

## **The Storyteller's Art in Old Hittite**

### **The Use of Sentence Connectives and Discourse Particles**

Jacqueline BOLEY

*Old Saybrook, Conn. USA*

L'emploi dans le hittite ancien des particules du discours, comprenant les connectifs, est analysé. On propose que la narration orale de cette période, qui change peu l'ordre des mots et use peu de la subordination, néanmoins maintient un style vif et immédiat et exprime délicates juxtapositions, contrastes et liens logiques entre les phrases au moyen des particules.

An Old Hittite story is told with affecting simplicity. On the face of it, the ancient Hittite storytellers had not much shading available to them, and told their tales rather lamely: they used parataxis as a general rule, and there are few local particles. The only obvious method for highlighting an element is to front it, but even this expedient is employed with a wary hand. How could they get some drama into their dreary yarns? If one looks more closely, however, one finds that a great deal of the delicate nuances in the narrative rest on the sentence connectives. These forms need a thorough examination, which we would like to initiate in this paper.

§1. Let us begin with an analysis of the Zalpa story, a relatively long and well-preserved sample of early Old Hittite prose:

The first thing one may notice is that the use of subordinate clauses is very limited. The narrative is framed almost exclusively in simple sentences. In Zalpa there is even relatively little rearrangement of the word order, in order to stress particular elements: most clauses are in unmarked order. Nevertheless, as I will seek to demonstrate in this work, this story, of an extremely ancient date, is told with many overtones of logical connections between clauses and steps in the narrative, and much highlighting of contrasts and shifts of focus in the narrative. Let us look at the evidence:

§1.1. A simple sentence does not contain any sentence connective, as indeed the first clause of the whole text clearly shows:

(1) [MUNUS.LUGA]L [U]<sup>RU</sup>[k]anis 30 DUMU<sup>MES</sup> 1<sup>EN</sup> MU-anti hasta  
The [queen]n of Nesa bore 30 sons in one year (Zalpa Vs 1).

As the continuation shows, when there is no (logical, temporal, etc.) relation between clauses, sentence connectives are omitted, though one may get -wa, the particle of direct discourse. For instance, this is generally the case when direct discourse is introduced after a "thus X (said)" clause:

(2) UMMA ŠIMA (2) [ki-]i-wa kuit walkuan hashun tuppis sakanda sunnas ...  
Thus she said, 'this is some monstrosity I have borne!'. She filled baskets with dung (Zalpa Vs 1-2). See also *ter*, Vs 10-12 (q. 11).

### §1.2. Let us contemplate the rest of that paragraph:

(3) tuppis sakanda sunnas (3) nu DUMU<sup>MES</sup> ŠU andan zikket [s]us ID-a tarnas  
ID-s-a (4) ANA A.AB.BA KUR<sup>URU</sup>zalpuwa pedas  
DINGIR<sup>DIDL</sup>-s-a DUMU<sup>MES</sup>-us A.AB.BA-az (5) sara dair sus sallanuskir //

We may assay an idiomatic English translation of this passage:

She filled baskets with dung and laid her sons in (them) and committed them to the river - the river (then) carried them to the sea of the land of Zalpa, and the gods (of Zalpa) then took the sons out of the sea and raised them (Zalpa Vs 2-5).

This translation differs on many points from how the Hittite states the case. The primary concern of the English version is the logical progression of events. The Hittite, on the other hand, has a great deal more going on, in its rendition. To begin with, there is a subtle play of omission, replacement (by pronouns) and repetition of elements. This obviously gives a fair amount of information about the flow of the story. We may begin with how the Hittite narrative lays out known and unknown information.

The first thing one notices is that the first DUMU<sup>MES</sup>, which after its introduction is clearly the topic of the rest of the passage, is taken up by an enclitic pronoun in the *sus* ID-a *tarnas* clause. It is then omitted entirely in ID-s-a ANA A.AB.BA KUR<sup>URU</sup>zalpuwa pedas. Then it reappears as a **full NP** in DINGIR<sup>DIDL</sup>-s-a DUMU<sup>MES</sup>-us A.AB.BA-az sara dair and ends the paragraph as an enclitic pronoun again, in *sus sallanuskir*.

This alone gives a great amount of information about which clauses are connected and/or important. Clearly ID-s-a ANA A.AB.BA KUR<sup>URU</sup>zalpuwa pedas is connected to *sus* ID-a *tarnas*, since the same form, the -us of *sus*, represents the object/topic for both of them. The ID-s-a phrase is in the nature of an appendage to *sus* ID-a *tarnas*: it is so inextricably linked to it, by the common element ID, and by the omission of the object, that it almost has the effect of a relative clause in reference to ID-a.

To move on then to the last stage of q. 3, DUMU<sup>MES</sup> is repeated fully in the DINGIR<sup>DIDL</sup>-s-a clause, although it could be represented by an enclitic pronoun, as far as the syntax goes. This looks like a device to give importance to the sentence, which is after all the final outcome of the whole narrative. The storyteller states everything overtly, as if the story were just beginning again.

The enclitic for the sons in *sus sallanuskir* shows that this clause continues the final part of the narrative introduced by the DINGIR<sup>DIDL</sup>-s-a clause.

§1.3. We may gain different information entirely from the play of the initial NPs, as opposed to the clauses beginning with sentence connectives. It is clear that an initial NP is disjunctive, in itself. Thus ID-s-a and DINGIR<sup>DIDL</sup>-s-a overtly move us on to a new phase of the story. We might as well look at another paragraph, to observe the play between the clauses without sentence connective, and those with *nu* and *su*. I put each section of text that starts with an initial NP on a separate line, so the breaks are very clear:

(4) INA MU.3.KAM LUGAL-us pait<sup>URU</sup>zalpan arahzanda uetet (11)  
MU.2.KAM kattan esta  
'tabarnan 'happinn-a (12) katta uikta Ū LŪ<sup>MES</sup> URU<sup>LUM</sup> natta pianzi sus tamessir (B 29:  
nus damm[i]ssar) (13) se akir  
LUGAL-us<sup>URU</sup>hattusa DINGIR<sup>DIDL</sup>-as aruwanzi uet (14) Ū LUGAL ŠU.GI apiya talis  
sas sara URU-ya pait (15)  
uk-wa LUGAL-us-mis kisha Ū ERĪN<sup>MES</sup> katti-smi (!) nu URU-an harnikta //

In the third year the king went and surrounded Zalpa. Two years he was at it (the city). He asked for T. and H., and the men of the city wouldn't give them and they oppressed them and they died. The king went to Hattusas to worship the gods and left the old king there, and he (the old king) went up to the city (and said:) 'I have become your king' and the army is with me/was with him (? lit: them) and he destroyed Zalpa (Zalpa Rs 10-15).

It looks pretty clear that an naked initial NP represents a clean break with previous topics. There is essentially no logical connection between the king's siege, and how long it lasted; nor does this have immediate bearing on his asking for T. and H. The king's going to Hattusas then is a different topic altogether.

On the other hand, to return to ID-s-a and DINGIR<sup>DIDL</sup>-s-a, these two initial NPs are equally clearly connected to the previous narrative. ID-s-a ties in closely with ID-a in the previous clause: in fact, its function is to explain exactly what relevance that ID-a had, in terms of the next step in the narrative. Hence the fronting of the form: it has become a subordinate temporary topic. We have already pointed out how very closely bound to one another the two ID clauses are, as expressed by other means (the omission of the object-topic in the second clause). This topicalization of ID further strengthens the bond between the two clauses: the two are practically presented as two parts of the same phrase, by these means.

DINGIR<sup>DIDL</sup>-s-a represents the climax of (this part of) the narrative, and is thus obviously a most important term in the whole story. One may also point out that the gods are clearly the gods of Zalpa. One may well ask oneself if there is anything to make such a thing overt, in the phrasing of the passage. To come to the point, what significance does the -a appended to these forms have?

Another passage with ample use of initial NP + -a:

(5) // LUGAL-s-a IŠME sas yannis URU<sup>u</sup>harahsu-as ars(a) Û ERIN<sup>mes</sup> URU<sup>u</sup>zalpa (8) menahhanda uit san LUGAL-us hullit 'halp<sup>u</sup>is-a isparzasta (9) 'tamnassun-a husu-wantan IŠBATU san URU<sup>u</sup>hattusa uwatet //

"The king heard and he set out. He arrived in Harahsu and the troops of Z. came against him and the king defeated them. Happis escaped, (but) they caught T. alive and he brought him to Hattusas" (Zalpa Rs 7-9).

For 'happis-a and 'tamnassun-a, B 24' has 'happiss-a and 'tamnassunn-a. I.e., the scribe of B clearly took the final -a as a copulative connective, but it probably wasn't in the OH version.

In contrast to initial LUGAL-s-a, just mentioned, we find also initial LUGAL-us (Rs 13, quoted above). The occurrence of LUGAL-s-a at the beginning of a paragraph might look like evidence that when the final consonant of the main word was not doubled, the attached -a was not (necessarily?) a connective, but rather something else.

There seems evidence for two connectives, one geminating the previous consonant, the other leaving it single. The -a with the geminate spelling is clearly a connective, as e.g. in the already mentioned 'tabarnan 'happinn-a. However, StBoT 8 p. 68ff. and Houwink ten Cate (*Acta Orientalia Neerlandica*, 1971, p. 37-42) surmise that -a of the single consonant was originally adversative. Since -ma increases, apparently at -a's expense, as Hittite progresses, they propose that -ma is taking over from -a. Luraghi remarks that -a is quite often attached to initial Nom.s. She also analyzes -a as having "weak adversativity", adversative being described essentially as the art of the unexpected.

The problem is that -a without geminate spelling is almost invariably attached to an initial NP. Under these circumstances, it is obviously hard to know whether it is the NP or the connective that is expressing the adversative sense.

We might note that HW<sup>2</sup> does not separate the two presumed particles, remarking that -a is used to translate Û in Akkadian bilinguals, as well as Hattic *pala* "and, also", not so often Hattic *-pi* "but". It remarks: "Kann leichten zeitlichen Fortschritt der Handlung implizieren, da -(y)a-Sätze nicht in jeder Position mit dem vorausgehendem Satz vertauschbar sind" (p. 42-43). The lack of a generalized geminate spelling of the preceding consonant is treated as a peculiarity of the period.

It is perhaps possible indeed that the two uses of the same particle were kept separate by convention by the OH scribes. The fact is that there is a difference in quality between the geminated and single particle. Geminate spellings are in fact most popular for copulative phrases - the likes of 'tabarnan 'happinn-a or "the king and queen". Geminating -a usually is internal in the sentence, but

sometimes can take up initial position to bind two clauses together: cf. e.g. *tessummiuss-a pedai* of StBoT 8. In *Anittas*, we find

(6) // tan namma 'piustis LUGAL [UR<sup>u</sup>h<sup>u</sup>atti u[ir ] (37) *sardia<sup>u</sup>-ssann-a kuin uwatet sus* URU<sup>u</sup>sal[(amp)i //

A second time again P. the king of Hatti came; the escort which he brought, at S. [I smashed??] them (*Anittas* l. 36-7).

Here we have a geminate spelling, though -a follows an initial NP, that is not immediately recognizable as bound to the previous discourse. Are we to take it that this indeed represents the copulative -a, or is the double writing merely an oversight of the scribe? Frankly, one sees very little difference, either way. Cf. also from the *Laws*:

(7) *takku INA KUR luiya ... 1 ME [MAN]A KÜ.BABBAR pai assu-ssett-a sarnikzi nasma INA KUR URU<sup>u</sup>hatti nu-zza unatallan-pat arnuzi //*

If it's in Luwya, he gives 1 mina of silver and replaces his goods; or if it's in Hatti, he does restitution for the merchant (*Laws* I §5).

The -a which does not geminate, as stated above, is usually attached to an initial NP. There are however instructive exceptions to this (sort of) rule: In *Anittas*, we find the internal *appizzian-a* of the following q. 8; in the *Laws* the very likely internal A.ŠA<sup>HLA</sup>-n-a, q. 9 below<sup>1</sup>. To begin with *Anittas*:

(8) *karu 'uhnas LUGAL URU<sup>u</sup>zalpuwa<sup>u</sup> psiu-summ[in ] (40) [UR<sup>u</sup>nesaz URU<sup>u</sup>zalpuwa ped[as] (41) [app]izziyan-a 'anittas LUGAL.GAL<sup>u</sup> psiu-sum[m(in)] (42) [(U)<sup>RU</sup>z]alpuwaz appa URU<sup>u</sup>nesa pe[tahhun ] (43) [h]uzziyan-a LUGAL URU<sup>u</sup>zalp[uwa] hus[uwantan ] (44) [U]<sup>RU</sup>nesa uwatenun URU<sup>u</sup>hattusa-x ...*

[ta<sup>u</sup>]kkista san talahhun mān-as [ ] (46) *appizziyan-a kistanziattat san<sup>u</sup> phalmas[ui<sup>u</sup>z ? ]*

(47) *psiu-smis para pais san ispandi (48) nakkit dahhun pedi-ssi-ma ZÀ.AH.LI-an anie[nun ] //*

1. The problem of the derivation of two connectives, one copulative, one "conjunctive", might seem a complication. Copulative -a is derived from \*-h<sub>2</sub>o, the ancestor also of Luwian -ha, etc. But it is puzzling, if this is the true derivation, that we don't have -ha intervocalically in Hittite: \*-h<sub>2</sub> is supposed to be preserved in that position. AHP p. 167 suggests the difficult explanation that the laryngeal disappears in enclisis. But it must have been preserved enough to geminate the preceding consonant. By strict consistency, \*-h<sub>2</sub>o by AHP's phonological rule would be able to cover only the intervocalic version and the non-geminating -a. But the postvocalic -a is often clearly the intervocalic counterpart to the geminating copulative -a: one must be able to derive them from the same source.

There also has been serious difficulty fitting -ya into this pattern: most people think the -y was a glide that slipped in, when -a followed an -i. Puhvel however propose deriving copulative -a from -ya. Intervocalic -y- is lost at the prehistoric stage, which would fit in with the fact that OH consistently has simple -a after vowels (e.g. *parnasse-a* of the *Laws*): the inclusion of -y- seems a later Hittite feature. The development after a consonant is perhaps more of a problem. It has been objected that y- would not cause gemination of a previous consonant: it probably would have been preserved, although the evidence at word boundaries is almost nil. -a has also been derived from the pronoun \*-e/-o- (an adverbial form of it, whatever that means). The old derivation from \*-k<sup>w</sup>e seems quite discredited, one wonders how correctly. This seems a situation impossible to unravel, at least at the moment.

Once U. king of Z. brought Our God from Nesa to Zalpa. Finally I A. Great King brought Our God back from Z. to N.; H. the king of Z. I brought alive to Nesa; Hattusas ... and I left it alone: when finally it starved, H. and (?) Our God gave it up and I took it with might in the night; in its place I sowed vetch (*Anittas* 39-48).

As can be seen, once we have *appizziyan-a* initially (note also the initial *huzziyan-a* of l. 43), and once it occurs internally in a sentence. In the second case, it looks very likely to have simply been displaced from initial position by *mān*, much the way NPs with *-ma* often seem to be. The indication of the break has devolved from an initial NP to *mān* itself. Compare from the *Laws*:

(9) *takku* <sup>LUTUKUL-as</sup> A.ŠA<sup>BLA</sup>.ŠU *humandan kuiski wasi luzzi karpizzi takku* A.ŠA<sup>BLA</sup>-n-a *mekki wasi luzzi natta karpizzi takku* A.ŠA<sup>BLA</sup> *kule-ma arki nasma* LÚ<sup>MES</sup> URU<sup>LIM</sup> *pianzi ta luzzi karpizzi //*

If someone buys the whole fields of a farmer, he takes on the *luzzi*. If he buys a lot of the fields, he doesn't take on the *luzzi*. If the *kule* however splits fields/he splits the fields of the *kule*, or the men of the city give (them), he takes the *luzzi* (*Laws* 47b).

It looks very likely that A.ŠA<sup>BLA</sup>-n-a (*mekki*) is parallel to A.ŠA<sup>BLA</sup>.ŠU *humandan* of the previous line, and hence that A.ŠA<sup>BLA</sup>-n-a contains an Acc. sing., ending in *-n*. The *-a* is therefore very likely our particle. This construction seems very close to that of *appizzian-a* of q. 8 from *Anittas*: A.ŠA<sup>BLA</sup>-n-a seems to have been displaced from initial position by *takku*.

The real problem to taking the single-consonant *-a* as adversative is that it does not occur when there is no connection between its clause and previous material. And the only form that could represent the connection is *-a* itself. A true adversative sense seems a little odd in most cases anyway. E.g., in a case like LUGAL-s-a, the initial NP + *-a* really seems to be doing nothing more than moving the story along. Let us see how the passage with ID-s-a (q. 3) would read without the *-a*:

(10) \*\*\* [s]us ID-a *tarnas* ID-as ANA A.AB.BA KUR URU<sup>z</sup>alpuwa *peda*[s DING]IR<sup>DIDL</sup>-es DUMU<sup>MES</sup>-us A.AB.BA-az (5) *sara dair sus sallanuski* \*\*\*

All the disjunction and adversative sense is there already, without the particle. Actually, there is *more* disjunction than one gets with the version with *-a*. One can imagine only two reasons for including *-a*: 1) to point up the connection with previous material; or 2) to focus on a newly important element in the narrative. Perhaps in fact *-a* is doing both: it in essence seems to be used to show that a newly underscored form ties in with previous material.

For both ID-s-a and DING]IR<sup>DIDL</sup>-s-a in fact, the whole passage clearly represents one sequence in the story, with all the steps firmly linked to one another, though obviously with different interrelationships. Any self-respecting storyteller, one would imagine then as nowadays, would signal this fact, though not necessarily in the same fashion. I would suggest that *-a* is used to convey this sense: in other words, it is called into play to show that the

narration is one continuous whole, despite the slight disjunctive bumps shown overtly by the initial NPs.

If *-a* is a type of sentence connective, then the texts show considerable refinement of nuance. The language would in fact have been able simultaneously to show both a contrast and a connection between clauses. We might call this use "conjunctive", or "expectative", since its function is to bring us up to the next, as yet unrevealed, stage of the narrative.

Consider also the context of *ues-a*:

(11) UMMA LÚ<sup>MES</sup> URU<sup>LIM</sup> *kuwapit aumen nu ANŠE-is* [ark]atta [ ]

(11) UMMA DUMU<sup>MES</sup> *ues-a kuwapit aumen nu MUNUS-z[a?]* [ ] DUMU x[ h]asi

Thus the men of the city: 'where he have seen, an ass mounts ... Thus the sons: 'where we have seen, a woman bears [ ] son [ ] (*Zalpa* Vs 10-11).

From the flow of the conversation, it seems virtually certain that *ues* is emphasized: the men of Nesa say what they have seen, and then the sons reply, saying "well, we have seen (something different/just as interesting [??])". The text is broken, but it seems that the sons are describing their unusual birth, all in one go from the same mother. It is unsafe to assume that the sons are contradicting their interlocutors, which would constitute a real adversative sense: it may be that they are just adding to the observations of the inhabitants (roughly: "you've been observing donkeys, and we have seen god knows what with a woman"). But either way, they are still building on the observations just made by their partners in the conversation. *-a* might indeed have the function of focussing simply on the initial NP here, which would provide a kind of adversative sense, but it is hardly certain, and the context does encourage us to attribute to the syntagm the double role of showing a connection and a break with previous material at the same time.

Another very suggestive passage is

(12) // nu URU<sup>nesi</sup> URU<sup>DIDL</sup> *uetenun URU-yan a[p(pa)]* (56) *nepisas* DŠKUR-nas É-ir ... [ ... (ABNI)] (57) ... KASKAL-z-a *kuit assu utahh[un (apedanda halissianun)] //*

And in Nesa I built a fortress; after the fortress I built temples to the various gods; from my campaign what goods I had brought, I fitted (the temples) out with them (*Anittas* l. 55-8).

The connection between the building of the temples and their outfitting as described in the clauses beginning with KASKAL-z-a, is obvious.

One may speculate that in some contexts the sense of connection provided by *-a* weakened, and it ended up just marking the initial form (something like the formula "And so" with which one might pepper an anecdote: it really has no overtones of result or logical connection any more, in most cases; something like what HW<sup>2</sup> suggests above). *ues*, after all, begins a speech. One might favor this also with LUGAL-s-a of q. 5 above, which begins a whole

paragraph. But the weakening does not seem very far advanced: the distribution of *-a* favors its still having a pretty active role, though it may be tending in that direction.

To remove any lingering doubts that *-a* really has the function we ascribe to it, a most suggestive passage is *Anittas*<sup>2</sup>

(13) *mān tunnakisna-ma paizzi apas-a* (79) *perammit kunnaz esari* //  
When he comes into my inner chamber, he will sit before me on the right (*Anittas* 78-9)

As we shall see, the usual connective following *mān* is *nu*. This passage does indeed give the impression that *nu* and the (non-doubling) *-a* attached to an initial form (*apas*) give a comparable nuance. Both forms in fact follow *mān*, in an apparently analogous usage: *-a* is pressed into service apparently only when the NP is stressed by fronting. Since *nu* is virtually never adversative, this is another argument against taking *-a* as having such a sense. See also *'asgaliyas* <sup>URU</sup>*hurmi EN-as esta apass-a* (9) *kuwatta kuwatta* <sup>LÚ-es<sub>17</sub>\*</sup> *esta* (q. 19 below): one doubts that the geminate spelling means that this form and *apas-a* of *Anittas* show a different connective (the later scribes tend to geminate everything). There seems no occasion at all for an adversative sense, in either of these two passages.<sup>2</sup>

This passage, perhaps surprisingly, actually opens a vista of major importance from the point of view of our topic, the Old Hittite storyteller's art. Let us look more closely at the syntax of the phrase <sup>URU</sup>*harahsu-as ars(a) Û ERÍN<sup>MEŠ</sup> URU* *zalpa menahhanda uit* of q. 5. One may assume that *Û* represents *-a*, for the simple reason that the phrase *ERÍN<sup>MEŠ</sup> URU* *zalpa menahhanda uit* does not specify the (indirect) object. It must be carried over from the previous material, which is encouraged by the fact that that object must be the king, the topic for three sentences already. We seem only to find this sort of syntax, with omission of the central element, with the initial NP-*a* clauses.

Here, the close binding of the two clauses by the above-discussed syntactic means seems to be a device to show that they are contemporary. Even in modern English, one could say "he set out: when he got to H., the troops of Z. came to meet him". But a more dramatic colloquial rendition, with *exactly* the same temporal overtones but conveying a real sense of immediacy, would be "he set out: he got to H. and the Zalpanes came against him". The Hittite, if one follows it literally, is in fact telling the story in a very exciting way: "The king heard and he set out: as far as Harahsu he made it, and (there) the

2. There is also the curious case of the copied version of q. 4 from *Zalpa*. For *se akir* of OH, B has *se-a ekir*. Did the scribe of B think this sounded more "authentic"ally old? Or was he copying a different OH version from A, that had such a phrase in it? Most genuine OH has *akir* (the closest one might come to an old text with *ekir* is Mursilis' prayers XXIV 3, etc., which are taken from older models). At any rate, if *se-a* is really old, there does not seem much likelihood of an adversative thrust for *-a*: it is very likely used for emphasis and/or the "and so" nuance.

Zalpan troops came against (him) to give battle!". Nevertheless, there was actually nothing inherently dramatic about the syntax: this parataxis was in fact probably an ancient device to convey the sense "when" without the use of a conjunction or subordinate clause. A tantalizing example:

(14) ] (19) *siwaz 8 waksur aszi LUGAL-uss-a* <sup>6</sup>*makziyaz uizz[i*

When 8 *waksur* remain of the day, the king comes out of the *m*-house (*KBo* XVII 15 (*StBoT* 25 #27) Rs 19').

Perhaps *mān* was in the break before *siwaz*; if not, this use boils down to a paratactic "when".

This construction is pretty well proof that *-a* could not have been adversative. One wonders whether *mān* ... *-a* of q. 13 is not the older version of what we regard as the normal idiom *mān* ... *nu*. It is not difficult to imagine that the expression of contemporaneity started out with simple parataxis, with the addition of *-a* to underscore the connection between the phrases; that *mān* was then introduced, but the basic syntax was still maintained; and that only as a last stage was *nu* generalized after the conjunction.

It is interesting to compare this "contemporaneous" use of NP-*a* with the "intimate connection" function of *ÍD-s-a* in q. 3. One major difference is that in *sus* *ÍD-a tarnas* *ÍD-s-a ANA A.AB.BA KUR* <sup>URU</sup>*zalpuwa pedas*, not only the object, but also *ÍD* is held over from the previous clause. The Hittite story could clearly show a double connection, by the omission of the pronoun and the repetition of a key element. This changes the character of the syntax, and partly explains why we do not have the straight "contemporaneous" idiom here.

But in reality there is no reason to suppose that all occurrences of NP-*a* have to be strictly "contemporaneous": *'tabarnan 'happinn-a katta uikta Û* <sup>LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup> URU<sup>LIM</sup></sup> *natta pianzi* of q. 4, e.g., also shows more of an "intimate connection" function than a sense "when", though the only link between the clauses is the common object. It is clear that the "intimate connection" nuance is the primary one: it naturally very often takes on a temporal spin.

§1.4. Some of the last passages also introduce the particle *-ma* (in *tunnakisna-ma* (q. 13) and *pedi-ssi-ma* (q. 8) of *Anittas* and *kule-ma* of the *Laws* (q. 9)).

This particle is totally absent in what is preserved of the *Zalpa* story. *Anittas* is sparing of it, but at least it does occur. *-ma* shows a specific contrasting focus, within the previous framework: it often marks a contrast of substance, pitting two analogous elements or ideas against each other, always within the same framework as the previous narrative.<sup>3</sup>

3. See BOLEY, *Dynamics of Transformation in Hittite*, §5b.2b for an analysis of *-ma*.

Two other cases of *-ma*, in the same passage:

(15) // *mān* x x [ (*lahha paun*) ] (74) *nu* LÚ<sup>URU</sup> *purusha*[(*nda katti-mi henkum*)us ] (75) *su-mu* 1 *gišŠU.A AN.BAR* ... [(*hengur udas* )] (76) *mān appa-ma* <sup>URU</sup>*nesa* [*uwan(un)*] (77) *nu* LÚ<sup>URU</sup> *purushanda katti-mmi* [(*pehutenun* )] (78) *mān tunnakisna-ma* *paizzi apas-a* (79) *perammit kunnaz esari* //

When ... I went on campaign, the ruler of P. [brought] me gifts; specifically he brought me an iron throne, etc. as a gift. When I came back to Nesa, I brought the ruler of P. with me; when he goes into my inner chamber, he will sit on my right before me (*Anittas* 73-9).

The last original case of *-ma* in *Anittas* is:

(16) *nepisz-asta* (or *nepisz-as-ta?*) <sup>DIŠKUR</sup>*unni assus esta* (3) *nasta* (or *nas-ta?*) <sup>DIŠKUR</sup>*unni-ma man assus esta* (4) <sup>URU</sup>*nesas LUGAL-us* <sup>URU</sup>*kussaras LUGAL-i* x x //

From heaven he was dear to the Stormgod; since he was dear to the Stormgod ... (*Anittas* 2-3).

According to the copy B, l. 64 starts a paragraph with *uetta*[(*anne-ssi-ma* ...

Usually *-ma* is attached to the first full form of the sentence. Q. 9 from the *Laws* however may show that *-ma* could be appended onto the second full NP of the clause, unless A.ŠĀ<sup>HLA</sup> *kule* go together. It is clear from this that *-ma* is used to focus on a specific contrasting element.

One is rather intrigued by the fact that *-ma* seems to occur only after vowels, in these examples. With most vowels, the two particles are not in complementary distribution: *-a* also can be found after vowels. The two particles are in fact clearly not comparable in the earliest texts. One would never say *\*pedi-ssi-a*, for *pedi-ssi-ma* of q. 8. Why? because *-a* has too much overtone of connection? *-a* certainly is not used to focus on a specific contrast as *-ma* seems to be. For instance, one would probably not say *\*tunnakisna-ya* in the last sequence, even if the form were initial, or at least, if one did, it would probably have a different nuance. And certainly one could not say *\*apas-ma* with any propriety, in the last sentence.

But *-a* and *-ma* are apparently sometimes in complementary distribution, the latter being apparently obligatory after words ending in the vowel *-a*. One is hard put to it to see why *appa-ma* of q. 14 l. 76 of *Anittas* has *-ma* rather than *-a*: the nuance of the syntagm seems to parallel that of *appizzian-a*. Such a euphonic substitution is not impossible: note e.g. the possible replacement of *-an* by *-k[a]n* after *anda* in *StBoT* 8 I 26. This may have been the starting point for the rearrangement of the territories of *-ma* and *-a* in later Hittite.

*-a* of course did not necessarily hold the nuance taken over by *-ma*. Later speakers might very well have simply wished to make overt the adversative overtones that the initial NP provided, and they replaced *-a* with *-ma* because they no longer understood ordering a narrative with quite such delicate

nuances of connection + contrast as the older Hittites may have been used to. On the other hand, perhaps *-a* in origin was a simple connective, as we've been proposing, but did end up taking on an adversative overtone, because of its association with initial contrastive NPs. I don't favor this, but it is worth consideration.

§2. We may now take the leisure to look at the free-standing sentence connectives in *Zalpa*. The most obvious problem is how *nu* differs from *su*.

§2.1. *su* seems to have a tendency to mark a form introduced in the previous clause as the (new) topic. For instance, one might wish to see [*s*]us *ĪD-a tarnas* as signalling that the sons of the preceding clause were still the main focus. Especially since they obviously are central also in the next clause (*ĪD-s-a ANA A.AB.BA KUR* <sup>URU</sup>*zalpuwa peda[s]*): indeed, they are so central that they are left out, as being completely understood from the previous clause.

The end of the *Zalpa* narrative may serve to illustrate the apparent difference between *su* and *nu*:

(17) *LUGAL-us* <sup>URU</sup>*hattusa DINGIR*<sup>DIDLI</sup>*-as aruwanzi uet* (14) *Ū* *LUGAL ŠU.GI apiya talis sas sara URU-ya pait* (15) *uk-wa LUGAL-us-mis kisha Ū ERĪN*<sup>MEŠ</sup>*katti-smi* *nu URU-an harnikta* //

The king went to Hattusas to worship the gods and left the old king there, and he (the old king) went up to the city (and said:) 'I have become your king' and the army is with me/was with him (? lit: them) and he destroyed *Zalpa* (*Zalpa* Rs 13-15).

It would be nice to know what *Ū* stands for: *nu?* *-a?*

As can be seen, *nu* ushers in the last phrase of the whole story. But *su* appears in the middle, at the beginning of the final section of narrative (*sas sara URU-ya pait*). The *sas* definitely seems to establish the *LUGAL ŠU.GI* as the actor in the rest of the drama. After this, *nu* seems to be the connective of choice.

§2.2. Let us pause to follow the indications of topic in q. 5:

*LUGAL-s-a* is evidently the main topic, but it is contrastive (because it is initial) and marked as "conjunctive/expectative" by the addition of *-a*. It evidently is a new topic then. It is still the topic in the next clause, and we find *sas* to show this continuation. In the third clause <sup>URU</sup>*harahsu-as ars(a)*, there is an initial *Dir.* or *Loc.*, which is clearly ushering in a new set of topics for the narrative, but the main topic is still the king, so *-as* appears. *-as* in fact is set up as the elliptic central element in the next phrase *Ū ERĪN*<sup>MEŠ</sup> <sup>URU</sup>*zalpa menah-handa uit* (discussed above under q. 13). We might note that here, unlike our passage with *ĪD* of q. 3, this central element changes case in the second phrase. Very well, but the *san* in the clause immediately following can't be continuing the king as topic: he is overtly mentioned in that sentence. The new focus, for the rest of the paragraph, is clearly the *Zalpa* troops, which the king defeats, and the fate of the leaders of the *Zalpa* army. The *ERĪN*<sup>MEŠ</sup> <sup>URU</sup>*zalpa* is clearly

a new topic: it is being continued by *san*. We find the same situation with *'tamnassun-a husuwantan IŠBATU san ...* in the last line.

What then do we do with the passage from q. 4 above?:

(18) *'tabarnan 'happinn-a* (12) *katta uikta* *Û LÚ<sup>MES</sup> URU<sup>LIM</sup> natta pianzi sus tamessir*  
(B 29: *nus damm[i]ssar*) (13) *se akir*

He asked for T. and H. down (from the city), but the men of the city refused to give (them), and they oppressed them and they died. (*Zalpa* Rs 11-12).

Is the topic still T. and H., throughout this passage? For the same reasons as we adduced with *Û ERÍN<sup>MES</sup> URU<sup>LIM</sup> zalpa* above (namely that the object is omitted), it is likely that *Û LÚ<sup>MES</sup> URU<sup>LIM</sup>* represents *\*LÚ<sup>MES</sup> URU<sup>LIM</sup> -a. sus* could refer both to T. and H. or to the city people, though one is hard put to it to understand why the latter would have “died”. Unless this is a shorthand for “were utterly destroyed”: the city is in fact taken, as a result of/follow-up to this remark. In the passage with *Û ERÍN<sup>MES</sup> URU<sup>LIM</sup> zalpa* above, the pronoun *san* (LUGAL-*us hullit*) immediately following that clause referred to the *ERÍN<sup>MES</sup> URU<sup>LIM</sup> zalpa*. It is possible (probable?) that in this q., *sus* in an analogous manner refers to the *LÚ<sup>MES</sup> URU<sup>LIM</sup>*.

§2.3. To return to *su*, the way it is used in the narrative is most suggestive. A peculiar feature of this particle is that, unlike *nu* and *ta*, it is virtually always attached to an enclitic personal pronoun: that is, in almost all cases it is in the form *sas*, *san*, *se* or *sus*. Once we have it in the combination *su-mu* (q. 15 or 23a), but *\*su-ssil-smas* is to my knowledge not attested. It does not occur in the neuter syntagm *\*sat*, nor in the neuter plural.

If one looks at the behavior of the presumed syntagms with *su* in *Zalpa*, again, *sas*, etc., contrasts directly with *nu* if there is full NP in the sentence. That is, we find with the Acc.: *tuppus sakanda sunnas nu DUMU<sup>MES</sup> andan zikket* but *sus ÍD-a tarnas* (q. 3). We find e.g. *nu URU-an harnikta* at the end of the whole *Zalpa* text. Apparently, unless there is a real reason to include *su*, as in q.s 23a,b below, *nu* is the proper connective when no pronoun is in order. This gives the definite impression that *su* can't be in the constructions with enclitic pronoun that alternate with *nu* and a full NP: if it were, would it not be appropriate both when the relevant case-form is represented by a pronoun and when it is a full NP?

If we compare the behavior of these syntagms with possible counterparts in e.g. Homer, one discovers that they take up exactly the position, and function, that the simple anaphoric pronouns have. The fact is that continuing previously introduced material is the function of an anaphoric pronoun. Three examples showing the closeness of the Homeric pronouns and the Hittite “syntagms”:

(19a) // *'asgaliyas URU<sup>LIM</sup> hurmi EN-as esta apass-a* (9) *kuwatta kuwatta\* LÚ-es<sub>17</sub>\* esta san-asta atti-mi\*\** (10) *paknuir san arnut san URU<sup>LIM</sup> ankui IRDI* (11) *san URU<sup>LIM</sup> ankui-pat LÚIGL.DÜ-an\*\*\* iet sarkus LÚ-es<sub>17</sub>\* esta* (12) *akis-ma-as\*\*\*\* tepsawanni URU<sup>LIM</sup> kuzurui* † (13) *kaqqapus†† marakta man-kuwa kaqqapist†††* (14) *maklantes //*

A. was lord in H. He was a man in all senses of the word (?), and they calumniated (?) i.e., made him hateful(?) him to my father and he had him brought and drove him to A. and made him a scout (?). he was a mighty man, but he died in poverty. He slaughtered/distributed k.s in K. - it would have been better if they had been scrawny (??? i.e. if he hadn't been so rich and powerful, he would have been left alone?) (*KBo* III 34 II 8-14 = 36 Vs 16-20).

\* *kuwadda KBo* III 36 Vs 16  
\* *LÚ-es KBo* III 36 Vs 16, 18  
\*\* *at-tim-mi KBo* III 36 Vs 17  
\*\*\* omitted *KBo* III 36 Vs 18  
\*\*\*\* *akis-san KBo* III 36 Vs 18  
† *URU<sup>LIM</sup> kuzurui KBo* III 36 Vs 19  
†† *kakapus KBo* III 36 Vs 19  
††† *kakapus KBo* III 36 Vs 20.

Notice the nice use of *-a* following *apass-a*. The context really does not encourage seeing any adversative overtone in the particle, while a sense of connection (‘we’re enlarging on our description of the man just introduced’) seems quite appropriate.

(19b) // *'ispudasinaras LÚ<sup>LIM</sup> hupralas esta san 'askaliyas LÚ<sup>LIM</sup> URU<sup>LIM</sup> hurma* (16) *das san INA URU<sup>LIM</sup> ulla<sup>LIM</sup>mi\* LÚ<sup>LIM</sup> manihhatallan\*\* iet\*\** (17) *man\*\*\*-an-kan 'askaliyas kuenzi san ANA É EN.NU.UN dais* (18) *'askali-ma uddar arais 'isputasinari-ma pier* (19) *san-asta ÍSTU É EN.NU.UN tarnir sas 'askali-pat tet* (20) *marsanza-wa zik //*

I. was a *h*-man and A. man of H. took him and made him overseer in U. A. would have killed him, and put him in prison. But he raised words against A. and they gave (the right?) to I. and let him out of prison, and he said to A. ‘you’re a bastard!’ (*KBo* III 34 II 15-20 = *KBo* III 36 Vs 21-4).

\* What is actually written is *URU<sup>LIM</sup> u-tah-zu-mi!* However, *KBo* III 36 Vs 22 has *URU<sup>LIM</sup> ulla<sup>LIM</sup>ma*. It seemed reasonable to suppose that *u* + the first part of *tah* might be a badly written *ul*, and that the second part of *tah* + *zu* could be *lam* or perhaps *lám* (Neu however lists the latter only as a Sumerogram).  
\*\* *KBo* III 36 Vs 22: *maniyahhiskattallan iyat*  
\*\*\* this vowel is short in *KBo* 34 II 17, long in *KBo* III 36 Vs 22.

(20) *kuin-wa sanhiskiueni UMMA-NI san uemiyauen* (15) *uwatten URU<sup>LIM</sup> nesa paiwani*  
Whom do we keep looking for? Our mother: her have we found! Come, let us go to Nesa (*Zalpa* Vs 14-15).

Resisting the overwhelming temptation to take *san* here as meaning “whom do we seek? our mother and we have found her” – it does not seem to fit in any case with the flow of the Hittite – please compare from the Odyssey:

(21a) "ὦς ἔφατ' Ἀλκίνοος, τοῖσιν δ' ἐπὶ νῆδανε μῦθος.  
οἱ μὲν κακκείοντες ἔβαν οἰκόνδε ἕκαστος

Thus spoke A.; they were pleased with his words. They went to lie down each to his own home (Od. 13.16-17).



In an analogous passage, Hittite would undoubtedly give us *se*, where Greek has the pronoun οἱ. τοῖσιν however would probably be represented by *nu-smas*.

I am rather intrigued by the likes of the following, from Od. 16.356-7:

(21b) ἢ τίς σφιν τόδε εἶπε θεῶν, ἢ ἔσιδον αὐτοὶ  
νῆα παρερχομένην, τὴν δ' οὐκ ἐδύναντο κίχῃναι

Either one of the gods told them, or they saw the boat passing by, but couldn't overtake it.

τὴν here seems to show exactly the function we suggest for *san* in q. 20 above (not to mention the repeating *san*-s in q.s 19a,b). It continues previous material as a (sometimes new) topic. The placement of the Greek/Sanskrit pronouns, namely regularly sentence-initial, also corresponds exactly with Hittite *sas*. It is clear especially from Sanskrit that the particles like *δέ* which may ally or mark the clauses are a later addition to a basic sentence with an unadorned pronoun:

(22) *tām ā śúcim śúcayo ... apām nāpātām pāri tasthur āpah ... / tām āsmerā yuvatāyo yūvanām. ... pāri yanti āpah*

(The Son of Waters has created all beings ... all waters flow into the ocean): him indeed, the pure ... son of waters, the pure waters tend. Him, the youth, (like) maidens the waters unsmiling surround (RV 2.35.3-4ab).

Compare further *kuin ... sus* from *Anittas* (q. 33 below) with the frequent Vedic idiom *yó ... sá*.

I would like to make the perhaps revolutionary suggestion that, in the majority of cases, the syntagms *sas*, *san*, *se* or *sus* are in fact the personal anaphoric animate pronouns, descended from *\*só-*, and that they do not contain *su* at all. One might prefer to put it that the syntagms with *su* and the pronouns fell together, so that we can't be sure at any given instance which one we are looking at. The Hittite reflex of *\*só-* and that of *su + -as*, etc. would naturally be exactly the same. But it is most suggestive that we don't find the neuter *\*sat* in the presumed syntagm with *su*: the reflex of *\*só-* would naturally be animate. The patterning of the use of *sas*, etc., appears most often to be simply that of the anaphoric pronoun. It is not enough to consider that even if we had *\*su + -as*, the enclitic *-as* would produce the same pronominal patterning: if *sas* indeed always represented *su + -as*, we would expect *su* more often with full NPs, as mentioned above. The origin of *su* is doubtful: Carruba and Dunkel even think it is from the same root *\*só* as *sas*. But the two might very well have taken different paths of development: there is in fact no visible direct connection between *su* and *sas* in Hittite, and it is conceivable that the naked *\*só* could have become an adverbial form. See §5 below for more discussion.

We might look at the handful of definite examples of *su*, to see if any of this makes sense:

(23a) // *mān x x [(lahha paun)] (74) nu LÚ<sup>URU</sup>purusha[(nda katti-mi henkum)us ] (75) su-mu 1<sup>GIS</sup>ŠÚ.A AN.BAR ... [(hengur udas )]*

When ... I went on campaign, the ruler of P. [brought] me gifts; specifically he brought me an iron throne, etc. as a gift. (*Anittas* 73-5; see q. 15 for full passage).

(23b) *uk-wa atti-mi (5) [natt]a assus su-wa<sup>URU</sup>hattusa hengani paun (6) Ū DUMU<sup>MES</sup><sup>URU</sup>zalpa kattimmi 1 ME ERIN<sup>MES</sup>-za(-)e-a natta su-wa kuit natta akir*

'I am not dear to my father, and (as a consequence?) I went to H. to die; the men of Z. were with me: they are not (even??) 1000 troops (??), so why did they not die?' (*Zalpa* Rs 4-6).

A sense "in fact, in particular" would go nicely in the first case. In q. 23a, *su(-mu)* actually gives the sense "(he brought me gifts): **to be exact** (a list of the precise gifts he brought)". In the two occurrences from *Zalpa*, one might wish to see *su* as ushering in a logical conclusion. The bond between the last two clauses is so strong, in fact, that a pronoun is omitted in the *akir* clause.

Compare Sanskrit *sú*, which on occasion can show a similar nuance:

(24a) *imān sū asmai hrđā ā sūtaṣṭam /māntram vocema: kuvā asya vēdat?*

(Desirous of gain I have sent forth this eloquence... Will he ... make (my songs) well-adorned?, for he will enjoy (them).) This well-fashioned hymn **in fact** would we utter from our heart for him: perchance he will notice it? (*Rg Veda* 2.35.2a,b)

(24b) *abhi kranda stanāya, gārbham ā dhā /udanvātā pāri dīyā rāthena. dīṭum sū karṣa vīṣitam nāñicam: /samā bhavantu udvāto nipādāḥ*

Bellow towards us, thunder, deposit the germ, fly around with your water-bearing car. Draw **then** (as a logical follow-up) your water-skin unfastened downward: let the heights and valleys be level (*RV* 5.83.7).

*sá* itself also seems to have a comparable sense sometimes:

(25) *sá naḥ pitēva stanāve / Āgne sūpāyanó bhava*

(We bring homage to thee every day): **so** be of easy access to us, A., like a father to his son (*RV* 1.1.9ab).

The grammarians take *sá* as a Nom.: however, this particular use is considered troublesome, and translated "as such, thus" or similar. Such a form could easily have become adverbial.

It is possible however that the Hittites themselves got confused, and eventually started thinking of all occurrences of *sas* as if they contained *su*, after the analogy of *nu* which in combination with the enclitic pronouns produced *nas*, etc. An idiom that is most suggestive is: // **LUGAL-s-a IŠME sas yannis** (*Rs* 7, q. 5). This looks so much like the MH idiom *mahhan IŠME nasta* that it is very tempting to take *sas* as having the value we ascribed to *nasta* in this phrase\*: namely the function of marking a result of preceding material. For



that matter, *mān ... nu* looks something like *mahhan ... nasta* from the same later period. We had thought that *nasta* indicated contemporaneity – certainly some sort of logical connection between the preceding clause and that with *nasta*. One wonders: was *nasta* pressed into service to take the place of the two sentence connectives, as they lost currency (*su*) or changed function (*nu*)?

There is a clamorous exception to the “rule” that *su* occurs only with preterites:

(26) *ne LUGAL-as MUNUS.LUGAL-ass-a kitkar-smet tehhi* (22) *ser-a-ssan GAD-an pessiemi sus LÚ-as natta auszi //*

I put them on the king and queen's head: on top I throw a cloth and no man sees them (*StBoT* 8 IV 20-2).

*sus* might simply be an continuation of topic (i.e. just the pronoun). This phrase is unusual, however (it is the only occurrence in *StBoT* 8 of *su*/the pronoun *sa-*, and with a present tense to boot), so that one may suspect that it has some other significance. A resultative sense looks attractive for the “syn-tagm”, but I don't know that we can ever be sure about it.

However, *sas* probably was not normally thought of as containing *-as*. In fact, while *-as* is never found with a transitive verb, not even by mistake, *sas* may certainly be most common with intransitive verbs, but it does drift on occasion into the transitive sphere:

(27) *se pair HUR.SAG-i s[a? ] pahhur* (3) *parir se LÚNINDA.DÙ.DÙ huppir*

(The father of the king found a pebble in his bread) so they went and [ ] in the mountain they lit a fire, they knocked the baker about (and then they roasted him) (*Palace Chronicles* I 2-3).

One may take the first *se* to refer to *pair* rather than to the transitive phrase, but the second phrase can only contain *se* with the transitive *huppir*. See also perhaps q. 35, with the possible *se ... halukan peter*: there is something broken at the beginning of l. 15 before *halukan*, but it doesn't seem to be another verb. It is clear from this that *sas* and *-as* do not overlap in the minds of the Hittites.

§2.4. *nu* is the narrative particle *par excellence*, apparently. It is in fact used in many ways that have it tying in with previous material, but in a different sort of way from *su*.

One might note that with *sas* the story usually moves along in a sharper way than with *nu*. Cf. the following with *nus*:

(28a) *'sarmassun 'nunnunn-a* (16) *HUR.SAG tahayai pehuter nus GU<sub>4</sub>-li turir*

They took S. and N. to Mt. T. and yoked them like cattle (then they took one of N.'s relatives and killed him) (*Palace Chronicles* I 15-16).

There is some connection, however mild, between the men's being taken to the mountain and their being yoked there. This is one of the rare uses of *nu* with an Acc. pronoun in the Chronicles: *san*, or *sus* predominates. Consider also:

(28b) *dais-san ANŠE.KUR.RA-as kuida LÚMES KUŠ<sub>7</sub>*, (28) *ammiyantus-'mus nus 'isputasinaras maniyahheskizzi* (29) *GI-an G<sup>is</sup>UMBIN hashassuar G<sup>is</sup>TUKUL appatar nus apas annanut* (30) *kun apas annanut kuss-a ABI LUGAL ANA <>nakkilit* (31) *UGULA LÚMES SAGI pais kus 'huzzi UGULA LÚMES NIMGIR* (32) *kus 'kizzui UGULA LÚMES MEŠEDI pais sus ulkessarahhir //*

Because/then he put the drivers on the horses, the young ones among them, and I taught them (about) arrows ... and managing a weapon and he instructed them, this one he instructed. Some the father of the king gave to N. head of cupbearers, some he gave to H. head of heralds, some to K. head of MEŠEDI (and) they finished their training (*Palace Chronicles* II 27-32).

Again, *nus* ties in directly with previous material. *sus* on the other hand begins a statement that is more distinct from previous material. This feature of *sas* is most noticeable in q.s 19a,b, where we have a succession of *san/sas* to describe actions that in terms of the story are neatly separated from each other.

We may point out some more specialized idioms that emerge from the texts. For instance, after a *mān* “when” clause, the main clause almost invariably takes *nu*, apparently to indicate contemporaneity (?), but at very least the logical continuation of the narration (see under q. 14 for some discussion of “when” clauses). The examples:

(29) *// mān MU<sup>ur</sup>A istarna pair nu M[UNUS.LUGA]L namma* 30 *MUNUS.DUMU hasta* (7) *sus apasila sallanuskat*

When years passed, the queen again bore 30 daughters; she raised them herself (*Zalpa* Vs. 6-7).

(30) *mān URU<sup>ur</sup> tamar[mara] jarir nu tarsikanzi* (Vs 8)  
*mān URU<sup>ur</sup> nesa pair* (16) *nu-smas DINGIR<sup>ur</sup> es tamain karatan dair*

When they got to T, they said. / When they got to N., the gods gave them another inside (*Zalpa* Vs 15-16).

The same seems to hold for *kuwapit*:

(31) *UMMA LÚMES URU<sup>ur</sup> kuwapit aumen nu ANŠE-is [ark]atta [ ]* (11) *UMMA DUMU<sup>ur</sup> ues-a kuwapit aumen nu MUNUS-z[a?] DUMU x[h]asi*

Thus the men of the city: where we have seen, a donkey mounts ... Thus the sons: where we have seen, a woman ... bears... son (*Zalpa* Vs 10-11).

These are the only two types of subordinates clauses used in the text. It is very interesting that they both take *nu* after them.

*Anittas* has an interesting alternation of *nus* and *sus* after a *kuis* clause:

(32) *utne* (12) *[kui<sup>ur</sup>it]uit-pat arais nus humandus-p[at h]u[llanu]n*

Whatever land rebelled, I beat them all" (*Anittas* I. 11-12);

but:

(33) // *tan namma* <sup>1</sup>*piustis* LUGAL [<sup>UR</sup>]<sup>U</sup>*hatti u[it ]* (37) *sardia*-*ssann-a* *kuin uwatet*  
*sus* <sup>URU</sup>*sal[(amp)i ]* //

A second time again P. the king of Hatti came; the escort which he brought, at S. [I smashed??] them (*Anittas* I. 36-7).

§2.5. To sum up what we have gleaned so far of the Old Hittite narrative style, we have found that earliest Hittite has the following rhetorical nuances available to it through the use or omission of its connectives:

1) **no connective** is used for a clean break with previous material. Also for an initial statement.

2) **a fronted element followed by -a** also gives the sense of a break, but still within the framework of the previous narrative. We surmise that it represents a contrast plus a connection (its "conjunctive/expectative" function).

3) **-ma** is used to show that a particular element represents a new focus, within the framework of the paragraph, usually in contrast to an analogous previous element or concept.

4) **nu** gives the sense of the continuation of a previous topic. It is often used for an intermediate step in a narrative. It regularly follows *mān* and *kuis* clauses.

5) **su** seems to have some overtones of logical conclusion or resultative sense. But in most cases it occurs in the syntagms *sas*, *san*, *se*, and *sus*, which may simply represent the reflex of the anaphoric animate pronoun \**so*-.

6) **-wa** is used to present direct discourse.

This is a pretty rich arsenal of nuances to have at one's disposal. It is clear that Hittite can structure a narrative in very minute detail, showing various degrees and types of connection or contrast, and probably even a combination of the two (our "conjunctive/expectative" -a). It is, we surmise, also capable of spelling out steps in a logical sequence. And all this just by judicious use of its particles and connectives: the storytellers do not even have to alter the basic lay-out of the sentence structure, which, as we have mentioned, is generally set out in plain unmarked syntax, in early narratives.

To revisit q.s 1-3, the unity of the narrative is clear. Apparently there were different ways of showing continuation or disjunction of a topic, and perhaps also the possibility of showing logical climax or resultative sense, by means of a judicious use of particles and the inclusion or omission of anaphoric forms.

The modern languages would not express quite the same nuances: the emphasis would probably be on the logical steps involved, or even more likely on the temporal sequence. Not so much attention would be paid e.g. to

the topics, or to interconnections between clauses. And as a result, the story might actually not be viewed in the same way. The fact is that as we read it, the *sus* *ÍD-a tarnas* clause marks the end of the three-line sequence starting with the queen filling the baskets. Let us see what happens however if we follow the Hittite. *sus* *ÍD-a tarnas* seems to be treated not as an end, but rather as the beginning of the final sequence. *sus* apparently gives the information that the sons, who were introduced in the previous clause, are the topic from now on. The omission of the sons altogether from the "the river took them" clause gives the same information, but in a disjunctive context: this omission, and the repetition of *ÍD*, give the sense of a very close connection between it and the preceding clause, as if they are simply two sections of the same phrase. This, we would contend, is underscored by the addition of -a. The DINGIR<sup>DIDL</sup>-s-a clause is then marked overtly as important, even climactic, partly by the overt repetition of DUMU<sup>MES</sup>, which however has been a constant central element in the story for three clauses already. -a may be included to show that DINGIR<sup>DIDL</sup>-s is in some way connected to the previous narrative.

§3. We may now turn our attention to the *Laws*, which is not a narrative, and is generally in the present tense. It therefore is likely to have other styles of discourse structure, which it is of interest to explore.

§3.1. The first piece of new information to be gleaned from this source is that *takku*, unlike *mān*, generally takes no sentence connective in the apodosis that follows it:

(34) *takku* <sup>L0</sup>DAM.GAR *kuiski kuenzi* 1 ME MANA KÙ.BABBAR *pai*  
If someone kills a merchant, he gives a mina of silver (*Laws* I §5).

This is the general rule; there are exceptions, which we will discuss below (q.s 46ff.). We might point out that in later Hittite, when *mān* starts to be used to mean "if", it also takes no connective after it<sup>5</sup>.

The copy of Naramsin shows an interesting use of *ta* versus *se*:

(35) // *mān paizzi ispannit iskarhi[t]* (8) <sup>URUDU</sup>*tapulliyannit-a kuerzi mān-smas-t[a*  
*eshar]* (9) *siyari ape tandukis* (10) *ta-smas paimi mān-smas-ta e[s]har UL siyari*  
(11) *ape DINGIR<sup>MES</sup>-is ta-smas UL paimi* // (KBo III 16 Vs alone:) *mān ARAD<sup>MES</sup>-ma*  
*pair* 1<sup>EN</sup> *ARAD-ZU* (12) *ispannit isqarrit* (13) <sup>URUDU</sup>*tapulliyammit kuerta* (14) *ta-ssi-*  
*sta eshar siyati se EGIR-pa ANA* <sup>1</sup>*NARAM-ḫ30-na* (15) *[t/na]-as-si halukan peter*  
<sup>1</sup>*NARAM-ḫ30-nas tarskizzi* (16) *[mān]-wa-smas-ta ishar-ma siyati uk-ma-smas* (17)  
*[an]da zahhiya kuwat UL paimi* //

'When he goes and cuts him/them with the spit stuck (in him/them) and the t.; if [blood?] spurts from them, they are men and I will go against them; if blood does not spurt from them, they are gods and I won't go against them'. When the servants went, one of his servants cut (him) with the spit stuck (in him) and the t., and blood spurted from him, and they went back to N. and brought him the news, and N. kept saying, 'But

5. Not at the beginning, apparently: cf. e.g. a late OH original: *mān-as tamatta-ma KUR-ya nan tametaz KUR-az uwatetten* (XLIII 23 Vs 5-6). Or is *nu* just supporting -an? see q.s 49ff. below.

[if] blood spurts from them, why shouldn't I go into battle against them?' (XXXI 1 II 7-11 = *KBo* III 16 Vs 8-17. See also *KBo* III 18 Rs 2).

It jumps to the eye that we have *se*, for the Nominative, but *ta* with *-ssi/-smas*.

There is an interesting passage in *StBoT* 8, repeated, in which *ta* and *nu* alternate, after *mān*, which is starting to move towards a sense "if":

- (36) // [m]ān LUGAL-us MUNUS.LUGAL-ass-a taranzi *ta* DUMU<sup>MES</sup>-an parna paimi  
(12) [tak]ku u natta-ma taranzi *nu* natta paimi

When/If the king and queen say (so), I go to the house of the children; if they don't say so, I don't go (*StBoT* 8 IV 11-12; also III 17-18, with *mān* both times).

It is clear that there was quite some confusion around this time about the proper place of *ta* and *nu*.

Now this *ta* is an odd fish. As is well known, it occurs (in our texts anyway) only with presents (see q. 70 for the one exception, from the copied *Palace Chronicles*). Consider the following two examples from *KBo* XXII 1 (see the edition of Archi 1979):

- (37) // mān ABI tuliyas halzai nu-smas (17) gullakkuwan sahzi natta (18) LÚ<sup>MES</sup>NAŠI ŠI.DI.TI<sub>4</sub>-KUNU kasatta-wa (19) LÚ<sup>MES</sup>NAŠI ŠI.DI.TI<sub>4</sub>-KUNU dameskatteni (20) *ta* LUGAL-i kardimiyattus piskatteni //...

When my father calls you to assembly, he seeks to chastise/investigate you, not your provision carriers. Behold, you oppress your provision carriers and give anger to the king. (*KBo* XXII 1 l. 16-20)

- (38) kasatta-wa utiya paitteni nu ŠA LÚ<sup>MAŠDA</sup> (25) eshar-set natta sanhiskatteni // LÚ<sup>MES</sup>NAŠI ŠI.DI.TI<sub>4</sub>-ŠU natta punusteni (27) *ta* LÚ<sup>MAŠDA</sup> haddinandis isteni (28) parna-ssa paissi eksi eksi piyanazzi-a-ta (29) LÚ<sup>MAŠDA</sup> asiwandan-a set datti (30) DIN-ŠU natta punussi nu kisan (31) AWAT ABI-YA arhan harteni

Behold you go into the land and you don't investigate the blood of the poor man; you don't check over his provision carriers, but you do (that) of the rich man, you go to his house, you eat and drink and he gives you gifts; (while) you take the things of the poor man and don't investigate his claims, and this is how you fulfill the word of my father (*KBo* XXII 1 l. 24-31)

In the first example, *ta* seems simply to mean "and", while in the second it has a adversative overtone. The *Laws* may be able to provide some more information about *ta*: they make considerable use of it.

- (39) // takku É-ir nasma URU-an GÍŠKIRI<sub>6</sub> nasma uesin kuiski usneskatta ta[mais]-a paizzi *ta-kan* peran walhzi *ta-ssan* happari [s]er happar iezi ustulas 1 MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR pai

If someone offers a house or a city, an orchard or a meadow for sale, but another comes and 'strikes before' and makes a(nother) price/agreement over the (old) price/agreement, he pays 1 mina of silver for the crime (*Laws* II (a + q.) §35).

See §37 for the restoration of *tamais*. There, and in §36 (where it is slightly more broken), the phrase reads *tamais-a-kan piran* GUL-ahzi, without *ta-*

*kan*. The language has evidently been modernized; the syntax has not been taken from the OH model.

Note by the way the use of *-a* following *tamais*, which appears to fit in well with our analysis of the use of NP + *-a* above.

- (40) takku A.ŠA<sup>III-A</sup> NÍG.BA LUGAL kuiski harzi sahhan luzzi na[ita (karpizzi)] LUGAL-us GÍŠBANŠUR-az NINDA-an dai *ta-sse* pai //

If someone has a field as a gift of the king, he doesn't do *sahhan luzzi*: the king takes a bread from the table and gives it to him (*Laws* I §47a)

- (41) // LÚhipparas luzzi karpizzi nu LÚhippari happar le [ku]iski izzi DUMU-ŠU ... le kuiski wasi [ku]s-za LÚhippari happar izzi nas-kan happaraz [same]nzi LÚhipparas kuit happarait taz appa dai //

A h. takes *luzzi*; let noone make a deal with a h., let noone buy his child, etc. Whoever makes a *happar* with a *hippar*, he forfeits/retreats from the *happar*; what the *hippar* *happar*-ed, he takes (it) back. (*Laws* I §48).

This section gives an interesting view of the difference between *nu* and *ta*. *nu* is used after *kuis*, presumably to pick up the topic introduced by the "relative". This is quite regular in the *Laws* (we have already seen it in *Zalpa*, q. 31 above). A couple more examples:

- (42) takku ARAD-as huwai nas ANA KUR luya paizzi kuis-an appa[-ma?] (uwatezzi) nu-sse 6 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pai takku ARAD-as huwai nas kururiani[ti?] [(KUR-e)] paizzi kuis-an appa-ma uwatezzi nan-za apas-pat dai

If a slave runs and goes to Luwiya, the person who brings him back, he (the owner) gives him 6 shekels of silver. If the slave runs and goes to an enemy country, whoever brings him back takes him himself (*Laws* I §23).

The *nu* is obligatory when the topic changes case or is represented by an enclitic. It probably was not originally necessary when *kuis* was picked up by a Nom., but became a regular idiom:

- (43) kuis paprizzi nu apas-pat 6' [(GÍN KÙ.BABBAR)] pai  
Whoever pollutes, he gives 6 shekels of silver (*Laws* I §25).

Note the other syntax for saying this same sentence, in the same paragraph: it does not comport a *nu* after *kuis*:

- (44) paprizzi kuis 3 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pai

This is echoed e.g. in *KBo* XVII 9+ (*StBoT* 25 #12) II 10-12. *Anittas* may have the same construction with preposed *kuis* (*kuis-at hulli[zzi]* U<sup>[RU]</sup>nes]as LÚKUR-ŠU e[stu, l. 35], but as can be seen the passage is rather broken. The version with *nu* turns up in l. 49-51, but the topic has changed case and is now represented by *-an*. Q. 42 also suggests something similar. We might note the rare phrase with *ta* in this idiom: [k]uis sagais kisari *ta* LUGAL-i MUNUS.LUGAL-y-a tarueni "whatever sign occurs I tell the king and queen" (*StBoT* 8 IV 9).

In q. 41, *nu* also comes after the first sentence, apparently to show continuity with the ideas presented in that introductory statement. *ta* on the other hand is in a sequence that is very closely knit logically: all the clauses introduced by *ta* represent specific additional facets of what is in fact one scenario.

It does seem that in many cases, such as q.s 39ff. above, *ta* is almost standing in for a specific previously mentioned element. This recalls also the passages from *StBoT* 12 (see III 22ff.) in which a functionary gives a bread to the king *ta parsiya* (the king, that is). Compare also *StBoT* 12's *ta-kan waki* (IV 4), which is perhaps echoed by an LH version of a spring festival at Zippalanda:

(45a) // L<sup>U</sup>SAGIA 1 N<sup>INDA</sup>wagessar (12) askaz udai (13) LUGAL-i pai LUGAL-us parsiya (14) *ta-kan waki* //

The cupbearer brings one "bite" from the door/from outside, gives it to the king, the king crumbles (it), and bites from it (XXV 6 IV 11-14).

A passage that very much gives this impression is the likes of:

(45b) L<sup>U</sup> G<sup>IS</sup>TUKUL D<sup>UG</sup>tessummin appa epzi (31) LU[GAL-i] maniyahhi N<sup>INDA</sup>wagatas 2-ahhi ... (32) ... L<sup>U</sup> G<sup>IS</sup>TUKUL aruwaizzi ta[z] dai (33) LUGAL-us appa <sup>6</sup>halentiu paizzi //

The farmer takes back the *tessummi*, he hands the king 2 bites, etc.; the farmer bows and takes them back, the king goes back into the *halentiu* (*StBoT* 12 II 30-3).

*ta* is almost pronominal here.

In the following passage *ta* seems a pure connective: in this case, it follows *man*, but its clause is still part of the protasis. The conjunction *mān* here heads a phrase that is clearly adversative with respect to the previous sentence; nevertheless what strikes one again is that the *ta*-clause and its antecedent are logically inextricable from each other:

(46) takku L<sup>U</sup> G<sup>IS</sup>TUKUL Û L<sup>U</sup>HA.LA-ŠU taksan asanzi mān-i-za ir[(alauessanzi) (8) [t]az É-ZUNU sarranzi

If a farmer and his partner are agreed, when they have an argument and split their house (*Laws* I §53, *KBo* VI 2 III 7-8).

The same might hold for the following section, where *ta* picks up on an adversative *takku*:

(47) takku L<sup>U</sup>TUKUL-as A.ŠA<sup>UL</sup>A-ŠU humandan kuiski wasi luzzi karpizzi takku A.ŠA<sup>UL</sup>A-n-a mekki wasi luzzi natta karpizzi takku A.ŠA<sup>UL</sup>A kule-ma arki nasma L<sup>U</sup>MES URU<sup>UM</sup> pianzi ta luzzi karpizzi //

If someone buys all the field of a farmer, he takes on the *luzzi*. If he buys a lot of the fields, he doesn't take over the *luzzi*. If however a *kule* splits the fields/he splits the fields of the *kule* or the city men give it, he takes on the *luzzi* (*Laws* I §47b).

See also the end of §46.

One might wish to compare where *nu* follows *takku* in a similar manner. The passages seem purely narrative. First of all, there is the use of *nu* to couple two clauses in the conditional sequence itself, as in q. 42, which we will repeat here:

(48) takku ARAD-as huwai nas ANA KUR luya paizzi kuis-an appa[-ma? (uwatezzi)] nu-sse 6 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pai takku ARAD-as huwai nas kururian[ū? [(KUR-e)] paizzi kuis-an appa-ma uwatezzi nan-za apas-pat dai

If a slave runs and goes to Luwiya, the person who brings him back, he (the owner) gives him 6 shekels of silver. If the slave runs and goes to an enemy country, whoever brings him back takes him himself (*Laws* I §23).

We had already seen this in the beginning of q. 41 above. There is no particular logical connection between the clause *takku ARAD-as huwai*, and the clause with *nu* which tells where he is going: there is just a sequential bond between them.

The following citation has both this use, and the case in which *nu* starts the apodosis:

(49) takku ARAD-as huwai nan appa kuiski uwatezzi takku manninkuan epzi nu-sse <sup>KU</sup>E.SIR-us pai takku ket ID-az 2 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pai takku edi ID-az nu-sse 3 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pai

If a slave runs and someone brings him back, if he takes him nearby, he gives him his shoes; if it's on this side of the river, he gives him two shekels of silver, if it's on the other side, he gives him 3 shekels of silver (*Laws* I §22).

As one can see, *nu* is not obligatory, in the apodosis: the middle phrase does not have it. It is almost as if *nu* is included just to support the enclitic -sse. See also §11:

(50) takku L<sup>U</sup>.U<sub>19</sub>.LU-as ELLAM-as QAZZU nasma GİR-ŠU kuiski tuwarnizzi nu-sse 20/30 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pai

If someone breaks the hand or foot of a free man, he gives him 23/30 shekels of silver (*Laws* I §11).

It is interesting that the late copy C doesn't appear to have room for *nu-sse*.

In §9, *nu* seems to be pressed into service to support -za:

(51) [(takku)]u L<sup>U</sup>.U<sub>19</sub>.LU-as SAG.DU-ZU kuiski hunikzi karu 6 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR piskir huninkanza 3 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR dai ANA É.GAL 3 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR da<s>ker kinuna LUGAL-us ŠA É.GAL<sup>UM</sup> pessit nu-za huninkanza-pat 3 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR da[i]

If someone wounds the head of a person, he used to give 6 shekels of silver: the wounded person takes 3 shekels and they took 3 shekels for the palace; now the king has renounced the palace share, and the wounded person alone gets 3 shekels (*Laws* I §9).

We note, in fact, that when the *huninkanza* takes the silver the first time, -za is not included, and neither is *nu*. It is attractive to suppose, in this sort of

case, that *nu* is not syntactically necessary, and is included essentially to give -za something to lean on. See also

(52) *takku INA KUR luiya ... 1 ME [MAN]A KÙ.BABBAR pai assu-ssett-a sarnikzi nasma INA KUR<sup>URU</sup>hatti nu-za unatallan-pat arnuzi //*

If it's in Luwiya, he gives 1 mina of silver and replaces his goods; or if it's in Hatti, he does restitution for the merchant (*Laws* I §5).

See also q.s 42ff and fn. 5 above.

In the following §10, however, the paragraph seems to have a different sort of structure, within the parameters set out by the previous section §9. I would suggest that *ta* is preferred to *nu* because its clause represents an integral part of the whole scenario presented by the *takku* clause. One may remark, at least, that apart from in this first sequence, *nu* is preferred to *ta*:

(53) [(*takk*)]u LÚ.U<sub>19</sub>.LU-an kuiski hunikzi *tan* istarnikzi *nu* apun [(*saktaizzi*)] *pedi-ssi-ma* LÚ.U<sub>19</sub>.LU-an *pai nu É-ri-ssi anniskizzi* *kuitman-as lazziatta mān-as lazziatta-ma nu-sse* 6 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR *pai* LÚ.AZU-ya *kussan apas-pat pai*

If someone wounds a person and makes him sick, he takes care of him. In his place he gives a person and takes care of his house until he gets better. When he gets better, he gives him 6 shekels of silver and pays the physician (*Laws* §10)

See also §60-2 (A + B): *takku* GU<sub>4</sub>.MAH kuiski uemizzi *tan* parkunuzzi *ishas-sis-an gan[eszi]* 7 GU<sub>4</sub><sup>HLA</sup> *pai* "if someone finds an ox and cleans him (i.e. alters his markings?); his master however recognizes him, he gives 7 oxen"

Here, as with *su*, *ta* attached to an enclitic pronoun contrasts with *nu* followed by a full NP. But, in fact, when a passage is purely descriptive or narrative, *nu* is the only particle found, with or without an enclitic pronoun, as in:

(54) *takku* LÚ.U<sub>19</sub>.LU<sup>MES</sup> hannesni appantes *nu* sardias kuiski paizzi *nasta hannesnas ishas le[la]niatta nu* [1]<sup>U3</sup> sardian walhz[i] *nas aki sarnikzel* NU.GÁL

If people are taken in a trial and someone comes to help them, and the prosecutor gets mad and he strikes the accomplice and he dies, no restitution (*Laws* I §38).

*nu* doesn't seem really to be continuing topics here, as Justus would analyze it, since the topic hops around quite a bit, but each clause still starts with *nu*. After all, the topic of the first clause(s) is the LÚ.U<sub>19</sub>.LU<sup>MES</sup>, but by the time we get to the end of the paragraph, the *sardias* has taken over.

We might review the material from *KBo* XXII 1 now. It might be a good idea to repeat it:

(55) // *mān ABI tuliyas halzai nu-smas* (17) *gullakkuwan sahzi natta* (18) LÚ<sup>MES</sup>NAŠI ŠI.DI.TI<sub>4</sub>-KUNU *kasatta-wa* (19) LÚ<sup>MES</sup>NAŠI ŠI.DI.TI<sub>4</sub>-KUNU *dameskatteni* (20) *ta LUGAL-i kardimiyattus piskatteni //*

When my father calls you to assembly, he seeks to investigate/chastise (?) you, not your provision carriers. Behold, you oppress your provision carriers and give anger to the king. (*KBo* XXII 1 l. 16-20)

(56) *kasatta-wa utniya paitteni nu ŠA* LÚ<sup>MES</sup>MAŠDA (25) *eshar-set natta sanhiskatteni //* LÚ<sup>MES</sup>NAŠI ŠI.DI.TI<sub>4</sub>-ŠU *natta punusteni* (27) *ta* LÚ<sup>MES</sup>happinandas *isteni* (28) *parna-ssa paisi ezsi euksi piyanazzi-a-tta* (29) LÚ<sup>MES</sup>asiwandan-a *set datti* (30) *DIN-ŠU natta punussi nu kissan* (31) *AWAT ABI-YA arhan harteni*

Behold you go into the land and you don't investigate the blood of the poor man; you don't check over his provision carriers, but you do (that) of the rich man, you go to his house, you eat and drink and he gives you gifts; (while) you take the things of the poor man and don't investigate his claims, and this is how you fulfill the word of my father (*KBo* XXII 1 l. 24-31).

The narrative is evidently reasonably telegraphic and it is not entirely easy to follow which clauses belong with which. But it would seem that *nu* is called into play when its clause represents a sequential or narrative follow-up to the previous material. The very last clause cited, *nu kissan AWAT ABI-YA arhan harteni*, is a kind of overall summation of all the clauses preceding it.

*ta* on other hand, as we suggested when we first looked at this passage, apparently has an adversative feel to it, at least in q. 56. If we look more closely at the syntax, however, we may see that it does tie in with the clause before it: the LÚ<sup>MES</sup>NAŠI ŠI.DI.TI<sub>4</sub> are the same in both clauses. We may therefore tentatively suggest that *ta* has here exactly the same nuance of integral connection with previous material that we have been attributing to it in the *Laws*. The phrase *ta LUGAL-i kardimiyattus piskatteni* from q. 37/55 above may fit into the same pattern: it follows logically on the phrase preceding it. In this case the antecedent has been made to stand out from the previous discussion, but this is not always the case.

We will return to *ta* below, under -kuwa (§4.1, 2).

It is easy to see that *ta* and *nu* are not comparable, whether or not the nuance I am attributing to the former is correct. *nu* is the more colorless of the two, the "unmarked" one, which can even take on a mildly adversative sense itself on occasion, and is in a position to push its sister connective out of the way in later Hittite. In fact, it is already beginning to move into *ta*'s slot in *StBoT* 8. An example:

(57) *LUGAL-us* 3-ŠU *ais-set arri* (16) *tat hurtiyaliya lahui* MUNUS.LUGAL-s-a 3-ŠU *ais-set* (17) *arri nat hurtiyaliya lahui //*

The king rinses his mouth 3 times and pours it into the *h.*; the queen rinses her mouth 3 times and pours it into the *h.* (*StBoT* 8 l. 15-17).

Undoubtedly *tat* was the archaic version of this locution.

Q. 56 may also point up a feature of the connective-less prose, namely that within a framework, the connectives are omitted if actions are parallel. In (*ta* LÚ<sup>MES</sup>happinandas *isteni*) *parna-ssa paisi ezsi euksi piyanazzi-a-tta*, it seems evident that the actions described by *parna-ssa paisi ezsi euksi* are all on a level with each other, from the point of view of the narrative: they represent components of a single idea, and not logical steps in a sequence. Hence no connective

is required. With *piyanazzi-a-tta*, there is a shift to another subject, though still within the same framework: hence (probably!) the *-a*. The same might be said of <sup>LÚ</sup>*asiwandan-a set datti DIN-ŠU natta punussi*: <sup>LÚ</sup>*asiwandan-a* represents a shift and a connection together, but there is no logical progression in the two phrases that form this sequence, and therefore no connective. Again, one wonders how far *nu* really does represent topic continuation in OH, as Justus suggests, since in cases like this one might expect it for this purpose.

§3.2. To our list of rhetorical devices possible in OH, we may therefore add the following:

7) **no connective** is used not only for a clean break with previous material, and for an initial statement: it is also employed to express parallel clauses within the same framework.

8) *ta* apparently marks a close logical nexus between its clause and the preceding material.

9) *nu* is often used apparently as a filler to support enclitics.

§4. There are other particles of course, one being the elusive *-ku(wa)*.

§4.1. In Hittite, *-ku(wa)* has often been reduced to an appendage on various conjunctions and adverbs (*takku*, *anku?*, *neku/nikku*, *immakku*, *apiyakku*). It also has a conjunctive/disjunctive function in strings of similar elements, generally with a meaning bordering on "or". Please see the very interesting article of Eichner 1971 on this particle: he, following the equally interesting paper of Wagner 1967, takes *-ku* to mean essentially "if, whether":

(58) *nu kuwapi* <sup>PUTU-us</sup> *mumiezzi* [ ] (9) [ ] *-i-ku happeni-kku* <sup>GIŠ-i</sup> *kku hahhali-kku*  
*m[u]m[i]e[z]z[i]*

Where the Sungod falls, whether in x, in flame, in tree, in bush ... (XXXVI 44 IV 8-9).

(59) <sup>LÚ-na</sup> *ku MUNUS-na-ku* (B: <sup>LÚ-an-na</sup> *ku*) (Laws §1, 2 (B), §19a (A)).

(60) <sup>LÚ.U<sub>1</sub></sup> *LU-ku GU<sub>4</sub>-ku UDU-ku* (Laws I §98)

It is interesting that one OH text has *takku* used in a kind of expanded, full-clause version of this use of *-ku*:

(61) [ ] *-anzi takku mekes* (6) [ *m*] *ek tianzi takku tepus* (7) [ *t*] *epu tianzi*

If they are many, they put lots [ ]; if they are few, they put little [ ] (KBo XXV 23 (StBoT 25 #23) Rs 5-7).

Essentially *takku* is a sentence-initial version of the plain *-ku*, pressed into service when the elements to be compared/disjuncted are clauses rather than individual forms. *-ku* itself can essentially be used in this fashion, if there is a viable initial element to which it can append itself:

(62) *le-wa-tta nahi tuel-ku wasta[is]* (44') *ug-at* <sup>SIG<sub>5</sub>-ziyami</sup> *UL-akku* / [ *na*] *tti-kku*  
*tuel wasta[is]* (45') *ug-at* <sup>SIG<sub>5</sub>-ziyami</sup>

Don't fear: if it's your sin, I'll make it better; if it's not your sin, I'll make it better (XXXIII 27 l. 8 = XXXIII 24 l. 43-5).

In this case, the effect is to contrast the two clauses with *-ku*, but the particle actually flags only the two elements that are the alternatives.

*-kuwa* also may attach itself to an initial *man*:

(63) *sarkus* <sup>LÚ-es</sup> *esta* (12) *akis-ma-as/akis-san tepsawanni* <sup>URU</sup> *kuz(z)urui* (13)  
*kaqqapus marakta man-kuwa kaqqapist* (14) *maklantes* //

(A. was lord in H. He was a man in all senses of the word (?), and they calumniated (?) him to my father and he had him brought and drove him to A. and made him a scout (?)). He was a mighty man, but he died in poverty. He slaughtered/distributed k.s in K. - it would have been better if they had been scrawny (??? i.e. if he hadn't been so rich and powerful, he would have been left alone?) (KBo III 34 II 8-14 = 36 Vs 16-20).

†*kakapus* KBo III 36 Vs 20.

This passage is difficult, and various interpretations have been put on *man-kuwa*: Dardano's edition prefers to emend it to <sup>URU</sup>*ankuwa*. It all depends on where Kuzzuru was. If we take it as it is written, one could hazard a guess that *-ku* marks its clause as a logically dependent (but perhaps unexpected) corollary on the previous one. In fact, its phrase here would give a kind of wry twist on the previous story. A sense "Would rather, on the other hand the k.s had been scrawny ..." would seem to fit the bill: it is close to the sense we have been attributing to *-kuwa*, namely the faculty to mark an alternative or oppositional unit.

*-ku* seems to be a focussing, rather than a disjunctive or conditional element, by this analysis. In fact, it gives a good insight into how a conditional or "or" sense could have developed out of paratactic simple sentences, with no subordination (against Eichner, who looks to *-ku* as proof that PIE had Nebensätze). With *tuel-ku* and *natta-ku* of q. 62, the two alternative poles of the discussion, namely "your" and "not your", are both marked by the particle *-ku*. But neither *-ku* phrase is subordinate: there is no protasis or apodosis. The paratactic structure reminds one of the equally direct representations of the comparative in the earliest IE: "this man is bigger than a wolf", for instance, might be phrased as "the wolf is not big: this man is big" (see Pinault 1999). The *-ku* obviously became vested with the nuance of the opposition, after a while, but it is likely not to have had it in the beginning: in all probability it was simply used rather to underscore the two adversarial elements.

We might like to see, by the way, if Luwian, which uses this particle in a syntactic capacity more than Hittite, confirms such a supposition, though of course there is no guarantee at all that Luwian developed the particle in the same way as Hittite did. Please see Appendix.

At any rate, as suggested above, following q. 61, *takku* is very likely to have started as a version of *-ku*, when the elements to be opposed or compared were phrases rather than single forms. It then spread to conditions where there

was no opposition. Conditional clauses with *takku* represent one of two types of subordinate clauses in general use in OH: the other type is the *mān* “when” clause. *kuis* clauses can’t truly be regarded as subordinate, though we do have *kuitman* and probably the causal *kuit*. Subordinate clauses are obviously only in their infancy, at this time. And in fact we find that the presumably older paratactic constructions are still alive and well in Old Hittite: for the paratactic “when” construction, see q.s 5, 14; for “if”, q. 62.

§4.2. It remains to understand why *ta* was chosen to be the support for *-ku* in this syntagm, rather than *su* or *nu*.

*takku* is not used for contrary-to-fact clauses: these are rather the province of the enclitic *man*. Please note that contrary-to-fact conditions even in later Hittite are definitely expressed in paratactic syntax. At any rate, *takku* is the conditional conjunction of **possibility**. This explains, among other things, why it is never found with the preterite.

*su*, with its probable overtones of result or narrowing down the discussion, is rather an unlikely choice for such a sense. As for *nu*, one may remark that *nu-kku* does exist in Palaic, so that it is of interest to look for a moment at how it is used, if at all possible. It seems to mean “now then (nun denn)”. *nu* presumably being the cognate of Homeric νῦν(v), Sanskrit *nū*, a sense “now > verily” is not amazing. But one then has to surmise that *nu-kku* would not have been appropriate for the conditional sense because *nu* cannot carry it. But wasn’t *-kku* supposed to be the conditional element? One has to conclude that in fact *ta* had some sense that favored its being used in such phrases, and that *-kku* still had its focussing properties when it was appended to *ta*.

This seems like a tall order, but perhaps we can get out of it. The key may lie in the fact that *ta-kku*, as suggested above, originally was probably not the marker of conditional sense, but rather used to flag opposed clauses expressing alternatives. *ta* is not present when *-ku* can be appended to specific NPs or similar elements which can be opposed neatly to each other. *nu* obviously cannot handle this type of clause, but *ta* can.

I would like to propose a view of *ta* that will perhaps explain why it is used the way it is. *ta* is commonly taken to be cognate with forms of the pronoun *\*tō-*. And this would make a great deal of sense, in terms of how the particle is used in Hittite:

As is well known, the neuter pronoun is used in IE to indicate that a clause is to be treated as a unit comparable to an inflected NP. A couple of examples from the Odyssey:

(64) ἀλλ’ ἐμὸν αὐτοῦ χρεῖος, ὃ μοι κακὸν ἔμπεσεν οἴκῳ,  
δοῦά: τὸ μὲν πατέρ’ ἐσθλὸν ἀπώλεσα ...

(I have no urgency for the community), but my own problem, which has befallen my house, a double one: one being that I have lost a worthy father ... (Od. 2.45-6).

τό here looks awfully like *ta* of q. 62.

(65) νήπιος, οὐδὲ τὸ ἦδη, ὃ οὐ πείσεσθαι ἐμελλεν  
Simpleton, nor did he know that he was not going to persuade (Athena) (3.146).

Here ὃ ties in with an antecedent, the neuter pronoun τό.

(66) αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τὸ μὲν οὐ ποτ’ ἀπίστεον, ἀλλ’ ἐνὶ θυμῷ  
ἦδε’, ὃ νοστήσεις ὀλέσας ἅπο πάντας ἐταίρους

However I on the one hand never despaired, but I knew in my heart that you would return having lost all your companions (13.339-40).

Here one could view τὸ μὲν as an internal accusative “on the one hand”; at any rate ὃ certainly encapsulates its entire clause as an object for ἦδεα.

(67) αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ σὺν νηυσὶν ἀολλέσιν, αἷ μοι ἔποντο,  
φεῦγον, ἐπεὶ γίγνωσκον ὃ δὴ κακὰ μῆδετο δαίμων

However I, with all the ships which followed me, got out of there, after I had understood that the god meant ill (3.165-6).

Here ὃ is clearly used to mark a whole clause as a unit on a par with a full NP Acc.

There is of course the regular use of expressions like ἐς ὃ for “until”, and so on, which plainly use the neuter pronoun to encapsulate a whole clause in the status of a simple Acc.

Consider also the interesting

(68) Οὐ πῶ πᾶν εἶρηθ’, ὅτ’ ἄρ’ Ἀμφινόμοσ’ ἰδε νῆα,  
This (speech) was not even finished, when A. saw the boat (Od. 16.351).

ὅτε of course may descend from a neuter pronoun + τε (or is it *\*sō-tel-k’e*, as per Dunkel 1988 p. 100?). Sanskrit employs the simple neuter relative *yád* for the same sense.

One may see traces of this in the behavior of *ta*. To begin with, we have the use of *ta-kku* apparently to represent a whole clause that needs flagging, a construction which is normally found with a simple NP. Then, there is e.g. the evidence of q. 37/55, where we have *ta LUGAL-i kardimmiyattus piskatteni*: this almost sounds as if the king is saying “you do these bad things, and *this* gives the king cause for anger”. We have seen that many cases of *ta* seemed to have it referring, almost pronominally, to a previous element (e.g. q.s 39ff.).

Take again e.g. q. 38/56:

(69) *kasatta-wa utniya paitteni nu ŠA* <sup>LU</sup>MAŠDA (25) *eshar-set natta sanhiskatteni* // *LU*<sup>MES</sup>NAŠI ŠI.DI.TI-ŠU *natta punusteni* (27) *ta* <sup>LU</sup>happinandas isteni (28) *parna-ssa paissi ezsi euksi piyanazzi-a-ta* (29) <sup>LU</sup>asiwandan-a set datti (30) *DIN-ŠU natta punussi nu kissan* (31) *AWAT ABI-YA arhan harteni*



Behold you go into the land and you don't investigate the blood of the poor man; you don't check over his provision carriers, but you do (that) of the rich man, you go to his house, you eat and drink and he gives you gifts; (while) you take the things of the poor man and don't investigate his claims, and this is how you fulfill the word of my father (KBo XXII 1 I. 24-31).

How does the clause with *ta* differ from those with *nu*, and from the phrase starting with <sup>LÜ</sup>*asiwandan-a*? Let us suggest that *ta* in fact derives its use from some ancient construction in which it represented something like "you ignore the poor, and **that** boils down to your coddling the rich". The use of *nu*, not *ta*, in the last clause is a sign that the sentence is a natural follow-up, in this case a synopsis, of the whole scenario introduced by *ta*. The same might be said for the nuance of *nu* in the first two phrases quoted above.

Consider the copied *Palace Chronicles*, with the only extant example of *ta* with a preterite:

(70) LUGAL-un-wa-z mekki halihlatti <sup>D</sup>ispudasinara LUGAL-us das (22) <sup>1</sup>suppiuman <sup>1</sup>marassann-a ša-li LÜ<sup>MEŠ</sup>KUŠ, esir apun-a (23) <sup>LÜ</sup>uralla-ssaman iet ispanti lahemus hueskizzi (24) *ta* wastaus uemir kuida <sup>1</sup>suppiumni <sup>1</sup>marassa-ya (25) <sup>GIS</sup>ŠU.A <sup>LÜ</sup>ŠU.I parku ier apun umatiyassas piran asesir (26) apunn-a ukutiyas piran asesir // *ta* ispanti halzissanzi

You fawn on/offend the king greatly. Isputasinara the king took; S. and M. - they were x grooms - that one (I. presumably) he made their overseer (?). In the night he kept running checks (?) and they found failings (in the performance of S. and M.? or of the general staff?). So they put barber's chairs high for S. and M.: they set up this one before his squadron (?) and that one before (his) squadron. And they called regularly at night (KBo III 34 II 21-27).

Again, it appears that the phrases here with *ta* have a direct logical connection with their respective preceding clauses. In both cases the clause with *ta* is the result, a natural completion, of the scenario presented by its antecedent. In the first case, it brings out something that was not expected; in the second it does not.

It is easy to see how this use might have developed from a neuter pronoun, or some form with a similar function, that subsumed the previous material into itself: originally, one may imagine that an analogous phrase meant something like "there were checks run, and **that** meant (= "as a result") they found failings". Compare e.g. q. 39, where *ta* picks up twice on *tamais*, in an apparently similar fashion.

It is of course clear that even if the above comments are correct, we can see only traces of a pronominal function for *ta* in Hittite. *ta* is no longer seen as a marker of a whole clause, assuming that it ever was: it is some sort of conjunction. The next step, as we know from q. 36, was that *ta* became parallel to *nu* at some point. Then the two began to be confused (as in q. 57). And this brought *ta* eventually to extinction.

§4.3. It is of interest to compare the Sanskrit use of neuter pronouns. It turns out that they are often very close to what we have been proposing for *ta*.

To start out, one way of saying *if* already in Vedic is *ced*, which is derived from \**ca* + *id*, which is the exact (reverse) equivalent of *takku*. As is well known, *ca* is cognate with Latin *-que* and Greek τε, and of course, Hittite *-kuwa*. *id* is the neuter pronoun cognate with Latin *id*. However, it has no living use as a pronoun, any more than *ta* does in Hittite. Note that *ca* also shows the flagging function of *-ku(wa)* all by itself:

(71) antás ca prága, Áditir bhavāsi

If thou hast entered within, thou shalt be A. (RV 8.48.2a).

This is quite comparable to q. 64 above with *-ku*.

Some examples of "adverbial" uses of neuter pronouns in Vedic that seem to parallel, or at least presage, the sense we have proposed for *ta* in Hittite, that is, that of showing that its clause is an integral part of the scenario laid out by previous clauses. First, a couple of examples with *tád*, which is in full use as a neuter pronoun, besides having the syntactic uses illustrated below:

(72) vīṣṇor nú kaṁ vītryāni prá vocaṁ ...

prá tād vīṣṇuḥ stavate vītryēṇa

I now sing forth the virtues of V. (who does this and that). For this (= *tád*) V. is praised for his virtues (RV 1.154.1a, 2a).

Compare e.g. the equally live pronoun τό in q. 66 from Greek.

In the following, *tád* ties more in with the following *yát* clause, but it is still syntactic rather than a true pronoun:

(73) áśvyo váro 'bhavas tād indra

ṣṛké yát tvá prátyahan devá ékaḥ

A horse's tail wast thou **then** (= *tád*), I., on the spit when he spitted you, the one god (1.32.12ab).

*id* is a neuter pronoun that is generally used to emphasize a particular word in Sanskrit. But as a natural outcome of this it often has the effect of pointing up connections between phrases. It does not necessarily parallel *ta*, but at least may show how a pronoun of this kind can take on wide-ranging syntactic functions. A couple of examples:

(74) indro yáto 'vasitāsyā rājā  
sāmasya ca śrngāṇaḥ vājrabāhuḥ  
sá id u rājā kṣayati carṣaṇīnaṁ

Indra is the king of him that journeys and of him that rests, of creatures tame and horned, the thunderwielder - he obviously (= *id*) as king rules men (1.32.15a-c).

(75) sáñ codaya citrām arvāk rādha indra  
váreṇyaṁ āsad út te vibhú prabhú

Gather hither bounty manifold, I., worthy of desire, it is /should be yours in abundance (RV 1.9.5).

*id* in these last two q.s as usual marks the preceding form, in q. 72 a verb (unusual). This has the effect of creating a close logical bind between the *id* clause and the preceding one; it almost hints at a causal relation between the two phrases.

In the following, *id* seems simply to link the two clauses as parts of the same train of thought, much as *ta* seems to in Hittite:

*akṣāir mā dīvyah; kṛṣīm it kṛṣasva;  
vittē ramasva, bahū mānyamānah*

'Play not with dice: ply thy tillage; rejoice in thy property, thinking much of it' (10.34.13ab).

§5. We may recapitulate what we have found for the sentence connectives in Old Hittite:

1) **no connective** is used for a clean break with previous material. Also for an initial statement. It also expresses parallel clauses within the same framework.

2) **a fronted element followed by -a** also gives the sense of a break, but still within the framework of the previous narrative. We surmise that it represents a contrast plus a connection. It can be used to signal a sense of contemporaneity between clauses, i.e. a paratactic "when" construction.

3) **nu** gives the sense of the continuation of a previous topic. It regularly follows *mān* and *kuis* clauses, and can be included apparently simply as a support for enclitics.

4) **su** seems to have some overtones of logical conclusion or resultative sense. In most cases the forms *sas*, *san*, *se*, and *sus*, which are interpreted as \**su-as*, etc., may simply represent the reflex of the anaphoric animate pronoun \**só-*.

5) **ta** apparently marks a close logical nexus between its clause and the preceding material.

6) **-ma** is used to show that a particular element represents a new focus, within the framework of the paragraph, usually in contrast to an analogous previous element or concept.

7) **-ku(wa)** flags alternatives in an opposition. It is used to signal the paratactic equivalent of our conditional sense.

8) **-wa** is used to present direct discourse.

In addition to these particles, there are others not within the scope of this paper which have to be added to our arsenal of nuances available to a Hittite storyteller. We may cite in particular:

9) **-pat**, which seems to have focussing or underscoring properties.

10) **-kan**, which apparently marked an enclitic as topic and perhaps stood in for a topicalized oblique case<sup>6</sup>; and

11) other local particles, notably **-asta** and **-apa**, which may have developed syntactic properties already in OH<sup>7</sup>. **-asta** could also be pressed into service to mark an Abl. or ablative form, and in particular the term of a comparison (as is well known, the comparative sense was expressed in Hittite by means of a positive and the Abl. or the Dat. for the term against which the comparison was made). **-apa** underscored the term in a comparison among equals, a kind of paratactic method of expressing the sense "like". Both these particles were undoubtedly added to constructions that did not require them in the beginning.

One might wish to consider how the derivations proposed for the three Hittite sentence particles can explain their different properties.

*ta*, if it is an ancient neuter pronoun as is commonly surmised, possibly derives its use as a particle from the function of encapsulating a whole phrase into the grammatical status of an NP, or of referring to previous material as a whole. There is actually the possibility that it also had a more specific reference, as in q.s 39ff. Dunkel however would see the matter as the other way round: see the next entry on *su*.

*su* by one derivation had a sense "well > in fact" or similar. However, it has been suggested<sup>8</sup> that *su* derives from \**só*, which gives Sanskrit *sá*, Greek *ó*, and Gothic *sa*, among other things. Dunkel believes that the form, which had topicalizing tendencies, developed endings and became a full pronoun (*contra* Carruba). If this is so (it is attractive on various grounds), Hittite would have been somewhat ahead of the other languages in adding the endings, and quite adventurous in using it also for the animate Acc. and plural (though the Rg Veda apparently coined a Loc. *sásmin*). Hittite would however also show the simple form \**só* > *su*, which I would contend developed separately from the pronominal version *sas* (see §2.3 above). I would point out also that Latin *si(c)* and Germanic *so* "thus" are supposed to come from a root \**swe*, which could also be related to Hittite *su*: the derivation of the form is hardly clear.

Dunkel thinks that \**tó* > *ta* had a similar development. The pronominal inflection that would be based on the stem \**tó-* is very meagre in Hittite, as against the other IE languages, and what there might be overlaps with *sas*, which does not gibe with the rest of IE at all. It is peculiar that we have *ta-sse*, which presumably shows an enclitic pronoun \**soi*. All this might lead one

6. BOLEY, 2000, §5a.

7. See BOLEY, 2000, §1b.2 for *-asta*.

8. CARRUBA, 1985 (*Grammatische Kategorien* (VII. Fachtagung, Berlin, ed. B. SCHLERATH)); DUNKEL, 1988 p. 101ff.

to believe that the *\*so-* root was pronominal (there is also the free-standing possessive pronoun *set* (q. 38 l. 29) to suggest a live pronominal root *\*s-* in Hittite), but *ta* either was not a pronoun, or had long since lost all pronominal connections. *ta*, though, either by itself or in the syntagms *tan*, *tat*, *tus*, etc., seems to have a semi-pronominal behavior, as in q.s 39ff., that is, it seems to hark back to previous material. One could suppose that the development towards true pronominal character might have been arrested at some intermediate stage between a use as a particle and that of a pronoun. The neuter forms illustrated for Sanskrit (§4.3) and perhaps Greek (§4.2), might have perhaps developed clause-encapsulating capabilities, etc., out of their ancient use as a particle, rather than the other way round, though they were then reinterpreted as pronouns. This whole subject will need to be revisited.

*nu* on the other hand is a plain narrative sequential particle, a weakened “now > verily” or similar, which degenerates into a filler in many cases.

To end, Hittite developed a great subtlety in its discourse structure, despite a lack of complex constructions such as subordinate clauses and the modes. In particular, it created delicate nuances by means of its sentence connectives and marking particles. We must again revise our low estimate of the language as being threadbare and unequal to the task of expressing sophisticated concepts and relationships: once again Hittite has risen to the challenge and not been found wanting, though it certainly goes about its business in ways that are foreign to us. It remains to compare the Hittite data with narratives in the rest of the ancient IE languages, to see if we can flesh out some picture of how a tale was told in old PIE.

## Appendix: Luwian *-kuwa*

Unfortunately, the evidence for *-kuwa* in Cuneiform Luwian is meagre in the extreme. The particle seems to be an early-ish feature: the texts containing it are mainly birth rituals that, by Starke’s calculation, stem from (the end of) the 15th to (the end of) the 14th c. Hieroglyphic has eliminated *-kuwa* altogether.

The only connected passage is 102 III = 103 II 13:

// [i-ū]-un-ni-wa <sup>o</sup>EN.ZU-an-za<<-an-za>> kum-ma-ya-n[a-an-za (12) [ḫa-t]a-ya-an-na-an-za a-a-pa-an ḫi-iz-za-ū-un-ni

// i-ya-an-du-ku-wa za-aš-ši-in DUMU-an-na-aš-ši-i[n] (14) a-an-ni-in wa-ra-al-li-in ū-wa-ta-an-du (15) [a]n-ni-iš-ku-wa-ti pār-na-an-za ma-ad-du-ū[-wa-ti] (16) [p]a-ap-pār-ku-wa-at-ti ta-a-ti-iš-pa-wa-ti-ya-[ta]

III 1 [p]a-wa i-ya-an-du <sup>o</sup>EN.ZU-in-zi x[ ] (2) kum-ma-ya-n[a-an-za ḫa-t]a-ya-an-na-an-za (3) a-pa-an ḫi-iz-za-in-du //

za-am-pa-ku-wa DUMU-ni-in wa-al-li-in-du (5) ša-an-na-i-in-du pa-wa-an-tar a-an-ni (6) ti-i-ta-ni du-ū-wa-an-du

Let them go and bring the true mother of this child ... Let them raise the child and turn him upside down and let them put him to his mother’s breast.

*-kuwa* is probably setting its clause apart from that of the <sup>o</sup>EN.ZU-s, since the sequence is repeated twice, both times with the particle in the second half. A sense “on the other hand” for *-kuwa* is not impossible.

IV 1-has a telescoped version of these paragraphs: *-kuwa* occurs at the beginning, but not after *zam-pa*:

[i-ya]-an-du-ku-wa za-aš-ši-in [DUMU-an-na-aš-ši-i[n] a-an-ni-in wa-ra-al-li-in ū-wa-ta-a[n-du a-pa]-a-aš šar-ha-du a-pa-a-aš [ // [za-am]-pa DUMU-ni-in wa-al-li-in-du ša-an-na-i-in-du pa-wa-a[n-tar a-an-ni ti-i-ta-ni] du-ū-wa-an-du

See also some others in the beginning parag., which however is more broken:

103 Vs 5:

// (-)wa-šu za-ar-ta-ku-wa-t[a  
6: ]x-aš ma-an-ni-im-ma-a[n  
7: ]x-an wa-ša-ta-ti-ku-wa-ta wa-r[u<sup>2</sup>  
8: [an-ni-iš-k]u-wa-ti pār-na-an-za du-ū-na-ti[  
9: [pa-ap-pār]-ku-wa-at-ti ta-a-ti-iš-pa-wa-ta etc.

Apart from this, we have various fragments, all from KUB XXXV:

79 IV 10, 12: ]ni<sup>2</sup>-iš-ši-pa-ku-wa  
// [ z]i-pa-ku-wa la-aḫ-ḫi-i[n]-ta-ri  
99 I. 5, 7:  
// ] zanta ma-na-a-ta am-m[a  
i]š-ku-wa ḫa-an-ti-ša-an ŠAH[  
]x-ši ḫa-an-ti-ša-an MUŠ-wa[-  
wa-ḫ]i-ip-ni-ku-wa wa-lu-ti-in [(-)  
]x-wa-ra-ti wa-li-ip-ni-x[ \*

\* the broken sign here is unlikely to be part of *ku*

109 III 9: -]a?-li-wa-az-pa-ku-wa-at-ta SIG<sub>7</sub>.S[IG<sub>7</sub>]-ta. The context is a mess.

128 II 4, III 8, much too broken.

KBo VII 68 III 7: -]ar ku-i-en-ḫa at-ta-an-ku-wa-at[

13 x a-ku-wa-at-t[a (again 18, preceded by ḫur-za-ta-an).

This is the only text that is not a birth ritual: Starke dates it to the 14th c.

## Texts Cited

- Anittas = E. NEU, *Der Anittas-Text (Studien zu den Boğazköy Texten 18)*, 1974.
- A. ARCHI, 1979 = «L'humanité des Hittites» in *Florilegium Anatolicum: mélanges offerts à Emmanuel Laroche*, Paris.
- J. BOLEY, 1989 = *The Sentence Particles and the Place Words in Old and Middle Hittite (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 60)*, Innsbruck.
- , 2000 = *Dynamics of Transformation in Hittite - The Hittite Particles -kan, -asta and -san (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 97)*, Innsbruck.
- P. DARDANO, 1997 = *L'aneddoto e il racconto in età antica ittita: La cosiddetta 'Cronaca di Palazzo' (Biblioteca di ricerche linguistiche e filologiche no. 43)*, Rome.
- G. A. DUNKEL, 1988 = "J. Wackernagel und die idg. Partikeln \*só, \*ke, \*kem und \*an", *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie (Acts of the 9th Congress of the Indogermanische Gesellschaft, Basel)*.
- H. EICHNER, 1971 = "Urindogermanisch \*k'e 'wenn' im Hethitischen", *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft 29*.
- P. GOEDEGEBUURE, 1999 = "Enclitic Subject", presented at the IVth Congress of Hittitology, Würzburg.
- C. JUSTUS, 1976 = "Relativization and Topicalization in Hittite", *Subject and Topic*, ed. C.N.Li, New York.
- Laws 1) H. HOFFNER, *The Laws of the Hittites*, 1997.  
2) J. FRIEDRICH, *Die hethitischen Gesetze*, Leiden 1971.  
3) F. IMPARATI, *Le leggi ittite*, Rome 1964.
- S. LURAGHI, 1990 = *Old Hittite Sentence Structure*, London-New York.  
Palace Chronicles, see Dardano.
- G.-J. PINAULT, 1999 = "Zur Syntax der Komparation im Indogermanischen", delivered at the Arbeitstagung of the Indogermanische Gesellschaft "Indogermanische Syntax", Würzburg, Sept 29-Oct. 3 1999.
- F. STARKE, 1985 = *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift (Studien zu den Boğazköy Texten 30)*, Wiesbaden.
- H. WAGNER, 1967 = "Indogermanisch -k'e im Finnisch-Ugrischen", *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft 20*.
- Zalpa = H. OTTEN, *Eine althethitische Erzählung um die Stadt Zalpa (Studien zu den Boğazköy Texten 17)*, Wiesbaden, 1973.

## Addendum: Observations on nu and sas

The particle *nu* has a most elusive quality, especially for us, who are somewhat conditioned by its diluted and colorless use in later Hittite. As it seems clear that it was sliding into this deplorable condition over the course of OH, it is sometimes hard for us to make out traces of the older stage of the language, in which it (presumably!) had some character of its own. This paper seeks nonetheless to make the attempt, and to fine-tune the territory of *nu* as opposed to that of *-a*, *ta* and what we regard as the pronoun *sas*. A couple of observations on the omitted pronouns and on *sas* end the communication.

A) Above, we have seen ample use of *nu* in what looks like a filler capacity for instance, its regular appearance as a follow-up to *mān* clauses (§2.4). It also is often employed apparently solely to support enclitics; the particle disappears when the enclitics are not present (§3.1 (q.s 49ff.). To review a salient example of this:

1. takku ARAD-as huwai nan appa kuiski uwatezzi takku manninkuan epzi **nu-sse** KUŠE.SIR-us pai takku ket ID-az 2 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pai takku edi ID-az **nu-sse** 3 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pai

If a slave runs and someone brings him back, if he takes him nearby, he gives him his shoes; if it's on this side of the river, he gives him two shekels of silver, if it's on the other side, he gives him 3 shekels of silver (*Laws I §22*).

As can be seen, *nu* either supports an enclitic, or is omitted entirely. It is pretty clearly a filler in such a case.

Note however an example with *nu* without an enclitic, even though a Dat. pronoun would be appropriate:

2. le?-us-za nekus-'mus daskeuen[i n]u le saliktumari  
Let us [not?] take our sisters (to wife) don't go near (them) (*Zalpa Vs 19*).

Another restoration might be *ku]s-za* ..., in which case one would translate "are we taking these our sisters to wife?" or something similar.

This use of *nu* is most unusual, and leads one to suspect that the particle has some particular function here, not connected with the fact that a pronoun is understood in the context.

*nu* very often occurs in the final phrase of a passage, even of a text. An example:

3. LUGAL-us URU<sup>URU</sup>hattusa DINGIR<sup>DIDL</sup>-as aruwanzi uet (14) Û LUGAL ŠU.GI apiya talis sas sara URU-ya pai (15) uk-wa LUGAL-us-'mis kisha Û ERÍN<sup>MES</sup> kattismi ' \* nu URU-an harnikta //

The king came to H. to bow to the gods and left the old king there, and he went up to the city (and said) "I have become your king and the troops are with me" \* and he destroyed the city (*Zalpa Rs 13-15*).

\* or take this sentence out of the direct discourse and translate "I have become your king" and the troops were with him! ...".

4. // *labarnas* LUGAL<sup>URU</sup>hatti ishessar-azme[i] (9) *estu nu-za-pa utniyanza humanza* (10) *iski-smet anda* <sup>URU</sup>hattusa lagan hard[u/z[i] // *labarnas* LUGAL-us inarauanza *nu-sse-pa* (12) *utniyanza humanza anda inarahhi* // [I]abarnas É-ir-set (14) *tuskarattas hassas-sas* (15) *hanzassas-sas ne-ssan* (16) [N]<sup>4</sup>peruni uetan //

Let L. king of Hatti be their strength and let (?) the whole land hold its back in to Hattusas. L the king is strong and let the whole land take (?) strength on him. L's house is of joy and descendants and it is built on rock (XXXVI 110 Rs 13-16).

5. *watar* <sup>DUG</sup>tessummiya (17) *lahuan andan tuhhuisar ishiyan kitta na-ssan hassi PANI* <sup>PU</sup>GUR kitta //

Water is poured into a *tessummi*; within a bound *tuhhuisar* (a cult cleansing substance) lies, and it lies on the hearth before Nergal (KBo XVII 15 (StBoT 25 #27) Rs 16-17).

It is odd how the last clause of each sequence takes *nu* in these passages. Particularly interesting are the following two selections

6. *ta-smas hurtiy[allan ]* (14) *para epmi DUMU.É.GAL suppi watar para epzi* (15) LUGAL-i MUNUS.LUGAL-y-a LUGAL-us 3-ŠU ais-set arri (16) *tat hurtiyaliya lahui* MUNUS.LUGAL-s-a 3-ŠU ais-set (17) *arri nat hurtiyaliya lahui* //

The king rinses his mouth 3 times and pours it into the *h.*; the queen rinses her mouth 3 times and pours it into the *h.* (StBoT 8 I 13-17).

7. // [m]ān LUGAL-us MUNUS.LUGAL-ass-a taranzi *ta* DUMU<sup>MES</sup>-an parna paimi (12) [tak]u natta-ma taranzi *nu* natta paimi

When/If the king and queen say (so), I go to the house of the children; if they don't say so, I don't go (StBoT 8 IV 11-12; also III 17-18, with *mān* both times).

We had surmised (see above p. 86 [q. 36] and p. 91 [q. 57]) that these two passages showed a confusion of *ta* and *nu*. On more mature reflection, however, it strikes one that there might be a significance to the fact that in both cases the *nu* turns up in the last clause. Perhaps the sequence *ta ... nu* is not a symptom of blurring between the territories of the two particles after all, although it obviously makes for a fertile ground in which such a conflation could start to occur. A particularly suggestive passage is the following, in which, after nothing but *ta* throughout the very long paragraph (and also in the following section), the last clause before the dividing line has *nu*

8. LUGAL-us MUNUS.LUGAL-s-a asanzi (26) *ta kalulupus-mus gapinit hulaliemi* (27) ŠA QATI-ŠUNU ug-a hahhal harmi sinann-a harmi (28) <sup>GIS</sup>harpa-ma 1-anta LUGAL-as GİR-si kitta MUNUS.LUGAL-s-a 1-anta (29) kitta si sini temi da LUGAL-as MUNUS.LUGAL-s-a ain (30) x wain pittulius-muss-a *ta* hahhallit (31) gapinan dahhe kalulupi-smi hulalian kuit-a anda (32) halkias-a ZIZ<sup>HLA</sup>-s-a harsarr-a *nu* apat GİR-ŠUNU kitta // gapinan kalulupiz-mit hahhallit markahhi (34) halinas zeri harmi *tan* anda 3-is LUGAL-us MUNUS.LUGAL-s-a (35) zeriya allapahhanzi istappulli-set-a sulias (36) *ta* istaphe ...

They king and queen stand and I bind their fingers with string, of their hands; I hold a *h.* and I hold an image; 1 *h.* lies at the feet of the king, one lies (at the feet) of the queen and I say to the image "Take the pain of the king and queen and their fears!" and I take

the string which lies bound on their finger with the *h.*; heads of wheat and spelt lie at their feet. I cut the string from their finger with the *h.*; I hold a clay beaker and three times into the beaker the king and queen spit; its lid is of lead and I cover it (StBoT 8 IV 25-36).

We may tentatively suggest, on the basis of this positioning of *nu*, that the particle may signal the final outcome of, or conclusion about, a sequence of events.

What about the (myriad) cases in which *nu* is internal in a paragraph? See actually q. 7 above: the *nu* in fact occurs at the end of a sequence, not necessarily of a paragraph. A case like q. 5 above, but with the *nu* clause internal in a paragraph

9. *ke-san humanda* (21) [p]addani tehhi *ne* LUGAL-as MUNUS.LUGAL-ass-a kitkar-smet tehhi (22) *ser-a-ssan GAD-an pessiemi sus LÜ-as natta auszi* //

I put them on the king and queen's head on top I throw a cloth and no man sees them (StBoT 8 IV 20-22).

#### A few important examples

10. // <sup>URU</sup>hassui 'sandas DUMU.É.GAL LÜ [<sup>URU</sup>]hurma esta hurlass-a (25) *nahta nu eshe pennis ABI LU[GAL] IŠPUR sa[n] kukkureskir* //

In Hassu S. was the palace servant of the headman of Hurma (or "S. the palace servant was the headman in Hurma"). He was afraid of the Hurrians and ran to his lord; the father of the king wrote and they flattened him (KBo III 34 I 24-5 (Palace Chronicles)).

It is clear that the clause *nu eshe pennis* is the result, or perhaps it is better to say the final outcome, of the previous clause, *hurlass-a nahta*. A translation "and so" covers the nuance perfectly. Consider also

11. // *takku LÜ-as GU<sub>4</sub>-ŠU* [D-an zinuskizzi tamais-an su[(waizzi)] *nu* GU<sub>4</sub>-as KUN-an epzi *ta* [D-an zai Û BEL G[(U<sub>4</sub> [D-as pedai)] *nu-za apun danzi* //

If a man is making his ox cross a river and another pushes him and grabs the tail of the ox and (thus) crosses the river, and the river carries the owner of the ox away, they take that man (Laws §43).

*nu* seems to indicate the conclusion or final outcome of the action of shoving, which is expressed in the previous clause. "And so" again would probably cover the case. *ta* marks rather a close logical nexus with the previous sentence, here almost a resultative sense the translation "thus, thereby" could very well not be put in parentheses.

We might remark again, parenthetically, that for the phrase Û BEL G[(U<sub>4</sub>), the copy B has *nu*, but this does not necessarily represent the OH version. In a case like this, where a noun is clearly being introduced in a contrastive capacity, though it fits in with the previous material, we would expect an initial NP + *-a*, since the passage seems to require both a shift of topic and a connection with previous material at the same time. *nu* and *-a* are by no means comparable.

Another passage in which *nu* seems to have a similar nuance to q. 11 is

12. takku ARAD-as huwai nas ANA KUR luya paizzi kuis-an appa[-ma? (uwatezzi)] nu-sse 6 GÍN KÛ.BABBAR pai takku ARAD-as huwai nas kururian[ti? ((KUR-e)] paizzi kuis-an appa-ma uwatezzi nan-za apas-pat dai

If a slave runs and goes to Luwiya, the person who brings him back, he (the owner) gives him 6 shekels of silver. If the slave runs and goes to an enemy country, whoever brings him back takes him himself (*Laws* I §23).

We might like to contrast an outwardly similar passage with *ta*

13. [(tak)]u LÚ.U<sub>10</sub>.LU-an kuiski hunikzi tan istarnikzi nu apun [(sakaizzi)] pedi-ssi-ma LÚ.U<sub>10</sub>.LU-an pai nu É-ri-ssi anniskizzi kuitman-as lazziatta mán-as lazziatta-ma nu-sse 6 GÍN KÛ.BABBAR pai LÚ.AZU-ya kussan apas-pat pai

If someone wounds a person and makes him sick, he takes care of him. In his place he gives a person and takes care of his house until he gets better. When he gets better, he gives him 6 shekels of silver and pays the physician (*Laws* §10).

*ta* does not indicate a final outcome, a simple sense “in conclusion, and so” it gives more a sense of “thereby, thus, as a direct result”. It shows that its clause and the previous one(s) are inextricably linked logically, two parts, as it were, of the same scenario. *nu* on the other hand shows, perhaps where a sequence was heading, but certainly how it turned out.

The following seems to use *nu* to show that the bringing of the men to Mt. T. ended in their being yoked there:

14. <sup>1</sup>sarmassun <sup>1</sup>nunnun-a (16) <sup>HUR.SAG</sup>rahayai pehuter nus GU<sub>4</sub>-li turir

They took S. and N. to Mt. T. and yoked them like cattle (then they took one of N.'s relatives and killed him) (*Palace Chronicles* I 15-16).

This is one of the rare uses of *nu* with an Acc. pronoun in the *Chronicles*: *san*, or *sus* predominates. The other surviving passage with *nu* and a pronoun is

15. dais-san ANŠE.KUR.RA-as kuida LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup> KUŠ, (28) ammiyantus-<sup>1</sup>mus nus <sup>1</sup>isputasinaras maniyahheskizzi (29) GI-an <sup>GIŠ</sup>UMBIN hashassuar <sup>GIŠ</sup>TUKUL appatar nus apas annanut (30) kun apas annanut kuss-a ABI LUGAL ANA <>nakkilit (31) UGULA LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup>SAGI pais kus <sup>1</sup>huzzi UGULA LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup>NIMGIR (32) kus <sup>1</sup>kizzui UGULA LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup>MEŠEDI pais sus ulkessarahhir //

Because/then he put the drivers on the horses, the young ones among them, and I taught them (about) arrows ... and managing a weapon and he instructed them, this one he instructed. Some the father of the king gave to N. head of cupbearers, some he gave to H. head of heralds, some to K. head of MEŠEDI (and) they finished their training (*Palace Chronicles* II 27-32).

Again, *nu* seems to usher in the final outcome of the previous discourse. There is no real resultative sense here, and no strong logical link, such as we would find with *ta*: *nu* underscores simply the end product of a sequence.

I would like to return for a moment to q. 2. *nu le saliktumari* seems to fit very well into this pattern it shows the final conclusion to be drawn from the

previous observation, a most conclusive summing up of the whole argumentation or observations made before it. This applies also to

16. kasatta-wa utniya paitteni nu ŠA LÚ<sup>MAŠDA</sup> (25) eshar-set natta sanhiskattenni // LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup>NAŠI ŠI.DI.TI<sub>4</sub>-ŠU natta punusteni (27) ta LÚ<sup>happinandas</sup> isteni (28) parna-ssa paisi ezsi euksi piyanazzi-a-tta (29) LÚ<sup>asiwandan-a</sup> set datti (30) DIN-ŠU natta punussi nu kissan (31) AWAT ABI-YA arhan harteni

Behold you go into the land and you don't investigate the blood of the poor man; you don't check over his provision carriers, but you do (that) of the rich man, you go to his house, you eat and drink and he gives you gifts; (while) you take the things of the poor man and don't investigate his claims, and this is how you fulfill the word of my father (*KBo* XXII 1 l. 24-31, see Archi for edition).

In particular, note again the use of *nu* at the end of sequence, to sum up the whole of the previous discussion. Contrast *ta* in a similar position

17. // mān ABI tuliyas halzai nu-smas (17) gullakkuwan sahzi natta (18) LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup>NAŠI ŠI.DI.TI<sub>4</sub>-KUNU kasatta-wa (19) LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup>NAŠI ŠI.DI.TI<sub>4</sub>-KUNU dameskattenni (20) ta LUGAL-i kardimiyattus piskattenni //

When my father calls you to assembly, he seeks to investigate/chastise (?) you, not your provision carriers. Behold, you oppress your provision carriers and give anger to the king. (*KBo* XXII 1 l. 16-20).

*ta* seems to indicate a direct logical nexus between its clause and the previous material; *nu* gives rather the sense of conclusion, or final outcome. It may seem to have resultative overtones, but I would avoid taking it as a resultative particle; by showing how things turned out in the end, it can occasionally slide into a resultative nuance.

A last most suggestive example from Anittas, in which *nu* actually begins a sequence of paragraphs:

18. // nu URU<sup>nesi</sup> URU<sup>DIDL</sup> uetenun URU-yan a[p(pa)] (56) nepisas <sup>PIŠKUR</sup>-nas É-ir Ū É <sup>PIŠU</sup>[nasu(wummin ABNI)] // É <sup>PIŠU</sup>almasuittas É <sup>PIŠKUR</sup>-nas [(BELI-YA Ū É <sup>PIŠU</sup>inasummis ABNI)] (58) KASKAL-z-a kuit assu utahh[un (apedanda halis-siyanun)] // nu maltahhun nu hurtahhun

And in Nesa I built a fortress; after the fortress I built temples to the Stormgod and to Siusummi; A temple of H., a temple of the Stormgod and a temple of Siusummi I built; from my campaign what goods I had brought, I fitted (the temples) out with them. I spoke a vow and I spoke a curse. (On the same day I brought a mess of animals to Nesa...) (*Anittas* l. 55-58).

The previous paragraphs describe various victorious campaigns, which resulted in the booty with which Anittas was able to outfit his new temples. In particular, the campaign to Zalpa (l. 38ff.) is central, since the Zalpans had taken Siusummi away to their city, and one of Anittas' exploits was to bring him back to Nesa. It is clear that *nu* is ushering in the discussion of the final disposition of all the toil and spoil described in the previous text, and the phrase *nu maltahhun nu hurtahhun* is meant to lay the matter to rest in the most definitive manner possible.

Let us now tackle again a particularly intricate extract, in the hopes of squeezing even more out of it, in terms of what its syntax is able to tell us about the nuances available to the Hittite storytellers

(19) [MUNUS.LUGA]L [U]RU[k]anis 30 DUMU<sup>MES</sup> 1<sup>EN</sup> MU-anti hasta UMMA ŠIMA  
(2) [k]i-wa kuit walkuan hashun tuppis sakanda sunnas (3) nu DUMU<sup>MES</sup>-ŠU  
andan zikket [s]us ID-a tarnas ID-s-a (4) ANA A.AB.BA KUR URU<sup>URU</sup>zalpuwa peda[s]  
DINGIR<sup>DIDL</sup>IR<sup>DIDL</sup>-s-a DUMU<sup>MES</sup>-us A.AB.BA-az (5) sara dair sus sallanuskir //

Our idiomatic English translation of this passage ran

[The queen]n of Nesa bore 30 sons in one year. Thus she said, 'this is some monstrosity I have borne'. She filled baskets with dung and laid her sons in (them) and committed them to the river - the river (then) carried (them) to the sea of the land of Zalpa, and the gods (of Zalpa) then took the sons out of the sea and raised them (Zalpa Vs 1-5).

We had already shown (above p. 68 §1.2 and p. 69 §1.3) that there were subtle things that the English necessarily missed the close binding of the two ID clauses by means of an omitted pronoun; the "contrast + connection" construction given by the syntagm NP + -a; and we had discussed the interesting syntax whereby in the next to last sequence beginning with DINGIR<sup>DIDL</sup>-s-a, the sons are represented not as a pronoun, but as a full NP again. We surmised this full repetition was used to underscore the climax of the whole section of narrative. The question however came up about whether the first *sus*, l. 3, could have referred to *tuppis*, rather than to the DUMU<sup>MES</sup>-ŠU. This seemed unlikely, since the sons were the main focus of the story from the first line, but it was grammatically possible. Perhaps the observations above on the use of *nu* can help us determine the truth here with more certainty.

*nu* in the Zalpa text is rare apart from the *mān/kuwapit ... nu* sequences, there are only three occurrences of the particle *nu* URU-an *harnikta* of q. 3; *nu le saliktumari* of q. 2, and this one. We have seen that *nu* has in all likelihood been used to underscore the final outcome of a sequence. If we take it here as having the same value, the *tuppis* clause is simply an interpolation, leading up to the main event, namely the laying of the children in the baskets. This would make it likely that the children are indeed the focus of the subsequent discourse, and that *sus* refers to them. The position of *nu* would also encourage our analysis that by Hittite standards the *sus* immediately following was regarded as starting a second phase of the story.

One is intrigued by the fact that *nu* ushers in also the final phrase of the entire story, *nu* URU-an *harnikta*, of q. 3. While it is perhaps unlikely that *nu* directly refers to previous topics, it is obvious that if it sums up previous material, its clause is very likely to refer to central elements in the previous discourse. One might like to consider that *nu* URU-an *harnikta* is returning to and wrapping up the whole matter of the topic of the story, namely the city Zalpa. In the same way, one might like to see *nu* in *nu* DUMU<sup>MES</sup>-ŠU *andan zikket* in a similar light, as indicating a return to the main topic, the sons, after the brief interpolation introducing the baskets.

A digression is in order here. If we except this dubious example, there are only two cases of *sas* referring to inanimate quantities of animate gender in Old Hittite, both in copied texts. One is pretty certain ANJA GAL m[arnu]andas (?) (8) MUN-an *suhhair san-asta eukta* "they poured salt (into beer?) and he drank it off" of the copied KBo III 34+ I 8 (*Palace Chronicles*). The other, more dubious, example is in the copied part of Zalpa ] *san istahta*, KBo III 38 Vs 5. Unfortunately whatever *san* referred to is in a break, but it might seem odd that one would "taste" an animate quantity. *memal* "meal" (which is however a neuter!) is in the previous line the Sungod puts it into someone's mouth, which encourages thinking that the person is tasting something of this kind.

Apart from this, *sas* is resolutely used to refer to persons, an additional encouragement to take it as applying to DUMU<sup>MES</sup>-ŠU in q. 19. Actually, one begins to wonder if the surprising single occurrence of *sus* with a present tense, in StBoT 8 (q. 9) might not simply have been prompted by the fact that the pronoun had to refer to animate persons, and the *sas* series was still preferred in these cases (above p. 82-83 q. 28 for a number of other speculations).

We might, even more by the way, like to compare the similar Biblical story of Moses in the bulrushes

And she could no longer hide him and she took for him a basket of rushes and daubed it with tar and with pitch and put in it the child and put (it/him) in the reeds by the river's edge. (*Exodus* 2.3).

The King James Version renders this "And when she could no longer hide him, she took for him an ark of bulrushes, and daubed it with slime and with pitch, and put the child therein; and she laid it in the flags by the river's bank".

As can be seen, the pronoun is omitted in the last clause, where she puts (whatever) in the river, and the King James Version takes it that the basket is meant. While there may have been an intentional ambiguity here, that is, the text may wish to refer to both the basket and the child, the subsequent narrative treats the child as central (the next verse reads "and his sister stood by to see what would happen to him").

If one compares this to the Zalpa story, in which the children have already been central from the first line, it may seem doubly unlikely that the pronoun *sus* will not refer to them, rather to the baskets, which appear parenthetically in only one sentence. The ambiguity possibly allowed by the missing pronoun in the Hebrew is not an option here, since an overt pronoun must refer to something specific in its surroundings.

To sum up the findings with respect to *nu*, we have discussed above the many signs of an original "conclusive" character for the particle. However, it is undeniable that Old Hittite shows signs of a slow dilution of this proposed value. Q. 1 shows *nu* used essentially as a filler to support pronouns; and in



many cases in which it may have some vestige of its original force, it still seems almost a narrative particle. An extreme example is of course

20. takku LÚ.U<sub>19</sub>.LU<sup>MEŠ</sup> hannesni appantes nu sardias kuiski paizzi nasta hannesnas  
ishas le[la]niatta nu [L]<sup>U7</sup>sardian walhz[i] nas aki sarnikzel NU.GÁL

If people are taken in a trial and someone comes to help them, and the prosecutor gets mad and he strikes the accomplice and he dies, no restitution (*Laws I § 38*).

It seems clear that in OH *nu* is in a transition stage between its original use, and its weakened character of later Hittite.

#### Texts Cited

Anittas = E. NEU, *Der Anittas-Text (Studien zu den Boğazköy Texten 18)*, Wiesbaden, 1974.

A. ARCHI, 1979 = *L'humanité des Hittites, Florilegium Anatolicum, Mélanges offerts à Emmanuel Laroche*, Paris.

Palace Chronicles =

P. DARDANO, *L'aneddoto e il racconto in età antico ittita La cosiddetta 'Cronaca di Palazzo' (Biblioteca di ricerche linguistiche e filologiche no. 43)*, Rome, 1997.

Laws = 1) H. HOFFNER, *The Laws of the Hittites*, Leiden, 1997.

2) J. FRIEDRICH, *Die hethitischen Gesetze*, Leiden, 1971.

3) F. IMPARATI, *Le leggi ittite*, Rome, 1964.

StBoT = *Studien zu den Boğazköy Texten*, Wiesbaden.

Zalpa = H. OTTEN, *Eine althethitische Erzählung um die Stadt Zalpa (Studien zu den Boğazköy Texten 17)*, Wiesbaden, 1973.