

THE DILEMMA OF THE DOUBLED *-a*

Jacqueline Boley*

I am pleased to offer this communication as a token of esteem and admiration for Prof.s Belkis and Ali Dinçol, who over their long careers have contributed so strongly to the advancement of Hittite studies and knowledge of Hittite culture.

A) In an article on the Storyteller's art in Old Hittite (Boley 2004.1), I discussed the case of the particle *-a*. As is well known, there have been suggestions that there were two particles *-a*, one that geminates and one that does not geminate the preceding consonant. The former is treated essentially as a "copulative" particle; the latter is considered an "adversative" particle. It is a fairly accepted opinion that the non-geminating *-a* was supplanted by *-ma* in later Hittite. The paper on the Storyteller's art naturally concentrated on narratives, and was unable to find much difference between the two particles. On the contrary, there is some overlap between them, though there is a distinct difference in flavor between the two uses.

As may be remembered, in the narratives *-a* appeared mainly appended to initial NPs, which expressed a break or a contrast with previous material. In these cases, there is a clear connection with that previous material, which led to the conclusion that the NP was marking the break or contrast, and the particle was signalling the connection. This conclusion was reinforced by some indications that \dot{U} + logogram was probably representing Logogram + *-a*. \dot{U} is clearly used as a Akkadogram for the geminating *-a* (see q. 9 below); it is likely that it was used also to represent the non-geminating variety, a conclusion we arrive at from context rather than from direct alternations.

A.1a) Let us begin with some cases in which the two spellings seem to alternate in Old Hittite, as in

(1a) *mān?*] (19) *siwaz 8 waksur aszi LUGAL-uss-a*
Ēmakziyaz uizz[i]

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

but

(1b) *mān tunnakisna-ma paizzi apas-a* (79) *perammit kunnaz esari //*

"when he goes into my inner chamber, he will sit on my right before me" (Anittas 78-9).

Q. 1b represents the usual spelling after *mān*. We might note that the usual particle after a *mān* clause is *nu* or *-a*, as can be seen from the above citation. We also find *ta*, as in StBoT 8 IV 11. A similar situation obtains after *kui*- clauses: the particles of choice are *-a* and *ta*, alongside *nu*. *-ma* is never used. The particle *-a* therefore is not in the least in alternation with *-ma* here. If anything it shows some logical connection with the previous clause.

Another alternation:

(1) *takku kussan piyan sarnikzil* [NU.GÁL] *takku kussan-a natta piyan* 1 SAG.DU [*pai*]

"if the fee is given, no recompense; if the fee (+ *-a*) is not given, he gives 1 slave" (Laws A I §42)

See also the partially restored passage in §46:

(2) *takku-sse A.ŠA^H[^LA-as mekkis] piyanza luzzi karpezzi takku-sse A.ŠA^{HL}A-s-a tepus piyanza ...*

"if a large portion of the fields is given, he takes on the *luzzi*; if a small portion of fields (+ *-a*) is given ...".

This might appear at first blush a clear case of *-a* in the sense of *-ma*. Only we find it alternating with a geminate spelling in a very similar context:

]x *heyaues-a ne mān ser huyantes* (13)
[m]aninkuwantes mā[n]-e kattann-a huyantes ...

* Prof. Dr. Jacqueline Boley, Old Saybrook, Conn. USA.

“[and (?) rains: if/when they are running above ... near (?); if/when they are running below ... “ (KBo VIII 74+ (StBoT 25 #137) II 12-13).

One might perhaps surmise that the doubled spelling is a later construct on the single spelling, as later Hittite eliminates the latter. This may be true to some extent. But still, we find a geminate rather than a single spelling already in Anittas:

- (6) // *tan namma* ¹*piustis* LUGAL [^{UR}]^U*hatti* *u[it]* (37) *sardia*”-*ssann-a* *kuin uwatet* *sus* ^{URU}*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).

See also q.s 14/15, 16, 19 below for more examples of this kind of alternation.

A.1b) We may compare these passages with *-a* with similar ones containing *-ma*, to see if we can discern any difference in the usages of the two particles:

- (3) ... A.ŠA^{HIA} ŠA LÚ^{GIS}TUKUL *anda sittarezzi* ^{GIS}TUKUL-*li-ya harzi sahhann-a harzi takku* ^{GIS}TUKUL-*li-ma mimmai* LÚ^{GIS}TUKUL-*s-a* A.ŠA^{HIA} *harkantas taranzi nan-za* LÚ^{MEŠ} URU^{LIM} *anniskanz[i] takku* LUGAL-*s-a* NAM. RA^{HIA}-*an pai nu-sse* A.ŠA^{HIA} -*an pianzi tas* ^{GIS}TUKUL-*li kis[a]*

“He shall secure for himself a sealed deed concerning the land of the man having a TUKUL obligation, he shall both hold the TUKUL obligation and perform the *sahhan* services. But if he refuses the TUKUL obligation, they shall declare the land of the man having a TUKUL obligation to be that of a disappeared person and the men of the village will work it. If the king gives an *arnuwala*-man they will give him land and he will become a TUKUL-man” (Laws A I §40).

It must be apparent that the use of *-ma* here is not really comparable to the use of *-a* in q.s 1 and 2. In the latter, *-a* marks quantities in direct contraposition (given/not given; many/few). In q. 3, on the other hand, *-ma* picks up on a preceding term, and focuses it in a shift or opposition in the framework of the paragraph. The same may be said of *-ma* as opposed to *-a* in the following quotes:

- (4) *takku* LÚ^{GIS}TUKUL-*as* A.ŠA^{HIA}-ŠU *humandan kuiski wasi luzzi* [*karp*]*ezzi takku* A.ŠA^{HIA}-*n-a mekki wasi luzzi natta karpezzi takku* A.ŠA^{HIA} *kulei-ma arki nasma* LÚ^{MEŠ} URU^{LIM} *pianzi ta luzzi karpezzi*

“If anyone buys all the land of a man having a TUKUL obligation, he shall render the *luzzi* services. If he buys only the largest portion of the land, he shall not render the *luzzi* services. But if he carves out for himself fallow land or the men of the village give (it) he shall do *luzzi* service” (Laws A I §47B).

An especially clear case of the use of *-ma* to mark a shift within the context:

- (5) // *anda*-[*k*]*an/[-a]p halinas tessummius tarlipit suwamus* (27) 2-*ki petumini tarueni-ma-at eshar* “in 2 clay *tessummi*-s filled with *tarlipi* we bring; we however call it blood” (StBoT 8 I 26-7).

See Boley 2000 §5b.2b for some discussion of the value of *-ma* here. Compare also fn. 2 after q. 13.

A.1c) To sum up:

It would seem likely that non-geminating *-a* and *-ma* were not really comparable in Classical Old Hittite, though they may have been converging, in preparation for the reorganization of the particle system in later Hittite. This may have been determined partly by phonetics, since *-a* after vowels, particularly after the vowel *-a*, was easily lost or confused. One does get the impression that *-ma* was obligatory after the vowel *-a* already in OH. Compare *takku/mān taranzi ... takku natta-ma taranzi* of StBoT 8, e.g. IV 11-12 or *kuis hazzizzi/kuis natta-ma hazzizzi* of the copied Palace Chronicles (KBo III 34 II 33, 34), where *-ma* seems to have the balancing nuance of *-a*. *-ma* does also very occasionally turn up after a consonant, at least in the syntagm *-ma-as*, as in *heau-es-ma-as* of XXIX 3 I 8’ (StBoT 25 #1), and the copied

- (7) *sarkus* LÚ-*es esta* (12) *akis-ma-as/akis-san tep-sawanni*

“(A.) was a mighty man, but he died in poverty.” (KBo III 34 II 11-12 = 36 Vs 17).

Here the particle has its usual function of marking a shift in focus within a specific framework in the discourse, and is not a balancing particle like *-a*.

Later on, the particle *-a*, which had had two flavors in OH that had been very roughly separated into the geminating and non-geminating spellings (pronunciation?), was shunted pretty much entirely into the copulative meaning and geminating spelling. *-ma* took over whatever contrapositional use the particle had had, generally the province of the non-geminating spelling. It is pretty clear, however, that in moving *-ma* into the territory once occupied by *-a*, the Hittites had reinterpreted the old nuance of *-a*, and had in fact lost it.

B) The cases of doubled *-a* shed a little more darkness on this situation. By “doubled *-a*”, I am referring to the practice of appending *-a* or its equivalent to two parallel nouns¹ or propositions.

B.1) When they are written out, most cases of doubled *-a* have geminated consonant. We might note that this *-a* alternates with *-ya* after logograms and vowels, although that is no guarantee that *-ya* only alternates with geminating *-a*.

B.1a) We begin with cases of two parallel nouns:

- (8) *harkanzi-ma<<-an>>* (23) ^D*hantasepes anduhsas harsarr-a* ^{GIS}ŠUKUR^{<HI>A}-*ya* ...

“The H.s hold human heads and spears” (StBoT 8 I 22-3).

- (9) *IŠTU É.ŠA ERÍN*^{MEŠ}-*an* (34) [*t*]*tessumiuss-a* ^{GIS}ŠUKUR.ZABAR^U *udanzi*

“from inside they bring the *tessumi*-s and spears of the troops” (StBoT 8 II 33-4).

As can be seen, geminating *-a* alternates with *U* in this phrase.

B.1b) As for double *-(y)a* in parallel phrases, cf.

^{GIS}TUKUL-*li-ya harzi sahhann-a harzi*

of q. 2. Note that B puts in *sahhan-a* for *sahhann-a*, an unusual later Hittite substitution of a non-geminate

writing for an OH geminate writing: usually it is the other way round.

- (10) // *kasata-smas-kan utniyandan lalus dahhu[n]* (12) *irma*ⁿ-*smas-kan dahhun kardi-smi-ya-at-kan dahhu[n]* (13) *harsani-smi-ya-at-kan dahhun*

“behold I have taken from you the tongues of the land; sickness from you I have taken; from your heart I have taken it, from your head I have taken it” (StBoT 8 I 11-13).

- (11) *zikk-a-wa* ^{GIS}TUKUL *apass-a* ^{GIS}TUKUL

“You are a tool/weapon, that one is a tool/weapon” (KBo XXII 1 I. 21).

- (12) 2 DUMU.É.GAL [*a*]*randari kass-a* ^{GIS}ŠUKUR ZAB[AR *harzi*’] (22’) *kass-a* (^{GIS})ŠUKUR ZABAR *harzi*

“two palace servants stand; this one holds a spear, that one holds a spear” (KBo XVII 1+ II 21-2’ = KBo XVII 6 II 15’-16’).

The following passage also is very likely an example of a doubled *-a*:

- (13) LUGAL-*i* SIG₅-*antan GEŠTIN-an hinkatta apedass-a* (4) *tamain GEŠTIN-an pier apass-a uit* LUGAL-*i tet* (5) *natta apun GEŠTIN-an pier* LUGAL-*us kuin* (6) *austa apass-a uit QATAM-MA IQBI*

“(Z. was bronze-holder. The king’s father entrusted a *h.* vessel of wine to H. and M.;) he reserved good wine for the king. They gave other wine to those ones. That one came and said to the king, ‘they didn’t give the wine which the king saw’. That (other) one came and said the same (and they took him out and ‘did him’ and he died)” (KBo III 34 II 3-7 = KBo III 36 I. 11-15)²

¹ To my knowledge in Hittite the particle is never appended to more than two parallel nouns.

² More examples of doubled *-a*, e.g. in the very common *kett-a* *kett-a*:

2 DUMU^{MEŠ}.É.GAL *kett-a* 1-*is* *kett-a* 1-*is* *harzi*

“2 palace servants stand one on this side and one on that side” (KBo XXV 31 (StBoT 25 #31) II 9’+KBo XXV 42 left Col.4-5’+XLIII 48 I. 11-12’).

EGIR-ŠU^L *menias ietta* *kett-a* *kett-a* G[*l*-*an*] (11) *huttiannai tarnai-ma-an natta*

“behind him the *menias* comes, on this side and on that he draws an arrow, does not however shoot it” (KBo XVII 43 (StBoT 25 #43) I 10-11: similar KBo XVII 18 (StBoT 25 #42) II 11-12).

Just as a comment: one hardly understands, according to our interpretation of the values of geminating and non-geminating *-a*, why the text has *apedass-a* here in l. 3, where the context seems clearly contrapositional. Since it is a later copy, even though the text looks pretty faithful to old practice, one can never be sure that the late scribe didn't meddle. If he didn't, however – and as just hinted, version A of the Chronicles seems to be careful about such details – it would be an indication that geminating and non-geminating *-a* were not as separate as we might think.

It should be noted that *-a* is not always appended to the first member of such a counterposition. In this regard, of particular interest is

- (14) *apun ubatijas-sas piran asesir* (26) *apun-a uba'tijas piran asesir*

“they set up this one before his squadron (?) and that one before (his) squadron” (KBo III 34 II 25-6 (Palace Chronicles)).³

As for the value of *-a* in the above-cited examples: it is clear that it is not really copulative, but rather contrapuntal or contrapositional in nature. An accurate rendition of its function would be a translation “on the one hand ... on the other hand”. This is clearly more what we think of as the province of the non-geminating *-a*; nevertheless the particle usually geminates in this construction. It would seem that the two types of spelling are not really determining more than a slight nuance, if they are really doing anything to distinguish two particles.

B.2a) Non-geminating *-a* can also appear in the doubled construction, though not as often. This is, by the way, a clear indication that in OH *-ma* and *-a* were not comparable: to my knowledge *-ma* is never found in a construction of this kind.

First of all, we have cases in which the geminating and non-geminating *-a* are in alternation: We may compare the following with q. 14 above:

- (15) *kas-man kun epz[i] [k]as-a-man kun epzi*

“(if they had to pay, they would become evil and thieves:) this one might take that one; that one might take this one” (Laws I §49).

Here non-geminating *-a* takes up a position usually reserved for the geminating variant, in a direct counterposition, as q. 14 shows.

The following passage has parallel clauses, some marked by *-a*. Both the geminating and the non-geminating variety turn up here. Unfortunately the OH original KBo XVII 17 is quite broken, so that we must rely on the LH copy for the flow of the text:

- (16) [essari] essari-[si dakk]i SAG.DU-ZU (2') [ANA SA]G.DU-ŠU dakkī KIR₁₄ A[NA K]IR₁₄-si dakkī (3) [IGI^{HLA}.Š]U ANA IGI^{HLA}.sas dakkī GEŠT[U^{HLA}]-ŠU ANA GEŠTU^{HLA}.ŠU (4) [dakk]i ais-sit-apa KAxU-i da[kki] (5) [EME-Š]U ANA EME dakkī kapru-set-apa kapruī dakkī (6) m[eli]yas-sis melias iski-set-a iski-si dakkī (7) palt[an]ass-apa paltani dakkī GAB-ŠU ANA GAB-ŠU dakkī (8) ŠĀ-ŠU ANA ŠĀ-ŠU dakkī UZU^{NÍG}.GIG ANA UZU^{NÍG}.GIG (9) dakkī hah-ri-sset-a hahrisni dakkī (10) UZUÉLLAG.GÜN. A-ŠU ANA UZUÉLLAG.GÜN.A-ŠU dakkī (11) genzu-sset-a ge<n>zuwas dakkī KARSA-ŠU (12) ANA KARSİ-ŠU dakkī UZUÚ[R-Š]U ANA UZU<ÚR>-ŠU dakkī * (14) [m]euras-sis miuras dakkī ginu-set-a ginuas dakkī (15) GİR^{MES} ANA GİR^{MES} takkanzi ŠU[^{HLA}]-s-apa ŠU^{HLA}.as takkanzi //

“his form corresponds to his form; his head corresponds to his head, his nose corresponds to his nose, his eyes correspond to his eyes, his ears correspond to his ears, his mouth corresponds to his mouth, his tongue corresponds to his tongue, his kapru corresponds to his kapru, his meli-s to his meli-s and his back corresponds to his back.

his shoulders correspond to his shoulders, his breast corresponds to his breast, his heart corresponds to his heart, his liver corresponds to his liver and his lung corresponds to his lung, his É correspond to his É and his laps correspond to his laps, his belly corresponds to his belly, his member corresponds to his member, his miuras correspond to his miura-s and his knees correspond to his knees, his feet correspond to his feet, his hands correspond to his hands” (XLIII 53 I 1-15).

A similar passage:

essari-sett-a essari GAL-li SAG.DU-ZU (2') ANA SAG.DU-Š[U GAL-li] (20) [KA]xKAK-ŠU A[NA KAxKAK-ŠU GAL-li IGI^{HLA}.ŠU ANA IGI^{HLA}.ŠU GAL-li] (21) [a]is-sit-a issi GAL-li EME-ŠU ANA EME GAL-li] (22) [kap]ru-set-asta kapruaz GAL-li meli-sset-a (23) [me]lias GAL-li iski-set-asta iski-si GAL-li (24) [palt]a<n>a-ssit-asta paltani sallis ...

“his form is greater than his form, etc.” (XLIII 53 I 19-24)

B.2b) The flavor of the doubled construction with non-geminating *-a* is usually rather more narrative than the examples we just saw with the geminating *-a*, although it must be noted that (copied) q. 13 with gemination is rather narrative itself. The non-geminating variety of *-a* is usually in contexts that do not show a direct, often verbatim, counterpoint between two elements or clauses. Cf.

- (17) // LUGAL-s-a IŠME sas yannis URU^{harahsu}-as ars(a) ŪERÍN^{MES} URU^{zalpa} (8) menahhanda uit san LUGAL-us hullit ¹ha[p]pis-a isparzasta (9) ¹tamnassun-a husuwantan ISBATU san URU^{hatusa} 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 ¹happis-a and ¹tamnassun-a, B 24' has ¹hap-piss-a and ¹tamnassun-a.

It is reasonable to assume that q.s 2, 10-14 with the geminated consonant represent a direct comparison or

an indication of comparable status for the two terms marked by *-a* (or its surrogate *-ya*). In q. 17, on the other hand, the fate of the two chieftains was different, and so the juxtaposition is not of the same quality. Hence the non-geminating *-a*? Q. 15 casts such a surmise somewhat in doubt: the passage shows that the non-geminating *-a* could be used to point up a direct counterpoint just like the geminating *-a*.

The passage from Anittas quoted in q. 6 may also be an comparable example. We cite the relevant part here:

- (18) *karu¹uhnas LUGAL^{URU}zalpuwa^Dsiu-summ[in]* (40) [UR]^Unesaz^{URU}zalpuwa^{ped}[as] (41) [^{app}]izziyan-a¹anittas LUGAL.GAL^Dsiu-sum[m(in)] (42) [(^U)^{RU}z]alpuwaz^{appa} URU^{ne}-sa^{pe}[tahhun] (43) [^h]uzziyan-a LUGAL^{URU}zalp[^{uwa}] hus[^{uwantan}] (44) [(^U)^{RU}nesa^{uwatenun}

“Formerly 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” (Anittas 39-44).

Again, this passage is rather difficult to interpret. One may think of *-a* here as simply a narrative particle “then”, or similar. But *appizziyan* is the counterpart to *karu*, ushering in the complex issue of what Anittas did to counteract the actions described by the *karu* clause. *-a* is surely signalling this. And it gives good sense for Anittas to be saying that finally he had brought on the one hand the god, and on the other hand the successor of the thief of the god, back to Nesa: the actions are seen as the two parts of the description of how Anittas rectified the original removal of the god from Nesa. So *-a* following *appizziyan* may be doing double duty here. Certainly the *-a* following ¹huzziyan is a “balancing” particle, with a sense “and on the other hand”.

Cf. also:

- (19) *ta hahhallit* (28) *gapinan dahhe kalulupi-smi hualian^{ku}it-a anda* (29) *halkias-a ZÍZ^{HLA}-ass-a/ZÍZ^{HLA}-s-a^{harsarr}-a nu apatt-a GİR-ŠUNU kitta*

“and I take with a *h*. the string which is bound on their finger, and the heads of wheat and spelt, that too lies at their feet” (StBoT 8 IV 31-3 = KBo XVII 3+4 IV 27-9).

³ Cf. also e.g.

nus apas annanut (30) *kun apas annanut kuss-a ABILUGAL ANA ¹nakkilit* (31) *UGULA LÚ^{MES}SAGI pais kus¹huzzi* UGULA LÚ^{MES}NIMGIR (32) *kus¹kizzui* UGULA LÚ^{MES}MEŠEDI pais sus ulkessarahhir //

“...and he instructed them. This one he instructed, others 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” (KBo III 34 II 29-32 (Palace Chronicles)).

Note that from our interpretation of the particles, the division of clauses is likely to be as given above: *nu* marks the conclusion of a sequence, and the two *kun ... kuss-a* are in counterpoint to each other, *kuss-a* and the two *kus* thereafter are distributive.

This passage is a little confused for us, but here the spellings with and without gemination apparently alternate (*kuit-a/halkias-alharsarr-a*). The non-geminating spelling seems preferred with propositions that are linked in the narrative, the geminate spelling is favored when there is a direct copulative sense between two nouns. But it would appear that *kuit-a* and *harsarr-a* are directly contraposed.

B.2b) So, in the following, which *-a* is present?:

- (20) *takku* LÚ.Û₁₉.ULU-an LÚ-n-a-ku MUNUS-n-a-ku^{URU} *hattusaz* *kuis* LÚ^{URU} *luis* [ta]iezzí...

“if a person, whether a man or a woman, from Hattusas a Luwian steals” (Laws A I §19a).

B also has LÚ-n-a-ku MUNUS-n-a-ku in Laws §1, 2: it obviously was a standard phrase. But in §19a it doubles the consonant preceding *-a*, giving us LÚ-an-na-ku MUNUS-n-a-ku. Is this just later Hittite confusion, or is it an accurate rendition of the OH phrase? Since *-ku* “or” is a disjunctive, “balancing” particle itself, one might wonder how it could appear with a “copulative” *-a*. See also

- (21) *takku* NÍG.BA LUGAL TUPPI *kuiski* <harzi> *mān-za* A.ŠA^{HLA}-n-a k[aruilin] sarranzi Û NÍG.BA 2 QATAM LÚ^{GIS} TUKUL *dau* Û 1 QATAM LÚ^{HLA}.LA[-ŠU *dau*]

“If someone holds a landgrant of the king, when they divide earlier land, the TUKUL-man shall take 2 parts of the grant, his partner shall take one part” (Laws A I §53).

Û most likely represents *-a*. Which one? We may compare this passage with the similar

- (22) *takku* UDU-an UR.BAR.RA-ni *kuiski* *pessizzi* *ishas-sis* UZU^U *dai* *apas-a* KUŠ UDU *dai*

“if someone abandons a sheep to a wolf, his master takes the fat, he takes the hide” (Laws A I §80).

We may suppose that the non-geminating *-a* is present in q. 21, based on the lack of gemination on *apas-a* in q. 22 and the fact that there is a certain contrast between the two phrases marked by the particle. But it is far from certain.

C) To sum up:

Both the geminating and the non-geminating *-a* appear essentially to have the same character. They both mark juxtapositions, or a balancing, of elements or pieces of discourse that are comparable and need marking as such. Their basic sense is “on the one hand ... on the other hand”. The geminating *-a* is more likely in a “copulative” juxtaposition, and clearly alternates with *-ya* in various environments. The non-geminating *-a* is more usual in cases where there is more of a sense of contraposition between the two points of comparison. It is not clear how this latter *-a* relates to *-ya*. As an illustration of the difference in nuance, we might compare the strictly copulative LÚAZU *ugg-a* of StBoT 8 IV 7 with the regular *ug-a(-)* initially in clauses in StBoT 8 (e.g. II 30). But we have seen that often the line between the geminating and non-geminating particles is not so clear.

One wonders how far this apparent delicate shading in the use of the particle *-a* is the work of the Hittites themselves, and how far we are actually talking about two particles. The fact is that no one explanation can be given for the phonetic development of *-a*. It seems likely that various similar particles were inherited from PIE by Anatolian: at very least **-o* and **h₂o⁴*, if not also **-yo* (and **k^we*, which became our friend *-ku(wa)*). All these particles were essentially juxtaposing particles, but according to context could be used either for a more copulative, or for a more contrapositional or balancing nuance. An illustration: as is well known, **k^we* is the central copulative particle in almost all of IE, while in Hittite it descended into the disjunctive “or”.

The Hittites then by various phonological processes (which we can’t see clearly) ended up with cases of *-a* preceded by a geminated consonant alongside ones in which the consonant was not geminated. After vowels, for some reason, there is no trace of anything but **-o* and possibly **-yo*. It is hard to see exactly what happened, since we are not sure of any of the derivations. It is even quite possible that the gemination was caused by the morpheme boundary: Hittite has a

tendency to geminate consonants in that environment, as e.g. *assu-ssett-a*, *nu-tta*, *nu-ssi*, etc. demonstrate. We may surmise that these developments with CC-*a* and C-*a* were specialized into a system whereby the first was pushed a bit more towards the copulative nuance, while the other was favored in more purely juxtapositional contexts. This was never implemented with complete rigor. It looks to be an independent Hittite reinterpretation of the situation that had developed, namely that the language now had a particle *-a*, with two different behaviors after consonants that however presented no very clear difference in character. So one extreme of the range of meaning of the particle tended over to the geminating *-a*; the other extreme became the province of the non-geminating variant. The two spellings overlapped in the middle.

These two nuances of *-a* were then accompanied by *-ma* which apparently marked a shift in focus or an opposition within the framework of the discourse. *-a* and *-ma* were not comparable in OH, though *-ma* seems to have already become obligatory after a word ending in *-a*, probably because the particle *-a* was lost or confused in pronunciation there.

We hope that these data may be useful in giving an indication of the breadth of nuance available to the early Hittites, and the delicacy of shading which they sought to convey in their speech. The whole system into which these particles fit is about to be swept away in Middle Hittite, but Old Hittite still retains much that can illuminate the mentality of the ancient speakers of the early second millennium.

⁴ See Boley 2004.2 §2.3a ff. for the value of the particles; Kimball p. 412, Melchert p. 167, Puhvel p. 8-9, HW² article on *-a* for the various derivations.

Texts Cited

Anittas	E. Neu, <i>Der Anittas-Text</i> (Studien zu den Boğazköy Texten 18), 1974.	Kimball, S.E. 1999	<i>Hittite Historical Phonology</i> (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 95), Innsbruck .
Boley, J. 2000	<i>Dynamics of Transformation in Hittite - The Hittite Particles</i> -kan, -asta and -san (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 97), Innsbruck.	Laws	1) H. Hoffner, <i>The Laws of the Hittites</i> , Leiden 1997. 2) J. Friedrich, <i>Die hethitischen Gesetze</i> , Leiden 1971. 3) F. Imparati, <i>Le leggi ittite</i> , Rome 1964.
2004.1	“The Story-teller’s Art in Old Hittite - The Use of Sentence Connectives and Discourse Particles”, <i>Res Antiquae</i> 1.	Melchert, H.C. 1994	<i>Anatolian Historical Phonology</i> , Amsterdam-Atlanta Ga.
2004.2	“Historical Basis of PIE Syntax - Hittite Evidence and Beyond. Part Two: The Particles”, <i>Indogermanische Forschungen</i> 109.	Puhvel, J. 1984	<i>Hittite Etymological Dictionary</i> , Vol. 1, Mouton, Berlin-New York.
Dardano, P. 1997	<i>L’aneddoto e il racconto in età antico ittita: La cosiddetta ‘Cronaca di Palazzo’</i> (Biblioteca di ricerche linguistiche e filologiche no. 43), Editrice ‘Il Calamo’, Rome.		Palace Chronicles, see Dardano.