

THE HITTITE PARTICLE *-PAT*¹

by Harry A. Hoffner, Jr. (New Haven)

The most thorough and reliable summary to date of the evidence for the meaning and usage of the particle *-pat* is to be found in the 1960 second revised edition of J. Friedrich's *Hethitisches Elementarbuch*². J. Friedrich attempted there to summarize the results of earlier studies by F. Sommer, A. Götze, and H. Pedersen, but regretted that "eine umfassende Untersuchung fehlt". The present study, which is affectionately and respectfully dedicated to Professor Heinrich Otten on this his 60th birthday, seeks to be "umfassend", inasmuch as therein: (1) a bibliography and (2) the results of previous studies will be summarized, (3) the question of the transcription of the cuneiform sign employed to write the particle will be re-examined, (4) the distribution of the particle will be mapped, (5) acceptable translations of the particle will be evaluated, and (6) a synthesis of the various translations will be attempted. No etymology will be proposed, since that proposed long ago by H. Pedersen has been accepted by the writer.

1. Bibliography

The order of contributions, so far as I can determine, is:

B. Hrozný, SH (1917), 37 note 2; F. Sommer, OLZ 24, 1921, 197-200; E. Tenner, HAT (1926), 101; A. Götze, Madd. (1928), 55-57; H. Ehelolf apud J. Friedrich, Staatsv., II (1930), 170; B. Hrozný, OLZ 35, 1932, 258; A. Götze, AM (1933), 207-209; A. Götze-H. Pedersen, MS (1934), 64; H. G. Güterbock, ZA 42 (1934), 222-232; H. Pedersen, ArOr 7 (1935), 80-88; H. Pedersen, Hitt. (1938), § 60; F. Sommer, HAB (1938), 68, 177, 221; A. Goetze, Tunn. (1938), 48-49; J. Friedrich, HE I (1940), § 296; E. Benveniste, Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes, I (1969), 87sqq.; H. Ounstiphout, Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica 2 (1971), 71-102 [I have this ref. courtesy of Ph. Houwink ten Cate, and have not myself had access to the article].

¹ Although the bulk of this study was completed in the U.S.A. prior to my visit to Marburg in September 1972, it was my privilege to check and augment the references in the Marburg Boğazköy Archiv, through the courtesy of the Jubilar.

² J. Friedrich, HE I (2 ed., 1960), § 293, pp. 150-151.

No fundamental reappraisal of the particle's form and function has been published since J. Friedrich's in 1940. H. G. Güterbock's 1934 study was only concerned with the proper transcription of the cuneiform sign not with the form and function of the particle regularly written with this sign.

2. Results of previous studies

The particle has been characterized as "eine identifizierende Partikel",³ "eine hervorhebende Partikel",⁴ "identifizierende und hervorhebende Partikel",⁵ and "the particle of identity".⁶ The following translations have been offered: (1) on nouns, with reference to someone or something just mentioned, German "eben, ebenfalls", English "the aforementioned", with restrictive function, German "nur", English "only", (2) on verbs: indicating repetition or duplication, German "ebenfalls", English "likewise", indicating action which represents progression, German "auch noch, weiter", English "also, even", action contrary to expectation, German "trotzdem", English "nevertheless", (3) on possessive pronouns, identifying the possessor with the subject of the clause, German "eigen", English "own", (4) on the anaphoric pronoun *apa-* German "eben, der", Latin "idem", English "that very one", (5) on attributive adjectives, in the restrictive use, German "nur", English "only".⁷ Its position within complex constructions has been described as follows. When the particle is construed with a verb + preverb, it attaches itself to the preverb.⁸ When the verb is negated, the particle will attach itself to the negating word.⁹

3. Transcription of the sign

How shall one transcribe this particle? Various conventions have been observed. Some, seeking the utmost degree of objectivity, have simply drawn or printed the sign.¹⁰ But in most publications this practice cannot be followed with convenience or economy. The problem of correct

³ F. Sommer-H. Ehelolf, *Pap.* (1924), 88.

⁴ A. Götze, *Madd.* (1928), 169.

⁵ A. Götze, *Hatt.* (1925), 128; *NBr* (1930), 85; *AM* (1933), 307; J. Friedrich, *HWb* (1952), 165.

⁶ A. Goetze, *Tunn.* (1938), 48-49.

⁷ *HE I*, § 293.

⁸ F. Sommer, *OLZ* 24, 1921, 197sq.; A. Götze, *AM* (1933), 207.

⁹ A. Götze, *AM*, 207.

¹⁰ H. G. Güterbock, *ZA* 42 (1934), 222sq. and H. Pedersen, *ArOr* 7 (1935), 80-88; A. Goetze, *Tunn.* (1938), 48-49.

transcription is particularly acute in this case, since the particle is always written with the same sign¹¹, and that sign happens to be one of the few which in the Sumero-Akkadian writing system has a very large number of possible syllabic values.

This sign (no. 69 in the sign lists of A. Deimel, R. Labat and R. Borger, no. 42 in W. von Soden-W. Röllig, *Das akkadische Syllabar*) possesses the following values in Akkadian words: *be*, *bi*, *bad/t*, *pát/t*, *b/pít*, *míd/t*, *mút*, *tíl*, *ziz/s*, *úš*, *sun*, *šum*, and *qít*.¹²

The preceding list of values does not, however, imply that all of these values are viable options for the Hittite texts. A number are extremely rare, and many are attested only in documents geographically and chronologically removed from the Hittite empire. Thus it has been determined that of this much larger list of options only the following can be expected in Hittite texts: *pád/t* and *píd/t*, and in Akkadian words from the documents composed in the Hittite language: *be*, *bad/t* and *mít*.¹³ H. G. Güterbock doubted the legitimacy of *pád/t* values in his 1934 study, but H. Pedersen in 1935 argued for *pád/t* alongside of *píd/t* in such a manner as to persuade many Hittitologists, including J. Friedrich, to retain the *a*-containing reading for the particle.¹⁴ Over the years Hittitologists have preferred various readings for the particle. Below is a tabulation of their choices, brought into conformity with the now standard transcriptional conventions of Fr. Thureau-Dangin for the Sumero-Akkadian cuneiform writing system:

-mít	B. Hrozný, <i>SH</i> (1917)
-be/-pè	F. Sommer, <i>OLZ</i> 24 (1921), 197sq., E. H. Sturtevant, <i>CGr</i> (1933), B. Hrozný, <i>SH</i> (1917), 37 note 2, E. H. Sturtevant, <i>Gl.</i> (1931) advocated either -pè or -pét
-pát	F. Sommer-H. Ehelolf, <i>Pap.</i> (1924), A. Götze, <i>Hatt.</i> (1925), H. Ehelolf apud J. Friedrich, <i>Staatsv.</i> , II (1930), 170, B. Hrozný, <i>OLZ</i> 35 (1932), H. Pedersen, <i>MS</i> (1934), H. Pedersen, <i>ArOr</i> 7 (1935), 80sq., F. Sommer, <i>HAB</i> (1938), J. Friedrich, <i>HE I</i> (1940)
-pít	J. Friedrich, <i>Staatsv.</i> , I-II (1926-30), A. Götze, <i>Madd.</i> (1928), A. Götze, <i>NBr</i> (1930), E. H. Sturtevant, <i>Gl.</i> (1931), A. Götze, <i>AM</i> (1933), A. Götze, <i>MS</i> (1934), H. G. Güterbock, <i>ZA</i> 42 (1934), 224sq., A. Goetze, <i>Tunn.</i> (1938), E. Laroche, <i>RHA</i> 23 fasc. 77 (1965).

¹¹ Possible exception once noted by H. Ehelolf apud J. Friedrich, *Staatsv.* II (1930), 170.

¹² W. von Soden and W. Röllig, *Analecta Orientalia* 42 (1967), 8-9.

¹³ E. Forrer, *BoTU I* (1922), 16, 25; H. G. Güterbock, *ZA* 42 (1934), 222sq.

¹⁴ *ArOr* 7 (1935), 80-88, cited by J. Friedrich, *HWb*, 165, with endorsement.

With the exception of E. Laroche (in RHA 23 fasc. 77) most current Hittitologists employ the reading *-pát*, whether out of conviction or convention I cannot say, but surely under the influence of J. Friedrich's grammar and glossary, which have helped to establish a nearly unanimous convention. The values *be* and *pè*, formerly advocated for the particle, cannot be assumed for the writing of Hittite words, as demonstrated already by H. G. Güterbock and H. Pedersen. Hittite scribes indicated the syllable */be/* in Hittite words by means of the sign sequence BI-*e* (i.e., *pé-e*).¹⁵ The sign seems never to have been employed in Hittite words with the syllabic value *mit*, although this value is to be applied in the reading of the Boğazköy Akkadogram *MA-MIT* (for Akkadian *māmītu*). It was noted above that in 1934 H. G. Güterbock called into question the value *pát* for this sign, and that a year later H. Pedersen defended that value. Since H. Pedersen's arguments prevailed more from the appeal to his very attractive etymology than from a thorough investigation of the evidence for the alternation of the spellings *pát* and *pa-ad/t* or *pa-d/t*..., the following remarks are proper (indeed necessary) to an investigation such as this. The following words and names, which in Hittite texts are occasionally written with the *pát* sign, can be shown from "resolved" spellings to have contained the *a* vowel:

(GI)*pattar* is written both *pát-tar* (KUB IX 6 i 11, etc.) and *pa-at-tar* (KBo VII 74 i 7).¹⁶ Both H. Pedersen's (ArOr 7 [1935], 88) and G. Neumann's (Beiträge zur Namenforschung [1955], 112–114) etymologies, which assume the *a* vocalization, are therefore still viable options. Also attested for this word is the spelling *pa-at-ta-ni* (282/t + 428/t rev 3' and 4').

The adverb *apatta/apadda* (HWb 25) "dort, dorthin, dadurch, damit, deswegen" shows in KUB VII 41 ii 67 the writing *a-pád-da*, but in the duplicate KBo X 45 ii 65 [*a-pa*]-*at-ta*, and in KBo IV I rev 12 the writing *a-pa-at-ta-ia*, but in the duplicate KUB II 2 ii 13 *a-pád-da-ia*. But cf. also *a-pi-id-d[a]* (843/v 5')! The place name ^{URU}*Ha-pát-ḫa* (15/r v 17') is also spelled ^{URU}*Ha-pa-at-ḫa* in the same text (15').

The divine name ^D*Hebad* is most frequently written in cuneiform Hittite texts as ^D*Hé-bad*, but occasionally also ^D*Hé-pa-tu-uš* (KBo XIV 133 iii 16'), ^D*Hé-pa-du-uš* (KUB XXXIII 106 i 23, ii 8, KUB IX 6+ ii 6), and ^D*Hé-pa-du-un* (KUB XXXIII 106 + 1121/v, i 22').¹⁷

It should not be necessary for me to repeat the similar evidence which H. G. Güterbock adduced in 1934 for the value *píd/t*. Both syllabic

¹⁵ Already E. Forrer, BoTU I (1922), 16; also H. Pedersen, ArOr 7 (1935), 80sqq.

¹⁶ H. Otten, ZA 55 (1962), 159; H. A. Hoffner, Jr., JCS 24 (1971), 34.

¹⁷ On this name cf. E. A. Speiser, Introduction to Hurrian, § 51, p. 41, § 77, § 82; E. Laroche, Les Noms des Hittites (1966), 346sqq.

values are justifiable for the Hittite texts. But solely on the basis of H. Pedersen's etymology the *pát* reading has been preferred. Unfortunately "resolved" spellings (signs of the consonant + vowel or vowel + consonant type) of the particle *-pat* do not appear to have been employed.

Not often is the particle *-pat* followed by still other enclitics. Even if it were possible to demonstrate from Hittite texts that the reading *be* (or *pè*) was employed in genuine Hittite words, one could show from the evidence of these cases when the particle *-pat* is followed by still more enclitics that the syllabification patterns suggest a consonantal (and especially a dental) Auslaut. Furthermore, the syllabification patterns suggests that the pronunciation of the particle may at times have been vowelless.

(1) Regarding the evidence bearing on the Auslaut: the writing *pa-ra-a-pát-za* (KUB XIII 4 ii 39) in a document of the 13th century probably proves nothing about the nature of the sound immediately preceding the *-za*. In Old and Middle Hittite texts one would find an indication of the vocalic Auslaut of the preceding morpheme in the orthography. Thus *nu-ya-az* (KUB XVII 10 i 22'), *ḫa-mi-eš-ḫi-ia-az* (KBo III 29 i 19'), *ne-ez* (KBo XII 126 i 26), *ma-a-ne-ez* (KUB XXXVI 44 iv 6'), *a-ku-e-ni-iz-za* (KBo III 29 i 19'), *nu-uz* (KBo XVII 36 iv 11'), *nu-mu-uz* (KUB XXIX 3 i 5). Contrasted with this is the writing in a late text *pé-di-za* (KBo XII 30 ii 3). The writing *me-mi-an-pát-ši* (KUB XXI 37 obv 5) might have been expected to read **be-eš-ši*, had the particle had an *e*-Auslaut.

(2) A. Götze once cited II-*uš-BE* (i.e., *-pát*)-*at* (KUB XIII 4 ii 50) as evidence in favor of the vocalic Auslaut, since according to him one should find **II-uš-pát-ta-at* or **II-uš-pa-ta-at* according to normal syllabification patterns for the morpheme sequence II-*uš-pat-at*.¹⁸ Of course, one must always allow for unusual syllabification. Such cases are not unknown elsewhere in Hittite texts.¹⁹ But if we assume that the scribe tried to follow the "rules", we can still explain the writing without recourse to a vocalic Auslaut. Suppose the scribe was attempting to write a pronounced final syllable **pt-at*? If he wrote **pát-ta-at* or **pa-ta-at*, he would imply a vowel, where he did not wish to indicate one. The vast majority of occurrences of the particle are final, where the graph *-pát* need not imply a vowel. When it was not word final, the scribes may have employed just such strange syllabifications as these to convey its vowellessness.²⁰ The same hypothesis (the vowellessness of the particle) may explain A. Götze's other examples, namely the many instances in which the particle is immediately preceded by a vowel, yet

¹⁸ A. Goetze, Tunn. (1938), 49, note 153, but hesitant because of HAB, 179.

¹⁹ F. Sommer, HAB (1938), 179.

²⁰ Compare the Latin *-pte*, one of the cognates suggested by H. Pedersen in ArOr 7 (1935), 80–88, and MS (1934), 77sqq., 196sqq. Of A. Goetze's three objections in Tunn. (1938), 48–49, the first two have been eliminated by the demonstration of the value *pát* in Hittite texts, and by my explanation in this article of the lack of doubling in the initial labial, when it is preceded by a vowel.

without the doubling of the initial labial in the particle. A. Götze argued that such cases (e.g., *a-pi-ia-pát*, *ke-e-da-ni-pát*, *ki-i-pát*, etc.) according to E. H. Sturtevant's rule suggested an etymological, if not still pronounced, voicing of the labial (i.e., **be*, **bet*). But if the scribes were trying to represent pronounced **abi-ia-pt*, **kedani-pt* and **ki-pt*, why should they be expected to write **a-pi-ia-ap-pát*, etc.? The very fact that we have not been able to identify one example of a spelling of the particle other than with the *pát/pit* sign shows how firmly entrenched was this conditioned writing. Thus the scribes did not allow for themselves the option of writing **a-pi-ia-ap-ta* to express this vowelless final cluster.

4. Distribution

Not being a sentence particle, *-pat* has no fixed position within the chain of such sentence particles as *-wa(r)*, *-aš*, *-mu*, *-za* and *-kan* (cf. J. Friedrich, HE I § 288).

If a chain of sentence particles attaches itself to any word which also carries *-pat*, *-pat* will precede the entire chain: *zi-ik-pát-ma-za* (Targ. § 8, line r1).

F. Sommer has observed that, when *-pat* is construed with a verb + preverb, it attaches itself to the preverb rather than to the verb proper. There are exceptions to this rule, which A. Götze noted, but did not explain.²¹

-pat is suffixed to the preverb in the following instances: KBo IV 14 iii 41, KBo XVI 98 ii 16, KBo V 1 obv i 14, KBo III 63 i 7'-8', KUB XVII 21 iv 6, KUB XIII 4 i 56', KUB XXIX 7+ rev 12, 18, KBo VI 4 iv 2, KBo III 4 ii 28, KUB XX 1 iii 17, KUB XXIII 11 iii 14, KUB XIV 7(+) iv 11, KBo XII 3 iii 12', 2694/c right col. 8', KUB XLIII 49, 14', Bo 291 i 8, KBo XVI 98 ii 16, 1456/u right col. 12'. Of the exceptions, three may only be apparent exceptions (KUB VI 45 i 31, KBo I 42 i 8', ABoT 7+ v 2), leaving only one which resists my explanations (*ar-ḥa ḥa-aš-pi-ir-pát*, Madd. obv 46).

In KUB VI 45 i 30-31 I would regard *ša-ra-a* not as a preverb, but rather as a postposition governing the ablative *KAxU-az* (contra A. Götze, AM 209). The EGIR-*pa e-šu-u-ya-ar* of KBo I 42 i 7'-8' is not a finite verb form, but a verbal substantive and the predicate of an implied nominal sentence: "(The Akkadian word [*tukultu* or *takaltu*]) is (equivalent to Hittite) *appa ešuyar*". Thus in line 8' the second *appa ešuyar* as a unitary predicate noun carries the *-pat* ("likewise") at the end of the unit. The situation is very similar in ABoT 7+ v 2, where the neuter plural participle *anda ḥulaliḫanda* modifying ^{GIŠ}PA.ḪI.A DINGIR-LIM bears *-pat* at the very end of the unitary participle.

A. Götze noted that, when the verb + negation construction is to be modified by *-pat*, the particle attaches itself to the negative word.²²

²¹ F. Sommer, OLZ 24, 1921, 197sq.; A. Götze, AM (1933), 207 with note 1.

²² AM, 207.

In fact, the position after the negative seems to be preferred by the particle, even when there is also a preverb present.

-pat on the negation in KUB XXI 38 ii 12-13, KBo IV 12 i 25-26, KUB XXIII 103 ii 23, KUB XIII 4 ii 5, 30, KBo XV 33 ii 20, KUB XIII 35+ ii 8, 2. Pestgebet, § 10, line 8, KUB XVIII 2 iii 5', KUB XVI 41+ iii 12'. *-pat* on the negation, even with a preverb present, in 1. Pestgebet, § 8, line 37, KUB XIV 10 i 14-15, KUB XXII 40 ii 35', KBo XV 33 ii 20'. Exceptions to A. Götze's rule regarding the negations like the exceptions to F. Sommer's rule regarding the preverbs are only apparent and can be explained by the same principle applied above. In KUB I 16 (= HAB) ii 51 and 55 the form *ḥa-an-da-a-an* is the predicate of a nominal sentence. The *-pat* here governs that predicate rather than the negated verb *le-e* (*le-e*) . . . *e-eš-du*.

These rules respecting distribution have already been noted. Yet there are still others, which are suggestive of the essential function of the particle. Since *-pat* is fundamentally a particularizing particle, it is to be expected that, when it is construed with a word and its modifiers (noun + attributive adjective, noun + genitive modifier, verb + preverb, verb + adverb, verb + negative), it will usually attach itself to that modifier, which serves to particularize or define the construction to the highest degree.

With a noun and its attributive adjective *-pat* is attached to the adjective: KUB XIV 1 obv 47; KUB XL 2 obv 25'; KUB XIX 37 iii 25'; KBo VI 29 i 7; KBo III 1 ii 31, 36; cf. also below on *apa-*, *ka-*. With a noun and its genitive modifier *-pat* is attached to the genitive: KBo IV 10 obv 13'; KBo X 16 iv 6; KBo XI 10 iii 23; KBo XV 22 + KUB XLI 3 i 17' and 21'; KUB XI 1 iv 19'-20'; KUB XVI 16 rev 14; KUB XXIII 77a rev 16'; Hatt. I 11; and in unpublished ŠA É.MEŠ-ŠU-NU-pát (VAT 7687 ii 16').

When the demonstratives *apa-* (= Lat. *is*) and *ka-* (= Lat. *hic*) are construed as attributives with a noun, the particle *-pat* is attached to the demonstrative.

With *apa-*: *apēdani-pat* UD-ti (KBo X 20 i 39; ABoT 7+ iii 1; KUB XXIX 7+ obv 58, rev 1; KUB XXX 31 iv 20, 27-28; 240/f vi 25); *apēdaš-pat* UD.KAM. ḪI.A.-aš (KBo III 1+ ii 5); *namma* ^{GIŠ}AL ^{GIŠ}MAR *apē-pat* (KUB XXXIX 35+ = 34.65; 9 i 31'); *apēni-pat* URU-ri (KUB XII 48 obv 7); *apūš-pat* GAL.ḪI.A (Bo 2701 iii? 23'); *apē[dan]i-pat ḥupruš[ḫi]* (KBo XVII 95 ii 1); *apel-pat* [. . . ḫ]uprušḫiāš (ibidem 3-4); *apūn-pat* GUD (KUB XLIII 77 i 7); *apūš-pat* DINGIR.MEŠ (KUB XXVII 16 iv 24); *apēz-pat* ^{GIŠ}zupparit (KBo XV 48 ii 24'); *apē-pat* uddār (ibidem 25'-26').

With *kā-*: *kūš-pat* DINGIR.MEŠ (IBoT I 29 rev 32', 37'); DINGIR.MEŠ-*mu-uš* *kūš-pat* (KUB X 5 vi 5'); *kūn-pat* šēnan (Bo 3286 ii 17'); *kēdani-pat* INIM-ni (KUB XV 21, 9'); *kūš-pat* yaškuš (KUB XVIII 20, 11); *kī-pat* ŠIR.ḪI.A (400/d iv 18'-19'); *kūš-pat* maršaštarraš yaškuš (KUB V 9 obv 29).

The above constructions are to be kept distinct from those in which *apā-* and *kā- + -pat* are not construed with a noun (J. Friedrich, HE I § 293a: “*apāš-pat* = ‘eben der, *idem*’”).

apāš-pat: KBo VI 2 i 19', 53', 59', ii 32'; KBo VI 4 i 13'; KBo XI 1 obv 6; KBo XVII 29 i 3'; KUB VII 5+ ii 23'; KUB XIV 1 i 19; KUB XXIV 4+ rev 13; KUB XXVII 22 i 14; KUB XXI 19+ ii 22; KUB XXXVI 127 rev 11'; KUB XXXVII 1 rev 14'; KUB XL 92 obv 7; Bo 2898 obv ii' 9; Bo 3626, 8' and 9'.

kāš-pat, *kī-pat*, etc.: KBo VI 2+ iii 43; KUB V 7 obv 8, 9, 11; KUB VI 37, 9', 13'; KUB VII 53+ iv 7'; KUB XVIII 2 ii 16'; KUB XVIII 32, 10'; KUB XXIII 103 rev 20'; Al. T. 454 i 27'. For [a]pāšila-pat see KBo XI 14 iv 21'.

When a noun is governed by a postposition, *-pat* is attached to the postposition.

With *kattan-pat*/GAM-an-pat (KUB XIX 10 i 12; KUB XIX 11 iv 41).

-pat is attached to the following adverbs.

QĀTAMMA-pat (= Hitt. *apēniššan-pat*) “in the very same manner” (German “ebenso”): KBo V 2 iv 48; KBo VI 3 iv 17; KBo X 37 iii 37; KBo XI 19 i 8'; KUB VII 41 i 8; KUB VII 53+ iii 57; KUB XV 42 ii 19; KUB XXIII 103 obv 9', rev 7'; KUB XXIX 7+ rev 15, 16; KUB XXX 31+ i 22; IBoT I 29 obv 31, rev 16', 45'.

annaz-pat “once before too(?)”: KBo VI 25+ iii 5'-6' (here there is the possibility also that *annaz* ŠĀ-az is a case of partitive apposition, on which cf. J. Friedrich, HE I § 213a, in which case *annaz* would be the ablative of *anna-* “mother”); Bo 2934 i 2 in broken context but with no mention of a woman in the context.

appaia-pat “afterwards too(?)”: IBoT I 36 iii 25 (L. Jakob-Rost, MIO 11, 1965, 193: “auch zurück”). In view of the immediately preceding EGIR-pa-ma-aš *ku-ya-pi ú-iz-zi*, perhaps *a-ap-pa-ia-pát . . . ú-iz-zi* is describing the same action, in which case (despite the odd position of the preverb in the second clause) *appaia-pat* is not really an adverb at all, but a preverb.

a-pád-da-pát: KUB XXII 70 obv 11. *a-pád-da-an-pát*: KUB XIII 35 iv 41.

apija-pat “in that same place”: KBo V 1 i 5; KBo XIII 135, 6'; KBo XV 2 i 5'; KBo XV 34 ii 20'; KUB XV 31 iii 57; KUB XXIII 72 rev 50; KBo II 2 i 13; KUB XXXVI 2 b ii 24; KUB XXXI 101, 14; KUB XII 48 obv 7; Babyloniaca 4, 1911, 227, no. 5, obv 13.

annišan-pat “already before” (German “schon früher”): Hatt. IV 7.

araḫza-pat: Bo 3192, 5.

hūdak-pat “very quickly, promptly”: KUB XXI 19+ iii 11'-12'; Bo 4007, 8'.

kā-pat “right here” (German “eben hier”): KBo III 3+ i 31; KUB XXXIV 24+ iv 24.

kinun-pat: KUB XXIII 115, 11'; KUB XXIII 103 rev 22; KUB XXII 70 rev 46; and as predicate in implied nominal sentence KBo I 44 obv 15 (vocabulary).

kinun-pat-wa: Bo 4991, 5'.

kinuna-pat: KUB I 16 iii 38.

ki-iš-ša-an-pát: KBo VIII 42 i 4'; KBo XIII 227 i 16'; KBo XVI 59 obv 6'; KBo XX 67 ii 45; KUB XXXIX 9, 13.

kiš-an-pát: KUB XII 4 iv 10; Bo 2892 i 10'-11'; Bo 6018 i 1', 4'; 611/b left col. 8'.

kuyapi-pat “precisely when”: KBo XXI 20 i 8'; “where else . . . ?” KUB XXXIII 106 ii 16 (H. G. Güterbock, JCS 6, 1952, 23).

mekki-pat marri: KUB XIII 4 iii 54 (cf. i 38', iii 17).

namma-pat: KBo X 37 iii 34; KBo XI 19 i 7', 10'; KBo XXI 14 obv 7'; KUB VII 8+ iii 14'; KUB VII 30 right col. 5', 12'; KUB XI 32 iv 12'; KUB XII 11 iv 25, 26; KUB XIV 3 i 14, ii 56; KUB XIV 20+ i 14'; KUB XV 42 iii 20; KUB XVII 18 ii 9'; KUB XXV 1 i 22', v 48; KUB XXV 48 iv 22'; KUB XXVII 55 iii 6; KUB XXXII 87 iv 18'; KUB XXXIX 12, 11'; IBoT I 29 rev 15'; Bo 2447 iv 11; Bo 2598 iii 39', iv 24, 27; Bo 2846 v' 8', 9', 10', 18'; Bo 3079 iii 11; Bo 3162 obv 3'; Bo 4809 iii 1; Bo 4869 ii 3'; Bo 5591 obv 16'; 56/s iii 24'; KBo XIX 144 iv 19'.

nūya-pat “still (kept saying) as before”: KUB XIV 3 ii 28 (F. Sommer, AU, 8).

šer-pat: KBo XVI 5+ 5' (KUB XIV 16 ii 10; AM, 42-43); ABoT 8+ iii 19'.

šuyaru-pat: KUB XXIII 85 rev 8'; KUB XXXIII 112+ ii 22; Bo 975 right col. 16'; *aru-šuyaru-pat*: KUB XXXIII 106 iii 33' (HWb, 201; H. G. Güterbock, Oriens 10, 357sq.; M. Vieyra, RA 51, 1957, 98; J. Friedrich, HWb 3. Erg.-Heft 30; R. Stefanini, Athen. 40, 1962, 3sqq.; O. Carruba, StBoT 2, 13sqq.).

uktūri-pat “always, constantly, ever”: KBo XIII 114 iv 14; KBo XVII 105 ii 23'; KUB IV 47 obv 2; KUB XLIII 22 rev 11'; Bo 2393 + Bo 5138 left edge 6; 509/d iii 9'.

5. Translations

A. “the same, the aforementioned”

Quite frequently the particle *-pat* calls attention to a previous mention of the object or the action.²³ When the particle is attached to a noun or attributive adjective, it is best translated in English as “the same, the aforementioned”. When it is attached either to a verb or to the predicate noun or adjective, one may wish rather to translate it “likewise”. The fundamental significance of the particle, however, remains in these cases the same.

With nouns we may cite the following.

“When a slave has stolen, and his lord/owner says: ‘I will make the compensation in his behalf’, he shall make the compensation.” *takku mimmai-ma nu* 1R-an-pat *šūyizzi* “But if he (the owner) refuses, he forfeits the aforementioned slave” (Hittite Laws § 95). *nu-kan* 1Uḫḫa-LÜ-iš *aruni anda* BA.UG₆ DUMU.MEŠ-ŠUNU-ma-za *arḫa šarrandat nu-kan* I-aš ŠĀ A.AB.BA-pat (= *aruni-pat anda*,

²³ Already F. Sommer, OLZ 24, 1921, 197sqq.

or *aruni anda-pat*?) *ešta I-aš-ma-kan arunaz arḥa uit* "Uḥaziti died in the midst of the sea (i.e. on an island). His sons parted from one another. One remained on the aforementioned island, while the other left the sea" (KBo III 4 ii 52sq.; AM, 60sq.; HE I, § 293a; R. Stefanini, Puduḥepa, 54sq.).

In these sample cases the function of the particle of taking note of a previous mention is especially clear, because the very same Hittite word(s) is/are repeated: *İR* and *aruni anda*. Further clear instances, where the wording is identical, are:

KUB XL 2 obv 13-14; KBo XVII 74 iii 23-24; KBo X 20 i 4, 5, 10 with KUB XXX 39 obv 8; KBo XV 37 iii 27, 31, 36; KBo XV 69 i 9, 13, 20; KUB XXVII 1 i 20, 22; KBo XVII 105 iii 33, 34; KBo XIII 164 iv 10, 11; KUB VII 5 ii 7, 15, 16; KUB XXXI 84 iii 60, 64; KUB XXIII 77, 59, 60; KUB XXIII 1 ii 28a, 29; KUB XIV 20 18, 22; KBo IV 4 iv 12, 16; KBo III 4 iv 36, 37; Kup. § 13 C 7-C 8; KBo III 34+ ii 17, 19; *ibidem* 10, 11; etc.

In other passages the very same wording is not repeated with *-pat*, but the translation „the aforementioned” seems required:

ku-uš-pát DINGIR.MEŠ (IBoT I 29 rev 37', cf. also rev 32').

Requiring a translation "the same" are: *pedi-pat* (KUB XIX 9 i 15') and *pētan-pat* (IBoT I 36 iii 14).

Also permitting or requiring the translation "the aforementioned" are the many passages, in which *-pat* is attached to the adjective *ḫūmant-*: "each (or 'all') of the aforementioned" KBo XIX 128 iii 11; KUB XXXIX 9 obv 12; Hittite Laws § 56; KUB XXVI 1 iii 13; KUB XIX 5 obv 10, 11; KBo VI 29++ ii 17; Hatt. I 11, IV 72.

Often indistinguishable from the above-cited usages translated "the aforementioned" are passages from the lexical texts, in which the repeated Hittite entry is marked with *-pat*. I have preferred to treat these as predicates of nominal sentences and to translate them with English "(is to be translated) also/likewise . . ." (see KBo I 42 ii 16', 18', 42', KBo I 52 i 16).²⁴ When the particle is attached to a number, one often finds that the same number has appeared a few lines prior. Thus the significance of the particle is still essentially the same as in the passages cited above, where we chose to translate "the aforementioned". With the numerical idiom, however, the translation "aforementioned" is awkward in English. In many cases one can employ the words "the same . . . times":

nu akūyanna III-ŠU pianzi nu III-ŠU-pat apel ZI-ŠU akūyanzi (KUB XXX 15 + XXXIX 19 obv 19); *nu-mu LÚ.MEŠ URUUL-ma MÈ-ia me-na-aḥ-ḥa-an-da II-ŠU a-ū-ir na-aš II-ŠU-pát ḫu-ul-li-ia-nu-un* (KBo X 2 i 34-35); possibly in broken context of KBo XVII 83+ iii 5'-7'.

²⁴ F. Sommer, OLZ 24, 1921, 197sq.; H. G. Güterbock, JCS 6 (1952), 35.

Other occurrences with numerical expressions must be differently translated:

nu-uš II-i-la-pát ša-ku-ya-an-zi "they will (punish in some manner) the both of them"; *ták-ku te-ez-zi II-pát ak-kán-du* "if (the husband) says: 'Let both of them die!'" (Hittite Laws § 198); *kuiš-ma-an epzi n-an munḫāzzi n-an LUGAL-an aška UL uyatezzi n-uš-at II-aš-pat SAG.DU-aš UG-tar II-uš-pat-at akkandu* "whoever seizes him, harbors him, and does not bring him to the king's gate, it is a capital crime for the both of them, both of them shall die" (KUB XIII 4 ii 48-50); "the cliff Kuruštama (is) very steep, . . .] furthermore on this side and that side it (is) [very high and rugged], and the road does not suffice on it" *I-e-da-az-pát [ša-ra-a pé-en-nu-ma-an-zi]* "[to drive?/proceed? up], not even single file!" (KBo XIV 20 ii 12-15); "then such a person, whether man or woman, performs the ritual of uncleanness as follows (some call it 'the ritual of the river', but this ritual is one and the same)" (KUB VII 53+ i 8-10; Tunn., 5: "and this is just one ritual"); "whatever kind of defilement occurs" *na-at I-EN-pát a-ni-u-ur* "it is one and the same ritual (which they perform), and the men of Lalupija perform] this ritual" (KUB VII 29 i 2-4); fragmentary context in KUB XVII 27 iii 10; *nu NINDA. KUR₄.RA.ḪIA III-uš-pát QA-TAM-MA pár-ši-an-zi* "they break apart the same three loaves of bread in the same manner" (KBo XXI 85 i 47'-48').

B. "only"

Also exceedingly common are the passages, in which the particle imparts a restrictive or exclusive meaning. In most cases this thought is best translated into English by means of the word "only".

The restrictive use of *-pat* is particularly frequent in legalistic texts (laws, instructions, treaties), in which the precise limits of obligation and liability must be drawn. The loyalty of the vassal king must be to the reigning Hittite emperor only and to the crown prince which he himself designates:

KUB XXVI 1 i 16, 24; KUB XXVI 12 i 17-18; KUB XXI 42 iv 19, 21; KBo V 3++ i 8, 15, 31, 32; KUB XXI 106++ iii 10-11; KUB XXVI 32 ii 6; etc.

Likewise in the treaties the Hittite emperor guarantees the throne and its succession to the vassal and his designated heir: KBo IV 10 rev 24-25, obv 11, 13.

In the treaty between Zidanza and Pillija of Kizzuwatna the allotment of cities between the two powers is made quite precise by means of *-pat*: *n-e ŠA DUTU-ŠI-pat ašantu* "let these (cities) belong exclusively to His Majesty" and *n-e Pillijaš-pat a[šantu]* "let these b[elong] exclusively to Pillija!" (KUB XXXVI 108 obv 4-5).²⁵ The precise limits of Madduqatta's feudal holding are expressed with the words: "I have given to you the mountain land of Zippašlā"

²⁵ H. Otten, JCS 5 (1951), 129sq.; H. G. Güterbock, Journal of World History 2 (1954), 385 note 17; A. Goetze, JCS 11 (1957), 72sq.; O. R. Gurney, CAH, fasc. 44 (1966), 5, 14-15.

nu-ya-za apūn-pat eši "occupy only it!" (KUB XIV 1 obv 19). Hattušili I instructs his adopted son, Muršili I, that in all serious legal matters *nu* EME-[aš-a] EGIR-*pa pangayī-pat* [u]aḥanza ešdu "let the matter be turned over only to the pankuš!" (KUB I 16 iii 61-62).

The limits of liability are often described thereby:

nu SAG.DU-*az-pat šarnikdu* "let him pay with his (own) person only, (but let no one harm his house or his children)!" (2 BoTU 23 A ii 55-56); "formerly they used to pay six shekels of silver; the injured person would take three shekels, and they would take three shekels for the palace; but now the king as waived the share of the palace, *nu-za hūninkanza-pat* III GÍN.KÜ.BABBAR *dāi* "and only the injured person takes three shekels of silver" (Hittite Laws § 9); "if the slave of a Luḫian someone steals from the land of Luḫija and transports him to the land of Hatti, and his own recognizes him, *nu-za ĪR-ŠŪ-pat dāi šarnikzil* NU.GÁL "he shall take only his slave, there will be no compensation" (Hittite Laws § 21); "if (a head of domestic livestock) strays into another man's corral or fold, and its owner finds it", *n-an-za šakuyaššaran-pat d[āi]* LÚ.NÍ.ZU-*an UL epzi* "he may take what is rightfully his, but he may not have him arrested as a thief" (Hittite Laws § 66); other *šakuyaššar(an)-pat* passages, where an additional fine is levied are Hittite Laws §§ 70, 94, 95;

In the Telepinu Proclamation the restrictions as to which persons qualify for succession to the throne make good use of *-pat*:

LUGAL-*uš-šan hantezziāš-pat* DUMU.LUGAL DUMU-RU *kikkittaru* "let only a first-rank prince, a son, become the king!" (2 BoTU 23A ii 36).

In the protocol text KUB XXXI 100, which among other matters deals with the disposition of the king's wastes, *-pat* restricts the location of such wastes to the "great *huššili*":

[n]-*ašta* [haš]šuš *katta šallāi huššili-pa*[t pāiddu] "let the [ki]ng [go?] down (to relieve himself) only to the great *huššili*!" (KUB XXXI 100 rev 10; cf. H. G. Güterbock, Oriens 10 [1956], 353, and N. van Brock, RHA 71, 127).

In Hittite Laws §§ 166-167 the particle specifies which of the two claimants for a disputed stretch of cultivated land may reap it:

Ū A.ŠĀ-LAM *karū-pat kuiš šūniet t-az apaš dāi/warašzi* "and only he who sowed it first may take/reap it for himself".

Similarly the particle specifies the proper heir of a deceased person's estate:

mān ŠA É.NA₄-ma hinkanaš yaštul kuiški yaštai n-aš aki É-ŠŪ-ma-ši ŠA É.NA₄-pat ... parā-ma-kan DUMU.NITA DUMU.MÍ AŠŠUM É.GE₄.A-TIM LÚandaijandanni-ja *lē kuiški pāi* "if someone commits a mortal sin against the 'stone house', and he is executed, his estate shall belong exclusively to the 'stone house'; ... let no one give it away to son or daughter to be used as a gift to the daughter-in-law or son-in-law!" (KUB XIII 8, 11-15).

Exceedingly common in the oracle inquiries is the use of *-pat* to eliminate all possible causes for divine wrath other than the one under consideration (HE I § 293d):

BE-*an ki-i-pāt* KLIMIN *nu* MUŠEN *HUR-RI* SIG₅-*ru*, "if this and only this 'ditto' (i.e., 'is the cause of the god's wrath against us'), then let the MUŠEN *HURRI* omen-taking be favorable!" (Al. T. 454 i 16, ii 12, 24; cf. i 27, where in addition one reads *namma-ma GUR-i UL kui[tki]* "and there is noth[ing] else in addition").

Other passages not to be grouped together as representing a single type but containing sentences, in which *-pat* exhibits its familiar restrictive use, are:

KUB XXXII 115+++ iii 43 (= other vers. KBo II 3 ii 53); KUB VII 5 iv 18; IBoT I 30, 2-3; KUB XXIV 1 i 16, 18, 26, ii 2, 6, 9, 12; KUB XVII 21 i 1, 3, 4, 6; KBo V 6 (Deeds, frag. 28, A) ii 9; Kup. § 10 (C 38); KBo III 4 i 21 (AM, 20-23, and O. R. Gurney, The Hittites, 173-174); KUB IV 3+ obv 14; KUB XXIV 7 ii 10; KUB VII 53 + XII 58 (= Tunn.) i 10, iv 44; 2. Pestgebet § 5, line 3; KBo III 21 iii 8; Ullik., 1. tablet, A iv 6sq.; KUB XXXIII 121 ii 6 (ZA 49 [1950], 234sq.); KUB XIX 37 iii 25; KUB XIV 1 obv 51, 52; KUB XL 1 obv 21-22; KUB XIII 4 i 35, ii 69; KBo X 2 i 26.

C. "likewise, also"

Occasionally one meets a usage of *-pat*, where the particle marks a substantive as representing "another of the same kind":

nu ABU-ŠU *kuēl yaštai katta-ma* DUMU-ŠU *UL yašdulaš-pat* "someone's father sins, but his son is not also likewise a party to the sin" (Kup. § 7, C 15). And, if F. Sommer's restorations are correct, we might have another example in KUB I 16 ii 39: [DINGIR-L]IM-iš UR.MAḤ-aš *pedi* UR.[MAḤ-an-pat *tittanuzi*] "[the g]od [will install only/another] li[on] in the place of the (deceased) lion". Cf. also KBo III 4 ii 78; KUB XXIII 103 obv 25.

When a verbal phrase is repeated, and the speaker/writer wishes to call attention to the repetition, he may affix *-pat* to the second occurrence to the verb. And, although this is simply the verbal equivalent of the usage noted above with substantives, one cannot translate into English smoothly as "the aforementioned", but must use "likewise":

ug-ya pāun-pat (KUB XIV 3 ii 20, where F. Sommer translates: "Ich aber bin, wie gesagt, losgezogen"); *arḫa hašpir ... arḫa hašpir-pat* (KUB XIV 1 i 47-48); *parā UL arnutteni ... parā-pat UL arnutteni* (KUB XIII 4 i 51, 56); *tarneškizzi ... tarneškizdu-pat* (KUB XIII 4 iii 22-23); *warapdu ... waraptu-pat* (KUB XIII 4 iii 72, 75-77); *appa parkunuzi ... appa-pat parkunuzi* (Hittite Laws, Parallel series § XXXIV); *lahḫi kattan [i]āntat ... kattan lahḫi iāntat-pat* (KBo V 8 iv 7'-8'); *ešir ... ešir-pat* (KUB XIX 37 iii 39'-40'); *epzi ... epzi-pat* (KUB XXVII 59 i 25, 28); *pāun ... pāun-pat* (KBo XVI 8 i 7', 10'); *duyarneskimi ...*

duyarnahhi-pat (Bo 1966, 15', 18'); *ŠUM-ŠU halzi[...]* ... *namma-pat ŠUM-ŠU halzi[...]* (KBo XXI 14, 6'-7'); *yalahen ... yalhanniškitten-pat* (KUB XXIII 72 rev 28); *HA.LA-ŠUNU azzikkanzi ... HA.LA.MEŠ-ŠU-ma azzikkanzi-pat* (KBo III 5+ i 60-62); *EGIR-pa-ma-aš ... uizzi ... appa-ia-pat ... uizzi* (IBoT I 36 iii 24-26); *LÚSANGA ... hāni ... LÚSANGA-ma ... haniškirizzi-pat* (KBo XV 37 iv 47-49, v 8-9).

But one can also use the English word "also" to translate Hittite predicates marked with *-pat*, where the second action is no repetition of the first, but a new and additional action. While in the examples adduced above the particle could be translated by German "ebenfalls", in those which follow one would have to employ German "auch noch".

nu-mu huḫappir nu-mu arpašatta-pat "they maligned me, and in addition [auch noch] bad luck befell me" (Hatt. I 35); "when I, Tudḫaliya, the great king, arrived in the land of Ḫatti, the enemy troops f[led]" *namma-an-zan EGIR-anda-pat IŠBAT* "but I! furthermore set out after him still again [auch noch]" (KUB XXIII 11 ii 12-14); "and, when my father had become a god, my brother, Arnuanda, seated himself on the throne of his father", *EGIR-an-ma-aš irmaliyat-tal-pat* "but afterwards he also [auch noch] became (deathly) ill" (KBo III 4 i 4sqq.; HE I § 293c); "if from the palace they give to (some)one silver, gold, garments, bronze utensils as a gift for him, let it be named: 'The king gave it to him', and however much is its weight" *n-at ijan-pat ešdu* "let that also [auch noch] be recorded [literally: 'made']" (KUB XIII 4 ii 39-42); *apēdani mekki ŠĀ-er DINGIR-LIM-za piian-pat* "to him by the god much courage (literally: 'heart') has been given in addition" (KUB I 16 ii 38); "if a tenant farmer (Hitt. *arnuḫalaš*) leaves the land, for him who remains in his place" *nu-ši NUMUN. HA.A aniya-pat* "sow seeds in addition (i.e., give the one who remains an extra share of seed grain?)" (KUB XIII 2 iii 38-40); "that my son (is) noble; he breaks of the soil, plows, irrigates", *halkin-a [DÜ?-zi]-pat* "and even (auch noch) [produces] the grain" (VBoT 58 i 29-31); "when he is executed, he does not die alone", *MĀŠ-ŠU-ma-ši tettiian-pat* "his family is also (auch noch) associated with him (in the death penalty)" (KUB XIII 4 i 33); "when it became spring, I reviewed the troops at the Red River", *namma tuzziyaš-miš huittiianun-pat* "furthermore my troops I also drew up" (KBo II 5 ii 1-3); *man INA URUḪajaša pāun-pat* "I would have also proceeded into Ḫajaša, (but the year was too short)" (KBo IV 4 iii 22-23); *namma apēdani MU-ti INA KUR Arzaya ianniianun-pat* "furthermore in that year I traveled also into the land of Arzaya" (KBo III 4 ii 8-9); *namma URU Kaškaš uit-pat* "furthermore the Kaška city also came" (KBo III 4 i 31).

D. "although . . . , nevertheless . . ."

The particle was also employed to mark the verb in either the protasis or apodosis of sentences of the type "although . . . , nevertheless . . .":

nu-za-kan irmalaš-pat ŠA DINGIR-LIM ḫandandatar šer uškinun "although I was ill, nevertheless I kept seeing the divine power of the deity" (Hatt. I 44-45);

nu-kan aši memiian arḫa-pat paškuyanun ... nu-mu uit aši memiiaš tešḫaniškiyan tiyat "although I had completely forgotten that matter, . . . that matter came back and began to appear in my dreams" (KUB XII 27 i 5-7); *nu-za mān irmalanza-ša ešta DUTU-ŠI-ma-ta [ANA] AŠAR ABI-KA tittanun-pat* "although you were also ill, nevertheless I, His Majesty, installed you [in] the place of your father" (Dupps. § 7, lines 16sqq.).

E. "even"

Similar in that a result contrary to expectation is portrayed are those sentences, which are of a different grammatical structure from the above, where *-pat* may be translated "even":

LÚ.MEŠ ḫappinanteš-pat UL ašiyanteškantari "do not even the rich become poor?" (KBo IV 14 ii 52-53); *nu-mu kappin-pat DUMU-an DIŠTAR URUŠamuḫa ANA ABU-IA ūekta* "even when I was but a small child, Ishtar of Šamuḫa requested me from my father" (KBo VI 29 i 7-8).

kuin-ma-za LÚ-an LÚ.GURUŠ-an-pat ḫarnikta "even the man who is robust you have destroyed" (KUB XXIV 7 ii 4; cf. C. G. von Brandenstein, OrNS 8 [1939], 74-75: "und gar einen starken Mann"); *nu-ši-kan KASKAL-aš I-edaz-pat [šarā pennumanzi?] UL kišat* "and the road does not suffice on it [to drive/proceed up], not even single file!" (KBo XIV 20 ii 12-15; cf. above; Ph. Houwink ten Cate, JNES 25 [1966], 182, prefers: "and merely on one side there was a road [to the top . . .] was impossible"); *[ḫan]tezzin-pat auriyaš URU-an ūalḫuyani ... ūeš-a EGIR-pa takšulaš-pat URU-an ūalḫ[uyani]* "we will attack even a first-rank border city . . . we [will] also attack even a city allied (with us?)" (KUB XXIII 77a+ rev 15'-16'; E. von Schuler, Die Kaškaer [1965], 124: "sogar eine Stadt"); *EN-IA-pat kuḫapi URUAnkuḫa ištarkit* "even when my lord became ill in Ankuḫa, (at that time they had already defected)" (KUB XIX 23 rev 12'-13'); "a *LÚMEŠEDI* [may not go forth through] the gate whenever he wishes; when even urine presses him (*mān-an-za-kan šēḫunanza-pat tamāšzi*), . . . he must say to the *LÚMEŠEDI* who stands before him . . ." (IBoT I 36 i 33-35; L. Rost, MIO 11 [1966], 177: "wenn ihn gerade der Urin drückt"); *n-uš kappuḫayar-pat UL [kišari]* "even the counting of them [is] im[possible]" (KUB VIII 67, 12-13); *nu šallaš-pat ḫaššannaš ešḫar pangariḫattati* "(now) blood(shed) even of the 'Great Family' has become common" (KBo III 1 ii 31; E. Neu, StBoT 5 [1968], 135: "die Bluttat gerade der großen Familie");

A remarkable pair of instances, in which the translation "even" fits well, characterizes the introduction to proverbs or sayings, when they occur imbedded in the royal prayers of the queen Puduḫepa:

ANA DUMU.NAM.LÚ.ULULU-pat-kan anda memian kišan memiškanti (KUB XXI 27 ii 15), which I would translate: "even among mankind they are in the habit of speaking a word as follows" (contra A. Goetze, ANET, 1955, 393); *mān UN-aš-pat atti anni DUMU-an šallanuzi* "if even a man (i.e., merely on the human level) raises a child for (its) father (and) mother (and the father and

mother do not pay him the fee of the child-custodian, would he be happy?)” (KUB XIV 7 iv 11–14; cf. F. Sommer, HAB [1938], 73, A. Archi, SMEA 14 [1971], 196 note 37).

In both of these instances the queen cites a human precedent and by means of the particle *-pat* implies that, if this rule is valid on a merely human level, it should be much more so on the divine.

F. “surely”

Particularly common, when the particle is attached to volitional verb forms (imperatives and present-future forms in volitional context), is the meaning conveyed by English “surely”.

[*nu-kan ANA URU.Ne*]rik šer aggallu-pat “I would surely/even die for [the city of Ne]rik” (KUB XXI 19 + 1193/u iii 35; C. Kühne-H. Otten, StBoT 16 [1971], 41 note 80); *n-aš-ši-aš-kan EGIR-an-pat* [...] *parā ANA BURU_x halkin pāi* “he must surely give back to him the grain at the following harvest” (Bo 2628++ i 30–31; H. Otten-Vl. Souček, StBoT 1 [1965], 30sq.); *nu parā-pat nanništen n-at parā lē kuyapikki ijatteni* (KUB XXXI 101, 21–23); *n-at akkandu-pat* (KBo XVI 25 i 14; cf. iii 9, 12); *n-aš aku-pat* (KUB XIII 7 i 20, 23); *n-aš tarnieškiddu-pat* (KUB XIII 4 iii 23); *paiddu-pat* (KUB XIII 4 iii 24, 29); *lē-pat tezzi* (ibidem 25); *lē-pat ešzi* (ibidem 33); DINGIR-LIM-ni-ma-at ešzi-pat “rather it is surely (that which belongs) to the god” (ibidem ii 35); *n-aš QADU NUMUN-ŠU harakzi* (ibidem iii 51–52; cf. 53); “the territory, which the enemies plundered and kept for themselves, when they invaded the Hatti country”, *šumāš ANA DINGIR.MEŠ memiškiuyani-pat nu-šmaš-šan DĪNAM arnuškiuyani* “that (territory) we solemnly promise (to restore) to you and to make them account for it” (KUB XVII 21 ii 4–7; ANET, 399 with improvements); “the Assyrian king used to say” *ijami-man-pat-ya kuitki* “I surely would like to do something!” (KUB XXIII 103 rev 12sq.; edit. by H. Otten, AfO 19, 42; suggested interpretation already by H. G. Güterbock, OrNS 12 [1943], 154 on § 276).

G. “very”

It would appear that in two passages, in which *-pat* is attached to an adjective, a translation “very” is required.

[*ANA ABI-KA-ma-ya?*] ERĪN.MEŠ ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ mekki-pat ešta “[your father ha]d very many troops and horses” (KUB XIX 29 iv 19–20; AM, 18–21); “if there is a certain matter”, [*na*]šma-aš kuništaiaš-pat kuitki [*naš*]ma-aš ŠA MĪ-TI “and either it is very confidential? or it is concerning a woman” (KUB XXVI 1 iv 11–13, § 30). The translation fits these two passages quite well. In addition one could cite other passages, in which the translation “very” is possible, but perhaps not so plausible as in the above: *kappin-pat DUMU-an* “very small child” (KBo VI 29 i 7); *kappuyanteš-pat* ... *antuššeš* “very few men” (KUB XIX 37 iii 25’); URU.DIDLİ.ĪA-ŠUNU-ia karūliuš-pat “their very old cities” (KUB XL 2 obv 25’); *hantezziiaš-pat DUMU.LUGAL* “the very first (i.e., oldest) prince” (KBo III 1 ii 36).

H. “himself, herself, itself”

When the particle is attached to proper names, it can occasionally be translated „himself, herself, itself”, German “selbst”.

URU.Hattuši-pat “in Hattuša itself” (KUB I 16 ii 68–69; KBo VI 2 i 39’ = Hittite Laws § 19b; 1015/u obv 3’); ¹Pittagatalli-pat “Pittagatalli himself” (KBo V 8 iii 15; AM, 156–157, cf. also line 31); ¹Taḡagalayaš-pat “Taḡagalayaš himself” (KUB XIV 3 i 71).

J. “own”

With the possessive pronouns *-pat* corresponds to English “(his/her/its) own”, German “eigen” (HE I, § 293b).

apēl-pat annaš-šaš katta “with his own mother” (Hittite Laws § 189); SAG.DU-KA-pat “your own head” (Huqq. § 12, line 19); *tuēl-pat Ekarimmi* (KUB XXX 19++ iv 5; H. Otten, HTR 44sq.); *apēl-pat mīiaš* (KUB XXX 36 ii 10, 12); SAG.DU-ŠŪ-pat (KUB XII 34 + XV 39 i 21); *ŠUM-an-a tuēl-pat ŠA DINGIR-LAM* (KBo IV 6 i 19–20); *tuēl-pat GUL-ašša* (KBo III 21 ii 3–4); *E-ŠŪ-pat* (Hittite Laws § 51, line 4); *tuēkkanza-šiš-pat* (Hittite Laws § 49, line 54); *šumenzan-pat* (KBo XVI 25 i 44; KBo VIII 35 ii 20’, 21’); *IŠTU NĪ.TE-IA-pat* (KUB XIX 9 ii 8’); *apēl-pat UZU.Ī* (KBo IV 4 ii 2, 12–13; AM 112sq.).

K. With distributives

When the particle is attached to distributive expressions, it is not at all clear how it should be translated; cf. HE I, § 64c.

UD-at UD-at-pāt (KUB I 13++ iii 7); KASKAL-ši KASKAL-ši-pāt (KUB I 13++ ii 52; KBo III 5+ i 54, ii 3, 14, 45, iii 24, 59; KUB I 11 + XXIX 57 iii 18). A. Kammenhuber, Hippologia Hethitica, 1961, 269 and 343 s. v. *-pat*, who notes this construction, offers no suggestion as to how the distributives accompanied by *-pat* differ in meaning from those without it.

L. With negation

When the particle governs an assertion which is negated, whether the particle itself is attached to the negating word or to the predicate, one ought to translate “not at all” (German “gar nicht”), i.e., a strengthened negative.

kušduyāta lē ḫandān-pat (KUB I 16 ii 51; cf. line 55); *lē-pat kuitki memai* (KUB I 16 ii 62); *lē-pat zaluganumi* (KUB XXI 38 i 37); *UL-pat ija[nun]* (KUB XXI 38 ii 13); *UL-pat karuššiianun* (KBo IV 12 obv 26); *UL-pat ḫaḫnunun* (KUB XXI 17 ii 10); *lē-pat tamaiš šarratta* (KUB XIII 4 ii 5); *lē-pat ijatteni* (KUB XIII 4 ii 70–71); *lē-pat dālai* (KUB XXVI 17 ii 7’); *UL-pat peḫḫi* (KUB XIII 35+ ii 8);

EGIR-an *arḫa UL-pat dāi* (1. Pestgebet, § 8*, line 37 (25); *arḫa UL-pat taruḫtari* (2. Pestgebet, § 1, line 5; A. Götze: "noch immer nicht"); *UL-pat ʾaršiḫattari* (2. Pestgebet, § 10*, line 8; A. Götze: "ist . . . trotzdem (noch) nicht besänftigt"); *parā UL-pat pedanzi* (KBo XV 33 ii 20).

6. Synthesis

The passages cited in the preceding pages have been classified according to English words used to translate the particle. This is, of course, an outside standard imposed by one whose native language is not Hittite. Doubtless to the native speakers of Hittite usages which I have kept apart would have appeared the same.

Furthermore, one is able to see how one proposed English or German translation relates to the others, so that many of the various different words used to translate *-pat* all spring from a single shared and fundamental significance. The following translations have been proposed for *-pat*:

- (1) "the same, the aforementioned".
- (2) "only",
- (3) "likewise, also",
- (4) "although . . . , nevertheless",
- (5) "even",
- (6) "surely",
- (7) "very",
- (8) "self",
- (9) "own",
- (10) "at all".

It does not seem possible to me to unify all of these shades of meaning and trace them to a single origin. But some are only variations of others. In many of its uses *-pat* seek to impart precision, it specifies exactly. It was noted above that the distribution of the particle syntactically suggested such a function, in that it tended to be localized on that member of a complex phrase which most narrowly defines the whole. One can easily see how from the particularizing function a restrictive force might arise! "It is this king to whom you must give your allegiance and only to this one!" Similarly, use (1) follows as a particularization to relieve the ambiguity of several mentions of a "slave" (Hittite Laws § 95); the slave mentioned in the second instance

is in fact the very one mentioned earlier. In usage (9) the particle particularizes in order to eliminate the ambiguity of the possessive pronoun. The possessor is in fact the same person as the subject of the sentence. Usage (8) is only an extension of usage (2), for, when we say "Taḫagalaya himself did this", we mean "only T.", "T. and no one else". The concept of similarity or repetition links usages (1) and (3). Thus we have been able to link together usages (1), (2), (3), (8), and (9). A second group, which can be related together, are usages (6), (7), and (10). Here the particle functions to heighten in degree or in intensity. One could even derive (6) and (10) after a fashion from (2). *aku-pat* "he must surely die" and *lē-pat iḫatteni* "you shall not do (it)" are quite exclusive. The speaker allows no qualification or alteration of his command. "He must surely die" means "under no circumstances may he be allowed to live".

Usages (4) and (5) share the notion of an affirmation of a state contrary to expectation. How this is related to the particularizing (or even the intensifying) function of *-pat* is not clear.