

Hittite *ur-ki-ja-IZ-zi*

Kazuhiko Yoshida

Kyoto Sangyo University

<kazuhiko.yoshida@gmail.com>

1. 3 pl. preterites in *-jaer*

- (1) The 3 pl. preterites in *-jaer* are not attested in Old Hittite original manuscripts. Their emergence is inseparable from the morphological replacement of the suffix *-je-* by *-ja-* in *je/a*-verbs. In Old Hittite this replacement had not occurred yet, whereas the use of *-ja-* drastically increased in Middle Hittite and an example in *-jaer* came to be recorded, i.e. *da-ja-er* ‘they stole’ HKM 36 Vo 46 (MH/MS).
- (2) In Neo-Hittite the number of examples in *-jaer* increased, i.e. *a-ni-ja-er* ‘they carried out’ KBo 12.13 iii 10 (OH/NS), *a-ri-ja-er* ‘they determined by oracle’ KBo 4.6 Ro 26 (NH), *da-pár-ri-ja-e-er* ‘they led’ KBo 14.20 i 17 (NH), *ḥa-an-da-al-li-i-ja-er* ‘they waged’ KBo 4.4 iii 63 (NH), *i-ja-er* ‘they made’ KUB 34.90, 7 (NS), *ši-ja-er* ‘they sealed’ KBo 3.3 iv 3 (NH), KBo 3.3 iv 5 (NH), and *pí-ja-er* ‘they gave’ KUB 31.68, 43 (NH). *da-ja-er*, *i-ja-er*, *ši-ja-er*, and *pí-ja-er* originally belonged to types different from the *je/a*-class, but later secondarily took on a feature of the *je/a*-class.
- (3) A detailed philological examination shows that the suffix *-ja-* is generalized in the *je/a*-verbs, *anije/a-*, *arije/a-*, *daparrije/a-*, and *ḥandallije/a-* and virtually consistent in *ije/a-*, *šiya/šiye-*, *tāja/e-*, and *pāi/pianzi* at the Neo-Hittite stage at the latest. It is obvious that Hittite scribes who recorded the forms in *-jaer* must have perceived the synchronic stem as fixed and ending in *-ja-*, to which the canonical ending *-er* was attached so that they might be more clearly characterized as 3 pl. preterites (Yoshida 2024).

2. *je/a*-verbs in *-jai-*

- (4) The distribution of the forms in *-jai-* is extremely restricted: it is seen in the 3 sg. present and 3 sg. preterite together with a small number in the 2 sg. imperative. The verbal forms in *-ja-IZ-zi* together with those in *-ja-IT* (3 sg. preterite), *-ja-IT-ta* (3 sg. present mediopassive), *-ja-IT-ta* (3 sg. preterite mediopassive), *-ja-i* (2 sg. imperative) are not attested in Old Hittite original manuscripts save for one example, i.e. *ur-ki-ja-IZ-zi* ‘traces’ KUB 29.30 ii 5 (OS). Their diachronic distribution is the same as the 3 pl. preterites in *-jaer*, which is not recorded in Old

Hittite original manuscripts.

- (5) Of cardinal importance are the following four pairs of 3 sg. and 3 pl. forms:

3 sg. forms	3 pl. forms
<i>a-ni-ia-e-IZ-zi</i> KUB 41.15 Ro (?) 13 (NS)	<i>a-ni-ia-er</i> KBo 12.13 iii 10 (OH/NS)
<i>ta-pár-ri-ia-IZ-zi</i> ‘rules’ Bronzetafel ii 94 (NS)	<i>da-pár-ri-ia-e-er</i> ‘they led’ KBo 14.20 i 17 (NH)
<i>ta-pa-ri-ia-IT</i> KBo 13.101 i 3, 4	
<i>ši-ia-IZ-zi</i> ‘seals’ KUB 30.53 ii 15 (NS)	<i>ši-ia-er</i> KBo 3.3 iv 3 (NH)
<i>ši-ia-IT</i> KUB 21.15 i 20 (NS)	
<i>ḫa-an-da-li-ia-IT</i> ‘waged’ KUB 23.57, 4 (MS)	<i>ḫa-an-da-al-li-i-ia-er</i> KBo 4.4 iii 63 (NH)

These pairs strongly suggest that the 3 sg. forms in *-ia-IZ-zi* and *-ia-IT* were back-formed from the 3 pl. preterite in *-ia-er*.

- (6) It should be noted that the 3 pl. *-iaer* came to have the same sequence *-ae-* as the 3 pl. *-aer* of the *-āi/-ā-* class. The paradigm of the *-āi/-ā-* class has the 3 sg. active present *-āizzi*, preterite *-āit*, the 3 sg. mediopassive present *-āitta*, preterite *-āittat*, and 2 sg. active imperative *-āi*. It is significant that the *-ie/a-* class has the sequences *-iāi-* and *-iāe-* in the exact same positions of the paradigm. This parallelism between the two productive verbal classes naturally leads us to assume that the sequence *-iāi-* (*-iāe-*) in the *-ie/a-* class is a result of morphological influence from the sequence *-āi-* in the *-āi/-ā-* class.

Kloekhorst (2008:209, 643, 671, 707, 830, 865, 1006 etc.) observes that some *ie/a-* verbs have the 3 sg. pres. ending *-iaizzi* influenced from the *-āizzi* of the *-āi/-ā-* class. However, no systematic treatment is given to its creation.

I would argue that the analogical proportion that created the sequence *-iāi-* is shown below (Yoshida forthcoming):

3 pl. pret. <i>-āer</i> : <i>-iāer</i>	::	3 sg. pret. <i>-āit</i> : X_1
	::	3 sg. pres. <i>-āizzi</i> : X_2
	::	3 sg. mediopassive pret. <i>-āittat</i> : X_3
	::	3 sg. mediopassive pres. <i>-āitta</i> : X_4
	::	2 sg. imper. <i>-āi</i> : X_5

X_1 = *-iāit*, e.g. *la-aḫ-ḫi-ia-IT* KBo 12.33 ii 5 (NH)

X_2 = *-iāizzi*, e.g. *la-hi-ia-IZ-zi* KUB 5.1 i 1 (NH)

X_3 = *-iāittat*, e.g. *kar-di-mi-ia-IT-ta-at* KUB 48.106, 17 (MH/MS)

X_4 = *-iāitta*, e.g. *ka[r-di-mi-]ia-IT-ta* IBoT 1.36 i 49 (MH/MS)

X_5 = *-iāi*, e.g. *tar-ku-mi-ia-i* KUB 30.10 i 5 (OH/MS)

- (7) It is important to note that this proportion only became possible after the 3 pl. preterite *-iāer* was introduced at the Middle Hittite stage. This explains why the sequence *-iāi-* is lacking in Old Hittite verbs; cf. Oettinger 1979:382ff., Kümmel 2019.

3. *ur-ki-ja-IZ-zi*

- (8) The verbal forms in *-iāi-* are not attested in Old Hittite original manuscripts save for one example, i.e. *ur-ki-ja-IZ-zi* ‘traces’ KUB 29.30 ii 5 (OS). This form cannot be explained by the analogical proportion shown above because the morphological replacement of *-ie-* by *-ia-* had not yet occurred in Old Hittite original manuscripts. As for the 3 sg. present *ti-ja-IZ-zi* ‘steps’ KBo 6.26 iii 22 (OH/NS) recorded in a Neo-Hittite copy of the Old Hittite law texts, Hoffner (1997:148, n. 518) comments “Scribal error for *ti-i-ez-zi*?”. This suggestion seems quite valid because the same manuscript has another *ti-i-ez-zi* three lines below. I assume that the scribe started to write *ti-ja-(az)-zi* following his Neo-Hittite usage, but before finishing this form he recognized *ti-i-IZ-zi* in the corresponding original manuscript. The result is the hybrid form *ti-ja-IZ-zi*. This account may work in the case of later copies, but *ur-ki-ja-IZ-zi* recorded in an Old Hittite original manuscript cannot be explained in this manner. In short, the enigmatic *ur-ki-ja-IZ-zi* cannot be explained by the above analogical proportion or by scribal error in the copying process. We must seek a solution for the spelling *-ja-IZ-* in a different manner.
- (9) The context in which *ur-ki-ja-IZ-zi* is used is as follows (Restorations and translations are largely based on Hoffner 1997:122–123.).

KUB 29.30 ii 4–6 (OS)

(4) [tāk-ku LÚ?]-an an-na-nu-uḫ-ḫa-an ku-iš-ki ḫ[a-ap-pa-ra-IZ-zi nu te-IZ-zi ak-ki-iš-ḫa-ra-aš] (5) [iš-ḫa]-a-aš-ši-ša-an **ur-ki-ja-IZ-zi** n[a-an-za da-a-i an-ta-ja?-aš?-še?] (6) [2 SAG.D]U pa-a-i pár-na-aš-še-a šu-ḫa-ḫ[a-az-zi]

“If anyone sells a trained person, and (afterwards, before delivery) says: “He has died,” but his (new) owner tracks him down, he shall take him for himself, and in addition to him (i.e., to the trained person) he (the seller) shall give 2 persons. He shall look to his house for it.”

It is also recorded in a later copy:

KBo 6.10 iii 28–31 (OH/NS)



(28) [tāk-ku U[N?]-an] an-na-nu-uḫ-ḫa-an ku-iš-ki ḫa-ap-pa-ra-IZ-zi (29) [n]u te-IZ-zi BA.ÚŠ-ḫa-ra-aš iš-ḫa-aš-ši-ša-an (30) **ur-ki-ja-IZ-zi** na-an-za da-a-i an-da-e-še (31) 2 SAG.DU pa-a-i pár-na-aš-še-ja šu-ḫa-a-IZ-z[i]

There is a different form attested in another later copy, i.e. [*ur-k*]i-i-e-IZ-[zi], which has *e*-vocalism in the suffix.

KBo 14.67 ii 7–9 (OH/NS)

(7) [ták-ku UN-an] an-na-nu-uḫ-ḫa-an ku-iš-k]i ḫa-a[p-pa-ra-IZ-zi nu te-IZ-zi BA.ÚŠ?-
ḡa-ra-aš] (8)[iṣ-ḫa-aš-ši-ša-an **ur-k**]i-i-e-IZ-[zi na-an-za da-a-i] (9) [an-da-ḡa-aš-še 2
SAG.DU pa-a-i pá]r-na-[aš-še-a šu-ḡa-a-IZ-zi]

- (18) Kloekhorst (2008:927) suggests that *ur-ki-ḡa-IZ-zi* belongs to the *-āi/-ā-* class. However, it is not clear to me how the *ḡ* of *ur-ki-ḡa-mi* KUB 33.24 i 35 (OH/NS) and *ur-ki-ḡa-IZ-zi* is to be accounted for. (The context in which *ur-ki-ḡa-mi* is recorded is shown in Tischler 2010:102.) However, it is not clear to me how the *ḡ* of *ur-ki-ḡa-IZ-zi* is to be accounted for. It should probably be interpreted as a denominative verb in *-ḡe/a-* derived from *ūrki-* ‘trace, track’. However, the sequence *-ḡa-IZ-* still needs an explanation.

- (19) Although the suffix *-ḡa-* replaces *-ḡe-* in a conspicuous manner after Middle Hittite, *-ḡe-* has not been completely ousted in Neo-Hittite (*ḫu-ul-li-i-e-et* ‘fought’ KUB 14.15 i 29, *šar-ri-et* ‘divided’ KBo 2.5 iii 32, *šu-ul-li-e-et* ‘quarrelled’ KBo 16.17 iii 28, *šu-ul-li-et* KUB 6.41 i 32, *ti-i-e-ez-zi* KBo 5.9 iii 13, *ti-i-e-et* KBo 5.8 i 35, KUB 14.4 ii 12, *ḡa-ag-ga-ri-ez-zi* ‘rebels’ KUB 21.1 iii 41). Accordingly, [*ur-k*]i-i-e-IZ-[zi] KBo 14.67 ii 8 (OH/NS) referred to above must be regarded as an archaism. I assume that *ur-ki-ḡa-IZ-zi* KUB 29.30 ii 5 (OS) is the result of scribal error induced by the sequence *-Ca-IZ-zi* of *ḫa-ap-pa-ra-IZ-zi* ‘sells’ in the preceding line. It is noteworthy that the *i* sign  constitutes a part of the *ḡa* sign . The scribe was at first going to write *ur-ki-i-e-IZ-zi*, as retained in a later copy. While he was writing the *i* sign, his attention was attracted to the sequence *-Ca-IZ-zi* of *ḫa-ap-pa-ra-IZ-zi* ‘sells’ in the preceding line, so that he erroneously wrote *ur-ki-ḡa-IZ-zi*. Although the relevant *ḫa-ap-pa-ra-IZ-zi* was missing in this tablet, it must have been written in a lost broken join because it is retained in the NS copy (KBo 6.10 iii 28).



4. A case of scribal error (1)

- (20) In the ten-year Annals of the Hittite king Mursili II, i.e. KBo 3.4 ii 40, a complete similar case as the above *ur-ki-ḡa-IZ-zi* is observed.

KBo 3.4 ii 38–40

(38) ^{HUR.SAG}A-ri-in-na-an-da-an za-aḫ-ḫi-ḡa-nu-un nu-mu ^{dUTU} ^{URU}PÚ-na GAŠAN-ḡA
[]-er (39) ^{dU}NIR.GÁL BE-LÍ-ḡA ^dMe-ez-zu-ul-la-aš **DINGIR.MEŠ**-ḡa ḫu-u-ma-an-te-
eš pé-ra-an (40) **DINGIR.MEŠ**-i-e-er

“I beat Arinnanda, and Sun-god of Arinna, my lady, mighty Storm-god, my lord, Mezzulla, and all gods ran (**DINGIR.MEŠ**-i-e-er) before me.”

- (21) The first word on line 40 is perplexing. The scribe was obviously going to write *ḫu-u-i-e-er* ‘they ran’, but he mistakenly wrote **DINGIR.MEŠ**-i-e-er, in which **DINGIR.MEŠ** was taken from the preceding line. Again, the *ḫu* sign  and the **DINGIR** sign  share the same first

stroke. When he started to write the *hu* sign, his attention was attracted to DINGIR in the preceding line. After writing the erroneous DINGIR.MEŠ, he attached the ending *-i-e-er* to it.

5. A case of scribal error (2)

- (22) Another case is the verb *huittitti*, which is a hapax attested in the Anitta text. As is well known, the Anitta text is the oldest composition in Hittite. It is written in the following four different manuscripts A, B, C and D.

A = KBo 3.22 (OS)

B = KUB 26.71 i 1'-19' (OH/NS)

C = KUB 36.98 (+) 98a (+) 98b Vs. 1' – Rs. 6' (OH/NS)

D = KUB 50.1 (OH/NS)

- (23) The verb in question *huittitti* is recorded on line 15' in manuscript B. Manuscript B also includes *huittijati* on line 3', which is a standard mediopassive preterite meaning 'drew, pulled'. It should be noted that manuscript B is a Neo-Hittite copy of the Old Hittite text. In the same passage where *huittijati* in manuscript B occurs, manuscript A, which is an Old Hittite original manuscript, has an identical form. On the other hand, *huittitti* in manuscript B lacks its corresponding form in manuscript A.

manuscript A (OS)

manuscript B (OH/NS)

hu-it-ti-ia-ti KBo 3.22 Rs. 54

hu-it-ti-ia-ti KUB 26.71 i 3

hu-it-ti-it-ti KUB 26.71 i 15

- (24) It is clear that *huittijati* in the manuscript A is old and it is copied in the manuscript B without any modifications. On the other hand, *huittitti* in manuscript B is naturally considered as a new form that was modified during the duplication process. The other attestations of the 3 sg. preterite mediopassive created from the stem *huittija-* are *hu-it-ti-ia-ti* KUB 53.75 Vs. 19 (NS), *hu-it-ti-ia-at-ta-at* KUB 19.67 i 2 (NH) and *hu-u-it-ti-ia-at-ta-at* KUB 1.7 ii 10 (NH). In the latter two forms the original ending *-a* came to be doubly characterized by the addition of the newly created *-ta*; cf. Watkins 1969:85f. and Yoshida 2007:381.

- (25) The passages in which *huittitti* and *huittijati* are used in the Anitta text are shown below, respectively.

manuscript B (KUB 26.71 i 14-15)

x x *hu-la-le-eš-šar-še-et* I *LI-IM* IV ME ERÍN.MEŠ^{GIŠ} GIGIR.MEŠ ANŠE.KUR.RA.ḪI.A KÙ.[BABBAR x x x] *a-pa-ša hu-it-ti-it-ti ša-aš i-ia-an-ni-eš* 'Its surrounding area was made of 1,400 troops, war chariots, horses, silver ... That one pulled (them) and he set off.'

manuscript A (KBo 3.22 Rs. 54) + B (KUB 26.71 i 3) + C (KUB 36.98b Vs. 2')











[URU-ri-a]z ERÍN.MEŠ-ŠU *hu-it-ti-ia-ti ša-an* URU^{Ne-e-š}[(a pé-e-*hu-t*)e- x x] 'He pulled his troops from the town and X led it to Neša'

In the former passage the city's holdings such as 1,400 troops, war chariots, horses, and silver were enumerated and then the sentence *apaš=a huiittitti* 'that one pulled (them)' follows. In the latter passage, [URU-ri-a]z ERÍN.MEŠ-ŠU *hu-it-ti-ia-ti* means that 'he pulled his troops from the town'. There are not any discernible differences in meaning between *huiittitti* and *huiittiat*. In the previous literature *huiittitti* is unanimously treated as a 3 sg. preterite mediopassive. However, there are no additional explanations for its formal relation to *huiittiat* (Cf. Kronasser 1966:485, Neu 1974:95, 138, Puhvel 1991:348, Kloekhorst 2008:349 and Friedrich & Kammenhuber 2010:673).

- (26) From a formal point of view, *huiittitti* provides us with two idiosyncratic features that are deviant from the norm. The first idiosyncrasy is the ending *i* before the particle. The second idiosyncrasy is the double *-tt-* in the particle. It does not seem to me possible to find any compelling solution to these two problems from a linguistic point of view. On this point Carruba made the following interesting remark (Carruba 2003:50, footnote 72).

“verbi *hu-it-ti-IT-ti* exitum explicamus e signorum *IT* et *JA* similitudine (cf. l. 54); aliter perspicere possim in syllaba antiquissimum sonum *i* pro recentioribus *ie* ac *ija* (cf., e.g., priscum *-Ci-iz-zi*, recentiorem *Ci-e-iz-zi*, novum *Ci-ya-az-zi*)”

He suggested that the verb *hu-it-ti-it-ti* can be explained in terms of a similarity between the signs *IT* and *JA*. He also suggested another possibility that *i* represents the oldest state in contrast to more recent *ie* or *ija*, as seen in the change of the 3 sg. present active ending *-Ci-iz-zi* to *Ci-e-iz-zi*, and then to *Ci-ia-az-zi*. The latter possibility is, however, very unlikely because *hu-it-ti-it-ti* is recorded in a Neo-Hittite copy whereas *hu-it-ti-ia-ti* is in an Old Hittite original. Furthermore, the double *-tt-* in the particle still remains unexplained. On the other hand, the first possibility, i.e. the similarity between the signs *IT* and *JA* is worthy of more careful investigation.

- (27) It is true that the signs *IT*  and *JA*  are similar, but their similarity alone is not sufficient enough for the scribe to write *IT* in place of *JA* in *hu-it-ti-it-ti*. There must have been some other motivation for this scribal error. In this connection it should be noted that *hu-it-ti-ia-ti* has the *IT* sign before *JA* and that in these two signs the first horizontal stroke begins at the same position. It is therefore quite conceivable that when the scribe started to copy the *JA* sign in the original *hu-it-ti-ia-ti*, his attention was attracted by the preceding *IT* sign, so that he erroneously wrote *IT* instead of *JA* (    →    ); cf. Yoshida 2014.
- (28) 言語学 ‘linguistics’ → 言語語 (言 ‘speak’, 語 word’, 学 ‘study’)

6. Summary

The Hittite 3 pl. pret. forms in *-iaer* of the *ie/a*-class were created in and after the Middle Hittite period, when the suffix *-ia-* largely replaced *-ie-*. The 3 sg. pres. active *-iaizzi*, 3 sg. pret. active *-iait*, and 2 sg. imper. active *-iai* were analogically introduced from the

corresponding forms of the *āi-/ā-*class in and after Middle Hittite, when the 3 pl. *-iaer* came to have the same sequence *-ae-* as the 3 pl. *-aer* of the *āi-/ā-*class. However, the verbal form *ur-ki-ia-IZ-zi* ‘traces’ recorded in an Old Hittite original manuscript cannot receive the same analogical explanation. It is argued that *ur-ki-ia-IZ-zi* is the result of scribal error induced by the sequence *-Ca-IZ-zi* of *ḫa-ap-pa-ra-IZ-zi* ‘sells’ in the preceding line.

References

- Carruba, O. (2003) *Anittae Res Gestae: Recensuit et Commentavit* (= *Studia Mediterranea* 13, *Series Hethaea* 1). Pavia: Italian University Press.
- Friedrich, J. & Kammenhuber, A. (2010) *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*, Band III/2, Lieferung 19. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Hoffner, H. A., Jr. (1997) *The Laws of the Hittites. A Critical Edition*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kloekhorst, A. (2008) *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kronasser, H. (1966) *Etymologie der Hethitischen Sprache*. Band 1. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Kümmel, M. J. (2019) ‘Über die hethitische 3. Sg. Präsens auf *-ia-iz-zi*’. In Kim, R. I., Mynářová, J. and Pavúk, P. (eds.) *Hrozný and Hittite: The First Hundred Years. Proceedings of the International Conference Held at Charles University, Prague, 11–14 November 2015*. Leiden: Brill, 176–194.
- Neu, E. (1974) *Der Anitta-Text* (= *StBoT* 18). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Oettinger, N. (1979) *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums*. Nürnberg: Hans Carl.
- Puhvel, J. (1991) *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, Vol. 3, Berlin – New York: de Gruyter.
- Tischler, J. (2010) *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar, Teil IV, Lieferung 15*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Watkins, C. (1969) *Indogermanische Grammatik* III/1. *Geschichte der indogermanischen Verbalflexion*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Yoshida, K. (2007) ‘The Morphological History of Hittite Mediopassive Verbs’. In Nussbaum, A. (ed.) *Verba Docenti: Studies in Historical and Indo-European Linguistics Presented to Jay H. Jasanoff by Students, Colleagues, and Friends*. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press, 379–395.
- Yoshida, K. (2014) ‘Hittite *ḫu-it-ti-it-ti*’. In Taracha, P. with the assistance of Kapełuś, M. (eds.). *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Hittitology. Warsaw, 5–9 September 2011*. Warsaw: Agade, 1034–41.
- Yoshida, K. (2024) ‘The Hittite Third Plural Preterites in *-iaer*’. *MSS* 76/2:101–128.
- Yoshida, K. (forthcoming) ‘Hittite *je/a*-verbs in *-iai-*’. *MSS* 77.