

## Middle Hittite *-ške*-forms<sup>1</sup> in Benedictions and Curses

Andrej V. Sidel'tsev

Moscow

### 0. General information about *-ške*-forms

I base the argument of the paper on the following points, which I hold to be demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt:

0.1. *-ške*-forms have broadly imperfective semantics – durative, iterative, etc.<sup>2</sup>

0.2. The use of *-ške*-forms is not obligatory. That is, if a situation is viewed as iterative/habitual/ durative etc., it is likely, but not necessarily marked by verbal *-ške*-forms<sup>3</sup>.

0.3. The use of *-ške*-forms is semantically restricted<sup>4</sup>: they are not normally used with stative (e.g., *kiš-* “become” etc., *mai-* in the meaning “prosper” (not “grow, increase” which is freely used in *-ške*-forms – see II.2.1, IV.2.2) and *šišt-*<sup>5</sup> “thrive”<sup>6</sup>, majority of *-eš*-verbs) and some lexically durative verbs (e.g., *hark-* “have”, *pahš-* “guard”, *eš-* “be”, *šakk-* “know”, *arš-* “flow”<sup>7</sup>, etc.). Some verbs are not used in *-ške*-forms for historical reasons<sup>8</sup> (*pehute-* “carry”, *uwate-* “bring”). Some, like *karp-* “lift”<sup>9</sup>, cannot be easily classified.

0.4. A word is necessary about the method aspectual semantics is studied with in the present paper. First I delimit certain types of texts (with varying degree of generality – thus they can overlap) – instructions, curses, benedictions, etc. and analyse verbal aspect in these textual units. Only then, within these textual units, microcontexts are investigated. Needless to say, the results we obtain from the analysis of larger textual units deal with pragmatic use of aspect while the results from the microcontexts deal with aspect proper. What I want to

<sup>1</sup> *-ske*-forms is a generic name for aspectually marked imperfective forms (*-(e/i)šša-*, *-anna-*, reduplication).

<sup>2</sup> See Dressler, *Studien zur verbalen Pluralität*. Wien 1968; Hoffner, Melchert, *Anatolia Antica. Studi in memoria di F. Imparati*. Firenze 2002.

<sup>3</sup> See Dressler, *Pluralität*, pp. 207-208.

<sup>4</sup> See Hoffner, Melchert, *Studi Imparati*, p. 378.

<sup>5</sup> Contra Eichner, *Investigationes philologicae et comparativae. Gedenkschrift für H. Kronasser*. Wiesbaden, 1982, p. 26, followed by Tischler, *Hethitisches Handwörterbuch*. Innsbruck 2001, p. 150: all OS and MS uses attest exceptionlessly (!) *ŠI-IŠ-*.

<sup>6</sup> It may seem arbitrary to posit different aspectual marking for different meanings, but it is supported by very consistent usage of simple forms in positive contexts (*māu šišdu*, *maišten šišten*) – starting from OS (2× in (CTH 733.II.4) KBo 25.112 7'-8'), through MS (4× in (CTH 371) KBo 7.28+ Vs. 15', (CTH 139) KBo 8.35 Vs. II 15') into NS copies (see CHD, L-N, pp. 114-5). Last but not least, different aspectual marking of different meanings is well attested typologically.

<sup>7</sup> See HW<sup>2</sup>, A, p. 342.

<sup>8</sup> See Oettinger, *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums* (DBH 7). Dresden 2002, p. 212.

<sup>9</sup> See Dressler, *Pluralität*, pp. 192, 206. Actually, the verb *is* used in *-ške*-form, but only in medium (“rise”) in two texts from NS/NH (CTH 345), see HED, K, p. 97.

stress is that more or less precise conclusions about Hittite aspect are possible only in case of pragmatics, while purely semantic aspect assessment remains pretty subjective and vague.

0.5. The paper is based on the material from MS texts (unmarked in the body of the article; for the list see Košak, Konkordanz der hethitischen Texte at [www.hethiter.net](http://www.hethiter.net)). NS and OS data are used only to corroborate this evidence (lexically; their aspectual characteristics are not considered). No conclusions are drawn from them alone (see also fn. 92).

#### Aspect in Addresses to Gods

I.0. First a few words about aspect in direct speech in general. As different from indicative uses, aspect in direct speech does not describe, but rather prescribes the duration and character of some events. I.e., the connection between reality and language was the most obvious here. There are two main types of direct speech in Hittite texts – addresses to people (in treaties) and addresses to gods – curses and benedictions<sup>10</sup> (usually in magical rituals, but also in treaties and letters). The use of *-ške*-forms is the most straightforward in addresses to people – they are ordered to perform certain activities continually or repeatedly over a great period of time ('always' from human point of view). But in addresses to gods *-ške*- and simple forms are not evenly distributed in all types of microcontexts. Their distribution depends on two types of situations – negative and positive.

I.1. A curse or a benediction with a negative semantic component<sup>11</sup> is easily delimited by means of (a) a negative argument, characterized either in this very context or elsewhere by a negative attribute; (b) a negative semantic component in the meaning of the verb. Situations with a negative semantic component are negative situations. Actions of negative situations are expressed by simple verb forms. A benediction with a positive semantic component is delimited by means of (a) a positive argument, characterized either in this very context or elsewhere by a positive attribute; (b) a positive semantic component in the meaning of the verb. Situations with a positive semantic component are positive situations. Actions of positive situations are expressed by *-ške*-verb forms. The semantic interpretation of *-ške*-forms in quantified positive contexts may be twofold: the speaker asks the gods to cause these positive situations to occur many times/ constantly/ continually (durative or habitual aspectual meanings) or intensively with plurality of arguments in the future<sup>12</sup> (intensive or distributive aspectual meanings). See IV.2.1.1-4 for examples of overt lexical marking of contexts that enable me to draw these conclusions<sup>13</sup>. In negative situations the speaker asks

<sup>10</sup> See generally Archi, *Studia Mediterranea P. Meriggi dicata*. Pavia 1979, passim; id., *Documentum Asiae minoris antiquae. Festschrift für H. Otten*. Wiesbaden 1988, pp. 5-15; Kammenhuber, *MSS* 3 (1953), pp. 33-38; HW<sup>2</sup>, p. 403; Carruba, *StBoT* 2, pp. 18-19; Taracha, *Ersetzen und Entsühnen*. Leiden – Boston – Köln 2000, p. 141; Starke, *ZA* 69/1 (1979), 86-96; Oettinger, *StBoT* 22, pp. 71-92.

<sup>11</sup> I want to stress the difference between benedictions and positive semantic components. Benedictions can include negative semantic components (see IV.3).

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Carruba, *StBoT* 2, pp. 18-19 and very differently (on the basis of very heterogeneous data) Dressler, *Pluralität*, pp. 168-169, 191-192.

<sup>13</sup> This delimitation may sound rather assertive, but actually all we can say about many contexts is that they are marked in some way. The exact definition of this markedness remains hard to demonstrate objectively (see 0.4).

the gods with the help of simple forms not to cause a negative situation to occur many times/ continually or intensively, but rather to get rid of evil in one go. No other genre of texts shows similar distribution.

Now I will illustrate these points with concrete data. The taxonomy is arranged by semantic features (first negative and then positive).

#### II.1. Negative Situations (with Simple Form Verbs)

The list of negative semantic components is as follows:

II.1.1 negative semantic component in the meaning of the verb: e.g., *harnink*- "destroy":

(CTH 139) KBo 8.35 Vs. II 16' *ma-a-na-aš-ta ku-u-ša li-in-ga-a-uš šar-ra-ad-du-ma šu-ma-a-ša-kán* (17') *li-in-ki-aš DINGIR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-eš hu-u-ma-an-te-eš KUR<sup>HLA</sup>-KU-NU URU<sup>DIDLHLA</sup>-KU-NU DAM<sup>MEŠ</sup>-KU-NU* (18') *DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup>-KU-NU A.ŠA<sup>HLA</sup>-KU-NU GIŠ<sup>HLA</sup>-KIRI<sub>6</sub>.GEŠTIN<sup>HLA</sup>-KU-NU GU<sub>4</sub><sup>HLA</sup>-KU-NU UDU<sup>HLA</sup>-KU-NU* *har-ni-in-kán-du* "If you violate these oaths, may all the oath deities destroy you, your countries, your cities, your wives, your children, your fields, your vineyards, your oxen (and) your sheep";

the same text further elaborates this idea:

(CTH 139) KBo 8.35 Vs. II 19' *nu ma-a-an A-NA KUR<sup>URU</sup> Ha-a[t-t]i pár-hu-wa-an-zi ú-wa-at-te-ni \*nu\*-uš-ma-aš-kán* (20') *DZA-BA<sub>4</sub>-\*BA<sub>4</sub>-aš\* GIŠ<sup>HLA</sup>TUKUL<sup>HLA</sup>-KU-N[U] a-ap-pa na-a-ú nu šu-me-in-za-an-pát<sup>UZU</sup> i-e-z-a-aš-du* (21') *GI<sup>HLA</sup>-KU-NU-ma-kán a-ap-pa [na-]a-ú nu šu-me-in-za-an-pát ki-ir-še-me-et iš-kar-ra-an-ni-an-[du]* (22') *nu-kán ma-a-an li-in-ga[-a-u]š šar-ra-qa-du-ma nu-za GU<sub>4</sub><sup>HLA</sup>-KU-NU UDU<sup>HLA</sup>-KU-NU* (23') *an-du-uh-še-eš li-e ha-aš-[ša-an-z]i nu-uš-[m]a<sup>HLA</sup>-aš-kán NI-IŠ DINGIR<sup>MEŠ</sup> DUMU<sup>HLA</sup>-KU-NU* (24') *an-da-an kar-di-iš-mi-pá[t a]z-zi-ik-kán-du* "If you come to attack the land of Hatti, may Zababa turn back you[r] weapons and may they eat your own flesh; may (he) [t]urn back your arrows and may they pierc[e] your own hearts; but if you break the oa[th]s, your oxen, your sheep (and) men shall not procr[eat]e, and let the oath deities [d]evour your children within y[o]u (lit. in you, in your heart)";

II.1.2. negative arguments: subjects and objects: *šumēš/ šumās* "you" (who violated oaths or came to attack the land of Hatti, as well as all your possessions and relatives); angry god<sup>14</sup>; *alwanzatar* "sorcery"; *ēšhar* "blood"; *harātar* "offence"; *idālu hinkan* "evil death/ plague"; *hullātar* "infliction, defeat"; (*idālu-*) *hūrtāi-* "curse"; *idālu inan* "illness" (with various concrete specifications, e.g. *tapašša-* "fever"); [*išh*]uzzi- "bond"<sup>15</sup>; *idālu* "evil"; *karpi-* "wrath"; (*idālu-*)

<sup>14</sup> See for the angry god as an impure agent e.g.: (CTH 324.2.E) KUB 33.5 Vs. II 4' *DMAH-aš NIM.LĀL-an u-i-e-it i-it-ZA n[a<sup>HLA</sup>-ak<sup>HLA</sup>-ki<sup>HLA</sup>-i]n<sup>HLA</sup>* [cf. Mazoyer, *Télipinu, le dieu au marécage*. Paris 2003, p. 54] (5') *DTe-li-pi-nu-un zi-ik ša-an-ha ma-a-n[a-an ú-e-m]i<sup>HLA</sup>-e-ši* [cf. Mazoyer, *Télipinu*, p. 54] (6') *na-an QA-TI<sup>HLA</sup>-ŠU GI<sup>HLA</sup>-ŠU šī-ya-a na-an<sup>HLA</sup> ša-r[a-a]* (7') *ti-it-ta-nu-ut nu-ZA DUH.LĀL da-a na-an \*ar\*-ha a-an-a[š]* (8') *[n]a-an pár-ku-nu-ut na-an šu-up-<pi>-ya-ah na-an am-me-el* (9') *[k]at-ta ú-wa-te* "Hannahanna sent a bee, (saying) «Go seek m[ight]y»" [cf. Hoffner, *Hittite Myths*. Atlanta 1998, p. 18] *Télipinu*. When you [fin]d [him], sting him, his hands (and) his feet. Make him stand up[p]. Take wax and wip[e] him off. Purify him and make him holy again. Bring him back to me".

<sup>15</sup> Ropes, cords etc. were perceived as used in (or symbolizing) sorcery – see, for example CHD, L-N, s. v. *la-*; HED, E-I, p. 400.

*kardimiyatt-* “anger”; *kāšt-* “hunger”; *kūrur* “hostility”; KUR.KUR LÚ.MEŠ KÚR “enemy countries”; (*idālu-*) (*alwanzena-*) *lāla-* “evil (sorcerous) tongue”; *lingāi-* “perjury”; *paprātar* “defilement”; *šāuar* “fierceness/ rage”; *idālu* (*hatuga*) *uttar* “evil (terrible) word”; *wašdul* “sin/ despoliation”, etc.

Various verbs denoting all possible shades of “destroying/ getting rid of” or “not paying attention” are employed with these subjects and objects: *akk-* “die”; *ānš-* “wipe”; *araye-* “check”; *lē au-* “not see”; (*anda*) *epp-* “seize (into)”; *ed-* “eat”; *hark-* “perish”; (*arha*) *harnink-* “destroy”; *lē hašš-* “not give birth”; *huinu-* “make run”; (*šarā*) *huittye-* “draw”; *huwai-* “run”; *iye-* “make” (into something (e.g., soap, pebbles)); *iške-* “anoint”; *lē ištamaš-* “not listen”; *karp-* “lift”; *karš-* “cut”; *katta kišaye-* “comb down”<sup>16</sup>; (*arha*) *lā-* “loosen, release”; *mer-* “disappear”; *mern[u-* “make disappear”; *munnye-* “to hide”; *appa nai-* “turn back”; (*parā*; *arha*) (*lē*) *pai-* “go”; *pai-* “give”; (*arha*) *parh-* “chase”; *parkunu-* “purify”; *katta paš-* “swallow”; *arha peššye-* “throw away”; *puššaye-* “pound”; *šame-* “disappear”; *šippaye-* “peel”; *šuppiyah-* “make holy”; (*arha*) *da-* “take”; *dai-* “put”; (*arha*) (*lē*) *tarna-* “release”, *lē tarna-* “not let”, *anda lē tarna-* “not let in”; *lē tekkušye-* “not show”; *arha tiye-* “step off”; *arha tit(a)nu-* “place (out of)”; *tuhš-* “separate”; *arha tuwarna-* “break”; *appa lē uwa-* “not come back”; *wahnu-* “turn”; *walh-* “strike”; *warnu-* “burn”; *warš-* “wipe”; and some rarer ones; for examples see fn. 14, II.3.

II.1.3. The following data clearly show that negative verbal semantic components, attributes, direct objects, indirect objects and subjects are connected by the mechanics of syntactical transformation in the same situation (pacifying an angry god): angry god(s), anger:

*karaz=šan talliye-* + angry god (gen.) “implore his (i.e. angry god’s) *karaz*”, *iške-* + angry god (acc.) “anoint”, *handaye-* + angry god (subject) (med.) “set oneself right”, *galangaye-* + angry god (acc.) “appease”, *idālun kartimiyattan šāwar arha peššye-* + angry god (subject) “throw away evil anger (and) fury”, *parkunu-* + angry god (acc.) “purify”.

## II.2. Positive Situations (with -ške-Forms)

The list of positive semantic features is as follows:

II.2.1. positive semantic component in the meaning of the verb: *miyēške-* (*mai-*) “grow”:

(CTH 820.3) KUB 43.23 Rs. 9' *nu-wa-ra-at mi-i-e-eš-ki-it-ta-r[u]*<sup>17</sup> “Let them/it grow”;

II.2.2. positive arguments:

II.2.2.1. adverbial modifiers: *aššu*, *aššuli* “well, favourably”<sup>17</sup>, the verbs are *memiške-* and *tarške-* “say, speak”:

(CTH 330.1.T) KBo 15.31+ Vs. I 13' ŠA D<sup>IM</sup> URU *Ku-l[i]-ú-iš-na* DINGIR.LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup>-eš *š[u-me-eš]* (14') *na-aš-ta pár-na-aš iš-hu-u-uš A-NA* D<sup>IM</sup> URU *Ku[-li-ú-iš-na pí-ra-an]* (15') *a-*

<sup>16</sup> Cf. HW<sup>2</sup>, p. 80.

<sup>17</sup> See generally CHD, L-N, pp. 259-260 for the distinction between noun and adverb *aššu*.

*aš-šu me-mi-i[-š]-ki-tén* “Y[ou,] male deities of the Stormgod of Kul[i]wišna, spe[a]k well (about) the lords of the house [before] the Stormgod of Ku[liwišna]”;

II.2.2.2. objects: *aššu* “good; good word(s); good things/ weal”; *nahšarattan* “fearsomeness”, *huišwatar* “life”, *hattulatar* “health”, *innarawatar*<sup>18</sup> “strength”, *mayandatar* “youth(ful vigour)”, *miyatar* “growth”, MU<sup>HLA</sup> GÍD.DA “longevity”, IGI<sup>HLA</sup> *uškiyawar* “the eyes ability to see/ eyesight”, GÚ-tar *šarā appātar* “holding up of the neck (= stamina?, pride?)”, DINGIR<sup>MEŠ</sup> *aššiyawar/ aššiyatar* “gods’ love”, DINGIR<sup>MEŠ</sup> *miu(m)mar* “gods’ gentleness”, ZI-naš *duškarattan* “joy of the soul”, DUMU.NITA<sup>MEŠ</sup> “sons”, DUMU.MUNUS<sup>MEŠ</sup> “daughters”, *hāššuš hanzaššuš* “grand- and great grandchildren”, GU<sub>4</sub> UDU “cattle and sheep”, KASKAL “way”, GÍŠ-TUKUL *parā neantan* “weapon pointed forward”, *tarhuili* GÍŠ *tūri* “victorious spear”<sup>19</sup> etc.<sup>20</sup>. The verbs used with these positive objects are normally neutral *piške-* “give”, *memiške-*, *tarške-* “say, speak”; sporadically neutral *uppeške-* “send” (2× in the same text; see for the example II.2.2.3), *wewak-* “ask”. It is noteworthy that the two verbal forms are hapaxes used as contextual synonyms to the common *piške-* “give”, *memiške-*, *tarške-* “say, speak”; examples (see also II.3, IV.2.4, IV.3.6):

(CTH 820.3) KUB 43.23 Rs. 15' ... *nu še-er kat-t[a] ne-e-pí-iš-za* D<sup>UT</sup>U<sup>21</sup>-aš LUGAL-i [*a-aš-šu*] (16') *hu-iš-wa-tar mi-ya-tar tar-hu-i-li* GÍŠ *tū-u-ri pí-iš-ki-i[d-du]* (17') *kat-ta-ša-ra-a-ma ták-na-a-az šu-uh-mi-li-iš ta-ga-an-zi-p[a-a]š* (18') *ták-na-a-aš-ša* D<sup>UT</sup>U<sup>21</sup>-uš A-NA LUGAL *a-aš-šu hu-iš-wa-tar tar-hu-i-li* (19') GÍŠ *tū-u-ri pí-iš-ki-id-du* ... “Dow[n] from the sky above let the Sungod(?) give to the king [good(s),] life, growth, (and) a victorious weapon. Up from the earth below let the firm earth and the Sungoddess of the Earth give to the king good(s), life, (and) a victorious weapon”;

<sup>18</sup> A rarer word with presumably the same meaning: [*ta-aš-]nu-mar-ra* (CTH 373.A) KUB 30.10 Vs. 29' (following HEG, T, p. 265; Singer, *Hittite Prayers*. Atlanta 2002, p. 32; Trabazo, *BCBO* 6 (2002), p. 242; cf. Lebrun, *Hymnes et prières Hittites*. Louvain-la-Neuve 1980, pp. 113, 116); *ha-as-t[i-li-ya-tar]* (CTH 443) KBo 15.10+ Vs. I 35. Also *in-na-ra-ah-hu-ar* (CTH 489/430.3) KBo 17.60 Rs. 10'.

<sup>19</sup> Probably all this and something else is denoted by (CTH 190) HKM 81 Vs. 14 *nu A-NA DINGIR<sup>MEŠ</sup> ku-it ú-e-t[um-mar]* “What is desired by the gods” [following Alp, HBM, p. 274; cf. CHD, L-N, p. 466: *we[kta(?)]* “And what [you] have as[ked(?) from the gods”] (15) *nu-ut-ta a-pa-a-at pí-eš-kán-du* “Let them give it to you”. Cf. also Karasu, *Studi Imparati*, p. 424; id., *Hittite Studies in Honor of H. Hoffner*. Winona Lake 2003, p. 235 (“Let them bestow you whatever you wi[sh]”). Similarly (CTH 820.4) KBo 21.22 Vs. 14' ... *nu-ZA ku-it la-ba-ar-na-aš* LUGAL-uš *iš-ta-an-ZA-na-aš-ša-aš* (15') [<sup>UZU</sup>ŠA-aš-ša]-aš *i-la-a-li-iš-ki-iz-zi na-at-ši an-da a-ra-a-an e-eš-tu* (16') [*nu-ZA ku-it* MUNUS *Ta-wa-nq-an-na-aš* MUNUS.LUGAL ŠA ZI-ŠU ŠA <sup>UZU</sup>ŠA <ŠA>-ŠU *i-la-li-iš-ki-zi* (17') [*na-a]t-ši qn-dq a-ra-an e-eš-tu* “Let it be reached what *labarna*, the king, desires in [his heart] and soul; let it be reached [what] *tawananna*, the queen, desires in her <heart> (and) soul.” Cf. Kimball, *Language in Time and Space. A Festschrift for W. Winter*. Berlin – New York 2003, p. 188; Archi, *Fs Otten*<sup>2</sup>, pp. 14, 15 Anm. 38; Starke, *ZA* 69/1 (1979), p. 91.

<sup>20</sup> Some of these things are attested together in a ‘cornucopia’ list in (CTH 324.1.A) KUB 17.10 Rs. IV 28-35 and similar texts. See, e.g., Watkins, *Recent Developments in Hittite Archaeology and History. Papers in Memory of H. Güterbock*. Winona Lake 2002, pp. 169-172.

<sup>21</sup> Following Riemschneider, KUB 43, p. XI; CHD, L-N, p. 237; cf. Archi, *Fs Meriggi*<sup>2</sup>, p. 34; Torri, *StudAs* 2 (2003), p. 109. Catsanicos, *BSLP* 61/1 (1986), p. 124: D<sup>IM</sup>[M<sup>1</sup>].

II.2.2.3 the only example of positive subjects is *aššuš halugaš* “good message”<sup>22</sup>, the verb is *wemiške-* “find”:

(CTH 591.I.a.A) KBo 17.88+ Rs. III 8' ...[(m)]a-ya-an-ti-ma <sup>D</sup>UTU-š[um-mi <sup>MUNUS</sup>ta-wa-na-an(-na-i)] (9') [(ša-ku-aš M)]U<sup>HIA</sup>-uš up-p[í-i]š-k[án-d]u # (10') [9-an] LI-IM 9-an d[a-a]n 9-an GAŠAN<sup>TI</sup> MU<sup>HIA</sup>-uš a-aš-š[u-ša-aš] (11') [ha-lu-g]a-aš ú-e-m[i-(i)]š-k[(i-i)]d-du ma-ya-an-ta-a[n] (12') [<sup>D</sup>UT]U-šum-mi-in <sup>MUNUS</sup>t[a-w]a-na-an-na-an AN.BAR-aš <sup>GIŠ</sup>DAG-ti “Let them se[n]d [nine times] one thousand, nine times tw[ic]e, nine times ...? [(ye)]ars to o[ur (v)]igorous ‘Sungod’ (and) [the tawanana(na for the eyes’)]<sup>23</sup>. Let the ‘go[od messa]ge’ fi[n]d them, our vigorous[s S]ungod (i.e. the king) (and) the t[aw]ananna on a throne dais of iron”, also in 24'-26'; Rs. IV 10-11, 16-17, 22-25;

II.2.3 positive implication: *mūriuš mekkuš haške-* “bear many grapes” (for example see (CTH 820.3) KUB 43.23 Rs. 20'-22' in IV.2.3); GU<sub>4</sub>-it ... *maiške-* “Increase in cattle, etc.”; implication: (many) grapes, cattle is not overtly positive by itself, but it implies abundance: see (CTH 385.2) KUB 24.6 Vs. 3'-4' in IV.2.2.

### II.3. Simple Forms and -ške-forms

Contrast between positive -ške-forms and negative simple forms in the same context provides ‘minimal pairs’, which most clearly demonstrate not random character of the semantic/ pragmatic opposition between -ške- and simple forms.

II.3.1. Contrast between positive -ške-forms and negative simple forms in the same context:

(CTH 489.C/430) KBo 17.61 Rs. 2' [x-an *pár-ah-du* ša- (3') [ma-ni-in-k]u-an-du-uš MU<sup>HIA</sup>-uš KI.3 [K]I.4 (4') [A-NA DUMU.L]Ú<sub>19</sub>.LU-ma ta-lu-ga-uš MU<sup>HIA</sup>-uš *pí-iš-ki<sup>2</sup>-i*d<sup>2</sup>-du (5') [-d]u<sup>2</sup> ták-na-ša-at-za <sup>D</sup>UTU-uš <sup>NA4</sup>pa-aš-ši-lu-uš *i-e-id-du* (6') [na-at-ši-kán ar-ha<sup>2</sup>] *da-a-ú*<sup>1</sup> “[...] Let him chase! [...] short years, ditto 3, [...] ditto 4. But [to the mor]tal (i.e. the child) may he [continually giv]e long year[s]! [...] May the Sun-goddess of the Earth turn them into pebbles! [And away from him] let him/her take [them]!”<sup>24</sup>;

(CTH 489/430.3) KBo 17.60 Rs. 8' ... *ták-na-aš* <sup>D</sup>UTU-uš (9') [x-uš *zi-ik e-ip* nu nam-ma (10') [ar-ha *li-je tar-na-ti* A-NA DUMU-ma TI-tar in-na-ra-ah-hu-ar (11') [(MU<sup>HIA</sup> GÍD.DA *pí-iš-ki* “... Sun-goddess of the Earth, [...

<sup>22</sup> “Omen” according to Haas, *Geschichte der Hethitischen Religion*. Leiden – New York – Köln 1994, p. 824.

<sup>23</sup> Following Klinger, StBoT 37, pp. 319, 344-346. Cf. Archi, *Fs Meriggi*<sup>2</sup>, p. 42; Haas, GHR, pp. 824-825. Lit. “Let them send years to our vigorous ‘Sungod’ and the tawananna for (their) eyes<sup>2</sup>, nine times one thousand, nine times twice, nine times ...<sup>2</sup> years” with inversion and incorrect Paragraphenstrich. Cf. also HED, M, p. 12.

<sup>24</sup> Following Beckman, StBoT 29, p. 45.

(various evils)] may you seize! And further [...] you shall [no]t let (them) loose (again)! But for the child life, fitness (and) long years continually give!”<sup>25</sup>;

(CTH 443) KBo 15.10+ Vs. II 10 ... nu i-da-a-lu ar-ha nam-ma *pí-eš-ši-ya-te-[e]n* (11) nu [Š]A BE-LÍ QA-DU DAM-ŠU DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup>-ŠU a-aš-šu *me-mi-iš-ki-te-en* “Ca[s]t off evil again (and) speak well (about) the lord together with his wife (and) his sons” (lit. “speak the well-being [o]f the lord...”);

(CTH 443) KBo 15.10+ Vs. II 33 ... nu i[-da-]q[-l]u *har-ni-ik-tē-en* nu A-NA BE-LÍ A-NA DAM-ŠU DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup>-ŠU (34) a-aš-šu nam-ma e-eš-t[u nu-u]š-ši <sup>D</sup>UTU-uš <sup>D</sup>IM-aš-ša A-NA BE-LÍ A-NA DAM-ŠU DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup>-ŠU (35) a-aš-šu TI-tar ma-ya-an-dā-tar <sup>GIŠ</sup>TUKUL pa-ra-a ni-e-an-ta-an [na]m[-m]a *pí-iš-kat-te-en* “Destroy e[vi]l. Thereupon may it b[e] good for the lord, his wife (and) his sons. [T]h[e]n (you,) Sungod and Stormgod, give good, life (or: a good life<sup>26</sup>), youthful vigour, (and) a battle-ready weapon to the lor[d], <his> wife (and) his sons”.

Because the use of -ške-forms was not obligatory (see 0.2), not all the contexts contrast positive -ške-forms and negative simple forms.

II.3.2. Contrast between forms of the same verb (-ške-forms with positive arguments and simple forms with negative arguments) is most clean-cut for *pai-*. It is used with negative object/ subject 4x in simple form and never in -ške-form while with positive objects/ subjects it is very consistently used in -ške-form 25x (89% of all the uses of *pai-* in positive situations – see IV.1).

(CTH 332.3) KUB 33.68 Vs. II 19 ku-i-ša-at-ta ha-tu-ga-an ut-tar me-ma-i nu-uš<-ši> <sup>D</sup>[U . . . .] (20) <sup>GIŠ</sup>HAŠHUR.KUR.RA *pa-a-i* ku-i-ša A-NA <sup>D</sup>U EM-ŠA u[t-tar me-ma-i] (21) [n]u-uš-ši <sup>D</sup>U EM-ŠA <sup>GIŠ</sup>HAŠHUR *pa-i* ku-i-ša A-NA <sup>D</sup>U i-da-a-lu (22) [ut-ta]r me-ma-i nu-uš-ši <sup>D</sup>U x-ūl-d[u?-. . . . .] *pa-i* “Whoever speaks a terrible word to you, let you, Stormgod, give him an apricot<sup>27</sup>; whoever [speaks to the] Storm[god] a sour [word], let you, Stormgod, give him a sour apple; whoever speaks, let you, Stormgod, [give] him [ ]”;

(CTH 376.C) KUB 24.4+ KUB 30.12 Rs. 14 KUR <sup>URU</sup>Ha-at-ti-ma-aš-ta DINGIR<sup>MEŠ</sup>/an[-da a-aš-ša-(a)-u-i]r<sup>2</sup> IGI<sup>HIA</sup>-it a-uš-te-en (15) i-da-a-lu-ma hi-in-kán [i-da-a-la-u-wa-aš<sup>2</sup>/a-pí-e-da-aš<sup>2</sup>] ut-ne-y[a-aš *pí-iš-ke-en*”<sup>27</sup> “Oh god[s,] look at the land of Hatti with [favourabl]e eyes, but [gl]ive terrible death/ plague [to the bad<sup>28</sup>/ those”<sup>28</sup> countries”;

similarly (CTH 402.I) KBo 21.8 Vs. II 2 – 5; (CTH 483.IA) KUB 15.34(+) Vs. II 44 – 49; (CTH 433.3) KBo 17.105+ KBo 34.47 Rs. III 31 – 32;

(CTH 694) KBo 14.91+ KBo 29.106 8' ... B]E-EL É<sup>TIM</sup> ti-wa-li-ya-aš<sup>D</sup> Hu-wa-aš-ša-a[n-na] (9') ... M]U<sup>HIA</sup> GÍD.DA in-na-ra-u-wa-tar DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup> DUMU<sup>MUNUS</sup><sup>MEŠ</sup> ha-a-aš-š[u-uš] (10') [ha-an-za-aš-š]u-uš a-pí-ni-iš-šu-wa-an *pí-iš-ki*;

<sup>25</sup> Following Beckman, StBoT 29, p. 61.

<sup>26</sup> So CHD, L-N, p. 354.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Lebrun, *Hymnes*, p. 163.

<sup>28</sup> “Other” Singer, *Prayers*, p. 53.

(CTH 190) HKM 81 Vs. 9 *nu-ut-ta TI-tar ha-at-du-la-tar* (10) *in-na-ra-u-wa-tar* MU<sup>HIA</sup> G[ÍD.DA] (11) DINGIR<sup>MES</sup> -aš a-ši-ya-u-wa-a[r] (12) DINGIR<sup>MES</sup> -aš mi-ú-mar ZI-n[a]-aš (13) *du-uš-ga-ra-ta-an-na pí-eš[-kán-du]* (14) *nu A-NA DINGIR<sup>MES</sup> ku-it ú-e-t[um-mar]* (15) *nu-ut-ta a-pa-at pí-eš-kán-du* (see fn. 19).

### III. Statistics

However, if we mechanically apply the correlation 'negative situation > simple verb forms'; 'positive situation > -ške-forms', the statistics will be entirely beyond doubt only in the case of 'negative situation > simple verb forms': absolute majority of verbs in curses or benedictions with a negative semantic component are simple forms (209×, 92%) vs only 19× (8%) negative -ške-forms (see IV.3.6). The correlation is considerably lower for 'positive situation > -ške-forms': -ške-forms represent only 52% of all verbs used in positive situations (49×) vs 48% positive simple forms (45×). However, this slight prevalence does not falsify our claims. It is rather expected in view of the optional use of -ške-forms (see 0.2).

III.1. Besides, it is paralleled, for instance, by the verbs *ed-* "eat" and *eku-* "drink". They are used in benedictions 20× in simple forms and 14× in -ške-forms. The meaning of these<sup>29</sup> -ške-forms is clearly intensive<sup>30</sup> "eat one's fill", "drink one's fill"<sup>31</sup>. It is most clearly demonstrated by the complementary distribution between simple forms of *ed-* and *eku-* + *išpai-* "satisfy" or *ni(n)k-* "drink one's fill" on the one hand and only -ške-forms of *ed-* and *eku-* on the other. E.g.:

(CTH 330.1.M) KUB 33.62 Rs. III 10' ŠA<sup>DIM</sup> URU<sup>URU</sup> *Ku-li-ú-iš-na DINGIR.LÚ<sup>MES</sup> šu-me-eš e-iz-za-aš-tén* (11') *nu-za iš-pí-it-tén e-ku-te-en-ma nu-za ni-ik-te-en* "You, male deities of the Stormgod of Kuliwišna, eat and satisfy your hunger, drink and satisfy your thirst".

Simple forms are quite expected to be used with *išpai-* and *nink-* as the latter express intensive semantics. However, in the majority of cases (12× out of 20× – 60%) simple forms of *ed-* and *eku-* are used on their own, i.e. they represent cases when aspectual semantics is left unmarked. If we compare this statistics for *ed-* and *eku-* (54% -ške-forms vs 46% simple

forms) with that for semantically positive verbs 49× (52%) positive -ške-forms<sup>32</sup> vs 45× (48%) positive simple forms, we will immediately see a very close correlation.

III.2. I hold these figures (slightly more than 50%) to represent statistically the optional use of -ške-forms. However, I believe that more research is needed in this respect.

### IV. Borderline cases

Another possibility to raise the ratio of correspondence between positive situations and the use of -ške-forms is to introduce some restriction either on the definition of positive situations or on the usage of -ške-forms in positive situations. There are basically three possibilities: (1) limit the use of -ške-forms to certain verbs (centre – periphery of scribal usage) – see IV.1; (2) limit the use of -ške-forms to the situations where plurality can be easier expressed (quantification: centre – periphery of quantification – see IV.2; (3) introduce the scale of importance of positive and negative components coexisting in one situation – see IV.3.

IV.1. If we go back to the data on -ške-forms in positive situations (see II.2), we will easily notice that out of 49× -ške-forms with a positive semantic feature 34× (69%) are *piške-* "give" (25×) and *memiške-* (or synonymous *tarške-*) "speak, say" (9×). Thus the remaining 6+ 2 frgm. verbs (*hulališke-* "surround" 1×, *mieške-/maiške-/mišša-*<sup>33</sup> "grow" 3×, *haške-* "bear" 1×, *uppiške-* "send" 2×, *wemiške-* "find" 5×, *wewak-* "ask" 1×, 2× frgm.) are used only 15× (31%). I suppose it is a clear indication of highly fixed nature of 'positive' contexts marked by -ške-forms.

If we compare positive situations with -ške-forms versus positive situations with simple forms, we will immediately notice significantly different statistics: positive fixed -ške-forms are used 34× (89%) while positive fixed simple forms (solely of *pai-* "give") are attested only 4× (11%). On the other hand, positive not fixed -ške-forms are used 18× (30%, including *ištamaške-* 3×) vs positive not fixed simple forms 41× (70%). These statistical data make us seriously consider the possibility that the usage of -ške-forms in positive situations was not so much a purely grammatical phenomenon, but rather a kind of scribal usage, employed consistently in Middle Hittite for the most fixed (formulaic) positive situations with *piške-* "give" and *memiške-*, *tarške-* "say", only sporadically spreading to other semantically identical situations with different verbs.

IV.2. If we look generally at the ways to express plurality in a certain situation in Hittite, we will notice that some elements of situations are more liable to be marked as plural (quantified) than others. The easiest to quantify are (a) arguments of a verb (subjects and

<sup>29</sup> A verb which is used in similar contexts is *da-* "take" (offerings), used 4× in -ške-forms and 1× in the simple form: (CTH 491.1.A) KUB 43.58+ Rs. III 5' ... DINGIR<sup>MES</sup> -na-aš ZI-an-z[a] (6') *QA-TAM-MA SIG<sub>5</sub>-an-ZA e-eš-du* EN.SÍSKUR-m[a] ZI-an-ZA] (7') *QA-TAM-MA a-aš-ši-ya-an-ZA e-eš-du* [(8') *nu-uš-ši-kán SÍSKUR ar-ha aš-šu-l[i]* (9') *du-uš-ga-ra-an-ni-ya da-aš-ki-it-tén* [ . See Torri, StudAs 2 (2003), p. 105.

<sup>30</sup> The time span is limited to the offering at present: (CTH 458) KBo 34.62(+) KBo 34.70 Rs. IV 7' [ ]Š<sub>7</sub> TU 12 UZU<sup>UR</sup> UR<sup>HIA</sup> [ ] *pu-uš-pu-ši-i-e-eš* (8') *na]m-ma wa-ar-šu-la-aš wa[- ]x[- ]a-ru nu-uš-ši-kán* (9') [DINGIR<sup>MES</sup> *ku-it* NINDA<sup>UR</sup> *har-ši-in iš[-pa]-an-du-uz-z[i]-y[a]* ar-ha (10') [ ]x-ha-ni-e-wa-a[ ]la' *da-aš-ki-i[r]* *ki-nu-na-aš-ši-kán ar-ha* (11') *[aš-š]u-li nam-ma du-uš-g[a-ra-a]n<sup>ni</sup>-ni-ya da-aš-ki-it-tén #* (12') *nu-uš-ši-kán du-eg-ga-az* [ ] *x x ša<sup>ni</sup>-ni<sup>ni</sup>-iz-zi-iš* [cf. Groddek, AoF 26 (1999), p. 36 (Nr. 64), followed by HEG, P, p. 673] (13') *pu-uš-pu-ši-iš wa-ar-aš-t[a]* x DINGIR<sup>MES</sup> NINDA<sup>UR</sup> *har-ši-in iš-pa[-an-du-u]z-zi-ya* (14') *ar-ha aš-šu-li pár-ku-y[a-n]ni da-aš-ki-it-tén* [ ] (15') *na-aš PA-NI DINGIR<sup>MES</sup> pár-k[u-iš e-e]š-tu* ... "[ ] *pušpušis* from 12 body-parts. Then may the odour [ ]. As they, the [god]s, took from him a sacrificial loaf and libations ... [ ], now again take it from him favourably in [o]y. # From his/her (worshipper's) body [ ] ... he wipe[d] sweet [ ] (and) *pušpušis*. May (you,) the gods(,) take favourably [from him?] a sacrificial loaf and lib[ati]ons in the act of purify[i]ng/ purific[at]ion/ cleanliness. May he [b]e pu[re] in front of the gods".

<sup>31</sup> Dressler, *Pluralität*, p. 189.

<sup>32</sup> This is a kind of shorthand for -ške-forms in positive situations.

<sup>33</sup> Following Oettinger, *Stammbildung*<sup>2</sup>, p. 471; cf. HED, M, p. 7.



direct objects<sup>34</sup>) with lexical quantifiers like “many” (see IV.2.3-4); (b) verbal semantics like *increase, grow* (= become more numerous, become bigger, etc., see IV.2.2).

IV.2.1.1. Otherwise it is possible to quantify any situation concerning scope of the action with the help of lexical quantifiers like *uktūri* “always, for ever” (to prolong the action over a considerable period of time). Strangely, this possibility is very seldom used. The only example seems to be:

(CTH 433.3) KBo 17.105+ Vs. II 23` *nu-wa tu-uk ha-aš-ša-a-an uk-tu-u-ri-pát* LUGAL-wa-aš MUNUS.LUGAL-aš DUMU<sup>MES</sup>.LUGAL (24`) *ha-aš-še-eš ha-a-an-za-aš-še-eš an-da hu-u-la-li-iš-kán-du* ... “May the children, grandchildren, (and) great grandchildren of the king (and) queen surround you, hearth, forever...”.

A similar, but purely lexical marking is present in the following example:

(CTH 443) KBo 15.10+ Vs. II 5 *k[i-i] NA<sup>4</sup> pí-e-ru ma-a-ah-ha-an uk-tu-u-ri BE-LU Û DAM-ZU (6) DUM[U<sup>MES</sup>.Š]U QA-TAM-MA uk-tu-u-ri-eš a-ša-an-du* ... “As th[is] rock (is) everlasting, may the lord and his wife (and) [hi]s so[ns] be likewise everlasting ...!”.

The same idea can also be expressed by *appašiwatta*. As different from IV.2.4, durative lexical semantics of the verb *pahš-* makes it likely that we deal with durative meaning:

(CTH 253.2) KUB 21.41 Rs. IV 8` *nu AŠ-ŠUM BE-LÍ-ŠU-NU I-NA EGIR.[UD<sup>M</sup> (9`) DUTU<sup>SI</sup>-in-pát [pa-ah-ša-nu-ut-ten]*.

The conclusion is based on a better preserved NS context with *pahš-*:

(CTH 385.10) KUB 57.60 Vs. II 14` *la-bq-ar-na-an LÚ SANGA-KA (15`) MUNUS ta-wa-qan-na-an-na-an-da-qan [MUNUS AM]A.DINGIR<sup>LIM</sup>-KA (16`) QA-DU DUMU<sup>MES</sup>.ŠU DUMU.DUMU<sup>MES</sup>.ŠU ap-pq-ši-wa-qt-ta-az (17`) pa-qh-ši...* “Protect in the future *labarna*, your priest, your *tawananna*, priestess of the God's [mot]her, together with their<sup>1</sup> sons and their<sup>1</sup> grandsons”.

IV.2.1.2. *har(k)*-constructions can also serve as indicators of durativity (*keep* ...). Even though *har(k)*-constructions are multifunctional (see most recently HED, H, p. 155 with ref.) and some of the interpretations below are inevitably open to question, I believe that the data on the whole are conclusive enough:

(CTH 615.16) KBo 27.165+ Rs. 18` *-x-hi-eš-šar-te-et ak-ku-uš-ki-mi nu-wa-mu hu-iš-nu-an har-ak* “I am dying from ... . Keep me alive!”.

(CTH 190) HKM 73 Rs. 19 *kat-ti-ti hu-u-ma-an SIG<sub>5</sub>-in e-eš-du (20) nu-ut-ta DINGIR<sup>MES</sup> TI-an har-kán-du (21) nu-ut-ta ŠU<sup>HI.A</sup>-uš a-ra-ah-za-an-da (22) aš-šu-li har-kán-du (23) nu-ut-ta pa-ah-ša-an-da-ru* “May everything be fine with you, may the gods keep you alive, may (they) keep (their) hands favourably around you (and) protect you.”

In the following example we can see lexical marking of verbs as durative with the help of *har(k)*-construction in positive situations contrasting with unmarked verbs used with negative objects (= negative situation):

(CTH 404.1.I.A) KBo 39.8 Rs. III 26 *ka-a-šq-wa ŠA D[(IŠT)]AR iš-nu-u-ri-iš nu-wa-aš-*

<sup>34</sup> On the contrary, it is quite complicated to quantify indirect objects or adverbial modifiers. Whatever the theoretic explanation may be, the fact remains that I know practically of no cases of lexical marking of the plurality of indirect objects or adverbial modifiers in Hittite – without any connection with benedictions. See already Dressler, *Pluralität*, pp. 172-173, 178, but cf. IV.2.4.1.

*ma-aš a-aš-šu-i (27) TI-an-ni pa-ra-a tar-nq-an har-du i-da-a-la-u-i-ma-wa-aš-ma-aš-kán (28) ud-da-ni-i QA-TAM-MA mu-un-na-a-id-du* “Look, (this is) the *išnuri*-vessel of [(Išt)]ar. May (it) keep you turned over/ subject to well-being (and) life, but may it likewise hide you from the evil word”<sup>35</sup>.

I have to stress that the construction participle + *har(k)*- is never employed to mark durativity of a negative context<sup>36</sup>. Most probative is the following context where the *hark*-phrase is included into the text as part of the similitude and is directly followed by an unmarked form aimed at immediately destroying the action described by the *hark*-phrase (thus no durative interpretation is conceivable!):

(CTH 480) KUB 29.7+ Rs. 37 ... *ka-a-aš-wa ma-a-ah-ha-an šu-up-pí-wa-aš-har<sup>SAR</sup> hu-ur-pa-aš-ta-az an-da hu-u-la-li-ya-an-za (38) nu a-ra-aš a-ra-an a[r-ha Û-U]L tar-na-i i-da-a-la-u-wa-an-zi-ya NI-IŠ DINGIR<sup>LIM</sup>-ya hu-ur-ta-iš pa-ap-ra-an-na-a[n-z]a-ša<sup>37</sup> (39) e-ni<sup>38</sup> É.DINGIR<sup>LIM</sup> šu-up-pí[-wa-aš-ha-na-]aš<sup>39</sup> i-wa-ar an-da hu-u-la-li-ya-an har-du ki-nu-na ka-a-ša ku-u-un šu-u[p-pí-w]a-aš-har<sup>SAR</sup> (40) ar-ha ši-ip-pa-nu-un [ki-nu-n]a-an<sup>40</sup> kat-ta 1 ka-a-ki-in da-wa-ni-in kur-ku-un i-da-a-lu-ya ut-tar NI-IŠ DINGIR<sup>LIM41</sup> hu-u[r-ta-iš (41) pa-ap-ra-a-tar A-NA DINGIR<sup>LIM</sup> pí-ra-a]n<sup>42</sup> ar-ha QA-TAM-MA ši-ip-pa-id-du* ... “Look, as this onion (is) wrapped in (its) skins (and) one (skin) [does not] let go another (skin). And (so) may evil and perjury, curse and impu[ri]ty hold this temple enveloped/ wrapped like an on[io]n<sup>43</sup>. Look, now I have peeled off this on[io]n. [No]w I have kept one lousy/wretched<sup>?</sup> stump<sup>?</sup>/ stem<sup>?</sup>. And likewise may he peel off evil word, perjury, cur[se] (and) impurity [fro]m (lit. in front of) the god”.

The context (CTH 789) KBo 32.14 Vs. II 21 URU-ya-ša-an DINGIR<sup>MES</sup> *hu-wa-ar-ta-an har-kán-zi<sup>44</sup>* is sometimes analyzed as durative marking of a negative form: “The gods of the city will hold him cursed”<sup>45</sup>. However, it is at least ambiguous and permits a very

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Miller, StBoT 44, p. 88. A similar NH context: (CTH 61.II.7.A) KBo 5.8 Vs. I 13 ... *nu-mu i-da-a-la-u-i pa-ra-a Û-UL tar-na-a-i (14) a-aš-ša-u-i-ma-mu pa-ra-a tar-na-an har-zi* ... “He does not expose me to the evil but keeps me exposed to the good”. Cf. HED, H, pp. 147-148.

<sup>36</sup> Contra Neu, StBoT 32, p. 120 Anm. 48 with ref. *hark*-phrases do not *necessarily* have static meaning (nothing like “for ever”).

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Torri, StudAs 2 (2003), p. 142.

<sup>38</sup> Goetze, JCS 1 (1947), pp. 318-319; Trabazo, BCBO 6 (2002), p. 504. Cf. Lebrun, Samuha, foyer religieux de l'empire Hittite. Louvain-la-Neuve 1976, p. 123; Torri, StudAs 2 (2003), p. 142.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Torri, StudAs 2 (2003), p. 142.

<sup>40</sup> Lebrun, Samuha, p. 123; Trabazo, BCBO 6 (2002), p. 504. Cf. Torri, StudAs 2 (2003), p. 142.

<sup>41</sup> Following Lebrun, Samuha, p. 123; Torri, StudAs 2 (2003), p. 142.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Trabazo, BCBO 6 (2002), p. 504.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Torri, StudAs 2 (2003), p. 142.

<sup>44</sup> Similarly Rs. III 5. The analysis of the Hurrian original (see Neu, StBoT 32, p. 120; in Vs. II 9-10, 50-51: gerund is translated into Hittite as a finite verb + *mahhan*) leads us to the conclusion that the constructions were chosen by the translator into Hittite freely, without any pressure from the Hurrian original.

<sup>45</sup> See Neu, StBoT 32, p. 77; Wegner, *Einführung in die hurritische Sprache*. Wiesbaden 2000, p. 201: “Die Gottheiten der Stadt halten ihn (für immer) verflucht”.

different interpretation – see Hoffner, *Hittite Myths*<sub>2</sub>, p. 69: “And the city’s gods have made him accursed”.

IV.2.1.3. It is interesting to note that all the verbs that are quantified in IV.2.1.1-2 possess durative semantics, never habitual. It may be the reason why scope-of-the-action quantification is so rarely attested as majority of lexically durative verbs are never used in -ške-forms (see 0.3).

IV.2.2. Verbal **semantics** is slightly more often quantified if verbs possess lexical meaning incorporating either (a) a positive attribute (deadjectival verbs like *uktūriyahh* “make eternal/permanent” from *uktūri* “eternal/permanent”, *palheš* “expand”, “become wide or broad” from *palhi* “broad”) or (b) properly verbal semantics that lexically expresses quantity and its changes (e.g., *mai* “increase, grow” = “become more numerous, become bigger, etc.”):

NS (CTH 385.10.B) KUB 57.60+ Vs. II 10` *na-at pal-hi-iš-ki-it-ta-ru* (17`) ... *nu-uš ma-ya-an-da-ah-hi-iš-ki* (18`) *uk-tu-u-ri-ya-[(ah-hi-i)]š-ki* “May it (the land of Hatti) expand ... Rejuvenate them (the king and queen) and make them ete[r]nal”;

(CTH 385.2) KUB 24.6 Vs. 3` *[na]m-ma-an-na-aš KUR<sup>URU</sup> Ha-at-ti G[U<sub>4</sub>-it UDU-it ...]* (4`) *[hal-]ki-it GEŠTIN-it ma-i-iš-ki-i[d-du]*<sup>46</sup> “[Th]en/ [ag]ain let our land of Hatti increase in (lit. with) ca[t]tle, sheep, ... , gr[ain] (and) wine”.

IV.2.3. Quantification of verbal arguments is by far the most commonly attested type. The quantification is usually expressed by lexical quantifiers like “many”<sup>47</sup>:

(CTH 820.3) KUB 43.23 Rs. 20` ŠAH.TUR<sup>HLA</sup> *me-ek-ku-uš ha-aš-ki-iz-zi ke-e-el-la-az ŠA<sup>GIS</sup>KIRI<sub>6</sub>.G[ESTIN]* (21`) *1-aš-ša<sup>GIS</sup> ma-a-ah-la-aš ŠAH-aš i-wa-ar mu-u-ri-uš* (22`) *me-ek-ku-uš ha-aš-ki-id-du* “As a sow bears many piglets, may every single vine branch of this viney[ard] bear many grapes like a sow”.

It is also possible to indicate the underlying plurality of DUMU.NITA<sup>MEŠ</sup> DUMU.MUNUS<sup>MEŠ</sup> “sons (and) daughters” and of *antu* “goods” in general with the help of denominal verbs from the same stem (*makkeš* “be(come) numerous”):

NS (CTH 414.A) KBo 29.1 Rs. IV 2 *nu DUMU.NITA<sup>MEŠ</sup> DUMU.MUNUS<sup>MEŠ</sup> ha-aš-še-eš ha-an-za-aš-še-eš ma-ak-ki-eš-ša-an-du* “May (the king’s) sons, daughters, grandchildren (and) great grandchildren be numerous!”.

<sup>46</sup> Restorations follow CHD, L-N, p. 115.

<sup>47</sup> See also numerous analogous contexts (in the past tense) in NS texts: (CTH 324.3.J) KUB 33.12 (restored – see Watkins, *Mem.Güterbock*, pp. 170-171; Mazoyer, *Télipinu*, p. 64), (CTH 385.10) KUB 57.63 (see Archi, *Fs Otten*<sup>2</sup>, pp. 18- 19), (CTH 414.A) KUB 29.1 (see Trabazo, *BCBO* 6 (2002), pp. 434-451), etc. E.g., NS/OH (CTH 414.A) KBo 29.1 Vs. I 21 LUGAL-e-mu DINGIR<sup>MEŠ</sup> *me-ek-ku-uš MU<sup>KAM.HLA</sup>-uš ma-ni-ya-ah-hi-ir* (22) *ú-it-ta-an-na ku-ut-ri-eš-me-et NU.GÁL* “The gods have allotted many years to me, the king, and there is no limit<sup>2</sup> of the years” (following Trabazo, *BCBO* 6 (2002), p. 437; cf. HED, K, p. 298).

NS (CTH 385.10) KUB 57.63 Vs. II 39 *nu la-ba-ar-na-aš LUGAL-wa-aš* (40) *an-tu-uš-ši<sup>48</sup>-it pa-ra-a* (41) *pa-ra-a ma-ak-ki-iš-kat-ta-ru* “May the goods of *labarna*, the king, become more and more<sup>49</sup> numerous”.

Another way to express plurality is by means of “long” (i.e. many) applied to “years”. See among others (CTH 483.I.A) KUB 15.34+ Vs. II 39 in IV.2.4. See also (CTH 591.I.a.A) KBo 17.88+ Rs. III 8`-12` (II.2.2.3) for what appears to be an endless amount of years<sup>50</sup>.

IV.2.4. At first sight lexical quantifiers like *appašiwatta* seem ambiguous (but cf. IV.2.1): they may quantify either time scope of the verb (protect in the future = protect always) or the number of objects (health for the future = a lot of health, esp. when used in gen. *appašiwattaš*)<sup>51</sup>. Thus the actual time span of the action can be punctual (but intensive or with plurality of arguments, providing the client for the rest of his/ her life), or durative/habitual (occurring many times in the future):

(CTH 396.1) KBo 15.25 Vs. 22 ... *ka-q-ša-wa-aš-ma-aš EN SÍSKUR SÍSKUR pa-iš* (23) *šu-me-ša-wa [D<sup>D</sup>Gul-še-eš D<sup>M</sup>MAH<sup>MEŠ</sup> A-NA EN SÍSKUR TI-tar ha-at-du-la-a-tar* (24) *[i]n-na-ra-u-w[a-tar MU<sup>HLA</sup> GÍD.DA IG]I<sup>HLA</sup>-aš uš-ki-ya-u-wa-ar GÚ-tar ša-ra-a ap-pa-a-tar-ra* (25) *[I-N]A EGIR[UD<sup>MI</sup> pí-iš-kat-tén]* “Look, the offerant gave you an offering and you, [Gods of Fate (and) Mother]-goddesses, [give i]n/[fo]r the futu[re] life, health, [s]treng[th], longevity, ey[es]ight and holding up of the neck/ neck-lift (= stamina/ self-assurance<sup>52</sup>, pride<sup>53</sup>) to the offerant”;

(CTH 330.1.M) KUB 33.62 Vs. II 7` *[nu-za-kán<sup>?</sup>]<sup>54</sup> an-da wa-ah-nu-ut<sup>DIM URU</sup> Ku-li-ú-iš-na* (8`) *A-NA<sup>LÚ</sup> BE-EL É<sup>TIM</sup> MUNUS BE-EL-DI É<sup>TIM</sup> DUMU.NITA<sup>MEŠ</sup> DUMU.MUNUS<sup>MEŠ</sup>-aš* (9`) *aš-šu-li TI-an-ni in-na-ra-u-wa-an-ni ha-at-tu-la-an-ni* (10`) *MU<sup>HLA</sup> GÍD.DA EGIR.UD<sup>MI</sup> DINGIR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-aš a-aš-ši-u-ni-it DINGIR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-na-aš mi-ú-um-ni-it* “Turn [yourself], O Stormgod of Kuliwišna, toward the lord of the house (and) the lady of the house for (the

<sup>48</sup> Following CHD, P, p. 123.

<sup>49</sup> CHD, P, p. 123: “[*parā parā*] ad[d] comparative value to denominal verbs (“more and more ..., even ...er”).

<sup>50</sup> Many interesting indications of plurality of this kind come from NS/OH (CTH 414.A) KBo 29.1. See, e.g., IV.2.5.

<sup>51</sup> See HW<sup>2</sup>, A, p. 167 with ref. For the use in the genitive quantifying nouns see: NS (CTH 699) KBo 21.34+ Vs. I 65 ... *TI-tar-wa-mu ha-ad-du-la-a-tar* (Vs. II 1) *DUMU.NITA<sup>MEŠ</sup> DUMU.MUNUS<sup>MEŠ</sup> ŠA EGIR.UD<sup>MI</sup> pí-eš-ki* “Give me life, health, sons (and) daughters for (lit. of) the future”; NS (CTH 377.B) KUB 24.2 Rs. 14` *[nu-uš-ma-aš h]al-ki-ya-aš<sup>GIS</sup> GESTIN-aš<sup>GIS</sup> še-e-ša-na-aš GU<sup>HLA</sup>-aš UDU<sup>HLA</sup>-aš MÁŠ<sup>HLA</sup>-[aš]* (15`) *[(ŠAH<sup>HLA</sup> ANŠE.GİR.N)]UN.NA<sup>HLA</sup>-aš ANŠE<sup>HLA</sup>-aš gi-im-ra-aš hu-u-it-ni-it* (16`) *[(DUMU.LÚ.U<sub>19</sub>.LU-aš-ša Š)]A EGIR.UD<sup>MI</sup> mi-ya-a-tar pí-iš-ki* ... “Give [to them] (the king (and) queen)] future growth of [g]rain, vines, fruit-trees<sup>1</sup>, cattle, sheep, goat[s], (pigs, mul)[es], horses, together with wild animals of the steppe, [(and of humans)]”.

<sup>52</sup> HED, E-I, p. 280.

<sup>53</sup> Following CHD, Š, p. 68. Cf. HED, E-I, p. 369.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. HW<sup>2</sup>, A, p. 403.

giving of) sons, daughters, well-being, life, vigor, health, for long years in/for the future, through the love of the gods (and) the kindness of the gods”<sup>55</sup>.

The context is an elliptic and irregular transformation of the usual ... *nai* ... *piške* “turn (to the king and queen) ... give (them various positive substances)” phrase (see for examples (CTH 483.I.A) KUB 15.34+ Vs. II 39-40 in the same section below). Thus the temporal indication EGIR.UD<sup>MI</sup> should rather refer to this omitted (but implied) verb. In this respect we tend to agree with Melchert (quoted in CHD, L-N, p. 309), but with an important difference of opinion: we cannot and should not *restore* any *omitted piške* because of the syntactic transformation (*innarawatar* > *innarawanni*, etc.). We should rather posit a sporadic syntactic reduction of dat.+ *nai/wahnut* acc.+ *piške* > ... *nai/wahnut* +dat. +loc./dat., instr. probably on the model of *kappuwaye*- “take into account” > “take care of” normally employed with dat./loc. and instr.

Actually, there are no exact parallels for this use of *wahnu*-. out of similar texts (see HW<sub>2</sub>, A, p. 403, CHD, L-N, p. 309) NS (CTH 330.1.N) KUB 33.64+ KBo 21.60 Vs.<sup>7</sup> 4'-9' (see Glocker, *Eothen* 6 (1997), p. 42) is too fragmentary and preserves no verb; other texts of the same group do not display comparable contexts. The verb in NS (CTH 459) KBo 8.71 7' is likely to be *šar-x*-. The nonstandard character of the context is further stressed by inversion.

(CTH 371) KBo 7.28+ Rs. 40' *nu ma-a-an ú-wa-at-te-ni na-aš-ta a-aš-šu ša-ra-a ú-da-at-te-en* [*nu*<sup>7</sup> KUR<sup>72</sup>-ŠU<sup>72</sup>] (41') *ma-a-ú ši-iš-du nu EGIR.UD<sup>MI</sup> DINGIR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-na-an ud-da-a-ar ir-ha-a-an e-eš-t[u]* (42') *ma-a-ah-ha-an ták-na-a-aš<sup>D</sup> UTU-un ir-ha-a-it kat-ta-ma šu-ma-a-aš ir-ha-a-it* (43') L[UGAL<sup>7</sup>]-un *ap-pa-ši-wa-at-ta ir-ha-at-te-en* ... “When you come, bring up well-being. May it thrive and prosper [*in the land*]. May the gods' words b[e] performed in the future. As he performed for the Sungoddess of the Earth and performed for you, may you perform for the k[in]g<sup>7</sup> in the future...”<sup>56</sup>;

(CTH 483.I.A) KUB 15.34+ Vs. II 39 *na-aš-ta* [A-NA LUGA]L MUNUS.LUGAL *an-da aš-šu-li na-iš-du-ma-at* (40) *nu-uš-ma-a[š pi-i]š-ki-it-tén* TI-tar *ha-ad-du-la-a-tar* MU<sup>HI.A</sup> GÍD.DA EG[IR].UD<sup>MI</sup><sup>57</sup> “Turn [to the king] (and) queen favourably, [g]ive them life, health, longevity in/for the f[uture]”.

The following case is very fragmentary with lost verb, but definitely positive:

(CTH 389) KBo 39.7<sup>58</sup> 7' [ ]x<sup>MEŠ</sup> *ha-aš-š[a ha-an-za-aš-ša* (8') [ I-NA EGIR.UD<sup>MI</sup> [ # (9') [ ]na-aš a-aš-ši-yq-[tar (10') [ ] mi-ya-tar nu-uš[(-) (11') [ ša-al-h]i-ti-in nu-ú-x[ (12') [ ]x ma-a-an ZI-a[š (13') [ pa]-ra-a la-ga-a-[an har-k<sup>o</sup>.

<sup>55</sup> See CHD, L-N, p. 309. Cf. HW<sup>2</sup>, A, p. 403, Glocker, *Eothen* 6 (1997), pp. 35-36, and (wrongly – because of *-ma*) HED, E-I, p. 370: “for the well-being, life, strength, health, long years in the future of the lord and lady of the house and their children remove wrath, through the favour and kindness of the gods!”.

<sup>56</sup> The translation generally follows Singer, *Prayers*, p. 23. The only point of difference is his restoration of [the Sun-goddess(?)] in the last lacuna. Cf. Lebrun, *Hymnes*, pp. 85, 88.

<sup>57</sup> The restoration follows Haas, Wilhelm. AOAT 3, p. 192.

<sup>58</sup> Dating follows Groddek, DBH 11 (2004), p. 8.

However, there are contexts that favour the assessment of EGIR.UD<sup>MI</sup> as “for the future”, i.e. quantifying the number of arguments, not the time scope of the verb. Such contexts describe situations of granting good things in the past:

(CTH 324.1.A) KUB 17.10 Rs. IV 25 GU<sub>4</sub> AMAR-ŠU *pi-en-ni-iš-ta<sup>D</sup> Te-li-pi-nu-ša* LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL <KI.MIN> *nu-uš-za* (26) *hu-iš-wa-an-ni in-na-ra-u-wa-ni EGIR.UD<sup>MI</sup> kap-pu-u-e-et<sup>59</sup>* “The cow looked after her calf, Telipinu <looked after> the king and queen. He provided them in respect to life, vigour for the future”<sup>60</sup>, also *ibid.* 27<sup>61</sup>.

Another similar (NS) text employs *ukturi*:

(CTH 628.10e.F) KBo 20.60 Rs. IV 7' ..*tu-uq-q[(a-wa)]* (8') A-NA LUGAL TI-tar *ha-at-tu-la-tar ŠA EGIR.UD<sup>KAM-MI</sup>* (9') UR.SAG-in <sup>GIŠ</sup>TUKUL-in DINGIR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-*na-aš mi-nu-mar* (10') [(*u*)]*k-tu-u-ri pi-ya-an har-zi* ... “...(The Stormgod) has permanently (*ukturi*) given to you, the king, life, health, a heroic weapon for the future, (and) the gods' favour.” (following CHD, L-N, p. 291).

Particularly interesting is time indication in:

NS (CTH 385.10) KUB 57.63 Vs. II 1 x[ -t]a[š]a-aš-[š]a *hal-k[i-y]a-aš [ŠA]* (2) GEŠTIN<sup>[HI.A]</sup>-y[a GU<sub>4</sub>(?) UDU(?)] *mi-i-ya-tar* (3) *kat-ta ha-aš-[ša]-aš ha-an-za-aš-ša-aš pa-iš* “She gave growth of cr[o]ps and [of] wine, [cattle (and) sheep] down to grand[c]hildren (and) great grandchildren”.

Thus I interpret contexts from this section as quantifying arguments, not time scope of the verb.

IV.2.4.1. It is necessary to note that my understanding of quantification differs drastically from Dressler's one. For him plurality is a kind of agreement between sg. subject/object and simple form on the one hand and pl. subject/object and -ške-form on the other (Dressler, *Pluralität*, pp. 172-182, cf. esp. p. 180 for *pai*-). For me it is rather **intensity**, **abundance**<sup>62</sup>, expressed not by grammatical plural number, but lexically (and, as I strive to demonstrate, by -ške-forms): thus it is not just ‘grapes’ or ‘years’ that matter, but ‘many grapes’, ‘long years’, etc. (see IV.2.3). Mind that this quantification works nicely even for grammatically uncountable nouns like *hattulatar*: see fn. 51 where ‘strength of the future’ (=

<sup>59</sup> Similarly (CTH 334.6) KUB 33.38 Rs. IV 1 [*nu*]-ZA AM[A-aš<sup>2</sup> DUMU-an ga-ni-eš-ta] GU<sub>4</sub>-uš [AMAR-un] (2) [g]a-ni-eš-ta U[DU-u]š S[ILA<sub>4</sub>-an g]a-ni-i[š-ta] (3) [D]INGIR<sup>LUM</sup>-ma LUGAL MUNUS.LU[G]AL [g]a-n[i]-eš-ta K[UR-ZU-ya] (4) [g]a-ni-iš-ta nu-uš-ZA *hu-iš-wa-an-ni* [*in-na-ra-u-wa-an-ni*]<sup>7</sup> (5) EGIR.UD<sup>MI</sup> *kap-pu-u-i[t]*.

<sup>60</sup> Following Mazoyer, *Telipinu*, p. 80; Trabazo, *BCBO* 6 (2002), p. 147; HED, E-I, p. 370; Pecchioli Daddi, Polvani, *La mitologia ittita*. Brescia 1990, p. 83; similarly Goetze, ANET, p. 128. Cf. Hoffner, *Hittite Myths*<sup>2</sup>, p. 18: “The cow looked after her calf. And Telipinu too <looked after> the king and queen and took account of them in respect to life, vigor and longevity”.

<sup>61</sup> Mind the interesting contrast between imperative -ške-forms in addresses to gods and preterit simple forms in narrative within positive quantified situations. Unfortunately, the contrast is attested very sparsely in MS texts (only these 2x) and is mostly based on NS texts – see the following examples as well as fn. 47, 92. Thus it may just be incidental as the suggested rule did not work in NH.

<sup>62</sup> The concept itself is lexically attested in *iyata(r) tamēta(r)* “plenty (and) abundance”. See HED, E-I, pp. 350-352; Košak, *Studies Hoffner*, pp. 250-251; Watkins, *Heth.u.Ind.*, pp. 280-287; HEG, T, pp. 81-82; etc.



eternal, lasting, great strength) is attested. The difference is the clearest for locatives. Dressler's 'lokaldistributiven' cases mean that the action takes place in several locations within one situation. It is hard to imagine how **intensity** or **abundance** (features relevant for me) can be expressed in locatives because, as noted above (fn. 34), indirect objects and adverbial modifiers are not normally quantified.

IV.2.5. Sometimes there may be a conflict between two types of quantification, exemplified by *gulš-* "decree, ordain" which combines **explicit**<sup>63</sup> concrete localization of the verbal action with (possible, but not overtly marked) quantification of direct objects. In this concrete case the conflict is solved in favour of concrete localization of the verbal action, thus a simple form is employed<sup>64</sup>:

(CTH 370) KUB 34.53 Rs. 15' *a-aš-šu-ya-wa-aš-ši-kán gul-aš-tén* ... "And decree good for him!"

The concrete localization is based on a similar context (**late NS/MH**<sup>65</sup>):

(CTH 448.4.2) KUB 43.55 Vs. II 14 [*nu-u*]š-ši *a-pí-e-da-ni UD-ti ma-ah-ha-an* <sup>D</sup>*Gul-še-eš* <<-iš>> (15) [(DINGIR.MA)]H<sup>MES</sup>-iš-ša *aš-šu-ul gul-ša-an-zi* # (16) [*k(i-nu-n)*]a *ka-a-aš a-pa-a-aš UD*<sup>KAM</sup>-za *nu-kán* <sup>D</sup>*Gul-še-eš* (17) [(DINGIR.MAH<sup>M</sup>)]<sup>ES</sup>-iš-ša *ki-e-di UD*<sup>KAM</sup>-ti A-NA LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL TI-\*tar\* (18) [(*ha-at-tu-l*)]a-\*tar\* <<NA>> *in-na-ra-wa-tar MU*<sup>KAM</sup> GÍD.DA (19) [EGIR.UD<sup>MI</sup>?<sup>66</sup> *mi-(y)*]a-tar ZAG-aš-ša *ar-nu-um-mar DINGIR*<sup>MES</sup>-aš (20) [(*an-tu-uh-ša-a*)]š[(-ša) (a-a)]š-ši-ya-u-wa-ar (21) [(a)l-š(a-nu-wa-ar) *mi-i/nu-ú-mar*? (a-aš-š)]u-wa-ar *gul-aš-tén*<sup>67</sup> "As on that day (of birth) Gods of fate and [(Mother-goddess)]es decree his welfare, # **this (is like) that day**, and **on this day**, Gods of fate and [(Mother-goddess)]es, decree life, [(heal)]th, strength, longevity [in/for the future?], growth, bringing to the right<sup>68</sup>, love of gods [(and people)]e, [(a)lleg(iance), kindness <of the gods>, (goo)]ds? for the king (and) queen".

The following contexts also unambiguously denote concrete localization of determining/assigning the good things for a person<sup>69</sup>:

(CTH 820.4) KBo 21.22 Vs. 18' *kq-q-ša* GÍŠ.ÉRIN *kar-pí-i-e-mi nu la-ba-ar-na-aš ta-lu-qa-uš MU*<sup>HLA</sup>-uš (19') *uš-ne-eš-ki-mi ka-a-ša* GÍŠ.ÉRIN *kar-pí-i-e-mi na-aš-ta* (20')

<sup>63</sup> It is not normally marked elsewhere. The reason for such marking is that the verb describes determining/ assigning the amount of positive things (see already Starke, ZA 69/1 (1979), p. 88). This concretely localized action should not be confused with granting these things afterwards described by the bulk of positive contexts.

<sup>64</sup> The following concretely localized example is formally very close to benedictions, but is not a benediction. It is a 'technical' request to the god. No mention of the person is made as different from typical positive situations. Thus I exclude the context from the discussion: (CTH 373.A) KUB 30.10 Rs. 19 ... *ki-nu-na-ma-pa* [DINGIR-]YA *in-na-ra-u[-wa-]a-ar* (20) Û <sup>D</sup>LAMMA *an-da tu-u-ri-ya* ... "But now, my [god], harness together (your) strength and (that of) the Protective deity." Following Singer, *Prayers*, p. 32; Trabazo, *BCBO* 6 (2002), p. 247. Cf. Goetze, ANET, p. 401.

<sup>65</sup> See Taracha, *Ersetzen*, pp. 162-163, 202.

<sup>66</sup> The position of EGIR.UD<sup>MI</sup> is unusual, which casts doubt on the restoration. See IV.2.1, IV.2.4 for the normal position (**only** at the end or beginning of the list of positive things!). Cf. Taracha, *Ersetzen*, pp. 60, 141.

<sup>67</sup> Restorations follow Taracha, *Ersetzen*, pp. 58-60.

<sup>68</sup> "Erfolgs<sup>3</sup>bringen" Taracha, *Ersetzen*, pp. 61, 141-2.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. Kimball, *Fs Winter*, p. 188 fn. 42.

MUNUS<sup>70</sup> *ta-wa-na-an-na-aš ta-lu-qa-uš MU*<sup>HLA</sup>-uš *uš-ne-eš-ki-mi* "I lift up the scales and weigh<sup>70</sup> the long years of *labarna*; I lift up the scales and weigh the long years of *tawananna*"<sup>71</sup>;

NS/OH (CTH 414.A) KBo 29.1 Vs. II 8 *nu LUGAL-wa-aš MU*<sup>KAM.HLA</sup>-uš *ma-al-ki-ya-an-zi* (9) *ú-it-ta-an-na ku-ut-ri-eš-mi-it kap-pu-u-wa-u-wa-ar-ša-me-et* (10) *Ú-UL du-uq-qa-a-ri* "They are spinning the years of the king, and of the years no limit<sup>72</sup> or reckoning is to be seen"<sup>72</sup>.

IV.2.6. Now to some conclusions. All the quantified situations in IV.2.1-4 are clearly positive<sup>73</sup>. Majority of them also employ not only lexical, but also grammatical means of quantification – *-ške*-forms<sup>74</sup>. If we compare the data in sections IV.2.1-4 with those in II.2, we will see that aspectual marking by *-ške*-forms of overtly quantified positive situations is identical to that of positive situations not overtly quantified. Another obvious conclusion is that there is no complementary distribution between lexical and grammatical quantification.

IV.3. So far, for clarity I have discussed only the cases where either positive or negative semantics dominated. However, there are a number of borderline cases between the two types where both positive and negative semantic features are attested. The most important among these is represented by the negative implication. Situations containing negative implication can be overtly positive but always with a negative semantic feature which is implied, i.e. follows from an action or an object (i.e., the meaning of some component of a situation implies a prior negative situation). There are two kinds of negative implications – broadly situational and narrowly situational. As practically all benedictory texts are built around the same model of two situations "take bad, # give good", any concrete action of the second, positive situation has negative implications as far as **both situations** are concerned: *give health in this context* always implies that health is given to an ill person. I call this negative implication broadly situational. It can even be transposed from the first negative situation ("take bad") into the second positive one ("give good") by means of *appa* "back" (see IV.3.6). However, if we analyse the second positive situation **by itself** as isolated from the first – negative – one, we will immediately notice that *give good* does not imply that the person who is given this good did not have it previously. That is, it is possible to give (i.e., add) strength, etc. to strength, etc. that the person already has (cf. wrongly Starke, ZA 69/1

<sup>70</sup> The fact that the action is going on at the point of speaking may be emphasized by *kāša* (see Hoffner, Melchert, *Studi Imparati*, p. 379), as well as by *-ške*-form in progressive meaning.

<sup>71</sup> Following Archi, *Fs Meriggi*<sup>2</sup>, pp. 45-47; id., *Fs Otten*<sup>2</sup>, p. 14. Cf. HED, K, p. 92; Watkins, *How to Kill a Dragon*. New York – London 1995, p. 136-7; Dressler, *Pluralität*, p. 192.

<sup>72</sup> Following HEG, T, p. 426; Trabazo, *BCBO* 6 (2002), p. 443; Ofitsch, *StBoT* 45, pp. 481-483. Cf. HED, K, p. 298.

<sup>73</sup> Negative situations are quantified by *humant-* "all" only 2× out of 209×!

<sup>74</sup> See for statistics IV.4. Some of the verbs are never used in *-ške*-forms. 3 relevant contexts are fragmentary, in one case EGIR.UD<sup>MI</sup> is badly damaged.

(1979), p. 94 w. n. 101): see II.2.2.3 for granting years to the king and queen who are already vigorous<sup>75</sup>; also:

(CTH 591.I.a.A) KBo 17.88+ 24.116 Rs. III 23` *pa-id-du-wa in-na-ra-u-wa-an-te-eš in-na-ra-u-wa-an-te-eš* (24`) *pa-ah-ha-aš-nu-an-te-eš a-ša-an-du* ... "Let the strong ones be strong (and) protected/enduring"<sup>76</sup>;

OS (CTH 820.1) KUB 36.110 Rs. 11` *la-ba-ar-na-aš LUGAL-uš i-na-ra-u-an-za nu-uš-še-pa* (12`) *ut-ni-ya-an-za hu-u-ma-an-za an-da i-na-ra-ah-hi* "Labarna, the king, is strong, and the whole land makes him additionally strong"<sup>77</sup>.

This analysis implies that negative and positive situations within a benediction function independently, disparately from each other having different spatial and temporal marking. I.e. the positive situation is isolated from the negative one and transposed into another temporal sphere – future – from the corresponding negative one. Or it is quantified while the other one is not (see II.2-3 and IV.2.1-4 for examples). Consequently, in determining negative implication within a situation I rely only on the the situation itself (i.e. only the meaning of the verb or its immediate arguments implying a prior negative situation matters). It means that I analyse situations like *take/put into a good place* as containing narrowly situational negative implication because they automatically imply by themselves (without resource to the first situation) that the person was previously in another, i.e. bad place. All such cases with negative implication tend to employ simple forms of verbs (86%). Even though the situation itself is sometimes overtly marked by the positive semantic features (adverbial modifier of manner: *aššuli*, *aššu* "favourably"; attribute of the argument: *aššu* "good", etc., see IV.3.4-5), the negative implication still blocks the use of *-ške*-forms. Thus broadly situational negative implication does not make the situation negative while narrowly situational negative implication does. Now I go on to list examples of the latter.

IV.3.1. *ep*- "take", *tittanu*- "set" (in a good place) in prayers; implication: the object was previously in a bad place:

(CTH 374.2.A) KUB 36.75+ Rs. III 11` ... *nu-mu ŠiG<sub>5</sub>-u-wa-an-ti pí-e-di QA-T[I-YA]* (12`) *e-ip* ... "Take me by m[y] han[d] into a good place"<sup>78</sup>;

(CTH 371) KBo 7.28+ Vs. 13` ... *na-an-kán i-[da-a-la-u-wa-az<sup>79</sup>] (14`) [d]a-q<sup>79</sup> [n]a-an a-aš-ša-u-i pí-e-di ti-it-ta-nu-ut* ... "[T]ake him out of the e[vil] and p[ut] him into a good place" = (CTH 373.A) KUB 30.10 Rs. 7 [ ] *i-na-na-az [a-wa-]an ar[-ha] nam-ma ti-it-nu-ut* ...<sup>80</sup> "Raise [me fr]om my illness again";

IV.3.2. *ašnu*- "put in order"; implication: the object was previously in disorder:

(CTH 395.3) KBo 20.34 Rs. 8` ... *nu-uš-ma-aš EGIR-ŠU (9`) ku-it da-a-i na-at-ši-kán aš-ša-nu-ut-te-en* "... What he/she places for you then, put it in order for him/her!";

IV.3.3. *happinah*- "make rich"; implication: the object was previously poor:

(CTH 716.1.C) KBo 21.48 Vs. 6` [(*nu-za LUGAL*)] *MUNUS.LUGAL DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup>.LUGAL DUMU.DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup>.LUGAL E[(GIR-an aš-šu-li TI-an-ni ha-ad-du-la-an-ni in-na-ra-wa-an-ni MU<sup>HIA</sup> GÍD.DA EGIR.UD<sup>M</sup>)] (7) [(*kap-pu-wa*)]-i KUR<sup>URU</sup> *Ha-at-ti-ma-za EGIR-a[n]* ]<sup>81</sup> (8`) [(*na-at*)] *lu-lu-wa-a-i ha-ap-pí-na-ah-hi-ya-a[(t* ... "A[(fterwards car)]e [(for the king,)] the queen, the sons of the king (and) the grandsons of the king [(in well-being, life, health, vigor, (and) long years forever)]. Afterward[s] ] the land of Hatti. Sustain [(it) and make i[(t)] rich!";*

IV.3.4. *kappuwaye*- in the meaning "take into consideration"; *huišnu*- "save"; *wahnu*-, *nai*- "turn to"; *ištamaš*- "hear"; *au*-, *šakuwaye*- "look" (sometimes accompanied by *karp*- "lift (eye lashes)"; *lak*- "lower/ bend (eyes)" which emphasize the starting point of looking); implication: the object was previously ignored, forsaken by the deity:

(CTH 433.3) KBo 17.105+ KBo 34.47 Vs. II 13` [*nu-kán LUGAL-i MUNUS.LUGAL-ri A-[NA DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup>.LUGAL an-da aš-šu-li ne-eš-hu-ut* (14`) [A-NA] *LU<sup>MEŠ</sup>.MUŠEN.DÜ-ya-kán a[n-da] aš-šu-li ni-iš-hu-ut* "Turn favourably [to the king, que]n, t[o the children] of the king; and turn [f]avourably [to the] fowlers";

IV.3.5. *aššu uddār* ... *uwa*- "good words ... come"; implication: the words change their previous position and appear in a new place, thus there were no good words previously;

(CTH 433.3) KBo 17.105+ Rs. III 6` ... *i-da-a-la-u-wa ha-du-ga ku-e ud-da-a-ar (7) na-at-kán pa-ra-a pa-id-d[u a]n-da-ma-kán a-aš-ša-u-wa mi-i-ya-u-wa (8) ha-at-ta-an-ta u-i[d-du* ... "Let the words which are evil (and) fearful g[o] out, and let good, gentle/ reassuring (?) and wise ones co[m]e i[n]".

IV.3.6. As was shown above (IV.3.1-5), in situations with both positive and negative semantic components negative ones are normally stronger, even if they are as seemingly inconspicuous as negative implication. Very rarely, however, overlapping of positive and negative semantic features leads to exceptional aspectual marking (only under special circumstances). In the following two cases there is as strong negative implication as in the examples from IV.3.1-5 alongside positive objects. The conclusion is based on the presence of *āppa* (see IV.3)<sup>82</sup>. The contexts are marked by *-ške*-forms, I suppose, due to their

<sup>75</sup> For a similar situation with 'long years' see Starke's interpretation of KUB 29.1 in ZA 69/1 (1979), p. 88 w. n. 84.

<sup>76</sup> Following van den Hout, *Studies Hoffner*, p. 189; CHD, P, p. 10. Cf. HEG, T, p. 283; (implying a mistake) Haas, GHR, p. 825; Klinger, StBoT 37, pp. 321, 351.

<sup>77</sup> Following Starke, ZA 69/1 (1979), p. 82; HED, I-E, p. 367; cf. CHD, Š, p. 9.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. Singer, *Prayers*, p. 35: "Hold me in a favourable place".

<sup>79</sup> Cf. Lebrun, *Hymnes*, pp. 84, 86.

<sup>80</sup> Following Trabazo, *BCBO* 6 (2002), p. 243. Cf. Singer, *Prayers*, p. 32; Lebrun, *Hymnes*, pp. 114, 117.

<sup>81</sup> The phrase is absent from KBo 2.9+ Vs. I 34-35.

<sup>82</sup> More examples of negative implication inherent in *āppa* (or synonymous *dān*; cf. for both of them CHD, L-N, p. 118, differently *ibid.*, p. 459) come from the following texts dealing with "rejuvenation/renovation": NS/OH (CTH 458.12.B) KUB 43.63 Vs. 12 *nu la-ba-ar-na[(-an)] (13) [(a-aš-su)-uš-še-it] e-eš-ri-iš-še-it ne-wa-a-ah* (14`) [(*na-an EGIR-pa*)] *ma-ya-an-ta-ah* "Renovate/renew labarna's statue (and) [his (goods)] and rejuvenate [(him)]/ make [(him)] young [(again)]"; NS/OH (CTH 414.A) KBo 29.1 Rs. III 6` *UTU-uš-za IM-aš-ša LUGAL-un EGIR-pa kap-pu-u-e-er (7) na-*

belonging to the fixed (formulaic) positive situation marked by *piške*- “give” (see II.2.2.2, IV.1):

(CTH 373.A) KUB 30.10 Vs. 29 [nu-mu na-ah-ša-ra-at-ta-an ta-aš-ša]-nu-mar-ra a-ap-pa zi-ik-pát am-me-el DINGIR-YA *pi-iš-ki* “You, my god, give back [to me reverence] and strength!”;

(CTH 396.1) KBo 15.25 Vs. 9 ... [z]i-ga <sup>D</sup>Ú-i-šu-ri-ya-an-za (10) A-NA EN SÍSK[UR E]GIR-pa TI-tar ha-at-du-la-a-tar in[-n]a-ra-u-wa-tar MU<sup>HLA</sup> GÍD.DA (11) IGI<sup>HLA</sup>-wa-aš<sup>83</sup> u[š-ki-u-a]r GÜ-tar ša-ra-a ap-pa-a-tar-ra *pi-iš-ki* “[Yo]u, Wišuriyant, give back life, health, st[r]ength, longevity, eyes[igh]t and holding up of the neck/ neck-lift (= stamina<sup>84</sup>/ self-assurance, pride<sup>85</sup>) to the offerant”.

In two following cases double negations (i.e. grammatical negation + lexically negative verb or verbal object) produce overtly positive effect which is marked by *-ške*- despite still present negative components:

(CTH 373.A) KUB 30.10 Rs. 23 a-aš-ki DINGIR-YA Ú-UL aš-ša-nu-wa-an-da-an an-du-uh-ša-an *li-e iš-ša-at-ti* nu-mu da-a[n-du-k]i-iš-na-aš DUMU-li (24) *pi-ra-an ša-a-a[k-l]i-*

an da-a-an ma-ya-an-da-ah-hi-ir MU<sup>KAM.HLA</sup>-ša-aš-ša-an (22) ku-ut-ri-iš Ú-UL i-e-er “The Sungod and the stormgod have taken care of the king, they have rejuvenated him again and made no limit<sup>86</sup> of his years” [following CHD, L-N, p. 118; Trabazo, *BCBO* 6 (2002), p. 449; cf. HED, K, p. 298]; intransitive *appa mayanteš-* in (CTH 820.4) KBo 21.22 Rs. 55` ... nu-wa a-ap-pa ma-ya-an-te-eš “Become young again”; NS/OH (CTH 414.A) KBo 29.1 Vs. II 50 MU<sup>HLA</sup>-aš-ši EGIR ne-wa-ah-hi-ir na-ah-ša-ra-at-ta-a[n<sup>87</sup>] (51) ne-wa-ah-hi-ir # (52) ALAM-iš-ši NAGGA-aš i-e-er SAG.DU-ZU AN.BAR-aš (53) i-e-er ša-a-ku-wa-aš-ši TI<sup>MUSEN</sup>-aš i-e-er (54) ZU<sup>HLA</sup>-ma-aš-ši UR.MAH-aš i-e-er “They renewed his (the king’s) years (and) (his) fearsomeness. They made his form of tin. They made his head of iron. They made his eyes (those) of an eagle. They made his teeth (those) of a lion” [cf. unlikely Starke, *ZA* 69/1 (1979), p. 94] with very similar (CTH 820.4) KBo 21.22 Vs. 25`-28` [see Starke, *ZA* 69/1 (1979), p. 93]; etc. The negative implication of *appa*, *dān* is brought forth clearly by the following context. It occurs in a series of phrases dealing with ‘good’ actions of Hittites vs others’ ‘bad’ actions: (CTH 375.1.A) KUB 17.21+ Vs. I 14 nam-ma šu-me-en-ZA-an DINGIR<sup>MES</sup>-aš ku-e ALAM<sup>HLA</sup>-KU-NU ŠA KÙ.BABBAR GUŠKIN (15) nu-uš-ša-an [k]u-e-da-ni DINGIR<sup>LIM</sup>-ni ku-it tu-e-ek-ki-iš-ši (16) an-da ú-iz-z[a-p]a-an DINGIR<sup>MES</sup>-ša ku-e Ú-NU-TE<sup>MES</sup> ú-iz-ZA-pa-an-ta (17) na-at an-z[i-el] i-wa-ar EGIR-pa Ú-UL ku-iš-ki (18) ne-u-wa-ah-ha-a[n har-t]a “Furthermore, your divine images of silver and gold, when anything had grown o[l]d on some god’s body, or when any objects of the gods had grown old, no one [ha]d ever renewe[d] them as w[e] have” following Singer, *Prayers*, p. 41; Trabazo, *BCBO* 6 (2002), p. 253; cf. Lebrun, *Hymnes*, p. 143. In other words, the break between two stages of ‘being new’ is characterized by a negative attribute (‘old’) which has to be got rid of. It is even possible to see the difference between *appa*, *dān mayantahh-* (negative implication > simple form) and *mayantahheške-* (no negative implication > *-ške*-form) in NS (CTH 385.10.B) KUB 57.60+ Vs. II 17` (see IV.2.2). However, the text is NS, which weakens the argument.

<sup>83</sup> Following CHD, Š, p. 69.

<sup>84</sup> So Güterbock, *Or* 39/4 (1970), pp. 577-579.

<sup>85</sup> So CHD, Š, p. 69. Cf. HED, E-I, p. 369; Carruba, *StBoT* 2, p. 3.

ma-an<sup>86</sup> *li-e GÜB-la-ah-hi-iš-ki-ši* ... “Do not make me a man unwelcome/ unfavoured at the king’s gate. Do not destroy/ overturn my right before mankind<sup>87</sup>”.

The same double negation is attested in (CTH 330.1.A) KBo 15.32+ Rs. IV 2` ... nu-ut-ta nam-m[(a GİR<sup>MES</sup>-KA ha-ah-ha-la-a)n-te-eš?] (3`) [(<sup>NA4</sup>)]pa-aš-ši-li-iš-ša *li-e da-me-eš-ká[(n-zi* ... “Let [(brus)h and pebbles no longer hur[(t)] you, [(your feet)]” and (CTH 324.1.A) KUB 17.10 Vs. I 2` *li-e-wa kur-ku-ri-is-kat-t[a-t]i* for interpretations see Trabazo, *BCBO* 6 (2002), p. 129 n. 2 (add HED, K, p. 268); positive semantic component – in *parkunuške-* 3× in (CTH 440) KBo 9.146+ KUB 35.92+ Vs. 44`, 45`, 50`; positive implication – in (CTH 493) KUB 43.38 Rs. 5-7, see Oettinger, *StBoT* 22, pp. 18-21, esp. 53-4. Actually, only 5× *-ške*-forms are unambiguously used in curses (i.e., fully negative situations).

The next example describes the positive situation in the indicative, thus significantly differing from the vast majority of benedictions. Another unique feature is that negative object is suppressed by the positive implication of the verb – constant victories. Thus the verb is marked as beginning of a durative action, implying its infinite duration in the future:

(CTH 789) KBo 32.19 Rs. III 41` [nu-w]a ú-iz-zi šu-me-en-za-an GİS<sup>HLA</sup>TUKUL<sup>HLA</sup>-KU-NU (42`) [har-pa-]na-al-li-uš hu-ul-la-an-ni-wa-an da-a-i (43`) [A]ŠA<sup>HLA</sup>har-ša-a-u-ar-ma-wa-aš-ma-aš ú-iz-zi (44`) [w]a-al-li-ya-an-ni ma-a-i = Vs. II 16-19 “[And] thereupon your weapons will start defeating the [ene]mies, while your fields will thereupon grow to your [f]ame!”<sup>88</sup>.

According to Neu, *StBoT* 32, p. 412 *hu-ul-la-an-ni-wa-an da-a-i* is a purely Hittite translator’s invention as it corresponds to simple Hurrian future form, more accurately conveyed by Hittite *hull]izzi* in a duplicate.

IV.3.7. Thus if we exclude situations with negative implication from positive situations, the ratio of correlation between positive situation and the use of *-ške*-forms will increase considerably up to 80% (a much more **intuitively** convincing figure than 54% in III!) with simple forms in positive situations a mere 20% (12×). With this approach only the following verbs are used in simple forms in positive situations: *pai-* “give” (4×: 3× in the same context!), *da-* “take” (3×), *tarna-* “release” (2×), *kappuwaye-* and *luluwaye-* in the meaning “sustain”, *irhaye-* “perform” (all – 1×)<sup>89</sup>.

IV.3.8. Negative implication is a real phenomenon, but it is quite hard to determine, especially in the case of a dead language. So some interpretations in IV.3 may seem subjective. Even in this case the conclusions in IV.1-2 are secure and tangible enough to warrant the validity of ‘higher statistics’.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. Trabazo, *BCBO* 6 (2002), p. 246.

<sup>87</sup> Translation of the second sentence follows CHD, Š, p. 46. Cf. CHD, P, p. 298; Singer, *Prayers*, p. 33; Goetze, *ANET*, p. 401; Trabazo, *BCBO* 6 (2002), p. 247.

<sup>88</sup> Following van den Hout, *Studies Hoffner*, p. 198. Cf. Masson, *Studi Imparati*, p. 560.

<sup>89</sup> I exclude *karp-* “raise” 2× from the list because it is never used in *-ške*-forms in active (see 0.3).

IV.4. As I have already mentioned, all three possibilities to raise the ratio of correspondence between positive situations and *-ške*-forms are connected. I will now explicate the statement. If we correlate cases of negative implication with quantification, we will notice that even the statistics for quantification (2× verbs are marked as simple forms (33%), 4× as *-ške*-forms (67%)) is very close to that of quantification (see IV.3.7). It is also worth mentioning that both possibilities operate on much the same data: cases with negative implication simply do not have anything to quantify because they normally attest indirect objects in dative/locative (see IV.3.1, 4; the only exception is *aššu uttar* “good words” (IV.3.5)); verbs are semantically neutral (if we put aside the negative implication, of course; the only exceptions are *happinah*- “make rich”; *huišnu*- “save”; *ašnu*- “put in order” (see IV.3.2-4) that contain positive semantic features). Thus in this case these two features heavily overlap. Quantification explains away simple verb forms in the majority of situations with negative implication. However, only the latter can explain *aššu uttar*; *happinah*-; *huišnu*-; *ašnu*-. It may be noted that while two parameters of quantification – argument quantification and verb semantics quantification – work nicely, the possibility to quantify any situation concerning time scope of the action with the help of lexical quantifiers like *uktūri* “always, for ever” theoretically may be applicable to any verb<sup>90</sup>. This theoretical possibility, though, is never attested because (a) quantifying any situation for scope of the action is attested very rarely by itself (see IV.2.1.1-2) and, (b) as noted in IV.2.1.3, only lexically durative verbs are quantified as to time scope of the action. None of the verbs from IV.3.1-5 attests durative lexical semantics. If we correlate the scribal usage with quantification, we will easily see that they almost fully overlap in a similar way: positive fixed *-ške*-forms are practically always used with quantified (or easily quantifiable) direct objects<sup>91</sup>. Scribal usage and quantification also correlate very neatly – positive fixed *-ške*-forms are normally devoid of lexical negative implication.

Under these circumstances I suppose it is best to apply all the three restrictions onto the primarily formulated rule (see I.1) as their mostly (but not entirely) overlapping spheres of application will give us a true picture of this fragment of Middle Hittite grammar<sup>92</sup>.

<sup>90</sup> I.e. nothing prevents us from forming a *wahnu-ške*- “turn many times” as far as its quantification is concerned.

<sup>91</sup> The only exception is some of the uses of *memiške*- with *aššu* in the adverbial usage.

<sup>92</sup> The suggested rule did not work in NH. Neither did it exist in OH. The extended *piške*-benedictory formulas which form the core of our ‘fixed’ benedictions are not yet attested in OS texts. The only possible example is OS (CTH 416.1.B) KBo 17.7+ Rs. IV<sup>3</sup> 10<sup>3</sup> (-)<sup>3</sup> *pí-i-iš-te-en* which is preceded by *da-a-at-te-en* “Take (woe and angst)” in the previous line. But the context is hopelessly damaged and it is not even clear if it is positive or negative. Elsewhere OS texts display only short spells (see Singer, *Prayers*, p. 13) normally employing participles + *eš*- (*hu-šu-wa-an-ZA e-eš-tu* “May ... be alive” in (CTH 733.II.4) KBo 25.112(+) Vs. II 4<sup>3</sup>; *uk-tu-u-ri-eš a-ša-an-d[u]/tu* “May ... be eternal” in (CTH 416.1.A) KBo 17.1+ Rs. III 2, 6). The only verbal benedictory phrase contains (CTH 323.2.B) KBo 25.107 3<sup>3</sup> *pa-iš-k[at-ta-ru]* that can be restored by NS/OH VBoT 58 Vs. I 10<sup>3</sup> ... *nu tu-el* (11<sup>3</sup>) *wa-ar-šu-la-aš-te-eš pa-iš-ga-ta-ru*... “Let your refreshing go” and *māu* (see fn. 6). On the other hand even these scanty OS data attest some first traces of what was later codified into a system in MH period, namely ‘fixed’ benedictions with *memiške*-/ *tarške*-: (CTH 416.1.A) KBo 17.1+ Rs. III 5 ... *nu i-i* <sup>D</sup>UTU-i (6) <sup>D</sup>IM-ya *me-e-m[(i-i)]š-ki* ... “Go, (O eagle,) speak to the Sun-god and Storm-god...”. It then reappears in CTH 371, written in MH script, but normally assessed as an OH composition due to some archaic linguistic features (see, e.g., Singer, *Prayers*, p. 21). In any case CTH 371 represents the

Their combined application will leave us with a neatly defined core of the type of positive situations most often marked by *-ške*-forms (fixed formulaic situations with quantifiable objects and only positive semantic features) as well as a small number of fringe cases of sporadic extension of some features of the core situations onto other situations: (a) not formulaic situations with quantifiable objects or verbal semantics and only positive semantic features; (b) fixed formulaic situations with *piške*-, quantifiable objects and negative implication; (c) fixed formulaic situations with *memiške*-/ *tarške*- (4×), only positive semantic features but without quantifiable objects and some others. All the fringe cases conform to one or two of restrictions on the main rule, but never to all three, which is a normal situation for grammatical categories which, as general linguistics holds, are always fuzzy, i.e. possess a clean-cut core and less well-defined periphery.

### V. Conclusion

Thus I hope to have demonstrated correlation between the type of situation (positive - negative) and the use of aspectual verbal forms: actions of positive situations are expressed

next step in the development of ‘primitive’ OS/OH spells as Singer notes (*ibid.*, p. 13). The bulk of the texts with extended benedictory formulas with *memiške*-/ *tarške*- and *piške*- are undoubtedly MH compositions (CTH 373, 374; CTH 330 (see Glocker, Eothen 6 (1997), pp. 14-5), 433, 443, 483, 489, 694; Mašat-letters). All what is known about CTH 820.3 and 396 for sure, is that they are written in MS. If we believe that it is MS/OH (with present state of knowledge it is possible only to *believe*), then we may regard such texts either as transitory between typical OH and typical MH usage or as reflecting secondary influence of MH scribes. The closest parallels to the MH ‘positive’ benedictions are found in NS/OH (CTH 414.A) KUB 29.1 Vs. II 37-38 2× (cf. Trabazo, *BCBO* 6 (2002), p. 446) *paiš* “gave” with positive substances. They still differ very considerably, being attested only in the past. Benedictions in Rs. IV (which is composed later – see Trabazo, *BCBO* 6 (2002), pp. 431-2 w. lit.) are virtually indistinguishable from proper MH ones. It is instructive that the only context that could warrant OH use of imperative *pai*- in a benediction (NS/OH (CTH 413.B) KUB 2.2+ Rs. III 32 [*na*] *m-mā A-N[A M]UNUS.LU[GAL DUMU<sup>ME</sup>]<sup>Š</sup> DUMU.DU[MU]<sup>MEŠ</sup> *ha-aš-šu-uš* (33) [*ha-a*] *n-ZA[-aš-š]u-u[š-ša] pí-an-du*, see Schuster, HHB, pp. 63, 73) can be just a later (post OH) modification because it does not have an exact correspondence in Hattic (Schuster, HHB, p. 119). This demonstrates how much reserve and caution is needed in using texts like KUB 29.1 or KUB 57.63 (i.e. NS/pre-NH) for any **definitive** conclusions about OH or MH period. Thus I use such texts only for supporting otherwise established evidence (see also 0.5). The reasons for this are obvious: in the process of copying (and we possess only NS copies of any significant length, even though it is indisputable that the pro-text of KUB 29.1 was composed in OH time since we possess an OS duplicate) there must have occurred a number of alterations or additions. Thus such texts represent most likely a heterogenic mixture of features from different periods. See, e.g., very candidly Archi, *Fs Otten*<sup>2</sup>, p. 15: “Die Anrufung in [KUB 57.]63 weist also Konzeptionen auf, die sich während des Alten Reiches ausgebildet haben, in ihrer Formulierung jedoch direkte Gegenstücke in mittelhethitischen Texten haben”. Naturally, chronological disparity of the material may be responsible for some of the cases that I at present dub exceptions to the rule (e.g., they may represent relics of OH models of benedictions in MS/OH texts). However, I restrain from introducing this extra criterion now.*

by *-ške-* forms, those of negative ones – by simple forms. The difference in the correlation (more consistent for negative, less consistent – for positive) is easily explained by not obligatory use of *-ške-* forms.