

Asyndeton in Hittite *

Harry A. Hoffner, Jr. (Chicago)

1. Much attention has been devoted to the study of the conditions under which various Hittite conjunctions (*ta*, *šu*, *nu*, *-a/-ma*, *-a/-ja*) occur, the first two in Old Hittite, and the other three throughout all periods of Hittite¹. But this leaves an entire category of clauses without sufficient exploration: namely, clauses not introduced by any conjunction. Asyndeton (or asyndesis), as I use the term, is the simple juxtaposition of clauses without conjunction. Asyndeton in Hittite has only been studied in a rudimentary fashion. Friedrich 1960 dealt with certain aspects of the subject in his notes on where the conjunction *nu* was lacking, primarily in NH. Weitenberg 1992 made tabulations of relative frequency for asyndeton, enclitics and particles within a limited corpus, and looked for formal rather than semantic criteria to govern the use of conjunctions (his term was “particles”) versus asyndeton. Neither of these scholars attempted to give an overview of the subject diachronically or comprehensively. That is what I propose to do here².

2. Although much of the earlier studies of *nu*, *šu* and *ta* focused on their etymologies and what Weitenberg called their “semantic load”, he himself pointed to what in my view is the actual criterion for choosing between *šu* and *ta*, namely that the former introduced clauses with preterite verbs, and the latter those with present-future ones. Thus at least in that case, it is not the semantics of the conjunction

* The present article is an elaboration of a much smaller section in a forthcoming Hittite grammar by H.C. Melchert and this writer (Hoffner and Melchert forthcoming). It provides more discussion and documentation than could be allowed in the grammar. It is with genuine affection that I dedicate it to Silvin Košak, in pleasant memory of the years he spent with us in Chicago on the CHD staff and in admiration and gratitude for his valuable work on the Mainz *Konkordanz*.

1 Initial remarks on OH *ta* and *šu* were made by Friedrich in HE §§ 316-317. For *šu* see most recently Weitenberg 1992 with anterior literature. For *ta* see Rieken 1999 with anterior literature cited there. For *-a/-ja* and *-a/-ma* see Rieken 2000 with anterior literature. For *nu* see HE §§ 306-315. For an up-to-date review of the uses of all these conjunctions see chapter 29 in the forthcoming Hittite grammar mentioned in the previous note.

2 An article which came to my attention just when I was ready to submit this study is Philomen Probert, TPS 104 (2006), 17-83. Unfortunately, I was unable to make use of this article in the writing of this present study.

itself that is determinative, but features of the broader context, in this case the temporal relationship of the reported action to the speaker/writer (i.e., the tense of the main verb of the clause). We may eventually discover such rules for the employment of *nu*, *-a/-ja* and *-a/-ma*, as well as less for asyndeton. See below in § 25 for an attempt to correlate the stative PARTICIPLE + *har(k)*-construction in OH with asyndeton.

3. Our focus here will be upon *clauses* not joined by a conjunction, *not* individual nouns and adjectives, or noun phrases juxtaposed without conjunction (e.g., *ezzan GIŠ-ru* “straw (and) wood”³). That is a separate topic that needs to be pursued in its own right.

Recognizing Asyndeton

4. The absence of a conjunction (e.g., *ta*, *šu*, *nu*, *-a/-ma*, *-a/-ja*) is normally obvious and therefore easily recognized. But there is at least one situation in which it is masked. When a clause-initial word ending in a consonant hosts a clitic pronoun beginning with the vowel *a*, a situation is created in which the presence of the clitic conjunction *-a/-ma*⁴ in OH or the clitic conjunction *-a/-ja* in NH is uncertain. In Old Hittite a combination like *zi-ga-an* could be analyzed either as *zig≈a≈an* (with *-a/-ma*-) or as *zig≈an* (asyndeton). One can disambiguate such cases only by comparison with clear examples in parallel constructions: *kuitmān≈aš lazziat* “until he recovers” KBo 6.2 I 17-18 (OS) is shown to be asyndetic by other examples of postposed *kuitman* clauses (the point of clause juncture where a conjunction might otherwise occur is marked here with †), e.g., [(UD)].I[(^KA)]^M *tūrijazi † kuitman≈ašta* MUL^{MEŠ} *uḡanzi* “he may harness (the stray animal) for one day, i.e., until the stars come out” KBo 6.3 IV 7 (Laws § 70, OH/NS); *n≈at uīt ABI A-BI≈IA^m Šuppiluliumaš/EGIR-pa uetet † kuitman≈at EGIR-pa taninut* “Then my

3 KUB 11.6 II 7', ed. Hoffmann 1984, 36f. II 61; and Hatt. IV 83. On the expression see HW² E 141. The synonymous Akkadian expression on which the Hittite is modeled, *hāmū u hušābu*, is not asyndetic. Logograms juxtaposed in Hittite texts with neither logographic or syllabic Hittite conjunctions may or may not provide examples: GU₄ UDU “cattle (and) sheep”, DINGIR^{MEŠ} GAL.GAL DINGIR^{MEŠ} TUR.TUR “the great gods (and) the minor gods”. The combination LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL “king and queen”, on the other hand, is shown by OH examples to have contained a clitic conjunction.

4 Weitenberg 1992, 319 failed to notice this, when he claimed *iš-ḫa-a-aš-š[i-š]a-an* KUB 29.25 I 8 (Laws § 121, OS) as asyndetic **išḫāš≈šiš≈an*, whereas in its context as a fronted contrasted subject it clearly contained topicalizing *-a/-ma* (**išḫāš≈šiš≈a≈an*).

grandfather Šuppiluliuma proceeded to rebuild it until he had reorganized it” KUB 19.9 I 17-8 (DŠ).

5. The situation is even more obscure when the host word is a logogram, in which case gemination of the final consonant might not be shown by the writing of the phonetic complement. In OS LUGAL-ša-an can stand for *LUGAL-ušš≈a≈an, *LUGAL-uš≈a≈an, or *LUGAL-uš≈an! In post-OH, when -ma assumed the role of its allomorph -a, there remained no possibility of confusing such clauses in which topicalizing -a/-ma occurred with cases of asyndeton: the former was written *zi-ik-ma-an* (e.g., KBo 10.13 + KBo 10.12 II 32), EGIR-an-ma-aš (KBo 6.4 II 21), LUGAL.GAL-ma-an-kán (KBo 10.2 II 47), LUGAL-(uš-)ma-an⁵, and the latter *zi-ga-an* (KBo 5.9 II 41), LUGAL-uš-at-za (BT IV 23), or DINGIR^{LUM}-an (KUB 5.1 I 65.68.III 62). While further study is needed, it appears that in NH ambiguous spellings with logograms such as LUGAL-ša-an were avoided in favor of indicating asyndeton either with a fuller phonetic complement (e.g., LUGAL-uš-an) or no complement at all (e.g., LUGAL-an).

Conditions Requiring Asyndeton

Beginning a Unit

6. The most obvious situation in which asyndeton is required is where there is no connection to a previous clause. The absence of a conjunction is explained by the fact that there is nothing preceding to connect with. One finds this use primarily at the beginning of entire compositions, or at the beginning of recorded speech⁶. Beginning compositions: ^dUTU-e išha≈mi ḫandanza ḫannešnaš išhaš ... KUR-e zik dudduškeši “O Sungod, my lord, just lord of judgment ... you have mercy upon the land(s)” KUB 31.127 I 1-3. Beginning a long narrative following a brief introduction⁷: karū≈ššan karūil[ī]aš MU^{HI.A}-aš ^dAlaluš AN-ši LUGAL-uš ēšta “Long

5 But there are examples of -a/-ma- erroneously written with gemination by NH scribes, such as *a-ki-iš-ša-an* KBo 3.36, 18', where its duplicate A II 12's *a-ki-iš-ma-aš tepšauyanni* “but he died in poverty” shows that the OH original had **a-ki-ša-an* (*akiš≈a≈an*), with topicalizing -a/-ma- and OH local particle -an (but see Dardano 1997, 98f., who takes it as asyndeton *akiš≈šan*). Both Dardano's and Kammenhuber's interpretations (the latter reading *akišš≈an*, “starb ihn”) require asyndeton. But since none of the uses of asyndeton is to introduce strong contrast (“but”, “rather”), one may doubt these analyses.

6 But see the properly cautious remarks of Weitenberg 1992, 316 on this point.

7 Nigel Turner (Moulton and Turner 1963, 341) notes that in New Testament Greek compositions “asyndeton makes the beginning of new long sections conspicuous, e.g., Ro 9¹ 10¹ 13¹ 1 Pt 5¹ 2 Pt 3¹”.

ago Alalu was king in heaven” KUB 33.120 I 7-8. Beginning recorded speech⁸: *karū≈ya ēšhar*^{URU} *Hattuši makkešta* “Formerly in Hattuša bloodshed was common” KBo 3.1 II 48 (OH/NS); also in a dialogue where the speakers change: see *UMMA ABI ABI≈IA≈MA* † [*kuiš≈ya p*]aizzi *UMMA ABU≈IA≈MA* † *ammuk≈ya pāimi* “My grandfather asked: ‘[Who] will go?’ My father answered: ‘I will go.’” KBo 14.3 III 9-10 (DŠ, NH); and where the speakers change many times: *namma≈kan*^{LÚ} *patiliš kuiš šuhhi šer nu≈kan É-ri kattanda* / *halzai* † *akkanza kuiš n≈an≈kan ŠUM≈ŠU halziššai* † *kuuapi≈uar≈aš* / *pait n≈aš≈kan DINGIR*^{MEŠ} *-aš kuedaš anda nu apuš DINGIR*^{MEŠ} *kattan šarā* / *memiškanzi* † *INA É šinapši≈uar≈aš pait apašš≈a≈kan šuhhaz* / *kattanda halzai* † *kuuapi≈uar≈aš pait n≈aš≈kan DINGIR*^{MEŠ} *-aš kuedaš ...* / *namma anda nu kattan šarā apūš taranzi* † *apeja≈uar≈aš pait* / *maḥḥan≈ma DINGIR*^{MEŠ} *irhanzi nu TÚG*^{HIA} *kue apel x-x-x kattan šarā* / *memiškanzi* † *kā≈uar≈aš* KUB 30.28 rev. 1-8 w. dupl. KBo 34.80, x+1-6’, ed. Otten 1958, 96-97, or when a single speaker for rhetorical purposes simulates a dialog, asking a question and then answering it himself: † *UN-aš DINGIR*^{MEŠ} *-ašš≈a ZI-anza tamaiš kuiški* † *UL* “Is the mind of man and of god something different? No!” KUB 13.4 I 21 (pre-NH/NS)⁹; *kāš≈ma*^{LÚ} *QARTAPPU kuiš* † *ŠA MUNUS.LUGAL≈za kuit ŠA MÁŠ*^{TI} *harzi* † *INA KUR*^{URU} *HATTI ŠA MUNUS.LUGAL MÁŠ*^{TUM} *mekki šalli n≈aš≈mu ŪL imma*^{LÚ} *HA<TA>NU* “But who is this chariot driver? † Because he belongs to the family of the queen – † in the land of Hatti the queen’s family is extremely important – is he not my son-in-law?” KUB 14.3 II 72-74 (= Sommer 1932, II 73-75, NH). Another variation of this use is when a rhetorical question is asked and then answered by another such question: *ŠA LÚ.GAL.GAL*^{TIM} *É≈SUNU kuuapi* † *ŪL≈at harkēr* “Where are the estates of the great men? † Have they not perished?” KUB 1.16 III 45 (OH/NS).

7. But note that discourse-initial *nu* does occur, when there is a conscious allusion (“then”, “so”) to something said by the previous speaker: † *hāš nu kuēz uyaši* † *šuppaz≈ya uḡami nu≈ya kuēz šuppajaz* † *zaḥanittennaz≈ya nu≈ya kuēz zaḥanittennaz* † ^d*UTU-yaš≈ya É-az nu≈ya kuēz*^d*UTU-az* “‘Open!’ ‘So, where are you coming from?’ ‘I am coming from the holy thing.’ ‘So, from what holy thing?’ ‘From the z.’ ‘So, from what z.?’ ‘From the Sungod’s temple.’ ‘So, from what Sungod?’” KBo 21.22, 22-25 (OH/MS); [^d]IM-š≈a *tezzi nu≈uar≈an kuit ḥanda ŪL uemija[tten]* “But the Stormgod says: ‘So why didn’t you (pl.) find him?’” VBoT 58 I 23.

8 Turner (Moulton and Turner 1963 340f.) notes this use in the gospels of Matthew and John.

9 Friedrich (HE § 310c) tried to explain this use as “emphasis”.

Indirect statements and indirect questions

8. Indirect statements and indirect questions often **after verbs of perception** (seeing, hearing, knowing) are also asyndetic. This includes “that...” clauses (*kuit*): *ammel kās≈pat I-aš dammešhaš † kī≈an I-an dammešhanunun † IŠTU É. GAL^{LIM}≈pat≈kan kuit katta uijanun* “This was my only punishment (of the Taḡannanna): I punished her with this one thing: † only (-*pat*) that (*kuit*) I sent her down from the palace” KBo 4.8 II 12-14; *šakti≈mu≈za-kuwatka^d UTU-uš † DUMU-aš≈mu kuit NU.GÁL* “Do you perhaps know (all) about me, O Sungod, † that I have no child?” KUB 24.7 IV 35-36 (cf. also Bo 2810 II 11-12 cited in CHD Š 26); *ḪUL^{MEŠ}-šir≈ma≈at kēdani memijani † KUR UGU^{TIM} kuit ANA^{md} SÎN^dU AŠŠUM MUIRTUTTİM pešta* “But they were angry for this reason: † that (*kuit*) he gave the Upper Land to Arma-Tarḡunta to govern” KUB 21.17 I 4-5 (NH); *maḡhan≈ma LU^{MEŠ URU} Aššur aḡēr † URU^{DIDL.HI.A} BÂD≈kan kuit zaḡḡijaz katta daškeuḡan teḡhun* “When the Assyrians saw † that (*kuit*) I had begun to capture fortified cities in battle” KBo 4.4 IV 28-29 (NH); *[(nu^m Aitaqq)] amaš kuiš LUGAL^{URU} Kinza ēšta nu≈šši^m Niqma^dU-aš [kuiš] / [ḡant]ezziš DUMU-laš ēšta nu maḡhan aušta / † [anda]≈kan kuit ḡatkešnuḡanteš nu≈šmaš ḡalki^{HI.A}-uš namma / [tepaḡ]ešzi nu≈za^m Niqma^dU-aš^m Aitaqqaman ABU≈ŠU kuenta* “When Niqmadda, the oldest son of Aitaqqama, king of Qadeš, saw † that (*kuit*) they were besieged, and (*nu*) that their grain supplies were low, Niqmaddu killed Aitaqqama, his father” KBo 4.4 II 3-6 (NH). The last example shows that, at least in NH, when there were two parallel postposed “that” clauses, the first was introduced with a-syndeton, but the second with *nu*.

9. It also includes clauses containing the interrogative pronoun *kui*: *nu DINGIR^{MEŠ} ŪL / [šekteni k]uēll≈aš dammešhaš* “Or do you gods not [know] whose is the injury?” KBo 4.8 III 3-4 (NH); *ŪL šakka[ḡḡ]i † kuiš≈aš aši DINGIR^{LIM}-iš* “I don’t know who that god is.” KUB 33.106 III 44 (Ullik.); *šumeš≈ḡa [D]INGIR^{MEŠ} ŪL uškitteni † kiššan≈ḡa≈mu kuiš iḡan ḡarzi* “don’t you gods see who has done this (lit. thus) to me?” KUB 54.1 I 20-21 (NH). Not clause-initial: *KUR^{URU} Ūiluša≈ma ANA KUR^{URU} ḤATTI kuedani LUGAL-i auḡan arḡa tiḡat nu memiḡaš kui[(t)] / [(i)]štantanza n≈an ŪL šakka[ḡḡ]* “Since the incident occurred long ago, I don’t know from what Hittite king Ūiluša defected” KUB 21.2 + KUB 48.95 I 6-9 (NH); with subject matter of inquiry preceding: *kuedani≈ḡa uddanī uḡanun nu≈mu PŪ-anza punuḡdu ḡitenanza* “Let the spring, the water, ask me why I have come” KBo 10.45 II 23-24 (OH/NS).

10. It also includes postposed subordinate clauses introduced by *mān* “if” (*nu BELU LŪ^{MEŠ} KUR^{TI}≈pat punuḡ mān ammuk šaḡḡan luzzi iššaḡhun* “O lord, just ask the men of the land if I ever had to perform *šaḡḡan* and *luzzi* obligations!”

kuwatqa

HKM 52, 38-39 [MH/MS]), *kuṣapi* “where”: *namma≈ma≈uā<r>≈aš kuṣapi pait / nu≈uā≈aš ŪL IDE* But I do not know (text: ‘he does/did not know’) where he was going” HKM 6, 9-10 (MH/MS); (or preposed): † *kuṣapi≈uā paīši am-muk≈ma≈uā≈tta lē / šaggahhi* “Let me not know where you are going” KBo 5.9 II 44-45 [NH]), and *maḥḥan* “how” clauses (*zik^d IŠTAR^{URU} Nenuya GAŠAN-NI ŪL šakti* † KUR^{URU} *HATTI GIM-an dammešḥan* “Don’t you know IŠTAR of Nineveh, our Lady, † how the country of Hatti has been oppressed?” KBo 2.9 I 38-39 [NH]; *nu tuel^{LU} TEMU kuṣat ŪL punušta* † *memahḥun≈ši GIM-an* “Why did you not ask your messenger how I spoke to him?” KUB 23.101 II 5-6 [NH]; *nu≈za kāšma au* † ^dU NIR.GÁL≈*mu BELI≈IA maḥḥan peran ḥuianza* “Just see how the mighty Stormgod, my lord, goes before me!” KBo 5.8 I 12-13 [NH]). With the verb “to know that ...” one can also use a construction in which the indirect statement precedes the main clause asyndetically: † *kinun≈uā≈z nūuā^{MUNUS.MEŠŠ} ŠU.GI[-uš] / [punuškez]zi* † *ŪL šaggahhi* “I don’t know (if) she [is] now (*kinun*) still [consulting] Old Women.” KUB 1.16 III 68-69 (OH/NS). Similarly with *punuš*:- see KBo 10.45 II 23-24 (OH/NS) cited above in this paragraph.

Circumstantial Clauses

11. A circumstantial clause essential to the subordinate conditional clause can be asyndetic (further exx. in HE § 310e): *takku LÚ ELLUM araṣanniuš annanekuš anna(n)≈šmann≈a uenzi* † *kāš takija utnē / kāšš≈a takija utnēja* † *ŪL ḥara[ta]* “If a free man has sex with free maternal sisters and their mother – † the one (being) in one country and the other in another, † there is no crime.” KBo 6.26 III 32-34 (Laws § 191, OH/NS). Often such clauses serve as inserted explanatory glosses (HE § 310d): *kuiš≈aš imma k[ui]š / ŠA É.GAL^{LIM} MUNUS* † *mān≈aš ELLUM* † *mān<≈aš>^{MUNUS} SUḪUR.LÁ* “Whatever palace woman – † whether she is free or <she> is a hierodule” KBo 5.3 III 44-45 (MH/NS). See also KUB 14.3 II 72-74 cited in §6, and KUB 6.46 III 42-43 cited in § 18.

Clauses with potential-irrealis man/mān

12. Clauses with potential-irrealis *man/mān* are introduced asyndetically (HE § 310f and exx. in CHD *man*): *mān≈uā≈aš≈mu≈kan šullijāt kuṣapi ŪL* † *mān ḥandān LUGAL.GAL ANA LUGAL.TUR katterahḥer* “If (Urḫi-Teššup) had not at some time treated me disrespectfully, † would (the gods) really (*ḥandān*) have subjected a great king to a minor king?” Hatt. III 76-77 (NH).

Postposed kuitman clauses

13. Postposed *kuitman* temporal clauses are asyndetic: *nu É-ri≈šši anniškezzi † kuitmān≈aš lazziatta* “and he shall work on his estate until (the injured man) recovers” KBo 6.2 I 17-18 (Laws § 10, OS); cf. also KBo 6.3 IV 6-8 (Laws § 79, OH/NS), and above in § 4.

Postposed causal kuit clauses

14. Postposed *kuit* causal clauses are asyndetic: *ANA PANI ŠÀ≈[KA]≈ya≈z / duškišketta † LÚ-natar≈mit≈ya kuit pašta* “Are you rejoicing because you have swallowed my ‘manhood’?” KUB 33.120 I 28-29 (myth, NH); *mān GU₄ puḫugariš≈ma / EGIR KASKAL aki † KASKAL kuit tūya* “But if the substitute ox dies on the way, because the journey is long” KBo 4.2 IV 46-47 (NH).

Relative Clauses

15. Virtually all relative clauses in Old Hittite – pre- and postposed – are asyndetic, whereas those introduced by *nu* are less rare in Middle Hittite and become rather common in New Hittite.

Old Hittite preposed examples

16. Old Hittite evidence: † [^{LÚ}KA]Š₄.E *tarḫzi kuiš † I MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR ... pianzi* “Which runner wins, they give one mina of silver.” = “They give one mina of silver to the runner who wins.” KBo 20.33, 12 (OS) (note that in this case the following main clause is also asyndetic); † *kuiš ammel āppan LUGAL-uš kīšari nu* ^{URU}*Hattušan āppa ašāši n≈an nepišaš* ^d*IM-aš ḫazziēt[(tu)]* “Who(ever) becomes king after me and resettles Hattuša, let the Stormgod of Heaven strike him!” KBo 3.22, 49-51 (OS); *kuel≈aš arḫi aki / I ME* ^{GIŠ}*gipeššar A.ŠÀ karšijezi n≈an≈za dai* “On whose property it (scil. the body of a murdered man) lies, (the heir of the murdered man) shall cut off 100 *gipeššar* of the field and take it.” KBo 6.2 I 7-8 (Laws § 6, OS); *kuiš≈an āppa≈ma uḫatezzi n≈an≈za apāš≈pat dāi* “He who leads him (scil. an escaped slave) back shall take him for himself.” KBo 6.2 I 53 (Laws § 23, OS); *išhaš≈šiš≈an kuēl ḫašši ūemiezzi* “at whose hearth his master finds him” KBo 6.2 I 54 (Laws § 24, OS); † *paprezzi kuiš † III GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pāi* “He who defiled (it) shall give three shekels of silver.” KBo 6.2 I 57 (Laws § 25, OS); † *kuiš ammel āppan LUGAL-uš kīšari* “he who becomes king after me” KBo 3.22, lines 22.49 (OS); *ÉRIN* ^{MEŠ}*-n≈an kuiš anda pētai* “he who brings the troops in”

KBo 17.1 +, I 32 (ritual, OS); [k]uiš šagaiš kīšari “what sign occurs” KBo 17.1 +, IV 9 (OS). Quite rarely with *nu*: *nu* LUGAL-uš kuedanija utnianti laḫḫa paizzi “(Let the princes who are still minors go before the king,) and (*nu*) to whatever land the king goes on campaign (let them go in the presence of the king).” KBo 20.31 obv. 8 (OS). I am unaware of any postposed examples in Old Hittite. There are several examples, however, of embedded relative clauses, and in these examples the relative clause is joined to the preceding by *-a/-ma*: *nu apel É≈SU – kuel≈a^{GIŠ} ejan aški≈šši šakuṽān – a[rauṽan]* “The house of a person at whose gate an *ejan*-tree is planted is e[empt].” KBo 6.2 II 61-62 (Laws § 50, OS).

Middle Hittite examples

17. In MH (MS), the relative clause takes introductory conjunctions – with *nu*: *nu≈ššan kuedani DINGIR^{LIM}-ni kuit tuekki≈šši / anda uizzapan* “and whatever has become old on the body of the god” KUB 17.21 I 15-16 (MH/MS); *nu kuiš apenišsuṽa[n iezzi]* “then whoever [acts] in such a way (let the gods destroy him).” KBo 16.46 obv. 11 (MH/MS); *nu LÚ^{MEŠ URU} Gašga / kuiēš takšuli iḫandari* “those Kaškaean men who are coming to make peace” HKM 10, 20-21 (MH/MS); with *-a/-ma*: *kuiš≈šamaš memai≈ma [...]* “but whoever speaks [.....] to you” KUB 31.103, 12 (MH/MS); *anda≈ma kuiš LÚ-tar iezzi* “but then whoever does an exploit” KUB 31.103, 27 (MH/MS); with *-a/-ja*: *idālunn≈a≈ṽa≈tta memian [ku]iṣ peran mema[i]* “and he who speaks an evil word in your presence” KUB 14.1 obv. 37 (MH/MS); ANŠE.KUR.RA^{HLA}≈ja≈šmaš≈kan / *kuiš anda* “and the horses that are with you” HKM 15, 8-9 (MH/MS). But the older asyndetic construction occurs occasionally also in MH/MS: † *apel kuiš KUR-e ÉRIN^{MEŠ} / n≈aš≈kan namma / arḫa lē uizzi / † apija≈aš ēštu* “What troops are in that one’s land, let them not come out: let them stay there!” HKM 3, 7-10 (MH/MS); † ^{URU}*Lišipra≈ṽa kuin ašešḫi* “what (population of) Lišipra that I am resettling” HKM 10, 8 (MH/MS); † *kuiš≈ṽa ANA [ABI^{dUT}]U^{ŠI} U A[NA KUR^{URU}]ḪATTI menaḫḫanta kūrur / [tukk≈a]≈ṽar≈aš ANA^mMa[dduṽ]atta kūrur ēštu* “Whoever is an enemy to the father of His Majesty, let him be an enemy to you too, O Madduṽatta.” KUB 14.1 obv. 28-29 (MH/MS); † *KARAŠ-za≈kan kuiēš tepaṽeš i[špar]ter* “what few troops survived” KUB 14.1 obv. 48 (MH/MS); † *kuiš≈ṽa≈tta≈kkan ŠA KUR^{URU}[ḪATTI^{LÚ} ḫuḫanza u]iškettari* “whatever [fugitive] of the land of Ḫatti is sent to you” KUB 14.1 rev. 63 (MH/MS); a postposed example: *nu VIII DUMU^{MEŠ}-uṣ uṽadanzi † MUNUS-ni≈ššan kuiēš nāṽi pānzi* “They bring eight boys who have not yet gone to a woman.” KUB 9.31 II 9-10; *mān ta[m]aiš≈ma kuiški BELUM ḫandāitta kuiš ḫantezzi[a]nni arta* “But if some other official is available who is standing in the front line” IBoT 1.36 IV 20-21 (MH/MS);

New Hittite examples

18. In NH compositions relative clauses are regularly introduced by a conjunction: *nu NARARU kuiš uet* “and the auxiliary troop which came” KUB 19.11 I 16 (DŠ, NH); *nu≈kan ABU≈IA kuin* ^{LÚ}KÚR ^{URU}*Gašgan INA ŠÀ KUR^{TI} IKŠUD n≈aš* XII *ŠUTI kišat* “The Kaškaean enemy that my father encountered in the land consisted of twelve ‘tribal groups’.” KBo 14.3 III 15-16 (DŠ, NH); *nu≈ua≈za DUMU-aš kuiš zik* “you who are but a child” KUB 19.29 IV 20 (AM); *nu≈ua≈nnaš≈kan NAM.RA^{MEŠ} URU HATTI≈ja / kuiš anda uūanza* KUB 19.30 IV 8-9 (AM); ... *kez≈ma^m Hannuttiš kuiš KUR.KUR^{MEŠ} ŠAPLITI / manijaḥḥiškēt* “but in this direction Hannutti who was governing the Lower Lands” KUB 19.29 IV 11-12 (AM); *nu≈kan^m Nanazitin kuin DUMU.LUGAL ANA^m Nuūanza / GAL.GEŠTIN ḥaluki parā nehḥun* “and Nanaziti, the prince whom I dispatched to Nuūanza the Field Marshall with a message” KBo 4.4 II 68-69 (AM); *nu≈kan ŠÀ KUR.KUR^{MEŠ} URU HATTI^{LÚ} KÚR kuiš kuiš anda ēšta* “whatever enemy was in the Hatti-lands” Hatt. I 71 (Hatt. III). Only occasionally the older asyndetic construction survives in NH compositions – preposed: † *KUR.KUR^{HI.A} kue dannatta † ammuk EGIR-pa ašešanunūn nu≈mu≈kan apē≈ja ḥūmanda arḥa dāš* “Which empty lands I resettled, all those too he took away from me.” = “He also took away from me all those empty lands that I had resettled” Hatt. III 57-58; and postposed: *DINGIR.LÚ^{MEŠ} DINGIR.MUNUS^{MEŠ} ŠA LUGAL U MUNUS.LUGAL^{UTTI} † kuiēš daranteš † kuiēš ŪL daranteš* “Gods and goddesses of the King and Queen, those who (are) named, (and) those who (are) not named” KUB 6.46 III 42-43 (NH).

Conditional Clauses

19. Conditional clauses, both with *takku* and *mān* “if”, even if they do not start a new section of the composition¹⁰, often take no introductory conjunction: † *takku šumeš natta šaktēni* “if you do not know” KBo 22.1, 5 (OS); † *takku ARAD^{MEŠ}-amman ištarna ŠUM≈Š[UNU] / kuiški tezzi* “If anyone among my servants speaks their names” KBo 3.27 obv. 10-11 (OH/NS); † *takku≈ua≈ššan kī ḥazzizi ta≈ua DINGIR^{LUM} / † takku≈ua≈ššan natta≈ma ḥazzizi / ta≈ua antuūaḥḥeš* “if he guesses(?) (it), he is a god; but if he does not guess(?) (it), he is a mortal¹¹” KBo

10 As it could be argued they do when they begin new sections of the laws.

11 The lack of subject clitics in the two apodoses, whose implied verb is *ēšzi*, indicates the subject is non-referential: “it is a god ... it is a mortal”. Non-referential subjects are not expressed by subject clitics (see *mān* ^{LÚ}MÁŠDA≈ma “But if (it is) a poor man” KUB 7.1 II 9, KUB 7.54 III

3.60 II 14-16 (OH/NS); † *takku* DUMU.LU[GAL] / *hantezziš* NU.GÁL “if a first-rank prince does not exist” KBo 3.1 II 36-37 (OH/NS); † *takku tezzi* † *aku≈uar≈aš n≈aš aku* “if he says ‘Let him die’, then let him die” KUB 11.1 IV 20 (OH/NS); † *takku≈an ekunimaš walḫzi n≈an ḫandaiši / dāi* “if cold strikes him, put him in a warm place” KBo 3.23 I 7-8 (OH/NS); † *mān≈ši¹≈kan BEL≈ŠU⁽¹⁾ šer ŪL šarnikzi nu ...* “If his master does not make compensation for him (i.e., the slave who has incurred a penalty), ...” KUB 8.81 + KBo 19.39 III 6 (MH/MS); † *mān* II ZU₉ *našma* III ZU₉ *lāki* “If he knocks out two teeth or three teeth” KBo 6.4 I 18-19 (NH). Rarely even with postposed *takku* clauses: [*n*]≈*at parkunumi* † *takku≈at ēšzi* † *takku≈at* NU.GÁL (= *natta ēšzi*) “I will ‘purify’ it, whether it is or is not.” KUB 1.16 II 54 (OH/NS).

Main clause following a Conditional Clause

20. In Old Hittite it is common for the apodosis following a conditional clause using *takku* “if” to lack an introductory conjunction (Friedrich 1959, 88; Hoffner 1997, 12): *takku* LÚ.DAM.GÀR (dupl. KBo 6.3 I 10 adds ^{URU}HATTI) *kuiški kuēnzi* † I ME.MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR *pāi* “If someone kills a (Hittite) merchant, he shall give 100 minas of silver.” KBo 6.2 I 3 (Laws § 5, OS); *takku* LÚ.U₁₉.LU-*an EL-LAM* *kuiški dašuyahḫi našma* ZU₉≈*ŠU lāki* † *karū* I MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR *pišker* “If someone blinds a free person or knocks out his teeth, they used to pay one mina of silver.” KBo 6.2 I 9-10 (Laws § 7, OS); *takku šumeš natta šaktēni* / † *kāni* LÚ ŠU.GI-*ešš≈a* NU.GÁL *nu≈šmaš memai AUĀT ABI≈IA* “If you do not know (my father’s instructions), is there not here even an old man that he may tell you my father’s word?” KBo 22.1, 5-6 (OS)¹². This type is also found in other passages in OH/MS and OH/NS texts (e.g., *takku* ARAD^{MEŠ}-*am≈man ištarna ŠUM≈Š[UNU]* / *kuiški tezzi* † ARAD≈*miš lē* “If among my servants someone speaks their name, † let him not be my servant.” KBo 3.27 obv. 10-11, see also KBo 3.28, 12, VBoT 58

12 and § 827 in the forthcoming Hittite grammar). The form *antuyahḫeš*, though apparently plural, is to be understood here as a singular.

12 But there are cases where a clause-initial conjunction occurs, especially where a sentential particle also occurs: *takku* LÚ.U₁₉.LU-*aš ELLAM-aš QĀSSU našma* GÌR≈*ŠU kuiški tuṣa[rniezzi]* *nu≈šše* XX GÍN KÙ.BABBAR *pāi* “If someone breaks a free person’s arm or leg, he shall give to him 20 shekels of silver” KBo 6.2 I 20-21 (Laws § 11, OS); *mān* (var. *našma*) INA KUR ^{URU}HATTI / *nu≈za* (var. *nu-uz-za*) *unattallan≈pat arnuzzi* “If (var. ‘or if’) it is in the land of Hatti, he shall ‘bring’ (the dead body of) the merchant himself” KBo 6.3 I 12-13 (Laws § 5, OH/NS), dupl. KBo 6.2 I 5-6 (OS). This different pattern (the conditional clause introduced by *mān* or *takku*, and the apodosis by *nu*) also occurs in some OS rituals (so Otten and Souček 1969 91-92).

I 40-41) including OH/NS omen texts showing the sequence of *takku* ... (asyndeton) ...” (e.g., *takku≈za ÉLLAG UDU-aš tetan kiša †apedani UN-ši kallarešzi* “If the kidney (in extispicy) resembles (lit. becomes) a sheep’s *tetan*, † it will be unlucky for that person” KUB 4.1 IV 29)¹³. In post-OH the “if” word changed to *mān*, but the asyndetic introduction of the apodosis remained in isolated examples in MH/MS and even in NH: *mān ŪL≈ma uṣaši † ḫar(a)kši* “If you don’t come, † you will die.” HKM 35, 8-9 (MH/MS), *mān≈at [i]jazi † lē≈at kuiški šakki* “If he does it, let no one know it” KUB 21.17 III 31-32 (Hatt. III); *takku LÚ ELLUM arauanniuš annanekuš anna(n)≈šmann≈a ūenzi † kāš takija utnē / kāš≈a takija utnēja † ŪL ḫara[tar]* “If a free man has sex with free maternal sisters and their mother – † the one (being) in one country and the other in another, † there is no crime.” KBo 6.26 III 32-34 (Laws § 191, OH/NS). Old Hittite compositions, even in NS copies, even where *mān* instead of *takku* is the “if” word, sometimes preserve this pattern: *mān≈šamaš≈šta [ēšḫar] / šijāri † apē tandukiš* “If [blood] spurts from them, † they are mortals.” KUB 31.1 + KBo 3.16 II 8-9 (OH/NS). In MH and NH compositions (*not* copies of OH texts made by post-OH scribes), on the other hand, *nu* almost always introduces the apodosis following a protasis containing *mān* “if”. In NH compositions *nu* introduces the apodosis, even when the NH author has used *takku* as conscious archaizing: *takku URU-aš NU.GÁL n≈aš≈kan šamenzi* “If there is no town, (the heir of the murdered man) shall forfeit them (i.e., the indemnifying payments)” KBo 6.4 I 13 (Laws § IV, NH).

Main clause following temporal mān clause

21. Sometimes the main clause following a subordinate temporal clause with *mān* is asyndetic: *n≈aš≈šta* ^dIM-*unni≈ma mān āššuš ēšta / †* ^{URU}NEšaš LUGAL-*uš* ^{URU}Kuššaraš LUGAL-*i a[l]šan[za](?) k[iša]t* “And when he was dear to the Storm-god, the King of Neša became ... to the King of Kuššar.” KBo 3.22, 3 (OS); *mān DUMU*^{MES} ^{URU}HATTI LÚ^{MES} *ILKI uer † ABI LUGAL aruṣanzi / nu taršikanzi* “When Hittite subjects (who were) subject to *ILKU*-tax came, they did reverence to the father of the king, and said” KBo 22.62 + KBo 6.2 III 16-17 (Laws § 55, OS).

13 Many of the above observations on asyndesis in Hittite texts were made by Hoffner 1996.

Clauses with double finite verb forms and idiomatic meaning

22. Some clauses with double finite verb forms and idiomatic meaning can be classified as asyndeton: *nu ŪL tarḫuzzi ḥāšī* “and he cannot open (it)” KUB 17.10 I 33, *nu≈za maḥḥan DINGIR^{MEŠ} ijaZZi zinnāi* “As soon as he finishes worshipping the gods.” KBo 18.15, 11-13. But I prefer to keep apart as a special phenomenon the so-called serial (or phrasal) construction, in which forms of the verbs *uḫa-* “come” and *pai-* “go” are used like auxiliary verbs. On this construction see Disterheft 1984, 222f.; Dunkel 1985; Garrett 1990, 72-74; Neu 1995; Luraghi 1997, 42-44, 1998, 313-316; Dunkel 1998; Hock 2002; van den Hout 2003; Rieken forthcoming and van den Hout forthcoming, as well as §§ 984 and following in the new Hittite grammar.

23. When there is a preceding clause, the relationship of the two clauses determines whether or not a conjunction is called for. If the subsequent of two or more juxtaposed clauses expresses the same thought in a different form, usually no conjunction is employed: *nu^{LÚ} ḥippari ḥāppar lē kuiški ieZZi † DUMU≈ŠU A. ŠÀ≈ŠU^{GIŠ} KIRI₆.GEŠTIN≈ŠU lē kuiški uāšī* “(a ḥippara-man renders feudal services;) so let no one do business with a ḥ-man: † (that is,) let no one buy his son, his land, (or) his vineyard” KBo 6.2 II 49-50 (OS); *ammuk≈ma≈za parā ḥandānza kuit UN-aš ešun † PANI DINGIR^{MEŠ} kuit parā ḥandandanni ijaḥḥaḥat † ŠA DUMU NAM.LÚ.U₁₉.LU^{UTTI} ḪUL-lu uttar UL kuḫapikki ijanun* “But because I was an upright person, † because I conducted myself in uprightness before the gods, † because I never committed the evil deeds of (other) mortals, (you, O goddess, my lady, rescued me from all harm).” Hatt. I 46-50 (NH). For another example see the first two clauses of KBo 4.8 II 12-14 cited ~~below~~ in § 8. The most common form of this repetition of the same thought in other words is when one of the two clauses is negative and the other positive (or vice versa): exx. *nu≈za LUGAL.GAL kuit † UL≈za II-an taparanza* “and because you are a Great King, not some ‘second-in-command’” KBo 18.24 I 10 (NH letter), ed. Hagenbuchner 1989, 241-242 (“kein ‘Zweitbefehlender’”); *kuiš≈ma≈at iezi apeniššuyan uttar / n≈aš^{URU} Ḫattuši ŪL ḥuiššueZZi † aki≈pa[t≈š]an* “He who does such a thing does not remain alive in Ḫatti: he dies instead.” KBo 5.3 III 30-31 (MH¹⁴/NS); *takku ŪL≈ma A.ŠÀ A.GÀR † dammel pēdan* “But if it is not cultivated ground, (that is to say) it is virgin terrain” KBo 6.4 I 11 (Laws § IVb, NH), see Hoffner 1997, 11-13.20.172f., *takku≈šši A.ŠÀ^{HLA}-uš ḥūmanza UL pianza † tepu≈šši piḫan* “If the cultivated land is not given him in (its) entirety, (that is) what is given to him is

14 Obviously, this is a treaty of Šuppiluliuma I, but it has been shown to owe its grammatical peculiarities to earlier MH treaties (Neu 1979).

partial.” KBo 6.4 IV 23-24 (Laws § XXXVIII, NH); *kī≈ma≈za* ALAM [ABU≈IA] / ^m*Tuthalijaš U[L DÜ-at]* / † *ūk«k»*¹⁵≈at ^mKÜ.GA.P[Ú-aš LUGAL.GAL] ... *ijanun* “[My father] Tuthaliija [did] not [make] this statue; I, Šuppilulijama, [Great King,] ... made it (and inscribed it with his exploits).” KBo 12.38 II 4-10, cf. comments by Güterbock 1967, 80-81¹⁶. For further examples see KBo 6.3 IV 7 cited above in § 3, and KBo 4.8 II 12-14 cited in § 8.

not §3,
but §4

24. When describing a situation by a sequence of disjointed clauses that are not intended to convey a temporal sequence, asyndeton can be used: ^{Giš}*luttāuš kam-marāš IŠBAT* † *É-er tuḫḫuiš [IŠBAT]* “Mist seized the windows; † smoke [seized] the house.” KUB 17.10 I 5 (OH/MS). Perhaps it is the relatively timeless quality of a festival-ritual description that lent itself to the extensive use of asyndeton (HE § 309b).

25. While the OH conjunction *šu* constrains a preterite tense verb, and *ta* a present or imperative, the present tense form of the *ḫar(k)*-construction in OH/OS contexts in which *ta* figures prominently usually occurs in an asyndetic construction. It never occurs with *šu*, and only once occurs in a clause introduced by *ta*. Its predilection for asyndetic clauses is to be explained by its function as a stative, which fits it admirably to serve as a kind of circumstantial clause.

Summary and Conclusions

26. Of the above categories all involve contextual factors. In this respect they resemble the criterion in Old Hittite governing the choice of sentence-connecting conjunctions *šu* and *ta*, which is the tense of the clause’s finite verb. Weitenberg was right to stress that already in Old Hittite the pre-Hittite “semantic load” of the conjunctive particles *nu*, *šu* and *ta* was lost (see above in §2). What governed the choice of each conjunction in Old Hittite was a formal criterion.

27. Throughout all periods of Hittite asyndeton marked beginnings: either beginnings of entire compositions, or beginnings of recorded speech within a narrative.

28. In OH asyndeton was appropriate and called-for to introduce the second member of a pair of clauses, one of which was subordinate to the other. In some sub-

15 Here we have a case of asyndeton, but apparently with improper gemination. In the author’s current Late Hittite spoken language the second clause would have begun with *ammuk*. In his attempt to simulate an archaic style he inaccurately wrote *ú-uk-ka* for old *ú-ga*.

16 A rare occurrence of *nu* in this usage is found in [...] *aššan ŪL ḫuīsteni nu ḫarkteni* “... you will not live: you will die.” KUB 1.16 III 37 (OH/NS).

categories (e.g., postposed *kuit* and *kuitman* clauses) this procedure continued into MH and NH. In other cases (e.g., apodosis to *mān* clauses) it did not, but was replaced by *nu* introducing the second (in this case, main) clause.

29. Asyndeton continued throughout all periods of the language to mark certain semantic or discourse elements. It signaled the fact that two consecutive clauses were intended to be synonymous (§ 23). It marked the use of *uḫa*- and *pai*- as serial (or phrasal) verbs (§ 22). And it marked a series of consecutive clauses as descriptions of synchronous events or circumstances (in the festival texts) (§ 24).

References

- Disterheft, Dorothy
1984 Non-final verbs in Hittite. KZ 97:221-227.
- Dunkel, George
1985 IE hortatory **éy*, **éyte*: Ved. *éta ... stāvāma*, Hitt. *eḫu=wa it*, Hom. εἰ δ'ἄγε. MSS 46:47-79.
1998 Back to the Future in Hittite. MSS 58:51-55.
- Friedrich, Johannes
1959 Die hethitischen Gesetze. DMOA 7. Leiden: Brill.
1960 Hethitisches Elementarbuch, 1. Teil: Kurzgefaßte Grammatik. Edited by H. Krahe. 2nd ed. Indogermanische Bibliothek. 1. Reihe: Lehr- und Handbücher. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Garrett, Andrew James
1990 The Syntax of Anatolian Pronominal Clitics. Ph.D., Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Güterbock, Hans Gustav
1967 The Hittite Conquest of Cyprus Reconsidered. JNES 26:73-81.
- Hagenbuchner, Albertine
1989 Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter. 2. Teil. THeth 16. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Hock, Hans Henrich
2002 Vedic *éta ... stāvāma*: Subordinate, coordinate, or what? Pp. 89-102 in: Indo-European Perspectives, edited by Mark R.V. Southern. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man (JIES Monogr. 43).
- Hoffmann, Inge
1984 Der Erlaß Telipinus. THeth 11. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Hoffner, Harry A., Jr.
1996 Syntactical Perspectives on the Hittite Laws (unpublished paper). In: 206th Annual Meeting of the American Oriental Society. Philadelphia, PA.
1997 The Laws of the Hittites. A Critical Edition. DMOA 23. Leiden: Brill.
- Hoffner, Harry A., Jr., and Melchert, H. Craig
forthcoming A Grammar of the Hittite Language. LANE 1. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.

- van den Hout, Theo P.J.
 2003 Studies in the Hittite Phraseological Construction I: Its Syntactic and Semantic Properties. Pp. 177-203 in: FS Hoffner, edited by G.M. Beckman, R.H. Beal and J.G. McMahon. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
 forthcoming Studies in the Hittite Phraseological Construction. II. Its Origin in *la-a-ma-an-te-et na-ak-ki-i*. *Studia Anatolica in Memoriam Erich Neu Scripta*, edited by C. Rüster, J. Catsanicos and R. Lebrun. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.
- Luraghi, Silvia
 1997 Hittite. *Languages of the World/Materials* 114. München-Newcastle: LINCOM EUROPA.
 1998 I verbi ausiliari in ittita. Pp. 299-322 in FS Ramat, edited by G. Bernini, P. Cuzzolin and P. Molinelli. Roma: Bulzoni.
- Moulton, James Hope, and Turner, Nigel
 1963 A Grammar of New Testament Greek. Vol. III: Syntax. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Neu, Erich
 1979 Zum sprachlichen Alter des Hukkana-Vertrages. KZ 93:64-84.
 1995 Futur im Hethitischen? Pp. 195-202 in: *Verba et Structurae*. Festschrift für Klaus Strunk zum 65. Geburtstag, edited by H. Hettrich, W. Hock, P.-A. Mumm and N. Oettinger. Innsbruck: Universität Innsbruck.
- Otten, Heinrich
 1958 Hethitische Totenrituale. VIO 37. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Otten, Heinrich, and Souček, Vladimír
 1969 Ein althethitisches Ritual für das Königspaar. StBoT 8. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Rieken, Elisabeth
 1999 Zur Verwendung der Konjunktion *ta* in den hethitischen Texten. MSS 59:63-88.
 2000 Die Partikeln *-a*, *-ja*, *-ma* im Althethitischen und das Akkadogramm *Ù*. Pp. 411-419 in: 125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz. Festband anlässlich des 125jährigen Bestehens der Forschungsrichtung "Indogermanistik" an der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, edited by M. Ofitsch and C. Zinko. Graz: Leykam.
 forthcoming Die periphrastischen Konstruktionen mit *pai-* 'gehen' und *uwa-* 'kommen' im Hethitischen in *la-a-ma-an-te-et na-ak-ki-i*: *Studia Anatolica in Memoriam Erich Neu Scripta*, edited by C. Rüster, J. Catsanicos and R. Lebrun. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.
- Sommer, Ferdinand
 1932 Die Aḫḫijavā-Urkunden. ABAW NF 6. München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Weitenberg, Joseph Johannes Sicco
 1992 The Use of Asyndesis and Particles in Old Hittite Simple Sentences. Pp. 305-353 in: *Per una grammatica ittita: Towards a Hittite Grammar (StMed 7)*, edited by O. Carruba. Pavia: Gianni Iuculano Editore.