



THE HITTITE PARTICLE *-PAT**

By GILLIAN R. HART

THIS particle presents problems at many levels. Its phonological realisation is in doubt, its range of usage is wide and has not been fully described, and the analysis of the rules which govern its position in the sentence, essential though this is for the proper understanding of its functions, has never been completely carried out.¹ It is therefore not surprising that it should also have a disputed etymology, although until recently H. Pedersen's attempt to link it with Lithuanian *-pàt* 'selbst' was generally accepted. This etymology has now been challenged by O. Szemerényi, who proposes as an alternative a connection with I.E. **poti* 'towards, against' and supports

* This article is based on a thesis submitted in part fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Philosophy at Oxford in 1967. I should like to record my thanks to the University College of Wales, Aberystwyth, for generously giving me leave of absence to study Hittite in Oxford in 1966-7; to the Principal and Fellows of Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford, for their characteristic kindness and hospitality to me during that year, and especially to Professor O. R. Gurney, to whom I owe my initiation into Hittite studies, for his patient and helpful supervision of this work. Any errors which remain in it are of course my own responsibility.

¹ For previous discussions see B. Hronzý, *SH* 37² (1917); F. Sommer, 'Hethitisch *aruna-* und die Partikel *-pe*' *OLZ* 24 (1921), 197-200; E. Forrer, *BoTU* I 16 (1922); Sommer-Ehelolf *Pap.* 50 (1924); Tenner, *HAT* 101 (1926); A. Götze, *Madd.* 55-57 (1928); E. Sturtevant, *JAOS* 50 (1930), 127; B. Hronzý, *OLZ* 35 (1932), 258; A. Götze, *AM* 207-9 (1933); E. Sturtevant, *CGr.*¹ 77, 131 (1933); Götze-Pedersen *MS* 64 (1934); H. G. Güterbock, 'Die heth. Verben *pēdā-*, *piddā-*, usw. und die Lautwerte des Zeichens 𐎶', *ZA NF* 8 (1934), 222-232; H. Pedersen, 'Zum Lautwert des Zeichens 𐎶 im Hittitischen' *AO* 7 (1935), 80-88; E. Sturtevant, *Gl.*² 121 (1936); E. Sturtevant, 'The values of the *be*-sign in Hittite' *Lg.* 13 (1937), 285-291; H. Pedersen, *Hitt.* 76-79 (1938); A. Goetze, *Tunn.* 48¹⁵² (1938); F. Sommer, *HAB* 39², 68, 117, 221 (1938); E. Benveniste, 'Problèmes sémantiques de la reconstruction' *Word* 10 (1954), 251-254; J. Friedrich, *HW* s.v. *-pat* (1952); H. Kronasser, *Vergleichende Laut- und Formenlehre des Hethitischen*, Heidelberg (1956), 150; J. Friedrich, *Heth. El.* I² (1960) 150; O. Szemerényi, *Syncope in Greek and Indo-European and the nature of Indo-European accent*, Naples 1964, 337-395, esp. 343-349.

The abbreviations used in references to Hittitological literature are those of J. Friedrich, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch (HW)*, Heidelberg 1952, with *Ergänzungsheft* 1 (1957), 2 (1961) and 3 (1966).

this claim by comparing *-pat* with particles in other Anatolian languages. These have received a considerable amount of attention in the last few years, since Szemerényi's suggestion was made, and the question of their possible connections with *-pat* will be considered in the final section of this paper. Its main purpose, however, is not to discuss the etymology of the particle, but to investigate in more detail the question of its actual use in Hittite, as well as to reconsider that of its phonological value, which has already been quite extensively discussed. It is probably too much to expect that this exercise will produce a final answer to the question of etymology, but it may at least remove some of the misapprehensions about the uses of the particle which have been generated in part by the perilous process of translation and in part by a tendency to rely too heavily on the somewhat elastic term 'emphasis' as a substitute for description and universal solution for difficulties in explaining semantic developments. The concept of emphasis may have its place in the analysis of the functions of *-pat*, but it is a less useful one than has sometimes been supposed. *-pat* is unlike the majority of Hittite particles in that it is not confined to the introductory string of particles with which the Hittite sentence typically begins, but can occur anywhere in the sentence, subject to certain restrictions which will be described below, and in association with nominal or verbal elements. The central question of the enquiry is not 'how should we translate *-pat*?' (implying that there exists a uniquely appropriate equivalent in whatever language we want to translate into) but 'what is the functional relationship between *-pat* and the element of the sentence to which it is attached?'. In order to discover this, it is necessary first to make sure that *-pat* actually does affect the word to which it is attached, and not some other word; this is why it is so important to know what restrictions, if any, operate on the placing of *-pat* in the sentence.

The corpus used for the original thesis consisted of the following cuneiform texts: KUB I-XXXVIII, KBo I-XII and XIV, ABoT, IBoT I-III, VBoT, HT, FHG, *Babyloniaca* IV, *Alalah*: this yielded about 1250 examples, and I have also taken account

of subsequently appearing material when it seemed to cast fresh light on any aspect of the problem. It has not of course been possible to discuss all these examples in detail ; many of them in any case are in contexts too incomplete to reveal much about the particle's functions, though they can still provide information about such things as sequential rules and occurrences with different word-classes. My aim has been to give adequate illustration of the most typical uses, as well as to give due recognition to what is untypical ; to discuss passages where the use of *-pat* has been differently understood by different interpreters, and to examine the relationships between the uses, not with the intention of ' reducing ' them to an all-purpose formula which would run the risk of being either false or vacuous, but to see if it is at all possible to trace the course of its extension from one kind of context to another. For this reason I have dealt rather more fully with the uses of *-pat* with the verb than with its uses with nouns ; although they are numerically in a minority they show greater variety ; also the uses of *-pat* with nouns, doubtless because of their relative simplicity and greater frequency, have been understood in their essentials since Sommer dealt with them in 1921.

1. THE PHONOLOGICAL VALUE OF THE PARTICLE

The problem here consists in the fact that with one possible exception to be discussed below the particle is always written with the multivalent sign ꝥ. There has been much discussion of the question, but no really satisfactory solution has yet emerged.

One line of approach was to attempt to restrict the possibilities for the pronunciation of the particle by eliminating one or more of the values for the sign. This was tried by Götze, Pedersen and Sturtevant, with different results. Götze² argued against the reading *-pe* which had been adopted by Hrozný³ on the grounds that the sign ꝥ was as a rule followed by signs having initial *t/d*, and he adduced further evidence in favour

² *Madd.* 55-57.

³ *SH* 37².

of the value *-pit*. He also quoted evidence for the value *-pat* : a- \mathfrak{h} -*da* KUB II 2 ii 13 beside *a-pa-at-ta* in the duplicate KBo IV 1 rev. 12, and *ap- \mathfrak{h} -ri-ya-zi* KUB XIII 8 obv. 10 beside *ap-pa-at-ri-iz-zi* KBo VI 3 iii 76 and *ap-pa-ta-ri-iz-zi* KBo VI 2 iv 4, but rather than positing two separate values *-pit* and *-pat* on the basis of this evidence he was prepared to assume an intermediate value *pāt*, or to suppose that a different pronunciation, perhaps due to vowel assimilation, lay behind spellings with \mathfrak{h} where these alternated with *pa-at*. Pedersen⁴ accepted the values *pit* and *pat* but rejected *be*, while Sturtevant⁵ accepted *pit* and *be* to the exclusion of *-pat*. The debate about the value of the sign \mathfrak{h} was to a great extent inspired by a desire to settle the question of the etymology of the particle, a consideration which was particularly important to Sturtevant and Pedersen. Pedersen, who wanted to connect the Hittite particle with Lithuanian *-pāt* 'selbst', was persuaded by the strength of the semantic side of the etymology (argued in detail in Hitt. 76–79) to select *-pat* as the value for the particle. Sturtevant, while he admitted that Pedersen's etymology was attractive, felt bound to reject it on phonological grounds ; the initial voiceless stop demanded by the etymology should according to his own rule have been at least sometimes written double after a vowel, as the initial consonant of the particle never is. He therefore adopted *be* as the reading of the particle.

Güterbock⁶ however produced evidence for all three of the values in question for the sign, *pe*, *pit* and *pat*, and successfully refuted one of the chief arguments for the elimination of the value *pe*, the alleged alternation of the spellings \mathfrak{h} , *pi-it* and *pi/pi-e* in the same words, by demonstrating that *pi-it/* \mathfrak{h} alternations are found in different words from those in which *pi/pi-e/* \mathfrak{h} alternations occur.

Evidence for the value *pe/be* nevertheless remains slight. It consists of some rare spellings with \mathfrak{h} in the verb *peda-* 'take away', a compound of *pe-* and *da-* 'take', normally rendered by

⁴ *AO* 7 (1935), 80–88.

⁵ *Lg* 13 (1937), 285–291.

⁶ *ZA NF* 8 (1934), 225–232.

pi-e-da-. Güterbock's proposal that the adverb *a-ḫ-da(n)* 'there, thither, on that account' should be read *apeda(n)* because of *a-pi-e-da* 'thither', (i.e. to your country) in KUB VI 48 ii 3 cannot be unhesitatingly accepted⁷ because of the possibility that doublets may have existed as in the case of *tamatta* beside *tameda* from *tamaiš* 'other'.⁸ The verb *peda-* is thus left isolated as the only support for the value *pe/be*, and even here it has been suspected that confusion may have occurred between the two verbs *peda-* and *ḫ-dai* 'pay', which is always written with *ḫ*.⁹ The value *pe/be* for the sign cannot therefore be considered certain, but it remains a possibility.

The value *-pat* on the other hand has received fresh support from the spelling *pa-at-tar* in KBo VIII 74 i 7 for the usual GI *ḫ-tar* 'wicker basket' vel. sim.

The one piece of evidence which may have a direct bearing on the value of the particle is KBo V 3 iii 31 = Friedrich, *Staatsv.* II 124 :

29 ŠEŠ-[ŠU] SAL+KU-ZU ^{SAL}a-a-an-ni-in-ni-ya-mi-in Ū-
UL da-a-i

30 Ū-UL-at a-a-ra ku-iš-ma-at i-e-zi a-pi-ni-iš-[šu-u-w]a-an
[[-na]] ut-tar

31 na-aš ^{URU}Ḫa-at-tu-ši Ū-UL ḫu-u-iš-šu-u-iz-zi a-ki-pa
[nu-uš-š]a-an

32 šu-me-in-za-an KUR-e dam-pu-u-pi ku-it . . . etc.

'A brother does not marry his sister or his cousin; it is not permitted. Whoever does a thing of that kind, in Ḫattušaš he

⁷ Friedrich, *Staatsv.* I 148 reads [nu m]a-an a-pi-e-da-⟨aš⟩ ku-i[š-ki ḫu-u-wa-a-i, taking *apedaš* as genitive plural, but cf. Sommer *AU* 116³ and Friedrich, *Staatsv.* II 94 for *a-pi-iz* KUR-*e-az* = 'from your country'.

⁸ cf. especially KUB XXX 10 ii 5 *ta-ma-at-ta pi-e-di* and KUB XXXI 132,10 (duplicate) [t]a-me-e-da.

⁹ It may be noted that the iterative *piddaišk-*, listed by Güterbock among doubtful cases probably to be assigned to *peda-*, but booked by Friedrich *HW* under *piddai-* 'pay', agrees more closely in form with *piddai-* in view of the spelling with *ḫ*, but seems to belong with *peda-* in meaning in KUB XXXIII 91 obv. 6 and also in KUB XXII 40 ii 30. It is so understood by Sommer, *HAB* 40, Zuntz, *Ortsadv.* 65 and Kammenhuber, *MIO* 3 (1955), 52-3.

does not live, he dies. And whereas your country is uncivilised . . .’

Friedrich, *Staatsv.* II 51 took the *-pa* following *a-ki* to be a postvocalic form of the particle *-apa*, admittedly a characteristic of the older language, but here perhaps preserved in an old legal formula. Ehelolf (ap. Friedrich, *Staatsv.* II 170) because of traces following *-pa* before the break restored the end of the line as *a-ki-pa-a[t nu-uš-š]a-an*, and Friedrich compared *a-ku-** in KUB XIII 7 i 22. This restoration was criticised by Goetze, who doubted the value *pat* for the sign *** in *Tunn.* 48¹⁵². He objected that the *š]a-an* visible after the break had no place in the following sentence, and that after the sign which Ehelolf restored as *-at* more signs (particles ?) probably followed, including perhaps a subject pronoun. It is not, however, clear why *-ša-an* could not belong to the introductory particle-sequence of the following sentence, as Friedrich and Ehelolf took it to do. It is true that the following sentence begins with a causal *kuit*-clause, and that such clauses may sometimes lack introductory particles, but they need not, and, it seems, usually do not.¹⁰ Paradoxically, if Goetze’s attribution of *š]a-an* to a sequence of particles following *a-ki* were correct, the reading *-pa-at* would be established beyond reasonable doubt. The only elements capable of occurring between the verb and *-šan* are particles and enclitic pronouns. Within this restricted class the only elements which can begin with *pa-* are a postvocalic form of *apa*, and *pat*. Of these two *apa* can be eliminated as it always takes the final position in any sequence of particles in which it occurs ; this leaves *-pat* as the sole possibility.

Unfortunately for the decision of this question, Goetze’s assertion that *š]a-an* cannot belong to the next sentence remains unsupported. If the alternative sentence-division is preferred, *-pa* can only be the postvocalic form of *-apa* if no further particles follow it. The traces remarked by Ehelolf after it are visible in Hrozný’s copy, where they follow the *-pa* without a gap, and do not look like the *nu* which according to this

¹⁰ Friedrich, *Heth. Et.* I², 311.

hypothesis must have begun the introductory particle-sequence of the next sentence.

Thus the textual evidence, such as it is, is in favour of the reading *pa-at* here, and consequently of the value *-pat* for the particle. It remains to consider the contextual suitability of *-apa* and *-pat* in the passage in question.

The probabilities of occurrence in this text can easily be established as heavily weighted in favour of *-pat*. The index to Friedrich, *Staatsv.* contains twenty-nine examples of *-pat*, not including this passage, while there are no examples of *-apa* apart from this passage (admittedly from the earliest treaty in the collection). There is thus no support at all in this quite considerable body of material for the reading *-pa* (for *apa*).

The uses of *-apa* have been investigated by O. Carruba.¹¹ He finds that about half the examples of it are accompanied by a more precise local specification in the form of *anda(n)* or a dative, and concludes that the particle has a local force, which is to indicate motion from outside to inside or from far to near, or rest in proximity to some object as a result of such motion. The example here under discussion does not fall under one of these typical headings, but is taken by Carruba to have a causal sense 'er stirbt daran'. For such a sense he produces two parallels:

KUB XXIV 4 rev. 11

na-pa li-e a-aš-ša-a-u-e-eš [i-da-a-lu-u-wa-a-aš an-da ḥar-kán-zi]

'let not the good perish among the wicked'.¹² Here, however, the presence of *anda* suggests that the usual local sense of *-apa* is to be recognised.

KUB I 16 ii 24

nū-ša-pa ú-iz-zi zi-in-[na-i]

'and it will come about that he will put an end to them'¹³

Here a causal interpretation of *-apa*, although it cannot be

¹¹ *Orientalia* NS 33 (1964), 405-436.

¹² Restored from KUB XXIV 3 ii 56.

¹³ Sommer, *HAB* 55 refers to it as 'Partikel *-apa* mit unbekannter Funktion' and notes that the Akkadian text of the bilingual has nothing corresponding to it.

absolutely ruled out, does not compel acceptance either, and an alternative explanation of the presence of *-apa* suggests itself ; it may belong with *ú-iz-zi* rather than with *zi-in-na-i*, and point to the drawing near of an expected future event.

The case for a causal sense of *-apa* is thus not very convincing, and it may be doubted if such a sense is actually wanted in KBo V 3 iii 31, especially as that passage exhibits the not uncommon stylistic habit of Hittite writers of leading up to a positive statement with a negative one of similar import. While there is no reason to suppose that *-apa* has any place in such contexts, there are parallels for the occurrence of *-pat* with the verb of the positive sentence, which may be without a connecting particle, e.g. :

KUB XIII 4 iii 52

nu 1-aš-ša TI-nu-ma-aš *Ú-UL* e-eš-zi QA-DU NUMUN-ŠU-at
ḫar-kán-zi-pát

‘ not one is to be spared ; they shall perish together with their offspring ’.

KUB XXVI 92, 6

INIM ku-e-nu-ma-aš-ma-wa-kán *Ú-UL* ú-e-eh-ta-ri nu-wa-mu-
kán ku-na-an-zi-pát

‘ the proposal to kill (me) will not be changed, and they will indeed kill me ’.

KUB XXXIII 8 iii 10

ku-it-kán an-da pa-iz-zi na-at-kán nam-ma ša-ra-a *UL* ú-iz-zi
an-da-pát-kán ḫar-ak-zi

‘ what goes in does not come up again ; it dies in there ’.¹⁴

KBo IV 2 i 37

36 na-an-kán ar-ḫa *Ú-UL* tuḫ-ḫu-uš-zi

37 GE₆-an-ta-az-aš-ma-aš-kán an-da-pát se-eš-zi

‘ he does not cut it off ; it remains on them all night ’.

¹⁴ There are several variants : KUB XVII 10 iv 17 *an-da-da-an* (with Old Hittite particle *-an*) IBoT III 141 iv 12 *an}-da-at-ša-an* (thus the copy ; Otten, *Überl.* 25 reads *an-da-at-ta-an*), KUB XXXIII 54 iii 7 *an-da-at-kán*. *-pat* thus appears only in one of the later recensions, replacing the enclitic pronoun *-at* ; the error, if it is one, would be of interest from the point of view of the pronunciation of the particle as well as from that of the usage of the scribe's own time.

KUB XIV I obv. 25 = Götze, *Madd.*, 6

Ú-UL ša-an-na-aḥ-ḥi nu-wa-ra-aš-ta ḥa-at-ri-eš-ki-mi-pát
 ' I shall not conceal, but I shall write '.

It is clear from these parallels that *-pat* would also be appropriate in the context of KBo V 3 iii 31. There can be no doubt that of the two particles which could possibly be read there, the case for *-pat* is much stronger than that for *-apa*. In consequence the support for the pronunciation *pat* is rather better than has sometimes been supposed.

2. SEQUENTIAL RULES

Whereas the other enclitic particles of Hittite follow the first word of the sentence in a fixed order, *-pat* may occur anywhere in the sentence, subject to certain restrictions. The unit within which the position of *-pat* is more or less rigidly fixed is the constituent word-group, nominal or verbal. When *-pat* occurs with the first word in the sentence it has a fixed place in relation to other enclitic particles which may be attached to the first word ; it seems never to occur in strings of particles attached to initial connectives such as *nu*.

(a) *Nominal groups*

-pat is regularly attached to the first word in the group.

In Hittite the noun is preceded by adjectives and by dependent nouns in the genitive (in that order), and followed by postpositions, so that patterns of the following type occur :

With postposition : ha-aš-ši-pát an-da ' in the hearth ' KUB XXX 40, 21 ; A-NA EZEN.MEŠ-pát še-ir ' for the festivals ' KUB XVI 77, 25.

With adjectives : kap-pi-in-pát DUMU-an ' a small boy ' KBo VI 29 i 7 ; aš-ša-u-wa-aš-pát me-mi-ya-na-aš ' on good terms ' KUB I 8 iv 30.

With dependent noun in the genitive : tág-na-aš-pát ʾUTU-un ' Sun-god of earth ' KBo XI 10 iii 23.

Complex groups : [ḥa-an]-te-iz-zi-in-pát a-u-ri-ya-aš URU-an ' first town of the frontier guard ' KUB XXXIII 77 rev. 15 ; šal-la-aš-pát ha-aš-ša-an-na-aš e-eš-ḥar ' bloodshed of the royal family ' KBo III 1 ii 31.

When, as often happens, word-groups are written with Sumerograms and Akkadograms with appropriate changes in word-order, so that prepositions appear instead of postpositions and adjectives and dependent nouns in the genitive precede their nouns, *-pat* is no longer attached to the first word in the group, but to that grammatical element which it would have accompanied if the group had been written as Hittite ; e.g. *ŠA É.GAL* ^{LU}*A-BU-BI-TI*-pát ‘ of the palace of the *abubiti* ’ KBo X 20, 39 ; *DINGIR.MEŠ* ^{URU}*KÙ.BABBAR-ti*-pát ‘ the gods of Hatti ’ KUB VI 35 rev. 12. A consequence of this fixed position of *-pat* in nominal groups is that position cannot be used to decide whether *-pat* belongs functionally with the adjective etc. or to the noun. It remains to be seen if any such discrimination is possible on other grounds.

(b) *Verbal groups*

Here the situation is slightly different. It is possible to state a general rule, but there are exceptions. The general rule is that *-pat* is attached to that preverb or negative particle which stands closest to the verb, rather than to the verb itself. This holds good also if the preverb is separated from the verb by the intervention of a nominal group. e.g. with preverb(s) immediately before the verb :

EGIR-an an-da-pát na-iš KUB XIV 1 obv. 73 ; *ap-pa-an an-da-pát IŠ-BAT* KBo XII 3 iii 12 ; *ar-ḫa Ū-UL-pát ta-ru-up-ta-ri* KUB XIV 10 i 15 ; *ar-ḫa Ū-UL-pát ti-it-[ta]-nu-wa-an-zi* (with *-pat* erased after *ar-ḫa*) KUB V 24 1 25.

With separated preverb(s) :

na-aš a-ap-pa-ya-pát a-pu-u-un KAŠKAL-an ú-iz-zi IBoT I 36 iii 25 ; *nu a-ap-pa pa-ra-a-pát I-NA* ^{URU}*Ta-ni-pí-ya A.ŠA* *ku-e-ra-aš LUGAL-wa-az pí-ya-an-za* KBo III 7 iv 22–23.

The exceptional types of order which occur are :

(i). Preverb + *-pat* + negative + verb :

pa-ra-a-pát Ū-UL ar-nu-ut-te-ni KUB XIII 4 i 56.

(ii) Negative + *-pat* + preverb + verb :

Ū-UL-pát pa-ra-a ú-da-an-zi KUB XXII 40 ii 35.

(iii) *-pat* attached to the verb even though this is preceded by a preverb or negative particle :

ša-ra-a ú-iz-zi-pát KUB VI 45 i 31

ar-ḫa haš-pir-pát KUB XIV I obv. 47-48

ar-ḫa pa-a-an-zi-pát KUB XX 76 iii 19

Ú-UL pa-i-mi-pát-wa KUB XIV 8 ii 18.

These exceptions are unfortunately too few to suggest any obvious explanation for their occurrence, but it seems possible that the fact that variation can occur may mean that position in verbal groups is sometimes functionally significant. This could be the result of the development of specialised meanings in combinations of *-pat* with particular preverbs and negatives. This question is best deferred until the uses of *-pat* with the verb have been discussed.

(c) *-pat* with other enclitic elements.

-pat is preceded by the possessive suffixes, e.g. É-ir-še-it-pát KBo VI 2 i 28 ; *A-BU-YA*-pát KUB XXI 49 i 10 ; ÌR-ZU-pát KBo VI 2 i 45 ; and by the potential particle *-man*, KUB XXIII 92 rev. 12, KUB XXIII 103 rev. 13.

It is also preceded by *-ya* 'and' : *a-ap-pa-ya-pát* IBoT I 36 iii 25, although *-ma* 'but' follows it : *zi-ik-pát-ma-za* KBo V 4 rev. 1. All other enclitic elements (the particle of direct speech *-wa*, the enclitic pronouns and the directional particles) come after *-pat*. e.g. *-pát-wa-mu* KUB XXXVI 85 rev. 9 ; *-pát-mu-kán* KUB XIX 37 iii 25 ; *-pát-at* KUB XIII iv ii 50.

(d) *Other groups*

In a few cases *-pat* appears to belong to a *ku-it*-clause as a whole, and is attached to the first word in the clause ; e.g. KBo IV 8 ii 14 :

12 am-me-el ka-a-aš-pát

13 1-aš dam-me-eš-ḫa-aš ki-i-ya-an 1-an dam-me-eš-ḫa-nu-nu-un

14 IŠ-TU É.GAL^{LIM}.pát-kán ku-it kat-ta u-i-ya-nu-un

'This was my only punishment, and in this way only I punished her, just the fact that I expelled her from the palace'.

When a pair of nouns juxtaposed in asyndeton is repeated *-pat* is attached to the first : DU ^{URU}Iš-ta-nu-wa-pát ^DUTU-un 'the Storm-god of Ištanuwa (and) the Sun' KUB XXXIII 123 iii 42.

There is thus in general a strong tendency for *-pat* to behave in relation to the word-group in which it occurs in the same way as sentence-particles do in relation to the sentence, i.e. to be attached to the first word in the group. A slightly different rule obtains in the case of verbal groups, which also show the most irregularity.

3. FUNCTIONS

It may be useful to begin with a brief summary of the results of previous studies of the functions of *-pat*.

Hrozný¹⁵ on the evidence of the vocabulary KBo I 44 obv. 14 ff. where Akkadian *inanna* 'now' is glossed by Hittite *kinun*, and Akkadian *inannama* by Hittite *kinun-pat* inferred that *-pat* was an emphasizing particle equivalent to Akkadian *-ma*. He read the sign by which the particle is rendered as *be* or *pe*, and suggested that it might be connected with the Lycian particle *-pe*, and Latin *-pe* in *quippe*, *nempe*.

Sommer¹⁶ made the important observation that the particle often had an identifying function ; when in vocabularies the same Hittite word was used twice in succession to gloss different Sumerian or Akkadian words, the particle was added to the second occurrence of the Hittite word, and should therefore mean 'gleichfalls, ebenso, auch'. The particle also occurred outside vocabularies when something mentioned shortly before was repeated, and was often found with *QA-TAM-MA* 'thus' ; in contrast to *QA-TAM-MA* by itself, *QA-TAM-MA-pat* was found when there was no preceding clause of comparison, but the comparison resulted from the context. In addition, but without discussing the examples at length, Sommer suggested that besides having an identifying function ('auch' = 'gleichfalls') the particle had in some cases the meaning 'auch' = 'auch noch', a suggestion which was later developed by Götze.

¹⁵ SH 37².

¹⁶ OLZ 24 (1921), 197-200.

He also noted the occurrence of the particle with *humand-* 'all', and with distributive expressions. He doubted if the function of the particle was ever purely emphatic.

Tenner¹⁷ noted that the particle was employed with the verb of a sentence preceded by a concessive clause, so that it could be translated 'dennoch, trotzdem'. For the use of words originally signifying 'in the same way, thus' in such a sense he compared Greek *ὁμως, καὶ οὕτως, καὶ ὥς*.

Götze¹⁸ dealt only with the function of the particle in association with verbs, and produced further examples in favour of Sommer's translation 'auch noch', together with corresponding negative examples where the particle was equivalent to 'nicht auch noch'. In cases where the particle was attached to a verb which was negative when it might have been expected to be positive or *vice-versa* it acquired the sense 'doch noch, trotzdem', and its use after concessive clauses, already noted by Tenner, was to be included here. He posited another shift of meaning from 'auch noch' to 'ebenfalls noch', also taking place in connection with the verb, when the completion of the same action was carried out by a different subject. Unlike Tenner, who had started from the identifying use of the particle in his attempt to explain its development of the meaning 'nevertheless', Götze appears to have taken the sense 'auch noch' as basic, and 'doch noch' and 'ebenfalls noch' as semantic variants conditioned by the context. This left unanswered the question of how a particle which had an identifying function when associated with nouns could come to have what might be called an 'additive' function when associated with verbs.

Pedersen¹⁹ held that the basic meaning of the particle was '*ipse*', '*ipsius*', and that all its other uses could be explained as modifications of this. A particularly important observation, though not stressed as such by him, was that in association with verbs the particle conveyed the meaning 'fortwährend'. He

¹⁷ *HAT* 101.

¹⁸ *AM* 207-209.

¹⁹ *AO* 7 (1935), 80-88.

remarked that in a number of cases the choice between 'ebenfalls' and 'auch noch' as translations of the particle was a matter of style and taste, although there might sometimes be a slight difference in meaning. Far from considering the meaning 'auch noch' to be basic, he seems to have thought of it as a not particularly important shift from the 'ebenfalls' meaning. Like Tenner, Pedersen saw the meaning 'trotzdem' as a development from 'ebenfalls' in circumstances when an expected change did not come about, but the action took place just as it would have done if there had been no obstacle in the way of its accomplishment. In the use of the particle with nouns and adjectives Pedersen envisaged a development on the one hand from 'selbst' to 'selbiger' (der eben genannte) and further to 'derselbe', and on the other hand to 'allein'. He reiterated Sommer's statement that the particle never had a purely emphatic function, and urged that the description 'hervorhebende Partikel' should be removed from the glossaries as being positively misleading. Pedersen's article represented the first attempt to find a connection between all the uses of the particle which had so far been observed, and to assign historical priority to one of them, as a prerequisite to establishing the particle's etymology.

Benveniste²⁰ chose the Hittite particle as an illustration of the semantic problems involved in reconstruction, accepting Pedersen's interpretation of the Hittite evidence and most of the etymological conclusions based upon it. Observing that Indo-European languages possessed two distinct expressions of identity, one, exemplified by Gothic *sama*, for identity as permanence of the object, and the other, exemplified by Gothic *silba*, for identity as opposed to otherness, he concluded with regard to the Hittite particle :

'C'est évidemment à la notion de 'self' que répond la fonction de l'enclitique hitt. *-pat*, lit. *-pat*, dont l'emploi est hérité : h. *apaš-pat* 'précisément celui-là, lui-même', lit. *ten-pat* 'là-mème' aš *pats* 'moi-mème', avec un valeur de superlatif

²⁰ 'Problèmes sémantiques de la reconstruction', *Word* 10 (1954), 251-254.

developpé en lituanien : *pàts pirmàsis* 'le tout premier'.

Szemerényi²¹ in the course of a lengthy discussion of the etymological connections of I.E. **poti-s* 'master' attacked Pedersen's etymology of the Hittite particle and the interpretations of Hittite texts on which it was based. He argued that the range of uses established for the particle²² could not be reduced to the meaning 'self' which was basic for the etymology, the uses with verbs being particularly difficult to accommodate to such a meaning, and that the contextual evidence for that meaning was less than had been supposed, since most of the passages from the Hittite Laws in which Pedersen had translated the particle 'selbst' in support of his theory had been otherwise translated by Götze and Friedrich. As an alternative to Pedersen's etymology he proposed a connection with Old Persian *patiy* (postposition and adverbial particle) from I.E. **poti* with the meaning 'gegenüber, entgegen, gegen' which developed partly into an adversative 'but' and partly into 'in addition'. He suggested that the identifying function of the Hittite particle could have developed from a more original adversative sense, as in the case of Russian *že*, and compared the adversative function of the Luwian and Hieroglyph Hittite particle *-pa*, which he identified with Hittite *-pat*.

What emerges from this brief survey of previous work on the uses of the particle is that while a quite extensive catalogue of them has been compiled, conceptions of how they are inter-related are far from clear, and in many instances there is room for doubt about which of the catalogued functions is to be recognised. This situation arises from the fact that the catalogue of functions is inevitably drawn up in terms of the translator's own language, so that distinctions are drawn in what are from the point of view of Hittite arbitrary places. The pattern of description has tended to be imposed by the language of the translator, and it may happen that a given instance cannot be assigned to one category or another within that pattern without losing some part of its meaning in the process. The inadequacy

²¹ *Syncope in Greek and Indo-European*, 337-395, esp. 343-349, 352-356.

²² As described in Friedrich, *Heth.El.* I² 150-151.

of translating an element like *-pat* with the same word everywhere is generally recognized ; what is not so often stated is that to substitute a number of equivalents for one, while more illuminating than the first procedure, does not yield a final answer, and may even obscure the question by leading the translator into false dilemmas. In such a situation it seems preferable to consider the whole range of meaning which may be present in any given example, rather than to make an arbitrary choice of one of the catalogued meanings and forcibly exclude the others, a procedure which can only cause trouble to those who wish to use the results of the description for etymological purposes.²³

(a) *-pat* with nominal elements

The typical use of the particle is to mark an item which recurs. With nouns this can either confirm a possibly unexpected repetition or underline one which is already obvious. Instances of the first case are the use of *-pat* to indicate that two different individuals have the same name, e.g. :

1 SAL^{TUM} 'Kat-ti-it-ta-ḫi mTa-ti-li-e-ni Š[UM-ŠU]

1 DUMU.SAL ŠEŠ-ŠU 'Kat-ti-it-ta-ḫi-pát Š[UM-ŠU]

'one woman, her n[ame] Kattittahī of Tatileni. One daughter of her brother, her n[ame] Kattittahī likewise',²⁴ and its use in vocabularies, where, when the same Hittite word is used twice in succession to gloss two different Sumerian or Akkadian words, *-pat* is attached to the second instance of the Hittite word, e.g. KBo 1 44 obv. 14 (Sumerian omitted) :

I-NA-AN-NA ki-nu-un

I-NA-AN-NA-MA ki-nu-un-pát

This is the example which led Hrozný to believe that *-pat* was equivalent to Akkadian *-ma*, but the apparent correspondence

²³ The sort of difficulty to which this can lead is well exemplified by Szemerényi's discussion (*Syncope in Greek and Indo-European*, 344-349) of the interpretations on which Pedersen based his etymology ; the fact that Götze and Friedrich chose different words to render *-pat* does not mean that Pedersen's translations were (*pace* Szemerényi) 'mostly wrong'.

²⁴ H. Otten and V. Souček, *Das Gelübde der Königin Puduhepa an die Göttin Lelwani*, StBoT I, 20.

of the two particles here is fortuitous, as can be seen by comparing rev. 13–15 of the same tablet :

IM-MA-TI ku-uš-ša-an

IM-MA-TI-MA nu ku-uš-ša-an

A-NA IM-MA-TI nu ku-uš-ša-an-pát

as well as many other cases where *-pat* is attached to a repeated word in a vocabulary, but does not correspond to *-ma*.²⁵

Whatever similarities of usage there may be between the Hittite and Akkadian particles, this passage cannot be taken as evidence that the Hittites regarded one as an appropriate translation of the other.²⁶

In other cases *-pat* occurs with a repeated noun apparently for stylistic reasons rather than to serve any communicative necessity ; this is particularly noticeable with proper names, where it is unlikely that there should be any doubt about the identity of reference.

e.g. KBo XI 46 ii 7

6 LUGAL-uš *A-NA* ^DA.A par-ši-ya

7 na-at *PA-NI* ^DA.A-pát da-a-i

‘ The king breaks (bread) for the god Ea, and places it before the aforesaid god Ea ’.

KBo IV 9 v 44

38 na-aš-ta ^{LÚ}.MEŠNAR GIŠ.^DINANNA.HI.A

39 an-da pí-e-da-an-zi

.....

43 nu ^{LÚ}MEŠ^hal-li-ya-ri-e-eš

44 *IT-TI* GIŠ.^DINANNA.HI.A-pát i-ya-an-ta-ri

‘ The musicians carry in the Ištar instruments.....
the liturgists etc. walk with the aforesaid Ištar instruments ’

²⁵ e.g. KBo I 42 i 7–8, ii 15–16, 17–18, 41–42, iii 53–54. In i 28 the scribe has saved time by writing KI.MIN-pát ‘ ditto ’ instead of repeating the Hittite word (and also in v 5).

²⁶ It is interesting to note that *-ma* in these vocabularies is not used with repeated Akkadian words in the way *-pat* is with repeated Hittite words ; cf. KBo I 42 i 15–16, 17–18. For an analogous use of a Hurrian particle *-ma(n)* in the Ras Shamra vocabulary see Friedrich, *WZKM* 50 (1943), 53 note 3.

KUB XXXIII 123 iii 42

39 nu NA₄ ḫu-wa-ši-ya *A-NA* DU ŠA URU Iš-ta-nu-wa40 DU^UTU-i da-a-i41 nam-ma EGIR-an-da *IŠ-TU* GAL KAŠ 3-ŠU ši-pa-an-ti43 ši-pa-an-za-ki-iz-zi-ma DU URU Iš-ta-nu-wa-pát DU^UTU-un

‘ he sets up a ḫuwaši-stone also for the Storm-god of Ištuwa (and) the Sun, then afterwards he makes libations of beer out of a cup three times, and makes repeated libations to the aforesaid Storm-god of Ištuwa (and) the Sun.’

KBo V 8 i 29

28 nu URUTág-ga-aš-ta-an URU-an KUR URUTág-ga-aš-ta-ya
ar-ḫa wa-ar-nu-nu-un29 nam-ma-kán *I-NA* URUTág-ga-aš-ta-pát še-ir tu-uz-zi-ya-
nu-un

‘ I burned Taggašta city and the country of Taggašta, and then I camped up there in Taggašta ’.

In the majority of instances of this type, of which many more examples could be quoted, the style is emotionally neutral ; there is nothing ‘ emphatic ’ about the words to which *-pat* is attached. An example like the following is exceptional :

KBo XII 62, 11

11 nu DINGIR.MEŠ^mDu-ud-du-mi-in-pát *QA-DU* DAM-ŠU12 [DU]MU.MEŠ-ŠU *QA-TAM-MA* ḫar-ni-in-kán-du

‘ may the gods destroy the said Duddumi together with his wife and children ’.

Here one might be tempted to suppose that the presence of *-pat* had the effect of laying particular stress on the name Duddumi, but it would be a basic error to assume that the expression of emphasis of an emotional kind was the normal function of *-pat*. It appears to have such a function in the example under consideration because the sentence as a whole expresses strong emotion, but as we have already seen it is equally capable of occurring in such unemotional contexts as prescriptions for the conduct of rituals, a fact which suggests that its functions must have been something other than the mere addition of ‘ emphasis ’.

Similar to the use of *-pat* with repeated nouns is its occurrence

in combination with the pronoun *apāš*, which is itself anaphoric ; the combination may be used either adjectivally or pronominally. In its adjectival use it is most appropriately translated ' the same ', e.g. :

FHG 3, 41

38 ^Wša-ku-un-ni-eš-ma EN.SISKUR pa-ra-a ḫal-za-a-i

39 nu ^Wša-ku-un-ni-eš IŠ-TU ZA.ḪUM A-NA DINGIR^{LIM}
ŠU.MEŠ-aš

40 wa-a-tar pa-ra-a e-ip-zi A-NA EN.SISKUR-ya-kán

41 a-pí-iz-pát IŠ-TU ZA.ḪUM KÛ.BABBAR ŠU.MEŠ-aš
wa-a-tar

42 pa-ra-a la-a-ḫu-u-i

' The priest calls out the sacrificer, and the priest takes water for the hands out of a jug for the god, and for the sacrificer he pours water for the hands out of the same silver jug '.

KUB XXX 24 ii 13

12 na-aš-ta ALAM IŠ-TU ^{GIS}GIGIR a-ša-an-na-aš kat-ta
da-an-zi

13 nu ^{GIS}ZA.LAM.GAR a-pí-e-da-ni-pát pí-di ka-ru-ú ši-ya-an

14 na-at-kán ^{GIS}ZA.LAM.GAR-aš an-da pí-e-da-an-zi

' They take down the statue out of the carriage ; a tent (has been) pitched beforehand in the same place, and they take it into the tent '.

For *apedani-pat pidi* ' in the same place ', cf. KBo II 9 iv 16. Particularly common is *apedani-pat UD-ti* ' on the same day ', e.g. KBo II 18 rev. 21 ; KBo IV 4 iv 15 ; KUB XXX 31 iv 20 etc. Also found are *apedaš-pat UD.KAM-aš an-da* ' in those same days ' KBo II 2 i 55 ; cf. KBo IX 114, 4 and KBo III 1 ii 5 (Proclamation of Telipinuš) ; *apedani-pat GE₆-ti IBoT III 148 iii 20* ' in the same night ', and *apedani-pat meḫuni* ' at the same time ' KBo III 13 rev. 8 also occur.

The pronominal *apāš-pat* ' that same one ' can be used interchangeably with repeated noun + *-pat* ; in the Hittite Laws the phrase nu *İR-an-pát šu-ú-iz-zi* in I § 95 is parallel to nu *a-pu-u-un-pát šu-ú-iz-zi* in I § 99.²⁷

²⁷ Paragraph numbers according to the edition of J. Friedrich, *Die Hethitischen Gesetze*, Leiden 1959.

The examples so far considered, where *-pat* occurs with a repeated noun or with a pronominal substitute for a repeated noun, show clearly that the particle is used to indicate identity as permanence of the object. What remains to be seen is whether it also indicates identity as opposed to otherness, as Pedersen seems to have implied by translating it by Latin *ipse*. This was also the function which Benveniste believed that *-pat* must have inherited.

In considering this question it is important to remember that the resources of the Hittite language in respect to expressions of identity are different from those of, for example, Latin. There are no pronouns or adjectives which can be rendered as 'self' or 'same'. Apart from *-pat* there is another enclitic suffix *-ila* which is found attached to personal pronouns and to the anaphoric/demonstrative pronoun *apāš*. Its origin is obscure, but its function is reasonably clear; it indicates an opposition between the word to which it is attached and something else, and can be rendered as '-self' or 'of (his etc.) own accord'. This must reduce the likelihood of such a function for *-pat* in connection with the pronouns in question, though it cannot have any bearing on its function in other contexts (where *-pat* has the field to itself) or exclude the possibility that such a function was inherited by *-pat*. Whatever the origin of *-ila*²⁸

²⁸ It is quite uncertain whether the *-ila* suffix attached to pronouns has anything to do with the *-el/-ila* which is attached to the numeral 2 and imparts to it the meaning 'both'; cf. Friedrich *ZA NF* 5 (1921), 56 ff. This suffix was compared by Friedrich, *WZKM* 50 (1943), 51–64 with that in Hurrian *šinella* 'those two'; the consistent spelling with single *-l-* in Hittite might, he suggested, have been due to the influence of *-ila* 'self'. *-el* as a pronominal suffix is apparently of late origin (cf. Kammenhuber, *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, II 2, Leiden-Köln 1969, 213) and it seems possible that it arose alongside *-ila* on the analogy of the *-el/-ila* variation with the number 2, which existed already in Old Hittite (2-*el* in the Laws, *HG* II § 77 = KBo VI 26 iii 33, where the reading of the numeral has been confirmed by Güterbock, *JCS* 16 (1962), 23, and 2-*i-la* in KBo XVII 30 ii 2 and [4].) Parallels between the uses of *-el/-ila* and those of *-pat* are striking: both are used with pronouns and with the numeral 2 to convey the meaning 'both'. It is not possible to establish historical priority between 2-*el*/2-*ila* and 2-*pat*, which also occurs in the Laws, *HG* I § 84, but it seems conceivable that the use of *-pat* with

it does not appear to be Indo-European, and with personal pronouns at least it seems not to occur before the time of Šuppiluliumaš I, although there is an early example of *apāšila*.²⁹ The combination *apāšila-pat* occurs in KUB XXI 37 i 38 (from the time of Hattušiliš III) ; in KBo XI 14 iv 21 (a late ritual text), and in *Madduwattaš*, KUB XIV 1 rev. 44, 48, a text traditionally assigned to the very end of the Hittite Empire, although attempts have recently been made to date it considerably earlier on linguistic grounds.³⁰

Since the history and scope of the suffix *-ila* are not such as to rule out the possibility of 'ipse' functions for *-pat* the presence or absence of these can only be established by examining examples of the use of *-pat* itself. The extreme case of 'identity as opposed to otherness' is isolation ; what is predicated of the element to which *-pat* is attached is true of it and of nothing else. A less extreme case is contrast between the element to which *-pat* is attached and something else, either expressed or implied by the context, of which the same predication cannot be made. Examples where the *-pat* element is opposed to 'every X', 'no other X', are quite common. e.g. : KUB XXII 70 obv. 33
 33 ma-a-an ki-i-pát nam-ma-ma da-ma-i NÚ.GAL ku-it-ki
 34 nu IGI-zi MUSEN HURRI SIG₅-ru EGIR-za-ma NU.SIG₅-
 du

expressions of totality and completeness (for which see below, p. 153) may have started with *2-pat* coming into use alongside *2-ila* on the model of the pair *apāš-pat* : *apāšila*. This leaves open the question of whether the source of the pronominal *-ila* was the same as that of the one found with the numeral, as Friedrich seemed to suggest. The necessary condition for the development just suggested would be not that they had the same origin, but that Hittite speakers could have regarded them as the same, which in view of the later analogical innovations *ukel* and *apāšel* seems quite probable.

Unlike the combination *apāšila-pat* the corresponding *2-ila-pat* appears early if it is the right restoration in KBo XVII 30 ii 4, as seems likely by the occurrence of *2-ila* in line 2.

²⁹ A. Kammenhuber, *KZ* 83 (1969), 275 and *Handbuch der Orientalistik* II 2, 213.

³⁰ For the already quite extensive literature on the redating of this and other texts see A. Kammenhuber, *KZ* 83 (1969), 257¹ and 289⁶. One consequence of redating *Madduwattaš* would be to produce an isolated pair of examples of *apāšila-pat* from before the time of Šuppiluliumaš I.

‘ If (it is) just this but in addition nothing else at all let the first *hurri*-bird be favourable but the one after that be unfavourable ’.

This is an example of a formula found very frequently in oracle texts when a cause of divine wrath has been positively established and it is wished to ascertain if there are any others. The formula is so common that it is often abbreviated to *ma-a-an ki-i-pát nam-ma-ma* KI.MIN (KUB XVIII 21 ii 17 etc.) or even to *ma-a-an ki-i-pát* KI.MIN.

Somewhat similar examples can be found in historical texts, e.g. :

KBo X 2 i 26 (Annals of Hattušiliš I).

24 EGIR-az-ya-za-ma-mu-kán ¹⁰KÚR ŠA ^{URU}Hurri KUR-e
an-da ú-it

25 nu-mu KUR.KUR.MEŠ ḫu-u-ma-an-da me-na-aḫ-ḫa-an-
da ku-ru-ri-aḫ-ḫi-ir

26 na-aš-ta ^{URU}Ḫa-at-tu-ša-aš-pát URU-ri-aš 1-aš a-aš-ta

‘ but behind me the Hurrian enemy invaded the country, and all the countries became hostile before me, and only Hattušaš, the city alone, remained ’.

KBo V 6 ii 9 (Deeds of Šuppiluliumaš I)

9 nu-uš-ši A-NA KUR ^{URU}Kar-ga-miš ^{URU}Kar-ga-miš-pát
1-aš URU-aš

10 Ū-UL ták-šu-la-it

‘ and in the land of Kargamiš only Kargamiš itself, the one city, did not make terms with him ’.

KBo V 8 iii 31 (Annals of Muršiliš II)

31 nu-mu-kán ^mPi-it-tág-ga-tal-li-iš-pát

32 1-aš iš-par-za-aš-ta ERÍN.MEŠ-ma-aš-ši-kán ḫu-u-ma-an
ar-ḫa da-aḫ-ḫu-un

‘ P. himself alone escaped me, but I deprived him of all his infantry and chariotry ’

KUB XIV 1 obv. 51 .. Götze, *Madd.* 12-13

51 na-aš-ta ^mMa-ad-du-wa-at-ta-aš-pát ne-ku-ma-an-za iš-par-
za-aš-ta

‘ M. escaped naked ’ (when the rest of his household were captured by Kupanta-^DKAL)

It would be possible here to render ^m*Madduvattaš-pat* in English

either as 'M. himself' or as 'M. alone';³¹ from the Hittite point of view the important things to notice are (i) Madduwattaš has been mentioned before, so that the normal anaphoric use of *-pat* must be taken into account: (ii) Contrast is implied between Madduwattaš, who escaped, and his family, who were captured. This example is very similar to the previous one except for the omission of *1-aš* 'alone'. This omission throws the whole burden of expressing the contrast onto *-pat*. But it must be emphasized that this is an unusual state of affairs. In rendering *-pat* by 'only' it seems not always to be appreciated that the particle is hardly capable of fulfilling this function by itself; it requires usually quite explicit support from the context. This is not surprising in view of the fact that *-pat*, unlike the English 'only' has other functions as well.

Some of the most difficult cases to decide in this respect occur in the Laws. Here translators have differed sometimes, it seems, merely in the choice of a translation-equivalent for the particle, but at other times in ways which materially affect the interpretation of the passage in question. To this latter class belongs I § 5, concerning the killing of a Hittite merchant:

- 10 [(ták)]-ku ^{LU}DAM.GÀR ^{URU}Ḫa-at-ti ku-iš-ki ku-en-zi 1
ME MA.N[(A)] KÛ.BABBAR pa-a-i
 11 [(par-n)]a-aš-še-e-a šu-wa-a-iz-zi ták-ku *I-NA* KUR ^{URU}Lu-
 ú-i-ya na-aš[(-m)]a *I-NA* KUR ^{URU}Pa-la-a
 12 [(1 *ME*)] MA-NA KÛ.BABBAR pa-a-i a-aš-šu-še-it-ta šar-
 ni-ik-zi ma-a-an *I-NA* KUR ^{URU}Ḫa-at-ti
 13 [(nu)]-za u-na-at-tal-la-an-pát ar-nu-uz-zi

'If anyone kills a Hittite merchant he pays 100 minas of silver.³²
 . . . if in the country of Luwia or the country of Pala he pays 100 minas of silver and makes recompense for his goods; if in the country of Ḫatti he 'brings' the merchant(-*pat*).

The difficulties here are twofold. The first concerns the mean-

³¹ Götze translated 'Und Madduwattaš entkam da wieder nackt' without comment, apparently taking *-pat* as relating the whole episode to the similar one described in line 47, but such an interpretation is made unlikely by the fact that *-pat* is not attached to the verbal group.

³² Or 1½? See F. Imparati, *Le leggi ittite*, Rome, 1964, 196-198.

ing of the verb *arnuzzi*, literally 'brings' = 'causes to arrive'. Friedrich translates it as 'so büsst (?) er nur den Kaufmann', taking *arnuzzi* as equivalent to *šarnikzi* 'compensates for'; this enables him to translate the particle as 'nur'. But taken in this way the last sentence adds nothing to what has already been said, and to suppose that two different verbs are used in the same technical sense of 'compensate for' is unsatisfactory, as F. Imparati has pointed out.³³ It seems preferable here to accept her interpretation, which is that the culprit is required to produce the merchant's body for burial when he is killed in his own country and such a course is practicable. Secondly, the normal anaphoric use of the particle is possible; *unattallan* is the Hittite equivalent of the Sumerogram ¹⁰DAM.GÀR in the first sentence. But there is also a possibility of contrast between the two alternative provisions of the law which are additional to the fine and conditional on the location of the crime, expressed as an opposition between the merchant himself, whose body must be produced if he is killed in Hatti, and his goods, which must be compensated for if he is killed in Luwia or Pala. If this interpretation of *arnuzzi* is correct, Pedersen's rendering of *-pat* as 'selbst' or 'ipsum'³⁴ is unobjectionable; it is only the equation of *arnuzzi* with *šarnikzi* which makes possible the rendering 'nur'.

The next paragraph of the Laws which raises similar questions is I § 9 :

(If anyone injures a man's head, formerly they used to pay six shekels of silver; the injured man takes three shekels of silver and they used to take three shekels of silver for the palace: now the king has remitted the share of the palace)—

23 nu-za hu[(-ni-in-ká)]n-za-pát

24 3 <GÍN> KÙ.BABBAR da-a-i

'and the injured man takes three shekels of silver'.

Friedrich's translation here is 'und nur der Verletzte nimmt 3 Sekel Silber' which is a possible interpretation: the injured man, who still gets his compensation, is contrasted with the

³³ *La Parola del Passato* 66 (1959), 187; cf. *Le leggi ittite* 194-196.

³⁴ *AO* 7 (1935), 80-82.

palace, which no longer takes a share. But another possibility is that *-pat* in its anaphoric function relates the second occurrence of *ḫuninkanza* to the first, so that the sense of the passage could be approximately rendered 'the injured party, the same (party who used to receive that amount before) takes three shekels'. This seems bizarre from the English point of view. We should want to say in such a situation 'the injured man receives the same amount, three shekels', or 'the injured man continues to receive three shekels', expressing the constant element in the situation by asserting the sameness of the object or of the action rather than that of the subject. But in this situation all the elements are constant, including the subject (the injured man as a type, not as an individual), the verb and the object, so that *-pat*, the function of which is so often to pick out a constant feature, has as much reason to be attached to the subject as to anything else. Contrast between the injured man and the palace may have played a part in determining this choice, but it does not seem possible in a case like this to exclude either the anaphoric or the contrastive function. In order to avoid possible misunderstanding it should perhaps be stated that these functions are not mutually exclusive; there is no logical reason why they should not coexist, especially in a language which is apparently ill-equipped to distinguish between them. Our concern at the moment is to see if particular cases compel us to a choice between these as alternatives, not to enforce upon them one interpretation to the exclusion of the other in the belief that if one is right the other must be wrong. A more straightforward example is I § 21 :

('if anyone steals the slave of a Luwian from Luwia and brings him to Hatti and his master traces him')—

nu-za ʾR-ZU-pát da-a-i šar-ni-ik-zi-il [(NU.GÁL)]. Here ʾR-ZU-pát has been variously translated: 'den Sklaven selbst' (Pedersen);^{34a} 'nur seinen Unfreien' (Friedrich);³⁵ 'just the slave' (Goetze);³⁶ 'per sé proprio il suo servo prenda'

^{34a} *AO* 7 (1935), 81.

³⁵ *HG* 20.

³⁶ *ANET*² (1955), 190.

(Imparati).³⁷ This is a case where there is no doubt about what the law requires. The master may take his slave, but there is no compensation. The different translations reflect different conceptions of the function of *-pat* in this context. Friedrich's 'nur' implies that it is there to reinforce the following statement šar-ni-ik-zi-il [(NU.GÁL)] 'No compensation'. But here again the word to which the particle is attached occurred previously in the same paragraph, and the anaphoric function can also be taken into account. It is difficult to find fault either with Pedersen's 'selbst' or with Goetze's 'just', both of which seem intended to suggest that both anaphora and contrast are implied here, if I have understood them rightly.

An element of contrast is also possible in I § 23 :

('If a slave runs away and goes to Luwia whoever brings him back is given six shekels of silver ; if a slave runs away and goes into enemy country, whoever brings him back')—

na-an-za-an a-pa-a-aš-pát da-a-i 'that same man takes him for himself', the contrast being between the man who recovers the slave and the original master. But the predominant sense here seems to be anaphoric. Here of course the particle is attached to a demonstrative pronoun which has itself a similar function. It is interesting to note that this example is the only one which Szemerényi³⁸ is prepared to admit as an instance of identification, and will not admit it as evidence for an identifying function of the particle because the identity is inherent in the situation. It is true that the specific functions of *-pat* can best be determined by observing its use in contexts where it is not accompanied by elements of suspected similar functions, but granted that such instances can be found, as in the case of *-pat* they certainly can, its occurrences elsewhere with the pronoun *apāš* do not destroy the hypothesis that its meaning is in some way similar to that of the pronoun, but tend rather to support it.

I § 43 is somewhat similar :

³⁷ *Le leggi ittite*, 45.

³⁸ *Syncope in Greek and Indo-European*, 348.

52 ták-ku LÚ-aš GUD-ŠU ĪD-an zi-nu-uš-ki-iz-zi ta-ma-i-ša-an
 šu-ú-wa-iz-zi

53 nu KUN GUD e-ip-zi ta ĪD-an za-a-i nu BE-EL GUD
 ĪD-aš pí-e-da-i nu a-pu-u-un-pát da-a-an-zi

‘ If a man habitually drives his ox across a river, and another man pushes him and seizes the tail of the ox and crosses the river, and the river carries away the master of the ox, they take that same man.’ In view of the somewhat oracular phrasing of this paragraph it is difficult to say if any contrast is implied ; we do not know who ‘ they ’ are, or for what purpose they ‘ take ’ the offender ; all that is clear is that the guilty man must in some way suffer for his act. A more specific penalty is decreed for the offenders of I § 55, who are guilty of some form of sorcery :

1 [(tá)]k-ku LÚ EL-LAM MUŠ-an ku-en-zi da-me-e-el-la
 Š[(UM-an)]

2 te-iz-zi 1 MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR pa-a-i ták-ku ĪR-ša a-pa-a-
 aš-pát a-k[(i)]

(If a free man kills a snake and speaks another (person)’s name, he pays 1 mina of silver : if a slave, he himself dies’. Translators here have differed in their rendering of *apāš-pat* : Pedersen has ‘ wenn ein Sklave, so muss er mit seiner eigener Person büssen, er muss selbst sterben ’, while Friedrich has ‘ wenn (es) ein Unfreier (ist), wird eben dieser getötet ’. Pedersen’s translation assumes that *-pat* points to a contrast between the slave’s punishment and that of the free man ; he dies himself, rather than just paying a fine, while Friedrich’s seems to assume a simple identification, as in the case of I § 43.

I § 95 and I § 98 deal with the case of a slave who steals from a house, and that of a slave who sets fire to a house. In both these cases the slave’s master can choose between paying compensation on his behalf and surrendering him. The second alternative is expressed in the following ways :

I § 95 47 [ták-ku mi-i]m-ma-i-ma nu ĪR-an-pát šu-ú-iz-zi
 ‘ but if he refuses he renounces that slave ’.

I § 98 57 ták-ku Ū-UL-ma šar-ni-ik-zi

58 [nu] a-pu-u-un-pát šu-ú-iz-zi

‘but if he does not compensate he renounces that same one’. The equivalence of *-pat* with repeated noun and *-pat* with pronominal *apāš* has already been mentioned. The identifying function of the particle has some importance here. It must be the slave who committed the offence, not just any of his slaves, whom the master must surrender if he is unable or unwilling to pay compensation. On the other hand the possibility of a contrast between the compensation which the master must pay and the slave whom he must give up as an alternative cannot be ruled out.

Both identity and contrast are present in I § 51 :

- 3 ka-ru-ú ku-iš URU A-ri-in-na LUŠ.BAR ki-i[-ša-at (Û É-ZU
a-ra-a-u-wa-an LU.MES HA.LA.ŠU)]
4 Û LU.MES NI-ŠU-Û-ŠU a-ra-u-e-eš ki-n[(u-na É-ZU-pát EL-
LUM LU.MES HA.LA.ŠU)]

5 Û LU.MES NI-ŠU-Û-ŠU ša-aḥ-ḥa-an lu-uz-zi kar-pi-an-zi

‘Formerly whoever became a weaver in Arinna (was free) and his household and his partners and his employees were free ; now his household is free : his partners and employees are liable for *šahḥan* and *luzzi*.’

This is rather similar to I § 9, already discussed. It mentions a difference between what happened formerly and what happens now, and the constant feature of the situation, the freedom of the weaver’s household from *šahḥan* and *luzzi*, is marked by the attachment of *-pat* to the subject of the clause. On the other hand there is an explicit contrast between the still free household and the partners and employees who are no longer exempted from these obligations, and a rendering ‘now only his household is free’ is quite possible.

-pat with genitive case of a pronoun or with a pronominal possessive suffix can often be translated as ‘own’. This is not invariably the case, as can be seen by considering the example just mentioned, where a translation ‘his own house’ (as opposed to someone else’s house) would not be appropriate. The collocation of *-pat* with the pronominal possessive suffix is here a coincidence brought about by the repetition of the combination É-ZU ‘his house’.

Examples from the Laws where the translation 'own' is appropriate are I § 74 :

(If anyone breaks the horn or foot of an ox he takes that one for himself and gives the owner a good ox)—

71 *ták-ku BE-EL GUD te-iz-zi am-me-el-pát-wa-za GUD-un da-aḥ-ḥi*

72 *GUD-ŠU da-a-i Ū 2 GĪN KŪ.BABBAR pa-a-i*

'If the owner of the ox says "I will take my own ox" he takes his ox and he (the man who did the damage) pays two shekels of silver'.

There is clear contrast here between the man's own injured animal which he chooses to take and the sound one which is offered as a replacement.

II § 75 [(*ták-ku LÚ*)]-iš a-pi-e-e[(*l-pá*)]t an-na-ša-aš kat-ta wa-aš-ta-i

'if a man sins with his own mother'

Here too more seems to be conveyed by the particle than simple identification. It might be supposed that the particle was there in order to stress the closeness of the relationship and the enormity of the offence ; on the other hand it is not found in the other prohibitions of incestuous relationships in the same paragraph. It seems possible that the particle may point to a contrast between the man's own mother and the stepmother mentioned in § 76, relations with whom are an offence only if the father is still alive.

A further example of *-pat* added to a possessive suffix to convey the sense 'own' is KUB XI 1 iv 26 : *a-pí-e-da-ni-pát UKŪ-ši É-ri-iš-ši-pát i-da-la-u-e-eš-zi*

'It will go badly for that man in his own house'.³⁹

Pedersen's other example of *-pat* after a possessive suffix in the Laws is in I § 19 : *É-ir-še-it-pát ar-nu-zi*. Different interpretations have been given of this phrase, which prescribes what is to

³⁹ It seems better to take the verb as impersonal here than to adopt the interpretation of Sturtevant (*Chrest.* 193) 'he (i.e. the sorcerer) will come (and) turn against that very man and his house'. *É-rišši-pat* (locative) would then be similar to the usual *pidišši-pat* 'in his/its own place, on the spot' in KUB VIII 2 i 11 ; X 10 i 1 ; XI 25 iii 25 ; XXVI 69 vi 11, KBo II 9 i 12 ; VIII 84, 6 ; IBoT II 91 iii 5.

happen if a Hittite person, male or female, is 'stolen' by a Luwian and taken from Hattusas to Luwia/Arzawa, and there discovered by his/her 'master' (išḫaš). According to the usual view it specifies a very severe penalty : (the culprit) surrenders his household ; if this is right, *-pat* presumably belongs to the possessive suffix, as in the previous example. Friedrich on the other hand believes that in this case there is no penalty at all, and that the phrase means ' he just takes him home ' with *-pat* = 'nur' (cf. I § 21, discussed above, p. 118). The closest parallel I have found to such an adverbial usage of *-pat* in the sense of ' only ' is in KUB XXXIV 24, 10 : ka-a-pát-wa u-wa-e-u-en ' only here did we come ' supported by the previous statement ' We went to no other country '. Even this is not a complete parallel ; the instruction in I § 19 cannot be to take the person ' home and nowhere else ' ; it is the action specified by the verb which according to this interpretation has to be qualified by *-pat*, not the destination supposed to be expressed by É-ir-še-it-pát,⁴⁰ and this is not a normal adverbial use of the particle. This and the following sections of the Laws (§§ 19–21) are full of problems which although they are of considerable interest in themselves are not directly relevant to the interpretation of *-pat* and need not be discussed at length here ; two points only need be made. The rejection of ' nur ' in I § 19 is not a fatal objection to Friedrich's interpretation ; the phrase might possibly be taken to mean ' he takes him back home ' (to where he came from), a usage which can be paralleled from later texts, as will be seen later when we come to consider the functions of *-pat* in verbal groups. Secondly, in I § 19b, which deals rather surprisingly with a Hittite who ' steals ' a Luwian in Hattušaš and takes him to Luwia, ^{URU}Ha-at-[(tu-ši-pát)] makes it clear that the local specification is not, as might be supposed, an error. The use of *-pat* is here the identifying one ; it shows that the place of the crime is the same as in § 19a.

It is now time to summarize findings with regard to the

⁴⁰ For a discussion of this and other points of interpretation in §§ 19–21 see Friedrich, *HG* 20–21, 92–93 ; Güterbock, *JCS* 15 (1961), 67 ; Imparati, *Le leggi ittite*, 205–207.

presence of anaphora and contrast in the passages from the Laws which have been discussed. Anaphora will be considered to be present when the particle is attached either to a noun which has occurred previously in the paragraph or to a pronominal substitute for such a noun. Contrast will be indicated whenever the word to which *-pat* is attached occurs in a clause which is one of a pair which are opposed ; this opposition may relate to time ('formerly' versus 'now'), or status (slave versus free) or to a choice of actions open to one of the parties.

(i) *-pat* with nouns.

Anaphora is present in all cases. There is explicit contrast in the following :

I § 5 (alternative locations of crime)

I § 9, I § 51 (formerly/now)

I § 21 (negative sentence follows)

I § 95 (alternative choice offered)

Nothing more than anaphora seems to be indicated in I § 19b and I § 49. I § 19a shows anaphora if *-pat* belongs with the possessive suffix.

(ii) *-pat* with pronouns (mainly *apāš*). Here anaphora is automatically implied by the use of the pronoun itself. Explicit contrast occurs in :

I § 23 (different locations)

I § 25 (formerly/now)

I § 74, I § 99 (alternative choices)

II § 55 (free/slave)

It is absent in I § 43, probably in II § 75, and in I § 10, where it is laid down that a man who has caused someone to be ill must provide a man to work in his place until he recovers, and then pay six shekels of silver, and finally :

^{LÜ}AZU-ya ku-uš-ša-an a-pa-a-aš-pát [(pa-a-i)] ' he himself pays the doctor's fee '. There may be an implicit contrast here between the culprit and the sick man who would otherwise have to pay the doctor himself.

It appears, then, that anaphora is the factor most consistently associated with *-pat* in the Laws, not only when *-pat* is attached to the pronoun *apāš*, but also with nouns ; this should dispose

of the suggestion that it owes its 'identifying' function to association with an anaphoric pronoun. But an element of contrast is also often present. The function of *-pat* in such contrasts is often to mark that element of the situation which stays the same when other things change. Another noticeable feature of these texts is the use of *-pat* to mark the individual who personally experiences the effects of the penalty prescribed, and the tendency of the particle to occur in the last sentence in a paragraph when so used. When all this is taken into account Pedersen's 'selbst' seems no bad choice as a rendering of the particle. It covers both the aspects of identity defined by Benveniste, identity as permanence of the object and identity as opposed to otherness. There is an essential unity in the uses of *-pat* so far discussed which is in danger of being obscured by the choice of different translation-equivalents which may come to be regarded (wrongly) as logically excluding one another.

There are two places in the Laws where Friedrich settles for the translation 'auch'. General discussion of the admissibility of such a rendering belongs properly to the section dealing with the uses of *-pat* with the verb, and in fact one of the two examples in question does concern a verbal group; it comes from § XXXIV of the later 'Parallel Text' of the Laws and will be dealt with later. The remaining example is in I § 56, where *-pat* is attached to *hu-u-ma-an-ti-ya* 'in every (case)', but there seems to be no good reason for dissociating this particular instance from the numerous other occasions where the particle is attached to the words for 'all', including another case in the Laws, I § 49. These belong to the class of expressions of number, quantity and completeness with which *-pat* is often associated, a category which will be discussed later.

Little needs to be said about the use of *-pat* with personal pronouns, which is essentially the same as that with nouns. According to the context the particle may be rendered as 'idem', 'ipse' or 'solus'. The pronouns of the second person, especially the second person singular, are much more frequently found with it than those of the first person; an important reason for this is its very common use in hymns and prayers where

a second person singular pronoun is used in addressing the god, and many times repeated. A good example is a hymn to the Sun-god, KUB XXXI 127, where after the initial invocation the actions of the god are described ; the pronoun *zik* ' thou ' is used first by itself in line 3, and then followed by a succession of repetitions with *-pat*, which might appropriately be rendered ' tu idem '. An interesting comparison is afforded by a prayer of Muršiliš II to the Sun of Arinna⁴¹ which uses much of the same phraseology, but develops a ' tu solus ' sense for *zik-pat* :

29 *zi-ik-za* ^{DUTU} ^{URU}A-ri-in-na na-ak-ki-iš DINGIR-*LIM*-iš

30 *nu-ut-ták-kán* ŠUM-an lam-na-aš iš-tar-na na-ak-ki-i
DINGIR-*LIM*-ya-tar-ma-ták-kán

31 DINGIR.MEŠ-aš iš-tar-na na-ak-ki-i nam-ma-za-kán DIN-
GIR.MEŠ-aš iš-tar-na

32 *zi-ik-pát* ^{DUTU} ^{URU}A-ri-in-na na-ak-ki-iš šal-li-eš-ša-az

33 *zi-ik-pat* ^{DUTU} ^{URU}A-ri-in-na nam-ma-ták-kán da-ma-a-iš
DINGIR-*LUM*

34 na-ak-ki-iš šal-li-iš-ša Ū-UL e-eš-zi

Gurney translates : ' Thou, Sun-goddess of Arinna art an honoured deity ; and thy name is honoured among names. Thy divinity is honoured among the gods ; nay, among the gods thou alone, O Sun-goddess of Arinna, art honoured. Great also art thou alone, O Sun-Goddess of Arinna, nay, compared with thee no other deity is honoured and great.'

Definitely non-anaphoric uses of the particle are rather few. One early example, not quite certain in view of the incompleteness of the preceding context, is KBo III 28 ii 18 :

17 *at-ta-aš-ma-aš* ḫar-ša-ni-i ^DID-ya me-ik-ki-eš pa-ap-ri-eš-
kir šu-uš A-BI LUGAL

18 na-at-ta ḫu-iš-nu-uš-ki-e-it ^mKi-iz-zu-wa-aš-pát A-NA SAG
A-BI-YA ^DID-ya

19 pa-ap-ri-it-ta

' Against my father's person many were found guilty in the river-ordeal, and the king's father did not spare their lives : Kizzuwaš was found guilty in the river-ordeal (and was not

⁴¹ KUB XXIV 3 i 29 ff. ed. O. R. Gurney, *AAA* 27 (1940), 18.

spared)'. Kizzuwaš is not previously mentioned in what remains of the text, but as chief of the bodyguard (KBo III 34 ii 32) would presumably have been well known. The most likely interpretation here seems to be 'Kizzuwaš himself' or 'even Kizzuwaš', stressing the unexpectedness of such a fate for so important a personage. From a much later period two curious non-anaphoric uses can be quoted from prayers. The first is a prayer of Hattušiliš III and his queen Puduḫepa to the Sun-goddess of Arinna, KUB XIV 7 + XXI 19 iv 11 (cf. L. Rost, *MIO* 4 (1956), 332):

- 11 ma-a-an UKÛ-aš-pát
 12 at-ti an-ni DUMU-an sal-la-nu-zi nu-uš-ši at-ta-aš an-na-aš
 13 ŠA^{SAL}UMMEDA Ū-UL im-ma pa-a-i Ū-UL-ma-an-za-an-
 kán
 14 du-uš-ki-ya-zi am-mu-uq-qa-an A-N-A ŠA^{DU}URUN[e-ri-ik]
 15 DUMU-KA a-aš-ši-ya-an-ta-aš URU-ri an-da
 16 da-ri-ya-aḫ-ḫu-un

'If a human being rears a child for its father and mother do not the father and mother pay him/her the nurse's (wages), and is he/she not glad of it? I have taken trouble in the matter of the city of your beloved son, the Storm-god of Nerik . . .'

Here *-pat* is used to introduce an argument from analogy; people reward those who look after their children, so gods should do the same. The second example is from a prayer of Puduḫepa, KUB XXI 27 ii 15:

- 15 A-NA DUMU.NAM.LÚ.ULÛ^{LU}-pát-kán an-da me-mi-an
 kiš-an me-mi-iš-kán-zi
 16 ḫar-na-a-u-wa-aš-wa SAL-ni-i DINGIR-LUM ka-a-ri ti-ya[
 17 am-mu-uq-qa-za^{SAL}Pu-du-ḫe-pa-aš ḫar-na-a-wa-as SAL-za
 'Among mankind there is a saying "To the woman of the birth-chair the god grant[s] her wish." I, Puduḫepa, am a woman of the birth-chair . . .'

There is a strong general similarity between these two passages, despite differences of detail. A statement about a human custom is followed by an assertion that it is relevant to the speaker's own case. In appealing to what is said or done among mankind the speaker is not restricting the application of the

statement to them (*pat* is not = 'only') since the motive is to persuade the gods addressed that the case deserves their notice. The thought seems to be 'Among mankind (so much at least we know) this is what happens (and the gods may be expected to have much the same attitude).⁴² But it is difficult to account for the presence of *-pat* here, or to find a parallel for this kind of use.

It is only rarely that anything which can be described as a purely emphatic use of the particle is found, but in the following example its only function seems to be to express the writer's excitement and anxiety :

KUB XXXI 68 i 13 DUTU⁵⁷-ma-wa-mu-kán Ū-UL SAG.DU-
an-pát ku-ir-zi

'But will not his majesty cut off my head?'

This occurs in what is probably a letter; cf. the use of the particle in a similarly emotionally charged context in the letter already quoted, KBo XII 62, 11, where, however, anaphora is also present. The 'emphatic' function can be superimposed on the familiar anaphoric function, but is very occasionally autonomous.

The notion of emphasis needs to be treated with a certain caution. It is rather too easy to label a particular element as 'emphasising', and consider that the question has thereby been disposed of, whereas this is in fact only the first step in the enquiry. Given that a writer has chosen to single out a particular element for attention by marking it in a certain way, it is necessary to consider whether he has done so because he wishes it to be known that he has strong feelings on the point, or because it is the most informative part of his message, or for some other reason. Clearly it will not do to decide *a priori* that an element of unknown function is there to convey emotional emphasis and then deduce the existence of emotional emphasis from the presence of the element in question; there must be independent contextual evidence to support such a conclusion.

⁴² This belief is explicitly stated in KUB XIII 4 i 21 ('Instructions for Temple officials').

The foregoing examination of the uses of *-pat* with the noun has shown that it often occurs in contexts which can by no stretch of the imagination be described as emotional, and that in these contexts it is characteristically associated with a noun which is repeated, or with a pronominal substitute for one. The traditional label 'particle of identity' is perfectly justified. In addition to expressing identity as permanence of the object it may also in some cases serve to express identity as opposed to otherness ; the limiting case of this is where it conveys the sense 'only', but this sense seems to be quite strictly context-bound. In other contexts, like the ones quoted at the end of this section, where it seems legitimate to suppose that its use has something to do with emotional emphasis, this can be achieved either concomitantly with the anaphoric function or independently of it. This last state of affairs seems to be comparatively rare, and to be a mark of the more colloquial style found in letters and conversations.

Friedrich's brief definition of *-pat* as 'identifizierende und hervorhebende Partikel' is therefore correct : one cannot, with Pedersen, demand that the specification 'hervorhebende' be removed from the handbooks. At the same time it must be made clear that this is a relatively unimportant function ; it cannot be used as a universal key to all problems of interpretation and history. A similar duality is found in the uses of *-pat* with the verb, but here too it is *-pat* as particle of identity which has played the most influential part in the developments which appear to have taken place within the history of Hittite.

(b) *-pat in the verbal group*

The capacity of the particle for occurring with verbs, adverbs and preverbs as well as with nouns, pronouns and adjectives is one of the most interesting features of its syntax, but the relationship between these two broad divisions of its use have never been made clear.

There are two reasons for considering the uses with verbs to be secondary. In the first place the normal position for particles which modify the verb (the directional particles) is after the

first word in the sentence and at the end of the string of particles, attached to that word, whereas *-pat* is not confined to the initial string of particles, and when it does happen to occur there does not come at the end of the string but almost always at the beginning, that is to say, directly attached to the leading word. If *-pat* had been primarily an adverbial particle it is difficult to see why it should not have been, like the directional particles, restricted to the initial string, but should have developed an association with nouns and have become capable of occurring anywhere in the sentence.

Secondly, the use of *-pat* with the verb is rare in early texts compared with its use with nouns, but becomes more frequent later : this is the reverse of what might be expected if *-pat* had an adverbial origin. The link between the adnominal and adverbial uses of the particle seems to lie rather in those instances where it is attached to nouns which themselves complement the meaning of the verb or form part of adverbial phrases. The best-known example is the one discussed at length by Sommer, KBo III 4 ii 53 (Annals of Muršiliš II).⁴³

52 nu-kán mU-uh-ḫa-LÚ-iš a-ru-ni an-da BA.UG₆ DUMU.MEŠ-

SU-NU-ma-za ar-ḫa

53 šar-ra-an-da-at nu-kán 1-aš ŠÀ A.AB.BA-pát e-eš-ta 1-aš-ma-kán

54 mTa-pa-la-zu-na-u-li-iš a-ru-na-az ar-ḫa u-it

‘Uḫḫa-LÚ-iš died ‘in the sea’ (i.e. on an island) but his sons separated ; one remained ‘in the sea’ but the other, Tapala-zunauliš, left the sea’.

The literal translation in 53 would be ‘was in the aforesaid sea’ but such a translation would be inadequate and possibly misleading. The implication is not that the first son was in the same sea as opposed to a different sea, but that he went on being in the same place, the sea. The place he was in was the constant feature of his situation, and as such was marked by *-pat*. This may seem obvious, but has caused confusion ; Pedersen⁴⁴

⁴³ OLZ 24 (1921), 197–200.

⁴⁴ AO 7 (1935), 84.

quotes it as an example of a *-pat* which does not belong to the word to which it is attached. The difficulty is in fact purely one of translation, arising from the fact that Hittite points out the sameness of someone's situation instead in this case of using a special verb to indicate that he remains. It is convenient in English to use a different verb, as there is nothing literally corresponding to the Hittite idiom, but this does not mean that the Hittite idiom is to be classified as a special kind of adverbial use. The usage of *-pat* here is the familiar identifying one, and is not adverbial at all, but adnominal; it is however of great importance as a clue to the origins of the adverbial use. Similar examples are KUB II 5 v 6 :

2 ta ¹⁰ŠILA.ŠU.DU₈.LIŠ.A GAL KÙ.BABBAR

3 GEŠTIN-it LUGAL-i pa-a-i nu GAL ¹⁰ME-ŠE-DI

4 ¹⁰ŠILA.ŠU.DU₈.LIŠ.A-ya iš-ki-ša-az

5 EGIR-pa i-ya-at-ta-a-ri

6 IGI.HI.A-wa-aš-ma-at-kán LUGAL-i-pát

7 an-da-an ne-ya-an-te-eš

‘The cupbearer gives the king a silver cup with wine, and the chief of the bodyguard and the cupbearer retires (*sic*) backwards, but their eyes remain directed towards the king.’

KBo IV 2 i 37

36 na-an-kan ar-ḫa *Ú-UL* tuḫ-ḫu-uš-zi

37 GE₆-an-ta-az-aš-ma-aš-kán an-da-pát še-eš-zi UR.TUR-ya-kán ti-an-za É-ri-pát KI.MIN

‘He does not cut it off, but it remains on them all night, and the little dog which has been placed, there in the house, ditto.’

KBo IV 12 i 32 = Götze, *Hatt.* 42

31 [GIM-an-ma am-mu]-ug LUGAL-iz-zi-iḫ-ḫa-at am-mu-ug

32 [.....^mMi-id-da]^{an}-na-mu-wa ŠĀ-ta-pát e-eš-ta

‘But when I became king, to me (?)Middanamuwaš was still dear’.

KUB VI 44 iv 27 = Friedrich, *Staatsv.* I 138

26 [nu *IT-TI* ^{DUTU}*ŠI* H]UL-lu li-e i-ya-ši *IŠ-TU ŠA*
^{DUTU}*ŠI*

27 [GIM-an ar]-ta-ti nu *IŠ-TU ŠA* ^{DUTU}*ŠI*-pát ar-ḫ[u-ut]

‘ Do no wrong to My Sun ; as you have stood on the side of My Sun, continue to stand on the side of My Sun ’.⁴⁵

KUB XIII 4 ii 69

67 DINGIR.MEŠ-ma-kán šu-ma-aš *I-NA* EGIR UD-mi an-da
ša-an-ḫi-eš-kán-zi

68 nu-uš-ma-ša-at *A-NA* ZI.ḪI.A-*KU-NU* DAM.MEŠ-*KU-NU*
DUMU.MEŠ-*KU-NU* SAG.GEME.İR.MEŠ-*KU-NU*

69 i-da-a-la-u-wa-an-ni-pát a-ra-an-ta-ri

‘ But in the future the gods will seek you out ; they will persist in malice towards yourselves, your wives, your children and your servants.’

For such phrases as ‘ in the sea, in the house, on the side of My Sun ’ etc. it is possible to substitute single adverbs or preverbs, and *-pat* may be attached to these with similar effect. e.g.

KUB XXV 3 ii 5

2 GAL *ME-ŠE-DI* me-na-aḫ-ḫa-an-da ar-ta

3 [DUMU.MEŠ.É.G]AL-ma-kán *A-NA* LUGAL SAL.LUGAL

4 [g]i-nu-wa-aš GAD.ḪI.A ti-an-zi

5 GAL *ME-ŠE-DI*-kán me-na-aḫ-ḫa-an-da-pát

6 ar-ta-ri DUMU.MEŠ É.GAL-ma

7 EGIR-pa pa-a-an-zi

‘ The chief of the bodyguard stands opposite, but the palace servants place knee-cloths for the king and queen. The chief of the bodyguard continues to stand opposite, but the palace servants go back.’

Analysis of the function of *-pat* in combination with preverbs is affected by the rule that in verbal groups the particle is normally attached to the preverb in any case. In some cases it is possible to say that *-pat* modifies the preverb and not the verb, but in others a choice between these possibilities would make no difference to the sense. This latter situation results when the verb itself denotes a continuing state and the preverb specifies its location. Such a case is *anda-pat šeši* in KBo IV 2 i 37 quoted above, paralleled by *É-ri-pát* in the same line. Two

⁴⁵ Friedrich’s translation ‘ stehe (weiter) auf Seiten eben der Sonne ’ recognizes the identifying function of *-pat* as well as the sense of continuity thereby conveyed.

similar cases are found with *appan ki-*, literally 'lie behind' in the sense of 'hound, persecute':

KUB XIV 1 obv. 2 = Götze, *Madd.* 2

- 1 [tu-uq-q]a ^mMa-ad-du-wa-at-ta-an t[u-e]l KUR-ya-az ^mAt-ta-ri-iš-ši-ya-aš LÚ ^{URU}A-a[h-ḫi-y]a ar-ḫa par-aḫ-ta
 2 [nam-ma]aš-ták-kán EGIR-an-pát ki-it??-ta??-at nu-ut-ta
 [pa]r-ḫi-iš-ki-it nu t[u-]e-el ŠA ^mMa[-ad-du-wa]-at-ta
 [ḪUL-lu] ḫi-in-kán ša-an-ḫi-iš-ki-it

'you Madduwattaš Attariššiyaš of Abḫiya drove out of your country, and he continued to hound you, and pursued you constantly, and sought to bring you Madduwattaš to a bad end'.

ABoT 65 rev. 10

- 9 A-BU-KA-wa-mu-uš-šan

10 EGIR-an-pát ki-it-ta-ri EGIR-an ar-ḫa-wa-ra-aš-mu

- 11 Ú-UL nam-ma ne-e-a-ri

'your father is always hounding me, he never goes away from behind me'

When the verb is not one which denotes a continuing state, it is in some cases possible to see that *-pat* marks a constant feature (location) expressed by the preverb rather than the verb:

- KUB XXXIII 8 iii 9-10 na-at-kán nam-ma ša-ra-a Ú-UL
 ú-iz-zi an-da-pát-kán ḫar-ak-zi

'it will not come up again; it will die in there'.

A similar use of *-pat* with a preverb is found in KUB XIV 16 ii
 10 = Götze, *AM* 42-43

- 8 [nam-ma ^{URU}.....az I-NA ^{URU}Ḫa-at-tu-ši] EGIR-pa
 ú-wa-nu-un nu-mu ^{URU}Pal-ḫu-iš-ša-aš
 9 [ku-it ku-u-ru-ri-ya-aḫ-ḫa-an ḫar-ta nu I-]NA ^{URU}Pal-ḫu-iš-ša pa-a-un nu ^{URU}Pal-ḫu-iš-ša-an
 10 [GUL-ḫu-un nu-kán I-NA ^{URU}Pal-ḫu-iš-ša] še-ir-pát tu-uz-zi-ya-nu-un

'From ...I came back to Ḫattusaš. And since Palḫuiššaš had made war on me I went to Palḫuiššaš and smote Palḫuiššaš, and I camped up there in Palḫuiššaš'.

To the use of *-pat* with the preverb, as in this passage, a

possible alternative is its use with the place-name, as in the example quoted earlier, KBo V 8 i 29 : *nam-ma-kán I-NA URUTág-ga-aš-ta-pát še-ir tu-uz-zi-ya-nu-un*. This reveals quite clearly that the particle in the other example belongs to the preverb and not to the verb. The sameness of the location can be expressed either by adding *-pat* to the place-name or by adding it to the preverb.

Where the preverb specifies direction of movement rather than the location of an action the addition of the particle may have the effect of indicating restoration to a former state or position, as for example in IBoT I 36 iii 10 :

9 nu šar-kan-ti-i-uš ku-iš ¹⁰*ME-ŠE-DI* u-i-da-[a]-iz-zi
10 na-aš EGIR-pa-pát píd-da-a-i na-aš pa-iz-zi *A-NA* ¹⁰*ŠU-KUR.GUŠKIN*

11 ti-i-e-iz-zi

‘ The member of the bodyguard who brings the s. runs back again and goes (and) stands by the man of the golden spear ’ (behind whom he was in line 2) ; and in KBo XIV 63a iv 2, 3 :

1 [ma-aḥ-ḥa]-jan-ma ANŠU.KUR.RA.ḪI.A ar-ḥa la-an-zi nu-uš-kán a-na-aš-ši-ya-an-zi nu-uš-kán

2 [*A-NA É^{TI}*]^M an-da-pát ti-it-ta-nu-an-zi na-aš *IŠ-TU* 5
TA-AM x

3 []-ŠU-NU-ya-aš-kán IGI.ḪI.A-ŠU-NU an-da-pát ka-ri-ya-an-zi

‘ But when they unharness the horses they them and put them back in the stable and cover their and eyes again ’.⁴⁶ *ar-ha* ‘ away ’ when combined with *-pat* seems usually to undergo little or no change of meaning, except possibly to convey a sense of the completion of the process, e.g. KBo IV 2 iii 44 nu-kán a-ši me-mi-an ar-ḥa-pát pa-aš-ku!-wa-nu-un ‘ I quite forgot that matter ’ ; KBo IV 3 iii 33 ma-an-ta] ¹⁰UTU^{ŠI} a-pí-ya-pát ar-ḥa-pát [pí-eš-ši-ya-nu-un ‘ My Sun might there and then have cast you off completely ’. In two examples from the autobiography of Ḫattušiliš III a sense of restoration to a former position at a distance is possible :

KBo III 6 i 61 = Götze, *Hatt.* 14–15

⁴⁶ cf. A. Kammenhuber, *Hipp.Heth.*, 220–221.

60 nukán ŠA KUR URUḪa-at-ti LU KÚR ku-iš ku-iš e-eš-ta
na-an-kán IŠ-TU KUR.KUR.MEŠ URUḪa-at-ti

61 ar-ḫa-pát u-i-ya-nu-un

‘Whatever enemy was inside the land of Ḫatti I drove away out of the land of Ḫatti again’ (i.e. back to where they came from).

KUB I 1 ii 49 = Götze, *Hatt.* 18-19

nu-mu ŠEŠ-YA mNIR.GÁL EGIR-an-da ú-it nu URUAn-zi-
li-ya-an

URUTa-pi-iq-qa-an-na ú-e-te-it na-aš ar-ḫa-pát pa-it

‘My brother Muwattalliš came back and fortified Anziliaš and Tapiqqaš and went away again’.

But in neither of these cases can such an interpretation be pressed.

‘I drove them right away’; ‘he went right away’ would also be possible.⁴⁷

It is, however, the first of these categories, the combination of *-pat* with a preverb specifying location associated with a verb denoting a state, which is probably most important for the extension of *-pat* to the verb itself. From the point of view of content either the preverb or the verb could be taken to represent a constant feature of the situation, and from the formal point of view *-pat* could belong to the preverb or to the group of preverb + verb. Thus a reinterpretation of the group would be possible in which *-pat* could be taken as belonging essentially to the verb, so that its use could be extended to verbs unaccompanied by preverbs. That *-pat* with verbs could convey the meaning ‘fortwährend’ was noticed by Pedersen, but has been little stressed since.⁴⁸ Götze made, and afterwards withdrew,

⁴⁷ Other examples where *arḫa-pat* is probably to be so interpreted are KUB XIV 7 iv 11, KBo VI 29 iii 30 (both with the verb *peššiya-*, both from texts of Ḫattušiliš III). The latter has been differently interpreted by Götze, who takes *-pat* here to mean ‘in addition’; it will be discussed below, pp. 148-149.

⁴⁸ *AO 7* (1935), 82. It is not one of the meanings listed by Friedrich in *Heth. El.* I², 293, and Szemerényi, *Syncope in Greek and Indo-European*, 348-349, dismisses it in favour of the view that ‘all it (sc. *-pat*) does here is to emphasize the verb’.

the suggestion that *-pat* with the verb *eš-* 'be' conferred upon it the meaning 'remain', but he later came to the conclusion that the forms attributed to *eš-* 'be' belonged rather to *aš-* 'remain' and that the particle was not responsible for the sense of continuity.⁴⁹ The example upon which the discussion centred was KUB XIX 37 iii 40 :

35 nam-ma pa-ra-a pa-a-un nu *I-NA* URUKap-pí-e-ri tu-uz-zi-ya-nu-un

36 nu-uš-ša-an *I-NA* URUKap-pí-e-ri ku-it É DINGIR^{LIM}

37 ŠA PHa-ti-pu-na-a EGIR-an na-at hu-ul-da-la-a-nu-un

38 na-at Ū-UL ša-ru-wa-a-ir IR.MEŠ DINGIR^{LIM}-ya-aš-ša-an

39 ku-i-e-eš *I-NA* URUKap-pí-e-ri EGIR-an e-šir

40 na-aš ar-ḥa da-la-aḥ-hu-un na-at e-šir-pát

'Then I went forth and camped in Kapperi and the temple of Ḥatipunās which was behind Kapperi I spared and they did not plunder it, and the servants of the god who were behind Kapperi I left alone, and they went on living there'.

Götze's second translation of the last sentence 'sie blieben trotzdem wohnen' seems less satisfactory than his first 'sie wohnen weiter dort'; it hardly makes sense to say 'I left them alone, and despite that they remained'. There is in fact no need to impose a concessive sense on this instance of *-pat*, or to take *ešir* as being from *aš-* 'remain', since a similar use of *-pat* is clearly attested with other verbs denoting a state or physical attitude, e.g. :

KUB XXXIII 49a iii 27

24 nu ma-a-an ŠA DUG.KAM UZU šu-up-pa iš-ta-an-da-an ze-e-ya-ri

25 na-aš-ta ¹⁰SANGA *A-NA BE-EL* SISKUR ^{GI}ŠERIN ar-ḥa da-a-i

26 ma-a-na-at hu-u-da-ak-ma ze-e-ya-ri

27 nu ^{GI}ŠERIN *BE-EL* SISKUR ḥar-zi-pát

'If the clean meat in the pot cooks slowly the priest takes the cedarwood away from the sacrificer, but if it cooks fast the sacrificer keeps holding the cedarwood'.

Similarly in KUB X 15 iv 14 : ¹⁰IM.ME iš-qa-ru-uh ḥar-zi-pát

⁴⁹ Ap. Friedrich, *Staatssv.* II, 375 ; second thoughts *AM* 208, note 3.

‘ the anointed one keeps holding the pointed jar ’ (which he ‘ takes ’ in line 10).⁵⁰

KUB XXV 1 vi 42

41 a-še-eš-šar-ma ¹⁰U-BA-RUM-TIM

42 a-ra-an-ta-ri-pát

‘ but the assembly (and) foreigners remain standing ’. (They have been made to stand by the herald in lines 18–21.)

The particle may also be associated with the continuation of an action, e.g.

KUB XX 46 iii 16

9 nu LUGAL-uš i-la-na-aš

10 pi-ra-an ti-i-e-iz-zi

11 nu A-NA DINGIR^{LIM} a-ru-wa-a-iz-zi

12 ta-aš ḫa-a-li-ya

13 ta nam-ma a-ru-wa-a-iz-zi

14 na-aš-kán ku-it-ma-an

15 i-la-na-aš ša-ra-a a-ri

16 a-ru-u-uš-ki-iz-zi-pát

‘ The king steps in front of the stairs and bows to the god, and he kneels and bows again, and while he mounts the stairs he continues to bow repeatedly ’.

KBo III 5 i 62 (cf. A. Kammenhuber, *Hipp. Heth.* 85^h, 73^d)

60 nu ḪA.LA-ŠU-NU az-zi-ik-kán-zi

61 nu ku-it-ma-an 8 MU-ŠU ša-ra-a ti-it-ta-nu-an-zi ḪA.LA.-MEŠ-ŠU-ma

62 az-zi-ik-kán-zi-pát

‘ They (the horses) eat their rations, and while eight nights last (?) they go on eating their rations ’.

Ibid. iii 67

65 nu I-NA 5 MU-ŠI I-NA É ¹⁰IŠ a-ra-an-da

⁵⁰ Examples of *-pat* with *ḫark-* ‘ have/hold ’ are quite numerous ; cf. KUB VII 30, 11 ; X 15 iv 14 ; X 18 ii 18 ; X 54 ii 1 ; XXI 12 ii 17 ; XXVI 85 ii 13 ; XXXV 48 ii 7 ; KBo V 8 ii 14 ; VI 29 iii 16 ; ABoT 13 i 9. An extension of this use to a noun which is the direct object of the verb is probably responsible for ¹⁰SUK[UR]pát ḫar-zi, IBoT I 36 i 51, where the particle is not anaphoric, but expresses continuity ; the guardsman keeps his spear on the way through the gatehouse, but must deposit it with the porter on leaving.

66 nu ŠÀ.GAL az-zi-ik-kán-zi GE₆-ti-ma GE₆-ti

67 tu-u-ri-iš-ki-iz-zi-pát

‘ For five nights they stand in the stall and eat their fodder, but night by night he continues to harness them ’.

In these examples *-pat* is associated with the iterative-durative form of the verb, so that the sense of continuity is not here conveyed by the particle alone. The case is parallel to that of the combination of the particle in its identifying sense with the pronoun *apāš* ; taken alone such evidence cannot be used to establish the force of *-pat*, but taken in conjunction with other evidence it has some confirmatory value.

In the following examples the notion of continuity is negatively expressed :

KUB XIV 10 i 15 (‘ The plague has gone on for 20 years ’) :

14 nu-kán IŠ-TU KUR URUḪa-at-ti ḫi-in-kán

15 ar-ḫa Ū-UL-pát ta-ru-up-ta-ri

‘ And out of the land of Ḫatti the plague has still not ceased ’.

KUB XIV 14 ii 25

25 na-aš-za-kán ma-a-an ḫi-in-kán EGIR-an Ū-UL-pát
da-a-i nu ak-ki-iš-ki-it-ta-ri

‘ If he (the god) will not take away the plague and the dying continues ’ (there will be nobody left to make offerings).

The final important category where *-pat* marks the persistence of something expressed by the verb itself is that of verbs of motion. Although these have received more attention than the preceding categories it has not been noted that when *-pat* is found with a verb of motion its function is not to indicate that the motion is additional to what precedes but rather to convey that it is continued in the original direction. One of the clearest cases is KUB XIV 15 ii 4 = Götze, *AM* 46 :

3 [nu GISKal-mi-iš-na-a]n ši-ya-it na-an-kán EGIR-an-da KUR
URUḪa-at-ti uš-ki-it

4 [me-na-aḫ-ḫa-an-d]a-ma-an-kán KUR Ar-za-u-wa uš-ki-it
nu GISKal-mi-iš-na-aš pa-it-pát

5 [nu URUḪA]-pa-aš-ša-an ŠA mUḫ-ḫa-LÚ URU-an GUL-aḫ-ta
‘ And he (the Storm-god) hurled a thunderbolt, and the land of Ḫatti watched it retreating and the land of Arzawa watched it

advancing, and it went on and struck Apašša, the city of Uḫḫa-LÚ.’

There is certainly nothing additional about the sense of *-pat* in this example ; the thunderbolt can do nothing but follow its course. For human agents more variety of action is possible, but here too the use of *-pat* with verbs of motion is confined to a fairly narrow range of contexts :

(i) Following up a victory : KUB XIV 15 i 30 = Götze, *AM* 38–39

29 nu-za ma-aḫ-ḫa-an
30 [mMaš-ḫu-i-lu-wa-aš mSUM^DKAL-an DJUMU mU-uḫ-ḫa-
LÚ tar-aḫ-ta nam-ma[-aš] pa-ṭ-pát nu [KUR ^{URU}
Ḫa ?-pa-a-nu-wa-an

31 [GUL -aḫ-ta.....]

‘When Mašḫuiluwaš had defeated SUM^DKAL the son of Uḫḫa-LÚ, he then went on and attacked Ḫapanuwa’.

KBo III 4 ii 28 = Götze *AM* 50–51

27 nu mSUM-ma^DKAL DUMU mU-uḫ-ḫa-LÚ QA-DU ERÍN.
MEŠ-ŠU ANŠU.KUR.RA.MEŠ-ŠU tar-aḫ-ḫu-un

28 na-an-kán ku-e-nu-un nam-ma-an EGIR-an-pát AŠ-BAT
nu-kán I-NA KUR ^{URU}Ar-za-u-wa

29 par-ra-an-da pa-a-un

‘I defeated SUM-ma^DKAL the son of Uḫḫa-LÚ with his infantry and chariotry and smote him, and then I pursued him and went over into the land of Arzawa’.

(ii) Following a previously determined course :

KBo V 8 i 35 = Götze, *AM* 150–151

30 lu-uk-kat-ta-ma-kán KUR ^{URU}Iš-ta-lu-up-pa iš-tar-na ar-
ḫa pa-a-un

31 nu I-NA KUR ^{URU}Ták-ku-wa-ḫi-na an-da-an pa-a-un
nu-kán ku-ṭ-ma-an

32 KUR ^{URU}Iš-ta-lu-ub-ba iš-tar-na ar-ḫa i-ya-aḫ-ḫa-at
wKÚR ^{URU}Kab-bu-ub-ba-ma

33 KUR.KUR.MEŠ-ya Ga-aš-ga-ya ḫu-u-ma-an-da ni-ni-ik-
ta-at na-aš-mu-kán ú-ṭ

34 I-NA ^{URU}Ga-ap-pu-up-pu-wa-pát HUR.SAG-i še-ir pa-ra-a
me-na-aḫ-ḫa-an-da

35 ti-i-e-it ^DUTUŠI ma pa-a-un-pát nu KUR ^{URU}Tak-ku-wa-
hi-na

36 Ū KUR ^{URU}Ta-ḫa-an-ta-at-ti-pa ar-ḫa war-nu-nu-un

‘ In the morning I went through the land of Ištaluppa and went into the land of Takkuwaḫina. While I was marching through the land of Ištalubba (*sic*) the enemy from Kabbubbama and all the Gašga lands arose and came (and) took their stand on a mountain in the aforesaid Gappuppuwa (*sic*) ahead of me, but My Sun went on and burned the land of Takkuwaḫina and the land of Taḫantattipa ’.

KUB XIV 15 iv 28 = Götze, *AM* 70-71

(Muršiliš rejects an offer of submission by Manapa-Dattaš because of his former treachery) :

25 nu-wa a-pi-ya

26 am-mu-uk EGIR-an Ū-UL ti-i-ya-at nu-wa A-[NA^m Uḫ-]
ha-LÚ ^{URU}KUR-YA EGIR-an

27 ti-i-ya-at ki-nu-na-wa-da-za ÌR-an-ni da[-aḫ-hi m]a-an-ši
pa-a-un-pát ma-a-na-an ar-ḫa

28 ḫar-ni-in-ku-un nu-mu-kán AMA-ŠU me-na-aḫ-ḫa[-an-da
pa-ra-]a na-iš-ta

“ And on that occasion you did not support me but supported my enemy Uḫḫa-LÚ—and now am I to receive you as a vassal? ” I would have proceeded against him, I would have destroyed him utterly, and then he sent his mother out to meet me . . . ’.

Götze here translates ‘ Ich wäre trotzdem gegen ihn gezogen ’, but it is difficult to see how *-pat* can have a concessive force here. The only circumstance despite which Muršiliš could have decided to proceed against Manapa-Dattaš was the latter’s appeal for mercy, but this is separated from the sentence containing the verb to which *-pat* is attached by the Hittite king’s rejection of that appeal, after which a ‘ trotzdem ’ is out of place. It seems preferable to suppose that Muršiliš was here stating his intention to proceed with his original plan of marching against Manapa-Dattaš,

KBo IV 4 iii 23 = Götze, *AM* 124-125

17 nu ma-aḫ-ḫa-an KUR ^{URU}Kar-ga-miš ta-ni-nu-nu-un

18 nu-kán IŠ-TU KUR ^{URU}Kar-ga-miš ša-ra-a ú-wa-nu-un

- 19 nu *I-NA* KUR URUTe-ga-ra-am-ma an-da-an ú-wa-nu-un
 nu ma-aḫ-ḫa-an
 20 *I-NA* URUTe-ga-ra-am-ma a-ar-aḫ-ḫu-un nu-mu ^mNu-wa-
 an-za-aš GAL.GEŠTIN
 21 EN.MEŠ-ya ḫu-u-ma-an-te-eš *I-NA* URUTe-ga-ra-am-ma
 me-na-aḫ-ḫa-an-da
 22 ú-e-ir nu-mu an-da ú-e-mi-i-e-ir ma-an *I-NA* URUHa-ya-ša
 23 pa-a-un-pát nu-za MU.KAM-za še-ir te-e-pa-u-eš-ša-an-za
 e-eš-ta

‘ When I had put the land of Kargamiš in order I came up out of the land of Kargamiš and came into the land of Tegaramma. When I arrived in Tegaramma Nuwanzaš the ‘ Chief of the Wine ’ and all the other generals came to meet me in Tegaramma, and they found me there. I would have gone on to Hayaša, but it was getting too late in the year . . . ’

Götze, *AM* 125, translates ‘ Ich wäre auch noch nach Hayasa gezogen, aber das Jahr war zu kurz ’, but in his commentary (p. 209) he translates the particle by ‘ doch noch, trotzdem ’, and classifies this example among those cases in which *-pat* is attached to a verb which is unexpectedly negative or positive. But the approach of winter, the circumstance which might have been expected to prevent Muršiliš from undertaking a further campaign, is not mentioned until after the occurrence of the particle, and cannot therefore have produced any expectations affecting the verb to which the particle is attached. In view of this Götze’s first rendering ‘ auch noch ’ seems preferable. The particle here indicates, I believe, not that Muršiliš was considering an additional campaign, but that after marching northwards from Kargamiš to Tegaramma he was proposing to continue in a northerly direction to Hayaša.

There may be a similar reason for the presence of *-pat* in the next example, KBo III 4 ii 9 = Götze, *AM* 44-47

- 7 nam-ma URUPal-ḫu-iš-ša-az EGIR-pa *I-NA* URUKÛ.BAB-
 BAR-ši ú-wa-nu-un
 8 nu-za ERÍN.MEŠ ANŠU.KUR.RA.MEŠ ni-ni-in-ku-un
 nam-ma a-pí-e-da-ni MU-ti *I-NA* KUR Ar-za-u-wa
 9 i-ya-an-ni-ya-nu-un-pát

‘ And then from Palḫuiššaš I came back to Ḫattušaš and raised infantry and chariotry, and in that year marched on into Arzawa ’.

The expedition of Muršiliš against Arzawa seems here to be regarded from the point of view of direction as a continuation of his march back from Palḫuiššaš to Ḫattušaš. As in the previous example he stops, but only temporarily to recruit fresh troops before moving on in the same direction.

Since many of the preceding examples also contain *namma* ‘ furthermore ’ it has been suggested that the function of the particle is similar to that of the adverb, and that it indicates that an action is additional to what precedes. But the restriction with verbs of motion to the kind of situation exemplified above makes it unlikely that the particle duplicates the function of *namma*, which has a much wider use in the introduction of a new development in the action. *-pat* with verbs of motion has the more specific use of indicating either continuity of motion or persistence of its direction.

In KBo V 8 i 35, quoted above, the intended movement is completed despite adverse circumstances, the presence of the enemy in a position threatening the king’s line of march. In such a context it is possible to take the particle as simply marking persistence of motion, but it can alternatively be taken as being specifically motivated by the mention of the adverse circumstances, and translated ‘ despite this ’ or ‘ nevertheless ’. This happens to be one of the borderline cases, important because it demonstrates the probable starting-point of a new stage in the development of *-pat*’s uses. This ‘ nevertheless ’ use of *-pat*, which was first noticed by Tenner,⁵¹ has sometimes been chosen by translators in contexts which are not really appropriate to it, but it does exist, and can be found when the verb is not one of motion and there is no question of continuity of action. The classic example is KBo V 9 i 17 = Friedrich, *Staatsv.* I, 10–11 :

11 [ma]-aḫ-ḫa-an-ma A-BU-KA BA.UG₆ tu-uk-ma IŠ-T[U A-WA-AT A-BI-KA]

⁵¹ *HAT* 101.

- 12 ar-ḫa *Ú-UL* pí-eš-ši-ya-nu-un *A-BU-KA*-mu ku-it [tu-]el
 13 [*ŠU*]*M?*-an ḫu-u-i-du-u-wa-lu-wa-ra pi-ra-an me-mi-iš-k
 [i-it]
 14 nu-ut-ta a-pád-da-an EGIR-an ša-an-aḫ-ḫu-un tu-uk-[m]a
 15 [i]š-tar-ak-ki-it nu ir-ma-al-li-ya-at-ta-at
 16 [nu]-za ma-a-an ir-ma-la-an-za e-eš-ta ^DUTU^{SL}-ma-at-ta
 17 *A-NA A-ŠAR A-BI-KA* ti-it-ta-nu-un-pát
 ‘ When your father died, in accordance with your father’s word
 I did not reject you, but since your father in his lifetime (?) used
 to mention your name in front of me I concerned myself for that
 reason on your behalf. But you fell ill and were in poor health.
 Although you were ill My Sun nevertheless put you in your
 father’s place ’.

Here the particle is attached to a verb which expresses a single non-durative action, and its association with the notion of continuity seems to have disappeared. The only element in this situation which can be said to persist is the Hittite king’s intention to establish the son on his father’s throne, and it is the accomplishment of the intended action in the face of difficulties which is marked by *-pat*.

Another example comes from a prayer of Muwattalliš, KUB VI 46 i 30 :

- 29 ku-e-ma-mu *A-WA-TE*MEŠ *Ú-UL* iš-ta-ma-aš-te-ni am-mu-
 uk-ma-za-at
 30 *A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ* ar-ku-wa-ar i-ya-mi-pát na-at-mu-
 kán UKU-az
 31 KA X U-az ša-ra-a ú-iz-zi-pát na-at DINGIR.MEŠ EN.MEŠ
 32 iš-ta-ma-aš-šu-wa-an-zi pa-ra-a tar-ni-iš-ten

‘ Whatever words of mine you do not hear, but I make them nevertheless into a prayer to the gods, and they rise nevertheless from my human mouth—O gods, my lords, allow them a hearing ! ’⁵²

-pat here apparently concentrates attention on the positive realization of an action despite unfavourable conditions, but continuity cannot be ruled out here as it can in the previous

⁵² For this interpretation of *parā tarništen* cf. Ose, *Sup.* 12.

example. 'Still' might be the most appropriate translation in this context. A notable feature in line 31 is the attachment of *-pat* to the verb itself despite the fact that there is a preverb.

Some examples have already been quoted of the occurrence of *-pat* with the verb of a positive sentence which is preceded by a negative one of similar import. There are also cases where the negative sentence follows the positive one, e.g. KUB XIII 4 iii 24 :

23 ma-a-an ^{L^U}ḫa-li-y[a-a]t-tal-[la-aš]
 24 ku-e-da-ni-[i]k-ki e-eš-zi na-aš ḫa-a-li pa-id-du-pát
 25 ki-iš-ša-an li-e-pát te-iz-zi am-mu-uk-wa-za É.DINGIR^{LIM}.
 YA

26 pa-aḫ-ḫa-aš-ḫi a-pí-ya-ma-wa UL pa-i-mi
 'If a watchman is (assigned) to anybody, let him actually go into the precinct. Let him not say "I am guarding the temple of my god : I will not go there".'

KUB XII 70 i 24

24 A-NA U-NU-UT ^{D^UTU^{ŠI}} ku-it ku-it kat-ta-an GAR-ri
 nu-wa-ra-at A-NA DINGIR^{LIM} pí-ya-an-zi-pát Ū-UL-
 wa-ra-at EGIR-pa wa-aḫ-nu-wa-an-zi

'Whatever is stored among His Majesty's utensils they will duly give to the god ; they will not subvert it'.

KUB XIII 4 iii 29

29 ^{L^U}ḫa-li-ya-at-tal-la-aš<DINGIR^{LIM}>-ši pa-id-du-pat
 30 a-pa-a-aš-ma A-NA DINGIR^{LIM}-ŠU ša-ra-a še-šu-u-an-zi
 li-e kar-aš-ta-ri

'Let the watchman duly go to (the shrine of) his god ; let him not omit to spend the night up with his god'⁵³

This affirmatory use of *-pat* is sometimes found without an accompanying negative sentence. The 'Instructions for Temple Officials' again provides examples, e.g. KUB XIII 4 iii, 23 :

22 ma-a-an ^{L^U}SANGA ^{L^U}IM.ME ^{L^UMEŠ}ḫa-li-ya-tal-li-eš ku-i[š-ki]
 23 tar-ni-eš-k[i]-iz-zi na-aš tar-ni-eš-ki-id-du-pát

'If anyone admits a priest, an 'anointed one' or watchmen,

⁵³ ^{L^U}ḫa-li-ya-at-tal-la-aš-ši ed. ; <DINGIR^{LIM}>ši Sturtevant, *Chrest.*, 158.

let him duly admit them'. Here *-pat*, as so often, accompanies the repeated word.

Ibid. iv 31

(If you sell a plough ox or kill and eat it, and it is discovered :) nu a-pu-u-un GUD šar-ni-ik-te-ni-pát 'you will duly compensate for that ox'.

There are several examples where *-pat* occurs with the verb of a sentence preceded by an indefinite relative clause, or by alternative conditional clauses 'whether . . . or'. Instances of the first type are

KBo XI 1 i 27, a prayer of Muwattalliš :

26 iš-ḫi-ú-ul

27 EGIR-an-da ku-it ú-e-mi-iš-ki-mi na-at e-eš-ša-aḫ-ḫi-pát
'What obligation I shall afterwards find, that I shall fulfil' and

KUB XXI 27 iv 17 (a prayer of Puduḫepa). The second type is exemplified by the protocol KUB XIII 7 i 23 ('whether he is a high official or a man of lower rank') na-aš a-ku-pát 'let him die'. Somewhat similar is a passage from the *bel madgalti* instructions, KUB XIII 2, where the official's duties with regard to the *arnuvalaš* (deported person) settled on the land are laid down. In iii 38 the text continues : ar-nu-wa-la-ša-ták-kán
39 ku-iš KUR-az ar-ḫa ú-iz-zi pi-di-ma-aš-ši-ša-an ku-iš
a-aš-zi

40 nu-uš-ši NUMUN^{HLA} a-ni-ya-pát

'As for your *arnuwalas* who leaves the land, for the one who stays in his place provide seed in the same way'.⁵⁴

Up to this point an attempt has been made to link some of the uses of *-pat* with the verb with its basic adnominal use, which appears to be anaphoric. The connections traced may be summarised as follows :

Form	Function
Noun + <i>-pat</i>	Identifying : marks constant feature of situation
Noun + <i>-pat</i> in adverbial phrase	Same location etc.

⁵⁴ Alp, *JKF* 1, 122 translates 'wer aber an seiner Stelle bleibt, dem liefere ebenfalls Saatgut'.

Form	Function
Adverb/preverb + -pat	Persistence in/return to same location etc.
Verb + -pat	Persistence of : 1. State 2. Activity 3. Motion and direction of motion 4. Continuation of previously under- taken activity or motion despite obstacles. 5. Realization of intention despite ob- stacles, or regardless of conditions. 6. Positive realization of action, and negation of opposite.

There are also cases where *-pat* appears with a repeated verb, just as it can appear with a repeated noun. Instances where *-pat* appears in a repeated verbal group are KBo VI 4 iv 1-2 (the 'Parallel Text' of the Laws): EGIR-pa pár-ku-nu-zi EGIR-pa-pát pár-ku-nu-zi. As the first line of the paragraph is missing it is not clear whether EGIR-pa-pát pár-ku-nu-zi should be translated 'he carries out a second re-purification' or 'he carries out a re-purification, as in the previous case'. The example from the 'Instructions for Temple Officials' (KUB XIII 4 1 56) illustrates the appearance of *-pat* in verbal group which does not imply repetition of an action :
51 na-at DINGIR.MEŠ-aš ZI-ni pa-ra-a UL ar-nu-ut-te-ni

.....
56 na-at-ši pa-ra-a-pát UL ar-nu-ut-te-ni
'(If) you do not bring them to the gods themselves and do not, as aforesaid, bring them to them'.

An example where *-pat* appears with a repeated verb despite the presence of a preverb is KUB XIV 1 obv. 47-48 = Götze, *Madd.* 12-13

- 46 nu ERÍN.MEŠ KUR ^{URU}Ar-za-ṭ-[wa] A-NA mMa-ad
[-du-wa-at-ta]
47 pa[-a]-ṭir na-aš-ta ERÍN.MEŠ mMa-ad-du-wa-at-ta [ḥu]-ju
ma-an-ta-an-pát ar-ḥa ḥa-aš-pir na-aš-[ta mMa-ad]-du-
wa-at-ta-aš 1-aš

48 p[ár-aš-ta KA]RAŠ-za-kán ku-i-e-eš te-pa-u-eš i[š-par-]te-ir
a-pa-a-at-ma-kán hu-ṽ-ma-ṽn a[r-ḥa ḥa]-aš-pi-ir-pát

.....
' The troops of Arzawa went against Madduwattaš and utterly destroyed the troops of Madduwattaš. M. fled alone, and as for those few of his army who escaped, they destroyed them all utterly likewise '. Here the repeated verb does imply a repetition of the action. Götze's translation 'die aber vernichteten sie alle auch noch ' is perfectly acceptable as a translation, but the implication that *-pat* is equivalent to 'auch noch ' and denotes something additional must be resisted. This is a case where the same agents do the same thing to different victims on different occasions. It is natural to translate, with emphasis on the changing element in the situation ' they destroyed *them* all, too ', and on the basis of this to equate *-pat* with ' too ', but as far as the use of *-pat* goes the changes are accidental ; what is essential is the identity of the verb, to which the particle is attached.

The basic formal factor with which *-pat* is associated is the repetition of a word ; from this environment it is transferred to the anaphoric pronouns, especially *apāš*, which are substitutes for repetition.⁵⁵ The basic semantic feature is the sameness of some factor of the situation ; this sameness may range from something as concrete as the referent of a noun to any one of the complex of factors which constitute the referent of a verb. In one line of development the semantic feature of sameness becomes dissociated from the formal one of repetition. This happens when a substitute, which may be pronominal or adverbial, replaces the repeated noun. Having lost this formal anchor the particle's meaning becomes subject to shifts ; the final outcome is that in certain types of context the association with the notion of sameness is lost, and the function reduced to one of mere emphasis. Where the formal characteristic of repetition remains the situation is quite different. The function of the particle itself remains the same : by drawing attention to a

⁵⁵ *eni-pat* is found in KUB XII 23 ii 10 ; XXII 56 i 10 ; KBo II 2 iv 17, and *uniuš-pat* in KUB XVIII 63 i 20.

recurring item it marks what is constant in a situation. But the translation of the whole sentence in which it occurs is liable to draw attention to a variable element rather than to something constant, so that the particle may give the impression of being there to indicate that some additional factor has been introduced.

It is doubtful if *-pat* ever in fact indicates that the word to which it is attached expresses something additional. The examples collected by Götze in support of the meaning 'auch noch' are of various kinds: many of these contain verbs of motion, a category which has already been discussed. One of them (the example last discussed) is a case of repetition. Near repetition is involved in KBo V 13 i 15:

15 nu A-BU-ŠU ku-e-el wa-aš-ta-a-i kat-ta-ma

DUMU-ŠU Ū-UL wa-aš-du-la-aš-pát

'The son whose father commits a crime, but he is not implicated with him in the crime (is not likewise guilty)'. Here the constant feature is the crime, and it is accordingly to the word *wašdulas* that *-pat* is attached, not to DUMU-ŠU which represents the new element. In the next example, KBo III 4 i 6, the sameness is semantic and implicit rather than formal and explicit, but the principle holds good; *-pat* is attached to the word which refers to a repeated instance of the same event, not to the new subject concerned in it:

4 nu-za A-BU-YA ku-wa-pi DINGIR^{LIM}-iš DÙ-at

5 mAr-nu-an-da-aš-ma-za-kán ŠEŠ-YA A-NA GIŠGU.ZA A-BI-ŠU e-ša-at EGIR-an-ma-aš

6 ir-ma-li-ya-at-ta-at-pát

'When my father became a god my brother A. seated himself on his father's throne. But afterwards he likewise fell ill . . . '.

The remaining examples are more problematical. Two of them have *-pat* attached to the preverb, and it is not altogether certain whether the particle belongs to it or to the verbal group as a whole.

KBo VI 29 iii 30 = Götze *NBr.* 50-51

29 UDU LÚ. MÁŠ.GAL-ma ŠA DU[TU URUTÚL-na ku-i]š
ar-kam-ma-aš

30 na-an-kán *A-NA* ^DUTU URU[TÚL-na ar-ḥa]-pát pí-eš-ši-
ya-nu-un

31 nu *IŠ-TU* 10 É ti[-it-ta-nu-wa-an-z]i

‘The sheep which was the tribute of a member of the royal family to the Sun-goddess of Arinna I have remitted for the Sun-goddess of Arinna, and they supply it from ten households’.

This follows a paragraph dealing with the freeing from various obligations of a household dedicated to Ištar of Šamuḥa, and provides for the removal of an additional obligation, the duty to offer a sheep to the Sun-goddess of Arinna. It is the obligation which is additional; the act of remission is the same as in the previous paragraph. The verb, however, is not repeated, and the sameness, as in the previous example, is a purely semantic one. This interpretation assumes that *-pat* belongs to the verbal group as a whole, but the possibility cannot be ruled out that *-pat* belongs here to the preverb, as in the cases of *arḥa-pat* quoted above, in which case the phrase would mean ‘I completely remitted’ (the obligation).

KUB VI 41 iii 51 = Friedrich, *Staatsv.* 128-9

48 nu-mu ŠA ^mÉ.GAL.KUR-ma me-mi-an ḥu-u-da-ak *IŠ-PUR*

49 [(^m)]É.GAL.KUR-aš-wa-za-kán BAL zi-ik-ki-iz-zi nam-
ma-aš-za-kán EGIR-an-da

50 [(me)]-mi-ya-ni še-ir ka-ru-uš-ši-ya-at-ta-at nu-mu nam-ma
Ú-UL ku-it-ki ḥa-at-ra-a-eš

51 [(n)]am-ma EGIR-pa-pát wa-aḥ-nu-ut na-aš *A-NA* ^mÉ.-
GAL.KUR an-da ú-e-ri-ya-at-ta-at

‘He wrote to me at once about the affair of É.GAL.KUR, saying “É.GAL.KUR is starting a revolt”, then afterwards he kept silent about the matter and did not write me anything further, and then he turned round and entered into a conspiracy with É.GAL.KUR’.

Here the particle appears to belong to the preverb. By conspiring with É.GAL.KUR Mašḫuiluwaš ‘goes back on’ his initial act of loyalty in reporting the conspiracy and cancels the credit thereby acquired.

The last example to be discussed has met with various interpretations.

It is KBo V 8 ii 13-14 = Götze, *AM* 152-153 :

12 nu KUR^{URU}Ḫa-at-ti dam-me-eš-ḫa-ir nu ku-it KUR^{TUM}

13 ḫar-ni-in-ki-ir ku-it-ma-za e-ša-an-ta-at-pát

14 na-at ḫar-ki-ir-pát

‘ They (the Kaška enemy) oppressed the land of Ḫatti, and some land they laid waste, but other (land) they settled and kept ’. Götze translates ‘ einiges aber besetzen sie auch noch und hielten es auch ’; Pedersen⁵⁶ ‘ einiges aber hielten sie fortwährend für sich und hatten es dauernd ’. Szemerényi⁵⁷ comments ‘ It is clear that *-pat* is given an exaggerated importance—all it does is to emphasize the verb—and forcibly equated with “ ebenso, in der gleichen Weise ” itself rather far removed from “ ipse ”’. But Pedersen’s translation here, as in other cases, does not deserve this rather summary dismissal. His translation of *ḫarkir-pat*, to begin from the point of greatest certainty, is amply supported by the other instances where *-pat* occurs with this verb and gives it the sense of ‘ hold on to, keep ’, and this interpretation is perfectly suited to the context. It would therefore seem reasonable to suppose a similar force for the particle in association with the conjoined verb *ešantat*. But here there is a difficulty: *ešari* with *-za* is not a verb which expresses a continuing state; it means ‘ seat oneself ’, ‘ settle down ’, not ‘ be settled ’. The requirements of sense would be met by something like ‘ made a permanent settlement ’, although such a use cannot be paralleled. At all events it seems clear that they did not settle the land *in addition* to laying it waste; the territories subjected to these different treatments are explicitly contrasted by the use of *kuit* *kuit* ‘ some ... other ’.

In conclusion, the evidence which has been assembled in favour of ‘ auch noch ’ as an equivalent for the particle consists of a miscellaneous group of examples, none of which provides decisive evidence that *-pat* used in the verbal group conveys the sense that the element in the sentence to which it is attached represents something which it is wished to characterize as

⁵⁶ *AO* 7 (1935), 83.

⁵⁷ *Syncope in Greek and Indo-European*, 349.

additional to what has already been mentioned. The examples in question certainly do contain elements which are additional, but it is not to them that the particle is attached, but to what is constant ; it is in the process of translation that the false equation *-pat* = 'also' has come about. While translations such as 'auch noch' may in some cases be unobjectionable provided that they are taken as part of a larger context aiming to represent the whole of the sentence to be translated, and not as direct equivalents of the particle itself, if they are taken out of context, there is a danger both that they may be misapplied in the interpretation of other texts, and that they may mislead etymologists : for these reasons they are best avoided altogether.

The occurrences of *-pat* in negative and prohibitive sentences require separate consideration. The earliest to appear are the prohibitive examples, of which some are to be found in the adoption speech of Hattusiliš I, e.g. KUB I 16 ii 62 = Sommer, *HAB* 8-9

60 nu-ut-ta LÚ.MEŠŠU.GI URUKÙ.BABBAR-ti li-e me-
mi-eš-kan-du

61 [LÚ URUKu-uš-šar(?)] li-e LÚ URUHe-im-mu-wa li-e LÚ
URUTa-ma-al-ki-ya li-e

62 [LÚ^{URU}Za-al-pa lǐ]-e ut-ni-ya-an-za-aš-ta li-e-pát ku-iš-ki
me-ma-i

‘ Let not the elders of Hatti speak to you ; let not a man of Kuššar(?) let not a man of Hemmuwa, let not a man of Zalpa, let not any country at all speak to you.’

In such cases *-pat* may legitimately be described as 'emphatic': its function is to strengthen the prohibition. The rhetorical effect is here achieved by using *-pat* only in the culminating sentence. This is in marked contrast to the rather indiscriminate use of the particle in prohibitions (as well as in negative and even in positive statements) by the zealous author of the 'Instructions for Temple Officials'. Another point about this example which may be important is that the particle occurs in a generalizing prohibition. This suggests that there may be a connection between the use of *-pat* in prohibitions (by way of

generalizing prohibitions) and its equally early use in positive expressions of generality and completeness, to be discussed later. All these uses seem at first sight to have no connection with the well-established anaphoric functions of *-pat* with nominal elements, or with its uses with verbs which appear to be derived from the same source. The problem cannot be resolved chronologically, for the earliest texts provide evidence for both anaphoric and generalizing usages.

As to the use of the particle in the verbal group which appear to be derivable from its adnominal use, they are noticeably absent from the earliest texts except for a few cases where *-pat* is attached to a preverb, e.g. KBo XVII 74 + = *Ein althethitisches Gewitterritual*, ed. E. Neu, *StBoT* 12, iii 19' :

[LUGAL-uš SAL.LUGAL-aš-ša ša-ra-a] ti-en-zi še-ir-pát a-ru-wa-an-zi

Neu translates ' [König und Königin]stehen [auf.] So im stehen verneigen sie sich '. The particle here clearly belongs to *še-ir*, which is in fact an independent adverb here rather than a preverb. Other examples from early texts are too incomplete⁵⁸ to cast much light on the force of the particle, but their existence does at least draw attention to the dangers of using the argument from silence to exclude certain uses of *-pat* from early Hittite when their absence may be due merely to the relative shortage of material.

-pat with frequentative verb occurs in a prayer of Arnuwandaš and Ašmunikkal, KUB XVII 21 ii 6, but most examples of *-pat* attached to verbs come from the more abundant material of the Empire period. The existing evidence therefore cannot be said to support the view that *-pat* had an adverbial origin ; it points rather in the opposite direction.

(c) *-pat* with expressions of distribution and quantity

Hittite possesses expressions of the type of Sanskrit *divé-dive* 'every day' and Mycenaean Greek *we-te-i-we-te-i* 'every year'.

⁵⁸ e.g. *anda-pat* KBo XII 3 iii 12, *appa-pat* KBo IV 7 iii 10, *sarā-pat* KBo III 63 i 7.

To such expressions *-pat* may optionally be attached, e.g. UD-at UD-at-pát 'every day' KUB I 13 iii 7 etc. ; ITU-mi ITU-mi-pát 'every month' KUB XXI 7 i 3 ; KASKAL-ši KASKAL-ši-pát 'every time' KBo III 5 iii 59, etc.

This Hittite modification of an inherited formula may have had a formal origin in the affinity of *-pat* for the repeated word. An early example of a similar phenomenon is found in the Anittaš text, KBo III 22 i 12, [ku-i]t ku-it-pát. The difference in order between this and the ku-iš-pát-kán im-ma ku-iš of the much later 'Instructions for Temple Officials', KUB XIII 4 iii 4, is interesting. In the early example *-pat* is attached to the repeated word, but in the later one it has taken its usual place after the first word of the group. It looks as if the formal affinity of *-pat* for the repeated word has been replaced by a semantic association with distributional and generalizing expressions. But this kind of association must have existed in early times, to judge from the use of *-pat* with *humant-* 'all' in early texts such as the Laws. The use of the particle with *šakuwaššar* 'complete, intact', also in the Laws, clearly belongs to the same semantic field ; so does its use with the numeral 'two' which converts it to 'both', i.e. indicates that the set is complete. It was suggested earlier that the similarity between the suffix *-el/ila* found with the number 'two' and the suffix *-ila*, 'self', found with pronouns, might have contributed to the habit of using *-pat* with the number 'two', but the influence of words for 'all' is also a possibility. Unfortunately there is no way of establishing chronological priority here, so that this remains a matter for speculation. The gap between the anaphoric and the generalizing use of the particle is not impossible to bridge ; the problem which remains is to discover in which direction the bridge is to be crossed, and this may well prove to be insoluble by internal evidence.

The other number with which *-pat* is found is 'one' as in the following example, KUB VII 29 i 4 :

3 ku-it-ta-at im-ma ku-it pa-ap-ra-a-tar ki-ša-ri

4 na-at 1-EN-pát a-ni-ur

'Whatever impurity happens there is just one ritual'. This

use, like that of English 'only', is also found when *-pat* is attached to adjectives meaning 'few' or 'small', e.g.

KUB XIX 37 ii 25 kap-pu-u-wa-an-te-eš-pát-mu-kán an-tu-uḫ-
še-eš iš-par-te-ir

'only a few men escaped me'.

KBo VI 29 i 7

7 nu-mu kap-pi-in-pát DUMU-an ^DIŠ^TAR URUŠa-mu-ḫa

8 A-NA A-BU-YA ú-e-ik-ta

'When I was only a small boy Ištar of Šamuḫa asked my father for me'. The adjective *ḫantezzi*- 'first' is found with *-pat* in KBo III 1 ii 36 (Proclamation of Telipinuš); *ḫa-an-te-iz-zi-ya-aš-pát* DUMU.LUGAL. Here the limiting sense is again apparent; the succession is to be restricted to a prince of the first rank. Rather different is KBo VI 10 iii 21 (Laws II § 35) where *ḫa-an-te]-iz-zi-uš-pát* *ḫa-ap-pa-ri-uš* seems to mean 'the original price'. Friedrich translates 'nur die ersten Kaufpreise(?)' which is reasonable, but the phrase is reminiscent of Laws II § 51:

39 Û A.ŠA^{LAM} ka-ru-ú-pát ku-iš šu-u-ni-it

40 ta-az a-pa-a-aš da-a-i

'and the same man who formerly sowed the field takes it for himself', apparently with *-pat* anticipated in the relative clause in place of the usual *a-pa-a-aš-pát* in the clause that follows.

(d) *-pat* with adverbs.

-pat often occurs with adverbs formed from the stems of demonstrative pronouns. By far the most frequent combination is *QA-TAM-MA-pát* = Hittite *apeniššan-pat* 'just so, in the same way as before', e.g. KUB IX 31 iii 48 nu-kán an-da *QA-TAM-MA-pát* me-mi-iš-kán-zi 'and they speak inside in the same way'. Similarly *a-pi-ya-pát* is 'just there/then, at the same place/time', e.g. KBo V 1 i 5:

4 nu-za ma-a-an ŠAL^{TUM} na-a-ú-i

5 ḫa-a-ši na-aš-kán a-pi-ya-pát an-da e-eš-zi

'If the woman has not yet given birth and is in the same place'.

KBo V 9 iii 3

ii 49 na-aš-ma-at-ta ma-a-an ^DUTUŠr

iii 1 ku-e-qa me-mi-ya-nu-uš ḫar-wa-ši me-ma-i ku-u-uš-wa
me-mi-ya-aš

2 na-aš-ma-wa ku-u-un me-mi-ya-an i-ya ku-u-uš-wa me-mi-
ya-aš

3 ku-iš *Ú-UL* i-ya-u-wa-aš na-an-za-an a-pi-ya-pát

4 pi-di-iš-ši ar-ku-wa-ar DÛ-ya

‘ Or if My Sun says anything to you in secret, saying “ Do these things ”, or “ Do this thing ”, any of these things which is impracticable you must ask to be excused from doing there and then ’.

On *kā-pat* ‘ only here ’ see above, p. 123.

Kinun-pat is ‘ just now ’, ‘ at this exact time ’, as opposed to some other specified time, e.g. KUB XXII 70 ii 46 : cf. Sommer, *HAB* 181.

45 ^DUTUŠ^t a-pád-da-an še-ir du-ud-du ḫal-za-a-i du-ud-du-un-
ma

46 a-ri-ya-an-zi ma-a-an du-ud-du-uš ḫal-zi-ya-u-wa-an-zi
ki-nu-un-pát

47 SI X ŠÁ-ri ma-a-na-aš ḫa-at-tu-li-eš-zi ku-wa-pi nu du-ud-
du-un *QA-TAM-MA* ḫal-za-a-i

‘ His Majesty on that account shall cry “ Duddu ”. They take omens about the cry of “ Duddu ”, whether it is ordained that he should cry “ Duddu ” just now, or if he should cry “ Duddu ” thus when he recovers his health’. *-pat* is also found with *ḫudak* ‘ immediately ’ (KUB V 1 ii 34, KUB XXI 19 iii 12). A similar sense of immediacy is conveyed in the birth-omen in KBo VI 25 + XIII 25 (ed. Riemschneider, *Babylonische Geburtsomina in hethitischer Übersetzung*, StBoT 9, Wiesbaden 1970.)

iii 5’ ták-ku SAL [-za ḫ]a-ši nu an-na-az-pát

6’ ŠĀ-az [a?-]iš ar-ḫa ḫa-a-ši

7’ nu me-ma[-]i ^DU-aš KUR-e za-a-ḫi

‘ If a woman gives birth and right from his mother’s womb he (the child) opens his mouth and speaks, the Storm-god will smite the land.’

Expressions of continuity may also have *-pat* added, e.g. the adverb *nuwa* ‘ still ’ in KUB XIV 3 ii 38. In KBo X 2 ii 49

(Annals of Ḫattušiliš I) it seems possible that GE_6 -*az-pát* means 'while it was still night'; the other example of this phrase at KBo XII 75, 6 occurs in an incomplete context. *-pat* with the adverb *ukturi* 'permanently' occurs in KBo XVII 105 ii 23; cf. KBo XIII 114 iv 14.

namma-pat introduces the repetition of a previous action and is equivalent to 'again'; in this case the addition of *-pat* modifies the basic meaning of the adverb 'furthermore' by specifying that the new action introduced is one which has been performed before; e.g.

KUB XXV 1 i 22

18 na-aš-ta ^UGIŠ.PA pa-ra-a pa-iz-zi 'the herald goes out'

.....

22 na-aš-ta ^UGIŠ.PA nam-ma-pát pa-ra-a pa-iz-zi 'the herald goes out again', cf. also KUB XI 32 iii 14-16 with iv 9-13; KUB XII 11 iv 19 and 25.

It can be seen that in all these cases the uses of *-pat* with adverbs run parallel to its uses with nouns, pronouns and verbs. The anaphoric function is present in the case of derivatives from pronominal stems, sometimes combined with a sense of contrast with other possibilities, while other adverbs associated with *-pat* have affinities with its specifically adverbial functions of indicating duration and repetition. Here too there is the usual residue of purely emphatic uses such as *mekki-pat* 'very much' in KUB XIII 4 iii 54 (Instructions for Temple Officials); cf. KUB XIV 3 ii 32, XIX 37 ii 25.

A use of *-pat* with the adjective which deserves comment is *irmalaš-pat* 'even while I was ill' in KUB I 1 i 44 (Autobiography of Ḫattušiliš III). This 'concessive' use of the particle is uncommon, but cf. ^UKALA-*an-pát* 'even the vigorous man', in the hymn to Ištar, KUB XXIV 7 ii 14.

Finally, a curious and apparently anticipatory use of *-pat* is found with adverbs meaning 'formerly' in relative clauses. One example from II 51 of the Laws has already been mentioned above, p. 154. Another comes from the Autobiography of Ḫattušiliš III, KUB I 1 iv 7:

7 am-mu-uk-ma LUGAL-UT-TA ^DIS^{TAR} GAŠAN-YA an-
ni-iš-ša-an-pát ku-it

8 me-mi-iš-ki-it nu a-pí-e-da-ni me-ḥu-ni ^DIS^{TAR} GAŠAN-
YA

9 A-NA DAM-YA Û-at

‘Whereas my lady Ištar had formerly more than once promised me the kingship, on that occasion she appeared to my wife in a dream . . .’ In both these cases *-pat* may belong to the relative clause as a whole rather than specifically to the adverb: cf. the example quoted above, p. 104, in illustration of the position taken by *-pat* in clauses of this type.

(c) *-pat* with interrogative words

Examples of this use are rare:

KUB XXXIII 103 ii 9

9 ku-wa-at-pát-wa

10 zi[-ik] ^DKu-mar-bi-iš DUMU. LÚ.ULÛ^{LU} i-da-la-u-wa-ni
ša-an-ḥi-iš[-ki-ši

‘Why do you, Kumarbi, seek to harm mankind?’

KUB XXXIII 106 ii 16

k[u-wa-pi-pát an-da ar-nu-um-me-ni

‘Where now shall we carry the . . .?’

KUB XV 5 i 12

11 pa-ra-a-ma ‘A-ru-mu-ra-aš me-[mi]-iš-ki-iz-zi

12 a-ši-wa-kán AMA.AMA-KA ku-w[a-a]t-pát ḪUL-lu ti-ya-
an ḥar-zi

‘But the woman Arumuraš keeps saying ‘Why has your grandmother done that wicked thing?’

This use, of which all the examples occur in conversations, seems to be purely emphatic. A further example of *-pat* in a question, but this time attached to the verb which is followed by the interrogative word is KUB XXVI 89, 14 na-an-za-an ḥa-a-iš-pát ku-wa-at ‘why do you believe him?’

4. ETYMOLOGY

It has been suggested by Szemerényi that Pedersen’s etymology connecting *-pat* with Lithuanian *-pāt* ‘selbst’ should be rejected in favour of a connection with the I.E. adverb **poti*,

and that this latter etymology receives support from the evidence of other Anatolian languages. While his criticism of the Lithuanian side of the etymology falls outside the scope of the present study, his proposal to equate *-pat* with Luwian *pa-/pa* must now be considered. On the semantic side this equation rests on the assumption that the Hittite particle was originally adverbial and meant something like 'in addition', while its identifying and adnominal function was a later development, perhaps due to the influence of Akkadian *-ma*. There is nothing in the internal Hittite evidence to support this assumption. While *-pat* occurs in both nominal and verbal groups from the earliest texts onwards, its appearances in the verbal group are very rare in early texts both absolutely and by comparison with its adnominal occurrences. What is more, most of the uses of *-pat* in the verbal group can be accounted for in terms of a natural development from the adnominal use, and the passages which have been quoted in support of a meaning 'also' do not in fact show *-pat* attached to a word which represents a new element in the situation, but to one which represents a constant element. If any such development as that posited by Szemerényi took place, it belonged to the prehistory of Hittite, not its history. As for the influence of Akkadian *-ma*, it remains purely hypothetical; the supposed equation of *-pat* with *-ma* in a vocabulary has been shown to be illusory, and the evidence of bilingual texts does not suggest that *-ma* was automatically translated by *-pat* or vice versa.⁵⁹ The semantic side of the etymology is thus somewhat tenuous; it remains to consider its formal side.

The other Anatolian languages have the following particles formally similar to *-pat* :
 Luwian and Hieroglyphic Hittite enclitic *-pa* (Luwian also has sentence-initial *pa-*). This is a sentence-connective particle with a slight adversative sense, functionally similar to Hittite *-ma*. When enclitic it is attached to the first word in the sentence, and precedes other enclitic elements. Laroche⁶⁰ lists its uses as

⁵⁹ cf. Sommer, *HAB* 241.

⁶⁰ *BSL* 53 (1958), 163-167.

follows : (a) adversative ; (b) when initial, additive ; (c) to introduce the apodosis of a conditional sentence ; (d) to advance the narrative. It often occurs with *nanun* 'now' in the combination *nanumpa* 'nunc autem'.

Palaic enclitic *-pa*, with similar connective and adversative functions. Of the examples listed by Carruba⁶¹ those mentioned under 1. may belong to a different element, perhaps a postposition or preverb, but the analysis is still uncertain.

Lycian has two apparently distinct 'labial particles' *-pe* and *-be*. *-be* occurs in the combinations Lycian A *tibe*, B *cibe* 'or' ; B (also A ?) *sebe* 'and moreover' and elsewhere, mainly in Lycian B.⁶² It has been discussed by Laroche⁶³ who has compared it with Luwian (-) *pa* (-). *-pe* is found with negative particles, giving Lycian A and B *nepe*, A *nipe*. Here it is not a sentence-connective, but seems merely to reinforce the negative.⁶⁴ *-pe* often occurs attached to other words in Lycian B ; the function is difficult to determine in view of the great uncertainty of interpretation of the contexts in which it occurs, but it does not seem to be a sentence-connective here either. Carruba⁶⁵ is inclined to separate the *-pe* found with negatives from that found with other words, and to see in the latter a postposition related to *-epñ* (cf. Hittite *appa(n)*). Elsewhere⁶⁶ he actually proposes a connection between *-pe* and Hittite *-pat* on the basis of the association of *-pe* with negatives. If this is right Lycian *-pe* in *nipe* and *nepe* will have to be dissociated from Palaic *-pa* in *nippaš*, etc. Despite the apparent similarity there is a functional difference ; the Palaic particle, unlike the Lycian one, is connective and adversative, and seems rather to belong

⁶¹ *Das Palaische*, StBoT 10, Wiesbaden 1970, 66.

⁶² See Ph. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, *The Luwian Population groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspera in the Hellenistic Period*, Leiden 1961, 75 ; E. Laroche, *BSL* 53 (1958), 167 ; P. Meriggi, *RHA* 72 (1963) 15 ; O. Carruba, *Die Satzeinleitenden Partikeln in den indogermanischen Sprachen Anatoliens*, Rome 1969, 100-101.

⁶³ *BSL* 53 (1958), 163-167.

⁶⁴ *Die Satzeinleitenden Partikeln*, 101.

⁶⁵ *ibid.* 101.

⁶⁶ *SMEA* 12 (1970), 80-83.

with Luwian *-pa*, which has in its turn been compared with Lycian *-be* rather than *-pe*. The *-pp-* of Palaic *nippaš* is more likely to be the result of an assimilation (*nit+pa-*) than to represent an original voiceless stop, as Carruba remarks.

Lydian⁶⁷ has a non-enclitic introductory particle *fa-*, more often found in the combination *fak*, which is used especially to introduce the main sentence after a subordinate (relative, conditional, etc.) clause. It thus has some similarity of function with Luwian *pa-/pa*, with which it has been compared. The position is complicated by the coexistence in Lydian of a homonymous preverb *fa-*, the commonest Lydian preverb, which is in complementary distribution with the particle. While the particle invites comparison with Luwian *(-)pa(-)*, the preverb has been compared with Hittite *pe-* 'hin', or with I.E. **po*. It is not clear how the preverb modifies the meaning of the verb to which it is attached in Lydian, and therefore it is difficult to decide if preverb and particle are related, or what their most probable etymological connections may be. It should however be noted that Lydian *f-* corresponds with I.E. **p* if *fara* 'protection' vel. sim. is rightly connected with Hittite *paḥs-* 'protect'.⁶⁸ Lydian *b-* also corresponds to Anatolian labial plosives, but in this case apparently to those which are likely to have a voiced or voiced aspirate origin, e.g. in the pronominal stem *bi-* 'he' (cf. Hitt. *apāš*, Lycian *ebe* etc.); see also Gusmani, *Lydisches Wörterbuch*, under *brafrsi-*, *buk*. It is interesting in this connection to compare the verb 'give'; Lydian *bi-* in *fa-bi-* and *vc-bi-n-* has been compared by Carruba⁶⁹ with Hittite *pai-*, Luwian *piya-*, Hieroglyphic Hittite *pia-*, Lycian *pije-*. More interesting still is the Lycian reduplicated *pibijete* (*TL* 44b 44; 149 3, 5), with *b* in the root syllable. While it seems virtually certain that Lycian had no *p/b* distinction in

⁶⁷ Gusmani, *Lydisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg 1964, 111–113; Heubeck, *Lydiaka*, Erlangen 1959, 46, 77. E. Benveniste, *HIE* 32, believes that Hittite *pē-* and I.E. **po* are related.

⁶⁸ Gusmani, *Lydisches Wörterbuch*, 123.

⁶⁹ *Athenaeum* N.S. 38 (1960), 42; *ZDMG* 111 (1961), 460.

initial position (examples of initial *b-* being almost non-existent) there is equally no reason to suppose that the use of *p* and *b* between vowels was unmotivated by any real phonemic distinction (whatever the actual phonetic realization may have been). But if the distinction between Lydian *f-* and *b-* and that between Lycian *-p-* and *-b-* is taken seriously the equation of Luwian *pa-/pa* with Lycian *-be* is incompatible with the equation of Luwian *pa-/pa* with Lydian *fa-*, and one at least of these possibilities will have to be rejected. Little needs to be said about Hittite *-apa*, which has been thoroughly discussed by Carruba. It is not a sentence-connective but a directional or local particle, presumably of adverbial origin.⁷⁰ Whatever its origin, it is at least clear that its syntax and functions in Hittite are quite different from those of Luwian, etc. *-pa*; if there is any relationship it is a fairly remote one.

Such is the background, still full of uncertainties, against which the proposed new etymology of *-pat* must be considered. The real difficulty is that none of the 'labial particles' in the other Anatolian languages is like *-pat* in syntactic behaviour or function, with the possible exception of Lycian *-pe*, which is, it seems, not a connective particle and occurs freely in the sentence as well as being associated with negative particles; its functions, however, are still very obscure. Apart from the syntactic and functional discrepancy between *-pat* and Luwian, etc. *-pa* there is a phonological objection to equating them if the Hittite particle is correctly read as *-pat*; Palaic, unlike the other languages concerned (Luwian, Hieroglyphic Hittite and Lycian) does not lose a final *-t*, yet has *-pa-* before vowel. This particle cannot therefore be derived from I.E. **pot(i)*, as Szemerényi has suggested; it could still of course represent I.E. *po*, provided that the connection with Lycian *-be* was rejected in favour of that with Lydian *fa-*, but this would

⁷⁰ O. Carruba, *Orientalia* N.S. 33 (1964), 405–436, and *Die Satzeinleitenden Partikeln* 32–35. He favours a connection with Hittite *appa(n)*, I.E. **e[lo]pi*, but the meaning he has established for *apa*, as well as the constant spelling with *-p-*, suggests rather a connection with Skt. *abhi*, etc.

destroy the link with the Hittite particle in any of its possible phonological values.⁷¹

It must therefore be concluded that the suggested new etymology of *-pat* is to be rejected. As far as the Hittite evidence is concerned, closer investigation gives support to Pedersen's explanation ; the other Anatolian particles cited in favour of a derivation from I.E. **poti* are both formally and functionally distinct from *-pat* (except possibly for Lycian *-pe*, about which too little is yet known.)

University of Durham.

⁷¹ Yet another value for the sign 𐎶 has now emerged in Palaic, where it has been found in variation with *pi* : see Carruba, *Das Palaische*, 67 ; *SMEA* 12 (1970) 80-83.