Syntax of direct speech particle
-*wa(r)* in Hittite[1]

ANDREI V. SIDELTSEV

Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences
Moscow, Russia, B. Kislovskij per 1/1
acidelcev@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper deals with the syntax of the direct speech particle in Hittite, particularly its inconsistent use within direct speech. It is suggested that a syntactic account of what appears at first sight as an entirely chaotic distribution is possible.

KEYWORDS

direct speech, particles, syntax, Hittite.

---

0. BASIC SYNTAX OF -WA(R)

The particle of direct speech *-wa(r)* is employed to mark direct speech in Hittite (Fortson 1998; Hoffner and Melchert 2008: 354–357). If the direct speech consists of several clauses, *-wa(r)* often occurs in each clause of the direct speech (Fortson 1998: 21–22), as in the following example:

(1) NH/NS² (CTH 105.A) KUB 23.1+ obv. i 31'-32'

    1. *āššiyannaš=**wa**=nnaš*   ÌR^MEŠ   *ešuwen*

      love.GEN.SG=QUOT=us   subjects   be.1PL.PST³

    2. *kinun=ma=**wa**=tu=za*   UL   ÌR^MEŠ

      now=but=QUOT=you.DAT=REFL   NEG   subjects

    '(1) We were voluntary subjects. (2) Now we are no longer your subjects.' (Beckman 1996: 99; cf. Kühne and Otten 1971: 6–7; F. Fuscagni (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 105 [INTR 2013-05-07]).

The same happens if the direct speech comprises complex polipredicative structures (Fortson 1998: 22):

(2) OH/NS (CTH 321.B) KUB 17.5 obv. i 23'-25' (restored from KUB 17.6 obv. i 18'-22')

    1. *[(m)]ā(n)=**wa***   *gimra*   *pāi[(mi)]*

      if=QUOT   field.ALL.SG   go.1SG.PRS

    2. *[(zigg=a=**war**=ašta*   ^GIŠ*l)]uttanza*   *arḫ[(a   lē   autti)]*

      you=and=QUOT=LOCP   window.ABL.SG   away   PROH   look.2SG.PRS

    3. *[(mā(n)=**wa**)]**r**=ašta*   *[(arḫa=ma   autt)i]*

      if=QUOT=LOCP   away=but   see.2SG.PRS

    4. *[(nu=**wa**=za*   DAM=KA   DUMU^MEŠ=KA   autt)i]*

      CONN=QUOT=REFL   wife=your   children=your see.2SG.PRS

    '(1) When I go out to the open country, (2) don't look out the window. (3) If you look out, (4) you will see your wife and children.' (Hoffner 1998: 12; cf. E. Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter. net/: CTH 321 [INTR 2010-11-23]).

However, this is not obligatorily the case.

First, the use of *-wa(r)* is not obligatory. There are some direct speech sequences where it is not attested at all (Pecora 1984: 122–123; Fortson 1998: 22; Hoffner and Melchert 2008: 356–357):

(3) OH/MS (CTH 324.1.A) KUB 17.10+ obv. i 29'-30'

    1. *māḫḫan*   *iyaweni*

      how   do.1PL.PRS

    2. *kištantit*   *ḫarkweni*

      hunger.INS.SG   perish.1PL.PRS

    '(1) How shall we act? (2) We are going to die of hunger.' (Hoffner 1998: 15; cf. E. Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 324.1 [INTR 2012-05-10]).

---

² The abbreviations here and elsewhere follow the Chicago Hittite Dictionary (CHD).

³ The glossing follows Leipzig glossing rules with the following additions: CONN clause connective, LOCP locative particle, MED middle.

Second, in yet other cases inconsistent use of -*wa*(*r*) is also attested, i.e. it is used in only part of the clauses comprising direct speech. This has been known in Hittitology (see Fortson 1998: 21–25 for references) and in 1998 Fortson published a paper specifically devoted to the two types of distribution of -*wa*(*r*): consistent and inconsistent. He showed that certain types of texts show consistent use of -*wa*(*r*) (texts of an administrative or official nature: annals, treaties, official correspondence and proclamations), whereas others tend to employ it inconsistently (most notably, myths and rituals) (Fortson 1998: 22–24). Fortson suggests that it is the inconsistent use that reflects the original distribution, whereas the consistent use is a later generalization of the use of -*wa*(*r*)[4] (cf. Hoffner and Melchert 2008: 357).

I take this position as the starting point of my research and build upon it.

The aim of the paper is to understand whether this original distribution reflected in the inconsistent use of -*wa*(*r*) can be described in syntactically meaningful terms or defies syntactic assessment. Fortson (1998) already captured some important facts about the distribution of -*wa*(*r*) – namely the fact that -*wa*(*r*) was never used on vocatives in cases where vocatives preceded clause proper (Ibid: 29) and the even more important fact that -*wa*(*r*) tended to be used in the first clause of direct speech and then dropped (Ibid: 27). He also highlighted the cases where -*wa*(*r*) occurs on the first dependent clause but does not occur in the main clause that follows it (Ibid: 28).

After independently building up my own dataset (see section 7) obtaining 177 reasonably clear and sufficiently preserved cases and analysing them, I confirm the validity of Fortson's findings[5] and introduce some additional distributional generalizations which allows me to provide a full scenario for the use and non-use of -*wa*(*r*) in direct speech.

In what follows I will assess only the cases which belong to this original distribution, i.e. the cases where direct speech consisted of several clauses and only some of them employed -*wa*(*r*).

1. INCONSISTENT USE OF -WA(R)

As was already observed by Fortson, most commonly -*wa*(*r*) marks only the first clause of direct speech. The following generalization is clear:

-*wa*(*r*) scopes over several coordinated and contrastive clauses. This entails that it is located structurally higher than the point where the clauses are joined/contrasted. In surface syntax this position is after the first word of the leftmost clause, i.e. regular Wackernagel position for Hittite enclitics.

---

[4] "The simplest hypothesis to account for the absolutely regular usage is to take it as a stylistic standardization of this administrative genre of written Hittite. Numerous scholars have spoken of a Kanzleisprache used in these texts, and the unerringly regular -*wa*- placement in them I would argue is a characteristic of this stereotyped 'official' style" (Fortson 1998: 24).

[5] The only generalization of his which I do not uphold concerns the tendency for sentences containing imperatives not to host -*wa*(*r*) (Ibid. 29). It is falsified by my dataset: whereas some of the clauses with imperatives do not really contain -*wa*(*r*), others do. The inconsistency of this generalization is admitted by Fortson himself (Ibid: 30). I suppose the cases which do not attest -*wa*(*r*) in imperative clauses are due to the application of independently operating factors.

-wa(r) scopes over both the dependent and the main clause. This entails that it is located structurally higher than the point where the dependent clause joins the main one. In surface syntax this position is after the first word of the leftmost clause. Most commonly the leftmost clause is the first dependent clause. Less commonly it is the main clause (in this case dependent clause(s) follow the main clause).

We see this at work in examples like the following:

(4) NS (CTH 328.A) KBo 13.86 obv. 17'-19'

1. *nu=wa=kan*   *pargamuš*   ḪUR.SAG$^{\text{ḪI.A}}$-*uš*   [*šanḫa*]
   CONN=QUOT=LOCP   high.ACC.PL.C   mountains.ACC.PL.C   search.2SG.IMP

2. [*ḫāriu*]*š=kan*   *kuliyamuš*   [*šanḫa*]
   valley.ACC.PL.C=LOCP   ?.ACC.PL.C   search.2SG.IMP

3. [*ḫār*]*iuš=kan*   *ḫalluwamu*[*š*   *šanḫa*]
   valley.ACC.PL.C=LOCP   hollow.ACC.PL.C   search.2SG.IMP

'(1) Go search the high mountains. (2) Search the deep valleys. (3) Search the Blue Deep.' (cf. E. Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 328 [TX 2009-08-26, TRde 2009-08-26]).

(5) NS (CTH 390.A) KUB 7.1+ obv. ii 41-44

1. *kuiš=wa*[6]   *kuiēš=wa*   *ḫateššanteš*   *k*[*arāt*]*iš*
   who.NOM.SG.C=QUOT   who.NOM.PL.C=QUOT   shrivel.PTCP.NOM.PL.C   innards.NOM.PL.C

2. *nu*   *kī*   *šarakkuškandu*
   CONN   this.ACC.PL.N   water.IPFV.3PL.IMP

3. DUMU-*li=ma=at*   [*m*]*an*[*i*]*nkuwan*   *lē*   *tianzi*
   child.DAT.SG=but=they   near   PROH   step.3PL.PRS

4. *n=at=ši*   *kattan*   *arḫa*   *aranta*[*(ru)*]
   CONN=they=him   down   away   stand.3PL.IMP.MED

'(1) Whatever inner parts are dried up, (2) may they continually water(?) this/these. (3) May they not approach the child. (4) May they stand entirely away from it' (CHD Š: 239; cf. F. Fuscagni (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 390 [TX 20.03.2017, TRde 20.03.2017]).

(6) OH/NS (CTH 321.A) KBo 3.7 rev. iv 9'-13'

1. *mā(n)=wa=ššan* $^{\text{NA}_4}$*šU.U*   *šÚ.A*   *ēštummat*
   when=QUOT=LOCP   basalt   throne   sit.2PL.PRS.MED

2. *nu=za* $^{\text{LÚ}}$GUDU$_{12}$ *mān*   *pūl*   *tianzi*
   CONN=REFL   GUDU-priest   when   lot   put.3PL.PRS

3. $^{\text{LÚ}}$GUDU$_{12}$ $^{\text{D}}$*Zalinun*   *kuiš*   *ḫarzi*
   GUDU-priest   Zaliyanu.ACC.SG   who.NOM.SG.C   hold.3SG.PRS

4. *nu*   *wattarwa*   *šer* $^{\text{NA}_4}$*šU.U*   *šÚ.A*   *kitta*
   CONN   spring.ACC.SG.N   up   basalt   throne   lie.3SG.PRS.MED

5. *n=aš=šan*   *apiya*   *ešāri*
   CONN=he=LOCP   there   sit.3SG.PRS.MED

---

[6]   CHD (Š: 239) reads <<*kuiš=wa*>>, i.e. asesses the first relative pronoun=QUOT as a mistake.

'(1) When you sit on a diorite stool, (2) and when the «anointed priests» cast the lot, (3) then the anointed priest who holds (the image of) Zaliyanu (4) – a diorite stool shall be set above the spring – (5) and he shall be seated there.' (Beckman 1982: 20; cf. Hoffner 1998: 14; E. Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 321 [TX 2012-06-08, TRde 2012-06-08])[7].

It is important that such examples are attested overall 52 times:

21 dependent clauses with -wa(r) + main clause without -wa(r);
8 dependent clauses with -wa(r) + dependent clause without -wa(r) + main clause(s) without -wa(r);
23 main clauses with -wa(r) + main clause(s) without -wa(r).

The clauses constitute 100% of all cases where only the first clause is marked by -wa(r).

Out of all the cases which begin direct speech they occur in 55%. This pattern was explicitly observed by Fortson (1998: 27). However, an important difference between the treatment of Fortson and mine that should not be overlooked is that Fortson did not assess the distribution in syntactic terms. He stressed that -wa(r) marked «only the first member of a parallel series of items for some feature shared by all the members of the series» (Ibid: 28). «Another way of stating this is that it was grammatical in Hittite for -wa at the outset of a passage to have scope over the whole passage» (Ibid: 28).

But Fortson specifically focused on the cases where -wa(r) occurs on the first dependent clause, but does not occur in the main clause that follows it (Ibid: 28). This piece of distribution he assessed syntactically: '[…] marking only the subordinate clause or clauses of a multi-clausal sentence with -wa is an odd structural fact. An explanation is readily available, however, if one assumes […] that an earlier rule for -wa-placement was to insert one -wa per sentence […]. Prosodically it is a clitic, and therefore moved to the right of the first syllable host, namely the first stressed word in the sentence. By the rules of Hittite grammar, in a multiclausal sentence containing a subordinate clause, the subordinate clause preceded the main clause; if such a sentence was marked with -wa, the particle therefore appeared in the subordinate clause.'

1.1. -wa(r) in complex sentences

However, it is clear that the generalization which states that -wa(r) is used in the first clause of direct speech does not describe the data exhaustively. In other examples we see -wa(r) which is used in several first clauses of the direct speech:

(7) MH/MS (CTH 404.1.I.A) KBo 39.8 obv. i 40-41

1. *kāš=**wa***   KU$_6$-*uš*   *arunaš*   GU$_4$.MAḪ-*aš*
this.NOM.SG.C=QUOT fish.NOM.SG.C   sea.GEN.SG   bull.NOM.SG.C

2. *nu=**wa**=kan*   *kāš*   KU$_6$ [m]*āḫḫan arun[a]z   tuḫḫuštat*
CONN=QUOT=LOCP   this.NOM.SG.C fish   as   sea.ABL.SG separate.3SG.PST.MED

---

[7] The same distribution is preserved in all the copies.

3. *kinun=a*   *tuḫšandu*   [*ap*]*edaš*   UD-*aš*   EME[ʰ]ᴵ·ᴬ *ḫūrtāuš*
    now=but   separate.3PL.IMP those.GEN.PL   day.GEN.PL   tongues curses.ACC.PL

'(1) This fish is the «mighty bull of the sea». (2) And just like this fish was removed from the sea, (3) let now the tongues (and) curses of those days detach!' (Miller 2004: 66; cf. A. Mouton (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 404.1.I [TX 07.05.2012, TRfr 21.03.2012]).

It is obvious, however, how to deal with such examples. The clauses in examples like (**7**) are not isolated, but clearly belong to larger syntactic units – complex sentences. The first clause forms an independent sentence of its own, whereas clauses 2 and 3 form one complex sentence. It is easy to see that *-wa*(*r*) is used once in every sentence – after the first word of its leftmost clause. Naturally, if the clause does not form a unit with other clauses, *-wa*(*r*) is in this clause. If the complex sentence consists of two or more clauses, *-wa*(*r*) is only used after the first word of the leftmost clause. Normally in Hittite this leftmost clause is dependent, as in (**7**) cl. 2-3. Considerably less common, the leftmost clause is the main clause followed by a dependent clause. This latter option is seen in the following example:

(**8**) MH/MS (CTH 404.2) KBo 24.1+ obv. i 18'-19'

    1. [*ka*]*tta=**war**=at=kan*   *waršan*   *ēštu*
      down=QUOT=it=LOCP   wipe.PRTC.NOM.SG.N be.3SG.IMP

    2. *kēdani*   UD-*ti*   *kue*   [*u*]*ddār*   *aniyawen*
      this.LOC.SG   day.LOC.SG   which.ACC.PL.N   matter.ACC.PL.N   do.1PL.PST

    3. *nu=**wa**=ta=kkan*   *idālu*   *uddār*   *katta*   [QATAM]*MA*
      CONN=QUOT=you=LOCP   evil.NOM.PL.N   words.NOM.PL.N   down   likewise
      warš.an   *ēštu*
      wipe.PTCP.NOM.SG.N   be.3SG.IMP

'(1) Let the matters (2) which we have performed today (1) be washed off (of you)! (3) And let the evil words likewise be washed off of you!' (Miller 2004: 126–127).

In (**7**) above the first sentence was an independent clause (cl. 1), and thus *-wa*(*r*) in the first clause and in the second complex sentence were adjacent. However, in (**7**) this adjacency is simply the by-product of the fact that the first sentence was an independent clause, thus *-wa*(*r*) in the first sentence (cl. 1) turned out to be adjacent to *-wa*(*r*) in the second sentence (cl. 2–3) since in the latter it was within the first clause of the complex sentence (cl. 2).

But this need not necessarily be so. This is seen already in (**8**). Here clauses 1 and 2 form one complex sentence, whereas clause 3 forms an independent sentence of its own. *-wa*(*r*) is used once in every sentence – after the first word in each of the two sentences (complex sentence 1-2 and independent clause 3). But within the first sentence it is the main clause that unusually is leftmost (cl. 1). This is the reason it hosts *-wa*(*r*). Overall, it results in two examples of *-wa*(*r*) which are not adjacent.

In the following example we see two more examples of *-wa*(*r*) which belong to different sentences and which are not adjacent:

(**9**) MH/NS (CTH 404.3.B$_2$) KBo 43.319 obv. i 17'-19'

    1. *kāša*=***wa***   EN   SISKUR   *kuit*   *ēš*[(*har*   *iy*)*at*]
       PFV=QUOT   lord   ritual   which.ACC.SG.N   blood.ACC.SG.N   do.3SG.PST

    2. *n=at*   *nepiši*   *daganzipi*   [*paiddu*]
       CONN=it   heaven.LOC.SG   earth.LOC.SG   go.3SG.IMP

    3. *parkueš*=***war***=*a*[(*t=kan*   (*aš*)*and*(*u*)]   *nepišaš*   *daganzipašš*=*a* [ ]
       pure.NOM.PL.C=QUOT=it=LOCP be.3PL.IMP   heaven.GEN.SG   earth.GEN.SG=and
       DINGIR^{MEŠ} [ ]
       gods

'(**1**) Herewith bloodshed that the ritual patron has committed (2) let it go to heaven (and) earth! (3) May the gods of heaven and earth be pure!' (cf. Miller 2004: 137)[8].

This happens because *-wa*(*r*) in clause 1 marks the whole complex sentence consisting of clauses 1 and 2. As is normal, *-wa*(*r*) is used after the first word of the leftmost clause of the complex sentence (cl. 1). Thus it appears in clause 1, not 2. The next independent sentence consists of only one clause 3. Thus *-wa*(*r*) is used after the first word of this clause. The only difference between (**7**) above and (**9**) here is that in (**7**) the independent sentence consists of one clause preceding the complex sentence consisting of two clauses and in (**9**) the independent sentence follows the complex one.

The fact that all the examples above consisted of two syntactic units was clear. There was one complex sentence consisting of a dependent clause and a main clause and an independent main clause which clearly formed another sentence.

Naturally, the potential structures involving two or more independent tighter syntactic units are not exhaused by this type. We see another option of how exactly the two independent tighter syntactic units may be instantiated in the following case:

(**10**) MH/MS (CTH 404.1.I.A) KBo 39.8 obv. ii 27-29

    1. *kāša*=***wa***=*šmaš*   *tarpalliš*
       PFV=QUOT=you.DAT.PL   substitute.NOM.SG.C

    2. *nu*=***wa***=*šmaš*   *tueggaš*   *tarpalliš*   *ēštu*
       CONN=QUOT=you.DAT.PL   body.DAT.PL   substitute.NOM.SG.C   be.3SG.IMP

    3. KA×U-*i*   EME-*i*   *ḫūrtāuš*
       mouth.LOC.SG   tongue.LOC.SG   curse.NOM.PL.C

'(1) Here (is) a substitute for you. (2) Let it be a substitute for your persons (3) (and let it be) the curses in the mouth (and) on the tongue!' (Miller 2004: 73–74, cf. A. Mouton (ed.), hethiter. net/: CTH 404.1.I [TX 07.05.2012, TRfr 21.03.2012]).

Here there are two different syntactic units again – 1 and 2-3. They are two different sentences and not just one sentence. This observation follows from the fact that the second and third clauses have one illocutory force – imperative. Clauses 2 and 3 form a tight syntactic unit which is further and independently enhanced by the fact that the verb form in clause 3 is elliptically deleted as it is identical to that of clause 2. Each syntactic unit is marked once with *-wa*(*r*) – the indicative independent clause 1 and the imperative complex sentence 2-3.

---

[8]   The same distribution is preserved in ex. A 2083/g now published as KBo 53.29.

Further independent evidence for different sentences may be provided by the change of person between the sentences:

(11) NS (CTH 390.A) KUB 7.1+ rev. iii 11'-14'

1. *īt=**wa***   ᴹᵁᴺᵁˢ*ḫāšawan*   *pēḫute*
go.2SG.IMP=QUOT   hag.ACC.SG.C   bring.2SG.IMP

2. *nu=**wa**=šši=ššan*   *šer*   ᵁᶻᵁ*ḫupallaš*   *ḫuikdu*
CONN=QUOT=him.DAT=LOCP   up   skull.ACC.SG.N   conjure.3SG.IMP

3. *n=an*   *šuppauš*   *tētanuš*   *ḫuikdu*
CONN=him.ACC   pure.ACC.PL.C   hair.ACC.PL.C   conjure.3SG.IMP

4. *nu*   ᵁᶻᵁGEŠTUᴴᴵ.ᴬ=*šU*   *ḫuikdu*
CONN   ears=his   conjure.3SG.IMP

5. *n=an*   ᵁᶻᵁ*tītitan*   *ḫuikdu*
CONN=him.ACC   nose.ACC.SG.C   conjure.3SG.IMP

6. *n=an*   KA×U=*šU*   *ḫuikdu*
CONN=him.ACC   mouth=his   conjure.3SG.IMP

7. *n=an*   EME=*šU*   *ḫuikdu*
CONN=him.ACC   tongue=his   conjure.3SG.IMP

'(1) Go bring the Old Woman! (2) Let her conjure his skull above, (3) let her conjure his pure hair, (4) let her conjure his ears, (5) let her conjure his nose, (6) let her conjure his mouth, (7) let her conjure his tongue.' (cf. F. Fuscagni (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 390 [TX 20.03.2017, TRde 20.03.2017]; HED H: 386).

Here the verb in clause 1 is 2SG.IMP, whereas the rest of the clauses (2-7) attest 3SG.IMP verb forms. More importantly, these forms are not only in the identical person and number form, they are actually identical lexical verbs within virtually identical structure. This is a sure indication that clauses 2-7 form a tighter syntactic unit. Thus the fact that all this structure (2-7) has only one -*wa*(*r*) on its leftmost clause 2 is easily explained. Clause 1, on the other hand, is an independent sentence and thus employs its own -*wa*(*r*).

The complex sentence consisting of three clauses is seen in the following example:

(12) MH/lNS (CTH 402.H) KUB 41.1 obv. i 12'-14'

1. *kuiš=**war**=an*   *ḫarganušket*   [...]-*ket*
who.NOM.SG.C=QUOT=him   dark.CAUS.IPFV.3SG.PST   X.IPFV.3SG.PST

2. *kinunn=a=šši=kan*   *ḪUL-uwa*   *da-*[...   *daške*]*mi*
now=and=him=LOCP   evil.ACC.PL.N   sorcery   take.IPFV.1SG.PRS

3. *n=at*   EGIR-*pa* *išḫe=šši*   *pi*[*škemi*]
CONN=it   back   lord.DAT.SG=his.DAT.SG   give.IPFV.1SG.PRS

'(1) Who made him dark and [enchanted], (2) now I am taking from him evil [sorcery] (3) and I am giving it to its master.' (cf. A. Mouton (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 402 [TX 10.11.2014, TRfr 27.02.2013]).

Here cl. 1 is a relative clause and clauses 2 and 3 are resumptive coordinated main clauses. It is noteworthy that -*wa*(*r*) is used only within the dependent clause (cl. 1) and in none of the main ones (cl. 2 and 3) in (**12**). This yet again confirms the suggestion that -*wa*(*r*) occurs once per com-

plex sentence – after the first word of its leftmost clause, which is most commonly a dependent clause.

Yet another variety of how exactly the two complex sentences can be represented is seen in examples like the following one:

(13) NS (CTH 323.1.A) VBoT 58 obv. i 29'-31'

  1. [*itt*]*en*=***wa***   ᴰ*Telipinun*   *ḫalzišten*
       go.2PL.IMP=QUOT   Telipinu.ACC.SG.C   call.2PL.IMP

  2. *apāš*=***wa***   DUMU-*YA*   [*na*]*kkiš*
       that.NOM.SG.C=QUOT son=my   strong.NOM.SG.C

  3. *ḫarašzi*
       till.soil.3SG.PRS

  4. *teripzi*
       plow.3SG.PRS

  5. *wātar*   *nāi*
       water.ACC.SG.N   turn.3SG.PRS

  6. *ḫalkinn*=*a*   [*arḫa*]=*pat*   ᴺᴬ⁴*pirulūwari*
       grain.ACC.SG.C=and   away=FOC   free.from.stones.3SG.PRS

  '(1) Go call Telipinu. (2) That son of mine is mighty: (3) he breaks up ground, (4) plows, (5) irrigates, (6) and he even frees the grain from stones' (cf. HED H 184; CHD P: 313; E. Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 323.1 [TX 2009-08-26, TRde 2009-08-26]; Hoffner 1998: 28).

Here clauses 2-6 obviously form a tighter syntactic unit than clause 1. Clauses 3-4 explicate clause 2. Thus they form one complex sentence marked once with *-wa(r)* on its leftmost clause 2. Clause 1, on the other hand, is an independent sentence and thus uses its own separate *-wa(r)*.

It is important that in all the examples above there are some indications, independent from *-wa(r)*, that we are dealing with two different syntactic units, and not one or three. Obvious candidates for different syntactic units being each marked with *-wa(r)* are clauses of different illocutory force, like the following one:

(14) OH/NS (CTH 414.1.A) KUB 29.1 obv. i 35-36

  1. UL=***wa***   LUGAL-*waš*   *araš*=*miš*   *zik*
       NEG=QUOT   king.GEN.SG   friend.NOM.SG.C=my.NOM.SG.C   you.NOM.SG

  2. *nu*=***wa***=*mu*   *ini*   GIŠ-*ru*   *maniyaḫ*
       CONN=QUOT=me   this.ACC.SG.N   wood.ACC.SG.N   entrust.2SG.IMP

  3. *n*=*at*=*kan*   *karašmi*
       CONN=it=LOCP   cut.1SG.PRS

  '(1) Are you not my, the king's, friend? (2) Allocate these trees to me (3) and I will fell them.' (CHD L-N: 165; cf. S. Görke (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 414.1 [TX 11.06.2015, TRde 13.03.2015]).

In this example the first clause is interrogative and the second and third ones are declarative. Naturally, one expects that clause 1 forms its own independent sentence, whereas both 2 and 3 form one complex sentence. One expects each of them (1 and 2-3, respectively) to be marked once with *-wa(r)*. This expectation is met – *-wa(r)* is used once per sentence with different illocutory

force. Thus it is used once in the question (1) and once in the declarative sentence consisting of two main clauses (2-3).

One of the most beautiful and convincing examples of this type is:

(15) NS (CTH 390.A) KUB 7.1+ obv. ii 32-33

1. *ḫuišaš=wa*   *panzakittiš*   GIM-*an*   *weḫatta*
spindle.GEN.SG=QUOT   whorl.NOM.SG.C   as   turn.3SG.PRS.MED

2. DUMU-*li=ya*   *idālaueš*   *karāteš*   *kattan*   *arḫa*   *apenieššan*
son.DAT.SG=and   bad.NOM.PL.C   innards.NOM.PL.C   down   away   likewise
waḫandu
turn.3PL.PRS.MED

3. ŠA   GI=*ma=wa*   *ḫapušaššanza*   *maḫḫan*   *ḫapušašša*   EGIR-*anda*   UL
GEN   arrow=but=QUOT   shaft.ERG.SG   as   shaft.ACC.SG   back   NEG
wemiazzi
find.3SG.PRS

4. DUMU-*ann=a*   *idalaueš*   *karāteš*   QĀTAMMA   *lē*   *wemiyanzi*
son.ACC.SG=and   bad.NOM.PL.C   innard.NOM.PL.C   likewise   PROH   find.3PL.PRS

'(1) Just as the whorl of the spindle turns, (2) may bad innards likewise turn away from the child (3) As a shaft of an arrow does not find another shaft, (4) may likewise bad innards not find the child.' (cf. CHD P: 95; HED H: 132; F. Fuscagni (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 390 [TX 20.03.2017, TRde 20.03.2017]).

Here we see that *-wa(r)* was introduced into each of the two independent syntactic units (1-2, 3-4, respectively). Each sentence has the same structure – *dependent clause – main clause*. *-wa(r)* marks each sentence and is used once at its leftmost clause which is in this case a dependant clause (cl. 1 and 3 respectively). In both cases main clauses (2 and 4) were not marked by *-wa(r)*.

1.1.1. Further data on -wa(r).

Curious support for the hypothesis that *-wa(r)* occurred once per complex sentence comes from variations of its use in two copies of the same text where it is different direct speech internal clauses that do not attest *-wa(r)*:

(16a) NS (CTH 341.III.1.A) KUB 8.57+ 7'-14'

1. LÚGURUŠ-*a*[*nza=wa*   *ammuk*ˀ *p*]*eran*   *iyattari*
young.man.NOM.SG=QUOT   me   before   go.3SG.PRS.MED

2. *n*[(*u=wa*=šš)*i*   … -(*iš*)]
CONN=QUOT=him   X.NOM.SG.C

3. [(*n*)]*u=wa=kan*   *gimran* […]
CONN=QUOT=LOCP   field.ACC.SG

4. [(*n*)]*u=wa*   :*akkušša*   *kue*   [(*ammu*)*k*   *tarniškemi*]
CONN=QUOT   pit.trap.ACC.PL.N   which.ACC.PL.N   I   release.IPFV.1SG.PRS

5. *apāš=ma=at=kan*   SAḪAR[(ḪI.A-*a*)*z*   *šaḫiškezzi*ˀ]
that.NOM.SG.C=but=it=LOCP   dirt.ABL   fill.IPFV.1SG.PRS

6. :*aggatiuš=m*[(*a=**wa***   *kwiē*)*š*   *ammuk*   *tarniškemi*ˀ]
    trap.ACC.PL.C=but=QUOT   which.ACC.PL.C   I   release.IPFV.1SG.PRS

7. *apāš=ma=**wa**[r=*(*aš*   *šarā*   *d*)*āi*ˀ]
    that.NOM.SG.C=but=QUOT=them   up   take/put.3SG.PRS

8. [*n*]*u=**war**=aš=ka*[*n*   ÍD-*i*   *anda*   (*išḫūwaiške*)]*zzi*
    CONN=QUOT=them=LOCP   river.LOC.SG   in   throw.IPFV.3SG.PRS

'(1) A young man goes in front of me, (2) and […] hi[m …] (3) […] the field […] (4) The pit traps which I release, (5) he fills with dirt. (6) The traps which I lay, (7) he puts them up (8) and throws them into the river.' (The translation basically follows the understanding of E. Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 341.III.1 [TX 2009-08-27, TRde 2009-08-27]; cf. (Busse at https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=429, 428).

(16b) NS (CTH 341.III.1.E) KBo 10.46+ obv. i 20"-26"

1. ᴸᵁGURUŠ-*a*[*nza=**wa***   *ammuk*ˀ   *p*]*eran iyattari*
    young.man-NOM.SG=QUOT   me   before   go.3SG.PRS.MED

2. *nu=**wa**=šš*[*i*   … -]*iš*
    CONN=QUOT=him   x.NOM.SG.C

3. [(*n*)]*u=**wa**=kan*   [(*gimran*) …]
    CONN=QUOT=LOCP   field.ACC.SG

4. [(*n*)]*u=**wa***   [:]   *akkušša*   *kue*   *ammu*[*k*   *tarniškemi*]
    CONN=QUOT   pit.trap.ACC.PL.N   which.ACC.PL.N   I   release.IPFV.1SG.PRS

5. [*ap*]*āš=ma=<w>**ar**=at=kan*   SAḪARᴴᴵ·ᴬ-*a*[*z*   *šaḫiškezzi*ˀ]
    that.NOM.SG.C=but=QUOT=it=LOCP   dirt.ABL.SG   fill.IPFV.3SG.PRS

6. [:*ag*]*gatiuš=ma=**wa***   *kwiē*[*š*   *ammuk*   *tarniškemi*ˀ]
    trap.ACC.PL.C=but=QUOT   which.ACC.PL.C   I   release.IPFV.1SG.PRS

7. *a*[*p*]*āš=ma=aš*   *šarā*   *d*[*āi*ˀ]
    that.NOM.SG.C=but=them   up   take/put.3SG.PRS

8. [*n*(*u=**war**=aš=ka*)*n*   ÍD-*i*   *anda*]   *išḫūwaiškezz*[(*i*)]
    CONN=QUOT=them=LOCP   river.LOC.SG   in   throw.IPFV.3SG.PRS

'(1) A young man goes in front of me, (2) and […] hi[m …] (3) […] the field […] (4) The pit traps which I release, (5) he fills with dirt. (6) The traps which I lay, (7) he puts them up (8) and throws them into the river.' (E. Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 341.III.1 [TX 2009-08-27, TRde 2009-08-27]).

The two copies differ in the use of *-wa*(*r*) in two ways.

In clause 7 copy A attests *-wa*(*r*), whereas copy E does not. It is important that this is the main clause which follows the dependent clause 6 with *-wa*(*r*). Copy E without *-wa*(*r*) yet again confirms the rule set out above that *-wa*(*r*) is used once per sentence on its leftmost clause.

Paradoxically, in clause 5 the situation is exactly the reverse. Copy A does not attest *-wa*(*r*), whereas E does. Whether *-wa*(*r*) in clause 5 was dropped in A or introduced in E is impossible to determine. In any case, what is even more striking is that this drop or original non-use also fits into the general rules for *-wa*(*r*) outlined above – clause 5 in both copies is also a main clause which follows the dependent clause which keeps its *-wa*(*r*).

1.1.2. Complex sentences

The examples which I provided above were obvious with self evident division into complex sentences. However, for many other examples the division of clauses into complex sentences cannot be seen independently from the use of *-wa(r)*.

I suggest we use the data above concerning *-wa(r)* to determine how exactly clauses are joined to form complex sentences.

Some variation is expected here since identical clauses can form complex sentences with different structures.

The most important is that the relative volume of the complex sentence is very different. In case of the following example *-wa(r)* scopes over a multitude of clauses which are in very different hierachical relationships to each other but which still form one sentence:

(17) NS (CTH 410.A) HT 1 obv. ii 24-32

1. *kuiš=**wa***   DINGIR−*LUM*   KUR   ᴸᵁ́KÚR   *kī*   ÚŠ-*an*
   who.NOM.SG.C=QUOT   god   land   enemy   this.ACC.SG.N   plague.ACC.SG.N
   iyan   *ḫarzi*
   make.PRTC.NOM.SG.N   have.3SG.PRS

2. *nu*   *kāša*   *kūn*   UDU.NÍTA   *ḫaršanallandan*   *tuk*   ANA
   CONN   PFV   this.ACC.SG.C   wether   wreath.PTCP.ACC.SG.C   you.ACC   to
   DINGIR-*LIM*   *takšulanni*   *ūnnummen*
   god   peace.LOC.SG   bring.1PL.PST

3. *nu*   KÉŠ   *maḫḫan*   *daššuwanza*
   CONN   knot   as   strong.NOM.SG.C

4. *kēdani=ya*   ANA   UDU.NÍTA   *menaḫḫanda*   *takšulāizzi*
   this.LOC.SG=and   to   wether   against   make.peace.3SG.PRS

5. *zig=ma*   *kuiš*   DINGIR-*LUM*   *kī*   *ḫenkan*
   you=but   who.NOM.SG.C   god   this.ACC.SG.N   plague.ACC.SG.N
   iyan   *ḫarti*
   make.PRTC.NOM.SG.N   have.2SG.PRS

6. *nu*   ANA   KUR   ᵁᴿᵁKÙ.BABBAR-*ti*   *menaḫḫanda*   QATAMMA   *takšulāi*
   CONN   to   land   Hatti   against   likewise   make.peace.2SG.IMP

7. *nu=ššan*   KUR   ᵁᴿᵁ*ḫatti*   *aššuli*   *anda*   *namma*   *nāišḫut*
   CONN=LOCP   land   Hatti   favourably   in   then   turn.2SG.IMP.MED

'(1) What god of the enemy has made this plague, (2) now this wreathed wether we have brought for your pacification. (3) As the knot is strong (4) and (as) it makes peace with this wether, (5) you, the god, who has made this plague, (6) make peace likewise with the land Hatti, (7) turn again favourably to the land of Hatti.' (cf. S. Görke (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 410 [TX 09.12.2013, TRde 20.07.2012]).

Inside this syntactic unit we see both the coordination of main clauses (6-7) and the subordination of dependent and main clauses (1-2, 3-5). The entire complex sentence was seen by Hittites as one syntactic unit which brought about the use of *-wa(r)* only once after the first word of its leftmost clause.

In the following case, on the contrary, we see two complex sentences of much more restricted volume where parts of what constituted one complex sentence in the example above constitutes several distinct complex sentences in the following example:

(18) MH/MS (CTH 480.1) KUB 29.7+ rev. 27-32

1. *mān=**wa**   ANA   PANI   DINGIR-LIM   kuiški   kiššan   mem[iški]zzi*
   if=QUOT   to   before   god   someone.NOM.SG.C   thus   speak.IPFV.3SG.PRS

2. *kāš=**wa**   māḫḫan   šuppiwašḫar^SAR   ḫurpaštaz   anda*
   this.NOM.SG.C=QUOT as   onion.NOM.SG.C   skin.ABL.SG   in
   ḫūlaliyanza
   wrap.PTCP.NOM.SG.C

3. *nu   araš   aran   a[rḫa   UL]   tarnai*
   CONN   friend.NOM.SG.C   friend.ACC.SG.C   away   NEG   leave.3SG.PRS

4. *idālauwanzi=ya   NIŠ DINGIR-LIM=ya   ḫurtaiš   papranna[nz]aš=a*
   bad.ERG.SG=and   oath=and   curse.NOM.SG.C   defilement.ERG.SG=and
   eni É.DINGIR-LIM *šuppi[wašḫan]aš iwar   anda   ḫūlaliyan   ḫardu*
   this temple   onion.GEN.SG   like   in   wrap.PTCP.NOM.SG.N   have.3SG.IMP

5. *kinun=a   kāša   kūn   šu[ppiw]ašḫar^SAR   arḫa   šippanu[n]*
   now=but   PFV   this.ACC.SG   onion.ACC.SG   away   peel.1SG.PST

6. *[n=an=š]an   katta   1   kākin   dawanin   kurkun*
   CONN=it=LOCP   down   1   wretched.ACC.SG   stump.ACC.SG   retain.1SG.PST

7. *idālu=ya   uttar   NIŠ DINGIR-[LIM   ḫu]rtaiš   paprātar*
   evil.ACC.SG=and   word.ACC.SG   oath   curse.NOM.SG.C   defilement.ACC.SG
   ANA   DINGIR-L[IM   per]an   arḫa   QĀTAMMA   šippaiddu*
   to   god   before   away   likewise   peel.3SG.IMP

8. *nu   DINGIR-LUM* EN   *sískur=ya   apē[z   udd]anaz   parkuwaēš*
   CONN   god   lord   ritual=and   this.ABL.SG   matter.ABL.SG   free.NOM.PL.C
   ašandu
   be.3PL.IMP

'(1) If somebody speaks thus before a deity: (2) "As this onion (is) wrapped in (its) skin, (3) and one does not leave another, (4) and may evil (word) and perjury, curse and defilement hold this temple enveloped like an onion!" (5) Now I have just peeled away this onion. (6) and now I have kept only one lousy stump. (7) so likewise let him/it peel away evil words, perjury, curse, defilement from before the god. (8) Let god and sacrificer be free of that matter!' (cf. S. Görke and S. Melzer (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 480.1 [TX 15.02.2016, TRde 10.02.2016]; HED H: 406, K: 17, 266; Torri 2003: 142).

Here the first clause is within direct speech, but it also introduces another stretch of direct speech (2-4) which forms a complex sentence and uses -*wa*(*r*) only once on its leftmost clause 2.

The last example also obviously implies that there was a tendency of -*wa*(*r*) to spread to parts of the former complex sentence, and the spread was not consistent.

2. ANOTHER PATTERN OF THE USE OF -WA(R).

However, this pattern is not the only one. The two following examples differ radically from the examples considered so far in that *-wa(r)* here is used in the second – and last – clause of a complex sentence:

(19) MH/MS (CTH 404.1.I.A) KBo 39.8 obv. ii 13-14

1. [*tuḫš*]*aru*   *apel*   UD-*aš*   EME^{ḪI.A}
   remove.3SG.IMP.MED   that.GEN.SG   day.GEN.SG   tongues

2. *tuḫšaru*=**wa**   [*apel*]   UD-*a*[*š*   ḫ]*ūrtāuš*
   remove.3SG.IMP.MED=QUOT   that.GEN.SG   day.GEN.SG   curses.NOM^{i}.PL.C

'(1) Let the tongues of that day be removed! (2) Let the curses of that day be removed!' (Miller 2004: 71; cf. A. Mouton (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 404.1.I [TX 07.05.2012, TRfr 21.03.2012]).

Here there are two main clauses that form one tight syntactic unit with the same illocutory force, thus we see only one *-wa(r)*. This is in agreement with what we saw above. But what is radically new in this example is that *-wa(r)* is used in the second, not first, clause of the complex sentence.

We see the same in the following structurally different example:

(20) MH/MS (CTH 404.1.I.A) KBo 39.8 obv. i 46-49

1. KA×U-*it*   EME-*it*   *kuit*   *memišketten*
   mouth.INS.SG   tongue.INS.SG   what.ACC.SG.N   speak.IPFV.2PL.PST

2. *kinun*=*a*=**wa**   *kāša*   *tiššatwa*
   now=but=QUOT   PFV   t.

3. [(*nu*=**wa**=*šm*)]*aš*=*kan*   *tuḫšan*   *ēštu*   *tueggaš*
   CONN=QUOT=you=LOCP   remove.PTCP.NOM.SG.N   be.3SG.IMP   body.LOC.PL
   apedaš   [UD-*aš*]   EME^{ḪI.A}
   that.GEN.PL   day.GEN.PL   tongues

'(1) That which you two spoke to each other with mouth (and) tongue, (2) now (it is) hereby *tiššatwa*. (3) Let the tongues of those days be removed from your persons!' (Miller 2004: 66–68; cf. A. Mouton (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 404.1.I [TX 07.05.2012, TRfr 21.03.2012]).

Here there are two independent syntactic units again. The first one is formed by clauses 1 and 2, whereas the second one, clause 3, is an independent clause. Each sentence uses one *-wa(r)*. But in case of the sentence consisting of clauses 1 and 2 *-wa(r)* is not located in the leftmost clause 1 but rather in clause 2.

The following texts demonstrate that these examples are not isolated scribal errors:

(21) NH/NS (CTH 105.A) KUB 23.1+ obv. ii 29

1. ^{LÚ}*paḫḫuršin*=*pat*   *paḫḫašḫi*
   bastard.ACC.SG=FOC   protect.1SG.PRS

2. ^{LÚ}*pa*(*ḫ*)*ḫuršiyaš*=*ma*=**wa**   DUMU=*šú*?   *kuit*   DÙ-*mi*
   bastard.GEN.SG=but=QUOT   son=his   why   do.1SG.PRS

'(1) Will I protect even a bastard? (2) Why should I act on behalf of the son of a bastard?' (Beckman 1996: 102, cf. CHD P: 17; F. Fuscagni (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 105 [TX 07.05.2013, TRde 07.05.2013]).

In this example -*wa*(*r*) is used only in the last of the two coordinated main clauses of direct speech.

In my corpus, 7 cases show that -*wa*(*r*) marks the last main clause, whereas the previous dependent clause is not marked. This is also seen in the following example:

(22) NS (CTH 407.A) KBo 15.1 obv. i 14–21

1. *mān=man*   *kī*   *úš-an*   *ŠA*   KUR   ᴸᵁ́KÚR   *kuiški*
if=IRR   this.ACC.SG   plague.ACC.SG   GEN   land   enemy   some.NOM.SG.C
DINGIR−*LIM*   LÚ   DÙ-*at*
god   man   do.3SG.PST

2. *nu=wa=šši*   *k*[*āš*]*a*   LÚ   *unuwantan*   *ANA*   ᴸᵁ́*PŪḪĪ=ŠU*   *piḫḫun*
CONN=QUOT=him   PFV   man   adorned.ACC.SG   to   substitute=his   give.1SG.PST

3. *IŠTU*   SAG.DU=*ŠU*=*wa*   *kā*[*š*   *šall*]*iš*
with   head=his=QUOT   this.NOM.SG.C   big.NOM.SG.C

4. ᵁᶻᵁŠÀ-*za*=*wa*   *kāš*   *šalliš*
heart.ABL.SG= QUOT   this.NOM.SG.C   big.NOM.SG.C

5. ÚR-*azz=a+ya*=*wa*   *k*[*āš*   *šalli*]*š*
limb.ABL.SG=and+and=QUOT   this.NOM.SG.C   big.NOM.SG.C

6. *nu=wa=kan*   *zik*   DINGIR-*LIM*   LÚ   *k*[*ēz*]   LÚ   *unuwan*[*tit*   *parā*]
CONN=QUOT=LOCP   you   god   man   this.ABL.SG   man   adorned.INS.SG   out
galangaza   *ēš*
placated.NOM.SG.C   be.2SG.IMP

7. LUGAL-*i=ma*=*wa*   *ANA*   [ENᴹᴱˢ]   *ANA*   K[*ARAŠ*   *Ù*   *ANA*]   KUR   ᵁᴿᵁ*Ḫatti*   to
king.DAT.SG=but=QUOT   to   lords   to   army   and   to   land   Hatti   *ANA*
anda   *aššul*[*i*   *namm*]*a*   *ne*[*šḫut*]
in   favourably   then   turn.2SG.IMP.MED

8. […]*x=ma*=*wa*   *úš-an*   *kāš*   ᴸᵁ́ŠU.DAB   *ka*[*rapdu*]
x=but=QUOT   plague.ACC.SG   this.NOM.SG.C   prisoner   lift.3SG.IMP

9. EGIR-[*pa*=*wa*   *INA*   KUR   ᴸᵁ́KÚR   *p*]*ēdau*
back=QUOT   to   land   enemy   bring.3SG.IMP

'(1) If some male god of the enemy land has caused this plague, (2) I have just given to him an adorned man as a substitute. (3) This o[ne is gr]eat with respect to his head, (4) this one is great with respect to his heart, (5) and this one is great with respect to his limb. (6) You, male deity, be placated [with] th[is] adorned man. (7) Turn again in friendship to the king, the lords, the army, and to the land of Hatti. (8) […] but let this prisoner bear the plague (9) and transport (it) back into the land of the enemy.' (B.-J. Collins (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 407 [TX 10.11.2014, TRen 23.07.2014]).

Here *-wa(r)* is consistently used in 8 clauses counting from right to left from the end of the direct speech. But it is not used in all the clauses of the direct speech, namely the first clause. It is important that this clause is dependent on the main clause 2 in our count. The main clause makes use of *-wa(r)*, but its dependent clause does not.

2.1. A parallel for delayed -wa(r)

It is necessary now to explain the pattern *dependent clause without -wa(r) + main clause with -wa(r)* alongside the pattern *dependent clause with -wa(r) + main clause without -wa(r).*

However, Hittite provides a close and purely linguistic parallel for the coexistence of the two patterns.

Additional and independent data from another particle with sentential scope is insightful at this point – namely *-(m)a* "but". According to Meacham (2000), this particle is mostly used at the beginning of a complex sentence (consisting of a dependent clause and a main clause), i.e. after the first word of the leftmost clause within the complex sentence, which is most often a dependent clause, even if it contrasts the main clause that follows the dependent clause.

We unambiguously see this in the following example:

(23) MH/NS (CTH 264.A) KUB 13.4 obv. ii 38»-40»
1. *namma=at=za=kan*   ŠÀ   È–*TI*   *lē=pat*   *dāliyazi*
   then=it=REFL=LOCP   inside   house   PROH=FOC   leave.3SG.PRS
2. *parā=pat=za*   *uššaniyaddu*
   out=FOC=REFL   sell.3SG.IMP
3. *uššaniyazi=**ma**=at=za*   *kuwapi*
   sell.3SG.PRS=but=it=REFL   when
4. *n=at*   *ḫarwaši* *lē*   *ušniyazi*
   CONN=it   secretly   PROH   sell.3SG.PRS

'(1) Further, in no case shall he leave it inside his own house. (2) He must sell (it) off. (**3**) When he <u>sells</u> it, **though**, (4) he shall not sell it in secret' (Miller 2013: 254–255).

In this example in cl. 3 *uššaniyazi* is topical and the only other constituent in the clause, *kuwapi*, is not contrastively focused in this instance. Thus there is no contrast in this clause and *-(m)a* might be supposed to mark non-contrastive topicalization, but instead there is contrast in the following clause (cl. 4). The bearers of narrow contrast are the adverbial and the negation marker: *ḫarwaši lē*. Thus *-(m)a* still has adversative force not just over the leftmost clause 3 of the complex sentence where it occurs phonologically, but over all the entire sentence consisting of clauses 3-4.

This distribution of *-(m)a* fits the dominating tendency with *-wa(r)* as originally established by Fortson (1998) and is confirmed by statistics in my paper above – *-wa(r)* is most commonly used after the first word of the leftmost clause within a complex sentence.

But in some cases the particle *-(m)a* "but" is used in the main clause, and not in the dependent clause, as in the following cases:

(24) NH/NS (CTH 81.A) KUB 1.1+ rev. iv 58-59

(The king supposed to respect me, respected me, and the countries that had been my enemies I conquered them. For the Hatti lands I annexed territory upon territory.)

   1. *ANA*   *PANI*   *ABBA*ᴴᴵ·ᴬ=*YA*   *ABBA*   [(*AB*)*BA*ᴴᴵ·⁽ᴬ   *kuiēš*)]   *kūrur*
       to   before   fathers=my   father   fathers   which.NOM.PL.C   enemy.NOM.SG.N
       ēšir
       be.3PL.PST

   2. *ammuk=**ma***   *takšulā*[(*i*)]*r*
       me=but   make.peace.3PL.PST

  '(2) **But** (1) Those who had been enemies in the days of my fathers and grandfathers (2) concluded peace with me.' (Cf. van den Hout 2003: 204; Otten 1981: 26–27).

The example involves -(*m*)*a* with the function of strong contrast for Meacham (2000: 308 sub 1200). As different from some examples assessed by Meacham (2000: 236) this -(*m*)*a* cannot mark subject switch or topic change between the dependent and the main clause, the contrast is here between the whole complex sentence consisting of two clauses (1-2) and the previous complex sentence given here in the translation. The subject of clauses 1 and 2 is here identical, thus here we do not have -(*m*)*a* that 'link[ed] main clauses to their preceding dependent clauses when the subjects of the clauses were different', which is the main function of -(*m*)*a* in this syntactic context according to Meacham (2000: 236). We rather have the common contrastive function.

The following example is analogous. Here -(*m*)*a* marks contrast between two complex sentences – one consisting of one clause 1 and the other complex sentence consisting of two clauses 2 and 3. But it is placed inside the main clause 3, not inside the leftmost independent clause 2:

(25) NH/NS (CTH 62.A) KBo 5.9+ obv. ii 43'-45'

  1. [*eḫ*]*u=wa*   *īt*
      come.2SG.IMP=QUOT   go.2SG.IMP

  2. *kuwapi=wa*   *paiši*
      where=QUOT   go.2SG.PRS

  3. *ammuk=**ma**=wa=tta*   *lē*   *šaggaḫḫi*
      I=but=QUOT=you   PROH   know.1SG.PRS

  '(1) Come or go! (3) **But** (2) wherever you go, (3) I don't want to know about you' (cf. Beckman 1996: 57; G. Wilhelm – F. Fuscagni (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 62 [TX 16.10.2013, TRde 15.10.2013]).

Meacham captures the distribution of -(*m*)*a* in the following way: 'In terms of interclausal syntax, -*ma* may occur […] at the beginning of […] a grammatically dependent clause (preposed to its main clause) […] Less frequently -*ma* will occur at the beginning of a main clause preceded by a grammatically dependent clause' (Meacham 2000: 23, also 41, 76–77, 130–134, 198, 235–236). The idea goes back to Houwink ten Cate.

This is again exactly the pattern found with -*wa*(*r*). Thus -*wa*(*r*) corresponds with -(*m*)*a* "but" and it is unnecessary to assume any mirror counts from the right to the left at the right edge of direct speech alongside the dominating left to right count at the left edge of direct speech. We simply posit that there are two patterns with two sentential particles.

Mind that it is the patterns that are identical, whereas the use of concrete -*wa*(*r*) and -(*m*)*a* deviates in the concrete sentences, as, e.g., in (**24**) above. However, in a number of cases -(*m*)*a* and -*wa*(*r*) are used identically, as, e.g., in (**25**) above. These include the cases where both -*wa*(*r*) and -(*m*)*a* occur in the main clause following dependent clauses:

(**26**) lNS (CTH 426.1.1.A) KUB 7.58 obv. i 18'-22'

1. *mān*	EN	KARAŠ	*gimri*		*ḫatukišzi*
if	lord	troops	field.LOC.SG		get.narrow.3SG.PRS
2. *našma=aš=kan*	ŠÀ	MÈ	LÚKÚR		*zag-naḫḫiškizzi*
or=he=LOCP	inside	battle	enemy		set.right.IPFV.3SG.PRS
3. *anzel=**wa**=ma*	LÚKALAGHI.A		UL		*zag-naḫḫanzi*
our=QUOT=but	strong.men		NEG		set.right.3PL.PRS

'(1) If it becomes tight for a general on a campaign (2) or (if) in battle the enemy keeps having success, (3) but our fighting men do not succede' (cf. F. Fuscagni (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 426.1.1 [TX 07.10.2016, TRde 04.10.2016]; HED K: 247; HED H: 275).

Some other cases involve contrast between two main clauses:

(**27**) NS (CTH 323.1.A) VBoT 58 obv. i 18'-19'

1. *kī*		*azzikkitani*	*akkuškittani*
this.ACC.SG.N		eat.IPFV.2PL.PRS	drink.IPFV.2PL.PRS
2. *kappuwatten=**ma**=**wa**=za*		UL	*kuitki*
consider.2PL.PST=but=QUOT=REFL		NEG	something.ACC.SG.N

'(1) You eat and drink this, (2) but you have taken account of nothing' (Hoffner 1998: 28)[9].

By considering -*wa*(*r*) and -(*m*)*a* I have been able to demonstrate that Hittite attests two competing patterns of positioning both particles within complex sentences (*dependent clause without -wa(r)/-(m)a + main clause with -wa(r)/-(m)a* and *dependent clause with -wa(r)/-(m)a + main clause without -wa(r)/-(m)a*). The hypothesis is supported by the fact that 5 out of 8 clauses with the pattern *dependent clause without -wa(r) + main clause with -wa(r)* are attested in cases where only the first clause out of several clauses of direct speech does not attest -*wa*(*r*). In yet one more case there are two dependent clauses at the beginning of direct speech, both of them without -*wa*(*r*). Thus I provide an explanation for the cases which remained a mystery for Fortson (1998: 28. n. 24).

3. ANALOGICAL SPREAD

However, Hittite data concerning -*wa*(*r*) requires yet another factor regulating the use of -*wa*(*r*). We see it by comparing two examples that follow:

---

[9] The direct speech can stretch over more clauses, see E. Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 323.1 (TX 2009-08-26, TRde 2009-08-26), cf. Hoffner (1998: 28), who includes into the direct speech the next clause 'The shepherd and cowherd have died', but no -*wa*(*r*) is employed in any of the following clauses.

(28a) NS (CTH 341.III.1.B+D) KUB 8.55(+) rev. iv 3'-5'

1. [(*arḫa*=***wa***=*mu*   *dāli*   ᴅGIŠ.GIM.MA)]š
     away=QUOT=me   leave.2SG.IMP   Gilgames

2. *nu*=***wa***=*mu*=*za*   *zik*   EN-*aš*   *ēš*
     CONN=QUOT=me=REFL   you   lord.NOM.SG.C   be.2SG.IMP

3. [(*ammuk*=*ma*=*ddu*=*za*   ARAD-*iš*   *ēšlut*)]
     I=but=you=REFL   slave.NOM.SG.C   be.1SG.IMP

4. [*nu*=*tt*]*a*ˀ   [ᴳᴵˢ]ERINᴹᴱˢˀ   *kuiē*[(*š*   *šallanuškenun*)]
     CONN=you   cedars   which.ACC.PL.C   raise.IPFV.1SG.PST

'(1) Get off me, Gilgames! (2) Be my lord! (3) And I will be your slave! (4) And the cedars that I have raised for you, (5) I will cut […] strong beamsˀ (6) and [buildˀ] pal[acesˀ … for you]' (cf. E. Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 341.III.1 [TX 2009-08-27, TRde 2009-08-27]; CHD P: 375-6).

(28b) NS (CTH 341.III.1.C) KBo 6.1+ rev. iv 22'-26'

1. *arḫa*=***wa***=*mu*   *dāli*   ᴅGIŠ.GIMᴵ.MAŠ
     away=QUOT=me   leave.2SG.IMP   Gilgames

2. *nu*=*mu*=*za*   *zi*[(*k*   EN-*aš*   *ēš*)
     CONN=QUOT=me=REFL   you   lord.NOM.SG.C   be.2SG.IMP

3. *ammuk*=*ma*=*ddu*=*za*   ARAD-*iš*   *ēšlut*
     I=but=you=REFL   slave.NOM.SG.C   be.1SG.IMP

4. *n*[*u*]=*t*[*t*]*a*ˀ   [ᴳᴵˢ(ERINᴹᴱˢˀ   *k*)]*uiēš*   *šallanuškenun*
     CONN=you   cedars   which.ACC.PL.C   raise.IPFV.1SG.PST

5. *nu* […]   *daššauš*   :*pulpulī*[(-) …]   [*k*]*ar*(*a*)*šmi*
     CONN   strong.ACC.PL.C   beamˀ   cut.1SG.PRS

6. *nu*=*za*   ᴱ·ᴹᴱˢ*ḫal*[*enduwa*ˀ …]
     CONN=REFL   palaces

'(1) Get off me, Gilgames! (2) Be my lord! (3) And I will be your slave! (4) And the cedars that I have raised for you, (5) I will cut […] strong beamsˀ (6) and [buildˀ] pal[acesˀ … for you]' (cf. E. Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 341.III.1 [TX 2009-08-27, TRde 2009-08-27]; CHD P: 375-6).

Here two copies of the same text attest different number of -*wa*(*r*)'s. In copy C -*wa*(*r*) is only found in the first clause, whereas in copy B+D -*wa*(*r*) is found in the first and the second clauses. It is straightforward to interpret the data as the gradual spread of -*wa*(*r*) from the state preserved in C to the state preserved in B+D as the text was copied.

See already Fortson (1998: 28): the initial use of -*wa*(*r*) in the first dependent clause «led to a reanalysis, whereby learners must have thought that the rule was to mark each subordinate clause with the particle».

The spread was quite commonly attested in Hittite texts:

(29) NH/NS (CTH 583) KUB 48.122+ rev. iii 54'-56'

1. 1 *LIM*   UDU=***wa***   *ḫandan*[*zi*]
     1000   sheep=QUOT   prepare.3PL.PRS

2. *nu=**war**=[an*   ANA   DINGI]R-*LIM*   GAL   *šuppiyaḫḫanzi*
    CONN=QUOT=it   to   god   big   dedicate.3PL.PRS

3. *n=an=š[i*   SUM]-*anzi*
    CONN=it=him   give.3PL.PRS

'(1) 1000 sheep they shall make ready (2) and they shall dedicate them to the great god (3) and they shall give them to him.' (de Roos 2007: 86; cf. Mouton 2007: 249).

Here *-wa*(*r*) is seen not only in the first of several coordinated main clauses, but also in the second coordinated clause. Still the spread is not completely generalized over all the stretch of direct speech; *-wa*(*r*) is not used in clause 3. This fact is extremely important as the spread very commonly remained partial, producing examples where only part of direct speech clauses were marked by *-wa*(*r*).

The following case illustrates the use of *-wa*(*r*) in several coordinated dependent clauses:

(30) NS (CTH 398.A) KBo 4.2 obv. i 44-46

1. *kāš=**wa***   GIM-*an*   *ḫāš*   GAD[ḪI.A]   *iškunanta*   *parkunuzzi*
    this.NOM.SG=QUOT   as   soap.NOM.SG.C   linen   dirty.ACC.PL.N   clean.3SG.PRS

2. *nu=**war**=at*   *ḫarkēšzi*
    CONN=QUOT=it   get.white.3SG.PRS

3. *ŠA*   LUGAL   MUNUS.LUGAL   DUMU[MEŠ]   LUGAL   NÍ.TE[MEŠ]   LUGAL   NÍ.TE-*aš=šiš*
    GEN   king   queen   sons   king   bodies   king   body.ACC.PL=his
    É[ḪI.A]   LUGAL   *QATAMMA*   *parkunuddu*
    houses   king   likewise   purify.3SG.IMP

'(1) Just as this soap cleans dirty linens (2) (so that) they become white, (3) may it likewise cleanse the bodies of the king, the queen, (their) children and the palaces!' (Cf. CHD P: 170; D. Bawanypeck (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 398 [TX 24.03.2016, TRde 24.03.2016]).

-wa(*r*) is here used not only in the first of the two coordinated dependent clauses which precede the main clause, but also in the second of the two. It is not, however, used in the main clause (clause 3 in the example) which follows the two coordinated dependent clauses.

The other line of *-wa*(*r*) extention is over all the complex sentence. It is observed only if the sentence is initial in direct speech. Such cases are quite rare, being attested only 5 times in my corpus:

(31) MH/MS (CTH 404.1.I.A) KBo 39.8 obv. ii 1-2

1. *kuit=[(**wa**=za=kan)]*   *kuit*   *ištarna*   *ḫūrzaketten*
    which.ACC.SG.N=QUOT=REFL=LOCP   which.ACC.SG.N   between   curse.IPFV.2PL.PST

2. *kin[(un=a=**wa**)]*   *apuš*   *ḫūrtauš*   EME[ḪI.A]   ᴰUTU-*uš*   GÙB-*la*
    now=but=QUOT   that.ACC.PL.C   curses.ACC.PL.C   tongues   majesty.NOM.SG   left.ALL.SG
    w[(aḫnuddu)]
    turn.3SG.IMP

'(1) Whatever curses you spoke between you, (2) let now the sun-god (un)twist those curses (and) tongues to the left!' (Miller 2004: 69; cf. A. Mouton (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 404.1.I [TX 07.05.2012, TRfr 21.03.2012]).

In this example *-wa(r)* spreads to every clause of the complex sentence – from the initial dependent clause (1) to the main clause that follows it (2). Again the spread is from left to right.

We see in the corpus that the extention of *-wa(r)* was gradual over the complex sentence or over the coordinated clauses – with *-wa(r)* moving into each next clause step by step and not onto each clause of the whole stretch of direct speech at the same time. This follows from the series of dependent clauses in (**30**) above. There *-wa(r)* spread to the second clause, but not further to the third clause.

4. OLD HITTITE DATA

While discussing this spread of *-wa(r)*, it is important to bear in mind that already Old Hittite originals attest all three possible options of its use within direct speech – consistently no *-wa(r)*, consistent *-wa(r)* in every clause of direct speech, inconsistent use of *-wa(r)* not in every clause of direct speech.

We see all these options in the following examples:
inconsistent *-wa(r)*:

(**32**) OH/OS (CTH 3.1.A) KBo 22.2 obv. 14-15
  1. *kuin=**wa***   *šanḫiškiweni*
       which.ACC.SG.C=QUOT   seek.IPFV.1PL.PRS
  2. *UMMA=NI=šan*   *wemiyawen*
       mother=our=LOCP   find.1PL.PST
  3. *uwatten*
       come.2PL.IMP
  4. ᵁᴿᵁ*Nēša*   *paiwani*
       Nesa   go.1PL.PRS
  '(2) We have found our mother, (1) whom we have been seeking. (3) Come, (4) let us go to Nesa' (Hoffner 2003a: 181; cf. Otten 1973: 6–7).

(**33**) OH/OS (CTH 291.I.a.A) KBo 6.2+ rev. iii 17-18
  1. *kūšan=naš=za*   *natta*   *kuiški*   *iē[zzi]*
       wage.ACC.SG=us=REFL   NEG   someone.NOM.SG.C   do.3SG.PRS
  2. *nu=**wa**=nnaš=za*   *mimmanzi*
       CONN=QUOT=us=REFL   refuse.3PL.PRS
  3. LÚᴹᴱˢ   *ILKI=**wa***   *šumeš*
       men   *i.*=QUOT   you
  '(1) No one pays us a wage. (2) They refuse us (saying): (3) "You are men required to perform your jobs as *sahhan*-service"' (Hoffner 1997: 66–67).

Consistent *-wa(r)*:

(**34**) OH/OS (CTH 3.1.A) KBo 22.2 obv. 9
  1. *kāni=**wa***   *tunnakkiš*   *inutten*
       there=QUOT   inner.chamber.ACC.SG.N   heat.2PL.IMP

2. *nu=w[a*   ANŠ]E-*iš*   *arkatta*
    CONN=QUOT   donkey.NOM.SG.C   fuck.3SG.PRS.MED
'(1) Heat up an inner chamber here, (2) and the donkey will climb(?)' (Hoffner 2003a: 181; cf. Otten 1973: 6–7).

Consistent lack of *-wa*(*r*):

(35) OH/OS (CTH 291.I.a.A) KBo 6.2+ obv. ii 19
    1. *kī*   GIŠTUKU[L-*l*(*i=met*)]
      this.NOM.SG.N   TUKUL.NOM.SG.N=my.NOM.SG.N
    2. [(*k*)]*ī=ma*   *šaḫḫa=met*
      this.NOM.SG.N=but   *šaḫḫan*.NOM.SG.N=my.NOM.SG.N
'(1) This is my TUKUL-obligation (2) and this other is my obligation for *šahhan*-services' (Hoffner 1997: 47–48).

Copies also attest these same options. They either maintain the original usage (of all three kinds, e.g., all the later copies faithfully preserve lack of *-wa*(*r*) in (**35**) and inconsistent use of *-wa*(*r*) in (**33**)), or they introduce *-wa*(*r*) where it was not used originally, as illustrated by (**36a-b**):

(36a) OH/OS (CTH 291.I.a.A) KBo 6.2+ rev. iv 3, preserved in KUB 13.13 rev. 4-5
    INA   *QATI*   DINGIR-*LIM*   *ākkiš*
    in   hand   god   die.3SG.PST
'It died by the hand of a god.' (Hoffner 1997: 81–82).

(36b) OH/NS (CTH 291.I.b.A) KBo 6.3+ rev. iii 75
    IŠTU   DINGIR–*LIM=**war**=aš*   BA.ÚŠ
    with   god=QUOT=he   died
'It died by the hand of a god.' (Hoffner 1997: 82).

The same three options are preserved through Middle Hittite into New Hittite. See, e.g., inconsistent use of *-wa*(*r*) in a New Hittite composition from the time of Hattusili III:

(37) NH/NS (CTH 106.II.2) KBo 4.10+ obv. 42'- 47'
    1. ANŠE.KUR.RA   KARAŠ=***wa***=*šši*   *kuit*   *INA*   URU*Ḫatti*   *šA*   KUR
      horse   troops=QUOT=him   which.ACC.SG.N   in   Hatti   of   land
      ĭD*Ḫulaya*   É   *duppaš*   *ḫarzi*
      Hulaya   house   basket.GEN.SG   have.3SG.PRS
    2. *n=at=šiy=at*   ᵈUTU-*š=I*   *arḫa*   *peššiyat*
      CONN=it=him=it   sun=my   away   throw.3SG.PST
      followed by many more clauses without *-wa*(*r*)
'(So the King and the Queen have made this agreement with you:) (2) My Majesty has remitted (1) the chariotry and infantry of the land of the Hulaya River for which the armory in Hatti holds claim, etc' (I basically follow the German translation of van den Hout 1995: 34–37; cf. Beckman 1996: 106).[10]

---

[10]   Van den Hout (1995: 65) assesses the context as direct speech, whereas Beckman does not, I follow van den Hout's argument.

(38) NH/NS (CTH 293) KUB 13.35+ obv. ii 1-4

1. MUNUS.LU[GAL⸗*y*]*aʾ*⸗***wa***   *kuedaš*   UKÙ^{MEŠ}-*aš*   ANŠE.GÌR.NUN.NA^{ḪI.A}
    queen=and=QUOT   which.GEN.PL   men.GEN.PL   mules
    man[*iy*]*aḫzi*
    entrust.3SG.PRS

2. *īt*⸗***wa***⸗*šmaš*   *pāi*
    go.2SG.IMP=QUOT =them   give.2SG.IMP

3. *ammuk*⸗*ma*⸗***war***⸗*aš*⸗*kan*   *anda*   *wahnuškinun*
    I=but=QUOT=them=LOCP   in   turn.IPFV.1SG.PST

4. *nu*   *naššu*   *ammel*   *daḫḫi*
    CONN   or   my   take.1SG.PRS

5. *našma*⸗***wa*** *tamel*   *daḫḫi*
    or=QUOT   different.GEN.SG take.1SG.PRS

6. *nu*⸗***wa***⸗*šši*   *apūš*   *piḫḫi*
    CONN=QUOT=him   that.ACC.PL   give.1SG.PRS

etc[11]

'(3) Yet I have been (secretly) exchanging the mules (1) of those to whom the queen has charged me to give them, saying: (2) 'Go, give (them) to them' (4) I either take my own (mules) (5) or (those) of someone else (6) and give them to him (i.e. the person for whom the queen intends them).' (Hoffner 2003b: 58; cf. Werner 1967: 6–7).

It is also present in New Hittite copies of pre-New Hittite compositions, as, e.g., in

(39) OH/NS (CTH 385.10.A) KUB 57.63 obv. ii 6'-15'

1. *araḫzenan*⸗***wa***   ŠA   ^{LÚ}KÚR   KUR.KUR-*TIM* *labarnaš*   *kiššaraz*
    neighbour.ACC.SG=QUOT GEN   enemy   countries   labarna.GEN.SG   hand.ABL.SG
    ḫarkiyaettaru
    perish.3SG.MED.IMP

2. *āššu*⸗*ma* KÙ.BABBAR GUŠKIN *anda*   ^{URU}*Ḫattuši*   ^{URU}*Arinna* *šiunan*
    good=but silver   gold   in   Hattusa.LOC.SG   Arinna   god.GEN.PL
    URU-*aš*   *piddāndu*
    city.LOC.PL bring.3PL.IMP

3. KUR   ^{URU}*Ḫatti*⸗*m*[(*a*⸗*ka*)]*n*   *labarn*<*aš*>   ^{MUNUS}*tawana*[(*n*)]*naš* *kiššarī*
    land   Hatti=but=LOCP   labarna.GEN.SG   tawananna.GEN.SG hand.LOC.SG
    tarrū   *w*[(*eši*)]*ttaru*
    abundantly graze.3SG.MED.IMP

4. *n*=*at*   *pa*[(*lḫi*)]*škettaru*
    CONN=it broaden.IPFV.3SG.MED.IMP

'(1) May the hostile foreign lands perish by the hand of the *labarna*, (2) and let them take goods, silver and gold to Hattusa and Arinna, the cities of the gods. (3) May the land of Hatti graze abundantly in the hand of the *labarna* and the *tawananna* (4) and may it expand!'

---

[11] Continued by more clauses with consistent -*wa*(*r*).

(Singer 2002: 26; E. Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 385.10 [TX 2016-11-24, TRde 2016-11-24])[12].

Such examples support the original hypothesis concerning the spread of *-wa(r)*.

In summary, it is important to observe that the spread of *-wa(r)* obviously started taking place in pre-Old Hittite time and it never completely generalized, although it occurred throughout the history of Hittite. It is extremely important that despite the spread of *-wa(r)* in the history of Hittite its inconsistent use remained a viable option until the end of the written history of the Hittite language.

4.1. Spread from left to right as the only option for extention of *-wa(r)*?

It was suggested above that the analogical extention of *-wa(r)* was over coordinated clauses from left to right. However, a closer look at one of the examples, (**40b**), reveals that the text possesses a copy, which I reproduce here as (**40a**) and which shows a different distribution of *-wa(r)*:

(**40a**) MH/NS (CTH 404.II.A) KBo 2.3+ obv. i 17'-19'

1. [(*kui*)]*t=wa=za=kan*   *kuit*   [(*ištarn*)]*a*   [(*ḫūrzakette*)]*n*
    which.ACC.SG.N=QUOT=REFL=LOCP   which.ACC.SG.N   between   curse.IPFV.2PL.PST

2. *kinun=a   apu*[(*š   ḫūrd*)]*āuš*   EME^HI.A   ᴰUTU-*uš*   [(GÙB-*la*
    now=but   that.ACC.PL.C   curses.ACC.PL.C   tongues   sun.NOM.SG   left.ALL.SG
    wa)]*ḫnud<du>*
    turn.3SG.IMP

'(1) Whatever curses you spoke between you, (2) let now the sun-god (un)twist those curses (and) tongues to the left!' (Miller 2004: 69; cf. A. Mouton (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 404.1.I [TX 07.05.2012, TRfr 21.03.2012]).

(**40b**) MH/MS (CTH 404.1.I.A) KBo 39.8 obv. ii 1-2

1. *kuit=*[(*wa=za=kan*)]   *kuit*   *ištarna*   *ḫūrzaketten*
    which.ACC.SG.N=QUOT=REFL=LOCP   which.ACC.SG.N   between   curse.IPFV.2PL.PST

2. *kin*[(*un=a=wa*)]   *apuš*   *ḫūrtauš*   EME^HI.A   ᴰUTU-*uš*   GÙB-*la*
    now=but=QUOT   that.ACC.PL.C   curses.ACC.PL.C   tongues   sun.NOM.SG   left.ALL.SG
    w[(*aḫnuddu*)]
    turn.3SG.IMP

'(1) Whatever curses you spoke between you, (2) let now the sun-god (un)twist those curses (and) tongues to the left!' (Miller 2004: 69; cf. A. Mouton (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 404.1.I [TX 07.05.2012, TRfr 21.03.2012]).

At face value the comparison of the two examples appears to show that (**40a**) with the use of *-wa(r)* only in the first of the two clauses was the starting point of the development, whereas (**40b**) with the use of *-wa(r)* in both of the two clauses shows a later spread of *-wa(r)*.

---

[12] The translation follows Singer (2002: 26), whereas the borders of the direct speech follow E. Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 385.10 [TX 2016-11-24, TRde 2016-11-24]).

This would seemingly fit perfectly well into the scenario outlined above – as one copy preserving the original distribution (-*wa*(*r*) in the first clause only (**40a**)) and the other copy (**40b**) attesting a later generalization (-*wa*(*r*) in every clause).

However, the problem is that the chronology of the examples is directly the opposite to the one supporting this scenario. The copy with only -*wa*(*r*) in the first clause (**40a**) which my scenario sets as the starting point, is actually chronologically later (New Hittite time) than the copy with generalized -*wa*(*r*) (Middle Hittite time) (**40b**) which my scenario holds to be secondary.

In this context it can be suggested that the later NS copy preserves the original distribution, whereas the earlier MS copy attests a later stage of development.

Alternatively, it can be suggested that it is the earlier MS copy which preserves the original for this group of texts distribution (consistent use of -*wa*(*r*) in every clause), whereas the later copy (**40a**) dropped -*wa*(*r*) in the second clause. In this scenario we would deal not with the spread of -*wa*(*r*) onto the second clause but with the reverse – mirror – process, namely, the drop of -*wa*(*r*) from the second clause. Paradoxically, this drop would happen according to the same set of rules as originally applied to the extention of -*wa*(*r*) but in the opposite direction. In other words, the clause furtherest to the right was the most susceptible for losing -*wa*(*r*) first.

It is actually the latter option which is compatible with the data. The key fact is that the consistent use of -*wa*(*r*) as in (**40b**) is also seen in yet another copy, II.B. As follows from the philological treatment of the editor of the text, Miller (2004: 241), II.A and II.B represent one recension of the text as opposed to I.A which is of a different recension. Thus the consistent -*wa*(*r*) in (**40b**) as seen in both I.A and II.B, which belongs to different recensions of the text, is likely to be the original Middle Hittite usage and its inconsistent use in (**40a**) is a New Hittite innovation.

4.1.1. ’Shrinking’ of -wa(r).

Thus a look at some of the data exemplified by (**40a**) above shows that the development in a number of cases was actually the reverse of the spread of -*wa*(*r*). In a number of cases we see that later copies attest a more reduced use of -*wa*(*r*) within the same stretch of direct speech.

Thus, curiously, we have to admit that both spread and, if one may use such a label, 'shrinking' (i.e., reduction of its use within a concrete stretch of direct speech) of -*wa*(*r*) are attested throughout the written history of Hittite. What is most striking and important is that they follow the same rules only in reverse order; the spread is from left to right and the shrinking is from right to left.

Thus we have to give up the simplistic scenario by which the spread of -*wa*(*r*) simply intensified through the written history of the Hittite language.

5. END OF DIRECT SPEECH -*WA*(*R*).

Yet another analogical extention of -*wa*(*r*) in direct speech is for it to mark the end of direct speech.

The counts of inconsistent use of -*wa*(*r*) in direct speech show that if -*wa*(*r*) marks only some clauses of the multiclausal direct speech, the distribution has three basic types:

(1.a) only first clause of direct speech

(1.b) only several first clauses of direct speech
     overall 95 (54%) cases out of 177;

(2.a) one clause within direct speech
(2.b) several consecutive clauses within direct speech
(2.c) several separate clauses within direct speech
     overall 20 (11%) cases out of 177;

(3.a) only last clause of direct speech
(3.a) only several last clauses of direct speech.
     overall 30 (17%) cases out of 177.
The first and last types can cooccur:

(1+3.a) only first and last clause of direct speech
(1+3.b) only several first and last clauses of direct speech
     overall 32 (18%) cases out of 177.

It is important that if we combine the statistics for types 1, 3 and 1+3, we see the following figures:

-wa(*r*) marks the beginning of direct speech in 78% of all cases,
-wa(*r*) marks the end of direct speech in 35% of all cases,
-wa(*r*) occurs within direct speech, neither at the beginning nor end only in 11%.

Whereas the tendency for *-wa*(*r*) to mark the beginning of direct speech has been observed since (Fortson 1998), the fact that *-wa*(*r*) marked the end of direct speech in one third of all its overall attestations has not been noticed until today. Still it is quite hard to ignore.

The combination of the strategy for *-wa*(*r*) to mark the beginning of direct speech with the strategy for *-wa*(*r*) to mark the end of direct speech produces the effect of *-wa*(*r*) simultaneously marking both beginning and end of direct speech. *-wa*(*r*) marking the beginning of direct speech resembles an opening quotation mark, whereas *-wa*(*r*) marking the end of direct speech is like a closing quotation mark. In the case of *-wa*(*r*) marking both beginning and end of direct speech we get a complete ancient analogy of functioning as modern quotation marks do – both before and after direct speech.

In a number of cases *-wa*(*r*) functioning as the marker of both beginning and end of direct speech independently follows from the syntactic rules described above – as *-wa*(*r*) occurring once per complex sentence in its leftmost clause, as in:

(41) MH/NS (CTH 404.3.B$_2$) KBo 43.319 obv. i 17'-19'
  1. *kāša=**wa***   EN   SISKUR   *kuit*   *ēš*[(*har*   *iy*)*at*]
      PFV=QUOT   lord   ritual   which.ACC.SG.N   blood.ACC.SG.N   do.3SG.PST
  2. *n=at*   *nepiši*   *daganzipi*   [*paiddu*]
      CONN=it   heaven.LOC.SG   earth.LOC.SG   go.3SG.IMP
  3. *parkueš=**war**=a*[(*t=kan*   (*aš*)*and*(*u*)]   *nepišaš*   *daganzipašš=a* [ ]
      pure.NOM.PL.C=QUOT=it=LOCP   be.3PL.IMP   heaven.GEN.SG   earth.GEN.SG=and

DINGIR^{MEŠ} [ ]
gods
'(1) Herewith bloodshed that the ritual patron has committed (2) let it go to heaven and earth! (3) May the gods of heaven and earth be pure!' (cf. Miller 2004: 137).

However, on the strength of examples like (**41**), which are quite numerous, see (**19, 20, 21**) above, *-wa(r)* came to be perceived by the scribes as means to mark the end of direct speech. Curiously, one *-wa(r)* was often perceived as not sufficient at the end of direct speech, thus there is a certain tendency for the spread of *-wa(r)* at the end of direct speech too. These are the examples in my corpus that attest a purely analogical spread of *-wa(r)* to mark the end of direct speech, and they cannot be described in syntactic terms. We see this in, e.g., the following example:

(**42**) MH/MS (CTH 404.1.I.B) KBo 44.17 rev. iv 11'-14'
1. [(*k*)]*uwapi karūilēš*   [(LUGAL^{MEŠ} EGIR-*pa*)]   *u*[*wanz*]*i*
    when   ancient.NOM.PL.C kings   back   come.3PL.PRS
2. *nu*=***wa***=*za*   KUR-*e*   [(*šaklinn*=*a*   EGI)]R-*an kappūwanzi*
    CONN=QUOT=REFL land.ACC.SG.N custom.ACC.SG.C=and again   count.3PL.PRS
3. [(*kī*=*y*)*a*=***w***(***a***   ^{NA4}KIŠIB   *api*)]*yakku niniktaru*
    this.NOM.SG=and=QUOT seal   then   move.3SG.PRS.MED
'(1) When the ancient kings return (2) and examine the lands and custom(s), (3) only then shall this seal also be broken.' (Miller 2004: 105–106; cf. A. Mouton (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 404.1.I [TX 07.05.2012, TRfr 21.03.2012]).

In this example the two clauses that close off direct speech are marked with *-wa(r)*. The use of *-wa(r)* is impossible to describe in syntactic terms here as both clauses with *-wa(r)* are part of the same complex sentence and thus only one *-wa(r)* per sentence is expected, in this case in the main cl. 3 or in the first clause 1. So I interpret (42) as evidence for the fact that *-wa(r)* spread at the end of direct speech from right to left. It is important that it is the dependent clause which immediately precedes the main clause that has *-wa(r)*. The one which is further to the left from the main clause is not marked by *-wa(r)* in this case.

This otherwise mysterious distribution is easily understood if the spread of *-wa(r)* operated at the end of the direct speech from right to left.

This distribution at the end of direct speech exactly parallels the distribution we saw in cases where *-wa(r)* marks the beginning of direct speech. The first clause to the left (which was in case of compound sentences most commonly a dependent clause) was marked with *-wa(r)*, whereas in the cases where *-wa(r)* marks the end of direct speech it occurs on the rightmost part of the complex sentence – which is always the main clause. This creates the mirror parallellism between the distribution of *-wa(r)* at the beginning and at the end of direct speech.

And it also implies that whereas at the beginning of direct speech the clause count went from traditional left to right, at the end of direct speech the count was in the opposite direction – from right to left. Both cases are united by the fact that the clause count operated from the respective edge of the direct clause – left in case of beginning of the direct speech and right in case of the end of direct speech.

The position of *-wa(r)* requires the count from right to left in only 13 cases out of the total 177 (7%), a statistically small but still significant figure. They cannot be simply ignored or written

down to scribal errors. A direct syntactic explanation of counting clauses from the beginning at the left edge of direct speech in Hittite and from the right at the right edge cannot be totally excluded but is still hard to believe. Speech is produced in one direction and the direction coincides with the left to right position on a page or even a clay tablet. It is difficult to envisage switching from rightward principle to the leftward one in writing down the direct speech in Hittite.

An explanation that comes to mind most readily is that we are rather dealing with some kind of purely scribal usage. These examples may possibly be understood as a conscious attempt of scribes to extend the well attested and dominating use of -*wa*(*r*) marking the beginning of direct speech (attested in 72% of all cases if we add up 95 cases of direct speech first -*wa*(*r*)'s and 32 cases of both direct speech first and last -*wa*(*r*)'s) to its marking the end of direct speech. In this case the count was from the opposite direction, so the structure of the distribution of -*wa*(*r*) also *mirrored* that at the left edge of direct speech.

CONCLUSION

Building upon Fortson (1998) I have shown that the distribution of -*wa*(*r*) in cases where it marked only parts of direct speech is not random. I showed that it was syntactically conditioned. The major rule governing its use is that it occurs once per complex sentence which may consist of several simple clauses, both with a dependent relationship between them (dependent clause + main clause) or coordinated (main clause + main clause, …). In this case most commonly -*wa*(*r*) is placed after the first word of the leftmost clause of this sentence. Much less commonly we see an alternative minor rule competing with the one above – when -*wa*(*r*) marked the main clause in the complex sentence consisting of *dependent clause + main clause*. In this its distribution is identical with that of the -(*m*)*a* adversative particle. Based on the statistics, this was a competing minor pattern in both cases.

At the same time Hittite texts show that by the beginning of the writing tradition and throughout its written history this original distribution was being extended in three directions: (a) -*wa*(*r*) spread over a coordinated stretch of clauses, either main or dependent, (b) -*wa*(*r*) spread over a whole sentence (dependent cl.(-dependent cl.)-main clause) from its first clause, (c) -*wa*(*r*) started marking 'end of quote' at the end of direct speech.

Statistically, the factor introduced above, namely, one -*wa*(*r*) per sentence – with several refinements directly accounts for only 102 cases out of 177, which is slightly more than half of the cases (58%). Introducing analogical spread and end-of-direct speech -*wa*(*r*) accounts for 59 other cases (33%). Only 16 cases remain completely unexplained which is a meager 9%. Many of these are examples found inside direct speech, only part of such cases can be explained.

A great number of examples that can only be explained by the analogical spread of -*wa*(*r*) over the chain of clauses of direct speech is only to be expected in view of the tendency known already from the Old Hittite to generalize -*wa*(*r*) over all the clauses of direct speech. This tendency brought about virtually complete generalization of -*wa*(*r*) in some genres of the Hittite 'literature', but in other genres the trend was in operation over all the history of the Hittite language, although it was never completely carried out.

It might be argued that syntactic explanation can simply be subsumed into the analogical extention of the use of -*wa*(*r*) from both ends of the direct speech. However, this is not so for two reasons. First, the syntactic account provides a principled assessment of the two statistically most

common types – direct speech first -*wa*(*r*) and direct speech last -*wa*(*r*). Second, quite a number of the examples that I have explained with the syntactic pattern (e.g., (**8, 9, 15, 16**) above) cannot be explained analogically at all.

Thus the account considerably narrows down the seemingly random distribution of -*wa*(*r*) building upon Fortson 1998. It does not completely remove the unmotivated use of -*wa*(*r*). Still, it is a useful tool to see the system in the distribution that was deemed erratic and irrational.

PRIMARY SOURCES

The study was based on the following corpus which is representative of all the historical periods of the Hittite language. The absolute majority of Old and Middle Hittite texts are included as well as a representative sample of the New Hittite texts.

OH/OS texts: Anitta text (Neu 1974), tale of Zalpa (Otten 1973), OS fragment of the Palace chronicle (Dardano 1997), rituals and myths as in (Otten and Souček 1969; Neu 1970, 1985), a Royal Reprimand of the Dignitaries (Miller 2013: 73–75), Laws (Hoffner 1997), oracle letter KBo 18.151 (Soysal 2000).

OH/NS copies: Palace chronicle (Dardano 1997), Edict of Telipinu (Hoffmann 1984), Hittite-Akkadian bilingual of Hattusili I (Sommer and Falkenstein 1938).

Complete body of MH/MS texts.

New Hittite originals and copies of earlier texts: rituals, myths and prayers as at http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/HPM/index.php; as well as Mursili II's Prayer Concerning the Misdeeds and the Ousting of Tawananna (Miller 2014); instructions (Miller 2013), letters (Hoffner 2009; Hagenbuchner 1989; Giorgieri and Mora 2004), court proceedings (Werner 1967), dreams and vows (Mouton 2007, de Roos 2007); deeds of Suppiluliumma (del Monte 2008), deeds of Mursili (Goetze 1933) with subsequent additions; Apology of Hattusili III (Otten 1981), other texts related to Hattusili III (Ünal 1974); Memorandum concerning Mursili III (Cammarosano 2009), Bronzetafel (Otten 1988), dictate of Mursili II (Miller 2007), catalogue entries (Dardano 2006), oracles (van den Hout 1998, Ünal 1978), treaties as in (Friedrich 1926, 1930; del Monte 1986; González Salazar 1994), Ulmitešub treaty (van den Hout 1995) and at http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_svh/textindex.php?g=svh&x=x, hyppological texts (Kammenhuber 1961), medical texts (Burde 1974), liver models (de Vos 2013).

REFERENCES

Beckman, Gary 1982. 'The Anatolian Myth of Illuyanka.' *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 14: 11–25.

Beckman, Gary 1996. *Hittite Diplomatic texts*. [SBL Writings from the Ancient World 7.] Atlanta, Georgia: Society of Biblical Literature.

Burde, Cornelia 1974. *Hethitische medizinische Texte*. [StBoT 19] Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Cammarosano, Michele 2009. 'A Coregency for Mursili III?' *AoF* 36/1: 171–202.

CHD – Hans Güterbock, Harry Hoffner, and Theo van den Hout (eds.) (1989–): *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

Dardano, Paola 1997. *Aneddoto e il racconto in età antico-hittita: La cosidetta "Cronaca di palazzo"*. [Biblioteca di ricerche linguistiche e filologiche 43.] Roma: Il Calamo.

Dardano, Paola 2006. *Die hethitischen Tontafelkataloge aus Hattusa (CTH 276-282)*. [StBoT 47.] Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

del Monte, Giuseppe F. 1986. *Il trattato fra Muršili Il di Ḫattuša e Niqmepa' di Ugarit*. [OAC 18] Roma: Istituto per l'oriente C.A. Nallino Centro per le antichità e la storia dell'arte del Vicino Oriente.

del Monte, Giuseppe F. 2008. *Le gesta di Suppiluliuma. Traslitterazione, traduzione e commento. L'opera storiografica di Mursili II re di Hattusa*. Vol. I. Pisa: Edizioni Plus Pisa University Press.

Fortson, Benjamin W. IV 1998. 'A New Study of Hittite -wa(r).' *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 50: 21–34.

Friedrich, Johannes 1926. *Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache*. 1. Teil. [MVAeG 31/1.] Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.

Friedrich, Johannes 1930. *Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache*. 2. Teil. [MVAeG 34/1.] Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.

Giorgieri, Mauro and Clelia Mora 2004. *Le lettere tra i re ittiti e i re assiri ritrovate a Ḫattuša*. [HANEM 7.] Padova: S.a.r.g.o.n Editrice e Libreria.

Goetze, Albrecht 1933. *Die Annalen des Mursilis*. [MVAeG 38.] Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.

González Salazar, Juan M. 1994. 'Tiliura, un ejemplo de la política fronteriza durante el imperio hitita (CTH 89).' *Aula Orientalis. Revista de estudios del Próximo Oriente Antiguo* 12: 159–176.

Hagenbuchner, Albertine 1989. *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter. 2. Teil. Die Briefe mit Transkription, Übersetzung und Kommentar*. [THeth 16.] Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

HED – Jan Puhvel 1984–. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. [Trends in Linguistics, Documentation 1] Berlin, New York and Amsterdam: Mouton.

Hoffmann, Inge 1984. *Der Erlass Telipinu*. [THeth 11.] Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

Hoffner, Harry A., Jr. 1997. *The Laws of the Hittites: A Critical Edition*. [DMOA 23.] Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Hoffner, Harry A., Jr. 1998. *Hittite Myths*. 2nd ed. [SBL WAW 2.] Atlanta, Georgia: Society of Biblical Literature.

Hoffner, Harry A. Jr. 2003a. 'The Queen of Kanesh and the Tale of Zalpa.' In: William W. Hallo and K. Lawson Younger Jr. (eds.) *The Context of Scripture*. Vol. 1. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 181–182.

Hoffner, Harry A. Jr. 2003b. 'Records of Testimony Given In the Trials of Suspected Thieves and Embezzlers of Royal Property (3.HI.B.1).' In: William W. Hallo and K. Lawson Younger, Jr. (eds.) *The Context of Scripture*. Vol. 3. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 57–60.

Hoffner, Harry A. Jr. 2009. *Letters from the Hittite Kingdom*. [SBL Writings from the Ancient World 15.] Atlanta, Georgia: Society of Biblical Literature.

Hoffner, Harry A., Jr. and H. Craig Melchert 2008. *A Grammar of the Hittite Language. Part 1. Reference Grammar.* Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.

van den Hout, Theo 1995. *Der Ulmitešub-Vertrag.* [StBoT 38.] Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

van den Hout, Theo 1998. *The Purity of Kingship. An Edition of CTH 569 and Related Oracle Inquiries of Tudhaliya IV.* [DMOA 25.] Leiden and Boston: Brill.

van den Hout, Theo 2003. 'Apology of Hattusili III.' In: William W. Hallo and K. Lawson Younger Jr. (eds.) *The Context of Scripture.* Vol. 1. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 199–204.

Kammenhuber, Annelies 1961. *Hippologia hethica.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Kühne, Cord and Heinrich Otten 1971. *Der Šaušgamuwa-Vertrag.* [StBoT 16.] Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Meacham, Michael D. 2000. *A Synchronic and Diachronic Functional Analysis of Hittite -ma.* (Ph.D. Diss., University of California, Berkeley)

Miller, Jared 2004. *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals.* [StBoT 46.] Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Miller, Jared 2007. 'Mursili II's Dictate to Tuppi-Teššup's Assyrian Antagonists.' *KASKAL* 4: 121–152.

Miller, Jared 2013. *Royal Hittite Instructions.* [SBL Writings from the Ancient World 31.] Atlanta, Georgia: Society of Biblical Literature.

Miller, Jared 2014. 'Mursili II's Prayer Concerning the Misdeeds and the Ousting of Tawananna.' In: Piotr Taracha (ed.) *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Hittotology Warsaw, 5-9 September 2011.* Warsaw: Agade, 516–557.

Mouton, Alice 2007. *Rêves hittites.* [CHANE 28.] Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Neu, Erich 1970. *Ein althethitische Gewitterritual.* [StBoT 12.] Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Neu, Erich 1974. *Der Anitta-Text.* [StBoT 18.] Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Neu, Erich 1985. *Althethitische Ritualtexte in Umschrift.* [StBoT 25.] Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Otten, Heinrich 1973. *Eine althethitische Erzählung um die Stadt Zalpa.* [StBoT 17.] Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Otten, Heinrich 1981. *Die Apologie Hattusilis III.* [StBoT 24.] Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Otten, Heinrich 1988. *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy.* [StBoT Bh 1.] Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Otten, Heinrich and Souček, Vladimir 1969. *Ein althethitisches Ritual für das Königspaar.* [StBoT 12.] Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Pecora, Laura 1984. 'La particella -wa(r)- e il discorso diretto in antico-eteo.' *Indogermanische Forschungen* 89: 104–124.

de Roos, Johan 2007. *Hittite Votive Texts.* [PIHANS CIX.] Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.

Singer, Itamar 2002. *Hittite Prayers* [SBL Writings from the Ancient World 11.] Atlanta, Georgia: Society of Biblical Literature.

Sommer, Ferdinand and Adam Falkenstein 1938. *Die hetitisch-akkadisch Bilingue des Hattusili I.* (Labarna II.) [Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philologisch-historische Abteilung NF Hf 16.] München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Torri, Giulia 2003. *La similitudine nella magia analogica ittita.* [Studia Asiana 2.] Roma: Herder.

Ünal, Ahmet 1974. *Hattušili III. Teil I. Hattušili bis zu seiner Thronbesteigung. Bd 2. Quellen und Indices.* [THeth 4] Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

Ünal, Ahmet 1978. *Ein Orakeltext über die Intrigen am hethitischen Hof (KUB XXII 70 = Bo 2011).* [THeth 6.] Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

de Vos, An 2013. *Die Lebermodelle aus Boğazköy.* [StBoT Bh 5.] Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Werner, Rudolf 1967. *Hethitische Gerichtsprotokolle.* [StBoT 4.] Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.