinely seems that the use of the intransitive/"reflexive" verb with *-za* is an offshoot of the dative use of *-za*, such as we find with *-za isk-*, etc. Note the remark on the parallelism of *-za wath-* and the "dative" *-za ŠU-ZU/GIR-ŠU hatta*, §3c.2c above. It is legitimate to wonder how much of a difference the Hittites perceived between these two uses of the particle. We may further note the relative looseness with which *-za* expresses the "reflexivity" of *arha pessiya-* in q. 186 (MH): the phrase means 'they throw (their clothes) away (from themselves)'. *-za* may be interpreted as representing the concept 'from themselves', but it clearly does not express that overtly: it merely gives a general indication that the subject is the party affected by the action.

It is necessary to entertain seriously the notion that *-za* has something more akin to the function of marking an intransitive sense in the verb, rather than anything like our strict reflexive use. It must be noted, however, in this regard, that "intransitive" in actual fact boils down to "subject-oriented", even in the modern languages: the difference between transitive and intransitive is basically that with the latter the subject is the one affected by the verbal content. *-za* in fact behaves much in the same way as the reflexive pronouns in some modern European languages, as we discussed briefly in §1b.4 and §3c.1. We ought to note that we have no trouble seeing this as *-za*'s function with *es-'sit* or *armahh-*; it is not so great a leap to extend our horizons a little, so as to include e.g. the verbs of body care. It should help that English normally expresses those same concepts with simple intransitive verbs. Seeing locutions like *-za hark-* in the same light may perhaps be a little more of a strain on the imagination, but one of course expects that not everything in Hittite will be immediately familiar, or find direct parallels in other tongues. In

Note also the following passage from the (possibly MH) *sallis wastais* text XXX 16+ I 10-11 (they slaughter a GUD.APIN.LAL, remarking): *zik-wa-za* GIM-an *kistat kas-a-wa-z QATAMMA ki[s]aru* "as you have become (i.e. dead), so let this one become". Please see comments, §2.2d below.

-za iya- is used as the active equivalent of this expression in KBo XVII 61 Rs 5 (StBoT 29 p. 44): *taknas-at-za DUTU-us NA₄passilus ieddu* "let the Sungoddess of Earth make them into pebbles".

See q. 25 for an MH example of the idiom in the LH q. 76 and following below.

§2.2c LH

Neu notes (1) p. 93) that with words indicating times of day or seasons, and the like, the particle does not occur with *kis-*: cf. e.g. *mahhan-ma hameshanza kisat* "when it became spring" (KBo III 4 II 50, AM p. 60).

With the particle:

(74) *nat-za I¹NUTIM kisanat* "they became one" (SV Kup §18 D III 52).

(75) *nu-za MUNUS^[annellas²] ANA MUNUS.LUGAL isiyahhi-skattallas kisat*

"A. (?) became a spy for the queen" (XIV 4 III 13-14).

Probably also III 16: see q. 164.

(76) *MU-anni-ma INA KUR URU^{ziharriya} paun nu-za ANA PANI ABI ABI-YA kuis URU^{gasgas} HUR.SAG^{tarikarimun} GEŠPÚ-az esat namma-as-za URUKÙ.BABBAR-si^{hargas} kisat nu uer URUKÙ.BABBAR-san GUL-hir nan mekki dammeshair nu DUTUŠI^{paun} nu-za HUR.SAG^{tarikarimun} kuis URU^{gasgas} esan harta nan GUL-un*

"the next year I went into the land of Z.; the Gasgan city which had taken Mt. T. by force at the time of my grandfather became a peril for Hattusas, and they came and smote H., and oppressed it greatly; I, My Sun, went and the Gasgan city which was holding Mt. T., I smote it" (AM p. 80, KBo III 4 III 57-61).

But note SV Targ Vs 17: *ini-wa idalu kisaru*; and *man-war-as-mu LÚ¹MUTI-YA kisari*, q. 118, and the following passage, with *kikkis-* without -za:

(77) *nu kikkistari QATAMMA ŠA ABU-ŠU-kan wastul ANA DUMU-ŠU ari nu-kan ammuqq-a ŠA ABI-YA wastul aras nat-za-kan kasa ANA DIM URU^{hatti} EN-YA . . . piran tarnan harmi eszi-ya-at iyauen-at nu-za-kan ŠA ABI-YA kuit wastul tarnan harmi nu ANA DIM URU^{hatti} . . . ZI-anza namma warsiyaddu*

"it happens thus: the sin of the father comes down to the son; and to me the sin of my father has come down; and behold, I have confessed/confess it before the Stormgod of Hatti my lord . . . : it is (true), we did it. Because I have confessed/confess the sin of my father, let the Stormgod's anger be calmed" (Murs. P.P. II §9).

A general statement of what "happens" apparently does not take the particle. Note also the phrase *man tuk-ma [warr]isuwanzi UL kisari* "if however it doesn't turn out that you can help" (SV Dup §10 D II 19).

In the meaning "go over (to someone), become of someone's party/side":

(78) *nas-za IŠTU ŠA I¹uhha-LÚ kisat*

"he became a partisan of U." (AM p. 68, XIV 15 IV 18).

See also:

zikk-a ANA DUTUŠI¹ awan arha le āiyasi] nu-za-kan apedani anda le kistati

"(Whoever tempts you), do not defect from My Sun, and do not go over to that one!" (SV Kup §13 C II 5-6).

Probably also AU Taw I 20-1.

Note however that *appa wahnū-*, as e.g. in SV Kup §18 D III 60, does not take the particle. See also the various locutions for 'defect' or something similar, both with and without -za, q.s. 305, 313.

In late LH *kis-* seems to take -za more regularly:

(79) *mann-a-za ŠA DUTUŠI¹ HUL-lu k[u²wa]pi kisari ANA DUTUŠI¹-ma ŠEŠMEŠ meqqaes [n]u apat kuwatqa iyatteni . . .*

ley 4) Chapter 3). This is a move which could not fail to render the language more literal, and, if we may risk a value judgment, more earth-bound and prosaic, though MH and LH are still quite lively tongues, and have not eliminated all less literal use of the particles. But this development certainly reduced the possibility of inserting optional shadings of meanings into the clause: there was not the OH range of forms to use for the purpose, and few opportunities (though still some) to vary the constructions, which were becoming rather standardized. In fact *-kan* itself may have been specialized to one use, perhaps the expression of perfectivity. If Ciantelli and HW² are correct that after OH there sprang up a use of *-asta* and *-kan* in Rückbezug, it would just another indication of this apparent trend in the language.

Similarly, Hittite reduced its options in the expression of subject orientation. In OH one could convey two nuances: middle or active (*-za*) subject orientation. In the later language the middle option apparently slowly withers. *-za* itself became more literal as time went on, though it does not seem to become quite as standardized as the local particles. But it does become part of regularized expressions, and ends up (at least it seems so to us) practically being governed by postposition/preverbs, as e.g. in q. 119, a notion which probably would not have occurred to anyone in OH. We find it, as in q.s 291, 292, alternating with the plain dative in a very literal sense. This is still not extremely common, but it is a new feature.

One might consider that if the derivation developed by Carruba (see §1b.2 above) is correct, we would have a case of a literal use developing a more abstract side, which we see in OH, and then losing it again over MH and LH. Carruba's arguments, particularly the placement of the Luwian *-ti* (a relative of *-za*) in the initial particle string, are persuasive. This sort of rise, peak and fall is of course documented in many languages: witness for instance the noun or verb morphology of the Indo-European languages. However, it is not perhaps usual to see a backward

trend. One may consider that *-apa* and *-an*, which probably go back to IE PWs, exhibit a progression from the literal to the abstract in their use, though they do not seem to have gone back to a predominantly literal function; they died out.

On the other hand, the derivation of *-za* is not clear by any means. And it is odd that we have so little evidence of a literal use of the particle in OH. This might not be so peculiar with a form that had no central grammatical function, even if it started out with a concrete sense. But with *-za* the only means of expressing active reflexivity in the language, it seems a very remote possibility that the particle would not have been used literally at least sometimes, if it had started out with that use.

The parallel we just drew with *-apa* and *-an* in fact does not entirely hold: in the case of those particles, other forms sprang up to take over their literal function (actually, it is not clear that *-an* ever lost it). The fact that the literal use of *-za* develops vigorously in MH and LH makes one suspect that it was important, so that it is unlikely that it would have died out entirely, or at least that it would not have been taken over by some other form, if *-za* itself had gone completely abstract. More than that, the circumstance that the concrete function becomes common in the later language, taking the place of the older use to a large extent, as the basic value of the construction, can in truth be taken as an indication that that function is an innovation.

It is of interest that Anittas, the earliest extant Hittite text, has no example whatsoever of *-za*. The particle clearly expanded its use over the course of Hittite; it is even possible that it had not been invented yet, at the time of Anittas. This would not leave much time for it to develop from a literal dative form to the relatively abstract use we see in OH, let alone to show so little trace of a literal function at all, at that time. (Since Anittas however is rather sparing of its particles and seems to avoid pronouns as a general rule, it is, perhaps, more probable that the use of *-za*, as of other particles, just was not very wide-spread yet.

particle with *zik* from MH to LH. The third person is very rarely found with the particle, even when it is parallel to a first or second person in the same mode of the verb. However, contrary to Hoffner's rule, it is not true that we never find a third person with *-za*: cf. for instance the clause from the Telipinus Edict cited in §2.1a; and XV 34 III 41-2 (C), quoted under q. 368 (though one might argue that *-za* is present because the base verbs are *ispiya-/nink-*). The phrase *nu-za LÚMES^UUMMEDA-KUNU* (in q. 40, possibly copied from a text of MH date) might possibly be interpreted as containing a third person animate subject, though it probably means "you are your (own) warders". A grammatically animate subject *MU.KAM-za* takes *-za* once (see §2.17 (*tepaues-*)). Inanimate subjects can certainly take *-za* with (*es-*) in the third person, e.g. in q.s 46, 267. (Q. 40 also has what looks like *-za* with an inanimate subject in *nu-za DINGIR^{MES}-as KÙ.BABBAR-i... eszi*). These seem marked in some way, as a comparison e.g. with q. 214 without particle will show.

It is clearly of interest at least to theorize as to why *-za* is used, in this apparently erratic fashion.

We might mention that *-za* occurs in lieu of a personal pronoun, as e.g. in *man-wa-za santes* (see under q. 6 above). A third person would probably be signaled by the inclusion of *-at*. *-za*, among other things, is probably indicating indirectly that a first or second person is in discussion. See also q. 42 from Madduwattas, and q. 41 from a copied MH text; a late LH example is q. 58. Because *-za* is present, there is a presumption that a second rather than a third person is intended, in these cases. 'You' fits the context of the Madduwattas example nicely; the late LH text does as a general rule also address itself directly to the parties to be put under oath (a parallel passage in which 'you' is spelled out is q. 59). See also q. 250. The late LH q. 5 probably shows a direct alternation between the same phrase with and without *-za*, depending on whether a second or third person is intended. An example with a first person plural in late LH comes from the Saus-

gamuwa Treaty (the passage is quoted under q. 51). For the first person singular, cf. e.g. q.s 46, 55, and 152 and the material quoted under them. The particle is not always included, at least in MH; in late LH, it is the second person plural which is often appears without particle, but then the pronoun *sumes* (or a variant) is present (see e.g. the discussion under q. 59 and q. 286).

It is interesting (though the connection to the above detailed use of the Hittite *-za* is obviously not clear) that in various modern languages, the pronouns are often reinforced (not just with the verb 'to be', of course). In the American South, for instance, there is the famous *y'all*, a shortened form of *you all*; there are also sporadic occurrences of *we all*. In the Romance languages, the form 'other' is often attached to the basic first and second plural pronouns to mark them: *voi altri* for instance is an optional variant on *voi* in Italian. The augmented form became the pronoun itself in many languages, as e.g. *nosotros* 'we' in Spanish, *vi-alter* 'you' in Milanese dialect, and so forth. For our purposes, it is interesting that the element 'other' is usually reserved for the first and second persons plural: it is not normally attached to the third person. The second person singular can also be marked, by reduplication: cf. e.g. 'thou art' in the Milanese and various Venetian dialects (Triestine, for example): *ti te set* and *(ti) ti xe* respectively. Milanese also reduplicates the third person singular: 'he is' is *lu l'è*; this is not as common though.

It is difficult to determine what the rationale for the use of *-za* with the verb 'to be' is. It is fair to say that *-za* is intended to draw attention to the subject, and in particular to what he "is" (since we are dealing with *es-*), at that specific time. In other words, *-za* is a mechanism by which the subject and the verbal content are both highlighted, with special reference to the latter's relevance to the former.

The particle in fact always seems to be included when the clause involves current events, or information of current interest, in terms of the narrative. This is highlighted by the use of *-za* with

APPENDIX

Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luwian

The occurrences of *-ti* in the texts available to us are rarer than those with the local particles (see e.g. Boley 4) Appendix). They are essentially limited to the first person singular and the third persons: texts with the second persons are extremely rare, and in fact we do not have an extant example of *-ti* with a second person, in any form of Luwian. However, in general the use of the particle seems quite similar to what we have seen for Hittite.

¶1 Cuneiform Luwian

¶1a There are no cases of the verb 'to be' with particle. However, 'become' (Hittite *kis-*) is frequent with *-ti*:

*zau-pa t[appas]a tiyammis pa-ti kuwatin [tapp]asa
tiyammis nawa ayari [tiy]ammis-pa-ti [t]ap-PIŠ-sa naw[a
a]yari za-ḫa SISKUR-assa [] apati nis ayari*

"Here are heaven and earth, as heaven does not become earth and earth does not become heaven, let this ritual likewise not become x" (XXXV 54 II 41-5).

Also XXXII 8+5 III 26-7. Note also *tain-ti-(ya)-ta malli ayaru* "let oil become honey", IX 6+ II 12, and similar passim in the text; also XXXII 8+ III 26-7.

These occurrences seem parallel e.g. to q. 73 in the Hittite section.

¶1b The verb 'take' occurs with *-ti*:

*annes-ma-wa-ti pusinzi x pusanninza lad[u] purin-ti-
(ya)-an kuis a[ta] a-ti purin ladd[u]*

"let the mother take x. Whoever made the p., let him take the p." (KBo XIII 260 II 6-9).

See also KBo XXIX 27 I 3 ff. (very broken; all the clauses with *ata* are in the breaks).

The formula of the last two clauses is repeated 7 times, with different objects, in II 10-23. See Boley 4) ¶1c, for some examples of *la-* without particle or with *-ta*. One is tempted to see *-ti* here as reflecting the sense of appropriation that we have seen for *-za*. But it is obviously not certain.

-ti with *ata* seems to indicate perhaps that the person made the object for himself, but it is not at all clear. (We note that *piya-* 'give' in the following paragraph does not take *-ti*).

In the following quote, however, *-ti* certainly indicates that the subject is taking the evils from his own head, etc.:

harmahati-ti-(ya)-an-ta tappanin latta
"he has taken it, the headache, from his (own, presumably) head"
(XXXII 8+5 III 11-12).
Also III 14-17 (ter).

Note XXXV 24+ Vs 8 ff. (similar XXXV 43 III 11ff.):
*[har]mahati-ti-(ya)-ta zas muwai alalattati-ti-[(ya)-ta zas muwai
m]annahunnati-ti-(ya)-ta zas muwai* . . . , where the verb *muwa-* is still in dispute. The previous paragraph, which is parallel to the one quoted above, may also contain *-ti* several times, with the same verb, but the first word of each clause is *nawatiya-ta*, which could be interpreted either as *nawati-(ya)-ta* or as *nawa-ti-(ya)-ta*.

¶1c The verbs of cleaning can have *-ti*. In the first example, the particle is equivalent to *-za* with the verbs of cleaning in Hittite (contrasting with a similar verb without particle):

*assa-mmas elelhandu tainati mallitai . . . assa-ti
elhadu tappasantis tiyammantis*

"let them clean (?) you with oil and honey . . . let heaven and earth clean (?) themselves" (IX 6+ II 10-11, 14-15).

In the following quote, however, *-ti* seems simply to signal that the object belongs to the subject:

*annis-kuwa-ti parnanza maddu[wati p]apparkuwatti
tatis-pa-wa-ti-(ya)-[ta] x-tiyati pusuriya[ti p]appasatti*
"The mother cleans her (*-ti*) house with m.; the father with x"
(XXXV 102+ II 15-18).

The following sets of examples point up a similar contrast:

(61) *ABU-YA-a-nnas-za* ^I*mursilis* 4 DUMUMESŠ ... *hasta nu-za humandas-pat EGIR-izzis DUMU-as esun nu-za kuitman nuwa DUMU-as esun ŠA KUŠKA.TAB.ANSE-za esun*

"My father Mursilis sired us four children; I was the youngest of all. And while I was yet a child and was groom, . . ." (Hatt. I 9-12). A parallel text, KBo VI 29+ I 6, has *ANA ABU-YA-za* ^I*mursili* EGIR-is [DUMU-as es]un.

But contrast a prayer of Hattusilis:

(62) *kuitman ABU-YA* ^I*mursilis* TI-anza *esta nu man DINGIRMESŠ ENMESŠ-YA ABU-YA salla[ka?]riahta ku ezqa memiyanaz ammuk-ma-za-kan apedani ANA INIM apiya UL kuitki an[da] esun nuwa-za DUMU-as esun man-ma-kan [x x] DINU ŠA MUNUS^{tawananna} GÉME-KUNU kisa[t] ABU-YA GIM-an MUNUS^{tawanannan} MUNUS.LUGAL te[p]nut apas-ma GÉME.DINGIR^{LIM} kuit est[a*

"while my father Mursilis was alive, if my father was high-handed with the gods my lords on any matter, I was not in on that matter then: I was still a child; if the trial of Tawananna your maidservant took place, when my father humiliated Tawananna the queen, because she was a maidservant of the deity (i.e. a priestess), . . ." (XXI 19 I 15-23).

See also AM p. 16, XIX 29 I 10.

Compare also the phrase DUMU-as (es-) without particle:

(63) *ANA TUPPI RIKILTI ŠA ABI-YA-ya-kan kuit kissan iyan MUNUS.LUGAL-wa-tta kuin MUNUS^{TUM} DAM-anni pai nu-wa INA KUR DU-tassa LUGAL-iznani apel DUMU-ŠU dai nu TUPPU RIKILTI kuwapi ier apun-ma-za MUNUS-an IDLA-MA-as ANA PANI ABI-YA datta-pat naui kinun-ma-za apun MUNUS-an IDLAMA-as man dai man-za-an UL dai nu apas memiyan UL dattari kuin-za imma DUMU-an IDLAMA malaizzi man-as apel ŠA MUNUS^{TI} DUMU-as man-as tamel kuelqa MUNUS-as DUMU-as nu kuis DUMU-as ANA IDLA-MA ZI-anza kuin-za DUMU-an IDLAMA-as malaizzi nu INA KUR URU DU-tassa LUGAL-iznani apun tittanuddu*

"Because it is written thus on the treaty tablet of my father: 'whatever woman the queen gives you to wife, make that woman's son king in T.'. But when they made the treaty tablet, K. had not yet taken that woman before my father. Now, whether or not K. takes that woman, that word does not apply: whichever son K. prefers, whether he is son of that woman or of some other woman, whichever son is of a liking to K., whichever son he prefers, let him put that one in as king in T.'" (B.T. II 84-93).

It is of interest that none of the similar phrases in the following paragraph has -za:

(64) *ANA* ^I*hattusili-wa* MU.KAM^HI.A *maninkuwantes UL-war-as TI-annas nu-war-an ammuk para pai nu-war-as-mu LU sankunnis esdu nu-war-as TI-anza* "the years of Hattusilis are near; he is not of life; give him to me, and let him be my priest and he shall live." (Hatt. I 14-17).

But contrast:

(65) *nu-mu-kan LÚMESŠMU.IR.TU₄.TI* *humantes arha das KUR.KURMESŠ-ya kue dannatta ammuk EGIR-pa asesanunun nu-mu-kan ape-ya humanda arha das nu-mu tepnut URU^hakpissan-ma-mu-kan IŠTU INIM DINGIR^{LIM} arha UL das ANA DU URU^{neriqq-a-za} [kuit] LÚSANGA esun nan-mu-kan apezza arha UL das*

"He took all my subjects from me, and the empty lands which I had resettled, he took those also, and humiliated me. But he did not take Hakis, on the word of the goddess, and because I was priest of the Stormgod of Nerik, he did not chase me from there either" (Hatt. III 57-61).

The following alternations are interesting:

(66) *DIŠTAR-mu-za-kan GAŠAN-YA* *humandaza-pat daskit man-mu istarkzi kuwapi nu-za-kan irmalas-pat ŠA DINGIR^{LIM} handandatar ser uskinun DINGIR^{LUM}-mu GAŠAN-YA humandaza-pat ŠU-za harta ammuk-ma-za para handanza kuit UKÜ-as esun ANA PANI DINGIRMESŠ kuit para handandanni iyahhat ŠA DUMU.NAM.LÚ.U₁₉.LU-UTTI HUL-lu uttar UL kuwapikki iyanun*

à-wa 187?.EARTH-*mi tá-ti-na* GRANDFATHER-*ha-na*
GRANDFATHER-*ha-ti-na* GRANDFATHER-*ha-x-x-x-ha* (GOOD)*wa-li-*
ia-nu-wa-ha

"I praised/gave luster on earth (?) to my father, grandfather, great-grandfather and great-great-grandfather".

Cf., with the same verb, and with particle, §15: *wa-mi-i á-mi-na* (POT)*á-ta+ri-i-na á-pa-ara/i* GOOD-*li-ia-nú-wa-ha* "I rendered my image illustrious thereafter".

When *wa-li-ia-nú-wa-ha* refers to the writer's ancestors, in §10, no particle is included.

¶ 2 b 'to take':

Normally the verb *ta-* does not appear with particle. See Boley 4) Appendix ¶2e, for some examples. Cf. however a possibly similar verb, with apparently the sense 'appropriate':

wa-ti za-ia HOUSE-*na-'* REL-*sa tu-wa-ti-ia*
wa-i/y[a?]-zi-ti

"whoever takes (?) these houses from T." (Kululu I §7).

¶ 2 c "to make, put":

Again normally this verb does not take a particle: see Boley 4) Appendix §2d. However, when the subject is the 'beneficiary' of the action, the particle appears:

ALL+MI-*sa-ha-wa-ti-i-mu* (or -*mu-ti-i*) KING-*ti-sa*
ta-ti-na i-zi-tà á-mi-tí JUDGE-*na-ri+i*...

"all the kings made me their father, on account of my justice, etc." (Karatepe §17 (Ho)).

With -*mu*, alongside mention of a (body) part of the subject:

á-mu-pa-wa-ma-tà á+x-za-ti-wa+ra-sa (FOOT)*pa-tà-za*
UNDER-*na-na* PUT-*ha*

"(the people who had not succumbed to the house of Muksas), I, A., put them under my feet" (Karatepe §22 (Hu)).

-*ma-tà* is resolved as -*mu-ata* 'them to me' (by an oversight, incidentally, in Boley 4) Appendix ¶2d, 'their feet' was written instead of 'my feet').

á-mi-i-na-pa-wa-u-mu (POT) *á-tari-i-na* CHISEL(-)
i-ara-za i-zi-i-há

"I made myself my own *atari* . . ." (Kargamis A 15b §11).

See also Maras IV §15 with GOOD-*liya-*, quoted in ¶2a above.

Also Karatepe §66: *á-ma-za-ha-wa-mu-ta á-da-ma-za-' á-ta tu-pi-wi* "I will sculpt my own name on (this gate) (over the name of Azatiwaras)". Similar §61.

But cf. CIH LIII (Nigde): *za-wa* CHISEL-*su-na sa-ru-wa-ni-sa i-zi-ia-tà á-pa-sá(-)ta+ra/i-sa* "Saruwanis made these sculptures (?) as his own image (?)". However the phrase is parsed, it seems to indicate a meaning similar to that of the preceding q.s, but the particle -*ti* is not present.

mu-wa-mi STELE *pa+ra/i-'* PUT // *wa-tá-'* REL-*i-sa mi-sa-'* . . . // *wa-ti-tá-' za-ti-i* STELE *pa-sa-'* x-x
"I put myself up a stele; whoever my (?) . . . , (and) x-s to this stele" (Emirgazi §3-5).

In the following example, apparently doing something to your own name comports -*ti*, but doing the same action for someone else does not:

á-wa-ti á-mi-i-sa MAN-*ti-i-sa* REL-*i-ta* REL-*i-ta á-dá-ma-za i-zi-i-sa-ta-i* // *mu-pa-wa-ta-'* [GO]OD-*sa+ra-ti*
[WI]TH-*ni i-zi-i-sa-ta-i*

"wherever my husband honors (?) his (-*ti*) name, he also honors (?) me with good" (A 1b §2-3).

We treated the verb 'bear (children)' under *iya-* in the Hittite, so we may as well quote the Hieroglyphic equivalents here:

a+ri-zi-pa-u-ta h[a]-sa-ha
"I generated descendants" (A 5b §2).

But A 18h §2 has *wa-mu-ta á-[m]i-zi a+ri-zi ha-sa-ha*. Meriggi suggests that -*u-* in A 5b §2 above be amended to -*mu-*.

We find the verb (in the third person, incidentally) without particle: cf. e.g. Karatepe §56 (*hastu*).

Also *ammuk-ma-za* LUGAL I[NA U]RU *hakpissa esu[n]*, Hatt. III 45.

Note: *kuitman-m[a-za* INA URU *palhuissa esun*, AM p. 42, XIV 16 II 11. XXXIV 45+ Vs 11 (StBoT 4 p. 50) has *nu-wa-za UL ser esun*.

For the plural: the late LH Sausgamuwa Treaty, (StBoT 16), remarks: *assiyannas-wa-nnas* IRMEŠ *esuen kinun-ma-wa-tu-za UL* IRMEŠ "we were vassals for love; now we are no longer your vassals" (XXIII 1 I 31-2). See also XXVI 88 Vs 5: *anzas-ma-nnas UKUMES-us kuit*.

With both first and second persons:

(49) *sulliyat-wa-mu-kan nu-wa-za zik* LUGAL.GAL *ammuk-ma-wa-kan* 1^{EN} HAL.SI *kuin daliyat nu-wa-za SA* 1^{EN} HAL.SI LUGAL-us

"You have wronged me: you are the great king, but as for me, I am king of the one fortress which you have left me" (Hatt. III 69-71).

KBo VI 29+ II 1-8 has the following interesting passage:

(50) *nu-wa-za zik* LUGAL.GAL *ammuk-ma-wa-za* LUGAL. TURRU . . . *nu-wa-za man zik* DI-esnaza *sarazis nu-wa tuk sarazziyahhandu man-ma-wa-za ammuk-ma* DI-esnaza *sarazis nu-wa ammuk sarazzihhandu*

"You are a Great King; I am a little king . . . If you are right in the quarrel, let (the gods) raise you (i.e. give you the right); if I am right in the quarrel, let them raise me!"

A peculiar phrase occurs in the broken Asertu myth, XXXVI 35 I 12-13: *kiss[an IQBI appan-wa-mu-za-kan es* []-du-za EGIR-pa *esmi* "(said thus:) be behind me and I'll be behind you". The expression could mean 'support me', but it is not at all clear: the rest of the passage seems rather aggressive, and so an interpretation of *appa(n) es-* as 'take out after' is also possible.

With imperatives:

(51) *man sumes-ma kuwatka idalu iyatteni nu-smas* DUTUŠI-ya *idalawahmi nu-za* DUTUŠI *apez linkiyaz ANA PANI* DINGIRMEŠ *parkuis eslit*

"If you however ever do any evil, I, My Sun, will hurt you back; let me, My Sun, be clean of that oath before the gods" (SV Huqq IV 47-9).

See also, with -smas:

(52) *nu-smas NIŠ* DINGIRLIM *mahhan* 1-an 1^{NUTU}[M-y]a-smas *esten*

"As the oath is one for all of you, so let you be one!" (SV Targ Rs 9).

(53) *sumes-wa-smas* IRMEŠ *AB[I-YA] esten nu-wa-sma[s* A-BU-Y]A *das nu-wa-smas ANA* Iuhha-LU *IR-anni pai[sta* "You were servants of my father, and my father took you and gave you as servants to U." (AM p. 58, XIV 15//16 III B 26-7).

Note the Alaksandus Treaty, §17 III 38-9 (and similar phrases *passim* in the State Treaties):

(54) *nu-za zik* 1^{alaksandu} ANA 1^{kupanta}-DLAMA *NARARUM* sardiyas *GEŠPÚ-ass-a es nan pahsi*

"You, A., be a help and strength to K. and protect him!"

In Mursilis' prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna, we find:

(55) *zik-za* DUTU URU *arinna nakkis* DINGIRLIM-is *nu-tta-kan* ŠUM-an *lamnas istarna nakki* DINGIRLIM- *yatar-ma-ta-kkan* DINGIRMEŠ-as *istarna nakki namma-za-kan* DINGIRMEŠ-as *istarna zik-pat* DUTU URU *arinna nakkis* *salless-a-z zik-pat* DUTU URU *arinna namma-ta-kan* *damais* DINGIRLUM *nakkis salliss-a UL eszi*

"You, Sungoddess of Arinna, are an exalted deity; your name is exalted among names, your godhead is exalted among the gods. Verily you are exalted among the gods, Sungoddess of Arinna; great are you, Sungoddess of Arinna; no other god is exalted and great (compared) to you" (XXIV 3 I 29-34).

This continues: -za is generally present when the subject is *zik*, not otherwise.

- KBo IV 10 *Rs* 22 under q. 10
 KBo IV 12 *Vs* 8-9 q. 68
 Vs 11, 16 under q. 267
 Vs 12 under q. 256
 Vs 22 q. 69
 KBo IV 14 II 7-12 q. 294
 II 31-2 under q. 57
 II 46-7 under q. 152
 II 53-6 under q. 313
 III 3-6 under q. 236
 III 28 under q. 313
 III 30-1 q. 314
 III 72-3 under q. 286
 KBo IV 34+ I 25-8 q. 426
 KBo V 6(+) (DS) I 9 under q. 122
 I 13 under q. 122
 I 21 q. 120
 I 22-3 q. 338
 II 14 under q. 169
 II 26 under q. 411
 II 28-9 under q. 167
 III 12-15 q. 118
 III 17 q. 215
 III 42 under q. 287
 IV 6-7 under q. 118
 KBo V 8: see AM.
 KBo VI 29(+) I 6 under q. 61
 I 31 under q. 343
 II 1-8 q. 50
 II 2-4 q. 304
 KBo VI 34(+) I 23-4, 42-3, II 12-13 under q. 317
 II 38-41 q. 174
 KBo VII 28 *Vs* 15-16 under q. 2
 KBo VIII 32 *Vs* 7-8 (StBoT 4) under q. 214
 KBo VIII 35 II 13 under q. 36
 II 22-4 q. 173
 II 28-9, II 33-5, III 5 under q. 147
 II 31 q. 147

- KBo VIII 74+ (StBoT 25 #137) III 13 under q. 87
 KBo IX 127+ I 7-8 §2.5b.3
 I 13ff. Appendix ¶1d
 KBo X 2 I 42-3 q. 277
 KBo X 7 III 13-16 q. 318
 IV 1-3 under q. 318
 KBo X 12 III 24-5 under q. 263
 KBo X 23+22 I 11 under q. 386
 KBo X 24 III 6-10 q. 21
 KBo XI 1 *Vs* 1-3 q.s 211, 408
 Vs 12-13 q. 409
 Vs 24-7 q.s 139, 169
 Vs 25 q. 308
 KBo XI 43 I 28 under q. 122
 KBo XII 22+ I 2-3 q. 372
 KBo XII 96 I 9-10 q. 416
 I 11 under q.s 26, 214
 IV 17 §2.5c.5
 IV 24 §2.5c.5
 KBo XII 128 I 6 §2.6c.5
 KBo XIII 119 I 7 q. 19
 KBo XV 1 I 10-11 (StBoT 3) q. 384
 I 14-16 q. 349
 I 35-6 under q. 349
 KBo XV 2(+) B *Vs* 6'-8' (StBoT 3) under q. 384
 C "Vs" 5-20' under q. 236
 B *Rs* 3 under q. 213
 Rs 17 over q. 255
 Rs 19-20 q. 264
 Rs 27-9 q. 136
 F *Rs* 5-6', Colophon q. 253
 KBo XV 7 I 7-8 (StBoT 3) q. 324
 I 11-13' q. 385
 I 13-14' q. 180
 KBo XV 9 + (StBoT 3) C "Rs" 10'-13' q. 397
 KBo XV 30 III 5 q. 380
 KBo XV 33 III 19 q. 30
 III 24ff. under q. 26

"If the men of P. do [these things], they are (loyal) vassals to My Sun; if they don't, they attack the lordship (of My Sun?) and make war (on me)" (Mitas Rs 24-6).

The first clause in q. 37 above might seem an example of an omission of *-za*. But see the other passages from Mitas, and the LH q.s 60ff. below. One might almost think that the inclusion of the particle depends partly on the taste or viewpoint of the individual writer: the writer of the Madduwattas text liked *-za*, the writer of the Mitas text didn't. But see the comments in §2.1d below.

In VIII 66 I. 3, 11, someone asks *kuis-za* MUNUS-*nas zik*; to which the reply is *ammuk-za* MUNUS KISIKIL (XXXIII 86 III 3). KBo XVII 32 Vs 8 has ŠA É-ŠU MUNUS.LUGAL-*as zik*. Appu tells his wife:

(39) MUNUS-*a*n-*za-wa-za* MUNUS-nili-*ya-z zik* [nu-]wa UL kuitki sakti

"you're a woman, you (behave, think) like a woman: you don't know anything!" (XXIV 8+ I 36-7).

Note also T.O. II 25 (C): DINGIR^{LUM}-*war-as kuit* "because he is a god, (if we steal his food, he won't do anything to us)", contrasted with *anda-ma-za sumas kues* LÚMESÉ.DINGIR^{LIM} "then you who are personnel of the temple" (II 59 and passim).

In this last text (whose date is disputed), there is a very peculiar passage with *es-*, once with *-za*, once without *-za* in a parallel phrase, and once even with no verb:

(40) *anda-ma* DINGIR^{MES}-*a[s] kuit* KÙ.BABBAR ... *sumas harteni nu-za* LÚMES UMMEDA-KUNU *nu-za* DINGIR^{MES}-*as* KÙ.BABBAR-*i ... eszi* NU.GÁL *kuit-kan* DINGIR^{MES}-*nas parni* *anda* NU.GÁL *kuit kuit* DINGIR^{LIM}-*ni-ma-at eszi-pat*

"Then, what silver, etc., of the gods you have, you are your (own) warders (?; see §2.1d for a comment), it is part of the silver, etc., of the gods; there is nothing (for you?). Whatever is inside the temple, there is nothing (for you?): whatever (there is), it is the god's" (T.O. II 32-5 (C)).

§2.1b.2 'Being' simply in a particular place might seem not to warrant *-za*: KBo XVII 32 Vs 5 has *man* HUR.SAG-*ri zik*, though the context is a little battered (see the example from Mursilis' Annals, quoted under q. 48, though). On the other hand, compare:

(41) *nu-za* DINGIR^{MES} LÚM[ES] GİSERIN-*as* [k]u^{wapi} *kuwapi* *man-za nepisi man takni ma[n]-za* HUR.SAG^{MES} [m]an ID^{MES}? *man-za* INA KUR URU^{mittanni} *man-za* KUR URU^{kinza} ...

"The male gods of the cedar, wherever you are, whether in heaven, whether on earth, whether mountains or rivers(?), whether in Mitanni or in Kinza ..." (XV 34 I 50-2 (C)).

See also II 33-4 for the *kuwapi kuwapi* clause. A very similar passage occurs in XV 32 I 40-2; an analogous one in VII 5 I 13-15. All of the clauses there have *-za*. The omission of *-za* in a few of the clauses in q. 41 is however undoubtedly a rhetorical device.

Finally, note:

(42) ABI DUTUŠI-*ma tuk* ANA I^{madduwatta} *kissann-a* *memiskit ehu-wa-za* INA KUR HUR.SAG[hari]yati *eshut nu-[wa]-za* ANA KUR URU^{hatti-ya} *manninkuwan*

"My Sun's father said thus to you, M., 'come!, settle in the land of Mt. H.; you also will be close to Hatti!'" (Madd Vs 17-18).

See §2.1d for an explanation of the translation of *-za* (*es-*) as a second person, in the last clause. But the pronoun is specified in:

uga-wa-za *manni[nk]uwan kuit* [nu-w]ar-at *uk hu[d]ak wa[lh]mi*

"Because I am near, I will strike them immediately" (Madd Vs 26). See also the copied (?) B.-M. A I 20.

§2.1b.3 Various phrases with adjectives or participles:

(43) *anda apinissan memiskanzi* [m]an-wa DUTUŠI-^{*} *kuiski* ANA [P]A[N]I DINGIR^{LIM} *idalauanni memian harzi* *nu-za* DINGIR^{LIM} *apez uddanaz parkuis es* DUTUŠI-^{*} *ya* ANA PANI DINGIR^{LIM} *parkuis es[d]u*

"They add thus: 'if anyone has mentioned My Sun for evil before the deity, be clean of that matter, deity, and My Sun, be clean before the deity'" (XXIX 7 Vs 4-6).

- VI 46 IV 32 under q. 32
 VII 5 I 13-15 under q. 41
 I 19, IV 11 §2.5b.3
 I 22 §2.7b.4
 I 23 under q. 196
 II 12 under q. 316
 II 14-15, IV 1 under q. 30
 II 20-1 under q. 196
 IV 2-3 q. 231
 IV 4, 9 under q. 30
 IV 6 under q. 231
 IV 7-8 §2.7b.4
 VII 6 I. 12, 14 under q. 30
 VII 8 II 9 §2.5b.3
 II 14-15 under q. 241
 II 20 under q. 196
 III 10-14 §2.7b.4
 VII 10 I 1-5 q.s 262, 431
 I 7-9 q. 234
 VIII 36 II 6 under q. 122
 III 14-15 under q. 122
 VIII 51 II 14-15 §2.15.3
 VIII 66 I. 3, II under q. 38
 IX 4 II 25 under q. 30
 II 29-31 under q. 30
 III 29-32 under q. 308
 IX 11+ I. 6 under q. 9
 IX 22+ II 15-16 q. 177
 IX 27 Vs 5 under q. 196
 IX 28 IV 5-7 q. 378, §3d
 IX 31 I 41 = HT I I 34 under q. 394
 II 1 = HT I I 55 under q. 394
 II 2-3 = HT I I 55-6 under q. 394
 II 4 = HT I I 57 under q. 36
 II 55-6, 57-8 = HT I II 28, 30 §2.15.2
 III 2-3 = HT I II 36-8 under q. 368
 III 5-7 = HT I II 39-41 q. 307
 III 17-18 = HT I III 5-7 under q. 342

- (IX 31)
 III 51-4
 IV 11-12, 40/26-7 = HT I IV 4-5, 17, 30
 IV 21-2 = HT I IV 25-6 = XLI 17 IV 12'
 IV 25 = HT I IV 28-9 = XLI 17 IV 14-15'
 IV 26, 39 = HT I IV 29 = XLI 17 IV 15'
 HT I IV 3 under q. 345
 XLI 17 II 16-17 under q. 307
 X 48 I 5 under q. 122
 X 72 II 18, V 17 under q. 307
 V 12-13 under q. 2
 XII 26 II 2-3 q. 10
 XII 51 I 22 §2.11b
 XII 60 I 18 under q. 284
 III 3 under q. 30
 XIII 4+: see T.O.
 XIII 7 I 17 §2.17 (*sanh*-)
 XIII 8 Vs 16-17 under q. 357
 XIII 9 II 3-8 q. 94
 III 10 under q. 350
 III 12-14 q. 223
 IV 7 under q. 94
 XIII 33 (StBoT 4) II 10 under q. 110
 II 18-20 under q. 110
 XIII 35+ (StBoT 4) I 10 under q. 148
 I 30-1 under q. 152
 I 35 q. 209
 I 39-44 q. 110
 II 27 under q. 288
 II 33 §2.15.3
 II 40, 44 under q. 354
 III 16 under q. 358
 III 23-4 under q. 358
 IV 6 under q. 110
 IV 20-1 under q. 148
 XIV 4 III 12 q. 163
 III 13-14 q. 75
 III 16 under q. 75

q. 424
 under q. 303
 q. 398
 under q. 308
 under q. 398

(Mursilis II, cont.):

- KBo IV 8 (Affair of the MUNUSAMA.DINGIR)
 XIV 4 (Affair of the Tawananna)
 XIV 14+; XIV 8, 10, 11; XIV 12; XIV 13+ (Plague Prayers, ed. Goetze)
 XXIV 1 = XXIV 2 (Prayer to Telipinu)
 XXIV 3, XXX 13 (= XXIV 4? CHD says MH) (Prayers to the Sungoddess of Arinna)
 XXXII 130 (Festival for Sausga of Samuha)
 XLIII 50 + XV 36+ (Mursilis Sprachlähmung; ed. Goetze-Pedersen)

Muwatallis II:

- Treaty with Alaksandus of Wilusa (ed. SV)
 KBo XI 1 (Prayer to Tesub; ed. Houwink ten Cate & Josephson)
 VI 45 + XXX 14 + 1111/z = VI 46 (Prayer to ^{DU} pihassassi)

Hattusilis III:

- I 1+: Apology // KBo VI 29+ (ed. Goetze, Hatt.)
 KBo IV 12 (Mitannamuwa decree, ed. Goetze, Hatt.)
 V 1 (Oracle text, ed. Ünal)
 XV 17+: Prayer of Puduhepa to Lelwani (StBoT 1).
 XXI 19 + 1303/u (+) XIV 7 (Prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna)
 XXI 27 (Prayer of Puduhepa to the Sungoddess of Arinna)
 XXI 29 (Treaty with Tiliura)
 XXII 70 (Oracle Text, ed. Ünal, TdH 6)
 XXXI 66 (Prayer of Urhitesub)

Tudhaliyas IV:

- Bronze Tablet (ed. Otten 4)).
 XXIII 1+1a+1b + XXXI 43 + XXIII 37 = VIII 82+: Sausgamuwa Treaty (StBoT 16)
 Land Grant (XXVI 43 +, ed. Imparati)

Suppiluliumas II:

- KBo IV 14 (or Tudhaliyas IV)
 XXVI 25

Late LH Texts:

- StBoT 3 (Substitute rituals for the king)
 XXIV 5 + IX 13+
 KBo XV 1
 KBo XV 2+
 KBo XV 7
 StBoT 4 (Court protocols)
 KBo VIII 32
 KBo XIV 59
 KBo XVI 61
 XIII 33, XIII 34+
 XIII 35+
 XXVI 69
 XXXI 76+
 XXXIV 45+
 XXXVIII 37
 Bo 5503
 KBo XIX 128 (Festival ritual, ed. StBoT 13)
 V 6 (Oracle text)
 XIV 3 (Tawagalawas Letter, ed. AU)

- (XXII 70) *Vs* 77-8
Rs 31
Rs 35
 XXIII 1 (StBoT 16) *I* 31-2
 XXIII 13 *Vs* 5
 XXIII 68 + ABOT 58 (Ismerikka) *Rs* 7
 XXIII 101 *II* 11
 XXIII 102 *I* 9-12
 I 11
 I 13-15
 XXIV 1 (= XXIV 2) *I* 25ff.
 II 7-8
 IV 19-21
 XXIV 2 *Vs* 3 = XXIV 1 *I* 3
 Vs 7-9
 Vs 15ff.
 Rs 5-10
 XXIV 3 + *I* 29-34
 II 28-9
 II 52-3 = XXIV 4 + XXX 13 *II* 9
 III 1-2
 III 13
 XXIV 5 + IX 13 (StBoT 3) *Vs* 10'
 Vs 17
 Vs 21
 Vs 24'
 Vs 27'
 Vs 30'
 Vs 33-4
 Rs 3
 Rs 15
 Rs 15-16
 Rs 17-18
 XXIV 7 *IV* 34
 IV 45-6
 XXIV 8 + *I* 36-7
 XXVI 9 *I* 2-3
 XXVI 19 *II* 12

- under q. 387
 under q. 387
 under q. 389
 q. 430, under q. 48
 under q. 122
 under q. 36
 under q. 32
 q. 429
 under q. 69
 under q. 69
 under q. 55
 under q. 169
 §2.5c.6
 under q. 55
 q. 301
 under q. 55
 q. 415
 q. 55
 q. 171
 q. 219
 under q. 415
 q. 22
 q. 346
 under q. 293
 under q. 384
 q. 303
 §2.16c.1
 §2.16c.1
 under q. 348
 §2.5c.6
 q. 386
 q. 347
 q. 370
 over q. 255
 under q. 30
 q. 39
 q. 44
 §2.5b.3

- XXVI 25 *II* 6-7
 XXVI 43+ *Vs* 4
 XXVI 69 *V* 8-9 (StBoT 4)
 VII 6-10
 XXVI 88 *Vs* 5
 Vs 7
 Rs 6
 XXVII 1 *I* 7-11
 I 20-2
 I 24-7, *I* 29-30
 III 20-1
 XXVIII 82 *I* 6
 XXVIII 96: *see I* 14.
 XXIX 1 *I* 15
 I 18-19
 III 4-5
 III 31-3
 III 43-4
 IV 1
 XXIX 3 (StBoT 25 #1) *I* 3-5 = XXIX 1 *I* 23-5
 XXIX 7 *Vs* 4-6
 XXX 10 *Vs* 6
 Vs 6-10
 Vs 10
 Vs 11
 Vs 13-14
 Vs 15
 Vs 16-17
 Vs 24-8
 Rs 1-4
 Rs 10
 Rs 14-17
 Rs 18-21
 XXX 12 *Vs* 18
 XXX 15+ *Vs* 29
 XXX 16+ *I* 1-2
 I 6
 I 10-11

- q. 388
 q. 340
 under q. 358
 q. 305
 under q. 48
 under q. 69
 under q. 285
 q. 401
 q. 302
 under q. 401
 q. 111
 under q. 9
 under q. 394
 under q. 25
 q. 26
 §1b.2
 q. 20
 q. 7
 q. 188
 q. 43
 q. 172
 q. 46
 q. 239
 q. 240
 under q. 395
 q. 336
 q. 395
 q.s 192, 238
 q. 124
 under q. 413
 q. 72
 q. 413
 q. 171
 under q. 199
 over q. 84
 over q. 84
 under q. 73

palkuiya-

(26) *nu-za-kan LUGAL-un duskeskanzi nan-za-an-kan palkuiyanta*

"they entertain the king and x him" (XXIX 1 III 4-5 (copied early text)).

Cf. KBo XV 33 III 24ff., *-zan . . . palwan harzi* (probably MH). Neu thinks it may be a *verbum dicendi*. See also active, KBo XII 96 I 11: *nu aliyani EGIR-anda le kuiski palwaizzi*.

sarra-

For this verb, see below, §2.13.

sazk-

(27) [*le-ma-za-ka*]_n *kas kun EGIR-pan sazkitta kas-a-za-kan kun [piran² sazk]itta*

This quote is from HAB (II 58-9). Not only is it not certain that *-za* is present in the first clause or *sazkitta* in the second, but the sense of the verb is obscure.

sud-

(28) *nu-za supta¹ri kuiski "and someone falls asleep"* (SV Targ Rs 38).

But: *nas GE₆-andaz UL suptari "he does not sleep at night"* (IV 47 I 3).

Note the active *ses-* with *-za*, in the Gurparanzahu myth, XXXVI 67 II 24':

(29) *Impakrus sasti pait nas-za katta(??) sesta*

"I. went to bed and lay down/fell asleep".

See also q. 396, and Appu (XXIV 8+ (copied MH)) I 30, II 7-8, but without particle I 25-6 (actually it is supplanted by *-san*). Another example without particle is the probably MH KBo XV 33 III 19:

(30) *man-si UL ZAG-an nas seszi kuwapi nu-za-kan apiya-pat warpzi*

"if it is not all right with him, where he sleeps, there he washes himself".

There is a possibility that *-za ses-* means 'lie down', while the simple *ses-* signifies the non-transformative 'lie, sleep'. The evidence is not conclusive: for instance, q. 396 from Mursilis' Aphasia has *-za* with *ses-*, but the sense seems to be 'the bed in which I habitually slept'. On the other hand, the late LH q. 363, e.g., has the simple *ses-*, clearly in the meaning 'sleep'. Contrast q. 30 above with q. 29 and the following (rather amusing) passage:

kun-wa-za DUMU-an da nu-kan É.ŠÀ-ni anda it nu-za-kan INA GIŠNÀ-as GAM seski nu taskupai
"take this baby and go into the house and lie down in bed and scream (and the whole city will think you are having a baby)" (XXIV 7 IV 45-6).

Note also: *nas-za uizzi EGIR-pa parza seszi nu-ssi-ssan UDU UZUGAB-i ser epzi*

"he goes and lies down on his back, and she puts a sheep on his breast" (IX 4 II 29-31).

He apparently lies down on his stomach, with *-za*, on II 25. See also VII 5 II 14-15, IV 1 (copied MH (probably)).

The expression 'sleep with someone' (*katta(n) ses-*) can have the particle: cf. with *-za*, XII 60 III 3 (Telipinus and the Daughter of Ocean), T.O. II 84, III 16 (of lying with one's wife), 68, and XXXVI 35 I 10 (Asertus); but without *-za*, Illuyankas I 25, 26 (possibly), VII 6 I. 12, 14. Also VII 5 IV 4, 9, but it is the god that is sleeping with the celebrant. The MH idiom *-ssi . . . katti-ssi*, etc., is reflected with *-za* in XXXIII 118 I. 24: *n]u-mu-za katti-ssi sasnut* "he made me sleep with him". Most of these are copied older texts (probably); Asertus may be, and IX 4 probably is, LH.

dusk-

(31) *UL-ma-w[a]-z tuskiskattaru*

"shouldn't he rejoice?" (KBo III 40 I. 3 (copied OH)).

Some interesting examples are XXXIII 120 I 27, 29, 30, where Kumarbi swallows the manhood of Anu *nas-za duskatta nas-[z]a haharsta* 'and he was happy and laughed (to himself = *-za?*)'. Anu then warns him not to be so happy:

- XLIV 4 Rs 7
 XLV 47 I 42-3
 XLV 79 Vs 5-6
 XLVII 36 Vs 13
 Vs 19
 XLVIII 99 I 13
 XLVIII 125 II 9
 LIX 66 II 7-8, 11-12
 IBoT I 33 I 1-4
 IBoT I 36 I 5-6
 I 8-9
 I 10-15
 I 30-2
 I 33-4
 I 43
 I 64-6
 II 13-14
 II 18-19
 II 31, III 43, 50
 II 49, 53, 57-8
 III 8
 III 12-16
 III 16-22
 III 31-4
 III 39-40
 III 55-6
 III 63
 III 74-5
 IV 2-5
 IV 38-9
 VBoT 58 I 19
 I 27ff.
 IV 5-6
 VBoT 120 III 5-7
 Bo 5503 Rs 8-9 (StBoT 4)
 203/f I 6-8
 VAT 8314 I 10
 HT 1: see IX 31.
- under q. 363
 under q. 316
 under q. 363
 §3b.2
 under q. 199
 under q. 33
 §2.15.3
 under q. 379
 q. 86
 q. 421
 q. 99
 q. 280
 q.s 195, 281
 q. 420
 under q. 420
 q. 198
 q. 296
 under q. 296
 under q. 96
 under q. 372
 under q. 103
 q. 100
 q. 103
 q.s 102, 295
 under q. 198
 q. 98
 under q. 306
 under q. 194
 q. 194
 q. 394
 §2.7a
 under q. 199
 under q. 410
 q. 381
 under q. 110
 q. 8
 under q. 14

- AM KBo II 5 III 39-45
 IV 15-17
 KBo III 4 I 9-13
 I 21-2
 I 23-4
 I 28-29
 II 7-8
 II 12-13
 II 13
 II 34
 II 41-5
 II 46-8
 II 50
 II 52-3
 III 29-31
 III 57-61
 III 90-2
 IV 37
 KBo IV 4 II 6
 II 8
 II 11, 12
 II 49
 II 65-6
 II 76-7
 III 7
 III 23, 24, IV 22
 III 26-8
 III 48-9
 III 63-4
 IV 20
 IV 23/27
 IV 36-7
 IV 57-60
 KBo V 8+ I 12-13
 II 13, 18
 II 27-30
 II 35-6
 III 12
 III 18-19
- §2.5c.2
 q. 344
 q.s 56, 127
 q. 165
 q. 213
 under q. 127
 q. 411
 under q. 213
 under q. 332
 q. 121
 q. 287
 q.s 128, 168
 §2.2c
 q. 337
 q. 288
 q.s 76, 137
 q. 159
 under q. 122
 q. 405
 under q. 150
 under q. 405
 under q. 204
 under q. 405
 q. 256
 under q. 294
 §2.17 (tepaues-)
 q. 167
 q.s 114, 156
 §3b.2
 under q. 9
 q. 157
 over q. 149
 q.s 151, 158
 q. 245
 under q. 136
 q. 290
 q. 412
 over q. 418
 q. 310

The active (probably!) once appears with *-za* in IX 11+ l. 6; its duplicate XXVIII 82 l. 6 (which CHD bills as OH/NS) has *haliyari*. The beginning of the phrase is broken off; Neu (1) p. 35 fn. 6) thinks it unlikely that the particle was included, presumably on the strength of the fact that the middle *haliya-* does not appear elsewhere with the particle. Neither does the active, usually: cf. e.g. KBo IV 4 IV 20 and *passim* in Mursilis' Annals, etc.

halzai-

See q. 212.

hanna-

(10) *nu-war-at-za-kan hanna<n>tati nu-war-at-za-kan santati*

"they disputed and got mad at one another" (XII 26 II 2-3 (LH)). Without particle, and without a reciprocal sense, in the equally late KBo IV 10 Rs 22, e.g.: *hannari-ya-si-kan le kuiski* "Let noone dispute with him!".

handai-

(11) *nu Iattarsiyas LÚ URU piggaya-ya ANA DUTUŠI LÚ MEŠ kurewanes kuit Imadduwattas-ma IR DUTUŠI ap[ed]as-za anda kuwat handaittat*

"because A. and the man of P. are vassals of My Sun, but M. is a servant of My Sun: why did you join them?" (Madd. Rs 89-90). This is Neu's rendering. Goetze restores *ap[at-sm]as-za* and translates the whole phrase: 'why was that set down? for them?'. Neu's interpretation is probably to be preferred.

But without particle XIX 5 Vs 13 (a letter of Manapa-DU): *nu-kan apuss-a anda SIxSĀ-at* "those also joined". Note also *anda damenk-* in a similar meaning, also without particle:

(12) *man-ma-[ka]n UKU-as-ma kuiski ŠA URULIM ANA LÚ MEŠ [UR]U gasga kuiski a[nd]a dammektari*

"If some person from the city makes a pact with the Gaskans" (XXI 29 IV 8-9).

We find this expression also in copied MH:

(13) *kun-wa GI-an GIM-an karsun nas UL anda tamektari*
"As I have cut this reed and it does not join itself back together" (B.U. I 25-6).

hatta-

(14) *EGIR-ŠU-ma LÚ MEŠ zilipuriyatallas uwanzi nu-za 6-ŠU walhanzi 1-as-za-kan [Š]U-ZU hatta 1-as-ma-za-kan [G]R-ŠU hatta*

"Then the z.-men come and strike themselves six times: 1 strikes his hand, the other his foot" (I 14 II 8-12 = XXVIII 96 l. 11-15 (copied OH?)).

VAT 8314 l.10 has another example of this verb with *-za*.

hullai-

Without particle:

(15) *man ERÍN MEŠ HI.A IŠTU LÚ KÚR hullantari*
"when the troops are defeated by the enemy" (XVII 28 IV 45 (LH)).

But with particle:

(16) *ERÍN MEŠ URU mizri-wa-za arha hullatat*
"the troops of Egypt were totally defeated" (XIV 17 II 29 (AM)).

iya-

(17) *uk-za ammel SIG5-andan KASKAL-an iyahhat*
"I went on my right way" (XVII 28 II 60 (LH)).

This verb rarely has the particle. See §2.10 for other verbs of motion.

impannai-

(18) *nu-za-ta namma anda le impanait[a]*
"don't worry (yourself)!" (XXXIII 68 II 6 (copied OH)).

HAB II 58-9
 III 24-5
 III 30
 III 31
 III 61
 III 72
 Hatt I 9-11
 I 9-12
 I 14-17
 I 17-20
 I 22-4
 I 29, I 67, IV 60
 I 38
 I 39-41, 43-50, 57-60
 I 43-6
 I 43-50
 I 57-60
 I 61-3
 I 61-4
 I 65-9
 I 73-4
 II 20-2
 II 29-30
 II 48-51
 II 63-4, 66-8
 II 66-7
 II 69-72
 II 74-8
 II 82-III 4
 II 84-5
 III 5
 III 5-7
 III 12-13
 III 45
 III 57-61
 III 69-71
 IV 7-11
 IV 11-12, 14-16

q. 27
 under q. 188
 q. 2
 q. 24
 §2.17 (*punus*-)
 §3b.7b
 q. 175
 q. 61
 q. 64
 q.s 178, 246
 q. 84
 under q. 267
 §2.15.3
 q. 116
 q. 247
 q. 66
 q. 406
 q. 242
 q. 108
 q. 311
 q. 48
 q. 119
 q. 214
 q.s 142, 291
 q. 160
 under q. 140
 q. 140
 q. 243
 q. 170
 under q. 117
 q. 150
 q. 161
 under q. 83
 under q. 48
 q.s 65, 218
 q. 49
 q. 312
 q.s 162, 326

(Hatt) IV 16-19
 IV 23-4
 IV 41-3
 IV 43-7
 IV 55-8
 IV 62-4
 IV 78-9
 IV 81-3
 IV 88-9
 Illuyanka
 KBo III 7 I 14
 I 25, 26
 XVII 5 I 4-5
 I 7
 I 10-12
 XVII 6+ I 2
 I 14-15
 I 19-22
 Kum Tablet I (XVII 7+) I 5, 9
 I 7
 IV 23-4
 Laws I §2, §3
 §4, §76
 §5
 §21, §23
 §27
 §28a-c
 §30
 §31
 §32-3
 §"32a"
 §"33"
 §40
 §41
 §43
 §48

q.s 81, 257
 under q. 247
 q. 83
 q. 407
 q. 57
 q.s 141, 328
 q. 60
 q. 362
 under q. 69
 §2.5b.3
 under q. 30
 under q. 373
 §2.5b.3
 q. 393
 §2.5b.3
 under q. 435
 q. 435
 §2.5b.1
 under q. 415
 under q. 247
 under q. 278
 under q. 278
 q. 278
 under q. 88
 q. 90
 q.s 190, 350
 q. 191
 q. 333, under q. 89
 under q. 89
 under q.s 89, 143, 330
 q.s 89, 143, 330
 §2.3a.2
 §2.3a.2
 under q. 88
 q. 144

Das ursprüngliche Medium tantum *es-* "sitzen" (Zustandsmedium) hat im Anschluß an sein direkt-reflexives Medium "sich setzen" (-*za*) ein scheinbar transitives Verbum "besetzen" (-*za*; mit Akkusativ des Ortes bzw. Örtlichkeit) entwickelt (Med. = Akt.).

Mit dem reflexiven Medium eng verbunden ist das sogenannte reziproke Medium ('Medium der Gegenseitigkeit'); vgl. Verbum reziprokes Medium

<i>ep-</i>	"fassen"	"sich (gegenseitig) fassen" (mit oder ohne Reflexivpronomen)
<i>hanna-</i>	"entscheiden, richten, anfechten"	"sich (miteinander) streiten, miteinander rechten" (- <i>za</i>)
<i>sa-</i>	"grollen, zürnen"	"sich (gegenseitig) zürnen, einander grollen" (- <i>za</i>)
<i>sarra-</i>	"trennen"	"sich (voneinander) trennen" (- <i>za</i>)
<i>zah(h)-</i>	"schlagen"	"sich (miteinander) schlagen, prügeln"
<i>zahhiya-</i>	"bekämpfen"	"sich (gegenseitig) bekämpfen"

vgl. gr. $\mu\alpha\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$.

Wie bei dem reflexiven Medium ist auch hier zu beobachten, daß die med. Formen mitunter noch zusätzlich durch die Reflexivpartikel oder das Reflexivpronomen gekennzeichnet sind.

§1c The complete roster of the middle forms Neu cites which occur with -*za* are as follows:

aniya-

(1) *nu-za URUkalasmas aniyattat I^hantiliss-a-z namma UL aniyattat*

(KBo III 63+ I 13-14 (copied OH?)).

The precise meaning of this expression is not clear. Cf. the active in B.U. I 16 (C), *asma-za aniet kuiski*, which Otten interprets as "oder jemand hat (schwarze Magie) getrieben".

Neu supposes that this phrase has something to do with purifying oneself.

arra-

See §2.16 below.

arsiya-

(2) *nu-za UD-an 2-ŠU 3-ŠU et nu-za arsi[y]ahhut*
"eat 2 and three times a day and take care of yourself!" (HAB III 30 (copied OH)).

Also X 72 V 12-13: *ÍD-as-ma-ta-kan [iw]ar (?) arsiyahhut*.
This text appears to be late MH or early LH.

Note however the OH or early MH prayer KBo VII 28 Vs 15-16: *nu mau sisdu nu ANA DINGIR MEŠ NINDA.KUR₄.RA^{HI}.A ... arsiyattaru*
"let (the land) grow and flourish and let bread offerings multiply for the gods".

aus-

See §2.7c.3 (q. 255 in particular).

ep-

The LH Song of Ulikummi has several occurrences of *appantat*, apparently in a reciprocal meaning 'they took each other by the hand'. The only clause with its beginning preserved whole has -*smas* for -*za*: *nu-smas-kan ŠU-az appan[dat, XXXIII 113 I 9]*. There is also the phrase *ŠU-az-at-kan appan[dat in XXXIII 115 III 13*, without the particle or its surrogate. (See Kumarbi p. 19, 23, 26 for the restorations).

es- (med.) 'sit'

See §2.4 below.

halanza-

(3) *nu-za U^L memmahhun apas-ma-mu-za-kan halanzatta*
"I said no and she became furious at me" (XXXVI 35 I 11 (LH)).
This is HW²'s reading of *halanza-*; CHD (p. 261) translates 'threatened(?)'.

(Murs.P.P. II)

§2 I. 1, 2

§4 I. 1-2

§5 I. 2

§6

§8 I. 5-6

§9

§11 I. 3, 5

I. 4

XXVI 86 III 2-3

Murs.P.P. XIV 13 I 41-3

Murs. Sp. Vs 3

Vs 19-20

Vs 31

Rs 16-21

Rs 24

Rs 32

Rs 37

Ob I 17-23

I 56-62

III 14-22

III 14-25

III 61-6

IV 3-6

IV 14-15

IV 20-1

IV 24

IV 32

IV 46-8

PHO I 4

I 8

I 13-14

I 20-1

I 22-5

I 27-31

I 36-9

II 18-22

III 3

under q. 169

q. 153

q. 423

under q. 276

q. 168

q.s 77, 276

over q. 253

under q. 256

under q. 7

q. 125

§2.15.3

§1a

under q. 298

q. 396

q. 389

under q. 169

under q. 300

q.s 79, 115, 154

q.s 205, 289

q. 80

q. 206

q. 286

q.s 155, 361

q.s 210, 227

under q. 286

§2.15.2

q. 261

q. 182

under q. 59

under q. 59

under q. 59

under q.s 155, 361

q.s 47, 204

q.s 208, 259

q. 360

q. 271

under q. 59

(PHO) III 3-6

III 16-20

III 24

IV 10-11

IV 14-15

IV 23-8, 32

IV 33

StBoT 1 I 2-3

III 14 (p. 32)

III 16-17

III 23

StBoT 8 I 15

I 16-17

III 15, IV 6

StBoT 12 I 4

I 12

I 31-33

II 28

II 30-33

II 35

III 42

III 8

IV 33-4

IV 41-2

SV Alak I 67-8'

I 76-7'

II 83, 87-8

III 18-19

III 38-9

SV Dup §4 I 16

D I 14-17

D I 32-3

D II 11

D II 19

D III 3-4

D III 4-5

SV Huqq I 8-11

q.s 58, 82

q. 212

under q. 59

under q. 207

under q.s 80, 206

q. 207

q. 59

q. 181

q. 138

q. 353

under q. 353

q. 371

under q. 371

§2.16.3a

§2.3a.2

§2.3a.2

q. 87

under q. 87

under q. 87

§2.3a

§2.16.3a

§2.16.3a

§2.16.3a

§2.16.3a

q. 222

under q. 418

q. 224

q. 319

q. 54

under q. 128

q. 67

under q. 310

under q. 25

under q. 77

§2.5c.6

under q. 128

q. 263

der verschwand oder mit **soi*, heth. -*se*, dann -*si*, zusammenfiel und die III. Pers. Sg. bezeichnete".

§1b.3 Josephson, RHA 81 (1967, p. 134 ff.), discusses -*za* with *es*- 'to be', and concludes that the particle is used in three functions: as an indication of an inherent quality; for identification of the subject; or as an indication that the rank or status of the subject is being discussed.

Hoffner treats the same subject, in JNES 28 (1969), p. 225 ff. He formulates the following rule (p. 226): If the subject of the nominal sentence is a first or second person pronoun (either explicit or implied), the sentence will contain -*za*. The only admitted exceptions are to be found in Old Hittite, where this rule was not yet in force. (In fn. 5, he specifies that -*za* is never used in a nominal sentence in OH). He does not explain why this might be the case. See §2.1d for some discussion.

§1b.4 It is perhaps obvious, but should be stated, that -*za* cannot correspond to a true reflexive pronoun, because it has no case. It therefore must be taken as providing a general indication that the subject is involved in the verbal content. Similarly, the particle may have nothing to do with motion, as Carruba in fact concludes: it occurs regularly in phrases with *es*- 'to be', and other stative verbs. Finally, with the first and second persons plural, it is well known that -*za* is often supplanted by -*nas* and -*smaš* respectively. These generally seem to be datives. This suggests that -*za* may be somewhat in the nature of an ethical dative, in all its uses.

One might wonder why -*za* is necessary. Hittite has a very well-developed Mediopassive, to express not only states, but also transformations involving the subject. It is obviously of interest to determine what the territories of the two constructions are.

In fact, I am interested in the mechanisms of the reflexive use, not just as it pertains to Hittite. There is in fact, one would say, no earthly reason why French has to say *se proméner*, rather than simply **proméner* (though actually this is not the best example: this verb at one time probably meant literally 'carry oneself forward', so the pronoun was necessary. But Quebec for instance could easily put **Je souviens* on its license plates: why the *me*?). In the case of *sich weigern* and *svegliarsi*, one might object that the verb means something else without the reflexive pronoun. But English, for instance, manages fine using "awake" for both the transitive and intransitive senses of the latter verb.

Why in any case was the reflexive pronoun used to mark the distinction between transitive and intransitive? In the case of *svegliarsi* this could seem understandable, since awaking is a process which the subject must perform. But there is nothing actively reflexive about it: the subject is not waking himself by any means, unless one thinks of the Italians as deeply involved with complex Freudian sub-conscious thought processes way back in Vulgar Latin. And why *sich* with *weigern*, which corresponds to Italian *rifiutarsi*? Again, English makes do with "refuse".

In fact, there are numerous verbs in all these languages which take the reflexive pronoun simply to designate activities that involve the subject and only the subject. They constitute in essence a fake middle. The pronoun is not necessary to the sense.

Furthermore, Latin had verbs, like *inclinare*, which were used in both a transitive and intransitive function, and many of these survive into the Romance languages. Italian *inclinare* itself has this feature. But it is interesting that there is an *inclinarsi*, alongside the intransitive *inclinare*. What is the difference?

§1b.5 To return to -*za*:

The particle occurs mainly with active verbs. However, it occurs quite regularly in phrases with *es*- "to be" and *kis*- "to become". In MH and LH, we find it with a number of middles. A

T.O. (XIII 4+) I 63-4
 II 15, 16, 19
 II 20, IV 26, 64
 II 25
 II 32-5
 II 46-7
 II 48-9, 79
 II 52-5
 II 59
 II 79
 II 80-1
 II 84, III 16, 68
 III 14
 III 17, 35
 III 25-6
 III 27
 III 35-8
 III 41-2
 III 54
 IV 19
 IV 26
 IV 28
 IV 49, 72-3, IV 50-1
 Tunn I 3
 I 7-9
 I 54
 II 21-2
 II 63-5
 III 43, 53-4
 IV 7
 IV 8-13
 Zalpa Vs 1-2
 Vs 4-6
 Vs 11-13
 Vs 13-14
 Vs 14
 Vs 16-17
 Vs 18,19

q. 196
 under q. 270
 §2.17 (kuen-)
 under q. 39
 q. 40
 q. 357
 under q. 357
 under q. 357
 under q. 39
 under q. 357
 under q. 25
 under q. 30
 under q. 25
 under q. 25
 under q. 25
 under q. 318
 q. 369
 §2.5b.3
 under q. 25
 under q. 226
 under q. 357
 under q. 404
 under q. 343
 under q. 196
 q. 237
 under q. 386
 under q. 382
 q. 382
 under q. 186
 under q. 98
 q. 417
 §2.5a
 §2.3a, §2.5a
 §2.5a
 q. 189
 under q. 89
 q. 341, under q. 89, §2.7a
 under q. 89

References

a) Cuneiform Texts

- ABoT *Ankara arkeoloji müzesinde bulunan Boghazköi tabletleri*, Istanbul 1948.
 HT *Hittite Texts in the Cuneiform Character from Tablets in British Museum*, London, 1920.
 IBoT *Istanbul arkeoloji müzelerinde bulunan Boghazköi tabletlerinden seçme metinler I-III*, Istanbul 1944, 1947, 1954.
 KBo *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi* (WVDOG 68ff.), Leipzig 1916-23, Berlin 1954-.
 VBoT A. Goetze, *Verstreute Boghazköi-Texte*, Marburg a.d.Lahn, 1930.

Texts cited only by their Roman numbers belong to the series *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi*, Berlin 1921-.

b) General References and Text Editions

- Adrados, F. *Lingüística indoeuropea*, Madrid 1975.
 AfO Archiv für Orientforschung, Berlin/Graz.
 Alp, S. *Hethitische Briefe aus Maşat-Höyük*, Ankara, 1991
 AM A. Goetze, *Annalen des Mursilis* (MVAG 38), Leipzig 1933.
 Anittas E. Neu, *Der Anittas-Text* (StBoT 18).

not appear to fit in with this theory, as it doesn't seem likely that any form of the numeral 2 started with a vowel. There is also the question, which he mentions, following Kronasser's suggestion about the ablative (VLFH '56, 102), as to whether the spelling *-za* represented /-tsy/, since *-za* is supposed to derive from common Anatolian **-ti > *-zi > -z(a)*: the *-a* of *-za* would then be a representation of the *-y* glide, a vestige of the original form of the particle. He cites the lone example of Murs.Sp. Vs 19-20, *piran-para-ya-az-zi apun GE₆-an IŠTU MUNUSTI¹ teshas* "Before that I refrained from women that night". Goetze takes *-zi* to represent **-z-y(a)*.

It is not my purpose to discuss the form of the particle at any length, partly because I am not sure we can determine with absolute certainty what it was, although it is clear that *-z* was probably the base form. But the fact that even in OH we find variation between *-z* and *-(z)za* after elements like *nu*, as Kühne and Melchert ably point out, is odd, though Melchert's explanation may be correct. One is reduced to wondering how the Hittites pronounced the particle in a combination like LUGAL-*us-za*: was it truly /*hassus-tsy*/, or was the *-a* of *-za* more likely actually articulated? (Surely not as an *-i*, either, or it usually would have been so written. The *-a* of *-za* might well have been a shwa-vowel, however, perhaps a remnant of the *y*-glide). Combinations like the MH *-za-ta* to represent **-z-sta* might indicate otherwise, but note that we find this syntagm after *nu* (see e.g. q. 18 below): **nu-uz-ta* could have been employed to represent more accurately how we think the particle was pronounced (We don't have this combination from OH, so we don't know how they wrote it).

It is at least possible that *-z* was the postvocalic form, and that *-za* was actually a primarily post-consonantal by-form, in OH. **-a* could also be a euphonic vowel, not derivable through etymology. There in fact does not appear to be much variation in the distribution of the two alternatives, at that period: only after -u- do we find variation between *-(z)za* and *-z*. Other particles have

two forms in Hittite: witness *-apa* which often appears as *-ap*, and especially *-asta* which has a combining form *-sta* in certain positions.

One has doubts that had one asked a Hittite what the particle was, (s)he would have answered *"-z"*, without at least a euphonic vowel, though obviously who knows? If the Hittites spoke like a great many Mediterranean peoples, doubling consonants (which they in fact seem to like doing in combined writings), and so forth, it is easy to conceive that they might have inserted euphonic vowels, much like a Mediterranean person speaking English. These are things one cannot possibly determine without resurrecting a Hittite.

At any rate, it is clear that the Hittites, at least after OH, normally wrote the particle as *-za*. Thus, and in keeping with the above musings, I have preferred to stick with *-za* as a representation of the particle in this work.

§1b Previous scholarship

§1b.1 Friedrich has a discussion of the so-called Reflexivpronomina in §239-244 of his Hittite Grammar. He notes that the use of the dative personal pronouns is sometimes parallel to *-za* (§239). The function of *-za* itself is seen: 1) as that of an ethical dative (§240); 2) as providing "eine leichte Schattierung der Bedeutung" to certain verbs, when it is present (§241); and 3) as building true reflexive syntagms with particular verbs, in the style of *sich weigern*, *se proméner*, *svegliarsi* (§242). That is, *-za* is regular, if not actually obligatory, with these verbs. In §243, he remarks that *-za* can be found in "Nominalsätzen", i.e. phrases with the verb "to be", but that the rationale for the particle in these cases is imperfectly understood.

- Güterbock, H.G. 1) *Kumarbi. Mythen vom churritischen Kronos* (Istanbuler Schriften 16), Zürich-New York 1946.
2) "The Song of Ullikummi", JCS 5, 6, New Haven 1961-2.
See also DS.
- HAB F. Sommer-A. Falkenstein, *Hethitisch-Akkadische Bilingue* (ABAW NF 16), Munich 1938.
- Hatt. A. Goetze, *Hattusilis. Der Bericht über seine Thronbesteigung nebst den Paralleltexten* (MVAG 29.3), 1925; and
Neue Bruchstücke zum grossen Text des Hattusilis (MVAG 34.2), 1930.
- Houwink ten Cate, P.-F. Josephson "Muwatallis' Prayer to the Stormgod of Kummanni (KBo XI 1)", RHA 25, 1967, fasc. 81.
- HW² J. Friedrich-A. Kammenhuber, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg 1975.
- IBS Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Innsbruck.
- Imparati, F. 1) *Le leggi ittite*, Rome 1964.
2) "Una concessione di terre da parte di Tudhaliya IV", RHA 32, 1974.
- JAOS Journal of the American Oriental Society, New Haven.
- Jakob-Rost, L. "Beiträge zum hethitischen Hofzeremoniell (IBoT I 36)", MIO 11, 1965.
See also Mast., TdH 2.
- JCS Journal of Cuneiform Studies, New Haven.

- Josephson, F. 1) "Pronominal Adverbs of Anatolian Formation and Function", RHA 79, 1966.
2) *The Function of the Sentence Particles in Old and Middle Hittite*, Uppsala 1972.
- Kammenhuber, A. 1) *Hippologia hethitica*, Wiesbaden 1961.
2) "Hethitisch, Paläisch, Luwisch, Hieroglyphenluwisch und Hattisch", *Handbuch der Orientalistik* Abt. 1 Bd. 2 Abschn. 1/2 Lief. 2, Leiden/Köln 1969.
3) "Syn- und Diachronisches zu hethitisch *anda*, *andan* und *anda mema-*", Festschrift Otten, Wiesbaden 1973.
- Kempinski, A.-Kosak, S. "Der Ismeriga-Vertrag", *Welt des Orients* 5.
- Kronasser, H. *Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache*, Wiesbaden 1962.
- Kühne, C. "Über die Darstellung der Reflexivpartikel -z", Fs Otten, 1988, 202ff.
- Laroche, E. 1) *Dictionnaire de la langue louvite*, Paris 1959.
2) *Les hieroglyphes hittites*, Paris 1960.
3) "Textes mythologiques en transcription", RHA XXIII/77, XXVI 82, Paris 1965, 1968.
4) *Catalogue des textes hittites*, Paris 1971.
- Laws J. Friedrich, *Die hethitischen Gesetze*, Leiden 1971.
- Lebrun, R. *Hymnes et prières hittites* (Homo Religiosus 4), Louvain-la-Neuve 1980.
(Contains editions of XXX 10, XXXI 127, KBo VII 28+, XXI 29).

<u>Appendix: Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luwian</u>	
1) Cuneiform Luwian	220
2) Hieroglyphic Luwian	223
Text Citations	227
References and Abbreviations	253

Foreword

This study treats the use of the particle *-z/-za*. It is based as much as possible on the hard evidence concerning *-za*, such as its syntactic behavior, parallelism with other forms in the language, and so on.

On a larger plane, however, the function of a "reflexive" particle is in great measure a semantic question, which means that one's interpretations are naturally open to discussion, not to mention disagreement. I therefore regard this work as putting forth ideas, as solid and well-founded as I can make them, of course, but essentially an invitation to elasticize one's mind and try out new ways of looking at language. This approach is particularly beneficial to Hittite, which often goes about things in a rather esoteric fashion: in fact, that is the main reason a study of Hittite is rewarding, because it affords an opportunity to become at home in strange-looking and unfamiliar territory, and to train oneself to believe what one is seeing.

I would like to thank Prof. Erich Neu of Bochum for his very helpful criticisms; and Prof.s Harry Hoffner and Annelies Kammenhuber for their kindness in allowing me to use their collections for research on this and my previous book.

J.B.

Old Saybrook, Conn.
Spring 1993.

Rizzi-Mellini: See Fs Meriggi.

Rüster, C. *Hethitische Keilschrift-Paläographie* (StBoT 20), 1972.

Singer, I. *The Hittite KILAM Festival* (StBoT 27-8), 1983-4.

SMEA *Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici*, Rome.

Starke, F. 1) *Die Funktionen der dimensionalen Kasus und Adverbien im Althethitischen* (StBoT 23), 1977.
2) *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift* (StBoT 30), 1985.

StBoT *Studien zu den Boghazköy-Texten*, Wiesbaden.
1) H. Otten-V. Soucek, *Das Gelübde der Königin Puduhepa an die Göttin Leuwani*, 1965.
2) O. Carruba, *Das Beschwörungsritual für die Göttin Wisurijanza* (KBo XV 25), 1966.
3) H.M. Kümmel, *Ersatzrituale für den hethitischen König*, 1967.
4) R. Werner, *Hethitische Gerichtsprotokolle*, 1967.
5) & 6): see Neu
14) J. Siegelová, *Appu-Märchen und Hedammu-Mythus*, 1971.
16) C. Kühne-H. Otten, *Der Sausgamuwa-Vertrag*, 1971.
17): see Zalpa
18): see Anittas
20): see Rüster
21): see Neu-Rüster
22) N. Oettinger, *Die Militärischen Eide der Hethiter*, 1976.
23), 30): see Starke
24) H. Otten, *Die Apologie Hattusilis III.*, 1981
25), 26): see Neu
27), 28): see Singer
29): see Beckman

SV J. Friedrich, *Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache*, MVAG 31.1, 34.1, 1926, 1930 (contains the Alaksandus, Duppitesub, Huqqanas, Kupanta-DLAMA, Manapa-DU, Targasnallis treaties).

Taw See AU.

TdH (THeth) *Texte der Hethiter*, Heidelberg.
1) G. Szabó, *Ein Hethitisches Entsühnungsritual für das Königspaar Tuthaliya und Nikalmati*, 1971.
2) L. Jakob-Rost, *Das Ritual der Malli aus Arzawa*, 1972.
3) & 4) A. Ünal, *Hattusili III*, 1973.
6) A. Ünal, *Ein Orakeltext über die Intrigen am hethitischen Hof* (KUB XXII 70 = Bo 2011), 1978.
9): see Prob.
11): see Tel.E.

Tel.E. I. Hoffmann, *Der Erlass Telipinus* (TdH 11), 1984.

T.O. See Anniw.

Tunn. A. Goetze, *The Hittite Ritual of Tunnewi* (American Oriental Series Vol. 14), New Haven 1938.

Von Schuler, E. 1) "Würdenträger des Arnuwanda", *Orientalia* 25, 1956. (Contains edition of XIII 20 +).
2) "Königserlässe", *Festschrift J. Friedrich*, Heidelberg 1959. (Contains edition of XIII 9).
3) *Die Kaskäer* (Ergänzungsband zur ZA NF 3), Berlin 1965.
See also B.-M., Ob., PHO.

INNSBRUCKER BEITRÄGE ZUR SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT

herausgegeben von

WOLFGANG MEID

Band 79