

THE PARTICLE *-a* AND ITS USAGE  
WITH RESPECT TO THE PERSONAL PRONOUN

by Philo H. J. Houwink ten Cate (Amsterdam)

A casual remark made by Professors H. Otten and V. Souček in their highly important edition of the Old Hittite ritual for the Royal couple (CTH no. 416 = StBoT 8, 1969) — actually a turning-point in Hittite studies — reads as follows: „Mit enklitischem *-a* ‚und‘, meist in adversativem Sinne ‚aber‘ gebraucht, erscheint *ú-ga* am Satzanfang; es dient zur Hervorhebung des Subjektes und kennzeichnet so häufig einen Subjektswechsel (vgl. I 7, II 20, 31, III 29, 38).“<sup>1</sup> With respect to *ú-ug-ga* the authors remark that it is specifically used in the meaning “and I”, continuing thereafter in the note 3: „Ob diese Schreibung eine funktionelle Besonderheit andeutet, ist hier nicht zu klären.“<sup>2</sup>

Elsewhere I have already elaborated upon this remarkable observation which is eminently justified: the difference in spelling is indeed functional and serves to distinguish between two different grammatical items, an emphatic or adversative particle on the one hand and the well-known conjunction *-a/-ya* on the other.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, the distinction admits to a wider applicability, since in texts in ‘Old Hittite script’ but also in later manuscripts from the Early Empire period a clear difference may be observed between a particle *-a*<sup>4</sup> with emphatic or adversative function and the well-known conjunction. In by far the majority of cases the latter effects a doubling of the preceding consonant while the former does not

<sup>1</sup> Cf. StBoT 8, 1969, p. 68.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. StBoT 8, 1969, ibidem.

<sup>3</sup> Acta Orientalia Neerlandica, 1971, pp. 37–42.

<sup>4</sup> J. Friedrich was the first to realize that in some instances an adversative meaning should be ascribed to the conjunction, cf. Staatsv. I, p. 177; see, too, E. Tenner, KfI I 3, 1930, pp. 388–389 and F. Sommer HAB, p. 93. But in a sense these scholars were anticipated by B. Hrozný (cf. note 105).

(henceforward I shall refer to the conjunction as *...a/-ya* in order to keep it distinct from the particle *-a*).<sup>5</sup> At the end of my earlier, provisional treatment I undertook the obligation to present elsewhere a full explanation of both this emphatic particle *-a* and of its usage with respect to the personal pronoun. I hope it may seem a fitting tribute to Professor H. Otten's exceedingly important merits for Anatolian studies, when I change my plans for a publication elsewhere in order to offer this paper as my personal contribution for this volume compiled by his many pupils and other admirers!

1. My treatment will be frequently interrupted in order to establish a particular point with the help of a paradigm, but I trust the general line of reasoning will be clear and convincing nevertheless. Paradigm 1 contrasts examples of the particle with others of the conjunction. Both groups of examples are chosen from large manuscripts in 'Old script' as well as from texts dating to the beginning of the Empire period. With respect to the latter I have applied a subdivision between those about which date a consensus has been reached and those which are still disputed.<sup>6</sup> For a reason which will become clear from the sequel of my treatment I omit examples where the particle or the conjunction<sup>7</sup> are followed by other enclitics. Writings of a logogram followed by *-sa* or *-na* seem to be indifferent and may conceal both the particle and the conjunction.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Is it possible that H. Pedersen was right, when he wrote on the Hier.-Luwian conjunction *-ha*: „Wenn sie *-ha* gelesen wird, läßt sie sich mit dem keilschriftlichen *-a* in der Weise vereinigen, daß man für das Keilschrift-hittitische in diesem Falle Schwund des *h* in dem enklitischen Wort annimmt; das nach Vokalen erscheinende keilschriftliche *-ja* würde auf einem Hiatus-einschub in der Wortfuge beruhen“ (ArOr 5, 1933, p. 184, but notice his remarks in MS, p. 46). In that case the 'doubling' of a preceding consonant might be an attempt to render an assimilation.

<sup>6</sup> In the first place those texts which are now enumerated in E. Laroche's CTH under the nos 131–147.

<sup>7</sup> I am well aware of the fact that this term 'conjunction' may be misleading in this respect that also *...a/-ya* is likely to have been originally a word enclitic. In its meaning "also, too" it has kept that function, moreover.

<sup>8</sup> Numerous variants in CTH no. 416 = StBoT 8 prove the equivalence of LOGOGRAM-*aš-ša* and LOGOGRAM-*ša*, cf. e.g. (KBo XVII) 1 III: 2 = 3 III: 1; 1 III: 7 = 3 III: 6; 1 IV: 30 = 3 IV: 26; 1 IV: 36 = 3 IV: 31 etc. etc. On the other hand an example like *ták-ku* LÚ-*ša* in CTH no. 291 I b A = KBo VI 3 II: 14 (J. Friedrich, HG, pp. 26–27, par. 30) seems to conceal the emphatic particle, cf. Acta Orientalia Neerlandica, p. 40 note 17.

Paradigm 1<sup>9</sup>

I (Old Hittite texts in 'Old script')

CTH no. 1 (man. A = BoTU 7):

[*ap-pi*]-*iz-zi-ia-na* (l. 41), [<sup>M</sup>*Hu*]-*uz-zi-ia-na* (l. 43), <sup>URU</sup>*Ha-at-tu-ša-na*? (l. 44), *ma-a-na-aš ap-pi-iz-zi-ia-na* (ll. 45–46), <sup>URU</sup>*Ša-la-ti-wa-ra-ša* (l. 53), *a-pa-ša* (l. 72),<sup>10</sup>

but *šar-di-aš-ša-an-na ku-in* (l. 37).

CTH no. 291 I a (man. A = KBo VI 2 +):<sup>11</sup>

*ták-ku ša-aḫ-ḫa-na mi-im-ma-i* (par. 41, II: 25),<sup>12</sup> *ták-ku ku-uš-ša-na na-at-ta pi-ia-a-an* (par. 42, II: 29), *ku-e-la* <sup>GIŠ</sup>*e-ia-an a-aš-ki-iš-ši ša-ku-wa-a-an* (par. 50, II: 62), *ut-tar-še-da* (par. 64, III: 43), *a-pa-a-ša* (par. 80, IV: 15), *an-da-na* (par. 98, IV: 54), *iš-ḫa-a-aš-ši-š[a....]* (par. 99. 1, IV: 56),

but *a-aš-šu-uš-še-et-ta* (par. 5, I: 5), *ša-aḫ-ḫa-an-na* (par. 40, II: 20),<sup>13</sup> *ša-aḫ-ḫa-an-na* (par. 41, II: 25), *k[u]-up-ta-ar-ra* (par. 44 b, II: 34), *Ü* <sup>LÚ.MEŠ</sup>*ka-ru-ḫa-le-eš-me-eš-ša* (par. 54, III: 14), *ku-uš-ša-aš-še-et-ta* (par. 76, IV: 5).<sup>14</sup>

CTH no. 416 (composite text):<sup>15</sup>

*ú-ga* (I: 7; II: 20; III: 38; IV: 27, 38), *ú-e-ša* (I: 21), *še-er-še-me-ta* (I: 31), *ša-a-wa-ta-ra-ša* (I: 37), *iš-tap-pu-ul-li-še-ta* (IV: 35),

but *ši-i-na-an-na* (KBo XVII 2 I: 10, composite text I: 5; IV: 27), *pu-ta-li-ia-an-te-eš-ša* (I: 25), *te-eš-šu-um-m[e-(i)]n-na* (I: 29)/ *[te-eš]-šu-um-mi-in-n[a]* (III: 31), *ti-iš-šu-mi-in-na* (I: 29)/ *ti-iš-šum-mi-i[n-na]* (III: 31),

<sup>9</sup> In each case the list is far from complete, since I have omitted all the examples where other enclitics follow on either the particle or the conjunction.

<sup>10</sup> This example shows a characteristic 'shortening' of the customary *plene* writing *a-pa-a-aš* which is also elsewhere attested to before an enclitic, cf. A. Kammenhuber, Altkeinsasiatische Sprachen (= HdO I, vol. II, 1/2, f. 2), p. 176.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. J. Friedrich, HG Tafel I.

<sup>12</sup> Note that *takku ....ma* also occurs in this manuscript (par. 40, II: 20; par. 44 b, II: 35; par. 47 b, II: 47).

<sup>13</sup> Actually this example forms part of a pair *...a/-ya .....a/-ya* meaning "both ... and ...".

<sup>14</sup> A final example of emphatic *-a* might be hidden in *ša-aḫ-ḫa-na ḫar-ak-z[i]*, par. 41, II: 26. CTH no. 291 I b A = KBo VI 3 II: 47 reads *ša-aḫ-ḫa-an-na* instead; CTH no. 291 II b = KBo VI 5 IV: 6 has *ša-aḫ-ḫa-an*.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. H. Otten-Vl. Souček, StBoT 8, 1969. The references refer either to the main text or to a variant.

*te-eš-šu-um-mi-uš-ša* (I: 38; III: 8), *te-eš-šum-mi-uš-ša* (II: 1; III: 52), *te-eš-šum-me-uš-ša* (II: 26), *te-eš-šu-mi-uš-ša* (II: 40, 48, 52), *ti-iš-šum-mi-uš-ša* (II: 52; III: 8), *te-e-kán-na* (III: 1), *pát-ta-ar-ra* (III: 24), *mar-nu-an-na* (IV: 5), *ú-ug-ga* (IV: 7, 24), *pít-tu-li-uš-ša* (IV: 14; KBo XVII 7 + IV: 5), *pít-tu-li-uš-mu-uš-ša* (IV: 30, 39), DUMU.MEŠ-*eš-ša* (III: 2), EREM.MEŠ-*an-na* (II: 34, 51), [LUG]AL-*uš-ša* (KBo XVII 7 + IV: 2), SAL.LUGAL-*aš-ša* (nom.) (I: 36; II: 32; III: 2, 7; IV: 11, 34), SAL.LUGAL-*aš-ša* (gen.) (I: 18, 37; II: 34, 38, 41, 46; IV: 21, 29; KBo XVII 7 + IV: 8), URUDU-*aš-ša* (I: 8), ZÍZ.ḪI.A-*aš-ša* (IV: 20, 32).<sup>16</sup>

## II A (Texts from the beginning of the Empire period)

CTH no. 28 (KBo XVI 47):<sup>17</sup>

[<sup>M</sup>]*Hu-u-ḫa-za-al-ma-ša* (Obv.: 2), [<sup>M</sup>]*Hu-u-ḫa-za-al-ma-na* (Obv.: 4),  
URU*Ḫa-at-tu-ša-ša* (Obv.: 14),

but [*ma*]-*a-an* SIG<sub>7</sub>?-*ma-iš-ta-an-na* *ma-ši-wa-an-ta-an* *wa-aš-ta-an-zi* (Obv.: 8).

CTH no. 373 (XXX 10):

*zi-ga* <sup>D</sup>UTU-*uš* (Obv.: 4), *ku-i-ta im-ma mi-eš-ḫa-ti* (Obv.: 11), *da-an-du-ki-iš-na-ša* (Obv.: 21), *ma-a-am-ma-an da-an-du-ki-iš-na-ša* DUMU-*aš uk-tu-u-ri ḫu-u*?-[*i*]-*š-wa-an-za e-eš-ta* (Obv.: 22),

but *iš-ḫi-eš-ša-mi-it-ta* (Obv.: 7), [*ta-aš*]-*nu-ma-ar-ra* (Obv.: 29), *ú-uk-ka* (Rev.: 16), *pít-tu-li-ia-aš-ša* (Rev.: 16).

CTH no. 443 (KBo XV 10 +):<sup>18</sup>

*a-pu-u-ša* SILÁ-*uš* (II: 64), <sup>SAL</sup>Zi-*ša* (II: 14; III: 56), [*i-da-a*]-*la-mu-u-ša* EME.ḪI.A (III: 54),

but *tu-u-ru-up-pa-an-na* (II: 22), *tu-u-ru-up-pu-uš-ša* (II: 29, 31), <sup>D</sup>IŠKUR-*aš-ša* (I: 32; II: 34, 48), <sup>D</sup>IŠKUR-*an-na* (I: 22), <sup>D</sup>UTU-*wa-aš-ša* (II: 18), ZÍZ-*tar-ra* (II: 58).

<sup>16</sup> But note that the variant EREM.MEŠ-*ta-na* in KBo XVII 3 II: 8 for EREM.MEŠ-*an-na* in KBo XVII 1 II: 37 violates my rule. In IV: 30–31 I would translate “And I take with the *h*. the thread with which (*ku-i-ta!-an-da*) a winding has been made around their finger(s)”. Following relative sentences are not uncommon in Old Hittite and an instrumental *ku-i-ta-an-da* would not be irregular, cf. *kēdanda* and *apēdanda*. Therefore I do not recognize *ku-i-ta* in IV: 31 as another example of either the emphatic particle or the conjunction.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. H. Otten, *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 17, 1967, pp. 55–62.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. G. Szabó, *Ein hethitisches Entsühnungsritual*, *THeth* 1, 1971.

## II B (‘Disputed’ texts)

CTH no. 138. 1 (XXIII 77 +):

*ku-i-ša* (Obv.: 32), *ú-e-ša* (Obv.: 50; Rev.: 16), *a-pa-a-ša* [*p*]*ít-te-ia-an-za* (Obv.: 54),

but [*ud-da-n*]*a-aš-ša* (Obv.: 29), <sup>URU</sup>*Ḫa-at-tu-ša-an-na* (Obv.: 79), *ku-u-ru-ra-aš-ša* (Obv.: 86), *šu-me-en-za-an-na* (Obv.: 102).

CTH no. 146 (XXIII 72 +):

*ku-i-ša* (Rev.: 15), *wa-a-ar-ra-ša* (Rev.: 19), *šu-me-e-ša* (Rev.: 26, 64), *na-ak-ki-ša* (Rev.: 52),

but [<sup>M</sup>X-*i*]*k-ki-na-a-aš-ša* (Obv.: 4), *da-a-ia-aš-kán-na* (Obv.: 12), *a-pa-a-at-ta* (Obv.: 12\*, 62), *a-pa-a-aš-ša* (Obv.: 37, 39), [<sup>M</sup>A-*r*]*i-ih-pí-iz-zi-in-na* (Rev.: 1), *šu-me-en-za-an-na* (Rev.: 18), <sup>M</sup>*Mu-u-wa-at-ta-al-li-iš-ša* (Rev.: 32), [<sup>L</sup>ḫ-*pit-ti-ḫ*]*a-an-za-aš-ša* (Rev.: 56), <sup>L</sup>*ku-uš-ša-ni-ia-tal-la-aš-ša* (Rev.: 68).

CTH no. 147 (XIV 1 +):<sup>19</sup>

*ma-a-an-wa-at-ta* <sup>M</sup>*At-tar-ši-ia-ša*? *ḫa-lu-ki u-i[-ia-zi]* (Obv.: 39), <sup>M</sup>*Ma-ad-du-wa-at-ta-ša* (Obv.: 44, 69; Rev.: 56, 61, 66), <sup>M</sup>*Ki-iš-na-pi-li-ša* (Obv.: 63),

but *tu-ug-ga* (Obv.: 10), *ḫu-iš-ú-e-te-en-na* (Obv.: 12), *ki-iš-ša-an-na* (Obv.: 17, 28), [*ta-ma-a-i*]*n-na* (Obv.: 44, cf. Rev.: 19), *a-pa-a-at-ta* (Obv.: 56), <sup>M</sup>*Pu-uš-ku-ru-nu-wa-an-na* (Obv.: 58), <sup>M</sup>*Pár-ta-ḫu-ul-la-an-na* (Obv.: 72), <sup>L</sup>*a-ú-ri-ia-la-aš* <sup>L</sup>*ša-pa-a-ša-al-li-iš*?-[*š*]*a ú*?-*ug*? (Rev.: 12, reading proposed by E. Forrer, *Klio* 30, 1937, p. 168 note 4), [... <sup>L</sup>*ša-pa-a-ša*]-*al-li-eš-ša* (Rev.: 16), *ta-ma-a-in-na* (Rev.: 19), <sup>M</sup>*Ma*?-*az-la-u-wa-aš-ša* (Rev.: 28), *ar-ga-mu-uš-ša* (Rev.: 32), *a-pu-u-un-na* (Rev.: 43), *uš-ki-iš-[g]a-tal-la-aš-ša* (Rev.: 45), *ú[-ug]-ga* (Rev.: 93).

2. Two possible methods are open, if one wants to discern whether in the usage of this particle particular changes took place or not: 1) a comparison between earlier and later versions of those texts that were either re-written or even more drastically re-adapted during the many centuries Hittite was used; 2) a comparison between earlier and later compositions which present the same legal formulas. Paradigms 2 and 3 illustrate in my opinion that there has been indeed a marked decrease in the use of this adversative particle, but next to that also a notable

<sup>19</sup> Cf. A. Götze, *Madd.*, but also H. Otten, *StBoT* 11, 1969.

difference in graphic representation. Later manuscripts ignore the earlier differentiation and present a 'doubling' of the preceding consonant also in the case of the particle. There where the particle is not expressed with a 'double' writing it is either omitted or replaced with *-ma* in the younger manuscript or text:

## Paradigm 2

Ex. 1: *a-pa-ša* [(*hu-it-ti-it-ti ša-aš i-ia-an-ni-eš*)] (CTH no. 1 A = 2 BoTU 7: 72; restorations taken from B = 2 BoTU 30 = XXVI 71 I: 15), but B *a-pa-aš-ša*.

Ex. 2: *ták-ku ša-aḥ-ḥa-na mi-im-ma-i* (CTH no. 291 I a A = KBo VI 2 II: 25), but CTH no. 291 I b A = KBo VI 3 II: 46 *ma-a-an ša-aḥ-ḥa-an mi-im-ma-i*.<sup>20</sup>

Ex. 3: *ták-ku ku-uš-ša-na na-at-ta pi-ia-a-an* (CTH no. 291 I a A = KBo VI 2 II: 29), but CTH no. 291 I b A = KBo VI 3 II: 50 *ták-ku ku-uš-ša-an-še-et Ū-UL pi-ia-a-an*.<sup>21</sup>

Ex. 4: *ták-ku ANŠE.KUR.RA tu-u-ri-ia-wa-aš ku-iš-ki ta-a-i-iz-zi ut-tar-še-da ki-i-pát* (CTH no. 291 I a A = KBo VI 2 III: 43), but CTH no. 291 I b A = KBo VI 3 III: 48 *ut-tar-še-et QA-TAM-MA-pát*.<sup>22</sup>

Ex. 5: [(KUBABAR-*i*)a GUŠKIN]<sup>(10)</sup> [*n*]a-at-ta ú-da-i ku-it ú-e-mi-iz-z[(*i* a-p)]a-ša pár[(-na-aš-ša pi-it-ta-iz-zi)] (CTH no. 8 D = XXXVI 104 Obv.: (9)–10, a manuscript in 'Old script'; restorations taken from ibidem A (2 BoTU no. 12 A = KBo III 34) I: 11–12), but A reads *a-pa-aš-ša*.

Ex. 6: *ku-iš ar-ḥa tar-nu-ma-ša EREM.MEŠ-az na-an*<sup>(8)</sup> *PUTU-ŠI ar-ḥa tar-na-aḥ-ḥi* (CTH no. 261. 5 = XXVI 17 I: 7–8), but CTH no. 259 A = XIII 20 I: 11 *ku-iš ar-ḥa tar-nu-um-ma-aš-ma EREM.MEŠ-az na-an PUTU-ŠI ar-ḥa tar-n[(a-aḥ-ḥi)]*.<sup>23</sup>

Ex. 7: *ku-i-ta im-ma mi-eš-ḥa-ti nu-za-ta ŠA DINGIR-IA du-ud-du-mar ḥa-at-ta-ta hu-u-ma-an-ta ša-ki-nu-un* (CTH no. 373 = XXX 10 Obv.: 11), but CTH no. 372 A = XXXI 127 + II: 26 *ku-it im-ma*. For *kuit-a* (*imma*) see the following example and note 46.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. J. Friedrich, HG, pp. 28–29, par. 41 and H. Otten-Vl. Souček, AfO 21, 1966, p. 3.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. J. Friedrich, HG, pp. 30–31, par. 42.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. J. Friedrich, HG, pp. 38–39, par. 64; H. Otten-Vl. Souček, AfO 21, 1966, p. 5.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. S. Alp, Belleten 11, fasc. 43, 1947, p. 390 together with note 10a.

Ex. 8: *ku-i-ta PUTU-uš me-mi-iš-ki-ši* <sup>(14)</sup>[(DINGIR.MEŠ-ša a)-ap-pa tu-u(g-pát a-ru-ú-e-eš-ká)]n-zi (CTH no. 372 D = XXXI 133 Obv.: 13–14; restorations taken from A = XXXI 127 + I: 33–34), but A reads *ku-it-ta*.<sup>24</sup>

## Paradigm 3

Supp. I–Murs. II:

Ex. 9: *zi-ga ma-a-an HU-uq-na-a-aš PUTU-ŠI zi-la-ti-ia* <sup>(18)</sup> [I-NA EG]IR UD-MI aš-šu-li Ū-UL pa-aḥ-ḥa-aš-ti (CTH no. 42 A = KBo V 3 + I: 17–18),<sup>25</sup> but *ma-a-an-ma zi-ig KU-pa-an-ta-PAKAL-aš zi-la-ti-ia PUTU-ŠI* <sup>(14)</sup> DUMU.MEŠ PUTU-ŠI AŠ-ŠUM BE-LU-UT-TIM Ū-UL pa-aḥ-ḥa-aš-ti (CTH no. 68 B = KBo V 13 II: 13–14).<sup>26</sup>

Ex. 10: <na-aš-ma> A-NA PUTU-ŠI LÚKÚR-ia ku-iš-ki [ti]-i-e-ez-zi <sup>(27)</sup> na-aš-ma ku-u-ru-ur KI.BAL ku-iš-ki e[ep-z]i tu-ga ḥa-at-ra-a-mi (CTH no. 42 A = KBo V 3 + II: 26–27),<sup>27</sup> but [na-aš]-ma-kán I-NA KURURU Ḥa-at-ti ku-iš-ki A-WA-AT LÚKÚR <sup>(32)</sup> [(ša)-ra-a iš-pár-za-az-zi nu LÚKÚR ku-iš-ki A-NA PUTU-ŠI a-ra[(-a-i)] (C III: 4) tu-ug-ma <sup>(5)</sup> A-NA KU-pa[-an-ta-PAK]AL ḥa-at-ra-a-mi (CTH no. 68 A (= KBo IV 7 +) III: 31–C (= KBo IV 3 +) III: 5).<sup>28</sup>

Murs. II–Muwatt.::

Ex. 11: *nu[-ut-ta] ma-aḥ-ḥa-an PUTU-ŠI EGIR-pa ḥa-at-ra-a-mi zi-ga le-e nu-un-tar-nu-ši* (CTH no. 67 = KBo V 4 I: 31; see, too, CTH no. 68 E = VI 41 + IV: 22–23),<sup>29</sup> but in exactly the same formula the Alaksandus Treaty (CTH no. 76) III: 22–23—composite text as given by J. Friedrich, Staatsv. II, pp. 70–71—reads [(...z)]i-i[(g-ma ...)].<sup>30</sup>

Ex. 12: *nu ma-a-an LÚKÚR ku-iš-ki ni-ni-ik-ta-ri na-aš a-pé-e-da-aš A-NA ZAG.ḪI.A* <sup>(44)</sup> [GUL-u-w]a-an-zi pa-iz-zi zi-ga iš-ta-ma-aš-ti (CTH no. 67 = KBo V 4 II: 43–44),<sup>31</sup> but in exactly the same formula the Alaksandus Treaty (CTH no. 76) reads *zi-ig-ma* (A III: 47).<sup>32</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Cf. H. G. Güterbock, JAOS 78, 1958, p. 240 (but perhaps *ku-i-ta* "when-ever"?).

<sup>25</sup> Cf. J. Friedrich, Staatsv. II, pp. 108–109, par. 3. In this paper I follow E. Laroche's qualification of the manuscripts, cf. CTH.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. J. Friedrich, Staatsv. I, pp. 122–123, par. 15.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. J. Friedrich, Staatsv. II, pp. 116–117, par. 14.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. J. Friedrich, Staatsv. I, pp. 132–133, par. 19.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. J. Friedrich, Staatsv. I, pp. 56–57, par. 6; pp. 134–135, par. 21.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. J. Friedrich, Staatsv. II, pp. 70–71, par. 15.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. J. Friedrich, Staatsv. I, pp. 66–67, par. 13.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. J. Friedrich, Staatsv. II, pp. 74–75, par. 17.

Ex. 13: [na]m-ma-za-kán š[u-me-e]š ku-i-e-eš 3 LÚ.MEŠ<sup>EL-LU</sup> (CTH no. 68 C = KBo IV 3 + IV: 20),<sup>33</sup> but in the Alaksandus Treaty (CTH no. 76) a comparable expression runs as follows: nam-ma-za-kán šu-me-eš-ša ku-i[-e-eš] 4 LUGAL.MEŠ (A III: 31).<sup>34</sup>

3. After we have established that in a number of later versions the particle *-a* is either omitted or replaced with *-ma*, it becomes quite understandable that in 14th and 13th century texts the presumed long form of the personal pronoun (actually the normal form of the personal pronoun with an added emphatic particle *-a*) is sometimes replaced in another manuscript by the normal form without this enclitic. Other examples show a variation personal pronoun + *-a* or + *-ma*.

#### Paradigm 4

Ex. 14: na-at zi-ig tu-el ZI-it<sup>(40)</sup> le-e e-ep-ši (CTH no. 42 A = KBo V 3 + III: 39–40), but B (KBo XIX 44 +) II: 27 reads [z]i-ga instead.<sup>35</sup>

Ex. 15: zi-ig ma-a-an me-mi-an<sup>(17)</sup> pi-ra-an pa-ra-a iš-ta-ma-aš-ti (CTH no. 68 B = KBo V 13 II: 16–17), but C (KBo IV 3 +) II: 12 reads zi-ig-ma and E (VI 41 +) II: 35 zi-ga.<sup>36</sup>

Ex. 16: nu zi-ig-qa<sup>M</sup>Ku-pa-an-ta-<sup>D</sup>KAL-aš<sup>(55)</sup> [(ŠA<sup>M</sup>)M]aš-hu-i-lu-wa i-wa-ar le-e i-ia-ši (CTH no. 68 E (VI 41 +) III: 54–55), but C (KBo IV 3 +) II: 31 reads nu zi-ig (A (KBo IV 7 +) III: 14 also has zi-ig-qa, however).<sup>37</sup>

Ex. 17: na-aš-ma<sup>LÚ</sup>KÚR GUL-aḥ-zi nu pé-e ḥar-zi<sup>(51)</sup> zi-ig-ma pi-ra-an ša-ra-a Ū-UL wa-a[(r-ri-iš-š)]a-at-ti (CTH no. 76 A = XIX 6 + III: 50–51), but B (XXI 5 +) III: 67 reads zi-ig-qa.<sup>38</sup>

Ex. 18: nu-wa-za zi-ig LUGAL.GAL (CTH no. 81 E = I 6 + III: 15), but A (I 1 +) III: 69 reads [zi-ig]-ga (KBo VI 29 II: 1 also uses zi-ig in the same expression).<sup>39</sup>

<sup>33</sup> Cf. J. Friedrich, Staatsv. I, pp. 144–145, par. 27.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. J. Friedrich, Staatsv. II, pp. 70–71, par. 17.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. J. Friedrich, Staatsv. II, pp. 126–127, par. 30.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. J. Friedrich, Staatsv. I, pp. 126–127, par. 17. For C II: 12 see now KBo XIX 64.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. J. Friedrich, Staatsv. I, pp. 128–129, par. 18. For A III: 14 see now KBo XIX 65.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. J. Friedrich, Staatsv. II, pp. 74–75, par. 17.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. A. Götze, Hatt., pp. 28–29 and 48–49.

4. Next to the data of paradigm 1 where a difference in representation is coupled with a distinction in function, a further proof for the existence of this particle may be sought for in those syntactical environments where an emphatic or adversative particle could be expected but an explanation as conjunction with the meaning “and” is excluded. I can think of two possibilities: a) the position after the first word of a main clause which is preceded by a secondary clause (cf. paradigm 5); b) as enclitic added to a clause in parenthesis which is, as it were, embedded in a larger sentence (cf. paradigm 6). In both these environments an interpretation as emphatic particle suits the context very well, while the meaning “and” is either excluded (a) or much less likely (b).

#### Paradigm 5

Ex. 19: ma-a-an tu-un-na-ki-iš-na-ma pa-iz-zi a-p[(a-ša)]<sup>(79)</sup> pé-e-ra-am-mi-it ku-un-na-az e-ša-ri (CTH no. 1 A = 2 BoTU 7: 78–79: restoration based on C (XXXVI 98 +) II: 6).

Ex. 20: nu ú-e-eš DINGIR.MEŠ-aš ku-it na[ah-ḥa-an-t]e-eš nu DINGIR.[M]EŠ-aš A-NA EZEN.ḪI.A<sup>(6)</sup> EGIR-an-pát ar-wa-aš-ta KU[R<sup>U</sup>]RU[N]e-ri-ig-ma-az<sup>(7)</sup> LÚ.MEŠ<sup>URU</sup>Ga-aš-ga ku-it da-a-an ḥar-kán-zi ú-e-ša<sup>(8)</sup> A-N[(A)]<sup>D</sup>[IŠ]KUR<sup>URU</sup>Ne-[r]i-ik Ū A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ<sup>URU</sup>Ne-ri-ik<sup>(9)</sup> SISKUR.S[ISKU(R.ḪI.A)]<sup>UR</sup>Ḫa-at-tu-ša-az<sup>URU</sup>Ḫa-ak-mi-iš-ši<sup>(10)</sup> up-pi[(i-š-ga-u-e)]-ni NINDA.KUR<sub>4</sub>.RA.ḪI.A<sup>DUG</sup>iš-pa-an-tu-uz-zi GUD.ḪI.A UDU.ḪI.A (CTH no. 375 A = XVII 21 + IV: 5–10; restorations taken from C = XXIII 17 + III: 9ff.).<sup>40</sup>

Ex. 21: nu-uš-ša-an DINGIR-LI[(M-iš) (a-pa-a-aš ma-a-an ne)-e?-(pi-ši)]<sup>(4)</sup> ma-a-na[(-aš t)]ág-ni-i zi-ga<sup>D</sup>UTU-uš kat-ti-ši pa-i-ši (CTH no. 373 = XXX 10 Obv.: 3–4; restorations taken from the parallel texts XXXVI 75 II: 10–11 and XXXI 127 + II: 11–13).

Ex. 22: nu-mu [ma-a]-an I-NA EGIR UD.KAM šu-me-eš LÚ.M[EŠ<sup>UR</sup>]Ḫa-ia-ša aš-š[u-l]i<sup>(42)</sup> pa-ah-ḥa-aš[-te]-ni am-mu-ga šu-me-eš LÚ.MEŠ<sup>URU</sup>Ḫa-ia-ša<sup>M</sup>Ma-ri-ia-an<sup>(43)</sup> LÚ.MEŠga-e-ni-eš ŠA KUR<sup>URU</sup>Ḫa-ia-ša aš-šu-li pa-ah-ḥa-aš-ḥi (CTH no. 42 A = KBo V 3 + IV: 41–43).<sup>41</sup>

<sup>40</sup> Cf. E. von Schuler, Die Kaškäer, 1965, pp. 160–161.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. J. Friedrich, Staatsv. II, pp. 134–135, par. 42.

## Paradigm 6

Ex. 23: ER[E]M.MEŠ-na-an *ku-iš an-da pé-e-ta-i* DUMU.É.GAL-ša<sup>(33)</sup> *pé-e-ra-aš-še-et* GIŠzu-pa-a-ri *ḥar-zi* EREM.MEŠ-na-an *a-ap-pa-an-an-da* <sup>(34)</sup> *pé-e-ta-i* (CTH no. 416 A = KBo XVII 1 I: 32–34).<sup>42</sup>

Ex. 24: LÚ.MEŠ URU<sup>U</sup>*ḥur-ri-ma-kán ma-aḥ-ḥa-an* LÚSANGA EGIR-an-da *a-ú-e-er* <sup>(16)</sup> *nu* EREM.MEŠ ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ ŠA KUR URU<sup>U</sup>*ḥur-ri ú-iz-zi* <sup>(17)</sup> *MTa-ku-uḥ-li-ša-kán* LÚa-mu-mi-ku-ni-iš an-da <sup>(18)</sup> *nu-kán* URU<sup>U</sup>*Mur-mu-ri-ga an-da wa-aḥ-nu-wa-an-zi* (CTH no. 40 IV A = KBo V 6 II: 15–18).<sup>43</sup>

5. This is a convenient place to discuss two important questions. First, in which syntactical environments does the particle occur? Secondly, from what period stem the earliest examples of a 'double writing'? A quick glance shows that three environments deserve to be taken into account: a) between two main clauses (env. 1a) or two subordinate clauses (env. 1b), in both cases in a strictly co-ordinative context; b) marking the transition from a preceding subordinate clause to the main clause introducing the latter and being attached to its first word or form (env. 2); at the beginning of a compound sentence and thus introducing the initial subordinate clause (env. 3). Particularly in Old Hittite the particle can be found after any lexical item, but it is of course especially frequent after those types of words or grammatical forms that are apt to be emphasized, e.g. personal or place names and pronominal forms of the demonstrative, personal or relative pronouns. Paradigm 1 shows such examples in abundance and there is no need to repeat those here. Among the more fully presented examples given so far the nos 1, 14, 16 and 18 show syntactical environment 1a. For environment 1b the reader is referred to the nos 10, 12 and 17. Type 2 is present in the nos 4, 5, 11 and 19–22. Type 3 is shown by the examples 2, 3, 6–9, 13 and 15.

As far as the place of *-a* in the typical concatenation of particles and enclitic pronominal forms in the beginning of the sentence is concerned, a preliminary remark is due. So far in treatments of these matters<sup>44</sup> no

<sup>42</sup> Cf. H. Otten-Vl. Souček, StBoT 8, 1969, pp. 20–21. The translation should be adapted.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. H. G. Güterbock, JCS 10, 1956, pp. 92–93. Here, too, the translation should be adapted.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. J. Friedrich, HE I<sup>2</sup>, par. 288 based on E. Laroche's cursory remarks in BSL 53, 1957–1958, p. 161ff. where E. Laroche deals with the Luwian data only commenting in passing on the Hittite usage in this respect.

satisfactory distinction has been made between those particles which refer to the first word of the clause (*-a* and also *-pát*) and those which serve to connect the sentence as a whole functioning in that case as a sentence connective (*...a/-ya* or *-ma*), define the clause as being irreal (*-man*),<sup>45</sup> or characterize it as being indirect speech (*-wa(r)-*). The examples of paradigm 7 may serve to show that *-a* does indeed belong to the first group preceding, *-ma* and also *-man*.<sup>46</sup> Since *-a* is also found in co-occurrence with *nu* and *namma*, it should clearly be kept distinct from the class of sentence connectives.<sup>47</sup>

## Paradigm 7

Ex. 25: LÚ-na-aš *ku-uš-ša-an* ITU.I.KAM 12 GÍN KUBABAR *pa-a-i* SAL-ša-ma *ku-ša-an* ITU.I.KAM 6 GÍN KU[BABAR] *pa-a-i* (CTH no. 291 I a A = KBo VI 2 I: 55).<sup>48</sup>

Ex. 26: *ka-a-aš-ma-an ku-u-un e-ep-z[i]* <sup>(57)</sup> *[ka]-a-ša-ma-an ku-u-un e-ep-zi* (CTH no. 291 I a A II: 56–57).<sup>49</sup>

Ex. 27: *ḥu-iš-wa-tar-ma-pa an-da ḥi-in-ga-ni ḥa-mi-in-kán ḥi-in-ga-na-ma-pa an-da ḥu-iš-wa-an-ni-ia ḥa-mi-in-kán* (CTH no. 373 = XXX 10 Obv.: 20).

<sup>45</sup> Elsewhere I have already commented upon the fact that particle *man* — when used enclitically — occupies a place in the concatenation related to that of *-ma*. This is of interest for the etymology of this particle (*ma* + *an*, according to H. Pedersen, MS, p. 59).

<sup>46</sup> It goes without saying that a strictly co-ordinative *...a/-ya* excludes an adversative use of *-a*, but note examples like *ki-nu-na-ia* and *a-pa(-a)-at-ta-ia/a-pát-ta-ia* which may prove that an emphatic *-a* precedes *...a/-ya*, cf. J. Friedrich, HE I<sup>2</sup>, par. 302b. See also the temporal conjunction *kuit-a* in *ku-it-ta-ia* ("and whenever" or "and ever since") dealt with in RHA XXV fasc. 81, 1967, p. 133 (add KBo V 8 II: 39 = A. Götze, AM, pp. 154–155).

<sup>47</sup> Perhaps it should be added here that a preceding *nu* — and apparently this also holds good for *namma* (and *kinun-a*?) — does not affect the initial position of a following word. In recent syntactical studies on the Hittite relative, conditional and temporal clauses both Held and Sternemann ignore a sentence initial *nu*, when it comes to defining whether the relative pronoun on the one hand or a conditional or temporal conjunction on the other may be said to occupy the first place in their respective clauses or not, cf. W. H. Held, The Hittite Relative Sentence, Language dissertation no. 55, 1957, p. 11 and R. Sternemann, MIO 11, 1965, p. 382. See, too, L. Zuntz, Ortsadv., 1936, p. 8 in her definition of an 'independent adverb'.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. J. Friedrich, HG, pp. 22–23, par. 24.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. J. Friedrich, HG, pp. 32–33, par. 49.

Ex. 28: *ma-an-kán ma-a-an A-NA* <sup>M</sup>*At-tar-ši-ia hu-iš-ú-e-te-en-na ka-aš-ti-ta-ma-an a-ak-te-en* (CTH no. 147 = XIV 1 + Obv.: 12).<sup>50</sup>

Ex. 29: *nu-ku-i-e-ša hu-ur-ta-li-an-zi* <sup>(17)</sup> *A-WA-A-AT LUGAL* (CTH no. 5 = 2 BoTU 10 β Obv.: 16–17).

Ex. 30: *nam-ma ku-i-ša LUGAL-uš ki-ša-ri nu ŠEŠ-aš NIN-aš i-da-a-lu ša-an-aḥ-zi* <sup>(47)</sup> *šu-me-eš-ša pa-an-ku-uš-ši* (CTH no. 19 II A = 2 BoTU 23 A II: 46–47).<sup>51</sup>

Ex. 31: *nam-ma an-tu-uḥ-ša-tar-ra ku-it mar-ša-aḥ-ḥa-an* (CTH no. 67 = KBo V 4 I: 28).<sup>52</sup>

An emphasized word or pronoun will usually occupy the front position in the clause but does this mean that the particle *-a* is restricted to an enclitic usage after a first word of a clause? Apparently not, since in sentences introduced by a temporal or conditional *mān*, a conditional *takku*, and also in relative clauses with a conditional connotation, *-a* is found after the second word of the sentence (cf. Paradigm 1, passim but also the examples nos 2, 3, 6). This also applies to *-ma*—see the replica of example 6 and also example 19—and perhaps this correspondence in location implies that such a usage of *-ma* should in fact be characterized as word enclitic. But however that may be, this conformity seems to define a first ‘common slot’ in which *-ma* might replace the emphatic particle *-a*. Perhaps it should be added here that in the older texts *kuiš-a*, the emphasized form of the relative pronoun in its indeterminate use as first defined by A. Goetze as early as 1933<sup>53</sup> and afterwards more fully described by W.H. Held in his study on the Hittite relative sentence (1957),<sup>54</sup> is clearly distinguished from *kuiš-(š)a* “everyone”.<sup>55</sup> It is also

<sup>50</sup> Cf. A. Götze, *Madd.*, pp. 4–5, par. 3.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. E. H. Sturtevant-G. Bechtel, *A Hittite Chrestomathy*, 1935, pp. 190–191, par. 30.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. J. Friedrich, *Staatsv. I*, pp. 56–57, par. 6; see, too, *ibidem*, pp. 134–135, par. 21, and *Staatsv. II*, pp. 68–69, par. 15 for the same expression.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. A. Götze, *AM*, p. 295 (Index).

<sup>54</sup> Cf. W. H. Held, *The Hittite Relative Sentence* (cf. note 47), passim.

<sup>55</sup> A. Kammenhuber, *Altkeinasatische Sprachen*, p. 178 already remarks that *ku-i-ša* in older texts is later represented as *ku-iš-ša* (this escaped my attention when I cursorily dealt with this pronoun in *Acta Orientalia Neerlandica*, p. 41). But she has failed to note that in older Hittite there is a clear distinction between the indefinite relative “whoever” and the pronoun *ku-iš-ša* “everyone”, cf. Ex. 30, as repeated in paradigm 8.

noteworthy that in texts from the early Empire period this emphasized indeterminate relative may be found next to *-ma* added to the second word of the clause in examples which seem to possess a conditional connotation.

#### Paradigm 8

Ex. 31: *nu a-pé-e[-el É-ZU]* <sup>(62)</sup> *ku-e-la* <sup>GIŠ</sup>*e-ia-an a-aš-ki-iš-ši ša-ku-wa-a-an a[-ra-a-u-wa-an]* (CTH no. 291 I a A = KBo VI 2 II: 61–62).<sup>56</sup>

Ex. 30: *nam-ma ku-i-ša LUGAL-uš ki-ša-ri nu ŠEŠ-aš NIN-aš i-da-a-lu ša-an-aḥ-zi* <sup>(47)</sup> *šu-me-eš-ša pa-an-ku-uš-ši* (CTH no. 19 II A = 2 BoTU 23 A II: 46–47), but *ku-iš-ša* “everyone” in *ibidem*, I: 9 and 19.<sup>57</sup>

Ex. 32: [*ma-a-an ku-iš(-ki) A-NA* <sup>D</sup>*UTU-ŠI*] *I ku-u-ru-ur šu-ma-a-ša-aš ku-u-ru-ur e-eš-tu ku-i-ša A-N* [*A* <sup>D</sup>*UTU-ŠI*]-*ma* <sup>(33)</sup> [...tāk-š] *u-ú-ul šu-ma-a-ša-aš tāk-šu-ú-ul e-eš-tu* (CTH no. 138.1 = XXIII 77 + Obv.: 32–33).

Ex. 33: *ku-i-ša-wa KUR-e-an-za-ma-at[-ta ku]-u-ru-u[r e-ep-zi nu-wa-aš-ša-an ku-it-ma-a]n ŠA* <sup>D</sup>*UTU-ŠI* <sup>(26)</sup> [*EREM.MEŠ za-aḥ-ḥi-ia-at-ta*]-*ri ú-ga-wa-za ma-an-ni[-in-k]u-wa-an ku-it [nu-w]a-ra-at ú-ug hu-u[-da]-a-ak wa-a[l-aḥ]-mi* (CTH no. 147 = XIV 1 + Obv.: 25–26).<sup>58</sup>

The second question raised in the beginning of this section is more difficult to answer. It is not so easy to determine at what time the earliest examples of ‘double writing’ were introduced. In the first place it should be acknowledged that an early manuscript in ‘Old script’ may preserve a possible example: (Ex. 34) *šu-me<sup>1</sup>-eš-ša* [*LUGAL-aš SJAL. LUGAL-aš-ša* <sup>(9)</sup> [...a-i-in wa-a-i-in [...da-a-at-te-en (CTH no. 416. 2 = KBo XVII 7 + IV: 8–9), cf. H. Otten-Vl. Souček, *StBoT* 8, 1969, pp. 40–41, „Nun möget ihr [des Königs] und der Königin [...Weh (und) Schmerz [...nehmen.“ Secondly, two examples in Paradigm 1 may have been wrongly classified as examples of *-a/-ya* concealing the emphatic particle instead: (Ex. 35) *nu MU-ti*

<sup>56</sup> Cf. J. Friedrich, *HG*, pp. 32–33, par. 50.

<sup>57</sup> See note 51.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. A. Götze, *Madd.*, pp. 6–7, par. 5 and H. Otten *StBoT* 11, 1969, pp. 15–16. See, too, *ku-i-ša e-eš-zi-ma* in CTH no. 146 = XXIII 72 + Rev.: 15, an example in which *-ma* seems to have an adversative function as well (see, too, Ex. 32–33).

*mi-e-ni-ia-aš ar-ma-la-aš* <sup>(16)</sup> *ma-aḥ-ḥa-an nu-za ú-uk-ka QA-TAM-MA ki-iš-ḥa-at* (CTH no. 373 = XXX 10 Rev.: 15–16), cf. H. G. Güterbock, RHA XXV fasc. 81, 1968, p. 143, “I became just like one who is ill every year”; see, too, (Ex. 36) [....]-*ia?* *ku-en-zi?* *nu-wa ú[-ug]-ga ŠAḤ-aš i-wa-ar ú-i-ia-mi* (CTH no. 147 = XIV 1 + Rev.: 93).<sup>59</sup> A representative group of texts from Suppiluliumas I and Mursilis II presents the following picture:

## Paradigm 9

## Suppiluliumas I

Sentence initially	Env.	After <i>nu(-)</i>	Env.
<i>am-mu-ga</i> CTH no. 42 A IV: 42 <sup>60</sup>	2	<i>zi-ga</i> CTH no. 42 B II: 27 <sup>66</sup>	1a
<i>zi-ga</i> ibidem A I: 17 <sup>61</sup>	3	<i>zi-iq-qa</i> ibidem A I: 10	2
ibidem A III: 12 <sup>62</sup>	3	ibidem A III: 58 <sup>67</sup>	2
ibidem B II: 9 <sup>63</sup>	3		
<i>tu-ga</i> ibidem A II: 42 <sup>64</sup>	1b		
<i>šu-me-ša</i> CTH no. 253.2 = XXI 41 IV: 5	2?		
<i>šu-ma-a-ša</i> CTH no. 268 = XXI 47 + IV <sup>1</sup> : 23/18	2		
<i>ku-i-ša an-tu-wa-aḥ-ḥa-aš</i> CTH no. 44.2 = XIX 26 I: 7, 17 <sup>65</sup>	3		

<sup>59</sup> Cf. A. Götze, Madd., pp. 38–39, par. 37. A similar example of an early emphatic usage nevertheless showing a ‘doubled’ consonant is *zi-ik-ka* in CTH no. 324.1 A = XVII 10 II: 20 (cf. E. Laroche, TMH, p. 33). If E. Laroche’s text-restoration is correct, the environment would need to be classified as no. 2. One would expect *zi-ga* instead (see below par. 10).

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Example 22.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. Example 9.

<sup>62</sup> KBo XIX 43 a III: 12.

<sup>63</sup> KBo XIX 44 Rev.: 9.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. Example 10.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. A. Goetze, Kizzuwatna, 1940, pp. 14–15.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Example 14.

<sup>67</sup> In both cases an emphatic interpretation seems preferable to the translation “You, too”, which is not altogether excluded for A I: 10, however, cf. J. Friedrich, Staatsv. II, pp. 106–107, par. 2 and pp. 128–129, par. 32. I would like to retract my remark on this text in Acta Orientalia Neerlandica, p. 41 together with note 26.

	Sentence initially	Env.	After <i>nu(-)</i>	Env.
Mursilis II				
<i>zi-ga</i>	CTH no. 67 I: 31 <sup>68</sup>	2	<i>zi-ga</i> CTH no. 69 A = XIX 49 + I: 37 <sup>74</sup>	3
	ibidem II: 44 <sup>69</sup>	1 b	<i>zi-iq-qa</i> CTH no. 61 II 1 = XIX 29 IV: 6 <sup>75</sup>	1 a
	CTH no. 68 E II: 35 <sup>70</sup>	3	CTH no. 68 E III: 54 <sup>76</sup>	1 a
	ibidem E IV: 23 <sup>71</sup>	2		
<i>zi-iq-qa</i>	CTH no. 68 B = KBo V 13 II: 5 <sup>72</sup>	2		
	CTH no. 69 A = XIX 49 + I: 68 <sup>73</sup>	1 a		

6. The replacement of *-a* by *-ma* (cf. the examples 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15) calls for further comment. As was already remarked in passing, *-ma* can be used both as a sentence connective and as a word enclitic stressing the one word to which it is attached. Perhaps it should be stressed that this latter *-ma* may very well occur side by side with a sentence initial *nu*.<sup>77</sup> Recent research by R. Sternemann,<sup>78</sup> H. Otten and V. Souček<sup>79</sup> has established that contrary to what was formerly thought *nu* is already

<sup>68</sup> Cf. Example 11.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. Example 12.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Example 15.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. Example 11; the passage is identical with CTH no. 67 I: 31 quoted above.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. J. Friedrich, Staatsv. I, pp. 122–123, par. 13.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. J. Friedrich, Staatsv. II, pp. 10–11, par. 6; other examples from CTH no. 69 are unclear.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. J. Friedrich, Staatsv. II, pp. 6–7, par. 4.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. A. Götze, AM, pp. 16–17 and note his remark with respect to this passage in the Index, p. 277 (sub *-a* B 2).

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Example 16. Unfortunately two examples in A. Götze’s Plague Prayers are unclear: 2nd Plague Prayer, par. 11: 1 = KIF I 2, 1929, pp. 216–217; 4th Plague Prayer, par. 14 IV: 22 = KIF I 2, 1929, pp. 248–249. But I do believe that A. Götze was right in his emphatic interpretation of [*nu...*] *am-mu-ug-qa* in both these passages.

<sup>77</sup> I do not agree with J. Friedrich, HE I<sup>2</sup>, par. 314 that this phenomenon would be rather rare, cf. an early example like CTH no. 1 A = 2 BoTU 7 Obv.: 3 (*na-aš-ta* <sup>DIM</sup>*un-ni-ma* *ma-a-an a-aš-šu-uš e-eš-ta*), and also CTH no. 42 A = KBo V 3–I: 19 (*nu-ut-ta-ma* *ma-a-an*<sup>(20)</sup> SAG.DU <sup>DUTU</sup>*ŠI QA-TAM-MA Ú-UL na-ak-ki-iš*; J. Friedrich’s text-emendation is unnecessary, cf. Staatsv. II, pp. 108–109, par. 3) as well as — in the same text — IV: 34 (*nu[<sup>nuš-m</sup>]a-aš-ma ku-iti* *im-ma ku-iti ḥa-at-ra-a-mi*, cf. Staatsv. II, pp. 132–133, par. 41). Other combinations also occur, *nu* together with emphatic *-a*, *nu* together with *...a/-ya*; *-ma* together with *...a/-ya*.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. R. Sternemann, MIO 11, 1965, pp. 405–406.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. StBoT 8, 1969, p. 92.

no!  
coll.  
[*nu-ma*]-*a-as-ma*



fairly common in Old Hittite in environment 2. R. Sternemann has also demonstrated that the use of *nu* in environment 3 shows a marked increase between older and later texts.<sup>80</sup> Studying the use of *-ma* as a sentence connective, one finds already in Old Hittite its use in environments 1 (a and b) and 3 very well established, but seldom occurring in environment 2, at the introduction of the main clause of a compound sentence. In the Old Hittite corpus as constituted for the Computer Project I know of only two examples of such a *-ma*: (Ex. 37) [*ták-k*]u-wa-aš-ma-aš-ta iš-ḫar-ma ši-ia-ti ú-ug-ma-aš-ma-aš<sup>81</sup> [IGI-*a*]n-da za-aḫ-ḫi-ia ku-wa-at Ú-UL pa-a-i-mi (CTH no. 311. 2 A = 2 BoTU 4 A II: 16-17);<sup>81</sup> (Ex. 38) [*m*]a-aʔ-aḫ-ḫa-an tág-na-a-aš<sup>82</sup> UTU-un ir-ḫa-a-it kat-ta-ma šu-ma-a-aš ir-ḫa-a-it (CTH no. 371 = KBo VII 28 + Rev.: 42).<sup>82</sup> In texts from the beginning of the Empire period the usage is already more common, but when one turns to the synchronic corpus of texts from the time of Mursilis II the picture is very different indeed. There such a usage is extremely common. In his commentary to KBo III 4 I: 5 (AM, p. 198) A. Goetze announced a future treatment of this use of *-ma* („der Partikel *-ma*, die eine neue Person einführt“) which, as far as I know, did never appear.<sup>83</sup> In environment 2 the particle *-a* in the older phases of the language and *-ma* more particularly in the later ones may serve to introduce a new subject in the main clause after e.g. a subordinate clause with temporal or conditional meaning. Used in this position they add a certain emphasis to the personal name or the personal pronoun which constitutes the subject in the main clause. In this respect I may perhaps refer to the variant for Ex. 37 in CTH no. 311. 2 B = 2 BoTU 4 B III: 2-3: [*ma-a-a*]n-ša-ma-aš-ta e-eš-ḫar-ra ši-ia[(-ti)]<sup>84</sup> [*ú-g*]a-aš-ma-aš me-na-aḫ-ḫa-an-da Ú-UL p[(*a-a-i-mi*)].<sup>84</sup> The examples of paradigms 2 and 3 seem to show that in this emphatic function the particle *-a* is sometimes replaced by *-ma* in a younger version or text, but it should be added that this apparently happened in all three environments. Therefore it is not so surprising that in general the use of *-ma* after a form of the personal or relative pronoun seems to be very rare during the older phases of the language<sup>85</sup> but rather common in

<sup>80</sup> Cf. R. Sternemann, l. c., pp. 397 and 405.

<sup>81</sup> Cf. H. G. Güterbock, ZA 44, 1938, pp. 54-55 together with note 7.

<sup>82</sup> Cf. J. Friedrich, RSO 32, 1967, p. 217ff. (unavailable to me).

<sup>83</sup> The examples are in fact so numerous as to defy enumeration, cf. A. Götz, AM, Index, and J. Friedrich, Staatsv. II, Index. See J. Friedrich, HE I<sup>2</sup>, par. 319.

<sup>84</sup> Cf. note 81.

<sup>85</sup> Next to Example 37 I have come across the following examples: CTH no. 8 = 2 BoTU 8 II: 56, [*šu-um-me-eš-m*]a (cf. F. Sommer, HAB, pp. 8-9 and 97), ibidem

later time. Since *-ma* is more often found after forms of the demonstrative pronouns *ka-* and *apa-* during those older phases, it seems an attractive hypothesis that by way of its use after *apa-*, *-ma* later extended its range of application to the personal pronoun *sensu stricto*. Furthermore, it may very well be that its spread to environment 2 (where *-a* was more common in the older texts) was stimulated by its growing synonymy to that emphatic particle.

In order to avoid the pitfall that this use of *-ma* after forms of the personal pronoun might constitute a stylistic peculiarity of either the historical texts in general or the texts of Mursilis II in particular, I have applied the mythological texts as a control corpus. It has been fairly well-established by now that in these texts an older Anatolian layer of myths can be distinguished from the later Hurro-Mesopotamian phase.<sup>86</sup> The results of this small investigation corroborated the conclusions formulated above, since the early Anatolian myths contain no examples of a personal pronoun followed by *-ma*. The later Hurro-Mesopotamian myths do show such examples, however, while a still preserved emphatic *-a* always shows a 'double writing' except when it forms part of a longer chain of enclitics, cf. paradigm 10.

7. The examples where an earlier *-a* is ignored in a later adaptation or version (paradigm 2 and 3) and those cases in which one manuscript of a late composition shows the enclitic particle *-a* (at that time doubling a preceding consonant when it is not followed by other enclitics) while another does not (paradigm 4) seem to show that the particle is on its way to disappear from the living language. This is confirmed by the fact that later texts only show it after pronominal forms of the personal, demonstrative or relative pronouns, while in earlier texts it may appear after any lexical item. But it should be stressed that even in the latest texts some stray examples are still to be found, cf. paradigm 11.

III: 38, [*ku-iš-ma-ká*]n (cf. F. Sommer, HAB, pp. 12-13 and 156); CTH no. 9.4 = 2 BoTU 11β II: 16, *ku-e-eš-ma*; CTH no. 311.1 = 2 BoTU 3 I: 8, *am-mu-ug-ma* (cf. H. G. Güterbock, ZA 44, 1938, pp. 68-69). Two of these examples are in fact text-restorations, perhaps to be replaced by [*šu-me-e-š*]a and [*ku-i-ša-ká*]n respectively; Ex. 27 has a variant which may be more authentic; therefore only two examples, one of each, seem to be certain. Even if more examples would turn up in texts which have not yet been included in the corpus of Old Hittite texts, the phenomenon might still be called relatively rare (I certainly reckon with this possibility).

<sup>86</sup> This point has been repeatedly stressed in recent years by A. Kammenhuber, cf. e.g. ZA 57, 1965, p. 179 note 13 (on pp. 179-180).

## Paradigm 10 (all examples sentence initial)

A. Anatolian mythological texts		B. Hurro-Mesopotamian mythological texts	
	Env.		Env.
<i>ú-ga</i> CTH no. 323.2 = VBoT 58 IV: 9 <sup>87</sup>	2	<i>ú-ug-ma-... CTH no. 346.2 = XXXIII 117 I: 8<sup>95</sup></i>	1a?
<i>ú-ga</i> CTH no. 336.5 A = XXXIII 60 Rev.: 8 <sup>88</sup>	2	<i>am-mu-ug-ma-... CTH no. 341 III C = VIII 53 II: 10 (nom.!)<sup>96</sup></i>	1a
<i>zi-ga</i> CTH no. 332.3 = XXXIII 68 II: 8 <sup>89</sup>	2	<i>ibidem: 23 (nom.!)<sup>97</sup></i>	1a
CTH no. 332.3 = XXXIII 68 II: 11 <sup>90</sup>	1a	<i>[z]i-ig-ma-... CTH no. 341.10 = XVII 3 III: 3<sup>98</sup></i>	1a
CTH no. 336.5 A = XXXIII 60 Rev.: 5 <sup>91</sup>	2	<i>tu-ug-ma-... CTH no. 345 Tabl. I C = XXXIII 102 + II: 13 (compos. text)<sup>99</sup></i>	1a
CTH no. 335.4B = XXXIII 70 II: 16 <sup>92</sup>	2		
CTH no. 335.6 = XXXIII 73 + 74: 11 <sup>93</sup>	2		
Other examples are either broken or uncertain.			
<i>tu-ga</i> CTH no. 323.2 = VBoT 58 IV: 12 <sup>94</sup>	2		

<sup>87</sup> I shall refer to E. Laroche's Textes mythologiques hittites en transcription (RHA XXIII fasc. 77, 1965, pp. 63–178 and XXVI fasc. 82, 1968, pp. 1–90) in the continuous numbering for both fascicles together given at the foot of each page: thus, TMH, p. 25.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. E. Laroche, TMH, pp. 93–94.

<sup>89</sup> Cf. E. Laroche, TMH, p. 68. But note *zi-ik-ka* in CTH no. 324.1 A = XVII 10 II: 20 (cf. note 59).

<sup>90</sup> Cf. E. Laroche, TMH, p. 68.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. E. Laroche, TMH, p. 93.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. E. Laroche, TMH, p. 102.

<sup>93</sup> Cf. E. Laroche, TMH, p. 104. But note *zi-ik-ka* in CTH no. 324.1 A = XVII 10 II: 20 (cf. note 59).

<sup>94</sup> Cf. E. Laroche, TMH, p. 25.

<sup>95</sup> Cf. E. Laroche, TMH, p. 193.

<sup>96</sup> Cf. E. Laroche, TMH, p. 128.

<sup>97</sup> Cf. E. Laroche, TMH, p. 129. See Example 40.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. E. Laroche, TMH, p. 133. See, too, CTH no. 348.2 = VIII 64: 8 = StBoT 14, 1971, pp. 42–43 in the text-edition of J. Siegelová; CTH no. 348.7 = XXXIII 85 Obv.: 9 = J. Siegelová, StBoT 14, 1971, pp. 56–57 (both examples in a broken context).

<sup>99</sup> Cf. H. G. Güterbock, JCS 5, 1951, pp. 148–149.

Ex. 39: [*zi-i(q-ga-z)*]a *ku-iš* DINGIR-LIM-iš (CTH no. 348.5 A = XXXIII 86 + II: 12; restorations taken from B = XXXVI 56 III: 9), but *ku-iš-za* SAL-na-aš *zi-ig* (ibidem XXXIII 86 + III: 3).<sup>100</sup>

Ex. 40: *ar-ḫa-wa-mu da-a-li* <sup>D</sup>GILGAMESŠ *nu-mu-za zi-i*[(*g* EN-aš *e-eš*)]<sup>(23)</sup> *am-mu-ug-ma-ad-du-za* ÌR-iš *e-eš-lu-ut* (CTH no. 341 III C = VIII 53 II: 22–23).<sup>97</sup> A comparable passage in Old Hittite runs as follows: [*zi-g*]a? *at-ta-aš-mi-iš e-eš ú-ga* DUMU-aš-ti-iš *e-eš-li-it* (CTH no. 39.5 = XXVI 35: 6).

## Paradigm 11

Ex. 41: [(*nu ki-nu-un ma-aḫ-ḫa-an* <sup>D</sup>UTU-ŠI)] A-NA <sup>M</sup>A-la-ak-ša-an-du *iš-ḫi-ú-la-aš* <sup>(9)</sup> [(*DUP-PA DÜ-nu-un nu zi-i*)]q-ga <sup>M</sup>A-la-ak-ša-an-du-uš <sup>(10)</sup> [*ḫa-aš-ša ḫa-a*]n-za-aš-ša *iš-ḫi-ú-la-aš DUP-PA kiš-an i-ḫa* (CTH no. 76 A = XIX 6 + II: 8–10; restorations taken from B).<sup>101</sup>

Ex. 42: *nu-kán zi-iq-qa* DINGIR-LUM [EN-I]A <sup>(43)</sup> A-NA <sup>M</sup>Ḫa-at-tu-ši-li ÌR-KA *aš-šu-li ḫa[r-p]i-[i]a-aḫ-ḫu-ut* (CTH no. 384 = XXI 27 IV: 42–43); cf. *nu-wa-mu-uš-ša-an zi-iq-qa ḫar-ap-ḫu-ut* in KBo III 7 I: 23 (CTH no. 321 A = E. Laroche TMH, p. 6, a young ms. of an old text).

Ex. 43: [LÚ.MEŠ] <sup>URU</sup>Ḫat-ti-ma-aš-ši IGI-an-da *w[a-aš-te-er]* <sup>(4)</sup> *ú-uq-qa Ú-UL wa-aš-ta-ḫu-un* (CTH no. 125 = XXVI 33 II: 3–4).<sup>102</sup>

Ex. 44: *ku-iš-ša-kán* & *zi-la-du-wa* DUMU-ŠÚ DUMU.DUMU-ŠÚ ŠÀ.BAL.BAL <sup>(87)</sup> & *zi-la-du-wa* ŠA <sup>M</sup>Ḫa-at-tu-ši-li <sup>SAL</sup>Pu-du-ḫe-pa <sup>(88)</sup> *iš-pár-za-zi na-aš-kán* ŠÀ DINGIR.MEŠ A-NA <sup>D</sup>IŠTAR <sup>URU</sup>Ša-mu-ḫa <sup>(89)</sup> *na-aḫ-ḫa-an-za e-eš-du* (CTH no. 81, composite text IV: 86–89).<sup>103</sup>

Ex. 45: *ú-ga-kán* A-NA <sup>M</sup>NIR.GÁL [(A-NA ÌR-K)]A *ZI-an-za an-da* <sup>(61)</sup> *du-uš-ga-i* (CTH no. 381 A = VI 45 III: 60–61; restorations taken from B VI 46 IV: 29–30 which reads [*am*]-mu-ga-kán).

8. The curious difference in representation of this particle *-a* between the older and later texts still needs to be explained. As appears from the paradigms 2–4 and 11 in particular, the older habit of a single writing

<sup>100</sup> Cf. J. Siegelová, StBoT 14, 1971, pp. 54–55 and 56–57.

<sup>101</sup> Cf. J. Friedrich, Staatsv. II, pp. 58–59, par. 7. See, too, KBo XIX 73.

<sup>102</sup> Cf. H. Otten, MDOG 94, 1963, p. 3: „[Die Einwohner] von Hatti aber [versündigten sich] ihm (= dem König) gegenüber; ich dagegen habe nicht gefehlt“; see, too, A. Goetze, JAOS 72, 1952, p. 68 note 10: “I however did not sin.”

<sup>103</sup> Cf. A. Götze, Ḫatt., pp. 40–41, but A. Goetze's translation „und wer“ is inferior to that by E. H. Sturtevant-G. Bechtel, A Hittite Chrestomathy, pp. 82–83, “whoever”.

of a preceding consonant is later replaced by the same characteristic doubling which was before used to represent the conjunction *-...a/-ya*. In my opinion this later habit might be another example of the more general, so-called 'analyzing' spelling of later scribes who apparently thought it essential to mark off an added enclitic from the preceding word to which it was attached. It seems as if they felt a need for a clear separation wishing to avoid a situation in which the borderline between 'carrier' and enclitic would be hidden in the middle of a syllable sign. The same phenomenon has been observed with respect to the equally enclitic possessive pronoun.<sup>104</sup> But when two or more enclitics are added, the later texts, too, sometimes show examples of a single writing of the preceding consonant, cf. Ex. 45 but see also Ex. 39.

9. The results of a full recognition of the workings of this particle with respect to the personal pronoun may thus be summarized as follows:

1) The real forms of the personal pronoun for the 1st and 2nd person singular are *ug* (nom.), *ammug* (acc.; dat.; in later texts also nom.), *zig* (nom.) and *tug* (acc.; dat.).<sup>105</sup> These forms have a free mobility throughout the sentence occurring also in first position.

2) "And I", "me, too", are always expressed by double writings like *ú-ug-ga/ú-ug-qa*, *am-mu-ug-ga/am-mu-ug-qa* etc. These forms, too, may occur anywhere in the sentence.

<sup>104</sup> Cf. H. Otten - Vl. Souček, StBoT 8, 1969, p. 58 together with references.

<sup>105</sup> Actually already B. Hrozný in his first complete Hittite grammar (BoSt 1-2, 1917, p. 103 note 3) realized what the real forms were („Es scheint also, daß wir unsere Pronomina nur als *ammug*, *zig*, *tug* (auch *ug*?) anzusetzen haben, wobei die gelegentlich angehängte Partikel *-a* — wie auch sonst — entweder die Bedeutungen ‚und‘, ‚ferner‘, ‚auch‘(?) hätte, oder bedeutungslos wäre“). His remark escaped general attention, but note F. Sommer's comments in AU, pp. 330 and 399. Scholars of the first generation of Hittitologists like E. Forrer (cf. his sketch of Hittite grammar in ZDMG 76, 1922, p. 206) and A. Goetze (cf. his Indices to Hatt., Madd. and AM) gave the right forms and so did comparatists like E. Benveniste and A. Meillet. But the more recent grammars like those of J. Friedrich, E. H. Sturtevant and H. Kronasser — also A. Kammenhuber in her paradigms in Altkleinasiatische Sprachen, pp. 209-210 do not distinguish between the real and the lengthened — emphatic — forms. It should be added here that A. Kammenhuber's paradigms do show that *ú-ga* and *zi-ga* are typical (emphatic) forms during the older phases of the language and that *ú-ug-ga/ú-ug-qa* and *zi-ig-ga/zi-ig-qa* are more characteristic for younger texts or manuscripts. Perhaps it is worthwhile to add also that the adversative connotation of *ki-nu-na* — absent in J. Friedrich's translation of the Laws — is duly rendered in B. Hrozný's edition (CH, 1922) in the customary translation "mais maintenant" (cf. par. 7 of Tablet I and elsewhere).

3) Especially in first or second position (the latter in particular after *nu*) *ú-ga* in 'Old script' but also in texts from the beginning of the Empire period, and *ú-ug-ga/ú-ug-qa* etc. etc. in later manuscripts or texts present a separate enclitic *-a* with emphatic or adversative meaning.

Two final remarks should still be added in order to round off my argument. First, although there seem to be some scattered examples of *ú-uk-ka* and *zi-ik-ka* in early texts possessing an emphatic function (cf. section 5 and note 59),<sup>106</sup> I have found so far not a single example in an early text where *ú-ga* or *zi-ga* may be translated as "and I" or "you, too". Secondly, the fact that—at least as far as pronominal forms are concerned—*-a* and *-ma* seem to exclude one another (no examples of *\*ú-ga-ma* in older texts or of *\*ú-ug-ga-ma/ú-ug-qa-ma* in young manuscripts) adds weighty support to my thesis. This incompatibility clearly shows that *-a* in itself already possesses an emphatic or adversative function.

<sup>106</sup> Fortunately in these two examples the way these forms are written indicates their age, since in younger manuscripts one would expect *ú-ug-qa* and *zi-ig-qa*, cf. my Records, pp. 51-52.