A GRAMMAR OF THE HITTITE LANGUAGE

Part 1: Reference Grammar

LANGUAGES OF THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST

Editorial Board

GONZALO RUBIO, *Pennsylvania State University*
Editor-in-Chief

JAMES P. ALLEN	*Brown University*
GENE B. GRAGG	*The Oriental Institute, Univ. of Chicago*
JOHN HUEHNERGARD	*Harvard University*
MANFRED KREBERNIK	*Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena*
ANTONIO LOPRIENO	*Universität Basel*
H. CRAIG MELCHERT	*University of California, Los Angeles*
PIOTR MICHALOWSKI	*University of Michigan*
P. OKTOR SKJÆRVØ	*Harvard University*
MICHAEL P. STRECK	*Universität Leipzig*

1. *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*, by Harry A. Hoffner Jr. and H. Craig Melchert
   Part 1: *Reference Grammar*
   Part 2: *Tutorial*

A Grammar of the Hittite Language

Part 1

Reference Grammar

by

HARRY A. HOFFNER, JR.
The University of Chicago

and

H. CRAIG MELCHERT
The University of California, Los Angeles

Winona Lake, Indiana
EISENBRAUNS
2008

© 2008 by Harry A. Hoffner, Jr., and H. Craig Melchert
All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Hoffner, Harry A.
A grammar of the Hittite language / by Harry A. Hoffner Jr. and H. Craig Melchert.
p. cm. — (Languages of the ancient near east ; 1)
Includes bibliographical references.
ISBN 978-1-57506-119-1 (hardcover : alk. paper)
1. Hittite language—Grammar. I. Melchert, H. Craig (Harold Craig), 1945–
II. Title.
P945.H59 2008
491′.998dc22

2008018385

To three giants of Hittitology,
in whose shadow we stand

Hans Gustav Güterbock†

Emmanuel Laroche†

Heinrich Otten

CONTENTS

Preface xv

Abbreviations and Conventional Markings xvii

General Abbreviations xviii

Bibliographical Abbreviations xx

Introduction 1

The Hittites and Their Language 1

Decipherment 1

The Text Corpus 2

Modern Resources for Study 3

Cuneiform Editions 3

Commentaries 4

Sign Lexicon 4

Grammars 5

Dictionaries 5

Text Catalogues and Name Collections 7

Chapter 1. Orthography and Phonology 9

The Cuneiform Writing System of the Hittites 9

Orthography 10

Writing Conventions 10

Transcriptional Conventions 14

Homophony 15

Polyphony 16

Multivalence 21

New Values 21

Logogram Pronunciation 22

Phonology 24

Individual Phonemes (Vowels and Consonants) 24

Vowels 25

Consonants 35

Phonotactics 48

Onomatopoeia 49

Accent 49

Chapter 2. Noun and Adjective Formation 51

Underived Stems 52

Derived Stems 53

Reduplicated Nouns and Adjectives 62

Compounded Nouns and Adjectives 63

Chapter 3. Noun and Adjective Inflection 64
Inflectional Endings 69
The Basic Scheme 69
Common-Gender Nominative 70
Common-Gender Accusative 71
Neuter Nominative-Accusative 71
Ergative 72
Genitive 73
Dative-Locative 74
Vocative 74
Allative 76
Ablative 76
Instrumental 77
Stem Variation 78
Chapter 4. Noun and Adjective Declension 79
a-Stem Nouns 79
Common-Gender *a*-Stem Nouns 79
Neuter *a*-Stem Nouns 82
a-Stem Adjectives 83
i- and *u*-Stem Nouns 85
i-Stem Nouns 86
i-Mutation 86
Common-Gender *i*-Stem Nouns 87
Neuter *i*-Stem Nouns 90
ai-Stem Nouns 92
i-Stem Adjectives 94
u-Stem Nouns 97
Common-Gender *u*-Stem Nouns 98
Neuter *u*-Stem Nouns 101
au-Stem Nouns 101
u-Stem Adjectives 102
e-Stem Noun 104
Consonantal-Stem Nouns and Adjectives 105
h̲-Stem Noun 105
l-Stem Nouns 105
al-Stem Nouns 106
e/*il*-Stem Nouns 107
ul-Stem Nouns 107
n-Stem Nouns 108
Neuter *n*-Stem Nouns 108
Common-Gender *n*-Stem Nouns 111
r-Stem Nouns and Adjectives 114
s-Stem Nouns 117
t-Stem Nouns and Adjectives 120
Simple *t*-Stem Nouns 121
nt-Stem Nouns and Adjectives 123
r/*n*-Stem Nouns 124

Non-Derived *r*/*n*-Stem Nouns 124
Derived Nouns with Suffix *-ātar* 126
Derived Nouns with Suffix *-eššar* 128
Derived Nouns with Suffix *-āwar* 129
Derived Nouns with Suffix *-mar* 130
Verbal Substantives 130
Irregular Consonant-Stem Nouns 130

Chapter 5. Personal Pronouns 132
Distinctive Features of Pronominal Stems and Endings 132
Accented (Independent) Personal Pronouns 133
Enclitic Personal Pronouns 135

Chapter 6. Possessive Pronouns 137

Chapter 7. Deixis: The Demonstratives 142
kā- and *apā-* 143
aši, *uni*, *ini* 144
anni- 146
Adverbs Built to Demonstratives 147

Chapter 8. Relative and Indefinite Pronouns 149
The Interrogative and Relative Pronoun *kui-* 149
The Indefinite Pronoun *kuiški* and the Distributive *kuišša* 149
Other Stems with Partial Pronominal Inflection 152

Chapter 9. Numbers 153
Form and Declension of the Cardinals 153
'One' 154
'Two' to 'Ten' 156
The Syntax of the Cardinals 158
Agreement in Case 158
Number Agreement with Non-Collectives 158
Counting Non-Decimal Sets 163
Word Order in Counting 165
Fractions 165
Ordinal Numbers 166
Ordinals in *-t-* 167
Multiplicatives 168
Distributives 170
Derivative Adjectives and Verbs 170
Numbers in Compounds 171
Compound Numbers 171

Chapter 10. Verb Formation 173
Reduplicated Roots 173
Verbal Suffixes and Infixes 175
Overview 175
The Individual Suffixes 175

Chapter 11. Verb Inflection 180
Types of Verbal Inflection 180
Irregularities in the *mi*-Conjugation 183
Irregularities in the *ḫi*-Conjugation 184
Medio-Passive Endings 184
Verbal Substantive, Participle, Infinitive, and Supine 185

Chapter 12. Conjugation of *mi*-Verbs 187
Consonantal Stems 187
Root Stems 187
Affixed Stems 196
Vocalic Stems 198
Ablauting 198
Non-Ablauting 210
Suppletive Verb 211
Verbs with Mixed Stems 212

Chapter 13. Conjugation of *ḫi*-Verbs 214
Consonantal Stems 214
Vocalic Stems 218
a-Stems 218
Stems Originally in *-Cw-* 222
ai-Stems 222
Stems with Mixed Inflection in *-a-* and *-i-* 224
Verbs with the Imperfective Suffix *-anna/i-* 226
Mixture of *mi-* and *ḫi*-Forms 227

Chapter14. Medio-Passive Conjugation 230
Consonantal Stems 230
Vocalic Stems 231
Chronology of the Medio-Passive Endings 233
Medio-Passive Stem Formation 233

Chapter 15. Grammatical Agreement 235
Types of Agreement 235
Lack of Agreement 239
In Gender 239
In Number 240

Chapter 16. Noun Cases 242
Generalities 242
Nominative 242
Vocative and “Naming Construction” 244
Other Forms of Direct Address 245
Accusative 246
Ergative 250
Genitive 250
Word Order in a Genitival Phrase 254
Dative-Locative 257
Indirect Object 257

Indicating Possession 258
Dative of Disadvantage 258
Goal 259
Purpose or Result 260
Location 260
Temporal Uses 261
Units of Measure and Dimensions 262
Additive-Incremental 262
Allative 262
Ablative 264
Instrumental 268
Cases with Particular Verbs 270
Chapter 17. Adjectives 271
Comparison of Adjectives 273
Comparative Degree 273
Superlative Degree 275
Chapter 18. Pronouns 277
Independent Personal Pronouns 277
Enclitic Personal Pronouns 279
(Third-Person) Subject Clitics 280
Intransitive Verbs with Subject Clitics 280
Intransitive Verbs without Subject Clitics 281
Other Clauses without Referential Subjects 282
Special Cases 282
Demonstrative Pronouns 283
kā-, *apā-*, and *aši*: Word Order 283
Declinable *kāš . . . kāš* as a Distributive Expression 285
Correlated *kā*-Forms Having Different Cases 286
Other Deictic Elements 286
The Indefinite Pronoun *kuišk*i 286
tamai- 287
Chapter 19. Adverbs 289
Local Adverbs 289
Temporal Adverbs 290
Adverbs of Manner 291
Denominative Adverbs 291
The Adverbial Suffix *-ili* 292
Adverbial Circumlocutions 293
Chapter 20. Local Adverbs, Preverbs, and Postpositions 294
Free-standing Adverbs 295
Preverbs 295
Postpositions 297
Chapter 21. Verb Voice 302
Active Voice 302
Middle Voice 303
Passive Voice 303

Chapter 22. Verb Tense 306
Present 306
Preterite 309
The Analytic Perfect Construction 310
Function 310
Form 310
Uniqueness within the Old Anatolian Indo-European Group 310
Examples 311
"Stative" Constructions with *ḫar(k)*- and *ēš*- 311

Chapter 23. Verb Mood 313
Indicative 313
Imperative 313
Optative, Potential, and Irrealis 314
Optative 315
Potential and Irrealis 315

Chapter 24. Verb Aspect 317
Imperfectives 317
Adverbial Markers 317
Suffix Markers 318
Nuances of Imperfective Aspect 318
Choice of Suffix 322
Suffix Redundancy 323
kāša(tta) and *kāšma* 323
The "Serial" Use of *pai*- 'to go' and *uwa*- 'to come' 324

Chapter 25. Non-Finite Verb Forms 330
Verbal Substantive 330
Infinitive 332
Supine 338
Participle 339

Chapter 26. Negation 341
natta 341
Word Order with *natta* 341
Negative Rhetorical Questions (with Negatives of Assertion) 342
nawi 'not yet' 343
Imperatival and Categorical Negative *lē* 344
lē=man and *nūman* 344
Categorical Negative *lē* 345
Word Order with *lē* 345
ne/ikku 345
Double Negatives 346
Carry-Over of Negative Force 346
Summary 346

Chapter 27. Questions 348
Intonation Marking 348
Yes–No Questions 348
Direct Questions with Interrogative Pronouns, Adjectives, and Adverbs 350
Questions Posing Alternatives 353
Indirect Questions 353
Chapter 28. Particles 354
The Particle *-wa(r-)* 354
The Particle *-z(a)* 357
Form 357
Reflexive Function 357
Lexical Use of *-z(a)* 360
Use in Nominal Sentences and with the Verb 'To Be' 362
The Local Particles *-an*, *-apa*, *-ašta*, *-kan*, and *-šan* 364
The Particle *-kan* 366
The "Local" Value 366
Accompanying the "Dative of Disadvantage" 371
The Terminative Value 372
With Verbs of Hostility 372
Aspect Independent of Verb's Lexical Meaning 372
Absence of Expected *-kan* 373
Summary 373
The Particle *-šan* 374
Co-occurring with the Adverb *šer* 374
Physical or Conceptual Movement toward an Object 375
The Particle *-an* 377
The Particle *-apa* 378
The Particle *-ašta* 382
The Particle *-pat* 384
Anaphoric 385
Particularizing 386
Restrictive 387
Contrastive 388
Chapter 29. Conjunctions 389
Clause-Initial Clause-Linking Conjunctions 390
Distribution 390
nu 390
šu 392
ta 393
Enclitic Clause-Linking Conjunctions 395
-a/-ma 395
-a/-ya 399
Asyndeton 401
Form 401
Function 402

Disjunction 405
naššu . . . naš(šu)ma 405
-(*a*)*ku* . . . -(*a*)*ku* 405

Chapter 30. Clauses 406
Word Order 406
Major Constituents 406
Deletion Processes 409
Sentential Clitics 410
Nominal and "To Be" Sentences 412
Dependent Clauses 414
Temporal Clauses 416
Causal Clauses 418
Concessive Clauses 419
Conditional Clauses 419
Simple Conditions 420
Contrary-to-Fact Conditions 422
Relative Clauses 423
Indirect Statements and Questions 426
Multiple Dependent Clauses 428

Chapter 31. Sumerian and Akkadian 430
Sumerograms 430
Nouns, Adjectives, and Participles 430
Pronouns 430
Verbs 430
Akkadian Grammar 430
Orthography 431
Superscripting 432
Phonetic Complements 433
Phonology 433
Morphology 434
Nouns and Adjectives 434
Pronominal Suffixes 437
Numbers 438
Verbs 438
Conjunctions 440
Calques 440
Prepositions 441

References 442

PREFACE

This book originated in supplementary teaching materials developed by the authors for classroom instruction. Several generations have learned Hittite with the help of the outstanding *Hethitisches Elementarbuch* of Johannes Friedrich (second edition: 1960). However, the passage of more than 40 years has inevitably rendered parts of Friedrich's grammar outdated or incomplete. A number of recent works have tried to address current instructional needs. Our own efforts to procure or produce teaching materials for the classroom led us to conclude that the time had come for a more comprehensive reference grammar of Hittite, along the lines of Wolfram von Soden's *Grundriß der akkadischen Grammatik* (latest posthumous edition in 1995), that could also serve as the basis for an accompanying set of graded lessons for language learners.

No descriptive grammar can ever pretend to be truly definitive. We have done our best to incorporate and synthesize the advances made since the work of Friedrich and to make this grammar as broad and up-to-date in coverage as possible. We ask indulgence in advance for the inevitable omissions and inadequacies. On points where there is no consensus, we have not hesitated to make reasoned choices, while striving to acknowledge different points of view. Our primary goal has been to describe the language systematically as it appears in the extant texts. We have referred to prehistoric factors only where we feel that they help elucidate features of attested Hittite or are of broad interest. We expressly disavow any intent of systematic coverage in this regard.

One of the most dramatic changes in Hittitology since 1960 has been our enhanced ability to establish a relative chronology not only of texts (recognized since the earliest days of the field) but also of individual copies of those texts, often written many years after the text's composition. We have sought to give full recognition to established findings in this area, but our initial intention of assigning Old, Middle, or New Hittite status to all cited forms in the paradigms proved to be overly optimistic. Many issues about the dating of texts and manuscripts remain unresolved. We have therefore limited ourselves to marking consistently only examples assured as Old Hittite by their appearance in copies from the Old Hittite period (OS = Old Script). We have otherwise been selective in making what we take to be valid generalizations about the date of various phenomena in appropriate passages in the grammar. Further refinements must be left for the future, including in installments of the ongoing major lexica.

The tutorial is a series of graded lessons arranged in a typical fashion. Major morphological categories are introduced a few at a time, along with a limited but representative sample of the lexicon. Each lesson has illustrative sentences suitable for practice in translation. In order to avoid inventing more Hittite sentences than absolutely necessary, we have insofar as possible used for the exercises Hittite sentences that actually occur in

the texts in either their original form or slightly adapted. We have keyed the tutorial to the reference grammar and have provided extensive notes for the exercise sentences, especially on matters of syntax, but we have designed the tutorial primarily for classroom use with an instructor who knows the language. Although some readers may be able to use the tutorial for self-instruction, we cannot give assurance that such a method will produce satisfactory results.

Our enormous overall debt to scholars past and present should be apparent throughout. We are indebted to colleagues too numerous to mention for their prompt sending of copies of published and unpublished works and responses to queries. We wish to thank in particular Professors John A. Brinkman, Benjamin Fortson, Theo van den Hout, Jay Jasanoff, Jared Klein, Norbert Oettinger, and Elisabeth Rieken for reading all or part of an earlier draft of the grammar and offering innumerable helpful suggestions and criticisms. The present version has been immeasurably improved due to their efforts. Nevertheless, since we were not able to follow all their suggestions, they cannot be accountable for whatever errors, omissions, or infelicities remain. For these we alone are responsible. We would also like to thank Mr. Aaron Butts of Duke University for working through an earlier draft of the tutorial and suggesting changes in it, and the LANE series editor, Professor Gonzalo Rubio, for further helpful suggestions. Last but not least, both authors are grateful to Winifred Hoffner for the hospitality, patience, and unfailing good humor which she has shown to us during the long and sometimes trying gestation period of this book and for standing together with us as loyal, long-suffering Chicago Cubs baseball fans!

The Authors
Christmas, 2005

ABBREVIATIONS AND CONVENTIONAL MARKINGS

In general, and unless otherwise noted in the remarks below, we follow the system of abbreviation used in the *Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (CHD). For further details, see below under "Bibliographical Abbreviations."

As we describe in more detail in the Introduction, the Hittite language can be regarded as developing in three stages: Old Hittite (ca. 1650–1450 B.C.), Middle Hittite (ca. 1450–1350), and New Hittite (ca. 1350–1190). As in the CHD, we employ the sigla OH, MH, and NH for Old, Middle, and New Hittite, and following a slash (/) indicate the date of the copy with OS, MS, and NS for Old, Middle, and New Hittite Script. Text datings follow the format of the CHD (e.g., OH/MS, etc., rather than the German system of using "ah" and "mh" to denote the date of the individual copy). OS used by itself implies OH/OS, NH by itself implies NS. But the datings themselves may differ from those of earlier printed CHD volumes. Wherever possible, we seek to conform to the datings of the copies now used in the on-line *Konkordanz* of the Mainz center for Hittitological research.

In citing Hittite text references, joined pieces published in separate places are noted as KUB 24.5 + KUB 9.13 obv. 31 or just as KUB 24.5+, which implies that there is a join but does not specify its identity.

The slanted equal sign (⸗) in Hittite transcriptions indicates a boundary before a clitic element. Since there is no convenient transliteration for the marker wedges that Hittite scribes prefixed to forms exhibiting foreign or unusual elements, we follow the CHD practice of using a graphic representation of the one- or two-wedge variants: 𒑱 and 𒑲.

Unlike verbs in the Semitic languages, Hittite verbs with third-person subjects are indifferent to the biological gender of their subjects. To avoid ugly renderings such as 'he/she/it . . . -s' in our translations, when the actual gender of the subject is unknown, we have arbitrarily used the masculine pronoun 'he'.

In the paradigms the following conventions are followed.

Parentheses within forms may mark optional modes of writing the word: e.g., *-az(a)* means that the ablative ending can be written either -C*a-za* or -C*a-az*; *annaz(a)* means that the ablative of *anna-* 'mother' can be written either *an-na-az* or *an-na-za*; *wal(a)ḫzi* indicates that this form can be written either *wa-al-aḫ-zi* or *wa-la-aḫ-zi*; *paḫḫu(e)naš* signals the existence of spellings *paḫḫuenaš* and *paḫḫunaš*; *a(u)wari(y)aš* signals the possible spellings *a-u-wa-ri-ya-aš, a-u-wa-ri-aš*, *a-wa-ri-ya-aš*, etc.; *ḫuiš(u)wanza* signals the existence of *ḫu-iš-wa-an-za* as well as *ḫu-i-šu-wa-an-za*. This applies also to optional plene spellings (e.g., *pēḫutezzi*). The same convention is used with transliterated forms: *šar-re-(e-)ez-zi.*

Parentheses may also occasionally mark a speech element lost through a regular sound change but restored in our broad transcription to aid lexical and/or grammati-

cal identification: e.g., Old Hittite *at-ta-aš-ša-an* 'his father' (acc.) will be transcribed *atta*(*n*)=*ššan; la-a-am-ma-a-mi-it* as *lāmmā*(*n*)=*mit;* Old Hittite *an-da-ma-pa*, when the form contains the clitic pronoun *-mu,* will be transcribed *anda=m*(*u*)=*apa* (§1.72, p. 32; and §28.100, p. 378). Likewise we clarify instances of "simplified spellings" (§1.10, p. 12), where a nongeminate consonant represents two identical consonants straddling a clitic boundary, by supplying one of the two identical consonants within parentheses (e.g., *iš-ki-še-et* will appear as *iški*(*š*)=*šet; at-ta-aš-mi-iš* 'their father' as *attaš=*(*š*)*miš*).

A parenthesized letter or syllable may also indicate alternative interpretations of a single writing (e.g., *kar*(*a*)*pzi* means that *kar-ap-zi* could be interpreted as either /karptsi/ or /karaptsi/); *annall*(*i*)*eš* indicates that *an-na-al-li-eš* (or *an-na-al-li-e-eš*) could also be transliterated *an-na-al-le-eš* (or *an-na-al-le-e-eš*).

Bolded forms indicate that the form is attested in OS, but may or may not occur in later periods. The bolding is OS-inclusive, not OS-exclusive.

Bolded forms with parenthesized letters (e.g., ***ḫuiš*(*u*)*wanza***) require that the alternate writings *ḫuišwanza* and *ḫuišuwanza* both occur in OS, not that one is OS and the other from a post-OS copy. Instances of the latter scenario require a second recording in the paradigm (e.g., ***nepiši,*** *nepiš*, not ****nepiš*(*i*)**). But as with all bolded forms, a writing ***ḫuiš*(*u*)*wanza*** leaves open the possibility that one or both of the variant writings also occurs in post-OS.

In rare cases (see §1.72, p. 32) a parenthesized letter indicates a phoneme lost through a phonotactic change: *ḫuišwatar=m*(*u*)=*apa* means that the form *ḫuišwatarmapa* arose through deletion of the *u* vowel before the suffixed particle *-apa*. Similarly *na-pa* (for *n*(*u*)=*apa*) in §28.100 (p. 378) the conjunctions *n*(*u*)*, š*(*u*), *t*(*a*) in §29.1 (p. 389), *ištamana*(*n*)=*šan* 'his ear', *tuzzi*(*n*)=*man* 'my army' in §6.5 (p. 139).

Entire forms marked by parentheses indicate those occurring rarely in the texts.

Forms in the paradigms of *mi*-conjugation verbs marked by a following † are *ḫi*-conjugation intrusions. Forms in the paradigms of *ḫi*-conjugation verbs marked with † are *mi*-conjugation intrusions.

When translating ancient texts or individual ancient words, we use pairs of single quotation marks ('. . .'). When quoting from a modern publication, however, we employ pairs of double quotation marks (". . .").

General Abbreviations

abl.	ablative	Akk.	Akkadian
abbr.	abbreviated, abbreviation	all.	allative
acc.	accusative	C	consonant (in CV, CVC, VC)
act.	active	CLuw.	Cuneiform Luwian
adj.	adjective	col.	column
adv.	adverb	coll.	collective

com.	common gender
conj.	conjunction
d.-l.	dative-loctive
dat.	dative
DN	divine name
dupl(s).	duplicate(s)
ed.	edition, edited (by)
e.g.	for example
erg.	ergative
Erg.	Ergänzungsheft
esp.	especially
etc.	et cetera
ex(x).	example(s)
f(f).	and following
fem.	feminine
fest.	festival (text)
gen.	genitive
Gilg.	Gilgamesh Epic (CTH 341)
GN	geographical name
Hatt.	Ḫattušili
Hitt.	Hittite
HLuw.	Hieroglyphic Luwian
Hurr.	Hurrian
ibid.	in the same place
idem	the same (author)
i.e.	that is
IE	Indo-European
imp.	imperative
imperf.	imperfective
impers.	impersonal
indef.	indefinite
inf.	infinitive
ins.	instrumental
interj.	interjection
interrog.	interrogative
intr.	intransitive
iter.	iterative
lit.	literally
loc.	locative
Luw.	Luwian
^{m}	marks the PN of a male person
masc.	masculine
MH	Middle Hittite
m.-p.	medio-passive (voice)
MS	Middle Hittite Script
Murš.	Muršili
Muw.	Muwatalli
n.	(foot)note
n(om).-a(cc).	nominative-accusative
neut.	neuter
NH	New Hittite
no.	number
nom.	nominative
NS	New Hittite Script
obj.	object
obv.	obverse
OH	Old Hittite
OS	Old Hittite Script
p(p).	page(s)
part.	participle
pass.	passive
perf.	perfect
pers. comm.	personal communication
PIE	Proto-Indo-European
pl.	plural
pl. tantum	only plural
PN	personal name
poss.	possessive
postpos.	postposition
PrAn.	Proto-Anatolian
pres.	present (tense)
pret.	preterite
prev.	preverb(s)
pron.	pronoun
rel.	relative
ref(s).	reference(s)
rev.	reverse
rit.	ritual
scil.	namely
sg.	singular
subst.	substantive
Sum.	Sumerian
sup.	supine
Šupp.	Šuppiluliuma
s.v.	under the word
Tel.	Telipinu
Tel. pr.	Telipinu proclamation
tr.	translation, translated (by)
trans.	transitive
translit.	transliteration
Tudḫ.	Tudḫaliya
V	vowel (in CV, CVC, VC)
var(s).	variant(s)
voc.	vocative
vs.	versus

x	in transliteration indicates an illegible sign
x	non-subscripted *x* stands for an indeterminate number
x	subscripted following a sign value indicates a value not yet assigned a number in official sign lists
×	within Sumerograms the multiplication sign × precedes sign element inscribed within another. See §1.14 (p. 15).
=	equivalences in dupls., lexical texts, etc.
₌	marks clitic boundaries
§	section (of this or other books)
*	prefixed to unattested forms
(. . .)	within a Hittite word encloses omissible part of word (see above, pp. xvii–xviii)
(. . .)	in translation encloses words not in the Hittite but needed in English
[. . .]	encloses phonetic interpretations[1]
[. . .]	encloses material lost in text break
[. . . (. . .) . . .]	(. . .) encloses material restored from a duplicate
<	derives or develops from
>	becomes/develops into
⟨ . . . ⟩	encloses material accidentally omitted by the scribe
⟨(. . .)⟩	encloses material omitted from main text but restored from a duplicate
⟪ . . . ⟫	encloses material to be omitted
/ . . . /	encloses phonological/phonemic interpretations[1]
˹	single-wedge marker
˺	double-wedge marker

Bibliographical Abbreviations

In-text bibliographical citations are in the Author-Date form ("Wilhelm 1992") except for a restricted number of reference works (e.g., CTH, HE, HED, HW, HW^2, HZL) which are so well-known and commonly used that it seemed inadvisable to refer to them in the Author-Date style, and others which, while not quite so standard as the above, we had occasion to refer to very frequently: AHP and LH. Journal abbreviations occur only in the comprehensive bibliography that closes this work.

AA	Archäologischer Anzeiger
AAA	Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology
ABoT	Ankara arkeoloji müzesinde bulunan Boğazköy tabletleri
AGI	Archivio Glottologico Italiano
AfO	Archiv für Orientforschung
AHP	Melchert 1994
AHw	von Soden 1965–85
AIPHOS	Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves
AM	Annals of Muršili, edited in Goetze 1933a
ANET	Pritchard 1969
AoF	Altorientalische Forschungen

1. It is generally impossible to capture phonetic detail for Hittite. We have therefore mostly limited our interpretations of its sound system to matters of contrast, marked by /. . ./. We have resorted to phonetic interpretations, given in [. . .], only where the distinction seemed especially salient. All such interpretations are provisional.

ArAn	Archivum Anatolicum
ArOr	Archiv Orientální
AuOr	Aula Orientalis
Belleten	Türk Tarih Kurumu Belleten
BiOr	Bibliotheca Orientalis
Bo	Inventory numbers of Boğazköy tablets excavated 1906–1912
Bo year/ . . .	Inventory numbers of Boğazköy tablets excavated from 1968 to the present
BrTabl.	The Bronze Tablet cited according to the edition of Otten 1988
BSL	Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris
BSOAS	Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies
CAD	Gelb et al. 1956–2005
CDA	Black, George, and Postgate 1999
CHD	Güterbock, Hoffner, and van den Hout 1980–
CLL	Melchert 1993b
CoS	Hallo and Younger 2003
CTH	Laroche 1971
DLL	Laroche 1959
DŠ	Deeds of Šuppiluliuma cited according to the edition of Güterbock 1956
EHS	Kronasser 1966
FHG	Laroche 1951a; 1952
FHL	Durand and Laroche 1982
GAG	von Soden 1952; latest revision von Soden 1995
Ḫatt.	Apology of Ḫattušili III cited according to the edition of Otten 1981
HE	Friedrich 1960
HED	Puhvel 1984–
HFAC	Beckman and Hoffner 1985
HKM	Maşat tablets cited by the cuneiform edition Alp 1991b
HS	Historische Sprachforschung
HSCP	Harvard Studies in Classical Philology
HT	Hittite Texts in the Cuneiform Character in the British Museum
HW	Friedrich 1952 (reprint Friedrich 1991)
HW^2	Friedrich, Kammenhuber, and Hoffmann 1975–
HZL	Rüster and Neu 1989; bare numbers refer to pages, numbers following # refer to sign numbers
IBoT	Istanbul arkeoloji müzelerinde bulunan Boğazköy tabletleri 1–4 — Istanbul 1944, 1947, 1954, Ankara 1988
IF	Indogermanische Forschungen
IM	Istanbuler Mitteilungen
IncLing	Incontri Linguistici
JAC	Journal of Ancient Civilizations
JANER	Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions
JANES	Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JCS	Journal of Cuneiform Studies
JIES	Journal of Indo-European Studies
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies
KBo	Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi
KlF	Kleinasiatische Forschungen

Konk.	Konkordanz der hethitischen Texte at http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/
KUB	Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi
KuSa	Wilhelm 1997
KuT	Precedes inventory numbers of Kuşaklı tablets
KZ	Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung (“Kuhns Zeitschrift”)
Laws	Hittite laws cited by § in LH
Lg	Language
LH	Hoffner 1997d
LSU	Riemschneider 1958
MDOG	Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orientgesellschaft zu Berlin
MIO	Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung
MSpr	Muršili’s Aphasia, ed. Lebrun 1985
MSS	Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft
N.A.B.U.	Nouvelles assyriologiques brèves et utilitaires
OA	Oriens Antiquus
OLZ	Orientalistische Literaturzeitung
Or NS	Orientalia Nova Series
PP 1–4	First to Fourth Plague Prayers of Muršili II, ed. Goetze 1930a
RA	Revue d’Assyriologie et d’Archéologie orientale
RHA	Revue hittite et asianique
RS	Ras Shamra text, cited by inventory number
SBo 1	Güterbock 1940
SMEA	Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici
StBoT	Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten
SV 1–2	State treaties cited according to the editions by Friedrich 1926; 1930
THeth 11	Hoffmann 1984
TIES	Tocharian and Indo-European Studies
TPS	Transactions of the Philological Society
Ullik.	Ullikummi myth, ed. Güterbock 1952
VBoT	Verstreute Boghazköi-Texte (Goetze 1930c)
VO	Vicino Oriente
WO	Die Welt des Orients
WZKM	Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes
ZA	Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete
ZDMG	Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft

INTRODUCTION

The Hittites and Their Language

0.1. The people we now call "Hittites" lived almost four thousand years ago in the central highlands of what is today the Republic of Turkey.[1]

0.2. The story of the rediscovery of the Hittite writing system, language, and civilization has been told often. In its main lines it runs as follows. Stone blocks found in Syria at the end of the 19th century with hieroglyphic inscriptions chiseled into them were correctly connected to the people known from the Hebrew Bible and the Neo-Assyrian annals as "Hittites." At that time scholars could not know that the language of these inscriptions was not Hittite proper but a closely related language now called "Luwian." Yet the assumption that these inscriptions related somehow to the ancient Hittites was correct. Similar inscriptions on rock reliefs in central Anatolia led explorers and archaeologists to impressive ruins near the village of Boğazköy. Official excavations begun there in 1906 under the direction of Hugo Winckler and Theodore Makridi revealed a great city dating from the time of the New Kingdom pharaohs of Egypt and the Kassite dynasty of Babylonia.[2] Several huge archives of clay tablets inscribed in a variety of cuneiform writing very similar to the contemporary Amarna archives found in Egypt were discovered. Although many tablets were composed in Akkadian and could be read immediately, confirming the excavators' suspicion that they had found the capital of "Ḫatti," the vast majority were written in the native language of the Hittites.

Decipherment

0.3. Two tablets in this native language had been found decades earlier in the Amarna archives, representing correspondence between the Egyptian pharaoh and the king of a land called "Arzawa" (later revealed to be located in southwestern Anatolia). A Norwegian scholar, J. A. Knudtzon, claimed the two Arzawa letters were written in a previously unknown Indo-European language (1902). His claim came under heavy criticism from specialists in Indo-European languages. In the second volume of the edition of the Amarna tablets O. Weber maintained that—according to a letter sent to Weber— Knudtzon had eventually lost confidence in his own discovery,[3] leading to the inaccurate

1. For coverage of the Hittites, their culture and history—written for the general reader—see any one of the following: Bittel 1970; Klengel and Klengel 1975; Macqueen 1986; Gurney 1990; Hoffner 1994, 1997a; Bryce 1998, 2002; de Martino 2003; Hoffner 2003a.

2. See Güterbock 1995b for the history.

3. Weber and Ebeling 1915: 1074.

assertion by others that Knudtzon had retracted his claim to decipherment. Working with a much larger corpus of well-preserved documents in the "Arzawa language" from Boğazköy, a Czech Assyriologist named Bedřich Hrozný demonstrated convincingly that Knudtzon's allegedly retracted theory was in fact correct and published the first adequate grammatical sketch of what became known henceforth as the "Hittite" language (Hrozný 1915, 1917).

0.4. The language now called "Hittite"[4] was the principal administrative language of the ancient kingdom of Ḫatti, attested in documents from the state archives in its capital city, Ḫattuša, and from a few other sites (see in detail §§0.6–0.10). According to the currently most widely accepted chronology these texts date from the 16th to 13th centuries B.C. Our limited written sources leave us almost wholly ignorant about the status of Hittite as a spoken language in terms of place, time, and social classes or population groups.[5]

0.5. Hittite is a member of the Anatolian sub-branch of the widespread Indo-European family that includes Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, and most of the modern languages of Europe. Other Indo-European languages of ancient Anatolia include Luwian, Palaic, Lycian, Lydian, and Carian. Hittite shows the typical features of an older Indo-European language: it is both synthetic, showing significant use of derivational suffixes to form words, and inflecting, marking the role of most words in a sentence by a system of endings (word-final suffixes). The historical relationship of Hittite (more correctly of the Anatolian sub-branch) to the rest of the Indo-European family is a matter of continuing debate, but this issue lies beyond the purview of the present descriptive grammar.

The Text Corpus

0.6. Hittite cuneiform tablets and tablet fragments, most of them recovered from the royal archives of the capital city, Ḫattuša, near the modern town of Boğazkale ('gorge castle'), number well over 30,000. This town earlier bore the name Boğazköy ('gorge village'), which, before the introduction of standardized writing of contemporary Turkish, appeared in archeological and philological literature of the 20th century as "Boghazköy," "Boghazköi," "Boghaz Keui," etc. Although the official name of the town today is Boğazkale ('gorge castle'), it is customary in scholarly literature to continue to spell the name Boğazköy (sometimes spelled without the Turkish *ğ* as Boghazköy), and we will do so in this grammar. The vast majority of the excavated tablets are conserved today in Turkish museums in Ankara, Istanbul, Boğazköy, and Çorum. Other sizable collections

4. The alternative name "Nesite" is rarely used, although the Hittites' own designation for their language was *ne/ašili*, *nešumnili* '(in) the language of (the city of) Neša' (also known as Kaneš, see Güterbock 1958). For orientation in the subject of the various names used in ancient and modern times for this people and their language see Güterbock 1959.

5. For recent discussions of this problem see Wilhelm 2002b, Melchert 2005b, and van den Hout 2006.

are found in the Pergamon Museum in Berlin, the British Museum, and the Louvre, with much smaller holdings in various academic institutions or museums in America, England, Europe, and the Middle East, as well as in private holdings.

0.7. Most known Hittite cuneiform texts were found at sites in central Turkey (Boğazköy, Alaca Höyük, Maşat Höyük, Ortaköy [Çorum], Kuşaklı, Kayalıpınar). A much smaller number were found in the tablet archives of ancient peoples of the Mediterranean littoral (Syria and Egypt)[6] who had diplomatic relations with the Hittites.

0.8. Although throughout the nearly 100 years of discovery and publication a very large corpus of Hittite texts and fragments has been published, there still remains a substantial number of tablets in Turkish museums awaiting publication. And although it seems unlikely that any additional large source of clay tablets will be found in Ḫattuša, beginning in 1990 a cache of more than three thousand tablets has been excavated at Ortaköy (ancient Šapinuwa) in the Çorum Province of Turkey (Süel 2002). The archive of Šapinuwa dates from the Middle Hittite period (ca. 1400–1350). Once published, it should shed valuable light not only on this relatively poorly understood period in the history of the Hittites but also on a crucial period in the development of their language between the Old and New Hittite periods. In 2005, during exacavations directed by Müller-Karpe at Kayalıpınar near Sivas, some Hittite, Hurrian, and Akkadian tablets were found. Hand-copies of them are being prepared by Elisabeth Rieken. Although it seems likely that in the coming decades additional small archives will be found at other provincial centers of the Hittite heartland, the weight of textual evidence will continue to be the large harvest of tablets from the capital city.

Modern Resources for Study

Cuneiform Editions

0.9. Of the excavated tablets, most of those from Boğazköy have been published as facsimile editions (drawings) in the following publications: 60 volumes in the series Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi (abbr. KUB), 45 volumes in Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi (abbr. KBo), 4 volumes in the Turkish series Istanbul arkeoloji müzelerinde bulunan Boğazköy tabletleri (abbr. IBoT) and a handful of other volumes in smaller series.[7] The task of publishing facsimile editions of Hittite cuneiform texts from the Boğazköy excavations is in the hands of the Boğazköy Archive of the Academy of Sciences of Mainz, Germany, whose former director was Heinrich Otten and whose current director is Gernot Wilhelm. This center for research maintains a wide range of research

6. Syria: Alalakh, Ugarit, and Emar; Egypt: Amarna.

7. Ankara arkeoloji müzesinde bulunan Boğazköy tabletleri (ABoT), Hittite Fragments in American Collections (HFAC), Fragments hittites de Genève (FHG), Fragments hittites du Louvre (FHL), Hittite Texts in the Cuneiform Character in the British Museum (HT), Kuşaklı-Sarissa (KuSa), Verstreute Boghazköitexte (VBoT).

resources, some available only to scholars visiting the site at Mainz (such as the comprehensive lexical files), and some available online at the Hethitologie Portal Mainz, including the online edition of Silvin Košak's *Konkordanz der hethitischen Texte* (see further below, p. 7), digitized photos of some tablets, a collection of personal names, a bibliography, and the beginnings of a set of digital editions of texts ("Digitale Publikation von Texten der Hethiter [DPTH]").

0.10. Approximately 116 tablets or large fragments from the now completed excavations at Maşat Höyük (ancient Tapikka) were published by Alp (1991a, 1991b). We can therefore expect no additional tablets from Maşat. A smaller number of tablets from the ongoing excavations at Kuşaklı (ancient Šarišša) directed by Andreas Müller-Karpe have been published by Gernot Wilhelm (1995, 1997, 1998, 2002a). Scattered individual tablets from Emar, Alalakh, Ugarit, and El-Amarna have been published in excavation reports and journal articles.

Commentaries

0.11. Since the early days of Hittitology in the 20th century, Hittite compositions of many textual genres have been reconstructed from the tablets and presented in transliteration, with critical notes, commentary, and (often) lexical indices. The earliest such series was Boghazköi Studien, edited by Ferdinand Sommer and published in Leipzig, Germany, in which the following important editions appeared: Hrozný 1917; Sommer 1920, 1922; Weidner 1923; Sommer and Ehelolf 1924. A second important series, Hethitische Texte, also published in Leipzig and edited by F. Sommer, is a subdivision of the more comprehensive series Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft. Today there exist at least three significant series of this type in Germany and several in Italy.[8] The largest and best known of the German series is Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz; abbr. StBoT), currently edited by Gernot Wilhelm.

Sign Lexicon

0.12. The authoritative sign lexicon for Hittite texts is *Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon: Inventar und Interpretation der Keilschriftzeichen aus den Boğazköy-Texten* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1989; abbr. HZL), compiled by two experts in the field, Christel Rüster and Erich Neu. Rüster assisted Heinrich Otten for many years in producing excellent hand-copies for the KBo series. Neu produced some of the standard guides for the dating of Hittite cuneiform texts on the basis of paleography. The volume not only contains the complete known repertory of signs but virtually all known variant forms of the signs, arranged under each entry in roughly chronological order. Under each sign entry are listed all known examples of its meaning as a logogram (see §1.5, p. 10;

8. A new series of text editions in Italy is the Series Hethaea (Italian University Press), which in turn is a subseries of Studia Mediterranea, edited by Onofrio Carruba.

§§1.37–1.44, pp. 22–24) and its use as a component of multisign logograms (Sumerograms and Akkadograms) and logographically written proper names that contain the sign in question. Of particular value to beginners, at the back of HZL are alphabetized lists of Sumerograms and Akkadograms with German and Turkish translations, logographically written proper names (divine names, personal names, geographical names), tables of common CV, VC, and CVC signs, and of easily confused signs.

Grammars

0.13. For more than forty years, the best instructional grammar of Hittite has been Johannes Friedrich's *Hethitisches Elementarbuch* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1960; abbr. HE).[9] Less satisfactory, but written in English, is the grammar by Held, Schmalstieg, and Gertz (1987). Very brief surveys also exist, such as Kammenhuber 1969b, Luraghi 1997a, Francia 2005, and Rieken 2005a. There is a grammatical sketch of the Middle Hittite texts from Maşat by Hoffner (forthcoming a). From the comparative Indo-Europeanist perspective an early influential work was Sturtevant 1933, which appeared in a revised and enlarged second edition as Sturtevant and Hahn 1951. Later significant systematic works from this perspective are Kronasser 1956, 1966, and Ivanov 1963.

Dictionaries

Hittite Language

0.14. The best concise coverage of the entire Hittite vocabulary is still Johannes Friedrich's *Hethitisches Wörterbuch* (first edition; Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1952; abbr. HW),[10] with its three supplements, reprinted posthumously under a single cover (Friedrich 1991). Although this work was last updated (in the third supplement) in 1966, it is marked by a careful, cautious, and accurate approach and is a model of conciseness. It provides a German translation of all words whose meanings were known to Friedrich, a selection of inflected forms, a brief bibliography of studies of the word's meaning, and sometimes a proposed etymology. A more recent Hittite-German word list that covers the entire alphabet is Tischler 2001. But although this is more up-to-date than HW, it lacks many useful features of Friedrich's earlier work, such as the inflected forms, the bibliographies, and the list of Hurrian vocabulary.

0.15. Two projects have been underway since the 1970s to produce complete dictionaries of Hittite on the scale of Wolfram von Soden's *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch* and the *Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.* The first is the revised and augmented second edition of Johannes Friedrich's *Hethitisches Wörterbuch,* begun under the direction of Annelies Kammenhuber of the University of Munich, Germany, and continued now by Inge Hoffmann. This dictionary (abbreviated as HW^2) began its coverage with *A* and has now partially completed the letter *Ḫ* in

9. Reprint, third unaltered edition; Heidelberg: Winter, 1974.

10. To be distinguished from HW^2, on which see §0.15.

volume 3. The second project is *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Work began in Chicago in 1974 under the joint direction of Hans G. Güterbock and Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the basis of lexical files collected over a period of ten years (1965–75) by Hoffner. This database was augmented by CHD staff during the following years. In order to avoid immediate overlap with the Munich project, the CHD began its published coverage with *L*. To date, volumes covering words beginning with *L*, *M*, *N*, *P* and the first two fascicles of *S* have appeared. The Chicago team has begun placing a partially modified version of the text of published volumes online (the so-called eCHD), so that articles can be consulted over the internet. Both of these projects attempt to include treatments of all known words appearing in published texts, whether or not their meanings have been determined, and to produce transcriptions and full translations of representative occurrences of these words. Such a full presentation enables users with limited access to the original sources to appreciate and weigh the evidence for determining the word's meaning. The CHD also includes notations indicating the best estimate of the date of original composition and of the copy of many cited sources. Using this documentation, a user can trace the chronological development of various meanings and grammatical usages.

0.16. The important multivolume work by Jaan Puhvel, *Hittite Etymological Dictionary* (7 vols. to date; Berlin: Mouton/de Gruyter, 1984–; abbr. HED), is now more than halfway through the alphabet (A–N) and is useful for more than etymological considerations. Puhvel conscientiously lists all inflected forms of words included in his corpus, gives translations of selected passages in which the inflected forms occur, and has useful semantic discussions. HED provides no dating of the forms and thus cannot show diachronic development within the attested languages. A second ongoing work, Johann Tischler's *Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar* (14 Lieferungen to date; Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 1977–), focuses primarily on etymology.

Luwian Language

0.17. The latest glossary of the cuneiform Luwian texts is Craig Melchert's *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: Self-published, 1993; abbr. CLL), which includes all words attested in the corpus edited by Frank Starke (1985) and gives selected coverage of Luwian words appearing in Hittite contexts. Melchert's lexicon may be obtained in PDF format from the author. Some Hieroglyphic Luwian words are listed and glossed in HW and its three supplements in the appendix "Nachbarsprachen." But the usefulness of glossaries and word-lists for Hieroglyphic Luwian published prior to Hawkins, Morpurgo Davies, and Neumann 1974, which changed the readings of several high-frequency signs and thus revocalized many words, is limited. Among these earlier works is Meriggi 1962, which was once a standard tool. Even Laroche 1960, which in many respects still remains a crucial tool, suffers in this respect. The new corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian texts (Hawkins 2000) contains a very useful partial index of Luwian

words, as do the vocabulary lists at the back of three recent introductory grammars of Luwian (Werner and Lüscher 1991; Plöchl 2003; Payne 2004), but a complete dictionary is still lacking.

Hurrian Language

0.18. An up-to-date Hurrian glossary is badly needed in view of the many newly available texts. The latest complete glossary published is by Laroche (1978–79), which must be supplemented by tabulations and lists in new publications, such as the Hurro-Hittite bilingual "Song of Release" edited by Erich Neu (1996). Neu's death in 1999 deprived us of his planned companion volume, which would have contained a complete glossary of this extremely valuable text. Other valuable sources on grammar include André-Salvini and Salvini 1999; Wilhelm 1992a, 1992b, 1992c; and Giorgieri 2000. For vocabulary, see Neu 1996, Catsanicos 1996, and the list of Hurrian words in the back of the introductory grammar by Ilse Wegner (2000).

Sumerograms and Akkadograms

0.19. An older listing of Sumerograms and Akkadograms in Hittite texts can be found in HW 264–315 and its three supplements. An up-to-date replacement is HZL 304–69, in which each logogram is accompanied by the number of the sign in the repertoire under which it is booked, as well as a German and a Turkish translation. Their results are also incorporated by Johann Tischler (2001) in his appendix of Sumerograms. Not restricted to examples attested in Hittite texts are the complete dictionaires of Akkadian, AHw and CAD, as well as the concise CDA.

Text Catalogues and Name Collections

Hittite Cuneiform Texts

0.20. No one can adequately keep up with Hittite textual evidence without a catalogue of text compositions. This is particularly so, because one not only has to identify and locate all the known compositions but must also reconstruct texts from myriads of joins and duplicates. In the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s the leading authority in this field was the French Hittitologist Emmanuel Laroche, whose *magnum opus* was his catalogue of Hittite texts, published originally in installments in the journal *Revue hittite et asianique* and subsequently produced in a revised and enlarged second edition as *Catalogue des textes hittites* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1971; abbr. CTH). Laroche later supplemented this ("Catalogue des textes hittites, premier supplément" *Revue hittite et asianique* 30 [1972]: 94–133). But more than thirty years have passed since the last update of this work, and Laroche's death precluded any further revision by him. Currently it is necessary to supplement CTH with the online additions at the web site maintained by Billie Collins ("Hittite Home Page," currently at Emory University) and the online version of S. Košak's *Konkordanz der hethitischen Texte* (currently at Universität Würzburg; hereafter abbreviated Konk.).

Toponyms

0.21. The first significant collection of toponyms in Hittite texts was published by Hayri Ertem (1973). The great Tübingen Atlas of ancient Western Asia has produced a series of valuable volumes cataloguing toponyms from the major text corpora and time periods. The volume covering the Hittite empire is by Giuseppe del Monte and Tischler (1978), with a supplement (1992). It contains not only the text references but translations of the immediate context of the more significant toponyms and a relatively complete bibliography of studies in which a location for the toponym in question has been proposed.

Personal Names

0.22. The first comprehensive collection and study of the personal names of the Hittite texts was by Laroche (1951b, 1955). A revised and much augmented second edition appeared in 1966. Additions to this second edition were published by Gary Beckman (1983a). The Hethitologie Portal Mainz web site now contains a *Répertoire onomastique* prepared by Marie-Claude Trémouille in 2002.

Divine Names

0.23. For many years, the only systematic and comprehensive collection of divine names was Laroche 1947. For some reason, although he published supplements and, eventually, revised editions of his collection of personal names, Laroche never attempted to revise his collection of divine names. The new comprehensive collection by Ben H. L. van Gessel (1998–2001) has the advantage of completeness and great detail. Every attested occurrence is listed, together with bibliography on each deity. But unlike Laroche's work, van Gessel's does not group the various deities according to their ethnic provenience, nor is there much discussion of the deities whose names are catalogued. For this one must consult the recent comprehensive volumes on Hittite religion by Volkert Haas (1994) and Maciej Popko (1995).

Chapter 1

ORTHOGRAPHY AND PHONOLOGY

The Cuneiform Writing System of the Hittites

1.1. The Hittite texts were written by professional scribes on clay tablets that were impressed with a stylus and dried in the sun and, to a lesser extent, on metal and on wax-covered wooden writing boards (referred to in the texts as *gulzattar* or, logographically, $^{GIŠ}LE\text{-}U_5$ [= Akk. *lē'u*]). Although it is unclear what script was used on the writing boards, none of which have survived, the script used on clay and metal tablets was cuneiform.[1] The cuneiform (from the Latin word for 'wedge-shaped') system derives ultimately from Southern Mesopotamia, present-day Iraq, where it was devised by the Sumerians for writing their own language and adapted centuries later for writing Akkadian, a Semitic language. In addition to cuneiform writing on clay tablets, the Hittites occasionally utilized a hieroglyphic script.[2] During the earliest phase of their kingdom's history, the Old Hittite period, officials used this hieroglyphic script to inscribe stamp and cylinder seals. Much later, during the so-called New Hittite (or Empire) period, kings began to use this system for carving royal inscriptions on rock faces or stelae. These royal inscriptions were composed in Luwian (Hittite *luwili*; for this designation see §19.15, p. 292), a language closely related to Hittite.[3]

1.2. Before the advent of the Old Assyrian merchant colonies at the beginning of the second millennium B.C., there was no writing in Anatolia (Kammenhuber 1969b: 161–62). Once the Old Assyrian writing system arrived, it was employed not only by the Assyrian merchants but also on occasions by the local Anatolian rulers (Balkan 1957; Kammenhuber 1969b: 162).

1.3. The exact time and the precise source from which the Hittites obtained the cuneiform writing system and applied it to the recording of their own IE language is unknown.[4] Since Assyrian trading colonies existed in central Asia Minor (Cappadocia)

---

1. For a surviving metal tablet see Neve 1987: 405–8 and Otten 1988, with English translations by Beckman 1999: 114–24 and Hoffner 2000. A silver tablet sent from Hatti to Egypt, containing the text of a treaty between the two countries, is described in the Egyptian translation of that tablet, which appears both on the walls of the temple of the god Amon at Karnak and in the Ramesseum; see the English translation by John A. Wilson (ANET 201).

2. On the origins of this script in Anatolia see Mora 1991 and Hawkins 2003.

3. On the Luwians and their language see now Melchert 2003d.

4. A good summary of the present state of our knowledge on this subject can be found in HZL 15–16.

as early as ca. 1950 B.C. and left behind written documents composed in cuneiform, one might have expected that the Hittites obtained knowledge of the cuneiform writing system from them. But even a cursory comparison of Old Assyrian and Old Hittite cuneiform writing reveals that (1) the shapes of the signs (palaeography), (2) the selection of logograms (Sumerograms), and (3) the choice of signs for the expression of a given syllable (orthography) are all quite different. For example, Old Assyrian uses the ḪI sign for the syllable *ti*, while Hittite scribes used the TI or DI signs. It is therefore generally assumed that Ḫattušili I (ca. 1650–1600),[5] during his military campaigns in North Syria, captured scribes who were using a form of the late Old Babylonian syllabary, and these captives formed the nucleus of the first scribal academy at Ḫattuša.[6]

Orthography

Writing Conventions

1.4. Because we have no living speaker of the Hittite language, acoustic recording, or transcription of Hittite words in an ancient contemporary alphabetic script, we have no way of knowing the precise sounds of the language. We gain access to Hittite phonology and morphology only through the filter of the conventions the ancient scribes employed when they wrote on clay using the cuneiform syllabary.[7]

1.5. The cuneiform syllabary from its earliest stages in Mesopotamia consisted of configurations of one or more wedges comprising what are called "signs." Signs on Hittite tablets are written left to right, with spaces between words. Signs are functionally distinguished as *phonetic* (or perhaps better *syllabic*) and *logographic*.[8] Logograms are signs or combinations of signs that designate a particular word in the target language (e.g., the noun 'king', the adjective 'large', or the verb 'to sit down'). Logograms in Hittite texts consist of words from the Sumerian and Akkadian languages; the former are called *Sumerograms*, the latter *Akkadograms*. Sumerograms in Hittite texts (apart from the information given by occasional Hittite phonetic complements; see §1.37, p. 22) usually fail to indicate the grammatical case of the noun or adjective[9] and the voice, tense,

5. Establishing an absolute chronology for the Hittite kings, and even for broad periods of their kingdom, has proven both difficult and controversial. Since this is not a history textbook, we will use only approximate dates when it becomes necessary to identify a period of Hittite history.

6. But Hecker (1992 and 1996) argues that the Hittites borrowed an atypical form of cuneiform known in the Old Assyrian milieu. Klinger (1998) also discusses the question of who taught the Hittites to write. For the latest discussion of the problem see Rubio 2006.

7. For general treatments of the subject of writing systems in the ancient Near East see Hawkins 1979, 1986; Morpurgo Davies 1986.

8. Logograms can serve either to represent spoken words or as "determinatives" to classify semantically an immediately following (much less commonly, a preceding) word; see §§1.39–1.44 (pp. 23–24).

9. Sumerian case markers (Thomsen 1984: 88–109) were not employed by Hittite scribes. For example, the Sumerogram LUGAL 'king' (without added Hittite ending) can stand for subject, agent, direct or indirect object, or possessor, as can the adjective GAL 'great'. When a Sumerogram stands in a case other

or person of the verb,[10] whereas Akkadograms usually indicate all of these.[11] Akkadograms consist of one or more signs read with the normal phonetic values (*UL* 'not', *A-BU* 'father', *A-WA-TUM* 'word'). Sumerograms often consist of a single sign and not infrequently are read with a value different from the sign's syllabic value in Akkadian or Hittite; for example, the sign , read *KA* in Akkadian and *ka* in Hittite is read INIM in both Babylonian and Hittite texts, when it is the Sumerogram meaning 'word'. But Sumerograms also can consist of two or more signs (DUMU.MUNUS 'daughter, girl').

1.6. Each cuneiform sign has a syllabic value. The repertoire of phonetic signs consists only of signs of the following structural types. Hittite scribes (unlike later Babylonian and Assyrian scribes) never used a single sign to represent CVCV other than in logograms.

Vowel	V	e.g., a, e, i, u
Consonant + Vowel	CV	e.g., ba, da, pé, ti, lu
Vowel + Consonant	VC	e.g., ab, eš, il, ut
Consonant + Vowel + Consonant	CVC	e.g., bar, kap, kán, kir, ḫar/ḫur

1.7. When we *transliterate*, we write the most appropriate values of the individual signs, connecting those belonging to a single word with hyphens (e.g., *a-ša-an-zi* 'they are'). Most Hittite words in this grammar are not transliterated but presented in *broad transcription*. When we use broad transcription, the hyphens are removed and adjacent repetitions of identical vowels are simplified (e.g., *a-ša-an-zi* > *ašanzi, na-at* > *nat*, but *ši-uš* > *šiuš*). Adjacent identical consonants are not simplified but remain geminate (*ap-pa-an-zi* > *appanzi*). Stop-final VC signs with voiced-voiceless possibilities (AD/AT, AB/AP, AG/AK, etc.) conform to the voice character of the following CV. For example, AD-*ta-aš* > *attaš* 'father', not **adtaš*. If the VC sign in question is word final, it is written voiceless (*e-ša*-AD > *ešat* 'he sat down'). Neither transliteration nor broad transcription pretend to reflect the precise pronunciation of Hittite words, only an approximation.

1.8. What is called *plene writing* (see also §1.46, p. 25) occurs when a vowel already represented in a CV or VC sign is redundantly expressed by an adjacent V sign, e.g.,

---

than subject or direct object, it is usually marked with an Akkadian preposition (see §31.37, p. 441) (e.g., *ŠA* LUGAL 'of the king', *ANA* LUGAL 'to/for the king', *IŠTU* ^{GIŠ}BANŠUR 'from the table'). An exception is the use of the sequence of noun plus its genitive complement KUR (*ŠA*) LUGAL 'land of the king', where the genitive marker *ŠA* is not obligatory.

10. For example, only the presence of a Hittite verbal ending attached as a phonetic complement to the end of the Sumerogram DIB 'seize' can indicate whether the subject is 'I', 'you', 'he', 'she', or 'they'.

11. Thus *A-BU* 'father' is normally subject, *A-BA* is direct object, *A-BI* is indirect object or possessor. Similarly with 'hand': *QA-TUM* subject, *QA-TAM* direct object, *QA-TI* object of preposition (Akkadian genitive case); see §31.20 (p. 436). See chapter 31 (pp. 430ff.) for a brief survey of Akkadian grammar. We say "normally" because in Hittite contexts the Akkadian case forms are occasionally used erroneously. Furthermore, an Akkadogram occasionally lacks the case ending altogether, resembling the construct state of the Akkadian noun (on which see §31.23, p. 437).

word-initial as ***e-e**š-ta* = *ēšta* or ***u-u**p-zi* = *ūpzi*, word-final as *pa-r**a-a*** = *parā*, or word-internal as *m**a-a-a**n* = *mān* or *i-d**a-a**-lu-uš* = *idāluš*. Vowels written plene are indicated in broad transcription with macrons (*ā*, *ē*, *ī*, *ū*). Much less common is a *hyper-plene* writing, where a word begins with two *a*-signs: *a-a-an* 'warm', *a-a-bi* 'ritual pit'. There is one example of non-initial hyper-plene writing, *-u-ú-*, found in the sg. nom.-acc. neut. *šu-u-ú* and sg. acc. com. *šu-u-ú-un* of the adjective *šuu-* 'full, filled', alongside ordinary plene spellings *šu-u* and *šu-u-un* (see the paradigm in §4.57, p. 104). The hyper-plene spelling here probably points to a stem /suwu-/ with an unusual sequence /-uwu-/ (see Goetze 1954: 404 n. 13 and AHP 54–55 and 115). The /w/ fills a hiatus produced by loss of a PIE laryngeal (see Watkins 1975: 378 and Oettinger 1976a: 39 n. 72). That the hyper-plene spelling indicates a preserved hiatus /su_u-/, as per Watkins and Oettinger, cannot be entirely excluded (see §1.142, p. 48). A mere long vowel /su:-/ (Berman 1972b: 188–89) would not account for the hyper-plene spelling (see also the discussion of Weitenberg 1984: 136–40). There are no known Hittite words consisting solely of a hyper-plene vowel, only descriptions of sounds heard in nature, such as *i-i*, as a hunter's imitation of the repetitive cry of a bird or animal (§24.11, p. 320).

1.9. Hittite scribes normally spelled single (non-geminate) intervocalic consonants as (C)V-C̲V (*te-pu* 'few', *a-pí-ya* 'here').[12] Rare exceptions to this rule are significant in that they often mark a clitic boundary. For example GUD-*un-aš-ta* (not *GUD-*u-na-aš-ta*) and UDU-*un-aš-ta* (not *UDU-*u-na-aš-ta*) in KUB 30.10 obv. 15 signal a clitic boundary between the accusative singular noun (GUD-*un* 'ox', UDU-*un* 'sheep') and the following clitic local particle *-ašta.*

1.10. Scribes write double (geminate) consonants intervocalically as (C)V-VC̲-C̲V (*na-at-ta* 'not', *a-ap-pa* 'back, again') or CVC̲-C̲V (*kat-ta* 'down'). However, alongside regular spellings for geminate consonants we also find shorthand (or simplified) spellings. One type omits the VC sign: GIŠ*lu-ti-ya-az* for *lu-ut-ti-ya-az* 'window'.[13] For shorthand spellings of geminates omitting the CV sign see §1.12.

1.11. Since Hittite (as well as Mesopotamian) cuneiform has no sign for a consonant without a vowel, it is impossible to write initial or final sequences of two or more consonants or internal sequences of three or more consonants without using at least one "empty" (i.e., unpronounced) vowel. As an example of an initial sequence, /smen-/ 'to forfeit' must be spelled *š**a-**me-en-* or *š**e-**me-en-*, and /spikusta-/ 'pin' must be spelled

12. The consonants in question are those underlined in this and the following paragraph.

13. Other examples of nongeminate writing of geminates are: *nu-kán* passim (see AHP 14); *ar-mi-zi-iš* KBo 13.86 rev. 2; *a-ša-nu-wa-an-za* KBo 4.6 obv. 14; *a-ša-u-i-it* KBo 11.1 rev. 18; *a-šu-u* KBo 8.47 obv. 6; *a-da-na* KUB 30.63 v 20; *ḫa-za-aš-ta* KUB 12.62 rev. 2 (second example); *ḫa-a-šu-uš* KUB 15.34 iii 40; *ḫa-ti-li* KUB 7.3:16′; ^{m}*Ḫa-tu-ši*-DINGIR-*LIM* KUB 26.68 i 5; [*ḫ*]*a-zi-wi*$_5$*-aš* KBo 41.152:12′; *ki-še-ra-aš-ša-an* KBo 3.27 obv. 3; *ki-ša-an* KUB 39.71 iv 16; *pa-ḫur* KBo 13.58 iii 17; *ša-ra-a-zi-ya-aḫ-ta* KUB 19.67 i 15; *ši-wa-ti* KBo 39.76 + KBo 41.64 ii 13; *tu-zi-uš* KBo 6.34 i 25, 27; *tu-zi-ya-aš* KUB 2.1 ii 23; *wa-ši-ya-at* KUB 44.4 + KBo 13.241 rev. 2. On the nongeminate writings of postvocalic pres. sg. 3 verbal ending *-zi* see Yoshida 1998.

še-pí-ik-ku-uš-ta, ši-pí-ik-ku-uš-ta- or *ša-pí-ik-ku-uš-ta-*. Kuryłowicz (1958), followed by many others, cites *ma-li-id-du-* and *mi-li-id-du-* as evidence for an initial sequence /ml-/. Examples of a final sequence are: *kar-aš* 'cut!' for /kars/, *wa-ar-aš* 'reap!' for /wars/, *wa-al-aḫ* 'hit!' for /walh/, *ša-an-aḫ* or *ša-an-ḫa* 'seek!' for /sanh/, and *ki-iš-šar-ta* 'by the hand' for /kissard/.[14] As an example of a medial triconsonantal sequence, /harspawants/ must be spelled *ḫar-aš-pa-wa-an-za*. As shown by the above examples, Hittite regularly uses final C*a* signs to spell word-final consonantal sequences. There are two attested exceptions, where final /-ants/ is spelled *-an-zi* instead of the usual *-an-za*: *namma=war=aš ḫanti tuḫšanzi* 'And furthermore, it (i.e., the bee) is *ḫanti tuḫšanza*' (KUB 17.10 i 39; OH/MS), and *mān ḫa-me-eš-kán-zi* (for *ḫa-me-eš-kán-za*, itself a late form of *ḫa-me-eš-ḫa-an-za*, see §1.138, p. 48) DÙ-[*ri*] 'When it becom[es] spring' (KUB 38.26 rev. 19; cult inv., NH). For more on empty vowels in Hittite writing see §1.137 (p. 47), §6.4 with n. 10 (p. 138), and AHP 29. Internal sequences of three consonants, the first of which is /n/, sometimes left the /n/ graphically unexpressed (so Kimball 1999: 315–16): *li-ik-zi* (/linktsi/) 'he swears' and *li-ik-ta* 'he swore'.

1.12. The normal rules of cuneiform writing require that a VC sign either occur word-final or be followed by a CV(C) sign. But examples exist of writings of the type VC-VC (see also above, §1.9). In one type, represented by the example *wa-al-aḫ-ta/-zi,* it is assumed that the written vowel in *aḫ* is not to be pronounced and represents a way around the limitation of cuneiform in writing sequences of three consonants (/walhta/ or /walhtsi/) (see §1.11). The same principle usually applies to spellings CVC-VC: e.g., *pár-aḫ-ta* represents /parhta/. In some cases, however, evidence shows that a CVC-VC spelling is merely shorthand for CV-CV-VC: LÚ*ḫi-ip-pár-aš* or *ḫu*(*-u*)*-up-pár-aš* alongside *ḫu-up-pa-ra-aš*. A second type consists of cases where it appears that the scribe has simplified a VC-CV sequence (with identical C) by omitting the CV sign. These cases are not examples of scribal errors, but a system of scribal shorthand used mostly[15] in post-OH. A scribe could write *šuppiš*, *šuppin*, *šuppaš*, or *šuppiyaḫ* (for example) as *šu-up-iš*, *šu-up-in*, or *šu-up-ya-aḫ*, as well as *šu-pí-iš* (VS 28.15 ii 15), UZU*šu-pa* (KUB 25.32 iii 29, 30), **šu-pí-in*, or **šu-pí-ya-aḫ.* Both types would be abbreviated writings. But while the latter forms give no hint that they are abbreviated, the former would be marked as such by a special orthographic pattern and would be understood to be equivalent to the writings *šu-up-pí-iš*, *šu-up-pí-in*, and *šu-up-pí-ya-aḫ.* This rule would account for the examples: *kiš-an* 'thus', *ma-a-aḫ-an* 'as', *ši-iš-at-ti*, *šu-up-iš*, *šu-up-ya-aḫ*, m*Pí-ip-pa-ap-aš*, *ḫa-at-an-na-aš* (HFAC 12 4), *ḫa-aš-uš* 'ashes' (< *ḫašš-*) (KUB 39.14 i 13), *nepiši kat-an* (KUB 24.5 + KUB 9.13 obv. 31), d*Ki-pí-ik-aš-du* (KUB 51.87 + KUB 20.19 iv 17), *na-ak-uš-ši-uš* (KUB 32.76:8′), d*Ya-ar-iš, tar-kum-ya-an*[-. . .],NA4*ku-un-ku-nu-uz-in*, *ša-ra-az-iš*, *i-ya-an-er* (KUB 33.115 iii 14). When the geminate consonant written in shorthand was a *z*, an additional rule applied: one should also read the shorthand in these cases as including an *i*-vowel following the geminate *z:* EGIR-*az-*

14. Also written *ki-iš-šar-at*; §4.82 (p. 115).

15. *me-e-ek-e-eš* is OH.

ya-za (abl.), *ša-ra-az-ya-az*, *ḫa-az-i-ú*, *ke*(*-e*)*-ez-ya* (for *kezzi=ya*), *iš-pa-an-tu-uz-aš-šar* (KBo 22.198 i 1′) (for *išpantuzziaššar*); thus also the interesting pres. sg. 3 forms of *mi*-verbs: *ú-e-mi-ya-az-ya-kán* (KBo 10.37 ii 26) (for *wemiyazzi=ya=kan*), [*t*]*i-i-e-ez* (KBo 34.90:8) (for *tiyēzzi* in dupl. KUB 15.34 i 43), *ḫu-u-it-ti-ya-az* (KBo 13.194:7) (for *ḫūittiyazzi*), *kap-pu-u-e-ez* (KUB 58.105 ii 12′) (for *kappuezzi*). Cases of this type occur too frequently to be scribal omissions and too irregularly to be cases of syncope (on syncope see §§1.76–1.78, pp. 32–33; §1.83, p. 35).

Transcriptional Conventions

1.13. Syllabically written Hittite, Luwian, and Hurrian words are always written in lowercase italic letters (Hittite *e-eš-zi* 'he is', Luwian *zi-la-ti-ya* 'in the future', Hurrian *al-la-ni* 'the Lady'), Akkadograms in upper case italic letters (*A-WA-TUM* 'word'), and Sumerograms in upper case non-italic letters (LUGAL 'king'). Signs forming a part of a Hittite, Luwian, Hurrian, or Akkadian word are connected to each other and to an adjacent Sumerogram with hyphens (*at-ta-aš* 'father', *A-BU-YA* 'my father', DINGIR-*LIM* 'god', LUGAL-*uš* 'king', ^{m}*Tup-pí-*^{d}IŠKUR 'Tuppi-Teššup').

1.14. Signs forming a single Sumerian word (KÙ.BABBAR 'silver') are usually connected by a period. But there is no uniform system among Hittitologists regarding the use of the period to connect component signs of Sumerian nouns or expressions. In some cases one finds two-word transcriptions such as EN SISKUR 'offerer' (lit., 'lord of the offering', Akk. *bēl niqê*), yet in other cases one-word transcriptions such as DUMU.LUGAL 'prince' (lit., 'son of the king', Akk. *mār šarri*) are used. The scribes themselves do not seem to have left what is called "word space" between the component signs in either case. An argument could therefore be made that, following the example of the scribes, we should write EN.SISKUR and DUMU.LUGAL—that is, always as a single compound rather than two words. But this creates an awkward situation for the plurals of several of these common compounds, where the plural marker occurs between the first and second components, creating ugly forms such as DUMU.MEŠ.LUGAL. In order to avoid this, we shall transcribe DUMU.LUGAL in the singular but DUMU.MEŠ LUGAL in the plural. Although strictly speaking this is inconsistent, it is a reasonable accommodation and allows us to continue with the standard transcription for Sumerograms found in most of the existing tools in the field of Hittitology (such as the HZL). There are also different approaches for transcribing the word 'enemy' (adjective and noun). Most treat the LÚ element as a determinative and transcribe ^{LÚ}KÚR, while the CHD transcribes it as a compound LÚ.KÚR. In this grammar we transcribe LÚ.KÚR in the singular but LÚ.MEŠ KÚR in the plural. In only a few cases a Sumerogram consisting of two or more signs has a reading which is not the sum of the readings of its components: KI.UD is to be read KISLAḪ 'threshing floor', QA.ŠU.DU$_8$ is to be read SAGI 'cupbearer', ^{MUNUS}EN.ME.LI as ^{MUNUS}ÉNSI. We also follow the CHD in writing KÙ.GI 'gold' (without prejudice as to its probable Sumerian pronunciation) instead of GUŠKIN. Sumerian scribes created sign complexes in which one sign was inscribed inside another. The reasons for this pro-

cedure need not concern us here, but the Sumerian pronunciation of such groups was usually not a sum of the components: KA ('mouth') with inscribed A ('water') was read as the verb NAGA 'to drink'. Whenever the Sumerian pronunciation for a sign-complex of this sort is known, the sign-complex is transcribed with that value (e.g., NAGA). If there is uncertainty about the pronunciation, the complex is written as KA×A, with the framing/container sign first, followed by the inscribed/contained sign second, the latter preceded by a multiplication sign. Most such complexes occurring in Hittite texts have known pronunciations: KA×A = NAG or NAGA 'to drink', KA×NINDA = KÚ 'to eat', KA×IM = BÚN 'thunder', KA×UD = ZU_9 'tooth', KA×ME = EME 'tongue'. Only a few complexes of this kind used in Hittite do not have known pronunciations, but at least one occurs rather commonly: KA×U 'mouth'. In the earliest period of Sumerian writing, the component signs in words did not always have to be in order. By the time of the Hittite scribes, this was no longer the case, but a few relics remained from the early period of writing in Mesoopotamia. Thus, the Sumerogram for 'poor man', ^{LÚ}MAŠ.EN.KAK, represents the old Sumerian writing of an early loan from Akkadian, **maška'en* (later Akk. *muškênu*). Sumerian scribes sometimes indicated plurality by simply repeating the sign of the pluralized item: thus, KUR 'land', but KUR.KUR 'lands'. Examples of this writing convention are still found in Hittite texts, but since the Hittite scribes had lost the rationale for this convention, they redundantly added a plural suffix as well (e.g., KUR.KUR.MEŠ). In some cases, instead of transcribing the sign twice, scholars transcribe the pair with the same roman letters but with a different identification number: SISKUR (representing a single sign), in contrast with SÍSKUR (representing SISKUR+SISKUR).

Homophony

1.15. The cuneiform syllabary contains many signs of identical phonetic value (e.g., there are several signs each for the syllables *a*, *i*, *e*, *u*, *ba*, *aš*, *šu*, *kan*, etc.). Signs with identical syllabic values are called *homophones*. In order to distinguish homophones in transliteration, Assyriologists and Hittitologists mark them with accents or subscript numbers. For example, unmarked *ba* in transliteration indicates the sign first established as having the /ba/ value, *bá* (with acute accent) denotes the second, *bà* (with grave accent) the third, ba_4 the fourth, and subsequent values are all indicated with subscript numbers. The accent mark always rests on the vowel or, in case the sign has two vowels, on the first (ÉRIN, ÉSAG, DÀRA, BÁḪAR).[16] In reading and writing Hittite in transliteration, it is very important to distinguish homophones. Some homophonous values of signs in the Mesopotamian forms of the syllabary are not used for writing Hittite. For example, the "number one" value of /pi/ is the sign GEŠTU (HZL #317), which in Hittite texts, when it is not a logogram, is always to be read *wa*. The sign most commonly

16. This practice was initiated in Hittitology by HZL (1989) and has become the new standard. The older practice, following an earlier Assyriological method, placed an acute accent on the second vowel (SILÁ) for the second value, a grave accent on second vowel (SILÀ) for the third, an acute accent on the first vowel (SÍLA) for the fourth, a grave accent on the first vowel (SÌLA) for the fifth.

used for the value /pi/ (or /bi/) is the sign transliterated *bi* or *pí*. Similarly, Hittite scribes preferred the "number two" signs for /kan/, /par/, /pat/ (also read /pit/), and /tuh/. But in most cases the signs used are the "number one" variants. Very few homophonous signs are used interchangeably in Hittite. In the case of the homophonous signs *šu* and *šú*, the latter is used almost exclusively in logograms (*-ŠÚ* 'his/her/its') or proper names (m*Kaš-šú-ú*). In the case of *ur* and *úr*, the former is much more common than the latter. In the following three pairs, the first sign can also have the *i*-containing value given in parentheses, while the second sign has only the *e*-containing value: *ḫe* (*ḫi*) and *ḫé*; *ze* (*zi*) and *zé*; *né* (*ni*) and *ne*. In very late texts the syllabic value /eš/, which normally is represented only by the sign EŠ, can also be expressed by the sign MEŠ (which then has the transcriptional value $eš_{15}$, for which see §1.35, p. 21).

Polyphony

1.16. Some cuneiform signs have more than one phonetic value, that is, they are *polyphonous*. Some CV type signs whose initial consonant is a stop can have either a voiced or voiceless[17] interpretation: BU can be *bu* or *pu*.[18] Signs of the types VC and CVC do not indicate whether the final stop is voiced or voiceless (b or p, d or t, g or k). For example, the sign AB can be read *ab* or *ap*, ID as *id* or *it*, UG as *ug* or *uk*. Moreover, when writing Hittite, the scribes do not even use contrastively those CV signs with initial stop that distinguish voicing in the Akkadian syllabary: *a-ta-an-zi* and *a-da-an-zi* 'they eat', *ta-ga-a-an* and *da-ga-a-an* 'on the ground', *ad-da-as* and *at-ta-aš* 'father' (§§1.84–1.86, pp. 35–36). Nevertheless, when transcribing syllabically-written Hittite words, Hittitologists normally transliterate the obstruent according to the value of the cuneiform sign most favored by the tradition of Hittitologists. Usually the favored transliteration is that which uses the number one value (*pa*, not *bá*; *du*, not *tù*; *ga*, not *kà*). Exceptions to this pattern are the preferred transliterations utilizing the voiceless stops such as *pí* or *pé* (instead of *bi*), *tén* (instead of *din* or *den*), *pár* (instead of *bar*), *pád/t* or *píd/t* (instead of *be*), *tág/k* (instead of *dag/k*). CV signs possessing a number-one value of both voiced and voiceless nature, e.g., BU = *bu* or *pu,* are normally rendered with the voiceless stop.[19] Hittitologists are divided as to how they transliterate signs in the Sumero-Akkadian syllabary intended to express the Akkadian emphatic velar *q* in combination with a vowel (primarily QA, since /qi/ and /qu/ were rendered in the

17. We use the terminology "voiced" and "voiceless" in this book, although we are aware that for Hittite other scholars prefer the terms "fortis" and "lenis" or "tense" and "lax." See AHP 13–21 and Luraghi 1997a: 3 with n. 1.

18. In Hittite, all CV signs in which the C is a stop (/b/, /p/, /d/, /t/, /g/, /k/) were probably pronounced voiceless at the beginning of words (§1.86, p. 36). In that sense we are not speaking of real polyphonic values in spellings such as *ga-an-ki* and *ka-an-ki* 'he hangs'. Nor in the interest of phonetic realization do we transliterate *ga-an-ki* as *kà-an-ki* (or *kà-an-*gi_5).

19. The above rules are ideals. Most scholars have their own personal preferences or habits in transcription. This is particularly notable in the case of proper names: some write d*Ku-mar-bi*, others d*Ku-mar-pí*; some d*Te-li-pí-nu*, others d*Te-li-bi-nu.*

contemporary Akkadian syllabary with the KI and KU signs). Because Hittite possessed no such consonant, many scholars prefer to *transliterate* QA as ka_4 and *transcribe*[20] it as *k* (e.g., HZL), while others (including the CHD) prefer to avoid the subscripted value and rely on users to know that *qa* in *transliterated* Hittite does not represent an emphatic velar. Because the signs Vg-gV, V-k-kV and Vq-qV all equally represent /VkV/ in Hittite, or something like this, and V-gV, V-kV and V-qV represent /VgV/, it is obvious that the function of a transliteration of Hittite is not to show precise pronunciation but to code the individual cuneiform signs in roman script, choosing where possible from common alternative values those which most nearly approximate what we think was the pronunciation. For this purpose, for example, it makes no difference whether one transliterates ^{NA_4}*za-ap-za*-QA-*ya* KUB 51.43 i 9 as ^{NA_4}*za-ap-za-qa-ya* or ^{NA_4}*za-ap-za-*ka_4*-ya,* because both according to the rules of Hittite spelling (see §§1.84–1.85, p. 35, and §1.7, p. 11) and from the writing of this word in alphabetic Ugaritic and Hebrew as *spsg* we can tell that the consonant in question was /g/. Instead of employing in this case the transcriptional value ga_5 for QA, which is attested in Akkadian and listed in HZL but rarely if ever used by Hittitologists, we would advocate the use of the 'unmarked' value *qa.* We have chosen to employ the CHD procedure in this grammar. Readers will see the letter *q* used both in transliteration and transcription of Hittite, Luwian, and Hurrian words, and should not assume that this indicates the existence of emphatic velar phonemes in those languages.

1.17. The stops which occur at the end of VC or CVC signs, when they occur word-final, are written as voiceless: *ḫu-u-da-ak* 'promptly', *e-ep* 'seize!', *e-et* 'eat!'

1.18. One sign in Hittite is used with both a CV value and a quite different CVC value: the RI sign is usually read *ri,* but in certain environments, especially in writing derived nouns in *-(a)t(t)alla-* (see §2.32, p. 57), it must be read *-tal-*: see *ú-na-at-tal-la-an-pát* 'the merchant himself' KBo 6.3 i 13 (OH/NS) with duplicate *ú-na-at-ta-al-la-an-pát* KBo 6.2 i 6 (OS). The value *tal* of the RI sign is also used word-initial in the verbs *talliya-* and *talḫāi-*.[21] A few signs with primary CV values in Hittite are used in either logograms or proper names with a differing CVC value: *pa* has the *ḪAT* value in the geographical names *ḪAT-TU-ŠA, ḪAT-TI*, etc.; *ši* has the value *LIM* in Akkadograms.

1.19. Signs of the type CVC can have more than one reading. Seven signs each have alternate CVC values that differ significantly: *pár* can be read as *maš*, *kal* can be read as *dan*, *kur* can be read as *mad/t*, *tar* can also be read as *ḫaš* in Hittite words and as *KUT* in Akkadograms such as *AS-KUT* 'I fell silent', *kir* can be read as *piš* or *paš*, *ḫar/ḫur* can be read as *mur* (although the *mur* value is largely restricted to the royal name Muršili and the geographical name Amurru), and the BAD (*pát*) sign can be read as *MIT* in the Akkadogram *MA-MIT* (Akk. *māmītu* 'curse').

20. On the distinction between transliteration and transcription see §1.7 (p. 11).

21. On the latter see Košak 1993 (reading *tal-ḫa-a-an-du*).

1.20. Sometimes, however, the consonants of a CVC sign are stable and the difference is only in the internal vowel. CiC signs routinely also have the value CeC (*pét*/*pít, šer*/*šir, ker*/*kir*). But other vowel differences also exist: *ḫar* and *ḫur* are the same sign, as are *pát* and *pé*/*ít*, *pár* and pir_x, and possibly *kat* and kit_9 and *kar* and kir_8.[22] In the 13th century the sign DIN ( ), usually read *tén*, acquired the value /tan/, which HZL (sign #330) represents without an assigned number as tan_x[23] (see §1.35, p. 21).

1.21. Rarely scribes would attempt to disambiguate a CVC sign's internal vowel by adding a CV sign of unambiguous vowel immediately preceding it or a VC one following it. In such cases we transliterate the sequence using a superscript as follows: *e-*^{še}*šer* (i.e., *ešer*) 'they were sitting'.[24]

1.22. In cases where the difference is also in the consonants, scribes used the same disambiguating methods, writing *pí-iš-*^{ke}*ker* 'they used to give' KUB 29.25:4 = Laws §119 copy aa (OS), where the superscripted *ki*/*e* sign guides the reader to select the *ker* value of the following sign in preference to its *piš* value,[25] *pár*^{ar}*-na* KUB 35.68:8′ and ^{m}*Máš*^{aš}*-ḫu-i-lu-wa(-an)* KUB 14.15 iv 37′, 38′ to distinguish *pár* and *maš*, and ^{m}*Mi-id-dan*^{an}*-na-mu-u-wa-aš* KBo 4.12 obv. 22 to distinguish *dan* from *kal*.[26]

1.23. But other examples of preposed CV or postposed VC signs seem to have no disambiguating value, because the adjacent CVC signs had only one known syllabic value in Hittite writing:[27] *kar-*^{di}*dim-mi-ya-az* 'anger' KUB 24.4 rev. 10, ^{NINDA}*pur*$^{u-ur}$*-pu-ru-uš* KUB 9.17. i 23, $^{MUNUS.MEŠ}$*kat*^{at}*-re-eš* 'female musicians' KBo 32.2 rev. 9′, KBo 42.85 i 3, *pé-ner*^{er} 'they drove' KBo 4.2 ii 20, *tuḫḫueššar túḫ*^{uḫ}*-ša* 'he uses *tuḫḫueššar*.' Because in most of the cited cases the practice seems unnecessary, one wonders why it was done. In cases where it occurs only once or twice, one could surmise scribal error.

---

22. For the proposal of kit_9 see Goetze 1927: 60 and Sturtevant and Hahn 1951: 13 n. 8. HZL #173 cautiously writes this value (as well as kir_8) within parentheses in view of Otten (1973: 23), who questioned the use of kit_9 (especially in OH) in view of the observation by von Soden and Röllig (1991: 13) that the value /kit/ for the GAD sign does not occur in Akkadian texts before the first millenniun. Otten agreed with the recommendation of Sommer and Falkenstein (1938: 69 n. 3) that the assured value /kat/ be used regularly in Hittite, and the a/i variations thereby occasioned be explained in other ways within Hittite. The verb *pí-iš-*KAR 'they used to give' KUB 38.3 i 17 (NH) might be read $pí\text{-}iš\text{-}ker_8$ to harmonize with the normal writings *pí-iš-ker* and *pí-iš-ke-er*, but doing so might mask a rare and important variant form. See Neu 1989a on the third-person plural preterite active ending *-ar*.

23. In transliteration a subscripted x (not the multiplication sign but the letter "x" representing the algebraic symbol for "unknown number") denotes a demonstrable phonetic value that has not yet received a standardized numerical value in HZL or the Akkadian syllabaries.

24. *nu araḫza kuēš e-*^{še}*šer* 'And those who were sitting outside (. . . came in the gate-building)' KUB 41.1 iv 9. The form was incorrectly explained as a late intransitive ('sitzen') to the causative verb *ašeš-*/*ešeš-* 'to seat' by Jakob-Rost (1972: 50–51, 74, followed by HED E/I 209 and HW^2 A 386b).

25. This example courtesy of T. van den Hout.

26. The last two examples courtesy of S. Košak.

27. The first three examples were called to our attention by N. Oettinger.

But in examples such as *tuḫḫueššar túḫ^{uḫ}-ša,* which occurs fairly often, scribal error is an improbable explanation.[28]

1.24. Word-final *-m* was lost in the case endings of Akkadian nouns and adjectives during the historical period of Hittite (see §31.20, p. 436). But words were sometimes still written conventionally with final -CV*m* signs (e.g., *-TUM, -TIM, -TAM, -LUM, -LIM, -LAM*, etc), and even -V*m* (e.g., ^{GIŠ}*KÀ-AN-NU-UM*), although the *-m* was no longer pronounced in concurrent Akkadian. Extrapolating from this practice, NH scribes felt free to use CV*m* signs for /CV/ in writing Hittite words, not only in word-final position (*e-eš-tum*, read *e-eš-tu*$_4$ for /e:stu/ 'let be'), but also in other cases (*iš-dam-ma-aš-mi* for /istamasmi/ 'I hear'). See also use of the KAM sign in *ar-kam-mi-* 'lyre' (and *ar-kam-mi-ya-ya-la-* 'lyre-player'), which alternates with (*a-*)*ar-ga-*(*a-*)*mi-* but never with **ar-ga-am-mi-*. Spellings -CV*m-m*V- in NS are thus not always reliable indicators of a genuine geminate /-mm-/. Even some -V*m-m*V- spellings in NS are suspect. Note NS *du-um-me-e-ni* and even *tum-um-me-*(*e-*)*ni* for consistent OS and MS *tu-me-e-ni* or *du-me-*(*e*)*-ni* 'we take'. It is very unlikely that the /-m-/ in words such as this became geminate from OH to NH. Such complications make it difficult to determine the reality of geminate /-mm-/ in a number of words.

1.25. Rarely one finds cases of a sign sequence CVC$_1$-C$_1$V (other than CV*m*) in which C$_1$ is not to be understood as geminate.[29] This is the case with the TÚL sign in *wa-aš-túl-la/i-*, alternating with *wa-aš-d/tu-la/i-*, but never **wa-aš-tu/du-ul-la/i* (see §4.66, p. 108). Other possible examples include *naḫšaratt-* 'fear' (written in sg. nom. as *na-aḫ-ša-ra-az*, *na-aḫ-šar-az*, and in a blended writing *na-aḫ-šar-ra-az*, but never written **na-aḫ-ša-ar-ra-az*).

1.26. The vowel of each CV-type sign is usually specific. But some CV signs whose vowel is *i* often have a second reading with *e*:

	BI	pí	pé
	GI	gi	ge
	ḪI	ḫi	ḫe
	KI	ki	ke
	LI	li	le
	NI	ni	né
	RI	ri	re

28. *túḫ-uḫ-ša* might have the same function as *wa-al-aḫ-ta* (/walhta/), to indicate /tuhhsa/.

29. Reading cuneiform signs of the type CVC as CV$_x$ recognizes a scribal convention that derives from the Sumerians, the inventors of cuneiform, where the final consonant of nouns written CVC (e.g., GUD 'ox') is repeated when followed by suffixes beginning with a vowel: GUD-da (read gu$_4$-da for /guda/) 'of the ox', although this is not to be understood as gemination.

1.27. For some of the above /Ce/ sequences, a second sign with value restricted to CONSONANT + *e* is equally or even more common: *ḫé* (ḪÉ) is more common than *ḫe* (ḪI/ḪE) for /he/; *ne* (NE) is more common than *né* (NI) for /ne/. On the other hand, *mi* and *me* are different signs, as are *ši* and *še*, and *ti* and *te.*

1.28. Almost all *i*-containing VC signs can also have an *e* value (see also §1.63, p. 29):

	IB	ib, ip	eb, ep
	ID	id, it	ed, et
	IG	ig, ik	eg, ek
	IM	im	em
	IR	ir	er
	IZ	iz	ez

1.29. Exceptions: *eš* and *iš* are different signs, as are *el* and *il*, *en* and *in*. One VC sign that can be read with any vowel is AḪ, read *aḫ*, *eḫ*, *iḫ*, or *uḫ*.

1.30. Aside from the AḪ sign (*aḫ*, *eḫ*, *iḫ*, or *uḫ*), no CV or VC type sign used in Hittite fails to distinguish between vowels other than *e* and *i.* The vowel categories *a* — *e*/*i* — *u* are always kept distinct in such signs. This is in contrast to contemporary Akkadian usage, where the PI sign (HZL #317), read syllabically only as *wa* in Hittite, has the possible readings *wa*, *we*, *wi*, and *wu.*

1.31. The signs *i* and *ú* (word-initial) and *i*, *u*, and *ú* (intervocalically), when followed by a vowel sign of a different quality, are often used to represent /y/ and /w/: OH *i-an-zi* /yantsi/ ‘they do/make’, *i-*(*e-*)*ez-zi* /ye:tsi/ ‘he does/makes’, *i-ú-ga-an* /yugan/ ‘yoke’, *ta-i-az-zi-la-an-ni* /tayatsilanni/ ‘in theft’, *šu-wa*(*-a*)*-i*(*-e*)*-ez-zi* /suwaye:tsi/ ‘he shall look’, *i-da-a-la-u-e-eš* /ida:lawe:s/ ‘evil (ones)’, *a-ra-a-u-aš* /ara:was/ ‘exempt’, *ú-ez-zi* /we:tsi/ ‘he comes’, *na-a-ú-i* /na:wi/ ‘not yet’, *ša-ú-i-ti-iš-za* /sawidists/ ‘weanling (animal)’, *ḫa-az-zi-ú-i* /hatsiwi/ ‘ceremony, ritual’.

1.32. Where there is doubt about the vocalic identity of a given ambiguous sign, the scribes often added clues. *pé* or *pí* followed immediately by *-e* is almost always to be interpreted as *pé-e*, only rarely as *pí-e*. /karpye:tsi/ could be spelled *kar-pí-ez-zi* but usually as *kar-pí-e-ez-zi* (with an extra *e*) to disambiguate the writing of the following *iz*/*ez* sign. Similarly, we find *pí-i-e-et-ta* ‘allotment.’ Even *šieššar* ‘beer’, which uses the unambiguous ŠI sign, is often further disambiguated by the writing *ši-i-e-eš-šar*, to prevent a mistaken reading **šeššar*. See the remarks on “plene writing” in §1.8 (p. 11), §1.46 (p. 25), and §4.19 (p. 87).

1.33. There appear to be a few instances of sequences spelled C*i-e* with an *unambiguous* C*i* sign that must nevertheless be read as /Ce:/—*mi-e-ni* KUB 29.9 i 11, 15

(sg. d.-l. of /me:na-/ 'face'), [*t*]*i-e-pu* KBo 25.23 rev. 7′ (sg. nom.-acc. neut. of /te:bu-/ 'little'). Nevertheless, we should be extremely cautious in appealing to this possibility in questionable cases. For example, *ti-i-et* in the duplicate KBo 3.36 obv. 24′ shows that *ti-e-et* in KBo 3.34 ii 19 (OH/NS) is a form of *tiye-* ('stepped [to Aškaliya, saying]'), not of *te-* ('said'). What used to be considered a pronominal stem *ši-*(*i*)*-e-* but now is correctly recognized as the number 'one' (see Goedegebuure 2006) should not be read as /se:-/ (see already Neu 1997: 147).

Multivalence

1.34. Many signs in the Hittite cuneiform syllabary are multivalent. That is, they have logographic as well as syllabic (or phonetic) values. Examples are:

Sign Name	Sumerographic value(s)	Akkadographic value	Hittitographic value
A	A 'water'	*A* in *A-NA* 'to'	*a* in *a-ri* 'he arrives'
AN	DINGIR 'god' or AN 'sky'	*AN* in ^{LÚ}*ḪA-ZA-AN-NU* 'city administrator'	*an* in *ma-a-an* 'when, if'
DI	DI 'judgment, legal case', SILIM 'well-being'	*DI* in *AR-DI* 'slave' and *DI-NI* 'judgment', TI_4 in *BE-EL-TI*$_4$ 'my lady'	*di, de* in *pé-di* 'in place', *e-de-ez* 'on that side'
EN	EN 'lord'	*EN* in *UŠ-KE-EN* 'he bowed'	*en* in *ku-en-zi* 'he kills'
GA	GA 'milk'	*MA-AD-GA-LA-TI* 'districts'	*ga* in *e-ga-aš* 'ice'
GÁN	GÁN 'field', IKU (unit of measure)	*GÁN*, *KÁN*	*gán, kán* in *ḫi-in-kán* 'plague'
KA	INIM 'word, matter'	*-KA* 'your (sg.)'	*ka* in *ka-a-aš* 'this'
MI	GE_6 'dark' or 'night'	*MI* in *MI-IM-MA* 'whatever'	*mi* in *mi-li-it* 'honey'
TAR	TAR, KUD 'to cut (off)'	*KUD*/*T* in *AS-KUT* 'I fell silent'	*tar* in *tar-aḫ-zi* 'he conquers'

New Values

1.35. In only a few cases the Hittite scribes appear to have introduced a new phonetic value to an existing cuneiform sign. Because their word for wine (Sumerian GEŠTIN) was *wiyanaš*, they gave to the GEŠTIN sign ( ) the value /wi/, which we transliterate as wi_5 (see HZL #131). In texts written in the 13th century, the MEŠ sign (or), which normally stands for the Sumerian plural marker must occasionally be read as phonetic $eš_{15}$ (see HZL #360A and §1.15, p. 16 here), and the sign DIN ( ), usually read *tén*, acquired the value /tan/, represented without an assigned number as tan_x (see §1.20, p. 18). The sign that has the logographic value zíz 'wheat' ( ) and in most other contemporary cuneiform systems the syllabic value *áš* has the syllabic value *tàš*

in Hittite (see HZL #241), as well as occasionally in Akkadian texts from El Amarna and Ugarit (see Labat 1988: 155, sign #339). It was not therefore a Hittite innovation, unless it spread from Ḫattuša to Syria and Egypt.

1.36. Hittite scribes utilized ligatures of the PI (*wa*, *we*, *wi*, *wu*) sign with the vowel signs *a*, *e*, *i*, and *u* subscripted to render sounds in the Hurrian and Hattic languages that were nonexistent in their own language (probably labial fricatives such as [f] or [v]). These graphic innovations are conventionally transcribed with subscripted vowels thus: = wa_a, we_e, wi_i, wu_u, or $wu_{ú}$ (see HZL ##318–26). This contrasts with the customary writing of initial /we/ and /wi/ as *ú-e-* and *ú-i-* (rarely *u-i-*) and post-initial /we/ as *-u-e* or *-ú-e-* and /wi/ as *-u-i* or *-ú-i* in native Hittite words. The scribes also used spellings in which *pV* (or *bV*) alternated with *wV* to indicate the fricative sounds in Hattic and Hurrian words.

Logogram Pronunciation

1.37. We assume that logograms in Hittite contexts were normally pronounced by Hittite scribes with their Hittite equivalents, both when reading a tablet aloud and when dictating. The Sumerogram LUGAL ('king') was pronounced with the Hittite word for 'king' *ḫaššuš*, MUNUS.LUGAL-*aš* 'queen' as *ḫaššuššaraš,* ^{d}UTU-*uš* 'sun(god)' as ^{d}*Ištanuš*, and GAL 'large, great' as *šalliš*.[30] Words could be written with Sumerograms to which the final syllable (often containing the all-important inflectional ending) was indicated as a phonetic complement: LUGAL-*uš* 'king' (subject case [nominative], singular), LUGAL-*un* (direct object case [accusative], singular), GAL-*iš* 'great' (subject case [nominative], singular), DÙ-*zi* (= Hitt. *iyazi*) 'he does' (present tense third person singular), etc. Not to be read in Hittite are apparent logograms in a few proper names, which are rebus writings, such as: $^{m.GIŠ}$GIDRU-*ši*-DINGIR-*LIM*, to be read using Akkadian values as ^{m}Ḫattušili.[31] Some personal names of Hittite officials are Akkadian in origin, such as ^{m}DUMU.UD.20.KAM HKM 22:9, to be read with Akkadian values as ^{m}*Mār-ešrē* HKM 31:20 'son of day twenty' (i.e., boy born on the 20th day of a festival; see Alp 1991a: 78–79).

1.38. When a single word or phrase contains Sumerograms, followed by both Akkadian and Hittite phonetic complements, the resulting form can be bewildering: DINGIR-

30. There are a very few cases where the spelling may suggest otherwise. For instance, *A-BU-YA-an-na-aš-za* for *attaš=miš=naš=za* Ḫatt. i 9, and possibly also *BE-LU-uš-ša-an* HKM 52:25; 80 obv. 5, if this really stands for *išḫāš=šan*. That Hittite scribes sometimes used the logogram's own pronunciation in dictating texts to copyists is clear from errors in hearing such as BA.UŠ for proper BA.ÚŠ 'he died', ^{GIŠ}GÚ.ZA for correct ^{GIŠ}GU.ZA 'throne', etc. For discussion of the broader subject of "Fehlertypologie" with examples see Rüster 1988. The auditory error ("Hörfehler") is not mentioned in her article. It would be a subcategory of her section 2 ("Zeichenvertauschung"), which however she describes only as "eine Verwechslung ähnlich *aussehender* Keilschriftzeichen" (p. 295, italics ours), although in her list of examples (pp. 299–303) there are cases clearly due to auditory (not visual) similarity: DÙ for DU, DÙ for DU_8, GIŠ for KIŠ, ZU for ZÚ.

31. ^{GIŠ}GIDRU = Akkadian *ḫaṭṭu* 'staff, stick'. DINGIR-*LIM* = Akkadian *ili* 'of a god'. *Ḫattu* + *ši* + *ili* = the royal name *Ḫattušili*! A parade example of a rebus writing (see HE §8c "spielerische Schreibungen").

LIM-iš ‘god’ uses Sumerian DINGIR ‘god’ followed by the end of the Akkadian equivalent noun *ilum* ‘god’ (albeit in the genitive case, *ilim*), followed by the last syllable of the Hittite noun *šiuniš* ‘god’ (§4.50, p. 100). Such hybrid writings are few in number, even if those few words occur frequently.

1.39. Some Sumerograms prefixed (much less commonly suffixed) to nouns are *determinatives*. They are class markers, identifying the noun in question (whether that noun is written in Hittite, Sumerian, or Akkadian) as belonging to a particular semantic class:[32]

DUG	ceramic or stone containers
GIŠ	trees or objects entirely or partially made of wood
ḪUR.SAG	mountain names
ÍD	river names
KI	appended to place names, but also to the logogram URU ‘city’ in URU.KI, see §9.51 (p. 167)
KUR	country names
LÚ	designations of male persons, excluding personal names
MUŠ	reptiles
MUNUS	designations of female persons, including personal names
MUŠEN	bird names; generally not prefixed, but appended to the word it modifies
NA_4	minerals or objects of stone
SAR	green plants; always appended
TÚG	textiles or garments
URU	city names
URUDU	objects entirely or partially made of copper
(Single vertical wedge)	personal name of a male individual

1.40. In transliteration (but not in the cuneiform writing itself) these determinatives are superscripted (e.g., $^{\text{URU}}$*Nerik* ‘the city Nerik’, *ḫaraš*$^{\text{MUŠEN}}$ ‘eagle’). Sometimes what appears at first to be a determinative is rather a logogram: KUR $^{\text{URU}}$*Ḫalpa* ‘land of (city) Aleppo’ (not $^{\text{KUR.URU}}$*Ḫalpa*), LÚ *ṬĒMI* ‘messenger’ (literally ‘man of the message’) (not $^{\text{LÚ}}$*ṬĒMI* ‘message belonging to the male class’), LÚ *MEŠEDI* ‘guard’ (lit., ‘man of the spear’) (not $^{\text{LÚ}}$*MEŠEDI* ‘spear belonging to the male class’). In the last two cases the virtually consistent retention of the Akkadian genitive ending *-I* on the second noun betrays its function in Akkadian as a genitive.

1.41. Proper names regularly bear determinatives. Thus, mountain names (and names of mountain deities) have prefixed ḪUR.SAG, river names (and names of river deities) have prefixed ÍD, names of springs and spring deities have prefixed TÚL (or PÚ), city

32. A complete repertoire of these determinatives can be found in HZL.

names have prefixed URU. Names of deities other than mountain, river, or spring deities have a prefixed DINGIR ('god') sign, which, however, is rendered as a superscripted lowercase *d*: ^{d}*Teššub*.[33] Male and female personal names have prefixed signs that are rendered by superscripted *m* and *f*: (mnemonic for 'male/masculine' and 'female/feminine') ^{m}*Ḫattušiliš*, ^{f}*Puduḫepaš*. The ^{m} sign is a single vertical wedge usually representing the numeral 'one'. The ^{f} sign elsewhere represents the word MUNUS 'woman' or the syllabic value *šal*.[34]

1.42. A few determinatives are placed not in front of their nouns but after them: MUŠEN 'bird' in *ḫaraš*$^{\text{MUŠEN}}$ 'eagle',[35] KI 'place' in $^{\text{URU}}$*Ḫalpa*$^{\text{KI}}$ 'Aleppo', SAR appended to the names of herbs or vegetables (e.g., *ḫaḫḫašittin*$^{\text{SAR}}$). See §31.10 (p. 432).

1.43. We follow the CHD system, where the Sumerian plural suffixes MEŠ, Ḫ.A, and DIDLI are superscripted as determinatives only when the noun that precedes them is Hittite, Luwian, Hurrian, or Akkadian, but not when it is Sumerian, since then the Sumerian plural marker is to be read as part of the Sumerogram. If we do not write a Boğazköy Akkadogram *MA-AD-GA-LA-TI* 'watchposts' (the plural of *MADGALTU*) as *MA-AD-GA-L*$^{A\text{-}TI}$ or the plural of English 'land' as 'land^{S}', then neither should we write a Sumerogram KUR.KUR.Ḫ.A as KUR.KUR$^{\text{Ḫ.A}}$ (contra HE §6d). Sometimes the plural marker interrupts a syllabic writing, such as *ḫal-ki*$^{\text{Ḫ.A}}$*-uš* 'crops'. For the unusual placement of determinatives on compound nouns see §2.60 (p. 63).

1.44. While the suffixed plural markers (MEŠ and Ḫ.A) are equally common in all periods, the suffixed plural marker DIDLI is rare after Old Hittite, and when it does occur, it is redundantly combined with another plural marker (DIDLI.Ḫ.A).[36] While no regular rule for the selection of one of these three Sumerian plural markers has been discovered, there is a marked tendency to use MEŠ with nouns denoting persons and Ḫ.A with other objects. Prefixed determinatives (as class markers) are less frequently used in OH than in MH and NH.

Phonology

Individual Phonemes (Vowels and Consonants)

1.45. It is important to distinguish between the supposed ancient pronunciation (to the extent that we can reconstruct it) and the conventional pronunciation employed by

33. So in the CHD. Many Hittitologists prefer an upper case D: ^{D}*Teššub*. Occasionally, a noun denoting an object, when it is to be thought of as deified, will also bear the DINGIR determinative: e.g., ^{d}*ḫašša-* '(deified) hearth'.

34. For this reason many other Hittitologists prefer the superscripted roman numeral "one" for the first ($^{\text{I}}$*Ḫattušiliš*) and upper case SAL or MUNUS for the second ($^{\text{MUNUS}}$*Puduḫepaš*).

35. But also prefixed: $^{\text{MUŠEN}}$*ḫara*(*n*)-, especially in OS texts; see Neu 1983: 53 for examples.

36. This suggests that, early on, the meaning of DIDLI was lost to Hittite scribes, as was the KAM in UD.(numeral).KAM (§9.51, p. 167).

modern scholars. The following description applies to the ancient pronunciation unless explicitly stated otherwise. The cuneiform writing system has a limited ability to express the phonemes of the Hittite language.

Vowels

Plene Writing and Vowel Length

1.46. The so-called plene writing (e.g., *pa-a-*, *ti-i-*, *šu-u-*, *te-e-*, etc.; see §1.8, p. 11) offered a means of expressing *vowel length*, but we cannot be certain that plene writing always indicates length (as opposed to *stress*) or that non-plene writing always denotes short vowels. Many scholars assume the existence of both short and long vowels in Hittite, but there is no consensus on their distribution or on the phonemic status of long vowels (see Melchert 1992 and Kimball 1999, both with copious references to other views). Melchert (1984b: 162) adduces three additional reasons for plene writings: (1) to show *e*-coloring of the vowel with ambiguous C*e*/*i* and *e*/*i*C signs; (2) to mark the position of the accented syllable (e.g., sg. nom. *te-e-kán* vs. gen. *ták-na-a-aš* (§4.71, p. 110);[37] (3) in the case of all monosyllables except clause-initial conjunctions (*nu*, *ta*), to avoid writing a word with only one sign (*da-a* 'take!', *i-it* 'go!'). Other reasons may include: (4) rarely to indicate interrogative intonation (§27.2, p. 348); and (5) to distinguish real vowels from mere graphs, as in *pa-ra-a* (/pra/), where the first *a* is merely graphic, and ^{URU}*Da-la-a-wa* /Tlawa/ (in later Greek letters Τλῶς), and ^{URU}*Pa-la-a* /Pla/ (see Βλαηνή and Παφλαγωνία). Most of the Hittite words cited in this grammar are cited in "broad transcription," not in transliteration. In broad transcription, the plene writings cited above are indicated with macrons: *tēkan*, *taknāš*, *dā*, *īt*, *parā*, ^{URU}*Dalāwa*, ^{URU}*Palā*.

1.47. In the noun pairs *uttar* versus *uttār* and *ḫuidar* versus *ḫuidār*, the difference in vowel length marks a contrast between singular and plural (§3.20, p. 71). The single word *nu-u-wa* 'still, yet' is diffentiated from the combination of conjunction *nu* and clitic *-wa* (*nu-wa*) consistently by the plene writing of the former. But other examples of what appears to be the same word or form with longer and shorter spellings—for example, *še-er* and *še-e-er* 'above' and *pa-an-zi* and *pa-a-an-zi* 'they go'—are not different words but different spellings of the same word. Such variant spellings in the same document sometimes arose when a scribe who preferred the short writings copied a document whose scribe preferred the long ones. In some cases, there may be a diachronic dimension: *še-e-er* is the OS writing of what in later periods was written short *še-er* (§6.6, p. 140).

37. Although NI can be read either *ni* or *né*, ŠI is not read **še* in Hittite-language texts. Thus, while the *i* in OH dative-locative *ut-ni-i* vs. nominative-accusative *ut-ne-e* 'land' might be for disambiguating the vowel, there can be no such motivation for dative-locatives *iš-ši-i* 'mouth' and *ḫa-aš-ši-i* 'hearth'. Some sort of length or stress must be indicated in the latter cases.

Inventory of vowels

1.48. Hittite seems to have distinguished four vowels (*a*, *e*, *i*, *u*), each of which could be long or short. Despite the claim of Eichner (1980: 156) and Hart (1983: 124–30), there is no basis for assuming a Hittite vowel /o/, spelled with the sign *u* (reflecting prehistoric diphthong **Vu*), distinct from /u/, spelled with the sign *ú* (reflecting prehistoric **u*). Both *u* and *ú* are used to spell reflexes of **u* and **Vu*-diphthong (Melchert 1992: 186–87; Kimball 1999: 79–80).[38] See now Rieken 2005b for the possibility of a *secondary* split of pre-Hittite */u/ (from all sources) into phonetic [o] and [u], probably with marginal phonemicization of /o/.

Vowel Alternations

e and *i*

1.49. Despite the ambiguity of certain *e*- or *i*-containing cuneiform signs, the two vowels were certainly distinct phonemes in Hittite (Otten and Souček 1969: 56; Melchert 1984b; 1992).

1.50. Many words containing the vowels *e* or *i* show no fluctuation over time:

*Words with Stable **e***

1.51. Word-initial: *e-eš-zi* 'he is' (never **i-iš-zi*), *e-ep-zi* 'he seizes' (never **i-ip-zi*), *e-ed-mi* 'I eat', *e-ḫu* 'come!' (never **i-ḫu*), *e-ku-zi* 'he drinks' (never **i-ku-zi*), *e-eš(-ša)-ri* 'form, shape, image' (never **iš-ša-ri*), *ega-* 'ice' (never **i-ga-*), *enant-* 'tame (animal)', *ētri-* 'food'.

1.52. Word-internal: *še(-e)-er* 'above, over', *te-ez-zi* 'he speaks' and *te-et* 'he spoke', *ú-e-te-et* 'he built', *ku-(e-)en-zi* 'he kills' or *ku-(e-)en-ta* 'he killed' never alternate with forms in *i* (e.g., **ši-ir*, **ti-iz-zi*, **ú-i-te-et*, **ku-(i-)in-zi*, etc.).[39]

1.53. Word-final: *ku(-i)-e* 'which' (pl. neut.), *a-pé-e* 'those' (pl. neut.), *ut-ne-e* and *ut-né-e* 'land' (nom.-acc. neut.) — versus *ut-ni-i* (d.-l.) — *pé-e* in *pé-e ḫar(k)-* 'to present', and *le-e* 'let not'. The contrast of the plural *ke-e* 'these' with (neuter) singular *ki-i* 'this' is stable through OH, MH, and early NH, breaking down only in late NH.

38. While many words are spelled consistently with either *u* or *ú*, there are also many cases of alternate spellings, even in the same manuscript. Examples include: *ḫu-u/ú-ni-ik-zi* KBo 6.2 i 13 and 16 (OS), *iš-nu-u-ri* KBo 6.34 i 32 vs. *iš-nu-ú-ri* KUB 41.26 i 26, *lu-u-ri-iš* KUB 13.5 iii 5; vs. *lu-ú-ri-iš* KUB 13.18 iii 6, *mu-u-ga-an-zi* KBo 10.20 iii 43 vs. *mu-ú-ga-it* KBo 3.7 i 13, *pu-u-ul* KBo 3.7 iv 10 etc. vs. *pu-ú-ul* KBo 26.20 iii 24, *pu-u-nu-uš-ta* KUB 36.35 i 8 vs. *pu-ú-nu-uš-ša-an-zi* KBo 20.5 iii! 7, *pu-u/ú-ti-iš* KUB 32.123 ii 18 and 40, *tu-u-li-ya* KUB 6.46 iii 51 vs. *tu-ú-li-ya* KUB 21.1 iv 39, *u-re-e-na-an-da* KBo 11.10 iii 26 vs. *ú-re-e-na-an-ta* KBo 11.72 iii 13.

39. There are extremely rare mixed spellings such as *ku-i-en-zi*, *ú-i-e-eš* 'we' KUB 30.36 ii 8. On *ti-e-et* with dupl. *ti-i-et* (allegedly 'he said') see §1.33, p. 21. On *ku-i-en-zi* see Melchert 1984b: 78.

*Words with Stable **i***

1.54. Word-initial: *iyatar* ‘proliferation, fertility, abundance’ and its cognate forms, *ilan-* ‘step(?)’, *iš-ša-al-li* ‘spittle’, *i-iš-š°* (the oblique stem of *aiš* ‘mouth’), *išiyaḫḫ-* ‘to trace, track, spy out’, *išk*(*iya*)- ‘to anoint’, *iškiš* ‘back’, *išnura-* ‘kneading trough, dough-pan’, *i-it* ‘go!’ (in deliberate disambiguity from *e-et* ‘eat!’, §1.56), *i-da-*(*a-*)*lu* ‘evil’, *i-wa-ar* (postposition) ‘like, as’, *innarā* ‘independently’ (written *in-* not **en-*), ^{GIŠ}*in-ta-lu-uz-zi* ‘shovel(?)’. OH spellings *ya-an-zi* ‘they do/make’ and *ya-an-ni-iš* ‘they set out’ of what later is consistently written *i-ya-an-zi* and *i-ya-an-ni-iš* suggest that these words begin with *y*, not *i*. The consistent spellings *iš-tV-* and *iš-kV-* without alternate spellings **šV-tV-* or **šV-kV-*, for words with etymological initial sequences **st-* and **sk-* argues that these contain a real “prothetic” vowel, as in foreign words beginning with sequences loaned into Turkish *istasyon* ‘station’ (Oettinger 1979: 416–17 against AHP 31–33).[40] See further §1.137 (p. 47). The situation for **sp-* is complicated. It is likely that consistent *iš-pa-an-t°* ‘night’ also shows a real prothetic *i-*, while *ša*/*še*/*ši-pí-ik-ku-uš-ta-* ‘pin’ has preserved /sp-/ (see §1.11, p. 12). For the special case of *ši*(*-ip*)*-pa-an-d°* ‘to libate’ (also with consistent *i*-vocalism) beside *iš-pa-an-d°*, see Forssman (1994).[41]

1.55. Word-final: The sg. d.-l. ending on nouns in OH is always *-i* rather than *-e*. In MH and NH, this is also almost always the case. For some exceptions in *-e* see §1.61.

1.56. There is contrast between *e* and *i*, as seen in *e-et* ‘eat!’ and *i-it* ‘go!’, as well as in clitic *-še* ‘to him/her/it (dative)’ and the dative-locative of the clitic possessive *-ši* ‘in his/her/its . . .’ (Otten and Souček 1969: 56). The last example is only found in OH; see the next section.

*Words with Fluctuation between **e** and **i***

1.57. Certain words changed *e* to *i*, or vice versa, within the attested history of Hittite: (*i-*)*iš-ša-i* > *e-eš-ša-i* ‘(s)he performs’, *i-ku-na-* > *e-ku-na-* ‘cold, cool’, *i-ni* > *e-ni* ‘that (one)’,[42] *i-ni-iš-ša-an* > *e-ni-iš-ša-an* ‘thus’,[43] *ke-e* > *ki-i* ‘these’ (pl. nom. com. and pl. nom.-acc. neut., §7.3, p. 143), *-še* > *-ši* ‘to him/her’. The present first-singular *ḫi*-conjugation ending is often *-ḫé* in OS, but in post-OH always *-ḫi*. The first two examples

40. But Eichner’s reading *i-iš-ta-ma-aš-ša-du* in KUB 6.46 i 39 (1992: 80) has not stood the test of Singer’s collation (1996: 54 ad B i 38), which showed [x NI]NDA.GUR$_4$.RA *A-NA* ^{D}UTU AN-*I* accidentally omitted from the line following *iš-ta-ma-aš-ša-du* inserted by the scribe between [*ḫu-u-ma-*]*an-te-iš* and *iš-ta-ma-aš-ša-du*, all of which the copyist Weber misunderstood and miscopied. There is, therefore, no example of plene writing of this “prothetic” vowel in Hittite.

41. There is no proof for prothetic *i-* with initial **sm-*. The equation of Palaic *šameri-* with Hittite *išmeri*(*ya*)- (Čop cited in AHP 155) is quite uncertain. Furthermore, even if the equation were valid, it would not affect our understanding of the Hittite pronunciation, which must be determined exclusively on the basis of inner-Hittite spellings.

42. There is still no certain example of either *ini* or *eni* in OS.

43. There is no certain example of *eniššan* in OS, whereas all certain examples are in NS. However, *iniššan* occurs as late as in NH letters (KBo 18.86:29).

may reflect a phonetic change (Melchert 1984b: 153–56; but see Rieken 1996: 294–97), and the last two instead reflect a morphological replacement (*-še* > *-ši* after the nominal dative-locative ending *-i*; *-ḫe* > *-ḫi* after *-mi*, *-ši*, *-zi*, etc.). The other changes are surely real, but their conditioning is not fully explained. On the limited appearance of *-iš* for pl. nom. com. *-eš* in NH see now Sidel'tsev 2002, especially p. 72.

1.58. Some words show a fluctuation that cannot be explained as a development from earlier to later phases of Hittite. The examples cited in the preceding paragraph show that there were at least some real changes in the distribution of /e/ and /i/ from OH to NH. The examples also raise the possibility, however, that NH copyists misunderstood the patterns they found in older texts and introduced errors and even unreal creations. Because much of our evidence consists of NS copies of texts of uncertain date and compositional history, in the following cases (and many others) we cannot determine the status of the variations in *e*- and *i*-spellings. One should always be prepared to find isolated examples of *e* for *i* or vice-versa. See §1.65, p. 30.

1.59. Word-initial *i/e* vacillation: *iš-na-* and *eš-na-* 'dough', *eš-* (medio-passive) 'to sit down, die down' has *e-ša-ri* and *i-ša-ri* 'it (a fire) dies down', *i-ga-at-ta-ru* and *e-ga-at-ta-ru* 'let it become cool', ^{GIŠ}*el-zi-* and ^{GIŠ}*il-zi-* 'scale of a balance', *e-ne-ra-an*, *i-ni-ra-aš*, and *in-na-re-en* 'eyebrow', ^{GIŠ}*e-ri-pí-* and ^{GIŠ}*i-ri*(*-im*)*-pí-* 'cedar' (loanword from Akkadian *erinnu* via Hurrian; §4.16, p. 86), *iš-ḫa-aḫ-ru* and *e-eš-ḫa-aḫ-ru* 'tear(s)', ^{MUŠ}*il-lu-ya-an-k°* and ^{MUŠ}*el-li-ya-an-k°* 'serpent'.

1.60. Word-internal *i/e* vacillation: *te-eš-šum-mi-uš* 'cups' (acc.) and *ti-iš-šum-mi-uš* (both OS in Otten and Souček 1969: 13), *pé-eš-ta* and *pí-iš-ta* '(s)he gave', *ke-e-da-ni* and *ki-i-da-ni*[44] 'to/for this', *u-i-ya-at-tén* and *ú-e-ya-at-tén* 'send! (pl.)', *ú-e-mi-ya-* and *ú-i-mi-ya-* 'to find', *pé-*(*e-*)*ra-an* and once *pí-i-ra-an* 'before', *ši-ik-nu-*. . . vs. *še-ek-nu-*. . . 'robe', *ḫi-in-kán* vs. *ḫé-en-kán* 'plague'.

1.61. Word-final *i/e* vacillation: pres. sg. 2 *mi*-conjugation ending is usually *-ši*, but see *ar-ša-ni-e-še* 'you envy', and *wa-ar-iš-ša-at-te* 'you help'.[45] In substantives one finds sporadic word-final *e* for *i* in NH (or NS) in the sg. d.-l. of *a*-stem nouns (*eš-ḫé*, *iš-dam-ma-ne* [§4.2, p. 80], *pé-e-te*, *an-tu-uḫ-še*; Neu 1979a: 187–88) and of the consonantal stem adjective *ḫu-u-ma-an-te* 'to all' (see Hoffner forthcoming: §45) and of *u*-stem adjectives (§3.24, p. 74; §4.43, p. 98; *a-aš-ša-u-e* KUB 31.127 iv 1, compare also *i-da-la-u-e* KUB 29.1 iii 11 (OH/NS) and ḪUL-*u-e* KUB 21.5 iii 66, *pa-an-ga-u-e* KUB 31.42 ii 22, *te-pa-u-e-wa-mu* KUB 33.106 ii 5, Weitenberg 1984: 319 §844).[46]

---

44. All examples are late: KUB 6.46 iii 61 (Muw. II), KUB 7.1 + KBo 3.8 i 8, KUB 30.16 + KUB 39.1 i 12.

45. *wa-ar-iš-ša-at-te* for /warrissa-/ is another example of the system of scribal shorthand discussed in §1.12, p. 13.

46. In the sg. d.-l. of *u*-stem nouns and adjectives the stem vowel *u* tends (already in OH) to color the d.-l. ending vowel *i* to *e*. This is so common as to resist interpretation as an anomaly. See Neu 1979a: 187–88, Weitenberg 1984: 319. Weitenberg is cautious and claims that the formation is not prior to Muw. II.

Also in the vocative of *u*-stem nouns and names: LUGAL-*u*-*e* (MS), LUGAL-*e,* ^{d}UTU-*e* (Weitenberg 1984: 314 §833). For vocatives in *-e*, see §3.28 (p. 74). Also voc. *at-ti-me* 'O my father' for expected **at-ta-mi*, *iš-tar-ni-šu-um-me* KUB 26.81 i 7′ and iv 9, vs. *iš-tar-ni-šum-mi*, act. pres. sg. 1 verb RA-*me* KUB 22.25 + KUB 50.55 rev. 12; and NS dative-locatives like *pé-e-te* and *pé-te* for *pé-di*. There is not yet any consensus on just which of these orthographic variations represent real linguistic alternations and which are merely unusual or "nonstandard" spellings. Under these circumstances, prudence suggests that we should *transliterate* such cases according to the most frequent values for the signs used, as done above. It would be premature to impose our individual judgment by transliterating *at-ti-mì* or *pé-ti*$_7$, implying that we know for certain that Hittite scribes employed the respective signs with these values. However, as in other cases, such as the representation of glides (see §1.31, p. 20) or the interpretation of ambiguous *e*/*i* signs (see §1.64), we and other scholars do not hesitate to make judgments in *broad transcription*. One should therefore be prepared to encounter "normalized" spellings such as *pēti* for *pé-e-te*, to which we will always attach a warning that it *is* smoothed over and indicate precisely what signs are used.

1.62. Similarly, there sometimes occur, even in carefully written texts, examples of what are called "broken writings" (e.g., *-me-in* or *-mi-en*): *te-eš-šu-um-me-in* for *teššummin* (Otten and Souček 1969: 13), *ḫu-ul-lu-mi-en* for *ḫullumen* KUB 23.21 obv. 29, and examples such as *ku-uš-ša-ni-eš-ši-it* in Laws §157, copy p, where we must understand *kuššani=šši*t. Unless one thinks such writings actually reflect hiatus (§1.142, p. 48), one has to assume that only one of the two indicated vowels is valid and make a judgment as to which is intended. Once such a decision is made, some scholars indicate the decision by using rarer transcriptional values: *-mì-in* or *-me-en*$_6$, while others prefer to reserve the interpretive stage for broad transcription, transliterating *-me-in* but transcribing the sequence as *ḫullumen* and always indicating to the reader the nature of the spelling. In this grammar we follow the second procedure. In neither case should one assume that Hittite scribes *regularly* used ME with the *mì* value or IN with the *en*$_6$ value.[47]

1.63. Many cuneiform signs of the type vowel + consonant in which the vowel is *i* may also be read *e* (see §1.28, p. 20). Thus, in words spelled with such signs, both vowels must be attested in plene writing (e.g., *e-ek-* and **i-ik-*, *e-ep-* and **i-ip-*, *e-et-* and *i-it-*, *e-eš-* and *i-iš-*; §1.8, p. 11 and §1.46, p. 25) in order for the words to count as examples with fluctuation. The following words which are represented as fluctuating in the 'bound transcriptions' of Friedrich *HW*, are not yet attested with a plene *i* vocalization: *ekt-* 'net' (*e-ek-ta-*, never **i-ik-ta-*), *ekdu-* (*e-ek-du*, but never **i-ik-du*), ^{GIŠ}*eppiya-*

But in view of three cases of OH/NS and two of MH/NS, we would hesitate to exclude its beginning in the pre-NH period.

47. The same caution needs to be observed in the case of rare necessary values such as *eš*$_{17}$ for MEŠ (e.g., in LÚ-*eš*$_{17}$), which must not be invoked arbitrarily but only in restricted environments (pl. nom. com. of nouns or adjectives) and in absolutely clear cases in late NH.

(*e-ep-pí-ya-*, never **i-ip-pí-ya-*), *e-er-* (in *e*-grade form *e-er-te-ni* of the verb *ar-* 'to arrive'), *e-er-ma-an* 'illness, disease', *e-ez-za-an* 'chaff.' The pret. pl. 3 verbal ending *-er*, even when written *-i*-IR, must be read *-i-er*. When this ending is written with CVC signs, it must be read *-šer* (not *šir*), and *-ker* (not *kir*), just as final DIN in the pret. and imp. pl. 2 must be read *-tén*, rather than *-tin.* For the legitimate syllabic values in Hittite of the DIN sign see §1.20 (p. 18).

1.64. For persons unaware of the complexity of the writing system it is also confusing that many Hittitologists use the *i* value of ambivalent *e*/*i* signs as the "unmarked" value—i.e., the default reading—whenever there is no plene vowel to disambiguate, e.g., *pí-ra-an* (which could just as well be interpreted as *pé-ra-an*; so Melchert 1984b and CHD P s.v.). Of the major dictionaries in progress at present, both HW^2 and HED use the so-called unmarked *i* value. The CHD, on the other hand, insists on an "interpreted" transliteration (**-šet* transliterated as *-še-et*, not *-še-it*). Many words whose writings always contain one of these signs and that never use plene writing are uncertain as to their vocalization.

1.65. The cases of vocalic stability appear to refute the idea that *e* and *i* merged completely in Hittite at any period (pace Kimball 1999: 73–79). The picture, however, is admittedly complex and to some extent confusing. We must allow for the possibility that different phonological rules applied at different stages in the language and that texts composed in one period but recopied many years later present an artificial and unreliable picture of the phonology.

e/*i* and *ai*

1.66. Some of the alternations between *e*/*i* and *ai* noted by HE §13 reflect morphological replacements in NH. For the replacement of *kappuezzi* and *kappuet* by *kappuwāizzi* and *kappuwāit* see Oettinger 1979: 336. Both *paišta* and *pešta* 'he gave' are replacements of *paiš*, and *nešḫut*/*nišḫut* 'turn yourself' is replaced by *naišḫut* (see Jasanoff 2003: 183). Quite different are the problematic examples of etymologically well-founded *e* rarely written *ai* (HE §13b) or *ae*: *a-ep-ta* KBo 5.6 i 11 for *e-ep-ta* 'he seized', *ma-eq-qa-uš* KUB 26.1 iii 58 for *me-eq-qa-uš* 'many', *ap-pé-e-ez-zi-* alongside [*ap-p*]*a-iz-zi-an* and [*ap-p*]*a-iz-zi-uš-ša*, and *ḫe*(*n*)*k-*/*ḫai*(*n*)*k-* (Neu 1974: 41 with notes).

a and *e*

1.67. Most alternations of *a* and *e* in nouns and verbs reflect so-called ablaut, for which see §3.37 (p. 78).

1.68. There was a historical progression of thematic *mi*-conjugation verbs with forms such as *i-ez-zi* and *i-e*(*-ez*)*-zi* in OH and early MH to *i-ya-*(*az-*)*zi* in late MH and NH (Carruba, Souček, and Sternemann 1965). Forms such as *i-ez-zi*, *ti-ez-zi*, *pé-eš-ši-ez-zi*, etc., were not pronounced differently from *i-e-*(*ez-*)*zi*, *ti-e-ez-zi*, *pé-eš-ši-e-ez-zi*, etc. The second set of spellings is merely a more explicit writing of the first set, for the sign IZ

can be read as *iz* or *ez*. If members of the first set really were pronounced /itsi/ and /titsi/, one should be able to find **i-im-mi*, **ti-im-mi* (or **ti-i-mi*) and **pé-eš-ši-mi*, **pé-eš-ši-ši*, **pé-eš-ši-nu-un* forms in the same OH paradigms.[48] The appearance of a nominative-accusative plural com. *i*-stem ending *-iyaš* beside *-iēš* in New Hittite appears to show a similar change (§3.16, p. 71).

1.69. The variation in first- and second-plural endings *-weni*/*-teni* and *-wani*/*-tani* is the result of early differences in the position of the stress: *-wani*/*-tani* were the outcomes when the endings did not receive stress, while *-weni*/*-teni* were the stressed outcomes. The latter endings then spread at the expense of the former.[49] Pairs like *apteni* and *eptani* are particularly suggestive of a pattern resulting from different accent placement.[50]

a and *u*

1.70. The clitic second-singular pronoun has two allomorphs, *-tta* and *-ddu*. The latter is regularly selected when immediately followed by the particles *-z*(*a*) and *-šan* (Hrozný 1917: 127–28; HE §40; Luraghi 1997a: 25; see §5.14, p. 135). The fact that similar-sounding *ta=za* ('and' + reflexive particle) remains unchanged shows that this change was not phonological but "morphophonemic" (i.e., applying only in the case of particular morphemes).[51]

Combinatory Vowel Changes

Vowel Assimilation

1.71. Eichner has proposed that the form of the sg. d.-l. of *pedan* 'place', written *pé*/*í-di*, is always to be read /pidi/ where the first /i/ in place of expected /e/ is to be attributed to the influence of the following /i/ of the ending (briefly 1973: 84 n. 5; in more detail, 1980: 143–48, especially n. 65). Eichner would also compare *mi-li-it* 'honey' < **melit* (compare Luwian *mallit*). The presence of *pé-e-di* beside *pé*/*í-di* (even in the same ms., as in KBo 3.4 iii 28 and 33) suggests that the latter can and should be read as /pedi/ and leaves the proposed rule in doubt.

48. Melchert 1984b: 54–55. The pres. pl. 3 forms of the *mi*-conjugation, such as *i-en-zi* 'they do, make' and *ú-en-zi* 'they come' for the more common *i-ya-an-zi* and *ú-wa-an-zi*, are probably pre-NH but are not clearly older than the more common forms.

49. AHP 137–38, crediting Warren Cowgill for the analysis. For the view that *-wani* and *-tani* are due to Luwian influence see Rosenkranz 1952: 13–15; Carruba 1966a: 41; 1966b, 1968. Otten and Souček (1969: 78), however, showed from OH evidence that these endings are not due to Luwian influence.

50. In the analysis cited in n. 49 Melchert assumed that the difference in stress placement was morphologically conditioned and carried no functional significance. It is possible, however, that pairs like *paiweni* and *paiwani* 'we will go' (see §12.41, p. 209) reflect differing sentential intonation, indicating modality: interrogation, subjunctive ideas, etc., semantic features expressed in other IE languages through the subjunctive and optative moods, significantly missing from Hittite (§11.3, p. 180; §23.10, p. 314).

51. There are no regular alternations between *i* and *u*. For a few sporadic cases of uncertain status see AHP 178.

Elision

1.72. When the conjunctions *nu* and *šu* are followed by a clitic beginning with a vowel other than /u/, the vowel of the conjunction is elided: *nu=aš* > *n=aš*, *nu=at* > *n=at*, *nu=e* > *n=e*, *nu=ašta* > *n=ašta*, etc. (Ungnad 1920). This rule also applies to the clitic pronoun *-mu-* 'me': *ḫuišwatar=m(u)=apa* (OH/MS), *ḫingan=a=m(u)=apa* (OH/MS), *kinun=a=m(u)=apa* (OH/MS), *anda=m(u)=apa* (OH/NS), *nu=mm(u)=ašta* (OH/MS); see CHD *-mu* a, b 4′; HE §38a; and in this grammar, §28.110 (p. 382). That this rule is morphophonemic is shown by the fact that it fails to occur in other *u* + *a* sequences: *ēpdu=an* KUB 23.68 obv. 24 (MH/NS), *karū=aš* KBo 4.14 ii 13 (NH), KUB 60.86 obv. 5′ and *karūw=at* KUB 14.14 rev. 18′, or in *takku=aš* Law §27, *takku=an* Law §28, etc.

1.73. When the clitic conjunction *-ma* 'but' is followed by another clitic beginning with *u*, the *a* of *-ma* is elided: *ta-a-i-mu-uš-za* (< *tāi=ma=uš=za*) KBo 20.32 ii 9, *i-en-zi-mu-uš* 'But they make them' (< *ienzi=ma=uš*) KBo 16.78 i 10, *lu-uk-kat-ta-mu-uš-kán* (< *lukkatta=ma=uš=kan*) KBo 27.165 rev. 15′ (MS). *nam?-mu-uš(-za-kán)* KUB 7.1 ii 11 is not an example of *namm(a)* + *-uš* (see CHD L–N 391).

1.74. The initial *-a-* of the local particles *-apa* and *-ašta* is elided after the dative singular clitic *-še-* or *-ši-*: *nu-uš-še-pa* < *nu=šše=apa* KUB 36.110 obv. 11 (OS), or *nu-uš-ši-iš-ta* < *nu=šši=ašta* HKM 116:30 (MH/MS). This rule is morphophonemic, as shown by its failure to apply in the case of the local particle *-an* and the non-geminating clitic conjunction *-a*: *nu-uš-še-an* Law §78 (OS) and *a-pé-e-a* KUB 36.100 rev. 4 (OS). It also does not occur in *na-at-ši-at* (see §30.19, p. 411), where the same morpheme *-ši* is involved.[52]

1.75. For the morphologically conditioned deletion of various stem-final vowels before vowel-initial suffixes see §2.2 (p. 51).

Syncope

1.76. Sequences *-(i)ya-* and *-(u)wa-* in many cases contract, respectively, to *-i-* and *-u-*. Forms such as *ti-in-ti-eš* (IBoT 1.36 ii 48 [MH/MS], for normal *ti-ya-an-te-eš*), *ḫu-u-la-li-it-ta-at* (ibid. iii 39, for normal *ḫu-u-la-li-ya-at-ta-at*), and *šu-u-un-ta-an* (ibid. ii 41, for *šu-wa-an-ta-an*) show syncope, as do SIG_5*-in* 'well' KUB 31.105:4 and passim (for **lazzin*[53] < **lazziyan*, sg. neut. of stem **lazziyant-*), *appezzin* < *appezziyan* 'subsequently', *dapin* (see *dapian*, §8.10, p. 152), *terin* (see *teriyan*), and *šuḫmilin* (sg. neut. < **šuḫmiliyant-*, §15.13, p. 239), and imperfectives of stems in *-ye-*/*-ya-* (*ilališke-* < *ilalye-*, *wemiške-* < *wemye-*, etc.). See further the occasional contraction of the NH pl. nom.-acc. com. *i*-stem ending *-iē*/*aš* to *-iš* (see §4.19, p. 87). Possibly also in stem-final position in the imp. 2 *ḫuitti* < *ḫuittiya-* (Oettinger, pers. comm.). Additional examples include *lelḫundāi-* 'to pour' (see part. *lilḫuwant-* 'poured'), *miyaḫunte-* 'to be old',

52. Since *na-at-ši-at* occurs only in text copies from late NH, it is possible that the elision rule seen in the cases with *-ašta* and *-apa*, neither of which survived in the living language of late NH, had ceased to operate by the time this repeated pronoun construction was coined.

53. Perhaps attested in restored [*la?-a*]*z-zi-in* KUB 43.31 left col. 9 (OS) (van den Hout 1991: 198).

miḫuntaḫḫ- ‘to make old’ (see *miyaḫ(u)wandaḫḫ-* ‘to make old’) all from **miyaḫwant-* ‘old’ (Melchert 1984b: 53, 58, 133), *šanḫunta* ‘roasted things’ from *šanḫuwant-*. But there are many examples where the contraction fails to occur, and neither the chronological distribution nor the precise conditioning for the syncope (in terms of accent or word length) is clear. For a recent discussion of the problem see Rieken (2001), where cases are also cited that may reflect processes other than syncope: (1) possible examples of ablaut (see §3.37, p. 78) such as *antuwaḫḫa-/antuḫša-* ‘human being’, *waštul-/uštul-* ‘sin’, or *warāni/urāni* ‘burns’; (2) multiple stems for the same word such as *laḫu-i* and *laḫuwa-i* ‘pours’ (see §§13.17–13.18, p. 222).[54] Some examples may show either syncope or something else: *uriwarant-/wariwarant-* ‘blazing (fire)’, ^{NA_4}*kunnan-*/^{NA_4}*kuwannan-* ‘bead’, pl. d.-l. *šeknuš/šeknuwaš* ‘robe’, *ulkiššara-/walkiššara-* ‘skilled’, etc. In addition, it is possible that the genitive singular of personal names ^{m}*Nunnuš* and ^{m}*Taruḫšuš* reflects syncope instead of a genitive singular **-s* ending. See also §1.79.

1.77. Syncope is also seen in OH *naššu . . . naššu=ma* ‘either . . . or’ > post-OH *naššu . . . našma* (see §29.59, p. 405), and may be assumed for the protoform **aši=ma* > OH *āšma* (see below, §7.16, p. 146).[55]

1.78. It is uncertain whether any alternations of *ue~u* or *ui~u* are also to be attributed to syncope. One possible case is *karūli-* for *karu(w)ili-*.[56] Ablaut (see §3.37, p. 78) is more likely in OH *ḫu-šu-wa-an-da-an* and *ḫu-uš-wa-an-da-an* for later *ḫuišwant-* ‘living, alive’ (see EHS 37–38; Otten and Souček 1969: 57 for the forms). Here an original ‘zero-grade’ adjective has been renewed under the influence of the related verb *ḫue/iš-* ‘to be alive’. In examples such as *kuera-/kura-* ‘field’ and *tuekka-/tukka-* ‘body, limb’, there is no good basis for choosing between syncope and ablaut. Even less clear is the alternation in *wilan-/ulin-* ‘clay’. Some apparent alternations reflect rather different stems. The pair *ḫuinu-* and *ḫunu-* ‘cause to run’ are based on the respective weak stems *ḫuy-* and *ḫu(w)-* of the base verb *ḫuwai-* ‘to run’ (see Melchert 1984b: 52).[57]

---

54. This also seems the most probable explanation for *memiyani* vs. *memini*, sg. d.-l. of ‘word’ (§4.75, p. 112). Text chronology shows that *memiyani* occurs later than *memini*, so that syncope seems unlikely.

55. There are no sure examples of apocope. One possible instance is the form *na-at* for *na-at-ta* ‘not’. The form *na-at* in *š=an attaš=miš* ^{m}*Kizzuwan na-at⟨-ta⟩ḫu-e-⟨eš-⟩-nu-ú-ut* ‘and my father did not spare(?) Kizzuwa’ KBo 3.28 ii 19 (OH/MS) in view of the many sign omissions in the immediate context is almost certainly a case of an accidental omission of the *ta* in *na-at-ta* (so Laroche 1973: 187, 189). *nakkuš nat* [*šarnik*]*za* KBo 6.2 iv 54–55 (Laws §98 copy A, with var. in copy B *nakkuš ŪL šarnikzi*) might be a genuine example, if we interpret copy A as the NH scribe of copy B did: ‘it is a loss; he shall not make compensation’ KBo 6.2 iv 54–55 (OS) (see CHD *nakkuš*, which takes this as two clauses). But one cannot exclude the interpretation of Hoffner in LH 95–96, 197, reading *na-at* as *n=at* with *-at* referring to É-*ri kuit ḫarkzi*. The example [. . .] / *nat aruwaizzi* ‘[. . .] does not bow’ KUB 44.63 + KUB 8.38 ii 21–22) may show genuine apocope as well. *n*[*a-a*]*t-tu-wa-az* KUB 43.31 left col. 7 (OS?) (which is a variant of *ú-UL-wa-az* KUB 58.48 iv 3 [OH/NS]; CHD *natta* a 1′ a′) may either show syncope of expected *na-at-ta-wa-az* or be an additional example of an old shorter variant of *natta*, *nat* ‘not’.

56. *ka-ru-ú-li-uš=ma=za* DINGIR.MEŠ-*uš* / ^{d}IM-*aš* ZAG-*az ašašta* KBo 32.13 ii 26–27.

57. The stems *uda-* and *wida(i)-* simply belong to two different verbs meaning ‘to bring’. Only the second (like *peḫute-* and *uwate-*) takes as its objects living beings capable of self-propulsion (see CHD P 352

Diphthongization ("Breaking")

1.79. In certain cases, words with original *u* come to be spelled with *uwa*: e.g., *paḫḫur* 'fire' appears as *paḫḫuwar*, *kurške-*[58] 'to cut' as *kuwarške-*, etc. For further examples see Rieken (2001: 372–74), who plausibly suggests that these cases show a genuine sound change whereby the *u* develops into a diphthong.

Vowel Insertion ("Anaptyxis")

1.80. It is reasonably certain that some original sequences of consonants were broken up in pre-Hittite by secondarily inserted vowels (see English *athlete* pronounced [æθəlit]). However, the limitations of the cuneiform writing system in spelling consonant sequences (§1.11, p. 12) make it hard to distinguish with certainty genuine inserted vowels from those that are merely graphic, and there is no consensus on this issue.[59] The discussion here is limited to those cases where it is likely that addition of suffixes to roots leads to genuine vowel insertion.

1.81. Insertion of *i*/*e*. An *i* or *e* is inserted between a root ending in a labial or velar stop or in *-ḫ-* and the suffix *-ške-*: *appi*/*eške-, šarninki*/*eške-*, *šanḫi*/*eške-*. The vowel is consistently *i* in OH, but spellings with *e* begin in MH, and in NH one finds both *i* and *e* with some frequency (Melchert 1984b: 108, 134). There is a similar insertion before the pret. sg. 3 ending *-š* (Oettinger 1993: 41): *akkiš* to *akk-* 'to die' and *išiyaḫḫiš* to *išiyaḫḫ-* 'to denounce'. Likewise in pret. sg. 3 *takkišta* and other forms of *takš-* 'to fashion'. The behavior of roots ending in a dental consonant is more complex. In MH we find pret. sg. 3 *ḫatteš* to *ḫatt-* 'to pierce', with insertion, as in the previous examples (Oettinger 1993). However, the usual treatment when *-ške-* is added to a root ending in a dental stop is insertion of *-i-* *after* the [s]: *azzikke-* to *e*/*ad-* 'to eat' (< /ad-ske-/) and *zikke-* to *dai-* 'to put' (< /d-ske-/).[60] This development is also sometimes seen after roots ending in other dental consonants: alongside *tar-aš-ke-* (/tarske-/) to *tar-* 'to say' we also find *tar-ši-ik-ke-* with inserted *-i-*. Likewise for the addition to *ḫann*(*a*)- 'to dispute, to judge' we find both *ḫanniške-* (with *i*-insertion before the *s*) and *ḫaššikke-* (< **ḫann-ske-* with *i*-insertion after the *s* and assimilation (see §1.120, p. 43). For possible anaptyxis of *i* in the origin of the instrumental ending see §3.35, p. 77.

1.82. Insertion of *u*. Some verbs whose attested stem in Hittite ends in *-a-* (§13.9, p. 218) or *-e-* (§12.23, p. 199) originally had variants without the final vowel. When these appear before suffixes beginning with *-w-* (pl. 1 *-wen*(*i*); verbal noun *-war*; infini-

in summary of *peda-* B).

58. Written *kur-aš-k°*.

59. A new systematic treatment of the problem is sorely needed. The analysis in AHP 29–33 is both incomplete and in some respects erroneous.

60. Against AHP 30 and with Oettinger (1979: 318) and others, the consistency of the spellings with *i* argues that the vowel is real. In *zikke-*, the root appears in an archaic form without the *-i-* seen in the inflection of *dai-*. The rare alternate form *zaške-* StBoT 25 #137 iii 15′ must represent a genuine variant treatment.

tive *-wanzi*), a *u* is inserted before the *-w-*, and the new sequence *-uw-* is then dissimilated to *-um-* (§1.126, p. 44). E.g., **dweni* > **duweni* > *tumēni* 'we take' (OH) to *dā-*, **tarnwanzi* > **tarnuwanzi* > *tarnu*(*m*)*manzi* 'to release' to *tarna-*. This insertion may be viewed as anaptyxis, but see AHP 57 (with references to Eichner 1988 and Bernabé 1983) for other interpretations.

1.83. Insertion of *a.* There are two probable cases of syncope followed by anaptyxis to resolve an internal sequence of three consonants of which the middle one is *r*. In the first example *kutruweneš* 'witnesses' by syncope became **kutrweneš*, which then resolved by anaptyxis to *kutarweneš* (*ku-tar-ú-e-ni-eš* KUB 23.78b 9′) (Oettinger 1982b: 164). In the second example *etriyant-* '(well-)fed, fattened, robust' by syncope became **etryant-*, which then resolved to *etaryant-* (*e-tar-ya-an-t*[*a-an*] KUB 12.63 obv. 16) (Melchert 1997b).[61]

Consonants

Contrasts in Stops

1.84. Sturtevant (1933: 66–67), following a suggestion by Mudge, first argued that there is a phonemic contrast in Hittite between single and double ("geminate") stops in intervocalic position.[62] Further research has fully confirmed this analysis. While there are a few examples of inconsistent spellings (e.g., occasional *i-ya-ta-ri* for regular *i-ya-at-ta-ri*), most morphemes are written consistently with either single or double stops. Patterned exceptions actually confirm the contrast (see AHP 14), while many others may be explained as "simplified spellings" (see §1.9, p. 12, and §1.12, p. 13). One can even cite a small number of semantically contrasting minimal or near-minimal pairs: *apā-* 'that' (with rare sg. acc. com. *apān*) vs. *app-* 'to seize (part. sg. nom.-acc. neut. *appān*), *padān* 'of the feet' vs. *paddan* 'dug' (sg. nom.-acc. neut.), *šekan* 'cubit' vs. *šekkan* 'known' (part. sg. nom.-acc. neut.).

1.85. In general Hittite intervocalic single stops reflect PIE voiced and voiced aspirate stops, while geminate stops continue PIE voiceless stops (Sturtevant 1933: 66–67), and explanations have been found for most apparent exceptions (AHP 16 and Kimball 1999: 261–64, with references to Čop, Eichner, and others). There is no consensus as to whether the phonetic contrast in attested Hittite is one of voicing or of some other feature such as "fortis" vs. "lenis" or "aspirated" vs. "unaspirated" (see AHP 16–18 with references to a variety of opinions). For the sake of simplicity we here describe the contrast in stops as one of voicing, but we do not mean thereby to take a definitive stance on this issue.[63]

---

61. That the attested spelling variants both represent a sequence [trw] with non-syllabic [r] is highly unlikely but cannot in principle be excluded.

62. Compare the similar conventions for writing Hurrian stops in syllabic cuneiform (Wegner 2000: 39–40).

63. Whether or not the stops spelled as geminate in Hittite were voiceless, they seem to have been so heard by Ugaritic scribes: see alphabetic writings of Hittite names such as *Šu-up-pí-lu-li-u-ma* (*tpllm*).

1.86. It is likely that the phonemic contrast in Hittite stops existed only word internally. It was neutralized in word-initial and word-final position (see AHP 18–21 and Luraghi 1997a: §1.1). Since the device of marking the contrast by single vs. geminate spellings was only used consistently intervocalically, it is difficult to prove the contrast for internal sequences of stop plus another consonant, but a handful of examples suggest that it probably applied there: see /-dr-/ in *appatriye-* 'to commandeer' < *appāttar* 'seizing' spelled *ap-pa-ta-ri-ez-zi* and *ap-pa-at-ri-ez-zi* Law §76 (OS and NS, respectively) vs. /-tr-/ in *ḫatrešš*(*n*)- 'crossroads, intersection' < *ḫatta-* 'to cut' spelled *ḫa-at-*(*ta*)*-re-eš-n*°.

Inventory of Consonants

1.87. It is believed that Hittite possessed voiced and voiceless consonants of the following types: stops (*b*, *p*, *d*, *t*, *g*, *k*, g^w, k^w), affricate (*ts*), fricatives (*š*, *ḫ*), and sonorants (*m*, *n*, *l*, *r*, *y*, *w*).

Stops

1.88. There are four series of stops in Hittite—bilabial, dental, velar, and labiovelar—all of which can be voiceless or voiced when intervocalic. The following table of Hittite stops is adapted from Luraghi 1997a: §1.2.1. As in Luraghi's table, capitalized voiceless stops represent cases where the voicing opposition is neutralized, and forms that end in a hyphen represent stem forms. The # sign represents the word boundary.

/p/: *a-ap-pa* 'back, again', *šu-up-pí-* 'pure'
/b/: *a-pa-a-aš* 'that one'
#/P/: *pé-e-ri-ya-aš* 'of the house', *pa-ra-a* 'forth, forwards'
/P/#: *e-ep* 'seize' (sg. imp.).
/t/: *kat-ta* or *ka-at-ta*[64] 'down(ward)', *at-ta-aš* or *ad-da-aš* 'father', *e-eš-tu* 'let him be'
/d/: *i-di* or *e-di* 'on this side', *wa-a-tar* 'water'
#/T/: *ta-a-ru* 'wood, tree', *tu-uk* 'you' (sg. acc. or dat.)
/T/#: *ke-eš-ša-ri-it* 'by the hand' (instrumental case), *e-et* 'eat' (sg. imp.), *i-it* 'go' (sg. imp.)
/k/: *tu-e-eg-ga-* 'body', *lu-uk-ke-et* 'he set fire to', *ša-ag-ga-aḫ-ḫi* 'I know'
/g/*:* *la-a-ki* 'he bends', *la-ga-*(*a-*)*an* 'bent, inclined'
#/K/: *kat-ta* 'down(ward)', *ke-eš-šar-* 'hand', *ki-iš-ša-an* 'thus', *ku-ú-ša-ta* 'bride-price'
/K/#: *la-a-ak* 'bend' (sg. imp.), *ša-a-ak* 'know', *zi-*(*i-*)*ik* 'you' (sg. nom.), *am-mu-uk* 'me' (acc. or dat.), *ḫu-u-da-a-ak* 'promptly'

64. The usual spelling is *kat-ta*, but occurrences of *ka-at-ta* (KUB 20.4 vi 4′, KUB 20.43:9′, KUB 58.50 iii 7) and one of *ka-at-ta-an* (KUB 56.46 vi 21) show that the double writing of the dental is secure. HED K 128 ("rarely *ka-at-*") cites no example.

/g^{w}/: *ša-a-ku-wa* ‘eyes’, *a-ku-an-zi* ‘they drink’ [65]
#/K^{w}/: *ku-iš* ‘who’, *ku-en-zi* ‘he kills’
/K^{w}/#: *e-ku* ‘drink!’, *-ku . . . -ku* ‘whether . . . or’

1.89. In addition to signs indicating voiced and voiceless stops, the cuneiform syllabary possessed some that were intended to represent so-called emphatic stops of the Semitic Akkadian language: the velar conventionally represented by the Roman letter *q* and the dental represented by *ṭ*.[66] Because even the Babylonians and Assyrians often wrote these consonants with the same signs they employed for the nonemphatic counterparts, we have only one sign in the Hittite syllabary whose number-one transcriptional value contains an emphatic: QA. On the question of how to transliterate QA in Hittite words see above, §1.16 (p. 16).

Affricates

1.90. The cuneiform signs conventionally transcribed as containing a *z* represent a sound (or sounds) with three distinct sources in Hittite. (1) Some cases reflect a sequence /t+s/: the sg. nom. of the common gender *t*-stem *aniyatt-* /aniyat-s/ is spelled *a-ni-ya-az* vs. sg. gen. *a-ni-ya-at-ta-aš*.[67] (2) In other cases it represents the affricate /ts/ resulting from the dissimilation of a dental stop before another dental stop (see §1.125, p. 44): imp. sg. 3 /e:tstu/ ‘let him eat’ is spelled *e-ez*(*-za*)*-du*. (3) In still others it represents the sound resulting from prehistoric assibilation of **ty* and **ti*: suffix *-zziya-* < **-tyo-* in *ḫa-an-te-ez-zi-ya-* ‘front, first’ (see §2.53, p. 61) and pres. sg. 3 ending *-zzi* < **-ti* in *e-ep-zi* ‘takes’ etc. The first two sources suggest that *z* stands for a voiceless dental affricate /ts/, and we follow most Hittitologists in adopting this value.[68] Nothing precludes a palatal or palatalized affricate (see the sound of English ‘church’) for those cases resulting from assibilation. However, there is no evidence for a *phonemic* contrast between these instances and those reflecting /t+s/.

1.91. The affricate /ts/ written with *z* or *zz* may have had no voiced counterpart. It occurs word initial, medial, and final: *za-aḫ-ḫa-iš* ‘battle’, *ú-ez-zi* ‘he comes’, *a-ru-na-az* ‘from the sea’, *ke-e-ez* ‘on this side’, *ne-ku-uz mēḫur* ‘in the evening time.’ But see Yoshida (1998), who claims that original single intervocalic *-z-* is /dz/ and *-zz-* is /ts/.

---

65. On the absence of intervocalic -V*k-ku-* for /k^{w}/ see the discussion in AHP 61.

66. Also patterning with *q* and *ṭ* in Semitic languages is the sibilant *ṣ*. But in the Hittite cuneiform syllabary, there are no signs for this *ṣ* that cannot as easily be read as *z*.

67. That *z* is representing an affricate /ts/ here is confirmed by the fact that in those cases in clitic sequences when /-t+s-/ becomes /-ss-/ and the dental stop *is* lost, the *z*-containing signs are *not* used (see the examples in §1.111, p. 41).

68. Even if the Ugaritic alphabetic place name *lwsnd* denotes the city name ^{URU}*Lawa*(*z*)*zantiya* (del Monte and Tischler 1978: 237–38), it would constitute evidence that Hittite *z* was not /ts/ only if Ugaritic had an available affricate /ts/ phoneme. The uncertainty of interpreting Ugaritic *ṣ* as an affricate /ts/, as it is in Hebrew, instead of an ‘emphatic,’ as in Arabic, also makes this evidence uncompelling. The contrast /s/ vs. /z/ in Ugaritic does, however, indicate that the -(*z*)*z*- in ^{URU}*Lawa*(*z*)*zantiya* was voiceless.

For the possibility that some instances of *z* stand for a voiced fricative [z] see §1.136 (p. 47).

Fricatives

1.92. The precise value in Hittite of the sound represented by the cuneiform signs containing *š* cannot be determined at present. The cuneiform syllabary as adopted by the Hittites had only two sets of CV and VC signs, used non-logographically,[69] containing sibilants: *šV*/*Vš* and *zV*/*Vz*. Having adopted the *z*-containing signs for an affricate (§1.90), Hittite scribes had no signs left to indicate a sibilant other than those with *š*. Therefore the fact that *š* indicates a voiceless (alveo-)palatal sibilant (like English *sh*) in Akkadian says nothing about the quality of the sound in Hittite. The voiceless sibilant of PIE was surely a dental-alveolar /s/, but nothing assures us that it retained that value in Hittite. All that one can declare with certainty is that Hittite had a single /s/ phoneme. It may have been pronounced as dental-alveolar [s], alveo-palatal [ʃ], or even palatal [ç], or some combination of these, according to environment.

1.93. Evidence cited from the transliteration of names in other writing systems is complex. Advocates of the /s/ interpretation point to writings of Hittite royal names in Egyptian Hieroglyphs with the sign representing a folded cloth (Gardiner 1957: 507, sign S 29) and conventionally transcribed by Egyptologists as *s*+acute accent (on this, see Edel 1948, 1973). However, the royal name Šuppiluliuma—which happens to be the only Hittite royal name that is linguistically Hittite (rather than Luwian, Hurrian, etc.: *šuppi-* 'pure' + *luli-* 'pond' + ethnicon *-um(a)n-*) appears in alphabetic Ugaritic as *ṯpllm*. Hurrian names compounded with *-šarri* and spelled with *š*-containing signs at Boğazköy appear in Ugaritic alphabetic texts as *ṯr*. Tropper (2000: 108–13) concludes (p. 113): "Es ist somit wahrscheinlich das ug. /ṯ/ doch als nicht-affrizierter, stimmloser Interdental [t̲] gesprochen wurde." Since Ugaritic cuneiform employed another sign for /s/, it is highly unlikely that the *ṯ* was pronounced [s]. The pronunciation [s] or [ʃ] ("*sin*" or "*shin*") used by individual scholars today for the Hittite sibilant is entirely conventional, and no inferences regarding the Hittite articulation should be drawn from it.

1.94. The cuneiform signs containing *ḫ*[70] (that is, *aḫ*, *ḫa*, *ḫi*, *ḫu*, *ḫal*, *ḫar*, *ḫat*, *túḫ*, etc.) represent a voiceless velar fricative [x] in Akkadian (like Arabic *khalīfah* 'caliph', Scottish *loch*, or Hebrew *lēkh l^{e}kha* 'get out of here!'). Hittite *ḫ*(*ḫ*) also probably stands for a velar fricative, but other possibilities (such as a pharyngeal fricative) cannot be excluded.[71] We use /h/ in phonemic transcriptions merely for the sake of typographic

69. Obviously they did have [s] signs used exclusively for Sumerograms: SA 'sinew', SI 'horn', SU 'flesh', etc. These signs eventually comprised the third set of sibilant-containing signs in Akkadian (ŠA, ZA, SA).

70. For typographic economy some publications use *h* for *ḫ* and *s* for *š*.

71. Ancient Ugaritic and ancient and modern Arabic use different written characters to designate the two distinct phonemes realized as velar and pharyngeal fricatives (usually transliterated as *ḫ* and *ḥ*, respectively). Since a few proper names written in Hittite with *ḫ* appear in alphabetic Ugaritic with the velar frica-

simplicity and do not thereby intend any claim regarding its realization. The sequence *šḫ* is pronounced as [s] or [ʃ] plus the separate strong fricative, not as the single sound [ʃ] of English *sh*, German *sch*, or Turkish *ş*.

1.95. Both *ḫ* and *š* show contrasting single and double writing intervocalically: *a-ša-an-zi* 'they are', *a-aš-ša-an-zi* 'they remain', *e-ša-an-zi* 'they sit', and *e-eš-ša-an-zi* 'they work, produce'. For the *ḫ*/*ḫḫ* contrast, see the minimal pair *ša-a-ḫa-an* and *ša-ḫa-a-an* 'blocked, clogged' (part. sg. neut.) versus *ša-aḫ-ḫa-an* (noun denoting a kind of obligation), as well as a number of words that consistently write intervocalic *ḫ*: e.g., *laḫu*(*wa*)*i-* 'to pour', ^{GIŠ}*zaḫurti-*, the verb *waḫ-*/*weḫ-* 'to turn' and its derivatives *waḫatar*, *waḫeššar*, *mēḫur* (*mēḫuni,* etc.) 'time', the second *ḫ* in the medio-passive ending -(*ḫ*)*ḫaḫari*, -(*ḫ*)*ḫaḫati*, etc.[72] The *ḫḫ*/*ḫ* contrast is generally thought to reflect a tense/lax or voiceless/voiced distinction (Luraghi 1997a: §1.2.3). The lax/voiced sound of nongeminate *ḫ* is reflected in the spelling of the Hittite personal and royal name ^{m}Tudḫaliya in Ugaritic alphabetic script as *tdġl* (where the phoneme written *ġ* is a lax/voiced counterpart to *ḫ,* the contrast being [γ] to [x], the same as Arabic غ to خ; see also Hebrew *tidʿal* < **tudġal* in Genesis 14:1, 9), and in the place name written *gt trġnds* 'winepress of *T.*',[73] which as in the city/country name Tarḫuntašša certainly contains the name of the stormgod ^{d}Tarḫunta. If so, note that both cuneiform *ḫ* and *t* are reflected as voiced *ġ* and *d.*

1.96. The examples of consistent contrasting *š* and *šš*, on the other hand, are interpreted as consonantal length (i.e., gemination) (Luraghi 1997a: §1.2.3).

Sonorants

1.97. Hittite sonorants include two nasals /m/ and /n/, two liquids /l/ and /r/, and two approximants or semivowels /y/ and /w/ (European scholars often write these as *i̯* and *u̯*). The phoneme /r/ never occurs in intial position, nor /m/ in final position. The simple nasals and liquids contrast with geminates in intervocalic position: *ku-na-an* 'struck/killed' (part. sg. nom.-acc. neut.), *ku-un-na-an* 'righthand' (adj. sg. acc. com.), *a-ra-aš* 'colleague', *ar-ra-aš* 'anus', *ma-a-la-i* 'she agrees', *ma-al-la-i* 'she mills'. Examples:

1.98. /m/: *la-a-ma-an* 'name', *ḫa-me-eš-ḫi* 'in spring', *ḫu-u-ma-an-te-eš* 'all' (pl. nom. com.), *me-ma-al* 'meal, groats'.

1.99. /m:/: *am-mu-uk* 'me', *kam-ma-ri* 'in a swarm/cloud', *nam-ma* 'again, next', *dam-mi-iš-ḫa-aš* 'oppression', *mi-im-ma-i* 'refuses', *wa-an-nu-um-mi-ya-aš* 'orphan'.

---

tive *ḫ*, the velar fricative interpretation is slightly more likely. Also favoring the velar fricative interpretation is the writing of ^{m}*Tu-ud-ḫa-li-ya* as *tdġl* (see §1.95). But given the mistakes in hearing phonemes from other languages, this argument can only be suggestive, not conclusive.

72. There are, of course, occasional lapses: *me-na-ḫa-an-da* (KBo 7.14 obv. 7, OS) for normal *me-na-aḫ-ḫa-an-da.*

73. See also the place name *trġds*, with nasal reduction.

For the problem of apparent intervocalic geminate *m* in words using CV*m-m*V see §1.24, p. 19.

1.100. /n/: *ne-e-wa-an* ‘new’, *da-me-da-ni* ‘to another’, *pí-ya-na-iz-zi* ‘he rewards’, *ú-wa-nu-un* ‘I came’, *pít-ti-nu-zi* ‘he runs off with’, *ga-pí-nu-uš* ‘threads’, *ki-nu-un* ‘now’, *ku-na-an* ‘struck, killed’, *ú-na-at-ta-al-la-an* ‘merchant’, *ḫu-ú-ni-ik-zi* ‘injures’, *ú-nu-wa-an-zi* ‘they decorate’, *pu-nu-uš-ša-an-zi* ‘they inquire’.

1.101. /n:/: *an-na-aš* ‘mother’, *šu-ul-la-an-na-az* ‘out of wantonness’, *túḫ-ša-an-na-i* ‘he shall harvest (a grapevine)’, *zi-in-na-i* ‘he finishes’, *a-ra-wa-an-ni-iš* ‘free’, *an-ni-iš-ki-iz-zi* ‘he performs’, *an-nu-uš* ‘mothers’ (acc.), *in-na-ra-a* ‘independently’, *in-na-ra-u-wa-an-za* ‘vigorous’, *in-na-ra-wa-tar* ‘vigor’, *zi-in-ni-it* ‘he finished’, *ti-in-nu-zi* ‘he paralyzes’, *u-un-na-i* ‘he drives (here)’, *šu-un-na-i* ‘he fills’.

1.102. /l/: *la-a-la-an* ‘tongue’, *ma-a-la-i* ‘he agrees’, *kar-ma-la-aš-ša-i* ‘he causes permanent injury’, *da-a-la-i* ‘he leaves’, *ḫa-a-li* ‘corral, pen’, *i-da-a-lu-uš* ‘evil’, *ḫi-i-li* ‘in the courtyard’, *lu-ú-li-ya* ‘in a pond’, *tu-li-ya* ‘to the assembly’, *wa-aš-tu-la-aš* ‘of a/the sin’, *me-ma-al* ‘meal’.

1.103. /l:/: *ma-al-la-i* ‘she mills’, *ú-na-at-ta-al-la-an* ‘merchant’, *iš-kal-la-a-ri* ‘he tears off’, *ḫu-uš-še-el-li-ya-az* ‘from the mud pit’, *il-lu-ya-an-ga-aš* ‘serpent’, *še-ḫi-il-li-ya-aš* ‘of purity’ (Hurrian loanword, §4.16, p. 86), *ta-az-zi-il-li-iš* (a kind of priest), *šu-ul-la-an-na-az* ‘out of wantonness’, *ḫu-ul-la-an-zi* ‘they contest’.

1.104. /r/: *a-ra-aš* ‘colleague’, *ke-eš-ša-ra-aš* ‘hand’, *ka-ru-ú* ‘long ago, formerly’, *e-ša-ri* ‘he sits down’, *ku-u-ru-ri* ‘to a foreign (land)’, *i-wa-a-ru* ‘dowry, inheritance share’, *ta-ra-an-za* ‘promised’, $^{\text{GIŠ}}$*ma-a-ri-in* ‘spear’, *ut-tar* ‘word, thing’, *šēr* ‘above’, *ḫasduēr* ‘brushwood’, *kurur* ‘hostility’.

1.105. /r:/: *ar-ra-aš* ‘anus’, *ša-ar-ra-an-zi* ‘they divide’, *ú-wa-ar-ra* ‘for help’, *pár-ra-an-da* ‘across’, *mar-ri* ‘rashly’, *mar-mar-ri* ‘in a marsh(?)’, *me-er-ra-a-an-ta-ru* ‘let them disappear’, *mi-ir-mi-ir-ru-uš* ‘drainage waters, foul waters’ (pl. acc.), *u-ur-re-er* ‘they came to the aid of’, *me-ḫur-ri*$^{\text{ḪI.A}}$ ‘times’.

1.106. /y/: *i-ez-zi* ‘he does/makes’, *i-an-zi* ‘they go’, *ma-ya-an-za* ‘young adult’, *šu-wa-i-ez-zi* ‘he shall look’, *ta-i-ez-zi, ta-a-i-e-ez-zi* and *ta-ya-az-zi* ‘he steals’, *ta-a-i-ú-ga-aš* ‘two-year-old’, *ša-a-i-ú-uš* (an animal), *ta-ki-ya* ‘in another’, *da-a-i* ‘puts’ (< *dai-*).

1.107. /w/: *wa-a-tar* ‘water’, *ú-ez-zi* ‘he comes’, *ú-e-te-ez-zi* ‘he builds’, *a-ra-a-u-wa-aš* ‘exempt’, *na-ú-i* ‘not yet’, *ne-e-wa-an* or *ne-e-u-wa-an* ‘new’, *ne-e-u-*[*it*] or *né-u-i-i*[*t*][74] ‘with new’, *i-wa-ar* ‘like’, *i-wa-a-ru* ‘dowry’, *ú-wa-a-tar* ‘vision, sight’, *šu-wa-i-ez-zi* ‘he shall look’, *du-wa-a-an* ‘on one side’, *da-šu-wa-an-za* ‘blind’, *a-ú* ‘see!’, *ḫa-az-zi-ú* ‘rite’.

74. In preferring the reading *né-u-i-i*[*t*] to *ni-u-i-i*[*t*], the issue is similar to the case of *pé*/*í-di*, for which see §1.71, p. 31.

1.108. Rarely, an initial *w* followed by a vowel is written with *ú* or *u* preceding a *wV* sign: *ú-wa-ar-kán-ta-an* (*warkant-*) 'fat', *ú-wi$_5$-te-ni-it* 'with water', *ú-wi$_5$-ta-ar* 'waters', *u-wa-al-aḫ-zi* 'he strikes', etc. (see Melchert 1984b: 13, 20–21).

1.109. As indicated above (§1.97), there is a regular contrast intervocalically between single and geminate nasals and liquids, and, as expected, most words are stable in showing either one or the other. However, in some instances, words that have a single *n, l*, or *r* in the older language unexpectedly show geminate spellings in NH (NS): e.g., *ku-en-ner* for *ku-e-ner* 'they killed' (see §12.6, p. 190), *iš-ḫi-ú-ul-la-aš* for *iš-ḫi-ú-la-aš* 'of the treaty', *kat-te-er-ra-* for *kat-te-ra-* 'lower'. This feature is particularly common in verbal substantives with the ending *-i*: *ar-ku-wa-ar-ri* $^{\text{ḪI.A}}$ 'pleas', *minumarri* $^{\text{ḪI.A}}$ 'soothings', etc., but is by no means regular there (compare *kururi* $^{\text{ḪI.A}}$ 'hostile'). For further examples see AHP 165. These late geminate spellings cannot be explained away in the manner of those for *m* (see §1.24, p. 19). The question of their linguistic reality and possible conditioning remains to be answered.

1.110. For the dissimilation of *uw* to *um* and *wu* to *mu* see §§1.126–1.127, pp. 44–45.

Assimilation of Consonants

1.111. *tš > šš* This change, which occurs only when *t* and *š* are divided by a clitic boundary, seems to have been a phenomenon of OH, clearly reflected in OS texts, sometimes side-by-side with examples in which the lost dental has been restored. OS rituals show instrumental *ka-lu-u-lu-pí-iš-mi-t*(*a-aš-ta*) 'with their fingers' or *ka-lu-lu-pí-iz-mi-it* with restored *-t-*. In OH/NS texts we find further exx.: HE §36c claimed this assimilation on the basis of *kuit kuit p*[*ešta*] *ta-aš-še šarnikzi* 'whatever (*kuit kuit,* neut.) (the first man) gave (for the bride), (the eloper) shall give it (*-at*) to him as compensation' KBo 6.3 ii 6–7 = Laws §28a (OH/NS) (HE §36 c: < *ta=at=še* 'und es ihm' and *na-aš-ša-an* KBo 5.2 iv 12 [< *nu* + *-at* + *-šan*]); we see it also in ($^{\text{d}}$Tarḫunta encountered eight 'sons of the gods' on the road,) *na-aš-ši ḫinkantat* 'and they bowed to him, (saying: 'O Tarḫunta, our father! Where were you?')' KUB 33.66 + KBo 40.333 iii 8 (OH?/MS); in the OH?/MS festival text from Šarišša KuT 53 ii 15–19 (ed. Wilhelm 2002a: 345) the neuter noun 'half' (see §9.42, p. 165) in the phrase *kuit* MAŠ-*AM ḫarzi* 'what half he holds (in his right hand)' is resumed *na-aš-ša-an . . . išt*[*anani*] *. . . dāi* 'he puts it (*-at*) on the altar'; but restored in i 50: [*na-a*]*t-ša-an*. Other exx. from OH/NS texts: $^{\text{GIŠ}}$*pāini=w*[*a=tt*]*a kuit* $^{\text{É}}$*ḫilamni=šit ārta* (15) *nu=war=a*(*t*)*=šta karšdu nu=war=at* $^{\text{URU}}$*Agade* $^{\text{d}}$*IŠTAR-aš* (16) [$^{\text{GIŠ}}$TUKUL].ḪI.A-*eš iyandu* 'Let him cut down the *paini*-tree that stands for you(?) in his gate house, and let them make it into weapons of $^{\text{d}}$*IŠTAR* of Akkad' KBo 22.6 iv14–16, see iv 21; ḪUR.SAG-*i=kuw=at=šan . . .* [*tak?š*]*anni=kuw=a*(*t*)*=ša*⟨*n*⟩ 'whether it (is) in the mountain . . . or it (is) in the [pl]ain' KUB 43.60 i 5–7, and *kad!-du-uš-mi-it* for *kaddut=šmit* 'with their talons' KUB 43.60 i 17.

1.112. *tn* > *nn* *ḫattā̆tar*, gen. *ḫattannaš* (from **ḫattatnaš*), see §4.106 (p. 128). Since most examples are found in nouns with nom.-acc. in *-ātar* and oblique stem in *-ann-* or in their transparent derivatives, the *-tn-* is sometimes trivially restored by analogy, whence exceptions like *iyatnaš* (gen. of *iyātar* 'abundance') and *takšatniya-* 'to make level' (< *takšatar, takšann-* '(a) plain'). There is no need or justification for attributing the *-tn-* in these examples to Luwian influence. *-tn-* is also preserved in transparent derivatives such as the causatives *ḫatnu-* 'to dry (something) out' to *ḫat-* 'to become dry' and *tit(ta)nu-* 'to make stand up' to *tiya-* 'to stand'. Luwian influence *is* clear in the case of the loanword *ḫuitar* (gen. *ḫuitnaš*) 'wild animals' and is likely in other examples such as *ḫarā̆tar* 'offense' (d.-l. *ḫaratni*, abl. *ḫaratnazi*) and *kattawatnalli-* 'plaintiff'. See HE §32 2 and Neumann 1964: 50 with literature, among others.[75] A loanword explanation is possible but unprovable for examples such as *mitnaz* and *wetna-* (a wild animal).[76] One clear exception to the rule in a native Hittite word is *utne* 'land, country'. For the latest discussion on the derivation of this word and the reason for the nonassimilation, see Oettinger 2000b: 183–84.

1.113. The clitic *-a* that means 'also, and' geminates a preceding consonant, reflecting a prehistoric assimilation of **-C+ha* (see Luwian *-ḫa* 'also, and'). After vowels 'also, and' appears as *-ya.* This clitic must not be confused with the postconsonantal clitic *-a* of OH that does *not* geminate a preceding consonant. See §§29.24, 29.25 (p. 395).

1.114. Addition of *-a* 'and' to a sg. nom. in /-ants/ (spelled *-an-za*) leads to [-ants.sa], spelled *-an-za-*(*aš-*)*ša* (HE §25b).

1.115. In OH and MH the clitic 'and' appended to a logogram was attached to its last consonant (i.e., on the case ending): LUGAL-*ša* (= *ḫaššuš* + *-a*) 'and the king'. In NH the scribal habit changed: the case ending no longer occurred on the phonetic complement, and the clitic took the form *-ya*: LUGAL-*ya* 'and the king (nom.)'.

1.116. When the clitic 'and' occurs on ablatives, the endings *-az-zi-ya* and *-ez-zi-ya*[77] are not to be interpreted as *. . .*az=ya* or *. . .*ez=ya.* The *i* is rather a genuine reflex in protected non-final position of the earlier ablative ending **-ati* > *-azzi* > *-az* (§3.32, p. 76): *ḫūmandazzi=ya* KUB 26.1+ i 27 and ^{TÚG}*termazzi=ya* KUB 22.70 obv. 56, UN-*azzi=ya* (i.e., *antuḫšazzi=ya*) ibid. 57. There are rare examples of this earlier, longer ablative even in final, unprotected position: *kēzzi* KBo 4.2 iii 14 and *kuēzzi* HKM 24:45 (MH/MS), KUB 15.34 iii 43 (MH/MS), KUB 16.39 ii 13, KBo 4.9 vi 6, 10 (for expected *kez* and *kuez*) (Sommer and Ehelolf 1924: 29).

---

75. The aberrant hapax sg. gen. *ḫuittaš* with its geminate *-tt-* remains problematic, despite the efforts of Carruba (1966a: 18–19 n. 27). Luwian influence is also possible for the unusual MH variant *ḫannetnit* for regular *ḫannešnit* (see AHP 272–73 with reference to Čop for an apparent change *sn-* > *-tn-* in Luwian; and compare the Southern American English pronunciation [ɪdnɪt] for 'isn't it').

76. We disagree with the proposed restoration [. . . . . *ḫu-*]*ú-e-et-na-aš* in KUB 1.16 ii 46 (HED H 353), which would assign the only occurrence to date of *wetna-* to *ḫuedar* 'wildlife'.

77. As in *kez . . . kezzi=ya*.

1.117. Some cases of *z* before or after a nasal may stand for a voiced fricative [z] resulting from voicing assimilation of *s* (see §1.136, p. 47).

1.118. *nm* > *mm* At clitic boundaries *n* may assimilate to immediately following *m*, producing a geminate consonant that is occasionally reduced to a single *m*:[78] *ad-dam-ma-an* < *attan=man* 'my father' (sg. acc.) KBo 3.44:9; *tu-ek-kam-ma-an* < *tuekkan=man* 'my body' KUB 30.10 obv. 14, ÌR.MEŠ-*am-ma-an* < ÌR.MEŠ-*an=man* 'of my servants' KBo 3.27 obv. 10; *ma-a-am-ma-an* < *mān=man* KUB 30.10 obv. 22; not graphically geminate *ša-aḫ-ḫa-me-et* < *šaḫḫan=met* 'my obligation for *šaḫḫan*-services' KBo 6.2 + KBo 19.1 ii 19 (Laws §40, OS), *la-a-am-ma-a-mi-it* < *lāman=mit* 'my name' KUB 1.16 iii 13 (OH/NS).

1.119. *nš* > *šš* The assimilation of *nš* to *šš* at clitic boundaries is fairly common already in OH (Otten and Souček 1969: 57–58): *e-er-ma-aš-me-et* (< *ērman=šmet*), *er-ma-aš-ma-aš-kán* (< *erman=šmaš=kan*), *an-na-aš-ma-an-na* (< *annan=šmann=a*), *ḫa-tu-ga/ka-aš-me-et*, *da-a-aḫ-ḫu-uš-ma-aš-ta* < *dāḫḫun=šmaš=šta.* The resulting geminate is regularly spelled as such between vowels but is occasionally reduced to *š*: *an-na-aš-ša-an*, *pé-e-ra-aš-ši-it*, [*tar-l*]*i-pa-aš-ša-an*, *kar-di-mi-ya-at-ta-aš-ša-an*, and *na-aš-ša-an*, but ^{d}*ši-ú-šum-m*[*i-in*] < ^{d}*šiun=šummin* 'our deity' KBo 3.22:39 (OS); ^{d}*ši-ú-šu*[*m-*(*mi-in*)] ibid. 41. Less usual, *nš* > *z*: *pé-e-ra-az-mi-it* (< *pēran=šmit*) (OS). Beginning in MH, one finds back-forms in which the *n* was secondarily restored: *na-an-ša-an*, *ma-a-an-ši*, *ma-aḫ-ḫa-an-ša-ma-aš*, *pé-ra-an-ši-it*.

1.120. An assimilation *nš* > *šš* is also seen in the *-ške*-suffix forms of some roots ending in *-n-*: *ku*(*w*)*aške-* to *kuen-* 'to kill'. Some other verbs showing earlier assimilated forms, such as imperfective stems *ḫaššike-* (< *ḫanna-* 'to judge'[79]) and *taršike-* and *tar*(*a*)*ške-* (< *tarna-* 'to let'; Otten 1969: 5 with n. 4), occasionally later developed more "regular," unassimilated forms: *ḫanneške-* and *tarneške-*. The unassimilated sequence *nš* is rare in Hittite: *a-an-ši* 'he wipes' (and other forms of this verb *anš-*), the noun *anšaššiwi-* 'corpse(?)'.

1.121. An *n* can arise where it is etymologically unjustified by remote assimilation to another nasal preceding or following in the word (Oettinger 1994; Kimball 1999: 318–19): *ḫaššannanza* for *ḫaššannaz* 'from the family', *tetḫešnanza* 'with thunder',[80] *ḫantešnaz* 'from the hole' for *ḫattešnaz*, *naḫšarantan* for *naḫšarattan* 'fear' (sg. acc. of *naḫšaratt-*), *li-in-kán-ta* KUB 13.35 i 9 for correct *li-in-kat-ta* 'he swore' (HE §31b); *tanantezzi* for *tannattezzi* or *tannatteszi* 'it will be laid waste' (Riemschneider 1970: 32). See further §4.110 (p. 129).

---

78. Goetze 1930b: 5–6, with many exx.; HE §§31, 36. But the claim for *ḫalkim pianzi* (with dupl. *ḫalkin pianzi*) in Laws §112 has recently been rightly questioned by Otten (1990), who argues from a duplicate that *ḫal-ki-im* should be read *ḪAL-QÍ-IM,* i.e., as an Akkadian genitive.

79. Kept distinct from *ḫaške-,* the imperfective stem of *ḫaš*(*š*)- 'to give birth' and *ḫaleške-,* that of *ḫaš*(*š*)-/*ḫeš-* 'to open'.

80. For an alternate account of the ablatives in *-anza* see Jasanoff 1973.

1.122. *mn* > *mmn* > *mm* *m* is geminated before *n* (spelled -Vm-nV- or -Vm-mV-nV-) and then the sequence *-mmn-* is often simplified to *-mm-* (see AHP 152–53 with refs.) and even written *-m-* (as in *šu-mu-ma-aḫ* 'unite!' in KUB 29.1 ii 43; see §2.47, p. 60): pl. d.-l. of $^{\text{NINDA}}$*šaram*(*a*)*n-* (a type of bread) is *ša-ra-am-na-aš*, *ša-ra-am-ma-na-aš*, and *ša-ra-am-ma-aš* (see §4.69, p. 108); with the suffix *-uman-* (§2.45, p. 60) we find $^{\text{URU}}$*Šutummanaš* 'the man of Šuta' and *tameummaḫḫ-* 'to make (of) another' and *tameummešš-* 'to become (of) another' from the adjective *tameum*(*a*)*n-* '(belonging to) another'.

1.123. *mn* > *nn* does not exist in Hittite. The genitive *ḫilannaš* in Laws §82 and §89 was derived by Friedrich (1959) from *ḫilamnaš*, genitive of *ḫilammar* 'portico', but by Laroche (1957a: 18–19) from unattested **ḫilatar*. The former solution is unlikely, since one would have to assume *mn* > *mm* and *mn* > *nn* in the same language during the same time period.

1.124. Possible partial assimilations such as *nt* > *nd* are masked by the lack of a means in Hittite cuneiform for showing the voiced-voiceless distinction in the obstruents when they directly follow another consonant (*-an-ta-* and *-an-da-* are in free variation).

Dissimilatory Changes

1.125. *dt*/*tt* > *zt* Hittite preserves a PIE rule by which the first of two dental stops is dissimilated to an affricate [ts].[81] It is by this change, e.g., that /e:d-tu/ 'let him eat' appears as [e:tstu], spelled *e-ez-*(*za*)*-du* or redundantly as *e-ez-za-aš-du* (see §12.3 [p. 187] for further examples). This affricate was also retained even in cases where the following dental stop was itself assibilated to an affricate, producing an unusual geminate affricate. Thus /e:d-tsi/ 'he eats' appears as [e:ts.tsi], spelled *e*(*-ez*)*-za-*(*az-*)*zi*.

1.126. *uw* > *um* A word-internal sequence *-uw-* is dissimilated to *-um-*,[82] as seen in the first-plural verbal endings *-mani*, *-meni*, and *-men*[83] and the verbal substantive ending *-mar* and infinitive ending *-manzi* (see §§25.2–25.3, p. 330), which take the place of regular *-wani*, *-weni*, *-wen*, *-war*, and *-wanzi* in the *nu*-causative verbs (HE §29a; Otten and Souček 1969: 78–79): *warnu-* + *-weni* > *warnu*(*m*)*meni*, in the verb *au-*/*u-* 'to see' in *umeni* 'we see' and *aumen* 'we saw' (OS), *ešḫarnu-* + *-wāi-* > *ešḫarnumāi-* 'make blood-red' (Melchert 1984b: 27), and possibly also in the bird name *tarumaki-* 'woodpecker(?)' from *taru-* 'wood, tree' + *waki-* (see *wak-* 'to bite') (see also below p. 63, n. 28, §11.22 [p. 186], §§12.44–12.47 [pp. 210–211]). This dissimilation also affects the secondary sequence *-uw-* in forms like *tarnum*(*m*)*eni* 'we leave' < *tarn-uweni* to *tarn*(*a*)- 'to leave'. For the source of *-uw-* in these cases see §1.82 (p. 34). Third-plural present forms like *arnuwanzi* and participles like *arnuwant-* are not counter-examples, since

81. This rule is usually characterized as "*s*-epenthesis," but as per Weriand Merlingen and others is more accurately viewed as dissimilation (see Melchert 2003c: 154, with references).

82. Kammenhuber 1969b: 137; Melchert 1984b: 22–27. Observed already by HE §29.

83. Already in OS in *a-ú-me-en*.

these represent *arnu-* + *-anzi*/*-ant-* without inherent *-w-*, and the rule does not apply to a secondary *-w-* inserted to fill a "hiatus" in a sequence *-uV-*. The rule also does not apply in secondary sequences of *-uw-* occurring at a clitic boundary, thus *pāndu=wa=z ašandu* KBo 3.1+ ii 13 (ed. THeth 11:28–29).

1.127. *wu* > *mu* *idālu-* 'bad' forms its pl. nom. com. as *idālaweš*, but its acc. pl. com. as *idālamuš*,[84] and the pl. acc. com. of *newa-* 'new' is *ne-mu-uš*. Similarly, in texts from MH into the 13th century the pl. acc. of *šiu-* 'deity, god' is DINGIR.MEŠ-*mu-uš* (= *šimuš* < *šiwuš*) (Neu 1974: 121–22 with notes). Along with HE (§§29, 75, 169, 174) and Otten and Souček (1969: 57), we regard this as a true dissimilatory sound change ("Lautwechsel") against Neu (1974: 121–22), who maintains that this writing is a "graphic substitute" ("Ersatzschreibung") and indicates a pronunciation /siwus/, not /simus/. See other unusual pl. acc. com. forms such as *zašḫimuš* 'dreams' (< *zašḫai-*), *laḫḫemuš* 'errands, trips' (< *laḫḫa-*?), *šallamuš* < *šalli-* 'big' (see p. 95, n. 76).

1.128. The opposite of remote assimilation, namely, remote *dissimilation* (Oettinger 1994: 310–14), occurs in the following examples:

1. *n—m* > *l—m* *lāman* 'name' (< pre-OH **nāman*), *lammar* 'hour' (< pre-OH **nammar*), perhaps also *lē* 'let not' (< pre-Hittite **nē*) arising from combinations *lē=man* and *lē=mu*.
2. *m—n* > *m—l* *irmanant-* 'having sickness' (§2.24, p. 56) > *irmalant-* 'sick, ill'.
3. *l—l* > *l—r* *ḫapalzil* (kind of stew?) > *ḫapalzir*.
4. *r—r* > *r—n* **urāri* > OH *ú-ra-a-ni* and post-OH *wa-ra-a-ni* 'it burns', and *wa-ra-a-nu* 'let it burn' from the verbal stem *war-* and the medio-passive endings *-ari* and *-aru*.

Loss (Deletion) of Consonants

1.129. There are some examples of sporadic loss of stops in the middle of sequences involving sonorants: e.g., *kišnu-* (2×) for */kistnu-/* (usually written *kištanu-*) 'to extinguish', *ḫinnuzi* for *ḫinganuzi* (/hinknutsi/) 'makes to bow', *ḫamanzi* for *ḫamangazi* (/hamanktsi/)'intertwines'. For further examples, see AHP 166–67. There are too many examples for them all to be due to scribal errors.

1.130. There are genuine examples of sporadic loss of /s/ before /ts/: *a-ar-zi* for *a-ar-aš-zi*, *pa-ap-pár-zi* for *pa-ap-pár-aš-zi*, *ták-ki-iz-zi* for *ták-ki-iš-zi*, *ta-pu-uz-za* for *ta-pu-uš-za*. For reasons against assuming this loss in pres. sg. 3 verb forms in *-e*(*z*)*zi* (Riemschneider 1970: 65), see Watkins (1973), who showed that these belong to stative verbs in *-e-* (§10.11, p. 177).

1.131. There are a few instances that suggest a genuine if sporadic deletion of *ḫ* next to stop: *idālawatti* beside *idālawaḫti* 'you harm', and *warput* for expected **warpḫut* 'Bathe!' for which Neu (1968b: 191) compares *ši-ip-pa-an-du-un* Bo 2738 iv 5 (now

84. Goetze 1927: 120 n. 4; Sommer and Falkenstein 1938: 76 n. 1; HE §29b; Melchert 1984b: 22–23.

KUB 58.79 iv 5) for regular *ši-ip-pa-an-da-aḫ-ḫu-un* (/sipandhun/). For *ēšḫar* and genitive *ešnaš* see §4.102 (p. 126).

1.132. There was a weak articulation of intervocalic and preconsonantal *r*, causing sporadic nonrepresentation in writing (HW §30b; EHS 65–70; AHP 125). Intervocalic: *pé-an* for *pé-ra-an* 'before', ^{TÚG}*kueššar* for ^{TÚG}*kureššar* (a garment), *pu-u-ut* for *purut* 'mud'. Preconsonantal: *waggantеš* for *warkanteš* 'fat ones', *artati-* for *artarti-* 'mushroom(?)'. To these one might also add: *naḫšarnuške=wa*[*r=an kuieš*] *uritenuške=war=an kuieš* '[those who] were frightening [him], those who were terrifying him' KUB 60.157 iii 7–8, where one expects the third preterite plural ending *-er*. The loss in this case and in *a*(*r*)*tarti-* may be dissimilatory, but the loss of *r* before *w* could also be compared with *nw* > *w* (§1.135). This might explain the use of the prop vowel *i* in *kaniriwant-* 'thirsty' (Elisabeth Rieken, pers. comm.). The appearance of the quotation particle as *-wa-* before a consonant may be a regularization of the preconsonantal loss of *r* (see §28.4, p. 354).

1.133. Final *r* was lost prehistorically in final position after an unaccented vowel (Neu 1982; Melchert 1988b; Yoshida 1990: 108–12). Most cases of preserved final *-ar* reflect original syllabic **r̥*. Old Hittite reflects this contrast in plural *paprāta* beside singular *paprātar* 'impurity', *mīyata* alongside *miyātar* 'prosperity', *ḫatrešša* alongside *ḫatreššar* 'message', *kušduwāta* 'slanders, false accusations', *šullāta* 'disrespectful acts'; *ḫa-an-ne-eš-ša-še-et*, [*pár-t*]*a-a-u-wa-aš-ši-it-wa*, *ḫa-at-ta-ta-mi-it*. Compare also plural ^{UZU}*ḫappešša* (also written ^{UZU}ÚR.ḪI.A-*ša*) alongside singular ^{UZU}*ḫappeššar* 'body part'. This occurs even when the "final" *r* is protected by a suffix: *ḫattata=mit* 'my wisdom' (Sommer and Falkenstein 1938: 179). This loss probably also accounts for the appearance of the quotation particle *-war* as *-wa* in final position (see §28.4, p. 354) (cf. Goetze and Pedersen 1934: 30–32; Sommer and Falkenstein 1938: 66).

1.134. A prehistoric loss of intervocalic **y* is still reflected in the oblique forms of *i*-stem adjectives such as sg. gen. *šallaš* (see Sommer 1932: 357 with lit., Melchert 1984b: 44–45, and §4.37, p. 94) and in OH medio-passives such as *ne*(*-e*)*-a* 'turns' (see §1.142, p. 48).

1.135. In certain circumstances *n* is lost before immediately following *ḫ*, *k*, *t*, *w*, or *z* (Kimball 1999: 316–19; see also Goetze 1930b: 5–6, with many exx.; HE §§31 and 36). **ḫ:** *ša-a-aḫ* (imp.) for *ša-an-aḫ* 'seek'; **k:** *ḫi-kán-ni* KBo 3.36 i 9 for *ḫinkani*, *li-ku-wa-an-ni* KUB 9.31 i 42 for *linkueni* 'we will swear', *ma-an-ni-ku-wa-an* IBoT 1.36 i 17 (MH/MS) for *manninkuwan* 'near', *pa-ga-u-wa-aš* KUB 24.13 iii 23 for *pangawaš* 'of the multitude', $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$*ša-ku-ni-e-eš* KUB 39.71 i 5 as plural of ^{LÚ}*šankunni* 'priest', *za-ki-la-tar* KUB 42.91 iii 8 for *zankilatar* 'compensation'; **t:** *ḫu-u-ma-da-az* KUB 13.2 iii 35 (MH/NS) alongside *ḫūmandaz*, *ú-e-eš-ša-ta* HT 1:30 with dupl. *ú-e-eš-ša-an-ta* KUB 9.31 i 37 'they clothe themselves', *iš-ḫu-uz-zi-ya-te-eš* KUB 9.31 i 39 with dupl. *iš-ḫu-uz-zi-ya-an-te-eš* HT 1 i 32 'belted', *ši-ip-pa-ti* KUB 6.46 i 60, 64 (NH) for *sippanti* 'he offers'; also across word boundary: *ki-iš-ša te-ez-zi* 'thus he says' (for *kiššan tezzi*) (Kümmel 1967: 17); **w:** *ma-a-wa* < *mān=wa* 'when/if (+ quotation particle)' KUB

36.45:2 and passim; **z:** *li-in-ga-zi* < *linkanzi* ‘they swear’, *ša-an-ḫa-zi* < *šanḫanzi* ‘they seek’; UN.MEŠ-*an-na-za* < *antuḫšannanza* (ergative of *antuḫšātar*) KUB 1.1 i 30. Since these spellings alternate with ones showing the *n*, it is possible that the nasalization was preserved in the preceding *a* vowel and not entirely lost. We cannot decide this question from the orthography.[85] In any case, the alternate spellings without *n* are too frequent to be emended as scribal errors. LÚ*ḫalugatallattin* < *ḫalugatallan=tin* ‘your messenger’ in VBoT 1 obv. 19 may show the same loss or instead assimilation of *-nt-* to *-tt-* at a clitic boundary. See for such assimilations §§1.118–1.119 (p. 43) and §6.5 (p. 140).

Epenthesis

1.136. A secondary sequence [ns], usually resulting from an earlier syllabic nasal plus *s*, appears in Hittite as *nz*, contrasting with assimilation of original */VnsV/ to /VssV/ (AHP 121): **n̥sós* > **ansás* > *anzāš* ‘us’. Similarly, liquid (*l* or *r*) + *š* alternates with liquid + *z* in some cases: d*Gulšeš* and (verb) *gulš-* alongside noun *gulzi-*, nom. *gulzatar* IBoT 3.101 obv. 4, abl. *gulzattanaz*; as well as in *maršaštarri-* and *marzaštarri-*, d*Paḫḫurzeš* and d*Paḫḫuršeš*, *piršaḫḫanna* and *pirzaḫḫanna*, É*arzana* and É*aršana*, *naḫzi* and *naḫši* (Carruba 1966a: 36; AHP 121), *guršipi-* and *gurzippant-*. The status of the *z* in such examples is not clear. It may stand for [ts], reflecting epenthesis of *t* in sequences of sonorant plus *s* (AHP 121), or it may represent a voiced fricative [z], showing sporadic *assimilation* of [s] to the preceding sonorant. The latter alternative is supported by the alternation of *š* and *z* in *š*(*a*)*mankurwant-* ‘bearded’ and *z*(*a*)*mankur* ‘beard’ (AHP 94), which appears to show sporadic assimilation of [sm-] to [zm-] (contra AHP 172). See Oettinger (1994: 322), however, for an explanation of *z*(*a*)*mankur* in terms of epenthesis.

Other Alternations

1.137. The apparent word-internal alternation of *š* and *z* in *zašḫai-* and *zazḫai-* ‘dream’(HE §27 c, with literature) is to be interpreted as showing alternate graphic representations of initial /tsh-/, i.e., a sequence of affricate [ts] + fricative [x] (Elisabeth Rieken, pers. comm.). Likewise, initial *zašk*/*g-* represents /tsk-/: (1) in the rare imperfective stem *zaške-* to *dai-* ‘to put’ (see p. 34, n. 60) without anaptyxis vs. regular *zikke-*; (2) in *zašgaraiš* ‘anus’ (lit., ‘feces-mouth’). In the latter, original initial **sk-* has for some unknown reason become /tsk-/ instead of regular *išk-* with prothesis (see *išgašuwant-* ‘covered with dung’). The same development is seen in *z*(*a*)*kkar* beside regular *šakkar* ‘dung’ (see AHP 121).

1.138. One occasionally finds *k* for *ḫ* and vice-versa when either is in contact with a sibilant, an interchange that suggests a partial neutralization in this environment:

85. Possible support for the presence of a nasalized vowel may be found in the spelling *ge-em-zu* (KBo 5.3 i 24) for *ge-en-zu* ‘lap; mercy’, where an etymological *m* is extremely unlikely (see Weitenberg 1984: 165). The example *ḫu-in-pa-an* (KUB 33.36 iii 4) for usual *ḫu-im-pa-an* suggests the same reduction to a nasalized vowel also before a labial stop.

ḫameškanza for *ḫamešḫanza* 'spring', but also ^{UZU}*išḫiša-* for ^{UZU}*iškiša-* 'back' KUB 33.112 iv 14 (HE §28a), $^{MUNUS.MEŠ}$*ḫazḫara-* for $^{MUNUS.MEŠ}$*ḫazkara-*[86] and *išḫaruḫ-* for *iškaruḫ-* (Kronasser 1966: 98; Kümmel 1967: 109). More doubtful is the equivalence of *ta-aḫ-ša-at-ta-ri* and **takšattari* (Kümmel 1967: 109).

1.139. The sequence *nunu* can appear haplologically as *nu* in: *kištanun* KUB 27.67 iii 11 for **kištanunun* 'I extinguished', *mernun* KUB 13.35 i 28 for **mernunun* 'I caused to disappear'. Such haplology is not, however, limited to *nunu*: *kap-pu-u-wa-ar* 'counting' HKM 21:6 (MH/MS) < **kappuwawar, arkuwar* 'plea' < **arkuwawar.* On haplology at Maşat see Hoffner forthcoming.

1.140. Metathesis of *š* and *p* is possible in the passage of Akkadian loan ^{LÚ}*A-ŠI-PU* into Hittite ^{LÚ}*a-pí-ši-* (§4.16, p. 86) (Kümmel 1967: 95–96), as well as Akkadian/Hurrian and Hittite *guršip-/gurzip-/gurpiši-* (Kümmel 1967: 105–6). Metathesis of *š* and *r* is attested in the alternation *ašara/i-* and *araša/i-* (HED A 128–29). Forms like OH *e-uk-ši* 'you drink' alternating with post-OH *e-ku-uš-ši* (/ek^{w}si/) reflect not metathesis but the uncertainty of the scribes as to how to write a unitary labio-velar consonant [k^{w}]. See also *tar-uk-zi* for /tark^{w}zi/, elsewhere written *tar-ku*(*-uz*)*-zi.*

Phonotactics

1.141. Consonants. All voiceless obstruents, both glides (*w* and *y*), and all sonorants except *r* occur word-initially (on the neutralization of voicing in word-initial and word-final stops see §1.86, p. 36). The affricate /ts/ and the fricative /s/ appear freely in word-final position; /h/ occurs principally in the imperative second singular of verbs with stems ending in *ḫ.* Word-final /n/, /l/, and /r/ are common; there is no final /m/. The glides /y/ and /w/ occur word-finally if one interprets diphthongs as consisting of vowel plus glide. The nature of the cuneiform writing system makes it difficult to determine the status of consonantal sequences. For a mere attempt to sketch some of the possibilities see AHP 110–14.

1.142. Vowels. Most Hittite vowels occur freely in word-initial and word-final position. For possible restrictions see AHP 114. *Hiatus*—i.e., a sequence of two vowels not forming a diphthong—is relatively rare in Hittite. The most certain common example is the sequence [-e.a-] in cases such as *ne-*(*e-*)*a*(*-ri*) 'turns' and KUR-*e-aš* 'of the lands'. But there is a tendency for this hiatus to be filled with *-y-,* and one also frequently finds forms such as *ne-ya-ri* and *ut-ne-ya-aš* (see Melchert 1984b: 46–47, with references). Still another likely case consists of the sequences *-a-*(*e-*)*eš* and *-a-uš* in the pl. nom. and acc. com. of *i*-stem adjectives with ablaut (§3.37, p. 78), such as *šal-la-*(*e-*)*eš* and *šal-la-uš* 'great'. They are *probably* pronounced as [sal.la.e:s] and [sal.la.us], but absolute proof is not possible. For other, more dubious cases see AHP 115. For the adjective *šu-u*(*-ú-uš*) 'full' see §1.8, p. 12.

86. For this and some other examples as reflecting a change *kr* > *hr* see now Oettinger 2000a.

1.143. It is impossible to determine whether sequences of /i/ and /u/ followed without written glide by a different vowel are always *pronounced* with an intervening glide as [iyV] and [uwV] or are sometimes pronounced with hiatus as [iV] and [uV]. The spelling *ši-eš-ša-ni-it* alongside *ši-i-e-eš-ša-ni-it* for 'with beer' (ins.) may represent a genuine alternate pronunciation [si.e:ssniT] alongside [siye:ssniT] or merely another spelling for the latter. Likewise, *kap-pu-ez-zi* alongside *kap-pu-u-*(*e*)*-ez-zi* 'counts' may stand for [kapu.e:tsi] or [kapuwe:tsi], and *pa-ri-an* alongside *pa-ri-ya-an* for [pari.an] or [pariyan].[87] The occasional insertion of a glide in vowel sequences at clitic boundary (e.g., *ták-ku-wa-at* KBo 6.2 ii 35 [OS] for *takku=at* or *ša-aḫ-ḫa-ni-ya-aš* Ḫatt. iv 85 [NH] for *šaḫḫani=aš*) also does not prove that all such sequences were pronounced with an inserted glide.

Onomatopoeia

1.144. Onomatopoeia is difficult to identify, even in a living language. Nevertheless, there are nouns for natural phenomena (storms), animals, or musical instruments that appear to imitate the sounds made: *ḫaršiḫarši-* 'thunderstorm', *akuwakuwa-* (name of a small amphibian), *šaluwašaluwa-* and *kallikalli-* (names of birds named for the repeated call they make), *ḫuḫupal-* (percussion instrument; see §2.19, p. 54), *galgalturi-* (percussion instrument). These examples share the feature of reduplication (§§2.56–2.57, p. 62), a universal characteristic of onomatopoetic words. A few of the reduplicated verbal stems (§§10.3–10.5, pp. 173–174) may therefore imitate the sounds they denote, such as *ḫaḫḫarš-* 'to laugh', *tetḫa-* 'to thunder', and *taštašiya-* 'to whisper'.[88] Compare the archer-hunter who utters the repetitive cry *ee ee* of his prey (§24.11, p. 320, and §1.8, p. 12).

Accent

1.145. Our knowledge of the Hittite accent is quite limited. Some scholars have proposed that plene spellings (see §1.46, p. 25) directly mark the position of the accent (Hart 1980; Carruba 1981). However, we subscribe to the view that plene spellings for the most part directly indicate vowel length. Nevertheless, vowel length may indirectly show the place of the accent in that prehistoric long vowels were preserved and short vowels lengthened under the accent (see, e.g., Kimball 1983; Eichner 1980 150–64). Drawing inferences about the accent in this way faces several problems. First, the use of plene spellings is far from consistent. Second, it is by no means assured that indication of vowel length is the only function of plene spellings (again see §1.46, p. 25).[89] Third, there is no guarantee that the accent in attested Hittite has consistently remained

87. To further complicate matters, in many instances we also cannot exclude that it is the high *vowel* that is lacking: either *ši-eš-ni-it* or *ši-i-e-eš-ša-ni-it* (or both) could represent spoken [sye:ssniT].

88. For an onomatopoetic verb 'to whistle' in Hattic see Singer 2002a.

89. It at least seems clear that, when a word contains *two* plene spellings, one of the instances cannot reflect the accent: e.g., *idālawēš* 'evil' (pl. nom. com.). Such examples are far from rare.

in the prehistoric position which led to the supposed lengthening effects. In sum, there is a high degree of circularity in the reasoning just described. All statements about the position of the accent in Hittite should be viewed with this caveat in mind.

1.146. There are a significant number of examples in both nominal and verbal inflection where the position of the Hittite accent as reflected by plene spellings matches that reconstructed for Proto-Indo-European and where, consequently, it is widely assumed that Hittite has preserved the inherited accentual pattern. For example, Hittite sg. nom.-acc. *tēkan* vs. sg. gen. *taknāš*, sg. d.-l. *taknī* 'earth' (see §4.71, p. 110) appears to continue directly PIE **dhéĝhōm* vs. **dhĝh-′* with mobile accent (for the PIE inflection of 'earth' see Schindler 1967). Likewise, *ēšzi* 'is' vs. *ašānt-* 'being' < **h₁ésti* vs. **h₁sónt-* (see Oettinger 1979: 86–98). For the accompanying stem variation known as "ablaut" see §3.37, p. 78). We will call attention to cases on which there is widespread agreement, but readers should not infer that there is any consensus on the position of the accent in general.

Chapter 2
NOUN AND ADJECTIVE FORMATION

2.1. The Hittite lexicon includes the following parts of speech: nouns, adjectives, pronouns, numbers, verbs, adverbs, postpositions, conjunctions, and particles.[1] Of these, only nouns, adjectives, and verbs show productive patterns of stem formation.[2]

2.2. Nominal and verbal stem formation in Hittite, as in other older Indo-European languages, generally consists of *addition* of a derivational suffix to a root or to a stem consisting of a root plus one or more suffixes: e.g., *ḫark-* 'to perish' > *ḫark-a-* 'ruin, destruction' and > *ḫark-nu-* 'to cause to perish, destroy'; *išpant-* 'to libate' > *išpant-uzzi-* 'libation' > *išpantuzzi-aššar-* 'libation vessel'. However, Hittite also shows significant traces of the PIE phenomenon widely known as the "Caland System" (see Meier-Brügger 2000: 271–72, 2003: 288–91). However it is to be explained historically, this process appears descriptively as derivation by *substitution*: i.e., the (final) suffix of the base is deleted with the addition of another suffix. This happens most typically when the base is an adjective, and Hittite shows many cases with stems in *-u-*, *-i-*, and *-ant-*.[3] Examples with *-u-*: *park-u-* 'high' > *parg-ašti-* and *parg-atar* 'height', also *park-nu-* 'to make high' and *park-ešš-* 'to become high, tall'. Examples with *-i-*: *palḫ-i-* 'wide' > *palḫ-ašti-*, *palḫ-atar* and *palḫ-eššar* 'width', also *palḫ-ešš-* 'to become wide'; *parku-i-* 'pure, clear' > *parku-e-* 'to become clear' and *parku-nu-* 'to purify'. Examples with *-ant-*: *ḫappin-ant-* 'rich' > *ḫappin-aḫḫ-* 'to make rich' and *ḫappin-ešš-* 'to become rich'; *papr-ant-* 'impure, guilty' > *papr-e-* 'to be proven guilty by ordeal'. On the model of the examples with *-ant-*, Hittite also extended this pattern to the suffix *-want-* (see Melchert 1984a: 80): *mišri-want-* 'splendid, perfect' was reinterpreted as *mišriw-ant-* before *-ant-* was deleted in the formation of *mišriw-aḫḫ-* 'to make splendid, perfect'. For more examples see the respective paragraphs on specific nominal and verbal derivational suffixes. Since the pattern with substitution was synchronically irregular for (pre-)Hittite speakers, suffix addition—not replacement—being the *regular* pattern, one also predictably finds examples of the same suffixes with the regular process of addition: *ḫatku-* 'narrow' > *ḫatku-ešš-* 'to become narrow', *uktūri-* 'long-lasting' > *uktūri*(*y*)*-aḫḫ-*

1. Negations (such as 'not') and preverbs (such as 'up, down') are here subsumed under adverbs, although in the body of this grammar the latter will often be referred to under the more explicit term "preverb."

2. For verbal stem formation see chapter 10.

3. Our goal here is to describe the situation within Hittite. We make no attempt to distinguish between inherited examples and innovative examples modeled on the former.

'to make long-lasting' *nakkī-* 'important' > *nakki(y)-atar* 'importance, dignity', *mayant-* 'young' > *maya(n)d-atar* 'youth' and *mayant-aḫḫ-* 'to make young'.

2.3. Noun and adjective stems can be subdivided into derived and underived. In using the term "underived," we intend no claim as to the word's status in pre-Hittite—only that *within the historical period* of Hittite there existed no more basic form from which the word in question was derived. We also include possible loanwords in this category, since they too bear no Hittite derivational suffix. What follows is a brief orientation to the most important classes of underived stems and a survey of productive suffixes. The last comprehensive treatment of Hittite nominal stem formation is EHS. See also the valuable discussions of selected stem classes in Weitenberg 1984 and Rieken 1999a.

Underived Stems

2.4. The largest class of underived stems ends in *-a-* (see EHS 165–66). A few of these continue PIE *o*-stems (Kammenhuber 1969c: 279–80; Szemerényi 1996: 182–85; Meier-Brügger 2000, 2003: F309, F311). The majority of adjectives in PIE were *o*-stems (Meier-Brügger 2000: 201; 2003: 218), which are continued by Hittite *a*-stems.

2.5. Many common gender nouns denoting body parts are *a*-stem nouns: *antaka-* 'loins(?)' (see Melchert 2003a), *arra-* 'anus', *e/inera-* 'eyebrow', *ḫaršana-* 'head' (also an *r/n*-stem *ḫaršar*, *ḫaršanaš*), *ištamana-* 'ear', *kaka-* 'tooth', *kalulupa-* 'digit', *keššara-* 'hand' (also an *r*-stem), *lala-* 'tongue', *laplipa-* 'eyelid', *paltana-* 'shoulder', *pantuḫa-* 'bladder(?)', *pappaššala-* 'esophagus', *pata-* 'foot', *patalḫa-* 'sole of the foot', *tetana-* 'hair.' Likely also belonging here are *anašša-* 'upper back(?)' and *titita-* 'nose', for which no gender-specific forms are yet attested.

2.6. Other common gender *a*-stem nouns with no apparent derivational suffix are: *aška-* 'gate', *irḫa-* 'border, boundary', *laḫḫa-* 'campaign', *nata-* 'reed; arrow', *palzaḫḫa-* 'statue base, pedestal', *nega-* 'sister', *negna-* 'brother' (logograms ŠEŠ and *AḪU*), *dammešḫa-* 'oppression, injury', *tešḫa-* 'sleep', etc.

2.7. Underived *a*-stem adjectives include: *āndara-* 'blue', *arawa-* 'free, exempt', *kunna-* 'righthand', *marša-* 'false, deceitful', *nēwa-* 'new' and *pittalwa-* 'plain, simple'. For their inflection see §4.10 (p. 83).

2.8. Assured loanwords among common gender *a*-stems are relatively few: for example, ^{É}*arzana-* < Akkadian *arzannu* 'groats' (Hoffner 1974), $^{LÚ.SANGA}$*kumra-* < Old Assyrian *kumru* (Otten 1990b) = ^{LÚ}GUDU$_{12}$ (Hoffner 1996a). Less certain are: ^{LÚ}*ḫatwaya-* (a cult functionary), perhaps < Hattic *ḫatweš* (Soysal 2004: 17, 145, 279, 456), ^{É}*kippa-* 'reed hut' < Sumerian (É.)GI.PAD (see Taracha 2001), and *šipa-* (a secretion or infection of the eye) < Akk. *šīpu* (see Fincke 2000).

2.9. Because in post-OH many nouns which were originally not *i*-stems took on *i*-stem appearance in the nominative and accusative due to the so-called *i*-mutation (see

§4.17, p. 86), we limit our list of underived *-i*-stems here to those that show exclusively *i*-stem inflection.

2.10. Among nouns identifiable in this manner are: (common gender) *auli-* 'artery(?), sacrificial animal', *ḫalki-* 'grain, barley', *ḫurki-* 'wheel', *išmeri-* 'rein', *kalmi-* 'wooden log, thunderbolt(?)', *kappāni-* 'caraway seed, cumin', *karpi-* 'anger', *kurakki-* 'pillar', *lūli-* 'pond, cistern', *pūri-* 'lip', *tuzzi-* 'army', and *zakki-* 'latch'; (neuter gender) *elzi-* 'scales', *ḫaḫ(ḫa)ri-* 'lung, diaphragm', *ḫāli-* 'corral, pen', *ḫuwaši-* 'stela', *kenupi-* 'pottery, earthenware', *kullupi-* 'sickle', *luzzi-* 'forced labor, corvée'.

2.11. Underived *i*-stem adjectives include: *ḫuelpi-* 'fresh, young', *kappi-* 'small', *nakkī-* 'heavy; difficult', *ukturi-* 'lasting, durable'.

2.12. The majority of assured loanwords appear in Hittite as *i*-stems. Common gender examples: *aganni-* (a container) < Akk. *agannu*, ^{LÚ}*apiši-* (incantation priest) < Akk. *āšipu* (with metathesis), *kakkari-* (a kind of bread loaf) < Akk. *kakkaru, nura(n)ti-*, 'pomegranate' < Akk. *lurindu* (**nurindu*), *šankunni-* 'priest' < Akk. *šangû* < Sum. sanga (with possible stem influence from Hurrian as the intermediary of the loan?), *aḫrušḫi-* 'censer' < Hurr. *aḫrušḫi*, *šaḫi-* (kind of wood) < Hattic *šaḫiš*. Neuter examples: *atupli-* (a garment) < Akk. *utuplu*, *ḫazzizzi-* 'ear' < Akk. *ḫasīsu*, *tuppi-* 'clay tablet' < Akk. *ṭuppu*, *keldi-* 'well-being' < Hurr. *keldi*, ^{GIŠ}*parnulli-* (kind of tree and its wood) < Hattic (Soysal 2004: 148, 300, 590).

2.13. Examples of *u*-stems underived within the historical period of Hittite are: (common gender) *ḫaššu-* 'king', *ḫeu-* 'rain', *paršdu-* 'sprout, shoot, bud', *pupu-* 'lover, paramour', *šiu-* 'god', *tašku-* 'testicle(?)', *wappu-* 'river bank', and *wellu-* 'meadow'; (neuter gender) *āššu-* 'goods', *ḫalenzu-* 'duckweed, algae', *ḫattalu-* 'door bolt', *išḫaḫru-* 'tears', *iwaru-* 'dowry, inheritance share', *kapanu-* 'trunk (of tree)', *kapru-* 'throat(?)', *kapunu-* (a unit of land measurement), *genu-* 'knee', *genzu-* 'lap, womb, mercy', *šāru-* 'plunder, booty', *tāru-* 'tree, wood', and *welku-* 'grass.'

2.14. Loanwords appearing in Hittite as *u*-stems are quite rare. Only one example is at all likely, the common gender ^{NINDA}*taparwašu-* (kind of bread) < Hattic.

Derived Stems

2.15. Derived nouns and adjectives consist of a root (whether noun, adjective, verb, or adverb) to which one or more derivational suffixes have been added. The resulting combination constitutes the derived stem, to which the case endings are added (HE §§43–53; EHS 160–343; Kammenhuber 1969b: 291–300; Berman 1972b; and Meriggi 1980: §§1–4). The following is a list of the principal suffixes for forming derived stems of nouns and adjectives and examples of the resulting forms. Luwian suffixes that occur in Hittite-language contexts are marked with the notation "Luw."

2.16. The suffix ***-a-*** forms common gender action and result nouns from verbs (EHS 166–67):[4] *alwanzaḫḫa-* 'sorcery' < *alwanzaḫḫ-* 'to bewitch, hex', *ḫarga-* 'ruin, destruction' < *ḫark-* 'to perish, be destroyed', *ḫašša-* 'grandchild' (perhaps originally 'offspring') < *ḫaš(š)-* 'to give birth to, generate', *karša-* 'cut (of meat), sector (of territory)' < *karš-* 'to cut off', *maniyaḫḫa-* 'administration, district' < *maniyaḫḫ-* 'to administer, govern (in iter.)', *maninkuwaḫḫa-* 'vicinity, neighborhood' < *maninkuwaḫḫ-* 'to approach, draw near', ^{NINDA}*parša-* 'bread fragment' < *parš-* 'to break, fragment', *šarra-* 'part, share' < *šarra-* 'to divide.'[5]

2.17. The suffix ***-aḫi(t-)*** (Luw.) (see §2.55, p. 62) forms neuter abstract nouns from adjectives and nouns, expressing status: *tuḫukantaḫit-* 'status of a crown prince' < *tuḫukanta/i-* 'crown prince', *malḫaššallaḫit-* 'practice of ritual magic' < *malḫaššalla/i-* 'pertaining to ritual magic', *nakkuššaḫit-* 'status of a scapegoat' < *nakkušša/i-* 'scapegoat', *tarpaššaḫit-* 'status of a substitute' < *tarpašša/i-* 'substitute', *lapanallaḫit-* 'status of a warden of the salt deposits' < *lapanalla/i-* 'warden of the salt deposits', *muwaddalaḫit-* 'overpowering might, victoriousness' < *muwattalla/i-* 'overpowering, victorious'. It also appears on a few terms for concrete objects: *ḫaršandanaḫit-* (part of a wagon or chariot wheel). Other nouns in *-aḫi-* in Hittite contexts may be of Hurrian derivation.

2.18. The suffix ***-ai-*** productively forms common-gender action nouns from verbal roots: *ḫurtai-* 'curse' < *ḫu(wa)rt-* 'to swear', *išḫamai-* 'song' < *išḫamai-* 'to sing', *ištarninkai-* 'illness' < *ištarnink-* 'to make ill', *linkai-* 'oath'< *link-* 'to swear', *maniyaḫḫai-* 'administrative district' < *maniyaḫḫ-* 'to administer', *šagai-* 'omen, sign' (see *šakiya-* 'to give a sign'), *wagai-* 'grain pest, 'biter'' < *wag-* 'to bite', *waštai-* 'sin' < *wašta-* 'to sin', *zaḫḫai-* 'fight' < *zaḫḫ-* 'to strike'. There are also a few common-gender nouns formed to nominal bases: *ḫullanzai-* 'defeat' (see *ḫullant-* 'defeated'). Of unclear derivation: *kurkurai-* 'verbal intimidation, threat', *šaklai-* 'prerogative, right, custom, rite', *zašḫai-* 'dream.' Most neuter *ai*-stems are underived. For some examples see §§4.34–4.35 (pp. 93–94).[6]

2.19. The suffix ***-al-*** forms neuter instrumental nouns from verbal bases. Some of these are assuredly native Hittite: *ardal-* 'rock-cutting saw' < *ard-* 'to saw', *ḫuḫupal-* (a percussion instrument) < *ḫup-* 'to make a hollow sound' (imitative, §1.144, p. 49), *išḫiyal-* 'band' < *išḫi(ya)-* 'to bind.' Others are certainly loanwords from Luwian (see §2.55, p. 62): *ariyal-* 'basket' < *ariya-* 'to lift', *winal-* 'staff, club.' Some cases may be either Hittite or Luwian in origin: e.g., *tarmal-* 'hammer.' Some Luwian stems in *-al-* are borrowed into Hittite as common gender stems with either *a*-stem or *i*-stem inflection: e.g., *pappaššala/i-* 'esophagus'.

---

4. We differ from Kronasser (EHS §96), who interprets several these forms as containing a suffix *-ḫa-*.

5. Berman (1972b: 115–16) adds further examples, including uncertain ones such as ^{LÚ}*kīta-*.

6. On the problem of $^{(MUNUS)}$*ḫazgarai* 'female musicians' to *ḫazgara-* and *šišai* 'tail' beside *šēša-* see Oettinger 1995: 214–15. Also relevant is Rieken 2004a: 535, 540, who only cites Rößle on *ḫazkara-*. Also see §3.21 (p. 72).

2.20. The suffix ***-ala-*** forms adjectives from nouns: *genzuwala-* 'merciful' < *genzu* 'mercy', *lišši̯ala-* 'pertaining to the liver' < *lišši-* 'liver'. Subsequent substantivization of adjectives of this kind in the sense 'the one pertaining to/who deals with . . .' leads to productive use of *-ala-* to form what are effectively agent nouns from other nouns: LÚ/MUNUS*arkamiyala-* 'player of the *arkammi*-instrument', *arzanala-* (a functionary) < É*arzana-* 'inn', *auriyala-* 'border guard' < *auri-* 'border post', *ḫaršiyala-* 'one who offers NINDA*ḫarši-*', LÚ/MUNUS*ḫuwaššanala-* 'worshiper of d*Ḫuwaššana*', *išpanduziyala-* 'one who offers libations' < *išpanduzzi* 'libation', *karimnala-* 'temple servant' < *karimn-* 'temple', LÚ*šerḫala-* < *šerḫ*(*a*)- (a substance), **palšala-* (written LÚ.KASKAL-*la-*) 'guide, caravan leader' < *palša-* 'road, journey, caravan',[7] *tawalala-* 'one who serves *tawal*-drink', LÚ*walḫiyala-* 'one who serves *walḫi* drink', LÚ*zuppariyala-* 'torch-bearer' < *zuppari-* 'torch'. This pattern of forming agent nouns eventually leads to deverbal examples: *gangala-* 'scale (for weighing)' < *gank-* 'to weigh', LÚ*tarweškala-* 'dancer' < imperfective form of *tarwāi-* 'to dance', LÚ*laḫḫiyala-* 'traveler(?)' < *laḫḫiya-* 'to travel.' One such adjective derives from an adverbial base: *tuwala-* 'distant' < *tuwa* 'at a distance'.

2.21. The suffixes ***-alla-*** (Luw.) and ***-alli-*** (Luw.) form nouns from nouns (see §2.55, p. 62). Nouns in *-alla-* or *-alli-* referring to persons are common gender (*appaliyalla-* 'plotter, usurper' < *appali-* 'trap', *irḫu*(*i*)*talla-* 'basket-carrier' < *irḫuit-* 'basket'), while those referring to things are neuter (*ḫaršanalli-* 'crown' < *ḫaršan-* 'head', *puriyal*⟨*li*⟩- 'lip (*pūri-*) cover',[8] *šakuwalli-* 'eye (*šākuwa*) cover', *zeriyalli-* 'cup-stand' < *zeri-* 'cup'). Derived adjectives with this suffix are: *annalla-* 'motherly, maternal'; *annalla*/*i-* 'former, previous',[9] *attalla-* 'fatherly, paternal'.

2.22. The suffix ***-an-*** forms neuter action/result nouns from verbal bases: *ḫenkan* 'death' (< *ḫenk-* 'to allot'), *naḫḫan* 'fear' (< *naḫḫ-* 'to fear'), *mudan* 'garbage' (< *mudāi-* 'to remove').

2.23. The roles of the suffix ***-ant-***[10] are various and complex (HE §48; Melchert 2000: 58–61). We may distinguish the following attested functions of *-ant-* as a derivational suffix in Hittite.[11] First, it is used to form participles (see §§25.39–25.45,

7. Since both stems *palša-* and **palši-* (sg. nom. KASKAL-*iš*, derived verb KASKAL-*šiyaḫḫ-*) exist for the base noun, both **palšala-* and **palšiyala-* (CHD P) are possible. The Hittite noun is formed on the pattern of LÚ.KASKAL = Akk. *ša ḫarrāni*(*m*) 'caravan leader' (OAss, CAD Ḫ 113; AHw 327a sub mng. 4).

8. The hapax *puriyal-* 'lip cover' is either a scribal error for **puriyalli* or a nonce creation based on *puriyalli-* due to the superficial influence of real nouns in *-al*. See *paršul-* alongside more common *paršulli-* 'bread fragment' due to nouns in *-ul* such as *išḫiul*.

9. See §4.10 (pp. 83–84), with n. 40, and §4.17 (pp. 86–87).

10. Descriptively, in Hittite we can speak of a single *-ant-* suffix (hence, "the suffix"). Historically, we posit distinct origins for several of the functions. See, for example, Melchert 2000: 58 n. 20 on the different PIE sources for the Hittite *-ant-* suffix in its participial and possessive uses.

11. In drawing these distinctions we make no claim regarding the prehistoric source(s) of the *-ant-* suffix. We analyze forms of *neuter* noun stems ending in *-anza* and *-anteš* not as derivational but as examples of the ergative case. See §§3.8–3.9 (pp. 66–67) and §3.21 (p. 72).

pp. 339–340; on the *-nt-* participle in PIE see Szemerényi 1996: 317–18; Meier-Brügger 2000: 173; 2003: 185).

2.24. The suffix *-ant-* also forms possessive denominal adjectives (HE §48 b 1):[12] *perunant-* 'rocky' (< *peruna-* 'rock'), $^{(NA_4)}$*akuwant-* '(roads) covered with shells or pebbles (^{NA_4}*aku-*)', *natant-* 'provided with a drinking tube (*nata-*)', ^{TÚG}*kurešnant-* 'wearing a (woman's) headdress (^{TÚG}*kureššar*)', *irmanant-* 'having sickness (*irman*), ill'. The noun *utneyant-* 'population, inhabitants' could also be a possessive denominal adjective in origin '(those) possessing the land (*utne-*)'. The mountain name $^{ḪUR.SAG}$*Tarlipanta* may indicate a mountain on which the berries grew from which they made the dark red *tarlipa*-drink.

2.25. The suffix *-ant-* also has a delimiting or "individualizing" function (Melchert 2000: 58–61, 68–69). When it is added to names of the seasons, the reference is to a particular instance (Goetze 1951: 469–70): *ḫamešḫant-* 'the (next/following) spring' vs. *ḫamešḫa-* 'spring-time (in general)'.

2.26. In a number of adjective and noun pairs, however, there is no longer any discernible difference in meaning between the base stem and the extended stem in *-ant-*: *aššu-* and *aššu*(*w*)*ant-* 'good, pleasant', *ikuna-* and *ikunant-* 'cold', *irmala-* and *irmalant-* 'ill', *šuppi-* and *šuppi*(*y*)*ant-* 'holy sacred', *dapi-* and *dapiyant-* 'entire', *šankunni-* and *šankunniyant-* 'priest', *gaena-* and *gaenant-* 'in-law', *ḫuḫḫa-* and *ḫuḫḫant-* 'grandfather.' In the above cases, both short and extended stems of the adjectives and nouns are still attested in Hittite. There are other examples in which only the extended stem in *-ant-* has been preserved, but the shorter stem must be presumed as a base of other derived forms: see §2.2 (p. 51).

2.27. A few Hittite stems in -(*a*)*nt-* reflect the addition of a *-t-* to a stem in -(*a*)*n-* (Oettinger 1982a; 2001b). Here belong such examples as *išpant-* 'night' (see Avestan *xšapan-*) and *kanint-* 'thirst' (see *kanin-ant-* 'thirsty' with the possessive suffix discussed in §2.24).

2.28. The suffix ***-aššа/i-*** forms denominal adjectives denoting appurtenance which may themselves become nouns: ^{d}*Ḫilašši-* '(demon) of the courtyard (*ḫila-*)', ^{d}*Wašdulašši-* '(demon) concerned with sin (*waštul-*)', ^{d}*Ištamanašša-* '(deity) of the ear', ^{d}*Šakuwašša-* '(deity) of the eye', ^{URU}*Tarḫuntašša-* '(city) of (the god) Tarḫunta', etc.

2.29. The suffix ***-(a)šḫa-*** usually forms common gender action/result nouns from verbs (EHS 167): *unuwašḫa-* 'adornment' < *unuwāi-* 'to adorn', *ḫarnamniyašḫa-* 'revolt' < *ḫarnamniya-* 'to revolt', *tariyašḫa-* 'fatigue' < *ta*(*r*)*riya-* 'to exert oneself',

12. See, correctly, Sturtevant and Hahn (1951: §119). Not all such cases reflect participles of intervening but unattested denominal verbs (against Goetze [1930b: 34–35] and others). See on this point Oettinger 1981. Some examples naturally allow for both possibilities: *annanuzziant-* 'wearing a halter' may be derived directly from ^{KUŠ}*annanuzzi-* 'halter' or via an unattested verb **annanuzziya-* 'to fit with a halter', and ^{TÚG}*kurešnant-* 'wearing a woman's headdress' either from ^{TÚG}*kureššar* or **kurešnāi-* 'to fit with a *k*'.

nuntariyašḫa- ‘haste’ < *nuntariya-* ‘to hasten’, *armuwalašḫa-* ‘moonlight’ < *armuwalāi-* ‘to shine (of the moon)’, *kariyašḫa-* ‘compliance, pity’ < *kariya-* ‘to comply, accede’, *maliyašḫa-* ‘agreement, concurrence, approval’ (< CLuw *mali-/malāi-* ‘to think’; see Hitt. *malāi-* ‘to approve’). The status of the apparent denominal example *luliyašḫa-* ‘swampland, moor’ < *luli*(*ya*)- ‘pond’ and others with no attested base forms, such as *ḫapparnuwašḫa-* ‘radiance, halo’, *karitašḫa-* ‘grass(?)’, and *marruwašḫa-* (a stone), is unclear.[13]

2.30. The suffix ***-ašti-*** forms common gender nouns to adjectival bases: *dalugašti-* ‘length’ < *daluki-* ‘long’, *pargašti-* ‘height’ < *parku-* ‘high’, *palḫašti-* ‘width’ < *palḫi-* ‘wide’. See also *lu*(*m*)*pašti-* ‘pain, grief’ without known base. The stem vowels of *i-* and *u*-stem adjectives are deleted before this suffix (see §2.2, p. 51).

2.31. The suffix ***-att-***[14] forms common gender action/result nouns from verbal and adjectival bases: *aniyatt-* ‘performance, equipment’, *tuḫḫiyatt-* ‘groaning/screaming in pain’, *kardimiyatt-* ‘anger’, *karuiliyatt-* ‘previous state’, *naḫšaratt-* ‘fear’, *duškaratt-* ‘amusement, entertainment.’ For archaic *šiwatt-* ‘day’, without attested base, see p. 121, n. 206.

2.32. The suffix ***-(a)t(t)alla-*** (see §2.55, p. 62) forms common-gender agent nouns. Denominal examples: *ḫaliyatalla-* ‘guard, watchman, sentinel’ < *ḫāli* ‘sector, watch’, *ḫalugatalla-* ‘messenger’ < *ḫaluga-* ‘message’, ^{LÚ}*kinartalla-* ‘lyre-player’ < **kinar* ‘lyre’ (< Semitic **kinnār*, Hebr. *kinnôr*), ^{MUNUS}*kankatitalla-* ‘woman serving *kankati*-soup’. Deverbal examples: *peran ḫuyatalla-* ‘helper’, *išḫamatalla-* ‘singer’ < *išḫamai-* ‘to sing’, *palwatalla-* ‘crier’ or ‘clapper ‘ < *palwāi-*. Many are formed on the imperfective *-šḱe/a-* stem (§12.31–12.33, p. 204): *išiyaḫḫiškatalla-* ‘spy, informant’, *maniyaḫiškatalla-* ‘governor, adminstrator’, *memiškattalla-* ‘eloquent, verbose’, *piškattalla-* ‘sparing (one)’, *uškiškattalla-* ‘watchman’, *weḫeškattalla-* ‘sentry’, *wešuriškatalla-* ‘strangler’, *wiwiškatalla-* ‘wailer’. Of uncertain derivation: *aršanatalla-* ‘envier’ (see *aršane-* ‘to envy’ §10.11, p. 177), *ḫukmatalla-* ‘enchanter’ (see *ḫukmai-* ‘spell’), ^{LÚ}*kuššanatalla-*, *kuššaniyatalla-* ‘hired laborer, wage earner’ (see *kuššan* ‘wage’).

2.33. The suffix ***-ātar*** forms neuter abstract/action nouns from verbs, adjectives, and nouns: (1) from verbs: *aggātar* ‘death’, *akuwatar* ‘drinking’, *appātar* ‘seizing’, **armaḫḫatar* ‘conception, pregnancy’, *āššiyatar* ‘love’, *adātar* ‘eating’, *ḫašātar/*

13. Since all clear examples are based on stems ending in *-a-*, one cannot tell whether the productive suffix was *-šḫa-* or *-ašḫa-*. Contra Starke (1979: 258), there is no solid evidence that all examples of the productive deverbal suffix *-(a)šḫa-* are Luwianisms. Nor is there yet evidence for the suffix even being productive in either form of Luwian. In terms of attested Hittite, examples such as *tešḫa-* ‘dream’ are underived (see Starke 1979: 248–50).

14. See §4.91 (p. 120) and §4.94 (p. 121, paradigms). On this class of action noun see Berman 1972b: 155–56 and Laroche 1975. For discussion of the semantic content of this suffix see Rieken 1999a: 118. On the problematic words *maniyaḫḫiyatt-*, *watarnaḫḫaz*, *ḫuppar*⟨*at*⟩*t-*, *ḫandatt-*, and *lamarḫandatt-* see Rieken 1999a: 120–25.

ḫaššatar ‘procreation, womb, clan’, *ḫūigatar* ‘heap of threshed grain(?)’, **maniyaḫḫatar* ‘administration’ (< *maniyaḫḫ-* ‘to administer’), *šullātar* ‘wantonness, disrespectfulness’; (2) from adjectives: *ḫatugātar* ‘fright’, *idālawatar* ‘evil’, *marlatar* ‘foolishness’, *nakkiyātar* ‘importance, dignity’, *palḫātar* ‘width’; (3) from nouns: *anniyatar* ‘motherhood’, **andayandatar* ‘status of a live-in husband’, *antuḫšātar* ‘humanity’,[15] **gainatar* ‘in-law-ship’, *pišnātar* ‘manliness, manhood’, MUNUS-*tar* ‘womanliness.’ The stem vowels of some adjectives in *-i-* (*ḫatuka/i-* ‘frightening’ §4.39 [p. 97], *palḫi-* ‘wide’) and *-u-* (*parku-* ‘high’) are deleted before this suffix (see §2.2, p. 51).

2.34. The suffix ***-eššar*** forms neuter action nouns and abstracts from verbs and adjectives: (deverbal) *ašeššar* ‘seated group’, *ḫanneššar* ‘judgment’, *ḫatteššar* ‘hole (cut)’, *ḫatreššar* ‘sending; message’, (TÚG)*iškalleššar* ‘torn garment’, TÚG*kureššar* ‘woman’s headdress’ (< *‘cut piece of cloth’ < *kuer-* ‘to cut’), *mukeššar* ‘prayer’, *patteššar* ‘hole (dug)’, *šieššar* ‘beer’ (< *šai-* ‘to press’), *taruppeššar* ‘total’, *tetḫeššar* ‘thundering’, *tieššar* ‘orchard’ (*‘a planting of trees’ < *dai-* ‘to put’), *uppeššar* ‘something sent (*uppa-*), ‘gift’; (de-adjectival) *alwanzeššar* ‘sorcery’, *palḫeššar* ‘width’, *papreššar* ‘impurity’, *parkeššar* ‘height’, *šuppeššar* ‘holiness, purity’. The stem vowels of adjectives in *-i-* and *-u-* (*šuppi-* ‘holy, pure’, *parku-* ‘high’) are deleted before this suffix (see §2.2, p. 51). Also a few collectives from nouns: e.g., *lalakueššar* ‘swarm of ants’. For the inflection see §4.108 (p. 128).

2.35. The suffix ***-iya-*** forms adjectives from nouns and adverbs and probably forms numeric adjectives: *išpantiya-* ‘nocturnal’ < *išpant-* ‘night’, *ištarniya-* ‘middle’ < *ištarna* ‘in the midst of’, *anduriya-* ‘internal, interior’ < **andur-* (see *andurza* ‘inside’), *araḫzeya-* ‘outer, external’, *ḫantiya-* ‘special, separate’, *nuntariya-* ‘swift, swiftly rising’, *3-*ya-* (**teriya-*) ‘threefold’ and *4-*ya-* (**mewiya-*?) ‘fourfold’ in 3-*yaḫḫ-* ‘to make threefold’ and 4-*yaḫḫ-* ‘to make fourfold’, *šiptamiya-* ‘sevenfold(?)’ (a beverage name based on the numeral ‘seven’. For an alternate explanation of 4-*yaḫḫ-* see §9.59 (p. 170).

2.36. The suffix ***-ili-*** forms adjectives from various bases: *karuili-* ‘previous, former’ < *karū* ‘formerly’, *šannapili-* ‘empty’ < *šannapi* (adverb of disputed meaning), *tarḫuili-* ‘victorious, mighty’. For the adverbial suffix *-ili* see §19.15 (p. 292).

2.37. The suffix ***-ima-***[16] forms common-gender action nouns from verbs and adjectives: *ekunima-* ‘cold’ < *e/ikuna-* ‘cold’, *kurkurima-* ‘intimidation’ < *kurkuriya-* ‘to intimidate’, *katkattima-* ‘trembling’ < *katkattiya-* ‘to tremble’, *laḫlaḫḫima-* ‘agitation, worry’ < *laḫlaḫḫiya-* ‘to be agitated’, *lalukkima-* ‘brightness’ < *lalukke-* ‘be(come) bright’, *taškupima-* ‘screaming’ < *taškupāi-* ‘to scream’, *tetḫima-* ‘thundering’ < *tetḫa-* ‘to thunder’, *tuḫḫima-* ‘groaning, agony, pain’ < *tuḫḫāi-* ‘to groan, be in pain’, *wante-*

15. The Hittite word may have originally meant ‘status of a human being’, but its use in historical Hittite is always as a collective: ‘mankind, humankind’.

16. Initially analyzed by Laroche (1956). On the semantics and history of this suffix see Oettinger 2001a. Sometimes written with geminate *m*.

wantema- ‘lightning’, *wawarkima-* ‘door-pivot, hinge’, *weritema-* ‘anxiety’ < *werite-* ‘to be anxious’.

2.38. The suffix ***-ri-*** forms common-gender and neuter nouns to verbal bases (some not directly attested). Common: *auri-* ‘observation post’ < *au*(*š*)- ‘to see, look’, ^{SÍG}*kišri-* ‘?’ < *kiš-* ‘to comb (wool).’ Neuter: *ētri-* ‘food’ < *et-* ‘to eat’. Indeterminate: **mišri-* ‘brilliance’ (< **miš-* ‘twinkle’) in *mišriwant-* ‘brilliant’ and *mišriwātar* ‘brilliance’.

2.39. A linguistic relic which, when added to nouns denoting human (or divine) males, marks the corresponding female is the derivational suffix -(*š*)*šara-*. This suffix distinguishes the pairs *ḫaššuš* ‘king’ and *ḫaššuššaraš* ‘queen’, *išḫaš* ‘lord’ and *išḫaššaraš* ‘lady’, *šuppiš* ‘holy/consecrated man’ and *šuppeššaraš* ‘virgin’ (see HE §50a; Laroche 1966: 302–6; EHS 109, 111, 124, 129; Kammenhuber 1969b: 189–90, 198, 261, 269, 297; 1993 196–98), and the Hittite words underlying ÌR ‘male slave’ and GÉME ‘female slave.’[17] It operates like the English *-ess* in pairs such as *actor* : *actress*, *waiter* : *waitress*, and *master* : *mistress*. Compare Luwian *nan-i-š* ‘brother’ and *nan-ašr-i-š* ‘sister’ (*-ašr-*). On this element in onomastics see Laroche 1966: 302–6. The source of this suffix is probably an old word for ‘woman’ seen in Luwian **ašr*(*i*)- (base of the derivatives *ašraḫit-* ‘femininity’, *ašrul*(*i*)- ‘female, feminine’). The Hittite word for ‘woman’, however, reflects the PIE root **g*^{w}*en-,* as does Luwian *wanati-* (see Starke 1980). On the putative Hittite *kuinna-* ‘woman’ see Neu 1990; Carruba 1991, 1993a, questioned by Güterbock (1992; 1995c). Puhvel (HED K 306–8) agreed with Güterbock in questioning the philological basis of Neu’s example of *kuinna-* ‘woman’ but agreed with Carruba’s identification of the adjective *kuwanša-* and *kuwašša-* ‘female’ and reconstructed the Hittite noun ‘woman’ as *ku*(*w*)*an*(*a*)-.

2.40. For ***-talla-*** *s*ee -(*a*)*t*(*t*)*alla-* in §2.32.

2.41. The suffix ***-tara-*** forms agent nouns from verbal bases: *weštara-* ‘herdsman’ < *weš*(*iya*)- ‘to graze’, *akuttara-* (an official) < *eku-*/*aku-* ‘to drink’. See §4.82 (p. 115).

2.42. The suffix ***-ul-*** forms neuter nouns from verbs (for their inflection see §4.66, p. 107): *takšul* ‘peace, friendship’ < *takš-* ‘to join’. The *a* of the verb stem is deleted before this suffix: *waštul* ‘sin, offense’ < *wašta-* ‘to miss the mark, sin’, *išḫiul* ‘obligation, treaty’ < *išḫiya-* ‘to bind’, *immiul* ‘mixture’ < *immiya-* ‘to mix’, *paršiul* ‘crumb’ < *paršiya-* ‘to crumble’, and *šešarul* ‘sieve’ < *šešariya-* ‘to sift’.[18] There is one example from an adjective: *aššul* ‘goodness, favor, well being’ < *aššu-* ‘good’, and two from nouns: *kazzarnul* (a textile) < *karza*(*n*)- (weaver’s tool)[19] and *paḫḫurul* (an implement).

---

17. See the derived verb GÉME-*aššarešš-* ‘to become a (female) slave’ for evidence that the noun underlying GÉME ‘woman slave’ is derived from that underlying ÌR ‘man slave’. See LH 43, 139, 185–86, 263.

18. This word is *not* an i-stem (contra Neu apud Rieken 1999a: 470 n. 2317). The correct reading of KBo 44.142 (183/n) rev. 5′ is [. . . x ^{NINDA}*wa-ge-*]*eš-šar* 10-*li*, not [. . . *še-*]*eš-šar-u-li.*

19. On this derivation see Rößle 1998.

2.43. The suffix ***-ula-*** forms common-gender nouns from various bases: *ašandula-* ‘garrisoning’, *pittula-* ‘loop’.

2.44. The suffix ***-ulli-***[20] forms neuter instrumental and result nouns from verbs: *ištappulli-* ‘lid, stopper’ < *ištapp-* ‘to stop up’, *kariulli-* ‘body-veil’ < *kariya-* ‘to cover’, ^{DUG}*ḫariulli-* (a container), *kuškuššulli-* ‘mortar bowl in which foodstuffs are crushed’ < *kuškuš-* ‘to crush’, *ḫuttulli-* ‘tuft, something plucked’ < *ḫu*(*i*)*ttiya-* ‘to pull, pluck’, *paršulli-* ‘bread fragment’ < *parš*(*iya*)- ‘to break’,[21] and *pupulli-* ‘ruins’ (from an unclear base). The *a* of the verbal stem -(*i*)*ya-* is deleted before this suffix.

2.45. The suffix ***-uman-*** forms ethnica based upon place-names (Kammenhuber 1969b: 120–21, 124, 215, 268, 271, 295; Oettinger 1982b; Melchert 1983: 4–6; Kammenhuber 1993: 194–95, 660–61, Oettinger 2003: 147); for its inflection see §4.74 (p. 111). Examples: (sg. nom.) ^{m}*Šuppiluliumaš* ‘(man) of ^{URU}Šuppiluliya’, ^{URU}*šutummanaš* ‘the (man) of Šuta’, ^{URU}*ḫattušummaš*,[22] (sg. gen.) ^{LÚ}*luwiumnaš* ‘of a man of Luwiya’, (sg. acc.) ^{URU}*purušḫandumnan* ‘the man from Purušḫanda’, (pl. nom.) ^{URU}*šudulumniš* ‘(elders) of Šudul’, ^{URU}*anunum*(*i*)*neš* ‘the men of Anunuwa’, ^{URU}*šalampūmeneš* ‘the men of Šalampa’, ^{URU}*kātapūmeneš* ‘the men of Kātapa’, $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$*nešumeneš* ‘men of Neša.’ Case uncertain from lack of context: ^{URU}*uššumnaš* ‘man of Ušša’. For *kanišumnili* and *nešumnili* ‘in the language of Kaniš/Neša (= Hittite) see §19.15 (p. 292); and note ^{URU}*palaumnili* ‘in the language of the land of Pala’, ^{URU}*ištanumnili* ‘in the language of Ištanuwa.’ Note too the ethnic pronoun *kuenzumnaš* ‘whatever his home’ KBo 1.35 iii 9 (Kammenhuber 1969b: 215, 271) built on the interrogative-relative pron. *kui-* ‘who, what’ (EHS 102, 113, 194). Note also *arunuman-* ‘maritime’ from *aruna-* ‘sea’. The Luwian ethnicon is in *-wann*(*i*)- (Kammenhuber 1969b: 153, 268, 295, 318): see ^{URU}*ninuwawann*(*i*)- ‘of Nineveh’.

2.46. Personal names were often based upon ethnica (see Laroche 1957b, 1966; Hoffner 1998c). These names can use either the Hittite ethnicon *-uman-* or the old Hattic *-il* + Hittite theme vowel *-i-*. The royal name Šuppiluliuma certainly contains the toponym ^{URU}Šuppiluliya + the suffix *-uman-*, and the following personal names *may* contain that suffix: Šuppiuman, Artumanna, Zardumanni, Piriyašauma, Naḫuma. The following contain *-ili*: Ḫattušili (‘from Ḫattuša’), Arinnili (‘from Arinna’), Nerikaili (‘from Nerik’), Gašgaili (‘from the Kaška people’), Ḫupešnaili (‘from Ḫupišna’), Katapaili (‘from Katapa’), Taḫurwaili (‘from Taḫurpa’), Ḫanikkuili (‘from Ankuwa’), Ḫimuili (‘from Ḫemuwa’), Karaḫnuili (‘from Karaḫna’).

2.47. This same ***-uman-*** suffix is preserved in factitive verbs: *tameummaḫḫ-* ‘to make different’ (**tameuman-* ‘belonging to another’ < *tamai-*), and *šumumaḫḫ-* (for **šumummaḫḫ-*) ‘to make (several objects) one (**šumuman-*), unify’ (see Rieken 2000b and §9.62, p. 171). These factitive verbs are derived from the zero-grade form of the

20. Some examples may be collective plurals in *-i* of noun stems in *-ul-*.

21. Also attested is an *l*-stem *paršul-*. CHD P 192 s.v.

22. See ^{URU}*Ḫa-at-tu-*[*š*]*um-ma-aš* KBo 7.14 rev. 3 (OS).

suffix *-*umn*- with assimilation to -*umm*- (see §1.122, p. 44), whose geminate is not consistently written.

2.48. The suffix ***-ur-*** forms neuter nouns from verbs: *aniur*- 'ritual' < *aniya*- 'to perform', *ḫengur*- 'gift' < *ḫenk*- 'to (pr)offer'. Compare also with unclear bases: *kudur*- (a body part), *kurur*- 'hostility'; for the inflection see §4.80 (p. 114). The *a* of the verbal stem -(*i*)*ya*- is deleted before this suffix.

2.49. The suffix ***-uzzi-*** forms common-gender and neuter instrumental nouns from verbs: *kuruzzi*- 'tool for cutting' < *kuer*- 'to cut', *išpanduzzi*- 'vessel for libating' < *išpand*- 'to libate'. The *a* of the verbal stem -(*i*)*ya*- is deleted before this suffix (*išḫuzzi*- 'belt, sash' < *išḫiya*- 'to bind').

2.50. The suffix ***-want-***[23] forms possessive adjectives from nouns: *šamankurwant*- 'having a beard', *duškarawant*- 'having joy', *pittuliyawant*- 'having anxiety', *kištuwant*- 'having hunger', *kanir*(*u*)*want*- and *kanešš*(*u*)*want*- 'thirsty', *innarawant*- 'having vigor', *lalukkiwant*- 'having brightness', *mišriwant*- 'having brilliance', *ešḫarwant*- 'having bloodstains', *lupannawant*- 'wearing a diadem', *kurutawant*- 'wearing a horned crown(?)', *ḫupigawant*- 'wearing a veil', *naduwant*- '(terrain) having reeds', ^{URU}*Wiyanawanda* '(city) having vines.' One also finds some deverbal examples: *armaḫḫuwant*- 'pregnant', *kartimmiyawant*- 'having anger, angry', *naḫšariyawant*- 'having fear, afraid' (see on their formation Oettinger 1988). In view of the last two examples in -*iya*-, it is possible that the forms *tar*(*a*)*šganiyawant*- 'covered with colostrum(?)' (^{GA}*tar*(*a*)*šgan*, see Hoffner 2005) and *šeḫuganiyawant*- 'covered with meconium(?)' (**šeḫugan*-) are built to denominative verbs **tar*(*a*)*šganiya*- and **šeḫuganiya*-.

2.51. The suffix ***-(u)war*** forms the verbal substantive of most verbs (see §11.20, p. 185).

2.52. The suffix ***-zil-*** forms result nouns from verbs: *šarnikzil*- 'compensation', *tayazzil*- 'theft'.[24]

2.53. The suffix ***-zzi(ya)-*** forms adjectives from local adverbs: *ḫantezzi*(*ya*)- 'former, first', *appezzi*(*ya*)- 'latter, later, last', *šarazzi*(*ya*)- 'higher, uppermost' (< **-tyo*- §1.90, p. 37; paradigms in §4.10, p. 84, and §4.38, p. 96).

2.54. Nouns (frequently divine names) ending in ***-šepa-*** or ***-zipa-*** (Laroche 1947: 67–68) may contain a derivational suffix or be true compound nouns containing a word *še/ipa*- 'spirit(?)' that is not directly attested.[25] For -(*n*)*zipa*- alongside -*šepa*- see §1.136

23. See Goetze 1930b: 34–35; Sturtevant and Hahn 1951: §119; HE §49d; Kammenhuber 1969b: 188–89, 294; Oettinger 1988; Sihler 1995: §346 (< the "hysterokinetic suffix" -*went*- in PIE).

24. The pl. acc. [*ša*]*r-ni-ik-zi-lu-uš* KUB 46.42 iv 6, KUB 46.38 i 7, 10 (NH) indicates that at least *šarnikzil*- had common-gender forms as well as neuter.

25. The word *šīpa*-/*šipa*- once suspected of being this word (see Laroche 1947: 67–68 and AlHeth 84 n. 250) seems to denote a disease of the eyes or an impairment of vision.

(p. 47). As a suffix (or in a compound) it occurs in *daganzipa-* 'earth' (< *tekan*, *dagan* 'earth'), *taršanzipa-* 'platform', ^{d}*Ḫantašepa-* (< *ḫant-* 'forehead'), ^{d}*Ḫilanzipa-* (< *ḫila-* 'court'), ^{d}*Išpanzašepa-* (< *išpant-* 'night'), ^{d}*Miyatanzipa-* (< *miyātar* 'fruitfulness' [*r*/*n*-stem]), $^{(d)}$*aškašepa-* (< *aška-* 'gate').

2.55. Some of the derivational suffixes listed above are either borrowed from Luwian or created within Hittite by modification of Luwian material. Direct borrowings: (1) abstracts in *-aḫit-* (Starke 1990: 153–76) and (2) participles in *-m*(*m*)*i-*. Modifications: (3) nouns in *-alla-* and *-alli-* from the Luwian adjectival suffix *-alla*/*i-* (Melchert 2005b) and (4) 'agent' nouns in *-*(*a*)*t*(*t*)*alla-* from a reanalysis of the same Luwian suffix *-alla*/*i-* (Oettinger 1986a). The new suffix *-*(*a*)*t*(*t*)*alla-* spreads at the expense of the native suffix *-ala-*. In still other cases, a native Hittite suffix is reinforced by borrowings from Luwian: (5) nouns in *-al-*,[26] and (6) genitival adjectives in *-aššа*/*i-*. In these last two types, it is often difficult to decide whether a particular example involves borrowing or not.

Reduplicated Nouns and Adjectives

2.56. Hittite and Luwian vocabulary contains a considerable number of reduplicated nouns, verbs, and adjectives (van Brock 1964; EHS 119–22; and Kammenhuber 1969b: 184, §17,3). For reduplicated verbal stems see §10.3 (p. 173). Reduplication in both verbs and nouns is a feature of PIE (Beekes 1995: 171; Sihler 1995: 487 §443), but the process is also highly productive cross-linguistically. None of the examples below can be shown to be inherited from PIE. Some are probably formed according to inherited patterns, while others are wholly new.

2.57. Among the nouns and adjectives: *ḫuwaḫḫurti-* 'throat', *titita-* 'nose', *tetana-* 'hair', *laplipa-* 'eyelash' (see Luwian *lalpi-*), *gaga*/*i-* 'tooth', *pa*(*p*)*paššala*/*i-* 'esophagus', *šiša*(*i*)- 'tail', *duddumi-* 'deaf; deaf person', *memal-* 'meal', *ḫalḫaltumar*(*i*)- 'corner', *ḫaršiḫarši-* 'stormy weather', *akuwakuwa-* (a small animal, possibly onomatopoetic for the animal's noise, but denied in HED A 26, citing *lalakueša-* 'ant'), *šaluwašaluwa-* and *kallikalli-* (bird names, imitating their repeated call?), *artarti-* (a plant name), *wantewantema-* 'lightning', ^{GIŠ}*karkaralli-, šiggašigga-*, and GAL.GIR$_4$ *tariyattariyan.* Along with the many names for plants and animals, note the common occurrence of reduplicated nouns for anatomical terms.

2.58. A special kind of reduplication is what in German is called *Lallwörter* (EHS 117–19), words derived from baby talk (compare in English *Mama*, *Daddy*, *bye bye* and terms for bodily discharges such as *pee pee* and *poo poo*). It is likely that in Hittite such words as *atta-* 'father' (Luwian *tāta*/*i-*), *anna-* 'mother', *ḫuḫḫa-* 'grandfather', and *ḫannaḫanna-* 'grandmother' belong to this class (see also *pappa-* 'father' in the com-

26. For this type see Starke 1990: 300–342 and Rieken 1999a: 445–58, though Starke wrongly denies and Rieken underestimates the number of native Hittite examples.

pound *pappanekneš* ‘brothers having the same father’). And since words for body parts are among the first acquired by young children, it is completely possible that several of those listed in the preceding paragraph owe their form to baby talk.

Compounded Nouns and Adjectives

2.59. Compounded forms also exist (Güterbock 1955; HE §53 a; Hoffner 1966; Kammenhuber 1969b: 183–84; Neu 1986): *dāyuga-* ‘two-year-old’ (*dā* ‘two’+ *yuga-*, §9.3, p. 153), *appašiwatt-* ‘future’ (*āppa* ‘after’ + *šiwatt-* ‘day’), *šallakartātar* ‘negligence’ (*šalla* ‘high’ + *kart-* ‘heart’ + *-ātar*), *zašgaraiš* ‘anus’ (*zaškar* ‘excrement’ + *aiš* ‘mouth’), *pattarpalḫi-* (a bird name: ‘broad of wing’, *pattar* + *palḫi-*), *annanekeš* ‘sisters having the same mother’ (*anna-* ‘mother’ + *nega-* ‘sister’), *pappanekneš* ‘brothers having the same father’ (*pappa* ‘father’ + *negna-* ‘brother’), *tuzziyašeššar* ‘camp/settlement of an army (*tuzzi*)’; URU-*riyašeššar* ‘settlement of a city’[27] (second component *ašeššar* ‘settlement’), and possibly *tārumaki-*$^{\text{MUŠEN}}$ ‘woodpecker’ (*tāru-* ‘wood/tree’ + *wak*(*a*)*i-* ‘biter’ (analysis by Hoffner 1966),[28] with *uw* > *um* across word boundary [§1.126, p. 44]). The negation *nūman* ‘not want(ing) to’ (Hoffner 1982) seems to consist of a negative element (*nū*?) added to the optative *man* (see CHD sub both *man* and *nūman*; see §26.19, p. 344).

2.60. There are also forms that are better described as “univerbations.” The first type consists of nouns with a modifying genitive: $^{\text{LÚ}}$*maniyaḫḫiyaš išḫa-*, $^{\text{LÚ}}$*mukešnaš* EN-*aš*, $^{\text{LÚ.MEŠ}}$*ḫazziwaš išḫeš*, $^{\text{NINDA}}$*šaramnaš ḫāliš*, etc. (Neu 1986, esp. his table on p. 116). The seond type comprises nouns derived from a preverb + verb combination (HE §53 b): $^{(\text{LÚ})}$*peran ḫuyatalla-* ‘he who runs before, helper’, *parā ḫandandātar* ‘divine power, providence, fate, luck’, $^{\text{LÚ}}$*antiyant-* ‘son-in-law who moves in with his bride’s family’ (< *anda iya-*), *kattakurant-* ‘(jug) cut off beneath’, *šerkurant-* ‘(loaf) cut off above’ (Hoffner 1966). The third type is formed by the combination attributive adjective + head noun: $^{\text{UZU}}$*parkui ḫaštai* ‘(cut of meat called) pure bone’, $^{\text{UZU}}$*dānḫašti* ‘(cut of meat called) second bone’. That all of these combinations were treated as single words is shown by the fact that, when they are marked by determinatives (§§1.39–1.44, pp. 23–24), the latter appear on the preceding genitive or preverb rather than on the head noun.

---

27. Friedrich (HW[1] [1952] 299), who was well aware of the syllabic reading *ḫappira-* for URU, nevertheless listed this word under the URU Sumerogram because he was uncertain of its syllabic Hittite reading. Kammenhuber (1954: 406) and Kronasser (EHS 291) considered it to stand for **ḫappiriyašeššar* and took *ḫappiri* as d.-l. of the normal *a*-stem *ḫappira-* ‘city’. Neu (1974: 106–7) and Oettinger (1976a: 46) considered it to be based not on a d.-l. but on an alternate stem *ḫappiri*(*ya*)-. Although Neu and Oettinger may be right about *ḫappiri*(*ya*)- ‘city’, the interpretation of URU-*riyašeššar* as **ḫappiriyašeššar* has now been placed in doubt by KBo 27.12 iii 4, a duplicate to KBo 6.34 iii 29, which instead of URU-*ya-še-eš-šar* reads [. . .-]x-*ḫu-ri-ya-še-eš-šar*! This suggests that underlying URU in this word was a word [. . .-]*ḫuri*(*ya*)-, not **ḫappiri*(*ya*)-.

28. For *wagai-* with *wakin* (*tārumaki*[*n*$^{\text{MUŠEN}}$]) in the sg. acc., compare the derived action nouns *ḫullanzai-* and *zaḫḫai-* with sg. acc. in *ḫullanzin* and *zaḫḫin.* See §4.32 with n. 66 (p. 92).

Chapter 3

NOUN AND ADJECTIVE INFLECTION

3.1. Hittite is an inflecting language, marking the syntactic role of verbs and of nominal categories (such as noun, adjective,[1] pronoun,[2] and some declinable cardinal numbers) by word-final suffixes ("endings"). The inflectional categories of nouns, adjectives, and some pronouns are gender, case, and number.

3.2. Gender. Grammatical gender is evident (and pertinent) only in the nominative and accusative cases. Hittite recognizes two grammatical gender classes, traditionally called *common* and *neuter*, alternatively *animate* and *inanimate*. Characteristics of the Hittite neuter or inanimate nouns are the same features that characterize neuter nouns in other old IE languages: identical forms in the nominative and accusative cases, and a zero ending in the singular (except in *a*-stems, where the ending is -(*a*)*n*).

3.3. Hittite nouns have no formal feminine gender (EHS 106–7). It remains a matter of debate whether this reflects a prehistoric merger of inherited masculine and feminine into a common (or animate) gender (so Kammenhuber 1969b: 253; Harðarson 1994: 32–39, and others) or an archaic system in which there was no feminine distinct from the masculine (so, e.g., Neu 1969: 237–41). Likewise controversial is the suggestion that adjectives of the type *dankui-* 'dark', *parkui-* 'pure', are formal relics of the PIE feminine that have lost their original connotation as feminines (Pedersen 1938: 35–36; see also Kronasser 1966: 107; Kammenhuber 1969b: 253; Oettinger 1987; and Starke 1990: 85–87). In respect to the lack of a masculine-feminine contrast, the Hittite declension of pronouns and substantives resembles that of nouns such as Latin *fēlis* 'cat' and *canis* 'dog', which can be masculine or feminine according to the biological gender of the animal referent (Sihler 1995: 244). See §2.39 (p. 59) for the suffix used by Hittites to designate females (-(*š*)*šara-*).

3.4. As in other IE languages, there is a broad correlation in Hittite between the grammatical gender of a noun and the animacy of its referent: nouns denoting living beings—divine, human, or animal—are usually common or animate. But as in other systems, this correlation is an imperfect one, and numerous exceptions exist.[3] Nouns

1. Including the participles as a verbal adjective.

2. There is a special set of case endings for the pronouns, which show different forms for the gen., abl., ins., pl. nom. com., and neut. (see §5.4, p. 133).

3. Many common-gender nouns denote non-living things (*aimpa-* 'burden', *aggala-* 'furrow', *alpa-* 'cloud', *aruna-* 'sea', *peruna-* 'rock', *ega-* 'ice', *ḫaluga-* 'message') because they belong to the *a*-stem class, and only common-gender *a*-stems are productive in Hittite (see §§2.4–2.6, p. 52).

referring to inanimate objects may be common or neuter gender. The determining factor is formal, not semantic: certain suffixes or inflectional types belong to a given gender, regardless of the semantic field to which the referent belongs (see §§2.15–2.55, pp. 53–62, for these suffixes).[4] For example, many body parts are common gender, not because they are an inalienable part of the human being and therefore could be argued to be inherently "animate," but because they belong to the *a*-stem class, and only common gender *a*-stems are productive in Hittite (see §§2.4–2.8 [p. 52], §§4.1–4.5 [pp. 79–82]). Hittite also preserves the inherited neuter *u*-stem *genu-* 'knee' and the neuter root noun *ker/kard-* 'heart', while *lišši-* 'liver' and *ḫaršar/ḫaršan-* 'head' are also neuter (all these belonging to well-attested neuter inflectional types in Hittite). This formal factor overrides the general tendency of nouns referring to humans and animals to be common gender. Of nouns referring to groups of humans, ÉRIN.MEŠ-*t-* 'troops' is common gender, because productive *t*-stems are common gender,[5] while *antuḫšātar* 'people, humanity', *ḫaššātar* 'family', *ašeššar* 'assembly', *ḫappiriyašeššar* 'population of a city', and MUNUS.MEŠ*ḫazkara*(*i*)- (group of female musicians) are all neuter, because the suffixes *-ātar* and *-eššar* form neuter nouns, as does *-a*(*i*)- when forming collectives.[6] Of nouns referring to groups of animals, *ḫuitar* 'wild animals' and *lala*(*k*)*ueššar* 'swarm of ants' are necessarily neuter because of their stems, although their referents are animate.

3.5. The essentially formal basis of grammatical gender described in §3.3 did not prevent speakers from occasionally employing common gender to mark true "animatization," based on the undeniable widespread correlation of common gender with animacy of the referent. For example, it can hardly be accidental that *genu-* 'knee', a neuter noun, is inflected as common gender only in the phrase 'the walking knee' (sg. acc. *iyantan genun* KBo 40.25 i 24′)[7], where it is being depicted as an *active* body part. Similarly, in a ritual passage where a house is to be transformed into a ram, the neuter noun *per* appears as a secondary common-gender sg. nom. *parnaš* in one version (KBo 10.45 iv 31), in contrast to the ergative *parnanza* of the duplicate (KUB 41.8 iv 30).[8]

---

4. Nouns in *-aḫit-*, *-al-*, *-ātar*, *-eššar*, etc., are formally neuter or inanimate. Nouns in *-ala-*, *-ašḫa-*, *-att-*, *-ima-*, etc., are formally common or animate.

5. The noun for 'troops' is unknown. One possibility might be *tuzziyant-*, as claimed by Tischler (2001: 222) and others. For although the sg. nom. ÉRIN.MEŠ-*az* in KBo 17.1 i 30 (OS) would be an unusual spelling for /-ants/, it is not unparalleled (see §1.135, p. 46, and §3.21, p. 72): *li-in-ki-ya-az* KUB 30.34 iv 7 (MH/NS) is an ergative (Laroche 1962: 26, 32), and MUNUS.MEŠ*ḫazkaraiyaza* / *ḫazkaranza* are alternate spellings of the ergative of *ḫazgarai-* (see Hoffner 1998a: 37–40 and §3.9 below [p. 67]).

6. The same principle applies to nouns referring to plants and to all kinds of manufactured items, such as containers, buildings or parts of buildings, wooden and metal tools, and other semantic fields. For convenient lists see Tischler 2001 under the respective determinatives DUG, É, GIŠ, URUDU, and so on. Compare the well-known example of the German diminutive suffixes *-chen* and *-lein*. Since these form neuter nouns, even diminutives referring to people are grammatically neuter: *Mädchen* 'girl', *Fräulein* 'young woman'.

7. See the scribal confusion about the same construction in *i-ya-an-ni-ya-an* (neut.) *ge-nu-un* (com.) KUB 9.34 iii 37, ed. Hutter 1988: 38–39, 82–83.

8. This is no more remarkable or significant for the overall system than the fact that grammatical gender affects poetic imagery in modern IE languages (e.g., the moon is typically depicted as a female in Romance

3.6. Since the "gender" opposition in Hittite contrasts only animate and inanimate, there is no formal distinction between masculine and feminine gender, only a derivational suffix *-(š)šara-* (§2.39, p. 59) used to form nouns denoting human (or divine) females from corresponding male-denoting nouns.

3.7. For two reasons it is necessary to insist on the unremarkable facts cited in §§3.3–3.5 regarding the relationship of grammatical gender and semantic animacy in Hittite. First, misconceptions about the distinction have prevented a proper appreciation of the role of the ergative case (see §§3.8–3.9 below). Second, Starke (1977: 122–26) has incorrectly claimed that in OH there was a *grammatical* contrast in the behavior of nouns referring to persons and animals ("Personenklasse") and those referring to inanimate objects ("Sachklasse").[9] Specifically: (1) case forms in *-i* of nouns referring to living beings are allegedly attested in OH only in functions belonging to the *dative* (recipient, goal, and one from whom something is removed), while case forms in *-i* of nouns referring to inanimate objects occur only in the function of a *locative*, expressing location (goal for these nouns being marked in OH only by the allative in *-a*, and place from which only by the ablative); (2) nouns referring to living beings ("Personenklasse") never occur in OH in the allative, ablative, or instrumental. If the word *attaz* in KBo 20.31:1 (OS) is a form of 'father', as the context suggests, it furnishes direct counterevidence for the second claim.[10] For further evidence refuting both (1) and (2) see the examples cited in the respective paragraphs on the case syntax of the dative-locative (§16.65, p. 257; §16.68, p. 258; and §16.70, p. 259) and the instrumental (§16.107, p. 269).

3.8. "**Split Ergativity**." Case syntax in Hittite for the most part operates according to an "accusative" system typical for an IE language: subjects of both transitive and intransitive verbs appear in the nominative, while direct objects of transitive verbs appear in the accusative. However, as established by Laroche (1962), when a *neuter* noun functions as the subject of a transitive verb, it obligatorily takes the form *-anza* (sg.) or *-anteš* (pl.) (see further §3.21, p. 72). He properly labeled this form an "ergative," although his own characterization of its behavior left ample room for doubt. Garrett (1990b) has since demonstrated that Hittite nominal syntax shows precisely the features expected of a language with a "split ergative" system.[11] Pronouns and common-gender nouns follow the "accusative" pattern: as subjects they appear in the nominative (whether

languages, where the word is feminine gender, but as a male in German, where it is masculine gender).

9. Unfortunately, this analysis has been uncritically accepted by a number of scholars (e.g., Luraghi 1997a: 8 §2.1.3, 13 §§2.1.5.9–10; and Tjerkstra 1999: 7 and 100 n. 22).

10. In KBo 20.31 and its duplicate KUB 57.69 (ed. Hoffner 1992a) the word *attaz* is followed immediately by *ḫu-uḫ-ḫ*[*a?-*. . .], and the following context refers to DUMU.MEŠ 'sons', *AḪI=KA* and *negnan* 'brother', and AMA 'mother'.

11. "Split ergativity" refers to a situation in which a language uses both accusative and ergative patterns of case syntax side by side, the distribution of which can be conditioned by a variety of grammatical factors. We stress that we insist here only on the validity of the split ergative system for attested Hittite. We take no stand on its historical origin (for an alternative to the view presented by Garrett (1990b), compare Oettinger 2001b: 311–12, with refs., and Josephson 2003a and 2004). Furthermore, the status of ergativity in PIE is

the verb is transitive or intransitive) and as direct objects in the accusative. But neuter nouns follow an "ergative" pattern: they appear in the "absolutive" case as the subjects of intransitive verbs and objects of transitive verbs, but in the "ergative" as the subjects of transitive verbs.[12]

3.9. Rejection of an ergative case in Hittite has been based on two invalid objections (for both see, e.g., Starke 1977: 182 n. 24):[13] (1) Hittite does not show the features of a typical ergative language such as Hurrian; (2) *-anza*/*-anteš* belong to a quasi-derivational *-ant*-suffix that semantically "animatizes" neuter nouns referring to inanimates (when they are functioning in what is loosely labeled an "active" sense). The first of these objections is irrelevant: since Hittite shows split ergativity, where the ergative pattern applies only to a subset of the nominal system, we would not expect it to show the features of a fully ergative language such as Hurrian. The second claim is simply false. As stressed by Hoffner (1998a: 37–40), the noun $^{\text{MUNUS.MEŠ}}$*ḫazkara*(*i*)- (female musicians) is *semantically* animate, referring only to persons, but as a collective it happens to be *grammatically* neuter. The fact that the word appears as $^{\text{MUNUS.MEŠ}}$*ḫazkaraiyaza* / *ḫazkaranza* just when it is the subject of a *transitive* verb confirms that the ending *-anza* marks ergative case. It is illogical to say that *-anza* here "animatizes" a noun that is already semantically animate. Nor is the notion of being "active" the determining factor. Grammatically neuter nouns referring to persons or things appear in the nominative-accusative (properly "absolutive") when they are the subjects of *intransitive* action verbs: *ašeššar šarā tiyazi* 'the assembly stands up', *wātar arašzi* 'water flows'. These and other facts confirm that the selection of the endings *-anza* and *-anteš* is grammatically conditioned (by neuter gender and subjecthood of transitive verbs) and has nothing to do with semantic animacy. "Ergative case" is the only proper characterization for such a feature.

3.10. Just as formally defined grammatical gender occasionally is employed to mark genuine animacy of a usually inanimate referent (see §3.5), so, unsurprisingly, the Hittites in a few instances also used the available ergative marker for the same purpose, extending its usage in such cases beyond its proper grammatical sphere. For example, in a ritual context where a house is likened first to a ram and then to a ewe, it appears in one version (KUB 41.8 iv 30, 34) as *parnanza* as subject of both an intransitive and transitive verb. That the ergative may occasionally function simultaneously as appositional direct address without abandoning its ergative role, as in *n=uš attaš nepišanza* EGIR-*an tarna* 'O father heaven, turn them back!' is also unremarkable.

3.11. Case. OH distinguishes as many as eight cases of the noun and adjective in the singular and as many as six in the plural (Forrer 1922; HE §§54–56). They are:

---

an entirely separate issue, on which see, among others, Villar 1983; Luraghi 1987; Rumsey 1987; Comrie 1998; and Oettinger 2001b.

12. For the sake of simplicity, we elsewhere retain the traditional term "nominative-accusative" for the case that should properly be termed "absolutive."

13. Others who reject the notion of ergativity in Hittite include Benveniste 1962b; Kammenhuber 1985: 452–55; Neu 1989b; Carruba 1992; and Marazzi 1996: 161–62.

(1) vocative, (2) nominative, (3) accusative, (4) genitive, (5) allative, (6) dative-locative, (7) ablative, and (8) instrumental.[14] A ninth case, the ergative (§§3.8–3.9 and §3.21), occurs only with neuter nouns. Dative and locative singular have already merged into a common "dative-locative" form in the singular in OH. The plural in OH contrasts nominative, accusative, genitive, and dative-locative, plus ablative and instrumental (but the last two cases show no contrast between singular and plural). The allative and instrumental, productive in OH and MH, survive in NH only in isolated expressions. The common gender nominative and accusative plural also merge in NH. Hittite nominal cases function like those in other case languages: the nominative marks the *subject*, the accusative the *direct object*, the genitive *possession*, the dative-locative the *indirect object* or *place in/to which*, the ablative *place from which*, and the instrumental *means or accompaniment*. The OH allative marks only place to which. For the uses of the cases in detail see chapter 16.

3.12. Number. PIE substantives distinguished singular, dual, and plural (Szemerényi 1996: §7.1.3). Animate nouns contrasted a "count" or "distributive" plural with a collective plural (Eichner 1985). The Old Anatolian languages such as Hittite show only indirect traces of the dual. These scattered examples are treated synchronically as collective plurals.[15] Thus, in the declension of substantives and pronouns (for the latter, see chapters 5–8) Hittite distinguishes only singular and plural number. Inflectional endings of the noun, adjective, and clitic pronoun distinguish singular from plural in OH in all cases but the instrumental (ending -(*i*)*t*) and ablative (ending -(*a*)*z*). The latter two cases are indifferent to number throughout the history of the language. In post-OH the genitive is identical in singular and plural.

3.13. OH also preserves the PIE contrast between a "count" (or "distributive") plural and collective plural in common-gender nouns (Neu 1969; Eichner 1985; Neu 1992; Melchert 2000). These collective forms have been previously regarded incorrectly as neuters and their occurrence on substantives of common gender as evidence for heterogenericity in Hittite nouns (for heterogenericity see §15.14, p. 240). These examples do not show alternation in gender but rather a contrast in number: *alpa* 'bank of clouds' vs. *alpeš/alpuš* '(individual) clouds', *gul-aš-ša* 'fate' (of a person) vs. ^{d}*Gulšeš/Gulšuš* 'the Fates' (goddesses). See Melchert 2000: 62–64 for further instances. There was originally no such contrast for neuter nouns, which had only the collective plural (Eichner 1985). Hittite did develop several devices for providing a count plural for neuter nouns. One such device was to use the only appropriate endings it had—namely, those of the

14. Since neuter nouns do not distinguish nominative and accusative, their appearance in the ergative case as subjects of transitive verbs still results in only an eight-way contrast within the paradigm of neuter nouns.

15. For literature on the dual see Szemerényi 1996: §7.13. For traces of the dual in Hittite and Luwian see among others Rieken 1994: 52–53, with references (citing *da*(*n*)*ḫašti-* 'double-bone', *išmeri-* 'reins' and *elzi-* 'scales'). Of the terms for body parts occurring in pairs (eyes, ears, nostrils, etc.), only *šākuwa* '(two) eyes' has a possibility of ultimate derivation from an old dual.

common-gender nouns: e.g., *luttaeš* and *luttauš* 'windows' for neuter *luttai-* 'window'. For the use of a suffix *-ant-* to show a count plural of collectives see §9.26 (p. 159). The contrast between collective and count plural appears to have been lost by NH, where one finds only singular and plural, with the plural of neuter nouns marked by the endings of the old collective. For the sake of simplicity, the collective endings are for the most part referred to below as "nominative-accusative plural neuter" except in those cases where they clearly belong to common-gender nouns.

Inflectional Endings

The Basic Scheme

3.14. The following paradigm shows the basic scheme of noun and adjective endings in Hittite. Extremely rare alternative endings have been omitted, as have all except the most straightforward distributional restrictions. For these see the detailed paragraphs which follow the paradigm.

	Old Hittite		New Hittite	
Case	sg.	pl.	sg.	pl.
nom. com.	*-š*, *-Ø*[16]	*-eš*[17]	*-š*	*-uš*, *-eš*, *-aš*[18]
acc. com.	*-n*, *-an* (cons. stems)	*-uš*	*-n*, *-an* (cons. stems)	*-uš*, *-eš*, *-aš*[18]
n.-a. neut.	*-Ø*, *-n* (*a*-stems)	*-Ø*,[19] *-a*,[20, 21]	*-Ø*, *-n*	*-Ø*, *-a*,[21] *-i*[21, 22]
erg.	*-anza*	*-anteš*	*-anza*	*-anteš*
gen.	*-aš*[23]	*-an*, *-aš*	*-aš*	*-aš*
d.-l.	*-i*, *-ya* (*i*-stems),[24] *-Ø* (cons. stems)	*-aš*	*-i*, *-e*, *-ya* (*i*-stems), *-ai*[25]	*-aš*

16. See §3.15, §4.65, p. 107 (*šarnikzil*), §4.82, p. 115 (some nouns in *-ar*).
17. Luraghi (1997a: §2.1.6) adds *-aš*. But what is attested (as a hapax) is only *-iaš* (see below, n. 31).
18. For the rules governing the choice see §3.16.
19. With and without lengthening of the vowel of the stem. See §3.20.
20. With consonantal stems.
21. Plural nom.-acc. in *-a* or *-i* belonging to certain common-gender forms are collectives.
22. The endings *-a* and *-i* are used with consonantal stems and *-i* with verbal substantives. See §3.20.
23. Also *-s* in *nekuz* (§3.22). Some, including Luraghi (1997a: §2.1.6), claim sg. gen. in *-an* in OH. We have found no unambiguous case in Old Script. See §3.23.
24. OS examples: ^{GIŠ}*ḫu-lu-ka-an-ni-ya* (*eša*) KBo 17.15 rev! 20 (OS), *ḫu-wa-ši-ya* KUB 28.75 iii 19 (OS), *ta-ki-i-ya* URU-*ri* 'in another city' KBo 6.2 i 7 (OS), *lu-li-ya* 'in a vat' KBo 6.2 i 56 (OS), *ša-ni-ya ú-it-ti* 'in the same year' KBo 3.22:10 (OS), *ša-ni-ya ši-wa-at* 'on the same day' KBo 3.22:60 (OS), *lu-ut-ti-ya* KBo 8.74++ iii 20 (OS), KBo 17.74++ ii 5 and passim (OS?, see Konk.), ^{d}*Ḫal-ki-ya* (*paršiya*, in sequence with all other DNs in d.-l.) KUB 41.10 rev. 6 (OS), KUB 28.75 iii 25 (OS).

	Old Hittite		New Hittite	
Case	sg.	pl.	sg.	pl.
voc.[26]	*-e*, *-i*, *-Ø*		*-Ø*	
all.[26]	*-a*		*-a*[27]	
abl.	*-az(a)*,[28] *-za*[29]		*-az(a)*	
ins.	*-it*, *-d/ta*		*-it*, *-d/ta*[30]	

Common-Gender Nominative

3.15. Singular common. With the exception of a few nouns with stems in *-ar-* (see §4.82, p. 115) and possibly a few with stems in *-zil-* (see §4.65, p. 107, for *šarnikzil*), all of which take a zero ending, the sg. nom. common-gender ending is /-s/. On the cuneiform writing of this /s/ on stems ending in *nt* and *Vt*, see §1.11 (p. 13) and §1.90 (p. 37).

3.16. Plural common. The OH ending is *-eš*.[31] In the MH Maşat letters, the pl. acc. com. ending *-uš* begins to be used for the nominative (and the pl. nom. com. *-eš* for the accusative): see Hoffner forthcoming: §54, §56. The ending *-aš* also appears on *i*-stem nouns such as *ḫalki-* 'grain, crop': *ḫal-ki*$^{\text{ḪI.A}}$*-aš* HKM 19:6 (Hoffner forthcoming: §53). Variable use of *-eš* and *-uš* for both pl. nom. com. and pl. acc. com. continues into NH, but by late NH (i.e., the reigns of Ḫattušili III, Tudḫaliya IV, Šuppiluliuma II) a stable distribution is achieved (Melchert 1995). The ending *-uš* becomes the regular ending for a merged pl. nom.-acc. com. for all stem classes, with the following exceptions: (1) *u*-stem adjectives generalize *-aweš* (eliminating the irregular pl. acc. com. in *-amuš*); (2) stems in *-t-* (mostly *-nt-*) use *-eš* with a few exceptions;[32] (3) the

25. See *labarnai* LUGAL-*i* KUB 2.2 + KUB 48.1 iii 9, *tabarnai* KUB 44.60 iii 15, $^{\text{MUNUS}}$*tawanannai* KBo 17.88 + KBo 24.116 iii 21 (MS), $^{\text{d}}$*Mammai* KUB 27.67 ii 45, $^{\text{URU}}$*Ēblai* KBo 32.19 iii 37′ (MH/MS). None of these examples is found in OS. For an explanation of this ending see §3.24.

26. The vocative and allative did not exist in the plural.

27. To the extent that a distinctive allative form in *-a* occurs in NH compositions, it is an archaism and not a form of current speech. In NH the allative was replaced by the dative-locative.

28. The *-aza* ending is secondary and not attested in Old Hittite (OS). The ablative and instrumental are indifferent to number.

29. The ending *-za* is confined to consonantal stems, e.g., *ši-it-tar-za* 'with sundisks' and *ne-pí-iš-za* 'from heaven', É-*er-za* 'from the house' (§3.26, p. 74).

30. To the extent that the instrumental occurs in NH compositions, it is an archaism and not a form of current speech. In NH the instrumental was replaced by the ablative.

31. There is a single exception [*ḫa-an-te-e*]*z-zi-aš* 'first, older' KBo 22.2 obv. 18. The appearance of *-iaš* for *-ieš* could show an isolated early example (OS) of the change cited for MH in this paragraph and in §4.19 (p. 87) for NH *i*-stems (see also §1.68, p. 31), but an archaism is also possible, as per Neu (1979a: 192).

32. *nu=wa=šmaš* SIG$_5$*-anduš* $^{\text{ŪL}}$*=pat peḫḫi* 'I do not give them good ones' KUB 13.35+ ii 8 (Hatt. III), and *duwarnanduš* in iv 12; *šekkanduš* KBo 23.114 obv. 23, 25 (oracle questions about Urḫi-Teššub).

relative-interrogative *kui-* generalizes *kuiēš* (§8.2, p. 149) (see McIntyre, cited by Melchert 1995). No such regularity is found for *i*-stems, which show mostly *-iuš* and *-auš*, but *-ieš* and *-aeš* continue to be found, along with *-iyaš* (and rarely even *-aš* and *-iš*; see Melchert 1995: 271). Contrary to repeated claims, there is no compelling evidence for the ending *-aš* as pl. nom.-acc. com. other than with *i*-stems.[33] There is thus no merger between the plural nominative-accusative and the plural dative-locative in NH. In late NH,[34] unambiguous writings of the nominative plural common ending as *-iš* occur: *i-da-la-u-i-*EŠ[35] UN.MEŠ-*ši-iš* (= *antuḫšiš*) 'evil persons', *al-wa-an-zi-ni-*EŠ *an-tu-uḫ-ši-iš* 'sorcerous persons', LÚ.MEŠ-*iš* (= *pišniš*) 'men', DINGIR.MEŠ-*iš* (= *šiuniš*) 'deities', ŠEŠ.MEŠ-*iš* (= *negniš*) 'brothers', *ka-ru-ú-i-li-iš* LUGAL.MEŠ-*i*[*š*] (= *ḫaššuiš*) 'former kings', *ḫa-a-ra-ni-iš* MUŠEN 'eagles' (§1.57, p. 28; §4.75, p. 112).

Common-Gender Accusative

3.17. Singular common. The accusative singular of common-gender nouns with vocalic stems is *-n* (*antuḫšan* 'human' < *antuḫša* + *n, ḫalkin* 'grain' < *ḫalki* + *n, ḫaššun* 'king' < *ḫaššu* + *n*). Consonantal stems use *-an* (*kardimmiyattan* 'anger' < *kardimmiyatt* + *an*).

3.18. Plural common. The OH ending is *-uš*. For developments in MH and NH see §3.16.

Neuter Nominative-Accusative

3.19. In the neuter nominative-accusative singular, most nouns and adjectives use the bare stem: *aiš* mouth, *šuel* 'thread', *ḫaḫḫal* 'brushwood', *šalli* 'great', *idālu* 'evil', *taru* 'tree, wood', *tekan* 'earth'. *a*-stems add an *-n*: *ezzan* 'chaff, straw', *ekan* 'ice', *yugan* 'yoke', *pedan* 'place', *kunnan* 'right'.

3.20. On the neuter nominative-accusative plural in general in Hittite see Gertz 1982**.** In older texts we find a zero ending for neuter plural *i*-stems and *u*-stems, such as GIŠ*išparuzzi* 'rafters' and *idālu uddār* 'evil words' (see p. 103, n. 121, and Watkins 1982). There is no tendency to merge neuter nominative-accusative singular and plural (contra Prins 1997), as shown by the fact that in later texts the zero ending is replaced by *-a* (*ḫaliya* 'corrals', *šarliya* '*š*.-loaves', *genuwa* 'knees', *idālawa* 'evils'), which is

33. If our claim is valid, one has to assume scribal corruption of the following passage: *kāša=wa ammel tuēggaš=miēš ānta* 'Now my body parts are warming up' VBoT 58 i 24 (OH/NS), where the plene written *-mi-e-eš* for the pl. nom. com. possessive clitic and the medio-passive pres. pl. 3 *a-a-an-ta* point to a plural subject *tuēggaš*.

34. A possible earlier example occurs in MH/MS: *kē=a* DUMU.MUNUS.MEŠ-*i*[*š* . . .] KBo 16.45 obv. 8, which because of *kē* cannot be read DUMU.MUNUS.MEŠ-*u*[*š*]. In any event, instances of this writing of the pl. nom. com. ending would be very rare prior to NH.

35. In view of the unambiguous *-iš* ending on the nouns, it is possible that the attributive adjectives also had this ending, hence, *i-da-la-u-i-ìš* and *al-wa-an-zi-ni-ìš* (reading EŠ as *ìš*, a value that the sign unquestionably has in late NH).

the regular ending for consonantal stems such as *šuppala* (see §4.64, p. 106), *kudurra* (see §4.81, p. 114), *iškiša* (see §4.89, p. 119) and *aniyatta* (see §4.94, p. 121). The ending *-i* is attested principally with the verbal substantives of the type *arkuwarri* $^{\text{ḪI.A}}$, *šāwarri*, and *minumarri* $^{\text{ḪI.A}}$ (see HE §185 b 2), and *r*-stem adjectives and nouns such as *zankilatarri* $^{\text{ḪI.A}}$ (§4.104, p. 127), *šuppeššarri* $^{\text{ḪI.A}}$, *kururi* $^{\text{ḪI.A}}$ (§4.85, p. 117), *ḫalḫaltumari*, *ḫuppari*, and *aniuri* (§4.84, p. 117; §4.81, p. 114), but we also find *aniyatti* alongside *aniyatta*.[36] Some neuter *r*/*n*-stems that regularly take a zero ending also show plurals with deletion of the final *-r* (e.g., *kušduwāta* 'calumnies'; see §1.133, p. 46). A few neuter nouns (principally in *-r*/*n*-) also directly continue an archaic PIE pattern by which the plural nominative-accusative was distinguished from the singular by a different ablaut pattern (see §3.37, p. 78): singular *wādar* (written *wa-a-tar*) 'water', plural *widār* (written *ú-i-da-a-ar*) 'waters, (bodies of) water', singular *uttar* 'word, utterance, matter', plural *uttār* (written *ud-da-a-ar*) 'words', singular *ḫuidar* 'wildlife' (written variously: collective *ḫu-u-i-tar*, *ḫu-u-e-da-ar*, *ḫu-i-ta-ar*, but never with plene writing in final syllable), distributive plural *ḫuidār* 'beasts' (written *ḫu-i-ta-a-ar*, *ḫu-i-da-a-ar*, *ḫu-u-i-ta-a-ar*, always with plene writing in last syllable; for the forms see HED H 353–54). In all three of the above examples, a collective idea is either possible or explicit in the singular, and an individualizing idea is required for the plural. In the word *a-aš-šu-u* 'goods, possessions', the old plural of the adjective *a-aš-šu* 'good', the plene writing of the final syllable reflects the original presence of a laryngeal (**-uh*$_2$) (see Watkins 1982 and AHP 86, 131, 184).

Ergative

3.21. As described in §3.8 (p. 66), when a neuter noun appears as the subject of a transitive verb, it takes an ergative case ending: *-anza* in the singular (rarely written *-az*, §1.135 [p. 46]) or *-anteš* in the plural. In cases where there is a difference between the nominative-accusative and oblique stem in the base neuter noun, the ergative endings are regularly attached to the oblique stem: *ḫaštiyanza* < *ḫaštai-*/*ḫaštiy-* 'bone', [*ḫuw*]*alliššananza* < *ḫu*(*wa*)*lliš*(*n*)- '?', *paḫḫuenanza* < *paḫḫur*/*paḫḫuen-* 'fire', *linkiyanza*/*linkiaz* and *linkiyanteš* < *lingai-*/*linkiy-* 'oath(-deity)' (§3.10, p. 67). There are rare exceptions: $^{\text{GIŠ}}$*luttanza* < *luttai-*/*luttiy-* 'window'. Ergatives built to a collective stem are known in the case of $^{\text{[MUNUS].MEŠ}}$*ḫa!-az-ka-ra-a-i-ya-za*, $^{\text{MUNUS.MEŠ}}$*ḫa-az-qa-ra-i-ya-za*, [$^{\text{MUNUS.MEŠ}}$*ḫ*]*a-az-ka-ra-an-za* 'female temple musicians'[37] built to the collective *ḫazkarai* (for which see Hoffner 1998a), and possibly *linkiyanza* and *linkiyanteš* 'oath-deity/-deities built to the collective *kuie* MA-ME-TE$^{\text{MEŠ}}$ (**lingai*) *dapianda* KBo 16.98 iv 21 (CHD L–N 64 "pl. neut. nom.") of *lingai-* 'oath'. One must be careful to distinguish the ergative endings *-anza* and *-anteš* on *neuter* nouns from the homophonous sg. nom.

36. *aniyatta* is attested already in OS (see Neu 1983: 15–16 n. 74), while *aniyatti* is attested only in post-OS.

37. Although in this case the ergative *singular* ending *-a*(*n*)*za* was selected, in all occurrences the verbs of which the noun is the subject are plurals, showing that the plurality of the referent was kept in mind (see again Hoffner 1998a).

and pl. com. endings of *common-gender* stems in *-ant-* (whether these endings are historically related is a separate question, on which see p. 55, n. 11). One must further distinguish the ergative ending *-anza* when it is spelled without the *-n-* as *-az(a)* (see §1.135, p. 46) from the ablative ending (see §3.33, p. 77).

Genitive

3.22. Singular. For the genitive singular in PIE the endings: *-es*/*-os*/*-s* are posited (Sihler 1995: 248; Szemerényi 1996: 160; Meier-Brügger 2000: 183, 2003: 196). For the Hittite sg. gen. only the ending *-aš* (from PIE **-os*) is widely attested, although there is a rare use of *-š* with *nekuz* in the set phrase *nekuz meḫur* 'at twilight time' (originally *'time of twilight') (see Rieken 1999b: 84 with n. 400). Other forms such as UD-*az* (= *šiwaz*) 'in/on the day' may not be genitives but nominatives. The genitive personal names ^{m}*Nunnuš* and ^{m}*Taruḫšuš* and the DN ^{d}*Tašammaz* of the old language (so Neu 1979a: 185–86 with n. 22) may be relics of such a gen. in *-š* (opposed by Melchert 1984a) but pose problems that cannot yet be resolved. See also §4.44 (p. 98) and §4.50 (p. 100) (*šiunzanna-* < /siuns/ + /anna-/?).

3.23. Plural. In OH there existed a distinct form for the pl. gen., marked by an ending in *-an* < PIE **-ōm* (Laroche 1965; Kammenhuber 1969c: 304–5, 311, 313). It occurs on *padānn=a* ^{GIŠ}GÌR.GUB 'stool of the feet' (OS), *šiunan antuḫšiš* 'people of the gods' (OH/NS), ŠEŠ.MEŠ-*n=a* NIN.MEŠ-*n=a ištarna* 'among brothers and sisters' (OH/NS), $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$*ḫāpian parna* 'to the house of the *ḫ*.-men' (OH/MS), DUMU.MEŠ-*an parna* 'to the house of the (royal) children' (OS), and DINGIR.MEŠ-*nan=a ištarna* 'but (*-a*/*-ma*) among the gods' (OS), *araḫzenan* ŠA LÚ.KÚR KUR.KUR-*TIM* 'the lands of the surrounding enemies' (OH/NS).[38] As shown by Laroche (1965: 33–41), some examples of this ending must be interpreted as plurals, and all OH occurrences can be so read.[39] Despite repeated claims, there are no assured OS examples of *-an* marking genitive singular (LUGAL-*an āški* in Laws §187 may be 'to/in the gate of the kings', see p. 98, n. 89). Apparent examples of *-an* as a singular in post-OS copies of OH archetypes either are not genitives (see Laroche) or may be errors. One example from a MH text might be explained by a plural conception of the sky, analogous to the plural form in the Semitic languages (Akkadian *šamû*, WSem *šmm*): *nepišan* [(DINGIR.MEŠ *taknaš* DINGIR.MEŠ)] 'the gods of the heavens, the gods of earth' KUB 26.6:6′–7′ (the duplicate KBo 8.35 ii 10 reads *nēpišaš* DINGIR.MEŠ; cited CHD L–N 448 as either sg. or pl. gen.). Beginning already in OH we find a competing pl. gen. ending *-aš*, which becomes the only genitive ending in NH. It is impossible to determine whether this ending reflects a merger with the dative-locative plural or the genitive singular.

---

38. The first example refutes the claim (Kammenhuber 1969c: 254–55 [§30.2c] and 304–5 [§42]) that the ending was limited to *semantically* animate nouns.

39. Laroche's own conclusion (1965: 40) that *-an* originally had a collective meaning has no basis in fact, as his analysis of the attestations shows, but rests entirely on his erroneous prehistoric analysis of the pronominal pl. gen. ending *-enzan*. His claim of a prehistoric collective value for *-an* is refuted by the exclusively plural meaning of the cognate endings Lycian *-ẽ* and Lydian *-av*.

Dative-Locative

3.24. Singular. In Hittite the dative and locative, which were formally distinct in both singular and plural in PIE (in sg. dat. *-*ei*, loc. *-*i*; in pl. dat. *-*bh*(*y*)*os*, *-*mos*, loc. -*su*, see Szemerényi 1996: 160–61; Meier-Brügger 2000: 183, 2003: 196–97), have merged, ending in -*i* in the singular, -*aš* in the plural. The only sg. d.-l. ending in OS is -*i*. This is the regular ending throughout Hittite. In MH and NH we also find rarely -*e*: [*ḫ*]*ūmante=ya* HKM 88:5 (MH/MS), KUB 13.2 iv 10′ (MH/NS), and the *u*-stem forms *a-aš-ša-u-e* and *i-da-la-u-e* cited above in §1.61 (p. 28). In the case of *a*-stems, the stem-vowel is usually deleted before the d.-l. ending -*i*, but in a few cases we find the ending *added* to the stem in -*a*-, producing an ending -*ai* (e.g., *labarnai*). This rare ending is a sporadic innovation and does not represent an archaism (so, correctly, Neu 1979a: 188).[40] In some cases it can plausibly be explained as influenced by an immediately preceding *i*-stem attributive adj. ending correctly in -*ai*: *šallai ḫaššannai* 'to the great family'. In other cases the *a*-stem vowel was not deleted in a foreign word or foreign name: ^{URU}*Ēblai*, ^{d}*Mammai*, [^{d}*Apr*]*itai*, *labarnai*, and ^{MUNUS}*tawanannai* (so again Neu 1979a: 188, followed by Miller 2004: 141).

3.25. From a pre-Hittite IE locative in *-*we*/*on-t-i* was derived the infinitive in -*wanzi*, while the supine in -*wan* may have been derived from the endingless locative *-*we*/*on* (Laroche 1970: 41–42; Neu 1979a: 189). For another view, deriving the Hittite infinitive from an old ablative, see p. 185, n. 36.

3.26. A zero ending (an "endingless locative," also posited for PIE by Meier-Brügger 2000: 183; 2003: 196, but not by Szemerényi 1996: 160) also exists for a small group of nouns (Neu 1980, with additions by Oettinger 1982c): *šiwat* 'on the day', *dagan* 'on the ground', *nepiš* 'in heaven', É-*er* (**per*) 'in the house', *lamman* 'in/on the name' (see p. 109, n. 142), *keššar* 'in the hand' (see p. 116, n. 183), and possibly also *tapuwaš* 'on the side/rib' (see p. 118, n. 190) and ŠÀ-*er* (**ker*) 'in the heart'. See below in §3.32 for ablative forms built on the endingless locative, an archaism (Neu 1980): É-*erza* (versus *parnaz*, §3.32, p. 77; §4.115, p. 130), possibly also *nepišza* (versus *nepišaz*, §3.32 and §4.89 [p. 119] with n. 197), and *ketkarza* and *tapušza*, whose archaic status is shown by the fact that they are attested only as adverbs. For examples and uses see below in chapter 19. The few examples of the dative-locative of *u*-stems like GIŠ-*ru* are probably merely scribal errors but in any case do not reflect anything archaic in PIE terms.

3.27. The **plural** always had only one ending (-*aš*) throughout the Hittite period.

Vocative

3.28. The vocative proper exists only in the singular. Plural entities are addressed using appositives, often but not always in the nominative (see §16.16, p. 245). A voc.

40. Forms of the dative-locative of the *i*-stem adjectives *šuppai* and *šallai* are not examples of this archaic ending but can be explained in terms of the behavior of *i*-stem adjectives (see §4.37 and n. 71, p. 94).

(sg.) ending in zero is posited for PIE (see Szemerényi 1996: 160; Meier-Brügger 2000: 183–84; 2003: 196). In Hittite, most common nouns and adjectives (including a few *u*-stems)[41] the vocative appears as the bare stem (i.e., it has an ending in zero). Compare: (*a*-stems:) *išḫā-mi* 'my lord', ^{d}IŠKUR-*ta atta=šu*[*mmi*] 'O Tarḫunta, ou[r] father', (*u*-stems:) ^{d}*Mukišanu* 'O Mukišanu', ^{d}*Ištanui šarku* LUGAL-*ue* 'O Ištanu, pre-eminent king'. In OH, *u*-stem appellatives and names take the ending *-i*/*-e*: ^{d}UTU-*i* (*^{d}*Ištanui*) 'O Sungod', LUGAL-*ui* (**ḫaššui*) 'O king' (Neu 1979a: 179; Eichner 1974b: 234–35).[42] In at least two cases, *a*-stem nouns have a vocative in *-i* with the *a*-stem vowel deleted before it: *atti=me* 'O my father' and [ŠE]Š-*ni=mi* 'O my brother' (= **negni=mi* from *negna*-) (see CHD sub *-mi*-e 2′ and *negna*-). For a possible third instance (*lāli* 'O tongue') see p. 81, n. 25, for an alternative explanation. With *i*-stems the evidence is inconclusive: ^{d}*Kumarbi*, ^{d}*Impaluri*, *šalli* 'great' in ^{d}*Ištanu* GAL-*li* LUGAL-*ue* (i.e., **ḫaššue*) 'O Ištanu, great king', [^{d}*Ala*]*waimi le=aš namma zaḫḫiškeši* 'O Alawaimi, don't fight them any longer'. The enclitic possessive pronouns, which show *i*-mutation (§4.17, pp. 86–87), show either *-i* or *-e* vocalization in the vocative: *išḫā-mi* 'my lord', [ŠE]Š-*ni=mi* 'O my brother', *atti=me* 'O my father'. The use on vocatives of the clitic possessives in *-met*/*-mit* (^{d}UTU*=met* 'O my Sungod', EN*=mit* 'O my lord', DUMU*=mit* 'O my son', *wappu=mit* 'O my river bank'), which only occur in MS or NS copies of older texts is based on a misunderstanding of the clitic possessives by copyists who no longer had these as a living part of their language. Such writings do not represent a real usage of any period (see Otten 1973: 55; and §6.11, p. 141). Consonantal stems seem to show both the bare stem and the *-i* ending: ^{d}*Wišūriyanta* 'O Wisuriyant!' (read [wisuriyant/d]), but *pedanti* 'O place!' and KÙ.BABBAR-*an-ti* 'O Silver!'[43]

3.29. No unambiguous example of a vocative form of a neuter substantive is yet known in Hittite. To serve as the vocative of the neuter nouns *pedan* 'place', *nepiš*- 'sky', and KÙ.BABBAR 'silver', Hittite speakers used vocatives in *-anti*: *pedanti* 'O place!', and KÙ.BABBAR-*an-ti* 'O Silver!',[44] or instead of the vocative they used an appositional direct address, such as in *n=uš attaš nepišanza* EGIR-*an tarna* 'O Father Sky, release

41. This fact seems to undermine Luraghi's attempt (1997a: §2.1.6.2) to distinguish *u*-stems in naming constructions (e.g., ^{m}*Tuttu* ŠUM*=*ŠU 'Tuttu is his name') from *u*-stem vocatives, since both use the bare stem.

42. See, however, with *-e:* ^{d}UTU-*e* (= ^{d}*Ištanue*) *išḫa=mi* 'O Sungod, my lord!' KUB 31.127 i 1, and ^{d}UTU-*e šarkui* LUGAL-*ue* 'O Sungod, heroic king!' (ibid. 15).

43. Although the break before the form in question might be restored as [. . . DUMU-*iš-š*]*i* KÙ.BABBAR-*an-ti lē=mu=kan kueš*[*i*] KUB 36.18 ii 7 and the form in question understood as a dative concluding the preceding clause.

44. These forms show the vocative ending *-i* with stems in *-ant*- either directly or indirectly: directly, if one interprets *pedant*- and KÙ.BABBAR-*ant*- as contemporary examples of the "individualizing" suffix *-ant*- (see §2.25, p. 56); indirectly, if one views them as vocatives corresponding to ergatives in *-anz*(*a*). Regardless of its prehistoric source (on which see the refs. in n. 11, p. 66), sg. erg. *-anz*(*a*) /-ants/ that marks a subject matches *formally* the sg. nom. com. of a stem in *-ant*-. Thus, in cases of genuine personification, speakers could have analogically created vocatives in *-anti* by analyzing ergative /-ants/ as /-ant+s/ and adding the productive *-i* to the presumed stem /-ant-/. The absence of assibilation makes it extremely un-

them' KUB 15.34 iv 32, where the ergative case ending (*-anza*) on the neuter noun *nepiš-* is appropriate, since the neuter noun here takes a transitive verb. In the case of Silver, the form addresses a person bearing that name, not the metal itself (see Hoffner 1988b: 163–64). The 'place' addressed by the vocative *pedanti* is to be thought of in some sense as capable of understanding and responding to the address and therefore "animate." Of the situation in PIE, Szemerényi (1996: 159) writes: "In the neuter, nom. voc. acc. of the same number are not distinguished."

3.30. Neu (1979a: 178) and Luraghi (1997a: 15 §2.1.6) claim a vocative plural ending *-eš* but give no example to substantiate it. Nominative *pro* vocative occurs in rare instances in the singular but so far not in the plural. They may have in mind an example of appositional direct address (§16.16, p. 245), distinct from the true vocative (§16.13, p. 244).

Allative

3.31. Old Hittite had in the singular a noun case ending in *-a* indicating motion 'to', 'toward', or 'into'. The allative is exclusively the case of 'whither, to what place', not 'where, in what place' (so, correctly, Otten and Souček 1969: 62–63; incorrectly, Kammenhuber 1979a). This case was discovered by Forrer (1928), who called it the "Richtungskasus." It is sometimes called the "directive" (Laroche 1970; Brixhe 1979; Kammenhuber 1979a; Luraghi 1997a) or "terminative" (Starke 1977; Held, Schmalstieg, and Gertz 1987). The CHD III/1 (1980) p. xvi introduced the term *allative* as a deliberate pendant to its opposite, the *ablative*. So long as the case in *-a* is kept distinct from the dative-locative in *-i*, it is of little consequence which of the several proposed names one gives it. In this grammar, we use the term *allative*. On the history of research, see Starke 1977: 131–35. From the allative form of the heteroclitic action nouns in *-ātar* is derived the infinitive in *-anna* (§4.107, p. 128; see also Laroche 1970: 41–42; Neu 1970: 55 n. 30). Many scholars think that common local adverbs such as *anda*, *arḫa*, *parā*, and *šarā*, which express directed movement, originated as allatives (see Laroche 1970; Neu 1974: 67; Starke 1977). Perhaps beginning already in OH (Otten and Souček 1969: 62–63; Neu 1979a: 189–90) and intensifying in MH, the allative forms in *-a* (but not the infinitives or local adverbs) were replaced by forms in *-i.* In NH speech, the allative no longer existed, although allative forms continued to be copied by NH scribes from older archetypes.

Ablative

3.32. The ablative and instrumental cases do not distinguish singular and plural. The usual ablative ending is *-az,* with occasional post-OH spelling variant *-aza* (see Melchert 1977: 443–47). The alternative post-consonantal ending *-za* (not *-aza*) is archaic (see

---

likely that the vocatives in *-anti* are archaisms of any sort (see the arguments of Carruba [1992: 86] against Garrett [1990b: 275]).

§3.26 and §4.115 [p. 130]) and thus far found only in É-*erza* ‘from the house’, *nepišza* ‘from heaven’ (OS), *šittarza* (§4.84, p. 117), and the frozen ablative in the local adverbs *tapušza* ‘to the side’ (§19.11, p. 291, §20.28, p. 300; compare GÙB-*laz* ‘to/on the left’, *kunnaz* ‘to/on the right’), *ketkarza* ‘at the head’ (§3.26; §7.19, p. 147), *andurza* ‘inside’ (§16.92, p. 265, §19.5, p. 289), *araḫza* ‘outside’ (§19.5), *āppa par*(*š*)*za* ‘backwards’ (Neu 1980). The endings *-az* (following vowels) and *-za* (following consonants) are almost in complementary distribution in Old Script manuscripts (Melchert 1977). But already in these oldest manuscripts *-az* begins to encroach on *-za* in the consonantal stems. There are occasional instances of the use of the Akkadian preposition *IŠTU* ‘from’ followed by the inflected ablative form of the noun: *IŠTU* KUR *Lu-ú-ya-az* ‘from the land of Luwiya’ KBo 6.2 i 42 = Laws §20 (OS), on which see LH 31 with n. 48.

3.33. There is a rare ablative ending *-anza*: assured examples include ^{GIŠ}*luttanza* KBo 8.42 obv. 2 (OS), *luttianza* KBo 21.95 i 11, *išḫananza* KUB 39.102 i 1, *papprannanza*, and *uddananza* KUB 12.58 iv 26–27. However, some alleged examples (e.g., *ḫannešnanza*, *ḫuitnanza*, and *tuppianza* cited by Melchert 1977: 449–50) are instead ergatives (for *uddananza* in both functions see §4.101, pp. 124–125). Since the ergative ending may also appear as *-az(a)* (see §1.135, p. 46), caution is needed in interpreting forms with endings *-anza*, *-az*, and *-aza*.

3.34. For the variant ending *-*(*a*)(*z*)*zi* that regularly appears before the clitic *-ya* ‘also, and’ and rarely in word-final position, see §1.116 (p. 42).

Instrumental

3.35. The instrumental, like the ablative, does not distinguish singular and plural. Alongside the prevailing instrumental ending *-it* or *-et*, we also find a rare ending *-d*/*t*(*a*): *ganut* and *genut* < *genu-* ‘knee’ (see p. 101, n. 111), *šakuit* and *šākuwat*[45] < *šākuwa-* ‘eye’, *kiššarit* and *kiššarta* ‘with the hand’, *ištaminit* and *ištamanta* ‘with the ear’, *wedanda* and *wetenit* ‘with water’, *šaganda* ‘with oil/grease’, *uddanta* ‘by the word’. See also *kad!-du-ut* ‘with (the eagle’s) talons’ KUB 43.60 i 17. It is plausible that the simple dental without preceding *i* was the earliest Hittite instrumental ending (Neu 1979a: 190), with the *i* developing by anaptyxis (§§1.80–1.81, p. 34) in the environment of a preceding dental. One also finds this ending with the demonstratives: *apedanda* ‘with that, therewith’ (HED A 87), *kedanta* ‘with this’ (see Melchert 1977: 458). For an example in a unique infinitive form see p. 185, n. 36. The unique form *iēšnat* in *namma alwanzenan i-e-eš-na-at* DINGIR.MAḪ-*aš iwa*[*r* . . .] [. . .-]*andu* ‘Then let them [. . .] the sorceror with *ieššar*, like the Mother Goddess’ KBo 21.12 rev.? 23–24 (for sg. nom.-acc. *iēššar* see KUB 9.39 ii 2 and 8.39 2, 4, 5) is probably an imperfect attempt to replace an older instrumental *i-e-eš-ni-it* with an ablative *i-e-eš-na-az*. It is not evidence for an instrumental ending *-at*.

45. KUB 23.72 + rev. 15 (Mita text, MH/MS).

Stem Variation

3.36. In most cases the *stem*, consisting of a root or a root plus one or more suffixes, to which inflectional endings are attached, is invariant in Hittite. In some instances, there is variation in the stem, not always reflecting the PIE morphological feature *ablaut*, on which see §3.37. In nouns and adjectives, such variation usually contrasts the singular nominative and accusative (sometimes only the singular nominative) with all other forms of the paradigm, but other patterns also exist. It is difficult to prove, but likely, that in a few nominal paradigms the variation in the shape of the stem is accompanied by a shift in the accent (see on this issue §1.46, p. 25). In the demonstrative pronouns, there is also a contrast between the stem of the nominative and accusative versus the other cases see (§7.3, p. 143).

3.37. Ablaut. Hittite nominal (and verbal) inflection shows some traces of the PIE morphological process of vowel alternation called *ablaut* (also *apophony* or *vowel gradation*).[46] Most PIE roots and suffixes were defined by the sequence of consonants they contained. PIE roots are conventionally cited with an **e* vowel, but in inflected words a root or suffix[47] could appear with short **e* or **o* (*full grade*), long **ē* or **ō* (*lengthened grade*), or no vowel (*zero grade*).[48] It was common in PIE for different parts of a single paradigm to show different ablaut grades (e.g., nominative-accusative versus the other cases, or singular versus plural). Inflectional classes that show such alternations are labeled *ablauting* (such as *i*-stem nouns; see sg. nom. *wešiš* — pl. nom. *wešaēš*). As in other IE languages, in Hittite the appearance of ablaut has been changed due to prehistoric sound changes and the tendency to generalize one ablaut grade throughout a paradigm. Details will be left to the description of the individual inflectional types.[49]

---

46. There was a strong correlation in PIE between the position of the accent and the ablaut pattern, and it seems virtually certain that the vowel alternations of ablaut were originally phonologically conditioned. But by the time of PIE, ablaut was a *morphological* process: a given morphological category had a particular ablaut. This is still seen in the "strong" verbs of modern Germanic languages such as English and German: present *sings*/*singt*, past *sang*/*sang*, past participle *sung*/*gesungen*. For a general overview of PIE ablaut see Sihler 1995: 108–24; Meier-Brügger 2000: 135–42; 2003: 144–52.

47. There was also ablaut in a limited number of inflectional endings (e.g., see §3.22 [p. 73] on the three PIE forms of the singular genitive ending).

48. In roots or suffixes that contained one of the sonorant consonants **m*, **n*, **l*, or **r*, the sonorant became syllabic (see the sound of English *bottom*, *button*, *bottle*, *butter*) in the zero grade when between two consonants or between consonant and word boundary. Likewise, the glides **w* and **y* became respectively **u* and **i* in the same position.

49. For the definitions and terminology of PIE inflectional types now popular in the field see, e.g., Meier-Brügger 2000: 188–201; 2003: 201–18. No attempt can be made here to describe the historical development of these types in Hittite. For many of the consonant stem nouns see Rieken 1999a.

Chapter 4

NOUN AND ADJECTIVE DECLENSION

a-Stem Nouns

4.1. Of the Hittite nouns and adjectives with vocalic stems, those with stems in *a* equal in number the total of those in *i* and *u* combined. They form the largest and most regular Hittite stem-class. In this class, substantives and adjectives decline identically, in contrast to the *i*- and *u*-stem classes. For *a*-stem nouns in the Old Anatolian languages see Kammenhuber 1969b: 193–94, 279–80 and Meriggi 1980: §§5–40.

Common-Gender a-Stem Nouns

4.2. The following are paradigms of *a*-stem common-gender nouns (HE §§64–65). Forms in bold type are in OS. Forms in parentheses are less common variants.

	'human being'[1]	'father'	'mother'	'lord'
	Singular			
nom.	*antuḫšaš*, *antūwaḫḫaš*, *antuwaḫḫiš*[2]	***attaš***, *addaš*	***annaš***	***išḫāš, išḫaš***[3]
acc.	*anduḫšan*, *antūḫšan*,[4] *antuwaḫḫan*,	***attan***, *addan*	***annan***	*išḫān*
voc.[5]		*atta*,[6] *atti*[7]		*išḫā*, *išḫa*

1. The stems *antuwaḫḫa-* and *antuḫša-* are largely suppletive in OH (perhaps due to ablaut grade, according to Rieken 2001: 190–91; see here §1.76, p. 33): the former in sg. nom., the latter elsewhere. The stems begin to compete in MH, and in NH the latter has almost completely displaced the former.

2. The rare form *antūwaḫza* (KUB 12.44 iii 7), sg. nom. by context, if correct, is presently inexplicable (HW² A 118–19 "wertlos").

3. This form is found in OS only with attached clitics.

4. The rare writing *an-tu-u-uḫ-ša-an* occurs in the NH fragment Bo 3379 8′ (StBoT 19 50).

5. Another *a*-stem vocative: *ne-eg-na* 'O brother' (see Hoffner 1988a).

6. ^{d}IŠKUR-*ta* [*a*]*t-ta-šu*[*m-mi*] 'O Tarḫunta, our father!' KUB 33.66 + KBo 40.333 iii 8, ed. Groddek 1999: 38, 40, 46.

7. *at-ti-me* 'O my father!' (KBo 12.70 rev.! iii 10, see CHD sub *marnan* A and *parganu-*).

	‘human being’[1]	‘father’	‘mother’	‘lord’
gen.	***anduḫšaš***, *antuḫšaš*, *antuwaḫḫaš*[8]	*attaš*	*annaš*	*išḫāš*
d.-l.	*antuḫši*, *antuḫše*[9]	***atti***	***anni***	***išḫī***[10] (*ešḫe*, *išḫa*[11])
	Numerically Indifferent			
abl.	*antuḫšaz*[12]	***attaz***	*annaz(a)*	
ins.[13]	*antuḫšet*[14]			
	Plural			
nom.[15]	*antuḫšeš*, *antuḫšiš*,[16] *antuwaḫḫeš*, *antuḫšuš*[17]	*attiēš*,[18] *attiš*, *adduš*	*anniš*	*išḫēš*[19]
acc.[20]	*anduḫšuš*, *antuḫšuš*, *antuḫšeš*[21]	***attuš***	***annuš***, *anniuš*[18]	EN.MEŠ-*uš*
gen.	*antuḫšaš*	*addaš*		*išḫāš*
d.-l.	*antūwaḫḫaš*, *antuḫšaš*, *anduḫšaš*	*addaš*		*išḫaš*[22]

8. *an-du-uḫ-ša-aš* KBo 17.1 + KBo 25.3 i 23 (OS); *an-tu-uḫ-ša-aš* KUB 31.127 + ABoT 44 i 37 (OH/NS).

9. *an-tu-uḫ-še* KUB 43.58 i 52 (MS), KUB 44.61 rev. 7, 19. For dative-locative in *-e* see §3.24, p. 74 and §1.61, p. 28. *an-tu-uḫ-še* is not yet attested in OS.

10. Always written non-plene (e.g., *iš-ḫi-iš-ši*) when enclitic pronoun is attached.

11. *iš-ḫa-aš-ši* KUB 24.9 i 51 (TH 2:28 i 57) with var. *iš-ḫi-eš-ši* KUB 41.1 i 10. See also EN-*a=šši* in KUB 36.74 iii 6, 7.

12. *an-tu-uḫ-ša-az* ‘together with (its) inhabitants’ BrTabl. i 88 (Tudḫ. IV), *an-tu-uḫ-ša-az-zi-ya* (with clitic *-ya* ‘and’, see §1.16, p. 42; §3.34, p. 77) BrTabl. i 89 (Tudḫ. IV). Also attested in the writing UN-*az* (NH). Correct LH 270, where sg. acc. LÚ.U$_{19}$.LU-*na-az* (**antuḫšan=a=z*) is incorrectly labeled “abl.”

13. Other *a*-stem sg. ins.: *tešḫit* ‘by means of a dream’, *patet* and GÌR-*it* ‘by foot, on foot’, *unuwašḫit* ‘with decoration’, *zapzikit* ‘with glazed dinnerware’, and *lalit* ‘with the tongue’.

14. *an-tu-uḫ-še-et* 1691/u ii 5 (MS).

15. Other *a*-stem pl. nom.: *ḫaššeš*, *ḫanzaššeš*, *kakkapiš*, *pappanikneš*, *tuekkeš*, and *walleš* in *-eš* or *-iš*, and *kakapuš*, ZAG.ḪI.A-*uš* (**irḫuš* ‘borders’ KBo 5.13 i 27) in *-uš*.

16. *an-tu-wa-aḫ-ḫe-eš* KBo 3.60 ii 16 (OH/NS) is possibly sg. nom. by context, although seemingly pl. nom. in form; *an-tu-uḫ-ši-iš* KBo 3.1+ ii 32 (OH/NS), [*an-tu-u*]*ḫ-še-eš* HKM 50:5 (MH/MS).

17. UN.MEŠ-*uš* BrTabl. ii 48. For other examples of *a*-stem nouns with late NH pl. nom. in *-uš* see above sub §3.16, p. 70.

18. See §4.17, p. 86.

19. *iš-ḫe-e-eš* KUB 30.68 obv. 6, KBo 19.88:4′, *iš-ḫé-eš* KBo 3.46 obv. 38. There are no examples of pl. nom. **iš-ḫi-iš* or **iš-ḫi-i-iš* to match *at-ti-iš*, *an-ni-iš*, etc.

20. Other *a*-stem pl. acc.: *nēkuš* ‘sisters’, ŠEŠ.MEŠ-*uš* (**negnuš*) ‘brothers’, DUMU.MEŠ-*uš* ‘sons, children’, ZAG.ḪI.A-*uš* ‘borders’ KBo 4.10 rev. 21, ÍD.MEŠ-*uš* ‘rivers’, ḪUR.SAG.MEŠ-*uš* ‘mountains’.

21. HKM 89:15 (MH/MS) is accusative by context. [*šu*]*lleš* in 89:19 seems also to be pl. acc.

22. *iš-ḫa-*[*aš*?-]*ša-aš-ma-aš-ša-an* (*išḫaš=a=šmaš=šan*) KBo 3.1 i 21 (OH/NS).

	‘tongue’	‘ear’[23]	‘roof’	‘sea’
	Singular			
nom.	*lālaš*	*ištaminaš*, *ištamanaš*[24]	*šuḫḫaš*	*arunaš*
acc.	***lālan***	*ištamanan*	*šuḫḫan*	*arunan*
voc.	*lāli*[25]			
gen.	*lalāš*	—[24]	*šuḫḫaš*	*arunaš*
d.-l.	*lāli*	*iš-dam-ma-ne*,[26] *ištamani*[27]	***šūḫḫi***	***aruni***
all.[28]			*šuḫḫa*	***aruna***[29]
	Numerically Indifferent			
abl.	EME-*az*	*ištamanaz*	*šuḫḫaza*, *šuḫḫazi(=ya)*[30]	***arunaz***, *arunaza*
ins.	*lālit*	*ištaminit*, *ištamanta*[31]		
	Plural			
nom.	***lāleš***	*ištamaneš*[32]		
acc.	***lāluš***	*ištāmanuš*	*šuḫḫuš*	*arunuš*
coll.	*lāli*[25]		*šuḫḫa*	
gen.	EME.ḪI.A-*aš*			*arunaš*[33]
d.-l.			*šuḫḫaš*	

23. For the development of the word for ‘ear’ see Oettinger 2003: 147–51. The word was originally a common gender *n*-stem of the type of *išḫiman-* (see §4.74, p. 111), as still reflected in the archaic instrumental *išḫimanta*. For the most part, however, the word came to be inflected as a common gender *a*-stem *išḫa/imana-*. There is no syllabically written neuter form of this noun *ištaman* in KUB 14.13 i 18–20, as HED E/I 458 claims. But such a neuter singular **ištaman* may stand behind the spelling GEŠTU-*an* KUB 8.83 4–5 (OH/MS), back-formed from a collective *iš-ta-ma-aš-*[*mi-it*] ‘your (pl.) ears’.

24. UZU*ištamanaš=kan* KUB 55.20 + KUB 9.4 i 4, cited by HED E/I 458 as genitive, is nominative by context.

25. For the repeated direct address form *la-a-li la-a-li* ‘Tongues! Tongues!’ KBo 20.59:16′ and EME.ḪI.A EME.ḪI.A KUB 44.4 + KBo 13.241 rev. 22 (the latter with apparent neuter agreement) as collectives, see Hoffner 2003b: 621. Alternatively, *la-a-li* could be a sg. voc. in *-i* (compare *atti=me* ‘O my father’), on which see §3.28, p. 75, and §16.14 (p. 244).

26. *iš-dam-ma-né-eš-ši* KBo 10.45 ii 26. For sg. d.-l. in *-e* see §3.24 (p. 74). The writing *-dam-ma-* may not imply geminate *m*; see §1.24 (p. 19).

27. The unique writing UZU*iš-ta-ma-aš-ni* KUB 55.20 i 5 is due to a scribal error (read *iš-ta-ma*⟪*-aš*⟫*-ni* with Neu apud Rieken 1999a: 406 n. 2042).

28. Among *a*-stem allatives: *laḫḫa* ‘to/on a campaign’ (OS), *ḫapā* ‘to the river’, ZAG-*na* ‘to the right’.

29. *a-ru-na* KUB 36.110 iii 21 (OS), and fairly frequently in OH/MS or OH/NS.

30. The abl. *šūḫza* (OS) belongs to another stem *šuḫ*(*ḫ*)-: see Rieken 1999a: 65–66.

31. See §3.35 (p. 77).

32. *iš-ta-ma-né-eš* KBo 13.31 ii 11.

33. KUB 36.89 rev. 4 (NH) see HED A 179.

4.3. For the stem, gender, and paradigm of *keššar*, *keššara-* 'hand' see §4.82 (p. 115).

4.4. For the vocatives see §3.28 (p. 74).

4.5. The common *a*-stem noun *pada-* 'foot' is mostly written with the logogram GÌR. But some syllabic forms exist: pl. acc. *pa-a-tu-u*[*š*] KBo 25.46:3, pl. gen. *pa-ta-a-an* KBo 17.74 i 9 (OH/MS), *pa-ta-a-n*(*a*) (= *patān=a*) KBo 20.8 obv.? (4), 19 (OS), [*p*]*a-a-ta-an* KUB 34.120:6 (OH/NS), KUB 44.36 ii 14 (OH/NS), d.-l. *pa-ta-a-aš*(*-ša-aš*) KBo 17.15:10 (OS), ins. *pa-te-et* KUB 51.20 rev. 5 (NS) and GÌR.ḪI.A-*it* (**pate*/*it*) in KBo 10.2 ii 19 (OH/NS).[34] The extremely common *a*-stem noun 'son, child' is always written logographically[35]: sg. nom. DUMU-(*l*)*aš*, sg. acc. DUMU-(*l*)*an*, sg. gen. DUMU-(*l*)*aš*, sg. d.-l. DUMU-*li*, pl. nom. DUMU.MEŠ(*-eš*), pl. acc. DUMU.MEŠ-*uš*, pl. gen. DUMU.MEŠ-*aš*, pl. d.-l. DUMU.MEŠ-*aš*.

Neuter a-Stem Nouns

4.6. Neuter *a*-stem nouns are much less common (HE §64), because only common gender *a*-stems are productive in Hittite. Examples are: *peda-* 'place', *ega-* 'ice', and *yuga-* 'pair, yoke'. For ^{GIŠ}*eya-* (an evergreen tree) see below, §4.70 (p. 110).

	'place'	'ice' [36]	'yoke' [37]
	Singular		
nom.-acc.	***pēdan***, *pedan*	*ekan*	*yugan*
gen.	***pēdaš***, *pedaš*	*ekaš*	*yugaš*
d.-l.	***pēdi***, *pedi*	***eki***	*yuki*
	Numerically Indifferent		
abl.	*pēdaz(a)*, *pedaz(a)*		
ins.			*yukit*
	Plural		
gen.	*pēdaš*		
d.-l.	*pēdaš*, *pedaš*		

34. The Hittite *a*-stem has replaced an original root noun, whose alternating accent is probably still reflected in the differing position of the vowel length in the pl. acc. versus the pl. gen. and d.-l. See §1.146 (p. 50).

35. The suggestion that *pulla-* is the syllabic reading for 'son' (Hoffmann 1992) is unconvincing; see CHD P sub ^{É}*pulla-*.

36. A secondary common gender sigmatic sg. nom. is also attested: *e-ga-aš* KUB 21.18 rev. 19 (HED E/I 257, citing Laroche 1969a: 372–73). See also Hoffner 1971. No attested form of *ega-* unambiguously indicates an *n*-stem.

37. A rare example of the bare root occurs in $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$ḪÚB.BI 3 *i-ú-uk ú-en-zi* 'three pairs of acrobats/dancers come' KBo 25.72:11′ (OS). For discussion see Rieken 1999a: 61–62.

4.7. More common than neuter singular nouns are those inflected only in the collective (neuter) plural, indicating items consisting of aggregates of components: ^{TU7}*ḫaramma* (a kind of stew), ^{GIŠ}*galamma* (a part of the door), $^{(UZU)}$*šuppa* 'consecrated meat',[38] *kušata* 'bride price', *tarušḫa* (a leather part of the harness). This latter type can be identified by the fact that there is no clear sg. nom.-acc. form in *-an.* Only attested in the nominative-accusative are *ḫaramma*, *galamma*, *piyētta*, *pūrana*, and *tarušḫa.* The other two nouns have the following limited paradigm.

	'consecrated meat'	'bride price'
nom.-acc.	***šuppa***	*kūšata*, *kušāta*, *kūšāta*
gen.	*šuppa(ya)š*	*kušataš*

4.8. On vocatives of neuter substantives see §3.29 (p. 75).

a-Stem Adjectives

4.9. For primary (i.e., underived) *a*-stem adjectives see §2.7 (p. 52). See also those in *-ala-* (§2.20, p 55), *-alla-* (§2.21, p. 55) and *-iya-* (§2.35, p. 58). Other examples can be found in the lists provided by Reichert (1963: 65–74) and Jie (1994: 6–21).

4.10. The paradigm of *a*-stem adjectives (HE §65):

	'empty'[39]	'external'	'right-hand'	'earlier, former'[40]
	Singular			
nom. com.	—	*araḫzenaš*[41]	*kunnaš*	*annallaš*
acc. com.	*t/dannattan*	*araḫzenan*	ZAG-*an*	*annallan*
n.-a. neut.	*t/dannattan*	*araḫzenan*	*kunnan*	*annallan*
gen.		*araḫzenaš*	ZAG-*naš*	*annallaš*
d.-l.	*dannatti*	*araḫzeni*	***kunni***, **ZAG-*ni***	*annalli*
all.		*araḫzena*	ZAG-*na*	

38. ^{UZU}*šuppa* is a lexicalized form of the archaic collective plural of *šuppi-* 'sacred, consecrated'; see §4.37 (p. 94).

39. The adjective *dannatta-* 'empty' is exclusively an *a*-stem. The forms *dan-na-at-*《*ta*》*-te-eš* and *dan-na-at-te*!*-in* in KUB 36.89 rev. 41–42 belong to a noun 'desolation, wilderness' (Haas 1970: 155), not to the adjective, and a noun is also appropriate for the example *dan-na-at-ti-iš* in KUB 21.29 i 12 (Hatt. III).

40. An *i*-stem *annalli-* also exists, for which the sg. neut. *annalli*, the sg. acc. com. *annallin* and the plural form *annalliuš* (*annalliuš* KUB 38.34:7, KUB 40.2 rev. 8, and *annaliuš* HT 4:13) are attested. See §2.21 (p. 55) and §4.17 (p. 86).

41. We do not distinguish the signs ZI and ZÉ in the bound transcription of this word, since ZI can also be read *ze*.

	‘empty’[39]	‘external’	‘right-hand’	‘earlier, former’[40]
	Numerically Indifferent			
abl.		*araḫzenaza*	***kunnaz***, **ZAG-*a*[*z*]**	*annallaz*
ins.[42]			***kunnit***	
	Plural			
nom. com.	*dannadduš*	*araḫzeneš*,[43] *araḫzenuš*	ZAG-*niš*	*annall(i)eš*, *annalliš*
acc. com.[44]		—[43]	ZAG-*nuš*	
n.-a. neut.	*t/dannatta*	*araḫzena*	*kunna*	*annalla*
gen.		*araḫzenaš*		*annallaš*
d.-l.	*dannattaš*			*annallaš*

	‘bewitching’	‘first’	‘last’	‘exempt, free’
	Singular			
nom. com.	*alwanzenaš*	*ḫantezziyaš*	***appezziyaš***	***arawaš***[45]
acc. com.	*alwanzenan*	*ḫantezziyan*	*appezziyan*	*arawan*
n.-a. neut.	*alwanzenan*	***ḫantezzian***	—[46]	*arawan*
gen.	*alwanzenaš*	***ḫantezziyaš***		*arawaš*
d.-l.	*alwanzeni*			*arawi*
all.	*alwanzena*			
	Numerically Indifferent			
abl.	*alwanzenaz*	*ḫantezzi(y)az*	*apezzi(y)az*	*arawaz*
ins.[47]	*alwanzenit*			*arawit*
	Plural			
nom. com.	*alwanzeneš*	***ḫantezzieš***[48]	***appezzieš***[48]	*araweš*
acc. com.	*alwanzenuš*	*ḫantezziuš*	***appezziuš***	
n.-a. neut.	*alwanzena*			
gen.	*alwanzenaš*			
d.-l.	*alwanzenaš*		*appezziyaš*	

42. Other *a*-stem sg. ins.: *ne-e-u*[-*it*] and *ni-u-i-i*[*t*].

43. Written *a-ra-aḫ-zé-né-e-eš* (with the NI sign) and transcribed *araḫzenieš* by HED A 134. *araḫzenaš* in the NH examples *uni araḫzenaš* KUR.KUR in KBo 3.4 i 26 and *kē araḫzenaš* KUR.KUR.MEŠ ibid. i 28 (for the word order see 18.25, p. 284) cannot be pl. acc. com. as often assumed, as shown by the modifiers *uni* and *kē*. If we are not dealing with a misspelling for *araḫzena* in both places, the construction might be that of a genitive ‘land(s) of the outside’, perhaps modeled on *takšulaš utnē* ‘lands of peace’.

44. For the *a*-stem adjective *newa-* the pl. acc. *ne-mu-uš* reflects the shift **newuš* > *nemuš* (see §1.126, p. 44).

45. *a-ra-u-aš* KBo 22.62 + KBo 6.2 iii 22 = Laws §56 (OS), *a-ra-u-wa-aš* KUB 8.41 iii 12 (OS).

46. From the sg. nom.-acc. neut. of *appezziya-* was formed the adverb *appezziyan* (from OS) / *appezzin* ‘afterwards’ (see §1.76, p. 32; §19.6, p. 290).

47. Other *a*-stem sg. ins.: *ne-e-u*[-*it*], and *ni*(or *né*)-*u-i-i*[*t*].

48. See p. 70, n. 31.

	‘internal, interior’	‘central, middle’	‘upper, superior’
	Singular		
nom. com.	*anturiyaš*	*ištarniyaš*	
acc. com.		*ištarniyan*	*šarāzziyan*[49]
n.-a. neut.		*ištarniyan*	
gen.	*anturiyaš*		*šarāzzi(y)aš*
d.-l.	*anturiya*	*ištarniya*	*šarazziya*
all.			*šarazziya*
	Numerically Indifferent		
abl.			*šarāzzi(y)az*
	Plural		
nom. com.	*anturieš*, *anturiuš*		*ša*[*razz*]*iēš*,[50] *šarazziuš*
gen.			*šarazziyaš*
d.-l.	*anturiyaš*	*ištarniyaš*	*šarazziyaš*

4.11. The oblique case forms (gen., abl., ins.) and the pl. nom. and acc. of *ḫantezziya-*, *appezziya-*, and *šarazziya-* would be indistinguishable from those of the shorter, *i*-stem forms, of these words, *ḫantezzi-*, *appezzi-*, and *šarazzi-* (§2.53, p. 61; §4.38, p. 94).

i- and *u*-Stem Nouns

4.12. For *i*- and *u*-stem nouns in the Old Anatolian languages see Kammenhuber 1969b: 194–95, 270–82 and Meriggi 1980: §§41–92. For the *u*-stem nouns in Hittite see Weitenberg 1984 and the reviews by Melchert (1984a), Carruba (1989), and Eichner (1991).

4.13. There is a strong parallelism between the inflection of *i*- and *u*-stems in Hittite in terms of where and how they show ablaut. Where the former have *-i-*, *-iy-*, and *-ay-*, the latter have, respectively, *-u-*, *-uw-*, and *-aw-*. In contrast to the *a*-stem class, substantives and adjectives of the *i*- and *u*-stem classes for the most part decline differently. Substantives regularly have an invariant stem in *-i-*/*-u-* (respectively, *-iy-* and *-uw-* before *-a-*). Adjectives, however, show ablaut (see §3.37, p. 78), usually showing *-i-*/*-u-* in the nominative and accusative singular, but *-a*(*y*)*-*/*-aw-* in the nominative and accusative plural and in the oblique cases. There are exceptionally some substantives with ablaut and some adjectives without it.

49. Only in the broken context of KUB 33.62 ii 4′, where Haas (1994: 713) and Glocker (1997: 34) take it as sg. acc. com. The reconstruction of the context and grammatical interpretation proposed by these scholars is quite uncertain. The form could also be a sg. nom.-acc. neut.

50. KUB 19.2:47 (NH).

i-Stem Nouns

4.14. There are ten times as many common gender *i*-stem nouns as neuter *i*-stem nouns. Several productive derivational suffixes end in *-i-*: *-alli-*, *-ašti-*, *-ili-*, *-ri-*, *-ulli-*, *-uzzi-* (see §2.21–2.49, pp. 55–61)

4.15. The nouns *āpi-* 'ritual pit', *erḫui-* 'basket', and *zakki-* 'latch' entered Hittite from Luwian, whence they retain remnants of a Luwian *t*-stem in the sg. d.-l. *erḫuiti*, *zakkitī*, *āpiti*, and abl. *āpitaz* (Starke 1990: 198–200, 211–12, 221). The Luwian nouns with nominative-accusative singular in *-aḫi* are also *t*-stems (see DLL 132 §5). They are usually inflected as *i*-stems in Hittite (common gender or neuter), but with the *-t-* often in the oblique cases (see the paradigms in §4.23). Luwian influence is also seen in the abl. ending *-ati* occurring on the noun *aulati* (§4.23).

4.16. Many nouns borrowed from Hurrian end in *i*, the *i*-vowel often being a part of a Hurrian suffix: *-šḫi-* (*aḫrušḫi-*, *ḫubrušḫi-*), *-ḫi-*, *-ki-*, *-ški-*, *-ugari-*, *-uri-*, *-arti-*, etc.[51] Loanwords from Hurrian or Akkadian mediated through Hurrian enter Hittite as *i*-stems: *tuppi-* 'clay tablet' < Akk. *ṭuppu*, *šankunni-* 'priest' < Akk. *šangû* < Sum. sanga (with possible stem influence from Hurrian as the intermediary of the loan?), *aganni-* (a container) < Akk. *agannu*, ^{LÚ}*apiši-* (incantation priest) < Akk. *āšipu* (with metathesis, §1.140, p. 48), *atupli-* (a garment) < Akk. *utuplu*, *ḫalzi-* 'region, district' < Akk. *ḫalṣu*, *ḫazzizzi-* 'ear' < Akk. *ḫasīsu*, *kakkari-* (a kind of bread loaf) < Akk. *kakkaru*, *nura*(*n*)*ti-* 'pomegranate' < Akk. *lurindu* (**nurindu*), etc.

i-Mutation

4.17. Complicating the picture of the *i*-stem noun is the phenomenon of so-called *i*-motion (or *i*-mutation). Most (but not all) Luwian nominal stems insert an obligatory *-i-* between the stem and the case endings of the nominative and accusative of the common gender, singular and plural (Starke 1990: 56–93). In the case of *a*-stems, the *-a-* of the stem is deleted before the *-i-*. Derivatives show that the *-i-* is not part of the stem. The result, however, is in effect a paradigm with *-i-* in some forms and *-a-* in others. When the Hittites began to borrow Luwian nouns and suffixes (see §2.55, p. 62), they not only imitated the Luwian usage in loanwords but also carried it over in some cases to native Hittite words. In paradigms of such nouns, the *-i-* forms tend to be found in the common gender nominative and accusative, and the *-a-* forms elsewhere (Rieken 1994: 43–47). This entailed not only creating new *-i-* forms to old *a*-stems (pl. nom. com. $^{MUNUS.MEŠ}$*katrīēš* to ^{MUNUS}*katra-* 'female musician', *attiēš* to *atta-* 'father', pl. acc. com. *anniuš* to *anna-* 'mother', *gimriuš* to *gimra-* 'field', sg. acc. com. ^{GI}*natin* to *nata-* 'reed'), but also by "reverse *i*-mutation" new *-a-* forms to old *i*-stems (sg. gen. ^{GIŠ}*ḫulugannaš*

51. For these derivational suffixes in Hurrian see the grammatical treatments of Hurrian, such as Speiser 1941; Bush 1964; Neu 1988b; Girbal 1990; Wilhelm 1992a; and Wegner 2000: 47–52, 75–77.

and abl. ^{GIŠ}*ḫulugannaz* to ^{GIŠ}*ḫuluganni-*, which in OH is a simple *i*-stem without mutation [see sg. d.-l. ^{GIŠ}*ḫuluganniya*, abl. ^{GIŠ}*ḫuluganniaz*]). Predictably, however, there was some confusion, most notably in stems with suffixes containing *-l*(*l*)-: e.g., for 'former', we find the stems *annala-*, *annalla-*, *annali-*, and *annalli-* (Rieken 1994: 49–50). In cases where a noun is poorly attested, especially in OH, we cannot always be certain whether the stem is originally in *-a-* or *-i-* (e.g., *palša-* and *palši-* 'way, road'). Our convention with nouns showing *i*-mutation is to write the stem as *-a/i-* (e.g., nouns with stem *-aššа/i-*).

4.18. In *i*-stems the inflectional endings combine with the stem as follows (see also Neu 1985): (1) endings which consist of simple consonants or zero are affixed directly to the *i*; (2) case endings which begin with an *a*-vowel are affixed to the longer stem in *-iy-* or *-ay-*. Case endings that begin with an *e* or *u* vowel (pl. nom. com. *-eš*, pl. acc. com. *-uš*) are affixed directly to the *i*-stem: *ḫal-ki-e-eš*, *ḫal-ki-uš*. A glide may have existed in speech, but no special spelling (such as **ḫal-ki-i-uš*) indicates this.

4.19. NH *i*-stem common-gender nominative-accusative plurals in *-i*(*y*)*aš* (e.g., *ḫalkiaš*) show that examples spelled ambiguously (§1.26, p. 19) as *-Ce/i-e-eš* (e.g., *ḫalke/i-e-eš* and *tu-uz-ze/i-e-eš*) are to be read as *-Ciēš*, not *-Cēš* (see §1.32, p. 20). In NH there is also occasional contraction of *-iēš* to *-iš* (e.g., pl. nom. com. *ḫalkiš* and *tuzziš*; see nn. 54 and 56, p. 88), producing a pl. nom.-acc. com. ending identical to that of the sg. nom. com. (see §1.76, p. 32; and Melchert 1995: 271–72).

4.20. The allative of the *i*-stems ends in *-iya*, and the sg. d.-l. ends in *-ī* or *-i*. Forms with the ending *-iya* also occasionally appear in post-OS texts in a dative-locative function.[52]

4.21. Rare forms of the nominative singular such as *tu-uz-zi-aš* (instead of the normal *i*-stem noun *tu-uz-zi-iš* 'army')[53] may be analogical formations with the stems in *-iya-* (for the paradigm of *iya*-stems see §4.10, p. 84).

4.22. On the endings of the plural nominative in late NH see §3.16 (p. 70).

Common-Gender i-Stem Nouns

4.23. Paradigms of common-gender *i*-stem substantives with non-ablauting stem:

---

52. For an allative example see either *kāšatta=wa utniya paitteni* 'you are about to go to the land' KBo 22.1:24 (OS), or *n=an=kan tuzziya anda uwate* 'Bring him in to the army' HKM 35:6–7 (MH/MS). For a d.-l. example see ^{NA_4}*ḫuwašiya* 1 UDU *appa*[(*nzi*)] 'they seize one sheep at the stela' KUB 53.14 ii 12–14 (par. KUB 53.12 iv 1-8); and with an *ai*-stem, see *luttiya* 1-*iš* . . . *šipanti* 'he libates … once at the window' KBo 17.74+ ii 5 (OS).

53. This rare form, *tuzziaš*, is found only in KBo 2.5 ii 13 (NH), ed. AM 182.

	‘grain’	‘army’	‘artery(?), sacrificial animal’
	Singular		
nom.	***ḫalkiš***	*tuzziš*	*auliš*
acc.	*ḫalkin*, [d]***Ḫalkin***	***tuzzin***	*aulin*
gen.	***ḫalki(y)aš***	*tuzzi(y)aš*	*auliyaš*
d.-l.	***ḫalkiya***, ***ḫalki***, *ḫalkī*	*tuzziya*	*auliya*, *aulī*
all.		*tuzziya*	
	Numerically Indifferent		
abl.	*ḫalkiyaz(a)*	*tuzzi(y)az*	*aulati* (Luw.)
ins.	***ḫalkit***		
	Plural		
nom.	*ḫalkiēš*,[54] *ḫalkiaš*[55]	*tuzziēš*,[56]	*aulieš*, *auliuš*
acc.	*ḫalkiuš*, *ḫalkiyaš* *ḫal-ki-(e-)eš*, *ḫal-ki*[ḪI.A]*-aš*[57]	*tuzziuš*, *tuzziyaš*	*auliuš*
coll.	*ḫalki*[ḪI.A]		
gen.	*ḫalkiaš*		
d.-l.	*ḫalkiaš*		

	‘lip’	(a type of priest)	(a type of priest)
	Singular		
nom.	*pūriš*	*purapšiš*	*pāt̄iliš*, *pāteliš*, *bāt̄iliš*
acc.	*pūrin*		
d.-l.	*pūri*, *pū⟨r⟩iya*	*purapši*	
	Numerically Indifferent		
abl.	*pūriyaz*		
ins.	*pūrit*		
	Plural		
nom.	*pūriēš*	*purapšīēš*, *purapšiuš*	*patiliēš*, *pātilieš*, *batiliēš*
acc.	*pūriuš*, *pūriūš*	*purapšiuš*	
gen.			*patiliēš*, *patiliyaš*
d.-l.	*pūri(y)aš*	*purapšeyaš*	*patiliēš*, *pātiliyaš*

54. See §4.19. An additional rare pl. nom., *ḫalkiš*, was cited without reference in HW 47. Perhaps *nu ḫal-ki-iš išḫiyanteš* KUB 15.11 ii 6 was meant. This form is not registered in HED H 37.

55. *ḫal-ki*[ḪI.A]*-aš* in HKM 19:6 (MH/MS); see HED H 37 and Hoffner forthcoming §53. See §3.16 (p. 70).

56. A rare instance of pl. nom. *tu-uz-zi-iš* occurs in KUB 31.42 iii 19 (MH/NS).

57. *ḫal-ki*[ḪI.A]*-aš* in HKM 19:10 (MH/MS) is pl. acc. (HED H 38 and Hoffner forthcoming §57).

	‘latch’	‘observation post’	‘spring, water source’
	Singular		
nom.	*zakkiš*, *zakkeš*	*auriš*	*aldanniš*, *aldaniš*
acc.	*zakkin*		
gen.	*zakki(y)aš*	*auri(y)aš*, ***a(u)wari(y)aš***	
d.-l.	*zakkitī*,[58] *zakkiya*	*auri*, *auriya*	*aldanni*, *aldani*
	Numerically Indifferent		
abl.		*auriyaza*	*altaniyaz*
	Plural		
nom.		*auriēš*, *auriuš*[59]	*altanniš*, *altannuš*
acc.	*zakkiuš*$^{(\underline{Ḫ}\text{I.A})}$, *zakk̄iēš*	*auriuš*, *auwariēš*[60]	*altanniuš*
coll.	*za-ak-ki!* $^{\underline{Ḫ}\text{I.A}}$		
d.-l.		*auriyaš*	*altanniaš*, *aldannaš*

	‘belt, sash’	‘anger’	‘ritual pit’	‘fleece(?)’
	Singular			
nom.	*išḫuziš*	*karpiš*		$^{\text{SÍG}}$*ēšriš*
acc.	*išḫuzzin*	*karpin*	*ā̓pin*	$^{\text{SÍG}}$*ēšrin*
gen.			*apiaš*	
d.-l.		*karpi*	*āpiya*, *āpiti*	
	Numerically Indifferent			
abl.			*ā̓piyaz*, *āpidaz(a)*	
	Plural			
nom.		*karpiuš*		
acc.	*išḫuzzi(y)aš*[61]		*apīyaš*	
coll.			*āpi*	$^{\text{SÍG}}$*ēšri*
d.-l.			*āpiyaš*	

58. See §4.15 (p. 86).

59. Late NH in BrTabl. III 44.

60. Attested in KUB 13.1+ i 19 (MS).

61. See LH 139f., 279. Only attested in NS. Analyzed by Friedrich 1959: 112, 122 and HED E/I 401 as free-standing genitive.

Neuter i-Stem Nouns

4.24. Paradigm of neuter *i*-stem substantives:

	‘stela’	‘libation’	‘clay tablet’
	Singular		
nom.-acc.	***ḫuwāši***	***išpandu(z)zi***	***tuppi***
erg.			*tuppianza*
gen.	***ḫuwaši(y)aš***	***išpantuzzi(y)aš***	***tuppi(y)aš***
d.-l.	***ḫuwašiya***, *ḫuwaši*	*išpanduzzi*, *išpantuziya*	*tuppi*, *tuppiya*
all.	***ḫuwāšiya***		
	Numerically Indifferent		
abl.			***tuppi(y)az***, *tuppiazza*
	Plural		
nom.-acc.	*ḫuwaši*$^{ḪI.A}$		*TUP-PA*$^{ḪI.A}$
gen.			*TUP-PA*$^{ḪI.A}$*-aš*

	‘basket’	‘garbage pit, dump’	‘bridge’ (pl. tantum)
	Singular		
nom.-acc.	*ērḫūi*, ***ērḫui***, *erḫui*	*ḫuššil*[62]	
gen.	*erḫūiyaš*	*ḫūššiliyaš*	
d.-l.	*erḫūiti*[63]	*ḫuššili*, *ḫuššiliya*, *ḫuššulli*	
	Numerically Indifferent		
abl.	*erḫuyaz*, *erḫūiyaz*	*ḫuššiliaz*	
ins.	***ērḫuit***		
	Plural		
nom.-acc.			*armizzi*
d.-l.			*armizziyaš*

62. This sg. nom.-acc. shows apparent confusion with stems in *-il* (see §4.65, p. 107). Note also the sg. d.-l. below with a different stem *ḫuššulli-*. The limited evidence makes it hard to determine the original inflection of this noun.

63. The form *er-u-i-ti* KUB 38.25 i 16, 21, transliterated as *er-⟨ḫu-⟩u-i-ti* (i.e., scribal error) in HED E/I 283, is rather a real form, showing a Luwian sound change (see AHP 258) in this loanword from Luwian.

4.25. Other neuter *i*-stem nouns: *appuzzi-* ‘tallow, fat, grease’, *arkami-* (a musical instrument; on the ghost geminate *m* see §1.24, p. 19), *erimpi-* ‘cedar’, *ēšri-* ‘form, shape, image’, *ētri-* ‘food’, *ḫāli-* ‘pen, corral, sector’, *ḫaršiḫarši-* ‘bad weather’, *ḫaršiyalli-* ‘pithos vessel’, *ḫazziwi-* ‘rite, cult act’, *iššalli-* ‘saliva, spittle’, etc.

4.26. In addition to *tuppianza* (listed above), ergatives of the neuter nouns *šanna=pili-* / SUD-*li* ‘void’ and ^{UZU}*appuzzi-* ‘fat’ exist in the forms SUD-*li-an-za* (see CHD sub *šannapili-*) and ^{UZU}*appuzziyanza*.

4.27. Perhaps dual or collective in origin: *elzi-* ‘scales’, *ḫulali-* ‘distaff’.

4.28. Paradigm of *i*-stem substantives with ablauting stem:[64]

	‘spear(?)’	‘pasture’
	Singular	
nom. com.		*wešiš*
acc. com.	***mārin***	***wešin***
gen.	*māriyaš*	
d.-l.		*wešai*
	Numerically Indifferent	
ins.	*māraīt*	
	Plural	
nom. com.	***māriēš***	*wešaēš*
acc. com.	***māriuš***	*wešauš*

4.29. The stem of allative ^{É}*makziya* KBo 22.186 ii 8 cannot yet be determined, since no case form exclusive to an *i*-stem is yet attested.

4.30. Paradigm of the mixed *r*- and *i*-stem noun *ḫalḫaltumar*(*i*)- ‘corner’.

	Singular
all. or d.-l.	*ḫalḫaltumari*[65]
	Numerically Indifferent
abl.	*ḫalḫaltumaraza*
	Plural
nom.	*ḫalḫaltumariyēš*
n.-a. coll.	*ḫalḫaltumār*, *ḫalḫaltūmari*
gen.	*ḫalḫaltu(m)mariyaš*, *ḫalḫaltumaraš*
d.-l.	*ḫalḫaltumariyaš*, *ḫalḫaltumaraš*

64. Largely based upon Neu 1985: 259–60.

65. KBo 4.1 obv. 19 (so HED H 20); the form A-NA 4 *ḫal-ḫal-du-um-ma-ri-ya* KUB 7.41 i 7 (analyzed as sg. d.-l. *ḫalḫaldummariya* in HED H 20–21 and HW^2 H 29) is uncertain, because at the beginning of a new sentence the *-ya* could be the conjunction ‘and’.

4.31. The noun *ḫalḫaltumar-* ‘corner’ was originally a neuter *r*/*n*-stem (see §4.112, p. 130), but underwent a complex series of secondary developments. First, the neuter noun generalized the *r*-stem (seen in the collective *ḫalḫaltumār*, sg. d.-l. *ḫalḫaltumari*, and *ḫalḫaltumaraš* and *ḫalḫaltumaraz*). Second, the alternative collective *ḫalḫaltumari* was created (§3.20, p. 72). Finally, *ḫalḫaltumari* was taken as the base for creating an *i*-stem count plural (see Melchert 2000: 65–66).

ai-Stem Nouns

4.32. For the derivation of stems in *-ai-* see §2.18 (p. 54). Since the oblique stem of these nouns is identical with that of ordinary non-ablauting *i*-stem nouns (§4.23, p. 88), examples of the latter inflection also occur, such as sg. acc. *šaklin*, *ḫullanzin*, and *zaḫḫin*.[66] On the other hand, the older common gender *i*-stem *tuḫḫui-* ‘smoke’ (OH/MS *tuḫḫuiš*, *tuḫḫuin*) acquires a new stem *tuḫḫuwai-* (NS *tuḫḫuwaiš*, *tuḫḫuwain*). Nouns in *-ai-* show ablaut in the stem (see §3.37, p. 78; HE §68a: Weitenberg 1979, 1984): the original pattern had *-ai-* (also spelled *-ae-*) in the nominative and accusative and *-i-* (*-iy-* before *-a-*) in the oblique cases. But there is a tendency to generalize *-ai-* (*-ay-* before *-a-*), so that it appears in the oblique cases as well, hence *zaḫḫait*, *lingayaš*, etc.

4.33. Common-gender action nouns:

	‘battle’	‘oath’	‘curse’	‘quarrel’
	Singular			
nom.	*zaḫḫaiš*	*lingaiš*	*ḫurtāiš*	*ḫalluwāiš*
acc.	*zaḫḫain*, *zaḫḫin*	*lingain*, *lingāen*, ***lingaen***	*ḫurtāin*	*ḫalluwāin*
erg.		*linkiyanza*, *linkiyaz*[67]		
gen.	*zaḫḫiyaš*	*linkiyaš*, *lingayaš*	*ḫurtiyaš*	
d.-l.	***zaḫḫiya***	***linkiya***, *lingai*, *lenqai*, *lingae*	*ḫurtiya*, *ḫurtai*	
	Numerically Indifferent			
abl.	*zaḫḫiyaz(a)*	*li/enkiyaz(a)*	*ḫurtiyaz*	*ḫalluwayaza*
ins.	*zaḫḫait*			
	Plural			
nom.		*lingaiš*	*ḫurdaēš*	
acc.		*lingāuš*	*ḫurtauš*	

66. Compare *zaḫḫain* ~ *zaḫḫin* ‘battle’ and *ḫullanzain* ~ *ḫullanzin* (VS 28.26 rev. 9) with *šaklain* ~ *šaklin* ‘custom, right’.

67. On the status of these ergatives formed to a common gender noun (or possibly to the collective of such a noun) see §3.10 (p. 67). The rare example of a sg. neut. *apāt=wa* NIŠ DINGIR-*LIM* KUB 26.92:7 reflects a sporadic back-formation from the pl. collective *lingae* (see the similarly back-formed sg. neut. *šumanzanan* to common gender *šumanza*(*n*)-, as per Melchert 2000: 64 n. 34).

	‘battle’	‘oath’	‘curse’	‘quarrel’
coll.		*ling*[*a*]*e*		
erg.		***linkiyanteš***[67]		
gen.			*ḫurdiyaš*	

	‘custom, right’	‘portent’	‘sin’	‘song’
	Singular			
nom.	*šaklāiš*	***šagaiš***	*waštāiš*	*išḫamaiš*
acc.	*šaklāin*, *šaklin*	*šagain*	*waštāin*	*išḫamain*
gen.	*šaklāyaš*	*šakiyaš*		
d.-l. or all.	*šaklāi*, *šakliya*			
	Numerically Indifferent			
abl.	*šaklayaza*			
	Plural			
nom.	*šakl*[*āeš*], *šaklauš*			
acc.	*šaklauš*	*šagauš*	*waštauš*	*išḫama*[*uš*]
coll.		*šagae*		

4.34. Neuter nouns:

	‘bone(s)’	‘window(s)’
	Singular	
nom.-acc.	*ḫaštae*, ***ḫaštai***	*luttai*, *luddāi*
erg.		*luttanza*
gen.	***ḫašti(y)aš***[68]	*lutti(y)aš*
d.-l.		*luttiya*
	Numerically Indifferent	
abl.	*luttiyaz*, ***luttanza***, *luttianza*	
	Plural	
nom.		^{GIŠ}AB.MEŠ-*uš*[69]
acc.		*luttāuš*
coll.	*ḫāštai*, *ḫaštāe*[70]	
gen.		***lutti(y)aš***
d.-l.		*luttiyaš*

68. Attested as *ḫa-aš-ti-i-aš* in KBo 20.8 rev. 7 (OS).

69. ^{GIŠ}AB.MEŠ-*uš* and acc. *luttāuš* are “count plurals” (see §3.13, p. 68).

70. Both *ḫaštāe* and *luddāi* (in all their spelling variants) reflect prehistoric collectives. All clear attested cases of ‘window’ are functioning as singulars. It is often hard to tell whether one should translate ‘bone’ or ‘bones’ for *ḫaštāi*.

4.35. An aberrant form of *zašḫai-* 'dream' is pl. acc. *zašḫimuš*, which behaves as though the stem were **zašḫiu-*; see pl. acc. *šimuš* from /siw-us/ to *šiu-* 'god'. See §1.126 (p. 44), §4.45 (p. 98), and §4.50 (p. 100).

i-Stem Adjectives

4.36. The *i*-stem adjectives (with a few exceptions) show ablauting stems, taking the zero grade in nominative, accusative, instrumental, allative, and sometimes dative-locative[71] singular, and the full grade *ai* or *au* in all other cases (HE §71, Kammenhuber 1969b: 194–95, 280–81; Neu 1985). The (stem +) endings for the *i*-stem adjective are:

	Singular	Plural
nom. com.	*-iš*	*-aeš* or *-aiš*
acc. com.	*-in*	*-auš*
n.-a. neut.	*-i*	(older) *-a*, (secondary) *-aya*
gen.	(older) *-aš*, (secondary) *-ayaš*	(older) *-aš*, (secondary) *-ayaš*
d.-l.	*-ai*, *-i*	
all.	*-iya*	
	Numerically Indifferent	
ins.	*-it*	
abl.	(older) *-az*, (secondary) *-ayaz*	

4.37. The forms in *-aya-* show a secondary restoration of the intervocalic *y*, which was lost prehistorically (see §1.134, p. 46, and Sommer 1932: 357 with literature), either in Proto-Anatolian (Melchert 1984b: 44–45) or in pre-Hittite (AHP 130). The forms that have been claimed (e.g., HE §15a) to show syncope (§1.76–§1.78, pp. 32–33) — *šallaš* < **šallayaš*, *šallaz* < **šallayaz*, *šuppa* < **šuppaya* — are actually older than those showing the secondary restoration. The regular system of ablaut given in §4.13 (p. 85) is sometimes altered by influence from the *i*-stem nouns, and adjectives in *-ui-* are further affected by the inflection of stems in *-iya-*.

4.38. Paradigms of the *i*-stem adjectives. Ablauting: *šalli-*, *šuppi-*, *mekki-*, *ḫarki-*, *karši-*, *palḫi-*, *daluki-*, *dankui-*, *parkui-*, *warḫui-*. Non-ablauting: *karūili-*, *nakkī-*, *arawanni-*, *annauli-*, *ḫarwaši-*, *ḫuelpi-*. For *ḫatuka-/ḫatuki-* and *daluka-/daluki-* see §§4.39–4.40 (p. 97).

71. Hence forms like *šuppi* from *šuppi-* + *-i*, beside *šuppai* from full grade *šuppai-* + *-i*.

	‘large’	‘holy, pure’	‘much, many’
	Singular		
nom. com.	*šalliš*, *šalleš*[72]	*šuppiš*	*mekkiš*
acc. com.	*šallin*	*šuppin*	
n.-a. neut.	*šalli*	***šuppi***	***mekki***
voc.	**šalli* (GAL-*li*)		
gen.	*šallaš*, *šallayaš*	*šuppayaš*	
d.-l.	*šallai*, *šalli*	***šuppai***, *šuppi*, *šuppa*[73]	
all.	*šalla*		
	Numerically Indifferent		
abl.	*šallayaz*	***šuppaz(a)***, *šuppayaz(a)*	*meqqayaz*
ins.		*šuppit*	
	Plural		
nom. com.	*šallaēš*, *šalleš*, *šallauš*	*šuppaēš*, ***šuppeš***	*meggaēš*, *meqqauš*[74]
acc. com.	*šalliuš*,[75] *šallāyuš*[76]	*šuppauš*	*meqqāuš*
n.-a. neut.	*šalla*, *šallaya*, *šallai*	*šuppa*, *šuppaya*	*meggaya*
gen.	*šallayaš*	*šuppayaš*	*meqqayaš*
d.-l.	*šallayaš*, *šalliyaš*	[*šu*]*ppaš*, *šuppayaš*	

	‘rough, dense’	‘pure’	‘dark’
	Singular		
nom. com.	*warḫuiš*, *warḫūīš*	*parkuiš*, *parkueš*	***dankuiš***, *dankuwayaš*
acc. com.	*warḫuīn*, *warḫūīn*	***parkuin***	*dankuin*, *dankūīn*
n.-a. neut.	*warḫūi*	*parkui*[77]	*dankui*
gen.	*warḫuwayaš*	*parkuwaš*, *parkuwayaš*	*dankuwayaš*

72. See §1.58 (p. 28).

73. In *šuppa pedi* KUB 30.42 iv 22 the allative *šuppa* is functioning as a dative-locative in a post-OH text.

74. *me-ek-ke-eš* belongs to the stem *mekk-*, as the CHD points out. It should therefore *not* be read *me-ek-ki-eš* (see §4.41, p. 97).

75. Analogical to substantives.

76. In the rare form *šal-la-mu-uš* KBo 27.11 obv. 2 (NS) and a semi-logographic GAL-*la-mu-uš* KBo 12.89 iii 11 (MS?) the *m* is secondary, analogical to the stems that take this ending regularly; see §1.127 (p. 45) and §4.45 (p. 98).

77. Written *pár-ku-i*, *pár-ku-ú-i*, and *pár-ku-u-i*. What was read by Archi (1979: 45–46) as *pár-ku-i* in KBo 22.1:6 (OS) should be read *me-ma-i* (see CHD *mi*(*ya*)*ḫu*(*wa*)*nt-* 2b).

	‘rough, dense’	‘pure’	‘dark’
	Singular		
d.-l.		*parkuwai*	*dankuwā̆i*, *dankui*
all.			*dankuwa*[78]
	Numerically Indifferent		
abl.	*warḫūwayaz*	*parkuwayaz(a)*	*dankuwayaz*, *dankuwayazza*, *dankuyaz*, *dankuwaz*
ins.		*parkuwāit*	*dankuit*
	Plural		
nom. com.	*warḫuwaēš*, *warḫūiš*, *warḫuēš*	*parkuwaēš*, *parkuēš*, *parkuwāeš*, *parkuwaiš*, *parkuiēš*	*tankuwaēš*, *tankuēš*
acc. com.	*warḫuwauš*		
n.-a. neut.	*warḫuwa*, *warḫuwaya*	*parkui*, *parkue*, *parkuwa*, *parkuwae*, *parkuwaya*	*tankuwaya*, *tankuwa*, *dankuwai*
d.-l.		*parkuwayaš*, *parkuiyaš*	***tankuwaš***

	‘white, bright’	‘wide’	‘old, former’
	Singular		
nom. com.	*ḫarkiš*	*palḫiš*[79]	*karūiliš*, *karūileš*
acc. com.	*ḫarkin*		*karūilin*, *karūlin*
n.-a. neut.	*ḫarki*		*karūili*
gen.			*karūiliyaš*
d.-l.			*karūili*
	Numerically Indifferent		
abl.			*karūiliyaz(a)*
ins.			*karūi*[*li*]*t*
	Plural		
nom. com.	*ḫargaēš*	***palḫāēš***, *palḫāeš*, *palḫaēš*, *palḫiēš*	*karūiliēš*, *karūeliēš*, *karūiliš*, *karūiliuš*, *karūiliyaš*, *karūilaš*
acc. com.			*karūiliuš*, *karūiliaš*
n.-a. neut.	*ḫarga*, *ḫarki*	*palḫi*	*karūila*, *karūili*, *karūiliya*
d.-l.			*karūiliyaš*, *karūiliaš*

78. *da*!*-an-ku-w*[*a tág*]*-na* KBo 11.14 iii 26.

79. Forms included here are only the adjective *palḫi-*, not the noun. Additional forms attested for the noun are: sg. acc. com. *palḫin*, sg. gen. *palḫaš*, sg. d.-l. *palḫi*, pl. nom.-acc. neut. *palḫa*, *palḫaea*, etc.

4.39. The adjective *ḫatuka-/ḫatuki-* 'awesome, frightening' has singular nominative and accusative *a*-stem forms, but all other case forms appropriate to an *i*-stem: sg. nom. com. *ḫadugaš*, sg. acc. com. *ḫatugan*, sg. nom.-acc. neut. ***ḫatugan***, d.-l. *ḫatugai*, abl. *ḫatugayaz*, pl. nom. com. *ḫatugaeš*, *ḫadugaeš*, acc. com. ***ḫatugauš***. The bolded forms, which occur in OS, show that these competing stems existed already in OH.

4.40. The adjective *daluka-/daluki-* 'long' is so far unattested in OS copies. It has a late NH *a*-stem sg. nom. com. form (GÍD.DA-*aš*), several oblique case forms appropriate to an *i*-stem (*dalugai*, *dalugayaz*, *talugaēš*, *talugauš*, *talugay*[*a*]), several in MS, and an atypical pl. d.-l. form *dālugauwaš* (MH/NS),[80] which resembles the corresponding form of the *u*-stem adjectives (see §4.51, p. 101). The unambiguous *a*-stem forms are NH or NS. And *dalugawaš*, if it is not an error, is probably from the NH scribe. The oldest occurrences (*talugaēš*, *talugauš*, *talugay*[*a*], all MS) point to an *i*-stem.

	Singular	Plural
nom. com.	GÍD.DA-*aš*[81]	*talugaēš*
acc. com.		*talugauš*, *dalugaeš*
n.-a. neut.	*daluga*[82]	*talugay*[*a*][83]
gen.		*talugaš*,[84] *dalugaš*
d.-l.	*dalugāi*[85]	*dālugauwaš*
	Numerically Indifferent	
abl.	*dalugayaz*[86]	

4.41. The adjective *mekki-* 'much, many' also has a *k*-stem in OH (§4.60, p. 105) that exhibits the following forms (see CHD L–N s.v.): sg. acc. com. *me-e-ek-kán*, *me-ek-kán*, sg. nom.-acc. neut. *me-e-ek*, pl. nom. com. *me-ek-ke-eš*, *me-ek-ke-e-eš*, pl. acc. com. *me-ek-ku-uš*. These forms are often erroneously cited as forms of the stem *mekki-* in Hittite grammars (see Sturtevant and Hahn 1951: §148a; HE §71; and Held, Schmalstieg, and Gertz 1987: 16).

u-Stem Nouns

4.42. The inflection of *u*-stem and *au*-stem nouns is analogous to that of the *i*- and *ai*-stems (§4.18, p. 87; see Weitenberg 1984 and Neu 1985). The ablaut rules (§3.37, p. 78) are the same: (1) endings which consist of simple consonants or zero are affixed directly to the *u*, (2) case endings which begin with a vowel are affixed to the longer stem in *-u*(*w*)- or *-aw*-.

80. KUB 27.67 ii 40, iii 44 (MH/NS), marked as suspect with '!' in HW 206.
81. KUB 26.1 iii 15 (Tudḫ. IV).
82. *da-lu-ga* TI-*tar* VAT 7481 iv 6 (OH/late NS). Sg./pl. neut. as adverb *talūga* KBo 10.7 ii 27, 31.
83. KUB 17.10 iii 29 (OH/MS).
84. The form in KUB 17.10 iii 33 (OH/MS) in broken context could be pl. gen., pl. d.-l., or pl. acc.
85. KBo 10.24 v 9 (OH/NS).
86. *dalugayaz* M[(U.KAM-*za*)] KUB 15.17 i 5 (NH).

4.43. Several irregularities must be pointed out: (1) in the sg. d.-l. in NH, an ending *-e* emerges as an alternative to *-i* (§1.61, p. 28; §3.24, p. 74)[87] and (2) the pl. acc. com. is *-amuš*, which comes from **-awuš* by the rule in §1.127 (p. 45). With substantives: *ḫeyamuš* 'rains', *kēlamuš* '?', *wappamuš* 'banks'. With adjectives: *āššamuš* 'dear', *ḫalluwamuš* 'deep', *itālamuš* 'evil', *pargamuš* 'high', *šargamuš* 'preeminent', *šūwamuš* 'full' (OS), *daššamuš* 'heavy', etc.

4.44. Some authorities affirm the existence of a sg. gen. in *-š* (e.g., Neu 1979a: 185–86 with n. 22; and Weitenberg 1984: 315 §836). Others (e.g., Melchert 1984a) have declared themselves unconvinced by the sparse evidence.[88] For discussion of possible cases of the sg. gen. in *-š*, see §3.22 (p. 73) and §4.50 (p. 100).

4.45. In *zašḫimuš* 'dreams' (< *zašḫai-*) Tunn. iii 51 and *šallamuš* (also written GAL-*lamuš*; both < *šalli-*) 'great', the *-m-* before the ending *-uš* is secondary; see §4.35 (p. 94) and n. 76 (p. 95).

4.46. The stem + endings for the *u*-stem (non-ablauting) substantive are:

	Singular	Plural
nom. com.	*-uš*	*-ueš*
acc. com.	*-un*	*-uš*
n.-a. neut.	*-u*	*-uwa* (older *-u*)
gen.	*-uwaš*	*-uwaš*, *-uwan*[89]
all.	*-uwa*[90]	
d.-l.	*-ui*	*-uwaš*
	Numerically Indifferent	
abl.	*-uwaz*	
ins.	*-uit*, *-ut*[91]	

Common-Gender u-Stem Nouns

4.47. Paradigms for sample *u*-stem common gender nouns:

87. See Neu 1985: 187–88 and Weitenberg 1984: 318.

88. For emending the contextually genitive LÚ ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-*uš* (Laws §40, ms. A) to LÚ ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-*ša*! see LH 47–48. The OS form of ŠA (HZL #158/11, see LH 237, third shape of ŠA in ms. A) is much closer in form to UŠ than are its post-OS forms.

89. It cannot be determined for certain whether LUGAL-*an* (**ḫaššuwan*) is singular 'of the king' (HHw 46 "des Königs") or plural 'of the kings'. Because the Hittite genitive ending *-an* derives from a PIE pl. gen. **-ōm*, we have listed it here as plural (on the pl. gen. *-an* see §3.23, p. 73).

90. See *italuwa* KBo 18.151 rev. 19 (OS), Ú.SAL-*wa* (**welluwa*) in §4.46, *genuwa* in §4.51 (p. 101).

91. For *kad*!-*du-ut* 'with (the eagle's) talons' KUB 43.60 i 17 (OH/NS) see §3.35 (p. 77). See *kad-du-uš-mi-it* < **kaddut=šmit* 'with their talons' also in i 17 (Watkins 1995). The latter form incorrectly interpreted as nom.-acc. neut. in HED K 138.

	non-ablauting	
	‘meadow’	‘king’
	Singular	
nom.	*wēlluš*	**LUGAL-*uš***[92]
acc.	*wellun*	**LUGAL-*un***
voc.		LUGAL-*ue*
gen.	*wēlluwaš*	**LUGAL-(*w*)*aš*,** *ḫaššuwaš*[93]
d.-l.	*wēllūi*	**LUGAL-*i***, LUGAL-*ue*[94]
all.	Ú.SAL-*wa*	
	Numerically Indifferent	
abl.	*wēlluwaz*, *wellūwaz*	LUGAL-*waz*
ins.	Ú.SAL-*it*	
	Plural	
nom.[95]		LUGAL.MEŠ-*iš*
acc.		LUGAL.MEŠ-*uš*
coll.	*wellu*,[96] *welluwa*	
gen.		**LUGAL-*an***[97]
d.-l.	***wēlluaš***, *welluwaš*	LUGAL.MEŠ-*aš*

	ablauting[98]	
	‘rain’[99]	‘river bank’
	Singular	
nom.	*ḫeuš*	
acc.	***ḫēun***	*wappun*
voc.		*wappu*[100]
gen.	*ḫewaš*, *ḫeyawaš*	*wappuwaš*
all.		*wappuwa*
d.-l.		*wappui*

92. The alleged syllabic writing of the sg. nom. *ḫa-aš-šu-uš* claimed by Güterbock (1957, in KUB 31.100 rev. 9–10; thereafter cited in HW Erg. 2 12) is shown by the parallel passage KBo 24.57 i 7–8 to be pl. acc. of *ḫaššš-* ‘ashes’ (see Puhvel, HED H 210).

93. See *namma ḫaššīš dapušza ḫa-aš-š*[*u*]-*w*[*a-aš lamni*] 1=*šU šipanti* KBo 13.165 iii! 6–7, restored following KUB 30.41 iv 5.

94. See §4.42 and §1.61 (p. 28).

95. Other *u*-stem pl. nom. com. forms: ^{É}*tarnueš*, *ḫuppidanueš*.

96. Weitenberg (1984 182–83) considers this noun neuter in MH/MS (*ú-e-el-lu* KBo 5.7 = LS 1), with a transfer to common gender in NH. See other collective forms *ú-e-el-lu* VBoT 58 i 10 (OH/NS), *ú-el-lu* KUB 17.8 iv 27 (pre-NH). *ú-e-el-lu-wa*[in KUB 8.41 (StBoT 25 #109) ii 16.

97. See p. 98, n. 89.

98. Also ablauting is $^{(TÚG)}$*šeknu-* (full grade *šeknau-*). On the ablauting suffix *-nu-*/*-nau-* see Weitenberg 1984: 221–22.

99. On Hittite *ḫeu-* see Ünal 1977 and Neu 1981a, with their literature.

100. For this unusual vocative of a noun denoting an inanimate object see §3.29 (p. 75).

	Numerically Indifferent	
abl.		*wappuwaz*
ins.	*ḫeawit*	
	Plural	
nom.	*ḫeweš*, ***ḫeyaweš***, *ḫēmuš*, *ḫé-e-u-uš*[101]	
acc.	*ḫé-e-ú-uš*, *ḫe(y)amuš*	*wappamuš*,[102] *wappuš*[103]

4.48. Weitenberg (1984: 270–71) regards *warku*(*i*)-,and *wašku*(*i*)- as secondary *u*-stems developed from primary *i*-stems. For the source of the *i*-stems see Starke 1990: 180–81.

4.49. The noun *ḫēu-* 'rain' already in OH has an ablauting paradigm of the type shown by the adjective *idālu-*, but this is far too early to be the result of analogy with the *u*-stem adjectives (Kammenhuber 1969b: 281; Neu 1985: 260 §2.1). The noun *wappu-* 'river bank' has an OH/MS ablauting form *wappamuš* (< **wappawuš*), but its other forms show a transfer to the non-ablauting class.

4.50. The noun *šiu-* 'god' has a complex inflection.[104] From a stem *šiu-* (< prehistoric **dyĕu-*) are formed: sg. nom. ***šiuš***,[105] and sg. acc. ****šiun***.[106] A stem *šiw-*(< **diw-*) is the base of pl. acc. *ši-mu-uš* (also written DINGIR.MEŠ-*mu-uš*) (< **šiwuš*; see §1.127, p. 45). The oblique cases are formed from a stem *šiun-* that was abstracted from the OH sg. acc. ****šiun***: sg. gen. ***šiunaš***, d.-l. ***šiuni***, pl. gen. ***šiunan***, *šiunaš*, ins. *šiunit*.[107] This stem also came to be used for the nominative and accusative singular, with the addition of "*i*-mutation" (see §4.17, p. 86), thus sg. nom. **šiuniš* (DINGIR-*LIM-iš*), acc. **šiunin* (DINGIR-*LIM-in*). A rare sg. gen. in /s/ (see §3.22, p. 73, and §4.44, p. 98) built to this longer stem may also be found in the OS compound noun $^{\text{MUNUS}}$*šiunzanna-* (/syuns/ + /anna/) 'god's (or gods') mother', written logographically in OS either in the Sumerian and Akkadian order of constituents as $^{\text{MUNUS(.MEŠ)}}$AMA.DINGIR(-*LIM*) or in the Hittite

101. The form *ḫēmuš* is expected for pl. acc. from /he:w-us/ (see §1.127, p. 45), attested in secondary use as a pl. nom. A pl. acc. /he:us/ could easily be analogical after other *u*-stems, where the pl. acc. is the same as the sg. nom. (e.g., *wappuš*), but the plene spelling in *-u-uš*/*-ú-uš* remains unexplained.

102. Pl. acc. com. *wa-ap-pa-mu-uš* KUB 33.10 ii 11 (OH/MS).

103. Otten 1961: 120–21, "zu den Flußufern." Per Weitenberg 1984: 329 an accusative of direction.

104. See Goetze and Pedersen 1934: 72–73, 80; Ehelolf 1936; Laroche 1967; Kammenhuber 1969b: 141, 182–83, 186, 290–91; Steiner 1971; and especially Watkins 1974; Neu 1998; and Rieken 1999a: 35–39.

105. In the sg. nom. of the OS noun(!) forms $^{\text{d}}$*šiuš=šummiš* 'our god' and $^{\text{d}}$*šiuš=šmiš* 'their god'.

106. Preserved in with final *n* assimilated to the following sibilant in $^{\text{d}}$*šiu*(*n*)*=šummin* 'our god' (common noun, *not* a proper name).

107. For a similar development of the stem Ζην- in Greek 'Zeus' and in the interrogative-indefinite *τιν- (τινα, τινος, τινι) from older accusative singulars see Sihler 1995: 338. The form *ši-ú-na-an*, beginning a clause in an OS text, could already be an example of this development, if it is not, as Neu (StBoT 26:168) tentatively suggests, *šiun* + local particle *-an*.

order as $^{MUNUS(.MEŠ)}$DINGIR.AMA. See Neu (1983: 169 n. 501, 224) for the OS forms. If the above analysis is correct, which is uncertain, the representation of the /ns/ in /syuns/ as *nz* could reflect the secondary nature of the sg. gen. in /syun+s/ (see §1.136, p. 47, even though the *n* here was never syllabic).[108]

Neuter u-Stem Nouns

4.51. Paradigms for the (non-ablauting) *u*-stem nouns of neuter gender, *genu-* 'knee' and ^{GIŠ}*tāru-* (GIŠ-*ru*) 'tree, wood':

	Singular		Plural	
nom.-acc.	*genu*[109]	^{GIŠ}***tāru***, GIŠ-*ru*	*genuwa*	GIŠ-*ru*$^{Ḫ.A}$
erg.		GIŠ-*ruwanza*		
gen.	*genuwaš*	GIŠ-*ruwaš*	***genuwaš***	GIŠ-*ruwaš*
all.	*genuwa*			
d.-l.		GIŠ-*(ru)i*, (GIŠ-*ru*)[110]	*genuwaš*	
	Numerically Indifferent			
abl.	*genuwaz*			
ins.	***genut***, *ganut*[111]		GIŠ-*ruit*	

4.52. The phonetically identical singular and plural forms of the nominative-accusative of the neuter noun GIŠ-*ru* (**tāru*) are sometimes distinguished graphically in the texts by means of the plural determinative: GIŠ-*ru* (sg.) and GIŠ-*ru*$^{Ḫ.A}$ (pl.).

***au*-Stem Nouns**

4.53. Hittite shows a small class of nouns with stems in *-au-* whose inflection is entirely parallel to that of nouns in *-ai-* (see §4.32, p. 92; and Weitenberg 1979), except that the generalization of the "full-grade" stem is more nearly complete, with only the noun *ḫarnau-* 'birthing stool' showing a few traces of ablaut (see §3.37, p. 78). There is only one common-gender noun attested, *ḫarnau-* 'birthing stool'. Neuter nouns include *ḫarganau-* 'palm, sole', *šišḫau-* 'sweat', and ^{GIŠ}*tanau-* (a tree). Most of these nouns are poorly attested. The only plural attested thus far is the count plural *ḫarganawiš* (KUB 33.66 ii 3).

---

108. For *šiunzanna-* as showing syncope from **siunas-anna-* see Watkins 1974: 105. For further discussion of the difficult *šiunzanna-*/*šiwanzanna-* see also Rieken 1999a: 37 n. 160. We take *šiwanzanna-* to be a case where older *-u-* undergoes "breaking" to *-wa-*; see Rieken 2001 and here §1.79 (p. 34).

109. The alleged common-gender form *ge-nu-uš* abstracted from *genuššuš*, *ginušši*, *ginuššin* (see HW 107; and Held, Schmalstieg, and Gertz 1987: 16) has been explained by Eichner (1979) as a false analysis of *genušši-*.

110. A rare form: KBo 4.2 i 30, 35.

111. This form (KUB 12.63 obv. 26, MS) is an archaism showing zero grade of the root (on ablaut see §3.37, p. 78; for *ganut* as an instrumental see §3.35, p. 77).

4.54. Paradigms for *au*-stem nouns:

	‘birthing stool’ (com.)	‘poplar’ (neut.)
	Singular	
nom.	*ḫarnāuš*[112]	GIŠ*ḫarāu*
acc.	*ḫarnaūn*	GIŠ*ḫarāu*
gen.	*ḫarnāuwaš*, *ḫarnuwaš*[113]	GIŠ*ḫarauwaš*
d.-l.	*ḫarnāwi*, *ḫarnuwi*[114]	GIŠ*ḫārawi*/*ḫarāwi*

u-Stem Adjectives

4.55. The normal stem + endings for the *u*-stem adjective are:

	Singular	Plural
nom. com.	*-uš*	*-aweš*
acc. com.	*-un*	*-amuš*
n.-a. neut.	*-u*	*-u* (older), *-awa*
gen.	*-awaš*	*-awaš*
all.	**-awa*	
d.-l.	*-awi*, *-awe*[115]	*-awaš*
	Numerically Indifferent	
abl.	*-awaz*	
ins.	*-awit*	

4.56. Substantivized adjectives sometimes show ablaut (§3.37, p. 78) and sometimes not: e.g., *āššuwaz* and *āššawaz* ‘with goods’ in the NH composition *Deeds of Šuppiluliuma* (Weitenberg 1984: 322–23).

4.57. Paradigms for the *u*-stem adjectives (all ablauting except *ḫallu-* and *dampu-*). For other forms see *šarku-* ‘exalted’ (ablauting), *tepšu-* ‘insignificant’ (ablauting), and *alpu-* ‘sharp’ (non-ablauting).

112. The sg. nom.-acc. neut. form *ḫarnāu* is a secondary creation, surely due to the fact that all other *au*-stems are neuter. The hapax sg. acc. *ḫarnāin* is an error due to confusion with the substance *ḫurnai-*. See Puhvel, HED H 175.

113. KBo 17.65 obv. 15 (MH?/MS).

114. KBo 17.65 rev. 1 (MH?/MS).

115. See §1.61 (p. 28) and §4.43 (p. 98).

	‘good’	‘high’	‘bad’	‘raw, uncooked’	‘all, entire’
	Singular				
nom. com.	***āššuš***	*parkuš*	*idāluš*		***pankuš***, *panguš*
acc. com.	*āššun*	*parkun*	*idālun*		*pankun*
n.-a. neut.	***āššu***	*parku*	***idālu***	*ḫuišu*, *ḫuešu*	*panku*
gen.	*āššawaš*	—[116]	ḪUL-*uwaš*[117]		*pangawaš*
d.-l.	*āššawi*, *āššawe*	*pargawi*[118]	***itālawi,*** *idālawi*, *idālawe*		*pangawi*, *pangawe*
	Numerically Indifferent				
abl.	*āššawaza*	*pargawaz*	*idālawaz(a)*, ḪUL-*uwaz*[119]	*ḫuešawaz(a)*, *ḫuišawaz*, *ḫuiššawaza*, *ḫušuwaza*, *ḫuešuwaza*	*pangawaz*
ins.	*āššawet*		*idālawit*		*pankuit*
	Plural				
nom. com.	*āššaweš*	*pargaweš*	*idālaweš*	*ḫuišaweš*, *ḫuwišaweš*, *ḫuešaweš*	*pangaweš*
acc. com.	*āššamuš*	*pargamuš*, *pár-ga-u-uš*, *pargawēš*[120]	*idālamuš*		*panqaweš*
n.-a. neut.	*āššawa*, *āššu*[121]	*pár-ga-u-wa*, *parku*[122]	*idālawa*, *idālu*[121]		
gen.			*idālawaš*, ḪUL-*uwaš*		
d.-l.		*pargawaš*	*idālawaš*	*ḫuiša⟨w⟩aš*	

116. *pár-ku-wa-aš* KUB 10.11 i 11 (HW 161) for expected **pargawaš* does not exist, since the form in question is from *parkui-* ‘pure’.

117. Forms like ḪUL-*u-wa-aš* KBo 4.14 iii 17 need not imply **idāluwaš*, since the complement can represent the final signs of *i-da-a-la-u-wa-aš*.

118. *pár-ga-u-i*. A form *pár-ga-u-e-i* is also attested once (KBo 3.8 iii 10), a conflation of *pár-ga-u-i* and *pár-ga-u-e*. All currently attested sg. d.-l. forms are NH or at least NS.

119. The hapax *i-da-a-la-az uddānaz* KUB 15.42 ii 9 (HW and HED) may be a mistake for *i-da-a-la-⟨u⟩-az*. There is no phonological explanation for the form as it stands.

120. *pár-ga-u-e-eš* KBo 4.4 iv 30 (NH).

121. For pl. nom.-acc. neut. see *i-da-a-lu ud-da-a-ar . . . a-aš-šu ud-da-a-ar* ‘bad things . . . good things’ KUB 33.68 ii 11-12 (OH/NS). Examples of pl. attributive adjective *idālu* are cited in Weitenberg 1984: 211–12 (§531). For these and the substantivized collective pl. *āššū* ‘goods, property’ (OS) see §3.20 (p. 71).

122. *pár-ku* in KUB 24.1 i 25; see Weitenberg 1984: 132–33.

	‘small, few’	‘heavy’	‘narrow, tight’	‘deep’	‘full’[123]
	Singular				
nom. com.	***tepuš***	*daššuš*, *taššuš*	*ḫatkuš*		***šu-u-uš***
acc. com.	*tepun*	*daššun*	*ḫatkun*		*šu-u-un*, *šu-u-ú-un*
n.-a. neut.	***tēpu***	*daššu*, *taššu*			*šu-u*, *šu-u-ú*
gen.	*tepawaš*			*ḫalluwaš*	
d.-l.	*tepawe*				
	Numerically Indifferent				
abl.	*tepawaz(a)*		***ḫatgawaz***	*ḫalluwaz*	*šu-u-az*
ins.					
	Plural				
nom. com.	*tepawēš*, *te-e-pa-u-i-eš*[124]	***daššaweš***		*ḫalluēš*, *ḫalluš*[125]	
acc. com.		*daššamuš*		*ḫalluwamuš*, [*ḫal*]*luwauš*[126]	*šu-u-wa-mu-uš*
n.-a. neut.	*tepawa*	*daššawa*			
gen.					
d.-l.				*ḫalluwaš*	

e-Stem Noun

4.58. The noun *utne-* ‘land, country’ has an ablauting paradigm in OH, with *utnē* in the nominative-accusative, both singular and plural, and a weak stem *utni*(*y*)- in all other cases (see Neu 1974: 109–14). These weak stem forms (e.g., *utniyaz*) were preserved in NH copies of OS originals. But in later Hittite *utnē-* was generalized as the stem for the entire paradigm, with a *-y-* often inserted before endings beginning with an *-a-* (see §1.142, p. 48). In the OS sg. d.-l., **utnē-i* contracted to *utnē*, thus becoming indistinguishable from the sg.-pl. nom.-acc. For preservation of *tn* see §1.112 (p. 42).

123. Paradigm (for which see Weitenberg 1984: 140) given in transliteration instead of broad transcription because of the unusual spellings (§1.8, p. 11).

124. KBo 6.5 iv 26; for interpretation as /te:pawis/ see LH 55 n. 174.

125. *ḫal-lu-uš* KUB 31.71 iii! 9 (late NH).

126. One would expect **ḫalluš* (non-ablauting) or **ḫallamuš* (ablauting). The attested forms are irregular. See discussion of the similar form *šuwamuš* in §1.8 (p. 11).

	Singular	Plural
nom.-acc.	*utnē*	***utnē***
gen.	*utne(y)aš*	*utne(y)aš*
d.-l.	***utnē***	*utne(y)aš*, ***utnīaš***
all.	*utniya*	
	Numerically Indifferent	
abl.	*utne(y)az*, *utniyaz*	

Consonantal-Stem Nouns and Adjectives

4.59. For athematic nominal suffixes in PIE see Watkins 1998: 62–63. For nouns with consonantal stems in the Old Anatolian languages see Kammenhuber 1969b: 196–99, 283–91, and Meriggi 1980: §§93–130. For those in Hittite see Rieken 1999a.

4.60. Hittite nouns and adjectives show only a limited number of consonants or consonant sequences in stem-final position: *ḫ*, *l*, *n*, *r*, *š*, and (*n*)*t*. In OH, however, alongside the more common adjectival stem *mekki-* 'much, many' there existed a *k*-stem *mekk-* (see §4.41, p. 97; and CHD sub *mekki-*). For possible traces of additional stems in velars see Rieken 1999a: 61–66, to which we may also add ^{NINDA}*tūnik* (sg. nom.-acc.), ^{NINDA}*tūningaš* (sg. gen.), whether or not it is an inherited word, and see n. 30 (p. 81) and n. 37 (p. 82). There are no *b*/*p*-stems, and the only *m*-stem is *giem-* 'winter', attested in the sg. d.-l. *gi-e-mi* 'in winter' (Rieken 1999a: 77–78). Other PIE root nouns with bilabial stop stems have migrated to the vocalic stem class (see Goetze 1937 and HED H 115 [on *ḫapa-* 'river']).

4.61. The following derivational suffixes (for their meanings, see chapter 2) end in consonants: *-aḫit-*, *-al-*, *-an-*, *-ant-*, *-att-*,*-ātar*, *-eššar*, *-t-*, *-ul-*, *-ur-*, *-want-*, *-war*, and *-zil.*

ḫ-Stem Noun

4.62. One *ḫ*-stem noun is known, the neuter *išqaruḫ* (a vessel). Representative declined forms are: sg. nom.-acc. *iškaruḫ*, *iškariḫ* (both MS), sg. d.-l. *išqaruḫi* (NS), ins. *iškaruḫit* (MS).

l-Stem Nouns

4.63. On *l*-stem nouns see Rieken 1999a: 419–98. According to HE p. 54 §79, all *l*-stem nouns are neuters (see also Kammenhuber 1969b: 297–300). This is clearly the case for stems in *-al* and *-ul* (Rieken 1999a: 445–72). The situation is less clear for those in *-i*/*el* (Rieken 1999a: 473–94). There are no *l*-stem adjectives, unless *takšul* belongs to this class.

***al*-Stem Nouns**

4.64. For nouns formed with a suffix *-al-* see §2.19 (p. 54). Other nouns ending in *-al* are: *ḫaḫḫal* 'brushwood(?), underbrush(?)', *memal* 'meal, flour', *ḫuḫupal* (musical instrument),[127] *šuppal* 'domestic animal', *tawaral* (a kind of bread), *katral* (a metal harness piece), *šiyattal* 'blade(?)', *kurtal* (a container), *tawal* (an intoxicating beverage), *māl* (perhaps 'intelligence, cleverness, skill'). On *puriyal* (perhaps for *puriyalli*) 'lip cover' see §2.21 with n. 8 (p. 55). In *memal*(*l*)- (and probably *ḫaḫḫal*(*l*)-) the geminate *-ll-* is original, but because this was simplified to *-l* in word-final position in the nominative-accusative, there was a tendency to generalize *-l-* (see Rieken 1999a: 71–73). The single example with a geminate in *tawal-* is probably in imitation of *memall-*, but we cannot be sure because the origin of the word is quite unknown. The geminate in pl. nom.-acc. *ḫuḫuppalli* is part of a separate phenomenon whose status remains unclear: see §1.109 (p. 41). Paradigms for the stems in *-al*:

	'brushwood(?), underbrush(?)'	'meal, groats'	(a beverage)	(musical instrument)	'cattle'
	Singular				
nom. com.					*šuppalaš*[128]
n.-a. neut.	***ḫāḫḫal***	***mēmal***	*tawal*	***ḫuḫupal***	*šuppal*, *šuppalan*
erg.					*šuppalanza*
gen.	*ḫaḫḫallaš*	*mema(l)laš*	***tawalaš***		
d.-l.	*ḫaḫḫali*		*tawali*	*ḫuḫupali*	*šupli*, *šuppali*
	Numerically Indifferent				
abl.		*memallaz*	*tawalaz*	*ḫuḫupalaz*	
ins.	***ḫāḫḫallit***	*mema(l)lit*	*tawalit*, *(tawallit)*	*ḫuḫupalit*	
	Plural				
n.-a. neut.	*ḫaḫḫali*			***ḫuḫupalli,*** *ḫuḫupal*, *ḫuḫupāla*	*šuppala*
gen.					*šuppalan*[129]
d.-l.	*ḫaḫḫallaš*				

127. See on this noun Melchert 1988a; Polvani 1988; Güterbock 1995a; Prins 1997: 57–58, 117; Dinçol 1998.

128. On the problem of the alternative *a*-stem forms of *šuppal-*, including sg. nom. com. *šuppalaš*, see Melchert 1993a: 111.

129. *šuppalann=a ḫanneššar* KUB 31.127 + ABoT 44+ i 43 (OH/NS).

e/il-Stem Nouns

4.65. Nouns ending in *-e/il*, including those with a derivational suffix *-zil*, are: *ḫurkil* 'unnatural sex act, incest', *alil* 'blossom, flower', *ḫurutil* (kind of stew), *dammašḫuel* (variety of pear tree?), *šuil* 'thread', *pa(ḫ)šuil* (kind of fodder), *tayazzil* 'theft', *šarnikzil* 'compensatory payment', *gazzimuel* (a leather part of the harness), *ḫapalzil* (kind of stew?). *ḫapalzel* is sometimes dissimilated to *ḫapalzir*. On the problem of apparent common-gender forms to some stems in *-i/el* see Melchert 2001, but compare also Rieken 1999a: 482–83 and 490–91. The forms with suffix *-zil* are older than those with *-zel.*

	'blossom'	'thread'	'unnatural sex act, incest'	'compensatory payment'
	Singular			
nom. com.	*alilaš*[130]			***šarnikzil***,[131] *šarnikzel*[132]
n.-a. neut.	*alil*,[133] *alel*	*šuil*, *šuel*	***ḫurkil***, *ḫurkel*	***šarnikzil***,[131] *šarnikzel*
gen.	*alilaš*		*ḫurkilaš*[134]	*šarnikzilaš*
d.-l.	*alili*	*šuili*		
	Numerically Indifferent			
abl.	*alilaz*		*ḫurkilaza*	*šarnikzilaz*
ins.		*šuilit*		
	Plural			
acc. com.				*šarnikziluš*[135]
n.-a. neut.	*alili*^{ḪLA}			

ul-Stem Nouns

4.66. Nouns ending in *-ul* (for examples see §2.42, p. 59). An NH alternate common-gender *a*-stem *aššula-* exists for *aššul* 'favor, well being', with sg. nom. *aššulaš* and sg. acc. *aššulan.* NH forms of the sg. gen. *aššulaš* and the sg. d.-l. *aššuli* could just as well belong to it as to the older neuter *l*-stem. A noun *takšul* means 'peace, alliance'.[136]

130. Because of the multivalence of the LI sign, all post-OS forms with endings beginning with a vowel (*a-li-la-aš*, *a-li-li*, *a-li-la-az*) could also be read *alelaš*, *aleli*, *alelaz.*

131. In OS contexts (all in the Laws) this sg. nom. form is ambiguous as to its gender. Explicit common-gender evidence is post-OH.

132. See [*mā*]*n šarnikzel kuiš* 'If (there is) any restitution' in KUB 14.8 rev. 30 (Murš. II).

133. Since *alel* is unattested prior to NS, whereas *alil* is found in OH/MS, it is probable that *alil* was the OH form of the word.

134. *ḫur-ke-la-aš* and *ḫur-ke-la-za* are also possible readings.

135. On this late NS form as evidence of animacy see Melchert 1997a: 713.

136. According to Neu (1979b), both *kurur* and *takšul* are nouns, not adjectives.

	‘sin’	‘obligation’	‘well being’	‘peace, alliance’
	Singular			
nom.-acc.	*waštul*, *wašdul*	*išḫiul*	*aššul*	***takšul***
gen.	***uštulaš***, *waštulaš*, *waštullaš*[137]	*išḫiulaš*	*aššulaš*	*takšulaš*
d.-l.	*wašduli*, *waštulli*		*aššuli*	*takšuli*
	Numerically Indifferent			
abl.	*waštullaz*, *wašdulaza*	*išḫiulaza*		
ins.	*wašdulit*, *waštulit*			*takšulit*
	Plural			
nom.-acc.	*waštul*[ḪLA 138]	*išḫiuli*		*takšul*

4.67. There are also *a*-stem nouns in *-ula-*, such as *ašandula-* and *pittula-*. See §2.43 (p. 60).

n-Stem Nouns

Neuter n-Stem Nouns

4.68. Most *n*-stem nouns (§§4.68–4.71) are neuter (Kammenhuber 1969b: 197–98 §19.5; Oettinger 1980): *tēkan* ‘earth’, *ērman* ‘illness’, *lāman* ‘name’, *kuššan* ‘wage’, *šaḫḫan* ‘feudal due’, *naḫḫan* ‘fear, reverence’, *ḫengan* ‘death, plague’, *šagan* ‘oil’, *takšan* ‘midst’, *šekan* ‘span’, *ilan* ‘step, degree’, *inan* ‘disease’.[139]

4.69. The *a* in the final syllable *-an* of some *n*-stems does not appear in their oblique cases:[140] *laman* ‘name’ (gen. *lamnaš*, not **lamanaš*), *šaraman* (a kind of bread) (abl. *šaramnaz*), *kuššan* ‘wage’ (d.-l. *kušni*), *tēkan* ‘earth’ (gen. *taknāš*), *wilan* ‘clay’ (gen. *wilnaš*[141]).

---

137. The forms transcribed *waštullaš*, *waštulli*, and *waštullaz* are written *wa-aš-túl-la/i-*, in which the sign sequence *-túl-la/i-* may not require the positing of a geminate *l*, as **wa-aš-d/tu-ul-la/i-* would (§1.25, p. 19). See also §1.97 (p. 39) and §1.109 (p. 41).

138. *wa-aš-du-ul-la* KUB 18.9 ii 15 in broken context is most likely *wašdull=a* with *-a/-ya* ‘and’ and is no evidence for a pl. nom.-acc. *waštulla*.

139. The stems *karzan-* (a weaver’s tool) and ^{GIŠ}*ḫanzan-* ‘?’ inflect in Hittite as neuter *n*-stem *pluralia tantum*, with forms parallel to *šaraman-* (pl. nom.-acc. *karza*, oblique stem *karzan-*). For competing accounts of the prehistory of *karzan-* see Eichner 1973: 98 n. 78 and Rieken 1999a: 391–92.

140. This alternation does not reflect ablaut but the fact that the prehistoric syllabic **-n̥* of the nominative-accusative appears as Hittite *-an*, while **-n-* of the oblique cases is preserved. See n. 48 (p. 78).

141. In addition, *wilan* ‘clay’ shows an unusual sg. d.-l. *ú-li-ni-i.*

4.70. Paradigms for the neuter *n*-stems:

	(a tax or obligation)	'name'	(a kind of bread)
	Singular		
nom.-acc.	*šaḫḫan*	*laman*	
gen.	*šaḫḫanaš*	*lamnaš*	*šaramannaš*, ***šaramnaš***, *šarammaš*
d.-l.	*šaḫḫāni*	*lamni*, *lamman*[142]	*šaramni*
	Numerically Indifferent		
abl.	*šaḫḫanaz(a)*, *šaḫḫanza*	*ŠUM-za*[143]	*šaram(ma)naz*
ins.	*šāḫḫanit*	*lamnit*	***šaramnit***
	Plural		
nom.-acc.	*šaḫḫani*		*šaram(ma)na*, *šaramma*,[144] ***šarāma***
d.-l.	*šaḫḫanaš*	*lamnaš*	***šaramnaš***

Case	'wage, fee'	'plague'	'oil'
	Singular		
nom.-acc.	***kuššan, kūšan***	***ḫinkan***, ***ḫenkan***	*šagan*[145]
gen.		*ḫinganaš*	***šagnāš***
d.-l.	***kuššani,*** *kušni*, *kuššanī*	***ḫengani***, ***ḫingani***, *ḫeganni*	*šagni*[146]
	Numerically Indifferent		
abl.	***kuššanaz,*** *kušnaz*	*ḫinganaz(a)*	
ins.			***šaganda***[147]
	Plural		
nom.-acc.	*ku-uš-ša-ni*[148]		

142. The so-called endingless locative (Neu 1980). The form *la-am-ni-i* belongs to the heteroclitic noun *lammar* 'moment, hour'.

143. See §31.23 (p. 437).

144. The variant *šaramma* results from *šaramna* by assimilation (see §1.122, p. 44). Here the regular ending *-a* has been added to the stem *šaramn-*. The variant *šarāma* is an archaism (see Gertz 1982: 298, 305).

145. *ša-ga-an* KBo 38.68 obv. 8.

146. *ša-ag-ni* KBo 32.14 iii 11 (MH/MS).

147. *ša-gán-da* KBo 22.2 obv. 2 (OS).

148. This form in *-i* is a collective, not a count plural, just as in English *wage* and *wages* are used interchangeably.

	(a tree variety)[149]	'bead' [150]
	Singular	
nom.-acc.	***eyan***[151]	*kuwannan*, *kunnanan*, *kunnan*
gen.	*eyaš*, *eyanaš*	*kunnaš*, *kunnanaš*
d.-l.	*eya*, *eyani*	
	Numerically Indifferent	
abl.	*eyaz*	*kuwannanaza*
ins.	*eyanit*	*kunnanit*
	Plural	
nom.-acc.	*eya*, GIŠ*e-i-e* [152]	*kuwanna*
gen.		
d.-l.		*kuwannanaš*

4.71. Paradigm for neuter *n*-stem *tekan* with ablaut (§3.37, p. 78):

nom.-acc.	***tēkan***[153]
gen.	***taknaš***, *taknāš*
d.-l.	*taknī*,[154] ***tagān***,[155] *tāgan*
all.	***taknā***
abl.	*taknāz(a)*

4.72. Alternating vowel length in this paradigm as well as ablaut grades suggest word stress on the plene position (AHP 185); see §1.8 (p. 11) and §1.146 (p. 50).

149. This word shows a mixture of *n*-stem (*eyanaš*, *eyani*, *eyanit*) and *a*-stem forms (*eyaš*, *eya*, *eyaz*). Because it is found in OS only in the nom.-acc. for *eyan*, which could be either (see §4.6, p. 82, for the *a*-stem neuter paradigm), diachronic priority can be established for neither stem.

150. This word as attested shows a mixture of *n*-stem and *a*-stem forms. It is found to date only in NH or NS texts.

151. Sometimes written *e-a-an*.

152. All nominative-accusative forms written *e-ya* we take as plurals, even if in some cases they function as collectives denoting a single object. The form GIŠ*e-i-e* is problematic. What appears to be I + E graphically is probably a scribal lapse for graphic I + A, i.e., IA (/ya/).

153. This word is conventionally written *tēkan*, *taknāš* in broad transcription. Both *te-kán* and the endingless locative *da-ga-an* with their single writing between vowels suggest that the velar was voiced. The nature (in Hittite) of the initial stop (*d* or *t*) is uncertain.

154. AHP 185, 187, 361.

155. An identical form *tagān* (OS) or *dagan* occurs also in the compound noun *daganzipa-* (*dagan* + *šipa-*) 'earth-genius' > 'earth'. See §1.136 (p. 47).

Common-Gender n-Stem Nouns

4.73. All common-gender *n*-nouns in Hittite except one (§4.78, p. 113) show a pattern in which the sg. nom. ends in *-aš* (without *-n-*!), while all other cases have a stem containing *-n-*.[156] In many instances the latter stem is invariant *-an-*, but some nouns show ablaut (see §3.37, p. 78), with variants *-en-* and *-n-* as well as *-an-* (see Oettinger 1980; Neu 1981b: 350–51; Oettinger 1982b: esp. 175–77; Melchert 1983: 3–12; and, above all, Oettinger 2003, largely superseding the previous treatments; but compare the different analysis by Rieken 2004b).

4.74. Nouns belonging to the type with sg. nom. *-aš*, oblique in *-an-*/*-en-*/*-n-*, include: *arkamman-* 'tribute', *alkištan-* 'branch', *ḫāran-* 'eagle', *memi*(*y*)*an-* 'word, thing', *išḫima*/*en-* 'cord', and the ethnicon suffix *-um*(*a*)*n-* (for the last item, see §2.45, p. 60).[157] Only the last two show a vocalic alternation *e*/*a.* There is a tendency in all these nouns to adopt the inflection of the *a*-stems—in two directions: based either on the sg. nom. or on the oblique stem. Thus one finds sg. acc. *ḫāran* beside *ḫāranan*, and, in fact, only *arkamman*, *memi*(*y*)*an*, and ^{m}*Šuppiluliuman*, as if the stems were *ḫāra-*, *arkamma-*, *memi*(*y*)*a-*, and ^{m}*Šuppiluliuma-*. On the other hand, one also finds sg. nom. *alkištanaš*,[158] *išḫimanaš*, and ^{URU}*šutummanaš* 'man of Šuta', as if the stems were *alkištana-*, *išḫimana-*, and *šutummana-*. The inflection of stems in *-uman-* is further complicated by the loss of the *-a-* in the oblique stem (see §4.69, p. 108) and the phonetic changes this produces (see §1.122, p. 44). For further examples of forms of *-uman-* see §§2.45–2.47 (p. 60).

4.75. Paradigms for animate nouns with sg. nom. in *-aš* and oblique stem in *-an-*:

	'eagle'	'tribute'	'cord, rope'
	Singular		
nom.	***ḫāraš***	*arkammaš*	***išḫimāš***, *išḫimanaš*
acc.	***ḫāranan***, *ḫāran*[159]	*arkamman*	*išḫimenan*, *išḫimanan*, *išḫaminan*
gen.	*ḫāranaš*	*arkammanaš*	
d.-l.		*arkammani*	

156. This type reflects a PIE paradigm where the sg. nom. lacked not only the *-n-* but also the regular sg. nom. ending *-s*. See Latin *homō*, *hominis* 'human being, man'. Hittite has added the regular ending *-s* to the sg. nom.

157. Possibly also $^{(DUG)}$*šāšan-* 'lamp', which seems to have developed secondarily in NH a geminate *n*, perhaps remodeled on the basis of Luwian loanwords in *-anna*/*i-*.

158. [^{GIŠ}*alk*]*ištanaš* at KUB 33.117 iv 11.

159. Sg. acc. *ḫāranan* is OS; *ḫāran* does not occur before MH and is a back formation, analogical to sg. nom. *ḫāraš*.

	‘eagle’	‘tribute’	‘cord, rope’
	Numerically Indifferent		
abl.			*išḫimanaz*
ins.			*išḫimanit*, *išḫimanda*, *išḫimanta*
	Plural		
nom.	*ḫāraniš*[160]		*išḫimāneš*
acc.		*arkammuš*, *argamanuš*	***išḫimanuš***
gen.		*arkammanaš*	

Note that the adverbial derivative ‘like an eagle’ shows the *n*-stem: *ḫāranili*. For the instrumental forms *išḫimanda* and *išḫimanta* see §3.35 (p. 77).

4.76. The noun *memi*(*y*)*an*- ‘word’ also has a variant stem *memin*- seen in the forms *memini* and *meminit* (see n. 54, p. 33). The unique paradigm of ‘grape cluster’ may reflect mixture of two different paradigms (an *i*-stem *mūri*- and a derived stem *mūri*(*ya*)*n*-) or simply *mūri*(*ya*)*n*- with contraction.

	‘word’	‘grape cluster’
	Singular	
nom.	*memi(y)aš*	*mureš*, *mūriš*
acc.	*memi(y)an*[161]	*murin*
gen.	*memiyanaš*	
d.-l.	*memini*, *memiyani*, *memieni*	
	Numerically Indifferent	
abl.	*memi(ya)naza*	
ins.	*memi(ya)nit*	*mūrinit*
	Plural	
acc.	*memiyanuš*, *memiyaneš*, *memiyaš*	***mūriuš***,[162] *mūriyanuš*
gen.	*memiyanaš*	
d.-l.	*memiyanaš*	

160. See §1.57 (p. 27), §3.16 (p. 70).

161. *memi*(*y*)*an* is also attested in NH as a secondary sg. nom.-acc. neut.

162. From KUB 43.23 (rev. 21), which we consider to be OS, contra Konk., which lists it as MS.

4.77. The noun meaning ‘witness’ originally had a stem in *-wa/en-* with sg. nom. in *-waš*, like the nouns in §4.74 (p. 111) (Oettinger 1982b), and is likewise subject to leveling as an *a*-stem *kutruwa-*.

	Singular	Plural
nom.	*kutruwaš*[163]	*kutrueš*, *kutruwaš*, *kutrūš*,[164] *kutruwaneš*, *kutruweneš*, *kutarweneš*[165]
d.-l.	*kutrui*	*kutruwaš*

4.78. The Hittite word for ‘woman’ (MUNUS-*n*-), which is descriptively an *n*-stem, shows a unique paradigm with the addition of *-s* in the sg. nom.[166] If Neu (1990) and Carruba (1991; 1993a) are right, the underlying Hittite word was *kuinn*(*a*)-. But there are objections worth considering (Güterbock 1992, 1995c).

	Singular
nom.	**MUNUS-*za***, MUNUS-*aš*[167] MUNUS-*iš*[168]
acc.	**MUNUS-*nan***, MUNUS-*an*
gen.	MUNUS-*naš*, MUNUS-*aš*
d.-l.	MUNUS-*ni*, MUNUS-*i*
	Plural
nom.	MUNUS.MEŠ-*eš*, MUNUS.MEŠ-*iš*, MUNUS.MEŠ-*uš*
acc.	MUNUS.MEŠ-*uš*
gen.	MUNUS.MEŠ-*aš*
d.-l.	MUNUS.MEŠ-*aš*

4.79. A small class of common-gender nouns has a stem in *-anzan-* (Melchert 2003b). Examples include: ^{GIŠ}*alanzan-* (a kind of tree), *ištanzan-* ‘soul, mind, will’, *laḫ*(*ḫ*)*anzan-* ‘shelduck’, and $^{(Ú)}$*šumanzan-* ‘(bul)rush’. These nouns closely resemble those in §4.75 in having a sg. nom. in *-anzaš* without *-n-*, while the rest of the cases are based on a stem *-anzan-*. But they also have a sg. nom. in *-anza* without the final *-š*. Once again, there is a tendency to remodel this alternating paradigm as an *a*-stem, either after the sg. nom. (thus MS sg. gen. *alanzaš* as if to *alanza-* or NS pl. acc. *la*(*ḫ*)*ḫanzuš*

163. KBo 15.25 obv. 35 *nu=za zik* ^{d}UTU-*uš kutruwaš ēš*.

164. In *kutrūšš=a* (var. *kutruwašš=a*) EGIR-*an iyanteš ašandu* KUB 13.4 ii 36–37 the form *kutrūš* is pl. nom., not sg.

165. *ku-tar-ú-e-ne-eš* KUB 23.78B ii 9. See on this writing §1.83 (p. 35).

166. On suggestions for the Hittite word underlying MUNUS (earlier reading SAL) ‘woman’ (either **g*(*u*)*wen-*, or **g*(*u*)*wan-*), see Neu 1990; Carruba 1991; Güterbock 1992; Carruba 1993a; Güterbock 1995c; Weitenberg 1995: 337; HED K 306–8; and Rieken 1999a: 39–42.

167. As shown by the spelling MUNUS-*na-aš* KUB 8.66 iii 3 and 10, MUNUS-*aš* is a secondary *a*-stem based on the oblique forms (see §4.74, p. 111).

168. MUNUS-*iš* KUB 44.4 + KBo 13.241 rev. 27.

as if to *la*(*ḫ*)*ḫanza*-; even *laḫanziuš* [late NS] as if to **laḫanzi*-) or after the other cases (thus NS sg. nom. *ištanzanaš* as if to *ištanzana*-). The noun *šumanzan*- also back-forms a neuter singular based on the collective plural *šumanza*.

r-Stem Nouns and Adjectives

4.80. Of the *r*-stem nouns (HE §80; EHS; Kammenhuber 1969b: 287), those in *-ur* (§2.48, p. 61) are all neuters, with the exception of ^{NA_4}*ḫekur* 'rock sanctuary', which has common gender agreement (*kūn* ^{NA_4}*ḫekur*) but as yet no unequivocal common gender inflection.[169] There are only two nouns in *-er*: *ḫašduer* 'brushwood', an old collective, is inflected as a neuter, while *ḫašter*- 'star' is common gender and adds an *-s* in the sg. nom., producing *ḫaštērz*(*a*).[170] The sg. nom. MUL-*aš* and the stem form ^{URU}MUL-*ra* suggest that a secondary *a*-stem *ḫašte*/*ira*- arose as it did in the case of *keššar* > *keššara*- (§4.82).[171] Stems in *-ar* include nouns of both genders and adjectives.

4.81. Paradigms of nouns in *-ur* and *-er:*

	'soup, stew'	'ritual'	(a body part)	'brushwood'	'star'
	Singular				
nom. com.					*ḫašterza*
acc. com.					MUL-*an*, ^{URU}*Ḫaštiran*, ^{URU}*Ḫašteran*
n.-a. neut.	***paršūr***	*aniur*	*kudur*	*ḫašduēr*	
gen.	*paršūraš*	*aniuraš*			^{URU}*Ḫaštiraš*, ^{URU}MUL-*raš*, MUL-*aš*
	Numerically Indifferent				
abl.	*paršūrazzi*[172]	*aniuraz*		*ḫašduerraza*[173]	
ins.	*paršūrit*				
	Plural				
nom. com.					**MUL.Ḫ**I.A-***eš***
n.-a. neut.		*aniuri*[174]	*kudur(r)a*, *kudurri* $^{Ḫ I.A}$	*ḫašduer*	

169. Inflected forms of ^{NA_4}*ḫekur* are virtually non-existent. Most examples are part of place names where the word is written in the stem form. The final wedge (*-aš*?) on the pl. nom. form ^{NA_4}*ḫé-kur*-$^{Ḫ I.A}$*-aš* cited by HED H 289 is clearly indicated in the copy with a circle of dots as partially erased. Without immediate context, it is a toss-up whether in KBo 17.62 + KBo 17.63 iv 4 to read ^{NA_4}*ḫé-kur-uš* with unusual syllabification or ^{NA_4}*ḫé-kur* ⟨SAG.⟩UŠ (with Beckman 1983b: 38–39), and nothing in that context suggests the need for a plural form.

170. See Weitenberg 1995: 334–35, citing anterior literature.

171. The earliest examples of sg. nom. MUL-*aš* are in MS manuscripts.

172. See §1.116 (p. 42).

173. On the geminate sonorant see §1.109 (p. 41).

174. *a-ni-ú-ri* is incorrectly registered as sg. d.-l. in HED 1:70.

4.82. In the case of nouns in *-ar* we must distinguish between original *r*-stems and secondary ones. Of original *r*-stems, neuter nouns in *-ar* such as *ḫappar-* 'purchase, sale' have an invariant stem and require no further comment.[175] The PIE *r*-stem polysyllabic animate nouns are generally transferred to the *a*-stem class in Hittite (Rieken 1999a: 261–68): e.g., agent nouns in *-tara-* (< PIE **-tor*; see §2.41, p. 59). There is one exception, the word for 'hand' (Weitenberg 1995: 334; Rieken 1999a: 261–62), which is once attested with the inherited asigmatic sg. nom. com. *keššar-šiš* 'his hand'.[176] This is also the only *r*-stem noun to show traces of ablaut in its stem. The alternation of *e*, *i*, *a*, and zero between the *šš* and the *r* of the word for 'hand' probably indicates that no vowel stood in that position and the word contained a consonantal sequence *ssr* (so AHP 29). In the earlier stages of Hittite the word for 'hand' had the following paradigm (HE §80b): sg. nom. *ke-eš-šar*, sg. all. *ki-iš-ra-a*, sg. d.-l. *ki-iš-ri* or *ke-eš-šar* (§3.26, p. 74), ins. *ki-iš-šar-ta*, *ki-iš-šar-at*.[177] In OH the vowel in the first syllable of sg. nom. *keššar* was stressed *e*, but in the other forms of the paradigm was unstressed *i* (AHP 101). In the later language, 'hand' became a common gender *a*-stem noun, as others of its class (e.g., the agent nouns in *-tara-*) had previously done. The only forms diagnostic of this later *a*-stem are the sg. nom. examples: *kišširaš*, *keššeraš*, and *kešširaš*. Late NH pl. acc. *kiššariuš* shows the same intrusive *i* found in *anniuš* (< *anna-* 'mother'), *gimriuš* (< *gimra-* 'steppe, grassland'), *šittariuš* (< *šittara-*), and *laḫanziuš* (< *laḫanza* [a bird]), on which see §4.2 (p. 79), §4.17 (p. 86), §4.79, and §4.84.

	'hand'	'purchase, sale'[178]
	Singular	
nom. com.	***keššar***, *kišširaš*,[179] *keššeraš*, *kešširaš*	
acc. com.	*kiššeran*, *kišširan*[180]	
n.-a. neut.		*ḫappar*
gen.	*kiššaraš*	

175. See n. 178 for the form *ḫappariuš*. Against HED H 125 (following Laroche), the hapax *ḫa-ap-pí-ir* in KBo 12.70 rev. 14 (NS) is a back formation based on *ḫappirāi-* beside *ḫapparāi-*. See Rieken 1999a: 318 n. 1549, following Kimball.

176. On this correct interpretation of *keššar=šiš* see Weitenberg 1995: 334, with references. Contrary to Kammenhuber (1969b: 281, 287, 310), it is not *keššar=šiš*, but rather the form ŠU-*aš-še-et* of the NH parallel text that is erroneous.

177. For the orthography *ki-iš-šar-at* see §1.11 (p. 12) and §1.12 (p. 13).

178. We follow LH 121, 207–8, 276, which takes *ḫa-ap-pa-ri-uš* in Laws §146 (aa ii 11) as a different stem, *ḫappari*(*ya*)- 'sale price' and rejects the view that this is to be read as [*ḫant*]*ezziyaš ḫappari=uš wāši* 'he shall buy them at the price of the first (man)', proposed by Neu, StBoT 18 107 and followed by HW² H 215–16 and HED H 125–26.

179. *ki-iš-ši-ra-aš* VBoT 58 i 39 (OH/NS).

180. *ki-še-ra-aš-ša-an* (**kiššeran=šan* 'his hand') KBo 3.27 obv. 3 (OH/NS), *ki-iš-še-ra-an* KUB 11.34+ IBoT 4.54 iv 6 (OH/NS), KBo 24.45 obv. 31.

	‘hand’	‘purchase, sale’[178]
	Singular	
d.-l.	***kiššarī,*** *kiššari*,[181] *kišširi*, *kišrī̆*,[182] *keššar*[183]	*ḫappari*
all.	*kišrā*[184]	
	Numerically Indifferent	
abl.	*kiššaraz*	*ḫapparaz*
ins.	*keššarta*, ***kiššarta***, *kišarta*, *ki-iš-šar-at*, *kišrī̆t*, *kiššerit*, *kišširit*[185]	
	Plural	
nom. com.	*kiššariš*	
acc. com.	*kiššeruš*, *kiššariuš*	
gen.	*kišraš*, *kiššaraš*	
d.-l.	*kišraš*	

4.83. Due to a pre-Hittite change involving final sequences of **-Cros/m* (Melchert 1993a), a number of common-gender nouns (*šittara-*, *ḫuppara-*) came to have sg. nom. and sg. acc. forms in *-ar* although their stems were in *-ra-*. Contrary to Neu (1982–83: 125–26), there is no evidence that there was any gender alternation in any of these stems in OH. The anomalous sg. nom. and sg. acc. com. forms in *-ar*, however, were replaced in later Hittite by *a*-stem forms in *-araš* and *-aran*.[186]

4.84. The paradigms of *šittar* ‘sun disk’ and *ḫuppar* (a vessel) follow:

	‘sun disk’ (com.)	(a vessel)
	Singular	
nom. com.	*šittar*	***ḫuppar***, ***ḫūpparaš***[187]
acc. com.	*šittara/in*	***ḫupparan***
gen.		*ḫupparaš*
d.-l.		***ḫūppari***

181. *ki-iš-ša-ri-i* StBoT 8 i 28 (OS), *ki-iš-ša-ri* KUB 13.20 i 18 (MH/NS), *ki-iš-ša-ri-iš-mi* ‘in(to) their hand’ StBoT 8 i 20 (OS), *ki-iš-š*[(*a-ri-iš-ši*)] ‘in(to) his hand’ KUB 11.1 ii 5 restored by KUB 11.6 i 4′ (= THeth 11:24 i 70) (OH/NS), *ki-iš-ša-ri-mi* KBo 3.1 ii 22, KBo 3.23 i 4 (OH/NS).

182. *ki-iš-ri-i* ‘in(to) the hand’ HKM 44:10 (MH/MS), *ki-iš-ri-mi* ‘in(to) my hand’ KBo 3.28:7, *ki-iš-ri-it-ti* ‘in(to) your hand’ KBo 3.21 ii 5 (Adad hymn, MH/NS), KUB 31.127 i 23.

183. *ke-eš-šar* “endingless locative.” See Neu 1980: 33–35.

184. KBo 8.42 rev. 4 (OS or OH/MS).

185. *ki-iš-še-ri-it* KUB 29.40 iii 32, *ki-iš-ši-ri-it* KUB 30.37 i 5, 6 (cult inv., NH?), *ki-iš-šar-ta* KBo 20.8 obv. 11 (OS), KBo 8.35 iii 7 (MH/MS), KUB 12.63 obv. 26, 31 (OH/MS), etc.

186. In the case of the word for ‘horn’, the response to the above sound change was the creation of two separate paradigms: a neuter *a*-stem *šawitra-* and a neuter *r*-stem *šāwatar* (Melchert 1993a: 105–6).

187. See *še-me-e-na-aš ḫu-u-up-pa-ra-aš šu-u-uš* KBo 20.8 rev. 4 (OS); *ke-e-da-ni-ma* $^{\text{GIŠ}}$*ḫu-up-pa-ra-aš kat-ta ki-it-ta* KUB 33.59 iii 8–9 (OS).

	‘sun disk’ (com.)	(a vessel)
	Numerically Indifferent	
abl.	*šittaraz*, *šittarza*	*ḫupparaza*
ins.		*ḫupparit*
	Plural	
nom.	*šittareš*	
acc.	*šittariuš*, *šittaraš*	***ḫupparuš***
coll.		*ḫuppari*

4.85. Paradigms for *r*-stem adjectives:

	‘hostilility’	‘full, complete’	‘ominous’
	Singular		
nom. com.	***kurur***	*šakuwaššaraš*, *šakuwaššar*	
acc. com.		***šakuwaššaran***	*kallaran*
n.-a. neut.	*kurur*	***šakuwaššar***	*kallar*[188]
gen.	*kururaš*	*šakuwaššaraš*	
d.-l.	***kūruri***	*šakuwaššari*	
	Numerically Indifferent		
abl.		*šakuwaššaraza*	
ins.		*šakuwaššarit*	*kallarit*
	Plural		
nom. com.	*kurur*	*šakuwaššaruš*	
acc. com.		*šakuwaššaruš*	
n.-a. neut.	*kurur*, *kururi*$^{\underline{ḪI.A}}$, *kurura*		*kallar*, *kallāra*
gen.	*kururaš*		

4.86. We follow Neu (1979b; 1983: 97 with n. 354) and others in analyzing *kurur-* as a noun secondarily used as an adjective. The adjectives in *-ar* (e.g., *šakuwaššar*, *kallar*) have the same history as the nouns described in §4.83.

s-Stem Nouns

4.87. For the PIE origins of the inflection of Hittite *s*-stems see Rieken: 1999a 171–83; Beekes 1995: 185–86; and Sihler 1995: 305. In Hittite most *s*-stem nouns are neuter, the exceptions being *ḫāš* ‘soap’ and *ḫandaiš* ‘heat’. The following nouns belong to the *s*-stem class: *aiš* ‘mouth’, *ankiš* (a kind of plant), *ḫandaiš* ‘heat’, *ḫapuš* ‘reed stalk(?),

188. [. . . *k*]*al-la-ar* KUB 12.43:4′ (MS?; OS according to Konk.).

penis(?)', *ḫāš* 'soap', *ḫupallaš* 'scalp(?) or skull(?)', *iškiš* 'back', *kutriš* 'reckoning' (see HED K 298), *nepiš* 'sky, heaven', *purpuriš* (a vessel), *kalmuš* 'lituus, crook' *maldaniš* 'mushroom(?)', *dannaš* (a kind of bread), *zaškaraiš* 'anus' (< *zaškar* 'excrement' + *aiš* 'mouth'). *aiš* 'mouth' and the compound *zaškaraiš* containing it are the only *s*-stem nouns that show ablaut. The noun *ḫu*(*wa*)*lli*(*š*)/*ḫuwalliš*(*ša*)*n*- 'pine cone' shows both an *s*-stem, an extended stem *-šn-* (see §4.90 with n. 202, p. 120), and a shorter *i*-stem (HW 74, HED H 424).

4.88. Paradigms for *s*-stem nouns:

	'mouth'	'side'[189]	*dannaš*-bread
	Singular		
nom.-acc.	***aiš***	*tapuwaš*	*dannaš*
erg.		*tāpuwaššanza*	
gen.	*iššaš*	*tapuwaššaš*	
d.-l.	***iššī***, *aiššī*	*tāpūwaš*(?)[190]	
all.	*iššа*		
	Numerically Indifferent		
abl.	*iššaz*		
ins.	*iššit*		*dannašit*[191]
	Plural		
acc. com.	KA×U.ḪI.A-*uš*[192]		
d.-l.		*tapuwaš*	

	'lituus'	'heat'	'soap, ash'
	Singular		
nom. com.		*ḫandaiš*[193]	*ḫāš*, *ḫaššaš*
acc. com.			*ḫaššan*

189. The adverbs *tapuša* 'to the side' and *tapušza* 'beside' were originally the allative and ablative of this *s*-stem.

190. The second *ta-a-pu-u-wa-aš* form in KUB 9.4 i 9, which HW 213 assigned to the genitive, is contextually a dative-locative (probably singular). Perhaps it is an endingless locative.

191. KUB 2.8 i 34. The forms $^{\text{NINDA}}$*tannaza* and *dannaza* do not belong to his word; instead they are sg. nom. to stems in *-ant-*.

192. KUB 14.4 ii 10 (NH). This example is not evidence for heterogenicity in this word but rather a sporadic example of the use of a common-gender form for a count plural in early NH (see §3.13, p. 68).

193. Although no inflectional aspect of this word shows it to be common gender, it must be such. Neuter nouns cannot serve as subjects of transitive verbs (see §§3.8–3.9, pp. 66–67), whereas *ḫandaiš* does so: *mān=a*[(*n*)] *ḫandaiš walḫzi zig=an ekunimi dai* KBo 3.23 i 5–6 (NS), with restoration from KUB 31.115 (NS).

	‘lituus’	‘heat’	‘soap, ash’
	Singular		
nom.-acc.	*kalmuš*		
gen.	*kalmušaš*[194]		
d.-l.	*kalmuši*	*ḫandaiši*	
	Numerically Indifferent		
abl.	*kalmušaz*, *kalmušati* (Luw.)		
ins.	*kalmušit*		
	Plural		
acc. com.			*ḫaššuš*

4.89. One group of nouns has members with secondary common-gender stems in the nominative and accusative extended by a thematic vowel *a*: *iškiš*(*a*)- ‘back’, *nepiš*(*a*)- ‘sky’, *atešš*(*a*)- ‘axe’.

	‘back’	‘sky’	‘axe’[195]
	Singular		
nom. com.		[*nep*]*išaš*, AN-*aš*	
acc. com.	*iškišan*	*nepišan*	*ateššan*
nom.-acc.	***iškiš***	***nēpiš***[196]	*ateš*
erg.		*nepišanza*	
gen.	*iškišaš*	***nepišaš***	
d.-l.	*iškiši*	***nepiši***, *nepiš*[197]	
all.	*iškiša*	***nēpiša***[198]	

194. If *kalmušiyaš* KBo 34.175:6′ belongs to the paradigm of *kalmuš*, it resembles *kardiyaš* to *kard*- ‘heart’ (see §4.116, p. 131), but it may also belong to a derived adjectival stem **kalmušiya*- ‘of the lituus’.

195. Against Rieken (1999a: 192), the form *a-te-eš-ša-na-aš* in KUB 9.31 i 27 is not “hopelessly corrupt” but merely a sg. nom. used in a list despite its syntactic role as a direct object, for which there are parallels. This secondary sg. nom. com. to a stem *atešš*(*a*)*na*- shows that this noun originally belonged to the type of *s*-stem with an *-n*- in the oblique cases; see §4.90 (p. 120). Only the extended stem in *-šš*n- can explain the consistent geminate *-šš*- in this word, which cannot be explained by accent: see AHP 150–51.

196. *ne-e-pí-iš* (OS), *ne-pí-iš* (OS and later), *ne-pé-eš* only in NS; see CHD L–N 448. Plene writing of the initial syllable is common in OS.

197. On the endingless loc. *nepiš* see Neu 1980.

198. *ne-e-pí-ša* (OS), *ne-pí-ša* (NS).

	‘back’	‘sky’	‘axe’[195]
	Numerically indifferent		
abl.	*iškišaz*	***nēpišza***,[199] *nepišaz(a)*	
ins.	*iškišitti?*		*ateššit*, *ateššet*
	Plural		
acc. com.?			*ateššuš*[200]
n.-a. neut.	*iškiša*		*atišša*
gen.		*nepišan*[201]	

4.90. Another group shows an *-n-* extension in the oblique cases: *ḫaḫriš*(*n-*) ‘lung’, *ḫatalkiš*(*n-*) ‘hawthorn’, *ḫaddareš*(*n-*) ‘intersection, fork’, *ḫu*(*wa*)*lliš*(*n-*) ‘pine cone’,[202] *kuppiš*(*n-*) ‘stool, camp-chair’, *takšeš*(*n-*) ‘assemblage’, *tunnakkiš*(*n-*) ‘inner chamber’, *dandukiš*(*n-*) ‘humanity, the human race’, *uppiš*(*n-*) ‘what is sent’ (AHP 150–51; Rieken 1999a: 386–404).[203] Later, members of this group were regularized by being fitted into the heteroclitic *r*/*n*-stem class with new nominative-accusative forms such as *tunna(k)keššar* (KUB 25.15 rev. 4, 15; KBo 30.69 iii 4), etc.

	‘inner chamber’
nom.-acc.	***tunnakkiš***
gen.	*dunnakkešnaš*, [*t*]*unnakkešnaš*
d.-l.	*du*[*nnake*]*šni*
all.	***tunnakišna***, *tunnakkišna*

t-Stem Nouns and Adjectives

4.91. While PIE simple *t*-stems are rare (Beekes 1995: 178), those in *-nt-* are not. Due to the wide use and productivity of a derivational suffix *-att-* used to form action nouns, the number of *t*-stem nouns in Hittite is fairly large (Pedersen 1938: 40–41; Kronasser 1956: 129–31; EHS 254–56; Kammenhuber 1969b: 196; Rieken 1999a: 83–170). The only neuter *t*-stems in Hittite are those in *-itt-* (see §4.95, p. 122).

4.92. The combination of *t*/*d* with an immediately following *š* (as in the sg. nom. com.) is represented by the graph *z* in Hittite cuneiform (see §§1.90–1.91, p. 37). If an-

199. *ne-e-pí-iš-za* KUB 43.23 rev. 15 (OS) and *ne-pí-iš-za* KBo 3.22:2 (OS). The alternate interpretations of the latter as sg. gen. (Otten 1951: 40 and EHS 327) and as endingless loc. + particle *-za* (see n. 9, p. 363 and §3.26, p. 74) are unfounded.

200. KBo 29.199:7′, cited in HED A 227–28 in unpublished form as “*atteššuš-ma* ZABAR 97/b r. 7.”

201. This form may be pl. gen. (see §3.23, p. 73, and CHD L–N 448).

202. Attested in the ergative form [*ḫu-w*]*a-al-li-iš-ša-na-an-za* KUB 7.58 i 3.

203. For the stems *karzan-* and ^{GIŠ}*ḫanzan-* included in this class by Rieken (1999a: 391–92) see n. 139 (p. 108).

other consonant immediately preceded this /ts/ in final position, it was necessary to write it in cuneiform as *-za*, with an unpronounced *a*. This situation is especially common with stems in *-nt-*, where the final sequence of three consonants /nts/ was written -V*n-za*.

4.93. Common-gender *t*-stem nouns include one PIE root noun, the word for 'year' (*wē/ītt-* < **wētt-*), and several nouns derived with a suffix *-t-*. Of the latter only *kar(a)itt-* 'flood' < **ĝr(o)i-t-* shows partially preserved ablaut (§3.37, p. 78). Others have generalized the *o*-grade: *kašt-* 'hunger' < **g(ʰ)os-t-* (but *e*-grade is reflected in the derivative *kištuwant-* 'hungry'), *šaš-t-* 'sleep, bed' to *šeš-/šaš-* 'to sleep', and *kutt-* 'wall' < *ĝʰ(o)u-t-* (see HED K 298).[204] The noun *ḫalmaššuitt-* 'throne dais' is a loanword from Hattic. There is also a productive class of nouns with the suffix *-att-*, for which see §2.31 (p. 57).

Simple t-Stem Nouns

4.94. Paradigms of common-gender *t*-stem nouns:

	'anger'	'task, ritual'	'famine'	'year' [205]	'day' [206]
	Singular				
nom. com.	*kardimiyaz*, *kartimmiyaza*	*aniyaz* [207]	***gāšza***, *kašza*	**we/izza*, MU.KAM-*za*	**UD.KAM-*az***, UD-*az*, *šīwaz?* [208]
acc. com.	***kardimiyattan***	*aniyattan*	*kaštan*	**we/ittan*, MU-*an*	UD-*an*
gen.	*kardimiyattaš*	*aniyattaš*		**we/ittaš*, MU.KAM-*aš*	[d]***Šīwattaš***, UD-*aš*, *šīwaz?*
d.-l.	TUKU.TUKU-*atti*, *kartimmi(y)atti*	*aniyatti*	*kāšti*	***wītti, we/itti***	*šiwatti*, ***šīwat***, *šiwāt*, [209] **UD-*ti***
all.					**šiwatta* [210]

204. A derived *t*-stem *nekut-* 'evening' is attested only in the set phrase *nekuz meḫur* 'evening time', where *nekuz* is judged to be an old genitive < **nekʷ-t-s* (Rieken 1999a: 84 with n. 400, following Schindler).

205. The word for 'year' reflects a PIE *e*-grade, but there is evidence for both *e*- and *i*-vocalism in the Hittite word: *ú-e-et-ta*-[(*an-da-an-ni*)] KBo 3.22:64 (OS) vs. *ú-i-it-ti* KUB 29.32:2 and KUB 4.72 iv 2. Spellings like pl. gen. *ú-e/it-ta-an* are therefore ambiguous. See on this problem AHP 144–45.

206. On *šīwatt-* see Pedersen 1938: 175; Kammenhuber 1969b: 196, 204–5; AHP 102, 131; Rieken 1999a: 102–5; Yoshida 2000.

207. Against taking *a-ni-at-še-et* (OS) as evidence for secondary neuter gender see Rieken (1999a: 107), who emends to *a-ni-ya-at-⟨ta⟩-še-et*. For the possibility that *aniat* as attested is a correct collective plural and an archaism see AHP 87.

208. Interpretation as nominative or genitive is possible (see Neu 1983: 15–16 n. 74; Starke 1990: 458 n. 1666, Rieken 1999a: 102–3).

209. See also the second member of the OH *a-ni-ši-wa-at* 'today, henceforth' (Rieken 1999a: 104).

210. Abstracted from compound [*ap-pa-š*]*i-wa-at-ta* KUB 31.64 iv 1′ (MH/MS), Rieken 1999a: 103.

	‘anger’	‘task, ritual’	‘famine’	‘year’ [205]	‘day’ [206]
	Numerically Indifferent				
abl.				MU.KAM-*za*	UD(.KAM)-*az*
ins.			*kāštit*		
	Plural				
nom. com.				MU.ḪI.A-*uš* [211]	UD.KAM.ḪI.A-*uš*
acc. com.	***kardimiyattuš***, *kartimmiyadduš*			**MU.ḪI.A-*uš***	UD.ḪI.A-*uš* [212]
coll.		***aniyatta***, *aniyatti*, ***aniat***(?) [207]			
gen.				*we/ittan*, MU.ḪI.A-*aš*	
d.-l.		*aniyattaš*		MU.KAM.ḪI.A-*aš*	UD.ḪI.A-*aš*, UD.KAM.ḪI.A-*aš*

	‘flood’	‘joy’	‘fear’	‘wall’
	Singular			
nom. com.	***karaīz***, *kariz*, *gerēzza*	*dušgaraz(a)*	*naḫšaraz*,[213] *naḫšarraz*	*kuzza*
acc. com.		*tušgarattan*, *dušgaratan*,	*naḫšarattan*	*kuttan*
gen.		*tuškarattaš*		*kuttaš*
d.-l.	***karaitti***, *karitti* [214]	*dušgaratti*, [215] *dušqarati* [216]	*naḫšaratti*	***kutti***
	Numerically Indifferent			
abl.		*duškaratta(z)za*	*naḫšarataza*	*kuttaz*
ins.				
	Plural			
nom. com.	*garitteš*, *garittiš*		*naḫšaratteš*	*kutteš*
acc. com.			*naḫšaradduš*	*kudduš*
d.-l.			*naḫšarattaš*	*kuttaš*

4.95. Neuter *t*-stems are represented by *militt-* ‘honey’ and *šeppitt-* (a cereal). Neither noun occurs in the plural.

211. MSpr. obv. 6 (Murš. II).

212. KBo 4.8 ii 22 (Murš. II).

213. IBoT 1.36 i 59 (MH/MS) with CHD L–N 344. Rieken (1999a: 115) argues against the interpretation as ablative of **naḫšar-*.

214. *karaitti* KUB 36.110:18 (OS), *karit*[*ti*] KBo 22.6 i 27 (OH?/NS).

215. RS 25.421 rev. 58.

216. KUB 22.42 obv. 6′ (NH). See Rieken 1999a: 116 n. 533.

	‘honey’	‘*šeppit*-grain’
nom.-acc.	*milit*, **LÀL-*it***	*šeppit*
erg.	LÀL-*anza*	
gen.	*militaš*	***šeppittaš***, ***šeppidaš***
d.-l.	LÀL-*ti*	
ins.	LÀL-*it*	

nt-Stem Nouns and Adjectives

4.96. Common-gender nouns in *-nt-* include one root noun, *kant-* (a cereal, ‘oats’?), one probable old participle, *ḫuwant-* ‘wind’, and several types of stems derived with a suffix *-(a)nt-* (for these see §§2.25 and 2.27, p. 56). For the ergative *case* in *-anza*/*-anteš*, see §3.8 (p. 66).

4.97. Adjectives in *-nt-* for which no shorter bases can be found in Hittite are *ḫūmant-* ‘all’ and *am(m)iyant-* ‘small’. For derived adjectives with a suffix *-ant-* see §2.24 and §2.26 (p. 56) and for those with a suffix *-want-* see §2.50 (p. 61). Hittite participles, which are also formed with a suffix *-ant-* (§§25.39–25.45, pp. 339–340), may sometimes be substantivized.

4.98. Paradigms of Stems in *-nt-*:

	‘night’ (noun)	‘all’ (adj.)	‘living’ (adj.)	‘captured’ > ‘captive’
	Singular			
nom. com.	*išpanza*	***ḫūmanza***	***ḫuiš(u)wanza***, ***ḫušuwanza***	*appanza*
acc. com.	*išpandan*	***ḫūmandan***	***ḫuš(u)wand/tan***, *ḫuišwandan*	*appantan*
n.-a. neut.		***ḫūman***		
gen.	*išpandaš*	*ḫūmandaš*	*ḫuišwantaš*	*appantaš*
d.-l.	***išpanti***, ***išpandi***	***ḫūmanti***	*ḫuišwanti*	*appanti*
	Numerically Indifferent			
abl.	*išpandaz*	*ḫūmandaz*		*appantaz*
ins.		***ḫūmantit***		
	Plural			
nom. com.[217]		***ḫūmanteš***, *ḫūmanduš*	***ḫuiš(u)wanteš***	***appānteš***
acc. com.		***ḫūmanduš***, *ḫūmanteš*	*ḫuišwanduš*	*appanduš*
n.-a. neut.		***ḫūmand/ta***		*appanti*[218]
gen.		*ḫūmandaš*		*appantaš*
d.-l.		***ḫūmandaš***		*appantaš*

217. Other *nt*-stem plural nominatives are: IM.ḪI.A-*uš* (**ḫuwanduš*) ‘winds’ KUB 24.1 iv 16 (Murš. II).

218. Perhaps this is rather a collective in *-i*.

r/n-Stem Nouns

4.99. PIE "heteroclite" stems have the peculiarity of taking a suffix in the nominative-accusative different from the one used in the rest of the cases. The only widespread type (the so-called *r/n* stems) has a suffix ending in *-r* in the nominative-accusative and a suffix ending in *-n-* in the rest of the cases. This class is known in other old IE languages (Beekes 1995: 187; Sihler 1995: §§290–92; Szemerényi 1996: §7.3.4). In Hittite it is a large and productive class (Hrozný 1915: 24–25, 1917: 64–65; HE §81; Kammenhuber 1955b = Kammenhuber 1993: 1–10; EHS 278–321; Oettinger 1986b: 11–15). All *r/n*-stem nouns are neuter. No adjectives belong to this class.

4.100. There are five groups of nouns which exhibit this *r/n* alternation in their declension: (1) words built directly to the root, (2) derivatives in *-ātar*, (3) derivatives in *-eššar*, (4) derivatives in *-āwar*, and (5) derivatives in *-mar*.

Non-Derived r/n-Stem Nouns

4.101. Group 1: Archaic words (some inherited from PIE) built directly to the root (often no longer recognizable), with and without ablaut (see §3.37, p. 78), some with mobile accent (see §1.8, p. 11; §1.46, p. 25; and §1.145, p. 49):[219] *uttar* 'word', *wātar* 'water', *mēḫur* 'time', *ēšḫar* 'blood', *paḫḫuwar/paḫḫur* 'fire', *lammar* 'hour', *kuttar* 'neck(?), strength', *šēḫur* 'urine', *pankur* (a body part) (see Kammenhuber 1969b: 198–99; Sihler 1995: 298–302). As Sihler observes (p. 298), "the lexicon involved belongs to the most basic stratum of vocabulary—body parts and words like 'water', 'fire', 'blood', and 'day'." In Hittite, however, the word for 'day' (*šiwatt-*) is not an *r/n*-stem.

	'word'	'water'	'time'	'blood'	'fire'
	Singular				
n.-a.	*uttar*	***wātar***	***mēḫur***	***ēšḫar***, *išḫar*, *ēššar*[220]	***paḫḫur***, *paḫḫuwar*
erg.	*uddananza*	*wetinanza*, *witenanza*		*ēšḫananza*	
gen.	*uddanaš*, *uttanaš*	***witenaš***[221]	*meḫunaš*	***išḫanāš***, *išḫānaš*, *ēšnaš*	*paḫḫu(e)naš*
d.-l.	*uddani*, *(uddānī)*	*weteni*, *witeni*	***mēḫuni,*** *meḫueni*	*ēšḫani*, *išḫani*	*paḫḫu(e)ni*

219. The position of the accent in these forms can be determined by vowel gradation and plene writings. For details on the ablaut and accent pattern of these stems in PIE see Rieken 1999a: 269–70; Beekes 1995: 174–76, 187; Szemerényi 1996: 161–62, with differing views and terminology. See also Meier-Brügger 2000: 190–201; 2003: 204–18 on the general framework.

220. Note that the *ḫ* in this word is omissible (see §4.102). It is not due to a scribal error.

221. The vast majority of *weten-*, *witen-*, etc. spellings have *e* in the second syllable (*-te-*). Spellings such as *ú-i-ti-ni-it* KBo 23.1 iv 24 are exceedingly rare. The initial syllable *wi-* or *we-* is inevitably spelled with *ú-e/i-*, once *ú-wi$_5$-*, but not **u-e/i-*. On the alternation of initial *ú-i-* / *ú-e-* in this word see Kammenhuber 1969: 199 with anterior literature.

	‘word’	‘water’	‘time’	‘blood’	‘fire’
	Numerically Indifferent				
abl.	*uddanaz(a)*, *uddananza*[222]	*wetenaz(a)*, *wetenazza*, *witenaz(a)*		*e/išḫanaz*, *ēšnaza*, *išḫananza*	*paḫḫu(e)naz(a)*
ins.	*uddanit*, *uddanta*[223]	***witanta***, *wetenit*, *witenit*, *witinit*, *wedanda*, *widand/ta*		*ēšḫanta*, ***išḫanda***, *ēšḫanit*[224]	*paḫḫu(e)nit*
	Plural				
n.-a.	***uttār***, *uddār*[225]	***widār***, ***witār***, *wedār*, *uwitār*[226]	*meḫurri* $^{\text{Ḫ.A}}$[227]		
erg.	*uttanānteš*, *uddananteš*	*wetenanteš*			
gen.	*uddanaš*	A.Ḫ.A-*aš*	*meḫunaš*		
d.-l.	*uddanāš*, *uttanaš*	*uwitenaš*,[228] *wetenaš*[229]	*meḫunaš*		

	‘hour’	‘neck(?)’	‘urine’	(body part)
	Singular			
n.-a.	*lammar*	*kuttar*	*šēḫur*, *šēḫuwar*	***pankur***
gen.	*lamnaš*		*šeḫunaš*	*pankunaš*
d.-l.	*lamni*, *lammar*	*kuttani*	*šeḫuni*	
all.			*šeḫuna*	
	Numerically Indifferent			
abl.		***kuttanaz***		
ins.		*kuttanit*		*pankunit*

222. See §3.33 (p. 77).

223. For the instrumentals in *-d/ta* after a resonant (*uddanta*, *wedanda*, *išḫanda*) see §3.35 (p. 77) *ud-da-an-ta* is attested in KUB 30.10 obv. 18 (OH/MS).

224. Listed in HW² 2:121a without refs.

225. The form *uddārra=met* ‘my words’ KBo 3.28 ii 20 (OH/NS) appears to show double marking of the plural (for the ending *-a* compare *kallāra* in §4.85, p. 117) and the gemination seen with neuter nominative-accusative plurals in *-i* (see §1.109, p. 41). The reality of this isolated form in a late copy is open to question.

226. The non-plene spelling of the second syllable in the plural ‘waters’ is unusual. *ú-e-ta-ar* KBo 12.100 rev. 6 may be Luwian (see the immediate context). But ***ú-e-da-ar*** KBo 25.2 ii 8 is not only Hittite but Old Script! See also *ú-wi*$_5$*-ta-ar* in KUB 13.3 iii 23.

227. This final *-i* on the neuter plural is more common in the verbal substantives (*arkuwarri* $^{\text{Ḫ.A}}$, *minumarri* $^{\text{Ḫ.A}}$) and in the non-heteroclitic consonantal stems (*kurur* > *kururi* $^{\text{Ḫ.A}}$, *ḫuḫupal* > *ḫuḫupalli* $^{\text{Ḫ.A}}$, *kurtal* > *kurtalli* $^{\text{Ḫ.A}}$, *alel* > *aleli* $^{\text{Ḫ.A}}$) than on *r/n*-stems. But see *zankilatarri* $^{\text{Ḫ.A}}$ in §3.20 (p. 72). On the subject of this final *-i* on neuter nouns see Prins 1997: 56–61.

228. KUB 13.3 iii 37.

229. KUB 39.71 i 24.

4.102. Note that the *ḫ* in *ēšḫar* is omissible in NH. Friedrich (HE §28 b) explained this as due to a weakly articulated *ḫ*, which may even have been omitted dialectally. HW² E 121 includes only one example, *e-eš-šar* (in its NH paradigm), and attributes it to a scribal error. HED E/I 313 acknowledges several forms without *ḫ* and considers them to be due to a secondary development. AHP 71 indicates that the phenomenon is pre-Hittite, not independent in Hittite (see also Rieken 1999a: 303). AHP 71 considers gen. *ēšnaš* old, with nom. *ēššar* analogical to it. The *i* in *išḫan-* (see also *išḫarwant-*, *išḫaškant-* 'bloodied', *išḫanittara-* 'blood relative' [see Singer 1999], and *išḫarnumāi-* 'to bloody') is explained as a prothetic vowel that originated in the oblique forms of the collective plural and spread to the nominative-accusative (Melchert 1984b: 109 n. 66, citing Schindler). The alternation *paḫḫur/paḫḫuen-* in the word for 'fire' shows ablaut, but the single example *meḫueni* for *meḫuni* is merely analogical to *paḫḫueni*. It is quite uncertain whether the variants *paḫḫuwar* and *šeḫuwar* represent ablaut or not. Ablaut is definitely shown by the alternation in the word for 'water' between *wātar*, *widār*, *wedan-*, and the set of variants *witen-/weten-/wetin-*. The alternation of *i* and *e* in *witen-/weten-* is explicable as *i* < **e* in the unaccented root syllable (Rieken 1999a: 292–93). Of these doublets Rieken claims that the former occurs in the older texts.

4.103. Instrumental in *-ta*. Note too that in three out of the four *r*/*n*-stem nouns whose instrumental is attested (*uddanta*, *išḫanda*, *wedanda*), the archaic ending *-d/ta* is found either instead of or alongside of the normal ending *-it*. On the form *išḫimanda* (< *išḫima*(*n*)-) see Oettinger 1982a: 235 §2.4. See also §3.35 (p. 77) and p. 185, n. 36.

Derived Nouns with Suffix -ātar

4.104. Group 2: Derived nouns in *-ā̆tar* (Sturtevant and Hahn 1951: 98 §159; EHS 291–97) show *-tar* in the nominative-accusative, where *-ar* reflects a PIE syllabic **r̥* (see n. 48, p. 78) and *-tn-* or assimilated *-nn-* in the other cases. They include many abstracts or words for states or status (see §2.33, p. 57) , as well as some concrete nouns (§4.105). Hittite has also borrowed a few nouns from Luwian with a suffix *-(t)tar/-tn-*, such as *ḫuitar* 'wildlife, fame' and *karš*(*a*)*ttar* 'segment' (Starke 1990: 455–56 and 560–64). These inflect like the nouns in *-ātar*, except that they never show assimilation of *-tn-* to *-nn-* (see §1.112, p. 42).

	'impurity'	'reverence, respect'	'servitude'	'sorcery'
	Singular			
nom.-acc.	***paprātar***	*nakkiyātar*	ìR-*nātar*	*alwanzā̆tar*
erg.	*paprannanza*			*alwanzannaz*
gen.	*paprannaš*			*alwanzannaš*
d.-l.	*papranni*	*nakkiyanni*	ìR-*anni*	*alwanzanni*
	Numerically Indifferent			
abl.	*paprannaz(a)*, *paprannanza*		ìR-*nanaz*	
ins.		[*nakk*]*i*[*y*]*annit*		

	‘impurity’	‘reverence, respect’	‘servitude’	‘sorcery’
	Plural			
nom.-acc.	*paprāta*			*alwanzāta*

	‘growth’	‘insolence’	‘life’	‘journey’
	Singular			
nom.-acc.	***miyatar***, *miyātar*	***šullātar***, *šullatar*	***ḫuišwatar***	*laḫḫiyatar*
gen.	*miyannaš*		*ḫuišwannaš*	
d.-l.		*šullanni*	*ḫuišwanni*	*laḫḫiyanni*
	Numerically Indifferent			
abl.		*šullannaz(a)*	*ḫuišwannaza*	
ins.			*ḫuišwannit*	
	Plural			
nom.-acc.	*mīyata*	*šullāta*[230]		*laḫḫiyatar*

	‘fine’	‘wildlife’	‘segment, parcel’
	Singular		
nom.-acc.	*zankilatar*	*ḫūitar*, *ḫuetar*	*karšatar*, *karšattar*
erg.		*ḫuitnanza*	
gen.		*ḫuitnaš*	
d.-l.			*karšaddani*
	Numerically Indifferent		
ins.		*ḫuitnit*	
	Plural		
nom.-acc.	*za(n)kilatar*$^{\text{HI.A}}$, *zankilatarri*$^{\text{HI.A}}$	***ḫuitār***, *ḫuidār*	

4.105. The plural forms of nouns in this class are especially rare because they almost never denote concrete, countable objects, but either states (e.g., *nakkiyātar*) or classes of animate entities (*ḫuitar* ‘fauna, game’, *antuḫšātar* ‘humanity’). Some words that originally denoted a status developed into designation for concrete instances of the status. Thus *šiuniyātar* ‘deity’ developed into a term for a cult emblem or image, and LÚ-*nātar* (**pišnātar*) ‘manhood’ > ‘manly deed, exploit’ > ‘military campaign’. In the meaning ‘military campaigns’ we find the plural form LÚ-*natar*$^{\text{ḪI.A}}$ KBo 12.38 ii 14 (NH). For the ending *-i* on plural neuters see §3.20 (p. 71). Forms without final *-r* are archaisms and represent originally distinct pl. nom.-acc. forms (Neu 1982; Melchert 1988b). These again represent concrete instances: e.g., *ḫattāda*/*ḫattata* ‘wise thoughts’, *alwanzāta* ‘acts of sorcery’, *paprāta* ‘acts of impurity’, *kušduwāta* ‘instances of slander’,

230. [*š*]*u-ul-la-a-ta* 78/w 3′ (NS).

išḫaššarwata ‘lordly acts(?)’, *iyata tamēta* ‘instances of growth and proliferation’ (= ‘things that grow abundantly’, see HED E/I sub *iyatar*), etc.

4.106. Almost all nouns in this class show an assimilation of *-tn-* to *-nn-* (see §1.112, p. 42), the earlier forms of the oblique cases of the *-ātar* nouns, **-atnaš*, **-atni*, **-atnaz*, assimilating to *-annaš*, *-anni*, *-annaz*. But there are some exceptions, such as sg. d.-l. *ḫaratni* to *ḫarātar*. Compare also the derivatives *iyatniyant-* ‘abundant’ < *iyātar* ‘growth’ and *takšatniya-* ‘to make level’ < *takšātar* ‘plain’.

4.107. Although some verbs form their verbal substantive with the suffix *-ā̆tar* (§11.20, p. 185), only their sg. nom.-acc. and sg. gen. are attested. These same verbs form their infinitive in *-anna*, originally the allative of the verbal substantive in *-ātar*.

Derived Nouns with Suffix -eššar

4.108. Group 3: Derived nouns in *-eššar* (for examples see §2.34, p. 58; Sturtevant and Hahn 1951: 98–99 §160) show *-šš̆ar* in the nominative-accusative, where *-ar* reflects a PIE syllabic **r̥* (see n. 48, p. 78) and *-šš̆n-*(see §4.109) in the other cases. As with the *-ātar* class, the concrete *-eššar* nouns have overt plural forms: *uppeššar*$^{\text{Ḫ.A}}$ ‘gifts’, *mukiššar*$^{\text{Ḫ.A}}$ ‘invocations’, *ileššar*$^{\text{Ḫ.A}}$ ‘omens, portents’, $^{\text{UZU}}$ÚR-*peššar*$^{\text{Ḫ.A}}$ ‘limbs, body parts’, $^{\text{TÚG}}$*kureššar*$^{\text{Ḫ.A}}$ ‘women’s headdresses’, *ḫalkueššar*$^{\text{Ḫ.A}}$ ‘items provided for the cult’, DI.Ḫ.A (*ḫanneššar*) ‘cases’, and KAŠ.Ḫ.A (*šieššar*) ‘portions of beer’. Verbs derived from these nouns employ the oblique stem (see §10.10, p. 176).

	‘judgment’	(a woman’s headdress)	‘impurity’	‘thunder’
	Singular			
nom.-acc.	*ḫanneššar*	*kureššar*	*papreššar*	*tetḫeššar*
erg.	*ḫannišnanza*[231]			
gen.	***ḫannešnaš***, *ḫanniššanaš*	*kurešnaš*		*tetḫišnaš*
d.-l.	***ḫa-an-ne-iš-ni***, *ḫannešni*, *ḫannaššani*	*kurešni*	*paprešni*	
	Numerically Indifferent			
abl.	*ḫannešnaz*			*tetḫešna(n)za*
ins.	*ḫannešnit*, *ḫannetnit*[232]	*kurešnit*, *kurišnit*		
	Plural			
nom.-acc.	DI.Ḫ.A	*kureššar*$^{\text{Ḫ.A}}$		

231. Also *ḫunḫunešnanza* (from *ḫunḫu*(*n*)*eššar*) and *annašnanza* (from *annaššar* KUB 43.75 obv. 20).

232. This form is a hapax, with no clear explanation. For one possibility see AHP 273, citing Čop.

	‘beer’	‘gift’	‘hole’	‘invocation’
	Singular			
nom.-acc.	***šiēššar***	*uppeššar*	*ḫatteššar*	*mukeššar*
erg.				
gen.	KAŠ-*ešnaš*		*ḫattešnaš*	*mukešnaš*, [*muk*]*iššanaš*
d.-l.		*uppešni*	*ḫattešni*	*mukešni*
	Numerically Indifferent			
abl.	KAŠ-*za*		*ḫantešnaz*	
ins.	*šieš(ša)nit*			
	Plural			
nom.-acc.	KAŠ.ḪI.A	*uppeššar*$^{ḪI.A}$		*mukiššar*$^{ḪI.A}$

4.109. The regular form of the suffix, *-eššar*/*-eššn-*, is spelled consistently with *-eš-* in original texts of all periods (Melchert 1984b: 90, 128, 140). Variant spellings with *-iš-* are to be viewed as indicated in §§1.57–1.62 (pp. 27–29). Since many nouns in *-eššar* are closely associated with verbs, they can also assume the vocalism of the verbal stem: e.g., *ḫannaššar* ‘judgment’ (beside the usual *ḫanneššar*) after *ḫanna-* ‘to judge’. There are also a few nouns in *-aššar* built to unknown roots, such as *annaššar* (part of a building?). Spellings of the oblique stem in *-e*/*iš-ša-nV-* are to be read with an empty vowel as [-essnV-], where *-ša-* is used to indicate explicitly the geminate [-ss-].

4.110. Note also the examples of secondary nasalization (see §1.121, p. 43) in *tetḫešnanza* (for **tetḫešnaza*) and *ḫantešnaz* (for **ḫattešnaz*). Nasalized ablatives, e.g., *tetḫešnanza* ‘with thunder’, can be confused formally with ergatives such as *ḫannišnanza* ‘the judgment’ (see §4.107). Only the context will reveal which form is intended.

Derived Nouns with Suffix -āwar

4.111. Group 4: Stems in *-āwar*, denoting concrete physical objects (Sturtevant and Hahn 1951: 99 §161; HE §85). The oblique stem is *-aun-*, including gen. *-aunaš* ([*pa-*]*ar-ta-ú-na-aš* KUB 36.49 i 8, OS(?)). All the following are neuters: *ašāwar* ‘fold, pen’, *karāwar* ‘horn(s)’, *partawar* ‘wing, feather’. For the plural forms without *-r* as archaisms see §1.133 (p. 46) and §4.105 (p. 127).

	Singular		
nom.-acc.	*ašāwar*	*partawar*	*karāwar*
gen.		***partaunaš***	SI-*aš*
d.-l.	***ašauni***, *ašaunai*		***garauni***
	Numerically Indifferent		
abl.	*ašaunaz*	*partaunaz*	SI-*az*
ins.		***partaunit***	
	Plural		
nom.-acc.	*ašawa(r)*	*partawa(r)*	SI.ḪI.A-*ar*

Derived Nouns with Suffix -mar

4.112. Group 5: Nouns with stems in *-mar* (HE §§86, 185), not to be confused with the verbal substantives in *-mar*, for which see §11.20 (p. 185) and §11.22 (p. 186). All neuters: *ḫilammar* 'gate building', *tiyammar* 'cord', *ḫarnammar* 'yeast', *arpamar* (a pastry), **ḫaršummar* 'headwaters (of a river)'. For *ḫalḫaltumar*, which is not heteroclitic but retains the stem *r* in inflection and shows an *i*-stem count plural form (*ḫalḫaltumarēš*), see §4.30 (p. 91).

	Singular			
nom.-acc.	*ḫilammar*	*tiyammar*	*ḫarnammar*, *ḫarnamma*[233]	
erg.	*ḫilamnanza*			
gen.	*ḫilamnaš*			
all.	***ḫilamna***			
d.-l.	***ḫilamni***			
	Numerically Indifferent			
abl.	***ḫilamnaz***			
ins.		*tiyammanda*		
	Plural			
gen.				*ḫaršumnaš*
d.-l.				*ḫaršumnaš*

4.113. The claim that the form *ḫilannaš* (sg. gen.) in Laws §82 and §89 belongs to *ḫilammar* can only be valid if one believes in a shift of *mn* > *nn* in Hittite. See §1.123 (p. 44). Verbs derived from these nouns employ the oblique stem: *ḫarnamniya-* 'to cause a ferment, stir up, excite' (< *ḫarnammar* 'ferment, yeast').

Verbal Substantives

4.114. Most verbs form their verbal substantive with the suffix *-war* (§11.20, p. 185), which sometimes appears as *-mar*, as described in §§11.22 (p. 186). But with very rare exceptions cited there, only the nom.-acc. and sg. gen. (in *-w/maš*!) are attested. Verbs with verbal substantive in *-war* likewise form their infinitive in *-wanzi*, originally the abl.-ins. of the verbal substantive in *-war* (see p. 185, n. 36).

Irregular Consonant-Stem Nouns

4.115. The following is the paradigm of the word **pēr* 'house' with oblique stem *parn-*, but also (only) in the sg. gen. a special form *periyaš* (Hoffner 1995c). Note also the sg. d.-l. *pēri* and abl. **pērza* (É-*erza*) built on an endingless locative **pēr*.

233. The second form (*ḫa-ar-na-am-ma* from KUB 7.1 i 26) is spelled like a plural (§1.133, p. 46), but a plural of 'yeast' (kinds/pieces of yeast?) seems difficult to maintain. This may be another case of the "weak *r*" (on which see §1.132, p. 46).

	Singular	Plural
nom.-acc.	**É-*er*** (**pēr*)	É-*er*, É.ḪI.A, É.MEŠ
erg.	*parnanza*	
gen.	***parnaš***, *periyaš*[234]	É.MEŠ-*naš* (**parnaš*)
d.-l.	*pēri* (*pé-e-ri*), *parni*, É-*er* (**pēr*)	*parnaš*
	Numerically Indifferent	
all.	***parna***	
abl.	*parnaz(a)*, ***É-erza*** *(*pērza)*,[235] **É-*az***	

4.116. The PIE neuter root noun for ‘heart’ appears in Hittite with sg. nom.-acc. ŠÀ-*er* (**kēr*) ‘heart’ and oblique stem *kard-* (except for the sg. gen., where we find only *kardiyaš*).[236]

	Singular	Plural
nom.-acc.	ŠÀ-*er (*kēr)*	(UZU)ŠÀ.ḪI.A
erg.	—	
gen.	*kard/tiyaš*	
d.-l.	***karti***, *ker*[237]	
all.	*karta*, ŠÀ-*ta*	
	Numerically Indifferent	
abl.	***kartaz***	
ins.	*kardit*	

234. The form *pé-e-r*[*i*?*-ya-aš iš-ḫe-e-eš*] or *pé-e-r*[*a*?*-aš iš-ḫe-e-eš*] (the only trace of the disputed sign is a single horizontal wedge head which could be either the only horizontal in RI or the upper one at the beginning of RA) in KUB 51.56:4′ duplicates É-*aš* BE-LU^{MEŠ}-*TIM* in KUB 29.1 iii 41. The reading *pé-e-r*[*i-ya-aš iš-ḫe-eš*] proposed by Hoffner (1995c) was objected to by Rieken (1999a: 306 n. 1471) because the parallel between gen. *kardiyaš* built to the oblique stem is not an exact parallel to **pēriyaš* built to the nominative-accusative stem. But since the stem *pēr-* is already securely attested in the oblique cases (d.-l. *pé-e-ri*, É-*ri*, abl. É-*er-za*), and because there is no reason from the duplicate KUB 29.1 to expect *pēri pēr*[*an* . . .], which Neu suggested to her as an alternative restoration of KUB 51.56, we would prefer to their restoration either *pēr*[*iyaš išḫeš*] or *pēr*[*aš išḫeš*] (pending results of collation of the trace).

235. §3.26 (p. 74).

236. It is the appearance of the *i* only in the genitive (so also in HLuwian) that is noteworthy. The alleged sg. gen. *kartaš* cited by some scholars (among others, Sihler 1995 and Rieken 1999a: 52 n. 238; see below), is debatable. Its existence is claimed on the basis of an analysis of the form *kar-ta-aš-ma* in VBoT 58 i 13 as *kartaš=ma* (allative *karta=šma* was proposed by HW 103 and favored by Hoffner [by letter to Rieken, cited Rieken 1999a: 52 n. 238]). The matter is further complicated by the apparent duplicate KBo 25.107, which reads [. . . . . *a*]*ppuzzi karta*[-. . .] instead of DUMU.MEŠ *kartašma*. It is best not to claim a genitive *kartaš* until the reading and interpretation of VBoT 58 i 13 and its apparent duplicate can be resolved to everyone’s satisfaction.

237. An endingless locative in *ker=ti*(*=tta*) *minuandu* KBo 3.21 iii 12, 16, 22, 26 (Eichner 1979: 45 n. 9). An alternative view is that *kerti* is itself an aberrant locative form (see CHD L–N 291 sub *minu-* C section a (citing Neu) and Rieken 1999a: 52–53).

Chapter 5
PERSONAL PRONOUNS

Distinctive Features of Pronominal Stems and Endings

5.1. It is a characteristic of IE languages that the pronominal paradigms exhibit certain differences from the nominal and adjectival ones (Kammenhuber 1969b: 207). Pronouns have some distinctive declensional endings and often show more than one stem form (see Sihler 1995: 384–85; Szemerényi 1996: 203 §8.1; and Rieken 2002). This is particularly true of the independent personal pronouns,[1] where a different stem distinguishes the nominative from the other cases: nom. *$e\hat{g}h_2$ 'I' versus acc. **me* 'me'. In Hittite we see this in *ūk* 'I' (nom.) versus *amm-* 'me' in the other cases, *zik* 'you (sg.)' (nom.) versus *tu-* in the other cases, or *wēš* 'we' (nom.) versus *anz-* 'us' in the other cases.[2] The clitic forms of the same pronouns may show the non-nominative stem of the accented form (*-mu*, *-tu*) or yet another stem (*-naš*, *-šmaš*).

5.2. In the relatives and interrogatives (see chapter 8) the nominative and accusative often share one stem, while the other cases show a different one: *kuiš* 'who' (sg. nom. com.), *kuin* 'whom' (sg. acc. com.) versus *kue*(*da*)- (see §8.2, p. 149). Compare also the adjective *tamai-* 'other' (§8.10, p. 152), which has the forms *tamaiš* (sg. nom. com.), *tamain* (sg. acc. com.) but oblique forms *tamel* (gen.), *tamedani* (sg. d.-l.), *tamedaz* (abl.). See §9.7 (p. 154) and §9.11 (p. 156) on numbers which employ the typical pronominal endings *-ēl* and *-edani*.[3]

5.3. Pronouns are often strengthened by means of particles: French *ce*, *celui*, *celui-ci*. Latin *ego-met*, *nōs-met* (Szemerényi 1996: 202). The *-ila* in *zikila* 'you yourself', *ukila* 'I myself', and *apāšila* 'he himself' is such a particle, confined to the nominative forms (see §18.7, p. 279), as is the *-i* on the pronoun *aši*, *uni*, *eni* (see §§7.10–7.16, pp. 144–146).

---

1. Also called "accented personal pronouns" (Luraghi 1997a: 24).

2. In Hittite only the 'you (pl.)' accented pronoun shows a single stem *šum-* for all grammatical cases (§5.8).

3. In the case of the demonstrative pronouns *ka-* 'this' and *apa-* 'that', the normal forms of the sg. nom. and acc. com. (*kāš — kūn* and *apāš — apūn*) do not share the same stem. The less common late variants *kān* and *apān* were perhaps formed on analogy with *kuiš*, *kuin*. See §7.3 (p. 143), §7.7 (p. 144).

5.4. There are case endings which are peculiar to pronouns (see also §7.4, p. 143). In the PIE pronominal systems the neuter nominative-accusative singular often had a final dental stop (see Kammenhuber 1969b: 309 §45, 1; Sihler 1995: §374, 2; Szemerényi 1996: 204–5), which matches *apāt* 'that', *kuit* 'what', and the clitics *-met* 'my', *-tet* 'your', and *-šet* 'his'. In the sg. nom.-acc. neut. OH had *kī* ('this') without the final dental, but *apāt* ('that') with it. The genitive singular and plural use the ending *-el* (see §7.8, p. 144): *ammēl* 'my', *tuēl* 'your', *apēl* 'his/her', *anzēl* 'our', *šumēl* 'your (pl.), *kēl* 'this one's', *kuēl* 'which one's, whose', while in OH and MH the genitive plural uses *-enzan* in the accented pronoun (*šu*(*m*)*menzan* 'your [pl.]' §5.10, p. 134) and demonstratives (*kinzan* and *kēnzan* 'of these', *apenzan* 'of those'). In late Hittite, *-ell-* served once as the basis for a possessive stem *apella-* 'belonging to him/her/it': *a-pé-el-la-az* KUB 14.4 iv 23, an example of the degenitival adjective class which existed already in OH (on which see Hoffner 2006, as well as §6.2, p. 137, and §9.61, p. 170). Sometimes insertions appear between stem and endings: CLuwian *zāšta/i-* 'this (very)' (CLL 281) with inserted *-št-*, and Hittite sg. d.-l. *kēdani* (i.e., *ke+dan+i*) 'this', not **ke-i.* The ablative, in addition to the ending *-az*, also uses simple *-z* (as in *kēz* and *apēz*). In the instrumental of the demonstratives, the ending */d/*, written *-da* (§3.35, p. 77; see *ape+dan+da*), takes the place of *-it.* The ending *-e* of the common-gender nominative plural (*kē* 'these', *apē* 'those') reflects a pronominal ending **-oi* inherited from PIE (see Sihler 1995: 386 §374, 5). Hittite also shows an ending *-e* in the pronominal neuter nominative-accusative plural (*kē* 'these', *apē* 'those', *kue* '(the ones) which'). In the personal and the enclitic possessive pronouns there is no formal difference between ablative and instrumental (both cases in *-edaz* in the accented personal pronoun, both in *-e*/*it* in the enclitic possessives), whereas in the demonstratives the endings differ (abl. *-ez*/*-edaz*, ins. *-edanda*).

5.5. True personal pronouns (i.e., those of the first and second person) show no grammatical gender (i.e., animate vs. inanimate), presumably because in speech situations both speaker and addressee were assumed to be living beings, that is, inherently 'animate'.

5.6. In Hittite the anaphoric demonstrative pronoun *apā-* 'the aforementioned (one)' (see chapter 7) also functions as the accented pronoun for the third person ('he, she, it, they'). There is no formal differentiation of *apā-* when it is used as a personal pronoun from when it is used as a demonstrative pronoun. For its forms see §7.3 (p. 143).

Accented (Independent) Personal Pronouns

5.7. The accented first-person and second-person singular pronouns do not have case endings in the nominative, dative-locative, or accusative. The endings *-ēl*, *-enzan*, and *-edaz* of the genitive and ablative are shared with other pronouns (§5.4).

5.8. The following is the paradigm of the independent personal pronouns:

	First Person	Second Person
	Singular	
nom.	***ūk***, *ammuk*[4]	***zik***, ***zīk***[5]
acc.	***ammuk***, *uk* (late)	***tuk***
gen.	***ammel***, *ammēl,*	***tuēl***
d.-l.	***ammuk***, *ūk* (late)	***tuk***
abl.	*ammēdaz(a)*	*tuēdaz(a)*
	Plural	
nom.	***wēš***, *anzāš* (late)	***šumeš***, *šumēš*, *šummeš*,[6] *šum(m)āš* (late)
acc.	***(anzaš)***, *anzāš*	*šum(m)āš*, *šum(m)ēš* (late)
gen.	***anzel***, *anzēl*	*šu(m)menzan*,[7] *šumēl* (NH)
d.-l.	*anzāš*	*šum(m)āš*, *šum(m)ēš* (late)
abl.	*anzēdaz*	*šum(m)ēdaz*

5.9. Alleged forms of the independent personal pronouns with *-a* extensions (e.g., *ú-ga*, *ú-uq-qa*, *zi-ga*, *zi-iq-qa*; see, e.g., HE §96 and Kammenhuber 1969b: 209–10, 250) do not exist. All such sequences represent the pronoun + the clitics 'and' or 'but' (Houwink ten Cate 1973b; Neu 1997; and chapter 29 here).

5.10. Old Hittite (OH) employs as nominatives only the forms *ūk*, *wēš*, *zik*, *šumēš*, *apāš*, and *apē*, whereas in MH and NH various dative or accusative forms have come to be used as nominatives, and in two cases (*ūk* and *šumeš*) the reverse also has taken place. In OH *ammuk*, *anzāš*, and *šumāš* serve only as datives or accusatives. We have already seen (§3.14, p. 69; §3.16, p. 70; §4.2, p. 79; §4.10, p. 83; etc.) that this mutual contamination of nominative and accusative cases in the plural is common among nouns and adjectives. Since in the first- and second-person pronouns (*ammuk, tuk*) the dative and accusative forms are identical, *šumeš* (originally nominative), which first was extended to the accusative, soon was extended further to the dative (KUB 26.12 ii 25). Similarly *ūk* is employed as both accusative and dative in the late NH period. The form *šumenzan* is OH (but not yet in OS), while *šu*(*m*)*mel* is so far attested only in NH, modeled on *ammel*, *tuel*, and *anzel*. On the other hand *anzel* 'our' is attested already in OS (see n. 8)

4. Post-OH.

5. Rarely this form has a long *i*, e.g., *zi-i-ik* KBo 25.112 i 5; ii 12, 13, 19, 20; iii 3, 4, 8, etc. (OS); and *zi-i-g*[*a-an*] KBo 5.9 iii 8 (Murš. II).

6. The forms with geminate *m* are all post-OS.

7. KUB 12.43:4′ (MS?; OS according to Konk.). A rare variant form [*šu*]*minzan*=*a* occurs in KBo 3.27 obv. 15 (OH/NS), see CHD P sub *pankur*.

and is therefore not an NH innovation (contra Sommer and Falkenstein 1938: 77 and HE §97b).[8] Plural *apenzan* 'their' always contrasts with singular *apel* 'his, her, its'.

Enclitic Personal Pronouns

5.11. More on the unaccented/clitic personal pronouns can be found in §18.3 (p. 277) and §30.19 (p. 411).

5.12. In addition to accented (or independent) personal pronouns, the old Anatolian family of IE languages possessed a set of clitic forms that fill the role of direct and indirect objects of the personal pronouns. The Hittite forms are:

First- and second-person forms:

	Singular	Plural
1st-person acc.-dat.	***-mu***	***-naš***
2nd-person acc.-dat.	***-ta***, *(-du)*	***-šmaš***

Third-person forms:

	Singular	Plural
nom. com.	***-aš***	***-e*** (OH/MH), *-at* (MH/NH)
acc. com.	***-an***	***-uš*** (OH/MH), *-aš* (MH/NH)
n.-a. neut.	***-at***	***-e*** (OH/MH), *-at* (MH/NH)
dat.	***-še*** (OH), *-ši* (MH/NH)	*-šmaš*

5.13. These enclitic pronouns can only occur in certain locations in the clause and in relation to other clitics on the same word. For this see §§30.15–30.21 (pp. 410–412). For the rules governing occurrence of the enclitic third-person subject pronoun see §§18.13–18.19 (pp. 280–283).

5.14. The enclitic *-mu* loses its *u*-vowel in a morphophonemic change when immediately followed by *-ašta* or *-apa* (§1.72, p. 32, and CHD *-mu* a). Geminate writings *-Vm-mu* rarely occur in OH/NS texts (CHD *-mu* a). Enclitic *-ta* is written regularly with

8. The secure attestation of *anzel* 'our' in the OS Zalpa text (*UMMA* LÚ.MEŠ URU-*LIM āšma anze*[*l* MUNUS].LUGAL ^{URU}*Kaniš* 30 MUNUS.DUMU 1=*ŠU ḫāšta* KBo 22.2 obv. 12–13 OS) makes extremely unlikely the theory of Forrer (1922, 1926: 17) (transliteration of Bo 2423 = 2 BoTU 10 = KBo 3.27), rejected by Sommer and Falkenstein (1938: 75), revived by Kammenhuber (1969b: 209–10) and Neu (1997: 140–41), and rejected with additional evidence by CHD *mān* 1 a 2′, *-mi-* d 11′, *pankur* 2 a) that there was in OH a first plural independent genitive pronoun **ammenzan*, formally parallel to *šumenzan* 'your (pl.)'. The true expected first plural genitive **anzenzan*, if it ever existed, was already replaced by *anzel* in prehistoric times.

the TA sign. There are only a handful of exceptions, in which the DA sign is used.[9] The particle *-ta* also regularly occasions a geminate writing of a following *-kan* (written *-ták-kán*), unlike the other dative-accusative clitic pronouns ending in a vowel: *-mu-kán*, *-še/-ši-kán.* The allomorph *-tu* (usually written with the DU sign, rarely TU)[9] regularly occurs when this pronoun is immediately followed by either the clitic particle *-z(a)* or *-šan* (§1.70, p. 31). The form *-še* is the OH form, replaced later by *-ši.* The initial consonant is written singly following a consonant or logogram but geminate following a vowel in *-ta*, *-še*, and *-naš*, but not in *-mu* (see above in this paragraph for rare exceptions in NS). The clitic *-šmaš* occurs following vowels, *-šamaš* following consonants or logograms.

5.15. The first- and second-person pronoun forms (*-mu*, *-ta*, *-naš*, *-šmaš*) can be either dative or accusative, while the third-person forms *-še*, *-ši*, and *-šmaš* can only be dative: *-mu* 'me (acc.), to/from me (dat.)', *-ta* 'you (acc.), to/from you (dat.)' (with the *-du* allomorph occurring before *-za*), *-naš* 'us (acc.), to/from us (dat.)', *-š(a)maš* 'you (pl. acc.), to/from you' (dat.); whereas: *-še/i* 'to/from him, her, it', *-š(a)maš* 'to/from them.'

9. On the free variation in principle of TA/DA and TU/DU see §1.16 (p. 16), §1.85 (p. 35).

Chapter 6
POSSESSIVE PRONOUNS

6.1. Of the old Indo-European languages of Anatolia, only Hittite and Luwian clearly attest enclitic possessive pronouns.[1] OH and MH expressed the possessive relationship by suffixing to the noun a possessive pronoun ('my', 'thy', 'his/her/its', 'our', etc.). In later MH and throughout NH this construction was first supplemented and then replaced by an analytical one, using the genitive independent pronouns *ammel* 'my', *tuel* 'your', *apel* 'his', 'her', 'its', *anzel* 'our', and *šumel* 'your' (for the functions of which see §18.4, p. 278): *apēl waštul* 'his sin' (MH), *ammel aššul* 'my greeting' (MH), *tuel* KUR-*i* 'your land' (MH). An even later development during the final century of NH was the declinable possessive pronoun *tue*(*da*)- 'your', as in: *ūL=war=an=kan tuetaza memiyanaz kuenner* 'did they not kill it (the bull) at your word?' KUB 8.48 i 12 (Gilg.), *tuedaš āššiyantaš pēdaš* URU*Ḫakmiš* URU*Nerik* 'in your favorite places, Ḫakmiš (and) Nerik' KUB 36.90 obv. 16–17, *nu=za kē* KUR.KUR LÚ.KUR *INA* MU.10.KAM *ammēdaz* ŠU-*az tar*(*a*)*ḫḫun* 'I conquered these hostile lands in ten years with my (own) hand' KBo 3.4 iv 45–46; see Francia 1996b: 212–13. In NS texts, logographically written nouns and their possessive suffixes (e.g., DUMU=*YA* 'my son') do not indicate the form of the Hittite possessive. If the text is an NS copy of an OH or MH original, it is possible that the Akkadian possessive suffix covers an enclitic possessive pronoun. But if the text is an NH composition, it probably covers a genitive independent pronoun.

6.2. The rare form *apellaz* KUB 14.4 iv 23 suggests the existence of a small class of degenitival adjectives, including this possessive pronoun *apella-* (and the analogous *kuēlla-*'whose' [*cuius*], p. 282, n. 21), built to the genitive form *apel* (see Hoffner 2006 and §5.4, p. 133, and §9.61, p. 170). Since *apez* existed to express 'from it', it is likely that in the sentence *nu* MUNUS.LUGAL *ammuk* DAM=*YA* DUMU=*YA ANA* d*Išḫara* [*ḫurza*]*kket nu=nnaš=kan anda šipanzaket nu=kan* DAM=*YA apellaz* BA.ÚŠ 'And the queen kept [curs]ing me, my wife, and my son before (the goddess) Išḫara, and kept making offerings against us, and my wife died from the (actions) of that one (i.e., the queen)' KUB 14.4 iv 22–23 the form *apellaz*, instead of just being a meaningless alternative to *apez* (HW^2 sub *apā-2* 5.4.g "durch jene," and de Martino 1998: 38 with n. 141), actually meant 'from (that) of her' (so Sommer and Falkenstein 1938: 93 n. 1, 1947: 87; Houwink ten Cate apud Josephson 1967: 1239 n. 18; Kammenhuber 1969b: 214 "durch

1. On the enclitic possessive pronoun in Hittite see HE §§106–9, 245–56; Houwink ten Cate 1967; Kammenhuber 1969b: 210–12; Otten and Souček 1969: 70–71; Rosenkranz 1978: 71–72; Villar 1988; CHD L–N (1989) 222–23; Francia 1995, 1996b; Neu 1997. An attempt to identify this category in Luwian was made by Carruba (1986).

das von ihr, durch ihre Machenschaften"). For the geminate *l* in *apella-* see §1.109 (p. 41).

6.3. Another method for indicating the possessive relationship was the use of dative enclitic pronouns of the type *-mu*, *-ta*, *-naš*, *-ši*, *-šmaš* (see Luraghi 1997a: 23): LÚ.KÚR.MEŠ*=mu=kan* LÚ.MEŠ*aršanatalluš* ^{d}*IŠTAR* GAŠAN*=YA* ŠU-*i dāiš* '*IŠTAR*, my lady, put into my hand my enemies and my enviers' StBoT 24 i 58–59; see German "etwas mir in die Hand legen." This method is not yet attested in OS manuscripts (Güterbock 1983: 75).

6.4. The following is the paradigm for the enclitic possessive pronoun:[2]

Case	'my'	'thy'	'his'	'our'[3]	'your (pl.)'	'their'
	Singular					
nom. com.	***-miš***, *-meš*[4]	*-tiš*, *-teš*[5]	***-šiš***, *-šeš*[6]	*-šummiš*	***-šmiš***	***-šmiš***
acc. com .	***-man***, *-min*	***-tan***, *-tin*	***-šan***, *-šin*[7]	*-šumman*,[8] ***-šummin***[9]	*-šman*, *-šmin*	***-šman***, *-šmin*
n.-a. neut.	***-met***	***-tet***	***-šet***, *-šit*	***-šummet***, *-šummit*	*-šmet*,[10] *-šmit*	***-šmet***,[10] ***-šmit***

2. See HE 65 §108; Kammenhuber 1969b: 211–12.

3. Otten 1959: 180 and 1973: 35; Neu 1974: 65–66, 119, 128; and Francia 1995. The identity of *šummi-* as the pl. 1 possessive was not yet known to Friedrich (HE), Kammenhuber (1969b), and Rosenkranz (1978), who considered it a variant of *šmi-* 'your (pl.)' or 'their'.

4. Not so far attested as **-me-eš*, but only with "broken" writings *-mi-eš* and *-me-iš* (see CHD sub *-mi-*), both of which could be interpreted as *-miš* (using HZL's transcriptional method, *-mi-ìš* and *-mì-iš*).

5. Although the more common, and expected, form is *-ti-iš*, the by-form *-te-eš* is attested in *nu waršulaš=te-eš ammel katta uwaru* 'Let your (sg.) *waršulaš* appear to me' KUB 36.44 iv 4 (OH/MS), *nu tuel waršulaš=te-eš paišgataru* 'And let your *waršulaš* go' VBoT 58 i 10–11 (OH/NS), and ^{d}EN.LÍL-*aš attaš=teš* KUR-*e* 4 *ḫalḫaldumari tu*[*k=p*]*at kišri=tti t*[*iy*]*an ḫarzi* 'Your (sg.) father, Enlil, has put the land (namely) the four corners in your hand alone' KUB 31.127 + ABoT 44 + i 22–23 (OH/NS). Also *ek-za-te-eš* 'your net' KBo 3.21 ii 16. Note that all examples are in post-OH copies.

6. The example of *-šaš* in KBo 25.72 right col. 16 (OS) is uncertain.

7. The NH *-šin* is found in *at-ta-aš-ši-in* (**attan=šin*) KUB 34.19 iv 8 (OH/NS) (see StBoT 9:56–57), EN-*《iš-》ši-in-ma* KBo 6.4 iv 6 (NH) (see LH 54 n. 168 and EN-*ŠU* in identical construction in iv 8, 10), *la-at-ti-en-š*[*i?-in?*] KUB 17.18 iii 14 (cited CHD *latti-* 1 c). We follow Eichner's analysis of *ge-nu-uš-ši-in* (1979), which therefore does not contain the clitic pronoun (see §15.13, p. 239, and p. 101, n. 109).

8. ^{d}UTU-*šum-ma-an* in KUB 43.53 i 17 (OH/MS) probably preserves without modernization the reading in an OS archetype.

9. The *i* vocalization of the sg. acc. *-šummin* (instead of expected **-šumman*) is a striking lack of concurrence with the other OS sg. acc. com. forms *-man*, *-tan*, *-šan*, and *-šman*, but it must be correct, if ^{d}*šiušummin* in KBo 3.22 (OS Anitta) is really the noun + possessive 'our deity' and not just a proper name that happens to sound like the words 'our deity', and if ^{d}UTU*=šummin* 'our sun' (referring to the king) KBo 20.67 + KBo 17.88 iv 17 (OH/MS?) reflects an OS original's spelling.

10. Whenever this ending must immediately follow an unassimilated consonant in its noun's ending (this normally occurs only in the neuter and with complemented adverbs of the type *pēraššamet* [for *peran=šamet*] and EGIR-*an=šamet*), since cuneiform writing cannot represent a sequence of three consecutive consonants without some empty vowel, the enclitic possessive ending *-šmi-* will be written *-ša-mi-* or *-še-mi-*.

Case	'my'	'thy'	'his'	'our'	'your (pl.)'	'their'
voc.[11]	*-mi*, *-me*,[12] *-me/it*			*-šum*[*mi*][13]		
gen.[14]	***-maš***	*-taš*	***-šaš***	*-šummaš*		
d.-l.[15]	***-mi***, *-mit*	*-ti*	***-ši***	***-šummi***	***-šmi***, (*-šumi*)[16]	***-šmi***
all.	*-ma*[17]	*-ta*[18]	*-ša*[19]			
	Numerically Indifferent					
abl.-ins.	*-mit*	*-tit*, *-tet*	***-šet***, *-šit*		*-šmit*	*-šmit*
with adverbs	***-met***, ***-mit***	*-tit*	***-šet***, ***-šit***[20]			***-šmet***,[10] ***-šmit***
	Plural					
nom. com.	*-miš*	*-te/iš*	***-šeš***, *-šiš*	*-šummeš*, *-šummiš*	***-šmeš***[21] *-šmiš*	***-šmeš***,[22] *-šmiš*
acc. com.	*-muš*	***-tuš***	*-šuš*	***-šummuš***	*-šmuš*	***-šmuš***, *-šumuš*
n.-a. neut.	*-met*, *-mit*		***-šet***, *-šit*	*-šumet*		***-šmit***, ***-šmet***, *-šummit*[22]
gen.	*-man*					
d.-l.		*-taš*	***-šaš***			

6.5. Both the substantive and the enclitic possessive pronoun are declined (for rare exceptions in NH see §6.9, p. 141) and agree in number, gender, and case: *kiššari=mi* 'in my hand' (lit. 'in the hand' + 'in my'), *tuzziyaš=miš* 'my army' (sg. nom. com.), *kardiyaš=taš* 'of thy heart' (lit. 'of the heart' + 'of thy'), *atti=ši* (lit. 'to the father' +

11. On the forms in *-e/it* see §6.11 (p. 141).

12. Attested in *at-ti-me* 'O my father' KBo 12.70 rev.! 10b (CHD *-mi-* e 2′ a′).

13. KUB 33.66 + KBo 40.333 iii 8.

14. There are no cases of a possessive *-man* 'my' used with a genitive singular in OS and thus no assurance of the reality of such a usage (pace Kammenhuber 1969b: 212, 1969c: 33; Rosenkranz 1978: 71–72).

15. Including with adverbs, such as *katti=mi*, *katti=tti*, *katti=(š)ši* and *ištarni=šummi*, *ištarni=šmi*. On the forms in *-e/it* see §6.11 (p. 141).

16. *kat-ti-šu-mi* HKM 57:21 'to you (pl.)'.

17. In *pár-nam-ma* (= *parna=mma*), see CHD sub * *mi-*.

18. For allative *-ta*, see §16.85 (p. 264).

19. Attested in *pár-na-aš-ša* 'to his house' (see CHD P sub *per*, *parn-*), *iš-ša-aš-ša* 'into his/her mouth' KBo 3.38 obv. 4, KUR-*e-aš-ša* 'to his land' KUB 23.11 iii 22, *an-ta-ga-aš-ša* 'to her loins(?)' KUB 36.44 iv 12, and *ḫu-u-um-ma-aš-š*[*a*] . . . [*a-ša-ú-n*]*a-aš-ša* 'to its sty . . . to its pen' KBo 26.136 obv. 18–19.

20. [*pé-*]*e-ra-aš-ši-it* KBo 17.3 i 26 (OS).

21. See *a-re-eš-me-eš* (**areš=šmeš*) 'your colleagues' in KBo 6.3 iii 22 = Laws §55 (OH/NS).

22. See LÚ.MEŠ*ka-ru-ḫa-le-eš-me-eš-ša* 'and their *k.*-men' in KBo 6.2 iii 14 = Laws §54 (OS).

23. E.g., KBo 3.1+ i 23 (OH/NS), ed. Hoffmann 1984: 16–17.

'to his'), *ištarni=šmi* 'in your (pl.) midst', *areš=šmeš* 'your (pl. nom.) companions', *šarḫuwanduš=šuš* 'her unborn child (lit. 'her innards', acc. pl.)'.[24] For more examples of this kind of agreement see §15.3 (p. 235). Final *n* in the substantive regularly assimilates to the first consonant of the possessive pronoun (see §§1.118–1.119, p. 43). Compare the following singular accusative forms: *ḫalugatalla*(*n*)*=tin* 'your envoy', *ištamana*(*n*)*=šan* 'his ear', *tuzzi*(*n*)*=man* 'my army', *arḫa*(*n*)*=šan* 'his border', *arra*(*n*)*=šan* 'his anus', *pantuḫa*(*n*)*=šan* 'his bladder'.

6.6. In OH (OS), the singular and plural nominative-accusative neuter forms show consistently *-et*: *me-e-ni-im-me-et*, *ša-aḫ-ḫa-me-et*, *ša-a-ku-wa-aš-me-et* (more than 40 exx.), with only rare exceptions (*šu-up-pa-aš-mi-it* StBoT 25 #13 iv 18′, *i-da-a-lu-uš-mi-it* StBoT 26 #151 ii 4). The ablative-instrumental shows regularly *-it*: *iš-ša-az-mi-it* StBoT 25 #3 i 18 and dupl. StBoT 25 #4 i 13, *ka-lu-lu-pí-iz-mi-it* StBoT 25 #4 iv 30 (plus 6 more exx.), with two exceptions: *ka-lu-lu-pí-iz-me-e*[*t*] StBoT 25 #3 iv 34 and [(*ki-iš-ša-ra-az-s*)]*e-et* StBoT 25 #12 ii 12. The use with adverbs (adpositions) is more complex. With *ketkar* 'at the head', which clearly reflects a form containing a noun, we find only *-et* (3 exx.), while with *pēran* 'in front' the regular usage is with *-it*: *pé-e-ra-am-mi-it* KBo 3.22:79 (OS), [*pé*]*-e-ra-aš-ši-it* StBoT 25 #4 i 26, *pé-e-ra-az-mi-it* StBoT 25 #4 iii 44 (plus 3 more exx.), vs. two exceptions *pé-e-ra-aš-še-et* StBoT 25 #3 i 33 and *pé-ra-an-te-et* KUB 26.35:9. The use of the "split genitive" construction (see §16.38, p. 251) and mostly *-et* suggests that *šer* 'above, on' behaves like *ketkar*: *še-e-er-še-me-et* StBoT 25 #6 ii 14′ (plus 5 more exx.) vs. one exception *še-e-er-ši-it* KBo 6.2 iv 47. See on the "split genitive" construction Garrett 1998. On the overall problem of *-et*/*-it* spellings see Otten and Souček 1969: 72–73; Melchert 1984b: 122–26; and Francia 1996b.

6.7. The same clitic possessive case form in *-i*/*et* is shared by ablative and instrumental (StBoT 8:71, 73), as is shown by the following examples with ablative nouns: *iššaz=*(*š*)*mit* 'from their mouths' KBo 17.1+ i 18 (OS) (StBoT 8:20–21, 58, 66), *šarḫuwantaz=šet* 'from its stomach' KBo 6.3 iv 28 = Laws §90 (OH/NS), *tuggaz=šēt* (sic) 'from his body' KUB 17.10 iii 10 (OH/MS), *tuēggaz=šit* KUB 43.34:11′, ZAG-*az=tet* 'at your right hand', *ḫunḫumaz=šit* KBo 3.8 iii 20, É-*az=*(*š*)*mit* 'from their houses' KBo 30.20 iii 3, *kuttanaz=šmit* 'from their shoulders' KBo 20.20 + ABoT 35 + KBo 17.36 + KBo 25.54 i 14 (StBoT 25 #54 OS). See Houwink ten Cate 1967. It has been claimed by Francia (1996b: 210 n. 2) that no example exists of an instrumental use of a clitic possessive pronoun, suggesting that the "ablative-instrumental" forms are all ablative. But see OS *ka-lu-lu-pí-iz-mi-it* StBoT 8 iv 33 'with their fingers'[25] and [. . .]x *tu-u-ri-it-ti-it* in broken context of KBo 3.17+ iii 23.

24. Compare Heb. pl. *yeladêha* 'her unborn child(ren)' in the Exodus 21:22 assault law.

25. See Melchert 1977: 166–68. It is hard to see how *kalulupizmit* could be anything but an instrumental form (so correctly Neu, StBoT 26: 171 nn. 513–14). If it were ablative, which is possible in the context, one would surely have *ka-lu-lu-pa-az-mi-it*.

6.8. In the dative-locative the clitic possessive is found on adverbs and postpositions which themselves have the form of a dative-locative: *ištarni=šummi* 'in our midst' (= *anzaš ištarna*), *katti=tti* 'together with you' (= *tuk katta*), *katti=šummi* 'with us' (= *anzaš katta*). See §20.26 (p. 300) with references.

6.9. In the empire period (NH), when the enclitic possessive was passing out of use, speakers lost the sense of the bipartite nature of constructions like *attaš=miš* and began to decline only the final element. Thus sg. acc. *attašmin* (for **attan=min*), *attašman* (for **attan=man*) 'my father', and *attaštin* (for **attan=tin*) 'thy father' (HE §109b; see also Francia 1996b: 210–11).

6.10. In the singular accusative forms the *a* vocalism (*-man*, *-tan*, *-šan*) is earlier (OH and sporadically MH),[26] the *i* vocalism (*-min*, *-tin*, *-šin*) is NH. But see above, §6.4, nn. 8 and 9 (p. 138), on OH *-šummin* 'our' (sg. acc.).

6.11. There is no pl. nom.-acc. neut. **-ma*, **-ta*, **-ša*, etc.; the sg. nom.-acc. neut. serves instead: *šākuwa=šmet* 'their eyes' KBo 17.1 i 24 (OS). Later scribes wrongly assumed that the forms ending in *-it* or *-et* were "all-purpose" and falsely spread them to other cases such as vocative singular (§3.28, p. 74) or dative-locative singular in copies of older texts. There is no basis for assuming that the use of *-i/et* with the vocative or dative-locative was part of Hittite speech in any period (Otten 1973: 55 and Melchert 1977: 259–62, against Houwink ten Cate 1967).

6.12. It is not always easy to decide, especially in post-OS copies, whether *-šu*(*m*)*mi-* indicates the plural 3, plural 2, or plural 1. For analysis of examples see Francia 1995, 1996b. Attached to ordinary substantives, the writing *-šu*(*m*)*mi-* refers in OS and MS originals to 'our' but in NS copies can be either 'their', 'your (pl.)' or 'our'. In OH *ištarni=šummi* always means 'between us', whereas in NH compositions it may mean 'between us', 'between you (pl.)', or 'between them'. In the latter case it is due to a misunderstanding of older texts where 'between us' was meant.

---

26. [*uk=ma*] ^{m}*Tudḫaliyaš išpandaz tuzzi*(*n*)*=man* SUD-*nun* KUB 23.11 ii 22 (NS).

Chapter 7
DEIXIS: THE DEMONSTRATIVES

7.1. The function of the demonstratives, called *deixis*, is to indicate position of a third party or object relative to the deictic center. In ordinary speech the deictic center is the person speaking. In what is called "situational deixis," a speech is reported and the deictic center is that of the person whose speech is reported, not that of the reporting speaker. The two most common systems are a two-way contrast based on distance from the speaker (*this* = near, *that* = far) or a three-way contrast based on primary relationship to speaker and person spoken to: (1) I-*deixis* (here, near the speaker, proximal), (2) you-*deixis* (there, near the one(s) addressed, medial), (3) yonder-*deixis* (over there, not near speaker or hearer, distal) (Szemerényi 1996: 204 with bibliography in n. 1). In the case of Hittite, Goedegebuure (2002–3) has demonstrated a three-way deixis: *kā-*, *apā-*, and *aši* (but see §7.17, p. 146, for a possible minor two-way contrast). In face-to-face speech situations the spoken demonstratives were probably reinforced by gestures of eye and hand. Sometimes Hittite texts refer to such demonstrative gestures with phrases such as IGI.ḪI.A-*it iezzi* 'he makes (a signal) with (his) eyes' or *QATAM dāi* 'he extends (lit. places) the hand'. The proximal demonstrative *kā-* 'this' can refer to the object on which the writing is found or to a person bringing the tablet to the recipient: *kī=ma=za* ALAM [*ABU=YA*] ^{m}*Tudḫaliyaš U*[*L* DÙ-*at*] *ūq*⟪*q*⟫^{1}*=at* ^{m}KÙ.GA.TÚ[L-*aš* LUGAL.GAL] . . . *iyanun* '[My father] Tudḫaliya [did] not [make] this statue; I, Šuppiluliyama, [Great King,] . . . made it (and inscribed it with his exploits)' KBo 12.38 ii 4–10 (cf. comments by Güterbock 1967: 80–81; see also KBo 10.2 iii 21–22. Since both KBo 12.38 and KBo 10.2 are copies on clay tablets of the two statue inscriptions, the original function of the *kī* has been lost). See also *maḫḫan=ta kāš tuppianza anda wemiyazzi* 'when this tablet reaches you' HKM 14:3–5; *mān=ma=wa ŪL=ma nu=wa=šši kāš* ^{LÚ}*QARTAPPU pedi=*⟨*š*⟩*ši ešaru kuitman=aš uezzi kuitman=aš apiya* EGIR-*pa uezzi* 'But if not, then let this charioteer (who brings or accompanies this tablet) stay there in place of him (as a hostage to guarantee safe return), while he is coming (here, to me) and returning there' KUB 14.3 ii 70–72 (= Sommer 1932: ii 71–73, NH).

7.2. In *kiššan* 'in the following (i.e., yet to be stated) manner' and *apeniššan* 'in the preceding (i.e., just stated) manner' (§7.18, p. 147) we have the cataphoric ('as follows') and anaphoric ('as just stated') use of adverbs based upon deictic pronouns. The third

1. Here we have a case of asyndeton, but apparently with improper gemination. See §29.38 end (p. 400), and §29.47 (p. 402).

type, *iniššan/eniššan*, is attested as both anaphoric (KBo 5.6 iii 16) and cataphoric (KBo 5.6 iv 4) in the same text, probably because in the latter case it builds upon the "recognitional" function (see Goedegebuure 2002–3) of the distal demonstrative *aši* / *uni* / *ini*, with reference to something well known to both speaker and addressee (in this case the Hittite king and his addressee, the Egyptian queen). In other occurrences, *i/eniššan* seems more likely to be anaphoric like *apeniššan* (KUB 19.30 iv 11–12; KBo 4.4 iv 50; KBo 5.8 i 16–17; KBo 3.4 iii 83–84—all Murs. II).

kā- and *apā-*

7.3. The proximal and medial demonstratives in Hittite are *kā-* 'this' and *apā-* 'that'; the Luwian equivalents are *za-* and *apā-*. The medial demonstrative, *apā-*, also serves as a third-person independent pronoun (§5.6, p. 133). When it does so, its singular nominative shares with the first- and second-person singular nominative pronouns *ūk* and *zik* the ability to take the suffix *-ila* (*apāšila* 'himself'; see §18.7, p. 279). The following is the paradigm for the Hittite demonstratives *kā-* 'this' and *apā-* 'that':

	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
nom. com.	***kāš***	***kē***, *kūš*,[2] *(kēuš)*[2]	***apāš***, ***(apaš)***	***apē***, *apūš*[2]
acc. com	***kūn***, *(kān)*	***kūš***, *kē*[3]	***apūn***, *(apān)*	***apūš***, *apē*[3]
n.-a. neut.	***kī***, *kē*[2]	***kē***, *kī*[2]	***apāt***, ***(apat)***	***apē***
gen.	***kēl***	***kinzan***, *kēdaš*[2]	***apēl***	*apenzan, apēdaš*[2]
d.-l.	*kēdani*, ***(kēti)***	*kēdaš*	***apedani***, *apēdani*, *(apētī)*	*apēdaš*
	Numerically Indifferent		Numerically Indifferent	
abl.	*kez(za)*[3]		*apēz(za)*[3]	
ins.	***kēdanta***, *kidanda*, ***kēt***[4]		*apedanda*, *apēt*	

7.4. Hittite demonstratives, even in OH, show a mixture of nominal and pronominal endings. Nominal endings are present in the singular nominative common (*-š*) and accusative (*-n*) and the plural accusative common (*-uš*). Pronominal endings are evident in the neuter forms, the singular and plural genitive (*-el*, *-nzan*) and the plural nominative common (*-e*). Although the declension of the two primary contrasting demonstratives, *kā-* and *apā-*, shows broad agreement, there are a few striking differences. In the singular nominative-accusative neuter OH had *kī* 'this' but *apāt* 'that'. In the PIE pronominal systems, singular nominative-accusative neuter often had a final dental stop

2. Only in LH.

3. Only post-OH.

4. Only in the use to mark relative location 'on this side', a meaning later expressed by the ablative *kēz*.

(see Kammenhuber 1969b: 309 §45, 1; Sihler 1995: §374, 2; Szemerényi 1996: 204–5), which matches *apāt.* The source of *kī* is unclear. Also unclear is the source of the elements *-d-* and *-an-* in the oblique cases. The rare nom.-acc. neut. *kīni* (e.g., KBo 34.142 i 7′) resembles *ini* (see §7.12). It is unclear whether *ke-e-ni* attested in broken contexts is a variant matching *eni* or a faulty spelling for dative-locative *ke-e-da-ni* (see Neu 1980: 50–51, n. 116, and 1997: 156–57).

7.5. The ending *-e* of the common-gender nominative plural reflects a pronominal ending **-oi* inherited from PIE (see §5.4, p. 133). In OH (i.e., OS) we find only common-gender nominative plural *-e* and accusative plural *-uš*. The nominative plural forms in *-uš* represent contamination from the accusative forms. The isolated example *keuš* represents a conflated formation of the old ending *-e* + the later ending. On the implications of these features for the dating of Hittite texts see Houwink ten Cate 1970: 14 and Hoffner 1972: 17. In the MH (MS) letters from Maşat we find both *-uš* (*apūš*) and *-e* (*apē*, *kē*) for the common-gender accusative plural (Hoffner forthcoming §148).

7.6. The regular spelling of *apē* as *a-pé-e* (i.e., *a-bi-e*) helps to avoid orthographic confusion with the Akkadogram A-BI, as well as the Hittite (perhaps originally Hurrian) noun *ābi* 'ritual pit' (see Hoffner 1967a) normally written *a-a-bi*.

7.7. The forms *kān* and *apān* are isolated and occur in later texts. The antiquity of the *kūn* and *apūn* forms in Hittite is supported by the archaic pronoun *aš-i* (sg. nom.), *un-i* (sg. acc.) (Laroche 1979), which preserves the same vowel contrast.

7.8. The genitive singular shows the same characteristic pronominal genitive ending *-el* that marks the independent personal pronouns (§5.4, p. 133) and the plural genitive ending *-enzan* that marks the independent personal pronoun *šumenzan* (§5.7, p. 133, and §5.10, p. 134).

7.9. For the instrumentals *kidanda* and *apedanda* see §3.35 (p. 77).

aši, uni, ini

7.10. There is a third demonstrative—formally similar to Latin *is*, *ea*, *id*—built on the same stem *a-* (and variants) as the third-person enclitic (anaphoric) pronoun (see §5.12, p. 135) but showing the same vocalic opposition (*a – u*) in the nominative and singular accusative common as the demonstratives *kā-* and *apā-*, a different singular neuter ending (*ini* vs. *-t*), and having no plural forms. Laroche (1979), following Pedersen (1938), claimed that forms which others had attributed to separate paradigms (with stems *aši-*, *uni-*, *i/eni-*; see HW 36, 41, 234) were actually—at least during the Old Hittite period—members of the same paradigm. He was followed in turn by Neu (1979c: 79, 82), who utilized the diachronic aspect as a dating criterion.

7.11. The original unified paradigm resembled the following (Goedegebuure 2002–3: 25–28):

sg. nom. com.	*aši*
sg. acc. com.	*uni*[5]
n.-a. neut.	*ini*
d.-l.[6]	*edani*
abl.[6]	*ede(z)za*, *etez(a)*, *edaza*

7.12. The common-gender nominative and accusative forms consist of an inflected stem *a-* followed by the deictic element *i.* The inflection can be compared to *kāš* and *apāš* (ending: *-aš*) and *kūn* and *apūn* (ending: *-un*). The source of nominative-accusative neuter *ini* (later *eni*) and of the stem *ed-* of the dative-locative and ablative is not clear.

7.13. Of the forms in the paradigm above that are not attested in OS, all but the ablative forms *edezza*, *edaza* probably existed in OH speech. The form *edi* has been previously regarded as a dative-locative predecessor of NS *edani.* There is no solid evidence from its occurrences that it is a dative-locative. On the contrary, its OS use in complete parallel with the old instrumental *kēt* (see §16.93, p. 266) suggests that it too had the functions later expressed by the ablative forms *edezza*, *edaza*, which represent post-OH creations.

7.14. It appears that by NH even the speakers of Hittite no longer understood how these unusual forms fit into a single paradigm. New forms arose through analogy to the customary paradigms, assuming that the stems to be inflected were *aši-*, *uni-*, and *eni-*. A new nominative *ašiš* was formed from the "stem" *aši-*.[7] The many occurrences of *aši*[8] in

5. Goedegebuure (2002–3: 28 n. 55) claims a sg. acc. com. *a-ši* in KBo 17.17 (+) KBo 30.30 obv. 6′–7′ (OS!). We have less confidence in this reading, especially because it is in OS, and would prefer some other interpretation. It is notable that, in contrast to the NH paradigm with its example of a singular genitive, the pre-NH paradigm has no example of a genitive form. It is therefore worth considering that *aši* is the missing genitive. Granted that the case-forms preceding the final *-i* in the pre-NH paradigm are all pronominal, whereas *-aš* is the nominal genitive case ending. But there is no **eli* form to match the pronominal genitive ending (in *kel* and *apel*), and the Luwian genitive adjective in *-aššiš-* resembles it. The passage would make as good or better sense if *aši* is understood as a free-standing genitive: 'O Sungod of the gods, I hereby give to the gods (the equivalent/substitute) of that one. I give Our Sun Labarna, (inasmuch as) [I] give his equivalent. Here is his equivalent, his living (substitute)!' With this translation we would be opting for Goedegebuure's possibility 2a (on p. 65), namely, that *aši* anticipates and is coreferential with the possessive clitic *-šan* 'his (equivalent)' in *a-a-an-da-aš-ša-an*.

6. These forms function as adverbs marking relative location, as indicated by Goedegebuure.

7. Goedegebuure (2002–3: 5) considers only two new stems to have been created in NH: *uni-* and *eni-*, both based upon the accusative forms in the pre-NH paradigm. She apparently (following HW² A 400a "wertlos") considered *ašiš* in its one occurrence as an invention of the scribe (2002–3: 24).

8. For this form in the singular accusative see Goedegebuure 2002–3: 4 n. 13.

NH as singular nominative common are simply carried over from the pre-NH paradigm, and the 18 occurrences as singular accusative common exhibit a merger of the nominative and singular accusative common in late NH (Tudḫaliya IV and following). For the new stem *uni-*, the forms *uniš* (sg. nom. com.), *unin* (sg. acc. com.), *uniyaš* (sg. gen.), and *uniuš* (pl. nom. and acc. com.) are attested. For the new stem *eni-*, the forms *eniš* (sg. nom. com.) and *eniuš* (pl. nom. or acc. com.) are attested. Objections to Laroche by Kammenhuber (in HW² A 400) on the basis of an alleged *uniuš* in OH (reference to the form was not given!) remain to be confirmed. It appears rather that all *uniuš* forms are found in NH. That "correct" forms such as *aši* (sg. nom. com.), *uni* (sg. acc. com.), *eni* and *ini* (neut.) continue to occur in NH (Muršili II), pace Kammenhuber, is not surprising. They constitute no serious objection to Pedersen's and Laroche's analyses.

7.15. The ablative and dative-locative forms also continue the pre-NH paradigm, not being alignable with either of the newly created stems.

7.16. This third demonstrative appears to have been distal and has functions commonly found in other languages possessing such a third demonstrative (see Goedegebuure 2002–3). Goedegebuure found that *aši* served in four roles typical of demonstratives: (1) situational, (2) recognitional, (3) discourse deictic, and (4) tracking or anaphoric. To it was built an interjection/adverb identical in formation with *kāša/kāšma* (Hoffner 2002–3). As *kāš=a* consists of an initial component derived from the near demonstrative *kā-* plus the topicalizing *-a/-ma* (*kāš=a* regularly in OH, rebuilt as *kāš=ma* in post-OH when non-geminating *-a* was lost and *-ma* occurred in all environments), so OH (i.e., OS) *āšma* must be analyzed as a contracted form from *aši* plus *-a/-ma*, selecting *-ma* in post-vocalic environment (§29.24, p. 395).[9] On this type of contraction, compare OH *naššu=ma* > post-OH *našma* (again see Hoffner 2002–3 for the details and above in §1.77, p. 33).

anni-

7.17. From the stem *anni-* (HED A 51–55) there is only the singular nominative common form *anniš*. To this stem belong the adverbs *annaz* and *annišan* 'once, long ago' (compare *kez* and *kiššan*). The meaning of *annišan* suggests a far-deictic meaning 'that' for *anni-*. There is also a very rare stem *ani-* (or *ana-*) seen in the compound *a-ni-ši-wa-at* 'today' KBo 3.45:12′ (see Neu 1980: 15–16; HW² A 81b; HED A 52). This meager evidence suggests that an original contrast in spatial deixis between *ana/i-* *'this' and *anna/i-* *'that' shifted to temporal deixis: *ani=šiwat* 'on this day' > 'today' vs. *annaz* *'at that time' > 'formerly'.

9. Of course, there are examples in NH of *aši* followed by the particle *-a/-ma* which do not show the contraction. But these are not examples of the adverb any more than every *kāš* followed immediately by *-a/-ma* is an example of the adverb *kāša/kāšma*, or every *kuiš* followed by *-a/-ya* is the distributive *kuišša* 'each'.

Adverbs Built to Demonstratives

7.18. In Hittite a number of adverbs are derived from the demonstrative bases, from one of which in turn an adjective is derived. As a rule it is the stems *ke/i-* and *ape/i-* that occur in the pronominal adverbs, just as the stem *kuwa-* (versus *kui-*) occurs in pronominal adverbs and conjunctions *kuwapi*, *kuwapikki*, *kuwattan*, etc. (Kammenhuber 1969b: 207). Local and temporal adverbs differ in their frame of reference. In local adverbs, mirror frames of reference exist between speaker and addressee (each has his own *kā* 'by me' versus *apiya* 'by you'): see examples KUB 14.3 ii 71–72 (= Sommer 1932: ii 72–73) (§30.37, p. 417), HKM 18 left edge 2–5 (§30.43, p. 418), and especially KUB 21.38 obv. 11–12 (§30.69, p. 427), whereas in the temporal a single frame is shared by both: proximal (indeed, immediate) and medial/remote (*kinun* 'now' versus *apiya* 'then').

ka-/ke-	*apā-/ape-*
kā 'here, hither'[10]	***apiya*** 'there, thither'
kēt 'from/in this direction' (OH only)[11]	
kēz 'from/in this direction' (post-OH only)[12]	*apēz* 'from that place'
kinun 'now, at this time'	***apiya*** 'then, at that time'
kiššan,[13] *kīniššan*[14] 'in the following manner'	***apiniššan***,[14] *apeniššan*, *(apēniššan)* 'in the preceding manner'
kiššuwant- (adj.) 'this kind of a . . . '	*apeniššuwant-* (adj.) 'that kind of a . . . '

7.19. The demonstratives *kā-* and *apā-* also occur in *kitpantalaz* 'from this moment on' and *apit pantalaz* 'from that moment on'. While the first is always written as one word and the second in its two occurrences as two words, both are probably univerbations with a single accent. This is reflected not only in the spelling *ki-it* vs. *ke-e-et* (see §1.46, p. 25, and AHP 139), but also in the placement of *-pat* in *apit pantalaz=pat* (§16.94, p. 266, and §28.118, p. 384). See also *ketkarza* 'at the head'. The combination of a demonstrative stem with ending *-e/it* and a noun in the ablative parallels the use of the clitic possessive ending *-e/it* which serves both instrumental and ablative (see §6.7, p. 140). The demonstratives had no separate ablative form when these adverbial expressions were created.

---

10. OH variant of *kā* is *kāni* (KBo 22.2 obv. 9). The CLuwian equivalent of *kāni* is *zāni* (CLL 277) built to the near demonstrative root *zā-*.

11. In the broken context [. . .] *kēt ūnnāi* KBo 17.23 obv. 5 'Drive (or: he drives) in this direction [. . .]' seems likely.

12. In OH we also find *kēt* for 'on this side'.

13. For *kiššan* in interrogative clauses see §27.3 (p. 348).

14. Kammenhuber (1969b: 207) considers *kiniššan* an analogical formation to *apeniššan*, but the existence of older *iniššan* < *ini* and of *kīniššan* < *kīni* suggests that *apiniššan* was already modeled on the other two in OH and that the vocalization *apeniššan* was later and secondary, just like that of *eni* and *eniššan*.

7.20. In some derivatives of the near/medial demonstrative that serve the same semantic function, the endings are not the same: *kinun* 'now' (< *kā-*) versus *apiya* 'then' (< *apā-*).

7.21. One adverb built upon *kā-* (e.g., *kāša/kāšma,* on which see Hoffner 1968b and see §§24.27–24.30, pp. 323–324) has no counterpart built upon *apā-* but intead one built on the distal demonstrative *aši* (*āšma*, on which see Hoffner 2002–3). Since *kāša/kāšma* is built upon the near (speaker-proximal) demonstrative, it serves appropriately to add temporal immediacy to the finite verb forms associated with it. The form *āšma*, on the other hand, being built on the distal (remote) demonstrative has no such function with regard to the accompanying verb but instead marks spatial, temporal, or "disassociative" distance in the thought expressed (Hoffner 2002–3).

Chapter 8

RELATIVE AND INDEFINITE PRONOUNS

8.1. In Hittite the common form *kui-* serves both interrogative and relative functions, while the indefinite function is filled by *kuiški* 'someone, anyone'. Only in combination with *takku*/*mān* 'if' can *kui-* have an indefinite meaning (see Latin *sīquis*).[1]

The Interrogative and Relative Pronoun *kui-*

8.2. The following paradigm of *kui-* 'who, which' serves for both functions. As with the demonstratives, there was a stem for the nominative and accusative (*kui-*) vocalized differently from that of the oblique cases (*kue-*) (see §5.2, p. 132). For the syntax of the interrogative pronouns see chapter 27 and for relative pronouns see chapter 30.

	Singular	Plural
nom. com.	***kuiš***	***kuiēš***, *kuēš* (*kueuš*[2])
acc. com.	***kuin***	***kuiuš***, *kuiēš*,[3] (*kueuš*, *kuiš*,[4] *kue*[5])
n.-a. neut.	***kuit***	***kue*** (*kuie*)
gen.	***kuēl***[6]	**kuenzan*[7]
d.-l.	***kuedani***	***kuedaš***
abl.	*kuēz(za)*	

The Indefinite Pronoun *kuiški* and the Distributive *kuišša*

8.3. The indefinite pronoun 'some(one), any(one)' is *kuiški* with inflected *kui-* plus particle *-kki*/*-kka.* The distributive 'each, every' is *kuišša*, with inflected *kui-* plus the

1. Possibly also in *parkunuši=ma=za* ŪL *kuit nu=za anda imma ḫatkišnuši* KBo 3.1 ii 44 (OH/NS). See §26.7 (p. 342).

2. Attested in copies of Muw. II's treaty with Alakšandu of Wiluša (CTH 76).

3. See §3.16 (p. 70).

4. *ku-iš* KUB 32.123 iii 31 (cited in HW 114).

5. *nu-mu* MUŠEN.ḪI.A *ku-e up-pé-eš-ta na-at ar-ḫa ḫ*[*ar-*]*ra-an-te-eš e-š*[*ir*] *na-aš e-du-un-na Ú-UL* 'The birds which (*kue*, could be collective [§§3.12–3.13, p. 68]) you sent to me were spoiled (pl. com.), and I neither ate them (pl. com.) (nor . . .)" AT 125 obv. 11–13 (NH), see ibid. 5 (cited HW 114 as "Atch 5, 11"). See also in the paradigm of HE §119.

6. Too rare to be added to the table of forms is *ku-u-e-el* KUB 12.21 i 15 (OH/NS), ed. Hoffner 1992a.

7. Expected on analogy with sg. *apel* — pl. *apenzan*. There may be a vestige of this independently unattested form in the indefinite ethnic adjective *kuenzumna-* (see §2.45, p. 60).

conjunction *-a/-ya* ‘also, and’. See also adverbial *kuwapitta* ‘everywhere, in each place’. The plural forms (*kuiušša*, *kuedašša*) always refers to groups, often numbered (*kuedašša* ANA 3? [. . .] HKM 90:6′), or collectives with 1-*NUTUM* or *TAPAL* (IBoT 3.114 obv. 8 restored from dupl. KUB 58.83 ii 21; KUB 32.123 + KBo 29.206 i 7, 11, 25 [vs. the sg. *kuedaniya* 1-*edani* in line 14]; KUB 58.100 ii 6). Forms wholly in parentheses in the table below are rare.

	*kuišk*i		*kuišša*	
	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
nom. com.	***kuišk*i**	*kuiēšqa*, *kuēšqa*	*kuišša*[8]	
acc. com.	***kuink*i**	*kuiušga*	*kuinna*	*kuiušša*
n.-a. neut.	***kuitk*i**	*kuēq(q)a*, (*kuekki*)	*kuitta*	
gen.	***kuēlka***, *kuelka*, *kuelqa*, *kuelga*, (*kuēlki*)[9]		***kuella***	
d.-l.	***kuedanikki***, (*kuedanikka*)	*kuedašqa*	***kuedaniya***	*kuedašša*
	Numerically Indifferent		Numerically Indifferent	
abl./ins.	*kuezqa*, (*kuezzaqa*, *kuizzaqa*)[10]		*kuezziya*	

8.4. *kuišša* is not used as a generalizing relative ‘whoever’ (contra Sommer and Falkenstein 1938: 59, HE §120 b and §125). Of Sommer’s proof texts, several are written with ungeminated *š*, thus excluding analysis as *kuišša*, and the others with geminate *š* (e.g., *nu* DUMU.MEŠ *kuišša kuwatta utne* [(*paizzi*)] KBo 3.67 i 9) are genuine distributives. One should not confuse *kuišša* ‘each, every(one)’ showing geminate *-šš-* with *kuiša* (*ku-i-ša*) ‘whoever’, where the non-geminating conjunction *-a/-ma* merely reinforces the unspecified sense of clause-initial *kuiš* (§30.59, p. 424).

8.5. The particle of *kuišk*i regularly appears as *-(k)ki* when the vowel in the immediately preceding syllable is *i* (*kuišk*i, *kuink*i, *kuitk*i, *kuedanikki*) and as *-(k)ka* in other environments. On the other hand, some *-(k)ki* and *-(k)ka* forms appear as exceptions to the above rule: gen. *kuēlki*, nom.-acc. neut. *kuekki*, and d.-l. *kuedanikka.*

8.6. On the word order in constructions with *kuelka* + head noun see §16.55 (p. 255). For word order of *kuišk*i with negatives see §26.7 (p. 342), §26.14 (p. 343), and §26.21 (p. 345). On general principles of word order with *kuišk*i see §§18.33–18.36 (pp. 286–287).

8. See §8.4.

9. *ku-e-el-ki* KBo 39.219:8, KUB 23.68 obv. 15 (MH/NS), KBo 39.219:8; *ku-el-ki* KBo 9.137 ii 9, KBo 19.61 iv 2, KUB 13.23:3. Since all of the non-plene examples are at end of line and cramped for space, it appears that the plene writing was the norm.

10. Written *ku-e-ez-za-qa* KUB 22.52 obv. 11 and *ku-i-iz-za-qa* IBoT 3.122:7.

8.7. The generalizing relative concept is expressed by the repetition of the relative pronoun or adjective, with or without an intervening *imma*: *nu=kan kuiš kuiš* URU-*aš anda* SI×SÁ-*ri* 'Whatever town is determined within (that radius of the crime site)' KBo 6.4 i 12–13 (NH), *nu ḫantezziyaš* LÚ-*aš kuit kuit p*[*ešta*] *ta=šše šarnikzi* 'he shall give as compensation to him whatever the first man [gave]' Laws §28a; *nu* URU.DIDLI.ḪI.A *kuiēš kuiēš* [*š*]*A* $^{m.d}$*SIN*-^{d}U 'Whatever cities belong to Armatarḫunta' Ḫatt. iv 71–72. Sometimes with *imma* but no repetition of the relative: *kuēl imma* GIŠ-*ruwaš ḫaḫḫallaš alil* 'The flower of the *ḫaḫḫal* of whatever tree' KUB 24.14 i 8.

8.8. *kuiški*, *kuinki*, *kuitki*, *kuedanikki*, etc. can be translated 'someone/something' or 'anyone/anything': *naššu* DINGIR-*LIM-ni kuiški peran wašti* '(if) either someone sins before a deity' KUB 1.16 iii 60 (OH/NS); *nu šarnikdu* LUGAL-*i=ma=apa lē kuitki* 'then let (the offender) compensate, but to the king let there be no responsibility (lit., let there not be anything)' KUB 11.1+ iv 21 (OH/NS).

8.9. The following is a chart of correlatives for Hittite similar to those given in traditional Latin and Greek grammars (see also Laroche 1979).

	Proximal demonstrative	Medial demonstrative	Interrogative	Relative	Generalizing Relative	Indef. pron.	Distributive
Pronoun	*kāš*, *kūn* (com.)	*apāš*, *apūn* (com.)	*kuiš*, *kuin* (com.)	*kuiš*, *kuin* (com.)	*kuiš* (*imma*) *kuiš* 'whoever'	*kuiški*, *kuinki* 'someone, anyone'	*kuišša*, *kuinna* 'each' (com.)
Local adverb	*kā* 'here, hither'	*apiya* 'there, thither'	*kuwapi* 'where?, whither?'	*kuwapi(t)*, *kuedani pedi* 'in/to what place, where, whither'	*kuwapi(t)* *kuwapi(t)* 'wherever'	*kuwapikki*, 'somewhere, anywhere'; *UL kuwapikki*, 'nowhere'	*kuwapitta* 'in each/ every place, everywhere'
Causal	*kedani šer*, *kēz* 'for this reason'	*apadda(n) (šer)*, *apēda*, *apezza* 'for that reason'	*kuwat*, *kuedani šer*, *kuit* 'why?'	*kuit* 'because'		*kuedanikki šer* 'for whatever reason'	
Ablatival	*kēz* 'from here, on this side'	*apēz* 'from there, in that direction'	*kuēz* 'whence?, from where?'			*kuezka* 'in any direction', *UL kuezka* 'in no direction'	
Temporal	*kinun* 'now'	*apiya* 'then'	*kuwapi* 'when?'	*mān*, *maḫḫan*, *kuwapi* 'when'	*kuwapi* *kuwapi* 'whenever'	*kuwapikki* 'anytime', *UL kuwapikki* 'never'	
Modal	*kiššan* 'thus, as follows'	*apeniššan* 'thus, in the preceding manner'	*maḫḫan*, *mān* 'how?'	*maḫḫan* 'as'		*kuwatqa*, *manqa* 'anyway, anyhow'	

Other Stems with Partial Pronominal Inflection

8.10. The adjective *tamai-* 'other' (for the stem see §5.2, p. 132), following a pattern found in other early IE languages (see Sihler 1995: 385 §374.2a on this "pronominalization"), inflects partly like a noun in *-ai-* (see §4.32, p. 92), partly like the pronouns *kā-*, *apā-* and *kui-*. Also partly pronominal is the inflection of *dapi*(*ya*)- 'all, entire'. The following shows their inflections:

	Singular		Plural	
nom. com.	***tamaiš***, *tamāiš*, *damāiš*, *dammaiš*		*ta-ma-e-eš*, *da-ma-e-eš*, *damauš*	
acc. com.	***tamaīn***, *tamāin*, *damāin*	*dapian*	***tamāuš***, *damauš*	*dapiuš*
n.-a. neut.	***tamai***, *damāi*	*dapi(y)an*, *dapin*[11]	*ta-ma-a-i*	*dapida*
gen.	*dammel*, *tamēl*[12]	*dapiyaš*		*dapidaš*
d.-l.	*damedani* (*damētani*, *tamētani*)	*dapī*	*damedaš*	*dapiyaš*
all.	***tamatta***, *tameda*			
	Numerically Indifferent			
abl.	*tamedaz(a)*		*dapiza*, *dapidaz*	

8.11. The adjective *dapiya-* 'entire', a synonym of *ḫūmant-*, first appears in texts in NS.

8.12. In some places in the paradigm, an extended stem *dapi*(*y*)*ant-* takes the place of *dapiya-*, perhaps under the influence of its synomym *ḫūmant-*: sg. nom. com. *dapiyanza*, abl. *dapiandaza*, nom. com. pl. *dapianteš*, pl. nom.-acc. neut. *dapianda*, pl. d.-l. *dapiandaš*. Nom.-acc. neut. *dapi*(*y*)*an* could belong either to *dapi*(*y*)*a-* or *dapi*(*y*)*ant-*.

8.13. It was thought by some[13] that the adjective *dam*(*m*)*eli-*, which they translated 'another kind of' (German *andersartig*, *anderer*), was derived from the stem *tamai-* (perhaps by way of the genitive pronominal form *damel*). But since the meaning of *dammeli-* is rather 'virgin (land), unworked or uncultivated (land)',[14] it is doubtful if it can be derived from *tamai-*.[15]

11. See §1.76 (p. 32).

12. The sg. gen. *tamēdaš* KUB 13.2 ii 29 (in parallelism with *šA* ^{d}U) cited by HW 207 is a late rarity.

13. Güterbock 1943; HW 207.

14. For sg. nom.-acc. neut *dam-me-el* and a discussion of this word see LH 20, 172–73. But the correct analysis of *dam-me-el* in Laws §6 (late parallel) continues to be ignored and the old incorrect one perpetuated (see Bernabé and Álvarez-Pedrosa 2000: 181: "un campo a otro").

15. Güterbock 1964: 153.

Chapter 9
NUMBERS

9.1. Like most Indo-European languages, Hittite possesssed cardinal numbers (*one*, *two*, *three*), ordinal numbers (*first*, *second*, *third*), derivative nouns, adjectives, and adverbs to express what we call fractions (*half*, *third*, *quarter*), multiplicatives ("x-times") and distributives (*two each*, *three each*), and factitive verbs based upon numerical-derived adjectives (*make one*, *unify*, *double*, *triple*). The principal prior study of Hittite numbers is by Eichner (1992); see now also Hoffner 2007.

9.2. A major obstacle to modern research into Hittite numbers is the fact that the scribes made extensive use of ciphers. For this reason the pronunciation of most Hittite numbers is unknown to us. Furthermore, since the number words are almost always written with ciphers and the complements consist of only one or two signs, it is extremely difficult to determine what information the complement provides. Does the complement consist of: (1) The case ending alone? (2) The end of the suffix plus case ending? (3) The entire suffix plus case ending? Or (4) the end of the numerical root plus entire suffix plus case ending? For example, since many different numbers can have the complements *-ki-iš*, *-li-iš*, and *-iš*, are we to assume the presence of three suffixes here, or two? Is the complement *-iš* an abbreviated writing of one of the other two longer complements? These difficult questions and many more like them beset the study of Hittite numbers.

Form and Declension of the Cardinals

9.3. Of the few number words which are written syllabically we may mention: the cardinals 'one' *šia-* (Goedegebuure 2006), 'three' *teri-*,[1] and 'four' *meu-*, the ordinals *ḫantezzi*(*ya*)- 'first' and *dān* 'second', and the compounding form *dā-* in *dāyugaš* 'two-year-old'. The number 'seven' may be attested in the beverage name *šiptamiya-*.

9.4. It appears that in PIE only the words for the cardinal numbers 'one' through 'four' were declined (Watkins 1998: 67; Szemerényi 1996: 221; Beekes 1995: 212–13). We have conclusive evidence that 'one' through 'four' also were declined in Hittite. Complements reflecting case inflection in some numbers above four may reflect declension of higher cardinals but more likely belong to forms with the "individualizing" suffix *-ant-* (see §2.25, p. 56).

1. Inferred from the genitive *teriyaš*, the ordinal adverb *terin* 'thirdly', and the beverage name *teriyalli-*.

9.5. The number 'two' follows exclusively the pronominal declension, as does 'one', with a single exception, while 'three' and 'four' follow that of the adjectives, again with a single exception.

'One'

9.6. Two words for 'one' are presupposed by Indo-Europeanists (see, e.g., Szemerényi 1996: 222 §8.5.2): **oinos*, stressing singleness or isolation, and **sem*, stressing togetherness or unity. It is possible that in Hittite also there were two words, but some candidates that are put forward, such as *šani-* and *ā-*, have proven uncertain. The most promising candidate is *šia-*, proposed by Goedegebuure (2006).

9.7. **šia-* '**one**' declines like the pronouns with the exception of the sg. nom.-acc. neut. 1-*an*.[2] There are also *i*-stem forms, whose formal and functional relationship to the stem **sia-* remains unclear. Compare the endings in the center column with the forms of the demonstrative pronoun *apā-* to the right.

Case	Writing	Ending	*apa-*
nom. com.	**1-*aš***, **1-*iš***[3]	*-š*	*apāš*
acc. com.	**1-*an***, 1-*in*[4]	*-n*	*apūn*
n.-a. neut.	**1-*an***[5]	*-n*	
gen.	1-*el*,[6] 1-*e-el*, *ši-i-e-el*	*-el*	*apēl*
d.-l.	***ši-e-da-ni***, *ši-e-ta-ni*, 1-*e-da-ni*	*-edani*	*apedani*
all.	1-*e-da*, 1-*e-et-ta(?)*, *ši-e-et-ta(?)*[7]	*-eda*	*apeda*

2. Compare for this pattern Sanskrit *éka-* 'one', which likewise shows pronominal inflection except for the sg. nom.-acc. neut. *ékam*.

3. Though far less common than 1-*aš*, nom. 1-*iš* is attested from OS on. In OS it is found in KBo 25.31 ii 9 (Neu, StBoT 26:283 with n. 1), where two palace men escort the NIN.DINGIR, one on each side holding her (the context is restorable from the NS dupl. KBo 25.42 left col. 1′–8′ and two parallel passages in KBo 25.46:6–7 and KBo 23.74 iii 15–16). 1-*iš* precedes its noun in HKM 46:4–6 (MH/MS); follows its noun in KBo 18.69 rev. 11 and KBo 18.76 rev. 10; see also KBo 5.2 iii 41; and occurs as a predicate adjective in 1-*iš kišat* KUB 41.23 ii 20. 1-*iš* replaces 1-*aš* KBo 4.9 v 4 in its dupl. KUB 11.29 v 11′. The sg. nom. com. form 1-*iš* is distinguishable from the multiplicative 1-*iš* (i.e., 1-*kiš*) only by context.

4. HKM 47:49 (MH/MS).

5. The form read "1-*at*(-*ta*)" and claimed as a sg. neut. of the numeral by Eichner (1992) is very likely a personal name ^{m}*Atta*(*i*) (see Ünal 1996: 21 n. 57 and Miller 2004: 450 n. 727). If there was a neuter form *1-*at*, no trace of it has yet been found in published texts.

6. For 1-*ela* see §9.61 (p. 170).

7. The analysis of 1-*ētta* as an instrumental with the geminating conjunction *-a* 'also' does not account for its meaning in context, contra Melchert (1977: 376–78), Eichner (1992: 39–40), and Goedegebuure (2006). It ought to mean 'into one', an allative function. We tentatively list it here as a variant of the allative 1-*eda*. For the alternate ending with geminate *-tt-* compare *apadda* beside *apēda* and *tamatta* beside *tameda* (see §§8.9–8.10, pp. 151–152). For the *e*-vocalism versus the other two forms in *-tta* compare perhaps alternations like *iētta* beside *iyatta*, but further research is needed to validate this explanation.

Case	Writing	Ending	*apa-*
abl.	1-*e-da-az*/*-za*,[8] 1-*e-ez*, *ši(-i)-e-ez*, *še-e-za*	*-edaz*, *-ez*	*apedaz*, *apez*
ins.	***ši-e-et***, 1-*e-ta-an-da*, *še-e-et(?)*	*-et*	*apet*, *apedanda*
neut. coll.	1-*e*	*-e*	*apē*

9.8. The sg. nom.-acc. neut. form 1-*an* is used for ordinary neuter nouns: e.g., 1-*an uttar* 'one thing' KUB 24.1 ii 3 and *apāt* 1-*an* 'that one (thing)' KUB 14.3 iii 62. The formally plural 1-*e* in KBo 18.172 obv. 16 is used to modify a noun that is a collective *plurale tantum*: 2 ^{GIŠ}*ŠURENNU* ŠÀ-*BA* 1 2 GIŠ.KÍN KÙ.BABBAR 1-*e*=*ma* 1 GIŠ.KÍN KÙ.BABBAR 'two emblems, of which one (is/consists of) two GIŠ.KÍN-trees, while one (consists of) one GIŠ.KÍN-tree.[9] Some instances of 1-*an* probably represent the sg. nom.-acc. neut. of the derived stem 1-*ant-*, which expresses the sense of 'one' as a unit,[10] as in KBo 5.4 rev. 9–10 (Targ., NH): [*nu*=*šmaš*] *NIŠ* DINGIR-*LIM kuit* 1-*an ADDIN nu*=*šmaš NIŠ* DINGIR-*LIM maḫḫan* 1-*an* 1-*NUTU*[*M*=y]*a*=*šmaš ēšten* 'because I have given you (pl.) an oath as one, as you have the oath as one, may you too be one' (see also KUB 9.31 iii 21). For the equivalence of Akkadographic 1-*NUTUM* and Hittite 1-*ant-* see further §9.27 (p. 160). Likely instances of this usage thus far attested all appear to be predicative.

9.9. The number 'one' is used in reciprocal constructions: 1-*aš* 1-*an walḫzi* 'the one hits the other', 1-*aš* 1-*edani pāi* 'the one gives to the other', 1-*aš* 1-*el* UDU-*un dāi* 'the one takes the other's sheep'; and in distributives (§18.29, p. 285; §19.10, p. 291; §24.12, p. 320; §28.119, p. 384): 1-*aš* 1-*aš* (or 1-*an* 1-*an*) as a unit means 'one by one; one at a time' or 'each in his turn' (for the nominative see KUB 13.4 iii 5–6 in §25.29, p. 336); the accusative 1-*an* 1-*an* is found in: *n*=*ašta* EN ÉRIN.MEŠ *šarikuwan* 1-*an* 1-*an anda tarniškezzi* 'and the army commander admits the *šarikuwa*-troops one by one' VS 28.30 iii 16–17 (fest.). Note that the 'one by one' aspect is further indicated by the imperfective *-ške-* verb form (see §24.12, p. 320). For the distributive use with other numbers compare 2-*at* 2-*at* (§9.12).

9.10. A special distributive value was assigned to 1-*aš-ša* in KUB 43.23 rev. 21 by Eichner (1992: 41), comparing *kuišša* 'each'. But 1-*aš-ša*, both in KUB 43.23 rev. 21 and in KUB 13.4 iii 52, probably means 'even one'.

---

8. See 1-*e-da-az* 1-*e-da-az* 'on one side . . . on (the other) one side, reciprocal, on a basis of equality, one to one' KUB 21.1+ iii 76, and 1-*e*⟨*-da*⟩*-az* . . . [1-]*e-da-az* also in correlation in KUB 30.15 obv. 27–28. Uncorrelated 1-*e-az* KUB 14.1 rev. 25 (MH/MS) is another example of 1-*e*⟨*-da*⟩*-az*. In the context it should mean 'together, jointly, as one'.

9. There is no reason to doubt this analysis (against Eichner 1992: 33). As Neu (1992) has shown, collective *pluralia tantum* are not rare in Hittite. Nor is a *plurale tantum* for a word of this meaning unexpected: cf. English *insignia* which for most current speakers has no singular *insigne*.

10. In the formulation of the *Oxford English Dictionary* under "one" III.7: "Designating a complex whole or entity in which a plurality of components or entities are united or put together; united, joined."

'Two' to 'Ten'

9.11. The declension of '**two**' shows the plural endings of the pronominal declension. Compare in the following table the plural endings of 'two' with those of *apa-* 'that': *apūš*, *apē*, *apel*, *apēdaš*, and *apēdanda* (see §7.3, p. 143).

nom. com.	2-*uš* (post-OH) [11]
n.-a. neut.	**2-*e*** [12]
gen.	2-*el*
d.-l.	2-*etaš*, 2-*aš*
ins.?	**2-*itanta*** [13]

9.12. The form 2-*el* KBo 6.26 iii 35 (Laws §191, OH/NS) is not, as HE §131 claims, a rare alternate form to the nom. com. 2-*uš* but in that passage is the regular pronominal genitive 'of two' meaning 'in the place of the two (women).' The phrase in question translates as 'but if (the cohabitation of a man with two sisters occurs) in the place of the two (2-*el pedi*), so that he knows (that his partners are sisters)': see LH 151 n. 536.[14] The writing 2-*an* might stand for *takšan* 'together', or for *2-*elan*, a sg. neut. used adverbially (see a different interpretation in Eichner 1992 63). The distributive form 2-*at* 2-*at* KBo 20.8 obv. 11 (OS) and KBo 20.83 i 4′ (OH/NS), which appears to mean 'by twos' or 'two by two', is perhaps an instrumental form with an ending *-at*, as in *šākuwat* (see §3.35, p. 77).

9.13. The following case forms of '**three**' are attested:

nom. com.	**3-*e-eš*** (i.e., **tereš* or **terieš*)
acc. com.	3-*uš*
n.-a. neut.	3-*e* [15]
gen.	*te-ri-ya-aš*

Of these forms, only nom.-acc. neut. 3-*e* shows the pronominal ending.

---

11. 2-*uš* in some contexts could be merely a shorter writing of 2-*eluš* (§9.61, p. 171).

12. 2-*e* in the construction LUGAL-*uš* 2-*e ekuzi* 'the king drinks two' could either refer to two vessels (GAL-*ri*) or be adverbial ('two times').

13. 2-*i-ta-an-ta* in KBo 25.35 ii 9′ (OS), in view of *apedanda*, is probably instrumental. The existence of this ending in OS suggests that *apēdanda* in KUB 26.71 i 7′, the NS duplicate of KBo 3.22: 58 (OS), may go back to an OS archetype. Cf. also 1-*e-ta*-[*a*]*n-da* KBo 22.203 obv.? 1 (OH/NS) in broken context.

14. The example 2-*ēl* in the passage [^{URU}*Ḫakpiš*(*šaš=ma=kan* ^{URU}*Išt*)]*a*[(*ḫar*)]*aššš=a* 2-*ēl išparzer* 'But Ḫakpišša and Išḫara together/both escaped' KUB 1.1 ii 14 (NH) awaits explanation, but it clearly has the meaning 'together, both'.

15. See n. 12 above.

9.14. '**Four**' has the following forms (Eichner 1992: 75):

nom. com.	*mi-e-ya-wa-aš*, *mi-e-wa-aš*
acc. com.	*mi-e-ú-uš*, **4-*uš***, 4-*aš*
gen.	*mi-i-ú-wa*⟨*-aš*⟩
d.-l.	*mi-ú-wa-aš*
ins.	4-*it*
abl	4-*az*

Since 'four' shows no other trace of pronominal endings, dative-locative 4-*taš* is probably not a pronominal ending (*-*edaš*) but rather a number extended by the "individualizing" *-ant-* (§§9.27–9.29, p. 160).

9.15. The cardinal number 'eight' has the following complementation in the dative-locative or accusative 8-*taš* (OS). In spite of the tempting connection of the *-t-* to the PIE final consonant of 'eight' or the use of a pronominal ending *-edaš* here (unattested in numbers higher than 'two' in Hittite), this is probably another instance of the "individualizing" *-ant-* with cardinal numbers.

9.16. 9-*an* seems to be the cardinal number 'nine'. For example, *nu mān* ^{D}UTU-*uš āššu kued*[*ani*] *paitti tug=a* 9-*an pāu kuiš* ^{LÚ}MAŠ.EN.KAK *nu=tta* 1 UDU *pāu* 'And if you, O Sungod, give goods to someone, let him give you nine (animals), (but) if it is a poor man, let him give you one sheep' VBoT 58 iv 11–12. On the dative-locative form 9-*anti* see §9.35 (p. 163).

9.17. Hundreds are written with the Akkadogram *ME*, thousands with *LI-IM*, and units of ten thousand with SIG$_7$. The first two of these three logograms are always preceded by a number, even for the unit 'one': 1 *ME* for 'one hundred', 1 *LI-IM* for 'one thousand'.[16] 'Ten thousand' can be written either 1 SIG$_7$(*-an*) or just SIG$_7$(*-an*). The phonetic complement *-an* is used in OS and MS only.[17] Large numbers are written with combinations of these logograms plus their preceding ciphers: 1 SIG$_7$ 5 *LI-IM* 5 *ME* NAM.RA.MEŠ '15,500 captives' KUB 14.16 iii 20, and 1 *ME ŠU-ŠI* 6 '166' KUB 42.33:11′ (NH). The semi-logographic writing of the adverbial form of 'thousand', *LI-IM-ti-li* 'by the thousands' KUB 8.67 iv 13′, 18′ (ed. Siegelová 1971: 40–41), need not indicate that the Hittite number 'thousand' ended in *-t-* or *-ti-*.[18] The complementation of SIG$_7$-*an* 'ten

16. If this rule applied also in compounds, it means that the title ^{LÚ}UGULA *LI-IM* cannot mean 'overseer of a thousand'.

17. Without preceding 'one' in the "Song of Release": *nu* SIG$_7$-*an* GUD.ḪI.A-*un ḫatteš* . . . SIG$_7$-*an* GUD.ḪI.A-*un ḫatteš* 3 SIG$_7$ UDU UDU.ŠÚ KUN.ḪI.A-*n=a ḫatteš* 'She slaughtered 10,000 oxen . . . 10,000 oxen . . . 30,000 fat-tailed sheep' KBo 32.13 ii 15–17 (MS); with preceding 'one' in 1 SIG$_7$-*an* MU.KAM.ÀM '10,000 annually' KBo 25.123:9 (OS).

18. See Germanic **thūs-hundi-* 'thousand'.

thousand' reveals relatively little about its stem. Judging from the ascending progression 9-*an* LI-*IM* 9-*an* SIG$_7$-*an* 9-*an* "GAŠAN+TI"[19] in KBo 17.88 + KBo 24.116 iii 9′, KBo 20.67 iv 23 (= StBoT 37:318 iii 10′; 324 iv 23), "GAŠAN+TI" was an even higher number such as 'hundred thousand'.[20] What appears to be two signs "GAŠAN.TI" in this MS copy is undoubtedly a scribal misreading of a single OS sign, which can be labeled purely descriptively, using the Mesopotamian system of sign names, as SIG$_7$-*šessig* (see Hoffner 2007).

9.18. All examples of the numbers 'two' through 'nine' + LI-*IM* ('thousand') take logograms as their head nouns. The head nouns can be written singular or plural. But the only attestation of Hittite agreement for such a head noun shows it be singular: *nu uni kuin* 9 LI-*IM* ÉRIN.MEŠ ^{m}*Pitaggatalliš uwatet n=aš=mu zaḫḫiya tiyat n=an zaḫḫiyanun* 'That 9,000-man army which Pigattalli led joined battle with me, and I defeated it' KBo 5.8 iii 24–26 (AM 158–59).

The Syntax of the Cardinals

9.19. Until recently, research on Hittite numbers has focused on their morphology. Their syntax, while unclear in many points, is beginning to come into focus (see Hoffner 2007).

Agreement in Case

9.20. Cardinal numbers were declined like substantives or pronouns, always agreeing with their head noun in **case**: *nu=šši* ANA KUR ^{URU}*Kargamiš* ^{URU}*Kargamišaš=pat* 1-*aš* URU-*aš* ŪL *takšulait* 'In the country of Carchemish, only Carchemish, the one town, did not make peace with him' KBo 5.6 ii 9–10 (NH), 1-*an* SAG.DU-*an* KBo 10.13 + KBo 10.12 ii 41, 1-*an uttar* 'one thing' KUB 24.1 ii 3 (see also i 16), 1-*edani* AMA-*ni* KUB 23.102 i 15, *tēriyaš* UD-*aš mi-i-ú-wa*⟨-*aš*⟩ UD-*aš* KASKAL-*an pāndu* 'Let them travel a journey of three days (or) of four days' KUB 43.60 i 10–11 (OH/NS), 21-*aš* $^{MUNUS.MEŠ}$*zintuḫiyaš ŠA* ^{URU}*Kalpaššanaḫila* KBo 10.10 iii/iv 7.

Number Agreement with Non-Collectives

9.21. When non-collective head nouns appeared with the numbers larger than 'one', the head noun could occur *either in the singular or plural*.

---

19. '(Let the gods send years to the king and queen)—nine thousands, nine ten-thousands, nine hundred-thousands(?) (of them)'. Not only are these ascending numerical units very large, but the number 'nine' itself in Hittite counting system represents the highest number usable for each of the count-units 'hundred', 'thousand', and 'ten-thousand'. Any number above nine requires switching to a higher count-unit (e.g., ten hundreds = one thousand, etc.). As a consequence, this pattern may suggest that "GAŠAN+TI" is 'one hundred thousand' and not a still higher unit such as 'one million'.

20. The reading SI[G$_7$-*a*]*n* in both lines for "*d*[*a-a*]*n*" in the critical edition by (Klinger 1996: 318, 324) was confirmed by collation S. Košak (7-27-2005). See Hoffner 2007.

9.22. Old Hittite syllabic evidence shows declined singulars: 5 *gāpinan* ‘five threads’ KBo 17.1 iv 15 (see Melchert 2000: 60 n. 28), 3 NINDA *ān* ‘three warm breads’, 5 GUD *tāyugaš* ‘five two-year-old oxen’ Laws §§57–58 (OS), [(5 GUD)] *šaudišza* ‘five weanling oxen’ Laws §57 (OS) (*tāyugaš* and *šaudišza* are both sg. nom. com., according to our understanding), 2 NINDA*wagataš* (OS), 10 NINDA*ḫaršin* (OS), 30 NINDA*ḫāliš* (OS), 3 NINDA*kištun* (OS), 10 DUG*ḫaršiš* (OS).

9.23. We also find plurals: 2 D*ḫantašepuš* ‘two figurines of *ḫ.*-deities’ (OS), *teššummiuš* 4-*uš* ‘four cups’ (OS), 3 NINDA*ḫaršaēš* (OS), 2 MUŠEN*partūniuš* (OS), 20 [*pur*]*puruš* (OS), 3 GIŠ*palzaḫuš* (OS), 3 *ši-i-ú-uš* ‘three deities’ (OS), 3 GIŠ*zaluwaniuš* (OS), 2 LÚ.MEŠ *ḫulḫuliyanteš* ‘two men fighting (each other)’, 3 *puššaleš* ‘three *p.*-garments’, 2 GIŠ*zaluwaniuš* 2 *ḫupparuš* ‘two *z.*’s (and) two *ḫ.*-vessels’, 2 *tu*[*n*]*ingaš* NINDA *ḫaršauš* ‘two thick loaves (made) of *tuningaš*’, 2 KUŠ*annanuzziuš* ‘two leather harnesses’ (OS), 8 TÚG*išḫimaneš neyanteš* ‘eight *i.*-garments (are) turned’, 2 LÚ.MEŠ*pi*[*tt*]*iyanduš* ‘two fugitives’, *āššū* IGI.ḪI.A=*KA lāk* LĪM *laplippuš kar*(*a*)*p* ‘turn (hither) your benevolent eyes; lift (your) thousand eyelashes’ KBo 7.28 obv. 11 (OH/MS) (and compare possibly 1 SIG_7 *l*[*aplipuš=tuš kar*(*a*)*p*] ‘lift your ten thousand eyelids’ KBo 27.18:4).

9.24. Some syllabic forms are ambiguous as to number, such as neuters: 2 *gipeššar* ‘two ells (of field)’, 7 GIŠ*ḫattalu* ‘seven bolts’, 6 *ḫarnāišar*, 10 NINDA*tūnik* ‘ten *t.*-breads’, 2 *ḫūppar* ‘two *ḫ.*-vessels’ (OS), 8 *wakšur* (OS), 3 NINDA*wageššar* (OS), 2 *zipattanni* (OS), 100 GIŠ*gipeššar* (OS).

9.25. Logographic writings reinforce the clear evidence of the syllabic writings. Logograms with numbers above 1 can either have or lack the plural markers MEŠ and ḪI.A: (a) **with**: 2 LÚ.MEŠ ‘two men’, 3 LÚ.MEŠ ‘three men’, 30 UDU.ḪI.A ‘thirty sheep’, 7 DINGIR.MEŠ ‘seven gods’, 9-*it* UZUÚR.ḪI.A-*it* ‘(together) with the nine body parts’, (b) **without**: 7 SAG.DU ‘seven persons’, 5 UDU.NÍTA ‘five male sheep’, 2 É NIM.LÀL ‘two beehives’.

Number Agreement with Collectives

9.26. There is a different method of indicating the numbers with **collective** nouns (Neu 1992). Collective nouns can be counted as well as “count plural” ones. But with the former what is counted are either sets or numbers comprising a single set: logographically ‘one’ is written 1-*NŪTUM*[21] (Akk. *ištēnūtum*), and all numbers above ‘one’ are numeral + *TAPAL*:[22] 2 *TAPAL*, 3 *TAPAL*, etc.[23] This way of writing the number with

21. Often abbreviated to 1-*NU*.

22. The abbreviation of Akkad. *TAPAL* as *TA* in inventory texts (Siegelová 1986: 704–5) is due to the nature of those late texts, as seen by the wholesale abbreviating of words in them. With numbers greater than ‘one’, however, the effect is the same: both x-*ta* (for -*anta*) and x-*TAPAL* indicate that sets are being numbered.

23. This is *not to say*, however, that *TAPAL* never occurs in Hittite with the number ‘one’. There are quite a few post-OS examples: KUB 30.32 obv. 19, 22, KBo 10.36 obv. 14, KBo 37.3 + KUB 28.87 rev. 5, etc.

collective nouns (i.e., numbering sets) is found with both logographically and syllabically spelled counted nouns: 1-*NUTIM* / 4 *TAPAL* ^{GIŠ}ZA.LAM.GAR.ḪI.A 'one tent/four tents' and 1-*NUTIM widār* 'one portion of water' 14 *TAPAL šeḫelliya⟨š⟩ widār* 'fourteen portions of water of purification'. Note that the second example—*widār*, the formal plural of the already semantically collective *wātar*—shows that this practice applies to all collective plurals, not just to those nouns that occur only as collectives.

9.27. As noted by Melchert (2000: 59–60), complementation of the numeral, when counting collective nouns, shows a stem *-ant-*.[24] This *-ant-* stem is the Hittite equivalent of Akkadographic writings with 1-*NŪTUM* or numbers greater than 'one' followed by *TAPAL*.

9.28. The endings on the *-ant-* stem agree in gender and case with the counted collective noun, showing a neuter form either when marking a formally singular but semantically collective noun (e.g., *paḫḫur* or *ḫappeššar*) or when modifying a marked neuter plural head noun. But the neuter plural ending *-anta* marks the number of sets, while the number of components in a single set is marked by an ending *-an*, which might be the neuter singular of *-ant-*.

9.29. Examples of numbers ending in *-anta*, marking the number of sets or groups: ^{GIŠ}*ḫarpa=ma* 1-*anta* LUGAL-*aš* GÌR=*ši kitta* MUNUS.LUGAL-*š=a* 1-*anta kitta* 'As for woodpiles, one (set of unspecified number in the set) lies at the foot[25] of the king, and one (at that) of the queen' KBo 17.3 iv 25–26 = StBoT 8 iv 28–29 (OS). It can be seen that in this case the head noun *ḫarpa* has an overt collective ending *-a*. Hence, it takes its number with the stem form *-anta*.[26] The full complement 1-*anta* clarifies shorter writings of the numeral with simple *-ta* in older texts. The phrase 4-*ta TAPAL* EZEN$_4$ ITU.KAM *kuit karšan ēšta* KUB 5.7 rev. 30 means 'that four monthly festivals had been neglected'. (The four festivals are conceived of as four *sets* of festival activities, *not* 'a single group/set of four festivals' which would have been written *4-*an* EZEN$_4$ ITU.) In this passage the collective subject (4-*ta TAPAL* EZEN$_4$ ITU.KAM) takes the singular verb *ēšta* by the rule of neuter plural subject taking singular verb. The singular linking verb (*ēšta*) in turn caused the predicate adjective *karšan* to be singular.[27] In NH, however,

---

But since no example of '1 *TAPAL*' is yet atttested in Old Hittite Script, it is possible that it was introduced later on (false) analogy with the numbers greater than 'one'. See 2-*NUTUM* KUB 38.3 i 14, unattested in Akkadian, which shows the same false analogy.

24. This analysis seems correct for many examples of collectives, but it does not account for all instances of numbers with collectives nor for all uses of 1-*NŪTUM* and *TAPAL* with nouns. See §9.37 (p. 163) and §9.40 (p. 164).

25. The possessive clitic *-ši* shows that the complete form was singular, **padišši*.

26. The form *m(i)uwaniyanteš* used in the horse-training texts for a team of four chariot horses (Eichner 1992: §3.4.4.1 and §3.4.4.3), if correctly analyzed as a participle (so CHD L–N 308–9), in spite of the *-ant-* suffix, would have nothing to do with the collective ('a team of four [horses]').

27. This is the simplest accounting. Alternatively, since taking 4-*ta* as 4-*anta* makes it redundant with immediately following *TAPAL*, one could translate 'that four monthly festivals for *you* had been neglected'

and especially in administrative texts, where abbreviated writings are common, we cannot be sure that the TA sign is not an abbreviation for *TA-PAL*.

9.30. As for examples of numbers ending in *-an*, marking the number of components in a set, we find two with the number 7-*an* and one with 9-*an*. The shorter ending *-an* occurs in 7-*an* modifying the head noun *paḫḫur*, which shows no overt collective ending, although it is collective in sense: *INA* UD.3.KAM=*ma kēz* 7-*an paḫḫur kēzzi=ya* 7-*an paḫḫur pariaḫḫi* 'On the third day I kindle a (single) group of seven fires on one side, and another group of seven fires on the other side' KBo 11.11 ii 5–6.[28] Each group of seven fires is regarded as a "set." The number 7-*an* seems to show the singular collective ending, not only because groups or sets are so clearly visualized, but also because 7-*an* can hardly be the simple cardinal. We adhere to the view of Melchert (AHP 181) and others that final *-an* is not the expected outcome of final syllabic *m̥* in **septm̥* 'seven'. It is likely that the beverage name *šiptamiya-* shows the *a* before the *m* because it was formed early enough to retain the regular internal treatment. The second example is not contextually as clear but fits the pattern observed elsewhere: NINDA.GUR$_4$.RA=*ya* 7-*an* ^{D}*Ḫebat paršiyannai memiškezzi=ya QATAMMA* 'as for thick breads, he breaks a set of seven for Ḫebat, and speaks the same way' KBo 11.14 ii 30–31 (MH/NS).

9.31. The examples with 9-*an* are less certain, since the *-an* complementing 'nine' could also be the end of the cardinal number itself. For example, *nu mān* ^{D}UTU-*uš āššu kued*[*ani*] *paitti tug=a* 9-*an pāu kuiš* ^{LÚ}MAŠ.EN.KAK *nu=tta* 1 UDU *pāu* 'And if you, O Sungod, give goods to someone, let him give you a set /group of nine (of animals, = singular neuter *šuppal* implied?). (But) he who is a poor man, let him give you a single sheep' VBoT 58 iv 11–12.[29] A second example is: ^{GIŠ}*zupari* 2=*šU* 9-*an kez!* 9-*an* lukkanzi [*k*]*ezzi=ya* 9-*an lukkanzi* 'torches: two sets of nine: on this side they light (one) set of nine, and on the other side they light another set of nine' KBo 20.34 rev. 10–11 (MH/NS). A third example is: EGIR-*anda=ma taknaš* ^{D}UTU-*i* 1 UDU GE$_6$ 2 UDU BABBAR 9-*an* UDU-*un tekan paddānzi nu=kan* UDU.ḪI.A *kattanta šippandanzi* 'But afterward for the Sungoddess of the Netherworld one black sheep, two white sheep, and a group of nine sheep—they dig (a hole in) the ground and sacrifice the sheep down in it' KBo

---

KUB 5.7 rev. 30. The alternate reading 4=*ta* with d.-l. *-ta* 'for you (O god)' could be defended on the basis of *UM-MA ŠU=MA* [*ANA*] DINGIR-*LIM=wa* EZEN$_4$ ITU.KAM *ŠA* ITU.6.KAM *karšan* KBo 14.21 i 8 (NH). This provisional solution, however, requires assuming that the graphic nexus between the numeral and the logogram *TAPAL* (which corresponds only to a stem on the declined number) could be broken by the enclitic pronoun, which in speech would follow the stem and ending. Both solutions have their difficulties.

28. Eichner (1992: 83–84) cited 7-*an* in KBo 11.11 ii 5–6 and saw that the *-an* could not be a reflex of PIE *septm̥*. He thought it could have contained an "*-nt-* stem" meaning 'seven at a time', but he does not elaborate this idea. For such an *-nt-* '-times' one could invoke the variant *ma-ši-ya-an-te* for *mašiyanki* 'however many times', but see CHD L–N s.v., where possibilities of paleographic confusion (TE for intended KI) are raised.

29. Here the symbolic meaning of 'nine' in the sense of an unlimited number may be present; see p. 167, n. 44.

11.10 ii 17–19. Note here how the "Y number" (see the following paragraph) 9-*an* and the singular (collective) head noun UDU-*un* point to a closed group of nine sheep separate from the enumerated single black sheep and two white ones.[30]

9.32. Since only in the nominative-accusative and dative-locative cases can the distinction between the singular and plural forms of the set-numbering ("collective") numbers be distinguished, the following table summarizes how these pattern, using either the number of sets ("X") or the number in each set ("Y") or both numbers. In the first two rows of the table the number represented by X, if it has any Hittite complement, takes *-anta* (even if its number is 'one'!), while Y, if it has a Hittite complement, takes *-an*.

Numbering Sets/Groups in Nominative-Accusative X = number of sets, Y = number in each set		
1	X set(s), each set of unspecified number (Y) of sheep [Y is not expressed]	X-*anta* (X *TAPAL* or 1-*NU⟨TIM⟩*) UDU
2	One set consisting of Y sheep [X, which is always understood as 'one', is not expressed]	Y-*an* UDU
3	X set(s) of Y sheep [both X and Y expressed]	X=*ŠU* (or X-*anki*) Y UDU

9.33. In row 3 neither X nor Y show collective suffixes. X-*anki* is the regular formation for 'X-times', while Y would be the normal cardinal number. The third row is included here not to illustrate use of the collective suffixes but to show how the Hittites indicated both the number of sets and the number of items in each. For this purpose they did *not* use the collective suffix on either number.

9.34. In the oblique cases no distinctive collective ending shows on the head noun, but when the sense is collective, the stem of the number is enlarged by *-ant-*.

9.35. The following two examples with oblique case endings represent numbers of components in a single set (row 2 in the table above). For an instrumental form see 10-*antit*: [. . . *I*]*ŠTU* 2 *QATI=KA* 10-*antit kalulup*[*it=titt=a* . . .] 'with your two hands, [and] with your (set of) ten fingers' KBo 17.32 obv. 12. In the latter example it is not ten "sets" of fingers, but ten fingers comprising a single set, which calls for the collective form of the number (i.e., with the *-ant-* suffix). Of course, the ablative and instrumental cases do not show distinctive singular and plural endings, but the semantics here favors the

30. For additional examples see KBo 11.72 iii 28; KBo 13.115:5–8.

singular meaning, i.e., indicating the number of items in the set.[31] The dative-locative collective 9-*anti ḫappešni* KBo 21.14 obv. 13 means 'on a/the set of nine members.'

9.36. When more than one set *of a specified number* is to be indicated, it is done by NUMBER+-*ŠU* preceding the number (row 3 in the table and see §9.38 below): ^{GIŠ}*zuppari* 2=*ŠU* 9-*an—kez!* 9-*an lukkanzi* [*k*]*ezzi=ya* 9-*an lukkanzi* 'torches: two sets of nine—on one side they light a set of nine, and on the other side they light a set of nine'. Since in this case the number is 'nine', we cannot tell whether the *-an* ending is the final part of the simple cardinal or whether the number is in its singular collective form.

9.37. One also finds numbers without phonetic complement with nouns that appear to be collectives, both logograms and syllabically written words: 2 ^{GIŠ}*KANNUM* alongside 2 *TAPAL* ^{GIŠ}*KANNUM* 'two racks/stands', 1 *galgalturi* beside 1-*NŪTIM galgalturi* 'one (set of) cymbals'. It is uncertain whether such writings are abbreviated for *1-*anta*, *2-*anta* or reflect a genuine alternative use of the simple cardinal numbers with collectives. For evidence of the latter see the example of 1-*e* cited in §9.8 (p. 155).[32] But the alternation with *TAPAL* in the first instance and 1-*NUTIM* in the second show that these are X numbers, numbering the sets, not indicating how many members were in each set. When the numbers lack complementation, it is only the context that can show whether they are X or Y numbers.

Counting Non-Decimal Sets

9.38. The PIE number nomenclature implies a ten-base system of counting. But just as in some IE languages other groupings can occur (*four-score*, *two dozen*),[33] so also in Hittite larger numbers were sometimes expressed in multiples other than tens or hundreds. The multiplier is regularly written with the Akkadian suffix *-ŠU*, while the multiplied number has either no complement or rarely the regular complement *-an* (see 9-*an* and §9.36 above). Note, however, that while the multiplicand varies (the favored numbers being seven and nine), the multiplier does not exceed four and rarely exceeds two, and the multiplicand is always larger than the multiplier. Only with nine, the highest of the multiplicands, is a multiplier larger than 2=*ŠU* used. A rare exception to this is the expression 8-*anki* 8 'eight times eight' KBo 53.47 obv. 1′–3′. Whether the regular writing with *-ŠU* for the multiplier in this construction always stands for the adverb in *-anki* is quite uncertain. Of the syllabically written numbered items used in these expressions only *kappin* is unequivocally singular, while *kištunaš*, *makitaš*, and *šarāma* are unambiguously plural.

---

31. The form 10-*anza* in 10-*an-za annan*[*ešḫi-*. . .] 'a set of ten *annan*[*ešḫi-*s]' KBo 24.11 rev. 10 could be the sg. nom. com. form of the suffix.

32. This use might particularly be expected in the later language; see Melchert 2000: 65 n. 36.

33. Buck 1949: 936 #13.31.

2=*ŠU*	4	= 8	$^{\text{NINDA}}$*wageššar*
2=*ŠU*	7	= 14	*ētri* $^{\text{Ḫ.A}}$, *kappin*, *paššilaš*, $^{\text{GIŠ}}$*GAG*
2-*iš*	8-*taš*	= 16	*kištunaš*, *makitaš*
2=*ŠU*	9	= 18	*šalakar*, NINDA.UMBIN.Ḫ.A, UDU.Ḫ.A
2=*ŠU*	9-*an*	= 18	$^{\text{GIŠ}}$*zupari*
3=*ŠU*	9	= 27	EME.MEŠ, NINDA.KUR$_4$.RA
4=*ŠU*	9	= 36	NINDA.ÉRIN.MEŠ
5.TA.⟨À⟩M	10	= 50	$^{\text{NINDA}}$*šarāma*

Sets of Two (Pairs)

9.39. When numbers of "pairs" of objects or persons were expressed, scribes wrote the number + *yugan* 'yoke, pair' (or logographically as number + *ṢIMDI*) + the noun in the plural: 9 *yugan* $^{\text{LÚ.MEŠ}}$*ḫunepiš* $^{\text{LÚ.MEŠ}}$*ḫalliyareš* 'nine pairs of *ḫ*-men (and) singers'; 2 *ṢIMDI* GUD.Ḫ.A *tu-ri-ya-an-zi* 'they shall hitch up two pairs/teams of oxen' Laws §166; 20 *ṢIMDU* ANŠE.KUR.RA.Ḫ.A=*wa*=*kan* [*k*]*arū parā neḫḫun* 'I have already dispatched 20 teams of (chariot) horses' HKM 19:21–22 (MH/MS). Some words introduced by 1-*NŪTUM* or number + *TAPAL* have meanings where 'pair' or 'team (of two)' would be suitable: Ḫ.UB.BI 'earrings', $^{\text{KUŠ}}$E.SIR.Ḫ.A 'shoes', $^{\text{(GIŠ)}}$*ḫuḫupal* 'clapper' (or similar concussive musical instrument), GUD.Ḫ.A 'oxen'. In these cases it is possible that some Hittite expression such as *yugan* 'pair, yoke, team' underlies 1-*NUTIM* or X *TAPAL*, rather than a number in *-ant-*. But one should not exclude the possibility that, as in Akkadian, 'pair' was simply conceived as a 'set (consisting of two)' (see §9.26, p. 159).

9.40. In many languages there are nouns referring to objects consisting of multiple parts that inflect only as plurals (the *plurale tantum* of the classical languages; see Latin *aedēs* 'temple' or English *scissors*, *pants*). In the case of the English examples cited, one always says/writes *one pair of scissors*/*pants*. Many such nouns in Hittite clearly are treated as *collective* plurals and are counted as described above in §§9.26 (p. 159) and following. On the other hand, there are also examples that appear to be inflected only as *count* plurals. These also are attested with 1-*NŪTUM* and *TAPAL*:[34] 1-*NŪTUM manniniš* 'one necklace', [x *T*]*APAL manniniuš* 'x necklaces'.[35] The contrast with 1-*NŪTUM ḫuḫḫurtalla*, also 'necklace' of some kind, shows that we cannot easily predict whether the Hittites viewed a particular composite object as a collective or set of discrete parts. Thus we do not yet know, for many examples attested as logograms with 1-*NŪTUM* and *TAPAL*, whether we should assume collective or count plurals.

34. Although we have no evidence that the Hittite equivalent in this case was the number suffixed with *-ant-*, this seems likely.

35. The formal singular *manniniš* merely reflects the fact that Hittite can use singular or plural with any number (§§9.21–9.23, pp. 158–159) and does not argue against the idea that 'necklace' is a noun viewed as a unit (or set) consisting of many parts.

Word Order in Counting

9.41. Numbers precede their head nouns. Exceptions are appositional: *n=ašta* URU*Ḫattušaš=pat* URU-*riaš* 1-*aš āšta* 'Ḫattuša the city alone (lit., as one) remained (loyal)' KBo 10.2 i 26 (OH/NS); [m*Ku*]*panta*-dLAMMA-*aš=ma=kan* LÚ URU*Arzauwa* 1-*aš ḫūwaiš* 'Kupanta-Kuruntiya, the man of Arzawa, fled alone' KUB 23.21 obv. 31–32 (CTH 143); *nu=mu=kan* m*Pittaggatalliš=pat* 1-*aš išparzašta* KBo 5.8 iii 31–32; to see that these are really appositional see the unabbreviated form in [(m*Tapalazunauliš=ma=k*)]*an* 1-*aš* SAG.DU-*aš išparzašta* KBo 3.4 ii 77; and m*Mammališ=ma=kan* 1-*aš* S[AG.DU-*aš išparzašta*] 'Mammali as the sole per[son escaped]' KBo 40.6 + KBo 14.7 i 6′; *nu=šši ANA* KUR URU*Kargamiš* URU*Kargamišaš=pat* 1-*aš* URU-*aš ŪL takšulait* KBo 5.6 ii 9–10; *nu=za ammuk* 1-*aš INA* É=*YA* 15,500 NAM.RA.MEŠ *uwatenun* 'And I alone led off 15,500 captives to my house' KUB 14.16 iii 20–21 (AM); *nu zik* 1-*aš ūnni* 'You drive here alone!' KUB 21.1 + KUB 19.6+ ii 69. It is also possible that 1-*aš* here stands for *šielaš* 'alone, single' (§9.61, p. 170). Note that all examples above are the number 'one'.

Fractions

9.42. The sign MAŠ (HZL #20, which may also be transcribed as ½) serves to represent the noun 'half', to which if needed the plural marker Ḫ.A (MAŠ.Ḫ.A or ½.Ḫ.A 'halves') or the Akkadian singular accusative phonetic complement -*AM* (MAŠ-*AM* or ½-*AM*) can be appended.

9.43. The underlying Akkadian noun is *mišlu*(*m*) 'half'. No syllabic writing of the Hittite word underlying MAŠ has yet been identified. All that can be determined at present is that it was neuter: *kuit* MAŠ-*AM ḫarzi n=at* KUB 20.99 ii 8–10.[36] Although the cuneiform writing system contained words and signs[37] for other fractions,[38] they are so far unattested in Hittite texts.

9.44. Attributive-adjective forms of the fractions may be found in the quantitative notations used following baked goods, which show the endings -*iš*, -*li*, and -*li-eš*. Eichner (1992: 89) plausibly suggests that these are fractional notations on the order of a

36. One example shows neuter *kuit* but *n=an* resuming: *nu* ZAG-*ni-it* [*QA-TI-ŠU*] *ku-it* ½-*AM ḫar-zi na-an-ša-an* D*IŠTAR-aš i*[*š-ta-na-n*]*i* ZAG-*az da-a-i* GÙB-*l*[*i-i*]*t-ta QA-TI-ŠU ku-it* ½-*A*[*M ḫar-zi*] *na-an-ša-an i*[*š-t*]*a-na-ni* GÙB-*la-az d*[*a-a-i*] KuT 53 ii 43–46 (ed. Wilhelm 2002a: 342–43). The same text just quoted for common-gender agreement has another example where assimilation of the sequence *nš* > *šš* shows a survival of OH phonology in an MH/MS text: *nu* [Z]AG-*ni*[*t QATE=ŠU*] *ku-it* ½-*AM ḫar-zi na-aš-ša-an* DIM-*n*[*a-aš iš-ta-na-ni*] ZA[G]-*az da-a-i* GÙB-*li-it-ta QATE=ŠU k*[*u-it*] ½-*AM ḫar-zi na-aš-ša-an* DIM-*na-aš iš-ta*[*-na-ni*] GÙB-*la-az da-a-i* KuT 53 ii 15–19. Although KuT 53 is an MH composition, not a copy of an older text, the unexpected resumption with -*an* (which contradicts the *kuit*!) may be due to a false resolution of a dictated *na-aš-ša-an*. The assimilated form *na-aš-ša-an* dictated to the scribe in two parts of the text would actually be from *na-at-ša-an* (see §1.111, p. 41). But confused by two possible sources (*n=at=šan* and *n=an=šan*), he resolved one instance falsely as *na-an-ša-an*.

37. E.g., ŠANABI 'two-thirds', KINGUSILA 'five-sixths'.

38. For the Akkadian see GAG §70 f–m.

'tenth', 'twentieth', or 'fortieth' of some unnamed unit of flour measure. There also exists in MH a form 10-*ti-li-iš* modifying 450 NINDA.ÉRIN.MEŠ (KUB 31.79:6, 17). This is undoubtedly the same suffix. If the dental is not part of the fractional suffix, it might reflect the *t* in PIE **dekm̥t-* 'ten' or an ordinal suffix **-to-*.

Ordinal Numbers

9.45. Only the following primary ordinals are attested in syllabic writings: *ḫantez-zi*(*ya*)- 'first' (declinable), *dān* 'second' (indeclinable). 'Second' is also written Akkadographically as 2-*NU-Ú* (i.e., Akk. *šanû*) or with cipher and Hittite complement as 2-*an*. The Hittite *t/damai-* (an extension of the stem *dā-* 'two') can serve as a declinable ordinal 'second' (Eichner 1992: 54, 57) but often means only 'another'.[39]

9.46. The form *āšma* is not the adverbial ordinal 'firstly', as used to be thought (HW and HW² sub voce; Eichner 1992: 43–44).[40] On the other hand, *dān* means 'second' (adj.) or 'secondly, thereafter' (adv.). It is *not* also a multiplicative ('two-times, double, twice').

9.47. The question arises: were the ordinals greater than 'second' declined? There are a few examples of ordinals in series, attested up to 'ten', all ending in *-an-na*.[41] But contrary to the claims of Sommer and Friedrich (e.g., HE §133 b), there is no Hittite ordinal suffix *-anna.* The alleged examples all consist of the ending *-an* and the geminating conjunction *-a* 'also' (attested in a series: '. . . also a second (time), and also a third (time)', etc.) (Eichner 1992: 62, 67, crediting Hrozný for this analysis). But in the attested examples, these ordinal numbers all modify the common-gender noun *zašḫain* 'dream' KUB 17.1 ii 4–11 or *ḫubrušḫin* KBo 5.2 ii 57–61, iii 1–12. There are no examples with neuter head nouns. This being the case, nothing proves that the final *n* is part of an ordinal stem or that the ordinals greater than 'second' did not decline.[42]

9.48. In a passage from the "Song of Kumarbi," 3-*ann=a=tta armaḫḫun nakkit* ^{D}*Tašmit* 'and thirdly I have impregnated you with the noble god Tašmišu' KUB 33.120 i 33, the form 3-*an* must be either a singular neuter used adverbally ('thirdly') or be indeclinable. The only other option—that it refers to the third deity—would require that it agree with the instrumental noun *nakkit* ^{D}*Tašmit* (which it patently does not).

9.49. Other numbers with *-an* complementation are probably not ordinals but cardinals; some if not all are of the "collective" type (see §9.30, p. 161).

---

39. Eichner 1992: 59 also derives *takiya . . . takiya* 'to one . . . to another' from this stem.

40. On the adverb/interjection *āšma* see §7.16 (p. 146). *āšma* provides no evidence for a stem *ā-* 'one' in Hittite.

41. Since in KBo 5.2 ii 57–iii 13 the series *ḫantezzin . . .* 2-*ann=a . . .* 3-*ann=a . . .* 4-*in . . .* 5-*n=a . . .* 6-*n=a . . .* 7-*n=a . . .* 8-*n=a . . .* 9-*n=a . . .* 10-*n=a* continues with 11*=ma* (intending 11-*an=ma*) . . . 12*=ma . . .* 13-*ma . . .* 14-*ma*, one could say that ordinal forms are attested even higher. But 10-*n=a* is the highest ordinal attested with the explicit complement *-an.*

42. Another example of agreement with a singular accusative common head noun is 3-*an* ŠU-*an* 'a third hand' KBo 9.79:6.

9.50. The forms ‘third’ *teriyan* (also written 3-*an*), ‘fourth’ (4-*an*), and ‘fifth’ (5-*an*) also existed in syncopated forms *terin* 4-*in* 5-*in* ‘third, fourth, fifth’ KBo 11.14 ii 15:[43] *ziqq=a* ^{D}UTU-*uš īt nu terin* 4-*in* 5-*in wēllui tūriya lā dariyantan tūriya=ma waršiyantan* ‘But you, O Sungod, go! And hitch (them) up in the meadow—a third, a fourth, a fifth (time): unhitch the worn out one, and hitch up the fresh one!’ The appearance of *-in* with ‘four’ and ‘five’ indicates that these ordinals also ended in *-i*(*y*)*an*, the *i* not being a part of the root of these numbers. This needs explanation. Either analogy with *teri*(*ya*)*n* is at work, or one has to posit an initial *i/ya* to the ordinal suffix (see §9.59, p. 170; and *šiptamiya*). The form of the ordinal numbers here is singular nominative-accusative used adverbially. ‘Thirdly’, etc., has the force of ‘a third time’. They are probably not accusative common-gender forms modifying the animal in question, because an unhitched animal, once given rest, would be re-hitched up, as the immediately following context indicates.

9.51. Logographic writings of time expressions such as UD.(numeral).KAM, ITU.(numeral).KAM, and MU.(numeral).KAM, and of one non-temporal word DUB.(numeral).KAM have an ambiguity that only the context can resolve: they can reflect either cardinal or ordinal numbers. Thus UD.1.KAM in one context may mean ‘one day’ and in another ‘day number one’. Similarly DUB.2.KAM can be either ‘two tablets’ or ‘tablet number two’ (= the second tablet). The original meaning of .KAM in the above constructions was the Sumerian genitive suffix *-*(*a*)*k* + the enclitic copula *-am* ‘it is’. This fused in writing as the single sign KAM. But Hittite scribes, ignorant of the real meaning of KAM in such constructions, abstracted from UD.1.KAM ‘first day’ or ‘day number one’ the discontinuous elements UD and KAM and created a new logogram UD.KAM ‘day’. By the same process they generated MU.KAM ‘year’ and ITU.KAM ‘month’, but not *DUB.KAM ‘tablet’. A second indication of their lack of understanding of the (NOUN).(NUMERAL).KAM construction was their generating by analogy with DUB.(number).KAM a writing *TUP-*(number)*-PÍ* ‘x tablets’ or ‘tablet number x’. Scribes also abstracted from the prefixed and suffixed determinatives of city names (e.g., ^{URU}*ḪA-AT-TI*^{KI} KBo 3.45:3′) a logogram URU.KI ‘city’.

Ordinals in *-t-*

9.52. The only candidates for ordinals in oblique cases with Hittite complementation seem to show a stem containing *-t-*: 9 MU.ḪI.A-*aš kappūwantaš* ^{D}*Alaluš* AN-*ši* LUGAL-*uš ēšta* 9-*ti=an* MU-*ti* ^{D}*Alaluwi* ^{D}*Anuš menaḫḫanda zaḫḫain* [*pa*]*iš* ‘For a mere nine years[44]

43. Noted as syncopated ordinals by Eichner (1992: 67–68), but with no comment on neuter gender.

44. The ‘nine’ years of these heavenly reigns could be understood as expressing innumerable years, since the number ‘nine’ is used in its symbolic sense of an incalculably large number (see Hoffner 2007: 377). See p. 161, n. 29. But it is not excluded in this one case, especially with the use of *kappuwant-* ‘countable, few’ (cf. *kappuwanta⟨š⟩* UD.KAM.ḪI.A-*aš* ‘in just a few days’ KBo 10.2 ii 17) and the asyndetically introduced following clause ‘in the ninth year . . .’, that the nine years are not ages but actual years and are meant to indicate truncated reigns. See Hoffner 1998b: 42 (‘for a mere nine years’).

Alalu was king in heaven; in the ninth year Anu gave battle against Alalu' KUB 33.120 i 12–13 (Song of Kumarbi, ed. García Trabazo 2002: 162–63 with n. 31, compare i 18 (9-*ti*=*an* MU-*ti*). See also: [(9-*an*-*t*)]*i* KASKAL-*ši*=*ma* 'but on the ninth time' KBo 10.45 ii 37 with dupl. This occurrence might show that the suffix was *-ant-*, but we cannot exclude the possibility that the *-an-* portion is the end of the number 'nine' and the *-ti* the regular dative-locative singular termination of a *-ta-* stem (perhaps an inherited **-to-*[45]).

9.53. The dental suffix—whether it is *-ant-* or *-t(a)-* —serves here to differentiate the final member of a numbered sequence from its predecessors. The ninth year is set off from the first eight, as is the ninth time the celebrant speaks, the conjunction *-a*/*-ma* marking the contrast. This is the expected function of an ordinal suffix in an older Indo-European language.[46] If, on the other hand, the suffix is *-ant-*, it would serve an individualizing or demarcating function analogous to its use with nouns for seasons of the year: as *ḫamešḫanti* ('in a particular spring') differs from *ḫamesḫi* ('in springtime = any spring').[47] In either case the function is that of an ordinal, and we classify these examples as such. For another view see Eichner 1992: 86.

Multiplicatives

9.54. As multiplicative *adverbs* in the meaning 'x-number of times' (for both temporal repetition and purely mathematical multiplication) we find numbers with phonetic complements in *-anki*[48] or *-kiš*/*-iš*[49] or written with the Akkadographic suffix *-ŠU* (GAG §71a). In the absence of contrary evidence we suggest that the Hittite suffix was *-anki*(*š*).[50] On possible *adjectives* in *-*(*l*)*iš* modifying bread names see §9.58.

9.55. Repetition focusing on the temporal aspect. NUMBER+*-iš šipanti* seems to be equivalent to NUMBER+*-ŠU šipanti* ('NUMBER-times'). This is particularly clear where the two writings alternate in immediate context: *nu* 3=*ŠU QATAM*⟨*MA*⟩ *memai* § [*INA*] 3 KASKAL-*NI*=*ma* 1-*iš kiššan memai* 'He/She speaks three times in the same way, but the

45. For PIE **-th$_2$o-* as an ordinal suffix see Meier-Brügger 2000: 219; 2003: 236.

46. See the description of the ordinal in PIE: "Den Ordinalzahlen kam im Uridg. . . . die Aufgabe zu, den Abschluß einer Reihe anzugeben (vgl. *Wir waren neun Nächte unterwegs. In der zehnten aber . . .*)" (Meier-Brügger 2000: 219).

47. See Goetze 1951: 469–70; followed by Melchert 2000: 58–61, 68–69.

48. The abbreviated complement *-ki* is known: 2-*ki pāi* 'he shall give twice/twofold' Laws §70.

49. The meaning of the form *a-an-ki* in KUB 4.1 iv 36, 38 remains unclear. Eichner (1992: 42–43; with incorrect citation as "KUB IV 2 iv 36, 38") interprets *ānki* as 'once', the reading for 1-*anki*. But the adverb *āšma* no longer provides support for *ā-* as a stem for 'one': see §7.16 (p. 146). On *šia-* as the stem for 'one' see Goedegebuure 2006. A sense 'an equal number of times' for *ānki* (see (LÚ)*ānt-* 'equal' [written hyperplene as LÚ*a-a-an-za*], as per Goedegebuure 2002: 64–68) does not seem contextually likely, and one would have expected a hyper-plene writing **a-a-an-ki* according to that theory. The most likely scenario is that the scribe twice wrote *a-an-ki* for 2-*an-ki.* The '2' and 'A' signs are quite similar, and the alternation of 'once' and 'twice' fits well in the context of dance moves.

50. One may compare for this alternation Greek πολλάκι/πολλάκις 'many times'.

third time (s)he speaks once as follows' KUB 30.15 + KUB 39.19 obv. 33–34 (Otten 1958 68–69). Likewise for NUMBER+*-anki*: ^{d}É.A-*aš* ^{GIŠ}*arašiyaš* 5-*anki ḫinkueni . . . nu ANA* ^{d}É.A 15=*ŠU ḫinkueni* 'We will bow five times at the *araši-* of Ea . . . we will bow fifteen times to Ea' KUB 33.106 ii 22–23. Such multiplicative numerals do not occur in clauses with imperfective (*-ške-*) forms. See for example: *āššu=ya* 3=*ŠU šarnikzi* KBo 6.4 i 5 (late laws), 3=*ŠU ḫarnikta* KBo 12.3 iii 5 (OH/NS), *nu=mu* LÚ.MEŠ ^{URU}*Ulma* MÈ-*ya menaḫḫanda* 2=*ŠU auer* KBo 10.2 i 34–35 (OH/NS), *nu=za* UD-*an* 2=*ŠU* 3=*ŠU ēt* KUB 1.16 iii 30 (OH/NS), 3=*ŠU ekuzi* IBoT 1.29 obv. 27 (MH). Exceptions occur when in addition to the multiplicative numeral a distributive expression also is present (see §24.12, p. 320), for example in *n=e=tta=kkan* MU.KAM-*ti* MU.KAM-*ti peran* 3=*ŠU* [*ḫalziškan*]*du* 'Let them read them (scil., the tablets) aloud before you three times *year by year*' KUB 21.1 + KUB 19.6+ iii 74 (NH). An indefinite relative form based upon the stem *maši-* 'how many' exists in the word *mašiyanki* 'however many times' (see CHD s.v.).

9.56. Repetition of sets in mathematical multiplication. Multiplicative adverbs meaning 'x-times' in the mathematical sense (i.e., 'two times [i.e., repetitions of] two is four') are also written logographically with NUMERAL + Akkadian *-ŠU* and with NUMERAL+*iš* or NUMERAL+*-anki*. Examples: 8-*anki* 8 'eight repetitions of eight (i.e., eight times eight)' KBo 53.47 obv. 1′–3′; [*kuwapi=ma . . . w*]*ātar ḫalkiya=ma=at* 10-*iš* 20-*iš naešḫu*[*t*] '[Where . . .] there is water, divert it to the crop(s) ten times, twenty times' KBo 12.40 iii 12 (= THeth 11:38 iii 6, OH/NS). Note that the ending *-iš* does not agree in gender or case with the noun *wātar*. It must therefore be a fixed (i.e., indeclinable) form.

9.57. The form 10-*pa* in ŠEŠ=*YA mal=wa=za tepu=ya Ū*[*L ša*]*kki* UR.SAG-*tar=ma=šši* 10-*pa piyan* 'My brother—he has not even a little intelligence, but valor is given to him ten times over' KUB 33.113 + KUB 36.12 i 35–36 seems to be a multiplicative.

9.58. Because any phonetic complement may exist in longer or shortened form, the shortened forms of two different suffixes may appear to be identical. It is therefore not certain that all numerals complemented by *-iš* are the same. Above we suggested that one group may be multiplicative and the same as forms showing longer complements in *-kiš*. But another line of evidence suggests shortened forms in *-iš* equivalent to longer forms in *-liš*. The sequence: 4=*ŠU* 9 ⟨NINDA.⟩ÉRIN.MEŠ 30-*iš* 2 NINDA *ḫarnantaššiš* 10-*iš* 2 NINDA GIDIM 10-*iš* 2 ^{NINDA}*wakiššar* 10-*li* 2 NINDA.ÉRIN.MEŠ 10-*iš adannaš* 9 NINDA.ÉRIN.MEŠ 30-*iš* KBo 21.1 i 3–5 shows the numbers 30-*iš*, 10-*iš*, 10-*iš*, 10-*li*, 10-*iš*, and 30-*iš*. The only number measuring bread weight or size that modifies a clearly neuter noun (^{NINDA}*wakiššar*) is 10-*li*. This suggests that the *-iš* forms are abbreviated for *-liš*, and that these are *adjectives* modifying the bread names. And indeed the following passage seems to confirm this theory: 10 NINDA.ÉRIN.MEŠ *ḫarpanza* 20-*liš* KBo 41.1b obv. 3. The theory is not without its problems: the *-iš* form is attested with ^{NINDA}*tunik* and ^{NINDA}*kaḫaret*, both of which *look like neuters.* And the neuter form in *-li* only occurs with ^{NINDA}*wageššar*, not with the other mentioned neuter bread names ^{NINDA}*tunik* and ^{NINDA}*kaḫaret*.

9.59. Hittite *may* have possessed another set of multiplicative adjectives ('twofold', 'threefold', 'sevenfold', etc.). This possibility is suggested by the fact that all factitive verbs in *-aḫḫ-* built to such adjectives exhibit a base ending in *-(i)ya-*, even for numbers whose stem in the cardinal form does not end in *i/y:* 3-*yaḫḫ-* 'to make threefold, multiply by three' (**teri-* + (*i*)*ya-* + *-aḫḫ-*), 4-*yaḫḫ-* 'to make fourfold, multiply by four' (< *me*(*ya*)*w-* + *-*(*i*)*ya-* + *-aḫḫ-*).[51] Two of the three factitive verbs based upon numbers known to date have this *-yaḫḫ-* ending (§10.9 with n. 11, p. 176). The exception, 2-*aḫḫ-* could either be a shorter variant of the longer complement *-yaḫḫ-* (compare the free variants SIG_5-*yaḫḫan*/SIG_5-*aḫḫan* and SIG_5-*yaḫḫir*/SIG_5-*aḫḫir*), or a factitive built to a special adjective 'twofold' not formed by derivation with *-(i)ya-*. This behavior would not be unusual typologically for the number two. An alternate account of 3-*yaḫḫ-* and 4-*yaḫḫ-* would assume that the former was built directly to the number *teri-* + *-aḫḫ-* 'to make three(fold?)', and that 4-*yaḫḫ-* is remodeled on analogy to 3-*yaḫḫ-*. This second account cannot explain *šiptamiya-* (name of a beverage), which directly attests a suffix *-(i)ya-*, if as usually assumed it is derived from the PIE cardinal number 'seven'.

Distributives

9.60. Distributives ('two each', 'four apiece', etc.) are expressed with the Sumerian suffixes -ÀM (signs: -A.AN) and -TA.ÀM (signs: -TA.A.AN) (HZL 274, sign #364).

Derivative Adjectives and Verbs

9.61. A "degenitival" adjective *šiela-* 'single; of one and the same' is derived from the genitive *šiēl* of *šia-* 'one' (Hoffner 2006). This word is the Hittite translation of Akkadian *ēdēnu* 'single, unattached; unmarried' in the lexical text KBo 1.44 + KBo 13.1 i 54 edited by Otten and von Soden (1968: 17). In its nominative plural form *šieleš* in Laws §31 (LH 40, 184), it describes the legal status of a free man and slave woman prior to their contracting a marriage (*n=an=za ANA* DAM=*ŠU dāi*). It is a necessary part of the "if" clause, because the focus of the law is upon the division of property when the marriage is dissolved, and this division would be affected if the man (for example) had another wife with legal claim to part of his property. Because of the equation *ĒDĒNU* = *šielaš* in the lexical text, we can assume that some form of *šiela-* was the Hittite reading underlying *ēdēnu* as a logogram elsewhere in Hittite texts. The same derivational suffix, *-ela-*, occurs in the adjective *apella-* 'the . . . of that one' (see §5.4, p. 133, and §6.2, p. 137). We also assume an adjective 2-*ela-* 'paired, in twos', literally '(they) of two' (see Hoffner 2006),[52] derived from the genitive of the number 'two' (2-*el*), show-

51. See Szemerényi 1996: 227–28, who shows the IE ordinal sequence **tri-yo-* and *k*^{w}*tur*(*i*)*yo-*.

52. *na-at-kán* 2-*e-lu-uš-pát A-NA* ^{GIŠ}MÁ *ša-ra-a* [*pa-a-ir*] (19) ^{d}GILGAMEŠ-*uš* ^{m}*Ur-ša-na-bi-iš-ša* 'And they—just (*-pat*) the two of them (lit., 'they of the two')—Gilgamesh and Uršanabi went up into the boat' KUB 8.50 iii 18–19 (NH). 2-*e-lu-uš* is a late Hittite nominative common plural, showing the regular nominative plural ending for *a*-stems in that period (see §3.16, p. 70).

ing the same suffix *-ela-* attested in *šiela-* 'of one, single'. The forms 1-*ela* and 2-*e/ila* represent an adverbial use of the nominative-accusative plural neuter of the same adjectives, meaning respectively 'one at a time' and 'together, as a pair, both'.[53] Examples: ^{LÚ}SANGA DUMU-*aššaš=a* ^{d}U ^{d}*Kataḫḫa* ^{d}x[ ] ^{d}*Telipinu* ^{d}*Ḫalkin* ^{d}U AN-*E* 1-*ela akuwanzi* 'The priest and the prince drink the Storm-god, Kataḫḫa, . . . (and) the Storm-god of Heaven one at a time' KUB 53.17 iii 10′–12′ (cited by Eichner 1992: 38 as Bo 2701 iii 12′); [. . . 2]-*ila=pat kar(ap)pianzi* 'The two lift [ ] together' (or 'They lift the two (nom.-acc. pl. neut.) [ ] together') KBo 17.30 ii 3 (OS, for restoration see 2-*ila* in ii 1); [. . . . . (-)*t*]*a* $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$SANGA 2-*ila* ^{URU}*Zuppara pānzi* 'the priests go to Zuppara in pairs (or 'both of them')' KUB 60.152 i 6; *n=at* 2-*ela ANA AB*[*U=YA*] *kattan uēr* 'And they came to my father together' KUB 19.7 i 8′–9′ (DŠ frag. 27, NH), *n=uš* 2-*ila=pat šakuwanzi* 'They *š.* (some form of punishment) them both together' KUB 13.9 iii 18. Although this suffix is not yet found on other numbers, there is *a priori* nothing to prevent Hittite speakers from having formed *3-*ela-* 'in threes', *4-*ela-* 'in fours', etc.

9.62. A likely derivative from PIE **sem-* is **šumuman-*, an adjectival derivative (see §2.47, p. 60) in *-uman-*, seen in the factitive verb *šumumaḫḫ-* 'to unite' (Rieken 2000b). For other factitive verbs based upon multiplicative adjectives in *-iya-* see §9.59.

Numbers in Compounds

9.63. In combination 'two' occurs in *tā-yugaš* 'two-year-old (animal)', and the ordinal *tān* 'second' occurs in the name of a cut of meat from an animal, ^{UZU}*dānḫašti* (literally, 'second bone').

Compound Numbers

9.64. Compound numbers are not the same as numbers in compound words. Rather they are quantitative expressions involving two or more mathematical units. In Hittite an example would be 6 IKU 5 *gipeššar* A.ŠÀ, where the larger unit is given first followed by the smaller one. From variant writings of the same expression we gather that what is sometimes written in numerical notation as (for example) 19½ *PA. šeppit* expresses what in the spoken language was 19 *PA.* ½ *PA. šeppit* (see HKM 111:11).[54] In other words, although the unit (*PARISU*) remained the same, the tally proceeded from whole numbers to the noun for the fraction, itself perhaps preceded by the cardinal number 'one' (*šia-*). This seems to be especially common when what is numbered is a unit of

53. The variation in vocalism in 2-*e/ila* is unsurprising if the Hittite stem was as expected **dwela-*: see AHP 144–45.

54. See also *n=aš* 2 DANNA ½ DANNA*=ya pennai*, 2 GÍN 1 ½ GÍN KÙ.BABBAR, *ŠA* 1 *UPNU* ½ *UPNI*, [1?] BÁN 5 *UP-NU* ½ *UP-NU* [. . .] KUB 58.49 iii 7; *parqašti* 1 SIG.KÙŠ ½ SIG.KÙŠ; but see: 2 GÍN 1 ½ GÍN KÙ.BABBAR KUB 29.39 i 11, 1 ½ IKU A.ŠÀ SBo I 2 obv. 12; 1 ½ *PA. ARTU* ^{GIŠ}*BURAŠI kinan*, where the 1 ½ is of a different commodity.

measure rather than a simple commodity. In expressions containing a whole number and a fraction, sometimes the Sumerogram for 'half' is preceded by the DIŠ sign ('one'), in which case 2 GÍN 1 MÁŠ should not be read as 'two' plus 'one and a half', but 'two plus *one* half.'[55]

55. Why otherwise is 2 GÍN 1 ½ GÍN KÙ.BABBAR *iya*[*tten*] KUB 29.39 i 11′ not written as 3 GÍN ½ GÍN KÙ.BABBAR *iya*[*tten*] or 3 ½ GÍN KÙ.BABBAR *iya*[*tten*]?

Chapter 10
VERB FORMATION

10.1. The finite verb form consists of a stem (a root with optional suffix) and an inflectional ending. For example, *laknuši* consists of: *lak* (verb root) + *-nu-* (causative stem-forming suffix) + *-ši* (pres. sg. 2 ending) 'you cause to fall down'. Hittite verbs use a single stem (which may undergo ablaut, see §3.37, p. 78) for all tenses and non-finite forms,[1] and all verbal categories are expressed by inflectional endings (for the endings see chapter 11).

10.2. Many verbs have root stems: *akk-* 'to die', *ar-* 'to arrive', *ar-* 'to stand', *ark-* 'to divide up', *eku-* (/ek^{w}-/) 'to drink', *ēpp-* 'to seize', *eš-* 'to be', *ḫan-* 'to dip', *ḫar*(*k*)- 'to hold', *kuen-* (/k^{w}en-/) 'to strike, kill', *kuer-* (/k^{w}er-/) 'to cut', *nāḫ-* 'to fear', and *walḫ-* 'to strike'. Some of these are ablauting: *akk-/ek-* 'to die', *ar-/er-* 'to arrive', *eku-/aku-*, *ēpp-/app-*, *eš-/aš-*, *kuen-/kun-*, *kuer-/kur-*. For their conjugation see §§12.2–12.17 (pp. 187–196). Many Hittite verbs, however, are derived from other verbs, from nouns, or from adjectives. Such verbs are characterized by suffixes or infixes which enlarge their stems. The most important of these will be discussed below.

Reduplicated Roots

10.3. Reduplicated verbal roots are encountered in Hittite (van Brock 1964; Oshiro 1995; Oettinger 1998; Rasmussen 2001). This verbal reduplication is of two types. The first shows reduplication of the entire root: *ašaš-/ašeš-* 'to seat' < *aš-/eš-* 'to sit', *ḫaliḫli*(*ya*)- 'to kneel' < *ḫaliya-* 'to kneel',[2] *ḫanḫaniya-* 'to be vexed(?), be dissatisfied(?)',[3] *ḫašḫaš-* 'to scrape', *katkattiya-* 'to tremble', *kikki-* < *ki-* 'to be placed' (see HED K s.v.), *kuwaškuwaš-/kuškuš-* < *kuwaš-* 'to crush', *laḫlaḫḫiya-* and *laḫḫilaḫḫeške-* 'to be agitated, anxious; mill about', *parip*(*a*)*rai-* < *parai-* 'to blow (a horn)', *partipartiške-* '?', *taštašiya-* 'to whisper' (onomatopoetic), *waltiwalteške-* (unknown meaning, perhaps 'to rage'). For this type of reduplication see EHS 120 and Raggi Braglia 1989: 208. The mineral name *kunkunuzzi-* may be derived from a reduplicated form of the verb < *kuen-* 'to strike', perhaps because this particularly hard mineral (basalt?) was used for milling

1. For possible rare exceptions see Melchert 1997c, but the evidence is sparse and debatable. See §14.9 (p. 233).

2. We include under this stem *only* the intransitive medio-passive form *ḫaliḫliyandāri* and corresponding iterative *ḫaliḫliskemi*. For the transitive verb *ḫaliḫla-* see below.

3. Compare for the meaning HLuwian *ha-ni-ya-* 'malicious'. The ˹˺ in front of transcribed Hittite words, as in the CHD, represents a pair of "marker wedges."

and pounding or required more than the usual amount of pounding to quarry. The stem *wariwarant-/uriwarant-* (< *war-*) 'burning' definitely shows a connective *-i-*.[4] Other instances of connective *-i-* are uncertain: the transitive verb *ḫaliḫla-* 'to flatter(?), + *arḫa* 'to put off (with flattery)(?)', is reduplicated from *ḫala/i-* 'to cradle (a child), to roll (a wheel)'.[5] If *ḫaliḫla-* is formed from the base *ḫala-*, then the *-i-* of *ḫaliḫla-* is like that in *wariwarant-*, but *ḫaliḫla-* could also represent full reduplication of the base *ḫali-*. If one connects *arrirra-* 'to scrape off' with *arra-* 'to wash' (both 'to scrub, rub clean'), it would also show a connective *-i-*.[6] The status of the first *-i-* in the three reduplicated *-ške-* forms *laḫḫilaḫḫiške-*, *partipartiške-*, and *waltiwaltiške-* is also uncertain. It could be a connective *-i-*, but it could also reflect mere copying of the stem-final *-i-* that appears before the *-ške-* (for which see §12.32, p. 204).

10.4. The second type, partial reduplication, takes several forms in Hittite: (1) reduplication with the vowel *e* in the first syllable: *wewakk-* < *wek-* 'to ask', *lelaniya/e-* 'to become furious', *šešd-* (< **še-šd-* with zero grade of the root **sed-*) 'to prosper' possibly from an earlier meaning 'to sit safely(?)';[7] (2) reduplication with *i* and zero-grade of the root (see Melchert 1984b: 98–100): *lilḫuwa-* < *laḫu*(*wa*)- 'to pour out (liquids)', *titḫa-* 'to thunder'; (3) reduplication with the vowel of the root: *ḫaḫḫarš-* 'to laugh' (probably also onomatopoetic), *papparš-* 'to sprinkle', *kukkurš-* < *kuer-* 'to cut up, mutilate', *kun*(*ni*)*kunk-* < *kunk-* '(?)', *pupušša-* 'to crush(?)', *kikkiš-* < *kiš-* 'to become', *lillipa-* < *lip-* 'to lick', *šišširiya-* < *šai-* 'to press (as a creditor)'. The examples with *-i-* could also belong to (2). The reduplication pattern in *mummiye-* (middle) (< *mau*(*š*)- 'to fall') is unclear.

10.5. Further research is needed to reach firm conclusions about the meaning and function of verbal reduplication in Hittite. The task is made difficult by the small number of attestations for most reduplicated stems. While an "iterative" or "intensive" value may be shown for some cases (Hoffner 1975: 139–40 and Oettinger 1998), this is not true for all (van Brock 1964: 144–45). There is no uniform pattern for the inflectional type of reduplicated stems. For reduplication in noun stems see §2.56 (p. 62).

---

4. The connective *-i-* is reminiscent of that in Sanskrit "intensives" such as *gánigam-* < *gam-* 'to go' and *kari-kṛ-* 'to make', for which see Schaefer 1994: 24.

5. The common denominator of the uses of the base verb is 'to grasp lightly with the two hands'. The precise meaning of the reduplicated stem remains elusive, but 'to flatter' fits the context of KBo 3.34 ii 21 and 'to put off (with flattery/excuses)' that of KBo 18.78 obv. 4 with *arḫa* (see a similar use of *ḫala-* in KBo 5.9 iii 9). For such a meaning from 'to grasp lightly with the two hands' compare English *to stroke* in the sense *to flatter* or alternatively the colloquial use of *to play* in *to play* (i.e. manipulate) *someone*. In any case, the derivation of transitive *ḫaliḫla-* from *ḫala-/ḫalai-* is confirmed by the use of the reflexive *-za* with both. We reject the widely favored derivation of (transitive) *ḫaliḫla-* from *ḫaliya-* 'to kneel'.

6. This derivation of *arrirra-* < *arra-* was suggested by Jay Friedman of the University of California at Los Angeles (in an unpublished paper delivered at the 2001 annual meeting of the American Oriental Society in Toronto).

7. Probably also *lelakk-* < *lak-* 'to bend, knock over' and *lelareške-* 'to soothe, conciliate', but these could also be read as *lilakk-* and *lilareške-* with *i*-reduplication.

Verbal Suffixes and Infixes

Overview

10.6. The verbal suffixes (and infix) and their known combinations:

	added to–			
Suffix	nouns	verbs	adjectives	function
-aḫḫ-	no[8]	no	yes	Factitive (‘to make . . . ’)
-āi-	yes	no	no	Denominative
-e-	yes	no	yes	Stative/Fientive (‘to be(come) . . . ’)
-ešš-	no[9]	no	yes	Fientive (‘to become . . . ’.)
-nu-	no[10]	yes	yes	Causative (‘to cause to . . .) (< verb) Factitive (‘to make . . . ’) (< adjective)
-anna/i-	no	yes	no	Imperfective
-ške/a-	no	yes	no	Imperfective
-šša	no	yes	no	Imperfective
Infix				
-ni(n)-	no	yes	no	Causative (‘to cause to . . . ’)

10.7. As deverbative suffixes, the imperfective suffixes *-ške/a-* and *-anna/i-* (hereafter, for simplicity, *-ške-* and *-anna-*) can be added to the verbal stems formed with the other suffixes listed and the infix *-ni(n)-*. Different imperfective suffixes co-occur: *-anna-* + *-ške-* in GUL-*annišket*, *ḫēwanešket*, *ḫuittiyanniškemi*, *peššiyanneškezzi.* Other combinations of more than one suffix are for semantic reasons relatively rare. The motivation for the exceptions is reasonably clear. One can combine the fientive suffix *-ešš-* and causative *-nu-*: *ḫatk-eš-nu-* ‘to cause to become narrow(ed), hemmed in’ > ‘to besiege’, *lalukk-eš-nu-* ‘to cause to become light’ > ‘to illuminate’. The causative *-nu-* can also be added to a stem with the imperfective suffix *-ške/a-* when the latter has a durative or habitual sense: *laḫlaḫḫeške-nu-* ‘to cause to keep running’ > ‘to gallop’ (trans.), *uške-nu-* ‘to cause to inspect’.

10.8. Verbs using all but one (*-anna-*, §13.25, p. 226) of the above suffixes inflect according to the *mi*-conjugation (see chapter 12).

The Individual Suffixes

10.9. The suffix ***-aḫḫ-*** is added to the stems of adjectives or numerals in order to produce verbs which mean ‘to make something what the adjective or numeral denotes’ or

8. Possible exception: *šiuniyaḫḫ-* if this is based on noun *šiuni-* ‘god(dess)’ instead of a postulated adjective **šiuni*(*ya*)- ‘divine(?)’.

9. See §10.14 (p. 178) for a possible exception: *ḫannitalwaešš-*.

10. The apparent exception *ešḫarnu-* ‘to bloody’ from *ešḫar* ‘blood’ may actually be formed from *ešḫariya-* ‘bloody’ on the model of *naḫšarnu-* ‘to frighten’ < *naḫšariya-* ‘to be(come) afraid’.

'to regard something/someone as (or declare someone to be, or treat someone as) what the adjective denotes'. See also §2.47 (p. 60), §9.59 (p. 170), §9.62 (p. 171), §10.6.

Adjectival Base	Factitive Verb
arawa- 'exempt (from)'	*arawaḫḫ-* 'to declare someone exempt from'
ḫantezzi(*ya*)- 'first'	*ḫantezziyaḫḫ-* 'to make first'
ḫappinant- 'rich'	*ḫappinaḫḫ-* 'to make rich'
**ḫaddul*(*a*)- 'healthy'	*ḫaddulaḫḫ-* 'to make healthy'
ikuna- 'cold'	*ikunaḫḫ-* 'to make cold'
idālu- 'evil'	*idalawaḫḫ-* 'to treat evilly; harm, injure'
kattera- 'inferior'	*katteraḫḫ-* 'to declare to be inferior, the loser (in a suit)'
mayant- 'youthful, vigorous'	*mayantaḫḫ-* 'to rejuvenate'
nakki- 'important'	*nakkiyaḫḫ-* 'to regard/treat as important'
newa- 'new'	*newaḫḫ-* 'to make new'
šarazzi(*ya*)- 'superior'	*šarazziyaḫḫ-* 'to declare to be superior (in a suit or a contest)'
3-*ya-* (**teriya-*) 'threefold'	3-*yaḫḫ-* 'to make threefold' [11]
4-*ya-* (< *meu-*, *meyau-*) 'fourfold'	4-*yaḫḫ-* 'to make fourfold' [11]

For a summary of the use of this very productive suffix see Oettinger 1979: 239–54. For the formal derivation of *ḫappinaḫḫ-* from *ḫappinant-* see §2.2 (p. 51).

10.10. The suffix ***-āi-*** is used to form denominatives from a wide variety of noun stems:[12] (1) from *a*-stems such as *šalpa-* 'excrement' (> *šalpāi-* 'to besmear') or ^{GIŠ}*tarma-* 'peg, stake' (> *tarmāi-* 'to nail down, fix'); (2) from a single *i*-stem *ḫaršanalli-* 'wreath, diadem' (§2.21, p. 55), itself a derived form in *-alli-* (> *ḫaršanallāi-* 'to wreathe');[13] (3) from *ai*-stems like *ḫalluwai-* 'quarrel' (> *ḫalluwāi-*'to quarrel'); (4) from *u*-stems like *lulu-* 'prosperity' (> *luluwāi-* 'to make prosper'), *iwaru-* 'dowry, inheritance share'

11. [3-*i*]*a-aḫ-ḫa-an-zi* 4-*ya-aḫ-ḫa-an-zi* KUB 9.4 ii 33, [3-*i*]*a-aḫ-ḫa-aḫ-ḫu-wa-ni* 4-*ya-aḫ-ḫa-aḫ-ḫu-wa-ni* ibid. 35. The 3-*yaḫḫ-* is fine for **teri-* 'three', but 4-*yaḫḫ-* poses a problem. One would expect **meuwaḫḫ-* or **meyawaḫḫ-* (i.e., 4-*waḫḫ* or 4-*yawaḫḫ-*). The adjectival base is probably derived from the cardinal by a suffix -(*i*)*ya-* (§2.35, p. 58, and §9.59, p. 170), which explains the *y* in 4-*yaḫḫ-*. Alternatively, the stem for 'multiply by four' may have been remodeled on that for 'multiply by three'.

12. We cite the suffix as *-āi-*. The long diphthong is not always expressed by plene spelling (see AHP 149). Since *Ca-*(*a*)*-e* is attested as a spelling for what assuredly is a long diphthong /a:y/ in nouns (*li-in-ga-en* and *ta-ma-a-e*), we assume consistently a long diphthong also for all verb forms with the suffix *-āi-*. That some OH instances of *-Ca-e-* (e.g., *tar-ma-e-mi*) represent uncontracted [Ca:_e] cannot be entirely excluded. See Melchert 1984b: 74–75 for discussion.

13. This exceptional example is due to the fact that the verb is modeled on the matching Luwian type formed from the *a*-stem suffix *-alla-* that took "*i*-mutation": see *ˀarkammanallawi* 'I make tribute-bearing' KUB 23.127 iii 6 in Hittite context < **arkammanalla/i-* 'tribute-bearing', attested in Hittite form as an *i*-stem *arkammanalli-*. But Hittite speakers surely viewed *ḫaršanallāi-* as derived from the *i*-stem *ḫaršnalli-*.

(> *iwarwāi-* 'to bestow a dowry/inheritance share'), *genzu-* 'pity, mercy' (> *genzuwāi-* 'to take pity on'), *išḫaḫru-* 'tears' (> *išḫaḫruwāi-* 'to shed tears'); (5) from *l*-stems such as *takšul-* 'peace, solidarity, alliance' (> *takšulāi-* 'to be allied, at peace') and *māl* 'intelligence, mind' (> *malāi-* 'to approve of'; see HED M 25–26, 76); (6) from *t*-stems such as *šawitišt-* 'weanling(?)' (or 'suckling(?)') (> *šawitištāi-* 'to wean(?)' [or 'to suckle(?)']; (7) from the oblique stem of nouns in *-šš*ar/*-šn-* like *ḫappeššar* 'body part' (> *ḫappišnāi-* 'to dismember'), *šaḫeššar* 'fortress' (> *šaḫešnāi-* 'to fortify'), and *elaššar* 'sign, revelation' (> *elašnāi-* 'to reveal'), etc.[14]

10.11. The suffix ***-e-***, like *-eš*š-, is added to adjectival (and a few nominal) stems to produce verbs which mean 'to be(come) what the adjective or noun signifies'. For the deletion of the suffix of the base adjective in some examples, but not others, see §2.2 (p. 51).

Adjectival or Nominal Base	Stative Verb
alpu- 'sharp, pointed'	**alpue-* (in *alpuemar*)
arawa- 'exempt (from)'	*arawe-* 'to declare oneself free (from)' [15]
**aršan*(*a*)- 'envious'	*aršane-* 'to become envious' [16]
ḫaššu- 'king'	*ḫaššūe-* (LUGAL-(*u*)*e-*) 'to become king'
lalukki- 'bright'	*lalukke-* 'to become bright'
maršant- 'false'	*marše-* 'to become false'
miyaḫuwant- 'old'	*miyaḫunte-* 'to become old, live long'
paprant- 'impure, guilty'	*papre-* 'to be proven guilty by ordeal'
parkui- 'pure, clear'	*parkue-* 'to become clear'
*GÉME-*a*/iššara-* 'female slave'	GÉME-*a*/iššare-* 'to become a female slave'

10.12. Watkins (1973), who identified this class of verbs in Hittite, called them "denominal statives," but recognized (1973: 67) that attested examples may have either stative or fientive meaning ('to be . . .' or 'to become . . .'). Hoffner (1998d) has shown that it is the fientive sense that predominates in Hittite and that, in those cases where both an *e-* and an *eš*š-verb exist for the same adjectival root, the former seems to have been replaced by the latter in the course of time (*arawe-* > *araweš*š-, GÉME-*a*/iššare- > GÉME-*a*/iššareš*š*-[17]).

10.13. The following are examples of verbs derived from an adjectival base by the suffix ***-eš*š-** which mean 'to become what the adjective signifies'. For the inflection of these verbs see §12.20 (p. 197).

14. For these classes and further examples see Oettinger 1979: 365–68.

15. For *arawe-* see LH 138–39, 219–20; and Hoffner 1998d.

16. For the original stem of this verb as being in *-e-* see *ar-ša-ne-e-ši* KBo 25.122 iii 2 etc. (OS) and Neu 1983: 28–29. The base stem is also seen in *aršanatalla-* 'envier' (§2.32, p. 57).

17. For the latter see n. 20 below.

Adjective or Noun Base	Fientive Verb
arawa- ‘exempt from’	*arawešš-* ‘to become exempt from’
ašiwant- ‘poor’	*ašiwantešš-* ‘to become poor’
ḫappinant- ‘rich’	*ḫappinešš-* ‘to become rich’[18]
ḫarki- ‘white’	*ḫarkešš-* ‘to become white’
ḫaštali- ‘brave’	*ḫaštalešš-* ‘to become brave’
ḫatku- ‘narrow’	*ḫatkuešš-* ‘to become narrow’
ḫatuka/i- ‘awesome, frightening’	*ḫatukešš-* ‘to become awesome’
idalu- ‘evil’	*idalawešš-* ‘to become evil’
mayant- ‘young’	*mayantešš-*‘to be(come) young’
mekki- ‘numerous’	*makkešš-* ‘to become numerous’[19]
parku- ‘high’	*parkešš-* ‘to become high’[18]
parkui- ‘pure’	*parkuešš-* ‘to become pure’
šalli- ‘large’	*šallešš-* ‘to become large, grow’
*GÉME-*a*/iššara-* ‘female slave’	GÉME-*a*/iššarešš- ‘to become a female slave’[20]

10.14. For the deletion of the suffix of the base adjective in some examples see §2.2 (p. 51). There is one apparent example derived from a noun: *ḫannitalwaešš-* ‘to become a litigant’ < *ḫannitalwa*(*n*)-.

10.15. Verbs formed by suffixing ***-nu-*** can be either (1) causatives of other verbs or (2) factitives of adjectives. See Sihler 1995: §455 (PIE *-*new*-/*-nu*-). Examples of the causative are: *arnu-* ‘to cause to arrive (*ar-*)’, *warnu-* ‘to cause to burn (*war-*)’, *linganu-* ‘to cause to swear (*link-*)’, *ḫarganu-* ‘to cause to perish (*ḫark-*)’, *waḫnu-* ‘to cause to turn (*weḫ-*)’. Sometimes one can hardly detect any difference in meaning between the root verb and the extension in *-nu-*: *paḫḫaš-* and *paḫḫašnu-* ‘to guard’, *tekkušš*(*i*)*ye-* and *tekkuš*(*a*)*nu-* ‘to show, reveal, present’. For the inflection see §12.44 (p. 210, paradigms).

10.16. Examples of factitives are: *mališkunu-* ‘to make weak (*mališku-*)’, *daš*(*ša*)*nu-* ‘to make strong (*dašš*u-)’, *šallanu-* ‘to make great (*šalli-*), magnify’, *tepnu-* ‘to make small/few (*tepu-*)’, *parkunu-* ‘to make pure (*parkui-*)’, *parknu-*[21] ‘to make high (*parku-*)’, *ešḫarnu-* ‘to make bloody (*ešḫar* ‘blood’)’. For the deletion of the stem-final *-u-* and

18. See §10.14.

19. The verb *makkešš-* ‘to become numerous’ < *mekki-* ‘much, many’ shows not only deletion of the stem vowel but also an alternation in the root vowel reflecting an archaic pattern with a zero-grade root **mk-* and inserted vowel.

20. For GÉME-*a*/iššare-, which was replaced in post-OH by GÉME-*a*/iššarešš-, see LH 43, 139, 185–86, 263 and §10.12 above.

21. Written *pár-ak-nu-* and *pár-ga-nu-*, indicating the absence of the apparent vowel before *-nu-*; see §1.11 (p. 12) on empty vowels in Hittite cuneiform.

-i- of the base adjective in most of the examples see §2.2 (p. 51).[22] On the derivation of *ešḫarnu-* see also n. 10 (p. 175).

10.17. The verbal infix *-ni(n)-* is inserted before the final consonant in certain verbs ending in *-k-*: *ḫark-* 'to perish' > *ḫarnink-* 'to destroy', *ištark-* 'to get sick' > *ištarnink-* 'to make sick', **šark-* > *šarnink-* 'to make compensation', **n(e)ik-* *'rise' > *ninink-* 'to mobilize, set in motion'. From the examples it is apparent that its force is causative or transitivizing. A similar value for the PIE nasal infix is seen in examples such as Old Irish *-roind* 'makes red' to a root meaning '(be) red'.

10.18. For the verbal suffixes *-šḫe-*, *-šša-*, and *-anna-* see chapter 24, "Verbal Aspect."

---

22. The verb *maknu-* 'to make numerous' < *mekki-* also shows the same alternation in its root vowel as in *makkešš-* (see n. 19 above).

Chapter 11
VERB INFLECTION

Types of Verbal Inflection

11.1. Hittite finite verbs are inflected for the person and number of the subject ("subject marking"), and for mood, tense, and voice.[1] There are also non-finite forms: verbal substantives, infinitives, participles, and so-called supines (see chapter 25).

11.2. Subject marking. Finite verbs are inflected in the usual three persons and in two numbers, singular and plural. Hittite has no dual ending. The finite verb is not marked for gender. Gender distinctions (common [or animate] and neuter [or inanimate], see §3.2–3.6, pp. 64–66) exist in the participle by virtue of its status as a verbal adjective.

11.3. The finite verb expresses only two **moods**, indicative and imperative (by convention, voluntative and exhortative first-person forms (§§23.4–23.5, p. 313) are included in the paradigm of the imperative). Modalities which in other Indo-European languages would be expressed by subjunctive or optative forms (*could*, *would*, *must*, *ought to*, *would like to*) are conveyed in Hittite by means of modal particles such as *man* (§23.10–23.16, pp. 314–316), or adverbs such as *imma* 'really' (see §19.8, p. 291; §26.10, p. 343; §27.4, p. 350) and *kuwatka* 'perhaps' (see §16.59, p. 255; §19.8, p. 291; §26.7, p. 342; §27.3, p. 349).

11.4. In the indicative mood there are two **tenses**, present (for present or future time) and preterite (for past time). In addition there are "analytic" constructions (like English *have/had gone* and *will go*) that explicitly express the present and past perfect and the future tense. The use of the present, the preterite, and the analytic perfect will be described in chapter 22 and the periphrastic future in chapter 24 (see also §§22.8–22.9, p. 308).

11.5. The finite verb is inflected for two **voices**, active and medio-passive. For their use see chapter 21. In the active voice finite verbs are inflected in one of two conjugations, the ***mi-* and *ḫi*-conjugations**, named for the endings of the first-person singular indicative in each set. The endings of the first- and third-person plural are identical in the two sets, while in the second-person plural all *mi*-verbs and most *ḫi*-verbs take *-ten*(*i*), while *ḫi*-verbs with stems ending in *-i-* take *-šten*(*i*). In all finite forms of both voices and all tenses and moods of the vocalic-stem verbs, endings beginning with a stop or with *ḫ* regularly appear with geminate spellings. Non-geminate spellings are either faulty of "simplified spellings" (see 1.10, p. 12).

1. For the optional explicit marking of imperfective aspect see chapter 24.

11.6. The following is the scheme of **endings** for the finite forms of the **active** verb. For medio-passive endings see §11.17 (p. 184).

	Present		Preterite	
	mi-conjugation	*ḫi*-conjugation	*mi*-conjugation	*ḫi*-conjugation
sg. 1	***-mi***	***-ḫi***, (***-ḫe*** in OH)[2]	***-un***,[3] ***-nun***[4]	***-ḫun***
2	***-ši***,*-ti*	***-ti***, *-šti*	***-š***, *-t*	*-ta*,[5] *-šta*,[6] (*-t*[7])
3	***-zi***[8]	***-i***, (**-e**)[9]	***-t***,[10] (*-š*)	***-š***, (***-ta***[11], *-šta*[6])
pl. 1	***-weni***,[12] (*-wani*[13]), ***-meni***,[14] (***-mani***),[13] (*-uni*)[15]		***-wen***, ***-men***	
2	***-teni***, (*-tani*)	***-teni***, (*-tani*), ***-šteni***	***-ten***[16]	***-ten***, ***-šten***
3	***-anzi***		***-er***, (*-ar*)[17]	

2. In OS rather consistently showing the *e*-vocalization (sign *-ḫé*); see Otten and Souček 1969: 56.
3. Used with consonantal stems.
4. Used with vocalic stems.
5. See *dātta* 'you (sg.) took' (MH/MS) and *paitta* 'you (sg.) gave' (NS).
6. Verb forms showing the *-šta* ending, either in sg. 2 or 3, are: *memišta* 'spoke', *pešta* 'gave', *ḫališta* 'cradled(?)', *tedašišta* (meaning unclear), *ulešta* 'blended(?), merged(?)', *udašta* 'brought', *unništa* 'drove here', *penništa* 'drove there', *uppešta* 'sent', *daišta* 'placed', *naišta* 'turned', *tarnešta* 'released', and possibly *aruešta* 'bowed(?)'. This ending is attested in MH/MS only in *memišta*. In other cases it is a NH innovation. The OS form *pal-ku-uš-ta* (CHD P 68) must contain a verbal stem in *-š*; Oettinger (1979: 333) has suggested **palkuešš-*.
7. Attested in *ḫi*-verbs in *-i-*; see *zāit* and *ḫalzait* in chapter 13 paradigms (§13.21, p. 223).
8. Since the sequence *šz* is elsewhere quite stable, the rare NH form *da-ma-aš-ti* KBo 5.9 ii 26 for expected *da-ma-aš-zi* may be just a scribal slip.
9. E.g., *wa-ar-aš-še* in KUB 29.30 iii 4 (OS).
10. This ending is spelled *-ta* in verbs whose stem ends in a stop or fricative: *e-ep-ta*, *e-eš-ta*, etc. (likewise when it occurs in the pret. sg. 2). Scholars disagree whether the final *a*-vowel is real or merely graphic. For the latter view see Pedersen 1938: 93, Sturtevant and Hahn 1951: 141, Kronasser 1956: 31, and Yoshida 2002; and for the former Eichner 1975: 79–80, Oettinger 1979: 9, 237, AHP 175–76, and Kimball 1999: 193–194.
11. This ending replaces *-š* in verbs whose stem ends in *-š*, e.g., *ḫāšta* 'gave birth' (OS), *wašta* 'bought'. See Oettinger 1979: 41.
12. The ending *-weni* can stand for either present indicative or imperative first-person plural. The two forms are distinguishable only by context.
13. For the endings *-wani* and *-tani* see AHP 138 with references to other viewpoints.
14. The endings *-meni* (*-mani*) and *-men* are largely confined to the *nu*-causative verbs, although one finds them also in *umeni* and *aumen* (from *au-* 'to see'). The use of the *m*-variants of *-weni*, *-wani*, and *-wen* after verb stems in *u* is phonologically conditioned (§1.126, p. 44).
15. There are enough attestations of this ending to suggest that it may be real and not merely the result of omission of the sign for *e*. See p. 192, n. 31, p. 207, n. 119, and p. 223, n. 43, and Otten (1969: 26), who adds *kar-aš-šu-u-ni*, SUD-*u-ni*, and *pa-a-i-u-ni*.
16. The ending *-ten* is can stand for either preterite indicative or imperative second-person plural. The two forms are distinguishable only by context.
17. For rare instances of an ending *-ar*, such as *ú-e-mi-ya-ar* 'they found' (from *wemiya-*), *ḫa-a-ni-ya-ar* 'they dipped/drew' (from *ḫāniya-*), and *ša-pa-ši-ya-ar* 'they scouted' (from *šapašiya-*) see Neu 1989a.

	Imperative	
	mi-conjugation	*ḫi*-conjugation
sg. 1	*-(a)llu*, (*-lit*, *-lut*)	*-allu*
2	***-Ø***, ***-i***,[18] ***-t***[19]	***-Ø***, *-i*[18]
3	***-d/tu***[20]	***-u***
pl. 1	*-weni*[12], ***-wani***[21]	
2	***-ten***[16]	
3	***-and/tu***	

11.7. The preterite third-plural person ending is typically spelled with the ambiguous IR sign (see §1.28, p. 20). Spellings such as *e-še-er* and *ú-te-er* with unambiguous *Ce* signs or *da-aš-ke-e-er* show that the ending is /-er/. We should therefore likewise read *pí-i-IR* from *pi-* (the weak stem of *pai-* 'to give') or *pé-eš-ši-IR* from *peššiya-* 'to throw' as, respectively, *pí-i-er* (beside *pí-i-e-er*) and *pe-eš-ši-er*. That is, the *-i-* in these forms serves either to indicate the stem vowel or a glide connecting the stem vowel to the ending *-er*. It is not intended to mark the IR sign as containing *-i-*.[22] Preterite third-plural active verbs ending in one of the signs NIR, ŠIR, TIR, KIR, or PIR should always be read with their alternate *e* vocalizations: *šu-un-ner* 'they filled', *e-šer* 'they were', *ú-ter* 'they brought', *e-ker* 'they died', *e-ep-per* 'they seized'.[23] For monosyllabic *dāir* and *pāir* see p. 224, nn. 48–50, and §12.41, p. 209.

11.8. In rare instances the pres. sg. 3 *mi*-conjugation ending *-zi* and the pres. pl. ending *-anzi* are written *-za* and *-anza* respectively: *e-eš-za* in KBo 6.2 iv 53–55 (Laws §98, OS) for *e-eš-zi* 'he/it is' in the duplicate KBo 6.3 iv 52–54 (OH/NS),[24] *ḫar-za* in KBo 9.73 obv. 12 (treaty with Ḫapiru, OS) for intended *ḫar-zi*,[25] *ša-ku-wa-an-za* (for *ša-ku-wa-an-zi*) KUB 13.2 iii 16 (MH/NS) (Melchert 1984b: 97), *šēpan iš-ḫi-an-za* (for *šēpan išḫianzi*) KBo 6.26 i 7 (Laws §158, OH/NS) with dupl. *iš-ḫa-a-i* (LH 126), and

18. E.g., *pa-aḫ-ši*. An example from the *ḫi*-conjugation is the imp. sg. 2 *tar-ni*.

19. This ending is confined to the *nu*-causative verbs (e.g., *parkunu-*, *šallanu-*, etc.), the imp. sg. 2 *īt* 'go!' from the unprefixed root *i-* found in *uezzi* 'comes' and *paizzi* 'goes' (see §12.42, p. 210), and the variant *uwatet* alongside expected *uwate* from *uwate-* 'to bring' (see §12.21, p. 199).

20. Old Hittite copies tend to use the cuneiform sign TU for this ending; later, the sign DU was preferred. This writing convention does not necessarily reflect pronunciation.

21. See *uwatten* ^{URU}*Nēša paiwani* 'Come, let us go to Neša' KBo 22.2 obv. 15 (OS).

22. Rare exceptions, such as *pé-eš-šer* from *peššiya-* 'to throw' do not invalidate the majority of the evidence, since forms of that verb such as *pé-eš-še-er* and *pé-še-et* indicate that the *e* vowel in *pé-eš-šer* was real. The forms *ḫa-a-ši-ir* 'they gave birth' KUB 21.38 obv. 60 (Hatt. III) from stem *ḫaš-* and *wa-aš-ti-ir* 'they sinned' BrTabl i 10 (Tudḫ. IV) from stem *wašta-*, both from late NH texts, are genuine exceptions. See also the atypical pres. sg. 3 *wašti* of this verb in §8.8 (p. 151).

23. The fact that HZL fails to list an *e*-containing value for some of these *Ci/er* signs is of no consequence.

24. See CHD *nakkuš* 'loss(?)' for discussion and literature.

25. See also another likely occurrence of *ḫar-za* for *ḫar-zi* in KBo 24.9:5′.

iš-tar-ni-ik-za for *iš-tar-ni-ik-zi* KBo 40.272 left 5′. Since two of these examples are found in Old Hittite manuscripts which do not elsewhere betray a sloppy copyist, it is likely that the writings with final *-za* for *-zi* reflect archaisms showing the regular loss of final *-i* in *-zi* from **-ti*, as in the ablative ending *-az* (see *-azzi=ya*; see §3.34, p. 77). But the single occurrence in *a-ar-aš-za* KUB 19.23 obv. 14 (NH) for intended *a-ar-aš-zi* 'it flows', cannot be an archaism. The usual ending *-zi* has its *-i* restored after the rest of the present verbal endings.

11.9. The imperative first-person singular is formed with the endings *-(a)llu*, *-lut*, or *-lit*, the latter two forms being much rarer than the first. The ending *-allu* clearly occurs in cases where the verb sterm ends in a consonant: *ašallu* (< *ēš-* 'to be'), *aggallu* (< *akk-* 'to die'), *šeggallu* (< *šakk-* 'to know'), *ḫaššiggallu* (< *ḫaššik-* 'to satisfy oneself'), *karšallu* (< *karš-* 'to cut off'), *tepaweššallu* (< *tepawešš-* 'to become less'), *uwallu* (< *au-/u(w)-* 'to see'). When the verb stem ends in *a*, one cannot detect the presence of the parenthesized vowel in *-(a)llu*: *memallu* (< *mema-* 'to say'), *udallu* (< *uda-* 'to bring'), *wemiyallu* (< *wemiya-* 'to find'), *kuwayatallu* (< *kuwayata(i)-* 'to be feared/formidable'). Imperfective stems in *-ške/a-* appear as *-ška-*: *ušgallu* (< *au-/u-* 'to see'). The ending *-llu* occurs with *nu*-causative verbs: *ašnullu* (< *aš(ša)nu-* 'to prepare'). The ending *-lut/-lit* is attested only for *ēš-* 'to be'.

Irregularities in the *mi*-Conjugation

11.10. There is a widespread intrusion of the ending *-ti* from the *ḫi*-conjugation during the NH period (see §12.3, p. 188; §12.8, p. 191; §12.20, p. 197; §12.33, p. 204). On rare occasions the pres. sg. 2 ('you . . .') ends in *-zi* instead of the expected *-ši* or *-ti*: *ištamašzi* 'you hear'[26] (the same form as for 'he hears') for normal *ištamašti* (with the *-ti* ending of the *ḫi*-conjugation).

11.11. In New Hittite (NH) compositions there is a marked tendency to replace the earlier pret. sg. 2 in *-š* ('you . . . ed') with the ending of the sg. 3 *-t*: earlier *ieš* (OH) and *iyaš* (MH) 'you did/made', but later *iyat*; earlier *šallanuš* 'you raised', later *šallanut*; earlier *paḫšanuš* 'you protected', later *paḫšanut*; earlier *aršanieš* 'you were envious', *tarkummiyaš* 'you announced', *šamenuš*(?),[27] and *memanušgaš* 'you were making (me) talk (imperfective)', later *tittanut* 'you made (something) stand'; earlier imperfective stem + ending *-škeš* (MH: *ḫatreškeš* 'you were sending', *daškeš* 'you were taking', *memiškeš* 'you were saying'), later *-šket* (NH). The form *pēḫuteš* KUB 30.28 rev. 12 (NS) is by context pret. sg. 3 'he led there' and is the result of late influence from the *ḫi*-conjugation on an otherwise *mi*-conjugation verb.

---

26. KBo 5.9 ii 16–17 *zik=ma=*[*an*] *ištamašzi*, see also iii 7; and KBo 4.3 + KUB 40.34 iv 31–32 *nu mān zik* ^{m}*Kupanta-*^{d}LAMMA*-aš ap*[*edaš menaḫḫanda*] *idalawešzi*.

27. *ša-me-nu-uš* KUB 31.112:11 (verb pret. sg. 2 according to Oettinger 1976b: MSS 35 99, noun according to Pecchioli Daddi 1975: 108–9).

Irregularities in the *ḫi*-Conjugation

11.12. In NH, *ḫi*-verbs with stems in *-i-* sometimes replace pres. sg. 2 *-tti* with *-šti* after the pres. pl. 2 in *-šteni*: *paišti/pešti* 'you give', *ḫalzešti* 'you call'.

11.13. In the pres. sg. 3, an ending *-ai* occasionally appears where one expects *-i*: *šipanti* and *šipandai* 'he libates, offers'.

11.14. Similarly, in the pret. pl. 3, *-aer* occurs alongside the more common *-er*: *šipanter* and *šipantaer* 'they libated' from the verb stem *šipant-*. Obviously, in forms such as *dāir* 'they took' the *a* is part of the verb stem, and the ending is only *-er*.

11.15. Conversely, the ending *-i* occurs in the pres. sg. 3 instead of an expected *-ai*: *waštai* 'he sins' (the more usual form, since the normal stem is *wašta-*) and *wašti* (which shows that the earlier stem was *wašt-*).[28]

11.16. The earlier ending *-š* of the pret. sg. 3 was replaced in later Hittite by *-šta*. See the paradigms in §13.13 (p. 219), §13.21 (p. 223), §13.23 (p. 224).

Medio-Passive Endings

11.17. The following is the scheme of endings for the medio-passive verb forms of the present, preterite, and imperative (for a similar table see Neu 1968a: 19). On the chronological distribution of the shorter and longer endings see §14.7 (p. 233).

	Singular	Plural
pres. 1	***-(ḫ)ḫa***, ***-(ḫ)ḫari***, *-ḫāri*, *-ḫaḫari*	***-wašta***, *-waštati*[29]
2	*-ta*, *-tari*, *-tati*	*-duma*, *tuma*, ***-tumari***, *tu(m)mat*
3	***-a***, ***-ari***, *-āri*, ***-ta***, ***-tari***, *-tāri*	***-anta***/*-anda*, ***-antari***, *-ant*/*dāri*
pret. 1	*-ḫati*, ***-ḫat***,[30] *-ḫaḫat*, *-ḫaḫati*, *-ḫaḫatti*	*-waštat, -waštati*[29]
2	*-at*, *-ta*, ***-tat***,[31] *-tati*	*-dumat*, ***-tumāt*** (?)[32]
3	*-at*, ***-ati***, *-ta*, ***-tat***,[33] *-tati*	*-antat*, ***-antati***
imp. 1	*-ḫaru*, *-ḫaḫaru*	*-waštati*
2	***-ḫut***, *-ḫuti*	*-tu(m)mat*, *-tumati*
3	*-aru*, ***-taru***	*-antaru*

28. N. Oettinger (private communication) has pointed out the same pattern in earlier *a-ar-ri* 'he washes" and later (*a-*)*ar-ra-i*.

29. Only in NH or NS texts.

30. In *paišgaḫat* in KBo 17.1+ iv 13 (OS).

31. In *kištat* KBo 6.2 ii 12 = Laws §37 (OS).

32. In *pa-iš-kat-tu-ma-a-a*[*t*?] KBo 8.42 obv. 9.

33. In *kištanziattat* KBo 3.22:46 (OS).

Verbal Substantive, Participle, Infinitive, and Supine

11.18. There are four non-finite verb forms: (1) the verbal substantive and (2) the verbal adjective or participle, both of which are declined; (3) the infinitive and (4) the supine, which are indeclinable. On their use see chapter 25.

11.19. In verbs that show stem variation the verbal substantive, participle, and infinitive are regularly formed from the stem shown by the present third plural: *ēpp-/app-* 'to take' > *appātar*, *appant-*, *appanna*, *ḫuek-/ḫuk-* 'to slaughter' > *ḫugatar*, *ḫugant-*, *ḫuganna*, *ḫandāi-* 'to prepare, arrange' > *ḫandāuwar*, *ḫandānt-*, *ḫandāuwanzi*, *ašaš-/ašeš-* 'to settle' > *ašešuwar*, *ašešant-*, *ašešuwanzi*, *pai-* 'to give' > *piyawar/piyatar*, *piyant-*, *piyawanzi*. For exceptions to this pattern see the respective paradigms in chapters 12 and 13.

11.20. The scheme of endings for the verbal substantive, participle, infinitive, and supine is as follows:

Set	Verbal substantive	Participle[34]	Infinitive	Supine
1a	*-war* (gen. ***-waš***)[35]	***-ant-***	***-wanzi***[36]	***-wan***[37]
1b	*-(u)mar* (gen. *-(u)maš*)	***-ant-***	*-(u)manzi*	
2	*-ātar* (gen. *-annaš*)	***-ant-***	***-anna***	***-wan***

11.21. Although the endings of the participle and the supine (*-wan*) are the same for all verbs, verbal substantives (forms in *-war, -(u)mar, -ātar*) and infinitives (*-wanzi, -(u)manzi*, *-anna*) have different sets. Set 2 appears on all monosyllabic *mi*-verbs showing vowel gradation (ablaut), e.g., *ēš-* 'to be', *ēd-* 'to eat', *eku-* 'to drink', *ēpp-* 'to seize', *kuen-* 'to strike, kill', *kuer-* 'to cut', *ḫuek-* 'to slaughter', *weḫ-* 'to turn', see §12.4 (p. 189). In addition a few monosyllabic non-ablauting (such as *dā-* 'to take' [see §13.11, p. 218] and *wak-* 'to bite' [see §13.1, p. 214]) and ablauting *ḫi*-verbs (such as *au*(*š*)- 'to see' [see §13.32, p. 228] and *pai-/piy-* 'to give') show this pattern. Set 1 appears on all other verbs. Some verbs switched classes over time and appear sometimes

34. See §4.97 (p. 123) for the paradigm of the participle.

35. Verbal substantives are commonly attested only in nominative-accusative and genitive case forms, but there may be rare isolated occurrences of other forms, such as the ablative *šallanumarraza* KUB 26.32 i 12 and the dative-locative ANA ŠA ^{D}U *šauwarri* KBo 11.1 obv. 8.

36. Plene writings of the infinitive ending, *-wa-a-an-zi*, are extremely rare; only two certain examples are known to us: *pa-ú-wa-a-an-zi* KBo 20.8 obv. 9 (OS) and *ši-pa-an-du-wa-a-an-zi* KUB 58.71 obv. right 14′ (late NS). A rare form of the infinitive ending (*-wanta*) occurs in *ši-pa-an-tu-an-ta*: *maḫḫan=ma* LUGAL-*uš šipantuanta irḫaizzi* 'But when the king finishes making offering' KUB 10.21 i 1–3. This ending is probably an archaic instrumental ending (see §3.35, p. 77, and p. 125, n. 223), which lends support to the view that the regular ending *-wanzi* is an old ablative < **-wen-ti* (Jasanoff 1973 and Melchert 1977: 411, among others). For another view, deriving it from a locative, see §3.25 (p. 74).

37. On the origin of the ending of the supine see §3.25 (p. 74).

with *-w/manzi* and sometimes with *-anna.* (See [possibly earlier] *šarranna* and NH or NS *šarrumanzi*; *šarra/e-* was originally a *mi*-verb but transfers to the *ḫi*-conjugation in NH; §13.13, p. 219.)

11.22. Verbs in Set 1 whose stems end in *u* (especially the *nu*-causative verbs) take the 1b endings, e.g., *arnumar*, *arnumanzi*, *arnuman*, *arnu*(*w*)*ant-*. Also *ḫi*-verbs such as *tarna-*, *penna-*, *unna-*, *arra-* 'to wash', *ḫašš-* 'to procreate', *šanna-* 'to conceal', *šarra-* 'to divide', *šunna-* 'to fill', *wašta-* 'to sin', and *mi*-verbs of the type *peḫute-* 'to lead there' and *wete-* 'to build' (see §12.21, p. 198).

11.23. The supine is usually (see §11.24 below) found in the *-ške-* stem: *ḫurzakewan*, *karpiškewan*, *uppeškewan*, *memiškewan*, *uiškewan*, *šanḫiškewan*, *miškewan*, *daškewan*, *walḫanniškewan*, *aruweškewan*, *tarḫiškewan*, *punuškewan*, *duškiškewan*, *uškiškewan*, *weškewan*, *šippanzakewan*, *ḫukkiškewan*, *ḫatreškewan*, *waluškewan*, *kururiyaḫḫiškewan*, *dameškewan*, *tešḫaniškewan*, *waḫnuškewan*, *ḫarninkiškewan*, *paišgauwan* (KBo 5.8 ii 5), *kappueškewan*. In all cases but *paišgauwan* 'go', *wēšgawan* 'weep', and *wiškawan* 'send', the stem is *-ške-* with *e*-vocalism.

11.24. Occasionally, instead of the *-ške-* stem, the verb in the supine takes the *-anna-* or *-šša-* stems: *īššuwan, piyanniwan* KBo 8.42 rev. 2–3 (OS), *eššuwan* (NS), *iyanniwan* (MS), *piddanniwan* (MS). At least twice it attaches to a reduplicated verbal root: *lilḫuwan daiš* KBo 32.14 iii 19 (MH/MS); [(*n=aš* DINGIR-*L*)*IM-iš*] *kikkiššūwan dāiš* KBo 3.67 ii 8–9 (restored by KUB 11.5 obv. 4). See §10.3 (p. 173). Quite rarely the verb shows no imperfective stem extension (Hoffner forthcoming: §129): *karipūwan dāir* 'they began to devour' KBo 3.1 i 21 (OH/NS), [(*šarriyawan*)] *dāir* KUB 24.8 iv 21–22 (OH?/NS) (restored by KUB 43.70a:2′), *tarḫūwan dāiš* KBo 3.7 iii 25 (OH/NS), *išparruwan da*[*i*(?) . . .] KBo 14.45:4, *ḫannuan dāiš* KUB 29.39 iv 8′; *pīyawa*[*n tiyaši*] KUB 14.29 + KUB 19.3 i 7 (AM 105). With the exception of the last-cited passage (Mursili II), these passages were copied from OH or MH archetypes. See too in MH/MS: *šapašiyawa*[*n dāir*] HKM 7:6. It is possible that in some of these cases the verbs themselves were felt to be inherently imperfective and needed no external marking (see Hoffner and Melchert 2002). Such might be the case with *karip-* 'to devour', *šapašiya-* 'to scout', and *išpar-* 'to spread out, trample'. But since others in the above list are actually attested with the overt imperfective marking (*šarriške-*, *tarḫeške-*, *ḫanniške-*), one cannot make this claim for them.

Chapter 12
CONJUGATION OF *mi*-VERBS

12.1. Hittite *mi*-verbs may conveniently be divided into those with stems ending in a consonant and those ending in a vowel. Among consonantal stems we may distinguish those without a suffix (so-called root stems), those with infixed *-nin-*, and those with suffixed *-eššˇ-*.[1] Root stems are subdivided into ablauting and non-ablauting classes (see §3.37, p. 78) for the notion of "ablaut"). Vocalic stems also may be classified as ablauting and non-ablauting types.

Consonantal Stems

Root Stems

Ablauting

Stems with *e*/*a* Ablaut

12.2. Some monosyllabic root stems (ending in a single consonant) show an alternation between *e* and *a* vocalism. This pattern reflects PIE ablaut between "*e*-grade" and "zero grade" respectively (§3.37, p. 78). The *typical* distribution is that *e* occurs in the present singular, preterite singular and plural, and imperative second- and third-person singular and second-person plural, and in the non-finite forms of set 1 verbs (§11.21, p. 185), and *a* occurs elsewhere. A similar distribution is seen in the ablaut of the imperfective suffix *-šˇke-* (see §12.33, p. 204). But there are exceptions to this pattern, and competing variants are found, e.g., *apteni* and *ēpteni* 'you seize', *appuen* and *ēppuen* 'we seized'.

12.3. Paradigms of root stems with *e*/*a* ablaut (*ēšˇ-* 'to be', *ēpp-* 'to seize', *ēd-* 'to eat', *eku-* 'to drink'):[2]

1. Factitive verbs in *-aḫḫ-* are *mi*-verbs only in post-OH. In OH they are *ḫi*-verbs (§13.6, p. 217).

2. The verb *šeš-*/*šaš-* 'to sleep' follows the same pattern. For attested forms see Oettinger 1979: 18–19.

	Present Indicative			
	Singular			
1	*ēšmi*	***ēpmi***	*ētmi*	*ekumi*[3]
2	*ēšši*,[4] *ēšti*† (NH)	*ēpši*, *ēpti*† (NH)	***ēzši***, [*ēzz*]*ašši*, *ezatti*†[5]	***eukši***,[6] *ekušši*, *ekutti*†[7]
3	*ēšzi*, ***(ēšza)***[8]	***ēpzi***	*ezazzi*, *ēzza(z)zi*, *ēzzāi*†[9]	***eukzi***,[3] ***ekuzi***, *ekuzzi*
	Plural			
1	*ešuwani*[10]	*eppueni*, *appueni*[11]	***ad/tueni***, *eduwāni*, *edue*[*ni*]	***akueni***, *akuwani*,[12] *ekueni*, *ekuwani*
2		*ēptēni*, *apteni*, *ēptani*[13]	*ezzatteni*, ***azzaštēni***	*ekutteni*
3	***ašanzi***	***appanzi***	***adanzi***, ***atanzi***, *atānzi*	***aku(w)anzi***, *eku(w)anzi*

3. We follow others in assuming that this stem ends in a labiovelar consonant /g^{w}/, not a sequence /gu/. As per Lindeman 1965, the crucial evidence is given by the first-person plural forms *a-ku-e-ni* and *e-ku-en*. If the stem were */agu-/ ~ */egu-/, the first-person plural forms would be **a-ku-me-ni* and **e-ku-me-en* (§1.126, p. 44). The attested first-person plural forms represent rather /agweni/ and /egwen/, with loss of the labial articulation of the labiovelar before /w/. Based on the evidence of the first-person plural forms, we may also view the variant OS spellings *e-uk-* beside *e-ku-* as attempts to write /eg^{w}-/, not as evidence for metathesis (of a nonexistent */egu-/ to */eug-/). HED E/I 262 lists *e-ú-uk-zi* from unpubl. text Bo 2692 V 23, cited by Singer 1975: 90.

4. The OS forms *e-eš-ši* and *e-eš-zi* belong to the verb 'to be sitting', not the verb 'to be'. See §28.30 (p. 362).

5. For the stem as *ez-*/*az-* before *-t-* see §1.125 (p. 44).

6. OH only. See n. 3 above.

7. For intrusive *-ti* see §11.10 (p. 183).

8. Rare variant *e-eš-za* in Laws §97, copy A (OS). Neu (StBoT 26:39) lists *i-eš-zi* as pres. sg. 3 of 'to be', based on [ ] / *ku-iš-ki i-eš-zi* [ ] in KUB 34.115 iii 5 (OS; see for text StBoT 26:368). The broken context leaves the identification uncertain. If it is correct, the unusual spelling *might* reflect a pronunciation [k^{w}iski(y) e:stsi] with an inserted yod, but all solid examples of such insertions involved clitics (see §1.143, p. 49, end).

9. For the source of the form *ēzzazzi* and its pronunciation as /e:ts.tsi/ see §1.125 (p. 44). In later Hittite the stem in /e:ts-/ was generalized, and in the process the verb was transferred to the *ḫi*-conjugation (hence *ēzzai*, *ēzzaš*, *ēzza*).

10. Written *e-šu-wa-ni* KUB 44.60 ii 1, HED E/I 285, HW^{2} 2:93b; no form **ešweni* (**e-šu-e-ni*) is attested yet. On the variant endings *-wani* and *-tani* see §1.69 (p. 31). Based on /agweni/ (see n. 3 above) and kuewen < **kuenwen* (§12.6), we assume likewise /eswani/, /e:pweni/, etc., with sequences of consonant plus /w/. However, pronunciations /esuwani/ or /e:puweni/ cannot be definitively excluded (§1.143, p. 49).

11. Written *e-ep-pu-u-e-ni* and *ap-pu-ú-e-ni* respectively, the latter in KUB 35.18 i 7. See Puhvel, HED E/I 275.

12. The forms *a-ku-e-ni* and *a-ku-wa-ni* 'we drink' with single *-k-* are not to be confused with *ak-ku-u-e-ni* 'we die' with geminate *-kk-*. In *a-ku-e-ni*/*a-ku-wa-ni* the labial component in the labiovelar is lost before the *-w-* of the ending.

13. HKM 57:33 (MH), not booked in HED or HW^{2}.

	Preterite Indicative			
	Singular			
1	*ešun*	***ēppun***	*edun*	*ekun*
2	*ēšta*[14]	*ēpta*[15]	*ezatta*	*ekutta*
3	***ēšta***	***ēpta***	*ēzta*, *ezatta*, *ēzatta*, *ezzaš*, *ezzašta*	***eukta***, *ekutta*
	Plural			
1	*ešuen*	*ēppuen*, *appuen*	*eduen*[16]	*ekuen*
2	*ēšten*[17]	*ēpten*		
3	***ešer***[18]	***ēpper***	*eter*	*ekuer*

	Imperative			
	Singular			
1	*ēšlut*, *ēšlit*, *ašallu*			
2	***ēš***	*ēp*	*ēd*, *ēzza*	*eku*
3	*ēšdu*, ***ēštu***[19]	***ēptu***, *ēpdu*	***ēzdu***, *ezzaddu*, *ezzašdu*	***ekuddu***
	Plural			
2	*ēšten*	*ēpten*	***ēzten***, *ezatten*, *ēzzašten*	***ekutten***
3	***ašantu***, ***ašandu***	***appantu***, *appandu*	*adandu*, *ēzzandu*	*aku(w)andu*

12.4. Verbal substantive: (class 1) *ešuwar*, (class 2) *appātar*, *adātar*, *akuwātar* (see §3.31, p. 76; §§11.20–11.21, p. 185; and §25.2, p. 330). Infinitive (class 2): *appanna* (with rarer class 1 *eppuwanzi*), ***adanna***, ***aku(w)anna***.[20] Participle: *ašant-*, *appant-*/***appānt-***, *akuwant-*. Imperfective: ***appiške-***, *azzi(k)ke-*, ***akkuške-***; this class does not select the imperfective suffix *-anna-*. See §13.25 (p. 226).

14. KBo 4.14 ii 8, KBo 5.9 i 16.

15. KUB 14.1 rev. 23 (MH/MS).

16. Written *e-du-u-en* 477/u 13.

17. The second-person plural ending is spelled exclusively *-te-en* in OS, *-te-en* or *-tén* thereafter. We ignore this difference in the paradigm entries.

18. Written *e-še-er* and *e-šer*, both already in OS.

19. OS written *e-eš-tu*. In NS also spelled *e-eš-tu*$_4$. See §1.24 (p. 19).

20. KBo 25.72:26 [*a-k*]*u-wa-an-na ú-e-ek-zi*. Despite the question mark on 'ah?' in Konk., the on-line photo shows without question that this is OS. Although it is the only example with *w* in OS to date, it must be admitted.

Stems with *ue*/*u* Ablaut

12.5. Three Hittite verbs reflect PIE *e*-grade vs. zero-grade ablaut (§3.37, p. 78) as *ue* vs. *u*. As attested, these verbs show *ue* in all finite forms except the present and imperative plural third-person. The latter show *u*, as do the non-finite forms.[21] In the verb *kuen-* 'to strike, hit, kill' the final *n* of the stem usually[22] is lost when followed by the *w*, *m*, and *š* which begin some verbal endings: *kuemi*, *kueši*, *kuewen*, imperf. *kuwaške-*. The origin of the variant stem *kuenn*V- remains unclear.

12.6. Paradigms of the monosyllabic *mi*-verbs containing the sequence *-ue-* (*kuen-* 'to strike', *kuer-* 'to cut', *ḫuek-* 'to exorcise'[23]):

	Present Indicative					
	Singular			Plural		
1	*kuemi*	*kuermi*	*ḫuekmi*, *ḫukmi*	*kuennummeni*		*ḫuekuwani*
2	***kueši***, *kuenti*,† *kueti*†			*kuenatteni*		
3	***kuēnzi***, *kuenzi*	*kuēr̄zi*[24]	***ḫuēkzi***, *ḫūkzi*	***kunanzi***, *kuennanzi*	*kuranzi*	*ḫūkanzi*

	Preterite Indicative					
	Singular			Plural		
1	*kuenun*, *kuenununun*	***kuerun***[25]		*kuewen*, *kuinnummen*		*ḫugawen*[26]
2	*kuinnešta*,† *kuenta*[27]			*kuenten*		
3	***kuēnta***, *kuenta*, *kuinta*	*kuērta*, *kuerta*	*ḫuekta*	*kuener*, *kuēn̄ner*[28]	*kuerer*	

21. Strictly speaking, in the verbs *ḫuek-* 'to slaughter' and *ḫuek-* 'to exorcise' *ḫue-* represents an initial sequence of /h/ and /w/, while *kuen-* 'to strike' and *kuer-* 'to cut' probably show a single initial labiovelar /k^{w}-/, but for all practical purposes all these verbs pattern alike.

22. A different treatment is seen in *kuennummeni* (NH) for expected **kueweni*, and *kuinnummen* (NH) for the attested variant *kuewen.*

23. The verb *ḫuek-* 'to slaughter' shows forms homophonous with those of 'to exorcise' except in the *-ške-* stem, where 'to exorcise' has consistent geminate *k* versus a usual non-geminate in 'to slaughter' (but note *ḫukkiškanzi* 'they slaughter' in KUB 9.3 iv 7). Attested forms of the latter verb are: ***ḫuēkmi/ḫuekmi***, *ḫuēkzi*/***ḫuekzi***, *ḫūkzi*/*ḫukzi*, ***ḫuēkku*[*eni*?]**, *ḫūkanzi*/***ḫukanzi***, pret. sg. 3 ***ḫuēkta***/*ḫuekta*, *ḫuekdu*, *ḫūganna*, ***ḫugant-***/*ḫūkant-*, *ḫuganniwan*.

24. The form *ku-er-ri* in KUB 24.12 iii 19 is faulty. The online photo in Konk. shows extraneous wedges: the RI is apparently written over an erased sign.

25. KBo 17.23 obv? 6′ (OS) *ku-e-ru-u*[*n*?] or (less likely) *ku-e-ru-e?-n*[*i?*], *ku-e-ru-un* 315/u 6, cited by HED K 213. The status of the pret. sg. 1 *kuēršun* in KBo 10.2 ii 48 remains unclear. See Oettinger 1979: 119 vs. HED K 217–18.

	Imperative						
	Singular				Plural		
2	*kueni*, *kuenni*				*kuenten*		
3	*kuendu*, *kuindu*	*kuērdu*	*ḫuekdu*		*kunandu*	*kurandu*	

12.7. Verbal substantive: *kue*(*n*)*numar*, *ḫūkātar*. Infinitive: *ḫūganna*, *kuranna*, *kunanna*, and *kuennummanzi* (§3.31, p. 76; §§11.20–11.21, p. 185; and §25.2, p. 330). Participle: *ḫūgant-*, *kunant-*, *kurant-*. Imperfective: *kuwaršk*e- (*ku-wa-ar-aš-ki-iz-zi* 169/x i 7 cited in Oettinger 1979: 119), *kureške-* (from *kuer-*), *ku*(*w*)*aške-* (from *kuen-*), *ḫūkkiške-*/*ḫukkiške-*. See also (*u*)*wanšikanzi* 'they fuck' from *wen-* 'to fuck'. The imperfectives *kuwaršk*e- and *kuwaške-* are the older forms, of which *kureške-* is a NH "regularization." The *kuwar-*, *kuwa*(*n*)- stem is the outcome of the zero-grade form of the root, as is *ḫuk-*/*ḫūk-* (see §3.37, p. 78; §12.2, p. 187). This class does not select the imperfective suffix *-anna-* (see §13.25, p. 226) except for *ḫuek-* 'to slaughter', which shows a supine *ḫuganniwan*.

Non-Ablauting

12.8. Many *mi*-conjugation consonantal root stems are non-ablauting. These include *na*(*ḫ*)*ḫ-* 'to fear' and virtually all monosyllabic stems ending in a sequence of two consonants: *walḫ-* 'to strike', *šanḫ-* 'to seek', *ḫark-* 'to perish', *ištark-* 'to get sick', *karp-* 'to lift', *link-* 'to swear', *warp-* 'to bathe', *kurk-* 'to store', *šalk-* 'to knead', *parḫ-* 'to chase', *ḫarp-* 'to associate (with)'. For syllabary limitations in expressing sequences of three consonants see §1.11 (p. 12). In order to express precisely the spelling of verbs with such sequences we have used narrow transliteration instead of the usual broad transcription in the following paradigms.

	Present Indicative			
	Singular			
1	*na-aḫ-mi*	*wa-al-aḫ-mi*	*ša-an-aḫ-mi*	*kar-ap-mi*
2	*na-aḫ-ti* †	*wa-la!-aḫ-ši*	*ša-an-ḫa-ši*, *ša-an-aḫ-ti*,† *ša-an-ḫa-ti*,† *ša-an-ḫa-at-ti*,† *ša-na-aḫ-ti* †	*kar-ap-ši*
3	*na-aḫ-zi*, *na-a-ḫi*,† *na-ḫi*,† *na-a-ḫi-i* †[29]	***wa-la-aḫ-zi***, ***wa-al-aḫ-zi***, *u-wa-al-aḫ-zi*	***ša-aḫ-zi***,[30] *ša-an-aḫ-zi*	***kar-ap-zi***

26. This form is analogical to the preterite first-person plural forms of the *-ā*(*i*)- verbs, e.g., *ḫandāwen*.

27. *kuinnešta* KUB 17.3 iii 4 (NH), *kuenta* KUB 14.1 rev. 23 (MH/MS).

28. Written *ku-e-ne-er* and *ku-e-ner*, *ku*-(*e*)-*en-ne-er* and *ku-en-ner*.

29. Also written logographically as ḪUŠ-*ḫi*. Some of these forms were booked as imperatives in CHD L–N s.v. But since the sg. 3 *na-a-ḫi*, attested already in the early language, probably indicates that this

	Present Indicative			
	Plural			
1	*na-a-ḫu-u-e-ni*, ḪUŠ-*u-ni*[31]	*wa-al-ḫu-u-e-ni*, *wa-al-aḫ-ḫu-e-ni*, *wa-al-ḫu-wa-ni*	[*ša-a*]*n-ḫu-e-ni*[32]	
2	*na-aḫ-te-e-ni*	*wa-al-aḫ-ta-ni*	*ša-an-aḫ-te-ni*, *ša-an-ḫa-te-ni*, *ša-an-ḫa-at-te-ni*	
3		***wa-al-ḫa-an-zi***	*ša-an-ḫa-an-zi*, *ša-an-ḫa-a-an-zi*, *ša-a-ḫa-an-zi*, *ša-a-an-ḫa-an-zi*, *ša-an-aḫ-ḫa-an-zi*	***kar-pa-an-zi***, *kar-ap-pa-an-zi*, *kar-(ap-)pí-an-zi*

	Preterite Indicative			
	Singular			
1	*na-a-ḫu-un*, *na-aḫ-ḫu-un*	***wa-al-ḫu-un***	*ša-an-ḫu-un*, *ša-aḫ-ḫu-un*, *ša-anaḫ-ḫu-un*	*kar-ap-pu-un*
3	*na-aḫ-ta*	*wa-al-aḫ-ta*	***ša-aḫ-ta***,[30] *ša-an-aḫ-ta*, *ša-an-na-aḫ-ta*	***ka-ra-ap-ta***,[33] *kar-ap-ta*
	Plural			
1		*wa-al-ḫu-u-en*		
2		*wa-al-aḫ-tén*	*ša-an-aḫ-tén*	*kar-ap-tén*
3		*wa-al-ḫe-er*	*ša-an-ḫe-er*	*kar-pé-er*

	Imperative			
	Singular			
2		*wa-al-aḫ*	*ša-a-aḫ*, *ša-an-ḫa*	*kar-ap*
3		*wa-al-aḫ-du*	*ša-aḫ-du*	***kar-ap-du***

verb was originally a *ḫi*-verb, *nāḫi* in *lē=ta nāḫi* is the regular indicative third-person singular with the *ḫi*-conjugation ending in an impersonal construction: 'Let there not be a fearing to you'. This interpretation avoids both the irregular use of imperative + *lē* and the unparalleled use of a singular enclitic personal pronoun as a reflexive.

30. For the loss of *-n-* see §1.135 (p. 46).

31. KUB 5.2:6, 10, 15 (div., NH); could be an error for ḪUŠ-*u-e-ni* or an example of a real ending *-uni*; see p. 181, n. 15, with references.

32. HKM 48:25 (MH/MS), see Hoffner 1997b. Accidentally omitted in CHD Š 163 top left.

33. *ka-ra-ap-ta* KUB 36.49 i 8 (OS).

	Imperative			
	Plural			
1				
2		***wa-al-aḫ-tén***	***ša-a-aḫ-tén*, *(ša-an-ḫa-at-tén)***	*kar-ap-tén*
3		***wa-al-ḫa-an-du***	***ša-an-ḫa-an-du***	

12.9. Verbal substantive: *na-a-ḫu-u-wa-aš* and *na-aḫ-ḫu-u-wa-aš* (gen.). Infinitive: *wa-al-ḫu-wa-an-zi*, *ša-an-ḫu-wa-an-zi*, *kar-pu-wa-an-zi*. Participle: *naḫḫant-*[34], *walḫant-*, *šanḫant-*, ***karpant-***. Imperfective: *naḫḫeške-*, *walḫi/eške-*, ***walḫanna/i-***, ***šanḫiške-***, *šanḫeške-*, *karpi/eške-*.

12.10. The verb *ḫar*(*k*)- 'to hold, have' is exceptional in that it deletes the final *-k-* before endings beginning with a consonant,[35] while the verbs *maz-* (< **mat-*)[36] and *išpart-* show the same dissimilation as *et-* (§1.125, p. 44):

	Present Indicative		
	Singular		
1	*ḫarmi*		
2	***ḫarši***, *ḫarti* †	*ma-za-at-ti* †	
3	***ḫarzi***, ***ḫarza***[37]	*mazza(z)zi*, *manzazzi*, ***mazze*** †, *mazzi* †	*išparzazi*, ***išparzizi***,[38] *išparzai* †,[39] *išparzaizzi*, *išpartīēzzi*[40]
	Plural		
1	*ḫarueni*,[41] *ḫarwani*	*mazzueni*[42]	
2	***ḫartenī***[43]		
3	*ḫarkanzi*		

34. Sg. neut. *naḫḫān*.

35. For divergent historical accounts of this pecularity see Watkins 1970: 71 and Cowgill cited by Eichner 1975: 90. False HED H 156.

36. The verb stem is written *maz-* here and in the CHD, because the dissimilation has spread in this word to all environments (e.g., pl. 1 *ma-az-zu-u-e-ni*), leaving no attested example of **mat-*. The appearance of *mazze* in OS shows that in this verb the spread of the stem *mazz-* and transfer to the *ḫi*-conjugation began already in OH. See p. 188, n. 9.

37. KBo 9.73+ obv. 12 (OS).

38. Written *iš-pa-ar-zi-zi* KUB 4.72 rev. 5 (OS).

39. The *išparzazi* writings are attested in MH. The *ḫi*-conjugation form *išparzai* does not occur before NH.

40. For the present third-person singular forms see Kühne and Otten 1971: 42.

41. Written *ḫar-u-e-ni*, *ḫar-ú-e-ni*, and *ḫar-u-en*, not **ḫa-ru-e-ni* and **ḫa-ru-en*.

42. Written *ma-az-zu-u-e-ni*.

43. KBo 22.1:31 (OS). This example shows lengthening of the final syllable vowel as part of interrogative intonation/stress (see §27.2, p. 348).

	Preterite Indicative		
	Singular		
1	*ḫarkun*		*išparzaḫḫun* †[44]
2	*ḫarta*	*mazzašta*[45]	*išparzašta*[46]
3	*ḫarta*	*ma(z)zašta*	***išparzašta***, *išparzaš*
	Plural		
1	*ḫaruen*[41]		
2	*ḫarten*		
3	*ḫarker*		*išparter*, *išparzer*

	Imperative		
	Singular		
2	*ḫark*		
3	***ḫartu***,[47] ***ḫardu***		*išparzašdu*, *išpartieddu*
	Plural		
2	*ḫarten*		
3	*ḫarkandu*		

12.11. Verbal substantive: gen. *mazzuwaš*. Participle: *išparzant-*.

12.12. In the case of *tarku-* (/tark^{w}/) 'to dance, whirl' and *watku-* (/watk^{w}/) 'to leap', the stem ends in a labiovelar *k*^{w}, not a consonantal sequence /kw/. We find the same kind of spellings and the same delabialization of the labiovelar as in *eku-* 'to drink' (§12.3, p. 188, with footnotes).[48]

12.13. Root stems ending in *-ink-* show forms with and without deletion of the *-n-* (see §1.135, p. 46) and various ways of spelling /-nk-/ and /-ng-/ when it is retained. Forms of *link-* 'to swear': pres. sg. 3 ***li-ik-zi***, *li-in-ga-zi*, *li-in-ik?-zi*, pl. 1 *li-in-ku-u-e-ni*, *li-ku-wa-an-ni*,[49] pl. 3 *li-in-kán-zi*, pret. sg. 1 ***li-in-ku-un***, sg. 3 ***li-ik-ta***, *li-in-ik-ta*, *li-in-kat-ta*, pret. pl. 1 ***li-in-ku-en***, *le-en-ga-u-en*,[50] pl. 3 *li-in-ke-er*, imp. sg. 2 *li-i-ik*, *li-in-ki*, sg. 3 *li-ik-du*, pl. 2 *li-ik-te-en*, *le-en-ik-tén*, pl. 3 *li-in-kán-du*, part. *linkant-*, imperf. *linkiške-*. The verbal substantive and infinitive are unattested.

44. KUB 25.21 iii 14 (HW 90, CTH 524 Kaška treaty). A *ḫi*-conjugation form (for expected **išpartun*), as is pret. sg. 3 *išparzaš*, but these are shown to be secondary by *išparzazi*, *išparzašta* (OS) and *išparzašdu*.

45. KUB 14.1 obv. 62 (MS).

46. KUB 19.49 i 6 (NH).

47. KUB 31.81 obv. 3 (OS).

48. But the appearance in NS of pret. sg. 3 *watkut* for earlier *watkutta* suggests that /k^{w}/ was eventually reanalyzed as /kw/ in this word (Oettinger 1979: 237).

49. This is a Luwianized form; see Oettinger 1979: 13.

50. See p. 191, n. 26.

12.14. In the case of *takš-* 'to put together, construct' the combination of the stem-final sequence of stop plus *š* followed by the consonant of various consonantal endings leads to an inserted vowel, either *e* or *i* (§1.81, p. 34), producing a preconsonantal stem *takke/išš-* beside a prevocalic stem *takš-*. Competing efforts to generalize one stem or the other lead to instances of prevocalic *takke/išš-* (e.g., *takkeššanzi*) and preconsonantal *takš-* (e.g., *taggašteni* [taks.steni]). Preconsonantal *takš-* is necessarily written as *tág-ga-aš-* (§1.11, p. 12). For the geminate *-šš-* in *takke/išš-* see AHP 150–52.

	Present Indicative		
	Singular		Plural
1	*taggaš*[*mi?*][51]		
2	*takkišši*, *taggašši*[52]		*takkišteni*, *takkešteni*, *taggašteni*
3	***takkiš*[*zi*]**,[53] *takkišzi*, *takkešzi*, *takkēšzi*, *takkizzi*[54]		***takšanzi***, *takkiššanzi*, *takkeššanzi*

	Preterite Indicative		
	Singular		Plural
3	***takkišta***, *takkešta*, *taggašta*		***takšer***, *takkēššer*

	Imperative		
	Singular		Plural
3	*taggašdu*		

12.15. Infinitive *takšu*(*w*)*anzi*. Supine *takkiškewan*. Participle *takšant-*. Imperfective stem *takkiške-*, *takkeške-*.

12.16. Another group of *mi*-verbs have stems that end in a sequence with *w* as its final component: *tarḫw-* 'to be able, be in charge/control', *šanḫw-* 'to roast'. The *w* becomes *u* before endings beginning with a consonant. In the verb *tarḫw-* metathesis to *taruḫ-* sometimes occurs. We assume a sequence /hw/ in these cases (not /h^{w}/) on historical grounds and thus also assume a real metathesis in *taruḫ-* as opposed to *eukzi* and *tarukzi* (see §1.140, p. 48; and §12.12, p. 194). Proof for this claim is lacking, since the crucial forms with endings having initial /w/ are not yet attested, where one would expect pres. pl. 1 **šanḫumeni*, pret. pl. 1 **šanḫumen*, etc. (see p. 188, n. 3 for the reasoning).

---

51. Restored arbitrarily as *tág-ga-aš*[*-ḫi*] in KBo 5.3 iv 43′ (= KBo 5.12 + KBo 5.3 iv 59) (Ḫukk.) by SV 2.

52. KBo 3.1 ii 15, treated as sg. 3 (by Oettinger 1979: 217–18 as an error, by Neu 1974: 91 as assimilated **takšzi*) when restoring *le-e ku*[*-iš-ki*] in the preceding line. But if one restores *le-e ku*[*-it-ki*] there, *tág-ga-aš-ši* can easily be taken as the regular and expected pres. sg. 2. For the second-person formulation see KBo 3.1 ii 42–45.

53. KUB 36.106 rev. 4 (OS).

54. See §1.130 (p. 45).

	Present Indicative
sg. 3	*ša-an-ḫu-uz-zi*, ***ta-ru-uḫ-zi***, *tar-ru-uḫ-zi*, *tar-ḫu-uz-zi*
pl. 3	*ša-an-ḫu(-wa)-an-zi*, *ša-an-ḫu-un-zi*,[55] *tar-ru-uḫ-ḫa-an-zi*
	Preterite Indicative
sg. 1	*ta-ru-uḫ-ḫu-un*
pl. 3	*tar-ḫu-e-er*
	Imperative
sg. 3	*tar-ḫu-du*, *tar-ḫu-id-du*
pl. 3	*ša-an-ḫu-u-wa-an-du*

12.17. Participle: *ša-an-ḫu(-u)-wa-an-t°*, *ša-an-ḫu-un-t°*,[55] *tar-ḫu-an-t°*.

Affixed Stems

Stems with Infixed ***-ni(n)-***

12.18. Paradigms for stems with nasal infix *-ni(n)-*. For the meaning of the infix see §10.17 (p. 179). These verbs show the form *-nink-* before endings beginning with a vowel or /w/ and *-nik-* elsewhere.[57]

	Present Indicative			
	Singular			
1	*ḫarnikmi*	***šarnikmi***	*ninikmi*	
2	*ḫarnikti* †		*ninikši*	*ištarnikši*
3	*ḫarnikzi*	***šarnikzi***	***nīnikzi***, *ninikzi*	***ištarnikzi***[58]
	Plural			
1		*šarninkueni*	*nininkuweni*	
2	*ḫarnikteni*	*šarnikteni*	*ninikteni*	
3	*ḫarninkanzi*	*šarni(n)kanzi*, *šarnenkanzi*	*nininkanzi*	
	Preterite Indicative			
	Singular			
1	*ḫarninkun*	*šarninkun*	*nininkun*	
2	*ḫarnikta*			
3	***ḫarnikta***	*šarnikta*	*ninikta*	

55. See §1.76 (p. 32).

56. KBo 17.105 iii 3 (MH/MS).

57. This ablaut pattern reflects a considerably modified PIE ablaut with *e*-grade infix **-ne-* alternating with zero-grade infix **-n-* (see §3.37, p. 78).

58. For the rare form *iš-tar-ni-ik-za* KBo 40.272 left 5′, probably for *ištarnikzi*, see §11.8 (p. 182).

	Plural			
1		*šarninkuen*		*ištarninkuen*
3	*ḫarninkir*	*šarni(n)ker*	*nininkir*	

	Imperative		
	Singular		
2	*ḫarnik*		*ninik*
3	*ḫarnikdu*	*šarnikdu*	
	Plural		
2	*ḫarnikten*		*ninikten*
3	*ḫarninkandu*	*šarninkandu*	*nininkandu*

12.19. Verbal substantive: *ḫarninkuwar*, *šarninkuwaš* (gen.), *nininkuwaš* (gen.). Infinitive I: *ḫarninkuwanzi*, *šarninkuwanzi*, *nininkuwanzi.* Participle: *ḫarninkant-*, *šarninkant-*, *nininkant-*.

Non-Ablauting Stems in ***-ešš-***

12.20. Verbs in *-ešš-* (Oettinger 1979: 238–55). For the meaning of the suffix see §10.13 (p. 177).

	Present Indicative
	Singular
2[59]	**ḫappinešti* (NÍG.TUKU-*ti*), *idalawēšti*, **kardimmešti* (TUKU.TUKU-*eš-ti*)
3	*innarawešzi*, *idālawešzi*, *ḫadukišzi*, *kallarešzi*, **kunnešzi* (ZAG-*nešzi*), *makkešzi*, *mi(ya)ḫu(wa)ntešzi*, *parkuešzi*, *dannatešzi*, *tepawešzi*, *warḫuešzi*, GÉME-*aššarešzi*, etc.
	Plural
1	[*išḫa*]*ššarweššue*[*ni*]
2	*idālawešteni*, *parkuešteni*
3	[*innar*]*aweššanzi*, *idālaweššanzi*, *maninkueššanzi*, *tepaweššanzi*
	Preterite Indicative
	Singular
1	*parkūēššun*, *tarḫuileššun*, GÙB-*liššun*, *ḫadduliššun*
3	*arawešta*, *idālawešta*, *kartimmēšta*
	Plural
2	*nakkeš*[*ten*][60]
3	*araweššer*, *mayateššer*, *maršeššer*, *šalleššer*

59. The replacement of *-ši* by *ḫi*-conjugation *-ti* appears to have been systematic in this class.
60. CHD L–N 371 (KUB 14.13 i 46).

	Imperative
	Singular
2	*miyeš*
3	*ḫaddulešdu*, *mi(y)ēštu*, *parkuēštu*
	Plural
3	*makkeššandu*

Vocalic Stems

Ablauting

Stems with e/a Ablaut

12.21. The following *mi*-verbs are univerbations with a prehistoric root *$*dheh_1$*- ‘to put’ (see §12.48, p. 211, and Oettinger 1979: 125–26): *uwate-* ‘to lead here’, *peḫute-* ‘to lead there’, *wete-* ‘to build’, *werite-* ‘to be afraid’. The descriptive ablaut *e/a* (reflecting PIE *e*-grade versus zero-grade; §3.37, p. 78) is fairly predictable:

	Present Indicative			
	Singular			
1	*uwatemi*	*pēḫutemi*	*witemi*, *wedaḫḫi* †[61]	*weritemi*
2	*uwateši*	*peḫuteši*	*wedaši*	*werizzašti* †
3	***uwatezzi***, *uwatezi*, *uwadazzi*	***peḫute(z)zi***, *pēḫute(z)zi*, *pēḫuttezzi*, *pēḫūtezi*	***wetezzi***, [*w*]*itezzi*, *wedai* †	*weritiz*[*zi*], *urizzizz*[*i*][62]
	Plural			
1	*uwateweni*, *uwatewani*, *uwatummeni*[63]	*pēḫutummēni*	*wedumēni*	
2	*uwatetteni*, *uwatettani*, *uwadateni*	*pēḫutetteni*, *pēḫu⟨t⟩ettani*		
3	***uwadanzi***	***pēḫudanzi***, *peḫudanzi*, *peḫutanzi*, *peḫutenzi*[64]	*wedanzi*	***waritanzi***, *werita*[*nzi*]

61. The stem *wete-* ‘to build’ comes to be influenced by the originally separate verb *wi/eda(i)-* ‘to bring’ and vice versa.

62. The forms *werizzašti* and *urizzizzi* (if the latter indeed belongs here) suggest a NH reinterpretation of the stem as **werit(t)-*. See the treatment of *ēd-* (*ezzazzi*) ‘to eat’ (§1.125, p. 44), *išpart-*, **mat-* (see §12.10 and n. 36, p. 193) and *ḫat-* (*ḫazzizzi*).

63. See §1.126 (p. 44).

64. Spelled [*pé*]-*e-ḫu-te-en-zi* KBo 25.50 left edge 7, not with the *-tén-* sign.

	Preterite Indicative			
	Singular			
1	***uwatenun***	*peḫutenun*	***wetenun***, *wedaḫḫun*,† *wetun*	
2	*uwatet*	*peḫutet*	*wedaš*†	
3	***uwatet***	*peḫutet*, *peḫuteš*†	***wetet***, *wedaš* †	*weriteš̆ta*†, *wiriteš̆ta*†, *werit*[*e- . . .]*
	Plural			
1	*uwatewen*		*wetu(m)men*†	
2		*peḫutetten*		
3	***uwater***, *uwatēr*	***peḫuter***	*weter*	

	Imperative		
	Singular		
2	*uwate*, *uwati*, *uwatet*[65]	*peḫute*, *peḫuti*	*wete*
3	*uwateddu*	*peḫuteddu*	*weteddu*, *wedau* †
	Plural		
2	***uwatetten***, *uwatatten*, *uwatitten*	*peḫutetten*	*wetatten*
3	*uwadandu*	*peḫudandu*	*wedandu*

12.22. Verbal substantive: *wetu*(*m*)*mar* (*ú-e-tu*$_4$*-mar*), **uwatummar*. Infinitive: *wetu*(*m*)*manzi* (*ú-e-tu*$_4$*-ma-an-zi*), **uwatu*(*m*)*manzi*(?). For the (*m*) in these forms see §1.126 (p. 44). Participle: *peḫudant-*, *wetant-*, *widant-*. Imperfective: *weteške-*, *weriteške-*. No iterative of *uwate-* is yet attested, and *peḫuteške-* (NH) from *peḫute-* is rare.

12.23. Other *mi*-verbs with vocalic alternating stems ending in *e/a* are of diverse origin:[66] *arkuwe-* 'to make a plea', *ḫulle-* 'to repulse, turn back, defeat (an enemy), reverse, cancel (an agreement)', *ḫarne-* 'to besprinkle', *išpa*(*r*)*re-* 'to spread (something) out, trample(?)', *kappuwe-* 'to count', *lukke-* 'to ignite', *šarre-* 'to divide', *šarkuwe-* 'to put on (footwear)', *šulle-* 'to be(come) wanton, disrespectful, ambitious', *šuwaye-* 'to look', *šuwe-* 'to push/drive away, forfeit, repudiate, divorce', *tāye-* 'to steal', *duwarne-* 'to break', *waššše-* 'to clothe', *zinne-* 'to finish'. In addition to the preceding verbs which

65. See p. 182, n. 19.

66. We prefer to avoid the label "simple thematic" class (Oettinger 1979: 24, 257–314). It is debatable whether any attested Hittite verbs with stems ending in *e/a* reflect PIE verbs that fit this definition. It is certain that many do not: e.g., *kappuwe-* 'to count' (see Oettinger 1979: 332–33), *zinne-* 'to finish' (Oettinger 2002: p. xx), *waššše-* 'to clothe' (Melchert 1984b: 31–35; Oettinger 2002: p. xx) and *šulle-* 'to be(come) wanton, disrespectful' (Melchert 2005a). But all these form a single class in Hittite. We use "alternating stems ending in *e/a*" merely as a neutral descriptive device.

have no suffix from the Hittite point of view, verbs with the suffix *-e-* (for whose meaning see §10.11, p. 177) also are probably inflected as alternating stems ending in *e/a*.[67] Many of these verbs follow this conjugational pattern only in OH, or in OH and MH, changing in NH to other patterns (*mi*-verbs in stem *-āi-*, *ḫi*-verbs in *-a-*, etc.). For some members of the paradigm we have attested only examples of the latter classes, not the predicted forms of the alternating vocalic stems in *-e-/-a-*. Footnotes below offer only a selection of such secondary forms. For a more complete survey see Oettinger 1979: 261–312.

12.24. The basic vocalic stems show an alternation between *e* and *a* that only partly reflects prehistoric ablaut, and in some cases we find both *e* and *a* (see §3.37, p. 78, and the idealized schema in Oettinger 1979: 259–60):[68]

active pres.	*-ami*	*-e/aši*	*-e/a(z)zi*	*-aweni*, *-ewani*	*-atteni*	*-anzi*
active pret.	*-anun*	**-eš(?)*	*-et*	**-awen*[69]	*-e/atten*	*-er*
active imp.	**-allu*	**-a*[70]	*-attu*	**-aweni*	*-e/atten*	*-antu*

12.25. Examples for the active voice of the *mi*-conjugation of alternating vocalic stems in *e/a*.

	Present Indicative
	Singular
1	*ḫarnami*,[71] *zinnami*[72]
2	***aršanēši***, ***ḫullaši***,[73] *šulleši*,[74] *waššaši*[75]
3	***arāwezzi***, ***ašiwantezzi***, ***ḫullezzi***,[76] *ḫullēzzi*,[77] ***ḫullazzi***,[78] ***lukkezzi***,[79] ***paprezzi***, *šarrēzzi*,[80] *šullēzzi*, *waššezzi*,[81] ***zinne(z)zi***[82]

67. We base this claim on the fact that *šulle-* 'to be(come) wanton' reflects the same suffix (see Melchert 2005a: 96, after Watkins 1973), and this stem does show *šulla-* in the participle *šullant-* (see Oettinger 1979: 291–92). Assured forms with stem ending in *-a-* from the *denominative* stems in *-e-* are not yet attested. The stem *paprant-* may be the participle to *papre-* 'to be proven guilty', but it could also be an adjective in *-ant-* derived directly from a base adjective **papra-* (see §2.26, p. 56).

68. In view of the diverse origins of this class, it may or may not be significant that the variants with *-e-* in the pres. sg. 2, pres. pl. 1, and pret. and imp. pl. 2 all belong to stems reflecting prehistoric **-eh$_1$-*.

69. The predicted preterite first plural form is not yet attested. We find only the replacement form *-umen* of the *ḫi*-verbs in *-a-*: *ḫu-ul-lu-mi-en*, *šarrumen*.

70. Contra Oettinger 1979: 259 and AHP 183 the expected outcome of the imv. sg. 2 is **-a* < **-e*. The attested example *šarri* (NH) shows the form of a *ḫi*-verb in *-a-* (see *tarni* to *tarna-*), while *waššiya* (NH) belongs to a stem *waššiya-*.

71. *ḫar-na-mi* KBo 40.272 6′, cited when unpublished as 1808/c 5′ by Oettinger (1979: 307).

72. NH *zinnaḫḫi*.

73. KUB 37.223 A7 (OS).

74. KUB 36.114 ii/iv 6 (OH/MS or MH/MS). NH *šulliyaši*.

75. NH *waššiyaši*.

76. *ḫu-ul-le-ez-zi* Laws §173a, copy aa iii 24 (OS).

	Present Indicative
	Plural
1	*ḫušuewani*,[83] *šarraweni*, *waššaweni*,[84] ***zinnaweni***[85]
2	*ḫullatteni*, *šarratteni*
3	*ḫullanzi*, *lukkanzi*, ***šarranzi***,[86] ***zinnan****zi*
	Preterite Indicative
	Singular
1	***ḫullanun***,[87] [*lu*]*qqanun*[88]
3	***ḫullet***,[89] *ḫurnit*, *lukket*, ***šarret***,[90] *šullēt*,[91] *zinnit*
	Plural
1	—[92]
2	*ḫuišweten*,[93] *šuwatten*, *šulletten*[94]
3	*ḫuller*, ***maršer***, *šarrer*[95]
	Imperative
	Singular
3	*ḫulladdu*[96]
	Plural
2	*zinnatten*
3	*šarrandu*, *šūwandu*, *waššandu*

77. NH *ḫu-ul-la-*(*a-*)*i* and *ḫu-ul-li-ya-az-zi*.

78. *ḫu-ul-la-az-zi* KUB 37.223 C4 (OS).

79. NH forms *lu-uk-zi*, *lu-ki-iš-zi* belong to an intransitive verb ‘to become bright’; *lu-uk-ki-iš-zi* ‘he sets fire to’ in Laws §100 is a NH scribe’s error for correct *lu-uk-ke-ez-zi*.

80. NH has the additional forms *šar-ra-*(*a-*)*i*, *šar-ri*, *šar-ri-ya-zi*, *šar-ri-ya-iz-zi*.

81. NH and NS also *waššiezzi*, *waššiyaz*(*z*)*i*, and *waššiyaizzi*.

82. NH *zinnāi*.

83. [*ḫ*]*u-šu-e-wa-ni* KBo 3.46 rev. 39 (OH/NS).

84. NH also has *waššueni*, which cannot possibly belong to the inflection in *-e-*/*-a-* and therefore has to belong to some other inflection class.

85. NH *zinnummeni*.

86. “*šullānzi*” in KBo 43.77: 7 cited when unpublished as 38/g by Oettinger (1979: 291) is irrelevant here, since it is shown by duplicates to be read [*pá*]*r-šu-ul-la-a-an-zi*. Contra Oettinger, *šullānun* in KBo 5.8 ii 2 belongs to *šullā*(*i*)- ‘to give (as) a hostage’ and gives no evidence for an *a*-stem variant of *šulle-*.

87. OH/NS *ḫu-ul-li-ya-nu-un*.

88. NH *šarraḫḫun* and *zinnaḫḫun*.

89. OH/NS *ḫu-ul-li-iš*.

90. MH/MS also *šarraš*, and NH *šarriyēt*.

91. NH also *šulliyat* and *šullāit*.

92. See p. 200, n. 69.

93. Written *ḫu-iš-ú-e-te-en*.

94. KUB 4.1 ii 11 (MH/NS).

95. NH has additional form *šar-ri-i-e-er*.

96. NH *zinnau*.

12.26. Infinitive: *waššauanzi*.[97] Verbal substantive.[98] Participle: *lukkan*, *šarran*, *waššan*. Imperfective stems: *šarraške-*, *šarreške-*, *šarriške-*, *waššeške-*, *waššiške-*.

12.27. In some cases the dearth of evidence from OS or even MS makes it difficult to determine the original stem class of the verb. The verbs *išpar*(*re*)- 'to kick, tread (on), spread out(?)' and *mall*(*e*)- 'to mill' may have originally been consonantal *ḫi*-verbs (thus Jasanoff 2003: 77–78 contra Oettinger 1979: 266–71, 277–79). Their currently known forms, however, are very similar to those of *mi*-verbs with alternating stems ending in *e*/*a*, and they are thus cited here. Forms of *išpar*(*re*)- (all NS unless marked): *išpar*(*a*)*ḫi*, *išparratti*, *išpāri*/*išpari*, *išparrezzi* (MH/MS!), *išparriyazzi*, ***išparanzi***, *išparranzi*, *išparḫun*, *išparraḫḫun*, *išparrer*, *išparḫut*, *išperten*, *išparrandu*, *išparriyawar*, *išparrant-*, *išparruwan*. Forms of *mall*(*e*)- (all examples are in NS):[99] *malli*, *mallai*, *mallezzi*, *mallazi*, *malliyazzi*, *mallanzi*, *mallanun*, *mallēt*, *mālla*,[100] *mallandu*, *malluwanzi*, *malluwar*, *mallan*, *malliške-*.

Ablauting Stems in ***-iye/a-***

12.28. Ablauting verbal stems in -(*i*)*ye*/*a*- (henceforth simply -*iya*-) include basic verbs such as *iya*- 'to do, make', *tiya*- 'to step, enter', *wemiya*- 'to find, meet', *ḫuett*(*iya*)- 'to draw, drag', *markiya*- 'to reject', *ḫaliya*- 'to prostrate oneself', *ḫariya*- 'to dig', *tāya*- 'to steal', and also denominals such as *ḫaḫḫariya*- 'to rake(?)', *ḫappariya*- 'to sell', *laḫ*(*ḫ*)*iya*- 'to campaign', *lam*(*a*)*niya*- 'to name', *urkiya*- 'to track down', and *zaḫḫiya*- 'to battle'. We frequently find both a stem in -*iya*- and some other stem for the same verb. In many cases the stem in -*iya*- appears to be the innovation, but in some this status is unclear. The *e*-grade forms with /-ye-/ (-Ci-(i-)e-) are more frequent in the older language and gradually disappear from use during NH.[101] When Hittite began to borrow Luwian *ḫi*-verbs with singular third-person forms in -*iyai* (which did not exist in Hittite), these verbs were given singular third-person forms in -*iyaizzi* (pret. sg. 3 -*iyait*), and these endings then came to be used occasionally with native Hittite stems in -*iya*- (already in OS *urkiyaizzi* 'tracks down'). One also finds a few preterite third-person plural forms in -*iyaer*.[102]

---

97. *wa-aš-ša-u-an-zi* KUB 54.76:5′, cited as Bo 1709 by Oettinger (1979: 301). In NS we find *šarrumanzi* with the form of a *ḫi*-verb in -*a*-.

98. The expected verbal substantive in *-*awar* is not yet attested. We find only forms in -*umar* with the form of a *ḫi*-verb in -*a*-: *šarrumar*, *ḫullumar*.

99. The restored form *m*[*a-al-l*]*a-a-i* listed in CHD L–N 125 from KBo 15.35 + KBo 15.33 i 11 (MS) does not exist. Read rather with Glocker (1997: 60; line 14′) *ú*-[*d*]*a-a-i*.

100. So Oettinger 1979: 278 n. 38; but probably to be interpeted as noun *māl* with 'and' *māll*=*a* 'and *māl*' (CHD L–N 124).

101. See on this point, among others, Carruba 1966b: 79–80; Houwink ten Cate 1970: 16; Melchert 1977: 32; and Oettinger 1979: 344.

102. On the genesis and spread of the forms in -*iyai*- see Melchert 2005b revising Oettinger 1979: 382–85. An example of a Luwian *ḫi*-verb with third-person singular in -*iyai* is *taparriyai*, altered to Hittite *taparriyaizzi*, whence also pret. pl. 3 *daparriyaēr*.

12.29. Paradigms for the unmixed *mi*-conjugation stems in *-iya-* (see also §§12.50–12.51, p. 212): *iya-* 'to do, make', *tiya-* 'to step, enter', *wemiya-* 'to find, meet', *ḫuittiya-* 'to draw, drag, attract'. Another common verb belonging to this class is *aniya-* 'to do, perform, make'.

	Present Indicative			
	Singular			
1	***iemi***,[103] ***iyami***, *iya(m)mi*	*tiyami*	*wemiyami*	*ḫuittiyami*
2	***ieši***, *iyaši*	*tiyaši*	*wemiyaši*	*ḫuittiyaši*
3	***iē(z)zi***, *iya(z)zi*, *iyaizzi*	***tiyezzi***, ***ti(y)ēzzi***, *tiezi*, *tiyazi*	***wemiezzi***, *wemiēzzi*, *wemiezi*, *wemiya(z)zi*	*ḫuittiezzi*, *ḫuittiyazi*, *ḫuittiyai*†
	Plural			
1	*iyaweni*	*tiyaweni*	*wemiyaweni*	
2	*iyatteni*	*tiyatteni*		*ḫuittiyatteni*
3	*ienzi*, ***iyanzi***	***ti(y)enzi***, *tiyanzi*	***wemiyanzi***	*ḫuittiyanzi*

	Preterite Indicative			
	Singular			
1	*iyanun*, *iyaun*	*tiyanun*	*wemiyanun*	*ḫuittiyanun*
2	*iyaš*, *iyat*	*tiyat*		
3	***iēt***, *iyat*	***tiēt***, *tiyat*	***wemi(e)t***, *wemiyat*	*ḫuitti(e)t*, *ḫuittiyat*
	Plural			
1	*iyawen*	*tiyawen*	***wemiyawen***	*ḫuittiyawen*
2	*iyatten*			
3	***iēr***	*tiyēr*, *tiyer*	*wemier*, *wemiyar*[104]	*ḫuittier*

	Imperative					
	Singular			Plural		
1	*iyallu*					
2	*iya*	*tiya*, *tīya*	*ḫuitti*	*iyatten*	*tiyatten*	
3	*iēddu*, *iyaddu*[105]	*tiyaddu*		*iendu*, *iyandu*	*tiyandu*	*wemiyandu*

103. *i-e-*[*m*(*i*)] StBoT 8 ii 22 (= StBoT 25 #3 ii 9′) (OS).

104. See p. 181, n. 17.

105. Rarely also *i-ad-du.*

12.30. Verbal substantive: *iyawar*, *tiyawar*, *ḫuittiyawar*. Infinitive I: *iyawanzi*, *tiyawanzi wemiyawanzi*, *ḫuittiyawanzi*; Infinitive II: *tiyanna*. Participle: *iyant-*, *ient-*, *tint-*, *tiyant-*, ***ḫuittiant-***, *ḫuittiyant-*.

Stems in ***-šk(e)-***

12.31. Occasionally, a *-šk(e)-* stem functions as the basic form of the verb (see §24.25, p. 323): e.g., *išk(e)-* 'to smear, anoint'. Most stems in *-šk(e)-* are derived imperfective stems, for whose use see chapter 24 on verbal aspect. Their formation is as follows. Base verbs with *e*/*a* ablaut in their stems add *-šk(e)-* to the *a*-form: *akkušk(e)-* (**ak*^{w}*-šk(e)-*) < *eku-* 'to drink'; *azzikk(e)-* (**ad-šk(e)-*) < *ēd-* 'to eat'; *appišk(e)-* < *ēpp-* 'to seize'). Those with *we*/*u* or *wa*/*u* use the *u*-form: *ḫukkišk(e)-* < *ḫuek-* 'to exorcise'; *ḫurzakk(e)-* (**ḫurtšk(e)-*) < *ḫuwart-* 'to curse'). The verbs *kuen-* and *wen-*are exceptional: *kuwašk(e)-* < **kwanšk(e)-*; *uwanšikk(e)-* < **wan-šk(e)-*. *ḫi*-conjugation verbs with *-ai-*/*-i-* use *-i-*: *pišk(e)-* < *pai-* 'to give'. *au*(*š*)-/*u-* uses *u-* (*ušk(e)-*). *ḫi*-conjugation verbs with *-a-*/*-i-* use *-i-*: *memišk(e)-* < *mema-* 'to speak'. Base stems in *-āi-* are usually reduced to *-e-* or *-i-*: *arwišk(e)-* < *ar*(*u*)*wāi-* 'to do reverence'; those in *-iye*/*a-* to *-i-*: *wemišk(e)-* < *wemiya-* 'to find'. Verbs that have acquired a non-original stem in *-a-* revert to the original base: *unušk(e)-*[106] < *unu*(*wa*)- 'to decorate, ornament'. The stem *dai-* 'to place' is usually reduced to just *d-*: *zikk(e)-* < **d-šk(e)-*. For the *-šk(e)-*stems of *ḫanna-* 'to judge' and *tarna-* 'to let' see §1.81 (p. 34) and §1.120 (p. 43).

12.32. Although the vowel which connects a verbal base ending in a consonant to the *-šk(e)*/*a-* suffix is regularly an *-i-* in the old language (§1.81, p. 34): *wekišk(e)-*, *ḫukkišk(e)-*, one also finds *-e-* later. The confusion between *-i-* and *-e-* also is extended to the *-šk(e)*/*a-* stems formed to verbs in *-iya-* (Melchert 1984b: 134–35, 147–50): *tišk(e)-*/*tešk(e)-* < *tiya-* and *anniškk(e)-*/*anneškk(e)-* < *aniya-* (note the special gemination in the *-šk(e)-* form of *aniya-*).

12.33. The *-šk(e)*/*a-* suffix shows *e*/*a* ablaut similar to the stems in *-iye*/*a-* (§§12.28–12.29), but the distribution of *e*/*a* in *-šk(e)*/*a-* has not yet been studied diachronically in as much detail as in *-iye*/*a-*. The matter is further complicated by the polyvalence of the GAD sign, which can be read either *kat* or *ki*/*et*$_6$. The *ki*/*et*$_6$ value is attested in Hittite almost exclusively in these *-šk(e)-* forms. If future study should establish what we feel the present incomplete assemblage indicates—namely, that in resolved writings of the endings where the sign GAD is otherwise used those found in pre-NH show an *a* vocalization, while those in NH show *e*, then it would be possible to conclude that the NH forms written with GAD should be read *ket*$_6$ while the pre-NH examples should be read *kat*. In order not to cloud the issue, forms written with the GAD sign are assigned an indeterminate vocalization in the table below. The following combinations of thematic vowel and endings are known:[107]

---

106. The form *ú-nu-uš-ke-ez-zi* is found in KBo 38.265 i 13′. The non-iterative form *ú-nu-uz-zi* ibid. 11′ shows that in this case *unu-* was the original base stem and *unuwa-* secondary.

107. The following table shows the regular inflection of *-šk(e)-* stems. Some forms are transliterated in order to show unambiguously the nature of the vowel following *-šk-*. In view of plene spellings such as

	Present Indicative	
	Singular	
1	*-škemi*	***daškēmi***, *daškemi*, *peškemi*, *išḫiškīmi*, *memiškēmi*
	-škami	*ḫandāišqami*, *išgāmi*
2	*-škeši*	***akkuškēši***, ***akkuškeši***, *daškeši*, *peškeši*, *piškeši*, *uškeši*
	-ške/atti[108]	*uš-ke/at-ti*†
3	*-škezzi*	***daškezzi***, *peškezzi*, ***ūškezzi***, *akkuškezzi*
	Plural	
1	*-škewani*	*akkuškēwani*, *akkuškeuwani*, *daškewani*
	-škeweni	***daškēweni***, ***šanḫiškeweni***
	-šgaweni	*dašgaweni*, *pišgaweni*
2	*-šketteni*	*da-aš-ke-et-te-ni*, *ú-e-ki-iš-ke-et-te-ni*
	-škettani	*ak-ku-uš-ke-et-ta-ni*, *up-pí-iš-ke-et-ta-ni*, *ú-e-te-eš-ke-ta-ni*, *ša-aš-nu-uš-ke-et-ta-ni*
	-ška(t)teni	*dāšqatēni*,[109] *da-aš-ga-at*[*-te-ni*],[110] *uškateni*,[111] *uš-ka-at-te-ni*,[112] *ša-aš-nu-uš-ga-at-te-ni*, ***ta-me-eš-ke/at-te-ni***
	-ške/atteni	*da-aš-ke/at-te-ni*, ***pí-iš-ke/at-te-ni***, *uš-ke/at-te-ni*, *uš-ke/at-te-e-ni*[113]
3	*-škanzi*	***daškanzi***, ***piškanzi***, *peškanzi*, *uškanzi*, *akkuškanzi*

da-aš-ke-e-mi we read non-plene forms with ambiguous *-ke/i-* consistently with *e*-vocalism (see §1.64, p. 30). The example *ḫu-u-e-eš-ki-iš* KBo 24.56A i 7 is exceptional. There are a few instances where stems in *-šķe-* are secondarily inflected as stems in *-iya-*: *iškiyazi*, *iškiyaizzi*, *iškiyanzi* to *iške-* 'to smear, anoint', *duškiyazi* to *duške-* 'to rejoice', *šeškiyawar* to *šeške-* (imperfective stem of *šeš-* 'to sleep').

108. See §11.10 (p. 183).

109. KUB 13.3 iii 6 (MH?/NS). While the ductus of the tablet is NS, many of the spellings indicate a much older original, to which perhaps this *a*-vocalization is due. On the strength of this form, other ambiguous writings in this tablet using the GAD sign (e.g., *uš-kat-te-e-ni* in i 14) can be vocalized with *a*. Another indication of the *a*-vocalization of the latter form is the plene writing of the following syllable: compare *da-a-aš-qa-te-e-ni* and the alternation of *da-aš-ke-wa-ni* and *da-aš-ga-u-e-ni*, which suggest that (in older Hittite) the *a* vocalization occurred when the stress fell on the following ending instead of on the /ske/ syllable.

110. KUB 31.113: 4′, 7′.

111. KBo 3.33 ii 11′ (OH/NS); the form is immediately preceded by a syllabic writing of *na-at-ta*, which in post-OH is normally written ideographically.

112. KUB 24.4 obv. 10 (MH/MS).

113. KUB 14.4 ii 4 (NH).

	Preterite Indicative	
	Singular	
1	*-šganun*	*dašganun*
	-škenun	*peškenun*, *uškenun*, *akkuškenun*, *daškenun*
2	*-škeš*, *(-škiš)*	*daškeš*, *zikkēš* (**d+škeš < dai-* 'to put'),[114] *ḫatreškeš*, *ḫuēškiš*
3	*-šket*	***zikkēt***, *dašket*, *pešket*, *ušket*, *akkušket*
	-šket	*ša-al-la-nu-uš-ke/at*[115]
	Plural	
1	*-šgawen*	*ušgawen*, *epurešgawen*, *šanḫišgawen*, [*w*]*ešgawen*
	-škewen	*wekiškewen*[116]
3	*-šker*	***daškēr***, *pešker*, *akkušker*
	-škar	*pí-iš-kar*[117]

	Imperative	
	Singular	
1	*-škellu*	*piškellu*
2	*-šket*	*peške*, *uške*, *akkuške*
3	*-škeddu*	*da-aš-ke-ed-du*, *uš-ke-ed-du*, *ak-ku-uš-ke-ed-du*
	Plural	
2	*-šketten*	*ak-ku-uš-ke-et-tén*, *da-aš-ke-et-tén*, *pí-iš-ke-tén*
	-škatten	*dāšqaten*
	-šket/atten	***me-mi-iš-ke-et-te-en***, *da-aš-ke/at-te-en*, *pí-iš-ke/at-te-en*, *pí-iš-ke/at-tén*, *uš-ke/at-te-en*, *ak-ku-uš-ke/at-te-en*
3	*-škandu*	*daškandu*, *piškandu*, *uškandu*, *akkuškandu*

12.34. Supine: *-škewan*, *-škawan* (written: *-š-ke-u-an*, *-š-ke-u-wa-an*, ***-š-ke-wa-an***, *-š-ga-wa-an*). Verbal substantive: *-škewar* (written: *-š-ke-u-wa-ar*). Infinitive: *-škewanzi* (written: *-š-ke-u-wa-an-zi*). Participle: *-škant-*.

*Ablauting Stems in **-ā(i)-***

12.35. Most *mi*-verbs in *-āi-* are part of a very productive class of verb stems formed from nouns and adjectives by means of a suffix. The ablaut *-āi-/-ā-* reflects

114. Both of these forms are found in KUB 14.1 (rev. 21 and 35), which is MH in MS. *ḫatreškeš* is found in HKM 30:15 (MH/MS).

115. KBo 22.2 obv. 7 (OS). Here there is a good chance that the *a* vocalism is to be preferred, since the *-nu*-causatives in OH probably carried the stress on the *nu* syllable. But see the different treatments of *ša-aš-nu-uš-ga-at-te-ni* and [*t*]*a*?*-aš-nu-uš-ke-et-ta-ni* in KBo 7.28 + KBo 8.92 24–25 (MS).

116. KBo 14.12 iv 17 (NH).

117. KUB 38.3 i 17 (NH). On the reality of the *a* vowel see Neu 1989a. See also p. 181, n. 17. On the preterite third-person plural ending in general see Yoshida 1991.

PIE **-āye-/-āyo-*. It is possible that OS spellings such as *tar-ma-e-mi* represent a sequence /tarma:.e-/ not yet contracted to /tarma:y-/. For all the preceding see Oettinger 1979: 30–34. The following are some of the verbal stems in *-āi-*:[118] *ḫandāi-* 'to prepare something, to be fitted, matched, joined', *ḫatrāi-* 'to send, write', *irḫāi-* 'to make rounds', *malāi-* 'to approve, consent to', *mugāi-* 'to invoke', *munnāi-* 'to hide, harbor', *mutāi-* 'to remove, discard, dispose of', *šaktāi-* 'to tend (medically)', *dammešḫāi-* 'to oppress', *tuḫḫāi-* 'to be short of breath'.

12.36. Paradigms of the verbal stems in *-āi-*. The ablaut form *-āi-* is found only in pres. sg. 3 (*ḫatrāizzi*), pret. sg. 2 and 3 (*ḫatrāeš* and *ḫatrāit*), and imp. sg. 2 (*ḫatrāi*) and 3 (*ḫantaiddu*).

	Present Indicative		
	Singular		
1	*ḫatrāmi*	*ḫandāmi*	*irḫāmi*
2	*ḫatrāši*	*ḫandāši*	
3	*ḫatrāizzi*	*ḫand/tāizzi*, *ḫantezzi*, *ḫandazi*, *ḫandāi*†	*arḫāizzi*, ***irḫaiz*[*zi*]**, ***irḫāizzi***, *irḫāi*†
	Plural		
1	*ḫatrāweni*, *ḫatrāuni*[119]	*ḫandāuni*[119]	
2	*ḫatrātt*[*eni*]		
3	*ḫatrānzi*	*ḫandānzi*	***irḫanzi***, ***irḫān*[*zi*]**

	Preterite Indicative		
	Singular		
1	*ḫatrānun*	*ḫandanun*	
2	*ḫatrāeš*		
3	*ḫatrāit*, *ḫatrāi/eš*†	*ḫandāit*	*irḫāit*
	Plural		
1		*ḫandāwen*	
2	*ḫatrātten*		
3	*ḫatrāer*	*ḫand/taer*	

	Imperative		
	Singular		
2	*ḫatrāi*	*ḫandāi*	
3	*ḫatrāu*†	*ḫand/taiddu*	

118. Oettinger (1979: 30–34) interprets the stem as *-ae-*.

119. [*ḫ*]*atrāuni* KUB 14.1 rev. 36 (MH/MS); *ḫandāuni* 1691/u ii 15, cited by Otten (1969: 26) and HED H 98. See also p. 181, n. 15.

	Plural		
2	*ḫatratten*		
3		*ḫand/tandu*	*irḫandu*

12.37. Verbal substantive: *ḫandawar*, *irḫawar.* Infinitive I: *ḫandawanzi*, *irḫawanzi.* Participle: *ḫatrant-*[120], *ḫandā̆nt-*, *irḫant-*.

12.38. Aside from the very few singular third-person forms listed above (*ḫandai*, *irḫai*, *ḫatrāu*) there is no confusion in Hittite between *mi*-verbs in *-āi-* and *ḫi*-verbs in *-ai-* (for which see §§13.20–13.21, p. 222). Note also pres. sg. 3 *iškallāizzi* alongside *iškallai* 'he tears'.

12.39. The following monosyllabic stems in *-āi-* are not formed with the suffix *-āi-* but originally had the same inflection as those with the suffix: *lāi-* 'to loose', *ḫāi-* 'to trust, believe', *šāi-* 'to be angry, rage'. But because their stems were monosyllabic, they were influenced by the *ḫi*-conjugation, forms of which are marked below with †. Although Oettinger (1979) assigns *lā-* (pp. 64–67) and *ḫae-* and *šae-* (*sic*) (pp. 360–64) to different classes, they conjugate almost identically in most periods of Hittite. Paradigms:

	Present Indicative	
	Singular	Plural
1	*lāmi*, *ḫāmi*	*lāweni*
2	*lāši*, *la-*[*a-i*]*š-ši*,[121] *ḫāši*	
3	*lāizzi*, *lāi*†, *šāizzi*	***lanzi***, *lānzi*, *šānzi*

	Preterite Indicative	
	Singular	Plural
1	*lānun·*, *lāūn*, *ḫānun*, *šānun*	*lāwen*
2	*laīš*, *ḫāiš*	*ḫatten*
3	*lāit*, *ḫāit*, *šāit*, *šāyit*, *šāiš*†	*lāer*, *ḫāer*

	Imperative	
	Singular	Plural
2	*lā*, *lāi*, *ḫā*	*lātten*, *ḫātten*
3	*lāu*, *lāddu*	

12.40. Verbal substantive: *šāwar*, *lāwar*. Infinitive: *lāwanzi*. Participle: *lānt-*, *ḫānt-*, *šānt-*. Imperfective stem: *la-a-*(*i-*)*iš-ke-*.

120. *mi*-verbs in *-ā*(*i*)- in OS texts regularly write the neuter singular participle with a plene final syllable: *ir-ḫa-a-an*, etc.

121. If correctly read, see HKM 30:19′ (MH/MS).

pai-* and *ue-

12.41. The extremely common verbs *pai-* 'to go' and *ue-/uwa-* 'to come'[122] exhibit many irregularities in inflection. They are univerbations of the motion prefixes *pe-* and *u-* (see §12.21, p. 198; and §18.32, p. 286) and the inherited motion verb $*h_1ei$- 'to go, walk, move'. The combination of ablaut and contractions of vowels led to complicated paradigms. For paradigms and discussion see Oettinger 1979: 131–32, 388–89. In OS 'to go' has a consistent alternation of *pai-* and *pā-*, except for the pret. pl. 3 *pāir* ([pa:yr]), later replaced by *payer* (*pa-i-er*) and *pāēr* based on *pai+ēr* and *pā+ēr*.

	Present Indicative				
	Singular			Plural	
1	***paimi***, *pāimi*, *pāmi*	***uwami***, *uwāmi*, *uwammi*		***paiwani***, *pāiweni*, *pāweni*	***uwaweni***
2	***paiši***, *pāiši*, *paši*, *paitti*†	***uwaši***, *uwāši*		***paitteni***, *paittani*[123]	*uwa͗tteni*, *uwattēni*
3	***paizzi***, *pāizzi*	***uēzzi***, ***uezzi***,[124] ***uwazzi***		***pānzi***, *panzi*	***uenzi***, ***uwanzi***[125]

	Preterite Indicative				
	Singular			Plural	
1	***pāun***, *pāūn*, *pānun*	*uwanun*, *uwānun*[126]		*pa͗iwen*, *pāwen*	***uwawen***
2	*paitta*†	***uēš***, *uwaš*			*uwatten*
3	***paīt***, *pa͗it*	***uet***, ***uēt***		***pāir***, *payer*, *pāēr*	***uēr***

	Imperative				
	Singular			Plural	
2	***īt***	***eḫu***		***ītten***, (*paitten*)[127]	***uwatten***, (*uetten*)[128]
3	*paiddu*, ***paittu***	*ueddu*		*pāntu*, *pāndu*	*uwandu*, *uwadu*

122. We interpret *ú-e/iC-* or *ú-e-eC-* as monosyllabic /we-/ and *ú-wa-* as disyllabic /uwa-/. See Melchert 1984b: 40–41.

123. The forms *paittāni* and *paittēni* are found only in MH/NS.

124. In the spelling *ú-i/ez-zi* it cannot be determined if the form was read /wezzi/ or /wizzi/. The *i* writing is the traditional (or "default") writing by Hittitologists. The former, however, is more likely in view of the plene writing *ú-e-ez-zi*. See AHP 140.

125. Both *uenzi* and *uwanzi* occur in all periods, but *uenzi* is much less common than *uwanzi* in NH.

126. *ú-wa-nu-nu-un* in BoTU 57 I 10, cited HW1 238, is probably a scribal error for *ú-wa-nu-un*.

127. See CHD P 21 for occurrences of imperative *paitten*.

128. *ú-et-te-en*, found only once, to our knowledge, in an NH copy of an OH text, may be a scribal error. *ú-wa-at-te-en* occurs twice in the immediate context.

12.42. The expected imperative second-person singular forms of *pai-* and *uwa-* (**pai*, **uwa*) are not attested, and the imperative second-person plural *paitten* occurs just once. Instead, unprefixed forms of $*h_1ei$- are used for the imperative of 'to go', and a special suffixed form for the imperative second-person singular of 'to come'.[129] For *pai-* the forms are sg. 2 *īt* (written *i-it*) and pl. 2 *ītten* (written *i-it-tén*/*i-it-te-en*). For *uwa-* the sg. 2 is *eḫu*.

12.43. Verbal substantive: *pāwar*, *uwawar.* Infinitive*:* ***pa(u)wanzi***, *pāwanzi*, *uwawanzi*. Participle: *pānt-*, *uwant-*.

Non-Ablauting

Stems in ***-nu-***

12.44. Sample causative verbs in *-nu-* include: *arnu-* 'to transport', *aš(ša)nu-* 'to arrange, provide', *paḫḫašnu-*/*paḫšanu-* 'to protect', and *waḫnu-* 'to turn, change'. For the meaning of the suffix see §10.15 (p. 178). Paradigms:

	Present Indicative			
	Singular			
1	*arnum(m)i*, *ārnumi*	***waḫnūmi***, ***waḫnumi***	*paḫšanumi*	*aš(ša)numi*
2[130]	*arnuši*, *arnutti* †	*waḫnuši*[131]		*aš(ša)nuši*
3	***arnu(z)zi***	***waḫnu(z)zi***, *waḫnuzi*		*aššanu(z)zi*, *āššanuzi*, *ašnu(z)zi*, *āšnuzi*

	Plural			
1	*arnummeni*	***waḫnumeni***, *waḫnummeni*		*ašnumeni*, *aššanummeni*
2	*arnutteni*	*waḫnutteni*	*paḫšanutteni*, *paḫḫašnutteni*	*aš(ša)nutteni*
3	*arnu(w)anzi*, *ārnuwanzi*, *arnūwanzi*	*waḫnuwanzi*	*paḫšanuwanzi*	*aš(ša)nu(w)anzi*, *āššanuwanzi*, *aššanūwanzi*

129. There are also two other attested forms of unprefixed reflexes of $*h_1ei$- 'to go': pres. pl. 3 *ya-an-zi* in KBo 22.2 obv. 7 (OS) and pres. sg. 3 *i-ez-zi* in KUB 33.66 + KBo 40.333 iii 6. The latter is backformed from the third plural, replacing historically expected but synchronically irregular **ezi*.

130. Other verbs: *ḫatkišnuši*, *ḫarganuši*, *karšanuši*, *laknuši*, *nuntarnuši*, *tinnuši*, *tittanuši*, etc.

131. Also written BAL-*nu-ši* KBo 4.14 ii 34; see Hoffner 1997c.

	Preterite Indicative			
	Singular			
2			*paḫšanuš*	
3	***arnut***, *ārnut*	*waḫnut*	*paḫḫaššanut*	*aš(ša)nut*
	Plural			
1	*arnummen*	*waḫnum(m)en*		*aššanummen*
2			***paḫšanutten***	
3	*arnuer*	*waḫnuer*	*paḫšanuer*, *paḫḫašša*[*nuer*]	*aššanuer*

	Imperative			
	Singular			
2	*ārnut*	*waḫnut*	*paḫḫaššanut*, *paḫšanut*	*aš(ša)nut*
3	*arnuddu*	*waḫnuddu*	*paḫšanuddu*, *paḫḫašnuddu*	*aššanuddu*
	Plural			
2	*arnutten*	*waḫnutten*	*paḫḫašnutten*, ***paḫšanutten***	
3	*arnu(w)andu*	*waḫnuwandu*	*paḫḫašnuandu*	

12.45. Verbal substantive: *arnummar*, *waḫnumar*, *waḫnuwar*, *paḫšanummar*, *aššanuwawar*, gen. *aš(ša)numaš.* Infinitive: *arnumanzi*, *waḫnummanzi*, *paḫšanummanzi*, *paḫḫaššanumanzi*, *aššanummanzi*, *ašnumanzi.* Participle: *arnuwant-*, ***arnuant***-,[132] *waḫnuwant-*, *paḫšanuwant-*, *paḫḫašnuwant-*, *paḫḫaššanuwant-, aš(ša)nuwant-*.

12.46. Imperfective stem: *arnuške-*, *aš*(*ša*)*nuške-*, ***waḫnuške***-.

12.47. For the forms in *-meni*, *-men*, *-mar*, *-manzi*, etc., see §1.126 (p. 44).

Suppletive Verb

te-/tar- ‘to say’

12.48. The stem *te-* ‘to say’(originally *‘to put’; see §12.21, p. 198) is supplemented by the stem *ter-*/*tar-* in forming a complete paradigm for this verb of speech. For a discussion see Oettinger 1979: 109–10.

132. On this form in Laws §77 manuscript A (OS) see discussion in LH 194.

	Present Indicative	
	Singular	Plural
1	***tēmi***, *temi*	***tarueni***
2	***teši***, *tēši*	*tarteni*, *tēteni*,
3	***tezzi***, *tardi*[134]	***taranzi***

Preterite Indicative	
Singular	Plural
tēnun	—
teš[133]	—
tēt	*terer*

	Imperative		
	Singular		Plural
2	*tēt*		***tetten***, (*tēten*)
3	*tēddu*		*darandu*

12.49. Participle: *tarant-*. Imperfective stem: ***tar-ši-ke-***, *tar-aš-ke-*.

Verbs with Mixed Stems

12.50. A number of Hittite verbs are attested as belonging to more than one stem-class. In some cases one stem is clearly a chronological replacement of another, but in other cases the temporal relationship is less clear. Verbs whose original stem class is reasonably clear have been treated under that class, with later replacement forms duly noted. What follows here are examples of verbs with multiple stems whose chronology is indeterminate.

mi-verbs with stems in *-āi-* (§§12.35–§12.37, pp. 206–208) and *-iya-* (§§12.28–12.30, pp. 202–204): *aršāi-/aršiya-* 'to cultivate', *ḫapparāi-/ḫappariya-* 'to do business, trade, sell', *šamnāi-/šamniya-* 'to create', *šarlāi-/šarliya-* 'to elevate, magnify', *tarkummāi-/tarkummiya-* 'to proclaim'.

mi-verbs with stems in consonant, *-āi-*, and *-iya-*: *ištalk-/ištalkāi-/ištalkiya-* 'to make smooth', *parš-/paršāi-/paršiya-* 'to break', *tarupp-/taruppāi-/taruppiya-* 'to assemble'.

mi-verbs with stems in consonant and *-iya-*: *malk-/malkiya-* 'to spin', *ḫark-/ḫarkiya-* 'to perish', *park-/parkiya-* 'to raise, rise', *ištark-/ištarkiya-* 'to sicken', *karš-/karšiya-* 'to cut'.

12.51. Often, however, one stem of a root belongs to the *mi-* and other(s) to the *ḫi*-conjugation:

Consonantal *ḫi*-stem and *mi*-stem in *-iya-*: *ānš-/ānšiya-* 'to wipe'.

ḫi-stems in *-a-* and *mi*-stems in *-iya-*: *dala-/daliya-* 'to leave, *duwarna-/duwarniya-*

133. See [*t*]*e-eš* KUB 60.150 obv. 9. In HKM 48:17 instead of *Ú-UL te-e-eš*, read *z*[*i-i*]*k-ke-e-eš*.

134. This unusual and unexpected form appears to be a Luwian present third-person singular form in *-ti*.

'to break',[135] *šart-/šartiya-* (and *šartāi-*) 'to wipe', *walla-/walliya-* 'to praise'. See also *nai-* and *neya-* §13.21 (p. 223).

ḫi-stems in *-ai-* and *mi*-stems in *-iya-*: *išḫai-/išḫiya-* 'to bind', *išpai-/išpiya-* 'to be satiated', *šai-/šiya-*.[136]

12.52. Not all apparent examples of the above are really the same verb: *mark-* 'to cut up' versus *markiya-* 'to disapprove of, reject'; *arš-* 'to flow' versus *aršāi-/aršiya-* 'to tend, care for, cultivate'; and *warš-* 'to reap, harvest' versus *waršiya-* 'to pacify, soothe'.

---

135. This verb also shows some forms belonging to a stem in *-e-/-a-* (see §12.23, p. 199) and to a *mi*-stem in *-āi-* (see §12.35, p. 206): *duwarnez(z)i*, *duwarnazi* alongside *duwarnāizzi*.

136. In this case two originally separate verbs have merged: *šai-* 'to press, seal' (*ḫi*-verb in *-ai-*) and *šiya-* 'to throw, shoot' (see *peššiya-* 'to throw (away), cause to fall').

Chapter 13
CONJUGATION OF *ḫi*-VERBS

Consonantal Stems

13.1. The stems of many *ḫi*-verbs end in a single consonant that may be geminate or non-geminate: *šakk-/šekk-* 'to know', *akk-/ek-* 'to die', *ar-/er-* 'to come to, arrive at', *ḫašš-/ḫeš-* 'to open', *ašaš-/ašeš-* 'to settle', *ḫašš-* 'to give birth', *ḫād-* 'to dry up.' Note that the first five stems show an ablaut *a/e* with a distribution nearly completely opposite that of *mi*-verbs in *e/a*. While there are exceptions such as *šekk-* 'to know', there is also a regular alternation by which stems ending in a geminate consonant show a non-geminate in the present third-person singular and preterite third-person plural. Note *aki* and *a/eker* to *akk-* 'to die' and the frequent contrast between present third-person singular and present third-person plural: *ištāpi/ištappanzi* 'to shut/stop up', *ḫāši/ḫaššanzi* 'to give birth' and *zāḫi/zaḫḫanzi* 'to strike'. See AHP 80–81. There is a tendency in this class for *-ta* to replace *-š* as the preterite third-person singular ending and for the *e* vocalism to spread at the expense of *a*.

	'to know'	'to die'	'to arrive at'	'to open'
	Present Indicative			
	Singular			
1	*šākḫi*, *šaggaḫḫi*	*ākmi* †[1]	*ārḫi*	
2	*šakti*, *šekti*	***ākti***	*ārti*	
3	*šakki*	***aki***	***āri***	*ḫāši*, *ḫašzi* †
	Plural			
1	*šekkueni*, *šikkueni*	*akkueni*[2]	*erueni*[3]	*ḫaššueni*
2	***šaktēni***, *šakteni*, *šektēni*	*ākteni*	*ārteni*, *artēni*, *erteni*	
3	*šakanzi*, *šekkanzi*	***akkanzi***	*aranzi*	***ḫaššanzi***, *ḫēšanzi*

1. So, instead of expected *ḫi*-conjugation **ākḫi* or **aggaḫḫi*. Other *mi*-conjugation forms of *akk-* are imperative *akdu* and pret. sg. 3 *akta*. Since the *mi*-conjugation forms are all in late texts, we can assume singular first-person *ḫi*-forms in OH and MH.

2. Written *ak-ku-(u-)e-ni*, in contradistinction to *a-ku-e-ni* 'we drink.' See p. 188, n. 12, and §1.84 (p. 35).

3. Written *e-ru-u-e-ni* and *er-u-e-ni*.

	‘to settle’	‘to give birth’	‘to dry up’
	Present Indicative		
	Singular		
1	*ašašḫi*, *ašašḫe*		
2	*ašašti*		
3	*ašaši*, ***ašāši***, *ašaše*	***ḫāši***	*ḫāti*
	Plural		
3	*ašēšanzi*, *ašišanzi*	*ḫaššanzi*	*ḫātanzi*

	‘to know’	‘to die’	‘to arrive’	‘to open’	‘to settle’	‘give birth’	‘to dry up’
	Preterite Indicative						
	Singular						
1	*šaggaḫḫun*		*ar(aḫ)ḫun*, *ār(aḫ)ḫun*		*ašašḫun*	***ḫāšḫun***, *ḫāšun* †	
2	*šakkiš*, *šākta*						
3	*šakkiš*,[4] *šakta*, *šekta*	***ākkiš***, *a(k)kiš*, *akta*, *aggaš*	***ārša***, *āraš*	*ḫāšta*	*ašašta*, *ašešta*	***ḫāšta***	*ḫāzta*
	Plural						
1	*šekkuen*		*aruen*, *eruen*[5]	*ḫēšuen*[6]			
2		*ākten*					
3	*šekker*	***aker***,[7] *eker*	***arer***, *erer*	***ḫēšer***, *ḫešer*, *ḫāšer*	*ašēšer*, *ašešer*, *ašešir*[8]	*ḫāšer*, *ḫāšir*	*ḫāter*

4. For the inserted *-i-* in *šakkiš*, *ākkiš*, etc. see §1.81 (p. 34). The spellings *a-ar-ša*/*a-ar-aš* represent /a:rs/. A form like *aggaš* could also be a spelling for /a:ks/, with no inserted vowel, but its appearance in MH (VBoT 1:24, MS) suggests a real ending /-as/ borrowed from *ḫi*-verbs in *-a-* (see §13.13, p. 220).

5. Written *ar-ú-en*, *e-ru-u-en*, *e-er-u-en*, *e-ru-en*.

6. Written *ḫé-e-šu-u-en*.

7. As a pret. pl. 3, only *a-ker* is thus far attested in OS. In later texts we find *a-ke-er*, *e-ke-er*, and *e-ker*.

8. *a-še-ši-ir* in KUB 23.42 obv. 1. For *e-še-šer* KUB 41.1 iv 9 see §§1.21–1.22 (p. 18) and n. 24 there.

	Imperative		
	Singular		Plural
1	*šeggallu*, *šiggallu*, *aggallu*, *akkallu*		
2	*šāk*, *āk*, *ḫāš*[9]		*šekten*, *arten*, *ḫēšten*, *ašešten*
3	*aku*, *aru*, *ḫāšu*, *ḫādu*, *akdu*†, *šakdu*†, *ḫēšdu*†		*šekkandu*, *akkandu*, *ḫēšandu*

13.2. Verbal substantive: *aggātar*, *ḫēšuwar*, *ašešuwar*.[10] Infinitive I: *ašešuwanzi*. Infinitive II: *aranna*(?).[11] Participle: *šekkant-* (rare *šakkant-*), *akkant-*, *arant-*, *ḫaššant-*, *ḫēšant-*, *ašešant-*, *ḫādant-*. Imperfective: *akkiške-*, *āraške-*, *ḫaške-*, *ḫeške-*, ***ašaške-***, *ašeške-*, *ašiške-*.

13.3. Some *ḫi*-verbs end in a sequence of two consonants: *paḫš-* / *paḫḫaš-* 'to guard', *ši*(*p*)*pand-* / *išpant-* 'to libate, offer'.

	Present Indicative			
	Singular		Plural	
1	*paḫḫašḫi*, *paḫḫašmi* †	***išpantaḫḫe***, *šipandaḫḫi*, *šippantaḫḫi*	*paḫšueni*	*šipanduwani*
2	*paḫḫašti*		*paḫḫašteni*	
3		***išpanti***, ***šipānti***, *šipandi*, *ši(p)panti*, *šipantai*[12]	*paḫšanzi*	***išpantanzi***, ***šipantanzi***, *šippantanzi*, *ši(p)pandanzi*

	Preterite Indicative			
	Singular		Plural	
1	*paḫḫa*[*šḫu*]*n*	*ši(p)pandaḫḫun*		*šipantuen*, *šipanduen*
3	*paḫḫašta*	*šipand/taš*, *šipanzašta*	*paḫšir*	*ši(p)panter*, *šippantaer*

	Imperative		
	Singular		Plural
2	*paḫši*		*paḫḫašten*
3			*paḫšandu*

9. All forms in *ḫašš-*/*ḫeš-* in this and the following paragraph belong to the verb 'to open'.

10. Written *a-še-šu-u-wa-ar*.

11. KUB 46.40 obv. 3 (NH).

12. Present sg. 3 *šipantai* and preterite pl. 3 *šippantaer* are due to late reanalysis as an *a*-stem modeled on *dā-* 'to take'.

13.4. Verbal substantive: *šipantuwar*, *šippanduwar*. Infinitive I: *išpanduwanzi*, *šippanduwanzi*. Participle: *paḫšant-*, *šipantant-*. Imperfective: *paḫḫaške-*, ***išpanzaške-***, *ši*(*p*)*panzake-*.

13.5. The originally consonantal stem *īšš-* (iter. to *iya-* 'to do, make') and the stems *laḫ*(*w*)- and *išḫ*(*w*)- are treated in §§13.15–13.19 (pp. 220–222) because their attested inflection is predominantly as vocalic stems.

13.6. Factitive verbs in *-aḫḫ-* are inflected exclusively as *ḫi*-verbs in OH (OS), but they are mostly inflected as *mi*-verbs in the later language. Note the different treatment of the ablauting adjective stem in the *u*- and *i*-stem adjectives: *idalawaḫḫ-* (not **idaluwaḫḫ-*) and *tepawaḫḫ-* (not **tepuwaḫḫ-*), but *šuppiyaḫḫ-* (not **šuppayaḫḫ-*).

	Present Indicative
	Singular
1	*idālawaḫmi*, *šuppiyaḫmi*, *manninkuwaḫmi*, SIG$_5$-*aḫmi*, KASKAL-*šiyaḫmi*
2	*idālawaḫti*, *kururiyaḫti*, ÌR-*aḫti*, SIG$_5$-*aḫti*
3	*arāwaḫḫi*, ***tašuwaḫḫi***, ***šuppiyaḫḫi***, *kururiyaḫḫi*, *katteraḫḫi*, *šarazyaḫḫi*, ḪUL-*waḫḫi (*idalawaḫḫi)*, *maninkuwaḫḫi*, *kartimmiyaḫḫi*, KASKAL-*aḫḫi*; (*mi*-forms:) *tašuwaḫzi*, *idālawaḫzi*, *maniyaḫzi*, *šuppiyaḫzi*, KASKAL-*šiyaḫzi*
	Plural
1	SIG$_5$-*aḫweni*; *dašuwaḫwani*, [3-*y*]*aḫḫaḫḫuwani*, 4-*yaḫḫaḫḫuwani*[13]
2	*katterraḫteni*, *šarazziyaḫteni*, SIG$_5$-*aḫteni*, [*šak*]*uwaššaraḫteni*
3	[3-*y*]*aḫḫanzi*, 4-*yaḫḫanzi*, KASKAL-*šiaḫḫanzi*

	Preterite Indicative
	Singular
1	*idālawaḫḫun*, *arāwaḫḫun*, *papraḫḫun*, *kururiyaḫḫun*, *šuppiyaḫḫun*, *kutruwaḫḫun*, *newaḫḫun*, *šappišaraḫḫun*, KASKAL-*šiaḫḫ*[*un*]
2 in *-ta*	LÚŠU.GI-*aḫta*
3 in *-aš*[14]	*allapaḫḫaš*, *ḫantezziyaḫḫaš*, *manninkuwaḫḫaš*, *newaḫḫaš*, *šuppiyaḫḫaš*, *taruppiyaḫḫaš*, *tatraḫḫaš*
3 in *-iš*	*iškunaḫḫiš*, *maniyaḫḫiš*, *pararaḫḫiš*, *taruppiaḫḫiš*, *watarnaḫḫiš*,
3 in *-ta*[15]	ÌR-*aḫta*, GÙB-*laḫta*, *išiyaḫta*, *idālawaḫta*, *katterraḫta*, *kuripaḫta*, *kururiyaḫta*, *liliwaḫta*, *papraḫta*, *šakiyaḫta*, *šarazziyaḫta*, *tašuwaḫta*, *tepawaḫta*

13. The redundant spelling *-aḫ-ḫa-aḫ-ḫu-wa-* for /-ahhwa-/ is unexplained, perhaps faulty.

14. The third-singular forms in *-aš* and *-iš* co-occur in KUB 28.82 i 16–17 and on the same verb (*taruppiyaḫḫaš* [16], *taruppiyaḫḫiš* [17]).

15. All examples of the third-person singular forms with *-ta* endings are NH.

	Preterite Indicative
	Plural
1	*idālawaḫḫuen*, ZAG-*naḫḫuen*, [KASKAL-]*šiyaḫḫuen*
2	ḪUL-*aḫten*
3	*kururiyaḫḫer*, *ulkeššaraḫḫer*, *ḫappina*[*ḫḫer*], *pēdaššaḫḫer*, ÌR-*naḫḫer*, *katterraḫḫer*, [*m*]*išriwaḫḫe*[*r*], *liliwaḫḫer*, *markištaḫḫer*, *arāwaḫḫer*, *papraḫḫer*, *newaḫḫer*, *mayandaḫḫer*, *dašuwaḫḫer*, SIG_5-*yaḫḫer*, *dannataḫḫer*

13.7. Verbal substantive: *šuppiyaḫḫuwar*. Infinitive: *maniyaḫḫūwanzi*, *šuppiyaḫḫuwanzi*. Participle: *idalwaḫḫant-*, *maniyaḫḫant-*, *šuppiyaḫḫant-*. Imperfective: *maniyaḫḫi/eške-*, *šuppiyaḫḫiške-*.

Vocalic Stems

13.8. The number of possible final vowels in stems of the *ḫi*-conjugation is more restricted than in stems of the *mi*-conjugation. There are basically only two types: stems in *-a-* and stems in *-i-,* but these mutually influence each other, and remodelings of original consonantal stems further complicate the situation.

13.9. Stems in *-a-*: According to the rule given in §1.126 (p. 44) these stems show first-person plurals and verbal nouns in *-um-*. There is, however, a strong tendency to level out this odd alternation in favor of the regular *-a-* stem and regular endings (see *dāwen*, *dāwanzi*, *dāwaš*).

a-Stems

13.10. Underived stems in *-a-*.

13.11. *dā-* 'to take':

	Present Indicative			**Preterite Indicative**	
	Singular	Plural		Singular	Plural
1	***dāḫḫe***,[16] ***dāḫḫi***,[17] *daḫḫi*	***tumēni***,[18] *dummeni*,[19] ***dāweni***,[20] *dāwani* [21]		***dāḫḫun***, *daḫḫun*	*dāwen* [22]
2	***dātti***, *datti*, *tatti*	***dattēni***, *datteni*		*dāš*	*datten*
3	***dāi***	***danzi***		***dāš***	***dāir*** [23]

16. *da-a-aḫ-ḫé* in CTH 416 (OS).

17. *da-a-aḫ-ḫi* in StBoT 25 #137 ii 10 (OS) and KBo 17.61 obv. 21, 25 (MH/MS).

18. Written *tu-me-e-ni* in CTH 416 (StBoT 25 #4 iii 43, iv 25, OS), CTH 752.2 (OS), KUB 43.25 obv. 12 (OS), KBo 17.25 obv.? 8′ (OH/MS) and *tu-me-ni* in KBo 25.8:2′ (OS), and *tum-me-e-ni* KUB 28.79:5 (OH/NS) and *du-me-e-ni* in CTH 443 (MH).

19. Written *du-um-me-e-ni* and *tum-me-e-ni* in Hatt. III and Tudḫ. IV texts, therefore late NH. See §1.24 (p. 19).

Imperative			
	Singular		Plural
2	***dā***		***dātten***, *datten*
3	***dāu***, *daddu* † [24]		*dandu*

13.12. Verbal substantive: *dāwar*, gen. *dāwaš.* Infinitive I: *dāwanzi.* Infinitive II: *danna.* Participle: *dānt-*. Imperfective: *daške-*.

13.13. Paradigms of verbs with *-u*(*m*)- in first-person plural (§1.126, p. 44, but see also §13.11, *tumēni* above), in the verbal substantive, and infinitive I: *tarna-* 'to let', *šarra-* 'to divide', *wašta-* 'to sin', *uda-* 'to bring here', *peda-* 'to carry off'. The late Hittite writing *ú*-TÉN-*zi* and *pí*-TÉN-*zi* does not indicate a second vocalization /utenzi/ or /pitenzi/ for the forms *udanzi* and *pedanzi*, since the *tén* (DIN) sign in late Hittite often should be read dan_x (§1.35, p. 21; §1.63, p. 29).

	Present Indicative				
	Singular				
1	***tarnaḫḫe***, ***tarnaḫḫi***		*waštaḫḫi*	*udaḫḫi*	***pēt̄aḫḫe***,[25] ***pētaḫḫi***, *pēdaḫḫi*
2	*tarnatti*, *tarnaši* †	*šarratti*	*waštatti*, *waštaši* †	***udaddi***, *udatti* [26]	*pēdatti*
3	***tarnāi***, ***tarnai***, *tarnaizzi* †	*šarrai*, *šarrizzi* †	***waštai***, *wašti* [27]	***udai***, *udāi*	***pēdai*** [28]
	Plural				
1	*tarnumeni*, *tarnummani* [29]	*šarraweni*		***udumēni***, *utummeni* [29]	***pētumeni***, *pedummeni* [29]
2	*tarnatteni*	*šarratteni*		*udatteni*	*petatteni*, *pēdatteni*
3	*tarnanzi*	***šarranzi***	*waštanzi*	***udanzi***	***pēdanzi***, *pedanzi*

20. Written *da-a-*[*u*-]*e-ni* StBoT 25 #137 ii 16 (OS), *da-a-u-e-ni* in KUB 16.16 rev. 20 (NH liver oracle).

21. Written *da-a-u-wa-ni* KUB 12.63 rev. 8 (CHD L–N sub *laḫḫiyala-*).

22. Written *da-a-u-en* and *da-a-u-e-en*.

23. We read *da-a-ir* as monosyllabic *dāir* (i.e., [da:yr]). See p. 224, nn. 48–50.

24. Much less common than *dāu* (*da-a-ú*).

25. OS: *pé-*(*e-*)*táḫ-ḫé.*

26. OS: *ú-da-ad-di* in KUB 33.59 iii 3; NH *ú-da-at-ti* KUB 33.121 ii 11.

27. The form *wa-aš-ti* (KUB 1.16 iii 60) suggests that this verb was originally a consonantal stem (see §11.15, p. 184).

28. OS: *pé*(*-e*)*-ta-i*, *pé-e-da-i*. Plene writing in the second syllable appears first in NS.

29. On the graphic *mm* in these forms see §1.24 (p. 19).

	Preterite Indicative				
	Singular				
1	***tarnaḫḫun***	*šarraḫḫun*	*waštaḫḫun*	***udaḫḫun***[30]	*pedaḫḫun*
2	*tarnaš*		*waštaš*		
3	***tarnaš***, *tarnešta*[31]	***ša-a-ar-aš***,[32] *šarraš*, ***šarret*** †	*waštaš*	*udaš*	***pēdaš***, *pedaš*
	Plural				
1	*tarnummen*,[29] *tarnuen*[33]	*šarrummen*[29]		*utummen*[29]	***pētumen***,[34] *petummen*[29]
2	*tarnatten*				
3	*tarner*	*šarrer*	*wašter*	***uter***	*peter*

	Imperative				
	Singular				
2	*tarna*, *tarni*	*šarri*		***uda***	***pēta***, *peda*
3	*tarnāu*, *tarnešdu*[35]			*udāu*	*pedāu*
	Plural				
2	*tarnatten*, *tarništen*[36]			*udatten*	*pedatten*, *pitešten*[36]
3	*tarnandu*			*udandu*	***pētantu***, *pedandu*

13.14. Verbal substantive: *tarnummar*, *šarrumar*, *wašdumar*, *utummar*, *petummar.* Infinitive I: *tarnummanzi*, *šarrumanzi*, *utummanzi*, *pedummanzi.* Infinitive II: *šarranna.* Participle: *tarnant-*, *šarrant-*, *waštant-*, *udant-*, *pedant-*.

13.15. Imperfectives in *-šša-*. Archaic forms of the stem *īšš*(*a*)- 'to do, make' show that the suffix *-šša-,* which marks the imperfective in some verbs instead of *-ške/a-,*

30. Attested in OS as *ú-daḫ-ḫ*[*u-un*] KBo 3.22:58.

31. *tarnešta* shows replacement of the *ḫi*-conjugation preterite third-person singular *-š* by *-šta*. See §11.16 (p. 184) and p. 181, n. 6.

32. SBo 1 Text 15:6, Bo 90/732:62 (OS). For the dating of the latter see Carruba 1993b: 81, 83. For the unusual syllabification see §1.12 (p. 13).

33. *tar-nu-en* KBo 3.60 iii 7 (OH/NS).

34. OS: *pé-e-tu-mi-en*.

35. *tarnešdu* and *eššešzi* are analogical to the preterite third-person singular forms *tarnešta* and *ēššešta*, whose *-ta* ending led to a reanalysis as from stems *tarnešš-* and *ēššešš-* with *mi*-inflection. Possibly the same process can be seen in *aušdu* and *aušzi*, reanalyzed on the basis of preterite third-person singular *aušta* (see §13.32, p. 228).

36. This variant is due to influence of the *ḫi*-verb stems in *-ai-* (see §13.21, p. 224).

originally had consonantal inflection.[37] The non-finite forms and derived stem in *-ške-* are also based on a stem *-(i)šš-*. For the most part, however, the suffix is *-šša-*. Other *ḫi*-verbs showing this derivational suffix are: *arpašša-* 'to be unlucky', *ḫalzišša-* 'to call', *ḫuitteššа-* 'to pull out, draw out', *karmalašša-* 'to suffer harm, be incapacitated', *šišša-* 'to press, seal', *tarpanallašša-* 'to take another's place', *warrišša-* 'to come to the aid of'.

	Present Indicative
	Singular
1	*iššaḫḫi*, *ēššaḫḫi*, *ḫalziššaḫḫi*, *war(r)iššaḫḫi*
2	*iššatti*, *ēššatti*, *ēššati* (rare), *ḫalziššatti*, *ši-iš-at-ti*, *warreššatti*, *warrišatti*, *wa-ar-iš-ša-at-te*
3	***īššai***, *iššāi*, *ēššāi*, *ḫalzileššai*, *ḫuitteššai*, *karmalaššai*
	Plural
1	*iššūeni*, *ēššūeni*
2	***īštēni***, ***īštenī***, *iššatteni*, *ēššatteni*, *warreššatteni*
3	*iššanzi*, *ēššanzi*, *ḫalzileššanzi*, *warreššanzi*
	Preterite Indicative
	Singular
1	*iššaḫḫun*, *ēššaḫḫun*, *warreššaḫḫun*
2	*ḫalzeššešta*
3	*iššišta*, *ēššešta*, *ēššišta*, *ešešta*, *warreššešta*, *warriššišta*
	Plural
1	*iššūen*, *eššūen*, *ēššuēn*
2	*ēššatten*
3	***īššer***, *ēššer*, *iēššer*, *ēššir*, (*ešer*), *ḫalzeššer*

	Imperative
	Singular
2	*īšša*, *ēšša*, *ēšši*, *warrešša*
3	*ēššau*, *ēššaddu*†, *ḫalzišdu*†, *warreššišdu*†
	Plural
2	***īšten***, *iššatten*, *ēššešten*
3	*iššandu*, *ēššandu*, *ḫalzeššandu*

13.16. Supine: ***īššuwan***, *iššuwan*, *ēššuwan.* Verbal substantive: *ēššumar*, *ēššuwar.* Participle: *warrišant-*. Imperfective: *ēššiker*, *ēššišker*, *ēššišket*, *ešešker.*

37. Specifically *i-iš-te-e-ni* and *i-iš-te-en* (OS).

Stems Originally in -Cw-

13.17. *laḫ(ḫ)w-* ‘to pour (liquids)’, reduplicated *lilḫw-*, and *išḫw-* ‘to pour (solid particles)’. These stems originally inflected with a stem in -C*w*- before vowel (necessarily written -C*u*-*w*V- or -C*u*-*u*/*ú*-V-) and -C*u*- before consonant. There was a marked tendency for these to be replaced by vocalic stems in -C(*u*)*wa*- throughout.

	Present Indicative
	Singular
1	*laḫuḫḫi*, *lāḫumi*† [38]
2	*laḫḫutti*
3	***lāḫui***, *lāḫuwai*, *laḫḫūwai*, *laḫuzzi*,† *lāḫūwāiz*[*zi*]†
	Plural
1	—[39]
2	
3	***laḫuanzi***, ***lāḫuwanzi***, *laḫuwanzi*

	Preterite Indicative
	Singular
1	*lāḫuwanun*† [39]
2	
3	*lāḫḫuš*, *lāḫuwaš*, *lāḫuwaiš*, *lāḫuš* [40]
	Plural
1	
2	
3	*laḫuwāer*

Imperative				
	Singular			Plural
2	—[39]		2	*laḫḫuten*, *lāḫḫuwaten*
3			3	*laḫuwandu*

13.18. Participle: *lāḫuwant-* (sg. neut. ***laḫuān***); verbal subst. *lāḫuwar*, gen. *lāḫuwaš*.

13.19. Just as *ḫi*-verbs in *-i-* tend to acquire the inflection of *mi*-verbs in *-iya-*, based on forms such as the present third-person plural in *-iyanzi*, so too there are a few examples of this verb as a *mi*-verb stem *laḫḫuwa*(*i*)- (e.g., *laḫuwanun*, *laḫuzzi*, *laḫuwaizzi*, etc.).

ai-Stems

13.20. Ablauting verbs in *-ai-*. We retain the traditional classification of these stems as “*ḫi*-verbs in *-ai-*.” The paradigms actually show a complicated alternation of stems in *-ai-*/*-āi-*, *-e-*, and *-i-*/*-y-*. As the following paradigms show, *-āi-* tends to compete with the other variants. There is the further important peculiarity that the present and preterite second-person plural endings in this class are attested from OS as *-šteni* and *-šten*, with an initial *-š-*. This *-š-* later tends to spread to the present second-person singular ending

38. KBo 32.176 i 16.

39. The pres. pl. 1 *la-ḫu-e-ni*, pret. sg. 1 *la-a-ḫu-un*, and imp. sg. 2 *la-a-aḫ* belong to a stem *lāḫ-* with identical meaning. See Hoffner 2003b: 620 (review of HED L).

40. KBo 32.14 ii 42 (see Neu 1994: 191–92).

(*-šti* for *-ti*). The replacement of the preterite third-person singular *-š* with *-šta* may be related or reflect the influence of consonant stems ending in *-š-* (see p. 181, n. 11, and §13.1, p. 215).[41]

13.21. Paradigms of *dai-* 'to put', *pai-* 'to give', *nai-* 'to turn', *zai-* 'to cross', *ḫalzai-* 'to call' (originally *išḫi-* 'to bind' belonged to this class; see §13.30, p. 227):

	Present Indicative					
	Singular					
1	***tēḫḫe***, ***tēḫḫi***, *teḫḫi*	***pēḫḫe***, ***pēḫḫi***, *peḫḫi*	*neḫḫi*	*neyami*[42]		**[*ḫalz*]*iḫḫi***, *ḫalziḫḫi*
2	*dāitti*, *tāitti*	*paitti*, *paišti*, *pešti*	*nāitti*, *neyati*	*neyaši*	*zāitti*, *zāši*	*ḫalzāitti*, *ḫalziyatti*, *ḫalzešti*, *ḫalziyaši*
3	***dāi***	***pāi***, (*pai*)	*nāi*, (*nai*)	*neyazzi*	***zāi***	***ḫalzāi***
	Plural					
1	*tiyaweni*, *tiyauni*[43]	*pīweni*, *piyaweni*	*naiwani*, *neyaweni*			*ḫalziwani*, *ḫalziyaweni*
2	*tāitteni*, *tāišteni*[44]	*pišteni*, *pešteni*	*naištani*, *naišteni*			*ḫalziyatteni*
3	***tianzi***, ***tianti***,[45] *tienzi*, ***tiyan****zi*	***pi(y)anzi***	*nēanzi*, *ne(y)anzi*			***ḫalzianzi***, *ḫalziyanzi*

	Preterite Indicative				
	Singular				
1	*teḫḫun*	*peḫḫun*	***nēḫ*[*ḫun*]**, *neḫḫun*, *neyaḫḫun*	*zeḫḫun*	***ḫalziḫḫun***
2		*paitta*, *pešta*	*naitta*	*zāit*	*ḫalzait*
3	*daiš*, *dāiš*, *dāišta dāitta*	***paiš***, *pāiš*, *paišta*, *pēšta*	*naiš*, *nāiš*, *naieš*, *nāišta*, *nāitta*, *nāit* †, *neyat* †	*zāiš*	*ḫalzaiš*, *ḫalzāiš*

41. For different views on the prehistoric source of the *-š-* see Oettinger 1979: 462 with refs. and Kloekhorst forthcoming.

42. Obviously, this paradigm is not *ḫi-* but *mi*-conjugation. It is placed here to call attention to the fact that *nai-* conjugates both ways. The *ḫi*-conjugation is older and more regular for *nai-*.

43. In *ti-ya-u-ni* 1691/u ii 18 (CTH 375.1 prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal, MH/MS). That this is not a scribal slip for *ti-ya-u-e-ni* is indicated by the immediately following *na-at* SIG$_5$-*aḫ-ḫu-ni* for SIG$_5$-*aḫ-ḫu-e-ni*.

44. Note that the *-šteni*, pret. sg. 2 and 3 *-šta*, and pret. pl. 2 *-šten* endings are characteristic of the *ḫi-*, not *mi-*, conjugation.

45. This form either represents an unexpected early Luwianism in OS or an error of audition with confusion between /t/ and /ts/. Compare for the latter possibility pres. sg. 3 *damašti* for *damašzi* (see p. 181, n. 8) vs. pres. sg. 2 *ištamašzi* for *ištamašti* (see §11.10, p. 183).

	Preterite Indicative				
	Plural				
1	*daiwen*,[46] *tiyawen*	*pīwen*, *piyawen*	*neyawen*	*zaiwen*	*ḫalziwen*, *ḫalziyawen*
2	***daišten***,[47] *tiyatten* †				
3	***dāir***,[48] ***daier***, *dāyēr*,[49] *daēr*,[50] *tier*[51]	***pīēr***, *pier*	*naer*, *neyer*		*ḫalzi(y)er*

	Imperative				
	Singular				
2	*dāi*	***pai***, *pāi*	*nāi*, *neya*		*ḫalzāi*
3	*dāu*	*pāu*, *pešdu*	*nāu*		*ḫalzāu*
	Plural				
2	*dāišten*	***pīšten***, *pišten*, *paišten*	*naišten*, *nāišten*, *neyatten* †	*zāitten*	*ḫalzišten*
3	*tiyandu*	*piandu*	*neyandu*		*ḫalzi(y)andu*

13.22. Verbal substantive: *tiyawar*, *piyawar*, *neyawar*, (gen.) *ḫalziyawaš*. Infinitive I: *tiyawanzi*, *piyawanzi*,[52] *ḫalziyawanzi* . Infinitive II: *tiyanna*, *piyanna*. Participle: *tiyant-*, ***piyant-***, ***nēant-***, *neyant-*, *ḫalziyant-*. Supine: ***īššuwan***, *iššuwan*, *ēššuwan*. Imperfective: ***zikke-***, ***piške-***, *naiške-*, *zāiške-*, *ḫalzišš(a)-* (see §13.15, p. 221).

Stems with Mixed Inflection in -a- and -i-

13.23. Paradigms for base verbs in *-a-*/*-i-*. Disyllabic stems that originally inflected as "*ḫi*-verbs in *-ai-*" (§13.20) were influenced by the *ḫi*-verbs in *-a-* (§13.13) and show

46. *da-i-ú-en* (MH), *da-i-u-e-en* (MH), *da-a-i-ú-en* (MH).

47. Also *išḫāišten* and *šaišten*.

48. We read thus *da-a-ir* ([da:yr]) in KBo 22.1:4 (OS), a form also attested in NH, contracted from prehistoric **dāyēr* with loss of intervocalic **y*.

49. *da-i-er* KBo 22.2 obv. 16 (OS), KBo 15.10 iii 44 and passim (MH/MS) reflects a renewed *dai-* + *-ēr* (with *dai-* from forms like *dai-wen*). See also *da-a-i-e-er* KBo 16.27 iii 9, iv 9 (MH/MS), KBo 6.34 i 27 (MH/NS), *da-a-i-er* KBo 15.10 ii 30 (MH/MS), *da-i-e-er* ibid. iii 47 (MH/MS), KBo 16.27 iii 15 (MH/MS), KBo 8.35 ii 29 and passim (MH/MS), HKM 57:17; and HKM 63:19 (both MH/MS), sporadically as late as KBo 16.61 rev.? 17 (late NH).

50. *da-e-er* HKM 47:11 (MH/MS), perhaps a scribal slip for *da-i-e-er*, the form found elsewhere in HKM texts.

51. *ti-e-er* and *ti-i-e-er*.

52. See, however, the cautionary remarks in CHD P 42 about this form possibly being from *piya-* 'to send'.

a mixture of *-a-* and *-i-* forms. The stems in *-a-* had already been generalized in the first- and second-singular in Old Hittite. In other persons, the variants with *-a-* spread at the expense of those with *-i-* within the period from Old to New Hittite. Originally *dāla-* 'to leave' belonged to this class (see §13.30). Stems: *mema-* 'to speak', *ūnna-* 'to drive (here)', *penna-* 'to drive (there)', *uppa-*'to send (here).'

	Present Indicative			
	Singular			
1	***mēmaḫḫe***, ***mēmaḫḫi***, *memaḫḫi*	*ūnnaḫḫi*	*pe(n)naḫḫi*	*uppaḫḫi*
2	*mēmatti*	*ūnnatti*	*pennatti*	[*up*]*patti*
3	***mēmāi***, *memai*	***ūnnāi***, *ūnnai*	***pennai***, *pennāi*	*uppāi*
	Plural			
1	*memiweni*, *memaweni*, *memiyaweni*	*unumē*[*ni*][53]	***penniweni***	*uppiweni*
2	*mema(t)teni*, *memišteni*	*ūnnatteni*, *ūnništeni*		*uppatteni*
3	*memi(y)anzi*, *memanzi*	*ūnniyanzi*, *ūnnanzi*	*penni(y)anzi*, *pennanzi*, *pinnanzi*	*uppi(y)anzi*, *uppanzi*

	Preterite Indicative			
	Singular			
1	*memaḫḫun*	*ūnnaḫḫun*	*pennaḫḫun*	*uppaḫḫun*
2	*memišta*	*ūnneš*, *ūnniš*		*uppešta*
3	*mēmišta*, *memaš*	*ūnneš*, *ūnnešta*, *ūnništa*	*penniš*, *penništa*, *pennaš*, *pennit* †	*uppaš*, *uppešta*
	Plural			
1	*memawin*, *memiyawen*	*ūnnumen*		*uppiwen*
2	*memišten*			
3	***mēmier***, *me(m)mier*, *memiēr*	*ūnni*[*er*]	*pennier*, *penner*[54]	*uppier*

53. KBo 41.42 i 5′, could also be from *unu-*/*unuwa-* 'to decorate'.

54. Written *pé-en-ner*, built on the stem *penna-*. Likewise the unusual *pé-ner*^{er}. We read *pé-en-ni-er* as *pennier* built on the stem *penni-*, after *mēmier*, not as a possible *pé-en-né-er*.

	Imperative			
	Singular			
1	*memallu*			
2	*mēmi*, *mema*	*ūnni*	*penni*	*uppi*
3	*mēmā̀u*, *memā̀u*, *memattu* †	*ūnnau*		*uppāu*
	Plural			
2	*memišten*	*ūnništen*	*penništen*	*uppišten*
3	*memandu*	*uniandu*, *ūnni(y)andu*		

13.24. Verbal substantive: *memiyawar*, *memmūwar*, **ūnnumar* (gen. *ūnnumaš*), **pennumar* (gen. *pennumaš*). Infinitive I: *memiyawa(n)zi*, *memiwanzi*, *memmūwanzi*, *pennu(m)manzi*, *pennuanzi*, *penniyawanzi*. Substantive: *memant-*, *memi*(*y*)*ant-*, *ūnnant-*, *penniyant-*,[55] *pennant-*, *uppant-*. Imperfective: *mēmiške-*, *penneške-*, *uppiške-*.

Verbs with the Imperfective Suffix -anna/i-

13.25. As verbs with the imperfective derivational suffix *-ške-* inflect according to the *mi*-conjugation, so those with the isofunctional suffix *-anna-* inflect as *ḫi*-verbs with mixed stems in *-a-* and *-i-*. There are also some examples of *mi*-conjugation forms modeled on *mi*-verbs in *-iya-*.

13.26. Examples of inflection of stems in *-anna-*.[56]

	Present Indicative
	Singular
1	*paršiyannaḫḫi*, *išḫūwannaḫḫi*, *ḫuittiyannaḫḫi*
3	*ḫattannai*, ***ḫuttiannai***, *ḫuittiannai*, ***iyannai***, ***nannai***, *parḫannai*, ***paršiyannai***, *(paršiyannāi)*, *tuḫšannai*, *walḫannai*
	Plural
3	***nannianzi***, ***walḫannianzi***, *iyannianzi*, *šallanniyanzi*, *ḫallannianzi*, *paršiyannanzi*

55. Neut. sg. nom.-acc. *pennian* KUB 12.58 iv 18 (NH) and [*p*]*ennan* KUB 39.49:16 (NS).

56. The occasional failure to spell the geminate *-nn-* by omitting the *-an-* sign (e.g., *wa-al-aḫ-ḫa-na-i*, *wa-al-ḫa-ni-an-da*, *ḫé-e-u-wa-né-eš-k*[*i-it*]), pace Neu 1981a, is of no linguistic significance.

	Preterite Indicative
	Singular
1	[*tuḫša*]*nnaḫḫun*, *iyanniyanun*†
3	***yanniš***, *iyanni/eš*, *piddanniš*, (but rarely: *iyanniyat*,† *paršiyannit*†)
	Plural
2	*iyanniyatten*
3	*ḫattannier*, *paršiyanner*[57]

	Imperative
	Singular
3	*walḫannau*
	Plural
3	*iškarranniandu*

13.27. Supine: ***piyanniwan***, *walḫanniuw*[*an*], GUL-*ḫanniyauwan*. Imperfective: *walḫanni/ešk anzi*, *walhanni/ešket*, *walḫannešker*, *walḫanniškett en*, *walḫanniškeuan*, *werianniškeši*, *laḫḫiyannišgaueni*, *ḫēuwanešk*[*et*].

13.28. Forms of the verb *iyanna/i-* in older texts follow the *ḫi*-conjugation like other *-anna-* duratives. But in NH *mi*-conjugation forms begin to appear.

13.29. The verb *piyanāi-* 'to reward' (with CHD P s.v., contra HW 169) is not a durative stem of *pai-*, *piya-* 'to give', as its *mi*-conjugation inflection, ungeminated *n*, and meaning in context clearly show.

Mixture of mi- and ḫi- Forms

13.30. The following verbs show a more thorough-going mixture of *mi-* and *ḫi-* forms than those in §13.23 (p. 224). The verb *dāla-* 'to leave' probably belonged originally to the class of *mema/i-* (§13.23) and *išḫi-* 'to bind' to that of *dai-* (§13.21, p. 223), while in the case of *šai-/šiya-* 'to press, thrust' there has been a merger of two originally separate verbs, one of which was originally of the *dai-* class belonging to the *ḫi*-conjugation and the other a stem in *-iya-* belonging to the *mi*-conjugation.[58] The available attested forms do not permit a confident assignment to a particular inflectional class.

57. Written *pár-ši-ya-an-ner*. For the interpretation of *ḫa-at-ta-an-ni-er* see n. 54 (p. 225).
58. See p. 213, n. 136.

	Present Indicative		
	Singular		
1	*dālaḫḫi*, *dāliyami*	*išḫiḫḫi*	*šiyami*, *šiammi*
2	*dalatti*, *dāliyaši*, *taliyaši*		
3	***dālai***, ***tālai***, *dālāi*, *dālaizzi*, *dāliyazi*, *taliyazi*	***išḫāi***,[59] *išḫai*, *išḫiezzi*, *išḫiyazzi*	*šīēzi*, *šīyāizzi*, *šiyaizzi*, *šiyazzi*, *šāi*
	Plural		
1	*dāliyaweni*, *tāliyaweni*		*šiyāweni*
2	*dālešteni*	*išḫiyatteni*	
3	*dāliyanzi*, *dālanzi*	***išḫianzi***, *išḫiyanzi*	*šiyanzi*

	Preterite Indicative		
	Singular		
1	*dālaḫḫi*, *dāliyami*	*išḫiḫḫi*	*šiyami*, *šiammi*
2			*šišta*[60]
3	***tāliš***, *dāliš*, *dālešta*, *dāliyat*, *dālaš*	*išḫāiš*, *išḫiyat*	*šīēt(ta)*, *šiyāit*, *šīyait*, *šaīš*, *šāiš*
	Plural		
1	*daliyawen*		
2	*daliyatten*	*išḫaište*[*n*], *išḫāten*	*šāišten*[61]
3	*dālier*	*išḫier*	*šiyaer*

	Imperative		
	Singular		
1	*dāla*, *dāli*		*šai*, *šiya*
2	*tālešdu*		
	Plural		
2	*dālešten*	*išḫiyatten*	*šišten*
3	*dālandu*	*išḫi(y)andu*	*šiyandu*

13.31. Verbal substantive: *dalumar*, *taliyawar*, *išḫiyawar*, *šiyawar.* Infinitive I: *šiyawanzi.* Infinitive II: *šiyanna.* Participle: *daliyant-*, ***išḫiyant-***, *šiyant-*.

13.32. The conjugation of *au*(*š*)- ‘to see’ (and the much rarer *mau*(*š*)- ‘to fall’) is classified as irregular. It shows an ablauting stem (full grade *au-*, zero-grade *u-*). The two

59. Laws §158 copy aa (OS).

60. KBo 3.34 i 23 according to Oettinger (1979: 473 §352), citing Eichner. See Dardano 1997: 34–35, 87–88 with n. 64.

61. *šāišten* KUB 26.82:9 quoted in HW 175 as imperative is, instead, preterite by context.

grades are also reflected in nominal derivatives: *au+ri-* ‘sentinel post, watch’ and *parā uwattalla-* ‘overseer, watcher’ (from *parā au*(*š*)- ‘to oversee’). The verbal paradigm shows an inserted *-š-* before endings beginning with *-t-* (see the verbs in *-i-* above!). Unexpectedly, the third-person forms singular show not only the inserted *-š-* but also *mi*-conjugation endings. On this phenomenon see p. 220, n. 35.

	Present Indicative		**Preterite Indicative**	
	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
1	*ūḫḫi*	***umēni,*** *aummeni*	*ūḫḫun*	***aumen***[62]
2	***autti***	*autteni, aušteni, ušteni*	*ašta*	
3	***ašzi***	***uwanzi***[63]	*ašta*	*auer*

	Imperative	
	Singular	Plural
1	*uwallu*	
2	*au*	*ašten*
3	*ašdu*	*uwandu*[63]

13.33. Infinitive II: *uwanna,* Verbal substantive II: *uwātar.* Imperfective: ***uške-***.

62. See Otten 1973: 30.

63. These forms are identical to the corresponding forms of the verb *uwa-* ‘to come’.

Chapter 14

MEDIO-PASSIVE CONJUGATION

14.1. We follow HE and Neu (1968b, 1968a) in presenting paradigms of medio-passives based on whether or not the stem ended in a consonant or a vowel.

Consonantal Stems

14.2. The following are verbs with consonantal stems conjugated in the medio-passive: *ar-* 'to stand', *eš-* 'to sit', and *kiš-* 'to happen; become' exclusively so, *paḫš-* 'to protect' and *tarupp-* 'to assemble (intr.); to be united; to be finished' predominantly so.

	Present Indicative				
	Singular				
1	***arḫari***, *arḫaḫari*	*ēšḫaḫari*	***kišḫa***, *kišḫaḫari*	*paḫḫašḫa*	
2	*artati*, *artari*	*ēštari*	*kišta*, *kištati*	*paḫḫašta*	
3	***arta***, *ārta*, ***artari***, *ārtari*, *artāri*	***eša***, ***ešari***, *ešāri*, *išari*	***kīša***, *kiša*, ***kīšari***, *kišari*, *kišāri*	*paḫša*, *paḫšari*	*taruptari*, *taruptāri*, *tarupdari*, *tarupta*
	Plural				
1	*arwašta*	***ešuwašta***, *ešuašta*, *ešuwaštati*		*paḫšuwašta*	
2				*paḫḫašduma*	
3	***aranda***, *arā̄nta*, *arānta*, ***[a]randari***, *arantā̄ri*, *arantāri*, *arāntari*	***ešanta***, ***ešanda***, *ešantari*, *ešandari*, *ešandāri*, *ašanta*, *ašanda*	*kišanta*, *kišantari*	*pāḫšanta*, *paḫḫaššantari*	*taruppantari*, *taruppandari*, *daruppantari*

	Preterite Indicative				
	Singular				
1	*arḫati*, *arḫaḫat*	*ēšḫat*, *ēšḫati*, *ēšḫaḫat(i)*, *ēšḫaḫatti*, *išḫaḫat*	*kišḫat*, *kišḫati*, *kišḫaḫat*	*paḫḫašḫat*, PAP-*aḫḫašḫat*, PAP-*ašḫat*, *paḫḫašḫaḫat*	
2	*artati*, *artat*	*ēštat*, *ešat*	***kištat***, *kišat*		
3	*artat*	*ešat*, ***ešadi***, *ešati*, *ēštat*	*kišat*, *kišati*	*paḫḫaštat*	*taruptat*, *darupdat*
	Plural				
1	*arwaštat*				
2			*kišdummat*		
3	*arantat*, *arandati*	*ešantat*	*kišantat*, ***kīšantati***, *kišantati*		*taruppantati*, [*tar*]*uppand*[*ati*], *taruppantat*

	Imperative				
	Singular				
1	*arḫaḫaru*				
2	*arḫut*, *ārḫut*	*ēšḫut*	*kišḫut*		
3	*artaru*	*ešaru*	*kišaru*	*paḫšaru*	*taruptaru*
	Plural				
2	*ardumat*, *ar-tum-ma-at*	*ēšdummat*	*kišdumat*	*paḫḫašdumat*	
3	*arantaru*, *arandaru*		*kišandaru*	*paḫšandaru*	*taruppantaru*

14.3. Note: Active and medio-passive verbs take the same forms of verbal substantive, infinitive, and participle.

14.4. Verbal substantive: *taruppuwar.* Infinitive: *ašanna.* Participle: *arant-*, *ašant-*, *kišant-*, *paḫšant-*, *taruppant-*.

Vocalic Stems

14.5. The following verbs with vocalic stems are conjugated in the medio-passive: *iya-* ‘to go’ and *ki-* ‘to lie (down)’ (exclusively so), *nai-/neya-* ‘to turn (intr.)’ and *zaḫḫiya-* ‘to fight’ (predominantly so; see also §14.11, p. 233):

	Present Indicative			
	Singular			
1	*iyaḫḫa*, *iyaḫḫari*, *iyaḫḫaḫari*	*neyaḫḫari*	*zaḫḫiyaḫḫa*, *zaḫḫiyaḫḫari*	
2	*iyattari*, *iyattati*	*neyattati*, *naišta(ri)*		
3	***iatta***, ***iētta***, *iyatta*, *iyattari iyaddari*, *iattari*, *iyattāri*, *iyatari*	***nēa***, *neyari*	*zaḫḫiyattari*	***kitta***, *kittari*
	Plural			
1	*iyawašta*		*zaḫḫiyawaštati*	
2	*iyadduma*		*zaḫḫiyadduma*	
3	*iyanta*, *iyantari*, *ientari*, *entari*[1]	***nēanda***, *neyanta*, *neyantari*		***ki(y)anta***, ***kianda***, *kiyantari*

	Preterite Indicative			
	Singular			
1	*iyaḫḫat*, *iyaḫḫaḫat*	*neyaḫḫat*	*zaḫḫiyaḫḫat*	
2	*iyattati*			
3	*iyattat*	*neyattat*, *neyat*	*zaḫḫiyattat*, *zaḫḫiyatta*	*kittat*, *kittati*
	Plural			
3	*iyantat*	*neyantat*, *neyantati*		*kīyantati*

	Imperative			
	Singular			
1			***zaḫḫiyaḫḫ[aru]***[2]	
2	***iyaḫḫut***	*naišḫut*, *nešḫut*	***zaḫḫiyaḫḫut***	
3	*iyattaru*	*neyaru*		*kittaru*
	Plural			
2	*iyaddumat*	*naišdumat*	*zaḫḫiyaddumat*	*kiddumati*
3	*iyantaru*	*neyandaru*		

14.6. Verbal substantive: *neyawar*. Infinitive: *zaḫḫiyawanzi*. Participle: *iyant-*, ***nēant-***, *neyant-*, *zaḫḫiyant-*.

1. KUB 33.52 ii 12 and KUB 40.28:1. On this spelling see Melchert 1984b: 14.
2. KUB 26.35:7. For restoration as imv. sg. 1 see imv. sg. 2 *zaḫḫiyaḫḫut* in line 8 and Neu 1968b: 203.

Chronology of the Medio-Passive Endings

14.7. It has been noted that many of the present medio-passive endings without *-ri* or *-ti* (*-ḫa*, *-ta*, *-a*, *-wašta*, *-duma*, *-anta*) appear to be especially common in documents from the earliest period. Preliminary "isolated observations" were made by Neu (1968a: 34–40). A statistical investigation that paid attention to the chronological order of the texts and manuscripts was carried out by K. Yoshida. The gist of his conclusions (Yoshida 1990: 95–102) was the following. The locus of *-ri* in OH was verbs in *-ari* but more specifically those in *-āri.* From this starting point the *-ri* spread to all classes throughout the history of Hittite, although some resisted longer than others.[3] In the preterite, on the other hand, the endings *without -i* spread at the expense of those with it. According to Neu (1968: 34), the motivation for both developments was probably the same: to make the medio-passive endings align with those of the active in having the present with final *-i* and the preterite without it.

Medio-Passive Stem Formation

14.8. Few medio-passive forms of *mi*-verbs that show *e/a* ablaut in the active are attested. For what follows see Neu 1968a: 50–51. The verb *ēpp-/app-* 'to take' shows consistent *a*-vocalism (pret. sg. 3 *appattat*, pl. 3 *appand/tat* versus active *ēpta* and *ēpper*), but for *mer-* 'to disappear' we find both *martari* and *mertat*. The *ḫi*-verb *ḫaš*(*š*)*/ḫeš-* 'to open' appears with *e*-vocalism (*ḫeštat*). The *ḫi*-verbs in *-ai-* (§13.20, p. 222) show the stem in *-i-*: *miyari* 'grows', *šiyati* 'was pressed forth'. From *au*(*š*)- 'to see' we find medio-passive *auš-* with transitive meaning and *u*(*wa*)- in the sense 'to appear, show oneself'. Stems in *-šk*e*/a-* appear to show both *e-* and *a*-vocalism, as in the active (see on this problem §12.33, p. 204, and Neu 1968a: 42–43).

14.9. In a few cases, verbs that show no suffix in the active form their medio-passive stem by adding *-*(*i*)*ye/a-*: e.g., *ḫark-* 'to perish', *ištalk-* 'to make smooth'. See Neu 1968b: 42 and Melchert 1997c: 84–86.

14.10. A fairly large group of verbs occur in the medio-passive only in the marked imperfective with the suffix *-šk*e*-*: *akk-*, *ariya-*, *ašiwantešš-*, *ešḫarwaḫḫ-*, *ikšāi-*, *impāi-*, *inu-*, *išḫiya-*, *kallarešš-*, *kunk-*, *kurkuriya-*, *makkešš-*, *marlāi-*, *mugāi-*, *pai-* ('to go'), *palḫešš-*, *pariparai-*, *pargaweššš-*, *parkešš-*, *dala-*, *dankuwaḫḫ-*, *tepaweššš-*, *uiya-*, *ulāi-*, *uššaniya-*, *uwa-* ('to come'), *walḫ-*, *wallu-*.

14.11. Perhaps because of the association of the medio-passive with intransitives, there is a strong tendency for medio-passives with *transitive* meaning to be converted to active *ḫi*-verbs in New Hittite (the so-called dynamic use; see Neu 1968a: 54–56 and Houwink ten Cate 1970: 18–20). Note, e.g., *ḫanna-* 'to litigate, judge' (with older pres. sg. 2 *ḫannatta*(*ri*), sg. 3 *ḫannari*, imp. sg. 3 *ḫannaru* etc., but attested in NH as active

3. Whether there are further conditioning factors on the pattern of its spread as Neu claims requires further study. On the present endings *-tati* and *-waštati* see K. Yoshida 1987.

ḫi-verb *ḫannaḫḫi*, *ḫannai*, *ḫannanzi*, *ḫannau*), *parḫ-* ‘to chase, expel’, and *šarra-* ‘to cross, transgress’.

14.12. The uses of the medio-passive will be discussed in chapter 21.

Chapter 15
GRAMMATICAL AGREEMENT

Types of Agreement

15.1. Grammatical agreement is part of a system of marking that enables speakers to indicate which parts of their utterances correlate with others (possibilities include number, gender, and case). In Hittite the following correlated speech elements show agreement in one form or another: (1) nouns with attributive adjectives or participles; (2) nouns with relative, indefinite, demonstrative, and possessive pronouns; (3) nouns or pronouns and their appositives (see §15.4); (4) antecedent nouns and their adverbial appositives; (5) antecedent nouns and their compared nouns in 'like . . . / as . . .' clauses with *mān* or *maḫḫan*; (6) the subject and the predicate noun or adjective in sentences with linking verbs such as *ēš-* 'to be' and *kiš-* 'to become'; and (7) nominal or pronominal subjects and their verbs.

15.2. **(1)** Nouns with attributive adjectives or participles: *arranza ḫalkiš* 'washed barley' KUB 1.13 iii 14, *damāin antuḫšan* 'another person' KBo 4.2 i 25, *ḫarran wātar* 'polluted water' KUB 13.3 ii 30, [(*araḫz*)]*enēš* (var. *araḫzenanteš*) *utnēanteš* [*ḫ*]*ūmanteš* 'all neighboring lands' KUB 24.4 rev. 7 (NH) with dupl. KUB 24.3+ ii 49, *tarpalliuš waššanduš* 'clothed substitutes' KBo 4.6 obv. 29, *kī* IGI-*zi* LÚ-*natar=mit* 'this my first exploit' Ḫatt. ii 29 (KBo 3.6 ii 13), *kē* KUR.KUR.MEŠ *dannatta* 'these depopulated lands' Ḫatt. ii 56, *šalli* KUR-*e* 'large land' KUB 23.11 iii 33, *IŠTU BIBRI* UR.MAḪ 4 *arantet akuwanzi* 'they drink from animal-shaped vessels of lions standing on all fours' KUB 10.89 i 20–21; *dankuwayaz*(*a*) *taknaz*(*a*) 'from the Dark Earth' KBo 5.3+ iv 56 and KBo 6.28 rev. 41 (both NH).

15.3. **(2)** Nouns with relative, indefinite, demonstrative, and possessive pronouns (§6.5, p. 139) as attributes: [*š*]*alla* É-*er kue* *n=e natta* [*parkunuttati*(?)] 'The houses which are great (in Tappaššanda) [have] not [been exempted(?)] (from taxes and corvée)' (all relevant forms here are nominative-accusative neuter plural) KUB 1.16 ii 66–67 (OH/NS); *nu=nnaš* É-*er kuit* *ēššuwen* [(*n*)]*u=nnaš=kan* DINGIR-*LUM anda artat* 'the goddess came to us there in the house which we had built for ourselves' Ḫatt. iii 6–7; [(*nu*) *kue k*]*ue ašauwar* *ēšta* [*n=*(*at*) *ANA* ÉRIN.MEŠ *ašanduli peḫḫun* 'whatever sheepfolds there were, I gave them to the troops for garrison' KBo 10.2 i 7–8; *kupiyatiš* . . . *ŪL kuiški* 'not any plot' KUB 13.35+ iv 44 (NH), *tuel* UN-*an lē kuinki* 'not any person of yours' KUB 14.3 i 19 (NH); *ḫatkun* UD.KAM-*an kuinki* 'any difficult (lit. tight) day' KBo 4.14 iii 19 (NH); *uppeššar kuitki* 'any gift' KUB 14.3 i 54–55 (NH); *apāš=pat memiaš*

'the aforementioned matter' KUB 14.14 obv. 36; *kē arkuwarri* 'these prayers' KUB 6.45 i 26 (NH); *kedani pedi* 'in this place' KBo 4.14 iv 48 (NH); *kardiaš=taš* 'of your heart' KBo 3.7 i 26; *tuzziaš=miš* 'my army' KBo 2.5 ii 13; *kūn* MUNUS-*an* 'this woman' KBo 4.6 rev. 12; *ḫaššatar=šet* 'his procreative power' KBo 6.34 ii 31; *areš=šmeš* 'your companions' Laws §55; *šarḫuwanduš=šuš* 'her unborn children' (pl. acc. com.) Laws §§17, 18; *ammēdaz* ŠU-*az* 'with my own hand(s)' KBo 3.4 iv 45 (NH).

15.4. (3) Nouns in apposition show agreement in number and case and normally supply additional information about a substantive which may or may not be essential to the meaning of the clause. **Nominative**: *lē=m*[*a=war=an auš*]*zi* ^{d}u-*aš* ^{URU}*Kumm*[*iyaš*] UR.SAG-*li-iš!* LUGAL-*uš* 'Let not the Stormgod (Teššub), the brave king of Kummiya, see him!' KUB 33.93 + KUB36.7a + KUB 17.7 iii 32 (Ullik., NS); ^{URU}*Tiliuraš* URU-*aš IŠTU* UD.KAM ^{m}*Ḫantili dannattiš ēšta* 'Tiliura, the city, was a waste since the time (lit. day) of Ḫantili' KUB 21.29 i 11–12 (NH); *takku* LÚ.U$_{19}$.LU-*aš* LÚ-*aš našma* MUNUS-*za takīya* URU-*ri aki* 'If a person, male or female, is killed in another town' KBo 6.2 i 7 (Laws §6, OS). **Accusative**: *nu=kan* ^{m}*Zidantan adda*(*n*)*=šan kuenta* 'he killed Zidanta, his father' KBo 3.1+ i 68 (OH/NS); ^{m}*Telipinušš=a=z* ^{f}*Ištapariyan ḫantezziyan* NIN-*SÚ ḫarta* 'Telipinu had (as wife) Ištapariya, his older sister' KBo 3.1+ ii 9–10 (OH/NS); *ABU=YA=(a)nnaš=za* . . . . . ^{f}DINGIR.MEŠ-IR-*inn=a* DUMU.[(MUNUS-*an*)] *ḫašta* 'My father begat us (four sons) . . . and DINGIR.MEŠ-IR, a daughter' Ḫatt. i 9–11 (NH); *dapiy*[*aš* (DINGIR.MEŠ)-*aš* (*addan*)] ^{d}*Kumarbin išḫamiḫḫi* 'I sing of Kumarbi, father of all the gods' KUB 33.96 i 3–4 (NS) with dupl. KUB 33.98 i 3′ (NS). **Genitive**: *n=apa* DINGIR.MEŠ-*iš attaš=šaš* ^{m}*Zidantaš ēšḫar=šet šanḫer* 'then the gods avenged the blood of his father Zidanta' THeth 11 i 69–70 (OH/NS) (restored from multiple copies). **Dative-locative**: *nu=kan apāšš=a pula*[*z*] *ANA* ^{d}U ^{URU}*Nerik* DUMU=*KA āššiyanti* [*ḫ*]*aptat* 'By destiny (lit., by lot) he too was associated with the Stormgod of Nerik, your beloved son' KUB 21.27 i 11–12 (NH).

15.5. (4) Other appositional constructions seem to be almost adverbial in force, i.e., they serve more to define or restrict the nature of the *verbal action* than the noun with which they are in apposition: *nu=mu kappin=pat* DUMU-*an* ^{d}*IŠTAR* ^{URU}*Šamuḫa ANA ABU=YA wēkta* '*IŠTAR* of Šamuḫa asked my father for me (when I was) just (*-pat*) a small child' KBo 6.29 i 7–8 (NH); *kāša tuk* ^{m}*Ḫuqqanān appezzin* UR.GI$_7$-*an šarā dāḫḫun* 'I took you up, Ḫukkana, (when you were) a lowly (lit., 'the last' or 'a young'[1]) dog' KBo 5.3 i 2–3 (MH/NS); *nu tu*[*k* ^{m}*Ma*]*ddu*[*wa*]*ttan QADU* DAM.MEŠ=*KA* [DUMU.MEŠ]=*KA* ÉRIN.MEŠ=*KA=ya ABI* ^{d}UTU-*ŠI kišduwān*[*d*]*uš ḫu*[*išnut*] 'The father of His Majesty saved your

1. The significance of the adjective *appezzi-* is debated by those who reckon now with the collated reading UR.GI$_7$ 'dog'. Klinger (1992: 192, 208 n. 42 'letzter Hund') reckons with a concept of rank, while T. van den Hout (personal communication) favors the concept of age ('young dog'), comparing UR.TUR GIM-*an* 'as a puppy' in the loyalty oath KUB 26.32 i 8. Since the separate term UR.TUR was available for expressing 'young dog, puppy', it seems more likely that Klinger's understanding is correct. Regardless of one's decision on this, the entire context suggests that the phrase 'as an *appezzi-* dog' is intended to show Ḫukkana's lowly estate when he was elevated by the Hittite king.

life, Madduwatta, together with your wives, your children, and your troops — (when you were) starving' KUB 14.1 obv. 8–9 (MH/MS); 'if a slave pays the bride-price for a free young man' *n=an* LÚ*antiyantan ēpzi* 'and takes him (as) a "live-in" son-in-law' KBo 6.3 ii 28 (Laws §36, OH/NS). Such examples are different from double accusatives with verbs like *iya-* 'to make', *ḫalzai-* 'to call', and *te-*, etc. (on which see §16.21, p. 247). For double accusatives used in partitive apposition see §16.24 (p. 247)

15.6. Some adverbial examples are participles in the nominative case, appearing immediately before the verb: *p*[*ai*]*t*[2]*=aš=šan* GIŠ.NÁ-*aš šarkuw*[*a*]*nza šešket* 'he lay down on the bed in the bedroom booted (i.e., with his boots one)' KUB 24.8 i 25–26 (pre-NH/NS); *n=aš=za* ITTI mAppu *waššanza šešket* 'and she (his wife) would lie down with Appu clothed (i.e., with her clothes on)' KUB 24.8 i 30; [*kuiš=wa=tta=kan*] *ŠA* KUR URU*Ḫat*[*ti* LÚ]*ḫuyanza anda uezzi* 'whoever of the land of Ḫatti takes refuge with you as a fugitive' KUB 14.1 obv. 34 (Madd.); d*Telipinuš lēlaniyanza uet uwantiwantaz titḫiśketta* 'Telipinu came angrily: with lightning he thunders' KUB 17.10 ii 33–34; [(*nu=kan ne*)]*pišaš* KÁ-*aš zik=pat aššanuwanza* dUTU-*uš šarreškeši* 'you pass through heaven's gate as an established Sungod' KUB 31.127 + ABoT 44+ i 30–31 (this case could be an appositional "vocative": 'O established Sungod' (see §15.7 and §16.16, p. 245). Since most nominative participles are predicates, the less-common non-predicative occurrences tend to assume the role of apposition to the subject. In some cases they translate best as adverbs of manner of adverbial phrases.

15.7. An appositional construction—not to be confused with the true vocative construction (see §16.16, p. 245)—is used for direct address.

15.8. **(5)** Antecedent nouns and their compared nouns in 'like . . . / as . . .' clauses with *mān* or *maḫḫan.* **Nominative**: *n=at* DINGIR-*LUM* LÚŠE.KIN.KUD-*aš māḫḫan . . . waršta* 'the deity, like a reaper, has reaped it' KUB 29.7 rev. 20–21 (MH/MS); *nu=kan* URU*Neriqqaš* URU-*aš* NA4*akuš* GIM-*an* [*aruni*] *anda ēšta* 'the city of Nerik was like a seashell [in the sea]' KUB 21.19 + 1303/u iii 14–15 (NH). **Nominative-accusative**: *nu=kan* NA4ŠU.U-*iš* d*Upeluriy*[*aš*] [ZAG-*n*]*i* UZUZAG.UDU-*ni* GIŠ*šiyattal maḫḫan artat* 'The Basalt (Monster) was standing on Ubelluri's right shoulder like a shaft' KUB 33.106 iii 46–47 (Ullik.). **Accusative**: *nu=mu* DINGIR-*YA ḫuišnut nu=mu wašdulaš kat*[*t*]*an arḫa išḫiyandan* LÚ-*an mān arḫa lā* 'Save me, O my god, and release me, (who am) like a man bound in sins' KUB 36.75 iii 9–11 (OH?/MS); *nu=war=uš arḫa dannaruš* DUGÚTUL.ḪI.A *maḫḫan duwarniškeši* 'you (the king) will break them (your enemies) like empty vessels' KBo 15.52 v 16–17 (NS); *apūn=ma=kan* d*IŠTAR . . .* KU6-*un* GIM-*an* ḫ*ūpalaza* EGIR-*pa ištapta* '*IŠTAR* trapped him (e.g., Urḫiteššup) like a fish in a net' KBo 6.29 ii 33–34 (NH). **Genitive**: [*šu*]*minzan=a* ÌR.MEŠ-*am=man* UR.BAR.RA-*aš mān pang*[*ur*] 1-*EN ēštu* 'But let the clan of you, my subjects, be one like (that) of the wolf' KBo 3.27:15–16 (OH/NS); the first three words in this sentence are all genitives in agreement.

2. Restoring *p*[*a-i-t*]*a-aš-ša-an* following *pa-a-i-ta-aš* in KUB 24.8 i 29, against *š*[*a-aš-t*]*a-aš-ša-an* in Siegelová 1971: 4.

15.9. **(6)** In nominal sentences and those with linking verbs such as *ēš-* 'to be' and *kiš-* 'to become' the subject agrees with its subject complement—with a predicate noun in case and number, and with a predicate adjective in case, number, and gender: *annaš=šiš* MUŠ-*aš* 'his mother (is) a snake' KUB 1.16 ii 20 (OH/NS); *U* É-*SU arāuwan* LÚ.MEŠ ḪA.LA[(-*ŠU U* LÚ.MEŠ*NIŠŪ=ŠU*)] *arāwēš* 'his house (is) exempt, also his heirs and relatives (are) exempt' KBo 6.9 i 2–3 (Laws §51, OH/NS) restored from KBo 6.2 iii 2 (OS); KUR-*e šalli ēšta* 'The country was large' KBo 11.1 obv. 19; *pēdan mekki nakki* 'The place (is) very important (or 'hard to reach')' ABoT 60 obv. 20–21. For an old pl. nom. com. see *kē* UGULA 1 *LI-eš ešer* 'These were overseers of one thousand' KBo 8.42 rev. 6 (OS). The example *nu* UN.MEŠ-*uš maršanteš* 'The people (are) deceitful' KUB 19.23 rev. 11 shows good NH agreement. See further examples below in §16.5 (p. 242) and following.

15.10. **(7)** A nominal subject agrees with its verb in number: DUMU-*RU=wa=mu=kan akta* 'A son died on me, (and I didn't perform the last rites)' KUB 5.9 obv. 26 (NH oracle inquiry); *UMMA* LUGAL-*MA* m*Zuliyaš=wa ḫapā paiddu* 'Let Zuliya go to the river (ordeal)' KUB 13.3 iii 29 (MH/NS); *takku* 2 LÚ.MEŠ *na*[(*šm*)]*a* 3 L[(Ú.M)]EŠ *akkanzi* 'if two or three men are killed' KBo 6.3 ii 30 (Laws §37, OH/NS) with dupl. KBo 6.2 ii 11 (OS), *nu=šmaš* DINGIR.DIDLI-*eš tamaīn karātan dayer* 'and the gods gave to them (e.g., the sons of the Queen of Kaneš) a different appearance' KBo 22.2 obv. 16 (OS); *takku* LÚ.MEŠ *zaḫḫanda ta* 1^3-*aš aki* 'If men fight, and one dies' KBo 6.26 ii 16 (Laws §174, OH/NS).

15.11. A pronominal subject agrees with its verb in person and number: *ug=an=za* DUMU.MUNUS-*TI ŪL ḫalziḫḫi* 'I will not call her my daughter' KUB 1.16 iii 25 (OH/NS); *ūk=wa* LUGAL-*uš=šmiš kišḫa* 'I will become your king' KBo 22.2 rev. 15 (OS); *ūk=wa=zz=(š)an* [(*šānu)n*] 'I was enraged' KUB 33.10 ii 6 (OH/MS); *nu ḫandan ūk kiššan memallu* 'And let me truly say the following' KUB 6.45 + KUB 30.14 iii 73–74 (NH); *našma=at zik* ˹*mališi* 'or (if) you contemplate it' KBo 4.14+ ii 78; *zik=wa* UR.BAR.RA-*aš kištat* 'you have become a wolf' KBo 6.2 ii 12 (OS); *zig=a parkuyātar iya* 'as for you, make purification!' (imp.) KUB 1.16 ii 67 (OH/NS); *paprezzi kuiš* 'he who defiles' KBo 6.2 i 57 (OS); *takku* ÌR-*aš ḫuwāi n=aš ANA* KUR *Luwīya paizzi* 'if a slave runs away and (he) goes to the land of Luwiya' KBo 6.2 i 51 (OS), *apāš=a paiṭ* dIM-*ni teṭ* 'he proceeded to say to the Stormgod' VBoT 58 i 16 (OH/NS); EGIR-*pa=ma=aš* URUKÁ.DINGIR.RA *paiṭ* 'afterwards he went to Babylon' KBo 3.1 i 28 (OH/NS); *nu wēš* m*Arnuwantaš* LUGAL.GAL *U* f*Ašmunikal* MUNUS.LUGAL.GAL GUD.ḪI.A-*uš* UDU.ḪI.A *warkanduš* SIG_5-*anduš* . . . EGIR-*pa pešgaweni* 'We—Arnuwanda, Great King, and Ašmunikal, Great Queen—will give back (to the gods) fat and goodly cattle and sheep' KUB 31.124 ii 14–17 (MH/MS); *kuitman=wa=za wēš* (eras.) *INA* URU*Ḫattuši ešwen* 'while we were in Ḫattuša' HKM 17:5–6 (MH/MS); *šumeš* LÚ.MEŠ GIŠTUKUL *tameškatteni* 'you (pl.) are oppressing the TUKUL-men' KBo 22.1:3 (OS); *šumešš=a apeniššan īšten* 'and you (pl.)

3. See LH 139 n. 477.

must keep doing as before' (imp.) KBo 22.62 + KBo 6.2 iii 20 (OS); *armawanteš=a kuieš nu=za apē=ya* ŪL *ḫaššanzi* 'as for those who are pregnant, even they do not give birth'KUB 17.10 i 15 (OH/NS); *takku* LÚ-*aš* ELLUM GÉME-*ašš=a šieleš n=at anda aranzi* 'if a free man and a slave woman are single, and they (*=at*) cohabit' KBo 6.3 ii 16 (OH/NS), *apē=ma=an ēpper nu=šši kuštuēšker* 'but they (the citizens of Tappaššanda) seized him (Prince Ḫuzziya) and began to intimidate(?) him' KUB 1.16 ii 64 (OH/NS).

Lack of Agreement

In Gender

15.12. It is doubtful that there are more than a few cases of true lack of agreement in gender. When a resumptive pronoun refers back to two nouns, one of which is common and the other neuter, the speaker cannot avoid choosing between the two: for example ^{d}IM*=wa* LÚ.MEŠ LÚ.KÚR (com.) KUR.KUR.MEŠ LÚ.KÚR (neut.) *tuk=pat ANA* LUGAL *ŠAPAL* GÌR.MEŠ *zikkezzi nu=war=uš* (com.) *arḫa dannaruš* DUG.KAM.ḪI.A *maḫḫan duwarniškeši*, 'The Stormgod puts the enemy men (com.) and the enemy lands (neut.) under your feet, O king, and you smash them (com.) like empty vessels' KBo 15.52 v 14–17.

15.13. Other cases of disagreement in gender have been claimed for parts of the body, but there may be better explanations of the forms in question. For example, *genu=šši*t 'his knee' KUB 7.1 iii 7 is neuter, but *gēnuš=šuš* 'his knees' KBo 3.4 ii 20; KUB 13.4 ii 58 appears to be common gender. But Eichner (1979) has interpreted the latter as accusative plural of a noun *genušši-* 'Kniegelenk' (see also p. 101, n. 109, and p. 138, n. 7). The two forms of the noun 'hand': *keššar* (previously thought to be neuter) and *keššaraš* (common) seem to show inversion in the possessive pronouns: ŠU-*aš=šet* (which implies **keššaraššet*) (Laws §4) and *keššar=šiš* (Laws §3). But Neu (1983: 97 with n. 354) has plausibly proposed that *keššar* in *keššaršiš* is an asigmatic common gender *r*-stem (see §4.82, p. 115, with the paradigm), since there is no attested example of *keššar* as a (neuter) direct object. The use of the neuter possessive pronoun in ŠU-*aš=šet* is simply erroneous. Other possible instances of disagreement in gender may also require reconsideration: *mān antuwaḫḫaš šuppi* 'if a person is pure (neuter!)' is rather: 'If a person is in a pure state [d.-l.]' KBo 5.2 i 3; and alongside correct *išpantan ḫūmandan* 'the entire night' we can regard GE$_6$-*an ḫūman* (KUB 1.13 iii 28; KBo 3.5 i 30) as faulty. On the other hand, there is no conflict between *antuhšātar* and *kuinna* in: *nu*[*=kan a*(*ntuḫšatar*)] (neut.) *kuinna* (com.) *apel ANA* URU*=ŠU* EGIR-*pa* [(*peḫutet*)] 'and he led back the population, each one (person of the *antuḫsatar*) to his (own) city' KUB 19.11 iv 14–15, since the *kuinna*, *apel*, and *-ŠU* refer to units within the *antuḫsatar*. The phrase *šuḫmilin genu* KBo 10.37 ii 33 may be explained as regular agreement, with *šuḫmilin* being a contracted form of **šuḫmiliyan* (§1.76, p. 32), sg. nom.-acc. neut. of an extended stem **šuḫmiliyant-* 'firm' beside *šuḫmili-*.[4]

4. Catsanicos 1986: 147 n. 154. But his comparison with *šuppin* in KBo 12.89 ii 13 is false, since *ḫappuriyan šuppin* is common gender.

15.14. Sure cases of gender variation are few. We do find sg. nom.-acc. neut. *memi(y)an* 'word' alongside usually common-gender *memiya(n)*-. GEŠTU-*an* 'ear' is sg. nom.-acc. neut. in KUB 8.83 4, 5, alongside usual common-gender *ištamana*-.[5] But the vast majority of alleged cases listed in the dictionaries simply do not exist. Some examples involve a failure to recognize the Hittite practice of writing the bare stem form with numbers (see §9.24, p. 159, and §16.3, p. 242). Writings such as 1 ^{GIŠ}*intaluzzi* or 1 ^{DUG}*ḫuppar* (§4.84, p. 116) are no evidence for neuter gender; both *intaluzzi*- 'shovel' and *ḫuppar*- 'bowl' are consistently common gender. Other putative cases involve common-gender nouns with collective plurals and neuter nouns with count plurals (§3.13, p. 68). For example, *alpa*- 'cloud' is only common gender. But in addition to its regular accusative plural *alpūš* 'clouds' it has a collective plural, *alpa* 'cloudbank'. Similarly, *luttai*- 'window' is neuter only. But since the regular (neuter) plural would have had a collective sense in OH, for reference to discrete individual windows we find *luttaeš, luttauš.* This is a matter of distinction between collective and count plural, *not* variation in gender. This number distinction is widespread in Old Hittite (pace Prins 1997: 62–63). In cases written with logograms we cannot be certain whether we are dealing with forms of the same word: e.g., in the case of *ērman*- 'illness', we find alongside GIG-*an* also sg. nom. com. GIG-*aš.* The latter may reflect real variation in gender or conceal another word for 'illness, sickness'.

In Number

15.15. Disagreement in number may be accounted for in several ways. A collective singular can be conceived as a plural: *nu=mu=kan* GIM-*an* UN.MEŠ-*annaza ŠA* ^{d}*IŠTAR* GAŠAN*=YA kaniššūwar ŠA* ŠEŠ*=YA=ya* [*aš*]*šulan auēr* 'but when the population (sg.) saw (pl.) the honor of *IŠTAR*, my lady, to me and the favor of my brother toward me'[6] Ḫatt. i 30–32 (NH); [KA]RAŠ-*za=kan kuiēš tepaweš i*[*špar*]*ter apāt=ma=kan ḫūman a*[*rḫa ḫ*]*ašpir=pat* 'they utterly annihilated it (*apāt*, sg. neut.) all (sg. neut.), the army (com. sg.) which (com. pl.) escaped (pl.) few in number (com.pl.)' KUB 14.1 obv. 48 (MH/MS).

15.16. As in some other Indo-European languages, neuter plural (collective) nominal subjects take singular predicates (§§3.12–3.13, p. 68). When the predicate is an intransitive verb, it will be singular: ^{m}*Āškali=ma uddār arāiš* 'but accusations arose against Aškali' KBo 3.34 ii 18. When the predicate is made up of the verb 'to be' and a predicate nominative adjective, the adjective takes the singular form by attraction to the form of the verb 'to be' (van den Hout 2001). This pattern is then extended to nominal sentences, which have no linking verb (e.g., 'to be'). That the singular form of the predicate adjective is due to its attraction to the verb 'to be' is shown by the fact that neuter plural nouns take neuter plural attributive adjectives: *idālawa uddār*, *liššiyala . . . uddār*, *šakkanta* UL *uwanda uddār*, *kue uddār*, *tamāi kuēkki uddār*.

---

5. For a possible explanation of the latter example see Melchert 2000: 66. The source of neuter *memiyan* is unclear. Perhaps a neuter singular participle of *mema*- 'the spoken thing'.

6. The dative *-mu* receives the verbal action implied in both *kaniššuwar* and *aššulan*.

15.17. There are a few apparent examples of common-gender plural subjects with singular predicates: *ḫēwēš kīša* 'rains will occur' KUB 8.1 iii 8–9; *kī=wa wallēš maḫḫan arlipa artari* 'as these *w.* stand *arlipa*' KUB 29.1 iv 10–11;[7] *ANA* SAG.DU DUMU ^{MUNUS}SANGA*=wa ūrkēš idālawešketta nu=wa kē ūrkēš kīšandati* 'The signs were coming out unfavorably for the person of the priestess' son, and these signs occurred' KuT 49:4–5.[8] All examples attested thus far are with intransitive verbs, a feature that would be shared with the usage of singular verbs with collective plural subjects. The phenomenon calls for further investigation. For the Hittite construction as the possible source of the Greek "Pindaric schema" see Watkins 2000: 2–3.

15.18. Singular forms are often used following numbers greater than '1' (see §9.21 and following, p. 158). And, finally, there are cases where a scribe used a plural verb on the second of two clauses in which one member of a pair of persons acts: 1 LÚ *MEŠEDI* ^{KUŠ}*kuršan kar*(*a*)*pzi* ^{URUDU}*ḪA*[*ṢṢINNA=ya*] 1 LÚ *MEŠEDI=ma ŠA* DINGIR-*LIM* ^{GIŠ}*ḫuppanta zeriyalli=ya karpanzi* 'One palace guard lifts a leather shield (and) an axe, while another palace guard lifts (text: they lift!) the god's *ḫuppanta* and potstand' KUB 11.23 v 8–12 (Note the extraposition of the ^{URUDU}*ḪA*[*ṢṢINNA=ya*]).

---

7. This example supplied by Norbert Oettinger (pers. comm.).

8. The last example cited by Watkins (2000: 14). For the text see Wilhelm 1998: 178.

Chapter 16
NOUN CASES

Generalities

16.1. As indicated in chapter 3, Hittite nouns and adjectives are inflected in the following cases: nominative, vocative, accusative, ergative, genitive, allative, dative-locative, ablative, and instrumental.

16.2. Five of these cases (accusative, allative, dative-locative, ablative, and instrumental) are always adverbal, i.e., dependent on the verb (including participles), while the genitive is usually adnominal (for exceptions see §16.57, p. 255, and §16.61, p. 256). The ergative appears only as the subject of a transitive verb. Nouns and pronouns in the nominative serve as subjects of finite verbs but as predicates only of the linking verbs *ēš-* 'to be', *kiš-* 'to become', etc. (§16.5). A noun in the vocative (together with any accompanying attributive adjectives), and rarely the nominative standing for the vocative (§16.17, p. 245), constitutes a clause in itself (Hoffner 1998a).

16.3. Stem form. There are several situations in which scribes used the bare stem form. (a) As a real pronounced form it could represent the vocative case (§3.28, p. 74) or (b) a "naming construction" (§16.15, p. 244). The bare stem represents (c) a purely graphic entity when the noun in question is a proper name (personal, divine, or geographical), when it follows an Akkadian preposition (*ANA*, *INA*, *ŠA*, etc.), or in listings immediately following a numeral (*nu* 2 $^{\text{NINDA}}$*zipinni n=uš . . . ašešanzi* KBo 5.1 ii 16–17). Situation (c) is referred to as "Akkadographic" in the CHD. Some Hittitologists have such words typeset in uppercase italics like real Akkadograms.

Nominative

16.4. The **nominative** case is primarily the case of the **subject of a clause**, regardless of the nature of the predicate (noun phrase or verb). Thus in the sentence *annaš=šiš* MUŠ-*aš* 'his mother (is) a snake' (KUB 1.16 ii 20), the noun *annaš* is in the nominative case, the subject of the sentence whose predicate is MUŠ-*aš*. In the verbal sentence *išḫāš=šiš=an ganešzi* 'its owner recognizes it' (Laws §61), the noun *išḫāš* is also nominative by virtue of its function as subject of the verb *ganeš-*.

16.5. Any demonstrative, attributive adjective, or other such form modifying the subject of the sentence will also be nominative under the conditions of grammatical agreement (see chapter 15). Nouns or adjectives which serve as the **predicate** in sentences

with linking verbs ('to be', 'to become', 'to appear', etc.) also stand in the nominative case. For example, MUŠ-*aš* 'snake' in *annaš=šiš* MUŠ-*aš*. The predicate nominative is sometimes called a "subject complement."

16.6. As in other languages, the verb 'to be' may be omitted in Hittite in the present tense. Because of the absence of an expressed finite verb, these sentences are often called "nominal sentences." Examples are: DAM *BELI-NI=ma=wa=nnaš wannummiyaš* 'the wife of our master (is) a widow' KBo 14.12 iv 19–20 (DŠ frag. 28); *takku* DUMU.MUNUS LÚ-*ni taranza* 'if a daughter (is) promised (in marriage) to a man' KBo 6.3 ii 5 (Laws §28); [*pa*]*rtauwa*(*r*)*=šet=wa amiyanta apašš=a=uwa amiyanza* 'its wings (are) small, and it (is) small' KUB 17.10 i 38 (Tel. myth, OH/MS). For -(*u*)*wa* see §28.2 (p. 354). See §15.9 (p. 238) for additional examples. In at least one example, the verb 'be' is also omitted when past time has been established in a preceding clause and carries over to that with 'be': *karū kuiš INA* ^{URU}*Arinna* ^{LÚ}UŠ.BAR *kī*[(*šat*)] *U* É-*SU arāuwan* LÚ.MEŠ ḪA.LA[(-*ŠU U* $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$*NIŠŪ=ŠU*)] *arāwēš* 'Formerly, one who becaame a weaver in Arinna, his house (was) exempt, also his heirs and relatives (were) exempt' KBo 6.9 i 2–3 (Laws §51, OH/NS) restored from KBo 6.2 iii 2 (OS). See also the examples cited in §16.15 (p. 244), where 'be' is omitted in the context of mythical past time.

16.7. The predicate noun or adjective will also occur in the nominative case when the verb *ēš*- 'to be' is expressed: *ūgg=a* ^{MUNUS}*annannaš ēšmi* 'and I am an *annanna*-woman' VBoT 58 iv 3 (OH/NS); *nu kī kuit ēšmi* 'and what is this that I am?' (or 'and this which I am') KUB 57.3:11 (NH); *šumeš=a* [DINGIR.MEŠ-*aš u*]*ddānī*[1] *naḫḫanteš ēšten* 'You (pl.) be afraid of the word/matter [of the gods]' KUB 1.16 iii 49–50 (OH/NS); [*apē=a k*]*ušduwāta lē lē ḫandān=pat ēšdu* 'And let [those] false accusations never — never be established!' KUB 1.16 ii 55 (OH/NS). Similarly when the verb is *kiš*- 'to become': *zik=wa* UR.BAR.RA-*aš kištat* 'You have become a wolf' KBo 6.2 + Hrozný 1922 plate v, ii 12 (Laws §37, OS).

16.8. Since appositional elements, regardless of their case, can serve for direct address (see §16.16, p. 245), we naturally find many nominatives so used.

16.9. The naming function of the nominative case is reflected in its frequent appearance in lists: 3 GUD.MU.2 3 GUD.MU.1 4 *šawitišza pāi* 'he shall give three two-year-old oxen, three yearling oxen, and four weanlings' (Laws §63). As the example shows, this usage includes cases where the list as a whole may logically be construed as the direct object of a verb.

16.10. Partitive apposition, richly attested in the accusative (§§16.24–16.25, pp. 247–248; §16.42, p. 252) and rarely in the ablative (§16.94, p. 266; §16.102, p. 267), may also be found in the nominative: *nu maḫḫan* MU.KAM-*za meḫur tiyazi šeliaš šunnumanzi*

1. The KUB copy is incorrect here; for the correct reading [. . . *u*]*d-da-a-ni-i* see already the transliteration from the original by Forrer (1922; 1926: 15), followed by Sommer and Falkenstein (1938: 14–15). The photo published at the back of Sommer's book is too dark to be useful for collations.

'and when the year, (that is,) the season/time for the filling of the *šeli*-s arrives' KUB 21.17 iii 9–10 (NH). As in other cases of partitive apposition, the noun denoting the whole precedes that denoting a part.[2]

Vocative and "Naming Construction"

16.11. The **vocative** is used in exclamations and in direct address (Güterbock 1945; Eichner 1974b: 5–57; and Hoffner 1998a). Hittite does not employ an interjection (like English 'O') to introduce the vocative.

16.12. Form. For the inflection of the vocative see §§3.28–3.30, pp. 74–76.

16.13. Syntax. The true vocative stands in its own clause (Hoffner 1998a), and even in contexts of reported speech often does not take the quotative particle *-wa* (§28.2, p. 354, and following).

16.14. Occurrences. The true vocative is used principally in prayers, rituals, and mythological texts: ^{d}UTU-*e išḫa=mi* 'O Sungod, my lord' KUB 31.127 i 1 (OH/NS);[3] ^{d}UTU-*e šarkui* LUGAL-*ue* 'O Sungod, heroic king' KUB 31.127 i 15; ^{d}*Mukišanu* ^{LÚ}SUKKAL=*YA* 'O Mukišanu, my vizier!' KUB 12.65 + KBo 26.71 iii 18; *šiuni=mi zik=mu iyaš* 'O my god! You made me' KUB 30.10 rev. 11–12; *inanaš* ^{d}UTU-*i kāša=tta* SÍSKUR *peḫḫun* 'O Sungod of Illness! I have hereby given to you a sacrifice' KUB 7.1 i 6; see also ibid. i 15; [^{d}*Ala*]*uwaimi lē=aš namma zaḫḫiškeši* 'O Alawaimi! Fight them no longer!' KUB 27.67 ii 31; (they bowed down to the Stormgod and asked:) ^{d}IŠKUR-*ta atta=šu*[*mmi*] *kuwapi ēšta* 'O Tarḫunta, ou[r] father! Where were you?' KUB 33.66 + KBo 40.333 iii 8–9 (MS). In all these examples the vocative stands in a separate clause of its own and is not included in the immediately following clause with the verb (see Hoffner 1998a). Sometimes, perhaps indicating an urgent address, the vocative or other address form is repeated: EME.ḪI.A EME.ḪI.A 'Tongues! Tongues!' KUB 44.4 + KBo 13.241 rev. 22 and its syllabic equivalent *lāli lāli* KBo 20.59:16 (see §§3.28–3.30, pp. 74–76, and p. 81, n. 25).

16.15. Also exhibiting the form of the bare stem (§3.19, p. 71; §3.28, p. 75), but not serving the purpose of direct address, is the form used for the introduction of new names (Güterbock 1945; Hoffner 1968a; Hahn 1969; Laroche 1969b; Stefanini 1974; Hoffner 1998c): MUNUS-*aš*[4] *ŠUM=šet* ^{f}*Šintalimeni* '(there was) a woman, her name was Š.' KUB 33.121 ii 5; URU-*aš ŠUM-an=šet* ^{UR}[^{U}*Š*]*udul*, '(there was) a town, its name was

2. The example cited could alternatively be analyzed as showing an accusative of direction (§16.27, p. 248: 'When the year arrives at the time for filling the *šeli*-s'.

3. Immediately followed by appositional direct address (§16.16): *ḫandanza ḫannešnaš išḫaš* 'O just lord of judgment' KUB 31.127 i 1–2. For examples from Greek and Vedic of vocative immediately continued by a nominative form of address, see Meier-Brügger 2000: 249 (§S 406). In those languages a nominative of this sort is not appositional address, as it is in Hittite.

4. On the sg. nom. MUNUS-*aš* see §4.78 (p. 113) with n. 169.

Šudul' KUB 24.8 i 7; and with reverse order of constituents in the second clause: *nu=kan šer* LÚ-*aš* m*Appu* ŠUM-*an=šet* 'Up there (there was) a man, Appu (was) his name' KUB 14.8+ i 9–10.

Other Forms of Direct Address

16.16. Appositional Direct Address. In other Indo-European languages, nominative case forms appear in the role of vocatives (i.e., in direct address; see Meier-Brügger 2000: 249–50; 2003: 265). For rare examples of this in Hittite see §16.17. In Hittite, however, most instances of the nominative of direct address appear in an embedded appositional construction, which may be used not just in the nominative but in whatever case is appropriate to the syntax, often with the name in apposition to an accented second-person pronoun used for direct address. **Nominative**: DINGIR.MAḪ dIM-*ni tet iya kuitki* [d]IM-*aš* 'DINGIR.MAḪ said to the Stormgod, 'Do something, Stormgod!' KUB 17.10 i 30–31; *anda=ma šumēš BELU*MEŠ TU_7 *ḫūmanteš* . . . ITU-*mi* ITU-*mi linkišketen* 'Furthermore, all you (nom.) who are in charge of (lit. 'lords of') the stew, . . . you must take monthly oaths' KUB 13.3 ii 20–26 (MH/NS). **Genitive:** *nu tuel šiunaš uddanta natta* SIG_5-*aḫḫat* 'And did I not prosper by your word, O god?' KUB 30.10 obv. 18 (OH/MS). Here *šiunaš* is genitive singular in apposition to *tuel* 'your, of you'. **Dative-locative:** [*tuqq=a=war*]*=aš ANA* m[*Maddu*]*watta QATAMMA menaḫḫanta kūrur ēštu* 'Against [you (dat.) too], O [Maddu]watta (d.-l.), let him likewise be hostile!' KUB 14.1 obv. 31.

16.17. Rarely, however, in the singular (not in the plural[5]) the nominative stands in its own clause in place of the vocative. Only five examples are known: (1) *aiš* EME-*aš gagāš qāša=šmaš=kan parkuin mišriwantan ḫarkin* GIŠGIDRU *ŪL walḫantan* UDU-*un šipantaḫḫun* 'O mouth, tongue, tooth! Lo, I have sacrificed to you a pure, dazzling white sheep, never struck with a rod' KBo 15.10 ii 8–10 (MH/MS), ed. Szabó 1971; (2) *UMMA* d*Gulšaš* dNIN.TU-*aš* dIM-*naš attaš kuit=wa uw*[(*aš*)] 'Thus (said) d*Gulša* (and?) dNIN.TU: 'O Father Stormgod! Why have you come?' KUB 33.24 (+) 33.28 i 38 (OH/NS); (3) dUTU-*uš* dIM-*aš ŪL šullatar* 'O Sungod! O Stormgod! No disrespect (exists)' KBo 6.13 i 9 (Laws §169; the last clause is elliptical; see §18.17, p. 282; and §30.13, p. 409); (4) *wappuwaš* DINGIR.MAḪ-*aš kāša=za* 12 UZUÚR *paprannanza tuēl* ŠU-*it šapiyan*[*za*] *parkunuwanza* 'O DINGIR.MAḪ of the River Bank! Be cleansed now (*kāša*) from defilement and purified by your hand with respect to (your) twelve body parts' KUB 12.58 iv 1–3; EME-*aš* EN-*aš kuwapi pāši* 'Where are you going, O lord of the tongue?' KUB 12.62 obv. 10, see rev. 3. It is inappropriate, however, to claim (as does Kammenhuber[6]) that with common-gender substantives the vocative corresponds in general to the nominative, since this implies that such forms are really vocatives that merely share the same endings with

5. Examples such as [*šumē*]*š=a* LÚ.MEŠ KUR URU*Išmirika ḫūmanteš linkiya ardumat* 'You men of Išmerika, stand under oath!' KUB 23.68 + ABoT 58 rev. 11, where the address formula might or might not be a part of what follows immediately, should be considered appositional. See Hoffner 1998a: 42–44.

6. "Der Vokativ bei Subst. commune entspricht im allgemeinem dem Nominativ" (Kammenhuber 1969b: 193).

the nominative. When Luraghi (1997a: §2.1.5.1) writes, "It [the nominative] is also used as a vocative in the plural," she ignores the fact that any case form in singular or plural can be used for direct address as long as it does not occupy its own separate clause, as does the true vocative. The fact that there appears to have been no distinctively plural vocative ending does not justify her claim (§2.1.6.2) that "the nominative [plural] is used in its place." See the treatment of this subject in §16.14 (p. 244).

Accusative

16.18. The accusative case is the primary case governed by the finite transitive verb. As such its most common use is as (1) the immediate direct object of the transitive verb. But, like the accusative case in Greek and Latin, the Hittite accusative can also serve as (2) a second object, both in a predicatival sense (as in English 'he made me captain of the team', 'he called me a coward', 'they consider him handsome'; see §16.21),[7] and in partitive apposition, from which develops the accusative of respect (see §§16.24–16.25), (3) a cognate accusative (the *figura etymologica* of the classical languages, see §16.26, p. 248),[8] (4) an accusative of direction (see §16.27, p. 248), (5) an accusative of the way (see §16.28, p. 249),[9] (6) an accusative of extent/duration (see §16.29, p. 249), and (8) an adverbial accusative (see §16.30, p. 249).

16.19. The principal use of the accusative case is as the direct object of transitive verbs: [(*takk*)]*u* LÚ.U_{19}.LU-*an kuiški ḫūnikzi t=an ištarnikzi nu apūn šāktāizzi pēdi=šši=ma* LÚ.U_{19}.LU-*an pāi* 'If someone injures a man and makes him ill, he shall look after him and give a man in his place, (. . . but when he recovers, he shall give him six shekels of silver)' KBo 6.2 i 16–17 (Laws §10, OS) restored from KBo 6.3 i 25 (NS).

16.20. The normally intransitive verb *ēš-/aš-* is used with *-z(a)* transitively in the sense 'to dwell in, inhabit, occupy' and thus takes an accusative direct object (HW² E 97, 109–10): [*k*]*āša=wa=tta* KUR $^{ḪUR.SAG}$*Zippašlā* AD[*DIN*] *nu=wa=za apūn=pat eši namma=ma=wa=*[*z*] *parā tamāin ḫapātin tamai* KUR-*e* ZI-*it lē ēštari* 'I have herewith (*kāša*) given you the mountain country Zippašlā. Occupy only it. Beyond (this), do not intentionally occupy any other river country or land' KUB 14.1 obv. 19–20 (MH/MS); [^{d}UT]U-*uš=za* ^{URU}ZIMBIR-*an ēšzi*, ^{d}*sÎN-aš=ma=za* ^{URU}*Kuzinan ēš*[*zi*], ^{d}U-*aš=za* ^{URU}*Kummiyan ēš*[*zi*], ^{d}*IŠTAR-iš=ma=za* ^{URU}*Nenuwan ēš*[*zi*], ^{d}*Nanayaš=ma=za* ^{URU}*Kiššinan* [*ēšzi*] ^{URU}KÁ.DINGIR.RA-*an=ma=za* ^{d}AMAR.UTU-*aš ē*[*šzi*] 'the Sungod dwells in Sippar, the Moongod dwells in Kuzina, the Stormgod dwells in Kummiya, (the goddess) *IŠTAR* dwells in Nenuwa, Nanaya dwells in Kiššina, and in Babylon Marduk dwells' KUB 24.8+ iv 13–18 (NS); [*mān=war=aš* ŪL*=m*]*a uezzi nu=wa-kán* KUR-*e peran ēšten* '[If] he does

7. See on this type van den Hout 1992.

8. See HE 119 sub §199a. Note, however, that we view Friedrich's second type of "inneres Objekt" as an adverbial accusative (§19.14, p. 292).

9. See HE 120 sub §201b. Example: *man=kan* $^{ḪUR.SAG}$*Teḫšinan šarā pāun* 'I would have gone up Mt. Teḫšina'.

[not] come, occupy the land in advance!' KUB 14.16 i 17–18 (annals of Murš. II, NH). Note that *eši* in KUB 14.1 is formally active transitive, and *ēštari* in the same passage is a transitive medio-passive. This usage (pace HW² E 109–10) is at least as early as MH/MS, not coined in the reign of Muršili II.

16.21. Double accusatives (van den Hout 1992) are particularly common with verbs which are causatives of transitive verbs: ÍD-*an zāi* 'he crosses the river' and GUD=*ŠU* ÍD-*an zīnuškezzi* (*zinu-* is the causative of *zai-*) 'he makes his ox cross the river', both in KBo 6.2 ii 30–32 (Laws §43, OS). But verbs other than causatives of transitives also take double objects, among them: *iya-* 'to make something (first acc.) into something (second acc.)'; *n=uš arunaš irḫuš iēt* 'he made them (*=uš*) borders (*irḫuš*) of the sea' (KBo 3.1+ i 8, OH/NS); *n=uš* LUGAL-*uš* . . . LÚ.MEŠAPIN.LÁ *iyanun* 'I, the king, made them farmers (LÚ.MEŠAPIN.LÁ)' KBo 3.1+ ii 29–30 (OH/NS); ÌR=*YA*=*ma*=*wa nūwān parā daḫḫi nu*=*war*=*an*=*za*=*kan* LÚ*MUTI*=*YA iyami* 'I refuse to (*nūwan*; see §26.1, p. 341; and §26.19, p. 344) take my servant and make him my husband' KBo 5.6 iii 14–15 (NH); *nu=za* URU.dU-*šan šal*[(*li*) *AŠR*]*U iyat* 'he (Muwatalli II) made the city Tarḫuntašša 'the great place' (i.e., the new capital city)' KBo 6.29+ i 32 (NH).

16.22. From the fundamental meaning 'to make into' constructions of this kind developed into a means of expressing the idea 'to treat like': *U* ⟨*ANA*⟩ DUMU.MEŠ URU*Nēš*[(*a id*)]*ālu natta kuedanikki takkišta* [*š*/*n*?=*uš*] *annuš attuš iēt* 'He harmed none of the citizens (lit., sons) of Neša, but treated [them] like mothers (and) fathers' KBo 3.22 obv. 7–9 (OS) with dupl. KBo 22.5 obv. 7 (NS); *kuiš*=*war*=*an*=*z*=*an* [*dāi nu*=*war*]=*an uppiyaššar* DÙ-*zi* 'who will [take] him (the speaker's son) and treat him like a gift?' KUB 33.93 iii 28–29 (Ullik. I A).

16.23. Other verbs which like *iya-* take a double object are: *ḫalzai-* 'to call' *te-/tar-* 'to designate as, declare to be', *šallanu-* 'to raise up to be', *išḫai-* 'to provide someone with something'. Examples: [LUGAL-*uš*=*an*=*za*] DUMU-*la*(*n*)=*man ḫalziḫḫun* 'I, [the king,] have proclaimed [him] (to be) my son' KUB 1.16 ii 3–4; [*nu*=*šmaš* TUR-*lan*] *labarnan tenun* '[to you] have I declared [the young man] to be the Labarna' KUB 1.16 ii 2–3; *takku* . . . A.ŠÀ.ḪI.A *ŠA* LÚ GIŠTUKUL *ḫarkantan taranzi* 'if they declare the fields of a craftsman to be vacated' Laws §40; *nu* ḪUL-*lun* (i.e., *idālun*) UD.KAM-*an* LÚ.ḪUL-*an* (i.e., *ḫuwappan*) *šallan*[(*uškezzi*)] 'and he raises up a bad day to be (or 'which is') an evil' KUB 33.96 i 6 (Ullik. I A); MUNUS.MEŠ *wannummiuš* KIN-*an išḫāi* 'he provides the widow women with a task' KBo 16.54+ 15′.

16.24. Another double accusative construction in Hittite is **partitive apposition**, which corresponds to the Greek σχῆμα καθ' ὅλον καὶ μέρος. It is found almost exclusively in relation to the human body: *takku* ÌR-*an našma* GÉME-*an* KIR_{14}=*šet kuiški wāki* 'if anyone bites off the nose of a slave boy or a slave girl' (lit., 'bites a slave boy or slave girl, namely his/her nose') KBo 6.3 i 35 (Laws §14, OH/NS); (if any child is sick,) *n=an tuīkkuš išgaḫḫi* 'and I anoint him, (namely his) members' KUB 7.1+ i 40. That this

construction only became popular after Old Hittite is clear from passages in the laws where the Old Script copy KBo 6.2 uses the genitive construction and the NH copyist of KBo 6.3 replaced it with the σχῆμα (Laws §§11–13). Partitive apposition overlapped the function of the so-called split genitive (see §16.38, p. 251) and eventually replaced it.

16.25. When the partitive accusative construction undergoes passivization, the "whole" (scil., the person) becomes the subject, while the "part" (scil., the body part) remains in the accusative, producing the so-called accusative of respect. Examples: *n=aš genzu ḫamikta⟨t⟩ n=aš* ^{UZU}*pantūḫaššan ḫamiktat* 'he was bound with respect to (his) *genzu* (scrotum?), he was bound with respect to his bladder' KUB 7.1 iii 5–6 (CHD P 95); DINGIR.MEŠ*=za=kan* KA×U*=KUNU idālauwaz uddānaz . . . ārranteš ēšten* 'Be washed (clean), O gods, with respect to your mouths, from evil words, . . .' KUB 43.58 ii 39–41; *wappuwaš* DINGIR.MAḪ*-aš kāša=za* 12 ^{UZU}ÚR *paprannanza tuēl* ŠU*-it šapiyan*[*za*] *parkunuwanza* 'O DINGIR.MAḪ of the River Bank! Be hereby (*kāša*) cleansed from defilement and purified by your hand with respect to (your) twelve body parts' KUB 12.58 iv 1–3; 2 TÚG*=ma*! SAG.DUL ZA.GÌN *pūrin tittalitaimenzi* 'Two garments, head cover(s), blue, *tittalitāi*-ed (i.e., decorated in a certain way) with respect to the border/hem' KUB 12.1 iv 43 (inventory, NH), see CHD P 386. In rare cases one finds the accusative of respect extended beyond the passive construction: ^{d}U*-aš* IGI.ḪI.A*-wa* [*išḫ*]*aḫruwanza* 'The Stormgod, tearful of eyes, . . .' KUB 33.113 + KUB 36.12 i 30′–31′ (Ullik. II B).

16.26. The **cognate accusative**, the *figura etymologica* of the classical languages and of several Semitic languages,[10] exists in Hittite as well. The characteristic of this construction is a verb which takes as direct object a noun from the same root or stem (hence, "cognate accusative"): *ḫanneššar ḫanna-* 'to judge a judgment'; *ḫuitteššar ḫuittiya-* 'to pull out tufts'; *ḫukmaeš ḫuek-* 'to incant incantations'; *ḫullanzan ḫulle-* 'to fight a fight'; *išḫiul išḫiya-* 'to tie a tie'; *išḫueššar išḫuwa-* 'to heap a heap'; *kupiyatin kup-* 'to plot a plot'; *memiyan mema-* 'to speak a word'; *šarnikzel šarnink-* 'to make compensation'; *šaštan šeš-* 'to sleep a sleep'; *uppeššar uppa-* 'to send sendings'.

16.27. Accusative of Direction. As the dative-locative case answers the question 'in what place?' so the allative and occasionally the accusative case answer the question '**to** what place?' (HE §201): *nu=za=kan arunan tapuša*[11] [*iyanniyanun*] '[I went] to the side (allative) of the sea (acc.)' KUB 17.7 ii 11–12 (Ullik. I); *nu=šmaš=kan* ḪUR.SAG*-an parḫanzi* 'and they will chase you into the mountain (acc.)' KUB 13.3 ii 11; *t=uš alki*[*št*]*ān tarnaḫḫe* 'and I release them (scil., birds) to the branch' KBo 17.1+ iv 38. This is what Neu (1980: 30 n. 67) calls "Akkusativ der Richtung" (accusative of direction); see also Francia 1996a, especially 149–50 and Zeilfelder 2001: 25–39. It is an archaic feature seen in other old PIE languages. It is unclear whether there is a functional

10. Compare the paronomastic infinitive constructions of Akkadian (Ungnad 1992: §109d) and the *schēma etymologicum* of Biblical Hebrew (Gesenius, Kautsch, and Cowley 1910: §117 p and §113 l–x).

11. *ta-pu-ša* was accidentally left out of the hand copy in KUB 17.7; see Otten 1950: 13 n. 2.

distinction between the accusative of direction (i.e., of place-to-which) and the allative, or merely a replacement of the former by the latter (Neu 1980).

16.28. Distinct from the accusative of direction is the **accusative of the way**: *laḫḫan kuwatta* ÉRIN.MEŠ-*uš paizzi n=e appa ŪL* SIG_5-*in uīškanta* 'on whatever expedition the troops went (actually, both verbs are present tense) they returned unsuccessful' KBo 3.1+ ii 3–4; *taknaš=at* ^{d}UTU-*aš* KASKAL-*an paiddu* 'let it (i.e., the evil) go the way of the Sungoddess of the Netherworld!' KUB 17.10 iv 13; *nu=kan MULÛ parkuin kuwapi* EGIR-*an šarā uwaši* 'when you come up behind the bare(?) high ground' KUB 19.37 ii 30–31 (AM); *man=kan* $^{ḪUR.SAG}$*Teḫšinan š*[*arā*] *pāun* 'I would have ascended Mt. Teḫšina' KUB 19.37 iii 49. Francia (1997: 139–40) lists these as accusatives of extension in space. Her additional examples we would also consider accusative of the way, although the noun in the accusative is not *palša-* (= KASKAL) 'way'.

16.29. The accusative of **extent**, **dimension**, or **duration** is seen in the following examples. Of **time**: *nu=za* UD-*an* 2*=ŠU* 3*=ŠU ēt* 'eat twice (or) thrice in the course of a day!' KUB 1.16 iii 30; *nu išpandan ḫūmandan iyaḫḫat* 'And I marched throughout the night' KBo 5.8 iii 21 (AM 158–59); [(*peran par*)]*ā=ya=zzi apūn* G[(E_6-*a*)]*n IŠTU* MUNUS-*TI* [(*tešḫaš*)] 'And beforehand (*peran parā*) throughout that night (accusative of extent) (the king) abstained from (intercourse with) a woman' KBo 4.2 iii 58–59, ed. Lebrun 1985 (obv. 19–20); *nu karū* MU.10.KAM LUGAL-*ueznanun* 'I had already reigned for ten years' KBo 3.4 iii 62 (AM). The accusative UD.KAM.ḪI.A in KBo 4.4 iii 62, cited by Francia as accusative of duration, could be understood rather as 'during the daytime' (see §16.95, p. 266), especially since the expression lacks a number. **Extent of space**: *INA* UD.1.KAM*=war=aš AMMADU pargawēškad*[(*d*)]*aru INA* ITU.1.KAM*=ma=war=aš* IKU-*an pargawēš*[(*kadd*)]*ari* 'In one day may (Ullikummi) grow a cubit, in one month may he grow an IKU' KUB 33.98 iii 15–16 (Ullik. I); see CHD *nai-* 15. In the last-cited example it is not the time that is in the accusative but the height (*AMMATU*, IKU-*an*). This last example refutes the claim by Francia (1997: 145) that—unlike Greek and Latin—Hittite does not use the accusative to express extension in space as a measure. For the dative-locative occasionally designating extent of time see §16.75 (p. 261).

16.30. The plural nominative-accusative neuter of adjectives is regularly used adverbially (see §19.13, p. 292). Also adduced as adverbial accusatives: *ḫantezzi* 'in the first place, first of all', *lammar* 'immediately', and *karuwariwar* 'in the morning'.

16.31. The construction with the "experiencer" as a grammatical accusative object of an **impersonal verb** is found with verbs of sickness (*ištark-*, *irmaliya-*) and emotional states such as fear (*naḫḫ-*; see §16.32). Since none of the secure examples are from OS or MS copies, we cannot claim its existence earlier than the New Hittite period. Some of the better examples use dative-accusative clitic pronouns, which are ambiguous: *mān=mu ištarkzi kuwapi* 'whenever I became ill' ("historical present"; §§22.6–22.7, pp. 307–308) Ḫatt. i 44; *tuk ištarkta* 'you became ill' (lit., 'it ill-ed you'). The following example with a transitive medio-passive shows an unambiguous accusative object:

[(*nu*)] ^{m}LUGAL-^{d}*SIN-uḫ-un* [ŠEŠ=*Y*]*A* [. . . *ištar*(*kiyattat n=aš*)] BA.ÚŠ ‘And Šarri-kušuḫ, my brother, became ill, and he died’ KBo 4.4 i 5–6 with dupl. KUB 14.29 + KUB 19.3 i 31 (both NH). We see the origin of the impersonal verb *ištark-* in the following NH example, where the grammatical subject (‘illness’ in the nominative) is expressed: *nu* ^{GIŠ}*kalmišnaš pait=pat* [*nu* ^{URU}*A*]*paššan ŠA* ^{m}*Uḫḫa*-LÚ URU-*an* GUL-*aḫta* ^{m}*Ūḫḫa*-LÚ-*inn=a* GUL-*aḫta n=an idāluš* GIG-*aš ištarkta* ‘And a comet(?) went and struck Apašša, Uḫḫaziti’s city; it struck Uḫḫaziti, and a serious (lit., ‘bad’) illness befell him’ KUB 14.15 ii 4–6 (NH), see ibid. ii 13.

16.32. We also interpret *-ta* in *lē=ta nāḫi* ‘fear not’ KUB 30.36 ii 8 (OH/NS) and in *lē=wa=tta nāḫi* KUB 33.24 i 43 (OH/NS) as accusative and *nāḫi* as an impersonal present third-person singular instead of imperative second-person singular. We reject the latter analysis because singular dative clitics are nowhere else attested in reflexive function in Hittite (see §28.18, p. 358), and because the *lē* + imperative construction is quite rare (see §26.17, p. 344, and CHD *lē*). Compare also: *nu=wa=šša*n *mān pāimi n*[(*aḫi=mu*)] *par*(*a*)*šni* UR.BAR.RA-*ni* ‘(Above, on the *ḫankuri-* (are) a *š.* (and) a lamb;) when I go up there (*-šan*), I fear (lit., ‘it fears me’) with respect to the leopard (and) the wolf’ KBo 21.90 rev. 51–52 (fest. of Tetešḫabi, OH/MS), with dupl. KBo 21.103 rev. 51–52.[12] For the impersonal construction compare German *mich fürchtet*, Latin *mē verētur.*

16.33. Note, however, that in NH both the verbs of sickness and fear can also be construed with a personal subject: (Arnuwanda, son of Šuppiluliuma, sat down on the throne of his father,) EGIR-*an=ma=aš irmaliyattat=pat* ‘but later he became ill as well’ KBo 3.4 i 5–6 (AM 14–15). For examples of *naḫ*(*ḫ*)- see CHD L–N 338–41.

Ergative

16.34. For the use of the ergative case with neuter nouns see §3.8 (p. 66).

Genitive

16.35. The Hittite genitive is for the most part an adnominal case: a noun in the genitive modifies another noun in various ways. Evidence for an adverbal genitive is very sparse and uncertain (§16.57, p. 255). The genitive is also used in OH with postpositions (§§16.58–16.59, p. 255), and the genitive may appear in a free-standing construction (§16.61, p. 256). On the Hittite genitive see Otten and Souček 1969: 60–62; Carruba 1978–79; D. Yoshida 1987.

16.36. The Hittite adnominal genitive has the following uses: (1) to indicate the possessor (possessive genitive); (2) to indicate the whole of which the head noun denotes a part (partitive genitive); (3) to indicate the material, contents, or container of the head noun; (4) to indicate the actor (subjective genitive) or acted upon (objective genitive)

12. On this passage see CHD Š sub *šāša-* A.

when the head noun denotes an action; (5) to indicate the length, width, capacity, or weight of the head noun (genitive of measure); and (6) to indicate the purpose for which the head noun is intended.

16.37. The most common genitive use is the **possessive genitive** (in OH, see D. Yoshida 1987: 12–46): *kuel=aš arḫi aki* 'on what (person)'s property he dies' KBo 6.2 i 7 (Laws §6); GÉME-*aš šarḫuwanduš=šuš* 'the slave woman's unborn child' KBo 6.3 i 43 (Laws §18); *attaš=šaš=a* É-*ri aki* 'and (if) she dies in her father's house' KBo 6.3 ii 3 (Laws §27); *ammel=pat=wa=za* GUD-*un daḫḫi* '(I have decided that) I will take my own ox' KBo 6.3 iii 71 (Laws §74); URU*Nešaš* LUGAL-*uš* 'Neša's king' KBo 3.22:4 (OS); *attaš=šaš* É-*ri* 'in the house (dative-locative) of his father (lit., 'of father, of his')' KUB 33.24 (+) 33.28 ii 12; LUGAL-*an āška* 'to the gate (allative) of the kings (archaic genitive in -*an*)' KUB 13.4 ii 49.

16.38. Often in Old (and rarely as an archaism in Middle) Hittite the dependent genitive is doubled by a clitic possessive pronoun on the head noun (called by Otten and Souček 1969: 70 "pleonastischer Gebrauch"). Garrett (1998), who calls it a "split genitive," has shown that this construction is normally restricted to inalienable possession (the head noun, which is the thing possessed, is a body part, etc.): LÚ.U$_{19}$.LU-*aš ELLAM-aš* KIR$_{14}$*=šet* KBo 6.2 i 24 (Laws §13, OS); GÉME-*aš šarḫuwan*[*du*]*š=šuš* KBo 6.3 i 43 (Laws §18 (OH/NS); *kēl me-n*[*e*!]-*iš-ši-it* 'this one's face' KBo 6.26 i 36 (Laws §166 OH/NS[13]); [*a*]*mmell=a lāmā*⟨*n*⟩*=mit* KUB 1.16 iii 13 (OH/NS); *labarnašš=a* MU.ḪI.A*=šeš* 'the Labarna's years' KBo 17.22 iii 9 (OS); *ammel tuēggaš=miēš* 'my members' VBoT 58 i 24 (OH/NS). The NS examples are mere recopying from the OH archetype, since the clitic possessive was moribund in NH. There is one assured MH/MS example: *šumenzan=pat ker=šemet* 'your (pl.) hearts' KBo 8.35 ii 21; and another very likely one in a MH composition containing OH archaisms:[14] [(*weš=a=wa*) AN-*aš* KI-*aš*(*š=a*) ZALAG.G]A-*aš=*(*š*)*miš* (var. *la-lu-uk-ki-mi-iš*) 'we are the illumination (var. luminaries [pl.]) of heaven and earth' KUB 33.91:8 restored from dupl. KUB 36.19 iv? 13–14 (see CHD *lalukkima-* 1). The scribe of the duplicate has made the singular ZALAG.GA-*aš* into a plural because of the two genitive nouns and has modernized the construction by deleting the doubling clitic -*šmiš*. It is unclear whether the Akkadogram clitic possessive attests this usage in other MH/MS examples such as: *tuel* . . . ŠEŠ*=KA* HKM 63:12 (MH/MS).

16.39. In some cases, however, even as early as OS, this construction seems not to express inalienable possession: *mān* DUMU-*aš* ^{d}IM-*naš šašanti=šši ḫuekzi* 'when the prince recites an incantation to the concubine of the Stormgod' KUB 8.41 ii 7 (OS);

13. Preserved only in NH copy KBo 6.26. In OS KUB 29.30 iii 2′–3′ it is usually restored, but there is unfortunately no way to prove its presence there.

14. Such as the occurrences of *weš=a=wa* (without -*za*) alongside the NS scribe's modernizations with *weš=a=wa=z* in nominal sentences.

LUGAL-*aš* MUNUS.LUGAL-*š=a* . . . *paprātar=šamet* ‘their (i.e.) the king’s and queen’s impurity’ StBoT 8 ii 10–11.

16.40. In the same way in Old Hittite (OS) the doubling possessive can be suffixed to a primitive noun-become-adverb (for *ketkar*, see §3.26, p. 74; §3.32, p. 77; §7.19, p. 147; for *šer*, see §§16.58–16.59, p. 255; §20.26, p. 300): LUGAL-*aš* MUNUS.LUGAL-*š=a ketkar=šamet* ‘at the heads of the king and queen’ KBo 17.1 + KBo 25.3 ii 27–28 (OS); LUGAL-*aš* MUNUS.LUGAL-*aššš=a šē*[(*r=šemet*)] ‘over/above the king and queen’ ibid. ii 20.

16.41. The **partitive** genitive (“genitive of the whole”; D. Yoshida 1987: 88–90) is weakly attested in OH by the following: *ŠA* ^{LÚ}URUDU.NAGAR *ŪL kuiški arauwaš* ‘no one of the copperworker(s) is exempt’ KBo 6.6 i 31 (Laws §56, OH/NS) and a few other examples adduced by Yoshida, which are somewhat doubtful. One of these, also proposed by Neu (1974: 46, 56): *šardia*(*n*)*=šann=a kuin uwatet* of the Anitta text (Neu: “wen von seinen Helfern” [*š.* is plural genitive]), is also doubted by Houwink ten Cate (1984: 79 n. 51). This clause could be interpreted as ‘his auxiliary troop (acc.) which he brought’, taking *šardian* as singular accusative. In most clear cases of the partitive genitive in Old Hittite, the genitive seems to depend on the indefinite pronoun *kuiški* as the head pronoun. As a partitive genitive in the NH period Friedrich (HE 1 §211) cites: *nu=za ḫūmandaš=pat* EGIR-*ezziš* DUMU-*aš ešun* ‘I was the last child of all’ Ḫatt. i 11. This example, however, like other forms in *-aš* in the superlative constructions (§17.17, p. 275), may be taken as either genitive or dative-locative plural. The example URU-*aš pupulli* ‘the ruins (neut. nom.-acc.) of a city’[15] could be an instance of a possessive genitive, but the city does not really ‘possess’ the ruins; rather, the ruins are all that is left (i.e., a part) of the city. Further examples that express superlatives can be found in §17.17 (p. 275).

16.42. When the relationship of possessor to possessed is also one of whole to part (as with the human body), possession can instead be construed as a partitive relationship. In such cases an OH possessive genitive may be replaced in post-OH by partitive apposition (the so-called σχῆμα, §16.24, p. 247): *takku* LÚ.U$_{19}$.LU-*aš ELLAM-aš QASSU našma* GÌR*=ŠU kuiški tuwa*[*rnizzi*] ‘If anyone breaks a free person’s arm or leg’ KBo 6.2 i 20 (Laws §11, OS). Here the OS copy KBo 6.2+ (A) uses the genitive, while the NH copies B and C replace it with partitive apposition (§16.10, pp. 243–244) in the accusative:[16] *takku* LÚ.U$_{19}$.LU-*an ELLUM QASSU našma* GÌR*=ŠU kuiški tuwarnizzi*. This partitive apposition replaced the older split genitive (§16.38, p. 251) and is consequently only used with inalienable possession (head nouns are body parts, etc.; Garrett 1998).

---

15. (Sum.) gú-ba1 = (Akk.) *te-lu* ‘tell, mound of ruins’ = (Hitt.) URU-*aš p*[*u-pu-ul-li*] ‘r[uins] of a city’ KBo 1.42 iii 6, ed. Hoffner 1967b 303 with n. 23; see CHD P s.v. *pupulli-*.

16. See HE 123–24 §213; Kammenhuber 1969b: 203–4; D. Yoshida 1987: 34–35; Neu 1997: 142–43; LH 24–25, 176 on §9).

16.43. The **genitive of material** '(made) of' (D. Yoshida 1987: 70–76) is attested in: DUG.GIR$_4$-*aš* GAL-*in* 'goblet (made) of fired clay' KUB 13.3 ii 26; 1 ^{GIŠ}*šunilaš* ^{GIŠ}*laḫḫuraš* TUR 'one small *laḫḫura*- table (made) of *šunila*- wood' VBoT 58 iv 18 (OH/NS); IM-[*aš*] *ḫupuwāi* '*ḫ*.-vessel (made) of clay' KBo 39.8 ii 55 (MH?/MS); *š*[(*eppittaš*)] ^{NINDA}*dannaš* '*dannaš*-loaves (made) of *šeppit*-cereal' KUB 9.16 i 19–20 (NS) with dupl. KUB 10.48 i 3; and a final example: NÍ.TE-*aš=ma=šši* NA$_4$-*aš* ^{NA_4}*ku*[*nk*]*unuzziyaš* DÙ-*anza* 'its body (was) made of *k*.-stone' KUB 33.95 + KUB 36.7b + KUB 33.93 iv 12 (Ullik., NS). For more examples in OH see Otten, StBoT 8 61.

16.44. The **genitive of contents** (head noun is the container, genitive is the contents; D. Yoshida 1987: 83–87) is exemplified in: *nu ḫūman mekki ḫandait* GEŠTIN-*aš* ^{DUG}*palḫi marnuwandaš* ^{DUG}*palḫi* [*w*]*alḫiyaš* ^{DUG}*palḫi* '(The goddess Inara) prepared everything on a grand scale: large vessels of wine, large vessels of *marnuwan*-beer, large vessels of *walḫi*-beer' KBo 3.7 i 15–17 (OH/NS); zíz-*aš* ^{DUG}*ḫaršiyalliya peran* 'in front of the storage vessel of wheat' KBo 15.36 + KBo 21.61 ii 13 (OH/MS); 1 ^{DUG}DÍLIM GAL ^{TU_7}*šampukkiyaš* 'one large bowl of *šampukki*-stew' KBo 5.1 iii 10–11; ZA.ḪUM KÙ.BABBAR *ŠA MÊ* 'one silver ZA.ḪUM-vessel of water' KUB 39.70 i 17; *ḫalkiyaš=ši* ^{DUG}*ḫaršiyalli* 'for him a storage vessel of grain/barley' KUB 21.17 ii 12 (NH). Another pattern in Hittite for indicating 'a (vessel) of (liquid content)' is not with a genitival construction but with case concord: 12 DUG *marnuan* KUB 53.14 i 6, 11 (OH/MS?); 1 *ḫuppar marnuan* i 27. This may be purely graphic, another example of the Akkadographic writing of a Hittite noun. Note that, unlike the genitival construction, here the noun of content always follows the head noun, as in Akkadian syntax. If the construction is real, one may compare German uses such as 'eine Flasche Milch' = 'a bottle of milk' (T. van den Hout, pers. comm.).

16.45. The opposite of the genitive of contents is the **genitive of the container**: *ŠA* É*garupaḫiaš* . . . [(*ez*)]*zan* GIŠ-*ru* 'the chaff (and) wood of (i.e., contained in) the granary' Ḫatt. iv 82–83.

16.46. When the head noun denotes an action, the genitive can indicate the subject or object of the action (so-called **subjective** and **objective genitive**). Subjective: *kī=mu kuit ŠA* ^{m}*Marrūwa* LÚ ^{URU}*Ḫimmuwa ḫaliyatar ḫatrāeš* 'This homage of Marruwa, the ruler of Ḫimmuwa, about which you wrote to me' HKM 13:4–5 (MH/MS). Objective: MUNUS-*aš dāuar* 'the taking of a woman' KBo 1.53:10, *ŠA* KUR ^{URU}*Amka* GUL-*aḫḫuwar* 'the attacking of the land of Amqa' KBo 5.6 iii 5–6 (DŠ frag. 28).

16.47. In the **genitive of measure** the units of weight or measure always follow their head nouns: 4 ^{NINDA}*ḫaršauš tarnaš* 'four thick breads of (i.e., weighing each) a *tarnaš*'—i.e., not 4 *tarnaš* ^{NINDA}*ḫaršauš* or the like. Perhaps it was the presence of the numeral '4' preceding the ^{NINDA}*ḫaršauš* which caused the genitive *tarnaš* to move to a position following the governing noun, to remove the ambiguity (is it 4 loaves each one *tarnaš* or an indeterminate number of loaves each of 4 *tarnaš*?). Also dependent on *kuišša* 'each': *nu* 9 NINDA.GUR$_4$.RA.ḪI.A *anda neyanduš tarnaš* 9 NINDA.GUR$_4$.RA.ḪI.A Ì

tarnaš 3 NINDA *ān kuišša tarnaš udanzi* 'And they bring (in) nine thick loaves braided together (each weighing) a *tarnaš*, nine oiled thick loaves (each weighing) a *tarnaš*, and three warm loaves (each weighing) a *tarnaš*' KUB 17.23 i 2–4; NINDA.LÀL=*ya*=*šša*n *ḫūmanduš kuišša parā tarnaš kittari* KUB 32.128 i 5–6; 3 NINDA-*an ḫazzilaš* KUB 7.53 i 22; NINDA*iduriš* ZÍD.DA *ḫazzilaš* KBo 15.37 i 8; 1 DUGDÍLIM.GAL TU_7 *šemeḫunaš ḫazzilaš* KBo 16.49 iv 6. No example of a syllabically written unit of measure occurs in the plural with a numeral (e.g., *2 *tarnaš*, *2 *ḫazziliyaš*), but logographic examples occur: *ŠA* 2 *UPNI* KUB 13.4 i 6; KBo 21.1 i 8; *ŠA* 3 *UPNI* ibid. i 9; *ŠA* 3 *ŠĀTI* KUB 30.15+ obv. 26.

16.48. The genitive sometimes indicates the person or object *for* which the head noun is intended: ŠU.MEŠ-*aš wātar* 'water (neut. nom.-acc.) of (i.e., *for*) the hands', *genuwaš* GAD-*an* 'cloth (accusative) of (i.e., *for*) the knees'; *tayezzilaš šarnikzel* 'compensation of (i.e., *for*) theft' KUB 13.9 ii 8–9 (MH/NS); *IKRIBI*ḪI.A *ŠA* d*IŠ*[*TAR*] 'votive offerings of (i.e., *for*) d*IŠTAR*' KBo 16.83 ii 12 (NH); *ŠA* dNIN.GAL SÍSKUR 'the ritual of (i.e., *for*) NIN.GAL' KUB 45.47 iv 36.

16.49. The use of the genitive "ablativally" in the phrase GE_6-*yaš* KI-*aš* KI.BAD-*aš* (i.e., *tankuwayaš daganzipaš tuwalaš*) 'remote *from* the Dark Earth' KUB 33.106 iii 38–39 is isolated (see §30.42, p. 418). See also [*m*]*ān* É-*er ēšḫanaš* . . . *kurkurimaš linkiyaš parkunuwa*[*nzi*] 'When(ever) [they] purify a house of/from bloodshed, . . . calumny, (and) perjury' KUB 7.41 i 1–2, where one might expect ablatives (cf. KBo 10.45 iv 39–41 [the same ritual] and VBoT 111 iii 17–18).

Word Order in a Genitival Phrase

16.50. In the **normal word order** the genitive precedes its head noun (see Sommer and Falkenstein 1938: 47–48), except for the genitive of measure (on which see §16.47, p. 253).

16.51. If a demonstrative adjective modifies a head noun governing a genitive, the word order is DEMONSTRATIVE + GENITIVE + HEAD: *nu ini ŠA* GIŠ*INBI*ḪI.A *ēšr*[*i*] 'That image (made) of fruits' KUB 39.11:40 (NH); *kāš tandukešnaš* DUMU-*aš* 'this mortal (lit., this child of mortality)' KUB 7.5 i 8.

16.52. If an attributive adjective modifies a head noun governing a genitive, the sequence is ATTRIBUTIVE + GENITIVE + HEAD: *ḫandānza maniya*[*ḫ*]*ḫayaš išḫāš zi*[*k*] 'You are a just lord of rule' KUB 31.127 i 20 (prayer).

16.53. Certain conditions describe the less common cases in which the sequence HEAD + GENITIVE is found:

16.54. Principally, it is the presence of a Sumerogram (or Akkadogram) in the construction which causes the reversal of the sequence: DINGIR.MEŠ EN.MEŠ *nepišaš* KI-*aššeš*=*a* 'the gods, lords of heaven and of earth' KUB 6.45+ i 36; AN.BAR GE_6 *nepišaš* 'black iron of (i.e., from) the sky' (= meteorite iron) KBo 4.1 i 39.

16.55. When the genitive is the indefinite pronoun *kuelka*, it normally follows the head noun: *šuppala=ššet kuēlqa* ‘someone’s animals’ KBo 6.26 i 22 (Laws §163, OH/NS); *parna=ma kuēlka* ‘to someone’s house’ KBo 6.2 ii 35 (Laws §44b, OS); *takku* GUD-*aš* A.ŠÀ.ḪI.A-*ni kuelqa aki* ‘If an ox dies on someone’s field’ KBo 6.3 iii 68 (Laws §72, OH/NS); *wašdul kuēlqa*[*au*]*tti* ‘you see someone’s sin’ KUB 1.16 iii 59–60. This pattern persists even when the *kuelka* is negated: [(ÌR-*na*)]*n=ašta* GÉME-*šan natta kuelka daḫḫun* ‘I took no one’s [male slave] (or) female slave’ KUB 31.4 + KBo 3.41 6 restored from KBo 13.78 obv. 5. For further examples see the following paragraphs.

16.56. The use of the genitive *kuelqa* as an indefinite **pronoun** described in §16.65 is not to be confused with *kuelka* as an indefinite **adjective** modifying a noun in the genitive, for which see §§18.35–18.36 (p. 287).

16.57. One uncertain example of an **adverbal** partitive genitive is *n=ašta* ^{DUG}*palḫan ḫūmandan ek*[*uer*] ‘They (Illuyanka and sons) drank (some) from (lit., ‘of’) all the basins’ KUB 17.5 i 11 (OH/MS) (thus Melchert 1989: 182). The lack of any other attested examples leaves the reality of this usage in doubt. This usage shares features of the rare partitive ablative (see §16.102, p. 267).

16.58. Certain postpositions governed the genitive in Old Hittite but the dative-locative in New Hittite (see §20.15, p. 298, and following for examples): *attaš=maš āppan* ‘after (the death of) my father’ KBo 3.22:30 (OS), LUGAL-*waš peran* ‘in front of the king’ KBo 20.12 i 5 (OS), *annaš=maš katta* ‘with my mother’ KBo 3.40:14, *nēpišaš kattan* ‘under the sky’ KUB 29.3 i 11 (OS); *ammel katta* ‘with me’ or (with verbs of sending) ‘to me, to where I am’ KUB 36.44 iv 4 (OH/MS), *ḫaššāš katta* ‘next to the brazier’ (KBo 17.15 rev.! 15 (OS) (for postpositions with enclitic possessives see §20.26, p. 300).

16.59. In New Hittite one postposition continues to govern the genitive case, *iwar* ‘in the manner of, like’ (see the dictionaries; Hoffner 1993; and §19.9, p. 291). Examples: UR.GI$_7$-*š=aš iwar . . . aki* ‘he will die . . . . . like a dog’ KBo 32.14 left edge 6 (MS); LÚ-*aš iwar* ‘like a man’ KUB 31.69 obv. 5; ŠEŠ.MEŠ-*aš iwar* ‘like brothers’ KBo 10.12 iii 10; LÚ.KÚR-*aš iwar* ‘like an enemy’ KBo 5.4 rev. 15; *ŠA* ^{m}*Mašḫuiluwa iwar* ‘like Mašḫuiluwa’ KUB 6.41 iii 55 (Murš. II); LUGAL-*uēznaš iwar* KBo 16.17 + KBo 2.5 iii 30–31 = *ŠA* LUGAL-*UTTI iwar* ‘in the manner of royalty, like a king’ KBo 3.4 iii 75 (AM 88–89); *ŠA* ^{LÚ}ŠU.DIB *iwar* ‘like a captive’ KBo 3.6 iii 62′ (= Ḫatt. iv 31 with variant ^{LÚ}*LI*); ^{URU}*Ḫattušaš iwar* ‘in the Hittite manner’ KUB 21.17 iii 7; *anzel iwar* ‘like us’ KUB 17.21 i 17; *nu ammel iwar kuwatqa iya*[*ši*] ‘Perhaps you will act like me’ KUB 60.136:4 compared with *nu ziqq=a kuatqa ŠA* ^{m}*Mašturi iwar iyaši* ‘Perhaps you too will act like ^{m}Mašturi’ KUB 23.1 ii 29–30 (Tudḫ. IV); *ANA* KUR LÚ.KÚR-*KA zakkiyaš iwar tiya*[*zi*] ‘he will enter (literally, step to) the land hostile to you like a key (enters a lock)’ KUB 29.11 ii 4 (translation of Akkadian lunar omen); *nu=wa ug=a* ŠAḪ-*aš iwar uiyami* ‘and I will squeal like a pig’ KUB 14.1 rev. 93 (MH/MS); *nu=wa=kan apēl* ZI-*an*

DINGIR.MEŠ *uwitenaš iwar arḫa lāḫḫuwaten* ‘pour out his soul, O gods, like water’ KUB 13.3 iii 1–2 (ins.).

16.60. In later NH *iwar* is occasionally written (not spoken!) as a preposition before logograms or proper names written as logograms (without case endings; Hoffner 1993): *ūk iwar* LUGAL ^{KUR}*Karg*[*amiš*] ‘I, like the King of Carchemish’ KBo 18.48 obv. 19 (letter); *iwar* ^{m}*Manini* ‘like Manini’ KUB 5.1 i 43 (see ibid. 87, 90, 93); *iwar* MUNUS ŠU.GI ‘like an Old Woman’ IBoT 1.33:84; *iwar* ^{URU}*Arzawa* ‘in the manner of Arzawa’ KUB 18.67 obv.? 12; *iwar* ^{LÚ}*TAPPIŠU* ‘like his colleague’ KUB 8.48 i 15–16 (Gilg.). In this pseudo-Akkadographic construction it simply imitates the word order of the Akkadian preposition *kīma* ‘like’.

16.61. The independent (or **free-standing)** genitive ‘he of . . . ’ (HE §212, D. Yoshida 1987: 1–11), or *genitivus absolutus* (Carruba 1966a: 41–42), is attested from Old Hittite on. Examples: *šāwataraš* ‘he of the horn; horn-player’ KBo 17.1+ i 37 (OS); ^{LÚ}*arka*(*m*)*miyaš* (= ^{LÚ}*arka*(*m*)*miyalaš*) ‘*arka*(*m*)*mi*-player’ (see Otten and Souček 1969: 61–62); *waštulaš* ‘he of the “sin”; the offender’ Laws §§147–48; *tuk . . . linkiyaš=šaš iēt* ‘he made you . . . (a person) of his oath’ KUB 14.1 obv. 13 (direct obj.); *tayazilaš* ‘he of the theft; the thief’ Laws §73, ‘the (compensation) for theft’ Laws §§94–95 (direct obj.); *kardiaš=taš* ‘that of your heart, your wish’ KBo 3.7 i 26 (direct obj.); *āššauwaš memiyanaš* ‘(he) of good words’ = ‘he who is on good terms’ Ḫatt. iv 50; TI-*annaš* (= *ḫuišwannaš*) ‘he of (long) life, long-lived’ KBo 3.6 i 13 (= Ḫatt. i 15) (NH); with the genitive of the verbal substantive (see §25.5, p. 330): *naḫḫūwaš* ‘he of being reverent’ KBo 3.6 iv 15 (NH); *paršnauwaš* ‘the (cupbearer) of squatting’ KUB 10.89 i 19 and passim; *šarā pāuwaš* ‘(a person) of going up (into the temple)’ KUB 13.4 ii 12; and of infinitives *arḫa tarnummaš* ‘he who is to be released (from military service)’ KUB 13.20 i 11; *kuit=ma* DI-*šar šumel* $\bar{U}_L$ *tar*(*aḫ*)*ḫūwaš* ‘what legal case is of your not-being-able’ = ‘whatever case you cannot settle’ KUB 13.20 i 36. Note that the genitive of the verbal noun may have the force of ‘he who (or that which) can (or must) be . . . -ed’, as illustrated in the last two examples.

16.62. Free-standing genitive independent pronouns also exist: *apēl* ‘his (water)’ Laws §162; *anzel* ‘our (people)’ KUB 9.31 iii 47; *ammel daḫḫi* ‘I will take (what is) mine’ KUB 13.35 ii 3. See Sommer and Falkenstein 1938: 92–93 with notes.

16.63. The same construction is attested in Akkadian texts (Ungnad 1992: §30 and §114), and is attested also by Akkadograms in Hittite texts: *ŠA MAMETI* ‘he of the oath, the liegeman’ (see *linkiyaš=šaš* above); *ŠA* KASKAL-*NIM* ‘that of the road’ = ‘provisions for the trip’ KUB 9.31 iii 13.

16.64. Related to the free-standing genitive is the usage in the expression LUGAL-*uš* GUB-*aš* = *arandaš* (or TUŠ-*aš* = *ašandaš*) *ekuzi* ‘the king—in a standing (or sitting) position—drinks . . .’ which occurs frequently in the festival texts. This often has been discussed, for instance by Holland (1986: 165 note). If GUB-*aš* stood for the genitive of the verbal substantive (*arawaš* or *ašawaš*), it would be easier to understand: ‘he of the

action of standing/sitting'. But since it is the genitive of the participle, it is problematic: 'he of the one standing/sitting'.

Dative-Locative

16.65. The dative and locative cases have merged in Hittite, in both form and function. There is no basis for the claim of Starke (1977: 63–68) of different functions according to an alleged distinction between nouns referring to persons and those referring to things (§3.7, p. 66). The functional merger of the two cases is shown: (1) by use of the merged dative-locative to express 'place from which' with inanimate referents (§16.69, p. 259); (2) use of the dative-locative to express 'place to which' with inanimate referents already in OH (in competition with the allative; §16.70, p. 259); (3) use of the dative-locative to express location with persons in combination with postpositions, also already in OH (§16.72, p. 260); (4) use of the dative-locative singular of the enclitic personal pronouns to refer to inanimate objects (§16.71, p. 260). The third usage is still rare in OH in comparison with the genitive (see §16.35, p. 250), but it does exist, and the last usage is exceptional, but the first two are not, despite claims to the contrary. For obvious pragmatic reasons, nouns referring to persons are more frequent in some uses, and nouns referring to things in others, but there is no *grammatical* contrast. We group the uses in what follows into those related to the dative and those related to the locative purely for expository purposes, to make clearer the relationship to uses in other languages. See also Yakubovich 2006.

Indirect Object

16.66. The use of the dative-locative for the **indirect object**, answering the question 'to whom', derives from the **dative** case. This usage occurs with nouns, independent and enclitic pronouns, and with nouns represented by logograms. In the last case, when phonetic complements are lacking, one can only detect the dative-locative case by the employment of the Akkadogram preposition *A-NA* 'to, for'. Examples: (nouns) *takku* DUMU.MUNUS LÚ-*ni taranza* 'if a young woman is promised to a man' KBo 6.3 ii 5 (Laws §28, OH/NS); *takku* DUMU.MUNUS-*aš* LÚ-*ni ḫamenkanza nu=šši kūšata piddaizzi* 'if a girl is betrothed to a man, and he gives the bride price for her' KBo 6.3 ii 11 (Laws §29, OH/NS); [*kāša*] DUMU=*mi Labarni* É-*er peḫḫ*[*un*] 'I have [hereby] given a house to my son Labarna' KUB 1.16 ii 30–31 (OH/NS); *ta* LUGAL-*i kardimiyattuš piškatteni* 'and you are giving to the king reasons to be angry' KBo 22.1: 20 (OS); (independent pronouns) *apedašš=a tamain* GEŠTIN-*an piyēr* 'But to them they gave a different wine' KBo 3.34 ii 3–4; (enclitic pronouns) *nu ḫantezziyaš* LÚ-*aš kuit kuit p*[*ešta*] *ta=a*(*t*)*=šše šarnikzi* 'He shall make compensation to the first man of whatever [he paid]' KBo 6.3 ii 6–7 (Laws §28, OH/NS); (logograms) *nu ANA* DINGIR-*LIM* ŠU.MEŠ-*aš wātar parā ēpzi* 'He holds out to the deity water for the hands' KUB 39.70 i 19. Rarely, the ideographically written noun, which appears to be a dative, has no *ANA* to introduce it: *nu=šše* 6 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR *pāi* ^{LÚ}A.ZU=*ya kuššan apāš=pat pāi* 'he will give to him six shekels of silver and to the physician that same (man) will pay the fee' KBo 6.2 i 19 (Laws §10, OS).

Indicating Possession

16.67. The use of the dative-locative to indicate **possession** is attested not only in predicates of clauses with the verb 'to be'—[*k*(*ēzza=ma maḫḫ*)*an* (*ANA* ŠEŠ=*YA*) . . . (. . . *ḫuiššuwališ*)] DUMU-*aš* [(*ŪL*) *ēš*(*ta*)] 'Now at this time (*kēzza*) since there was not a son entitled to rule belonging to my brother' (i.e., 'since . . . my brother had no son') Ḫatt. iii 40–41 (on which see Košak 1996), but even non-predicatively without that verb.[17] The co-occurrence of a dative clitic pronoun and a clitic possessive pronoun in MS or NS copies of OH texts may reflect a real usage or merely a faulty updating in which the new use of the dative clitic was added while the old clitic possessive was retained: *šu=mu* DINGIR.DIDLI DUMU ^{URU}*Pur*[*ušḫanda*] *kišri=mi daier* 'The gods put the Purušḫandaean in my hand (lit., 'to me in the hand'; see German *mir in die Hand legen*)' KBo 3.28:6–7 (OH/NS); [*uk=a ANA*] DINGIR=*YA kuit iyanun nu=mu* É=*YA inani peran pittuliyaš* É-*er kišat* 'But what have I done to my god, that because of illness my house has become a house of fear?' KUB 30.10 rev. 13–14 (OH/MS). A dative of possession using the relative pronoun *kui-* is found in the following: *paltanuš kuedani awan katta kiyantari* 'one whose shoulders are hanging down idly' (approximate and clumsy Hittite attempt to translate Akkadian *aḫu nadû* 'he is idle', lit., '(his) hand(s) hang down') KBo 1.42 ii 32 (NH). For the possessive genitive see above, §16.37 (p. 251).

Dative of Disadvantage

16.68. The so-called dative of disadvantage is reflected in the use of the dative-locative translatable as 'from' with verbs such as (*-kan arḫa*) *da-* 'to take (from)', (*peran arḫa*) *munnāi-* 'to hide (something from)', *šanna-* 'to hide (something from)', and *tuḫš-* 'to separate (something from)', *wek-* 'to ask (something from someone)'. In all the following examples the dative-locative represents a person, or at least a living being (deity, animal, etc.), and in the vast majority of occurrences a "local" particle, either *-šan* or *-kan*, occurs (see §28.76, p. 371). With local particle: [(*kā*)]*šata=šmaš=kan utniyandan lāluš dāḫḫun* [(*erm*)]*a*(*n*)*=šmaš=kan dāḫḫun* 'I have just taken the slanders of the inhabitants from you. I have taken the illness from you' KBo 17.1 i 11–12 (OS) (see ibid. iv 38 with *-ašta*: [(*dāḫḫu*(*n*)*=šmaš=šta aīn wāīn* [*pittuliuš=šm*(*uš*)]*š=a* 'I have taken from you the woe, pain, and your anxieties'); *ŪL=ma=kan dān kuedaniki kuitki ḫarmi* 'Nor have I taken anything from anyone' HKM 68:5–6 (MH/MS); *nu=šši=ššan* ^{GIŠ}*ḫuešan* ^{GIŠ}*ḫulali=ya arḫa daḫḫi nu=šši* ^{GIŠ}BAN . . . *peḫḫi* 'I take the spindle and distaff from him (*-šši*) and give him (*-šši*) a bow' KUB 9.27 + KUB 7.8 i 23–25 (rit.);[18] *apel=ma=šši=kan*

17. As per Güterbock (1983), the non-predicatival use of the dative clitic pronouns to mark possession is not attested in OS. This usage does appear in MS and NS copies of OH compositions, as shown by the examples cited below. It is unclear whether these examples reflect OH grammar or are merely the result of modernization by copyists.

18. Here the disadvantage/advantage polarity is particularly sharp in the opposition of the two verbs, with *-šan* accompanying (*arḫa*) *dā-* 'to take away' and no particle accompanying *pai-* 'to give'. See also BrTabl. iv 18–19 (Tudḫ. IV) in §28.76 (p. 371).

arḫa dāḫḫi ‘I take his away from him’ KBo 17.61 obv. 21; *našma=an=kan ANA* ^{d}UTU-*ŠI=ma munnāši* ‘or if you hide (*munna-*) him from (*ANA*) His Majesty’ KBo 5.4 obv. 9 (NH; see CHD *munnai-* b); (if someone reveals a plot to you,) *zik=ma=an=kan ANA* ^{d}UTU-*ŠI šannatti* ‘and you conceal (*šanna-*) it (*=an*) from (*ANA*) His Majesty’ KUB 21.1 iii 26–28 (NH); (if a girl is betrothed to a man, and he brings the bride price for her, but afterwards the parents contest it,) *n=an=kan* LÚ-*ni tuḫšanzi kūšata=ma* 2*=ŠU šarninkanzi* ‘they may separate (i.e., withhold) her from the man (LÚ-*ni*), but they must pay back his bride price twofold’ KBo 6.3 ii 12–13 (Laws §29, OH/NS); see *n=an=ši=kan tuḫšanta* (var. *tuḫšanzi*) ‘they may withhold her from him (-*ši*)’ KBo 6.3 ii 10 (Laws §28, OH/NS); (if you hear evil concerning My Majesty,) *n=at=mu=kan mān šannatteni* ‘and conceal it from me’ KBo 5.3 i 28 (MH/NS); without particle: (the gods were angry at Kešši) *nu=šši ḫūitar* [*ḫ*]*ūman peran arḫa munnāer* ‘and hid all the game from him’ KUB 33.121 ii 13–14 (NH) (see CHD *munnai-* a 2); *nu=mu . . .* ^{d}*IŠTAR* ^{URU}*Šamuḫa ANA ABU=YA wēkta* ‘*IŠTAR* of Šamuḫa requested me from my father’ KBo 6.29 i 7–8; see Güterbock 1943: 154 and HE §207e. Possibly also the following (with verb *peššiya-* mng. 8 ‘to cause to fall’), if we adopt the translation favored by CHD P: *takku* UDU-*un* UR.BAR.RA-*ni kuiški peššiezzi* ‘If someone causes a sheep to fall from (the mouth of) a wolf (i.e., snatches it away)’ KBo 6.2 iv 14 (Laws §80, OS), see CHD P 322, with literature cited there. But much is still uncertain about this passage from the laws. The dative of disadvantage is also seen in clauses with the verb *akk-* ‘to die’ and the dative of persons most affected thereby (see §28.76, p. 371).

16.69. This usage to express ‘that from which something is removed’ is extended in Hittite to include things as well as persons, already in OS—with local particle: [(*irm*)]*a*(*n*)*=šmaš=kan dāḫḫun kardi=šmi=ya=at=kan dāḫḫu*[*n* (*ḫarša*)]*ni=šmi=ya=at=kan dāḫḫun* ‘I have taken the sickness from you. I have both taken it from your heart(s) and taken it from your head(s)’ KBo 17.1 i 12–13 (OS); in the later language: (they cook a piglet and bring it back;) *nu=kan kuwapitta ḫappešni tepu daḫḫi* ‘and I take a little bit from each body part (and sacrifice it to the Sungoddess of the Earth)’ KUB 17.28 i 17–18; without particle: *n=an* LUGAL-*eznanni arḫa tittanut* (When my father Ḫattušili (had) made war against Urḫiteššub, son of Muwattalli,) he removed him *from* kingship’ BrTabl. i 8. For further examples of this usage see Melchert 1977: 188–89, 289, 310, and 352. Not all of the examples listed there, however, are valid, in particular ##46 and 47 on p. 189.[19]

Goal

16.70. The dative-locative also is regularly used to express ‘place to which’ (goal) with inanimate objects already in OS: LUGAL-*uš ḫūppari šipanti* ‘The king libates into a bowl’ KBo 25.61 rev. 9 (thus with Klinger 1996: 440 against Starke 1977: 57–58); *ḫalieaš ḫar*(*a*)*pta* ‘strays into/associates with (another) pen’ KBo 6.2 iii 48 (Laws §66,

19. In example #46 *genuwaš* is genitive, not dative-locative, and in #47 the context shows rather that ‘carries it (i.e., the divine image) out *to* the tent’ is meant. See lines 15–21 in the following context.

OS) (with Friedrich 1959: 39 and LH 77 against Starke 1977: 51); *takku* GUD.ḪI.A A.ŠÀ-*ni pānzi* 'if oxen go into (another man's) field' KBo 6.2 iv 12 (Laws §79, OS; with Friedrich 1959: 43, Souček 1970: 274, and LH 84 against Starke 1977: 53; *takku* LÚ-*an paḫḫueni kuiški peššiezzi n=aš aki* 'if anyone makes a man fall into a fire, so that he dies' KBo 6.2 ii 33 (Laws §44a, OS; with Friedrich 1959: 31 and LH 52 against Starke 1977: 56). These examples show, contra Starke (1977: 51–66), that in OS the dative-locative as well as the allative expressed 'place to which' with inanimate objects. Compare A.ŠÀ-*ni pānzi* 'they go to the field' with *parna paimi* 'I go home'. We do not have enough examples of each case with the same verb to determine whether there was any contrast in meaning. Old Hittite speakers *may* have used the allative selectively with verbs of perambulation or gross movement, while they used the dative-locative with verbs of non-perambulatory and minor movements (see §16.82, p. 263).

Purpose or Result

16.71. In OH, where the dative-locative and allative are always written differently, we find a clear example of the dative-locative of purpose or result: *šu=wa* ^{URU}*Ḫattuša ḫengani pāun* 'I went to Ḫattuša to die (lit., 'for death')' KBo 22.2 rev. 5 (see comments in Francia 1996a: 139, 148); in the famous phrase from the laws (OS) we also find a rare use of the enclitic dative-locative pronoun used to express purpose with a thing: *parna=šše=a šuwayezzi* 'and (the plaintiff/victim) shall look to the (accused's) house for it (i.e, the compensation) (Güterbock 1983; LH 168–69 with refs.; also see here §30.17, p. 411). Post-OS examples: *n=uš pankuš parā ḫingani ḫarta* 'and the assembly held them for the death penalty' KBo 3.1 ii 28 (OH/NS); *nu=mu ANA* DINGIR-*LIM* ÌR-*anni pešta* 'and he (my father) gave me to the deity for servitude' Ḫatt. i 18; [GIM-*an=ma=at* ^{URU}UD.KIB.NU]N.ME *erer n=at=z*[(*a* ^{d}UTU-*i*! DI-*ešni tiyēr*)] '[But when] they arrived at [Sipp]ar, they stood before Shamash for judgment' ABoT 48:4′ (OH/NS) with dupl. KBo 19.108:3′ (NS). The Akkadographic preposition is normally *AŠŠUM* but occasionally *ANA*: *nu=šši apel* DUMU.MUNUS=*SU* NIN=*YA* ^{f}*Muwattin AŠŠUM* DAM-*UTTIM paiš* 'And he gave to him his own daughter, my sister Muwatti, in marriage' KUB 6.44 + KUB 19.53 i 6–7 (NH), versus *ANA* DAM-*UTTI=ŠU* describing the same event in KUB 14.15 iv 41 (AM). That *ḫannešni* KBo 6.2 ii 13 and *kuššani* KUB 29.29+ ii 31′ are examples of the dative-locative of purpose seems unlikely (pace Francia 1996a: 148).

Location

16.72. The dative-locative reflects the locative case in answering the question 'where? in what place?' *takku* LÚ.U$_{19}$.LU-*aš* LÚ-*aš našma* MUNUS-*za takiya* URU-*ri aki kuel=aš arḫi aki* 1 *ME gipeššar* A.ŠÀ *kar*(*a*)*šši*[*y*]*ēzzi n=an=za dāi* 'If a person—male or female—is found dead in another village, the one in whose boundary (s)he dies, he shall cut off 100 *gipeššar* of field, and he (the surviving heir) shall take it' KBo 6.3 i 14–15 (Laws §6, OH/NS); *nu* ^{É}*ḫalentuwaš šalli ašeššar* 'Then in the *ḫalentuwa*-buildings a large assembly (convenes)' KUB 9.16 i 15–16; *genuwaš=šaš* 'on his knees' KBo 17.61 obv. 22;

tepšauwanni ‘in disgrace/obscurity’ KBo 3.34 ii 12; *apedani pedi* ‘in that place’ HKM 47:53 (MH/MS); *nepiši* ‘in the sky’ KBo 3.28:16; *aruni* ‘in the sea’ KBo 3.4 ii 51, 52 (AM). Nouns in the dative-locative referring to persons are also used in a locative sense with postpositions, already in OH. In OH this usage with certain postpositions (*peran*, *šer*, etc.) competes with the genitive, which is more common (§§16.58–16.59, p. 255); in later Hittite one finds only the dative-locative. Example: DUMU.É.GAL LUGAL-*i peran ḫuwāi* ‘the palace official runs ahead of the king’ KBo 17.15 rev. 18 (OS).

16.73. The dative-locative is never used to express the agent with a passive (pace HE §207b). In the two examples *zik=za=kan ammuqq=a* 1-*edani* AMA-*ni ḫaššanteš* ‘Were you and I begotten in one mother?’ KUB 23.102 i 14–15, and *šiyēl* ÌR.MEŠ*=šU* [*INA* 1 AM]A *ḫaššanteš* ‘The servants of ‘Number One’ (i.e., the king?) have been begotten in one mother’ KUB 1.16 ii 47 (OH/NS) the mother is viewed as the *place* of birth, not the agent (*contra* Mora and Giorgieri 2004: 190: ‘generati dalla stessa madre’, citing Starke 1993: 23; 1997: 464–65, 482). For the locative with the verb ‘to give birth, beget’ see Sanskrit *jamayāmāsa Nalo Damayantyām* . . . ‘Nala begat in/on Damayantī . . .’ Hittite shows variable syntax for *ḫaššant-* ‘born, begotten’ plus the noun for mother: ŠEŠ.MEŠ ^{d}UTU-*ŠI=ya kuiēš šakuwaššara*⟨(*š*)⟩ *ŠA* MUNUS.LUGAL *awan* GAM *ḫaššanteš* ‘Also the brothers of His Majesty who are begotten also of the legitimate queen’ KUB 21.42 iv 16–17 (restored from KUB 40.24 rev. 5) with a genitive, but also ŠEŠ.MEŠ ^{d}UTU-*ŠI=ya kuiēš IŠTU* MUNUS.LUGAL *ḫaššanteš* KUB 26.12 i 12–13. The last example with *IŠTU* could be either an ablative of origin (§16.89, p. 264) or an instrumental/ablative of agent (§16.107, p. 269, and §16.99, p. 267, respectively). See also §21.14 (p. 305).

Temporal Uses

16.74. The dative-locative is used for **temporal** expressions, usually simply expressing a period **within** which something occurred (Francia 1997: 143–44): *išpandi* ‘at night’; *ḫantaiši meḫuni* ‘in the hot time (of the day)’; GUD *puḫugarin=ma kuedani* UD-*ti unuer nu=za* ^{d}UTU-*ŠI apedani* UD-*ti war*(*a*)*pta* ‘His Majesty bathed on the day on which they adorned the ox of ritual substitution’ KBo 4.2 iii 56-57, with dupl. KUB 43.50 obv. 8 + KUB 15.36 obv. 10; *gimmanti* ‘in winter’ HKM 17:10 (MH/MS). As in other languages, Hittite location in time is expressed in terms of place (Hoffner 2002). Simple dative-locative of nouns expressing units of time: *witti* ‘in the year’; *šiwatti* ‘on the day’; *lamni* ‘in the hour’. In combination with postpositions: *-mu peran* ‘before me’; *-še/i āppan* ‘after him (i.e., his death)’; etc.

16.75. In other examples it is the **extent** or duration of time which is indicated by the dative-locative (or its equivalent, Akk. *INA*): [(*nu*)] *INA* MU.7.KAM *taḫušiyaḫḫa* ‘For seven years I endured’ KUB 1.4 + KBo 3.6 iii 30 (= Ḫatt. iii 62); ^{m}*Kešši*š ITU.3.KAM-*aš* ḪUR.SAG.MEŠ-*aš anda weḫatta* ‘Kešši wandered for three months in the mountains’ KUB 33.121 ii 15; *INA* UD.1.KAM*=war=aš AMMADU pargawēškad*[(*d*)]*aru INA* ITU.1.KAM*=ma=war=aš* IKU-*an pargawēš*[(*kadd*)]*ari* ‘In one day may (Ullikummi) grow a cubit, in one month

may he grow an IKU' KUB 33.98 iii 15–16 (Ullik. I); *nu=za kē araḫzenaš* KUR.KUR.MEŠ LÚ.KÚR *INA* MU.10.KAM *tar(a)ḫḫun* 'and I conquered these lands in ten years' KBo 3.4 i 28–29; 1-*EN* MU-*anti ḫāšta* '(The Queen of Kanesh) bore (children) in the course of one particular year' KBo 22.2 obv. 1 (OS). The notion of a particular year comes from the fact that the noun for 'year' shows the *-ant-* derivational suffix (§2.25, p. 56). For the **accusative** designating extent of time see §16.29 (p. 249).

16.76. For the use of dative-locatives of time words repeated in distributive expressions, see §19.10 (p. 291).

Units of Measure and Dimensions

16.77. The dative-locative is also used with **units of measure or degree**. ^{d}*IŠTAR=* [(*ma=mu=kan* GAŠAN=*YA ilani ilani*)] *namma tišket* 'But *IŠTAR*, my lady, kept on advancing me by degrees (*ilani ilani*, distributive expression, see §19.10, p. 291)' Ḫatt. iv 39–40; *nu=tta* ^{GIŠ}GIGIR.ḪI.A [. . .] . . . ŠE.ḪI.A NUMUN.ḪI.A *išḫuešni pišket* KAŠ.GEŠTIN.ḪI.A=*ya=tta* BÙLUG BAPPIR.ḪI.A *EMṢA* [GA.KIN.AG.ḪI].A *išḫuešni piš*[*ket*] 'And he kept giving you chariots, [. . .] . . . grain and seeds in large amounts (*išḫuešni*); and [he kept] giving you beer-wine, malt, beer-bread, rennet (and) [cheese]s in large amounts' KUB 14.1 obv. 7–8 (MH/MS).

16.78. Occasionally the dative-locative indicates not the unit of measure but the **dimension** to be measured: *n=aš dalugašti* 3 DANNA *palḫašti*[*=ma=aš* . . . x DANNA] ½ DANNA=*ya* 'she was three miles in length and x and a half miles in width' KUB 33. 98 + KUB 36.8 i 15–16 (Ullik. I B).

Additive-Incremental

16.79. The OH expression *anda=šše=a* (as well as its NH modernized form *anda=ya=šši*) 'in addition to it' (see fuller discussion in §30.17, p. 411) supports an additive-incremental use of the dative-locative (*=šše* 'it') already in OH.

Allative

16.80. The **allative case** (identified by its characteristic ending *-a*) in Old Hittite exclusively indicates 'place to(ward) which', in contradistinction to the dative-locative, which usually (not always; see §16.70, p. 259) answers the question 'in what place?' The allative occurs with "directive" verbs ('go', 'come', etc.), as opposed to "stative" ones ('lie') (Starke 1977; Rieken 2005a: 106). On the form and name of the allative see §3.31 (p. 76).

16.81. Comparison of the pairs *nepiša* 'to the sky' KUB 17.8 iv 19 and *nepiši* 'in the sky', as well as *aruna* 'to the sea' KUB 12.60 i 11 and *aruni* 'in/at the sea' makes this distinction quite clear: [(*eḫu*)] ^{d}*Telipinu zik=za* [. . . *a*(*runa īt*) *ne*]*pišaš* ^{d}UTU-*un arunaz* [EGIR-*p*(*a uw*)*ate*] ^{d}*Telipinuš aruna pait* 'Come, Telipinu! You go . . . to the sea. Bring

back the Sungod of Heaven from the sea. So Telipinu went to the sea' KUB 12.60 i 9–11 (myth, OH/NS) with dupl. KUB 33.81 iv 6–7 (NS).

16.82. The allative expresses that object[20] to(ward) or into which a movement is directed (*parna* 'to the house', *laḫḫa* 'to a campaign', *aruna* 'to the sea', *ḫapā* 'to the river', *gimra* 'to the open field', *iššā* 'into the mouth', *tunnakišna* 'into the bedroom', *nepiša* 'to the sky', *taknā* 'into the ground/earth'). With many of the same nouns of location, the dative-locative, on the other hand, designates the object in or on which a thing is situated (*parni* 'in the house', *iššī* 'in the mouth', *nepiši* 'in the sky', *takni* 'on earth'). Whereas the allative implies movement, the dative-locative implies rest. When describing the role of the allative, it is important to distinguish verbs of perambulation or gross movement — *pai-* 'to go', *uwa-* 'to come', *iyanni-* 'to set out', *iya-* (mid.) 'to travel', *arnu-* 'to transport, carry', *uda-* 'to bring', *peda-*, *uwate-*, *peḫute-*, *tarna-* 'to release', etc., all of which govern the allative — and those which describe non-perambulatory and minor movements such as *šipant-* 'to libate', such as *išḫuwa-* 'to pour (solids into)', *laḫuwa-* 'to pour (liquids into)', *dai-* 'to place (upon)', which in OS mostly construe with the dative-locative (but note the example with *ḫariya-* 'to bury' cited below). Conclusions drawn from NH copies of older texts, where the scribes no longer fully understood the function of this case, are particularly dubious.

16.83. Speakers could use, even if they only rarely did so, the allative for movement through time: 'He shall feed them (i.e., cattle)' [*nu=šša*]*n parā ḫamešḫanda ar*[*nuzi*] 'and shall bri[ng] them (i.e., the cattle) through to the following spring' KBo 6.2 iv 60 (Laws §100, OS; see Starke 1977: 136 and LH 97–98, 198), where *ḫamešḫanda* is an allative based on the *-ant-* individualizing suffix (see §2.25, p. 56). Compare OH MU-*anti* (**wittanti* also an *-ant*-suffixed time-word in the dative-locative) which indicates 'during the course of a *particular* year' (see §16.75, p. 261).

16.84. The use of the allative of 'place to which' is attested in texts showing the Old Script: [*appe*]*zziyan=a* ^{m}*Anittaš* LUGAL.GAL ^{d}*Šiušu*[*m*(*min* ^{U})^{RU}*Z*]*ālpuwaz āppa* ^{URU}*Nēša pē*[*daḫḫun*] 'But subsequently I, Anitta, the Great King, brought our deity back from Zalpuwa to Neša' KBo 3.22:41–42 (OS); *mān tunnakišna=ma paizzi* 'When he goes into the inner room' KBo 3.22:78 (OS); *taknā ḫariemi* 'I bury (it) in(to) the ground' StBoT 8 iii 8–9, DUMU.MEŠ(*-an*) *parna paimi* 'I go into the house of the children' ibid. ii 3, 16f., iii 17; *š=uš* ÍD-*a tarnaš* 'and she let them (the baskets containing her babies) into the river' KBo 22.2 obv. 3 (OS). But even in Old Hittite texts which were recopied in the New Hittite period ("OH/NS") the true use of the allative survives: *n=aš laḫḫa paizzi* 'and he goes to a campaign' KBo 6.3 ii 48 (Laws §42, OH/NS); ^{m}*Zuliyaš=wa ḫapā paiddu* 'let Z. go to the river ordeal' KUB 13.3 iii 29; *n=aš=za parna=šša iyanniš* 'and he (Appu) went to his house' KUB 24.8+ i 24–25; *n=at* É.ŠÀ-*na pēdāi* 'and he carries it to the inner room' KUB 2.6+ ii 8, etc.

20. Rare instances of what may be persons are all late and quite likely due to confusion on the part of speakers for whom this case was no longer a part of their living speech.

16.85. The allative ending is found also on clitic possessive pronouns accompanying nouns in the allative: *parna=šša* 'to his house', *parna=mma* 'to my house', *tuel parna=t*[*ta*] 'to yo[ur] house' KBo 23.9 i 10; see §6.4 (p. 139).

16.86. The local meanings of the allative and dative-locative are given greater precision by the addition of the local adverbs *anda*(*n*), *appa*(*n*), *ḫandaš*, *ištarna*, *katta*(*n*), *peran*, *šarā*, and *šer*.[21] And although most of these constructions are attested only in the New Hittite period, when no formal distinction is made between allative and dative-locative singular, it is often possible on the basis of meaning (motion toward or rest in/on) to assign them to either allative or dative-locative. For instance, *šer* 'above, upon' goes with the dative-locative, while *šarā* 'up onto' goes with the allative.

16.87. The allative goes out of use in NH, surviving only in a few lexicalized expressions such as *tapuša* 'aside, to the side' and *dameda* 'elsewhere'.

Ablative

16.88. The fundamental study of the ablative and instrumental cases in Hittite is Melchert 1977. For the ablative endings attested for nouns see §3.32 (p. 76). For the ending on clitic possessive pronouns accompanying nouns in the ablative see §6.4 (p. 138).

16.89. The ablative most often designates the **origin of a movement** and answers the question 'from what place?': *iššaz* 'out of the mouth', *nepišaz* 'from the sky', *wetenaz* 'out of the water'. Often the notions of source and separation are equally stressed in an utterance. Examples where **source** or **origin** (Melchert 1977: 192–93) is more prominent are: *karū* ^{m}*Ūḫnaš . . .* ^{d}*šiu*(*n*)*=šumm*[*in* ^{U}]^{RU}*Nēšaz* ^{URU}*Zālpuwa pēd*[*aš*] 'Previously (King) Uḫna had carried off (the statue of) our deity from Neša to Zalpuwa' KBo 3.22 obv. 39–40; *namma* ^{URU}*Palḫuiššaz āppa* ^{URU}KÙ.BABBAR-*ti uwanun* 'Then I came back home from Palḫuišša to Ḫattuša' KBo 3.4 ii 7 (annals of Murš.); *n=ašta* ì-*an šarḫuwantaz=šet* KAR-*ezzi* 'he may recover the lard from its (i.e., the dog's) stomach' KBo 6.3 iv 28 (Laws §90, OH/NS; see §16.111, p. 270); *kāša=mu* PN ^{URU}*Kašepūraz ḫatrā*[*it*] 'PN has just written to me from the city Kašepura' HKM 25:4–5 (MH/MS); 5 ANŠE.KUR.RA.ḪI.A*=wa eker nu=war=aš parnaza šarninkun* 'five horses died, and I replaced them from (my own) house (i.e., personal property)' KUB 13.35+ ii 40; *nu=kan* ^{d}UTU-*uš n*[(*epišaz k*)*atta*] *šakūwaiyat* 'The Sungod looked down from the sky' KUB 24.8+ iv 22–23, 30–31; *nu* DINGIR.MEŠ-*az ariyaer* 'so they sought information by oracle from the gods' KBo 4.6 obv. 26; written with *IŠTU*: ('he does not render corvée labor himself,) *IŠTU* É *ABI=ŠU=ma k*[*arpianzi*] 'but [they] re[nder] (it) from the house of his father' KBo 6.2 ii 40 (Laws §46, OS). Only rarely is this sense of the ablative employed with a noun or pronoun denoting a person: ŠEŠ*=YA=ma ammēdaza* NÍG.TUKU-*ti kuitki* 'My brother, you

21. On the derivation of local adverbs in *-a* see §3.31 (p. 76).

are enriching yourself somewhat at my expense (lit., 'from me')' KUB 21.38 obv. 16 (see §18.5, p. 278).

16.90. Examples where **separation** ('from what place?') is more prominent are: DINGIR.DIDLI-*š=a* DUMU.MEŠ-*uš* A.AB.BA-*az šarā dāir* 'But the gods picked up the boys from the sea' KBo 22.2 obv. 4–5 (OS), ed. StBoT 17:6; see Melchert 1977: 149); GIŠTUKUL.ḪI.A-*uš=š⟨m⟩uš=šta* ZAG.DIB-*za daḫḫun* 'I removed (lit., took) their(!, text 'his') weapons from (their) shoulders' KBo 3.1+ ii 30 (OH/NS); LUGAL.GAL *tabarnaš ŠA* GÉME.MEŠ*=ŠU* ŠU.MEŠ-*uš IŠTU* NA_4 ARA_5 *daḫḫun ŠA* ÌR.MEŠ*=ya* ŠU.MEŠ*=ŠUNU IŠTU* KIN *daḫḫun* 'I, the Great King, the Tabarna, took the hands of his (i.e., the enemy king's) servant girls from the millstone; I took the hands of (his) man servants from the sickle' KBo 10.2 iii 15–17 (annals of Hatt. I, OH/NS); 1-*aš=ma=kan . . . arunaz arḫa uet* '(one of the two brothers stayed in their island refuge, lit. 'in the sea') but the (other) one . . . left the island (lit., came out/away from the sea)' KBo 3.4 ii 53–54 (annals of Murs. II). Verbs used in clauses with the ablative of separation are (1) intransitive motion verbs (*pai-* 'to go', *uwa-* 'to come'), (2) transitive motion verbs (*ḫuittiya-* 'to pull, draw', *peda-* 'to carry', *dā-* 'to take', *uda-* 'to bring', *uwate-* 'to lead, conduct'), and at least three verbs which themselves express separation: *šamen-* 'to withdraw from', *tuḫš-* 'to separate (someone/-thing) from', and *ti/ešḫa-* 'to abstain from'. A rare example where a person is denoted by the ablative is [(*peran par*)]*ā=ya=zzi apūn* G[(E_6-*a*)]*n IŠTU* MUNUS-*TI* [(*tešḫaš*)] 'And beforehand throughout that night (accusative of extent, §16.29, p. 249) (the king) abstained from a woman' KBo 4.2 iii 58–59 (so Melchert 1977: 348, correctly).

16.91. From the notion of origin or source it is easy to derive the idea of **cause** (Melchert 1977: 192; LH 166): [*takku* LÚ-*an n*]*ašma* MUNUS-*an šullannaz kuiški kuenzi* 'If someone kills a (free) man or woman out of (sheer) wantonness' KBo 6.3 i 1 (Laws §1, OH/NS), see also Laws §§2, 27, GIM-*an=ma* ŠEŠ*=YA* mNIR.GÁL *IŠTU AMAT* (for *AWAT*) DINGIR-*LIM=ŠU INA* KUR *ŠAPLITI katta pait* 'but when my brother Muwatalli because of a word (Akkad. *IŠTU* covers the Hitt. ablative) from his god went down (from Ḫattuša) to the Lower Land' Ḫatt. i 75–76 (NH); *apēz=kan uddanaz arḫa akkiškanzi* 'people die because of that behavior' KBo 5.3 iii 38–39 (NH); *ŪL=war=an=kan tuetaza memiyanaz kuenne*[*r*] GUD *alūn* d*Ḫuwawainn=a* 'Was it not because of your word/command that they (scil., Gilgamesh and Enkidu) killed the Bull of Heaven and Ḫuwawa?' KUB 8.48 i 12–13 (Gilg.).

16.92. The ablative is also used for **indicating directions** (Melchert 1977: 151–52, 195–96). See §18.5 (p. 278; for independent pronoun in ablative), §20.27 (p. 300) and §20.28 (p. 300). A similar usage of a "from" construction can be found in the Semitic languages: Hebrew *miss^{e}môl* 'on/to the left', *miṣṣafôn* 'to the north'. Hittite examples are *kunnaz* 'on the right', GÙB-*laz* 'on the left', *ḫantezziyaz* 'in front', *iškišaz* 'in back, backwards', *appezziyaz* 'in the rear', *ammedaza* 'on my side', *tuedaza* 'on your (sg.)

side', *anzedaza* 'on our side', ^{m}*Urḫitešupaz* 'on Urḫitešup's side'. The postposition *tapušza* is an ablative of direction in origin (see §§20.28, p. 300). This kind of ablative is widely used to indicate the boundaries of a territory: ^{URU}*Ūššaza=ma=šši* ^{URU}*Zarātaš* ZAG-*aš* ^{URU}*Zarātaš=ma=kan ANA* KUR ^{ÍD}*Ḫūlaya āššanza* 'In the direction of Ūšša, Zarāta is his boundary, but Zarāta belongs to the land of the Ḫulaya River' KBo 4.10 obv. 21 (NH).

16.93. A few OH examples depart from the normal function of the ablative form, which serves to express direction with reference to a point usually expressed by the dative-locative ('on the left [abl.] (of) point of reference [d.-l.]'); these unusual examples use the ablative to indicate the point of reference: (land located) ^{NA_4}*ḫuwašiaz anda* . . . ^{NA_4}*ḫuwašiaz araḫza* 'inside of the stela . . . outside of the stela' SBo I 4 = LSU 4 obv. 15–16 (where the ablative *ḫuwašiaz* is the point of reference). See discussion of SBo I 4 = LSU 4 obv. 15–16 in Melchert 1977: 153–54. An OS example (unfortunately partly broken) has the same construction of ablative and *anda* meaning 'inside of', i.e., toward the speaker from the ablative point of reference: *utnē ḫūmanda* ^{URU}*Zālpuaz anda arunaz* [*anda*(?) . . .] 'All the lands on this side of Zalpuwa, [on this side(?)] of the sea [. . .].' KBo 3.22:38 (Anitta, OS). Two other Old Hittite examples where the ablative marks the reference point, but where *kēt* and *edi* fill the role of *anda* and *araḫza*, are: *takku kēt* (later var. *kēz*) ÍD-*az* . . . *takku edi* ÍD-*az* 'if he is on this side of the river . . . if he is on that side of the river' KBo 6.2 i 49–50 (Laws §22, OS) (where the river [abl.] is the point of reference: the pair does *not* mean 'in the direction of this river . . . in the direction of that river') and $^{[LÚ.ME]Š}$MUḪALDIM *išpantuziaššaruš edi taršanzipaz* [x-x] *pēdanzi* 'The cooks carry off the libation vessels to the other side of the *taršanzipa*-platform' KUB 43.30 (StBoT 25 #30) ii 6–7 (OS). In these instances there is no reason to take *edi* as a dative-locative any more than OS *kēt* (see §7.13, p. 145).

16.94. The ablative is used in **temporal** constructions. The forms *kitpandalaz* 'from this moment on' KUB 11.1 iv 5, *apit*(-)*pantalaz=pat* 'from that very moment' KUB 33.118 i/iv? 24, DUMU-*annaz* 'from childhood' KUB 30.10 obv. 10 (prayer, OH/MS), *annaz=ma kartaz* 'from (my) mother's womb (lit., heart)' KUB 30.10 rev. 20, and (*apez/kez*) UD(.KAM)-*az* 'from (that/this) day' are clear examples of 'time from which' (Melchert 1977: 289, 310, 352–53). It appears that speakers distinguished this usage from the following one by the obligatory demonstrative (*apez/kez*). The construction *annaz kartaz* 'from the mother's womb' also shows partitive apposition (§16.10, p. 243; §16.24, p. 247; §16.38, p. 251; §16.42, p. 252).

16.95. But beginning in MH/MS the ablative is also used for the *kind* of time, like the German genitive "nachts" = 'by night': UD(.KAM)-*az* (*šiwattaz*) 'by day' KBo 5.8 i 24, KUB 19.37 iii 11 (Murš. II) and *išpandaz*(*a*) (GE_6.KAM-*za*) 'by night' HKM 25:7 (MH/MS), KUB 23.11 ii 22 (MH/NS), KBo 5.6 i 22, KUB 19.37 iii 12, KBo 4.4 iii 63 (Murš. II), just as rarely the accusative may appear (KBo 4.4 iii 62 in §16.29, p. 249). For the accusative of extent of time see §16.29 (p. 249); for dative-locative of location in or extent of time see §16.74, p. 261, and §16.75, p. 261).

16.96. A **perlative** ablative (translated 'through'; Melchert 1977: 157, 208) is found in ^{d}UTU-*uš*=[(*kan* ^{GIŠ}*lutt*)]*anza anda tarnai* 'The Sungod slips in(?) through the window' KUB 33.70 ii 2 (NS); *namma*=*aš*=*kan* ^{GIŠ}AB-*az andan* 2=*š*[*U appanzi*] 'Next [they hold] them (the *laḫḫanza*-ducks) in through the window twice' KUB 39.7 ii 22 (late NS).

16.97. For the one-time occurrence of the ablative for **comparison** see §17.15 (p. 274).

16.98. In the post-OH period we see uses of the ablative taken over from the instrumental for the expression of **means** (Melchert 1977: 209–12): *n*=*aš* IZI-*az kattan* [*lukkun*] 'And [I burned] them down with fire' KBo 10.2 iii 39 (OH/NS); *ḪAṢṢINNU*=*wa* ŠU-*za ēp* 'take the axe with (your) hand!' KUB 8.50 iii 11, *zaḫḫiyaz katta daḫḫun* 'I captured (the cities) through battle' KBo 3.4 iv 40, *apūn*=*ma*=*kan* ^{d}*IŠTAR* ^{URU}*Šamuḫa* GAŠAN=*YA* KU$_6$-*un* GIM-*an* *ḫūpalaza* EGIR-*pa ištapta* 'the Šamuḫian *IŠTAR*, my lady, ensnared him like a fish in (i.e., by means of) a net' KBo 6.29+ ii 33–34 (NH), *n*=*ašta* LUGAL-*uš* ^{URU}*Taḫ*[*ur*]*pi ša*[*r*]*ā* ^{GIŠ}GIGIR-*az paizzi* 'the king goes up to Taḫurpa by chariot' KBo 10.20 i 16–17 (OH/NS).

16.99. Similar to the ablative of means is the **ablative of agency** (with passive verbs), likewise first used in post-OH texts (Melchert 1977: 214–15, 367): *INA* ^{URU}*Ta*=*nipiya* $^{A.ŠÀ}$*kueraš* LUGAL-*waz piyanza* 'a field in Tanipiya was given by the king' KBo 3.7 iv 22–23 (OH/NS); ^{URU}*Ḫattušaš utne ḫinganaz tamaštat* 'the land of Ḫattuša has been oppressed by a plague (abl.)' PP 1 i 8–9; *IŠTU* DINGIR-*LIM*=*mu parā parā* SIG$_5$-*iškattari* 'through the agency of the goddess (abl.) things went better and better for me' KBo 6.29 i 10–11 (NH), ed. Goetze 1925: 44–47 (*IŠTU* DINGIR-*LIM* might stand for *šiunit* or *šiunaz*); *kinuna ammuk* ^{m}NIR.GÁL LUGAL-*uš tuedaz* [*IŠ*]*TU* ^{d}U *piḫaššašši šallanuwanza arkuwēškemi* 'Now, I, King Muwatalli, who have been raised up by you, O Stormgod of P., am offering (this) prayer' KUB 6.45 iii 32–33 (Muw. II).

16.100. Less common is the **comitative ablative** (Melchert 1977: 397–98): *n*=*aš*=*kan tetḫešnaza katta aruni araš* '(the Stormgod sprang up from his wagon,) and came down with thunder (abl.) to the sea' KBo 26.65 iv 21–22 (Ullik. III), ^{d}*IŠTAR*-*iš*=*ma*=*kan* AN-*az* UR.SAG-*annaz arḫa uet* '*IŠTAR* came out of the sky with bravery (abl.)' KUB 33.113 + KUB 36.12 + KBo 26.64 i 17′–18′ (Ullik. II B). Some examples of this type function virtually as adverbs: *parḫešnaz* 'with haste' = 'hastily'.

16.101. Uncertain cases with *IŠTU* could be covering either instrumental or ablative: [(*nu IŠTU* KAR)]AŠ [(ANŠE.KUR.RA).MEŠ *pāun*] '[I went(?)] accompanied by infantry and chariotry (abl.)' Ḫatt. iii 45–46. For the instrumental of accompaniment see §16.108 (p. 269).

16.102. A rare **partitive** ablative can be observed in: *n*=*ašta IŠTU* ^{UZU}NÍG.GIG *ḫuiša*=*waz wākuen* 'we have bitten off (some) of the raw liver (abl.)' HT 1 i 44. Usually, the partitive function is conveyed by apposition rather than by a particular case form. See an example in the ablative: *annaz kartaz* 'from (my) mother's womb' KUB 30.10 rev. 20

(see §16.94), the much better attested partitive apposition in the accusative (§§16.24–16.25, pp. 247–248) and a possible example in the nominative (§16.10, p. 243).

16.103. For the ablative with various **postpositions** see §20.27 (p. 300) and §20.29 (p. 300).

Instrumental

16.104. For the instrumental endings see §3.35 (p. 77). The **instrumental** designates the tool, **means**, **instrument**, or material by or through which an action is accomplished (GUD.ḪI.A-*it* 'by the oxen', *šaganda* 'with grease', *paḫḫunit* 'with fire', *lālit* 'with the tongue', *natit* 'with an arrow', *wetenit* 'with water', ^{GIŠ}*ḫatalkešnit* 'with a (branch of) hawthorn', etc.). It is used to express **cause** (*kāštit* '(die) from hunger'), and, with passive verbs, the **agent** (see *šiunit* 'by the god'). There is also an instrumental of **accompaniment** (*appantet kunantit* 'together with captured and killed (men)'. By New Hittite the instrumental is no longer productive, its functions having been assumed by the ablative (Melchert 1977: 424–25). When a noun in either the ablative or instrumental case is represented by an ideogram, it is specified as to case by the Akkadian preposition *IŠTU* 'from, with, by means of'. See chapter 31.

16.105. The instrumental case is employed chiefly to denote the **means** or **instrument** by which an action is performed (Melchert 1977: 162–64, 227–45, 300–301, 327–32, 371–73): *tuppuš šakanda* (instrumental of *šagan* 'oil, grease') *šunnaš* 'she filled (i.e., caulked) the baskets with grease' KBo 22.2 obv. 2 (OS); *anda=kan ḫalīnaš teššummiuš tarlipit šūwamuš* 2-*TAM pētumini* 'Twice(?) we bring in cups (made) of *ḫalinaš*, filled with *tarlipaš*' KBo 17.1 + KBo 25.3 i 26–27 (OS); *nu tuḫḫiyattit ākti* 'and you will die by means of suffocation' KBo 7.14 obv. 5 (OS); *nu=kan* IZI *šer wetenit kištanuanzi* 'they extinguish the fire on top with water (*wetenit*)' KBo 4.2 i 12, *nu nepišaš* ^{d}UTU-*un* IGI.ḪI.A-*it uškezzi* 'she sees the sun of heaven with (her) eyes' KBo 4.8 ii 19 (NH), ed. Hoffner 1983a: 188; *idālawa* IGI.ḪI.A-*wa* ^{GIŠ}*ḫatalkešnit katta tarmān ēšdu* 'let the evil eyes be pinned down by the hawthorn' KUB 12.44 iii 8–9; [(*nu* ^{d}*IŠTAR*)] GAŠAN=*YA ANA* ^{m}*Muršili ABI=YA* Ù-*it* ^{m}NIR.GÁL-*in* ŠEŠ=*YA uiyat* '*IŠTAR*, my lady, sent my brother Muwattalli to my father by means of a dream (i.e., in a dream of the father)' Ḫatt. i 13–14; *nu* ^{MUŠ}*illuyankan išḫiman*[(*ta*)] *kalēliēt* '(Ḫupašiya) tied up the serpent with cord(s)' KUB 17.5 i 15–16 (OH/NS); *nu=kan* GÌR-*it šarā pāun* 'I went up on foot' KUB 14.3 i 24 (Hatt. III); LUGAL-*uš uezzi naššu* ^{GIŠ}GIGIR-*it našma* ^{GIŠ}*ḫulugannit INA* É-*TIM* GAL *paizzi* 'The king proceeds to travel to the Great House either by chariot or by cart' KBo 19.128 i 2–5, ed. StBoT 13:2f.

16.106. There are also instances of the instrumental used to express **cause**: *man=kan mān ANA* ^{m}*Attaršiya ḫuišwetenn=a kāštit=a=man ākten* 'and even if you had escaped from Attaršiya (contrary-to-fact condition), you would have died from hunger' KUB 14.1 obv. 12 (MH/MS). The phrase *man mān . . . man* expresses the contrary-to-fact condition (HE, p. 166, §330; see also CHD sub *man*). See also [*k*]*ištantit ḫarkueni* 'we will die of hunger' KUB 17.10 i 29 (OH/MS). For an attempt to motivate the use of the

instrumental instead of the more common ablative (§16.91, p. 265) see Francia 2002a. It is possible, of course, that the Hittites viewed 'hunger' (*kaštit*) not as a cause but as a means of dying.

16.107. The source of the ablative of agency used with passive verbs was the instrumental of **agency**: ^{GIŠ}TUKUL.ḪI.A-*iš=wa=tta šiunit piyanteš* 'weapons have been given to you by the god' KBo 22.6 + KUB 48.98 i 24–25 (OH?/NS); [DUMU.DUMU].DUMU=*ŠU ŠA* ^{m}*Ḫattušili* LUGAL.GAL *ŠA* LUGAL ^{URU}*Kuššar* ^{d}*šiunit k*[*anišša*]*ndaš* (gen.) NUMUN-*aš* (nom.) '[great-grand]son of Hattušili (II), Great King, seed of the king of Kuššar (i.e., Ḫattušili I) who was recognized by the god' KBo 6.28 obv. 4–5 (Hatt. III) [on this last passage see Goetze 1968; Carruba 1971: 78; and especially Güterbock 1970: 75]. Since the instrumental is replaced in all uses by the ablative in NH (see §§16.98–16.100, p. 267, and Melchert 1977: 423–30), the use of the instrumental to mark the agent with a passive participle cannot be an innovation and must reflect OH practice, despite the lack thus far of OS examples. This absence may easily be due to chance, given the relative rarity of expressed agents with the passive. Despite the claim of Starke (1977: 102–4), the fact that agency is expressed *once* in OS by the circumlocution *INA QATI* + genitive 'by the hand of' in no way proves that agency marked by the instrumental of a noun referring to a person did not occur in OH. For the instrumental as the case of the agent in PIE (inherited in Hittite) see Jamison 1979.

16.108. The instrumental is also used to express **accompaniment** ("**comitative**") **or inclusivity**: ^{LÚ}NAR ^{GIŠ}*ḫunzinarit* SÌR-*RU* 'The singer sings to the accompaniment of the *ḫunzinar* instrument' KUB 30.24 ii 9–10; *maḫḫan=ma=at šeḫelliyaš witenit* EGIR-*pa uwanzi* 'But when they come back with the water of purification' KUB 7.20 obv. 10–11; ('I eliminated 16 men of the enemy') *appantet kunantit* 'with (or 'including') = 'counting both') captured and killed (men)' HKM 10:40 (MH/NS).

16.109. In a very few cases the instrumental expressing **separation** is attested. For example, *n=aš=kan šaḫḫanit luzzit arawaḫḫun* 'I freed them from *s.* and *l.*' KBo 10.2 iii 18–19 (annals of Hatt. I). Such examples are attested only in copies of older compositions, and it is unlikely that this usage of the instrumental is genuine for any period of the language (see Melchert 1977: 426 with refs.).

16.110. Since the Akkadograms *IŠTU* and *QADU* could conceivably reflect either the ablative or the instrumental, we cannot identify the case of the following comitative examples with certainty: LÚ ^{URU}*Šal*[(*atiwara QADU* DUMU.MEŠ=*ŠU arāi*)*š nu=mu* IGI]-*anda uet* 'The king (lit., man) of Šalatiwara arose together with his sons, and he came [ag]ainst [me] (in battle)' KBo 3.22:65–66 (OS, restorations from NS dupl.); *ŠA* GÉME=*YA=a=ta kuedani uddanī watarnaḫḫiškenun tuel=ma=an=kan maḫḫan maniyaḫḫanteš IŠTU* ZÍD.D[A] *arḫa dayaer n=an=šan* [. . .] *INA* ^{URU}*Taḫazzimuna* EGIR-*pa pēḫut*[*e*]*r* 'Concerning what I informed you about my maidservant, when your subjects stole her away together with the flour (she had milled), they carried her back to Taḫazzimuna' HKM 36:42–48 (MH/MS), ed. Alp 1991a 184–187.

16.111. In OH the instrumental of the enclitic possessive pronouns (see chapter 11) is used with nouns in the ablative, since no ablative forms of the enclitic possessives existed (HE §218c): *šarḫuwantaz=šet* 'from its stomach' KBo 6.3 iv 28 (Laws §90, OH/NS; see §6.7, p. 140); *iššaz=(š)mit* 'out of their mouths' KBo 17.1 i 18 (OS), ZAG-*az=tit* 'on your right' KUB 31.127 i 66; *kartaz=mit* 'from my heart' IBoT 3.135:6. To be similarly understood is *kitpantalaz* 'from this moment on' KUB 11.1 (BoTU 23B) iv 5. There is no basis for the claim of Houwink ten Cate (1967) of an old "locative" form in -(*e*)*d*.

Cases with Particular Verbs

16.112. A number of verbs can be construed with different cases, in many instances showing a slightly different meaning.

16.113. *wātarnaḫḫ-* (1) with the *accusative* of the person means 'to command or commission (someone)', while (2) with the thing spoken in the accusative and the person in the *dative* it means 'to send a message or announcement to (someone)' (AU 223). See KBo 18.48 obv. 10–11 (interpret contra Hagenbuchner 1989: 9).

16.114. *nāḫ-* 'to fear, be afraid of' governs two different cases: (1) the accusative: *naḫmi=uš* 'I fear them' KUB 8.65:22; (2) the dative-locative: *paḫḫuenašš=a uddanī mekki naḫḫanteš ēšten* 'be very careful also in the matter of fire' KUB 13.4 iii 44; (3) the ablative: *nu=za ḫalluwayaza mekki naḫḫanteš ēšten* 'be very careful of strife' KUB 13.4 iii 43. In addition there is the impersonal use discussed in §16.32 (p. 250).

16.115. *punušš-* 'to ask, inquire' can be construed in two ways. (1) One can say: 'to question someone (*accusative*) about something (*dative-locative*)', e.g., *n=aš* ^{d}UTU-*ŠI ANA* DI.ḪI.A *punušmi* 'and I, My Majesty, will question them regarding the legal disputes' KBo 3.3 iv 9–10; or (2) one can say: 'to investigate something (*accusative*) for someone (*dative-locative*): *nu=šmaš=kan* DI.ḪI.A *punuškeddu* 'Let him investigate legal disputes for you (*-šmaš*)' KBo 3.3 iii 28–29.

16.116. Similarly the verb *wek-* 'to ask, request' construes with the accusative of the thing requested and the dative of the person asked: *kinuna=wa=šmaš kuit wēkmi* 'What now shall I ask from them (i.e., the gods)?' KUB 34.53 rev. 8 (CTH 370).

16.117. *šarra-*: (1) (active) with the *accusative* and no *-kan* (often with *-za*) means 'to divide something'; while (2) (active or medio-passive) without *-za*, but with *-kan* or *-ašta* and the accusative or more often the *dative-locative*, it means 'to pass through, cross over, transgress'.

Chapter 17
ADJECTIVES

17.1. The inflection of adjectives is essentially the same as that of nouns.

17.2. An adjective can be modified by an adverb, as in ḪUR.SAG.MEŠ=*ya*=*wa* <u>*mekki*</u> ḪUL-*uēš* ‘The mountains too are <u>very</u> bad’ KUB 23.103 rev. 21 (NH).

17.3. Adjectives can be attributes or predicates. Most attributive adjectives precede their head nouns (*šalli* KUR-*e* ‘the great land’), while predicate adjectives regularly follow a noun subject (KUR-*e šalli ēšta* ‘the land was great’). For more on the word order of predicate adjectives see §30.28 (p. 413) and following.

17.4. Examples of the normal word order with attributive adjectives: *nakkiš* DINGIR-*LIM-iš* ‘honored city’ (sg. nom. com.); *nakkī pedan* ‘honored place’ (sg. nom.-acc. neut.); *nakkit* ^{d}*Tašmišu* ‘with the honored Tašmišu’ (ins.); *pangawi* ÉRIN.MEŠ-*ti* ‘to all the troops’ (sg. d.-l.); *panqauwaz* EME-*azza* ‘from every (evil) tongue’ (abl.); *pargamuš* ḪUR.SAG.MEŠ-*muš* ‘the high mountains’ (pl. acc. com.); *pargauwaš auriyaš* ‘into the high watchtowers’ (pl. d.-l.); *parkuin išnan* ‘clean/pure dough’ (sg. acc. comm.). For further examples see the respective articles in the CHD for the adjectives cited here and others.

17.5. Attributive participles regularly follow their head nouns. For examples of the regular order and some of the few exceptions see §§25.41–25.42 (p. 339).

17.6. The universal quantifiers *ḫūmant-* and *dapiant-* (both translatable as ‘all, entire’) also regularly follow their head nouns. This may be due to their meaning or to their formal resemblance to participles in *-ant-*. Examples: *nu*=*za*=*apa utniyanza ḫūmanza* (10) *iškiš*=*šmet anda* ^{URU}*Ḫattuša lagan ḫard*[*u*] ‘and let the entire land keep their backs bowed down (lit., inclined) toward Ḫattuša’ KUB 36.110 rev. 9–10 (OS), *ḫa*[*ḫḫimaš*] *utnē ḫūman tinut* ‘The freezing wind paralyzed the entire land’ VBoT 58 i 7–8 (OH/NS), *nu* DAM.MEŠ=*ŠU* [DUMU.MEŠ=*ŠU* NAM.RA.ḪI.A]=*SÚ*《-*NU*》 *āššū*=*ya ḫūmanta*=*pát dāš* ‘and he took his wives, [his children,] his [civilian captives] and all the goods’ KUB 14.1+ obv. 50 (MH/MS); *nu išpandan ḫūmandan iyaḫḫat* ‘and I traveled the entire night’ KBo 5.8 iii 21 (NH); ^{GIŠ}BÚGIN=*ya*=*wa* ^{DUG}*išnuri* GIR$_4$.ḪI.A *dapianda ŠA* ^{LÚ}MAŠ.EN.KAK=*pát dašgaweni* ‘We take BÚGIN-vessels, kneading troughs, and all the pottery belonging to that very poor man’ KUB 16.16 rev. 14–15; $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$*Gašga*$^{ḪI.A}$=*ma*=*an*=*kan dapianteš* GAM UGU RA-*anzi* ‘But all the Kaska men will strike it (the city) up from below’ KUB 5.1 iii 61–62.

17.7. The quantifier *ḫūmant-* rarely precedes its noun: *ḫūmand*[*az* K]UR.KUR.MEŠ-*za eḫu* 'come from every land' KUB 36.90 obv. 39; *araḫzenaš ḫūmantaz* KUR-*yaz* KBo 20.107 + KBo 23.50 iii 26 (vs. normal *utnē ḫūmanda* KBo 3.22:38 [OS], *utnē ḫūman* VBoT 58 i 8 [OH/NS]). These exceptions are only a very small fraction of the thousands of examples of the regular word order, where *ḫūmant-* follows its head noun. Some apparent exceptions actually form part of the rule. For example, preposed *ḫūmant-* is normal when used with body parts: *ḫūmantet kardit* 'with the whole heart' KUB 30.10 obv. 24, 27 (see analogous *dapian* ZI-*an* 'the entire ZI' KUB 5.1 i 2, etc.); *ḫūmandaz tueggaz* KUB 24.9 i 45 (vs. normal [N]Í.TE=*ŠU ḫūman* KUB 26.8 ii 3); *ḫūmandaza ḫappešnaz* 'from every limb' KUB 30.40 i 17; *ḫūmantaza tarnaza* 'from every *tarna-*' KBo 15.37 iii 51–52. Preposed *ḫūmant-* is also regular when it is substantivized and modified by a predicatival adjective: *ḫūman āššu* 'everything that is good' KUB 17.10 i 22 (but see *āššu ḫūman* 'every good thing' KBo 10.37 iii 43); *ḫūman* GIBIL-*TIM* 'everything that is new' KBo 17.65 obv. 24; but *idālu ḫūman* 'all/every evil' KBo 15.21 i 22.[1]

17.8. Attributive adjectives in *-want-* may precede or follow their head nouns. The postposed examples may or may not be due to their formal resemblance to participles in *-ant-*.[2] Preposed examples: *išḫarwantuš* TÚG.ḪI.A-*uš* 'blood-red garments' KBo 17.1 i 25 (OS); *išḫarwandan* ^{d}U.GUR 'bloody Nergal' KUB 9.34 i 26; *pakkuššawan šeppit* 'cracked *šeppit*-grain' KBo 21.1 i 15; *ḫūišwanduš=a=kan laḫḫanzuš* 'live *l.*-birds, on the other hand (adjective fronted and with contrastive *-a*/*-ma*)' KUB 39.7 ii 33. Postposed examples: ^{MUŠEN}*ḫaranan ḫušuwandan* 'a live eagle' KBo 17.4 ii 14 (OS); *ḫāranan*^{MUŠEN} *lēliwandan* 'the swift eagle' KUB 17.10 i 24 (OH/MS); *luliyaš* ˹*naduwanza* 'a reedy marsh' KUB 52.91 iii 3.

17.9. The original syntax of nouns with the quantifiers *mekk*(*i*)- 'much' and *tēpu-* 'a little, few' was that of an appositional phrase, with the quantified noun in its appropriate case followed by the adjective as a neuter substantive. This syntax is still rarely attested for *tēpu-*: NA_4 ZA.GÍN *tepu* . . . *ḫūštišš=a tepu* 'lapis lazuli — a little bit . . . and *ḫušti*-material (sg. nom. com.!) — a little bit' KBo 5.2 i 37–38. It is better preserved in the partitive expression *kuitta parā tēpu* '(of) each in turn a little bit' following lists (see CHD *parā* 9a). The terms *tēpu-* in most cases and *mekk*(*i*)- in all cases[3] appear as attributive adjectives that agree with their head noun in gender, number, and case and, as expected, they regularly precede their head noun. But unsurprisingly the original syntax

1. The example [(*nu=tta ḫū*)]*man šupp*[*i* (*parkui p*)]*iškanzi* KUB 24.1 ii 15 (restorations from parallels such as KUB 24.2 obv. 18–19) may involve an adverbial use of the adjectives, as per Gurney (1940: 21): 'and everything they present to thee holy (and) pure'. See also remarks in CHD P 165 sub *parkui-* a2o.

2. Some stems in *-want-* function as virtual participles (see §2.50, p. 61) but, as the examples cited here show, postposing affects both these and possessive *-want-* adjectives.

3. Since the word for 'field' written A.ŠÀ is common gender in KBo 6.2 (demonstrated in LH 311), it is likely that the phrase *takku* A.ŠÀ-*n=a mekkī wāši* in KBo 6.2 ii 46 (OS) is likewise literally 'But if he buys a field—a large portion of it . . .', with the older syntax. Elsewhere *mekk*(*i*)- is always an attributive adjective.

also is partially preserved in occasional instances where *mekk(i)-* and *tēpu-* follow the head noun, but show agreement in number and gender: *mūriuš mekkuš* 'many (grape) clusters' KUB 43.23 rev. 22 (OS); $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$*išpantuzziyaliuš tēpawēš* 'few libation servers' KUB 14.8 rev. 19 (NH). The semantic essence of the old syntax is caught in the OH quoted speech in colloquial language: ^{GIŠ}TUKUL GÍD.DA *wēkmi* x [. . . *=mu* ^{GIŠ}TUKUL GÍD.DA] *pāu nu=wa mekki* 'I will demand long weapons (as follows): 'Let him give [me long weapons] — plenty (of them)!' KBo 3.38 obv. 32–33 (OH/NS), ed. StBoT 17:8–9.

17.10. There are also some examples where ordinary attributive adjectives appear to follow their head nouns: *ḫāriyaš nakkīyaš* 'inaccessible valleys' KUB 30.36 ii 4; SÍG *mita/i-* 'red wool' (frequent; examples in CHD *mit(t)a-* 1). For two attempts to define the conditions for this postposing see Laroche 1982 and Francia 2001.[4]

17.11. More complex rules of word order are treated in §16.47 (p. 253), §§18.24–18.28 (pp. 284–285), §18.37 (p. 287), §26.3 (p. 341), §26.21 (p. 345), §§30.1ff. (pp. 406ff.).

Comparison of Adjectives

17.12. Hittite does not express the comparative ('better') and superlative ('best') degree by suffixes, as is the case in Greek -ιων and -ιστος or -τερος and -τατος, Latin (*-ior* and *-issimus*), and English (*-er* and *-(e)st*), but by syntactic means.

Comparative Degree

17.13. The **comparative degree** was expressed by the predicate adjective governing the object of comparison in the dative-locative case (HE §§221–23). Thus: *nu=wa=kan ANA* ÉRIN.MEŠ*=KA* ÉRIN.MEŠ*=YA mek*[*ki*], *ANA* ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ*=ma=wa=tta* ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ*=YA mekki* 'my troops (ÉRIN.MEŠ*=YA*)[5] are more numerous (*mekki*)[6] than your troops (*ANA* ÉRIN.MEŠ*=KA*); my horses are more numerous than your horses' KUB 19.29 iv 18–20; *namma=kan anzel* TI-*anni* [(*ŪL Š*)]*A BELU*⟪^{MEŠ}⟫*-NI* TI-*tar nakkī* 'if the life of our lord (i.e., the king) (*ŠA BELU-NI* TI-*tar*) is not dearer (to us) (*UL* + *nakkī*) than our own life (*anzel* TI-*anni*)' KUB 31.42 ii 18–19; *ANA* LUGAL KUR ^{URU}U-*taššа=kan* 1-*aš* ^{LÚ}*tūḫukantiš šalliš ēšdu namma=ma=šši=kan lē kuiški šalliš* 'Only the crown prince (*tūḫukantiš*)

4. A very high percentage of such postposed examples involve cases like SÍG *mita/i-* 'red wool' where the head noun is written logographically (with or without phonetic complement). We must therefore consider seriously the possibility that many or most such examples do not reflect the genuine Hittite word order but merely imitate graphically the Sumerian word order in phrases written entirely logographically like SÍG SA_5 'red wool'. Further investigation of genuine postposed adjectives in Hittite must take into account this possible confounding factor. In assessing postposed attributive adjectives one must also be careful to set aside examples of adjectives used appositionally (see §§15.5–15.6, pp. 236–237).

5. The Hittite noun underlying ÉRIN.MEŠ is common gender, ÉRIN.MEŠ*-t-*.

6. The nouns for 'troops' and 'horses' are common gender. The form *mekki* may be construed as a collective noun 'a large amount' serving as the predicate. As a noun and not an adjective, it need not show agreement.

shall be greater than the King of Tarhuntašša; let no one else be greater' BrTabl. II 80–81 (Tudḫ. IV). Note how the local particle *-kan* is employed in all of the previous (NH) examples. Yet in OH/NS this particle is not always present: *ēššari=šett=a ēššari*[7] GAL-*li* SAG.DU=*SÚ ANA* SAG.DU=*Š*[*U* GAL-*li*] [K]A×KAK=*ŠU ANA* KA×KAK=*ŠU* GAL-*li* IGI.ḪI.A=*ŠU ANA* IGI.ḪI.A=*ŠU* GAL-*li* (21) [*a*]*iš=šet=a iššī* GAL-*li* EME=*ŠU ANA* EME=*ŠU* GAL-*li* (22) [*kap*]*ru=šet=ašta kapruaz* GAL-*li mieli=ššet=a* (23) [*mi*]*eliaš* GAL-*li iški*⟨*š*⟩*=šet=ašta iškiši* GAL-*li* (24) [*paltan*]*aš=šiš!=ašta palta*[*n*]*ī šalliš* GAB=*ŠU A*[*NA*] (25) [GAB=*ŠU ša*]*lli* ŠÀ=*ŠU ANA* ŠÀ=*ŠU* GAL-*li* 'this one's (lit., his) stature is greater than that one's (lit., his) stature; his head is greater than his head; his nose is greater than his nose; his eyes . . . , his mouth . . . , his tongue . . . , his *mieli* . . . his back is greater than his back' KUB 43.53 i 19–25 (quoted by Sommer and Falkenstein 1938: 219 in unpublished state).

17.14. Several observations are pertinent to the KUB 43.53 passage which was just quoted: (1) the local particles *-kan* or *-ašta* are missing in some cases in OH (NS), as shown by the first six, eighth, eleventh, and twelfth clauses, but *-ašta* appears in the seventh (*kapru*), ninth (*iškiš*), and tenth (*paltanaš*) clauses; (2) the gender of the predicate adjective is in most cases neuter,[8] although in line 21 — EME=*ŠU ANA* EME=*ŠU* GAL-*li* 'his tongue is greater than his tongue' — the usual gender of EME (= *lala-*) is common;[9] and (3) although the possessive pronoun is employed with both members in all logographic writings, it never appears with the second member (i.e., the dative-locative) in the syllabic writings. An instance of the common gender in this kind of predicate adjective employed comparatively is in: [*paltan*]*aš=šiš!=ašta*[10] *paltanī šalliš* 'his shoulder is larger than his shoulder' KUB 43.53 i 24.

17.15. In line 22 of KUB 43.53 Sommer found a rare example of the **ablative of comparison**: *kapru=ššet=ašta kapruaz* GAL-*li* 'his *kapru* is larger than his *kapru*'. See also Melchert 1977: 215–16, who regards it as "secondary at best." Note the presence of the particle *-ašta*. It would be convenient if we could show that *-kan* was used in comparisons with the dative-locative, while *-ašta* was used in those with the ablative. But *-ašta* seems also to occur with dative-locative comparisons (see KUB 43.53 i 23–24 in the preceding paragraph). So far, only *-kan* (no *-ašta*) occurs in the NH examples of this comparative construction. Since this is the only example of an ablative in this function, we suspect that the text is not in order. An Old Script (hyp)archetype could have had the shape of *i* (HZL #217) confusable with the Old Script AZ sign (HZL #92/6), in which case a scribe at some point in the chain of transmission wrote original *kap-ru-i*

7. Judging from the parallel SAG.DU=*ŠU ANA* SAG.DU=*ŠU* which follows, the first *ēššari* is nominative and the second dative-locative. Note that the order of cases differs here from the earlier cited NH examples.

8. Since in this case we are not dealing with any form of plurality, a collective interpretation of the forms in *-i* is not possible (see p. 273, n. 6).

9. Note, however, that in two passages cited in CHD sub *lala-*, namely, KBo 2.3 i 50 (MH/NS) and KBo 23.72 rev. 24 (OH or MH/MS), there is a nominative form EME-*an*, which has to be neuter. Perhaps in KUB 43.53 too EME is neuter.

10. Emend *-ši-ta-aš-ta* here to *-ši-ša!-aš-ta* for the correct common-gender form.

as *kap-ru-az.* At least this is a possible explanation, if we hesitate in accepting this rare construction on the basis of a single example.

17.16. The syntactic construction employed for comparison is the same when the predicate is the stative verb *takk-* 'to be like' (active and medio-passive): ^{GIŠ}TUKUL.ḪI.A-*ēš=w*[*a=tta*] *šalli ḫūwanti ḫatugai kari*[*tti . . . . . .*] *weteni takkantari* '[Your] weapons are like the great wind, the terrifying flood, and the [. . .] water' KBo 22.6 i 26–28, and a long series of clauses involving the body parts in KUB 43.53 i 2′–15′. In the latter passage, as a few lines later in the long passage cited above from i 19′–25′, the occurrence or non-occurrence of local particles (in this case *-apa*) seems arbitrary. It occurs in 4 out of 23 clauses (lines 4, 5, 7, 15). In two of the four instances the noun has the clitic possessive, and in two it does not.

Superlative Degree

17.17. To express the **superlative degree** in post-OH one construes the adjective with a plural form in *-aš*, either the dative-locative or genitive (see §16.41, p. 252): *šallayaš=kan* DINGIR.MEŠ-*aš kuiš šalliš* 'he who among the great gods is the great(est)' KUB 31.141:3. Often the dative-locative plural is further strengthened by *ḫūmant-* 'all': *nu* DINGIR.MEŠ-*naš ḫūmandaš ŠA* ^{URU}*Kaštama* ^{d}*Zašḫapunāš šalliš* 'among all the gods of Kaštama Zašḫapuna is the great(est)' KBo 3.7 iv 15–17 (Illuyanka myth, OH/NS); *nu=za ḫūmandaš=pat* EGIR-*ezziš* DUMU-*aš ešun* 'among (or perhaps genitive, 'of'?) all (the children) I was the young(est) child' Ḫatt. i 11; [(*nu=za* ^{d}U *maḫḫa*)]*n šarāzziyaš šarāzziš* [(*zik ḫante*)]*zziyaš=a=z ḫantezziš zi*[(*k*)] 'As you, O Stormgod, are the highest of the high, and the foremost of the foremost' KBo 34.34:11–12 (OH/MS) with dupl. KUB 33.68 iii 6–8 (OH/NS). The first example, showing otherwise unmotivated *-kan*, favors the dative-locative interpretation. The remaining examples without *-kan* favor the genitive one.

17.18. What are clearly dative-locatives are occasionally also strengthened by *ištarna* 'in the midst of': KUR-*e=kan ištarna apāš ḫappinanza* 'in the midst of the land (i.e., in all the land) he was the rich(est)' KUB 24.8+ i 10–11 (Appu story); even with an adjectival verb: DINGIR-*LUM* DINGIR.MEŠ-*aš ištarna tarḫuilešzi* 'the god is the bravest among the gods' KUB 36.55 ii 31–32.

17.19. When the adjective is not a predicate, the objects with which comparison is made stand not in the dative-locative but in the genitive: *daššuš=a=šši* ^{d}*Anuš* DINGIR.MEŠ-*aš ḫantezziyaš=šmiš peran=šet arta* 'mighty Anu, foremost of the gods, stands before him' KUB 33.120 i 9 (Song of Kumarbi myth).[11]

11. *ḫantezziyaš=šmiš* 'their foremost' is in apposition to the grammatical subject *daššuš* ^{d}*Anuš* in this example. It is also possible that *ḫantezziyaš* is here substantivized ('the leader of the gods'), in which case we are not dealing with a superlative.

17.20. Since all the examples cited in the preceding three paragraphs stem from post-OH, where *-aš* can be either dative-locative or genitive plural, caution is needed in the case identification. Note that some examples show the particle *-kan*, while others do not. It may be that (originally) the dative-locative construction required *-kan*, while that with the genitive did not. But we cannot prove this.

Chapter 18
PRONOUNS

Independent Personal Pronouns

18.1. The use of the cases (see chapter 16) is the same for nouns, adjectives, and all classes of pronouns. As in the case of nouns (§16.68, p. 258), the dative of the personal pronouns is used to indicate not only 'to' and 'for' but also 'from' with verbs like 'to take' (the so-called dative of disadvantage). The merger of dative and locative into a single case form (§16.65, p. 257) is reflected in both the independent and enclitic dative pronouns, which do not formally distinguish dative from locatival use.

18.2. Since the finite forms of Hittite verbs already indicate that the subject is 'I', 'we', 'you', '(s)he', or 'they', the presence of an independent personal pronoun in the nominative case indicates a special emphasis on the subject or a conscious contrast with the subject of a neighboring clause. Thus, *ūk=wa* LUGAL-*uš=šmiš kišḫa* 'I will become your king' KBo 22.2 rev. 15 (OS) could have been written LUGAL-*uš=šmiš=wa kišḫa* without ambiguity as to the subject. Use of the independent pronoun as subject in order to mark contrast with a different actor in a neighboring clause can be seen in: MUŠEN*ḫāranan* LU[GAL-*aš* MUNUS.LUGAL-*aššš*]*=a šēr=šamet* 3*=*[(*ŠU*)] DUMU.É.GAL *waḫnu*[*zzi ū*]*g=a=šmaš=šan* ÉRIN.MEŠ-*an šē*[(*r*)] 3*=ŠU waḫnūmi* 'The palace servant waves an eagle three times over the king and queen, but I wave (a model of) troops over them three times' StBoT 8 ii 30–32 (= KBo 17.1 + KBo 25.3 ii 16–18) (OS). See: *zik=wa* UR.BAR.RA-*aš kištat* 'You have become a wolf' KBo 6.2 ii 12 (Laws §37, OS),[1] *n=an=za zik dā* '(No one else has accepted my advice,) but *you* must accept it' KUB 1.16 iii 27 (OH/NS).

18.3. The same is the case with forms of the dative and accusative, since a corresponding clitic form of the pronoun (*-mu*, *-ta*, *-ši*, *-naš*, etc.; §§5.12ff., pp. 135ff.) could have been used: *weš=a kuwapit aumen nu* MUNUS-*za* [30] DUMU [1*=ŠU ḫ*]*āši nu=zza anzaš* 1*=ŠU ḫāšta* 'Where have *we* seen (it),[2] that a woman bears [thirty] sons [at one time]? Yet she bore *us* all at once!' KBo 22.2 obv. 11–12 (OS); *ḫandanza=kan a*[(*nt*)]*uḫšaš tuk=pat āššuš n=an zik=pat šar*[*l*]*iškeši* 'It is to *you* (in particular) that the just person is dear, and *you* (in particular) always elevate him' KUB 31.127 i 8–10 (OH/NS) with dupl. KUB 31.128 obv 7′–8′ (NS). In these last examples the natural emphasis involved in using the independent form is strengthened by the particle *-pat.*

1. The *zik* is necessary to disambiguate in the NH copy (KBo 6.3 ii 29), where the finite verb *ki-ša-at* is identical with the third singular form.

2. Reading *a-ú-me-en* instead of *a-ru-me-en* (Eichner 1974a: 185). Alternatively, one may retain the reading *arumen* and understand the sentence as 'Where have we (ever) been (lit., 'arrived'), that . . .'.

18.4. Likewise emphatic or contrastive in at least in pre-NH is the independent genitive pronoun for which a clitic possessive could have been used. In NH, when the clitic possessive pronoun was no longer current in speech, the independent genitive pronoun was often used without implication of contrast or emphasis. Examples of emphasis or contrast: *kuiš ammel āppan* LUGAL-*uš kīšar*[*i*] 'He who becomes king after *me*' KBo 3.22:22, 49 (OS). For a clear opposition of *ammel* and *tuel* see: *zilatiya=ta katta* [(*ḫašš*)]*a ḫanzašša tuēl* DUMU-*an ammel* DUMU.MEŠ*=YA* DUMU.DUMU.MEŠ*=YA* [*paḫḫaš*]*šantari=pat* 'In the future, to the third and fourth generations, *my* sons and grandsons will likewise loyally protect *your* son' KUB 21.1 + KUB 19.6 i 73–75; see *ammel* ÌR.MEŠ*=YA* . . . *tuēl* ÌR.MEŠ*=KA* 'my servants . . . your servants' HKM 74:10, 15–16 (MH/MS); *zik ammel* É-*na lē uwaši ug=a tuēl parna* $Ū_{L}$ *uwāmi* '*You* must not come to *my* house, and *I* will not come to *your* house' KUB 29.1 i 19–20 (OH/NS). In the last example the independent pronouns in both nominative (*zik*, *uk*) and genitive cases (*ammel*, *tuel*) stand opposed to each other, and the two clauses are connected using the contrastive particle *-a*/*-ma* (*ug=a*).

18.5. The ablative forms of the independent pronoun usually convey the directional sense of the ablative (§16.92, p. 265), with the resultant meaning 'on my/your side' or 'in my/your favor': *nu* DINGIR.MEŠ *ammēdaza* [(*tiandu*) *nu=wa* DI-*eš-šar ammed*]*az ḫannandu* 'Let the gods stand on my side and adjudicate the case in my favor' KUB 26.79 i 11–12 with dupl. KUB 14.17 iii 18–19; ^{d}É.A-*aš* GALGA-*aš* LUGAL-*uš tue*[*d*]*aza artari* 'Ea, the king of wisdom, is standing on your side' KBo 26.118 + KBo 26.65 iv 24 (Ullik. III); *anzedaza tiyēr* DINGIR.MEŠ *anzedazza memier* 'The gods took our side. They spoke on our behalf' KUB 7.58 i 13′–14′. Only rarely do they have the normal ablatival force of 'from' in the sense of source: ŠEŠ*=YA=ma ammedaza* NÍG.TUKU-*ti kuitki* 'My brother, you are enriching yourself somewhat at my expense (lit., 'from me')' KUB 21.38 obv. 16. Another possible example would be: *tuk=ma=wa ammetaz* SIG_{5}-*išzi* 'from me good will come to you' BrTabl. ii 52 (Tudḫ. IV). This use is rare, because the ablative case itself is so rarely applied to human beings (§16.99, p. 267). But ablatives of independent pronouns can also convey the more usual idea of agency with passsives and participles (see §16.99, p. 267): LÚ-*iš=ma=kan* DAM*=SU=ya kuiēš āššiya*[*ntari*] *nu=šmaš=kan āššiyatar* ZAG[*-a=š*]*šan ar*[*nuwanzi*] *n=at tue*⟨*d*⟩*azza* ^{d}*IŠTAR-liazza* [*t*]*arān* '(as for) the man and wife who love each other and bring their love to completion, it is decreed (lit., 'spoken') by you, O ^{d}*IŠTAR*' KUB 24.7 i 38–40; *kinuna ammuk* ^{m}NIR.GÁL LUGAL-*uš tuedaz IŠTU* ^{d}U *pihaššašši šallanuwanza arkuwēškemi* 'But now I, Muwattalli, the king raised up by you, O Stormgod Piḫaššašši, am making petition' KUB 6.45 + KUB 30.14 iii 32–33.

18.6. Ablative forms can be found in **double case constructions**, where they function like adjectives (Luraghi 1997a: 24 §§2.1.11, 2.3.1.1): *tuedaza memiyanaza* 'on the authority of your word', *ammedaz* ŠU-*az* 'with my hand', *ammedaza* ^{GIŠ}BAL.TUR-*az* 'with my spindle', *anzedaz memiyanaz* 'on the authority of our words', *anzedaz* ^{d}*Gulšaz* 'on the authority of our fate-deity'.

18.7. The suffix *-il*(*a*) added to the independent pronouns expresses the idea of '-self', not in a reflexive[3] but an emphatic sense (like Latin *ipse*), always nominative (see also p. 357, n. 2): *ukila* 'I myself', *zikila* 'you yourself', *šumāšila* 'you yourselves', *apāšila* 'he himself', *apāšila*[4] and *apāšiluš*[5] 'they themselves' (see above in §5.3, p. 132, and Sommer 1922: 48 n. 1, 1938 141 n. 3; HE §99, HED A 88; and HW² I 165–66). Forms in *-el* (or *-il*)[6] without the final *a* are also attested: *ú-ki/e-el* KUB 40.1 rev.! 14; *zi-ki/e-el* KBo 16.41 i 14; *a-pa-ši-el* KUB 36.89 obv. 19; *a-pa-a-ši-el* KBo 22.260 obv. 7 (for *-ši-el* see §1.62, p. 29). Although *apāšila* is properly used only with third-person subjects, on rare occasions in NH one even finds it employed with a second-person singular verb: *našma=an apāšila ḫalziyatti* 'Or you yourself call him' (thus with HED A 88 and Beckman 1999: 67) KBo 5.4 rev. 26 (Muw. II). This shows a developing tendency to use the third-person form independently in the subject-reinforcing sense 'self'. To claim (with HW² A166b sub 2) that *apāšila* is singular accusative here ('oder du rufst ihn selbst') seems to betray a basic misunderstanding of the role of the pronouns in *-il*(*a*) which reinforce only subjects, not direct or indirect objects.

Enclitic Personal Pronouns

18.8. The dative plurals of the enclitic personal pronouns may be used reflexively (§28.18, p. 358).

18.9. The dative of possession can be expressed with enclitic personal pronouns (§16.67, p. 258).

18.10. The use of postpositions/adverbs with a spatial locatival sense to govern (enclitic) personal pronouns, not yet attested in OS, can be seen in the following examples: *nu=šši peran arḫa tarnaš* 'and you gave way before him' KUB 14.1 obv. 62 (MH/MS); *namma=man=ši* EGIR-*an* KASKAL.MEŠ-*TIM I*[*ṢBAT*] 'Then he wanted to seize the roads behind him' KUB 14.1 rev. 27 (MH/MS); *nu=mu kā* ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ *kuiški kattan* 'Some chariotry is here with me' HKM 30:9 (MH/MS); *ŪL=ma=mu* GIŠTUKUL LÚ.KÚR *kuwapikki šer waḫnut* 'Nor did she ever let the weapon of the enemy whirl over my head' Ḫatt. i 41–42; *nu=šši* d*IŠTAR* URU*Šamuḫa* GAŠAN=*YA palaḫšan šer ēpta* 'And *IŠTAR* of Šamuḫa, my lady, held her *p*. over him' (KUB 31.20 iii 6–7 + KBo 16.36 iii 9–10).

---

3. For the Hittite expression of the reflexive (the other use of English '-self') see §§28.16ff. (pp. 357ff.).

4. Although in the following passage *apāšila* is used with a plural subject, the discordant numbers between the serial verb *uezzi* and the main verb *mallanzi* show that the speaker was confused as to the number of his compound subject: *nu uezzi=ma* d*IŠTAR-iš* d*Ḫebatušš=a* [NA4ḪAR].ḪAR *apāšila mallanzi* 'Then it will happen that d*IŠTAR* and Ḫebat will themselves mill grain' KUB 33.103 ii 7–8 (NS); see HW² A 166b.

5. A NH scribe has affixed to *apāšil*(*a*) the plural nominative common ending used (in NH) with *a*-stem nouns, namely *-uš* (§3.14, p. 69, §3.16, p. 70).

6. Since all forms occur to date only in NS texts, it is impossible to determine if the final EL sign is to be read *el* or il_5.

18.11. The temporal meaning ‘before’, which may have been derived from an earlier spatial concept transferred to time (on this see Hoffner 2002 and see §16.74, p. 261), is seen with a personal object in passages such as: *peran=ma=at=mu* ‘before me, however, (so-and-so governed) it’ Ḫatt. i 27.

18.12. Rarely also the dative-locative of a third person “personal” pronoun is used to express the ideas ‘to it’ and ‘for it’ (*parna=šše=a* ‘and to (his) house *for it*’ Laws §§1–20; see §16.71, p. 260). The pronoun *-še* in reference to a thing (‘it’) also occurs in *anta=ya=šše* ‘in addition *to it*’ KUB 29.28 i 10 (Laws §128, OS).

(Third-Person) Subject Clitics

18.13. Third-person subject clitics never occur in sentences with transitive verbs with or without explicit direct objects (Garrett 1990a, following Watkins). Their occurrence with intransitive verbs is basically lexically determined (Garrett 1996: 90). Intransitive verbs that take subject clitics select *eš-* as the auxiliary verb in the analytic perfect, while those that do not occur with subject clitics use *ḫark-* (see §22.19, p. 310, and Garrett 1996: 102–6). Many, but by no means all, of the intransitive verbs that occur with subject clitics fall into well-defined semantic classes. The behavior of a given intransitive verb must ultimately be determined on a case-by-case basis.[7]

Intransitive Verbs with Subject Clitics

18.14. (1) Intransitive verbs of travel/perambulation such as *ar-* ‘to arrive’, *ḫuya-* ‘to run’, *iya-* (m.-p.) ‘to go, march’, *pai-* ‘to go’,[8] *uwa-* ‘to come’ (but neither *pai-* nor *uwa-* take the clitic subject when used as serial verbs, §24.31, p. 324), *parš-* ‘to flee, take flight’, *piddai-* ‘to run, flee’, and *šarra-* (m.-p.) ‘to traverse, cross a distance’, (2) stative and change-of-state verbs such as *akk-* ‘to die’, *arai-* ‘to get up, stand up’, *ašandulāi-* ‘to encamp, go into garrison’, *ēš-* ‘to be’,[9] *ēš-* (m.-p.) ‘to sit (down)’,[10] *ḫark-* ‘to perish, die, get lost’, *ḫarp(iya)-* (m.-p.) ‘to reassociate, change one’s association’, *ḫaššik-* ‘to

7. Hittite intransitive verbs that take subject clitics and select the auxiliary *eš-* correlate with the class commonly labeled in linguistic literature “unaccusative” and those without subject clitics that select *ḫark-* as auxiliary with the class termed “unergative.” For a full discussion of “split intransitivity” in Hittite see Garrett 1996.

8. The inner accusative construction (§16.18, p. 246) KASKAL-*an pai-* ‘to travel the way’ containing the so-called accusative of the way (§16.28, p. 249), behaves like an intransitive verb of perambulation in taking the clitic subject pronoun: *taknaš=at* ^{d}UTU-*aš* KASKAL-*an paiddu* ‘Let it go the way of the Sungoddess of the Earth’ KUB 17.10 iv 13 (OH/NS).

9. An apparent exception is: *šarkuš* LÚ.MEŠ (var. LÚ-*eš*) *ēšta* ‘he was an outstanding man’ KBo 3.34 ii 11–12 (OH/NS), which lacks the subject clitic *-aš*. Not an exception is: *kāša* GUD.MA[Ḫ] [*daššu*]*š? ēšta* ‘Lo, there (once) was a [powerf]ul bull’ KUB 31.4 + KBo 3.41:17–18 (see §18.27, p. 282).

10. E.g., *n=e ḫaššaš katta ešanta* ‘They sit down beside the hearth’ StBoT 25 #54 iii 10′ (OS). Exceptions: *ta ešanda* KBo 17.74 + KBo 21.25 + ABoT 8 i 18 (OH/MS, StBoT 12, 19), possibly [^{d}*Kuma*]*rbiš=a=kan iyawaniyawanza* ^{URU}*Nipp*[*uri* . . .] [. . .] *pait išḫaššarwanti=ya=za=an i*[*š* . . .] [. . .] *ešat* KUB 33.120 i 42–44 (MH/NS), *nu gimr*[*i* . . .] *paiškanta ešanda* KUB 53.15 ii 9–10.

become satisfied with drink', *igāi-* (m.-p.) 'to freeze', *irmaliya-* (m.-p.) 'to get sick', *išpai-/išpiya-* 'to become satisfied with food', *iyanni-* 'to set out', *ki-* 'to lie (down)', *karuššiya-* 'to fall silent', *kiš-* (m.-p.) 'to become, happen', *kištanziya-* 'to get hungry', *lāzziya-* 'do well, flourish', *mai-* 'to grow',[11] *mayantešš-* 'to grow up', *mer-* 'to disappear', *neya-* (m.-p.) 'to turn', *putkiya-* 'to swell up', *šalliya-* 'to melt', *šeš-* 'to lie down, sleep', *šupp-* 'to fall asleep', *tiya-* 'to take up a position', *war-* (m.-p.) 'to burn', *weḫ-* (m.-p.) 'to turn, change', *zeya-* (m.-p.) 'to become cooked', and the *-e-* and *-ešš-* fientives such as *miyaḫḫuntešš-* 'to grow old', *mieššš-* 'to become sweet', *parkue(šš)-* 'to become pure', *šalleššš-* 'to grow up', (3) medio-passives which function as true passives of transitive actives such as *šai-* 'to seal' and *wemiya-* 'to find',[12] (4) medio-passives with (usually active) transitive counterparts, but occurring with the reflexive clitic *-z(a)* such as *munnāi-* 'to hide',[13] (5) verbs expressing emotions such as: *aršaniya-* 'to be upset', but also 'to be upset with someone, envy someone', *ḫaḫḫarš-* 'to laugh' or 'to laugh at', *kartimmiya-* (m.-p.) 'to get angry', *naḫ-* 'to become afraid' and 'to fear (something)', *šāi-* 'to be/get angry' but also 'be/get angry at' (both usually with *-za*), *šulle-* 'to become wanton/disrespectful', *taškupiške-* 'to wail, lament', *duške-* 'to become happy, rejoice' but also 'to amuse, entertain', *uwaya-* 'to arouse pity', *wiške-* 'to weep, wail'. In their transitive uses these verbs take no clitic subject.

18.15. Some intransitive verbs with clitic subjects fall into no clear category: *ḫaliya-* 'to kneel', *ḫe(n)k-* 'to bow',[14] *ḫuntariya-* 'to fart.'

Intransitive Verbs without Subject Clitics

18.16. Intransitive verbs used impersonally without referential subjects do not take subject clitics: *āppai* 'it is finished', *idālaweššzi* 'it turns bad',[15] *mai* 'it prospers', *šeššzi* 'it thrives',[16] and *titḫai* 'it thunders.'[17]

---

11. KUB 39.41 rev. 10, cited CHD L–N 114b.

12. E.g., *namma=at šiyēttari* 'Then it is sealed' KBo 25.163 v 6′ and *n=at wemiyattaru* 'Let it (cause of the plague) be discovered!' KUB 14.10 iv 19.

13. E.g., *n=aš=za munnaittat* 'He hid himself' KUB 33.120 i 38.

14. This verb actually appears both with and without a clitic subject: *n=aš ḫinga* 'He bows' KBo 20.11 iii 4 (OS) vs. *ANA* LUGAL *ḫekta a-ap-pa-e-a* (i.e., *āppa=ya*) *ḫekta* 'He bows to the king, and he bows back' KBo 20.10+ i 5–6 (OS). Against Garrett (1996: 97–98) these examples cannot be assigned to two different verbs. For the variation in *ḫe(n)k-* see §1.135 (p. 46).

15. *nu ue*[(*zzi*)] *apēdani=pat* UN-*ši É-ri=šši=pat id*[(*alawēšzi*)] 'it will turn out badly for that person in his/her own house' KBo 3.67 iv 13–14 with dupl. KUB 11.1 iv 25′–26′ (OH/NS). See also: *apedani* UN-*ši kallarešzi* 'it will be unlucky for that person' KUB 4.1 iv 29. As a change of state verb with referential subject, *idālaweššš-* does take a subject clitic: ḪUL.MEŠ-*šer=ma=at kēdani memiyani* 'But they became estranged in this matter' KUB 21.17 i 4 (NH).

16. E.g., *nu mān māi šeššzi* 'And when prosperity and abundance come' KBo 3.7 i 6–7 (OH/NS) (for the nature of this clause see §30.34, p. 415). Contrast the use of a subject clitic with *mai-* with a referential subject: *n=aš miškewan dāi* 'It (a vineyard) will begin to prosper' KUB 12.44 ii 28.

17. GIM-*an ḫameššḫanza* DÙ-*ri tetḫai* 'When it becomes spring (and) it thunders' KBo 2.7 rev. 16–18.

Other Clauses without Referential Subjects

18.17. No clitic subject pronoun regularly occurs in elliptical 'to be' (*ēš-*) clauses with non-referential subjects such as *ḫurkil* '(it is) *ḫurkil'* Laws §§189, 191, 195;[18] *ŪL ḫarāʾtar* '(it is) no offense' Laws §§191, 193–194 and §200; *ŪL šullatar* '(it is) not (a case of) disrespect' KBo 6.13 i 9 (Laws§169, OH/NS); MUNUS-*naš waštaiš* '(it is) the woman's sin' KBo 6.26 iv 7 (Laws §197, OH/NS); *alwanzatar DĪN* LUGAL '(it is) sorcery; (it is) a case for the king' Laws §111; or *natta* LÚ.MEŠ *ṢIDITI=KUNU* '(is it) not your provisions-bearers?' KBo 22.1 17–18 (OS);[19] *takku ŪL=ma* A.ŠÀA.GÀR *dammel pēdan* 'But if (it is) not a cultivated field, (but it is) uncultivated land' KBo 6.4 i 11 (Laws §IV, NH); *mān* LÚMAŠ.EN.KAK*=ma* 'But if (it is) a poor man' KUB 7.1 ii 9, KUB 7.54 iii 12; *n=an punuš mān kiš(š)an mān ŪL kiš(š)an* 'Just ask him whether (it is) so or if (it is) not so' KUB 21.38 obv. 12 (NH); also "existential" sentences such as *šarnikzil* '(There is/will be) compensation' KBo 6.26 i 27 (Laws §163, OH/NS; with LH 131). Other similar one-word clauses may be cases of ellipsis of a finite verb (§30.13, p. 409). In the past tense the verb *ēšta* occurs: *ŪL ēšta* 'was it not (so)?' Ḫatt. i 51. Instances where a subject clitic pronoun is used are rare: *nu=war=at=mu šallakartata*[*r*] *kupiyatiš=ma*[*=war=a*]*š ŪL kuiški* 'There was negligence on my part, but there was no intent to defraud' KUB 13.35+ iv 43–44 (NH);[20] *nu* DINGIR.MEŠ *ŪL* [*šekteni k*]*uēll=aš* (§6.2, p. 137)[21] *dammešḫaš* 'Or do you gods not know whose is the injury?' KBo 4.8 iii 3–4 (NH). It appears that Hittite occasionally (so far *only* in NH) permitted a subject clitic for a nonreferential subject, and that when this happened, it was marked by the feature of gender attraction.

Special Cases

18.18. Finally, there are some verbs whose lack of a subject pronoun seems idiosyncratic: *aruwāi-* 'to bow' (vs. *ḫe*(*n*)*k-* 'to bow'!), *gimmantariya-* 'to spend the winter',

18. Compare also *nakkuš* 'It is *nakkuš*' in the Hittite laws, which shows no subject clitic marker. Note also that *takku* ÌR-*iš* KBo 6.4 i 18–19 (Laws §VII, NH; see ibid. i 26 [Laws §IX]) must be translated (with LH 22, 24) 'But if it (not 'he') is a slave', since without *-aš* the subject is non-referential.

19. A borderline case, which may show the use of a subject clitic for a non-referential 'it' subject is: [*lē kui*]*ški tezzi* LUGAL-*š=a duddumili kardiyaš=šaš* [*iezzi n*]*=at parkunumi takkuw=at ēšzi takkuw=at* NU.GÁL KUB 1.16 ii 53–54. The clause [*pa-a*]*ḫ-ḫa-aš-nu-wa-an ēšta* HKM 89:25 (MH/MS) is problematic on several grounds.

20. The striking difference in gender (*-at* to *-aš*) in the clitic subject pronouns of this pair of tightly joined clauses shows clearly that we have gender attraction to the two predicates.

21. We choose this analysis based on the preceding cited example where an enclitic subject pronoun definitely is used for a nonreferential subject and shows gender attraction to the noun predicate. This solution does present a problem in that indirect speech requires that the content clause should be introduced asyndetically, whereas geminate *ll* here would seem to point to the presence of the conjunction *-a-*/*-ya-*. However, other such examples do occur (e.g., KBo 12.38 ii 6, cited in §7.1, p. 142), however they are to be accounted for. An alternative solution for the present case would be to assume *kuēllaš dammešḫaš* 'whose is the injury' with a degenitival pronominal adjective of the type established by Hoffner 2006.

ḫaš- ‘to open’, *ḫuwapp-* ‘to behave badly toward’, *kururiyaḫḫ-* ‘to be hostile, make war’, *nuntarnu-* ‘to hurry’, *šalik-* ‘to approach’, *šuwaya-* ‘to look at’, *waḫnu-* ‘to turn, change’ (intrans.), *wašta-* ‘to sin’.[22]

18.19. A special problem is also posed by the verb *ar-* (m.-p.) ‘to stand’. Like *eš-* (m.-p.) ‘to sit’ it belongs with the stative verbs that take the subject clitic, but it fails to take the subject clitic in the Kikkuli hippological treatise (e.g., KUB 1.13+ iii 11, 21), a text which in many other aspects of its grammar shows that it was not composed by a native speaker of Hittite.

Demonstrative Pronouns

kā-, apā-, and aši: Word Order

18.20. The demonstratives *kā-* ‘this’ (proximal, near the speaker), *apā-* ‘that’ (medial, near the addressee), and *aši* ‘that’ (distal, far) can be used either as pronouns or adjectives. If the clause is verbal, the pronoun may occupy whatever position in the clause is appropriate to its syntactic function (subject, object, etc.).

18.21. In post-OH nominal sentences the pronoun *apāš* or *kāš* normally precedes its predicate noun or adjective: *nu=mu kī* IGI-*zi* LÚ-*natar=mit* ‘This was my first heroic deed’ Ḫatt. ii 29 (KBo 3.6 ii 13); *nu=wa=nnaš kā*[(*š* E)]N-*aš=pat* ‘this one alone is our lord’ KUB 26.12 + KUB 21.42 i 17–18 (von Schuler 1957: 23).

18.22. In OH (OS), however, a different pattern applied, where the accented pronoun subject followed the predicate (see §30.29, p. 414).

18.23. There is also a rare use of the demonstrative in an appositional construction, in which case the demonstrative immediately follows its noun: (Queen Puduḫepa writes to Ramesses II of Egypt:) *nu ANA* ŠEŠ=YA ˹*lump*[*ašti*]*n apūn* DÙ-*mi* ‘Am I doing that to ‘My Brother’ (Ramesses) as a grief ?’ KUB 21.38 rev. 12 (NH), eds. Helck 1963; Stefanini 1964); KUR*Alašiyan=ma=za=kan pede=šši* [ÌR-*aḫḫu*]*n arkammanaḫḫun*, *arkamman=ma=šši=kan* [*kū*]*n išḫiyanun* ‘But I subjected Alašiya and made it tributary on the spot; and as tribute I imposed the following (= *kūn*)’ KBo 12.38 i 7–9 (NH); ed. Güterbock 1967: 75, 77). (‘Because there are many herbal medicines, I will inquire which herb is determined by oracle. I will also inquire about physicians’) *kuiš=mu* LÚA. ZU SI×SÁ-*ri nu=kan* Ú *ANA* dUTU-*ŠI* ŠÀ IGI.ḪI.A *apāt* ˹*parritti* ‘And as medicine the physician who is designated to me by oracle will apply that to His Majesty’s eyes’ KUB 22.61 i 18–19 (NH), ed. Burde 1974: 4 (“soll . . . selbiges Kraut streichen”); it is not clear why

22. In view of the attested transitive active use of *waštanzi* ‘(if) they omit (so much as a thread)’ in KBo 16.47:8′ the absence of a subject clitic with *wašta-* ‘to sin’ may reflect that in Hittite terms it is a generically used transitive without expressed object ‘to make an omission’, like *ēd-* ‘to eat’.

the *apāt* is separated from the Ú in this clause; see ibid. i 6. It is unclear whether it is significant that our only attested examples come from late NH.

18.24. The unmarked position of the adjectival demonstrative is preceding its substantive. When that substantive is further modified by either an attributive adjective or a noun in the genitive case, the latter intervenes between demonstrative and substantive.

18.25. With intervening genitive — **(1) with *kā-***: *kī* ^{URU}*Šina[ḫu]wa⟨š⟩* ^{URU}*Ubariyašš=a* [*uttar l*]*ē iyatteni* 'Do not do this thing of the cities X and Y!' KUB 1.16 ii 50–51 (OH/NS); *kišš*[*a*]*n=ma=mu kuit ḫatrāeš kuitman=wa=mu* ^{d}UTU-*Šī kī ŠA* LÚ.MEŠ ^{URU}*Gašga takšulaš uttar ḫatrāši ammug=a=wa memian INA* KUR ^{URU}*Išḫupita ḫuškemi* 'But concerning what you wrote me as follows: 'Until you, Your Majesty, write me about this matter of the peace of the Kaškaean men, I will await word in the land of Išḫupitta'' HKM 10:23–32 (MH/MS); *kī=mu kuit ŠA* ^{m}*Marrūwa* LÚ ^{URU}*Ḫimmuwa ḫaliyatar ḫatrāeš* 'This homage of Marruwa, the ruler of Ḫimmuwa, about which you wrote to me' HKM 13:4–5 (MH/MS); *kē=ma namma ŠA* KUR ^{URU}*Ḫatti=pat* KUR.KUR.ḪI.A-*TIM* KUR ^{URU}*Gašga* [*n*]*=at* $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$SIPA ŠAḪ *U* LÚ.MEŠ *EPIŠ* GAD *ēššer* (var. *ešer*) 'Moreover, the following (lit., 'these') lands which belong to Ḫatti, the Kaška land — they were swineherds and weavers — (Arawanna, Kalašma, Lukka, etc., have declared themselves free from the Sungoddess of Arinna)' KUB 24.3++ ii 38–39 (pr. of Murs. II); *antuḫšātar=ma kuit nu=š*[*ši=š*]*an ŪL=ya kuit uttar wemiyaweni n=at=š*[*an ked*]*ani linkiyaš tuppiya ŪL kitta*[*ri*] 'Whatever matter we do not find out about the population will not be placed on this tablet of the oath' KBo 5.3+ ii 60–62 (MH/NS); *kī=wa ēšnaš uttar tuppiyaz au* 'Just consider (lit., 'see') this record of bloodshed' KBo 3.1++ (THeth 11) ii 47–48 (OH/NS); **(2) with *apā-***: *apūn ŠA* GIDIM NINDA-*an parkunuer* 'They purified that bread/food of the deceased' KBo 11.1 rev. 11 (pr. of Muw. II); **(3) with *aši***: *nu uni ŠA* $^{HUR.SAG}$*Ašḫarpaya* ^{URU}*Gašgan zaḫḫiyanun* 'So I fought that Kaškaean (group) of Mt. Ašḫarpaya' KBo 3.4 iii 41, ed. AM 76–77; *nu=wa=mu=kan uni araḫzenaš* KUR.KUR⟨*-aš*?⟩ LÚ.KÚR *peran kuenni* 'Strike down before me the aforementioned enemy of the surrounding lands' KBo 3.4 i 26, ed. AM 22.

18.26. With intervening attributive adjective or participle used attributively: *kāš* 600 ÉRIN.MEŠ 'these (grammatically sg.) 600 troops' KUB 14.15 iv 48 (AM 74); see *kīy=ašta warān paḫḫur* GIM-*an kištati* 'just as this blazing fire was extinguished' (participle *warān*) KBo 6.34 iv 5–6 (MH/NS), ed. Oettinger 1976a; *kī=ma idālauwa uddār kuieš ēššanzi* 'those who are performing these evil things' KBo 3.1 ii 61; *ammel kāš=pat* 1-*aš dammešḫaš* 'This (is) my only punishment (for her); (in this way only I punished her: just the fact that I expelled her from the palace)' KBo 4.8 ii 12–13, 16 (NH) ed. Hoffner 1983a (where the number is used as attributive); *k*[(*ē* 3 LÚ.MEŠ *I*)]*N*[*A*] ^{URU}*Tanipiya a*[(*šanzi*)] 'these three men remain in Tanipiya' KBo 3.7 iv 20–21 (OH/NS); *edani pangawi* LÚ.[(KÚR)] 'that entire enemy (force)' KBo 14.3 iv 29; *nu=kan uni pankun ŠUTI kuenta* 'he struck that entire tribe' KUB 19.18 i 5′–6′ (NH).

18.27. When, however, one or both of the words following the demonstrative is a logogram (but see above in §18.25), divergence from this order is permitted: **(1) genitive follows head noun**:[23] *nu=za kī* ALAM*=YA ŠA* KÙ.GI *iyanun* 'so I constructed this gold statue of myself' KBo 10.2 iii 21 (annals of Hatt. I, OH/NS); *kē=ma ṬUPPA*$^{ḪI.A}$ *išḫiūllaš karū aniyan ēšta* 'these tablets of the treaty were already executed' KBo 4.10 i 38, see 50 (treaty with Ulmiteššub of Tarḫuntašša); *nu apāt=aya uttar ŠA* ^{f}*Danuḫepa iya*[*t k*]*uiš nu=za apašš=a* DINGIR-*LIM-iš karū kišat* 'He too who committed that deed against (lit., 'of') Danuḫepa has already died (lit., 'become a god')' KUB 21.19 + 1303/u (+) KUB 14.7 ii 12–13 (NH); *nu kē ṬUPPU ŠA* DI.ḪI.A *apiya šiyanzi* 'They will seal these legal documents (lit., 'these tablets of cases') there' KBo 3.3+ iv 12–13 (NH); *nu=za maḫḫan eni ṬUPPA ŠA* KUR ^{URU}*Mizri peran wemiyanun* 'When I found before myself that tablet of (i.e., about) the land of Egypt' KUB 14.8 i 31–32 (NH); *aši* MUNUS.LUGAL ^{URU}*Ḫuruma* 'That queen of Ḫuruma' KBo 3.28:21. **(2) Attributive adjective follows head noun**: *nu=mu kē* KUR.KUR.MEŠ *dannatta AŠŠUM MUIRDUTTIM pešta* 'she (the goddess) gave me these depopulated lands to govern' Ḫatt. ii 56, see lines 63–64.

18.28. The demonstrative naturally can also be followed by a substantivized adjective or a "free-standing" genitive (§16.61, p. 256): [*kuw*]*at=mu kī tepu paitta* 'why did you give me this little bit?' KUB 1.16 iii 10 (OH/NS); *kūn=ma=wa=za ŠA* 2 GÌR.MEŠ*=ŠU kuwat ḫāšun* 'why have I borne this two-legged (child) (lit., 'this one of its two legs')?' KUB 24.7 iii 23–24 (story of cow and fisherman); *kī=pat ŠA* ^{f}*Tunnawiya* MUNUS ŠU.GI *QATI* 'this (ritual) of Tunnawiya, the Old Woman, is finished' KUB 7.53 iv 7 (colophon).

Declinable kāš . . . kāš as a Distributive Expression

18.29. As an equivalent to the English distributive 'this . . . and that' Hittite coordinates either *kāš . . . kāš=ma* (*. . . kāš=ma*) or *kāšš=a . . . kāšš=a* (*. . . kāšš=a*). We have arbitrarily cited the nominative common singular, but correlated forms can show any case, gender, or number. Examples: *kāšš=a . . . kāšš=a* 'this one . . . that one' StBoT 8 ii 35–36 (OS); *kī* ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-*li=met kī=ma šaḫḫa*(*n*)*=met* 'this is my craftsman's fief, and that is my *šaḫḫan* field' Laws §40 (OH); *kēl . . . kēll=a* 'this one's . . . that one's' (OH); *kedani . . . kedani=ya* 'to this one . . . to that one'. The distributive *kā-* also occurs in the expression *kez . . . kezzi=ya* 'on this side . . . and on that side', or in *kiššan . . . kiššan=a* 'in this way and in that way'. Notice that Hittite sometimes views such pairs as contrastive, marking the second member with *-a*/*-ma* (*kī . . . kī=ma*) and sometimes as coordinated, using *-a*/*-ya* (*kāšš=a . . . kāšš=a*, *kez . . . kezzi=ya*, etc.). Note that although (especially with the use of *-a*/*-ma*) the pairing has the function of contrast, the same (near) demonstrative is used for both members. Similar in force is *kuieš . . . kuieš* (pl. nom.) 'some . . . others'.

23. In the following examples the presence of logograms either as head noun or genitive or both renders the Hittite word order less certain.

18.30. Sometimes *kāš kāš* (or even simple *kāš*) is used to represent a name to be supplied: [LUGAL-*i*=*k*]*an kāš kāš ištarningain* EGIR-*pa dāš* 'So-and-so has taken back [from the king(?)] the illness' KUB 29.1 ii 32 (rit., OH/NS); *kāš*=*war*=*at*=*ši* LUGAL-*uš paiš* ('If from the palace they give him [i.e., a temple servant] silver, gold, . . . , let it be enumerated/specified:) 'King So-and-so (lit., 'this king') gave it to him' ' KUB 13.4 ii 34 (pre-NH/NS), cf. CHD *lamniya-* 2b. Note that *kāš kāš* takes a singular verb. On the other hand, *kāš kāšš*=*a* 'this one and that one' takes a plural verb: 'When they gave it to him', *nu*=*wa kāš kāšš*=*a arantat* 'so-and-so and so-and-so were present' KUB 13.4+ ii 37–38 (instructions for temple officials, ed. Sturtevant and Bechtel 1935). The latter construction also occurs in the accusative: *kī*=*ya kī*=*ya iyami* 'I am about to do such-and-such' KBo 3.7 i 22 (Illuyanka, OH/NS).

Correlated kā-Forms Having Different Cases

18.31. When correlated *kā*-forms have different cases, this is sometimes used (like *araš ari* and *araš aran* or 1-*aš* 1-*an*[24]) to express reciprocal action ('one . . . the other'): *kāš*=*man kūn epzi* 'one might seize the other' Laws §49; [*lē*=*ma*=*za*=*ka*]*n kāš kūn* EGIR-*pan šazketta* 'let one [not] . . . the other!' KUB 1.16 ii 58 (OH/NS).

Other Deictic Elements

18.32. Although the primary demonstrative pronouns of Hittite are *kā*-, *apā*-, and *aši*, they are not the only deictic elements in Hittite speech. The contrasting inseparable prefixes *u*- and *p*(*e*)- on verbs of movement (*uda*-, *peda*-, *uwate*-, *peḫute*-, *ue*-, *pai*-) also indicate movement relative to the speaker (the 'I'): *u*- toward the speaker and *pe*- away. See §12.21 (p. 198, *uwate*-, *peḫute*-), §12.41 (p. 209, *ue*-, *pai*-).

The Indefinite Pronoun *kuiški*

18.33. The constructions with *kuiški* are formed as follows. When *kuiški* is used substantivally, it tends to take a position quite close to the finite verb (i.e., toward the end of the clause): *n*=*ašta uttar* [*lē k*]*uiški šarratta* 'let no one transgress the command' KUB 1.16 ii 49–50; *naššu* DINGIR-*LIM*-*ni kuiški peran wašti* 'or if someone (*kuiški*) sins before a deity (DINGIR-*LIM*-*ni peran*)' KUB 1.16 iii 60 (OH/NS) (note how *kuiški* interrupts DINGIR-*LIM*-*ni peran*); *ḫaššanna*(*n*)=*šan*=*za*=*kan le kuinki kuenti* 'of his clan do not kill anyone' KBo 3.1 ii 45 (OH/NS); *nu*=*šši* LÚ.KÚR *zaḫḫiya menaḫḫanda namma* $\bar{U}_L$ *kuiški mazzašta* 'no enemy (LÚ.KÚR . . . $\bar{U}_L$ *kuiški*) dared any longer (to go) against him in battle' DŠ frag. 28, A i 7–8 (NH); *nu mān kišan kuiški memai* 'And if someone speaks thus' KUB 1.4 iii "40(28)" (= Ḫatt. iii 73–74; dupls. A and F read *kuiš* instead of *kuiški*); *šaḫḫaniy*=*aš luzzi lē kuiški ēpz*[(*i*)] 'Let no one (*lē kuiški*) seize them for land tax (or) for corvée' Ḫatt. iv 85.

---

24. For reciprocals expressed with correlations of the numeral 'one': 1-*aš* 1-*an* (or 1-*edani*, 1-*edaz*, etc.), see §9.9 (p. 155).

18.34. In some cases the form of substantival *kuiški* even follows the finite verb at the end of the clause: [*takku* LÚ-*a*]*n našma* MUNUS-*an ELLAM walḫzi kuiš*[*k*]*i n=aš aki* 'If anyone strikes a free man or woman, so that s/he dies' KBo 6.3 i 6 (Laws §3, OH/NS); [*n*]*ašma=šmaš* EGIR-*ziaz ištamašzi kuiški kuitki INA* É.GAL-*LIM=ma=at ŪL memai* 'or if anyone of you subsequently hears anything, but doesn't tell it to the palace' KUB 21.42 + i 26–27; *mānn=a ANA* NUMUN ^{md}LAMMA *nakkišzi kuitki* 'And if anything weighs upon the progeny of Kurunta' BrTabl. ii 75–76 (Tudḫ. IV); *mān tuk=ma* ^{m}*Kupanta-*^{d}LAMMA-*an waggariyazzi kuiški* 'if anyone revolts against you, Kupanta-LAMMA' KUB 19.54 iv! 8 (Murs. II treaty with Kupanta-LAMMA); *namma=mu mān uppāi kuiški mān=mu ŪL kuiški uppāi nu=mu ṬUPPA*$^{ḪI.A}$ *ḫatrātten nu šigallu* 'Furthermore, write me letters and let me know whether someone will send (oil) to me or no one will send (it) to me' KBo 18.2 rev. 8–12 (NH).

18.35. When *kuiški* is used as an attributive adjective and the modified noun has no other modifying adjective, *kuiški* immediately follows the noun: *nu=šmaš šardiyaš kuiški paizzi* 'And some supporter goes to them' KBo 6.3 ii 31 (Laws §38, OH/NS); *nu=mu kā* ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ *kuiški kattan* '(There is) some chariotry (lit., 'horses') here with me' HKM 30:8–9 (MH/MS); *mān DINU=MA kuitki šalleszi* 'But if some legal case becomes (too) large' KBo 3.3 iii 29–30 (NH); *mān* DUMU.LUGAL *kuiški waštai* 'If any prince sins' KBo 3.1+ ii 59 (OH/NS); see also HKM 46:15–16 for a *kuinki* example.

18.36. When the attributive adjective is *tamai-*, *kuiški* follows it directly and precedes the head noun: *ANA* KUR-*TI=man tamāin kuinki* EN-*an iyanun* KBo 5.13 i 21–22 (see also KBo 4.3 i 11); see also KBo 16.97 rev. 32 (MH/MS) *tamaīš=ma kuiški* ^{d}*IŠTAR* 'some other *IŠTAR*' vs. rev. 30 '*IŠTAR* of my father'; *mān=aš apel ŠA* MUNUS-*TI* DUMU-*aš mān=aš tamēl kuēlqa* MUNUS-*aš* DUMU-*aš* 'Whether he is the child of that woman or he is the child of some other woman' BrTabl. ii 90–92 (Tudḫ. IV), but this also occurs occasionally without *tamai-*: ḪUL-*lun=ma kuinki* INIM KUB 21.5+ iii 1; *tuel kuinki* ÌR-*TUM* KUB 14.3 iv 47; *kuiški idāluš memia*[*š š*]*A* BAL KBo 5.4 obv. 10. See also KBo 5.13 i 36 *apašila=ma kuiški* URU-*aš*.

tamai-

18.37. When used adjectivally, *tamai-* 'another' (for pronominal forms in its declension see §5.2, p. 132; for the paradigm §8.10, p. 152) like most other adjectives precedes its noun: *tamai utne* 'another land', *tamaiš išḫāš* 'another lord', *tamai pedan* 'another place', *tamaiš kupiyatiš* 'another plot', *tamaiš* URU-*aš* 'another city.' Occasionally, when its head noun is a logogram without Hittite phonetic complement, *tamai-* as attributive adjective follows its noun: *maḫḫan=ma=šš̌an* LUGAL-*uš ANA* KASKAL.GAL *parā ari* ^{GIŠ}GIGIR*=ma tamai tūriyan ḫantan* 'but when the king comes forth upon the Great Road, another chariot is harnessed (and) ready' KUB 10.18 i 24–26; $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$ALAN.ZU$_9$ *tamaeš* TÚG GÙN.A *waššan ḫarkanzi* 'the other performers wear brightly colored garments' KBo 4.9 i 45–46; NINDA.KUR$_4$.RA *damauš* in KUB 7.5 ii 27.

18.38. When used substantivally, *tamai-* means ‘another (one)’ and is construed within its clause just like any ordinary noun: *ištarna* UD.ḪI.A-*ti=ma* NINDA.KUR$_4$.RA *damauš paršiyannaḫḫi nekuz meḫurr=a damauš paršiyannaḫḫi* ‘at midday I break other loaves, and in the evening I break (still) others’ KUB 7.5 ii 26–30; *takku* DUMU.MUNUS LÚ-*ni taranza tamaiš=a=an* (or *tamaiš=an*) *pittenuzzi* ‘If a young woman is promised (in marriage) to a man, and another (man) runs off with her’ KBo 6.3 ii 5–7 (Laws §28a, OH/NS); *kur-zu-na-aš* (var. *lam-na-aš*) [LUGA]L-*uš aki* ^{GIŠ}GU.ZA*=ŠU=ma=za=kan tamaiš(!) ešari* ‘a . . . king will die, and another will sit down on his throne’ KUB 8.1 ii 18–19 (omens, OH/NS).

Chapter 19
ADVERBS

19.1. Whereas an adjective is a word that qualifies a noun, an adverb is one that qualifies a verb, an adjective, or another adverb. The italicized words in the following examples are English adverbs: 'he walks *slowly*', 'the day has ended *too* soon', 'she is *less* talkative than her neighbor'.

19.2. Interrogative adverbs can serve as conjunctions introducing subordinate clauses (as interrogatives they can also introduce indirect questions; see §30.68ff., pp. 427ff.): *kuwapi* 'when/when?' or 'where/where?', *maḫḫan* 'when, as soon as/when?' or 'as/how?', *kuššan* 'when' (rare).

19.3. Adverbs can be derived from other parts of speech by the addition of a suffix or by the use of a particular noun case (see §16.30, p. 249). On adverbs formed on a demonstrative base see §7.18 (p. 147).

19.4. In the examples cited below note that the same adverb may be assigned to several categories. For example, *apiya* is listed below in local ('there') and temporal ('then') meanings, as is *kuwapi* 'where, when'.

Local Adverbs

19.5. Local Adverbs: *kā* 'here, hither' (OH *kāni*), *kēt* 'on this side',[1] *kēz* 'from here, on this side' (often in correlation *kēz . . . kēzzi=ya* 'on this side . . . on that side'), *apiya* 'there, thither', *a-pád-da*, *a-pád-da-an* (post-OH) 'there, thither, to that place',[2] *apēz* 'from that place',[3] *edez* 'on that side of', *kuwapi* 'where, whither', *kuwapiya*

1. *takku kēt* (var. B *kēz*) ÍD-*az* 2 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR *pāi takku edi* ÍD-*az nu=šše* 3 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR *pāi* 'If (it happens) on this side of the river, he shall pay two shekels of silver; if on that side of the river, he shall give him three shekels of silver' KBo 6.2 i 49–50 (Laws §22, OS); [(UGULA $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$MUḪALDIM)] *ḫaššāš katta kēt arta* 'The foreman of the cooks stands next to the fireplace on this side' KBo 17.15 obv. 14–15.

2. *apēda* (OH/NS) occurs securely as 'therefore' (see §19.8 with p. 291, n. 7) and possibly once in NH broken context (KUB 6.48 ii 3, see SV 2:148, cited HW^2 A 180) as 'thither'. We read the forms with the *pát*/*pít* sign as *-pád-* based on the contrast *da-ma-at-ta* vs. *da-me-e-da* 'to another (place)', which appears to show that the forms with geminate *dd*/*tt* had *a* vocalism.

3. *kinun=a apēz dā nu apē* NUMUN.ḪI.A *anniya* 'Now take from there and sow those seeds' HKM 54:25–26; [*m*]*ān* ^{SÍG}*maištan=a mašiwantan waštanzi* [*n*]*=uš* ^{d}UTU-*ŠI kezza zaḫḫiyami zik=uš apezza zaḫḫiyaši* 'If they fail (to give) so much as a tiny bit of wool, I, My Majesty, will fight them from this side, and you shall fight them from that side' KBo 16.47:8–9.

'everywhere';[4] *kuwapit* 'where, whither'; *kuwapitta* 'everywhere'; *kuwatta* 'wherever'; *dameda* 'elsewhere'; 1-*eda* 'alone'; *anda*(*n*) 'inside, within'; *andurza* 'on the inside; from inside'; *araḫza* 'on the outside; from outside', *araḫzanda* 'around, about', *arḫa* 'away'; *āškaz* 'outside'; *menaḫḫanda* 'opposite, against' (usually a preverb or postposition, not an adverb); *parā* 'further, in addition'; *peran* 'in front'; *šer* 'above'; *šarā* 'upwards'; *katta* 'down'; *kattan* 'below'; *kattanta* 'downward'; *tapuša*, *tapušza* 'alongside, laterally, to the side'; *arḫayan* 'separately'; *tūwa* and *tūwaz* 'at a distance, remotely'; *maninkuwan* 'nearby, in the vicinity'; *duwan . . . duwan* 'here . . . there; in this direction . . . in that (the opposite) direction'. On the possible derivation of local adverbs in *-a* from old allatives see §3.31 (p. 76). For more on the use of local adverbs such as *katta* 'down' and *kattan* 'below' see chapter 20.

Temporal Adverbs

19.6. Temporal Adverbs: *mān* 'when' (OH), *maḫḫan* 'when' (NH); *kuwapi* 'when' (§8.9, p. 151; §19.2, p. 289; §30.34, p. 415); *kuitman* 'while' (§30.37, p. 416); *kuššan* 'when, as soon as'; *kinun* 'now'; *apiya* 'then'; *kuwapi*(*k*)*ki* 'anywhere, anytime'; *natta kuwapikki* 'nowhere, never'; *kuwapiya* 'always, whenever'; *karū* 'formerly, long ago, already'; *annišan* 'formerly'; *annaz*(*a*) 'at one time, formerly' (§7.17, p. 146); *tapešni* 'previously(?)'; *lukkatta* 'on the morrow'; *zilatiya*, *ziladuwa* (Luwian loanword) 'subsequently, in the future'; *katta=ma* 'later on, afterwards'; *namma* 'next, finally'; *nūwa* 'still, yet'; *nawi* 'not yet'; *peran parā* 'provisionally, previously'; *duwan parā* 'until now'; *ḫūdāk* 'immediately, suddenly'; *lammar* or *lamnī* 'instantly, immediately';[5] *lammar lammar* 'at any moment'; 1-*anki* 'immediately, at once'; *parḫešni* 'quickly'; *kuššanka* 'anytime, whenever'; *UL kuššanka* 'never'; *appan* (EGIR-*an*) and *appanda* 'afterwards' (both can be written EGIR=*ŠU*); *appezziyan* or *appezzin* 'afterwards'; *appašiwatti* (EGIR-*pa*-UD(.KAM)-*ti*) 'in the future'; *karuwariwar* 'early in the morning'; *ḫandaiši meḫuni* 'in the heat of the day, at noon'; *nekuz meḫur* 'in the evening'; *mištiliya meḫur* (a time of day); *išpandaz* 'at night'; UD.KAM-*az* 'in the daytime'.

19.7. The Hittite manner of referencing temporal relationships using terms of spatial reference is a complicated subject in its own right (see Hoffner 2002). Does the speaker face the future, with the past behind him, or does he face the past, which he can and does know, with the yet unknown future behind him? The second theory is supported by the normal use of *peran* for 'before' and *āppan* 'after', and *appašiwatt-* (lit., 'afterday') for 'future'. Also *ḫantezzi*(*ya*)- 'older, earlier-born' (< *ḫant-* 'front, forehead') versus *appezzi*(*ya*)- 'younger, later-born'. Yet there are a few expressions suggesting

4. *menaḫḫanda*[(=*ya*=*ša*)*n k*(*urakki*)] *tapuwaš* ZAG-*ni* GÙB-*li nu kuwapiya QATAMMA* 4 *wallu*[*š dāi*] 'Opposite the pillar, alongside, on the right, on the left — everywhere in the same way [he deposits] four *walluš*' KBo 4.1 rev. 3–4. The term *kuwapiya* also means 'whenever'; see §19.6.

5. *n*=*an MAḪAR* ^{d}[UTU-*ŠI*] *lammar uwada*[*ndu*] 'Let them conduct him immediately to My Majesty' HKM 12 rev. 3–5.

the opposite, such as *-mu peran* ‘before me’ KUB 13.4 ii 58–59 (MH/NS) in the sense of tasks awaiting my attention in the future.

Adverbs of Manner

19.8. Adverbs of Kind and Manner and Causality: *kiššan* ‘thus, as follows’;[6] *apeniššan* ‘thus, as just seen or said’; *eniššan* ‘thus, in the previously mentioned manner’ (see §7.18, p. 147); *apēda* (OH/NS), *a-pád-da*, *a-pád-da-an* ‘for that reason, therefore’;[7] *kuwat* or *kuit* ‘why?’, *kuwatka* ‘somehow, perhaps’, UL *kuwatka* ‘by no means, in no way’, *arumma* ‘highly, exceedingly’, *imma* ‘actually, really’, *katta* ‘accordingly, subsequently’, *karši* ‘really, truly, genuinely’, *maḫḫan* ‘how?’ ‘as’, *manka* (usually UL *manka*) ‘in some way, in any way’, *kuwatta kuwatta* ‘in every respect’.[8] One occurs in both main and subordinate (i.e., dependent) clauses: *maḫḫan* ‘as, how’. For additional manner adverbs see §16.30 (p. 249) and §§19.13–19.14 (p. 292)

19.9. Adverbial phrases of manner are formed with the postpositional *iwar* ‘in the manner of, like’, which governs the noun preceding it in the genitive case (LÚSAGI-*aš iwar* ‘in the manner of a cupbearer’) (see Hoffner 1993 and §16.59, p. 255), and the postpositive conjunctions *mān* (CHD *mān* mng. 1) and *maḫḫan* ‘like’ (see §20.32, p. 301).

19.10. Distributive adverbs (§24.12, p. 320; §28.119, p. 384) are formed by repetition: usually dative-locative, *ilani ilani* ‘gradually, step by step, by degrees’; *uddanī uddanī* ‘word by word’; *witti witti* or MU(.KAM)-*ti* MU(.KAM)-*ti* ‘year by year’; ITU(.KAM)-*mi* ITU(.KAM)-*mi* ‘month by month’; UD(.KAM)-*at* UD(.KAM)-*at* ‘day by day’; GE_6-*ti* GE_6-*ti* ‘night by night’; *lammar lammar*[9] ‘moment by moment, at any moment’; KASKAL-*ši* KASKAL-*ši* ‘trip by trip’; but also other cases: KISLAḪ-*az* KISLAḪ-*az* ‘from each threshing floor’ KBo 16.72:5′; ZAG.GAR.RA ZAG.GAR.RA ‘altar after altar’; 1-*an* 1-*an* ‘one by one (acc.)’; etc. See also É.DINGIR-*LIM* É.DINGIR-*LIM* Bo 6251 obv. 3, and *gipešni gipeš*[*ni*] KUB 45.78 iv? 3′. For the use of distributives of time words with *-ške-* verbs see §24.12 (p. 320). This construction must be carefully distinguished from the use of the repeated vocative (or direct address form) such as *lāli lāli* (= EME.ḪI.A EME.ḪI.A) ‘O tongues! Tongues!’ (see p. 81, n. 25).

Denominative Adverbs

19.11. As **denominative adverbs** one finds either (1) frozen case-forms of nouns or (2) frozen case forms of adjectives, including derivatives with the productive suffix *-ili*.

---

6. For *kiššan* in interrogative clauses see §27.3 (p. 348) and §30.69 and §30.71 (p. 427).

7. See *kuit ḫanda . . . apēda* ‘why? . . . for that reason’ KBo 3.41 + KUB 31.4 obv. 16–19, cited HW² A 180. The meaning ‘thither’ for this word is not assured (see §19.5, p. 289).

8. m*Aškaliyaš* URU*Ḫurmi ešta apāš=a kuwatta kuwatta* LÚ.MEŠ (var. LÚ-*eš*) *ēšta* ‘Askaliya lived (lit., ‘was’) in Hurma, and he was a man in every respect’ CTH 8 (A = KBo 3.34) ii 8–9.

9. We follow the CHD (s.v. *lammar*) in taking these forms as endingless dative-locatives.

19.12. Examples of frozen case-forms of nouns are: the accusatives *karuwariwar* 'in the morning', *nekuz meḫur* 'in the evening'; the dative-locative forms *aššuli* 'in a friendly manner', *parḫešni* 'in haste', *tapešni* 'at the first'; the ablatives of direction *kunnaz* (ZAG-*az*) 'on the right', *iškišaz* 'backwards', *ḫantezziyaz* 'forwards' (on these see §16.92, p. 265), *tūwaz* 'at a distance', *tapušza* 'to the side', *šiwattaz* (UD.KAM-*az*) 'in the daytime', *išpandaz* (GE_6.KAM-*az*) 'at night'.

19.13. The neuter nominative-accusative of adjectives can serve as an adverb: (1) in the singular: *tepu* 'somewhat, a little, a bit', *mekki* 'very, greatly', *ḫantezzi* (at) first (opportunity)' (§16.30, p. 249), *karši* in LÚ.KÚR *karši zaḫḫiyadduma*[*t*] 'really/truly fight the enemy!' KUB 13.20 i 19; (2) in the plural: *ḫatuga* (< **ḫatugaya*) 'in a terrifying manner', *munnanda* 'secretly, hidden'. The ablative *annaz* of the demonstrative stem **anna*- 'that, yonder' is used as an adverb 'formerly'.

19.14. Neuter accusatives of pronouns and numerical adjectives can also serve an adverbial function (HE §199b regarded these as "inner objects"): *tuk ŪL kuitki idālawaḫḫun* 'I harmed you in no way' KBo 5.13 i 23 (Murš. II); *apātt=a*[*ya*] [*NI*]*Š* DINGIR-*LIM šarratti* 'in that way too you transgress the oath' KBo 5.4 rev. 23–24 (Murš. II); *kīy=an* 1-*an dammešḫanun* '(only) in this one way did I harm her' KBo 4.8 ii 13.

The Adverbial Suffix *-ili*

19.15. A productive denominative adverbial suffix is *-ili* (originally plural nominative-accusative neuter of adjectives such as *karuili-* 'old'). It is suffixed directly to consonantal stems: *pittiyantili* 'like a fugitive (*pittiyant-*)'; *karuššiyantili* 'quietly' (*karuššiyant-*)'; *mayantili* 'like a young man'; MU.KAM-*li* or MU-*tili* (*witt-*) 'annually, yearly'; UD.KAM-*tili* (*šiwatt-*) 'daily'; *ḫaranili* 'like an eagle (*ḫaran-*), swiftly'; MUNUS-*nili* 'of a womanly nature (MUNUS-*n*-)'. The suffix elides the *a* of *a*-stem nouns: *ni/ašili* 'in the (speech) manner of (the city of) Neša'; ^{URU}*ḫurlili* 'in the Hurrian language' (*ḫurla-*); *luwili* (without determinative) 'in the Luwian language' (< ^{URU}*Luwiya*). Since we lack a good example of an adverb based on a *u*-stem, it is unclear how *-ili* was suffixed to such nouns, although probably the *u* was not elided. One assumes that it would have been analogous to the formation of the adjective *karūili-* 'primordial' from the adverb *karū* 'long ago' and the adjective *tarḫuili-* 'valiant'. When based on geographic names, *-ili* often denotes the language (or some other cultural characteristic) of that region: ^{URU}*nišili*, *našili*, and *nešumnili* (the latter two without determinative) 'in the language of the city of Neša', 'in Hittite'; ^{URU}*ḫattili* 'in the (pre-IE) language of the Hattians', 'in Hattic'; *luwili* (without determinative) 'in the Luwian language' (< ^{URU}*Luwiya*); ^{URU}*palaumnili* 'in the language of the land of Pala', 'in Palaic'; ^{URU}*ḫurlili* 'in Hurrian' (< *ḫurla-*), ^{URU}*pabilili* 'in Akkadian'; *laḫšanili* 'in the mode/manner of the city Laḫšana' (a dance style); *ḫuppiššanili* 'in the mode/manner of the city Ḫubišna' (a dance style). For a full list of the adverbs in *-ili* (without translations) see Reichert 1963: 120 and Jie 1994: 27–28.

Adverbial Circumlocutions

19.16. For cases where a finite verb in a construction with an infinitive describes the manner of action see §25.34 (p. 337).

19.17. For cases where an infinitive describes the manner of action of a finite verb see §25.35 (p. 337).

19.18. An adjective (or participle) in the nominative (appositional to the subject) can function like an adverb in English translation. See §15.6 (p. 237).

Chapter 20

LOCAL ADVERBS, PREVERBS, AND POSTPOSITIONS

20.1. Hittite has a number of words expressing various spatial relationships, such as 'up', 'down', 'in(to)', 'out', 'beside', 'away'. With a few exceptions, these occur in a variety of syntactic roles. One may compare for this flexibility the uses of English 'up': 'I found the enemy up in the citadel', 'I climbed up the stairs', 'I threw up my hands'. In the first example 'up' is a free-standing adverb that describes where the action of the predicate takes place. In the second, it is a preposition forming a phrase with 'the stairs'. In the third it is a "verbal particle" that delimits the meaning of the verb (the latter being typically a verb of motion). It is also commonplace for the verbal particles to occur in combinations with verbs in an evolved, non-spatial sense: 'I turned up the heat', 'I tore up the letter'. Hittite has equivalents of all of these uses. The challenge is to determine which are which. In what follows we draw upon the results of Zuntz 1936; Goetze 1963; Starke 1977; Boley 1985; Tjerkstra 1999; and Francia 2002b.

20.2. We follow the CHD P 109–30 (sub *parā*) and Francia (2002b: 2–9) against Starke (1977: 127–31[1]) in assuming that most Hittite local/spatial adverbs occur in three distinct syntactic roles: (1) as free-standing adverbs; (2) as preverbs; (3) as postpositions. As per Tjerkstra (1999: 158–75) and Francia (2002b 6, 214), one cannot distinguish these different uses solely on the basis of word order; one must also use functional criteria. Inevitably, some attested examples are ambiguous and open to competing interpretations. The existence of such examples does *not* refute the basic claim of a three-way contrast. In what follows we purposely cite only enough unambiguous examples to establish each of the three usages. For more complicated and problematic cases see the works cited in §20.1 and CHD sub *parā*, *pēran*, and *šarā*.

20.3. Starke (1977: 131–87) established (based on OS evidence) that in Old Hittite there was a contrast between two paired sets of adverbs, one of which expressed 'place to/toward which' and one 'place where':[2] Those of Set 1 are more common as preverbs, and those of Set 2 as postpositions. But this is a tendency, not a rule.

---

1. For some arguments against Starke's claim of a single syntactic category of adverb see Salisbury 1999: 61–65.

2. We prefer to avoid the labels "directive" or "allative" for Set 1 and "locatival" for Set 2. We also take no stand on the question of the origin(s) of this system. On the latter see among others Laroche 1970: 35–41; Neu 1974: 59–61; and Starke 1977: 132.

Set 1: 'Place to Which'	Set 2: 'Place Where'
anda 'into'	*andan* 'within, inside'
āppa 'back'	*āppan* 'behind, after'
katta 'down'[3]	*kattan* 'below'[3]
parā 'out, forth'	*pēran* 'in front, before'
šarā 'up(ward)'	*šer* 'above, over'

20.4. It is important to recognize the use of the 'place where' set to express a location as the result of movement: [DUM]U.MEŠ LUGAL *pānzi* LÚ.MEŠ *MEŠEDI-an āppan tienzi* 'The princes proceed to station themselves behind the bodyguard' KBo 20.12+ i 3–4 (OS) (Salisbury 1999: 64 and Francia 2002b: 7–9, 57 and 68; overlooked by Starke 1977). This system mostly remains intact in New Hittite (Francia 2002b, but see Salisbury 1999: 64 on a limited change). There is a strong tendency for Set 1 to be used mostly as preverbs and Set 2 most often as postpositions, but at least in New Hittite there are exceptions to this pattern. Both sets function as free-standing adverbs. While many questions of detail remain to be answered, certain main facts seem clear.

Free-standing Adverbs

20.5. The following examples of syntactically free-standing local adverbs are merely illustrative and do not exhaust the possible different meanings of each: *anda=ma=kan* UDU-*un kuwāpi kuewēn nu linkiya kattan kiššan daiwen* 'in addition when we had killed a sheep (as part of the treaty-making ceremony), we placed the following (obligations) under oath' KBo 16.47:15–16 (MH/NS); *takku* IN.NU.DA *andan* NU.[GÁL] 'if there [is] no straw inside' KBo 6.2 iv 61 (Laws §100, OS); *āppa=ma* LUGAL ^{URU}*Ḫ*[*atti*] . . . *ḫullanun* 'But afterwards . . . I struck the king of Ḫattuša' KBo 3.22 14–15 (OS); EGIR-*an=ma=aš irmaliyattat=pat* 'But afterwards he in fact became ill' KBo 3.4 i 5–6 (NH); *našma katta* DUMU.MEŠ ^{d}UTU-*ŠI kuiški waggariyazi* 'Or if subsequently someone revolts against the sons of His Majesty' KBo 5.13 iii 13 (NH); *ta* GIŠ-*ru kattan* 'And a tree (is) below' KBo 17.1 iv 16 (OS); *takku* A.ŠÀ.ḪI.A *kuēll=a parā wāši* 'If he buys in addition someone (else)'s land' Laws §XXXIX (OH/NS); *nu=šši pargatar peran* 1 *LIM* 9 *ME=ya* DANN[A] 'At first his height was 1900 DANNAS' KBo 26.65 i 17 (Ullik. III); *šarā=ma* GIŠ-*ru ḫazašta* 'But above, the tree dried up' KUB 12.62 obv. 8 (pre-NH); *nu=kan gurtan šer wetenun* 'And up there I built a citadel' KBo 4.4 ii 61–62 (NH).

Preverbs

20.6. In many Indo-European languages the basic meaning of the simple verbal stem is modified by the addition of various prefixes. In some languages these prefixes

3. With Starke (1977: 181–87) and against Tjerkstra (1999), Francia (2002b), and others, one must distinguish a separate *katta/kattan/katti-* which functions solely as a postposition meaning 'beside, next to, with' (see §20.21, p. 299).

occasionally appear separated from the verb. In Hittite most of these elements are freely separable and are thus labeled "preverbs."

20.7. In Hittite only two truly inseparable preverbs exist: *u-* 'here' and *pe-* 'there', attested in the pairs:[4] *uda-* 'to carry here' and *peda-* 'to carry away'; *uiya-* 'to send here' and *peya-* 'to send away'; *unna-* 'to drive here' and *penna-* 'to drive away'; *uwate-* 'to lead here' and *peḫute-* 'to lead away'; which are always written as single words. An exception is *pē* in *pē ḫar(k)-* 'to bring, present', in which the preverb is clearly separable: *pē=pat ḫarkanzi* 'they shall also present (it)'. On the particle *-pat* see chapter 28. All other Hittite preverbs are separable. More research is needed on the word order of Hittite preverbs, but with few exceptions they occur: (1) immediately preceding the verb; (2) separated from the verb by one element (usually a negation, indefinite pronoun, or locatival phrase); (3) fronted to clause-initial position.[5]

20.8. The following examples of preverbs are merely illustrative and do not exhaust the possible different meanings of each: ***anda***=*kan ḫalīnaš teššummiuš tarlipit šūwamuš* 2-*TAM pētumini* 'We bring in clay vessels twice(?)-filled with *tarlipa*-liquid' KBo 17.1 i 26–27 (OS); *lukkatta=ma INA* ^{URU}*Iyaḫrišša* **EGIR-*pa*** *uwanun* 'But on the next day I came back to Iyaḫrišša' KBo 4.4 iii 40; EN=*YA*=*wa*=*kan edaza* ***arḫa*** *aru* 'May My Lord get away from there' KBo 4.14 iii 34; *nu=kan* NAM.RA.MEŠ ***katta*** *uēr n=at=mu* GÌR.ḪI.A-*aš k*[(*att*)]*an ḫāliyanda*[(*t*)] 'The colonists came down, and they prostrated themselves at my feet' KUB 14.16 iii 16 restored from KUB 14.15 iii 46–47 (AM); *n=an=kan INA* KUR ^{URU}*Nuḫašši* ***parā*** *neḫḫun* 'And I sent him out to the land of Nuhašši' KBo 4.4 i 40 (AM); *n=an* ***parā*** *ḫuittiyanun n=an* EN-*LAM iyanun* 'I picked him out and made him a lord' KBo 16.17 + KBo 2.5 iii 25; LUGAL-*i* ***parā*** 1=*ŠU paizzi* 'He goes forward to the king one time' KBo 17.43 i 11–12 (OS); URU-*ri=ma=aš=kan* ***šarā*** *lē uezzi* 'Let him not come up into the city! KUB 21.29 ii 12; **less common**: *nu* DUMU.MEŠ=*ŠU* ***andan*** *zikēt š=uš* ÍD-*a tarnaš* 'She put her sons inside, and released them to the river' KBo 22.2 obv. 3 (OS); *ḫalkiš=ma=*⟨*šm*⟩*aš apiya aniyanza kuit nu* **EGIR-*an*** *tiyatten* 'because grain has been sown for you there, get behind (the matter)' HKM 18 left edge 2–3 (MH/MS); *nu ŠA* DUMU-*RI* ***kattan*** *IṢBAT* 'He undertook (concerned himself with) (the matter) of a son' KBo 5.6 iv 15 (DŠ, frag. 28)*; nu=nnaš uezzi* [*apā*]*š=pat* ***peran*** *ḫuwāiškeuwan dāi* 'he himself proceeds to begin running in front of us' KBo 3.40:8–9; ***šer***=*pat aruwānzi* '(the king and queen) do reverence "upward"' KBo 17.74+ iii 19 (OH/MS); ^{URU}*Šamuḫann=a* URU-*LUM* DINGIR-*LIM alwanzešnaza* ***šer*** *šunništa* 'And he filled up Šamuḫa, the city of the goddess, with sorcery' Ḫatt. ii 78–79 (NH).

20.9. The force of each preverb can be best detected through a study of the various verbs with which it combines and the resulting meanings of each combination. Espe-

4. This opposition corresponds neatly to German "her" and "hin."

5. We find the use of the terms "initial position" and "first position" in the literature on Hittite word order confusing and prefer to use the unambiguous terms "clause-initial" (i.e., absolute initial position in the clause) and "following clause-initial conjunction and attached clitics."

cially helpful in this respect are verbs of perambulation or motion: *iya-* 'to go'; *pai-* 'to go'; *uwa-* 'to come'; *unna-* and *penna-* 'to drive here/there'; *ar-* 'to arrive at, reach'; *tiya-* 'to step, enter'; *piddai-* 'to run'; *ḫuwai-* 'to run, flee'; *nai-* 'to turn, go'; etc. It can be seen from the above list that, even without recourse to preverbs, the Hittite language possessed a stock of verbs of motion which distinguished direction of movement. The preverbs refined the directional aspect inherent in the verb. Understanding the use of the preverbs is complicated by the fact that there are changes in their use from OH to NH (for the pair *anda* and *andan* see Salisbury 1999). These changes mean that the usage in later copies of earlier texts may be inconsistent. Further study is needed.

20.10. Two preverbs can occur with a single verb: *appan anda pai-*, *šer arḫa da-*, *appa šarā da-*, *peran katta*, *ištarna arḫa*. In some cases the first of two adverb/preverbs indicates the starting point of the motion (e.g., *šer katta* 'down from above'), while in others it merely specifies the direction indicated by the second (*peran katta* 'down in front of'). Limited to the first position in such a chain of two preverbs is *awan*, which occurs in *awan arḫa*, *awan katta*, and *awan šarā*. Since *awan* does not occur without another preverb following it, some believe that *awan* has no special meaning of its own but merely intensifies the following preverb (HW², HED). Melchert (1996: 135) proposed that *awan arḫa pai-* meant 'to go past (the side of)'. For a wide range of these constructions with tentative translations for each, see CHD P 18–19 (table of contents of *pai-* article).

Postpositions

20.11. Instead of prepositions Hittite has postpositions, called "place words" by some. They serve the same function as the prepositions of the other Indo-European languages: they lend greater precision to the local or temporal distinctions provided by the case-forms of the noun. Most of the words that function as postpositions in Hittite are the same as those that function independently as local adverbs: *šer*, *peran*, *katta*(*n*), etc. There is broad agreement that when a local adverb co-occurs with a preceding noun or pronoun in the genitive (in OH), the adverb is a postposition (see examples below in §20.16, p. 298, and following; and see §16.35, p. 250). We follow the majority view that in many, if not all, cases where the dative-locative is followed by a local adverb expressing *location*, the latter is also a postposition (examples below); but there are dissenting opinions (see Starke 1977: 172–77). Whether the local adverbs expressing direction/place to which (*anda* 'into', *āppa*, *arḫa*, *katta* 'down', *parā*, *šarā*) function as postpositions in combination with a preceding noun is a much-debated question on which even the present authors do not fully agree. Examples of this sort cited below (e.g., all those in §20.15, p. 298) are thus interpreted differently by individual scholars. Fortunately, for understanding the meaning of the texts it usually does not matter whether we assume that the local adverb in such cases is a postposition or an independent adverb. One should, however, note the difference between ḪUR.SAG-*i šer* 'on top of the mountain' and *INA* ^{URU}*Puranda šer* 'up/above in Puranda' (not 'on top of P.'!).

20.12. Often the bare case-form without postposition expresses the spatial relationship which we would indicate in English with a prepositional phrase: É-*ri* (**peri*) or É-*ni* (*parni*) 'in the house', *parnaz* 'out of (or from) the house'. See chapter 16.

20.13. In answer to the questions 'in what place?' (*kuwapi* or *kuedani pedi*) or 'at what time?' (*kuwapi*) the Hittites used the dative-locative case of a place or time word, often in combination with a postposition.

20.14. The following postpositions govern the **dative-locative**, at least in Middle and New Hittite (see §16.86, p. 264). Some governed the genitive in Old Hittite (§§16.58–16.59, p. 255).

20.15. *anda* or *andan* 'in, into': É-*ri anda*(*n*) 'in the house'; KUR-*e anda uet* 'he came into the land'; *aššuwaš anda* 'among (his) possessions/goods'; *aššawaš antuḫšaš anda* 'among good people'; $^{ḪUR.SAG}$*Ḫapadduini anda* 'in Mt. Ḫ'.; KUR *kururī anda* 'into an enemy land'; *ulinī anda* 'into the clay'; *kiššari anda* 'in the hand'; KASKAL-*ši anda* 'on the road'; *kuedanikki anda ištamašš-* 'to hear from/via someone'; *tuekki=šši anda* 'on his body'; *ašanduli anda* 'in garrison'.

20.16. *āppan* '(spatially) behind, (temporally) after': ^{É}*tarnui āppan* 'behind the *tarnu*-building', URU-*ri* EGIR-*an* 'behind the city', *ANA* MUNUS-*TI unuwanti* EGIR-*an* 'behind the dressed-up woman', *taršanzipi* EGIR-*an* 'behind the platform(?)', *ḫantezzi ḫubrušḫi* EGIR-*an* 'behind/after the first *ḫ*.-vessel'; in Old Hittite governing the **genitive**: [*nu* ^{m}*Pi*]*tḫānaš attaš=maš āppan* 'after (the death of) Pitḫana, my father' KBo 3.22:10, 30 (Anitta text, OS); *kuiš ammel āppan* LUGAL-*uš kišar*[*i*] 'whoever becomes king after me' KBo 3.22:22, 49 (OS).

20.17. Juxtaposing the readings of an OH text with its NS copy, one can see how the NH scribe modernized the genitive construction *ammel* EGIR-*an* 'after me' of his archetype to the dative one *ammuk* EGIR-*an* (THeth 11 iii 49).

20.18. *ḫandaš* 'for the sake of': *ŠA* ŠEŠ-*YA nakkiyanni ḫandaš* 'for the sake of the dignity of my brother'; *ammel* DUGUD-*ni ḫandaš* 'for the sake of my dignity'; ŠA ŠEŠ-*YA ḫandaš* 'for the sake of my brother'; *ŠUM-ni ḫandaš* 'for the sake of name/reputation'; [*k*]*edan*[*i=pa*]*t memini ḫandaš* 'for the sake of this very matter'.

20.19. *ištarna* 'in the midst of, among': *šiunaš* (DINGIR.MEŠ-*aš*) *ištarna* 'among the gods, in the midst of the gods'; *ANA* KUR ^{URU}*Ḫatti ištarna* 'in the midst of Ḫattuša'; in OH governing the **genitive**: ŠEŠ.MEŠ-*n=a* NIN.MEŠ-*n=a ištarna* 'among the brothers and sisters' KBo 3.1+ ii 50; *ḫaššannan ištarna* 'among the (royal) family' (Hoffmann 1984: 54 iv 31/23′, genitive in *-an*).

20.20. *kāššaš* (OH only) 'instead of' (takes the genitive): *kinuna* 1 UDU LÚ-*naš kaššaš=šaš ḫuittianta* 'But now they shall substitute one sheep for the man' KBo 6.26 i 41 (Laws §167, NS).

20.21. *katta* or *kattan* ‘with, alongside of’, and (with verbs of motion) ‘to’. Although in MH and NH *katta*(*n*) governs the dative-locative, in OH it governs the **genitive** — ***katta***: *ka*[*tti=mi*] SIG$_5$-*in tugg=a katta* SIG$_5$-*i*[*n*] *ēš*[*t*]*u* ‘It is well with me; may it be well with you too’ ABoT 65 obv. 3–4 (MH/MS); *annaš=maš katta* ‘with my mother, where my mother is’; *takku* LÚ-*iš* GUD-*aš katta* [*wašt*]*ai* ‘If a man has sexual relations (lit., ‘sins’) with a cow’ KBo 6.26 iii 20 (Laws §187, OH/NS); UDU-*aš katta* ‘with a sheep’ KUB 29.34 iv 5 (Laws §188, OH/NS); *apēl=pat annaš=šaš katta* ‘with her mother’, . . . DUMU.MUNUS-*aš katta* ‘with the daughter’ . . . DUMU.NITA-*aš katta* ‘with a son’ KBo 6.26 iii 26–28 (Laws §189, OH/NS); GÉME-*aš našma* MUNUSKAR.KID-*aš katta* ‘with either a slave girl or a prostitute’ KBo 6.26 iii 47 (Laws §194, OH/NS);[6] [(UGULA LÚ.MEŠMUḪALDIM)] *ḫaššāš katta kēt arta* ‘the overseer of the cooks stands on this side, next to the brazier’ KBo 17.15 iv 14–15 (OS); *ammel katta* ‘with (or: to) me’ KUB 36.44 iv 4; *ammel katta arnut* ‘to me’, *apēl katta* ‘to him’, *annaš=maš katta arnut* ‘bury me with my mother’. — ***kattan****: nu=mu kā* ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ *kuiški kattan n=an=da uppaḫḫi* ‘(There is) some chariotry here with me. I will dispatch it to you’ HKM 30:8–10 (MH/MS); *ammuk kattan* ‘with me’ KUB 23.77 rev. 68. *nu* ^{d}*Telipinu*[*š* ^{d}UTU-*un*] *arunašš=a* DUMU.MUNUS-*SU arunaz* EGIR-[*pa uwatet*] *n=uš* ^{d}IM-*aš kattan pe*[*ḫutet*] ‘Telipinu brought the Sungod and the daughter of the Sea(god) back from the sea and conducted them to the Stormgod (^{d}IM-*aš kattan*)’ KUB 12.60 i 13–15 (myth, OH/NS).

20.22. *kattan* ‘under, below’, mostly with the **dative-locative**: GIŠBANŠUR-*i kattan* ‘under the table’; *anda=ma=kan* UDU-*un kuwāpi kuewēn nu linkiya kattan kiššan daiwen* ‘in addition when we had killed a sheep (as part of the treaty-making ceremony), we placed the following obligations (lit., ‘placed as follows’) under oath’ KBo 16.47:15–16 (treaty); GIŠ*ḫatalkišni kattan tuli*[*yaš pedi*] ‘under the hawthorn tree, in the place of assembly’; **in OH with the genitive**: *nepišaš ka*[(*ttan ulilišk*)*eddumat*)] ‘under heaven you (pl., addressing trees) were growing’ KUB 29.3 i 11 (OS), restored by KUB 29.1 i 28 (OH/NS); see also Neu 1968b sub *uliliya-*).

20.23. *peran*[7] ‘before’, in NH with the **dative-locative**: *karti=šmi peran* ‘before their hearts (i.e., to themselves)’, ^{d}UTU-*i peran* ‘before the Sungod’, *šiuni=mi peran* ‘before my god’, GIŠBANŠUR-*i peran* ‘in front of the table’; in Old Hittite with the **genitive** or **dative-locative**: LUGAL-*waš pēran* or LUGAL-*i peran* ‘before the king’; also in New Hittite in the sense of ‘because of’: *kašti peran akkiš* ‘He died from (i.e., because of) hunger’, *inani peran* ‘on account of illness’, *pittuliyai peran* ‘because of fear’.

20.24. *šarā* ‘up onto’ (answering the question ‘to what place?’), mostly with the **dative-locative**: *šuḫḫi šarā* ‘up onto the roof’; GIŠDAG-*ti šarā* ‘up onto the dais’,

6. NH copies of the laws substituted dative-locative (ANŠE.KUR.RA-*i*) or accusative (*arnuwalan*) for these genitives (see Laws §200 in KBo 6.26 iv 23).

7. This word is written either *pé-e-ra-an* or *pé*/*pí-ra-an*. Many Hittitologists, considering the transliteration *pí* to be “unmarked,” represent the word even in broad transcription as *piran*. But only once (in an Old Script tablet) is there a writing *pí-i-ra-an*, and this passage is suspect.

^{NA_4}*ḫuwašiya šarā* ‘up to the stela’, ^{URU}*Taḫurpi šarā* ‘up to the city of Tahurpa’, ^{É}*ḫilamni šarā* ‘up to the portico (or: gate structure)’; sometimes with **allative**: DINGIR-*LUM=kan* KÁ.GAL-*ša šarā ari* ‘the (statue of the) god comes up to the main gate’, *šuḫḫa šarā paizzi* ‘he goes up onto the roof’.

20.25. *šer* ‘upon, over, above, on behalf of, concerning’, usually with the **dative-locative**: *šuḫḫi šer* ‘on top of the roof’; ḪUR.SAG-*i šer* ‘on top of the mountain’; NUMUN-*ni šer* NUMUN-*an* ‘seed upon seed’; ÌR-*i šer* ‘on the slave’s behalf’; *ANA* LÚ.MEŠ ^{KUR}*Amurra šer* ‘because of the people of Amurru’; *kuedani šer* ‘for the sake of what?’; LUGAL-*waš* ZI-*ni šer* ‘for the sake of the king’s life/soul’; *memiyani šer* ‘concerning the matter’. With the genitive, as in OH: *kuel šer* ‘on behalf of whom’.

20.26. Just as some postpositions take the genitive of nouns and independent pronouns in OH, so also they can occur with the enclitic possessive pronouns (see Houwink ten Cate and Josephson 1967; Otten and Souček 1969: 70–73; Otten 1973: 44–45; Neu 1983: 96): EGIR-*an=šamet* ‘after/behind them’; *šēr=šet* ‘on his behalf’; *peran=tet* ‘before you’. When this kind of *peran* takes enclitic pronouns beginning with *m* or *š*, the final *n* assimilates: *peraššet* ‘before him/her’; *perammet* ‘before me’. In the preceding examples the place words look like nominative-accusative neuter substantives, but see §6.6 (p. 140). In other examples a different group of postpositions look like dative-locative forms: *ištarni=šummi* ‘in our midst’ (= *anzaš ištarna*), *katti=tti* ‘together with you’ (= *tuk katta*), *katti=šummi* ‘with us’ (= *anzaš katta*). See §6.8 (p. 141). The use of the genitive or an enclitic possessive pronoun with *peran*, *šer*, etc., does not alter the fact that they are postpositions (see Salisbury 1999: 61–62 against Starke 1977: 131). Whether any of them are derived *historically* from nouns is a separate question. See in addition to the above authors Melchert 1984b: 122–26.

20.27. In answer to the question ‘from what place?’ the Hittites used the ablative, often in combination with one of the above-mentioned adverbs: URU-*az katta* ‘down from the city’ (ancient Anatolian cities were built on hills or mounds); A.AB.BA-*az šarā* ‘up from the sea’; ^{URU}*Gašipuraz šarā* ‘up from Gašipura’; *ḫantešnaz šarā* ‘up from the hole (in the ground)’. But see *tuzziyaz āppa* ‘behind the army’ (not ‘from behind the army’!). Once again the issue of whether the adverbs here are postpositions is debated, mostly without consequence for the meaning.

20.28. Also governing the dative-locative is *tapušza* (*tapuša*) ‘alongside of’: *ḫaššī* (or GUNNI-*i*) *tapušza* ‘alongside the brazier’; *pattešni tapušza* ‘beside the hole’; *tabarwašui tapušza* ‘beside the *t.*-bread’; ^{GIŠ}DAG-*ti tapušza* ‘beside the dais’; *luttiya tapušza* ‘by the window’; *ḫuwašiya tapušza* ‘beside the stela’. The form *tapušza* is an ablative of direction (see §16.92, p. 265) from the *š*-stem noun *tapuš-* ‘side’: A.AB.BA *tapuša* ‘to the (other?) side of the sea; overseas’.

20.29. Perhaps governing the **ablative** is *parā* ‘forth from, out of’: ^{GIŠ}ZA.LAM.GAR-*az parā* ‘out of the tent’; yet one also finds KÁ-*aš parā* ‘out of the gate’, in which the

noun in *-aš* is not an ablative. See for this use of dative-locative to indicate ‘place from which’ §16.69 (p. 259).

20.30. *parranda* and *pariya*(*n*) both mean ‘over, across, beyond; out in’, yet *parranda* governs the dative-locative, while *pariya*(*n*) governs the accusative: *aruni parranda* or *arunan pariyan* ‘across the sea’ or ‘out in(to) the sea’.

20.31. The postposition *iwar* ‘in the manner of; as’ governs the genitive (see §§16.59–16.60, pp. 255–256, and §19.9, p. 291).

20.32. An older view claimed that the postpositives *mān* and *maḫḫan* ‘like, as’ governed the genitive case (Goetze and Pedersen 1934), but it has since been shown that they can govern any case, namely, the case of the noun or pronoun to which they make a comparison (Güterbock 1943: 154). Postpositional comparative *mān* (see CHD L–N *mān* 1 with literature) is attested from Old Hittite onwards (Neu 1974: 103–4 with n. 227; contra Kammenhuber 1969a: 280–81).

Chapter 21
VERB VOICE

21.1. Functionally, we may distinguish three verbal voices: active, passive, and middle.[1] In the active voice the subject is the initiator of the action (the "agent") expressed by the verb with no further implication. In the passive the subject is the recipient of the verbal action (the "patient"). In the middle voice the subject both initiates and is somehow affected by the verbal action.[2]

21.2. In Hittite, active verb forms express the active voice, while medio-passive forms can express either active, middle, or passive voice. Some individual verbs show only one of these functions in their medio-passive forms, but others more than one according to context (see Neu 1968a on the functions of the medio-passive system). The passive is most often expressed not by a finite (medio-passive) verb form but by a construction with the verb 'to be' plus the participle (see §§21.10–21.12, pp. 304–305).

Active Voice

21.3. Active verbs may be divided into **transitive** and **intransitive**. Transitive verbs regularly take an accusative object, while intransitive do not. Sample transitive active verbs are *ēpp-* 'to seize', *dā-* 'to take', *dai-* 'to put', *pai-* 'to give', *walḫ-* 'to strike, hit', and *kuer-* 'to cut'. These and other transitive verbs can occur without a direct object in suitable contexts: e.g., ('My father sent infantry and chariotry, and they attacked Egyptian Amqa') *namma=ya uiyat nu namma wal(aḫ)ḫer* 'He sent again, and they struck again' KUB 14.8 i 20 (NH). Sample intransitive active verbs are: *ēš-* 'to be', *āš-* 'to be left over, remain', *šeš-* 'to sleep', *up-* 'to rise (of the sun)', *išpart-* 'to escape, survive', and *ḫark-* 'to perish'. These and a few others are always intransitive, that is, they never take a direct object (except for 'cognate objects', *aššu šaštan šeš-* 'to sleep well'). A number of active verbs can either take a direct object or not: *šakuwai(a)-* 'to look' or 'to see (someone)', *tarḫ-* 'to prevail' or 'to defeat (someone)', *naḫ(ḫ)-* 'to be afraid' or 'to fear (someone)', *penna-* 'to drive'. The difference in usage is sometimes marked by the addition of *-za* (see §28.25, p. 361). With *naḫ(ḫ)-* 'to be afraid' there is also a third option: the impersonal use (see §16.32, p. 250)

1. We follow here, for descriptive purposes, the traditional conception of "voice" or "diathesis" prevalent in Indo-European studies, for which see Neu 1968a: 1–3 and Meier-Brügger 2000: 243, 2003: 259. We cannot enter into the controversy over the proper cross-linguistic definition of the categories "middle" and "passive." See among others on this issue Kemmer 1993, Fox and Hopper 1994, and Rubio 2007: §3.13.3.

2. See the characterization of the Greek middle by Goodwin (1965: 267): "in the middle voice the subject is represented as acting upon himself, or in some manner which concerns himself."

21.4. Hittite **medio-passive** *forms* that show active (instead of middle) *function* may be transitive or intransitive. Examples with **transitive** meaning (so-called "deponents"): *paḫš-* 'to guard', *šarra-* (with *-kan*) 'to transgress',[3] *parš-*, *paršiya-* 'to break (bread)'. Most of these are also attested with active forms in the same meaning. The latter tend to spread at the expense of the former from OH to NH. Often the medio-passive forms of such verbs are preferred in OH and MH, and the active forms in NH (see §14.11, p. 233).

21.5. Examples with **intransitive** meaning: *ar-* 'to be standing', *aššiya-* 'to be dear, loved', *ḫaliya-* 'to prostrate oneself', *ēš-* 'to take one's seat, sit down', *iya-* 'to go', *igāi-* 'to become cold', *išduwa-* 'to become known', *ki-* 'to be situated, lie', *kiš-* 'to occur, happen, become', *pangariya-* 'to be widespread, general', *dukk-* 'to be seen, be observed, regarded, important', etc. Some of these are semantically "transformative" or "change of state" (*ēš-*, *kiš-*, *ḫaliya-*, *igāi-*, *išduwa-*) and others stative (*ar-*, *ki-*, *aššiya-*, *dukk-*, *pangariya-*). As a rule, verbs of this class are *not* attested in both active and middle forms with no apparent difference in meaning, but there are some exceptions such as *ḫaliya-* 'to prostrate oneself', *ḫuya-* 'to flee, run', and *naḫšariya-* 'to be afraid'.

Middle Voice

21.6. Some medio-passive forms of transitive active verbs, often accompanied by *-z(a)*, are **reflexives**, expressing an action performed by the subject on the subject: *nai-* (act.) 'to turn something', (m.-p.) 'to turn oneself'; *unuwāi-* (act.) 'to decorate', (m.-p.) 'to decorate oneself'; see also *ašeške-* (m.-p.) 'to seat oneself'; *arra-* (m.-p.) 'to wash oneself'; *munnāi-* (m.-p.) 'to hide/conceal oneself'; ÌR-(*n*)*aḫḫ-* 'to subject oneself'.

21.7. Some medio-passives, when plural, can be understood as **reciprocals**, with the action performed by the subjects on each other: *zaḫḫiya-* (m.-p.) 'to fight each other'; *ēpp-/app-* (m.-p.) 'to take each other by the hand'; *šarra-* (m.-p.) 'to part from each other'; *ḫanna-* (m.-p., and *-za*) 'to contend with each other (in court)'.

Passive Voice

21.8. Some medio-passive verbs function as **passives** to corresponding actives: *armizziya-* (act.) 'to bridge something', (m.-p.) 'to be bridged (of a river)'; *ḫalzai-* (act.) 'to call for, name', (m.-p.) 'to be called'; *ḫamenk-* (act.) 'to bind', (m.-p.) 'to be bound'; and *ḫandāi-* (act.) 'to match, correlate (as transitives)', (m.-p.) 'to be matched, correlated'.[4] Other verbs in the medio-passive form which belong to this category and may

3. Note, however, that even in NH the verb *šarra-* in its meaning 'to separate, divide' has a passive meaning 'to be separated, divided' in the medio-passive.

4. The medio-passive use is largely confined to oracle texts. The usual translation is 'be determined', but the idea behind this use is that an oracular event/observation is matched to a verdict ("favorable"/"unfavorable"). The other active meaning 'to prepare', of course, has no correlation to the meaning of the medio-passive forms.

have a passive sense are: *aš(ša)nu-* 'to be brought into order'; *arai-* 'to be stopped', *ariya-* 'to be investigated by oracle', *ḫanna-* 'to be judged', *ištamaš-* 'to be heard', *au(š)-* 'to be seen'; *immiya-* 'to be mixed', *kariya-* 'to be covered', *lā-* 'to be loosed', *laḫuwa-* 'to be poured (liquids)', and *lag-* 'to be knocked down, knocked crooked', *tarupp-* 'to be assembled', *uwa-* (< *auš-*) 'to be seen', ÌR-*naḫḫ-* 'to be subjugated'. It is not claimed that every medio-passive form of the above-listed verbs must be interpreted as passive, only that at least one example of each verb is.

21.9. Some agentless passives are effectively equivalent to intransitives: *irḫāi-* (act.) 'to bound or limit', (m.-p.) 'to come to an end'; *zinne-* (act.) 'to put an end to', (m.-p.) 'to come to an end', etc.

21.10. The medio-passive form of the verb is not the preferred choice for expressing the passive of verbs that exist in the active. Usually a construction employing the (passive) participle in *-ant-* of a transitive verb plus a finite form of the verb 'to be' is employed. On predicative participles see Houwink ten Cate 1973a; Laroche 1975; Boley 1984; Wagner 1985; and also §25.43 (p. 339).

21.11. The following are examples of passive participles of transitive verbs used as predicates with the verb 'to be' expressed: *nu utnē maniyaḫḫešker nu* URU.DIDLI.ḪI.A GAL.GAL-*TIM tittiyanteš ešer* 'They governed the land, and the large cities were assigned (to them)' KBo 3.1+ i 10–11 (Telipinu proclamation, OH/NS); *n=apa* ŠEŠ.MEŠ=*ŠU* DUMU.MEŠ=*ŠU* LÚ.MEŠ*gaenaš=šiš* LÚ.MEŠ *ḫaššannaš=šaš U* ÉRIN.MEŠ=*ŠU taruppanteš ašandu* 'Let (the future king's) brothers, sons, in-laws, the men of his clan and his troops be united' KBo 3.1+ ii 40–42 (OH/NS); *nu=za PANI* LÚ.KÚR *mekki paḫḫaššanuanza ēš* 'Be very much on your guard (lit., 'be protected') before the enemy!' HKM 1:11–13 (MH/MS); URU.DIDLI.ḪI.A=*ma* [(*kuiēš š*)]*A* KUR URU*Ḫatti ištappanteš ešer* 'What cities of the Land of Ḫatti were blockaded' Ḫatt. ii 41–42; (The birds which you sent to me,) *n=at arḫa ḫarranteš ešer* 'they were spoiled, (so I didn't eat them)' AT 125:12 (NH); (Let those who prepare the daily bread be clean;) *war*[*p*]*antiš=at kartanteš ašandu išḫēniuš=šmaš=kan* UMB[IN.MEŠ=*y*]*a dān ēšdu* 'let them be washed and clean, and let the body hair and fingernails be removed from them' KUB 13.4 i 15–16 (pre-NH/NS). In most cases the construction with the participle and 'be' represents a "state" passive: *n=at arḫa ḫarranteš ešer* 'they (scil., some killed birds) were spoiled (= rotten)' AT 125:12 (NH), but in some of the examples cited it is impossible to tell whether they refer to a state or to an event/action (see §22.25, p. 312, for more on this problem).[5]

21.12. With the verb 'to be' unexpressed: *šiyēl* ÌR.MEŠ=*ŠU* [*IŠTU* 1 AM]A *ḫaššanteš* 'the servants of 'Number One' (i.e., the king) (are) born [of one mo]ther' KUB 1.16 ii 47 (OH/NS); *takku kuššan piyān* 'if the wage has been paid' KBo 6.2 + KBo 19.1 ii 28 (OS); *takku* DUMU.MUNUS LÚ-*ni taranza* 'if a girl has been (or: is) promised to a man'

5. The distinction here is the same as German *die Tür ist geöffnet* 'the door is opened' (= open) versus *die Tür wird geöffnet* 'the door is (being) opened'.

KBo 6.3 ii 5 (OH/NS); *šeknu=šmet anda nēan* 'their *š.*-garments are turned inside-out' KBo 3.34 i 21 (OH/NS); [^{GIŠ}BAN]ŠUR=*ka*[*n* GA]D-*it kariyan* 'the table (was) covered with the linen cloth' KUB 24.8 i 22 (NS); [(*t*)]*uk=wa* IGI-*anda* ^{GIŠ}ERIN-*pí karū* [(*duw*)]*arnan* TU_7.ḪI.A=*ya=tta* I[GI-*anda*] *karū zanuwan* 'Before you the cedar (is) already broken, before you meals (are) already cooked' KUB 33.102 ii 10–12 (Ullik. I); KUR ^{URU}*Ḫa*[*tti IŠ*]*TU* NUMUN LUGAL-*UTTI šuwan* 'the land of Ḫatti (is) filled with the seed of kingship' KUB 26.1 i 10–11 (edict of Tudḫ. IV); *dāššu išḫišša tuk=pat piyan* 'a weighty lordship(?) (is) given to you' KUB 31.127+ i 19 (hymn to Šamaš); *nu=za karū maḫḫan annaza* ŠÀ-*za ḫaššanza ešun* 'when long ago I was born from my mother's womb' KUB 31.127 + ABoT 44+ iv 24 (OH/NS). For the use of *-za* in the last example, see §28.34 (p. 363). The verb 'to be' is often unexpressed when the time referred to is the present or the statement is a general, timeless one (§22.3, p. 306).

21.13. Surrogates for passives. Some transitive verbs form no passive at all but employ forms of other verbs of related meaning (so-called suppletives). Thus forms of *akk-* 'to die' are used to express the passive of *kuen-* 'to kill'. Similarly forms of *ki-* 'to be situated, lie, be placed' are used instead of passive forms of *dai-* 'to put, place'; *šer tiya-* appears as a passive for *šer dai-* 'to place upon'; and *-za kiš-* 'to become' as a passive for *iya-* 'to make'.

21.14. In passive constructions it is customary to leave the agent unspecified. When, however, an agent is specified, the noun or pronoun denoting the agent can appear in either ablative (see §16.99, p. 267) or instrumental (see §16.107, p. 269) cases, never the dative-locative (see §16.73, p. 261).

Chapter 22
VERB TENSE

22.1. Not only does the Hittite language lack the subjunctive and optative moods of other old Indo-European languages but like the Germanic languages it has only two "synthetic" (non-phrasal) tenses: (1) the present and (2) the preterite. On the "analytic" construction with participle and the verbs 'to have' and 'to be' compare §22.19 (p. 310) and following.

Present

22.2. As its name indicates, the present tense sometimes indicates an action simultaneous with the time of speech. These examples translate best as English present "progressives" ('to be . . . -ing'): *antuḫšātar=ma=wa=nnaš arantallin*[(*zi*)] 'the people are murmuring against us' KUB 6.41 i 25 (Murš. II);[1] *nu=za* LUGAL-*uš=a utne=met* É-*er=mitt=a paḫḫašmi* '(the gods have entrusted to me the land and my house,) and I, the king, am (now) protecting my land and my house' KUB 29.1 i 18–19 (rit., OH/NS); EGIR-*pa!=ma tezzi nu kuit iššanzi apāš=šši* EGIR-*pa tezzi* ^{GIŠ}*ḫūlali ḫarzi* ^{GIŠ}*ḫūšuš šuwaduš ḫarkanzi* 'But he replies (to the eagle): 'And what are they doing?' (For the use of *nu* here see §29.48, p. 403, and examples in §27.8, p. 351, and §27.10, p. 352.) (The eagle) replies: 'She is holding a distaff, (and) they are holding full spindles' ' KUB 29.1 ii 5–7; *kuedani=wa=za menaḫḫanda išḫamiškeši* 'To whom (lit., 'facing whom') are you singing?' KUB 36.12 ii 9 (Ullik. II). This "immediate present" can also be made more explicit by the addition of the adverbs *kāša*(*tta*) and *kāšma* (see §24.29, p. 324).

22.3. Certain other syntactic choices correlate with the bipartite present–preterite tense system of Hittite: The verb *ēš-* 'to be' is often unexpressed when it would be in the present tense but never in the past tense. In OH the choice of *ta* versus *šu* as a sentence connective correponds to present (including the "analytic perfect" [§§22.19–22.23, pp. 310–311] which uses a present tense auxiliary verb) or preterite tense verbs (§29.3, p. 390).

22.4. Hittite uses the present tense to express a present state with the adverbs *karū* 'already' and *nawi* 'not yet'. English employs the present perfect: *n=aš karū paizzi* 'he has already gone'; and *n=aš nawi paizzi* 'he has not yet gone'. For these constraining adverbs with the preterite see below, §22.16 (p. 309).

---

1. The present pl. 3 *arantallinzi* is an unreal hybrid form resulting from imperfect Hittitization of a Luwian **arantallinti*. There is no genuine Hittite third plural ending *-inzi*.

22.5. Statements of general validity (sometimes called "**gnomic**") are expressed in Hittite by the present tense (see also §24.15, p. 321): IGI-*zian* GIM-*an* ^{GIŠ}*ḫurkin* EGIR-*ziš anda* ^{ŪL} *wemiyazi* 'As the rear (wheel) does not overtake the front wheel' KBo 11.14 ii 22–23 (OH/NS); MUŠEN-*iš=za=kan* ^{GIŠ}*taptappan* EGIR-*pa ēpzi n=an* ^{GIŠ}*taptappaš ḫu*[*išnuzi*] 'A bird takes refuge in the nest(?), and the nest(?) saves it' KUB 14.8 rev. 22 (PP 2, NH); *ANA* DUMU.NAM.LÚ.U$_{19}$.LU*=pat=kan anda memian kišan memiškanzi ḫarnāuwaš=wa* MUNUS-*nī* DINGIR-*LUM kāri tiya*[*zi*] 'Among mortals they have a saying (lit., 'they speak as follows'): 'A god yields to the wish of a woman of the birthing stool' ' KUB 21.27 ii 15–16; *lalaš=wa armizzi* 'the tongue is a bridge' KBo 11.72 iii 5 (MH?/NS; CHD L–N 22); and other proverbs (for a collection of which see Beckman 1986 and CoS 1:215 exx. 5 and 9).

22.6. Hittite also uses the formal present tense to indicate past time, especially in narrative. This is what is usually called a "**historical present.**" Since all identified examples are found in New Hittite texts, it is possible that this construction was not used in Old Hittite.[2] In the following examples present tense forms translatable as past are underlined: *maḫḫan=ma=aš* ^{URU}*Tūwanuwa ari nu* ^{ŠAPAL} ^{URU}*Tuwanuwa dāi nu=za* ^{URU}*Tūwanuwan zaḫḫiyauwanzi ēpzi* 'When he reached Tuwanuwa, he positioned (himself) below Tuwanuwa[3] and began to fight against Tuwanuwa' KUB 19.18 iv 16–18 (DŠ frag. 15); [*luk*]*katti=ma=kan* $^{ABU=YA}$ ^{URU}*Tiwanzanaza katta* KUR-*e=kan anda pennai* EGIR-*ann=an* $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$*QARTAPPI=ŠU* 6 *ṢIMDUM* ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ *ḫarzi nu* $^{ABU=YA}$ *maḫḫan nannai nu=kan edani pangawi* LÚ.KÚR 1-*anki=pat anda ḫandaizzi n=an=za=an* $^{ABU=YA}$ *zaḫḫiyauwanzi=pat ēpzi* 'The following day my father drove down from Tiwanzana into the land, (while) in the rear his charioteers and six teams of horses were supporting him. And as my father was driving, he encountered that whole enemy at once, and my father engaged him in battle' KBo14.3 iv 26–31 (DŠ frag. 15); *ANA* ^{m}[*Piḫu*]*niya=ma* GIM-*an nakkešta* [*n=aš tamedani*] *namma* [^{ŪL}] *kuedanikki paizzi n=aš*[*=mu kattan uet*] *n=*[*aš=mu ue*]*t* GÌR.MEŠ-*aš* GAM-*an ḫaliyat*[*tat*] 'When it became difficult for [Piḫu]niya, he did[n't] go (lit., 'doesn't go') to anyone [else], but [he came to me,] and he [proceed]ed to prostrate himself at [my] feet' KUB 19.30 i 16–18; *nu* ^{m}*Aitaqqamaš kuiš* LUGAL ^{URU}*Kinza ēšta nu=šši* ^{m}*NÍQ-MA*-^{d}U-*aš* [*kuiš*] [*ḫant*]*ezziš* DUMU-*laš ēšta nu maḫḫan aušta* [*anda*]*=kan kuit ḫatkešnuwanteš nu=šmaš ḫalkiuš namma* [*tepaw*]*ešzi nu=za* ^{m}*NÍQ-MA*-^{d}U-*aš* ^{m}*Aitaqqaman* $^{ABU=ŠU}$ *kuenta* 'When Niqmadda, the eldest son of Aitaqqama, King of Kadesh, saw that they (were) blockaded, and that furthermore the crops (i.e., food supplies in siege) were in short supply (sg. verb!), Niqmadda killed Aitaqqama, his father' KBo 4.4 ii 3–6 (AM 122–23). Note that in the last example the 'historical present' *tepawešzi* (and the implied verb *ašanzi*; see §16.6, p. 243) are in a *kuit* 'that' clause subordinate to *aušta*,

2. The pattern of use of the present tense in past narratives in Old Hittite seems to be regulated differently. For a preliminary description see Melchert 1998: 416–17 (but the examples he cites for the "historical present" in Old Hittite are all dubious).

3. That is, he besieged the city. See *kattan dai-* with the same meaning. Perhaps ^{ŠAPAL} GN *dai-* is merely another way of writing GN *kattan dai-*.

that is, they concern what the young man ‘saw’ (*aušta*) and therefore were matters present to him at the time he ‘saw’.

22.7. Historical presents are by far most common when the subject is grammatically third person. In historical narratives which are expressed in first person (e.g., Muršili’s annals or Ḫattušili III’s Apology), the first-person forms are all preterites, and the only historical presents are in third person, referring to people other than the narrator. Of course, first-person present forms which actually express future actions occur frequently **in direct discourse** recorded in these narratives, but that is an entirely different matter: *nu* ^{m}*Kantuzilin* [*kiššan watarnaḫḫun* LÚ.MEŠ] ^{URU}*Nuḫašši=wa kuit kururiyaḫḫer* [*nu=war=aš arḫa ḫarnik nu=wa=šmaš m*]*ān* ÉRIN.MEŠ ^{URU}*Mizrī* [*warreš*]*ša*[*nzi nu=wa=mu ḫ*]*a*[*trai nu=wa*] *ammuk* [*pāimi*] *nu=war=an zaḫḫiyami* ‘And I i[nstructed Kantuzzili as follows:] ‘Because the men of Nuhašši have made war, [destroy them.] If Egyptian troops come to their aid, [write to me,] and I [will go] and fight them’ KUB 14.17 ii 22–26 (AM 86).

22.8. The present tense can also express an English **future** (‘shall’, ‘will’): *URRAM ŠERAM kuiš ammuk* EGIR-*anda* LUGAL-*uš kišari* ‘whoever in the future shall become king after me’ KBo 3.1 ii 40 (Tel. pr., OH/NS); *ANA* ^{LÚ}*MUTI-KA=wa ammuk peran ḫūiyami nu=wa=za=kan* ^{URU}KÙ.BABBAR-*aš ḫūmanza IŠTU ŠA* ^{LÚ}*MUTI=KA neyari* ‘I will march before your husband, and all Ḫatti land will turn to the side of your husband’ Ḫatt. iv 9–11.

22.9. Commonly the temporal ambiguity of a present-tense form is resolved by the use of a temporal adverb (§19.6, p. 290) such as *URRAM ŠERAM*, *zilatiya*, or *appašiwatti* or by the employment of the phrasal/serial construction with *uwa-* or *pai-*, which when in the present-future tense always refers to the future (see §§24.31–24.42, pp. 324–329).

22.10. Speakers could constrain a “present progressive” or immediate future meaning of the present tense with the introductory words *kāša* or *kāšma* (see §24.29, p. 324).

22.11. In ‘if’ clauses (introduced by either *takku* or *mān*) the present-tense form is always hypothetical or future in meaning (see §§30.49ff., pp. 420ff.): *takku=wa=šša*n *kī ḫazzizi ta=wa* DINGIR-*LUM takku=wa=šša*n *natta=ma ḫa*[*zzizi*] *ta=wa antuwaḫḫeš* ‘If he achieves this, he is a deity; but if he doesn’t achieve it, he is a mortal’ KBo 3.60 ii 14–17; *takku* DUMU.LUGAL *ḫantezziš* NU.GÁL *nu kuiš tān pēdaš* DUMU-*RU nu* LUGAL-*uš apāš kišaru* ‘If there shall not be a first-rank prince, then let a prince of second rank become king’ KBo 3.1 ii 36–38; *takku* DUMU.LUGAL*=ma waštai nu* SAG.DU-*az=pat šarnikdu* ‘If a prince “sins” (i.e., attempts homicide), let him pay only with his own person (not with those of his extended family)’ KBo 3.1 ii 55–56. For ‘if’ clauses with the preterite see §§30.53ff. (pp. 422ff.).

22.12. Like the English future tense, the Hittite present tense used for future time often expresses affirmation. In the first person it indicates willingness to comply with a request or simple expression of intention to act: *UMMA ABI ABI=YA=MA* [*kuiš=wa p*]*aizzi*

UMMA ABU=YA=MA ammuk=wa pāimi [*nu=kan A*]*BI ABI=YA ABU=YA parā naišta* 'My grandfather said, "[Who] will go?" and my father replied: "I will go." [Whereupon] my grandfather sent my father out' KBo 14.3 iii 9–11 (DŠ frag. 14); *ŠA* ^{d}*IŠTAR parā ḫandandatar memaḫḫi n=at* DUMU.NAM.LÚ.U$_{19}$.LU-*aš ištamašdu* 'I shall declare (lit., 'speak') the divine providence of (the goddess) *IŠTAR*, and let (all) humanity hear it!' Ḫatt. i 5–6; *kuitman=ma=za* DUMU-*aš ešun nu=za* KUR.KUR LÚ.KÚR *kue tarḫiškenun n=at ṬUPPU ḫantī* DÙ-*mi n=at PANI* DINGIR-*LIM teḫḫi* 'I shall make a separate tablet (in which to enumerate) those enemy lands which I conquered while I was (only) a prince, and I shall deposit it before the goddess' Ḫatt. i 73–74; ^{d}*IŠTAR=ma=mu* GAŠAN=*YA* Ù-*a*[(*t*)] *nu=mu* Ù-*it kī memišta* DINGIR-*LIM-ni=wa=tta ammuk tarnaḫḫi nu=wa lē naḫti* '*IŠTAR*, my lady, appeared to me in a dream and in the dream said to me: "I will turn you over to a (friendly protective) deity, so don't be afraid!"' (or perhaps rhetorical question: 'Would I turn you over to a (hostile) deity? Don't be afraid!') Ḫatt. i 36–38.

22.13. In the second person the effect can approximate a command (HE 136 §258, 2):[4] NINDA-*an azzašteni wātarr=a ekutteni* 'You shall (i.e., must) eat (only) bread and drink (only) water' KUB 1.16 iii 48 (OH/NS).

Preterite

22.14. The preterite form, when not marked by constraining adverbs, is used freely to refer to any past event. According to context, the preterite may refer to a simple past action ("perfective"), an ongoing action ("imperfective"; see §24.3, p. 317), an action prior to another action in the past ("pluperfect"), or an action completed in the past (usually the recent past) whose effects carry over into the present (so-called present relevance). English may render these meanings respectively with its simple past ('he went'), past progressive ('he was going'), past perfect ('he had gone'), and present perfect ('he has gone').

22.15. Speakers marked a present perfect meaning of the preterite form with the introductory words *kāša* or *kāšma*. This adverb has a constraining function (see §24.28, p. 324) just as does the use of the phrasal/serial construction with *uwa-*/*pai-*, which marks the future (§§24.38ff., pp. 327ff.).

22.16. Hittite uses the preterite with the adverbs *karū* and *nāwi* (§26.11, p. 343, and following) to express a state anterior to another reference point in the past. English usage requires a past perfect translation for such cases: *n=aš karū pait* 'he had already gone'. *n=aš nāwi pait* 'he had not yet gone'.

22.17. For the use of the preterite in conditional clauses with *mān* 'if' see §30.53–30.55 (pp. 422–423).

4. German *Heischefutur.*

22.18. Temporal *mān* ('when') with the preterite very rarely corresponds to the English future perfect (see Sommer 1932: 163, cited by HE §258a1 as similar to *futurum exactum* of Latin). The example cited by Sommer is *mān=ma=šiy=at=kan* ˀ*ušāiḫa n=aš* EGIR-*pa* *INA* KUR=*KA* *ue*[*z*]*zi*' when I (shall) have denied it (i.e., the land he attacks) to him, he will come back into your land' KUB 14.3 iii 60–61 (NH). Standard current English omits the 'shall' in this construction: 'when I have defended it from him'. The present-future verb *uezzi* in the apodosis shows that a future perfect is intended by the (Luwian) preterite form ˀ*ušāiḫa.*

The Analytic Perfect Construction

Function

22.19. Hittite expresses the completion of an action prior to the time of speech (present perfect 'has gone') or prior to another action in the past (pluperfect 'had gone') (§22.14, p. 309) either with the simple preterite form, with the simple preterite plus the adverb *kāša/kāšma* (see §22.15, p. 309), or by means of a construction with the (past) participle followed by an *indicative*[5] form of the verb *ḫar*(*k*)- 'to have' or *eš*- 'to be'.[6] In Old Hittite the conjunction *šu* correlates with analytic perfect constructions using a preterite auxiliary verb, while *ta* patterns with the present tense auxiliary verbs (see §29.3, p. 390).

Form

22.20. There are two types of this construction (initially observed by Benveniste 1962a: 63, 65): one with the auxiliary verb *ḫar*(*k*)- and another with the auxiliary verb *eš*-. Transitive verbs as well as some intransitive verbs employ the first type, while other intransitive verbs use the second.[7] As the examples cited below show, in the construction with *ḫar*(*k*)- the participle is always in the neuter nominative-accusative singular, while in that with *eš*- the participle agrees with the subject in gender, number, and case.

Uniqueness within the Old Anatolian Indo-European Group

22.21. No analogous construction exists in Luwian (Melchert 2003d: 206; Dardano 2005: 93 n. 4). Since it antedates the development of similar constructions in the Romance and Germanic languages, caution is needed in making hasty comparisons ("un rapprochement sommaire") with those constructions (see Benveniste 1962a: 41).

---

5. When the imperative of the auxiliary verb is used, the construction has a different force. See §22.24 (p. 311).

6. See Boley 1984; Dardano 2005.

7. Intransitive verbs that take *eš*- as the auxiliary verb also require subject clitic pronouns (see §18.13 (p. 280) and belong to the class often labeled "unaccusative," while those that take *ḫar*(*k*)- do not occur with subject clitics and belong to the "unergative" class. See Garrett 1996: 102–6 revising Sommer and Ehelolf 1924: 30 and Boley 1984. Dardano (2005: 99 and 103) follows Garrett.

Examples

22.22. Present perfect examples with present of *ḫar(k)*- and with unexpressed *eš*- (§22.3, p. 306): *ta mān* DUMU.MEŠ É.GAL *kuēzzi paršnan ḫarkanzi n=at apezza peššiyazi* 'If he throws (it) to the side on which the palace officials have crouched' KBo 4.9 vi 6–8; *n=at=za=kan kāša ANA* ^{d}U ^{URU}*Ḫatti* EN*=YA U ANA* DINGIR.MEŠ *BELU*^{MEŠ}*=YA peran tarnan ḫarmi* '(The sin of my father also reached me), and I have confessed it before the Stormgod of Ḫatti, my lord, and the gods, my lords' KUB 14.8 rev. 14–16 (PP 2, NH); *nu=ššan mān ḫalkiēš aranteš n=aš=kan arḫa waršten* 'When the crops have ripened (lit., 'arrived'), harvest them! (Bring them to the granary!)' HKM 25:15–19 (MH/MS); *ammell=a=mu=kan kuiēš ŠA* ^{d}UTU-*ŠI peran arḫa watkuwanteš* 'Also those (subjects) of mine, His Majesty, who have fled from me, (let them be an enemy to you, as they are an enemy to Mašḫuiluwa)' KBo 19.70:22′–24′ (Manapa-Tarḫunta Treaty).

22.23. Past perfect examples with preterite of *ḫar(k)*- and *eš*-: *nu=mu ištamaššan kuit ḫarker* '(I went into the land of Taggašta.) Because they had heard about me, (I no longer went after them with force by day, I marched at night)' KBo 5.8 i 23–25 (DŠ); *ŠA* LÚ.MEŠ ^{URU}*Taggašta=ma kuiēš* ÉRIN.MEŠ *NARĀRĒ anda warriššanteš ešer n=at arḫa parāšeššer* 'But the auxiliary troops of Taggašta who had come to help (my opponents) dispersed' KBo 5.8 i 18–20 (AM 148–149); *ANA* ^{URU}*Katḫariya=ya kuiš* ÉRIN.MEŠ ^{URU}*Gašgaš ḫūmanza wa*[*rr*]*i panza ēšta* 'The whole Kaška army that had gone to K. also to help' KUB 19.11 iv 36–37 (DŠ frag. 13); *nu=kan antuḫšātar kuit INA* URU.DIDLI.ḪI.A*=ŠUNU* EGIR-*pa pān ēšta* 'Because the population had gone back into their cities' KBo 5.6 i 19–20 (DŠ fr. 28).

"Stative" Constructions with *ḫar(k)*- and *ēš*-

22.24. The (neuter singular) participle + *ḫar*(*k*)- construction with **transitive** verbs can also have the meaning 'to hold/keep (someone/-thing) . . . -ed'). This is simply the literal meaning of the two components: *ḫar*(*k*)- 'to hold' + the passive participle of the transitive verb: *nu* LÚ.KÚR-*an utnē kuttanit tar*(*a*)*ḫḫan ḫarta* '(the king) held the land(s) of the enemy subjected by (his) strong arm' KBo 3.67 i 6 (Tel. pr., OH/NS); *nu* KUR-*e paḫḫašnuwan ḫarker* 'They held the land protected' (not the pluperfect: 'They had protected the land') KUB 14.16 i 24, ed. AM 28; *nu=war=aš=kan* LÚ.MEŠ ^{URU}*ḪURRI anda waḫnuwan ḫarkanzi* 'the Hurrians are keeping them surrounded' KBo 5.6 ii 25 (DŠ frag. 28). This construction is **more common** with the auxiliary verb *ḫar*(*k*)- in the **imperative**. When the particle *-za* occurs in this construction, it construes not with the auxiliary verb *ḫar*(*k*)- but with the verb in the frozen neuter participle. The construction participle + imperative of *ḫar*(*k*)- does not express a tense but should be translated 'keep (something) . . . -ed': *nu=tta* DINGIR.MEŠ TI-*an ḫarkandu nu=tta aššuli paḫšandaru* 'May the gods keep you alive and protect you in wellbeing' HKM 10:45–46 (MH/MS); *nu=mu* DINGIR-*LUM ištamanan lagān ḫar*(*a*)*k* 'O god, keep your ear inclined to me' KUB 24.1 i 16–17 (NH); *nu ŠA* LÚ.KÚR *kuiēš* KASKAL.ḪI.A *n=aš=za BEL MADGALTI kappūwan ḫardu*

n=aš=za gul(aš)šan ḫardu ‘let the district commander keep track of (lit., ‘keep counted’) the routes of the enemy (incursions) and keep a written record of them’ KUB 13.2 i 9–10 (MH/NS); URU.DIDLI.ḪI.A BÀD=*kan kuiēš maniyaḫḫiya anda nu=za ḫurupan* EGIR-*an kappūwan ḫarkandu* ‘Let them keep *ḫurup*-ed and keep track of the fortified cities in the administrative district’ KUB 13.2 i 22–23; *nu=wa karuššiyan ḫar(a)k* ‘so keep quiet!’ KUB 14.4 iv 11 (NH); *nu=wa=za=kan iškiša āppa INA* KUR $^{ḪUR.SAG}$*Zippašlā tiyān ḫar(a)k* ‘So keep yourself placed with your back towards the land of Mt. Zippašlā’ KUB 14.1 obv. 16–17 (MH/MS); *parkuwaya* TÚG.ḪI.A *waššan ḫarkandu* ‘Let them have on clean clothes (lit., ‘keep clean clothes worn’)’ KUB 13.4 i 16 (pre-NH).

22.25. As in the case of *ḫar(k)*- with a frozen neuter singular participle, the construction with *ēš*- (unexpressed in the present tense, §22.3, p. 306) and a nominative participle of an “unergative” intransitive verb can also indicate a state rather than an event or action: (The birds which you sent to me,) *n=at arḫa ḫarranteš ešer* ‘they were spoiled (= rotten), (so I didn’t eat them)’ AT 125:12 (NH); *nu=kan* 1-*aš* 1-*edani šer mauššanza* ‘(if there are two kidneys) and one is fallen on top of the other’ KUB 4.1 iv 26 (extispicy). In many contexts it is hard to tell with intransitive verbs if a completed event or a state is intended.

Chapter 23
VERB MOOD

23.1. The Hittite language has only two moods: indicative and imperative. There are no separate sets of verbal forms with the force of a subjunctive or optative. The potential, unreal, or wished for are expressed by the indicative together with the optative and potential particle *man* (usually written *ma-an* or *-ma-an* in contrast to the temporal or conditional conjunction *ma-a-an*).

Indicative

23.2. The indicative mood is used to report real events in the past or present as well as to refer to anticipated future events and to make statements of general validity. For examples see illustrations of the present and preterite tense in chapter 22.

23.3. Negative commands (both prohibitive and inhibitive) are expressed by the negative *lē* and the present indicative (CHD L–N *lē* §a; see §26.16, p. 344): *nu=kan* NAM.RA.MEŠ *katta uer n=at=mu* GÌR.MEŠ-*aš k*[(*atta*)]*n ḫaliyanda*[(*t*)] *BELI=NI=wa=nnaš lē ḫarnikti* 'The civilian captives came down and fell down at my feet, (saying,) 'Our lord, do not destroy us!'' KUB 14.16 iii 16–17 restored from KUB 14.15 iii 46–47 (NH); *BELI⟨=NI⟩=wa=naš karū* [*ku*]*it ḫarnikta nu=wa BELI=NI lē namma uwaši* 'Our lord, because you destroyed us once before, do not come again!' KBo 4.4 iv 45–46 (NH). Rarer and so far only in NH copies of OH texts is the use of the imperative with *lē* (CHD *lē* §c; see §26.17, p. 344).

Imperative

23.4. What are conventionally termed first-person singular "imperative" forms (those ending in -(*al*)*lu* in the active) are actually "voluntative" (HE §263b), expressing the desire or strong intention of the speaker, equivalent to English 'let me . . . ', 'may I . . . ', or 'I will surely . . .': [(*n=at=za=k*)]*an naššu tešḫit uwallu* 'Either let me see it in a dream . . .' KUB 14.8 rev. 42; *nu=mu ḫatrāi nu šeggallu* 'Write to me and let me know' KUB 23.88 obv. 6; *nu ḫandan ūk kiššan memallu* 'Truly I wish to say the following' KUB 6.45+ iii 73–74 (NH), tr. ANET 398 ('Truly I wish to speak thus'); *nu* SISKUR *ŠA* ^{ÍD}[*Mala*] *iyallu n=at=kan aššа*[(*n*)]*ullu* 'And I intend to perform the ritual of the [Mala] River and complete it' KUB 14.11 iii 19–20 (NH); *nu=wa u*[*g*]*a* ŠAḪ-*aš iwar wiyami* [*namma=w*]*a akkallu* 'I will squeal like a pig, [and then] I will surely die' KUB 14.1 rev. 93–94 (MH/MS).

23.5. The first-person plural imperative (properly a "cohortative" or "exhortative," HE §263c) is formally identical with the present-future indicative (endings *-weni*, *-wani*, *-meni*, *-mani*, *-waštati*). The presence of the imperative can only be determined by context. The presence of *eḫu* or *uwatten* in the exhortative sense 'come on!' indicates the imperatival use. The first-person plural forms express a wish of the speaker that the addressee join him in the performance of an action ('let us . . .'): *eḫu ANA* ^{d}U EN=*YA* . . . DI-*ešni tiyaweni* 'Come, let us go before the Stormgod, my lord, . . . for judgment' KBo 6.29 ii 2–4 (NH); *kinuna=wa eḫu nu=wa zaḫḫiyauwaštati* 'Come now, let us do battle with each other' KBo 3.4 ii 13–14 (NH); *uwatten* ^{URU}*Nēša paiwani* 'come, let us go to Neša' KBo 22.2 obv. 15 (OS). For further examples see §23.7 and §24.32 (p. 325).

23.6. The second-person forms are direct commands or requests: *nu=wa=mu* ^{d}UTU ^{URU}*Arinna* GAŠAN=*YA kattan tiya nu=wa=mu=kan uni araḫzenaš* KUR.KUR LÚ.KÚR *peran kuenni* 'O Sungoddess of Arinna, take my side and slay before me that enemy of the surrounding lands' KBo 3.4 i 25–26 (NH, Murs. II); *nu=war=aš ēpten nu=war=aš=mu parā p*[*ešten*] 'Arrest them and extradite them to me' KUB 14.15 i 14 (NH); *namma=mu* DINGIR-*LUM* GAŠAN=YA Ù-*at* [*QADU*] É-*TI=wa=mu* ÌR-*aḫḫut* 'then the goddess, my lady, appeared to me in a dream, (saying,) "Serve me with (your) house!"' Ḫatt. iii 4–5.

23.7. The third-person forms are employed when the speaker expresses to a second party the wish that a third party may perform some action. Occasionally, there is either the implied seeking of the consent of the second party for the third party to do this or the implication that the second party joins the speaker in this wish: *nu=wa zaḫḫiyauwaštati nu=wa=nnaš* ^{d}U *BELI=YA DINAM ḫannāu* 'Let us do battle, and may the Stormgod, my lord, decide our case' KBo 3.4 ii 13–14, ed. AM 46; *ANA* ^{d}UTU-*ŠI=ma* EN=*YA ŠA* ^{m}*Ḫašdu*-DIN[GIR-*L*]*IM kuit ḫatrāmi* ^{d}UTU ^{URU}TÚL-*na* GAŠAN=*YA uškedu* 'Let the Sungoddess of Arinna, my lady, examine what I shall write to His Majesty regarding Ḫašduili' KUB 40.1 obv. 37–38; *šiuneš=da aššuli paḫšantaru* 'May the gods kindly protect you' AT 125:3 (from salutation in a letter); *utne=wa māu šešdu* 'May the land prosper and have rest' KBo 3.7 i 5 (OH/NS); *nu ANA* DINGIR.MEŠ EN.MEŠ=*YA* ZI-*anza namma waršdu* 'To the gods, my lords, may the mind again be gentle' KUB 14.14 rev. 14′ (PP 1 §8). When a second party is not addressed, a strong wish for a third party's action can be expressed by using the present tense and the ("speaker-") optative particle *man* (see §23.11).

23.8. Imperative forms are rarely used in prohibitions with *lē* (see §26.17, p. 344).

23.9. For the isolated use of present indicative forms in positive commands see §22.13 (p. 309).

Optative, Potential, and Irrealis

23.10. For the expression of the potential, the unreal, or the wished for, notions associated with the subjunctive and optative moods of Greek and Latin, Hittite scribes

employed the indicative together with a particle *man*, which they usually (but not always) distinguished from the conjunction *mān* (written *ma-a-an*) by the shorter spellings *ma-an* or *ma-na/u-*. All examples but one (KBo 5.8 iii 15)[1] of the plene writing of potential *man* are clause-initial and followed by a vowel: *ma-a-nu-uš-kán* KBo 3.1 ii 11 (OH/NS); *ma-a-na-an* KBo 3.4 iii 11 in AM 66. Further examples may be found in CHD L–N sub *man*. Unlike the conjunction *mān* 'when, if', *man* is not found in clauses beginning with *nu* (HE §310 f), nor with *ta* or *šu.*

Optative

23.11. The particle *man* can express a desire of the speaker (so-called speaker optative [Hoffner 1982]): [*nu kuit* (É.MEŠ DUMU.L)]UGAL *danna ilaliyanzi nu kiššan* [*da*]*ranzi* [(*aši=man=wa* URU-*aš a*)]*mmel kišari* '[Because] they covet the princes' houses, they speak as follows: "That city ought to be mine"' KBo 3.1 ii 63–64 (Tel. pr., OH/NS); *kāša=mu kī tet* ^{m}*Kalbayaš* KA×U-*az memišta man=wa=naš išḫanittarātar iyaweni* 'Kalbaya has just said this to me — he conveyed it orally — "We ought to make for ourselves a blood relationship"' VBoT 2:1–3 (letter); *man=wa* ^{d}UTU-*ŠI* TI-*ešzi* 'I hope His Majesty recovers' KUB 15.30 iii 5.

23.12. The "subject optative" (Hoffner 1982), which expresses a wish not of the speaker but of the grammatical subject of the clause, can be seen in: *mān=uš=kan* ^{m}*Ḫuzziyaš kuenta nu uttar išduwāti* 'Ḫuzziya wanted to kill them, but the matter became known' KBo 3.1 ii 11; and in the following example the grammatical subject is also the speaker: *man INA* ^{URU}*Ḫayaša pāun=pat nu=za* MU.KAM-*za šer tepaweššanza ēšta* 'I wanted to go also to Ḫayaša, but the year was too short for that' KBo 4.4 iii 22–23 (Mursili II annals). On the dual use of *man* for speaker- and subject-optative see also CHD *man*, a.

Potential and Irrealis

23.13. Future potential is expressed with *man* and the present tense: *mān=wa=mu* 1-*an* DUMU-*KA paišti man=war=aš=mu* ^{LÚ}*MUTI=YA kišari* 'If you would give me one of your sons, he would become my husband' KBo 5.6 iii 12–13 (NH); *našma=*⟨*m*⟩*an=wa=kan uniuš* EN.MEŠ *ḫalla*[*llā*] *pānzi ūqq=a=man=wa pēḫudanzi* 'Or those lords might defect and also take me away (with them)' KBo 4.14 ii 79–80 (NH). For possible further examples see §26.23 (p. 346), §30.52 (p. 421).

23.14. Past potential is expressed with *man* and the preterite tense: [*m*]*an=ta=kkan* É *ABI-KA* KUR-*KA=ya* ^{ŪL} *arḫa dāir man=at* [(*da*)]*mēdani kuedanikki piyēr* 'Could they not have taken from you your father's house and your land and given them to someone else?' KBo 5.13 i 20–21 (NH).

1. But note that the scribe of this text corrected *ma-a-an-mu* in iii 18 to *ma-an-mu* because it would have violated this rule.

23.15. For hypothetical future actions deemed undesirable or unlikely to occur because of undesirable results expressed in the apodosis,[2] Hittite uses *man* with a preterite in the protasis and a present or mixture of preterite and present (*maršer . . . kīšantati . . . ēpzi . . . ēpzi*) in the apodosis: *ma-a-am*[*-ma-an-ša-ma-aš*?] (i.e., **mān=man=šmaš*)[3] *tayazzil pišker man ḫūmanteš=pat maršēr* [*man*]*=e?* LÚ.MEŠNÍ.ZU *kīšantati kāš=man kūn ēpzi* [*k*]*āš=a=man kūn ēpzi* 'If they [were] to charge [them] with theft, all of them might dissemble or become thieves; this one might seize that one, and that one might seize this one' KBo 6.2 ii 53–55 (Laws §49, OS; see LH 59–60). The reason for the alternating tenses is unclear. For another example with present tense in the apodosis see KUB 30.10 obv. 22–23 in §30.54 (p. 422).

23.16. Past contrary-to-fact conditions are expressed with *man* and the preterite indicative, both in main clauses alone and in combinations of conditional and main clause: *man=kan mān* ANA *mAttaršiya ḫuišwetenn=a kāštit=a=man ākten* 'Even if you (pl.) had survived Attaršiya, you would have died from hunger' KUB 14.1 obv. 12 (MH/MS); *man=za* É]RIN.MEŠ] EGIR-*an karū p*[*a*]*ḫḫašnut antuḫšaš=a=kan uttar kiššarī anda karū daiš* 'If you had already protected the troops, (the god) would have already put into your hand the matter of the persons' HKM 38:3–7 (MH/MS); *nu=šmaš* LÚ*auriyaluš kuit arantat mān=kan mān* ANA *mPittaggatalli=pat warpa teḫḫun man=mu* LÚ*auriyaluš kuit* ŠA *mPitaggatalli auēr man=mu* ŪL *duḫušiyait* 'And because sentries were in place for them, if I had tried to surround Pittaggatalli himself, because the sentries of Pittaggatalli would have seen me, he would not have waited' KBo 5.8 iii 14–18 (NH). Note the complex syntax in the last example: three dependent clauses (causal—conditional—causal) followed by the main clause. For the omission of *nu* or other conjunction to introduce the final clause see §§29.46–29.58 (pp. 401–405).

---

2. Sometimes called "non-past contrary to fact." We choose a different formulation, since future actions cannot be judged as factual or non-factual, only as likely or unlikely.

3. See LH 59–60, 191–92.

Chapter 24
VERB ASPECT

24.1. Whereas *tense* marks the time of a reported action or state relative to the time of speech, *aspect* in its broadest sense describes the internal temporal structure of a verbal predicate. This topic is complex and controversial, and the use of terminology varies widely (some scholars, especially Slavicists, reserve the term *aspect* for a much narrower application than that used here). Here our goal is to make clear the meaning of various Hittite verbal forms as they occur in the texts and to correct certain widespread misinformation on their use. For a more detailed but by no means exhaustive description see Hoffner and Melchert 2002. The preliminary treatment of Melchert 1998 is also useful but in need of revision.

24.2. For Hittite it is sufficient to distinguish *imperfective* aspect, in which an event is viewed as having an internal temporal structure, from *perfective* aspect, in which it is not.[1] Perfective aspect is the unmarked partner in Hittite. Imperfective aspect, whether it is explicitly marked or not, takes on various specific meanings outlined below, based on the combination of the lexical meaning of the verb and certain contextual markers.

Imperfectives

Adverbial Markers

24.3. Any basic verbal stem in Hittite may be read as perfective or imperfective, provided that its inherent meaning and the context are appropriate. The latter value is assured by the presence of markers such as the conjunction *kuitman* 'while', the adverb *mašiyanki* 'as many times as', or multiplicative expressions such as NUMBER-*anki* (or NUMBER-*ŠU*) 'X-times' (see §9.55, p. 168; §24.12 end, p. 320). Compare *namma=aš* *INA* ^{HURSAG}*Zukkuki* EGIR-*pa uet* 'Then he came back to Mt. Zukkuki' KBo 5.6 i 1 (perfective) versus *nu kuitman* $^{m.GIŠ}$GIDRU-LÚ-*iš* *IŠTU* KUR ^{URU}*Mizri* EGIR-*pa uet* 'While Ḫattušaziti was coming back from the land of Egypt' KBo 5.6 iii 26 (imperfective). The aspect indicator in the second sentence is *kuitman*: nothing in the form *uet*—neither suffix nor inherent lexical component of *uwa-* — dictates or indicates aspect. Likewise, *n=uš* GUD-*li turier* 'They yoked them like cattle' KBo 3.34 i 16 (OH/NS) versus *tūriyanzi=ma=aš* *mašiyanki nu* KASKAL-*ši* KASKAL-*ši=pat* *INA* 7.IKU.ḪI.A *anda penneškezzi* 'But as many times as they hitch them up, each time he drives them seven IKUs' KBo 3.5 ii 13–15.

1. *Perfective aspect*, in which an action is viewed as an indivisible whole, should not be confused with the *perfect tense*, which refers to a completed action.

Here *tūriyanzi* refers to iterated action just as much as the suffix-marked *penneškezzi* and the contextual marker KASKAL-*ši* KASKAL-*ši*.

Suffix Markers

24.4. Most but not all Hittite verbs may also optionally mark imperfective aspect *explicitly* by the addition of one of three suffixes *-šk(e/a)-*, *-šš(a)-*, and *-anna/i-* (henceforth for simplicity *-šk(e)-*, *-šš(a)-*, and *-anna/i-*). Certain classes of verbs, however, do not take the suffix, because their inherent meaning either already implies imperfectivity or is incompatible with it. The stative verbs *šakk-* 'to know', *ḫar(k)-* 'to hold, keep', and *ar-* 'to stand' and the entire class of denominal "statives" in *-e-* (many of which mean 'become X' in Hittite; see §§10.11–10.12, p. 177) and the denominal fientives in *-eš(š)-* (which mean 'become X'; see §§10.13–10.14, pp. 177–178) are not attested with an imperfective suffix. The verb *iya-* (m.-p.) 'to be in motion, be walking' takes *-anna/i-* only in the inceptive sense 'to set out, start to walk' (see §24.18, p. 322), and the verb *akk-* 'to die' takes a *-šk(e)-* medio-passive form only in the distributive sense, with and without a subject: *akkiškettari* 'there is much dying', that is, 'many people are dying'. See §24.16 (p. 321).

24.5. The suffixes *-šk(e)- and -šš(a)-* are often labeled "iterative" or "iterative-durative," while *-anna/i-* is usually said to be "durative" (e.g., HE 73–75 §§137, 141). This description is misleading in two respects. First, as established by Bechtel (1936) and Dressler (1968), the use of the suffixes *-šk(e)-* and *-šš(a)-* is much broader than implied by the name "iterative-(durative)." Friedrich (HE §141 and §269) actually recognizes many, though not all, of the variety of meanings cited below. Second, contrary to the claim of Friedrich (HE §137 and §269e) and others, the use of *-anna/i-* is completely equivalent to that of the other two suffixes; it is not limited to durativity.

Nuances of Imperfective Aspect

24.6. At least the following different meanings are attested for the three suffixes *-šk(e)-*, *-šš(a)-*, and *-anna/i-*.

24.7. They may have a **progressive** meaning, describing an ongoing action, in some instances setting the scene for another action—so-called "backgrounding" (see Bechtel 1936: 52–57, against Dressler 1968: 185–88, and others). For example: *takku* LÚ-*aš* GUD=*ŠU* ÍD-*an zīnuškezzi* 'If a man is driving his ox across a river (and another person pushes him off, seizes the ox's tail and fords the river [all non-*šk(e)-*])' KBo 6.2 ii 30 = Laws §43 (OS); *nu anniškemi kuin n=an=kan* ŠUM=*ŠU ḫalziḫḫi* 'I call by his name the one whom I am treating' (KUB 12.63 obv. 28). Here the *-šk(e)-* forms provide the timeframe in which the other events described by the non-*šk(e)-* verbs take place. In a further example the contemporaneity of the two actions ("backgrounding") is further marked by *kuitman* 'while': *kuitman=ma=z=(š)an* BEL SÍSKUR *IŠTU* SAG.DU=*ŠU tētan laplē*[*pan*] *enērann=a ḫūittiyannai* MUNUSŠU.GI=*ma luwili kiššan ḫūkkiškezzi* 'While the ritual client

is pulling the hair, lash(es), and brow(s) from his own (*-za*) head, the Old Woman is reciting in Luwian as follows' KUB 32.8 iii 6–10. Note the functional equivalence of the two suffixes in *ḫūittiyannai* and *ḫūkkiškezzi*, both of which are marking ongoing actions. The adverb *kāša*, which always implies an element of temporal immediacy, may be used to emphasize that the action is going on at the moment of speaking (contemporaneity): *kāšatta=wa* LÚ.MEŠ*NAŠI ṢIDITI=KUNU dameškatteni* 'You are oppressing your provisions bearers!' KBo 22.1 obv. 18–19 (OS). For more on the grammaticalization of *kāša* see §§24.27–24.30 (pp. 323–324).

24.8. Imperfective forms are also used to indicate **duration** of an activity over an extended period of time. In some cases the period of time is explicitly indicated: *nu* GE_6*-an ḫūmandan uzuḫrin* ḪÁD.DU.A *azzikkanzi* '(the horses) eat [hay] throughout the entire night (§16.29, p. 249)' KUB 1.13 ii 10–11; *nu* URU[*Šanaḫḫuit*]*tan INA* ITU.5.KAM *zaḫḫeškenun* 'and I fought against Šanaḫuitta for five months (§16.75, p. 261)' KBo 10.2 i 47 (OH/NS). In other cases a non-*ške-* verb is used to mark the endpoint of the extended action expressed by the marked imperfective stem: *nu* É*-ri=šši anniškezzi kuitmān=aš lāzziatta* 'He will (continue to) work in his (the victim's) house, until he (the victim) recovers' KBo 6.2 i 17–18. Sometimes the period of time is left unexpressed, with no explicit endpoint: *takku* GIŠTUKUL*-li=ma mimmai* LÚ GIŠTUKUL*-š=a*(!, text *-uš*) A.ŠÀ.ḪI.A *ḫarkantaš taranzi n=an=za* LÚ.MEŠ URU*-LIM anniškanzi* 'But if he refuses (to perform) the craft, they shall declare the fields to be those of a vacating craftsman, and the men of the city shall work them' KBo 6.2 + KBo 19.1 ii 20–21 = Laws §40 (OS), with dupl. KBo 6.3 ii 40–41 (OH/NS), ed. LH 47–48, 187–88. Alternatively, this last example could show the inceptive use of the imperfective, translatable as 'and the men of the city shall begin to work them' (see §24.4, p. 318; §24.18, p. 322).

24.9. The meaning of the marked imperfectives in **imperatives** is often 'keep on . . . -ing' (which can be viewed either as progressive or durative): *BELU=mu aššul ḫatreške namma=ššan ANA* É*=YA* IGI.ḪI.A*-wa ḫar*(*a*)*k* 'Keep sending greetings to me, O lord. And further keep (your) eyes on my house' HKM 27:23–25 (MH/MS); *nu=ššan parā kalānkanza ēš nu=tta kuit memiškemi nu=mu* DINGIR*-LUM ištamanan lagān ḫar*(*a*)*k n=at išt*[*am*]*aške* 'Be appeased, and with respect to what I am saying to you, O god, keep your ear inclined to me and keep listening' KUB 24.1 i 15–17. Note that the inherently stative verbs *ēš-* 'be' and *ḫar*(*k*)- 'hold, keep' do not take the *-ške-* form, including in the periphrastic construction with the participle plus *ḫar*(*k*)- (see §24.4, p. 318).

24.10. Likewise, the use of a *-ške-* form with the negative *lē* sometimes carries the meaning of an "**inhibitive**"; that is, it means 'stop . . . -ing' versus the usual 'prohibitive' meaning 'don't . . . !' (see §26.16, p. 344): *šumeš=ma=aš=za* ZI*-az kuwat daškatteni kinun=a=kan apūš* NAM.RA.MEŠ *ANA* m*Duppi-*dU *arḫa lē daškatteni* 'Why do you keep willfully taking them for yourselves? Now stop taking those civilian captives away from Duppi-Tešub!' KBo 3.3 iii 24′–26′ (NH); TÚG.ḪI.A*=wa kue zik w*[*aššiyaši nu*]*=war=at ANA* DUMU*=KA lē peškeši apāš=ma=at=ši pišket* '"Stop giving the clothes you w[ear] to

your son!" But she kept giving them to him' KUB 22.70 rev. 35–36 (NH). But note that not every imperfective form used with *lē* is inhibitive. The context shows that the following example refers to a habitual action (see §24.13): *n=an=ši dušgarauwanza piškellu pidduliyauwanza=ma=da lē peškemi* '(But the leavened bread which I give to you), may I (always) give it to you joyfully. May I not (ever) give it to you under constraint' KUB 6.45 + KUB 30.14 iii 66–67 (NH).

24.11. The suffix *-ške-* and equivalents may mark **iterativity**, repetition of an action either continually or intermittently: EGIR=*ŠU* ^{LÚ}*meneyaš iētta kētt=a kētt=a* GI-*an ḫuittiannāi tarnāi=ma=an natta ī ī ḫalziššāi* 'The *m.*-man walks behind. He keeps drawing (back) the arrow towards this side and that, but does not let it go. He keeps crying out "ee ee" (imitating a bird or animal cry? §1.8, p. 11; and §1.144, p. 49)' KBo 17.43 i 10–11. Note that despite the translation with 'keep . . . -ing' the meaning here is iterative, not durative (the action is *repetitive*, not *continuous*). For an example involving separate occasions see again the example *tūriyanzi=ma=aš mašiyanki nu* KASKAL-*ši* KASKAL-*ši=pat INA* 7. IKU.ḪI.A *anda penneškanzi* 'But as many times as they hitch them up, each time they drive them seven IKUs' (KBo 3.5 ii 13–15). Note again the equivalence of the three suffixes for the same usage. On this same sentence see above §24.3 (p. 317).

24.12. The last example cited also illustrates the fact that the use of the marked imperfective stem is virtually obligatory with distributive expressions such as UD-*at* UD-*at* 'day after day', ITU-*mi* ITU-*mi* 'month after month', GE_6-*ti* GE_6-*ti* 'night after night', MU-*ti* MU-*ti*'year by year', *lammar lammar* 'moment by moment', *uddanī uddanī* 'word by word', etc.: *ANA* DINGIR-*LIM anda* UD-*at* UD-*at memiš*[*kezzi nu* DIN]GIR-*LAM walliškezzi* '(the scribe who reads the royal prayer to the cult statue of the deity) says it to the deity daily and repeatedly praises the deity' KUB 24.2 i 1–2, see KBo 3.5 i 4; *uddār=met=ta peḫḫun nu kī* [*tupp*]*i* ITU-*mi* ITU-*mi peran=tit ḫalzeššandu* 'I have given you my words. Let them read this tablet aloud in your presence monthly!' KUB 1.16 iii 56–57 (OH/NS). The verb *iya-* (m.-p.) 'be in motion', however, does not take the imperfective suffix (except in the inceptive sense, §24.4, p. 318): *n=ašta* LÚ.KÚR *QATAMMA kuit* KUR-*e anda lammar lammar iattar*[*i*] 'And because the enemy likewise marches moment by moment into the land' HKM 8:12–14 (MH/MS). Marked imperfectives are also used with 1-*an* 1-*an* 'one by one' (see §9.8, p. 155). Imperfectives are normally *not* used with multiplicatives in *-anki* unless there is also a distributive expression in the clause (§9.55, p. 168).

24.13. The marked *-ške-* stem or equivalents may also express **habitual**, regular, customary, or characteristic behavior: *IŠTU* ^{GIŠ}BANŠUR=*ma=za=kan kuezza azzikkenun IŠTU* GAL=*ya=kan kuezza akkuškenun šašti=ya=za=kan kuedani šeškiškenun IŠTU* ^{URUDU}DU_{10}×A=*ya=za=kan kuiezza arreškenun* 'the table from which I regularly ate, also the cup from which I regularly drank, also the bed in which I regularly slept, also the wash bowl from which I regularly washed myself' (see Goetze and Pedersen 1934: 10–11, lines 16–19). Note the contrast with KBo 4.2 iv 37–39 (a few lines later), where the king speaks of what happened on a single occasion (non-*ške-* forms). With the preterite tense the

habitual meaning may be accompanied by the adverb *karū*: *takku* LÚ.U_{19}.LU-*an ELLAM kuiški dašuwaḫḫi našma* ZU_9=*ŠU lāki karū* 1 MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR *pišker kinun=a* 20 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR *pāi* 'If someone blinds a free person or knocks out his tooth, formerly they used to give one mina of silver, but now one gives twenty shekels of silver' KBo 6.2 i 9–10 = Laws §7 (OS). But the use of *karū* is not obligatory for this meaning: *nu=wa ANA* DINGIR-*LIM IŠTU* É.GAL-*LIM* 1 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR SÍG SA_5 SÍG ZA.GÌN 1-*NUTUM* ^{KUŠ}NÍG.BÀR.ḪI.A=*ya pešker kinun=a=wa* $EZEN_4$ *ašraḫitaššin iēr* KÙ.BABBAR=*ma=wa* SÍG SA_5 SÍG ZA.GÌN ^{KUŠ}NÍG.BÀR.ḪI.A=*ya ŪL piyēr* 'From the palace they used to give to the deity one shekel of silver, red and blue wool, and a set of curtains, but now they celebrated the Festival of Womanhood, and they didn't give the silver, red, and blue wool and curtains' (KUB 5.10 i 8–13, NH). Note again the contrast with the non-*ške*- forms referring to a specific single action.

24.14. The habitual sense of -*ške*- is effectively lexicalized in *maniyaḫḫeške*- 'to administer, govern', from *maniyaḫḫ*- 'to handle' (always with -*ške*- in this sense except as an infinitive; see CHD s.v.). See also the remarks on *nanna*- 'to drive' below, §24.22 (p. 322).

24.15. Likewise -*ške*- or equivalents may used for so-called **gnomic** statements of general validity (see §22.5, p. 307): *ḫalkiš=wa maḫḫan* NAM.LÚ.U_{19}.LU GUD UDU *ḫuitarr=a ḫūman ḫuišnuškezzi* 'just as grain keeps all humans, cattle, sheep and wild game alive' KBo 4.2 i 58–59. In particular, *memiškanzi* is used for 'they say, one says, it is said'. It thus introduces proverbs or popular sayings expressing customary behavior (Beckman 1986), but the verb expressing the customary behavior in this case does not appear in the marked form: *ANA* DUMU.NAM.LÚ.U_{19}.LU=*pat=kan anda memian kišan mem*[*i*]*škanzi ḫarnāuwaš=wa* MUNUS-*nī* DINGIR-*LUM kāri tiya*[*zi*] 'Among mortals they have a saying: "A god yields (non-imperfective present tense *tiyazi*, §22.5, p. 307) to the wish of a woman of the birthing stool"' KUB 21. 27 ii 15–16.

24.16. The marked imperfective stem may be used **distributively**, to refer to actions performed on a series of objects (the action is thus from a certain point of view iterated) (Dressler 1968: 172–82): ^{NINDA}*ān*$^{ḪI.A}$ NINDA.KU_7.ḪI.A *kue paršiyannianzi nu=kan anaḫi daškanzi n=at=kan* EGIR-*pa zikkanzi* 'They take a taste of the warm breads (one by one) (and) the sweet breads which they break (one by one) and put them back (one by one)' KUB 25.32 iii 23–25. Here the focus is on doing something to the multiple objects 'one-by-one'. This usage is very common in ritual contexts. Note again the equivalence of the -*anna*/*i*- and -*ške*- forms. Likewise, an action may be viewed as unfolding in several stages or consisting of repeated movements: *nu=kan* MUNUS ŠU.GI ^{DUG}*ḫupuwaya ḫaššī anda laḫuškezzi* ^{DUG}*ḫupuwaya=ma tuwarniškezzi* 'The Old Woman pours out little by little (from) the *ḫ*.-vessel onto the hearth, and she breaks the *ḫ*.-vessel piece by piece' KBo 39.8 ii 32–33 (MH?/MS).

24.17. It is less certain whether Hittite ever similarly marks a single action performed by multiple subjects, but a likely example is: *UMMA* ^{m}*Uḫḫamuwa* LÚ ^{URU}*Arzawa mān=kan*

ŠÀ KUR-*TI akkiškettari* ‘Thus (says) Uḫḫa-muwa the man of Arzawa: If there is (much) dying in the land (i.e., a plague in which many people die)’ HT 1 ii 17–18; see Dressler 1968: 162–63. Since the context surely suggests that there are multiple deaths, it is likely that this is the basis for the *-ške-* form.

24.18. In the case of verbs that refer to prolonged activities or to processes, the *-ške-* form or equivalent may be **inceptive**, focusing on the beginning of the activity: *māḫḫan=ma=kan* ^{GIŠ}*ḫulugganniš parā iyannai* ‘When the carriage begins to move’ IBoT 1.36 ii 23–24 (MH/MS) (stem *iya-* ‘to walk, march, move’). The case of *iyanna-* is complicated by the likelihood that it was eventually lexicalized as a separate verb ‘to go’. A further example of inceptive meaning is: *p*[*ai*]*t=aš=šša*n [^{GIŠ}]NÁ-*aš šarkuwanza šešket* ‘He proceeded to go to sleep in bed with his shoes on’ KUB 24.8 i 25–26 (stem *šeš-* ‘to sleep’). Here the meaning of *šeške-* is not habitual (see §24.13, p. 321) but refers rather to entry into the activity of sleeping. For the “serial” use of *pai-* see §§24.31ff. (pp. 324ff.) An example of inceptive value with a process verb is: DINGIR.DIDLI-*š=a* DUMU.MEŠ-*uš* A.AB.BA-*az šarā dāir š=uš šallanušker* ‘the gods took the boys up out of the sea and began to raise them’ KBo 22.2 obv. 4–5 (OS). Note, however, that the same verb in its *-ške-* form can indicate the entire protracted course of the action: (‘O my god, ever since my mother gave birth to me’) *nu=mu ammēl* [DINGIR=*YA*] [*šal*]*lanuškeši* ‘you, [O my god], have been raising me’ FHG 1 ii 16–17 (OH/NS); similarly KUB 30.10 obv. 6–7 (OH/MS).

24.19. The inceptive value is also seen in the construction of the so-called supine with the verbs *dai-* ‘to put’ and *tiya-* ‘to step’ meaning ‘to begin to/undertake to ‘ (see §§25.37–25.38, p. 338). With extremely rare exceptions the “supine” is always formed from the marked imperfective stem (see §11.24, p. 186; §25.37, p. 338): *īššuwan daišten . . . piyanniwan daišt*[*en*] ‘you began to do . . . you began to give’ KBo 8.42 rev. 2–3 (OS); *nu=mu* ÉRIN.MEŠ *peškewan dāir* ‘They began to give me troops’ KBo 3.4 iii 24. Note again the equivalence of the three suffixes in this usage.

Choice of Suffix

24.20. The productive suffix for all the functions just described is *-ške-*. Only a handful of verbs take one of the other suffixes.

24.21. The verbs *ḫalzai-*, *iya-* ‘to make, do’, *šai-*, and *warrai-* form their marked imperfective stems in *-šša-*. In NH the stem often appears as *-eššа-* instead (see on this problem Melchert 1984b: 153–55, and Rieken 1996: 294–97).

24.22. The verbs *ḫatta-*, *ḫuittiya-*, *iškar-*, *iya-* ‘to walk, go’, *paršiya-*, *šalla*(*i*)-, and *tuḫš-* regularly employ the suffix *-anna/i-*. In OH and MH *walḫ-* also takes *-anna/i-*. A few other verbs are attested with only one or two examples of *-anna/i-* beside more common *-ške-*: *ḫuek-* ‘to slaughter’, *ḫulla-*, *išḫuwa-*, *išpar-*, *laḫḫiya-*, *pai-*, *parḫ-*, *peššiya-*, *piddai-*, *dai-*, *talliya-*, *weriya-*. The infrequency of occurrences with *-anna/i-* in some

cases may be due to the small number of occurrences of *any* imperfective suffix with that particular verb. In the case of *ḫulla/e-* all occurrences of *-ške-* are NH, while the only occurrence in OH or MH is *-anna/i-*, which may indicate that it (like some of the other verbs) had an original preference for *-anna/i-* but changed to the only remaining productive suffix *-ške-* in NH. A special case is *nanna-*, which has been lexicalized as a separate verb 'to drive', while only *naiške-* serves as the marked imperfective form of *nai-*.

24.23. As the productive form of the category, the suffix *-ške-* spread at the expense of the other two. In NH one finds *walḫiške-* for *walḫanna-* (also rarely *ḫalziške-* for *ḫalzišš(a)-*).

Suffix Redundancy

24.24. As described, the added suffix explicitly marks a verbal stem as expressing one of the values given above, versus the simple verb that is functionally neutral. By a common linguistic process, there is a tendency to reinforce the expressive value of the suffix by repeating it: *uškiške-* beside *uške-*, [*ap*]*piškiškemi* (HKM 89: 18) alongside usual *appiške-*, and *šeškeške-* and *šeškiške-* in NH texts alongside *šeške-*. By the same process, the productive *-ške-* is often redundantly added to *-anna/i-*: *ḫewaneške-*, *ḫuittiyanniške-*, *laḫḫiyanniške-*, *paršiyanniške-*, *peššiyanniške-*, *šallanniške-*, *takšanniške-*, *walḫanniške-*, *werianniške-*. Examples like the one in KBo 3.6 i 71–72, where *walḫiškewan* and *walḫanniškewan* (*daiš*) 'began to beset' are used equivalently in successive lines, show that the extra suffix adds no functional value.

24.25. Somewhat different are cases where the suffix *-ške-* lost its expressive value already in prehistoric times and became what is in Hittite the basic verbal stem: *iške-* 'to smear, anoint', *paške-* 'to fix, fasten', *duške-* 'to rejoice'. Naturally, these verbs can, like any other, add the suffix in its productive function: *duškiške-*.

24.26. On the formal aspects of reduplication in Hittite verbs see §10.3 (p. 173). The precise function of the different types of reduplication and their relationship to the "marked imperfective" stems requires further study. In some cases there seems to be a functional overlap between the two.

kāša(tta) and *kāšma*

24.27. It is customary among translators of Hittite texts to render these forms with a mechanical 'behold', 'lo' (or their equivalents in other languages). But as Hoffner (1968b) pointed out, this approach misses both the clear pattern of their use with the Hittite verbal tenses and the fundamental function of these adverbs. Previous interpreters of these forms have rightly signaled their ultimate derivation from the base of the proximal demonstrative *kā-* 'this' and the adverb *kā* 'here' denoting spatial proximity. The implication of the proximal demonstrative origin of the forms should not be lost

in the approach to interpreting their force in combination with the verbal tenses. Thus, *kāša* (and its post-OH form *kāšma*) renders both past and non-past verbal tenses more immediate.

24.28. With preterite verbal forms the effect of the adverb is to express so-called present relevance, a meaning carried in English by the present perfect 'have (just) . . . -ed' (Hoffner 1968b): [(*k*)]*āšata=šmaš=kan utniyandan lāluš dāḫḫun* 'I have (just) taken the slanders ('tongues') of the population from you' KBo 17.1 i 11 (OS); *kinuna kāša* f*Gaššuliyawiaš tuēl* GÉME-*TUM ištarkiat* 'Your servant Gaššuliyawiya has become ill' KBo 4.6 obv. 27 (NH). See also HKM 25:4–5 (§16.89, p. 300). The presence of *kāša* is not *obligatory* in order for a Hittite preterite verb to have the meaning of a present perfect (§22.14, p. 309), but its use does effectively constrain such a reading (§22.15, p. 309). In other cases the just completed "past" act can be rendered with 'have hereby/herewith . . . -ed' (see KUB 7.1+ i 6 in §16.14, p. 244). The adverbs 'hereby' and 'herewith' are appropriate to some uses of *kāša* with either the present or the preterite (see next paragraph).

24.29. With present verbal forms the meaning conveyed by *kāša* and equivalents varies by context (Hoffner 1968b). In some cases it reinforces an "immediate present" (contemporaneous with the speech act) reading 'is . . . -ing (right now)' (see §24.7, p. 319, for an example). Ḫattušili I wrote: [*k*]*āšma* m*Muršiliš* DUMU=*Y*[*A*] 'Muršili is hereby my (adopted) son (and designated heir)' KUB 1.16 ii 37 (OH/NS). The adverb here underscores the "performative" force of the statement (it is the verbal declaration itself that carries out the action described, as in 'I (hereby) swear/promise/forbid . . .'). In still other cases the adverb points to the immediate future ('be on the point of' or 'be about to'): *UMMA* d*Inar* m*Ḫūpašiya kāša=wa kī=ya kī=ya iyami* 'Inara spoke as follows to Hupasiya: 'I am about to do such-and-such a thing' KBo 3.7 i 21–22 (Illuyanka Myth, see the translation by Hoffner 1998b: 12).

24.30. The precise significance of its use with the imperative is harder to determine. It may add immediacy ('Do this *right now*'); see the example KUB 12.58+ ii 1–3 cited in §16.25 (p. 248).

The "Serial" Use of *pai-* 'to go' and *uwa-* 'to come'

24.31. The *serial* or *phrasal*[2] construction consists of a finite form of *pai-* 'to go' or *uwa-* 'to come' that normally agrees in person, number, tense, and mood with another finite verb that follows it in the same clause. The *pai-*/*uwa-* verb appears either in clause-initial position or immediately following a clause-initial conjunction and any attached clitics.[3] Any sentential particles or enclitic pronouns associated functionally with the

2. For a discussion of the terms *serial* and *consecutive* to describe syntactic structures in Hittite see van den Hout forthcoming.

3. The fronting of other elements occasionally results in the appearance of the *pai-*/*uwa-* verb after two other constituents: *zig=a*[(*=šī mān pāi*)]*ši apūn memiyan* EGIR-*pa mematti* 'But if you proceed to repeat that

main verb are attached to the *pai-/uwa-* verb or the preceding conjunction—a confirmation that the two verbs are in the same clause. The second verb normally carries its full lexical meaning, while the first only modifies the meaning of the second verb or that of the entire clause. The second verb (the "full verb") also governs the use of third-person enclitic subject pronouns (see §§18.13ff., pp. 280ff.). When *pai-* and *uwa-* function as full verbs, they require subject pronouns (see §18.14, p. 280). But when they serve as serial/phrasal verbs, if the main verb in the serial construction is transitive or "unergative," the clitic subject is omitted. This provides a further confirmation that the two verbs are in the same clause and the first is a serial/phrasal verb. The serial/phrasal *pai-/uwa-* construction is never negated, nor does the *pai-/uwa-* verb ever take a preverb or the "marked imperfective" *-ške-* suffix. The "full" verb, however, may take this suffix.

24.32. The defining features just cited are important in separating the serial construction as attested from two other usages.[4] First, the agreement between the *pai-/uwa-* verb and the full verb distinguishes the serial construction from the exhortative use of the imperative second singular and plural of 'to come', as in: *eḫu=wa zaḫḫiyauwa*[*štati*] 'Come (on), let us fight one another!' (KUB 34.23 ii 17); *uwatten* ^{URU}*Nēša paiwani* 'Come (on), let us go to Nesa' (KBo 22.2 obv. 15; OS). Second, the consistent fronting of the *pai-/uwa-* verb distinguishes the serial construction from cases of two or more finite verbs in asyndeton, including those where one verb is semantically subordinated to the other: *nu* $Ū_L$ *tarḫuzzi ḫāši* 'He cannot open (it)' (KUB 17.10 i 33); *nu=za maḫḫan* DINGIR.MEŠ *iyazzi zinnāi* 'As soon as he finishes worshipping the gods' (KBo 18.15, 11–13). For further examples of finite verbs in asyndeton see van den Hout forthcoming.

24.33. There is no agreement on the precise meaning of the Hittite serial construction or its origin.[5] This usage is typologically comparable to colloquial English 'to go and . . .' ('Why did you go and do that?'/'Let's go and get married') and similar constructions in other languages. The English usage very often has the connotation that the action described is a "turn of events"; that is, it is surprising (often but not always unpleasantly so), or culminating, following upon, and logically completing a preceding action. As noted below, one can often discern similar connotations in the Hittite serial construction. However, the very colloquial status of the English construction and its restriction to certain dialects makes 'go and . . .' unsuitable as a standard translation. The best English equivalent applicable to most examples is probably the one adopted by the CHD: 'to proceed to . . .' (see the examples cited below). What is clearly false and to be avoided is the frequently encountered interpretation of the phrasal verb as an impersonal

matter to him' KBo 5.3+ iii 27–28 (MH/NS).

4. Whether there is a *historical* connection between the serial construction and either of the other usages (see respectively Dunkel 1985 and Hock 2002) is a quite separate question. For a very different view of the historical development see van den Hout forthcoming.

5. For a range of views see Disterheft 1984: 222–23; Dunkel 1985; Garrett 1990c: 72–74; Neu 1995; Luraghi 1997a: 42–44, 1997b: 313–16; Dunkel 1998; Hock 2002; van den Hout 2003; Rieken forthcoming and van den Hout forthcoming.

'it will happen/happened that . . .'. As the agreement of the phrasal verb with the main verb shows, there is nothing impersonal about the construction.

24.34. The suggested English translation 'to proceed to . . .' is intended to convey that the serial construction underscores a *transition* from one action to another. That is, it seems to emphasize some direct connection between the clause containing the serial construction and the immediately preceding context (see van den Hout 2003). It is important to stress that this connection—temporal, causal, or other—is inherent in the context and would remain even if the serial construction were not employed.[6] The characterization just given is frustratingly vague but, as the following examples show, no other common denominator can be identified in *all* the various uses of the serial construction.

24.35. The serial construction is common in **past narratives**, where events naturally often occur in (temporal) succession: ^{d}IM-*aš* ^{d}UTU-*i piyēt ītten=wa* ^{d}UTU-*un uwatet*[*ten p*]*āir* ^{d}UTU-*un šanḫeškanzi n=an* ŪL *wemiya*[*nzi*] 'The Stormgod sent for the Sungod: 'Proceed to fetch the Sungod!' They proceeded to search for the Sungod, but they did not find him' VBoT 58 i 21–22 (the search is a direct consequence of the preceding command; on the serial construction in the imperative sentence see §24.41, p. 329, below);[7] *nu* KUR.KUR.MEŠ *ḫūma*[*nda a*]*rḫa ḫar*(*a*)*kta n=at uet ABI ABI=YA* ^{m}*Šuppiluliumaš* EGIR-*pa wetet* 'All the lands had gone to ruin. My grandfather Šuppiluliuma proceeded to rebuild them' KUB 19.9 i 6–8 (the rebuilding grows out of the stated need to rebuild; *nu* ^{MUNUS}*Ištapariyaš* MUNUS.LUGAL BA.ÚŠ EGIR-*pa=ma uet* ^{m}*Ammunaš* DUMU.LUGAL BA.ÚŠ 'Ištapariya the queen died, and afterwards Ammuna the prince proceeded to die' KBo 3.1+ ii 31–32. The second death compounds the first. Here is the element of the unexpected (and the culminating!) 'turn of events' that we note is inherent in the 'go and', 'went and' in colloquial American English. As in the case of American English 'proceed to', the Hittite serial usage may also underscore here the finality of the event.[8]

24.36. It is clear in the last example that the serial verb *uet* cannot have its usual meaning of spatial movement. In other cases the context does imply movement, but it is hard to decide whether this meaning can or should be attributed to the serial form of *uwa-*/*pai-*: *nu=mu=kan* AMA=*ŠU menaḫḫ*[*anda par*]*ā naišta n=aš=mu uet* GÌR.MEŠ-*aš kattan ḫaliyattat . . . nu=mu* MUNUS-*TUM kuit menaḫḫanda uet n=aš=mu* GÌR.MEŠ-*aš kattan*

6. It is therefore not surprising to find nearly identical passages with and without the serial construction, such as example 50ab cited by van den Hout 2003.

7. The use of the "marked imperfective" form in *-ške-* in this example emphasizes either the beginning of the search or its duration. This and other counterexamples cited below contradict the claim of Dunkel (1985: 63) that the serial construction marks perfective aspect (on which see §§24.2–24.3, p. 317). For the use of the present tense here see Melchert 1998: 416–17.

8. This frequent nuance of the serial construction likely reflects the inherent lexical aspect of the motion verbs *pai-*, which typically means 'to go' in the sense 'to leave, depart' or 'to go to (a goal)', and *uwa-* 'to come (forth)' or 'to come to (a goal)'. For the "terminative" sense of these verbs see Starke 1977: 202 with references.

ḫaliyattat ‘He sent his mother to meet me, and she proceeded to prostrate herself at my feet . . . Because the woman came to meet me, and prostrated herself at my feet’ KUB 14.15 iv 28–29. It is clear that genuine movement is involved in both descriptions of this single event, but one may argue that it is expressed in *-mu . . . menaḫḫanda uet* in the second instance but by *-mu . . . menaḫḫanda parā naišta* in the first, not by the serial *uet*. The latter may instead underscore that the woman’s act was an immediate consequence of being sent by her son. Note also once again the likely connotation of surprise: the woman’s act is presented as being almost “unheard of” and quite unanticipated. That is, she *actually* did this, and the king is so impressed that he complies. The fact that the second time the action is described it is *not* in the serial construction fits this idea. It is only a real surprise when it is first mentioned.

24.37. The serial construction also is well attested in ritual contexts, where a succession of events is common: 12 ^{UZU}ÚR.ḪI.A*=ya=an* QATAMMA*=pat irḫaizzi n=aš=za uezzi* EGIR-*pa par(a)šza šešzi* ‘She (the practitioner) also makes the rounds of his twelve members in the same fashion. He (the client) proceeds to lie down backwards’ KUB 9.4 ii 28–30 (the client’s action permits the practitioner to repeat the treatment in another position). Here there is no element of surprise, but there is a culminating aspect: the serial construction was not used to describe his first lying down; only his complementary lying down backwards, which completes all possibilities. Another example: *nu* $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$*ḫalliyarēš* $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$ALAN.ZU$_9$ ^{LÚ}*palwatallaš* ^{LÚ}*kītaššaitti* $^{GIŠ.d}$INANNA.ḪI.A*=pat iyantari nu=za pānzi* AŠAR*=*ŠUNU *appanzi* ‘The *halliyara*-singers, the performers, the clapper, and the *kita*-man walk with the aforementioned *IŠTAR*-instruments, and they proceed to take their places’ KBo 4.9 v 42–45 (the positioning of the various participants not only follows directly upon their entrance together but also is a culminating act marking the end of the preceding walking). One may note again that the actual movement involved is expressed overtly by the *iyantari* of the preceding sentence.

24.38. One future event can also be viewed as directly dependent on another. For reasons that are not yet clear, all examples of declarative statements attested thus far show *uwa-* in this usage of the serial construction (for one account of this see Rieken forthcoming, but see also §24.42, p. 329, below): *nu=šši eni* GIG *awan arḫa namma tittanut n=aš ḫaddulešdu namma nu uezzi* DUMU.MUNUS GAL *zilatiya tuk* DINGIR-*LAM walliškezzi* ŠUM*-ann=a tuēl=pat* ŠA DINGIR-*LAM memiškezzi* ‘Remove that illness from her and let her become healthy again, and the princess will henceforth proceed to praise you, O deity, and speak your name, O deity’ KBo 4.6 obv. 17–20 (the action of the princess is promised as a direct *quid pro quo* if the deity restores her to health. Note again that there is a dramatic turn of events after she has become healthy. Now she is able to do the following two actions: for the first time she will *begin* to praise the deity, etc.);[9] *mān=za* 1-*EN* URU-*LUM=ma kuinki ašašti nu=kan kāšma* NIEŠ DINGIR-*LIM šarratti*

9. The use of the “marked imperfective” in *-šške-* may once again be taken either in an “inceptive” sense (‘will begin to praise’, see §§24.18–24.19, p. 322) or as expressing duration (‘will praise continually and indefinitely’, §24.8, p. 319). Likewise imperfective and contradicting the claim of Dunkel (1985: 63) is the

n=an uwammi LÚ.KÚR-*aš iwar* GUL-*aḫmi* ‘But if you occupy some one city, you will transgress the oath, and I will proceed to strike it in the fashion of an enemy’ KBo 4.3+ i 22–24 (breaking the oath will bring certain retribution; notice how often in our examples this construction occurs where there is a prominent change of subject); *n=an=kan tuzziya anda uwate mān* ŪL*=ma uwaši ḫar*(*a*)*kši* ‘Bring them (heavily armed troops) to the camp. But if not (= if you don’t), you will proceed to die!’ HKM 35:6–9 (MH/MS). The addressee is threatened with sure punishment if he fails to carry out the order, both a dramatic turn of events and “terminative” in a very concrete sense.

24.39. In another set of uses of the serial construction the connection is not to a previous action or event but to an expressed or unexpressed wish of a person or deity. This usage takes several forms. One is seen in deliberative questions,[10] mostly commonly—but not exclusively—in oracle questions of the following sort: *paimi=kan* ^{d}UTU-*ŠI antuḫšan INA* ^{URU}*Šamūḫa parā neḫḫi nu=ššan paizzi INA* ^{URU}*Šamūḫa ANA* ^{d}*IŠTAR ṢERI mukeššar pedi=pat pāi namma=šši* EZEN$_4$-*an iēzzi memiyanuš=a PANI* DINGIR-*LIM aššuli memai* ‘Should I, My Majesty, therefore dispatch a person to Šamuḫa? Should he therefore give a *mukeššar* rite for ^{d}*IŠTAR* of the Battlefield on the spot in Šamuḫa, then make a festival for her and speak friendly words before the deity?’ KUB 32.130 4–9 (MH/MS). Although the phrasal verb *pai-* must be repeated in the second clause, since it changes from *paimi* to *paizzi* (another “turn of events”), it is unnecessary in the two clauses which follow, since there is no further change of subject. This deliberative use is also seen in the following series of questions: *nu panzi ANA* DINGIR-*LIM IŠTU* KÙ.GI NA$_4$ ^{TÚG}*termazzi=ya pianzi* (answer: ‘no’) *nu pānzi ANA* DINGIR-*LIM* ^{TÚG}*termaz* UN-*azzi=ya pianzi* (answer: ‘no’) *nu pānzi ANA* DINGIR-*LIM* 1 TÚG *pianzi* ‘Should they therefore make a gift to the deity with gold, jewels, and fine garments? (answer: ‘no’). Then[11] should they make a gift to the deity with fine garments and persons? (answer: ‘no’). Then should they make a gift to the deity of one garment (answer: ‘no’)’ KUB 22.70 obv. 56–58 (series of oracle questions). The restriction here to deliberative questions is significant, because in non-deliberative oracle questions of the type ‘Will *the enemy* do such-and-such?’ the phrasal construction is *not* used. In the deliberative oracle questions the proposed actions are presented as following from the suspected will of the deity being questioned: in effect, the meaning is ‘*Do you wish* that one . . . ?’ Questions using the serial construction are restricted to the deliberative type, but not all deliberative questions are required to do so.

24.40. Still another example has nothing to do with oracular inquiry but shares the notion ‘should I/we/he/they’ in the sense of ‘do you wish that I/we/he/they . . . ?’. It is

---

serial construction in the nominal sentence: *nu=wa u*[(*ezzi*)] *tuēl=p*[*a*(*t* ^{É}*karimmi*)] *nakkiyaḫḫan* ‘And *your* temple will proceed to be revered’ KUB 30.19+ iv 4–5. It is clear that the state of reverence is to continue indefinitely. See also the example with expressed ‘be’ in KBo 17.88+ iii 23′–24′ (MS).

10. On questions in general see chapter 30.

11. This English ‘then’ is not intended to be temporal but ‘in that case’, continuing the previous ‘therefore’ in alternative clauses. See p. 329, n. 12.

a question put to Ḫattušili III, who is being pursued by Urḫi-Teššub with lethal intent: *paiweni=war=an=kan kuennumēni* ‘Should (= do you wish that) we kill him (scil., Urḫi-Teššup)?’ KBo 6.29 ii 25 (ed. Goetze 1925: 109). This construction is another in the type of the *man* and *nūman* clauses (§§23.10–23.16, pp. 314–316) which supply the lack of a subjunctive or optative mood in Hittite with which to express the modalities of potentiality and wish (see §22.1, p. 306; §23.1, p. 313; §23.10, p. 314).[12]

24.41. The use of the serial construction to mark an action that flows directly from someone’s will naturally also occurs with imperatives: 5 ŠEŠ.MEŠ=ŠU *nu=šmaš* É.MEŠ *taggašta pāndu=wa=z ašandu nu=wa=za azzikkandu akkuškandu idālu=ma=šmaš=kan lē ku*[*itki*] *taggašši* ‘As for his five brothers, he built houses for them: “Now let them proceed to settle down. Let them eat and drink. Let one do no evil to them” ’. KBo 3.1+ ii 13–15; ÌR ^{m}*Šaparta=ya=kan kuin INA* KUR ^{URU}*Gašga parā neḫḫun ueddu=wa* DUMU ^{m}*Šaparta anda w*[*e*]*miyaddu* ‘And let the servant of Šaparta whom I sent out proceed to find the son of Šaparta’ (MH/MS) HKM 66:20–23; *paiddu=wa dušgaraz=pat ēštu* ‘Now/So let there be joy’ KBo 17.88 + KBo 24.116 iii 25–26. Note again the clearly imperfective sense of the last example. See also the example of a second-person imperative in §24.35 (p. 326) above.[13]

24.42. Yet to be discovered is the rationale for the choice between *pai-* and *uwa-* as the phrasal verb. Rieken (forthcoming) has argued that *pai-* marks an action in proximity to a reference point, while *uwa-* indicates that there is a temporal distance between the action and the reference point. This generalization seems to hold for cases of *pai-* but by no means for all examples of *uwa-*, as shown by several passages cited above. It is not credible that there is any significant temporal gap between the sending of the mother to fall at the knees of the Hittite king and her doing so (KUB 14.15 iv 28–29; §24.36, p. 327). The same applies to the ritual treatment described in KUB 9.4 ii 28–30 (§24.37, p. 327). And surely the threat of capital punishment for failure to carry out an order is meant to apply immediately (HKM 35:6–9; §24.38, p. 327). There is likewise no reason to think that the king does not want the missing person found forthwith (HKM 66:20–23; §24.41). These and other counterexamples still leave the basis for the choice of *pai-* or *uwa-* unclear.

---

12. Here too one can capture the desired nuance with English ‘then’: ‘Shall we then kill him?’. But it is important to note that this is an “implicational” use of ‘then’, implying a preexisting intention or wish (in this case of the king, in the oracle questions of the deity). In this example, which begins direct speech and where there is no preceding action, a temporal ‘then, thereupon’ makes no sense (contra Disterheft 1984 et al.).

13. We have included ‘now’ in our translations of these sentences because we believe it captures the force of the serial construction that the content of the expressed command is to follow directly upon the wish of the speaker. Compare the use of “deliberative” ‘then’ in the oracle questions above.

Chapter 25

NON-FINITE VERB FORMS

25.1. The Hittite language has four non-finite verb forms (§11.18, p. 185): the verbal substantive, the infinitive, the supine, and the participle.[1]

25.2. The forms of the verb in *-war*, *-mar* (singular genitive *-waš*, *-maš*) and *-ātar* (singular genitive *-annaš*) preliminarily discussed in §4.114 (p. 130) and §11.20 (p. 185) mark what is called the **verbal substantive**. The verbs which form their verbal substantive with *-war*/*-mar* form the infinitive with *-wanzi*/ *-manzi*; those with verbal substantives in *-ātar* form the infinitive in *-anna* (see §3.31, p. 76; §§11.20–11.21, p. 185). The choice of ending is wholly a matter of the class of the verb and in no way reflects a difference in meaning or usage.

25.3. The terminology of the various verbal nouns in Hittite is summarized by the following table.

	Verbal Substantive	Infinitive	Supine	Participle
Ending	*-war, -mar, -ātar*	*-wanzi, -manzi, -anna*	*-wan*	*-ant-*

Verbal Substantive

25.4. The verbal substantive names an action, as in English '*Walking* is a healthy activity.' With extremely rare exceptions (see n. 35, p. 185) the Hittite verbal substantive is restricted to the nominative-accusative and genitive cases.

25.5. The verbal substantive in the nominative-accusative may function as the **subject**: *kī kuit daliyawar* SI×SÁ-*at* '(now with regard to) this omission which has been determined' KBo 14.21 i 28; *wekuwar* '(this composition is) a *wekuwar* [an 'asking/requesting']' in the colophon that follows KUB 15.5+ iv 40. The verbal substantive is the citation form used to translate Akkadian "infinitives" in Sumerian-Akkadian-Hittite lexical texts: (Akk.) *ša*ʾ*ālu* = (Hittite) *punuššuwar*, (Akk.) *šita*ʾʾ*alu* = (Hittite) *punuškewar*, (Akk.) *uzzuzu* = (Hittite) *katta=šan arnumar* KBo 1.44 i 11–13, ed. MSL 17:101.

25.6. In the nominative-accusative it may express the **direct object** of a transitive verb: [*nu=za m*]*aḫḫan* ABU=YA *wal*(*aḫ*)*ḫuwar aušzi* 'when my father saw the attacking, (he drove up to Tuwanuwa)' KBo 14.3 iv 39, ed. Güterbock 1956; '(with regard to the

1. On the first three of these see Kammenhuber 1954, 1955a.

shipments which I have been sending to you, if I send you an *aššul*-gift,) *zik=ma=at=za parā dammenkuwar ḫalzeššatti* 'you call it forming an attachment (perhaps even 'ingratiating oneself')' KBo 18.24 i 4–7 (see Otten 1968–69: 112–13 and Mora and Giorgieri 2004: 92, 95); *nu=za ANA* KARAŠ *uwātar . . . iyanun* 'I made for the army an inspection (lit., 'a seeing')' KBo 4.4 iii 28; IGI.ḪI.A-*aš=mu uwātar pāi* 'give me the seeing of (my) eyes!' KUB 27.67 ii 65.

25.7. It may appear as an **adnominal genitive**: *taknaza dāuwaš* SÍSKUR 'the ritual of taking (something) from the earth' KUB 17.18 iii 20, see Taracha 1990; *maḫḫan=ma* $^{d.KUŠ}$*kuršaš . . . irḫauwaš pedi ari* 'but when the (deified) hunting bag reaches the place of the *irḫawar* rite' KUB 20.25+ i 4′–5′ (*JNES* 20:92–93); ANŠE.KUR.RA *tūriyawaš* 'a draft horse (lit., 'horse of hitching up')' KBo 6.2 + KBo 19.1 iii 43 = Laws §64 (OS).

25.8. The verbal substantive occurs frequently as a **free-standing genitive** without expressed head noun (see §16.61, p. 256). In this usage it often has a potential or deontic sense ('. . . -able' or 'to be . . . -ed'), especially when negated: *mān* ^{LÚ}*UBARUM=ma kuedani* (var. [*kued*]*ani*[*k*]*i*) *uezzi* [(*n=aš mān*) *INA*] É.DINGIR-*LIM šarā pāuwaš* 'but if a privileged outsider comes to someone and is "one of going up" (i.e., one allowed access) to the temple' KUB 13.5 ii 11–12 (with restorations from KUB 40.63 i 17); *mān=aš ḫarkannaš* 'if he is "one of perishing" (i.e., one deserving the death penalty)' KBo 4.10 i 10; *nāḫūwaš* 'one of fearing' (i.e., respectful) Ḫatt. iv 55; *kuiš arḫa tarnummaš* 'he who is to be released (from military duty)' KUB 13.20 i 11; *nu* [(*annanu*)*mm*]*aš* 6 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR *pāi* 'he shall give six shekels of silver as the (price) of training' KBo 6.26 iv 29–30 (Laws §200b) with dupl. KUB 13.14 + KUB 13.16 rev. 6–7, ed. LH 158–59; note the following **negated** examples: *kuit=ma* DI-*šar šumel ŪL tar*(*aḫ*)*ḫūwaš* 'whatever litigation (proves) impossible for you (plural) (to resolve/settle)' KUB 13.20 i 36; ^{ÍD}*Aranzaḫit ŪL mazzuwaš* '(I have impregnated you) with the Tigris River, not to be resisted' KUB 33.120+ i 32 (NS); *nu=wa memiya*[(*š*)] *n*[*akkiš Ú-UL=m*]*a=war=aš arḫa p*[*e*]*šši yauwa*[(*š*)] 'the matter is important; it is something not to be cast aside' KUB 33.93 + KUB 33.96 iv 46 (Ullik. I A). This use of the verbal substantive has a parallel in the use of the action nouns in *-ātar* as free-standing genitives (see TI-*annaš* (= *ḫuišwannaš*) 'he of (long) life, long-lived' KBo 3.6 i 13 (= Ḫatt. i 15), §16.61, p. 256).

25.9. The verbal substantive, having both a nominal and a verbal aspect, can take its **logical object** in either the genitive or accusative case. When its nominal aspect is prominent, it takes its object in the **genitive**: *ammuk=man=wa ammel* [*R*]*AMANI=YA ammell=a* KUR-*eaš tepnumar tametani* KUR-*e ḫatranun* 'Would I have written to another country of my own and my country's humiliation?' KBo 5.6 iii 54-iv 2 (DŠ frag. 28); ŠEŠ*=YA=ma=mu kuit kiš*(*š*)*an TAŠPUR ŠA* DUMU.MUNUS*=wa zaluganum*[*ar UL āra*] 'Concerning what you, my "brother" (referring to Ramesses II), wrote to me, saying: "Detaining the (promised) daughter [is not permitted]"' KUB 21.38 obv. 34 (letter of Puduḫepa); LÚ.MEŠ KUR ^{URU}*Mizra=ma maḫḫan ŠA* KUR ^{URU}*Amqa* GUL-*aḫḫuwar ištamaššanzi* 'but when the people of Egypt heard (lit., 'hear') the attacking of the land of Amqa' KBo 5.6 iii 5–6;

nu=tta=kkan ŠA ^{d}UTU-*ŠI kuitki* ˹*kuggurniyauwar* EGIR-*pa anda udai* ‘and he brings up again some slander of His Majesty’ KUB 23.1 iii 12–13 (Šauškamuwa); ŠEŠ-*UTTA=ma U ŠA* ḪUR.SAG*Ammana uwauwar kuit namma memeškeši* ‘Why do you continue to speak yet again of brotherhood and of coming (to) Mt. Amanus?’ KUB 23.102 i 5–6 (NH). When its verbal aspect is prominent, it takes its object in the **accusative**: *n=uš* ^{m}*Išpudašinaraš maniyaḫḫeškezzi* GI-*an* ^{GIŠ}UMBIN *ḫašḫaššuwar* ^{GIŠ}TUKUL *appātar* ‘Išpudaš-inara taught (historical presemt ‘shows’ or ‘teaches’) them (how) to smooth/sharpen an arrow (or) a wheel (and) to hold a weapon’ KBo 3.34 ii 28–29 (“Palace Chronicle,” OH/NS). Perhaps even the dative-locative: *nu=za ANA* KARAŠ *uwātar . . . iyanun* ‘I made for the army an inspection (i.e., I inspected the army)’ KBo 4.4 iii 28. The logical subject of the verb contained in the verbal substantive can also occur in the genitive case: IGI.ḪI.A-*aš=mu uwātar pāi* ‘give me the seeing of (my) eyes!’ KUB 27.67 ii 65.

Infinitive

25.10. The Hittite infinitive is unmarked for voice and may equate to the active or passive infinitive of other languages (English ‘to give’ or ‘to be given’ respectively).

25.11. The infinitive, both when it depends on a finite verb and on a noun, expresses purpose. Depending on a finite verb: *nu=wa=kan . . .* ^{m}*Pipitaḫin ša*[*p*]*āšiyawanzi* [*par*]*ā neḫḫun* ‘I sent Pipitahi out to do reconnaissance’ HKM 17:16–17 (MH/MS); *takku āppatriwanzi kuiški* [*p*]*aizzi* ‘If anyone goes to requisition’ KBo 6.26 i 28 (Laws §164, OH/NS); sometimes the verb governing the infinitive is itself non-finite (e.g., a participle): ˹*allallā pāwanzi=wa=za* UGU *linkanuwanza* ‘I have been made to swear with the regard to defection’ KBo 4.14 ii 46–47 (treaty). Depending on a noun: 1 ^{DUG}*ḫaniššaš* GEŠTIN *šipanduwanzi* ‘one jug of wine for libating’ KUB 7.53 i 23 (rit. of Tunn.).

25.12. The infinitive can depend on a (predicate) adjective: *eki* BÀD-*ni* LUGAL-*aš* KASKAL-*š=a takšuwanzi* ^{GIŠ}SAR.GEŠTIN-*aš tuḫḫušuanzi* (var. KBo 6.3 iii 24 *tuḫšuwanzi*) *ŠA* [(^{LÚ}URUDU.NAG)]AR *natta kuiški arawaš* ‘No one of the metalworkers shall be exempt with respect to making ice, a fortification wall, and a king’s road, or harvesting vineyards’ KBo 22.62 + KBo 6.2 iii 21–22 (Laws §56, OS); ^{URU}*Akitumaš=ma=aš* SISKUR-*eššar anda uškiyawanzi kuit šanezzi* ‘she (i.e., my mother) is an offering of the Akiti festival which is pleasant to look at’ RS 25.421:54–56 (ed. Laroche 1968).

25.13. The infinitive can be construed so that its logical direct object stands in the **accusative** case (note also the variety of auxiliary verbs and their force): *anzel=za=ka*[*n*] ÉRIN.MEŠ-*an* ÉRIN.MEŠ 〈LÚ.〉KÚR *walḫuwanzi zikkezzi* ‘The enemy’s troops will begin to attack our troops’ KBo 10.7+ iii 15–16; ^{GIŠ}*armiz*[*zi=wa*] *IŠTU* NA_4 *wedumanzi karū zinnanda* ‘They have already finished building the bridge with stones’ HKM 72:4–6 (MH/MS); *nu=za* ^{URU}*Tuwanuwan zaḫḫiyawanzi ēpzi* ‘he began to fight Tuwanuwa’ KBo 14.3 iv 22 (DŠ frag. 15); *ā*[*ppa*]*=ma=kan* ^{m}*Attariššiyaš* LÚ ^{URU}*Āḫḫiyā arḫa uet nu* EGIR-*an tuk=pat* ^{m}*Madduwattan kunanna šanḫ*[*iške*]*t* ‘Afterwards, Attariššiya, the man of

Aḫḫiyā, came, and was seeking to kill you, Madduwatta' KUB 14.1 obv. 60 (MH/MS); *nu=za pait* URU*Alminan wetummanzi IṢBAT* 'he proceeded to begin fortifying Almina' KBo 5.6 i 9 (DŠ frag. 28A); *nu=wa=za* DUMU-*aš kui*[*š zik*] [*nu=w*]*ar=an=kan taparuna kuwapi paiši* 'And you who are but a child, where will you go to rule him?' KUB 19.29 iv 20–21, ed. AM 20–21; md LAMMA-*aš=a kue* KARAŠ.ḪI.A *INA* KUR URU*Nuḫašši ḫalkiuš ḫarninkuwanzi peḫudan ḫarta* 'The troops that Kurunta had led to Nuḫaše in order to destroy (their) crops' KBo 4.4 ii 63–64, ed. AM 120–121; *nu uwaši ŠA* ḪUR.SAG*Tašša* NA4*perunuš IŠTU* SAG.DU=*KA* GUL-*aḫḫuwanzi zinniškeši* 'You will end up striking the rocks of Mt. Tašša with your head' KUB 33.120 i 34–36 (Song of Kumarbi); *mān* NINDA*taparpašuš šarrumanzi taruptari* 'when the distribution of *taparpašu*-breads is completed' KUB 10.89 i 16–17.

25.14. The preceding examples with common-gender nouns show that the following with neuter nouns are also direct objects in the accusative: *āššu* UZU.Ì *ḫuwappann=a* UZU.Ì *uwanna* 'to see the favorable inner organ and the unfavorable one' KBo 3.21 ii 9–10 (MH/NS); [*nu kuit*] É.MEŠ DUMU.LUGAL *danna ilaliyanzi* '[And because] they want to take the estates of the prince(s)' KBo 3.1 ii 63 (OH/NS); *lišši yala=tta=ma nepišaš daganzipaš=a uddar kattan arḫa petummanzi* 'It is for you to take along the oracular words of heaven and earth' KBo 3.21 ii 6–7 (hymn to Adad, MH/NS); *mān=za* LÚ.MEŠKISAL.LUḪ É.MEŠ GIBIL *ḫaneššūwanzi appanzi* 'When the courtyard washers begin plastering the new building(s)' KUB 29.1 iii 29 (without *ANA* the logogram É.MEŠ GIBIL is probably accusative, not dative-locative); *maḫḫan=ma=za ḫalkueššar ḫandāuwanzi zinnāi nu=za* EZEN4 *namma iyauwanzi ēpzi* 'when he finishes preparing the materials (for the festival), he will then begin performing the festival itself' KUB 27.59 i 23–25; *n=at ANA* dUTU-*ŠU uwanna ḫandāer* 'and (the lords) arranged for His Majesty to see them (aforementioned chariots)' HKM 63:20–21 (MH/MS) — note that the logical subject here is in the dative-locative. The uses of MH *liliwaḫḫuwanzi* in the Maşat letters (HKM 13:10–12, HKM 15:10–13, HKM 20:6–12, etc.) are adverbial ('hastily'), with the *accusative* objects depending upon the main verb in the clause.

25.15. More often, the logical direct object of an infinitive stands in the **dative-locative**: d*Anuš=ma=ta* dEN.LÍL-*aššš=a . . . ANA* LÚ.MEŠ KÚR=*ŠUNU wemiyawanzi tuk wātarnaḫḫer* 'Anu and Enlil . . . commissioned you to "find" their enemies' KBo 3.21 ii 12–13 (MH/MS); *kuedaš=ma=kan ANA* EZEN4.ḪI.A GAL.ḪI.A *ŠA* EZEN4.MEŠ ITU *ašnumanzi ḫandandat* 'The great festivals of the monthly festivals that were determined to be performed' ABoT 14+ v 9–11 (CTH 568, oracles); EME.ḪI.A EME.ḪI.A *kuwapi=wa paitte*[*ni*] NA4*peruni* ˹*palḫuna paiweni . . . ANA* NA4KA ˹*duwarnuma*[*nzi p*]*aiweni* UR.MAḪ GIŠ-*ruanzi* KI.MIN UR.BAR.RA ˹*patalḫauna* KI.MIN *:zammanti* DUMU.NITA *lalauna* KI.MIN 'Tongues, tongues, where are you going? We go to *palḫa*- the rock, . . . we go to break the KA-stone, we go to *tarwāi*- the lion, we go to *patalḫa*- the wolf, we go to release the *zammant*-boy (from a spell)' KUB 44.4 + KBo 13.241, rev. 22–25 (ritual incantation); MUNUS.LUGAL f*Pudu*[(*ḫepaš=kan kuwapi*)] mUR.MAḪ-LÚ-*in* [(GAL DUB.SAR.MEŠ U)]RU*Ḫattuš*[(*i ANA ṬUPPA*ḪI.A)] URU*Kizzuwa*[(*tna š*)]*anḫūwanzi* [(*weriyat*)] *n=ašta kē*

ṭUP[(*PA*$^{HI.A}$ *ŠA*)] EZEN$_4$ *išu*[(*waš ap*)]*iy*[(*a* UD-*at arḫa aniyat*)] ‘When Queen Puduḫepa commanded Walwaziti, (who is) chief of the scribes, to seek in Ḫatti for tablets of Kizzuwatna, on that day he copied out these tablets of the Festival of (*ḫ*)*išuwaš*’ KBo 15.60 vi 3–11 restored from duplicates KBo 7.45 rev. left 6′–9′, KBo 40.65:1′–7′ and KBo 15.52 vi 39–45 (colophon); *mān INA* UD.2.KAM *lukkatta nu* MUNUS.MEŠ *uktu*[*riy*]*a ḫaštiaš leššūwanzi pānzi* ‘At dawn on the second day women go to the pyre to collect the bones (dative)’ KUB 30.15 i 1–2 (OH/NS).

25.16. In some cases we cannot be sure if the object is in the dative or accusative: *apāš=ma=mu ḫarkanna . . . šanḫta* ‘but he sought to kill me (lit., ‘he sought me for perishing’)’ Ḫatt. iii 63; *mān=mu idalauwanni=ya kuiš waggariya*[*w*]*anzi šanḫazi* ‘if someone in wickedness seeks to rebel against me’ KUB 21.47 + KUB 23.82 rev. 23; *nu kuiš* ^{LÚ}NAGAR GIŠ-*ṢI* ḪUR.SAG ^{GIŠ}*innaššaš karšuwanzi paizzi* ‘He who is a carpenter goes to the mountain to cut beams’ KUB 29.1 iii 14–15 (rit., OH/NS) (*innaššaš* in NH copy could be accusative plural, but is probably dative here); see also KBo 22.62 + KBo 6.2 iii 21–22 above sub §25.12 (p. 332). The following could be an example of the logical object in either the dative or the accusative, depending on whether *ANA* or the ending *-an* is to be taken more seriously: *našma ANA* ^{m}*Duppi-*^{d}IM-*upan INA* KUR ^{URU}*Amurri ANA* LUGAL-*UTTIM arḫa tittanummanzi takkešzi* ‘of (if) he plots to remove Duppi-Teššup (logical object, but dative) from kingship in Amurru’ KBo 5.9 ii 34–36 (Murš. II).

25.17. In some instances the logical object of the infinitive appears in Hittite as the grammatical subject of the clause, while the infinitive is dependent on the verb ‘to be’ or other predicatival expressions: NINDA.KUR$_4$.RA *paršiyawanzi* NU GÁL ‘There are no loaves for breaking’ KUB 12.12 v 32; [*kē*]*z=ma=kan* ^{URU}*Tiyaššiltaš QADU* A.ŠÀ A.GÀR*=ŠU* [*IN*]*A* ^{URU}*Timmuḫala šipanduwanzi anda appanza* ‘in this direction (the city) Tiyaššilta with its fields and meadows (is) combined with (the city) Timmuḫala for the purpose of being made sacrosanct (to a deity)’ KUB 19.37 ii 21–22 (NH); *IŠT*[*U* KUR] ^{URU}KÙ.BABBAR-*TI* ^{LÚ}*MUNNABTUM* EGIR-*pa piyanna ŪL āra* ‘a fugitive (nom.) is not right for giving back from the land of Ḫatti (i.e., it is not permitted to give back a fugitive from the land of Ḫatti)’ KBo 5.4 obv. 38 (NH); ^{LÚ}*MUNNABTUM* EGIR SUM-*wanzi ŪL āra* ‘It is not permitted to give back fugitives’ KUB 19.55 rev. 4 (NH); *nu=šši* GUD *pūḫugariš piyawanzi* SI×SÁ-*at* ‘A substitute ox was determined for him for giving (if from *pai-*; or, ‘for sending there’, if from *piya-*)’ KBo 4.2 iii 50 (NH); *mān* URU-*LUM kuiš . . . ANA* ^{m}*Ulmiteššup piyanna UL* ZI-*anza* (lit.:) ‘If some village/city is not the wish to give to Ulmi-Teššup’ (i.e., ‘If it is not (His Majesty’s) wish to give some village/city to Ulmi-Teššup’) KBo 4.10 ii 18.

25.18. When there is an impersonal verb such as ‘it doesn’t succeed that’ or ‘it doesn’t happen that’, the logical subject of the infinitive can stand in the dative: *mān tuk=ma* [*warr*]*išuwanzi ŪL kišari* ‘But if you are unable to [as]sist’ KBo 5.9 ii 19 (Murš. II); *nu=nnaš=kan epurawanzi ŪL ḫapdat* ‘We couldn’t *epura-*’ KBo 18.54 rev. 14–15 (letter); according to one possible interpretation, the passages BrTabl. i 96–97 and ii 1–2 (Tudḫ. IV) would also serve as examples.

25.19. Often the infinitive combines with a finite verb idiomatically, as if the latter were an auxiliary verb.

25.20. The infinitive combines with the auxiliary verb *ēpp-* and *-za* with the meaning 'to begin to do something' (Goetze 1925: 89; SV 2:154; and HW^2 2:64–65). This construction is attested once in a New Hittite copy of an Old Hittite ritual: *mān=za* LÚ.MEŠKISAL.LUḪ É.MEŠ GIBIL *ḫaneššūwanzi appanzi* 'When the courtyard-washers begin plastering new buildings' KUB 29.1 iii 29 (OH/NS). But since there is no other example in either OH or MH, we should probably attribute this construction to the NH scribe rather than his OH archetype. A few securely datable New Hittite examples: *nu=za pait* URU*Alminan wetummanzi IṢBAT* 'He went and began to fortify Almina' KBo 5.6 i 9 (DŠ by Murš. II), not found in Muršili II's own military annals; *nu=mu=za alwanzaḫḫūwanzi namma QADU* DAM=*ŠU* DUMU=*ŠU ēpper* 'They — (he) together with his wife and son — began again to bewitch me' Ḫatt. ii 77–78. In addition, the construction is found routinely in NH ritual and cult texts: *nu=za* DINGIR.MEŠ *ḫūittiyawanzi appanzi* 'And they begin to draw the gods' KUB 15.31 i 33, iii 48; *nu=za* EZEN$_4$ *namma iyauwanzi ēpzi* 'And he begins to celebrate the festival again' KUB 27.59 i 24–25.

25.21. The infinitive with *dai-* and *-za* also means 'to begin to (do something)' (lit., 'to place oneself to (do something)'): *anda=ma=z=kan mān* LÚ.KÚR-*aš kuwāpi uwalḫuwanzi dāi* 'Then when the enemy begins (lit., 'sets himself') to attack' KBo 16.50 (oath of Ašḫapala, MH/MS); *anzel=za=kan* ÉRIN.MEŠ-*an* ÉRIN.MEŠ ⟨LÚ.⟩KÚR *walḫuwanzi zikkezzi* 'Enemy troops will begin to attack our troops' KBo 10.7 + HSM 3645 iii 15–16, see ibid. 19–20. See the same verbal construction without the infinitive: LÚ.KÚR=*za=kan maḫḫan* URU*Kāšašan* URU*Taḫazzimunann=a* ⟨*walḫuwanzi*⟩ *zikkezzi* 'How the enemy begins ⟨to attack⟩ the (towns of) Kasasa and Tahazzimuna' HKM 27:3–6 (letter MH/MS).

25.22. The infinitive with *tiya-* also means 'to begin to (do something)': *nu* DINGIR.MEŠ *ḫūmanteš ANA* d*Ullukummi . . .* GUD.ḪI.A *maḫḫan uwayawanzi tīer* 'And all the gods like cows began to low towards Ullukummi' KBo 26.65 iv 19–20 (Ullik. III). See also: [. . . LÚ]-*LUM kuwapi waššūwanzi tianzi* KUB 31.69 obv. 8 (NH); 1 NINDA.KU$_7$ BA.BA.ZA *ŠA* 2 *UPN*[*I*] 1 DUG*ḫalwatalla* LÀL 1 DUGḪAB.ḪAB GÚ.GÍD.DA *ANA AŠ*[*RI*ḪI.A] *irḫauwanzi tiya*[*nzi*] *nu AŠRI*ḪI.A *irḫanz*[*i*] KUB 25.19 vi 13–17 + IBoT 4.80:4–8 (NS); LUGAL-*uš irḫawanzi tiyazi* 3=*ŠU! irḫaizzi* dU URU*Zippalanda* ḪUR.SAG*Dāḫa* d*Ḫašmāyu* KUB 11.30 + IBoT 4.197 iii 22–25. This construction is strikingly similar to the more common use of *tiya-* with the supine (see §25.37, p. 338).

25.23. The infinitive with the verb *zinne-* is translated 'to finish (doing something)': *maḫḫan=ma* LÚNAR *AWA*[*TE*MEŠ] *memiyauwanzi zinna*[*i*] 'but when the singer finishes speaking the words' KUB 39.84 obv. 1–2; *nu=za* GIM-*an* [. . .] SISKUR.ḪI.A *iyawanzi zinnaḫḫi* 'And when I finish performing the rituals' AT 125:22–24; *maḫḫan=ma=za ḫalkueššar ḫandāuwanzi zinnāi nu=za* EZEN$_4$ *namma iyauwanzi ēpzi* 'when he finishes preparing the materials (for the festival), he will then begin performing the festival itself' KUB 27.59 i 23–25.

25.24. Similar in meaning is the infinitive with *šarā tittanu-*[2] and *aš*(*ša*)*nu-*: *nu tuel ŠA* ^{d}UTU ^{URU}*Arinna ḫimmuš* SÍSKUR.ḪI.A EZEN$_4$.ḪI.A *iyauwanzi šarā tittanuškanzi* 'They perform fully your *ḫimmuš*, rituals (and) festivals, O Sungoddess of Arinna' KUB 24.3 i 23–25 (Murš. II). With *aš*(*ša*)*nu-*: *maḫḫan=kan* MUNUS ŠU.GI *mugauwanzi ašnuzi nu aruwaizzi* 'When the Old Woman finishes invoking (the deity), she bows down' KUB 17.23 i 1–2; *n=ašta* GIM-*an tuppa*$^{ḪI.A}$*-aššʼ=a memiyanuš anda memiyauwanzi aššanuwanzi* 'When they finish speaking the words of the tablets' KUB 17.18 ii 15–16.

25.25. The infinitive with *ḫandalliya-* means 'to dare to (do something)' KBo 4.4 iii 62–63 (AM 132–33).

25.26. The infinitive with *mazz-* also means 'to dare to (do something)': [*mā*]*n apāš=ma memiyawanzi UL mazzazzi* 'But if he doesn't dare to tell (his superior)' KUB 13.4 iii 76. See CHD *mazz-* a 1′ d′.

25.27. The infinitive with *tarḫ-* means 'to be able to (do something)': *nu=war=at=za namma iyatnuwan ḫāšuwāi*^{SAR} [*pu*]*ššuwanzi lē kuiški tarḫzi* 'And let no one be able to [cr]ush it, the *iyatnuwan ḫašuwai* plant, again' KUB 29.7 + KBo 21.41 rev. 27–28, but also 'to defeat someone (accusative) in doing something': *ŠUŠŠI* LÚ.MEŠ 70 ^{LÚ}GURUŠ[*=z*]*a šišiyauwanzi tarḫta* 'he defeated sixty men (and) seventy young men in shooting' KUB 36.67 ii 23 (Gurparanzahu myth).

25.28. The infinitive with *wakkar-* means 'to almost do something, not quite do something' (lit., 'to lack to do something'): (When Ḫebat saw Tašmišu,) *nu=kan* ^{d}*Ḫebaduš šuḫḫaz katta mauššuwanzi waqqareš* 'she almost fell down from the roof (where she was standing)' KUB 33.106 ii 7–8 (Ullik. III A). See also §25.34 (p. 337).

25.29. The infinitive with *karš-* means 'to fail to (do something), neglect to (do something)': ('Whoever crosses the threshold of the gods',) *nu* 1-*aš* 1-*aš INA* É.DINGIR-*LIM šarā šēšūwanzi lē=pat karštari* 'Let him not neglect — each in his turn (lit., 'one by one') — to spend the night up in the temple' KUB 13.4 iii 5–6 (pre-NH/NS).

25.30. The infinitive with *mimma-* means 'to refuse to (do something)': ^{m}*Maddu=wattaš=a=z* KUR $^{ḪUR.SAG}$*Ḫāriyati ašānna mimmaš* 'Madduwatta refused to occupy the Mt. Ḫāriyati district' KUB 14.1 obv. 18; ḪUR.SAG-*aš=za arauwanzi memmai ḫariyaš=za appānna memmai* KASKAL-*šaš=za karipuwanzi memmai* 'The mountain will refuse restraining (or: to be restrained). The valley will refuse seizing (or: to be seized). The road will refuse devouring (or: to be devoured)' KUB 12.62 rev. 3–6 (ritual). It is unclear if

2. See also LÚ.MEŠ E.DÉ.A*=ma* DINGIR-*LAM* KÙ.GI *ienzi ANA* DINGIR-*LIM=ma aniur=šet maḫḫan n=an aniyauwanzi QATAMMA šarā tittanuwanzi* 'the smiths make a gold (statue of) the god, and they perform/treat him/it fully just as his/its protocol is' KUB 29.4 i 6–8. The phrase *šarā tittanu-* means 'to complete, finish' (HW 225 'vollenden'). This interpretation is to be preferred to Puhvel's 'undertake' (HED H 315), if by that is implied an ingressive aspect.

the *-z(a) . . . UL me/i(m)ma-* that means ‘to refuse’ is a usage of *mema-* ‘to say’ (hence: ‘to say “no”’; see CHD L–N *mema-* 12b) or an unusual extension of the meaning of the non-negated *mimma-* ‘to refuse’ to its negated form: *ŠA* É.GAL-*LIM=ma=z* NUMUN.ḪI.A *aniyauwanzi ŪL mimatti* ‘(How can you make haste in regard to the seed of the lords and plant the seed of the lords,) but refuse to sow the seeds supplied by the palace (lit., ‘of the palace’)?’ HKM 55:27–28 (MH/MS); and see CHD L–N *mema-* 12b for further examples.

25.31. The infinitive with *tarna-* means ‘to allow (something to be done)’: *nu namma* ^{d}UTU-*ŠI* ^{URU}*Dukkaman* URU-*an* [*š*]*āruwawanzi UL tarnaḫḫun* ‘And then I, His Majesty, did not permit the city Dukkama to be plundered’ KBo 4.4 iv 23–24 (AM); *ammuk=ma=za=kan pariyan pāuwa*[*nzi*] *ŪL tarnaš* ‘But he did not allow me to go beyond’ KUB 23.87:10–11 (letter).

25.32. The infinitive with *nuntarnu-* means ‘to (do something) hastily or precipitately’: DINGIR.MEŠ*=ma* ZI-*anza daššuš* [(*nu ēppuwan*)]*zi ŪL nuntarnuzi* ‘But the determination of the *gods* is strong. It is in no hurry to seize (an offender), (and when it does seize, it does not let go again)’ KUB 13.5 ii 30–31 (pre-NH/NS) with restorations from dupl. KUB 13.6 ii 14.

25.33. The infinitive with *irḫāi-* means ‘to perform (an action) in a circular way’: 1 ^{DUG}*KUKUB* KAŠ*=ya šipanduwanzi irḫaizzi* ‘he libates also one pitcher of beer in a circle’ or ‘he makes the rounds libating a pitcher of beer’ KBo 24.45 obv. 12.

25.34. In some cases the finite verb describes the manner of the action expressed by the infinitive and is equivalent to what would be an adverb in languages such as English: *nu* [*k*]*uitman akkuškanzi kuitman a*[*kuan*]*na ḫūmanteš irḫānzi* [*i*]*šḫamiškan=ma apā*[*t*] SÌR *n=at išḫamiyawanzi* EGIR-*pa a*[*rku*]*škanzi* ‘and while they are drinking, while all are completing the drinking, that song is being sung, and they are singing it *responsively* (lit., ‘they are responding [*arkuške-*] to sing’)’ KUB 25.37 + KUB 35.131 + KUB 51.9 i 38–40 (CTH 771.1); *maniyaḫḫiaš išḫan kuin BEL=ŠU iezi nu=šša*n *apedani* URU-*ri* EGIR-*an* IGI.DU$_8$.ḪI.A *dānna maknut* ‘(This is the man) whom his lord makes a district governor, and behind (the back of) the city he took tribute *excessively* (lit., ‘behind the city he increased to take tribute’)’ KBo 32.14 iii 13–15 (Song of Release). See also §25.28 (p. 336) on the use of *wakkar-* plus infinitive.

25.35. Occasionally the infinitive describes the manner in which the action of the main verb is executed: *liliwaḫḫuwanzi nai* ‘Send quickly!’ ABoT 60 rev. 3–4, VBoT 2:10–12; *liliwaḫḫuwanzi arnutten* ‘Move quickly!’ HKM 15:12–13; *liliwaḫḫuwanzi ūnni* ‘Drive here quickly!’ HKM 14:7; *nu INA* 8 *MUŠI penniyawanzi* 6 DANNA *arnuanzi* ‘And for eight nights they move them six DANNAs at a trot’ KBo 3.5 i 57–58 (Kikkuli horse training manual); *n=uš šakurūwawanzi ḫaššiknuanzi* ‘And they satisfy them (i.e., the horses) by watering’ KUB 29.40 ii 5.

25.36. The infinitive with *natta āra* means 'It is not permitted to (do something)': ^{LÚ}*MUNNABTUM* EGIR SUM-*wanzi* *UL* *āra* 'It is not permitted to give back fugitives' KUB 19.55 rev. 4 (NH); *nu* *UL*=*ma* *āra* UGU *šēšuanzi* 'Or is it not permitted to spend the night up there?' KUB 5.1 i 38 (NH). The infinitive with the negated impersonal (third-person singular) verb form *ŪL ḫapdat/ḫapdari* and the dative of the actor means 'couldn't/can't (do something)' (lit., 'it was/is impossible for (the person) to (do something)'): *nu*=*nnaš*=*kan epurawanzi* *ŪL* *ḫapdat* 'We couldn't *epura-*' KBo 18.54 rev. 14–15 (NH); *epurawanzi*=*ma*=*kan* *UL* *ḫapdari* 'it will be impossible to *epura-*' KBo 18.54 rev. 19.

Supine

25.37. The form of the verb in -(*u*)*wan* is called the supine. It is employed only in constructions with an auxiliary verb, either *dai-* 'to put' or *tiya-* 'to step, arrive, enter' (see HE §§184c, 273, and 259c). Principal studies of the supine are Ose 1944 and Kammenhuber 1955a. The supine construction is never negated, and no word breaks the nexus between the supine and its auxiliary verb (*dai-* or *tiya-*). This is in contrast to the infinitive (see *nu namma kel* *ŠA* KUR.KUR-*TIM* LÚ.[MEŠ *ṬEMI*] *MAḪAR* ^{d}UTU-*ŠI uwawanzi* *ŪL* *tarnai* 'he doesn't let messengers from these lands come before My Majesty' KUB 14.1 rev. 30–31 (MH/MS); and *ŠA* É.GAL-*LIM*=*ma*=*z* NUMUN.ḪI.A *aniyauwanzi* *ŪL* *mimatti* HKM 55:27–28 above in §25.30, p. 337). In the supine the verb almost always takes an imperfective stem (see §§11.23–11.24, p. 186; §24.19, p. 322). The older texts show a preference for *dai-* 'to put' as the auxiliary verb; later texts can employ either *dai-* or *tiya-* 'to step, enter', although *tiya-* is most commonly confined to the plural: *tiyaweni*, *tier*. The form *ti*(-*ya*)-*an-zi* is ambiguous, as it could be parsed as third-person plural present of either verb. Rarer (mostly OH or MH) plural forms of *dai-* as auxiliary verb are: *daišten*, *dāir* and *daier*; otherwise it is employed in the singular: *teḫḫi*, *daitti*, *dāi*, *daiš*.

25.38. One usually translates the supine construction 'to begin to do something', 'to be ready to do something', 'to be willing to do something'. It is found occasionally in almost all types of text, but it is used quite extensively in only two types: the NH mythological narratives (see DeVries 1967) and the NH military annals (see Goetze 1933a and Güterbock 1956), but especially in the former. There is a noticable complementary distribution of the two semantically similar constructions (both meaning 'to begin to . . .'), supine with *dai-* or *tiya-* and infinitive with *ēpp-*: where the supine construction is found, the infinitival one is not, and vice versa. Thus the infinitval construction is not found in the myths or in the annals of Muršili II, but the supine construction occurs, and in the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma, authored by Muršili II, the infinitival construction occurs, but the supine construction is not found. In the Apology of Hattušili III the supine construction is quite common, while the infinitive + *ēpp-* occurs once. The infinitive + *ēpp-* construction occurs rarely prior to New Hittite, while the supine construction was in normal use from Old Hittite times. For *dai-* with the infinitive see §25.21 (p. 335). For *tiya-* with the infinitive see §25.22 (p. 335).

Participle

25.39. The participle expresses a state. With transitive verbs it usually corresponds to the passive participle of other languages, expressing the state of a person or thing acted upon: *appant-* 'seized, taken', *paršiyant-* 'broken', *piyant-* 'given', *ḫaššant-* 'born', *taruppant-* 'assembled, united'). With intransitive verbs it may indicate an attained state: *akkant-* 'having died', *pānt-* 'having gone', *uwant-* 'having come [a river in flood stage]', but sometimes also an ongoing state equivalent to an English present participle: *arant-* 'standing', *ḫuwant-* 'running', *naḫḫant-* 'afraid'. Participles of transitive verbs used generically can be either active (*šekkant-* 'knowing', *ištamaššant-* 'hearing [ear]', *uwant-* 'seeing [eye]', *adant-* 'having eaten', *akuwant-* 'having drunk', ^{d}*Wišuriyant-* 'the strangleress') or passive. One even finds the very same verbs used in both ways: *šekkant-* both 'knowing (spirit)' and 'known (person)'.

25.40. Like any adjective, the participle can function as an attribute of a noun, as a predicate, or substantivized as a noun itself.

25.41. Like other adjectives, the participle is used attributively to modify a noun. But when it does so, it rarely (see the next paragraph) precedes the noun, as do most adjectives (§17.4, p. 271), but follows it, as do the universal quantifiers *ḫūmant-* 'all' and *dapiyant-* 'all' (§17.6, p. 271): [*g*]*aggapan zanuandan tianzi* 'they set out a cooked *gaggapa*-animal' KUB 20.11 ii 22; LÚ ^{GIŠ}BANŠUR 2 NINDA.KUR$_4$.RA KU$_7$ *paršiyanduš šuppaza* ^{GIŠ}BANŠUR-*za dāi* 'A table-man takes two broken up sweet loaves from the the sacred table' KUB 10.52 vi 13–14; ^{LÚ}SAGI-*aš waššanza* 'a fully clothed cupbearer' KUB 10.21 ii 11; ^{NA_4}*paššiluš ānduš* 'warm pebbles' KUB 7.53 ii 22, KUB 17.23 i 13; ^{É}*karimnaš* SIG$_5$-*and*[*aš*] 'sanctuaries in good condition', URU.DIDLI.ḪI.A . . . *ašanduš* 'settled . . . cities' KBo 11.1 obv. 33.

25.42. Exceptional preposed participles are: *witantuš* URU.ḪI.A-*uš* 'fortified cities' KUB 36.108 obv. 6, 8 (OS); *warān paḫḫur* 'a burning fire' (KBo 6.34 iv 6), *IŠTU ABI=YA kaneššanza* UN-*aš* 'a person recognized/honored by my father' KBo 4.12 obv. 9; *anda ḫūppanduš* NA$_4$.ḪI.A 'stones gathered together' VBoT 24 ii 20 (Anniwiyani rit.), ed. Sturtevant and Bechtel 1935: 100–126; *paršiyanduš* NINDA.KUR$_4$.RA.ḪI.A 'broken breads' KUB 7.5 ii 9 (Paškuwatti rit.), ed. Hoffner 1987; ^{GIŠ}GIDRU ŪL *walḫantan* UDU-*un* 'a sheep never struck with a rod' KBo 15.10+ ii 9–10 (MH/MS); and *a-a-an-du-uš* ^{NA_4}*paššiluš* KBo 16.54 + KUB 32.131 + KBo 20.73 iv 18, if (as is usual) *ānt-* is viewed as the participle of a verb *ā-* (Neu 1968b: 1; Friedrich and Kammenhuber 1975–84 44–45).

25.43. Like other adjectives, the participle can fill the role of a predicate ('the land is large', 'the situation is grave'), where it can be regarded as the second component of an equation, X = Y: *kī ṬUPPU arḫa ḫarran ēšta* '(the prototype of) this tablet had deteriorated (and was recopied)' KUB 33.120 + KUB 48.97 iv 32–33 (colophon); *ḫarkišš=a* ^{NINDA}*ḫaršiš karū paršiyanza* 'and the white *ḫ.*-bread (was) already broken up' KUB

10.52 vi 8–9. Negated: [*apē=a k*]*ušduwāta lē lē ḫandān=pat ēšdu* ‘And let [those] false accusations never — never be established!’ KUB 1.16 ii 55 (OH/NS). In the preceding examples the verb — either expressed or implied — is *eš-* ‘to be’. But the neuter singular participle of many verbs is used in the predicate with the auxiliary verb *ḫar(k)-* ‘to have, hold’. On this see §22.19–§22.25 (pp. 310–312).

25.44. The participle can be substantivized: *ḫuninkanza* 3 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR *dāi* ‘the injured party takes three shekels of silver’ Hittite Laws §9; *akkant-* ‘dead person’, LÚ*pitteyant-* ‘fugitive’, LÚ*maniyaḫḫant-* (CHD s.v.); see also the divine name d*Wišuriyanza* ‘the strangleress’ (see Carruba 1966a: 49–52 and the review by Hoffner 1968b).

25.45. Since the verbal origin of the participle was not forgotten, it continued to be used with preverbs (*anda ḫūppanduš* NA_4.ḪI.A ‘stones gathered together’ VBoT 24 ii 20) and with complements qualifying its verbal element, such as nouns in the instrumental case: *IŠTU ABI=YA kaneššanza* UN-*aš* ‘a person honored by my father’ KBo 4.12 obv. 9; É*ḫīli=ma zeriyalli* GAD-*it kariyanda karū artari* ‘potstands covered with linen cloths are already standing in the courtyard’ KUB 10.21 ii 7–8;[3] *nu=šša*n d*Telipinuš* Ì.DÙG.GA-*it papparšanta* KASKAL-*ša iyanni* ‘O Telipinu, set out on the road sprinkled with fine oil’ KUB 17.10 ii 29–30 (Tel. myth, OH/MS); *aiš* EME-*aš gagāš qāša=šmaš=kan parkuin mišriwantan ḫarkin* GIŠGIDRU ŪL *walḫantan* UDU-*un šipantaḫḫun* ‘O mouth, tongue, tooth! Behold I have sacrificed to you (plural) a pure, gleaming white sheep never (lit., ‘not’) struck with a rod’ KBo 15.10 + KBo 20.42 ii 8–10 (rit., MH/MS). This recalls similar constructions involving pure adjectives whose meanings resemble passive participles: *marnuwantet šūn* ‘full (i.e., filled) with *marnuwant*-beer’ KBo 21.72 i 13). This use is more common as a predicate than as an attribute.

3. *kariyanda* (pl. neut.) shows that *zeriyalli* is a plural. The verbal force of *kariyanda* is complemented by GAD-*it* ‘with linen’.

Chapter 26
NEGATION

26.1. During the Empire Period Hittite possessed **five negative words**: (1) the negative of assertions *natta* (usually written as an Akkadogram UL or *Ú-UL*, on which see §31.9, p. 432), rarely as Sumerogram NU), (2) the negative of prohibition *le-e*, (3) the negative of 'not yet', *nāwi* (older spelling *na*(*-a*)*-ú-i* continuing into latest periods, later *na*(*-a*)*-wi*$_5$ unattested before New Hittite), (4) the negative of wish or potential *nu-u-ma-*(*a-*)*an* (or *nu-u-wa-*(*a-*)*an*), and (5) *nekku* 'not . . . somehow?' (HE §§279–83). All five of these words have been comprehensively treated in the CHD, volume L–N (1990).

natta

26.2. In Hittite the primary negative of **assertions** *na-at-ta* (Akkadian UL) may modify any sort of predicate except a verb in the imperative: (1) present or preterite indicative finite verbs, (2) adjectives or participles, (3) nouns (including verbal substantives—see §25.8, p. 331), (4) adverbs. For examples see Hoffner 1986: 91–92 and CHD L–N sub *natta* b. In addition, *natta* may modify elements other than the predicate: (subject) *natta=an ūk tarnaḫḫun* LUGAL-*š=an* MUNUS.LUGAL-*š=a tarnaš* 'It was not I who released it, the king and queen released it' KBo 17.3 iii 4–5 (OS); (direct object) *natta apūn* GEŠTIN-*an piyēr* 'It was not that wine that they gave' KBo 3.34 ii 5 (OH/NS); (other) DUMU.LÚ.U$_{19}$.LU *ŪL innarā uwanun ŪL=ma šullanni uwanun* 'O mortal, it was not rashly that I came, not in wantonness that I came.' See CHD L–N sub *natta* c. Finally, *natta* may also modify non-predicatival verbal substantives and participles: *ŪL uwawaš* 'one of not coming' (i.e., 'one not permitted to come'); *ŪL naḫšariyawanza* 'the unafraid'; *ŪL pittuliantan* 'the unintimidated'; *ŪL zanuwanti* 'uncooked'.

Word Order with natta

26.3. The usual word order is *natta* (UL) (or other negation: *lē*, *nāwi*, *nūman*) immediately before the verbal form (Hoffner 1986: 86): *takku šumeš natta šaktēni* 'If you do not know' KBo 22.1:5 (OS); *luzzi natta karpiyezzi* 'he shall not perform corvée work' KBo 6.2 ii 40 (OS). With preverbal constructions *natta* (and other negatives; for *lē* see §26.22, p. 345) breaks the nexus between preverb and verb: *nu namma arḫa UL tarnāi* 'he doesn't let go again' KUB 13.4 ii 23–24 (pre-NH); *nu=war=aš=mu parā ŪL peštēni* 'and (if) you don't hand them over to me' KUB 14.15 i 15 (NH). There are occasional exceptions to this rule with *anda*: *ŪL anda ešun* 'I was not present' KUB 21.19 i 35, ii 5; *nu=kan UL=ma anda šalikmi* KUB 5.1 i 29, but no exceptional examples with *arḫa*,

katta(*n*), *parā*, or *šarā*. For further examples, exceptions, and discussion see Hoffner 1986: 86–89.

26.4. The negative *natta* can be fronted and separated from its finite verb, often in rhetorical questions (Hoffner 1986: 89–90): *natta ūk* ÍD.MEŠ-*uš* ḪUR.SAG.MEŠ-*uš arunušš=a* [EGIR-*p*]*a tarmaīškimi* 'Is it not I who restrain the rivers, mountains and seas?' KUB 31.4 + KBo 3.41:12–13 (OH/NS); *ūL=wa* LUGAL-*waš araš=miš zik* 'Are you not the friend of me, the king?' KUB 29.1 i 35 (OH/MS); emphatic assertion: *ūL=at=ši=kan arḫa danzi* 'They shall *not* take it away from him' BrTabl. ii 99 (Tudḫ. IV). See further examples in §26.9 (p. 343). For other elements fronted to clause-initial position see §30.5 (p. 407).

26.5. In contrastive sentences (often with the finite verb fronted), the negation comes at the end, after the finite verb (Goetze 1927: 114): *namma=ma=kan* KUR ^{URU}*Ḫapālla kuenta=ya ūL ēpta=ya=at ūL* 'But then you neither attacked the land of Ḫapalla nor seized it' KUB 14.1 rev. 23 (MH/MS); [*nu=war=an*] *šannatti=ya lē mu*[*nn*]*āši=y*[*a=w*]*ar=an lē* 'you must neither hide him nor conceal him' KUB 14.1 obv. 35 (MH/MS); *DINAM šarazzi katteraḫḫi lē katterra šarazziyaḫḫi lē kuit ḫandan apāt īšša* 'Don't declare a superior case to be inferior, don't declare an inferior case to be superior, do what is right' KUB 13.2 iii 27–28 (MH/NS); *paimi nāwi ūḫḫi nāwi* 'I haven't yet gone, nor have I yet seen' KBo 3.34 i 23 (OH/NS), *warpzi=ma=za nāwi* 'but he hasn't yet bathed' KUB 13.4 iii 79 (MH/NS). See also the threefold example below in §26.20 (p. 345; categorical negative).

26.6. Negatives immediately precede indefinite pronouns or adverbs (Hoffner 1986: 88–89): *kušann=a natta kuiški iē*[*zzi*] 'No one pa[ys] a wage' KBo 6.2 iii 17 (Laws §55, OS); [*i*]*dālu natta kuedanikki takkišta* 'He did harm to no one' KBo 3.22:8 (OS); *nu* ^{LÚ}*ḫippari ḫāppar lē* [(*ku*)]*iški iezzi* 'No one shall do business with a *ḫippara*-man' KBo 6.2 ii 49–50 (Laws §48, OS); *kinun=a=wa* ANŠE.KUR.RA.ḪI.A *nawi kuiški uezzi* 'But now no cavalry has yet come' HKM 19:15–17 (MH/MS).

26.7. When an indefinite pronoun or adverb (*kuiški*, *kuinki*, *kuitki*, *kuwatqa*) is delayed until after the verb, it takes with it any negative associated with it: *arruša pāuwar šanḫzi lē kuiški* 'Let no one seek to defect' KUB 26.12+ ii 16–17; *āššu kuiuš iššaḫ*[*ḫun nu=mu?*] *ḫuišnuzzi ūL kuiški* 'Of those whom I treated well no one saves [me]' KUB 30.10 rev. 24–25 (OH/MS); and with *kuit* for *kuitki*: (You must not say:) *arḫa=wa parkunummi parkunuši=ma=za ūL kuit nu=za anda imma ḫatkišnuši* '"I will thoroughly clean up," while however you yourself clean nothing up, but you yourself rather oppress' KBo 3.1+ ii 43–44 (OH/NS).

Negative Rhetorical Questions (with Negatives of Assertion)

26.8. A rhetorical question is an utterance which has the outward form of a question but which instead of seeking information seeks to make *an emphatic contrary assertion*. As such, a negative rhetorical question only employs negatives of assertion, and never the imperatival negative *lē*. And although all examples identified to date use the nega-

tion *natta* (UL), there is no reason to doubt that Hittite speakers could have employed any of the negatives of assertion in rhetorical questions. A sentence such as **nāwi ūḫḫi utneyaš ḫenkan* (or: **utneyaš ḫenkan nāwi ūḫḫi*) 'Have I not yet see the land's plague?' is completely possible, as is **nūman peḫḫi* DUMU.MUNUS=YA (or: *DUMU.MUNUS=YA *nūman peḫḫi*) 'Do I not wish to give my daughter?' For discussion of **negative rhetorical questions** see Hoffner 1986: 89–91 with the earlier literature cited there; also Melchert 1985; and chaper 27 below.

26.9. Negative rhetorical questions ('Has he not done so-and-so?') are the functional equivalents of emphatic positive assertions ('He has certainly done so-and-so!'). In Hittite they frequently show the negative in clause-initial position: *natta=šamaš* LÚ.MEŠDUGUD *tuppi ḫazzian ḫarzi* 'Has (my father) not inscribed a tablet for you dignitaries?' KBo 22.1: 23 (OS); *ŪL=war=an=kan tuetaza memiyanaz kuenner* 'Was it not at your word that they killed it (the Bull of Heaven)?' KUB 8.48 i 12 (Gilgamesh, NH). See further in §26.4 (p. 342) and §30.5 (p. 407).

26.10. But in even more cases (see tabulation in Hoffner 1986: 89) the negative is not clause-initial: (If a mortal were to live forever and the unpleasant illness of such a man were to continue,) *man=at=ši natta kattawatar* 'Wouldn't it be a grievance for him?' KUB 30.10 obv. 23 (prayer, OH/MS); *man zik ŪL aršanieše* 'Wouldn't you be upset?' ABoT 65 rev. 6 (MH/MS); often with UL *imma*: *ug=a=wa=z ŪL imma* LÚ-*aš* 'Am I not indeed a man?' KUB 23.72 obv. 40 (MH/NS); *nu=wa=nn*[*aš apāš*] *ŪL imma* DUMU EN-*E=NI* 'Is he not indeed the son of our lord?' KUB 26.1 i 22–23 (NH); *nu=wa=ta UL imma peḫḫi peḫḫi=tta* 'Will I indeed not give it to you? I will (certainly) give (it) to you!' VBoT 2:8–9 (letter to an Egyptian pharaoh).

nawi 'not yet'

26.11. A second negative of assertion is *nāwi*, which is usually translated '**not yet**'. When the accompanying verb is present tense, it is translated with an English present perfect ('has/have not yet . . . -ed'), while when accompanied by the preterite, it is translated with a past perfect ('had not yet . . . -ed'). See §22.4 (p. 306).

26.12. A common use of *nāwi* is in the construction with *kuitman* 'while' (§19.6, p. 290; §30.34, p. 415): *kuitman . . . nāwi uezzi* 'while he has not yet come' = 'before he comes' (CHD *nāwi* a 2′); *kuitman . . . nāwi uet* 'while he had not yet come' = 'before he came' (CHD *nāwi* b 2′ and §30.37, p. 416).

26.13. When *nāwi* occurs in a sentence with unexpressed verb 'to be' (*ēš-* see §22.3, p. 306) (CHD *nāwi* c), the implied tense of *ēš-* is present, and the construction is translated 'have/has not yet . . . -ed'.

26.14. As in the case of the other negatives, certain classes of words may intervene between *nāwi* and the finite verb (CHD *nāwi* d): indefinite (*kuiški*) and relative pronouns (*kui-*), conjunctions such as *kuitman*, and adverbs such as *anku* and *kuwapikki*.

26.15. Like the other negatives, *nāwi* breaks the nexus between preverb and verb (Hoffner 1986: 86–89): *anda=aš=šan parna nāwi paizzi* ‘(but) he hasn’t yet gone into the house’ KBo 6.3 iv 36 (Laws §93, OH/NS); *kuitman=wa ḫanneššar* [*a*]*rḫa nāwi ariyaweni* ‘before we seek a decision (by oracle)’ KBo 16.47:16–17 (MS); *n=ašta kuit=man ḫ*[*aliy*]*az . . .* [. . .] *katta nāwi uwan*[*zi*] ‘before they come down from the district’ KUB 13.1 + 885/z i 6–7, ed. Pecchioli Daddi 2003: 70.

Imperatival and Categorical Negative *lē*

26.16. The imperatival *lē*, used as both prohibitive (‘Don’t do that!’) and inhibitive (‘Stop doing that!’),[1] regularly occurs with the present indicative (CHD *lē* a), occurring with all three persons: *lē šaggaḫḫi* ‘I don’t want to know’ CHD *lē* a 1′; *lē umēni* ‘Let us not see’ ibid. a 4′; *nu=wa* BELI=NI INA ^{URU}*Ḫayaša lē pāiši* ‘Our lord, don’t go to the city of Ḫayaša!’ KBo 4.4 iii 25–26 (AM 124–25); *nu* ^{LÚ}*ḫippari ḫāppar lē* [*ku*]*iški iezzi* ‘Let no one do business with a *ḫippara*-man’ KBo 6.2 ii 49–50 (Laws §48, OS).

26.17. The negative *lē* rarely associates with the imperative (see Sommer and Falkenstein 1938: 91–92 and CHD *lē* c; all examples are from NH copies of Old Hittite documents): *lē ḫandān=pat ēšdu* ‘Let it not be determined’ KUB 1.16 ii 51 (OH/NS); *nu=tta* LÚ.MEŠ ŠU.GI ^{URU}KÙ.BABBAR-*TI lē memiškandu* ‘Let the elders of Ḫattuša not speak to you’ ibid. ii 60. Another alleged (CHD *lē* c) example, *lē=wa=tta nāḫi* ‘Don’t be afraid’ KUB 33.24 i 43, KUB 30.33 i 15, and *lē=ta nāḫi* KUB 30.36 ii 8, KUB 30.33 i 15, is better understood as an impersonal third-person singular present with accusative *-ta* ‘let it not make you afraid’ (see §16.32, p. 250).

lē=man and nūman

26.18. The combined form *lē=man* (CHD *lē* b) consists of *lē* and the “speaker optative,” indicating a wish of the speaker (*-man*, see §23.1, p. 313; §23.10, p. 314; §§23.11–23.12, p. 315; Hoffner 1982). It is slightly more “polite” than *lē* without the optative particle and is appropriate when the person addressed is a superior: *lē=man=še* LUGAL-*uš kiššan tezzi* ‘I wish the king would not speak thus to her’ KUB 1.16 iii 65–66 (OH/NS), and ABU=YA=*man=wa=kan* MUNUS.LUGAL=*ya lē ḫannetalwanēš ammuqq= a=man=wa lē kuitki* ḪUL-*wēšzi . . . lē=man=wa=mu kuitki* ḪUL-*wēšzi* ‘I wish that my father and the queen would not be opponents-at-law. I wish it would also not do *me* any harm. . . . I wish it would not do me any harm’ KUB 31.66 iii 5–8, 19 (NH).

26.19. The compound *nūman* (§2.59, p. 63) is the negative “subject-optative” counterpart (see §23.12, p. 315; and Hoffner 1982), indicating a negative wish of the subject of the sentence. The NH KUB 31.66 passage with its separation of *lē* and *man* (in *ammuqq=a=man=wa lē kuitki* ḪUL-*wēšzi*) shows that that combination had not been

1. See §24.10 (p. 319). The prohibitive is the negation of the perfective aspect (‘do’), while the inhibitive expresses the interruption of the imperfective aspect (‘is doing’).

frozen into a single word as **lēman*, which seems to have been the case with the compound *nūman.* Whereas the special sense of *lē* + *man* as the negation of the speaker optative was so close to simple *lē* as to be almost indistinguishable (perhaps accounting for its sparse use), the peculiar force of *nūman* as the negation of the "subject optative" could not be expressed by any of the other negatives. See the table in §26.26 (p. 347). Sommer and Falkenstein (1938: 198) compared *lē man* to Latin *utinam ne* 'would that . . . not. . .'. On the other hand, *nūman* (*nūwan*) expresses the wish of the subject of the sentence (Hoffner 1982). While LUGAL-*uš lē uezzi* means 'may the king not come' (i.e., 'I the speaker do not wish the king to come'), LUGAL-*uš nūman uezzi* means 'the king does not wish to come' (regardless of whether I wish it).

Categorical Negative lē

26.20. A rare, but clearly attested usage of *lē* is the **categorical negative** (see Hoffner 1977: 151–52 and CHD *lē*): 'In a meadow there stands a *šišiyamma-* tree. Beneath it sit a blind man and a deaf man.' *tašwanza aušzi lē duddumiyanza=ma ištamašzi lē ikniyanza piddai lē* UḪ$_7$.ḪI.A-*aššaš=a uddananteš* EN.SISKUR *QATAMMA lē uwanzi* 'The blind man certainly does not see. The deaf man certainly does not hear. The lame man certainly does not run. In the same way the words of sorcery will certainly not see the man for whom this ritual is performed' KUB 12.62 + KBo 53.3 rev. 8–10. This use of *lē*, the usual prohibitive negative, to express an emphatic negative assertion is paralleled by the use of the first-person singular "imperative" (voluntative) to express a positive assertion of strong intention (see §23.4, p. 313). On the post-verbal (contrastive) position of *lē* here see §26.5 (p. 342).

Word Order with lē

26.21. When *lē* precedes the finite verb, it usually allows only certain types of words to separate it from the verb, notably indefinites such as *kuiški*, *kuitki*. Its occurrence in final position in nominal sentences (CHD *lē* d) ÌR=*miš lē* 'Let him not be my subject!' is possible only through the suppression of the implied verb 'to be': ÌR=*miš lē ēšzi*.

26.22. Like the other negatives (§26.3, p. 341), *lē* usually breaks the nexus between preverb and verb (Hoffner 1986: 86–89): *anda lē tarniškanzi* KUB 31.86 ii 25; *t=at āppa šarā lē uēzzi* StBoT 8 iii 12–13 (OS); *arḫa lē autti* KUB 17.6 i 20 (OH/NS); *parā lē uwanzi* 'they shall not come out' KUB 13.8:8 (MH/NS). The rare exceptions are late (Muw. II) and involve *anda*: *ANA* KUR-*TI=ma=at=kan lē anda šanḫti* KBo 11.1 obv. 39 (contra rev. 8!); *tapa*[*riya=wa=mu*]*=za=kan lē anda kištati* KUB 14.3 i 20–21 (Ḫattušili III).

ne/ikku

26.23. There is a kind of negative question that — unlike the rhetorical question (§26.8, p. 342) — does not necessarily assume either a positive or negative answer

but strongly suggests a positive one. This type of question in Hittite is expressed with *nekku:* KUR-*e=wa nikku kuwapikki ḫarkan man=wa* URU.DIDLI.ḪI.A *nikku kūwapikki dannateššanteš mān=wa* ^{LÚ}ÉRIN.MEŠ *nikku kuwapiki ḫullanteš* 'The land is not destroyed somewhere, is it? The cities wouldn't be devastated somewhere, would they? The troops wouldn't be defeated somewhere, would they?' (If they aren't, then why has this deity come to me?) KUB 24.8 ii 16–18 (OH?/NS), ed. Siegelová 1971: 8–9. We take both the plene *ma-a-an* and the non-plene *ma-an* in this sequence to be the irrealis *man* (see §§23.10ff., pp. 314ff.). The term *ne/ikku* (see CHD L–N s.v. *ne*(*k*)*ku* for *ni-ik-ku*, *ni-ku*, *ne-ek-ku*, and *ne-ku* writings) contains the -(*a*)*ku* seen in the disjunctive marker -(*a*)*ku*, used in 'whether . . . or' constructions (§29.60, p. 405; and Eichner 1971).

Double Negatives

26.24. In Hittite a double negative does not equal a positive but rather an intensified negative. Although there seem to be no examples of *nāwi*, *nūman*, or *nekku* in double negative constructions, both *natta* (*UL*) and *lē* are so used: *nu=war=an . . . ḫuwappi* DINGIR-*LIM-ni ŪL parā ŪL kuwapikki tarnaḫḫun* 'I never turned him over . . . to a hostile deity, never!' Ḫatt. iv 12–13; [*apē=a k*]*ušduwāta lē lē ḫandān=pat ēšdu* 'And let [those] false accusations never — never be established!' KUB 1.16 ii 55 (OH/NS), see ibid. ii 30. But a negated non-finite verb and a negated finite verb in the same clause are independent of each other: *ektaš=ma=ddu=šša*n *irḫaz ŪL naḫšariyawanza arḫa ŪL uezzi* 'But even he who is not afraid will not escape (lit., 'come out of') the circle of your net' KBo 3.21 ii 17–18.

Carry-Over of Negative Force

26.25. The force of a negative in one clause can continue into the following one (Sommer 1922: 8 n. 3; Goetze 1925: 93), as in the English translations: '(As malt has no ability to germinate,) *ŪL=an* A.ŠÀ-*ni pēdanzi n=an* NUMUN-*an ienzi* 'they don't carry it into the field and use it as seed' KBo 6.34 ii 32–33 (Soldiers' Oath); see [BÙLUG] *māḫḫan tepšuš ŪL=an gimra pēd*[*anzi*] *n=an* NUMUN-*an iyanzi ŪL=ma=an* NINDA-*an iya*[*nzi*] É ^{NA_4}KIŠIB *tianzi* 'As [malt] is sterile, they don't carry it into the field and use it as seed, nor do they make it into bread and deposit it in a storehouse' KUB 17.10 iii 16–19 (OH/MS); *ḫaššannaš* DUMU-*an idalu lē kuiški iyazi nu=šši=šan* GÍR-*an takkešzi* 'Let no one mistreat a son of the (royal) family and drive a dagger into him' KBo 3.1 ii 35 (OH/NS).

Summary

26.26. To summarize, the following table lists the negatives of Hittite together with translations:

natta (UL)	makes a negative assertion	'he[2] has not (does not, will not) come'
nāwi	denies action prior to the time of the action in the main clause	'(until now) he has not yet come' or '(until then) he had not yet come'
lē	expresses negative wish or command of the speaker; or (rarely) states a categorical negative	'may he not come' or (rare) 'he never comes'
nūman	states a negative wish of the subject of the sentence	'he does not (did not) want to come'
nekku	in negative rhetorical questions this suggests a positive answer, but without the unavoidable positive aspect of *natta imma*	'he isn't coming, is he?'

2. For the sake of convenience we have chosen the third-person masculine singular present tense to illustrate these usages. But obviously any person can serve as the subject. And in the indicative either present-future or past tense verbs can be used.

Chapter 27
QUESTIONS

27.1. As in other languages, questions in Hittite may be direct or indirect. Direct questions are full sentences that either pose queries answerable by affirmation or denial or that contain interrogative pronouns, adjectives, or adverbs, whose answers require supplying addition information. Indirect questions are subordinate clauses depending on verbs such as 'to know' or 'to see'. Yes–no questions are marked only by prosodic features such as voice intonation (see §27.2; HE §284; and Mascheroni 1980: 53–54). As such they are usually formally unmarked in writing. Marking these questions by inverted word order, as in English 'Are you going?' versus 'You are going', is not a feature of Hittite, although it remains true that, as in declarative sentences, marked elements within a question could be fronted.

Intonation Marking

27.2. Scribes in Assyria and Babylonia who wrote Akkadian in cuneiform script sometimes indicated the interrogative intonation by a plene spelling of the vowel in the final syllable of the central word in the interrogative clause (von Soden 1995: §153d; Ungnad 1992: §24d). Since the Hittite cuneiform writing system was initially derived from scribes who used it to write Akkadian, it is no surprise that in one of the oldest Hittite tablets, KBo 22.1, an instructions text written in the Old Hittite ductus, one finds the same phenomenon in writing Hittite yes-no questions: *nu kiššan* AWĀT *ABI=YA arḫān ḫar-te-**ni-i*** 'Is this the way you hold my father's word (as) a limitation?' (lines 30–31; see chapter 12, n. 43, p. 193 above). One further example may be present in a NH letter: [*IŠTU?*/*PANI*?] *ABU=KA=ya* GIM-*an ešer nu me-ma-aḫ-**ḫi-i*** 'And shall I tell (you), how they were [with(?)] your father?' KBo 18.22 obv. 6. This is the only known example of the form *memaḫḫi* with a plene writing of the final vowel. Since this phenomenon is found to date only rarely, it apparently did not become a regular scribal method of indicating interrogative stress. See Hoffner 1995a: 88. On the possible functions of plene writing see §§1.46–1.47 (p. 25).

Yes–No Questions

27.3. Sample yes-no questions are: ŠEŠ*=YA=za malāši* 'Are you agreed, my brother?' KUB 14.3 iii 62 (Tawaglawa letter, NH); DINGIR-*LUM=za kīdaš waškuwaš šēr* TUKU.TUKU-*uwanza* 'O deity, are you angry on account of these offences?' KUB 5.10 i 12 (oracle question, NH); *kiššan* AWĀT *ABI=YA paḫšanutten* 'Is this the way you (pl.) have

kept my father's word (i.e., command)?' KBo 22.1:4–5 (note the fronting of *kiššan* 'in this way'); *peḫḫi=wa⟨r⟩=at=ši mān=wa=ši* UL *pe*[*ḫḫi*] 'Shall I give it to him? (What) if I do not give it to him?' KUB 12.60 i 21 (OH/NS); and see KBo 22.1:30–31 in the preceding paragraph. In Hittite one probably answered such a question not with a 'yes' or 'no' word but with a confirming or denying sentence: ŠEŠ*=YA=za malāši* 'Are you agreed, my brother?' was answered with *malāmi=za* 'I agree' or *UL=za malāmi* 'I don't agree' (so assumed by Hoffner 1995a: 89). But since our only examples of yes–no questions are either rhetorical ones which do not elicit an overt reply, or questions in letters for which we possess no specific reply (KUB 14.3 iii 62), or questions in oracles, where the answer only comes in the standard manner of "favorable" or "unfavorable," we cannot verify this supposition. As just stated, some **yes–no questions** are also rhetorical questions which expect a denial of the situation claimed in the query: *nu ammel dammešḫaš ŠA* DAM*=YA ḫinkan* SIG_5*-yattat* 'My punishment is the death of my wife. Has (this) gotten any better?' (implied answer: No, it has not gotten any better) KBo 4.8 ii 20–21 (NH), ed. Hoffner 1983a: 188; *zik=za=kan ammuqq=a* 1-*edani* AMA-*ni ḫaššanteš* 'Were you and I born of one mother?' (implied answer: No, we were not) KUB 23.102 i 14–15 (NH); *n=an=kan ANA* GIŠGIGIR *waggariyanun našma=an=kan* ŠÀ É-*TI waqqariyanun* 'Did I rebel against him in the chariot, or did I rebel against him in the house?' Ḫatt. iii 67–68; (man doesn't live forever; his days are numbered; if a mortal were to live forever, (and) the painful ills of man were to remain,) *man=at=ši natta kattawatar* 'wouldn't that (lit., 'it') be a punishment (lit., 'grievance') for him?' KUB 30.10 obv. 23; *nu ziqq=a kuwatqa ŠA* m*Mašturi iwar iyaši* 'Will you perhaps also act like Mašturi?' KUB 23.1+ ii 29–30, ed. Kühne and Otten 1971: 10–11. Further examples in Hoffner 1995a: 90. Some **rhetorical yes–no questions** serve as the apodosis of a contrary to fact conditional clause: [DUMU.LUGAL]*=ma*[*n=wa=*]*nnaš kuwapi ēšta anzāš=man=wa* [*da*]*mēdani* KUR-*e uwawen mān=wa=naš* [*an*]*zel BELI wekiškewen* 'If we had [a prince] anywhere, would we have come into a foreign land and kept requesting a lord for ourselves?' KBo 14.12 iv 15–17 (DŠ frag. 28, NH), ed. Güterbock 1956: 97–98 (differently restored[1]); *mān=war=aš=mu=kan šulliyat kuwapi UL mān ḫandān* LUGAL.GAL *ANA* LUGAL TUR *katterraḫḫer* 'If he (Urḫitešub) had not at some time become wanton/disrespectful towards me, would (the gods) have truly subjected a Great King to a minor king?' Ḫatt. iii 76–77. Others introduce a clause giving the grounds: *kinuna apel* TI-*tar idalawēšta* TI-*anza<=aš> kuit nu nepišaš* dUTU-*un* IGI.ḪI.A-*it uškezzi* 'Has her (i.e., Tawannanna's) life become bad, just because she is (still) living and sees with her eyes the Sungod of Heaven?' KBo 4.8 ii 18–19 (NH), ed. Hoffner 1983a: 188; see also LÚŠÀ.TAM [. . . ḪUL]-*luš* [GIŠŠÚ.A-*an*] [*kui*]*š dāiš nu=za UL ešat* LÚ ⟨GIŠ⟩BANŠUR-*aš* ḪUL-*luš* [GIŠBANŠUR-*un kuiš*] [*d*]*āiš nu=za ŪL ezatta* LÚŠAGI.A-*aš* ḪUL-*l*[*uš* GAL-*in*] *kuiš pāiš nu UL ekutta* 'Is the

1. Güterbock restored [DUMU.LUGAL-*wa*] *ma*[*-a-a*]*n-na-aš*, but making DUMU.LUGAL-*wa* a separate clause and leaving *ma*[*-a-a*]*n-na-aš* without the particle *-wa* makes for very awkward syntax, and we cannot read [DUMU.LUGAL-*wa-*]*ma*[*-a-a*]*n-na-aš* as one word, because both *a-ši-ma-an-wa* KUB 11.6 ii 11 (= Hoffmann 1984: 36 ii 64) (OH/NS) and *anzaš=man=wa* in this very same passage show that the proper sequence requires *-man* to precede *-wa*.

chamberlain [wr]ong [w]ho set [the chair] (for you), that you did not sit down? Is the table-man wrong [who] set [the table] (for you), that you did not eat? Is the cupbearer wrong who gave (you) [the cup,] that you did not drink?' KUB 33.96 + KUB 36.7a iv 55–58 (Ullik. I), ed. Güterbock 1952: 26.

27.4. **Negated** questions are usually **rhetorical questions**, which do not seek information but presume a positive answer. See above §§26.8ff. (pp. 342ff.). Although these are often marked by fronted negation, this is not always the case (contra HE §282c; see Hoffner 1986). For fronted examples see §26.9 (p. 343); for non-fronted examples: §26.10 (p. 343). Because of their emotional content, rhetorical questions often (but not always) employ *imma* 'actually, really, indeed' (see Otten apud Rost 1956: 332–33; Melchert 1985; and above sub §26.10, p. 343). For negative questions that do not necessarily assume a positive answer see §26.23 (p. 346).

27.5. A special class of yes–no question is the deliberative question, on which see §24.39 (p. 328).

Direct Questions with Interrogative Pronouns, Adjectives, and Adverbs

27.6. The following are some examples of direct questions using interrogative pronouns, adjectives, and adverbs. Mascheroni (1980: 60–61) calls them "domande complende" (German "Ergänzungsfragen"), because the reply cannot be merely 'yes' or 'no' but must supply the information requested ('where, how, why, when') (see Hoffner 1995a: 92–104). Hittite, like English and many other languages, has so-called *wh*-movement, by which interrogative forms are placed at the beginning of their clauses, regardless of the role they play in the sentence (subject, direct object, indirect object, etc.) (Garrett 1994, following Hale 1987). Most interrogatives thus appear in clause-initial position (as in English) or immediately following sequences of clause-initial conjunctions and sentential clitics (which do not "count" as full words for this purpose). Hittite, however, does with some frequency allow *one* word (or constituent—see the last two examples in §27.7) to occur before the interrogative. Compare the similar phenomenon with relative pronouns (§§30.5ff., pp. 407ff.), but the motivation for the variation with interrogatives is much less clear. We may guess that some pragmatic considerations of emphasis or "focus" are involved (see the example in §27.11, p. 352), but no obvious difference in meaning is discernible for many examples. As in the case of relative pronouns, there are also a few instances where the interrogative word occurs still later in the clause, preceded by more than one constituent (see the examples in §27.12, p. 352, and others below). These require further study.

27.7. Direct questions are formed with the interrogative pronoun (*kui-* 'who, what'). Clause-initial: [*mān* ^{d}UTU]-*un ēpmi n=an munnāmi nu* ***kuit*** *iēzzi* ^{d}IM-*aš* 'If I seize the Sungod and hide him, then what will the Stormgod do?' KUB 36.44 i(!) 5–6; *nu* ***kuit*** 'so what?' KUB 1.16 ii 9 (OH/NS); ***kuit*** *iyanun* ***kuit*** 'What did I do? What?' KUB 31.4

+ KBo 3.41:3; ***kuedani***=*wa*=*za menaḫḫanda išḫamiškeši* ‘Before whom are you singing?’ KUB 36.12 ii 9 (Ullik. II); *nu*=*za* ***kuēl*** *walliyatar ŪL*=*za ŠA* ^{d}U *piḫaššašši* EN=*YA walliyatar* ‘Then whose glory am I? Am I not the glory of the Stormgod *piḫaššašši* my lord?’ KUB 6.45+ iii 48–49 (pr. of Muw. II), note that *-za* excludes the translation ‘Then whose is the glory? Is it not the glory of the Stormgod *p.*’ found in ANET 397–98; ***kuel***=*wa*=*kan* ZI-*anza uriš dandukeš*=*wa*=*kan* ZI-*anza uriš* ‘Whose soul is great? The mortal soul is great’ KUB 43.60 i 27–28. Not clause-initial: *uk*=*uš punuškemi* [*kī*=*wa* ***k*]*uit*** *walkuwan* ‘I ask them, “What is this mob?”’ KBo 3.40:15; *apāš*=*a pait* ^{d}IM-*ni tet kī* ***kuit*** *kišat* ‘He proceeded to say to the Stormgod, “What is this that has occurred?”’ VBoT 58 i 16 (OH/NS); [(KUR.KUR.ḪI.A)=*m*]*a ḫūman* ***kuiš*** *ḫarzi* ‘Who holds all the lands?’ KUB 31.4 + KBo 3.41:12. In the just-cited example the noun and its attribute [(KUR.KUR.ḪI.A)=*m*]*a ḫūman* ‘all lands’ are counted as one position. Note that in *kūš arḫa* ***kuiš*** *peḫutet* ‘Who led these (people) out (here)?’ KBo 3.34 i 19 (OH/NS), ed. Dardano 1997: 34–36, *kuiš* appears to be in “third” position.

27.8. With interrogative adjective *kui-* ‘what?’. Clause-initial: ***kuit***=*wa*=*šši*=*kan ŠUM-an* [*teḫḫi* ^{d}]*Gulšuš*=*wa*=*mu* DINGIR.MAḪ.ḪI.A-*uš kuin* DUMU-*an* SUM-*er* ‘What name [shall I give] to him, the child whom (lit., ‘what child’) the *gulša-* and *kunuštalla*-deities have given me?’ KUB 33.93 iii 16–17 (Ullik. I). If the second clause in the preceding example is not another exception to the word-order rule, it would indicate that the coordinated subject [^{d}]*Gulšuš*=*wa*=*mu* DINGIR.MAḪ.ḪI.A-*uš* was counted as one position. In the following dialogue we see how the interrogative adjective *kui-* is used to narrow possibilities: *ḫāš nu* ***kuēz*** *uwaši šuppaz*=*wa uwami nu*=*wa* ***kuēz*** *šuppayaz zaḫanittennaz*=*wa nu*=*wa* ***kuēz*** *zaḫanittennaz* ^{d}UTU-*waš*=*wa* É-*az nu*=*wa* ***kuēz*** ^{d}UTU-*az* ‘ “Open!” “So, where are you coming from?” “I am coming from the holy thing.” “So, from what holy thing?” “From the *z.*” “So, from what *z.*?” “From the Sungod’s temple.” “So, from what Sungod?”’ KBo 21.22:22–25 (OH/MS). Both in this dialogue, in the first example in §27.10 (p. 352), in the second example cited in §27.7, and in the second example cited in §27.9 the *nu* implies that the course of thought (perhaps the “logic”) is consciously carried on by the new speaker (see §29.48, p. 403). In most cases this requires the word ‘so’ in English. Not clause-initial: *UMMA ŠI*=*MA* [*k*]*ī*=*wa* ***kuit*** *walkuan ḫāšḫun* ‘She said: “What mob is this that I have borne?”’ KBo 22.2 obv. 1–2 (OS);[2] [*tue*]*ll*=*a* DUMU.MEŠ=*KA* ***kuin*** *šagain iyanzi* ‘And what miracle do (i.e., can) your sons perform?’ VBoT 58 i 7; [*zi*(*qq*=*a*=*z*)]*a* ***kuiš*** DINGIR-*LIM-iš nu ŪL* [. . .] ‘What (kind of a) deity are you, that [. . .] not [. . .]?’ KUB 33.86 ii 12 with dupl. KUB 36.56 iii 9 (StBoT 14:54).

27.9. With *maḫḫan* ‘how?’ Clause-initial: ***māḫḫan*** *iyaweni kištantit ḫarkueni* ‘What shall we do (lit., ‘how shall we act’)? We will die of starvation!’ KUB 17.10 i 29–30 (OH/MS). Not clause-initial: *nu*=*wa wattaru māḫḫan iyan* ‘So, how is the fountain made?’ KBo 21.22:41–42 (OH/MS).

2. One could also translate ‘What is this mob that I have born?’ with *kuit* as interrrogative pronoun.

27.10. With *kuit ḫanda* ‘why?’ Clause-initial: [d]IM-*š=a tezzi nu=war=an* ***kuit ḫanda*** *UL wemiya*[*tten*] ‘The Stormgod says: ‘So, why didn’t you (pl.) find him?’’ VBoT 58 i 23. Not clause-initial: [*uk=uš*] *punuškimi karāwar=šet* ***kuit ḫanda*** *lipšan* ‘I ask [them]: ‘Why is its (i.e., the bull’s) horn bent/cracked?’’ KUB 31.4 + KBo 3.41:16 (OH/NS).

27.11. With *kuedani šer* ‘on what account?’ ‘why?’ not clause-initial with a fronted adversative element: DUMU.MEŠ LUGAL*=ma* ***kuedani*** [(***še***)]***r*** *ḫarkiškantari* ‘But as for the princes, why are they dying (i.e., being put to death)?’ KBo 3.1+ ii 56–58 (OH/NS).

27.12. With *kuwat*, *kuit* ‘why?’ Clause-initial: ***kuit****=wa uw*[(*aš*)] ‘Why have you come?’ KUB 33.24(+)28 i 38; [*UMMA ŠI=MA* ***ku***]***wat****=mu kī tepu paitta* ‘She said: “Why have you given me this little bit?”’ KUB 1.16 iii 10 (OH/NS); LUGAL-*ušš=a memaḫḫun* [***kuwa***]***t****=war=e akkanzi* ‘And I, the king, said: “[Wh]y should they die?”’ KBo 3.1 ii 28–29 (OH/NS); (The Egyptian queen wrote back to Suppiluliuma I:) ***kuwat****=wa apeniššan TAQBI appaleškanzi=wa=mu* ‘Why do you speak thus: “They are deceiving me”?’ KBo 5.6 iii 52–53 = DŠ frag. 28 (NH); (Pharaoh Ramses II writes to Puduḫepa:) *kuwat=war=an=mu kinun ŪL pešta* ‘Why have you not given her (scil., the bride) to me now?’ KUB 21.38 obv. 8 (NH). Not clause-initial: LÚ.MEŠ *ṬEMI=YA=mu* ***kuwat*** *ŪL uieškettani* ‘Why are you not sending my envoys (back) to me?’ HKM 53:29–30 (MH/MS); *zik=wa=kan apūn anda* ***kuwat*** *aušta* ‘Why did you look at that (woman)?’ KBo 5.3+ iii 71 (MH/NS); *nu kūn memiyan* ***kuwat*** *iyatten* ‘Why did you do this thing?’ KBo 3.3+ iii 3–4 (NH); *annišan=war=an* [LUGA]L-*eznanni* ***kuwat*** *tittanut kinun=ma=wa=šši kururiyaḫḫuanzi* ***[k]uwat*** *ḫatriškeši* ‘Why did you previously put him on the throne, and why now are you writing to him to declare war?’ KUB 1.4 + KBo 3.6 + iii 40–42 (Ḫatt. iii 75–76). Many other examples in Hoffner 1995a: 97–100.

27.13. With *kuwapi* ‘Where?’ Clause-initial: *nu* ***kuwapi*** dUTU-*uš mumiēzzi* [. . .]-*i=ku ḫappēni=kku* GIŠ-*i=kku ḫaḫḫali=kku mumiēzzi* ‘So where will the Sungod fall? Will he fall into the [. . .], or the flame(?), or the tree(s), or the brush?’ KUB 36.44 iv 8–9 (OH/MS?); ***kuwapi****=*[(*war=at*)] *andan piddaiškanzi* 2 LÚ.MEŠ*ATḪUTIM* ‘Where are they running to, (these) two brothers?’ KUB 33.113 + KUB 36.12 + KBo 26.64 i 19–20 (Ullik. II B, NS); EME.ḪI.A EME.ḪI.A ***kuwapi****=wa paitte*[*ni*] ‘Tongues! tongues! Where are you going?’ KUB 44.4 + KBo 13.241 rev. 22 (NS). In rhetorical question interrogative *kuwapi* preceded by the fronted topic: *ŠA* LÚ.GAL.GAL-*TIM* É*=SUNU* ***kuwapi*** *ŪL=at ḫarkēr* ‘Where are the houses/estates of the grandees? Have they not perished?’ KUB 1.16 iii 45 (OH/NS).

27.14. With *kuwapit* ‘Where?’ ‘To what place?’ ***kuwapit*** *aumen nu* ANŠE-*iš arkatta* ‘Where have we seen (it), that a donkey will climb?’ (expressing incredulity; see §18.3, p. 277, with n. 2) KBo 22.2 obv. 10 (OS); [(*mān=wa A*)]*NA* dIM URU*Nerik pāiwani nu=wa=šša*n ***kuwapit*** (variant: *kuwapi*) *ešwaštati* ‘When we go to the Stormgod of Nerik, where shall we sit down?’ KBo 3.7 iv 6–7 (OH/NS).

27.15. An example with a mixture of ways of posing questions: *nu mašiēš* MU.ḪI.A *pāir* [*mašieš=a*]*=kan ḫuwāir ŠA* LÚ GAL.GAL-*TIM* É-*SUNU kuwapi ŪL=at ḫarkēr* ‘How many years have passed? [How many] have fled? And where (are) the houses/estates of the grandees? Have they not perished?’ KUB 1.16 iii 44–45 (OH/NS).

27.16. The interrogative clause can be followed by a clause expressing the reason for the query: *nu=za kuiš* . . . [*nu anz*]*el* Ú.SAL *arḫa wešieškeši* ‘Who are you . . . that you devour our meadow?’ KUB 24.7 ii 56–57 (NS); *kuit=wa waštul=tit nu=war=at=t*[*a* SIG_5*-aḫmi*] KUB 24.8 i 45 (pre-NH/NS) could be translated ‘What is your problem (lit., ‘sin’), [that I may remedy] it for you?’[3] See §27.18 for another example.

Questions Posing Alternatives

27.17. Questions which pose alternatives take a special form (Sommer 1932: 77–78; Hoffner 1995a: 101). The second question of the pair frequently uses *-ma* to mark the word which best expresses the alternative (see CHD sub *-ma* a 1′ b′ 4″, where it is shown that the initial *nu* is only optional): BAL ***andurza*** *kuiški* DÙ-ya*zi* . . . *nu* BAL ***araḫza=ma*** *kuiški* DÙ-*zi* ‘Will someone revolt from inside (the kingdom), or will someone revolt from outside?’ KUB 5.4 i 33–35; *nu=war=at* ŠE[Š=*YA* ***IDE*** *nu=w*]*ar=at* ***ŪL=ma IDE*** ‘Does my ‘brother’ know it or not?’ KUB 14.3 i 52 (NH); ***kuit****=at* ŠEŠ-*UTTA n=at* ***kuit=ma*** *ŠA* ḪUR.SAG*Ammana uwawar* ‘What is it, (this) “brotherhood”? Or what is it, (this) “coming (to) Mt. Amanus”?’ KUB 23.102 i 7–8 (letter to Adad-nirāri of Assyria); see Sommer 1932: 78.

27.18. A special kind of alternative question is that which is also rhetorical in nature, implying a denial of *both* stated alternatives: DAM=*YA* MUNUS.LUGAL ***idalawaḫta*** *ku*[*i*]*t*[*k*]*i n=an* ***tepnutta=ma*** *kuitki nu=kan* [f]*Tawannannaš* DAM=*YA ku*[*e*]*n*[*d*]*a* ‘Did my wife harm the queen in some way, or did she demote her, so that Tawannanna killed my wife?’ KUB 14.4 iii 21–22 (prayer of Murš. II), with collation by Rüster confirming *ku*-[*e*]*n*-[*d*]*a* (cited by de Martino 1998: 28 n. 65).

Indirect Questions

27.19. For indirect questions see §§30.68ff. (pp. 427ff.).

---

3. Because the *ku-iš* restored in *nu-wa-ra-an-ká*[*n* GE_6*-i*] KI-*pí-ya an-d*[*a ku-iš*(*?*) *pé-e-d*]*a?-i?* ‘And who will carry him off to the dark netherworld?’ KUB 33.93 + KUB 36.7a + KUB 17.7 iii 30′ (Ullik. I A, ed. Güterbock 1952: 18) would occur later than the second position, the line should probably be restored without *ku-iš* and the clause understood as carrying over the force of the *ku-iš* in line 28′: ‘Who will . . . and (will) . . . and (will). . . ?’

Chapter 28

PARTICLES

28.1. Hittite has a wide variety of particles, most of them sentential, but several not. Sentential particles are attached (following clitic conjunctions such as *-a*/*-ma* [§§29.23ff., pp. 395ff.], *-a*/*-ya* [§29.38, p. 399] or the non-sentential particle *-pat* [§§28.115ff., pp. 384ff.]) to the first word in the clause. For the order in which these and other sentential clitics appear see §30.15 (p. 410). One must base all conclusions regarding the true positioning of both sentential and word clitics on instances where the phrases in which they occur are written entirely phonetically. Hittite scribes for the most part do not write clitics in the middle of phrases written partially or entirely logographically. We thus find examples such as: MUNUS.MEŠ*zintuḫiyēš* URU*Taḫurpa=ma=kan* (KBo 11.73 iii 7–8) for what was likely spoken as **Taḫurpaš=ma=kan zintuḫiyēš* or *INA* É KUŠ*kuršaš=ma* (KUB 59.2 iii 3) for **kuršaš=ma parni*, etc. See further p. 396, n. 10.

The Particle *-wa(r-)*

28.2. Direct quotes are marked by a particle *-wa*(*r-*) suffixed to the first word of the quoted utterance (Hrozný 1917: 98 n. 1, 144; Pecora 1984; and Fortson 1998). Rarely, when the particle follows an *a*-vowel, it is spelled *-u-wa-*(*r . . .*): [*pa*]*rtauwa*(*r*)*=šet=wa amiyanta a-pa-aš-ša-u-wa amiyanza* 'its wings (are) small, and it (is) small' KUB 17.10 i 38 (Tel. myth, OH/MS); for evidence see Hoffner 1985.

28.3. The longer form *-war-* is used when another enclitic beginning with a vowel is added: *aku=war=aš* KUB 11.1 iv 20 (OH/NS); *IŠTU* DINGIR-*LIM=war=aš* BA.ÚŠ Laws §75; *nu=war=an=za=an peḫutet* KUB 12.60 i 18 (OH/NS); *kī=mu kuit ŠA* m*Marrūwa* LÚ URU*Ḫimmuwa ḫaliyatar ḫatrāeš parā=war=an=kan neḫḫun* HKM 13:3–5 (MH/MS); *nu=war=at=apa* KBo 3.1 ii 49 (OH/NS); *ug=a=war=uš* ibid. ii 15; [*kuw*]*at=war=e akkanzi* ibid. ii 29.

28.4. When followed by a consonant or in word-final position, the form is *-wa*: *nu=wa* passim; *attaš=taš=wa* KUB 1.16 ii 65 (OH/NS); [ì]R-*iš=wa=šša*n KUB 1.16 ii 71; [*kā*]*ša=wa=z* KUB 1.16 iii 67; *kinun=wa=z* ibid. iii 68; *apāš=wa=kan* HKM 6:7 (MH/MS).

28.5. For the likely source of the form *-wa* see §§1.132–1.133 (p. 46).

28.6. Rarely (about 26 times) *=wa=* appears for *=war=* before a vowel: *peḫḫi=wa*⟨*r*⟩*=at=ši mān=wa=šši* ŪL *pe*[*ḫḫi*] KUB 12.60 i 21 (OH/NS); *apāš=wa=kan ištarna arḫa uet namma=ma=wa*⟨*r*⟩*=aš kuwapi pait nu=war=aš* ŪL *IDE* HKM 6:7–10 (MH/MS); SUM-*er=wa*⟨*r*⟩*=at=ši kuwapi nu=wa kāš kāšš=a arantat* KUB 13.4 ii 37–38

(pre-NH/NS); *nu=wa=mu* 1-*EN* DUMU=*KA pāi nu=war=aš ammuk* ^{LÚ}*MUTI=YA INA* KUR ^{URU}*Mi⟨z⟩ri=ma=wa⟨r⟩=aš* LUGAL-*uš* KBo 5.6 iv 10–12 = DŠ frag. 28 (NH) (note, however, the evidence of other mistakes in this context); [*t*]*ētanuš=ma=wa⟨r⟩=at* KUB 33.41 ii 5; *našma=wa⟨r⟩=at=za=kan* KUB 14.8 obv. 2 (PP 2); see also *mān=wa⟨r⟩=ašt*[*a*] KUB 34.53 obv. 2, which is otherwise always *=war=ašta*. Note that this omission always occurs before an enclitic beginning with *a*, never before those beginning with *e* or *u*. This restriction tends to suggest that these are examples of the weak articulation of intervocalic *-r-* (see §1.132, p. 46).

28.7. Quoted speech is frequently introduced by a *verbum dicendi*, such as *mema-*, *te-* or *tar-*, *ḫalzai-*, *taštašiya-*, *punušš-*, or *mimma-*: *nu kišan* ***mematti*** *eni=wa idālu kišaru* 'And you say as follows: "Let that evil thing happen!"' KUB 6.41 iii 46–47 (Kup.); *takku BEL* GUD ***tezzi*** *ammel=pat=wa=za* GUD-*un daḫḫi* GUD=*ŠU dai* 'If the owner of the ox says: "I will take my own ox", he shall take his ox' KBo 6.3 iii 71–72 (Laws §74); *UMMA* ^{m}DUMU. UD.20.KAM *ANA* ^{m}*Uzzū* ŠEŠ.DÙG.GA=YA *QIBI=MA PANI* ^{m}***Pullī=kan*** *ammel aššul* ***ḫalzai*** GUD=*ya=wa=mu kuin tet nu=war=an=mu uppi* 'Thus says Mar-ešrē: Speak to Uzzu, my dear brother: Give my greeting to Pulli: 'Send me also the ox you promised me!'' HKM 22:9–16; *nu=tta uezzi pe*[(*ran kui*)]*ški* ***t*****[(*aštašiyaizzi*)**] ^{d}UTU-*ŠI=wa=du=za=kan* ḪUL-*lauwanni* [*kiša*]*n kišann*[(*=a*)] *zikkezzi* 'Someone will proceed to whisper in your presence: "His Majesty is planning this and that (lit., 'thus and thus') for evil against you"' KUB 21.1+ iii 17–19 (Alakš.), ed. SV 2: 68–71; Otten 1957; *nu=tta mān* DINGIR.MEŠ *kiššan* ***punuššanzi*** *kī=wa kuit iēššer* 'If the gods ask you as follows: "Why were they doing this?"' KBo 17.105 ii 17–18 (incant., MH/MS); *n=an* ***punuškewan*** *dā*[*iš k*]*uit=wa waštul=tit* '(The Sungod) began to ask him (i.e., Appu): "What is your trouble?"' KUB 24.8 i 44–45 (OH?/NS), ed. StBoT 14:6f.; [(*m*)]*ān* DUMU.MEŠ ^{URU}*Ḫatti* LÚ.MEŠ *ILKI uēr ANA ABI* LUGAL *aruwa*[*nzi*] *nu taršikanzi kūšan=naš=za natta kuiški iēz*[(*zi*)] *nu=wa=nnaš=za* ***mimmanzi*** LÚ.MEŠ *ILKI=wa šumeš* 'When the sons of Ḫatti, men owing *ILKU,* came, they bow to the father of the king and say: "No one pays us a wage; they refuse us, (saying:) 'You are men owing *ILKU*'"' KBo 22.62 + KBo 6.2 iii 16–18 (Laws §55, OS).

28.8. Occasionally, quoted speech is introduced abruptly, without any verb of speech: *nu=kan* NAM.RA.MEŠ *katta uēr n=at=mu* GÌR.MEŠ-*aš k*[(*att*)]*an ḫāliyanda*[(*t*)] *BELI-NI=wa=nnaš lē ḫarnikti* 'The civilian captives came down and prostrated themselves at my feet, (saying:) 'Our lord, do not destroy us!'' KUB 14.16 iii 16–17 (AM 56–57) restored from KUB 14.15 iii 46–47; other examples of verbs which do not denote speech acts followed by direct discourse: after *arnu-* KUB 36.90 obv. 7; *auš-* KBo 24.124 rev. 1, KBo 24.128 rev. 2, KUB 5.24+ ii 12, KUB 44.4+ rev. 9; *iya-* KBo 11.10 iii 16–17; *ēpp-* KBo 5.3+ iii 70–71, KUB 33.106+ ii 5, IBoT 1.36 i 56; *ešša-* KBo 14.21 ii 58; *kappuwe-* KUB 36.51 rev. 3, KUB 17.10 i 21; *piya-* KUB 12.60 i 16, KBo 13.228 i 5–6, RHA 77:83f. B i 21; *peda-* KUB 13.4 iv 70; *šakuwai*(*a*)- KUB 24.8 iv 31; *šuḫḫa-* KUB 12.26 ii 22; *tarna-* KUB 22.70 rev. 44; *dai-* KBo 3.60 ii 13–17, KUB 13.4 iv 27; *tešḫaniya-* KUB 1.1+ iii 4–5, iv 9; *uiya-* KBo 3.40:10, KBo 4.14 iii 73, KUB 1.1

i 14–15, KUB 17.10 i 24, KUB 24.2 i 5, KUB 26.89:5, KUB 33.52 ii 4; *waḫnu-* KBo 9.106 ii 1, KUB 44.4+ rev. 25; *ḫzuwāi-* KUB 44.4+ rev. 10–11. See also the comments in CHD sub *palwai-*.

28.9. Once a saying is quoted which justifies a legal decision: *takku* MUNUS-*nan kuiški pittinuzzi n*[*u=kan šard*]*iyeš āppan anda pā*[*n*]*z*[*i*] *takku* 3 LÚ.MEŠ *našma* 2 LÚ.MEŠ *ak*[(*kanzi*)] *šarnikzil* NU GÁL *zik=wa* UR.BAR.RA-*aš kištat* 'If anyone runs off with a woman, and helpers (of the bride's family) go after them, if three men or two men are killed, there shall be no compensation, (because:) "You have become a wolf"' KBo 6.2 ii 10–12 (Laws §37, OS) dupl. KBo 6.3 ii 29–30 (NS).

28.10. In at least one case, this indicates that the words constitute a popular saying (on which see CHD *lala-* 1b, followed by Beckman 1986): *lalaš=wa* (var. EME-*aš=wa*) *armizzi* 'The tongue is a bridge' KBo 11.72 iii 5 with dupl. KBo 11.10 iii 17.[1]

28.11. Occasionally, especially when there is an introducing verb of speech, the particle *-wa* can be omitted. Friedrich (HE §292), quoting himself and Sommer, claims that this is particularly true in the mythological texts and cites a passage from OH/NS Illuyanka: *nu šarā nepiši atti=šši ḫalzāiš ammugg=a* EGIR-*pa anda ēp lē=mu genzuwaiši* 'He called up to heaven to his father: "Take me together with (them)! Have no mercy on me!"' KBo 3.7 iii 27–30; see edition by Beckman 1982. But the particle is also omitted in Old Hittite (OS) rituals such as: *ta kiššan mēmaḫḫe tuwattu* DINGIR.MEŠ-*eš* 'And I say as follows: "Mercy, O gods!"' KBo 17.5 ii 9 (StBoT 8); and in letters, where quotations are sometimes embedded within quotations: *kišš*[*an*]*=ma=mu kui*[*t ḫ*]*atrāeš* ÉRIN.MEŠ ^{GIŠ}*za*[*l*]*tay*[*aš=wa k*]*uiš* ^{URU}*Kaše*[*pū*]*ra pait* [. . .] . . . [*ki*]*ššan memiškanzi maḫḫan* [LÚ.MEŠ ^{U}]^{RU}*Gašg*[*a uwan*]*zi nu=wa=k*[*an par*]*ā* EGIR[-*anda pai*]*wani nu=w*[*ar=uš=ka*]*n šarā* [*arn*]*u*[*m*]*eni* 'Concerning what you wrote to me as follows: "The troops of the (wooden) *zaltaya* who went to Kašepura, they are speaking thus . . . : 'When the men of the Kaška [come], we will [go] forth after (them), and we will bring them up'"' HKM 24:4–10; [URU-*r*]*i=ma=kan anda kiššan memiyawen* [*nu uezz*]*i* ^{d}UTU-*ŠI* ^{URU}*Taggaštan walḫzi ḫalkiu*[*š*]*š=a=kan* [*ar-ḫ*]*a (*collated) *waršzi* 'But in [the city] we said: '[Then] His Majesty will [proceed to] strike Taggašta and harvest the crops' HKM 47:17–19; in a formal prayer, where the first lines consist of a long series of divine names and epithets: *nu kišša*[*n m*]*emai* ^{d}UTU *ŠAMÊ U* ^{d}UTU ^{URU}TÚL-*na* GAŠAN=*YA* MUNUS.LUGAL GAŠAN=*YA* MUNUS.LUGAL *Š*[*A* KU]R ^{URU}*Ḫatti* KUB 6.45 i 10–11; in the instructions text ABoT 53 + KBo 16.54:17–18 the clause *nu* LÚ.MEŠ ^{GIŠ}TUKUL LÚ.MEŠ ŠU.GI *anda ḫalza*[*i*] [*nu=*]*šmaš kiššan memi* 'Summon the TUKUL-men and the elders and speak as follows to them' is followed by a lengthy quote without any use of *-wa*; similarly [*nu . . . kišša*]*n memaḫḫi* KUB 57.105+ ii 24 and *n=an* DUMU.MUNUS *šuppiššari pai nu wiyeškezzi anda=ma=kan kiššan memiškezzi* VBoT 24 iii 34–36 and *n=ašta* ^{NA_4}*paššiluš IŠTU* KAŠ *kištanumi nu kiššan memaḫḫi* ibid. iv 1–2 and *šerr=a=ššan* ZÍD.DA ZÍZ MUN=*ya šuḫḫai nu kiššan memai* KBo 11.14 i 20 and *nu kiššan memai* KBo 15.21 i 17 in rituals. Examples are also given by Mascheroni (1980: 57–58), who claims that in texts from later periods *-wa* is much

1. Incorrectly read as *la-la-na-aš* in HW 3. Erg. 22; on HW^{2} sub *armizzi* 'bridge' see correction in Hoffner 1983b: 412.

less likely to be omitted, and cites KBo 16.61 obv.? 4, where the scribe has inserted the particle as an afterthought above the line.

28.12. The particle can be omitted when the quoted speech consists of a single word: *nu* ^{URU}*Nišili kiššan ḫ*[*alza*]*i tapuša* '(The guard) calls out in Hittite: "To the side!"' IBoT 1.36 iii 64–65 (*MEŠEDI* instruction, MH/MS), ed. Güterbock and van den Hout 1991; *duddu ḫalziššaḫḫi nu=mu* DINGIR-*LIM=YA ištamaš* 'I call "Help!" Hear me, O my god!' KUB 30.11 rev. 21′ (OH/MS). See §§16.13–16.14 (p. 244) for its frequent omission with the vocative.

28.13. It is not uncommon in quoted speeches which stretch over several clauses to find *-wa* omitted in one or more of the consecutive clauses.

28.14. Quoted speech very rarely begins with a conjunction: [^{d}]IM-*š=a tezzi nu=war=an kuit ḫanda* UL *wemiya*[*tten*] 'And the Stormgod said: "And/So (*nu*) why didn't you find him?"' VBoT 58 i 23, tr. Pecchioli Daddi and Polvani 1990: 57–70; Hoffner 1990: 26–28. See §29.48 (p. 402).

28.15. The above discussion, which is based on the current generally-held view, assumes that consistent use of the particle at the beginning of each clause is the norm and omission is to be explained case by case. This view has been challenged by Fortson (1998), who argues that the use of the particle was limited in spoken Hittite and conditioned by various discourse factors, some traces of which are still visible in more informal text varieties. The consistent use of the particle in every sentence of quoted speech represents in his view a stylistic standardization of the more formal literary standard of Hittite administrative texts.

The Particle *-z(a)*

Form

28.16. This particle is conventionally referred to as *-za*, but there is evidence to show that its real form was merely /-ts/. First, in OH and MH it is regularly spelled as *-z* after a morpheme ending in a vowel: *zi-ik-wa-az*, *lu-uk-kat-ti-ma-az*, *ta-az*, *nu-uz*, *ne-ez*, *ma-a-né-ez*, and (not final) *ta-az-kán*, *an-da-ma-az-kán*, *a-ap-pa-ma-wa-az-kán* (see Kühne 1988). Second, when it occurs before the local particle *-šan*, the sequence of the two is spelled simply *-za-an*, i.e., /-ts-san/ (see §28.83, p. 374). Elsewhere it is spelled *-za*. Under no circumstances (contra Sturtevant 1933: 105 and Kammenhuber in HW^{2}) does it take the form *-az* (see Sommer and Falkenstein 1938: 114 n. 4). The *a* which precedes it *always* belongs to the preceding morpheme (*-ma-az* = *=ma=z*).

Reflexive Function

28.17. A **reflexive** pronoun is one which refers back to the subject of the sentence or clause in which it stands. English reflexive pronouns contain the element '-self': 'myself, himself, herself, yourself, ourselves'.[2] These may function as direct objects, as in

2. The reflexive pronouns are not used to express the '-self' forms in English used for emphasis, as in 'He said it himself'. For this purpose Hittite uses the suffix *-il*(*a*) (see §18.7, p. 279) or the particle *-pat* (see

'he hit himself', as indirect objects, as in 'I bought myself a sandwich', or as objects of prepositions, as in 'he compares others to himself'. For the first two of these functions Hittite uses either the particle *-z(a)* or the enclitic dative pronoun (only in the plural) of the same person as the grammatical subject of the clause.[3] Reflexivity may also be indicated without a particle by the medio-passive forms of certain verbs (see §21.6, p. 303).

28.18. In Hittite (as in Latin) the dative forms of the personal pronouns can serve as reflexives. In Hittite this procedure is applicable to the plural: (first person dat.-acc.:) *nu=nnaš* DUMU.NITA.MEŠ DUMU.MUNUS.MEŠ *iyawen* 'and we begat for ourselves sons (and) daughters' (Ḫatt. iii 4); (third person dat.:) *warpanzi=ma=wa=šmaš ŪL* 'but they do not wash themselves' KUB 16.16 i 28. The unexpected choice of the dative in the last example for a direct object is in order to assure the reflexive meaning, since *warpanzi=ma=war=uš ŪL* with accusative *-uš* in place of the dative *-šmaš* would mean 'they do not wash them (i.e., a second group)'.

28.19. The usual means of expressing the reflexive idea in Hittite is the enclitic particle *-za* (alternate form *-z*), whose position in the chain of sentence enclitics is noted in §30.15 (p. 410), and which serves without inflection for all persons, numbers, and genders.

28.20. When the verb is **transitive** and the clause has no other accusative form, *-za* may indicate that the **direct** object of the verb is the same person as its subject: *warpanzi=ma=wa=z ŪL* 'but they do not wash themselves (*-z*)' KUB 16.34 i 8–9; *kinuna=šmaš=za* LUGAL-*uš labarnaš ulanun* 'Now (*kinuna*) I, the *labarna*, have united (*ulanun*) myself (*-za*) to you (*-šmaš*)' KUB 29.1 i 33–34 (OH/NS).

28.21. When the verb is **transitive** and the clause contains a direct object (an accusative), *-za* may indicate that the **indirect** object of the verb is the same person as its subject ('to/for himself') (see van den Hout 1992): *nu=za* DUMU.NITA.MEŠ DUMU.MUNUS.MEŠ DÙ-*nun* 'and I made (*iyanun*) for myself (*-za*) sons and daughters' KUB 21.38 obv. 58; *nu=za* PN . . . DAM-*anni ḫarta* 'and he had PN for himself in wifeship' KBo 3.1+ i 32–33 (Tel. pr., OH/NS); NINDA-*an=za wemiyanun . . . wātar=ma=z wemiya⟨nun⟩* 'I found for myself bread . . . I found for myself water' KUB 30.10 obv. 16–17 (OH/MS); *n=at=za=kan pedi=pat* ÌR-*aḫta* 'he made them (*-at* refers back to a neuter collective noun for people) subject to himself on the spot' KUB 19.9 i 15; *nu=za* . . . NAM.RA *INA* É.LUGAL *uwatenun* 'I brought civilian captives into the king's house for myself' KBo 3.4 ii 41 (AM); *nu=za=kan INA* KUR ^{URU}*Ḫatti* ^{d}UTU ^{URU}TÚL-*na* ŠUM-*an daišt*[*a*] 'but in the land of Ḫatti you have placed upon yourself the name "Sungoddess of Arinna"' KUB 21.27 i 4; *nu=za kī* ALAM=*YA ŠA* KÙ.GI *iyanun* 'I made for myself this gold statue of myself' KBo 10.2 iii 21–22 (OH/NS); *n=an=za ANA* DAM=*ŠU dāi nu=za* É-*er U* DUMU.

§§28.115ff., pp. 384ff.).

3. It is likely, but not yet fully established, that Hittite (only NH?) may also use *-z(a)* as the object of a postposition. A likely example is: *nu=za* ÉRIN.MEŠ *NARĀRU ŠA* KUR-*TI tepauwaza* GAM-*an ēppūn* 'I took with me auxiliary troops of the country in small numbers' KBo 3.6 ii 7. See Francia 2002b: 53.

MEŠ *ienzi* ‘and he takes her to himself as his wife, and they make for themselves a house and children’ KBo 6.3 ii 17 (Laws §31, OH/NS); [*kui*]*š=za* ^{LÚ}*ḫippari ḫāppar iezzi* ‘he who makes a business transaction for himself with a *ḫipparaš*-man’ KBo 6.2 ii 51 (Laws §48, OS); GAL-*iš=za* ^{d}UTU-*uš* EZEN$_4$-*an iēt* ‘The great Sungod made a party (lit., ‘festival’) for himself’ KUB 17.10 i 19 (OH/MS); *namma=z uet ABI* ^{d}UTU-*ŠI tuk* ^{m}*Madduwattan linkiyaš=šaš iēt* ‘then my father (lit., ‘the father of My Majesty’) proceeded to make you, Madduwatta, a sworn ally (lit., ‘one of his oath’) for himself’ KUB 14.1 obv. 13–14 (MH/MS); *n=ašta* DINGIR.MEŠ-*aš=pat* ZI-*ni iyatten nu* NINDA-*an ēzzatteni wātar=ma ekutteni* É-*err=a=za iyatteni* ‘Act in the will of the gods, and you will eat bread, drink water, and make a house for yourselves’ KUB 13.4 ii 69–71 (instructions for priests, pre-NH). When the verb *iya-* ‘to make’ is construed with a double object (‘to make something into something else’),[4] it sometimes takes *-za* and sometimes does not. In these cases the-*za* refers back to the subject as a dative of interest.

28.22. Beginning in Old Hittite, the particle *-za* can serve in a possessive construction to identify the possessor with the grammatical subject of the clause (‘his own’, ‘her own’, ‘our own’, etc.; Hoffner 1973a: 523–24): *nu=zza* DUMU.MUNUS.MEŠ*=ŠA ANA* DUMU.NITA.MEŠ*=ŠA paiš* ‘(The queen) gave her own daughters to her own sons (in marriage)’ StBoT 17 obv. 17 (OS); *nu=za=kan* DUMU.MEŠ*=ŠU parā šuwiezzi* ‘(if a mother removes her garment from her son,) she thus disinherits her own son (pl. ‘sons’ is a scribal error’)’ Hittite Laws §171 (OH/NS); New Hittite examples: *namma=an=za=an ANA* SAG.DU*=ŠU šer anzāšš=a* [*ANA* DUMU].MEŠ*=ŠU šer linganut* ‘he made him swear loyalty to himself (lit., ‘to his own head’), and us he made swear loyalty to his sons’ KBo 4.4 iv 59–60; *ammuk=wa=za* É.DINGIR-*LIM=YA paḫḫašḫi* ‘I am guarding my own temple’ KUB 13.4 iii 25–26 (pre-NH), (when someone has paid compensation for homicide,) *nu=za=*(*š*)*ta* SAG.DU-*SU wašta* ‘he has purchased his own life (lit., ‘head’)’ KUB 13.9 ii 3–4, *nu=za=kan* 2 EN.SÍSKUR *wātar INA* SAG.DU.MEŠ*=ŠUNU šarā laḫuwanzi* ‘and the two offerers pour the water on their own heads’ KBo 2.3 iv 4–5. The construction can even omit the possessive: *nu=za* ŠEŠ-*aš* ⟨ŠEŠ⟩-*an kattan pešket* [^{LÚ}*a*]*raš=ma=za* ^{LÚ}*aran kattan pešket* ‘brother betrayed his own brother, friend betrayed his own friend’ KBo 2.5 iv 16–17 (AM); *nu=za=kan* IGI.ḪI.A-*wa kuwattan ANA* KUR LÚ.KÚR *andan nāiškenun nu=mu=kan* IGI.ḪI.A-*wa* LÚ.KÚR EGIR-*pa ŪL kuiški nāiš* ‘toward whatever enemy land I directed my own eyes, no enemy was able to turn my(!) eyes back’.[5] Ḫatt. i 67–69;[6] *nu=za* ^{d}*IŠTAR* GAŠAN*=YA parā ḫandandatar . . . tikkuššanut* ‘*IŠTAR*, my lady, revealed her own sovereign power’ Ḫatt. iii 15–16; *ta=z kiššeruš ār*[*ri*] ‘and he washes his own hands’ KUB 20.96 iii 6. In all these cases the *-za* has primary reference to the subject’s being the possessor of something mentioned in the clause; it does not construe primarily with the finite verb. See German *Sie waschen sich die Händ*e.

4. On the double-accusative constructions see van den Hout 1992.

5. For the thought, compare ^{d}*Kumarbiyaš* IGI.ḪI.A-*wa ŪL namma manzazzi* ‘he was no longer able to resist Kumarbi’s eyes’ KUB 33.120+ i 20–21.

6. If the IGI.ḪI.A-*wa* in the second clause had belonged to the enemy, who is the grammatical subject of *naiš*, the particle *-za* would have appeared again in the second clause.

Lexical Use of -z(a)

28.23. Some verbs exhibit significant differences in meaning, depending upon whether or not they are construed with *-za* (Hoffner 1973a: 521):

Verb	without *-za*	with *-za*	Bibliography
au(š)-	'to see (physically)'	'to see with insight, experience, understand, see in a dream'	Friedrich 1952: 38 sub *auš-*; Hoffner 1973a: 523; Boley 1993: 106–16
ēpp-	'to seize, grasp'	'to betake oneself to, take refuge in' (with *-za* + *-kan*)[7]	Hoffner 1970, 1973a
ēš-	'to sit, remain seated'	'to take a seat, sit down'	Goetze 1933b: 4–5; Neu 1968b: 27–28; Boley 1993: 73–76
ḫalzišš(a)-	'to summon'	'to call' in the sense of 'give a name to'	
iya-	'to do, make'	'to celebrate (festivals), worship (gods)'	Boley 1993: 77–86
kiš-	'to occur, happen'	'to become (something)'	But see Neu 1968b: 97–98; and Hoffner 1973a: 522 n. 14; Boley 1993: 49–54
mald-	'to recite, speak'	'to take a vow'	Laroche 1964: 8–12; CHD *mald-*
ninink-	'to move, stir up (something)'	'to muster (troops)'	CHD sub *ninink-*[8]
peda-	'to dispose of'	'to carry off with/for oneself'	
šak-	'to be aware of, know'	'to know, master (a skill), to recognize (authority)'	
šakuwaye-	'to look (toward something, with d.-l.)'	'to see (something, with acc.)'	Hoffner 1973a
tarḫ-	'to have the upper hand, prevail, be able'	'to conquer (someone)'	
tepnu-	'to demote, curtail'	'to belittle (verbally)'	Hoffner 1977

7. HW² E 51–52, 63–64.

8. In meaning 1 ('mobilizing or mustering troops') the verb can occur with or without *-za*. But in the other meanings (2–8) *-za* does not occur.

28.24. The connection between the reflexive meaning of *-z(a)* and its idiomatic use with particular verbs is far from clear. Some, though by no means all, of the idiomatic uses can be classified under the labels of (1) "transitivity toggle" and (2) "transformative."

28.25. The particle *-za* often serves to distinguish a transitive from an intransitive use of a verb ("transitivity toggle"; Hoffner 1973a: 524–26). Note that in this transitive/intransitive opposition the "transitivity toggle" *-za* always marks the transitive use. The best-established case is with *tarḫ-*: (1) trans. with *-za* 'to overcome, subject', (2) intrans. without *-za* 'to have the upper hand, be superior'. A second case is *šakuwai(a)-* 'to look, see' (Hoffner 1973a: 524). The verb *šakuwai(a)-* 'to look, see' like its synonym *au(š)-* occurs sometimes with *-za* and sometimes without. But the factor determining the need for *-za* is not the same as with *au(š)-*, where it has to do with seeing something closely associated with the seer. Rather it is the same factor which operates with the verb *tarḫ-*: when the verb takes a direct object, the particle *-za* will regularly accompany it: [(*nu=kan* ^{d}UTU-*uš nepišaz*) *katta š*]*akuwait nu=za* ^{d}*Ullukummin šakuiškezzi* [(^{d}*Ulluk*)*ummiš=a=za* (*nepiš*)]*an* ^{d}UTU-*un šakuiškezzi* 'The Sungod looked (without *-za*) down from the sky and saw (with *-za*) Ullukummi, and Ullukummi saw (with *-za*) heavenly Sungod' KUB 33.93 iv 28–29 (Ullik. I A iv 33–34). Beginning in MH, *ēš-* also developed a transitive use 'to occupy, settle in (a land, area)'. In this usage it shows *-z(a)*: [*k*]*āša=wa=tta* KUR $^{ḪUR.ŠAG}$*Zippašlā* *AD*[*DIN*] *nu=wa=za apūn=pat eši* 'I have herewith given you the land of Mt. Zippašla; so occupy (or: settle in) it' KUB 14.1 obv. 19 (MH/MS); see Goetze 1933b: 4 sub e; Hoffner 1973a: 525 with n. 25; and Boley 1993: 73.

28.26. In a few instances the particle *-z(a)* may be said to have a "transformative" value. That is, it underscores a change of state. This usage, which is attested only in post-OH, is clearest with the verbs *kiš-* 'to happen; become' and *ēš-* 'to sit (down'.

28.27. The occurrence of *-za* with *kiš-* in post-OH correlates rather consistently with its use as a linking verb (i.e., with a second, "predicate" nominative). When no second nominative occurs (and in these cases the subject is always third person), the meaning is 'to happen, take place, occur' and there is usually no *-za*: *n=at uezzi šummaš* *ANA* LÚ.MEŠ KÚR ^{URU}*Išmirika waštul kišari* 'And a "sin" will occur for you men of Išmirika' (i.e., you men will become guilty of an infraction of the treaty) KUB 23.68 rev. 6 (MH/NS); *gašza kišat* 'A famine occurred' HKM 113:10 (MH/MS), EGIR-*ann=a=kan* *INA* ŠÀ KARAŠ *ḫinkan kišat* 'And afterwards a plague occurred (i.e., broke out) in the army' KBo 5.6 i 9–10 (DŠ frag. 28); *ini=wa=mu uttar karuwiliyaz pe*[(*ran*)] *ŪL kuwapikki kišat* 'Such a thing never occurred before to me' KBo 14.9 iii 7′–8′ (DŠ frag. 28); *nu maḫḫan ḫamešḫanza kišat* 'But when spring came (lit., 'when spring occurred')' KBo 2.5 ii 1 (annals of Murš. II).

28.28. When a second nominative occurs (and in these cases the subject can be any of the three persons), the meaning is 'to become, turn out to be' and there is usually a *-za* or equivalent dative clitic pronoun agreeing in person with the subject: *nu* MU-*ti mēniaš armalaš maḫḫan n*[*u=za ug*]*=a apāš kišḫat* 'Like one sick throughout the cycle of the

year, I became that one' KUB 30.11 rev. 12–13 (OH/MS); *nu=za ūk apā*[*š k*]*išḫaḫa*[*t*] 'I became that one' KUB 36.79a + KUB 31.127 + KUB 31.132+ iii 19 (OH/NS); *nu=za* ABU=YA *kuwapi* DINGIR-*LIM-iš* DÙ-*at* 'And when my father died (lit., 'became a god')' KBo 3.4 i 4 (NH); *ammuk=ma=za* ANA PANI ŠEŠ=YA EN KARAŠ *kišḫaḫat* 'But during the reign of my brother I became an army commander' Ḫatt. i 24 (NH).

28.29. Exceptionally, in predicate nominative clauses with *kiš-* no reflexive particle occurs: *man=war=aš=mu* ^{LÚ}*MUTI=YA kišari* 'he would become my husband' KBo 5.6 iii 13 (NH); *nu=kan* ABU=YA *kuin* LÚ.KÚR ^{URU}*Gašgan* INA ŠÀ KUR-*TI IKŠUD n=aš* 12 *ŠUTI kišat* 'The hostile Kaška which my father encountered in the land turned out to be twelve tribal groups' KBo 14.3 iii 15–16 (NH).

28.30. The particle *-z*(*a*) does not occur with *ēš-* 'to sit' in Old Hittite (i.e., OS). One distinguishes a transformative medio-passive 'sit down, seat oneself' and a non-transformative active 'sit, be sitting' meaning of the verb *ēš-* (the latter formally indistinguishable from *ēš-* 'to be', which probably survives in NH in the sense 'to abide, remain' (see n. 12, p. 366). Beginning in MH, the medio-passive alone is used for non-transformative 'sit, be sitting' and the medio-passive plus *-z*(*a*) for transformative 'sit down'. See Boley 1993: 73–76.

28.31. Very probably the use of *-z*(*a*) with *naḫ-* also marks the transformative use 'to become afraid' as opposed to the non-transformative 'to be afraid': (1) without *-za* 'to be afraid of something/someone': LUGAL-*uš=wa lē naḫti* 'O king, stop being afraid' KBo 15.52 v 14, see 21; *naḫmi=wa* 'I am afraid' KUB 14.3 ii 26 (NH); *nu nāḫun* 'and I was afraid' KUB 12.27 i 3 (NH); (2) with *-za*: 'to become afraid' *nu=wa=za=kan šer nāḫun* 'I became afraid on (that) account' KUB 13.35 ii 33 (NH). Admittedly, it is sometimes impossible contextually to decide which meaning is appropriate. For this reason we should concede that the use of *-z*(*a*) to mark the transformative use of *naḫ-* may not have ben carried through with the thoroughness that it was with *kiš-* 'to become' and *ēš-* 'to sit down'.

Use in Nominal Sentences and with the Verb 'To Be'

28.32. The particle *-za* often occurs in clauses with the verb 'to be' expressed or merely understood. Friedrich (HE [1960] §243) called such clauses "Nominalsätzen" (nominal sentences), although strictly speaking only the second type deserves that name. The conditions for the use of *-za* or equivalent dative enclitic pronoun in such sentences are the following (Hoffner 1969; see also 1973a: 520–21): (1) In Old Hittite no *-za* or enclitic reflexive dative was employed, regardless of the person of the subject; (2) in New Hittite either *-za* or a dative enclitic reflexive pronoun is required when the subject of the sentence is 'I', 'we', or 'you' (sg. or pl.) — i.e., a first- or second-person subject; (3) Middle Hittite is a transitional period for this rule: earlier texts follow the OH pattern, later ones the NH pattern. Note that this rule applies *only* to sentences whose verb is 'to be'. Other rules govern clauses using other verbs and *-za*. Boley (1993) underesti-

mated the validity of this rule, and many of her alleged counterexamples were explained by Hoffner (1996b).[9]

28.33. Since the period when *-za* is used as the distinguishing mark for first- and second-person subjects of the verb 'to be' is New Hittite, we shall consider the New Hittite evidence first. And since most of our texts date from that period, it has the most examples.

28.34. First-person singular subject: *ammuk=ma=za parā ḫandānza kuit* UN-*aš ešun* 'but because I was a divinely-guided person' Ḫatt. i 46–47 (NH); [*amm*]*uk=ma=za nūwa* TUR-*aš ešun* 'but I was still (only) a child' KUB 19.29 i 10′ (NH); *nu=za* ^{d}UTU-*ŠI apez linkiyaz . . . parkuiš ēšlit* 'then let me, the emperor, be pure from that oath' KBo 5.3 iv 32 (MH/NS); *ammuk=ma=za* ^{f}*Puduḫepaš annalliš* GÉME=*KA* 'but I, Puduḫepa, am your long-standing maidservant' KUB 21.27 i 7 (NH); *ammuqq=a=za* ^{f}*Puduḫepaš ḫarnāwaš* MUNUS-*za* 'I too, Puduḫepa, am a "woman of the bearing stool"' KUB 21.27 i 17 (NH).

28.35. First-person plural: *anzāš=ma=wa=nnaš* ÌR.MEŠ ^{d}UTU-*ŠI=pat* 'but we are *subjects* of His Majesty too' KBo 4.3 iv 15 (Murš. II, ed. SV 1:144–145); *anzaš=ma=naš* DUMU.LÚ.U_{19}.LU *kuit* 'because we are *human* beings' KBo 11.1 rev. 15 (prayer of Muw. II), ed. Houwink ten Cate and Josephson 1967: 109, 119 with comments on pp. 134–35.

28.36. Second-person singular: TI-*anza=wa=za ēš* 'Be alive!' (a greeting) (KUB 33.106 iii 7); [MUNUS]-*anza=wa=za* MUNUS-*nili=ya⟨=wa⟩=z zik* 'you are a woman and of a womanly nature' (KUB 24.8 i 36);[10] *zik=za kuiš* 'who are you?' KBo 5.11 iv 24.

28.37. Second-person plural: *nu=za ḫaliy*[*aš*] *uddanī mekki paḫḫaššanuwanteš ēšten* 'so be very vigilant concerning the matter of the night watch!' KUB 13.4 ii 73–74 (pre-NH/NS); *anda=ma=za šumaš kuiēš* LÚ.MEŠ É DINGIR-*LIM* 'furthermore you who are temple servants' KUB 13.4 ii 52; *šummeš=šmaš kuiēš* LÚ.MEŠ SAG 'you who are eunuchs' KUB 26.1 i 6 (NH); see also ibid. iii 45; *nu=za mān parkuwaēš* 'if you are pure' KUB 13.4 iv 53 (NS); *takku=za papranteš=ma* 'but if you are defiled' KUB 13.4 iv 54 (NS); *man=wa=za šānteš* 'if you are angry' KUB 15.32 i 46 (NS).

28.38. The following NH clause sequence contains one first-person subject and one second-person: *appan=wa=mu=za=kan ēš* [*namma?=w*]*a=du=za tuk* EGIR-*pa ēšmi* 'be behind me, and I will be behind you!' KUB 36.35+ i 12–13 (NS), see i 1 (*nam-m*]*a-wa-du-za tu-uk*), ed. Otten 1953a; 1953b; Hoffner 1965.

---

9. We reject the arguments of Nowicki (2000), followed by Josephson (2003b: 215–17), that *ne-pi-iš-za* in KBo 3.22:2 (OS) is to be analyzed as an endingless locative *nepiš* + reflexive *-za* in a sentence with 'to be' in the third person. None of the other alleged examples presented by Nowicki and Josephson for such use of *-za* from any period are valid. We therefore retain the analysis of *nepišza* as an ablative. See p. 120, n. 199.

10. Note that there are two clauses in this cited material: MUNUS-*nili=ya=z* contains a new set of sentence particles.

28.39. The particle's absence with first- or second-person in NH is extremely rare and perhaps intentionally archaizing: DUMU LÚ.U_{19}.LU-*aš ešun* 'I was a mortal' KUB 6.45 iii 26 (NH).

28.40. Contrast the following examples of NH 'to be' sentences with **third-person subjects**, in which neither *-za* nor a dative enclitic pronoun is required: *n=aš=kan* ŠÀ DINGIR.MEŠ *ANA* ^{d}*IŠTAR* ^{URU}*Šamuḫa naḫḫanza ēšdu* 'so let him be reverent to *IŠTAR* of Šamuḫa among the gods' (Ḫatt. iv 88–89); *kuit=wa waštul=tit* 'what is your problem (lit., sin)?' KUB 24.8 i 45; *kuiš=war=aš aši* DUMU-*aš* 'who is he, this child?' KUB 33.95 + KUB 36.7b iv 14 (Ullik. I A); *kī=wa kuit* 'what is this?' KBo 6.34 i 30 (MH/NS).

28.41. In Old Hittite and early Middle Hittite this use of the reflexive to distinguish first- and second-person subjects from third-person ones in 'to be' clauses was not yet operational. Observe the non-occurrence of the reflexive in OH and early MH 'to be' sentences with first- and second-person subjects: **First-person singular:** [(^{m}*Ḫappi*)]*š ANA* LÚ.MEŠ ^{URU}*Zalpa taršikizzi ūk=wa a*[(*tti*)]*=m*[(*i*) *natt*]*a āššuš* 'Ḫappi says to the men of Zalpa: "I am not dear to my father"' KBo 22.2 rev. 4–5 (OS); *ūgg=a* ^{MUNUS}*annannaš ēšmi* 'I too am an *a.*-woman' VBoT 58 iv 3 (OH or MH/NS); [*ū*]*k BEL* ^{GIŠ}TUKUL *ešun* 'I was a Lord-of-the-Weapon' KBo 3.35 i 9 (OH/NS). **First-person plural:** [KÙ.BABBAR-*wa BELI-NI l*]*ē=wa=nnaš=kan kueši weš=a=wa* [*nepišaš taknašš=*]*a lalukkimiš* 'O Silver, our lord!] Do not kill us! We are the luminaries [of heaven] and [earth]!' KUB 36.19 iv? 13–14 (OH?/NS) (see Hoffner 1988b: 160). **Second-person singular:** *zig=a=wa* ^{GIŠ}TUKUL 'you are a TUKUL(-man)' KBo 22.1:21 (OS); *maršanza=wa zik* 'you are treacherous' KBo 3.34 ii 20 (OH/NS). Also in a NH ritual but imitating archaic syntax: DUMU-*annaš=ši* DAM=*SU zik* 'you are his child-producing wife' KUB 7.8 ii 3–4 (see Hoffner 1987: 280, 285). **Second-person plural**: *šumeš=a* [DINGIR.MEŠ-*aš u*]*ddani naḫḫanteš ēšten* 'Be respectful toward the word [of the gods]' KUB 1.16 iii 49 (OH/NS); LÚ.MEŠ *ILKI=wa šumeš* 'you (pl.) are men bound to render *ILKU*-tax'. Notice how in OH the independent pronoun (*zik*, *šumeš*) often occurs in final position, when the verb *ēš-* is left unexpressed (§22.3, p. 306).

28.42. A similar use of dative pronouns referring back to the subject is used in nominal sentences in Hieroglyphic **Luwian**, where one finds in sentences with first-person singular subjects (Latinogram EGO 'I') the regular use of the enclitic pronoun *-mi*: EGO-*mi U+ra/i-hi-li-na* 'I am Urhilina' (Restan and Qalʿat el Mudiq = Hawkins 2000: (2:)409. On this subject see F. Josephson in Houwink ten Cate and Josephson 1967: 135–36 with anterior literature cited there.

The Local Particles *-an*, *-apa*, *-ašta*, *-kan*, and *-šan*

28.43. The particles *-an*, *-apa*, *-ašta*, *-kan*, and *-šan* belong to a single class of sentence particles which modify the action expressed by the main verb and its "adverbal" adjuncts. The nature of that modification is disputed: some thinking that it marks primarily local relationships (Goetze 1933b; Carruba 1964; HE §§287–88), and another

(Josephson 1972) that it marks verbal aspect. These two viewponts are not mutually exclusive (Carruba 1964: 432–36; Boley 1989; Hoffner 1992b; and Josephson 1995). We retain here the term "local particles" as a convenient means of distinguishing this group from other sentence particles such as *-za* (likewise Luraghi 1997a: 52–53).

28.44. The normal position of these particles is last in the chain of sentence enclitics, which chain is suffixed to the first accented word of the clause. Less commonly, these particles can be suffixed to a dative-locative in the interior of the clause (Neu 1993).[11] When this happens, the same particle or another "local" particle in the normal position may also occur at the head of the clause: *n=**ašta** parā šuḫḫi=**šš**an šarā* DINGIR.LÚ.MEŠ*-aš pēdai* 'He carries (it) out (*=ašta* with *parā*) up onto (*=šan* with *šarā*) the roof for the male deities' KBo 21.33+ iv 20–21 (Neu 1993: 138); *nu=kan ma*[*ḫḫan*] NINDA.GUR$_4$.RA *ANA* LÚ.MEŠMUḪALDIM *ḫandāizzi n=**ašta** šarḫanan ḫaššī=**kan** anda lāḫuwāi* 'When he prepares thick bread(s) for the cooks, he pours out (*=ašta . . . laḫuwai*) the *šarḫana*-liquid into the brazier (*=kan anda*)' KUB 27.69 ii 4–8. As Neu correctly notes, the two local particles in the same clause refer to distinct local notions.

28.45. The first two of these particles (*-an*, *-apa*) are found chiefly in documents composed during the Old Hittite period. With the disappearance of these two, and eventually of *-ašta*, their functions were assumed by *-šan* and *-kan*. This fact makes it impractical to use the majority of Hittite texts, which either originate or were recopied with modernizations during this late period, to determine reliably the original functions of even *-šan* and *-kan*, since many of their uses in the late period originally belonged to the now defunct *-an*, *-apa*, and *-ašta.* In our discussion of each particle we present representative examples of their usage, organized into coherent groupings. Speculations about a possible unitary or basic meaning and etymology are reserved for the end. The presentation of the evidence is illustrative, not exhaustive (except for the very rare *-an*), and even the classification of the material is tentative.

28.46. These five particles occur in complementary distribution, and thus the presence of any one in a given chain of sentence particles excludes the others (Hoffner 1973a; Kammenhuber 1979b).

28.47. Of the five, *-kan* by far occurs most frequently. It also has the least restrictive sphere of meaning, including in its own semantic range the nuances of several of the other four. For this reason, especially in NH copies of OH or MH compositions, one can find almost identical sentences, one of which contains *-kan* and the other *-šan*, *-ašta*, *-apa*, or *-an*. The same cannot be said for any of the other four particles, which differ markedly from each other. The first clues to the meaning of these particles were found in sentences containing verbs of movement (Goetze 1933b; HE §295). This does not, however, indicate that the conditioning factor for the use of the particles is always the main verb in its clause. Good evidence exists that often the more pertinent consideration is

11. For the same occasional irregularity in Hieroglyphic Luwian see *á-mi-ya-za-ta* with local particle *-tta* in KARATEPE §XXX and comments by Meriggi 1966–75: II/1, p. 93.

the presence or absence of a local expression (noun phrase in the locative, local adverb, postpositional phrase, or preverb) (Goetze 1933b: 16–30; Tjerkstra 1999: 131–40).

The Particle *-kan*

The "Local" Value

In 'To Be' Sentences

28.48. The "local" value of *-kan* is clearest where it co-occurs with a local adverb in nominal sentences and in those with the verb 'to be'. This usage is not yet attested before MH, although it is found in OS with the particle *-šan.* For one interpretation of this fact see Boley 2001.

28.49. With *anda* 'with', 'in': ANŠE.KUR.RA.ḪI.A*=ya=šmaš=kan kuiš anda* 'And also the horses that are with you (move them into His Majesty's presence with haste in three days!)' HKM 15:8–9 (MH/MS); *nu=mu=kan kuiš idaluš memiaš* ZI*-ni anda* 'The evil thing that is in my soul . . .' KUB 6.45 iii 45–46 (prayer of Muwatalli II); *nu* ^{m}*Ūḫḫa*-LÚ*-iš kuit* GIG*-at n=a*[*š=ka*]*n aruni anda ēšta* 'and because Uḫḫaziti became ill, he remained on the island (lit., 'in the sea')' KBo 3.4 ii 50–51 (NH).[12]

28.50. With *āppan* 'behind': ^{GIŠ}TUKUL *ŠA* ^{LÚ}KUŠ$_7$.KÙ.[G]I*=ma=kan kuiš* EGIR*-an* 'But the "weapon of the gold-spear man" that is behind . . .' BrTabl. i 44–45 (Tudḫ. IV). See with *-šša*n: ÌR.MEŠ DINGIR*-LIM=ya=šša*n *kuiēš INA* ^{URU}*Kappēri* EGIR*-an ešer* 'And also the servants of the deity who were behind Kapperi' KUB 19.37 iii 38–39 (NH) (and ibid. 42 and 44).

28.51. With *šer* 'up': ÉRIN.MEŠ*=ya=kan pankuš šer ēšta* 'And the entire army was up (there)' KUB 14.16 iii 11 (NH); *wātar=ma=kan kuit ANA* $^{ḪUR.SAG}$*Arlanta šer* 'But the water that is up on Mt. Arlanta . . .' KBo 4.10 obv. 25 (NH).

28.52. But no particle seems to co-occur with *kattan* 'below', 'down' in such sentences: *nu kuitman ABU=YA INA* KUR ^{URU}*Kargamiš*^{iš} *kattan ēšta* 'And while my father was down in Kargamiš' KBo 5.6 iii 1–2 (NH). Lack of a particle also seems regular with *peran*: [. . . . . .]*=ma=mu peran arpuwanteš eš*[*er*] '[The roads/the mountains] were arduous ahead of me' KUB 19.37 iii 50 (NH). We do find *-kan* with the combination *peran ēš-* when it means 'be responsible for' (lit., 'remain before'[12]): *nu=wa=kan* KUR!*-e peran ēšten* 'Be responsible for the land!' KUB 14.16 i 17 (NH).

With Local Adverbs and Non-motion Verbs

28.53. The particle *-kan* likewise occurs with the same local adverbs in other sentences with non-motion verbs and some local expression. In none of these cases is the

12. This active *ēš-* is the stative (non-eventive or non-transformative; see §28.30, p. 362) counterpart to medio-passive *ēš-* 'take one's seat, sit down' (Hrozný 1917: 165; Goetze 1927: 100–105), and not the verb 'to be'. Supporting this analysis is the example in KUB 14.16 i 17 cited below in §28.52. In the case of the imperative *ēšten* the verb 'to be' would have taken the particle *-za*.

local adverb a preverb construed with the verb, since it in no way modifies or limits the meaning of the verb.

28.54. With *anda* 'in' (beginning in MH/MS): (The carpenter heard himself being cursed,) *nu=šši=kan anda i*[*dāl*]*awešta* 'and (his mood) became sad/bad within him' KBo 32.14 rev. 44 (MH/MS); also in KUB 33.120 iii67–68 (NS) with ŠA-*ni* added; and in KBo 26.65 iv 10 (NS), KUB 36.25 iv 2 (NS) and KUB 36.35 i 24–25 (NS) with explicit subject ZI-*anza* (NS); the same expression but with [*anda*]*n* KBo 32.14 left edge 1–2 (MH/MS);[13] *nu=kan* ^{m}*Ūḫḫa*-LÚ-*iš aruni anda* BA.ÚŠ 'Uḫḫaziti died on an island (lit., 'in the sea')' KBo 3.4 ii 52 (NH); *nu=za=kan* ḪUR.SAG.MEŠ-*aš anda šāšduš ēššešta* 'He made resting places for himself in the mountains' KBo 5.8 ii 28 (NH).

28.55. With *āppan* 'behind' and *āppa* 'back': *nu=kan* (var. -*šan*) *ḫalkiuš* EGIR-*an ma*[(*knunun*)] 'and I multiplied crops behind(?)' KBo 3.1 iii 44 (OH/NS), ed. TH 11:38–39; [*namma*]*=aš=ta=kkan* EGIR-*an=pat kittat* '[then] he kept after you (and kept pursuing you)' KUB 14.1 obv. 2 (MH/MS); *nu=tta=kkan* ^{m}*Attarišši̯an* EGIR-*an arḫa ka*[*ršta*] 'and I cut Attariššiya off from (going) after you' KUB 14.1 obv. 4 (MH/MS); *namma=kan* ^{m}*Madduwattaš* LÚ.MEŠ ^{URU}*Dalawa ANA* KUR ^{URU}*Ḫatti* EGIR-*an arḫa=pat naiš* 'Then Madduwatta turned the men of Talawa away from following (lit., 'from behind') the land of Ḫatti' KUB 14.1 obv. 73 (MH/MS); *nu=kan antuḫšātar* ^{URU}*Ḫatti ANA* URU.DIDLI.ḪI.A ^{URU}*Gašga* EGIR-*an kuiēš* ^{É}*arzanan ḫarker kuiēš=ma=kan ḫāppiri* EGIR-*pa pānteš* 'Some of the Hittite population had hostel(s) behind the Kaskean towns, while some had gone back into town' KBo 5.6 i 15–17 (NH).

28.56. With *šer* 'up': 'When I arrived in Aštata, I went up in the city Aštata', *nu=kan gurtan šer wetenun* 'And I built a citadel up (there)' KBo 4.4 ii 61–62 (NH).

With Local Adverbs and Motion Verbs

28.57. The particle *-kan* is generally absent when a motion verb has no associated preverb, even when an explicit local expression is present: *nu INA* TÙR *pāun* 'and I went to the sheepfold' KBo 17.61 rev. 8 (MH/MS); *INA* ^{É}*šinapši=war=aš pait* 'he went to the *šinapši*-building' KUB 30.28 rev. 4 (NS); ^{d}UTU-*ŠI kuit INA* KASKAL ^{URU}*Nerik ŪL pait* 'Because His Majesty did not go on a trip to Nerik' KUB 2.15 v 22–23 (NS); *n=aš INA* KUR ^{URU}*Ḫayaša pait* 'And he went to the land of Ḫayaša' KUB 19.11 iv 41 (NH). But there

13. Aside from *nu=šši=kan* ZI-*anza anda* ḪUL-*ue*[*šta*] 'and she became deeply distressed' KUB 36.35 i 24–25 (Ašertu and Elkunirša myth), which to our knowledge no one has dated earlier than NH, the NH continuation of this construction lacks *anda*(*n*) and the local particle: (If anyone disposes of contaminated materials from a purification ritual on another's property, he must purify that house,) *mān* É-*ri=ya kuitki idālawēšzi* 'and if anything goes wrong in the house, (he shall purify it again and make compensation for the loss)' KBo 6.4 iv 1–2 (NH); see also Laws §31 NS copy B, and KUB 11.1 iv 26 (OH/NS). The meaning of *idālawešš-* in this construction is different from that expressing hostility, which is without *anda* and local particle: *nu* 1-*aš* 1-*edani idalāweszi* KBo 5.4 rev. 3 (NH), or is a plural reciprocal verb without dative-locative or *anda* but with *-kan*: *nu=kan lē idalāwēštēni* 'don't be angry with each other' KBo 5.4 rev. 21 (NH).

are exceptions, especially with the verb *ar-/er-* 'to arrive': *maḫḫan=wa=kan ammuk INA* KUR ^{URU}*Išḫupitta ārḫun* 'When I arrived in the land of Išḫupitta' HKM 10:34–35 (MH/MS); versus *mān* ^{m}*Tudḫaliyaš* LUGAL.[GAL] ^{URU}*Ḫattuši ārḫun* 'When I, Tudḫaliya, [great] king, arrived in Ḫattuša' KUB 23.11 iii 12–13 (MH/NS). The verb *ḫuwai-* 'to run' also takes *-kan* in combination with *ḫaššan*, accusative of 'hearth': *ḫaššan=kan* 1*=ŠU ḫūyanzi* 'they run around(?) the hearth once' KBo 25.46:5, etc. (OH).

28.58. Use of *-kan* (or alternatively *-ašta* or *-šan*) is frequent with intransitive or transitive verbs of motion when these are accompanied by a preverb, but there are also examples where there is no particle, and the frequency of the use of the particle can vary markedly from one preverb+verb combination to another.

28.59. Examples of *anda* 'in(to)', 'to' + motion verb with *-kan*: *ANA* DUMU.MUNUS GAL*=ma=kan anda aššuli namma nešḫut* 'Turn again towards the princess in benevolence' KBo 4.6 obv. 16 (NH); *ANA* LÚ.MEŠ ^{URU}*Paḫḫuwa=ma=aš=kan anda pait* 'But he went to the men of Paḫḫuwa' KUB 23.72 rev. 17 (MH/MS); *anda=kan ḫalīnaš teššummiuš tarlipit šūwamuš* 2-*TAM pētumini* 'We twice(?) bring in two clay vessels filled with *t.*'; KBo 17.1 i 26–27 (OS) (see ibid. i 31–32, 34 with particle *-an*!); *mān* EGIR-*pa kuwatga waḫnuzi n=aš=kan* KUR-*ya anda uezzi* 'If he turns back somewhere and comes into the country' HKM 46:10–12 (MH/MS).

28.60. Examples of *anda* + motion verb without *-kan*: *t=uš anda* ^{É}*ḫalentiu* [(*pēdanzi*)] 'And they bring them into the palace' KBo 17.11+ i 47 (OS); *nu* ^{m}*Ḫimu*-DINGIR-*LIM kuit ANA* ^{m}*Kapiya U ANA* ^{m}*Zilapiya paiš n=at anda arnunun* 'What Ḫimuili had given to Kapiya and Zilapiya I collected (and gave it to the men of Kašipura)' HKM 68:19–21 (MH/MS); *nu=mu* KARAŠ *INA* ^{URU}*Ḫarrana anda āraš* 'My army arrived in Ḫarrana' KBo 4.4 iii 27 (NH); *nu=nnaš ABU=YA anda arnut* 'My father brought us together' BrTabl. ii 46 (Tudḫ. IV); *nu=šši ABU=YA* ZAG *anda ḫuittiat* 'My father moved in (i.e., reduced) his boundaries' BrTabl. i 23.

28.61. A verb of directional movement with *andan* 'towards' as a preverb appears to require *-kan* in NH: *nu=za=kan* IGI.ḪI.A-*wa kuwattan ANA* KUR LÚ.KÚR *andan nāiškenun* 'Towards whichever enemy land I turned my eyes . . .' Ḫatt. i 67–68.

28.62. No particle appears in NH when *andan* occurs as a postposition with a place-name (see Salisbury 1999: 69) and the motion verb thus is without a preverb: *nu INA* KUR ^{URU}*Takkuwaḫina andan pāun* 'I went to(wards) the land of Takkuwaḫina (and while I was crossing the land of Ištalubba . . .)' KBo 5.8 i 31 (NH). Note that the example cited makes clear that *andan* in this construction does not mean specifically 'in(side)'.

28.63. The preverb *āppa* 'back' plus a motion verb does not regularly take a particle: (And when the King of Egypt had conquered the Land of the Hurrians) [(*nu* EG)]IR-*pa* KUR *Aba pait* 'He went back to the land of Aba' KUB 21.17 i 17 (NH); *lukkatta=ma INA* ^{URU}*Iyaḫrišša* EGIR-*pa uwanun* 'But on the next day I came back to Iyaḫrišša' KBo 4.4 iii 40 (NH).

28.64. But a few examples of *āppa* + motion verb with *-kan* do occur: *nu=šmaš=kan* ^{d}ZA.BA.BA-*aš* ^{GIŠ}TUKUL.ḪI.A=*KUN*[*U*] *āppa nāu* ‘May Zababa turn your weapons back against you!’ KBo 8.35 ii 19–20 (MH/MS); *ANA* URU.DIDLI.ḪI.A=*ma kuedaš* SIG$_5$-*r*[*i n*]*u=kan ḫinkan* EGIR-*pa lē paiz*[*zi*] ‘(In the cities where people are dying from plague, let there be recovery,) and let the plague not come back to the cities in good health’ KUB 14.13 iv 20–21 (NH); *n=an=kan* EGIR-*pa INA* KUR=*ŠU pēḫutezzi* ‘And he leads him back to his own land’ KUB 24.5 obv. 26 (NH).

28.65. Examples of *arḫa* ‘away, off’ + motion verb with *-kan*: EN=*YA=wa=kan edaza arḫa aru* ‘May my lord get away from there’ KBo 4.14 iii 34 (NH); ‘Because the booty, civilian captives, cattle, and sheep had become too much for me’, *nu=kan namma ammuk IŠTU* KARAŠ *arḫa ŪL pāun* ‘I could no longer get away from the camp’ KBo 5.8 iv 14–15 (NH); 1-*aš=ma=kan* ^{m}*T*[*apala*]*zunauliš arunaz arḫa uet* ‘T. came away from the sea alone’ KBo 3.4 ii 54 (NH); *n=an=kan arḫa uwater* ‘And they brought him away’ KBo 3.4 + KUB 23.125 iii 8 (NH) (vs. *n=an arḫa uwater* ibid. iii 12!); in addition with the verb *kuer-* the particle *-kan* serves to distinguish ‘to cut off from’ (with *-kan*) from ‘to cut up’ or ‘to cut apart (with a double object)’[14] (both without *-kan*). See *nu=kan IŠTU* 9 ^{UZU}ÚR *arḫa ku*[*ermi*] ‘[I] cut off from nine members’ KBo 13.101 i 13 (NS). See §28.110 (p. 382) for a similar use of *-ašta*.

28.66. Examples of *arḫa* + motion verb without *-kan*. The one clear generalization is that the construction *-za arḫa pai-* ‘go home’ never takes *-kan*: *n=aš=za arḫa INA* KUR=*ŠU pait* ‘He went home to his own country’ KUB 14.1 obv. 65 (MH/MS). Other examples: *n=aš arḫa=pat pait* ‘And he went *away*’, (he didn’t come near me at all) Ḫatt. ii 49 (NH); *n=an arḫa pēḫutet* ‘He carried them (troops and chariotry) away’ Ḫatt. ii 51 (NH); *namma arḫa uwanun nu maḫḫan INA* ^{URU}*Šammaḫa ārḫun* ‘Then I came away, and when I arrived in Šammaḫa’ KBo 3.4 iii 45 (NH); *nu arḫa* [*INA*] ^{URU}*Ištaḫara uwanun* ‘I came away to Ištaḫara’ KBo 2.5 i 7–8 (NH).

28.67. Examples of *katta* ‘down’ + motion verb with *-kan*: *nu=kan* NAM.RA.MEŠ *katta uer* ‘The civilian captives came down (and they prostrated themselves at my feet)’ KUB 14.16 iii 16 (NH); *n=an=kan ŠA* ^{LÚ}ŠU.DAB *iwar katta uwatenun* ‘I brought him down like a prisoner’ KBo 3.6 + iii 73 (NH).

28.68. Examples of *katta* ‘down’ + verbs of directional movement without *-kan*: [LUG]AL ^{URU}*Kuššara* URU-*az katta* [*pa*]*ngarit u*[*et*] ‘The King of Kuššara came down from the city en masse’ KBo 3.22:5 (OS); GIM-*an=ma* ŠEŠ=*YA* ^{m}NIR.GÁL *IŠTU AMAT* DINGIR-*LIM=ŠU INA* KUR *ŠAPLITI katta pait* ‘But when my brother Muwattalli went down to the Lower Land at the word of his god’ Ḫatt. i 75–76; *n=aš INA* $^{URU.d}$U-*tašša katta pēdaš* ‘And he carried them down to Tarḫuntašša Ḫatt. ii 53; *n=aš IŠTU* KUR ^{URU}UGU-*TI katta uet* ‘He came down from the high country’ KUB 19.10 i 8 (DŠ, NH).

14. *uer=ma* AN-*iš kuwapi tekann=a* ^{URUDU}*kuruzzit arḫa kuerer* ‘When they proceeded to cut apart heaven and earth with a cutting tool’ KBo 26.65 iii 42, see iii 52–53 (Ullik., NS).

28.69. Examples of *parā* ‘out, forth’ + verbs of directional movement with *-kan*: *parā arnu-* ‘to send’ *n=aš=kan ANA* KISLAḪ *parā arnutten* ‘And send it (grain, pl.) to the threshing floor HKM 25:18–19 (MH/MS) (but see also with *-ašta* in HKM 52:44–46); *parā nai-* ‘to send’: *n=an=kan kāša parā neḫḫi* ‘I am sending him right now’ HKM 2:12–13 (MH/MS) (and often in the MH Maşat Letters, but see with *-ašta* in KUB 14.1 obv. 61, MH/MS); *n=an=kan INA* KUR ^{URU}*Nuḫašši parā neḫḫun* ‘And I sent him to the land of Nuhassi’ KBo 4.4 i 40 (and often in NH). See *n=ašta ANA* MUN ^{URU}*Šārmana tamaiš antuḫšaš parā lē paizzi* ‘Let no other man go out for the salt of Sarmana!’ BrTabl. ii 14–15 (Tudḫ. IV).

28.70. Examples of *parā* ‘out, forth’ or ‘forward, further on’ + verbs of directional movement without *-kan*: *n=at ANA* ^{d}IŠKUR *ABI=KA* [*U ANA* ^{d}UTU ^{URU}PÚ-*n*]*a* AMA=*KA parā arnut* ‘Pass it (my plea) on to the Stormgod your father and the Sungoddess of Arinna your mother!’ KUB 21.27 iv 21–22 (prayer of Muwatalli); *n=an parā ḫuittiyanun n=an* EN-*LAM iyanun* ‘I picked (lit., ‘pulled’) him out and made him a lord’ KBo 16.17 + KBo 2.5 iii 25–26; *lukkatti=ma INA* ^{URU}*Taptina parā iyaḫḫat* ‘But on the next day I marched on towards Taptina’ KBo 4.4 iii 43; LUGAL-*i parā* 1=*ŠU paizzi* ‘He goes forward to the king one time’ KBo 17.43 i 11–12 (OS); *nu=mu=za* ŠEŠ=*YA* ^{m}NIR.GÁL *parā uīšket* ‘My brother Muwattalli used to send me forth’ Ḫatt. i 66. The adverb *parā* with the meaning ‘forward, further on’ appears never to occur with a local particle (Goetze 1933b: 128; Tjerkstra 1999: 64; CHD *parā* 3).

28.71. Examples of *šarā* ‘up’ + verbs of directional movement with *-kan* (MH and NH): [*šar*]*ā=at=kan ārškandu* ‘let them keep coming up’ KUB 40.56 + KUB 31.88 iii 8 (MH/MS); *n=aš=kan* ^{URU}*Gašipūraz šarā* SIG_5*-in arnut* ‘Send them (the prisoners) up well from Kašipura’ HKM 65:11–12 (MH/MS); *n=an=z*[*a=k*]*an* URU-*ri šarā peḫuteddu* ‘And let them (troops) carry it up into the city for themselves’ HKM 24:50 (MH/MS); [^{URU}*Tūma*]*nnaz=ma=aš=kan* $^{ḪUR.SAG}$*Kaššū šarā pait* ‘But from Tumanna he went up Mt. Kaššu’ KUB 19.13 i 42 (NH); *n=aš* EGIR-*pa paiddu* URU-*ri=ma=aš=kan šarā lē uezzi* ‘Let him go back! Let him not come up into the city! KUB 21.29 ii 12 (NH); URU=*an=kan šarā lē uwadazzi* ‘Let one not bring him up to the city!’ KUB 21.29 iii 37–38 (NH) (see with *-ašta* in HKM 43:3, MH/MS). For other exx. (*š. ḫuittiya-*, *iya-*^{ttari}, *išpart-*, *penna-*, *peda-*, *tarna-*, *uiya-*, *up-*, *uda-*, *watku-*) see CHD *šarā* B. The adverb *šarā* + some motion verbs, such as *arai-* ‘to arise’ and *ēpp-* ‘hold/lift (up)’, take *-kan* only when there is an ablative in the clause (see CHD *šarā* B 1 a 3′).

28.72. Examples of *šarā* +motion verb without *-kan*: *š=aš šarā* URU-*ya pait* ‘And he went up to the city’ KBo 22.2 rev. 14 (OS); *n=at INA* É.DINGIR-*LIM* UGU *pānzi* ‘And they go up to the temple’ KBo 2.8 i 21 (cult inv., NH); *t=at āppa šarā lē uēzzi* ‘And let them not come back up again!’ KBo 17.1 iii 12–13 (OS).

28.73. The particle is also found in certain other verbal constructions intended to convey local restrictions (Goetze 1933b: 30 n. 2): *pedi ninink-* ‘to muster on the spot’,

pedi daliya- ‘to leave on the spot’, ŠÀ-*ta tarna-* ‘to take to heart’, *kiššari dai-* ‘to put in the hand’, KASKAL-*ši dai-* ‘to put on the road’.

28.74. An interesting contrast is between *šanḫ-* with and without local particle (Hoffner 1992b). Without *-kan* or *-ašta*, *šanḫ-* denotes ‘to search for (someone or something)’, but when the verb has one of the local particles, it means ‘to search (an area or place)’. This usage certainly reinforces the other evidence for a local dimension to the presence or absence of this class of particle.

28.75. Goetze (1933b: 30) noted another small class of verbs which regularly employs *-kan* or *-(a)šta*—verbs of crossing over: *šarra-* and *zai-*. To these should also be added *ištarna arḫa pai-* ‘to pass through, traverse (with acc.)’. In fact, there is an opposition between *šarra-* without local particle, which usually means ‘to divide, separate’, and with local particle (*-ašta* or *-kan*), which means ‘to cross over, transgress’ (see CHD *šar(r)a-* D). This distribution shows that the earlier assumption (compare the translation “verletzen” in HW 183) that with oaths and commands it meant ‘to break, violate’ (< ‘to divide’) was incorrect: the semantic development was from ‘to go across, traverse’ to ‘to transgress’. The command or oath is also a kind of boundary or limit in an extended sense. In HW it was not even noted that the usage with oaths, like that physical traversing, was associated with *-kan*. Somewhat in the same semantic domain is the verb *šamen-* which with *-kan* means ‘to pass by’ and, by extension as a transitive, ‘to forfeit, relinquish’: (Let no one do business with a *ḫippara*-man . . . whoever does business with him) *n=aš=kan ḫāpparaz* [*šeme*]*nzi* ‘shall forfeit his purchase price’ KBo 6.2 ii 58–59 (Laws §48, OS) restored from KBo 6.4 iv 39 (NH), and other exx. in CHD Š 120. Other exx. are post-OS.

Accompanying the “Dative of Disadvantage”

28.76. The verb *akk-/ekk-* ‘to die’ is a change-of-state verb. Normally it does not take a local particle (*-kan*, etc.). But when there is a dative expression indicating the person(s) most affected by the subject’s death (almost certainly the “dative of disadvantage,” §16.68, p. 258), *-kan* regularly occurs (compare informal American English “then my wife died on me”), all exx. NH: *nu=šmaš=kan* EN=*ŠUNU kuit* ^{m}*Pipḫuriyaš immakku* BA.ÚŠ ‘And because their lord, Pipḫuriya (throne name of the pharaoh), had just died on them, (the men of Egypt became afraid)’ KBo 5.6 iii 7–8 (NH) (for *immakku* here see Hoffner 1995b); LÚ-*aš=wa=mu=kan* BA.ÚŠ DUMU=*YA=ma=wa=mu* NU.GÁL ‘My husband (lit., ‘man’) died on me, and I have no son’ KBo 5.6 iii 10–11 (NH); and *ammel=wa* ^{LÚ}*MUDI=YA kuiš ēšta n=war=aš=mu=kan* BA.ÚŠ ‘He who was my husband died on me’ KBo 5.6 iv 4–5 (NH); *nu=kan* BE-*an ANA* LUGAL ÌR.MEŠ ZI *akkanzi* ‘If (his) favorite servants die on the king’ KBo 4.14 iii 37–38 (NH), and *UMMA* ^{d}UTU-*ŠI=MA ANA* ^{m}*BABA-AḪI-IDDIN QIBI=MA* EN=*KUNU=*⟨*š*⟩*maš=kan kuit* BA.ÚŠ . . . *ABU=ŠU=ši=kan kuit* BA.ÚŠ ‘Thus says His Majesty: Say to ^{m}Baba-aḫi-iddin: ‘Because your (pl.) lord (the Assyrian king) has died on you (pl.) . . . because his father has died on him’ ‘ KUB 23.103 + KUB 23.92 rev. 8–9,

16 (NH), *nu=tta* ^{d}*Gulšaš* ḪUL-*aḫda n=aš=ta=kkan* BA.ÚŠ ‘your luck turned against you, and he died on you’ KUB 23.85 rev. 6 (NH). The adverb *-kan* (or *-ašta*) also regularly occurs with the verb *dā-* when it means ‘take away from’ and with the combination *arḫa dā-* ‘to take away from’. This too is the “dative of disadvantage”: *našma=šši piyan kuit ḫarmi nu=šši=kan arḫa kuitki dāi* ‘Or takes away from him any of what I have given him’ BrTabl. iv 18–19 (Tudḫ. IV), even if in some instances what is removed is an evil (e.g., ABoT 4a i 11–14, OS). Similar is its use with the verb *tuḫš-* ‘to separate (from)’: (If the parents disapprove of the marriage of a young woman to the man who abducted her,) *n=an=ši=kan tuḫšanta* ‘they may separate her from him’ KBo 6.3 ii 10 (Laws §28, OH/NS). See further exx. in §§16.68–16.69 (pp. 258–259).

The Terminative Value

28.77. Some uses of *-kan* have no discernible local dimension. The clearest case is that of the verb *kuen-*, which is not a verb of movement, never occurs with a preverb, and only rarely and coincidentally appears in clauses with an expression for a location. When *kuen-* occurs without *-kan*, it means ‘to strike, hit’; with *-kan* it means ‘to strike dead, kill’. Here, then, *-kan* seems to have a “terminative” force; it adds finality to the action described by the verb. One finds a similar use of *-kan* with (*arḫa*) *ḫašp-* ‘to destroy, annihilate’. Possibly the OH/OS use of of *-kan* in ÉRIN.MEŠ-*ti=kan mauszi* ‘the army will fall (be defeated)’ KUB 4.72B:3, and the OH/NS use of *-kan* with *wak-* ‘to bite off’ (*ta=kkan wāki* KBo 17.74+ iv 4) should be explained on this basis. But the nuance added by *-kan* can be quite subtle. The verb (*arḫa*) *ḫarnink-* ‘to destroy’ takes *-kan* only when the verb’s subject is a deity, whose ‘destroying’ can be seen as having a special degree of finality (Hoffner 1992b).

With Verbs of Hostility

28.78. Another class of verbs regularly employing *-kan* has a common semantic element of hostility: *pēran walḫ-* ‘to strike first, preempt (a competitor)’ (already in Laws §146, OS), *šulle-* ‘to show disrespect’ (only NH; w/o particle in MH/MS), *idalawešš-* ‘to become evil, hostile’, *ḫuwapp-* ‘to be ill-disposed toward’, *zammurāi-* ‘to afflict, oppress’. See §§28.93–28.94 (p. 377) on *-šan* with similar verbs.

Aspect Independent of Verb’s Lexical Meaning

28.79. Since many studies of the particles *-kan*, *-ašta*, *-apa*, etc. focus on the lexical, in that they list all verbs which take a particular particle, it is important to note that the semantic aspect conveyed by *-kan* (for instance) is shared by all verbs in a lengthy sequence: *IŠTU* ^{GIŠ}BANŠUR*=ma=za=kan kuēzza azzikkenun IŠTU* GAL*=ya=kan kuēzza akkuškenun šašti=ya=za=kan kuedani šeškeškenun IŠTU* ^{URUDU}DU$_{10}$.A*=ya=za=kan kuēzza arreškenun* ‘the table from which I regularly ate, the cup from which I regularly drank, the bed in which I regularly slept, the wash-bowl from which I regularly washed myself’ KBo 4.2 iv 28–32 and duplicates (see Goetze and Pedersen 1934: 10–11, lines

16–19). This suggests that the aspect shared by all these clauses is independent of each particular verb's meaning. Note that the same is not true of the particle *-za* in the above-cited sequence: it is omitted in the *akkuškenun* clause. For tentative observations on the presence or absence of *-z(a)* with *eku-* see Hoffner 1973a: 524–25.

Absence of Expected -kan

28.80. Not fully clarified is the circumstance that *-kan* fails to occur where expected, when the clause begins with *takku* 'if' (HE §298,2): *takku* ^{LÚ}DAM.GÀR ^{URU}*Ḫatti kuiški kuēnzi* 'if someone kills a Hittite merchant' KBo 6.2 i 3 (Laws §5, OS); *takku=uš* LÚ-*iš wemiyazi t=uš kuenzi* 'if the man (i.e., husband) finds them (his wife and her lover in the act of adultery) and he kills them, (he will not be accused of murder)' KBo 6.26 iv 8–9 (Laws §197, OH/NS). In both cases the verb *kuen-* in the meaning 'kill' occurs, which normally requires *-kan*. Both examples which Friedrich cites from the laws in clauses without *takku* which use *-kan kuen-*, namely, Laws §§90 and 199, are found in New Hittite copies. In the latter there is even alternation: *kuenzi=uš* LUGAL-*uš* . . . *n=an=kan kunanzi* KBo 6.26 iv 17, 21 (OH/NS). All examples of *takku=kan* occur in NH translations of Akkadian omen texts.

Summary

28.81. It is hard to make generalizations about the overall use of *-kan* that are valid for all the available data. We have not handled all problematic attestations. For example, the significance of the use of *-kan* with OH/OS *gank-* 'to hang up (an object)' and *lip-* 'to lick up' is still unclear, as is its use with *dā-* 'to take' and an instrumental but no dative ('from') in KUB 30.30 (OS). Contrary to what was once claimed, the use of *-kan*, *-ašta*, or *-šan* with *šipant-* 'to offer, libate, consecrate' cannot easily be distinguished in meaning or in the nature of the direct object from its use without a particle. There does seem to be some correlation between the lack of a specific starting or end point for an action and the absence of *-kan*: note examples such as *anda pai-* 'to converge', *anda ḫuittiya-* 'to pull in, reduce', *parā pai-* 'to go (further) on'. This pattern suggests that, conversely, the presence of a starting or end point (explicit or implicit) that limits the action described is associated with the use of *-kan*. However, the positive evidence for this association is not as regular as one would expect. This problem remains even if one excludes OH on the basis that the usage of *-kan* was not yet fully established then (see Tjerkstra 1999: 144, following others). It does seem reasonably certain that one must allow for both local and aspectual functions for *-kan*, but the boundary between these is not entirely clear. Starting and end point may be construed in spatial or temporal terms, and development of a "terminative" value from a particle with an original local meaning is commonplace. One may therefore derive *-kan* from a PIE aspectual particle **-ken* seen in Sanskrit (*nú*) *kam* and Greek (*nú*) *ken* (Josephson 1972: 418 and others), from a local adverb **kom* 'by, with, next to' seen in Latin *cum* 'with' but also in Latin *con-cīdō* 'to cut up/to pieces', etc. (Josephson 1976: 173), or from both (see Dunkel

1990: 115–22). On the other hand, the view of Boley (2001), that *-kan* originally had an entirely non-local sense which led to the other uses, is hard to reconcile with the evidence we have presented here.

The Particle *-šan*

28.82. The particle *-šan*, like *-kan*, expressed a relationship largely spatial and so closely related to that conveyed by *-kan* that it occasionally substituted for *-kan* in sentences of the type outlined above for *-kan*. Particularly difficult is the distinction in coordinated sentences such as: *nu=šš̆an para=ya* [*lē*] *naitti* EGIR-*pa=ya=kan lē mauš̆ta* 'Neither postpone(?) (the offerings to the gods); nor fall behind(?)' KUB 1.16 iii 51–52 (OH/NS) (so tentatively CHD L–N 363). Yet these two particles are by no means synonymous. Since *-apa* and *-ašta* (particularly *-apa*) were used principally in Old and Middle Hittite and *-apa* became rare in New Hittite, their functions tended to be assumed by *-kan* and/or *-šan*. In particular, *-apa*, whose function was to convey the notion of movement up against something, was replaced by *-šan*. Some functions of *-ašta*, on the other hand, seem to have been assumed by *-kan*.

28.83. In Old Hittite texts the writing *-za-an* can be interpreted either as (1) *-za* and *-an* (local particle) or (2) *-za* and *-šan*. In New Hittite texts, since the local particle *-an* no longer existed, the same sequence either had to be (2) or — in the case of *n=an=za=an*, which one can compare with *n=at=ši=at* — the second *=an* is a meaningless repetition of the first ('him') (see §30.19, p. 411).

28.84. In Old Hittite texts, where the clitic possessive pronoun 'his' on singular common-gender nouns has the vocalization *-šan*, one must be careful not to confuse this with the local particle, especially in cases where the possessive pronoun occurs on the first word of a clause.

28.85. We noted above in §28.48 (p. 366) that the "local" value of *-kan* is clearest where it co-occurs with a local adverb in 'to be' sentences. From this point of view one should note in OS an example of *-šan* in a 'to be' sentence without *šer* 'above, upon' but with the meaning 'upon': *n=e=šš̆an* $^{[N]A_4}$*pēruni wetan* 'and it (Labarna's palace) is built upon a rock/cliff' KUB 36.110 rev. 15–16 (OS). Its early date, combined with the absence in the clause of complicating factors, such as a finite form of a particular verb of movement or a local adverb, gives this example particular importance.

Co-occurring with the Adverb šer

28.86. The particle *-šan* is particularly common from OS onward in clauses containing the adverb *šer* 'above, over' or verbs of putting, placing, or standing, which can occasionally also be construed with *-kan*. The occurrence of *-šan* probably gives to these verbs the particular nuance 'stand over', 'place upon', etc. Examples with *šer:* [*u*]*g=a=šmaš=šan* ÉRIN.MEŠ-*an šē*[(*r*)] 3=ŠU *waḫnūmi* 'but I wave the soldier(-bread) over

them' KBo 17.1 ii 17–18 (StBoT 8 ii 31–32) (OS). In addition to physical superposition ('upon'), this construction is found from OS on for relative conceptual position ('upon, in addition to, instead of'): (if someone is in the process of selling a house, a village, a garden, or a pasture, but another (seller) goes and strikes first,) *ta=ššan* [(*ḫappari*) *š*]*ēr ḫappar iēzzi* 'and makes a deal of his own instead (lit., 'makes a sale upon a sale')' KUB 29.29 ii 9–10 (Laws §146, OS) restored from NS copy; see Hoffner, LH 121.

28.87. Without *šer* but with main verbs implying superposition. Physical superposition: *t=aš=šan ḫalmašuitti tiēzzi* 'and he (i.e., the king) steps upon the throne dais' KUB 43.30 ii 16 (OS); $^{\text{NINDA}}$*šarrui=m*[(*a=šš*)]*an* ÉRIN.MEŠ-*az ēšzi* 'the "soldier-bread" is "sitting" on the *šarruwa*-bread' KBo 17.1+ i 30 (OS) restored from KBo 17.3 i 24 (OS); *nu=ššan* [. . .] *ašāši* 'and seats [. . .] upon [. . .]' KBo 3.22:27–28 (OS); [*k*]*āšma* $^{\text{m}}$*Muršiliš* DUMU=*Y*[*A nu=*]*za apū*[*n šekten*] [*nu=*]*ššan apūn ašešte*![*n*] 'Muršili is hereby my son. Recognize him (as such), and seat him (on the throne)!' KUB 1.16 ii 37–38 (OH/NS); *attaš=taš=wa* [$^{\text{GIŠ}}$ŠÚ.A*=ši* DUMU.NITA NU GÁL Ì]R-*iš=wa=ššan ešari* '[There is no son for the throne] of your father; a (mere) subject (lit., 'slave') will sit down upon it!' KUB 1.16 ii 70–71 (OH/NS); *walḫanzi=ššan* 'they beat on (them, i.e., musical instruments)' StBoT 13 passim (OS); *n=aš=šan* $^{\text{GIŠ}}$*pūriyaš* BABBAR *ki*[*tta*] 'and it (a bowl) lies on white wooden *puriya*'s' KBo 20.8 rev. 5 (OS) (compare *šēr=a=šša*[*n* . . .] $^{\text{GIŠ}}$*pūriaš* BABBAR *kit*[*ta*] ibid. 10–11); *nu=mu=ššan kī yugan išḫ*[(*aište*)*n*] '[you have] bound this yoke upon me' KUB 31.4 + KBo 3.41 obv. 7 (OH/NS). But without explicit *šer* some instances of *-šan* refer to spatial relationships that do not unambiguously refer to superposition: (water is poured into a cup,) *andan tuḫḫuišar išḫiyan* [*k*]*itta na-aš-š*[(*a-a*)]*n* (*n=at=šan* > *naššan*) *ḫaššī PANI* $^{\text{d}}$U.GUR *kitta* 'inside lies *tuḫḫuišar* bound, and it (all) lies on/at the hearth in the presence of the god Nergal' KBo 17.40 iv 11–12 (OH/MS) with OS dupl. KBo 17.15 rev.! 17 confirming *naššan*; *n=aš=šan katta* $^{\text{DUG}}$GÌR.KIŠ-*ya laḫweni* 'and we pour it down into a GÌR.KIŠ-vessel' KBo 17.25 obv. 9 (OS); DUMU-*la*⟨*š*⟩*=maš=šan* [*tuel*] *kuit kardi nu=za apāt ēšši* 'My son, do whatever is upon/in (*-šan*) [your] heart!' KUB 1.16 iii 62–63 (OH/NS); KUB 1.16 ii 70–71.

Physical or Conceptual Movement toward an Object

28.88. As common as this co-occurrence with *šer* and notion of superposition may have been for *-šan* — and in OS texts it is virtually the *only* usage of the particle — it is by no means the entire range of possible meanings. In post-OH, including in later copies of Old Hittite texts, *-šan* was used to express other relationships. First among these is movement directed toward an object. With verbs of movement: (The Great Seagod quarreled with the other gods,) *n=a*(*n*)*=š*[*an nepišaš* $^{\text{d}}$UTU-*un*] *katta pēḫutet* 'and he brought him, [(namely) the Sungod of Heaven,] down (to his home in the sea, and hid him)' KUB 12.60 i 3–4 (OH/NS), restored after ibid. i 10; $^{\text{d}}$UTU-*uš=ma=ššan šar*[(*ā nep*)]*iši iyanniš* 'but the Sungod went up to heaven' KUB 24.8 ii 11–12 (OH?/NS), see also KUB 33.120+ i 37 (Song of Kumarbi); *nu=ššan* $^{\text{d}}$*Wišuriyandan katta* Í[D-*i pedaḫḫi*] 'and [I take] (the goddess) Wišuriyanza down [to] the river' KBo 15.25 obv. 5 (ritual);

EGIR-*pa=ma=ššan* URU-*SU šannapiliš nūman paizzi kāšti kaninti* ‘he did (lit., ‘does’) not wish to go back to his city empty-handed, in hunger and in thirst’ KUB 33.121 ii 15–16 (Kešši story); *nu=šmaš=šan kāša DINAM kuit arnummeni n=at ištamašten* ‘Hear the case which we are bringing to/before (*-šan*) you’ KUB 4.1 ii 5–6.

28.89. With other verbs, expressing a kind of conceptual movement (temporal, auditory, visual, attentive, etc.): (If someone sets fire to another’s storage shed, he must feed that one’s cattle,) *n=uš=šan parā ḫamešḫanda arnuzi* ‘and bring (i.e., sustain) them to the following spring’ KBo 6.3 iv 60–61 (Laws §100, OH/NS); *mān AWAT* LUGAL*=ma ŪL paḫḫašnutteni* [*x x x x*]*x-aš=šan ŪL ḫuišteni nu ḫarkteni* ‘If you do not keep the word of the king, you will not survive (lit., ‘live’) unto (*-šan*) [. . . . .]; you will perish’ KUB 1.16 iii 36–37 (OH/NS); *nu=nnaš=šan anda miyēš nu=nnaš=šan anda talliyēš* ‘be gentle toward us, be pleasant toward us’ VBoT 24 iii 38–39. With *-šan*, *ANA* followed by a place designation, and the medio-passive form of *nai-*, the meaning is ‘to turn toward’. Whether one uses the translation ‘toward’ or ‘against’ depends upon the qualifying adverb of manner: *aššuli* ‘in a favorable manner’ or LÚ.KÚR-*li* ‘in a hostile manner’: [(*nu=šš*)]*an ANA* KUR ^{URU}*Ḫatti aššuli anda namma naišḫut* ‘turn again toward the land of Ḫatti in favor’ KUB 9.31 ii 59–60; see also KUB 15.32 i 54–55; *nu=z=*(*š*)*an ANA* KUR ^{URU}*Ḫatti* LÚ.KÚR-*li* IGI.ḪI.A *dāi* ‘(whoever) sets his eyes against the land of Ḫatti in enmity’ KBo 6.34 i 17–18, 36–37, ii 12–13. With *ANA* or *anda* and verbs of speech, *-šan* focuses upon the person addressed: ^{d}UD.SIG$_5$*=ya=šan anda tezzi* ‘he also speaks to the god Favorable Day’ KUB 39.33 iii 11–12, cited as 120/p in Otten 1958: 114–15; *namma=ššan uddār parā QATAMMA memai* ‘Next he speaks words in the same way (to her)’ KBo 2.9 iv 15–16. Interestingly, both speaking to and listening to someone show the same syntax, but the latter with *parā* instead of *anda*: *nu=ššan* ^{m}*Keššiš parā ANA* DAM*=ŠU=pat IŠ*[*ME*] ‘now Kešši listened only (*-pat*) to his wife’ KUB 33.121 ii 6, see also line 8.

28.90. In some cases (mostly with *anda*) the implication of *-šan* is more than direction (‘toward’) and practically amounts to movement which reaches the goal and enters into it (‘into’). Old Hittite references (including one OS ex.): *anda=š*[(*a-an parna nāwi paizzi*)] ‘(If they capture a free man at the beginning of his act of breaking into a house,) that is, he has not yet gone inside’ KBo 6.2 iv 37 (Laws §93, OS) restored from NS copies but clearly showing the beginning of *-šan* in the OS original; *nu=zan* (if this is *=z=šan* instead of *=z=an*) ^{d}IM-*aš* ^{UZU}ŠÀ *šakuwa=še*⟨*t*⟩*t=a* EGIR-*pa dāš* ‘and so the Stormgod took back into himself his heart and eyes’ KBo 3.7 iii 18–19 (OH/NS). Post-OH references: (You come up from the sea, O Sungod) *nu=ššan nepiši ti*[(*ya*)]*ši* ‘and you enter heaven’ KUB 6.45 iii 14–15 (NH); *namma=ššan* BÀD.MEŠ-*ni anda lē kuiški* [(*paddā*)]*i* ‘let no one dig into the city wall’ KUB 31.86 + 1203/u ii 22 (MH/NS).

28.91. Related to the idea of ‘into’ or ‘inside’ is that of things which rightfully pertain to or belong to an object or person. The passage concerning the Stormgod’s eyes and heart cited above (KBo 3.7 iii 18–19) certainly shares this notion. Another example is a rare instance of *-šan* in a ‘to be’ clause (for an OS instance with a different nuance of *-šan*

see §28.85, p. 374): [*ŠA* AMAR*=m*]*u=ššan* 4 GÌR.MEŠ*=ŠU kūn=ma=wa=za ŠA* 2 GÌR.MEŠ*=ŠU kuwat ḫāšun* ‘my [calf] should have four feet (lit., ‘my [calf’s] four feet should be in/on it’); why then have I borne this one with only two feet?’ KUB 24.7 iii 22–24 (NS).

28.92. A sexual idiom, similar to biblical Hebrew *bôʾ ʾel* ‘to go in unto (a woman)’, is: *ANA* UDU.U$_{19}$*=ma=ššan* UDU.ŠIR*-aš kuedani nāwi pāizzi* ‘a ewe to which a ram has not yet gone (sexually)’ KUB 9.32 rev. 21–22.

28.93. When physical or conceptual movement ‘toward’ is hostile, we translate ‘against’. Old Hittite references: *išḫaš*[*š*]*=a=šmaš=šan taštašeškewan dāir* ‘and they began to whisper/conspire against their lords’ KBo 3.1 i 22 (OH/NS); *ANA* É*=ŠU=ma=ši=ššan U ANA* DUMU.MEŠ*=ŠU idalu lē takkiššanzi* ‘but let them not plan evil against his house or his sons’ ibid. ii 55–56; *uk=wa=z=*(*š*)*an* [(*šānun*)] ‘I became angry at (them)’ KUB 33.10 ii 6 (OH/MS), restored from KUB 33.9 ii 13, where *-šan* is lacking; *mān=šan* ^{d}*Telipinuš=a kuedanikki nakkešzi* ‘but (*-ma*) when Telipinu becomes difficult against anyone’ VBoT 58 iv 8–9 (OH/NS). Post-OH references: *mān=aš šūllet nu=ššan* EGIR*-pa* URU*-ri idālu takkiškewan daiš* ‘When he became ambitious, he began to plot evil against (his new) city’ KBo 32.14 ii 19–20 (MH/MS); *nu=mu=ššan INA* ^{URU}*Palḫuiša* EGIR*-an* LÚ?.KÚR? ^{URU}*Pešḫuruš* MÈ*-ya tiyat* ‘behind Palḫuiša, the hostile (city) Pešḫuru advanced against me for battle’ KBo 3.4 ii 2–3 (NH).

28.94. The particle *-šan* also occurs in clauses containing verbs of contending, contesting, quarreling. and striving. Middle Hittite example: *nu=wa=šša*[*n*] *ḫannešnanni* [*ḫ*]*annuwanzi ŪL tarratta* ‘you are not able to judge lawsuits’ KUB 40.62 + KUB 13.9 i 7–8 (MH/NS).

28.95. The only common denominator of the contexts in which *-šan* appears is that of physical or conceptual proximity, usually but not always produced by movement toward one person or thing by another, a very broad characterization that fails to distinguish *-šan* sufficiently from -(*a*)*pa* (§§28.100ff., pp. 378ff.), on the one hand, and *-kan* (§§28.48ff., pp. 366ff.) on the other. Nevertheless, such a meaning is quite compatible with the most likely derivation of the particle, from PIE **som* ‘(together) with’ (Josephson 1972: 419 and others). The problem of the precise difference in the nature of the proximity expressed by PIE **e/opi*, **kom*, and **som* extends far beyond the use of Hittite -(*a*)*pa*, *-kan*, and *-šan*. It is hard to see how the many uses of *-šan* in cases with no reference to verticality could have developed from a specific original value ‘(up)on, over’, as implied by the alternative account of *-šan* < **saran* (Carruba 1964: 429). One may still wonder whether the favoring of *-šan* in contexts referring to vertical contact is due to a secondary association of *-šan* with *šarā* and *šer* based on their phonetic resemblance.

The Particle *-an*

28.96. *-an,* the rarest of the local particles, was first identified by Otten and Souček (1969: 81). Following the plural clitic pronoun *-e* it takes the form *-n* (KBo 17.1 i 20, OS). That this change is morphophonemic is shown by the sequence *nu=šše=an* KBo 6.2

iv 10–11 (OS). It is attested scarcely a dozen times in a handful of OH compositions. Its usage falls into two broad categories.

28.97. With *anda* and various verbs: *t=an anda* 3-*iš* LUGAL-*uš* MUNUS.LUGAL-*š=a zēriya allapaḫḫanzi* 'And the king and queen spit into the cup three times' StBoT 8 iv 34–35 (OS); *anda=ad=an ḫarakzi* 'And it perishes therein' KUB 17.10 iv 17 (OH/MS) (see *anda=at=kan*/[*a*]*nda=at=šan ḫarakdu* in the NS copies KUB 33.8 iii 14 and IBoT 3.141 iv 13); ^{d}*Andaliyaš=an anda iyanniš . . .* ^{d}UTU*=an* DUMU-*aš anda pait* 'Andaliya started to go in . . . the son of the Sungod(dess) went in' KUB 12.63 rev. 19,22 (OH/MS); ERÍN.MEŠ-*n=an kuiš anda pētai* 'The one who brings in the troops . . .' KBo 17.1 i 32 (OS) (also with *anda peda-* ibid. i 31, 33; ii 12; and iii 29), but see *anda=kan . . . pētumini* ibid. i 26; *takku* GUD-*un kuiški kuššaniezzi nu=šše=an* ^{KUŠ}*ḫušan našma* ^{KUŠ}*tarušḫa anda dāi* 'If anyone rents an ox and then puts on it a leather . . . or a leather . . .' KBo 6.2 iv 10–11 (Laws §78, OS; *-an* replaced by *-kan* in NS copy).

28.98. Elsewhere: [*n*]*=e=n kiššari=šmi dāi* 'And he puts them in their hand(s)' KBo 17.1 i 20 (OS); *ḫarkanzi=ma=an* ^{d}*Ḫantašepeš anduḫšaš ḫaršā*[(*rr=*)]*a* ^{GIŠ}ŠUKUR〈.ḪI〉.A*=ya* 'The *Ḫantašepeš*-deities hold human heads and spears' KBo 17.1 i 22–23 (OS); *takkuw=at=an parna=ma kuēlka peššiezzi* 'But if he disposes of them in someone's house' KBo 6.2 ii 35 (Laws §44b, OS); *ḫappēni=ma=an* [(LÁL-*it* ì-*n=a*) *pešši*]*emi* 'But in(to) the open flame I [throw] the honey and fat' KBo 17.5 *ii* 7–8 (OS); 9-*ti=an* MU-*ti* 'in the ninth year' KUB 33.120 i 12,18 (Song of Kumarbi); *t=an karda=šma ša*/[(*ikti*)] 'and you shall penetrate their hearts' KUB 31.4 obv. 8–9 (OH/NS).

28.99. Since the notion of 'in(side)' is clearly present even in the examples without *anda* (the figurines of the deities may be assumed to be holding the objects in their hands), there seems little reason to doubt that *-an* underscores this meaning and is etymologically related to PIE **en* 'in' (and also to *anda*). See Oshiro 1990 [92].

The Particle *-apa*

28.100. The particle *-apa* shows the following writings: The rarest writing is ***-aba*** in ^{LÚ}LUL-*ši-ya-ša-ba* (for ^{LÚ}LUL-*ši-ya=š*(*=a?*)*=aba*, i.e., ^{LÚ}*tarašiyaš*(*=a?*)*=apa*) KBo 17.43 i 9 (OS) with dupl. KBo 17.18 ii 10 (OS), LÚ.MEŠ ^{GIŠ}BANŠUR-*ša-ba* KBo 20.32 ii 6, LÚ ^{GIŠ}BANŠUR-*aš-ša-ba* KBo 20.32 ii 11 (compare LÚ ^{GIŠ}GIDRU-*aš-ša-pa* KBo 20.32 ii 16), LUGAL-*ša-ba* KBo 41.101 6′. The writing ***-ap*** is found in *šu-ša-ap* (*š=uš=ap*) KBo 3.60 iii 3 (OH/NS), compare *ša-na-ap* (*š=an=ap*) ibid. ii 3, 5, 18, iii 9. Following certain vowels the *a* elides, giving ***-pa*** (§1.74, p. 32): *še-pa* KUB 36.27:2 (OH) and *še-e-pa* KUB 43.36 (OH) (i.e., *š=e=pa*), *nu-uš-še-pa* < *nu=šše=apa* KUB 36.110 obv. 11 (OS), *na-aš-ši-pa* KUB 33.21 iii 19, see KUB 33.31:2; and as late as the Appu myth KUB 24.8 i 43 (OH?/NS); *nu-uš-ši-pa* KUB 24.8 i 15, 16 (OH?/NS); *na-at-ši-pa* KUB 24.9 + JCS 24 37 iii 8, *na-an-ši-pa* KUB 35.148 iii 14. The most usual writing is ***-apa***: *na-pa* (for *n*(*u*)*=apa*)[15]

15. The unique *nu-pa* KUB 35.148 iii 29 is probably to be emended to *na*!*-pa.*

KBo 3.67 ii 5 and KBo 3.1 ii 20 (both Tel. pr., and passim in that text), KUB 43.60 i 11, *na-ta-pa* (*n=at=apa*) KUB 43.36:5; *an-da-ma-pa* (for *anda=m(u)=apa*, §1.72, p. 32) KBo 3.7 i 13 (OH/NS), see Carruba 1964: 420 and in CHD sub *-mu* b 4′; *ša-an-za-pa* KBo 12.18 i 6; *nu-za-pa* KBo 19.92:7; *nu-ša-pa* (*n=uš=apa* 'and them + *-apa*') KUB 1.16 ii 24 (OH/NS), *nu-wa-ra-ta-pa* (*nu=war=at=apa*) KBo 3.1 ii 49; the alleged *nu-un-na-p*[*a?*] of KBo 12.63 ii 5 claimed by HW² sub *-a–2* is worthless because, among other reasons, the context is broken and the *-p*[*a?*] is highly uncertain; one expects something like *nu-un-na-š*[*a- . . .]* (< *nu=nnaš=*).

28.101. So far as dating is concerned, *-apa* occurs often in OS and continues to be written in NH copies of OH texts down to the end of the empire. It is not yet attested, however, in MH historical texts (treaties and letters). The alleged example in the Ḫukkana Treaty (e.g., HW² sub *-apa*) does not exist (see Hoffner 1973b and CHD P s.v.). In addition to assured OH texts, *-apa* does appear in a few compositions that may be OH or MH (notably the Appu myth and the Ritual of Alli).

28.102. Most uses of *-apa* may be assigned to one of two broad categories, but there are a few examples that do not seem to fit either of them.

28.103. As noted by Carruba (1964: 422–24 and especially 430), many instances of *-apa* appear to share the notion of convergence: bringing one thing into physical contact with another (transitive verbs) or coming into physical contact with something (intransitive verbs). Examples: with *anš-* 'to wipe (something) onto, besmear, daub': LÚ*šerḫalaš ārt*[*a*] [*š*]*erḫan ḫarzi n=apa pūriūš ānškezzi* 'The *š.*-man stands, holds *š.* (a substance), and wipes his lips (with it)' KBo 19.163 i 22–23; with *arnu-* 'to bring': *n=apa arnuwanzi* KBo 21.95 i 15; with *anda ēpp-* 'to include': *ammugg=a=za=apa anda ēp lē=mu genzuwaiši* 'Include also me (with your enemies); don't spare me' KBo 3.7 iii 29–30 (OH/NS); with *ḫamank-* 'to bind, intertwine': *ḫuišwatar=m(u)=apa anda ḫingani ḫaminkan ḫingan=a=m(u)=apa anda ḫuišwanni=ya ḫaminkan* 'Life for me is bound up with death; death, however, for me is bound up with life too' KUB 30.10 obv. 20 (OH/MS); with *-za ḫandāi-* 'to fit (something) to (something else), mate, match, combine': *nu kuin* KASKAL-*an ḫarzi uran* KASKAL-*an ḫarzi marnuwalan* KASKAL-*an ḫarzi š=an=za=apa* KASKAL-*ši* LÚ.KASKAL-*laš ḫandāit* 'And what road does (the human soul) travel (lit., 'hold')? It travels the great road; it travels the invisible(?) road. The traveler has fitted it to his road' KUB 43.60 i 28–30; with (*anda*) *ḫar*(*k*)- 'to hold close' (verb conjecturally restored): [*nu=šše*] *uddār=met* [*šak*]*iškemi* SIG$_5$-*an*[*za=mu ārri*] [*taggan*]*iya=ta=mu=za=apa and*[*a ḫark*] *nu=mu tagga*[*niya=ta*] *taknaz paḫši* 'I am making my words known [to her]: Wash [me] well, [hold] me tightly to your breast, and protect me at your breast from the earth' KUB 1.16 iii 71–72 (OH/NS); with *anda iyanna/i-* 'to go to': *n=aš=ši=*(*a*)*pa anda iyann*[*iš*] *n=an punuškewan da*[*iš*] 'he went to him and began to question him' KUB 24.8 + KUB 36.60 i 43–45 (Appu story); with *anda lag-* 'to lean against/upon': [*l*]*abarnaš* LUGAL URU*Ḫatti šaḫeššar=šumme*[*t*] *ēštu nu=z=apa utniyanza ḫūmanza iškiš=šmet anda* URU*Ḫattuša lagan ḫard*[*u*] *labarnaš* LUGAL-*uš inarawanza nu=šše=*(*a*)*pa utniyanza*

ḫūmanza anda inaraḫḫi ‘Let the Labarna, the King of Ḫatti be our fortress. The entire land should lean its(!, text ‘their’) back against Ḫattuša. The Labarna, the king, is vigorous; and the entire land shall be vigorous with him’ (i.e., by the contact with him; the force of *anda* is carried over from the sentence with *anda* + *lag-*) KUB 36.110:9–12 (OS); with *anda* + *mugāi-* ‘to invoke’: *parḫuen*[*aš kitta*] *n=aš=ši=pa anda mugānza* [*ēšdu*] ‘*p.* [lies here; may] he [be] invoked by it’ (i.e., be attracted to it) KUB 33.21 iii 18–19; with *andan* +*pai-* ‘to give in addition (to)’: *andan=apa apē*[(*niššūwan pāi*)] ‘he shall give the same amount in addition to it’ KUB 29.23 :14 = Laws §110 (OH/NS); with *dai-* ‘to place’: *kī=wa ēšnaš*[16] *uttar tuppiaz au karū=wa ēšḫar* URU*Ḫattuši makkešta nu=war=at=apa* DINGIR.MEŠ*-iš šallai ḫaššannai dāir* ‘Behold this tale of bloodshed from the tablet! Formerly bloodshed in Ḫatti was rife, and the gods laid it on the royal family (lit., ‘Great Family’)’ KBo 3.1 ii 47–49 (OH/NS); with *takk-* ‘to match’: *aīš=šit=apa* KA×U*-i dāk*[*ki*] ‘His mouth matches (his) mouth’ KUB 43.53 i 4 (OH/NS) (multiple examples ibid. i 5–15); with *tarupp-* ‘to gather, bring together, unite’: *n*[(*=apa*) DU(MU.MEŠ*=ŠU*) ŠEŠ.M(Š*=ŠU*)] [(LÚ.MEŠ*gaenaš=šešš=a* LÚ.MEŠ*ḫaš*)]*šannaš* (var. + *=šaš*) *U* [(ÉRIN.MEŠ*=ŠU*)] [(*taruppanteš eše*)]*r* ‘And his sons, his brothers, his in-laws, his family, and his troops were united’ KBo 3.1 i 1–3 (Telipinu pr.); with *anda tiya-* ‘to come together, convene’: (The Stormgod convoked all the gods:) *anda=m*(*u*)*=apa tiyatten* ‘Come (lit., ‘step’) together to me!’ KBo 3.7 i 12–13 (OH/NS); with *anda turiya-* ‘to unite, hitch together’: *kinun=a=m*(*u*)*=apa* [DINGIR*=Y*]*A innarau*[*w*]*ār U* dLAMMA *anda tūriya* ‘But now, [O] my [god], unite with me vigor and good luck (lit., ‘the Patron Deity’)’ KUB 30.10 rev. 19–20 (Kantuzili prayer), the plene writing of *innarawar* here is unique; with *uda-* ‘to bring’: NIM.LÀL *tēriyaš* UD*-aš mīuwa*⟨*š*⟩ UD*-aš* KASKAL*-an pāndu n=apa iyatar=mit udandu* ‘Let the bee(s) go a journey of three days (or) four days, and let them bring (to me) my prosperity’ KUB 43.60 i 10–12; in a nominal sentence: LUGAL*-i=ma=apa lē kuitki* ‘Let there be nothing for the king’ = ‘Let the king have nothing to do with it/no involvement’ KUB 11.1 iv 21, ed. THeth 11:52–53.

28.104. In other cases *-apa* appears to have a “terminative” sense.[17] In most of these it underscores that an action is brought to a conclusion (“endterminativ”). Compare §28.77 (p. 372) for this use with *-kan.* Examples: with ***appai-*** ‘to finish’: *n=apa ašeššar pankuš=a āppai* ‘the seated group and the entire congregation finish (worshiping)’ KUB 53.14 ii 1 (OH/MS); *n=apa* DUMU.LUGAL *appai* ‘and the prince finishes’ KUB 53.14 ii 2 (OH/MS); *t=apa āppai* KBo 21.93 ii 8; with ***ḫašš-*** ‘to open (up)’: [*m*]*ān lukkatta=ma t=ap*[(*a ḫaššanzi* KUŠNÍG.BÀR*-a*)]*n* [(*uššia*)*nz*]*i* ‘When the morrow comes, they open up and pull back the curtains (in the temple)’ ABoT 9 + KBo 17.74 + KBo 21.25 i 31–32 (OS?); *n=apa* [. .] EGIR*-pa ḫaškeši* KBo 11.14 iii 25–27 (OH/NS); *mān=apa* É*ḫalentuwa ḫaššanzi* KUŠNÍG.BÀR*=ašta uššiyanzi* ‘when they open the residential palace and pull back the curtains’ KUB 25.16 i 1–3 (OH/NS); with ***iya-*** ‘to make into (with double obj.)’

16. See §4.101 (p. 126).

17. For the notion “terminative,” including both “endterminativ” and “anfangsterminativ” see among others García Ramón 2002: 111.

nu=war=at=⟨š⟩ta karšandu n=at!=apa GIŠBANŠUR.MEŠ *iyandu* ‘Let them cut (a tree) down and make it into tables’ KBo 22.6 iv 17–18 (OH/NS); with ***pai***- ‘to go’: *nu tuliyan ḫalzišten mān=apa uttar=šet paizzi nu* SAG.DU-*naz šarnikdu* ‘Convene the assembly. If his plan (lit., ‘word’) goes to its conclusion, then let him pay with his head’ KBo 3.1 ii 51–52 (OH/NS); with ***šanḫ***- ‘to seek for, avenge (blood/death/murder)’:[18] m*Zidantašš=a* LUGAL-*uēt n=apa* DINGIR.MEŠ m*Pišeniyaš išḫar šanḫer* ‘Zidanta became king, and the gods sought (i.e., avenged) the blood/murder of Pišeni’ KBo 3.1 i 66–68 (OH/NS)*;* m*Ammunašš=a* LUGAL-*uēt n=apa* DINGIR.MEŠ-*iš attaš=šaš* m*Zidantaš ēšḫar=šet šanḫer* KBo 3.1 i 69–71 (OH/NS); with medio-passive *tarupp*- ‘to be completed’: [(*m*)]*ān=apa* NINDA[(*taparpašuš šarrumanzi taruptari*)] ‘when the distribution of *taparpašu*-breads is completed’ KUB 41.42 iii 5′, restored from dupl. KUB 10.89 i 16–17, which lacks *-apa*; with ***uwa***- ‘to come’ or EGIR-*pa uwa*- ‘to return’: *mān=aš=apa laḫḫaz=ma* EGIR-*pa uezzi* ‘Whenever he returns (to home base) from an expedition’ KBo 3.1+ i 18 (OH/NS); [*nu š*]*A* f*Zi. alwanzatar=šet idālu uddār=šet* QATAMMA [*ḫar*]*kdu n=at=apa* EGIR-*pa lē uezzi* ‘Let the sorcery (and) evil word of the woman Ziplantawiya likewise get lost, and let it not come back here’ KBo 15.10 + KBo 20.42 ii 15–16 (MH/MS); *mān=apa* LUGAL-*uš* URU*Lawazzantiya uwanun* ‘When I, the king, came to Lawazzantiya’ KBo 3.1+ ii 20–21 (OH/NS); with ***zinne***- ‘to destroy, wipe out’: *n=uš=apa uezzi zin*[*nai*] ‘she will proceed to wipe them out’ KUB 1.16 ii 24 (OH/NS). The use with ***ēd***- ‘to eat up’ and ***karap***- could either be the terminative use (‘eat up’) or an extension of the convergence aspect: complete assimilation or envelopment of the eaten object. Examples: *š=an=ap azzikanzi* ‘and they eat him’ KBo 3.60 ii 3 (OH/NS); *š=an=ap atānzi* KBo 3.60 ii 5 (OH/NS); *š=an=ap ēzta* KBo 3.60 ii 18 (OH/NS); with *karap*- ‘to devour’: *ḫēwēš* [*k*]*īša* BURU_{14}.ḪI.A SIG_5*-anta daganzipaš* [*ḫu*]*idār parāi n=apa ḫalkin karapanzi* ‘Rains will occur,[19] crops will thrive, wildlife of the earth will appear, and they[20] will devour the grain’ KUB 8.1 iii 8–10 (OH?/NS).

28.105. The motivation for the use of *-apa* with the verb *arai*- ‘to arise’ remains unclear: [*ar*]*aiš=a*(=?)*pa*[21] m*App*[*u*]*š n=aš=za parna=šša* [*iy*]*anniš* ‘Appu arose and set out for his house’ KUB 24.8 + KUB 36.60 i 24–26 (OH/NS);[22] *araiš=a*(=?)*pa* m*Appuš* GIŠNÁ*-az nu=za ḫarkin* SILA_4*-an dāš n=aš* dUTU-*i kattan iyanni*[*š*] ‘Appu arose from his bed, took a white lamb, and set out for the Sungod’ KUB 24.8 + KUB 36.60 i 38–40 (OH/NS); *ēšzi=pat natta=aš=a*[*pa a*]*rāi* ‘(s)he keeps on sitting; (s)he does not get up’ KBo 19.163 ii 33–34 (OH/NS) (reading *na-at-ta-ša!*[*-pa a-r*]*a-a-i*); *n=apa* NIN.DINGIR *ara*[*i . . .*] KBo 21.90 obv. 11–12 (OH/MS); [*mā*]*n lukkatta=ma n=apa* NIN.DINGIR-*aš*

18. Note, however, that this construction also exists with *-ašta* and without sentence particle (CHD sub *šanḫ*- mng. 5).

19. Although *ḫēwēš* is common-gender plural, its verb *kīša*(*ri*) is singular here. See 15.17 (p. 241).

20. Although *ḫuitār* is formally neuter singular, semantically it is a collective, indicating many animals; hence, the shift to the plural verb here.

21. For the ambiguity of clitic boundaries here see §29.47 (p. 402).

22. The very fact that -(*a*)*pa* apears to have gone out of use after OH points to an OH archetype for this text.

arāi ‘when morning comes, the NIN.DINGIR priestess arises (and . . .)’ KBo 21.95 i 17 (OH/NS).

28.106. The use of *-apa* with *waqqar-* ‘to be lacking’ does not seem to fit into any of our categories: *nu=šši=pa ŪL kuitki waqqari nu=šši=pa* 1*-an uttar waqqari* DUMU.NITA*=ši* DUMU.MUNUS*-iš* NU.GÁL ‘Nothing was lacking to him; only one thing was lacking to him: he had neither son nor daughter’ KUB 24.8 + KUB 36.60 i 15–17 (OH?/NS).

28.107. The grouping of the examples just given obviously is quite tentative. The notion of physical contact of one object with another seems to be shared with *-šan* (see §28.95, p. 377), and most of the verbs cited in §28.104 (p. 380) refer to actions that are inherently “telic.” Verbs such as *pai-* ‘to go’ and *uwa-* ‘to come’ occur dozens of times without *-apa*. Nevertheless, the frequent co-occurrence with *anda* specifically in its derived sense ‘(up) to’ is noteworthy (contrast the usage with *-an* in §28.97, p. 378), and in the example with *pai-* it appears to be *-apa* that adds the nuance ‘to its conclusion’. Development of the “terminative” sense from that of physical contact would be trivial. See Latin *op-primō* ‘to press against’ but also ‘to overwhelm, destroy’. As suggested by Carruba (1964: 429), an etymological connection of Hittite *-apa* with Latin *op-*/*ob-* and related forms is likely (and with Hittite *āppa*).

The Particle *-ašta*

28.108. Like *-apa* (*-pa*) and *-an* (*-n*), the particle *-ašta* elides its *a*-vowel after an *e-* or *i*-vowel, thus: *ta-aš-ši-iš-ta* KUB 31.1 + KBo 3.16 ii 14 (OH/NS); *nu-uš-ši-iš-ta* KUB 17.10 iv 2 (OH/MS); *peran arḫa=ma=šši=šta* KUB 23.11 iii 17*; nu-uš-še-eš-ta* KUB 33.5 iii 12 (OH/MS).

28.109. But (as with *-apa* KBo 3.7 i 13 in §28.100, p. 378) an immediately preceding *u*-vowel elides, leaving an *a* vocalization (see §1.72, p. 32): *nu-um-ma-aš-ta* KUB 31.130 rev. 7 (OH/MS) and *nu-ma-aš-ta* KUB 36.75 iii 12 (OH/MS) and KBo 14.74:3 (from *nu* + *-mu* + *-ašta*).

28.110. Most discussions of *-ašta* have emphasized its use to mark separation or divergence, often with the preverbs *arḫa* and *parā* (see, e.g., Carruba 1964: 408–12). Examples of this kind are in fact frequent: *n=ašta parā paiwani* ‘And we go out/leave’ KBo 17.3 i 15 (OS); *t=e=šta pānzi* ‘They leave’ KBo 17.9 iv 9 (OS); *ḫāranan=ašta parā pētanzi* ‘They remove the eagle’ KBo 17.1 ii 37–38 (OS); *t=uš=(š)ta šarā tumēni* ‘We pick them up’ KBo 17.1 iv 25; *š=an=ašta arḫa pēḫuter* ‘They led him off’ KBo 3.34 ii 6–7 (OH/NS); *n=ašta* ZAG*-an* ^{U}[^{ZU}GEŠ]TU*-an arḫa kuērzi* ‘He cuts off the right ear’ KUB 27.67 ii 48–49. See §28.65 (p. 369) for a similar use of *-kan*. As already noted by Goetze (1933b: 128),[23] it is the presence of *-ašta* (or another particle; see CHD *parā*) that gives the sense ‘to go out, leave’ to *parā* + *pai-*, which without the particle means ‘to go forward’ or ‘to go further/on’.

23. See also CHD P *parā* mngs. 1 and 3.

28.111. From the basic idea of separation one may easily derive a partitive sense, selection from a group, explicit or implicit (see Carruba 1964: 412–13, who aptly compares Italian *ne*): *n=ašta* ^{URU}*Ḫattušaš=pat* URU-*riaš* 1-*aš āšta* 'Out of (all other cities) the city of Ḫattuša alone remained' KBo 10.2 i 26 (OH/NS); perhaps also *nepišz=ašta* ^{d}IM-*unni āššuš ēšta* 'To the Stormgod from heaven he was dearest (of all)' KBo 3.22:2 (OS). Similar is the use of *-ašta* to mark comparison: *išk*i⟨*š*⟩*=šet=ašta iškiši* GAL-*li* [*paltan*]*aš=šiš!=ašta paltanī šalliš* 'His back is bigger than (his) back; his shoulder is bigger than (his) shoulder KUB 43.53 i 23–24 (OH/NS).

28.112. In many cases, however, *-ašta* occurs in contexts referring to arrival at a goal, including entry (with *anda*): [*m*]*ān=ašta* GAL*=ŠUN*[*U* LUGAL-*i ḫa*]*ndāitta* 'When their leader draws even with the king' KBo 20.14 + KBo 25.33 i 9 (OS) (ibid. i 13 without particle!); *n=ašta māḫḫan šarkantin ANA* $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$*MEŠEDUTIM ḫandānzi* 'When they bring the petitioner in line with the guards' IBoT 1.36 iii 20 (translation with Güterbock and van den Hout 1991: 25 and CHD Š 58); *n=ašta* ŠÀ KUR.KUR.MEŠ *anda* ^{d}UTU-*uš tiyat* 'In the midst of the lands the Sungod stood' KBo 10.2 ii 52–53 (either OH/NS or NH); *nu azzikkeddu akkuškedd*[*u mān=aš āššuš*] *n=ašta šarā uiškettaru* 'Let him continue to eat and drink. [So long as he is on good behavior,] let him continue to come up (to the palace)' KUB 1.16 ii 33–34 (royal edict, OH/NS).

28.113. With verbs of movement it seems to be associated with the idea of transition or crossing: [*lē=ma*] *šarkaliyatumari lē ku*[*iš*]*ki* [*ku*]*rur n=ašta uttar* [*lē k*]*uiški šarratta* 'Do[n't] elevate yourselves (over your brothers)! Let there be no hostility! And let [no] one transgress the word (of the king)!' KUB 1.16 ii 49–50; *n=ašta nepišaš* KÁ-*uš zik=pat* [*aššanuw*]*anza* ^{d}UTU-*uš šarrašketta* 'you, [establish]ed Sungod, pass through the gate of heaven' KUB 36.75 + Bo 4696 i 7–8 (OH/MS); '(The Kaskaeans) come and take the gifts, then they swear (oaths), but when they arrive back (home)', *n=ašta lingāuš šarranzi* 'They transgress the oaths' KUB 17.21 iv 16–17 (prayer , MH/MS); *n=ašta kuiš kūš NIŠ* DINGIR-*LIM šarriezzi* 'Whoever transgresses these oaths' KBo 6.34 ii 46–49 (Soldiers' oath, MH/NS), ed. Oettinger 1976a: 10–11; *lingainn=a=šta ŪL kuššanka šarraḫḫat* 'I never transgressed an oath' KUB 30.10 obv. 12–14 (OH/MS); *mān=ašta kūš=a lingāuš šarradduma* 'If you transgress these oaths' KBo 8.35 ii 16 (treaty with the Kaška, MH/MS); *n=ašta uttar* [*lē k*]*uiški šarratta* 'Let no one transgress the words' KUB 1.16 ii 49–50 (OH/NS); *laḫḫiyauwaš=za* [*uttar*] *ŪL imma šekteni šer=ašta kuitki šarran* 'Do you actually not know [the matter] of campaigning: that something concerning (it) has been transgressed?' KBo 16.25 i 33–34 (MH/MS); *n=ašta* ÍD-*an zaitten* 'You crossed the river' KUB 31.101:6–7, but see with *-kan* in ibid. 10–11.

28.114. One possibility for uniting the apparently diverse meanings just cited is to suppose that *-ašta* originally marked passage from one spatial domain across a boundary into another domain (see Josephson 1995: 171, comparing the Russian verbal prefix *za-*). The specific uses with reference to separation, transition, and arrival would merely reflect varying focus on one aspect of the movement according to context (and choice

of the speaker). It is also easy to see why overlap with *-kan* and *-šan* might occur when *-ašta* was used with reference to arrival.[24] Luwian *-ta* shows a similar range of uses: see especially [(*w*)]*ār=ša=tta* ÍD-*ti* [*nan*]*amman* . . . [*w*]*ār=ša=tta zīl*[*a* ÍD-*i*] *anda* [(*n*)]*āwa iti* 'The water is led from the river . . . the water does not henceforth go into the river' KUB 35.54 iii 17–20. This correspondence makes attractive the suggestion of Josephson (1972: 419) that Hittite -(*a*)*šta* is etymologically derived by a resegmentation from **-te* seen in Luwian and Palaic *-ta*, Greek ὅτε 'when' etc. (see also Josephson 1997: 50–52). For another very different view see Carruba 1964: 427–28.

The Particle *-pat*

28.115. Hittite *-pat* is an enclitic particle of specification, limitation, and identity, attested since Old Hittite (Hart 1971; Hoffner 1973b; and CHD P with full discussion and anterior literature).

28.116. Normally it was written with the BE sign (⊢≺ HZL sign no. 13, pp. 96–97), which in Boğazköy texts has several syllabic values. The problem of the correct transcription of HZL sign no. 13 is particularly important for this particle, since the particle is almost always written with the same sign. For evidence establishing the reading /pat/ see Hoffner 1973b and CHD P s.v.

28.117. Its position. Since it is not a sentence particle, *-pat* does not occur within the chain of such sentence particles as *-wa*(*r*), *-aš*, *-mu*, *-za*, and *-kan* (see Friedrich, HE §288; Hart 1971: 102; Hoffner 1973b: 104). If a chain of sentence particles attaches itself to any word which also carries *-pat*, *-pat* will precede the entire chain: e.g., in OH *ammel=pat=wa=za* KBo 6.3 iii 71 (Laws §74, OH/NS).

28.118. When *-pat* is construed with a word and its modifiers (noun + attributive adjective, noun + genitive modifier, verb + preverb, verb + adverb, verb + negative), it will usually attach itself to that modifier which serves to particularize or define the construction to the highest degree (Hoffner 1973b: 105). Hart (1971: 102) describes the distribution differently: *-pat* is regularly attached to the first word in nominal groups. Hart points out (1971: 103) that "a consequence of this fixed position . . . is that position cannot be used to decide whether *-pat* belongs functionally with the adjective etc. or to the noun."

28.119. With pairs of nouns in distributive expressions it occurs on the second (i.e., last) noun, suggesting the phrase is felt to be a unit: KASKAL-*ši* KASKAL-*ši=pat* KBo 3.5 ii 13–15 (NH); ITU-*mi* ITU-*mi=pat* KUB 22.7 obv.? 3; UD-*at* UD-*at=pat* KUB 1.13+ iii 7. See §19.10 (p. 291).

28.120. As established by Hart (1971), Hoffner (1973b), and others, the basic function of *-pat* is to call attention to the marked items' identity with a previously stated or

24. On its alternation with *-kan* see already Güterbock 1964.

implied entity. But this meaning is realized in a number of ways. In the following discussion we have tried to classify the different uses according to inner Hittite criteria and then present the various alternative translations suitable for each. We have made every effort to avoid the trap of imposing an outside standard conditioned by our own native language. Nevertheless, some usages that we have kept apart would probably have appeared indistinguishable to native speakers of Hittite, and they may have perceived further distinctions that we overlook. In many instances one simply cannot decide between competing interpretations. Hart (1971: 116–21) discusses many examples that are ambiguous. For a listing of possible uses see CHD P s.v.

Anaphoric

28.121. The first major use of *-pat* may be termed "anaphoric." It is used to indicate that a person, object, circumstance, or action is in some sense identical to one mentioned previously in the discourse (Sommer 1921). The fact that various translations are used to express this function ('the (very) same, the aforementioned, likewise, continue to . . .') should not obscure the fact that the basic meaning is the same. In some cases, however, the notion of identity seems to have been relaxed to include an action that is not identical to a preceding one but a natural continuation of extension of it. These examples are best expressed in English by 'also, furthermore' or the like. Finally, since one reason to stress that someone continues to do something is that the action is unexpected, *-pat* can acquire a meaning 'nevertheless, anyhow'.

28.122. When the particle is attached to a noun or attributive adjective, it is best translated in English as 'the (very) same, the aforementioned'. When it is attached either to a verb or to the predicate noun or adjective, one may wish rather to translate it 'likewise'. The fundamental significance of the particle, however, remains the same in these cases.

28.123. With nouns we may cite the following: 1 MUNUS-*TUM* ^{f}*Kattittaḫi*-^{m}*Tatilēni* *Š*[*UM*=*ŠU*] 1 DUMU.MUNUS ŠEŠ=*ŠU* ^{f}*Kattittaḫi*=*pat* *Š*[*UM*=*ŠU*] 'one woman, her name Kat=tittaḫi of Tatileni. One daughter of her brother, her name Kattittaḫi likewise' Otten, StBoT 1:20; 'When a slave has stolen, and his lord/owner says: 'I will make the compensation in his behalf', he shall make the compensation' [*takku m*]*immai*=*ma nu* ÌR-*an*=*pat* [(*šuwezzi*)] 'But if he (the owner) refuses, he forfeits the aforementioned slave' KBo 6.3 iv 47 = Laws §95 (OS), restored from KBo 6.2 iv 48 (OS).

28.124. When a verbal phrase is repeated, and the speaker/writer wishes to call attention to the repetition, he may affix *-pat* to the second occurrence to the verb. And, although this is simply the verbal equivalent of the usage noted above (§28.122) with substantives, one cannot translate into English smoothly as 'the aforementioned' but must use 'likewise', or 'continues to . . .', or ' . . . s as before'. This is the usage discussed by Hart (1971: 135–36) and Hoffner (1973b: 111–12). For example, *aruwāizzi . . . ta namma aruwāizzi n*=*aš*=*kan kuitman ilanaš šarā ari aruwiškezzi*=*pat* 'He bows . . . he

bows again; and all the while he is mounting the stairs he keeps on bowing' KUB 20.46 iii 11–16.

28.125. But one can also use the English word 'also' to translate Hittite predicates marked with *-pat*, where the second action is no repetition of the first but a new and additional action. While in the examples adduced above the particle could be translated by German 'ebenfalls', in those which follow one would have to employ German 'auch noch'; 'And, when my father had become a god, my brother, Arnuwanda, seated himself on the throne of his father' EGIR-*an=ma=aš irmaliyattat=pat* 'but afterwards he also [auch noch] became (deathly) ill' KBo 3.4 i 5–6, ed. HE I §293c; 'If from the palace they give to (some)one silver, gold, garments, bronze utensils as a gift for him, let it be named: "The king gave it to him," and however much is its weight' *n=at iyan=pat ešdu* 'let that also [auch noch] be recorded [lit., 'made']' KUB 13.4 ii 35.

28.126. The particle *-pat* can mean 'nevertheless' in the sequence 'although . . . , nevertheless . . .' (contrary to expectation; Tenner 1926: 101; Pedersen 1935; Hoffner 1973b: 112–13); on the semantic development from 'ebenfalls' to 'trotzdem' in Tenner and Pedersen's thinking see Hart 1971: 107; [*nu*]*=za mān irmalanzaš=a ēšta* ^{d}UTU-*ŠI=ma=ta* [(*ANA*)] *AŠAR ABI=KA tittanunun=pat* 'although you were also ill, nevertheless I, My Majesty, installed you [in] the place of your father' KBo 5.9 i 16–17 with dupl. KBo 16.19: 2′–3′ (Murš. II), ed. SV 1:10–11.

Particularizing

28.127. The second major use of *-pat* is to restrict a *particular* exemplar or representative of a class of things. One may call this "emphasizing," and in some cases *-pat* may be be translated with the English emphatic reflexive ('we ourselves'), but the implied restrictive contrast with other members of a conceived class is always present ('we' and no one else). *-pat* may also be used to underscore an overt contrast between actions: *natta* X . . . Y-*pat* 'not X . . . (but rather) Y'. Finally, the stricture 'X, and only X' can lead to a meaning 'even X' (compare English 'the very thought of' = 'even the thought of, the mere thought of').

28.128. When the particle is attached to proper names, it can occasionally be translated 'himself, herself, itself', Latin 'ipse', German 'selbst': ^{URU}*Ḫattuši=pat* 'in Ḫattuša itself' (= 'even in Ḫattuša') KBo 6.2 i 39 (Laws §19b); ^{m}*Pittaggatalli=pat* 'Pittaggatalli himself' KBo 5.8 iii 15, ed. AM 156–57, see also line 31).

28.129. Sometimes also with personal pronouns: *nu=mu kāšma šumeš=pat kuit ḫatrātten* 'concerning what you yourselves have just written to me' HKM 17:13–15 (MH/MS), ed. Alp 1991a: 142–43; *apāšila=pat* KUB 14.1 rev. 44, 48 (MH), KUB 21.37 i 38 (Hatt. III), KBo 11.14 iv 21 (MH/NS), see Hart 1971: 113–14 for discussion.

28.130. With the possessive pronouns *-pat* corresponds to English '(his, her, its) own (i.e., and no one else's)', German 'eigen' (HE § 293b; Hart 1971: 122–23; Hoffner

1973b: 115); *ammel=pat=wa=za* GUD-*un daḫḫi* ‘I will take my own ox’ KBo 6.3 iii 71 (Laws §74); *apē*[(*l=pa*)]*t annaš=šaš katta* ‘with his own mother’ KBo 6.26 iii 26 (Laws §189); SAG.DU-*KA=pat* ‘your own head’ KBo 5.3 ii 19 (Ḫukk.).

Restrictive

28.131. Also exceedingly common are passages in which the particle imparts a *restrictive* or *exclusive* meaning. In most cases this thought is best translated into English by means of the word ‘only’. This usage is particularly frequent in legal texts (laws, instructions, treaties), in which the precise limits of obligation and liability must be drawn.

28.132. In the treaty between Zidanza and Pilliya of Kizzuwatna the allotment of cities between the two powers is made quite precise by means of *-pat*: *n=e ŠA* ^{d}UTU-*ŠI=pát ašantu* ‘let these (cities) belong exclusively to His Majesty’ and *n=e* ^{m}*Pilliyaš=pat a*[*šantu*] ‘let these b[elong] exclusively to Pilliya!’ KUB 36.108 obv. 4–5.

28.133. The precise limits of Madduwatta’s feudal holding are expressed with the words: ‘I have given to you the mountain land of Zippašla’ *nu=wa=za apūn=pat eši* ‘occupy only it!’ KUB 14.1 obv. 19.

28.134. The limits of liability are often defined with it: *nu* SAG.DU-*az=pat šarnikdu* ‘Let him pay with his (own) person only, (but let no one harm his house or his children)!’ KBo 3.1 ii 55–56; ‘If someone steals the slave of a Luwian from the land of Luwiya and transports him to the land of Ḫatti, and his owner recognizes him’, *nu=zza* ÌR*=ŠU=pat dāi šarnikzil* NU.GÁL ‘he shall take only his slave, there will be no compensation’ KBo 6.2 i 47 (Laws §21).

28.135. In the Telipinu Proclamation the restrictions as to which persons qualify for succession to the throne make good use of *-pat*: LUGAL-*uš=šan ḫantezziyaš=pat* DUMU.LUGAL DUMU-*RU kikk*[(*iš*)]*taru* ‘let only a first-rank prince, a son, become the king!’ KBo 3.1 ii 36 (royal edict, OH/NS).

28.136. Exceedingly common in the oracle inquiries is the use of *-pat* to eliminate all possible causes for divine wrath other than the one under consideration (HE §293d): BE-*an kī=pat* KI.MIN *nu* MUŠEN *ḪURRI* SIG$_6$-*ru*, ‘if this and only this ‘ditto’ (i.e., ‘is the cause of the god’s wrath against us’), then let the MUSEN *ḪURRI* omen-taking be favorable!’ AT 454 i 16, ii 12, 24; for confirmation of the sense ‘only’ see also *namma=ma* GUR-*i UL kui*[*tki*] ‘And there is noth[ing] else in addition’ AT 454 i 27.

28.137. Occasionally, restrictive *-pat* modifies an entire clause: *ammel kāš=pat* 1-*aš dammešḫaš kī=ya=an* 1-*an dammešḫanunun IŠTU* É.GAL-*LIM=pat=kan kuit katta uiyanun* ‘This was my only punishment (for her); in this way only I punished her: just the fact that I expelled her from the palace’ KBo 4.8 ii 12–14 (Murš. II); *n=aš kuwapi=pat* SA$_5$-*ešzi* ‘Only when it becomes red’ KBo 21.20 i 8 (NH).

Contrastive

28.138. The particle *-pat* may also highlight a positive statement contrasted with a negative statement of identical import. First the negative, then the positive: *INA* KUR ^{URU}*Ḫatti ŪL ḫūiššūezzi aki=pa-a*[*t=š*]*an* '(he who does such a deed) will not go on living in the land of Ḫatti: he will die there (*=šan*)' KBo 5.3+ iii 31 (Ḫukk.), ed. SV 2:124–25 with note "Zu S. 151" on p. 170; *ŪL=ma=mu* ^{GIŠ}TUKUL LÚ.KÚR *kuwapikki šer waḫnut* ^{d}*IŠTAR=mu=za=kan* GAŠAN=*YA ḫūmandaza=pat dašket* 'At no time did she let the weapon of an enemy be waved (threateningly) over me. In all this *IŠTAR* my lady took me to herself' Ḫatt. i 41–43.

28.139. First the positive, then the negative: *n=an=za šakuaššara*[(*n=pat d*)]*āi* ^{LÚ}NÍ.ZU*=an natta ēpzi* '(If the owner of an animal which has strayed to another man's pen finds it there,) he shall take it as his rightful property, but he shall not seize him (i.e., the owner of the pen) as a thief' KBo 6.2 + KBo 19.1 iii 49–50 (Laws §66, OS); [*nu=za* ^{d}UTU*=ŠI*] *tuk=pat* ^{m}*Alakšandun šaggaḫḫi apūn=ma=za* [*UL šaggaḫ*]*ḫi* 'I, My Majesty recognize you alone, Alakšandu; I do not recognize him' KUB 21.5 ii 9–10 (Muw. II).

28.140. 'Even' modifying a single word within a clause: *nu=za=kan irmalaš=pat ŠA* DINGIR-*LIM ḫandandatar šer uškenun* 'Even as an ill person (although I was ill,) I kept seeing the divine power of the deity over me' Ḫatt. i 44–45; $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$*ḫappinanteš=pat ŪL ašiwanteškantari* 'do not even the rich become poor?' KBo 4.14 ii 52–53; *nu=mu kappin=pat* DUMU-*an* ^{d}*IŠTAR* ^{URU}*Šam*[*uḫ*]*a ANA ABU-YA wēkta* 'even when I was but a small child, ^{d}*IŠTAR* of Samuḫa requested me from my father' KBo 6.29 i 7–8; *nu=kan* ^{URU}*Zippašnan* GE_6*-az=pat šarā pāun* 'Even at night (i.e., one expects military operations during the day, but at night they are unusual and unexpected) I went up to Zippašna' KBo 10.2 ii 49–50 (OH/NS).

Chapter 29
CONJUNCTIONS

29.1. Clause linkage is marked either by conjunctions or by simple juxtaposition (what is traditionally called asyndeton). There are five clause-linking conjunctions in Hittite: *n*(*u*), *šu* (*š*-), *t*(*a*), *-a*/*-ya*, and *-a*/*-ma*. Two of these (*-a*/*-ya* and *-a*/*-ma*), however, can serve other purposes in the sentence: contrasting a single word in one clause with one in a corresponding position in an adjacent clause (*-a*/*-ma*) and linking members of a series of words ('X, Y, and Z') in a single clause (*-a*/*-ya*). These two therefore do not connect clauses in all their occurrences. The conjunction *šu* (*š*-) occurs only with attached enclitics and never stands alone,[1] while free-standing *nu* and *ta* are common. The possible significance of this difference is not yet clear.

29.2. The Akkadogram *U* (written with the sign Ù) can also serve graphically to represent *nu* or *-a*/*-ya*, but only when it immediately precedes a logogram, including logographically written proper names[2] and numerals. When *U* connects nouns in a series, it stands for *-a*/*-ya* on the following word; rarely, a syllabically written noun (or even another logogram) immediately following it can redundantly indicate 'and' by an explicit *-a*/*-ya*: $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$KUŠ$_7$ *U* $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$*karuḫališ=šmešš=a* KBo 6.2 iii 14 (OS),[3] *IŠTU* MUŠEN.ḪI.A *U IŠTU* SU.MEŠ*=ya* KBo 4.4 ii 50 (NH). Akkadian prepositions are normally repeated after *U* in coordinated logograms, whether nor not the coordination indicates multiple persons/objects or apposition (on the latter see Sommer 1932: 130): *ANA . . . U ANA*,[4] *ŠA . . . U ŠA*, *IŠTU . . . U IŠTU*, *ITTI . . . U ITTI*, *MAḪAR . . . U MAḪAR*, *PANI . . . U PANI*, *QADU . . . U QADU*.[5] But *UMMA* is not repeated: *UMMA* PN$_1$ *U* PN$_2$.[6]

---

1. A possible exception, *šu-u* in the broken context of KBo 12.14 rev. 4 (OH/NS), was suggested to Weitenberg (1992: 338 n. 9) by Houwink ten Cate.

2. Rarely even a name with its case ending: ^{m}*Zinwašeliš U* ^{m}*Lelli*[*š*] *meggaeš* KBo 3.1+ ii 24–25 (OH/NS).

3. Also *nu* ^{URU}*Tapigga* ^{URU}*Anziliya* ^{URU}*Ḫariya U ANA* ^{URU}*Ḫaninqawa=ya* ŠE-*AM U* ZÍZ*=ya* [*k*]*ue anniyan ēšta* HKM 54:8-13 (MH/MS), GIM-*an=ma=mu-kán* $^{m.d}$*Sin*-^{d}U-*aš* DUMU ^{m}*Zidā ŠA* ^{d}*IŠTAR* GAŠAN*=YA U ŠA* ŠEŠ*=YA=ya āššulan aušta* Ḫatt. ii 74–75 (NH) and *U*? ^{URU}*Tiyaššiltašš=a QADU* $^{A.ŠÀ}$A.GÀR*=ŠU* [*ANA*] ^{d}IŠKUR *šipandaza* KUB 19.37 ii 23 (AM 168).

4. E.g., HKM 23 obv. 1–2 and 25:1–3 (MH/MS). But see Hagenbuchner-Dresel 1999: 54 for differing conventions at Ḫattuša and Tapikka (Maşat).

5. E.g., HKM 33:35–36 (MH/MS); but not in HKM 82:3.

6. E.g., HKM 48:2–3 (MH/MS).

Clause-Initial Clause-Linking Conjunctions

Distribution

29.3. Old Hittite uses all three of these clause-linking conjunctions. The conjunctions **šu* (*š-*) and *ta* (*t-*) are in complementary distribution, the former with preterites and the latter with present-futures (Weitenberg 1992: 327), as well as with imperatives (see §15.11, p. 239, last example)[7] and the analytic present perfect *ḫar*(*k*)-construction (cf. KBo 4.9 vi 6–7 [OH/NS]). As per Weitenberg, the preponderance of *ta* in ritual texts and its rarity in historical texts is merely a function of the typical use of tenses in these genres, and likewise its extensive use in the Laws together with the total absence of *šu* there. In post-OH copies of OH texts both *šu* and *ta* are quite frequently preserved by scribes, and there is no noticeable tendency for *ta* to be preserved more frequently than *šu.* Claims that *šu* was eliminated from active use earlier than *ta* (Weitenberg 1992: 309; Rieken 2000a: 411–12) must therefore be regarded as unproven.

29.4. Weitenberg (1992: 325) stresses that *nu*, *šu*, and *ta* always serve to link clauses and thus never occur in discourse-initial position. This is strictly true for *šu* and *ta* (see §29.48, p. 402). But *nu* is used discourse-initial when a new question follows logically upon an earlier answer: 'So . . . ?' or 'If that is the case, then . . . ?' See §27.8 (p. 351).

29.5. Establishing differences in the usage of *nu*, *šu*, and *ta* has proven difficult. The complementary distribution of *šu* and *ta* according to tense suggests that they are functional variants, and in many respects their use is parallel. Many of their uses indeed are also shared with *nu*. For attempts to discern patterns in the use of *šu* and *ta* see Weitenberg 1992 and for a very different account of *ta* see Rieken 1999b. We content ourselves here with illustrating use of the conjunctions with different clause types, with special attention to cases where they seem to overlap (e.g., §29.15, p. 393).

nu

29.6. *nu* connects independent clauses from OS onward. In the following examples the actions are definitely sequential (at times the second or final clause expressing a result, 'so that . . .', 'therefore'): *kalulupi*(*t*)*=šmit=ašta išg*[(*ara*)]*nta dāi* [***n***]*=e=n kiššari=šmi dāi* ***n***=*ašt*[(*a pa*)]*rā paiwani* 'He takes the things fastened to their fingers and puts them in their hand(s), and we leave' KBo 17.1 i 19–20 (OS); 100 *gipeššar* A.ŠÀ *kar*(*a*)*šši̯ezzi* ***n***=*an=za dāi* 'he shall cut off 100 *gipeššar* of field and take it for himself' KBo 6.2 i 8 (Laws §6, OS); *kinun=a* LUGAL-*uš* ŠA É.GAL-*LIM peššiet* ***nu***=*za ḫūnikanza=pat* 3 GÍN KUBABBAR *d*[*āi*] 'But now the king has waived the palace's share,

7. There is only one exception to this distribution in OS: *šēr=a=šš̆an* GAD-*an peššiyami š=uš* LÚ-*aš natta aušzi* 'I throw a cloth over them, and no man will see them' KBo 17.3 iv 18–19. Even when one includes copies, the complementary distribution remains clear: of slightly more than 100 examples of *š*(*u*) where the context can be determined, only five occur with present-futures. Examples of *t*(*a*) with preterites are also rare even in post-OH copies, less than a dozen out of several hundred.

so that only the injured party shall take 3 shekels' KBo 6.2 i 15 (Laws §9, OS); [*takku* LÚ-*a*]*n našma* MUNUS-*an ELLAM walḫzi kuiš*[*k*]*i* ***n***=*aš aki* '[If] someone strikes a free [man] or woman, so that s/he dies' KBo 6.3 i 6 (Laws §3, OH/NS); *kāša*=*wa kī*=*ya kī*=*ya uttar iyami* ***nu***=*wa*=*mu*=*ššan ziqq*=*a ḫarpḫut* 'I am about to do such-and-such, so you too join me!' KBo 3.7 i 21–23 (OH/NS); *nu*=*kan kāšma* ANŠE.KUR.RA.ḪI.A *parā neḫḫun* ***nu***=*za PANI* LÚ.KÚR *mekki paḫḫaššanuanza ēš* 'I have just dispatched chariotry, so be much on the alert toward the enemy' HKM 1:8–13 (MH/MS); *zik*=*ma*=*wa*=*za* DUMU-*aš* ***nu***=*wa UL kuitki šakti* 'You are a mere child, and so know nothing at all' KUB 19.29 iv 16 (NH).

29.7. *nu* connects two subordinate clauses: *takku* ÌR-*aš ḫuwāi* ***n***=*aš ANA* KUR *Luwiya paizzi* . . . 'If a male slave runs away and goes to the land of Luwiya . . .' KBo 6.2 i 51 (Laws §23, OS); *kuiš ammel āppan* LUGAL-*uš kīšar*[*i*] ***nu*** ^{URU}*Ḫattušan āppa ašāš*[*i*] . . . 'Whoever becomes king after me and resettles Ḫattuša . . .' KBo 3.22:49–50 (OS); *ŠA* ^{m}*Piḫinakki*=*mu kui*[*t*] *uttar ḫatrāeš* ^{m}*Piḫinakkiš*=*za maḫḫan* ^{URU}*Lišipran ēški*[*tt*]*ari* ***nu***=*wa*=*za karu* 30 É-*TUM ašešan* [*ḫ*]*arzi* 'Concerning the message you sent me about Piḫinakki: how Piḫinakki is settling the city Lišipra, and (how) he has already settled (there) 30 households' HKM 10:3–6 (MH/MS); [*mān*] *āššu*=*ma ŪL pē ḫarzi* ***n***=*an*=*kan šullannaza* [*ku*]*iški kuenzi* 'But if he (scil., the merchant) does not have goods in his possession, and (the offender) kills him out of wantonness' KBo 6.4 i 6–7 (Laws §III, NH); ^{d}UTU-*ŠI*=*ma maḫḫan iyaḫḫat* ***nu*** *maḫḫan ANA* ^{URU}*Šallapa* [*arḫu*]*n* 'When I, My Majesty, marched, and when I [reac]hed Šallapa' KUB 14.15 ii 7 (NH, Murš. II). See §29.18 (p. 394), where *ta*, *-a-*/*-ya-*, and *U* also fill this role.

29.8. *nu* connects a subordinate clause to a following independent clause. This usage occurs already in OS with **temporal** clauses (see §30.36, p. 416): *mān* ^{URU}*Tamar*[*mara*] *arer* ***nu*** *taršikanzi* 'When they arrived in T., they said (historical present; see §22.6, p. 307)' KBo 22.2 obv. 8 (OS); *m*[*ā*]*n lukkatta*=*ma* ***nu*** ^{LÚ}A.ZU *ūgg*=*a paiwani* 'But when it dawns, the physician and I go' KBo 17.1 iv 7 (OS); *mān IN*[*A* U]D.2.KAM *ā*[*ppa paiwa*]*ni* ***n***=*apa ḫaššueni* 'When we go back on the second day, we open up' KBo 8.74+ ii 9 (OS); *mān* ^{MUŠEN}*ḫāranan ḫuš*[(*uwandan appanzi*)] ***n***=*an udanzi* 'When they catch a live eagle, they bring it' StBoT 8 ii 19–20 (OS); also in OH/NS: *nu mān* (7) *māi šešzi* ***nu*** EZEN$_4$ *purulliyaš* (8) *iyanzi* 'And when prosperity and abundance come, they celebrate the festival of *purulli*' KBo 3.7 i 6–8 (OH/NS). But in OH an independent clause following a subordinate temporal clause can also be introduced by *šu* (§29.12, p. 392), by *ta* ([*m*]*ān lukkatta*=*ma* ***t***=*apa ḫaššanzi* KBo 17.74 + KBo 34.10 i 31 [OH/MS], see also KBo 17.4 ii 10–11 [OS]), or by asyndeton (marked † in this and the immediately following paragraphs): *mān* ^{MUŠEN}*ḫāranan* ÉRIN.MEŠ-*ann*=*a* 3=*ŠU waḫnumi* † *ḫāranan*=*ašta parā pētanzi* 'When (i.e., after) I wave the eagle and the troops three times, they carry the eagle out' KBo 17.1 + KBo 25.3 ii 37–38 (OS), see also KBo 3.22 78–79 (OS).

29.9. *nu* also connects a preposed **relative** clause to a main clause, already from OS onward: ^{d}UTU-*az utnē* [*kuit k*]*uit*=*pat araiš* ***n***=*uš ḫūmanduš*=*p*[*at ḫ*]*u*[*llanu*]*n* 'Whatever lands rebelled. . . , I fought all of them!' KBo 3.22:11–12 (OS); *nu kuit* [(LU)]GAL-*uš*

tezzi ***nu*** *apāt iyami* ‘And what the kings says, that I do’ KBo 17.4 ii 12–13 (OS); *kuiš=an āppa=ma uwatezzi* ***n=an=za*** *apāš=pat dāi* ‘whoever brings him back shall keep him for himself’ Laws §23 (OS). This usage is also attested for *šu*, *ta*, and asyndeton: for *šu* see example in §29.14 (p. 393), for *ta* see §29.20 (p. 394), for asyndeton see: *kuiš=at ḫull*[*ezzi*] † ^{U}[^{RU}*Nēš*]*aš* LÚ.KÚR=*ŠU ē*[*štu*] ‘Let whoever defaces it (scil., the inscription) be the enemy of the city Neša’ KBo 3.22:35 (OS).

29.10. In OH and MH texts conditional clauses (‘if’ clauses) are often connected to following main clauses without conjunction (i.e., asyndeton; marked with †): *takku* ^{LÚ}DAM.GÀR (dupl. KBo 6.3 i 10 adds ^{URU}*Ḫatti*) *kuiški kuēnzi* † 1 *ME* MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR *pāi* ‘If someone kills a (Hittite) merchant, he shall give 100 minas of silver’ KBo 6.2 i 3 = Laws §5 (OS); *takku* LÚ.U$_{19}$.LU-*an ELLAM kuiški dašuwaḫḫi našma* ZU$_9$=*ŠU lāki* † *karū* 1 MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR *pišker* ‘If someone blinds a free person or knocks out his teeth, they used to pay 40 shekels of silver’ KBo 6.2 i 9–10 (Laws §7, OS); *takku šumeš natta šaktēni* † *kāni* LÚ ŠU.GI-*eš=a* NU GÁL *nu=šmaš memai AWĀT ABI=YA* ‘If you do not know (my father’s instructions), is there not here (with you) even an old man that he may tell you my father’s word?’ KBo 22.1:5–6 (OS); *mān UL=ma* † *uwaši ḫar*(*a*)*kši* ‘But if not (= if you don’t bring the prisoner), you will proceed to die’ HKM 35:8–9 (MH/NS); *mān=ašta* ^{LÚ}*pitteanza* ^{URU}*Ḫattušaz* ^{URU}[*Kizzuwatni*] *paizzi* † ^{m}*Šunaššuraš=an ēptu* ‘If a fugitive goes from Ḫattuša to [Kizzuwatna] Šunaššura must seize him’ KUB 8.81 ii 11–12 (MH/MS). But there are cases in OS and copies of OH manuscripts where a clause-initial conjunction occurs: *takku* LÚ.U$_{19}$.LU-*aš ELLAM-aš QĀSSU našma* GÌR=*ŠU kuiški tuwa*[*rnizzi*] ***nu=šše*** 20 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR *pāi* ‘If someone breaks a free person’s arm or leg, he shall give to him 20 shekels of silver’ KBo 6.2 i 20–21 (Laws §11, OS); *mān* (var. *našma*) *INA* KUR ^{URU}*Ḫatti* ***nu=za*** (var. ***nu-****uz-za*) *unattallan=pat arnuzzi* ‘If (var. ‘or if’) it is in the land of Ḫatti, he shall “bring” (the dead body of) the merchant himself’ KBo 6.3 i 12–13 (Laws §5, OH/NS), dupl. KBo 6.2 i 5–6 (OS). The conjunction *nu* is used mainly when a clitic is attached, but see also the first example in §29.18 (p. 394). For an example with *ta* and no clitic see §29.21 (p. 394).

29.11. In post-OH (including most OH/MS and OH/NS manuscripts) *nu* is normally used to introduce main clauses following subordinate ones: ‘(But if it is not cultivated land, but uncultivated (steppe), (they shall measure) 3 DANNAS in this direction and 3 DANNAS in that,) *nu=kan kuiš kuiš* URU-*aš anda* SI×SÁ-*ri* ***nu*** *apūš=pat dāi takku* URU-*aš* NU GÁL ***n=aš=kan*** *šamenzi* ‘and whatever town is determined within (that measured area), he shall take them. If, however, there is no town (in that area), he will forfeit (his claim)’ KBo 6.4 i 12–13 (Laws §IVb, NH); ‘(Ḫupašiya said to ^{d}Inar:) *mā*(*n*)*=wa katti=ti šešm*[*i* ***nu***]*=wa uwami kardiaš=taš iyami* ‘If I may sleep with you, I will proceed to do what you wish’ KBo 3.7 i 25–26 (OH/NS).

šu

29.12. *šu* connects independent clauses, which typically refer to sequential actions: *tuppuš šakanda šunnaš nu* DUMU.MEŠ=*ŠU andan zikēt* ***š=uš*** ÍD-*a tarnaš* ‘She filled (the

interstices of) the baskets with grease (in order to waterproof them), put her sons inside, and released them to the river' KBo 22.2 obv. 2–3 (OS); ^{m}*Šarmāššun* ^{m}*Nunnunn=a* $^{ḪUR.SAG}$*Taḫayai peḫuter n=uš* GUD-*li turier* ^{m}*Nunnušš=a* ^{LÚ}*kaina⟨n⟩=ššan ēpper* ***š=an*** ^{m}*Šarmāššuwi* ^{m}*Nunnuwi=ya šakuwaš=šma⟨š⟩ ḫuēkta* 'They led S. and N. to Mount T. and (*nu*) yoked them like oxen. They also seized the in-law of N. and (*šu*) slaughtered him before the eyes of S. and N.' KBo 3.34 i 15–18 (OH/NS). Note the apparently parallel use of *nu* and *šu* in the last example, usage assured as OH by the OS duplicate KUB 36.104 obv. 14–15; LUGAL-*š=a IŠME* ***š=aš*** *iyanniš* 'The king heard (about it), and he set out' KBo 22.2 rev. 7 (OS); *U* LÚ.MEŠ URU-*LIM natta pianzi* ***š=uš*** *tameššer* ***š=e*** *aker* 'But the men of the city would not give (them), so they oppressed them, and they died' KBo 22.2 rev. 12–13 (OS); *š=an* ^{d}*Ḫalmaš*[*uiz*] ^{d}*šīuš=*(*š*)*miš parā paiš* ***š=an*** *išpandi nakkit dāḫḫun* 'Then Ḫalmašuit, their god, handed it over, and I took it at night by force' KBo 3.22:46–48 (OS). Note that the last clause in each of the last two examples may also be read as 'final' clauses: 'so that they died' and 'so that I took it. . . .' We also find one example in a post-OH copy with the imperative: ḪUR.SAG-*i=kuw=at=šan* [NI]M. LÀL*=at udau* ***š=an*** *pedi=šši dāu* 'If it is on the mountain, let the bee bring it and put it in its place' KUB 43.60 i 5–6 (OH/NS). There are no examples of *šu* or *ta* linking clauses with imperatives in OS, while there are several with *nu*.

29.13. *šu* connects a subordinate (temporal) clause to a following independent clause: *mān=aš appezziyan=a kištanziattat* ***š=an*** ^{d}*Ḫalmaš*[*uiz*] ^{d}*šīuš=*(*š*)*miš parā paiš* 'But when subsequently (the city) suffered famine, their god Ḫalmašuit handed it over' KBo 3.22:45–47 (OS). The absence of *šu* connecting conditional clauses to main clauses is expected, given the restriction of *šu* to occurrence with the preterite.

29.14. *šu* connects a preposed relative clause to a main clause: *šardia⟨n⟩=ššann=a kuin uwatet* ***š=uš*** ^{URU}*Šal*[(*amp*)*i* . . .] 'And also the auxiliary troops that he brought, them in Šalampi [. . .]' KBo 3.22:37 (OS).

ta

29.15. *ta* connects independent main clauses in a chronologically sequential series of actions: [(*uwa*)]*mi kīdanda pattanit ekan utiškemi* ***ta*** *zaḫḫiškemi* [(***ta***=*za*)] *utnē ḫarnikmi kīdanda natīt*$^{!}$ (text *na-ti-i-da*) ***t=an*** *karda=šma šal*[(*ikti*)] 'I will proceed to carry ice with this basket. And I will fight, and I will destroy the land with this arrow, and you (the arrow?) shall penetrate their hearts' KUB 31.4+ obv. 8–9 (OH/NS); LUGAL-*uš* 3*=šU aīš=šet ārri* [(***t***=*at*)] *ḫurtiya*[(*li*)]*ya lāḫui* MUNUS.LUGAL-*š=a* 3*=šU aīš=šet* [(*ā*)]*rri* ***n=at*** *ḫurtiyaliya lāḫui* 'The king washes his mouth three times and pours it (the water) into the basin. The queen also washes her mouth three times and pours it into the basin' KBo 17.1 i 15–16 (OS). Note the apparently completely parallel use of *nu* and *ta* here; [. . .] ^{d}*Ḫantašepuš teššummiušš=a dāi* ***t***[*=ašta*] *parā paiw*[*a*]*n*[*i*] '[. . .] takes the Ḫ.-deities and the vessels, and we leave' KBo 17.1 I 38–39 (OS). See the use of *nu* in [. . . . .] *kiššari=mi dāi n=ašta parā paiwani* 'He puts [. . . . .] in my hand, and we leave' KBo 17.3+ i 15′ (OS).

29.16. *ta* introduces the last clause of a multi-clause apodosis: *takku* A.ŠÀ.ḪI.A NÍG.BA LUGAL *kuiški ḫarzi šaḫḫan luzzi nat*[*ta karpiezzi*] † LUGAL-*uš* ^{GIŠ}BANŠUR-*az* NINDA-*an dāi* ***ta***=*šše pāi* 'If someone holds fields as a gift from the king, he shall not [render] *šaḫḫan* (or) *luzzi*: the king shall take food from his table and give it to him' KBo 6.2 ii 43–44 (Laws §47a, OS).

29.17. *ta* introduces a result clause: *kinuna* LUGAL-*uš idalu mekki ūḫḫun* ***ta*** LUGAL-*wa*⟨*š*⟩ *uddārr*=*a*=*met lē šarrattuma* 'But now I, the king, have seen much evil, so you (plural) must not transgress even (*-a*/*-ya*) the words of me, the king' KBo 3.28:20–21 (OH/NS). In the following example, the NH scribe has used *nu* to introduce the second result clause: ḪUR.SAG-*an tarmaemi* ***t***=*ašta edi natta nēari* [(*arun*)]*an tarmāmi nu āppa natta lāḫui* 'I will fix the mountain in place, so that it may not move; I will fix the sea in place, so that it may not flow back' KUB 31.4 + KBo 3.41 13–14 (OH/NS) with dupl. KBo 13.78 obv. 15.

29.18. *ta* connects two subordinate clauses: [(*takk*)]*u* LÚ.U$_{10}$.LU-*an kuiški ḫūnikzi* ***t***=*an ištarnikzi nu apūn šāktāizzi* 'If someone injures a person, and (*ta*) he falls ill, he must care for him' KBo 6.2 i 16–17 = Laws §10 (OS) with dupl. KBo 6.3 i 25–28 (OH/NS); a wide variety of conjunctions join the following multi-clause protasis: *takku* LÚ-*aš* GUD=*ŠU* ÍD-*an zīnuškezzi tamaiš*=*a*=*an š*[(*uwaizzi*)] *nu* GUD-*aš* KUN-*an ēpzi* ***ta*** ÍD-*an zāi U BEL* G[(UD ÍD-*aš pēdai*)] 'If a man is making his ox cross a river, but (*-a-*/*-ma-*) another (person) shoves him off and (*nu*) seizes the ox's tail, and (*ta*) crosses the river, and (*U*) the river carries off the owner of the ox, . . .' KBo 6.2 ii 30–32 = Laws §43 (OS) with dupl. KBo 6.3 ii 52–53 (OH/NS).

29.19. *ta* connects a subordinate temporal clause to an independent clause: UD.2.KAM *mān lukta* ***t***[***a*** . . .] 'On the second day when it dawns, . . .' KBo 25.68 + KBo 17.13 rev. 9 (OS); [*m*(*ān lukkat*)]*ta*=*ma t*=*apa ḫaššanzi* 'But when it dawns, they open up' KBo 17.11+ i 31 (OS); *nu mān* LUGAL-*un* MUNUS.LUGAL-*a*[*nn*=*a* (*aniem*)*i*] ***ta*** LUGAL-*i kiššan tēmi* 'And when I treat the king and queen, I say to the king as follows:' StBoT 8 ii 15–16 (OS).

29.20. *ta* connects a preposed relative clause to a main clause: [*k*]*uiš šagaīš kīšari* ***ta*** LUGAL-*i* MUNUS.LUGAL=*ya tarweni* 'We tell the king and queen what portent occurs' KBo 17.1 iv 9 (OS); *nu ḫantezziyaš* LÚ-*aš kuit kuit p*[*ešta*] ***ta***=*šše šarnikzi* 'He compensates the first man for whatever he gave' KBo 6.3 ii 6–7 (Laws §28); [*kui*]*š*=*za* ^{LÚ}*ḫippari ḫāppar iezzi n*=*aš*=*kan ḫāpparaz* [*šeme*]*nzi* ^{LÚ}*ḫipparaš kuit ḫapparāit t*=*a*(*t*)=*z āppa dāi* 'Whoever makes a purchase from a *ḫippara*-man shall forfeit his purchase price, and the *ḫippara*-man shall take back what he sold' KBo 6.2 ii 51–52 (Laws 48). Note the use of both *nu* and *ta* connecting a relative clause to a main clause in the same passage.

29.21. *ta* connects a complex conditional clause to a following main clause: *takku iwaruaš išḫāš* $^{A.ŠÀ}$*kulēi ārki našm*[*a*=*šše*] LÚ.MEŠ URU-*LIM* A.ŠÀ.ḪI.A-*an pianzi* ***ta*** *luzzi karpiezzi* 'If an heir cuts out for himself/herself idle land, or the men of the village give him/her land, (s)he shall render the *luzzi*-services' KBo 6.2 ii 41–42 (Laws §46, OS).

29.22. *ta* connects a single conditional clause to a following main clause (so far only in post-OH copies): *takku=wa=ššan kī ḫazzizi* ***ta****=wa* DINGIR-*LUM takku=wa=ššan natta=ma ḫa*[*zzizi*] ***ta****=wa antuwaḫḫeš ta=wa* [. . .] *zaḫḫuweni* 'If he guesses this correctly, it is a god; if he does not guess correctly, it is a human being, and we will fight [. . .]' KBo 3.60 ii 14–17. The absence of a subject clitic in both apodoses may be due to the subject being non-referential ('it is', not 'he is': meaning essentially 'we are dealing with' a god or a human being).

Enclitic Clause-Linking Conjunctions

29.23. In addition to the clause-initial clause-linking conjunctions *nu*, *šu*, and *ta*, Hittite has two enclitics, topicalizing/contrastive *-a*/*-ma* (cf. CHD *-ma*) and conjunctive/additive *-a*/*-ya*, which among other uses can serve to link clauses.

-a/*-ma*

Form

29.24. In OH the topicalizing/contrastive enclitic conjunction appears as *-a* after words ending in a consonant and as *-ma* after vowels (see Rieken 2000a: 412, following Melchert).[8] As first pointed out by Houwink ten Cate (1973b), topicalizing/contrastive *-a* does *not* geminate a preceding consonant, whereas conjunctive/additive *-a* does. See below, §29.38 (p. 399), for more on this feature.

29.25. In MH/MS *-ma* is generalized as the topicalizing/contrastive marker also after words ending in a consonant. The non-geminating *-a* is regularly still used only after independent personal pronouns (see end of §29.30, p. 397, below, on this usage): e.g., *ug=a* KUB 14.1 obv. 26, KUB 23.72 obv. 40; *ammug=a* HKM 10:26; *zig=a* HKM 10:30; *tug=a* HKM 52:10; *weš=a* KUB 23.77 lower edge 50; *šumeš=a* KBo 16.27 i 7; *šumāš=a* HKM 75:22. It is also still found occasionally with personal names, but alternating with *-ma*: ^{m}*Madduwattaš=a* KUB 14.1 obv. 18 etc. but also ^{m}*Madduwattaš=ma* KUB 14.1 obv. 72 etc. Other use of non-geminating *-a* in MH compositions is extremely rare: *antuḫšaš=a=kan* HKM 38:5; *memiyanuš=a=kan* KBo 16.27 iv 27; *kaštit=a=man* KUB 14.1 obv. 12; *išnaš=a=šmaš=šan* KBo 39.8 ii 7 (MS, cf. Miller 2004: 219). In NH only *-ma* is used productively. *kinuna* serves as a mere variant of *kinun* 'now', and an isolated example such as *ug=a=kan ANA* ^{m}NIR.GÁL . . . 'In me, Muwatalli . . .' in KUB 6.45 iii 60 is surely an imitation of older usage in the context of a prayer.

Position

29.26. *-a*/*-ma* is usually attached to the first accented word in the clause. There are two systematic exceptions (see the CHD under *-ma* f for further details). First, in OH and

8. We do find in OS a few examples of *-a* after *-e*: e.g., *kē=a* KUB 31.143a iii 23 and *kē=a=šta* in KUB 8.41 ii 9 vs. *kē=ma=šta* ibid. ii 13 in parallel contexts. See also p. 399, n. 14.

MH *-a/-ma* is not attached to the subordinating conjunctions *takku*, *mān*, and disjunctive *našma*[9] but is postponed to the second accented word:[10] *takku=at=an parna=ma kuēlka peššiezzi* 'But if he disposes of them in someone's house' KBo 6.2 ii 35 (Laws §44b, OS). In NH one finds instead regularly *mān=ma*. Second, when it is used to mark alternatives in double questions (see CHD *-ma* a 1′ b′ 4″ and §29.31, p. 397, below), *-a/-ma* is attached to that word in the second question which constitutes the alternative, wherever that word appears in the clause (see the first example cited in §29.31).[11]

29.27. *-a/-ma* occurs only on the second and succeeding members of a sequence of topic changes. In what at first glance seems to be an exception: *ḫuišwatar=ma=pa anda ḫingani ḫaminkan ḫingan=a=ma=pa anda ḫuišwanni=ya ḫaminkan* (so HED H 66, CHD *-ma* a 2′; same mistaken analysis on *ki-nu-na-ma-pa* by HW² A 128b) we must rather segment *ḫuišwatar=m(u)=apa . . . ḫingan=a=m(u)=apa* and render 'Life for me is bound up with death; death on the other hand (*ḫingan=a*) is for me bound up with life too (*-ya*)' (so CHD *-mu* a, correcting the above earlier analysis). The loss of *u* before the *a* in *-apa* is in accord with the rule stated in CHD *-mu* a (and see above in §1.72, p. 32), and explains the *a* between *ḫingan* and *-ma-pa.* The *-a* is the correct form for topicalizing *-a/-ma* following a consonant.

Function

29.28. The main function of *-a/-ma* is to signal a change of topic with respect to some constituent in the preceding clause. Although there is a semblance of clause contrast, in most cases it can be seen that what is being contrasted is a particular constituent in each of the two clauses.

29.29. Thus (as in the CHD article on *-ma* a) the first and primary function is "marking the correlation of single words in adjacent clauses": *karū . . . kinun=a* 'formerly . . . but now' Laws §81 (OS) and passim in the laws; *karū . . .* [*app*]*ezziyan=a* 'formerly . . . but subsequently' KBo 3.22:39, 41 (OS), see ibid. 46; *šarāzzi . . . kattirra=ma* 'above . . . below' KUB 31.127 ii 1, 3 (OH/NS), ZAG-*az=tet . . .* GÙB-*laz=ma=tta* 'on your right

9. *našma*, being itself a contracted form of *naššu=ma* (§1.77, p. 33), would not be expected to host an additional *-ma*, although one does find *namma=ma*.

10. We are unaware of examples of postponement beyond the second position. Apparent examples involving logograms are misleading, since the underlying Hittite word order differs, e.g.: *mān* EN $^{A.ŠÀ}$A.GÀR*=ma* TI-*anza* 'but if the field's owner is (still) living' KBo 6.4 iv 18 (Laws §XXXVII, NH), ed. LH 57, where the underlying Hittite would have the genitive 'field's' ($^{A.ŠÀ}$A.GÀR) preceding the sg. nom. 'owner' (EN = *išḫāš*). From a Hittite perspective the entire group EN $^{A.ŠÀ}$A.GÀR is a unit. See also [(*takku* A.ŠÀ.ḪI)].A *ŠA ŠANÎM=ma ḫarzi* 'But if he holds fields of another' KBo 6.2 + KBo 19.1 ii 16 = Laws §39 (OS). The rule that *-a/-ma* is not postponed beyond the second position helps to demonstrate that in *takku* $^{A.ŠÀ.ḪI.A}$*kulēi=ma ārki* 'But if he divides up *kule*-fields' KBo 6.2 ii 47 = Laws §47B (OS) A.ŠÀ.ḪI.A is a determinative and *kulēi* a nominative-accusative rather than a dative-locative; see LH 56 n. 187.

11. There are some instances of postponed *-ma* whose motivation remains to be explained: e.g., *nu=kan mašiēš imma* UD.ḪI.A *anda=ma* SI×SÁ-*ri n=aš=kan* UGU GUB-*ri* 'He (the king) will stay up there however many days are determined for that(?) by oracle' KUB 5.1 i 60–61 (NH).

. . . on your left' ABoT 44 i 59–60 (OH/NS); GUD-*uš=za* AMAR-*un* UL *kappuwaizzi* [UD]U-*uš=ma=za* SILA$_4$-*an* UL *kappuwaizzi* 'The cow doesn't take care of her calf; the sheep doesn't take care of her lamb' KUB 33.37 + KUB 33.39 iv 4–5 (OH/NS); *nu=za kuišš=a* (var. [*ku*]*iš*) DUMU.NITA-*li* N[INDA-]*an* UZU.Ì*=ya pāi* [*kui*]*š=ma=za* DUMU.NITA-*li aku*[(*wa*)]*nna pāi* 'One (of the men in the community) gives bread and meat to his son, and another gives something to drink to his son' KUB 24.8 i 19–21 (OH/NS) with dupl. KUB 43.70b:6–8. Several of the above marked pairs are lexically contrastive (right-left, upper-lower). But we also find the particle marking identical pronouns or pronominally based adverbs in a sequence where each has a different referent: 3 *wattaru iēt kēdani* . . . *kēdani=ma* . . . *kēdani=ma* . . . 'He made three wells: at this one . . . , at this (other) one . . . , (and) at this (other) one . . .' KUB 33.59 iii 7–9 (OH/MS); *kāš=man kūn ēpz*[*i*] [*k*]*āš=a=man kūn ēpzi* 'This one might seize that one, and this (other) one might seize that (other) one' KBo 6.2 ii 56–57 (Laws §49, OS); *kēz* . . . *kēz=ma* 'on this side . . . but on this (other) side' KUB 19.37 ii 20, 21, 24 (NH).

29.30. From the above examples and the others cited in the CHD *-ma* a 1′ it can be seen that the translation 'but' rarely fits and that, while there is contrast, the primary concern is signaling a *change of topic*: from the cow to the sheep, from the right hand to the left, from the spring to the harvest, from the one well to the other two in the sequence, or the one father giving food to the other father giving drink. Sometimes a change of subjects is marked by *-a*/*-ma: išḫaš=šiš* UZU.Ì *dāi apāš=a* KUŠ UDU *dāi* 'his (the shepherd's) master shall take the meat (of the sheep), but he himself (i.e., the shepherd) (*-a*/*-ma*) shall take the sheepskin' KBo 6.2 iv 14–15 (Laws §80, OS); *maḫḫan=ma=za ABU=YA* ^{m}*Muršiliš* DINGIR-*LIM-iš kišat* ŠEŠ*=YA=ma=za=kan* ^{m}NIR.GÁL *ANA* ^{GIŠ}GU.ZA *ABI=ŠU ešat ammuk=ma=za ANA PANI* ŠEŠ*=YA* EN.KARAŠ *kišḫaḫat* 'But when my father Muršili died (lit., became a god), and my brother Muwatalli sat down on the throne of his father, I during my brother's reign became commander of the army' KUB 1.1 i 22–24 (NH). It is this common use of *-a*/*-ma* to mark a change of subject that accounts for its popularity in being affixed to (often fronted) independent pronouns: *ú-ga* 'but I' StBoT 25 #3 ii 6 (OS); StBoT 25 #4 iii 37 (OS); *zi-ga* 'but you' HKM 58:30 (MH/MS), KUB 1.16 ii 67 and KUB 31.110 10′ (OH/NS); *ú-e-ša* 'but we' KBo 22.2 obv. 11 (OS), KBo 16.50:11 (MH/MS); *šu-me-ša* 'but you (pl.)' KUB 1.16 iii 49 (OH/NS); *šu-me-e-ša* KUB 23.72 rev. 64 (MH/MS); [*šu-me-*]*e-ša* KUB 23.68 rev. 11 (MH/NS); *a-pa-a-ša* 'but she' KBo 6.2 iv 15 (OS); *a-pa-ša* KBo 3.22:72 (OS), VBoT 58 i 16 (OH/NS); *a-pé-e-ma* 'but they' KBo 20.26 + KBo 25.34 obv. 14 (OS).

29.31. Obviously a construction so well fitted to mark a change in topic and signal a contrast was perfectly adapted to mark alternatives in double questions which pose contrary or at least mutually exclusive alternatives: *n=at pānzi ANA* DINGIR-*LIM IŠTU* NA$_4$ *pianzi* . . . *n=at ANA* DINGIR-*LIM IŠTU* KÙ.GI*=ma pianzi* 'Shall they proceed to give it to the deity with gems . . . or shall they give it to the deity with gold?' KUB 22.70 obv. 51–53 (NH); especially common when the second alternative is a simple negation: *nu=war=at* ŠE[Š*=YA IDE nu=w*]*ar=at ŪL=ma IDE* 'Does my brother know it, or does he not know it?'

KUB 14.3 i 52 (NH). That the *-ma* in these cases is not a clause connective is obvious in the cases where its clause is already introduced by *nu.*

29.32. It may well be that from the established use of *-a*/*-ma* to mark change of topic within two adjacent clauses there developed a more general use to contrast the adjacent clauses themselves. One can probably see this in the first *-ma* occurring in the example from KUB 1.1 i 22–24 ('but when . . .') cited above in §29.30 (p. 397). But most of the examples cited in CHD *-ma* b (pp. 93–94) to support this usage can instead be used as illustrations supporting the former use. What makes some of them appear to mark clause contrast is the fact that the element within the clauses that is contrasted is the verb itself, even identical verbs, or the negation: *aliyaš=wa ŪL wāi ŪL=ma=wa wāki ŪL=ma=wa išparrezzi* 'The deer makes no (loud) cry, nor does it bite, nor does it trample' KUB 14.1 rev. 91 (MH/MS) (further exx. in CHD *-ma* b 4′); *ŪL* GUD-*uš ŪL=ma=wa* UDU-*uš* 'there were no cattle, nor were there sheep' KUB 36.51 obv. 7 (OH/NS). Nevertheless, there do appear to be rare examples where the contrast is probably[12] the entire clause: 'If a girl is betrothed to a man, and he pays the bride-price for her, and subsequently the parents abrogate it and withhold her from the man, they shall repay double the aforementioned bride-price,) *takku* LÚ-*š=a* (*-a*/*-ma*) DUMU.MUNUS *nawi dāi n=an=za mimmai* 'but if the man has not yet taken the girl, and he refuses her, (he must forfeit the bride-price which he paid)' KBo 6.3 ii 14 (Laws §§29–30); *takku=za* MUNUS-*za* LÚ-*an m*[*immai*] . . . *takku=za* LÚ-*š=a* MUNUS-*an šuw*[*ezzi*] 'If a woman rejects a man (i.e., wishes a divorce) . . . If on the other hand a man expe[ls] (i.e., divorces) a woman' KUB 26.56 ii 1, 4 (Laws §26, OH/NS); 'If in a village someone holds fields as an inheritance share (*iwaru*), . . .' *takku=šše* A.ŠÀ.ḪI.A-*š=a te*[*-e-pu-uš piyanza*] 'But if the fields [are given] to him f[ew in number]' KBo 6.2 ii 39 (Laws §46, OS); *takku addaš=šeš=a ḫuišwanza* 'but if his father is (still) living' KUB 29.34 iv 13 (Laws §190, OH/NS).

29.33. The use in the expression *namma=ma . . . tamai-* (CHD *-ma* b 8′) may have to do with the implied topic change signaled by the adjective *tamai-* 'another'. See also: [(*tamāi*)]*š=a=kan pēran wal*[*aḫz*]*i* 'but another man strikes first' KUB 29.30 + KUB 29.29 ii 18 (Laws §148, OS) with restoration from KBo 6.10 iii 26 (OH/NS).

29.34. The use with anaphora (CHD *-ma* d) also grows out of the topicalizing function, although the change of topic may not always be very clear. That it does grow out of this topicalizing function is seen in the fronting of the repeated word, to which then *-a*/*-ma* is suffixed: ^{d}UTU-*š=at aruni pēda*[*š*] § *aruni=ma* URUDU-*aš palḫaeš kianda*[*ri?*] 'The Sun-god took it off to the sea, and in that sea copper vessels are lying' KUB 33.66 ii 8–9 (OH/MS?); *ANA* DINGIR-*LIM pēran* ^{GIŠ}*eyan a*[*rta*] ^{GIŠ}*eyaz=ma=kan* UDU-*aš kuršaš kank*[*anza*] 'Before the deity a fir tree st[ands], and from that fir tree a hunting bag is han[ging]' KUB 33.38 iv 6–7 (OH/MS).

29.35. The CHD proposes to see another extension of the root use of *-a*/*-ma* in its use to show concurrent actions, with or without *kuitman* in the immediately preceding

12. The motivation here too could be change of subject from 'girl' and 'parents' to 'the man'.

clause (*-ma* b 7′): *nu kuitman ABU=YA INA* KUR ^{URU}*Kargamiš*^{iš} *kattan ēšta* ^{m}*Lupakkin=ma=kan . . . parā naišta* ‘And while my father was in the land of Carchemish, he sent out Lupakki . . .’ KBo 5.6 iii 1–3 (NH); *n=at parā tiyanzi* ^{LÚ}Ì.DU$_8$*=ma=aš=kan ḫa*[*tti*]*li lamnit ḫalziššai* ‘(those who spend the night up in the palace) step forward, (while) the gateman calls them by name in Ḫattic’ KBo 5.11 i 6–7. And although here too the actual motivating factor may sometimes be either a change of subject, verb, or topic, there does seem to be good reason to believe that this extended usage exists.

29.36. The root use of marking a change of topic is further extended in the use of clause-initial *anda=ma* ‘now in addition’,[13] which (often immediately following a paragraph break) signals a change to another matter for discussion (see CHD *-ma* e 2′ a′). In the Akkadian letters from Amarna the same function is performed by the word *šanītam* ‘now in addition (e.g., on another subject; lit., ‘secondly’).’ Another good example is found in a MH letter from Kuşaklı-Šarišša: § *ANA* DUMU.MUNUS.MEŠ*=ya laḫraš* (42) MUŠEN.ḪI.A *aumen nu laḫraš* (43) MUŠEN.ḪI.A *arḫa pe*[*šš*]*ier* § (44) *anda=ma=mu ANA* GA[L] KÙ.GI (45) *kuit ḫatrāeš n=an kankaḫḫun* (46) *nu* 30 GÍN.GÍN.NU KI.LAL*=ŠU* (47) *n=an ANA* ^{m}*Walwalli ADDIN* ‘And about the young women we observed the (oracle) birds of *laḫraš*, and the birds gave a negative answer. § On another subject: regarding what you wrote to me about the gold cup: I weighed it, and its weight was 30 shekels. And I gave it to Walwalli’ KuT 50 41–47, ed. Wilhelm 1998: 181–84.

29.37. For *-a*/*-ma* in *kuiša* see §8.4 (p. 150).

-a/*-ya*

Form

29.38. Conjunctive/additive *-a*/*-ya* takes the form *-a* after syllabically written Hittite words ending in a consonant, which consonant is then geminated, but *-ya* after syllabically written words ending in a vowel: *a-pa-a-aš-ša* (*apāšš=a*) ‘(s)he too’, *a-pé-e-ya* (*apē=ya*) ‘those too’.[14] In Old Hittite the topicalizing/constrastive particle would be written *a-pa-a-ša* (*apāš=a*) ‘he on the other hand’ and *a-pé-e-ma* ‘those on the other hand’. In NH there occasionally arises a double writing of the conjunction (*-aya*) following a word ending in a consonant, usually with the gemination of that consonant

13. This is similar to the use of *anda* in *anda=ya=šši* ‘and in addition to it’ KBo 6.3 iii 61 (OH/NS, older *anda=šše* KBo 6.2 iii 57, OS) = Laws §70. The example *an-da-še-ya* Laws §110 in copy d (LH 107, 269) shows the same order of clitics as *parna=šše=a šuwayezzi*.

14. There is only one small set of exceptions to this rule. We do find in the older language a very few examples of *-a* after *-e* (HW^2 A 43b): (As he chants before the *ḫalputi*), *kē=a QATAMMA* ‘these things too (he chants) in the same way’ KBo 25.112 ii 14-15 (OS); *nu kē=a QATAMMA*[*=pat l*]*inker* ‘These (men) too have sworn an oath in the [very] same way’ KBo 8.35 ii 28 (Treaty; MH/MS); *I-NA* NINDA.ḪI.A *a-ku-wa-an-na-e-a* $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$*išpunn*[*aleš*] [. . .]*-zi* ‘the *išpunala*-men […] in food and drink’ KBo 11.34 i 9-11, where the extra *-a* shows that the *-e* is not simply a misdrawn *-ya*. See also LH 168 on *parna=šše=a* in the Laws (and in §30.17, p. 411, below). These examples may reflect the use of *-e-a* to spell /-ya/ in word-final position. See AHP 35 and 141. Apparent exceptions such as *me-ma-al-ya* KBo 15.34 iii 8 and *i-ya-at-ya* KUB 21.38 obv. 54 are the result of weary, careless, or unskilled scribes.

(HW^2 43b): *a-pád-da-ya* ‘that too’, *a-ra-wa-an-na-aš-ša-ya* ‘and the *a.*-ritual’, *ḫa-a-da-an ḫar-ra-a-an-na-ya* ‘dried and crushed’, GAD-*it-ta-ya* ‘and with a linen cloth’, but rarely without the gemination: *ki-nu-na-ya* ‘now too’, *a-pa-a-ša-ya* ‘and that one’. In Old Hittite the gemination or lack of such before *-a*, which distinguished the conjunctive-additive from the topicalizing/contrastive marker, was often obscured with logograms by the occcasional practice of writing only one syllabic Hittite sign after the logogram. If LUGAL and MUNUS.LUGAL were nominative, the pair could be written either LUGAL(*-uš*) MUNUS.LUGAL-*aš-ša* or LUGAL(*-uš*) MUNUS.LUGAL-*ša* (standing for **ḫaššuš ḫaššušaraššʾa*) ‘the king and queen’. But in post-Old Hittite the same combination would be written LUGAL(*-uš*) MUNUS.LUGAL*=ya*. Because the topicalizing/contrastive *-a* had disappeared in New Hittite (see §29.25, p. 395), copyists did not always understand its usage in older texts and replaced it incorrectly with geminating *-a* rather than with *-ma*. One must therefore sometimes interpret geminating *-a* in such copies as the topicalizing/contrastive marker. Rarely the opposite is true: intended conjunctive/additive *-a*/*-ya* is wrongly written without gemination of the preceding consonant: [*ku-i*]*t da-a-an da-ya-na* ‘what was taken and stolen’ HKM 30:24 (MH/MS).

Position

29.39. When it connects *clauses*, conjunctive/additive *-a*/*-ya* regularly is attached to the first accented word in the clause. Like *-a*/*-ma* (see §29.26, p. 395) it can be postponed to the next accented word following *takku*, *mān*, etc. Since these subordinating conjunctions are regularly clause-initial, this means that postponed *-a*/*-ya* and *-a*/*-ma* must attach to the second accented word in the clause. If for some reason the subordinating conjunction itself is postponed, *-a*/*-ya* and *-a*/*-ma* will appear on the next accented word following the conjunction: [*nu*]*=za mān irmalanzaš=a ēšta* ^{d}UTU-*ši=ma*[*=t*]*ta* [ANA] *AŠAR ABI=KA tittanunun=pat* ‘Even though you were ill, I His Majesty still installed you in the place of your father’ KBo 5.9 i 16–17 (NH). For further examples of *-a*/*-ya* postponed to the second word of the clause see CHD *mān* 7d. When *-a*/*-ya* connects a series of words in the same clause, it attaches to the last word in the series (see §29.40).

Function

Connecting Individual Words

29.40. *-a*/*-ya* is the only connective which joins *individual words*. Some examples are: *nu=tta* DINGIR.MEŠ ^{d}É.A-*aššʾa ḫattannaš* LUGAL-*uš aššuli paḫšantaru* ‘May the gods and Ea, the (divine) king of wisdom, keep you in good health’ HKM 3:18–20; *kāša=wa* $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$*šapašalliēš AŠPUR nu=wa* ^{URU}*Malazzian* ^{URU}*Taggaštann=a šapaˈšiyar* ‘I have just sent scouts, and they have scouted the cities Malazzia and Taggašta’ HKM 6:18–22 (MH/MS).

Connecting Clauses

29.41. *-a*/*ya-* can also be used to connect clauses, when actions are viewed as parallel to one another: (he shall pay so many shekels of silver) *āššu=ya* 3*=šU šarnikzi* ‘and he shall replace the goods threefold’ KBo 6.4 i 5 (laws parallel series §III, NH), (he

shall give six shekels of silver to the injured man,) ^{LÚ}A.ZU=*ya kuššan apāš=pat pāi* 'and he shall give the fee to the physician' KBo 6.2 i 19 (Laws §10, OS); (If a man defiles a vessel, previously they gave 6 shekels of silver, he who defiles (used to) give three shekels of silver,) [LUGAL]-*ann=a parna* 3 GÍN KUBABBAR *dašker* 'and they used to take three shekels of silver for the house of [the kings]' KBo 6.2 i 58a (Laws §25, OS). It is important to note that Hittite *-a*/*-ya*, unlike English 'and' or German *und*, is not used to connect consecutive actions (see correctly Friedrich HE I §304). That is, it does not stand for 'and (then)', for which Hittite uses one of the sentence connectives *nu*, *šu*, or *ta* (see §29.6, p. 390; §29.12, p. 392; §29.15, p. 393).

Correlative 'both . . . and'

29.42. The Hittite equivalent of 'both . . . and' is a pair of correlative *-a*/*-ya*, whether connecting individual words or clauses. Examples: *āppann=a perann=a* 'both behind and in front' KBo 7.14 i 9 (OS); *ištananaš kett=a kētt=a* 'on both this side and that side of the altar' KUB 32.117 rev.$^{!}$ 12 + KBo 19.156 iii 5 (OS); *erma*(*n*)*=šmaš=kan dāḫḫun kardi=šmi=ya=at=kan dāḫḫu*[*n*] [(*ḫarša*)]*ni=šmi=ya=at=kan dāḫḫun* 'I have taken the sickness from you. I have both taken it from your heart(s) and taken it from your head(s)' KBo 17.1 i 12–13 (OS). Double *-a*/*-ya* plus the negative is equivalent to 'neither . . . nor': *namma=ma=kan* KUR ^{URU}*Ḫapālla kuenta=ya* $Ū_L$ *ēpta=ya=at* $Ū_L$ 'But then you neither attacked the land of Ḫapalla nor seized it' KUB 14.1 ii 23 (MH/MS).

Additive 'also, too' and Concessive 'even'

29.43. In some cases clause-connecting *-a*/*-ya* has an additive force best expressed by 'also' or 'too': (If I, My Majesty, go to war . . .) *nu=mu ziqq=a QADU* ÉRIN.MEŠ ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ *kattan laḫḫeškeši* 'you too shall go to war with me with your troops and chariots' KUB 21.5 iii 21 (NH); *nu-za* ^{d}*IŠTAR* GAŠAN-*YA parā ḫandandatar apēdani=ya meḫuni tikkuššanut* '*IŠTAR* My Lady displayed her providence also at that time' Ḫatt. iii 15–16 Also Ḫatt. iv 18–19 in a variant of the same sentence. See the position of *apiya=ya* 'then too' in Ḫatt. ii 37, 38, 45.

29.44. Sometimes *-a*/*-ya* has the concessive sense 'even' (see German *auch*): *našma=kan kēl tuppiaš* 1-*ann=a memian waḫnuzi* 'or changes even one word of this tablet' BrTabl. iv 19–20 (Tudḫ. IV). This use is especially common with the conjunction *mān* in the meaning 'even if' (see §30.46, p. 419).

29.45. When *-a*/*-ya* functions in one of these two senses, it occurs on the focus word, wherever that word occurs in the clause.

Asyndeton

Form

29.46. Asyndeton is the simple juxtaposition of coordinate discourse elements without conjunction. Our concern here will not be with juxtaposed nouns and noun phrases

(e.g., *ezzan* GIŠ-*ru* ‘straw (and) wood’, and the Hittite equivalents of GUD UDU ‘cattle (and) sheep’[15]), but with clauses.

29.47. The absence of a conjunction is normally obvious and therefore easily recognized. But there is at least one situation in which it is masked. When a clause-initial word ending in a consonant hosts a clitic pronoun beginning with the vowel *a*, a situation is created in which the presence of the clitic conjunction *-a-/-ma-*[16] in OH or the clitic conjunction *-a-/-ya-* in NH is uncertain. In Old Hittite a combination such as *zi-ga-an* could be analyzed either as *zig=a=an* (with *-a-/-ma-*) or as *zig=an* (asyndeton). One can disambiguate such cases only by comparison with clear examples in parallel constructions: *kuel=a=aš arḫi aki* ‘on whoever’s property he is killed’ KBo 6.2 i 7–8 (Laws §6, OS) can be shown not to be asyndeton on the basis of clear examples such as *kuiš=a=šmaš* LÚ.KÚR LÚ *ṬEMI uiēzzi* ‘whatever enemy sends an envoy to you’ KUB 23.72 rev 22 (MH); *kuitmān=aš lazziatta* ‘until he recovers’ KBo 6.2 i 17–18 (OS) is shown to be asyndetic by other examples of postposed *kuitman* clauses (§30.37, p. 416). The situation is even more obscure when the host word is a logogram, in which case gemination of the final consonant might not be shown by the writing of the phonetic complement. In OS LUGAL-*ša-an* can stand for *LUGAL-*ušš=a=an*, *LUGAL-*uš=a=an*, or *LUGAL-*uš=an*! In post-OH, when *-ma* assumed the role of its allomorph, there remained no possibility of confusing such clauses in which topicalizing *-ma* occurred with cases of asyndeton: the former was written *zi-ik-ma-an* (e.g., KBo 10.13 + KBo 10.12 ii 32); EGIR-*an=ma=as* KBo 6.4 ii 21); LUGAL.GAL*=ma=an=kan* (KBo 10.2 ii 47), LUGAL-(*uš-*)*ma-an*;[17] and the latter *zi-ga-an* KBo 5.9 ii 41; LUGAL-*uš-at-za* BrTabl. iv 23, or DINGIR-*LUM-an* KUB 5.1 i 65, 68, iii 62. While further study is needed, it appears that in NH ambiguous spellings with logograms such as LUGAL-*ša-an* were avoided in favor of indicating asyndeton either with a fuller phonetic complement (e.g., LUGAL-*uš-an*) or no complement at all (e.g., LUGAL-*an*).

Function

29.48. The most obvious situation in which asyndeton is appropriate is where there is no connection to a previous clause. One finds this use primarily at the beginning of compositions, or at the beginning of recorded speech. Beginning entire compositions:

15. The combination LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL ‘king and queen’, on the other hand, is shown by OH examples to have contained a clitic conjunction.

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

17. But there are examples of *-a-/-ma-* erroneously written with gemination by NH scribes, such as *a-ki-iš-ša-an* KBo 3.36 18′, where its duplicate A ii 12 has *a-ki-iš-ma-aš tepšauwanni* ‘but he died in poverty’, showing that the OH original had **a-ki-ša-an* (*akiš=a=an*), with topicalizing *-a-/-ma-*and OH local particle *-an* (but see Dardano 1997: 98–99, who takes it as asyndeton *akiš=šan*). Both Dardano’s interpretation and Kammenhuber’s interpretations (the latter reading *akišš=an* ‘starb ihn’) require asyndeton. But since asyndeton is not attested to introduce strong contrast (‘but’, ‘rather’), one may doubt these analyses.

^{d}UTU-*e išḫa=mi ḫandanza ḫannešnaš išḫaš* . . . KUR-*e zik dudduškeši* ‘O Sungod, my lord, just lord of judgment . . . you have mercy upon the land(s)’ KUB 31.127 i 1–3. Beginning a long narrative following a brief introduction: *karū=ššan karūil*[*iy*]*aš* MU.ḪI.A-*aš* ^{d}*Alaluš* AN-*ši* LUGAL-*uš ēšta* ‘Long ago Alalu was king in heaven’ KUB 33.120 i 7–8. Beginning recorded speech: *karū=wa ēšḫar* ^{URU}*Ḫattuši makkešta* ‘Formerly in Ḫattuša bloodshed was common’ THeth 11 ii 48 (OH/NS); even in a dialogue where the speakers change several times: see KUB 30.28 rev. 1–13 with dupl. KBo 34.80:1′–8′, ed. Otten 1958: 96–97, or when a single speaker simulates a dialog for rhetorical purposes, asking a question and then answering it (see KUB 14.3 ii 72–7 in §29.51). But note that discourse-initial *nu* does occur, when there is a conscious allusion to something said by the previous speaker (‘then’, ‘so’): see the examples cited in §27.7, p. 350 (KUB 1.16 ii 9); §27.8, p. 351 (KBo 21.22:22–25); §27.9, p. 351 (KBo 21.22:41–42); and §27.10, p. 352 (VBoT 58 i 23).

29.49. When there is a preceding clause, the relationship of the two clauses determines whether or not a conjunction is called for. If the subsequent of two or more juxtaposed clauses expresses the same thought in a different form, usually no conjunction is employed: *ammuk=ma=za parā ḫandānza kuit* UN-*aš ešun* † *PANI* DINGIR.MEŠ *kuit parā ḫandandanni iyaḫḫaḫat* † *ŠA* DUMU NAM.LÚ.U$_{19}$.LU-*UTTI* ḪUL-*lu uttar UL kuwapikki iyanun* ‘But because I was an upright person, † because I conducted myself in uprightness before the gods, † because I never committed the evil deeds of (other) mortals, (you, O goddess, my lady, rescued me from all harm)’ Ḫatt. i 46–50 (NH). The most common form of this repetition of the same thought in other words is when one of the two clauses is negative and the other positive (or vice versa): exx. *takku ŪL=ma* $^{A.ŠÀ}$A.GÀR † *dammel pēdan* ‘But if it is not cultivated ground, (that is to say) it is virgin terrain’ KBo 6.4 i 11 (Laws §IVb, NH), see LH 11–13, 20, 172–73; *takku=šši* A.ŠÀ.ḪI.A-*uš ḫūmanza UL pianza* † *tepu=šši piyan* ‘If the cultivated land is not given him in (its) entirety, (that is) what is give to him is partial’ KBo 6.4 iv 23–24 (Laws §XXXVIII, NH). See also KBo 12.38 ii 4–10 (NH) cited in §7.1 (p. 142).

29.50. A circumstantial clause essential to the subordinate conditional clause can be asyndetic (further exx. in HE §310e): *takku* LÚ *ELLUM arawanniuš annanekuš anna*(*n*)*=šmann=a uenzi* † *kāš takiya utnē kāšš=a takiya utnēya* † *ŪL ḫara*[*tar*] ‘If a free man has sex with free maternal sisters and their mother — † the one (being) in one country and the other in another, † there is no crime’ KBo 6.26 iii 32–34 (Laws §191, OH/NS). Often such clauses serve as inserted explanatory glosses (HE §310d): *kuiš=aš imma k*[*ui*]*š ŠA* É.GAL-*LIM* MUNUS † *mān=aš ELLUM* † *mān*⟨*=aš*⟩ MUNUS.SUḪUR.LÁ ‘Whatever palace woman — † whether she is free or ⟨she⟩ is a hierodule’ KBo 5.3 iii 44–45 (MH/NS).

29.51. Another variation of this use is when a question is asked and then answered by a rhetorical question: *ŠA* LÚ.GAL.GAL-*TIM* É=*SUNU kuwapi* † *ŪL=at harkēr* ‘Where are the estates of the great men? † Have they not perished?’ KUB 1.16 iii 45 (OH/NS); *kāš=ma* ^{LÚ}*QARTAPPU kuiš* † *ŠA* MUNUS.LUGAL=*za kuit ŠA* MÁŠ-*TI ḫarzi* † *INA* KUR ^{URU}*Ḫatti*

ŠA MUNUS.LUGAL MÁŠ-*TUM mekki šalli n=aš=mu ŪL imma* ^{LÚ}*ḪA⟨DA⟩NU* ‘But who is this chariot driver? † Because he belongs to the family of the queen — † in the land of Ḫatti the queen’s family is extremely important — is he not my son-in-law?’ KUB 14.3 ii 72–74 (= Sommer 1932: ii 73–75, NH).

29.52. Conditional clauses, both with *takku* and *mān* ‘if’, even if they do not start a new section of the composition, often take no introductory conjunction: *mān=ši!=kan BEL=ŠU*(!) *šer ŪL šarnikzi* ‘If his master does not make compensation for him (i.e., the slave who has incurred a penalty)’ KUB 8.81 + KBo 19.39 iii 6 (MH/MS); *mān* 2 ZU$_8$ *našma* 3 ZU$_8$ *lāki* ‘If he knocks out two teeth or three teeth’ KBo 6.4 i 18–19 (NH).

29.53. In Old Hittite it is common for the apodosis following a conditional clause using *takku* ‘if’ to lack an introductory conjunction (see §29.10, p. 392, and §30.48, p. 420, and the first example in §29.50, p. 403). Old Hittite compositions, even in NS copies, and where *mān* instead of *takku* is the ‘if’ word, sometimes preserve this pattern: *mān=šamaš=šta* [*ēšḫar*] *šiyāri* † *apē tandukiš* ‘If [blood] spurts from them, † they are mortals’ KUB 31.1 + KBo 3.16 ii 8–9 (OH/NS). In NH compositions, however, this is no longer the case, even when the NH author has used *takku* as conscious archaizing: *takku* URU-*aš* NU.GÁL *n=aš=kan šamenzi* ‘If there is no town, (the heir of the murdered man) shall forfeit them (i.e., the indemnifying payments)’ KBo 6.4 i 13 (Laws §IV, NH).

29.54. Sometimes the main clause following a subordinate temporal clause with *mān* is asyndetic (see §30.36, p. 416; KBo 6.2+ iii 16–17).

29.55. Postposed *kuitman* clauses show no advance in time and dispense with any conjunction, just as is the case with foregrounded clauses following a backgrounding imperfective (see Hittite Laws §43). Virtually all relative clauses (§§30.58–30.64, pp. 424–426) in Old Hittite are asyndetic, whereas those introduced by *nu* are less rare in Middle Hittite and become rather common in New Hittite. Postposed temporal *mān* clauses are asyndetic (for preposed ones see CHD *mān* 5): *n=ašta apātt=a* 3*=ŠU dā n=at=mu u*[*ppi*] † *mān damaiš kuišk*[*i*] *uezzi* ‘then take three times that (property stolen from me by the slave woman) and send it to me whenever any other (messenger) comes (here)’ HKM 30 left edge 1–4 (end of the piggyback letter).

29.56. Clauses with potential-irrealis *man/mān* are introduced asyndetically (HE §310–311 and exx. in CHD *man*): *mān=war=aš=mu=kan šulliyat kuwapi ŪL* † *mān ḫandān* LUGAL.GAL *ANA* LUGAL.TUR *katteraḫḫer* ‘If (Urḫi-Teššup) had not at some time treated me disrespectfully, † would (the gods) have subjected a great king to a minor king?’ Ḫatt. iii 76–77 (NH).

29.57. When describing a situation by a sequence of disjointed clauses that are not intended to convey a temporal sequence, asyndeton can be used: ^{GIŠ}*luttāuš kammarāš IṢBAT* † É-*er tuḫḫuiš* [*IṢBAT*] ‘mist seized the windows; † smoke [seized] the house’ KUB 17.10 i 5 (OH/NS). Perhaps it is this timeless quality of a prescriptive ritual that lent itself to the extensive use of asyndeton (HE §309b).

29.58. Some clauses with double finite verb forms and idiomatic meaning (§24.32, p. 325, final two exx.) can be classified as asyndeton.

Disjunction

naššu . . . naš(šu)ma

29.59. Disjunction is regularly expressed in Hittite by *našma* 'or' or by *naššu . . . našma* 'either . . . or'. *našma* developed by syncope from *naššu=ma* (§1.77, p. 33), which contains the topicalizing/contrastive conjunction *-a/-ma*. These may conjoin clauses or individual words: (clauses) *n=an=kan ANA* GIŠGIGIR *waggariyanun našma=an=kan* ŠÀ É-*TI waqqariyanun* 'Did I rebel against him in the chariot, or did I rebel against him in the house?' Ḫatt. iii 67–68; *nu=šši naššu adanna peškezzi našma=šši akuwanna peškezzi* 'He either gives him to eat or he gives him to drink' KUB 13.4 i 24; (individual words) *takku* LÚ.U_{19}.LU-*aš* LÚ-*aš našma* MUNUS-*za takīya* URU-*ri aki* 'If a person, male or female, is killed in another town' KBo 6.2 i 7 (Laws §6, OS); LUGAL-*uš uezzi naššu* GIŠGIGIR-*it našma* GIŠ*ḫulugannit INA* É-*TIM* GAL *paizzi* 'The king proceeds to travel to the Great House either by chariot or by cart' KBo 19.128 i 2–5. For further examples see the CHD articles for *našma* and *naššu*.

-(a)ku . . . -(a)ku

29.60. A pair of enclitic disjunctive markers is -(*a*)*ku* . . . -(*a*)*ku* 'whether . . . or', attested from the oldest written stage of the language: *U* 4 SAG.DU *pāi* LÚ-*n=aku* MUNUS-*n=aku* 'and he shall give four persons, whether man or woman' KBo 6.3 i 2 (Laws §1, OH/NS); [(*andan*)]*=a* É-*ri kuit ḫarkzi* LÚ.U_{18} LU_{LU}*=ku* GUD*=ku* [UD]U*=ku ēšzi* 'and whatever perishes in the house the estate, whether it be human being, ox or [she]ep' KBo 6.3 iv 53 (Laws §98, OH/NS); *nu kuwapi* dUTU-*uš mumiēzzi* [. . . -]*i=kku ḫappēni=kku* GIŠ-*i=kku ḫaḫḫali=kku mumiēzzi* 'So where will the Sun-god fall? Will he fall into the [. . .], or in the flame(?), or in the tree(s), or in the brush?' KUB 36.44 iv 8–9. Very likely it is this construction, not *naššu . . . našma*, that underlies the Akkadographic *LŪ . . . LŪ . . . Ū LŪ* 'whether . . . or . . . or' in KBo 3.22:60–63 (OS), which is only attested in OS (see §31.35, p. 440). On the Akkadian construction see GAG §117 c/d, AHw 559–60 *lū* C 2–3, CAD L 224–27, or CDA 184 *lū* C.

29.61. In some cases the pair -(*a*)*ku* . . . -(*a*)*ku* is equivalent to *takku . . . takku* 'if . . . (or) if': *UMMA* DNIN.TU *lē=wa=tta nāḫi tuē*[(*l=ku wašta*)*iš*] *ug=at* SIG_5-*ziyami ŪL-a=kku* (var. [*na*]*tta=kku*) *tu*[(*el w*)*aštaiš*] *ug=at* SIG_5-*ziyami* 'Thus says (the goddess) NIN.TU: Don't be afraid! If it is your fault, I will make it right; (or) if it is not your fault, I will (still) make it right' KUB 33.24 (+) KUB 33.28 i 43–45. For -(*a*)*ku* in the negative *nekku* see §26.23 (p. 346).

Chapter 30
CLAUSES

Word Order

30.1. The following description of Hittite word order applies to both independent and dependent clauses. The latter differ only in the presence of a subordinating conjunction, for whose positioning see §§30.31ff. (pp. 414ff.). In nominal sentences (§30.22, p. 412), which contain no finite verb, the subject regularly precedes the predicate (but see §30.29, p. 414).

Major Constituents

30.2. The functionally neutral or "unmarked" word order in Hittite is S(ubject) O(bject) V(erb).[1] The clause negation immediately precedes the verb (for details and exceptions see §26.3, p. 341). In nominal sentences (§30.22, p. 412) the clause negation precedes the predicate noun, adjective, or adverb (for an example see §30.24, p. 412). Within the predicate the order of the direct object and indirect object relative to each other and to other constituents such as postpositional phrases, dative-locatives, and adverbs is yet to be established.

30.3. Within noun phrases genitive modifiers precede their head noun except for the genitive of measure (see §16.50, p. 254, and §16.47, p. 253). Demonstratives and adjectives regularly precede the noun and any genitive modifier (see §§18.24–18.25, p. 284, and §§16.51–16.52, p. 254). Attributive participles, however, and a few other adjectives in *-ant-* regularly *follow* their head noun (see §25.41, p. 339). On the word order of the indefinite pronoun/adjective *kuiški* see §§18.33–18.36 (pp. 286–287).

30.4. Various discourse factors not infrequently lead to deviations from the neutral S-O-V word order.[2] In formal terms, we may distinguish at least four processes: front-

1. As usual in this formula, "O(bject)" actually represents any constituent of the predicate except the finite verb, not only the direct object of transitive verbs but also such things as adverbs, negations, postpositional phrases, and infinitives. "S(ubject)" includes nouns (and noun phrases), accented personal pronouns, demonstrative pronouns, but not the indefinite pronoun-adjective *kuiški* (§18.33, p. 286).

2. We use the vague term "discourse factors" intentionally. It is clear that such things as "emphasis," "focus," and "topicalization" play a significant role in Hittite word order, but we cannot yet systematically correlate these with particular configurations. Furthermore, some patterns are almost certainly governed by other considerations: See §30.58 (p. 423) on the obligatory fronting involved in determinate relative clauses.

ing, extraposition, and left- and right-dislocation.[3] By far the most common of these is **fronting**, by which any constituent can be moved either to absolute initial position in the clause or to the position immediately following clause-initial conjunctions and any clitics dependent upon them.

30.5. Examples of fronting to clause-initial position: (verb; see also §26.5, p. 342) *eḫu pāiweni* *INA* URU*Apzuwa MAḪAR* dÉ.A ‘Come, let us go to Apzuwa into Ea’s presence’ KUB 33.106 ii 19 (Ullik. III); *waḫnumi=an=kan kuwapi* ‘When should I alter it?’ KUB 21.38 obv. 40; (negative; see §26.9, p. 343) *ŪL=at=ši=kan arḫa danzi* ‘They shall not take it away from him’ BrTabl. ii 99; (preverb) *anda=kan ḫalīnaš teššummiuš tarlipit šūwamuš* 2-*TAM pētumini* ‘Twice(?) we bring in cups (made of) *ḫalīna-* filled with *tarlipa*-drink’ KBo 17.1 i 26–27 (OS); (temporal adverb) *annaz* URU*Iyaruwataš* URU-*aš ŠA* KUR URU*Parga ēšta* ‘Formerly the city Iyaruwata had belonged to the land of Parga’ KBo 3.3 i 3–4; (direct object) 13 *PA KUNAŠU* m*Ḫatipa*-LÚ URU*Narapiduwa ḫarzi* ‘Ḫatipaziti holds 13 measures of emmer wheat in Narapiduwa’ HKM 111:5–6 (MH/MS); (indirect object) DINGIR-*LIM-ni=wa=tta ammuk tarnaḫḫi* ‘I will hand you over to a deity’ Ḫatt. i 37–38; (noun in dative-locative) URU*Kuzuruwi kakkapuš marakta* URU*Ankuwa kakkapiš maklanteš* ‘In Kuzuru he butchered *kakkapa*-animals; in Ankuwa the *kakkapa*-animals are emaciated’ KBo 3.34 ii 12–14 (OH/NS).

30.6. Examples of fronting to “first” position following clause-initial conjunction: (verb) *nu=mu memišket* GIM-*an* ‘As she had been telling me, (so it also happened)’ Ḫatt. iv 17; (negative) *nu ŪL=ya kuit iyan ēšta* ‘And even that which had not been made, (she gave that away)’ KUB 14.4 ii 10–11; (preverb) *n=at* EGIR-*pa ŠA* KUR URU*Ḫatti* KUR-*e iyanun* ‘I made it once again Hittite territory’ KBo 3.4 + KUB 23.125 iii 95; (temporal adverb) *nu ziladuwa kūn memian lē kuiški ḫulliyazzi* ‘Henceforth let no one contest this word’ KBo 4.10 obv. 46; (direct object) *nu* É dIŠTAR m*Dudḫaliyaš* DUMU=*YA* ‹*tapardu* ‘Let Tudḫaliya my son administer the house of *IŠTAR*’ Ḫatt. iv 77–78; (indirect object) *nu=za ANA* DINGIR-*LIM* LÚ*šankunniyanza* BAL-*aḫḫun* ‘I sacrificed to the goddess as priest’ Ḫatt. i 18–19.

30.7. When fronting occurs, usually the fronted constituent is marked by the topicalizing/contrastive conjunction *-a*/*-ma* (see §29.28, p. 396), but fronting also occurs without *-a*/*-ma*, as examples in the preceding paragraph show. Subjects may also undergo fronting, as shown by examples in “determinate” relative clauses, where the subject appears before the relative pronoun that has itself undergone “wh-movement” (see §30.59, p. 424, and see Hale 1987: 47–48 and Garrett 1994: 45–46): DUMU=*ŠU=ma=wa=šši=za=kan kuiš ANA* GIŠGU.ZA *ABI=ŠU ešat* ‘But his son, who sat down on the throne of his father, (was already a mature man)’ KBo 3.4 i 11–12.[4]

3. The following account couched in terms of “movement” of constituents is intended to be purely descriptive and makes no claim regarding how these facts are to be analyzed in terms of syntactic theory.

4. It is possible, but by no means proven, that any constituent marked by *-a*/*-ma* has been fronted. If this is true, then all subjects thus marked have been fronted, even those in non-relative clauses where otherwise there is no visible sign of fronting.

30.8. Fronting of more than one constituent in a single clause is well attested (against the claim of Garrett 1994: 39): *nu=šši ziladuwa* ŠA ⟨KUR⟩ URU*Ḫatti laḫḫiyanni* 2 ME *iyattaru* 'Henceforth let 200 of his (men) go on a military campaign of the land of Ḫatti' KBo 4.10 obv. 43–44; 28 PA. ZÍZ.ḪI.A *INA* URU*Ḫariya* m*Ḫimu*-DINGIR-*LIM* ⟨m⟩*Maruwaš* m*Tiwa*-LÚ LÚKUŠ$_7$ KÙ.[G]I *šuniškanzi* 'Ḫimuili, Maruwa, and Tiwaziti sow twenty-eight measures of barley in Ḫariya' HKM 111:24–27 (MH/MS); *ṬUPPA ANNIYAM INA* URU*Tāwa ANA PANI* m*Neriqqaili* DUMU.LUGAL . . . m*Ḫalwaziti* LÚDUB.SAR DUMU m*Lupakki* LÚ URU*Ukkiya ELṬUR* 'Ḫalwaziti, the scribe, son of Lupakki of Ukkiya, inscribed this tablet in Tawa in the presence of Prince Neriqqaili . . .' BrTabl. iv 30–43.

30.9. Far less frequent than fronting is **extraposition**, by which a constituent other than a subject or direct object is moved to the right of the finite verb:[5] 2 d*Ḫantašepuš ḫarwani* GIŠ-*aš* 'We are holding two Ḫantašepa-deities—of wood' KBo 17.1 i 22; *ḫalkin . . . išpiyatarr=a pēdaš gimri uēllui marmaraš andan* '(Telipinu went away), and he carried off grain . . . and abundance—to the steppe, to the meadow, into the *m.*' KUB 17.10 i 10–12; DUMU.É.GAL *šuppi wātar parā ēpzi* LUGAL-*i* MUNUS.LUGAL-*i* 'The palace official holds out pure water—to the king and queen' KBo 17.1 i 14–15; *nu=mu=kan* ZI-*YA dankui daganzipi kattanta pānza apēdani uddāni peran* 'My soul has gone down into the Dark Netherworld because of that matter' KBo 13.62:10–11. Noun phrases that are *in apposition to* the subject or direct object may also be extraposed, but the latter remain in their regular position: *U* 4 SAG.DU *pāi* LÚ-*n=aku* MUNUS-*n=aku* 'and shall give four persons—male or female' KBo 6.3 i 2 (Laws §1, OH/NS). See also *ta kalulupuš=šmuš gāpinit ḫulāliemi* ŠA *QATI=ŠUNU* 'And I wrap their fingers with yarn—(the fingers) of their hands' StBoT 8 iv 26–27.

30.10. By **left-dislocation** a subject or object is moved outside its clause to the left. Its extra-clausal position is shown by its appearance before a clause-initial conjunction or another clause-initial constituent to which sentential clitics are attached (see Garrett 1990c: 266–69 and 1994: 38): (**Subject**) ḪUR.SAG.MEŠ-*aš widār* GIŠKIRI$_6$.ḪI.A *wēllu nu tuel waršulaš=teš paišgataru* (var. [*pa-iš-k*]*at-ta-ru*) *n=uš lē tinnuzi* 'The waters of the mountains, the gardens, the meadow(s) — let your refreshment keep going (singular), and let (Ḫaḫḫima, the Freeze) not paralyze them' VBoT 58 i 10–11 (OH/NS); d*IŠTAR* DINGIR-*LIM=**aš**=mu* '(As for) *IŠTAR*, she is my goddess' Ḫatt. iv 74; m*Pīyaš* m*Šunupaššiš* 5 LÚ.MEŠ *katti=šmi* URU*Talmaliyaš nu=za linkiya takšulaš uttar kattan QATAMMA=pat daiēr* '(As for) Piya, Šunupašši (and) five men with them of Talmaliya, they placed the word of treaty under oath for themselves in the very same way' KBo 8.35 ii 30–31 (MH/MS); **(Direct Object)** m*Ḫuidudduwalliš n=**an*** URU*Šallašna ašašer* '(As for) Ḫuidudduwalli, they settled him in Šallašna' HKM 113:14–15 (MH/MS); **(Indirect Object)** 5 ŠEŠ.MEŠ*=ŠU nu=**šmaš*** É.MEŠ *taggašta* '(As for) his five brothers, for them he fashioned houses' KBo 3.1 ii 13 (OH/NS). As the preceding examples illustrate, whenever possible the left-dislocated constituent is resumed by an enclitic pronoun (so-called 'clitic

5. See McCone (1979), who does not, however, make the distinction between "extraposition" and "right-dislocation," referring in general to "amplified sentences."

doubling').[6] The last two examples cited appear to show that left-dislocated objects appear in the nominative case, but further study is needed to determine whether this is a regular feature of left-dislocation.

30.11. By **right-dislocation** either a subject or object is moved outside the clause to the right, following the finite verb (see Garrett 1990c: 252–56). As in the case of left-dislocation, there is "clitic doubling" of subjects of "unaccusative" intransitive verbs and of direct objects. Right-dislocated direct objects appear in the accusative case: [(*n=**a**)]**n** *lē šannatti memian* 'Do not conceal it, the matter' KUB 26.1 iv 14; *n=**at** kutruwēš ašandu* ^{d}UTU *ŠAMÊ* ^{d}UTU ^{URU}*Arinna* 'Let them be witnesses, the Sungod of Heaven, the Sungoddess of Arinna' BrTabl. iii 81 (Tudḫ. IV); *n=**aš** šarā t*[(*īyat* ^{d}*Ku*)]*marbiš* 'He stood up, (did) Kumarbi' KUB 33.102 ii 17; *kuit=war=**aš** uezzi* AN-*aš* ^{D}UTU-*uš* [(KUR-*e*)*aš* ^{LÚ}SIPA.UDU-*aš*] 'Why is he coming—the Sungod, shepherd of the lands?' KBo 26.58 iv 44–45 (JCS 5:158–59) (with dupl. KUB 33.104 iv 3′–4′). Right-dislocation is especially frequent in translations of Hurrian literature (see McCone 1979: 470), where it is probably used to mirror Hurrian word order,[7] but the first two examples cited here show that this usage appears also in native Hittite compositions.[8]

Deletion Processes

30.12. Hittite shows various types of discourse-conditioned deletion or omission. None has received systematic investigation, and the description here is limited to a few illustrative examples.

Ellipsis

30.13. Ellipsis refers to the omission of any element of a sentence that can be recovered from the context. It may, but need not be, identical to undeleted material. Examples from Hittite: *ēšḫar INA* KUR ^{URU}KÙ.BABBAR-*ti āra n=at ŪL* 'Is bloodshed in the land of Ḫatti permissible? It is not!' KUB 14.3 ii 8 (NH); LUGAL-*UTTA=wa=mu kā pedi=ši pāi mān=wa ŪL=ma nu=wa ŪL uwami* 'Give me the kingship here on the spot! If (you do) not (give me the kingship here on the spot), I will not come!' KUB 14.3 i 14–15 (Taw.); SIG_5 *dān nu=kan anda* SUD-*li* 'Well-being is taken and (is put) into SUD' KUB 5.24 i 21–22 (KIN oracle); see SIG_5 *dān nu=kan* DINGIR-*LIM-ni karpi* GAR-*ri* 'Well-being is taken and is put with the deity's anger' KUB 5.24 ii 10–11; *takku* GUD.MAḪ-*aš ḫāli kuiški šamenuzzi DĪN* LUGAL *ḫapparranzi* 'If someone dispenses with a bull's pen (i.e., lets it run free), it is a case for the king; they shall put (the bull) up for sale' KBo 6.26 ii 21–22 = Laws

6. The clitic doubling is impossible when the left-dislocated element is the subject of a transitive verb: See §18.13 (p. 280).

7. In at least one case where the Hurrian archetype is preserved, the order of constituents is identical (*peššiyandu=ya=**an** aliyanan* $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$*ṢĀIDŪTIM* 'Let them, (namely) the hunters, fell it, (namely) the deer' KBo 32.14 ii 13–14 (StBoT 32:113)). In most cases in the Hittite translations the Hurrian original is unavailable to us.

8. Another example of right-dislocation in a native Hittite composition (in this case with fronting of the verb) is: *paḫši=ya=**an*** ^{d}UTU-*ŠI* 'Also protect him, His Majesty' KBo 5.3 i 16.

§176 (OH/NS) (see LH 220); *šarnikzil* (*šarnikzi*) 'he shall make compensation'[9] KBo 6.26 i 27 = Laws §163 (OH/NS).

Gapping

30.14. Gapping is the deletion of a repeated verb or verb plus other elements from the second and any subsequent clauses in a sequence related by coordination. The phenomenon is known from many languages, both ancient and modern. It is illustrated in English by the following example: "I will be giving some help to mother on Monday, and Bill ⟨ ⟩ on Tuesday." In this case the elements gapped are both the verb and its objects ("will be giving some help to mother"). Here are two examples from Hittite: *kuptarr=a=kan* [GIŠZA.LAM.GA]R-*a*[*z*] [*katt*]*a udanzi šēnann=a* ⟨GIŠZA.LAM.GAR-*az katta udanzi*⟩ *n=an* ÍD-*i* [*išḫun*]*nanzi* 'The remnants they bring down out of the tent, and the figure ⟨they bring down out of the tent⟩, and they [thro]w it into the river' KUB 12.58 iii 14–16, ed. Goetze 1938: 16–17; *nu mān* LÚ-*iš akkanza nu=šš̌an šeliya anda* ŠA GIŠ*INBI* ALAM *gulšanzi mān* MUNUS-*za=ma akkan*⟨*za*⟩ *nu=šš̌an* ZÍZ-*aš šeliya anda* IŠTU GIŠ*INBI* ⟨ALAM *gulšanzi*⟩ 'And if it is a man who has died, they depict (his) figure out of fruits in a grain pile, but if it is a woman who has died, ⟨they depict (her) figure⟩ with fruits in a pile of wheat' KUB 30.24 iii 38–41, ed. Kassian, Korolëv, and Sidel'tsev 2002: 398–99, 410 (commentary).

Sentential Clitics

30.15. Hittite makes widespread use of sentential clitics, which are attached to the first word in a clause (the so-called *Wackernagel* position). These clitics include: (1) the quotative particle *-wa*(*r*-), (2) the reflexive particle *-za*, (3) the enclitic personal pronouns, and (4) the local particles *-an*, *-ap*(*a*), *-*(*a*)*šta*, *-kan*, and *-šan*. When they co-occur, there is a specific sequence in which they appear (see Laroche 1958: 161, HE §288). This ordering is illustrated below, first by means of a chart showing the "slots" in the sequence and the clitics capable of filling each. Comments on the occupants of each "slot" and various co-occurrence restrictions follow.

Host	1	2	3	4	5	6
Accented Word (+ *-a*/*-ya*)	*-wa*(*r*)	*-naš*	*-a-* (e.g.,	*-mu*	*-za*	*-an*
Accented Word (+ *-a*/*-ma*)		*-šmaš*	*-aš*, *-an*,	*-ta* /*-du*		*-apa*
nu			*-at*, *-e*, *-uš*)	*-še*/*i*		*-ašta*
šu						*-kan*
ta						*-šan*

30.16. The first column contains the host on which the clitics of slots 1–6 depend. If an accented word through fronting appears in initial position, it may take either of the

9. If one assumes ellipsis of a verb *šarnikzi*. But one may also assume (with LH 131) an existential sentence 'compensation (will exist)', i.e., 'there will be compensation'.

conjunctions *-a/-ma* or *-a/-ya* followed by the sentential clitics. If the sentence begins with *nu*, *šu*, or *ta*, however, neither *-a/-ma* nor *-a/-ya* can follow. Although *-a/-ma* and *-a/-ya* are enclitics, they are not properly sentential ones. They owe their occasional position before the chain of sentential clitics (slots 1–6) entirely to their dependence on a fronted accented host word. This is not, however, the only position where they may appear (see §29.26, p. 395, and §29.39, p. 400).

30.17. There is one situation, attested in two OH constructions, in which the enclitic conjunction *-a/-ya* 'and'[10] follows rather than precedes the third-person singular dative-locative clitic pronoun *-še* of slot 4. One sees it in the archaic expression *parna=šše=a šuwayezzi* 'and he shall look to the house for it' that concludes a number of laws (see LH 292–93) and in the equally archaic expression *anda=(š)še=ya* 'and in addition to it' in Laws §110 (NH copy d[11]). Already in OS (Laws §128, copy aa) the expression was altered to *anda=ya=šše*, and in post-OH to *anda=ya=šši* (§70, §110, and §128; see LH 78–79, 107 [with n. 346], 116–17, and 201), but no modernized version of the former expression (**parni=ya=šši*) is attested.

30.18. Slot 1 contains the quotative particle *-wa(r)* that indicates direct speech. For more on its form and use see §§28.2ff. (pp. 354ff.).

30.19. Slots 2 to 4 are occupied by the enclitic personal pronouns, for whose form see chapter 5 and for whose use chapter 18. The dative-accusative pronouns of the first- and second-person **plural** and the dative of the third-person plural appear in Slot 2, the nominative and accusative third-person pronouns in Slot 3, and the dative-accusative pronouns of the first and second **singular**, as well as the dative pronouns of the third-person singular, occur in Slot 4. The pronouns of Slots 2 and 4 are mutually exclusive and never co-occur. Slot 2 contains the plurals; slot 4 the singulars (Hoffner 1986: 93–94). In late New Hittite the nominative-accusative pronoun of Slot 3 may be *repeated* after the dative-locative pronouns (so far attested with *-ši*, *-naš*, and *-š(a)maš*) or *-za*: e.g., *na-at-ši-at*, *na-aš-ši(-ya)-aš*, *na-an-za-an*, *na-at-za-at* (Goetze 1930b: 19–20; for further examples see HW^2 I 41b sub *-a–2* to which add the rare examples with the plural dative-locative: with *-naš* in *nu=war=an=naš=an anzel* ZI-*ni piyawēn* KUB 13.4 iv 72–73 (Hoffner 1986: 93–94); with *-š(a)maš* in *nam-ma-at-ša-ma-ša-at-kán* KUB 27.67 ii 36 with dupl. KBo 53.21 i 8′). The sequence *n=an=za=an* occurs for the first time in the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma I, written by Muršili II,[12] although it may have been introduced

10. Since in OH the expected form of this expression with *-a/-ma* would have been **parna=šše=ma*, it is certain that we are dealing with *-a/-ya* here.

11. Although found only in a NH copy, the very strangeness of this form and its exact correspondence to the admittedly OH *parna=šše=a* guarantee that it is an isolated survival of an OH formation antecedent to *anda=ya=šše* in Laws §128 in OS copy aa.

12. *n=an=za=an* in DŠ frag. 15 F iv 30 and DŠ frag. 26 KUB 34.23 ii 8, and DŠ frag. 28 A KBo 5.6 iv 6–7 DUMU=*YA=wa=mu* NU.GÁL ÌR=*YA=ma=wa nūman daḫḫi nu=war=an=za=an* LÚ*MUTI=YA iyami.* See in KUB 14.16 ii 15-16 (AM) *maḫḫan=ma=an=za=an=kan* EGIR-*pa uḫḫun*, which has the same author as DŠ. It also occurs in NH copies of OH and MH compositions: *n=an=za=an* in the NH manuscript KBo 6.3 (B) of Laws §23, where the OS copy A reads *n=an=za*, in *n=an=za=an* in KUB 1.16 ii 44 (OH/NS), and *našma=an=za=an*

by the later scribe who recopied the text. This double writing is a late conflation of the two configurations DAT-LOC-PL + Slot 3 and Slot 3 + DAT-LOC-SG. There are exceptional cases (but not many; see Hoffner 1986) where a Slot 2 plural pronoun occurs in Slot 4. For example, $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$SAGI*=ya=at=naš parā=ya=aš=naš piškanzi* (text erroneously *piškiwani*) $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$MUḪALDIM-*š=at=naš arraškanzi=ya=aš=naš* 'On the one hand, they are our cupbearers, and they give them (-*aš*, i.e., cups) to us. They are our cooks, and they wash them (-*aš*, i.e., dishes) for us' KBo 32.15 ii 27–29 (MH/MS); and *tet=war=at=naš iyaweni=war=at* 'Tell it to us! We will do it!' KUB 12.63 obv. 24 (OH/MS). Again: *kuwapit . . . uwatettani n=an=šamaš āppa apiyakku peḫḫi* 'Whither will you escort him, that I should give him back to you there?' KBo 8.35 ii 6–7 (MH/MS), and *n=at=šamaš* [EGIR-*an ara*]*nta* '(The guards who hold spears) stand behind them' IBoT 1.36 iii 46 (MH/MS). In all the above cited examples the plural pronoun, whether first-, second-, or third-person, is a dative (never accusative), and all examples are from texts originally composed in the OH or MH periods. On the overall issue see Hoffner 1986: 93–94.

30.20. Slot 5 contains the reflexive particle *-za*, for which see §§28.16ff. (pp. 357ff.). For the late NH repetition of Slot 3 pronominal clitics between Slots 5 and 6 see above in §30.19 (p. 411).

30.21. Slot 6 is occupied by the local particles *-an*, *-ap*(*a*), -(*a*)*šta*, *-kan,* and *-šan*, on whose use see chapter 28.

Nominal and "To Be" Sentences

30.22. If a clause has as its verb 'am, is, are, was, were, will be' (see Cotticelli-Kurras 1992a; 1992b), its predicate will be either (1) a noun or pronoun, (2) adjective, (3) adverb, or (4) adverbial phrase. For example, 'the king is (1) a warrior, (2) brave, (3) nearby, (4) in the palace.' When the verb 'to be' (*ēš*-) would appear in the present tense, it is often omitted, producing so-called nominal sentences (see §22.3, p. 306).

30.23. Adjective predicates of 'to be' sentences (2) agree with the subject in number (singular, plural), gender (common or neuter), and case (nominative) (see above in chapter 15).

30.24. Noun, pronoun, and numeral (the cited 1-*edaz* 1-*edaz*) predicates can be any number or gender and any case except accusative, ergative, allative, or instrumental. Examples of 'to be' or nominal sentences with predicates in various cases: *nu=wa=za* ŠA 1-EN ḪALṢI LUGAL-*uš* 'I am king (**nom.)** of one fortress' KUB 1.7 iii 38 (Ḫatt.); *šumeš=a=šši=kan takšulaš* 'but you are at peace (lit., of peace) with him' KUB 26.40:98 (MH/MS) (**gen.**); *ki=ma tuel ēštu* 'let this be yours (**gen.**)' KBo 7.28 + KBo 8.92 17,

KUB 31.115 11 (OH/NS), and *namma=an=za=an* in KUB 23.11 iii 14 (MH/NS). But none of these is in OS or even MS; they are NH copies, subject to the same modernizing that we see in KBo 6.3 of Laws §23, where the OH copy is extant.

etc. (OH/MS);[13] *n=aš apēl* 'it (scil., an irrigation ditch and its flow) is his (**gen.**)' Laws §162 (OH/NS); *tuqq=a* $\bar{U}L$ *kuitki ēšzi* 'also to you is nothing' = 'you also have nothing' KUB 21.38 obv. 16 (**dat.**); ÉRIN.MEŠ*=wa=kan* ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ *kuiš* INA ^{URU}*Murmuriga šer* 'What army (was) up in Murmuriga (**d.-l.**)' KBo 5.6 ii 24 (NH); *kī=ma* AWATE^{MEŠ} $\bar{U}L$ *kuit*[*ki*] 1-*edaz* 1-*edaz* IŠTU KUR ^{URU}*Ḫatti=at* 'These matters (i.e., treaty regulations) (are) by no means reciprocal (lit., from [this] one, from [that] one (**abl.**)); they are (solely) from the land of Ḫatti **(abl.)**' KUB 21.1+ iii 76–77 (Murš. II).

30.25. Sentences where the verb 'to be' predicates the existence of the subject may consist merely of the subject and the verb, but the verb may take a complement: *mān* NUMUN DUMU.NITA*=ma* $\bar{U}L$ *ēšzi* 'but if there is no male progeny' KBo 4.10 obv. 12; URU BÀD EGIR-*pa appannaš AŠRU* NU.GÁL *kuiški ēšta* 'there was no fortified city, no place of retreat' KBo 5.8 ii 24–25; NINDA.KUR$_4$.RA *paršiyawanzi* NU.GÁL 'there are no loaves for breaking' KUB 12.12 v 32. The verb 'to be' may be omitted in the present tense: $\bar{U}L$ GUD-*uš* $\bar{U}L$*=ma=wa* UDU-*uš* 'there were no cattle, there were no sheep' (historical present) KUB 36.51 obv. 7 (OH/NS); URU-*aš* ŠUM-*an=šet* ^{URU}*Šudul . . . nu=kan šer* LÚ-*aš* ^{m}*Appu ŠUM-an=šet* 'There was a city, its name was Šudul . . . and there was a man up there, his name was Appu' KUB 24.8 + KUB 36.60 i 7–10.[14]

30.26. The adverb *kāša*/*kāšma* may be employed (always clause-initial), if it is intended to convey the notion that the equation of subject and predicate has just taken effect (performative use; see §7.21, p. 148; §22.15, p. 309; §24.7, p. 319; §§24.27–24.30, pp. 323–324) or that the situation described is presented vividly: *nu=za kāša šumeš* LÚ.MEŠ KUR ^{URU}*Išmirika ḫūmanteš* IT[*TI* ^{d}UT]U-[*ŠI l*]*i*[*n*]*kiyaš=šaš* 'All you men of Išmirika are hereby (men) of his oath (**gen**.) with respect to His Majesty' KUB 23.68 + ABoT 58 rev. 7 (MH/NS); *kāša=za* ^{URU}*Ḫattuši MAḪAR* $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$*TAPPI=NI* 'I am now in Ḫattuša in the company of our colleagues' (**d.-l.**) HKM 36 left edge 3 (MH/MS).

30.27. If the *subject* is either first- or second-person ('I', 'we', 'you'), the reflexive particle *-za* (§§28.16ff., pp. 357ff.) must be employed in Middle and New Hittite (see examples in the previous paragraph and §§28.32ff., pp. 362ff.). The particle is not used in this function in Old Hittite.

30.28. It is *normal* for the subject to precede the predicate, whether that predicate be a noun, accented pronoun, adjective, or adverb(-phrase): see the examples in §30.24 (p. 412). For an example of a predicate adjective see *kī=ma uttar nakkī* 'This matter, however, is important' KUB 7.1 iii 27. However, nominal sentences and those with 'to be' are subject to the same movement rules as other clauses (see §§30.4ff., pp. 406ff.): (**fronting**) *ammel kāš=pat* 1-*aš dammešḫaš* 'Mine is only this one punishment' KBo 4.8 ii 12–13; *kā=ya* INA É*=*KA *ḫūman* SIG$_5$-*in* 'also here in your house all is well' HKM 2 left

13. There is disagreement on the reading of the first sign: as KI or SILIM. See Singer 2002b: 27 n. 2.

14. It seems more likely to take URU-*aš* as nominative as understood here and translated by Hoffner (1998b: 83 §2; likewise Siegelová 1971: 5), although it is also possible to take it as genitive in a split genitive construction: 'the city's name was Šudul' (for which see §16.38, p. 251).

edge 1–2 (MH/MS); (**left-dislocation**) ^{d}*IŠTAR* DINGIR-*LIM=**aš**=mu* '(As for) *IŠTAR*, she is my goddess'. Examples of **right-dislocation** appear to be limited to accented pronominal subjects. In the following example the first and last clauses show right-dislocation and fronting, the second merely fronting: *parkuiš=aš apāš mišriwanza apāš ḫarkiš=aš apāš* 'She is pure, that one. Lovely is that one. She is white, that one' KBo 4.6 obv. 13–14. The only example with a right-dislocated *noun* subject (also with fronting of the predicate adjective) is from a translation of a Hurrian sentence and may only mirror Hurrian word order (§30.11, p. 409): *daššuš=war=**aš** ḫalluwaiš* 'strong is it, the strife' KUB 33.96 iv 10′ (Ullik. I).

30.29. Old Hittite appears to show a different pattern in nominal sentences with accented pronominal subjects, where the regular word order is predicate + subject: *UL* DUMU=*YA apāš* KUB 1.16 ii 14 (OH/NS), (but *natta=aš* DUMU=*YA* is also permitted); *maršanza=wa zik* 'you are treacherous'; *kinun=a=wa=kan arḫa namma lē nēyanza zik* 'Now do not any longer be turned away!' KBo 20.82 ii 18–19 (pre-NH); *ḫandānza maniya*[*ḫ*]*ḫayaš išḫāš zi*[*k*] 'you are a just lord of government' KUB 31.127+ i 20 (OH/NS); *dankuwayaš* KUR-*e*[*aš*] *attaš annaš zi*[*k*] 'you are father and mother of the dark land(s)' KUB 31.127+ i 21 (OH/NS); *ḫannešnaš išḫāš zik* 'you are a lord of judgment' KUB 31.127+ i 24 (OH/NS).[15] See further examples in §26.4 (p. 342), §28.36 (p. 363), and §28.41 (p. 364). On this as a characteristic of OH see Hoffner 1987: 280, 285. The reverse sequence (accented personal pronoun subject followed by the predicate) is found when there are two virtually identical adjacent clauses with contrasted pronoun subjects: *zikk=a=wa* ^{GIŠ}TUKUL *apašš=a* ^{GIŠ}TUKUL 'both *you* are a TUKUL-man, and *he* is a TUKUL-man' KBo 22.1:20 (OS); *attaš=miš ēš ug=a* DUMU-*aš=tiš ēšlit* '(*You*) be my father, and *I* shall be your son' KUB 26.35:6 (OS); *takku* GUD *šaudišza natta* G[UD MAḪ]-*aš* . . . *takku* GUD *tāyugaš apaš* GUD.MAḪ-*aš* 'If it is an unweaned calf, it is not a bull . . . (but) if it is a two-year-old bovine, *that* (contrastive!) is a bull' KBo 6.2 iii 23–24 (OS).

30.30. In nominal sentences with non-referential subjects the third-person clitic subject pronoun is usually omitted, and if no conjunction is used, the result is sometimes a one-word nominative case predicate (§18.17, p. 282; and §30.13, p. 409).

Dependent Clauses

30.31. Most Hittite dependent clauses are formally marked by various subordinating conjunctions, never by word order or verbal mood (as in English 'Were I rich . . .' or German 'Wäre ich . . .'). For occasional unmarked conditional clauses see §30.56 (p. 423). Sentences may be composed either of one or more coordinate independent clauses, or by the combination of one or more dependent clauses and an independent one. The apodosis can be implied but unexpressed, such as 'may the gods destroy me/

15. The large number of examples in CTH 733 (KUB 8.41 and similar texts) such as *dandukišni taḫat=tanuitiš zi*[*k*] KUB 8.41 ii 2 (OS) do not add support, since the *dandukišni* is fronted for contrastive purposes versus DINGIR.MEŠ-*naš ištarna*.

us/you/him/them' (see CHD *mān* 7e). Example: *našma=kan mān* ^{d}UTU-*ŠI kuedani anda idālu ištamašti n=at=mu=kan mān šannatti n=at=mu* ŪL *mematti apūnn=a=mu antuḫšan* ŪL *tekkuššanuši n=an anda imma munnāši* 'Or if you hear evil about My Majesty from someone, (if) you keep it from me and don't tell me and do not reveal that person to me and even hide him, (implied: the gods will punish you)' KBo 5.3 i 27–30 (MH/NS). Since this type of suppressed apodosis is confined to divine punishments, it is likely that the suppression was prompted by a fear of mentioning the punishments. See HKM 34:13–17 (HBM, pp. 180–83) and CHD L–N *mān* 7e2′ for further examples.

30.32. In the terminology of traditional grammar one can identify the following types of dependent clauses in Hittite: (1) temporal ('when', 'while', or 'until'), (2) causal ('because'), (3) concessive ('although'), (4) conditional ('if'), (5) relative ('who' or 'which'), (6) indirect statements or questions ('that', 'how', or 'whether').

30.33. The manner of constructing such clause types varies over time in the Hittite textual record. The details have not yet been worked out for many of these syntactic structures.

30.34. Each of the six types of dependent clause mentioned above in §30.32 is marked by a characteristic subordinating conjunction. The following table summarizes the Hittite subordinating conjunctions.

Clause Type	Old Hittite	New Hittite
1. temporal 'when; until'	*mān*; *kuitman*	*maḫḫan*, *kuwapi*; *kuitman*
2. causal 'because'	*kuit*	*kuit*
3. concessive 'although'	*mān*	*mān*
4. conditional 'if'	*takku*, (rarely *mān*)	*mān*
5. relative 'who', 'which'	*kui-*	*kui-*
6. indirect statement 'that'		*kuit*, *maḫḫan*, *mān*

A seventh type frequently found in other languages, namely **final** or **result** clause, is not a dependent clause in Hittite, but rather a coordinate independent one (HE §322), or the same meaning is conveyed by means of an infinitive (see §§25.10–25.36, pp. 332–338). Compare the following example: *n=aš* ŪL *tarnaḫḫun n=an=kan* ŪL *kuenner* 'I did not allow them; and they did not kill him' > 'I did not allow that they should kill him' KBo 6.29 ii 27–28. Or this example from the laws: [*takku* LÚ-*a*]*n našma* MUNUS-*an ELLAM walḫzi kuiš*[*k*]*i n=aš aki* '[If] someone strikes a free [man] or woman, so that he dies' KBo 6.3 i 6 (Laws §3, OH/NS). The suggestion of Stefanini (1988: 255), followed by Pecchioli Daddi and Polvani (1990: 50 n. 8) and García Trabazo (2002: 85 n. 26), that in KBo 3.7 i 6–7 one should assume a use of *mān* introducing a dependent clause to express purpose seems unlikely, because no other example of this alleged use has ever been found.

30.35. A complex sentence containing a preposed subordinate clause can itself naturally be linked to its preceding context by the connective *nu*: *nu ABU=YA maḫḫan nannai nu=kan edani pangawi* LÚ.KÚR 1-*anki=pat anda ḫandaizzi* 'And as my father was driving, he encountered that whole enemy all at once' KBo 40.293 + KBo 14.3 (DŠ frag. 15 F) iv 28–31; or by the more contrastive *-ma*: *namma=aš* EGIR-*pa gimmandari=ya*[(*uwanz*)]*i* ^{URU}*Ḫattuši uet maḫḫan=ma=za=ka*[*n* (EZEN$_4$ MU.KAM-*TI*)] *karpta n=aš INA* KUR ^{URU}*Ištaḫara pait* 'Then he came back home to Hattuša to spend the winter; but when he had finished the annual festival, he went to Ištaḫara' KBo 5.6 (DŠ frag. 28 A) i 40–42.

Temporal Clauses

30.36. Temporal clauses in Old Hittite (OH) are frequently marked by *mān* 'when', which in OH was only beginning to gain the secondary meaning 'if' that it acquired in NH (see CHD *mān*, and see §§30.47ff., pp. 419ff.). Post clause-initial *kuwapi* 'when' first appears post-OH. But since in OH *mān* had uses other than 'when' — for example, postpositional 'like', 'just as', interrogative 'how?', and indirect question 'whether' (CHD *mān* mngs. 1–4), the temporal use 'when' was marked by a consistent fronted position in the clause. Many examples can be found in the CHD *mān* article sub mng. 5. Here we cite only a few examples: *mān* DUMU.MEŠ ^{URU}*Ḫatti* LÚ.MEŠ *ILKI uēr* † *ANA ABI* LUGAL *aruwa*[*nzi*] *nu taršikanzi* 'when Hittite men subject to *ILKU*-tax came, they did reverence to the father of the king and said' KBo 6.2 + KBo 22.62 iii 16–17 (Laws §55, OS); *mān* ^{URU}*Tama*[*rmara*] *arer nu taršikanzi* 'when they arrived at Tamarmara, they said'[16] KBo 22.2 obv. 8 (OS); *mān=aš šallešta=ma nu=za* DUMU.MUNUS ^{d}*Illuyankaš* DAM-*anni dāš* 'when he grew up, he took the daughter of the serpent as his wife' KBo 3.7 iii 6–8 (OH/NS).

30.37. Other **temporal** clauses meaning 'while' or 'until' are marked by *kuitman* (see §19.6, p. 290; §26.12, p. 343; §30.34, p. 415; and §24.3, p. 317). 'Until' clauses follow the main clause asyndetically: *nu* É-*ri=šši anniškezzi* † *kuitmān=aš lazziatta* 'and he shall work on his estate until (the injured man) recovers' KBo 6.2 i 17–18 (Laws §10, OS); see also KBo 6.3 iv 6–8 (Laws §79, OH/NS). 'While' clauses usually precede the main clause. They are connected to what precedes by *nu* or another conjunction, unless they are the first sentence in a discourse (see §29.4, p. 390; see HKM 10:24–28 cited below for an example beginning a discourse). Although the following main clause is usually asyndetic (e.g., *nu=za kuitman nūwa* TUR-*aš ešun* † *ŠA* ^{KUŠ}KA.TAB.ANŠE=*za ešun* 'While I was still a child, I was a bridle-holder' KUB 1.2 i 11 = Ḫatt. i 12), it is sometimes introduced by *nu* or other conjunction (*-a* in HKM 10:24:24–28 below): *nu kuitman ABU=YA INA* KUR ^{URU}*Mittanni ēšta* ***nu*** LÚ.KÚR ^{URU}*Arauwannaš kuiš* KUR ^{URU}*Kiššiyā* GUL-*anneškit* ***n***=*at mekki tamaššan ḫarta* 'and while my father was in the land of Mittanni, the Arawannaean enemy, who was attacking the land of Kiššiya, had greatly oppressed it' KBo 3.4 iii 47–49 (AM); *kuitman=wa=mu* ^{d}UTU-*ŠI kī ŠA* LÚ.MEŠ ^{URU}*Kaška takšulaš*

16. Present tense verbs here describe past acts; see §22.6 (p. 307).

uttar ḫatrāši ammug=a=wa memian INA KUR URU*Išḫupitta ḫuškemi* ‘While you, Your Majesty, send me this word about making peace with the Kaška people, I am awaiting word in the country of Išḫupitta’ HKM 10:24–28 (MH/MS); *parā=ma* MU.KAM.ḪI.A-*aš kuitman* ŠEŠ*=YA* mNIR.GÁL-*iš INA* KUR URU*Ḫatti ēšta* ***nu*** KUR URU*Gašga*ḪI.A *ḫūmanteš kururiyaḫḫer* ‘But further, in the years while my brother Muwattalli was in the land of Ḫatti, all the Kaskean lands become hostile’ Ḫatt. ii 16–18; *kuitman* in copies B and E, *kuedaš* in copy A). Several *kuitman* ‘until’ clauses in a row are asyndetic, when they are synonymous, merely expressing the same idea in different terms (see LH 167–68): ‘This official will remain where he is’ *kuitman=aš uezzi kuitman=aš apiya* EGIR-*pa uezzi* ‘until (the person whose safety is guaranteed) comes (to me) and returns there’ KUB 14.3 ii 71–72 (= Sommer 1932 ii 72–73, NH); on *apiya* here see §7.18, p. 147). ‘Before’ is expressed by *kuitman . . . nawi* (see §26.12, p. 343). In a few cases *kuitman* occurs in main clauses with a meaning something like ‘in the meantime’: (If someone whispers to you ‘His Majesty is plotting thus and so against you’) *zik=*[*m*]*a apūn memiyan ANA* dUTU*=ŠI kuitman ḫatrāi* ‘In the meantime write of that matter to His Majesty’ KBo 5.4 obv. 29–30 (Murš. II).

30.38. The regular ‘when’ word in NH is *maḫḫan* (also written GIM-*an*). It usually appears clause-initially but may also be preceded by *nu* (with any clitics) or by a fronted constituent (see examples below). The most common pattern is temporal clause followed by a *nu*-introduced main clause: *maḫḫan=ma ABI ABI=YA apēz* EGIR-[*pa u*]*et n=aš INA* KUR URU*Ḫayaša pait* ‘But when my grandfather came back from there, he went to the land of Ḫayaša’ KUB 19.11 iv 40–42 (DŠ); [*nu=kan*] *maḫḫan ABU=YA* ŠÀ KUR-*TI āraš* [*nu=ka*]*n* LÚ.KÚR URU*Gašgaš kuiš INA* ŠÀ KUR URU*Ḫatti uwanza ēšta nu* KUR-*e mekki idalawaḫta* ‘[And] when my father arrived in the land, the enemy Kaškaean who had come into the land of Ḫatti had greatly ravaged the land’ KBo 14.3 iii 12–14 (DŠ); *maḫḫan=ma* URU.DIDLI.ḪI.A *wetummanzi zinnit n=aš* URU*Almina andan pait* ‘But when he finished fortifying (lit., building) the cities, he went to Almina’ KBo 5.6 i 5–7 (DŠ); *maḫḫan=ma ḫamešḫanza kišat* ‘But when it became spring’ KUB 14.15 i 23; with several ‘when’ clauses in a row: dUTU-*ŠI=ma maḫḫan iyaḫḫat nu maḫḫan ANA* URU*Šallapa* [*arḫu*]*n* ‘But when I was marching, and when I [reached] Šallapa’ KUB 14.15 ii 7 (AM).

30.39. In New Hittite one also finds temporal use of *kuwapi* in the “second” (Wackernagel) position as ‘when’ (§19.6, p. 290): *apeneššuwantan=ma memian kuwapi* [(*išta=mašti*)] *nu=za=kan memiyani* (var. *memiyanni*) *šer lē k*[(*aruššiyaši*)] ‘But when you hear of such a matter, do not be silent about the matter’ KUB 21.1 + KUB 19.6 + KBo 19.73 + KBo 19.73a ii 82–83 (Alakš.); *ABU=YA kuwapi* m*Ḫattušiliš ANA* m*Urḫitešupaš* DUMU m*Mūwattalli menaḫḫanda kururiaḫta n=an* LUGAL-*eznani arḫa tittanut* ‘When my father Ḫattušili became hostile towards Urḫiteššub, son of Muwattalli, and he removed him from the kingship’ BrTabl. i 6–8; *nu ṬUPPU RIKILTI kuwapi iēr apūn=ma=za* MUNUS-*an* mdLAMMA-*aš ANA PANI ABI=YA datta=pat nawi* ‘And when they made the treaty tablet, Kurunta had not yet taken (in marriage) that woman in the presence of my father’ BrTabl. ii 86–87; *anda=ma=kan* UDU-*un kuwāpi kuewēn nu linkiya kattan kiššan daiwen* ‘But in

addition when we had killed a sheep (as part of the treaty-making ceremony), we placed the following obligations (lit., placed as follows) under oath' KBo 16.47:15–16 (treaty); see §25.15 (p. 333) for KBo 15.60 vi 3–11.

30.40. Instead of a single temporal adverb, a form of the relative *kui-* modifying a noun of time (hour, day, year, night, time) may occur: *kāša=kan kī tuppi kuedani* UD-*ti parā neḫḫun n=ašta* ÉRI[N].MEŠ KUR UGU *apēdani* UD-*ti arḫa ḫuittiyanun nu=mu=šša n ziqq=a* KARAŠ=*pat ḫūdāk arnut* 'On what day I have dispatched this tablet, on that day I have drawn forth troops of the Upper Land, and you too must promptly bring troops to me' HKM 71:24–31 (MH/MS); *n=ašta ANA* LÚ.MEŠ ^{URU}*Paḫḫuwa kuedani* UD-*ti kururaš memian anda ištamašteni nu apedani* [UD-*ti*] *ārten* 'On what day you hear a word of hostility among the men of Paḫḫuwa, on that [day] get there, (and strike Paḫḫuwa!)' KUB 23.72 + rev. 27–28; *nu=šši kattan* EGIR-*pa kuedani mēḫuni ārḫun* BÀD-*eššar=ma ŠA* GIŠ-*ṢÍ* 40 *gipeššar katta uet* 'at what time I caught up with him, a fortification wall (made) of wood (measuring) 40 *gipeššar* (ca. 20 m) came down' KBo 6.29 ii 31–33; *ēpzi=*[*ma kued*]*ani mēḫuni nu namma arḫa UL tarnāi* 'at what(ever) time (an angry deity) seizes, he doesn't ever let go' KUB 13.4 ii 23–24; *nu* ^{d}*SĪN-aš kueda*[*ni*] GE_6-*ti šakiyazi nu apēdani* GE_6-*ti ŪL kuitki ienzi* 'And on what night the Moon gives a sign, on that night they do nothing (i.e., all normal activities are suspended)' KUB 17.28 iii 21–23.

Causal Clauses

30.41. Causal clauses regularly precede the main clause and contain the word *kuit* 'because' in the "second" position (HE §323). In a sequence of two consecutive causal clauses, *kuit* is optional in the second clause (§30.73, p. 428).

30.42. In "second" (Wackernagel) position: KUR ^{URU}*Kizzuwatna=ya kuit ḫantezziš auriš* 'And because the land of Kizzuwatna is the first border watch point' HKM 74:12–14 (MH/MS); *nu=mu* ^{d}*IŠTAR* GAŠAN=*YA kuit kaniššan ḫarta* ŠEŠ=*YA=ya=mu* ^{m}NIR.GÁL *āššu ḫarta* 'Because *IŠTAR*, my lady, had honored me, and my brother Muwatalli held me in favor' KUB 1.1+ i 28–30 (Hatt. III); *nu=za* ^{d}*Upelluriš kuit* GE_6-*yaš* KI-*aš* KI.BAD-*aš nu=za aši nu*[*t*]*tariyan* DINGIR-*LIM-in ŪL šakti* 'Is it because you are remote from (see §16.49, p. 254) the Dark Earth, O Upelluri, that you do not know that upstart deity?' KUB 33.106 iii 38–39 (Ullik. III); KUR-*e=ma ḫūman kuit IŠTU* LÚ.KÚR [*dann*(*attaḫḫan*)] *ēšta* 'Because the whole land had been depopulated by the enemy' KUB 19.11 iv 12–13 (DŠ); and ^{URU}*Gašgaš=ma ḫūmanza kuit takšūl ēšta* 'Because the entire Kaška (group) was at peace (with us)' KBo 5.6 i 14 (DŠ).

30.43. Later than the "second" position: *ḫalkiš=ma=*⟨*šm*⟩*aš apiya aniyanza kuit nu* EGIR-*an tiyatten n=an anda ēpten n=an=kan* ÉSAG-*ḫi anda išḫūitten* 'because grain has been sown for you there (see §7.18, p. 147), get behind (the matter): gather it in and store it in a storage pit!' HKM 18 left edge 2–5 (MH/MS); [*z*]*ig=a=zza* ^{m}*Ḫuīlliš* (37) [*M*]*A*[*Ḫ*]*AR* ^{d}UTU-*ŠI kuit ēšta* 'But because you, Ḫuilli, were with His Majesty' HKM 55:36–37 (MH/MS); KUR ^{URU}*Nerigga=ma=z* LÚ.MEŠ ^{URU}*Gašga kuit dān ḫarkanzi* 'But

because the Kaška-men have taken for themselves the land of Nerik' KUB 17.21 iv 6–7 (MH/MS).

30.44. Note that in the first example cited in §30.43 *kuit* is preceded by three constituents (subject *ḫalkiš*, adverb *apiya*, and predicative participle *aniyanza*). The following example appears to show *four* constituents before *kuit*: *ammuk=ma* LUGAL-*UTTA* ^{d}*IŠTAR* GAŠAN=*YA* *annišan=pat kuit memišket* 'But because *IŠTAR*, My Lady, had *previously* promised *me* the kingship . . .' Ḫatt. iv 7–8.

30.45. Either the causal clause or its result clause or both *may* be **asyndetic**, but in NH usually both are introduced by *nu*: ***nu***=*mu* ^{d}*IŠTAR* GAŠAN=*YA* *kuit kaniššan ḫarta* ŠEŠ=*YA*=*ya*=*mu* ^{m}NIR.GÁL *aššu ḫarta* ***nu***=*mu*=*kan* GIM-*an* UN.MEŠ-*anna*⟨*n*⟩*za ŠA* ^{d}*IŠTAR* GAŠAN=*YA* *kaniššuwar ŠA* ŠEŠ=*YA*=*ya* [*aš*]*šulan auer* ***nu***=*mu* ˹*aršaniyer* 'Because *IŠTAR*, my lady, had recognized me, and my brother Muwatalli held me in favor, when (mean-spirited) men saw the recognition of *IŠTAR* and the favor of my brother, (***nu***) they envied me' KUB 1.1 i 28–32 (Hatt. III); ***n***=*aš katta ašanna kuit* SI×SÁ-*at* ***n***=*an katta ašašḫun* 'And because she (i.e., the Tawananna) was indicated by oracle to be removed (from her office) (lit., made to sit lower), I removed her' KBo 4.8 ii 6–7 (prayer, Murš. II). When the causal clause follows the main clause, it is introduced asyndetically: *ANA PANI* ŠÀ=[*KA*]=*wa*=*z duškišketta* † LÚ-*natar*=*mit*=*wa kuit pašta* 'Are you rejoicing because you have swallowed my "manhood"?' KUB 33.120 i 28–29 (myth, MH/NS).

Concessive Clauses

30.46. Concessive clauses ('although', 'even if') can be introduced with *mān* . . . -(*y*)*a* or *man mān* . . . -(*y*)*a* 'even if': ^{m}*Urḫi*-^{d}U-*upaš*=*ma*=*mu mān* ḪUL-*lušš*=*a ēšta ammuk*=*ma* . . . *ŪL*=*pat karuššiyanun* 'But although Urḫi-Teššup was hostile toward me, yet I was not silent' KBo 4.12 i 24–26; [*nu*]=*za mān irmalanzašš*=*a ēšta* ^{d}UTU-*ŠI*=*ma*=*tta* [*ANA*] *AŠAR ABI*=*KA tittanunun*=*pat* 'Although you were sickly, nevertheless (-*ma* . . . -*pat*) I, My Majesty, installed you in the place of your father' KBo 5.9 i 16–18. When the apodosis expresses a hypothetical situation, both protasis and apodosis are introduced by potential *man* ('irrealis'): *man*=*za ŪL manga waštulaš ēšta* [*m*]*an*=*ta*=*kkan* É *ABI*=*KA* KUR=*KA*=*ya ŪL arḫa dāir man*=*at damēdani kuedanikki piyēr* 'Even if you had been in no way a party to the crime, couldn't they have taken away from you the house of your father and your land and given it to someone else?' KBo 5.13 i 19–20 (see CHD *man* b 2′ [p. 142]); see *man*=*mu* [*mān* KASKAL.MEŠ *pera*]*n arpuwanteššš*=*a ešer a*[*mmuk*=*man*=*kan*] [*INA*] ḪUR.^{SAG}*Teḫšina šarā*=*pat pāu*[*n*] 'Even [if the roads before] me had been impassable, I would still (-*pat*) have ascended Mt. Teḫšina' KUB 19.37 iii 51–53 (AM 176–179.).

Conditional Clauses

30.47. A **conditional** clause expresses the premise that must hold if the action or state of the main clause is to be fulfilled. Conditions may be fulfillable or non-fulfillable.

Simple fulfillable conditions may refer to past, present, or future time.[17] **Contrary-to-fact** conditions are based on a premise that is known to be false and are thus unfulfillable. Simple conditions are introduced either by *takku* (in Old Hittite) or *mān* (in post-Old Hittite), both meaning 'if' (see §30.48 on the diachrony). Contrary-to-fact conditional clauses (CHD *man* b 2′) are introduced by the potential particle *man* (usually written *ma-an* or *ma-n*°) and *mān* 'if'. Often these two words are blended as *ma-am-ma-a-an* (from **man*+*mān*).

30.48. Preliminary study indicates that in the case of conditional sentences the manner of connecting dependent 'if' clause (protasis) with result clause (apodosis) was significantly altered between Old and New Hittite. But even in OH the method seems to have varied. In the OH Hittite laws and elsewhere[18] the protasis was introduced by *takku* 'if', and the apodosis followed without introductory conjunctive particle (Friedrich 1959: 88; LH 12). That is, the main clause was joined asyndetically to the preceding dependent clause. This type is also found in other passages in OH/MS and OH/NS texts (e.g., *takku* ÌR.MEŠ-*am*=*man* (see §1.118, p. 43) *ištarna* ŠUM=Š[*UNU*] *kuiški tezzi* † ÌR =*miš lē* 'If among my servants someone speaks their name, † let him not be my servant' KBo 3.27 obv. 10–11, see also KBo 3.28:12, VBoT 58 i 40–41). These include OH/NS omen texts showing the sequence of *takku* . . . (asyndeton) . . .' (e.g., *takku*=*za* ÉLLAG UDU-*aš tetan kiša* † *apedani* UN-*ši kallarešzi* 'If the kidney (in extispicy) resembles (lit., becomes) a sheep's *tetan*, † it will be unlucky for that person' KUB 4.1 iv 29).[19] **In post-OH** the 'if' word changed to *mān*, but the asyndetic introduction of the apodosis remained in isolated examples in MH/MS and even in NH: *mān* ŪL=*ma* † *uwaši ḫar*(*a*)*kši* 'But if not (i.e., if you do not bring the prisoners), you will surely die' (see §24.31ff., pp. 324ff.) HKM 35:8–9 (MH/MS), *mān*=*at* [*i*]*yazi* † *lē*=*at kuiški šakki* 'If he does it, let no one know it' KUB 21.17 iii 31–32 (Hatt. III). In some Old Hittite rituals, however, a different pattern is found: the conditional clause is introduced by *mān* or *takku*, and the apodosis by *nu* (so Otten and Souček 1969: 91–92). In MH and NH compositions (*not* copies of OH texts made by post-OH scribes), on the other hand, *nu* almost always introduced the apodosis following a protasis containing *mān* 'if'.

Simple Conditions

30.49. By far the most common type of conditional clause in Hittite is the **simple future** (open or fulfillable) condition, attested especially in the Laws, in omen texts, in instructions, and in treaties. In Old Hittite: *takku* LÚ.U_{19}.LU-*aš* LÚ-*aš našma* MUNUS-*aš takīya* URU-*ri aki* † *kuel*=*aš arḫi aki* † 1 *ME* GIŠ*gipeššar* A.ŠÀ *kar*(*a*)*šši*[*yezzi*] *n*=*an*=*za dāi*

17. Conditions may also be either particular ('If the king sends/will send 1,000 troops, we will defeat the enemy') or general ('If anyone violates/shall violate the oath, he will die'), but this distinction does not appear to be relevant for Hittite grammar.

18. *takku šumeš natta šakteni* † *kāni* LÚŠU.GI-*ešš*=*a* NU.GÁL *nu*=*šmaš memai AWĀT ABI*=*YA* 'If you do not know, is there here not even an old man, that he may tell you the word of my father?' KBo 22.1 5–6 (OS).

19. Many of the above observations on asyndesis in Hittite texts were made by Hoffner (1996c).

'If a person, man or woman, is ever/shall be killed in another(?) city, (the victim's heir) shall deduct three acres from the land of the person on whose property the person was killed and shall take it for himself' KBo 6.2 i 7–8 (Laws §6, OS); note that the apodoses clauses contain present-future tense verbs (*kar*(*a*)*šši̯ezzi* and *dāi*) and are introduced asyndetically and by *nu*.

30.50. Other examples from OH texts copied by NH scribes (OH/NS): *takku* DUMU.LUGAL *ḫantezziš* NU.GÁL *nu kuiš tān pēdaš* DUMU-*RU nu* LUGAL-*uš apāš kišaru* 'If there shall not be a first-rank prince, then let a prince of second rank become king' KBo 3.1 ii 36–38 (OH/NS); *takku* DUMU.LUGAL=*ma waštai nu* SAG.DU-*az=pat šarnikdu* 'If a prince 'sins' (i.e., attempts homicide), let him pay only with his own person (not with those of his extended family)' KBo 3.1 ii 55–56 (OH/NS); *takku* MUNUS-[*za ḫ*]*āši nu annaz=pat* ŠÀ-*az* [*a*]*īš arḫa ḫāši nu memai* † ^{d}U-*aš* KUR-*e zāḫi* 'If a woman gives birth, and right from the mother's womb it (the infant) opens its mouth and speaks, the Stormgod will strike the land' KBo 6.25+13.35 iii 5–7 (birth omen).

30.51. Simple future conditions with *mān* 'if': *mān INA* UD.12.KAM ^{d}*SIN-aš aki* † KUR-*e anda* BURU$_5$ *arāi* 'If the Moongod ever dies (i.e., is eclipsed) on the twelfth day, a swarm of locusts will arise in the land' KUB 8.1 iii 3 (lunar omen); *mān=wa* [LÚ] ^{URU}*Aššur uezzi nu=war=an zaḫ*[*ḫi*]*yatten* 'If the Assyrian comes, fight him' KUB 14.16 i 16 (AM 26–27); *mān=war=ān ŪL=ma ēptēni nu=war=an=mu parā ŪL pēštēni nu=wa uwami nu=wa=šmaš QADU* KUR=*KUNU arḫa ḫarnikmi* 'If you do not seize him (the fugitive) and do not give him over to me, I will come and destroy you together with your country' KBo 5.13 i 7–9 (Treaty with Kupanta-Kurunta). Here, as often, the force of *mān* 'if' carries over into an additional protasis introduced by *nu*.

30.52. Hittite also has the equivalent of what are traditionally termed "less vivid" future conditions, marked with *man* to express greater uncertainty. Compare the Greek construction with optatives in both protasis and apodosis and the irrealis particle ἄν in the apodosis (Goodwin 1965: 301 §1408). With *man* in both the protasis and apodosis (for the omission of 'if' see §30.56, p. 423): *man=kan* ^{d}UTU-*ŠI BELI=YA BELU kuinki parā naitti man* KUR-*i* LÚ.KÚR *ŪL dammišḫaizzi* '(If) you, Your Majesty, were to send a lord (to lead an army), the enemy would not oppress the land' HKM 46:15–17 (MH/MS). By his use of the irrealis *man* particle the speaker is not excluding the possibility of the king's sending an army; instead he appears to be making a greater concession to the king's freedom to choose: 'If you were to send . . . , this would be helpful, but you may have good reasons for not doing so'. With the first *man*-irrealis written plene (see CHD *man* b 2′ c′): *mān=wa=mu* 1-*an* DUMU-*KA paišti man=war=aš=mu* ^{LÚ}*MUTI=YA kišari* 'If you were to give me one of your sons, he would become my husband' KBo 5.6 iii 12–13 (DŠ).[20]

20. We cannot accept Puhvel's interpretation of this example as an optative 'If you give me a son of yours, may he become my husband!' (HED M 37). Indeed we explicitly deny his claim that "there is insufficient evidence to sustain a 'potential' category with *man* and present tense . . . or a 'subject-optative' . . .

30.53. Examples of a **simple present condition**: *nu=ššan mān ḫalkiēš aranteš n=aš=kan arḫa warašten* 'If the crops are ripe, harvest them!' HKM 25 15–17 (MH/MS); *n=aš mān karū pānza* 'If he is/has already gone . . .' HKM 66 23–24 (MH/MS); '(Does my brother then have nothing?)' *mān* ANA DUMU ^{d}UTU *našma* DUMU ^{d}U *ŪL kuitki ēšzi našma aruni ŪL ēšzi tuqq=a ŪL kuitki ēšzi* 'If the son of the Sungod or the son of the Stormgod has nothing, or the sea has nothing, (then) you also have nothing!' KUB 21.38 obv. 15–16 (Letter of Puduḫepa to Ramses II). For an additional OH example see p. 420, n. 18. An example of a **simple past condition** is: NINDA-*an=za wemiyanun n=an=za* AḪITI=YA *natta kuwapikki edun wātar=ma=z wemiya⟨nun⟩ n=at* AḪITI=YA *ŪL kuwapikki ekun* '(if ever) I found bread, I did not eat it secretly; (if ever) I found water, I did not drink it secretly' KUB 30.10 obv. 16–17. The following example of a **simple past condition** employs the "historical present" (see §22.6, p. 307): *mān=mu ištarakzi kuwapi nu=za=kan ḫirmalaš=pat ŠA* DINGIR-*LIM ḫandandatar šer uškenun* 'If I ever became ill, even (while) ill I experienced the divine power of the deity' Ḫatt. i 44–45.

Contrary-to-Fact Conditions

30.54. Unfulfillable (contrary-to-fact) conditions or undesirable future situations (§23.15, p. 316) are marked with *man* or *mān* + *man* in the protasis and *man* in the apodosis. One attested example of a **present contrary-to-fact** condition shows a preterite tense verb in the first protasis, but present tense in the second protasis and in the apodosis: *mām=man* (= *mān man*) *dandukišnaš=a* DUMU-*aš uktūri ḫuišwanza ēšta man=a=šta mān antuwaḫḫaš idāluwa inan arta man=at=ši natta kattawatar* 'If a mortal were to live forever, and the evil sickness of man were to remain (lit., stand), would that not be a grievance for him?' KUB 30.10 obv. 22–23.[21] Another has a preterite verb in the protasis and the first two clauses of the apodosis, but present verbs in the last two clauses of the apodosis: *ma-a-am*[*-ma-an-ša-ma-aš*?] (i.e., **mān=man=š(a)maš*)[22] *tayazzil pišker man ḫūmanteš=pat maršēr* [*man*]*=e* LÚ.MEŠNÍ.ZU *kīšantati kāš=man kūn ēpzi* [*k*]*āš=a=man kūn ēpzi* 'If they [were] to charge [them] with theft, all of them might dissemble, they [mig]ht become thieves; this one might seize that one, and that one might seize this one' KBo 6.2 ii 53–55 (Laws §49, OS). A third has a preterite verb in the protasis and a present verb in the apodosis: *mam=man=za=kan kuiški* É-*er tamaiš arnut man zik ŪL aršanieše* 'If someone else were to confiscate your house, would you not be upset?' ABoT 65 rev. 5–6 (MH/MS). The generalization appears to be that the construction must begin with a preterite and end with a present tense, but the rationale for the distribution of the tenses of any intermediate verbs remains unclear.

---

alleged examples have found better integration in the optative and contrary-to-fact constructions discussed above" (HED M 39).

21. The parallel text KUB 36.79 ii 50 has *artari=ya* in the second apodosis, confirming the present tense. The omission of the verb 'be' in the apodosis shows that it is in the present tense (see §22.3, p. 306).

22. See LH 59–60, 191–92.

30.55. Past contrary-to-fact conditions show consistently preterite verbs in both the protasis and apodosis. Examples: *man=kan mān* ANA ^{m}*Attaršiya ḫuišwetenn=a kāštit=a=man ākten* 'Even if you had survived Attaršiya, you would have died of hunger' KUB 14.1 obv. 12 (MH/MS); *nu=šmaš* ^{LÚ}*auriyaluš kuit arantat mān=kan mān* ANA ^{m}*Pittaggatalli=pat warpa teḫḫun man=mu* ^{LÚ}*auriyaluš* (var. ^{LÚ}*auriyatalluš*) *kuit* ŠA ^{m}*Pitaggatalli auēr man=mu* ŪL *duḫušiyait* 'And because sentries were in place, if I had tried to surround Pittaggatalli himself, because the sentries of Pittaggatalli would have seen me, he would not have waited for me' KBo 5.8 iii 14–18 (NH). As the second example shows, when the potential-irrealis *man* is employed together with conditional clauses, no clause connective (*nu* or *-ma*) is used. For further examples of past contrary-to-fact conditions see CHD *man* b 2′ c′.

30.56. Sometimes *mān* 'if' is unexpressed in conditional clauses: *INA* ITU.12.KAM DUMU-*aš miyari* † *apāš* DUMU-*aš* ^{LÚ}ŠU.GI-*ešzi* '(if) a child is born in the twelfth month, that child will live to an advanced age' KUB 8.35 i 9 (menology); *wašdul kuēlqa autti . . . nu=za pankun* EGIR-*pa punuške* '(if) you see a crime, always consult the *pankuš*' KUB 1.16 iii 59–61 (OH/NS); NINDA-*an=za wemiyanun n=an=za* AḪITI=YA *natta kuwapikki edun wātar=ma=z wemiya⟨nun⟩ n=at* AḪITI=YA ŪL *kuwapikki ekun* '(if ever) I found bread, I did not eat it secretly; (if ever) I found water, I did not drink it secretly' KUB 30.10 obv. 16–17. A similar use with the present-future tense (both in real future conditions and past contrary-to-fact conditions) exists in informal USA sports-TV jargon: 'He catches that ball, and the game is over'.

30.57. Often, in *sequences* of 'if' clauses, instead of *takku* or *mān*, the word *našma* 'or (if)' introduces the **conditional** clause without *mān*: *našma* LÚ.KÚR GUL-*aḫzi nu pē ḫarzi zik=ma peran šarā* ŪL *wa*[(*rrišš*)]*atti nu* LÚ.KÚR ŪL *zaḫḫiyaši* 'or (if) the enemy attacks, and holds (the acquired position), but you don't come to assist in advance, and you don't fight the enemy' KUB 21.1 iii 50–52 (NH). On occasions, however, the more complete *našma mān* is employed: *našma mān* KUR-*TUM kuitki zaḫḫiyaza* LUGAL KUR ^{URU}*Ḫatti anda ḫatkišnuzzi* 'of if the King of Ḫatti besieges some land in battle' KBo 5.9 iii 23–24 (NH); *našma mān* ANA ÌR-*DI kuedanikki waštul waštul=ma=zza=kan* ANA PANI EN=*ŠU tarnāi* 'or if some slave sins, he shall confess his sin before his master' KUB 14.8 rev. 25–26 (NH); *našma mān* BELU *kuinki* [(*kēz*)] [(KUR-*az*)] *laḫḫiyauwanzi uiyami* 'or if from this land I send out some lord to campaign' KUB 21.1 iii 7–8; *našma mān* DINGIR-*LIM-ni kuedani* $EZEN_4$ GA *ēšzi* 'or if for some deity there is a Festival of Milk' KUB 13.4 iv 41 (pre-NH).

Relative Clauses

30.58. The most common type of dependent clause in Hittite is the **relative clause** (see chapter 8 for the relative pronouns). There are two fundamental differences between relative clauses in Hittite and those in languages such as English. First, since relative clauses in English must immediately follow the noun they describe or modify, they are

most often *inserted* into the main clause: 'The horse *that he rode* was strong' or 'The man *who*(*m*) *I saw* walked away', especially when the modified noun is the subject of the main clause. When the modified noun is the direct object of its clause, the unmarked word order is subject-verb-object (SVO), with the object last, and therefore the relative clause does not interrupt the main clause: 'I know a woman *who likes cats*'. Most Hittite relative clauses *precede* the main clause, while a few follow; relative clauses *never* interrupt a main clause. Second, while in English the noun phrase referred to by the relative clause (the "antecedent") always stands in the main clause (underlined in the examples given), in Hittite preposed relative clauses (by far the most common type) the antecedent stands in the *relative* clause (in the appropriate case) and is resumed in the main clause by (1) an enclitic pronoun, (2) a demonstrative pronoun, or (3) a demonstrative plus the repeated noun, again in the appropriate case. In rare instances (4) there is no resumptive word, but the antecedent still stands in the relative clause. Examples: (1) *nu* DUMU-*an kuin ḫukkiškemi n=an=kan* ŠUM=ŠU *tēmi* 'Which child I am saying spells over, him I say his name' = 'I call by name the child whom I am saying spells over' KUB 7.1 i 7; (2) KUR.KUR.ḪI.A *kue dannatta ammuk* EGIR-*pa ašešanunun nu=mu=kan apē=ya ḫūmanda arḫa dāš* 'Which empty lands I resettled, all those too he took away from me' = 'He also took away from me all those empty lands that I had resettled' Ḫatt. iii 57–58; (3) [(GU)]D *pūḫugarin=ma kue*[(*d*)]*ani* UD-*ti unuēr nu=za* ^{d}UTU[(=*šı ape*)]*tani* UD-*ti war*[(*p*)]*ta* 'On which day they adorned the substitute ox, on that day His Majesty bathed' = 'His Majesty bathed (on) the day on which they adorned the substitute ox' KUB 43.50 + KUB 15.36 obv 18–19 (NH); (4) [^{LÚ}KA]Š$_4$.E *tarḫzi kuiš* † 1 MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR . . . *pianzi* 'Which runner wins, they give one mina of silver' = 'They give one mina of silver to the runner who wins' KBo 20.33:12 (OS). For the asyndeton in (4) see §29.55 (p. 404).[23]

30.59. Hittite and English relative clauses do share one important feature: the relative pronoun must undergo "wh-movement," that is, it is fronted in its clause, regardless of its function (subject, object, locatival expression, etc.): see Berman 1972a: 4–5. But this pattern is complicated in Hittite by another factor not present in English: Hittite distinguishes between *determinate* and *indeterminate* preposed relatives (see Held 1957; Hale 1987: 46–49; and Garrett 1994: 43–49). Determinate relative clauses refer to specific things whose existence has already been established in the discourse, as in all four examples given above in §30.58. Indeterminate relatives, on the other hand, refer to indefinite things whose existence is not necessarily established: (5) *kuiš ammel āppan* LUGAL-*uš kīšari nu* ^{URU}*Ḫattušan āppa ašāši n=an nepišaš* ^{d}IŠKUR-*aš ḫazziēt*[(*tu*)] 'Who(ever) becomes king after me and resettles Ḫattuša, let the Stormgod of Heaven strike him!' KBo 3.22: 49–51 (OS); (6) *nu=šši=šan kuit šaḫḫan* LUGAL-*uš dāi nu apāt ēššai* 'What(ever) service the king imposes upon him, he shall do it' KBo 6.4 iv 16–17 (Laws §XXXVII, NH). Notice that since indeterminate relative clauses do not estab-

23. The present description could not take into account the newly published analysis of OH relative clauses by Probert (2006).

lish the reality of what is said, they are always equivalent to conditional clauses (= 'If someone becomes king after me and . . .', and 'If the king imposes some service upon him . . .') and take present-future verbs. As first shown by Held (1957), in Hittite *indeterminate* relative clauses, the relative pronoun must occur in clause-initial position or follow directly a clause-initial conjunction and any attached clitics (for the latter possiblity see example 6 above); it cannot be preceded by any accented constituent. In *determinate* relative clauses the relative pronoun must be preceded by *at least* one accented constituent, as the result of "fronting" (see §30.5–30.6, p. 407). Sometimes only one constituent of a noun phrase is fronted, resulting in a noun being separated from its modifiers or from a coordinated noun: (7) *nu=za kē kue AWATE*^{MEŠ} *ANA* ^{d}IŠKUR *ABI=KA U ANA* ^{d}UTU ^{URU}TÚL-*na* AMA=*KA arkuwar ēššaḫḫi* 'These words which I make as a plea to the Stormgod your father and to the Sungoddess of Arinna your mother . . .' KUB 21.27 iv 44–45; (8) *nu* NUMUN.ḪI.A *kue ḫūman šanḫuta* 'all the seeds which were roasted' KBo 4.2 i 62 (rit.); (9) NAM.RA.ḪI.A KUR ^{URU}*Nuḫašši kuiēš U* NAM.RA.ḪI.A KUR ^{URU}*Kinza ABU=YA arnut* 'The civilian captives of the land of Nuḫašši and the civilian captives of the land of Kinza that my father removed . . .' KBo 5.9 ii 38–39 (NH). See also example 2 cited above: KUR.KUR.ḪI.A *kue dannatta ammuk* EGIR-*pa ašešanunun* 'the empty lands that I resettled'.

30.60. In the vast majority of determinate relative clauses, the relative pronoun is preceded by only one syntactic constituent (Hale 1987: 49; Garrett 1994: 46). But there remain genuine exceptions in which more than one constituent precedes the relative pronoun. In addition to example 4, ^{LÚ}KAŠ$_4$.E *tar(a)ḫzi kuiš* cited above, where the relative pronoun follows the subject noun and the verb, note also the following: (10) [(*nu=mu* LUGAL)].MEŠ *MAḪRU=YA āššauwaš memiyanaš kuiēš ešer* 'The kings senior to me who had been on good terms with me . . .' Ḫatt. iv 50; and (11) *nu* ^{m}*Urḫi*-^{d}U-*upaš BELU*$^{ḪI.A}$ *kuiēš kuwapi arḫa uiyat* 'The lords whom Urḫiteššub had sent away somewhere . . .' (Ḫatt. iv 19–20). For similar exceptions with interrogatives see §27.7 (p. 351) and §27.12 (p. 352), and see also §30.43 (p. 418) on the position of the causal conjunction *kuit*. Further research and some revision of the formal description in Hale and Garrett may be needed. For understanding the crucial distinction between indeterminate and determinate relatives, it is enough to determine whether or not the relative pronoun is preceded by at least one accented constituent.

30.61. In extremely rare instances Hittite does employ a pair of preposed relative clauses where the first must be understood as subordinate to the second: DINGIR-*LIM=kan kuedani ANA* ^{DUG}GÌR.GÁN *anda arranzi n=ašta wātar kuit ANA* ^{DUG}GÌR.GÁN *anda n=at PANI* DINGIR-*LIM apēz=pat IŠTU* ^{DUG}GÌR.GÁN *dāi* 'In which vessel they wash the god, the water which is in the vessel, it he places before the god with that very same vessel' = 'He puts the water which is in the vessel in which they wash the god before the god with that very same vessel' KUB 27.16 i 30–33 (NS).

30.62. Occasionally, Hittite relative clauses follow the main clause. Their structure superficially matches that of English: the antecedent is in the main clause and is not

resumed in the relative clause. Garrett (1994: 47) distinguishes two types. The first is the "non-restrictive" relative, which, like those in English, does not identity the antecedent noun phrase but merely adds further incidental information (such a clause is usually marked by a pause in spoken English and is set off by commas in writing). For example, DINGIR.LÚ.MEŠ DINGIR.MUNUS.MEŠ *ŠA* LUGAL *U* MUNUS.LUGAL-*UTTI kuiēš daranteš kuiēš ŪL daranteš* 'Gods and goddesses of the King and Queen, those who (are) named, (and) those who (are) not named, (those whose temples the King and Queen frequent, and those whose temples they do not frequent)' KUB 6.46 iii 42–43 (NH).

30.63. Also postposed after the main clause are "indefinite relatives." Unlike preposed indeterminate relatives, these presuppose the existence of the noun phrase referred to. But unlike preposed determinate relatives, the noun phrase is indefinite, not something specific that has already been mentioned: e.g., *nu* 8 DUMU.MEŠ-*uš uwadanzi* MUNUS-*ni=ššan kuiēš nāwi pānzi* 'They bring eight boys who have not yet gone to a woman' KUB 9.31 ii 9–10 (NS); *mān ta*[*m*]*aiš=ma kuiški BELUM ḫandāitta kuiš ḫantezzi*[*a*]*nni arta* 'But if some other official is available who is standing in the front line' IBoT 1.36 iv 20–21 (MH/MS).

30.64. Very rarely, forms of relative *kui-* stand for unexpressed clauses of the type 'who (is/are there)', in which case *kui-* stands in the main clause itself: *UMMA* ^{d}UTU-*ŠI-MA ANA* ^{m}*Kuikuišanduwa kuedaš QIBI-MA* 'thus says His Majesty: say to Kuikuišandu (and) who(ever are also there)!' (Ortaköy 90/1400 1–3 [letter], cited in Süel 1992: 491; the lines which follow contain second-person plural imperative verb forms). Note: the absence of clitic *-a*/*-ya* on *kuedaš* may indicate that Kuikuišanduwa is included.

Indirect Statements and Questions

30.65. Indirect statements and **indirect questions** generally follow the main clause and are introduced asyndetically (the point of asyndeton is indicated below by †). Almost all of our examples come from NH or at least NS texts. Indirect statements usually contain *kuit* 'that': *ammel kāš=pat* 1-*aš dammešḫaš* † *kīy=an* 1-*an dammešḫanunun* † *IŠTU* É.GAL-*LIM=pat=kan kuit katta uiyanun* 'This was my only punishment (of the Tawannanna). I punished her with this one thing: † only (*-pat*) that (*kuit*) I sent her down from the palace' KBo 4.8 ii 12–14; often **after verbs of perception** (seeing, hearing, knowing): *maḫḫan=ma* LÚ.MEŠ ^{URU}*Aššur auēr* † URU.DIDLI.ḪI.A BÀD*=kan kuit zaḫḫiyaz katta daškeuwan teḫḫun* 'When the Assyrians saw † that I had begun to capture fortified cities in battle' KBo 4.4 iv 28–29 (NH); [(*nu* ^{m}*Aitaqq*)]*amaš kuiš* LUGAL ^{URU}*Kinza ēšta nu=šši* ^{m}*Niqma-*^{d}U-*aš* [*kuiš*] [*ḫant*]*ezziš* DUMU-*laš ēšta nu maḫḫan aušta* † [*anda*]*=kan kuit ḫatkešnuwanteš nu=šmaš ḫalki*$^{ḪI.A}$*-uš namma* [*tepaw*]*ešzi nu=za* ^{m}*Niqma-*^{d}U-*aš* ^{m}*Aitaqqaman ABU=ŠU kuenta* 'When Niqmadda, the oldest son of Aitaqqama, king of Kadesh, saw † that they were besieged, and that their grain supplies were low, Niqmaddu killed Aitaqqama, his father' KBo 4.4 ii 3–6 (AM 112–113).

30.66. Instead of a *kuit* clause, verbs of perception or speaking can take an adjective, noun, or participle as a second direct object: *ammuk=war=an akkantan* IQBI 'he told me it was dead' KUB 13.35 iii 17; *maḫḫan=ma* KUR.KUR.MEŠ LÚ.KÚR ^{m}*Arnuandan* ŠEŠ=YA *irman ištamaššer* 'But when the enemy lands heard that my brother Arnuanda was ill' KBo 3.4 i 6–7 (AM).

30.67. With the verb 'to know that . . .' one can also use a construction in which the indirect statement precedes the main clause asyndetically: *kinun=wa=z nūwa* $^{MUNUS.MEŠ}$ŠU.GI[*-uš*] [*punuškez*]*zi* ŪL *šaggaḫḫi* 'I don't know (if) she [is] now (*kinun*) still [consulting] Old Women' KUB 1.16 iii 68–69 (OH/NS).

30.68. Indirect questions (Mascheroni 1980: 58–59) are often formed in conjunction with clauses containing the verb *šak-* 'to know', *auš-* 'to see', or *ḫatrāi-* 'to write', as well as *punušš-* 'to ask'. They usually follow their main clause but occasionally precede, as the examples cited below show.

30.69. Using *mān* 'if, whether' (HE §333; Mascheroni 1980: 58; and CHD sub *mān* 4) — with single *mān*: *nu* BELU LÚ.MEŠ KUR-*TI=pat punuš mān ammuk šaḫḫan luzzi iššaḫḫun* 'O lord, just ask the men of the land if I ever had to perform *šaḫḫan* and *luzzi* obligations!' HKM 52:38–39 (MH/MS); — with *mān . . . mān* 'whether . . . or': *nu* ^{m}[*Urḫiteš*]*upaš kuit apiya n=an punuš* † *mān kišan mān* ŪL *kišan* 'Since Urḫi-Teššub is there (see §7.18, p. 147), just ask him if it is so or not so' KUB 21.38 obv. 11–12 (NH); *nu* ŪL *šagga*[*ḫḫun*] † *mān=za* LUGAL KUR ^{URU}*Mizri ANA* [*ABI*]=YA *edaš ANA* KUR.KUR.MEŠ *šer ar*[*kamma*]*n iyat* † *mān=za* UL *kuitki* [*iyat*] 'I don't know if the King of Egypt has rendered tribute to my father for those lands or if he has rendered nothing' KUB 31.121a ii 12–15; cf also KUB 31.121 iii 11–14.

30.70. Using a form of *kui-* 'who? what?' (all exx. NH or NS): *nu* DINGIR.MEŠ ŪL [*šekteni* † *k*]*uēll=aš dammešḫaš* 'O gods, don't [you know] whose is the injury?' KBo 4.8 iii 3–4, ed. Hoffner 1983a: 188; ŪL *šaqqa*[*ḫḫ*]*i* † *kuiš=aš aši* DINGIR-*LIM-iš* 'I don't know who that god is' KUB 33.106 iii 44 (Ullik.). Not clause-initial: *šumeš=wa* [D]INGIR.MEŠ ŪL *uškatteni* † *kiššan=wa=mu kuiš iyan ḫarzi* 'don't you gods see who has done this (lit., thus) to me?' KUB 54.1 i 20–21 (NH). With subject matter of inquiry preceding: KUR ^{URU}*Wiluša=ma ANA* KUR ^{URU}*Ḫatti kuedani* LUGAL-*i auwan arḫa tīyat nu memīyaš kui*[(*t*)] [(*i*)]*štantanza n=an* ŪL *šaqqa*[*ḫḫi*] 'Since the incident occurred long ago, I don't know from what Hittite king Wiluša defected' KUB 21.2 + KUB 48.95 i 6–9 (Alakš., NH); *kuedani=wa uddanī uwanun nu=mu* TÚL-*anza punušdu witenanza* 'Let the spring, the water, ask me why I have come' KBo 10.45 ii 23–24 (OH/NS).

30.71. Using *kuwapi* 'where?': *kiššan=mu kuit ḫatrāeš kāša=wa* LÚ.KÚR *uet nu=wa=za=kan* ^{URU}*Ḫaparan iniššan tamašta* ^{URU}*Kašipuran=ma=wa=kan kēz tamašta apāš=wa=kan ištarna arḫa uet namma=ma=wa*⟨*r*⟩*=aš kuwapi pait nu=war=aš* ŪL IDE § *nu apāš* LÚ.KÚR *alwanzaḫḫanza imma ēšta n=an* ŪL *ša-a-ak-ta*《*-aš*》 '(Concerning) what you wrote me as follows: "The enemy has come and has besieged the city Ḫapara on that

side, and has besieged the city Kašipura on this side; and he has passed through (and gotten away). But I do not know (text: 'he does/did not know') where he was going." Was that enemy perhaps bewitched, that you did not know him?' HKM 6:3–14 (MH/MS), ed. Alp 1991a: 126–29. With question preposed: † *kuwapi=wa paiši ammuk=ma=wa=tta lē šaggaḫḫi* 'Let me not know where you are going' KBo 5.9 ii 44–45 (NH).

30.72. Using *maḫḫan* 'how?' (see CHD L–N, *maḫḫan* mng. 3) — with *maḫḫan* clause preceding: [*ḫ*]*antezziuš=ma=at* LUGAL.MEŠ *maḫḫan* [*a*]*rḫa pittalāer n=at* ^{d}UTU ^{URU}TÚL-*na* GAŠAN=*YA* [*š*]*akti* 'How the earlier kings neglected it (i.e., Nerik), you, Sun-goddess of Arinna, my Lady, know it' KUB 21.27 i 16–18 (prayer, NH), ed. Sürenhagen 1981: 108–111, see ibid. i 43; *nu=šmaš=kan ḫūmandaz maḫḫan* [. . . . .] *nu apātt=a* DINGIR.MEŠ-*eš=pat šekteni* 'You gods also know how [. . . . . -ed] you from/with everything' KBo 53.10 ii 11–12 (MH/MS); — with *maḫḫan* clause following: *zik* ^{d}*IŠTAR* ^{URU}*Nenuwa* GAŠAN-*NI ŪL šakti* † KUR ^{URU}*Ḫatti* GIM-*an dammešḫan* 'Don't you know *IŠTAR* of Nineveh, our Lady, † how the country of Ḫatti has been oppressed?' KBo 2.9 i 38–39 (prayer in a rit., NH); *nu tuel* LÚ *ṬEMU kuwat ŪL punušta* † *memaḫḫun=ši* GIM-*an* 'Why did you not ask your messenger how I spoke to him?' KUB 23.101 ii 5–6 (NH).

Multiple Dependent Clauses

30.73. The force of a subordinating conjunction can continue in multiple subsequent clauses: (**conditional**) [(*takk*)]*u* LÚ.U$_{19}$.LU-*an kuiški ḫūnikzi t=an ištarnikzi nu apūn šāktāizzi* 'If someone injures a (free) person and incapacitates him, he shall treat him' KBo 6.2 i 16–17 (Laws §10, OS); *mān kī=pat namma*[*=ma*] *damāi* NU.GÁL *kuitki nu* IGI-*zi* [SU.MEŠ SIG$_5$-*ru*] 'If it is only this, and there is nothing additional, let the first [exta be favorable] KUB 22.70 rev. 1 (NH); (**temporal**) *ABU=YA kuwapi* ^{m}*Ḫattušiliš ANA* ^{m}*Urḫitešupaš* DUMU ^{m}*Mūwattalli menaḫḫanda kururiaḫta n=an* LUGAL-*eznani arḫa tittanut ANA* $^{m.d}$LAMMA=*ma=kan waštul ŪL kuitki āšta* 'When my father Hattusili became hostile towards Urḫiteshub, son of Muwattalli and removed him from the kingship, no sin inhered in Kurunta' BrTabl. i 6–9 (NH); (**causal**) *ammuk ŪL kuitki kuit dammišḫān ḫarmi ŪL=ma=kan dān kuedaniki kuitki ḫarmi QATAMMA=ma=mu kuwat dammišḫiškanzi* 'Because I have damaged nothing, and (because) I have taken nothing from anyone, why are they injuring me in that way?' HKM 68:4–7 (MH/MS) (and §30.75).

30.74. A temporal clause can be followed by a causal clause (here connected by *-ma*) and then its main clause: *nu=za* ***maḫḫan*** URU-*an tarḫ*[*ta*] [*ABU=YA=m*]*a=kan* DINGIR.MEŠ-*aš* ***kuit*** *naḫḫa*[*nza ēšta*] [(*nu*)] *šarāzzi gurti ŠA* ^{d}[*Kubaba*? (*U ŠA*)] ^{d}LAMMA *ma*[- . . . (?)] *ŪL kuinki tarnaš* '**When** (i.e., after) my father had conquered the city (of Carchemish), **because** he feared the gods, he allowed no one [to spoil(?)] the upper citadel [or the temples(?)] of [Kubaba] and the Patron Deity' KBo 5.6 iii 31–35 (DŠ frag. 28.A). The reason for the adversative *=ma* here may perhaps be made clear by a slightly different translation: '(Although) my father had conquered the city, yet (*-ma*) because he feared the gods, he allowed no one. . . .' The same pattern can be seen with *kuwapi*: *nu ABU=YA*

kuwapi $^{m.GIŠ}$PA-LÚ-*in* *INA* KUR ^{URU}*Mezri* *IŠPUR* *n=an* *kiššan* ***kuit*** *wataraḫta* ‘**When** my father sent Ḫattušaziti to Egypt, **because** he commanded him as follows . . .’ KBo 5.6 iii 45–47 (DŠ frag. 28.A).

30.75. The opposite order of causal followed by temporal clause also occurs: *nu=mu* ^{d}*IŠTAR* GAŠAN*=YA* ***kuit*** *kaniššan ḫarta* ŠEŠ*=YA=****ya****=mu* ^{m}NIR.GÁL *āššu ḫarta* ***nu****=mu=kan* **GIM-*an*** UN.MEŠ-*anna⟨n⟩za* *ŠA* ^{d}*IŠTAR* GAŠAN*=YA* *kaniššūwar* *ŠA* ŠEŠ*=YA=ya* [*aš*]*šulan* *auēr* ***nu****=mu* *ˀaršaniyēr* ‘And **because** *IŠTAR*, my lady, had recognized me, **and** my brother Muwatalli held me in favor, **when** people saw the recognition by *IŠTAR* and the favor of my brother, they envied me’ Ḫatt. i 28–32.

30.76. A conditional clause can be followed by a causal clause, a temporal clause, and then its main clause: ***mān*** GUD *pūḫugariš=ma* EGIR KASKAL *ak*[*i* KASKAL? ***k***(***uit***)] *tūwa* *n=at* **GIM-*an*** *apiya* [*ara*(*nzi* ***nu*** *tamain* GUD *pūḫugarin* . . . *apēzza* . . . [*n*(*ann*)]*anzi* ‘But **if** the substitute ox dies on the way, **because** it (i.e., the destination city) is far, **when** they [arrive], they will drive another . . .’ KBo 4.2 iv 46–49 = MSpr rev. 32–35.

30.77. Relative clauses also co-occur in the same sentence with other dependent clauses: *nu* *ammel* ***kuwapi*** *AWATE*^{MEŠ} DINGIR.MEŠ *ištamaššanzi* *nu=mu=kan* ***kuiš*** *idaluš* *memiaš* ZI-*ni* *anda* *n=an=mu* DINGIR.MEŠ EGIR-*pa* SIG$_5$-*aḫḫanzi* *šarlanzi* ‘**When** the gods hear my words, the bad thing **that** is in my soul, they will make it right and lift it from me’ KUB 6.45 iii 45–47.

Chapter 31
SUMERIAN AND AKKADIAN

31.1. Much in Hittite language and literature is elucidated by Assyriology. Ancient Mesopotamian civilization (law, religion, economy, etc.) can be studied in any number of popular handbooks. Those aspects of Akkadian grammar and writing system which affect the reading of Hittite texts can be found in HE, pp. 170–182 (grammar) and HZL (writing system).

Sumerograms

31.2. One needs to know relatively little about Sumerian grammar in order to properly understand the Sumerograms in Hittite texts. They consist of the root forms of a limited number of nouns, adjectives, and verbs.

Nouns, *Adjectives, and Participles*

31.3. Noun case is normally not indicated by means of the common Sumerian suffixes, nor are any of the Sumerian verbal suffixes employed. For details see §31.17 (p. 434). When the plural markers are affixed to Akkadograms or syllabically written Hittite words, they are postpositional determinatives and are written in superscript (e.g., *QA-TE*$^{\text{ḪI.A}}$*-YA* 'my hands'). When they occur on Sumerograms, we follow the convention of the CAD and CHD in not superscripting them (e.g., UDU.ḪI.A 'sheep'); see §31.11 (p. 432). Plurals of nouns or adjectives are sometimes indicated by double writing: KUR.KUR(.MEŠ) 'the lands', DINGIR.MEŠ GAL.GAL DINGIR.MEŠ TUR.TUR 'the great gods (and) the lesser gods'. None of the overt plural markings is obligatory: the simple noun or adjective root can stand for the plural (see §31.18, p. 435, for details).

Pronouns

31.4. Sumerian pronominal suffixes are limited to the third-singular -BI 'its', seen in KI.LAL.BI 'its weight'.

Verbs

31.5. Rarely a verbal prefix, proper in Sumerian texts only to the preterite but employed more broadly in Hittite, BA- occurs in the complex BA.ÚŠ 'he died' (ÚŠ 'to die').

Akkadian Grammar

31.6. The best preparation for understanding Akkadograms in Hittite is a formal course in Akkadian. If only self-study is possible, either H. A. Hoffner's English trans-

lation of A. Ungnad's concise outline of Akkadian grammar (1992) or the two-volume introductory grammar by J. Huehnergard (2005a; 2005b) is recommended. The comprehensive grammar is by von Soden (1995; abbr. GAG[3]). There are two grammars of the Boğazköy corpus of Akkadian, that is, the Akkadian unilingual texts written by scribes in the Hittite capital. The older is by Labat (1932); the more recent is by Durham (1976). The latter was a Ph.D. dissertation at Harvard University and is not available commercially. It is not the purpose of this chapter to treat the material examined by these authors. Instead, what follows is a brief synopsis of Akkadian grammar as it appears in logograms found in Hittite contexts. It may seem strange to treat the *grammar* of what are essentially logograms scattered in sentences controlled by *Hittite* grammar. But it is important to have an orientation in Akkadian grammar in order to properly understand the Hittite scribes' use of these logograms.

31.7. Akkadian words and forms in Hittite context are called *Akkadograms* and are transcribed in printed publications in uppercase italic (§1.13, p. 14). For the nature of the cuneiform writing system see above, §§1.5ff. (pp. 10ff.).

Orthography

31.8. Hittite scribes did not use separate cuneiform signs to indicate voiced and voiceless stops (see above in chapter 1). For example, the orthographic system they inherited used both the DA and TA signs for *either* /da/ *or* /ta/. Akkadian *bēlti-ni* 'our lady' was usually written *BE-EL-DI-NI*, using the DI sign for what in Akkadian is a voiceless stop. Akkadian *labka* 'moist' (masc. sg. acc.) was written *LA-AB-GA*, using the GA sign for voiceless *KA*, which required more strokes to form. In transliteration it is possible to use the TÌ value of the DI sign to write *BE-EL-TÌ* and the KÀ value of GA to write *LA-AB-KÀ*. The transliterator in this way aids readers in identifying the intended Akkadian word, but such writings may tend to mislead readers into thinking that the ancient scribe has sought to represent the voiceless phoneme by a particular sign, when in fact he has not. In this grammar,[1] when representing Akkadograms in bound transcription, we consider it proper to render Akkadograms in a way that they can be correctly identified in an Akkadian word list or dictionary. We willingly sacrifice the accuracy of reflecting the signs the Hittite scribe wrote for the sake of clarity of meaning. Thus the Akkadogram *BE-EL-DI* '(my) lady' intends Akkadian *bēlti* (or *bēltī*) and in this grammar is written in bound transcription as *BĒLTI*. Similarly, *TE-ŠI* 'spring' comes from the Akkadian plural *dīšī*,[2] and ^{GIŠ}*GA-AN-NU*(*M*) 'pot-stand' represents ^{GIŠ}*KANNU*(*M*). In restricted contexts rare values of signs were used: in writing Akkadian *bēli-ni* 'our lord', Hittite scribes did not write *BE-LI-NI* but *BE-LÍ-NI*, using the NI sign with its unusual value *LÍ*.

1. In Hittitological literature in general it is more usual to find the Akkadograms rendered according to the main values of the cuneiform signs: *BELDI*, *TEŠI*, *GANNUM*, etc.

2. There is a very real possibility that the similarity in shape of TE and DI caused Hittite scribes to confuse the two signs in *DI-ŠI* as *TE-ŠI*, for at no time and in no geographic region in which Akkadian was written was this word vocalized as **dēšū* but rather as *dīšū* (Babylonian) or *daš'ū* (Assyrian).

31.9. The negative word *UL* (§§26.1ff., pp. 341ff.), is regularly written *Ú-UL* with two signs in Akkadian texts, not because there is vowel length but because this was the accepted spelling of the word in the writing system of the Akkadian scribes who introduced cuneiform writing at the Hittite capital. It is the regular way of spelling the word in Old Babylonian Akkadian. It is likewise written with two signs in all but the last century of scribal practice at Boğazköy. In texts written there during the thirteenth century the word was written with only one sign (*UL*, not *Ú-UL*). In the convention of the CHD, when representing the two-sign writing in broad transcription the *u*-vowel is written with a long mark, *ŪL*. We follow this convention in order to indicate the spelling. But by this writing we *do not mean* that we believe there was any difference in vowel length indicated by the different writings. In Hittite texts no phonetic complement indicates the underlying Hittite equivalent *natta.* That is, we find no writing **Ú-UL-ta*.

Superscripting

31.10. In transcribing Hittite texts superscripting is employed mostly with determinatives (§1.39, p. 23, §1.43, p. 24).[3] Sumerian words such as GIŠ 'wood, tree', URU 'city', KUR 'country', URUDU 'copper', NA_4 'stone', TÚG 'cloth, garment', NINDA 'bread', LÚ 'man', MUNUS 'woman', ḪUR.SAG 'mountain', ÍD 'river', DUG 'vessel, container', etc., are often prefixed to words in order to identify their semantic class, category, or material. A few determinatives are not prefixed but rather suffixed to their nouns (§1.42, p. 24): MUŠEN 'bird', SAR 'vegetable', and KI 'place' (in ^{URU}*Ḫatti*^{KI}, ^{URU}*Arinna*^{KI}, ^{URU}*Ḫalpa*^{KI} and KÁ.DINGIR.RA^{KI}). The occasional writing URU.KI (in MAŠKIM URU.KI and EN URU.KI) is a (false) Hittite abstraction from the fuller form with specific place names, just as UD.KAM 'day' and DUB.KAM 'tablet' were abstracted by Hittite scribes from longer expressions with numerals (see §9.51, p. 167; and p. 434, n. 5).

31.11. The most common post-positioned determinatives are the plural markers MEŠ and ḪI.A. Limited to the earliest written phases of Hittite is DIDLI, often combined with ḪI.A as DIDLI.ḪI.A. Although none of these was originally a plural marker in Sumerian itself but were first used to indicate the plural of Sumerograms in Akkadian texts, we follow the CAD and CHD convention and do not superscript them when they pluralize Sumerograms. Thus we write URU.DIDLI.ḪI.A, not URU$^{DIDLI.ḪI.A}$, but *ŠIPTUM*$^{ḪI.A}$ 'incantations', *ḪERĪTUM*$^{ḪI.A}$ 'ditches', *NAMMANTUM*$^{ḪI.A}$ 'measuring vessels'. While the Sumerian plural marker ḪI.A was occasionally employed on Hittite words (*kururi*$^{ḪI.A}$, *lapanalli*$^{ḪI.A}$*-uš*, *ḫalki*$^{ḪI.A}$*-uš*), the other plural markers MEŠ and DIDLI were not.

---

3. Rarely, superscripting is used in transliterations to indicate the function of a sign as the scribe's hint as to the correct reading of the immediately preceding polyvalent sign. An unusual example of this, which seems to have no purpose in Hittite, is in the sequence of signs *túḫ* + *a*/*iuḫ* + *ša*, which we transcribe *túḫ*^{uḫ}-*ša*, superscripting the A/I/UḪ sign, in order to show that it intends to show that the TÚḪ sign is to be read with a CVC value ending in VOWEL + Ḫ. This seems unnecessary, since in Hittite the TÚḪ sign only has values ending in VOWEL + Ḫ (i.e., *taḫ*, *tuḫ*, *daḫ*, *duḫ*).

Phonetic Complements

31.12. We follow the procedure of the CHD in not superscripting phonetic complements, either Hittite or Akkadian. We therefore write DINGIR-*LIM* 'god(dess)', and DINGIR-*LIM*-*iš*. Even such apparently awkward forms as É.ḪI.A-*TIM* 'houses' (for Akkadian *bītātim*), KÁ.GAL.ḪI.A-*TIM* 'city gates' (for Akk. *abullātim*), KASKAL.ḪI.A-*TIM* 'roads' (for Akk. *ḫarrānātim*), DUB.ḪI.A-*TIM* 'clay tablets' (for Akk. *ṭuppātim*), TUR.ḪI.A-*TIM* 'small (ones)' (for Akk. *ṣeḫrūtim*), NÍG.BA.ḪI.A-*TIM* 'gifts' (for Akk. *qīšātim*), and KUR.KUR.ḪI.A-*TIM* 'countries' (for Akk. *mātātim*) are not essentially different from *lapanalli* $^{\text{ḪI.A}}$-*uš* and *ḫalki* $^{\text{ḪI.A}}$-*uš* cited above. And there is no doubt that the final -*TIM* in *BE-LU* $^{\text{ḪI.A}}$-*TIM* 'lords' was intended to be read as part of the Akkadian word. Admittedly, there were a few inept scribes who falsely regarded -*TIM* (or -*TI*, without mimation; see §31.20, p. 436) as a kind of universal plural for Akkadian words. When this happened, it was affixed to words where a final syllable *-tim* or *-dim* cannot reasonably be assumed: $^{\text{GIŠ}}$BANŠUR.ḪI.A-*TIM* 'tables' is inappropriate for the Sumerian loanword in Akkadian *paššūru*, which inflects in the plural as a masculine noun: *paššūrū/ī*. But since this happened rarely, it does not justify our treating -*TIM* like a postpositional determinative.

31.13. While Hittite phonetic complements on Sumerograms are quite common (e.g., LUGAL-*uš* 'king'), those on Akkadograms are understandably rare, because with an Akkadographically written noun there is little chance of ambiguity of either number or case, and with finite verb forms the person of the subject and the tense are also normally quite clear. There are few instances of unnecessary Hittite complements on Akkadograms, and never on those in the construct state: *n=at=mu=kan talza AŠPUR-zi UL* 'he(!)[4] will not send it to me *talza*' KUB 40.1 rev! 17; *EL-LAM-aš QĀSSU* 'his hand (that) of a free man' KBo 6.3 i 29 (Laws §11). For *BE-LU-uš*(-*ša-an*) 'lord' (sg. nom.) HKM 52:25 and HKM 80 obv. 5 there may be a better explanation (see p. 22, n. 30).

Phonology

31.14. Akkadian possesses three basic vowels (*a*, *i*, and *u*) and a secondary vowel *e* derived from either *a* or *i*. These all occur both short and long, although the long vowels are rarely written *plene*. Real diphthongs are rare. There are two semi-vowels in Akkadian: *y* and *w*. A glottal stop (transcribed ʾ but often omitted in cuneiform writing) reflects a prehistorical merger of five distinct Proto-Semitic sounds. The presence in the noun or verb root of a Proto-Semitic laryngeal (*ḥ or* ʿ) in contact with an *a*-vowel colored that *a* (and sometimes also any *a* in the neighboring syllable) to the secondary vowel *e*. This shift was followed by the loss of the laryngeal and the compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel: **baʿl-* 'lord' > **beʿl-* > *bēl*; feminine **baʿlat-* 'lady' (= queen)' > **beʿlat-* > *bēlet-*; **malqaḥt-* 'that which is taken (as a tax or impost)' > **malqeḥt-* > *melqēt-*. In Hittite texts the first two nouns are seen in the singular as *BĒLU*

4. The Hittite complement *-zi* shows that the verb is third-person singular, but the Akkadian form *AŠPUR* (versus *IŠPUR*) should be first-person singular!

(*BĒLTU*), construct *BĒL* (*BĒLET*), and plural as *BĒLŪTI* (*BĒLĒTI*) (written EN-(*UT-*)*TIM*); the third noun appears in the construct with clitic possessive pronoun as *MELQĒSSU* (often inadequately transcribed as *ME-EL-KI-IZ-ZU*) 'its tax/perquisite'.

31.15. The consonants of Akkadian are represented in the following table:

	voiced	voiceless	emphatic	nasal
dentals	d	t	ṭ	n
labials	b	p		m
velars	g	k	q (velar)	
sibilants	z	s, š	ṣ	
liquids	l, r			
glottals		ʾ		
velar fricatives		ḫ		

31.16. The sibilant *š* immediately preceding a dental stop became *l*, as seen in MB *iltuḫḫu* 'whip' from OB *ištuḫḫu* and in *ilṭur* 'he wrote' from *ištur* (infinitive *šaṭāru*). In the opposite sequence—dental followed by *š*—the *š* first shifted to *s*, whereupon the dental fully assimilated to the *s*, producing *ss*. This development is most frequently seen in the nominative-accusative construct forms of nouns whose stems end in a consonant when followed by a clitic possessive pronoun beginning with *š* (e.g., *-šu* 'his', *-ši* 'her', *-šunu* 'their', etc.). Among Akkadograms in Hittite one finds it routinely in the word *QA-AS-SÚ* (less commonly written ŠU-*SÚ*) for Akkadian *qāssu* 'his hand' (nom. or acc.), which derives from the construct state *qāt* of the noun *qātu* 'hand' and the third-person masculine pronominal suffix *-šu* 'his'. Other examples where the gemination of the sibilant is masked by a Sumerogram are: KUR-*SÚ* for Akkadian *māssu* (< *māt-šu*) 'his land', SAG.DU-*SU* for Akkadian *qaqqassu* (< *qaqqad-šu*) 'his head', É-*SÚ* for Akkadian *bīssu* (< *bīt-šu*) 'his house', ÌR-*SÚ* for Akkadian *warassu* (< *warad-šu*) 'his man-slave', É-*SÚ-NU* 'their house(s)', TÚG-*SÚ-NU* (*ṣubāssunu* < *ṣubāt-šunu*) 'their garment(s)', NAM.RA.ḪI.A-*SÚ-NU* (*šallassunu* < *šallat-šunu*) 'their captives, prisoners of war', NIN-*SÚ-NU* (*aḫāssunu* < *aḫāt-šunu*) 'their sister', DUMU.MUNUS-*SÚ* (*mārassu* < *mārat-šu*) 'his daughter'.

Morphology

Nouns and Adjectives

31.17. Noun case is normally not indicated by means of the common Sumerian suffixes, nor are any of the Sumerian verbal suffixes employed. Only six Sumerian suffixes are employed on nouns or adjectives: (1) the genitive in *-a*(*k*),[5] seen in ANŠE.KUR.RA

5. The velar (k) is preserved only when immediately followed by another vowel-initial suffix, which in Hittite texts occurs only in the KAM immediately following a number (e.g., UD.10.KAM 'day of ten', i.e., 'tenth day', DUB.2.KAM 'second tablet').

('donkey [*anše*] of the foreign counry [*kur* + *-a*(*k*)]'), (2) the adjectival/participial ending *-a*, seen only occasionally, as in ì DÙG.GA ('oil [*ì*] that is fine/good [*dug* + *-a*]'), and (3, 4, 5, and 6) the plural indicators MEŠ, ḪI.A, E.NE, and DIDLI, as well as the combinations MEŠ.ḪI.A and DIDLI.ḪI.A. The suffix DIDLI alone (i.e., without ḪI.A added) is very rare and occurs only in the oldest texts. In a small number of cases a Sumerian word is doubled in the plural, such as KUR.KUR.MEŠ or KUR.KUR.ḪI.A 'countries', and in the case of DINGIR.MEŠ GAL.GAL 'the great gods', URU.DIDLI.ḪI.A GAL.GAL-*TIM* 'the large cities', 4 GIŠBAN TUR.TUR 'four small bows', the attributive adjective alone is doubled. This usage is occasionally extended even to a syllabically written Hittite noun: 5 *gapinan* TUR.TUR 'five small threads'.

31.18. Sumerograms did not need to have plural markers, especially when the context or preceding numbers made the plurality clear. Since the Hittite nouns behind NAM.RA 'deportees', GUD 'cattle', and UDU 'sheep', when conceived in the plural, were grammatically singular but with collective meaning, it was natural for them to often dispense with overt plural markers. And since, even in Hittite, the syntax of numbering permitted the counted item to be in the singular (§9.22, p. 159), it is not surprising to find 5 GUD instead of 5 GUD.ḪI.A. The Akkadian noun inflects through three cases in the singular (nominative, genitive, accusative) and two in the plural (nominative and genitive-accusative). Only in the earlier phases of Akkadian (Old Akkadian, Old Assyrian, and Old Babylonian) does the ending of the nominative and accusative singular consistently differ. Beginning in Middle Babylonian, both cases were written with the ending of the nominative (*-u* or *-um* with mimation).

31.19. *šarr-*[6] is the masculine noun stem meaning 'king', while *šarrat-* is the feminine noun stem meaning 'queen'. Similarly, *bēl-* is the masculine noun stem 'lord', while *bēlt-* is the feminine equivalent meaning 'lady (= queen)'. In the singular these nouns decline as follows:

nominative	*šarrum*	*šarratum*	*bēlum*	*bēltum*
genitive	*šarrim*	*šarratim*	*bēlim*	*bēltim*
accusative	*šarram*	*šarratam*	*bēlam*	*bēltam*

31.20. From this it is apparent that *šarr-* and *bēl-* are the basic root of the words, *-at-* (or *-t-*) is a feminine stem-forming suffix, and the endings of the singular are *-um*, *-im*, and *-am*. Another Akkadian noun whose feminine suffix is *-t-* is *mārtum* 'daughter' (compare *mārum* 'son'). The final *m* on these endings is omissible in the Hittite time-frame. The final *m* in the feminine noun forms is also omissible (sg. *-*(*a*)*tu*, pl.

6. When we discuss Akkadian forms in their own right (for instance, in the following paradigms), we will often write them in lowercase italic, as we would if we were discussing an Akkadian text. When Akkadian words or forms occurring as logograms in a Hittite context are discussed, the Akkadian parts of the logogram will be written in uppercase italic, while the Sumerian parts will be written in uppercase roman letters.

-ātu). This omissible final *m* is called "mimation." In the plural the forms in classic Old Babylonian are:

nominative	*šarrū*	*šarrātum*	*bēlū*	*bēlētum*
genitive-accusative	*šarrī* or *šarrē*	*šarrātim*	*bēlī*/*bēlē*	*bēlētim*

31.21. In the Hittite usage the genitive-accusative forms were often used in place of the nominative. What makes the masculine noun-stem plural is the long vowel in the endings, which is not indicated in the Hittite writings of Akkadian nouns. What makes the feminine noun-stem plural is the long *ā* vowel in the feminine root-forming suffix, *-āt-* (in some cases *-ēt-*), likewise normally unrepresented by plene writing in Hittite. Some Akkadian nouns which are masculine in the singular form feminine plurals: *nāru* 'river' (pl. *nārātum*), *ḫarrānu* 'road' (pl. *ḫarrānātum*), *ikkaru* 'farmer' (pl. *ikkarātum*). These can also be found in Hittite texts: ÍD.MEŠ-*TIM*, KASKAL.MEŠ-*TIM*, $^{\text{LÚ.MEŠ}}$ENGAR.MEŠ-*TIM*.

31.22. Akkadian adjectives decline like the noun, except that in the masculine plural the ending is not *-ū*, *-ī*, but *-ūtu*(*m*) and *-ūti*(*m*). Hittite scribes, like their contemporary Middle Babylonian and Middle Assyrian scribes, often used this adjectival masculine plural ending on nouns. Thus *BĒLŪTI* (written EN.MEŠ-*TIM* or *BE-LU*$^{\text{MEŠ}}$-*TI*) was the plural of *BĒLU* 'lord'. And since in Hittite masculine and feminine are not distinguished in any grammatical category, it is rare — especially in post-OH — that any scribe uses a feminine form of the Akkadian adjectives. Common Akkadian adjectives used in Hittite texts as logograms are: *ellu* 'free', *emṣu* 'sour', *ḫaṣartu* 'green', *labku* 'moist', *rīqu* 'empty', and *šalmu* 'complete'. As used by the Hittite scribes, whose knowledge of Akkadian was rudimentary, the properly nominative ending *-u*(*m*) is often used for the accusative, while the proper endings for accusative and genitive are much less frequently used for the nominative. For example, the Akkadian nominative DINGIR-*LUM* (= Akk. *ilum*) 'god' can be a direct object in Hittite context, while the Akkadian genitive DINGIR-*LIM* is often used as a nominative, when there is also a clarifying Hittite nominative case ending added (DINGIR-*LIM-iš* for *šiuniš*). The Akkadian accusative form DINGIR-*LAM* is extremely rare as anything but a direct object.

31.23. The combination of two nouns in a possessor + possessed relationship ('the king's son') is constructed differently in Akkadian than in Hittite. In Hittite one wrote *ḫaššuwaš* DUMU.NITA (i.e., 'of the king + the son'). In Akkadian the noun denoting the possessed comes first, assuming a form called the "construct state." This construct form is followed by the possessor in the genitive case: *mār* 'son (in construct)' + *šarri*(*m*) 'of the king' (gen.). The construct state of a noun is formed by removing the case ending: *māru*(*m*) 'son' (sg. nom.), *mār* 'son (of)' (construct); *šarratu*(*m*) 'queen', *šarrat* 'queen (of)' (construct); *bēltu*(*m*) 'lady', *bēlet* 'lady (of)' (construct); and thus *mātāt* 'lands (of)', *amēlūt* 'men (of)'. When the resulting stem would end in a doubled consonant, sometimes the doubling is preserved by adding a short *i* (*ṭuppi* 'tablet (of)', *libbi* 'heart

(of)') and at other times, when the final doubled consonant is a liquid or resonant, it is simplified (*šarrum* 'king', *šar* 'king (of)'. Hittite phonetic complements are never added to Akkadograms in the construct state. The most frequent construct forms encountered in Hittite contexts are *BĒL* 'lord (of)', *ṬUPPI* 'tablet (of)', *PĀN* 'face (of), before', *QĀT* 'hand (of)', *ŠAPAL* 'underside (of), below', *AŠŠUM* (contracted in Akk. itself from earlier *ana šūm*) 'for the sake of', and *AŠAR* 'place (of)'. The construct of *māru* 'son' is found in the personal name of a Hittite scribe: ^{m}*Mar-ešrē* 'son of (i.e., born on) the twentieth (day of the month)'. The logogram for 'name' has become a frozen form in Hittite, written with the single sign *ŠUM*, as though it were always in the construct state, never as *ŠU-MU*, *ŠU-MA* or *ŠU-MI* (see §31.37, p. 441). The familiar Akkadian prepositions *INA* 'in(to)', *ANA* 'to', 'for', *IŠTU* 'from, with', *QADU* 'with', *ITTI* 'together with', and *MAḪAR* 'before' are followed by nouns in the Akkadian genitive case or by a Sumerogram with an Akkadian complement to indicate case, e.g., *IŠTU* KUR-*TI* (= Akk. *ištu māti*) 'from the land'.

Pronominal Suffixes

31.24. Akkadian nouns take possessive suffixes. With singular nouns:

nominative-accusative			genitive	
māri-ya[7]	'my son'		*māri-ya*	'of my son'
mār-ka	'your (masc. sg.) son'		*māri-ka*	'of your son'
mār-ki[8]	'your (fem. sg.) son'		*māri-ki*	'of your son'
mār-šu	'his son'		*māri-šu*	'of his son'
mār-ša	'her son'		*māri-ša*	'of her son'
mār-ni	'our son'		*māri-ni*	'of our son'
mār-kunu	'your (masc. pl.) son'		*māri-kunu*	'of your son'
mār-kina	'your (fem. pl.) son'		*māri-kina*	'of your son'
mār-šunu	'their (masc. pl.) son'		*māri-šunu*	'of their son'
mār-šina	'their (fem. pl.) son'		*māri-šina*	'of their son'

31.25. Most examples of possessive suffixes in Hittite texts are affixed to Sumerograms, much less often to Akkadograms (*BE-LÍ-NI* 'our lord',[9] *UM-MA-NI* 'our mother'), and not at all to Hittite words. And since in Hittite there was no masculine-feminine distinction in inflectional forms, the suffixes *-KI* 'your' and *-ŠA* 'her' are quite rare, and *-KINA* 'your (pl.)' and *-ŠINA* 'their' virtually nonexistent. See §31.16 (p. 434).

7. In classical Old Babylonian this would be *mār-ī*, but Hittite scribes always wrote the suffix 'my' as *-YA*. Similarly, Hittite scribes wrote nominative-accusative *bēl-ī* 'my lord' as *BE-LI*/*LÍ-YA*.

8. Often in Hittite texts the distinctively feminine Akkadian suffixes (*-ki*, *-ša*, *-kina*, *-šina*) are replaced by the more common masculine forms: *-ka*, *-šu*, *-kunu*, *-šunu*.

9. The correct form of 'our lord' in the nominative and accusative is *bēlni*, genitive *bēlīni*. The Hittites, however, used the genitive form for all cases.

Numbers

31.26. Numbers. The following Akkadian cardinal numbers are found in syllabic writing in Hittite texts: 1-*EN* (*ištēn*) 'one', *ešrē* 'twenty' (gen. of *ešrā*; see §31.23, p. 437). The following ordinal numbers are found: *šanû* 'second', *šalšu* 'third' (in ^{LÚ}*ŠALŠU* 'third man'). Akkadian multiplicative expressions ('x times') are formed with the genitive of the ordinal numbers plus the third-person singular possessive suffix *-šu* 'its': *šalšī-šu* 'three times', *ḫamšī-šu* 'five times'. One finds this in semi-logographic form (e.g., 1=*ŠU*, 2=*ŠU*) everywhere in Hittite as the equivalent of the Hittite multiplicatives in *-anki* (see §§9.54ff., pp. 168ff.).

Verbs

31.27. Verbs. Since, especially in NH, the scribes utilized Akkadian verbs as logograms for their Hittite counterparts, a brief summary of the Akkadian verb is necessary here. But since the Hittite scribes used only a few of the most common Akkadian verbs as logograms — and usually in the preterite tense, even when in good Akkadian the present-future is called for — the student of Hittite does not require the detailed control of Akkadian verbal paradigms which would be required for reading Akkadian texts. The Akkadian language belongs to the Semitic family. As such, its verbal conjugation is based upon a combination of prefixes, suffixes, and patterns of internal vowels. Each Akkadian verb has a consonantal skeleton which we call a root. Most of these are triconsonantal (sometimes called "strong" roots), e.g., *špr* 'to send'. The dictionaries list the verbs by their inifinitve form. For those attested in the G- or Basic Stem this infinitive takes the form $C_1aC_2\bar{a}C_3u(m)$, where C_1, C_2, and C_3 represent the first, second, and third consonants of the strong root. The verb 'to send' would be listed as *šapāru*(*m*).

31.28. The combination of prefixes and suffixes used for the preterite (past tense) paradigm follows:

Translation	Prefix	Stem	Suffix
'I sent'	*a-*	*špur* [10]	
'You (masc. sg.) sent' [11]	*ta-*	*špur*	
'He [12] sent'	*i-*	*špur*	
'We sent'	*ni-*	*špur*	
'You (pl.) sent'	*ta-*	*špur*	*-ā*
'They (masc.) sent' [13]	*i-*	*špur*	*-û*

31.29. The present-future tense forms in Akkadian — paradigm forms *ašappar*, *tašappar*, *išappar* — are extremely rare as logograms in Hittite. In the land grant texts

10. *špur* is the preterite stem of *šapāru*. The corresponding present-future forms of the paradigm contain the present-future stem *-šappar-*.

11. The corresponding feminine form *tašpurī* is unused in Hittite logograms, since Hittite did not distinguish masculine from feminine grammatically.

the form *IRAGGUM* from *ragāmu* 'to (legally) contest (a claim)' is found, going back to OH or MH usage. But otherwise, such forms are not to be found. 'You (pl.)' forms of Akkadian verbs (*tašpurā*) as logograms are rare, if they exist at all.

31.30. So-called "strong" roots, triconsonantal with no weak consonants, inflect largely as indicated in the above simplified paradigm. See *AKRUB* 'I vowed', *IKRUB* 'he vowed', *AMQUT* 'I fell', *ASKUT* 'I became silent', *AŠPUR* 'I sent', *IŠPUR* 'he sent', *NIŠKUN* 'we placed, laid'. The so-called "weak" verbs substitute a semi-vowel (*y* or *w*) or a long vowel for one or more of the three consonants of the root.[14] Some "weak" verbs are actually biconsonantal. In traditional Akkadian grammars it is customary to identify the position of the so-called "weak" radical in a hypothetical triconsonantal pattern. Hence, the verb *mātu*(*m*) 'to die' is traditionally identified as "middle weak" (as if the triradical skeleton were **mwt*). The verb *qabû* 'to say' is "final weak," and *epēšu* 'to do, make' is "initial weak." The presence of a weak consonant in one or more positions of the root results in an inflectional paradigm that is quite different from that given above. For students of Hittite who cannot take a formal introductory course in Akkadian it is more practical simply to learn the individual inflected forms of weak verbs — which are limited in number in Hittite texts — as vocabulary items, than to seek to explain the paradigms of all types of weak verb.

31.31. Middle weak verbs occurring in Hittite logograms are: *UŠMĪT* (causative Š-stem preterite of *mātu* 'to die'). Final weak verbs include *qabû* 'to speak' (finite forms *IQBI*, *AQBI*, impv. *QIBÎ*, etc.), *leqû* 'to take' (forms *ILQĒ*, written *IL-QÉ-E*), *šemû* 'to hear' (forms *AŠME*, *IŠME*), *banû* 'to build, fortify' (forms *ABNI*, *IBNI*). Initial weak verbs include *amāru* 'to see' (forms *ĪMUR* 'he saw'), *epēšu* 'to make' (participial form *ĒPIŠ* 'maker of'). Initial and final weak verbs include *idû* 'to know' (form *IDE*).

31.32. The paradigm given above in §31.28 is of the Basic (or Primary) Stem (called G-Stem, for German *Grundstamm*). There are also derived stems in Akkadian: the so-called intensive-factitive D-Stem (with doubled middle radical),[15] the causative Š-Stem,[16] the passive N-Stem,[17] and variants of each of these with infixed *-ta-*[18] and *-tan-*[19] syllables.

31.33. Some verbs color the *a* vowels in the prefixes of the G- and N-Stems to *e*: *tēpuš* (from root *ʾpš*). In the 'we' form of the G-stem the vowel *i* replaces *a*: *niddin* 'we

12. In Akkadian there is also a 'she sent' form *tašpur*, but in Hittite texts the 'he sent' form is used for both genders.

13. The corresponding feminine form *išpurā* is unused in Hittite logograms, since Hittite did not distinguish masculine from feminine grammatically.

14. This statement represents an oversimplification of the complex nature of the Akkadian verbal system, but it will serve the purpose of this brief survey.

15. One of whose basic roles is to form factitive verbs.

16. Principal use to form causatives.

17. Principal use to form passives of the G-Stem.

18. Usually adding a reflexive or reciprocal idea.

19. Usually adding an iterative or frequentative idea.

gave', *nilqe* 'we took', *niškun* 'we put'. In the D- and Š-Stems the prefix always contains a *u*-vowel, e.g., *ušmīt* 'he killed', *tušmīt* 'you killed', *uškēnnū* 'they bowed'.

31.34. The most common Akkadian verbs used as logograms in Hittite are *ṣabātu* (*IṢBAT*[20] 'he seized' from Akkadian *ṣabātu* 'to seize', used for Hittite *ēpta*), *nadānu* 'to give' (*IDDIN* 'he gave', *ADDIN* 'I gave', *IDDINŪ* 'they gave', *NIDDIN* 'we gave' from Akkadian *nadānu*, used for forms of *pai-/piya-* 'to give'), *qebû* (final weak) 'to say' (*IQBI* 'he said', *TAQBI* 'you said'), and *šemû* 'to hear' (*IŠME* 'he heard', *TAŠME* 'you heard', *NIŠME* 'we heard'). These forms occur so frequently and in such predictable contexts that they pose no serious problem to recognition. Imperative forms of Akkadograms are limited to *šupur* 'send!', *qibī* 'speak!' (sg.), normally at the beginning of letters, and *misī* 'wash!' (written *MI-I-ŠI*) in Babylonian-influenced rituals. Participles are limited to ^{LÚ}*ĒPIŠ* 'maker (of)', ^{LÚ}*SĒBÛ* 'brewer', ^{LÚ}*NĀŠI ṢIDĪTI* 'provisions bearer', *MUNNABTU* 'fugitive', and ^{LÚ}*ṢĀ'IDU* 'hunter'. A fairly complete list of all inflected Akkadian verb forms found in Hittite texts can be found in HZL 362–69. A commonly occurring Sumerogram verb which contains the verbal prefix BA is: BA.ÚŠ 'he died'.

Conjunctions

31.35. The principal conjunction of Akkadian is *u* 'and' (Semitic *wa*), which von Soden (AHw, GAG) distinguished in *transcription* from the disjunctive *ū* 'or' (Semitic **'aw*, Hebr. *'ô*). In many periods of Akkadian different *u*-signs are conventionally and more or less consistently used to distinguish *u* 'and' from *ū* 'or'. 'And' was written Ù in most periods and dialects, but often Ú in Old Assyrian and U in Middle Babylonian and Middle Assyrian. In Hittite texts the Akkadogram *U* 'and' is always written with the sign Ù. Akkadian *ū* 'or' occurs in Hittite texts only as a component of the Akkadian disjunctive combination *lū . . . lū . . . ū lū* 'whether . . . or . . . or)' (see §29.60, p. 405), written *LU-Ú . . . LU-Ú . . . Ú LU*[*-Ú*] in KBo 3.22:61–62 (OS), but *LU-Ú . . . LU-Ú . . . Ù LU-Ú* in the NS dupl. KUB 26.71 i 9′. An Akadian enclitic conjunction *-MA* (GAG §123a; AHw 569–70) occurs much less frequently, principally in the combinations *UM-MA* PN-*MA* 'thus says/said PN' and *UM-MA ŠU-Ú-MA* 'thus (s)he says/said'.

Calques

31.36. Calques are literal translations of foreign idioms. Hittite possessed a small number of calques derived from Akkadian idioms based upon *BĒL* 'lord of': *ḫannešnaš išḫa-* 'opponent in court' (lit., 'lord of the judgment') (< *BĒL DĪNI*), *auriyaš išḫa-* 'district commander, provincial governor' (lit., 'lord of the watch-post') (< *BĒL MADGALTI*), *ēšḫanaš išḫa-* 'heir of a murdered man, kinsman avenger of blood' (lit., 'lord of the blood-money') (< *BĒL DĀMI*[21]), *iwaruaš išḫa-* 'holder of a dowry or inheritance share'

20. The uppercase italic forms represent forms actually found in Hittite Akkadograms. They are also found in Akkadian texts.

21. Korošec (1931: 38, followed by CAD D 80 with literature) thought that only in Hittite did the expression derived from Akkadian *bēl dami* have the meaning 'avenger of blood', since Akkadian *bēl dami*

(*BĒL ŠERIKTI*), *parnaš išḫa-* ‘home owner, householder’ (*BĒL*/*BĒLET* É-*TIM*), *tuzziyaš išḫa-* ‘military commander’ (< EN KARAŠ), *maniyaḫḫayaš išḫa-* ‘administrator, judge’, *uddanaš išḫa-* ‘opponent in court(?), enemy(?)’ (< *BĒL AWATIM*), etc. The syllabic Hittite writings of other similar combinations, such as *BĒL* DINGIR-*LIM* ‘worshiper’, EN.SÍSKUR (*BĒL NIQÊ*) ‘sacrificer’, EN *QĀTI* ‘craftsman’, have not yet been found in extant texts. And some of the Hittite idioms with *išḫa-* seem modeled on the Akkadian calques yet have no known Akkadian counterparts: *mukišnaš išḫa-* ‘person who commissions the *m.*-ritual’. Several of the syllabic Hittite examples take the LÚ determinative on the genitive, as though the genitive + head noun were regarded as an indivisible compound (on such forms see Neu 1986).

Prepositions

31.37. Prepositions. The following Akkadian prepositions are attested in Hittite contexts (see §31.23, p. 436, for the cases they govern): *ANA* ‘to, for’, *AŠŠUM* ‘for, as’, *INA* ‘in’, *IŠTU* ‘from, with’, *ITTI* ‘with’, *MAḪAR* ‘before, in the presence of’, *PĀN*(*I*) ‘before’, *QADU* ‘together with, along with’, *ŠAPAL* ‘under, below’. Some of these originated as constructs of nouns: *MAḪRU*, *PĀNŪ*, *ŠAPLU*. They and other nouns often combine with a preceding preposition to form compound prepositions: *ANA PĀNI* and *INA PĀNI* ‘before’, *INA MAḪAR* ‘in(to) the presence of’. The preposition *AŠŠUM* ‘for the sake of, on account of’ is such a formation, being derived from *ana šūm* ‘in/for the name of’. The Sumerogram EGIR without Hittite complement often stands for the Akkadian pseudo-preposition (*w*)*arki* ‘behind, after’. In general *ANA* covers the Hittite allative and dative cases, *INA* generally the locative, *IŠTU* the ablative and instrumental, *PĀN* and *INA PĀN*(*I*) the postpositional *peran* with preceding noun in dative-locative, and *ŠAPAL* the postposition *kattan* with preceding noun in dative-locative.

---

only means ‘slayer, murderer’. This claim is now disputed. Mishali (2000) describes the functionary in Neo-Assyrian legal proceedings as “an intermediary responsible for carrying out the redemption of blood or redemption payment . . . (it) does not refer to the murderer or the avenger.” Barmash (2004: 52–56), on the other hand, claims that Akkadian *bēl dami* encompassed the two meanings: ‘killer’ and ‘avenger’.

REFERENCES

Alp, Sedat. 1991a. *Hethitische Briefe aus Maşat-Höyük.* Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları VI/35. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

_____. 1991b. *Hethitische Keilschrifttafeln aus Maşat-Höyük*. Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları VI/34. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

André-Salvini, Béatrice, and Mirjo Salvini. 1999. A New Trilingual Vocabulary from Ras Shamra and the Relationship between Hurrian and Urartian. Pp. 267–76 in *Nuzi at Seventy-Five*, edited by D. I. Owen and G. Wilhelm. Bethesda, MD: CDL.

Archi, Alfonso. 1979. L'humanité des hittites. Pp. 37–48 in *Florilegium Anatolicum: mélanges offerts à Emmanuel Laroche*, edited by E. Masson. Paris: de Boccard.

Balkan, Kemal. 1957. *Letter of King Anum-hirbi of Mama to King Warshama of Kanish*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Barmash, Pamela. 2004. *Homicide in the Biblical World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bechtel, George. 1936. *Hittite Verbs in -sk-: a Study of Verbal Aspect*. Ann Arbor: Edwards Brothers.

Beckman, Gary M. 1982. The Anatolian Myth of Illuyanka. *JANES* 14: 11–25.

_____. 1983a. A Contribution to Hittite Onomastic Studies. *JAOS* 103: 623–27.

_____. 1983b. *Hittite Birth Rituals.* Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 29. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1986. Proverbs and Proverbial Allusions in Hittite. *JNES* 45: 19–30.

_____. 1999. *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*. Second edition. Writings from the Ancient World 7. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Beckman, Gary M., and Harry A. Hoffner Jr. 1985. *Hittite Fragments in American Collections*. Philadelphia: American Schools of Oriental Research.

Beekes, Robert S. P. 1995. *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Benveniste, Émile. 1962a. *Hittite et indo-européen: études comparatives*. Paris: Maisonneuve.

_____. 1962b. Les substantifs en *-ant* du hittite. *BSL* 57: 44–51.

Berman, Howard. 1972a. Relative Clauses in Hittite. Pp. 1–8 in *The Chicago Which Hunt: Papers from the Relative Clause Festival, April 13, 1972*, edited by P. M. Peranteau, J. N. Levi and G. C. Phares. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

_____. 1972b. *The Stem Formation of Hittite Nouns and Adjectives*. Ph.D. diss., The University of Chicago.

Bernabé, Alberto. 1983. Hethitica. *AuOr* 1: 39–43.

Bernabé, Alberto, and Juan Antonio Álvarez-Pedrosa. 2000. *Historia y leyes de los hititas: Textos del imperio antiguo, El código*. Akal/Oriente 3. Madrid: Akal.

Bittel, Kurt. 1970. *Hattusha: Capital of the Hittites*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Black, Jeremy A., Andrew George, and J. Nicholas Postgate. 1999. *A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian*. Santag 10. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Boley, Jacqueline. 1984. *The Hittite hark-construction*. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 44. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

_____. 1985. Notes on Hittite Place Word Syntax. *Hethitica* 6: 5–43.

_____. 1989. *The Sentence Particles and the Place Words in Old and Middle Hittite*. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 60. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

_____. 1993. *The Hittite Particle -z / -za*. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 79. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

_____. 2001. Suggestions for the Original Function of *-kan*. Pp. 19–28 in *Anatolisch und Indogermanisch/Anatolico e Indoeuropeo: Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft Pavia 22.–25. September 1998*, edited by O. Carruba and W. Meid. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Brixhe, Claude. 1979. Le directif du vieux-hittite et ses ascendances indo-européennes. Pp. 65–77 in *Florilegium Anatolicum: mélanges offerts à Emmanuel Laroche*, edited by E. Masson. Paris: de Boccard.

Brock, Nadia van. 1964. Les thèmes verbaux à redoublement du hittite et le verbe indo-européen. *RHA* 22 (75): 119–65.

Bryce, Trevor R. 1998. *The Kingdom of the Hittites*. Oxford: Clarendon.

_____. 2002. *Life and Society in the Hittite World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Buck, Carl Darling. 1949. *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Burde, Cornelia. 1974. *Hethitische medizinische Texte*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 19. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Bush, Frederick W. 1964. *A Grammar of the Hurrian Language*. Ph.D. diss., Brandeis University.

Carruba, Onofrio. 1964. Hethitisch *-(a)šta, -(a)pa* und die anderen "Ortsbezugspartikeln." *Or NS* 33: 405–36.

_____. 1966a. *Das Beschwörungsritual für die Göttin Wišuriyanza*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 2. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1966b. Die Verbalendungen auf *-wani* und *-tani* und das relative Alter der heth. Texte. *Die Sprache* 12: 79–89.

_____. 1968. Die I. und II. Pers. Plur. im Luwischen und im Lykischen. *Die Sprache* 14: 13–23.

_____. 1971. Hattusili II. *SMEA* 14: 75–94.

_____. 1978–79. Sul genitivo in anatolico. *Atti del Sodalizio Glottologico Milanese* 20: 31–32.

_____. 1981. Pleneschreibung und Betonung im Hethitischen. *KZ* 95: 232–248.

_____. 1986. Die 3. Pers. Sing. des Possessivpronomens im Luwischen. Pp. 49–52 in *Kaniššuwar: A Tribute to Hans G. Güterbock on his Seventy-fifth Birthday, May 27, 1983*, edited by H. A. Hoffner Jr. and G. M. Beckman. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

_____. 1989. Review of J. J. S. Weitenberg, *Die hethitischen U-Stämme* (Amsterdam, 1984). *OLZ* 84: 422–27.

_____. 1991. Searching for Woman in Anatolian and Indo-European. Pp. 155–81 in *Perspectives on Indo-European Language, Culture and Religion: Studies in Honor of Edgar C. Polomé*, edited by R. Pearson. McLean, Virginia: Institute for the Study of Man.

_____. 1992. Le notazioni dell'agente animato nelle lingue anatoliche (e l'ergativo). Pp. 61–98 in *Per una grammatica ittita: Towards a Hittite Grammar*, edited by O. Carruba. Pavia: Iuculano.

_____. 1993a. Hethitisch *kuinna-* 'Frau'; *kuwansa-* 'weiblich' und anderes. *HS* 106: 262–71.

_____. 1993b. Zur Datierung der ältesten Schenkungsurkunden und anonymen Tabarna-Siegel. *IM* 43: 71–85.

Carruba, Onofrio, Vladimir Souček, and Reinhard Sternemann. 1965. Kleine Bemerkungen zur jüngsten Fassung der hethitischen Gesetze. *ArOr* 33: 1–18.

Catsanicos, Jean. 1986. A propos des adjectifs hitt. *šu-ḫmili-* et véd. *sū-máya-*: quelques remarques sur le traitement du groupe *˚V-H_xC˚* à la jointure des composés. *BSL* 81: 121–80.

_____. 1996. L'apport de la bilingue de Hattusa à la lexicologie hourrite. Pp. 197–296 in *Mari, Ébla et les Hourrites: Dix ans de travaux*, edited by J.-M. Durand. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations.

Comrie, Bernard. 1998. The Indo-European Linguistic Family: Genetic and Typological Perspectives. Pp. 74–97 in *The Indo-European Languages*, edited by A. G. Ramat and P. Ramat. London: Routledge.

Cotticelli-Kurras, Paola. 1992a. *Das hethitische Verbum 'sein': Syntaktische Untersuchungen*. Texte der Hethiter 17. Heidelberg: Winter.

_____. 1992b. Die hethitischen Nominalsätze. Pp. 99–136 in *Per una grammatica ittita: Towards a Hittite Grammar*, edited by O. Carruba. Pavia: Iuculano.

Daddi Pecchioli, Franca. 1975. Il *ḫazan(n)u* nei testi di Hattusa. *OA* 14: 93–136.

Dardano, Paola. 1997. *L'aneddoto e il racconto in età antico-hittita: La cosidetta "cronaca di palazzo."* Biblioteca di ricerche linguistiche e filologiche 43. Rome: Il Calamo.

_____. 2005. I costutti perifrastici con il verb *ḫar(k)-* dell'ittito: stato della questione e prospettive di metodo. *Or NS* 74: 93–113.

DeVries, Bert. 1967. *The Style of Hittite Epic and Mythology*. Ph.D. diss., Brandeis University.

Dinçol, Belkıs. 1998. Beobachtungen über die Bedeutung des hethitischen Musikinstruments ^{GIŠ}*ḫuḫupal*. *Anatolica* 24: 1–5.

Disterheft, Dorothy. 1984. Non-final Verbs in Hittite. *KZ* 97: 221–27.

Dressler, Wolfgang. 1968. *Studien zur verbalen Pluralität. Iterativum, Distributivum, Durativum, Intensivum in der allgemeinen Grammatik, im Lateinischen und Hethitischen.* Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse: Sitzungsberichte, 259/1. Vienna: Böhlau.

Dunkel, George. 1985. IE hortatory **éy, *éyte*: Ved. *éta . . . stávāma*, Hitt. *eḫu=wa it*, Hom. εἰ δ'ἄγε. *MSS* 46: 47–79.

Dunkel, George E. 1998. Back to the Future in Hittite. *MSS* 58: 51–55.

Durand, Jean-Marie, and Emmanuel Laroche. 1982. Fragments Hittites du Louvre. Pp. 73–107 in *Mémorial Atatürk: Études d'archéologie et de philologie anatoliennes.* Paris: Éditions recherches sur les civilisations.

Durham, John W. 1976. *Studies in Boğazköy Akkadian*. Ph.D. diss., Harvard University.

Edel, Elmar. 1948. Neue keilschriftliche Umschreibungen ägyptischer Namen aus den Boğazköy-Texten. *JNES* 7: 11–24.

_____. 1973. Hethitische Personnamen in hieroglyphischer Umschrift. Pp. 59–70 in *Festschrift Heinrich Otten: 27. Dez. 1973*, edited by E. Neu and C. Rüster. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Ehelolf, Hans. 1936. Hethitische-akkadische Wortgleichungen. *ZA* 44: 170–95.

Eichner, Heiner. 1971. Urindogermanisch *$K^{w}e$ 'wenn' im Hethitischen. *MSS* 29: 27–46.

_____. 1973. Die Etymologie von heth. *mēḫur*. *MSS* 31: 53–107.

_____. 1974a. Indogermanische Chronik 20b —II. Anatolisch. *Die Sprache* 20: 183–86.

_____. 1974b. *Untersuchungen zur hethitischen Deklination* (Diss. Teildruck). Erlangen.

_____. 1975. Die Vorgeschichte des hethitischen Verbalsystem. Pp. 71–103 in *Flexion und Wortbildung: Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Regensburg, 9.–14. September 1973*, edited by H. Rix. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

_____. 1979. Hethitisch *gēnuššuš*, *ginušši*, *ginuššin*. Pp. 41–61 in *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch: Vergleichende Studien zur historischen Grammatik und zur Dialektgeographie*, edited by E. Neu and W. Meid. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

_____. 1980. Phonetik und Lautgesetze des Hethitischen — ein Weg zu ihrer Entschlüsselung. Pp. 120–65 in *Akten der VI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Wien, 24.–29. September 1978*, edited by M. Mayrhofer, M. Peters, and O. Pfeiffer. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

_____. 1985. Das Problem des Ansatzes eines urindogermanischen Numerus 'Kollektiv' ('Komprehensiv'). Pp. 134–69 in *Akten der VII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin, 20.–25. Februar 1983*, edited by B. Schlerath and V. Rittner. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

_____. 1988. Anatolisch und Trilaryngalismus. Pp. 123–51 in *Die Laryngaltheorie*, edited by A. Bammesberger. Heidelberg: Winter.

_____. 1991. Review of J. J. S. Weitenberg, *Die hethitischen U-Stämme* (Amsterdam, 1984). *ZA* 81: 155–57.

_____. 1992. Anatolian. Pp. 29–96 in *Indo-European Numerals*, edited by J. Gvozdanović. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ertem, Hayri. 1973. *Boğazköy metinlerinde geçen coğrafya adları dizini.* Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları 230. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi.

Fincke, Jeanette. 2000. *Augenleiden nach keilschriftlichen Quellen: Untersuchungen zur altorientalischen Medizin*. Würzburger medizin-historische Forschungen 70. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann.

Forrer, Emil. 1922. Die Inschriften und Sprachen des Hatti-Reiches. *ZDMG* 76 (Neue Folge 1): 174–269.

_____. 1922, 1926. *Die Boghazköi-Texte in Umschrift, Zweiter Band: Geschichtliche Texte*. Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 42, Hefte 1–2. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

_____. 1928. Ein siebenter Kasus im Alt-Kanisischen. Pp. 30–35 in *Altorientalische Studien: Bruno Meissner zum sechzigsten Geburtstag am 25. April 1928 gewidmet von Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern*. Leipzig: Harrassowitz.

Forssman, Bernhard. 1994. Zu hethitisch *šipand-* und *išpand-*. Pp. 93–106 in *In honorem Holger Pedersen: Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 26. bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen, 93–106*, edited by J. E. Rasmussen and B. Nielsen. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Fortson, Benjamin. 1998. A New Study of Hittite *-wa(r)*. *JCS* 50: 21–34.

Fox, Barbara A., and Paul J. Hopper. 1994. *Voice: Form and Function*. Typological Studies in Language 27. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Francia, Rita. 1995. Costruzione e valore del pronome possessivo enclitico di prima plurale in hittito. *SMEA* 35: 93–100.

_____. 1996a. Funzioni sintattiche nei testi dell' antico ittita: il locativo di meta e scopo e l'accusativo di direzione. *IncLing* 19: 137–53.

_____. 1996b. Il pronome possessivo enclitico in antico ittita: alcune riflessioni. *VO* 10: 209–59.

_____. 1997. L'accusativo de estensione nello spazio e nel tempo in ittita. *Annali del Dipartimento di Studi del Mondo Classico e del Mediterraneo Antico, Napoli* 19: 139–45.

_____. 2001. La posizione degli aggettivi qualificativi nella frase ittita. Pp. 81–91 in *Anatolisch und Indogermanisch/Anatolico e Indoeuropeo: Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft Pavia 22.–25. September 1998*, edited by O. Carruba and W. Meid. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

_____. 2002a. L'espressione della causa in ittita. Pp. 277–84 in *Anatolia antica: Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati*, edited by S. de Martino and F. Pecchioli Daddi. Florence: LoGisma.

_____. 2002b. *Le funzioni sintattiche degli elementi avverbiali di luogo ittiti anda(n), āppa(n), katta(n), katti-, peran, parā, šer, šarā*. Rome: Studia Asiana 1. Herder.

_____. 2005. *Lineamenti di grammatica ittita*. Studia Asiana 4. Rome: Herder.

Friedrich, Johannes. 1926. *Staatsverträge des Ḫatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache, 1. Teil.* Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft 31/1. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

_____. 1930. *Staatsverträge des Ḫatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache, 2. Teil.* Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft 34/1. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

_____. 1952. *Hethitisches Wörterbuch: Kurzgefaßte kritische Sammlung der Deutungen hethitischer Wörter*. 1st ed. Heidelberg: Winter.

_____. 1959. *Die hethitischen Gesetze*. Documenta et Monumenta ad Orienti Antiqui 7. Leiden: Brill.

_____. 1960. *Hethitisches Elementarbuch, 1. Teil: Kurzgefaßte Grammatik*. 2nd ed. Indogermanische Bibliothek, 1. Reihe: Lehr- und Handbücher. Heidelberg: Winter.

_____. 1991. *Kurzgefasstes Hethitisches Wörterbuch: Kurzgefasste kritische Sammlung der Deutungen hethitischer Wörter*. Indogermanische Bibliothek, 2. Reihe, Wörterbucher. Heidelberg: Winter.

Friedrich, Johannes, Annelies Kammenhuber, and Inge Hoffmann. 1975ff. *Hethitisches Wörterbuch.* 2nd ed. Indogermanische Bibliothek. 2. Reihe: Wörterbücher. Heidelberg: Winter.

García Ramón, José-Luís. 2002. Zu Verbalcharakter, morphologischer Aktionsart, und Aspekt in der indogermanischen Rekonstruktion. Pp. 105–36 in *Indogermanische Syntax: Fragen und Perspektiven*, edited by H. Hettrich and J.-S. Kim. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

García Trabazo, José Virgilio. 2002. *Textos religiosos hititas: Mitos, plegaries y rituales*. Biblioteca de Ciencias Bíblicas y Orientales 6. Madrid: Editorial Trotta.

Gardiner, Alan. 1957. *Egyptian Grammar*. 3rd ed. London: Oxford University Press.

Garrett, Andrew James. 1990a. Hittite Enclitic Subjects and Transitive Verbs. *JCS* 42: 227–42.

_____. 1990b. The Origins of NP Split Ergativity. *Lg* 66: 261–96 (Anatolian discussed on 265–80, 287–91).

_____. 1990c. *The Syntax of Anatolian Pronominal Clitics*. Ph.D. diss., Harvard University.

_____. 1994. Relative Clause Syntax in Lycian and Hittite. *Die Sprache* 36: 29–69.

_____. 1996. Wackernagel's Law and Unaccusativity in Hittite. Pp. 85–133 in *Approaching Second: Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena*, edited by A. L. Halpern and A. M. Zwicky. Stanford, CA: CSLI.

_____. 1998. Remarks on the Old Hittite Split Genitive. Pp. 155–163 in *Mír Curad: Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*, edited by J. Jasanoff, H. C. Melchert, and L. Oliver. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Gelb, Ignace J., Thorkild Jacobsen, Benno Landsberger, A. Leo Oppenheim, Erica Reiner, Miguel Civil, and Martha T. Roth, eds. 1956–. *The Assyrian Dictionary of The Oriental Institute of The University of Chicago*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

Gertz, Janet E. 1982. *The Nominative-Accusative Neuter Plural in Anatolian*. Ph. D. diss., Yale University.

Gesenius, Wilhelm, Emil Kautsch, and Arthur Ernest Cowley. 1910. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Translated by A. E. Cowley. 2nd English ed. Oxford: Clarendon.

Gessel, Ben H. L. van. 1998–2001. *Onomasticon of the Hittite Pantheon, Parts 1–3*. Handbuch der Orientalistik 1/33: 1–3. Leiden: Brill.

Giorgieri, Mauro. 2000. Schizzo grammaticale della lingua hurrita. Pp. 171–277 in *La civiltà dei hurriti*. Naples: Macchiaroli.

Girbal, Christian. 1990. Zur Grammatik des Mittani-Hurritischen. *ZA* 80: 93–100.

Glocker, Jürgen. 1997. *Das Ritual für den Wettergott von Kuliwišna*. Eothen 6. Florence: LoGisma.

Goedegebuure, Petra M. 2002. KBo 17.17+: Remarks on an Old Hittite Royal Substitution Ritual. *JANER* 2: 61–73.

_____. 2002–3. The Hittite Distal Demonstrative *ASI* (*UNI*, *ENI*, etc.). *Die Sprache* 43: 1–32.

_____. 2006. A New Proposal for the Reading of the Hittite Numeral '1': *šia-*. Pp. 65–88 in *The Life and Times of Ḫattušili III and Tutḫaliya IV: Proceedings of a Symposium held in Honour of J. de Roos, 12–13 December 2003, Leiden*, edited by T. P. J. van den Hout and C. H. van Zoest. Leiden: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul.

Goetze, Albrecht. 1925. *Ḫattušiliš: Der Bericht über seine Thronbesteigung nebst den Parallelltexten*. Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft 29. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

_____. 1927. *Madduwattaš*. Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft 32. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

_____. 1930a. Die Pestgebete des Muršiliš. *KlF* 1: 161–251.

_____. 1930b. *Neue Bruchstücke zum grossen Text des Ḫattušiliš und den Paralleltexten*. Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft 34. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

_____. 1930c. *Verstreute Boghazköi-Texte*. Marburg an der Lahn: Published by the editor.

_____. 1933a. *Die Annalen des Muršiliš*. Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft 38. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

_____. 1933b. Über die Partikeln *-za, -kan* und *-šan* der hethitischen Satzverbindung. *ArOr* 5: 1–38.

_____. 1937. Transfer of Consonantal Stems to the Thematic Declension in Hittite. Pp. 488–95 in *Mélanges linguistiques offerts à M. Holger Pedersen*, edited by L. Hjelmslev. Copenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard.

_____. 1938. *The Hittite Ritual of Tunnawi*. American Oriental Series 14. New Haven, CT: American Oriental Society.

_____. 1951. On the Hittite Words for 'Year' and the Seasons and for 'Night' and 'Day'. *Lg* 27: 467–476.

_____. 1954. Review of J. Friedrich, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*, Lieferungen 1–4 (Heidelberg, 1952–54). *Lg* 30: 401–5.

_____. 1963. Postposition and Preverb in Hittite. *JCS* 17: 98–111.

_____. 1968. The Predecessors of Šuppiluliumaš of Hatti and the Chronology of the Ancient Near East. *JCS* 22: 46–50.

Goetze, Albrecht, and Holger Pedersen. 1934. *Muršilis Sprachlähmung*. Det Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Hist.-filol. Meddelelser 21/1. Copenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard.

Goodwin, William W. 1965. *A Greek Grammar*. London: MacMillan.

Groddek, Detlev. 1999. CTH 331: Mythos vom verschwundenen Wettergott oder Aitiologie der Zerstörung Liḫzinas? *ZA* 89: 36–49.

Gurney, Oliver R. 1940. Hittite Prayers of Mursili II. *AAA* 27: 3–163.

_____. 1990. *The Hittites*. 2nd ed. Baltimore: Penguin.

Güterbock, Hans Gustav. 1940. *Siegel aus Boğasköy I.* Archiv für Orientforschung Beiheft 5. Berlin: Weidner.

_____. 1943. Review of J. Friedrich, *Hethitisches Elementarbuch, 1. Teil: Kurzgefaßte Grammatik* (Heidelberg, 1940). *Or NS* 12: 151–55.

_____. 1945. The Vocative in Hittite. *JAOS* 65: 248–57.

_____. 1952. *The Song of Ullikummi: Revised Text of the Hittite Version of a Hurrian Myth*. New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research.

_____. 1955. Zu einigen hethitischen Komposita. Pp. 63–68 in *Corolla linguistica: Festschrift Ferdinand Sommer zum 80. Geburtstag am 4. Mai 1955 dargebracht von Freunden, Schülern und Kollegen*. Heidelberg: Winter.

_____. 1956. The Deeds of Šuppiluliuma I as Told by His Son, Muršili II. *JCS* 10: 41–68, 75–98, 107–30.

_____. 1957. Review of J. Friedrich, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg, 1952). *Oriens* 10: 350–62.

_____. 1958. Kaneš and Neša, Two Forms of One Anatolian Place Name. *Eretz-Israel* 5 (Mazar Volume): 46–50.

_____. 1959. Towards a Definition of the Term 'Hittite'. *Oriens* 10: 233–39.

_____. 1964. Lexicographical Notes II. *RHA* 22 (74): 95–113.

_____. 1967. The Hittite Conquest of Cyprus Reconsidered. *JNES* 26: 73–81.

_____. 1970. The Predecessors of Šuppiluliuma again. *JNES* 29: 73–77.

_____. 1983. Noch einmal die Formel *parnaššea šuwaizzi*. *Or NS* 52: 73–80.

_____. 1992. Ist das hethitische Wort für 'Frau' gefunden? *HS* 105: 1–3.

_____. 1995a. Reflections on the Musical Instruments *arkammi*, *galgalturi* and *ḫuḫupal* in Hittite. Pp. 57–72 in *Studio historiae ardens: Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Philo H. J. Houwink ten Cate on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, edited by T. P. J. van den Hout and J. de Roos. Istanbul: Institut historique et archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul.

_____. 1995b. Resurrecting the Hittites. Pp. (4:) 2765–78 in *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*, edited by J. M. Sasson. New York: Scribner's Sons.

_____. 1995c. The Hittite Word for 'Woman' Again. *HS* 108: 12–15.

Güterbock, Hans Gustav, Harry A. Hoffner Jr., and Theo P. J. van den Hout. 1989–. *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

Güterbock, Hans Gustav, and Theo P. J. van den Hout. 1991. *The Hittite Instruction for the Royal Bodyguard*. Assyriological Studies 24. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

Haas, Volkert. 1970. *Der Kult von Nerik*. Studia Pohl 4. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.

_____. 1994. *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*. Handbuch der Orientalistik 1/15. Leiden: Brill.

Haas, Volkert, and H. Thiel. 1978. *Die Beschwörungsrituale der Allaiturah(ḫ)i und verwandte Texte*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 31. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.

Hagenbuchner, Albertine. 1989. *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter, 2. Teil*. Texte der Hethiter 16. Heidelberg: Winter.

Hagenbuchner-Dresel, Albertine. 1999. Bemerkungen zu kürzlich edierten Briefen. *ZA* 89: 50–64.

Hahn, E. Adelaide. 1969. *Naming Constructions in Some Indo-European Languages*. Philological Monographs of the American Philological Association 27. Cleveland: American Philological Association.

Hale, Mark. 1987. Notes on Wackernagel's Law in the language of the Rigveda. Pp. 38–59 in *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill: Papers of the Fourth East Coast Indo-European Conference, Cornell Univ. 1985*, edited by C. Watkins. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Hallo, William W., and K. Lawson Younger. 2003. *The Context of Scripture, Volume 1: Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World.* Leiden: Brill.

Harðarson, Jón Axel. 1994. Der Verlust zweier wichtiger Flexionskategorien im Uranatolischen. *HS* 107: 30–41.

Hart, Gillian R. 1971. The Hittite Particle *-PAT*. *TPS*: 94–162.

_____. 1980. Some Observations on Plene-Writing in Hittite. *BSOAS* 43: 1–17.

_____. 1983. Problems of Writing and Phonology in Cuneiform Hittite. *TPS*: 100–154.

Hawkins, J. David. 1979. The Origin and Dissemination of Writing in Western Asia. Pp. 128–66 in *The Origins of Civilization*, edited by P. R. S. Moorey. Oxford: Clarendon.

_____. 1986. Writing in Anatolia: Imported and Indigenous Systems. *World Archaeology* 17: 363–76.

_____. 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*. Untersuchungen zur indogermanischen Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft 8.1. Berlin: de Gruyter.

_____. 2003. Chapter Four: Scripts and Texts. Pp. 128–69 in *The Luwians*, edited by H. C. Melchert. Leiden: Brill.

Hawkins, J. David, Anna Morpurgo Davies, and Günter Neumann. 1974. *Hittite Hieroglyphs and Luwian: New Evidence for the Connection*. Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse 73 No. 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Hecker, Karl. 1992. Zur Herkunft der hethitischen Keilschrift. Pp. 53–63 in *Uluslararası 1: Hititoloji Kongresi Bildirileri (19–21 Temmuz 1990)*. Çorum, Turkey: Uluslararası Çorum Hitit Festivali Komitesi Başkanlığı.

_____. 1996. Zur Herkunft der hethitischen Keilschrift. Pp. 291–303 in *Richard F. S. Starr Memorial Volume*, edited by D. I. Owen and G. Wilhelm. Bethesda, MD: CDL.

Helck, Wolfgang. 1963. Urḫi-Tešup in Ägypten. *JCS* 17: 87–97.

Held, Warren H., Jr. 1957. *The Hittite Relative Sentence*. Language Dissertations 55. Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America.

Held, Warren H., Jr., William R. Schmalstieg, and Janet E. Gertz. 1987. *Beginning Hittite*. Columbus, OH: Slavica.

Hock, Hans Henrich. 2002. Vedic *éta . . . stávāma*: Subordinate, Coordinate, or What? Pp. 89–102 in *Indo-European Perspectives*, edited by M. R. V. Southern. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man.

Hoffmann, Inge. 1984. *Der Erlaß Telipinus*. Texte der Hethiter 11. Heidelberg: Winter.

_____. 1992. Das hethitische Wort für 'Sohn'. Pp. 289–93 in *Hittite and Other Anatolian and Near Eastern Studies in Honour of Sedat Alp*, edited by H. Otten, E. Akurgal, H. Ertem, and A. Süel. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Hoffner, Harry A., Jr. 1965. The Elkunirsa Myth Reconsidered. *RHA* 23 (76): 5–16.

_____. 1966. Composite Nouns, Verbs, and Adjectives in Hittite. *Or NS* 35: 377–402.

_____. 1967a. Second Millennium Antecedents to the Hebrew *'OB*. *JBL* 86: 385–401.

_____. 1967b. Ugaritic *pwt*: A Term from the Early Canaanite Dyeing Industry. *JAOS* 87: 300–303.

_____. 1968a. Birth and Namegiving in Hittite Texts. *JNES* 27: 198–203.

_____. 1968b. Review of Carruba, *Das Beschwörungsritual für die Göttin Wišuriyanza* [StBoT 2] (Wiesbaden, 1966). *JAOS* 88: 531–34.

_____. 1969. On the Use of Hittite *-za* in Nominal Sentences. *JNES* 28: 225–30.

_____. 1970. Remarks on the Hittite Version of the Naram-Sin Legend. *JCS* 23: 17–22.

_____. 1971. Hittite *ega-* and *egan-*. *JCS* 24: 31–36.

_____. 1972. Review of P. Houwink ten Cate, *Records of the Early Hittite Empire (c. 1450–1380 B.C.)* (Istanbul, 1970). *JNES* 31: 29–35.

_____. 1973a. Studies of the Hittite Particles, I. Review of O. Carruba, *Die satzeinleitenden Partikeln in den indogermanischen Sprachen Anatoliens* (Rome, 1969). *JAOS* 93: 520–26.

_____. 1973b. The Hittite Particle *-PAT*. Pp. 99–118 in *Festschrift Heinrich Otten: 27. Dez. 1973*, edited by E. Neu and C. Rüster. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1974. The *Arzana* House. Pp. 113–22 in *Anatolian Studies Presented to Hans Gustav Güterbock on the Occasion of His 65th birthday*, edited by K. Bittel, P. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, and E. Reiner. Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Institut in Het Nabije Oosten.

_____. 1975. Hittite Mythological Texts: A Survey. Pp. 136–45 in *Unity and Diversity: Essays in the History, Literature, and Religion of the Ancient Near East*, edited by H. Goedicke and J. J. M. Roberts. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

_____. 1977. Studies in Hittite Vocabulary, Syntax and Style: Hommage à M. Emmanuel Laroche. *JCS* 29: 151–56.

_____. 1982. Hittite *mān* and *nūman*. Pp. 38–45 in *Investigationes philologicae et comparativae: Gedenkschrift für Heinz Kronasser*, edited by E. Neu. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1983a. A Prayer of Muršili II about his Stepmother. *JAOS* 103: 187–92.

_____. 1983b. Review of J. Friedrich and A. Kammenhuber, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*[2] I/4–5 (*araḫzena-arzanatar*) (Heidelberg 1979–80). *BiOr* 40: 407–17.

_____. 1985. Review of H. Otten, *Die Apologie Hattusilis III.* [StBoT 24] (Wiesbaden, 1981). *JAOS* 105: 337–39.

_____. 1986. Studies in Hittite Grammar. Pp. 83–94 in *Kaniššuwar: A Tribute to Hans G. Güterbock on his Seventy-fifth Birthday, May 27, 1983*, edited by H. A. Hoffner Jr. and G. M. Beckman. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

_____. 1987. Paskuwatti's Ritual Against Sexual Impotence (CTH 406). *AuOr* 5: 271–87.

_____. 1988a. A Scene in the Realm of the Dead. Pp. 191–99 in *A Scientific Humanist: Studies in Memory of Abraham Sachs*, edited by E. Leichty, M. deJ. Ellis, and P. Gerardi. Philadelphia: University Museum.

_____. 1988b. The Song of Silver. Pp. 143–66 in *Documentum Asiae Minoris antiquae: Festschrift für Heinrich Otten zum 75. Geburtstag*, edited by E. Neu and C. Rüster. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1990. *Hittite Myths*. Writings from the Ancient World 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

_____. 1992a. Advice to a King. Pp. 295–304 in *Hittite and Other Anatolian and Near Eastern Studies in Honour of Sedat Alp*, edited by H. Otten, E. Akurgal, H. Ertem, and A. Süel. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

_____. 1992b. Studies in the Hittite Particles, II: On Some Uses of *-kan*. Pp. 137–52 in *Per una grammatica ittita: Towards a Hittite Grammar*, edited by O. Carruba. Pavia: Iuculano.

_____. 1993. Hittite *iwar* and Related Modes of Expressing Comparison. *IM* 43: 39–51.

_____. 1994. The Hittites. Pp. 127–56 in *Peoples of the Old Testament World*, edited by A. J. Hoerth, G. L. Mattingly, and E. M. Yamauchi. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker.

_____. 1995a. About Questions. Pp. 87–104 in *Studio historiae ardens: Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Philo H. J. Houwink ten Cate on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, edited by T. P. J. van den Hout and J. de Roos. Istanbul: Institut historique et archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul.

_____. 1995b. Hittite *immakku*: "moreover" or "just now"? Pp. 191–94 in *Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia*, edited by O. Carruba, M. Giorgieri, and C. Mora. Pavia: Iuculano.

_____. 1995c. The Stem of the Hittite Word for 'House'. *HS* 108: 192–94.

_____. 1996a. Hittite Equivalents of Old Assyrian *kumrum* and *epattum*. *WZKM* 86: 151–56.

_____. 1996b. Review of J. Boley, *The Hittite Particle -z / -za* (Innsbruck, 1993). *BiOr* 53: 750–61.

_____. 1996c. Syntactical Perspectives on the Hittite Laws. Unpublished paper read at the 206th Annual Meeting of the American Oriental Society, Philadelphia, PA.

_____. 1997a. Hittites. Pp. 84–88 in volume 3 of *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East*, edited by E. M. Meyers. New York: Oxford University Press.

_____. 1997b. On Safari in Hittite Anatolia. Pp. 5–21 in *Studies in Honor of Jaan Puhvel, Part One: Ancient Languages and Philology*, edited by D. Disterheft, M. Huld, and J. A. C. Greppin. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man.

_____. 1997c. On the Hittite Use of Sumerian BAL in the Expression BAL-*nu*-. *ArAn* 3: 191–98.

_____. 1997d. *The Laws of the Hittites: A Critical Edition*. Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui 23. Leiden: Brill.

_____. 1998a. From the Disciplines of a Dictionary Editor. *JCS* 50: 35–44.

_____. 1998b. *Hittite Myths*. 2nd ed. Writings from the Ancient World 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

_____. 1998c. Name, Namengebung. C. Bei den Hethitern. Pp. 116–21 in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*, vol. 9, edited by E. Ebeling, B. Meissner, E. Weidner, W. von Soden, and D. O. Edzard. Berlin: de Gruyter.

_____. 1998d. On the Denominative Verb *arāwe*-. Pp. 275–84 in *Mír Curad: Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*, edited by J. Jasanoff, H. C. Melchert, and L. Oliver. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

_____. 2000. The Treaty of Tudḫaliya IV with Kurunta of Tarḫuntašša on the Bronze Tablet Found in Ḫattuša (2.18). Pp. 100–106 in volume 2 of *The Context of Scripture*, edited by W. W. Hallo and K. L. Younger. Leiden: Brill.

_____. 2001. Some Thoughts on Merchants and Trade in the Hittite Kingdom. Pp. 179–89 in *Kulturgeschichten: Altorientalistische Studien für Volkert Haas zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by T. Richter, D. Prechel, and J. Klinger. Saarbrücken: Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag.

_____. 2002. Before and After: Space, Time, Rank and Causality. Pp. 163–71 in *Silva Anatolica: Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, edited by P. Taracha. Warsaw: Agade.

_____. 2002–3. Hittite *a-aš-ma*. *Die Sprache* 43: 80–87.

_____. 2003a. Daily Life among the Hittites. Pp. 95–120 in *Life and Culture in the Ancient Near East*, edited by R. Averbeck, M. W. Chavalas, and D. B. Weisberg. Bethesda, MD: CDL.

_____. 2003b. On a Hittite Lexicographic Project. Review of J. Puhvel, *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, Vol. 5: *Words beginning with L. Indices to Volumes 1–5* (Berlin, 2001). *JAOS* 123: 617–25.

_____. 2005. Placenta, Colostrum and Meconium in Hittite. Pp. 337–58 in *Antiquus Oriens: Mélanges offerts au Professeur René Lebrun*, volume 1, edited by M. Mazoyer and O. Casabonne. Paris: Harmattan.

_____. 2006. The Hittite Degenitival Adjectives *šiela-*, 2-*ela-* and *apella-*. Pp. 189–97 in *The Life and Times of Ḫattušili III and Tutḫaliya IV: Proceedings of a Symposium Held in Honour of J. de Roos, 12–13 December 2003, Leiden*, edited by T. P. J. van den Hout. Leiden: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul.

_____. 2007. On Higher Numbers in Hittite. Pp. 377–85 in *VI Congresso Internazionale di Ittitologia Roma, 5–9 settembre 2005*, edited by A. Archi and R. Francia. Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici 49. Rome: CNR — Istituto de Studi sulle Civiltà del'Egeo ed del Vicino Oriente.

_____. forthcoming. A Grammatical Profile of the Middle Hittite Maşat Texts in *la-a-ma-an-te-et na-ak-ki-i: Studia Anatolica in memoriam Erich Neu scripta*, edited by C. Rüster, J. Catsanicos, and R. Lebrun. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.

Hoffner, Harry A., Jr., and H. Craig Melchert. 2002. A Practical Approach to Verbal Aspect in Hittite. Pp. 377–90 in *Anatolia antica: Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati*, edited by S. de Martino and F. Pecchioli Daddi. Florence: LoGisma.

Holland, Gary B. 1986. Nominal Sentences and the Origin of Absolute Constructions in Indo-European. *KZ* 99: 163–84.

Hout, Theo P. J. van den. 1991. A Tale of Tissaruli(ya): A Dramatic Interlude in the Hittite KI.LAM Festival? *JNES* 50: 193–202.

_____. 1992. Remarks on Some Hittite Double Accusative Constructions. Pp. 275–304 in *Per una grammatica ittita: Towards a Hittite Grammar*, edited by O. Carruba. Pavia: Iuculano.

_____. 2001. Neuter Plural Subjects and Nominal Predicates in Anatolian. Pp. 167–92 in *Anatolisch und Indogermanisch/Anatolico e Indoeuropeo. Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft Pavia 22.–25. September 1998*, edited by O. Carruba and W. Meid. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

_____. 2003. Studies in the Hittite Phraseological Construction. I. Its Syntactic and Semantic Properties. Pp. 177–204 in *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, edited by G. M. Beckman, R. H. Beal, and J. G. McMahon. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

_____. 2006. "Institutions, Vernaculars, Publics." Pp. 221–62 in *Margins of Writing: Origins of Cultures*, ed. by S. L. Sanders. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

_____. forthcoming. Studies in the Hittite Phraseological Construction, II: Its Origin in *la-a-ma-an-te-et na-ak-ki-i: Studia Anatolica in memoriam Erich Neu scripta*, edited by C. Rüster, J. Catsanicos, and R. Lebrun. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.

Houwink ten Cate, Philo H. J. 1967. The Ending *-d* of the Hittite Possessive Pronoun. *RHA* 24 (79): 123–32.

_____. 1970. *The Records of the Early Hittite Empire (c. 1450–1380 B.C.)*. Uitgaven van het Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul 26. Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut in het Nabije Oosten.

_____. 1973a. Impersonal and Reflexive Constructions of the Predicative Participle in Hittite. Pp. 199–395 in *Symbolae Biblicae et Mesopotamicae Francisco Mario Theodoro de Liagre Böhl Dedicatae*, edited by M. A. Beek, A. A. Kampman, C. Nijland, and J. Ryckmans. Leiden: Brill.

_____. 1973b. The Particle *-a* and Its Usage with Respect to the Personal Pronoun. Pp. 119–40 in *Festschrift Heinrich Otten: 27. Dez. 1973*, edited by E. Neu and C. Rüster. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1984. The History of Warfare according to Hittite Sources: The Annals of Hattusilis I (Part II). *Anatolica* 11: 47–83.

Houwink ten Cate, Philo H. J., and Folke Josephson. 1967. Muwatalli's Prayer to the Storm-God of Kummanni (KBo XI 1). *RHA* 25 (81): 101–40.

Hrozný, Friedrich. 1915. Die Lösung des hethitischen Problems. *MDOG* 56: 17–50.

_____. 1917. *Die Sprache der Hethiter*. Boghazköi-Studien 1–2. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Huehnergard, John. 2005a. *A Grammar of Akkadian.* 2nd ed. Harvard Semitic Studies 45. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

_____. 2005b. *Key to A Grammar of Akkadian.* 2nd ed. Harvard Semitic Studies 46. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Hutter, Manfred. 1988. *Behexung, Entsühnung und Heilung: Das Ritual der Tunnawiya für ein Königspaar aus mittelhethitischer Zeit (KBo XXI 1 — KUB IX 34 — KBo XXI 6)*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis 82. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Ivanov, V. V. 1963. *Xettskij jazyk*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo vostočnoj literatury.

Jakob-Rost, Liane. 1972. *Das Ritual der Malli aus Arzawa gegen Behexung (KUB XXIV 9+)*. Texte der Hethiter 2. Heidelberg: Winter.

Jamison, Stephanie. 1979. The Case of the Agent in Indo-European. *Die Sprache* 25: 129–43.

Jasanoff, Jay H. 1973. The Hittite ablative in *-anz(a)*. *MSS* 31: 123–28.

_____. 2003. *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jie, Jin. 1994. *A Complete Retrograde Glossary of the Hittite Language*. Uitgaven van het Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul 71. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.

Josephson, Folke. 1967. Pronominal Adverbs of Anatolian: Formation and Function. *RHA* 24 (79): 133–54.

_____. 1972. *The Function of the Sentence Particles in Old and Middle Hittite*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Indoeuropaea Upsaliensia 2. Uppsala: Skriv Service AB.

_____. 1976. On the Function of the Gothic Preverb *ga-*. *IF* 81: 152–75.

_____. 1995. Directionality in Hittite. *Analecta Indoeuropaea Cracoviensia* 2: 165–76.

_____. 1997. Joint Celtic, Italic and Anatolian Evidence for the Expression of Deixis, Directionality. Pp. 49–52 in *Miscellanea Celtica in memoriam Heinrich Wagner*, edited by S. M. Mathúna and A. Ó. Corráin. Uppsala: Uppsala University Press.

_____. 2003a. Semantics and Typology of Hittite *-ant-*. Pp. 91–118 in *Indo-European Word Formation*, edited by J. Clackson and B. A. Olsen. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum.

_____. 2003b. The Hittite Reflexive Construction in a Typological Perspective. Pp. 211–32 in *Language in Time and Space: A Festschrift for Werner Winter on the Occasion of His 80th Birthday*, edited by B. L. M. Bauer and G.-J. Pinault. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

_____. 2004. Singulative and Agentive in Hittite and Germanic. Pp. 257–62 in *Per aspera ad asteriscos: Studia Indogermanica in honorem Jens Elmegård Rasmussen sexagenarii Idibus Martiis anno MMIV*, edited by A. Hyllested. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Kammenhuber, Annelies. 1954. Studien zum hethitischen Infinitivsystem I–III. *MIO* 2: 44–77, 245–65, 403–44.

_____. 1955a. Studien zum hethitischen Infinitivsystem IV–V. *MIO* 3: 31–57, 345–77.

_____. 1955b. Zur Genese der hethitischen *-r/-n*-Heteroklitica. Pp. 97–106 in *Corolla linguistica: Festschrift Ferdinand Sommer zum 80. Geburtstag am 4. Mai 1955 dargebracht von Freunden, Schülern und Kollegen*. Heidelberg: Winter.

_____. 1969a. Die Sprachstufen des Hethitischen. *KZ* 83: 256–89.

_____. 1969b. Hethitisch, Palaisch, Luwisch und Hieroglyphenluwisch. Pp. 119–357 in *Altkleinasiatische Sprachen*, edited by B. Spuler. Leiden: Brill.

_____. 1969c. *Hethitisch, Palaisch, Luwisch, Hieroglyphenluwisch und Hattisch: Altkleinasiatische Indices zum Handbuch der Orientalistik*. MSS Beiheft 4. Munich.

_____. 1979a. Direktiv, Terminativ und/oder Lokativ im Hethitischen. Pp. 115–42 in *Hethitisch und indogermanisch: Vergleichende Studien zur historischen Grammatik und zur Dialektgeographie*, edited by E. Neu and W. Meid. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

_____. 1979b. Zwischenbilanz zu den hethitischen Enklitikaketten. Pp. 185–96 in *Florilegium Anatolicum: Mélanges offerts à Emmanuel Laroche*. Paris: de Boccard.

_____. 1985. Zum Modus Injunktiv und zum Drei-Genus-System im Ur-Indogermanischen (c. 3000–2500 v.Chr.). Pp. 435–66 in *Studia linguistica diachronica et synchronica Werner Winter sexagenario*, edited by U. Pieper and G. Stickel. Berlin: de Gruyter.

_____. 1993. *Kleine Schriften zum Altanatolischen und Indogermanischen*. 2 vols. Texte der Hethiter 19. Heidelberg: Winter.

Kassian, Alexei S., Andrej Korolëv, and Andrej V. Sidel'tsev. 2002. *Hittite Funerary Ritual: šalliš waštaiš*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 288. Münster: Ugarit Verlag.

Kemmer, Suzanne. 1993. *The Middle Voice*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Kimball, Sara E. 1983. *Hittite Plene Writing*. Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania.

_____. 1999. *Hittite Historical Phonology*. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 95. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Klengel, Horst, and Evelyn Klengel. 1975. *Die Hethiter und ihre Nachbarn: Eine Kulturgeschichte Kleinasiens von Çatal Hüyük bis zu Alexander dem Großen*. Leipzig: Koehler and Amelang.

Klinger, Jörg. 1992. Fremde und Aussenseiter in Hatti. Pp. 187–212 in *Aussenseiter*, edited by V. Haas. Konstanz: Universitätsverlag Konstanz.

_____. 1996. *Untersuchungen zur Rekonstruktion der hattischen Kultschicht.* Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 37. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1998. "Wer lehrte die Hethiter das Schreiben?" Zur Paläographie früher Texte in akkadischer Sprache aus Boğazköy: Skizze einiger Überlegungen und vorläufiger Ergebnisse. Pp. 365–76 in *Uluslararası Hititoloji Kongresi bildirileri: Çorum, 16–22 Eylül, 1996: Acts of the IIIrd International Congress of Hittitology, Çorum, September 16–22, 1996*, edited by S. Alp and A. Süel. Ankara: Uyum Ajans.

Kloekhorst, Alwin. forthcoming. The Hittite 2 pl.-ending *-sten(i).* In *Atti del 6° Congresso Internazionale di Ittitologia*, edited by A. Archi and R. Francia. Rome: Herder.

Knudtzon, Jürgen Alexander, Sophus Bugge, and Alf Torp. 1902. *Die zwei Arzawa-Briefe: Die ältesten Urkunden in indogermanischer Sprache*. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Korošec, Viktor. 1931. *Hethitische Staatsverträge*. Leipziger rechtswissenschaftliche Studien 60. Leipzig: Weicher.

Košak, Silvin. 1993. Die Stadtwerke von Hattuša. *Linguistica* 33: 107–12.

_____. 1996. Ein hethitisches *ghost word* entgeistert. *AoF* 23: 95–97.

Kronasser, Heinz. 1956. *Vergleichende Laut- und Formenlehre des Hethitischen*. Heidelberg: Winter.

_____. 1966. *Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache I*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Kühne, Cord. 1988. Über die Darstellung der hethitischen Reflexivpartikel *-z*, besonders in postvokalischer Position. Pp. 203–33 in *Documentum Asiae Minoris antiquae: Festschrift für Heinrich Otten zum 75. Geburtstag*, edited by E. Neu and C. Rüster. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Kühne, Cord, and Heinrich Otten. 1971. *Der Šaušgamuwa-Vertrag*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 16. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Kümmel, Hans Martin. 1967. *Ersatzrituale für den hethitischen König*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1958. Le hittite. Pp. 216–51 in *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Linguists (1957)*, edited by E. Sivertsen. Oslo: Oslo University Press.

Labat, René. 1932. *L'Akkadien de Boghaz-Köi: Étude sur la langue des lettres, traités et vocabulaires akkadiens trouvées à Boghaz-Köi*. Bordeaux: Delmas.

_____. 1988. *Manuel d'épigraphie akkadienne*. 6th ed., edited and expanded by Florence Malbran-Labat. Paris: Geuthner.

Laroche, Emmanuel. 1947. *Recherches sur les noms des dieux hittites* (= *RHA* 7 1947*)*. Paris: Maisonneuve.

_____. 1951a. Fragments hittites de Genève. *RA* 45: 131–36, 184–94.

_____. 1951b. *Recueil d'onomastique hittite*. Paris: Klincksieck.

_____. 1952. Fragments hittites de Genève (2). *RA* 46: 42–50.

_____. 1955. Onomastique hittite: additions et corrections. *RHA* 13 (57): 41–58.

_____. 1956. Hittite *-ima-,* indo-européen *-mó-*. *BSL* 52: 72–82.

_____. 1957a. Études de vocabulaire VI. *RHA* 15 (60): 9–29.

_____. 1957b. Notes de toponymie anatolienne. Pp. 1–7 in *MNHMHΣ XAPIN: Gedenkschrift Paul Kretschmer, 2. Mai 1866–9. März 1956*, edited by H. Kronasser. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1958. Comparaison du louvite et du lycien. *BSL* 53: 159–97.

_____. 1959. *Dictionnaire de la langue louvite*. Bibliothèque archéoligique et historique de l'institut français d'archéologie d'Istanbul 6. Paris: Maisonneuve.

_____. 1960. *Les hiéroglyphes hittites, I*. Paris: CNRS.

_____. 1962. Un 'ergatif' en indo-européen d'Asie Mineure. *BSL* 57: 23–43.

_____. 1964. La prière hittite: vocabulaire et typologie. *Annuaire de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études (V^e section)*: 8–29.

_____. 1965. Études de linguistique anatolienne. *RHA* 23 (76): 33–54.

_____. 1966. *Les noms des Hittites*. Paris: Klincksieck.

_____. 1967. Les noms anatoliens du 'dieu' et leurs dérivés. *JCS* 21: 174–77.

_____. 1968. Textes de Ras Shamra en langue hittite. Pp. 769–84 in *Ugaritica V: Nouveaux textes accadiens, hourrites et ugaritiques des Archives et Bibliothèques privées d'Ugarit, commentaires des textes historiques*, edited by J. Nougayrol, E. Laroche, C. Virolleaud, and C. F. A. Schaeffer. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.

_____. 1969a. Fragments hittites du traité mitannien de Suppiluliuma I^er. Pp. 369–73 in *Ugaritica VI*, edited by J. Nougayrol, E. Laroche, C. Virolleaud, and C. F. A. Schaeffer. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.

_____. 1969b. Vocatif et cas absolu en anatolien. *Athenaeum* NS 47: 173–78.

_____. 1970. Études de linguistique anatolienne, III. *RHA* 28: 22–71.

_____. 1971. *Catalogue des textes hittites*. Études et Commentaires 75. Paris: Klincksieck.

_____. 1973. Fleuve et ordalie en Asie Mineure hittite. Pp. 179–90 in *Festschrift Heinrich Otten: 27. Dez. 1973*, edited by E. Neu and C. Rüster. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1975. Noms d'action en indo-européen d'Anatolie. Pp. 339–46 in *Mélanges linguistiques offerts à Emile Benveniste*. Paris: Société de linguistique de Paris.

_____. 1978–79. *Glossaire de la langue hourrite*. 2 vols. Paris: Klincksieck.

_____. 1979. Anaphore et deixis en anatolien. Pp. 147–52 in *Hethitisch und indogermanisch: Vergleichende Studien zur historischen Grammatik und zur Dialektgeographie*, edited by E. Neu and W. Meid. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

_____. 1982. Epithètes e prédicats en hittite. Pp. 133–36 in *Serta Indogermanica: Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 60. Geburtstag*, edited by J. Tischler. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Lebrun, René. 1985. L'aphasie de Mursili II = CTH 486. *Hethitica* 6: 103–37.

Lindeman, Fredrik Otto. 1965. Note phonologique sur hittite *eku-* 'boire'. *RHA* 23 (76): 29–32.

Luraghi, Silvia. 1987. Reconstructing Proto-Indo-European as an Ergative Language: A Test. *JIES* 15: 359–80.

_____. 1997a. *Hittite*. Languages of the World/Materials 114. Munich: Lincom Europa.

_____. 1997b. I verbi ausiliari in ittita. Pp. 299–320 in *Ars linguistica: Studi offerti a Paolo Ramat*, edited by G. Gernini, P. Cuzzolin, and P. Molinelli. Rome: Bulzoni.

Macqueen, James G. 1986. *The Hittites and Their Contemporaries in Asia Minor*. 2nd ed. London: Thames and Hudson.

Marazzi, Massimiliano. 1996. Hethitische Lexikographie: *CHD* L-N, Facz. 4. *Or NS* 65: 157–65.

Martino, Stefano de. 1998. Le accuse di Muršili II alla regina Tawananna secondo il testo KUB XIV 4. Pp. 19–48 in *Studi e Testi I*, edited by S. de Martino and F. Imparati. Florence: LoGisma.

_____. 2003. *Gli Ittiti*. Le Bussole 96. Rome: Carocci.

Mascheroni, Lorenza M. 1980. Il modulo interrogativo in eteo I: note sintattiche. *SMEA* 22: 53–62.

McCone, Kim R. 1979. The Diachronic Possibilities of the Indo-European 'Amplified' Sentence: A Case History from Anatolian. Pp. 467–87 in *Studies in Diachronic, Synchronic, and Typological Linguistics: Festschrift for Oswald Szemerényi on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, edited by B. Brogyanyi. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Meier-Brügger, Michael. 2000. *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

_____. 2003. *Indo-European Linguistics*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Melchert, H. Craig. 1977. *Ablative and Instrumental in Hittite*. Ph. D. Diss., Harvard University.

_____. 1983. A 'New' PIE **men* Suffix. *Die Sprache* 29: 1–26.

_____. 1984a. Review of J. J. S. Weitenberg, *Die hethitischen U-Stämme* (Amsterdam, 1984). *Kratylos* 29: 79–82.

_____. 1984b. *Studies in Hittite Historical Phonology*. Ergänzungsheft zur Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung 32. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

_____. 1985. Hittite *imma* and Latin *immo*. *KZ* 98: 184–205.

_____. 1988a. Luvian Lexical Notes. *HS* 101: 211–43.

_____. 1988b. Word-final *-r* in Hittite. Pp. 215–34 in *A Linguistic Happening in Memory of Ben Schwarz: Studies in Anatolian, Italic, and Other Indo-European Languages*, edited by Y. L. Arbeitman. Louvain-La-Neuve: Peeters.

_____. 1989. Review of D. Yoshida, *Die Syntax des althethitischen substantivischen Genitivs* (Heidelberg, 1987). *Kratylos* 34: 181–82.

_____. 1992. Hittite Vocalism. Pp. 181–96 in *Per una grammatica ittita: Towards a Hittite Grammar*, edited by O. Carruba. Pavia: Iuculano.

_____. 1993a. A New Anatolian 'Law of Finals'. *JAC* 8: 105–13.

_____. 1993b. *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon*. Lexica Anatolica 2. Chapel Hill, NC: Published by the Author.

_____. 1994. *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Leiden Studies in Indo-European 3. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

_____. 1995. Neo-Hittite Nominal Inflection. Pp. 269–74 in *Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia*, edited by O. Carruba, M. Giorgieri, and C. Mora. Pavia: Iuculano.

_____. 1996. Review of H. G. Güterbock and T. van den Hout, *The Hittite Instruction for the Royal Bodyguard* [AS 24] (Chicago, 1991). *JNES* 55: 134–35.

_____. 1997a. Review of H. G. Güterbock and H. A. Hoffner, eds., *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Instiute* P, fasc. 2 (Chicago 1995). *JAOS* 117: 713–14.

_____. 1997b. Syncope and Anaptyxis in Hittite. Pp. 177–80 in *Sound Law and Analogy. Papers in Honor of Robert S. P. Beekes on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday*, edited by A. Lubotsky. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

_____. 1997c. Traces of a PIE Aspectual Contrast in Anatolian? *IncLing* 20: 83–92.

_____. 1998. Aspects of Verbal Aspect in Hittite. Pp. 413–418 in *Uluslararası Hititoloji Kongresi bildirileri: Çorum, 16–22 Eylül, 1996: Acts of the IIIrd International Congress of Hittitology, Çorum, September 16–22, 1996*, edited by S. Alp and A. Süel. Ankara: Uyum Ajans.

_____. 2000. Tocharian Plurals in *-nt-* and Related Phenomena. *TIES* 9: 53–75.

_____. 2001. Hittite Nominal Stems in *-il*. Pp. 263–72 in *Anatolisch und Indogermanisch/Anatolico e Indoeuropeo: Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft Pavia 22.–25. September 1998*, edited by O. Carruba and W. Meid. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

_____. 2003a. Hittite *antaka-* 'Loins' and an Overlooked Myth about Fire. Pp. 281–88 in *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, edited by G. M. Beckman, R. H. Beal and J. G. McMahon. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

_____. 2003b. Hittite Nominal Stems in *-anzan-*. Pp. 129–39 in *Indogermanisches Nomen: Derivation, Flexion, und Ablaut*, edited by E. Tichy, D. S. Wodtko, and B. Irslinger. Bremen: Hempen.

_____. 2003c. PIE "thorn" in Cuneiform Luvian? Pp. 145–61 in *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, edited by K. Jones-Bley. Washington: Institute for the Study of Man.

_____. 2005a. Latin *insolesco*, Hittite *šulle(šš)-* and PIE Statives in *-ē-*. Pp. 90–98 in *Hṛdā mánasā: Studies Presented to Professor Leonard G. Herzenberg on the occasion of his 70-birthday*, edited by N. N. Kazansky, E. R. Kryuchkova, A. S. Nikolaev and A. V. Shatskov. Saint Petersburg: Nauka.

_____. 2005b. The Problem of Luvian Influence on Hittite: When and How Much? Pp. 445–60 in *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel: Akten der XI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 17.–23. September 2000, Halle an der Saale*, edited by G. Meiser and O. Hackstein. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

———, ed. 2003d. *The Luwians*. Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section One: The Near and Middle East 68. Leiden: Brill.

Meriggi, Piero. 1962. *Hieroglyphisch-hethitisches Glossar*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1966–1975. *Manuale di Eteo Geroglifico*. Rome: Ateneo.

_____. 1980. *Schizzo grammaticale dell'Anatolico*. Accademia nazionale dei Lincei. Memorie. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, serie 8, 24/3. Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei.

Miller, Jared L. 2004. *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 46. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Mishali, Ayala. 2000. The *bēl dāmē*'s role in the Neo-Assyrian legal process. *Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 6: 35–53.

Monte, Giuseppe F. del. 1992. *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte, Supplement*. Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes 6/2. Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients, Reihe B 7/6. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Monte, Giuseppe F. del, and Johann Tischler. 1978. *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte*. Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes 6. Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients, Reihe B, 7. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Mora, Clelia. 1991. Sull'origine della scrittura geroglifica anatolica. *Kadmos* 30: 1–28.

Mora, Clelia, and Mauro Giorgieri. 2004. *Le lettere tra i re ittiti e i re assiri ritrovate a Hattuša*. History of the Ancient Near East Monographs 7. Padua: Sargon.

Morpurgo Davies, Anna. 1986. Forms of Writing in the Ancient Mediterranean World. Pp. 51–77 in *The Written Word: Literacy in Transition*, edited by G. Baumann. Oxford.

Neu, Erich. 1968a. *Das hethitische Mediopassiv und seine indogermanischen Grundlagen*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 6. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1968b. *Interpretation der hethitischen mediopassiven Verbalformen*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 5. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1969. Review of W. Kastner, *Die griechischen Adjektive zweier Endungen auf -oς* (Heidelberg, 1967). *IF* 74: 235–41.

_____. 1970. *Ein althethitisches Gewitterritual*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 12. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1974. *Der Anitta-Text*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 18. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1979a. Einige Überlegungen zu den hethitischen Kasusendungen. Pp. 177–96 in *Hethitisch und indogermanisch: Vergleichende Studien zur historischen Grammatik und zur Dialektgeographie*, edited by E. Neu and W. Meid. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

_____. 1979b. Hethitisch *kurur* und *takšul* in syntaktischer Sicht. Pp. 407–428 in *Studia Mediterranea Piero Meriggi dicata*, edited by O. Carruba. Pavia: Aurora.

_____. 1979c. Zum sprachlichen Alter des Hukkana-Vertrages. *KZ* 93: 64–84.

_____. 1980a. *Studien zum endungslosen Lokativ des Hethitischen*. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 23. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

_____. 1980b. *Althethitische Ritualtexte in Umschrift.* Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 25. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1981a. Noch einmal hethitisch *heu-* 'Regen'. Pp. 203–12 in *Bono Homini Donum: Essays in Historical Linguistics in Memory of J. Alexander Kerns*, edited by Y. L. Arbeitman and A. R. Bomhard. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

_____. 1981b. Review of J. Tischler, *Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar*, Lieferung 2 (Innsbruck, 1978). *IF* 86: 347–51.

_____. 1982. Hethitisch /r/ im Wortauslaut. Pp. 205–25 in *Serta Indogermanica: Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 60. Geburtstag*, edited by J. Tischler. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

_____. 1982/1983. Zum Genus hethitischer *r*-Stämme. *Linguistica* 28/29: 125–30.

_____. 1983. *Glossar zu den althethitischen Ritualtexten*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 26. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1985. Zur Stammabstufung bei *i*- und *u*-stämmigen Substantiven des Hethitischen. Pp. 259–64 in *Sprachwissenschaftliche Forschungen: Festschrift für Johann Knobloch zum 65. Geburtstag am 5. Januar 1984 dargebracht von Freunden und Kollegen*, edited by H. M. Ölberg, G. Schmidt, and H. Bothien. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

_____. 1986. Zur unechten Nominalkomposition im Hethitischen. Pp. 107–15 in *o-o-pe-ro-si: Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag*, edited by A. Etter. Berlin: de Gruyter.

_____. 1988a. *Das Hurritische: Eine altorientalische Sprache in neuem Licht*. Akademie der Wissenschaften und Literatur, Mainz. Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, 1988/3. Stuttgart: Steiner.

_____. 1988b. Zur Grammatik des Hurritischen auf der Grundlage der hurritisch-hethitischen Bilingue aus der Bogazköy-Grabungskampagne 1983. Pp. 95–116 in *Hurriter und Hur-*

ritisch. Konstanzer Altorientalische Symposien, vol. 2, edited by V. Haas. Konstanz: Universitätsverlag Konstanz.

_____. 1989a. Zu einer hethitischen Präteritalendung *-ar*. *HS* 102: 16–20.

_____. 1989b. Zum Alter der personfizierenden *-ant*-Bildung des Hethitischen: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der indogermanischen Genuskategorie. *HS* 102: 1–15.

_____. 1990. Das hethitische Wort für 'Frau'. *HS* 103: 208–17.

_____. 1992. Zum Kollektivum im Hethitischen. Pp. 197–212 in *Per una grammatica ittita: Towards a Hittite Grammar*, edited by O. Carruba. Pavia: Iuculano.

_____. 1993. Zu den hethitischen Ortspartikeln. *Linguistica* 33: 137–52.

_____. 1994. Zur mittelhethitischen Sprachform der hurritisch-hethitischen Bilingue aus Ḫattuša. Pp. 189–202 in *Iranian and Indo-European Studies: Memorial Volume of Otakar Klíma*, edited by P. Vavroušek. Prague: Enigma.

_____. 1995. Futur im Hethitischen? Pp. 195–202 in *Verba et Structurae: Festschrift für Klaus Strunk zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by H. Hettrich, W. Hock, P.-A. Mumm, and N. Oettinger. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

_____. 1996. *Das hurritische Epos der Freilassung I: Untersuchungen zu einem hurritisch-hethitischen Textensemble aus Ḫattuša*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 32. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1997. Zu einigen Pronominalformen des Hethitischen. Pp. 139–169 in *Studies in Honor of Jaan Puhvel, Part One: Ancient Languages and Philology*, edited by D. Disterheft, M. Huld, and J. A. C. Greppin. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man.

_____. 1998. Hethitisch *ši-mu-uš*. *HS* 111: 55–60.

Neumann, Günter. 1964. Drei luwische Wörter. *MSS* 16: 47–53.

Neve, Peter J. 1987. Die Ausgrabungen in Boğazköy-Ḫattuša 1986. *AA*: 381–412, 754–55.

Nowicki, Helmuth. 2000. Zum Einleitungsparagraphen des Anitta-Textes (CTH 1,1–4). Pp. 347–55 in *125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz: Festband anlässlich des 125 jährigen Bestehens der Forschungsrichtung "Indogermanistik" an der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz*, edited by C. Zinko and M. Ofitsch. Graz: Leykam.

Oettinger, Norbert. 1976a. *Die Militärischen Eide der Hethiter*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 22. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1976b. Indogermanisch **s(h$_2$)neu̯r/n* 'Sehne' und **(s)men-* 'gering sein' im Hethitischen. *MSS* 35: 93–103.

_____. 1979. *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums*. Erlanger Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kunstwissenschaft 64. Nürnberg: Carl.

_____. 1980. Die *n*-Stämme des Hethitischen und ihre indogermanischen Ausgangspunkte. *HS* 94: 44–63.

_____. 1981. Hethitisch *ganenant-* 'gebeugt, dürstig'. *MSS* 40: 143–53.

_____. 1982a. Die Dentalerweiterung von *n*-Stämmen und Heteroklitika im Griechischen, Anatolischen und Altindischen. Pp. 233–46 in *Serta Indogermanica: Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 60. Geburtstag*, edited by J. Tischler. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

_____. 1982b. Reste von *e*-Hochstufe im Formans hethitischer *n*-Stämme einschliesslich des 'umna'-Suffixes. Pp. 162–77 in *Investigationes philologicae et comparativae: Gedenkschrift für Heinz Kronasser*, edited by E. Neu. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1982c. Review of E. Neu, *Studien zum endungslosen Lokativ des hethitischen* (Innsbruck, 1980). *BiOr* 39: 364–68.

_____. 1986a. Anatolische 'Kurzgeschichten'. *HS* 99: 43–53.

_____. 1986b. *'Indo-Hittite'-Hypothese und Wortbildung*. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 37. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

_____. 1987. Bemerkungen zur anatolischen *i*-Motion und Genusfrage. *HS* 100: 35–43.

_____. 1988. Hethitisch *-want-*. Pp. 273–86 in *Documentum Asiae Minoris antiquae: Festschrift für Heinrich Otten zum 75. Geburtstag*, edited by E. Neu and C. Rüster. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1993. Mittelhethitisches *hatte*š 'sie schlachtete'. *Linguistica* 33: 153–55.

_____. 1994. Etymologisch unerwarteter Nasal im Hethitischen. Pp. 307–30 in *In honorem Holger Pedersen: Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 26. bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen*, edited by J. E. Rasmussen and B. Nielsen. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

_____. 1995. Griech. ὀστέον, heth. *kulēi* und ein neues Kollektivsuffix. Pp. 211–28 in *Verba et structurae: Festschrift für Klaus Strunk zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by H. Hettrich, W. Hock, P.-A. Mumm, and N. Oettinger. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

_____. 1998. Skizze zur Funktion der Reduplikation im Hethitischen. Pp. 451–56 in *Uluslararası Hititoloji Kongresi bildirileri: Çorum, 16–22 Eylül, 1996: Acts of the IIIrd International Congress of Hittitology, Çorum, September 16–22, 1996*, edited by S. Alp and A. Süel. Ankara: Uyum Ajans.

_____. 2000a. Der hethitische Lautwandel *kr* > *hr*. Pp. 357–62 in *125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz: Festband anlässlich des 125jährigen Bestehens der Forschungsrichtung "Indogermanistik" an der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz*, edited by M. Ofitsch and C. Zinko. Graz: Leykam.

_____. 2000b. Heth. *udn*ē, arm. *getin* 'Land' und lyk. *wedre/i*. Pp. 181–87 in *Anusantatyai: Festschrift für Johanna Narten zum 70. Geburtstag*, edited by A. Hintze and E. Tichy. Dettelbach: Röll.

_____. 2001a. Hethitisch *-ima-* oder: Wie ein Suffix affektiv werden kann. Pp. 456–77 in *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitiologie, Würzburg, 4.–8. Oktober, 1999*, edited by G. Wilhelm. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 2001b. Neue Gedanken über das *nt*-Suffix. Pp. 301–16 in *Anatolisch und Indogermanisch/Anatolico e Indoeuropeo: Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft Pavia 22.–25. September 1998*, edited by O. Carruba and W. Meid. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

_____. 2002. *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums: Nachdruck mit einer kurzen Revision der hethitischen Verbalklassen*. Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 7. Dresden: Technische Universität Dresden.

_____. 2003. Zum Ablaut von *n*-Stämmen im Anatolischen und der Brechung *ē* > *ya*. Pp. 141–52 in *Indogermanisches Nomen. Derivation, Flexion, und Ablaut*, edited by E. Tichy, D. S. Wodtko, and B. Irslinger. Bremen: Hempen.

Ose, Fritz. 1944. *Supinum und Infinitiv im Hethitischen*. Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft 47/1. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Oshiro, Terumasa. 1990 [92]. The Function of the Sentence Particle *-an* in Old Hittite. Pp. 3–10 in *Folia Linguistica Historica: Acta Societatis Linguisticae Europaeae, XI/1–2*. The Hague: Mouton.

_____. 1995. The Verbal Reduplication in Hieroglyphic Luwian. *Orient* 30–31: 294–301.

Otten, Heinrich. 1950. *Mythen vom Gotte Kumarbi: Neue Fragmente*. Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Orientforschung der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften 3. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

_____. 1951. Zu den Anfängen der hethitischen Geschichte. *MDOG* 83: 33–45.

_____. 1953a. Ein kanaanäischer Mythus aus Bogazköy. *MIO* 1: 125–50.

_____. 1953b. Kanaanäische Mythen aus Hattusa-Bogazköy. *MDOG* 85: 27–38.

_____. 1957. Zusätzliche Lesungen zum Alakšandu-Vertrag. *MIO* 5: 26–30.

_____. 1958. *Hethitische Totenrituale*. Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Orientforschung der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften 37. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

_____. 1959. Zur Kontinuität eines altanatolischen Kultes. *ZA* 53: 174–84.

_____. 1961. Eine Beschwörung der Unterirdischen aus Boğazköy. *ZA* 54: 114–57.

_____. 1968–1969. Die Tontafelfunde von 1967. *AfO* 22: 111–13.

_____. 1969. *Sprachliche Stellung und Datierung des Madduwatta-Textes*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 11. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1973. *Eine althethitische Erzählung um die Stadt Zalpa*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 17. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1981. *Die Apologie Hattusilis III.: Das Bild der Überlieferung*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 24. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1983. Der Anfang der HAZANNU-Instruktion. *Or NS* 52: 133–42.

_____. 1988. *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy: Ein Staatsvertrag Tuthalijas IV.* Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten Beiheft 1. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1990. Bemerkungen zur Überlieferung einiger hethitischer Texte. *ZA* 80: 223–27.

_____. 1992. Erwägungen zur Kontinuität altanatolischer Kulte. Pp. 34–42 in *Uluslararası 1. Hititoloji Kongresi Bilderileri (19–21 Temmuz 1990)*. Çorum, Turkey: Uluslararası Çorum Hitit Festivali Komitesi Başkanlığı.

Otten, Heinrich, and Wolfram von Soden. 1968. *Das akkadisch-hethitische Vokabular KBo I 44 + KBo XIII 1*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 7. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Otten, Heinrich, and Vladimir Souček. 1969. *Ein althethitisches Ritual für das Königspaar*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 8. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Payne, Annick. 2004. *Hieroglyphic Luwian*. Elementa Linguarum Orientis 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Pecchioli Daddi, Franca. 2003. *Il vincolo per i governatori de provincia*. Studia Mediterranea 14. Pavia: Italian University Press.

Pecchioli Daddi, Franca, and Anna Maria Polvani. 1990. *La mitologia ittita*. Testi del Vicino Oriente antico 4.1. Brescia: Paideia.

Pecora, Laura. 1984. La particella *-wa(r)-* e il discorso diretto in antico-eteo. *IF* 89: 104–24.

Pedersen, Holger. 1935. Zum Lautwert des Zeichens ⊢ im Hettitischen. *ArOr* 7: 80–88.

_____. 1938. *Hittitisch und die anderen indoeuropäischen Sprachen*. Det Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Hist.-filol. Meddelelser 25/2. Copenhagen.

Plöchl, Reinhold. 2003. *Einführung ins Hieroglyphen-Luwische*. Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 8. Dresden: Technische Universität.

Polvani, Anna Maria. 1988. Appunti per una storia della musica cultuale ittita: lo strumento *huhupal*. *Hethitica* 9: 171–79.

Popko, Maciej. 1995. *Religions of Asia Minor*. Translated by I. Zych. Warsaw: Academic Publications Dialog.

Prins, Anna Adriana Maria. 1997. *Hittite Neuter Singular–Neuter Plural: Some Evidence for a Connection*. Leiden: Research School CNWS.

Pritchard, James B. 1969. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament.* 3rd ed., with suppl. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Probert, Philomen. 2006. Clause Boundaries in Old Hittite Relative Sentences. *TPS* 104: 17–83.

Puhvel, Jaan. 1984–. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary.* Berlin: Mouton.

Raggi Braglia, Maria S. 1989. IE *per- 'volare' nelle lingue anatoliche. *OA* 28: 201–11.

Rasmussen, Jens E. 2001. From the Realm of Anatolian Verbal Stem Formation: Problems of Reduplication. Pp. 355–68 in *Anatolisch und Indogermanisch/Anatolico e Indoeuropeo: Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft Pavia 22.–25. September 1998*, edited by O. Carruba and W. Meid. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Reichert, Pierre. 1963. Glossaire inverse de la langue hittite. *RHA* 21 (73): 59–145.

Rieken, Elisabeth. 1994. Der Wechsel *-a-/-i-* in der Stammbildung des hethitischen Nomens. *HS* 107: 42–53.

_____. 1996. Beiträge zur anatolischen Sprachgeschichte. *AoF* 23: 289–97.

_____. 1999a. *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 44. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1999b. Zur Verwendung der Konjunktion *ta* in den hethitischen Texten. *MSS* 59: 63–88.

_____. 2000a. Die Partikeln *-a, -i̯a, -ma* im Althethitischen und das Akkadogramm *Ù*. Pp. 411–19 in *125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz. Festband anlässlich des 125 jährigen Bestehens der Forschungsrichtung "Indogermanistik" an der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz*, edited by C. Zinko and M. Ofitsch. Graz: Leykam.

_____. 2000b. Hethitisch *šumumaḫḫ-*. *HS* 113: 171–75.

_____. 2001. Einige Beobachtungen zum Wechsel *u-/(u)u̯a-* in den hethitischen Texten. Pp. 369–80 in *Anatolisch und Indogermanisch/Anatolico e Indoeuropeo: Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft Pavia 22.–25. September 1998*, edited by O. Carruba and W. Meid. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

_____. 2002. Ein Lautgesetz und der Obliquusstamm des urindg. Personalpronomens. Pp. 407–16 in *Novalis Indogermanica: Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 80. Geburtstag*, edited by M. Fritz and S. Zeilfelder. Graz: Leykam.

_____. 2004a. Merkwürdige Kasusformen im Hethitischen. Pp. 533–43 in *Šarnikzel: Hethitologische Studien zum Gedenken an Emil Orgetorix Forrer*, edited by D. Groddek and S. Rößle. Dresden: Technische Universität Dresden.

_____. 2004b. Reste von *e*-Hochstufe im Formans hethitischer *n*-Stämme? Pp. 284–94 in *Indo-European Word Formation: Proceedings of the Conference held at the University of Copenhagen October 20th–22nd 2000*, edited by J. Clackson and B. A. Olsen. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum.

_____. 2005a. Hethitisch. Pp. 80–127 in *Sprachen des Alten Orients*, edited by M. P. Streck. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

_____. 2005b. Zur Wiedergabe von hethitisch /o/. Pp. 537–49 in *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel: Akten der XI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 17.–23. September 2000, Halle an der Saale*, edited by G. Meiser and O. Hackstein. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

_____. forthcoming. Die periphrastischen Konstruktionen mit *pai-* 'gehen' und *uwa-* 'kommen' im Hethitischen. In *la-a-ma-an-te-et na-ak-ki-i: Studia anatolica in memoriam Erich Neu scripta*, edited by C. Rüster, J. Catsanicos, and R. Lebrun. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.

Riemschneider, Kaspar K. 1958. Die hethtitischen Landschenkungsurkunden. *MIO* 6:321–81.

_____. 1970. *Babylonische Geburtsomina in hethitischer Übersetzung*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 9. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Rosenkranz, Bernhard. 1952. *Beiträge zur Erforschung des Luvischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1978. *Vergleichende Untersuchungen der altanatolischen Sprachen*. Trends in Linguistics, State-of-the-Art Reports 8. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.

Rößle, Silvester. 1998. Heth. *karza* 'Gerät des Webers' und *kazzarnul* 'eine bestimmte Tuchart'. *MSS* 58: 111–28.

Rost, Liane. 1956. Die ausserhalb von Boğazköy gefundenen hethitischen Briefe. *MIO* 4: 328–50.

Rubio, Gonzalo. 2006. Writing in Another Tongue: Alloglottography in the Ancient near East. Pp. 31–64 in *Margins of Writing, Origins of Cultures*, edited by S. L. Sanders. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

_____. 2007. Sumerian Morphology. Pp. 1327–79 in *Morphologies of Asia and Africa*, edited by A. S. Kaye. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Rumsey, A. 1987. Was Proto-Indo-European an Ergative Language? *JIES* 15: 19–38.

Rüster, Christel. 1988. Materialien zu einer Fehlertypologie der hethitischen Texte. Pp. 295–306 in *Documentum Asiae Minoris Antiquae: Festschrift für Heinrich Otten zum 75. Geburtstag*, edited by E. Neu and C. Rüster. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Rüster, Christel, and Erich Neu. 1989. *Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon: Inventar und Interpretation der Keilschriftzeichen aus den Boğazköy-Texten*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten, Beiheft 2. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Salisbury, Donna. 1999. *anda* and *andan* in Neo-Hittite. *JCS* 51: 1–12.

Schaefer, Christiane. 1994. *Das Intensivum im Vedischen*. Historische Sprachforschung Ergänzungsheft 37. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Schindler, Jochem. 1967. Das idg. Wort für 'Erde' und die dentalen Spiranten. *Die Sprache* 13: 191–205.

Schuler, Einar von. 1957. *Hethitische Dienstanweisungen für höhere Hof- und Staatsbeamte*. AfO Beiheft 10. Graz: Weidner.

Sidel'tsev, Andrej. 2002. A New Morphophonological Rule for Middle Hittite? Pp. 21–80 in *Memoriae A. A. Korol'ëv dicata*, edited by A. S. Kassian and A. V. Sidel'tsev. Moscow: Languages of Slavonic Culture.

Siegelová, Jana. 1971. *Appu-Märchen und Hedammu-Mythus*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 14. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1986. *Hethitische Verwaltungspraxis im Lichte der Wirtschafts- und Inventardokumente*. Prague: Národní Muzeum v Praze.

Sihler, Andrew L. 1995. *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Singer, Itamar. 1975. Hittite *ḫilammar* and Hieroglyphic Luwian *ḫilana*. *ZA* 65: 69–103.

_____. 1996. *Muwatalli's Prayer to the Assembly of Gods through the Storm-God of Lightning (CTH 381)*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

_____. 1999. A New Hittite Letter from Emar. Pp. 65–72 in *Landscapes, Territories, Frontiers and Horizons in the Ancient Near East: Papers presented to the XLIV Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Venezia, 7–11 July 1997*, volume 2: *Geography and Cultural Landscapes*, edited by L. Milano, S. de Martino, M. F. Fales and G. B. Lanfranchi. Padova: Sargon.

_____. 2002a. A Hattian 'whistle'? *NABU* 2002 No. 3: 66–67 #67.

_____. 2002b. *Hittite Prayers*. Writings from the Ancient World 11. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Soden, Wolfram von. 1952. *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik*. Analecta Orientalia 33. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.

_____. 1965–85. *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1995. *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik*. 3rd revised ed., edited by Werner R. Mayer. Analecta Orientalia 33. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.

Soden, Wolfram von, and Wolfgang Röllig. 1991. *Das Akkadische Syllabar.* 4th ed. Analecta Orientalia 42. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico.

Sommer, Ferdinand. 1920. *Hethitisches I*. Boghazköi-Studien 4. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

_____. 1921. Hethitisch *aruna-* und die Partikel *-pé*. *OLZ* 24: 197–201.

_____. 1922. *Hethitisches II*. Boghazköi-Studien 7. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

_____. 1932. *Die Aḫḫijava-Urkunden*. Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Abteilung NF 6. Munich: Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

_____. 1947. *Hethiter und Hethitisch*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Sommer, Ferdinand, and Hans Ehelolf. 1924. *Das hethitische Ritual des Papanikri von Komana*. Boghazköi-Studien 10. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Sommer, Ferdinand, and A. Falkenstein. 1938. *Die hethitisch-akkadische Bilingue des Hattusili I. (Labarna II.)*. Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Abteilung NF 16. Munich: Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Souček, Vladimir. 1970. Zur Sprache der hethitischen Gesetze. *ArOr* 38: 269–76.

Soysal, Oğuz. 2004. *Hattischer Wortschatz in hethitischer Textüberlieferung*. Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section One: The Near and Middle East 74. Leiden: Brill.

Speiser, Ephraim Avigdor. 1941. *Introduction to Hurrian*. Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research 20. New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research.

Starke, Frank. 1977. *Die Funktionen der dimensionalen Kasus und Adverbien im Althethitischen*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 23. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1979. Zu den hethitischen und luwischen Verbalabstrakta auf *-šḫa-*. *KZ* 93: 247–61.

_____. 1980. Das luwische Wort für 'Frau'. *HS* 94: 74–86.

_____. 1985. *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 30. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1990. *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 31. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1993. Zur Herkunft von akkad. *ta/urgumannu*(*m*) 'Dolmetscher'. *WO* 24: 20–38.

_____. 1997. Troia im Kontext des historisch-politischen und sprachlichen Umfeldes Kleinasiens im 2. Jahrtausend. *Studia Troica* 7: 446–87.

Stefanini, Ruggero. 1964. Una lettera della regina Puduhepa al re di Alasija (KUB XXI 38). *AIPHOS* 29: 3–69.

_____. 1974. Ancora sul vocativo ittita. *AGI* 59: 37–42.

_____. 1988. Alcuni problemi ittiti, lessicali e sintattici. Pp. 251–56 in *Studi di Storia e di Filologia Anatolica dedicati a Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli*, edited by F. Imparati. Florence: Librarie Italiane Estere.

Steiner, Gerd. 1971. Gott. D. Nach hethitischen Texten. Pp. 547–75 in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*, vol. 3, edited by E. Ebeling, B. Meissner, E. Weidner, W. von Soden, and D. O. Edzard. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Sturtevant, Edgar H. 1933. *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Sturtevant, Edgar H., and George Bechtel. 1935. *A Hittite Chrestomathy*. Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America.

Sturtevant, Edgar H., and E. Adelaide Hahn. 1951. *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language*. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Süel, Aygül. 1992. Ortaköy: Eine hethitische Stadt mit hethitischen und hurritischen Tontafelentdeckungen. Pp. 487–492 in *Hittite and Other Anatolian and Near Eastern Studies in Honour of Sedat Alp*, edited by H. Otten, E. Akurgal, H. Ertem and A. Süel. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

_____. 2002. Ortaköy-Šapinuwa. Pp. 157–166 in *Recent Developments in Hittite Archaeology and History*, edited by K. A. Yener and H. A. Hoffner, Jr. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Sürenhagen, Dietrich. 1981. Zwei Gebete Hattusilis und der Puduhepa: Textliche und literaturhistorische Untersuchungen. *AoF* 8: 84–168.

Szabó, Gabriella. 1971. *Ein hethitisches Entsühnungsritual für das Königspaar Tutḫaliya und Nikalmati*. Texte der Hethiter 1. Heidelberg: Winter.

Szemerényi, Oswald J. L. 1996. *Introduction to Indo-European Linguistics*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Taracha, Piotr. 1990. More about the Hittite *taknaz da-* Rituals. *Hethitica* 10: 171–184.

_____. 2001. Hethitisch ^{É}*kippa-* und das Sumerogramm (É.)GI.PAD mesopotamischer Texte. *AoF* 28: 132–146.

Tenner, E. 1926. Ein hethitischer Annalentext des Königs Muršiliš II (KBo V 8 = Bo 2022). Text, Übersetzungsversuch, sprachliche Anmerkungen. Pp. 83–106 in *Jubiläums-Festschrift der II. Städtischen Realschule zu Leipzig*. Leipzig: Zweite Städtische Realschule.

Thomsen, Marie-Louise. 1984. *The Sumerian Language: An Introduction to Its History and Grammatical Structure*. Mesopotamia: Copenhagen Studies in Assyriology 10. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag.

Tischler, Johann. 2001. *Hethitisches Handwörterbuch*. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 102. Innsbruck.

Tjerkstra, Françoise A. 1999. *Principles of the Relation between Local Adverb, Verb and Sentence Particle in Hittite*. Cuneiform Monographs 15. Groningen: Styx.

Tropper, Josef. 2000. *Ugaritische Grammatik*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 273. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Ünal, Ahmet. 1977. Naturkatastrophen in Anatolien im 2. Jahrtausende v. Chr. *Belleten* 41: 447–72.

_____. 1996. *Studies in Ancient Anatolian Magical Practices: The Magic Ritual of Ḫantitaššu from the City of Ḫurma against Troublesome Years*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Ungnad, Arthur. 1920. Das Personalpronomen der dritten Person in der hethitischen Satzverbindung. *ZDMG* 74: 417–422.

_____. 1992. *Akkadian Grammar*. Translated by H. A. Hoffner Jr., 5th edition. Society of Biblical Literature Resources for Biblical Study 30. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Villar, F. 1988. On the 2nd Person Singular Pronoun in Hittite and in Indo-European. *JIES* 16: 1–8.

Villar, Francisco. 1983. *Ergatividad, acusatividad y género en la familia lingüistica indoeuropea*. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca.

Wagner, Heinrich. 1985. *Das Hethitische vom Standpunkte der typologischen Sprachgeographie*. Testi linguistici 7. Pisa: Giardini.

Watkins, Calvert. 1970. On the family of *arceō*, ἀρκέω and Hittite *ḫark-*. *HSCP* 74: 67–74.

_____. 1973. Hittite and Indo-European Studies: The Denominative Statives in *-ē-*. *TPS* 104: 51–93.

_____. 1974. 'god'. Pp. 101–10 in *Antiquitates Indogermanicae: Studien zur indogermanischen Altertumskunde und zur Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte der indogermanischen Völker*, edited by M. Mayrhofer. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

_____. 1975. Die Vertretung der Laryngale in gewissen morphologischen Kategorien in den indogermanischen Sprachen Anatoliens. Pp. 358–78 in *Flexion und Wortbildung: Akten der V. Fachtagung der indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Regensburg, 9.–14. Sept. 1973*, edited by H. Rix. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

_____. 1982. Notes on the Plural Formations of the Hittite Neuters. Pp. 252–62 in *Investigationes philologicae et comparativae: Gedenkschrift für Heinz Kronasser*, edited by E. Neu. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1995. *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____. 1998. Proto-Indo-European: Comparison and Reconstruction. Pp. 25–73 in *The Indo-European Languages*, edited by A. G. Ramat and P. Ramat. London: Routledge.

_____. 2000. A Distant Anatolian Echo in Pindar: The Origin of the Aegis Again. *HSCP* 100: 1–14.

Weber, Otto, and Erich Ebeling. 1915. *Die El-Amarna Tafeln: Anmerkungen und Register*. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Wegner, Ilse. 2000. *Einführung in die hurritische Sprache*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Weidner, Ernst. 1923. *Politische Dokumente aus Kleinasien: Die Staatsverträge in akkadischer Sprache aus dem Archiv von Boghazköi*. Boghazköi-Studien 8. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Weitenberg, Joseph Johannes Sicco. 1979. Einige Bemerkungen zu den hethitischen Diphthong-Stammen. Pp. 289–303 in *Hethitisch und indogermanisch: Vergleichende Studien zur historischen Grammatik und zur Dialektgeographie*, edited by E. Neu and W. Meid. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

_____. 1984. *Die hethitischen U-Stämme*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

_____. 1992. The Use of Asyndesis and Particles in Old Hittite Simple Sentences. Pp. 305–53 in *Per una grammatica ittita: Towards a Hittite Grammar*, edited by O. Carruba. Pavia: Iuculano.

_____. 1995. Sigmatization and Thematization in Hittite. Pp. 333–44 in *Studio historiae ardens: Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Philo H. J. Houwink ten Cate on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, edited by T. P. J. van den Hout and J. de Roos. Istanbul: Institut historique et archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul.

Werner, Rudolf, and Barbara Lüscher. 1991. *Kleine Einführung ins Hieroglyphen-Luwische*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis 106. Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag.

Wilhelm, Gernot. 1992a. Hurritische Lexikographie und Grammatik: Die hurritisch-hethitische Bilingue aus Boğazköy. *Or* NS 61: 122–41.

_____. 1992b. Notizen zum hurritischen Wörterbuch. *SMEA* 29: 245–48.

_____. 1992c. Zum viersprachigen Vokabular aus Ugarit. *SMEA* 29: 249–54.

_____. 1995. Die Tontafelfunde der 2. Ausgrabungskampagne 1994 in Kuşaklı. *MDOG* 127: 37–42.

_____. 1998. Zwei mittelhethitische Briefe aus dem Gebäude C in Kuşaklı. *MDOG* 130: 175–87.

_____. 2002a. Die Keilschriftfunde der Kampagne 2001 in Kuşaklı. *MDOG* 134: 342–51.

_____. 2002b. Die Sprachen des Hethiterreiches. Pp. 46–49 in *Die Hethiter und ihr Reich: Das Volk der 1000 Götter*, edited by Kunst- und Ausstellungshalle der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Stuttgart: Theiss.

———, ed. 1997. *Keilschrifttexte aus Gebäude A*. Kuşaklı–Sarissa I/1. Rahden/Westf.: Leidorf.

Yakubovich, Ilya. 2006. Freestanding Genitive and Hypostasis in Hittite. *JNES* 65: 39–49.

Yoshida, Daisuke. 1987. *Die Syntax des althethitischen substantivischen Genitivs*. Texte der Hethiter 13. Heidelberg: Winter.

Yoshida, Kazuhiko. 1987. The Present Mediopassive Endings *-tati* and *-waštati* in Hittite. *Die Sprache* 33: 29–33.

_____. 1990. *The Hittite mediopassive endings in -ri*. Untersuchungen zur indogermanischen Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft 5. Berlin.

_____. 1991. Reconstruction of Anatolian Verbal Endings: The Third Person Plural Preterites. *JIES* 19: 357–74.

_____. 1998. Hittite Verbs in *-Vzi*. Pp. 605–14 in *Uluslararası Hititoloji Kongresi bildirileri: Çorum, 16–22 Eylül, 1996: Acts of the IIIrd International Congress of Hittitology, Çorum, September 16–22, 1996*, edited by S. Alp and A. Süel. Ankara: Uyum Ajans.

_____. 2000. The Original Ablaut of Hittite *šiu̯att-*. *MSS* 60: 175–84.

_____. 2002. Observations on Some Cuneiform Spellings: Epithetic or Graphic? Pp. 165–76 in *Acts of the Thirteenth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, Los Angeles, November 9–10, 2001*, edited by K. Jones-Bley, M. E. Huld, A. Della Volpe, and M. R. Dexter. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man.

Zeilfelder, Susanne. 2001. *Archaismus und Ausgliederung: Studien zur sprachlichen Stellung des Hethitischen*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Zuntz, Leonie. 1936. *Die hethitischen Ortsadverbien arḫa, parā, piran als selbständige Adverbien und in ihrer Verbindung mit Nomina und Verba*. Speyer: Pilger.