



On the USE of Hittite -ZA in Nominal Sentences

Harry A. Hoffner, Jr.

Journal of Near Eastern Studies, Vol. 28, No. 4. (Oct., 1969), pp. 225-230.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0022-2968%28196910%2928%3A4%3C225%3AOTUOH-%3E2.0.CO%3B2-U>

Journal of Near Eastern Studies is currently published by The University of Chicago Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/ucpress.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

JOURNAL OF
Near Eastern Studies

OCTOBER 1969 • VOLUME 28 • NUMBER 4

EIGHTY-SIXTH YEAR

ON THE USE OF HITTITE -ZA IN NOMINAL
SENTENCES

HARRY A. HOFFNER, JR., *Yale University,
New Haven, Conn.*

THE question of the origin and meaning of the Hittite particle *-z* or *-za* has engaged the best minds in Hittitology from the first. A virtually complete survey of the literature can be found in J. Friedrich's *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*,¹ so that it is only needful here to mention some of the scholars who have made significant contributions to the understanding of the particle's function. In chronological order of first contribution they were: Hrozny, Ungnad, Sommer, Götze, Friedrich, and Pedersen.

Among the many uses of this particle one may make a primary division between those occurring in verbal sentences and those occurring in nominal sentences.² Most of the investigations of *-za* to date have been primarily concerned with the former category. In consequence little is known today of the rules governing the occurrence or non-occurrence of *-za* in the nominal sentence. Thus Friedrich writes in his *Hethitisches Elementarbuch* (2d ed., 1960): "*-za* steht auch in Nominalsätzen . . . aber unregelmässig; die genauen Bedingungen sind noch nicht gefunden."³ In a recent essay (1967) F. Josephson has attempted to explain the conditions for the employment of *-za* in nominal sentences and its contribution to the meaning, as follows: "Our translation is motivated by the common use of reflexive pronoun with the verb *eš* "to be" and in nominal clauses, mostly with indication of an inherent quality or for identification and also with indication of rank or status."⁴ One is impressed and puzzled by the diversity in the meanings

¹ The following literature is cited: Hrozny, *Sprache der Hethiter* (Leipzig, 1917), pp. 96, 98, 136, 185; Ungnad, *ZDMG*, 74 (1920), 417-22; F. Sommer, *Hethitisches II* (*Boghazköi-Studien*, VII) [1922], 18² and 39²; Götze, *Arch. Or.*, 5 (1933), 3-16; Götze-Pedersen, *Mursilis' Sprachlähmung* (1934), pp. 38-40, 80-83; J. Friedrich, *OLZ*, 1936, cols. 306-10; Pedersen, *Hittitisch und die anderen indoeuropäischen Sprachvergleichen* (1938), p. 60; Sommer, *HAB* (1938), 38, pp. 114⁴, 178. A few observations on the orthographic representation and the uses of *-z(a)* in the Hittite laws can be found in O. Carruba, V.

Souček, and R. Sternemann, *Arch. Or.*, 33 (1965), 8-10. But since, as this article demonstrates, *-za* is not found in nominal sentences in Old Hittite, no cases will be found in the laws or in the last mentioned article by Carruba *et al.*

² As will be evident to the reader who examines the evidence presented here, the criteria governing the use of *-za* in nominal sentences are quite of a different order from those governing its use in sentences containing verbs other than "to be."

³ *Hethitisches Elementarbuch* (2d ed., 1960), p. 133.

⁴ *RHA*, 81 (1967), 134.

thus attributed to the particle. For what do "inherent quality," "identification," and "rank or status" share other than the obvious fact that these are all possible predicates in a nominal sentence? Furthermore, this theory cannot adequately explain the occurrence of *-za* in nominal sentences with an adverbial predicate, such as: *nu-za ma-a-an HUR.SAG-i nu-za ma-a-an ú-e-el-lu-ú-i nu-za ha-a-ri-ya ku-wa-pi-it-za im-ma ku-wa-pi*, "if you are in the mountain, if you are in the meadow, (if) you are in the valley, or wherever you are" (IX 27 + i 40-42; see further below). An inherent quality is something permanent, a rank or status something temporary, and an identification could be either. Such a definition of the conditions for the use of *-za* in the nominal sentence is, therefore, unsatisfactory.

I believe that the conditions are much simpler and have nothing significant to contribute to the "meaning" of the nominal sentences in which the particle occurs. The determining factor is the person of the subject. One can state the rule at the outset as follows. *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.⁵

Before proceeding to the first set of examples let us keep in mind the complementary distribution (mutual substitutability) of *-za* and the oblique enclitic pronoun which corresponds in person and number with the subject of the sentence.⁶ We shall see that the conditions for the use or non-use of this enclitic pronoun in the nominal sentence are the same as those which govern the occurrence of *-za*.

Since equational sentences with and without the verb "to be" (*eš-*) behave in the same way on this point, I shall include examples of both types. First, equational sentences with nominal or pronominal subject, nominal predicate, and the verb "to be" expressed: *am-mu-uk-ma-za pa-ra-a ha-an-da-a-an-za ku-it UKÛ-aš e-šu-un*, "but because I was a favored person" (Apology of Hattušiliš, I 46);⁷ *mPa-ap-pa-aš LÛu-ri-an-ni-iš e-eš-ta*, "Pappaš was the *uriyanniš*" (KBo III 34 obv i 5);⁸ *ki-i kar-di-y[a⁹-aš-ša-a]š DUMU.MEŠ e-še-er*, "these were his favorite sons" (KBo III 34 iii 17). Note that *-za* is used when the subject is a first person pronoun but not when the subject is a third person pronoun or its equivalent. Since, however, the last two examples are taken from an Old Hittite text, it will be necessary to examine further cases in order to establish the argument.

Second, equational sentences with nominal or pronominal subject, adjectival or participial predicate, and the verb "to be" expressed: *[am-m]u-uk-ma-za nu-u-wa TUR-aš e-šu-un*, "but I was still a child (or 'small'¹⁰)" (XIX 29 i 10); *nu-za ku-it-ma-an nu-u-wa TUR-aš e-šu-un* (Apology of Hattušiliš, I 12); *nu-za UTUŠI a-pé-e-ez li-in-ki-*

⁵ While failing to discern the true conditions for the particle's occurrence in the later stages of the language, Josephson does observe that "it is absent especially in the older language" (RHA, 81, 135). We may be more precise and emphatic than he and affirm that it is *never* used in the nominal sentence in Old Hittite.

⁶ Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 131-33.

⁷ Citations of the text which we shall call the "Apology of Hattušiliš" are taken from the edition by A. Götze, *MVAeG*, 29/3 (1925) with occasional corrections from A. Götze, *MVAeG*, 34/2 (1930) and E. H. Sturtevant and G. Bechtel, *A Hittite Chrestomathy* (Philadelphia, 1935).

⁸ Cited by Josephson in *RHA*, 81, 135, but with incorrect transliteration (*LÛu-ri-ya-an-ni-iš*).

⁹ Transliterate so, not *kar-di-[ia-aš-ša-aš]* with Josephson, *loc. cit.* The edition shows clear traces of what appears to be the *-y[a-* and thus accords with the somewhat "younger" spelling of I 16 ii 53 as against the older spelling *kar-di-aš-ta-aš* (without the glide) attested in the Illuyankaš Myth (KBo III 7 i 26) and found also in other portions of this very same text (*LÛu-ri-an-ni-iš* in KBo III 34 i 5 instead of **LÛu-ri-ya-an-ni-iš*).

¹⁰ We read *TUR-aš*, not *DUMU-aš*, because it is not his filiation but his age which Hattušiliš stresses.

ya-az A-NA PA-NI DINGIR.MEŠ pá-r-ku-iš e-eš-li-it, “then let me, the emperor, in the presence of the gods be free from that oath!” (KBo V 3 iv 32);¹¹ *TI-an-za-wa-za e-eš*, “be alive!” (XXXIII 106 iii 7; but cf. *ibid.* iii 27 without *-za*¹²); *nu-za ha-li-ya-aš ud-da-ni-i me-ek-ki pa-aḥ-ḥa-aš-ša-nu-wa-an-te-eš e-eš-ten*, “so be ye very vigilant concerning the matter of the night watch!” (XIII 4 ii 80–81);¹³ also with the oblique personal pronoun: *nu-uš-ma-aš ú-wi-te-na-aš na-aḥ-ḥa-an-te-eš e-eš-ten*, “so be ye afraid with regard to¹⁴ the (king’s drinking-) water!” (XIII 3 iii 22).¹⁵ Note that all cases with *-za* or the oblique enclitic pronoun exhibit a first or second person subject. Third person subjects in similar clauses do not take *-za*: *na-aš-kán ŠÀ DINGIR.MEŠ A-NA ʾIŠTAR URUŠa-mu-ḥa na-aḥ-ḥa-an-za e-eš-du*, “so let him be one who shows special reverence to Ištar of Šamuḥa among the gods!” (Apology of Hattušiliš, IV 88–89).

Third, equational sentences with nominal or pronominal subject, nominal or adjectival predicate, and no verb “to be” expressed: *am-mu-uk-ma-za ʾPu-du-ḥé-pa-aš an-na-al-li-iš GEMÉ-KA*, “I, Puduḥepaš, am your long-standing maidservant” (XXI 27 i 7); *am-mu-uq-qa-za ʾPu-du-ḥé-pa-aš ḥar-na-a-wa-aš MÍ-za*, “I, Puduḥepaš, am a woman of the birthstool”¹⁶ (XXI 27 ii 17); *an-za-a-aš-ma-wa-an-na-aš ʾIR.MEŠ ʾUTUŠi-pát*, “we are the emperor’s slaves too” (KBo V 11 iv 23); [*MÍ-a*] *n-za-wa-za MÍ-ni-li-ya-az zi-ik*, “you are a woman and of womanly disposition” (XXIV 8 + i 36);¹⁷ *zi-ik-za ku-iš*, “who are you?” (KBo V 11 iv 23); *zi-iq-qa-za ku-iš DINGIR LIM-iš*, “what kind of god are you?” (XXXIII 86 + ii 12);¹⁸ *zi-ga-az ʾIŠḥa-tal-kiš-na-aš ḥa-mi-eš-ḥi-ya-az BA ʾBARṯi wa-aš-ša-[š]i EBUR-ma-az iš-ḥar-wa-an-d[a w]a-aš-ša-ši*, “you are¹⁹ the white thorn; in spring you wear white, in fall you wear red” (XXXIII 54 + ii 13–14). In Old Hittite the *-za* is not employed in this construction: *mar-sa-an-za-wa zi-ik* (KBo III 34 ii 20). The language of the solar hymn (XXXI 127 +)²⁰ is also archaic in this respect: *ne-pi-ša-aš ták-na-aš-ša ḥu-u-la-le-eš-ni zi-ik-pát ʾUTU-uš la-lu-ki-ma-aš* (“in the circle of heaven and earth you only, O Ištanuš, are the luminary”) . . . *ḥa-an-da-a-an-za ma-ni-ya-aḥ-ḥa-ya-aš iš-ḥa-a-aš zi-ik da-an-ku-wa-ya-aš KUR-e-aš at-ta-aš an-na-aš zi-ik* (“you are a just lord of judgment, father and mother of the dark earth are you”) . . . *ḥa-an-né-eš-na-aš iš-ḥa-a-aš zi-ik* (“lord of judgment are you”) . . . *ʾUTU-uš dam-me-iš-ḥa-an-da-aš ku-ri-im-ma-ša an-tu-uḥ-ḥa?-aš at-ta-aš an-na-aš zi-ik* (“O Ištanuš, you are father and mother of the oppressed and lonely man”) (XXXI 127 + i 14–15, 20–21, 24, 35–36). With a second person plural subject: *an-da-ma-za šu-ma-aš ku-i-e-eš LÚ.MEŠ É.DIN-GIR LIM*, “but ye who are temple servants” (XIII 4 ii 59); *šu-um-me-eš-ma-aš ku-i-e-eš*

¹¹ Treaty of Šuppiluliumaš I with Hukkanaš of Hayaša. Edition by J. Friedrich, *Heth. Staatsverträge*, II (MVAeG 34/1, 1930), 103–63.

¹² Cited by Josephson, *RHA*, 81 (1967), 135.

¹³ Sturtevant and Bechtel, *op. cit.*, pp. 156–57.

¹⁴ Both *uwitenaš* (plur.) and *uddani* (sg.) in the preceding examples are datives and must be rendered “in regard to” or “concerning” (Friedrich, *Heth. Elementarbuch*, p. 121).

¹⁵ ANET, p. 207.

¹⁶ On this expression see Hoffner, *JNES*, 27 (1968), 198⁴.

¹⁷ The repetition of *-z(a)* in this phrase shows that we are dealing with a double predicate: *MÍ-anza-wa-za MÍ-ni-li-a-z zik*.

¹⁸ In Latin a formal distinction exists between the interrogative pronoun (*quis, quid*, “who?”) and the interrogative adjective (*quī, quae, quod* “which?”).

This formal distinction does not exist in Hittite, where *kuis* and *kuid* can be employed as interrogative pronoun (“who?” “what?”) or adjective (“which?”).

¹⁹ The repetition of *-az* (= *-za*) in *zi-ga-az* and *ḥa-mi-es-ḥi-ya-az* makes it impossible to translate: “You, O white thorn, wear . . .”

²⁰ On this hymn consult the fundamental study by H. G. Güterbock *JAOS*, 78 (1958), 237 ff. As regards the age of the solar hymn, Professor Güterbock has already demonstrated that the portion from which my examples have been taken may be traced back to the period of Kantuzziliš, i.e., just before the beginning of the Amarna Age (*ibid.*, pp. 238 and 242). While this does not entitle us to call it Old Hittite, it gives a firm basis for explaining this apparent archaism as a carry-over from the pre-imperial period into the first generation of the empire.

LÚ.MEŠ SAG, “ye who are grandees” (XXVI 1 i 6; also *ibid.* iii 45; but cf. *ibid.* iii 61 without *-šmaš*²¹). In the older language neither the *-za* nor the *-šmaš* was required: LÚ.MEŠ *IL-KI-wa šu-me-eš*, “you are men bound to render the *ILKU*-tax” (Hittite laws §55). An understanding of the conditions for the occurrence of *-za* or the oblique enclitic pronouns in nominal sentences can occasionally help in identifying the subject, when it is unexpressed: *nu-za ma-a-an pár-ku-wa-a-e-eš*, “if you are pure” (XIII 4 iv 53);²² *ták-ku-za pa-ap-ra-an-te-eš-ma*, “but if ye are impure” (XIII 4 iv 54);²² *ma-an-wa-za ša-a-an-te-eš*, “if ye are angry” (XV 32 i 46); *am-mu-uk-ma-wa-kán 1-EN HAL-ŠÍ ku-in da-li-ya-at nu-wa-za ŠA 1-EN HAL-ŠÍ LUGAL-uš 1?-aš*, “I alone am king of the one fortress which he left to me” (Apology of Hattušiliš, III 70–71); *in-na-ra-u-wa-aš-ma-aš da-a-ri-ya-an-te-eš KUR.KUR.MEŠ URU Ha-at-ti-ma-wa hu-u-ma-an-da 1ŠTAR A-NA mHa-at-tu-ši-li EGIR-an-da ne-eš-hu-un*, “on your own (*innara*) ye (oblique *-šmaš* for *-za*) are weak (*dariyanteš*²³), but I, Ishtar, have turned all of the Hittite lands after Hattušiliš” (Apology of Hattušiliš, IV 21–23);²⁴ and even in the nominal sentence with adverbial predicate: *nu-za ma-a-an HUR.SAG-i nu-za ma-a-an ú-e-el-lu-ú-i nu-za ha-a-ri-ya ku-wa-pi-it-za im-ma ku-wa-pi*, “if you are in the mountain, (if) you are in the meadow, (if) you are in the valley, or wherever you are” (IX 27 + i 40–42). It is the presence of *-za* in these sentences which requires that they be not translated with third person subjects.

In all nominal sentences with third person subjects neither *-za* nor the oblique enclitic pronouns are employed: *ku-it-wa wa-aš-túl-ti-it*, “what is your sin?” (XXIV 8 i 45); *ku-iš-wa-ra-aš a-ši DUMU-aš*, “who is he, this child?” (Song of Ullikummiš, 1st Tablet A iv 14);²⁵ *ki-i-wa ku-it*, “what is this?” (KBo VI 34 i 30); *nu ku-iš ta-a-an pé-e-da-aš DUMU-RU*, “he who is a second-rank son” (BoTU 23A ii 37); *nu ku-iš TUR.MÍ ha-an-te-ez-zi-iš*, “then she who is a first-rank daughter” (BoTU 23A ii 38); *A-NA A-BI-YA-ma-aš mMur-ši-DINGIR LÍ . . . DUMU NIN-ŠU A-NA 1UTUŠI-ma-aš a-an-ni-in-ni-ya-mi-iš*, “to my father, Muršiliš, he is a nephew, but to (me,) the emperor he is a cousin” (XXI 1 iii 34–36); *MU.KAM-za-wa-ta še-er te-e-pa-u-e-eš-ša-an-za*, “the year is too short for you (literally, ‘the year is short upon you’)” (KBo IV 4 iii 24; AM 124); *e-ku-na-ša-aš na-aš Ú-UL g[e-en-zu-wa-la-aš]*, “he is cold; he is not tender-hearted” (I 16 ii 7); *ták-ku dan-na-at-ta-an-ma*, “but if it (the vineyard) is bare” (Hittite laws 107); *mi-iš-ri-wa-an-za hu-u-ma-an-da-az-za aš-ša-nu-wa-an-za*, “(she was) beautiful and endowed with every (charm)” (XXXIII 121 ii 5–6); *pár-ku-i-ša-aš a-pa-a-aš mi-iš-ri-wa-an-za a-pa-a-aš har-ki-ša-aš a-pa-a-aš na-aš hu-u-ma-an-da-az a-ša-nu-wa-an-za*, “she is pure, she is beautiful, she is fair, and she is endowed with every (charm)” (KBo IV 6 i 13–14). No *-za* is to be found either in the nominal sentences with third person subjects unexpressed: *al-wa-an-za-tar*, “(it is) sorcery” (Hittite laws §45); *DI.KUD LUGAL*, “(it is) a case for the king” (Hittite laws §45); *hu-u-ur-ki-il*, “(it is) an abomination” (Hittite laws §195). Note, however, that all three examples just cited are Old Hittite.

²¹ Josephson, *RHA*, 81 (1967), 134–35.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ That the verbal base *d/tariya-* has a meaning something like “to exert oneself” or “to be exhausted, weak” has been the suggestion of H. G. Güterbock since *Oriens*, 10 (1957), 358 f. The participle *dariyanteš* according to this view would mean “weak, without strength,” and would accord well with the contrast (*-ma*) afforded by the following clause.

²⁴ Unacceptable to me are the translations of A. Götze, *Hatt.*, pp. 33 and 100², A. Kammenhuber (MSS 3, 1953, 41), and E. H. Sturtevant, *A Hittite Chrestomathy* (1935), pp. 79 and 97, although the latter correctly analyzes *innara-wa-šmaš*.

²⁵ Text in *JCS*, 5 (1951), 22 with translation by Güterbock on page 23.

It should be clear from the many sentences adduced from Hittite texts in the preceding paragraphs that, whether or not the verb “to be” is expressed, the conditions are the same for the occurrence of the reflexive particle *-za* or its replacement, the oblique enclitic pronoun referring back to the subject. These conditions are: that in texts composed after the reign of Šuppiluliumaš I, if the subject of the nominal sentence is a first or second person pronoun expressed or only implied, the presence of either *-za* or the oblique enclitic first or second person pronoun is required. If, on the contrary, the subject of such a sentence is a noun or a third person pronoun expressed or implied, neither *-za* nor the oblique enclitic pronoun is required.

In order to illustrate this rule in another manner I shall adduce a passage in which two nominal sentences (both with the verb “to be” expressed) are in immediate juxtaposition. The subject of the first is a noun (i.e., the third person), while that of the second is a first person plural pronoun. Observe the sudden appearance of *-za*, as the subject changes: *nu DINGIR.MEŠ GIM-an ar-ḫa-ya-an a-š[a-an-zi] ú-e-ša-za QA-TAM-MA ar-ḫa-y[a-an e-šu-e-ni]*, “as the gods exist (= dwell) separately, so let us exist separately!” (XXIV 8 iv 19–20).²⁶ In contrast to the previous example note the following sentence, in which the juxtaposed nominal sentences have as their subjects second- and first-person pronouns respectively. Here we observe that *-za* is required in both cases: *ap-pa-an-wa-mu-za-kán e-eš [nu-wa]-du-za tu-uk EGIR-pa e-eš-mi*, “get behind me, and I will get behind you!” (XXXVI 35 + i 12–13).²⁷

The Old Hittite examples without *-za* or the oblique enclitic do not contradict the rule but constitute an aspect of its formulation. Several Old Hittite examples have already been adduced above. One or two more follow: *ú-ug-ga ʿAn-na-an-na-aš e-eš-mi*, “I am Annannaš” (VBoT 58 iv 3); *Ú-UL at-ta-aš-mi-iš e-eš Ú-UL(!) DUMU-aš-ti-iš e-eš-li-it*, “be not my father, and let me not be your son!” (XXVI 35 6–7).²⁸

It is interesting to note that in extremely late texts, i.e., those from the reign of Šuppiluliyamaš (= Šuppiluliumaš II), whereas we can detect a serious attempt on the part of the scribes at archaizing,²⁹ the rule which we have here formulated is observed in the same way as in other texts after the reign of Šuppiluliumaš I: *ú-uk-wa-za*³⁰ *EGIR-an e-eš*, “get behind me!” (KBo XII 64 iv 3);³¹ *nu A-BU-YA mTu-ud-ḫa-li-ya-aš LUGAL.GAL GIM[-a]n a-ša-an-za LUGAL-uš e-eš-ta . . . ú-uk-za dUTUŠI Ta-bar-na-aš*

²⁶ Professor Güterbock has pointed out to me that, since *e-šu-e-ni* is a conjectural restoration here, it might be appropriate for me to explain why I have opted for the translation “they are/exist” (*eš* “to be”) rather than “they sit” (“sitzen,” not “sich setzen”). My reasons are: (1) although exceptions do exist, it is surely the custom in the simile clauses of the type *GIM-an/maḫḫan . . . QĀTAMMA/apeniššan . . .* for the verbs to be the same in the two clauses being compared. Thus the restoration *e-šu-e-ni*, while based on no duplicate, is the most probable. (2) If *e-šu-e-ni* belongs in the second clause, then the contrast of *eš* without *-za* and *eš* with *-za* would have to be reflected in a translation: “Wie nun die Götter getrennt sitzen, ebenso wollen wir uns auch getrennt setzen,” which I would consider inappropriate to this context. The contrast of “sitzen” and “sich setzen” is not the reason for the sudden appearance of *-za* in the second clause; it is rather that the subject has changed from third to first person. Thus Friedrich’s 1950 translation “sind” and “sein” (ZA, 49,

223) is the more suitable, though of course the semantic development of “to be (in a place)” into “to dwell (in a place)” is to be assumed here.

²⁷ Discussed from a different viewpoint by this writer in *RHA*, 76 (1965), 6.

²⁸ XXVI 35 6–7 was called to my attention in regard to the absence of *-za* by Professor Laroche in a personal letter dated October 27, 1968. Laroche also notes that the absence of *-za* in nominal sentences in the *dandukišni* texts (*JCS*, 1, 187 f.) is “a hint at the archaic character of their language throughout.”

²⁹ Note in particular as archaizing the attempt to make use of the older independent pronoun form *ug* (now long since supplanted by *ammuk*).

³⁰ While the scribe uses *ug* correctly in KBo XII 38 ii 22, he has employed it incorrectly here in KBo XII 64 iv 3, where it should be the dative-locative form *ammuk* governed by the post-positional *EGIR-an*!

³¹ This passage was brought to my attention by Professor Laroche.

^mKÙ.GA.[TÚ]L-aš LUGAL.GAL LUGAL KUR ^{URU}[Ha]t-ti UR.SAG (KBo XII 38 ii 11-13, 22-24).³²

I am aware of very few genuine exceptions to this rule: *šu-um-ma-aš-ma ku-i-e-eš* LÚ.MEŠ SAG, "ye who are grandees" (XXVI 1 iii 61; but probably error for *šu-um-ma-aš-ma-za*, judging from *ibid.* i 6 and iii 45); DUMU.LÚ.ULŪ^{LU}-aš *e-šu-un*, "I was a mortal" (VI 45 iii 26 and duplicate VI 46 iii 66);³³ *nu A-NA* ^aUTUŠI *hu-u[-ma-a]n-te-es-pát pí-ra-an hu-u-i-ya-an-te-eš e-eš-ten*, "all of you must run before the emperor!" (XXVI 1 iii 13-14). The following passage earlier appeared to constitute an exception, but now appears to conform to my rule, since it probably preserves archaic features of the language of its Old Hittite forerunner:³⁴ LÚ.MEŠ AŠ-mi-iš³⁵ [*le*]-e *ki-iš-ta ga-a-i-na-aš-mi-iš le-e ki-iš-ta [a?-r]a?-aš-mi-iš a-ra-a-aš-mi-⟨iš⟩ e-eš*, "you must not become my equal(?), you must not become my in-law; be my friend(?) and comrade!" (XXIX 1 i 12-13; for another translation cf. Goetze in ANET 357).

To summarize: the first and second person pronouns, when they constitute the subject of the nominal sentence, demand *-za* or its oblique enclitic pronoun stand-in. Stated differently, when the subject of the nominal sentence is either the speaker or his addressee(s) or both ("inclusive 'we'"), the reflexive pronoun is required. When the subject of the nominal sentence is a person or object not involved in the discourse as either addressor or addressee, no need is felt for the reflexive.

Like all rules of grammar this one must be judged by (1) its ability to organize and interpret the phenomena, (2) its applicability in the largest possible percentage of attested cases, and (3) its simplicity. In precisely these three areas the rule which has just been proposed and illustrated represents a considerable advance over previous attempts to explain the conditions for the use of *-za* in nominal sentences.³⁶

³² H. G. Güterbock, *JNES*, 26 (1967), 76 and 78.

³³ Because the particle *-za* is lacking in both copies, this is not just a slip in one "manuscript."

³⁴ Professor Güterbock informs me that XXIX 1 has all the characteristics of the old language. He further informs me that when he checked Bo 1299 (= XXIX 3, an older duplicate of XXIX 1) in the museum at Istanbul, he found that it is in the Old Hittite writing. It is his opinion therefore that "the big tablet (XXIX 1) is a later copy retaining many (but not all) of the peculiarities of the old original. So the lack of *-za* here may be explained by the old age of the text (or its prototype)." (The preceding is quoted from a personal letter of February 13, 1969 with Professor Güterbock's permission.)

³⁵ LÚ.MEŠ AŠ-mi-iš, which occurs in Hittite texts only here, is translated by Goetze: "my rival" (J. B. Pritchard, *ANET*², p. 357; italics are Goetze's). The basis for this translation, which has never been explained in print by Professor Goetze, is apparently the following. The sign AŠ, when given the Sumerian pronunciations **ru* (*ru-ú*) or **deli* (*de-li*, *de-e-li*), is defined in Akkadian by the adjective *gimālu*, "equal

(in size or rank)" (cf. Deimel, *ŠL* II 1:10; *CAD*, G, pp. 110-11). Other Akkadian values for the sign AŠ given by Deimel are *amēlu* and *zikaru*, "man," and *ēdu/wēdum* and *dēlum* (the latter a Sumerian loan from *deli*), "single, solitary, lonely man; only child" (*CAD*, D, p. 129; *CAD*, E, pp. 36-38). The function of the plural marker MEŠ in our Hittite passage is unclear, as indeed the entire passage is! What is clear, however, is the fact that *eš-* (and even *kiš-!*) does not take *-za* in Old Hittite, even when the subject of the sentence is a first or second person pronoun or its equivalent.

³⁶ Professor Güterbock informs me that he was unaware of this rule before seeing my manuscript, but he has been fully aware for many years now of the function of *-za* in determining when a juxtaposition of nouns must be understood as subject and predicate of a nominal sentence. Compare his observations in *ZA*, 39 (1930), 18, *JAOS*, 65 (1945), 254, and *JNES*, 26 (1967), 74⁴. In fact *ZA*, 39 (1930), 18 brings to our attention still another instance of our rule in action: *ŠEŠ-YA na-ak-ki-iš-mu-za ŠEŠ-a[š(?)]*, "MY brother! Thou art a revered brother to me!"