Syntactic structures in Mursili's Aphasia

Carol F. Justus[†]

Austin

1.0 Introduction

Goetze & Pedersen's (1934) philological edition of the text known to Hittitologists as Mursili's Aphasia was thorough, and Lebrun's (1985) subsequent re-edition incorporated fragments not previously known[1], but the purpose of this text is still unclear. Most people classify it as a ritual (CTH 486), but it begins as a first person narrative, and the colophon names it 'When in Tell Kunnu the Sun Mursili heard the thunder' (C IV 52-54). Van den Hout[2] acknowledged that the text gives us a mixed message, that it combines both report style and ritual style, without accepting Justus' (1981)[3] suggestion that systematic grammatical patterns in the text might exemplify the syntactic paradigms of a school text.

The question here remains as to the purpose of the text and its problematic shifts in person and tense. Do they result from a mindless collapse of text types or can they be explained within the framework of syntactic and pragmatic Hittite narrative structures?

The Aphasia text, by contrast with many loosely strung together Hittite compositions, develops a set of themes that begin with Mursili, the Great King, as speaker and actor. Further thematic structures see him, through the agency of the Storm-god, reduced to the ashes of an ox in the Storm-god's temple at Kummanni. The narrative content begins with the role of the Storm-god in Mursili's speech loss and progresses through Mursili's oracular inquiries to the ritual process in which Mursili ceases to act and undergoes entire loss of subject-hood or topic-hood as he acquiesces to the Storm-god's demand to outfit an ox as substitute for himself.

After the introductory paragraph (§1 C III 40-44), four "*mahhan* 'when' "events move the narrative forward to its final conclusion (§5 C IV 41-49). Along the way, the composition illustrates three different noun subject constructions with the medio-passive verb *handaittat*, several shifts in perspective, and no less than five complex theme or topic-focus constructions that introduce new focal information to advance the narrative.

Mursili's Aphasia (CTH 486)[4]

---

[1] Goetze-Pedersen. MS; R. Lebrun, "L'aphasie de Mursili II = CTH 486", *Hethitica* 6 (1985), pp. 103-137 with G. Beckman's, *JNES* 47 (1988), pp. 141-143 transcription corrections.

[2] Th. van den Hout, "Some Thoughts on the Composition Known as Mursili's Aphasia (CTH 486)", *Antiquus Oriens. Mélanges offerts au Professeur Lebrun*. Vol. I, Michel Mazoyer and Olivier Casabonne, edd. Paris 2004, pp. 359-380. (Collection KUBABA. Série Antiquité V).

[3] C. Justus, "Visible Sentences in Cuneiform Hittite", *Aspects of Cuneiform Writing*. M. Powell, ed. Cleveland, OH 1981, pp. 373-408; 398. (*Visible Language* 15).

[4] The text here is based on C (KBo 4.2, III 40ff.) with restorations from [(A & B)] comparing mostly hand

§1 (III 40) *UMMA* ^{D}UTU-*ŠI* **¹Mursili** LUGAL.GAL:

I-NA ^{URU}***Til-Ku**[(nnu)]* (41) *nannahhun*   'I drove into ...'
nu harsi-harsi udas   **namma** ^{D}**U**(-*as*) *hatug*[*a*] **(42) tethiskit**
nu nahun   '(with the result that) I feared'
nu=mu=kan *memias* KAxU-*i an*[(*da*)] (43) *tepawesta**
nu=mu=kan *memias tepu* **kuit**(*ki*) (44) *iyattat*
nu=kan *asi memian arha=pat paskuwanu*[(*n*)]*

(45) ***mahhan=ma*** *ueir* MU$^{HI.A}$ EGIR-*anda pair**
nu=mu *ui*[(*t*)] (46) *asi memias teshaniskiuwan tiyat*
nu=mu=kan *zazhi** (47) *anda* ŠU DINGIR-*LIM aras*
KAxU-*iss=a=mu=kan tapusa** *pait*
(48) ***nu*** *ariyanun*
nu ^{D}U ^{URU}*Manuzziya* **SIxSÁ**-*at* **(handaittat)**

(49) ^{D}U ^{URU}*Manuzziya=ma katta ariyanun*
nu=ssi ^{GUD}*puhugaris** *piyawanzi* IZI-*it wahnumanzi*
(51) [(MUŠEN $^{HI.}$)^{A}] *wahnumanzi* **handaittat**
^{GUD}*puhugarin**=**ma** (52) [*ariy*]*anun*
n=as *pidi=ssi I-NA utni* ^{URU}*Kummanni*
(53) [*I-NA* (É)] DINGIR-*LIM piyawanzi* **handaittat**

PERSPECTIVE SHIFTS, TOPIC CONTINUES⁵

nu ^{GUD}*puhugarin** (54) [(*unueir*)]
nu=ssan ^{D}UTU-*ŠI* ŠU-*an dais*
(55) [(***n=an=kan***)] *I-NA* KUR ^{URU}*Kummanni para nair**

PERSPECTIVE SHIFT FOR COMPLIANCE DETAIL

---

copies of the cuneiform with the editions. An asterisk (*) marks a word with plene writing, and logograms are often replaced with Hittite phonetic forms in order to focus in syntactic and discourse structures that do not depend on script conventions.
⁵ Pragmatic distinctions bolded in the text include MAIN TOPICS, which refer to thematic presupposed, given, anaphoric, or deictic information, and FOCAL TOPICS, which refer to newly topical information. Topic-related information is also bolded as particles mark continuation of them and focal topics are marked by *kui*-based forms. General distinctions of discourse information structure are more narrowly defined in studies such as *Subject and Topi.*, C. Li. ed., NY 1976, and M. Halliday & R. Hasan *Cohesion in English.* London 1976. Hittite discussions build on C. Justus, "Relativization and Topicalization in Hittite", *Subject and Topic*, pp. 215-245; C. Justus, "Hittite *istamas-* 'hear': Some Syntactic Implications", *MSS* 38 (1979), pp. 93-115.

---

^{D}UTU-*ŠI=ma* (56) [(EGIR-*an hin*)]*katta*
^{GUD}*puhugarin**=**ma kuedani* UD-*ti* (57) [(*unueir*)]   (when focus)
[(*nu*)]=*za* ^{D}UTU-*ŠI apedani* UD-*ti warapta*

(58) [(*piran para*)]*yazzi apun** G[(E_6-*a*)]*n IŠ-TU* MUNUS-*TI* (59) [(*teshas*)]
[(*k*)]*aruwariwa*[(*r=ma=za* ***mahhan***)] *warapta*
(60) [(***nu=kan*** *A-NA* ^{GUD}*puhugari** ŠU-*an apenissan*)] *dais*

(61) [(***mahhan=ma=kan*** ^{GUD}*puhugarin** *para*)] *nair**
(62) [(^{D}UTU-*ŠI=ma=za* ^{GUD}*puhugari** *appanda I-*)]*NA*
siwatti.7.K[(AM *suppa*) (*wa*)*ra*(*pzi*)]   TENSE SHIFTED
(63)? [(***kuitman=ma*** ^{GUD}*puhugarin** *I-NA* ^{URU}*Kummanni arnu*)]*ir*

(64)? [*kui*(*tmann=an pie*)*ir*] [*n=as*? (*istantait kuit*)]
(65)? [*nu*? (^{D}UTU-*ŠI natta kuit*(*ki*) (*huskit*)]
(66)? [(*nu* UD.7.KAM=*pat pedas*)] [(*IŠ-TU* UD.7.KAM) ...]
(67)? [(***mahhan=ma*** UD.7.KAM *p*)*ai*(*t*)]   *nu=za* ^{D}UTU-*ŠI*) ...

---

§2 (B) A (31) = C (IV 1-13) COMPLIANCE CONTINUES: **BURNING BIRDS ...**

---

§3 (C) A (Rs. 4) = C (IV 16) COMPLIANCE CONTINUES: *A-NA* ^{D}U *amba*[*ssi* ...]

---

§4 TOPIC CONTINUES, COMPLIANCE DETAIL CONTINUES:

(C IV 21) *A-NA* ^{GUD}***puhugari=ma=kan*** [(***kueda***)*ni* UD-*ti* ŠU-*an*] (22) *tehhun*   (when)
para=an=kan *ku*[(***wapi** nair***)]   (where)
[(***nu***)] (23) ^{TÚG}NÍG.LÁM^{MEŠ} *apedani* UD-*ti* [***kue*** (*wassan*) *harkun*]   (what)
(24) ***nu=kan*** *apeya* ^{TÚG}NÍG.LÁM^{MEŠ} [(*anda ap*)*panta*] (OR: *ape=ya*")
(25) *QA-DU* ^{TÚG}E.ÍB GÍR ^{KUŠ}E.SIR *IT-TI* [^{GUD}*puhugari** (*para*)] *nair**
(26) ***n=at*** *peter*

^{GIŠ}***GIGIR=ya=kan*** *turiyan** (27) *QA-DU* ^{GIŠ}BAN ^{KUŠ}MÁ.URU.URU$_6$
ANŠE.KUR.RA$^{HI.A}$ *para** *nair**
(28) ***n=at*** *pennir*
IŠ-TU ^{GIŠ}BANŠUR=*ma=za=kan kuezza** (29) *azzikkinun*   (what focus)
IŠ-TU GAL=*ya=kan kuez*(*za*)* (30) *akkuskinun*
sasti=ya=zza=kan kuedani (31) *seskeskinun*
IŠ-TU ^{URUDU}ÁB=*ya=za=kan kuezza** (32) *areskinun*
kuitta=ya *imma* UNUTUM *anda* (33) *weriyan esta*
nu *Ú-UL* ***kuitki*** *dattat*
(34) *IŠ-TU* DINGIR-*LIM QA-TAM-MA* **handaittat**

^{TÚG}NÍG.LÁM^{MEŠ} ^{GIŠ}GIGIR ANŠE.KUR.RA$^{HI.A}$ =*ya*

(35) [(ked)]ani memiyani tattat

^{D}U-as **kuedani** (36) [(UD-ti hatu)]ga tethiskit harsi-harsi udas   (when)
(37) [(nu ^{TUG}NÍG.)]LÁM^{MEŠ} **kue** apedani UD-ti wassan harkun   (what)
(38) [(A-NA ^{GIŠ})]GIGIR=**ya=kan kuedani** apedani UD-ti (39) [(arha)]hat   (where)
nu ke ^{TUG}NÍG.LÁM^{MEŠ} anda appanta

(40) [(^{GIŠ}GIGIR=ya)] turiyan*   apatt*=a dair*

---

§5 FINAL COMPLIANCE: BURNING (WITH PERSPECTIVE SHIFT)
(41) **mahhan=ma** ^{GUD}puhugarin* arnuwanzi
nu ŠA ^{GUD}puhugari*
GIM-an SISKUR annalaz (42) IŠ-TU ^{GIŠ}LI.U$_5$ gulassan   (how info)
ishiul=si **mahhan** iyan A-NA DINGIR-LIM=ya SISKUR.SISKUR ambassi keldi=ya (45)
annalaz IŠ-TU ^{GIŠ}LI.U$_5$ **GIM-an** iyan
(46) **n=at** QA-TAM-M[(A essanzi)]   (fused-anaphora)
man* ^{GUD}puhugaris*=**ma** (47) EGIR KASKAL a[(ki)]   POTENTIAL EVENT
KASKAL-as **kuit** tu)]wa   (why)
[(n=at **mahhan**)] (48) apiya=ya [arnu(anzi)]
[(**nu** tamain)] ^{GUD}puhugarin* (49) apez(za) [(unuwashaz(a) unu)wandan
(nann)anzi
(50) **nu** apu[(s)] unuw(ashus) ap(edani)] (51) IT-TI ^{G}[(^{UD}puhugari* warnuwanzi)]

Colophon: (52) D[UB.1.KAM (QA-TI x) kuw(api I-NA ^{URU}Til-^{I}Kun)nu]
(53) [^{D}UTU-ŠI ^{I}Mur(sili ?) (tethessar istama)sta ?]
(54) [ŠU (PAP.NI.NI.LI) DUB.SAR$^{??}$ IŠ-TUR]

The text purports to be the words of a king who tells how he lost his speech and how he consulted the Storm-god of Manuzziya when his "mouth went sideways" (C III 40-48). In compliance with oracular inquiry (ariyanun ... handaittat C III 48), a substitute ox and birds are to be given and burned (C III 49-51), and the ox is to be brought to Kummanni for sacrifice in the Storm-god's temple (C III 52-53).

Thematic development moves from Mursili, the speaker (C III 40), to the Storm-god as thunderer (C III 41), as the subject of oracular inquiry (C III 48-49), and as ordainer of ritual procedure (C III 49-53). Finally the ox (C III 51ff.) begins to take Mursili's place as the ritual equates the two. When Mursili emerges as ritual participant with the ox (C III 54-56), he is no longer the first person topic but a third person object in the story, on a par with the third person ox to which he ritually transfers himself by laying his hands on the ox (C III 58-67?).

If one can equate a scribal ruling with a linguistic paragraph, the content of the text falls into five paragraphs. The first takes Mursili from first person narrator to third person object (C III 40-67?), the second and third (C IV 1-16) describe local sacrifices, the fourth goes into detail

about which of Mursili's possessions go with the ox to Kummanni and which do not (C IV 17-40), and the last deals with final sacrifice issues after the ox has left Hattusa (C IV 41-50).

Temporal mahhan clauses introduce four thematic story-line events in structures that move the narrative beyond the initial thundering event:
- **1** (C III 45) years later Mursili's speech problem worsened leading first to oracular inquiry and its revelation;
- **2** (C III 61) then to the preparation of the ox to be led away;
- **3** (C III 67?) and to the (local?) bird sacrifices alongside details about Mursili's effects that did or did not go with the ox to Kummanni; and
- **4** (C IV 41 = §5) the eventual ox sacrifice at Kummanni.

2.0 Structural Analysis

The Aphasia text is a study in Hittite thematic development: It repeats basic structures more than three times, varying each and increasing its complexity. Besides thematic "mahhan 'when'" constructions, at least two others suggest that the Aphasia text represents a composition based on a sophisticated grammatical knowledge of Hittite discourse techniques. The first, paradigmatic noun phrase subjects of handaittat, only briefly mentioned here, while the second, variations on theme-focus constructions that embed the Hittite counterpart of relative clauses, is more detailed. Inescapable then is some mention of possible Hittite devices for perspective shift. Section (2.1) recalls the range of forms that nominal subjects and objects take in Hittite, while (2.2) studies the interplay of so-called "relative" constructions with topical information, and (2.3) looks at issues of time, voice, and perspective shift in the text. Much remains for further study beyond these paradigmatic structures in the Aphasia text, but these are striking in their systematic nature.

2.1 Noun phrase paradigms

Syntactic studies in many languages classify verbs according to the kind of noun clause embeddings that they take, whether they take an infinitive or a finite 'that' clause, and whether the construction occurs in subject or object position with the verb. Ose[6] found that many Hittite verbs took infinitive clauses ("supine" constructions), while Friedrich[7] looked at the internal structure of infinitive clauses showing that the infinitive governed argument relations independent of the main verb. To this extent Hittite would have subordinate constructions similar to those of other languages.

It has, nevertheless, been debated whether finite clauses with verbs such as Hittite istamas- 'hear' and sak(k)-/sek(k)- 'know', which do not take dependent infinitive clauses, are subordinate or not. Both 'hear' and 'know' take a range of object noun forms[8], from a simple noun like uddar 'words' ([uddar]$_{object}$ kuies sekteni 'you who know (my) words') to a noun phrase like

---

[6] Ose, Sup.
[7] HE^2 I, pp. 143-144.
[8] Justus, MSS 38 (1979), pp. 100-110; C. Justus, sak(k)- / sek(k)-, Mat.heth.Thes. 10 (1981), pp. 16ff; 39-44.

apun memian 'that matter' ([*apun=wa memian*]$_{object}$ *Ú-UL sekkueni* 'we do not know that matter'). Are apparent "paratactic" clauses such as 'they say / call me very motherly' as dependent on 'know' as simpler noun arguments such as 'words'?[9]

(1) ([*nu ammel :annan tissan ... memiskanzi*]$_{object}$ ŠEŠ-*YA=ya=an sakti*
'you, my brother, also know it (that) they say I am very motherly' KUB XXI 38 Vs. 58f.

Such finite object clauses have the usual Hittite object position, before the verb, and they are semantically governed by the verb 'know', although their finite clausal form appears to be loosely coordinated. Such semantically governed arguments would seem to be formally variant noun clauses, but neither 'hear' nor 'know' takes dependent infinitives.

Subjects of Hittite medio-passive *handaittat* (= SIxSÁ-*at*) 'be determined, prove to be' in the Aphasia text fill the gap with a range of nominals that include both a finite noun clause and dependent infinitives. An earlier study[10] suggested that the Aphasia scribes wove in this data to demonstrate the paradigmatic set of syntactic structures that *handaittat* took. Summary versions here attest a simple noun phrase in the subject slot with *handaittat* (2a: ^{D}U ^{URU}*Manuzziya* 'Storm-god of Manuzziya' C III 48), an infinitive clause (2b: ...^{GUD}*puhugaris piyauanzi...* 'ox to give ...' C III 50-51), and a finite noun clause (2c: *natta kuitki dattat* 'not anything be taken' C IV 33-34):

(2a) NOUN PHRASE: *nu* [^{D}U ^{URU}*Manuzziya*]$_{subj}$ *handaittat* C III 48
'the Stormgod of M. proved, was determined (to be the one)'

(2b) DEPENDENT INFINITIVE: *nu* [...^{GUD}*puhugaris piyauanzi...*]$_{subj}$ *handaittat* C III 50-51
'it proved, was determined for a *puhugari*-ox to give/ be given to him'

(2c) FINITE NOUN CLAUSE: *nu* [*natta kuitki dattat*]$_{subj}$ ... *handaittat* C IV 33-34
'(that) nothing is (to be) taken... it proved to be, was determined'

With this paradigmatic range of nouns constructions, the Aphasia text answers syntactic questions that linguists ask but Hittite philologists usually neglect[11].

---

[9] Justus, Mat.heth.Thes. 10 (1981), pp. 41-42; on =*an* 'it / that', C. Justus, "Typological Symmetries and Asymmetries in Hittite and IE Complementation", *Linguistic Reconstruction and Indo-European Syntax. Proceedings of the Colloquium of the 'Indogermanische Gesellschaft'*, Paolo Ramat, Anna Giacolone Ramat, and Giorgio Graffi, edd. Amsterdam & Philadelphia 1979, pp. 183-206. 193-199.

[10] C. Justus, "Storage and Organization of Hittite Grammatical Knowledge", *Proceedings of the Fifty-first Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale (2005)*, Robert D. Biggs, Jennie Myers, and Martha Roth, edd. Chicago, in press.

[11] P. Cotticelli-Kurras, *handai-*, Mat.heth.Thes. 11 (1989) clearly lays out data dealing with many facets of grammar but not the issue as to the range of subject complements that *handai-* takes or whether its constructions argue more for parataxis or hypotaxis in Hittite.

2.2 "So-called Relative" Clauses

As is frequent in language, thematic constructions begin with old (presupposed) information, using cohesive devices in ways that are predictable for a native speaker. In Hittite initial clauses state the theme or topic, and final main clauses usually understand the topic opened in the first clause as main verb argument[12]. Levels of topic development take place between an initial "topic" clause and a final "main" clause.

Such Hittite multi-clause sequences, like many in other older Indo-European languages, appear to be loosely strung together (paratactic) sequences[13]. As such they were once explained as an evolutionary stage of syntax in which subordinating (hypotactic) structures had not yet developed. Arguments to the contrary suggest that Hittite syntax represents a typologically variant system of word and clause order patterning, that the loose connection between clauses may be the result of a typological change in progress and that older Hittite and Indo-European multi-clause constructions deserve more study[14].

The form of Hittite "so-called relative" constructions in particular focused on the issue as to whether Hittite, like older Indo-European counterpart constructions, were subordinate or whether they attested an evolutionarily prior stage of language in which subordination was not yet fully developed[15]. The Old Hittite "relative" construction from the ritual for the royal couple illustrates the kind of paratactic structure on which these views were based:

(3a) [*kuis sagais kisari*]$_{relative/obj clause}$ *ta* LUGAL-*i* MUNUS.LUGAL=*ya tarueni*

"what sign appears, to (the) king queen=and we tell.' (KBo 17:1, iv 9 StBoT 8:36)
English order: 'We report to the king and queen the sign that appears.'

This structural type also occurs in Greek and Latin where philological traditions described it as *attractio inversa* (both relative *kuis* and head noun *sagais* share the same nominative case governed by relative verb *kisari*), and generative syntactic treatments termed it "headless" (there is no "antecedent" head in the main clause). As a typological variant, it is compatible with verb-

---

[12] Justus, *Subject and Topic*, 1976, pp. 215-245, in dealing with the problem of defining a "basic sentence" and a category "subject" for Hittite found that construction-initial clauses have full nouns, as expected of basic sentences on the basis of other language data, but final clauses in which crucial arguments of the verb are omitted or pronominalized with reference to occurrences in the text make main statements. Both initial and final clauses in Hittite constructions thus share features of basic sentences, but neither has them all.

[13] P. Hopper, "A Discourse Perspective on Syntactic Change: Text-building Strategies in Early Germanic", *Reconstructing Languages and Cultures*, Edgar C. Polomé and Werner Winter, edd. Berlin 1992, pp. 217-238, identifies similar structures in Old English and analyzes them as "text-building" devices.

[14] Justus, *Subject and Topic*, 1976, pp. 215-245; *MSS* 38 (1979), pp. 96-100; *Aspects of Cuneiform Writing*, pp. 376; 383-384; 398f.

[15] C. Justus, "Syntactic Change: Evidence for Restructuring among Coexistent Variants", *JIES* 6 (1978), pp. 107-132; 112-113; *MSS* 38 (1979), pp. 98-102; Mat.heth.Thes. 10 (1981), pp. 74-79.

final word order patterning[16]. It also partially shares a "nonreduction strategy" found in languages as diverse as African Bambara, Japanese, Hindi, and Navajo[17].

The (3a) construction type contrasts with the more usual type in which an antecedent would be in the accusative case (*sagain*) governed by the main verb (*tarueni*) and the relative would be nominative as subject of the subordinate verb (*kisari*):

(3b) **hassui tarueni sagain kuis kisari* "to the king we-report the sign which occurs.'

This pattern does not occur in Hittite, nor does Hittite have *attractio* constructions familiar from Greek and Latin where the relative pronoun is "attracted" to the case of the antecedent (**kuin sagain*), but both Hittite and Latin share patterns that repeat the noun in both correlative clauses, case-marked appropriate to its use in each clause[18].

(3c) [*uddani=ma=wa=tta kuedani halzissai*]_{relative clause} *nu=wa uttar liliwan*
    '[for matter you for what he calls],   matter (is) urgent'
        'The matter about which he calls you is urgent.' Siegelova, StBoT 14 (1971), p. 50 ll. 11f.

In the first clause *uddani kuedani* 'for what matter' is dative-locative with *halzissai*, but *uddar* 'matter' is nominative-accusative as the neuter subject of the predicate *liliwan*.

In Hittite such "relative" constructions do not stand alone but form part of larger topic-focus constructions[19]. Hittite typically begins a construction with a known topic, whether the topic is subject of the verb or not, the topic may or may not be case marked, and it typically has an argument relation to both initial and final main clause verbs. It may be repeated, or a pronoun may refer to it in successive clauses. Sentence initial position and various enclitic particles and pronouns track topic reference, while *kui*-based forms introduce new focal information into the discourse.

The Aphasia text (4: C III 55-57) exemplifies the basic construction.

(4) ^DUTU-*ŠI=ma* (56) [(EGIR-*an hin*)]*katta*   **INITIAL TOPIC CLAUSE**
^{GUD}*puhugarin*=ma kuedani* UD-*ti* (57) [(*unueir*)]   (*kui*-marked 'when' focus)
[(*nu*)]=*za* ^DUTU-*ŠI apedani* UD-*ti warapta*   **FINAL MAIN CLAUSE**
    'My Majesty / the Sun (who) made obeisance then, bathed on the day that they ornamented the ox.'

The topic, ^DUTU-*ŠI* 'my Majesty / the Sun', as given information (referring to Mursili, the theme of the text), is in initial position, and the *kui*-marked phrase, *kuedani siwatti*, introduces a

---

[16] E. Löfstedt, *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache*. Uppsala 1911, pp. 222-229; Justus, Mat.heth.Thes. 10 (1981), pp. 66-73.
[17] T. Givón, *On Understanding Grammar*. NY 1979, p. 147.
[18] Justus, *JIES* 6 (1978), pp. 119-126.
[19] Justus, *Subject and Topic*, 1976, pp. 225-240; *Aspects of Cuneiform Writing*, pp. 384-395; Mat.heth.Thes. 10 (1981), pp. 115-125.

---

specific point in the event as new focal information (on the shift from first-person Mursili to third-person 'my Majesty', see 2.3.2 below). Both topic and focus nouns are then arguments of the final main verb *warapta* 'bathed' telling who and when. The old given / topical information is presupposed, the new focal information asserted. Repetition of ^DUTU-*ŠI* in the final main clause is similar to repetition of *uddar* (3c above), and both 'My Sun" and focal 'day' are arguments of the final verb.

Topic-focus constructions in the Aphasia text vary in complexity, culminating in the tour de force of (8b: §4b below). Since each construction is complex in its own way, separate sections discuss them. Section (2.2.1) deals with parallel (coordinated) focal clauses (2.2.1) and (2.2.2) examines the relation between indefinite *kuit(ki)* and focal information introduced by *kui*-based forms, while (2.2.3) deals with three complex variations on non-parallel focal constructions in §4 (examples 8a-c).

2.2.1. Parallel Focal Clauses

In (4 above) there was one focal clause, but in (5) a series of five *kui*-based focal forms introduce parallel focal clauses. They are parallel in their common function as complex subjects of the final verb *dattat* (C IV 28-33), itself the complex noun clause subject of final main verb *handaittat* (§4b below).

(5) *IŠ-TU* ^{GIŠ}BANŠUR=*ma=za=kan kuezza** (29) *azzikkinun*
    'but the table from which I ate,
[*IŠ-TU* GAL=*ya=kan kuez(za) akkuskinun*
    'and the cup from which I drank,
[*sasti=ya=zza=kan kuedani seskeskinun ...*
    'in bed also in which I slept ...
IŠ-TU ^{ÚRUDU}ÁB=*ya=za=kan kuezza** (32) *areskinun*
    'and the basin from which I washed
kuitta=ya imma UNUTUM anda (33) *weriyan esta*
    'and whatever utensil was named
(6) *nu natta kuitki dattat ...* 'not whatever was taken.'

'Nothing was taken: (not) the table from which I ate, the cup from which I drank, the bed in which I slept, the basin in which I washed, (nor) any utensil whatever named ...'

Four *kui*-based forms in (5) introduce new items, the table, the cup, the bed, and the wash basin, and a fifth adds the equally parallel indefinite, 'and whatever other utensil'. Each noun functions independently in its own clause as ablative, dative-locative case, or nominative-accusative arguments of subordinate verbs of eating, drinking, sleeping, washing, and being named, but as a parallel group, they are all grammatical subjects of *dattat* 'was ... taken'.

Within this six-clause construction fall two indefinite forms, *kuitta* 'whatever' and *kuitki* 'something, anything', both *kui*-based forms. If *kuitta* 'what(ever utensil)' had not sufficiently

subsumed the new category of 'not taken' items, the use of *kuitki* as subject of main verb *dattat* 'take', would seem to resume the set of new items as a sort of pragmatic *et cetera* statement reinforcing the discourse value of other *kui*-based forms ('they did not take X, Y, Z, or anything else belonging to this category'). As pragmatically part of the newly introduced information, focal and indefinite information contrasts with established topics, Mursili, the Storm-god, and the ox. The focal newness of the personal utensils that are "not taken" separates them from the known (topical) artifacts involved in the ox ritual. New and indefinite information differs from presupposed topical information in that it is asserted for the first time in the discourse, not presupposed. It is not surprising then to see both focal and indefinite forms built on the same *kui*- base.

2.2.2 Focal and Indefinite kuit(ki)

The first *kui*-based form in the Aphasia text fell already in the introduction (C III 43) to introduce Mursili's smallness of speech as new by contrast with his (presupposed topical) speech in general (C III 42-44). It is written as indefinite *kuitki* in one scribe's version (C III 43) but as *kuit* in another (A = KBo XLIII 50 Vs. 4):

(7) *nu=mu=kan memias issi an[(da)] tepawesta*   **Main Topic**: 'my speech'
'To me speech mouth in became small ...
nu=mu=kan memias tepu kuit(ki) iyattat   **New Focus**: 'smallness of speech'
'to me speech what/how(ever) small went
nu=kan asi memian arha=pat paskuwanu[(n)]
'aforesaid (small) speech I forgot / neglected completely.'

'The speech in my mouth became small, (but then) the smallness with which my speech went, I completely forgot/neglected.'

Typically, initial *nu=mu* repetitions mark continued relevance of the main topic 'my speech', and *nu* maintains 'speech' as topic to the last clause, but new focus marking *kui*- opens the new topic, the smallness of speech that will play a larger role later. Introducing the 'smallness of speech' as pragmatically focal differentiates it as new information that will have continued topical relevance.

Scribes themselves apparently confused indefinite and focal marking of new information. Since both new focal and indefinite information is pragmatically undefined, not presupposed as topical information is, this hesitation between *kuit* and *kuitki* may be related to the undefined character of both.

2.2.3 Interlocking Focal Clauses

Other *kui*-marked focal clauses are complex, not in introducing parallel series of new items in the same argument relation to the main verb as in (5) above, but in the ways that multiple focal clauses may have more than one argument relation to a final main verb. Three

separate constructions in the Aphasia text (8a-c: §4a-c below) appear to overlap or "interlock" with each other in variations on multiple focal noun development.

Each construction shares a basis with the topic-focus construction in that each starts from an initial topic; the ox in (8a: §4a), Mursili's battle-ready chariot in (8b: §4b), and in (8c: §4c) the chariot and clothes restricted to the day it thundered. In all (8a-c) an initial theme (topic) dominates, and both the initial verb and a final main verb governs topic and focal nouns in a variety of argument relations.

The well-established ox to be offered as substitute for Mursili himself is initial topic (theme) of the first construction (8a: §4a C IV 21-26), focal *kui*-based expressions introduce time (*kuedani siwatti*), place (*kuwapi*), object 'clothes' (^{TÚG}NÍG.LÁM^{MEŠ} ... *kue*) as different argument relations of the final verb (*anda*) *appanta* 'they seized'.

(8a: §4a) *A-NA* ^{GUD}*puhugari=ma=kan kuedani siwatti kesseran tehhun*   (when focus)
    'On the ox, the day when I put my hand,

para=an=kan kuwapi nair
    'to where they led him away,   (where focus)

nu ^{TÚG}*NÍG.LÁM*^{MEŠ} *apedani siwatti kue wassan*
'the clothes on that day which I wore,   (what focus)

nu=kan apeya ^{TÚG}*NÍG.LÁM*^{MEŠ} *anda appanta*   **MAIN VERB**
'they took the clothes there (with the ox).'   C IV 21-24 passim

'The ox, the day when I put my hand on him, to where they led him, what clothes I wore that day, there (with him) they took the clothes.'

Word order, clause order, and argument relations of nouns clarify topicality development and the grammatical cohesion among clauses that often introduce one noun per clause. Many Hittite topic constructions dedicate the entire first clause to a topic statement and introduce one focal noun per clause (4, 5 and 7 above) thereafter. The construction in (8a: §4a) differs in that the first clause contains both the topic (the ox) and a *kui*-marked focus as arguments of the first verb *tehhun* 'I placed', but patterns of word and clause order are typical for Hittite syntax.

In Hittite neither word nor clause order patterns are random, but they differ typologically from those in English. Hittite orders objects before the verb, English orders them after:

O ^{GUD}*p.* (on) ox	O *kesseran* hand	V *dais* placed	V *dais* placed	O *kesseran* hand	O ^{GUD}*p.* (on) ox
O ^{TÚG}NÍG.LÁM^{MEŠ} clothes	V *wassan / appanta* wore / took		V *wassan / appanta* wore / took		O ^{TÚG}NÍG.LÁM^{MEŠ} clothes

Besides word order within each clause, clauses are ordered among themselves such that focal clauses follow initial thematic clause(s) and precede final clauses containing verbs of which thematic and focal nouns are arguments. Internal grammatical cohesion is also important. The final verb *(anda) appanta* here understands the ox and the clothes as arguments, each in a different relation. Clause order then follows on the basis of topic structure, thematic clauses first, focal clauses next, and final main verb clauses last. A thematic noun stands in initial position in the entire multi-clause construction, regardless of its case role relation to any verb, and cohesive devices such as *nu* connectives track its continued importance as topic. Focal *kui-* forms introduce new information as distinct from the topic, and the final main clause has the verb that takes topic and focus nouns as arguments.

Hittite order: 'On the ox, the day when I put my hand (on him), to where they led him away, the clothes on that day that I wore, they took the clothes there (with the ox) on that day.'

English, which puts objects last, begins with the main clause (the one with the verb to which subordinate or relative nouns are arguments) and typically adds subordinate relative clause information afterward.

English order: 'They took away (with the ox) the clothes that I had on the day when I put my hand on the ox to where they led him.' OR 'They took away to where they led the ox the clothes that I had on the day when I put my hand on him.'

An English paraphrase might better capture both the Hittite emphasis on the topical ox and its argument relations in both initial and final clauses:
'For the ox, they seized the clothes that I had on the day I put my hand on him and led him away with them.'

Hittite topic position plus *A-NA* 'on, with' allows 'ox' a case role relation with both the verb of its clause *tehhun* 'I placed' and other verbs of the construction. Initial thematic position, enclitic pronominal *=an* in *n=an ... nair* 'they led him', and *apeya* in final *apeya ... appanta* 'for there (with the ox) ... they seized' track the continued role of the topical ox and where he was to go. In English main versus subordinate clause distinctions topicality is implied, but overt word order, case, or prepositions emphasize case role relations. Hittite on the other hand emphasizes topicality structure with initial position, particles, and topic-organizing *kui*-based forms. Hittite *kui-* forms are not subordinate as are relative pronouns because their primary function is to introduce new focal information by contrast with the main topic, not syntactically subordinate clauses.

Construction (8b: §4b C IV 26-34) recalls Mursili's chariot and horses along with his bow and quiver as presupposed themes in initial position. Actions involving them first develop a complex topic construction before the complex focus construction (C IV 26-28).

(8b: §4b-Topic) $^{\text{TÚG}}$NÍG.LÁM$^{\text{MEŠ}}$ $^{\text{GIŠ}}$GIGIR=*ya=kan turiyan QA-DU* $^{\text{GIŠ}}$BAN
$^{\text{KUŠ}}$MÁ.URU.URU$_6$ ANŠE.KUR.RA$^{\text{ḪI.A}}$ *para nair*
    n=at pennir   **TOPIC NOUN CLAUSE COMPLEX**

'They drove away (my) clothes and harnessed chariot together with the bow, quiver, (and) horses (that) they led off.'

The thematic topics here are undoubtedly Mursili's prized battle possessions, items perhaps second only to him in defining his power and importance.
After recalling these items chosen for the ritual purpose, the parallel focal clauses discussed above (8b: §4b-Focus = 5-6 C IV 28-33) introduce Mursili's personal utensils.

(8b: §4b- Focus) (= 5-6 above) *IŠ-TU* $^{\text{GIŠ}}$BANŠUR=*ma=za=kan kuezza* (29) *azzikkinun*
    (plus items in 5 above) *nu natta kuitki dattat*   **FOCUS NOUN CLAUSE COMPLEX**
'nothing was taken from the table I ate from ...,

Together, the thematic (8b: §4b-Topic C IV 26-28) and focal constructions (8b: §4b-Focus C IV 28-33) serve as coordinated noun clause subjects to medio-passive verb *handaittat*. (8b: §4b) $^{\text{TÚG}}$NÍG.LÁM$^{\text{MEŠ GIŠ}}$GIGIR=*ya=kan turiyan ... n=at pennir*
' (My) clothes and yoked chariot ... (that) they drove.'   **TOPIC NOUN CLAUSE**

IŠ-TU $^{\text{GIŠ}}$BANŠUR=*ma=za=kan kuezza* (29) *azzikkinun ... nu natta kuitki dattat*
    'The table that I ate from (and ...) 'nothing was taken,   **FOCAL NOUN CLAUSE**

... apenissan handaittat 'it was determined / proved to be thus.'   **MAIN CLAUSE**

'It was determined / proved to be thus (according to the god):
[TOPIC] (that) they (should) drive away the yoked chariot ... ,
[FOCUS] but that (of other things ...) they (should) not take anything.'

With (8b: §4b) the Aphasia scribes have reached a zenith of complex topic-focus development. The basic structure is similar to that of (4 and 7 above) in that an initial theme is stated as given, and a later focus introduces nouns that have arguments of the final main verb. The complexity here is three fold: the main verb *handaittat* takes two complex subject noun clauses as arguments (the thematic 'driven-away clothes and yoked chariot' and the focal 'not-taken utensils'), the thematic noun clause relation is a construction composed of three clauses, and the focal noun clause relation is multi-layered with five focal clauses dependent as subjects on a final main clause, *nu natta kuitki dattat*. Beyond theme and focus embeddings as subject of *handaittat*, there is yet another layer of clauses dependent in a subject relation, the clauses dependent on *dattat*.

All clauses appear to be loosely coordinated, but to understand the meaning, it is necessary to understand that *handaittat* is a construction-final main verb on which two preceding complex noun clauses grammatically depend and that dependent *dattat* itself is a pre-final final main verb.

After the tour de force in (8b: §4b), the construction in (8c: §4c C IV 34-40) is still complex but perhaps less so because it shares similarities beside its differences. It begins with a complex thematic construction as above, but then holds a final coordinated thematic clause (C

IV 40) emphasizing that even the yoked chariot (^{GIŠ}GIGIR=*ya*) goes until after the focal construction. Mursili's clothes, chariot, and horses are thematic, and the thematic construction recalls that they belong to the ritual (C IV 34-35).

(8c: §4c-Topic) ^{TÚG}NÍG.LÁM^{MEŠ} ^{GIŠ}GIGIR ANSHE.KUR.RA$^{ḪI.A}$=*ya*
(35) [(*ked*)]*ani memiyani tattat*   (Focus: C IV 35-39 ...)
(40)   [(^{GIŠ}GIGIR=ya)] *turiyan**   *apatt**=*a dair**

'For this reason (e.g., it was determined ...: §4b), they took (my) clothes, chariot, (and) horses (IV 34-35) ... and (my) yoked chariot, that too they took (IV 40).'

The two-clause construction begins the topic statement (C IV 34-35), and the final main clause (C IV 40) ends it, as if added afterward for emphasis: 'and the yoked chariot too'!

Between the two topic statements lies the complex focus construction (§4c: Focus C IV 35-39), an interlocking construction similar to that of (8a: §4a above) but with a difference. Again a topic noun stands in initial position and the nominative case complementation (*-as*) (^{D}U-*as* '(Storm-god) Tessupas') marks him as subject of the thematic verb, *tethiskit* 'thundered'. The *kui*-marked temporal focal, 'day' (*kuedani siwatti*) here is again in the same initial clause, but is restrictive. It restricts the following focal nouns coordinated with =*ya*, ^{TÚG}NÍG.LÁM^{MEŠ} *kue* 'clothes' and ^{GIŠ}GIGIR=*ya* to those of "that day".

(8c: §4c- Topic-Focus)
[^{D}U-*as kuedani siwatti hatuga tethiskit* ...]₁   **TOPIC + when FOCUS**
'Storm-god on what day terribly thundered, ...

[*nu* ^{TÚG}NÍG.)]LÁM^{MEŠ} *kue apedani siwatti wassan harkun*]₂ ...   **what when FOCUS**
'clothes which on that day had worn / had on'
[(*A-NA* ^{GIŠ})]GIGIR=*ya*=*kan kuedani apedani* UD-*ti* (39) [(*arha*)]*hat* (where when FOCUS)
'and the chariot in which I stood on that day'

(8c: §4c- Final Main Clause)

nu ke ^{TÚG}NÍG.LÁM^{MEŠ} *anda appanta* C IV 21-24   **what MAIN CLAUSE**
'these clothes they seized.'

'The Storm-god (Tessupas), the day when he thundered terribly, the clothes that I had on that day, along with the chariot in which I stood on that day, these clothes they seized ...'

Grammatically, the focused temporal noun is an argument of all focal clause verbs (*tethiskit* 'thundered, *wassan* 'wore' and *arhahat* 'stood'), but not to the construction final verb *anda appanta* 'they seized'. Anaphoric *apedani siwatti* tracks the role of restrictive focal *kuedani siwatti* and the verbs to which it is a temporal argument, while *ke* tracks the object relation of focal 'clothes', a focal noun that is argument to both *wassan* and *anda appanta*. In

---

English order the final main verb comes first, and all others follow: 'They seized the clothes [that I wore] and the chariot [that I stood in] [on the day that the storm-god thundered terribly]. Any pragmatic distinction between the different demonstrative stems, *apa-* and *ka-* (*apedani siwatti* versus *ke* ^{TÚG}NÍG.LÁM^{MEŠ} 'those clothes') needs much more study.

Again the connective particle *nu* maintains discourse topicality cohesion, while *kui*-based forms develop the new focal relations. Since both clothes and chariot are known, the newness associated with 'clothes' and 'chariot' is their temporal restriction (*kuedani siwatti*). Only the clothes and the chariot involved in the day when the Storm-god thundered are implicated.

Hittite topicality devices track discourse pragmatic information through a thematic construction dominated by an initial topic that has case role relations, explicit or understood, with two or more verbs in the construction. Initial thematic clause and final main verb order effects a clause order very different from the typically initial English main clause. So-called "relative" *kui*- forms in Hittite do not look subordinate because their primary function has more to do with topicality tracking, than with case role tracking, and because Hittite word order is predominately verb final, not object final. Hittite syntax is not therefore loosely strung together. There is simply a different basis of cohesion as there is a different pattern of word and clause order. Grammatically subordinate case role relations precede the main verb just as grammatically subordinate English clauses follow it. Word order and pragmatic strategies are typologically different.

2.3 Topical Time, Voice, and Perspective Shifts

Not only do typologically variant Hittite grammatical devices structure topicality, but other devices also order events and shift voice and perspective in more and less expected ways.

2.3.1 Event Order

The temporal conjunction, *mahhan* 'when' introduces four topical events that segment the narrative and develop a story line[20]. All follow the initial thematic event, Mursili's hearing the thunder in Tell Kunnu, referred to in the colophon.

The first *mahhan* event, 'When the years came and went ...', (C III 45-60), begins some lines after the initial first person statement, 'I / Mursili drove into Til-Kunnu (and) the Storm-god thundered ...' and introduces the serious speech loss that culminates in Mursili's putting his hand on the ox in acquiescence to the Storm-god's power. Throughout the first *mahhan* 'when' event segment, narrative actions continue as first person actions except for impersonal *handaittat* that introduces the will of the Storm-god.

The second *mahhan* event (C III 61) 'when they led the ox forth ...') shifts to the actions that fulfill the prescriptions of the Storm-god, and within this second event come shifts of voice (2.3.2 below) and perspective (2.3.3 below).

---

[20] R. Longacre, *Storyline Concerns and Word Order Typology in East and West Africa*. UCLA 1990, pp. 2-7 outlines "storyline" analysis as the basis for examining typologically variant structures that occur.

The third *mahhan* event shift comes at the end of a specified seven-day period: (C III 67?) 'When the seventh day passed ...' during which Mursili bathes and the ox goes off to Kummanni. There follow bird, *ambassi*, and *keldi* sacrifices expressed with repetitive language that seems to point to continuation of the same topical *mahhan* event, but may bear more investigation.

The fourth and last *mahhan* shift begins §5 with a shift in perspective. Main verbs in that paragraph are present tense and third person narrative, all quite removed from Hattusa and Mursili's personal involvement.

2.3.2 Voice Shift

Toward the end of the first *mahhan* event a shift in voice takes place. Mursili's first person narrative ends with the last oracular inquiry (*ariyanun* C III 52). Before the second mahhan event begins (C III 61), the first person 'I' referring to Mursili has shifted to third person ᴰUTU-*ŠI*, (C III 55) a much-discussed shift. Is the scribe copying from different text genre? Is it a scribal error?

With the narrative flow, a person shift at this point may well have meaning, introducing as it does the implementation of the ox ritual (C III 53ff.). It shifts from Mursili, the Great King, the theme and actor, and reduces him, on the Storm-god's order, to ᴰUTU-*ŠI*, a third person subject of the ritual on a par with the ox, who will be sacrificed instead of him. If the Aphasia author(s) wanted to objectify Mursili as subject to the Storm-god's will, his role as first person narrator would be peculiar. This voice shift leads the reader see the action, no longer from the perspective the speaker-agent, Mursili, but from the perspective of someone viewing him as a king reduced to acting as the speech-maimed object of the Storm-god's agency. It looks more like a narrative device than a scribal error.

2.3.3 Perspective Shift

The second *mahhan* event (C III 61-66), is both a grammatically interesting and textually difficult section. Narration continues in the third person, but because the tablets are broken, the text is difficult and pieced together. It seems agreed that the verbs also continue as preterit (*nair* 'they led', *arnuir* 'they brought', *pier* 'they gave', and *huiskit* 'did [not] delay') with one lone present, *warapzi* 'he bathes'.

The sequential order of events in narratives tends to be iconic to the story-line sequence. In order to interrupt that order, shifts in tense and aspect may foreground or background events[21]. English progressive and imperfect forms often alternate with a preterit in this function: 'He was crossing [imperfect] the street when the car hit [preterit] him'. The preterit 'hit him' would be on the story line in a narrative, and imperfect 'was crossing' would add background detail.

In Mursili's story, preterits move the narrative story line along as expected, but once the ox sacrifice is underway, activities may not all be taking place sequentially at Hattusa. How will the

---

[21] P. Hopper. "Aspect and Foregrounding in Syntax", *Discourse and Syntax*, Talmy Givón ed. (Syntax and Semantics 12). NY 1992, pp. 213-242.

scribe indicate the simultaneity of events at different places and their relative importance to the story line?

In line C III 62 present tense *warapzi* 'bathes' contrasts with preterit actions relating to the ox as it leaves for Kummanni. It may thus function as a narrative device to distinguish the king's action from story-line preterits that concern the ox. If the king's purity bathing is to take place simultaneous with the trip of the ox to Kummanni, such a tense shift might indicate it. In American westerns explicit phrases such as, "Meanwhile, back at the ranch, (the Indians are attacking)" emphasize a narrative detour. If the Aphasia text is a narrative that includes simultaneous events, there must be devices for marking it.

Temporal *kuitman* 'while' must be a device for interrupting the story line sequence. In (9) this *kui*-based form introduces new focal time that contrasts with thematic *mahhan* events and differences of perspective between what is happening simultaneously with both Mursili and the ox.

(9:) *mahhan=ma=kan* ᴳᵁᴰ*puhugarin para nair*
'When/after they led the ox away,

ᴰUTU-*ŠI=ma=za* ᴳᵁᴰ*puhugari appanda I-NA siwatti.7.KAM suppa wa[ra]pzi*
'the Sun (my Majesty) for 7 days after the ox, bathes pure

kuitman=ma ᴳᵁᴰ*puhugarin I-NA* ᵁᴿᵁ*Kummanni arnuir*
'while they brought the ox to Kummanni.

[kui]tmann=an pie[ir n=as ?] istantait kuit
'and while they gave him, because he lingered,

[nu ?] ᴰUTU-*ŠI natta kuit[ki] huskit*
'the Sun did not in any way delay, ...'

The internal structure of this *mahhan* construction looks very much like a theme-focus construction with *mahhan* marking thematic time and the *kui*-marked forms introducing new but simultaneous temporal information. The topical *mahhan* event of leading the ox forth is interrupted by time-shifted bathing (present *warapzi*) and new ongoing temporal focus on the period of time or process of bringing the ox to Kummanni, (*arnuir*) and delays (*istantait*) along the way that contrast with the king's lack of delay at home (ᴰUTU-*ŠI natta kuit[ki] huskit*).

In terms of nominal information structure (noun clause and theme-focus constructions above), the ox of the initial clause is topic, but the king (ᴰUTU-*ŠI*), the erstwhile narrator and topic, is not focal. What is new is the perspective shift brought about first by present tense of *warapzi* 'bathes', then by simultaneous *kuitman* time. Indefinite *kuit(ki)* again resumes the focal events much as it does in (8b: §4b) above. The internal cohesion in this *mahhan* theme-focus construction is punctuated with uses of the enclitic particle *=ma* and alternation between the temporal conjunctions *mahhan* 'when' and *kuitman* 'while'.

2.4 Topical Time and Manner

The last paragraph of the text (10-11: §5 C IV 41-46) then shifts from events at Hattusa to events leading up to the sacrifice of the ox in Kummanni. Therewith begins the fourth and last *mahhan* 'when' event (C IV 41) 'when they bring the ox ...'. Finite story-line verbs are present tense: *arnuwanzi* 'they bring', *essanzi* 'they perform'.

(**10**: §5a) *mahhan=ma* ^{GUD}*puhugarin arnuwanzi*   **TOPIC CLAUSE**
'But when/after they bring the ox,

nu ŠA ^{GUD}*puhugari mahhan* SISKUR *annalaz* (42) *IŠ-TU* ^{GIŠ}LI.U₅ *gulassan*
'concerning the ox, as the ritual (is) written from the old tablet,

ishiul=si mahhan iyan 'as its prescription (is) made,

A-NA siuni=ya SISKUR.SISKUR *ambassi keldi=ya* (45) *annalaz IŠ-TU* ^{GIŠ}LI.U₅ *mahhan iyan* 'and as it is done according to the old tablet for the god's and *ambassi & keldi* rituals,

n=at apennissan essanzi 'this way they perform it.'   **MAIN CLAUSE**

Between thematic and final main clauses, non-initial *mahhan* 'like, as' with nonfinite participles *gulassan, iyan, iyan* introduce background information. Pragmatically participial information is not new, nor is there a *kui*-based form to suggest that it is, and the explicit statement that it is from the "old tablet" reinforces its known character.

Grammatically, thematic *mahhan* 'when' and presuppositional *mahhan* 'like, as' have contrasting roles, although both introduce known information. They deserve more study from the perspective of discourse information. Are there parallels elsewhere?

The last construction of §5 and of the Aphasia text (11: §5b C IV 46-50) begins with conditional *man* 'if' and continues in the present tense dealing with the eventuality of the ox's death on the way to Kummanni.

(**11**: §5b) *man* ^{GUD}*puhugaris=ma* EGIR KASKAL *aki*   'if the ox on the journey dies,
              KASKAL-*as kuit tuwa*   'because the journey (is) far,
              n=at mahhan apiya=ya [*arnu*]*anzi*   'as far as they [bring] it,
              nu tamain ^{GUD}*puhugarin apez*(*za*) *unuwashaz*(*a*) *unu*[*wandan*] *nann*[*anzi*] 'another
              ox decorated with those ornaments they drive,
              nu apus [*unuw*]*ashus* [*ap*]*edani IT-TI* ^{GUD}*puhugari warnuwanzi* 'those ornaments
              with that ox they burn.'

The ox continues to be the topic even as the *kui*-marked focal conjunction, *kuit* 'because', introduces the length of the journey (C IV 47 KASKAL *kuit tuwa*), but this adverbial *kui*-based form differs from "relative" uses above in that it does not function as an argument of any verb.

One might have expected the 'second ox' (C IV 48 *tamain* ^{GUD}*puhugarin*) to be focal, because it is not the same ox. The fact that *tamain* contrasts grammatically with *kuit* may suggest that the "second ox" is thematic in its relation to the first ox. In the final main clause, the ornaments originally put with the ox (*apus unuwashus* 'those ornaments') and the (second) ox (*ap*]*edani IT-TI* ^{GUD}*puhugari* 'with that ox') are arguments of the verb *warnuwanzi* 'they burn', and they mark the culmination of the narrative that began as first person narration of Mursili and ends with the immolation of his substitute. In the course of the text, our perspective on Mursili should have changed.

3.0 Conclusion

Three versions of this text are extant, all from periods of history that comfortably post-date the rule of Mursili[22]. Why were they kept? Van den Hout pointed out that scribes kept texts and consulted them for historical precedents[23]. Paragraph (§5) of the Aphasia text itself speaks of performing the ritual "according to the old tablets". But do apparent shifts in genre beside shifts in person and tense betray a hasty adaptation of older models or an independent composition with a legitimate structure of its own? What aspect of the three copies of the Aphasia text might have been kept for later reference? What do we learn from the text?

Beyond the fact that the Great King Mursili lost his speech and as a result, in a substitution ritual, submitted completely to the will of the Storm-god, we do not learn whether or not the stricken king regained his speech. If, as Lebrun pointed out, all extant text versions were independent compositions written in the thirteenth century BC or later (well after Mursili's reign), scribes would by this time have known whether he regained his speech or not, but that seems irrelevant to this narrative. We also learn little about actual historical events, but we learn a lot about Hittite discourse grammar and the structure of Hittite narrative composition.

We learn that medio-passive *handaittat* takes a range of nominal subjects from the simple 'Storm-god of Manuzziya' to the finite focus noun clauses in (8b: §4b) and dependent infinitive clauses in (2b: C III 49-53).

Paradigmatic variation on *kui*-based forms illustrates their basic use in topic-focus patterning where they have different case role relations as arguments to pre-final and final main verbs. We also see discourse informational similarities between indefinite and focal uses as well as adverbial *kuit* 'because' which has no argument relation to any verb. Did Hittite have restrictive and non-restrictive focal uses comparable to English restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses? Certainly focal information could be construed to restrict other focal information (8c: §4c). Although Hittite clauses appear loosely strung together, different focal constructions show a range of different ways in which they effect cohesion, both pragmatic cohesion involving thematic differences related to presupposed and asserted information and grammatical cohesion based on argument relations between nouns and verbs. Despite the apparent poverty of Hittite subordinate structures, shifts in perspective comparable to

---

[22] R. Lebrun, *Hethitica* 6 (1985), pp. 126-128, based on consultation with Neu.

[23] Th. van den Hout, "Institutions, Vernaculars, Publics: The Case of Second Millennium Anatolia", 2005 manuscript, §2.2 notes that not Hittite archival material was kept for primarily administrative purposes, but that other library material was possibly kept for "academic" or literary purposes.

foregrounding and backgrounding strategies in modern narratives appear to be discernable, although they deserve much more study. It also remains to compare syntactic and pragmatic patterns found in the Aphasia text with other Ancient Near Eastern school compositions. What grammatical issues do texts in the older language exemplify?

There is also the suspicion that Hittite speakers spoke one way but scribes with the leisure to use the stylus and clay to play with the limits of oral structures may have developed a more thought-out literary style. In arriving at a construction like that of (8b: §4b), they may also have been playing with the limits of oral structures. The English tongue twister, "Peter Piper picked a peck of pickled peppers" plays on sound sequences, but the Aphasia text may play instead on a different kind of linguistic pattern, perhaps clause sequences and the variety of internal cohesive structures that could relate them. Whether examples of that knowledge here represent a conscious effort on the part of the scribes or a less conscious literary play on Hittite linguistic style, they reflect a sophisticated grammatical awareness that deserves further study.