Addenda and Corrigenda to Harry A. Hoffner Jr. and H. Craig Melchert, *Grammar of the Hittite Language (GrHL). Reference Grammar*

It was long planned that—following a now common practice—addenda and corrigenda to the reference grammar volume of the *GrHL* would be posted online on the Eisenbrauns website and the respective home-pages of the authors. These plans were delayed due to a variety of reasons. As is often the case, the appearance of reviews stretched over several years, and following publication of the *GrHL* Professor Hoffner was very much preoccupied with other research projects. His sudden death in March, 2015, forestalled any planned collaboration on these notes upon my own retirement the following June.

The very long delay in the appearance of these addenda and corrigenda inevitably has had serious consequences. Most obviously, consultation with my late co-author was impossible. We had informally discussed preliminary notes written in January, 2011, in response to the first reviews, but I must stress that Professor Hoffner never had the opportunity to explicitly approve even those, so I am *solely responsible* for the content of what follows. The passage of eight years has also unsurprisingly greatly increased the number of newly published works on various aspects of Hittite grammar. It was our cherished hope that publication of *GrHL* would stimulate new research, but the gratifyingly brisk pace of activity during the long delay adds to the challenge of preparing an adequate response. Fortunately, current technology permits rapid further updating, so this surely incomplete initial effort may be modified promptly. I not only welcome but indeed solicit help in filling omissions, including any reviews beyond those listed below that have escaped my attention.

H. Craig Melchert June, 2017 (melchert@humnet.ucla.edu)

Published reviews of *GrHL*:

Adiego, Ignacio X., *Aula Orientalis* 28 (2010) 139-42.

Cotticelli-Kurras, Paula, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 100 (2010) 296-301.

Francia, Rita, *Orientalia* 78/2 (2009) 217-21.

Hazenbos, Joost, *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction* 11 (2014) 63-6.

Kloekhorst, Alwin, *Kratylos* 55 (2010) 13-24.

Philomen Probert, http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2009/2009-05-49.htm (*Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, online journal available at http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/).

Simon, Zsolt, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 71.2 (2012) 338-42.

Yakubovich, Ilya, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 67, 1-2 (2010), 148-54.

To spare users from unnecessary scrolling within this document, new bibliography is introduced as needed; author-year references are to works in the bibliography of *GrHL*.

p. 1, note 1: for further general treatments of the culture and history of the Hittites see the various sections in Jack Sasson et al. (ed.), *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East* (New York 1995), Fiorella Imparati, La civiltà degli Ittiti: caratteri e problemi, pp. 365-456 in O. Bucci (ed.), *Antichi popoli europei* (Rome 1992), and Ahmet Ünal, *Hitither devrinde Anadolu* 1-3 (Istanbul 2002-2005). Bryce 1998 should now be replaced by Trevor Bryce, *The Kingdom of the Hittites*, New Edition (Oxford and New York 2005). For overviews of Anatolian archaeology see Marie-Henriette Gates, Archaeology in Turkey, *American Journal of Archaeology* 101 (1997) 241-305, and Roger Matthews, A History of the Preclassical Archaeology of Anatolia, in Sharon R. Steadman and Gregory McMahon (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Anatolia: (10,000-323 BCE)* (Oxford 2011), a volume that contains other articles on Anatolian archaeology, history, prehistory and other topics.

p. 2, §§0.4 and 0.6: the use of the term 'archives' is merely conventional and is not intended to prejudice the much debated question of 'archive' vs. 'library' regarding collections of documents in the Ancient Near East. On this issue see the ample bibliography given by Francia, *Orientalia* 78.2 (2009) 219-220, as well as Silvia Alaura, *Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia* 87 (2015) 89-116, with further more recent bibliography.

p. 5, §0.13: there is now a gratifying abundance of instructional grammars/primers for Hittite:

van den Hout, Theo P. J. 2011. *The Elements of Hittite*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rieken, Elisabeth. 2015. *Einführung in die hethitische Sprache und Schrift* (Lehrbücher orientalischer Sprachen 2) (unter Mitwirkung von Ute Gradmann und Jürgen Lorenz), 2., verbesserte Auflage. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Vanséveren, Sylvie. 2006. *Nisili. Manuel de langue hittite*. Vol. 1 (Lettres orientales, 10). Leuven: Peeters.

Zeilfelder, Susanne. 2003. *Hethitisches Übungsbuch*. DBH 9. Dresden: Verlag der Technischen Universität Dresden.

——. 2011. Hittite Exercise Book (English translation by Esther-Miriam Wagner). Second, revised edition. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

One should also take note of the second edition of Francia 2005:

Francia, Rita. 2012. *Lineamenti di grammatica ittita*, seconda edizione (Studia Asiana 8). Rome: Herder.

and of the grammatical sketch of Watkins 2004:

Watkins, Calvert. 2004. Chapter 18: Hittite, pp. 551-75 in Roger Woodard (ed.), *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

p. 5, §0.16: the *Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar* of Johann Tischler is now complete with the appearance of Lieferungen 15 (2010) and 16 (2016). Volumes 8, 9 and 10 of the *Hittite Etymological Dictionary* of Jaan Puhvel have also appeared, completing coverage through words beginning with *SA*-. These have now been joined by Alwin Kloekhorst, *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon* (Leiden 2008)—henceforth *EDHIL*—which also includes an extensive historical phonology and morphology.

p. 9, §1.1: on the much debated question of the script(s) and languages represented on wooden writing boards see among others Massimiliano Marazzi, Sigilli, sigillature e tavolette di legno: alcune considerazioni alla luce de nuovi dati, pp. 465-474 in *VITA. Festschrift in Honor of Belkıs Dinçol and Ali Dinçol* (Ankara 2007), with references to his earlier studies; Ilya Yakubovich, *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language* (Leiden 2010), p. 297 with references; Willemijn Waal, *Anatolian Studies* 61 (2011) 21-34; and Annick Payne, *Schrift und Schriftlichkeit* (Wiesbaden 2015), pp. 104-116.

pp. 9-10, §1.3 with note 6: for a thorough review of the question of the source of Hittite cuneiform and a rejection of the North Syrian scenario cited here see pp. 370-82 in Mark Weeden, *Hittite Logograms and Hittite Scholarship* (Wiesbaden: 2011). For the recent debate regarding just when the Hittites began to use cuneiform to write **Hittite** see the proposals of Maciej Popko, Althethitisch?, pp. 575-81 in Detlev Groddek and Marina Zorman (eds.), *Tabularia Heathaeorum: Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag* (Wiesbaden: 2007) and Theo van den Hout, Reflections on the origins and development of the Hittite tablet collections in Hattuša and their consequences for the rise of Hittite literacy, pp. 71-96 in Franca Pecchioli Daddi *et al.* (eds.), *Central North-Anatolia in the Hittite Period. New Perspectives in Light of Recent Research: Acts of the international conference held at the University of Florence (7–9 February 2007)* (Rome: 2009) and compare the skeptical response by Alfonso Archi, When did the Hittites begin to write in Hittite?, pp. 37-46 in Yoram Cohen *et al.* (eds.), *Pax Hethitica: Studies on the Hittites and their Neighbors in Honour of Itamar Singer* (Wiesbaden: 2010). I share Archi's doubts that Hittite was not written before the reign of Telipinu.

p. 13, §11, end: with Kloekhorst (*Kratylos* 55.14), the spellings *li-ik-zi* and *li-ik-ta* represent a genuine phonetic loss of /n/ before a dorsal obstruent plus consonant. That the nasal is often analogically restored is unsurprising. See further the corrective note below to §1.135 (p. 46).

p. 15, line 14: Read 'Mesopotamia'.

p. 16, §1.15, end: read *eš*$_{17}$ (= MEŠ). Likewise p. 21, §1.35.

p. 18, §1.22: Read '^{m}*Maš-ḫu-i-lu-wa(-an)*' without acute accent.

p. 18, §1.23: the textual reference for *tuḫḫueššar túḫ^{μḫ}-ša* ‘cuts the *t.*’ (sic!) is KBo 4.13 ii 6-7.

p. 21, §1.35: the new value for MEŠ is transliterated as *eš$_{17}$*.

It has not been fully acknowledged that Hittite scribes use the sign <e> alone or in a sequence <e-a> to spell /ya/. One incontrovertible example is dat.-loc. pl. *ḫa-a-li-E-aš* (KBo 6.2 iii 48, OH/OS, Laws §66), which cannot be read as *ḫa-a-le-e-aš* (*contra* Hoffner 1997: 76), which could never have been a form of *ḫāli-* ‘pen, corral’, but stands for *ḫa-a-li-ya$_x$-aš*. Another is *a-ni-e-az* at IBoT 2.128 Ro 5. Compare also *ša-li-e-a-an-da* at KBo 47.81 Ro 5. In view of these sure examples, one should likewise judge *me-mi-e-ni* (KBo 10.2 ii 8 & 18.54 Ro 11) as equivalent to the more frequent and expected *me-mi-ya-ni*. Likewise, the spelling *me-e-e-ni* (KUB 42.105 iii 6) is not evidence for a suffixal *e*-grade (*contra* Kloekhorst, *Kratylos* 55.14), which could only be spelled †*me-(e)-i-e-ni*, but stands for /me:jani/. The sequence <e-a> is also occasionally used to spell the enclitic conjunction *=ya*: *šu-up-pa-e-a* = *šuppa=ya* (KBo 20.24 iii$^{!}$ 9, OH/OS; see Neu 1983: 174). See for further examples below p. 281, note 14 and p. 399, note 14. One or two similar uses of <e-a> also appear in Boğazköy Akkadian: *ki-e-a-am* (KBo 1.5 i 13&29 and iv 14) and *šá-ni-e-a-am* (ibid. iv 28): see Durham 1976: 326, note 451. Such spellings in Hittite may support the claim of Martin Kümmel (forthcoming) that Hittite /a/ had an allophone [æ] or [ɛ] after [j]: Über die hethitische 3. Sg. Präsens auf *-ia-Iz-zi*, paper presented at Hrozny and Hittite: The First Hundred Years, Charles University, Prague, 11-14 November 2015.

p. 22, §1.36: the cuneiform sign for *wa$_a$* was inadvertently omitted. See HZL #326. The penultimate sentence should read: ‘This contrasts with the customary writing of initial /wa/ as *wa-* (rarely *ú-wa-*) and initial /we/ and /wi/ as *ú-e-* and *ú-i-* or *wi$_5$-* (rarely *u-i-*) and post-initial /wa/ as *-(u)-wa-* and post-initial /we/ as *-u-e-* or *-ú-e-* and /wi/ as *-u-i-*, *-ú-i-* or *-wi$_5$-* in native Hittite words.’

p. 24, §1.44: for the identification of a plural marker MEŠ$_4$ invented by the Hittites see Jürgen Lorenz and Elisabeth Rieken, MEŠ$_4$—ein Pluraldeterminativ im Hethitischen, pp. 184-93 in Šárka Velhartická (ed.), *Audias fabulas veteres. Anatolian Studies in Honor of Jana Součková-Siegelová* (Leiden and Boston: 2016).

p. 25, §1.46: Simon (*JNES* 71.340) correctly points out that the second vowel of *pa-ra-a* is surely long, so that the plene spelling need not be attributed merely to an effort to distinguish the presence of a vowel versus its absence. Likewise the shift in accent in words like ‘earth’ also entails vowel length under the accent. Since there is universal agreement that prehistoric short vowels were lengthened in Hittite at least in *open* syllables, it is doubtful that the plene spelling in *da-a* ‘take!’ and *i-it* ‘go!’ (from an immediate preform **íd(h)i*) is motivated by avoidance of writing words with a single sign. Plene spelling to indicate question intonation also involves vowel lengthening (likely under the accent—see von Soden 1952: 206). There is considerable disagreement regarding the precise conditions under which prehistoric short vowels are lengthened under the accent in *closed* syllables, but with the exception cited below of sequences *ú/i-*

e/i-e/iC most scholars do regard instances of plene spellings in closed syllables as showing length. Of the five alleged uses of plene to mark something other than length cited here, we are left only with the disambiguation of *Ce/i* and *e/iC* signs. However, the demonstration by Alwin Kloekhorst, *Accent in Hittite: A Study in Plene Spelling, Consonant Gradation, Clitics, and Metrics* (Wiesbaden 2014), pp. 138-61, that in Hittite medial spellings of the type *ºu/ú-e-eC* and *ºi-e-eC* the *-e-* does not mark vowel length, but serves to mark the preceding glide in /we/ and /ye/ sequences—in the absence of CV signs parallel to *wa* and *ya*—has reduced the number of putative examples of plene *e* and *i* in *unaccented* syllables to near zero. One may therefore question whether plene spellings ever directly mark any feature other than vowel length—with the exception just cited and the one that immediately follows.

Kimball (1999: 67), following an earlier suggestion of Kronasser and Rosenkranz, argued that starting in MH and regularly in NH the sequence <ḫu-u> came to be used as a ligature *ḫu+u* equivalent to just < ḫu> (perhaps to disambiguate <ḫu> from the similar sign <ri/tal>). This is also partially adopted by Kloekhorst *EDHIL* 51, but strangely not applied to the sequences that mainly demonstrate the usage. As per below (§1.94), it is to Kloekhorst that we owe the demonstration that <ḫu> before vowel represents a *unitary* labialized dorsal fricative /x^{w}/ (or /χ^{w}/), already in pre-Hittite. The underlying (phonemic) shape of a root like *ḫueg-* 'to conjure' is therefore /x^{w} eg- ~ xug-/ (with delabialization of the unitary labiovelar before [u]), entirely parallel to /k^{w}en- ~ kun-/ 'to kill'. Since there is a phonotactic constraint in Hittite against [u] next to /x/ (or /χ/), /xug-/ appears automatically as [x/χog-]. There is no basis for a phonemic /Hueg- ~ Hog-/, and the idea that innovative MS/NS *ḫu-u-V(C)-* reflects a change to /xoV(C)/ (Kloekhorst loc. cit.) is quite unbelievable, especially since there is *no* such change in the labiovelar stop /k^{w}/ (which continues to be spelled *ku-V(C)-*). When we add further examples where an assuredly unaccented short [o] following *ḫ* suddenly is written "plene" in NH (*me-e-ḫu-u-na-š=a me-e-ḫu-u-ni* at KUB 13.4 iv 38, etc.) vs. OH/OS *me-e-ḫu-ni* (KBo 3.22 Ro 19), we are justified in regarding the <u> in such spellings as merely a graphic device and transliterating these as *me-e-ḫu+u-ni* and likewise *ḫu+u-ek-zi* and *ḫu+u-kán-zi*. While this does not affect words written consistently *ḫu-u-CV-* or *ḫu-u-uC-* from OH/OS, it does mean that such spellings in MS and NS are not alone probative for true vowel length (compare the similar problem with late spellings *CVm-mV* and *CV-Vm-mV*, §1.24).

Kloekhorst, *Accent in Hittite*, pp.155-158, interprets spellings of *-e-eC-* after word-initial /k^{w}-/ and /x^{w}-/ (that is, *ku-e-e-n-zi* or *ḫu-e-ek-zi*) and word-initial sequences *ú-e-eC-* and *i-e-eC-* also as spellings for /we-/ and /ye-/ and not evidence for vowel length, analogous to word-internal *ºu/ú-e-eC* and *ºi-e-eC*. Parallelism suggests that this is true for word-initial *ú-e-eC-* and *i-e-eC-* (the vowels may still be long, but one cannot cite the spellings as evidence). However, as argued above, the labiovelars are unitary consonants, and there is no glide /w/ present, so there is no motivation for a spelling for /we/. In these sequences the plene spelling surely does mark vowel length (compare the remarks of Kimball, *Kratylos* 60.24-25).

Word-initial spellings *V_1-V_1C-* also do mark vowel length. See the discussion below on §1.88.

p. 25, §1.47, third line: Read 'differentiated'.

p. 26, §1.48: Simon (*JNES* 71.341) quite reasonably laments the absence of a chart of Hittite vowel and consonant phonemes. More to the point, the basis for concluding just how many and which phonemes exist in Hittite is only rather haphazardly presented. Although many uncertainties remain due to the ambiguities of Hittite cuneiform writing, there is no reason why a more explicit account should not be attempted. For an earlier treatment see H. Craig Melchert, Hittite Phonology, pp. 555-67 in Alan S. Kaye (ed.), *Phonologies of Africa and Asia* (Winona Lake 1997), but some aspects are predictably now badly dated. In the case of vocalism the major change is recognition of two more vowels /o/ and /o:/, so that we must posit ten Hittite vowel phonemes.

Vowels

	Front	Central	Back
High	/i/, /i:/		/u/, /u:/
Mid	/e/, /e:/		/o/, /o:/
Low		/a/, /a:/	

The position of the low vowel as "central" is conventional; the /a/ may well have been phonetically back. There is no doubt that the four vowels /i/, /u/, /e/ and /a/ contrast with each other, in both their short and long varieties. For the short vowels one may cite *-ri* vs. *-ru* (indicative vs. imperative medio-passive endings), *=mi-it* vs. *=me-et* 'my' (instrumental vs. nominative-accusative singular neuter of the enclitic possessive), *ḫar-ki-iš* 'white' (nominative singular common gender) vs. *ḫar-ga-aš* 'destruction' (nominative singular), *nu* (conjunction) vs. *n=e* (conjunction plus enclitic pronoun 'they', nominative plural common gender), *al-pu* 'pointed' (nominative-accusative singular neuter) vs. *al-pa* 'clouds' (nominative-accusative collective plural), *at-te-eš* vs. *at-ta-aš* 'father' (nominative plural vs. nominative singular). For the long vowels note: *ki-ša-an* ([kí:san]) 'become' (nominative-accusative singular neuter of the participle) vs. *ku-ú-ša-an* 'bride, son-in-law' (accusative singular), *i-it* 'go!' vs. *e-et* 'eat!', *ki-i* 'this' (nominative-accusative singular neuter) vs. *ka-a* 'here, hither', *ú-da-aš* ([ú:das]) 's/he brought' vs. *e-da-aš* ([é:das]) 'those' (dative-locative plural), *ú-uk* 'I' vs. *a-ak* 'die!', *e-eš-zi* 'is' vs. *a-aš-zi* 'remains'. There are some significant changes in the distribution of /i/, /i:/ and /e/, /e:/ from Old to New Hittite. This leads to incorrect spellings in later copies of old texts (a large portion of the Hittite corpus), and one must be prepared to find *i* for expected *e* and vice-versa in NS copies of older texts.

It is now clear that, aside from a few specially conditioned exceptions, "plene spellings" (that is, CV_1-V_1 and V_1-V_1C) do indicate vowel length, but as illustrated by *pé-ra-an* beside *pé-e-ra-an* cited earlier, use of plene spelling is not always consistent. This and the fact that phonetically long vowels are *to some extent* conditioned by the accent complicates the question of to what extent the short and long varieties of each vowel contrast. Examples such as *ki-it-ta-(ri)* 'lies' (surely [kít:a(ri)]) vs. *i-it-te-en* 'go!' (Imv2Pl) [í:t:en] and *tu-uk* 'thee' [túk] vs. *ú-uk* [ú:k] 'I' suggest that the short and long high vowels are at least marginally contrastive. The situation for /a/ vs. /a:/ and /e/ vs. /e:/ remains much debated: any further studies will have to start from the very thorough investigation by Kloekhorst, *Accent in Hittite*, pp. 23-414, taking into account the remarks of Kimball, *Kratylos* 60 (2015) 23-34.

Already Rieken (2005) properly criticized the argumentation against a contrast of spellings with <u> and <ú> reflected here in footnote 38 and in the corresponding discussion by Kimball (1999: 79-80). One cannot argue for a spelling equivalence on the basis of unique *ḫu-ú-ni-ik-zi* in KBo 6.2 i 16 versus three spellings *ḫu-u-ni-(in)-k^{o}* in the preceding paragraph in the face of the *invariance* shown by hundreds of spellings with only <u> before or after <ḫ>—likewise for many other examples that show overwhelmingly either <u> or <ú>. The fact that in a few poorly attested words we may not be able to determine which spelling is the correct one does not alter this fact. The studies of Rieken (2005) and especially Kloekhorst (*EDHIL* 35-60) have fully confirmed the claims of previous scholars that the vowel signs <u> and <ú> represent different vowels, despite my and others' longstanding doubts. While spellings *ú-CV*, *ú-uC*, and *Cu-ú* represent [u:], those in *u-CV*, *u-uC*, and *Cu-u* stand for a lower back rounded vowel plausibly assumed on various grounds to be [o:]. While not every detail about the distribution of the vowel has been fully worked out, it is clear that the [o:] is to a large extent conditioned by its environment and thus in complementary distribution with [u:]. Nevertheless, there are at least a few environments where they contrasted: e.g., the dative-locative singular of *pít-tu-u-la-* 'loop, snare' must have been [pit:ó:li], as shown by instrumental *pít-tu-u-li-it*, while that of *wa-aš-túl-* 'sin' was [wastú:li] (*wa-aš-du-ú-li*). Determining the distribution of short [o] is made difficult by the fact that the *Cu* and *uC* signs are used to spell both [u] and [o]. However, there are reasons to believe that the preterite active first singular verb ending was [-on] (see Kloekhorst *EDHIL* 609), while the *u*-stem accusative singular common gender ending was surely [-un], matching the nominative singular common gender ending [-us] and nominative-accusative singular neuter ending [-u]. In sum, while the "functional load" of the /o/ and /o:/ phonemes and of other long vowels may have been limited, we may provisionally assume ten contrastive vowels for Hittite.

It is also assured that Hittite had contrastive short and long diphthongs /aj/ and /a:j/ and /aw/ and /a:w/, but once again the less than consistent use of "plene" spellings to indicate the long versions means that we cannot always tell the difference with certainty. Such cases do not refute the existence of a length contrast, as redemonstrated by Alwin Kloekhorst, *Accent in Hittite*, pp. 392-7. As previously shown by Kloekhorst (*EDHIL* 42-3, 59-60), for /aw/ and /a:w/ in native words the spelling is overwhelmingly *Ca-(a)-ú*; one finds *Ca-(a)-u* only in a few likely or assured loanwords. Whether the latter is a monosyllabic diphthong /a(:)o/ or a disyllabic sequence /a(:)o/ cannot be determined. A NH conditioned sound change of /a(:)wn/ to /a(:)on/ (Kloekhorst ibid. 42) is dubious.

p. 27, §1.54: despite the arguments of Yakubovich, *BiOr* 67.151-152, the alternative spellings *iš-pa-an-t^{o}* and *ši-pa-an-t^{o}* can hardly represent /spand-/. We now know how the Hittites wrote an initial cluster /sp-/ (see GrHL §1.11): with alternating *še/i/a-pV-*, as in *še-/ši-/ša-pi-(ik)-ku-uš-ta-* 'pin, needle' (its possible etymology is irrelevant). This practice is consistent with how other initial clusters are spelled. The absolutely fixed spelling of *ši-pa-an-t^{o}* (in hundreds of examples) makes it clear that the first vowel is real, however this is to be explained historically. Debate on the problem of this verb continues: compare H. Craig Melchert, *Journal of Language Relationship/Вопросы языкового родства* 14/3 (2016) 187-196, and the response by Ilya Yakubovich, ibid. 196-205.

p. 28, § 1.61: the work cited as Hoffner, forthcoming, has now appeared, A Grammatical Profile of the Middle Hittite Maşat Texts, pp. 111-141 in Jörg Klinger, Elisabeth Rieken and Christel Rüster (eds.), *Investigationes Anatolicae: Gedenkschrift für Erich Neu* (Wiesbaden 2010).

p. 30, §1.66: on spellings *ai/ae* for expected *e* see the remarks of Kloekhorst, *Kratylos* 55.14 with refs.

p. 32, §1.74: as noted by Kloekhorst, *Kratylos* 55.14, beside unelided *nu-uš-še-an* in Laws §78 one also finds elided *ne-en* (/n=e=n/) in KBo 17.1+25.3 i 20 (OS).

p. 31, §1.70 (and also p. 136, §5.14): an exception to the stated distribution of the allomorph *-ddu* is found in KBo 17.105 ii 35' in the sequence *na-aš-ma-du-kán*. See Daliah Bawanypeck, *Die Rituale der Auguren* (Heidelberg 2005), p. 100, but the other example she cites from KUB 12.34 i 9, alleged *nu-ud-du-kán*, does not exist. Read rather after collation *nu-wa-aš-ma-aš-kán* with Jared Miller, *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals* (Wiesbaden 2004), p. 67 with note 107. On the origin of the *-ddu* allomorph see Ilya Yakubovich, *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language*, pp. 196-99.

p. 36, §1.86: the status of word-final stops was almost certainly more complicated than implied in the statement here. As argued by Yoshida (2002: 167-70), the lenition of word-final stops in pre-Hittite was restricted to postvocalic position (e.g. *kuit=a* 'but what'), and a form like Pret3Sg *ēšta* 'was' was /e:st/. While this might suggest a neutralization by complementary distribution, it is far from certain that Imv2Sg *ḫark* 'hold!' (/xark/) and unattested but safely inferable Imv2Sg **ḫark* 'perish!' (/xarg/) were homophonous. *Contra* Kloekhorst, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 121 (2016) 221, *takku* 'if' and *nekku* 'nonne' do not prove word-final geminate /k^{w}:/, since they may and likely do represent /tak:u/ and /nek:u/ with word-final /-k:u/ < **-k^{w}u* <**-k^{w}ə* < **-k^{w}e*. There are **no** probative examples of apocope of short **-e#* in Hittite.

p. 36, §1.87: we may represent Hittite consonant phonemes in the following table.

Consonants

	Labial	Dental	Palatal	Velar	Labiovelar
Stops					
Fortis	/p:/	/t:/		/k:/	/k^{w}:/
Lenis	/p/	/t/		/k/	/k^{w}/
Affricate		/t^{s}:/			
Fricatives					
Fortis		/s/		/x:/	/x^{w}:/
Lenis				/x/	/x^{w}/
Nasals	/m/	/n/			
Liquids		/l/, /r/			

p. 36, §1.88: the major issue regarding Hittite stops is the question of the phonetic feature that distinguishes the two contrasting series and their overall distribution. Melchert (1994: 13-21) and Kloekhorst (*EDHIL* 21-25) conclude (not entirely on the same grounds) that the synchronic contrast in Hittite is between fortis and lenis stops, which in intervocalic position are realized respectively as long /T:/ vs. short /T/—although both retain for simplicity /T/ vs. /D/ in transcriptions.

The definition of "fortis–lenis" is a complex issue that does not exclude voicing (see https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fortis_and_lenis), and the lenis stops may easily have been realized as phonetically voiced in favorable environments, but there was no *contrast* in voicing. That the fortis stops were long intervocalically is shown by the fact that they close a preceding syllable (Melchert 1994: 18 and Kloekhorst, *Accent in Hittite*, pp. 21-2 and 544-6, and *Indogermanische Forschungen* 121 (2016) 213-7). Recognition of the fact that Lycian *ebette* 'those' (dat.-loc. pl.) matches Hittite *apedaš* 'idem' (Kloekhorst, *Accent in Hittite*, pp. 571-4) shows that even etymological voiced stops secondarily geminated by "Čop's Law" were realized as voiceless, so that the assumption of some geminate voiced stops in Hittite and Luvian (Melchert 1994: 20) may and should be abandoned.

The arguments of Alwin Kloekhorst, Initial stops in Hittite (with an excursus on the spelling of stops in Alalaḫ Akkadian), *ZA* 100 (2010) 197-241, for a limited contrast of fortis vs. lenis stops word-initially results in a synchronic system that is *prima facie* typologically improbable (likewise that given in *Indogermanische Forschungen* 121 (2016) 217-20). Fortis stops were generalized in word-initial position.

There is also no probative evidence for an initial glottal stop phoneme /ʔ/ in Hittite or Luvian, contra Alwin Kloekhorst, *HS* 119 (2006) 77-81 and The preservation of *h_1 in Hieroglyphic Luwian: two separate *a*-signs, *HS* 117 (2004) 26-49, and Zsolt Simon, Das Problem der phonetischen Interpretation der anlautenden *scriptio plena* im Keilschriftluwischen, *Babel und Bibel* 4 (2010) 249-65, and Once again on the Hieroglyphic Luwian sign *19 ⟨á⟩, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 11 (2013) 1-21. For counter-arguments regarding Hittite cuneiform orthography see Mark Weeden, *BSOAS* 74 (2011) 61-8. A full refutation of the claims of Kloekhorst and Simon regarding the signs <a> and <á> in Hieroglyphic Luvian is neither appropriate nor necessary in the present context. Suffice it to say that alternate spellings of the same lexemes in the same texts are attested **at all periods** of the hieroglyphs, and these cannot be explained away as "aberrant" spellings or shown to be conditioned except by various combinations of ad hoc explanations.

p. 38, §1.94: The dorsal fricatives may well have been uvulars (thus /χ:/, /χ/, /χ^w:/ and /χ^w/), rather than velars. See now Michael Weiss, The Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals and the Name of Cilicia in the Iron Age, pp. 331-40 in Andrew Miles Byrd, Jessica DeLisi & Mark Wenthe (eds.), *Tavet Tat Satyam: Studies in Honor of Jared S. Klein on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday* (Ann Arbor – New York 2016). In any case the unnecessarily algebraic use of /H/ (and /h/) may and should be avoided, at least for synchronic Hittite and Luvian.

For arguments for the existence of two unitary labiovelar fricatives see respectively Alwin Kloekhorst, *Historische Sprachforschung* 119 (2006) 97-101 (also *EDHIL* 836-9) and H. Craig Melchert, The PIE Verb for 'to pour' and Medial *h_3 in Anatolian, pp. 127-

32 in Stephanie W. Jamison, H. Craig Melchert, and Brent Vine (eds.), *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference* (Bremen: 2011). For the same reasons given above for the stops, I now choose to represent the contrast in the dorsal fricatives as fortis and lenis instead of voiceless and voiced (so also Kloekhorst *EDHIL* 27).

p. 39, §1.97: as discussed by Kloekhorst, *EDHIL* 29-31, there are reasons to doubt that the glides [w] and [j] were phonemic in Hittite. In most cases they are certainly allophones of /i/ and /u/ next to another unlike vowel. Even if a third plural like /kistnu-ant^{s}i/ 'they extinguish' was pronounced as [kist.nu.wan.t^{s}i] (which is indeterminable), this surface outcome was produced by regular syllabification rules, and the contrast with [kist.nu.man.t^{s}i] < /kistnu-want^{s}i/ 'to extinguish' was not underlying.

p. 46, §135: while one may reasonably speak of a general "weakness" of a nasal before another consonant, this paragraph uncritically and confusingly describes together what are surely a series of distinct phenomena. First, as already noted above (p. 13, §11, end, with reference to Kloekhorst, *Kratylos* 55.14), loss of a nasal before *k* or *ḫ* plus an *additional* true consonant (non-glide) is a regular pre-Hittite sound change, reflected in OH forms such as *li-ik-zi* 'swears' (KBo 6.2 iv 3, OS). See also Andrej Shatskov, *AoF* 33 (2006) 289-290. Spellings such as *ša-a-aḫ-te-en* (Imv2Pl) or *li-i-ik* (Imv2Sg) suggest that there was also compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel. Unsurprisingly, the nasal was restored in later Hittite, except in verbs in *-ni(n)k-*. Second, loss of *n* before *m* and *w* in OH was also a regular sound change, seen in *kuemi*, *kuewen* and also OH *ša-aḫ-ḫa-me-et* (KBo 6.2 ii 19, OS), as well as the cited *ma-a-wa* for *mān=wa*. The nasal was again regularly restored in *mān=wa*. Third, there is the illustrated sporadic non-spelling of a nasal before any following obstruent, likely reflecting a genuine loss of the nasal with nasalization of the preceding vowel (which may or may not have subsequently been denasalized). Both the deocclusion of the nasal and loss of nasalization may have been subject to synchronic variation.

p. 62, §2.57: see on nominal reduplication Norbert Oettinger 1998 and his further paper Das Verhältnis von nominaler und verbaler Reduplikation im Indogermanischen und Anatolischen, pp. 241-246 in H. Craig Melchert (ed.), *The Indo-European Verb* (Wiesbaden 2012).

p. 63, §2.59: on copulative compounds in Hittite see Elisabeth Rieken, Kopulativkomposita im Hethitischen, pp. 99-103 in Nikolai N. Kazansky (ed.), *Hr̥dā Mánasā: Studies presented to Professor Leonard G. Herzenberg on the occasion of his 70-birthday* (St. Petersburg 2005). For an updated comprehensive survey of compounds in Hittite see Cyril Brosch, *Nominalkomposita und kompositions-ähnliche Strukturen im appellativen Wortschatz des Hethitischen*. Magisterarbeit, Freie Universität Berlin 2008 (available for download at https://uni-leipzig.academia.edu/CyrilBrosch) and Nominalkomposita und komponierende Ableitungen im Hethitischen, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 37 (2010 [2011]) 263-301.

p. 63, §2.60, fourth line: Read 'se<u>c</u>ond'.

p. 66, §3.7: several scholars have tried to refine the notion of "Personenklasse" and "Sachklasse"—see Joseph J. S. Weitenberg, Proto-Indo-European nominal classification and Old Hittite, *Munchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 48 (1987) 213-30; Zeilfelder 2001: 198ff., and Petra Goedegebuure, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 102 (2012) 280, with note 24. However, even this revised version of an alleged grammatical division of Hittite nouns based on animacy is unworkable. The agentive and comitative use of the instrumental with nouns with animate referents in Old Hittite refutes the claim that nouns of this type did not appear in the instrumental (see below p. 269 on §§16.107-108).

The precise sense of ablative ^{d}UTU-*az* in the Anitta text (KBo 3.22 Ro 11; OH/OS) remains much debated. The interpretation of Neu (1974: 11) "mit (Hilfe von) Šiu" cannot be correct, since it construes the ablative in the wrong clause and presupposes an impossible comitative or instrumental use of the ablative in Old Hittite. Contextually, the most likely interpretation is "welches Land auch immer vom Sonnengott sich erhob…": thus Onofrio Carruba, p. 23 in *Anittae Res Gestae* (Pavia 2003), who argues correctly (*ibid.* p. 98) that an interpretation "to the east" is contextually very unlikely, but his attempt to relate the Sun-god to the title of the *Hittite* king is anachronistic, and his and others' equation of ^{d}UTU and ^{d}*Šiu*- in the Anitta text must be rejected. The word ^{d}*šiu*- is the generic 'god' here as elsewhere. See Itamar Singer, "Our God" and "Their God" in the Anitta Text, pp. 343-9 in Onofrio Carruba, Mauro Giorgieri and Clelia Mora (eds.), *Atti del II congresso internazionale di hittitologia* (Pavia: 1995). He is correctly followed by Gary Beckman, The Anitta text, pp. 216-9 in Mark W. Chavalas (ed.), *The Ancient Near East: Historical Sources in Translation* (Oxford and Malden: 2006). Beckman interprets the clause as "Whatever land under the sun rose up…". This also makes good sense in context, but the use of the ablative would be somewhat unusual. In any case, whatever precise sense one assigns ^{d}UTU-*az*, the divine determinative assures that the referent is semantically animate. In view of the very small number of examples for the OH genitive plural in *-an* (types and tokens) and the restricted nature of the OH/OS corpus, little significance can be attached to the absence thus far of any examples to grammatically neuter nouns (*pace* Zeilfelder and Goedegebuure). The absence of nouns with animate reference in the allative is a pragmatic, not grammatical feature. In sum, there remains no credible basis for animacy as a grammatical category in Hittite nouns.

pp. 66-67, §§3.8-3.10: no aspect of Hittite synchronic grammar has aroused as much controversy as the status of "split ergativity". The following is merely a very partial list of publications since the writing of *GrHL* (see for further works, including on diachrony, the references in Goedegebuure, 2012):

Dardano, Paola. 2010. Zur anatolischen Morphosyntax: das Suffix *-(a)nt-* und seine Bildungen, pp. 173-88 in Aygül Süel (ed.), *Acts of the VIIIth International Congress of Hittitology, Çorum, August 25–31, 2008*. Ankara: T.C. Çorum Valiliği.

Goedegebuure, Petra. 2012. Split-ergativity in Hittite (review article of Patri 2007). *ZA* 102: 270-303.

Melchert, H. Craig. 2011. The problem of the ergative case in Hittite, pp. 161-7 in Michèle Fruyt *et al.* (eds.), *Grammatical case in the languages of the Middle East and Europe. Acts of the international colloquium Variations, concurrence et*

évolution des cas dans divers domaines linguistiques, Paris, 2–4 april 2007. Chicago: The Oriental Institute.
Patri, Sylvain. 2007. *L'alignement syntaxique dans les langues indo-européennes d'Anatolie*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
Rizza, Alfredo. 2010. Contributi allo studio dell'ergatività in anatolico: basi teoretico-tipologiche. Sopra alcune recenti pubblicazioni. *Atti del Sodalizio Glottologico Milanese NS* 3: 144-62.
——. 2013. Ipotesi su problemi di genere, numero ed ergatività in eteo. *Atti del Sodalizio Glottologico Milanese NS* 7: 237-51.
Zeilfelder, Susanne. 2014. Probleme des hethitischen Nominativs: split-ergativity and Casus commemorativus, pp. 199-210 in Cyril Brosch and Annick Payne (eds.), *Na-wa/i*-VIR.*ZI/A* MAGNUS.SCRIBA: *Festschrift für Helmut Nowicki zum 70. Geburtstag*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Goedegebuure (2012) has refuted not only the unique analysis of Patri (2007), but also the widespread interpretation by which forms of neuter nouns in *-anza* and *-anteš* in agentive function reflect a *derivational* process by which inanimates are transferred to the class of animates. Further remarks on this point here may thus be kept brief. First and above all, the derivational analysis fails because the ergative forms are also used for grammatically neuter nouns with *animate* semantic referents (correct Goedegebuure 2012: notes 10 and 24, *contra* Dardano 2010: 180, Rizza 2013: 240, Zeilfelder 2014: 205): there is thus *no* motivation at all for a derivational process transferring an already semantically animate noun like *antuḫšātar* to the "animate class". Second, the noun *utniant-* 'population, inhabitants' which certainly *is* a genuine derivative from *utnē/utni-* 'land' (likely with the possessive *-ant-* seen in *pērun-ant-* 'rocky' etc.) proves precisely the opposite of what is intended by Dardano (2010: 178) and Zeilfelder (2014: 204). As a genuine derived noun, it naturally occurs in a variety of case and number forms and syntactic roles. It is precisely the complementary distribution of forms in *-anza* and *-anteš* to neuter nouns (appearing exclusively in agentive function) that marks them as ergative case forms of the neuter nouns, not nominatives of inexplicably defective common gender nouns. Third, the use of common gender forms of demonstratives, possessive pronouns, and adjectives to modify ergative nouns may be due to suppletion or ergative/nominative syncretism (Goedegebuure 2012: 297 with references)—that the ergative case endings *historically* reflect the nominative of stems in *-ant-* is no longer in question. Finally, the use of neuter anaphoric pronouns to resume ergatives confirms that the latter remain grammatically neuter (Melchert 2011: 162-3)—on the putative example of common gender resumption see below. These facts all uphold the split ergative analysis against the derivational alternative.

Goedegebuure (2012) arrives at the same conclusion, but argues that split ergativity only became fully grammaticalized in Middle Hittite. While this claim cannot be strictly refuted, it is in several respects problematic. First, *contra* Goedegebuure 2012: 272-3, note 11, Zeilfelder 2014: 200, *et al.*, given the robustness of the ergative pattern, it is not circular to suppose that *ḫandaiš-* (attested in agentive function at KBo 3.23 i 6; OH/NS) is common gender. What *is* circular is the unjustified presumption that any *s*-stem in Hittite must be neuter gender—already refuted by *ḫāšš-* 'ash; soap'. Since *ḫandaiš-* with its unique stem in *-aiš-* does not belong to any established class of Hittite *neuter s*-stems

(in *-aš-*, *-iš-*, *-i/eš(n)-* or *-uš-*), it must be taken as common gender until a convincing account of its stem formation has been presented. The other alleged example of a neuter noun in agentive function (KUB 30.34 iv 4-10; MH/NS) is also not probative: *kinuna* ^{É}*ḫalinduwa«š»* É.DINGIR.MEŠ=*ya parkunut nu kī <i>nan ēšḫar NIŠ* DINGIR-*LIM kuwapi paizzi zik šūrašūra*$^{!}$*š*^{MUŠEN} *apadda ītten* (sic!) *nu ēšḫananza linkiyaz* ^{É}*ḫalinduwa* É.DINGIR.MEŠ *lē ēpzi* § *nu kartimmiyaz lē kuitki nu šāwar lē kuitki*. The number of scribal errors and the discrepancy between the sets of evils in the succession of clauses leaves some room for doubt, but the reading of CHD Š 316b remains plausible: "It (the *s.*-bird) has purified the palace and temple. Go (pl.!) you *s.*-bird wherever this illness, bloodshed and perjury goes. Let the bloodshed and perjury not seize the palace and temple. Let not the anger (seize) anything. Let not the sullenness (seize) anything." But even if this interpretation is correct, we are dealing with "gapping". There is no collocation of *šāwar* with a transitive verb and its direct object. Other similar instances in Hittite show use of the nominative as the default case: direct objects appear in the nominative in lists (§16.9) and when "left-dislocated" (§30.10). We thus cannot exclude that 'anger' and 'sullenness' stand here in the nominative in what are effectively "add on" sentence fragments. Compare also the contrast in Lycian between *s=ẽne: tesẽti: qãñti: trm̃milijẽti* 'The Lycian oaths (erg.) shall strike (pl.) him!' (TL 149,10) vs. *m=ẽne tubidi: q*[*l*]*a*[(*j*)]=*eb*[*i s*]*e malija: se t*[*asa*]: *miñtaha* 'The mother of the local temenos shall strike (sg.) him, and Maliya, and the oaths of the *mindis* (coll. pl.).' There are no assured examples of neuter nouns serving as the subject of a transitive verb in Hittite.

The only example of a neuter noun appearing in an agentive role in Middle Hittite compositions in Middle Script appears in the ergative: *maḫḫan=ta kāš tuppianza anda wemiyazzi* 'when this tablet reaches you' (HKM 14:3-5 etc.). Goedegebuure (2012: 297) takes conflicting evidence of anaphoric agreement in two NS copies of a MH ritual (KBo 45 and KUB 41.8) as evidence for a transition from *-ant-* as a derivational morpheme to *-ants* as an ergative inflectional ending. One problem with this claim is that the fully grammaticalized use of *-anza* and *-anteš* in ergative function in the MS copy of the OH Telipinu Myth (KUB 17.10 iv 5-12) would need to be attributed to the Middle Hittite copyist, which strains credulity. It is also dubious to infer *anything* about the reality of Middle Hittite grammar based on NS copies, and one cannot safely claim that "In Middle Hittite therefore we may expect both common and neuter gender forms for enclitic pronouns with *-anza* antecedents" (*loc. cit.*). There is another at least equally likely explanation for the discrepancy. KUB 41.8 ii 20-21 has: '(Let the pure water (*šuppiš* A-*anza*, agentive) cleanse the evil tongue, uncleanliness, blood, sin, curse. Just as the wind disperses chaff and carries it across the sea, may it (Ø, the pure water, agentive) also disperse the blood (and) uncleanliness of his house, and may it (Ø, agentive) carry it across the sea.)' *n=aš=šan* [(*anda*)] ḪUR.SAG-*aš šuppayaš paiddu n=aš=kan ḫall*[(*uwaš*)] *altannaš paiddu* 'Let it (comm. nom. sg.) go into the pure mountains, let it (comm. nom. sg.) go to the deep springs!'. The duplicate KBo 10.45 ii 55 has *n=at=kan* (neut. nom.-acc. sg.) in both instances. Since *=kan* is known to replace *=šan*, it is reasonably certain that the MH original had *=šan* in both occurrences, but one must bear in mind that neither extant copy necessarily was made from the original. It is established that in Old Hittite /-t=s-/ at clitic boundary assimilated to /-s=s-/, including /n=at=san/ to [n=as=san] (§1.111, p. 41). The copyist of KUB 41.8 may thus have misanalyzed a *na-aš-ša-an* in the first occurrence of his model as containing the common gender

nominative singular and adjusted the second occurrence to match it. The supposed competition in Middle Hittite of neuter and common gender for enclitic pronouns with ergative antecedents may thus be a mirage. The difference between *parnaš* in KUB 41.8 iv 30 and *parnanza* in KBo 10.45 iv 35 as the subject of an intransitive verb also need not reflect any diachronic change, (*contra* Goedegebuure 2012: 299). The sentence says 'Let also this city and this house become **a ram**!'. We have here a clear case of use of either the ergative or conversion to the common gender to mark genuine animacy in a neuter noun whose referent is inherently inanimate. There is no clear evidence that these were both not available for this purpose throughout the history of Hittite (also non-probative is *nepišanza* beside *nepišaš*). Since there is only to my knowledge a single instance of an ergative modified by an adjective in an assured New Hittite composition (ḪUL-*uanza* GIG at KUB 5.1+ ii 8 and iii 31), one can also hardly draw any diachronic inferences from the fact that the adjective here has /-ants/ (*contra* Goedegebuure 2012: 297). In sum, there is at present no compelling evidence that the grammaticalization of the "individualizing" suffix **-e/ont-* in ergative function is not already Old Hittite.

p. 72, §3.20: on the secondary origin of the neuter nominative-accusative plural ending *-i* see now the persuasive account by Elisabeth Rieken, *HS* 125 (2012) 285-94.

p. 74, §3.24: although the ending *-iya* in both dative and locatival function in *i*-stems **already in Old Hittite/Old Script** is acknowledged in footnote 24, p. 69, its existence is entirely ignored here. The statement that "The only sg. d.-l. ending in OS is *-i*" is patently false. For a thorough treatment of the issue see Dita Frantiková, The problem of the *-a* ending in the Hittite dative/locative, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 121 (2016) 187-97. Frantiková also refutes the claim that the allative ending *-iya* became the "normal" dative-locative ending for *i*-stems in post-Old Hittite (putatively for reasons of disambiguation). See below regarding §4.20, p. 87.

Chapters 4-8 and 12-14: Hasenbos, *IJDL* 11.64-65, quite legitimately questions the rationale for just which forms of a given word are or are not given in the representative paradigms. No attempt at exhaustiveness in listing every spelling variant was intended (that seems the proper province of lexica), but it obviously is desirable that the paradigms be as complete as available attestations permit, and that goal clearly was not achieved. I have contented myself here with trying to fill the most obvious gaps and also recheck in particular the status of OH/OS occurrences. In order not to delay this first updating even further, only Chapters 4-8 are fully treated here. The verbal chapters will be treated in subsequent updates.

p. 80: the genitive singular ***attaš*** should be bolded as occurring in OS (KBo 3.22 Ro 10); the accusative plural *iš-ḫu-u-uš* is attested at KBo 15.31 i 14.

p. 81: genitive singular ^{UZU}GEŠTU-*aš* 'of the ear' is attested at KUB 45.28 Ro 2; nominative singular ***arunaš*** is attested in OS (KBo 25.12 ii 5&6), and likely genitive singular ***arunaš*** (KBo 3.38 Ro 32); of interest for /u/ vs. /o/ vocalism is *a-ru-ú-ni* at KUB 36.41 i 13.

p. 82: the actual spellings for the genitive singular and instrumental of ‘yoke’ are respectively ^{GIŠ}ŠUDUN-*aš* (KUB 7.8 iii 6) and ^{GIŠ}[ŠUDU]N-*it* (KBo 4.1 Vo 12).

p. 83, note 40: further *i*-stem forms attested are nom. sg. comm. *annalliš* (KUB 21.27 i 7) and abl. *annalliyaz* (KBo 21.37 Vo 14).

p. 84: dative-locative plural *kunnaš* appears at KBo 20.89 Vo 10 (MS); [***ḫantezziy***]***a*** in a *locatival* sense is surely to be restored at KBo 25.17 Ro 1 (OS; see Neu 1983: 51) and probably also to be read at KBo 17.75 i 46 (vs. *ḫantezzi=ya*); dative-locative plural *ḫantezzi(y)aš* is well attested; genitive singular *appezzi(y)aš* is also attested.

p. 84, note 43: the example *araḫzenaš* KUR.KUR.MEŠ-*az* in KBo 20.107+ ii 10 shows undeniably genitive singular of a noun ‘from the lands of the outside’; see Daliah Bawanypeck, *Die Rituale der Auguren* (Heidelberg 2005), pp. 108&116. One should thus also assume a genitive singular for the examples cited and others from KBo 3.4. There is no compelling evidence for a nominative plural common gender †*araḫzenaš*. The aberrant acc. sg. comm. *araḫzenun* at KUB 21.38 Ro 49 should be acknowledged; dat.-loc. sg. *arahzeni* appears at Bo 86.299 iii 18 and KBo 4.10 Ro 13.

p. 85: the nominative-accusative neuter (collective) plural *an-tu-u-ri-ya* appears at KUB 44.64 iii 11 substantivized as ‘innards’. I cannot vouch for the dative-locative singular listed.

p. 87, §4.20: the implication that the use of the ending *-iya* in dative-locative function is only post-OH is false, as the last example in footnote 52 already shows. For further examples from OH/OS see footnote 24, p. 69 and in detail the treatment by Dita Frantiková cited regarding §3.24 at p. 74 above.

p. 88: although it is surely a secondary creation, one must acknowledge nominative singular *tuzziaš=miš* at KBo 2.5 ii 13; an instrumental *tu-zi-it* is attested at KUB 40.61:7+13.28:11; a collective plural ^{UZU}*a-ú-li* appears at KUB 133 ii 32; a genitive singular or plural [$^{LÚ(.MEŠ)}$*p*]*urapšiyaš* is to be read at KUB 42.106 Ro$^{?}$ 13.

p. 89: however one analyzes the example from the Laws (see footnote 61), genitive singular *išḫuzziyaš* is certain at KUB 33.92 iii 15; accusative singular *a-ú-ri-in* is attested at KBo 12.69:5; the attested OS spelling of the genitive singular is specifically ***a-wa-ri-ya-aš*** (KUB 36.49 i 9 etc.); it is likely that *a-a-pí-iš(-ša)* at KUB 34.57:4 is nominative singular of ‘ritual pit’.

p. 90: ablative *ḫuwašiaz* is multiply attested at 2064/g Ro 15ff. and *ḫūwašiyaz* at KUB 10.17 i 14&33 and elsewhere; a count plural 3 ^{NA4}*ḫūwašiu[š]* appears at KUB 40.2 Ro 15 (see §3.13, end); dative-locative plural *ḫu-(u)-wa-ši-(ya)-aš* is well attested in various spellings; the OS spelling of the nominative-accusative of ‘libation (vessel)’ is consistently ***išpantuzzi***; ablative *išpandu(z)zi(y)az* is well attested and instrumental ^{DUG}*išpanduzit* appears at KUB 24.2 Ro 12; ^{DUG}*išpantuzzi* at KUB 17.21 ii 16 & iv 10 is nominative-accusative plural; the OS spelling for the genitive singular is specifically

[t]up-pí-aš (KUB 36.106 Vo 5); the OS ablative (KBo 3.22:33) is almost entirely restored, so the presence/absence of *-ya-* cannot be determined; the spelling *tup-pí-za* at KUB 23.95 iii 18 and 7.53 ii 6 may be faulty for *tup-pí-<ya>-za* or a genuine variant; *tuppiaš* and *TUP.PA*$^{ḪI.A}$*-aš* at KUB 17.18 ii 14.15&25 attest the genitive plural; also *tuppiyaš* at KUB 33.106 ii 20; note Luvian nom.-acc. pl. ^{GIŠ}*e/irḫuit[a]* in Hittite context at KBo 17.5 Vo 63; it is not assured that 'bridge' is consistently a collective plurale tantum—one should not dismiss likely nom. sg. comm. ^{GIŠ}*armiziš=ti[š]* 'your bridge' at KBo 13.86 Vo 2.

p. 91: dative-locative ^{GIŠ}*māri* appears at KBo 4.9 iv 10 & KUB 11.19 iv 12; the ablative ^{GIŠ}*mārita[z]* at KUB 43.56 ii 16 argues for a loanword from Luvian, making highly questionable the claim that the instrumental *māraīt* at KBo 17.43 i 7 is the same word with an ablauting stem (compare the separate entries in the *CHD*); 'pasture' undeniably does show an ablauting stem, but there are additional forms with *-i-*: dative-locative singular *weši* (KBo 12.73 Ro$^{?}$ 3), ablative *wešiyaz* (KBo 6.10 iv 7, 6.15:11), likely instrumental *wešid=a* (2064/g Vo 3), nominative plural *wešeš* (KBo 32.14 ii 27-28, MS) and dative-locative plural *wešiyaš* (KBo 32.14 ii 29, MS); for the nominative-accusative collective plural of 'corner' read *ḫal-ḫal-tu-u-mar* (KUB 31.130 Ro 6).

p. 92, §4.31: it is far from certain that 'corner' was ever an *r/n*-stem. Most evidence points to a neuter *r*-stem (§4.82). The few NS examples of the count plural in *-iyēš* could be built on the secondary collective nominative-accusative plural ending *-i* (on which see the paper by Rieken cited above, p. 72, §3.20).

pp. 92-93, §4.33: acc. pl. *zaḫḫauš* appears at KUB 33.92 iii 3 and *zaḫḫāuš* at KUB 36.7b iv 16; whatever one thinks of their status, one must acknowledge the existence of nom. sg. *ḫurtaš* at KUB 29.1 i 45 and acc. sg. *ḫurtan* at KUB 41.23 ii 16; likewise to be noted are spellings with *ḫu-u-ur-* (nom. sg. KUB 43.58 ii 49, gen. sg. KUB 17.18 ii 30 etc., abl. KUB 43.58 i 47, acc. pl. KUB 35.92+KBo 9.146 Vo 13) and *ḫu-(u)-wa-ar-* (acc. sg. KBo 9.146 Vo 23, abl. KUB 35.92 Vo 19), but see above on NS spellings with *ḫu-u-* (p. 25, §1.46, second paragraph); the OS nom. sg. spelling is precisely ***ša-ga-i-iš***.

p. 93, §4.34: dat.-loc. sg. *ḫaštai* is attested at KUB 9.4 i 15 and inst. *ḫaštīt* at KUB 13.27 Vo$^{!}$ 23; *ḫašti(y)aš* at KUB 30.15 Ro 1&17 is assuredly dat.-loc. plural (also KUB 39.9 Ro 8 and 39.11 Ro 50); erg. sg. *ḫaštianza* appears at KUB 9.4 i 37; ^{GIŠ}*luttai* at KUB 17.10 iv 21 is assuredly a collective plural (with Hoffner 1998b: 17).

p. 96: coll. nom.-acc. pl. *warḫūi* is attested at KUB 31.89 ii 7 (modifying *šuḫḫa*); further at least graphically syncopated forms of *karuwili-* are nom.-acc. sg. nt. *ka-ru-ú-li* at KUB 25.31:14&16, abl. *ka-ru-ú-li-ya-az* at KUB 13.2 iii 2&11, nom. pl. com. *ka-ru-ú-li-e-eš* at KBo 2.3 iv 10 and acc. pl. com. *ka-ru-ú-li-uš* at KBo 11.14 iii 28.

p. 97, §4.40: nom. pl. com. ***talugaēš***, acc. pl. com. ***ta-lu-ga-ú-uš***, and dat.-loc. pl. ***ta-lu-ga-aš*** are attested in OS at KBo 17.22 iii 7, iii 6, and iii 8 respectively; nom.-acc. pl. nt. *ta-lu-ú-ga* is attested in adverbial use at KBo 10.7 ii 27&31. For the spellings of 'rain' with *-u-* and *-ú-* before *-uš/-un*, which are quite inconsistent, see the entry in *HW*^{2}.

p. 99, §4.47: the OS dat.-loc. pl. at KBo 20.19:7 is ***ú-el-lu-aš*** without plene (KUB 8.41 ii 16 has an incomplete ***ú-e-el-lu-w[a(-)***); nom. pl. LUGAL-*u-e-eš* occurs at KUB 36.55 iii 10.

p. 101, §4.51: while it is true that no acc. pl. †*genuš* exists, the secondary acc. sg. com. *g/ke-nu-un* in 'the walking knee' at KUB 9.34 iii 34&37 cannot be denied; *gēnu* at KUB 17.29 ii 9 is nom.-acc. plural (see ibid. ii 11); dat.-loc. pl. *kanuwaš* at KBo 14.93 iii 17 likely belongs here (with Kloekhorst *EDHIL* 467).

pp. 103-104, §4.57: acc. sg. comm. ***āššun*** is attested in OS at KUB 36.49 iv 7; dat.-loc. pl. *āššau(w)aš* is multiply attested; gen. sg. *idālauaš* occurs at KBo 16.56:7&16 and *idalauwaš* at KUB 31.127 i 45; erg. sg. *idālauwanz(=iya)* is attested at KUB 29.7 Vo 29; nom.-acc. pl. nt. *ḫūišuwa* is found at KUB 39.69 Vo 4; collective plural (probably substantivized) ^{UZU}*ḫu-(u)-i-šu* is massively attested; dat.-loc. pl. *ḫūišuaš* appears at KUB 32.1 iii 11 and *ḫuišuwaš* at KBo 17.83 ii 10 & KUB 20.88 vi 15; the OS nom. sg. is ***tēpuš*** with plene; inst. *tepauīt* occurs at KBo 23.28 i 57 vs. *tepuit* at KBo 15.37 i 25; abl. *daššauwaz* is attested at KBo 19.110:4, and dat.-loc. pl. *daššauaš* at KBo 19.109 iv 6 & dupl.

pp. 104-5, §4.58: nom.-acc. sg. ***utnē*** is also attested in OS (KBo 3.22 Ro 11 and KBo 25.122 iii 1&2). The intended OS example for dat.-loc. sg. ***utnē*** is KUB 8.41 iii 15, where the contrast with *dandukišni* and parallelism with DINGIR.MEŠ-*naš=a ištarna* elsewhere in the text argues for [DINGIR.MEŠ]-*aš utnē* 'in the land of the gods' (or perhaps [DINGIR.MEŠ-*naš=a arawa*]*š utnē* 'in the land of the free gods').

pp. 107-8: on the prehistory of Hittite stems in *-īl-* and *-ūl-* (NB spelled *-ú-ul* and *-ú-lV-*!) see now Elisabeth Rieken, The Origin of the *l*-Genitive and the History of the Stems in *-īl-* and *-ūl-* in Hittite, pp. 239-56 in Karlene Jones-Bley et al., *Proceedings of the 19th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference: Los Angeles, November 3-4, 2007* (Washington DC 2008). The attempt to deny that nom. sg. *alil* 'flower' in KUB 33.68 ii 1-2 is common gender (CHD Š 179 et al.) is strained in the extreme. This noun is with Rieken 2008: 246 originally common gender, just like *šarnikzil-* 'restitution'. The accusative singular form *alel* at KUB 39.6 Ro 15 and 4.4 Ro 8 is entirely ambiguous as to gender; clearly neuter is *alil* at KUB 46.30:33 and IBoT 2.39 Vo 22. Since homophonous nominative and accusative singular forms in common gender nouns were unusual in Hittite, originally common gender stems in *-il-* were either partially converted to *a*-stems (nom. sg. *alilaš*) or became neuters. Spellings of 'thread' with *-il* are older than those with *-el*. There is thus no basis for supposing any genuine Hittite nominal stems in *-ēl-*. On the derivation of *ḫurkīl-* and *šuwīl-* (sic!) see Rieken 2008: 249. For 'restitution' one also finds NH nom.-acc. pl. nt. [*šar*]*nikzel*^{MEŠ} at KUB 50.6 iii 50.

pp. 109-110, §4.70: nom.-acc. sg. ***šaḫḫan*** is already in OS (KBo 6.2 ii 25&43) and in assimilated forms with following enclitic possessive (see CHD Š 2); nom.-acc. pl. *šaḫḫana* appears at KBo 4.10 Ro 42 and KUB 26.43 Ro 54 (NH); nom.-acc. sg. ^{NINDA}*šarāman* occurs at KBo 30.82 i 12; OS ***ku-ú-ša-an*** (KBo 6.2 ii 17; Laws §55)

means ‘son-in-law’ (Rieken 1999: 158 et al., following Starke 1977: 144) and must be stricken from the paradigm of *kuššan*; ergative singular *ḫing/kananza* is attested at KUB 24.3 ii 25 = 24.4 Ro 15; erg. sg. Ì-*anza* appears at KUB 24.1 i 12 = 24.2 i 10, and abl. Ì-*az*/Ì-*za* is also attested; dat.-loc. sg. ^{NA4}*kunnani* is found at KUB 35.145 Ro 11.

p. 110, §4.71: abl. ***taknāz*** and gen. sg. ***taknāš*** appear at KUB 43.23 Vo 17&18, which I regard as OS (cf. below p. 112, note 162).

pp. 111-112, §4.75: dat.-loc. ^{MUŠEN}*ḫārani* occurs at KBo 12.77:12; nom. pl. ***išḫimāneš*** is also OS (KBo 17.15 Vo$^{!}$ 10), and the acc. pl. has plene spelling: [***iš***]***ḫimānuš*** (ibid. Vo$^{!}$ 7).

p. 112, §4.76: abl. *memiaz* appears at KUB 5.24 i 24; *memiyaš* at KBo 5.9 iii 2 is nominative plural (in partitive apposition ‘(of) these things which…’); as per the CHD L-N: 333, all (6x) spellings of ‘(grape) cluster’ show *mu-u-ri-* (including OS KUB 43.23 Vo 21), except KUB 57.110 ii 8 (= Bo 884) *mu-ú-ri-iš*, which still is surely the same word.

p. 113, §4.78: it is crucial to acknowledge the spelling MUNUS-*anza* for the nominative singular of ‘woman’ (KUB 30.29 i 1 etc.). Furthermore, the likely appearance of /k^{w}ant^{s}(a)/ as a feminine personal name (see Hawkins apud Weeden, *BSOAS* 74.1 (2011) 70-71) supports the already persuasive synchronic analysis of ‘woman’ as an *n*-stem /k^{w}an-/ by Kloekhorst, *EDHIL* 505. A Hittite stem †*kuinn(a)*- for ‘woman’ may be abandoned; the plene spelling MUNUS-*ni-i* for the dative-locative singular is noteworthy, even if all examples are NS (KUB 7.6:10, 13.4 ii 77, 21.27 ii 16).

p. 114, §4.81: it is important to note that all plene spellings of *paršur*- ‘stew’ are spelled with *-u-*, including the OS example ***pár-šu-u-ur*** (KBo 25.79 iv 6). See CHD 193-4 and Kloekhorst, *EDHIL* 646. The majority spelling of *aniur*- ‘ritual’ is also with *-u-*, but one must acknowledge the three examples with *-ú-* (see Kloekhorst, *EDHIL* 180). The example *a-ni-u-ri* at KUB 35.54 iii 45 likely is dative-locative singular (‘held/had [ ] for the ritual’), and the reading at KUB 9.4 iv 33 (Puhvel, *HED* 1-2: 70) is erroneous, but *contra* Rieken, *HS* 125 (2012) 287, note 4, *et al.*, a dative-locative for *a-ni-ú-ri* at KUB 5.6 iii 30 would leave the transitive verb *katta dāi* ‘lays down/deposits’ with no object (or antecedent). One should assume with Beckman (pp. 198-199 in Gary Beckman, Trevor R. Bryce, and Eric H. Cline, *The Ahhiyawa Texts*, Atlanta: 2011) that *aniuri* is nom.-acc. pl., the object of *katta dāi*. However, his emendation *ku-e*$^{!}$*=kán* and overall syntactic analysis cannot be accepted: *dā*- ‘take’ in Hittite never means ‘carry’ as in English, and DINGIR-*LUM* in the next clause is the direct object, so a preposed relative clause is excluded. One should read rather *ku-iš*$^{!}$*=kán* (with Theo van den Hout, p. 4 in *The Purity of Kingship*, Leiden: 1998, and Ahmet Ünal, *Archivum Anatolicum* 8 (2005) 66) and assume a postposed relative clause: ‘Shall we proceed to do as follows? A man will go to Kuwalana, who will deposit (the) ritual materials of (= for) the deity. They will carry the deity between a billy goat and a fire, then treat him/her ritually.’ In view of the clear ergative *aniyawaranza* at KBo 10.45 iv 10 (to the verbal noun *aniyauwar* seen at KBo 15.21 i 15), it is likely that one should read the matching word in the duplicate KUB 41.8

iv 38 (sic!) with Kloekhorst, *EDHIL* 180, as erg. sg. *a-ni*$^{!}$*-u*$^{!}$*-ra-an-za*, but this must be marked as an emendation for the *a-pí-ra-an-za* of the autograph.

pp. 115-116, §4.82: nom. sg. *keššar(=šiš)* (Laws §3) is an archaism, but it is *not* in OS; as per Kloekhorst, *Kratylos* 55.16, acc. sg. ***[k]iššeran*** appears in KBo 17.45,5 (OS); the alleged dative-locative *keššar* should be stricken (for the reasons given by Neu 1980: 33-35); abl. ***ḫāpparaz*** is OS (KBo 6.2 ii 51, Laws §48); *ḫapper* at KBo 12.70 Ro$^{!}$14.15, if genuine, could represent an archaic collective plural (seen in the derivatives 'sell' and 'city'), but given the use of <pár> to spell *pé-er*, a false resolution of *ḫa-ap-pár* in NS cannot be excluded. It certainly belongs to the same word (with *HW*^{2} Ḫ 215-216 and Kloekhorst, *EDHIL* 295).

pp. 116-117, §4.84: since in all complete contexts ***ḫuppar*** follows a numeral, it is likely a "pseudo-Akkadographic" writing of the stem form, not a true endingless nominative singular; ***ḫupparuš*** is OS only if one treats KBo 17.74+ as OS (against the standard view of Neu, 1970: 7, et al.); the CHD Š 457 takes *šittar* as nom.-acc. neuter, but no passages cited prove that it is neuter. However, since all examples are NS, and all but a handful follow a numeral, whether any examples are genuine common gender nominative or accusative singulars with zero ending may also be doubted; as per the CHD, loc. cit., *šittaraš* is attested, either a genitive singular or plural or dative-locative plural.

p. 117, §4.85: all plene spellings of *kurur-* show *-u-*. It must be stressed that the OS example of ***kurur*** nom. sg. comm. (KBo 3.22 Ro 25) is predicatival, not attributive. This is also true for all instances of *ku-(u)-ru-ur* in NH texts that are functionally nominative singular or plural common gender; as per the CHD Š 62, the nom. sg. comm. *šakuwaššar* (KUB 23.54 Ro 10) is also predicatival, which may not be accidental in what is likely a NH text.

pp. 118-119, §4.88: the OS spelling of the nom.-acc. sg. of 'mouth' is specifically ***a-i-iš*** (KBo 17.1 i 15 etc.); abl. ***iššaz*** is OS (KBo 17.1 i 18=17.3 i 13). The entry for 'side' must be radically revised in the light of the convincing suggestion of Rieken (1999a: 208)—despite her own partial withdrawal of it—: one should assume a *u*-stem *tāpu-* 'flank' (body part only!), which is directly attested in dat.-loc. pl. *tapuwaš* in KBo 4.1 Vo 4 (= KUB 2.2 ii 3) and *tāpuwaš* in KUB 9.4 i 9; in the rest of KUB 9.4 this stem is replaced by a substantivized form of the appurtenance adjective *tāpuwašša-*, originally 'rib' (compare *genušša/i-* 'knee-joint'): coll. nom-acc. pl. *tāpuwašša* 9.4 i 9, gen. sg. *tapuwaššaš* 9.4 i 27 and erg. sg. *tāpuwaššanza* 9.4 i 27. As in the case of *genušša/i-* and *genu-*, the synchronic difference in sense of *tāpu-* and *tāpuwašša-* was likely minimal, but from this body part was derived a genuine *s*-stem **tāpuš-* 'side' (in general), attested only in the adverbial forms *tapūša* and *tapušza*. There is **no** support for a Hittite or Luvian derived neuter *s*-stem †*tāpuwašš-* with an inexplicable geminate *-šš-* (*pace* Rieken 1999: 209). Whether TI-*anza* and TI-*i* in KUB 9.34 ii 41 stand for the original *u*-stem or the derived stem in *-aššа-* cannot be determined. Although it occurs only in NS, dat.-loc. sg. *ḫandaši* should be acknowledged, especially since the derivation of this unique stem is quite unexplained (see Kloekhorst, *EDHIL* 291-2 with refs.). Since its stem type is entirely indeterminate, this noun **must** be classified as common gender (see further discussion above at pp. 66-

67). Several more forms of ‘ash, soap; dirt’ are attested (see *HW*^{2}: Ḫ 388-391): dat.-loc. sg. *ḫaššī* (KUB 45.5 iii 10), abl. *ḫaššaz* (KUB 24.12 iii 7), inst. *ḫaššit* (KUB 9.39 i 6, 43.74 Ro 4), but nom. pl. comm. *ḫāššeš=a* (KBo 32.16 iii 2) is entirely ambiguous (Neu 1996: 283).

p. 120, §4.90: abl. *tu[nnak]išnaza* appears at KUB 30.57+59 LCol 10; several case forms are attested with É.ŠÀ plus phonetic complements, including erg. É.ŠÀ-*nanza* at KUB 7.41 i 20, matched in agentive use by nom. sg. comm. É.ŠÀ-*aš* in the parallel KBo 10.45 i 11.

pp. 121-122, §4.94: abl. [*a*]*niyattaz* is attested at KUB 44.61 LEdge 1 (see Burde 1974: 20) and acc. pl. *aniyadduš* appears at KBo 10.45 iv 45; *kaštaza* at KBo 11.85:10 is surely the ablative of ‘hunger’; whatever its interpretation, ***štwaz*** (KBo 17.15 Vo 19) is OS; loc. **UD-*at*** is in OS (KBo 17.11 i 14 = StBoT 25 i 30); a secondary nom. pl. *karittiyaš* appears at KBo 8.47 Ro 10 (NS!) and acc. pl. *karidduš* at KBo 12.73 Ro 8 and 19.109A iv 21 (both partially restored); *karittaš* at KBo 12.1 i 7 may be either genitive singular or dative-locative plural.

p. 123, §4.98: KBo 3.55 ii 8 shows acc. pl. *ḫu-u-uš-wa-an-du-uš*; nom-acc. sg. neut. *(anda) appān* appears at KBo 18.170a Vo 6 (also *anda…appan* at KUB 13.33 ii 8); nom.-acc. pl. neut. (*anda) appanda* is multiply attested.

pp. 124-125, §4.101: nom.-acc. sg. ***uttar*** is multiply attested in OS (KBo 6.2 iii 43, KUB 37.223 d 5, and KBo 16.71 ii 10); the ergative singular of ‘blood’ is multiply attested in various spellings (*išḫananza* KUB 14.14 Vo 11, *ēšḫananza* KUB 30.34 iv 7, etc.), inst. *ēšḫanit* appears at Bo 3696 i 7&10 per Kloekhorst, *EDHIL* 257; dat.-loc. sg. ***paḫḫueni*** is OS (KBo 6.2 ii 33); all. [*pa*]*ḫḫuena* likely appears at KBo 11.1 ii 11; erg. sg. *paḫḫuenanza* occurs at KBo 32.14 ii 7&8 (pre-NH/MS) and *paḫḫuenaza* at KBo 12.128 RCol 5; inst. *šēḫunit* is found at KBo 16.89 ii 4 and 12.111:7 and erg. *šēḫunanza* at IBoT 1.36 i 34 (MH/MS).

p. 129, §4.108: since *uppi-* is the older weak stem of ‘to send’, the spellings *up-pí-ya-aš-šar* (KUB 33.93 iii 29, 23.103 Ro 23) and *up-pí-aš-šar* (KUB 23.101 ii 3.4.8) should probably be taken seriously and the spelling *up-pí-eš-šar* read as /up:ies:ar/ (with Kloekhorst, *EDHIL* 921); allative *ḫattešna* appears at KBo 11.14 iii 9.

p. 129, §4.111: the example [*pa*-]*-ar-ta-ú-na-aš* (sic!) (KUB 36.49 ii 8, OS?) may be genitive singular (or plural) or dative-locative plural; *pár-ta-u-na-aš* (VBoT 125 ii 3) is most likely dative-locative plural.

p. 131, §4.115: dat.-loc. sg. **É-*ri*** is well attested in OS; while its existence is presupposed by forms like *pēri* and É-*erza*, there are no compelling examples of an *attested* endingless locative †É-*er* (*pace* Neu 1980: 29-30).

p. 131, §4.116: nom.-acc. singular is attested phonetically in *ke-er-še-me-et* ‘your (plural) heart(s)’ at KBo 8.35 ii 21 (MH/MS) and KUB 40.28:2; one should also understand the

faulty ^{d}IŠKUR-*aš ke-er-ti-it-«ta»* in KBo 3.21 iii 12 as ‘your, the Storm-god’s heart’ (nom.-acc. singular with the OH “split genitive” construction) and likewise the faulty *ke-er-ti-<it>* in following lines as nom.-acc. sg. ‘your heart’, with Goetze and Archi, contra CHD L-N 291 and all others. As elsewhere, the copyist misunderstood the enclitic possessive and tried unsuccessfully to renew it with second singular dative enclitic *=ta*. There is no probative evidence for either an endingless locative †*ker* or an aberrant †*kerti*. The OS dat.-loc. singular is also spelled ***kardi*** (KBo 17.1 i 12, 25.102 Ro 6),

p. 135, §5.12: the second singular clitic pronoun should be given as ***-tta*** (*-ddu*), since the stop clearly is fortis. That the initial consonants of ***-naš*** and ***-še***, *-ši* are also geminate after a vowel is duly noted in §5.14. Until a satisfactory account has been given for why that of ***-mu*** is *not* in the same environment, it would be misleading to suggest that we know that the initial consonants of ***-naš*** and ***-še***, *-ši* (and likewise the local particle ***-šan***) are underlying geminate/fortis (*contra* Kloekhorst, *Kratylos* 55.17).

p. 139, §6.4: as per Detlev Groddek, p. 90, note 7, in Henning Marquardt, Silvio Reichmuth & José Virgilio García Trabazo (eds.), *Anatolica et Indogermanica: Studia linguistica in honorem Johannis Tischler septuagenarii dedicata* (Innsbruck 2016), several more forms of the enclitic possessive pronouns are attested (but for pragmatic reasons the non-first person cells for the vocative should be marked with — as non-occurring):

Allative ‘our’: *-šumma* (KBo 47.7 Ro 16', MS, $^{A.ŠÀ}$*kuera=šumma*)
Allative ‘their’: *-šma* (KBo 42.74:6' *tagganiya=šma*)
Nom.-Acc. Plural Neuter ‘thy’: *-tet* (KBo 44.65:5' [*u*]*ddār=tet*)
Gen. Plural ‘their’: *-šman* (KUB 54.75 Ro 3, [*p*]*a-ta-a-aš-ma-an*)

See for a more detailed presentation of the last example Detlev Groddek, *Historische Sprachforschung* 126 (2013) 118-22.

p. 142ff.: a number of aspects of Chapter 7 on deixis require revision or reconsideration in the light of Chapters 1-5 in Petra Goedegebuure, *The Hittite Demonstratives: Studies in Deixis, Topics and Focus* (Wiesbaden 2014), to which global reference is made. Specific remarks below are selective and not exhaustive.

p. 142, §7.1: it appears that the three-way person-based deictic contrast of proximal *kā-* (near the speaker), medial *apā-* (near the addressee), and distal *aši+* (not speaker- or addressee-oriented) was simplified in Late New Hittite (Tutḫaliya IV and Šuppiluliuma II) to a two-way distance-based system consisting only of proximal *kā-* and non-proximal *aši+* (Goedegebuure, *The Hittite Demonstratives*, especially pp. 274-6).
For an extensive and updated summary of the uses of proximal first-person *kā-* and medial second-person *apā-* see respectively *ibid.* Chapters 5 and 4.

p. 142, §7.2: on the use of *apeniššan* and *i/eniššan* see the corrective below p. 147, §7.18.

p. 143, §7.3: the table displaying attested forms of *kā-* and *apā-* requires a few revisions and additions. The dat.-loc. singular ***kēdani*** is OS (KUB 33.59 iii 7-9); an extended acc. pl. com. *ku-u-ši* is attested at VBoT 58 Ro 34 (OH/NS) — see Petra Goedegebuure, p. 60 in Ron Kim et al. (eds.), *Ex Anatolia Lux: Anatolian and Indo-European Studies in honor of H. Craig Melchert on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday* (Ann Arbor – New York 2010). There is no doubt that there was also an extended neuter nom.-acc. sg. *kīni* (matching *ini* and like the latter appearing as *kēni* in NS): see Petra Goedegebuure, pp. 309-12 in Detlev Groddek and Marina Zorman (eds.), *Tabularia Hethaeorum: Hethitologische Studien Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag* (Wiesbaden 2007). The remarks at the end of §7.4 should be revised accordingly.

p. 144, §7.6: Kloekhorst, *Kratylos* 55.17 is correct in dismissing the entire content of this paragraph, which should be stricken (see the discussion above on plene spellings at p. 25, §1.46).

p. 145, §7.11: for a much elaborated and updated summary of the paradigm of *aši+* at various stages of Hittite see now Goedegebuure, *The Hittite Demonstratives*, pp. 221-225.

p. 146, §7.17: *pace* Simon, *JNES* 71.341, note 7, and Kloekhorst, *EDHIL* 173-4 and 767, there is no doubt about the reality of Old Hittite *ana-* with near deixis and MH/NH *anna/i-* with far deixis, but their relationship is *not* that presented (p. 303) in H. Craig Melchert, 'Čop's Law' in Common Anatolian, pp. 297-306 in Jens E. Rasmussen (ed.), *In honorem Holger Pedersen…* (Wiesbaden 1994). See the corrective in H. Craig Melchert, Deictic Pronouns in Anatolian, pp. 151-61 in Kazuhiko Yoshida and Brent Vine (eds.), *East and West: Papers in Indo-European Studies* (Bremen 1997). While native (but obsolescent) Hittite near-deictic *ana-* (attested only in *ani-šiwat* 'today' and the hapax *a-ni-da-ni* at KBo 47.230:18) reflects **ó-no-*, far-deictic *anna/i-*, which first appears only in late Middle Hittite, is almost surely a loanword from Luvian, < **é-no-* by the *real* 'Čop's Law' (not the alleged limited Common Anatolian version posited in Melchert in the work cited above, which almost certainly does not exist). For a thorough description of *anna/i-* in Hittite see now Goedegebuure, *The Hittite Demonstratives* 211-17.

p. 147, §7.18: against the implication in the table given, it is *i/eniššan* that serves as the anaphoric pendant 'in the aforementioned manner' to cataphoric *kiššan* 'in the following manner' in discourse-tracking usage. See Petra Goedegebuure, *The Hittite Demonstratives*, pp. 171-7. For the real use of *apeniššan* in comparisons with *māḫḫan* and for counter-expectant focus see *ibid.* pp. 249-52.

p. 151, §8.7: for important refinements regarding the use in generalizing relatives and other free choice expressions of iterated *kui- kui-* and *kui- imma (kui-)* see Andrej Sideltsev and Ilya Yakubovich, pp. 79-83, *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 70/1 (2016).

p. 152, §§8.10-12: the presentation of the stems *dapi(a)-/dapid-* and *dapiant-* 'all, entire, each' is unsatisfactory. First, with a *single* exception (nom.-acc. pl. neuter *dapiya* at KBo 12.38 i 24), neither stem is ever spelled with the sign *-ya-*. All other forms listed as spelled with a yod should be given as *dapia°*. Second, since the lack of explicitness seems to have led to misunderstanding, the frequent stem *dapid-* is real, reflecting Luvian origin (see §4.15, p. 86) and is not an erroneous spelling for or irregular reduction of *dapiant-* (*contra* Tischler, *HEG* 3.127, *et al.*). The genitive singular †*dapiyaš* should be removed from the paradigm, but the following forms added (in addition to *dapiya* cited above): nom. pl. com. *dapieš* (KUB 44.50 i 8), *dapiteš* (IBoT 3.100:9), abl. *dapiaz* (KUB 18.12 Ro 5). On the syntax of *dapi(a)-/dapid-* and *dapiant-* see below p. 271, §17.6 with references to the works of Kimball and Oettinger.

p. 158, §9.21: the statement made here needs significant modification. Alfredo Rizza, On the syntax of numerals in Hittite and in the ANE linguistic area, *Atti del Sodalizio Glottologico Milanese NS* 6 (2011)[2012] 235-61, argues that in Old Hittite ritual texts (common gender) nouns with animate reference appear consistently as plurals after cardinal numbers, neuter nouns with inanimate reference appear consistently as singulars, while common gender nouns with animate reference show a split, appearing almost exclusively as plurals after the inflected cardinals 2-4, but almost always as singular after the uninflected numbers 5 and higher. A comparison with the MH Ammihatna ritual seemed to suggest a different system in later Hittite. Elisabeth Rieken, Die Numeruskongruenz nach Kardinalzahlen im Hethitischen, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 118 (2013) 321-38, has confirmed and refined Rizza's results for Old Hittite and shown that the same system remains intact in later Hittite. She also thoroughly discusses various conditioned exceptions.

p. 173, §10.3: as noted by Kloekhorst, *Kratylos* 55.17, the ghost stem †*kikki-* should be stricken. For a comprehensive survey of reduplicated verbal stems in Hittite see now Timothy R. Dempsey, *Verbal Reduplication in Anatolian*, PhD. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 2015.

p. 175, §10.7: the consistent single *-n-* in *ḫēwaniške-* shows that it is a "marked imperfective" form of a stem *ḫē(ya)waniya-* 'to rain' (of the small class of verbal stems in *-aniya-*), as argued by Kloekhorst, *Kratylos* 55.17.

p. 175, §10.8: this effectively gratuitous paragraph should be stricken. As noted by Kloekhorst, *Kratylos* 55.17, it is in any case incorrect as formulated, since *-šš(a)-* is inflected consistently in the *ḫi*-conjugation (see §13.15), while factitives in *-aḫḫ-* are inflected as *ḫi*-verbs in Old Hittite, but mostly as *mi*-verbs in later Hittite (§13.6).

p. 180, §11.5: on the distribution of the second plural endings *-šten(i)* see Kloekhorst, *Kratylos* 55.18, with reference to his more detailed treatment in *SMEA* 50 (2007) 493-500.

p. 181, §11.6: the table of personal endings should include a forward reference to the rare present third person endings *-z(a)* and *-anz(a)* discussed in §11.8; the first person plural

allomorph ***-wani*** occurs multiple times in OS. Despite the claim of Kloekhorst, *Kratylos* 55.18, it remains a matter of debate whether the vowel of the *mi*-conjugation preterite second and third person endings *-tta* after consonant is linguistically real or merely graphic, so one must continue to acknowledge both viewpoints. As argued by Kloekhorst, loc. cit., one may eliminate the alleged *ḫi*-conjugation preterite second singular ending *-t*, since the two putative examples may and should be restored with *-tta*: *za-a-it-[ta]* (KUB 33.106 iii 10) and *ḫal-za-it-[ta]* (KUB 30.10 Ro 9). Footnote 14 should be expanded to indicate that *-(u)men(i)* also occurs in some *mi*-conjugation verbs of the "*e/a*"-class (see the discussion below regarding pp. 198-202, §§12.21-27) and in *ḫi*-conjugation verbs of the "*a*-class" (pp. 218-220, §§13.9-14).

p. 182, note 19: the imperative second singular ending also appears in *te-(e)-et* to *tē-*'to say' (see p. 212, §12.48).

p. 195, §12.16: Alwin Kloekhorst, *Historische Sprachforschung* 119 (2006) 98-101 and *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon* (Leiden 2008), 836-9, has shown that there is no verb stem *tarḫ-* in Hittite, only a stem /tarh^{w}-/ 'be powerful; overcome, conquer', spelled alternately *tar-ḫu-* and *ta-ru-uḫ-C-/tar-uḫ-ḪV-*, entirely parallel to *eku-/euk-* 'to drink'. His argument is the complete absence of any spellings †*tar-ḪV-*, as predicted for a true stem /tarh-/ (compare such spellings for *parḫ-* 'to chase'). A unitary labiovelar is confirmed by the preterite first plural *tar-ḫu-en* (not †*tar-ḫu-me-en*). In the absence of counterevidence, one must assume likewise that 'to roast' is /sanh^{w}-/.

pp. 198-202, §§12.21-12.27: the entire treatment of *mi*-verbs with alternating stems in *-e-/-a-* requires considerable revision.

First, as correctly pointed out by Yakubovich, *BiOr* 67.150, there is no justification for distinguishing *synchronically* the group of verbs *uwate-*, *peḫute-*, *wete-* and *werite-* (whatever their etymologies, on which there is far from unanimity) from the other verbs that show a stem alternation *-e-/-a-*, which as stated in §12.23 are of diverse origin. These verbs should thus be incorporated into §§12.23-12.25.

Second, as argued on multiple grounds by Kloekhorst, *EDHIL* 727-9, the active verb †*šarre/a-* does not exist and should be stricken. The robust MH/MS evidence for a Pres3Sg *šārri* (see *CHD* Š 230) shows that the active verb 'to divide, apportion' is originally a consonant-stem *ḫi*-verb of the type of *ārr-* 'to wash' (§13.3, p. 216) and like it only secondarily joined the *ḫi*-verbs in *-a-* (§13.13, p. 219, as already correctly noted for *wašt(a)-* 'to sin'). The alleged OH/OS Pret3Sg *šarret* at KUB 36.106 Vo 5 (thus *CHD* Š 230) does not exist. As Kloekhorst rightly points out, in the sense 'transgress' we expect in OH the medio-passive. A "precocious" use of the active as in NH is not entirely unthinkable, but the verb occurs in the protasis of a *sanction formula*, which is always formulated in the present-future (and the verb at Ro 9 confirms the same for this text). We must therefore read at line end with Kloekhorst *šar-ri-et-[ta]*, which stands next to *šar-ra-at-ta* just like *mar-ri-ye-*$^{-tta(ri)}$ beside *marra-*$^{tta(ri)}$ 'to melt, dissolve'. Existence of OH *šarri(y)e-*$^{-tta(ri)}$ also makes even more understandable the coexistence of active *šarriye-*^{mi} beside *šarra-*$^{-ḫḫi}$ 'to transgress'in NH. All graphically ambiguous NS examples of the type *šar-RI-(e)-ez-zi* must be read as *šar-ri-(e)-ez-zi* (*contra CHD* Š 230).

Naturally, given the existence of a NH *ḫi*-verb *šarra*- and *mi*-verb *šarriye/a*-, preterite third plurals spelled *šar-RI-er* are ambiguous, but *šar-ri-(i)-e-er* is not and clearly belongs to the latter.

Third, while the original inflection of *mall(a)*- 'to grind', attested thus far only in NS, remains uncertain, it is now clear that we must distinguish the verb *išpār-/išpar-*$^{-ḫḫi}$ 'to spread (out)' from *išparre/a-*$^{-mi}$ 'to kick, trample'. For the original inflection of 'to spread' see Kloekhorst, *EDHIL* 406-7. For the original inflection of 'to kick, trample' and the only secondary confusion of the two stems in NH see H. Craig Melchert, Hittite *išpar*- "to spread out" and *išparre/a*- "to kick", pp. 499-506 in Piotr Taracha (ed.), *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Hittitology. Warsaw, 5. to 9. September 2011* (Warsaw 2014).

Finally, there are good reasons to think that in Old Hittite there likely *were* some subclasses within the "*-e-/-a-*" type of *mi*-verbs. *Contra* Kloekhorst, *EDHIL* 120, one cannot *synchronically* assign verbs like *zinni-/zinna*- 'to finish' to the Hittite class with *e/*zero ablaut—the Pres1Pl ***[zi]nnauweni*** is already OH/OS (KBo 17.25 Ro 2)—nor *ḫulle/a*- 'to defeat', for which we find Pres2Sg ***ḫullaši*** and Pres3Sg ***ḫullazzi*** and Pret1Sg ***ḫullanun*** in OH/OS (respectively KUB 37.223 a7 and c4, and KBo 3.22 Ro 11&15). These forms are only explicable as due to already prehistoric influence of verbs like *šuwe/a*- 'to push, reject'. However, contrary to the assertion in note 69 (p. 200), the prehistory of stems like *ḫulle/a-*, *duwarni/a-*, and *zinni/a*- (Kloekhorst, loc. cit. and the respective lemmata) shows that the first plural and verbal nominal forms in *-CumV*- are older than those in *-CawV*-. Furthermore, as Kloekhorst correctly observes, at least *duwarni*- and *zinni*- show *i*-vocalism (the reading †*zinnezzi* in §12.25 for OS ***zi-in-ni-z[i]*** must be corrected!). For one account of the unexpected *i*-vocalism see Anthony Yates, Anatolian Default Accentuation and Its Diachronic Consequences, *Indo-European Linguistics* 3 (2015) 145-87, especially section 2.1. It is likely, but not provable, that we should also read ambiguous *ḫu-ul-LI*- as *ḫulli*-, not *ḫulle*-. However, a dearth (in many cases a complete lack) of evidence for most verbs of this class in OS and MS, especially in diagnostic person and number forms, makes any definitive subdivision of the class impossible at present. And the OS examples cited above make it clear in any case that analogical effects began already in Old Hittite, so considerable synchronic variation must be conceded. Thus even further OS and MS evidence might not entirely solve the issue.

p. 207, §12.36: given the appearance already in OH/OS of spellings *-Ca-(a)-e(C)* for what can only have been a diphthong [a:j] (***li-in-ga-en*** KUB 36.108 Ro 10, ***[t]a-ma-a-e*** KBo 20.18 Vo? 4, ^{UZU}***ma-aḫ-ra-en*** KBo 17.30 ii 2), the claim of Kloekhorst, *Kratylos* 55.20, that the denominative verbal suffix was /a:e/ in attested Hittite is doubtful. In any case, however, spellings such as *tar-ma-a-e-[mi]* (IBoT 3.135 (Vo) 3) and *pa-lu-wa-a-an-zi* (KBo 44.1423 Ro 3) already in OH/OS show that the stem was *-āi-/-ā*- or *-āe-/-ā*- with a consistently long vowel (reflecting prehistoric **-ó-ye/o-*; a compensatory lengthening of the vowel, as suggested by Kloekhorst, *EDHIL* 90 and 133, is impossible, since the yod was syllabified with the following vowel and was not tautosyllabic with the preceding one).

However, the proposal by Kloekhorst, *EDHIL* 132-5, that in Old Hittite there was originally a contrast between the *-āi-/-ā*- type < **-o-ye/o*- and an *-āye-/-āya*- type < **-eh₂-ye/o*- is illuminating. Recognition of at least some trisyllabic and quadrisyllabic stems of

the latter type (e.g., *šakuwāye/a-* 'to look at') eliminates the need for *ad hoc* explanations for *tāye/a-* 'to steal' (Melchert 1994: 130 w/refs.), which is regular from **(s)teh$_2$-ye/o-*.

p. 211, §12.48: the use of *ak(k)-/ek-* (sic!) 'to die' as 'to be killed' for the largely missing passive of *kuen-* 'to kill'—at best attested in the hapax *kunati* at KUB 34.45+ Ro 11, for which see Neu 1968: 101-2 and Rudolf Werner, *Hethitische Gerichtsprotokolle* (Wiesbaden 1967) p. 53—and similar cases are duly treated on p. 305, §21.13. That these should be characterized as "suppletion", as suggested by Cotticelli-Kurras, *ZA* 100.299, is dubious, since the respective pairs in question all form complete individual paradigms and do not constitute a single averbo.

pp. 239-41: on the overall issue of agreement involving coordinated noun phrases and that of the "*constructio ad sensum*" see the publications of Cyril Brosch: Koordinierte singularische Nomina im Hethitischen und ihr Kongruenzverhalten, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 40/1 (2013) 20-41; Gemischte und pluralische Koordinationen im Hethitischen und ihr Kongruenzverhalten, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 40/2 (2013) 314-36; Agreement patterns of coordinations in Hittite, pp. 327-52 in Jürg Fleischer, Elisabeth Rieken, and Paul Widmer (eds.), *Agreement from a diachronic perspective* (Berlin – New York 2015); Genus- und Numerusinkongruenzen im Hethitischen – Willkür oder Regel?, *Die Sprache* 51/1 (2016) 60-82. See further H. Craig Melchert, Agreement Patterns in Old and Middle Hittite, pp. 165-80 in Shu-Fen Chen and Benjamin Slade (eds.), *Grammatica et verba Glamor and verve: Studies in South Asian, historical, and Indo-European linguistics in honor ofHans Henrich Hock on the occasion of his seventy-fifth birthday* (Ann Arbor – New York 2013). The last-named work also acknowledges (but does not explain) the previously recognized peculiar use of nom.-acc. neuter plural *=e* to refer to *singular* antecedents in the sequences *n=e=tta* and *n=e=šš̆an*, which continues in NH compositions (e.g., KBo 19.73 iii 73-4 *kī kuit ṬUPPU…n=e=tta=kkan…*), when *=e* has long since been replaced in all other uses by *=at*.

p. 242, §16.3 and p. 244, §16.15: Yakubovich, *BiOr* 67.154, is correct in arguing that the "naming construction" does not involve a bare stem. Examples in that form are simply further examples of "Akkadographic" spelling. The real syntax is that seen in other older Indo-European languages, an inserted nominal sentence, with the name correctly in the nominative: e.g. KBo 15.37 i 20-23 *namma=kan ANA* ^{d}IM *manuzziya kuiš* TI$_8^{MUŠEN}$ GUŠKIN *ŠUM=ŠU Eribuškiš* GEŠTU-*ni=kan neyanza n=an=ši=kan arḫa danzi* 'Furthermore, they take away the eagle of gold—its name is Eribuski—which is turned towards the ear of (the statue of) the Storm-god of *m.*' For further examples showing the nominative case in this construction see pp. 86-87 in Silvain Patri, *L'alignement syntaxique dans les langues indo-européennes* (Wiesbaden 2007), although Patri fails to understand the Akkadographic variant and falsely posits an "onomastic" case in Hittite.

pp. 244-245, §§16.11-14 and 16.17: see now Heiner Eichner, Zur Syntax des vedischen und hethitischen Vokativs im Vergleich, pp. 119-40 in Šárka Velhartická (ed.), *Audias fabulas veteres. Anatolian Studies in Honor of Jana Součková-Siegelová* (Leiden and Boston: 2016). He also cites (p. 135) a further genuine example of the nominative used for the vocative (KUB 9.25+27.67 i 42-43)—but the example from KUB 14.15 iv 29-30

is simply another of many examples for appositional direct address (§16.16). A seventh example of nominative for vocative is found in KBo 26.79:13 (Ḫedammu): see Detlev Groddek, *Studies…Součková-Siegelová* p. 157 with note 75.

p. 246, §16.18, end: read (7) for (8).

pp. 246ff., §§16.18-16.33: see for a comprehensive treatment of the syntax of the Hittite accusative Paola Cotticelli-Kurras, Indogermanische Kasussyntax: Verwendungen und Wandel des Akkusativs im Hethitischen, *SMEA* 49 (2007) 123-45. However, the use of the accusative in the expression *zupparit* LUGAL-*un waḫnu-* 'to swing the king with a torch' (p. 131, note 22) is not an accusative of respect. The king *is* the affected object, since the action removes impurity/evil from him. See on the syntax H. Craig Melchert. 'God-Drinking': a Syntactic Transformation in Hittite, *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 9 (1981) 245-54. However, on the much-discussed expression 'to drink a god' see now the correctives of Hans G. Güterbock, To Drink a God, *CRRAI* 34 (1998) 121-9 and above all Oğuz Soysal, Philological Contributions to Hattian-Hittite Religion (I), *JANER* 8 (2008) 45-58. See for a recent overall survey of Hittite verbs with alternating use of the accusative Jaan Puhvel, Transivity Shifting in Hittite and Indo-European, *Historische Sprachforschung* 124 (2011) 26-32.

Nor is the use of *ḫuwai-* 'run' with the accusative in Old Hittite ritual contexts (Cotticelli-Kurras, p. 136, example 36) an accusative of direction. As per Frank Starke (1977: 40-41), *ḫuwai-* 'run; flee' never takes a goal in Old Hittite. As shown by KBo 25.31 ii 8-12 and duplicates (and other similar passages), the OH use with an accusative and particle *=kan* is an idiom for 'to run around': NIN.DINGIR-*aš* LÚ ^{GIŠ}GIDRU-*aš pēran ḫuwāi* N[(IN.DINGIR-*aš uezzi* 2 DUMU.MEŠ É.GAL ŠÀ-*BA kētt=a*)] 1-*iš kētt=a* 1-*iš ḫarzi* 15 $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$*ḫā*[(*piēš* ^{URU}*Ḫatti* EGIR=*ŠU*)] *išgaranteš ḫaššan=kan* 1-*ŠU* [(*ḫuwāi*)] § *mān=ašta* LUGAL-*i* NIN.DINGIR-*aš ḫandāētta* L[Ú x (LÚ ^{GIŠ}GIDRU)] *āppianzi ta* A.ŠAR=*ŠUNU appanzi* 'The staff-bearer of the NIN.DINGIR-priestess precedes. The NIN.DINGIR-priestess comes. There are two palace officials of whom one keeps to one side, one keeps to the other. Fifteen *hapiya*-men are lined up behind her. She runs (around) the hearth once. When the NIN.DINGIR-priestess draws even with the king, the [ ] (and) the staff-bearer step back and take their places.' See correctly Petra Goedegebuure, *The Hittite Demonstratives*, pp. 281-2. See also KUB 56.46 ii 14-17.

p. 254, §16.48, third line: Read '*tayazzilaš*'.

p. 254, §16.54: while the word order head noun+genitive modifier with "logograms" may in most instances be regarded as merely graphic, Maksim Kudrinski, Hittite heterographic writings and their interpretation, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 121 (2016) 159-75, has presented compelling evidence for some instances of genuine noun+genitive modifier order based on interference from Akkadian and Sumerian in the Hittite of the Hattuša scribes.

p. 256, §16.60: the phrase 'is written (not spoken!) as a *preposition before* logograms or proper names' means to say that in spoken Hittite the genitive of the noun was always *followed* by *iwar* as a *postposition*, not that *iwar* was not spoken at all!

pp. 265-6, §16.92: *pace* Kloekhorst, *Kratylos* 55.21, the ablative of direction towards is well established (including with motion verbs), and in the boundary descriptions of treaties the viewpoint is always from the city whose boundaries are being described, so 'towards X' is the only sensible translation, as already seen by Garstang and Gurney. See Melchert 1977: 200-03, 311, and 358-9.

p. 269, §16.107: for a renewed demonstration that in Old Hittite the case of the agent was the instrumental see H. Craig Melchert, The Case of the Agent in Anatolian and Proto-Indo-European, pp. 239-249 in Dieter Gunkel *et al.* (eds.), *Sahasram Ati Srajas: Indo-Iranian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of Stephanie W. Jamison* (Ann Arbor and New York: 2016). Compare the remarks above on §3.7 (p. 66).

p. 269, §16.108: an important example of the comitative use is found in the Laws, §190, where one finds *takku=šša*n *akkantit tianzi* 'If they have sex with a dead person' (KUB 29.34 iv 11), matching *takku-šša*n GIDIM-*it*$^{!}$ *tiezi* 'If one has sex with a dead person' (KBo 6.26 iii 29). See Hoffner 1997d: 150. Compare the remarks above on §3.7 (p. 66).

p. 271, §17.5: most if not all participles that follow the noun are not attributive, but rather appositional or "depictive"; see Elisabeth Rieken, Das hethitische Partizip: Zur Schnittstelle von Syntax und Semantik, in Georges-Jean Pinault, Claire Le Feuvre and Daniel Petit (eds.), *Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft "Adjectifs verbaux et participes dans les langues indo-européennes", 24.-26.9.2014* [in press].

p. 271, §17.6: the regular order of the universal quantifiers *ḫūmant-* and *dapiant-* following their head noun probably reflects their original appositional syntax, which was only partially renewed by prenominal position as they became attributive adjectives (as stated in §17.9 for *mekk(i)-* and *tēpu-*). For *ḫūmant-* as originally a participle 'taken together' see Sara Kimball, Hittite *humant-* 'All, Entire, Each', pp. 201-12 in Alan J. Nussbaum (ed.), *Verba Docenti: Studies in Historical and Indo-European Linguistics Presented to Jay H. Jasanoff by Students, Colleagues, and Friends* (Ann Arbor – New York 2007). One may compare for the meaning and the syntax attested Hittite *anda appant-* 'taken together, inclusive', as at KBo 4.2 iv 39: *nu kē* ^{TÚG}NÍG.LAM.MEŠ *anda appanta* 'and these festive garments taken together'.

Sara Kimball, Hittite *dapi-* 'all, whole, each', pp. 159-69 in Dieter Gunkel et. al. (eds.), *Sahasram Ati Srajas: Indo-Iranian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of Stephanie W. Jamison* (Ann Arbor – New York: 2016), revives the root etymology of Edgar Sturtevant to **dheb-* 'massive, heavy' (or similar), but struggles with the apparent substantival inflection (pp. 167-8). The solution is that despite her assertion to the contrary, there is clear evidence for Luvian origin. As implied (but unfortunately not made explicit) above at §8.10, p. 152, forms such as abl. *dapidaz*, nom. pl. com. *dapiteš*, nom.-acc. pl. *dapida* and gen. pl. *dapidaš* are *not* to be emended (Kimball, loc. cit.) or taken as very irregular reductions of *dapiant-* (Tischler, *HEG* 3.127), but reflect that *dapi-* is another Luvian loanword into Hittite with the very productive noun-forming suffix *-it-*. Norbert Oettinger, Pronominaladjektive in frühen indogermanischen Sprachen, pp. 1327-35 in R. Bombi et al. (eds.), *Studi linguistici in onore di Robert Gusmani*

(Alessandria 2006), recognizes the stem *dapit-* as well as the peculiar non-writing of /j/ in all but a single instance of both *dapi-* and *dapiant* as reflective of a loanword, but tries unnecessarily to explain away the adjectival use in Hittite of a Luvian noun (pp. 1329-31). The predominant position of *dapi(d)-* and *dapiant-* following its head noun would be entirely in order if the original syntax was appositional: X, a mass (of it) = X *en masse*. The syntax of Luvian *pu-u-na* and *pu-u-na-ta* 'all' suggests a similar origin (see Starke 1990: 303 with note 1034 and reference to HLuvian *430 'all, whole').

Since by their origin both *ḫūmant-* *'taken together' and *dapid-* *'mass (thereof)' would have been suitable only for plural objects ('all') or for things consisting of parts ('entire'), it is not surprising that the normal attributive prenominal position is predominant with individual body parts: §17.7.

p. 273, footnote 4: the differing opinion of Francia, *Orientalia* 78/2 (2009) 220, is duly noted, but doubts remain regarding the reality of some apparently postposed adjectives after nouns written with logograms.

pp. 273-276: see on the comparison of adjectives Paola Cotticelli-Kurras, Zum hethitischen Komparativ, pp. 33-45 in Michaela Ofitsch and Christian Zinko (eds.), *125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz* (Graz 2000). Regarding the isolated use of the ablative for the comparandum (p. 274, §17.15), her suggestion (p. 38) that the dative-locative in comparison is being used as an ablative, making the isolated *kapruaz* less aberrant than it first seems, is attractive, but against her claim on pp. 37-8 following Starke, the syncretism of the dative with the locative is already Old Hittite (OS), as is the use of the dative-locative to express 'place from which', based on an extension of the "dative of disadvantage" from nouns with animate referents to those with inanimate referents: see p. 259, §16.69. See further on comparison in Hittite Susanne Zeilfelder, Steigern und Vergleichen im Hethitischen, pp. 475-82 in J. Prosecky (ed.), *Intellectual Life of the Ancient Near East* (Prague 1998).

p.278, §18.4: as correctly pointed out and stressed by Detlev Groddek, pp. 89-97 in Henning Marquardt, Silvio Reichmuth & José Virgilio García Trabazo (eds.), *Anatolica et Indogermanica: Studia linguistica in honorem Johannis Tischler septuagenarii dedicata* (Innsbruck 2016), the discussion of pronominal possession in Hittite fails to point out that it is indeterminate, not determinate (as in modern English or German, for example). That is, it is equivalent *either* to 'my X' *or* 'an X of mine'. This applies to both the independent genitive pronoun and the enclitic possessive pronouns (for an indeterminate example of the latter see the example from KuT 50 Ro 15, cited by Groddek, p. 91). This is not a new discovery: in KBo 14.12+ iv 24–5 (DŠ 28, E_3) *nu=wa=nnaš BELI=NI* DUMU=*KA pāi* clearly means 'Give us, our Lord, a son of thine!' and is correctly translated thus by Güterbock (1956: 98). However, Groddek is entirely justified in complaining that this grammatical fact has nowhere been explicitly recognized and that Hittitologists tend to assume a determinate reading as the default, often leading to wrong or seriously misleading interpretations. For example, in KUB 14.8 i 21–22 (Muršili's 2nd Plague Prayer) *n=at uēr nu ANA ABI=YA* DUMU=*ŠU* [(LUGAL)]-*ueznanni anku weker nu=šmaš maḫḫan ABU=YA apēl* [(DUMU)]=*ŠU pēšta* the sense also is clearly 'they came and asked my father outright for a son of his for the kingship, and when my father

gave them a son of his…', but Singer (2002b: 58) incorrectly translates 'his son', implying for general English readers that he had only one. Likewise false/misleading is the translation of KUB 14.4 iv 22 here in *GrHL* 137 and by others, which furnished the impetus for Groddek's clarifying treatment.

p. 279: one topic effectively entirely omitted in the description of pronominal syntax is the use of the accented anaphoric (third-person) pronoun *apā-*. For a comprehensive treatment see now Goedegebuure, *The Hittite Demonstratives* Chapters 6-9, detailing the use of *apā-* for various kinds of focus and for contrastive topics.

pp. 286-7, §§18.33-36: see on the syntax of Hittite *kuišk*i (indefinite pronoun and adjective) Chapter 3 in Mattyas Huggard, *Wh-words in Hittite: A Study in Syntax-Semantics and Syntax-Phonology Interfaces* (University of California, Los Angeles, PhD. dissertation 2015) and the alternative analsyis of Andrej Sideltsev, The Riddles of Hittite Indefinite Pronouns, *AoF* 42/2 (2015) 199-275.

p. 287, §18.35, fifth line: Read '*DINU=*<u>*ma*</u>' (Hittite, not Akkadian).

p. 290, §19.6: As shown by Valentina Cambi, The Hittite adverb *karū*: 'early, formerly; already', pp. 219-34 in K. Jones-Bley et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 16th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference. Los Angeles. November 5-6, 2004* (Washington 2005), the adverb *karū* in preverbal position always means 'already', while in clause-initial position it usually means 'formerly, earlier'. However, there are some instances where *karū* in the sense 'already' has been "fronted" to clause-initial position, such as KUB 21.38 Ro 61 *karū=ma kuiēš ḫaššanteš wemiyanun* 'But those whom I found already born…', or to the position following initial conjunction and clitics, as in Cambi's own example 10.

p. 299, §20.21: the **postposition** *katta/kattan* means only 'with, beside' (or with motion verbs simply 'to') and must not be confused with *katta* 'down(wards)' and *kattan* 'below, under' (*contra* Kloekhorst, *Kratylos* 55.21).

p. 307, §22.6: for a very useful treatment of the "historical present" see Paola Cotticelli-Kurras, Textlinguistische Annäherungen in den hethitischen Erzähltexten, pp. 43-56 in Onofrio Carruba & Wolfgang Meid (eds.), *Anatolisch und Indogermanisch…* (Innsbruck 2001). As she indicates, against the statement in note 2, the present tense examples in Old Hittite past narratives *are* examples of the historical present, when correctly construed as a means of "Aufmerksamkeitslenkung" ("foregrounding" and "backgrounding"), but the pattern of use almost certainly changed from Old to New Hittite. On the use of *preterital* forms of *-šk*e- and *-šša-* for "backgrounding" in New Hittite see the reference to the work of Alexandra Daues below at p. 317ff (end).

p. 313ff., Chapter 23: see for a brief overview of the various means in Hittite of expressing modality in the broadest sense Marina Zorman, Modality in Hittite, *Historische Sprachforschung* 126 (2013) 127-41.

p. 314, §23.7: as noted by Kloekhorst, *Kratylos* 55.21, the translation of *šešdu* in *māu šešdu* as 'have rest' is false. Whether or not the verb *ši/ešd-* (sic!) is *historically* from the root **sed-* 'to sit', synchronically the verb means 'to prosper'.

p. 317ff.: the contention of Cotticelli-Kurras, *ZA* 100.297 with note 4, that American linguists do not distinguish "aspect" and "manner of action" is false. The problem with identifying the suffixes *-šk(e/a)-*, *-šš(a)-*, and *-anna/i-* as markers of "Aktionsart" is that none of them mark any specific Aktionsart, but indicate a range of meanings whose only common denominator is imperfectivity. Aside from a few semantically motivated exceptions, they also appear freely on all types of Hittite verbal stems, including those that mark lexical Aktionsart (e.g., *-aḫḫ-*, *-āi-*; *-e-*, *-ešš-*; *-nu-*, *-nin-*). Unlike the latter, *-šk(e/a)-*, *-šš(a)-*, and *-anna/i-* are grammatical, not derivational morphemes, and for this reason they alone are treated here in Chapter 24.

On the function of the suffix *-šk(e)-* in Hittite compare the comprehensive study by Valentina Cambi, *Tempo e Aspetto in ittito: con particolare riferimento al suffiso -ske/a-* (Alessandria 2007), with reference to her earlier treatment of the topic. On the use of the basic verbal stem with multiplicative expressions (p. 317, §24.3) see the remarks of Probert, *BMCR* 2009-05-49, under her point 3 (near the end of the review). On the use of preterital forms of *-šk(e)-* and *-šša-* for "backgrounding" in New Hittite see pp. 89-94 in Alexandra Daues, Zum Funktionsbereich des Suffixes **-sḱe/o-* im Junghethitischen und Homerischen, pp. 82-99 in Rosemarie Lühr and Sabine Ziegler (eds.), *Protolanguage and Prehistory. Akten der XII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, vom 11. bis 15. Oktober 2004 in Krakau* (Wiesbaden 2009).

p. 324ff.: The debate regarding the structure and meaning of the "serial" or "phraseological construction" with *pai-* and *uwa-* continues. Two works referred to as forthcoming have now appeared: (please note for both the corrected book title/place of publication!): Theo van den Hout, Studies in the Hittite Phraseological Construction II. Its Origin, pp. 191-204 in R. Lebrun & J. De Vos (eds.), *Studia Anatolica in memoriam Erich Neu dicata* (Leuven 2010); Elisabeth Rieken, Die periphrastischen Konstruktionen mit *pai-* "gehen" und *uwa-* "kommen" im Hethitischen, pp. 217-39 in J. Klinger, E. Rieken, & C. Rüster (eds.), *Investigationes Anatolicae. Gedenkschrift für Erich Neu* (Wiesbaden 2010). See now also Bernhard Koller, Hittite *pai-* 'come' and *uwa-* 'go' (sic!) as Restructuring Verbs, *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 3:1 (2013) 77-97, whose analysis suggests that while 'proceed to…' is an appropriate translation for *pai-* (a "control verb"), the often suggested 'it happens/happened that…' is more accurate for many cases of *uwa-* (a "raising verb"), when the latter is used where the action of the lexical verb is **not** due to the volition of the subject.

pp. 332-334, §§25.11-16: see the reference at p. 415, §30.34 below to Zeilfelder 2001 on the expression of finality in Hittite, who includes discussion of such use of the infinitive.

p. 336, §25.28: given the clear space following *waqqareš*, one should retain the restoration [*ma*]-*an tiyat* of Güterbock, *JCS* 6.20 (with the *CHD* L-N, p. 142), and the interpretation 'Had she taken a step…' (*contra* Kloekhorst, *Kratylos* 55.21).

p. 338, §25.37: there is no question that due to ambiguous forms like present third plural *ti-(ya)-an-zi* there was a reanalysis that led to secondary use of *tiya-* with the supine instead of original *dai-*, but since there is no evidence that forms like preterite third singular *tiyat* ever belonged to the paradigm of *dai-* 'to put, place', the use of *tiya-* 'to step' in NH cannot be denied (*pace* Kloekhorst, *Kratylos* 55.21).

p. 338, §25.38, eighth line: Read 'infinitival'.

p. 350ff., §§27.6-27.15: It has now been independently demonstrated by Petra Goedegebuure, Focus structure and Q-word questions in Hittite, *Linguistics* 47/4 (2009) 945-69, and Mattyas Huggard, On Wh-(Non)-Movement and Internal Structures of the Hittite Preposed Relative Clause, pp. 83-104 in Stephanie W. Jamison, H. Craig Melchert, and Brent Vine (eds.), *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference* (Bremen 2011), that contrary to previous claims Hittite does not show "overt *wh*-movement" and is an "*in situ wh*-language". The placement of *wh*-words in both interrogative and relative clauses is determined by the overall focus structure of the clause. For full discussion of *wh*-interrogatives see Goedegebuure, *loc. cit.*, and Mattyas Huggard, Chapter 4 The Syntax of Interrogatives in *Wh-words in Hittite: A Study in Syntax-Semantics and Syntax-Phonology Interfaces* (University of California, Los Angeles, PhD. dissertation 2015). For the implications for Hittite relative clauses see the comments on §§30.58-64 (pp. 423-26) below.

pp. 350-51, §27.7: recognition that Hittite is in fact an "*in situ wh*-language" resolves the paradox that the word order in interrogatives of the type 'what is this/that?' is of the type *kī=wa kuit* (KBo 6.34 i 36 etc.), noted by Olav Hackstein, p. 351 with note 7, in his paper Von der Diskurssyntax zur Satzsyntax: Hethitisch *kī kuit*, pp. 345-59 in Detlev Groddek and Sylvester Rößle (eds.), *Šarnikzel. Hethitologische Studien zum Gedenken an Emil Orgetorix Forrer* (Dresden 2004). However, the example cited by Hackstein at KBo 22.2 Ro 2 is not an ordinary question, but belongs to the exclamatory 'what kind of…?!' *kī kuit* type: [*k*]*ī=wa kuit walkuwan ḫāšḫun* 'What kind of *w*. have I given birth to?' (with Otten 1973: 7). Likewise, the example cited here (*GrHL* §27.7) from KUB 31.4 + KBo 3.41 Vo 15–6 is not an ordinary informational question, but the exclamatory type: *uk=uš punuškemi* [*kī=wa k*]*uit walkuwan* [*išḫam*]*ai*[*šte*]*ni* 'I ask them: "What is this monstrosity/gibberish you are singing?"'. See on these clauses and the sense of *walkuwan* H. Craig Melchert, p. 207 in: Hittite *kī (kuit)* and Vedic "*sá-figé*", pp. 204-13 in Andrew Miles Byrd, Jessica DeLisi and Mark Wenthe (eds.), *Tavet Tat Satyam. Studies in Honor of Jared S. Klein on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday* (Ann Arbor and New York 2016).

p. 364, §28.42: for the relevance of the use of reflexive pronouns in nominal sentences in Hieroglyphic Luvian to the emergence of the same use in Middle Hittite see now Ilya Yakubovich, *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language*, pp. 184-88.

p.386, §28.127, third line: Read 'may be translated'.

pp. 395-9: for excellent further discussion of the syntax and function of *=a/=ma* see Petra Goedegebuure, *The Hittite Demonstratives* Chapter 9. As she makes clear, however, the findings based primarily on the interaction of non-geminating *=a/=ma* and *apā-* require amplification and confirmation based on a broader survey of the use of *=a/=ma*. Many of her results are also incorporated into the study by Andrej Sideltsev and Maria Molina, Enclitic *-(m)a* 'but', clause architecture and the prosody of focus in Hittite, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 120 (2015) 209-53, who further address the problem of the function and syntax of **clause-internal** *=a/=ma* and its pattern of use with subordinating conjunctions, as well as the interplay of syntax and phonology (prosody) in the behavior of both *=a/=ma* and *=a/=ya*. Their example (27) from HKM 72 Ro 9-10 should almost certainly not be emended, but it nevertheless is another example of the preverbal contrastive focus they identify: *n=ašta* ^{GIŠ}*murta tuel=ma* [--] *karšš̌andu* "Let *your* (men) cut *m.*-wood!" (against the preceding advice to wait for wood to finish the bridge).

p. 400, sixth line: Read 'occasional'.

pp. 400-01, §§29.41-45: for a thorough demonstration of the functional difference between clause-coordinating geminating *=a/=ya* '(both…)and' and expanding focus geminating *=a/=ya* 'also; even' and their syntactic behavior see Petra Goedegebuure, *The Hittite Demonstratives*, Chapter 8. However, as discussed below, p. 410 regarding §30.15, the long-supposed distinction of "initial" and "first" position in the clause does not exist at the level of syntax. So the complementary distribution of the *clause-coordinating* geminating *=a/=ya* '(both…)and' and *ta* or *nu* is due to the fact that they are members of the same functional class and are semantically mutually exclusive.

pp. 402ff., §§29.48ff.: on the function of clausal asyndeton in Hittite see Harry A. Hoffner, Asyndeton in Hittite, pp. 385-99 in Detlev Groddek and Marina Zorman (eds.), *Tabularia Hethaeorum: Festschrift für Silvin Košak* (Wiesbaden 2007) and Susanne Heinhold-Krahmer, Asyndeton in vorangestellten temporalen Nebensätzen mit der Konjunktion *kuwapi*?, pp. 106-22 in Itamar Singer (ed.), *ipamati kistamati pari tumatimis: Luwian and Hittite Studies Presented to J. David Hawkins on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday* (Tel Aviv 2010). Their combined results show that the condition "…where there is no connection to a previous clause" includes not only (a) the beginning of a composition and (b) direct speech, but also (c) the beginning of a new major discourse unit and (d) parenthetical epexegetic insertions.

p. 409, §30.11: Contrary to the claim made here, it is highly unlikely that "right dislocation" is a genuine feature of native Hittite. First of all, examples in translation literature are clearly motivated by the desire to imitate the word order of the source language and as "translationese" *cannot* be used as evidence for Hittite grammar. See for Hittite texts based on Hattic Alfredo Rizza, *I pronomi enclitici nei testi etei di traduzione dal hattico* (Pavia 2007), esp. pp. 68-73 and 171-173. For texts based on Hurrian models see Elisabeth Rieken, Verberststellung in hethitischen Übersetzungstexten, pp. 498-507 in Thomas Krisch & Thomas Lindner (eds.), *Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog: Akten der XIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 21. bis 27. September 2008 in Salzburg* (Wiesbaden 2011), esp. p. 499. For arguments against the

reality of the alleged handful of examples in native Hittite contexts see H. Craig Melchert, Alleged "Right Dislocation" in Hittite, pp. 137-145 in Andreas Müller-Karpe, Elisabeth Rieken & Walter Sommerfeld (eds.), *Saeculum: Gedenkschrift für Heinrich Otten anlässlich seines 100. Geburtstags* (Wiesbaden 2015 = StBoT 58). For an unpersuasive attempt to demonstrate true discourse grammatical function for such structures in translation and non-translation literature see Andrej Sideltsev, The Origin of Hittite Right Dislocations, pp. 827-72 in Piotr Taracha (ed.), *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Hittitology: Warsaw, 5-9 September 2011* (Warsaw 2014).

p. 410, §30.15: as demonstrated by Brian Agbayani and Chris Golston, Second-position is first-position: Wackernagel's Law and the role of clausal conjunction, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 115 (2010) 1-21, interclausal conjunctions are in fact syntactically interclausal—they do not stand *first* in the second clause. The result of this realization is that syntactically so-called "initial position" and "first position" are identical. It is the various constituents listed in columns 1-6 that appear syntactically *first* in the clause (I emphasize that determining their structural positions and ordering in relation to each other is far from settled). Syntactically, the pronoun *=uš* 'them' in *partaunit=uš* "them with a wing" and in *t=uš* "and them" is clause-initial in both cases. Since the pronoun is prosodically weak and cannot stand at the left edge of a phonological phrase, it is in the spoken sentence attached in the first instance as a clitic to the first fully accented word in the clause (there being no other available host), while in the second instance it is attached as a clitic to the interclausal conjunction. The presentation of Agbayani and Golston represents merely one formal analysis of this "syntax-phonology" interface. What is crucial is that there is no syntactic structural difference between the two configurations, other than the presence of an interclausal conjunction instead of clausal asyndeton.

pp. 411-412, §30.19: on the origin of repeated enclitic sequences such as *n=at=ši=at* as resulting from interference from Luvian see Yakubovich, *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language*, 357-67, with reference to Elisabeth Rieken, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 33 (2006) 278.

p. 415, §30.34:

(1) The temporal use of *maḫḫan* and temporal and conditional use of *kuwapi* actually begins in Middle Hittite: see Alexandra Daues, "Zum Bedeutungsspektrum von heth. *kuwapi*", *Historische Sprachforschung* 125 (2012) 90-111 (espec. p. 93). See further below p. 417 regarding §30.39.

(2) a further type of dependent clause must be recognized for New Hittite, that introduced by *eni kuit* 'as to that fact that' and *kī kuit* 'as to this fact that…'. See on their usage Petra Goedegebuure, *The Hittite Demonstratives* (2010) 162-8 and 310-11. For two competing accounts of their origin see Olav Hackstein, Von der Diskurssyntax zur Satzsyntax: Hethitisch *kī kuit*, pp. 345-59 in Detlev Groddek and Sylvester Rößle (eds.), *Šarnikzel. Hethitologische Studien zum Gedenken an Emil Orgetorix Forrer* (Dresden 2004) and H. Craig Melchert (following Gary Holland), pp. 205-7 in: Hittite *kī (kuit)* and Vedic "*sá-*

figé", pp. 204-13 in Andrew Miles Byrd, Jessica DeLisi and Mark Wenthe (eds.), *Tavet Tat Satyam. Studies in Honor of Jared S. Klein on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday* (Ann Arbor – New York: 2016). However, the claim by Melchert (2016: 205, note 3) that in oracular questions *eni kuit* and *kī kuit* are pragmatically equivalent must be rejected—see rather Goedegebuure, *loc. cit.*

(3) for a thorough treatment of the expression of "finality" in Hittite see Susanne Zeilfelder, Zum Ausdruck der Finalität im Hethitischen, pp. 395-410 in Onofrio Carruba & Wolfgang Meid (eds.), *Anatolisch und Indogermanisch…* (Innsbruck 2001). Note in particular her tentative but plausible identification of two instances of *mān* indicating finality (p. 400). NB that only §§25.11-16 here actually treat infinitives expressing finality.

p. 417, §30.38: as established by Alexandra Daues, *Historische Sprachforschung* 125 (2012) 91-4, *maḫḫan* in *temporal* use is incompatible with "marked imperfective" verbal forms in *-ške-*. See also immediately below on *kuwapi*.

p. 417, §30.39: for a comprehensive treatment of the contrast in usage between *maḫḫan* and *kuwapi* as **temporal** subordinating conjunctions see Alexandra Daues, "Zum Bedeutungsspektrum von heth. *kuwapi*", *Historische Sprachforschung* 125 (2012) 90-111, who carefully distinguishes between the use of the preterite and the present of *kuwapi*. However, the apparent use of both *maḫḫan* and *kuwapi* as temporal conjunctions in the same clause (Bo 86/299 ii 53-55 cited in note 33 and KBo 6.29 ii 22-23 cited as example (16) p. 108) is a mirage: one may in each case take *kuwapi* as an indefinite 'at some time' (more idiomatically in English 'at a certain time'), which also explains the unexpected position of *kuwapi* in the first instance. NB that Daues amply confirms, as long silently but not explicitly acknowledged, that *kuwapi* with the present-future often has a conditional sense: 'in (the) case that'. For the specific use of *kuwapi natta (ŪL)* in the sense 'if not' see pp. 126-7 in Elisabeth Rieken and David Sasseville, Hethitisch *kuwapi UL, kattan išḫaššarwaḫḫ-* und KUB 21.38 Vs. 14′, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 39 (2012) 124-9.

p. 419, §30.46: for a more comprehensive and fine-grained analysis of concessive clauses in Hittite see Rosemarie Lühr, Einräumung und Zugeständnis: Skalare und universale konzessive Konditionalsätze im Hethitischen, pp. 221-230 in J. Prosecky (ed.), *Intellectual Life of the Ancient Near East. Papers Presented at the 43rd Rencontre assyriologique internationale, Prague, July 1–5., 1996* (Prague 1998).

p. 421, §30.52: as noted by Probert, *BMCR* 2009-05-49, note 2, the statement that *mān* in the first clause of the citation from KBo 5.6 iii 12-13 is the potential particle and not the conjunction 'if' contradicts what is said on p. 315 (top, under §23.10). The latter formulation is correct, and *mān* in *mān=wa=mu…paišti* is the conjunction: 'If you give me…'.

pp. 423-26, §§30.58-30.64: recent research has shown that major revisions are required in the description given of Hittite relative clauses (RCs):

(1) there are several more types of Hittite RCs than previously acknowledged. For a summary (by no means exhaustive) see H. Craig Melchert, Relative Clauses in Anatolian, pp. 287-95 in Sergio Neri, Roland Schuhmann and Susanne Zeilfelder (eds.), »dat ih dir it nu bi huldi gibu« *Linguistische, germanistische und indogermanistische Studien Rosemarie Lühr gewidmet* (Wiesbaden 2016). First, against the claim in §30.58 Hittite *does* rarely but undeniably show some RC's embedded *within* the main clause: *namma=ma=za damain BELAM kui«e»š=aš kuiš* [UKU-*aš*] *ANA* ^{d}UTU-*ŠI* EGIR-*an arḫa lē kuinki šākti* 'Furthermore, do not recognize any other lord, whatsoever [person] he is, behind the back of His Majesty!' (KBo 5.3 i 14-15; MH/NS). Besides this "non-restrictive" example there are also at least one instance each of such embedded "restrictive" and "indefinite" RCs (see Melchert, *op. cit.* p. 293). Second, internally headed RCs may also rarely be embedded as noun phrases coordinated with another noun phrase: *kāša* ^{m}*Hattušiliš* LUGAL.GAL *šummaš ANA* LÚ.ME.EŠ ^{URU}*Tiliura araḫzanda=ya kuiēš* URU.DIDLI.HI.A *zik EN* KUR-*TI kuiēš maniyaḫḫeškeši ANA* LÚ.ME.EŠ ^{URU}*Hatti* LÚ.ME.EŠ ^{URU}*Gašga=ya išḫiūl kišan išḫiyanun* 'I Hattusili, the Great King, have made a treaty (lit. bound an obligation) as follows for you, the people of Tiliura, and (for) the cities that are round about, which you, governor of the boundary territory administer, for both Hittites and Gasgeans.' (KUB 21.29 i 6–10; NH). This very complex sentence also has a postposed non-restrictive RC modifying the embedded RC. Third, Probert (2006) has argued for the existence in Old Hittite of embedded RCs that are "fronted" *within* their clause. Finally, besides previously recognized "non-restrictive" and "indefinite" types (§§30.62-30.63), Hittite postposed RCs also include restrictive examples: *apūnn=a=za arḫa d*[(*āl*)]*i karū=za kuin ḫarši* 'Also let go/give up the one whom you already have (as wife)!' (KBo 5.3+ iii 63-64). There is also an apparent example of a postposed "free" RC (without true antecedent): *n=at=za ariyami kuit=mu* Ú SIxSÁ-*ri* 'I will investigate by oracle which herb is determined for me.' (KUB 22.61 Vo! 16-19; NH).

(2) Contrary to the claim in §30.59, Hittite does *not* show overt "*wh*-movement": see Petra Goedegebuure, Focus structure and Q-word questions in Hittite, *Linguistics* 47/4 (2009) 945-69, and Mattyas Huggard, On Wh-(Non)-Movement and Internal Structures of the Hittite Preposed Relative Clause, pp. 83-104 in Stephanie W. Jamison, H. Craig Melchert, and Brent Vine (eds.), *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference* (Bremen 2011). Furthermore, the alleged grammatical distinction between "determinate" and "indeterminate" preposed RCs as presented following the works of Held, Hale, and Garrett cannot be upheld in its previous formulation. First, while the relative pronoun or adjective in "indeterminate" (better "conditional") preposed RCs does regularly appear at the front of the clause due to being in "informational focus" (see Goedegebuure and Huggard, *loc. cit.*), the so-called "determinate" type does not form a natural class (see Huggard), and the notion of "determinate" should be abandoned. Second, other constituents *can* occasionally appear to the left of the relative pronoun or adjective even in "indeterminate=conditional" RCs (against the standard claim): *namma ANA* ^{d}UTU-*ŠI kuiš* LÚ.KÚR [*n=aš / tuk*] LÚ.KÚR *ēšdu* 'Whoever is an enemy to *His Majesty* (= 'if anyone is an enemy…'), let him be an enemy to *you*!' (KBo 5.4 Ro 32-33, NH). However, *contra* Melchert, *Studien…Lühr* p. 288, this example involves not

"contrastive focus", but a forward-looking contrastive topic (see Goedegebuure, *The Hittite Demonstratives* p. 566 and *passim*). See also the following example with "tail-head linking" in the first, but not the second conditional RC: *ANA Piyaššili* ŠEŠ.DÙG.GA=*YA ANA* DUMU.M[EŠ=*ŠU*] DUMU.DUMU.MEŠ=*ŠU zilati*[*ya*] *šallanni kī išhiūl iyanun ŠA* ^{m}*Piya<š>šili kuiš* DUMU=*ŠU* DUMU.DUMU=*ŠU našma kuiš ŠA* ^{m}*Piya<š>šili* NUMUN-*aš INA* KUR *Kargamiš šalli pēdan tiyazi* 'I have made this treaty for (his) elevation for my dear brother Piyassili (and) for his sons and grandsons in the future. Whatever son (or) grandson of Piyassili, or whatever descendant of Piyassili ascends the throne in the land of Carchemish…' (KBo 1.8 6-14; NH). For the notion of "tail-head linking" see Rieken 2000a: 416, but contrary to her claim this construction is extremely frequent in Hittite: see on this "anaphoric" use of =*ma* CHD L-N p. 96 (section d.). See also for non-initial position of the *wh*-word in preposed conditional RCs KBo 3.1 ii 40 (OH/NS), KUB 23.77 Ro" 27 (MH/MS), 23.72 Vo 27-28 (MH/MS), KUB 14.1 Ro 24 (MH/ MS), KBo 5.9 iii 2-3 (NH).

p. 426, §30.45: egregiously omitted was reference to the study by Paola Cotticelli-Kurras, Die Konstruktionen mit *verba dicendi* und *sentiendi*, pp. 87-100 in Onofrio Carruba, Mauro Giorgieri & Clelia Mora (eds.), *Atti del II Congresso internazionale di hittitologia* (Pavia 1995).

p. 444, under Dardano 2005: Read 'costrutti' and 'verbo'.

p. 446, under Francia 2007: Read 'di estensione'.

p. 446, under García Trabazo 2002: Read 'plegarias'.

p. 452, under Hoffner 2007. Read 'Istituto di Studi sulle Civiltà del'Egeo e del Vicino Oriente'.

p. 455, for Kloekhorst, Alwin. forthcoming: Read 'Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2008. The Hittite 2nd pl.-ending *-šteni*, pp. 493-500 in Alfonso Archi and Rita Francia (eds.), *VI Congresso Internazionale di Ittitologia. Roma, 5-9 settembre 2005* (= *Studia Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 50). Rome: CNR — Istituto di Studi sulle Civiltà del'Egeo e del Vicino Oriente.'

p. 462, under Pecchioli Daddi 2003: Read 'di provincia'.

Despite the statement (preface xvi) that the tutorial was not intended for self-instruction, one must acknowledge the fact that some have so used it and will continue to do so—and likewise the reality that some of those using the tutorial for classroom instruction are not Hittite specialists. Therefore, those who wish to have a translation key for the Hittite sentences in the lessons may email Craig Melchert (melchert@humnet.ucla.edu) and request one *for their personal or instructional use*.