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**Abbildung 5: Struktureigenschaften eines systematischen etymologischen Wörterbuchs**

<table>
<thead>
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In Abbildung 5 sind die wesentlichen Struktureigenschaften eines systematischen etymologischen Wörterbuches dargestellt, um die wichtigsten Aspekte der Erörterung noch einmal zusammenzufassen. Die Abbildung legt nicht Details der etymologischen Wörterbuchgestaltung fest, sondern nur die zugrundeliegenden Beziehungen, so daß auch in der gedruckten Form sehr unterschiedliche Anordnungen dieser Struktur entsprechen können, um die vielfache etymologische Strukturierung des Wortschatzes systematisch zu erschließen. Dabei sollte deutlich sein, daß eine solche systematische Strukturierung nach etymologischen Prinzipien auszurichten ist. Ein etymologisches Wörterbuch sollte nicht die Aufgaben anderer Wörterbücher, wie die eines semantischen Thesaurus oder eines Wortfamilienbuchs, duplizieren.
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Hittite *imma and Latin *immō *)

1. Introduction

The Hittite adverb *imma was first equated with Latin *immō by Götzte-Pedersen, MS 77–79. The equation has been repeated ever since, but usually without much conviction, and Puhvel, *Hittite Etymological Dictionary* 1/2 (1984) 361, prefers to leave the derivation of both *imma* and *immō* open.

There are evidently two causes for the reservations held about the equation. One is the lack of a convincing morphological and phonological analysis of the putative PIE *immō.* *) A geminate *-mm- for PIE is problematic. Götzte-Pedersen venture ‘expressive’ gemination as a source of the *-mm-, followed by Ernout-Meillet, *dict. étym.* 455, and Hahn, Lg 18 (1942) 103. In a word which clearly has a rhetorical function (see below), such an explanation is not implausible. However, it has proven difficult to formulate objective and explicit criteria for what may and may not be ‘expressive’. As a result, application of the concept (like that of substrata) inevitably has an ad hoc quality which inspires little confidence.

Furthermore, even if one accepts an ‘expressive’ source for the geminate, *-immō* remains obscure. Both Marstrander, *Caractère indoeuropéen,* 27, and Hahn, Lg 18.101–103, analyze *imma* as containing Hitt. -ma ‘but’ (viewing the first element as pronominal *ei/- and imperative *i ‘go’ respectively). While either of these analyses is conceivable in typological terms, neither provides an explicit account of the observed usage of *imma.* This brings us to the other source of doubt about the equation *imma = *immō*; there seems to be no general agreement on the meaning of *imma.*

*) For the abbreviations of Hittitological works, see Friedrich-Kammenhuber, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch,* Zweite völlig neubearbeitete Auflage, Lfg. 1 (Heidelberg: 1975) 13–23.

I am grateful to G. Dunkel for having read a draft of this paper and offered several helpful suggestions. Responsibility for the views expressed here remains mine, of course.

*) The final vowel of Lat. *immō* is regularly long. The occasional scansion *immō* in Plautus and Terence is explainable in terms of the ‘iambic shortening rule’. Hitt. - may easily represent unaccented *-e* in absolute final position, so I assume a long vowel for PIE.

Friedrich, *HW* 82, lists a bewildering variety of meanings for *imma: ‘going so far as’, finally, completely’, rather, even, all the more’. In addition, the combination *UL (= natta)* *imma* is defined as ‘not exactly, nearly’ or ‘not at all, not even’, while *imma* with relative pronouns and adverbs is rendered as ‘else’: *kuit imma (kuit)* ‘whoever else’. Puhvel lists nearly as many ‘distinctive uses’: ‘moreover; indeed; (nay) even; nevertheless; really; -ever (with relatives)’.

The above welter of meanings can be reduced to essentially five distinct functions: (1) corroboration or asseverative (‘really, indeed’), (2) additive (‘moreover, also, else’), (3) intensifying (‘even, all the more, going so far as’), (4) contrastive (‘rather’), and (5) generalizing (‘-ever’). If one reads Sommer’s discussion, *AU* 87f, it is clear that the translation ‘finally, completely’ is also to be understood as intensifying, while Puhvel’s one example of ‘nevertheless’ may just as well be understood as ‘even’. Obviously, some of the above functions can be derived one from another.

In fact, Götzte-Pedersen, who recognized all of these functions, argued that they could all be derived from the first, namely corroboration or asseveration. However, their discussion is so brief that their conclusion is hardly more than an assertion. Puhvel’s recent list of ‘distinctive uses’ and the discrepancies which one finds in the interpretation of *imma* in translations of texts show that the claim of a unitary function for *imma* has not been accepted. A reexamination of the use of the adverb seems necessary. Since some of the different meanings suggested for *imma* are context-dependent, it will be useful to group the attestations into four groups: *natta imma, imma* in positive sentences following negative sentences, *imma* in other positive sentences, and *imma* with relatives.

2. *natta imma*

The key to understanding *natta imma* lies in recognizing that all clear examples of this combination occur in rhetorical questions. Perhaps the most obvious example is that in the Amarna Letter (*CTH* 151), *VBoT* 2,7–9: *nu mān ḫuḏān ammel DUMU:SAL-YA šanḫiškiš nu-ttu ĬL imma pĩḫi pĩḫi-ttu ‘If you properly seek my daughter, will I not give (her) to you?—I will give (her) to you.’ This example was already correctly translated by Hrozný and is cited by Götzte-Pedersen, who suggest that the problematic instance in the Tawagalawa Letter (*CTH* 181, *KUB* XIV 3 II 75) may also be inter-
interpreted as a rhetorical question: n-ai-mu UL imma LU-iHA(DA)NU 'Is he not my son-in-law?' (likewise Puhvel). This interpretation solves the paradox which Sommer, AU 138–139, found so troubling. Further clear examples of natta imma in rhetorical questions are found in the letter of Puduhepa, KUB XXI 38 Vs 15. 48. 51. 53 (see Puhvel, with reference to Rost and Helck), KUB XIV 7 IV 11–13 (Rost, MIO 4 (1956) 332, Surenhagen, AoF 8 (1981) 97, and Puhvel), and KUB XXVI 8 I 12–13 (see Puhvel contra von Schuler, Dienstanzw. 9).

Other instances of natta imma make far better sense as rhetorical questions than as negative statements. One is found in the Instructions for the LUGALUGAL (CHT 255, KUB XXI 42 I 7–8) and is entirely parallel to that in KUB XXVI 8 mentioned above: DUMU.MES EN.MES.-YA-wa-nna[i] x-x UL imma NUMUN EN-YA 'Are we sons of "my" lord not the seed of "my" lord?'.

In KUB XXIII 72 Vs 40 (CHT 146, MH ms.) we find nu-war-a-li Āti-ii ug-a-wa-z UL imma LÚ-ai 'He is a man. Am I not a man?'. It is unlikely that the speaker is saying that he is not a man.

The only other example known to me of natta imma in a complete context is in the letter KBo XVIII 104 Rs 7–8: nu-za tug =Huwaišanna- IAMA-yan UL imma saggabi ḫi 'Do I not acknowledge you, H.?'. Here the interpretation as a rhetorical question is certainly reasonable, if not required. The same expression probably occurs in the broken passage KUB XIV 8 Vs 43 with reference to acknowledging sins. Two more instances of natta imma are in broken contexts: KBo XVIII 27 Vs 14 (a letter) and KUB XXXIV 75,3 (in a dialogue).

Most of the examples of natta imma thus occur in sentences which must be taken as rhetorical questions, and all are amenable to this interpretation. It is important to realize, however, that imma is not required for a rhetorical question: see KUB XIV 7 IV 13 (Surenhagen, AoF 8. 97) and KUB XXI 38 I 52 (Helck, JSC 17. 91, follow-

2) Von Schuler, Dienstanzw. 23, fails to recognize either the syntax or the meaning of the sentence. We have here a nominal sentence in the first person marked by the reflexive pronoun here -naš instead of -za): see Hoffner, JNES 28 (1969) 225 ff. Von Schuler’s restoration an-da at the beginning of line 8 is epigraphically uncertain and makes little sense in the context. I am unable to suggest a solid alternative, but since the second sign definitely is not nasa, it is certain that we have a single nominal sentence.

3) Gurney, AAD 28 (1948) 35, reads LUGAL instead of LÚ-ii, but also understands the second sentence as a rhetorical question: ‘He was a page; am I not a man?’. In his notes, p. 40, he suggests that the sentence must be either interrogative or highly ironical. It is undoubtedly both.

3. imma alone following a negative sentence

In this context imma alone has been interpreted as contrastive (‘rather’), intensifying (‘even’), or additive (‘also’). For most examples, which refer to real or putative treaty violations, any of these interpretations is plausible. One example will serve to illustrate (KUB XXIII 77, 60–61; CHT 138, MH ms.): UL-man-an EGIR-pa URU ḫattušil pišen n-an-kan parā INA KUR LUGAL imna ‘And should you not give him back to Hattusa, (but someone) rather/even/also guides him forth to the land of an enemy . . .’. In all such passages, the imma clause indicates a sin of commission linked to a sin of omission expressed by the preceding negative clause: cf. also KBo III 1 I 44 (NH copy of an OH text!), KBo V 6 III 38. IV 3–4, KBo V 3 I 29 and passim, KBo V 4 Vs 8. Rs 45. 47–48, KBo V 9 II 43, KUB XIV 1
ure, the following positive clause cannot be interpreted as an additional or worse violation. Thus the additive or intensifying analysis for *imma* fails in this case, while the contrastive sense ‘rather’ fits quite well. The same applies to the later passage in the same ritual (KUB XXXI 31 II 2–4): *UNUT LUGAL-an UL appanzi KAXU-az-kan imma LUGAL[PAM] anda memai* ‘But they do not hold the implements of the king “behind”’. (Rather) one inserts the office of the king verbally’. See also KUB XXIX 7 Vs 3–4. 14–15 etc.

While ‘rather’ will handle the ritual passages above, it fails in the case of KUB XIII 2 III 4–7 (CTH 261): *nu-šan ANA TÛL SISKUR.SISKUR kitari n-at-ši ertianda arakandu kušdani-MA ANA TÛL SISKUR NU.GAL n-at-kan šarā imma arakandu* (‘If a ritual is established for a spring, let them perform it for and a. (it, i.e. the spring), but for whatever spring there is no ritual, let them even/also a. it up.’) Since in this case the same action (arī-) is to be taken whether there is a ritual or not, a contrastive ‘rather’ is impossible. A meaning ‘also, in addition’ would be appropriate here, but so would an intensifying ‘even’. As noted above, Puhvel’s ‘nevertheless’ for this passage is effectively equivalent to ‘even’.

Thus in the typical treaty passages *imma* may plausibly be interpreted as ‘even’, ‘rather’ or ‘also, in addition’. In the ritual passages only ‘rather’ seems suitable; ‘also’ and ‘even’ are excluded. On the other hand, in KUB XIII 2 ‘rather’ makes no sense, while ‘even’ or ‘also’ fits well. What sense are we to make of this distribution? First of all, I would point out that the contrastive sense of ‘rather’ is inherent in all passages by the mere juxtaposition of a negative and a positive clause. It is by no means certain that this nuance would have to be expressed in Hittite by an overt morpheme at all. Thus while ‘rather’ is appropriate for a large number of instances, this fact is a rather weak argument for attributing this meaning to *imma*. On the other hand, the one clear instance where ‘rather’ does not fit cannot be ignored.

The ritual passages also argue strongly against ‘also’. This leaves us with ‘even’, which fits the treaty passages and KUB XIII 2, but which does not make much sense in the ritual passages. A clue to

---

4. In a similar passage in the Alaksandu Treaty (CTH 76, KUB XXII 4 11 51–53) the intensifying sense is conveyed by a repetition of the preverb: *[nu ašēdāni] EGIS EGIS-an [rišaš] ‘(but) you (actually) step behind him…’. See Duskel, KZ 95 (1981) 221.

5. The precise meaning of EGIR-an ‘behind’ here is not entirely clear. It probably means that they grasp the objects ‘from behind’; i.e., the priests involved hold out the signs of office prominently while themselves remaining in the background. One could also suppose, however, a reference to some unnamed object such as the altar.

6. The phrase *anda memai* ‘speak in’ is the standard Hittite expression for indicating the insertion of spoken passages in the course of a ritual, particularly when the actual words are not cited (if the words are quoted, one often finds of course *kilīm memai* ‘speak thus’). See especially the colophon of Mursili’s prayer to the Sun-goddess, KUB XXIV 3 IV 1–8, which explicitly states that the words of the prayer were inserted (*anda memai*) into a *mugēwar* ritual, the action of which was described on a separate tablet.

7. For the first *arākandu* the duplicate Bo 2821 has *[āš]-aš-ya-at arākandu ‘also let them a. it up’ (see von Schuler, Dienstanw. 47). Von Schuler and Puhvel apparently take *arīke*- as the iterative of *ar*- ‘arrive’, but the latter does not take an accusative. A transitive *arīk*- (not ‘flow!’) is assured from other texts, but its meaning is not yet clear.
solving this problem lies in the differing word order of the ritual examples and the rest. In most treaty passages and in KUB XIII 2, imma directly precedes the verb. If we look again at the ritual examples, we see that they do not follow this pattern. Here we find SAL. LUGAL [T]AM1 .. ma-kan imma ... and KAXU-az-kan imma ... If imma typically follows the word it modifies, as suggested by examples in Sections 4 and 5 below, then it should modify SAL.LUGAL[TAM] and KAXU-az respectively. Such an interpretation is in fact quite apt. In the first instance, the contrast is between the action taken for the king and that taken for the queen. Thus if we take imma as emphasizing, we obtain good sense: 'The office of queen one inserts verbally'. On the other hand, the point of the second passage is that one is merely inserting the king's office verbally, rather than holding up the signs of office as usual: 'But they do not hold the king's implements "behind". One inserts the king's office by mouth'. Here the emphasis is on the method employed, not the person involved.

If we reexamine the treaty passage, we find that an analysis of imma as emphasizing also fits these. While they all share a tone of righteous indignation over the real or hypothetical violation, it is by no means necessary to assume that the focus is the same in each case. For example, KUB XXIII 77,60–61 cited above may be reasonably taken as: 'And should you not give him back to Hattusa, (but someone) actually guides him forth to the land of an enemy!'. The point here is that the violator does not just fail to deliver the fugitive, but lets him go, and as a final indignity guides him precisely to an enemy of Hattusa. Similarly, the Madduwa passage KUB XIV 1 Vs 69 (CTH 147, MH ms.) makes good sense if imma is assumed to emphasize the preceding word: "Maddu wa[t]ai-a namma URU.Dalawwa zabbiya UL kuit pait n-alta ANA LÜ. MES URU.Dalawwa imma kattan arha hatrai 'But M. did not then go into battle against D. at all. He actually wrote away to the very men of D. ...'. That is, Madduwa conspired with the very people he was supposed to attack.

In several of the treaty passages imma follows kisšan or eniššan in a clause with mema 'speak'. Here again imma may be plausibly taken as emphasizing the adverb: the focus of the indignation is on the actual words quoted. See for example KBo V 9 II 43 (CTH 62): n-an ANA LUGAL KUR URU.Hatti EGIR-pa Ü[L] petši nw-bi kisšan imma mematti 'And you do not give him back to the King of Hatti, (but) actually speak to him thus'. Compare KBo V 6 IV 3-4, V 4 Rs 47–48 and probably KUB VI 48 Rs 3.

In KUB XXIII 77,78–79 (CTH 138) the focus is on the verb: [še ... -šen] wadilukitten-an imma 'Do not—him. Praise him'. In KBo V 4 Rs 45 the focus is on the intent of the action: [n-a]n UL warriššatt ni-tśan idālāwi imma parā šikiti 'And you do not come to his aid, (but) overlook (it, i.e. the danger) for evil'. An emphasizing function for imma also fits the passage in the deposition KBo XVI 63 Vs 5 (CTH 293): [Û]L kušiši ASME = Dušiša[ ] imma ANA ŠTU kiššan memiša 'I didn't hear anything. It was D. who spoke thus to His Majesty'. Note that this last example, where there is a change of subject, is a further argument against either an intensifying or additive function for imma.

In the remaining examples of imma following a negative sentence, imma lies between the preverb and verb. In these cases imma does not modify the preverb, but the entire combination of verb + preverb: KBo V 3 I 29 (CTH 42) apūnm-a-mu antuššan UL tekkuššanu n-an andā imma munnaši 'And that man too you do not point out to me, (but) actually conceal him'. Based on its behavior elsewhere, imma modifying the verb ought to follow the verb. While such an order is attested (see KUB XXIII 77,79 above and Section 4 below), it is rare and found only with a simplex verb. The reason for this is undoubtedly that placing imma after the verb is contrary to the general Hittite rule that the verb is sentence-final. While other elements of the sentence may be 'extraposed' after the verb, this has the effect of emphasizing them. This would be inappropriate for imma, whose function is to emphasize rather the word which precedes it. It is thus natural that sentence-final imma would be avoided where possible. The combination of preverb + verb permits imma to be postponed to the preverb while modifying the entire combination. In general terms this is comparable to the inflexion of anaphoric pronouns in Old Irish between preverb and verb. These too, of course, function as subjects or objects of the preverb-verb combination, not just the preverb.12)

12) In the example KUB XXIII 77,79 above, this problem is solved by placing the verb itself in emphatic initial position: wadilukitten-an imma.

13) Such 'extraposition' is comparable to what Gonda calls 'amplified sentences' in Sanskrit. On this construction in Anatolian see now McCone, F., Šemerényi (1979) 467 ff.

14) A more direct parallel is furnished by Vedic emphasizing ud, which regularly follows a simple verb, but follows the preverb in a preverb + verb combination: see Grassmann, Wb. z. Rigveda s.v.
An emphasizing function for *imma* can thus account for all the examples in treaties as well as those in the ritual texts. We are left with the occurrence in *KUB* XIII 2, where an intensifying 'even' seems most appropriate. While we could attempt to force an interpretation of *imma* as emphasizing here, it seems preferable to admit an intensifying function for *imma* where it follows a negative sentence. Deriving this from a basic emphasizing function is not difficult: cf. Fr. même, which is both emphasizing (*lui-même ‘himself’) and intensifying (*même les justes ‘even the just’, quand même ‘even though’). It is important to notice that the asseverative function of *imma* which we found in its use with *natta* is also visible in its occurrence after negative sentences, as I have tried to indicate in the translations above by ‘actually’. Gøtze-Pedersen already noted the element of surprise in such sentences, which leads to the use of *imma* to assert the reality of what is stated: ‘If you actually do so-and-so (much to the surprise of any reasonable person) . . .’. The juxtaposition of such an unexpected event and a preceding negative sentence leads easily to the intensifying sense of ‘even’. As already indicated, most of the treaty passages make sense with either ‘even’ or ‘actually’.

Thus *imma* following negative sentences shows the same asseverative function as in *natta imma*. Comparison of certain examples shows that *imma* is also emphasizing; i.e., the asseveration is focused on the element of the sentence which immediately precedes *imma*. Note that again with very few exceptions *imma* occurs in dialogue or in texts formulated in the second person (treaties and instructions).

4. *imma* in other positive sentences

In this environment *imma* has been interpreted as additive (‘also, moreover’), intensifying (‘even’), and asseverative (‘indeed’). In some instances any of these interpretations is suitable. There are, however, some examples where only an emphasizing or asseverative sense is appropriate. Several of these are in positive sentences which are contrasted with following negative sentences.

One is *KUB* X 1 I 17–21 (CTH 627): *Lisaŋga* *UrvaArinna* *Lisaŋga* *UrvaZippalanda-ya rudaewanza aranta imma USKEN-NU-ma *UL*. ‘The priest of Arinna and the r. priest of Zipplanda do indeed stand, but they do not bow’. Likewise *KUB* XIII 4 III 49–50 (Instructions for Temple Servants, CTH 264): *n-an-kan UKU-li imma tätteni UL-an-kan DINGIR.LIM-nil tätteni ‘You (may) indeed steal it from a man, but you (may) not steal it from a god’. Puhvel also interprets both of these examples as ‘indeed’. There is nothing in the preceding context of either passage to serve as the point of departure for an additive or intensifying sense.

Emphasis and asseveration are also the only reasonable solution for the more famous passage in *KUB* XIII 4 III 49–52: *n-ažia kuedani SÅ ŠE.DINGIR.LIM-waštul kišari ŠE.DINGIR.LIM-ma imma 1-an ūr₇ urvaHattušil-ma LUGAL-aššu *UL* ḫarazki ŠE waštul kušiyazi n-aš QUADU NUMUN-SU ḫarazki. The parallel use of ḫarazki argues for the interpretation of Friedrich, SV 2, 158, and Sturtevant, JAOS 54 (1934) 386 (similarly Puhvel): ‘In which temple the sin occurs, the temple alone indeed shall perish, but Hattusa (and) the property of the king shall not perish. The one who commits the sin shall perish along with his offspring’.11 Sommer, *AU* 88, and Goetze, *ANET* 259, prefer to interpret the *imma* clause as part of the prodosis: ‘(Even) if the temple in which the sin occurs alone perishes, but Hattusa and the king’s property do not perish . . .’. By this interpretation the sinner is to die even if his sin results only in the loss of the temple, not in a general conflagration. By the other interpretation, the point is that only the sinner and the temple in which he sins are to suffer for it, not anyone else. The latter seems a far more likely stipulation for the instructions to make. That the guilty party would die even for destroying merely the temple (hardly an insignificant loss!) seems self-evident. On the other hand, given the Hittites’ notion of collective guilt, the insistence on limiting the punishment in this case seems apropos.12 For this interpretation only an emphasizing and asseverative sense for *imma* is appropriate. In this as in the preceding two examples, the *imma* clause is being con-

11 Puhvel prefers an apportion ‘but Hattusa, the king’s possession’, and one could even suppose ‘the property of the king of Hattusa’, but this is irrelevant to the point under discussion.

12 Compare the plague prayers of Mursili, the entire point of which is the attempt of the king to assume personal responsibility for the supposed sin and to expiate it, thus sparing the people as a whole. See also *KUB* XXIV 3 II 55–59 (CTH 376) with duplicates: *n-aš li-[i]ššeruša idilaqašanda ṣaḫ̄arsu n-aš man ŠE.DINGIR.LIM-nimma-[aššu li-EN (EN.E2M)] našima SHEN-EN-[šašu li-DINGIR.MES-gušu -(pats)] I-an ḫa-arinkandu (KUR 133) *RUKUBABBAR-[i]-ma-aššu . . .] ‘Let not the good perish among the wicked! If it is one city, or it is one house, or one man, let the gods destroy that which very one alone, but the land of Hatti . . .’. 
trusted with a negative clause which follows it. While asseveration permits such a preceding or following clause, the latter is impossible for addition or intensification, which require a prior referent of some kind.

On the other hand, those passages in which an additive or intensifying function has been suggested for *imma* may be equally well or better explained as emphatic or asseverative. Puhvel follows Götze, *AM* 15, in interpreting KUB XIX 29 I 9 (*CTh* 61) as additive: *šeš-YA BA.ŪŠ imma* ‘Moreover (i.e. to top off antecedent calamities) my brother died’. However, the only event which is clearly mentioned in the badly broken preceding context in his brother’s illness. One may therefore with equal plausibility understand the sentence as asseverative: ‘And my brother indeed died’ (as a result of the aforementioned illness). Since the brother’s death is the catalyst for all succeeding events, it is natural that it be focused upon.

In KUB XIV 1 Rs 88–89 (*CTh* 147) Madduwatta insists that the Hittite king’s father never told him to keep his hands off Alasiya, but then obligingly says: *kinuma-wa mān* 4UTUSM ḌAM.RA.ḪA ḌU/Alasiya imma ḏppe wewakki ṼU-VA-AN ni ʧa p(ih)j ‘But if His Majesty now does indeed demand back the deportees of Alasiya, I will give them back to him’ (likewise Puhvel). Obviously, one could also understand ‘If he demands back even the deportees of Alasiya . . .’, but the point remains the same. Madduwatta is claiming that he is willing to give back the deportees precisely of a country, Alasiya, for which there were no previous instructions. Since there has been no mention of any other deportees, an additive sense ‘also’ is definitely excluded.

The passage KBo V 3 + III 54 (Hukkana Treaty, *CTh* 42) concerns a certain Mariya, who dared to look upon one of the royal concubines. Unfortunately for him, his indiscretion was viewed by, of all people, the king himself: *apās-an-kan anda aūṣi ABI 4UTUSLMa-kan imma GAB-az arha aūṣi* ‘He (Mariya) looked at her, (while) the father of His Majesty himself was looking out the window’! Friedrich, *SV* 2.129, and Puhvel take *imma* as ‘moreover’, viewing the second sentence as an added circumstance: Mariya not only committed an indiscretion, but was also caught in the act. I find it equally likely (with Götze-Pedersen) that the point of the sentence is not merely that he was discovered, but by whom he was discovered.

In the Prayer of Kantuzzili, KUB XXX 10 I 11 (*CTh* 373, MH ms.), we find *kürit imma mišhāti nu-za-kan ŠA DINGIR-YA dud-

---

*dumar hattāta ūmanta iaki[v] ni.* Goetze, *ANET* 400, takes *maši* in the sense ‘prosper’ and renders the first clause as ‘Even when I fared well . . .’; Friedrich, *HW* 82, following Sommer, prefers ‘The more I grew . . .’. Given the reference in the preceding line to ‘from childhood’, Friedrich’s interpretation of *maši* as ‘grow (up)’ seems assured. It is by no means necessary, however, to assume with him an additive sense for *imma*, which we have seen cannot be correct for some occurrences. The focus here (and in the entire passage) is on the time of the action: ‘Indeed at the very time I was growing up, I (already) gave testimony to all the mercy and wisdom of my god’ (*kürit imma* = ‘just when’).

A couple of passages seem to suggest an additive meaning ‘also’ for *imma*, but since both contain a -ya ‘also, and’, it seems better to assign ‘also’ to the latter and retain an emphasizing or asseverative sense for *imma*: *VBoT* 58 I 33 (*CTh* 323) *takku-wa apē aki[r nu-wa k]ē-ya imma aki* ‘If those have died, (then) indeed these too surely have died’ (see Laroche, *RHA* 77 (1965) 84 for the restorations). Likewise KBo IV 14 III 23–24 (*CTh* 123): *tuk-ma karī kē INIM.MEŠ pīrān GAM tiyan DŪ-nun zikīla-ya-at memikiti imma* ‘Because I have already had these words laid down before you, and indeed you yourself have also kept saying them’.

In KUB XXXIX 12,9 (*CTh* 450) we find the incomplete sentence *n-at-kan INA UD.H.KAM imma kar[.]*. Otten, *TR* 71, takes *imma* as ‘rather’, but there is nothing to recommend this contrastive interpretation. An emphasizing ‘indeed on the very first day’ is far more likely.

In summary, then, in this environment as in others only the interpretation of *imma* as asseverative and emphasizing fits all occurrences. Furthermore one may see by reviewing the examples that in all cases *imma* may be sensibly taken as emphasizing precisely the word which precedes it. One additional instance of *imma* in a positive sentence appears to contradict this claim, but the problem is only apparent. A ritual prescription KUB XXX 35 I 6 (*CTh* 400) contains the following instruction: *nu kwari wappwraw[?] purut LÚ.MEŠDUG.GA₄.BUR imma daškanzi nu apadda paši*. The focus

---

13) Likewise Puhvel, except that he overlooks the -ya ‘also’. The tablet has *imma* written together with the beginning of the next sentence (*im-ma-ma-an-wa-at-ši*), but in view of its overall usage a sentence-initial *imma* is inexplicable, and I follow Puhvel’s illuminating suggestion that *imma* goes rather with memīkit.
here seems to be on the place where the celebrant is to go. One would thus expect *kuwaqi imma* ‘just where ... there you shall go’. However, in this case the goal is defined in terms of the potters’ activity, and one may also obtain good sense by taking *imma* with *lūmē*<sub>1</sub> *dug*<sub>1</sub> *ga*<sub>1</sub>, *bur*: ‘And you shall go wherever the potters themselves take the clay of the riverbank’. That is, the celebrant is to go to the place on the riverbank where the clay is of such quality that the professionals themselves, the potters, go there. In this example, too, then, *imma* may be understood as emphasizing the immediately preceding word.

I have reserved for last the text which contains more examples of independent *imma* than any other, *KUB* XXXI 71, a text which has not been previously discussed in connection with *imma*, although it has now been available for nearly fifty years. The reason for this silence is not far to seek. Although Laroche hesitantly lists the text under *CTH* 297 (depositions of various sorts), it is clear from line IV 1 f that we have here a dream narrative of the queen (cf. *CTH* 584). The difficulty of interpreting a description of a dream is obvious. We cannot exclude a priori even the most improbable events, nor may we assume a logical sequence of events. A fully adequate treatment of this text is not possible here, but I believe that the usage of *imma* can be shown to be consistent with that in other contexts in a way which also accounts for the frequency of occurrence.

In addition to one instance in a broken context (II 20), *imma* occurs five times in *KUB* XXXI 71: III 7 *nu-mu-kan imma*, III 16 *nu-wa-mu imma*, III 25 *aNŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ-ma-wa imma*, IV 8 *nu-wa-kan imma*, and IV 22 *parā-ma-wa-mu-kan imma*. The occurrence in IV 8 appears to contradict the claim that *imma* emphasizes the word preceding it, since there is nothing here for it to emphasize. Indeed, it is unlikely that it could emphasize enclitic -mu in the other two examples. For emphatic ‘me’ we would expect *ammu* *imma*. Note, however, that all five examples of *imma* in this text are in second position in the sentence. In other words, *imma* is postposed to the first element of the sentence unit: compare preverb + *imma* + verb above in Section 3.

This suggests that *imma* here modifies not any particular element in the sentence, but the sentence as a whole. It is in effect equivalent to English ‘you see’: (IV 22–24) *parā-ma-wa-mu-kan imma namma damēda/kuedaqa ḫalenduwa/and a/perhiyet ‘But then, you see, he led me out into some other h. room’. This frequent use of *imma* modifying the entire sentence in a dream narrative reflects the speaker’s doubts that the listener will believe what she says. Therefore she insists repeatedly on the veracity of her report by means of *imma*, which has the same asseverative sense we have seen elsewhere. The only difference is that here it applies to the entire sentence, not to some particular element. Note once more with *imma* in positive sentences the frequent appearance in dialogue or second-person contexts.

5. *imma* with relatives

In this environment *imma* has been interpreted either as additive (‘wh-ever else’) or as merely generalizing (‘wh-ever’). By the latter view *kuīš imma* (kuišt) is equivalent in usage to *kuīš kuīš*. The interpretation of *imma* as ‘else’ is quite suitable for passages where the generalizing relative follows and completes a list of specific alternatives. See e.g. *KUB* VII 5 13–15 (CTH 406): *nu-zat màn ḤUR-SAG-i nu-zat màn wēllwēt nu-zat màn hārīya kuwaqīt-za imma kuwaqīt ‘Whether you are in the mountain, or are in the meadow, or are in the valley, or (wherever else you may be ...’.

However, an additive meaning does not make sense when the generalizing relative comes at the head of such a list, such as *KB* V 3 III 44 (CTH 42): *kuīš-aš imma kuīš ŠA É.GAL.LIM SAL màn-āf SAL ELLUM màn-āf SAL.SUḪ.UR.LAL ‘Whatever woman of the palace she may be, whether she is a free woman or a concubine’. The additive meaning ‘else’ is also inappropriate in the many cases where the generalizing relative is used without any prior mention of other possibilities, as in the ritual text *KUB* XXIV 14 I 6–8 (CTH 397): *kalwaššan*<sup>15</sup> *tапalakasšan*<sup>15</sup> *haḫḫatittin*<sup>15</sup> *eštu*<sup>15</sup> *GILlandı*<sup>15</sup> *kuś*<sup>15</sup> *imma* *GUR-ruwaš* ‘(I take) k. plant, t. plant, h. plant, barley, (and) twigs of any tree whatever’. Since there has been no prior mention of any trees (‘plants’ (SAR) are not trees), one cannot interpret *kuś* *imma* *GUR-ruwaš* as ‘whatever other/additional tree’. In a survey of all relative forms with *imma* available to me I have found no basis for a distinction between *kuś* *imma*, *kuś* *imma* *kuś* and *kuś* *kuś*.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>14</sup> This use of *imma* is not the only distinctive syntactic feature of Hittite dream narratives. Compare the frequent use of *mān* ‘like, as (it were)’, indicating the speaker’s own uncertainty as to what he or she saw.

<sup>15</sup> My corpus of relatives with *imma* consists of the following (this includes duplicates): *KB* II 4 II 5, II 6 III 17, IV 2 IV 32–33, IV 14 II 58, III 67, V 3 III 33, III 44, IV 8–9, 18, V 4 V 39, V 14 I 26, V 13 II 4, 31, VII 60 Rs 7, VIII 50 I 6, XII 42 Rs 12, XIII 58 II 22–24, XIII 177 I 12–13, XVI 8 II 25, XVI 14 1; XIX 43 +
All seem to be equivalent generalizing relatives, as indicated already by Götte-Pedersen and Puhvel. There seems to be no justification for the contrast implied by Friedrich, HE P. 69: \textit{kui-kui} `whoever', \textit{kui-imma kui} ` whoever else'.

The form and distribution of the relative forms with \textit{imma} do raise several questions, however. First of all, it is striking that the form \textit{kui-imma} \textit{(kui-)} is completely absent in OH manuscripts, nor does it occur to my knowledge in any copy of an assured OH composition.\textsuperscript{16} It is true, of course, that \textit{imma} in other uses is also extremely rare in OH, but we do have one example in an OH manuscript (\textit{KUB} XXXVI 106 Vhs 5) and several others in later copies of OH texts (\textit{KBo} III 1 II 44, \textit{VBoT} 58 I 33). Furthermore, we have seen that \textit{imma} in its other uses is highly concentrated in dialogues or similar genres. Examples from narratives are rare. Since the corpus of OH manuscripts is largely ritual prescriptions in the third person and historical narratives, the rarity of \textit{imma} is not surprising. However, \textit{imma} with relatives is not so restricted, being distributed evenly across all types of texts. The complete absence of this construction in OH thus calls for another explanation.

There is also the problem of the status and relationship of the different forms of relative plus \textit{imma}. In my sample, there are 36 examples of \textit{kui-imma kui-}, 12 of \textit{kui-imma}, 3 of \textit{kui-imma} and 2 of \textit{imma kui-}. In view of the evidence we have seen above for \textit{imma} following the word it modifies, the authenticity of the last type \textit{imma kui-} is questionable. One of the apparent examples of \textit{imma kui-} probably does not exist. In \textit{KBo} XVI 14, 10–11 + XVI 8 II 25–26 we read: \textit{nu-kara KUR URU GAGA imma kui- šA KUR URU Pala iyyattat}. While one could understand this as `Whoever Gasgana enemy marched into Pala...', the Gasgana enemy has already been mentioned two lines previously. The second reference is therefore more likely to be specific than general. It thus makes more sense to take \textit{imma} as emphasizing the preceding word, as usual: `As for the Gas-

tially present in OH manuscripts, and it may not be accidental that in both occurrences it is non-initial: \textit{KBo} XVII 11 + J 5 (\textit{StBoT} 25, Nr. 25) \textit{LU.MES UBARU LÚ-af} \textit{kuiš kuiš} and \textit{KBo} XXV 61 Rs 20 (\textit{StBoT} 25, Nr. 61) \textit{azzaaz kuiš kuiš}.\textsuperscript{15}

While more examples would be desirable, this restricted distribution suggests that the iterated form developed or at least was originally favored in Hittite in those contexts where simple \textit{kui-} could not be used in a generalizing sense, namely, where some other stressed element occurred in sentence-initial position.

\textsuperscript{17} Friedrich also errs in claiming that \textit{kušša} (with geminate -\textit{š}-) \textit{can} mean `whoever'. The form with geminate consonant means either `every' or `and wh-ever', where the geminating -\textit{a} marks `and': see e.g. \textit{KBo} IV 14 III 67 and IV 2 IV 32–33.

\textsuperscript{18} Although the obscure \textit{azzaaz} looks like a sequence of sentence-initial conjunction plus enclitics, the other occurrence in \textit{KBo} XXV 58 II 2 [ ]-x-u \textit{azzaaz} [ ] with a preceding noun ending argues against this.
Since simple sentence-initial kui- is the common generalizing form in OH, it seems likely that the form kui- imma results directly from the posting of imma to such a kui-. Nine of the twelve examples of kui- imma are clause-initial. The longer forms kui-imma kui- and kui-kui-imma would be a conflation of what were originally alternatives: clause-initial kui-imma and non-initial kui-kui-. The conflated form may of course be used in either position. However, the distribution of kui-imma kui- and kui-kui-imma argues that these result from adding iteration to kui-imma, not by adding imma to kui-kui-: all three examples of kui-kui-imma and three-fourths of those of kui-imma kui- are clause-initial. On the other hand, kui-kui- itself outside OH is about evenly distributed between initial and non-initial position.

Since clause-initial kui- is by itself generalizing, we must next ask why it would have come to be reinforced by imma, which does not seem to alter the sense. The answer has already been intimated above. A generalizing relative is equivalent to a general conditional clause: cf. KBo V 3 II 33 (CTH 42) kuiēi-ās imma kuiš antuštisšis ‘Whatever man he may be’ and ibid. IV 8–9 mān-ās kuiš imm[a] kuiš antuštisšis ‘If he is any man whatever.’ It introduces new information. This is a likely context for an asseverative adverb.

Götte-Pedersen had already claimed that the generalizing function could arise from the basic use of marking asseveration, but they gave no parallels or explanation. A good parallel is furnished by English ‘who(whoso)ever’. For ‘so’ as asseverative, compare the use in indignant replies: ‘You didn’t really do that?—I did so!’ The English set of ‘whoever’, ‘whoso’ and ‘whosoever’, all equivalent in usage (the second now being obsolete), may be compared directly to kui-kui-, kui-imma and kui-kui-imma. While neither Hitt. imma nor English ‘so’ is necessary to mark the relative as generalizing, the use of an asseverative adverb here is natural, seeing that the speaker is introducing a new proposition to the listener, a condition on which a following action depends: cf. KBo II 4 II 5 (CTH 672) kuiš imma INBU EN šUR Nerik weeniyazi ‘Whatever (kind of) fruit the lord of Nerik may actually/indeed find’ (= ‘If provided that the lord of Nerik indeed finds fruit of some sort’).

19) Götte, ZA NF 2.266 f., was undoubtedly correct in viewing the variant kui-ās imma kuiš as being originally a nominal sentence with -ās as the subject ‘he’. However, the accusative form in lBoT I 36 III 36 kui-an imma kuis, where a real direct object ‘him’ makes no sense, suggests that kui-ās (imma) kuiš was at some point reanalyzed as a unit equivalent to simply kuiš (imma) kuiš.

In summary, then, our reexamination of the use of imma in all contexts has confirmed the assertion of Götte-Pedersen that all functions of imma can be derived from that of asseveration. Furthermore, we have seen that imma regularly emphasizes the immediately preceding word; i.e., the focus of the asseveration may be on any element of the sentence. If the sentence as a whole is to be affirmed, imma appears in second position in the sentence.

6. Related forms in Anatolian

Before turning to the PIE source of imma, we need to mention briefly several related forms within Anatolian. In Hittite we find the rare form immakkus, which has been convincingly analyzed as imma plus -kuš ‘and’ (< *-k*e): see among others Eichner, MSS 29 (1971) 37 & 43. The only occurrence in a complete context is KBo V 6 III 7–8 (CTH 40): nu-immaš-kan EN-ŠUNU kuiš Pippušuruwāyas immakkus BA.ÜS. Here immakkus has consistently been given an additive sense: ‘Because on top of that his lord P. had died’ (see Puhvel with refs.). In the context this implies that the Egyptian queen asked the Hittite king for one of his sons in marriage for two reasons: fear of the Hittites’ military prowess and the death of her husband. While this interpretation is quite possible, nothing forces this conclusion. Given the rather peculiar word order (the subject EN-ŠUNU and its appositive ‘Pippušuruwāyas’ split by kuiš ‘because’), we may also reasonably interpret immakkus as ‘and indeed’ > ‘to be sure, namely’: ‘Because their lord—namely P.—had died’ (cf. Germ. und zwar = ‘namely, that is’). Nothing about the usage of immakkus contradicts our conclusion that imma is asseverative: ‘indeed, actually’.

It is important to note that we now have in HLuvian the expression REL-/ta-sa-pa-sawal/ išma-MA REL-/ta-sa, i.e. REL-/is-pa-sawal ima REL-/is (see Hawkins, AnSt 25 (1975) 130). Given this parallel to Hitt. kuiš-imma kuiš- (HLuvian orthography does not of course show the genitmate), the form imma which occurs three times in CLuvian in obscure contexts is almost certainly the same word as Hitt. imma. Our asseverative adverb is undoubtedly Common Anatolian.

20) The use of imma with a relative in HLuvian appears to argue against the suggestion made above that such use of imma is late in Hittite itself. However, given the function of imma as described here, I do not believe a parallel but independent development of the same usage can be excluded. On the other hand, the complete absence in OH may be due to chance, and we may be facing another example of the parallel expansion of a productive pattern which was only present in embryo at some earlier stage (in this case Common Anatolian).
7. Hittite *ima* and Latin *immō*

The above confirmation of the asseverative function of Hittite *ima* should put to rest any doubts about the equation with Latin *immō*. All uses of the latter can also be derived easily from the same basic function. Because it is often used in sentences that contradict something said previously, *immō* has often been glossed as ‘rather’ (see e.g. Oxford Latin Dictionary s.v.). However, just as in the similar Hittite cases (Section 3 above), the contrastive meaning is a function of the simple juxtaposition of the contradictory statements. The meaning of *immō* itself is asseverative: e.g. Martial 3.47.15 urbem petebat Bassus? *immō rūs ibat* ‘Did B. head for the city!’—Actually, he went to the country’; Cicero Att. 9.7.4 causa igitur non bona est? *immō optima* ‘So the case is not good?’—Actually, it’s excellent’ (cf. Puhvel); Cicero Att. 6.2.7 uenio ad Brutum tuum, *immō nostrum* ‘I am coming to your, actually our, Brutus’. Just as in Hittite *ima* may reinforce *-a/-ya* ‘also, even’ (see Section 4 above), Latin *immō* often supports *uero* etiam: Cicero Cat. 1.1.2 *uiuit*? *immō uero etiam in senatum uenit* ‘Is he alive?—Indeed (he is), he even comes to the senate!’ (cf. again Puhvel). Naturally *immō* also often reinforces *quiēn*, which itself is asseverative: ‘indeed, in fact’; The asseverative force of *immō* is also reflected in its frequent cooccurrence with interjections like *here(u)le* and *edepol* (= ‘by God!’). Like Hitt. *ima*, Lat. *immō* is particularly frequent in dialogue.

We thus have an equation Hitt. *ima = Lat. immō* pointing to a PIE *immō* which has an asseverative and emphasizing function. Hittite tells us further that it was originally postposed to the word it emphasized. These two facts suggest that *immō* is related to the emphasizing particle Skt. *id = Av. it* As an example of the use of *id* we may cite RV 1.1.4: *ágne yámi yajñam adhváraṁ viśvádiḥ paríbhúrm ásá śá id devśu gacchati* ‘Oh Agni, whatever sacrifice (and) ritual you surround on all sides, that indeed goes to the gods’. Note as well as with *ima* the combination of asseveration and emphasis.

Given this close functional match, I propose that Hitt. *ima* and Lat. *immō* continue a PIE *id-mō*, with the same particle as Indo-Iranian *id* (ultimately the nt. nom. acc. sg. of the pronominal stem *ei-), plus the enclitic conjunction *-mō reflected in Hitt. *-ma*. A full discussion of the use of Hitt. *-ma* (and its alternate non-generating *-a*) would require a separate article. For the present, it will suffice to say that the description of Grk. *dē* given by Schwzyer, Gr. Gram. 2.562, will serve very well for Hitt. *-a/-ma*: ‘Es bezeichnet, daß (gegenüber dem Vorhergehenden) etwas Anderes, Neues kommt . . . es wird in andern Sprachen entweder (als scheinbar überflüssig) nicht ausgedrückt oder zu genau durch ‘und’, ‘oder’, ‘aber, jedoch, dagegen, sondern’, ‘denn, nämlich’ wiedergegeben (und dann kopulativ, adversativ, kausal genannt). The reason for the combination *id-mō* is apparent. The latter marks the introduction of new information, implying more or less strongly a contrast with something already mentioned: hence the so-called ‘contrastive’ or ‘asseverative’ use of Hitt. *-ma*. Pragmatically, the introduction of new information, particularly that which contrasts with or even contradicts a previous statement, is a likely context for an asseverative particle. The speaker, anticipating some resistance to his new claim, feels the need to insist upon it. The cooccurrence of *id* and *-mō* is thus natural. Since each is postposed to that element which is the focus of the asseveration (respectively contrast), we would also expect them to be juxtaposed.

The analysis of *immō* as *id-mō* also accounts for the troublesome geminate in both Hittite and Latin. Direct evidence for a cluster *-dm* is scarce in both languages, but what we have supports *mm* as the result. Hitt. *kam(m)-ari- ‘defectate’ matches CLuv. *katmar-* and probably continues *ghod-?-i.* For Latin Leumann-Hofmann-Szantyr I. 200 cites manuscript *annmīrō* for *admīrō*, while examples such as *caementum* < *cadamentum* are explained via *cadamentum* with assimilation and then simplification of the geminate after a long vowel or diphthong (cf. Meillet-Vendryes, gram. comp. 83). More importantly, the derivation of *immō* from *id-mō* accounts for and is supported by the manuscript spelling *immō* in Plautus and Nonius (see Walde-Hofmann s.v.), which has previously been ignored or dismissed. The form *immō* may easily represent an intermediate stage in the assimilation: *id-mō* > *immō*.

The derivation of *ima = immō* from *id-mō* thus accounts for the phonological shape of both reflexes as well as derives their asseverative and emphasizing function from the well-established PIE

\[\text{For the derivation see Tischler, HEG 474, with references. The preserved *dm* of CLuv. *katmār*- contradicts the assimilated *mm*- in CLuv. *ima* and HLVuv. *ima* (read *immō*). However, the preserved initial *k*- is also irregular in *katmār*, since initial *gh* is regularly lost in Luvian: cf. *ixk(a)-ni* ‘hand’ < *ghe₂-ni- and *immā(n)-ni* ‘open field, country’ < *gē₂-ném-. I suppose one could appeal to the *expressive* nature of such a lexical item to explain the irregular developments, but for reasons stated in Section 1 above I find this unattractive. I prefer to admit frankly ignorance as to why both stops are irregularly preserved in this word.}\]
particle *id, whose syntactic behavior also matches that of Hitt.
imma (see again note 10). Given the function of the enclitic
conjunction *-mō as shown by Hitt. -ma, the combination *id-mō is also
natural. By Kurylowicz's first law, the complex *id-mō spread in Hittite
and Latin at the expense of simple *id, eventually replacing it alto-
gether (but see below).22)

8. Hittite and Luvian id(?)

I believe that the above analysis of imma = immō is well enough
established to stand by itself, but there is a good possibility that we
have direct evidence for the particle *id in Anatolian. In the OH text
KBo III 27 Vols 22–27 (CTh 5, NH ms.) we find the following: män
[män-šan] hâšš [t] paḫḫur pariš[t] eni natta-it u[dd]är-me[t] lârrat-
tuma m[ān]-šan paḫḫur natta parišteni ta uizzī uru[ ]atušān
M] UŠ-aši huššiazi 23 If you protect my words, you will also protect
[ ] and my land. If you fan the fire on the hearth, you will indeed
not break my words. If you do not fan the fire, a serpent will come
and envelope Hittusa.

Since the passage is badly broken, some justification of the restora-
tions and translation is necessary. The relatively well-preserved
last two lines clearly contain a conditional sentence, with a negative
prodosis and an unfavorable apodosis: failure to perform an action
will have dire results. The preserved paḫḫur pariš[t] argues that
the preceding sentence is also conditional, parallel to the second,
with the important difference that the prodosis is positive. We have
here the contrast between what will happen if orders are carried out
and if they are not. Note that this points to a favorable apodosis in
the first sentence, but what we find is uđdar[r-met]̥ lârratumma 'you will
break my words'. I believe that this forces a reading of clause-initial
x-at-ta as [n]a-at-ta 'not', which fits the traces of the first sign. We

22 The longer form imma adopts the syntax of Hitt. -ma, which comes to
occur after any stressed element, not just the first in a clause. That immō no
longer functions as a postposition in Latin is scarcely surprising.

It is worth stressing that the analysis of *immo as *i-d-mō not only accounts
for the isolated pair imma = immō; but also gives us a cognate for previously
isolated Hitt. -ma. Despite Puhvel's summary dismissal, I believe that Hahn, Lg
18.103f, is probably correct in relating -ma ultimately to Grk. mēn, mēn and mā.
Many details of her analysis, however, are false or dubious, and I cannot follow
her in relating all of these to PIE *sem- 'one'. Her connection of *mō etc. to the
interrogative stem *me- (Hitt. maši 'how/as many', etc.) seems quite possible,
but far from assured.

thus obtain in negative form a favorable apodosis for the case when
the orders are carried out. This leaves us with an unexplained clearly
written -it. While one is always hesitant to establish a form based on
one occurrence, I see no way to explain the -it as a scribal error.
Given its appearance in the predicted position enclitic to the first
word in the clause, it is hard not to identify this -it with the Vedic
particle id. Hitt. and Luv. imma show that the particle must have once
existed in Anatolian.

C-Luvian also appears to show one example of an enclitic particle
-it. The Ritual of Tunnavi (Tunn. I 58–59) contains the following
Luvian incantation: ariyaddališ *IŠKUR-anza šarrī tappašša ḫēḫīyīya
tappašša-it šarrī tīyamī ḫēḫīyīya. The sign it is written over an erasure
and is less than perfect, but both Götze- Sturtevant, Tunm. 10, and
Laroche, DLL 91, read -it without comment. Laroche lists tap-pa-ša-
it (sci. tap-pa-aš-sa-it) as abl.(?), but this is pure desperation. The
only attested Luvian ending for the ablative-instrumental is -atti, and
the Hittite instrumental -it has no place here. Furthermore, the bro-
ken Hittite parallel KUB IX 34 I 12 has nepiš-ma, which is clearly
nom.-acc. This is matched perfectly by CLuv. tappašša, which is tappašša (= nepiš) plus the frequent suffix -ša which is attached to nom.-
acc. sg. neuters in Luvian.23) In addition, it is clear from the last three
words in each sentence that they are parallel in construction.
We thus expect a nominative (= vocative) tappašša to match IŠ-
KUR-anza: 'Oh a. Storm-god, run above heaven! Heaven, run above
earth!'. Note that CLuv. -it seems to equate here to Hitt. -ma. In
view of imma from *id-ma and what was said about this combi-
nation above, this is not surprising. The goal here is to contrast heaven
as an active being in the second sentence with its passive role as a
place in the first. In Hittite this is accomplished with -ma, which
marks a change of subject, as often: 'As for (you), heaven,...'. CLuvian
uses instead emphasizing -it, which again matches Vedic id in
syntax and function.
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23) Çop. IE 75 (1970) 90, attempts to extend his rule of *Cv > aCv Cv in CLuv
eto explain the double -ša- of tappašša, but all good examples of his rule
involve accented *e. The -ša of the nom.-acc. sg. is the suffix -ša, while in the
oblique cases CLuv. shows the expected single *-š: dat.-loc. tappašš and anim.
tappaššanti-.
Hethitisch *tiśalli-* „Säugling, Kleinkind“

Zu den zahlreichen nur einmal belegten Wörtern im Hethitischen gehört auch eines, das bis jetzt *tiśalli-* oder GUD1 *tiśalli-* gelesen wurde. HW 224 b setzt es fragend als „zeugungsfähig(?), brünstig(?)“ an, in Anlehnung an J. Friedrich, ArchOr 6, 366, und auch noch J. Tischler, Hethitisch-deutsches Wörterverzeichnis (1982) 91 bringt die Bedeutung „zeugungsfähig“(?) zuvor aber den Hinweis „Nomen u(nbekannter) B(edeutung)“. Die Textstelle mit dem erwähnten Wort (KUB V 9 Vs. 3 ff.) stellt eine Orakelfrage dar:

3  nu LŪMEŠ  E.GAL  pu-nu-tša-u-en  UM-MA-ŠU-NU-MA  
4  X(t) ti-ša-al-li-in-ya  ŠA  MU 3RAM  ša-ak-nu-ya-an-da-an  
5  IG1-u-en nu-ya-kān DUG an-da  tiša-in-ta  
6   DINGIR  LUM e-ni ku-it-ki  iši-ja-aḫ-ta nu  MUŠEN  HUR-RI  
     SIG5-3 nu  NU  SIG3

Friedrich, der sich ArchOr 6 (1934) 366 mit Anm. 4 mit diesem Satz befaßte, lieferte die provisorische Übersetzung:

„Wohnen bei...es untreues Kind (?) von 3 Jahren gesch...t [Anm. 4]: „Ein oder zwei unleserliche Zeichen. IG1-u-en „wir sahen“ wäre graphisch möglich, scheint aber daran, daß die Form aumen lautet ...“) und es ... te in ein Gefühl hinein.“

Daran knüpft er folgende Überlegung:

„Ob die Verbform *tiša-in-ta* (3, Sg, Praet.) und das Adjetiv *tiśal-il* etwa mit der Zeugungsfähigkeit des Tieres zusammenhänge – § 176 A der Gesetze spricht davon, daß das Kind und andere Haustiere im 3. Jahre zeugungsfähig werden –, muß dahingestellt bleiben.“

Fest steht auf jeden Fall, daß das erste Zeichen in Zeile 4 schwer zu lesen ist (offenbar über Rasur geschrieben). Ein *tiśalli-* mit der Bedeutung „zeugungsfähig(?)“ wie in HW ist aber aus der Luft gegriffen. Entweder ließ man GUD1 *t*, dann hat *tiśalli-* keinen Glos senkeil, oder man l i e s *tiśalli-*, dann steht „zeugungsfähig“ völlig im leeren Raum.

H. G. Güterbock, der die Lesung mit Glos senkeil bevorzugte (Kum 59), stellte denn auch fest, daß die Bedeutung sich nicht sicher bestimmen lasse. E. Laroche (DLL 98) dagegen verband *tiśalli-*

---
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