

**Old Hittite *kuidza* ‘but as for’, introducing contrastive topics in  
left-dislocation**

Petra M. Goedegebuure

Oriental Institute, Chicago

Abstract:

Left-dislocation in Hittite is a well-known though rare grammatical construction.

The left-dislocated constituent, typically only a noun, occurs to the left of the clause-initial conjunction or clause-initial phrase and is co-referential with a clitic pronoun in the main clause. The left-dislocated noun is usually in the nominative, irrespective of the case of the resumption in the main clause. There is, however, another type of left-dislocation, equally rare, that has been overlooked. A philological reassessment of several famous Old Hittite texts such as the Palace Chronicles (CTH 8), the Ritual for the Royal Couple (CTH 416), and the Illuyanka Myth (CTH 321) shows that left-dislocated noun phrases may also be introduced by *kuidza* ‘but as for’. This expression is often erroneously translated as a causal or temporal subordinator. The case of the noun phrase introduced by *kuidza* matches with the case of the resumptive pronoun in the main clause. This construction marked contrastive topics, but it did not survive: in Old Hittite contrastive topics could also simply occur as the first word of the clause, marked

by means of *-a* or its allomorph *-ma*. Beginning in Middle Hittite this became the only productive means to express contrastive topics.

## 1. Introduction

Hittite has quite a few means to highlight elements on clause and discourse level. Besides such obvious focus particles as *ṣpat* ‘just, only’ and *ṣja* ‘and, also’ — obvious because they are easy to identify—, word order is now well established to correlate with the pragmatic articulation of the clause (Goedegebuure 2009, 2014). Contrastive topics, for example, are always clause initial and often followed by *-a/-ma*, while contrastive focus arguments overwhelmingly occur in immediately preverbal position. Beyond the clause proper, cross-linguistically the positions immediately to the left and to the right of the clause boundaries are often used to convey special pragmatic status within the developing discourse. In the remainder of this paper I will limit the discussion to left-of-the-clause-phenomena.

Left-dislocation in Hittite, though quite rare, is well described (e.g., Garrett 1990:266-69; Garrett 1994:38-9; Hoffner and Melchert 2008:408-9; Luraghi 1990:92; Sideltsev 2015; Vai 2011:39-42). The dislocated constituent occurs to the left of the clause-initial conjunction or clause-initial phrase and is co-referential with a clitic or full pronoun in the main clause, and zero in case the left-dislocated constituent is co-referential with a following transitive subject:

1<sup>1</sup> KBo 3.22 obv. 7-8 (OH/OS, Anitta, CTH 1)

He arrested **the king of Neša**,

U DUMU.MEŠ URU<sub>nēš[a]</sub><sub>i</sub> # [id]ālu natta kuedanikki takkiš-ta

but son.PL <sup>city</sup>N. # evil:ACC.S.N not anyone:DAT.S allot-3S.PST

But (as for) **the sons of Neša**, he did not harm (lit. allot evil to) anyone;

2 KBo 3.1 ii 13 (OH/NS, Telipinu, CTH 19)

He also sent Taruḫšu, a courier: he (i.e., Taruḫšu) killed Ḫantili together with [his] sons. (Then) Ḫuzziya became king, and Telipinu had Ištariya, his (i.e., Ḫuzziya's) sister of first rank (as wife). Ḫuzziya would have

---

<sup>1</sup> In the examples co-referential elements are indexed; # marks a clause boundary; bold face indicates contrastive elements or elements that are relevant for the discussion. Glosses follow the Leipzig Glossing Rules (<https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php>). In bound transcription ‘≣’ denotes a clitic boundary, ‘-’ a morpheme boundary, and ‘~’ the boundary between a logogram and syllabogram. Additional glosses: C = common gender, CONN = connective, IND = individuator, ITER = iterative.

killed them, but the matter became known, and Telipinu chased **them** away.

5 ŠEŠ.MEŠ<sub>z</sub>ŠU<sub>i</sub> # nu<sub>z</sub>šmaš<sub>i</sub> É.MEŠ taggaš-ta  
 5 brother.PL<sub>z</sub>his # CONN<sub>z</sub>3PL.DAT house.PL allot-3S.PST

(As for) **his five brothers**<sub>i</sub>, he allotted them<sub>i</sub> houses

3 KUB 17.10 iii 1 (OH/MS, CTH 324)

Kammarušepa saw him (i.e., the angry god). She moved the wing of an eagle [...] and stopped **him**.

karpī-š<sub>i</sub> # n<sub>z</sub>an<sub>i</sub> arāe-t  
 anger-NOM.S.C # CONN<sub>z</sub>3S.ACC.C stop-3S.PST

(**His**) anger<sub>i</sub>, she stopped it<sub>i</sub>.

4 HKM 113 rev. 14-15 (MH/MS, Tudḫaliya III, CTH 244)

There was a famine before [...]. [...]-**atta** (and) **Ms. Aliwanatti** went in dire need [fro]m(?) [...], from the city, to Šugaziya.

<sup>m</sup>ḫuidudduwalli-š<sub>i</sub> # n<sub>z</sub>an<sub>i</sub> <sup>URU</sup>šallašna ašaš-er  
 ḫ.-NOM.S.C # CONN<sub>z</sub>3S.ACC.C Š.-LOC.S settle-3PL.PST

(As for) **Mr. ḫuidudduwalli**, they settled him in Šallašna.

The Hittitological literature suggests that left-dislocated phrases appear in the nominative case, irrespective of the function the referent of the dislocated phrase assumes in the main clause (so with caution Hoffner and Melchert 2008:409). It would therefore seem that one of the functions of nominative case is to mark left-dislocated constituents. Hittite would then mark left-dislocated constituents the same way as the Indo-European languages in general (for which see Havers 1926). It has been overlooked that a left-dislocated noun phrase may also already appear in the same case as its resumption in the main clause:

5 KUB 23.11 ii 36'-38' (MH/NS, Tudḫaliya I/II, CTH 142)

After I had destroyed Āššuwa, I returned to Ḫattuša. As captives I brought **10,000 troops and 600 horses (and) chariots** [together with (their)] **chariot-drivers** to Ḫattuša. I settled them in Ḫattuša.

<sup>m</sup>SUM.<sup>d</sup>LAMMA<sub>i</sub>    <sup>m</sup>ḫ<sup>1</sup>uggulli-n<sub>i</sub> [U<sup>m</sup>malaz]iti-n<sub>i</sub>    ŠA    <sup>m</sup>SUM.<sup>d</sup>LAMA  
Pijamakurunta    K.-ACC.S.C    [and M.]-ACC.S.C    of    Pijamakurunta

LU<sup>kaena</sup>-n<sub>i</sub>    # nu    ap-ūšš<sub>i</sub>za  
in-law-ACC.S.C    # CONN    DEM3-ACC.PL.C=also

[URUKU.BABBAR~š-i    u]ḫ<sup>1</sup>ya<sup>1</sup>te-nun  
[Ḫattuša-LOC.S    br]ing-1S.PST

(As for) **Piġamakurunta<sub>i</sub>, Kugulli [... and Malaz]iti, in-law<sub>i</sub>** of

Piġamakurunta, those<sub>i</sub> too I brought to Ḫattuša.

The same applies to another overlooked type of left-dislocation. In Old Hittite left-dislocated noun phrases are regularly introduced by *kuid=a* ‘but as for’. When thus introduced the case of the left-dislocated noun phrase *always* matches the case of the resumptive pronoun in the main clause (for a full analysis of ex. 6 see sections 2 and 4):

6 KBo 3.34 ii 27-28 (OH/NS, Muršili I, CTH 8)

*kuid=a*            LÚ.MEŠKUS<sub>7</sub> *āmmiānt-uš-šm-uš<sub>i</sub>*

as.for=but        charioteer        young-ACC.PL.C=their

# *n-uš<sub>i</sub>*                    *mišputašinara-š*        *manijaḫḫe-ške-zzi*

# CONN=3PL.ACC    I.-NOM.S.C            manage-ITER-3S.NPST

But as for **their young charioteers<sub>i</sub>**, Išpudaš-Inar manages **them<sub>i</sub>**.

I argue that the function of *kuid=a* is to introduce contrastive topics, as opposed to the currently prevailing analysis of *kuit* as a causal or temporal conjunction.<sup>2</sup>

In section 2 I discuss previous analyses of topic-introducing *kuid=a*. Why the lexeme is *kuid(=a)* and not *kuida* is explained in section 3. The functional analysis of *kuid=a* as ‘but as for’ based on the Palace Chronicles (CTH 8) and the Ritual of Thunder (CTH 631) takes place in section 4. Section 5 contains a philological reassessment of several difficult passages from the Ritual for the Royal Couple (CTH 416), the Illuyanka Myth (CTH 321), and a fragment naming Alluwamna (CTH 23). Section 6 presents the single known case of *kuid=a* in a verbal clause, and in section 7 I propose a new analysis of yet another passage from the Palace Chronicles. Sections 8 and 9 contain a linguistic analysis and the conclusion, respectively.

## 2. Previous interpretations

---

<sup>2</sup> Elsewhere (Goedegebuure 1998:241 n. 21) I described the function of *kuid=a* as merely highlighting the left-dislocated constituent, without further discussion.

The instances of OH topic-introducing *kuit* that I have identified have usually been translated as ‘because’<sup>3</sup>, presumably because the subordinator *kuit* introduces background clauses that may serve as the reason or motivation for the state of affairs of the following main clause, as in ex. 7:

7 KUB 31.121a ii 11’-12’ (NH, Muršili II, CTH 379)

---

<sup>3</sup> Not every initial *ku-i-ta/ku-i-da* is topic-introducing *kuid=a* ‘but as for’. Relatives may also appear clause-initially with *-a*, e.g. as subject in KBo 53.10 ii 8 (MH/MS), and object in KUB 36.83 iv 6’ (NS) (for more references see Dardano 1997:74 fn. 16). Such relatives will not be further discussed here. The remaining instances of *ku-i-ta/ku-i-da* in fragmentary context that are either topic-introducing *kuid=a* or something else are: Bo 7703:3’ (CTH 8, OH) *ku-i-da* (mentioned in Soysal 2005:143); KUB 12.66 iii 2’ (CTH 321, OH/NS) *ku-i-t[a ...]*; KUB 34.51:11’ (CTH 370, pre-NH/NS) *ku-i-ta dandukešni[ ... ]*; KBo 17.49:5’ (CTH 670, OH/pre-NS) *ku-i-ta LUGAL-u[š ...]*; KBo 38.188 r.col. 6’ (CTH 458, MS?) *ku-i-ta=ua=du=za [...]*; KBo 39.272:6” (CTH 832) *ku-i-da É[...]*; KUB 36.109:8’ (CTH 275, MH/MS) *[k]u-i-ta ŠEŠ.MEŠ=ŠU<sup>LÚ.MEŠ</sup> gainaš=šiš na-a[t ...]*. For the reading *ku-i-ta* in KUB 36.109:8’ also see Miller 2013:162, 355 n. 106, *pace* Christiansen 2012:318 (reading *ku-it-ta*), Carruba 1977:190 (reading *ku-i-ša*).



[He] sent Lupakki and Tarḫuntazalma[, and] they beat those countries. §

Now, the king of Egypt died in those [day]s.

<i>ammuk=ma</i>	<i>kuit</i>	<i>nū[wa]</i>	TUR~ <i>a-š</i>	<i>eš-un</i>
1S:NOM=but	given.that/because	still	child-NOM.S.C	be-1S.PST
<i>nu</i>	<i>ŪL</i>	<i>šagga-h[hu]n</i>		
CONN	not	know-1S.PST		

But **given that/because** I was sti[ll] a child, I did not know (whether the king of Egypt had made a p[le]a against my [father] because of those countries or whether he did not [do] anything)

But, as suspected by Inglese (2016:111-3), causal *kuit* did not yet exist in Old Hittite. Inglese (l.c.) has collected three instances of this alleged Old Hittite causal *kuit* followed by *-a/-ma*, all attested in the Palace Chronicles (KBo 3.34). With good reason he expresses strong doubts about a causal function for these tokens of *kuit*. One passage in particular (KBo 3.34 ii 27-29) clearly illustrates the grammatical and interpretative difficulties involved. Among the, at least, nine different and contradicting analyses, there is not just disagreement regarding the correct translation and syntactic status of our lexeme, but even regarding the shape of the lexeme as either *kuit* followed by *-a/-ma* or as *kuida/kuita*.

In what follows I attempt to represent and compare the many different approaches. In order to do so I divided the clauses into smaller units and marked

each unit with a letter (for the glossing of the passage and the translation, see ex.

22c):

- 8 a *ta išpanti ḫalziššanzi*  
b *daīš=šan ANŠE.KUR.RA-aš*  
c ***kuida***  
d LÚ.MEŠ<sup>7</sup>KUŠ<sup>7</sup>  
e *āmmijantu(š)=šmuš*  
f *n=uš<sup>m</sup> Išputašinaraš manijaḫḫieškizzi*  
g *GI-an<sup>GIŠ</sup> UMBIN ḫašḫaššuar<sup>GIŠ</sup> PAN<sup>14</sup> appātar*  
h *n=uš apāš annanut*

A combination of letters such as (a, b+c+d+e) forms a code that needs to be read off as follows: the five units *a* to *e* form two clauses, one consisting of unit *a*, the other of units *b+c+d+e*:

- 9 clause 1: *ta išpanti ḫalziššanzi*  
clause 2: *da-i-iš-šan ANŠE.KUR.RA-aš **kuida** LÚ.MEŠ<sup>7</sup>KUŠ<sup>7</sup> āmmijantu(š)=šmuš*

---

<sup>4</sup> For the reading PAN<sup>1</sup> instead of TUKUL, see Starke 1995:136 n. 290.

This is the solution offered by Beal (1992:536), who translates “They are always calling at night, **because** he places/placed<sup>5</sup> their young Chariot-Fighters for?/on? horses,” followed by Weeden (2011:159) with the slightly different translation “**because** he put (assigned?) their immature LÚ.MEŠ IŠ on (to?) horses, (and Ispudas-Inara kept on (hist. pres.) instructing them).” Because of its sentence internal position, I assume that these editors analyzed unit *c*, *ku-i-da*, as a unified lexeme *kuida*.<sup>6</sup> Inglese sees a unified lexeme as well (2016:112 n. 45) and translates it as “since”:

10 (b+c+d-e-, f+g): “**Since** (he) put the man to the chariots, the young ones among them, Ispudasinara instructed them in the opening of the axles of the wheel and in the holding of weaponry,” Inglese 2016:111-2. It seems that

---

<sup>5</sup> Beal offers a translation both of the present tense *daī(=ššan)* and the past tense *daīš(=šan)*.

<sup>6</sup> Since most editors do not discuss the formal features of *ku-i-da*, this conjecture is *only* based on the combination of the position of *ku-i-da* mid-clause and a translation without a conjunction such as ‘and’ or ‘but’.

“the man” represents unit *d*. Note, however, that Inglese is inclined to treat *kuit* as a relative that introduces explicative clauses.

The translation ‘because’ is also proposed by those who separate *-a* from *kuit*. We find the following:

- 11 (b+c, d+e+f): “**Aber weil** er (die Mannschaften) zu den Pferdengespannen stellte, lehrte Işpudaşınara ihre jungen Streitwagenkämpfer,” Gilan 2015:123.
- 12 (b+c+d+e, f): “**E poiché** pone sui cavalli i miei <sup>LÚ</sup>IŞ piccoli (= inesperti??), allora Isputa-Inara continua a sorvegliarii,” Daddi Pecchioli 1975:120-1 (who notes that the sentence internal position of *kuid-a* is “alquanto irregolare,” p. 121 n. 96).

Unified *kuida* has also been translated as a temporal subordinating conjunction:

- 13 (b+c+d+e, f): “**Nachdem** er meine jungen Wagenlenker auf die Pferde aufsitzen ließ, wird (ebenfalls) Isputasınara sie ständig beaufsichtigen!” Soysal 1989:85, also see Zeilfelder 2001:86, Dardano 1997:74 (“dopoché”), 106 (“**Dopo** aver disposto sui carri i conducenti, in particolare gli inesperti tra di loro [...], Ispudasınara li addestrava”).

In one case we find *kuida* as a generalizing adverb in a main clause:

- 14 (b+c+d+e): “Er stellte **vor allem** die jungen [...] Streitwagenkämpfer zu den Pferde(gespannen),” Klinger 2001:64.

In another case *kuid-a* serves as an apposition to the charioteers:

- 15 (b+c+d+e): “**And** he placed my small (= few?) charioteers, **all being counted**, on their chariots,” Josephson 1972:237.

Or *kuit* is not translated at all:

- 16 (a, b+c+d-e-, f+g): “// e (questi) nel corso della notte impartiscono ripetutamente (gli ordini);” (Marazzi 2002:508). “**E**, avendo collocato sui rispettivi carri i conducenti // - quelli dei loro (scil. dei due comandanti) inesperti -, Išputašinara ne cura il rispettivo addestramento: // come estrarre le frecce (all’altezza) della ruota, come afferrare l’arco” (Marazzi 2002:509-10).

It seems that Marazzi takes *kuit* as a subordinator that allows the translation of a finite clause as a participial construction.

17 Finally, Neu (1995:234) and Soysal (2005:143; 2006:15) translate *kuid=a* as “but as for the fact (that),” without offering context.

In other passages *kuida* has been translated as paratactic ‘therefore’ (CHD P, 161b: “Therefore they elevated a barber’s chair for Šuppiuman and Marašša” KBo 3.34 ii 24-25); and finally, we also encounter *kuida* as a general relative pronoun ‘what(so)ever’ (e.g., HED K, 223: “whatever is wound around their finger,” KBo 17.3 iv 28. For further discussion see section 5).

To summarize, the sequence *ku-i-da* has been analyzed as a single lexeme *kuida*, in which manifestation it is translated as general relative pronoun ‘what(so)ever’, subordinating causal ‘because, since’ (9, 10), temporal ‘after’ (13), or paratactic ‘therefore’; it is taken as generalizing adverb in a main clause (14); or it is simply left untranslated (16). Others analyze *ku-i-da* as *kuit* plus the adversative particle *-a/-ma*, translating *kuit* as a subordinating conjunction ‘because’ (11, 12), ‘as for the fact that’ (17), or as apposition in a main clause (15).

The editors of KBo 3.34 ii 27-29 struggled with much more than just finding the correct translation and the correct form of *kuid(=)a*. For those who take *kuid(=)a* as subordinating, does the *kuid(=)a* clause connect to the preceding (ex. 9) or following clause (the rest)? Who is the subject of *dai-* ‘to put’? Is it Išpudašinar or someone else? Is the verb *dai-* in the past or present tense? And if we follow

Beal and Weeden, what exactly is the causal relation between “calling at night” and “putting on horses”? If we follow the others, what exactly is the causal relation between “someone (but who?) putting young charioteers on horses” and “Ispudasinar training them”? One can therefore understand why a substantial number of editors have abandoned the causal interpretation.

### 3. Formal analysis of *ku-i-da*

Before we continue with a functional analysis, we need to reject *kuida* as a single lexeme. Presumably (because this is never made explicit), the analysis of *kuida* with causal meaning as a unified lexeme (ex. 9, 10) is inspired by the endings of the Old Hittite causal pronominal demonstrative *apēda* ‘therefore’ and the adverbial phrases *kuwatta(n) šer* ‘for what reason, why’ and *apadda(n) šer* ‘for that reason, therefore’. The form *apeda* is more archaic than *apadda(n)*, and one could surmise that *kuwatta(n)* might also have had a forerunner. Given the alleged causal meaning of *kuida* as ‘for what reason = because’, this form might thus very well fill the empty slot in the proportion ‘archaic x : *apeda* = innovated *kuwatta(n) šer* : *apadda(n) šer*’ and thus be the forerunner of *kuwatta(n)*. The formal issue with this equivalence is that the form should have been *\*kueda*. All other oblique cases of the relative are built on the stem *kue-*, and this should have been the case here as well. Also, if *kuida* were a generalizing adverb (ex. 14) or a

relative pronoun (e.g., HED K, 223) one would expect reduplication of the final consonant.<sup>7</sup>

Thus, we need to parse *ku-i-da* as *kuit* followed by *≠a*. In Old Hittite *-a/-ma* almost always cliticizes to the first word of the clause. Even though delayed *-a/-ma* is acceptable under certain conditions (Sideltsev & Molina 2015), *kuid≠a* in the middle of the clause is ungrammatical (Inglese 2016:112 n. 45). Accepting this and taking it as a non-negotiable point of departure, this necessarily leads to a very different organization of the clauses in every instance of *kuid≠a*. With respect to KBo 3.34 ii 27-29, *daī≠šsan/daī≠šsan ANŠE.KUR.RA-aš* is now a complete clause (ex. 8b), and *kuid≠a*<sup>LÚ.MEŠ</sup>KUŠ<sub>7</sub> *āmmijantuš≠šmuš* (8c+d+e) is no longer part of a verbal clause but needs to be treated as a left-dislocated constituent, with resumption by the clitic pronoun *-uš* in the main clause (f) (glosses and translation are presented in ex. 22c):

---

<sup>7</sup> This is despite the listings of *kuiša imma kuiš* and *kuita imma kuit* in HED K, 223. In each case the alleged *-a* is hidden in the spelling *ku-i-ša-aš* or *ku-i-ta-at* and occurs in a postposed elaborative clause. Since such clauses are often asyndetically joined with the preceding clause (Hoffner and Melchert 2008:403), we should analyze these forms as *kuiš≠aš* and *kuit≠at*.



- 18 a <sup>(27)</sup> *ta išpanti ḥalziššanzi*  
 b *daī-ššan/daīš-ššan ANŠE.KUR.RA-aš*  
 c *kuid-a (d) <sup>LÚ.MEŠ</sup>KUŠ<sub>7</sub> (e) <sup>(28)</sup> āmmiāntu(š)-šmuš*  
 f # *n-uš <sup>m</sup>Išputašinarāš manijaḥḥieškizzi*  
 g <sup>(29)</sup> *GI-an <sup>GIŠ</sup>UMBIN ḥašḥaššuar <sup>GIŠ</sup>PAN<sup>!</sup> appātar*  
 h *n-uš apāš annanut*

#### 4. Conclusive evidence: a new join, and a reanalysis of KBo 3.34 ii 22-32

A recent join (see Goedegebuure 2017) shows that *kuid-a* not merely occurs in clause-initial position but indeed introduces a constituent outside and to the left of the main clause. The beginning of one of the Rituals of Thunder (CTH 631) describes how the princes, princesses, the nobility and distinguished visitors are led out of the assembly hall when it thunders (KBo 20.61 + KBo 34.185 i 1-5, OH/MS):

- 19 When the king and queen sit in grand assembly, and afterward the Storm-god thunders, the princes, princesses, grantees and those distinguished visitors that sit before the king are made to stand, and the staff bearers lead them out (of the assembly hall).

The next paragraph starts with *kuid=ā* (i 6) but was damaged beyond restoration before the discovery of the join. The added fragment, KBo 31.183, now provides the missing left halves of lines i 7-18, fully restoring the context of *kuid=ā*. While the preceding paragraph (ex. 19) describes how all the nobles and royals, except king and queen, are led out of the assembly hall, the paragraph starting with *kuid=ā* discusses the actions of the performers among the staff and the preparations for the ritual acts with king and queen (here already translated with *kuit* as ‘as for’. (The passage is glossed in ex. 21):

20 §<sup>6</sup> *kuit=ā* LÚ.MEŠ GIŠ <sup>d</sup>INANNA.ĪI.A Û LÚ.MEŠ ALAN.ZU,<sup>7</sup> LÚ.MEŠ  
 ṽ<sup>h</sup>allijari<sup>1</sup>eš andurza AŠAR=ŠUNU=pat<sup>8</sup> ḫarkanz[i n=āšta]<sup>1</sup>AN<sup>1</sup>[A] LUGAL  
 MUNUS.LUGAL DUMU.MEŠ É.GAL<sup>9</sup> ginu<sup>u</sup>aš G[ADA.ĪI.A da]nzi  
 “**But as for** the lyre players and the performers (and) the cantors, they just  
 keep their positions inside. The palace attendants remove the napkins (lit.  
 knee-cloths) from the king and queen.”

With *kuid=ā* as ‘because’ this would translate as: “But **because** the lyre players and the performers (and) the cantors just keep their positions inside (the hall), the palace attendants remove the napkins from the king and queen.” This makes no sense: there is no logical connection between the two states of affairs.

Another option would be to translate *kuid=a* as temporal ‘after’ (compare ex. 13 for this meaning): “But **after** the lyre players and the performers (and) the cantors just keep their positions inside (the hall), the palace attendants remove the napkins from the king and queen.” This translation, while certainly better than ‘because’, is still very awkward. The subordinate clause, in the present tense, expresses the *continuation* of a state, which directly contradicts what is required by ‘after’, namely entering the state and having completed that action (“after they have taken up their positions (and are now keeping them”).

Irrespective of such semantic clashes, these translations ignore that ‘keeping their positions inside’ is the main assertion, in other words, *andurza AŠAR=ŠUNU=pat ḥarkanzi* “they just hold their positions inside” has to be part of the main clause. In this case, it contrasts with the previous assertion of shepherding the nobility out of the assembly hall: it is new information, not background information. This has been correctly observed by Barsacchi (2017:101), but his solution is to translate *kuit=a* as a temporal adverb *nel frattempo* ‘in the meantime’ in a main clause. Unfortunately this solution only works for this passage and KBo 3.34 ii 24 (*kuid=a* <sup>m</sup>Šuppiumni <sup>m</sup>Marašša=ja GIŠŠU.A <sup>LU</sup>ŠU.I *parku ier* “In the meantime they set up high a barber’s seat for Šuppiuman and Marašša”. I will present a different translation in ex. 22b).

The only analysis that does justice to the subordinating nature of *kuit* while at the same time preserving ‘they just hold their positions inside’ as the

main assertion, is to let *kuit* introduce the performers as a new topic to the left of the clause, with *-a* in its topic shifting function. This way, both the new topic and their actions are contrasted with a preceding topic and their actions (the contrasted topics are boldface, the contrasted actions underlined):

21a **Topic 1**

<i>nu</i>	<b>DUMU.MEŠ</b>	<b>LUGAL</b> <sup>(3)</sup>	<b>DUMU.MUNUS.MEŠ</b>	<b>LUGAL</b>	
CONN	child.PL	king	child.woman.PL	king	
LÚ.MEŠ	<b>DUGUD-TIM</b>	LÚ.MEŠ	<b>UBARUTIM</b> <sup>(4)</sup>	<i>PANI</i>	LUGAL <i>kui-ēš</i>
important.people		foreigners		before	king REL-NOM.PL.C
<i>aš-anzi</i>	<i>n=uš</i>		<i>ar-nu-anzi</i>		
sit-3PL.NPST	CONN=3ACC.PL.C		stand-CAUSE-3PL.NPST		
<sup>(5)</sup> <i>n=uš=kan</i>		LÚ.MEŠ	<sup>GIŠ</sup> GIDRU	<i>parā</i>	<i>pehud-anzi</i>
CONN=3ACC.PL.C=PTCL		man.PL	staff	forth	lead-3PL.NPST

The **princes, princesses, grandees and the distinguished visitors** who sit before the king, they make them stand, and the staff bearers lead them out (of the assembly hall).

21b **Topic 2**

<sup>(6)</sup> *kuit=a*    **LÚ.MEŠ**    **GIŠ** <sup>a</sup>**INANNA.ĪIA**    *Ù*    **LÚ.MEŠ**    **ALAN.ZU,**

as.for=but man.PL wood Inanna.PL and man.PL performer  
 (7) LÚ.MEŠ ʾhallijari<sup>1</sup>-eš # ø andurza AŠAR=ŠUNU=pat<sup>(8)</sup> ḫark-anz[i]  
 man.PL cantor-NOM.PL.C (they) inside place=their=just hold-3PL.NPST

But as for the **lyre players and the performers (and) the cantors**,  
 they just keep their positions inside (the assembly hall).

Applying the same solution to *kuid=a* in KBo 3.34 ii 24 and 27-28, and taking the larger context into account, we now have a stretch of discourse with three panels describing the activities of three different sets of referents (bold face), each set the discourse topic of its panel:

22a The king took Išpudaš-Inar (the potter), (and) Šuppiuman and Marašša.  
 The latter two (lit. they) were the overseers of the chariot-fighters.

**Topic 1:** about Išpudašinar and his actions as chief

Person	<b><i>apū-na</i></b> <sup>(23)</sup>	<sup>LÚ</sup> <i>uralla-(n)=šm-an</i>	<i>ie-t</i>
	3S-ACC.C=but	chief-ACC.S.C=their-ACC.S.C	make-3S.PST
Actions	<i>išpant-i</i>	<i>lahhem-uš</i>	<i>ḫue-ški-zzi</i>
	night-LOC.S	test.run-ACC.PL.C	run-ITER-3S.NPST
Goal	<sup>(24)</sup> <i>ta wašta-uš</i>	<i>wem-er</i>	

CONN mistake-ACC.PL.C find-3PL.PST

but he made *him* (Išpudaš-Inar), surprisingly, their chief<sup>8</sup>. He always runs test-runs at night, so that they could find mistakes.

---

<sup>8</sup> The hapax <sup>LÚ</sup>*uralla-* has been translated as ‘horse-trainer’ (Kloekhorst 2008:926; also see HEG U, 92 for discussion, with literature). Because Išpudaš-Inar trains the chariot-fighters, not the horses, Beal (1992:357, 537-8) opts for ‘training sergeant’, who is a subordinate to the UGULA 1 *LI*-s Šuppiuman and Marašša. This, however, does not do justice to the surprise as indicated by *apūn=a* (ex. 22a, Person clause), and also not to the likewise unexpected situation that Išpudaš-Inar himself teaches the inexperienced chariot-fighters the basics of archery, as indicated by the use of *apāš* (ex. 22c, Action clauses). This situation is only unexpected if Išpudaš-Inar is not a subordinate of Šuppiuman and Marašša, but their superior. There is support for the superior rank of Išpudaš-Inar if we analyze *uralla-* as ‘chief’. The morpheme *-alla-* shows that it is a Luwian formation, which allows us to take *ura-* as the Luwian lexeme ‘great’. I also suggest *uralla-* is the word behind GAL in GAL <sup>LÚ</sup>.MEŠNP (and not *šalli-* or *hantezzi-*), thus *uralla(n)šman* = GAL<sub>≠</sub>ŠUNU.

22b **Topic 2:** about Šuppiuman and Marašša and their training of the chariot-fighters

Persons	<i>kuid=a</i>	[ <sup>m</sup> Šuppiumn- <i>i</i>	<sup>m</sup> Marašša- <i>ia</i> ];	
	as.for=but	Š.-DAT.S	M.-DAT.S=and	
Actions	# <sup>(25)</sup> <i>ø</i> <sub>i</sub>	GIŠŠÚ.A	LUŠU.I	<i>parku</i> <i>i-er</i>
	(for them)	chair	barber	high:NOM-ACC.N make-3PL.PST
	<i>apū-n</i>	<i>ubatij-aš=š-aš</i>	<i>peran</i>	<i>ašeš-er</i>
	3S-ACC.S.C	unit-GEN.S=his-GEN.S	before	seat-3PL.PST
	<sup>(26)</sup> <i>apū-nn=a</i>	<i>ubatij-aš</i>	<i>peran</i>	<i>ašeš-er</i> §
	3S-ACC.S.C=and	unit-GEN.S	before	seat-3PL.PST
Goal	<sup>(27)</sup> <i>ta</i>	<i>išpant-i</i>	<i>ḫalz-išš-anzi</i>	
	CONN	night-LOC.S	call-ITER-3PL.NPST	
	<i>daī-ø=ššan</i>	ANŠE.KUR.RA- <i>aš</i>		
	put-2S.IMP=PTCL	chariot (lit. horse)-DAT.PL		

But as for **Šuppiuman and Marašša**, (for them)<sup>9</sup> a barber's seat was set up high: One was seated in front of his unit and the other was seated in

---

<sup>9</sup> Unfortunately for the current argument, beneficiaries are often not expressed in Old Hittite.

front of (his) unit, so that they could call at night: “Place (some chariot fighters) on the chariots!”

22c **Topic 3:** the young chariot-fighters and their training

Persons *kuid=a* [LÚ.MEŠ<sup>7</sup>KUŠ<sup>7</sup> (28) *āmmijant-uš-šm-uš*]<sub>j</sub>  
 as.for≠but charioteer young-ACC.PL.C≠their-ACC.PL.C

Actions *n=uš*<sub>j</sub> <sup>m</sup>*Išputašinara-š* *manijahhe-ške-zzi*  
 CONN≠3PL.ACC I.-NOM.S.C manage-ITER-3S.NPST

(29) GI-*an* <sup>GIŠ</sup>UMBIN *hašhaššuar*<sup>10</sup> <sup>GIŠ</sup>PAN! *appātar*  
 arrow-ACC.S.C umbin.tool polishing:NOM-ACC.N bow holding:NOM-ACC.N

*n=uš* *apā-š* *annanu-t*  
 CONN≠3PL.ACC 3S-NOM.S.C train-3S.PST

...

---

<sup>10</sup> I take <sup>GIŠ</sup>UMBIN *hašhaššuar* as the equivalent of <sup>GIŠ</sup>UMBIN TAR = Akk. *gullubu* ‘to cut with the <sup>GIŠ</sup>UMBIN tool > to shave’ (CAD G, 129), hence GI-*an* <sup>GIŠ</sup>UMBIN *hašhaššuar* simply means ‘the polishing (of) the arrow(s)’ (for *hašhaš-* ‘to polish’, see HW<sup>2</sup> H, 419). I do not believe that the actual <sup>GIŠ</sup>UMBIN ‘wheel’ of the chariot or a sharpening-wheel is involved in the training of the chariot-fighters. For different interpretations that do take <sup>GIŠ</sup>UMBIN as a wheel, see e.g., Beal 1992:550-2, Dardano 1997:108, Marazzi 2002:511.



Goal           (32) ... š=uš           
                   CONN=3PL.ACC    make.skilled(?)-3PL.PST

But as for **their young chariot-fighters**, Išpudaš-Inar is in charge of them. The polishing of the arrow, the holding of the bow, it is *he* (instead of Šuppiuman and Marašša) who trained them. (One he (further) trained, and others the father of the king gave to Nakkili, Chief of the Cupbearers, others he gave to Huzzi, Chief of the Heralds, yet others to Kizzu, Chief of the Bodyguards,) in order to make them skilled (?).

Topic 1 deals with the position and function of Išpudaš-Inar. The king has appointed Išpudaš-Inar, formerly a potter (*huprala-*), as the chief of Šuppiuman and Marašša, the overseers of the chariot-fighters. Išpudaš-Inar sees to it that Šuppiuman and Marašša run tests at night for training purposes. The next topic is about Šuppiuman and Marašša as overseers, and how they will perform those tests. For whatever reason they are seated on high barber chairs, and at night they call for the chariot-fighters to take their stand on the chariot. I analyze the verb *dai-* as an imperative in direct speech, introduced by *halziššanzi* ‘they call’. Finally, topic 3 is about the inexperienced chariot-fighters, who are not yet ready for the chariots. They first need to learn how to polish an arrow and hold the bow before they can take their stand on the chariot. Against expectations Išpudaš-Inar

is the one to take on their basic training, instead of Šuppiuman and Marašša. This counter-expectation is overtly marked by the use of *apāš* in Replacing Focus<sup>11</sup> in KBo 3.34 ii 29.

Based on exx. 21b, 22b and 22c, we can extract the following formal and functional properties for *kuid=a*:

1. *kuit=a/kuid=a* introduces a left-dislocated (or extra-clausal) constituent;
2. the left-dislocated constituent can be resumed in the main clause by a clitic, see Topic 3 above;
3. the left-dislocated constituent is already marked for the role it will have in the following main clause;
4. The left-dislocated constituent does not just indicate a topic shift, but marks a contrastive topic. In all instances it stands in contrast with a preceding topic.
5. The referent(s) of the left-dislocated constituent are sometimes new to the discourse (ex. 21b, 22c), but if so, they are still part of the common ground, though inactive in the discourse. The performers are expected to be present in the assembly hall for entertainment (ex. 21b), and the young

---

<sup>11</sup> For this concept, see Goedegebuure 2014:382-408.

chariot-fighters (ex. 22c) are a subset of the chariot-fighters mentioned in ex. 22a.

### 5. Additional cases of *kuidza* introducing noun phrases

With these five properties in hand we can now try to explain the other instances of *kuidza*, most of which occur in contexts that likewise have caused problems of analysis and interpretation.

As with the Palace chronicles (KBo 3.34), *kuitza* in the ritual KBo 17.3 iv 28<sup>12</sup> (CTH 416) has led to as many different analyses as there are editors.<sup>13</sup> The original editors of the text (Otten & Souček 1969:39) assumed that *kuit* was a relative pronoun in a preposed relative clause, with *-a* somehow in the middle of the clause and the predicate *hulalian* also in a highly unusual clause-internal position:

---

<sup>12</sup> Previously discussed in Goedegebuure 2014:442 with n. 476 and Goedegebuure 2007:308.

<sup>13</sup> Montuori (2017), who provides the most recent edition, erroneously reads *ki-it-ta* instead of *ku-i-ta* in KBo 17.3 iv 28.

- 23 *kalulupī=šmi ḥulalian kuit=a anda* **und was**<sub>i</sub> an ihren Fingern (Sg.)  
angebunden (ist),  
*ḥalkiaš=a ZÌZ<sup>HI.A</sup>-š=a* und (zwar) die ‘Köpfe’  
*ḥaršārr=a* sowohl von Gerste, als auch  
von Spelt,  
*nu apatt=a GÌR=ŠUNU kitta* auch das<sub>i</sub> liegt bei ihren Füßen.

In such a construction *kuit* should have been analyzed as a relative adjective modifying the ears (*ḥaršārr=a*) of barley and spelt, but the breaking of the nexus between these two phrases by *anda* and the use of *-ja* ‘also’ on *ḥaršār* seems to have led the editors to treat the noun phrase *ḥalkiaš=a ZÌZ<sup>HI.A</sup>-š=a ḥaršārr=a* as appositional, clarifying the referent of *kuit*. Under their analysis the resumption of *kuit* is *apat*. Puhvel (HED H, 3), on the other hand, connects the relative clause to the preceding clause (later, in HED K, 223, Puhvel takes *kuita* as ‘whatever’):

- 24 *ta ḥāḥallit<sup>(28)</sup> gāpinan dāḥḥe* with *h*. I take the thread  
*kalulupī=šmi ḥulalian kuit=a anda* **and what** is wound on their  
finger[s].

Contextually neither solution works. The ritual is completely preserved from the beginning up to this passage, and it is clear that the ears were never tied to the

fingers of the king and queen. The fingers are only wrapped with the colored cops of yarn,<sup>14</sup> while the ears are simply bound in sheaves. Ex. 25 shows the sequence of events. Siglum D tracks the ears, while A tracks the cops:

25 Translation of KBo 17.3+ iv 10-19, with dupl. KBo 17.1+ iv 14-22 (§ 43)

When I take pain, woe and anxieties from the king and queen, the queen gives me

(Aa) five small cops of yarn (5 *gāpinan*): one white, one black, one red, one yellow/green, and one blue woollen (cop).

---

<sup>14</sup> Against all dictionaries and lexicons, *gapina-* does not mean ‘thread’, but ‘cop (of yarn)’. This translation is based on the fact that the verb *kapinai-* ‘to make a *gapina-*’ (denominative *-ai-* verb of *gapina-*) in KBo 47.4:6’ (CTH 402) and *hulaliija-* ‘to wrap’ are used as synonyms (e.g., KBo 12.126 + KUB 24.9 i 49, CTH 402). If *gapina-* had meant ‘thread’, then *kapinai-* should have meant ‘to make into a thread’, but the alternation with *hulaliija-* in the same context blocks this meaning. Because of this equivalence *kapinai-* means ‘to make into something wrapped’, hence *gapina-* is wrapped yarn, thus a cop of yarn. The Luwian analogue of *gapina-* is <sup>síG</sup>*šurit(a)-* (see Nikolaev 2017 for etymological discussion of the latter; *šurit(a)-* is related to Greek *σφαῖρα*, or *sphere*).

(Ab) Along with (that) there is one (piece of) wood, with five twigs (lit. five (are) its twigs). I suspend one cop from a twig each<sup>15</sup>.

(B) (There are) two small woodpiles.



(C) With mud-plaster and with l[a]r[d]<sup>16</sup> I *form* one figurine of clay.

(D) (There are) ears of barley, bound (into a sheaf), and ears of spelt, bound (into a sheaf).

(A+B+C+D) I place all these (items) in a basket and place them at the head(rests) of the king and queen. I throw a cloth on top so that no one will see them.

---

<sup>15</sup> Presumably by attaching a thread from the cop at a branch. The cop itself is left dangling, as the verb *kank-* ‘to suspend, hang’ indicates.

<sup>16</sup> The sign remnants in KBo 17.1 iv 19 allow the reading ʾl̄.Š[A]H-*it-ta* ‘and with lard (lit. pork fat)’, compare the hand copy  with  (HZL nr. 72). For the mixing of animal fat with clay see *man warkan ulinī anda imienun* ‘I could have mixed the fat into the clay’ KBo 3.46 ii 13’ (OH/NS, CTH 13).

The next day, at dawn, the ritual practitioner and an assistant, who is deaf, enter the premises (presumably the bedroom) and pick up the four sets of items from the basket while the king and queen are still present. The ritual continues:

26 Translation of KBo 17.3+ iv 23-27, with dupl. KBo 17.1+ iv 26-31 (§ 44-45)

(Aa) Then I wrap their digits with the cops, (that is, the digits) of their hands,<sup>17</sup>

(Ab) while I hold the branch

(C) and the figurine.

(B) But (as for) the wood piles, one set is placed at the feet of the king and one set is placed (at the feet) of the queen.

(C) (§ 45) Then I say to the figure: “Take the king’s and queen’s woe, pain and their anxieties,”

---

<sup>17</sup> Since we are only dealing with five cops, not ten, the king and queen must press one hand each against a hand of the other, so that the five fingers of one hand each are aligned. The five cops, still attached to the branch by means of a thread, are then wrapped around (i.e., stuck on) each pair of fingers.

After the figurine is asked to absorb the physical and emotional burdens of the king and queen, the ritual practitioner takes hold of one of the cops of yarn (ex. 24).<sup>18</sup> The cops are the *only* objects wrapped around the fingers, invalidating the translations in ex. 23 and 24.

The last action with the cops in complete context is the unraveling or unspooling of the cops by means of the fingers and the twig (*gāpinan kalulupi(t)šmet ḥaḥḥallit mārkaḥḥi*, KBo 17.3+ iv 30). That means that before this act the cops were still attached to the twig and the fingers of king and queen when the ears are placed at their feet.

This sequence of events invalidates yet another suggestion. Starke (1977:178) assumes that not only the ears of grain and barley are placed at the feet of the king and queen, but also the cops (similarly Mouton 2016:85):

27	<i>kalulupišmi ḥulalian kuita</i>	(Nun liegt auch das,) <b>sowohl was an</b>
		ihren Fingern (Sg.) gewickelt (war)
	<i>anda</i>	(und zwar) hinein

---

<sup>18</sup> I imagine that this could be achieved by touching one of the cops with the branch with the five twigs—now called *ḥāḥḥal* ‘bush’—, to which the cops are still attached by means of a thread.



*ḥalkiašza ZÌZ<sup>HI.A</sup>-šza ḥaršārrza* als auch die Köpfe sowohl von Gerste  
als auch von Weizen (zu ihren  
Füßen.)

This is of course impossible if the cops are still wound around the fingers of king and queen (unless we assume that king and queen somehow placed their still connected hands next to their feet on the floor. If so, this is left implicit, and therefore seems very unlikely, let alone that it is a quite disgraceful position).

Meacham (2000:65, ex. 28) and Boley (2007:121; ex. 29) provide contextually acceptable solutions, although it is unclear if Meacham seems to introduce another referent with “what(ever) is wound around their finger(s),” or whether he treats the relative clause as appositional to *gapina-*:

28 *ta ḥāḥallit* <sup>(28)</sup> *gāpinan dāḥḥe* and with the twig I take the thread,  
*kalulupi=šmi ḥulalian kuitza anda* **what(ever)** is wound around their  
finger(s),

Boley’s (2007:121) sentence parsing is therefore to be preferred, despite the gender mismatch between common gender *gāpina-* and the neuter pronoun *kuit* and neuter participle *ḥulalian*. Whatever solution we choose, the gender mismatch remains:

29 *ta hāhallit* <sup>(28)</sup> *gāpinan dāhḥe*      and I take with a *h.* the string  
*kalulupi=šmi ḥulalian kuit=a anda*      **which** is bound on their finger,

Still, the syntax remains unusually convoluted. Because unusual word order often correlates with pragmatic prominence, fronted *kalulupi=šmi* ‘their finger’ and *ḥulalian* ‘wrapped’ are presumably brought to prominence, but in this case, it is unclear why the wrapped finger needs to be brought to prominence.<sup>19</sup> However, if we take the *-a* on *kuit=a* seriously, *kuit=a* should be clause initial. Only the phrase *kalulupi=šmi ḥulalian* is now appositional and serves to remind the audience that the cops are still wound around the fingers. The words *kuit=a anda* now have to form an extra-clausal constituent with *ḥalkiaš=a ZÌZ<sup>HL.A</sup>-š=a ḥaršārr=a*.

The resulting sentence shows the same grammatical features and discourse structure as the other *kuid=a* sentences: an extra-clausal constituent introduced by *kuid=a* is resumed in the immediately following main clause by means of an

---

<sup>19</sup> Houwink ten Cate’s (1973:122 fn.16) solution to read an instrumental *ku-i-ta-an-da* and translate “And I take with the *h.* the thread with which (*ku-i-ta!-an-da*) a winding has been made around their finger(s)” does not solve this problem.

element in the same case (ex. 30c), and again the *kuid=a* constituent contrasts with a preceding topic (KBo 17.3+ iv 25-29, with dupl. KBo 17.1+ iv 28-33 (§ 44-45):

30a **Topic 1:** (B) positioning the two woodpiles

(25) GIŠ *harp-a<sub>i</sub>zma*

heap-NOM-ACC.PL.N<sub>but</sub>

# **1-ant-a<sub>i</sub>** LUGAL-*aš* GÌR<sub>z</sub>ši ki-tta

1-IND-NOM.-ACC.PL.N king-GEN.S foot<sub>z</sub>his:LOC.S lie-3S.NPST

MUNUS.LUGAL-*šza* **1-ant-a<sub>i</sub>** (26) ki-tta

queen-GEN.S<sub>and</sub> 1-IND-NOM.-ACC.PL.N lie-3S.NPST

But (as for) **the wood piles**, one set is placed at the feet of the king and one set is placed (at the feet) of the queen.

30b Conjunction and accompanying act of touching one of the cops (Aa) with the brush (Ab). The ritual practitioner thus serves as a conduit between image (C) and the royal patients:

*ta* *hāhall-it* (28) *gāpina-n* *dā-hḫe*

CONN brush-INSTR cop-ACC.S.C take-1S.NPST

*kalulup-išm-i*                      *ḥulalian-ø*  
 finger-LOC.S=their-LOC.S      wrap:PTCP-NOM.-ACC.S.N

(Then I say to the figure: “Take the king’s and queen’s woe, pain and their anxieties.”) Then with the brush I single out a cop, (still) wrapped around their finger(s).

30c **Topic 2:** (D) positioning the sheaves of barley and spelt ears

*kuit>a*      *anda* <sup>(29)</sup>    *ḥalki-aš>a*<sup>20</sup>                      *ZÍZ*<sup>HI.A</sup>-š>a                      *ḥaršārr>a*<sup>21</sup>  
 as.for=but    together    barley-GEN.S=but      emmer-GEN.S=and      head:NOM.-ACC.PL.N=also  
 # *nu*      *apa-tt>a*                                      *GÌR*=ŠUNU    *ki-tta*

---

<sup>20</sup> Meacham (2000:65) understands *ḥalkijaš>a* *ZÍZ*.HI.A-š>a as “both of barley and of emmer,” but this requires an emendation of *ḥalkijaš>a* to *ḥalkijaš<š>a* for both KBo 17.3 iv 29 and its duplicate KBo 17.1+ iv 33, with the expected reduplication of the consonant to which *-ja* “and, also” cliticizes. Instead of suggesting the same mistake in two documents—unless one can prove that one is written off the other—, it seems better to treat *-a* as *-a/-ma* and not as *-ja*. For another repetition of *-a/-ma* in the extra-clausal constituent, see ex. 33.

<sup>21</sup> The focal particle *-ja* ‘also’ is already marking the additive focus in the left-dislocation. This is theoretically important, because not only case but also pragmatic roles seem to be marked in the left-dislocated element.

CONN 3S-NOM.-ACC.S.N<sub>also</sub> foot<sub>their</sub> lie-3S.NPST

Now, as for the combination of (*anda*) **ears, too, of barley and emmer**, **that *too*** is placed at their feet.

To use the list of five features:

1. *kuit<sub>a</sub>/kuid<sub>a</sub>* introduces a left-dislocated (or extra-clausal) constituent:  
*kuit<sub>a</sub> anda ḥalkiaš<sub>a</sub> ZÌZ<sup>HL.A</sup>-š<sub>a</sub> ḥaršārr<sub>a</sub>*
2. the left-dislocated constituent is resumed in the main clause: the resumption is *apat*.
3. the left-dislocated constituent is already marked for the role it will have in the following main clause, which here is the nominative.
4. The left-dislocated constituent does not just indicate a topic shift, but marks a contrastive topic: the contrast is between the two piles of wood and the sheaves.
5. The referents are part of the common ground but are also relatively inactive: the sheaves were last mentioned in iv 19-20, two paragraphs before the current mention.

A secured sentence-initial *kuit<sub>a</sub>* occurs in the Illuyanka myth CTH 321, in yet another opaque context. In all treatments *kuit* is translated as causal

conjunction<sup>22</sup> (KUB 12.66 iv 18'-23', w. dupl. KUB 17.6 iv 12-18, KBo 3.7 iv 15'-21'):

31    *nu* DINGIR.MEŠ-*naš dapias ŠA* <sup>URU</sup>*kāštama* <sup>d</sup>*zašhapūnāš šalliš*  
§ *kuit-a* <sup>d</sup>*zalinuišaš DAM=ZU* <sup>d</sup>*tazzuwašiš šašanzašiš kē* 3 LU.MEŠ *INA*  
<sup>URU</sup>*tanipija ašanzi*

---

<sup>22</sup> Beckman 1982:20: “**Because** she is the wife of Zali(ya)nu, (and) Tazzuwašši is his concubine, these three persons will remain in (the town of) Tanipiya”; Haas 2006:101: “**Und weil** sie des Zali(ya)nu Gemahlin ist, und Tazzuwassi seine Geliebte ist, bleiben diese drei in (der Stadt) Tanipiya”; Hoffner 1998:14: “**Because** she is the wife of Zaliyanu, and Tazzuwasi is (his) concubine, these three men (i.e., unnamed GUDU-priests?) remain in the town of Tanipiya”; Mouton 2016:457: “**Du fait qu**’elle est l’*épouse* de Zaliyanu (et que) Tazzuwašši (est) sa concubine, ces trois hommes s’installeront dans le ville de Tanipiya”; Pecchioli Daddi and Polvani 1990:54: “**E poiché** è la sposa di Zali(ya)nu e Tazzuwašši ne è la concubina, [...] queste tre divinità (lett.: persone) restano nella città di Tanibiya”; Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 321 (TX 2012-06-08, TRde 2012-06-08): “**Weil** sie aber Zaliyanus Frau (ist und) Tazzuwašši seine Konkubine, sind diese drei Personen in der Stadt Tanipiya.”

Zašḥapuna (the wife of Zalinu) is the greatest among all the gods of Kaštama. § Now, **because** she is the wife of Zalinuiš, (and) Tazzuwaši is his concubine, these three “persons” stay in Tanipiya.

Formally the structure is clear. The string *kuit=a* <sup>d</sup>*zalinuišaš* DAM=ZU <sup>d</sup>*tazzuwašiš* *šašanza=šiš* is subordinate to the main clause *kē* 3 LU.MEŠ *INA* <sup>URU</sup>*tanipiya ašanzi*. Under the traditional analysis *kuit* is a causal subordinator, which means that *kuit=a* <sup>d</sup>*zalinuišaš* DAM=ZU <sup>d</sup>*tazzuwašiš* *šašanza=šiš* is a nominal clause, with DAM=ZU and *šašanza=šiš* serving as the nominal predicates for the subjects “she” (= Zašḥapuna) and Tazzuwaši, respectively. But this leads to problems of interpretation. The subject *kē* 3 LU.MEŠ ‘these three persons (representing the deities?)’ is now without referent. The proximal demonstrative *kā-* in anaphoric function usually tends to resume immediately preceding enumerations (Goedegebuure 2014:316-19). The list unfortunately consists of two deities only, so one would have to propose an emendation of ‘three’ to ‘two’ to mend the mismatch between causal clause and main clause.

Another issue is the lack of overt subject expression of Zašḥapuna in the subordinate clause. While I cannot claim this with 100% certainty for Hittite, across paragraph boundaries or at the beginning of a new discourse unit, continued discourse referents still need to be expressed by means of a noun phrase. The well-established cognitive reason for this is that the accessibility or

activation state of a referent diminishes at a discourse boundary. At the start of a new discourse unit, the referent needs to be reactivated by means of an expression that is heavier than a pronoun or zero.

These issues can be resolved if we take *kuit* as topic-introducing and *Zalinuišaš* as nominative instead of genitive. The number of referents in the *kuit* clause now matches the number of referents in the main clause, so we no longer need an emendation. And since DAM=ZU ‘his wife’ is no longer a nominal predicate ascribed to Zašḥapuna, but a separate referential act to this deity, the problem of the lack of expression of the subject has been resolved as well. In the absence of nominal predicates we are simply dealing with a left-dislocated constituent introduced by *kuit=a* (KUB 12.66 iv 18’-23’, w. dupl. KUB 17.6 iv 12-18, KBo 3.7 iv 15’-21’):

32      Thus say the gods to the priest, Mr. Taḥpurili: “When we go to the Stormgod of Nerik, where shall we sit?” § Thus says the priest, Mr. Taḥpurili: “How would you (all) sit on the basalt-throne?” So, like a priest they will cast for themselves the lot. The ‘priest’ that holds (the lot of) Zalinu shall sit on the basalt-throne set above the spring.  
§ All the gods enter. They cast for themselves the lot.

*nu*      DINGIR<sup>MEŠ</sup>~*n-aš dapi-aš*      ŠA<sup>URU</sup> *kāštama*      <sup>d</sup>*zašḥapūnā-š*      *šall[(i-š)]*



CONN god<sup>PL</sup>-DAT.PL all-DAT.PL of <sup>city</sup>K. <sup>deity</sup>Z.-NOM.S.C great-NOM.S.C

§ *kuit*≈*a* <sup>d</sup>*zalinuiša-š*<sub>i</sub> **DAM**≈*ZU*<sub>i</sub> <sup>d</sup>*tazzuwaši-š*<sub>i</sub> *šašana*≈*šiš*  
 as.for≈but <sup>deity</sup>Z.-NOM.S.C wife≈his <sup>deity</sup>T.-NOM.S.C lover:NOM.S.C≈his

# *k-ē* **3 LU.MEŠ**<sub>i</sub> *INA* <sup>URU</sup>*tanipija* *aš-anzi*  
 these-NOM.PL.C 3 man.PL in <sup>city</sup>T. be-3PL.NPST

Zašhapuna is the greatest among all the gods of Kaštama. § Now, as for **Zalinuiša, his wife, (and) Tazzuwaši his concubine, these three “persons”** will stay (lit. will be) in Tanipija.

From the perspective of referent accessibility, the use of names, noun phrases and epithets makes sense. The name Tazzuwaši is a first mention of this deity and she is therefore not accessible at this point in the text. Because of that she requires the most explicit markers of identification, not just presenting her name but also establishing her relationship to Zalinu. Zašhapuna was mentioned in the immediately preceding sentence. Repetition of the name is not necessary, but since a paragraph line separates this previous mention from the *kuit*-clause, a noun phrase (DAM≈ZU) is still the preferred means of expression over a pronoun. Finally, the last mention of Zalinu occurred in KUB 12.66 iv 14', six clauses and

two paragraph lines removed. The reactivation of the referent requires a name, but since Zalinu had already been under discussion, there is no need for any further markers of identification.

To summarize:

1. *kuit>a/kuid>a* introduces a left-dislocated (or extra-clausal) constituent: *kuit>a* <sup>d</sup>*Zalinuišaš* DAM<sub>ZU</sub> <sup>d</sup>*Tāzzuwašiš šašanzašiš* is no longer a full nominal clause, but a constituent consisting of three elements, Zalinu, his wife (Zašḥapuna), and Tazzuwaši.
2. the left-dislocated constituent is resumed in the main clause: the resumption of the three gods takes the shape of *kē* 3 LÚ.MEŠ. We do not need emendation of 3 to 2.
3. the left-dislocated constituent is already marked for the role it will have in the following main clause, which is the nominative.
4. The left-dislocated constituent does not just indicate a topic shift, but marks a contrastive topic: Here it seems that the contrast is between the triad, residing in Tanipiya, and the rest of the gods mentioned in the text, visiting the Storm God of Nerik.
5. The referents could all be considered part of the common ground, but are relatively inactive or new to the discourse: Tazzuwaši is completely new, and Zalinu had not been mentioned for a while. The

only active referent is Zašhapuna. In my view, this explains why the text simply mentions DAM-ZU and does not repeat the name.

Despite the damaged context of the next example, only the restoration of *kuit* leads to a grammatically acceptable sentence. Delayed *-a/-ma*, such as we see here on *šumaš*, typically cooccurs with the conditionals *takku* or *mān*, *našma* ‘or’ and *kui-* forms (Sideltsev & Molina 2015:211 with further references), and is also attested with *kuit=a* in ex. 34. The sign TA at the break in KUB 26.77 i 10 excludes restoring *takku*, *mān* and *našma*, which leaves only *kuit*. The string *kuit=a šumaš;za* <sup>m</sup>*Alluwamna* <sup>f</sup>*Ḥarapšeki;ia* could still be part of a verbal clause, but that would leave unexplained the [...-]x-aš in i 11. We do not expect anything to interrupt ‘you, Alluwamna and Ḥarapšeki with your children’. Because the sign remnant in i 11 is consistent with a reading MA, we can restore [*nu-uš-m*]a-aš, which both fits the space and provides the resumption of the extra-clausal constituent:

33 KUB 26.77 i 10-11 (CTH 23, OH/NS)

But when the king se[nt?] **Šanku** (as a representative?) of the throne, [they] kept the grain and wine. [H]e (i.e., the king?), surprisingly, [remained] quiet.

<sup>(10)</sup> § [*kui*]t=a *šumaš;za* <sup>m</sup>*Alluwamna* <sup>f</sup>*Ḥara[pšeki;ia]*

as.for>but 2PL.ACC>but A.-VOC.S H̄.-VOC.S>and  
 #<sup>(11)</sup> [nu>šm]aš̄i QADU DUMU.MEŠ>KUNU arḥa šuē-[t]<sup>23</sup>  
 CONN>2PL.ACC with son.PL>your away push-3S.PST  
 But [as fo]r you, o Alluwamna (and) Ḥar[apšeki, he] banish[ed] you  
 along with your children. (He [allo]cated you to the city of Mallitaškuri  
 (saying) “Let them go (and) li[ve] there.”)

Because of the damaged state of the tablet, only three of the five features of the *kuid>a* construction are reasonably certain. Features 4 and 5 are more speculative:

1. *kuit>a/kuid>a* introduces a left-dislocated (or extra-clausal) constituent:  
*kuit>a šumaš>a* <sup>m</sup>*Alluwamna* <sup>t</sup>*Ḥarapšeki>ja* is no longer part of a verbal clause, but one constituent consisting of the addressees, with the names as a parenthetical.

---

<sup>23</sup> With Hoffmann (1984:141f.), I prefer to restore a pret.sg.3 *šu-e-<sup>l</sup>e<sup>l</sup>[t]* instead of a sg.1 *šu-e[-nu-un]* or *šu-e[-mi]* (so for example Tischler, HEG Š/2:1221, Kloekhorst 2008:797) in view both of the scratches that match the sign IT and of the pret.sg.3 in i 13.

2. the left-dislocated constituent is resumed in the main clause: the resumption of the couple is *šmaš*.
3. the left-dislocated constituent is already marked for the role it will have in the following main clause, which is the accusative.
4. The left-dislocated constituent does not just indicate a topic shift, but marks a contrastive topic: Here it seems that the contrast is between the treatment of Alluwamna and Ḥarapšeki, who are banished, and the lack of punishment of some persons who do not deliver grain and wine, presumably against orders.
5. Referents are part of the common ground and relatively inactive or new to the discourse: Alluwamna and Ḥarapšeki are not new to the discourse, but the immediately preceding discourse is about Šanku. Presumably Alluwamna and Ḥarapšeki had become inactive discourse referents after their last mention in KUB 26.77 i 1-2.

#### 6. *kuita* in a verbal clause

There is one case of *kuita* in a verbal clause where *kuit* is neither a relative nor our topic-introducing particle with scope over a NP. Because we are dealing with a verbal clause, retention of the translation ‘as for’ for *kuit* now leads to the familiar use of *kuit* as ‘as for the fact that’, with the important difference that *kuit* is still clause-initial. Unfortunately, the remainder of the passage is lost:

34 KBo 3.24 obv. 19' + KBo 53.275 (OH/NS, CTH 39)

Tawan[anna .....] her father [...] the population [...]. I, however, [did not harm (?)] the daughter. The dau[ghter ...]. [...] her out [of] 𒀭a[ttuša]. “Find [...], and [...] it to you. Eat and drink, [but in] 𒀭a[ttuša you] may not see the eyes [of the king].”

§ *kuid=a* DUMU.NITA-*n=a* ēpp-[un ...]  
as.for>but son-ACC.S.C>but seize-1S.PST  
But as for the son that [I] seized, [...]

### 7. Crushing the baker or the stone?

In the final passage from the Palace Chronicles where *kuid=a* has been identified (KBo 3.34 i 3), *kuid=a* is clearly clause-initial but unfortunately in a broken passage. Because topic-introducing *kuid=a* only followed by a noun phrase had not yet been recognized, the only option was to restore a verb, *IŠBAT* ‘he seized’, in the break immediately following *kuid=a*: *kuid=a* [ *IŠBAT pašši* ] *an šallin* “But given the fact that/because [he found/seized] a *large* pebble, they punctured him (i.e., the baker) and made him disappear/made him go up in smoke” (so CHD Š, 122, Dardano 1997:28-9 with discussion on p. 74-5, Haas 2006:55, HW<sup>2</sup> 𒀭, 817a. With temporal “nachdem” Soysal 1989:83). In view of the two other extra-clausal

*kuid=*a constituents in the Palace Chronicles (KBo 3.34 ii 24, 27), I prefer a simple extra-clausal constituent without a verb here as well. This leads to a very different understanding of the passage:

35a KBo 3.34 i 2-4 (CTH 8, OH/NS) w. dupl. KBo 13.44 i 2-4 (NS), KUB  
36.104 obv. 1'-2' (OS)

In Kuššar the father of the king found a stone in a [*tun*]*ink*-bread.

**Topic 1:** treatment of the baker

*š=*e                      *pā-er*  
CONN=3PL.NOM      go-3PL.PST

ḪUR.SAG-*i*              *ša[nnapil]i*<sup>24</sup>              *paḥḥur*                      <sup>(3)</sup> *par-er*  
mountain-LOC.S      empty.place-LOC.S      fire:NOM-ACC.S.N      fan-3PL.PST

*š=*e                      LÚNINDA.DÙ.DÙ      *ḥūpp-er*  
CONN=3PL.NOM      baker                      do.evil-3PL.PST

---

<sup>24</sup> For the restoration of *ša[nnapil]i* see Neu 1995:242.

They went and fanned a fire on a mountain in an e[mpty place<sup>25</sup>],  
and maltreated the **baker**.

35b **Topic 2:** treatment of the stone

*kuid=a*[     *andan* (?)   *pašši*]*la-n*     *šalli-n*<sup>26</sup>  
as.for>but    inside            stone-ACC.S.C    large-ACC.S.C

(<sup>4</sup>) # *š=an* <sub>i</sub>            *hatt-ann-er*            *š=an*                    *šami*[-*nu-er*]  
CONN=3S.ACC.C    strike-3PL.PST    CONN=3S.ACC.C    disappear-CAUS-3PL.PST

But as for the [peb]ble [inside (the bread) (?)] being large, they crushed<sup>27</sup> it  
and so [made] it disappear.

---

<sup>25</sup> Since not *šannapili* but *danatt(a/i)-* modifies localities (Dardano 1997:72, 112),  
*šannapili* is the substantive *šannapili* B ‘empty (place)’ (CHD Š, 161).

<sup>26</sup> HW<sup>2</sup> H, 486b takes *š=e ... šallin* as one sentence. This is impossible: transitive  
clauses do not take enclitic subjects, as recognized in HW<sup>2</sup> H, 817a (with the  
correct analysis).

<sup>27</sup> In order to crush a stone, one needs to continually strike it with a tool with a  
small hitting surface like a hammer. This makes the verb *hatt-*, also used for  
arrows hitting a target or puncturing an object, appropriate, although *walh-* could  
have been used as well.



The reconstruction of a verb in the break is certainly possible, compare ex. 34, but not assured. The reconstruction of *andan* ‘inside (the bread)’ (compare ex. 30c for another adverb in the *kuid=a* constituent) is not assured either, but it does cancel a particularly gruesome fate<sup>28</sup> for the baker, namely the crushing of the baker, or even drilling holes in him, and his subsequent burning<sup>29</sup> (perhaps as an offering to the gods?<sup>30</sup>), while it adds an appropriate action for the disposal of the stone. The baker does not escape punishment since that is covered by *hū(wa)pp-* ‘to maltreat’ and presumably involves the fire.

#### 8. Overview and linguistic analysis

---

<sup>28</sup> Killing personnel for an impurity in the victuals for the king is not unheard of. Another palace narrative where someone is killed after he was found guilty of contaminating the king’s water with a hair of his is KUB 13.3 iii 21-35.

<sup>29</sup> In case the baker is still the victim of all these actions, I prefer to derive *šaminuer* from *šamenu-* B ‘to burn’ instead of *šamenu-* A ‘to make disappear’ (so CHD Š, 122 with caution) since the fire in KBo 3.34 i 2-3 needs to serve a purpose.

<sup>30</sup> I owe this suggestion to my colleague Rich Beal.

The following table contains a schematic overview of all instances of *kuid=a* discussed above:

	date	<i>kuid=a</i> phrase	case of NP	type of resumption	case of resumption
	<b><i>kuid=a</i> introducing a NP</b>				
21b	OH/MS ritual	<i>kuid=a</i> NP+NP+NP	nom.pl.c.	# $\emptyset$ (transitive subject)	n/a
30c	OH/OS ritual	<i>kuid=a anda</i> [NP <sub>=a</sub> +NP <sub>=ja</sub> ] NP <sub>=ja</sub>	nom.pl.n.	# <i>nu apatt=a</i>	nom.s.n.
32	OH/NS myth	<i>kuid=a</i> NP+NP+NP	nom.s.c.(x3)	# <i>kē</i> 3 LU.MEŠ	nom.pl.c.
22c	OH/NS hist.	<i>kuid=a</i> NP	acc.pl.c.	# <i>n=uš</i>	3acc.pl.c.
33	OH/NS hist.	<i>kuid=a</i> NP <sub>=a</sub> (+vocatives)	2acc.pl.	# [ <i>nu=šm</i> ]aš	2acc.pl.
35	OH/NS hist	<i>kuid=a</i> [ <i>andan?</i> ] NP	acc.s.c.	# <i>š=an</i>	3acc.s.c.
22b	OH/NS hist.	<i>kuid=a</i> NP+NP <sub>=ja</sub>	dat.s.(x2)	# $\emptyset$	(dat.)
	<b><i>kuid=a</i> introducing a verbal clause</b>				

34	OH/NS hist.	<i>kuid=a NP=a V</i>	acc.s.c.	[...]	n/a
----	----------------	----------------------	----------	-------	-----

Ex. 1-4 showed left-dislocated constituents that only consisted of a NP. If marked for case at all, the case was nominative, irrespective of the function the element assumes in the following clause. As Samuels (2009:290-91) already implied, this behavior is consistent with the type of left-dislocation known as Hanging Topic Left Dislocation (HTLD). We now have evidence for another type of left-dislocation in Hittite, the type where the dislocated element is syntactically (and pragmatically!) dependent on the main clause.

The function of the *kuid=a* dislocation<sup>31</sup> is to reactivate a referent that is part of the common ground in order to be commented upon in the following main clause, hence from an Information Structural perspective the *kuid=a* dislocation is a Topic. The *kuid=a* Topic is also always contrastive. The referent of the *kuid=a* dislocation is part of the common ground either because the referent is accessible based on knowledge of the communicative setting (the royal family and nobles in

---

<sup>31</sup> It is not clear how ex. 5 should be interpreted, as the only case of left-dislocation currently known to me that does not use *kuid=a* but otherwise behaves like the *kuid=a* dislocation. More examples are needed to fully understand both the synchronic and diachronic picture.

the assembly hall will typically be entertained by performers; when training chariot-fighters, there will be novices and more advanced students) or because it was mentioned before but has been replaced as a discourse topic. This, I believe, could be the difference with the Hittite HTLD. It seems that the referents of the Hittite HTLD, though contrasting with a preceding topic, are often not only new to the discourse but also not automatically accessible through triggering by something else in the discourse<sup>32</sup>.

Traditionally, there are two types of left-dislocation that fit the functional description of both being part of the common ground and being contrastive, Germanic-type Contrastive Left Dislocation (CLD) and Romance-type Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD<sup>33</sup>). The difference between CLD and CLLD that is relevant for the present study is the type of resumption. The resumption of a CLLD must be a clitic, whereas the resumption of a CLD is the tonic pronoun *der/die* (Van Riemsdijk 1997:7), which can also be contrastively accented. But in Hittite we see

---

<sup>32</sup> But there are exceptions, such as <sup>d</sup>*IŠTAR DINGIR-LIM=aš=mu* “(As for) Šaušga, she is my goddess” KUB 1.1 iv 74 (NH, Ḫattušili III, CTH 81). The whole text is a dedication to Šaušga (Ištar), so Šaušga is neither new nor inaccessible in the context. There is also no perceivable contrast.

<sup>33</sup> For CLLD as Contrastive Topicalization in Spanish, see Arregi 2003.

both types of resumption, tonic in ex. 30c (Focus pronoun) and 32 (adnominal demonstrative), and clitic in ex. 22c, 33 and 35 (note that transitive subjects in the Anatolian languages cannot be expressed as a clitic, hence ex. 21b and 22b do not have clitic resumptions), so the formal distinction between CLD and CLLD does not seem relevant for Hittite. It is therefore better to follow a more recent unified approach to left-dislocation that distinguishes between two types of left-dislocation (López 2016): H-type, which covers Hittite HTLD, and D-type, which covers Hittite *kuid=a* dislocation, while allowing for further language-specific distinctions such as CLD and CLLD.

H-type dislocation survived into New Hittite, while D-type *kuid=a* dislocation disappeared after Old Hittite. A few instances of Old Hittite NP<sub>i</sub>=a/ma were discussed by Garrett (1994:38-9) as cases of left-dislocation, such as ex. 30a, repeated here as 36, with *ḫarpa=ma* contrasting with *kuit=a ... ḫaršārr=a* in 30c:

36 (25) GIŠ<sup>25</sup>*ḫarp-a<sub>i</sub>=ma*

heap-NOM-ACC.PL.N<sub>i</sub>but

# **1-ant-a<sub>i</sub>**

1-IND-NOM.-ACC.PL.N

LUGAL-*aš*

king-GEN.S

GÌR<sub>i</sub>*š*

foot<sub>i</sub>his:LOC.S

*ki-tta*

lie-3S.NPST

MUNUS.LUGAL-*š=a* **1-ant-a<sub>i</sub>**

(26) *ki-tta*

queen-GEN.S=and            1-IND-NOM.-ACC.PL.N            lie-3S.NPST

But (as for) **the wood piles**, **one set** is placed at the feet of the king and **one set** is placed (at the feet) of the queen.

To me it seems that this type of left-dislocation competed with our *kuid=ā* and may have helped to render *kuid=ā* obsolete. Further research is needed, but the loss of *kuid=ā* as a contrastive topic marker probably also coincided with an expanding use of *kuit* as introducing backgrounded verbal clauses that are outside the scope of negation (just like topics), see ex. 34. This *kuit* should be translated as ‘as for the fact that ...’.

From the backgrounding function of *kuit* in verbal clauses, it was only a small step to *kuit* as causal subordinating conjunction in Middle and Neo-Hittite. As a result of the reanalysis of *kuid=ā*, Old Hittite no longer has a causal subordinating conjunction. Causality in Old Hittite is only expressed overtly by the paratactic conjunction *š(u)-* ‘so, for this reason, as a result, etc.’ (CHD Š, 517-29).

The purpose of this study was to identify the *kuid=ā* dislocation and establish its function, but much has been left for further study. What are its origins? There is no evidence of a similar construction in the other Anatolian languages, so we should assume that the rise of the *kuid=ā* dislocation is an inner-

Hittite development. Further study of topicalization in combination with *-a/-ma* and of HTLD should also clarify the difference in meaning between these topic-introducing strategies and *kuid=a*, which could only be hinted at here.

### Bibliography

- Arregi, Karlos (2003). "Clitic Left Dislocation is Contrastive Topicalization," *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 9.1/2:31-44
- Barsacchi, Francesco G. (2017). *Le feste ittite del tuono: edizione critica di CTH 631*, StAs 12 (Florence: Firenze University Press).
- Beal, Richard H. (1992). *The Organisation of the Hittite Military*, THeth 20 (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter).
- Beckman, Gary (1982). "The Anatolian Myth of Illuyanka," *JANES* 14: 11-25.
- Boley, Jacqueline (2007). "The Dilemma of the Doubled *-a*," *VITA – Festschrift in Honor of Belkıs Dinçol and Ali Dinçol*, edited by M. Alparlan, M. Doğan-Alparlan, H. Peker (Istanbul: Ege Yayınları), pp. 117-124.
- CAD = Oppenheim A.L.† et al. (1956–). *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago).
- Carruba, Onofrio (1977). "Beiträge zur mittelhethitischen Geschichte, I. Die Tuthalijas und die Arnuwandas II. Die sogenannten "Protocoles de succession dynastique" I.-II.," *SMEA* 18: 137-174; 175-195
- CHD = Hans G. Güterbock †, Harry A. Hoffner †, Theo P. J. van den Hout, et al. (eds.) (1980-). *The Hittite dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago).
- Christiansen, Birgit (2012). *Schicksalsbestimmende Kommunikation. Sprachliche, gesellschaftliche und religiöse Aspekte hethitischer Fluch-, Segens- und Eidesformeln*, StBoT 53 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz)
- Daddi Pechhioli, F. (1975). "Il *HAZAN(N)U* nei testi di Hattusa," *OA* 14: 93-136
- Dardano, Paola (1997). *L'aneddoto e il racconto in eta' antico-hittita: la cosiddetta "cronaca di palazzo"*, Biblioteca di ricerche linguistiche e filologiche 43 (Rome: Il calamo).
- Garrett, Andrew (1990). "The syntax of Anatolian pronominal clitics" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University).

- (1994). “Relative Clause Syntax in Lycian and Hittite,” *Die Sprache* 36/1: 29-69.
- Gilan Amir (2015). *Formen und Inhalte althethitischer historischer Literatur*, THeth 29 (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter).
- Goedegebuure, Petra (1998). “The Hieroglyphic Luwian Particle REL-*i=pa*,” in *Acts of the IIIrd International Congress of Hittitology, Çorum, September 16-22*, pp. 233-245.
- (2007). “‘Let only Neša become populous!’, and more. Philological notes on Old Hittite,” in *Tabularia Hethaeorum. Hethitologische Beiträge, Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by Detlev Groddek and Marina Zorman (Harrassowitz Verlag: Wiesbaden), pp. 305-312.
- (2009). “Focus Structure and Q-word Questions in Hittite,” in *Interpersonal grammar: a cross-linguistic perspective*, edited by Evelien Keizer and Miriam van Staden, Thematic issue of *Linguistics* 47/4: 945-967.
- (2014). *The Hittite Demonstratives. Studies in Deixis, Topics and Focus*, StBoT 55 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).
- (2017). “A New Join to a Hittite Festival of Thunder: KBo 31.183 + KBo 34.185 + KBo 20.61 (CTH 631),” *N.A.B.U.* 2017/2 (juin): 105-107.
- Haas, Volkert (2006). *Die hethitische Literatur: Texte, Stilistik, Motive*, (Berlin: De Gruyter).
- Havers, Wilhelm (1926). “Der sog. ‘Nominativus pendens’,” *IF* 43: 207-57
- HED = Jaan Puhvel (1984-). *Hittite Etymological Dictionary* (Berlin - New York – Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter).
- HEG Š/2, U = Johann Tischler (1977-2016), *Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar*, (Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität).
- Hoffmann, Inge (1984). *Der Erlaß Telipinus*, THeth 11 (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter).
- Hoffner, Harry A. (1998). *Hittite Myths. Second Edition*, WAW 2 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).
- Hoffner Jr., H.A. and Melchert, H. Craig (2008). *A Grammar of the Hittite Language. Part I: Reference Grammar*, LANE 1 (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns).
- Houwink ten Cate, Philo H. J. (1973). “The Particle *-a* and its Usage with Respect to the Personal Pronoun,” in *Festschrift Heinrich Otten. 27. Dezember 1973*, edited by E. Neu and Ch. Rüster (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz), pp. 119-39.
- HW<sup>2</sup> = Friedrich, Johannes, Anneliese Kammenhuber et al. (1975 et seqq.), *Hethitisches Wörterbuch. Zweite, völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage auf der Grundlage der edierten hethitischen Texte* (Heidelberg: Winter).



- Inglese, Guglielmo (2016). *Subordination and Sentence Connectives in Old Hittite*, LINCOM Studies in Indo-European Linguistics 49 (Munich: LINCOM academic publishers).
- Josephson, Folke (1972). *The Function of the Sentence Particles in Old and Middle Hittite* (Uppsala: Skriv Service AB).
- Klinger, Jörg (2001). "Historische Texte: Aus der sogenannte "Palastchronik"", in *TUAT Erg.:* pp. 61-64.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin (2008). *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 5 (Leiden, Boston: Brill).
- López, Luis (2016). "Dislocations and Information Structure," in *The Oxford Handbook of Information Structure*, edited by Caroline Féry and Shinichiro Ishihara (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 402-21
- Luraghi, Silvia (1990). *Old Hittite Sentence Structure* (London and New York: Routledge).
- Marazzi, Massimiliano (2002). "Esercitazioni di carri da guerra: revisione di un passaggio della Cronaca di Palazzo," in *Anatolia antica. Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati*, edited by Stefano de Martino and Franca Pecchioli Daddi, Eothen 11 (Florence: LoGisma), pp. 507-18.
- Meacham, Michael-David (2000). "A Synchronic and Diachronic Functional Analysis of Hittite *-ma*" (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley).
- Miller, Jared L. (2013). *Royal Hittite Instructions and Related Administrative Texts*, WAW 31 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature)
- Montuori, C. (ed.), [hethiter.net/](http://hethiter.net/): CTH 416 (TX 08.02.2017, TRit 24.07.2015).
- Mouton, Alice (2016). *Rites, mythes et prières hittites*, LAPO 21 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf)
- Neu, Erich (1995). "Grammatische Skizze zum Text der althethitischen 'Palastchronik'," in *Studio historiae ardens. Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Philo H.J. Houwink ten Cate on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, edited by Th.P.J. van den Hout and J. de Roos (Leiden: NINO), pp. 225-244.
- Nikolaev, Alexander (2017). "Luvian <sup>(sìG)</sup>*šūrita* 'balls of yarn'," in *Usque ad Radices: Indo-European Studies in Honour of Birgit Anette Olsen*, edited by Bjarne Simmelkjær Sandgaard Hansen, Adam Hyllested, Anders Richardt Jørgensen, Guus Kroonen, Jenny Helena Larsson, Benedicte Nielsen Whitehead, Thomas Olander, Tobias Mosbæk Søborg (Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum), pp. 567-574.
- Otten, Heinrich and Vladimir Souček (1969). *Ein althethitisches Ritual für das Königspaar*, StBoT 8 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).
- Pecchioli Daddi, Franca and Anna Maria Polvani (1990). *La mitologia ittita*, Testi del Vicino Oriente Antico 4 (Brescia: Paideia Editrice).

- Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 321 (TX 2012-06-08, TRde 2012-06-08)
- Riemsdijk, Henk van (1997). "Left Dislocation," in *Materials on Left Dislocation*, edited by Elena Anagnostopoulou, Henk C. van Riemsdijk, Frans Zwarts (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing), pp. 1-10
- Samuels, Bridget (2009). "On the left periphery in Anatolian," *Linguistic Analysis* 35: 275–98.
- Sideltsev, Andrej (2015). "Hittite Clitic Doubling as an Innovative Category: Its Origin," in *Tradition and innovation in the ancient Near East: proceedings of the 57th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Rome 4–8 July 2011*, edited by Alfonso Archi in collaboration with Armando Bramanti (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns), pp. 417-26.
- Sideltsev, Andrej and Maria Molina (2015). "Enclitic *-(m)a* 'but', clause architecture and the prosody of focus in Hittite," *IF* 120: 209-253.
- Soysal, Oğuz (1989). "Mursili I. - Eine historische Studie" (Ph.D. diss. Universität Würzburg).
- (2005). "Beiträge zur althethitischen Geschichte (III). Kleine Fragmente historischen Inhalts," *ZA* 95: 121-144
- (2006). "Beiträge zur althethitischen Geschichte (IV): Ein Textanschluß an KBO 3.24 (CTH 39.1)," *N.A.B.U* 2006/1: 15-16
- Starke, Frank (1977). *Die Funktionen der dimensionalen Kasus und Adverbien im Althethitischen*, StBoT 23 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).
- (1995). *Ausbildung und Training von Streitwagenpferden. Eine hippologisch orientierte Interpretation des Kikkuli-Textes*, StBoT 41 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).
- Vai, Massimo (2011). "Osservazioni sulla periferia sinistra della frase in ittita," in *Anatolistica Indoeuropeistica e Oltre nelle Memorie dei Seminarî offerti da Onofrio Carruba (anni 1997-2002) al Medesimo presentate*, Tomo I, edited by M. Barbera, G. Borghi, M. Mariani, A. Rizza, R. Ronzitti, V.S. Tomelleri, M. Vai (Milano: Qu.A.S.A.R. s.r.l.), pp. 39-56
- Weeden, Mark (2011). *Hittite Logograms and Hittite Scholarship*, StBoT 54 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).
- Zeilfelder, Suzanne (2001). *Archaismus und Ausgliederung. Studien zur sprachlichen Stellung des Hethitischen*, Idg.Bibl. 3 (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter).