

KANIŠŠUWAR

A TRIBUTE TO HANS G. GÜTERBOCK

ON HIS
SEVENTY-FIFTH BIRTHDAY
May 27, 1983

Edited by

HARRY A. HOFFNER, JR.

and

GARY M. BECKMAN



THE ORIENTAL INSTITUTE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

ASSYRIOLOGICAL STUDIES · No. 23

CHICAGO · ILLINOIS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
EDITORS' FOREWORD	vii
BETROTHAL OF GIRLS DURING CHILDHOOD IN ANCIENT ASSYRIA AND ANATOLIA. <i>Kemal Balkan</i>	1
INHERITANCE AND ROYAL SUCCESSION AMONG THE HITTITES. <i>Gary Beckman</i>	13
NEW BOGHAZKÖY JOINS AND DUPLICATES. <i>Howard Berman</i>	33
BILDLICHE DARSTELLUNGEN HATTUŠILI'S III. IN ÄGYPTEN. <i>Kurt Bittel</i>	39
DIE 3. PERS. SING. DES POSSESSIVPRONOMENS IM LUWISCHEN. <i>Onofrio Carruba</i>	49
LE NOM DE MATIWAZA SUR UN SCEAU HIÉROGLYPHIQUE. <i>H. Gonnet</i>	53
HITTITE FRAGMENTS IN PRIVATE COLLECTIONS. <i>O. R. Gurney</i>	59
STUDIES IN HIEROGLYPHIC LUWIAN. <i>J. D. Hawkins and</i> <i>A. Morpurgo Davies</i>	69
STUDIES IN HITTITE GRAMMAR. <i>Harry A. Hoffner, Jr.</i>	83
BRIEF COMMENTS ON THE HITTITE CULT CALENDAR: THE OUTLINE OF THE AN.TAḪ.ŠUM FESTIVAL. <i>Philo H. J. Houwink ten Cate</i>	95
DIE HETHITISCHEN FRAGMENTE FHL 68 UND 106. <i>Annelies</i> <i>Kammenhuber</i>	111
THE TELEPINU MYTH RECONSIDERED. <i>Galina Kellerman</i>	115
"THE GOSPEL OF IRON". <i>Silvin Košak</i>	125
HITTITE <i>nakkuš</i> — <i>nakkuššiš</i> . <i>Emmanuel Laroche</i>	137
EIN aA VERTRAG ÜBER GEMEINSAME HAUSHALTUNGSFÜHRUNG AUS DER ZEIT DER KÜLTEPE-SCHICHT I ^b . <i>L. Matouš</i>	141
ZUR DATIERUNG DER HETHITISCHEN PFERDETEXTE. <i>Erich Neu</i>	151
EIN RITUAL VON AŠDU, DER HURRITERIN. <i>H. Otten</i>	165
SOME RARE OBJECTS FROM THE KARUM OF KANISH. <i>Tahsin Ozgüç</i>	173
SUPPLEMENT TO THE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF HANS GUSTAV GÜTERBOCK	185
INDEX	189

STUDIES IN HITTITE GRAMMAR

HARRY A. HOFFNER, JR.

The University of Chicago

Hans Güterbock has contributed more than any other living scholar to the elucidation of Hittite grammar. It is an honor for me to offer this small study to him on his seventy-fifth birthday, when his insight into the Hittite language has never been greater.

A. ON THE NEGATIVE *natta*

1. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Hrozný, SH (1917) 184 ("nicht", wr. also *Ú-UL* and *NU*; erroneously added *ne-et-ta*); Zimmern, OLZ 1922:297; Sommer, AU (1932) 41, 98, 384f. (mostly concerned with the meaning "nein" and the use in questions); Götze, AM (1933) 255 (wr. *na-at-ta* once in Murš. II); Friedrich, HE (1940) par. 285, 288–90 (= HE² 279, 281–83) (excellent summary of usage); Carruba, ZDMG Suppl. 1 (1968, printed 1969) 235 (on diachronic distribution of *na-at-ta* and *Ú-UL* writings); Houwink ten Cate, Records (1970) 49 (on the vacillation between *na-at-ta* and *Ú-UL* in MH texts); Kammenhuber, KZ 83:269, 278 (denying validity of writings *na-at-ta* and *Ú-UL* as a criterion for text dating); Mauer in THeth 9 (1979) 163 (repeating Kammenhuber's point of view).

2. THE WRITING OF *natta*

a. Syllabic writings

It is agreed by all that pronounced *natta* underlies the ideographic writings. That the same spoken word underlies all writings does not, however, alter the fact that in the vast majority of instances scribes writing in the earliest period (all OS texts and most MH/MS ones) wrote that word syllabically (*na-at-ta*), while with a mere handful of exceptions scribes writing new compositions in NH wrote either *Ú-UL* or *UL* (so already Carruba 1968). The spelling *na-at-ta* in a new NH composition was first noted by Götze (AM

255, noting KBo 5.8 i 21). Other examples are StBoT 16 obv. 5, 11 (Tudh. IV), KBo 18.28 iv 7 (NH letter), KUB 28.80 iv 11 (NH colophon with archaizing writings like *da-i-e-er* [iv 6] and *ku-u-ru-*...), KBo 1.30:5, 7 (NH vocab.). Examples from pre-NH/NS texts prove only that the NH scribe followed the convention of his pre-NH original in writing the word syllabically.

The writing *na-at*, which occurs once in OS (KBo 6.2 iv "55") and twice in OH/NS (KBo 3.28:19, KUB 12.63 i 32), may be a mistake for *na-at-ta*. KBo 6.2 iv "55" (OS, law 98) was read "*na-at* 'ne - pas'!" by Hrozný (Code Hitite 76). Friedrich (HG 48 n. 4) read *na-at*-[*ta*], but the spacing of signs on the tablet does not permit the assumption that the last sign of *na-at-ta* was separated from the rest of the word, since there was apparently another word which followed it on this line. For further discussion of law 76, utilizing the wording of its duplicate KBo 6.3 see the article by E. Laroche in this volume.

Yet the fact that this same writing *na-at* occurs three times, all in texts originally written in OH, makes one wonder if such a strange writing might be evidence for a rare variant of this word. It is understandable how *na-at* "not" might have been avoided in order to prevent confusion with *n=at* "and it". The writing *na-at-ta* could only be confused with *n=at=ta* "and they/it (to) you", a combination which never occurs, being replaced by *ne-et-ta* (*n=e=ta*) KBo 4.10 rev. 12.

b. Akkadographic Ú-UL and UL

Mauer (THeth 9:163) claimed that the writing *UL* (versus Ú-*UL*) provides a criterion for dating a text to the 13th century, but gave no evidence to support this assertion. Kühne (StBoT 16:26 n. 17) gave 'einige Belege' but claimed that scribes already in the mid-14th century occasionally wrote *UL*.

The writing *UL* (with one sign) occurs in late NS copies of texts whose originals date from OH. Thus, it is found in a copy of the Telepinu myth (KUB 33.4 and KUB 33.8, CTH 324). It can also be found in a late copy of the MH *BÊL MADGALTI* instruction (KUB 40.57 iv 8). It occurs regularly in copy A (KUB 13.4) of CTH 264 (instructions for the temple personnel, pre-NH/NS), contrasting with Ú-*UL* in the other copies. It is found twice in copies of Muršili II annals (KUB 14.17 iii 6 [written over onto the obverse, where cramped space dictated the shorter *UL*], KBo 16.6 lower edge 3), and in a copy of Muršili II's prayer to Telepinu (KUB 24.1 iii 20). But it first occurs with any frequency in texts composed after the reign of Muwatalli. The Muwatalli texts CTH 76, 171, 381 and 382 have 34 examples of Ú-*UL*, and none of *UL*. The writing Ú-*UL* continues either exclusively or along with *UL* in the following texts composed after Muwatalli: (Numbers separated by a colon express the ratio of occurrences of Ú-*UL* to *UL*.) The Apol-

ogy of Ḫattušili III (CTH 81) 35:2. Puduḫepa's letter to Egypt (CTH 176) 30:5. Ukkura inquest (CTH 293) 34:0. KUB 5.1 (CTH 561: oracles on campaigns of Ḫatt. III) seems to use *UL* exclusively, while the similar text KUB 5.3+ (CTH 563.1) has 4:5. KBo 4.10 (CTH 106: Ulmitešup) 5:0. One Tudḫ. IV instr. (CTH 255.2) uses *Ú-UL* exclusively, while the other (CTH 255.1) prefers *Ú-UL* to *UL* by a 19:6 ratio. The Šaušgamuwa treaty has 7:0 and 2 examples of *na-at-ta*. Cult inventories of Tudḫ. IV (CTH 525) about 3:12. Šuppiluliyama II: KBo 12.38 (CTH 121) 0:4. KBo 4.14 (CTH 123) 12:9. KUB 26.32++ (CTH 124) 0:6. From the foregoing evidence it could be concluded that the writing *UL* (versus *Ú-UL*) first appears in copies made in the reign of Ḫattušili III and becomes common only in Šuppiluliyama II texts. But it should be noted that, even after *UL* appears in the reign of Ḫattušili III, it is only preferred by scribes of certain texts, usually oracle texts or cult inventories. The Šuppiluliyama I oracle text cited by Kühne (StBoT 16:26) contains only a single example of *UL* (KUB 18.2 ii 17), and since oracle texts were sometimes recopied (cf. CTH 562.2 and 568), one cannot be absolutely certain that KUB 18.2 was a 14th century original.

c. NU and the negation of GÁL

The NU which in oracle texts occurs in the combinations NU.SIG₅ and NU.ŠE does not stand for a separate negative word (*natta* or *lē*). Rather NU.SIG₅ and NU.ŠE represent a single verb which means "to be unfavorable" (Sommer, HAB 91 n. 1).

In DUMU-*miš=a* NU(.)DUMU-*aš* KBo 3.27 (BoTU 10β) 14, it is extremely unlikely that NU.DUMU stands for a noun meaning "no son". More likely the NU represents *natta* (Sommer, HAB 212).

Another example of NU standing for *natta* is GIM-*anmamu* ABU-KA LÚ^{LÚ}LIṬŪTI . . . NU SUM "But when your father didn't give me the hostages . . ." KUB 19.55 + KUB 48.90 lower edge 4 (Milawata letter, 13th century). Here it is very unlikely that NU.SUM stands for a negative verb ("withheld"). Much more likely is the assumption that this stands for *natta pešta* (Hoffner, AfO Beiheft 19:134).

NU.GÁL stands for *natta ēšzi/ašanzi* "do(es) not exist". OS: *kāni* LÚŠU. GI-*eš=a* NU.GÁL "Are there here no old men?" KBo 22.1:6, cf. CHD sub *miyaḫuwant-*; OH/post-OS: *šarnikzel* NU.GÁL Laws 21, 37, 38, 42, 49, 90; *ḫarātār=šet* NU.GÁL Law 197; *takku* URU-*aš* NU.GÁL Late parallel version to law 6; [*takk*]u INA LÌB-BI NIM.LÀL NU.GÁL Law 92; *takku* IN.NU.DA [*a*]nda NU.GÁL Law 100; *takku=at ēšzi takku=at* NU.GÁL (= *natta ēšzi*) KUB 1.16 ii 54 (OH/NS); *takku* DUMU.LUGAL *ḫantezziš* NU.GÁL . . . *mān* DUMU.LUGAL-*ma* DUMU.NITA NU.GÁL KBo 3.1 ii 36-7 (OH/NS); MH: ERÍN.MEŠ.ḪI.A=*ma=wa=kan* ANŠE.KUR.RA.ḪI.A

anda NU.GÁL Mašat 75/15:11–12 (MH/MS); *kā=wa* NU.GÁL *kuiški* Mašat 75/104:16 (MH/MS). Sometimes *natta ēšzi* is written *UL* Ì.GÁL or NU Ì.GÁL: [*nu ku*]edani ANA DINGIR-LIM LÚ É DINGIR-LIM Ì.GÁL [*kue*]dani=ma ANA DINGIR-LIM LÚ É DINGIR-LIM NU Ì.GÁL KBo 13.72 rev. 4–5; [...] *UL* Ì.GÁL KBo 12.64 iv 5 (treaty fragment, 13th Cent.); [*kuitki*] Ì.GÁL *kuitki=pat* NU Ì.GÁL KUB 40.88 iii 9 (deposition, NH), ed. StBoT 4:22f.; *mān* ANA É.GÁL É ^dUTU-aš *maršaštarreš UL kuiški* Ì.GÁL KUB 5.9 obv. 9 (oracle, 13th Cent.).

It is not necessary to use a syllabically written form of *eš-* to specify the present tense in this construction. To express the past tense, however, it is necessary to do so: *nu=ššan kappuwawar* NU.GÁL *ēšta* KBo 3.4 ii 43–4, iii 35, 54, KUB 14.15 iii 52 (all AM); URU BÀD EGIR-pa *appannaš AŠRU* NU.GÁL *kuiški ēšta* KBo 5.8 ii 24–5 (AM); *nu=mu=kan ŠÀ KUR* ^{URU}Hattī SAL-TUM NU.GÁL *ēšta* KUB 21.38 obv. 52 (Pud.); GIM-an *wātar* NU.GÁL *ē[šta]* KUB 14.3 i 42 (Taw.).

3. THE POSITION OF *natta* IN THE CLAUSE

a. The normal position

The normal position of *natta* in the verbal clause is before the verb (HE 281). OS: *takku šumeš natta šaktēni* KBo 22.1:5, cf. *ibid.* 25, 26, 30; *luzzi natta karpīezzi* KBo 6.2 ii 40; *šahhan natta iššer* *ibid.* iii 15; *š=uš LÚ-aš natta aušzi* StBoT 8 iv 22; *nikuš=šmuš natta ganeššir* KBo 22.2 obv. 18 (cf. 17) (StBoT 17); [*takku n*]atta=ma *uwaši* KBo 7.14 obv. 5; MH/MS: *ŪL šanḥuanzi* KBo 15.10 ii 76; *ŪL dammišhaizzi* Mašat 75/113:17 (FsLaroche 30); NH: *ŪL takšulait* KBo 5.6 ii 10 (DŠ frag. 28); NUMUN *ŪL annieškir* Hatt. ii 16 (= B ii 1).

b. *natta*, *lē*, *nawi* and the preverbs

natta usually comes between the preverb and the verb (Friedrich, HE 281), but there are many examples of the reverse order. The same is true for the negative *lē*, but all known examples of *nawi* follow the preverb. The following examples, listed by preverbs, will supplement the few examples given by Friedrich. By “preverb” I mean here such words as *anda*, *andan*, *appa*, *appan*, *arḥa*, *katta*, *kattan*, *parā*, *šarā*. I am well aware that some Hittitologists prefer to call these adverbs. Members of this group, however, are more closely associated with the finite verb than are such other adverbs as *kinun*, *apiya*, *hūdāk*, etc.

***anda*:** *našta andaya ŪL kuinki tarnai* IBoT 1.36 i 73 (MH/MS); *andatkan lē*

IGI-wantarinuškāzi KUB 13.2 iii 7 (MH/NS); *anda* ŪL uit Alakš. B i 11; *anda* ŪL dalaḥḥun Alakš. A i 76; *anda* ŪL kuiški peššiškī KUB 13.35+ i 20 (StBoT 4:4); *anda* ŪL kuiški KAR-zi KUB 15.1 ii 32–33 (Hatt. III); *anda* ŪL tiyami KUB 26.32 + 23.44 + 31.106 iii 13–14; but; ŪL kuitki *anda* ešun KUB 21.19 (+ KUB 14.7) i 19, KUB 14.7 i 15; ŪL *anda* ešun KUB 21.19 i 35, ii 5; *nukan* ŪL-ma *anda* šalikmi KUB 5.1 i 29, cf. ii 10, 54. *lē* and *nawi*: mostly *anda* + *lē* + vb.—[(BĀD-ešni)=ya=kan a]nda *lē* kuiški warnuz[(zi)] KUB 31.86 ii 28–29 w. dupl. KUB 31.89 ii 16–17 (MH/NS); *puruttiyaššan* (var. *puruttešni*) GUD UDU . . . *anda* *lē* tarniškanzi ibid. ii 24–25 w. dupl. KUB 31.89 ii 12; *arahzenaš=a=kan anturiyaš=a* [(ANA AN.ZA.G)ÀR] . . . ^{GIŠ}zup=paru *anda* *lē* kuiški dāi ibid. ii 26–27 w. dupl. KUB 31.89 ii 14, etc.; but rarely reversed (2x in Muw.): ANA KUR-TI-matkan *lē* *anda* šanḫti KBo 11.1 obv. 39 (contra rev 8!); *tapa*[riyawamu]zakan *lē* *anda* kištati KUB 14.3 i 20–21; *nawi*: *andaššan* parna *nawi* paizzi law 93. The subject of word order of *anda*(n) with the negatives was not raised in Kammenhuber, FsOttēn 141–160 or in HW² 105b (IV 4. Prāv.).

appa(n)/EGIR-pa/EGIR-an: [ūk idalu āp]pa ŪL iyammi KUB 1.16 iii 24 (OH/NS); [aruna]n tarmami nu *appa* natta laḥui KUB 31.4 + KBo 3.41:14 (OH/NS); GUD-unašta ḥāliaz *appa* ŪL kuššanqa karšun KUB 30.10 obv. 15 (OH/MS); zig=aš *appa* Ū[L paitta] KUB 14.1 rev. 35 (MH/MS); karū=za šumenzan É.DINGIR.MEŠ-K[UN]U EGIR-an anzel [iwar] ŪL kuiški kap=pūwan ḥarta KUB 17.21 i 7–8 (MH/MS); cf. ibid. i 12, 17; numukan IGI.ḪI.A-wa ^{LÚ}KÚR EGIR-pa ŪL kuiški nāiš Hatt. i 68–69; but: nuwašmaš KASKAL.ḪI.A ŪL EGIR-pa ḥišwandari ABoT 60 obv. 17 (MH/MS). With *lē* the word order is always *appa*(n) *lē*, never the reverse: tat *appa* šarā *lē* uēzzi StBoT 8 iii 12–13 (OS); ^dTelepinuwaš=a . . . šāwar *appa* QĀTAMMA *lē* uizzi KUB 17.10 iii 26f., cf. iv 19; n=at=apa EGIR-pa *lē* uizzi KBo 15.10 ii 16, iii 58 (MH/MS); nušmaš kī uttar NĪŠ DINGIR.MEŠ EGIR-an *lē* tarnanzi KBo 5.3 ii 7, cf. 50–51. HW² 149 does not list a preverbal function for *appa* and only suggests a possible one for *appan* (“Vielleicht schon Prāv.”), referring to VI 2b (pp. 153f.), where however only an adverbial function is mentioned. No mention is made of word order with *natta* or *lē*.

arḥa: arḥawa ^{LÚ}.MEŠSIPA.GUD . . . ŪL dališkizzi ABoT 60 obv. 12–13 (MH/MS); iктаš=ma=du=ššan irḥaz ŪL naḥšariyawanza arḥa ŪL uizzi KBo 3.21 ii 17–18 (OH?/NS); nu namma arḥa ŪL tarnāi KUB 13.4 ii 23–24 (pre-NH/NS); nu ḥurpaštanuḥ arḥa ŪL išḫuwai KUB 29.1 iv 18–19 (NH); nu=šši=ššan ^dUTU-ŠI ^{URU}Iyaruwattan URU-an arḥa ŪL dahḫi KBo 3.3+ i 31–32 (NH); no counterexamples known. With *lē* only *arḥa* *lē* is attested: zikka=war=ašta ^{GIŠ}luttan[za] arḥa *lē* autti KUB 17.6 i 19–20; našta arḥa *lē* kuitki (var. kuiški) ḥarkzi KUB 31.86 ii 15; natkan ziladuwa ŠA ^mUlmitešup:war[watni] arḥa *lē* kuiški dāi KBo 4.10 rev. 22–23. *nawi*: kuitmanwa ḥanneš=

šar arħa nawi ariyaweni KBo 16.47:16–17. HW² 259–287 makes no reference to the syntax of the negated *arħa* + vb.

katta, kattān, kattanta: GAL-yaz KÁ.GAL-az *katta ŪL paiškanda* IBoT 1.36 i 60 (MH/MS); *numu namma kattān ŪL kuiški uizzi* ABoT 60 rev. 6–7 (MH/MS); *INA KUR^{URU} Alminawarankan kattanta ŪL kuwatka tarnummeni* KBo 5.6 i 4–5 (DŠ frag. 28); but *ŪL-wa kuššanka katta ēpta* KUB 24.8 i 28–29, 33–34 (pre-NH/NS). *lē* and *nawi: našta* . . . GUD UDU [URU]-az *katta lē tarnanzi* KUB 13.2 i 7f.; *našta kuitman ħaliaz^{LÚ.MEŠ} ħaliyatalleš katta nawi uwanzi* KUB 13.1 + i 6–7. There are no examples of *lē katta(n)* or *nawi katta(n)*.

parā: *nankan parā ŪL kuiški tarnai* laws 34 and 36; *nat ANA^d UTU-ŠI parā Ū[L paitta]* KUB 14.1 rev. 23 (MH/MS); *parā ŪL pīe[zzī]* IBoT 1.36 i 31, (MH/MS); *ZI-itmaškan parā ŪL paizzi* ibid. i 47; *kuiš ŠA KUR^{URU} Ĥatti NAM.RA.ĤI.A parā ŪL pāi Ĥuqq.* iii 69; cf. iii 71; *nat DINGIR.MEŠ-aš ZI-ni parā ŪL arnuteni* KUB 13.4 i 51 (pre-NH/NS); *nuwamukan parā ŪL iyašħatta* KBo 5.6 iv 3 (DŠ frag. 28 A); no counterexamples are known. In the imperative most examples are *parā lē: apušmakan parā lē uwanzi* KUB 13.8:8 (MH), *parāmaškan lē kuiški tarnai* ibid. 9, *parāmaškan . . . lē kuiški pāi* ibid. 14–15; [*nūza*] *memian parā lē kuedanikki [mem]atteni* KUB 26.8 ii 6–7, but *lēwaranzan kuedanikki [parā] mematti* KUB 26.1 i 58–59 (same text, restored by von Schuler, Dienstanw. 11).

šarā: *našta namma šarā ŪL uizzi* KUB 17.10 iv 16–17 (OH/MS), cf. Myth. 37; *nušmaš . . . EZEN.ĤI.A kiššan šarā ŪL kuiški tittanuwan ħarta* KUB 17.21 i 21–23 (MH/MS); *mān 12^{LÚ.MEŠ} MEŠEDI-ma šarā ŪL arta* IBoT 1.36 i 11–12 (MH/MS); [*nat*] *wetinzama šarā ŪL arnuzi* KUB 31.86 ii 11 (MH/NS); no counterexamples are known. Also w. *lē: naškan šarā lē uiškitta* KUB 1.16 ii 36.

edi: *ĤUR.SAG-an tarmaemi tašta edi natta neyari* KUB 31.4:13 + KBo 3.41:12; but in a rhetorical question *ŪL DUMU.MEŠ-ŠU edi nāir* KUB 1.16 iii 41 (OH/NS).

c. *natta* and indefinite pronouns and adverbs in -ki, -ka

kuiški, kuitki, kuwapikki, kuezka, kuššanka, and kuwatka regularly follow *natta* immediately. Usually they come between *natta* and the verb. **OS:** [*i*] *dālu natta kuedanikki takkišta* KBo 3.22:8 (StBoT 18:10f.); *kušanna natta kuiški iē[zzī]* KBo 6.2 iii 17 (law 55); *kinuna natta kuwapikki pāun* StBoT 8 iv 13; **OH/MS:** *natta/ŪL kuššanka* KUB 30.10 obv. 12, 13, 15, rev. 21; *natta/ŪL kuwapikki* ibid. obv. 16, 17; *ħuišnuzzi ŪL kuiški* ibid. rev. 24–25; **OH/NS:** *LUGAL-š=a ŪL kuitki [š]aggahħi* KUB 1.16 iii 5, cf. iii 26; [*n*] *atta=šta kuitki kuedanikki dahħun* KUB 31.4 + KBo 3.41 (= BoTU 14β) 4, cf. 5, 6; **MH/MS:** *anzel [iwa]r ŪL kuiški kappūwan ħarta* KUB 17.21 i 7–8; *namma arħa ŪL*

kuēzka uwanzi ibid. iii 20; cf. ibid. i 12–13, 17–18, 20, 22–23; *ŪL kuinki tarna[i]* IBoT 1.36 i 73(bis), *ŪL kuiušga ūhḫun* KUB 23.72 obv. 20; **NH:** *nuwa ŪL kuitki šakti* KUB 19.29 iv 16 (AM 18); *numu ŪL kuiški aušta* KBo 4.4 iii 35 (AM 126); *nuwa damēdaniya KUR-e ŪL kuedanikki AŠPUR* KBo 5.6 iv 8–9; *numu :ḫuwappi DINGIR-LIM-ni :ḫuwappi DI-ešni parā ŪL kuwapikki tarnaš* Hatt. i 40–41; cf. ibid. i 49–55; *numukan ḪUL-lu uttar katta ŪL kuitki āšta* ibid. i 62; *numukan IGI.ḪI.A-wa LÚKÚR EGIR-pa ŪL kuiški nāiš* ibid. i 68–69; *nušmaškan ŪL kuezqa kuit ḫaptat* ibid. ii 76; *naš ŪL kuitki DÙ-nun* ibid. iii 27–28.

This order is observed with *lē* and *nawi* as well: *URRAM ŠĒRAM kī [tuppi l]ē kuiški ḫulliezzi* KBo 3.22 34 (OS); *nu LÚḫippari ḫāppar lē [(ku)]iški iezzi* KBo 6.2 ii 49–50 (law 48, OS); *nušši EGIR-an nawi kuitki tekkuššiyaizzi* Mšt 75/113:12–14 (MH/MS); *kinunawa ANŠE.KUR.RA.ḪI.A nawi kuiški uizzi* Mšt 75/15:15–17 (MH/MS); *nu ANA KUR LÚ.KÚR nawi kuitman kueda=nikki pāun* KBo 3.4 i 20–21 (AM 20); *nāwi kuwapik[ki] SIxSÁ-at* KUB 19.23 rev. 6–7; *nāwi kuitki ēšta* KUB 42.100 iv 15. With transposition of the verb to the head of the clause for emphasis: *ḫuišnuzzi ŪL kuiški* KUB 30.10 rev. 24–25 (OH/MS), *iyawe[n=ma]=war-at ŪL kuitki* KBo 22.6 iv 12 (OH/NS).

d. *natta* and the adverbs *manqa* and *imma*

***manqa*:** All examples of negated *manqa* are either *UL manqa* or *nūman manqa* (cf. CHD sub *manqa*). No *lē manqa* or *nawi manqa* is attested. Neither is the sequence *manqa UL/natta* found.

***imma*:** Cf. below under 4 c.

4. *natta* IN QUESTIONS

a. *Previous studies*

In 1932 Sommer observed that, when *natta* occurs in rhetorical questions, it often takes a clause initial position (AU 54 n. 4). Although not all clauses with initial *natta* are rhetorical questions, the clause initial position serves to show emphasis, which is appropriate in rhetorical questions. Sommer did not say if rhetorical questions with non-initial *natta* existed. In a lecture at the 1983 Midwest Regional Meeting of the American Oriental Society to be published soon, Güterbock noted several examples of rhetorical questions with non-initial *natta*.

This new evidence prompted me to reexamine the subject in a comprehensive manner, in order to determine what role was played by word order in negative sentences. In the corpus of Hittite texts which I examined, out of 48 examples of clause initial *natta* in adequately preserved contexts, 15 were rhetorical questions and 33 were not. This demonstrates the validity of

Sommer's remarks. Clause initial *natta* obviously functions in most cases merely to emphasize the negative, without any implication of a question. In the following paragraphs I give a selection of negative rhetorical questions, choosing for inclusion those not already cited by Güterbock, whose paper will soon be available in published form.

b. Rhetorical questions with initial natta

natta=šamaš LÚ.MEŠ DUGUD tuppi ḥazzian ḥarzi "Has (my father) not inscribed a tablet for you dignitaries?" KBo 22.1 obv. 23 (instr., OS); *natta* LÚ.MEŠ NAŠI ŠIDIDI=KUNU ibid. 17–18; ŠA LÚ GAL.GAL-TIM É-ŠUNU kuwapi ŪL-at ḥarker "Where are the houses of the grandees? Have they not perished?" KUB 1.16 iii 45 (edict, OH/NS), ed. HAB 14f.; *natta* ūk ÍD.MEŠ-uš ḤUR.SAG.MEŠ-uš arunuš=a [EGIR-p]a tarmaiškimi "Do not I . . . the rivers, mountains and seas?" KUB 31.4 + KBo 3.41:12–13 (OH/NS); ŪL-wa LUGAL-waš araš=miš zik "Are you not the friend of me, the king?" KUB 29.1 i 35 (myth and rit., OH/MS); [Ū]L-war=aš gimraš DUMU-aš "Is he not a son of the steppe?" VBoT 58 i 28 (missing god myth, OH/NS), ed. Myth 24; ŪL SAL.SUḤUR.LAL iyattat "Didn't a harem woman go by? (And he gazed at her.);" Ḥuqq. iii 54; UL=at=kan A-NA DAM-ŠU . . . [š]anḥzi "Will (the offended god) not (also) require it of his (the offender's) wife . . . ?" KUB 13.4 i 36–37 (instr., pre-NH/NS), ed. Chrest. 148f.; nuza kuēl walliyatar ŪL-za ŠA dU piḥaššašši EN-YA walliyatar "And whose praise will I be? Will I not be the praise of the Stormgod p., my lord?" KUB 6.45 iii 48–49 (prayer, Muw.); ŪL-at ŠUM[-n]i ḥandaš iyanun "Did I not do it for the sake of (my good) name?" KUB 21.38 obv. 52 (letter of Pud.), ed. Stefanini, Pud. 12; (Don't the parents give him the fee of the nurse?) ŪL=ma=an=za=an=kan duškiyazi "And don't they (attaš annaš takes sg. verbs here) rejoice in it?" KUB 14.7 iv 12–14 (prayer, Hatt. III); ŪL=war=an=kan ~~t~~etaza memiyanaz kuenni[r] KUB 8.48 i 12 (Gilg., NH); ŪL=wa ŠA LUGAL ÚŠ išiyaḥta KUB 14.4 iv 26 (Murš. II); [Ū-U]L-at=za kikkištari KBo 4.14 ii 4 (Šupp. II).

c. Rhetorical questions with non-initial natta

To Güterbock's list of six examples we may add a further sixteen: [tak]u=wa=šmaš=šta išḥar=ma šiyati ūk=ma=šmaš [IGI-a]nda zahḥiya kuwat ŪL pāimi "But if their blood has spurted forth, why should I not go against them in battle?" KBo 3.16 obv. 16–17 (Naramsin, OH/NS), ed. Güterbock, ZA 44:54f., 63 (deciding against reading the var. in B as a rhetorical question); (If a mortal were to live forever, the unpleasant illness of the man would also continue;) man=at=ši ^{and}natta kattawatar ^{were}"Wouldn't it (then) be a grievance

for h
"Wou
aršan
indee
Amer
KUB
ŪL in
up fo
indee
wa=za
i 17
<DA>
138f.
know
JAOS
ŪL in
uškat
KUR
nat Ū
KBo

The
torica
wemi
OH/N
their
OH/N
(i.e.,

ūk=
atti=m
natta
ḥuišw
KUB
ŪL n
FsOtt

for him?" KUB 30.10 obv. 23 (prayer, OH/MS); *man zik ŪL aršanieše* "Wouldn't you be upset?" ABoT 65 rev. 6 (letter, MH/MS), cf. HW² sub *aršaniya-* and CHD sub *man*; *nuwata ŪL imma peḫḫi peḫḫi=ta* "Shall I not indeed give it to you? I will give (it) to you!" VBoT 2:8-9 (letter to Amenophis III); *ug=a=wa=z ŪL imma LÚ-aš* "Am I not indeed a man?" KUB 23.72 obv. 40 (Mita text, MH/MS); *nušši attaš annaš ŠA^{SAL}UMMEDA ŪL imma pāi* KUB 14.7 iv 12-13 (cf. above); (He whom we will indeed take up for ourselves:) *nuwann[aš apaš] ŪL imma DUMU EN-E=NI* "Is he not indeed the son of our lord?" KUB 26.1 i 22-23 (instr., Tudḫ. IV); *ammuqqa=wa=z a ŪL DUMU! EN-KA* "Am I not also a son of your lord?" KUB 21.42 i 17 (cumulative line count 24); probably also *našmu ŪL imma LÚḪA-⟨DA⟩-NU* KUB 14.3 ii 75 (Taw.), despite contrary argument of Sommer, AU 138f.; *nu DINGIR.MEŠ ŪL [šekteni k]uel=aš dammešḫaš* "Do you gods not know whose is the injury?" KBo 4.8 iii 3-4 (prayer of Murš. II), ed. Hoffner, JAOS 103:188; *nutta ŪL imma peḫḫi* VBoT 2:8-9, ANA ŠEŠ-YA SAL-TUM *ŪL imma ēšta* KUB 21.38 obv. 53 (Pud.); *nu šumeš DINGIR.MEŠ ŪL uškatteni* KUB 14.4 ii 3-4 (Murš. II), cf. *ibid.* ii 8; *natmu ANA LÚ.MEŠ KUR^{URU}Ḫatti piran ŪL imma walliyatar ŪL kuit ēšta* KUB 21.38 obv. 48; *nat ŪL imma walliyatar* *ibid.* 51; *URU^{URU}Niḫiryaza=kan ŪL 1-aš arḫa unnaḫḫun* KBo 4.14 ii 9 (Šupp. II), cf. *ibid.* ii 11.

d. *natta* in non-rhetorical questions

The following examples show that negative questions which are not rhetorical always employ *natta* in non-initial position: *nuwaran kuit ḫanda ŪL wemiya[nzi]* "Why do they not find him?" VBoT 58 i 23 (missing god myth, OH/NS); *TÚG-ŠUNU^{TÚG}išḫialšemetta kuit natta ešḫa[š]kanta* "Why are their garments and their sashes not bloodied?" KBo 3.34 i 20 (anecdotes, OH/NS); *kuwat=war=an parā ŪL pe[šti]* "Why will you not extradite them (i.e., *arnuwalan*)?" Ḫuqq. iii 71, ed. SV 2:130f.

5. *natta* NEGATING THE PREDICATE OF A NOMINAL SENTENCE

a. *An adjective or participle*

ūk=wa a[tti]=m[i natt]a āššuš KBo 22.2 rev. 4-5 (OS) with NS dupl. *ūk=wa atti=mi ŪL āššuš* KBo 3.38 rev. 20; *takku kuššan piyan . . . takku kuššan=a natta piyan* KBo 6.2 ii 28-29 (OS); *dandukišnaš=a DUMU-aš ukturi natta ḫuišwanza* KUB 30.10 obv. 21 (OH/MS); *ekunaš=aš n=aš ŪL g[enzuwalaš]* KUB 1.16 ii 7 (OH/NS); *nutta⟨⟨ma⟩⟩ mān* SAG.DU^dUTU-ŠI QĀTAMMA *ŪL nakkiš* KBo 5.3 i 19-20 (Ḫuqq.) (note: Contra Houwink ten Cate, FsOtt 133 n. 77 the emendation is necessary. *nu* and *-ma* can indeed stand

in the same clause, but not in the same chain of introductory sentence particles. The example *nu[-uš-m]a-aš-ma* in KBo 5.3 iv 34 after collation must be read *š[u-um-m]a-aš-ma.*; *kuieš ŪL daranteš* KUB 6.45 iii 6 (Muw.); *am=mukmaškan ŪL anda malanza* KUB 21.38 obv. 26 (Pud.); [*ANA PANI LÚMUTI=ŠU=y*]a=ši *kue ŪL a-a-ra ēšta* KUB 14.4 i 13 (Murš. II); *takku atti=ma anni ŪL āššu* Law §28, late version.

b. A noun

natta GUD.MAḤ-aš . . . *apaš* GUD.MAḤ-aš KBo 6.2 iii 23–24 (OS); *natta* ANŠE.KUR.RA.MAḤ-aš . . . *apaš* ANŠE.KUR.RA.MAḤ-aš *ibid.* 27, 28; *man=at=ši natta kattawatar* KUB 30.10 obv. 23 (OH/MS); *ŪL DUMU-YA apā[š]* KUB 1.16 ii 14 (OH/NS); *ŪL-wa LUGAL-waš araš=miš zik* KUB 29.1 i 35 (OH/NS); [*Ū*]L-waraš *gimraš* DUMU-aš VBoT 58 i 28 (OH/NS); *ug=a=wa=z ŪL imma LÚ-aš* KUB 23.72+ obv. 40 (MH/MS); *nuwaratmu :šallakartatar :kupiatišmawarašmu ŪL [kuiški]* KUB 13.35 i 25 + KUB 23.80 obv. 11 (Hatt. III); *LÚTARTENU-ma ŪL ANA LUGAL ayawalaš* KUB 14.3 i 11–12 (Taw.); *nuwaratmu ŪL waštul* KUB 26.1+ iii 30–31 (Tudh. IV); *ammukkawaza ŪL DUMU EN-KA* KUB 21.42 i 17 (Tudh. IV); *mān teši LUGAL KUR URUKaranduniyaš=wa ŪL LUGAL.GAL* KUB 21.38 obv. 55–56; *n=at=mu ANA LÚ.MEŠ KUR URUHatti piran ŪL imma wal=liyatar* *ibid.* obv. 48; cf. obv. 51. Cf. also other examples sub 4 b and c.

c. Adverbs or other predicates

^d*Telepinušwa* DUMU-YA *andan* NU.GÁL “T., my son, is not there” KUB 17.10 i 21–22 (Tel. myth, OH/NS) cf. above under 2 c; *nat ŪL kā* ABoT 65 obv. 7 (MH/MS); *URUMaraššantiya=z* [*Ū*]L MAḤAR ^dUTU-ŠI *ešun* *ibid.* 12–13; *kī=ma AWATE^{MEŠ} ŪL kuitki 1-edaz 1-edaz IŠTU URUHatti=at* Alakš. A. iii 76–77 (Muw.); *UL-yawa kuit iyawaš nuwarat iya* KUB 21.38 obv. 39 (Pud.); *n=an punuš mān kišan mān ŪL kišan* *ibid.* 12 (cf. 24); *ŪL anda* Hatt. iii 22, KBo 3.4 iv 47.

6. *natta* NEGATING AN ELEMENT OTHER THAN THE PREDICATE

Other Hittite negating words (*lē*, *nawi*, *nūman*, etc.) are unsuited to this task. In this use it is possible for there to be still another word negating the predicate. *numu LUGAL-an āški* DINGIR-YA *ŪL aššanuwandan anduḥšan lē iššatti* KUB 30.10 rev. 22–23 (OH/MS); *kāšašmaškan parkuin mišriwantan ḥarkin* ^{GI}PA *ŪL walḥantan UDU-un šipandahhun* KBo 15.10 ii 8–10 (MH/MS); *iktaš=ma=du=ššan irḥaz ŪL naḥšariyawanza arḥa ŪL uizzi* KBo 3.21 ii 17–18 (OH/NS).

In another type of sentence *natta* negates the subject for emphasis. Here

one should translate with an English cleft sentence ("It was not . . . who . . ."): *natta=an ūk tarnahhun LUGAL-š=an SAL.LUGAL-š=a tar-naš* "It was not I who released it. The king and queen released it" StBoT 8 iii 4–5 (OS); cf. *natta ūk* ID.MEŠ-uš HUR.SAG.MEŠ-uš *arunuš=a* [āpp]a *tar=maiškimi* KUB 31.4:12 + KBo 3.41:11 (OH/NS); ^{URU}*Nihiryaza=kan ŪL 1-aš arha unnaḥhun* KBo 4.14 ii 9, cf. ii 11; *n=aš ŪL 1-aš aki* KUB 13.4 i 33; *n=e āppa ŪL SIG₅-in uiškanta* TelPr. ii 3–4; cf. also exx. under 3 c.

B. ON THE DATIVE-ACCUSATIVE ENCLITIC PRONOUN

Friedrich (HE pp. 147f., sec. 288) noted that the usual order of sentence enclitics seems to admit exceptions in the case of the dat.-acc. personal pronouns. But these are not exceptions, since they conform to a simple rule. When the dat.-acc. pronoun is plural (i.e., *-šmaš* or *-naš*), it always precedes the third person enclitic pronoun *-a*. But when the dat.-acc. pronoun is singular (*-mu*, *-ta*, *-ši*), the pronoun *-a* may follow only in the case of *-ši* and only if it has also preceded (i.e., it is represented twice; *n=at=ši=at*, etc.; examples in HW² sub *-a*²).

Examples of the plural dat.-acc. pronoun followed by the pronoun *-a*: *nu=šmaš=an karipten* Tel.pr. ii 73 (OH/NS); *linkiya=naš=at kattān kittaru* KBo 16.50:20–21 (oath of Ašḥapala, MH/MS); *nu=šmaš=at=kan piran ḥal=ziandu* Mšt 75/13:24–25 (MH/MS), ed. Alp, *Belleten* 44:45ff.; ŠA KUR-TI=*wa=naš=at išḫi[ul]* . . . KUB 14.1 obv. 86 (Madd., MH/MS); *nu=šmaš=a[t piran walluškitten]* KUB 23.68 + ABoT 58 obv. 17 (Išmerika treaty, MH); *nu=šmaš=at ḥanni* KUB 13.2 iii 32 (*BĒL MADGALTI*, MH/NS); *zik=a=š[ma]š=at mān paitti* EGIR-*pa me[mat]ti* Huqq. iii 23, cf. ii 8; *nu=šmaš=at=kan anda ēppir* KBo 5.6 (DŠ frag. 28 A) i 20; *nu=šmaš=at* KUB 13.4 i 51, ii 68, iv 8, 22, 33, 46, 66 (instr., pre-NH/NS); *nu=šmaš=an uwatteni* EGIR-*zian arha šarratteni* ibid. iv 20; *našma=wa=naš=an uššaniyawen našma=war=an=kan waḥnumen* ibid. iv 73–74; *nu=šmaš=aš* ^{LÚ}EMI=ŠUNU *kuit* KUB 14.3 i 64; *nu=šmaš=at* KUB 13.3 iii 15 (NH), KBo 11.1 obv. 36 (Muw.), KBo 4.12 obv. 28 (Ḥatt. III); *nu=šmaš=at=kan* KUB 21.27+ iv 7 (Pud. prayer); *nu=šmaš=aš lē šekteni* KUB 21.42 iv 18 (instr., Tudh. IV); *nu=naš=aš karū* GIM-an İR-DUM *kulawanieš ē[šta k]inun=n(aš)=aš* (text: *ki-nu-na-aš*) QĀTAMMA İR *kulawanieš ēšdu* KUB 19.55 + KUB 48.90 rev. 45–46 (Milawata letter, 13th century), ed. Hoffner, *AfO Beiheft* 19 (1982) 131f.; *nu=šmaš=an* ⁴İŠTAR *šarlaimmin šipanzakanzi* Ḥatt. iv. 74.

There is one possible example of *-naš* flanked by doubly written pron. *-a*: *nu=war=an=naš=an anzel* ZI-ni *piyawen* KUB 13.4 iv 72–73. This cannot be read *nu=war=naš=an*, because there would be no reason for the *r* in *-war-*. It

is also possible that one should read: *nu=war=an=naš=šan*. The only other exception is: *tet=war=at=naš iyaweni=war=at* "Tell it to us; we will do it" KUB 12.63 obv. 24 (OH/MS).

The conditions governing the position of the pl. dat.-acc. pron. (-*šmaš*, -*naš*) in the chain of introductory particles seem not to have changed from OH through the 13th century. The doubling of the pron. -*a*- before and after the sing. dat.-acc. pronouns, on the other hand, is a phenomenon which first appears in late NH.