I am pleased to offer the following lines in tribute to Harold Koch, with fond memories of the times shared in Room B of Widener Library at Harvard when we began graduate study of historical linguistics together nearly four decades ago.¹

The Hittite adverb duwān in those rare instances where it occurs alone is generally interpreted as 'hither' (Beckman 1996:157, Tischler 2001:182, Rieken 1999:69), and the equally rare combination duwān para as 'hitherto, heretofore' (Friedrich 1952:231, Güterbock & Hoffner 1995:128-129 and Tischler loc. cit.). The far more frequently attested correlative duwān...duwān is typically glossed as 'hither and thither' (both Friedrich and Tischler, loc. cit.).

Nevertheless, the most popular etymology for duwān is that which derives it from PIE *dweh,m (*[dwam] by 'Stang’s Law' as discussed below) and sees it as forming a direct word equation with Grk. διά 'for a long time, long ago': see Tischler 1994:491-492 with references to Pisani, Schindler and others. The adverb duwān is further analyzed as a fossilised accusative singular of a root noun also seen in Hittite tūwa '(a)far' and tūwaz ‘from afar’ (see e.g. Melchert 1984:30, following Schindler, and Rieken 1999:70). For correlated duwān...duwān there is a competing etymology based on PIE *two-...two- ‘the one...the other’ (Benveniste 1962:84-85), but see the serious reservations of Cardona (1987:5).²

Neither etymology explains the assigned synchronic meaning 'hither' for duwān alone. Furthermore, correlated duwān...duwān means simply ‘in one direction...in the other’ (Hoffner 1997:133). There is no evidence that in the correlated instances the first direction is near-deictic, indicating motion towards the speaker. It is thus far from clear that single duwān and correlated duwān...duwān are related. Finally, duwān (para) should mean ‘for a long time; long ago’ by the first etymology. In what follows I will address these discrepancies as well as briefly review the formal problems of deriving Hittite tūwa and tūwaz from the same prehistoric paradigm as duwān, which have never been fully acknowledged.

I begin with the combination duwān para. The overall usage of Hittite para is compatible with either ‘heretofore’ or ‘long ago, for a long time’ for duwān para.

¹ I presented a preliminary oral version of this analysis at the Twenty-Fifth East Coast Indo-European Conference at The Ohio State University in Columbus, Ohio, June 21, 2006. I am grateful to members of that audience, in particular to Jay Jasanoff, for helpful critical remarks. I, of course, remain solely responsible for the views expressed here.
² Tischler (1994:492) is wrong in implying that Cardona uncritically endorsed Benveniste’s comparison.
In both cases para would mean 'before (in time), previously', for which one may compare para ḫand(andal)ṭār ('divine) providence' (actually ('divine) pre-ordination, preparation', as per Puhvel 1991:105 contra Güterbock & Hoffner 1995:130) and peran para 'previously, beforehand', with renewal by addition of the synchronic adverb for 'before'. Compare also peran para UD.KAM-an 'the day before' (thus contra Güterbock and Hoffner 1997:303).

The contexts of two of the attested instances of duwān para also permit either 'heretofore' or 'long ago, for a long time'. The first is found in an oracular inquiry (KUB 5.1 iii 53-54, NH/NS): BAD-an=ma=mu=za dU āruNerik SAG.DU DINGIR-LIM-iš duwān para GIM-an SAG.KI-za ḫarta kinuna=ya QATAMMA kēdana=za=kan LĪ-ri kuwatan imma kuwatan neyāḥāri nu=mu pean ḫāyāšī 'If you, Storm-god of Nerik, are my personal deity, as you (have) protected (me) for a long time/heretofore, will it now also be likewise? Wherever I turn on this campaign, will you run ahead of me?'

The second appears in a prayer of Muršili II regarding the plague (KUB 14.14 Ro 37-39, NH/NS). I give in parentheses a translation of several preceding clauses in order to make clear the overall context: ('The land of Hatti prospered...You gods have now proceeded subsequently to take vengeance on Tuthaliya the Younger. My father [-ed] on account of the blood of Tuthaliya. Whatever princes, lords, commanders, officers went over to the side of [my father] died from [that] affair. That same affair also reached the land of Hatti, and the land [of Hatti] began to die because of [that] affair.') nu KUR āruGIDRU-ti duwān para[a ] kinun=ā ḫinkan para namma da[ššē]sta KUR āruGIDRU-ti ħ ‘inganan [mekkī] dammēšḥātit 'The land of Hatti [has] -ed for a long time/heretofore, but now the plague has become even worse. The land of Hatti has been [much] oppressed by the plague.'

The decisive third example of duwān para again comes from an oracular inquiry (KBo 2.2 iii 19-27, NH/NS): ('If you alone, Sun-goddess of Ariinna, are angry because of the vows (made to obtain) offspring, and in addition no other deity is joined with you, let the signs be favorable: ... unfavorable. § Seeing that this was the outcome,') DINGIR-LUM kūit duwān para[a ]allakartan ḫarkun nu=ž[a DINGIR-LUM apaddan šer kartimmiyauwanza nu TE, MES NU.SIG₂-du ŠU₃,A GUB-an

---

3 My textual citations follow the conventions of the Chicago Hittite Dictionary. The sigla OH, MH, and NH (Old Hittite, Middle Hittite, and New Hittite respectively), refer to the date of the composition of the texts, while OS, MS, and NS (Old Script, Middle Script, and New Script) indicate the relative age of the manuscripts. For the various text editions see Laroche (1976) or visit the online Konkordanz der hethitischen Texte created by Silvin Košak: http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk.

4 Likewise indeterminate is KUB 6.9+ i 12-13 (restored with Van den Hout 1998:16): [ANA [UŢU-Š]-kan kūit LUGAL-żeznami a[ššar duwān] para arḫa zalukīša 'As to the fact that [for his Majesty] the a[ccession] to kingship has been heretofore/for a long time postponed.' We may safely assume that the important enthronement ritual usually took place soon after the de facto assumption of the kingship, so that a delay in the ceremony from one year to the next (see van den Hout 1981:279-283 and 1998:85-88) could well have been regarded by the king and his advisors as 'for a long time'.
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NU.SIG § mān-za DINGIR-LUM apaddan-pat šer kartimiyauwanza duwan-ta kuit parā š'allakartan ḫarkun... 'Because I had offended the deity through hubris long ago, are you the deity angry on that account? Let the signs be unfavorable. The throne is (on the) left: unfavorable. If you the deity are angry only on that account, because I had offended you through hubris long ago...'.

Gütterbock and Hoffner (1995:129) translated the clauses with duwan parā as 'Because I [o]ffended the [dei]ty heretofore...because I have offended you heretofore.' In so doing, they overlooked the past tense of the auxiliary verb ḫark-.... Hittite is quite strict in its use of tense in the analytic perfect construction with the verbs ḫark- 'to have, hold' and šē- 'to be' plus the past participle. It without exception employs present tense of the auxiliary for the present perfect and the preterite for the past perfect (see Hoffner & Melchert forthcoming §§22.22-23). Since the use of 'heretofore' implies that a past action is described with reference to the present time, it is only compatible with a present perfect, for which we would expect š'allakartan šarmi 'I have offended' with present tense of the auxiliary. The use of the preterite šarkan shows that the action of the clause is being described with reference to another past action, and the preceding context makes it clear what that other action was: namely, the vows made to the Sun-goddess to obtain offspring. Having learned that the latter action is one cause of divine anger, the inquiry next asks whether it is the only one. Informed that it is not, the inquiry then proceeds to investigate other possible earlier causes. That one of them might be characterised as having happened 'long ago' is entirely reasonable. The interpretation 'for a long time, long ago' thus seems justified for the combination duwan parā.

Evidence for duwan alone is limited to four assured examples. The first occurs in a text of Muršili II regarding arbitration of disputes in Syria (KBo 3.3 iii 29-33, NH/NS): ('But if there is some legal dispute, let the Priest intervene in disputes among you, and let him investigate the disputes for you.') mān DINU-MA kuški šalleši i-at arha šēpūwanzi ŪL tarāḫteni n-at=kān duwan MAHAR 4TU-ŠI parā naššen n-at 4TU-ŠI arha šepi 'But if some legal dispute becomes too big, and you cannot dispose of it, send it duwan before His Majesty, and His Majesty will dispose of it.' Beckman (1996:157) translates duwan as 'here', following the conventional interpretation. The context obviously is consistent with such a sense, but by no means imposes it. One wonders why such a specification of place or direction is needed, since the location of the Hittite king is hardly in doubt. We might also expect the normal word for 'here, hither' in Hittite, which is ka, though obviously the existence of another term for this notion is possible.

The other three previously overlooked examples of duwan alone provide us with the crucial evidence to determine its true meaning. All of these appear in a

---

1 The incident is referred to again several lines later in KBo 2.2 iv 2-4, also with the past tense of the auxiliary: DINGIR-LUM-ye kuit duwan parā š'allakartan ḫarkun nu apaddan=na šer SISKUR SUM-anzī 'And also because I had offended the deity through hubris long ago, will they also give an offering on that account?'
single text, one of the Middle Hittite Maṣat letters. The first two occur in the same passage and must be treated together, with the preceding and intervening context (HKM 66: 23-25 & 31-32, MH/MS): (‘Also the servant of Saparta whom I sent to the Gasga country (with the words): ‘Let him proceed to find the son of Saparta!’) n-aš [m]än k[a]řü pänza n-an=m[u]=kan duwān para nai ‘if he has/is already gone, send him to me duwān.’ (‘If he hasn’t gone yet, write to Lulu and Zuwwanna. Let one take three Gasga men in his place. But let him go and find the son of Saparta.’) namma=as mahḥ[a]n EGIR-pa paizzi n-an=mu=kan duwān para nai ‘Then when he returns, send him to me duwān.’

The third instance of duwān comes at the very end of the letter and deals with a completely different topic (HKM 66: LeftEdge 1-5): ‘nu ammuk duwān h[a]reškatten “Taḥazzilimm-a kuit walḥ[e]’ nu-šši kāša L[U] TEMI awan arha uet SIG5-anza-wa=z[a n]-šši=kan lē kuwatqa laḥṭahjiyašši ‘You (pl.) kept writing to me duwān that [they?] had also beaten/struck Taḥazzili. A messenger has just come from him: ‘I am well.’ Do not worry at all about him.’

The use with an imperative excludes a meaning ‘long ago, for a long time’ for duwān alone, while the fact that the addressee is ordered to send the servant duwān in the event that he has already gone likewise eliminates ‘hither, here’. The addressee cannot reasonably be ordered to send the servant anywhere if he has already departed on his previously assigned mission. The only plausible sense I can see for duwān in this context is ‘later, subsequently’. The addressee is to send the servant only later, after he has returned from his mission. If the man has already left, then there is nothing more to be done. If he has not yet left, the addressee is to take the opportunity before he leaves to secure three men to carry out his regular duties in his absence.

A sense ‘later, subsequently’ also fits the first example cited above from KEo 3.3 iii 29-33: ‘But if some legal dispute becomes too big, and you cannot dispose of it, send it subsequently before His Majesty, and His Majesty will dispose of it.’ The meaning ‘later’ will not work for the last example cited with a preterite verb, but here we may assume rather ‘late(ly), (of) late’: ‘You (pl.) kept writing to me lately that [they?] had also beaten/struck Taḥazzili. A messenger has just come from him: ‘I am well.’ Do not worry at all about him.’ Thus Hittite duwān

---

6 It is crucial to note that in this passage the adverb para is functioning as a preverb with the imperative verb nai, the combination of which means ‘to send’ (nai alone would mean ‘turn!’), and thus para does not form a syntagm with duwān. Confusion on this point long prevented me from understanding the passage correctly and may have caused others to overlook the evidence here for duwān alone.


8 In purely formal terms the verb h[a]reškatten of the first clause could also be interpreted as imperative second plural: ‘Keep writing to me...', but the following context argues strongly for a preterite second plural.

9 The adverb ‘late’ alone is attested well into the 19th century in English in the sense ‘lately, of late’. Since Hittite has no morphological marker of the comparative, we would not expect any difference between (of) late and ‘later’. 
'late' covers the range of English 'later' and 'lately', having the former value with a present-future or imperative verb, and the latter with a preterite.

Reconciling the difference between 'late' for duwān alone and 'long ago, for a long time' for duwān parā is not difficult. One may compare Latin sērus 'late' which forms a direct word equation with Old Irish sīr 'long(-lasting)' and Welsh hir 'long' (spatial and temporal) < PIE *seh₂-ro-. For the Hittite I assume preservation of an older meaning 'long' (of time) in the fixed phrase duwān parā (note again the Greek cognate δὴ) and a shift to 'late(r)' in simple duwān.

The attested meaning of the well documented correlated pair duwān...duwān clearly is 'in one direction...in the other', and in some cases it appears to be equivalent to kēt...kēt=a 'to/on the one side ...to/on the other side'. The latter sense is typical in ritual contexts, as in the following (KBo 26 Ro 23-24, OH/OS):[10]

[p]ēdī-smi-pat tuwān 1-ŠU waḥanzi ḫUMES ALAM.ZU[...Ś...tuw]ānn=a 1-ŠU waḥanzi[i] 'The [ ] turn once in place in one direction. The 'performers' [ ] turn once in the other direction.' The cited example with its specification of 'in place' makes it clear that the synchronic sense of correlated duwān ...duwān contains no inherent element of distance.

However, some examples do incorporate the notion of movement across a distance. I cite first a famous example from the Hittite Laws (KBo 6.26 i 35-38, OH/NS): (If someone sows seed upon (another's) seed, his neck shall ascend the plow.)[1+1] SIMDI GU ḫHILA turiyanzi kēl mene-ššit duwān kēl=a mene-ššit duwān nēyanzi LŪ-eš aki GU ḫHILA=ya akkanzi 'They shall hitch up two teams of oxen. They shall turn the face of one in one direction and of the other in the other direction. The man shall be killed, and the oxen shall be killed.' While the text does not spell out the gory details, it is clear that the oxen are to be driven far enough in opposite directions to pull apart and kill the perpetrator.

In two other instances the distances involved are specified.[11] The first is from a late version of the Hittite Laws (KBo 6.4 i 11-13, NH/NS): takku UL=ma ĀGAR āmmel pedan duwan 3 DANNA duwan=a 3 DANNA nu=kūš kuš URU-ās anda SīxSA-ri... 'But if it is not a cultivated land, but a virgin place, (they measure) three DANNA's in each direction, and whatever city is determined (to be) within (that radius)...'. The second appears in the Myth of Appu (KBo 19.108: 10, OH/NS): [...duwān IKU-an S]UD-at duwan=a IKU-an SUD-a[i] [ ] drew [ one IKU in one direction] and drew one IKU in the other direction.[12]

I see no way to exclude entirely derivation of correlated duwān...duwān from a virtual *tweh₂,m...tweh₂,m to the 'oppositional' stem *two- à la Benveniste, thus assuming a completely different historical source for this expression from that

[10] Compare also instances with papparš- 'to sprinkle (liquid)' in KUB 12.40 ii 7-8 (NS), with ḫuwaš to scatter, sprinkle (dry material)' in KUB 10.72 ii 23-24 (NS), and with lājuwa- 'to pour' in KUB 41.33 Ro 14 (MH/NS).


[12] See also the very similar example with terippiya- 'to plow' in KUB 13.1 iv 21 & 23 (MH/MS).
for duwān (parā). However, as already pointed out by Cardona (1987:5), there is not only no other evidence for a stem *two- in Anatolian, but also none for an accented pronominal stem *to- on which the stem *t-wo- was probably built (for this analysis see the arguments of Cardona 1987). It thus seems far more economical to suppose that the correlated use of duwān...duwān began in examples where the original meaning was ‘for a distance...for a distance’. Reanalysis to ‘in one direction...in the other direction’ led to a ‘semantic bleaching’ whereby the expression could be used merely for ‘on/to the one side...on/to the other side’.

According to this scenario, the accusative singular *dweh₂m of a PIE root noun ‘distance’ was used as an ‘accusative of extent’ both spatially and temporally. The meaning *‘for a distance’ is attested indirectly in Hittite correlated duwān...duwān, while the sense of ‘for a long time, long ago’ is reflected directly in Greek δήν and Hittite duwān parā. Hittite duwān ‘late(r), (of) late’ represents a secondary development of the temporal use.

The attested usage of Hittite duwān therefore presents no obstacles in semantic terms to its derivation from PIE *dweh₂m and its equation with Greek δήν, as widely assumed. The derivation of the Hittite also faces no formal problems, if one accepts the minor PIE synchronic rule known as ‘Stang’s Law’, by which word-final *-eh₂m was realised as phonetic *[ámn] (see Meier-Brügger 2003:97 with references). Indeed, the extraparadigmatic status and hence likely early morphological isolation of Hittite duwān makes it one of the strongest pieces of evidence for this particular application of ‘Stang’s Law’.

The derivation of Hittite tūwa ‘far’ and tūwaz ‘from a distance’ from the same root noun paradigm as that of duwān is far less straightforward, despite the claims in Melchert (1984:30) and Rieken (1999:69-70). Any analysis of these forms must begin with the attested orthographic facts. The adverb duwān is spelled overwhelmingly with initial tu-wa- or du-wa-: tu-wa-a-an (12x), tu-wa-an (2x), du-wa-a-an (19x), du-wa-an (20x) vs. only three instances of tu/du-u-wa-. On the other hand, tūwa appears at least a dozen times always as tu-u-wa, and tūwaz likewise shows overwhelmingly tu-u-(wa): tu-u-wa-az (at least 33x), tu-u-wa-za (9x), tu-u-az (4x). In view of these figures we may safely regard the hapax tu-az (KUB 25.36 v 4, MS) as an error.

There can be no doubt that the pattern just described reflects a real linguistic contrast between duwān on the one hand and tūwa/ tūwaz on the

---

13 I reconstruct a virtual *tweh₃m ...tweh₃m because *twm would surely have led to Hittite *tän (see Melchert 1994:128 with references).

14 I am much indebted to Professor Theo van den Hout for sharing with me the files of the Chicago Hittite Dictionary on duwan, which considerably amplified my own data. The three exceptions are du-u-wa-an in KBo 4.4.1.38 (NH/NS), and two instances of tu-u-wa-an (KBo 25.3 RîCo 6', OH/OS2 and KUB 23.34.5, MH/NS). The spelling with initial tu- is clearly the older practice, gradually replaced by du-, which alone is attested in New Hittite compositions. Since voiced stops are devoiced word-initially in Hittite (see Melchert 1994:18-20), the spelling of the initial stop as tu- or du- has no functional significance.
other. The claim of Rieken (1999:70) that both spellings represent [twa-] is not remotely credible. If this were the case, we would expect the distribution of tu/du-wa- and tu/du-u-(wa)- to be roughly the same in all three words. We must conclude rather that duwan spelled with tu/du-wa- does have the shape [twan], as we would expect from a preform *dwäm, while the spelling tu-u-(wa)- shows that the other two must be disyllabic [tu:wa] and [tu:wat].

How we should account for this discrepancy remains unclear. One approach is to attribute it to the effects of the PIE synchronic rule known as ‘Lindeman’s Law’. By this rule all monosyllabic forms of the original paradigm of the putative root noun for ‘distance’ would have had beside them disyllabic variants: nom. sg. *d(u)weh₃s, acc. sg. *d(u)weh₃m (phonetically *[d(u)wam] as per above), and arguably an endingless locative *d(u)weh₃. If both variants persisted into pre-Hittite, we may assume that the *dw- of the shorter variants blocked the regular dissimilation *duw- → *dum- in the longer (see Melchert 1984:23-27). If we further assume that by this stage there was no longer any unitary paradigm, but merely two isolated adverbs *d(u)wam and *d(u)wa, nothing precludes that the former generalised the monosyllabic variant and the latter the disyllabic. The latter then developed regularly into tua, and the ablative tua was formed secondarily on the basis of the presumed endingless locative.

If *dweh₃ ‘distance’ continued to form a unitary paradigm into the prehistory of Hittite, it seems to me ad hoc to suppose that the accusative singular generalised the monosyllabic variant *dwam, while the presumed endingless locative generalised disyllabic *duwa. There is an alternative. If we consider again the pre-Hittite paradigm of *dweh₃, we may reasonably assume that the nominative singular *dweh₃s became pre-Hittite *twas, either by regular phonological change or by reshaping from *twahs after the accusative singular *twam from PIE *dwam. The regular outcome of the weak stem *dhu₃ in Hittite would have been *tuh₃- (cf. tuh₃hi- ‘cough, gasp’ < *dhu₃h₃-). Thus genitive singular *tuh₃a₃s, dative-locative *tuh₃i₃, allative *tuh₃a₃, ablative *tuh₃az. That such an irregular paradigm would have been reshaped seems clear. The question is: just how? A complete levelling after the strong cases would certainly have been possible: hence gen. sg. *twas, dat.-loc. *twa, and so forth. However, monosyllabic forms in the non-direct cases of a substantive

---

15 For further examples of initial Cu-u-(wa)- as a spelling for [CuwV-] see Melchert (1984:28).
16 For the PIE phenomenon known as ‘Lindeman’s Law’ see among others Meier-Brügger (2003:91) with references. For this basic approach to the problem of tua and tua was see already Melchert (1984:30), following Jochem Schindler, but without full recognition of the complications involved.
17 Since tua ‘far’ is attested in the sense of both an allative and a locative, it may plausibly be derived in functional terms from either a locative or an allative. For other Hittite adverbs in-a showing synchronically both functions compare kā ‘here, hither’ and apiya ‘there, thither’.
18 The apparent retraction of the accent in tua < *duwa is reminiscent of that in CLuvian p̣̣ya- ‘give’ or tua- ‘put, place’ (see Melchert 1994:89), however these are to be explained.
would have been highly unusual in Hittite. I submit then that a direct replacement of *tu-hw- by *tu- as the stem in these cases is equally plausible. The insertion of a hiatus-filling -w- would then have been entirely regular (see Melchert 1984:28-29).

A choice between the alternatives just presented depends crucially on whether or not a unitary paradigm of *dweh₂- 'distance' persisted into the prehistory of Hittite. I see at present no basis for deciding this question and thus for a reasoned choice between them.¹⁹

References


¹⁹ Rieken (1999:70 with note 332) objects on phonological grounds to the alternative derivation by Eichner (1978:160) of *tůwa and *tuwaz from an adjective *důh₂-yo- (endorsed in Melchert 1994:128). Her objection may or may not be valid. For the loss of prehistoric *y in Hittite in a sequence *-Vh₂yV- one may compare present third plurals in -āniz < *-eh₂yentī (Melchert 1994:130). On the other hand, the shape *důh₂-yo- is quite close to that of *teh₂-yē’-‘to steal’, which does appear as Hittite tāy- with preserved -y-, as stressed by Rieken. In any case, reconstruction of an adjective stem *důh₂-yo- ‘far, distant’ just to provide the basis for the two adverbs tůwa and tuwaz seems at best uneconomical, if not ad hoc.


