



H. Craig Melchert

Ex Anatolia Lux

Anatolian and Indo-European studies
in honor of

H. Craig Melchert

on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday

edited by

Ronald Kim

Norbert Oettinger

Elisabeth Rieken

Michael Weiss



Beech Stave Press

Ann Arbor • New York

Hittite *mān*, *māḥhan*, *māḥḥan*, *māḥḥanda* and *mānḥanda*

Alwin Kloekhorst

In the *Chicago Hittite Dictionary* (Güterbock et al. 1983–, hereinafter *CHD*), the meaning of *mān* is given as follows (L–N:143–4): “like (postpos.); just as, as (conj.); how (interrog. adv. in main clause); if, whether (conj. introducing an indirect question); when, whenever (conj.); while (?), as long as (?); if (conj. introducing a conditional clause).” The meaning of *māḥhan* is given in the *CHD* as follows (L–N:100): “like (postpos.); as, just as (subordinating conj. of comparison); how, that (conj. in indirect statement or question); how (interrogative adv.); when, as soon as (temporal subordinating conj.).” For *māḥḥanda*, a few times also spelled *mānḥanda*, the meaning “just as (subordinating conj.)” is given (L–N:111).

As we see, *mān* and *māḥhan* are practically identical in their use and meaning, whereas *māḥḥanda* is used in a specific meaning that is shared by *mān* and *māḥhan* as well. This of course raises the question of what the exact distribution of these three forms is. The *CHD* does not express an opinion on this matter,¹ and also in the new *A Grammar of the Hittite Language* by Hoffner and Melchert (2008) no discussion of the difference between these three words can be found (*māḥḥanda* is not even mentioned in the entire book!). The only observations offered by Hoffner and Melchert (2008) are that the temporal meaning ‘when’ is in OH times expressed by *mān*, but in NH times by *māḥhan*, and that the meaning ‘if’ is in NH times only expressed by *mān*, which replaces older *takku*, and not by *māḥhan*.² Nevertheless, already in 1966 Carruba solved most of the basic issues regarding the distribution between *mān*, *māḥhan* and *māḥḥanda*/*mānḥanda*, although some of the details remain unclear, especially concerning the phonetic interpretation of some proposed developments. Although Carruba’s theory is sometimes referred to in more recent literature,³ its absence in the *CHD* and Hoffner and Melchert 2008 and especially the lack of clarity regarding some details makes it worthwhile to review it and to try to solve the loose ends.

Carruba’s basic idea (1966:32–4) is that *māḥḥan* is the outcome of older *māḥḥanda*,

¹It only remarks that “[t]he position of *māḥḥanda*... and *m[āḥhan]* in their clauses requires comments” (*CHD* L–N:110).

²Hoffner and Melchert 2008:290, 415–7.

³E.g. Laroche 1980–81:490, Tischler 1990:87; Melchert 1994:182; Kimball 1999:335; Puhvel 1990:41. In Kloekhorst 2008:338–9 I suggested that *māḥhan* and *māḥḥanda*/*mānḥanda* reflect two different formations, the former containing **ḥan* < nom.-acc.sg. **ḥ₂ent*, the latter **ḥanda* < nom.-acc.pl. **ḥ₂enteb₂*. I do not adhere to this view any longer.

which itself developed out of *mānḥanda*. This *mānḥanda* is then analyzed as a univerbation of *mān* and *ḥanda* “entsprechend, gemäß.”⁴ However, the chronological, semantic and phonological aspects of this theory require some comments.

Chronology

First we must focus on the chronology of the attested forms. According to *CHD s.v.*, both *māḥḥan* and *māḥḥanda/mānḥanda* occur in OS as well as MS texts. If *māḥḥan* really developed out of *māḥḥanda/mānḥanda*, as Carruba’s theory has it, then how can we explain that both forms occur in texts of the same period? Since our ideas on the dating of Hittite texts are constantly evolving, it is always useful to look critically at the dating of specific forms. As already said, according to the *CHD* (L–N:III) *māḥḥanda/mānḥanda* occurs in texts that have to be dated to the OH as well as to the MH period. If we compare the dating of these texts as given by the *CHD* to their dating nowadays given by Hetkonk, we get a quite different picture. It appears that, according to the dating standards of Hetkonk, *all* the texts in which attestations of *māḥḥanda/mānḥanda* can be found, must be dated to the OH period: the *CHD* dates the text KUB 33.59, where in iv 7 we find [*m*]a-a-ah-ḥa-an-ta, as “OH/MS,” but Hetkonk nowadays dates this text as “ah.”; the text KBo 16.45, where in obv. 7 we find *ma-a-an ḥa-an-da* (with word space), is dated by the *CHD* as “MS,” but Hetkonk dates this text too as “ah.” As the *CHD* itself admits, the OH/NS attestation GIM-an-da, cited as a possible sumerographic spelling of *māḥḥanda*, is attested in such a broken context that an interpretation as GIM-an = *māḥḥan* + -tta ‘to you’ cannot be excluded.⁵

In the case of *māḥḥan*, the *CHD* (L–N:100) states that it can be found in OS, MS as well as NS texts. If we compare the dating of the texts in which attestations of *māḥḥan* are found as given by the *CHD* to their dating as nowadays given by Hetkonk, it turns out that the one alleged OS text containing *māḥḥan* in fact might be younger: KBo 9.73, where in obv. 9 we find *ma-a-ah-ḥa-an*, is dated by Hetkonk as “ah.?(mh.?)” Besides this one alleged OH example of *māḥḥan* as cited in the *CHD*, Erich Neu cites a form “*ma-a-ah-ḥa-an-m*[a]” in his transliteration⁶ of the OS text KBo 25.87:7 which he then analyzes as *māḥḥan* “mit Partikel -ma.”⁷ This reading cannot be correct, however, as in OH times the particle -ma only occurs after vowels, its postconsonantal variant being non-geminating -a.⁸ The form is therefore better read

⁴With this discovery the older theories that *māḥḥan* is the “Lentoform” of original *mān* (Friedrich 1952:132; likewise Kronasser 1966:353) or that *mān* is the “Allegroform” of original *māḥḥan* (Szemerényi 1956:99) became untenable. Note however that Szemerényi already analyzed “*māḥḥan(t)*” as reflecting a compound consisting of the interrogative stem *ma-* + *ḥant-* ‘face’, forming a neuter form used as an adverb.

⁵All attestations of *māḥḥanda/mānḥanda* are as follows: *ma-a-ah-ḥa-an-da* KBo 6.2 iii 19 (OS), KBo 17.1 iii 1 (fr.) (OS), KBo 17.22 iii 8 (OS), KBo 19.1 iii 45 (OS), KBo 25.87:7 (OS; not cited by the *CHD*, but see below), KBo 25.122 ii 4 (OS); [*m*]a-a-ah-ḥa-an-ta KUB 33.59 iv 7 (OS); *ma-a-an-ḥa-an-da* KBo 25.112 ii 14 (OS), KBo 22.1:22 (OS), KUB 28.75 ii 24 (OS); *ma-a-an ḥa-an-da* KBo 16.45 obv. 7 (OS).

⁶Neu 1980:167.

⁷Neu 1983:112, repeated in Neu 1985:147.

⁸The only alleged other case where -ma would appear in a postconsonantal position in an OS text, is

as *ma-a-ah-ḥa-an-d*[a].⁹ This means that there are no secure examples of *māḥḥan* in OS texts.

Schematically, we get the following overview:

	<i>māḥḥanda/ mānḥanda</i>	<i>māḥḥan</i>
OS	+	–
MS	–	+
NS	–	+

As we see, *māḥḥanda/mānḥanda* and *māḥḥan* now turn out to be in a chronologically complementary distribution: *māḥḥanda/mānḥanda* only occurs in OS texts, whereas *māḥḥan* only occurs in MS and NS texts. Carruba’s theory that *māḥḥan* is the younger variant of *māḥḥanda/mānḥanda* has now gained chronological support.

Semantics/Function

The second point we should look at is the semantics of the two forms: do *māḥḥanda/mānḥanda* and *māḥḥan* have the same function and meaning? The best way to check this is by looking at younger copies of OH originals where *māḥḥanda/mānḥanda* is used. In doing so, we find that in all such cases the younger copy shows *māḥḥan*. A first example of this is KBo 6.2 + KBo 22.62 iii 19–20 (OS):

(19) ... *ma-a-ah-ḥa-an-da a-re*-[eš-(š)-me-eš]

(20) *šū-me-eš-š-a a-pé-ni-iš-ša-an i-iš-te-e*[n]

‘You, too, must do just as your comrades’

In a younger copy of this text, *māḥḥanda* has been replaced by *māḥḥan*:¹⁰

KBo 6.3 iii (OH/NS)

(22) ... *ma-ah-ḥa-an a-re-eš-(š)-me-eš šū-m*[e-eš-š-a]

(23) *a-pé-e-ni-iš-ša-an e-eš-te-en*

ḥé-e-a-u-e-eš-ma-aš (KUB 29.3 i 8), which Neu (1983:64) analyzes as nom.pl. *ḥēayēš* ‘mit -ma ‘aber’ und Pronomen -aš ‘eos’.’ This cannot be correct either: in OH times the acc.pl.c. form of the enclitic pronoun is -uš, which only in NH times is replaced by -aš. Since we cannot be dealing with nom.sg.c. -aš either (the sentence already contains a nominative form, namely *ḥēayēš*), the form can only be analyzed as *ḥé-e-a-u-e-eš-(š)-ma-aš* ‘the rains for you/them’ (note that the NS copy KUB 29.1 i 27 has *ḥé-e-ia-u-e-eš* without any enclitics).

⁹Collation on the basis of a photograph of this tablet (available through Hetkonk) shows that the last sign indeed can be read as *d*[a]; compare on the same photo the sign *da* as found in KBo 17.30 ii 4 (which is a join to KBo 25.87). Note that this attestation of *māḥḥanda* should be added to the *CHD*.

¹⁰In another NS copy of this text, KBo 19.4, we only find i (6) [...]*ma-ah-ḥa-a*[n ...], which breaks off at the crucial point.

The same is true for KBo 6.2 + KBo 19.1 iii 44–6 (OS):¹¹

(44) *ták-ku MÁŠ.GAL e-na-an-da-an ták-ku DÀRA.MÁŠ an-na-nu-uh-ḫa-an*
ták-ku UDU.KUR.RA e-na-[an-da-an]

(45) *ku-iš-ki ta-a-i-ez-zi ma-a-ah-ḫa-an-da ŠA GU₄.APIN.LÁ ta-ia-zi-la-aš*

(46) *ki-in-z[a]-a[n-n-a u]r²-[tar?]* QA-TAM-MA

‘If someone steals an *enant*- billy-goat, a trained deer [or] an *enant*- mountain goat, just as in the case of theft of an ox, also of these the disposition is the same.’

In all its younger copies, *māḫḫanda* has been replaced by *māḫḫan*:

KBo 6.3 (OH/NS) iii

(49) *ták-ku MÁŠ.GAL e-na-an-da-an ták-ku DÀRA.MÁŠ an-na-nu-uh-ḫa-an*
ták-ku UDU.KUR.RA e-na-an-da-an

(50) *ku-iš-ki da-a-i-ez-zi ma-ah-ḫa-an ŠA MÁŠ.GAL (sic) šar-ni-ik-zi-i-il a-pé-e-el-l-a QA-TAM-MA-pát*

KBo 6.8 (OH/NS) ii

(3) *ták-ku MÁŠ.GAL e-na-an-da-an ták-ku DÀRA[.MÁŠ an-na-nu-uh-ḫa-an]*

(4) *ták-ku UDU.KUR.RA e-na-an-da-an ku-iš-ki da-a-[i-ez-zi]*

(5) *ma-ah-ḫa-an ŠA MÁŠ.GAL (sic) šar-ni-ik-ze-el <a-pé-el-l-a> QA-TAM-MA-pát*

KUB 13.12 (OH/NS) obv.

(7) [*ták-ku M*]ÁŠ.GAL *e-na-an-da-an* [*ták-ku DÀRA.MÁŠ*]

(8) [*an-na-nu-uh-ḫ*]a-an *ták-ku UDU.KUR.RA* [*e-na-an-da-an ku-iš-ki*]

(9) [*da-a-i-ez-z*]i *ma-a-ah-ḫa-an* Š[A...šar-ni-ik-ze-el a-pé-el-l-a QA-TAM-MA-pát]

These examples show that *māḫḫanda*/*mānḫanda* and *māḫḫan* are used in identical contexts, having identical meanings. Together with the chronological distribution discussed in the preceding section, this is sufficient proof that Carruba was right that *māḫḫan* has to be regarded the younger outcome of OH *māḫḫanda*/*mānḫanda*.

Phonological developments

The last point we have to investigate is how we can account for the development of *māḫḫanda*/*mānḫanda* to *māḫḫan* on a phonological level. First, a few remarks about

¹¹Cf. Hoffner 1997:75–6.

the formal aspects of *māḫḫan*. This word is spelled *ma-a-ah-ḫa-an* as well as *ma-ah-ḫa-an*.¹² According to the CHD (L–N:100), in MS texts and in NS copies of OH and MH compositions we find *ma-a-ah-ḫa-an* as well as *ma-ah-ḫa-an*. In NH originals, however, we only find *ma-ah-ḫa-an*. This implies that the variants *ma-a-ah-ḫa-an*/*ma-ah-ḫa-an* are chronologically distributed: older *ma-a-ah-ḫa-an* vs. younger *ma-ah-ḫa-an*. This fits in well with the observation that OH long /ā/ in the sequence /āCCV/ has been shortened to /a/ in the course of time (cf. Kloekhorst 2008:98). This means that we are here dealing with a phonetically regular development of older *ma-a-ah-ḫa-an* /māHan/ to younger *ma-ah-ḫa-an* /maHan/.

Now we should focus on the development of *māḫḫanda* to *māḫḫan*. According to Carruba (1966:34), the disappearance of the final syllable *-da* of *māḫḫanda* could have taken place via two scenarios. It has been lost either (1) “infolge der enklitischen Stellung, vor allem am Anfang des Satzes”; or (2) “über ein gesprochenes *māḫḫant*, da ungeschütztes *t* nach *n* im Heth. ausfällt.” Some of the scholars that follow Carruba’s derivation of *māḫḫan* < *māḫḫanda* remain agnostic about the phonetic side of this development. For instance, Tischler (1990:87) talks about a ‘shortening’ “aus unbekannten Gründen” and Puhvel (2004:41) comes up with “an apocopated variant **mānḫant*,” without explaining what he means by this. Melchert (1994:182) is more explicit, however. According to him, “[t]he loss of the final syllable in *mānḫanda* > *māḫḫan* [...] is surely specially conditioned in a weakly accented conjunction,” whereby he follows Carruba’s first scenario. Yet, as far as I know, no other specially conditioned phonetic developments in weakly accented conjunctions have taken place in the (pre)history of Hittite. I am therefore inclined rather to follow Carruba’s second scenario.

At first sight, we would tend to interpret *māḫḫanda* phonologically as /māHanta/ with a full word-final vowel /-a/. Yet, it seems impossible to me that an OH form /māHanta/ would develop into younger /māHan/, even in sentence-initial position, where it might have been weakly accented: other OH words in /-anta/ always remain as such, e.g. 3pl.pres.midd. forms ending in *-anta*, nom.-acc.pl.n. forms like *ḫūmanta*, and, more importantly, an adverb like *mēnaḫḫanda* ‘facing, opposite’, which must have stood in unaccented position as well.¹³ I therefore reject a phonological interpretation of *māḫḫanda* as /māHanta/.

¹²The one attestation *ma-ah-ḫa-a-an* (KUB 51.19 obv. 9 (MS)) must be a scribal error; compare erratic *gal-gal-tu-⟨tu⟩u-ri* in the preceding line (cf. CHD L–N:100).

¹³The shortening of /ē/ to /e/ as seen in the development of OH *me-e-na-ah-ḫa-an-da* to NH *me-na-ah-ḫa-an-da* must be explained as due to loss of accentuation in enclitic position (I will expand on this topic on another occasion). Note that the three attestations of *me-na-ah-ḫa-an*, without final *-da* (KUB 10.17 ii 29, KUB 20.35 iii 11, KBo 25.109 ii 6), which are adduced by Neu (1974:61 n. 84) as possible parallel cases to the loss of *-da* in *māḫḫanda* > *māḫḫan*, must in at least two cases be regarded as scribal errors, as is clear from the facts described by Neu himself, namely that the first form occurs on a tablet that also contains the form *me-na-ah-ḫa-an-da*, with *-da* (ibid. iii 25), and that the last form occurs on a tablet that contains other scribal errors as well. Therefore, these three attestations, which are clearly aberrant when compared to the enormous numbers of attestations with *-da* or *-ta* (more than 300 examples in my files), must be regarded as non-probative.

It is also possible, however, to phonologically interpret *māḥḥanda* in a different way. Consider the spelling of the following instrumentals: *ḥar-ša-an-ta* ‘with the head’, *iš-ḥa-an-da* ‘with blood’, *iš-ḥi-ma-an-da*, *iš-ḥi-ma-an-ta* ‘with a rope’, *ú-i-da-an-da*, *ú-i-ta-an-ta*, *ú-e-da-an-da* ‘with water’. Since we know that the instrumental ending originally consisted of *-t* only, these forms are generally phonologically interpreted as follows: /Hrsánt/ < **h₃rs-én-t*, /isHánt/ < **h₁sh₂-én-t*, /isHimánt/ < **sh₂i-mén-t*, /uidánt/ < **ud-én-t*. Since in these words the spellings *-Ca-an-da* and *-Ca-an-ta* clearly represent /-Cant/, it is also possible that in *māḥḥanda*, which is spelled *ma-a-ah-ḥa-an-da* as well as *ma-a-ah-ḥa-an-ta*, the spelling *-Ca-an-da/-Ca-an-ta* represents /-Cant/. It is therefore unproblematic to interpret *māḥḥanda* phonologically as /māHant/, without a full word-final vowel /-a/.

The presence of word-final postconsonantal /-t/ (“ungeschütztes *t*,” in Carruba’s terminology) is rare in Hittite. In fact, we know that in the prehistory of Hittite, word-final postconsonantal **-t* was regularly dropped: e.g. the nom.-acc.sg.n. of participles in **-ent* yielded Hitt. *-an*.¹⁴ Only in cases where there was a model for analogical restoration was it restored. For instance, in the instrumentals just mentioned, **-t* must have been restored on the basis of instrumentals of nouns with a stem ending in a vowel where it was regularly retained. It is clear, however, that the presence of postconsonantal word-final /-t/ in these instrumentals in /-ant/ remained awkward, and in the post-OH period, they are therefore all replaced by forms in /-it/, e.g. *e-ēš-ḥa-ni-it* ‘with blood’, *iš-ḥi-ma-ni-it* ‘with a rope’, *ú-i-te-ni-it* ‘with water’. This indicates that the elimination of word-final postconsonantal /-t/ was still an ongoing process in Hittite. It therefore seems quite possible to me that an OH form /māHant/, whatever be the origin of the word-final /-t/ in it (which we will discuss in more detail below), yielded post-OH /māHan/, spelled *ma-a-ah-ḥa-an*, by regular sound change.

This means that Carruba’s theory that *māḥḥanda* within Hittite develops into *māḥḥan* is not only supported by chronological and functional observations, but also can be regarded as phonetically regular as well.

māḥḥanda

Now it is time to look at the origins of *māḥḥanda* = /māHant/ itself. As we have seen, *māḥḥanda* is a few times also spelled *mānḥanda*, and once even *mān ḥanda*, with word space, which led Carruba to the assumption that these forms go back to a univerbation of *mān* and *ḥanda*. According to him, “das anlautende *-n* von *mān* [ist] vor *-ḥ* assimiliert worden” as e.g. in *ma-a-am-ma-an* < **mān-man*.

¹⁴On the basis of forms like *e-ku-ut-ta* ‘he drank’ (not **e-ku-ut*) and *li-in-kat-ta* ‘he swore’ (not **li-in-kat*), we can tell that the postconsonantal 3sg.pret.act. ending of the *mi*-conjugation was /-ta/, and not /-t/, as is sometimes assumed. This means that we have to assume that the PIE 3sg.pret.act. ending **-t* was regularly lost, and was subsequently replaced by the corresponding middle ending *-tta* < **-to*, cf. Kloekhorst 2008:800–1.

Although Carruba is right that *-n-* seems to regularly drop before certain consonants, like *-m*,¹⁵ *-š*,¹⁶ and *-u*,¹⁷ it does not unconditionally drop before *-ḥ-*. For instance, the oldest forms of the paradigm of the verb *šanḥ-zi* ‘to seek, to clean’ show that the *-n-* is only dropped before *-ḥ-* when another consonant follows, but is retained when a vowel follows: *ša-ah-mi* vs. *ša-an-ḥe-er*. Since in *mānḥanda* the *-ḥ-* is not followed by a consonant, the loss of *-n-* is not expected. Melchert (1994:124) therefore states that the “consistent loss (or assimilation) of the first *n* in *mānḥanda* > *māḥḥan* ‘as’ is especially conditioned in a univerbation.” Although this may not be impossible, we could perhaps also explain the loss of *-n-* in *mānḥanda* > *māḥḥanda* in another way. The loss of *-n-* in *VnḥC* vs. the retention of *-n-* in *VnḥV* is determined by the heaviness of the cluster: in a heavy cluster *-n-* is dropped, in a light cluster it is retained. It seems quite possible to me that the presence of a long vowel before the cluster *-nḥ-* in *mānḥanda* makes this cluster heavy as well, /V:nHV/, and that this is the reason why *-n-* is dropped in this form.

mānḥanda > *māḥḥanda* > *māḥḥan* > *māḥḥan*

Taking all evidence into account, we can now set up the following chronology: the univerbation of *mān* /mān/ and *ḥanda* /Hant/ yielded the OH form *mānḥanda* /mānHant/, in which the *-n-* was regularly dropped in OH times already, yielding *māḥḥanda* /māHant/. A little while later, at the end of the OH period, word-final /-t/ was regularly dropped, yielding the MH form *māḥḥan* /māHan/. Within the course of the MH period, the long /ā/ of /māHan/ was regularly shortened as it stood in a non-final closed syllable, yielding *māḥḥan* /maHan/, which is the form that is found in some (late) MH originals, but especially in NH originals.

mān vs. *mān ḥanda*

The last question we should now ask ourselves is: what exactly is this element *ḥanda*? And what was the initial semantic and functional difference between *mān* and *mān ḥanda* > *mānḥanda* > *māḥḥanda* > *māḥḥan* > *māḥḥan*? We therefore have to first look more closely at the function and meaning of *mān* as attested in the oldest texts. If we schematize the semantic description of the OH attestations of *mān* as given in the CHD (L–N:143–4), we get the following table:

¹⁵E.g. *ku-e-mi* ‘I kill’ < **kuenmi* < **g^{wh}én-mi*, or *ma-a-am-ma-an* < **mān-man*, cf. Kloekhorst 2008:87–8 for details.

¹⁶E.g. *ku-e-ši* ‘you kill’ < **g^{wh}én-si*, *ḥa-a-ra-aš* ‘eagle’ < **h₃érōns*.

¹⁷E.g. *ku-e-u-en* ‘we killed’ < **g^{wh}én-uen*.

Meaning	Place in sentence
'when'	• conj. in main clauses + pres. • in main clauses + pret.
'just as'	• conj. in main clauses + pres. (when the verb is similar to that of the following clause) • postpos.
'how'	• in main interrogative clauses
'if/whether'	• conj. in indirect questions

We see that in principle the meaning of *mān* is fully determined by its syntactical use, i.e. by the type of sentence it occurs in, and by the place it occupies within that sentence. If, for instance, *mān* occurs in a main clause whose verb stands in the preterite, it can only mean 'when'; if it is used as a postposition, it can only mean 'just as'; if it is used in an indirect question it can only mean 'if/whether'; etc. There is one syntactical use, however, where the meaning of *mān* is ambiguous, namely when it occurs as a conjunction in a main clause whose verb stands in the present and is similar to the verb of the following clause. One such instance is the following context:

KBo 17.3 (OS) ii

(15) *ma-a-an* ^dUTU ^dIM *ne-e-pi-iš te-e-kán-n-a*

iii

(1) [*uk-tu-u-ri-eš* LUGAL-*uš* MUNUS.LUGAL-*š-a* DUMU^{MEŠ}-*š-a*]

(2) [*uk-tu-u-ri-e* *š-a-š-a-an-tu*]

This sentence can in theory be translated in two ways: (1) 'When the Sun-god, the Storm-god, Heaven and Earth are everlasting, may the king and queen and (their) children be everlasting'; or (2) 'Just as the Sun-god, the Storm-god, Heaven and Earth are everlasting, may the king and queen and (their) children be everlasting'. Although the second translation seems to make more sense than the first one, it cannot in principle be determined which translation is the correct one. Yet, the duplicate of this text shows *māḥḥanda* instead of *mān*:

KBo 17.1 (OS) iii

(1) [*ma-a-a*] *b-ḥa-an-da* ^dUTU-*uš* ^dIM-*aš* *ne-e-pi-iš te-e[-kán-n-a]*

(2) *uk-tu-u-ri-e-š* LUGAL-*uš* MUNUS.LUGAL-*aš-š-a* DUMU^{MEŠ}-*š-a* *uk-tu-u-ri-e-š a-š[a-a]n[-t]u*

This makes it clear that the correct translation of this text is: 'Just as the Sun-god, the Storm-god, Heaven and Earth are everlasting, may the king and queen and (their) children be everlasting'. It seems as if *mān*, which in this position is semantically ambiguous, has in the latter text been replaced by *māḥḥanda* in order to disambiguate the

meaning of this clause. Since *mān* is semantically ambiguous in sentence-initial position only, it cannot to my mind be coincidental that in OS texts, *māḥḥanda*/*mānḥanda* 'just as, like' is almost only¹⁸ used as a subordinating conjunction in sentence-initial position as well. These two facts must be interconnected.

We have already seen that *māḥḥanda*/*mānḥanda* probably is the result of univerbation of *mān* and *ḥanda*, as is especially indicated by the one attestation where we find *mān ḥanda* with word space. I assume that in cases where the word *mān* was ambiguous as to whether it meant 'when' or 'just as', namely when it was used as a sentence initial conjunction in a main clause with a present verb that was similar to the verb of the following clause, the meaning 'just as' was reinforced by using the word *ḥanda* /Hant/, the nom.-acc.sg. form of the noun *ḥant*- 'face, forehead', which in its adverbial use could mean 'in view of (the fact that), in accordance with'. In other words, by adding *ḥanda* 'in view of, in accordance with', which is semantically comparable to the meaning 'just as', the meaning of the semantically ambiguous conjunction *mān* 'when; just as' was disambiguated in favor of the meaning 'just as'. Apparently, *mān* and *ḥanda* soon univerbated and came to form a new conjunction *mānḥanda* 'just as', which then phonetically developed into *māḥḥanda*, etc.

This scenario also explains the presence of word-final postconsonantal *-t* in *māḥḥanda*/*mānḥanda* /mā(n)Hant/. Within the paradigm of *ḥant*- 'forehead' < **h₂ent*-, the nom.-acc.sg. form **h₂ént* should regularly have lost its word-final **-t*. Yet, on the basis of the other case forms within this paradigm, **h₂ent-V*, the **-t* was restored, yielding Hitt. /Hant/. Soon after the moment of univerbation of *mān* and *ḥanda* /Hant/ to *mānḥanda* /mānHant/ which subsequently developed into *māḥḥanda* /māHant/, the link with the paradigm of *ḥant*- 'forehead' was lost, however, and word-final postconsonantal *-t* was regularly dropped after all.

Later developments

Already within the OH period, we see that *māḥḥanda*/*mānḥanda* spreads to other syntactic contexts as well, as can be inferred from KBo 25.112 ii (14) *A-NA* [*ḥal-ḥu-u-ti ma-a-an-ḥa-an-d[a]*] (15) *ma-a-al-di ke-e-a QA-TAM-MA* 'just as he chants before the *ḥalpūti*, (he chants) these things in the same way', where *mānḥanda* is not used in sentence-initial position, but rather as a postposition. In MH times, where *mānḥanda* > *māḥḥanda* has phonetically developed into *māḥḥan* > *māḥḥan*, the use of *māḥḥan* becomes more widespread. Since the OH word *takku* 'if' disappeared and its function was taken over in MH times by *mān*, a new ambiguity arose. In cases where *mān* is used as the conjunction of a main clause with a present verb, it can now mean both 'if' and 'when'. In order to resolve this ambiguity, *māḥḥan* is used increasingly in the meaning 'when', and by NH times, the normal word for 'when' is *māḥḥan*, whereas *mān* is used as 'if'. It also seems that *māḥḥan* begins to replace *mān* in other functions that originally only belonged to the latter. It would, however, go beyond the scope of this paper to investigate these replacements in great detail.

¹⁸The CHD says in nine of the ten attestations, but in fact *māḥḥanda*/*mānḥanda* occurs sentence-initially in ten of the eleven attestations.

Conclusions

I hope to have shown that NH *mahhan* /maHan/ < MH *māhhan* /māHan/ is the phonetically regular outcome of OH *māhḫanda* /māHant/ < *mānḫanda* /mānHant/, which is the result of univerbation of *mān* and *ḫanda* /Hant/, and that the collocation of *mān ḫanda* was originally used to better distinguish the usage of *mān* ‘when’ and *mān* ‘just as’ in the one context where there could be doubt about its interpretation, namely when used as the sentence-initial conjunction of a main clause with a present verb form that is similar to the verb form of the following clause. After the univerbation of *mān* and *ḫanda*, the word *mānḫanda* underwent several phonological developments, yielding *māhḫanda* > *māhhan* > *mahhan*, which can now all be shown to be due to regular sound laws.

References

- Carruba, Onofrio. 1966. *Das Beschwörungsritual für die Göttin Wišurijanša*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Friedrich, Johannes. 1952. *Hethitisches Wörterbuch: Kurzgefaßte kritische Sammlung der Deutungen hethitischer Wörter*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Güterbock, Hans G., Harry A. Hoffner, and Theo P. J. van den Hout, eds. 1983–. *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Hetkonk = Silvin Košak. *Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln, Online-Datenbank*. www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/.
- Hoffner, Harry A., Jr. 1997. *The Laws of the Hittites: A Critical Edition*. Leiden: Brill.
- Hoffner, Harry A., Jr., and H. Craig Melchert. 2008. *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Kimball, Sara E. 1999. *Hittite Historical Phonology*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kronasser, Heinz. 1966. *Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache*. Bd. 1. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Laroche, Emmanuel. 1980–81. “Langues et civilisation de l’Asie Mineure.” *Annuaire du Collège de France* 81:485–93.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1994. *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Neu, Erich. 1974. *Der Anitta-Text*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- . 1980. *Althethitische Ritualtexte in Umschrift*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- . 1983. *Glossar zu den althethitischen Ritualtexten*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- . 1985. “Zum Alter der Pleneschreibung *ma-a-ah-ḫa-an* in hethitischen Texten.” *Hethitica* 6:139–59.
- Puhvel, Jaan. 2004. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Vol. 6, *Words Beginning with M*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Szemerényi, Oswald. 1956. “Latin *tantus*, *quantus* and the genitive of price, with an excursus on *quando* and Gk. ‘*πρῶτα*’.” *Glotta* 35:92–114.
- Tischler, Johann. 1990. *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*. Lieferungen 5 und 6: *L–M*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.