Josef-Hans Kühn / Ulrich Fleischer

INDEX HIPPOCRATICUS

cui elaborando interfuerunt et postremas curas adhibuerunt sodales Thesauri
Linguae Graecae Hamburgensis

Das Werk erscheint in 4 Lieferungen im Umfang von je etwa 250 bis 280 Seiten
(zweispaltig, im Lexikonformat)

Lieferung 1: (α-δῶϱον)
1986. Etwa 280 Seiten, brosch. Subskriptionspreis etwa DM 170,–

Lieferung 2: (ε-κώφωσις)
1986. Etwa 320 Seiten, brosch. Subskriptionspreis etwa DM 198,–

Die Lieferungen 3 und 4 werden 1987 vorliegen.
Subskriptionspreis des Gesamtwerkes (broschiert) etwa DM 700,–

In diesem Index wird der vollständige Wortschatz sämtlicher Schriften des Corpus
Hippocraticum dokumentiert (ausgenommen sind nur die Artikel und einige
Partikeln). Zitiert wird nach der bis heute wichtigsten, wiederholt nachgedruckten
Gesamtausgabe von E. Littré. Diese Grundlage wird erweitert um einige nicht bei
Littré gedruckte Texte und die Lemmata der Glossare Erotians und Galens, soweit
sie in den erhaltenen hippokratischen Schriften nicht nachweisbar sind; vor allem
aber ergänzt und korrigiert durch systematische Auswertung der neueren kri-
tischen Ausgaben und des handschriftlichen Befundes. Das eingeschlagene Ver-
fahren verbindet zwei Vorteile: einheitliche Zitierweise nach Littré und reich-
haltige Angaben zur Überlieferung aller, insbesondere der noch nicht kritisch
neuedierten Schriften. – In der Darbietung hält der Index die Mitte zwischen
bloßem Stellenverzeichnis und Lexikon. Gegliedert wird primär nach gramma-
tischen Kategorien und Bedeutungsunterschieden; ferner werden besondere Wort-
verbindungen und bemerkenswerte Dialektformen herausgehoben. Auch ist
weniger gewöhnlichen Wörtern eine Übersetzung (in Latein) beigegeben. – Vor-
ausgeschickt ist (in deutscher Sprache) eine sachliche Einleitung, die u.a. ein
Verzeichnis der hippokratischen Schriften mit Angaben zur Überlieferung, zu den
Ausgaben und wenn möglich zur Datierung enthält.

Die 1852 von Adalbert Kuhn begründete „Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung", die seit 1877 den Gesamtbereich der indogermanischen Sprachen berücksichtigt, widmet sich vor allem der historischen Sprachwissenschaft. Sie möchte der Verbindung von Textinterpretation und sprachwissenschaftlicher Analyse dienen, neuentdeckten Sprachdenkmälern zur Veröffentlichung helfen, aber auch neuen methodischen Ansätzen Gehör verschaffen.

„Kuhns Zeitschrift", im Jahre 1907 mit „Bezzenbergers Beiträgen" vereinigt, ist die älteste heute noch bestehende sprachwissenschaftliche Zeitschrift.

INHALT

Lehnbeziehungen gegeben. Er spricht in diesem Zusammenhang vom „Aufbau einer sprachlichen Lehngutkunde"[48]. Die Frage, ob alle diese Informationen in einem etymologischen Wörterbuch mit zu behandeln seien, hat bisher keine übereinstimmende Beantwortung gefunden.

Abbildung 5: Struktureigenschaften eines systematischen etymologischen Wörterbuchs

Einzeleintrag		
Parallelformen aus anderen Sprachen	etymologische Rekonstruktion	Hilfswissenschaften
	Wortgeschichte	
		bibliographische Angaben
Verweisstruktur		
Einzelverweise	Listenverweise	
	formal	inhaltlich
Alphabetischer Index		

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 Wörterbuchgestalt 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 Wortfamilienbuches, duplizieren.

Maringstraße 10   Gisela M. Neuhaus
4400 Münster

---

[48] Werner Betz, „Die Lehnbildungen und der Abendländische Sprachausgleich", *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur,* 6 (1944), p. 297.

Hittite *imma* and Latin *immō* *)

1. *Introduction*

The Hittite adverb *imma* was first equated with Latin *immō* by Götze - 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*.[1]) A geminate **-mm-* for PIE is problematic. Götze - 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, **imō* remains obscure. Both Marstrander, *Caractère indoeur.* 27, and Hahn, *Lg* 18.101–103, analyze *imma* as containing Hitt. *-ma* 'but' (viewing the first element as pronominal **e/i-* 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*.

---

[1]) The final vowel of Lat. *immō* is regularly long. The occasional scansion *ĭmmŏ* in Plautus and Terence is explainable in terms of the 'iambic shortening rule'. Hitt. *-a* may easily represent unaccented **-ō* 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': *kuiš imma* (*kuiš*) '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) corroborating 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* 87 f, 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, Götze - 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 ḫandān ammel* DUMU.SAL-*YA šanḫiškiši nu-tta ŪL imma piḫḫi piḫḫi-tta* '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 Götze - Pedersen, who suggest that the problematic instance in the Tawagalawa Letter (*CTH* 181, *KUB* XIV 3 II 75) may also be inter-

preted as a rhetorical question: *n-aš-mu ŪL imma* ᴸᵁ*ḪA⟨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, Sürenhagen, *AoF* 8 (1981) 97, and Puhvel), and *KUB* XXVI 8 I 12–13 (see Puhvel contra von Schuler, *Dienstanw.* 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 ᴸᵁ·ᴹᴱˢSAG (*CTH* 255, *KUB* XXI 42 I 7–8) and is entirely parallel to that in *KUB* XXVI 8 mentioned above: DUMU.MEŠ EN.MEŠ-*YA-wa-nna[š]* x-x *ŪL imma* NUMUN EN-*YA* 'Are we sons of "my" lord not the seed of "my" lord?'.[2]) In *KUB* XXIII 72 Vs 40 (*CTH* 146, MH ms.) we find *nu-war-aš* LÚ-*iš ug-a-wa-z ŪL imma* LÚ-*aš* 'He is a man. Am I not a man?'.[3]) 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* ᵐ*Ḫuwaš-šanna-* ᵈLAMA-*yan ŪL imma šaggaḫḫi* '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 (Sürenhagen, *AoF* 8. 97) and *KUB* XXI 38 I 52 (Helck, *JSC* 17. 91, follow-

---

[2]) Von Schuler, *Dienstanw.* 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 -*nnaš* 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 *wa*, it is certain that we have a single nominal sentence.

[3]) Gurney, *AAA* 28 (1948) 35, reads ᴸᵁIŠ instead of LÚ-*iš*, 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.

ing Rost). If we test the five different functions suggested for *imma* above in the context of rhetorical questions, we find that only the first, corroboration or asseveration, makes sense in all of them. Meanings (4) and (5) are out of the question. Senses (2) and (3), addition and intensification, would be appropriate for some examples, such as that in *KUB* XXIII 72 Vs 40: 'Am I not also/even a man?'. However, in others there is nothing in the preceding context to serve as the point of departure for addition or intensification. For example, to interpret *VBoT* 2,9 as 'Will I not also/even give (her) to you?' implies that there has been talk about giving something else. There is no basis in the text for such a presupposition.

We must conclude with Götze-Pedersen and Puhvel that *imma* in *natta imma* means 'really, truly, indeed'. By adding *imma* to a rhetorical question the speaker is insisting on the truth of the implied positive statement: 'Won't I give her to you?–Of course/indeed I will' (similarly Puhvel). The question remains as to the precise syntax of *imma*. Does it modify the verb, the combination then being negated by *natta* ('not really') or does *imma* modify *natta* ('really not')? Götze-Pedersen opt for the latter; Puhvel, to judge by his translations, for the former. Either analysis is compatible with the function of reinforcing the rhetorical question. We shall see below evidence that *imma* normally follows the word it modifies. From this we may infer that *imma* modifies *natta* in the combination *natta imma*. It is worth noting in conclusion that all occurrences of *natta imma* are found either in dialogue or genres which imply a dialogue (letters and prayers). The rhetorical value of *imma* is evident.

3. *imma alone following a negative sentence*

In this context *imma* 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; *CTH* 138, MH ms.): *ŪL-man-an* EGIR-*pa* ᵁᴿᵁ*Ḫattuši pišteni n-an-kan parā INA* KUR ᴸᵁKÚR *imma nāi* '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 II 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

Vs 69 (MH ms.), *KUB* XXIII 77,78–79, and probably *KUB* VI 48
Rs 3, XXVI 106 Vs 4–5 (OH ms.!), XLIII 76 Rs 11, and XXIII 27 Vs
15 (MH ms.).[4])

By the additive or intensifying interpretation *imma* expresses the
piling of one delict on top of another. The treaty violator is 'adding
insult to injury' to use the English vernacular. In all the examples
listed above this analysis is quite reasonable, but there is one text for
which it fails, *KUB* XXX 31 II 50–54 (*CTH* 479): EGIR-*an-ma*
UNUT LUGAL *appanzi nu namma* 1 *uzianza ŠA* SAL.LUGAL *IŠTU*
MUŠEN [*šipa*]*nti* UNUTUM-*ma* EGIR-*an ŪL appanzi* SAL.LU-
GAL[*TAM*]-*ma-kan imma anda* KAxU-*az memai* '... they hold the
implements of the king "behind".[5]) Next one performs one u. sacri-
fice with a bird on behalf of the queen, but they do not hold (her)
implements "behind". (Rather) one inserts the office of queen ver-
bally (lit. by mouth)'. The meaning of this somewhat strange phrase-
ology is this: in certain rituals the king and queen do not actually
participate personally, but are represented in various ways. One
method is for someone to hold up at the appropriate time the king's
or queen's signs of office. In this ritual that is the usual practice for
the king (but see below). However, in the case of the queen an even
simpler expedient is used: her participation is indicated merely by
reciting some appropriate phrase.[6])

It is clear that here the second action can only be viewed as replac-
ing the first, not as being added to it or intensifying it. The verbal
recitation is an acceptable alternative to presenting the signs of
office. Since the preceding negative clause is not a violation or fail-

---

[4]) In a similar passage in the Alaksandu Treaty (*CTH* 76, *KUB* XXI 1 II
51–53) the intensifying sense is conveyed by a repetition of the preverb: [*nu
apēdani*] EGIR EGIR-*an* [*tiyaši*] '(but) you (actually) step behind him ...'. See
Dunkel, *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 mema-* '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 *kiššan mema-* '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 mema-*) into a *mugawar* ritual, the action of
which was described on a separate tablet.

ure, the following positive clause cannot be interpreted as an addi-
tional 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* XXX 31 III 2–4): UNUT LUGAL-*ma* EGIR-*an ŪL appanzi*
KAxU-*az-kan imma* LUGAL[*TAM*] *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-ššan ANA* TÚL SIS-
KUR.SISKUR *kittari n-at-ši ēššandu araškandu kuedani-ma ANA*
TÚL SISKUR.SISKUR NU.GÁL *n-at-kan šarā imma araškandu* '(If)
a ritual is established for a spring, let them perform it for it and *a.* (it,
i.e. the spring), but for whatever spring there is no ritual, let them
even/also *a.* it up'.[7]) Since in this case the same action (*arš-*) is to be
taken whether there is a ritual or not, a contrastive 'rather' is impos-
sible. 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 inter-
preted 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 inher-
ent in all passages by the mere juxtaposition of a negative and a posi-
tive 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 numer 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

---

[7]) For the first *araškandu* the duplicate Bo 2821 has [*ša*]*rā-ya-at araškandu*
'also let them *a.* it up' (see von Schuler, *Dienstanw.* 47). Von Schuler and Puhvel
apparently take *arške-* as the iterative of *ar-* 'arrive', but the latter does not take
an accusative. A transitive *arš-* (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[*TAM*]-*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 reeaxamine 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 Madduwatta passage *KUB* XIV 1 Vs 69 (*CTH* 147, MH ms.) makes good sense if *imma* is assumed to emphasize the preceding word: ᵐ*Maddu*[*wat*]*taš-a namma* ᵁᴿᵁ*Dalauwa zaḫḫiya ŪL kuit pait n-ašta ANA* LÚ.MEŠ ᵁᴿᵁ*Dalauwa imma kattan arḫa ḫatrāit* 'But M. did not then go into battle against D. at all. He actually wrote away to the very men of D. ...'. That is, Madduwatta conspired with the very people he was supposed to attack.

In several of the treaty passages *imma* follows *kiššan* 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*Ḫatti* EGIR-*pa Ū*[*L*] *pešti nu-šši kiššan imma memaṭṭi* '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: [*lē ... -t*]*eni walluškitten-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 ŪL warriš-šatti nu-ššan idālāwi imma parā uškiši* '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): [*Ū*]*L kuitki AŠME* ᵐ*Duwiša*[ ] *imma ANA* ᵈUTUˢ*I kiššan memišta* '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) *apūnn-a-mu antuḫšan ŪL tekkuššanuši n-an anda imma munnāši* '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.[8] While other elements of the sentence may be 'extraposed' after the verb, this has the effect of emphasizing them.[9] 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 postposed to the preverb while modifying the entire combination. In general terms this is comparable to the infixation 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.[10]

---

[8] In the example *KUB* XXIII 77,79 above, this problem is solved by placing the verb itself in emphatic initial position: *walluškitten-an imma.*

[9] Such 'extraposition' is comparable to what Gonda calls 'amplified sentences' in Sanskrit. On this construction in Anatolian see now McCone, *Fs. Szemerényi* (1979) 467 ff.

[10] A more direct parallel is furnished by Vedic emphasizing *íd*, 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'. Götze-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): ^{LÚ}SANGA ^{URU}*Arinna* ^{LÚ}SANGA ^{URU}*Zippalanda-ya rudauwanza aranta imma UŠKEN-NU-ma ÜL* 'The priest of Arinna and the r. priest of Ziplanda do indeed **stand**, but they do not bow'. Likewise *KUB* XIII 4 III 49–50

(Instructions for Temple Servants, *CTH* 264): *n-an-kan* UKÙ-*ši imma tāitteni ÜL-an-kan* DINGIR^{LIM}-*ni tayatteni* '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-ašta kuedani* ŠÀ É.DINGIR^{LIM} *waštul kišari nu* É.DINGIR^{LIM}-*ma imma 1-an harakzi* ^{URU}*Ḫattušaš-ma* LUGAL-*aš aššu* ÜL *harakzi nu waštul kuiš iyazi n-aš QADU* NUMUN-*ŠU harakzi*. The parallel use of *harakzi* 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* 209, 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 apposition 'but Hattusas, 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-ašta l[(ē)]aššaweš idālawaš anda harkanzi n-aš mān* 1^{EN} URU^{LUM} *našma-[(at 1)^{EN} (É^{TUM})] našma 1^{E[N} L]Ú nu* DINGIR.MEŠ *apūn-[(pat)] 1-an h[arninkandu (KUR ^U)]^{RU}KUBABBAR-t[(i-ma-ašta) ...]* '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 very one alone, but the land of Hatti ...'.

trasted with a negative clause which follows it. While asseveration permits such a contrast with either 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.ÚŠ *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: *kinuna-wa mān* ᵈUTU*ŠI* NAM.RA.ḪI.A ᵁᴿᵁ*Ala-šiya imma āppa wewakki nu-war-an-ši āppa p*[*iḫḫ*]*i* 'But if His Majesty now does indeed demand back the deportees of **Alasiya**, I will given 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: *apaš-an-kan anda aušzi ABI* ᵈUTU*ŠI*-*ma-kan imma* ᴳᴵˢAB-*az arḫa aušzi* 'He (Mariya) looked in 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 *kuit-a imma miešḫati nu-za-kan ŠA* DINGIR-*YA dud-*

dumar ḫattāta ḫūmanta šaki[*n*]*un.* Goetze, *ANET* 400, takes *māi-* 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 *māi-* 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' (*kuit 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 akir* '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 karū kuit kē* INIM.MEŠ *piran* GAM *tiyan* DÙ-*nun zikila-ya-at memiškit imma* 'Because I have already had these words laid down before you, and indeed you yourself have also kept **saying** them'.[13])

In *KUB* XXXIX 12,9 (*CTH* 450) we find the incomplete sentence *n-at-kan INA* UD.1.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 kuwapi wappuwa*[*š purut* ᴸᵁ.ᴹ]ᴱˢDUG.GA₅.BUR *imma daškanzi nu apadda paiši.* 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-aš-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 *memiš-kit.*

here seems to be on the place where the celebrant is to go. One would thus expect *kuwapi 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 ^{LÚ.MEŠ}DUG.GA₅.BUR: 'And you shall go to 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 *ammug 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 damēdaš kuedašqa* ^É*ḫalenduwaš anda pēḫutet* '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.[14]) 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 *kuiš imma* (*kuiš*) is equivalent in usage to *kuiš kuiš.* 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 I 13–15 (*CTH* 406): *nu-za mān ḪUR-SAG-i nu-za mān wēlluwi nu-za mān ḫāriya kuwapit-za imma kuwapi* '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 *KBo* V 3 III 44 (*CTH* 42): *kuiš-aš imma kuiš ŠA* É.GAL^{LIM} SAL *mān-aš* SAL *ELLUM mān-aš* SAL.SUḪUR.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): *kalwišnan*^{SAR} *tapalkuštanan*^{SAR} *ḫaḫḫašittin*^{SAR} *euwan* ^{GIŠ}*ḫašduēr kuēl imma* GIŠ-*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 *kuēl imma* GIŠ-*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 *kui- imma, kui- imma kui-* and *kui- kui-.*[15])

---

[14]) 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.

[15]) My corpus of relatives with *imma* consists of the following (this includes duplicates): *KBo* II 4 II 5, II 6 III 17, IV 2 IV 32–33, IV 14 II 58. III 67, V 3 II 33. III 44. IV 8–9. 18, V 4 Vs 39, V 11 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, 10; XIX 43 +

All seem to be equivalent generalizing relatives, as indicated already by Götze-Pedersen and Puhvel. There seems to be no justification for the contrast implied by Friedrich, *HE* I².69: *kui- kui-* 'whoever', *kui- imma kui-* 'whoever else'.

The form and distribution of the relative forms with *imma* do raise several questions, however. First of all, it is striking that the form *kui- imma (kui-)* is completely absent in OH manuscripts, nor does it occur to my knowledge in any copy of an assured OH composition.[16] It is true, of course, that *imma* in other uses is also extremely rare in OH, but we do have one example in an OH manuscript (*KUB* XXXVI 106 Vs 5) and several others in later copies of OH texts (*KBo* III 1 II 44, *VBoT* 58 I 33). Furthermore, we have seen that *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 *imma* is not surprising. However, *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 *imma*. In my sample, there are 36 examples of *kui- imma kui-*, 12 of *kui- imma*, 3 of *kui- kui- imma* and 2 of *imma kui-*. In view of the evidence we have seen above for *imma* following the word it modifies, the authenticity of the last type *imma kui-* is questionable. One of the appaent examples of *imma kui-* probably does not exist. In *KBo* XVI 14, 10–11 + XVI 8 II 25–26 we read: *nu-kan* LÚKÚR URU*Gašga imma kuiš* ŠÀ KUR URU*Palā iyat-tat*. While one could understand this as 'Whichever Gasgaean enemy marched into Pala ...', the Gasgaean 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 *imma* as emphasizing the preceding word, as usual: 'As for the Gas-

V 3 II 52, XIX 61 IV 7, XXII 101 Rs 7, XXIII 1 I 5–6. II 20–21. 27–28; *KUB* IV 47 Vs 9, VII 5 I 13–15, VII 29 Vs 3, XIII 4 I 45. III 4. 52, XIII 20 I 8, XV 3 I 16, XV 34 I 64. II 34, XXIII 82 Rs 21. XXIV 14 I 8, XXVI 1 III 26. IV 30. 52, XXVI 8 I 12, XXVI 18 Vs 8. 10, XXVI 22 III 11, XXVI 37 I 9, XXX 42 IV 22–23, XXX 43 III 17–18, XXX 55 Rs 7, XXXII 123 III 13, XLIII 72 II 13–14; *IBoT* I 36 III 36.

[16]) It does occur in a few texts whose date of composition is no later than MH and could be earlier: *KUB* VII 5 (*CTH* 405), *KBo* XII 42 (*CTH* 822). The latter has been viewed as an OH composition, but I know of no linguistic feature in the text which proves OH rather than MH composition.

gaean enemy who had marched into Pala ...'. This leaves us with a single instance of *imma* + relative, *KUB* XV 3 I 16 (*CTH* 584): *mān* URU*Urukina mān imma kuwapi* 'whether (he is) in Urukina or wherever'. This solitary example, which runs counter to all other use of *imma,* may reflect simply an accidental omission of the first *kuwapi*.

On the other hand, a dozen examples of *kui- imma* can hardly be explained away as merely defective versions of the fuller *kui- imma kui-*. The question then becomes: does the form *kui- imma* result from a regular reduction of the fuller *kui- imma kui-* (or *kui- kui- imma*), or are we dealing with parallel additions of *imma* to simple *kui-* and to *kui- kui-*? I believe the answer to this is bound up with the problem of why we find no examples of *imma* with relatives in OH texts.

It is important to realize that neither *imma* nor iteration is necessary to mark a generalizing relative in Hittite. As already shown by Held, *RelSent* (1957) passim, a relative in clause-initial position in Hittite has a generalizing sense. This usage is already common in OH, as in Anitta, *KBo* III 22 Rs 49 (*CTH* 1): *kuiš ammel āppan* LUGAL-*uš kišari* 'Whoever becomes king after me ...'. Since such a generalizing relative introduces new information, it is often marked by the enclitic conjunction *-a* (non-geminating)/*-ma*, but the generalizing sense does not depend on the presence of the conjunction, contra Friedrich, *HE* I².70.[17]) It is the initial position in the clause that marks the relative as generalizing.

The iterated form *kui- kui-* is extremely rare in OH manuscripts, and it may not be accidental that in both occurrences it is non-initial: *KBo* XVII 11 + I 5 (*StBoT* 25, Nr. 25) LÚ.MEŠ*UBARU* LÚ-*a[š] kuiš kuiš* and *KBo* XXV 61 Rs 20 (*StBoT* 25, Nr. 61) *azzaea kuiš kuiš*.[18]) 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 *kui-* could not be used in a generalizing sense, namely, where some other stressed element occurred in sentence-initial position.

[17]) Friedrich also errs in claiming that *kuišša* (with geminate *-šš-*) can mean 'whoever'. The form with geminate consonant means either 'every' or 'and wh–ever', where the geminating *-a* marks 'and': see e.g. *KBo* IV 14 III 67 and IV 2 IV 32–33.

[18]) Although the obscure *azzaea* looks like a sequence of sentence-initial conjunction plus enclitics, the other occurrence in *KBo* XXV 58 II 2 [ ]-x-*us azzaea* [ ] 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 postposing 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) *kuieš-aš imma kuiš antuhšaš* 'Whatever man he may be' and ibid. IV 8–9 *mān-aš kuiš imm[a] kuiš antuwahhaš* 'If he is any man whatever'.[19] It introduces new information. This is a likely context for an asseverative adverb.

Götze-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 '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- imma kui-*. 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) *kuit imma INBU* EN ᵁᴿᵁ*Nerik wemiyazi* '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] Götze, *ZA* NF 2.266 f, was undoubtedly correct in viewing the variant *kuiš-aš imma kuiš* as being originally a nominal sentence with *-aš* as the subject 'he'. However, the accusative form in *IBoT* I 36 III 36 *kuin-an imma kuin*, where a real direct object 'him' makes no sense, suggests that *kuiš-aš (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 Götze-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 *immakku*, which has been convincingly analyzed as *imma* plus *-kku* 'and' (< *-k^we): 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-šmaš-kan* EN-ŠUNU *kuit* ᵐ*Piphururiyaš immakku* BA.ÚŠ. Here *immakku* has consistently been given an additive sense: 'Because on top of that their 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 ᵐ*Piphururiyaš* split by *kuit* 'because'), we may also reasonably interpret *immakku* 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 *immakku* contradicts our conclusion that *imma* is asseverative: 'indeed, actually'.

It is important to note that we now have in HLuvian the expression REL-*i/ia-sa-pa-wa/i i/ia-ma* REL-*i/ia-sa*, i.e. REL-*is-pa-wa ima* REL-*is* (see Hawkins, *AnSt* 25 (1975) 130). Given this parallel to Hitt. *kui- imma kui-* (HLuvian orthography does not of course show the geminate), 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]

---

[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 imma and Latin immō*

The above confirmation of the asseverative function of Hittite *imma* 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? immo rus ibat* 'Did B. head for the city!–Actually, he went to the country'; Cicero Att. 9.7.4 *causa igitur non bona est? immo optima* 'So the case is not good?–Actually, it's excellent' (cf. Puhvel); Cicero Att. 6.2.7 *uenio ad Brutum tuum, immo nostrum* 'I am coming to your, actually our, Brutus'. Just as in Hittite *imma* may reinforce *-a/-ya* 'also, even' (see Section 4 above), Latin *immō* often supports (*uero*) *etiam*: Cicero Cat. 1.1.2 *uiuit? immo 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 *quīn*, which itself is asseverative: 'indeed, in fact'. The asseverative force of *immō* is also reflected in its frequent cooccurrence with interjections like *herc(u)le* and *edepol* (= 'by God!'). Like Hitt. *imma*, Lat. *immō* is particularly frequent in dialogue.

We thus have an equation Hitt. *imma* = 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. *íd* = Av. *it̰*. As an example of the use of *íd* we may cite RV 1,1,4: *ágne yám yajñám adhvarám viśvátaḥ paribhúr ási sá íd devéṣu gacchati* 'Oh Agni, whatever sacrifice (and) ritual you surround on all sides, **that** indeed goes to the gods'. Note as with *imma* the combination of asseveration and emphasis.

Given this close functional match, I propose that Hitt. *imma* 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-geminating *-a*) would require a separate article. For the present, it will suffice to say that the description of Grk. *dé* given by Schwyzer, *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 'adversative' 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 scare in both languages, but what we have supports *-mm-* as the result. Hitt. *kam(m)arš-* 'defecate' matches CLuv. *katmarš-* and probably continues *ĝhod-mr̥-s-*.[21]) For Latin Leumann-Hofmann-Szantyr I.200 cites manuscript *ammīror* for *admīror*, while examples such as *caementum* < *caedmentum* are explained via *caemmentum* 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 *inmō* in Plautus and Nonius (see Walde-Hofmann s.v.), which has previously been ignored or dismissed. The form *inmo* may easily represent an intermediate stage in the assimilation: *idmō* > *inmō* > *immō*.

The derivation of *imma* = *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

[21]) For the derivation see Tischler, *HEG* 474, with references. The preserved *-dm-* of CLuv. *katmarš-* contradicts the assimilated *-mm-* in CLuv. *imma* and HLuv. *ima* (read *imma*). However, the preserved initial *k-* is also irregular in *katmarš-*, since initial *ĝh* is regularly lost in Luvian: cf. *iš(ša)ri-* 'hand' < *ĝhes-* and *im(ma)ri-* 'open field, country' < *ĝhĕm-*. 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 Kuryłowicz's first law, the complex *id-mō spread in Hittite and Latin at the expense of simple *id, eventually replacing it altogether (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 Vs 22–27 (*CTH* 5, NH ms.) we find the following: *mān uddā[r-met p]aḫš[anutteni] x-kan(?)[ ]utni-mmett-[a paḫšanu]tteni [mān-šan]ḫašš[ī] paḫḫur paraišt[eni n]atta-it u[dd]ār-me[t] šarrattuma m[ān]-šan paḫḫur natta paraišteni ta uizzi* URU[Ḥ]at[tušan M]UŠ-aš ḫulaliazzi* '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 Hattusa'.

Since the passage is badly broken, some justification of the restorations 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 paraišt[e]* 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 *uddār-met šarrattuma* '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 *immō as *id-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* 18.103 f, is probably correct in relating *-ma* ultimately to Grk. *mén, mēn* and *má*. 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/o- (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 *íd.* Hitt. and Luv. *imma* show that the particle must have once existed in Anatolian.

CLuvian also appears to show one example of an enclitic particle *-it.* The Ritual of Tunnawi (*Tunn.* I 58–59) contains the following Luvian incantation: *ariyaddališ* dIŠKUR-*anza šarri tappašī ḫueḫuiya tappašša-it šarri tiyami ḫuiḫuiya.* The sign *it* is written over an erasure and is less than perfect, but both Götze-Sturtevant, *Tunn.* 10, and Laroche, *DLL* 91, read *-it* without comment. Laroche lists *tap-pa-ša-it* (scil. *tap-pa-aš-ša-it*) as abl.(?), but this is pure desperation. The only attested Luvian ending for the ablative-instrumental is *-ati*, and the Hittite instrumental *-it* has no place here. Furthermore, the broken Hittite parallel *KUB* IX 34 I 12 has *nepiš-ma*, which is clearly nom.-acc. This is matched perfectly by CLuv. *tappašša*, which is *tappaš* (= *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 dIŠKUR-*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 combination 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 *íd* in syntax and function.

Curriculum in Linguistics   H. Craig Melchert
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514

---

[23]) Čop. *IF* 75 (1970) 90, attempts to extend his rule of *ěC₁ > aC₁C₁ in CLuvian to explain the double *-šš- of *tappašša*, but all good examples of his rule involve accented *ě. The *-ša* of the nom.-acc. sg. is the suffix *-ša*, while in the oblique cases CLuv. shows the expected single *-š-: dat.-loc. *tappašī* and anim. *tappašanti-*.

Hethitisch *titiššalli-* „Säugling, Kleinkind"

Zu den zahlreichen nur einmal belegten Wörtern im Hethitischen gehört auch eines, das bis jetzt ⟨*tiššalli-* oder GUD⟩ *tiššalli-* gelesen wurde. HW 224b 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* LÚ^MEŠ É.GAL *pu-nu-uš-šu-u-en* UM-MA-ŠU-NU-MA

4 X(-)*ti-iš-ša-al-li-in-ya* ŠA MU 3^KAM *ša-ak-nu-ya-an-da-an*

5 IGI-*u-en nu-ya-kán* DUG *an-da* ⟨*ti-ša-in-ta*

6 DINGIR^LUM *e-ni ku-it-ki i-ši-ya-aḫ-ta nu* MUŠEN ḪUR-RI SIG₅-*ru* NU.SIG₅

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

> „Wir haben ein . . .-es unreines Rind (?) von 3 Jahren ge . . . t [Anm. 4: „Ein oder zwei unleserliche Zeichen. IGI-*u-en* „wir sahen" wäre graphisch möglich, scheitert aber daran, daß die Form *aumen* lautet . . ."] und es . . . te in ein Gefäß hinein."

Daran knüpft er folgende Überlegung:

> „Ob die Verbalform ⟨*ti-ša-in-ta* (3. Sg. Praet.) und das Adjektiv *tiššalliš* etwa mit der Zeugung(sfähigkeit) des Tieres zusammenhängen – § 176 A der Gesetze spricht davon, daß das Rind 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 ⟨*tiššalli-* mit der Bedeutung „zeugungsfähig (??)" wie in HW ist aber aus der Luft gegriffen. Entweder liest man GUD⟩ *t.,* dann hat *tiššalli-* keinen Glossenkeil, oder man liest ⟨*tiššalli-,* dann steht „zeugungsfähig" völlig im leeren Raum.

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