
Vocatives and Direct Addresses in Hittite

Andrei Sideltsev

Abstract

This paper reviews the evidence from Hittite on morphological and syntactic marking of direct addresses. It is shown that the standard description of Hoffner, and Melchert in 2008 needs a revision. Careful examination of a considerable body of texts shows a mismatch between morphological (vocative case) and syntactic (separate syntactic unit) marking of direct addresses to gods and men. The real taxonomy of direct addresses in Hittite is as follows: (a) morphologically marked vocatives within the main clause, (b) morphologically marked vocatives in a separate syntactic unit, (c) morphologically marked nominatives (or unmarked logograms) in a separate syntactic unit, (d) morphologically marked nominatives (or unmarked logograms) within the main clause. All these structures are demonstrably different from appositional constructions.

Keywords

Hittite | syntax | vocative | clause

* Andrei Sideltsev is a researcher at the Department of Anatolian and Celtic Languages of the Institute of Linguistics (Russian Academy of Sciences).

INTRODUCTION¹

In this paper I will explore the syntax of Hittite vocatives. It has been suggested that they occur in a clause of their own² and do not host Wackernagel clitics³—and in particular the direct speech particle.⁴ I will discuss in detail whether true vocatives really occur in a separate clause and show that the reality is considerably more subtle, and that the unit is not a clause by any Hittite standard. I will also explore the use of *nu* vis-à-vis proper vocatives—a fragment of Hittite grammar that has been completely overlooked up to now.

I will also address the question of whether the only true vocatives are marked by the vocative case⁵ or one can also attribute nominatives to this category.⁶

Thus, the study will contribute to a more profound understanding of the basic and most fundamental facts of Hittite syntax—what a clause is and how it is marked. Its significance therefore goes beyond the topic of vocatives.

¹ I thank Ekaterina Lyutikova and the anonymous reviewers for ArOr who helped to greatly improve the paper. All errors of fact or interpretation are mine. The work was supported by grant RSF 18-18-00503 <https://rscf.ru/en/project/18-18-00503/>. The abbreviations used in this article are listed on the Cuneiform Digital Library Initiative (CDLI) website, available at http://cdli.ox.ac.uk/wiki/abbreviations_for_assyriology (September 1, 2021).

² Harry A. Hoffner, “From the Disciplines of a Dictionary Editor,” *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 50 (1998a): 41; Harry A. Hoffner, and Harold C. Melchert, *A Grammar of the Hittite Language. Part 1: Reference Grammar* (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2008), 244.

³ Heiner Eichner, “Zur Syntax des vedischen und hethitischen Vokativs im Vergleich,” in *Audias fabulas veteres. Anatolian Studies in Honor of Jana Součková-Siegelová. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East* 79, ed. Šárka Velhartická (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2016), 124.

⁴ Benjamin Fortson, “A New Study of Hittite -*wa(r)*,” *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 50 (1998): 21–34; Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*, 244.

⁵ As argued by Hoffner, “Disciplines,” 41 and Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*, 244.

⁶ As held by the long tradition before Hoffner, and Melchert. See, for example, Edgar H. Sturtevant, and E. Adelaide Hahn, *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language*. 2nd edition. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1951), 84; Johannes Friedrich, *Hethitisches Keilschrift-Lesebuch, I. Lesestücke* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1960), 44; Annelies Kammenhuber, *Hethitisch, Palaisch, Luwisch, Hieroglyphenluwisch und Hattisch. Altkleinasatische Indices zum Handbuch der Orientalistik, Edition 4 of Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* (Munich: J. Kitzinger, 1969), 193; Erich Neu, “Einige Überlegungen zu den hethitischen Kasusendungen,” in *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch. Vergleichende Studien zur historischen Grammatik und zur dialektgeographischen Stellung der indogermanischen Sprachgruppen Altkleinasien*. *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft* 25, ed. E. Neu and Wolfgang Meid (Innsbruck: Institute für Sprachwissenschaft – Universität Innsbruck, 1979), 177–96; Silvia Luraghi, *Hittite. Languages of the World/Materials* 114 (Munich: Lincom Europa, 1997), 15. The tradition is currently continued by Eichner, “Zur Syntax” and Susanne Zeilfelder, “Allmächt na! – Zum Vokativ im Hethitischen,” in “*dat ih dir it nu bi huldi gibu*”. *Linguistische, germanistische und indogermanische Studien Rosemarie Lühr gewidmet*, ed. Sergio Neri, Roland Schumann, and Susanne Zeilfelder (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2016), 528.

THE MORPHOLOGY OF VOCATIVES

From a morphological point of view, vocatives are marked in Hittite by a specialized vocative case.⁷ According to Hoffner:

The form of the vocative is the bare stem (*išḫa* “lord!”) or a form outwardly resembling the dative-locative singular, either with final *-i* (*atti=me* “O my father” KBo 12.70 rev.¹ 10b, *šarkui LUGAL-ue* “O heroic king”), or *-e* (*LUGAL-ue* “O king”).⁸

According to Hoffner, and Melchert:

In Hittite, most common nouns and adjectives (including a few *u*-stems) the vocative appears as the bare stem (i.e., it has an ending in zero). Compare: (*a*-stems:) *išḫā-mi* “my lord”, ^dŠKUR-*ta attā=šu[mmi]* “O Tarḫunta, ou[r] father”, (*u*-stems:) ^dMukišanu “O Mukišanu”, ^dIštanui *šarku LUGAL-ue* “O Ištanu, pre-eminent king”. In OH, *u*-stem appellatives and names take the ending *-i/-e*: ^dUTU-*i* (^dIštanui) “O Sungod”, *LUGAL-ui* (^dḫaššui) “O king” [...]. In at least two cases, *a*-stem nouns have a vocative in *-i* with the *a*-stem vowel deleted before it: *atti=me* “O my father” and [ŠE]Š-*ni=mi* “O my brother” (= ^d*negni=mi* from *negna-*) [...]. The enclitic possessive pronouns, which show *i*-mutation [...], show either *-i* or *-e* vocalization in the vocative: *išḫā-mi* “my lord”, [ŠE]Š-*ni=mi* “O my brother”, *atti=me* “O my father”. The use on vocatives of the clitic possessives in *-met/-mit* (^dUTU=*met* ‘O my Sungod’ [...]), which only occur in MS or NS copies of older texts is based on a misunderstanding of the clitic possessives by copyists who no longer had these as a living part of their language. [...] Consonantal stems seem to show both the bare stem and the *-i* ending: ^dWišūriyanta “O Wisuriyant!” [...], but *pedanti* “O place!” and KÙ.BABBAR-*an-ti* “O Silver!”⁹

Opinions differ as to whether addresses to gods can be marked by nominatives. Sturtevant and Hahn,¹⁰ Friedrich,¹¹ Kammenhuber,¹² Neu,¹³ Luraghi,¹⁴ and Eichner¹⁵ all argue that true vocatives can be marked by the nominative case in the singular and particularly in the plural (where there is no separate vocative

⁷ See Hoffner, “Disciplines,” 40; and Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*, 245.

⁸ Hoffner, “Disciplines,” 40.

⁹ Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*, 74–75.

¹⁰ Sturtevant and Hahn, *A Comparative Grammar*, 84.

¹¹ Friedrich, *Hethitisches*, 44.

¹² Kammenhuber, *Hethitisch, Palaisch, Luwisch*, 193.

¹³ Neu, “*Einige Überlegungen*.”

¹⁴ Luraghi, *Hittite*, 15.

¹⁵ Eichner, “Zur Syntax.”

plural ending). Hoffner, and Melchert¹⁶ expressly reject this approach. However, later on in their own presentation of the data they actually concede that addresses to gods are, in a number of secure cases, marked by the nominative in the singular, although they hold these cases to be sporadic and rare. Thus, the emphatic rejection by Hoffner, and Melchert of this tradition is inconsistent not only with the data, but also with their own assessment. Still, they explicitly reject the idea that true vocatives can be marked by the nominative plural:

It is inappropriate to claim (as does Kammenhuber) that with common-gender substantives the vocative corresponds in general to the nominative, since this implies that such forms are really vocatives that merely share the same endings with the nominative. When Luraghi¹⁷ writes, “It [the nominative] is also used as a vocative in the plural,” she ignores the fact that any case form in singular or plural can be used for direct address as long as it does not occupy its own separate clause, as does the true vocative. The fact that there appears to have been no distinctively plural vocative endings does not justify her claim¹⁸ that “the nominative [plural] is used in its place” [...].¹⁹

I will show that this is not the case as any case form in singular or plural can be used for direct address only under very specific circumstances—when it is appositive to a second person pronoun (explicit or implied by a second person verbal ending). Cases like (19b) below, which attest nominative marking of direct addresses that are not appositive to a second person pronoun in a separate syntactic unit, demonstrate beyond any doubt that the nominative case can mark direct addresses both in the singular and the plural. I will also show that nominative marking of direct addresses is not as rare as Hoffner, and Melchert believed.

THE SYNTAX OF VOCATIVES

From a syntactic point of view, the vocative is described as standing in “a separate clause of its own and is not included in the immediately following clause with the verb.”²⁰ Similarly, “a noun in the vocative (together with any accom-

¹⁶ Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*, 245.

¹⁷ Luraghi, *Hittite*, §2.1.5.1.

¹⁸ Luraghi, *Hittite*, §2.1.6.2.

¹⁹ Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*, 246.

²⁰ Hoffner, “Disciplines,” 41.

panying attributive adjectives), and rarely the nominative standing for the vocative [...] constitutes a clause in itself [...].”²¹

Wackernagel enclitics do not cliticise to vocatives

This is just stated and not explicitly argued for in the literature, but this descriptive generalization must follow from the fact that vocatives never host Wackernagel clitics,²² including the direct speech particle *-wa(r)*.²³ Instead, the Wackernagel clitics cliticize to the first word that follows the noun phrase in the vocative. The noun phrase can be constituted by one word or by several words, as in the following examples:

(1) NS (CTH 395.1.A) KBo 11.14 obv. ii 4

- 1a. ^dUTU-*ue* EN=*mit*
 sungod.VOC.SG lord=my.VOC.SG
 1b. EGIR-*pa=ma=a[n* *pāi]*
 back=but=it give.2SG.IMP

“(1a) **Sungod, my lord**, (1b) give **him** back!”²⁴

(2) INS (CTH 364.2.B) KUB 36.18 obv. ii 7’

- 1a. KÙ.BABBAR-*anti*
 silver.VOC.SG
 1b. *lē=mu=kan* *kueš[i]*
 PROH=me=LOCP kill.2SG.PRS

“(1a) **O silver**, (1b) do not kill **me!**”²⁵

Here, the respective clitic chains *=ma=an* and *=mu=kan* are not hosted by what would be the first word of the clause—^dUTU-*ue* EN=*mit* “sun-god, my lord” or KÙ.BABBAR-*anti* “silver,” but rather follow the first word that follows the

²¹ Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*, 242.

²² Hoffner, “Disciplines,” 41; Eichner, “Zur Syntax,” 124f.

²³ Fortson, “A New Study”; Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*, 244.

²⁴ Anna Chrzanowska, “Ritual der Ḫantitaššu von Hurma: ‘Wenn die Jahre eines Menschen gestört sind’ (CTH 395.1),” accessed May 7, 2021, https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20395.1&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=A.%20Chrzanowska. Cf. Ahmet Ünal, *The Hittite Ritual of Ḫantitaššu from the City of Hurma against Troublesome Years* (Ankara: Turkish Historical Society, 1996), 19 Anm. 29, but the emendation is not necessary; see Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*, 74–75.

²⁵ Elisabeth Rieken et al., “CTH 364.2 – Der Gesang vom Silber – Die Geburt des Silbers,” accessed May 7, 2021, https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_myth/intro.php?xst=CTH%20364.2&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al. Cf. Harry A. Hoffner, *Hittite Myths. Writing from the Ancient World* 2. 2nd edition. (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1998b), 49.

vocatives—EGIR-*pa* “back” and *lē* “may not.” As Wackernagel clitics otherwise consistently follow the first word of the clause in Hittite, this distributional property is striking and cannot be interpreted in any other way than is described by Hoffner²⁶ and Hoffner, and Melchert²⁷—as vocatives occurring outside of the main clause that contains the verb and in their own clause (but see 2.2 below on their true syntactic status).

This is supported by the data from my corpus (see Appendix for its composition). All the examples which attest nouns and adjectives marked by the vocative case in front of their main clause do not host clitics. The clitics rather follow the first word that goes after the vocative:

(3) MH/NS (CTH 372.A) KUB 31.127+ § 2 16 obv. i 17–19

- 1a. ^dUTU-*i* *šarku* LUGAL-*ue*
 sungod-VOC.SG exalted.VOC.SG king.VOC.SG
- 1b. DINGIR^{MEŠ}-*naš=kan* *iš<tar>na* *zik=pat* **ašnu***anza*
 gods.DAT.PL=LOCP inside you=FOC set.PTCP.NOM.SG.C

“(1a) O Sun-god, mighty king! (1b) Among the gods you are favored.”²⁸

The distributional property is particularly evident in the case of the direct speech marker *-wa(r)*, which is part of the enclitic chain. But unlike all other clitics, *-(wa)r* can be used at the beginning of every clause of a stretch of direct speech constituted by several clauses.²⁹ However, if one of the clauses within this direct speech sequence is the vocative clause, *-wa(r)* is used in every clause save the vocative clause:

(4) NS (CTH 450.1.1.2.A) KUB 39.35+ obv. i 17”–19”

- 1a. ^dUTU-*i*
 sungod-VOC.SG
- 1b. *kāša=wa=ta=kan* *kē* [*šuppala*? *ḥaddaw*]en
 PRF=QUOT=you=LOCP this.ACC.PL animal.ACC.PL slaughterer.1PL.PST

²⁶ Hoffner, “Disciplines,” 41.

²⁷ Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*, 244.

²⁸ Itamar Singer, *Hittite Prayers. Writing for the Ancient World* 11 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002), 36; Elisabeth Rieken et al., “CTH 372,” accessed May 7, 2021, https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_gebet/intro.php?xst=CTH%20372&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al.

²⁹ See Fortson, “A New Study,” and Andrei V. Sideltsev, “Syntax of direct speech particle *-wa(r)* in Hittite,” *Acta Orientalia Academia Scientiarum Hungaricae* 73 (2020).

2. *nu=war=at=ši=ššan* *šarr[i-zzi* *lē* *kuiški]*
 CONN=QUOT=them=him=LOCP separate-3SG.PRS PROH anyone.NOM.SG.C
3. [*ha*]*nnari=ia=wa=šši=ššan* [*ē* *kuiški]*
 sue.2SG.PRS=and=QUOT=him=LOCP PROH anyone.NOM.SG.C
- “(1a) **O Sun-goddess**, (1b) look, [we have slaughtere]d these [animals] for you. (2)[May no one] tak[e] them away from him, (3) and may n[o one s]ue him!”³⁰

Vocatives precede *kāsa*

Yet another indication of the position of vocatives in front of the clause (CP) in a separate syntactic unit is the much-discussed perfectivizing particle *kāsa/kāšma/kasatta*. There has recently been quite a lot of attention devoted to its semantics—whether it is aspectual (perfectivizing) or deictic (first person de-ixis).³¹ However, its semantics are of no direct interest to us in this paper. It is only its syntax that will be discussed here. When it hosts Wackernagel enclitics, it is a sure marker of the left edge of the main clause and of the fact that vocatives are in a clause of their own, preceding both the particle and the clitics:

(5) MH/MS (CTH 404.1.1.A) KBo 39.8 rev. iii 41

1a. ^dUTU-*i*

 sungod-VOC.SG

- 1b. *kāša=wa=[(š)]maš* *nakkuššiš* [(KA×U-it EME-it)]
 PRF=QUOT=you n.NOM.SG.C mouth-INST tongue-INST

“(1a) **O Sun-god!** (1b) It is a scapegoat for **you** both, with mouth and tongue.”³²

However, there are several cases in my corpus where *kāsa/kāšma/kasatta* follows the vocative(s), but does not host Wackernagel enclitics for the simple reason that there are no clitics in the clause:

³⁰ Alexei S. Kassian, Andrej Korolëv, and Andrei V. Sidel'tsev, *Hittite Funerary Rituals šalliš waštaiš. Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 288 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2002), 378–79; Magdalena Kapełuś, “Funerary Ritual. Day 8–9 (CTH 450.1.1.2),” accessed May 7, 2021, https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20450.1.1.2&prgr=&lg=EN&ed=M.%20Kape%C5%82u%C5%9B.

³¹ See the literature summarized in Charles Steitler, “The personal deictic function of *kāša*, *kāšma* and *kāšat(ē)a*: Further evidence from the texts,” in *Hrozny and Hittite: The First Hundred Years. Proceedings of the International Conference Held at Charles University, Prague, 11–14 November 2015*, ed. Ronald Kim, Jana Mynářová, and Peter Pavúk (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 365–81.

³² Cf. Jared L. Miller, *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kuzzuwatna Rituals. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 46 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2004), 91–93.

(6) OH/OS (CTH 412.3.1.A) KBo 17.17+ rev. iv 6'–7'

1a. [(DINGIR^{MEŠ}–*nan* ^dUTU–*i*)]

gods.GEN.PL sungod–VOC.SG

1b. *kāša* DINGIR^{MEŠ}–*aš* *aši* *p[(eš)kimi]* ^dUTU=*šumman*

PRF gods.DAT.PL that.ACC.SG give.IPF.1SG.PRS sungod=our.ACC.SG

2. *labā*]]*r*⁷⁷[(*nan* DINGIR^{MEŠ}–*aš* *aši* *pi)škimi*]

labarna.ACC.SG gods.DAT.PL that.ACC.SG give.IPF.1SG.PRS

“(1a) O Sungod of the gods, (1b) I hereby give that one to the gods, Our Sun Labarna. (2)

I shall give that one to the gods.”³³

As *kāša*/*kāšma*/*kašatta* is commonly the first element in the clause, the position to its left is likely to be in front of the clause (CP) and not within it, even in the absence of Wackernagel enclitics hosted by the particle. See, for instance, the following example where the clause boundary is marked by the clause connective *nu* immediately in front of *kāšma*:

(7) NH/NS (CTH 76) KUB 21.1+ rev. iii 1–2 = iii 29–30

nu *kāšma* *zik* ^m[(*Alakšandu*–*š* *PANI* *NIEŠ* DING)]IR^{MEŠ} *wašta*–*ši*

CONN PRF you.NOM Alaksandu–NOM.SG.C before oath gods sin–2SG.PRS

“Then you, Alaksandu, will have offended before the oath gods.”³⁴

Such cases should ensure that the vocative preceding *kāša* in (6) is exclausal too, even in the absence of Wackernagel enclitics.

Still, there are contexts, although admittedly rare, where *kāša* is the second element in the clause, or even—exceptionally—later. See Hoffner³⁵ for a collection of examples, such as,

(8) NH/INS (CTH 209.23) KBo 13.62 15

wēš–*šta* *kāša* *gimrān* *anda* [*šanḫ*–*uw*]*eni*

³³ Petra M. Goedegebuure, “KBo 17.17+: Remarks on an Old Hittite Royal Substitution Ritual,” *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religion* 2 (2002): 61–73. Cf. Erich Neu, *Althethitische Ritualtexte im Umschrift. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 25 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1980), 25–26; Mauro Giorgieri, “Un rituale di scongiuro antico ittita per Labarna-Ḫattušili,” *Studi Micenei ed Egeo Anatolici* 29 (1992): 68.

³⁴ Johannes Friedrich, *Staatsverträge des Ḫatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache. 2. Teil: Die Verträge Muršiliš’ II. mit Manapa-Dattaš vom Lande des Flusses Šeḫa, des Muwattalliš mit Alakšanduš von Wiluša und des Šuppiluliumaš mit Ḫukkanāš und den Leuten von Ḫajaša (mit Indices zum 1. und 2. Teil)* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs’sche, 1930), 66–67; Gary M. Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts. Writings from the Ancient World* 7 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1996), 84.

³⁵ Harry A. Hoffner, *Letters from the Hittite Kingdom. Writings from the Ancient World* 15 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 339.

we=LOCP.PRF field.ACC.SG in seek-1PL.PRS
 “We will now scour the countryside.”³⁶

This makes *kāša* a slightly less certain indicator that the material to the left of it is in front of the clause in a separate syntactic unit. Still, as the second position of *kāša* is so rare, I feel justified in assessing examples like (6) as containing vocatives in front of the clause (CP) in a separate syntactic unit. In view of the slightly greater uncertainty I separate them into a separate taxonomic category when I discuss statistics below.

Nu with vocatives

Besides these properties which are already established in the literature, there is yet another feature that has not (to my knowledge) been observed so far in Hittite studies: even though vocatives are assumed to form their own clause, there is no *nu* or other clause connective after the vocative(s) and before the rest of the clause, even though Wackernagel enclitics follow vocatives. Neither *nu* nor clause connectives are attested in front of vocatives either:

- (9) NS (CTH 344.B) KUB 36.1 r.Kol. 7’
 1a. EN=*mi*
 lord=my.VOC.SG
 1b. *kuwatt*=*a=aš* *ḫurzak*[*eši*]
 why=and=them curse.IPF.2SG.PRS
 “(1a) **My lord**, (1b) why are you cursing **them**?”³⁷

The generalization that vocatives are never followed (or preceded) by *nu* or any other clause connectives does not only follow from the observation that no unambiguous cases are attested that show both the vocative and the clause connective particle.³⁸ Even more convincingly, it follows from the fact that there are contexts that attest complementary distribution between the use of vocative and the use of *nu* within the same context: the syntactic unit with the vocative and the clause that immediately follows it do not use *nu* whereas all the other clauses in the same context use it:

³⁶ Hoffner, *Letters*, 338.

³⁷ Hoffner, *Myths*, 45; Elisabeth Rieken et al., “CTH 344 – „Das Lied vom Ursprung“: Das König-tum im Himmel oder die Theogonie,” Accessed May 7, 2021, https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_myth/intro.php?xst=CTH%20344&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al.

³⁸ The few cases that do can easily be interpreted differently; see below.

(10) NS (CTH 345.I.1.B) KUB 33.98+ obv. ii 3–5

1a. ^d*Impaluri*

Impaluri.VOC.SG.³⁹

- 1b. *kē=mu* *uddār* *išta[(maš)]*
 this.ACC.PL.N =me word.ACC.PL.N hear.2SG.IMP
 2. *n=at* *īt* ANA ^d*Kumarbi* *peran* <d>*ašša[(nu-t)]*
 CONN=it go.2SG.IMP to Kumarbi before make_strong-2SG.IMP
 3. *nu* *īt* ANA ^d*Kumarbi* *memi*
 CONN=it go.2SG.IMP to Kumarbi say.2SG.IMP

“(1a) *Impaluri*, (1b) hear **my** words. (2) Go make them strong before Kumarbi (3) Go speak to Kumarbi.”⁴⁰

It has to be observed that all these cases occur at the beginning of direct speech. This independently explains the absence of *nu* in front of the vocative as *nu* is not attested at the beginning of direct speech⁴¹. But it does not explain the lack of *nu* after the vocative. Left dislocations which are identical to vocative structures in many respects show that *nu* co-occurs with Wackernagel enclitics after the noun phase at the left edge of the clause, although it is not obligatory (see in detail below).

(11) MH/MS (CTH 324.1.A) KUB 17.10+ rev. iii 1

1a. *karpīš*

anger.NOM.SG.C

- 1b. *n=an* *arāet*

CONN=it stop.3SG.PST

“(1b) She stopped it, (1a) (namely,) **anger**.”⁴²

³⁹ This and other similar forms will be treated further on.

⁴⁰ Elisabeth Rieken et al., “CTH 345.I.1 – Das Lied von Ullikummi: hethitische Version – Erste Tafel,” Accessed May 7, 2021, https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_myth/intro.php?xst=CTH%20345.I.1&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al. Hoffner, *Myths*, 57 translates another exemplar (A) which deviates at this point.

⁴¹ *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, L-N, sub *nu*; Henry A. Hoffner, “Asyndeton in Hittite,” in *Tabularia Hethaeorum. Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag* (DBH 25), ed. Detlev Grodek and Marina Zorman (Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz, 2007), 385–99; Paul Widmer, “Hethitisch *nu* in den Masat-Briefen. Manuskript,” accessed May 7, 2021, https://www.academia.edu/34814159/Hethitisch_nu_in_den_Ma%C5%9Fat-Briefen (especially section 6.3).

⁴² Hoffner, *Myths*, 16; Elisabeth Rieken et al., “CTH 324.1,” Accessed May 7, 2021, https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_myth/intro.php?xst=CTH%20324.1&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al.

But surprisingly, no *nu* ever follows the vocative, even if there are Wackernagel enclitics in the clause.

This seemingly minor finding is nonetheless important as it augments the data on the contexts that block the use of *nu* (for a list, see CHD⁴³, Hoffner⁴⁴ and Widmer⁴⁵).

Vocatives in a separate clause?

It was suggested by Hoffner⁴⁶ and Hoffner, and Melchert⁴⁷ that vocatives occur in a separate clause. The obvious, although never explicitly stated, motivation for this is that vocatives do not host Wackernagel enclitics, which instead cliticize to the first word that follows them.⁴⁸

However, it must be stressed that this separate vocative “clause” is very much different from regular clauses in Hittite, to the extent that it cannot be descriptively labeled a clause.

The first difference from many other Hittite clauses is that it is never introduced by *nu*. As a consistent property this is conspicuous but not unique. There are other clauses that are never introduced by *nu* (see above)—most notably clauses with the irrealis marker, which in all other respects are regular clauses both from a Hittite and a cross-linguistic perspective.

The other property of vocative “clauses” that is really unparalleled in any other clause of Hittite, though, is that these vocative “clauses” are never separated from their main clause by *nu* or other clause connectives (i.e., they are never followed by clause connectives). This sets vocative clauses very clearly apart even from left dislocations, which are otherwise virtually identical to vocative “clauses,” but which can be separated from the main clause by *nu*, unlike vocative “clauses” (see in more detail below). Here I will simply illustrate the use of *nu* after the left dislocated phrase at the left edge (see (11) above).

Another very conspicuous feature of vocative “clauses” is the fact that they never host the quotative marker *-wa(r)*, even when the quotative marker is hosted by the main clause that follows them. This is particularly conspicuous

⁴³ CHD, L–N, 446–48.

⁴⁴ Hoffner, “Asyndeton,” 387–88.

⁴⁵ Paul Widmer, “Hethitisch *nu* als Mittel der informationsstrukturellen und syntaktischen Verknüpfung,” in *Pragmatische Kategorien. Form, Funktion und Diachronie. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 24. bis 26. September 2007 in Marburg*, ed. Elisabeth Rieken and Paul Widmer (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009), 332; see also Widmer, “*nu* in den Masat-Briefen” (especially section 6.3).

⁴⁶ Hoffner, “Disciplines,” 41.

⁴⁷ Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*, 244.

⁴⁸ Eichner, “Zur Syntax.”

in cases where vocative “clauses” are part of a series of clauses (both main and subordinate) which make up one unit of direct speech and where each clause makes use of *-wa(r)*—except the vocative “clause.”

All these properties set vocative “clauses” very distinctly apart from all other clauses in Hittite. It is particularly important that vocative “clauses” are different from nominal clauses, which follow the same pattern as regular clauses on all the points set out above.

The following example shows that nominal clauses can host the direct speech particle *-wa(r)*:

(12) OH/NS (CTH 8.A) KBo 3.34 obv. ii 20–21

1. *maršanza=wa* *zik*
stupid.NOM.SG.C=QUOT you
2. *LUGAL-un=wa=az* *mekki* *ḫaliḫlatti*
king.ACC.SG.C=QUOT=REFL much genuflect.2SG.PRS

“(1) You are a hypocrite, (2) you forever make obeisance to the king.”⁴⁹

The next example establishes that nominal clauses may be marked by the appearance of *nu* both before and after them:

(13) a NH/NS (CTH 381.A) KUB 6.45 obv. i 6–8

1. *nu=ššan* 35 NINDA.GUR₄.RA *tarnaš ŠA Zİ.DA* D[U]R₅ [DUGDÍLIM.G]AL SIG LÀL ŠÀ.BA Ì.DÜG.
GA NINDA.Ì.E.DÉ.A DUGÚTUL *šūwan me[m]al=m* LIM.GAL *šūwan* 30 DUGKUKUB GEŠTIN
CONN=LOCP (a list of substances)
2. *nu* GIM-*an* *kī* s[IXŠÁ-et]
CONN when this. NOM.SG.N establish.3SG.PST

“(1) On them there are: 35 thick breads of a handful of moist flour, a thin bowl of honey mixed with fine oil, a full pot of fat-bread, a full bowl of groats, thirty pitchers of wine. (2) And when he prepared these, ...”⁵⁰

There is yet another difference between nominal clauses and vocative clauses. It concerns the use of the reflexive particle *-za*. Whereas it is nearly obligatory in NH nominal clauses in the case of first- and second-person subjects (and

⁴⁹ Paola Dardano, *Aneddoto e il racconto in età antico-hittita: La cosiddetta “Cronaca di palazzo”* (Roma: Il Calamo, 1997), 49 and 51. See also *Hittite Etymological Dictionary* H, 31.

⁵⁰ Singer, *Prayers*, 86; Elisabeth Rieken et al. (ed.), “CTH 381 – Gebet Muwatallis II. an die Götterversammlung,” accessed May 7, 2021, https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_gebet/intro.php?xst=CTH%20381&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al.

optional in OH and MH),⁵¹ it is never attested in clear cases of vocative clauses. See, for nominal clauses:

(13) b NH/NS (CTH 376.1.A) KUB 24.3 obv. i 29'
 zik=za dUTU URU **Arinna** nakkiš DINGIR-LIM-iš
 you=REFL sungoddess Arinna weighty.NOM.SG.C god.NOM.SG.C
 “You, **O Sun-goddess of Arinna**, are an honoured goddess.”⁵²

Thus, summing up the section, it should be accepted that the intuition of Hoffner, and Melchert that vocatives are separate from the main clause is true. This follows from the fact that Wackernagel enclitics do not cliticize to vocatives, but rather cliticize to the first word that follows them. However, this syntactic unit is different from all the units which are clauses in Hittite. Namely, it never hosts the direct speech particle *-wa(r)*, even if every other clause making up one unit of direct speech includes this particle. Thus, vocatives do not constitute a separate clause; they constitute a syntactic unit which is distinct from the main clause.

How do we account for this apparent paradox—a clause by some criteria which is not a clause by others? An explanation has been put forward in general literature for other languages which attest vocatives analogous to the Hittite vocatives. According to this explanation, the apparently contradictory properties of Hittite vocatives are easily explained in structural terms: putting it as simply as possible for the Hittitological reader, every finite clause in Hittite (or any other language) constitutes a structural unit termed CP in generative linguistics. These can be main clauses and dependent clauses. Nominal clauses also belong here. The main property of this unit is the presence of predication, either explicit (finite verb) or implicit (nominal sentences). However, vocatives are in a unit that is not a CP, but is rather a kind of outbuilding (to use an architectural metaphor) above a CP. Thus, it is not an independent element, but an optional part of the clause (CP). Technically, this part of the clause is termed *SpeechActP*.⁵³ The use of the term “clause” is misleading in this case—a regular

⁵¹ Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*, 362–64.

⁵² Singer, *Prayers*, 51; Elisabeth Rieken et al., “CTH 376.1 – Hymnen und Gebete an die Sonnengöttin von Arinna,” accessed May 7, 2021, https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/tx-het_gebet/intro.php?xst=CTH%20376.1&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al.

⁵³ Peggy Speas and Carole Tenny, “Configurational properties of point of view roles,” in *Asymmetry in Grammar*, ed. Anna M. Di Sciullo (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2003), 315–44. Virginia Hill, “Vocatives and the pragmatics-syntax interface,” *Lingua* 117 (2007): 2077–2105. Other labels are *Vocative (VocP)*, on which see Andrea Moro, “Notes on Vocative Case: A Case Study in Clause Structure,” in *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2001: Selected Papers from Going Romance*, ed. Josep Quer, Jan Schroten, Mauro Scorretti, Petra Sleeman, and Els Verheugd

finite clause (including nominal clauses with zero copula) is a CP. The vocative “clause” is a structure on top of some of these CPs; it cannot exist independently. *Nu* and other clause connectives mark the edge of a CP, a prototypical clause, and thus do not appear in front of the vocative separate syntactic unit or in front of left dislocations. As the CP follows both left dislocations and vocative structures, *nu* is expected to occur after both of them, so its potential presence after left dislocations is borne out, but its consistent absence after vocative structures remains a mystery and requires an explanation. However, as we saw above, *nu* and other clause connectives are systematically not used in several types of clauses in Hittite, so its non-use after vocatives is not so extraordinary.

As a result of all these considerations, in the rest of the paper I distinguish between vocative structures as separate syntactic units and clauses proper. The former are labelled (1a) and the corresponding main clause is labelled (1b) whereas proper clauses are labeled (1), (2), etc.

It is important to stress that this position of vocatives is not the only one attested in Hittite. In what follows I will explore other positions vocatives can occupy.

VOCATIVES AND OTHER STRUCTURES IN HITTITE

In the previous sections we have seen that vocative structures are very clearly different from other similar categories in Hittite—(a) left dislocations that also precede the rest of the clause and (b) nominal sentences.

I have dealt with the difference between vocative structures and nominal clauses in detail above. Now I will dwell in more detail on left dislocations⁵⁴.

Left dislocations are similar to vocative structures in that they precede the rest of the clause. Like vocative structures, they do not host Wackernagel clitics, as in:

(Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2003), and Discourse/Attitude field (RoP), on which see Nicola Munaro and Cecilia Poletto, “On the diachronic origin of particles in North-Eastern Italian dialects,” *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 28 no. 2 (2006): 247–68. The cross-linguistic parallel was already observed by Zeilfelder, “Vokativ im Hethitischen,” 531–32 without providing the inner-Hittite argumentation proposed here.

⁵⁴ For more information on left dislocations, see Massimo Vai, “Osservazioni sulla periferia sinistra della frase in ittita,” in *Anatolistica indoeuropeistica e oltre nelle memorie dei seminari offerti da Onofrio Carruba (anni 1997–2002) al Medesimo presentate*, ed. Manuel Barbera, Guido Borghi, Manuela Mariani, Alfredo Rizza, Rosa Ronzitti (Milano: Quasar, 2011), 40.

(14) NS/NH (CTH 81.A) KUB 1.1+ rev. iv 73–75

- | | | |
|----|---------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. | ^{DUG} haršiyali=ya=kan | išhuiškanzi |
| | h.-vessel.ACC.SG.N=and=LOCP | pour.IPF.3PL.PRS |

2a. ^dIŠTAR

Istar

- 2b. DINGIR-LIM=aš=mu

god=she=me

“(1) And they pour a h.-vessel. (2a) (As for) **Istar**, (2b) **she** is my goddess.”⁵⁵

There is at least one context that has been attributed to left dislocations by Vai⁵⁶ but it displays a Wackernagel enclitic on the left dislocated phrase. In view of the fact that one Wackernagel enclitic is used on the left dislocation whereas two more clitics follow it, the context is more likely to be a nominal clause, “these (are) evil x tongues,” and not a left dislocation. Thus, the context should rather be presented as:

(15) MH/MS (CTH 443) KBo 15.10+ obv. i 13–14

- | | | | | |
|----|---------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|--------------------|
| 1. | kē=wa | idālaweš | []ešiyanteš | EME ^{H1A} |
| | this.NOM.PL=QUOT | evil.NOM.PL.C | x.NOM.PL.C | tongues |
| 2. | iššišta=ma=aš | | ^f Ziplantawiaš | |
| | make.IPF.3SG.PST=but=them | | Z.NOM.SG.C | |

“(Then she takes a k.-container of batter with tongues and speaks thus:) ‘(1) These (are) evil x tongues, (2) Ziplantawiya made them,’” following Kassian;⁵⁷ cf. Vai.⁵⁸

This property—the inability to host Wackernagel enclitics—is unique in Hittite to just these two structures (vocatives and left dislocations) and puts them in one natural class. Left dislocations are also similar to vocative structures in that they are never preceded by *nu* or other clause connectives (see above for examples).

However, the similarity between left dislocations and vocatives ends here. Unlike vocative structures, left dislocations can optionally be followed by *nu*, as was seen in (11) above.

⁵⁵ Heinrich Otten, *Die Apologie Hattusilis III. Das Bild der Überlieferung. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 24 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1981), 28–29; Theo P. J. van den Hout, “Hittite Canonical Compositions - Biography and Autobiography: Apology of Hattušili III,” in *The Context of Scripture*, Vol. I, *Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*, ed. William W. Hallo (Leiden – New York – Köln: Brill, 1997), 205 (Nr. 1.77).



⁵⁶ Vai, “Periferia,” 40.

⁵⁷ Alexei S. Kassian, *Two Middle Hittite Rituals Mentioning ^fZiplantawija, Sister of the Hittite King ^mTuthaliya II/I* (Moscow: Paleograph, 2000), 22–25.

⁵⁸ Vai, “Periferia,” 40.

Left dislocations are commonly marked by the nominative case, even if the verb in the main clause that governs them requires a different case:

(16) MH/MS (CTH 244?) HKM 113 rev. 14–15

- 1a. ^mHuidudduwalliš 
 Huidudduwalli.NOM.SG.C
- 1b. *n=an* ^{URU}šallašna 
 CONN=him Sallasna
 settle.3PL.PST

“(1a) (As for) **Huidudduwalli**, (1b) they settled him in Sallasna.”

This makes left dislocations superficially similar to those vocative structures that are marked by the nominative (see in detail below) and differentiates them from nouns in the vocative structures that are marked by the vocative.⁵⁹


So far, I have assessed vocative structures that contained noun phrases (both nouns and adjectives, or several nouns) marked by the vocative case. These (not very numerous) cases obviously form the core of the category “vocative structures” in Hittite. In what follows I will explore whether other cases deviating from this core can also be attributed to the same category or should rather be kept distinct from it and placed in different categories.



⁵⁹ Rarely, left dislocations can preserve the case they were assigned in the main clause. Outside of the problematic context OH/MS (CTH 412.2.A) KUB 12.63 obv. 29’–31’, that has received very different assessments in the literature, cf. CHD, P, 158; Alwin Kloekhorst, *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 636; Elisabeth Rieken, *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 44* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1999), 465–66; HEG, P, 468), a secure case is NH/NS (CTH 61.II.7.A) KBo 5.8 obv. ii 15–17, as suggested by the anonymous reviewer. Yet OH/MS (CTH 412.2.A) KUB 12.63 obv. 29’–31’ attests *-(m)a* on the left dislocation. However, even this analysis is not unanimous. Thus, Rieken, *Nominalen Stammbildung*, 465, and CHD, L-N, 173 assess it as *-š(a)*, whereas HEG, P, 468 and CHD, P, 158 assess it as *-š=a*. Rieken’s and CHD L-N’s assessment is supported by the fact that no other clause in the context—although many are closely parallel in other respects—hosts *-(m)a*. Thus, so far, the evidence for left dislocations hosting *-(m)a* and not hosting all other enclitics is rather slim, but I will return to the problem later on. Yet another potential candidate for both preserving the case of the main clause and hosting the *-(m)a* particle by the vocative is NS (CTH 323.1.A) VBoT 58 rev. iv 11’ according to Elisabeth Rieken et al., “CTH 323.1 - Vom Verschwinden und der Wiederkehr der Sonnengottheit,” accessed May 7, 2021, https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_myth/intro.php?xst=CTH%20323.1&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al. However, it ought rather to be analyzed differently, following Kellerman (quoted in Franca Pecchioli Daddi and Anna Maria Polvani, *La mitologia ittita. Testi del Vicino Oriente Antico 4* (Brescia: Paideia, 1990), 68 fn. 30, followed in his translation by Michel Mazoyer, *Télipinu, le dieu au marécage. Essai sur les mythes fondateurs du royaume Hittite*. Kubaba, Série Antiquité 2 (Paris: L’Harmattan, 2003), 170 and 181).

VOCATIVES AND APPositionAL CONSTRUCTIONS

It has been claimed by Hoffner,⁶⁰ Hoffner, and Melchert,⁶¹ and Melchert⁶² that true vocative structures are represented by a noun (or a noun phrase or several noun phrases) morphologically marked by the vocative case, which is used in a syntactic unit of its own (a separate clause for Hoffner, and Melchert; but see above).

They also acknowledge that there are nominative singular noun phrases that appear in the same separate syntactic unit as vocatives, but they imply that these are marginal or rare:

(17) MH/MS (CTH 443.1) KBo 15.10+ ob -10

- 1a. *aiš* EME-*aš* *gagāš*
 mouth.NOM.SG.N tongue.NOM.SG.C *tooth.NOM.SG.C*
- 1b. *qāša=šmaš=kan* *parku[i]n* *mišriwantan* *ḫarkin* ^{GIŠ}GIDRU *UL*
 PRF=you=LOCP pure.ACC.SG.C glistening.ACC.SG.C white.ACC.SG.C rod 
walḫantan UDU-*u[n]* *šipanta-ḫhun*
 strike.PTCP.ACC.SG.C sheep.ACC.SG.C sacrifice-1SG. 

“(1a) O mouth, tongue, tooth! (1b) Lo, I have sacrificed to you a pure, dazzling white sheep, never struck with a rod.”⁶³

If viewed without prejudice, this structure is syntactically identical to direct addresses to gods and people assessed above in that the direct address (1a) is in a separate syntactic unit and does not host Wackernagel clitics, which instead cliticize to the first word of the clause (1b) that follows the direct address. It only differs from “true vocatives” by case marking: in the examples above it was the vocative case; in (17) and other examples it is the nominative case.

All other structures translated as direct addresses to gods and people (rarely to personified substances) are held by Hoffner, and Melchert to be different from true vocative structures and assessed as appositional constructions. The main property of appositional constructions marking addresses to gods and people is that they do not constitute a syntactic unit of their own but are rather

⁶⁰ Hoffner, “Disciplines,” 41–42.

⁶¹ Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*, 244–45.

⁶² Henry C. Melchert, “Addenda and Corrigenda to Harry A. Hoffner Jr. and H. Craig Melchert, *Grammar of the Hittite Language (GrHL). Reference Grammar*,” accessed 1 September 2021, <https://linguistics.ucla.edu/people/Melchert/Addenda&CorrigendaGrHL2.pdf>.

⁶³ Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*, 245; Susanne Görke, “Zwei Rituale zur Besänftigung von Sonnen- und Wettergott mit der Erwähnung von Ziplantawiya, Tuthaliya und Nikkalmadi (CTH 443),” accessed May 7, 2021, https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20443.1&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=S.%20G%C3%B6rke.

used within the clause. The clause hosts Wackernagel enclitics including the direct speech particle *-wa(r)*. These enclitics can be hosted by other words if the appositional construction is within the clause.

(18) a MH/NS (CTH 372.A) KUB 31.127+ rev. iii 41'–42'

nu=mu=za mān zik DINGIR=YA menaḥḥand[a] idāluš
 CONN=me=REFL if you god=my against bad.NOM.SG.C
 “If you, **my god**, are displeased with me.”⁶⁴

If the appositional construction is the first word of the clause, it hosts the clitics:

(18) b NH/NS (CTH 380.1.A) KBo 4.6 rev. 16'–17'

DINGIR-LIM=ma=kan EN=YA irman ANA ⁶⁵*Kaššuliyawiya* EGIR-an *arḥa*
 god=but=LOCP lord=my illness.ACC.SG.C to Gassuliyawiya back away
namma karaš
 then cut.2SG.IMP
 “**O god, my lord**, remove the sickness from Gassuliyawiya!”⁶⁵

Appositional constructions are never marked by the vocative case; they are marked by the case which is required by the verb, postposition, or another noun that governs them.⁶⁶

Appositional constructions are most clearly seen in cases where both the second person pronoun the construction appositively refers to and the construction itself are neither vocative nor nominative.⁶⁷ In the following example both are dative:

(18) c MH/MS (CTH 373.A) KUB 30.10 rev. 17

n=at šiyuni=mi tuk mēmiškemi
 CONN=it god.DAT.SG=my.DAT.SG you.DAT.SG say.IPF.1SG.PRS
 “I keep telling it to you, **my god**.”⁶⁸

⁶⁴ Singer, *Prayers*, 39.

⁶⁵ Singer, *Prayers*, 72; Elisabeth Rieken et al., “CTH 380.1 - Gebet für die Genesung von Gaššuliyawia),” accessed May 7, 2021, https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_gebet/intro.php?xst=CTH%20380.1&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al.

⁶⁶ Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*, 245.

⁶⁷ See Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*, 245.

⁶⁸ Singer, *Prayers*, 33; Elisabeth Rieken et al., “CTH 373 - Kantuzzilis Gebet an den Sonnengott,” Accessed May 7, 2021, https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_gebet/intro.php?xst=CTH%20373&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al.

These are unambiguous appositional constructions, distinct from vocative structures in all respects, as is posited with good reason by Hoffner, and Melchert.⁶⁹

Vocatives and non-vocatives: a reassessment

However, the distinction between the three structures that Hoffner, and Melchert⁷⁰ hold to be clear-cut is in reality very different from the one they put forward.

First, I will reassess the number of cases Hoffner, and Melchert hold to belong to the category nominative used as vocative “in its own clause.” They acknowledge only five cases, and in 2020 Melchert⁷¹ acknowledged seven, including the one pointed out by Groddek⁷² and the one pointed out by Eichner.⁷³ This would indeed make this category rare, as argued by Hoffner, and Melchert.⁷⁴

However, a careful examination of the corpus brings many more cases of the nominative used as the vocative in a separate syntactic unit. The fact that it is a separate syntactic unit (although not a clause; see above) follows from the fact that, just like vocatives above, these nominatives do not host Wackernagel clitics, which are hosted instead by the word that follows the vocative;⁷⁵ see, for example, (19a) for singular and (19b) for plural:

⁶⁹ Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*, 245.

⁷⁰ Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*, 244–45.

⁷¹ Melchert, “Addenda and Corrigenda.”

⁷² Detlev Groddek, “Überlegungen zur Textherstellung des Hedammu-Mythos,” in *Audias fabulas veteres. Anatolian Studies in Honor of Jana Součková-Siegelová*, ed. Šárka Velhartická (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2016), 157 fn. 75.

⁷³ Eichner, “Zur Syntax,” 135.

⁷⁴ Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*, 245.

⁷⁵ Yet another potential indication of the position of the vocatives to the left of the clause (CP) is the syntactic clitics—words that occupy a fixed position at the left edge of the clause—either first or second (see Andrei Sideltsev, “Accented Clitics in Hittite?” *Transactions of the Philological Society* 115/2 (2017). But whatever position they occupy, the vocative in front of them does not count towards their position. Thus, they can be third, etc., after the vocative, e.g.,

NS (CTH 346.9) KBo 26.105 rev. iv 15'

1a. [...-i]š DINGIR^{MES}-eš

x.NOM.PL gods-NOM.PL

1b. UL **kuin** DINGIR-LAM šekkuwēn
NEG which.ACC.SG.C god know.1PL.PST












“(1a) [...] O gods, (1b) which god didn't we know?” (Elisabeth Rieken et al., “CTH 346.9 – Mythos von Kumarbi: ein Fragment,” accessed May 7, 2021, https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_myth/intro.php?xst=CTH%20346.9&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al.). Cf. Daniel Schwemer, *Wettergottgestalten Mesopotamiens und Nordsyriens im Zeitalter der Keilschriftkulturen: Materialien und Studien nach den schriftlichen Quellen* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001), 452. This evidence is important in that it supplements the evidence of Wackernagel clitics and is not identical to them, for which see, in detail, Sideltsev, “Accented Clitics.”

(19) a NH/NS (CTH 384.1.A) KUB 21.27+ rev. iii 43'–47'

- 1a. ^dZintuḫiṣ GAŠAN=YA ŠA ^dIM ^dUTU ^{URU}PÚ-na=ya
 Zintuhi.NOM.SG.C lady=my GEN stormgod sungod Arinna=and
 āššiyanza ḥaššaš
 beloved.NOM.SG.C progeny.NOM.SG.C
 1b. ANA ^dIM=za Ū ANA ^dUTU ^{URU}PÚ-na ^{UZU}GABA-aš TUDITTUM
 to stormgod=REFL and to sungod Arinna breast.GEN.SG pectoral
 2. nu=ddu=za lammar lammar katta uškanzi
 CONN=you=REFL hour.ACC.SG hour.ACC.SG down look.IPF.3PL.PRS

“(1a) O Zintuhi, my lady, beloved granddaughter of the Storm-god and the Sun-goddess of Arinna! (1b) You are an ornament on the breast of the Storm-god and of the Sun-goddess of Arinna, (2) and they watch you time after time.”⁷⁶

(19) b MH/MS (CTH 484.B) KUB 15.32+ obv. i 39–43

- 1a. DINGIR.MAH^{MEŠ} ^dGulšeš DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš antuḫšašš=a tueggaš
 DINGIR.MAH'S Gulsi.NOM.PL.C gods.GEN.PL men.GEN.PL=and body.GEN.SG
 DINGIR.MAH^{MEŠ} ^dGulšeš ^dZukkiš Anziliš
 DINGIR.MAH'S Gulsi.NOM.PL.C Zukki.NOM.SG.C Anzili.NOM.SG.C
 1b. kuwapi=wa=za imma kuwapi
 where=QUOT=REFL FOC where
 2. kuedani=wa=za imma kuedani KUR-e
 which.LOC.SG=QUOT=REFL FOC which.LOC.SG land-LOC.SG
 3. [m]ān=wa=za nepiši
 if=QUOT=REFL heaven.LOC.SG
 4. mān=wa=za  LOC.SG  ^{GME}  ^{ID}^{MEŠ}-aš [...] 
 if=QUOT=REFL  LOC.SG n  ins  L rivers-LOC.PL
 5'. kinuna=wa  EGIR-pa uwatten  šumenzan ŠA EN.SÍSKUR É-ri
 now=QUOT back come.2PL.IMP your GEN lord.ritual house.LOC.SG
 ištanani ^{GIŠ}ŠÚ.A-kitti kēdani  KUR-m 
 hearth.LOC.SG throne.LOC.SG this.LOC.SG al.LOC

“(1a) DINGIR.MAH's, Gulšeš, goddess DINGIR.MAH of gods and body parts of men, Zukki (and) Anzili (1b) wherever you are, (2) in whatever country you are, (3) whether you are in heaven, (4) or whether you are in the earth, mountains or rivers [...] (5') now come back for this ritual to the house of your lord of the ritual at the altar and throne.”⁷⁷

⁷⁶ Singer, *Prayers*, 104; Elisabeth Rieken et al., “CTH 384.1 – Gebet der Puduḫepa an die Sonnengöttin von Arinna,” accessed May 7, 2021, https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/tx-het_gebet/intro.php?xst=CTH%20384.1&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al.

⁷⁷ Francesco Fuscagni, “Rituale di evocazione per le dee DINGIR.MAH, le dee Gulšeš, le dee DINGIR.MAH degli dei e le dee DINGIR.MAH delle parti del corpo degli uomini e per le dee Zukki

This last example is particularly probative, demonstrating a very consistent use of the direct speech particle *-wa(r)* in every single clause except the direct address in a separate syntactic unit. This example—which is not isolated in my corpus—simultaneously very clearly falsifies the claim of Hoffner, and Melchert⁷⁸ that the nominative stands in its own clause in place of the vocative only in the singular (and not in the plural).

These structures in a separate syntactic unit are not always overtly marked by the nominative case. There are also quite a lot of unmarked nouns in a separate syntactic unit functioning as direct addresses to gods:

(20) MH/NS (CTH 372.A) FHG 1+ obv. ii 16

1a. [a]mmel DINGIR-LIM

my god

1b. kuit=**mu=za** AMA=YA ḥašta
what.NOM.SG.N=me=REFL mother=my bear.3SG.PST

“(1a) **My god**, (1b) ever since my mother gave birth to **me**.”⁷⁹

I place within this category two types of nouns: (a) those written logographically (i.e., in Akkadian or Sumerian) and not bearing any Hittite nominal morphology; and (b) bare stems, i.e., names written in Hittite, but used in their bare stem form without any ending. Here a question arises: how do we distinguish between bare stems and morphologically marked vocatives? They are identical for many nouns, as follows from the discussion at the beginning of the paper. The procedure to keep the two apart is very simple—it involves looking at the usage of the concrete noun (and nouns in general) in a concrete text. If perusal of the text shows that nouns are commonly inflected and that bare stems are limited to use with Akkadian prepositions, then I consider a noun of the type Madduwatta or Wisuriyanta (the latter most likely stands for *Wisuriyant) to be a morphologically marked vocative. If the text attests elsewhere the use of the bare stem as subject, direct and indirect object, possessor, etc., then I consider the noun of the same type, Madduwatta or Wisuriyanta, in its use as a direct address to be a bare stem and its attestation as unmarked for case; cf. Eichner,⁸⁰ who does not rely on textual evidence and appears to treat all names as bare stems. See, for example:

e Anzili (CTH 484),” accessed May 7, 2021, https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20484&prgr=&lg=IT&ed=F.%20Fuscagni.

⁷⁸ Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*, 245.

⁷⁹ Singer, *Prayers*, 36; Rieken et al., “CTH 372.”

⁸⁰ Eichner, “Zur Syntax,” 135.

(21) MH/MS (CTH 789.Tf04) KBo 32.35 r.Kol. 1'–4' (restored after the duplicate KBo 32.216+ rev. iii 9')

1a. ^m[*M(ēki)*]

Meki.VOC.SG

1b. [(*iya=war=at*) *aššuli?*] ^{URU}*Ēbl*[(*a* ^{GIŠ}*ŠÚ.A-AŠ* ^{URU}*-r-i*)]
 make.2SG.IMP=QUOT=it favourably Ebla throne-GEN.SG city-LOC.SG
parā *tarnumar*
 out release.ACC.SG

2. *nu=wa=ka*[(*n* ^{İR}=)KA *pa*] *rā* *tarna-ttaru*
 CONN=QUOT=LOCP servant=your out release-3SG.IMP.MED

“(1a) **Meki**, (1b) make **it**, release, favourably, in Ebla, the city of throne (2) may your servant be released.”⁸¹

The text itself is small and damaged, so it does not furnish enough data, but it forms part of a much larger text ensemble, CTH 789. The name Meki is consistently inflected in the Hittite version of the Bilingual. The only attestation of the bare stem is with the Akkadian preposition *ANA*. This is the expected context for the use of the bare stem⁸². Thus, I assess the context as containing the name marked for vocative. The same applies to many other analogous contexts from mythological texts and rituals.

Overall, in my corpus there are 31 examples with the nominative in a separate syntactic unit⁸³ functioning as vocatives (including five examples with *kāša/kāšma*⁸⁴), and 39 unmarked nouns (bare stems or logograms without Hittite inflexion)⁸⁵ in a separate syntactic unit functioning as vocatives (including

⁸¹ Erich Neu, *Das hurritische Epos der Freilassung 1. Untersuchungen zu einem hurritisch-hethitischen Textensemble aus Hattuša. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 32. (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1996), 503.

⁸² Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*, 242.

⁸³ (CTH 325.A) KBo 26.124+ obv. i 38–38; (CTH 348.I.20) KBo 26.79 12'–13'; (CTH 377.A) KUB 24.1+ obv. i 3–4; (CTH 381.B) KUB 6.46 rev. iii 52–53; (CTH 384.1.A) KUB 21.27+ rev. iii 43'–44'; (CTH 391.1.A) KUB 27.67+ obv. i 30–31; 42–43; rev. iv 9'; (CTH 404.5.II.A) KUB 58.79 obv. i 3–6; (CTH 408.A.1) KUB 7.2 obv. i 29–30; (CTH 409.I.A) KUB 7.53+ rev. iv 1–3; (CTH 429.1.A) KBo 10.37 rev. iii 39–42; rev. iv 13–14; (CTH 433.3.A) KBo 20.107+ obv. ii 8–9; (CTH 434.2.A) KBo 11.17(+) obv. ii 6'–7'; (CTH 443.1) KBo 15.10+ obv. ii 8–10; 19–20; 32–33; 39–40; 43; (CTH 446.C) KUB 41.8+ rev. iii 6–7; (CTH 447.A) KBo 11.10+ obv. ii 20'; (CTH 458.10.1.B) KUB 43.61 obv. i' 9'–10'; (CTH 458.63) KBo 55.59 11'; (CTH 484.1.A) KUB 15.31+ obv. i 36–39; (CTH 789) KBo 32.69 r.Kol. 1'–4'.

⁸⁴ (CTH 409.I.A) KUB 7.53+ obv. i 30–33; (CTH 400.1.G) KUB 30.34+ rev. iii 5–6; (CTH 402.A) KBo 12.126+ obv. i 12–13; (CTH 416.A) KBo 17.1 rev. iii 10–12; (CTH 447.A) KBo 11.10+ rev. iii 10–11.

⁸⁵ (CTH 40.IV.1.E₃) KBo 14.12+ rev. iv 13; (CTH 61.I.A) KBo 3.4+ obv. i 23; (CTH 70.1.A) KUB 14.4 rev. iv 17–18; (CTH 190) HKM 71 obv. 4; (CTH 341.III.3.A) KUB 8.48(+) obv. i 19; (CTH 342.1.2.B) KUB 36.37+ obv. ii 13'–14'; (CTH 343.1.A) KUB 33.114+ rev. iv 31'; (CTH 345.I.2.A) KUB 33.87+ obv. i 35'–36'; (CTH 345.I.3.1.A) KBo 26.65+ obv. 17–18; (CTH 345.I.3.2) KBo 26.69+ rev. iv 4'–5'; (CTH 348.I.4.A) KBo 19.109 rev. iv 26'–27'; (CTH 350.5) KBo 22.79 3'; (CTH 362.4) KUB 17.9 obv. i

four examples with *kāša/kāšma*⁸⁶). This is a very significant increase in comparison with just one example in Hoffner⁸⁷, five cases in Hoffner, and Melchert,⁸⁸ and seven examples of nominative for vocative in a separate syntactic unit recognized in Melchert.⁸⁹ The structure that represented true vocative constructions for Hoffner, and Melchert⁹⁰—morphologically marked vocatives in a separate syntactic unit—is attested 34 times⁹¹ (including two examples with *kāša/kāšma*).⁹² Thus, there are roughly as many nominatives (and unmarked nouns) used in a separate syntactic unit with the function of direct addresses as there are vocatives in a separate syntactic unit.

The data by itself can only be interpreted as both nominative and vocative functioning as direct addresses in identical syntactic contexts.⁹³ I therefore suggest we should return to the long line of research⁹⁴ which was challenged and rejected by Hoffner⁹⁵ and Hoffner, and Melchert.⁹⁶ Both nominatives and

23; (CTH 364.4.A) KUB 17.4 4'; (CTH 372.A) FHG 1+ obv. ii 16; (CTH 373.A) KUB 30.10 obv. 6'-8'; (CTH 374.A) rev. 6'-7'; (CTH 378.1.A) KUB 14.14+ obv. 8; (CTH 378.2.C) KUB 14.10 obv. i 1-3; (CTH 378.4) KUB 14.13+ obv. i 21-24; (CTH 402.A) KUB 24.9+ rev. iv 4'; (CTH 403.2.A) KBo 41.6+ obv. i 9; (CTH 409.1.A) KUB 7.53+ rev. iv 5-6; (CTH 422.A) KUB 4.1 obv. ii 1-2; (CTH 425.2.B) Bo 5451+ 17'-18'; (CTH 429.1.A) KBo 10.37 rev. iii 9-10; rev. iv 23-24; (CTH 433.2.A) KUB 17.105+ obv. ii 10'; (CTH 433.1.A) KBo 12.96(+) rev. iv 26; (CTH 433.3.A) KBo 20.107+ rev. iii 19'-20'; (CTH 526.14) KUB 25.23+ rev. iv 57'-58'; (CTH 566) KUB 22.70 rev. 65; KUB 55.66 rev. iv 3'-6'; (CTH 528.22) KUB 44.4+ rev. 22; (CTH 483.A) KUB 15.34(+) obv. i 40-41.

⁸⁶ (CTH 446.B) KBo 10.45 rev. iv 21; rev. iv 50-1; (CTH 456.2.1.A) KUB 36.83(+) obv. i 8; (CTH 456.2.1.D) KBo 54.36 obv. ii 1.

⁸⁷ Hoffner, "Disciplines," 42-3.

⁸⁸ Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*, 244.

⁸⁹ Melchert, "Addenda and Corrigenda," addenda to 244-45. Note the steady increase over the years.

⁹⁰ Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*.

⁹¹ (CTH 316) KBo 12.70+ rev. iv 10'-18'; (CTH 372.A) KUB 31.127+ obv. i 17-19; (CTH 373.A) KUB 30.10 rev. 10; 11-12; (CTH 341.III.3.A) KBo 19.116+ obv. i 3; (CTH 344.A) KUB 33.120+ rev. iii 30'-31', 31'-32'; (CTH 345.I.1.B) KUB 33.98+ obv. ii 3; (CTH 345.I.1.C) KBo 26.61+ obv. ii 32 frgm; (CTH 345.I.1.A) KUB 33.96+ rev. iii 38 frgm; (CTH 346.5) KUB 33.118 16'-17'; (CTH 347.2) KUB 36.74 rev. iii 8'; (CTH 348.I.1.G) KBo 26.71+ rev. iii 18'; (CTH 348.I.6.B) KUB 33.109+ obv. i 17 frgm; (CTH 348.I.22) KBo 26.82 2-3 frgm; (CTH 364.2.B) KUB 36.18 obv. ii 7'; (CTH 390.A) KUB 7.1+ obv. i 6; 7-8; (CTH 391.1.A) KUB 27.67+ obv. ii 31; 41-42; 63-64; (CTH 395.1.A) KBo 11.14 obv. ii 4; possibly (CTH 403.3.1.A) KUB 33.70 obv.² ii 5'-6'; (CTH 404.1.1.A) KBo 39.8 obv. i 23-25; rev. iii 41; (CTH 404.2.A) KBo 24.1+ 25'-26'; possibly (CTH 415.A) KUB 32.137(+) obv. ii 2; (CTH 450.1.1.2.A) KUB 39.35+ obv. i 17'-18'; (CTH 452.2) KBo 59.13 7' frgm; (CTH 396.2) KBo 15.27 obv. ii 2'; (CTH 716.1.A) KUB 15.35+ obv. i 23-26; (CTH 789.Tf04) KBo 32.35 r.Kol. 1'-4'.

⁹² (CTH 412.3.1.A) KBo 17.17+ rev. iv 6'-7'; (CTH 435.3) KUB 31.147 obv. ii 34'-35'.

⁹³ Eichner, "Zur Syntax," 134.

⁹⁴ Sturtevant and Hahn, *A Comparative Grammar*, 84; Friedrich, *Hethitisches*, 44; Kammenhuber, *Hethitisch, Palaisch, Luwisch*, 193; Neu, "Einige Überlegungen"; Luraghi, *Hittite*, 15; the tradition is continued by Eichner, "Zur Syntax."

⁹⁵ Hoffner, "Discipline," 41-42.

⁹⁶ Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*, 245-46.

unmarked nouns do stand in the same separate structure as true (i.e., morphologically marked) vocatives. These cases are much more numerous than was believed by Hoffner, and Melchert and cannot simply be dismissed. What is more, they are just as frequent as true vocatives in a separate syntactic unit.

It is also important that there is variation within the different copies of the same text between morphologically marked nominatives and morphologically marked vocatives. See, for example:

(22) NS (CTH 395.1.A) KBo 11.14 obv. ii 31–32

1a. ^d[U]TU-*i*

sungod-VOC.SG

1b. *ziq=za azzikki*

YOU=REFL eat.IPF.2SG.IMP

“(1a) **O Sun-god**, (1b) you eat!” following Eichner⁹⁷ contra Chrzanowska⁹⁸ and Ünal⁹⁹ who read *ziqqa* (*ziqq=a*).

A copy KBo 55.36+ obv. 15' shows nominative ^d[U]TU-uš (Ünal¹⁰⁰ and Chrzanowska¹⁰¹).

Thus, these data are identical to and further support the observations formulated on the material of morphologically marked vocatives in a separate syntactic unit. They yet again reiterate the idea that the morphological marking as nominative or vocative does not by itself determine the syntax of addresses to gods. Rather, both nominative and vocative noun phrases can be used in identical constructions, peculiar to direct addresses to gods.

Vocatives and non-vocatives within the clause: a reassessment

Another important property of the distribution of vocatives is that vocatives are also used not only in a separate syntactic unit, but also within the clause. As this fact has never been acknowledged in the literature on vocatives,¹⁰² I will

⁹⁷ Eichner, “Zur Syntax,” 133.

⁹⁸ Chrzanowska, “CTH 395.1.”

⁹⁹ Ünal, *Ritual of Ḫantitaššu*, 21.

¹⁰⁰ Ünal, *Ritual of Ḫantitaššu*, 21.

¹⁰¹ Chrzanowska, “CTH 395.1.”

¹⁰² Although some examples of this type have been provided in the papers on vocatives, thus Eichner, “Zur Syntax,” 132, quoted KBo 7.28 obv. 3 as containing a vocative. Yet in another place in the same paper Eichner, “Zur Syntax,” 135 explicitly states that in comparable cases the rules governing the placement of the enclitics on the first word following the vocative or nominative functioning as vocative were given up in later Hittite. Unlike Eichner, I do not see any diachronic development here—vocatives in a separate syntactic unit are attested in New Hittite originals alongside vocatives within the clause. Rather, vocatives were, throughout the history of Hittite, attested in two positions: in a separate syntactic unit and within the main clause.

dwelt on it in detail. There are quite a few of examples of this type attested in my corpus:

(23) a NS (CTH 459.11) KBo 13.204 6'

nu ēt ^dUTU-i
CONN eat.2SG.IMP sungod-VOC.SG
“Eat, o Sun-god!”¹⁰³

(23) b NS (CTH 343.1.A) KUB 33.114+ rev. iii 44'–45'

1.	kinun=ma[.=.] =mu	^d Nāra	ŠEŠ=mi		[i]štamaš
	now=but=?=me		brother=m	SG	hear.2SG.IMP
2.	nu	taknas	huwitar		
		CONN earth.GEN.SG	wild_life.ACC.SG	all.ACC.SG	satiate.2SG.IMP
				[h]ūman	nin[ik]

“(1) Now, **Nara**, **my brother**, hear me! (2) Mobilize all the animals of the earth.”¹⁰⁴

When it comes to proper names, it is a well-known fact that personal names can be employed in their bare form irrespective of their syntactic function and thus the name in the following context can in principle be unmarked:

(23) c MH/MS (CTH 147) KUB 14.1+ obv. 82

[nu=w]a ^mMadduwatta tuēkkuš anda mekki ārhun
CONN=QUOT Madduwatta.VOC.SG body.ACC.PL in much arrive.1SG.PST
“[... And] I have very much gotten to the heart of the matter(?), **O Madduwatta**.”¹⁰⁵

However, with personal names it is important to consider the distribution in the concrete text, as was suggested above for personal names in a separate syntactic unit.

In the text above, Madduwatta is very consistently used in its marked forms (nominative as subject 40 times) and there are no bare forms in the nominative

¹⁰³ Francesco Fuscagni, “Fragment eines *mugawar* mit Erwähnung des Sonnengottes (CTH 459.11),” accessed May 7, 2021, https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20459.11&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=F.%20Fuscagni.

¹⁰⁴ Hoffner, *Myths*, 47; Elisabeth Rieken et al., “CTH 343.1 – Mythos vom Königtum des Gottes LAMMA – Erste Version,” accessed May 7, 2021, https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_myth/intro.php?xst=CTH%20343.1&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al.. See also CHD, L-N, 442a.

¹⁰⁵ Beckman, *Diplomatic Texts*, 148. Identically Gary M. Beckman, Trevor R. Bryce, and Eric H. Cline, *The Ahhiyawa Texts. Writings from the Ancient Worlds* 28 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 83.

function, so I interpret this form not as an unmarked bare stem, but as the vocative form. The only bare forms are those used with the Akkadian prepositions ŠA, ANA, ITTI. The only bare stem is seen in obv. 47 in genitival ÉRIN^{MEŠ} ^mMad-duwatta “the troops of Madduwatta.” Against this impressive and statistically relevant background it is inevitable that Madduwatta in (23c) is interpreted as a morphologically marked vocative, not as a bare unmarked stem. There are many more analogous cases in my corpus.

What is even more curious is that there are nominative nouns (or nouns unmarked for case = bare stems) used as direct addresses within the main clause that cannot be assessed as appositional constructions. This is so in cases where there is no second person independently marked in the clause, either by the pronoun or by the verb endings:

(24) a NS (CTH 476.A) KBo 5.1 obv. i 45–46

<i>kinun=a=wa</i>	<i>kāša</i>	DINGIR-LUM	2-TA.ÀM	<i>šarnikta</i>
now=but=QUOT	PRF	god	second_time	compensate.3SG.PST

“Now, **O deity**, she has hereby compensated (for the transgression) for the second time.”¹⁰⁶

In such cases, even though the noun is not morphologically marked as vocative (it is rather nominative or written logographically), it cannot be assessed as an appositional construction for the simple reason that it has nothing to be appositive to. It is rather a morphological nominative functioning as a vocative within the main clause.

The following cases are even more probative as they attest noun phrases morphologically marked as nominative:

(24) b MH/NS (CTH 757.B) HT 1 obv. i 43'

<i>kāša</i>	^d AMAR.UTU	^d Innarauwant-ešš=a	<i>lenga-uen</i>
PRF	Santa	innarawant_deity-NOM.PL.C=and	swear-1PL.PST

“**Šanta and Innarawanteš-deities**, we have sworn!”¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁶ Alice, Mouton, “Rituel de Pāpanikri (CTH 476),” accessed May 7, 2021, https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20476&prgr=&lg=FR&ed=A.%20Mouton.

¹⁰⁷ Susanne Görke, “Das Ritual des Zarpiya aus Kizzuwatna (CTH 757),” accessed May 7, 2021, https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20757&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=S.%20G%C3%B6rke.

(24) c NH/NS (CTH 381.A) KUB 6.45+ rev. iii 25–26

^d10 *piḫaššašši-š* EN=YA DUMU.LÚ.U₁₉.LU-aš *eš-un*
 Storm-god of_lightning-NOM.SG.C lord=my human.NOM.SG.C be-1SG.PST
 “Storm-god of Lightning, my lord, I was but a human.”¹⁰⁸

It is important that ^d10 *piḫaššaššiš* EN=YA “Storm-god of Lightning, my lord” in (24c) is not an appositive dislocation but a nominative used as vocative, because there is nothing in the clause it could be in apposition to—there is no indication of the second person in the same clause and no second person pronoun is either available or implied by verb endings. (24c) does not explicitly mark the fact that the direct address is within the clause (there is no *nu* or enclitic), but (24b) does by placing *kāša*, a marker of the clause boundary, in front of the vocative phrase marked as nominative.

Thus, summing up the data from this section, it must be concluded that the cases treated here also have to be nominatives used as vocatives, not appositional constructions, even though they do not occur within a separate syntactic unit. Appositional constructions have to be appositive either to an explicit second person pronoun or an implicit second person pronoun implied by the verbal inflexion, but these structures have nothing to be appositive to. Thus, they have to belong to the same category as nominatives marking direct addresses in a separate syntactic unit in place of the vocative.

The existence of vocatives and nominatives used as direct addresses within the clause which are demonstrably not appositional phrases undermines the rigid distinction between nominative and vocative that Hoffner, and Melchert¹⁰⁹ assume.

In reality we see a very different picture: both vocatives and nominatives are used as direct addresses both in a separate syntactic unit and within the main clause.

Thus, *pace* Hoffner, and Melchert, there is a clear mismatch between the morphological marking of noun phrases and their syntax—nouns marked as vocatives, nouns marked as nominatives, and unmarked nouns can all occur in a separate syntactic unit, i.e., display the syntax unique to direct addresses. On the other hand, nouns marked as vocatives, nouns marked as nominatives, and unmarked nouns can all be used within the main clause (with rather free distribution within the clause) and thus, at face value in Hittite, do not possess any syntax peculiar to direct addresses. However, this second position is also typical of direct addresses. Cross-linguistic and theoretical studies show that

¹⁰⁸ Singer, *Prayers*, 91; Rieken et al., “CTH 381.”

¹⁰⁹ Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*, 244–45.

this second position is as typical of direct addresses as the first one (see below in section 5.4).

Overall, there are 31 examples with nominatives in a separate syntactic unit (including five examples with *kāša/kāšma*) functioning as vocatives and 39 examples with unmarked nouns in a separate syntactic unit (including five examples with *kāša/kāšma*) functioning as vocatives. Conversely, there are 24 examples¹¹⁰ of morphologically marked vocatives within the main clause and 10 examples of nominatives¹¹¹/unmarked¹¹² nouns within the main clause functioning as vocatives that cannot be appositional constructions. Naturally, there are many more nominatives/unmarked nouns within the main clause which lie somewhere between those functioning as vocatives and appositional constructions. The structure that represented true vocative constructions for Hoffner, and Melchert—morphologically marked vocatives in a separate syntactic unit—is attested 34 times (including two examples with *kāša/kāšma*). There are also 13 attestations¹¹³ of morphologically marked vocatives that lie somewhere between being in a separate syntactic unit and within the main clause, illustrated by:

(25) MH/MS? (CTH 446.A) KUB 7.41 obv. i 9–10

taknās ⁴UTU-i *kī* u[ttar] *daškiuwani*
earth.GEN.SG sungoddess-VOC.SG this.ACC.PL.N thing.ACC.SG/PL.N put.IPF.1PL.PRS
“O Sun Goddess of the Earth, we are taking this m[atter ...].”¹¹⁴

¹¹⁰ (CTH 76.A) KUB 21.1+ rev. iii 32–33; 38–39; (CTH 282.2) KBo 31.7+ rev. 12–14; (CTH 322.1.B) KUB 33.81 obv. i 6'; (CTH 324.1.A) KUB 17.10+ obv. ii 20'–21'; (CTH 341.III.6.A) KUB 8.62 rev. iv 10'–11'; (CTH 343.1.A) KUB 33.114+ rev. iii 44'–45'; (CTH 345.I.3.1.A) KBo 26.65+ rev. iii 7'; 26'; 30'–31'; rev. iv 9'–10'; 23'; 25'; (CTH 348.I.5.A) KBo 19.112 9'; (CTH 348.I.6.B) KBo 26.70+ obv. i 5; (CTH 371.1) KBo 7.28+ obv. 3'; (CTH 385.10.A) KUB 57.63 obv. ii 16–17; (CTH 386.8) VSNF 12.100 7–10; (CTH 459.11) KBo 13.204 6'; (CTH 731) KBo 25.122+ rev. iii 13'–14'; (CTH 733.II.a.1) KBo 25.112+ obv. ii 11'–13'; rev. iii 6'–8'; rev. iii 10'–12'; (CTH 820.3) KUB 43.23 obv. 10.

¹¹¹ (CTH 381.A) KUB 6.45+ rev. iii 25–26; (CTH 404.5.II.A) KUB 58.79 rev. iv 5–6; (CTH 292.II.a.A) KBo 6.13 obv. i 9; (CTH 757.B) HT 1 obv. i 43'.

¹¹² (CTH 374.C) KBo 52.13+ obv. ii 13'; (CTH 476) KBo 5.1 obv. i 45–46; (CTH 584.3) KUB 15.11+ obv. ii 5–6 following Johan de Roos, *Hittite Votive Texts. Publications de l'Institut historique-archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul* 109 (Leiden: NINO, 2007), 109; (CTH 590^o) KUB 56.19 obv. i 19; (CTH 377.A) KUB 24.1+ obv. i 19–20; (CTH 757.B) HT 1 obv. i 29'.

¹¹³ (CTH 8.A) KBo 3.34 obv. i 22–23; (CTH 324.2.B) IBoT 3.141 rev. iv 3; (CTH 325.A) KBo 26.124+ rev. iii 13'; (CTH 331.1.A) KUB 33.66+ rev. iii 8–9; (CTH 372.A) KUB 31.127+ obv. i 1–3; 15–17; 22–23; 58–59; (CTH 374.G) KUB 31.129 obv. i 4'–6'; (CTH 390.A) KUB 7.1+ obv. i 15; (CTH 446.A) KUB 7.41 obv. i 9–10; (CTH 458.2.A) KUB. 17.28+ obv. ii 56; (CTH 458.10.1.A) KUB 41.23+ obv. ii 18'–19'.

¹¹⁴ Otten, *Die Apologie*, 116–117; Billie J. Collins, “Hittite Canonical Compositions - Incantations: Purifying a House: A Ritual for the Infernal Deities,” in *The Context of Scripture, Vol. I, Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*, ed. William W. Hallo (Leiden – New York – Köln: Brill, 1997a), 168–72 (Nr. 1.68).

In such examples, due to the absence of Wackernagel enclitics, it is impossible to establish whether the vocative is in a separate syntactic unit or within the main clause.

Thus, there are as many nominatives used in a separate syntactic unit with the function of direct addresses as true vocatives. There is also no reason to believe that morphologically marked vocatives are more common in a separate syntactic unit than within the main clause. These statistical conclusions allow us to completely rewrite the fragment of Hoffner, and Melchert's Hittite grammar that deals with vocatives.¹¹⁵

Having established that some of the nominatives that function as vocatives within the main clause cannot be reduced to appositional phrases, I will now assess their syntax. As expected, both nominatives and vocatives used within the main clause do not display any syntactic peculiarities which are associated with their use in a separate syntactic unit.

When the noun phrase (both in vocative and nominative which are not appositional constructions) marking direct address is used within the main clause, there can be Wackernagel clitics in the main clause and it can be preceded by *nu* and other clause connectives—again, irrespective of whether the nominal marking direct address is morphologically in the vocative case, in the nominative case, or unmarked.

Two positions of vocatives

It follows from the argument in the previous sections that Hittite very clearly attests two locations for vocative phrases (which can be morphologically marked by the nominative or vocative cases or unmarked): one is in front of the clause (CP) (26a), and the other is inside the clause (CP) (26b):

- (26) (a) [vocative phrase_{CP}[...]];
 (b) _{CP}[(...) vocative phrase (...)], where the vocative phrase can be at the beginning, middle or end of the clause.¹¹⁶

It is important that vocative phrases which are in front of the clause (CP) and those which are inside the clause (CP) are identically marked by nominative or vocative cases (or unmarked). Thus, there is no difference at all—in the morphological marking or lexically. The sum total of the difference in Hittite lies in the fact that vocatives in front of the clause (CP) do not host Wackerna-

¹¹⁵ Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*, 244–45.

¹¹⁶ The clause (CP) is marked _{CP}[...] in the scheme.

gel clitics; rather, the clitics are invariably on the first word of the clause (CP) that follows them. Vocatives in this position are never preceded or followed by clause connectives. Vocatives within the clause (CP) occur later in the clause than the first word of the clause or they may constitute the first word of the clause. They are within the clause, the first word of which hosts Wackernagel clitics, and which may optionally start with a clause connective. It is curious that vocatives *are* clause initial in a number of cases, but this is attested very rarely. Even if they are at the beginning of the clause, they are either preceded by a clause connective that hosts the clitics, as in (23c) above, or there are no clitics at all in the clause, as in (24c) above. Thus, there are simply no data that could show that vocatives within the clause can directly host Wackernagel clitics.¹¹⁷ But I hold this to be incidental and solely due to two facts: (a) vocatives are rarely the initial word of a clause, and (b) clauses where vocatives are the initial word of the clause do not feature clitics. Naturally, it might be argued that the two distributional patterns are not incidental. Yet, cross-linguistic data¹¹⁸ never shows the ban on vocatives within CP starting the clause. It rather supports my opinion that the failure of direct addresses to gods and men to host Wackernagel clitics is only incidental—although the evidence is very indirect.

The distinction between the two positions has been recognized cross-linguistically. Structures like (26a) [vocative phrase_{CP}[...]] have been termed “calls” by Slocum¹¹⁹ whereas structures like (26b)_{CP}[(...) vocative phrase (...)] have been termed “addresses” (ibid.). Structurally, (26a) and (26b) are understood very differently, with two alternative analyses. The first approach is to assess the vocatives preceding the CP (26a) as a separate clause (CP) where the only constituent is the vocative phrase. Within this separate clause they occupy the structural position in (the specifier of) AddrP. This elliptic clause precedes the full clause (CP). Structures like (26b)_{CP}[(...) vocative phrase (...)] have been construed to be in the specifier of a specialized projection AddrP within the same CP as all the other material of the clause (ibid., 128–9). Alternatively, it is

¹¹⁷ My corpus has one context which would be relevant, and which is sometimes interpreted as vocative:

MH/NS (CTH 433.1.A) KBo 12.96(+) obv. i 10'–11'

^{uuz}hurhurta=ma=za=kan ḫalwamnaz šūwanza ēš
throat.VOC.SG=but=REFL=LOCP eagerness.ABL.SG fill.PTCP.NOM.SG.C be.2SG.IMP

“O throat, be filled with laughter!” (Daliah Bawanypeck, *Die Rituale der Auguren. Texte der Hethiter* 25 (Heidelberg: Winter, 2005), 73–75; CHD, Š, 535a). However, yet other scholars interpret it differently (see Paola Dardano, “Das hethitische Partizip - eine Frage der Diathese?” in *Proceedings of the 8th International Congress of Hittitology, Warsaw, September 5–9, 2011*, ed. Piotr Taracha (Warsaw: Agade, 2014), 254; HW², H, 644). Thus, it cannot serve as the only piece of evidence.

¹¹⁸ See Poppy Slocum, “The Syntax of Address” (PhD Diss., Stony Brook University, 2016).

suggested that the two constructions—(26a) [vocative phrase_{CP}[...]] and (26b)_{CP}[(...)]—represent different structures: the former (26a) are in the SpeechAct layer on top of the CP; the latter (26b) are in the AddrP projection in the CP, between topic and focus (*ibid.*). Slocum, the only author who proposes analysis for both types, considers this second option and rejects it as uneconomical (morphologically and lexically, vocatives outside and inside of the CP are identical). However, Hittite clearly favours this second option for two reasons. First, Hittite vocatives in (26a) [vocative phrase_{CP}[...]] are demonstrably different from those in (26b)_{CP}[(...)] in terms of Wackernagel clitic placement (which marks the edge of the CP in Hittite): Wackernagel clitics cliticize to the first word following vocatives in (26a) [vocative phrase_{CP}[...]] and cliticize to a word preceding vocatives in (26b)_{CP}[(...)] vocative phrase (...)]. Second, and most importantly, Hittite vocatives of the type (26a) [vocative phrase_{CP}[...]] are not independent CPs, as I have shown in detail. Thus, Hittite data is crucial in the theoretical analysis of vocatives.

It is important that, cross-linguistically, vocatives inside the CP (type 26b) are very similar to parenthetical clauses:¹²⁰ they are set off from the rest of the CP, prosodically and/or by accent. For example, in Vedic vocatives are marked by loss of lexical accent. When they appear in a prosodically prominent position, they receive initial accent (regardless of the lexical accent).¹²¹ In this respect, all vocatives, both within and outside of the CP, have repeatedly been called “extraclausal” in the older syntactic literature¹²². Still, it is important that in technical, minimalist terms the vocatives following the Wackernagel clitics or other clause boundaries in Hittite are inside the CP, as is emphasized for other languages by Slocum¹²³. They *are* parenthetical and set off from the rest of the clause and they are simultaneously *within* the CP whereas vocatives that do not host Wackernagel clitics are outside of the CP, on top of it or to the left of it. Due to the possible terminological confusion, I retain the distinction for Hittite between vocatives in a separate syntactic unit (26a) and vocatives within the CP (= clause) (26b) and avoid the vague definition “extraclausal” altogether as it can be taken to refer to either type.

¹¹⁹ Slocum, “The Syntax,” 26.

¹²⁰ See Slocum, “The Syntax”; Fortson, “A New Study,” 29; Andrew M. Devine, and Laurence D. Stephens, *The Prosody of Greek Speech* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 416–418.

¹²¹ William D. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar Including both the Classical Language, and the older Dialects, of Veda and Brahmana* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press and London: Oxford University Press, 1950), §314.

¹²² See the references in Slocum, “The Syntax,” 159 and *passim*.

¹²³ Slocum, “The Syntax,” *passim*.

Actually, the position of Hoffner, and Melchert,¹²⁴ as well as Melchert¹²⁵, is much nearer to this assessment than they appear to suggest: they admit the importance of both morphology and syntax for delimiting vocatives, although they do it rather inconsistently. When a morphologically unmarked (i.e., nominative, bare name, or logographically written) form is in its own clause and does not host Wackernagel enclitics, they separate the examples from appositional direct addresses and acknowledge them to be “a further genuine example of the nominative used for the vocative.”¹²⁶ Interestingly, Melchert in his *Addenda et corrigenda* to the grammar acknowledges as “a further genuine example of the nominative used for the vocative” only that example of Eichner¹²⁷ where the noun phrase does not host Wackernagel clitics. All other nominative or unmarked examples which host Wackernagel clitics he terms appositional direct address. This ensures the importance not only of morphology, but also of syntax for the assessment of vocatives—the point which I took much further in this and the previous sections.

VOCATIVES AND INTERJECTIONS

From a cross-linguistic perspective, vocatives are often in the same position as interjections. However, this is not so for Hittite. The class of interjections is virtually non-existent; its potential members rather behave like verbs. The following example shows that they can host *-wa(r)*, as distinct from true vocatives:

(27) MH/MS (CTH 147) KUB 14.1+ obv. 17

<i>eḫu=wa=za</i>	INA	KUR	HUR.SAG [Ḫari]yati	<i>ēšḫut</i>
come.2SG.IMP=QUOT=REFL	in	land	Hariyati	sit.2SG.IMP

“Come, occupy the land of Mount Hariyati, so that you will be near Hatti.”¹²⁸

In view of this data, I do not follow Eichner¹²⁹ when he writes that “im Hethitischen kann *eḫu* mit dem Vokativ oder einer weiteren Imperativform so kombiniert werden, dass ein Enklitikum (fakultativ) fernbleibt.”

¹²⁴ Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*, 244–45.

¹²⁵ Melchert, “Addenda and Corrigenda,” addenda to 244–45.

¹²⁶ Melchert, “Addenda and Corrigenda.”

¹²⁷ Eichner, “Zur Syntax,” 135.

¹²⁸ Beckman, *Diplomatic Texts*, 145.

¹²⁹ Eichner, “Zur Syntax,” 134.

Cases like the following have similarly been assessed as containing an interjection, *du(wa)ddu*.¹³⁰ However, more recent scholarship¹³¹ interprets the data differently—as *du(wa)ddu* being a finite verb form (second person singular imperative). Thus, contexts like the following attest a verb and a marked vocative in their separate verbal clause, which is a typical clause, and not a combination of an interjection and a vocative in a separate syntactic unit:

(28) OH/NS (CTH 385.10.A) KUB 57.63 obv. ii 16–18

1.	<i>nu</i>	<i>tuwa[(dd)]u</i>	<i>nepišaš</i>	^d UTU- <i>ui</i>
	CONN	mercy.2SG.IMP	heaven.GEN.SG	sungod.VOC.SG
2.	<i>ma[(i)]šzaš=tiš</i>		<i>kuēl</i>	<i>mišriw[(a)]nza</i>
	shine.NOM.SG.C=your.NOM.SG.C		whose	glittering.NOM.SG.C

“(1) Mercy, **O Sun-god of Heaven**, (2) whose brilliance is brilliant.”¹³² Clause 2 is read very differently by Archi,¹³³ CHD¹³⁴, and Singer,¹³⁵ but this is of no consequence for the analysis here.

Here the clause containing both *tuwaddu* and a morphologically marked vocative is preceded by *nu*—a fact which is never attested in cases of unambiguous vocatives in their own separate clause.

Naturally, the preference in such cases for the inverted word order V-Voc is slightly worrying. However, inversions are attested in direct speech quite frequently in rituals, myths, and prayers¹³⁶ and this by itself cannot be an argument in favor of the verb being an interjection.

A more disturbing fact is that these forms are frozen—always being second person singular imperative even in cases where the direct address is plural, as in:

¹³⁰ Ferdinand Sommer and Adam Falkenstein, *Die hethitisch-akkadische Bilingue des Hattusili I. (Labarna II.)*. Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philologisch-historische Abteilung NF 16 (Munich: Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1938), 181.

¹³¹ Norbert Oettinger, *Die Stammbildung des Hethitischen Verbums. Nachdruck mit einer kurzen Revision der hethitischen Verbalklassen*. *Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie* 7 (Dresden: Verlag der TU Dresden, 2002), 231. See also HEG, T, 475–76.

¹³² Elisabeth Rieken et al., “CTH 385.10 - Fragmente der Gebete an die Sonnengöttin von Arinna,” accessed May 7, 2021, https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_gebet/intro.php?xst=CTH%20385.10&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al.

¹³³ Alfonso Archi, “Eine Anrufung der Sonnengöttin von Arinna,” in *Documentum Asiae minoris antiquae. Festschrift für Heinrich Otten zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. Erich Neu and Christel Rüster (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1988), 5–31.

¹³⁴ CHD, L–N, 298.

¹³⁵ Singer, *Prayers*, 26.

¹³⁶ See Sideltsev, “Inverted Word Order in Middle Hittite,” in *Anatolian Languages. Studies in the Science and History of Language* 6, edited by Vitaly V. Shevoroshkin and Paul J. Sidwell (Canberra: Association for the History of Language, 2002), 137–88.

(29) OH/OS (CTH 416.C) KBo 17.5+ obv. ii 9

tuwattu DINGIR^{MEŠ}-eš
 mercy.2SG.IMP gods-NOM.PL.C
 “Mercy, o gods!”¹³⁷

However, there are unambiguous data that even the frozen forms are inside the clause. The data come from *eḫu* “come,” which in the following cases occurs in the same clause with the other finite verb even though *eḫu* is second person singular and the other verb is first person plural:

(30) NS (CTH 364.2.A) KUB 33.115 rev. iii 10’

eḫu=wa pāiweni adumin[i]
 come.2SG.IMP=QUOT go.1PL.PRS eat.1PL.PRS
 “Come, let us go and eat”¹³⁸ in an address to one person, the vizier of Tessub.

The only interjection that appears to precede the clause (CP) and does not host Wackernagel enclitics is *addu*:

(31) a NH/NS (CTH 70.1.A) KUB 14.4+ rev. iii 16–17

1a. **addu**
 sure

1b. *man*=*ma*=*za* DAM=YA ANA MUNUS.LUGAL *išiyahḫiškattalla*-š **k[išat]**
 IRR=but=REFL qwife=my to queen denouncer-NOM.SG.C
become.3SG.PST.MED

2. *nu* *idālu* *kuitki* *iyat*
 CONN evil.ACC.SG.N anything.ACC.SG.N do.3SG.PST

“(1a) **Sure!** (1b) Had my wife become a denouncer of the queen, (2) she would have done something wicked.”¹³⁹ Cf. Ünal:¹⁴⁰ “addu. Wenn meine Frau fuer die Koenigin eine Spionin wäre.”

¹³⁷ Neu, *Althethitische Ritualtexte*, 16; Claudia Montuori. “Quattro rituali antico-ittiti per la coppia reale (CTH 416),” accessed May 7, 2021, https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20416&prgr=&lg=IT&ed=C.%20Montuori.

¹³⁸ Hoffner, *Myths*, 50; Rieken et al., “CTH 364.2.”

¹³⁹ Jared L. Miller, “Mursili II’s Prayer Concerning the Misdeeds and the Outstanding of Tawannanna,” in *Proceedings of the 8th International Congress of Hittitology, Warsaw, September 5–9, 2011*, ed. Piotr Taracha (Warsaw: Agade, 2014), 521, 526; HED, A, 228.

¹⁴⁰ Ahmet Ünal, *Ein Orakel text über die Intrigen am hethitischen Hof* (KUB XXIII 70 - Bo 2011). *Texte der Hittiter* 6 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1978), 121.

The example has actually received several very different interpretations. Thus, Hoffner¹⁴¹ read **addu**=*man=ma=za*. However, Miller¹⁴² argued against this reading.

In his treatment of *addu*, Miller¹⁴³ remarked that “one might conclude that it is an interjection with an adversative and/or sarcastic nuance, something along the lines of ‘whatever, rubbish’ or perhaps Italian ‘ecco.’” It has already been noted by HED¹⁴⁴ that *addu* “can stand by itself extrasyntactically at the outset of a statement.”

Another example also has data in favour of *addu* being in a separate syntactic unit as it is followed by the word cliticizing a second position clitic *-(m)a* is NH/NS (CTH 61.II.4) KUB 14.17+ obv. ii 17’; see Miller.¹⁴⁵ Other contexts collected in Miller¹⁴⁶ and HED¹⁴⁷ are quite fragmentary and consequently not informative regarding the syntax of *addu*.

Thus, direct addresses marked by vocatives, nominatives, and unmarked nouns remain the only statistically significant expressions used in a separate syntactic unit. It has been shown that interjections which cross-linguistically are in the same separate syntactic unit are within the main clause in Hittite. There is only one rarely attested interjection that patterns with vocatives: *addu*. Occurrences of this interjection are very limited, but basically support the conclusions about the separate syntactic unit I laid out above for vocatives.

POTENTIAL COUNTEREXAMPLES

Having reviewed all the relevant material concerning vocatives and nominatives used as vocatives in Hittite, I will now assess whether the rules of its syntax as established above really hold for all the attestations.

It has been suggested, building upon Hoffner¹⁴⁸ and Hoffner, and Melchert,¹⁴⁹

¹⁴¹ Harry A. Hoffner, “About Questions,” in *Studio historiae ardens. Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Philo H.J. Houwink ten Cate on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday. Publications de l’Institut historique-archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul 74*, ed. Theo P. J. van den Hout and Johan de Roos (Leiden: NINO, 1995), 99.

¹⁴² Miller, “Mursili II,” 521 fn. 22.

¹⁴³ Jared, L. Miller, “The Kings of Nuḫḫašše and Muršili’s Casus Belli: Two New Joins to Year 7 of the Annals of Muršili II,” in *Tabularia Hethaeorum. Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Detlev Grotdek and Marina Zorman (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007), 525.

¹⁴⁴ HED, A, 228.

¹⁴⁵ Miller, “The Kings of Nuḫḫašše,” 525.

¹⁴⁶ Miller, “The Kings of Nuḫḫašše,” 525.

¹⁴⁷ HED, A, 228.

¹⁴⁸ Hoffner, “Discipline,” 41–42.

¹⁴⁹ Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*, 244–45.

that one of the positions of vocatives, nominatives, and unmarked forms marking direct addresses to gods, people, and personified substances is in a separate syntactic unit. A very conspicuous feature of these separate syntactic units is the fact that they are not—in clear cases—either preceded or followed by *nu* or other clause connectives.

Now I will review the potentially deviating cases and show that the few cases that can be seen as potential counterexamples to the rules formulated above are easily dismissed.

First, I will address the potential counterexamples to the rule that there is no *nu* after the vocative in a separate syntactic unit.

At face value the following case attests a vocative followed by *nu*:

(32) a MH/MS (CTH 820.4) KBo 21.22 rev. 49'

1a. [] ^d*Halmašš[u]iz*

Halmasuit.NOM.SG.C

1b. *nu=za*? *kinupi=ššit* *ginut*
CONN=REFL *k*.ACC.SG.N =his.ACC.SG.N open.2SG.IMP

“(1a) O **Halmasuit**! (1b) Force this *kinubi*!”

The reading and translation is according to Kellerman.¹⁵⁰ However, Carruba¹⁵¹ suggests a different restoration:

(32) b

1. [*eḫu*] ^d*Halmašš[u]iz*
come.2SG.IMP Halmasuit.NOM.SG.C

2. *nu=za*? *kinupi=ššit* *ginut*
CONN=REFL *k*.ACC.SG.N =his.ACC.SG.N open.2SG.IMP

“(1) Come, **Halmasuit**! (2) Force this *kinubi*!”

In this case the vocative forms its own clause with *eḫu* as the finite verb (see above for other fully preserved attestations). Although the solution remains hypothetical as it is restored by Carruba, this would remove the example from the list of exceptions. In any case, a fragmentary context cannot serve to refute a hypothesis.

The following case is sometimes assessed as an example of vocatives followed by *nu*. But it is more likely to be a left dislocation. As is known, left dislocations can be optionally followed by *nu*:

¹⁵⁰ Galina Kellerman, “The King and the Sun-God in the Old Hittite Period,” *Tel Aviv* 5 (1978): 200, 202.

¹⁵¹ Onofrio Carruba, “^dUTU^š,” in *Anatolia antica. Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati. Eothen* 11, ed. Stefano De Martino and Franca Pecchioli Daddi (Firenze: LoGisma, 2002), 149.

(33) NS (CTH 323.1.A) VBoT 58 obv. i 10'–11'

- 1a. **ḪUR.SAG**^{MEŠ}-aš **widār** ^{GIŠ}**KIRI**₆ **wēl**[l]u
 mountains.NOM.PL.C water.NOM.PL.N gardens meadow.NOM.PL.N
 2. **nu** **tuel** [w]aršulaš=teš? **paisgataru**
 CONN your fragrance.NOM.SG.C=your.NOM.SG.C go.^{IPF}.3SG.
 IMP.MED
 1b. **n=uš** **lē** **tinnu-zi**
 CONN=them PROH paralyze-3SG.PRS

“(1a) **The waters of the mountains, the gardens, the meadow(s)**—(2) let your refreshing go—(1b) but it (i.e., *ḫaḫḫima-*) not paralyze them (i.e., waters of the mountains, the gardens, the meadow(s)).”¹⁵²

The analysis of this example as a left dislocation (out of clause 1b) is considerably and independently strengthened by the fact that no direct address is available in the context. The possessive second person pronoun *tuel* in clause 2 is not coreferent with the dislocated nouns in clause 1a. Clause 2 is then paratactic within clause 1.

The following case has been similarly assessed as a vocative in a separate clause preceded by *nu*:

(34) a NS (CTH 394.B) HT 1 rev. iv 2

- 1a. **nu=wa=za** **DINGIR-LUM** **DINGIR-LIM-nili**
 CONN=QUOT=REFL god godlike
 1b. [e]t=za **eku**
 eat.2SG.IMP=REFL drink.2SG.IMP

“(1a) Oh Gottheit, nach Götterart (1b) [is]s (und) trink.”¹⁵³

However, I think the analysis is wrong and the example should rather be

¹⁵² Basically following Rieken et al., “CTH 323.1.” Similarly, “Die Gewässer der Berge, die Gärten, die Weiden! Deine Gnade soll (weiter)gehen, damit sie nicht (länger) erstarren!” Volkert Haas, *Die hethitische Literatur* (Berlin – New York: De Gruyter, 2006), 118. Often clause 2 is understood as the main clause to 1a. This implies introducing a pronoun into clause 2 which is not there in Hittite: “The waters of the mountains, the gardens, the meadow(s)—let your refreshing go (through) the lands—but let it (i.e. *ḫaḫḫima-*) not paralyze them” (Hoffner, Myths, 27); “L’eau des montagnes, les jardins, la prairie, que tion haleine les traverse et que (le Gel) ne les immobilise pas” (Mazoyer, *Telipinu*, 167, 178); “La tua essenza divina spiri sulle acque delle montagne, sui frutteti e sui prati, cosicché il gelo non possa paralizzarli!” (Pecchioli Daddi and Polvani, *Mitologia*, 64–65). Cf. the very different HEG, T, 375.

¹⁵³ According to Anna Chrzanowska, “Ritual des Ašḫella gegen eine Seuche in der Armee (CTH 394),” accessed May 7, 2021, https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20394&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=A.%20Chrzanowska.

¹⁵⁴ CHD, Š, 508b.

assessed following CHD¹⁵⁴ (“Then we gave to the deity some cooked meat, bread (and) beer [...], (saying) ‘You are a god (and act) in a godly manner. Eat (and) drink’ (or w. double -za: ‘You, O god, eat (and) drink as a god’),” with one modification: *ezza* should be assessed as the second person singular imperative verb form, not containing the reflexive particle (see for *ezza* Hoffner, and Melchert).¹⁵⁵ Thus I propose assessing the context as follows:

(34) b

- | | | | |
|----|-------------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| 1. | <i>nu=wa=za</i> | | DINGIR- <i>LUM</i> |
| | CONN=QUOT=REFL | | god |
| 2. | DINGIR- <i>LIM-nili</i> | <i>ezza</i> | <i>eku</i> |
| | godlike | eat.2SG.IMP | drink.2SG.IMP |

“(1) You are a god. (2) Eat (and) drink in a godly manner.”

At face value the following context can be interpreted as the vocative in its separate syntactic unit preceded by *nu* and followed by the direct speech particle -*wa(r)*:

(35) a NS (CTH 394.A)¹⁵⁶ HT 1 obv. ii 39–40

<i>nu=za=kan</i>	DINGIR- <i>LUM</i>	^d IM= <i>wa</i>	KUR=KA	<i>andan</i>	<i>naišḫut</i>
CONN=REFL=LOCP	god	stormgod=QUOT	land=your	in	turn.2SG.IMP

“Turn toward your land, O Storm God.”¹⁵⁷

However, the potential (morphologically unmarked) vocative DINGIR-*LUM* ^dIM “sun-god, storm-god” is also preceded by Wackernagel clitics, =*za=kan*, that are hosted by *nu*. As -*wa(r)* usually patterns with Wackernagel clitics in the same clause, the context has to be a mistake. It may contain either misplaced clitics or a misplaced *nu*, but I think it contains a misplaced -*wa(r)*. This conclusion is based on the fact that the text is preserved in two copies which slightly differ:

(35) b A (HT 1) obv. ii 39–40

<i>nu=za=kan</i>	DINGIR- <i>LUM</i>	^d IM= <i>wa</i>	KUR=KA	<i>andana?</i>	<i>naišḫut</i>
CONN=REFL=LOCP	god	stormgod=QUOT	land=your	in	turn.2SG.IMP

¹⁵⁵ Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*, 190.

¹⁵⁶ According to Silvin Košak, hethiter.net/: hetkonk (v. 1.995).

¹⁵⁷ José Virgilio García Trabazo, *Textos religiosos hititas. Mitos, plegarias y rituales* (Madrid: Trotta, 2002), 412–13; Billie J. Collins, “Hittite Canonical Compositions - Uhhamuwa’s Ritual against Plague,” in *The Context of Scripture, Vol. I, Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*, ed. William W. Hallo (Leiden - New York - Köln: Brill, 1997b), 162.

(35) c B (KUB 9.31) rev. iii 5–6

nu=za=kan DINGIR–LUM ^dIM* * INA KUR=KA *andan naišḫut*
 CONN=REFL=LOCP god stormgod in land=your in turn.2SG.IMP

Thus, only one of the two copies attests this misplaced *-wa(r)*, whereas all the copies attest *nu* + enclitics.¹⁵⁸ The present context is thus a mistransformation of the appositional construction within the main clause and not a counter-example to the rule that vocatives are never preceded by *nu*.

The following context is also philologically difficult:

(36) a MH/NS (CTH 402.A) KUB 24.9+ obv. ii 38'–39'

1a. [KASKAL-*a*]š  IR^{MEŠ} *idalu* *šumeš*
 WAY-GEN.PL  evil.ACC.SG.N you.NOM.PL
 1b. *n=at*  *pahḫaštien*
 CONN=it  protect.2PL.IMP

“(1a) You gods of the road, the evil, (1b) guard it!”¹⁵⁹

At face value it attests in a separate syntactic unit followed by *nu* + enclitic two heterogeneous elements: both an unambiguous left dislocation (*idalu* “evil”) resumed in the main clause by *-at* “it,” and an address to gods KASKAL-*aš* DINGIR^{MEŠ} *šumeš* “you, the deities of the way.” As we saw, left dislocations are compatible with *nu* whereas unambiguous vocatives are not. In this light the context can be assessed in two ways: either as *nu* being triggered by the left dislocation, or as the address to the gods KASKAL-*aš* DINGIR^{MEŠ} *šumeš* “you, the deities of the way” also being a left dislocation and not a vocative. In this case it was an appositional construction within the main clause and was later moved out of it together with the direct object to a separate syntactic unit. Thus, the complex context receives a convincing explanation that does not classify it as an exception to the rule, based on independent evidence.

What is important is that the context may also receive a very different interpretation. The text above is presented according to the online edition of Mouton.¹⁶⁰ However, elsewhere it has received a very different assessment (see

¹⁵⁸ The editor (Susanne Görke, “Das Ritual des Uḫḫamuwa (CTH 410),” accessed May 7 2021, https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20410&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=S.%20G%C3%B6rke) observes that in ex. B ^dIM is followed by an erasure which might have replaced *-wa*. If this is indeed so, the scribe of B corrected the mistake that is present in A.

¹⁵⁹ Alice Mouton, “Rituel d’Alli d’Arzawa (CTH 402),” Mouton, Alice. “Rituel d’Alli d’Arzawa (CTH 402),” accessed May 7, 2021, https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20402&prgr=&lg=FR&ed=A.%20Mouton.

¹⁶⁰ Mouton, “CTH 402.”

Jakob-Rost¹⁶¹ followed by CHD¹⁶²):

(36) b MH/NS (CTH 402.A) KUB 24.9+ obv. ii 38'–39'

1. [KASKAL-a]š DINGIR^{MEŠ} idalu šumeš [ēpten]
 way-GEN.PL gods evil.ACC.SG.N you.NOM.PL seize.2PL.IMP

2. n=at pahḫaštien

CONN=it protect.2PL.IMP

“(1) You gods o road, [seize?] the evil, (2) and guard it!”¹⁶³

The interpretation of Jakob-Rost is supported by the fact that the ends of the lines are in a lacuna (not noted in the online edition), so there is space for a short finite verb at the end of line 38'.

If assessed in this way, the context is no longer relevant for discussion in this section and is a completely regular case of nominatives as vocatives (or appositional structure) within the main clause. The diversity of interpretations, one of which is completely regular, makes the context a very unreliable and unlikely counterexample.

The following case can also be easily addressed:

(37) OH/NS (CTH 403.3.1.B) KUB 46.52 18–19

- 1a. ^dUTU-i

sungod-VOC/DAT.SG?

- 1b. nu=tta kāša GĪR^{MEŠ}=KA [(kattan purpuruš) ... šuḫḫa]ḫhun

CONN=you PRF feet=your down ball.ACC.PL.C scatter.1SG.PST

“(1a) O Sungod, (1b) I have just scattered/strewn (these) balls under your feet for you.”

¹⁶⁴

Here the noun ^dUTU-i can be, at face value, both a vocative and a dative. Dative is also the case that is required by the enclitic second person pronoun -tta, coreferent with ^dUTU-i, which is in the main clause. Naturally, as discussed above, left dislocations with cases other than the nominative are rare and not entirely secure; still, this example could belong to this group.

¹⁶¹ Liane Jakob-Rost, *Das Ritual der Malli aus Arzawa gegen Behexung (KUB XXIV 9+)*. *Texte der Hethiter* 2 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1972), 36–37.

¹⁶² CHD, P, 6.

¹⁶³ Jakob-Rost, *Das Ritual der Malli*, 36–7; CHD, P, 6.

¹⁶⁴ Susanne Görke, “Opferungen an den Sonnengott (CTH 403.3.1),” accessed May 7, 2021, https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20403.3.1&pr-gr=&lg=DE&ed=S.%20G%C3%B6rke; CHD, P, 390.

There follows a discussion of a homogeneous group of contexts, all from CTH 429.1, which attests an unusual concentration of very strange syntax.

(38) a OH/NS (CTH 429.1) KBo 10.37 obv. i 57'–58'

1a. [^dUTU-*uš* ^d10-*aš* ^dLAM]MA-*aš* DINGIR^{MEŠ}
 sungod.NOM.SG.C stormgod.NOM.SG.C protective_deity.NOM.SG.C gods
 dapianteš
 all.NOM.PL.C

1b. [(*nu* *dapia*)n-]x-*ten*
 CONN all X-2_{PL}.IMP

“(1b) **Sungod, Stormgod, Protective deity, all the gods**, (2b) you [](2pl.imper) [] all[.]!” following Christiansen.¹⁶⁵ Cf. Haroutunian,¹⁶⁶ who arranges the text similarly but restores it differently in A i 57'.

As read and restored by Christiansen and Haroutunian, the nominative functioning as direct address is here directly followed by the clause connective *nu*. However, the text as presented above is obtained by comparing two copies—A and D.¹⁶⁷ But the two copies of the context (A obv. i 57'–58' and D obv. i 18') do not actually overlap and I think the example by itself cannot be considered irrefutable evidence. It follows from comparing A i 54'–55' and D i 17' that line division was not always identical.¹⁶⁸ So, I suggest there was a verb form lost in the lacuna before the text preserved in D, with word distribution per line as in A i 54'–55' and D i 17' (or in A i 54' vs D i 15'). Thus, the example is not philologically sound.

For the following example, Christiansen¹⁶⁹ has already observed that there is a parenthetical clause between the vocative and the main clause.

¹⁶⁵ Birgit Christiansen, *Die Ritualtradition der Ambazzi. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 48 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006), 190–91.

¹⁶⁶ Hripsime Haroutunian, “The Hittite Ritual against a Curse (CTH 429),” in *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. Gary M. Beckman, Richard H. Beal, and Gregory McMahon (Winona Lake: Eisenbraun, 2003), 152.

¹⁶⁷ See Christiansen, *Die Ritualtradition*, 190.

¹⁶⁸ See Christiansen, *Die Ritualtradition*, 190.

¹⁶⁹ Christiansen, *Die Ritualtradition*, 193 fn. 815; see also Birgit, Christiansen, “Ein Ritual der Ambazzi gegen Verleumdungen (CTH 429.1),” accessed May 7, 2021, https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20429.1&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=B.%20Christian-sen,n.10.

(38) b OH/NS (CTH 429.1) KBo 10.37 obv. ii 7'–9'

- 1a. *nu* ^dUTU-uš ^d10-aš ^dLAMMA-aš *DI*[NGIR^{MES}]
 CONN sungod.NOM.SG.C stormgod.NOM.SG.C protective_deity.NOM.SG.C
 gods
dapianteš
 all.NOM.PL.C
2. *nu* ^{GIŠ}PAN-it GI-it *šiye*[*weni*]¹⁷⁰
 CONN bow-INST arrow-INST shoot.1PL.PRS
 1b. *awān arḥa paraḥten* *EME*^{MES} *ḪU*[*L-lamuš*...] *sammenanduš*
 away away chase.2PL es bad.ACC.PL.C create?
 PTCPL.ACC.PL.C

“(1a) Sungod, Stormgod, Protective deity, all the gods—(2) we shoot with bow and arrow—(1b) Drive away the evil tongues which are created [from ...].”¹⁷¹

Thus, the example does not provide counterevidence against the contention that *nu* does not occur between the vocative and the main clause. *Nu* here has nothing to do with either the vocative or with the main clause that follows it; it is merely part of the parenthetically introduced clause. *Nu* in front of the vocative is much harder to explain, but the fact that there is a *nu* in front of the vocative probably indicates that it is not a true vocative, but rather a false start of the main clause with the vocatives in the main clause, as often occurs in contexts involving parenthetical clauses.¹⁷² Confronting this example with the lexically identical example without the parenthetic clause below (38c) and with only one *nu* is particularly revealing.

I also think it is significant that all the most problematic cases are fragmentary and not fully preserved—there might be a verb at the end in some putative “separate syntactic units,” which would not then qualify as separate syntactic units. It is possible in view of ii 13 and 15 from the same text with writing on the edge. It is significant that fully preserved examples from the same text do not show any unexpected distribution of either *nu* or of vocatives, as in:

¹⁷⁰ Restored following CHD, Š, 18. Cf. Christiansen, *Die Ritualtradition*, 192–93: *nu* ^{GIŠ}PAN-it GI-it *šiye*[- ...] “Und mit Bogen und Pfeil schieß[t sie. ? -].”

¹⁷¹ Christiansen, “(CTH 429.1);” CHD, Š, 125 with different renderings of the problematic participle, which is of no importance for the present discussion.

¹⁷² See Andrei Sideltsev “Mismatch sentences in Hittite,” forthcoming.

(38) c OH/NS (CTH 429.1) KBo 10.37 obv. ii 18'–19'

nu	^d UTU	^d 10	^d LAMMA	ḪUL-lun	EME	ANA	DUMU-RU	
CONN	sungod	stormgod	protective_deity	evil.ACC.SG.C	tongue	to	son	a[wan] away
				arḫa	paraḫten			
				away	chase.2PL.IMP			

“Sungod, Stormgod, Protective deity, drive away the evil tongues from the child!”¹⁷³

Here we see unmarked forms used as nominatives (or as appositional structures—the context is ambiguous) in the same clause as the finite verb. As expected, *nu* occurs at the beginning of the clause.

It is extremely important and significant that the fully preserved examples from the same text present a fully regular structure, in which the noun phrases addressed to gods occur within the main clause. It is the fragmentary examples that receive a very unusual interpretation. As I have already said, fragmentary examples cannot serve as unambiguous evidence for counterexamples to a rule.

The following case attests a very complex and unusual syntax, even though Eichner¹⁷⁴ just lists it among the examples of vocatives not hosting Wackernagel enclitics without observing any other features:

(39) a NS (CTH 400.1.A) KUB 30.35 obv. i 8–12

- 1a. **wappu=mit**
bank.VOC.SG=my.VOC.SG
- 1b. **n=an=za**
CONN=him=REFL
2. *kuwat uwanun*
why come.1SG.PST
3. *kuit dariyahḫun*
why exert.1SG.PST
- 1b. *nu uwandu*
CONN see.3PL.IMP

“(1a) **My riverbank!** (2) Why did I come? (3) Why did I exert myself? (1b) May they see **him.**”¹⁷⁵



¹⁷³ Christiansen, *Die Ritualtradition*, 192–93.

¹⁷⁴ Eichner, “Zur Syntax,” 129.

¹⁷⁵ Sabine Melzer and Susanne Görke, “Ritual des Irija für die Reinigung einer Stadt (CTH 400.1),” accessed May 7, 2021, https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20400.1&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=S.%20Melzer%20%E2%80%93%20S.%20G%C3%B6rke.

Following the argument of the editor, clause 1b most likely attests a parenthetical construction, *n=an=za ... nu uwandu*, into which two questions are inserted. An analogous structure (as suggested by Melzer and Görke¹⁷⁶) without the parenthetical clause does not feature *nu*:

(39) b NS (CTH 401.1.A) KUB 30.36 obv. ii 3–7

- | | | | | | |
|-----|------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| 1a. | ḪUR.SAG ^{MEŠ} | GAL-TIM | pangauēš |  ^{ES} -T |  |
| | mountains | big | all.NOM.PL | PL | |
| 1b. | ḫāriyaš | nakkīyaš | | kuit | uwanun |
| | dale.LOC.PL | inaccessible.LOC.PL | why | come.1SG.PST | |
| 2. | kuit | tāriyanun | | | |
| | why | exert.1SG.PST | | | |
| 3. | DUMU | LÚ.U ₁₉ .LU-ŪTI | GU ₄ -un | mān ḫappūi | EGIR-an piššiēr |
| | son | humanity | bull.ACC.SG | like corral.LOC.SG | behind throw.3PL.PST |
| 4. | nu=mu=ššan | šumešš=a | ḪUR.S[A]G ^{MEŠ} | ḫarapten | |
| | CONN=me=LOCP | you=and | mountains | join.2PL.IMP | |


“(1a) All you big and small mountains, (1b) why did I come in the inaccessible valleys?

(2) Why did I exert myself? (3) They threw a human child behind the corral like a bull. (4)

And also you, mountains, join me!”¹⁷⁷

It is extremely significant for the account I am developing that here, as well as in other cases above, parenthetical (inserted, thus violating the normal sequence of clauses) constructions immediately after the separate syntactic unit with vocatives are compatible with *nu* whereas the regular main clause that follows the separate syntactic unit containing direct addresses is not. For more detail on parenthetical constructions, see Sidelstev.¹⁷⁸

The following case cannot be so easily dismissed as a mistake of any kind, and it is fully preserved:

(40) MH/MS? (CTH 446.A) KUB 7.41 rev. iv 22 

- | | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| 1a. | ^d Memišartiš | ne[piš]aš | KI-paš | |
| | Memesarti.NOM.SG.C | heaven.GEN.SG | earth.GEN.SG | |
| 1b. | nu=šmaš=šan | DUG | PIḪU | NAG lāḫuwanza |
| | CONN=you.PL=LOCP | cup | beer | drink pour.PTCP.NOM.SG.C |

¹⁷⁶ Melzer, and Görke, “(CTH 400.1).”

¹⁷⁷ Sabine Melzer, and Susanne Görke, “Das Ritual des Banippi (CTH 401.1),” accessed May 7, 2021, https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20401.1&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=S.%20Melzer%20%E2%80%93%20S.%20G%C3%B6rke.

¹⁷⁸ Sidelstev, “Mismatch sentences.”

In view of the nominative case marking of the nominals in their separate syntactic unit and the resumption of the nominals by the enclitic pronoun *-šmaš* in the main clause (and following the suggestion of an anonymous reviewer) I posit that ^d*Memišartiš ne[piš]aš* _{KL}-*paš* is simply a left dislocation out of the main clause, clitic doubled by *-šmaš* “you,” and not a nominative functioning as vocative.

(41) ~~ma~~NS (CTH 381.A) KUB 6.45+ obv. i 33-35
 1. ~~ma~~ EN=YA GU₄ ŠA d₁₀ ŠA KUR URU.KÙ.BABBAR-ti
~~peran~~
 Seri.NOM.SG.C=but lord=my bull GEN stormgod GEN land Hattusa.LOC
~~before~~
 tianza
 stem.PTCP.NOM.SG.C

- “(1) **Šeri**, my lord, bull of the Storm-god, champion of Hatti (lit.: ‘the one who steps in front in the Land of Hatti’); (2) In these words of the presentation of the plea introduce **me** before the gods.”¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁹ Heinrich Otten, "Eine Beschwörung der Unterirdischen aus Boğazköy," *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 54 (1961): 136–37; Collins, "Hittite Canonical Compositions," 171.

¹⁸¹ Jorg Klinger, "Das Gebet Muwatallis II. an die Versammlung der Götter durch den Wettergott des Blitzes (CTH 381)," in *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments, Neue Folge Band 7: Hymnen, Klagelieder und Gebete, Gütersloh*, ed. Bernd Janowski and Daniel Schwemer (Gutersloh: Gutersloher Verlagshaus, 2013), 125.

what appears as a vocative structure is part of the finite verb form, as demonstrated by Klinger:¹⁸¹ “der du vorangehst (in Bezug auf) das Land Hatti.” As is independently attested elsewhere, participles can function as part of the predicate. Thus, the example can be assessed as “Seri, my lord, bull of the Storm-god, (you are) stepping in front in the Land of Hatti.” In this understanding no reflexive particle is expected in the clause. This understanding would also remove the example from the body of vocatives; it would just be a regular clause, not a separate syntactic unit. However, there is a difficulty here too, as observed by Rieken et al.¹⁸² The land of Hatti is here in the genitive case (marked by the Akkadian preposition ŠA) ŠA KUR URUKÛ.BABBAR-ti, which is completely unexpected if the participle is part of the finite verb form, but is perfectly compatible with it as a nominalized form.

Consequently, the interpretation of Singer and Rieken et al. above still appears unavoidable. This would produce a nominative as a separate syntactic unit bearing *-(m)a* and followed by *nu*. Above, we saw that the structure is perfectly compatible with left dislocations. I suggest we assess this example as a left dislocation too.

The following case attests (restored) *-(m)a* on what is interpreted by the editor, Gilan,¹⁸³ judging by his translation, as a vocative (or, more likely, an unmarked form functioning as vocative) in a separate syntactic unit and *nu* after it:

(42) OH/NS (CTH 6) KUB 1.16+ rev. iii 27

- | | | | |
|----|----------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. | [zik=ma | DUMU=Y]A | ^m Muršili |
| | you=but | son=my | Mursili |
| 2. | n=an=za | zik | dā |
| | CONN=him=REFL | you | take.2SG.IMP |

“(1) **But you, my son, Mursili,** (2) you must heed it.”¹⁸⁴

However, previous editors, Sommer and Falkenstein,¹⁸⁵ translate the context very differently: “du aber bist mein Sohn, Mursili, tu du es!” This makes the vocative in Gilan’s¹⁸⁶ understanding a nominal clause. I follow Sommer and Falken-

¹⁸² Rieken et al., “CTH 381.”

¹⁸³ Amir Gilan, *Formen und Inhalte althethitischer Literatur. Texte der Hethiter 29* (Heidelberg: Winter, 2015), 27.

¹⁸⁴ Gary M. Beckman, “Edicts and Proclamations: Bilingual Edict of Hattušili I,” in *The Context of Scripture, Vol. II, Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World*, ed. William W. Hallo and K. Lawson Younger (Leiden – Boston – Köln: Brill, 2000), 81; Oğüz Soysal, *Muršili I. Eine historische Studie*. Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde der Philosophischen Fakultät I der Julius-Maximilians-Universität zu Würzburg, 1989, 79; Gilan, *Formen und Inhalte*, 78.

¹⁸⁵ Sommer, and Falkenstein, *Die hethitisch-akkadische Bilingue*, 13.

¹⁸⁶ Gilan, *Formen und Inhalte*.

stein and thus remove the example from the body of potential counterexamples. In any case, the context is too fragmentary to serve as unambiguous evidence.

Thus, summing up the section, we see that there are no contexts that can be convincingly interpreted as counterexamples to the rule which is introduced in the paper—that vocatives and nominatives marking addresses in a separate syntactic unit are neither preceded nor followed by *nu* or other clause connectives and cannot host Wackernagel enclitics.

An important result of this section is that some of the material in a separate syntactic unit can only be taxonomized as left dislocations. This data adds to the evidence from the first sections of the paper that left dislocations can host *-(m) a* and can function as appositional constructions to second-person indications in the main clause. The difference between the appositional constructions within the main clause and the appositional constructions in a separate syntactic unit will then simply lie in the fact that the latter will be dislocated out of the main clause.

CONCLUSIONS

In this paper I have reviewed the evidence of direct addresses to gods and men marked by vocatives, nominatives, and unmarked noun phrases on the basis of a database (for its composition, see Appendix).

I have shown that addresses to gods marked in all three ways are not limited to specialized syntactic structures. They can be used in a separate syntactic unit at the left of the clause or within the clause with roughly the same frequency. Addresses to gods and men within the clause are demonstrably different from appositional structures in clear cases.

When used in a separate syntactic unit to the left of the clause, addresses to gods and men (marked as vocative, nominative, or morphologically unmarked) are not in a separate clause; they are rather in a separate syntactic structure, a kind of “outbuilding” to some of the regular clauses. The fact that they are not separate clauses follows from the absence of the direct speech particle and the very consistent absence of either preceding or subsequent clause connectives (*nu* and others). The fact they are still in a separate syntactic unit follows from the fact that Wackernagel clitics cannot be hosted by vocatives and nominatives when they are used in this separate structure, a fact observed already by Hoffner¹⁸⁷ 1998a: 41, Hoffner, and Melchert,¹⁸⁸ and Eichner.¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁷ Hoffner, “Disciplines,” 41.

¹⁸⁸ Hoffner, and Melchert, *Hittite*, 244.

¹⁸⁹ Eichner, “Zur Syntax,” 126.

Appendix

The study of the Hittite vocative was based on the following corpus.

Old Hittite compositions in Old Script (OH/OS): Anitta text,¹⁹⁰ tale of Zalpa,¹⁹¹ old script fragment of the Palace chronicle,¹⁹² rituals and myths as in Otten and Souček,¹⁹³ and Neu,¹⁹⁴ a Royal Reprimand of the Dignitaries,¹⁹⁵ Laws,¹⁹⁶ oracle letter KBo 18.151.¹⁹⁷

Old Hittite compositions in New Script (OH/NS) copies: Edict of Telipinu,¹⁹⁸ Hittite-Akkadian bilingual of Hattusili I,¹⁹⁹ historical fragments studied by Soysal²⁰⁰ and De Martino,²⁰¹ palace chronicle,²⁰² fragments of the palace chronicle,²⁰³ edict of Pimpira,²⁰⁴ campaign of Mursili I (?) against the Hurrians,²⁰⁵ fragments concerning Mursili I and Babylon,²⁰⁶ Anatolian campaigns of Mursili I,²⁰⁷ deeds of Hantili I,²⁰⁸ annals of Hattusili I,²⁰⁹ deeds of Hattusili I,²¹⁰ Cannibal text,²¹¹ Puhanu-chronicle.²¹²

¹⁹⁰ Erich Neu, *Der Anitta-Text. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 18 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1974).

¹⁹¹ Heinrich Otten, *Eine althethitische Erzählung um die Stadt Zalpa. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 17 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1973); Gilan, *Formen und Inhalte*, 181–88.

¹⁹² Dardano, *Cronaca di palazzo*.

¹⁹³ Heinrich Otten and Vladimir Souček, *Ein althethitisches Ritual für das Königspaar. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 8 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1969).

¹⁹⁴ Erich Neu, *Ein althethitisches Gewitterritual. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 12 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1970); idem, *Althethitisches Ritualtext*.

¹⁹⁵ Jared L. Miller, *Royal Hittite instructions. Writings from the Ancient World* 31 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), 73–75.

¹⁹⁶ Harry A. Hoffner, *The Laws of the Hittites. A Critical Edition* (Leiden – New York – Köln: Brill, 1997).

¹⁹⁷ Oğüz Soysal, “Analysis of a Hittite Oracular Document,” *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 90 (2000): 85–122.

¹⁹⁸ Inge Hoffmann, *Der Erlass Telipinu. Texte der Hethiter* 11 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1984); Gilan, *Formen und Inhalte*, 137–57.

¹⁹⁹ Sommer and Falkenstein, *Die hethitisch-akkadische Bilingue*; Gilan, *Formen und Inhalte*, 67–82.

²⁰⁰ Oğüz Soysal, “Beiträge zur althethitischen Geschichte (III). Kleine Fragmente historischen Inhalts,” *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 95 (2005): 121–144; Soysal, *Muršili I*, 71–74, 75–78.

²⁰¹ Stefano De Martino, *Annali e res gestae antiochitici* (Pavia: Italian University Press, 2003), 84–87.

²⁰² Dardano, *Cronaca di palazzo*; Gilan, *Formen und Inhalte*, 116–27.

²⁰³ Soysal, *Muršili I*, 31–38.

²⁰⁴ Michele Cammarosano, *Il decreto antiochitico di Pimpira. Eothen* 14 (Trieste: LoGisma, 2006).

²⁰⁵ Soysal, *Muršili I*, 39–45; De Martino, *Annali*, 132–53.

²⁰⁶ Soysal, *Muršili I*, 54–55.

²⁰⁷ Soysal, *Muršili I*, 8–13; De Martino, *Annali*, 160–85.

²⁰⁸ Soysal, *Muršili I*, 74–75; De Martino, *Annali*, 194–200, 206–9.

²⁰⁹ De Martino, *Annali*, 21–80.

²¹⁰ De Martino, *Annali*, 21–81.

²¹¹ Gilan, *Formen und Inhalte*, 263–66.

²¹² Gilan, *Formen und Inhalte*, 297–306.

Complete body of Middle Hittite texts in Middle Script (MH/MS).

New Hittite originals and copies of earlier texts: rituals, myths, and prayers as at <http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/HPM/index.php>; Mursili II's Prayer Concerning the Misdeeds and the Ousting of Tawananna,²¹³ instructions,²¹⁴ letters,²¹⁵ court proceedings,²¹⁶ dreams and vows,²¹⁷ deeds of Suppiluliuma,²¹⁸ deeds of Mursili²¹⁹ with subsequent additions; Apology of Hattusili III,²²⁰ other texts relating to Hattusili III,²²¹ Memorandum concerning Mursili III,²²² Bronzetafel,²²³ dictate of Mursili II,²²⁴ catalogue entries,²²⁵ cult inventories,²²⁶ oracles,²²⁷ treaties as in Friedrich,²²⁸ Del Monte,²²⁹ and González Salazar;²³⁰ Ulmitešub treaty²³¹ and, at <http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/>

²¹³ Miller, "Mursili II."

²¹⁴ Miller, *Royal Hittite instructions*.

²¹⁵ Hoffner, *Letters*; Albertine Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter. 2. Teil. Die Briefe mit Transkription, Übersetzung und Kommentar* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1989); Clelia Mora and Mauro Giorgieri, *Le lettere tra i re ittiti e i re assiri ritrovate ad Hattuša* (Padova: SARGON, 2004).

²¹⁶ Rudolf Werner, *Hethitische Gerichtsprotokolle. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 4* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1967).

²¹⁷ de Roos, *Hittite Votive Texts*.

²¹⁸ Giuseppe F. Del Monte, *Le gesta di Suppiluliuma. Traslitterazione, traduzione e commento. L'opera storiografica di Mursili II re di Hattusa*, vol. I (Pisa: Edizioni Plus Pisa University Press, 2008).

²¹⁹ Albrecht Goetze, *Die Annalen des Muršiliš. Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft 38* (Leipzig: J.C.Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1933).

²²⁰ Otten, *Die Apologie*.

²²¹ Ahmet Ünal, *Hattušili III. Teil 1 Hattušili bis zu seiner Thronbesteigung. Band 2: Quellen und Indices. Texte der Hethiter 4* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1974).

²²² Michele Cammarosano, "A Coregency for Mursili III?" *Altorientalische Forschungen* 36, no. 1 (2009): 171–202.

²²³ Heinrich Otten, *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 1* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1988).

²²⁴ Jared Miller, "Mursili II's dictate to Tuppi-Teššup's Assyrian antagonists," *KASKAL* 4 (2007).

²²⁵ Paola Dardano, *Die hethitischen Tontafelkataloge aus Hattusa (CTH 276-282). Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 47* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006).

²²⁶ Joost Hazenbos, *The Organization of the Anatolian Local Cults during the Thirteenth Century B.C. Cuneiform Monographs 21* (Leiden: Brill, 2003); Michele Cammarosano, *Hittite Local Cults. Writings from the Ancient World 40* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2018).

²²⁷ Ünal, *Ein Orakel*; Theo van den Hout, *The Purity of Kingship. An Edition of CTH 569 and Related Oracle Inquiries of Tudhaliya IV* (Leiden – Boston – Köln: Brill, 1998); Beckman, Bryce, and Cline, *The Ahhiyawa*, 183–209.

²²⁸ Johannes Friedrich, *Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache*, 1. Teil. *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen-Agyptischen Gesellschaft* 31/1 (Leipzig: J.C.Hinrichs'sche, 1926); idem, *Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches*.

²²⁹ Giuseppe F. Del Monte, *Il trattato fra Muršili II di Hattuša e Niqmepa' di Ugarit* (Roma: Istituto per l'Oriente C.A. Nallino-Centro per le antichità e la storia dell'arte del Vicino Oriente, 1986).

²³⁰ Juan Manuel González Salazar, "Tiliura, un ejemplo de la política fronteriza durante el imperio hitita (CTH 89)," *Aula Orientalis* 12 (1994): 159–76.

²³¹ Theo van den Hout, *Der Ulmitešub-Vertrag. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 38* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995).

txhet_svh/textindex.php?g=svh&x=x, hyppological texts,²³² medical texts,²³³ Tunnawi ritual²³⁴ with subsequent additions, texts of the cult of tutelary deities,²³⁵ funerary ritual,²³⁶ Muwalanni ritual,²³⁷ ritual against depression,²³⁸ birth rituals,²³⁹ KILAM festival,²⁴⁰ purification rituals,²⁴¹ Ambazzi's ritual CTH 463,²⁴² ritual for the Protective deity of the fleece,²⁴³ rituals of the Hattian cultural layer,²⁴⁴ some other rituals,²⁴⁵ and wisdom texts.²⁴⁶

²³² Annelies Kammenhuber, *Hippologia hethitica* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1961).

²³³ Cornelia Burde, *Hethitische medizinische Texte. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 19* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1974).

²³⁴ Albrecht Goetze, *The Hittite Ritual of Tunnawi* (New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental society, 1938); Manfred Hutter, *Behexung, Entsöhnung und Heilung* (Freiburg (Schweiz) and Göttingen: Universitätsverlag and Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1988).

²³⁵ McMahon, Gregory. *The Hittite State Cult of Tutelary Deities. Assyriological Studies 25*. Chicago, Illinois: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1991.

²³⁶ Kassian, Korolëv, and Sidel'tsev, *Funerary Rituals*.

²³⁷ René Lebrun, "Rituels de Muwalanni à Manuzziya = CTH 703 BCILL 85," *Hethitica* 13 (1996): 39–64.

²³⁸ Gary M. Beckman, "A Hittite Ritual for Depression (CTH 432)," in *Tabularia Hethaeorum. Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag. Dresdner Beiträge Zur Hethitologie 25*, ed. Detlev Groddek and Marina Zorman (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007), 69–81.

²³⁹ Gary M. Beckman, *Hittite Birth Rituals. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 29* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983).

²⁴⁰ Itamar Singer, *The Hittite KILAM Festival. Part One. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 27* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1984).

²⁴¹ Rita Strauss, *Reinigungsrituale aus Kizzuwatna: ein Beitrag zur Erforschung hethitischer Ritualtradition und Kulturgeschichte* (Berlin-New York: de Gruyter, 2006).

²⁴² Christiansen, *Die Ritualtradition*.

²⁴³ Bawanyepeck, *Auguren*.

²⁴⁴ Jorg Klinger, *Untersuchungen zur Rekonstruktion des hattischen Kultschicht. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 37* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1996).

²⁴⁵ René Lebrun, "Textes religieux hittites de la fin de l'empire," *Hethitica* 2 (1977): 93–153.

²⁴⁶ Yoram Cohen, *Wisdom from the Late Bronze Age. Writings from the Ancient World 29* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013).

REFERENCES

- Archi, Alfonso. "Eine Anrufung der Sonnengöttin von Arinna." In *Documentum Asiae minoris antiquae. Festschrift für Heinrich Otten zum 75. Geburtstag*, edited by Erich Neu and Christel Rüster, 5–31. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1988.
- Bawanypeck, Daliah. *Die Rituale der Auguren. Texte der Hethiter* 25. Heidelberg: Winter, 2005.
- Beckman, Gary M. 1983. *Hittite Birth Rituals. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 29. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983.
- . *Hittite Diplomatic Texts. Writings of the Ancient World* 7. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1996.
- . "Hittite Canonical Compositions - Myths: The Storm-God and the Serpent (Illuyanka)." In *The Context of Scripture, Vol. I, Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*, edited by William W. Hallo, 150–51. Leiden – New York – Köln: Brill, 1997.
- . "Edicts and Proclamations: Bilingual Edict of Hattušili I." In *The Context of Scripture, Vol. II, Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World*, edited by William W. Hallo, and K. Lawson Younger, 79–81. Leiden – Boston – Köln: Brill, 2000.
- . "A Hittite Ritual for Depression (CTH 432)." In *Tabularia Hethaeorum. Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag. Dresdner Beiträge Zur Hethitologie* 25, edited by Detlev Groddek and Marina Zorman, 69–81. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007.
- Beckman, Gary M., Bryce, Trevor R., and Cline, Eric H. *The Ahhiyawa Texts. Writings from the Ancient Worlds* 28. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.
- Burde, Cornelia. *Hethitische medizinische Texte. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 19. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1974.
- Cammarosano, Michele. *Il decreto antico-ittita di Pimpira. Eothen* 14. Trieste: LoGisma, 2006.
- . "A Coregency for Mursili III?" *Altorientalische Forschungen* 36, no. 1 (2009): 171–202.
- . *Hittite Local Cults. Writings from the Ancient World* 40. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2018.
- Carruba, Onofrio. "dUTU^š." In *Anatolia antica. Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati. Eothen* 11, edited by Stefano De Martino, and Franca Pecchioli Daddi, 145–54. Firenze: LoGisma, 2002.
- CHD – *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, edited by Hans Güterbock, Harry Hoffner, and Theo van den Hout. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1989–.
- Christiansen, Birgit. *Die Ritualtradition der Ambazzi. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 48. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006.
- . "Ein Ritual der Ambazzi gegen Verleumdungen (CTH 429.1)." Accessed May 7, 2021. https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20429.1&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=B.%20Christiansen.
- Chrzanowska, Anna. "Ritual des Ašhella gegen eine Seuche in der Armee (CTH 394)." Accessed May 7, 2021. https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20394&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=A.%20Chrzanowska.
- . "Ritual der Ḫantitaššu von Hurma: „Wenn die Jahre eines Menschen gestört sind“ (CTH 395.1)." Accessed May 7, 2021. https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20395.1&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=A.%20Chrzanowska.
- Cohen, Yoram. *Wisdom from the Late Bronze Age. Writings from the Ancient World* 29. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.
- Collins, Billie, J. "Hittite Canonical Compositions - Incantations: Purifying a House: A Ritual for the Infernal Deities." In *The Context of Scripture, Vol. I, Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*, edited by William W. Hallo, 168–72. Leiden – New York – Köln: Brill, 1997a.

- . “Hittite Canonical Compositions - Uhhamuwa’s Ritual against Plague.” In *The Context of Scripture, Vol. I, Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*, edited by William W. Hallo, 162. Leiden - New York - Köln: Brill, 1997b.
- . “Hittite Canonical Compositions - Rituals: Zarpaya’s Ritual.” In *The Context of Scripture, Vol. I, Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*, edited by William W. Hallo, 162–63. Leiden - New York - Köln: Brill, 1997c.
- Dardano, Paola. *Aneddoto e il racconto in età antico-hittita: La cosiddetta “Cronaca di palazzo. Roma: Il calamo, 1997.*
- . *Die hethitischen Tontafelkataloge aus Hattusa (CTH 276–282). Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 47.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006.
- . “Das hethitische Partizip- eine Frage der Diathese?.” In *Proceedings of the 8th International Congress of Hittitology, Warsaw, September 5–9, 2011*, edited by Piotr Taracha, 236–62. Warsaw: Agade, 2014.
- De Martino, Stefano. *Annali e res gestae antico ittiti.* Pavia: Italian University Press, 2003.
- Del Monte, Giuseppe F. *Il trattato fra Muṣili il di Ḫattuša e Niqmepa’ di Ugarit.* Roma: Istituto per l’Oriente C.A. Nallino-Centro per le antichità e la storia dell’arte del Vicino Oriente, 1986.
- . *Le gesta di Suppiluliuma. Traslitterazione, traduzione e commento. L’opera storiografica di Mursili II re di Hattusa*, vol. I, Pisa: Edizioni Plus Pisa University Press, 2008.
- Devine, Andrew M., and Laurence D. Stephens. *The Prosody of Greek Speech.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Eichner, Heiner. “Zur Syntax des vedischen und hethitischen Vokativs im Vergleich.” In *Audias fabulas veteres. Anatolian Studies in Honor of Jana Součková-Siegelová. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 79*, edited by Šárka Velhartická, 119–40. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2016.
- Fortson, Benjamin. “A New Study of Hittite -wa(r).” *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 50 (1998): 21–34.
- Friedrich, Johannes. *Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache*, 1. Teil. *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen-Agyptischen Gesellschaft* 31/1. Leipzig: J.C.Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung, 1926.
- . *Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache*. 2. Teil: *Die Verträge Muṣiliš’ II. mit Manapa-Dattaš vom Lande des Flusses Šeḫa, des Muwattalliš mit Alakšanduš von Wiluša und des Šuppiluliumaš mit Ḫukkanāš und den Leuten von Ḫajaša (mit Indices zum 1. und 2. Teil).* Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs’sche, 1930.
- . *Hethitisches Keilschrift-Lesebuch, I. Lesestücke.* Heidelberg: Winter, 1960.
- Fuscagni, Francesco. “Fragment eines mugawar mit Erwähnung des Sonnengottes (CTH 459.11).” Accessed May 7, 2021. https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20459.11&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=F.%20Fuscagni.
- . “Rituale di evocazione per le dee DINGIR.MAH, le dee Gulšeš, le dee DINGIR.MAH degli dei e le dee DINGIR.MAH delle parti del corpo degli uomini e per le dee Zukki e Anzili (CTH 484).” Accessed May 7, 2021. https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20484&prgr=&lg=IT&ed=F.%20Fuscagni.
- García Trabazo, José Virgilio. *Textos religiosos hittitas. Mitos, plegarias y rituales*, Madrid: Trotta.
- Gilan, Amir. *Formen und Inhalte althethitischer Literatur. Texte der Hethiter* 29. Heidelberg: Winter, 2015.
- Giorgieri, Mauro. “Un rituale di scongiuro antico ittita per Labarna-Ḫattušili.” *Studi Micenei ed Egeo Anatolici* 29 (1992): 47–98.
- Goedegebuure, Petra M. “KBo 17.17+: Remarks on an Old Hittite Royal Substitution Ritual.” *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religion* 2 (2002): 61–73.
- Görke, Susanne. “Opferungen an den Sonnengott (CTH 403.3.1).” Accessed May 7, 2021. https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20403.3.1&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=S.%20G%C3%B6rke.

- . “Das Ritual des Uḫamuwa (CTH 410).” Accessed May 7 2021. https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20410&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=S.%20G%C3%B6rke.
 - . “Zwei Rituale zur Besänftigung von Sonnen- und Wettergott mit der Erwähnung von Ziḫantawiya, Tuthaliya und Nikkalmadi (CTH 443).” Accessed May 7, 2021. https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20443.1&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=S.%20G%C3%B6rke.
 - . “Das Ritual des Zarpiya aus Kizzuwatna (CTH 757).” Accessed May 7, 2021. https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20757&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=S.%20G%C3%B6rke.
- Goetze, Albrecht. *Die Annalen des Muršiliš. Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft* 38. Leipzig: J.C.Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1933.
- . *The Hittite Ritual of Tunnawi*. New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental society, 1938.
- González Salazar, Juan Manuel. “Tiliura, un ejemplo de la política fronteriza durante el imperio hitita (CTH 89).” *Aula Orientalis* 12 (1994): 159–76.
- Groddek, Detlev. “Überlegungen zur Textherstellung des Ḫedammu-Mythos.” In *Audias fabulas veteres. Anatolian Studies in Honor of Jana Součková-Siegelová*, edited by Šárka Velhartická, 141–64. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2016.
- Haas, Volkert. *Die hethitische Literatur*. Berlin - New York: De Gruyter, 2006.
- Hagenbuchner, Albertine. *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter. 2. Teil. Die Briefe mit Transkription, Übersetzung und Kommentar*. Heidelberg: Winter, 1989.
- Haroutunian, Hripsime. “The Hittite Ritual against a Curse (CTH 429).” In *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, edited by Gary M. Beckman, Richard H. Beal and Gregory McMahon, 149–68. Winona Lake: Eisenbraun, 2003.
- Hazenbos, Joost. *The Organization of the Anatolian Local Cults during the Thirteenth Century B.C. Cuneiform Monographs* 21. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- HED – Puhvel, Jan. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Trends in Linguistics, Documentation* 1-. Berlin – New York – Amsterdam, 1984-.
- HEG – Tischler, Johann. *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, 1983–2016.
- Hill, Virginia. “Vocatives and the pragmatics-syntax interface.” *Lingua* 117 (2007): 2077–105.
- Hoffmann, Inge. *Der Erlass Telipinu. Texte der Hethiter* 11. Heidelberg: Winter, 1984.
- Hoffner, Harry A. “About Questions.” In *Studio historiae ardens. Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Philo H.J. Houwink ten Cate on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday. Publications de l'Institut historique-archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul* 74, edited by Theo P.J. van den Hout and Johan de Roos, 87–104. Leiden: NINO, 1995.
- . *The Laws of the Hittites. A Critical Edition*. Leiden - New York - Köln: Brill, 1997.
 - . “From the Disciplines of a Dictionary Editor.” *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 50 (1998a): 35–44.
 - . *Hittite Myths. Writing from the Ancient World* 2, 2nd edition. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1998b.
 - . “Asyndeton in Hittite.” In *Tabularia Hethaeorum. Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag. Dresdner Beiträge Zur Hethitologie* 25, edited by Detlev Groddek and Marina Zorman, 385–99. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz, 2007.
 - . *Letters from the Hittite Kingdom. Writings from the Ancient World* 15. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009.
- Hoffner, Harry A., and Melchert, Harold C. *A Grammar of the Hittite Language. Part 1: Reference Grammar*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2008.
- . “Hittite Canonical Compositions - Biography and Autobiography: Apology of Hattušili III.” In *The Context of Scripture, Vol. I, Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*, edited by William W. Hallo, 199–204. Leiden - New York - Köln: Brill, 1997.

- . *The Purity of Kingship. An Edition of CTH 569 and Related Oracle Inquiries of Tudhaliya IV.* Leiden – Boston – Köln: Brill, 1998.
- Hutter, Manfred. *Behexung, Entsühnung und Heilung.* Freiburg (Schweiz) and Göttingen: Universitätsverlag and Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988.
- HW² – *Hethitisches Wörterbuch.* Zweite, völlig neubearbeitete Auflage auf der Grundlage der editierten hethitischen Texte. Edited by Johannes Friedrich, Annelies Kammenhuber, Paola Coticelli-Kurras, Federico Giusfredi, Albertine Hagenbuchner-Dresel, Joost Hazenbos, Walther Sallaberger. Heidelberg: Winter, 1984-.
- Jakob-Rost, Liane. *Das Ritual der Malli aus Arzawa gegen Behexung (KUB XXIV 9+).* *Texte der Hettiter* 2. Heidelberg: Winter, 1972.
- Kammenhuber, Annelies. *Hippologia hethitica.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1961.
- . *Hethitisch, Palaisch, Luwisch, Hieroglyphenluwisch und Hattisch. Altkleinasiatische Indices zum Handbuch der Orientalistik, Edition 4 of Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft.* Munich: J. Kitzinger, 1969.
- Kapeluš, Magdalena. “Funerary Ritual. Day 8-9 (CTH 450.1.1.2).” Accessed May 7, 2021. https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20450.1.1.2&prgr=&lg=EN&ed=M.%20Kape%C5%82u%C5%9B.
- Kassian, Alexei, S. *Two Middle Hittite Rituals Mentioning ‘Ziplantawija, Sister of the Hittite King’ Tuthaliya II/I.* Moscow: Paleograph, 2000.
- Kassian, Alexei S., Korolëv, Andrej, and Sidel'tsev, Andrei V. *Hittite Funerary Rituals šalliš waštaiš. Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 288. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2002.
- Kellerman, Galina. “The King and the Sun-God in the Old Hittite Period.” *Tel Aviv* 5 (1978): 199–208.
- Klinger, Jorg. *Untersuchungen zur Rekonstruktion des hattischen Kultschicht. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 37. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1996.
- . “Das Gebet Muwatallis II. an die Versammlung der Götter durch den Wettergott des Blitzes (CTH 381).” In *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments, Neue Folge Band 7: Hymnen, Klagelieder und Gebete, Gütersloh*, edited by Bernd Janowski and Daniel Schwemer, 124–28. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2013.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon.* Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Lebrun, René. “Textes religieux hittites de la fin de l’empire.” *Hethitica* 2 (1977): 93–153.
- Lebrun, René. “Rituels de Muwalanni à Manuzziya = CTH 703 BCILL 85.” *Hethitica* 13 (1996): 39–64.
- Luraghi, Silvia. *Hittite. Languages of the World/Materials* 114. Munich: Lincom Europa, 1997.
- Lyutikova Ekaterina, and Andrei Sidel'tsev. “Inserted relative clauses in Hittite.” Forthcoming.
- Mazoyer, Michel. *Télipinu, le dieu au marécage. Essai sur les mythes fondateurs du royaume Hittite.* Kubaba, Série Antiquité 2. Paris: L’Harmattan, 2003.
- McMahon, Gregory. *The Hittite State Cult of Tutelary Deities. Assyriological Studies* 25. Chicago, Illinois: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1991.
- Melchert, Henry C. “Addenda and Corrigenda to Harry A. Hoffner Jr. and H. Craig Melchert, *Grammar of the Hittite Language (GrHL). Reference Grammar.*” Accessed 1 September, 2021, <https://linguistics.ucla.edu/people/Melchert/Addenda&CorrigendaGrHL2.pdf>.
- Melzer, Sabine, and Görke, Susanne. “Ritual des Irija für die Reinigung einer Stadt (CTH 400.1).” Accessed May 7, 2021. https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20400.1&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=S.%20Melzer%20%E2%80%93%20S.%20G%C3%B6rke.
- Melzer, Sabine, and Görke, Susanne. “Das Ritual des Banippi (CTH 401.1).” Accessed May 7, 2021. https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20401.1&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=S.%20Melzer%20%E2%80%93%20S.%20G%C3%B6rke.

- Miller, Jared L. *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kuzzuwatna Rituals. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 46. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2004.
- . “The Kings of Nuḫḫašše and Muršili’s Casus Belli: Two New Joins to Year 7 of the Annals of Muršili II.” In *Tabularia Hethaeorum. Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by Detlev Groddek and Marina Zorman, 521–34. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007.
- . “Mursili II’s dictate to Tuppi-Teššup’s Assyrian antagonists.” *KASKAL* 4 (2007): 121–52.
- . *Royal Hittite instructions. Writings from the Ancient World* 31. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.
- . “Mursili II’s Prayer Concerning the Misdeeds and the Outstanding of Tawananna.” In *Proceedings of the 8th International Congress of Hittitology, Warsaw, September 5–9, 2011*, edited by Piotr Taracha, 516–77. Warsaw: Agade, 2014.
- Montuori, Claudia. “Quattro rituali antico-ittiti per la coppia reale (CTH 416).” Accessed May 7, 2021. https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20416&prgr=&lg=IT&ed=C.%20Montuori.
- Mora, Clelia and Mauro Giorgieri. *Le lettere tra i re ittiti e i re assiri ritrovate ad Hattuša*. Padova: SARGON, 2004.
- Moro, Andrea. “Notes on Vocative Case: A Case Study in Clause Structure.” In *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2001: Selected Papers from Going Romance*, edited by Josep Quer, Jan Schroten, Mauro Scorretti, Petra Sleeman, and Els Verheugd, 251–65. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2003.
- Mouton, Alice. “Rituel d’Alli d’Arzawa (CTH 402).” Accessed May 7, 2021. https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20402&prgr=&lg=FR&ed=A.%20Mouton.
- . “Rituel de Pāpanikri (CTH 476).” Accessed May 7, 2021. https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/intro.php?xst=CTH%20476&prgr=&lg=FR&ed=A.%20Mouton.
- Munaro, Nicola, and Cecilia Poletto. “On the diachronic origin of particles in North-Eastern Italian dialects.” *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 28 no. 2 (2006): 247–68.
- Neu, Erich. *Ein althethitisches Gewitterritual. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 12. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1970.
- . *Der Anitta-Text. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 18. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1974.
- . “Einige Überlegungen zu den hethitischen Kasusendungen.” In *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch. Vergleichende Studien zur historischen Grammatik und zur dialektgeographischen Stellung der indogermanischen Sprachgruppen Altkeinsiens. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft* 25, edited by Enrich Neu and Wolfgang Meid, 177–96. Innsbruck: Institute für Sprachwissenschaft – Universität Innsbruck, 1979.
- . *Althethitische Ritualtexte im Umschrift. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 25. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1980.
- . *Das hurritische Epos der Freilassung 1. Untersuchungen zu einem hurritisch-hethitischen Textensemble aus Hattuša. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 32. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1996.
- Otten, Heinrich. “Eine Beschwörung der Unterirdischen aus Boğazköy.” *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 54 (1961): 114–57.
- . *Eine althethitische Erzählung um die Stadt Zalpa. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 17. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1973.
- . *Die Apologie Hattusilis III. Das Bild der Überlieferung. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 24. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1981.
- . *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 1. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1988.
- Otten, Heinrich, and Vladimír Souček. *Ein althethitisches Ritual für das Königspaar. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 8. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1969.

- Oettinger, Norbert. *Die Stammbildung des Hethitischen Verbuns. Nachdruck mit einer kurzen Revision der hethitischen Verbalklassen. Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 7*. Dresden: Verlag der TU Dresden, 2002.
- Pecchioli, Daddi Franca, and Anna Maria Polvani. *La mitologia ittita. Testi del Vicino Oriente Antico 4*. Brescia: Paideia, 1990.
- Rieken, Elisabeth. *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 44*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1999.
- Rieken, Elisabeth, Lorenz, Jürgen, and Daues Alexandra. “CTH 372 – Hymne und Gebet an die Sonne (Šamaš).” Accessed May 7, 2021. https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_gebet/intro.php?xst=CTH%20372&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al.
- . “CTH 373 – Kantuzzilis Gebet an den Sonnengott.” Accessed May 7, 2021. https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_gebet/intro.php?xst=CTH%20373&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al.
- . “CTH 376.1 – Hymnen und Gebete an die Sonnengöttin von Arinna.” Accessed May 7, 2021. https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_gebet/intro.php?xst=CTH%20376.1&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al.
- . “CTH 380.1 – Gebet für die Genesung von Gaššuliyawia.” Accessed May 7, 2021. https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_gebet/intro.php?xst=CTH%20380.1&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al.
- . “CTH 381 – Gebet Muwatallis II. an die Götterversammlung.” Accessed May 7, 2021. https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_gebet/intro.php?xst=CTH%20381&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al.
- . “CTH 384.1 – Gebet der Puduḥepa an die Sonnengöttin von Arinna.” Accessed May 7, 2021. https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_gebet/intro.php?xst=CTH%20384.1&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al.
- . “CTH 385.10 – Fragmente der Gebete an die Sonnengöttin von Arinna.” Accessed May 7, 2021. https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_gebet/intro.php?xst=CTH%20385.10&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al.
- Rieken, Elisabeth, Lorenz, Jürgen, Bauer, Anna, and Görke, Susanne. “CTH 323.1 – Vom Verschwinden und der Wiederkehr der Sonnengottheit.” Accessed May 7, 2021. https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_myth/intro.php?xst=CTH%20323.1&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al.
- . “CTH 324.1 – Erste Version des Telipinu-Mythos.” Accessed May 7, 2021. https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_myth/intro.php?xst=CTH%20324.1&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al.
- . “CTH 343.1 – Mythos vom Königtum des Gottes LAMMA – Erste Version.” Accessed May 7, 2021. https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_myth/intro.php?xst=CTH%20343.1&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al.
- . “CTH 344 – „Das Lied vom Ursprung“: Das Königtum im Himmel oder die Theogonie.” Accessed May 7, 2021. https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_myth/intro.php?xst=CTH%20344&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al.
- . “CTH 345.I.1 – Das Lied von Ullikummi: hethitische Version – Erste Tafel.” Accessed May 7, 2021. https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_myth/intro.php?xst=CTH%20345.I.1&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al.
- . “CTH 346.9 – Mythos von Kumarbi: ein Fragment.” Accessed May 7, 2021. https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_myth/intro.php?xst=CTH%20346.9&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al.

- . “CTH 364.2 – Der Gesang vom Silber – Die Geburt des Silbers.” Accessed May 7, 2021. https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_myth/intro.php?xst=CTH%20364.2&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al.
- de Roos, Johan. *Hittite Votive Texts. Publications de l'Institut historique-archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul* 109. Leiden: NINO, 2007.
- Schwemer, Daniel. *Wettergottgestalten Mesopotamiens und Nordsyriens im Zeitalter der Keilschriftkulturen: Materialien und Studien nach den schriftlichen Quellen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001.
- Sideltsev, Andrei V. “Inverted Word Order in Middle Hittite.” In *Anatolian Languages. Studies in the Science and History of Language* 6, edited by Vitaly V. Shevoroshkin and Paul J. Sidwell, 137–88. Canberra: Association for the History of Language, 2002.
- . “Accented Clitics in Hittite?” *Transactions of the Philological Society* 115/2 (2017): 176–211.
- . “Syntax of direct speech particle -wa(r) in Hittite,” *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 73 (2020): 155–185.
- . “Mismatch sentences in Hittite.” forthcoming.
- Singer, Itamar. *The Hittite KILAM Festival. Part One. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 27. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1984.
- . *Muwatalli's Prayer to the Assembly of Gods through the Storm-God of Lightning. Catalogue des Textes Hittites* 381. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- . *Hittite Prayers. Writing from the Ancient World* 11. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002.
- Slocum, Poppy. “The Syntax of Address.” PhD diss., Stony Brook University, 2016.
- Sommer, Ferdinand, and Adam Falkenstein. *Die hethitisch-akkadische Bilingue des Hattusili I. (Labarna II.). Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philologisch-historische Abteilung NF* 16. Munich: Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1938.
- Soysal, Oğüz. *Muršili I. Eine historische Studie*. Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde der Philosophischen Fakultät I der Julius-Maximilians-Universität zu Würzburg, 1989.
- . “Analysis of a Hittite Oracular Document.” *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 90 (2000): 85–122.
- . “Beiträge zur althethitischen Geschichte (III). Kleine Fragmente historischen Inhalts.” *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 95 (2005): 121–144.
- Speas, Peggy and Carole Tenny. “Configurational properties of point of view roles.” In *Asymmetry in Grammar*, edited by Anna M. Di Sciullo, 315–44. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2003.
- Steitler, Charles. “The personal deictic function of *kāša*, *kāšma* and *kāšat(t)a*: Further evidence from the texts.” In *Hrozny and Hittite: The First Hundred Years. Proceedings of the International Conference Held at Charles University, Prague, 11–14 November 2015*, edited by Ronald Kim, Jana Mynářová and Peter Pavúk, 365–81. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
- Strauss, Rita. *Reinigungsrituale aus Kizzuwatna: ein Beitrag zur Erforschung hethitischer Ritualtradition und Kulturgeschichte*. Berlin-New York: de Gruyter, 2006.
- Sturtevant, Edgar H, and E. Adelaide Hahn. *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language* (2nd edition). New Haven: Yale University Press, 1951.
- Ünal, Ahmet. *Ḫattušili III. Teil 1 Ḫattušili bis zu seiner Thronbesteigung. Band 2: Quellen und Indices. Texte der Hethiter* 4. Heidelberg: Winter, 1974.
- . *Ein Orakel text über die Intrigen am hethitischen Hof* (KUB XXIII 70 - Bo 2011). *Texte der Hethiter* 6. Heidelberg: Winter, 1978.
- . *The Hittite Ritual of Ḫantitaššu from the City of Hurma against Troublesome Years*. Ankara: Turkish Historical Society, 1996.
- Vai, Massimo. “Osservazioni sulla periferia sinistra della frase in ittita.” In *Anatolistica indoeuropeistica e oltre nelle memorie dei seminari offerti da Onofrio Carruba (anni 1997-2002) al Medesimo*

- presentate*, edited by Manuel Barbera, Guido Borghi, Manuela Mariani, Alfredo Rizza, and Rosa Ronzitti, 39–56. Milano: Quasar, 2011.
- van den Hout, Theo. *Der Ulmitešub-Vertrag. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 38. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995.
- Werner, Rudolf. *Hethitische Gerichtsprotokolle. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 4. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1967.
- Whitney, William D. *Sanskrit Grammar Including both the Classical Language, and the older Dialects, of Veda and Brahmana*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, and London: Oxford University Press, 1950.
- Widmer, Paul. “Hethitisch *nu* als Mittel der informationsstrukturellen und syntaktischen Verknüpfung.” In *Pragmatische Kategorien. Form, Funktion und Diachronie. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 24. bis 26. September 2007 in Marburg*, edited by Elisabeth Rieken and Paul Widmer, 323–35. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009.
- . “Hethitisch *nu* in den Masat-Briefen. Manuskript.” Accessed May 7th, 2021. https://www.academia.edu/34814159/Hethitisch_nu_in_den_Ma%C5%9Fat-Briefen.
- Zeilfelder, Susanne. “Allmächt *na!* – Zum Vokativ im Hethitischen.” In “*dat ih dir it nu bi huldi gibu.*” *Linguistische, germanistische und indogermanische Studien Rosemarie Lühr gewidmet*, edited by Sergio Neri, Roland Schumann, and Susanne Zeilfelder, 531–32. Wiesbaden: Reichert.