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Abstract

This thesis investigates the syntax of unemphatic pronouns in the Anatolian branch of Indo-European, from both a diachronic and a descriptive synchronic point of view. Most of the particular morphological elements studied are clitics positioned by Wackernagel's Law, and evidence is presented throughout the thesis that this process must be understood syntactically rather than exclusively phonologically or prosodically. Chapter 1 contains surveys of the Anatolian family, the corpora of the languages used in the thesis (Hittite, Palaic, Cuneiform Luvian, and Lycian), and the unemphatic pronouns under investigation. Chapter 2 consists largely of a survey of some important features of Anatolian syntax: topicalization and WH-movement, verb serialization, focus movement, possessor raising, and quantifier float. It is also argued that the Anatolian languages have a split-ergative case-marking system in which neuters inflect ergatively and common-gender nouns accusatively.

Chapter 3 studies the distribution of subject clitics. Subject clitics were an innovation of the Anatolian family, and this chapter demonstrates that these clitics are in fact restricted, throughout Hittite and possibly Anatolian, to the subject position of clauses with unaccusative verbs. Chapter 4 studies the distribution of possessive pronouns. After an investigation of the Old Hittite system of possessor marking, it argues, first, that the process of possessor raising as well as possessive function for Wackernagel's Law pronouns were independent innovations of Middle Hittite and other Anatolian languages, and second, that after this innovation, Wackernagel's Law was constrained from operating in certain well-defined syntactic contexts. Chapter 5 studies two special features of Lycian. It argues that a characteristic construction of that language, the "topic construction", reflects the grammaticalization of an inherited discourse-driven left-dislocation structure, and that the Lycian nasal preterite continues inherited sequences of verb plus direct object.
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Chapter One: Introduction

1.1. Wackernagel's Law

This dissertation will investigate several aspects of the syntax of sentence-second clitics, also called Wackernagel's Law clitics, in the Anatolian branch of Indo-European. "Wackernagel's Law" is a descriptive cover term for a class of processes which position certain words—typically unstressed adverbs and pronouns—in the second position of their sentence. It was identified for Indo-European and discussed at length in a famous article by Wackernagel (1892), and has since been found in numerous languages throughout the world (see e.g. Kaisse 1985 for a review). Indo-European examples of the operation of Wackernagel's Law appear in (1.1a) from Arcadian Greek and (1.1b) from Vedic Sanskrit, and examples from Finnish (Nevis 1986: 6) and Warlpiri (Nash 1985: 178) appear in (1.2a) and (1.2b) respectively:

(1.1) a  IG 5.2.6 (Buck 1955: 201)

   eik án ti génetoī tōs ergonais tōs in toī autoī érgoi
   "If anything happens among contractors on the same job ..."

   b  RV 1.76.1d (cited by Hale 1987a: 9)

   kéna vá te mánasā dáśema
   "Or by what intent would we worship you?"

(1.2) a  Olet=han itsekī samaa mieltā

   are=PTCL self.too same opinion
   "You are yourself of the same opinion, you know"

   b  Karli jarniti=rmi=nja=rIa=jinta=rna=ju pantu-rnu

   boomerang trim=INF=REFL=PROX=COMP=I=me pierce-PAST
   "I cut myself (accidentally) while trimming the boomerang"
In (1.1a) the modal clitic an and the enclitic relative ti follow their clause's first word, as do the sentence-connective clitic va and pronominal clitic te in (1.1b) and the modal clitic han in (1.2a). In (1.2b) second position is occupied by a string of six clitics which follow, not the first word, but a sentence-initial syntactic constituent, in particular a VP.

The use of a single cover term like "Wackernagel's Law" in this dissertation is not intended to imply that all words in sentence-second position are positioned by a single process, or that sentence-second or Wackernagel's position can necessarily be defined uniformly even in a single language. The definition of second position in fact varies across languages, and within languages across Wackernagel's Law items: in some cases, "second" position follows a sentence's first phonological word, for example, and in some other cases it follows topicalized constituents of any length (compare [1.1] and [1.2a] on the one hand and [1.2b] on the other). With this caveat, though, it has proven and may continue to prove productive to consider various Wackernagel's Law phenomena together. The use of the term "clitic" here is, moreover, not intended to imply that elements with differing accentual status necessarily differ syntactically, or that a class of "clitics" will ultimately prove necessary in analytic linguistic description. All Wackernagel's Law elements in Anatolian appear to be phonologically enclitic.

My interests and approach in this dissertation are both synchronic and diachronic. It has of course long been known by historical linguists that the comparative method cannot be practiced without adequate synchronic descriptions; in the case of diachronic configurational syntax, as noted by Hale (1987a: 1-2), this requires the analytic techniques associated with generative syntax. It is equally true, although less often asserted, that at least in principle synchronic analysis cannot be practiced in the absence of diachronic analysis. This is because the objective of synchronic analysis—or generative analysis in particular—is an explanation of the productive linguistic knowledge of speakers of a given language, which, in many instances, can only be distinguished from unproductive memorized knowledge by means of diachronic analysis. For example, patterns of case
syncretism are certainly significant for any general theory of nominal case, but only diachronic analysis can reveal whether a particular syncretism results from the phonological merger of two historically distinct cases (which is unlikely to be generally significant) or from speakers' productive replacement of one case by another (which is quite likely to be significant). Likewise, although a theoretical account of Wackernagel's Law phenomena is not my objective, I will argue that the specific course of certain historical changes in Anatolian can cast some light on such a theory.

The particular focus of this dissertation is the operation of Wackernagel's Law on pronominal clitics, and especially the historical evolution and successive synchronic states associated with three varieties of pronominal clitics: subjects, possessive pronouns, and doubled or pleonastic pronouns. These topics will be discussed in chapters 3, 4, and 5 respectively, while chapter 2 will provide some necessary background discussion of Anatolian syntax in general. The title of this dissertation is thus excessive in scope inasmuch as there are some important aspects of pronominal clitic syntax which will not be discussed here. To give only two examples, I will not discuss either the conditions under which argument clitics in general can be omitted in Anatolian or the conditions under which certain non-verbal arguments, such as prepositional complements, can appear as pronominal clitics.

1.2. The Anatolian Languages and Corpora

The Anatolian branch of Indo-European consists of a number of languages attested from the second and first millennia B.C.E., almost all spoken in Anatolia (modern Turkey and northern Syria). In chronological order of attestations, the most significant Anatolian languages are Hittite, Palaic, Cuneiform Luwian, Hieroglyphic Luwian, Lycian, and Lydian. Of these Cuneiform Luwian and Hieroglyphic Luwian certainly subgroup, and I may use the term "Luwian" for features they share; other subgroups within Anatolian are likely but not yet proven. This dissertation systematically includes data from four Anatolian
languages—Lycian, Cuneiform Luvian, Palaic, and Hittite—discussed individually below. Several other languages have been excluded from the scope of this dissertation and warrant a brief comment. First, I have not attempted to collect data from Lydian, which is attested in some one hundred inscriptions from the middle of the first millennium B.C.E., or from Milyan (also called "Lycian B"), a sister of Lycian attested in two inscriptions from the same period, or from any of the minor and only possibly Anatolian languages like Carian and Sidetic. These languages are all too poorly understood to be useful in syntactic research, although Lydian in particular is well enough attested that it might in the future be able to play a more significant role.

Second, I have deliberately excluded data from Hieroglyphic Luvian—the only Anatolian language attested from both the second and first millennia—even though it is certainly well enough attested and understood to be relevant here. The reason for this decision is entirely pragmatic: a new edition of the Hieroglyphic Luvian corpus is in press, and in view of certain philological problems associated with this language, time spent collecting linguistic data in advance of the publication of this edition is probably wasted. I have no doubt that Hieroglyphic Luvian data will necessitate revision of at least a few of the conclusions of this dissertation.

1.2.1. Hittite

Hittite is by far the best attested and most extensively investigated Anatolian language. It is known from some thirty thousand clay tablets and tablet fragments (and one bronze tablet) engraved in the cuneiform script used throughout the Near East, most of which have been found in the course of excavating the Hittite capital at ancient Hattuša, near modern Boğazkale in central Turkey. On archeological and historical grounds these tablets have been dated between the middle of the eighteenth century and the end of the thirteenth century B.C.E., when the Hittite Empire was overthrown. The standard Hittite dictionary and grammar, both unfortunately out-of-date, are those of Friedrich (1952) and (1960).
respectively; newer dictionaries by Friedrich & Kammenhuber (1975ff) and Güterbock & Hoffner (1980ff) are not yet complete.

The Hittite language is conventionally divided into three periods, Old Hittite from ca. 1750 to ca. 1600, Middle Hittite from ca. 1600 to ca. 1400, and Neo-Hittite from ca. 1400 to ca. 1200; manuscripts dating from these periods can be identified paleographically, and texts composed during these periods can be identified linguistically. In addition, it is known that there are linguistic differences between early and late Neo-Hittite compositions, and it is has recently been suggested by Neu (1979a) that texts composed during the reign of Ṣuppiluliuma I in particular have, against the traditional assumption, more Middle Hittite than Neo-Hittite linguistic features (but see Melchert 1984a: 82-83 n. 8). In this dissertation I have therefore divided the "Neo-Hittite" period into five distinct chronological periods corresponding to the reigns of different kings: Ṣuppiluliuma I; Muršili II; Muwatalli; Hattušili III; and Tuthaliya IV with Ṣuppiluliuma II. I have thus collected data from seven distinct chronological periods of Hittite, although in contexts where the last five periods agree with respect to a particular linguistic phenomenon, I may refer to them collectively as "Neo-Hittite" without prejudice to Neu's views.

Since old texts were frequently re-copied during the five centuries of Hittite's attestation, any text may survive in a manuscript which is either contemporary with or later than its date of composition. An Old Hittite composition may survive in a more or less contemporary Old Hittite manuscript, for example, or in a Neo-Hittite manuscript copied some five hundred years afterwards. During this copying process, linguistic archaisms were often modernized and false archaisms were occasionally inserted. This means that the best evidence for determining the linguistic features of any stage of Hittite must be compositions from that stage recorded in manuscripts from that stage, and that later copies are only probative when it is possible to control for modernizations and false archaisms; see in general Melchert (1977: 2-9). In collecting Hittite data for chapters 3 and 4 of this dissertation I have therefore used primarily, for each of the seven chronological periods indicated above, texts
which were composed in that period and written down in contemporary manuscripts. All statements about these periods of Hittite are based on the corpora listed below, which are drawn from Melchert (1977: 40-131), Oettinger (1979: 574-77), Melchert (1984a: 80-83), and Yoshida (1990: 7-43), and arranged and numbered according to the system of Laroche (1971, 1972). In addition to limiting these corpora to contemporary manuscripts, I have excluded texts or manuscripts which are too short or fragmentary for meaningful syntactic research. Some texts were also excluded for reasons of time or accessibility, and future research could expand my corpora to include both these and late manuscripts of older texts. Otherwise, the following corpora are intended to include most contemporary manuscripts of well-preserved texts of a reasonable length. Data was collected either, if possible, from published editions or transliterations (cited in parentheses for those texts which have them) or, otherwise, directly from the published autographs.

1.2.1.1. Old Hittite

1. Proclamation of Anitta (Neu 1974)
   A. KBo 3.22

3. Zalpa (Otten 1973)
   1.A. KBo 22.2

8. Palace chronicle
   D. KUB 36.104

9. Palace chronicle fragments
   5. KBo 8.42

25. Treaty of Zidanza with Pilliya (Otten 1951)

27. Treaty with the Habiru (Otten 1957)


291. Laws, series one (Friedrich 1959; Otten & Souček 1966)
   1.A. KBo 6.2 + 19.1 + 1a + 22.61 + 62
1.B. KUB 29.16 + KBo 19.2

1.C. KUB 29.13

292. Laws, series two (Friedrich 1959)

1.A. KUB 29.25 (+) 28 (+) 29 + 30 (+) 32 (+) 35 + 36

416. Ritual for the royal couple

1.A. KBo 17.1 + 25.3 (Neu 1980a nr. 3)

1.B. KBo 17.3 + 4 + 20.15 + KUB 43.32 (+) KBo 17.2 (Neu 1980a nrs. 2, 4)

2. KBo 17.5 (Neu 1980a nr. 5)

3. KBo 17.6 (Neu 1980a nr. 6)

4. KBo 17.7 + 25.7 + IBoT 3.135 (Neu 1980a nr. 7)

627. KI.LAM festival (Singer 1984 nr. 1h)

ABoT 5+

631. Storm ritual (Neu 1980a nr. 25)

1.B. KBo 17.11 (+) KBo 20.12 (+) KUB 43.26

645. Fragments of festivals for the gods of the earth

6.B. KBo 17.15 (Neu 1980a nr. 27)

7. KUB 43.30 (Neu 1980a nr. 30)

649. Festival fragments naming the NIN.DINGIR

7. KBo 20.14 + KBo 25.33 (Neu 1980a nr. 33)

KBo 25.31 (Neu 1980a nr. 31)

KBo 20.26 + KBo 25.34 (Neu 1980a nr. 34)

665. Fragments naming the aššaleš (Neu 1980a nr. 54)

1.A. KBo 17.36 + KBo 20.17 + KBo 20.20 + KBo 25.54 + ABoT 35

669. Festival fragments

30. KBo 20.10 + 25.59 (Neu 1980a nr. 59)

733. Invocations to Hattic divinities

I.1.A. KUB 28.75 (Neu 1980a nr. 113)
II.1. KUB 8.41 (Neu 1980a nr. 109)
II.2. KUB 31.143 (Neu 1980a nr. 110)
II.3. KUB 31.143a + VBoT 124 (Neu 1980a nr. 111)
II.4. KBo 25.112 (Neu 1980a nr. 112)

820. Benedictions for the king
1. KUB 36.110 (Neu 1980a nr. 140)

1.2.1.2. Middle Hittite

28. Preimperial treaty (Otten 1967)

41. Treaty with Šunaššura (Götzte 1925b; Petschow 1963: 242-43)
   II. KUB 8.81 + KBo 19.39

133. Treaty of an Arnuwanda with the people of Išmerika (Kempinski & Košak 1970)

137. Treaty of an Arnuwanda with the Gasgas (von Schuler 1965: 134-38)
   KBo 16.27

146. Mida of Pahhuwa
   KUB 23.72 + 40.10

147. Madduwa (Götzte 1928; Otten 1969)

200. Letter from a "prefect" to the king (Hagenbuchner 1989 nr. 46)
   Uncatalogued. Mašat letters (Alp 1980)
   Mst 75/10-11, 13-15, 43, 45, 64, 69, 104

261. Bēl madgalti instructions (von Schuler 1957: 36-59)
   3. 3rd version. KUB 13.1 (+?) 31.87 + 31.88 + 40.56 (+) 40.55

262. Guard protocol (Jakob-Rost 1966)

270. Oath of Ašhapala (Otten 1960)

375. Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal concerning Nerik (von Schuler 1965: 152-65)
   1.A. KUB 17.21 (+) KBo 23.75
   1.B. KUB 31.124 (+) 31.72
404. Rituals of Maštigga (Rost 1953)
   2nd version. A. KUB 34.84+
   3rd version. KUB 34.82 + KBo 24.1
480. Ritual of Šamuha (Lebrun 1976: 117-38)

1.2.1.3. Šuppiluliuma I

42. Treaty with Hukkana (Friedrich 1930; Otten & Rüster 1972: 102-103)
44. Decree concerning the priesthood of Telibinu (Goetze 1940: 12-17)
49. Treaty with Aziru (Freydank 1959/60)
   II. KBo 10.13 (+) 12
50. Treaty with Šarri-Kušuh (Forrer 1926: 2.48-50)
52. Treaty with Mattiwaša (Friedrich 1925)
   II. HT 21 + KUB 8.80
154. Letter to the Pharaoh (Hagenbuchner 1989 nr. 208)

1.2.1.4. Muršili II

40. Deeds of Šuppiluliuma I (Güterbock 1956)
61. Annals (Götze 1933; Otten 1957)
62. Treaty with Duppi-Tešub (Friedrich 1926: 1-48)
67. Treaty with Targašnalli (Friedrich 1926: 51-94)
68. Treaty with Kupanta-dšLAMMA (Friedrich 1926: 95-179)
69. Treaty with Manapa-dšU (Friedrich 1930: 1-41)
70. On the affair of the Tawannanna
   1. KUB 14.4
   2. KBo 19.84, 85
378. Plague prayers (Götze 1929)
486. Aphasia (Lebrun 1985)

1.2.1.5. Muwattallī

76. Treaty with Alakšandu of Wiluša (Friedrich 1930: 42-102)
171. Letter to Adadnirari I (Hagenbuchner 1989 nr. 192)

381. Prayer to the storm god (Lebrun 1980: 257-73)

382. Prayer to Tešub of Kummanni (Houwink ten Cate & Josephson 1967)

1.2.1.6. Hattušili III

81. Apology (Otten 1981)

83. On the campaigns of Šuppiluliuma I (Riemschneider 1962)


1.A. KBo 6.29 + KUB 21.12 + 23.127

1.B. KUB 21.15

2. KUB 21.37

3. KBo 14.45

86. Requisition against Arma-§U (Ünal 1974: 18-31)

1.A. KUB 21.17

1.B. KUB 31.27

87. Royal decree in favor of Mittannamuwa (Götze 1925: 41-45)

KBo 4.12

90. Fragments concerning the restoration of Nerik (Cornil & Lebrun 1972)

176. Letter from Puduhepa to the king of Alašiya (Stefanini 1964)

383. Prayer of Hattušili and Puduhepa to the sungoddess of Arinna

KUB 21.19 (+) KUB 14.7

384. Prayer of Puduhepa to the sungoddess of Arinna

KUB 21.27

585. Vow of Puduhepa (Otten & Souček 1965)

1.2.1.7. Tuthaliya IV and Šuppiluliuma II

105. Treaty of Tuthaliya with Šaušgamuwa (Kühne & Otten 1971)
106. Treaty of Tuthaliya with Ulmi-Tešub  
KBo 4.10 + 1548/u (Otten & Rüster 1973: 85-86)
Uncatalogued. Treaty of Tuthaliya with Kurunta (Otten 1988)
121. The conquest of Alašiya (Güterbock 1967)
123. Treaty of Šuppiluliuma with an unkown partner (Stefanini 1965)
KBo 4.14 (+) KUB 40.38
177. Letters from Tuthaliya to Tukulti-Ninurta I
1. KUB 3.74 (Hagenbuchner 1989 nr. 190)
2. KUB 23.99 (Otten 1959: 65)
3. KUB 23.101 (Hagenbuchner 1989 nr. 203)
255. Instructions of Tuthaliya to the eunuchs (von Schuler 1957: 8-33)

1.2.2. Palaic and Cuneiform Luvian

The Palaic and Cuneiform Luvian languages survive only in passages of Hittite ritual texts which stipulate recitation in one of those languages. Palaic is quoted primarily in Old Hittite rituals, in other words from the first half of the second millennium B.C.E., and in only a dozen texts; it is therefore only marginally useful for comparative syntax. Almost all Palaic texts are collected with a grammatical sketch and glossary by Carruba (1970). Cuneiform Luvian is quoted in Hittite rituals dating from the sixteenth through thirteenth centuries B.C.E., but although there are some three hundred tablets containing Cuneiform Luvian, these represent fewer than a dozen completely independent texts. This fact, together with the texts' extremely restricted pragmatic domain, has made their interpretation and linguistic analysis somewhat difficult, but Cuneiform Luvian may nevertheless be understood better than any Anatolian language other than Hittite itself. The new standard edition of Cuneiform Luvian texts, with their Hittite contexts, is that of Starke (1985), and the standard, if somewhat out-of-date, lexicon and grammar are those of Laroche (1959). In chapters 3 and 4 of this dissertation I have based some statements about Cuneiform Luvian on an examination of that part of the corpus indexed by Laroche (1959).
1.2.3. Lycian

The Lycian language is attested from the seventh through fourth centuries B.C.E. on coins and in some one hundred and seventy-five inscriptions found in Lycia on the southern coast of Asia Minor, that is, roughly the region south of a line from Köyceğiz to Antalya in Turkey. For the purposes of this dissertation the coins preserve no useful information. Since the inscriptions are written in an epichoric alphabet modelled on the Ionian Greek alphabet, they are the best understood Anatolian testimony recorded in an approximately phonemic writing system. However, the value of this testimony is somewhat mitigated by Lycian's late date and especially by the fact that, while most of the inscriptions are understood, some of the longer ones—in particular the 138 Lycian lines of the Xanthos stele—are quite poorly understood. The most important of the well-understood longer inscriptions is inscribed on a stele discovered in 1973 in the Lētoōn at Xanthos. This is a cult document of some forty lines in each of three languages—Aramaic, Greek, and Lycian—which has naturally advanced the understanding of Lycian quite considerably. The Lycian texts known through the end of the eighteenth century were edited by Kalinka (1901) and by Friedrich (1932); texts preceded with the letters "TL" are cited from Friedrich's edition. More recently discovered texts have been edited by Neumann (1979) and are cited with the letter "N"; the Lētoōn trilingual in particular is N 320 and has also been edited by Laroche (1979). A grammatical sketch of Lycian and a lexicon with a complete word index are provided by Neumann (1969) and Melchert (1989a) respectively. Finally, note that the transcription of Lycian used in this dissertation is not the standard one: for typographical reasons, the character properly transliterated as an e with a tilde will here be written ĕ, and the character properly transliterated as an m with a tilde will here be written m. These transcriptions are in all cases unambiguous and will therefore cause no confusion, although they are admittedly undesirable.
1.3. Indo-European and Anatolian Pronominal Clitics

1.3.1. Emphatic, Sentence Connective, and Sentential Clitics

Wackernagel's Law in Indo-European is, as noted above, a class of processes rather than a unitary syntactic process. This was discovered by Hale (1987a, 1987b, 1990b), who found specifically that in Greek and Indo-Iranian—and by hypothesis Indo-European as well—there are three syntactically distinct classes of Wackernagel's Law: "emphatic clitics", "sentence connective clitics", and "sentential clitics". The first of these, the emphatic clitics, have semantic scope over a single word and are positioned immediately after that word. If words marked with emphatic clitics are sentence-initial for any reason, then the emphatic clitics will be sentence-second and, preceding all other clitics in the clitic chain, will appear to have been positioned by Wackernagel's Law. Sanskrit emphatic clitics cited by Hale include cīt and gha. The second class of clitics, the sentence connectives, function roughly to conjoin and disjoin clauses; some also conjoin or disjoin sub-clausal constituents. Sentence connective clitics cited by Hale include Greek te "and" and de "and, but" and Sanskrit ca "and" and vā "or", and by hypothesis Indo-European *kwe "and" (> Greek te and Sanskrit ca). Finally, the class of sentential clitics contains both pronominal clitics and adverbial clitics with sentential scope; among the latter Hale identifies Greek ke(n) and món and Sanskrit u and svīt.

The Anatolian languages also display the three classes of Wackernagel's Law clitics reconstructed by Hale for Indo-European. Thus each language has a set of sentential clitics, including pronominal clitics, the reflexive clitic (Common Anatolian *ti), the quotative clitic (Common Anatolian *wa(r)), and modal and adverbial clitics. In Hittite this last class includes man, an, kan, šan, (a)šta, and (a)pa. Anatolian sentential clitics are positioned immediately after their sentence's first phonological word (and after that word's emphatic clitics). There is no need here to discuss this class further: the pronominal clitics will be
discussed throughout, and the other sentential clitics, although not directly relevant, will also be extensively exemplified below.

There is one sentence-connective clitic in Anatolian, the descendant of Indo-European *kwe, which survives at least as Hittite kku, Palaic ku, and Cuneiform Luvian ku̯wa. Hittite kku has three functions (see Eichner 1971 and Watkins 1985 with references): it is a coordinating conjunction "and", its primary function historically; an emphatic particle; and a disjunctive conditional conjunction "if/either/whether ... or". In addition, kku appears in a number of lexicalized host-clitic compounds like takku "if" < *u=t=kku < a virtual *t̥a=kwe.

The three functions of kku are illustrated in (1.3a), (1.3b), and (1.3c) respectively:

(1.3) a KBo 19.163 ii 33'-34' per Watkins (1985: 495-96) (Festival, CTH 738)
[n=aš] ĺźzi=pat natta=kuw=-aš=apa ar]āi
"She remains seated and she does not get up"

b 533/t: 9 (Carruba 1969: 71)
"Itten=ku auštēn
"Go see!"

c KUB 33.24 i 43'-45' (Stormgod myth, CTH 325)
tuē[((=ku wašta)iš] ug=at SIG5-ziyami UL=a=kku tu[(el wašta)iš] ug=at SIG5-ziyami
"If it's your fault, I will make it good, and if it's not your fault, I will make it good"

Like its Indo-European cognates, kku can also have sub-clausal scope. For example, (1.4a) and (1.4b) respectively contain sub-clausal counterparts of the conjunctive use in (1.3a) and the disjunctive conditional use in (1.3c):

1 As Craig Melchert notes (p.c.), this function would explain the identifying and emphatic function of Palaic kewriter (Melchert 1984b: 24).
(1.4) a KBo 11.14 i 6-7 prototype per Watkins (1985: 495) (Ritual of Hantitaššu, CTH 395)
ZÍZ-tar šeppit parhuenaš ewan karaš hattar zinail=kù tiyan
"Spelt, wheat, parhuenaš-, barley, karaš-, lentil, and chick-peas are placed"

b KBo 6.3 i 45-46 (Law, series one, CTH 291, ed. Friedrich 1959: 20)
takku LÚ.UL.LU-an LÚ-ann=a=kù MUNUS-n=a=kù URU Hattušaz
kuiš[kil] LÚ URU Lûiyaš tâizzi
"If some Luvian man steals a person—both if a man and if a woman—from Hattuša ...

Finally, Anatolian also has emphatic clitics. Hittite in particular has three of these, which I will refer to as pat, ya, and ma and which very roughly function respectively as an identifying particle ("the same X", "only X", etc.—see Hart 1971), a conjunctive marker ("and X", "X too", etc.), and a focus marker ("and X", "but X", "as for X", etc., like Greek de). Their assignment to the emphatic class rather than the sentence-connective class depends in the first instance on their shared syntactic distribution rather than their semantic scope: all three can cliticize to non-sentence-initial words. Semantically, pat in particular very clearly has its scope over the word it follows, as in (1.5); note that other clitics follow it if it marks a sentence-initial word, as in (1.5c).

(1.5) a KBo 6.3 iii 54 (Laws, series one, CTH 291, ed. Friedrich 1959: 38)
n=an=za šakuwaššarran=pat dāi
"He takes only what is rightfully his"

b KUB 13.4 iii 24-26 (Instructions to priests and temple servants, CTH 264)
n=aš háli paiddu=pat kīššan le=pat tezzi ammek=wa=za É.DIN.IGIR.-LI-.YA pahhašhi apiya=ma=wa UL paimi
"Let him actually go into the precinct. Let him not say, 'I am guarding the temple; I will not go there'"
KBo 3.4 ii 53-54 (Annals of Muršili II, CTH 61, ed. Götte 1933: 60)

nu=kan 1-aš ŠÂ A.AB.BA=pat ėšta 1-aš=ma=kan m=Tapalazauliš arunaz arha uit

"One continued to be in the sea [i.e. island], while the other, Tapalazauliš, left the sea" (cf. Hart 1971: 130-31)


kappūwanteš=pat=mu=kan antuhšeš išpärtä

"Only a few people escaped me"

The analysis of ya and ma is considerably more problematic: both clitics must often be interpreted as having scope only over single words, and word-level emphasis may be the primary function of ma in particular. If, however, in some contexts at some stages of the language, ya and ma must be interpreted with sentential scope, then a priori they cannot syntactically be emphatic clitics in such contexts. They may instead pattern syntactically with the sentential or sentence-connective clitics, or they may constitute a fourth descriptive class peculiar to Anatolian; I have not investigated this problem systematically here. Even to the extent that ya and ma have scope over the words they follow, however, one reason for their frequent appearance at the head of the Wackernagel's Law clitic chain may be that elements with the semantic or pragmatic features marked by ya and ma also often have the semantic or pragmatic features marked by sentence-initial position, that is, associated with the process of topicalization discussed in chapter 2. By contrast, elements marked by pat only occasionally have these semantic or pragmatic features.

Both ya and ma have two allomorphs, in both cases reflecting the collapse of etymologically distinct morphemes. The allomorphs of ya, identified by Houwink ten Cate (1973), are postvocalic ya and postconsonantal a—the latter with gemination of the preceding consonant—and are illustrated in (1.6) and (1.7) respectively.
a KBo 20.10+ i 5-6 (Festival fragment, CTH 669, ed. Neu 1980a: 131)
   ANA LUGAL hekta āppa=ea hekta
   "He bows to the king and bows again"

b KBo 17.1+ ii 35'-36' (Ritual for the royal couple, CTH 416, ed. Neu 1980a: 8)
   halmaššuittī haššī=ya=][ needless gap] an tianzi
   "They place them on the throne and on the hearth"

c Bo 86/299 (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 18)
   mād.LAMMA-aš=ma=mu apēdani=ya mēhuni šer akta
   "But Kurunta would have died for me even at that time"

d KBo 4.10 obv 13 (Ulmi-Tešub treaty, CTH 106)
   mān=aš arahlzīni=ya KUR-e
   "Even if he is in a foreign land ...

(1.7) a KBo 6.2 i 4-5 (Laws, series one, CTH 291, ed. Friedrich 1959: 18)
   1 ME MANA KÙ.BABBAR pāī ššū=ssett=ā šarnīkzi
   "He gives one mina of silver and also replaces his goods"

b KBo 17.1+ i 18'-19' (Ritual for the royal couple, CTH 416, ed. Neu 1980a: 6)
   [DU(MU)],É.GAL LUGAL-aš MUNUS.LUGAL-ašš=a iššaz=mit lālan
   AN.BAR-aš [d]āī
   "The page takes the tongue of iron from the king's and queen's mouth"

c KBo 4.12 obv 24-26 (Decree, CTH 87, ed. Götze 1925: 42)
   mUrhi. [Du.]-upaš=ma=mu mān HUL-ušš=a šša
   "Even though Urhitešupa was hostile toward me ..."
Bo 86/299 i 63-64 (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 12)
nu KUR URU Parhann=ä IŠTU CIŠTUKUL épzi nu=kan aŋašš=ä ANA
LUGAL KUR URU du-tašša āššanza

"(If) he takes Parha too by force, that too will belong to the king of
Tarhuntasša"

Melchert (1984b: 30 n. 9) has discovered that within Old Hittite, the emphatic clitic ma too has two allomorphs: postvocally it is ma, and postconsonantally it is a without gemination (the very few exceptions to this distributional generalization are secondarily conditioned). Synchronically, in other words, the alleged non-geminating clitic a is in reality nothing but a postconsonantal allomorph of ma. This somewhat surprising allomorphy was eliminated in the later language by generalizing the postvocalic allomorph ma to all phonological environments. In fact, as already observed by Houwink ten Cate (1973: 124), non-geminating a was frequently replaced by mu in late copies of Old Hittite texts: the copyists must have considered ma at least functionally close to the otiote a. Old Hittite examples of the allomorphs ma and a are illustrated in (1.8) and (1.9) respectively, and Neo-Hittite postvocalic and postconsonantal examples of ma are illustrated in (1.10) and (1.11) respectively:

(1.8)  

a KBo 6.2 ii 35 (Laws, series one, CTH 291, ed. Friedrich 1959: 30)
takku=at=an parna=ma kuēlka peššizzi

"But if he throws them away into somebody's house ..."

b KBo 20.10 + KBo 25.59 i 5 (Festival fragment, CTH 669, ed. Neu 1980a: 131)

män zinniz[i=m]a

"And when he finishes ..."

c KBo 17.1+ i 7' (Ritual for the royal couple, CTH 416, ed. Neu 1980a: 5)
hurtiyalī=ma [AN.B]AR-aš nēpiš 1-EN kitta

"But in the bowl lies a heaven of iron"
(1.9)  a  KBo 6.3 iii 65  (Laws, series one, CTH 291, ed. Friedrich 1959: 40)
      män=an išhaš=šiš=a wemiyazi
      "But when its owner finds it ..."

     b  KBo 8.74+ iii 14'-15'  (Hymn and myth, CTH 752, ed. Neu 1980a: 223)
      nu=za ūg Giššuhupalli dā[h]e nu huppēmi MUNUSaraš=miš=a=ššan
      īštananaš āppa kē zaškizzi
      "I take the clappers and go hupp, and my colleague puts them back on the
      altar" (see Melchert 1988: 230-33)

     c  KBo 22.1 obv 29'  (Protocol, CTH 272, ed. differently Archi 1979: 46)
      Lūašiwandan=š šēt āštti
      "But the poor man you thereby 'take' " (see Melchert 1977: 172-74)

(1.10)  a  KBo 5.9 iii 17-18  (Duppi-Tešub treaty, CTH 62, ed. Friedrich 1926: 20)
      damedani=ma=aš=kan le kuwapikki neyatti
      "But don't send them anywhere else"

      b  Bo 86/299 i 94  (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 14)
      eni=ma ABU-YA ÜL šakta
      "But that one my father didn't know"

(1.11)  a  KBo 5.13 ii 34  (Kupanta-dLAMMA treaty, CTH 68, ed. Friedrich 1926:
      124)
      tuk=ma män dUTU-ŠIQ hatrāmi
      "But if His Majesty write to you ..."

     b  KUB 23.1+ ii 8  (Šaušgamuwa treaty, CTH 105, ed. Kühne & Otten 1971: 8)
      tuk=ma=za [n]dIŠTA-R.A.A-an LŪHADANU kuit DŪ-nu[n]
      "But because you, Šaušgamuwa, I made my brother-in-law ..."

1.3.2. Anatolian Pronominal Clitic Morphology

The final section of this chapter will identify the morphological entities which are the
objects of study of this dissertation. I will treat these pronouns here with special reference to
four parameters of variation displayed by NPs in general, parameters which are in part related but which are also occasionally conflated in the literature. These reflect variation in morphological, thematic, grammatical, and pragmatic status: every NP and hence every pronoun bears some morphological relation or case, some thematic relation or $\theta$-role, some grammatical relation, and some pragmatic relation.

To begin with the last of these, I suggest that NPs cross-linguistically may be classified as "emphatic" or "unemphatic". These two categories differ in the conditions on their use: very roughly, emphatic NPs are used in pragmatic contexts requiring emphasis or contrastive focus and prosodic contexts requiring stress, and unemphatic NPs are used in other contexts (although strictly speaking, "emphasis" may well be conditioned only prosodically, with prosody in some sense fed by focus and other semantic or pragmatic factors). Unemphatic NPs are probably always pronouns or zero, but in any case the emphatic-unemphatic contrast is ordinarily realized even among a language's pronouns. For instance, English has both emphatic object pronouns—*her, him, it, and them*—and unemphatic ones—*'r, 'm, 'z, and 'm* respectively. Similarly any null subject language has emphatic and unemphatic subject pronouns, which are respectively overt and phonologically null.

The objects of study of this dissertation are some of Anatolian's unemphatic pronouns in particular. The typology described above allows unemphatic pronouns to be subdivided in several ways—by case (morphological relation), by $\theta$-role (thematic relation), and by grammatical relation. This last property indicates nonstructurally what syntactic role an element has in a sentence. For instance, some NPs have grammatical relations with respect to the sentence as a whole: these include the relations "subject", "direct object", and "indirect object". Some NPs have grammatical relations only with respect to other NPs: these include the relation "possessor". Finally, some NPs have no grammatical relation at all: to borrow a term from Relational Grammar, they may be called "chômeurs". Note that grammatical relations and $\theta$-roles are not at all the same; for example, it is well-known that
possessors may have almost any \( \theta \)-role as long as they have some thematic connection with the NP they possess. The \( \theta \)-roles associated with the grammatical relation of possession will not be investigated in this dissertation.

In Anatolian, unemphatic pronominal possessors are of two syntactic types: most are positioned by Wackernagel's Law, but a few are instead adjacent to their governing noun. These occur in Hittite, Luvian, and Lycian. In Hittite there are two kinds of NP-internal possessive pronouns: clitic or suffixed possessive pronouns; and genitive demonstrative pronouns. The Hittite suffixed possessive pronouns agree with their hosts in gender, case, and number, and also inflect for possessors' person and number (see HE §107-109). For example, \( miš \) is nominative common-gender singular, first-person singular possessor; \( tiš \) is also nominative common-gender singular, but second-person singular possessor; and \( šma \) is directive singular, third-person plural possessor. Nouns with possessive suffixes cited in HE §109 include genitive \( hardiyaš-iaš \) "your (eg.) heart" and dative-locative \( hišari-miš \) "my hand" and \( atti-šiši \) "her/his/its father". In Cuneiform Luvian, a clear suffixed possessive pronoun is accusative common-gender \( šan \).

The other kind of NP-internal possessive pronoun attested in Hittite is simply the genitive of the demonstrative pronoun, for example \( apēl \) and \( apēdaš \), respectively the genitive singular and plural of \( apāš \) "that" < Common Anatolian \( *obōs \). Cognates of \( apēl \) and \( apēdaš \) are not attested elsewhere in Anatolian, but remodelled possessives built to the same stem do appear in Luvian and Lycian. These languages largely replaced the inherited Indo-European genitive in -s by a new possessive adjective in \( *osi- \) (e.g. CLuv. tiyammašši- "of the earth" < tiyanni- "earth" and Lyc. xštawatehi- "of the ruler" < xštawati- "ruler"), and in particular they replaced the inherited genitive of \( *obōs \) by a possessive adjective \( *obōsi- \). This is attested in Hieroglyphic Luvian but not Cuneiform Luvian; in Lycian, Common Anatolian \( *obōs \) survives as the demonstrative pronoun \( ebe \), and \( *obōsi- \) survives as the possessive pronoun \( ebehī- \), and syncopated and with metathesis as \( ehbi- \). The distribution of these forms will be discussed in chapter 4.
The Wackernagel's Law pronominal clitics in Anatolian may be conveniently discussed in three groups, all three inflected for gender and number. The first two groups—subject clitics and direct object clitics—are positively defined by grammatical relation, while the third group consists of all other pronominal clitics; I will refer to these as "oblique" clitics. Oblique clitics bear a variety of grammatical relations, and must analyzed synchronically as bearing a variety of cases (including at least the dative-locative and genitive, and probably also the ablative), but they are morphologically a single class. The direct object clitics and the oblique clitics are identical in the first and second person.

Anatolian has subject clitics only in the third person:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1.12)</th>
<th>Subject Clitic Paradigms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sg. comm.</td>
<td>*os</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg. neut.</td>
<td>*od</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl. comm.</td>
<td>*oy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl. neut.</td>
<td>*oy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the forms in (1.12) either directly reflect their Common Anatolian ancestors or represent fairly straightforward morphological developments; note in particular that Luvian *ata continues Common Anatolian *od with a so-called "prop vowel" *o. Subject clitics are not directly attested in Lycian.

The Anatolian subject clitics have the usual range of subject θ-roles. For example, in Hittite they may be agents, experiencers, or themes, as illustrated in (1.13a), (1.13b), and (1.13c) respectively:

(1.13) a KUB 14.15 iv 28-29 (Annals of Muṣili II, CTH 61, ed. Götze 1933: 70)

n = aš = mu uit GĪR.MEŠ-aš kattan halīyattat

"She then kneeled down at my feet"
b  StBoT 24 iv 88-89  (Autobiography of Hattušili III, CTH 81, ed. Otten 1981: 30)
\n\[n=aš=kan SÀ DINGIR.MEŠ ANA dištar URUŠamuha nahanza čšdu\]
\"Let him be afraid of Ištar of Šamuha among the gods\"

c  KUB 8.81 + KBo 19.39 ii 2-3  (Šunaššura II treaty, CTH 41, ed. Götze 1925b: 11)
\nmān=aš tām[ēd]az KUR-az INA KUR URU\ Kizzuwatna apašila paiz[z]i
\"If he himself goes from another land into Kizzuwatna ...\"

The third-person direct object clitic paradigm can be presented in a similar manner
(first- and second-person direct object clitics are listed below):

\begin{table}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
          & CAnat. & Hitt. & Palaic & CLuv. & Lycian \\
\hline
gs. comm.  & *om    & an   & an     & an    & ç, çne \\
gs. neut.  & *od    & at   & at     & ata    & ede \\
pl. comm.  & *ons   & uš, aš & aš & ç, çne \\
pl. neut.  & *oy    & e, at & e & ata & e, ede \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

Again the developments are fairly straightforward; Lycian çne and ede and Cuneiform Luvian ata continue the Common Anatolian forms plus the prop vowel *o. The evidence for Lycian e is presented in chapter 5.

The object clitics also seem to have the expected range of direct object interpretations, although it is rather difficult to determine what interpretations are expected. The Hittite object clitics in particular function thematically at least as patients and themes, as illustrated in (1.15a) and (1.15b) respectively:

(1.15)  a  KBo 6.3 ii 52  (Laws, series one, CTH 291, ed. Friedrich 1959: 30)
\[tamaš=an šuwaizzi\]
\"(If) another person pushes him ...\"
KBo 3.7 iii 30 (Illuyanka, CTH 321)

lē = mu genzuwäši

"Don't pity me"

The oblique clitics have a much wider range of grammatical relations—in various contexts they may be possessors of verbal arguments, complements of postpositions, or any of a variety of oblique verbal arguments—a wide enough range, in fact, that the traditional and etymologically accurate term "dative" clitic seems unacceptable. It is for this reason that I use the term "oblique" clitics. Their paradigm is presented in (1.16); note that in those languages which attest first and second-person object clitics, these are identical to the first and second-person oblique clitics listed here.

(1.16) Oblique Clitic Paradigms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hitt.</th>
<th>Palaic</th>
<th>CLuv.</th>
<th>Lycian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st sg.</td>
<td>mu</td>
<td>mu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd sg.</td>
<td>ta, ddu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd sg.</td>
<td>ši</td>
<td>du</td>
<td>du</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st pl.</td>
<td>naš</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd pl.</td>
<td>šmaš</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd pl.</td>
<td>šmaš</td>
<td></td>
<td>mmaš</td>
<td>ûne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lycian i can only be the cognate of Hittite ši if special clitic phonology is invoked to account for an otherwise irregular loss of *ši; on Lycian ûne see Melchert 1990a. The Palaic and Luvian third-person singular forms evidently originated as second-person singular forms—cognate with the Hittite second-person allomorph ddu, which appears only before the reflexive clitic za < *ti—while ironically, the cognate of Hittite ši is a reflexive marker in Palaic (and in Lydian).

Some of the grammatical relations and θ-roles borne by oblique clitics in Hittite are illustrated in (1.17-19). This presentation is not intended to be systematic or complete: a full study of the range of grammatical and thematic relations associated with oblique clitics
and with the dative case in Hittite remains to be undertaken. Indirect objects appear with
goal and recipient θ-roles in (1.17a) and (1.17b) respectively:

(1.17)  
a  
KBo 5.3 ii 28 (Hukkana treaty, CTH 42, ed. Friedrich 1930: 116)

nu=mu=ššan mān ERĪN.MEŠ-it ANŠE.KUR.RA.[HI].A-it lammar ĪL ārti

"If you don’t come to me instantly with troops and horses ..."

b  
StBoT 24 i 26 (Apology of Hattušili III, CTH 81, ed. Otten 1981: 6)

KUR UGU=ya=mu manyahanni peštā

"He also gave me the Upper Country to rule"

Other sentential grammatical relations are illustrated in (1.18), including what may
informally be called "benefactive", "maleactive", and "affected" θ-roles in (1.18a), (1.18b),
(1.18c) respectively:

(1.18)  
a  
KUB 19.49 i 60 (Manapa-šU treaty, CTH 69, ed. Friedrich 1930: 10))

nu=mu=za taššul čš

"Be friendly to me"

b  
KBo 5.4 ii 7 (Targašnalli treaty, CTH 67, ed. Friedrich 1926: 60)

zik=wa=mu=za kūrur čš

"Be hostile to me"

c  
KBo 5.6 iv 5 (Deeds of Šuppiluliuma I, CTH 40, ed. Güterbock 1956: 96)

nu=war=aš=mu=kan BA.ŪŠ

"He died on me"

Finally, there are oblique clitics which bear only sub-sentential grammatical relations, such
as the postpositional object in (1.19a) and the NP possessor in (1.19b):

(1.19)  
a  
KBo 5.4 obv 45 (Targašnalli treaty, CTH 67, ed. Friedrich 1926: 60)

nu=tta menahanda kuru[ri]yahhanzi

"(If) they’re hostile against you ..."
KBo 3.4 iii 85-86 (Annals of Muršili II, CTH 61, ed. Götze 1933: 90-92)

nu-šši KUR-ZU GUL-un

"I attacked his land"

All these unemphatic sentence-second pronouns contrast functionally with stressed or emphatic pronouns. For the purposes of this dissertation the most important emphatic pronouns are the demonstrative *obós mentioned above (Hittite, Palaic, and Luvian apāš and Lycian ebe) and the stressed first and second-person pronouns. Other demonstrative pronouns—such as Hittite aši and Anatolian *kʰ’os "this" (Luvian zaš, Hittite and Palaic kaš)—will play no role in the discussions of this dissertation, since either their deixis differs from that of the unemphatic pronouns or they are functionally marked vis-à-vis the reflexes of *obós, and in either case they do not minimally contrast with the objects of study here.
Chapter Two: Anatolian Syntax

Several features of Anatolian syntax will be discussed briefly in this chapter in order to facilitate the discussions of subsequent chapters. The descriptive generalizations made here are not based on the full corpora listed in chapter 1.

2.1. Phrase Structure

Since almost all Hittite sentences are verb-final, I will assume in this dissertation that verbs are base-generated in sentence-final position. Ultimately this assumption can be maintained only by showing that all Hittite sentences without final verbs can be generated by independently motivated syntactic processes, and to the extent that I am unable to do so here, the assumption must remain tentative. The majority of attested non-final verbs can indeed be explained as the result of one of two processes, topicalization and right dislocation, to be discussed in §2.2.2 and §5.3 respectively, and a few of the residual cases will be mentioned below. The assumption that Hittite sentences are underlyingly verb-final is adopted here largely for analytic convenience, and will crucially affect only a few of the proposals below.

Somewhat less well motivated is a second assumption about Hittite syntax, namely that sentences contain a VP to which the subject position is external. In other words, I assume for Hittite roughly the following underlying phrase structure:

\[(2.1) \quad \text{Hittite Phrase Structure}\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
S \\
\downarrow \\
NP \\
\downarrow \\
VP \\
\downarrow \\
V
\end{array}
\]
Evidence for the existence of a VP in Hittite, as in any language, would be any asymmetry between subjects and objects which is plausibly explained as a consequence of their respective positions outside of and within a VP. Some evidence to this effect is collected in chapter 3 and addressed formally in §4.5. If a VP exists, of course, then all sentences in which the subject does not precede the entire VP must be analyzed as the result of independent movement processes. I have made no systematic attempt in this dissertation to account for such sentences, although most of them can certainly be derived by the processes of topicalization and right-dislocation already mentioned.

I will make the same two assumptions about Cuneiform Luvian syntax, for the same reasons, but I make no special assumptions about Lycian syntax. Lycian word order is impressionistically quite different from Hittite or Cuneiform Luvian word order, and it is certain that the phrase structure rules and syntactic movement processes necessary to account for it will also be quite different.

2.2. Syntactic Fronting

2.2.1. Syntactic Fronting in Indo-European

Two syntactic fronting processes have been identified for Indo-European and in particular for Anatolian: topicalization and WH-movement. These processes, found in all old Indo-European languages, have been recognized informally at least since Delbrück, but their precise characterization is due to work by Hale (1987a, 1987b, 1990b) on Indo-Iranian, Hittite, and Greek. The first of these processes, topicalization, moves a single constituent from its base-generated position within the sentence to a structural position at the sentence's left margin, as illustrated schematically in (2.2); it is evidently associated pragmatically with special emphasis of some kind. Following Hale, I refer to the structural position occupied by topicalized constituents as "TOP".
(2.2) Topicalization in Indo-European

Instances of topicalization in Greek and Sanskrit are given in (2.3):

(2.3)  

a  Iliad 10.257

amphi dé hoi kunéen kephaléphin étēke

"He put his helmet on his head"

b  RV 1.35.5a

vi jánāñi chyāvāḥ śitipādo akhyan

"The dusky white-footed ones surveyed the people"

In (2.3a) and (2.3b) the TOP positions are filled respectively by the preposition/preverbs *amphi* and *vi*, as indicated by their respective separation from *kephaléphin* "head" and *akhyan* "saw", with which, it may be argued (as in Garrett 1988 for Greek), they underlyingly form a constituent.

WH-movement, the second securely established fronting process in Indo-European, positions WH-words like relative pronouns as illustrated schematically in (2.4), also to the left margin of the sentence. Following Hale, I refer to the structural position occupied by WH-constituents as "COMP".
Instances of WH-movement in Greek and Sanskrit are given in (2.5):

(2.5)  

\[ \text{hē muri' Akhaiois álge' éthēke} \]  

"... which laid countless pains on the Achaeans"

\[ \text{yás ta idhmám ābhárat siśvidānáh} \]  

"... who bears you the kindling sweating"

Since the TOP and COMP positions are both at the left of the sentence, it is possible in principle that they are merely two names for the same structural position; in fact, however, as shown by Hale, they must be structurally distinct positions. A more accurate representation of Greek and Sanskrit sentence structure is given in (2.6), where TOP and COMP are sisters of S' and S respectively\(^1\):

---

\(^1\) In most current transformational theories (e.g. Chomsky 1986) the nodes TOP, COMP, S', S, and S would be labelled SpecCP (i.e. Specifier of CP), C, CP (i.e. Complementizer Phrase), C', and IP (i.e. Inflection Phrase) respectively, but the precise labelling will not affect any of the arguments made here, except in §4.5, where the more accurate notation will be adopted.
Greek and Sanskrit sentences with both TOP and COMP filled are given respectively in (2.7a-b), cited by Hale (1990b), and (2.7c-d), cited by Hale (1987b: 44, 41).

(2.7)  

a  
Ilíad 1.300  
[TOP tōn d' állōn] [COMP há moi] ésti  
"But whatever of these others is mine ..."

b  
Ilíad 17.260  
[TOP tōn d' állōn] [COMP tís ken] héisi phresin ounōmat eípoi  
"Who could speak with his heart the names of those others?"

c  
RV 4.12.2a  
[TOP idhmāṃ] [COMP yās te] jahhārac chaśramāṇāḥ  
"... who, exerting himself, bears you the kindling"

d  
RV 8.84.5ab  
[TOP dāśema] [COMP kāsyā] mānasā yajñāsyā  
"With the thought of which worship would we worship?"

Two main arguments support Hale's claim that in Homeric Greek and Vedic Sanskrit, TOP and COMP are structurally distinct positions filled by syntactic movement processes. First, a WH-constituent may be preceded by at most one syntactic constituent other than Wackernagel's Law clitics, for example by a single word or an NP. This is explained if the COMP position is in fact preceded by another position—the TOP position—which can be filled only by movement. Second, two of the three classes of Wackernagel's Law clitics
discussed in §1.3.1 are in fact positioned differently vis-à-vis the TOP and COMP positions. In particular, sentence connective clitics like Greek τε or Sanskrit ca, or Greek de in (2.3a) and (2.7a-b), are positioned immediately after the first phonological word of the sentence, excluding null-position elements, while sentential clitics like the pronominal clitics in (2.3a), (2.5b), (2.7a), and (2.7c), and Greek ke in (2.7b), are positioned immediately after the COMP position if it is filled, and immediately after the sentence connective clitics if the COMP position is not filled. Only the assumption of distinct TOP and COMP positions permits an adequate description of the syntax of Wackernagel's Law in these languages.

2.2.2. Syntactic Fronting in Anatolian

On the basis of the comparison of Greek and Sanskrit, and in view of certain Hittite evidence, Hale reconstructs the structure in (2.6) for Indo-European itself—in other words, topialization and WH-movement processes with distinct landing sites, and in particular a TOP position to the left of a COMP position. The Hittite evidence concerns the interaction of topialization and WH-movement, processes illustrated in (2.8) and (2.9) respectively:

(2.8) a StBoT 24 i 27-28 (Apology of Hattušili III, CTH 81, ed. Otten 1981: 6)
piran=ma=at=mu mdešIN.dU-aš DUMU mZida maniyahhiškit
"But before me Arma.dU, son of Zida, had been administering it"

b KBo 6.3 ii 29 (Laws, series one, CTH 291, ed. Friedrich 1959: 26)
EGIR-anda=m[a=šma]š=kan [ša]rдиyaš paizzi
"And a šardiya-troop goes after them"

(2.9) a KBo 3.4 ii 41-42 (Annals of Muršili II, CTH 61, ed. Götze 1933: 56)
nu=za dUTU-ŠI kuin NAM.RA INA É LUGAL uwatēnum
"The deportees who I My Majesty brought to the palace . . ."

b StBoT 24 iv 69 (Apology of Hattušili III, CTH 81, ed. Otten 1981: 28)
ammuqq=a kūt harkun
"And also that which I had . . ."
KUB 23.1+ ii 25-26 (Śaušgamuwa treaty, CTH 105, ed. Kühne & Otten 1971: 10)

n=an datta κuiš mNIR.GAL-š LÛHADANU=y[a=a]n κuiš DÛ-at

"Muwatalli, who took him to himself and who also made him a brother-in-law"

KUB 36.13 i 32'-33' (Song of Ullikummi, CTH 345, ed. Güterbock 1952: 12)

nu=wa κuiš namma [za]hhiškizzi

"Who will fight any longer?"

KUB 14.3 ii 37 (Tawagalawa letter, CTH 181)

kuit apât

"What is that?"

The postpositions πiran in (2.8a) and appanda in (2.8b) have been topicalized — moved from their base-generated VP-internal positions to the TOP position — and as a result precede their clauses' subjects. The definite relative WH-constituents κuiš NAM.RA "which deportees" in (2.9a), kuit "which" in (2.9b), and κuiš mNIR.GAL-š "which Muwatalli" and κuiš "who" in (2.9c) have likewise been moved from their base-generated VP-internal positions, but since they are positioned by WH-movement their landing site is the COMP position. Finally, the interrogative WH-words κuiš "who?" in (2.9d) and kuit "what?" in (2.9e) have also been positioned by WH-movement.

Note that these WH-words may not actually appear to occupy the same position, since κuiš in (2.9d) is preceded by the common sentence-introductory particle nu, whereas kuit in (2.9e) is absolutely sentence-initial; likewise, since κuiš in (2.9a) and the first κuiš in (2.9c) are the third word in their sentences, but kuit in (2.9b) and the second κuiš in (2.9c) are each second in their sentences, it is not immediately obvious that all of these are positioned in the same way. However, as observed by Held (1957), Sternemann (1966), and Hale (1987a, 1987b), the Hittite sentence-introductory particles nu, ta, and ša are extra-clausal
for the purposes of syntactic movement processes other than Wackernagel’s Law, much as German aber behaves extra-clausally for the purposes of the verb-placement rule: they are "null-position" elements. It is possible for at least the later language that other elements—like našma "or if" and, as suggested by Houwink ten Cate (1973: 129 n. 47), namma "next" and kinuna "now"—fall into the same syntactic class. (As Hale 1987a, 1990b shows, a similar status must be posited for átha "then" in Vedic prose.)

Held (1957) demonstrated that Hittite definite relative pronouns and adjectives are never clause-initial, whereas indefinite relative pronouns and adjectives are (apart from null-position sentence-introductory particles and second-position clitics) invariably clause-initial. Definite relatives appear in (2.9a-c) above, and indefinite relatives cited by Held include the following:

(2.10) a KBo 6.34+ iii 39-40 (Military oath, CTH 427, ed. Oettinger 1976: 14)
kušwa-kan ke liuguš šarrizzi
"Whoever breaks these oaths ..."

b KUB 13.2 iii 29-30 (Béla madgalti instructions, CTH 261, ed. von Schuler 1957: 48)
kuedani=ma=ššan URU-ri EGIR-pa ėrti
"But in whatever town you return ..."

More specifically, as shown by Hale (1987a, 1987b), Hittite definite relative pronouns and adjectives are regularly preceded—again apart from null-position elements and clitics—by exactly one syntactic constituent, for example by a single word, as in (2.9a-c), or by a PP or internally complex NP, as in (2.11a) and (2.11b) respectively:

(2.11) a KUB 14.10+ iii 9’ (Plague prayer, CTH 378, ed. Lebrun 1980: 207)
[nu] hingani šer kue AWA[TEMES ūha[[ndaitat]]
"The reasons which were established for the plague ..."
KBo 3.4 iii 34-35 (Annals of Muršili III, CTH 61, ed. Götte 1933: 76)

URUKU.BABBAR-aš=ma=za EN.MEŠ ERÍN.MEŠ

ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ=ya kuin NAM.RA GU₄ UDU=ya uwatet

"But the slaves, oxen, and sheep which the lords, troops, and cavalry of Hatti brought back ..."

Similarly, as Hale (1987b: 43 n. 10) notes, non-initial WH-question-words are preceded by one syntactic constituent:

(2.12) a KUB 44.4 rev 9 (Birth ritual, ed. Beckman 1983: 176)

eni=ma=wa kuit

"But what is this?"

b KBo 6.34+ iii 14 (Military oath, CTH 427, ed. Oettinger 1976: 12)

[k]aš=wa kuiš

"Who is this?"

c KUB 23.102 obv 10 (Letter of Muwatalli, CTH 171, ed. Hagenbuchner 1989: 260)

ŠEŠ-tar kuiš kuedani hatreškizzi

"Who always writes (about) brotherhood to another?"

These facts can be explained by the hypothesis, advanced by Hale, that Hittite WH-interrogatives and definite relatives occupy a single position—in the terms used here, the COMP position—and that, as in Greek and Sanskrit, there is another syntactic position—the TOP position—to its left. Topicalized constituents and no other clause-internal elements may thus precede WH-moved elements. Within this framework, the distribution of indefinite relatives can be most easily explained by positing that they are obligatorily topicalized, either directly or via the COMP position; it is therefore impossible for clause-internal material to precede them.

Sternemann (1966: 381-90) has called attention to syntactic similarities between WH-words as described by Held and two Hittite lexical complementizers. These elements
are evidently either clause-initial or preceded by exactly one syntactic constituent, and I suggest that like definite relative pronouns and WH-question words, they too can occupy the COMP position; they may thus be preceded by whatever occupies the TOP position. Sternemann's collection, as well as those in CHD s.vv. and the specific remarks at CHD 110-11, show that mahhan "as, how, when" and mān "if, when" in their sentential-scope interpretations, as well as māhanda/mānhanda "just as", illustrated respectively in (2.13), (2.14), and (2.15), are preceded by at most one constituent:

(2.13) a KBo 5.6 ii 15 (Deeds of Šuppiluliuma I, CTH 40, ed Güterbock 1956: 92)
   LŪ.MEŠ URUHurri=ma=kan mahhan LŪSANGA EGIR-anda awer
   "But when the Hurrians saw that the Priest was opposite ..."

b KBo 6.29 ii 18 (Urhi-Tešub, CTH 85, ed. Götze 1925: 48)
   apāš=ma GIM-an ištamašta
   "But when he heard ..."

c KBo 5.8 i 40-41 (Annals of Muršili III, CTH 61, ed. Götze 1933: 150)
   LŪKÜR KUR ḫKummišmahaš=ma [ma]hhan ištamašzi
   "But when the enemy from the Kummišmaha River land heard ..."

d KBo.5.3 ii 34 (Hukkana treaty, CTH 42, ed. Friedrich 1930: 116)
   zig=an GIM-an ištamašti
   "As soon as you hear him ..."

---

2 The double question construction discussed at CHD 147-48 gives rise to apparent exceptions. Thus mān does not in fact have sentential scope at KUB 15.17 + KUB 31.61 i 8-9, [(UDU.HILA=ma MU.KAM)]-li mān 1 ME mān 50 UDU petkimi (ŪL ku(tki i)]iqqari "it makes no difference whether I give one hundred or fifty sheep every year", or at Bo 86/299 ii 88-89, kinun=ma=za apān MUNUS-an. mād LAMMA-aš mān dāi mān=za=an ĪL dāi "but now whether Kurunta takes that woman or doesn't take her ...". In both passages, mān precedes the (sub-clausal) element it focusses.
A syntactic constituent preceding mān or māhhan—in the TOP position, on my analysis, like elements preceding a definite relative pronoun—can be internally quite complex, as noted by Sterneemann (1966: 383) in connection with the following:

(2.16) a KUB 13.2 iiii 3r-32 (Bēl madgalti instructions, CTH 261, ed. von Schuler 1957: 48)

İR LÚ GEME LÚ wannumiyaš MUNUS-ni mān DI-ŠUNU čēzi

"If a man's male slave, a man's female slave, (or) a w. woman has a lawsuit ..."
KBo 5.6 iii 5-6 (Deeds of Šuppiluliuma I, CTH 40, ed. Güterbock 1956: 94)
LÚ.MEŠ KUR URUMizra=ma mahhan ŠA KUR URU Amka GUL-ahhuwar
ištamaššanzi

"But when the people of Egypt heard about the attack on Amka ..."

Cuneiform Luvian āhha in its sentential-scope interpretation "as, when" may, as Watkins (1986b: 61) notes, have the same distribution as Hittite mahhan. Compare the following:

(2.17) a  KBo 4.11 rev 46 (Ištanuvian ritual, CTH 772, ed. Starke 1985: 341)
 āhha=ata=ta alti auienta Uilušati

"When they came from steep Wiluša ..."

b  KUB 35.102+ iii 11 (Lunar magic, CTH 766, ed. Starke 1985: 223)
alti=ta āhha LÚ-iš auita [Wilušati?] \( ^{c} \)

"When the man came from steep Wiluša ..."

c  KBo 9.145 left 3' (Fragment, CTH 770, ed. Starke 1985: 132)
[du]pantī āhha=tiy=a[n ... 

"... they strike. As ..."

d  KUB 35.89: 17' (Spell against sickness, CTH 765, ed. Starke 1985: 228)
... ] a=wa=tī zinsa ĪD.TUR.MEŠ.KUNU āhha t[i- ...

"As ... these streams of yours ..."

In summary, Hale's first class of evidence for a distinct TOP position — evidence from the interaction of topicalization and WH-movement — is clearly present in Anatolian. Interrogative pronouns, definite relative pronouns, mahhan, mān, and māhanda can all be argued to be positioned in COMP; therefore any elements to their left, other than null-position elements and clitics, must be positioned in TOP. Hale's second class of evidence — evidence from clitic syntax — is unfortunately not available in Anatolian. In Greek, Sanskrit, and by hypothesis Indo-European, as noted above, sentential clitics were positioned immediately after the COMP position whenever it was filled, whereas
sentence-connective clitics were absolutely sentence-second; the two clitic types were thus positioned differently in sentences with the TOP and COMP positions both filled. In Hittite, however, sentential clitics are absolutely sentence-second even in sentences with TOP and COMP filled, as in many of the examples in (2.11-15). The rule positioning sentential clitics has evidently been collapsed with the rule positioning sentence-connective clitics—an innovation which, if it is reflected elsewhere, is an important characteristic of Common Anatolian.

The sentence-connective class is hardly robust in Anatolian, but, as indicated in §1.3.1, at least one member survives. Unfortunately the descendants of Indo-European *\textit{kwe} are not attested in any sentences with COMP filled, but the scanty evidence is at least consistent with its expected syntax and so with the view that it served as the model for the generalization of originally sentence-connective clitic syntax to the sentential clitics. The Hittite and Palaic invocations in (2.18) both show a paragraph initial \textit{nu-\textbackslash k(k)u}, etymologically "and now":

(2.18) a. KBo 12.128 ii 6' (Prayer fragment, CTH 389, ed. Lebrun 1980: 399)
\textit{nu-\textbackslash kku karu\textbackslash ten GE\textbackslash STU-ten}
"Be quiet and listen!"

b. KUB 35.165 rev 11'12' (Parole des pains, CTH 751, ed. Carruba 1970: 19)
\textit{nu ki memai nu-\textbackslash k\textbackslash u d\textbackslash Zaparwa a\textbackslash skum\textbackslash wua=\textbackslash ga wa\textbackslash q\textbackslash akanta}
"She says the following [in Palaic]: Zaparwa, these pure meats are to be eaten!" (see Melchert 1984b: 29)

The comparison of \textit{nu-\textbackslash kku} and \textit{takku} < *\textit{\textbackslash n\textbackslash a-\textbackslash kku} indicates that Anatolian *\textbackslash k\textbackslash w\textbackslash e at all stages, like the sentential clitics (and not the emphatic clitics), followed null-position elements rather than topicalized constituents. This is certainly expected if the syntax of Hittite sentential clitics was originally proper only to *\textbackslash k\textbackslash w\textbackslash e, and if sentences with an empty COMP—where the sentential clitics would always have immediately followed *\textbackslash k\textbackslash w\textbackslash e—were the model for a reanalysis of the position of the sentential clitics as indicated above.
2.3. Transitivity and Case-Marking

2.3.1. The Anatolian Ergative

Several Anatolian languages are characterized by a nominal formation which has long resisted successful analysis. This so-called "animatizing" or ergative formation is illustrated in (2.19) for the three languages where it is found.

(2.19)  
Hittite: sg. -anza, pl. -anteš (see [2.20])

Luvian: sg. -antix, pl. -antinzi, e.g. parnantinzi < parrn- "house"

Lycian: sg. *-et, pl. -et, e.g. tести < tas- "oath"

Laroche (1962) established that in Hittite and Luvian (the Lycian evidence was not yet known), this formation is typically built to neuter nouns and typically occurs with transitive subjects. Laroche therefore introduced the term "ergative", although even he did not consider it a true ergative case (see below). This formation is sometimes also referred to as "animatizing", to reflect the widespread view that it is characterized by a derivational suffix whose function is to transfer neuter transitive subjects to the common or "animate" gender. Anticipating my conclusion, I will here use the term "ergative" to refer to this formation. Hittite examples are ʾišhananza, ʾiššišanteš, pahhuananza, and tuppananza, built respectively to the neuter nouns eshar "blood", ʾišhešar "binding", pahhrur "fire", and ʾuppi "tablet":

(2.20)  

a  

nu KUR URU Hatti=ya apāš ʾišhananza arha namma žinne[šia]

"That murder moreover ended the land of Hatti too"

b  
473/t obv 11 (Puhvel 1984: 399)

[SA]G.DU-ann-a ʾiššišanteš appanzi

"The bindings also clasp the head"

---

3 This section reproduces, by kind permission of the Linguistic Society of America, most of the contents of §2 of Garrett (1990).
KBo 32.14 ii 6-7 (Hittite-Hurrian bilingual, quoted by Neu 1988: 101)

mān=an pahhuenaₙa arha warnuzi

"I wish fire would burn it up"

d Mṣt 75/10: 3 (Letter, ed. Alp 1980: 39)

mahhan=ta kāš tuppiₙaₙa anda wemiyazzi

"As soon as this tablet reaches you ..."

There are several reasons for the view that the Anatolian ergative is a derivational category whose members are common-gender nominatives. First, it resembles other such categories. For example, three Hittite nominal formations are characterized by a derivational suffix -ant- (nom. sg. -anza). Two of these are well-known: participles, which are deverbal adjectival ant-stems like akk-ant- "dead" (nom. sg. akkanza) from ak- "die"; and possessive adjectives, which are denominal adjectival ant-stems like perunant- "rocky" from peru(n)- "stone" and ganenant- "thirsty" from *ganer/*ganen- "thirst" (see Oettinger 1981). A third ant-suffix forms deadjectival adjectives like āššuₙant- from āššu- "good", šuppiₙant- from šuppi- "pure", daššuₙant- from daššu- "strong", and duddumiyant- from duddumi- "deaf". This third type probably originated in the possessive adjective type: given inherited or secondary pairs like the adjective āššu- "good" and a substantivized āššu "good(s)", possessive adjectives like āššuₙant- *"having good(s)" > "good" were built to the latter. As a result of this derivation, synchronically deadjectival ant-stem adjectives are virtual synonyms of their bases. Craig Melchert (p.c.) observes that this analysis accounts for the ablaut as well as the meaning of such adjectives, which are built with the zero-grade suffix (e.g. u-stem -u-), as is regular for denominal formations. If they had originated deadjectivally, the full-grade suffix (e.g. u-stem -aw-) would have been used, and forms like *āššawant- would be expected. Of course, the form āššawanza does exist, but it originated

---

4 A fourth synchronic ant-stem class includes t-extensions of (r)n-stems, e.g. ispant- "night" and gimmant- "winter". This formation is of Indo-European date; see Oettinger (1982) with references.
as an ergative built to the adjective āššu- rather than an ant-stem derivative of the type under discussion. Likewise idālawanza is the ergative built to the adjective idalu- "bad" rather than the nominative singular of a putative *idālawant- "evil" in sentences like the following:

(2.21) a KUB 33.121 ii 16-17 (Kešši, CTH 361)
   nu mKeššin [i]idālawanza GIG-anza harzi INÀ ITU.3.KAM
   "A bad sickness held Kešši for three months"

b KBo 17.62+ iv 9'-11' (Birth ritual, CTH 478, ed. Beckman 1983: 34)
   nu[...] idālawanza[a] uddananza pēdi QATAMM[A lē] ninikzi
   "Likewise let no evil thing lift ... from its place"

These originally adjectival forms idālawanza and āššawanza were secondarily extended to nominal function, for instance respectively in (2.35) below and the following:

(2.22) KUB 5.3 iv 6 (Divination, CTH 563)
   āššawanza EGIR.UD-MI ME-aš
   "Good took the future"

A second reason is that the Hittite ergative plural ending -anteš can only have originated as the suffix -ant- with the common-gender nominative plural ending -eš. Similarly, the Luvian ergative is characterized by the sequence -ant-, which regularly corresponds to the Hittite suffix -ant-, followed by the common-gender nominative endings -š (sg.) and -nai (pl.). Finally, adjectives modifying the Hittite ergative are evidently common-gender in form, not neuter; for example, apāš "that" in (2.20a) and kāš "this" in (2.20d) are the ordinary common-gender nominative demonstrative pronouns.

I will show here that the Anatolian ergative is nevertheless a genuine ergative case, first discussing its function, then showing that it cannot have originated in a suffix *-ant-, and finally identifying its actual source. Its synchronic status in the attested languages and the phenomena just discussed are treated in §2.3.4.
There are three possible synchronic analyses of the ergative. First, it may be morphologically inflectional and functionally syntactic. In other words, the Hittite case-marking system is of the crosslinguistically unexceptionable type in which most NPs inflect accusatively but the (here morphologized) inanimates inflect ergatively (on the typologically unexceptionable nature of the type see also Rumsey 1987a: 31, 1987b: 312 n. 12). On this view, the endings -anza and -anteš are ergative endings just as -š and -eš are nominative endings, and forms like išhananza, išhišunteš, pahučenanza, and tuppianza in (2.20) are just neuter ergatives. Of course, nothing about this analysis implies that all anza-formation transitive subjects built to neuter nouns are ergative case-forms. Other Hittite formations in -anza exist, and any particular anza-neuter could well belong to another class. The important feature of this analysis is that it entails that the ergative case is a grammatical category in Hittite and that neuters inflect ergatively.

Second, the ergative may be morphologically derivational and functionally syntactic. In other words, the endings -anza and -anteš consist of the nominative common-gender endings -š and -eš preceded by a derivational suffix -antu-. This suffix is presumably etymologically identical to the suffix of the participles and possessive adjectives. However, its function is not semantic (as expected of derivational morphology), but syntactic. On this analysis, neuters are excluded from the transitive subject position and the suffix -antu- has somehow been co-opted to change their grammatical gender when necessary. There is thus no semantic difference between e.g. the intransitive subject and transitive object tuppi and the transitive subject tuppianza. This analysis, like the preceding one, does not exclude the

---

5 A fourth analysis on which the ergative is a genuine ergative case with common-gender exemplars is impossible, however, since while gender-changing derivational processes are common, it is meaningless to describe an inflectional process as gender-changing. Gender is a feature of lexical stems, not inflected forms, and is in fact the very feature which determines a stem's case-forms. The logical possibility that the ergative is morphologically inflectional but functionally semantic may be dismissed for the reasons discussed below.
possibility that some transitive subjects in -anza are the nominatives of other ant-stem categories; it simply identifies a synchronically distinct, syntactically-motivated suffix -ant-.

Third, the ergative may be morphologically derivational and functionally semantic. As in the preceding analysis, that is, the sequences -anza and -antə consist of a derivational suffix -ant- followed by the nominative endings -ə and -eə. This analysis, however, unlike the preceding one, posits some semantic feature distinguishing base nouns like tuppi and derived nouns like tuppiant-. This semantic feature presumably developed from that of the other denominal ant-suffix mentioned above. On this analysis, any apparent connection among anza-forms, neuters, and transitive subjects is not the result of any syntactic fact about neuters or transitive subjects, but a consequence of some other (possibly pragmatic) factor. This analysis thus has the advantage of accounting easily for two classes of forms which appear otherwise to pose a problem: those similar to ergatives which are built to common-gender bases (e.g. tussiyanza to tussi- "atmy/camp"), and those which inflect in oblique cases (e.g. dative-locative udniyanti to udne "land"). All treatments of this issue prior to Laroche's assumed this analysis and therefore attempted to identify the semantic force of the derivational suffix -ant-.6

---

6 The traditional view that the ant-suffix has a collective value cannot be correct, as noted e.g. by Laroche (1962: 24-25) and Kronasser (1963-66: 258-63, with references at 256), but is still occasionally encountered (cf. Singh 1978). For the view that the ant-suffix has primarily some kind of individualizing, personifying, or intensive function, see Krause (1956: 189-92), Solta (1958: 15-21), Kronasser (1962), and more recently Neu (1989), and compare Benveniste's position discussed below. This view finds support in at most a few passages but, as we will see, cannot be maintained in general. A putative semantic function has also been identified by Georgiev (1965), according to whom anza-nouns (and adjectives) are diminutives; however, he presents no synchronic evidence to support this claim. The few diachronic proposals which have been made on the basis of these synchronic treatments (see also Lindemaa 1986) cannot account for the actual synchronic function of the ergative or the evidence to be discussed in §2.3.2 below.
The possibility that the first or second analysis above might be correct was raised only with Laroche's discovery of the syntactic distribution of nouns in *anza*, a distribution which, if meaningful, cannot be explained by the third analysis. Oddly enough, despite numerous attacks on it, the first analysis—the view that Anatolian is characterized by ergative case-marking—has never been proposed or defended explicitly (although it is occasionally assumed without comment, as in CHD). The assumption that Laroche favored this view is due to his unclear stand: while overtly introducing "*dans la description grammaticale du hittite ... un tertium quid absent des autres langues indo-européennes*"—the "ergatif"—he nevertheless stated immediately that "le suffixe -(a)nt- est la marque du *transfert d'un inanimé dans la classe animée*; il n'appartient pas au système des nombres (sg.-pl.-coll.), mais à celui des genres" (1962: 41). Likewise he claimed elsewhere that "pour devenir sujet de la phrase transitive-active, l'inanimé (neutre) doit se transformer en animé par l'addition du suffixe -(ant)- et de la désinence de nominatif" (1970: 50). Laroche's stated view is thus quite clearly that of the second analysis above.

Responses to Laroche, though, have in general attacked the first analysis. Benveniste (1962: 45), for example, presented the following two objections: first, the ergatives "ne se réfèrent jamais à des êtres humains individuels en fonction d'agent, ce qui devrait être pourtant l'emploi primordial d'"ergatifs""; and second, "les formes en *anza* ne sont à aucun moment des cas spécifiques d'une flexion hétérogène, mais seulement des nominatifs de thèmes en -(ant)-, dérivés d'autres thèmes". The first objection depends on a misunderstanding of the nature of ergative case-marking systems⁷, while the second

---

⁷ As does Starke's remark (1977: 182 n. 24) that "Genaugenommen kann von einem Ergativ nicht die Rede sein, denn das Hethitische kennt keine passivische Verbalauflassung wie z.B. das Sumerische oder das Hurritische". Compare the statement of Kammenhuber (1985: 453) that "Vergleiche zwischen ergativen und idg. Sprachen entfallen schon deshalb, weil Neutra als Subjekt in transitiven [see below!] und intransitiven un Nominalsätzen dasselbe flektierte Verb wie Substantiva mask., fem. bzw. Substantiva comm. in Hethitischen
coincides with Laroche's own expressed view. Laroche's and Benveniste's treatments nevertheless differ. According to Benveniste, ergatives are not only the nominatives of derived common-gender nouns, but are semantically distinct from their base nouns: they "désigneront des notions matérielles transférées au rang de puissances actives"; for example, "pirlwarz- "maison" devient ornant- 'maison comme siège de pouvoir' " (1962: 51).\(^8\) Benveniste thus subscribes to the third analysis above. On this analysis, as noted, the correlation established by Laroche is simply a consequence of the unusual pragmatics, and therefore the unusual semantic value, of inanimate agents.

This analysis is, however, demonstrably false. It entails that whatever the precise semantic value of the putative ant-suffix is, a noun without that value will lack the suffix even as a transitive subject; the evidence contradicts this prediction, however, as Laroche already showed on the basis of a survey of several dozen common neuter nouns, none of which occurred as transitive subjects. I have confirmed his conclusion by examining some twenty-five Hittite texts of various genres and dates, within which there is not a single certain neuter transitive subject aside from the ergatives themselves.\(^9\) Mistakenly adduced

\(^8\) Cf. Watkins (1972: 44-46). Of course, if "puissance active" designates the ability to be the subject of a transitive verb, Benveniste and Laroche do not materially differ. Benveniste's view is otherwise supported by no textual evidence. He argues further that the semantic feature of "puissance active" developed historically from the "fonction individualisante de -ant-" (1962: 50) putatively attested in season terms like ginmant- "winter" (cf. n. 4 above). Such a development, regardless of its semantic plausibility, is excluded by the syntactic distribution of the season by-forms in -ant- (see Laroche 1962: 35).

as a counterexample by Kammenhuber (1985: 454-55) is the following passage, where neither transitive clause has an overt subject (see Neu 1989 for a discussion of Kammenhuber's view that the ergative is a Neo-Hittite innovation):

\[(2.23) \quad \text{KBo 18.151 rev 7-8 (Oracle, CTH 827)}\]
\[\text{[it]alu[=(wa) araš h]enkan taš ... aššu arha tuḫšet}\]
"Evil arose, it took the plague ... it cut off good"

The few more plausible apparent exceptions can now be disambiguated. Thus in view of (2.24), handaš must be a common-gender š-stem (like ḫaš) rather than a neuter:

\[(2.24) \quad \text{KBo 3.23 i 5-6 (Admonitions of Pimpira, CTH 24)}\]
\[\text{mān=[(an)]} \quad \text{handaš} \text{ walahzi}\]
"If the heat hits him ..."

In the following sentence, kuitki is adverbial, not pronominal ("something", with Güterbock 1962: 29); the clause is literally "now it sickens my right shoulder somewhat":

\[(2.25) \quad \text{KUB 33.106 iii 43'-44'} (\text{Song of Ullikummi, CTH 345, ed. Güterbock 1952: 28})\]
\[\text{[k]inuna=mu ZAG-an} \quad \text{kuitki} \quad \text{UZUZAG.LU-an GIG-zi}\]
"Now my right shoulder is somewhat sick"

Similarly, in (2.26a), we may take HUL-lu (= idalu) as adverbial rather than adjectival (with Götze 1925: 41 and HE §200.2) and translate as indicated. Compare (2.26b), where HUL-lu "evil" would make no sense as the subject.

\[(2.26) \quad \text{a} \quad \text{KBo 4.12 i 5-6 (Decree of Hattušili III, CTH 87, ed. Götze 1925: 40)}\]
\[\text{ANA PANI} \text{ ABU}=\text{YA}=\text{mu kappin DUMU-an} \quad \text{HUL-lu} \text{ GIG GIG-at}\]
"In my father's time illness sickened me badly as a small child"

\%(2.26) \quad \text{b} \quad \text{KUB 19.5 obv 5 (Letter, CTH 191, ed. Forrer 1926: 1.90)}\]
\[\text{GIG-zi=ma=mu} \quad \text{HUL-lu}\]
"And it sickens me badly"
The apparent absence of neuter transitive subjects is not an accidental consequence of the pragmatic rarity of inanimate agents, as implied by Kammenhuber (1985: 454), since semantically inanimate common-gender nouns are frequently transitive subjects. Ergatives are therefore conditioned syntactically, not semantically; in other words, whatever their origin, they constitute a synchronically distinct category which functions to replace ordinary neuters in the subject position of transitive clauses. This means that some transitive subjects in -anza will not be ergatives; they may, for example, be substantivized possessive adjectives or lexicalized participles. Such nouns are not directly relevant to an investigation of the functionally distinct, syntactically conditioned ergative formation, a formation which cannot be explained by the third analysis above (cf. Laroche 1970: 50 n. 37).

At this point, I will discuss some apparent exceptions to the conclusion that the Hittite ergative has a synchronically syntactic function. First, nouns with ant-stems which are not transitive subjects may be assigned to other formations as appropriate. Apparent ergatives built to common-gender nouns could likewise belong to other categories, although they may instead represent sporadic extensions of the domain of the ergative formation from neuter nouns to inanimate nouns in general. Extensions of this type do not vitiate either the first or the second analysis above, and they certainly underlie several formations in which a semantic difference between common-gender base noun and anza-form is impossible to justify, such as kalulupanza "finger" and sankuwayanza "fingernail" at KUB 9.4 i 34-35, both

---

10 For example: alpa- "cloud" KUB 17.8 iv 9; aruna- "sea" KUB 12.65 iii 9, KUB 33.94 i 7; ekunima- "cold" KBo 3.23 i 7; halki- "grain" KBo 4.2 i 60; haluga- "message" KUB 7.58 i 7; hes- "rain" KUB 29.3 i 8, KBo 17.62+ iv 8; huvusut- "wind" KBo 17.62+ iv 8; kammara- "fog" KUB 17.10 i 5; katkatima- "trembling" KUB 33.98 ii 7; lala- (EME-al) "tongue" KUB 12.62 rev 6; mahla- "(vine) branch" KUB 43.23 rev 21; naššaratti- "fear" KUB 33.98 ii 8, KUB 28.4 obv rt.col. 21, IBot 1.36 i 59; pasšida- "pebble" KBo 15.32 iv 3; šurka- "root" KBo 17.22 iii 12; tuhui- "vapor" KUB 17.10 i 5; wesniema- "terror" KUB 28.4 obv rt.col. 21; and sahba- "battle" KUB 7.58 i 7.
under the influence of seven neighboring proper ergatives. In the following Cuneiform Luvian sentence, such an extension may also account for tiyammantiš, built under the influence of tappašantiš "heaven" to the common-gender noun tiyammi- "earth" (cf. the transitive subject tiyammiš at KUB 35.54 ii 51'):

(2.27) KUB 9.6+ ii 14-15 (Dupaduparša ritual, CTH 759, ed. Starke 1985: 113)

aš-ša-ti ělḥādu tappašantiš tiyammantiš

"Let heaven and earth wash their own mouth(s)"

A similar extension is found in Hieroglyphic Luvian:

(2.28) BOYBEYPINARI 2 III B3 - III C3 - IV A3 (Hawkins 1970: 85)

(CAELUM') ti-pa-sa-ti-sa-pa-wa/i-tu-u ('TERRA') ta-sa-REL+ra/i-ti-sa-ha

CAELUM-sa-ha TERRA-REL+ra/i-sa-ha DEUS-ni-i-zi IRA-ta-ti CUM-ni

"May heaven and earth and the gods of heaven and earth ... to him in anger"

Here *tipasantis "heaven" and *tasakurantis "earth" are ergatives, as noted by Hawkins (1970: 95), and the latter is, like tiyammantiš above, built to a common-gender noun. Moreover, since *tu "to him" is dative, this sentence must reflect a cross-linguistically trivial extension, whether sporadic or systematic in Hieroglyphic Luvian, of the domain of the ergative from properly transitive clauses to those with two-place agentive intransitive verbs.

The second group of exceptions involves personification. As Craig Melchert (p.c.) observes, since some neuter transitive subjects must routinely have entailed personification (e.g. Hieroglyphic Luvian *tipasantis = Cuneiform Luvian tappašantiš = Hittite nepišanza), extension of the ergative formation to common-gender nouns would have been favored when personification was intended. Thus suggestions like that of Neu (e.g. 1979: 425-27) that the ergative reflects a general Hittite process of animatization should be evaluated only on the basis of syntactically conditioned ergatives. In (2.29), the motivation is somewhat more complicated for the creation of the ergatives URU-az "town" (built to common-gender happira-) and paranzašš-a "house":

---
(2.29) KUB 41.8 iv 30 (Ritual for the infernal divinities, CTH 446, ed. Otten 1961: 138)

kāšš-a-za URU-az pARNANZAŠ-a [(UD)]U.A.LUM DÛ-ru

"And let this town and house become the ram"

It is syntactic inasmuch as the verb kiš- "become", while intransitive, has two arguments and in context an active interpretation (see above). It is not strictly syntactic, however, since personification is intended, and so not only pir/parn- "house" but "town" is given an ergative. The existence of a few instances of this type is to be expected and is not evidence against a syntactic treatment of the ergative formation. In order to defend the view that the ergative has in general the same motivation as (for instance) the putative thematization of neuters, it would be necessary to claim, with Tchekhoff (1978: 228-32), that this too is motivated by a syntactic constraint against neuter transitive subjects. There is no evidence for this view. Tchekhoff adduces the sentence in (2.30), translating "quand le feu saisit un homme à la gorge" (1978: 231, following Laroche 1971: 190).

(2.30) KUB 8.36 iii 1-2 (Catalogue, CTH 279, ed. Laroche 1971: 188)


Especially in view of the recently discovered ergative pahuenaš in (2.20) above, however, pahuenaš is almost certainly a genitive, and the sentence may mean "if (that) of the fire seizes a man in the throat" (see HE §212 on this use of the genitive and cf. Burde 1974: 40 on the "Beschwörung des Feuers"). Another argument might point to parnaš in the transitive subject position at KBo 10.45 i 5, i 19, and iv 31; since the last of these is parallel to (2.29), it seems certain, if parnaš is a common-gender nominative that thematization and ergative formation serve the same purpose in this text; alternatively, as Calvert Watkins (p.e.) suggest, parnaš too might be a genitive "(that) of the house". As noted, however, this purpose is only partially syntactic. Although there is no reason to doubt that a transfer to the common-gender class by means of thematization expressed personification, there is likewise no reason to believe that this process was more than occasional, or that it was ever employed
for strictly syntactic purposes when personification was not intended. The existence of a personified *parnāš as a transitive subject is thus of no relevance to the status of the ergative.

There are, finally and unsurprisingly, some transitive subjects in *anza which are at present ambiguous and may be either ergatives or possessive denominals. An example is *tuikkanza, built to the root noun *tuekk-'body' in the following sentence:\(^\textit{11}\)

\[(2.31) \quad \text{KBo 6.2 ii 54 (Laws, series one, CTH 291, ed. Friedrich 1959: 32)}\]

nu *tuikkanza=šiš=pat šarnikzi

"His own t. replaces (it)" or "his own t. makes restitution"

If the verb šarnink- here is transitive "replace", as at KBo 6.2 i 5 and elsewhere, then *tuikkanza could be either an ergative "body" or a possessive denominal meaning originally "having the body", but if šarnink- here is intransitive "make restitution", then *tuikkanza must be a possessive denominal. Two similar forms are *tuzziyanza and *udniyanza (from common-gender *tuzzi- "army/camp" and neuter *udne "land"). Since there are oblique case-forms of both *tuzziyant- and *udniyant-, these obliques must be substantivized possessive denominals (*"having the army/camp" > "soldier(s)" and *"having the land" > "population"). Instances of *tuzziyanza and *udniyanza as transitive subjects are thus ambiguous: they may be either ergatives (to *tuzzi- and *udne) or ordinary nominatives (to *tuzziyant- and *udniyant-), and the ambiguity can only be resolved case by case (if at all). In the cases of *tuikkanza and *tuzziyanza, there is no apparent reason to have built ergatives to common-gender nouns: neither is a personification or obviously under the influence of proper ergatives, and *tuzziyanza at least is not a sporadic creation. It may therefore be easier to take both as possessive denominals at present.

---

\(^{11}\) Calvert Watkins suggests (p.c.), in view of its ablauting paradigm (cf. e.g. gen. sg. *tukkaš), that this noun may not be thematic, and that nominative singular *tuekkš may actually continue *tueks directly, with an epenthetic vowel triggered by the coda cluster.
The last uncertain case is presented by linkiyanza and linkiyantesk "oath-deity/deities". These forms have been taken at CHD 67-69 (following Laroche) as ergatives of lingai- "oath" in an otherwise unattested meaning, and by Oettinger (1976: 41-42) as nominatives of an otherwise unattested substantivized possessive denominal linkiyan-. (<"having the oath"). Although the forms in question certainly mean something like "oath-deity" rather than simply "oath", such an extension is crosslinguistically trivial: compare the Lycian phrase "the oaths will strike/seize him" in (2.38) below, where teseti "oaths" cannot be a possessive denominal, as well as the following:

(2.32) a Hesiod, Theogony 231-32
Horkon th, hos de pleiston epikhthonfous anthropous pemaicci, hote kén tis hekon epforkon omósséi
"Oath, which most damages earthly men, when someone knowingly swears a false oath" (see Benveniste 1969: 2.168)

b Helgaqvida Hundingsbana 2.31
þic sceyli allir eídar bída
"All the oaths shall bite you"

The analysis of the CHD is thus semantically plausible. It is true, as Craig Melchert points out (p.c.), that the evidence for a neuter *lingai rests on the reading of a badly broken Hittite sign and on assumptions about the Hittite values of several logograms, and is therefore somewhat tenuous. If linkiyanza and linkiyantesk are ergatives, they are thus probably built to a common-gender noun; however, since they are attested as personifications, this too is possible. To resolve the matter, it would be necessary to identify an instance—not a transitive subject—either of lingai- in the meaning "oath-deity" or of linkiyan-. These would, respectively, support the position of the CHD or that of Oettinger. The existence and distribution of NIS DINGIR,(MES/LIM) and linkiyaš DINGIR,(MES) are irrelevant, since it is not doubted that linkiyanza/linkiyantesk and lingai-, as attested, differ semantically.
The remaining possible analyses of the ergative are (to repeat) first, that neuters inflect in an ergative case whose endings are -anza and -anteš, and second, that a functionally distinct derivational suffix -ant- transfers neuter transitive subjects to the common-gender class. The first analysis is of course preferable a priori, since ergative case-marking of the type proposed for Hittite is crosslinguistically unremarkable, whereas a derivational suffix whose function is to permit nouns of a particular gender to stand in a particular syntactic function would, as far as I know, have no parallel in Indo-European or elsewhere. Such a process would in fact be so remarkable that it is extraordinary that it has been widely accepted for Anatolian in the face of a straightforward alternative. However, since such typological considerations are at best only suggestive, I turn to the history of the ergative.

2.3.2. Phonology of the Ergative

I argued above that the Hittite ergative is conditioned syntactically, as is atypical of derivational morphology. In this section I will present evidence from Hittite and Lycian which shows that the Anatolian ergative in fact cannot be a development from the well-attested derivational suffix *-ant- (nom. sg. *-ant-s), but must rather be reconstructed with a sequence *-antiš.

To begin with, the evidence of Luvian is ambiguous. Examples of the Luvian ergative appear above and in (2.33):

(2.33) KUB 35.54 ii 49' - iii 1 (Ritual of Puriyanni, CTH 758, ed. Starke 1985: 68)

[š]ānduw=ata pārantinzi ... tarašantiš

"Let the house(s), ..., and the statue release them"

Other probable ergatives are haratn-antiš "scandal", GIG-anteš "sickness", and UZUNIĞ.GIG-antiš "liver", but two Luvian forms treated as ergatives by Laroche can now be reassigned to other categories. First, in (2.34), pāranza is not an ergative but just pān in the so-called ša-case:
(2.34) KUB 35.54 iii 26 (Ritual of Puriyanni, CTH 758, ed. Starke 1985: 69)

\[ a=ta \text{ halâl āšdu zâ } [p] \text{arnanza} \]

"Let it be pure, this house"

Hieroglyphic Luvian DOMUS-na-zâ may therefore well conceal *parnan-zâ rather than *pam-zâ (see Hawkins et al. 1974: 176). Second, at KUB 35.54 ii 51', huwahuršantinsi (unknown meaning) cannot be an ergative, even though it is the subject of a transitive verb, since at ibid. iii 27 and 36, hukhuršantinsi, the same form with syncope, is a subject of the intransitive verb āšdu "let it be". The noun is simply common-gender hu(wa)huršanti-.

The -i- which appears in the endings -antiš (sg.) and -antinsi (pl.), while absent in Hittite, need not be taken as a phonological archaism, since all inherited nti-stems were thematized (i.e. given a certain vocalic suffix) in Luvian as nti-stems. The Luvian evidence is thus consistent with the view that the ergative originated in a derivational suffix *-ant-: nom. sg. *-anu-s > -antiš and nom. pl. *-anu-es > -antinsi by regular phonological and morphological developments. Of course, since anti is also the regular phonological outcome of *anti, the Luvian data is equally consistent with the view that the Anatolian ergative was characterized by an ending *-anti to which the productive nominative endings -š and -nzi were secondarily added (see further §2.3.4.2 below).

Within Hittite, though, phonological evidence shows that *-anti must be the source of the Anatolian ergative ending. Since Anatolian *ti ordinarily gives /ts/ in final position in Hittite, an ending -anza can reflect either *-anti or *-ants. However, inherited final *i after *t was retained in sandhi before ya "and"; thus the productive ablative ending -aza < *-ati is regularly -azzi=ya before ya (see Melchert 1977: 439-42). Ordinarily, as noted in §1.3.1, the postconsonantal allomorph of ya causes gemination of the preceding consonant, e.g. the final z of the nominative singular of ant-stems (so kunanzašš=ya /gumantsšš=a/ "and the killed" at KBo 4.4 ii 75).

In addition to its productive ablative, Hittite has a marginal ablative in -anza < *-anti (see below). The historically correct shape of this ending before ya "and" is -anzi=ya, which
is attested once among the secure anza-ablatives identified by Melchert (1977: 448-50), in the form GÜB-anzi=ya "and from the left" at KUB 24.14 i 13. The ergative should show the same sandhi treatment if it originated in a sequence *anti. In other Hittite phonological environments, however, the ergative ending is identical to the suffix plus ending of the nominatives of ant-stems. Given this phonological overlap, their functional overlap (both occur as transitive subjects), and the frequency of ant-stems, the introduction in the ergatives of the analogical, properly postconsonantal sandhi treatment -anza=š=a should have been possible regardless of their original shape. Such a treatment is indeed attested in five of six instances of this sandhi context.¹² By contrast, the treatment -anzi=ya occurs once:

(2.35) KUB 29.7 rev 29-30 (Ritual of Šamuha, CTH 480, ed. Lebrun 1976: 123)
i-da-u-law-an-zi-ya NIŠ DINGIR-LIM=ya hurtaiš
pa-ap-ra-an-na[a[n-z]a]-ša ini É.DINGIR-LIM šuppi[wash]naš iwar anda hulaliyan hardu
"And may evil and perjury, curse and impurity hold this temple enveloped like an onion"

The two forms idālawanzi=ya "and evil" and parrananza=š=a "and impurity" illustrate, respectively, the sandhi treatments historically appropriate to anza-ablatives and to the nominative singulars of ant-stems. The first form, idālawanzi, must be an ergative rather than a possessive adjective, since the latter would be *idālawant- like āšuwanant- (see §2.3.1 above). Its final i has been taken as a Luvianism by Lebrun (1976: 137) and as the result of analogy to the anza-ablative by Melchert (1977: 298). However, although analogy could easily have led to an innovation in the ergatives on the model of transitive subject ant-stems

¹² Once in (2.35), and twice at KUB 41.8 iv 30 and 34 (both paranzaš=a "and the house"). Despite fragmentary contexts, šthananzaš=a "and blood" and [hwa]alliišanzaš=a "and the pine-cone" are presumably "ergatives" at KUB 4.1 ii 22 and KUB 7.58 i 4 respectively.
(hence the attested paprannanzaš=a, etc.), it seems unlikely to have led to innovation in the ergatives on the model of the anza-ablatives, a small class whose function is synchronically unrelated to that of the ergatives. By comparison, the very frequent nominative singulars of secure ant-stems never attest the sandhi outcome -anai=ya. This outcome is therefore synchronically unmotivated and likely to preserve an archaism.

The final *i of an original ergative ending *-anti seems also to have been preserved in a secondarily created Hittite vocative. It is well known that in addition to nominative -anza in vocative function, the vocatives of apparent nt-stems show two treatments, -nta and -nti (see e.g. Laroche 1969: 176-77 and Eichner 1982/83: 239 n36). The former treatment is associated with secure nt-stems such as the divine names Wišurinyanta at KBo 15.27:2 and d1IM-ta = *Tarhunta at KUB 33.24 + 28 iii 13. The treatment -nti, however, as Craig Melchert points out (p.c.), seems to be characteristic of ergatives:

(2.36) a

KUB 32.137 ii 2-3 (cf. ii 19; Foundation ritual, CTH 415)

anda=ma=kan kisšan memai pētanti ets=za nu=za duškiški

"... while one speaks as follows: "O place, eat and rejoice!""

b

KUB 36.18 ii 6'-7' (Song of Silver, CTH 364, ed. Hoffner 1986: 152)

EGRIR-pa memiškiwun da[i]š [lē=mu kuwaškiš]i KU.BABBAR-anti

lē=mu=kan kueš[i]13

"She began to reply: 'don't strike me, O Silver, don't kill me!'"

---

13 The restoration is that of Laroche (1968: 64; cf. 1969: 177); other restorations from the Song of Silver are those of Hoffner (1986). In this instance I follow Laroche rather than Hoffner because KU.BABBAR-anti is extremely unlikely to be dative-locative with a verb of speaking. If it were, it would be sentence-final and the verb of speaking which governs it would therefore probably be sentence-initial, perhaps immediately after memiškiwun da[i]š; this would make poor sense in context (cf. KUB 36.19 left 12'-13'). Given the form of pētanti, a secure vocative in (2.36a), there is no reason to doubt that KU.BABBAR-anti is also a vocative, as its context virtually requires.
The vocative pēanti in (2.36a) is unlikely to reflect a derived common-gender *pēd-ant-; compare neuter apāt ... pētan "that place" at ii 8 in the same manuscript. Likewise, it is unnecessary to assume (with Hoffner 1986: 163) a derived ant-stem underlying KŪ.BABBAR-anti in (2.36b), although such a derivation would be both semantically plausible ("[god] who has silver") and, as Calvert Watkins notes (p.c.), paralleled elsewhere in Indo-European (cf. the *nt-stems Latin argentum and Old Irish argat). Other than KŪ.BABBAR-anti itself, the logogram KŪ.BABBAR occurs in the Song of Silver with a secure phonetic complement in -ant- only in the form KŪ.BABBAR-anza, which in clear contexts appears only as a transitive subject, as in (2.37)\textsuperscript{14}:

(2.37)  
\hspace{1cm} KUB 17.4:2' (Song of Silver, CTH 364, ed. Hoffner 1986: 149) 
DUMU-an KŪ.BABBAR-anza GIŠP[A-it GUL-ahta]

"Silver struck the boy with a stick"

The treatment of KŪ.BABBAR in the Song of Silver is thus consistent with the view that it conceals a Hittite neuter whose ergative is KŪ.BABBAR-anza.\textsuperscript{15} This in turn allows an

\textsuperscript{14} The exception at KUB 17.4: 8', KŪ.BABBAR-anza anda pama=štio pait "Silver entered his house", may be comparable to the sentences discussed in §2.3.1 above.

\textsuperscript{15} The surviving Song of Silver fragments in fact show contradictory treatments of the gender of KŪ.BABBAR. Thus at KUB 33.115 iii 16', nakki=ma=ihan KŪ.BABBAR ..., nakki must, pace Hoffner (1986: 156 with n. 101), be a neuter adjective modifying KŪ.BABBAR (so Otten 1950: 29 n. 2); cf. KUB 36.19 left 8'-9', nakkiyatar=zi[a ... Š(U)MEŠ-it KŪ.BABBAR-anza ẹpi]a?] "Silver seized nakkiyatar with his hands" (restored slightly differently by Hoffner 1986: 159). On the other hand, the only pronouns which clearly refer to Silver are common-gender, e.g. ař at KUB 36.18 ii 20' and an at HFAC 12 i 7. At KUB 36.18 ii 5', [EG]IR-ｐa=aż=za=kan neya[t] "he turned around", the sign AŠ has been written over an erased AT, according to H.G. Gütterbock apud Hoffner (1986: 152 n. 59). I take this variation as support for the view that KŪ.BABBAR is grammatically neuter but personified and therefore common-gender ad sensum. The existence of a direct object KŪ.BABBAR-an at HFAC 12 i 7 does not contradict this view, since the Hittite word concealed by KŪ.BABBAR is unknown. (KŪ.BABBAR-i-an-za at Bo 5019 [Hoffner 1986: 161] may in fact consist of KŪ.BABBAR-i followed by the beginning of another word.)
explanation of the vocative KÜ.BABBAR-anti; the assumption of a derived noun *KÜ.BABBAR-anti- does not.

As indicated above, inherited *-anti ordinarily results in -anza; the lack of assimilation and retention of final i in these vocatives in -anti must thus in some way reflect the unusual phonological environment of vocatives, and will ultimately help determine precisely the conditioning of the development *-ti > z /tš/. These vocatives in -anti were undoubtedly created by the same trivial extension of subject-marking to vocative function observed throughout Indo-European. In this case, the locus of the change—whose phonology shows that it occurred before *-ti > z—must have been transitive clauses with null second-person subjects to which neuter (hence ergative) NPs were apposed; these were reanalyzed as vocatives.16

Since Laroche’s treatment of the ergatives, a related formation has been identified in Lycian. Among the possible instances noted by Carruba (1982: 14), a secure ergative is the plural tesēti from tasa "oaths" (independently identified by Laroche 1979: 89 n. 12 and Philo Houwink ten Cate apud Bryce 1976: 185). This form occurs twice in curse formulae17:

(2.38) a TL 135.2
s=euc teseti tubeiti trmmili
"and the Lycian oaths will strike him"

16 Ultimately, they were replaced via a subsequent extension of the same type, resulting in forms like nēpišanz[a] at KUB 15.34 iv 32, n=ús ātāl nēpišanz[a] EGIR-on tarma "father heaven, release them".

17 The denasalization in tesēti in (2.38a), as opposed to tesēti in (2.38b), reflects a sporadic Lycian phonological process. As Carruba (1982: 14) notes, trnmili and trmmiliqeti (if this reading is correct) in these two clauses seem to show, respectively, nominative and ergative adjectival agreement with tesēti. Laroche (1979: 89 n. 12) appears to follow Meriggi (e.g. 1980: 372) in analyzing trmmiliqeti as trnmili plus ĕti "under", but even if a postpositional ĕti existed, the necessary sense seems impossible in context.
s=êne tesêti qâñti trmmilijêti

"and the Lycian oaths will seize (?) him"

The ergative singular "oath" should also be *tesêti. A Lycian form in -êti < *-enti can reflect *-anti and *-antis inter alia, but not *-ants directly; tesêti in particular might thus continue *taks-anti or *taks-antis (cf. Laroche 1979: 73). In principle, the Luvian i-thematization of nt-stems could be a common innovation of Luvian and Lycian, and since -êti could be formally identical to both -antiš and -antinzi in Luvian, Lycian could provide no independent evidence of the original ergative ending. In fact, however, this cannot be the case, since secure nt-stems appear in Lycian as a-stems rather than i-stems (Melchert 1989b: 44 n. 35): ahñtatì "property, possessions", the frozen participle of the verb "be" (Laroche 1979: 68), is synchronically an a-stem ahñta-, not an i-stem *ahñti-; and in the phrase mahâi ... latai "gods of the dead", latai is probably (with Melchert 1989a: 34) the genitive plural of the frozen participle of la- "die", also treated synchronically as an a-stem lato-. The i-stem seen in Cuneiform Luvian ul-ant-i-š "dead" would have led to Lycian *tâti-. Since a stem *taks-ant- would thus give nom. pl. *taks-ant-a-nzi > Lycian *tasâtaì or the like, the ergative tesêti must instead reflect an original ending *-anti.¹⁸

¹⁸ The putative Lycian examples of i-thematization of *nt-stems mentioned by Carruba (1979: 82) and Neumann (1962: 208 and 1978: 127) are extremely uncertain (on e.g. aruwañti, see Melchert 1989a: 6) and must now be assigned other derivations.

Craig Melchert observes (p.c.) that the conditioning of the ergative in Lycian is demonstrably syntactic, not semantic. The phrase tasa mištaha "oaths of the mištî" appears at TL 75.4-5, m=êne tubidi q[i|a[i|e]b[i s]e Malîja se t[asa] mištaha "the local precinct (?) will strike him, and Malija, and the oaths of the mištî". In this sentence, tasa functions as the agent of a transitive verb and seems therefore to contradict the view that tesêti replaces it in in the transitive subject position. However, postverbal subjects preceded by the conjunction se "and" regularly (as here) fail to affect verbal agreement and are probably in their unmarked (i.e. intransitive
2.3.3. Origin of the Ergative

The reconstruction of an Anatolian ergative ending *-anti means that any historical connection with a suffix *-ant- is impossible. As mentioned above, the Hittite ablative has both a productive allomorph -aza < *-aïi, cognate with Luvian -aïi and Lycian -edi, and a rare allomorph -anza; I will argue with Puhvel (1984: 476-77), who does not mention any of the phonological evidence above, that the ergative originated in the ancestor of the anza-ablative.

Since the anza-ablative is confined to neuter singular nouns and mainly to r/n-stems (see Melchert 1977: 448-50), most analyses have rightly looked there for its source. For example, according to Jasnow (1973: 123-28), the anza-ablatives originated as ablative built to the endless locatives of r/n-stems, i.e. in Hittite terms forms like *papratan-za from papratar "impurity". Calvert Watkins (p.c.) notes as an alternative that *papratan-za would simply be the regular outcome of an ablative like *papratå-za built to the zero-grade weak stem (cf. dative-locative kišr-i "hand" < *gʰesr-i and instrumental kiššar-ta as if < *gʰesr-t). In either case, with the decline in productivity of both the endless locative and the zero-grade weak nominal stem, forms like *papratan-za became opaque; their ending was reanalyzed as *anza, and, on the model of other oblique cases like genitive *papratn-äš and dative *papratn-ai, they were remade as *papratn-anza (> Hitt. paprananza by sound law). Since this step could only have occurred in the subclass of the r/n-stems where strong stems in *-ar (e.g. papratar) contrasted with weak stems in *-n (e.g. *papratan-), the anza-ablative was at first confined only to such stems. Subsequently it was generalized to other neuters, but not to common-gender nouns.

---

subject) case, rather than in a marked form (the ergative). There cannot be any semantic difference between tasa here and tescî above.
Although it is ordinarily quite naturally assumed that the anza-ablative was an innovation of Hittite, nothing about the historical scenario just sketched precludes dating it to any other stage of Anatolian: by the same mechanism ablatives in *an-ti could have become opaque and have been remade in *n-anti. The absence of comparative evidence for an *anti-ablative in Anatolian is not particularly significant, since the anza-ablative is marginal even in Hittite, and loss or accidental nonattestation elsewhere would hardly be surprising. An early Anatolian neuter ablative allomorph in *anti is therefore possible.

While proposing that the anza-ablative is the source of the ergatives, Puhvel’s explication of the actual diachronic development seems to me certainly wrong. According to him, the source of the ergative is the construction seen in (2.47), with impersonal verb and ablative of agent:

(2.39) KUB 30.26 i 1-2 (Ritual of Zelliya, CTH 783)

mān UKÚ-ait ʾIšaraz GIG-zi

"If it ails a man from (the goddess) Išara", i.e. "if Išara makes a man sick"

On this view, clauses like (2.40), originally interpreted as in (2.40a), were reanalyzed as in (2.40b):

(2.40) KUB 30.34 iv 7-8 (Ritual, CTH 401)

nu ʾēšhananza ... ʾēhalinduwa ... lē ēpzi

a "Let it not seize the palace by bloodshed"

b "Let bloodshed not seize the palace"

There are two problems with this analysis. First, whatever the Indo-European status may have been of the impersonal construction with oblique agent, in Anatolian it is quite marginal (Melchert 1977: 393). It is unlikely to have occurred with sufficient frequency to

---

19 Even Puhvel does not take the Hittite ergative as a true ergative case; in his view anza-ablatives were "secondarily reinterpreted from paradigmatic to derivational status" (1984: 477).
provide a basis for the reanalysis suggested. Second, there is no reason to suppose that this construction was used only with transitive verbs; a clause like "it thundered from the gods" might well have been possible. On Puhvel's analysis there is therefore no explanation of the most salient characteristic of the ergative, namely that it appears just in transitive clauses.

The real models for the creation of the ergative must, in the manner outlined in Garrett (1990), have been transitive clauses with instrumental ablatives and no overt subjects, i.e. clauses like "(s/he) strikes it with a dagger", reanalyzed as meaning "a dagger strikes it". In Hittite terms, the development was as follows. Given an invented sentence like (2.41), originally interpreted as in (2.41a), the crucial innovation involved reanalysis as in (2.41b):

(2.41)  
\[
\begin{align*}
  n &= \text{at witenanza parkunuzi} \\
  a &= \text{"S/he purifies it with water"} \\
  b &= \text{"Water purifies it"}
\end{align*}
\]

For two reasons, we can be certain that clauses like (2.41a) existed. First, as we will see below, the creation of clitic subject pronouns in Anatolian followed that of the ergative, and, in any case, at no stage between Indo-European and the attested Anatolian languages did such pronouns occur in transitive clauses. The subject of a transitive verb was therefore always either stressed or zero; in particular, transitive clauses with null subject existed (and would have been common, as argued in Garrett [1990: 265]). Second, it is likely that at the relevant stage of Anatolian, the ablative was productively used in instrumental function. Although Hittite itself has an instrumental case, marked by the ending -(i)t, Melchert (1977: 466-71) has shown that there is no evidence that this functioned as a productive ending at any prior stage. In the other Anatolian languages, for example, cognates of the Hittite ablative are used in both ablative and instrumental functions. The Hittite instrumental may therefore be regarded as only secondarily productive.\(^{20}\)

---

\(^{20}\) Comparison with Skt. \textit{dakṣiṇa} "with the right hand" and \textit{ekhiṣe} "with attention" (Pinault 1979, Melchert 1984: 98, and Jochem Schindler apud Melchert 1977: 459-60) does not entail that -\textit{i}t was a productive
Prior to the creation of the Hittite opposition between ablative and instrumental, then, the unmarked transitive clause with expressed instrument will have had a null subject and an instrumental ablative. Whenever this instrument was grammatically neuter, its ablative will have had allomorphs in *-ați and *-anti. The restricted distribution and partial opacity of the latter facilitated its reanalysis as a marker of some other function, in particular as the subject of its clause. A Hittite example of the clause type which, on this view, provided the source of the ergative is given in (2.42):

(2.42) StBoT 24 ii 78-79 (Apology of Hattušili III, CTH 81, ed. Otten 1981: 16)

URUŠamuhann=a ... alwanzešnaza šer šumnistsa

"He also filled up Šamuh... with witchcraft" or "Witchcraft also filled up Šamuh"

The analysis presented here accounts for all the peculiarities of the Anatolian ergative. It is confined to neuters because the opaque ablative allomorph in which it originated was built only to neuters; the other ablative allomorph, being fully productive, was not liable to reanalysis. It is confined to transitive subjects because, as argued in Garrett (1990), instrumentals in intransitive clauses cannot be reanalyzed as subjects. By contrast, the view that the ergatives somehow originated as derived ant-stems requires not only ad hoc explanations of the Hittite and Lycian data discussed in §2.3.2 above, but also the proposal that a constraint against neuter transitive subjects somehow developed in Anatolian, and that somehow a derivational suffix with a specific semantic value was pressed into service to

instrumental ending of Indo-European or Anatolian, and is consistent with the view that the Hittite instrumental ending was generalized only in pre-Hittite from marginal or adverbial forms (of the type pangarit "en masse"). A typological comparandum is furnished by the Indo-European adverbial suffix *-tōs, which was generalized in Sanskrit and elsewhere as a productive ablative ending (see Brugmann 1892: 594-96).
"animatize" neuters just in one syntactic context. It is virtually impossible to imagine a motivation for such developments.

The fact that the ergatives originated as ablatives has a very important syntactic implication. At the stage of Anatolian ancestral to Hittite, Luvian, and Lycian, the ablative ending ended in *i. There would therefore have been no motivation for reanalyzing an ablative as a masculine or feminine nominative singular, since all nominatives ended in *-s. At least originally, therefore, the ergative must have been an ergative case with full inflectional status. This means that a synchronically accurate grammatical description of the appropriate stage of Anatolian must identify, for common-gender nouns, a nominative and an accusative case, but for neuter nouns, an ergative and an absolutive case. This stage was in fact Common Anatolian; in other words, as §2.3.4 will show, one of the few certain common innovations of the Anatolian languages was the creation of a split-ergative case-marking system.

2.3.4. Development of the Ergative in Hittite and Luvian

This section will consider the development and synchronic analysis of the attested morphological categories which continue the Anatolian ergative. The possible analyses are, first, that these categories are marked by (inflectional) ergative endings and, second, that they are the nominatives of nouns formed with (derivational) suffixes in a syntactic function. If the second analysis is correct, an inherited inflectional category has, in a rare change type, been reanalyzed as derivational. Although the problem is of course uninteresting if (as it may) it lacks diachronic or synchronic implications, I will argue briefly that the first, simpler analysis is sufficient.

A possible Hittite motivation for reanalyzing the ergative as derivational would have been the secondary homophony between inherited ergative singulars in -anza < *-anti and nominative singulars in -anza < *-anti-s; elsewhere the motivation is less straightforward. But of course, while the Hittite collapse of *-anti and *-anti-s might have facilitated this
change, it is not evidence for it. Still, several apparent morphological and syntactic changes could suggest that the Anatolian ergative was secondarily reanalyzed as derivational.

2.3.4.1. Adjectival Agreement

In Hittite and in one of two possible instances in Lycian, adjectives modifying the reflexes of the Anatolian ergative are apparently common-gender. In addition to those in (2.20a), (2.20d), and (2.29) above, Hittite examples include: kāš aniyawananza "this ritual" at KBo 10.45 iv 40; [idaluš GIG-anza "bad illness" at Bo 5333 (StBoT 9.18); uddananza ... kuiški "whichever word" at KUB 15.1 ii 32-33; and ekunaš wetenaz "cool water" at KUB 31.127+ iv 22 (cf. Melchert 1977: 256-57). The nouns aniyawananza, GIG-anza, uddananza, and wetenaz are all ergatives, and the adjectives kāš, idaluš, kuiški, and ekunaš all have the shapes of common-gender nominatives, not neuter intransitive subjects. Likewise trmmili in (2.38a) above has the shape of a masculine or feminine nominative plural, not a neuter plural intransitive subject. No adjectives modifying ergatives are attested in Luvian.

There is a second pattern of adjectival agreement in Hittite and Lycian, characterized by the use of apparently ergative endings (Hittite -anza, Lycian -eti) on adjectives modifying ergative nouns. Examples include Lycian trmmilijeti in (2.38b) above (if the reading is correct), Hittite *āšawanaza "good" and idālawanza "evil", both discussed above, and Hittite arahzenanteš "surrounding", which modifies udnianateš "lands" in the following sentence:

(2.43) KUB 24.3+ ii 49'-50' (Muršili II's prayer to the Sun goddess of Arinna, CTH 376, ed. Lebrun 1980: 162-63)

kinun=a arahzenanteš [udniant]eš hūmanteš KUR URUKU. BABBAR-ti [w(alh)]aneškiuwan da'ir

"But now all the surrounding lands began to attack the Hittite land"

This second pattern, although common to Hittite and Lycian, is probably secondary. The productivity of the nominal ergative endings is such that, if ergative adjectival agreement
had in fact been inherited, there would have been no motivation to replace it by the pattern more commonly attested; such a development is quite unlikely to have occurred twice. On the other hand, a secondary extension of the ergative nominal endings *-anza and *-qti to adjectival paradigms seems trivial. I conclude that the pattern with apparently nominative masculine or feminine adjectival agreement characterized Anatolian itself.

This pattern is not due to any early reanalysis of the ergative in *-anti as a masculine or feminine nominative—which would, as noted above, have been phonologically impossible—but to a paradigmatic gap caused by the creation of an ergative case. Since the original locus of this category was a class of neuter singular ablative nouns, ergative case-marking itself could originally have characterized only neuter singular transitive subject nouns. Even if the only adjectival ablative ending *-ati had been extended to mark adjectives modifying ergative nouns, its productivity in ablative function would have created pressure to replace it in the transitive subject position.

It was therefore necessary in Anatolian to introduce an ending for adjectives which modified nouns in the new ergative case. Evidently the logical possibility *-anti was not selected, but rather nominative masculine/feminine marking was extended to modify neuter ergatives. This should not be surprising. Once an ergative case had been created, a categorial distinction existed between ergative and absolutive. Even though the absolutive adjectival endings had been used for transitive subjects before the creation of ergativity, there is no reason to expect that the same endings would be secondarily reintroduced for transitive subjects. In fact, after the innovation of an ergative case, neuter and masculine/feminine adjectival inflection would have been distinct only in the absolutive case, and it would thus have been quite natural to model new neuter transitive subject adjectival endings on the pre-existing masculine/feminine ones.

In other words, seemingly nonneuter adjectives modifying ergatives in Hittite and Lycian may continue forms created, on the model of masculine and feminine transitive subjects, to fill a paradigmatic gap in Anatolian. There is no reason to analyze adjectives like apāš.
"that" in (2.20a) and kāš "this" in (2.20b) as nominative: in context they are morphologically ergative. The identity of the adjectival (common-gender) nominative and (neuter) ergative endings is simply a consequence of the origin of the latter, just as the existence in Neo-Hittite of a nominative plural ending -uš beside accusative plural -uṣ indicates only that the inherited accusative -uš is replacing the inherited nominative ending -eš, and not that plural subjects in -uš are accusative. This account is necessarily somewhat speculative, but as long as it is possible, adjectival agreement is not evidence that the Anatolian ergative case has become a derivational category.

2.3.4.2. Internal Structure

In Luvian, the inherited ergative ending *-anti was renewed with the productive common-gender nominative endings -š and -nzi, an innovation which could in principle have been common to Luvian and Lycian, since Luvian -antiš and -antinzi both correspond exactly to Lycian -çi. Similarly, Hittite has extended the sequence -anteš, properly the derivational suffix -ant- plus the nominative plural ending -eš, as the regular ergative plural ending: e.g. happišnan[eš "body-parts" (KUB 9.4 i 19 = 9.34 ii 36), išišnanteš "bindings" in (2.20b) above, lakkhumziyanteš "leafy branches", and uttananteš "words". These developments could be taken as evidence that Anatolian ergatives were reanalyzed in Hittite and Luvian as the nominatives of common-gender derived stems in Hittite -ant- and Luvian -anti-.

Again, however, it may be easier to regard the developments in question as the products of systematic pressure dating from the Anatolian period. Since the ergative case originated via the reanalysis of neuter singulars, it must originally have lacked plural forms, just as it lacked adjectival forms. But while the absence of an adjectival ergative ending created a paradigmatic gap which urgently required filling to allow adjectival modification of neuter transitive subjects, the paradigmatic gap created by the absence of a plural nominal ergative ending was not so serious. The ergative as a category could well have continued indefinitely
to have as its domain only singular neuters, with plural neuter transitive subjects retaining their inherited nominative or absolutive marking.

The failure of Hittite and Luvian to agree on the shape of the ergative plural ending supports this scenario and suggests that the extension of the ergative case to neuter plurals was a parallel innovation in Hittite and Luvian. Such a development, being systematically well-motivated, is trivial enough to be posited twice. Hittite and Luvian then filled this paradigmatic gap in different ways: in Luvian, the only other transitive subject plural ending, nominative -nzi, was added to the ergative singular ending -antii; and in Hittite, the proportional analogy in (2.44a) created an ergative plural ending -anteš on the basis of the nominative plurals of anti-stems. Subsequently in Luvian, the proportional analogy in (2.44b) replaced the inherited ergative singular ending -antii by a recharacterized -antiš.

(2.44)  

a nom. sg. -anza : erg. sg. -anza :: nom. pl. -anteš : x, x = erg. pl. -anteš

b nom. pl. -antinzi : erg. pl. -antinzi :: nom. sg. -antiš : x, x = erg. sg. -antiš

Analogical developments like these are perfectly possible. In Sanskrit, neut. nom.-acc. pl. -āni, historically proper to the n-stems, was extended to the a-stems, so that on the model of n-stem pairs like neut. nom.-acc. pl. nām-ā and nām-āni "names", inherited yug-ā "yokes" acquired a competing yug-āni. But although analogical pressure from the neuter n-stems led to the creation of a new neuter a-stem form, the a-stems were not themselves reanalyzed as n-stems, as can be seen from their continued independence elsewhere; cf. e.g. nom.-acc. sg. nām-a vs. yug-am, gen. sg. nām-nah vs. yug-asya. One linguistic category can thus easily provide the basis for analogical change in a second without any actual reanalysis of the second category itself, and in Hittite, for instance, common-gender nominatives in -anza could well have provided the basis for analogy within the ergative paradigm (sg. -anza) without any need for reanalysis of the ergatives as nominatives.

2.3.4.3. Verbal Agreement

While Hittite neuter plurals never agree with intransitive verbs and instead invariably co-occur with singular verbs (HE §196), the ergative plurals attested in Hittite and (twice)
in Lycian regularly agree with plural verbs. There is no relevant Luvian evidence. It could be argued that since the Hittite and Lycian reflexes of the Anatolian ergative do not pattern with (intransitive subject) neuters in verbal agreement, they should not be analyzed synchronically as neuters. However, the fact that ergative plurals do not share a property with intransitive subject neuter plurals is not proof that they are not neutral. The property in question may simply be diagnostic of intransitive subjects rather than subjects in general, and the behavior of ergatives may thus simply indicate what we already know, that they are not intransitive subjects. This is certainly the case here: there is no more reason to expect the absolutive verb-agreement rule to have been extended to ergative plurals than there is to expect it to have been extended to intransitive subject common-gender plurals. After the ergative case was created, the rule applied just to intransitive verbs with neutral plural subjects.

2.3.4.4. Anaphora

There is a positive indication that the ergative remains an ergative case in at least Hittite, namely, the evidence of pronominal anaphora. In at least two contexts, an ergative noun is resumed with a formally neutral pronoun. One of these appears in (2.45):

(2.45) KBo 10.45 iv 37-39 (Ritual for the infernal divinities, CTH 446, ed. Otten 1961: 138)

karizz=a=kan GIM-an URU-az šėhur IM-an arri šuhha=ma=kan A-az arri
n=at=kan GAM GIŠPIŠÁN-az ārzi

"And just as a flood washes urine and mud from the city, and water washes the roof and it flows down the drain"

The antecedent of the clitic pronoun at here is A-az (i.e. wutenanza), the ergative singular of wasar "water". It is not possible to interpret this passage alternatively as "and just as a flood washes urine and mud from the city and washes the roof with water, and it flows down the drain", i.e. with A-az an ablative. This is indicated by the presence of ma and proven by the fact that karīt- means "flood, crue, Hochwasser", rather than "Regenguss" (as translated by
Otten 1961: 139). In addition to the passages quoted by Larroche (1951: 69-70), note the following:

(2.46)  

a  KBo 10.45 iv 41 (Ritual to the infernal divinities, CTH 446, ed. Otten 1961: 138)  
n=at=kan kariz aruni anda pidau  
"Let the flood carry them into the sea"  

b  KUB 36.110 rev 17-21 (Benedictions for the king, CTH 820, ed. Neu 1980a: 228)  
appaliyallās=a Ė-[ir] karitti pēran u[etan] karaiz lah[ui] n=at parā šartai  
n=a[t ...] aruna [...]  
"But the enemy's house is built in front of the flood; the flood will flow,  
dislodge it, and carry (?) it to the sea"  

c  KUB 34.10 ii 9'-11' (Lunar divination, CTH 533)  
mān INI ITU.5.KAM dSIN-aš puš[a] girēz=a uizzi tā halkiHIA-uš pēdā[i]  
"If in the fifth month the moon wanes, a flood will come and carry off the  
grains"  

d  KBo 12.73:7'-8' (Hymn to Iškur-Adad, CTH 314)  
[D].Mēš-ašš=a=kan anda [k]aridduš aršanut  
"He made floods flow in the rivers"  

Since karitt- refers to a flood caused by overflowing rivers, and not to rain itself (the latter is Hittite heu-; note [hēau]eš gariṭtešš=a "rains and floods" at KUB 34.14:10), it would make no sense to speak of a karitt- washing roofs. In (2.45), then, the first two clauses must have different subjects: the (river's) flood which washes out the town, and the (rain) water which washes off the roof.

The second context where an ergative noun is resumed by a neuter pronoun is the following:
KUB 14.1+ obv 25-27 (Madduwalla, CTH 147, ed. Götze 1928: 6)

\[ \text{kuiš=a=wa KUR-anza=ma=t[ak]uru[r ēpzi nu=wa=ššan kuitma]n ŠA} \]
\[ \text{dUTU-ŠI [ERÍN.MÉŠ zahhiyata]ri ug=a=wa=za manni[nk]uwan kuit} \]
\[ \text{[nu=w]ar=at ūk hū[d]ak wā[lah]mi} \]

"But any land which takes hostility to you, while His Majesty's troops do battle and I am near, I shall immediately destroy it".

Here the subject of the first sentence, \text{kuiš KUR-anza} (i.e. \text{udneanza}) "whichever land", is resumed in the last sentence by at "it".

I have seen two other apparent cases of resumption of an ergative by an intransitive subject pronoun, neither of which is probative. On the pronominalization of KÙ.BABBAL in the Song of Silver, see note 15 above. The other instance is printed and translated at CHD 74 as follows:

(2.48) KUB 39.71 ii 44-47 (Ritual for Ištár-Pirinkir, CTH 71:8)

\[ \text{mahan=ma=za GLŠliššanza arḫ[a ...] n=at ANā DINGIR-LIM šer arha} \]
\[ \text{wah[nuzzu kuitman=m]a GLŠliššar wahn[(uškizzi)]} \]

"But when the \text{lūéššar} [burns (?)] out [...] he waves it over the deity; while he is waving the l. ...."

If \text{GLŠliššanza} were indeed an ergative, this would exemplify the agreement pattern of (2.45) and (2.47). However, although the antecedent of at here is obviously \text{lūéššar} in some form, without evidence of a transitive verb in the first clause there is no reason not to take \text{GLŠliššanza} as an ablative with arha. The presence of an absolutive \text{GLŠliššar} in place of \text{GLŠliššanza} in the parallel text KUB 39.70 i 5 is not evidence against an ablative, since \text{GLŠliššar} can only be in A or O function, and \text{GLŠliššanza} cannot be in either; the manuscripts therefore differ materially.

The pattern of agreement represented by (2.45) and (2.47) is unlikely to be ad sensum: even if semantically animate nouns, which are virtually all morphologically common-gender, are common-gender ad sensum (see note 15), there is no reason to suppose that Hittite
inanimates are neuter ad sensum, since unlike animates they are not limited to one grammatical gender, and there are no clear instances of neuter pronouns resuming common-gender inanimates. If pronouns agree with their antecedents, then, because at is neuter, A-as should be neuter too. In view of this agreement pattern, the view that forms like this are common-gender could be maintained in one of two ways. One could treat ergatives as underlying neuters which are made common-gender by an extraordinary syntactic process; but see note 5 above. Alternatively, one could propose that the clitic pronouns in (2.45) and (2.47) are neuter because they represent an underlying intransitive subject watar and an underlying object udne. This would entail a revival of the view that pronominalization is a syntactic process which transforms underlying nouns into surface pronouns; for a survey of the evidence against this view see e.g. Newmeyer (1986: 141-43). Both proposals are thus unacceptable. For these reasons the Hittite reflex of the Anatolian ergative must be analyzed synchronically, not just diachronically, as a neuter ergative rather than the nominative of a derived stem.

2.4. Verb Serialization

A typologically interesting feature of Anatolian syntax is the existence of serial verb constructions. Such constructions—roughly single sentences with more than one non-conjoined verb—are cross-linguistically common and have been especially well-studied among creoles and the languages of Africa and Papua New Guinea. In Hittite there are two distinct serial verb constructions. The first of these is the "consecutive" construction, as it is termed by Disterheft (1984) in its only special treatment (compare HE §312); I will also use the term "consecutive". This construction is characterized by the presence of two verbs: in addition to the usual sentence-final lexical verb, the clause's first or second stressed word is the verb pəi- "go" or uwa- "come", agreeing with the subject of the other verb. Examples of this construction appear in (2.49) for pəi- and (2.50) for uwa-:
(2.49) a  KBo 17.11 i 2-3  (Storm ritual, CTH 631, ed. Neu 1980a)  
[1]=aṣ paiz[x]i LÚ.MEŠ MEŠEDI-an pēran tiēz[zi]  
"He then walks before the guards"

b  KBo 10.23+ i 29'-31'  (KI.LAM festival, CTH 627, ed. Singer 1984: 10)  
[(n)]u paizzi GAL LÚ.MEŠ E.DÉ.A [[LUGA]]L-i šakuwannaš GišŠUKUR  
[(p)]āi  
"The chief smith then gives the ceremonial spear to the king"

c  KBo 16.61 rev 7 6  (Legal fragment, CTH 295, ed. Werner 1967: 60)  
paimi=war=aṣ ANA NAM.RA URURŠuwa[ššuwa] pihhi  
"I will then give them to the Šuwaššuwa deportees"

(2.50) a  KBo 5.13 i 35  (Kupanta-dLAMMA treaty, CTH 68, ed. Friedrich 1926: 116)  
n=an u[(wa)]mi LÚKUR-aṣ iwār walahmi  
"I will then attack you like an enemy"

b  KUB 14.1+ obv 62-63  (Madduwatta, CTH 147, ed. Götze 1928: 16)  
nu=ddu=za uit =Kišnapiliš an[dan] IŠTU KUR URURHatti huinut  
"Kišnapili then saved you from Hatti"

c  Bo 86/299 i 36-37  (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 12)  
nu=šši uit ABU-YA=pat URUX Santimman ZAG-an iyat  
"My father himself then made Šantimma his border"

d  Bo 86/299 ii 3  (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 14)  
n=at uizzi mān udai  
"If he then brings them ..."

e  Bo 86/299 i 97-98  (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 14)  
uit=ma mahhan ABU-YA memian IŠME  
"But when my father then heard the word ..."

As Disterheft shows, the two inflected verbs in this construction cannot be analyzed as parts of asyndetically conjoined sentences, since Wackernagel's Law elitic arguments of the
second verb invariably either precede or cliticize to the consecutive verb pāi- or uwa-. These consecutive verbs appear synchronically to occupy the structural TOP position, since like topicalized constituents they are either absolutely sentence-initially or follow null-position elements like nu and clitics; note that the consecutives in (2.50d-e) precede mān and mahhan, which, I suggested above, may occupy the COMP position.²¹ They cannot have their etymologically proper interpretation, as Disterheft also shows on the basis of cases where motion is impossible, but are evidently aspectualizers of some kind. For want of a better alternative, I here follow Disterheft in translating them consecutively. Diachronically, this construction must ultimately continue an asyndetic conjunctive structure, and in particular, for reasons that will become clear in chapter 3, it is likely to continue a structure in which the second verb is intransitive.

The consecutive construction is also attested in the following Cuneiform Luvian passage (and probably also at KBo 29.34 (+) VBoT 60 i 8):

(2.51) KUB 35.102 + ii 11'-14', iii 1-3 (cf. ibid. iv 1-2; Lunar magic, CTH 766, ed. Starke 1985: 222)

[i:]ni=wa dEN.ZU-anzanza kummaya[nza hat]ayannanza āpan hizzān[ni]
iyandu=kuwa za‰šin DUMU-anna‰ši[n] ánnin warallin uwat[a]=[ndu] ...
[p]a=wa iyandu dEN.ZU-inzi x[ ... ] kummayananza hatayannanza apan
hizzaindu

"Let us then entrust him to the Moongods' holy hatayanni-, and let them then bring this child's own mother ... Let the Moongods then entrust him to the holy hatayanni-"
See Melchert (1990c) on the readings and interpretation of this passage. The first instance of the intransitive verb iyandu "let them go" here is clause-initial and without an overt subject, and the transitive verb uwatandu "let them bring" is clause-final and likewise without an overt subject. If these two verbs headed two different clauses, then, as I will show in chapter 3, a subject clitic as would be expected with the first verb. If iyandu is taken as a consecutive, however, with precisely the syntax of its Hittite counterpart, then the sentence is syntactically unproblematic and may be interpreted as indicated. Given this clear case, both iynin "let us go" and the second instance of iyandu are certainly also consecutives. The former is also absolutely clause-initial, while the latter, like many of its Hittite counterparts, follows only a sentence-initial particle and clitics.

The immediate diachronic source of the Anatolian consecutive may be the second attested Hittite serial verb construction, fully grammaticalized only in the cases of pâi- and wwa-. This second construction requires syntactic and semantic investigation more systematic than I have been able to undertake here. Nevertheless I believe it is attested in at least three places, most securely in the following sentence from the ritual of Hatiya:

(2.52)  
KBo 15.25 rev 7-8  (Ritual of Hatiya, CTH 396, ed. Carruba 1966: 4) 
šēr=a=šan UZU[NÎG.GIC UZUŠ]A kuirzi dâi
"but he cuts, and places thereon, liver and heart"

In this sentence, not only do both inflected verbs (kuirzi "cuts" and dâi "places") share an overt object—which could in principle be treated as discourse-conditioned null object anaphora with the second verb—but the preverb šēr "on" and clitic locative particle šan must both be construed with the second verb rather than the first one.

A second example of this construction is the following:

(2.53)  
KBo 5.3+ iii 23  (Hukkana treaty, CTH 42, ed. Friedrich 1930: 124) 
zig=a=[šma]š=at mân paitti ECIR-pa mem[a]tti
"But if you go and repeat it to them"
If the proposal that consecutives are in TOP is correct, then the verb *païtī* "go" here cannot be a consecutive, since it is preceded not only by *mān* "if" but a topicalized *sig* "you" (in other words by both TOP and COMP).

A third example of this construction will be cited in chapter 3; other possible examples appear in (2.54).

(2.54) a  KUB 29.1 i 26-27  (Foundation ritual, CTH 414)
        hēyauēš kuit tašnuskīt šallanuškir
        "... which the rains have made strong and have made tall"

   b KBo 21.74 iii 8'-9'  (Medical ritual, CTH 461, ed. Burde 1974: 26)
       n=at anda [...] kināizzī SIG₅-ahzi
       "He sorts them therein and makes them right"

   c KUB 44.64 ii 12-13  (Medical ritual, CTH 461, ed. Burde 1974: 49)
       namma=at kīnaizzī pūwātzi SIG₅-ahzi
       "Then he sorts them, crushes them, and makes them right"

   d KUB 6.45+ iii 47  (Muwatalli's prayer to the Stormgod, CTH 381, ed.
       Lebrun 1980: 267)
       n=an=mu Dingir.Mēš ECīr-pa SIG₅-ahhanzi šarlanzi
       "The gods will make it right again and lift it from me"

   e KBo 12.38 i 7-9  (Conquest of Cyprus, CTH 121, ed. Güterbock 1967: 75)
       KURAlašiyan=ma=za=kan pede=šši [IR-ahhu]n arkamananahhun
       "But Cyprus I subjugated on the spot and obligated to tribute"

I will not suggest a structural analysis of verb serialization of this type (cf. e.g. Baker 1989),
but will simply note, in the absence of a constrained account of this construction in Hittite,
that it cannot be excluded that sequences superficially similar to (2.52-54)—that is, with
adjacent identically agreeing verbs—in fact exemplify the same serial verb construction
rather than asyndetic conjunction.
2.5. Focus Movement

It is well-known that certain elements frequently appear either near or immediately before the verb in Hittite and Luvian: these include preverbs, the negation, certain adverbs, and a small class of substantival morphemes including especially indefinite pronouns like *kuiški* "any(body)". The syntactic and semantic conditions on the appearance of such elements in this position (or class of positions) has not been systematically investigated to date, nor have the precise structural positions involved been determined, but some kind of focus movement is a priori a likely syntactic mechanism, and I will assume the existence of such a process in this dissertation. Examples of focus movement in Hittite include the following:

(2.55) a KUB 13.1 iv 5 (Bel madgalti instructions, CTH 261, ed. von Schuler 1957: 62)

naššu dammišhān kuiški kuitki [zarzi]

"Whether someone has injured something ..."

b Bo 86/299 iii 69-70 (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 24)

nu=šši=kan arha lē kuiški kuitki dāi

"Let nobody (lit. not anybody) take anything away from him"

c Bo 86/299 ii 74-75 (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 18)

nu=šši=kan mān wakšiyazi kuitki

"If something is lacking for him ..."

d Bo 86/299 iii 28 (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 22)

mān=ma ANA NUMUN m=Tuthaliya nakkešzi kuitki

"But if something weighs upon the seed of Tuthaliya ..."

Some apparent cases of focus movement may in fact reflect other syntactic processes. For instance, while the position of *kuitki* in (2.56) is probably governed by the same operations as in (2.55c-d), this cannot be proven syntactically, since it is logically possible
that *kuitki* has in fact not been moved syntactically and that the verb *nakkēszi* "weighs" has instead been topicalized.

(2.56)  
Bo 86/299 iii 22 (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 22)  

nušši nakkēszi *kuitki*  

"Something weighs upon him"

The same logical possibility is not present in (2.57) if my analysis of the position of consecutives is in correct, since the only known movement process which could affect the position of the verb *šannai* "conceals" is topicalization, a process which cannot operate in this case, since TOP is already filled by *uizzi" comes". Therefore *kuwatqa" somehow" must have been positioned via focus movement.

(2.57)  
KBo 15.25 obv 36 (Ritual fragment, CTH 500)  

uizzi=at ša[nai ku]watqa  

"S/he will then conceal it somehow"

Similarly, while it is possible to account for the word order in (2.58a) by assuming that the verb *šakta" knew" has been topicalized, apparently stranding two indefinite pronouns, the same explanation is not available for (2.58b), where the verb *ištamašzi" hears" is non-initial.

The word order in both sentences is probably due to focus movement.

(2.58).  
a  
KUB 26.1 iv 32 (Eunuch instructions, CTH 255, ed. von Schuler 1957: 16)  

[(nu=za)=ka]n šakta kuiški kuinki  

"Someone knew something"

b  
KUB 26.12 i 33 (Eunuch instructions, CTH 255, ed. von Schuler 1957: 24)  

našmaš maš EGIR-ziar ištamašzi kuiški kuitki  

"Or if someone hears something about you afterwards ..."

"Focus movement" may actually consist of several processes. In particular, I conjecture that the postverbal positioning of indefinites and other ordinarily immediately preverbal elements in sentences like (2.55c-d) and (2.56-58) may be the result of focus movement.
followed by a local verb fronting process. This is suggested by sentences like the following, where postverbal focus positioning is accompanied by overt emphatic marking on the verb:

(2.59)  a  Bo 86/299 ii 31 (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 16)
   ūk=ma ḫuTathaliyaš LUGAL.GAL kuitman LUGAL-izziahhat=pat naui
   "But as long as I, Tuthaliya the Great King, did not yet rule ..."

  b  Bo 86/299 ii 87 (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 20)
   apūn=ma=za MUNUS-an md̄LAMMA-āš ANA PANJ ABİ-ya datta=pat naui
   "Kurunta had not yet taken that woman for himself in my father's time"

  c  Bo 86/299 ii 99-100 (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 20)
   mān=ma DUMU-KA DUMU.DUMU-KA katta waštai=ya kuiški
   "But if some son (or) grandson of yours later also commits an offence ...

Support for this view comes from the following sentence, which appears to exemplify both focus movement and verb serialization, since the second verb otherwise lacks an object:

(2.60)  KBo 6.3 iv 18 (Laws, series one, CTH 291, ed. Friedrich 1959: 44)
   takku ŠAH.TUR kappi karašzi kuiški tūzzi
   "If someone cuts out and steals a small piglet"

If the position of karašzi before its indefinite subject is the result of a local fronting process, then, at an underlying level of representation, the two verbs are adjacent, and (2.60) may be assimilated to the process of serialization discussed above.

2.6. NP Syntax

2.6.1. Possessor Raising

Discussion of two syntactic processes affecting NPs—possessor raising and quantifier float—will conclude this chapter. As far as I know, neither process has been explicitly identified as such in the literature, but both are intended as analyses of very well-known phenomena. The first process, possessor raising, is hypothesized to operate in what is usually called "partitive apposition" or the "construction of the whole and the part" in Hittite
grammar (see HE §213 and Yoshida 1987: 34-37). These traditional terms describe any two tautosentential NPs which seem to have the same grammatical or thematic role—which, loosely speaking, are in apposition—such that one of them is in some sense part of the other.

Hittite examples of this include the following:

(2.61) a  KBo 3.4 ii 20 (Annals of Muršili II, CTH 61, ed. Götze 1933: 48)

 mâUhha-LÚ-n=a giniššuš ašešta

"He also set Uhhaziti (on his) knees"

b  KUB 8.36 ii 7' (Catalogue, CTH 279, ed. Laroche 1971: 188)

[mâ]n antuḫšan IGL.HI.A-w[a] ištar[akzi]

"If it sickens a man (in) the eyes ..."

c  KBo 14.18: 10' (Deeds of Šuppiluliuma I, CTH 40, ed. Güterbock 1956: 118)

n=an=kan SAG.DU.ZU kuerta

"He cut off his head"

d  KUB 34.84+ iv 18 (Ritual of Maštigga, CTH 404, ed. Rost 1953: 364)

nu 2 [B]ÉL SISKUR.SISKUR tuikkuš warši

"She rubs the two clients (on) the bodies"

(2.62) a  KUB 34.84+ i 26' (Ritual of Maštigga, CTH 404, ed. Rost 1953: 348)

n=at=kan SAG.[DU]-ŠUNU kariyanteš

"Their heads are covered"

b  KBo 5.8 iii 18-19 (Annals of Muršili II, CTH 62, ed. Götze 1933: 156)

nu=za=kan IGL.HI.A-wa etez ANA mâPittipara neyahhat

"I turned (in) the eyes to that side, to Pittipara"

In these and the vast majority of Hittite instances of "partitive apposition", the two NPs are a body part and the person (or organism) it is part of, and they seem to share the surface subject or direct object grammatical relation. The body part may in most cases also be
called an "accusative of respect": "he cut him off in respect to the head"; "if it sickens a man in respect to the eyes"; and so on.

The pragmatic function of possessor raising in (2.61-62) is probably like that of similar constructions in modern languages. In particular it is likely to resemble the function of the English construction illustrated in (2.64) as opposed to (2.63):

(2.63)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \quad \text{John kicked Bob's knee} \\
\text{b} & \quad \text{Vlad bit John's neck}
\end{align*}

(2.64)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \quad \text{John kicked Bob in the knee} \\
\text{b} & \quad \text{Vlad bit John in the neck}
\end{align*}

This English construction permits the possessor to be assigned the \( \theta \)-role proper to the possessed NP in the genitive construction, rather than any \( \theta \)-role of a possessor; in (2.64), for instance, Bob and John are interpreted as thematic patients and not as the possessors of patients. On the other hand, whereas the body parts in (2.63) are overtly assigned the patient \( \theta \)-role, in (2.64) they are overtly interpreted as locations and are only implicitly (if at all) patients. The Hittite construction in (2.61-62) could be assumed to have been used, like its English counterpart in (2.64), in pragmatic contexts where a possessor \( \theta \)-role is less appropriate than (say) a patient or theme \( \theta \)-role.

Despite widespread use, the term "partitive apposition" for this construction has no value beyond that of a very preliminary label: it is by definition a special case of NP apposition in general, which all languages probably permit, and the relation between a whole and its part is evidently one of the relations generally permissible in NP apposition. For example, in English, which has no special construction structurally parallel to the Hittite one under discussion, "partitive apposition" is perfectly acceptable syntactically:

(2.65)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \quad \text{The State House is in Boston, downtown, on Beacon Hill} \\
\text{b} & \quad \text{I was introduced to the Jacksons—the parents—yesterday after dinner} \\
\text{c} & \quad \text{You shot Dan in the leg, on the kneecap} \\
\text{d} & \quad \text{We brought presents for the Joneses, for every single one}
\end{align*}
If the very common Hittite type in (2.61-62) is "partitive apposition", then the relevant NPs are derived by whatever means apposition generally is derived, in the same manner as the apposed English NPs in (2.61-62), and they must have the syntax of apposed NPs generally. This is demonstrably not the case, however, as is implicitly recognized in referring this type to a special "construction of the whole and the part". Hittite apposition is in general vanishingly rare between clitics and free NPs, as I will show in §5.4, but the construction in (2.61-62) typically involves a clitic possessor and a free NP body part.

My alternative proposal, then, is that the apparently apposed NPs in (2.61-62) and most other Hittite instances of "partitive apposition" are derived by the syntactic process of possessor raising. This is a process which, like topicalization and WH-movement, relates two distinct levels of syntactic representation; like passivization or dative movement in other languages, it also has an important effect on grammatical relations. First, the possessor of an inalienably possessed object (such as a body part or a physical constituent of an inanimate object) is raised from its base-generated position within the NP to a position where it is a verbal argument and, in particular, assumes the underlying grammatical relation of the possessed object. Second, the possessed object assumes the chômeur grammatical relation: it is syntactically inert, incapable of being affected by other syntactic processes like passivization and Wackernagel's Law cliticization. A schematic illustration of this process is given in (2.66):

---

22 I do not mean by this to belittle the very important descriptive work which led to the discovery of partitive apposition, but merely to suggest that the descriptive category can and should now be replaced.

23 The following characteristics could, as usual, easily be restated in a non-derivation model: the syntactic claims made here are, I believe, largely independent of the details of formalism, although they naturally cannot be articulated without a particular formalism.
(2.66) Possessor Raising

If the examples in (2.61-62) are representative, this process may also be assumed to have a related effect on thematic relations: the underlying possessor assumes the $\theta$-role of the possessed NP, which in turn assumes some less prominent $\theta$-role.

Possessor raising is quite common cross-linguistically. In Chichewa, for instance, this process transforms the possessors of direct objects into direct objects themselves; thus kalulu "hare" is a possessor in (2.67a) but a direct object in (2.67b) (both cited from Baker 1988: 271).

(2.67) a Fisi anadya nsomba za kalulu

hyena ate fish AGR.of hare

"The hyena ate the hare's fish"

b Fisi anady-er-a kalulu nsomba

hyena ate.APPL hare fish

"The hyena ate the hare's fish"

The direct object status of kalulu in (2.67b) is indicated by its immediately postverbal position and by its ability to be the subject of the corresponding passive, (2.68) (cited from Baker 1988: 272).

(2.68) Kalulu anady-er-edwa nsomba ndi fisi

hare ate.APPL.PASS fish by hyena

"The hare had his fish eaten by the hyena"
The underlying direct object *nsomba* "fish" is syntactically a chômeur in (2.67b) and (2.68),
and cannot be the subject of any passive corresponding to (2.67b).

Likewise the possessor of a direct object in Tzotzil can (under circumstances discussed
by Aissen 1987: 126-54) assume direct object status, with the possessed NP demoted to
chômeur status. The objecthood of the underlying possessor is indicated by evidence from
agreement and passivization (cited from Aissen 1987: 126, 131): in (2.69a), the verb agrees
with the possessor of the underlying direct object and not with the object itself; in (2.69b),
where the morpheme *be* which licenses possessor raising is omitted, the verb cannot agree
with its object's possessor; and in (2.69c), the passive subject is the underlying possessor.

(2.69)  a  A-mil-b-on jutuk k-ol
        2SUBJ-kill-*be-*1SG.DIR.OBJ one 1SG.POSS-child
        "You killed one of my children"

   b  *A-mil-on k-ol
        2SUBJ-kill-1SG.DIR.OBJ 1SG.POSS-child
        "You killed my child"

   c  Ch-i-toyilan-h-at j-jol
        ASP-1SUBJ-keep.lifting-*be-*PASS 1SG.POSS-head
        "My head was lifted over and over"

There are three very important differences between possessor raising in Hittite and in
other more cross-linguistically typical possessor raising systems. First, possessor raising is
commonly licensed by a valence-increasing verbal morpheme—for instance, the applicative
morpheme -er- in Chichewā and the functionally similar -be- in Tzotzil—but in Hittite only
the raised possessor changes formally. Second, in both Chichewā and Tzotzil, a possessor
can undergo this process regardless of the particular thematic relationship between it and
the possessed NP. In Hittite, on the other hand, the process is restricted to partitive
relationships and in practice largely to body parts. Third, in both Chichewā and Tzotzil,
only the possessors of direct objects can undergo the process of possessor raising. This is
indicated for Chichewa by unacceptable instances of possessor raising with a PP and a subject (cited from Baker 1988: 275), in (2.70a) and (2.70b) respectively:

(2.70)  a  *Fisi anatumizira kalulu kalata kwa nsomba
    hyena sent.APPL hare letter to fish
    "The hyena sent a letter to the hare's fish"

b  *Kalulu anadyera udzu mbuzi
    hare ate.APPL grass goats
    "The hare's goats ate the grass"

Similarly Aissen (1987: 127) observes that possessor raising in Tzotzil only affects the possessors of underlying direct objects, and is unacceptable for underlying indirect objects and other oblique complements.

In Hittite, on the other hand, while the vast majority of instances of possessor raising involve either surface direct objects or surface subjects which are underlying direct objects, as in (2.61) and (2.62) respectively, descriptions of partitive apposition specifically adduce instances of apposed oblique NPs. Six instances of this type are cited at HE §213 and quoted in (2.71), and at least (2.71b) is paralleled elsewhere.

(2.71)  a  StBoT 24 iv 54-55 (Apology of Hattusilis III, CTH 81, ed. Otten 1981: 26)
    n=at ANA ABBA^{H}LA Ū ANA ABBA ABBA^{H}LA [ ... (UL ku)] edanikki
    uppir
    "They did not send them to any of my fathers and grandfathers"

b  KUB 21.1+ iv 45-46 (Alakšandu treaty, CTH 76, ed. Friedrich 1930: 82)
    nu=kam ANA dU[(TU-SÎ)] ŠU-i anda āš[šu lul]u au nu=kam ANA
    d'(UTU-SÎ ŠU)]-i anda miya[(hwan)ta]hhu
    "May you experience good lulul in His Majesty's hand, may you grow old in His Majesty's hand"
As noted at HE §213b2, however, the usage of the personal pronouns in (2.71d-e) is parallel to that of other forms in -ed- which cannot always be construed as partitivey opposed to any NP and which seem to have more generally possessive function (cf. Lebrun 1900: 373):

(2.72) a  KUB 36.90 obv 19-20 (Prayer, CTH 386, ed. Lebrun 1980: 365)
    ehu IŠTU HUR.SAG Hahuwa tuedaš ʾaššiyantaza
    "Come from Mt. Hahuwa, your favorite"

    lukkattaš=kan UD.KAM-ti ʾmDuthaliyan tuedaš ʾaššiyantas pēdaš
    URU Hakmiš URU Nerik AŠŠUM LŪ.SANGA-UTTIM iškanzi
    "Tomorrow they will anoint Tuthaliya to the priesthood in your favorite places, Hakmi and Nerik"

c  KUB 14.3 iv 4-5 (Tawagalawa letter, CTH 181)
    ammetaza=ma=wa=za=kan KUR-eza arha lē kurur
    "With respect to my country you are not to be hostile"

The plural form tuedaš in (2.72b) in particular shows that the forms in -ed- in (2.71d-e) and (2.72) are, synchronically, simply inflecting pronominal possessive stems ammedaz- and tuedaš-.

They may have been created within Neo-Hittite by analyzing the ablatives ammedaz "from
me" and *tuedaz* "from you" in some context as ablatives built to possessives, that is, as "from mine" and "from yours" respectively. This would have resulted in the creation of these new, only marginally productive pronominal stems in -ed- (cf. Houwink ten Cate 1966: 131).

The potential evidence for non-object possessor raising cited at HE §213 therefore reduces to the four examples in (2.71a-c) and others like them. The first of these, (2.71a), would be formally unproblematic as possessor raising: while the relation between an indefinite quantifier and an NP is ordinarily expressed by agreement, the genitive is sometimes used, as in (2.73).

(2.73)    KBo 6.2 iii 21-22 (Laws, series one, CTH 291, ed. Friedrich 1959: 36)
        ŠA [(LŬURUDU.)]NAGAR natta kuški araunas

"None (lit. not any) of his metalworkers is free"

On the other hand, (2.71a) is not probative as possessor raising, since, as noted above, some instances of ordinary apposition are partitive. Compare specifically the English appositions in (2.65d) and the following:

(2.74)    They did not send them to my cousins and my uncles and my aunts, not to any

Alternative analyses are more difficult for (2.71b-c), however. Three specific consequences follow if these are, as it seems they must be, taken as possessor raising rather than partitive apposition or some other construction, and consequently as evidence that the process of possessor raising in Hittite is indifferent to case or grammatical relation. First, although this process must be analyzed as resulting in a change in grammatical relations, it cannot—despite appearances—be analyzed as resulting in any change in thematic relations. In (2.71b), for instance, ḏUTU-ŠI "His Majesty" must be a thematic possessor and not a location, since "in His Majesty (with respect to) the hand" makes no sense. But if possessor raising does not affect thematic relations, then the account of its pragmatics offered above must be abandoned. A priori, to be sure, this account has no special virtue—it clearly cannot be applied to possessor raising in Chichewa or Tzotzil—but it is unclear what
alternative will explain the frequent use of possessor raising in Hittite with underlying direct-object body parts. Second, as I will show in chapter 4, there are many possibly possessive Wackernagel's Law oblique clitics which must be treated as syntactically ambiguous if possessor raising can apply freely to non-objects. Third, Hittite becomes somewhat unusual not only typologically but within the Indo-European and Anatolian context: the comparative evidence for possessor raising is confined to underlying objects.24

Within Anatolian, this comparative evidence involves Palaic, Cuneiform Luvian, and Hieroglyphic Luvian. Possessor raising is clearly attested in Palaic and Hieroglyphic Luvian, as in (2.75a) and (2.75b) respectively:

(2.75) a  
KUB 32.18 i 13' (Hymn and myth, CTH 752, ed. Carruba 1970: 8)

[s]ăuiiran=kuwar=an šittan

"Press him right (on) the horn" (Melchert 1984: 26)

b  
MARAŞ 4, 5 (Hawkins 1980: 143)

wa/i-tá VIR-ti-i-zí-i ("PES") pa-ti-zi | ARHA ("MANUS+CULTER")

REL+ra/i-ha-

"I cut off the men's feet"

For Cuneiform Luvian, Craig Melchert has called my attention to the sequences pa=an dāuwa, pa=an UZU EME-in, and a=an UZU E[ME], all unfortunately in broken contexts at KUB 7.68 (+) 69 ii 15', 17', 21', and 22': despite the lack of contextual information, these are likely to be "... her/him in the eyes ..." and "... her/him in the tongue ...". In a more complete context, possessor raising may occur in the following passage:

(2.76)  
KUB 9.6+ iii 21"-31" (Dupaduparša ritual, CTH 759, ed. Starke 1985: 115)

EN SISKUR=ma=šši=ya=aš mena[hh]anda ĮŠTU QATI-ŠU įpzi n=uš anda

uešuriyanzi n=uš arha duwarnanzi MUNUSŠU.GI=ma kiššan memai

---

24 These last two points are of course simply interesting consequences of non-object possessor raising, not arguments against it.
kuis=tar malhaššašzan EN-ya ādduwala ēriniti a=an
DINGIR MEŠ-inzi ēhha nātatta tatarhandu uitpanim=pa=an uidāindu
a=duw=[a]n annān pātanza dūwandu
nu MUNUSŠU.GI GI.HL.A ANA EN SISKUR.SISKUR ŠAPAL GİR.MEŠ-ŠU dāī
"Opposite her [the Old Woman], the celebrant also takes them [two reed
baskets] in his hands. They crush them by twisting. They break them apart.
The Old Woman speaks as follows [in Luvian]:
"Whoever does evil to the celebrant, may the gods crush him like reeds,
may they smash him uitpanim, may they put him under his [the
celebrant's] feet!"
The Old Woman places the reeds under the celebrant's feet"
(translation after Watkins 1986: 325)
The sentence in question is uitpanim=pa=an uidaindu "may they smash him uitpanim",
where uitpanim is assimilated from *uitpanin. Melchert (1984: 158) notes that uitpanim is
in apposition to an "him" and suggests that it may form at least a folk figura etymologica with
the verb uidāindu; Watkins (1986: 326) tentatively translates "smash him a smashing".
Certainly either a cognate accusative of this type or a resultative accusative would make
sense syntactically. Contextually, however, as Leslie Kurke observes (p.c.), the conventions
of homeopathic magic favor an interpretation on which the ritual twisting and crushing of
two reed baskets is followed by a more specific request, namely that the gods twist and crush
something resembling the two reed baskets: the testicles of the evil-doer. While this
argument is by its nature not provable, I therefore suggest that uitpani- may mean
"testicle(s)" and that the sentence in which it appears may illustrate possessor raising in
Luvian. If this is correct, the object of the following sentence is the evil-doer's testicles
(literally "it", sg. uitpanim) rather than the evil-doer himself, and the two sentences mean
"may they smash him in the testicles, may they put them under his feet". On this
interpretation, uitpani- "testicle(s)" may be a regular Luvian i-thematization of a noun
formed with the suffix of Hittite \textit{paltana-} "shoulder", reflecting a virtual \textit{*wi-\textsuperscript{h}h\textsuperscript{b}-ono-}
"having two little one(s)" (compare Latin \textit{bi-ped-} and Sanskrit \textit{dv\textsuperscript{v}-p\textit{\d}}\textit{d}- \textit{*"having two feet")}.

Elsewhere in Indo-European, according to Delbrück (1893: 385-86), the construction of the whole and the part is clearly found only in Indo-Iranian and Greek. Delbrück cites exactly one clear Indo-Iranian instance (from the Atharvaveda), however, and, as Mark Hale (p.c.) points out, the citation depends critically on a misprint in the edition then available to him. We may therefore disregard his conclusion that this "einfach und alterthümlich" construction was inherited from Indo-European (although the conclusion could in the end still prove true).

The construction is fairly common in Homeric Greek, where it is restricted to underlying
direct objects, as in the following examples:

\begin{itemize}
  \item [2.77] a \textit{Iliad 3.438}
  \textit{mé me, gónai, khalepōsin onо́desi thumōn ἐνιπτε}
  "Woman, don't reprove me (in) the \textit{thumos} with hard blames"
  \item b \textit{Iliad 4.461}
  \textit{tόn dē skōtos ósse kālupsen}
  "Darkness covered \textit{him} (in) the \textit{eyes}"
  \item c \textit{Iliad 4.501-502}
  \textit{tόn hr' Oduseús ... bāle douri kórsēn}
  "Odysseus struck \textit{him} (in) the \textit{temple} with a spear"
\end{itemize}

I would analyze these as the result of possessor raising—exactly as in Hittite except that,
like other such systems cross-linguistically, Greek possessor raising is restricted to the
underlying direct object position. As Delbrück (1893: 385) already saw, possessor raising
feeds passivization, and it is therefore the raised possessor which is the subject of the
corresponding passive:
(2.78) Iliad 5.284
bēbēlaik keneôna diamanres
"You have been struck (in) the flank straight through"

The history and prehistory of possessor raising in Anatolian (and by implication elsewhere) will be discussed in chapter 4.

2.6.2. Quantifier Float

The final syntactic process to be identified here has to do with the positioning of quantifiers, a class of adjectives including various words for "all" like Hittite humant-; I have not investigated the syntax of this class outside Hittite. Most Hittite adjectives, including demonstratives like kāš "this" and apāš "that", must precede their governing nouns, but quantifiers (and participles) need not. Ordinarily quantifiers are positioned immediately after their governing nouns, as in (2.80), but they also occur before their governing nouns, as in (2.81), and in the preverbal focus position, as in (2.82).

(2.80) a KBo 5.6 i 14 (Deeds of Šuppiluliuma I, CTH 40, ed. Güterbock 1956: 90)
URU Gašgaš=ma hūmana takšul ēsta
"And because the whole Gašga land was at peace..."

b KUB 14.10+ i 22-24 (Plague prayer, CTH 378, ed. Lebrun 1980: 204)
u=za hingani šer [(4)]NA DINGIR.MEŠ hūmandaš ĕrkuwar [ē]šahhu
"I made prayers about the plague to all the gods"

c KUB 21.27 i 3 (Puduhepa’s prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna, CTH 384, ed. Lebrun 1980: 330)
dUTU URUTUL-na=za GAŠAN-YA KUR-eaš hūmandaš
MUNUS.LUGAL-aš
"Sungoddess of Arinna, you are the queen of all lands"

(2.81) KBo 5.6 i 24 (Deeds of Šuppiluliuma I, CTH 40, ed. Güterbock 1956: 91)
n=at hūmandaš ĀNA BĀD.KARAS MĖ-ya panzi
"They went in battle to all the fortified camps"
(2.82)  IBoT 1.36 iii 37 (Guard protocol, CTH 262, ed. Jakob-Rost 1966: 194)

nu Lú·mEŠ MEŠDU-TIM EGIR-anda húmanteš pänzi

"All the guards go behind"

It is quite likely that the Hittite preverbal quantifier in (2.82) is positioned by the focus movement process identified very informally above. Either the post-nominal quantifiers in (2.80) or the pre-nominal one in (2.81) must be positioned by another process, however, and following conventional syntactic terminology, I will refer to this process as "quantifier float". Floating quantifiers are extremely common cross-linguistically, and naturally there are competing analyses even for well-studied languages in which they occur, such as English and French. In this dissertation I will assume that quantifiers are base-generated within NPs to the left of their nouns, and that quantifier float moves them to the post-nominal position. This is illustrated in (2.83):

(2.83)  Quantifier Float

The node dominating the NP and the raised quantifier in (2.83) is analyzed as a Quantifier Phrase ("QP") since, as I will show in §5.3.2, it does not behave syntactically like an NP.

Additional evidence for the view that this node is not an NP node might arise from an investigation of focus movement: it is plausible a priori that quantifiers are moved to the pre-verbal position illustrated in (2.82) only from the post-nominal position, in other words, that quantifier float feeds focus movement. This in turn might be explicable if, for structural reasons, elements within an NP cannot be positioned directly by focus movement, in which
case floated quantifiers could be taken as NP-external. This hypothesis will not be pursued further here.
Chapter Three: Subject Clitics

3.1. Transitive Verbs

The Hittite subject clitics—common-gender singular aš, neuter singular at, and plurals e and at—are illustrated in the following sentences:

(3.1)  

a  KBo 3.4 i 11 (Annals of Muršili, CTH 61, ed. Götze 1933: 16)  
uₙ=war=aš=za DINGIR-LIM-ı š DÛ-at  
"He became a god"

b  KUB 13.35 iv 45 (Legal case, CTH 294)  
martari=war=at=kan  
"They disappear"

c  KBo 6.2 iii 7 (Law, series one, CTH 291, ed. Friedrich 1959: 34)  
män=e=za [tālauššanzi]  
"If they become estranged"

d  KUB 24.8 iii 17 (Appu, CTH 360)  
n=at mayanteššer  
"They grew up"

It is well-known that Hittite object clitics are occasionally omitted even in contexts where specific referential direct objects must be understood (see e.g. HE §236); some discourse-conditioned null anaphora process is probably responsible for such gapping. It is also well-known, if rarely noted explicitly, that Hittite subject clitics are very frequently omitted; in clauses with no other overt subjects, they in fact seem to vary promiscuously with zero. Null counterparts of some of the clitics in (3.1) appear in (3.2):
(3.2) a KBo 3.4 ii 22-23 (Annals of Muršili, CTH 61, ed. Götz 1933: 50)
nu=mu=kan mSUM-ma.dLAMMA-an DUMU-ŠU QADU ÉRIN.MEŠ
ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ menahhandā parā naešta
"He sent his son SUM-ma-dLAMMA-a against me with soldiers and horses"
b KBo 17.1 + ii 36' (Ritual for the king and queen, CTH 416, ed. Neu 1980a: 8)
GIŠŠUKUR ZABAR walhannianzi 3-ŠU
"They strike the bronze lances three times"
c KBo 3.4 ii 34 (Annals of Muršili, CTH 61, ed. Götz 1933: 52)
nu=za=kan HUR.SAGArinnandā ēppir
"They took Mt. Arinnanda"

Since null subjects are vastly more common in Hittite than null objects of transitive verbs, it is somewhat unlikely that both are identically conditioned. As a step toward elucidating the conditioning of subject clitics, this section will revive and elaborate an observation by Calvert Watkins regarding their appearance with transitive verbs.

As noted by Watkins (1963: 42), the Hittite subject and object clitics do not co-occur in the clitic chain; in other words, chains like n=ɑ>x "and he" and n=an "and him" are common, whereas e.g. *n=ɑ>x=an and *n=an=ɑ>x "and he him" never occur. This is usually explained simply by observing that the Hittite clitic chain includes only one slot for third-person nominative or accusative clitic pronouns. ¹ Although descriptively unassailable, this

¹ See e.g. Hoffner (1978: 520). An irrelevant exception, the doubled nominalic clitic construction of chains like n=at=ši=at (StBoT 24 iii 18), is secondary and late (see HW² 41 and Hoffner 1986a: 93-94). Face the conjecture of Otten (1988: 57), the sequence na=ɑ>x=ši=ɑ>x at Bo 86/299 i 89 must instantiate this construction rather than one with a transitive subject clitic ɑ>x, and the sequence -ma-ɑ>x-ši-yo-ɑ>x at Bo 86/299 i 88 may be interpreted either as ma=ɑ>x=ši=ɑ>x, an instance of the same construction, or as ma=ši=ɑ>x, with only an object clitic.
observation begs the question of historical explanation; if taken as a starting-point in
diachronic study, it even presents a certain paradox. Mutually exclusive bound morphemes
in the same position, like aš and an, typically reflect an earlier stage at which mutually
exclusive free forms existed; however, there is no reason to doubt the free co-occurrence of
nominative and accusative stressed pronouns both in Indo-European and Common
Anatolian. On the other hand, in view of the absence of subject clitics outside Anatolian, the
distribution of clitics there is unlikely to be inherited.

The analysis in terms of clitic slots is in fact synchronically inadequate as well, since it
predicts that a third-person clitic subject or object should be free to appear in the open clitic
slot of a transitive clause whose other core argument is a non-clitic (object or subject
respectively). There are indeed numerous non-clitic subjects with clitic direct objects, such
as the following:

(3.3) a

KUB 23.1 i ii 10 (Šaušgammuwa treaty, CTH 105, ed. Kuhne & Otten 1971:
8)

n=an mNIR.GÁL-iš dāš

"Muwatalli received him"

b

KUB 24.8 iv 12 (Appu, CTH 360)

n=e=ta ū ṣ mema[hhi]

"I will tell you them"

We should therefore easily be able to find clauses with clitic subjects and non-clitic direct
objects, i.e. clauses of the form *n=aš mNIR.GÁL-in dāš "he received Muwatalli". As
observed in passing by Watkins (1968-69: 93), however, such clauses do not exist: Hittite
subject clitics do not occur in transitive clauses.

Testing this observation requires an explicit understanding of transitivity. For this
purpose, transitive clauses may be defined as clauses with transitive verbs, and transitive
verbs in turn as verbs which select accusative complements; clitic subjects naturally appear
freely with intransitive verbs like those in (3.1) above. However, given these definitions, not every clause with a clitic subject and an overt accusative would counter-exemplify Watkins's observation that transitive clauses lack subject clitics. This follows from two considerations. First, as mentioned above, Hittite transitive verbs do occasionally lack overt objects. The generalization would therefore be counter-exemplified by any sentence containing both a clitic subject and a verb with an implicit direct object. Second, transitive clauses as defined here do not include clauses with non-complement (adjunct) accusatives. Watkins's observation, in other words, would not necessarily be counter-exemplified by a clause with a clitic subject and an overt accusative, and in fact predicts that subject clitics can occur in clauses with adjunct accusatives.

There are two relevant classes of adjunct accusatives in Hittite: path adjuncts and, as discussed in chapter 2, inalienably possessed accusative chômeurs due to possessor raising. Since the latter ordinarily appear with non-adjunct accusatives, they do not ordinarily occur with subject clitics. For example, the following formulae are repeated over a dozen times each in one ritual text, with different body parts in the accusative:

---

2 The transitivity of some Hittite verbs varies according to chronological, semantic, or unknown factors. For instance, *nahh*- "fear" can be either intransitive, selecting a dative-locative argument, or transitive, selecting an accusative argument (see CHD 339-40); subject clitics appear with the intransitive verb only. Hence at StBoT 24 iv 55-56, *nahhwas=ma=mukul Lugal-uš ğīta n=aš=mu=kan našta"the king who had feared me continued to fear me", the second *mu*, and so presumably the first as well, must be dative-locative, and the entire passage can be assigned to the CHD's entry *nah(h)*- a 1' e' rather than a 4' ("ambiguous"). Likewise the participle *nahhant*- must be built to the intransitive *nahh*-, since it means "respectful toward" and takes dative-locative arguments (see CHD 340-41).

A similar case syntax governs *sullāt*- "quarrel", which, although selecting an accusative object in all unambiguous instances known to Sommer & Falkenstein (1938: 41), has since been attested intransitively (see Oettinger 1979: 293 with n. 69). Otherwise ambiguous instances of *mu* must therefore be dative-locative in passages like KUB 6.41 i 47, *nu=war=aš=mu=kan sullāt"he quarrelled with me", and KBo 5.8 iv 9, *n=at=mu=Han sullātēr"they quarrelled with me".
(3.4) a KUB 7.1 iii 18 (Ritual, CTH 390)
    n=an UZUarr(a)n=ḫšan KI.MIN (i.e. huikdu)
    "Let her cast a spell on him (in) his arse"

    b KUB 7.1 iii 25 (Ritual, CTH 390)
    n=an UZUarr(an) KI.MIN (i.e. lāun)
    "I have released him (in) the arse"

These formulae lack clitic subjects. It is possible, however, for an accusative of this type to be the only overt accusative in a passive clause; it is then in "apposition" to the clause's surface subject (compare Kronasser 1961: 161-62). Hence clitic subjects do appear with accusatives in the other formula of this text:

(3.5) KUB 7.1 iii 7 (Ritual, CTH 390)
    n=aš UZUarr(a)n=ḫšan hamiktat
    "He was bound (in) his arse"

Since UZUarr(a)n=ḫšan here cannot be a direct object, it must be taken as an adjunct accusative. 3

Path accusatives (see Friedrich 1930: 40 and HE §201b), are attested in clauses like the following 4:

3 In this "text with many scribal errors" (CHD 1), the final AT sign of hamiktat is omitted in several sentences analogous to (3.5); so, n=aš UZUNIG.GIC hamikta at ibid. 5 should be read hamiktat and translated "he was bound (in) the liver" rather than "he bound the liver". The latter would mean a subject clitic in a transitive sentence.

4 The intransitive construction KASKAL-an pāi- must be distinguished from transitive constructions like KASKAL-an iya- "make one's way", which do not occur with clitic subject pronouns. It is a construction's syntax, not its idiomaticity, which is relevant here. There are typological parallels to the Hittite accusative of route. For example, Austin (1982: 38-39) has noted that in various Australian languages with extensive ergative case-marking, "there are verbs that occur with an [absolutive, not ergative] NP ... and a complement noun phrase which has some or all of the morphosyntactic properties of a transitive object NP". Such a verb in Yidiñ, for
Path accusatives can co-occur with clitic subjects:

(3.7) a  IBoT 1.36 iii 25 (Guard protocol, CTH 262, ed. Jakob-Rost 1966: 192)
\[ n-aš āppa=ya=pat apūn KASKAL-an uizzi \]
"He also comes back that way"
A test of Watkins's observation should now be straightforward, and indeed, aside from
the two classes of putative counter-evidence just discussed, to my knowledge it has no
probative counter-examples. The establishment of this grammatical rule for Hittite has the
following two consequences. First, the rule may now be used as a philological tool: the
appendix to this chapter consists of discussions of some specific cases where Hittite subject
clitics have been mistakenly identified in the literature. Second, since the genuinely
attested Hittite subject clitics occur in a much more restricted environment than had
previously been supposed—namely the intransitive clauses as defined above—the rule
considerably improves the chances of determining the actual distribution of subject clitics in
Hittite and Anatolian. For example, one reasonable (but, in the end, false) hypothesis would
be that subject clitics are obligatory in third-person intransitive clauses without other overt
subjects. The remainder of this chapter will address this problem.

3.2. Independent Null-Subject-Creating Processes

There are several contexts which appear to show null third-person subjects but which
either ordinarily lack null subjects, or have them only as a result of independent processes.
The first three types are created by syntactic processes which were discussed in chapter 2,
namely topicalization and two varieties of verb serialization.

---

5 I have systematically checked the texts listed in chapter 2, note 9. As the comparative evidence would
suggest, composition and manuscript date play no role in the phenomenon under discussion.
The topicalization of a verb always creates the appearance of a null subject when its subject is not enclitic: the topicalized verb must occupy the TOP position, and the TOP position precedes all other possibly relevant elements of the sentence. Therefore, if a verb is initial or is preceded only by elements which ordinarily precede TOP, it cannot be excluded that the verb has indeed been topicalized. A subject following the verb under such circumstances may be taken as the base-generated subject unless some other evidence requires a different analysis. A clause of this type appears in (3.8):

(3.8) KUB 33.1 i 7' (Telipinu, CTH 324)

nu tetheškizzi dAšdi[abiš]

"Ašdabi thunders"

Since the verb tetheškizzi "thunders" may have been topicalized, with its subject remaining in its base-generated positions, it cannot be adduced as an example of a verb with a null subject.⁶

The consecutive construction discussed in §2.4 provides a second context in which null subjects have frequently been identified. In fact, as instances of verb serialization, the consecutives pāi- and uwa- invariably share the subjects of their clauses' lexical main verbs: they have null and overt subjects when their main verbs have null and overt subjects respectively. Therefore consecutives with transitive main verbs in particular cannot have clitic subjects: they may have null subjects, as in (3.9), or, as in (3.10), they may precede the lexical subjects they share with their main verbs.

(3.9) a KBo 5.6 iii 3-4 (Deeds of Šuppiluliuma I, CTH 40, ed. Güterbock 1956: 94)

nu pāir KUR URU Amka GUL-ahhir

"They then attacked Amka"

⁶ Note that it is merely possible that these verbs are topicalized; the syntactic process of right-dislocation, to be discussed in chapter 5, would also yield these surface sequences.
KUB 33.106 iii 42’ (Song of Ullikummi, CTH 345)

ūēr- = ma AN- įš kuwapu teka[nn-]ja U[RU][DU] kuruzzit arha kuerir

"But then when they cut apart heaven and earth with a cutter ..."

(3.10) KUB 33.103 ii 7-8 (Kumarbi, CTH 346)

mu uizzǐ- = ma dIŠTAR- įš dHepatušās- =a [NAR]A5 apāsila mallanzi

"And then Ištar and Hebat themselves will turn the millstone"

On the other hand, consecutives occurring with intransitive main verbs may have clitic subjects just in case their main verbs do, as in (3.11), or they may have lexical subjects, as in (3.12).

(3.11) a  
IBoT 1.36 iii 34 (Guard protocol, CTH 262, ed. Jakob-Rost 1966: 194)

n=āš paizzi apēdani kattan tiyazzī

"He then steps beside him"

b  
IBoT 1.36 iv 11-12 (Guard protocol, CTH 262, ed. Jakob-Rost 1966: 198)

n=āš paizzi GIŠ DUB[BI]N CUB-laz iyatta

"He then walks on the left of the wheel"

(3.12) a  
StBoT 24 ii 31 (Apology of Hattušili III, CTH 81, ed. Otten 1981: 12)

uit- = ma LŪKUR URU[(Pisḫuruš anda āraš)]

"But then the Pisḫurian enemy arrived"

b  
StBoT 24 ii 69 (Apology of Hattušili III, CTH 81, ed. Otten 1981: 16)

GIM-an- = ma uit Š[(EŠ-Y)]A kuwapu INA KUR Mizrī pait

"And when my brother then went at some time against Egypt ..."

Likewise other, better-known auxiliaries, such as the ingressive aspectualizer dāi- and the perfect aspectualizer har(k)-, do not affect the distribution of subject clitics; if the main verb is transitive, as in (3.13), subject clitics cannot appear, and if the main verb is intransitive, as in (3.14), subject clitics can appear.
The discussion in this chapter will only take account of features of a clause's main verb.

A third context in which null subjects could be mistakenly identified is the other verb serialization construction discussed in §2.4. Some examples are presented there in which the second verb is transitive; (3.15a-b) are the only clear cases I have seen where the second verb is intransitive.

(3.15) a KBo 5.3+ ii 31 (Hukkana treaty)
\[ n=\text{aš URU} \text{Hattuši } UL \text{ hūššūzzi aki=}pa[t^?] \]
"He doesn't remain alive in Hattuša but will die"

b KUB 26.12 iii 9 (Eunuch instructions, CTH 255, ed. von Schuler 1957: 26)
\[ \text{kuiški EME-an BAL-nuži HUL-uešta} \]
"(If) somebody makes the tongue rebellious and became evil ..."

In both cases, the second verbs are intransitive and seem to have null subjects, but since both immediately follow other verbs, it cannot be excluded that they are serialized, with aš the subject of aki "will die" and kuiški the subject of HUL-uešta "becomes evil". In fact, one consequence of the distribution of subject clitics to be established in this chapter is that the verbs in (3.15) must be serialized.

The following passage provides a context where the same explanation is possible but somewhat more uncertain at present:
(3.16) IBoT 1.33: 6-8

\[ n=a\ddash DUGUD-ni\ munnait\ 2\ ANA\ GUNNI\ UGU\ IZBAT\ n=a\ddash =kan \]

DUGUD-ni munnait 3 harki akkanni hadandaza CAM-da uit dGulsas

DUGUD-ni munnait

"It hid (itself) in 'importance' (and,) second, held (itself) over the 'hearth'. It hid (itself) in 'importance' (and,) third, came down into 'destruction' (and) 'death' from the dry (place) (and) hid (itself) in the 'importance' of the Gulšeš-deities." (CHD 331-32)

In this passage the intransitive verb munnait "hid" occurs twice with the subject clitic a\ddash, while the intransitive verbs uit "came" and munnait each occur once with no apparent overt subject. This distribution is unexpected, as I will show below; however, it may prove significant that in this passage a\ddash occurs precisely where the sentence-introductory particle nu occurs. I suggest specifically, although quite tentatively in view of the absence of decisive corroborative evidence, that the strict adjacency seen in (3.15) may not be necessary for verb serialization, which may instead be possible in a variety of contexts with adjacent VP-internal material. I repeat that this proposal is very speculative and would require extensive investigation to verify.

There is a fourth context where null subjects are sometimes mistakenly identified. Because the distribution of subject clitics is not usually regarded as systematic, interpreters of Hittite texts usually analyze the sentence-introductory sequence na-a\ddash-ta as n=a\ddashta, that is, as an allomorph of the sentence-introductory particle nu followed by an allomorph of the adverbial sentential clitic (a)\ddashta. In many cases this analysis is correct, but it is usually further implicitly assumed that the proper analysis is n=a\ddashta even in clauses with non-overt third-person singular subjects. This is explicitly stated at HW² 434 with the reasoning that "um Verwechslungen mit nominalem Wortausgang und pron. -a\ddash + -ta ... zu vermeiden, wurden schon im Aheth. ta\ddashta und na\ddashta für ta, nu + Ortspart. -a\ddashta reserviert". Of course, such an assertion cannot possibly be maintained in the absence of any hypothesis about the
distribution of subject clitics in otherwise subject-less statements. In fact, the distribution of subject clitics to be established below will show that the sequence *na-aš-ta* must frequently be analyzed as *n=aš=(§)ta*, that is, as an allomorph of *nu*, followed by the subject clitic *aš*, followed by an allomorph of *ašta*, just as *nu-ux-ta* is *n=ux=(§)ta*, with a common-gender plural object clitic. Cases where the rules to be identified below require the analysis *n=aš=(§)ta* include the following:

(3.17)  a  KBo 3.22 obv 2-3

nepišza=aš=(§)ta dIŠKUR-unni āššus češta n=aš=(§)ta dIŠKUR-unni=ma
mān āššus češta

"He was dear to the Stormgod from heaven, and since he was dear to the
Stormgod ..."

b  KUB 14.1+ obv 46

ma[n]han [IŠ]ME n=aš=(§)ta [pa]jt

"When he heard, he went"

c  KUB 33.84+ iv 24'

GiššU.A-za=aš=(§)ta arunaza katta uit

"He came down from the chair, from the sea"

d  IBoT 1.36 iv 23 (Guard protocol, CTH 262, ed. Jakob-Rost 1966: 200)

mān=aš=(§)ta GišGIR-za=ma kuwapi anda paizzi

"When he enters somewhere from the carriage"

e  KBo 6.25 + KBo 13.35 iii 4' (Oracle, CTH 540, ed. Riemschneider 1970: 22)

[AN]A? ZAC=aš=(§)ta ÜL ari

"He will not reach the right side (i.e. success)"
Bo 86/299 iii 22-24 (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 22)

NUMUN me|LAMMA=ma kuit IVA KUR URU dU-tašša LUGAL-iznani artari
n=aš=(k)ta šer akdu

"Let the descendant of Kurunta who stands in the kingship of Tarhuntašša
die for him"

Until the rules are determined, of course, clauses like the ones above must be regarded as ambiguous, and will not be counted as instances of either a null subject or the pronoun aš.

The final context for null subjects which are irrelevant to the discussion here—but unlike the contexts identified above, one which does indeed involve null subjects—is clauses with non-referential subjects. Such subjects are regularly phonetically null in Hittite, although this is not noted in the standard handbooks. Non-referential subjects may be singular or plural in Hittite, as in (3.18) and (3.19) respectively:

(3.18) a KBo 17.11+ i 31'
[m(aš lükatt)a]=ma
"But when it becomes light ..."

b KUB 13.1 i 18
māḥhan=ma nekuzzi
"But when it becomes evening ..."

c Bo 2533 i 25 (Neu 1968: 13)
nu=ši=kan lē areškatta
"May there be no oracle consulted for her"

d KUB 8.1 iii 6
zahhiya=kan pangawi ERĪN.MEŠ-ti maušzi
"There will be a fall in battle for the entire army"

e KBo 5.13 i 14-15
mān URU.KÙ.BABBAR-ši kuit AWAT BAL waštai
"If there is sinning in Hattuša in respect to some matter of rebellion ..."
f KBo 5.9 ii 19
mān tuk=ma [warr]išuwanzi ŪL kišari
"If it is not possible for you to help ..."

Bo 86/299 iii 13 (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 20)
nu mān IŠTU AWAT DINGIR-LIM kušadanikki GÛB-lišzi
"If it becomes unfavorable for someone according to the word of the divinity ...",

(3.19) KBo 5.3 iii 38-39
apēz=kan uddanan arha akkiškanzi
"People will die off from that matter"

In a few cases the fact that non-referential subjects are not pronominalized can be exploited for interpretation, for instance in comparing the following clauses from a medical text:

(3.20) a KUB 44.61 i 10
mān=ma=aš apiz ŪL SIG$_5$-ri
"But if he does not improve from that ...",

b KUB 44.61 i 17
mān apiz ŪL SIG$_5$-ri
"If there is no improvement from that ...",

Since there is no overt subject in (3.20b), the clause must be construed with a non-referential subject, as indicated, rather than with a null referential one.

3.3. Hittite Intransitive Clauses

The remainder of this chapter will be devoted to determining the distribution of third-person, referential clitic and null subjects of intransitive verbs in contexts which can be shown to lack stressed subjects. Its findings are simple: Hittite and evidently the other Anatolian languages have two classes of verbs, one whose members cannot occur with clitic
subjects, and one whose members ordinarily do occur with clitic subjects in contexts requiring an unemphatic third-person referential subject. Clitic subjects need not obligatorily occur with verbs of the second type, since the discourse-conditioned process responsible, especially in Old Hittite, for occasional null object anaphora would be expected to operate equally on subjects.

3.3.1. Tuthaliya IV and Šuppiluliuma II

In texts composed under Tuthaliya IV and Šuppiluliuma II, the following intransitive verbs never occur with clitic subjects and do occur with third-person referential null subjects:

\[(3.21)\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{au(3)} & \text- "see" \quad \text{(Bo 86/299)} \\
\text{kururiyah} & \text- "become hostile" \quad \text{(Bo 86/299)} \\
\text{link} & \text- "swear" \quad \text{(Bo 86/299)} \\
\text{mem} & \text- "speak" \quad \text{(255)} \\
\text{unna} & \text- "drive" \quad \text{(Bo 86/299)} \\
\text{wašu} & \text- "commit an offense" \quad \text{(105)} \\
\text{weh-\text{wah}} & \text- "turn" \quad \text{(255)}
\end{align*}\]

Examples include the following:

\[(3.22)\]
\[\begin{align*}
a & \quad \text{Bo 86/299 iii 80 \quad (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 24)} \\
& \quad \text{nu ūškandu īštamaškandu=ya}\text{\textsuperscript{7}} \\
& \quad "\text{Let them see and hear}"
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
b & \quad \text{Bo 86/299 ii 38 \quad (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 16)} \\
& \quad \text{nu ANA ZI-YA šer kiššan lenkatta} \\
& \quad "\text{He swore to me personally as follows}"
\end{align*}\]

---

\textsuperscript{7} \text{Note that īštamaškandu "let them hear" may be part of a VP conjunction or sentential conjunction, and is hence not counted in (3.21).}
c KUB 21.42 left edge 4

ANA LUGAL=ma UL mema[i]

"But he does not speak to the king"

d Bo 86/299 ii 5-6 (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 16)
manni=a IŠTU KUR ÊHulaššali lāpāni :wāniya ānānzi

"And if they drive from the Hulaya River land to the great saltlick ..." (see Watkins 1990b)

The following intransitive verbs, when they have third-person referential unstressed subjects, consistently occur with clitic subjects:

(3.23) ak- "die" (123, 255)

ar- "stand" (255)

ašandulai- "garrison" (Bo 86/299)

eš- "be" (105, 123, 177, 255, Bo 86/299)

ki- "lie" (105, 123, 255, Bo 86/299)

pai- "go" (105, 255)

tiya- "step" (105, Bo 86/299)

wuwa- "come" (105, 123)

Examples include the following:

(3.24) a KUB 26.1 iii 22

kuitman=aš aki

"Until he dies ..."

---

8 Here and throughout this chapter, citations of eš- "be" include all overt instances of the verb, whether functioning as a predicate or with a participle, and all instances of the verb gapped, whether functioning as a predicate or with a participle. All four of these categories pattern exactly alike with respect to all phenomena under discussion in this chapter.
b  Bo 86/299 iii 42  (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 22)
åsandulanzi\textbf{=}ma\textbf{=}at ṭē

"But they shall not garrison"

c  KUB 23.1+ iii 43-44  (Šaušgamuwa treaty, CTH 105, ed. Kühne & Otten 1971: 14)
tuqq\textbf{=}aš takšul ėšdu

"Let him be friendly to you"

d  Bo 86/299 ii 7  (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 16)
\textit{ANA LUGAL KUR URI\{d\}U-ta\={s}\={a}\textbf{=}at piyan}

"It is given to the king of Tarhuntasša"

e  Bo 86/299 iv 44-45  (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 28)
n\textbf{=}at \textit{IŠTU NA4KIŠIB d\{U\}TU\{UR\}UArinna Ü IŠTU NA4KIŠIB d\{U\} URI\{H\}ATTI}
šiyan

"It is sealed with the seal of the Sungoddess of Arinna and with the seal of the Stormgod of Hatti"

mān\textbf{=}ma\textbf{=}aš\textbf{=}ta\textbf{=}kkān ŠÀ KUR-KA\textbf{=}ma uizzī

"But if he comes to your land ..."

Both classes of intransitives are illustrated in the following passage:
Bo 86/299 iii 28-31 (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 22)

mān=ma ANA NUMUN "Tuthaliya naːkkēšzi kuitki n=āš ŠA KUR
URU HATTI LUGAL-iznani awan arha tiyazi NUMUN mdLAMMA=ma kuit
INA KUR URU dU-tašša LUGAL-iznani artari nu ANA LUGAL KUR
URU HATTI kururiyahu lē=aš=(§)a ĪR-ahtari

"But if something becomes difficult for a descendant of Tuthaliya, and he abdicates (lit. steps away from) the kingship of Hatti, let the descendant of Kurunta who stands in the kingship of Tarhuntašša become hostile to the king of Hatti, and let him not submit".

A subject clitic is used here with tiyazi "steps" but not with kururiyahu "let him become hostile"; the sequence le-e-aš-ta in the final clause is formally ambiguous but, in view of evidence cited below, must reflect lē=aš=(§)ta. (This does not violate rules of Hittite anaphora: a grammatically neuter but semantically animate NP like NUMUN - warwalam "descendant" may freely be resumed by a common-gender pronoun.)

3.3.2. Hattušili III

In texts composed under Hattušili III, the following intransitive verbs never occur with clitic subjects and do occur with third-person referential null subjects:

(3.26) link- "swear" (85)
mena- "say" (81, 85)
penna- "drive" (81)
waIh- "attack" (81)

Examples include the following:

(3.27) a StBoT 24 iv 17 (Apology of Hattušili III, CTH 81, ed. Otten 1981: 24)

nu=mu memiškit GIM-an kišat=ya=za

"It happened just as she told me"
b StBoT 24 iv 34-35 (Apology of Hattušili III, CTH 81, ed. Otten 1981: 24)
mān IVA KUR URU Karanduniya pennisṭa

"He would have driven to Babylonia"

The following intransitive verbs, when they have third-person unemphatic referential subjects, consistently occur with clitic subjects:

(3.28)

- ar- "stand" (176)
- aršaniya- "envy" (81)
- eš- "be" (81, 85, 86, 176, 384, 585)
- eš- "sit" (585)
- handanda- "lead on the right path" (81)
- hulla- "fight" (83)
- iya- "go" (83, 585)
- idalaweš- "become evil"
- kiš- "become" (81)
- marh- "?" (81)
- nahh- "be afraid" (81)
- pāi- "go" (81, 85)
- parš- "flee" (85)
- šallāi- "quarrel" (81)
- dāriya- "call" (87)
- tiya- "step" (81, 85)
- uwa- "come" (81, 85, 384)
- uwaya- "do harm" (81)

Examples include the following:

(3.29) a StBoT 24 iii 25-26 (Apology of Hattušili III, CTH 81, ed. Otten 1981: 18)
namma=aż LUSU.GI-anza [(ēša)]

"Moreover he was an old man"
b  KUB 31.51+ iv 14
  ešari=ma=at=za INA URU[(MUL-ra)]
  "But they are settled in Ašira"

c  KUB 21.17 i 4 (Requisition against Arma-du, CTH 86, ed. Ünal)
  HUL-eššir=ma=at kēdani memiyanı
  "They became unfriendly in that matter"

d  StBoT 24 ii 54 (Apology of Hattušili III, CTH 81, ed. Otten 1981: 14)
  URU Durmita=ma=aš URU Kuruštama ÛL-pait
  "But he did not go to Durmita and Kuruštama"

e  StBoT 24 iii 78 (Apology of Hattušili III, CTH 81, ed. Otten 1981: 22)
  kinuna=aš=mu=kan šulliyat kuit
  "Now because he quarrelled with me"

f  KBo 4.12 obv 7
  n=aš=mu=kan anda dāriyat
  "He called to me"

g  StBoT 24 ii 50 (Apology of Hattušili III, CTH 81, ed. Otten 1981: 14)
  maninkuwann=aš=mu ÛL-pat uit
  "He did not come near me at all"

There is apparent vacillation in the case of one of these verbs, aršaniya- "be envious":

(3.30) a  StBoT 24 i 30-32 (Apology of Hattušili III, CTH 81, ed. Otten 1981: 30)
  nu=mu=kan GIM-an UKÜ MEŠ-annaza ŠA diŠTAR GAŠAN-YA kaniššuwar
  ŠA ŠES-YA-ya [as]šulan aūer nu=mu :arsaniêr
  "When the population saw My Lady Ištar's goodwill and my brother's favor to
   me, people were envious of me"
b  StBoT 24 iii 54-55 (Apology of Hattušili III, CTH 81, ed. Otten 1981: 20)

GIM-an=ma=mu=kan mUrhi-dU-uppaš emiššan [S]A DINGIR-LIM aššulan
aušta n=aš=mu aršaniyat

"But when Urhi-Tešup in this way saw the divinity's favor to me, he was
envious of me"

This is likely to reflect a difference between referential and non-referential subjects, as I
have translated, but could in principle reflect a transitive/intransitive alternation in the
syntactic frame of the verb, in the manner of nahi- "fear" discussed in note 2 above. It is
also possible that the Glossenkeil marking in (3.30a) is relevant to the inconsistent
treatment.

There are also two exceptions to the present generalization in the corpus I examined.
The first may be given without comment:

(3.31) KUB 21.17 i 17 (Requisition against Arma-dU, CTH 86, ed. Ünal 1974: 20)

[(nu EGI)]R-pa KUR Aba pait

He went back to Aba"

The second exception occurs twice in manuscript M of the Vow of Puduhepa; other
manuscripts behave according to rule.

(3.32) a  KUB 26.63 iii 10' (Vow of Puduhepa, CTH 585)

SANGA-ešní karū anda D[IB-anz]a

"He was already placed in the priesthood"

b  KUB 26.63 iii 12' (Vow of Puduhepa, CTH 585)

SANGA-esni=ma=kan karū anda [DIB-sanza]

"He was already placed in the priesthood"

Even if the null subjects in (3.32) cannot be explained as scribal error or the like, note that
since null objects are occasionally gapped at all periods of Hittite (although most strikingly
in Old Hittite and genres influenced by Old Hittite prototypes), some null subjects are
expected in contexts where we would otherwise predict subject clitics. A few instances of the type in (3.31-32), therefore, do not pose a problem for the proposals of this chapter.

3.3.3. Muwattali

In texts composed under Muwattali, the following intransitive verbs never occur with clitic subjects and do occur with third-person referential null subjects:

(3.33)  
*arkwāʾ-* "plead" (382)
*auš-* "see" (382)
*ištamaš-* "hear" (76)
*memə-* "speak" (381)
*te-/tar-* "speak" (76)

Examples include the following:

(3.34)  
an KBo 11.1 obv 11
kinuna takšūlit IC1.H1.A-it anda *au

"May he now look with a conciliatory countenance"

b KUB 19.6+ iii 83
[n]u ištamaškandu

"Let them hear"

c KUB 19.6+ i 67'
nu kisan tezzi

"He speaks as follows"

The following intransitive verbs, when they have third-person unemphatic referential subjects, consistently occur with clitic subjects:

(3.35)  
*ar-* "stand" (382)
*eš-* "be" (76, 171, 382)
*hink-* "bow" (381)
*hueš-* "live" (381)
*iya-* "go" (381)
kurša. "?" (382)
lā. "be released" (382)
pāi. "go" (76)
tepawēš. "become small" (382)
unuē. "come" (76, 381)

Examples include the following:

(3.36) a KUB 23.102 obv 7
kui$t=a=at ŠEŠ-UTTA
"What else is it, (namely) brotherhood?"

b KUB 6.45+ iii 40
MUSEN-īg Gis šap tapan EGIR-pa ēpzi n=aš TI-ešzi
"The bird reassumes its nest and it lives"

c KUB 6.45+ iii 7-8
kuetaš=a[(t)] ANA Ē.MEŠ.DINGIR.MEŠ piran EGIR-pa UL iyantari
"Whoever's temples they do not frequent ..."

d KBo 11.1 obv 19
n=at tep[awēšta]
"It has diminished"

e KUB 19.6+ iii 41
[(n)]=aš=k[(an tu)]k anda uizzi
"He comes to you"

Again there are one or two exceptions—null subjects in contexts where overt subject
clitics would be expected.

(3.37) a KUB 21.5 i 8
[(tūwaz-a=ma)] ANA LUCAL.MEŠ KUR URU HATTI takšu[(l=pat ēšir)]
"From afar they remained true to the kings of Hatti"
KUB 6.45+ i 24 (Muwatalli's prayer to the Stormgod, CTH 381, ed. Lebrun 1980: 258)

GIM-ann=a=az idalawshanteš

"... how they are also abused ..."

Note in connection with (3.37b) that the parallel manuscript has an overt subject clitic

3.3.4. Muršili II

In texts composed under Muršili II, the following intransitive verbs never occur with clitic subjects and do occur with third person referential null subjects:

(3.38) ašandulai- "garrison" (61)
au(š)- "see" (61)
hatrāi- "write" (40)
gimmantariya- "spend the winter" (40)
kururiyahu- "become hostile" (40, 61, 67, 69)
lahhiyai- "travel, campaign" (62)
link- "swear" (68)
mana- "speak" (40, 61, 67, 68)
šakk- "know" (61)
tuhušiya- "wait" (40, 61)
uiya- "send" (378)
unnā- "drive" (61)
wahu- "change sides" (68)
wulh- "attack" (378)
wašia- "commit an offence" (68)

Examples include the following:

(3.39) a KBo 4.4 iv 62 (Annals of Muršili, CTH 61, ed. Götze 1933: 142)

nu=kan anda ašanduliškit

"He garrisoned"
b  KBo 5.4 obv 45
  nu=tta menahanda kuru[ri]yahanzi
  "They are hostile to you"

c  KUB 3.119 obv 16
  nu=za lah[hiyau(wanzi UL namma tarahheškit)]
  "He was no longer able to go to war"

d  KUB 6.41 iii 52
  [(nu=)]ši menahanda linkatta
  "He swore allegiance to him"

e  KUB 19.12 ii 1
  nu namma UL tuhušiy[ait]
  "He waited no longer"

f  KUB 14.15 ii 12
  nu=mu menahanda ūnništa
  "He drove against me"

g  KUB 6.41 iii 51 (Kupanta-4LAMMA treaty, CTH 68, ed. Friedrich 1926: 128)
  [na]mma EGIR-pa=pat wahnut
  "Then he actually changed sides"

h  KBo 4.3 iv 13
  nu ITTI dUTU-ŠI waštaš
  "He committed an offense against His Majesty"

i  KUB 14.8 obv 20'
  nu namma walahhir
  "Again they attacked"

Note that ašandulai- "garrison" lacks a subject clitic in (3.39a), although it is attested with one in (3.24b). There is not enough data to determine whether this variation is due to a
lexical shift from the class of verbs which occurs without subject clitics to that which occurs with them—a type of shift which would be expected to occur occasionally in the history of the language—or whether some other factor is responsible.

The following intransitive verbs, when they have third-person unemphatic referential subjects, consistently occur with clitic subjects:

\[(3.40)\]

- \(ak\)- "die" \((40, 61, 378)\)
- \(ar\)- "arrive" \((40, 61)\)
- \(ar\)- "stand" \((61)\)
- \(eš\)- "be" \((40, 61, 62, 67, 68, 378)\)
- \(eš\)- "sit" \((61)\)
- \(holīya\)- "kneel" \((40, 61)\)
- \(handāi\)- "be arranged" \((378, 486)\)
- \(hink\)- "bow" \((40)\)
- \(huwāi\)- "run" \((68)\)
- \(iya\)- "go" \((61, 62)\)
- \(iyannāi\)- "walk" \((40)\)
- \(irmaliya\)- "sicken" \((61)\)
- \(ištandāi\)- "linger" \((61)\)
- \(karuššīya\)- "be quiet" \((68)\)
- \(ki\)- "lie" \((68, 69)\)
- \(kiš\)- "become" \((40, 61, 68, 378)\)
- \(luwāi\)- "survive" \((378)\)
- \(miyaghunteš\)- "grow old" \((378)\)
- \(nahšariya\)- "be afraid" \((40, 61, 68)\)
- \(pāi\)- "go" \((40, 61, 67, 68, 378)\)
- \(parašā\)- "disperse" (?) \((61)\)
- \(parš\)- "flee" \((61)\)
*piddāi-* "flee" (68)
*šarra-* "break" (40, 61)
*šeš-* "sleep" (40, 378)
*šullāī-* "quarrel" (61, 68)
*tepawēš-* "diminish" (378)
*tīyā-* "step" (40, 61, 68)
*dadduwareš-* "become lame" (61)
*uwa-* "come" (40, 61, 62, 67, 68, 378)
*warrišša-* "come to help" (61)
*waṭku-* "jump" (68)
*wemīya-* "be found" (378)
*weriya-* "fall in with" (68)

Examples include the following:

(3.41) a KUB 34.27 + iii 23'-24'

\[ n = aš mahan \text{ INA } UR \text{Zithara ūraš } \]

"When he arrived at Zithara ..."

b KBo 3.4 i 10 (Annals of Muršili, CTH 61, ed. Götzke 1933: 16)

\[ nu = war = aš UR.SAG-iš LUGAL-uš ēšta \]

"He was a heroic king"

c KBo 5.4 i 34

\[ tuk = ma kuš LÛKÛRA\text{N}A dUTU-SI-ya = aš LÛKÛR \]

"The one who is an enemy to you is an enemy also to His Majesty"

d KBo 5.6 iv 11-12 (Deeds of Šuppiluliuma I, CTH 40, ed. Güterbock 1956: 97)

\[ nu = war = aš ammuk LÛMUDI-YA \text{ INA KUR } \text{ UR } \text{ Mi <s> ri = ma = wa <r> = aš LUGAL-uš} \]

"To me he will be a husband, but in Egypt he will be king"
KUB 14.15 iv 28-29
n=aš=mu uit CİR.MEŠ-aš kattan haliyattat
"She then kneeled down at my feet"

KBo 3.4 i 5-6 (Annals of Muršili, CTH 61, ed. Götze 1933: 14)
EGİR-an=ma=aš irmaliyattat=pat
"But then he got sick"

KBo 3.4 i 17 (Annals of Muršili, CTH 61, ed. Götze 1933: 20)
n=aš=kan ašanduli anda ıṣtandait
"He lingered in the garrison"

KBo 5.8 ii 4-5 (Annals of Muršili, CTH 61, ed. Götze 1933: 152)
n=at=mu lahhī kattan paıšgauwan tiër
"They began to go to war with me"

KBo 2.5 i 2-3
n=aš=mu=kan piran arha parašta
"It fled away before me"

KUB 14.15 iii 30
arha=war=at=za šarrandat
"They broke from one another"

KUB 19.13+14 i 33'
n=aš URUWašhaya šešta
"He slept in Wašhaya"

KUB 14.15 ii 6
n=aš ginušši dudduwarešta
"He became lame in the knee"

KUB 19.10 i 8
n=aš İŞTU KUR URUUGU-7I katta uit
"He came down from the Upper Country"
KBo 5.8 i 41-42 (Annals of Muršili, CTH 61, ed. Götze 1933: 150)

n=aš ANA LÚ.MEŠ URU Takkuwahina [war]reššešta

"He came to help the people of Takkuwahina"

The following pair of sentences shows quite clearly that the alternation under investigation is conditioned lexically rather than semantically:

(3.42) a  
KUB 34.24 iii 23

nu=kan ŠÀ KUR URU Hatti gimma[n]tariyat

"He wintered in Hatti"

b  
KBo 5.6 i 40 (Deeds of Šuppiluliuma I, CTH 40, ed. Güterbock 1956: 91)

namma=aš EGIR-pa gimmandariya[(uwanz)j] URU Hattuša uit

"Thereafter he came back to Hattuša to spend the winter"

Note also the following five clauses, all with unemphatic subjects, in which the presence or absence of a subject clitic is strictly in accordance with the rules described here:

(3.43)  
KUB 6.41 i 47-53 + KBo 5.13 i 4-6

nu=war=aš=mu=kan šullāit nu=wa=mu ĪR.MEŠ-YA kattan

harnamm[n]yt man=wa=mu menahanda kururijahta nu=war=aš=mu

piran arha [(piddāš)] nu=war=aš=kan kāšma šumāš anda uit

"He quarrelled with me, he provoked my slaves against me, he would have begun hostilities against me, he fled away before me, and behold, he came to you"

3.3.5. Šuppiluliuma I

I found no intransitive verbs with third-person referential null subjects in texts composed under Šuppiluliuma I. The following intransitive verbs, when they have third-person unemphatic referential subjects, consistently occur with clitic subjects:

(3.44)  
ak- "die" (42)

eš- "be" (42, 44, 49)

haliya- "kneel" (49)
huišwe- "live" (42)

huwāi- "run" (49)

ki- "lie" (42)

uwa- "come" (49, 52)

īR-nah- "submit" (49)

Examples include the following:

(3.45) a
KBo 19.26 i 10-11
n=aš ANA LUGAL mahhan LÚKÚR-ŠU apedani=ya=aš QATAMMA
LÚKÚR-ŠU ešdu
"Just as he is an enemy to the king, so let him also be an enemy to him"

b
KBo 10.12 iii 41'
n=aš huwaizzi
"He flees"

c
HT 21 + KUB 8.80: 11
zahhiya=nnaš=a[t] namma ŪL urē
"They did not come in battle to us"

d
KBo 10.12 i 19'
n=[aš=za ANA dUTU-ŠI L[UAGAL KUR URUH]attī ĪR-nahtat
"He submitted to His Majesty the king of Hatti"

3.3.6. Middle Hittite

In Middle Hittite texts, the following intransitive verbs never occur with clitic subjects
and do occur with third-person referential null subjects:

(3.46) halzāi- "call" (262)

hatrāi- "write" (147)

išhāmāi- "sing" (262)

išparre- "kick (flat)" (147)

link- "swear" (137, 375)
manninkuwahh- "draw near" (262)
mem- "speak" (200, 262, 404, 480, Mšt)
šanh- "sweep" (262)
te-iar- "speak" (262, 404)
wak- "bite" (147)
zahhiya- "fight" (147)

Examples include the following:

(3.47) a  KBo 16.27 ii 3'  
nu linkir  
"They swore"

b  IBoT 1.36 iii 71-72  (Guard protocol, CTH 262, ed. Jakob-Rost 1966: 196)  
nu [£halentōwaš (?)] KÁ.CAL-aš manninkuwahhi  
"He draws near to the door of the halentuwa-house"

c  KUB 14.1+ rev 91  
aliyaš=wa ŪL wāi ŪL=ma=wa wāki ŪL=ma=wa išparizzi  
"The deer does not cry, it does not bite, it does not kick"

d  KUB 14.1+ obv 59  
nu=ššan ANA mMadduwatta kuit šer zah[h]ir  
"Because they were fighting for Madduwatta ..."

The following intransitive verbs, when they have third-person unemphatic referential subjects, consistently occur with clitic subjects:

(3.48) ar- "arrive" (262, 375)
ar- "stand" (262)
eš- "be" (28, 133, 137, 147, 200, 261, 262, 404, 480, Mšt)
handanda- "lead on the right path" (262)
hink- "bow" (262)
huwāi- "run" (262)
"iya" "go" (262)
"iyannā" "walk" (147, 262)
"ki" "lie" (270)
"kiš" "become" (28, 133, 404)
"lak" "fall" (404)
"pāi" "go" (28, 41, 147, 262, 404)
"piddā" "flee" (262)
"tarup" "join together" (480)
"tiya" "step" (262)
"tuwānā" "break" (404)
"uwa" "come" (133, 147, 262, 480, Mṣt)

Examples include the following:

(a) IBoT 1.36 i 51 (Guard protocol, CTH 262, ed. Jakob-Rost 1966: 178)
luštaniya=ma=aš ari
"But he arrives at the side-door"

(b) KUB 34.84+ ii 45-46
[(kāša=w)]ar=aš Ú-it halkit warkanza
"Behold, it has become fat with grass and grain"

(c) KUB 14.1+ obv 73-74
n=at lŠTU LÚ.MEŠŠU.GI-TIM kattan apādani [x] iyanniwan [dā]jr
"They began to march there with the elders"

(d) KBo 2.3 iii c. 20
kinunn=a=[(war=at=kan)] kāša lagāri
"Look, now too they've fallen over"

(e) IBoT 1.36 i 44 (Guard protocol, CTH 262, ed. Jakob-Rost 1966: 178)
šēhuna=war=aš paizzi
"He'll go to urinate"
KBo 16.47 obv 11'

n=âš kuđani KUR-ya paizzi

"In whatever land he goes ..."

IBoT 1.36 ii 42-43 (Guard protocol, CTH 262, ed. Jakob-Rost 1966: 186)

n=âš paizzi TA Gîtšuluganni GîtšDUBBIN GÛB-laz tiyazzzì

"He then stations himself to the left of the wheel of the wagon"

KUB 14.1 + rev 60

nu=war=âš katti=ti uit

"He came to you"

3.3.7. Old Hittite

In Old Hittite texts, the following intransitive verbs never occur with clitic subjects and do occur with third-person referential null subjects:

(3.50)  

aniya- "work" (291, 669)

aruwâi- "bow" (291, 631)

ekû- "drink" (631, 665)

ed- "eat" (665)

halzâi- "call" (649)

hatrâi- "write" (272)

huek- "cast a spell" (733)

link- "swear" (291)

mald- "recite, vow" (631, 669, 733)

punusî- "ask" (9)

šanî- "sweep" (669)

šarnîmk- "make restitution" (291)

šipânt- "libate" (631)

šittariya- "order" (291)

tâl-"speak" (3, 291, 292, 416)
walk- "strike" (292)

weh-/weh- "turn" (649)

zinna- "end" (669)

Examples include the following:

(3.51)  a  KBo 6.2 i 17-18  (Law, series one, CTH 291, ed. Friedrich 1959: 18)

nu Ė-ri=šši anniškizzi

"He works in his field"

b  KBo 22.1: 22'

nu=šmaš mânhanda hatreškizzi

"Just as he customarily writes to you ..."

c  KUB 8.41 obv 1'

mân ANA DAM-ŠU huekzi

"When he casts a spell on his wife ..."

d  KBo 6.2 iv 3  (Law, series one, CTH 291, ed. Friedrich 1959: 75)

nu likzi

"He swears"

e  KBo 20.10 + 25.59 i 3

anda šanhanzi

"They sweep"

f  KBo 6.2 iv 58  (Law, series one, CTH 291, ed. Friedrich 1959: 48)

takku natta=ma šarnik[(zi)]

"If he does not make restitution ..."

g  KBo 17.11+ iv 30'-31'

kuttaš peran [šiuni 1-(iš šipant)]i

"In front of the wall he libates once to the god"
KBo 6.2 iii 19 (Law, series one, CTH 291, ed. Friedrich 1959: 36)

[(nu a)]nda šittarit

"He ordered ..."

StBoT 3 iv 12

[takk]u natta=ma taranzi

"But if they do not say ...", i.e. "if they say 'no' ..."

KBo 20.26+ obv 19'

[p]ēdi=šmi=pat ZAG-ni 1-ŠU wahanzi

"They turn once in place to the right"

The following intransitive verbs, when they have third-person unemphatic referential subjects, consistently occur with elitic subjects:

(3.52)  

ak- "die" (3, 291, 292)

ar- "stand" (631)

ar- "arrive" (3, 733)

eš- "be" (1, 25, 820)

eš- "sit" (665)

hark- "perish" (27, 291)

iyannāi- "walk" (3)

idalawēš- "become evil, quarrel" (291)

ki- "lie" (645)

kiš- "become" (291)

kištanziya- "starve" (1)

lāzziya- "recover" (291)

pāi- "go" (3, 291, 627, 631)

parkweš- "become pure" (9)

šamen- "withdraw" (291, 292)
tarku- "dance" (649)⁹

tiya- "step" (631, 649)

uwa- "come" (645)

GEME-reš- "become unfree" (291)

Examples include the following:

(3.53)  a  KBo 22.2 rev 13'

š-e akir

"They died"

b  KBo 25.112 ii 17'

mān=aš URU Karikūriška āri

"When he reaches Karikuriska"

c  KUB 36.108 obv 4

n-e ša dUTU-ŠI=pat ašantu

"Let them be His Majesty's"

d  KUB 36.110 rev 15’16'

n-e šan NAPČRUNI uctan

"They are built on a rock"

c  KBo 17.36+ iii 10'

n-e haššaš katta ešanta

"They sit by the hearth"

f  KBo 17.15 rev 17'

n=aš-ša[(n hašši PANI dU.GUR kitta)]

"It lies on the hearth before dU.GUR"

⁹ It is possible that tarku- in fact belongs under (3.51): I have seen two places where it lacks a subject clitic, as its meaning might lead us to expect (see below), while the one subject clitic it has is the unusual nominative plural form aš at KBo 20.26+ obv 18'.
3.3.8. Discourse-Conditioned Null Anaphora

As mentioned above, the presumably discourse-conditioned process responsible for occasional null objects, most frequently in Old Hittite, may be expected to have operated on subjects. In fact, in my view, a sign that research on subject anaphora has made real progress is that it is possible to isolate those cases where this process must be responsible for null subjects. The following Old Hittite subjectless clauses would, based on their verbs' behavior elsewhere in Old Hittite and consistently in the later language, be expected to have subject clitics:
(3.54) a KBo 3.22 rev 78
mān tunnakišna=ma paizzi
"When he goes into the inner room"

b KBo 17.11+ i 3'-4'
LÚ.MEŠMEŠEDI-an āppan tienzi
"They station themselves behind the guards"

c KBo 17.11+ i 36'
[hal(maššu(itaš tap))ušz[a t]iēzzi
"He stations himself next to the throne"

d KBo 17.11+ iv 14'
[(t)]a É.ŠA-na paizzi
"He goes to the inner room"

e KBo 17.11+ iv 25'
tunnakkišna p[aiizzì]
"He goes to the inner room"

f KBo 17.11+ iv 28'-29'
[(mišt)išiya mehir tunnakišna [pənzi]
"At mišt̄išiya-time they go to the inner room"

g KBo 22.2 obv 8
mān URU Tamar[mara] arir
"When they reached Tamarmara ..."

h KBo 22.2 obv 15
mān URU Neša pāir
"When they went to Nesa ..."

i KBo 22.2 rev 11'
MU.2.KAM kattan ēšta
"For two years he was below"
Considerably fewer cases were found in my Middle Hittite corpus, all from a single text in a genre with Old Hittite antecedents:

\[(3.55)\]

\(a\)  
IBoT 1.36 i 74 (Guard protocol, CTH 262, ed. Jakob-Rost 1966: 180)
\[n\textt{am}ma=kan para šA LŪM[EŠ]EDI ṭhilaz uškandari\]
"Then they come forth from the guards' court"

\(b\)  
IBoT 1.36 iii 63 (Guard protocol, CTH 262, ed. Jakob-Rost 1966: 196)
\[mān Gtšulugānnaza=ma nēari\]
"But if he turns from the wagon ..."

\(c\)  
IBoT 1.36 iii 71 (Guard protocol, CTH 262, ed. Jakob-Rost 1966: 196)
\[nu Gtšulukānnaz šhalitäwaś paizzi\]
"From the wagon he goes to the halitäwa-house"
d  IBoT 1.36 iv 26-27 (Guard protocol, CTH 262, ed. Jakob-Rost 1966: 200)
   nu=ššan GAL-az Ėkāškaštepaš sarā [uwa]nzi
   "They go up from the great gatehouse"

One or two Neo-Hittite cases of this type were already identified above. It is also easy to
find unexpected null-subject clauses in later manuscripts of ritual texts, where direct or
indirect influence from Old Hittite archetypes can never be excluded, as in the following
sentences, randomly selected among many others from the K.I.A.M festival:

(3.56) a  KBo 10.25 ii 4
   parašnauwaš=kan uizzi
   "He comes squatting (?)"

b  KUB 2.3 v 27'-28'
   GIM-an=ma GL[(ŠKÁ.CAL-aš)] aranzi
   "But when they arrive at the city gate ..."

c  KBo 27.42 i 2
   ta GLŠZA.I.A.M.GAR-aš paizzi
   "He goes to the tent"

d  KBo 10.23 ii 31'-32'
   LUGAL-i=kan menahanda aranta
   "They stand facing the king"

e  KUB 2.3 i 46
   t=ašta pänzi
   "They leave"

On the other hand, in most Middle Hittite texts and virtually all Neo-Hittite texts, the
distribution of subject clitics in my corpus is precisely in accordance with the rules
proposed above. It is not clear whether the unexpected null subjects identified in this
section should be attributed specifically to linguistic features of Old Hittite, or to features of
those literary genres which, precisely because of their close affiliation with Old Hittite, were
largely excluded from my corpus, or to both.

It should not be surprising, however, if unexpected null subjects are associated with specific literary genres. Ritual texts in particular are characterized by an extremely restricted pragmatic domain, and it is certainly imaginable a priori that discourse conditions might operate there which are otherwise largely unrecoverable in the language; by comparison, unexpected null objects too are probably more common in ritual texts than other genres. A typological parallel for the phenomenon of generically restricted null anaphora occurs in so-called "recipe contexts" in English, a language where null anaphora is ordinarily categorially disallowed. In recipe contexts, however, null anaphora is extremely common, as in the following passage cited by Massam & Roberge (1989: 135):

(3.57) Take the cake mix, 1 cup of water, and 3 eggs. Mix ___ well and beat ___ for 5 minutes. Pour ___ into a well-greased pan and bake ___ for 20 minutes. Remove ___ from oven and cool ___.

3.3.9. Summary

Overall the preceding survey has shown that there are two classes of intransitive verbs in Hittite, those which never occur with subject clitics and those which ordinarily do occur with subject clitics when their subjects are third-person and referential. The objective of this chapter has been to establish this descriptive generalization, and not to determine the membership of the two classes exhaustively. Nevertheless it should be clear that over the five hundred years of its attestation, Hittite is remarkably consistent not only in the specific assignment of individual verbs to one class or the other, but also in some general features of the two classes. These general features are both syntactic and semantic.

The class of intransitive verbs which never occur with subject clitics may be subdivided into three groups. First, there is a syntactically defined group: intransitive verbs with transitive counterparts whose subjects have the same θ-roles as the subjects of their transitive counterparts. I will refer to such intransitive verbs as "absolute" transitives. The following absolute transitives have been identified above:
aniya- "work" (OH)
auš- "see" (Tut IV, Muw, Murš II)
ěku- "drink" (OH)
ed- "eat" (OH)
halšā- "call" (MH, OH)
hatrāi- "write" (Murš II, MH, OH)
huek- "cast a spell" (OH)
išhamāi- "sing" (MH)
išparre- "kick (flat)" (MH)
išamaš- "hear" (Muw)
lahhiyāi- "travel, campaign" (Murš II)
malš- "recite, vow" (OH)
memarā- "speak" (Tut IV, Hatt III, Muw, Murš II, MH)
penna- "drive" (Hatt III)
*peda- "bring"
punušš- "ask" (OH)
šakku- "know" (Murš II)
šanh- "sweep" (MH, OH)
šarnink- "pay (compensation)" (OH)
šipante- "libate" (OH)
šittariya- "order" (OH)
dāi- "place" (Murš II)
te-/tar- "speak" (Muw, MH, OH)
tuhašiya- "wait" (Murš II)
ušiša- "send" (Murš II)
unna- "drive" (Tut IV, Murš II)
wak- "bite" (MH)
\textit{walh-} "attack" (Hatt III, Murš II, OH)

\textit{zahhiya-} "fight" (MH)

\textit{zinna-} "end" (OH)

Verbs marked with an asterisk in this and the following lists did not occur in the appropriate context in my corpus, but happen to have been noted elsewhere. Each such verb is appropriately exemplified either in the place cited or immediately after the list where it occurs, as here:

(3.59) KUB 13.35+ i 10

\texttt{nu=za=kan} linkiya anda kisan pe-daš

"He brought in as follows under oath"

The second subgroup of the class of intransitives prohibiting subject clitics is morphologically characterized. It contains several verbs which are intransitive but which belong to morphologically transitive verb classes, namely the class of factitives in \textit{-ahh-} and the class of causatives in \textit{-nu-}:

(3.60) \textit{kururiyahh-} "be hostile" (Tut IV, Murš II)

\textit{maninkuwahh-} "draw near" (MH)

\texttt{*nantarnu-} "hurry"

\textit{wahnu-} "change sides" (Murš II)

(3.61) KUB 36.12 iii 15'-16'

nu nuntarnut

"He hurried"

The third subclass is a miscellaneous one:

(3.62) \textit{arkuwaś-} "plead" (Muw)

\textit{aruwaś-} "bow" (OH)

\textit{gimmantariya-} "spend the winter" (Hatt III)

\textit{link-} "swear" (Tut IV, Hatt III, Murš II, MH, OH)

\texttt{*šalik-} "force one's way"
*šuwaya-* "look"

wašta- "commit an offence" (Tut IV, Murš II)

weh-/wah- "turn" (Tut IV, OH)

(3.63) a KBo 6.26 iii 51-53
ta DUMU.MUNUS=ši=ya šaliga ... ta anni=šši=a našma NIN-i=šši šaliga
"(If) he also forces himself on her daughter ... (If) he also forces himself on her mother or her sister ..."

b KBo 3.1 ii 50-51
nu LUGAL-waš haraštšanā šuwyēzzi

"(Whoever) sets his sights on the king's head" (see Melchert 1977: 222-23)

It is possible that some of the verbs in (3.62) in fact belong to the absolute intransitive class. For example, both link- "swear" and wašta- "commit an offence" occasionally occur with accusatives, as in (3.64-65) :

(3.64) Bo 86/299 ii 55 (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 18)

nu MAMETEMES kue lenqan harta

"The oaths which he had sworn ..."

(3.65) a KBo 16.47 obv 8'

[m]ān SIGmaštann=a mašiwanant waštanzi

"Even if they are remiss in respect to so much as a fiber of wool ..." (CHD 208)


nu ITTI KUR URU Hatti ÜL kuitki waštaš

"He committed no offence against the land of Hatti"

c Bo 86/299 i 10 (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 10)

LÚ.MEŠ URU Hatti kuit imma kuit waštír

"Whatever offence at all the people of Hatti committed ..."
In the case of *link- "swear", the difficulty lies in determining whether MAMETE<sup>MEŠ</sup> kue "which oaths" in (3.64) is a direct object or a non-argument "cognate object". The fact that *linkant- means "perjurer" rather than "oath" or the like—that *link- forms an active rather than a passive participle—argues that the absolutive in (3.64) is indeed an adjunct and not an argument. In the case of *wašta- "commit an offence", the difficulty lies in determining whether the apparent object NPs in (3.65) function as direct objects or adverbs.\(^{10}\)

The class of intransitive verbs which can occur with subject clitics—and which ordinarily do when their third-person referential subjects are omitted—may be divided into several syntactic-semantic subgroups. First, it includes a syntactically-defined class of verbs which are identical to transitives and whose subjects have the same \(\theta\)-roles as the objects of their transitive counterparts. Despite the possibility of confusion with the Indo-European morphological category, I will refer to these verbs as "middle intransitives". Many Hittite middle intransitives are formally (morphologically) middle, in opposition to active transitives, but by no means all of them are. This class includes the following:

\[(3.66)\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Meanings</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>haliya-</td>
<td>&quot;kneel&quot; (Murs II, Šupp I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handāi-</td>
<td>(mid.) &quot;be arranged&quot; (vs. act. &quot;arrange&quot;) (Murš II)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*huršakniya-</td>
<td>(mid.) &quot;burst&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irmaliya-</td>
<td>&quot;sicken&quot; (Murš II)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ıştark-</td>
<td>&quot;sicken&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lā-</td>
<td>(mid.) &quot;be released&quot; (vs. act. &quot;release&quot;) (Muw)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lak-</td>
<td>(mid.) &quot;fall&quot; (vs. act. &quot;knock out&quot;) (MH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{10}\) Note incidentally that ergative and absolutive case assignment are determined by transitivity itself and not the two verb classes described here: at KBo 5.13 ii 27-28, KUR-TUM kuñki arahe  ĀNA dUTU-ŠI kururiyahu = "some land outside will begin hostilities with His Majesty", the subject KUR-TUM kuñki "some land" is an absolutive neuter, not an ergative, because its verb kururiyahu = "will be hostile" is intransitive, even though it belongs to the class prohibiting subject clitics.
lazziya- (mid.) "recover" (vs. act. "set straight") (OH)
luluwāi- (mid.) "survive" (vs. act. "sustain") (Murš II)
*munnāi- "hide" (act., mid.: [3.16] above)
*paršiya- (mid.) "break"
šarra- "break" (mid.) (Murš II)
tarup- "join together" (act., mid.) (MH)
tuwarnāi- "break" (MH)

wemiyā- (mid.) "be found" (vs. act. "find") (Murš II)
wešiyā- (mid.) "fall in with" (vs. act. "call") (Murs II)
ĪR-nah- (mid.) "submit" (vs. act. "subjugate") (Šupp I)

(3.67) a KBo 6.34+ ii 14-15 (Military oath, CTH , ed. Oettinger 1976: 8)
 n=aš UZUSI-aš iwar huršakniyaddaru
 "Let him burst like sinew"

b KBo 6.34+ i 44 (Military oath, CTH , ed. Oettinger 1976: 8)
 n=aš=kan inanaš šer arha paršiyaddaru
 "Let him break apart with sicknesses"

The second intransitive class includes three semantically defined subgroups. First, there are statives:

(3.68) ar- "stand" (Tut IV, Muw, Murš II, MH, OH)
aršaniya- "envy" (Hatt III)
eš- "be" (Tut IV, Hatt III, Muw, Murš II, Šupp I, MH, OH)
eš- "sit" (Hatt III, Murš II, OH)
huišwe- "live" (Šupp I)
ištandāi- "linger" (Murš II)
karušišya- "be silent" (Murš II)
ki- "lie" (Tut IV, Murš II, Šupp I, MH, OH)
nahh- "be afraid" (Hatt III)
nahšariya- "be afraid" (Murš II)
šeš- "sleep" (Murš II)

Second, there are change-of-state verbs, including all the inchoatives in -eš:

(3.69)
ak- "die" (Tut IV, Murš II, Šupp I, OH)
hark- "perish" (OH)
huešwe- "live" (Muw)
idalawes- "become evil" (Hatt III, OH)
kiš- "become" (Hatt III, Murš II, MH, OH)
kištaniya- "starve" (OH)
*māi- "grow"
*mayanteš- "grow up" ([3.1d] above)
miyahhunteš- "grow old" (Murš II)
*mēš- "become gentle"
*militeš- "become sweet"
*merr- "disappear" ([3.1b] above)
parkuš- "become pure" (OH)
*putk- "swell"
*šalliya- "melt"
*šuppeš- "become holy"
tepawes- "become small" (Muw, Murš II)
dudduwaš- "become lame" (Murš II)
GEME-reš- "become unfree" (OH)

(3.70) a KUB 12.44 ii 28
n=aš mišktuwan dái

"It will begin to bear fruit" (CHD 115)
b KUB 17.10 ii 27
   n=aš QÄTAMMA mēēstu
   "Let it likewise become gentle"

c KUB 9.4 iii 27-28 [CHD 252]
   nu=šmaš=aš=kan anda mili<<ta>>tešdu
   "Let him become sweet to them"

d KBo 6.34+ i 39 (Military oath, ed. Oetinger 1976: 8)
   n=aš putkiētta
   "May he swell"

d KBo 6.34+ ii 2 (Military oath, ed. Oetinger 1976: 8)
   n=aš GAB.LÅL-[aš i]war šallitaru
   "May he melt like wax"

e KUB 29.8 ii 20-23
   UL=ma=aš kuwatqa šuppešzi
   "It does not become holy in any way"

Third, there are verbs of motion:

(3.71)  ar- "arrive" (Murš II, MH, OH)
   *arāi- "arise"
   huwāi- "run" (Murš II, Supp I, MH)
   iyā- "go" (Hatt III, Muw, Murš II, MH)
   iyannāi- "walk" (Murs II, MH, OH)
   *maušš- "fall"
   *mummiya- "fall"
   pāi- "go" (Tut IV, Hatt III, Muw, Murš II, MH, OH)
   paraša- "disperse (?)" (Murš II)
   parš- "flee" (Hatt III, Murš II)
   piddāi- "flee" (Murš II, MH)
šamen- "withdraw" (OH)

tiya- "step" (Tut IV, Hatt III, Murš II, MH, OH)

uwa- "come" (Tut IV, Hatt III, Muw, Murš II, Ṣupp I, MH, OH)

warrišša- "come to help" (Murš II)

watku- "jump" (Murš II)

(3.72) a KUB 12.65+ iii 10'

n=aš=kan šarā ḥūdak arāš

"It rose up quickly"

b KUB 28.4 obv 17b

n=aš=kan šer K.LAM-ni mušta

"It fell on the gatehouse"

c KUB 8.22 ii 7-8

n=at=kan katta [m]ummtanzi

"They fall (?) down" (CHD 328)

Finally, the class of intransitives which occur with subject elitics includes the following miscellaneous verbs:

(3.73) handanda- "lead on the right path" (Hatt III, MH)

hink- "bow" (Muw, Murš II, MH)

hūlla- "fight" (Hatt III)

kuršā- "?" (Muw)

marh- "?" (Hatt III)

šullāš- "quarrel" (Hatt III, Murš II)

dāriya- "call" (Hatt III)

tarku- "dance" (OH)

uwaya- "do harm" (Hatt III)

*wešk- "weep" ([3.14a] above)
3.4. Palaic and Cuneiform Luvian

Subject clitics are clearly attested in Palaic only in the following passages:

(3.74) a  KUB 35.165 rev 23'
       mān=aš marhanza
       "When s/he is marhanza ..."

b  KUB 32.18 i 7' = 9' = 18'
   ni=ppa=aš hašanti
   "They are not satisfied"

Null third-person referential subjects are attested with intransitive verbs in the following passages:

(3.75) a  KUB 32.18 i 7', 9', 18'
       ahuwanti
       "They drink"

b  KUB 35.165 rev 22'
   dZaparwaši ahūna huššinta
   "They have poured for Zaparwa to drink"

c  KUB 32.18 i 15' = KUB 35.168: 3'
   nit=kuwat parait
   "S/he did not come forth" (??)

d  KUB 32.18 i 7' = 9' = 18' (cf. KUB 35.165 obv 25, rev 9)
   ni=ppa=ši mušanti
   "They are not satisfied"

In (3.75d), of course, identification of a null subject depends on the assumption that an overt aš would result in a -Vš-šV- spelling in at least some of the five places the verb occurs. The appropriate Hittite and Palaic contexts are compared in (3.76a) and (3.76b) respectively:
KUB 17.10 i 19-20

"They ate, and they were not satisfied; they drank, and they were not satisfied"

KUB 32.18 i 7' (ed. Carruba)

"They eat, and they are not satisfied; they drink, and they are not satisfied"

The cognate intransitive verbs "drink" and "be satisfied" (and probably "eat" as well) have the same subject clitic syntax. This is consistent with the view that Palaic shares the Hittite distribution of subject clitics in intransitive clauses: as in Hittite, the copula can occur with a subject clitic, and absolute intransitives like "pour" and "drink" cannot occur with a subject clitic. I take this as evidence that both Hittite and Palaic inherited from their common ancestor these two syntactically distinct classes of intransitives.

Turning to Cuneiform Luvian, none of the subject clitics listed by Laroche (1959) occurs with a transitive verb, confirming the conclusion of §3.1. However, I have not yet examined the referential third-person null subjects to determine whether the Cuneiform Luvian distribution of subject clitics with intransitives parallels the one found for Hittite and Palaic. This project may be more usefully undertaken in conjunction with a similar analysis of the Hieroglyphic Luvian data, which has been consistently ignored here.

3.5. Lycian

Since the regular outcome of Common Anatolian word-final \*-*os is -e in Lycian, and the regular treatment of medial \*-*os is -eh-, the Common Anatolian subject clitic \*os would regularly give two allomorphs e and eh in Lycian. Neither is attested—in fact, no subject clitics are attested in Lycian—but this gap is insignificant. There is no context in any Lycian text where a subject clitic would be expected and is unambiguously absent: all clear
Lycian clauses with third person referential null subjects are transitive, and Anatolian transitive verbs are not expected to have clitic subjects. In a single case, to be discussed in chapter 5, a third-person singular subject clitic would be expected, but the evidence in that case does not exclude the possibility that a clitic e is actually present. The evidence of Lycian may therefore be disregarded in investigating the syntax of the Anatolian subject clitics.

3.6. The Syntax of Anatolian Subject Clitics

The evidence presented above indicates that either with or after the innovation of clitic subject pronouns, but in any case already in Common Anatolian, two lexical classes of verbs came to be distinguished syntactically: one class, including the transitives, the absolute transitives, and certain other intransitives, never had clitic subjects; and the other class, including the middle intransitives, statives, change-of-state verbs, verbs of motion, and certain other intransitives, ordinarily had clitic subjects in the absence of other overt third-person referential subjects.

An analysis of these developments is available based on the so-called "unaccusative hypothesis" developed originally by Perlmuter (1978) and subsequently by numerous researchers (see Grimshaw 1987 for a review). According to this hypothesis, many languages are characterized by an opposition between two classes of intransitive verbs, namely "unaccusatives" and "unerivatives". These two classes are generally distinguished in part semantically: the unergative class typically includes agentive intransitives and absolute transitives in the sense used here, and the unaccusative class includes most non-agentive intransitives and middle intransitives. Many attempts have been made, mainly unsuccessfully, to derive the behavior and membership of the two classes from the semantic properties of the various intransitive verbs (but see most recently Van Valin 1990). The two classes are also distinguished syntactically. Unaccusative verbs behave in some respects like transitives, and it is ordinarily taken as the defining characteristic of the two
intransitive classes that the surface subject of an unaccusative verb is in fact underlyingly its object, not its subject, whereas the surface subject of an unergative verb is an underlying subject. This means that the subjects of unaccusative verbs share with the objects of transitive verbs the property of being underlying objects, and the subjects of unergative verbs share with the subjects of transitive verbs the property of being underlying subjects:

(3.77)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Type</th>
<th>Surface Subject</th>
<th>Surface Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unaccusative</td>
<td>underlying object</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unergative</td>
<td>underlying subject</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitive</td>
<td>underlying subject</td>
<td>underlying object</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The specific implementation of the notion "underlying" of course varies according to the formal apparatus employed; within the transformational model used here, clauses with unaccusative verbs may be regarded as having the structure in (3.78).

(3.78)  

Unaccusative Verbs

By contrast, clauses with unergative verbs have the structure in (3.79).

(3.79)  

Unergative Verbs

The syntactic manifestations of the unaccusative/unergative contrast naturally vary from
language to language according to whatever syntactic parameters cross-classify underlying and surface subjectionhood and objecthood. For example, in Italian, the language where contrasts between unaccusatives and unergatives have been most extensively investigated, a representative unaccusative is *arrivare* and a representative unergative is *telefonare*. Compound past unaccusative verbs require the auxiliary *essere*, while unergatives require *aver* (the data in [3.80-81] is cited from Grimshaw [1987: 245]):

(3.80) a Giovanni arriva
     Giovanni è arrivato

     b Giovanni telefona
     Giovanni ha telefonato

Likewise the process of subject *ne*-cliticization is sensitive to the unaccusative/unergative contrast:

(3.81) a Ne arrivano molti

     b *Ne telefonano molti

As shown by the following sentences, cited by Rosen (1984: 53), Italian middle intransitives are unaccusative and absolute transitives are unergative:

(3.82) a Il pubblico ha fischiato il tenore
     Il pubblico ha fischiato

     b Bertini ha calato il sipario
     Il sipario è calato

Other manifestations of the contrast in various languages cited by Grimshaw (1987: 245-47) include Dutch impersonal passivization, English adjectival participle formation, Lakhota verbal agreement morphology, and arbitrary plural interpretation of null subjects in Spanish and Italian.

I suggest that the division of Anatolian intransitive verbs is another manifestation of the common division of intransitives into these two classes. This make sense both semantically and syntactically. Semantically, the class of Hittite intransitive verbs which can occur with
clitic subjects corresponds fairly well to classes of unaccusatives in other languages: see Rosen (1984: 44-45) on Italian, for instance. My proposal also makes pre-theoretical syntactic sense: instead of positing that Anatolian subject clitics cannot occur with transitive verbs or a lexically specified class of intransitive verbs, it permits the simpler generalization that Anatolian clitics do not occur as underlying subjects. In other words, while clitics may occur in underlying object positions (as the objects of transitives or the subjects of unaccusatives), they cannot occur in underlying subject positions (as the subjects of transitives or unergatives). The position from which clitics are blocked in Anatolian is indicated in the following representation:

(3.83) Cliticization from Underlying Subject Position

![Diagram]

Representations of clauses with surface subject and object clitics are given in (3.84) and (3.85) respectively:
Two final points must be noted. First, if the proposal that Anatolian clitic syntax manifests a distinction between unaccusative and unergative syntax is correct, this distinction should manifest itself elsewhere in the syntax of these languages. I have not attempted to identify any independent correlates of the unaccusative/unergative contrast in Anatolian, and it is of course possible in principle that the corpus available to us will not allow their identification, since many of the syntactic tests possible in living languages are necessarily unavailable even in research on a relatively well-attested dead language like Hittite.\textsuperscript{11} Second, while the present hypothesis does permit the generalization that

\textsuperscript{11} The distribution of possessor raising may furnish an independent test of the desired type. As far as I know,
cliticization from the underlying subject position is impossible in Anatolian, it does not provide an explanation for this in turn. This dissertation is, however, not the proper forum for a discussion of this somewhat more theoretical problem.

3.7. Appendix: Hittite Subject Clitics With Transitive Verbs

This appendix considers, case by case, Hittite contexts in which subject clitics have been identified in violation of Watkins's rule discussed in §3.1 above. In none of these cases does the evidence require positing a subject clitic.

a. The following sign sequences should be read as indicated rather than as indexed by Burde (1974): ku-ũ-ma-an-ma-aš-ši is kuimın=ma=šši not kuimın=ma=aš-ši at KUB 44.61 i 7-8; and GA-PA-NU-ya-aš-ši-kán is CAPANU=ya=šši=kán not CAPANU=ya=aš=šši=kán at KUB 44.63 ii 10'.

b. The following sign sequences should be read as indicated rather than as indexed by Beckman (1983): nam-ma-aš-ša-an is namma=ššan not namma=aš=ššan at KUB 9.22 ii 34 (with dupl.), iii 2, 8, 36; ABOT 17 ii 4-5; Q[A-TAM-γ]a-aš-ša-an is QATAM=ya=ššan not QATAM=ya=aš=ššan at KUB 9.22 iii 40; and a-ra-ah-ne-ni-ya-aš-ša-an is arahzeni=ya=ššan not arahzeni=ya=aš=ššan at ABOT 17 iii 11'.

c. At KBo 17.88 + KBo 24.116 iii 23-25, 쳑š-ša halugàš wemiskiddu mayantān दूर्णु=šummin Tawanannan AN.BAR-āš GIS;DAG-ii, aš should be taken as accusative plural rather than nominative singular, so that the translation is not "let it (aš), (namely) the 'good message', find our vigorous Sungod (i.e. the king) (and) the Tawananna on a throne

the only verbs whose subjects are raised direct-object possessors are verbs of the unaccusative class. Such a distribution would be explained if possessor raising were a process restricted to (underlying) VP-internal arguments.
dais of iron" (CHD 117), but is rather "let the 'good message' find them (aš), (namely) our vigorous Sungod ...."

d. At KUB 53.3 i 7', [n]=aš=kan parā pēdai, aš should be taken as accusative plural rather than nominative singular, so that the translation is not "und er schafft es hinaus" (Haas & Jakob-Rost 1984: 58), but is rather "(he) removes them".

e. At KUB 51.1+ iii 25'-26' (Haas & Jakob-Rost 1984: 43), Û 9 iukan L[(ûMEŠ]hunēpiša LÛMEŠ]halliyareš PANI DINGIR-LIM huyanteš n=at hunē[(piša tišk)anzi], the translation, which begins "and nine one-year-old (sheep), the hunēpiša-people, and the haliyari-people run before the god", cannot conclude with Haas & Jakob-Rost's (1984: 46) "...und sie stellen das hunēpiša hin". As Craig Melchert points out (p.c.), since we do not know what hunēpiša means and since in the second sentence it lacks a determinative, this sentence may instead be interpreted as "they step to the hunēpiša", with a directive.

f. At KBo 17.65 edge 8, namma=aš piyan[āizzi], we should translate "further, (s/he) pays them" rather than intransitively "further, (s)he pays a fee" (Beckman 1983: 147), since piyanāzi- is elsewhere transitive: cf. KBo 17.65 edge 5, namma=aš 3 BAL<-ši> piyanāizzi kuit=s[i āššu] "further, (s/he) pays them three times what is right to her": KBo 17.65 rev 64, [ši]pātī kuit n=an EN.SISKUR.SISKUR piyanāizzi kuit=ši āššu "the client pays the one who performs the offering what is right to him": KBo 6.3 ii 58, apūn piyanāizzi "(he) pays him"; and KBo 22.1 rev 28, parna=šša paiši ēzzi eukši piyanāzzi=a=tta "you go to his house, you eat (and) drink, and (he) rewards you".
g. Bo 3752 ii 2'-5' (Neu 1980: 179) reads as follows:

(3.86) šara šuhha paizzi [ 
  ta=kkan 1 SÍLAGE šipantti [ 
  t=asa=kan DUMU.É.GAL ap-pi-ī[tš-k-
  anda šunneškizzi [ 
  "he goes up to the roof ... he offers one black lamb ... the palace servant 
  seizes/holds them ..."

Neu (1983: 3) takes aš in line 4' as nominative singular. If this were correct, the line would either mean "he holds the palace servant" or (with proleptic aš) "he, the palace servant, holds ...", but neither is possible. In light of lines 16'-17' of the same text, [ta=kkkan ... ] Û 1 KÁŠ.É.SANIN DUMU.MEŠ.É.GAL ... appiškanzi "the palace servants hold [ ... ] and one 
K.G.", we might take aš as accusative plural and translate line 4' as "the palace servants holds 
them". Although this would be the only instance known to me of ta-aš "and them (acc.)" in 
an Old Hittite manuscript, as opposed to the usual tu-aš, it does appear at KUB 58.6+ i 5', 
ta-aš NINDA-arazatut iyaši "(he) makes them into X-puddings", as shown by Watkins 
(1990a). If the sign lŠ in 4' is not assured, however, the line may have some entirely 
different interpretation.

h. Güterbock (1952: 16-17) reads [... n]a-aš (?) Ì.DÚ.GA pédaš "he brought perfumed oil" at KUB 36.14 iii 19'. The traces in the autograph are consistent with this tentative 
reading, but do not force it, and we should seek another restoration.

i. Similarly Kümmler (1967: 36) reads [n]a-aš ANA NAM.RU arkuwar kišan DÚ-zi "he 
makes a request as follows to the deportees" at KBo 15.7: 14'. Again, however, the 
autograph traces are consistent with other readings.

j. At KUB 44.63 ii 5'-6', Burde (1974: 28) reads ku-ūt-ma[-na]-aš-kán wašši [ ] anda 
nawi tarnai. There is, however, no AŠ visible in the autograph. I suggest 
kü-ūt-ma-[an-ši]-kán ... or kü-ūt-ma-[an-ša]-kán ... "before he gives him the medicine".

k. There is also no evidence for an AŠ at KUB 8.36 ii 8', printed by Laroche (1971:
188) and Burde (1974: 38) as [na-a]š ki wašši dāī. The horizontal stroke taken by Laroche
and Burde as part of AŠ could equally well be part of NU (cf. KUB 8.36 ii 10'). We should
read [n]u ki wašši dāī "(he) takes this medicine"; cf. KBo 21.74 iii 7', nu ki Ú dāī, and KUB
44.64 iii 11'-12', nu kē wašši HILÁ dāī.

1. KBo 17.62+ i 27' is printed by Beckman (1983: 32) as [na-a]l? SAL-an arha
tarna[ndu]. While his translation, "may they release the woman", is undoubtedly correct,
the autograph does not show an AT, and there is now reason not to read one.

m. An interesting problem is posed by two passages from the Hedammu myth, printed
as follows by Siegelová (1971: 50):

(3.87) a  
KUB 12.65+ iii 10'

n=aš=kan taknaš ÍD-ašš=a KASKAL-an GAM-an arha [iyat]
"he took the way of the earth and the river below"

b  
KUB 33.122 ii 7'-8'

[n=aš=ka]n ÍD-za taknaza GAM-an arha [(KASKAL-an iyat)]
"he made his way via the river and earth below"

The verb iyat in (3.87a) and the clitic pronoun aš in (3.87b) are both restored. Mark Hale
points out to me that the idiom KASKAL-an iya- "make one's way" should not, as it does in
these restorations, be construed in two different ways (with the genitive and with the
ablative). For this reason, it seems reasonable to restore uit or pait rather than iyat in
(3.87a), so that KASKAL-an is a path accusative (see above), and a subject clitic is
permissible. In (3.87b) we should read [nu=ka]n.

n. At KUB 36.118: 8, nu=war=aš=za nahlān hardu is translated by CHD 341 as "let
him have respect", but now it is clear that we must take nahlān as a neuter participle used
adverbially, with the sentence meaning "let (him) hold them (aš) in reverence". This is one
of the two instances cited in CHD of a putative noun nahlān; since the other is also
questionable, the lemma should probably be deleted.

o. At KBo 4.4 iv 6, Götze (1933: 134) restores n=aš HUR.SAG NÁ₇₄pērum[u][s harkir]
"they held the rocky mountains", interpretation which must now be abandoned.

p. At KUB 14.15 ii 9, Gözze (1933: 48) restores n=aż=mu ÊRIN.MEŠ ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ INA URUŠallapa piraň šarā u-[da-aš]. If the restoration were correct, aš would now have to be a proleptic accusative plural: "(he) brought them — soldiers and horses — up to Šarrapa for me". Another restoration is more likely, however, such as u-[iš], with İŠTU understood after n=aż=mu: "he came up to Šallapa with soldiers and horses for me".

q. In view of the absence of the verb at KBo 17.65 edge 5, na-aš-za DUMU.MUNUS EGIR-an INA Ė-ŠU, translated by Beckman (1983: 147) as "and she [takes] the female child back into her house", there are at least two possible solutions. The aš may be a plural object with the child, if possible, as the subject; or, the verb may be intransitive (e.g. pažzi) with the mother as the subject and a missing İŠTU before DUMU.MUNUS.

r. KUB 33.84+ iv 24'-26' includes the following: ... dİŠAR-tš EGIR-an=ma=ši MÜŠhedammux x x -la-aš mahhan ha-t[u? / -i]t arha lahuiškizzi n=at dagān hatugaš karidu[š / ...]x-šanzi ..., with the translation beginning "just as Ištar and behind her ... Hedammu ... pour(s) out fearsome ..." Siegelová's (1971: 61) translation, "und sie am Boden furchtbare Flut[en ... auslö]sen", i.e. with at as the subject of the transitive lahuiškizzi, cannot be correct. A possible alternative would be to restore a second mahhan at the end of 35 or the beginning of 36, and conclude, "(so) on the earth they release it/them (at) like the fearsome floods", whatever the reference of at. For this type of construction cf. KUB 43.23 rev 19-22, nu=za 1 ŠAH māhhan ŠAH.TUR.HIA mekkuš haškizzi kell=a=a ŠA GIŠKIRI.G[ĒŠTIN] 1-aš=a GIŠmāhlaš ŠAH-aš iwar mūriš mekkuš haškiddu "just as one sow bears many piglets, also may every single (vine) branch of this vineyard, like the sow, bear many grape clusters" (CHD 112).

s. At KBo 19.128 v 14'-15', n=aż=kan [...] GIŠBANŠUR [...] dāi "and (he) places them (on) the table", and KBo 19.128 vi 4'-5', n=aż=k[an ... ZA]G.GAR.RI dāi "and (he) places them (on) the altar", we can now exclude the possibility (mentioned by Otten 1971: 53) that
aš is nominative singular.

1. At KBo 5.8 ii 17, \( n=aš \) LÜKÚRKURUšKASAŠ harṣita, Götte (1933: 153) correctly translates "die verwüstete der kaššašische Feind", but in his index he incorrectly takes aš as nominative singular.

2. At KUB 2.3 iii 25-28, \( \text{Damnaššaruššaš} = a \text{ wahnuwanzi} n=aš=kan \) IGLHILA-\( \text{wa LUGAL}-i \) anda neyanzi, aš cannot be the subject of a plural transitive "turn" as taken by Singer (1984: 123). It is instead an accusative plural with IGLHILA-\( \text{wa} \) an accusative of inalienable possession, as described above, and the passage means "and (they) turn the Damnassara-deities around; (they) turn them (in) the eyes toward the king", i.e. "they turn the deities' eyes toward the king". Compare CHD 351; KBo 10.24 iv 4, \( n=an \) LUGAL-\( \text{anda nā[i]} \) "(he) turns him toward the king"; and the passages cited by Neu (1968: 125) in connection with 530/\( z \): 13 (ibid. 124), \( n=aš=za=kan \) IGLHILA-\( \text{wa} \) EGIR-pa neyari "he turns back (in) the eyes", i.e. "his eyes turn back".

3. At KUB 13.9+ ii 7, \( mān=aš=za \) QADU DAM.MEŠ-ŠU DUMU.MEŠ-ŠU dān harzi is translated as "wenn er sich (ihn) nebst seinen Frauen, seinen Kindern genommen hat" by Freydenk (1970: 259). The correct translation must be "if (he) has taken them with his wives and children".

4. At KUB 37.228 obv 4-5, we can now exclude Starke's (1977: 164) reading, \( n=aš šēr=ši[i] šīwan tariyatta \) "he will call the god on his behalf", in favor of his alternative suggestion, \( n=aš šēr=šit \) IGL-wantariyatta.
x. KUB 24.7 i 48-55 reads as follows:

(3.88) \[ mā ]n MUNUS-TUM=ma ANA LŪMUTI-ŠU pu[kkanza] \\
[ ] puqqanuwan hart[i] mān [LŪ iš ANA] \\
[zi]k diŠTAR-iš išhuwa[u]ji [ ] \\
[zi]i na-aš mar-la-tar pu-pu-wa-[ ] \\
[zi]i man=at=kan watkuan[zi] \\
[T]I-nusi appansi=ma[ ] \\
[ y]ašuwar marla[mar] \\

"If a woman is hateful to her husband, [you] have made [her] hateful. If a man is hateful to his wife, [you,] Ištar, will pour [troubles (?)] on them. ...zi na-aš marlatar ppuw[a... were they to elope, the [...] will [not] save [them]. The [...]s will seize them. To be [...] is foolishness."

This passage, and in particular lines 52-53, have been treated several times; see CHD 191 with references. All treatments are equally problematic. If aš in 52 were the subject of the missing verb, then marlatar would be the direct object, and a transitive verb would have a subject clitic. On the other hand, if aš were an accusative plural direct object, then marlatar would have to be the subject; as shown in chapter 2, however, Hittite would require an ergative *marlannanza in the subject position of a transitive clause. Mark Hale points out the correct solution to me: if we take the space separating the signs ZI and NA in line 52 as an error by either the ancient or the modern copyist, then we can read [ZI]-na-aš, i.e. ištanzaš, a dative-locative or genitive plural. The correct restoration is probably [nu=za ZI]-naš marlatar pupuwa[lannaš] (or pupuwa[latara-a]) [danz]i (or [ME-kanz]i) "into their minds they take the foolishness of adultery" (or "foolishness and adultery"). For the idiom, compare KBo 4.14 ii 39-40, nu=mu=kan ZI-ni marlatar [le daškiš]i "towards me don't take foolishness into (your) mind" (and see Riemschneider 1970: 39).
Chapter Four: Possessive Clitics

4.1. Possession and Thematic Relations

The objective of this chapter is to determine the syntactic distribution of unemphatic and some emphatic possessive pronouns in Anatolian. As indicated in §1.3.2, possession (in the sense used here) is a grammatical rather than a semantic relation: a possessive pronoun need not have any particular thematic relationship with its possessed NP, although the two must have some thematic relation. Since, in the syntactic model used here, possessive NPs are structurally the underlying specifiers of their possessed NPs, the objects of study of this chapter may be described in three ways: as those unemphatic pronouns whose grammatical relations are to NPs rather than sentences or other elements; as those unemphatic pronouns which are structurally the underlying specifiers of NPs; or as those unemphatic pronouns whose \( \theta \)-roles are assigned by NPs rather than verbs. These are logically independent classes, of course, but in the present system of analysis they are effectively equivalent.

NP-internal possessive pronouns are easy to identify: they are the suffixed pronouns and genitive personal and demonstrative pronouns. On the other hand, identifying possessive Wackernagel’s Law pronouns is a difficult descriptive task. For this purpose I will take adnominal genitive NPs as models: if a sentential clitic pronoun could be interpreted as having a thematic relation to an NP in its sentence, and if that thematic relation is found elsewhere in the language between NPs and dependent genitives, then I will assume that the pronoun might be possessive. Among the \( \theta \)-roles assigned in Hittite by NPs to dependent genitives are those assigned to kinship and other relational terms, body parts and other inalienable objects, owned objects, and purpose specifiers, as with the following genitives cited by Yoshida (1987): annaš DINGIR-LIM-as “the divinity’s mother” (KUB 43.60 i 21); addaš ešharsaš “the father’s blood” (KUB 11.5 obv 8'); A.ŠA-as ZAG-an “the field’s border” (KBo 6.13 i 1); šunašaš parna “to the divinity’s house” (KBo 13.175 obv 5); ŠA KUŠ.\( \mathrm{GU} \)-as
"to the cowhide's owner" (KUB 36.100+ rev 10'); and kiššat uṣar "water of (i.e. for) the hands" (KBo 21.90 obv 8').

The possibility of such a relationship between a sentential clitic and an NP does not, however, prove that one exists. As noted in §1.3.2, the oblique Wackernagel's Law pronouns can have all the grammatical relations and θ-roles of adverbal (non-adnominal) dative NPs. If such a pronoun could in context be interpreted as having a θ-role which is elsewhere in the language found assigned to (adverbal) dative NPs—for example if it could be interpreted thematically as a goal, recipient, benefactive, malefactive, or affected complement—then I will assume that the pronoun might be underlyingly adverbal. Consequently, if a Wackernagel's Law pronoun could in context be interpreted either as the possessor of some NP or as an adverbal dative, then it cannot be adduced as evidence for the distribution of possessive pronouns. Once their distribution is determined on the basis of clear cases, of course, it may be possible to exclude either the possessive or the adverbal interpretation, but the ambiguous cases cannot themselves contribute to this determination.

Examples of such ambiguous pronouns are the following oblique Wackernagel's Law clitics:

(4.1) a  KUB 23.1+ iv 18

mān = ma = aš = ta = kkan šṣ KUR-KA = ma uzzi

POSSESSIVE: "But if he comes into your land ..."

GOAL: "But if he comes to you in (your) land ..."

(4.2) a  StBoT 24 iii 71-72 (Apology of Hattušili III, CTH 81, ed. Otten 1981: 22)

((nu = wa = mnaš diŠTAR URUŠ) šamu ha dU URU Neriqqa = ya [(haneššar hanna)] nzi

POSSESSIVE: "Let Ištar of Šamuha and the Stormgod of Nerik decide our case"

BENEFATIVE: "Let Ištar of Šamuha and the Stormgod of Nerik decide the case for us"
b  KUB 6.45+ i 26-27  
set setu kē arkuwarr̃HI.A ištamašten  
POSSESSIVE: "Listen to these my prayers"  
BENEFACTIVE: "Listen to these prayers for me"

c  KUB 34.24+ iv 25-26  
set setu emaš ABU-YA ANA DUMU-RI katta namma IZBAT  
POSSESSIVE: "Then my father concerned himself with their matter of a son"  
BENEFACTIVE: "Then my father concerned himself on their behalf with the matter of a son"

d  KBo 5.8 iv 13-14  
set setu =kan šarānu kuit NAM.RA GU ḫ UDU mekki nakkiššan ešta  
POSSESSIVE: "Because my booty in deportees, cattle, and sheep had become far too great ..."  
BENEFACTIVE: "Because the booty in deportees, cattle, and sheep had become far too great for me ..."

(4.3)  a  KUB 6.41 iv 19-20  
set setu =wa=ta=kan naššu ABU-KA našma=wa KUR-TUM arha dāi  
POSSESSIVE: "He'll take away either your father's house or land"  
MALEFACTIVE: "He'll take either the father's house or land away from you"

b  KBo 4.4 ii 5-6  
set setu =šmaš halkI.A-uš namma [lepau]ešzi  
POSSESSIVE: "Your grain will moreover become diminished"  
MALEFACTIVE: "Grain will moreover become diminished for you"

(4.4)  a  KBo 5.6 iii 7-8  
set setu =šmaš=kan EN-ŠUNU kuit pPiphururiyaš immakku BA.UŠ  
POSSESSIVE: "Since indeed their lord Nibhururiya did die ..."  
AFFECTED: "Since indeed (their) lord Nibhururiya did die on them ..."
b  KUB 43.50+ obv 4
    nu=mu=kan memiaš t[(epu)] kuitki šarā [(iyattat)]
    POSSESSIVE: "My voice went somewhat small"
    AFFECTED: "The voice went somewhat small on me"

There are two other configurations where oblique Wackernagel's Law pronouns occur which will be disregarded in this chapter. The first is the common existential construction:

(4.5)  a  KBo 5.3+ ii 26  (Hukkana treaty, ed. Friedrich 1930: 124)
    nu=šš[i] NIN.MEŠ-ŠU ŠA MÁŠ-ŠU ŠA NUMUN-ŠU mekkaēš ašanzi
    "She has many sisters of family and seed"

b  KBo 5.4 ii 16
    [našm]a=šmaš DINU=ma kuitki
    "Or if you have some lawsuit ..."

c  KBo 4.3 iv 42
    nu=šši mān DUMU-ŠU ėšzi
    "If she has a son ..."

d  KUB 6.41 i 25
    nu=wa=mu IBILA kuit [(NÚ.GAL)]
    "Because I had no heir ..."

e  Bo 86/299 iii 17  (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 20)
    mān=ši NUMUN DUMU.NITA=ma UL ėšzi
    "But if he has no male descendant ..."

f  Bo 86/299 iii 38  (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 22)
    ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ=ma=šši UL ėšzi
    "But he has no horses"

Although these sentences are most naturally translated as indicated, I take them literally as copular sentences with null non-referential subjects and pronominal oblique arguments:
"there are many sisters ... for her", "they say there are many sons for you", and so on. This analysis is confirmed by (4.6):

(4.6)  
   a  KUB 21.38 i 15  
       ANA ŠEŠ-YA NU.GÁL kuški  
       "My brother has nothing"
   b  KBo 11.10 ii 16'  
       ki=ma ANA dGulšaš ešdu  
       "Let the Gulša-divinities have this"
   c  KUB 21.38 i 15-16 (Letter, CTH 176)  
       män ANA DUMU dUTU našma DUMU dU UL kuški ešzi našma aruni UL  
       ešzi tuqq=a UL kuški ešzi  
       "If the Sungod's son or the Stormgod's son has nothing, or the sea has nothing, you too will have nothing"

For these reasons, the oblique pronouns in (4.5) are not underlyingly adnominal genitives and may be expected not to pattern syntactically with possessive pronouns. In this chapter I will disregard pronouns which appear in this construction. (Comparative evidence indicates that the construction is Indo-European, and Starke [1977: 86] and Yoshida [1987: 42] are probably right in attributing its absence in Old Hittite to chance.)

The other special context for oblique Wackernagel's Law pronouns is one where they are clearly adnominal underlyingly, but where their surface syntax is ambiguous:

(4.7)  
   a  KBo 5.8 iii 41-42  
       nu=mu dU NIR.GÁL kuši EN-YA ŠU-an harzi  
       "Because my lord the noble Stormgod holds my hand ..."
   b  KUB 14.15 iv 28-29  
       n=aš=mu uit GİR.MEŠ-aš kattan haliyattat  
       "They then knelt down at my feet"
c StBoT 24 ii 72-73 (Apology of Hattušili III, CTH 81, ed. Otten 1981: 16)
u = mu = kan PANGI ŠEŠ-YA kuit KARAS ANŠE.KUR.RA.MES ŠA KUR
URU Hatti ŠU-i cṣa
"The soldiers and cavalry of Hatti which were in my hand during my
brother's reign ..."

d KUB 34.84+ i 29'-30'
tuiggaš = a = š[maš = ku]n ŚIG ZA.GIN ŚIG SAš šuñl anda iyazzì
"But for their limbs she makes a cord of blue and red wool"

e KUB 34.84+ i 27'-28'
2 ŠU,[HI].A-a = šmaš = kan 2 EME.HI.A š[arã?] INA SAG.DU-ŠUNU dāi
"She puts two hands and two tongues on their head"

f KUB 34.84+ ii 28-29
nu=wa=šmaš tuiggaš tarpalliš eštu
"Let there be a substitute for your limbs"

g KUB 34.84+ ii 36-37
SAG.HI.A-aš = šmaš tuiggaš hūmandāš tarpalliš UDU GE6
"The black sheep will be a substitute for their heads and all (their) limbs"

h KBo 11.1 rev 16
KAXU-za=nāš = kan kue ŬL uıt
"Those which didn't come from our mouth ..."

i KUB 6.45+ i 30-31
n=at=mu=kan UKU-az EME-az šarā uızzi=pat
"They will indeed come up from my mortal mouth"

j KUB 21.27 iv 7'
nu=šmaš=at=kan KAXU-az uiddù
"Let it come from their mouth"
The object or oblique pronouns in these sentences could in principle be possessors directly positioned by Wackernagel's Law, of the type under investigation here. However, since they are all the possessors of body parts, they could instead have first advanced from possessor to object or verbal complement status by the process of possessor raising discussed in chapter 2, and only then have been positioned by Wackernagel's Law. Note that although there are, as indicated in chapter 2, extremely few clear cases of possessor raising with NPs which are not underlying direct objects, none of the relevant NPs in (4.7b-j) are direct objects. These sentences would thus all be disambiguated—and our understanding of Wackernagel's Law in Anatolian considerably improved—if it could be shown that there is in fact no good evidence for non-object possessor raising.

Naturally enough, there are also some oblique Wackernagel's Law clitics which are multiply ambiguous, as in the following sentence:

(4.8) KUB 43.50+ obv 3-4 (Aphasia of Mušili II, CTH 486, cd. Lebrun)

\[nu=mu=kan memiaš K[(AxU-\ i and)a (tepaešt)]a\]

POSSESSIVE: "My voice diminished in the mouth"

POSSESSIVE: "The voice diminished in my mouth"

POSSESSOR RAISING: "The voice diminished in my mouth"

AFFECTED: "The voice diminished on me in the mouth"

Sentences of this type will also be disregarded here.

4.2. Hittite

The internal history of Hittite is characterized by a change in the distribution of unemphatic possessive pronouns; as summarized at CHD 221-23, the development was roughly as follows. In Old Hittite the suffixed possessive pronouns were widely used, whereas in Neo-Hittite the oblique Wackernagel's Law pronouns were widely used in possessive function. In Old Hittite the suffixed pronoun marked unemphatic possession and the free genitive (for example apēl) marked emphatic possession, but in Neo-Hittite both the
Wackernagel's Law pronouns and the free genitive were used to mark unemphatic possession. My objective in this section is to determine specifically the distribution of each of these constructions at the various stages of Hittite, and if possible to elucidate the mechanisms whereby certain of them may have replaced others.

An important question which will remain open throughout this chapter concerns the Hittite readings of Akkadographic possession. As noted at CHD 222, there is no principled basis at present for determining, in any particular case, whether possession which is written only Akkadographically reflects a suffixed possessive pronoun, a free genitive pronoun, or no overt possession at all (as in the cases mentioned by Eichner 1979: 46 n. 10)—for instance, whether in a specific instance an NP like Ḫ-ŠU "its house" reflects pīr-exet, apēl pīr, or simply pīr. The correct Hittite readings of Akkadographic possession can only be determined on the basis of an understanding of the Hittite rules of possessor marking, which can in turn only be determined on the basis of cases with Hittite rather than non-Hittite phonetic material. For this reason I will make no assumptions here regarding the Hittite readings of any Akkadographic possession—in fact, I will ignore altogether any possession which is only indicated Akkadographically, and I will not undertake here the potentially interesting task of assigning Hittite readings to Akkadographic possession. (It is in any case unclear whether such assignments will have any linguistic implications, if they must be based on independently determined grammatical rules.)

4.2.1. Emphatic Possessive Pronouns

At all stages of Hittite, genitive personal pronouns and demonstratives were the semantically unmarked emphatic possessive markers. As indicated above, however, the same morphological objects were also used in at least some contexts to mark unemphatic possession (any phonological difference which might have distinguished their emphatic and unemphatic uses is of course permanently lost). In studying the distribution of unemphatic pronouns, therefore, it is necessary to identify and exclude from consideration those genitives which are emphatic. To do this, I have developed five diagnostics for
"emphasis"—contrast, emphatic marking, topicalization, apposition, and predication. Unfortunately, since these diagnostics cannot be expected to exhaust the contexts in which emphatic pronouns were used in Hittite, there will inevitably be a residue, that is, a set of genitive pronouns and demonstratives which appear in contexts where unemphatic possession is not otherwise predicted to occur. An Old Hittite example of this type is the following:

(4.9) KBo 22.2 obv 12-13 (Zalpa, CTH 3, ed. Otten 1973: 6)
äšma anze[|MUNUS.|LUGAL ^URU]Kaniš 30 MUNUS.DUMU 1-ŠU hašta

"Behold, our queen of Kaniš bore 30 sons at once"

This residue creates no methodological problem as long as it is not too large.

4.2.1.1. Overt Contrast

I have assumed that genitive personal pronouns and demonstratives are emphatic if they occur in contexts where they are arguably contrasted with some other NP. This of course does not entail that all pronouns in such contexts must be emphatic, and there are indeed demonstrably unemphatic pronouns (such as Wackernagel’s Law clitic pronouns) in such contexts. However, since any free genitive pronoun which occurs in such a context might be emphatic, the class must be disregarded in trying to understand the distribution of unemphatic possessive pronouns. Examples follow:

(4.10) a KBo 16.47 obv 17'-18'
nu=wa duTU-Šİ tue|l KUR-i [ŬL] parahzi zig=a=wa ŠA duTU-Šİ KUR-i lē parahši

"His Majesty will not harass your land, nor shall you harass His Majesty’s land"

b KUB 14.1+ obv 21
ERÍN.MES.HIA-KA=ya=wa ammel ERÍN.MES.HIA ašandu

"Let your troops also be my troops"
c  KUB 14.1+ obv 64
  n=ašta ŠA mAtta[riš]šiya=ya 1 LÚSIG₅-in kuenir anzell=a=kan 1 LÚSIG₅
  mZidānzan kuenir
  "They both killed one officer of Attarišiya, and killed one officer of ours, Zidānza"

d  KBo 5.3+ i 34 (Hukkan treaty, ed. Friedrich 1930: 110)
  katta=ma tueš DUMU.MEŠ-KA ammel DUMU-YA pahšari
  "And subsequently my son will protect your sons"

e  KBo 5.3+ i 37 (Hukkan treaty, ed. Friedrich 1930: 110)
  nu ammel DUMU-YA DUMU.MEŠ-KA=ya katta aššuli pahšari
  "My son will subsequently protect your sons too in friendship"

f  KBo 5.3+ i 18 (Hukkan treaty, ed. Friedrich 1930: 108)
  nu=tta man tueš mahhan SAG.DU-KA nakkiš nu=tta[=ma][] mān SAG.DU
  dUTU-ŠI QATAMMA ŪL nakkiš
  "Just as your head is important to you, if His Majesty's head isn't just as important to you ...

g  KBo 5.3+ i 22-24 (Hukkan treaty, ed. Friedrich 1930: 108)
  nu=mān tueš mahhan ANA SAG.DU-KA ZI-KA Ū ANA RAMANI-KA genzu
  haršī ŠU.HI.A-uš=za ararzanda haršī nu mān ANA SAG.DU dUTU-ŠI ZI
  dUTU-ŠI RAMĀN dUTU-ŠI ginzu QATAMMA ŪL harši
  "Just as you have affection for your head, your person, and yourself, and you hold your hands around (i.e. protect) them, if you don't have just as much affection for His Majesty's head, His Majesty's person, His Majesty's self ..."
4.2.1.2. Overt Emphasis

I have assumed that all genitives marked by an emphatic clitic (pat, ma, or ya) are emphatic. Examples follow:

(4.11) a KUB 14.1+ rev 41
nu = za = kan ammel = pat ERÍN.MEŠ.HI.A tarhi · luš karat [š ...]
"... my own troops ... heroic and k. ..."

b KBo 4.4 ii 2
nu = šma š apēl = pat UZU.[1 ucrī[r]
"They called his own flesh and blood on them"

c KUB 6.45+ i 21-23
hūdak = ma = az ammel = pat ŠA EN.MEŠ DINGIR.MEŠ ŠA
É.MEŠ.DINGIR-LIM-KUNU ([šume]l) ŠA ALAM-KUNU arkuwar iyami
"But I will immediately make a prayer regarding my own lord gods, your temples, and your images"

d KUB 14.13 i 24 (Plague prayer, CTH 378)
šumēll = a IR.MEŠ DINGIR-LIM meggaēš e[šir]
"Your servants too of the divinity were numerous"

e KBo 4.12 obv 17-18
ammel = a = šši aššul tukkāt
"My favor too mattered to him"
4.2.1.3. Topicalization

Since topicalization marks some kind of pragmatic emphasis, I have assumed that all topicalized possessive pronouns are emphatic. Examples follow:

(4.12) a Mšt 75/15: 29-30

[tu]el kuit [N]APŠADU apiya

"Those of your souls which are there ..."

b KUB 6.45 iii 45

nu ammel kuwapi AWATEMES DINGIR.MES štamašanzi

"As soon as the gods hear my words ...

c KUB 6.41 ii 26

[(nu tu el mahh)a(n M Mašhūuluwaš ABU.-KA ITTI dUTU-ŠI w)aštaš

"Just as your father Mašhūuluwaš sinned against His Majesty"

4.2.1.4. Predicative Possession

Emphatic possessive pronouns are obligatory in contexts like the following, that is, as predicates of copular clauses (cf. Otten 1967: 56 n. 6 and Kammenhuber 1969: 202):

(4.13) a KBo 16.47 obv 3'

n=at=za apēl kišantat

"They became his"

b KUB 8.81 + KBo 19.39 ii 8'

apēš=wa ammel

"This is mine"

c KUB 14.1 + rev 40

ammel=wa=za ėštēn

"Be mine"
4.2.1.5. Hosts of Apposition

Emphatic pronouns are also required when they are the targets or hosts of apposition.

Examples include the following:

(4.14)  

(a) KUB 14.1+ obv 2  
nu t[u]ēl ŠA wMa[dduw]atta [...] hinkan šanhiškit  
"He sought your — Madduwatta's — ... destruction"

(b) KUB 17.21+ i 11-13  
nu=za šumenzan ŠA [DINGIR.MEŠ] aššu KŪ.BABBAR GUŠKIN  
BIBRIH₂ A TÚG.HLA anzel iwar EGR-an ÜL kuiški kappūwan harta  
"Nobody had looked after your — the gods' — goods, silver, gold, rhyta, and clothes like us"

(c) KUB 17.21+ i 14-15  
namma š[u]menzan DINGIR.MEŠ-aš kue ALAM.HLA-KUNU ŠA  
KŪ.BABBAR GUŠKIN  
"Moreover, those of your — the gods' — statues which are of silver and gold ..."
4.2.2. Old Hittite

Within Old Hittite there are potentially five possessive constructions to be distinguished. First, there are two constructions used to mark emphatic possession which I
will refer to as the "genitive construction" and the "pleonastic genitive construction". The genitive construction consists simply of a genitive possessor and a possessed NP, and need not be specially illustrated here. The pleonastic genitive construction, a well-known feature of Old Hittite, consists of a genitive possessor, a possessed NP, and a pleonastic suffixed possessive pronoun. This construction appears in a range of texts of different genres, as in the following examples and (1.7b) above:

(4.15) a  KBo 22.1 obv 24'-25' (Protocol, ed. Archi 1979: 46)

nu ŚA LÚMASDÁ ḍšār=šet natta šanhiškatteni

"You do not seek the poor man's blood"

b  KUB 36.110 (Benedictions for the king, CTH 820, ed. Neu 1980: 228)

[labal]rnaş LUGAL-ans NINDA=san ade[ni]

"We eat the king labarna's bread"

c  KUB 36.104 obv 15'-16'

[(mNunnuš̄=a)] Lúgainaš=san ėppir

"They also took Nunnu's relative"

The third (potential) possessive construction is possessor raising, and the fourth and fifth, both unemphatic, involve the use of the suffixed possessive pronouns and the oblique Wackernagel's Law pronouns respectively. Representative examples of the suffixed possessive pronouns are the following:
(4.16) 

\[\text{[\text{m}P\text{i}]thānaš attaš=maš "my father Pithāna" (CTH 1)}\]

\[\text{šardias=šann=a kuin "and his helper who ..." (1)}\]

\[\text{pēdi=šī=ma "but in his place" (1, 8)}\]

\[\text{mēni=mmet "my face" (1)}\]

\[\text{niku=šmuš "their sisters" (3)}\]

\[\text{a[iti]=m[i] "to my father" (3)}\]

\[\text{LUGAL-uš=(ś)mīš "your king" (3)}\]

\[\text{karti=šmi "their heart" (3)}\]

\[\text{TūGiššal=š[(emēti=a)] "and their bands (?)" (8)}\]

\[\text{anīyatta=šet "his vestments" (631)}\]

\[\text{parna=šma "to your house" (272)}\]

\[\text{parna=šša "to his house" (272)}\]

It is uncontroversial that these suffixed pronouns are the usual markers of unemphatic possession in Old Hittite. It is less widely known that they are the only Old Hittite markers of unemphatic possession: oblique Wackernagel's Law pronouns are never used in possessive function in Old Hittite (hence their merely "possible" status referred to above). This generalization is based on my own corpus, but compare already Güterbock (1983: 75).

Note that the only "Old Hittite" instances of the oblique Wackernagel's Law clitic *mu* in possessive function cited at CHD 312 are in late (respectively Middle and Neo-Hittite) copies:

(4.17) a

\[\text{KUB 30.10 rev 25 (Kantuzzili prayer, CTH 373)}\]

\[\text{annaš=miš=a=mu [zi]k} \]

"But you are my mother"

b

\[\text{KBo 3.28: 6-7 (Palace chronicle fragment, CTH 9)}\]

\[\text{šu=mu DINGIR.DILDI DUMU URU[Pur[ušhand]] kišri=mi daier} \]

"The gods placed the son of Purušhanda in my hand"
Significantly, both instances of *mu* co-occur with a suffixed possessive pronoun. I take it that in each case the Old Hittite archetype had only the suffixed pronoun, which was later reinforced by the addition of the copyist's productive marker of unemphatic possession (*mu*).

I would like to suggest here that another of the four remaining potential Old Hittite possessive constructions also did not exist, namely, possessor raising. As noted in §2.6.1, this construction is found not only in Middle and Neo-Hittite, but also in Palaeic, Hieroglyphic Luvian, possibly Cuneiform Luvian, Greek, and once in Sanskrit. This naturally leads to the expectation that possessor raising should have existed in Old Hittite too, and that the abundantly attested later Hittite construction is simply a direct inheritance from Indo-European and Common Anatolian. However, while possessor raising was certainly quite productive in later stages of Hittite, the evidence that it existed in Old Hittite is problematic, while there is reason to assume that it did not exist there.

Twelve alleged cases of "partitive apposition" are identified, and in a few cases dismissed, by Starke (1977: 176) and Yoshida (1987: 34-36); I have discovered no other possible cases in my own Old Hittite corpus. Of these twelve, three cited by Yoshida (1987: 35-36) are from late copies of Old Hittite texts (KBo 3.23, KBo 3.34, and TelErl ii 29), and as Yoshida himself notes, such late copies typically replace the corresponding Old Hittite construction by possessor raising. Their testimony is hence of no value in determining the Old Hittite linguistic facts. A fourth instance, cited by Yoshida (1987: 34-35 n. 9) as the only instance of partitive apposition in Manuscript A of the Laws, is the phrase NİG.BA 2 QATAM "two parts of the gift" at KBo 6.2 iii 11. However, the actual Hittite desinence (and hence case) concealed by the ideogram NİG.BA "gift" can only be identified after the possible Old Hittite constructions are established on the basis of clear cases: if there were no evidence that Old Hittite allowed possessor raising, NİG.BA would have to be understood as genitive. A fifth instance is the phrase *11ašwanda*-*a šet* at KBo 22.1 obv 29'. Starke (1977: 176) explicitly takes this as partitive apposition, but translates "und das Seine (d.h. die Habe, der Besitz) des Armen": the thematic relationship he envisions between the two
nouns is thus in fact possessive rather than partitive, although he provides no basis for a putative construction "possessive apposition". Yoshida (1987: 35-36, following HW² 406) takes the phrase as a genitive followed by a possessive pronoun, without offering a translation (likewise "but his [things] of the poor" but with number incongruity?). Alternatively and in my view more sensibly, Melchert (1977: 172-74) takes it as an accusative followed by an instrumental pronoun "but the poor man thereby"; see (1.9c) above.¹ A sixth alleged instance of partitive apposition is the phrase hantaiši mēhun[i] "at the heat time" (KBo 3.22: 17, 19), cited by Starke (1977: 176), but even if this is apposition, it too is hardly partitive and it is certainly not possessor raising. As noted at CHD 242, mēhur "time" can be construed with an agreeing modifier, as with LŪ-ni mēhuni "at the man time", mišiliya mēhur "the m. time", and elašni mēhunni "at the e. time".

The remaining six alleged instances of Old Hittite partitive apposition cited by Starke and Yoshida are the following:

(4.18) a  KBo 17.1+ iv 16  (Ritual for the royal couple, CTH 416, ed. Neu 1980a: 11)
    ta GİŞ-ru kattan 1-EN 5 alkištaš=šiš

    "Und ein Baum (steht) unten; fünf (sind) seine Äste" (Otten & Souček 1969: 37)

    "Fünf Äste eines einzigen Baumes ..." (Starke 1977: 176)

b  KBo 17.15 rev 19'  (Festival fragment, CTH 645, ed. Neu 1980a: 74)
    šiwaš 8 wakšur āšzi

    "Eight w. of the day remain"

¹ Note that Melchert (1984b: 127) accepts Starke's analysis.
KUB 43.30 iii 15'-17' (Festival fragment, CTH 645, ed. Neu 1980: 78)

\[ x Ú GAL DUMU.MEŠ.É.GAL ANA UGULA LÚ.MEŠ.Ú.HÚB hū[ppi=šši

šuhha]nzi memal šemehunan UZUNÍG.GI(G ... ANA UGULA

L]Ú.MEŠ.Ú.HÚB hūppi=šši šuhhanz[i]

"... and the chief of the pages strew ... for the chief of the Ú.HÚB people

in his hūppi. They strew meal, šemehuna-, and liver for the chief of the

Ú.HÚB people in his hūppi"

KBo 17.1+ i 27'-28' (Ritual for the royal couple, CTH 416, ed. Neu 1980: 6)

DUMU.É.GAL-š Hantašepan LUGAL-š kīšarī dāi

"The page puts the Hantašepa-divinity in the king's hands"

KBo 17.1+ iii 25-27 (Ritual for the royal couple, CTH 416, ed. Neu 1980: 9-10)

1 MÁŠ.GAL-r[(i garauni=š)]ji muriyaleš ganganteš kē[(t= a gar)auni=š ]ji

muriyaleš ganganteš

"On one billy-goat's horn m.-breads are hung, and on the other side

m.-breads are hung on its (sc. other) horn"

KBo 6.2 ii 59' (Laws, series one, CTH 291, ed. Friedrich 1959: 33)

kuiš ŪRUA[rinna²] kuiš ŪRUDiZiplanti LÚSANGA-es JNA ŪRUDIDILI

hūmand[i] É.HI.A-ŠUNU ELLU

"Whoever (is a priest) in Arinna, whoever is a priest in Ziplanti, in each of

the cities their temples are free (of corvée)"

For (4.18a), the interpretation of Otten & Souček seems at least as plausible as that of

Starke, while for (4.18b), Neu (1980b: 14 n. 26) reasonably takes šwuū "day" as a genitive

in -š. Therefore neither passage is relevant.

The remaining cases—(4.18c-f)—all involve double dative-locatives. This is an odd
distribution, since by comparison the vast majority of instances of possessor raising in later
Hittite involve double accusatives, and, as noted in §2.6.1, the corresponding Greek construction is, like many possessor raising systems cross-linguistically, restricted to accusatives. There are (at least) three possible solutions to this distributional anomaly. First, it could be taken as an accident of history: possessor raising was productive in Old Hittite with the same syntactic distribution as in the later language, but only a few instances of the construction survive, all involving the dative-locative. Second, the dative-locative could be taken as the original locus of the construction: possessor raising in Old Hittite was restricted to this case, from which it spread to the accusative and other cases in Middle Hittite. This account has the disadvantage of being difficult to reconcile with the comparative and typological evidence. If a cognate construction is restricted to direct objects, and Old Hittite has innovated, what motivated a restriction to the dative-locative? On the other hand, if Old Hittite is archaic, why should a construction so typically associated with direct objects have originated with other NPs? Third, the four alleged cases of possessor raising in (4.18c-f) could be analyzed differently: either Old Hittite lacked possessor raising altogether, or for some reason it is not attested.

In view of the polythematic character of the Hittite dative-locative, I suggest that this last approach may be the most plausible: none of (4.18c-f) actually exemplifies possessor raising. First, both (4.18c) and (4.18e) are characterized by suffixed possessive pronouns which would be pleonastic on the possessor raising analysis; as noted below, however, such pronouns are not properly a feature of possessor raising at all in the later language. As for (4.18c) in particular, since a phrase "to the chief, to his hūppi" would not be "partitive" apposition, the two NPs ANA UGULA LŪ.MEŠU.HŪB "for the chief of the Ū.HŪB people" and hūppi-šii "in his hūppi" are best taken (with Yoshida 1987: 36) as translated above, the one as a thematic recipient or beneficiary and the other as a thematic goal or location. A similar interpretation may be acceptable for (4.18d): "the page puts the Hantašepa-divinity in the hands for the king". Compare (4.19), where dāi- "put" also occurs with both a subcategorized location and a benefactive complement:
(4.19) KBo 3.23 obv 4 (Admonitions of Pimpira, CTH 24)

nu=šmas=kan [N]INDA-an kiššari=<<i>mi an[da dai]

"Put the bread in their hand for them!"

Next, (4.18e) is characterized by an unexpected suffixed possessive pronoun. The construction expected with such a pronoun is the pleonastic genitive construction:

(4.20) a KBo 17.3+ iii 40 (Ritual for the royal couple, CTH 416, ed. Neu 1980: 16)

... jx-ša muriališ=-a MÁŠ.GAL-š=a garu[i=ši ...

"(They place?) m.-breads too on the billy-goat's horn"

b Bo 2689 ii 9-12 (CHD 333)

nu muriališ GU₄.HI.A-an karauni=šmi [katta] ganganzi

"They hang m.-breads on the oxen's horns"

I suggest understanding MÁŠ.GAL-ri in (4.18e) as a syntactically independent locative with distributed scope over both of the following clauses: "on one billy-goat, m.-breads are hung on its horn (sc. on one side) and m.-breads are hung on its horn on the other side too". This analysis is not the same as the partitive apposition analysis, on which any distributed scope of MÁŠ.GAL-ri is implicit and the entire passage may be translated, "on one billy-goat, m.-breads are hung on its horn (sc. on one side); m.-breads are hung on its horn on the other side too". See §5.5 for parallels for a left-dislocated NP of this type.

Finally, for (4.18f), recall that possessor raising and partitive apposition are not the same. As noted in §2.6.1, for instance, while English certainly has no possessor raising process, it does, probably like all languages, permit apposition which happens to be partitive. It would be wrong to attribute such appositions to a process or construction of partitive apposition: they are simply special cases of apposition. Likewise in all stages of Hittite, there should be some cases of apposition which are not possessor raising, that is, which are simply apposition which is interpreted partitively. In fact, for this reason the question asked by both Starke and Yoshida—was there partitive apposition in Old Hittite?—is misguided: there must have been, whether it is attested or not. A more
LÚ.ULÚ.LU-aš ELLAM-aš ʾaššānaš=šan (KBo 6.3 i 37)
UKÙ-an ILLAM GESTU-an (KBo 6.5 i 16)

"a free man's ear"

Note that KBo 6.3, cited here twice for the Old Hittite construction, is not an Old Hittite manuscript. It is cited because there are actually very few instances where a passage of the Laws exists both in an Old Hittite manuscript and in a later manuscript which has correctly modernized its Old Hittite model. Nevertheless, since Old Hittite manuscripts consistently show the pleonastic genitive construction, and since late compositions in contemporary manuscripts only show possessor raising, it is certain that KBo 6.3 accurately reproduces its Old Hittite model in (4.21b-c). In other places KBo 6.3, typically for late copies attempting partial modernizations of old models, has introduced a linguistic monstrosity: for example, at KBo 6.2 i 24' we find LÚ.ULÚ.LU-aš ELLAM-aš KAxKAK=šet, literally "of a free man his nose", but at KBo 6.3 i 33 and KBo 6.4 i 33 we find LÚ.ULÚ.LU-an ELLAM KAxKAK=šet, literally "a free man his nose". Since to my knowledge this construction—possessor raising with a pleonastic suffixed possessive pronoun—is not attested in manuscripts contemporary with their composition, I assume that it is nothing more than an attempt to make some sense of the Old Hittite construction (cf. already Eichner 1979: 46 n. 10).

While it is quite possible that Middle and Neo-Hittite copyists did not themselves understand the function of the pleonastic genitive construction, its consistent replacement by the structurally dissimilar possessor raising construction can only mean that these copyists considered the latter functionally appropriate in contexts where the pleonastic genitive construction had been used. In other words, at two distinct stages of the language—Old Hittite on the one hand and Middle and Neo-Hittite on the other hand—speakers considered the pleonastic genitive and possessor raising constructions, respectively, appropriate in the same contexts. Since these contexts in fact all involve direct object body-parts, clearly the primary context for possessor raising, the conclusion seems
inescapable that the pleonastic genitive construction had at least roughly the functional value which possessor raising had in the later language.

Consequently, if possessor raising was actually possible in Old Hittite, but is either marginally or not at all attested, it must have undergone two changes: first, between Common Anatolian and Old Hittite, it must have lost its inherited function and acquired another more marginal function such that it continued to exist but happens to be unattested; and second, between Old and Middle Hittite, it must have regained roughly its original function. While this account is not impossible, it should perhaps be set aside in the absence of a clear notion of what pragmatic function possessor raising might have had in Old Hittite—in other words, how possessor raising fit into the Old Hittite system of possessor marking.

The alternative account is that possessor raising did not exist in Old Hittite. In that case, either it was inherited by Anatolian from Indo-European, lost between Common Anatolian and Old Hittite, and subsequently newly innovated in Middle Hittite, or else both Indo-European and Anatolian lacked the construction, and its appearance in Hittite, Palaiic, Luvian, and Greek is the result of parallel innovation. The choice between these two accounts depends on one's view of the relative triviality of the changes assumed by each: the second account in particular may not be as implausible as it seems.

On either account, I suggest that the creation of possessor raising in Middle Hittite is related to the elimination of the suffixed possessive pronouns during the same period. The semantic or other weakening which drove this general process would have facilitated the reanalysis of some other construction as a functional replacement of the dying pleonastic genitive construction. The particular alternative construction selected—my own proposed source for possessor raising in Anatolian—was both a natural choice and itself dying, so that it was especially prone to opacity: a construction with an accusative possessor (typically a person) and a possessed element (typically a body part) in the endingless locative case. Such a sequence would often have been phonologically indistinguishable from a double
accusative construction. I know of no instances of this construction itself, but since the endless locative is a dying category in Hittite as attested, its absence is not surprising. All that is necessary for my hypothesis to be at least possible is that endless locative body parts occurred often enough in late Old Hittite or early Middle Hittite to be reanalyzed as something else, and that body parts could occur in the required construction. In view of the following—precisely analogous to the English sentences in (2.64)—I see no reason to doubt that the proposed source construction was possible in Old and Middle Hittite:

(4.22)  

a  KBo 3.21 iii 16-17 (Hymn to Adad, CTH 313) 

nu=tta kirti minuwandu lišši=ma=tta waršnuwandu

"Let them soothe you in the heart, and let them assuage you in the liver"


n=aš gimusši ddu du werešta

"He became lame in the knee"

Neu (1980b: 31-35) argues convincingly that, contrary to some proposals, endless locatives are attested for neither kir "heart" nor keššar "hand". His collection shows that the endless locative is clearly attested for Hittite body parts only in the basically adverbial forms kitkar "at the head", takšan "in the middle", and tapuš "at the side" (Neu 1980b: 20-28, 13-15, 41). This distribution does not favor my account, since it forces one of two assumptions: either unattested endless locatives of other body parts existed and were used in the construction in (4.22), or one or more of kitkar, takšan, and tapuš formed the original locus for possessor raising. Neither assumption is very attractive. However, if Old Hittite indeed lacked possessor raising, one of them must be adopted unless some other historical source for this process can be found within the language. On my account, then, sequences like Verb + Direct Object + kitkar "at the head (sc. of the direct object)"—or similar sequences with other endless locatives—occurred frequently enough to yield possessor raising directly. The endless locative in such sequences was, because of its morphological opacity, reanalyzed as an NP with an underlying syntactic and thematic
connection with the direct object; as a result, possessor raising was extended to other body part nouns which had not formed endingless locatives.

This suggestion is manifestly speculative, and in particular need not be accepted if it is assumed that Old Hittite did not lack possessor raising. I should repeat, however, that this assumption in its turn requires some account, first, of the fact that possessor raising is either not attested in Old Hittite or is only marginally attested there in pragmatic contexts outside its usual Middle and Neo-Hittite ones, and second, of the fact that the pragmatic function of Middle and Neo-Hittite possessor raising was evidently associated with the pleonastic genitive construction in Old Hittite. If it fails to explain these facts, then the traditional view that possessor raising was simply inherited directly from Indo-European is as speculative as the alternative proposed here.²

I now turn to another interesting feature of the syntax of Old Hittite possessive pronouns, the contrast between the ordinary genitive construction and the pleonastic genitive construction. It appears that this contrast reflects a grammatical distinction between the categories of alienable and inalienable possession. In other words, I suggest that inalienably possessed NPs in Old Hittite obligatorily occur with suffixed possessive pronouns when their possessors are at all overt, whether emphatic (indicated by a genitive) or unemphatic (indicated only by the suffixed pronoun): compare already Yoshida's (1987: 45) observation that "das enklitische Possessivpronomen kommt [often] bei der Angabe des Ganzen (Genitiv) und dessen Teils (Regens) vor". By contrast, alienably possessed NPs only occur

² The same scenario might in fact be more generally applicable: if the Anatolian system of suffixed possessive pronouns is inherited from Indo-European, then all the Indo-European languages which exhibit possessor raising would at some stage have confronted the dual pressure which on my account motivated its creation in Hittite, viz. the loss of suffixed pronouns pronouns and the decline in productivity of the endingless locative. The creation of possessor raising in Indo-European might therefore be an event natural enough, and with enough internal systematic motivation, to be posited independently for several languages.
with suffixed possessive pronouns when their possessors are overt and unemphatic. Such a contrast between alienable and inalienable possession is typologically quite natural, as is the specific articulation proposed here. Ponapean, for instance, has two types of possession: "direct" and "indirect" possession (see Rehg 1981: 164-91). For pronominal possessors, direct possession is indicated by a suffix attached to the possessed noun, and indirect possession is indicated by a suffix attached to a preposed nominal classifier, as in (4.23) and (4.24) respectively (cited from Rehg 1981: 166-67, 179):

(4.23)  
moange-i "my head"

kil-i "my skin"

pah-i "my arm"

ede-i "my name"

ngore-i "my dialect"

seme-i "my father"

(4.24)  
ne-i seri "my child"

kene-i muenge "my food"

nime-i saida "my soda"

were-i pwohu "my boat"

The direct-indirect contrast is conditioned lexically: every noun in the language is construed either with direct or with indirect possession. The system is clearly a system of alienable versus inalienable possession; direct possession, in Rehg's (1981: 166) words, "is characteristically employed where the relationship between the possessor and the thing possessed is viewed as permanent and indestructable", for example with body parts, parts of plants and things, and a few attributes and kinship terms. However, as Rehg (1981: 166) also notes, "It is difficult, if not impossible, to formulate a rule that will predict which nouns will be directly possessed". The Ponapean system of possessor marking is, in other words, founded on a contrast between alienable and inalienable possession, but where these
categories are linguistic rather than concrete. The system of possession which operated in Old Hittite appears to be of just this type.

In my Old Hittite corpus together with those instances of possession cited by Yoshida (1987) from Old Hittite manuscripts, I have found the pleonastic genitive construction to occur with the possessed NPs listed in (4.25-27). This list omits forms with no Hittite phonetic complementation, since, as noted above, we can only hope to interpret non-Hittite spellings on the basis of linguistic rules determined by examining Hittite spellings.

(4.25)  
aiš "mouth" (CTH 416)  
éšhar "blood" (272)  
išamina- "ear" pl. (291)  
kıššar "hand" (416, 627)  
meni- "face" (292)  
UZúmuhrāuš "?" (645)  
pada- "foot" pl. (416)  
pištullia- "pain" (416)

(4.26)  
atta- "father" (1)  
Lúgaina- "relative" (8)  
šašant- "concubine" (733)

(4.27) a  
KUB 36.110 rev 5'  
[labarnaš LUGAL-aš NINDA=šan  
"the King Labarna's bread"

b  
KUB 36.110 rev 13'  
labarnaš É-ir=šet  
"the Labarna's house"

c  
KBo 17.22 iii 9'-11' (ed. Neu 1980a: 208; cf. CHD 16)  
labarnaš=a MU.HI.A=šeš T[I-tar=šet ...] labarnaš šurkiš=š[eš ...] tegaš=šet  
"but the Labarna's years and life ... the Labarna's roots and earth"
The arrangement of these forms is as follows: body parts are listed in (4.25); kinship and relational terms are listed in (4.26); and cases where the possessor is the noun *labarna* are listed in (4.27). Yoshida (1987) cites no cases where the noun *labarna* is a possessor without a pleonastic suffixed possessive pronoun.

The (non-pleonastic) genitive construction occurs with the following possessed NPs among the Old Hittite manuscripts cited by Yoshida (1987), as well as three others to be discussed immediately:

(4.28)  *haluka*- "message" (CTH 649)

*kuššan*- "fee" (291)

*maššar*- "ritual" (733)

*palša*- "way" (291)

*pir*- "house" (I, 291, 631, 645, 654, 670)

DUMU "son" (15)

KUN "tail" (291)

TŪG-an "clothing" (670)

The distribution of these two constructions in Old Hittite manuscripts confirms fairly well the suggestion that they mark inalienable and alienable possession. As indicated above, the notion of alienability is linguistic, not logical: it may therefore be unproblematic that the royal title *labarna* invariably possesses inalienably (compare the cross-linguistically common phenomenon of honorific marking). The presence of DUMU "son" and KUN "tail" (one occurrence each) in the "alienable" category might be the result of some conditioned exception, or it is possible that, as in Ponapean, the membership of the two lexical classes is not absolutely predictable on semantic grounds. These nouns are alienably possessed in the following passages:

(4.29) a KBo 7.14 obv 11-12

... *mKiåraušša=a ubåti [mKa]rahnuiliš DUMU-as äppan dår[r]

"They place ... and the *ubåti* of Kiyaru behind Karahnuili's son"
KBo 6.2 ii 30'-31' (Laws, series one, CTH 291)

takku LÚ-aš GU₄-ŠU ÍD-an xinuškizzi tamaš=an š[(ũwaizzi)] nu GU₄-aš
KUN-an épzi ta ÍD-an zāi Ū BEL G[(U₄ ÍD-aš pēdai)]

"If a man is bringing his cow across a river, and another person pushes him, takes the cow's tail, and crosses the river, and the river carries off the cow's master ..."

In any case, if the pleonastic and non-pleonastic constructions do indeed mark inalienable and alienable possession, one would expect some instances where an apparently inalienably possessed noun is marked for alienable possession for any of several pragmatic reasons. The three remaining cases of the non-pleonastic construction seem to involve just just reasons. These three cases appear in two passages. In (4.30), either "tongue" in the special sense "slander, gossip" is inherently alienable, or the point is precisely that by removing the tongues they becomes alienable:

(4.30) KBo 17.1+ i 11'

[(k)]aša=ta=šmaš=kan utniyandan lāluš dāhhu[π]

"Behold, I take from you the 'tongues' of the population"

In (4.31), the heads are clearly conceived as detached objects rather than inalienable body parts:

(4.31) KBo 17.1+ i 23'

harkanzi=ma=an dHantašepäš andušaš harša[(rr)]=a

GİŞŠUKUR.<HI.>A=ya

"The Hantašepa-divinities hold both human heads and lances"

Examples like those in (4.32-33), from late copies of Old Hittite compositions, can be explained in two ways: either they are special cases like the immediately preceding ones, or, more probably, they reflect a stage after the death of the suffixed pronouns when the original distribution of the constructions in question was no longer clear. In other words, the
pleonastic genitives in (4.32) may be treated as false archaisms, and the lack of pleonasm in (4.33) as the result of modernization.

(4.32) \( \text{šuppala=štet kučlqa} \) "somebody's animal" (HG 163)

\[ \text{[ÍR-n]an=əšta GÉME=šan natta kwelka} \] "nobody's male and female slave"

(KBo 3.41 + KUB 31.4 obv 6')

\( \text{LUGAL=wa uddār=a=met} \) "and my the king's word" (KBo 3.28 ii 20')

(4.33) \( \text{šalaš=pat haššannaš ēšhar} \) "the great family's blood" (TelErl ii 31)

\( \text{SILĀ-əš ištananan} \) "the lamb's soul" (KUB 41.23 ii 15')

Finally, Yoshida (1987: 29-30) cites instances of the pleonastic genitive construction with \( \text{tu\text{u}el} \) "your" which would also counterexemplify the rule proposed here, but they are all based either on restorations or on the supposition that the Akkadographic possession marker \( \text{KA} \) must conceal a Hittite suffixed pronoun. As noted above, this supposition need not be correct.

In this connection a note is in order on the Old Hittite syntax of the postpositions \( \text{ki\text{t}kar} \) "at the head of" and \( \text{šēr} \) "above". Unlike all other postpositions, when \( \text{ki\text{t}kar} \) and \( \text{šēr} \) have emphatic genitive complements, they usually occur in a construction identical to the pleonastic genitive construction. This construction is illustrated in (4.34), and the construction regular with other postpositions in (4.35):

(4.34) a KBo 17.1+ iv 21 (Ritual for the royal couple, CTH 416, ed. Neu 1980a: 11)

\( \text{n-e LUGAL-əš MUNUS.LUGAL-əš=a [(ki)]tkar=šamet tehhi} \)

"I put them at the head of the king and queen"

b KBo 17.1+ ii 31'-32' (Ritual for the royal couple, CTH 416, ed. Neu 1980a: 8)

\( \text{DUMU.É.[GA]L MÜŞENhāran[an] LUGAL-əš MUNUS.LUG[AL-əš]=a} \)

\( \text{šēr=[ša]met wa[(hn)]uzzi} \)

"The page whirls the eagle over the king and queen"
The pleonastic genitive construction is of course precisely what is expected for kitkar and šēr if they originated as nouns (on šēr see e.g. Neu 1980b: 35-36): in construction with nominal complements they would originally have been inalienably possessed nouns, "at X's head" and "at X's top" or the like. What is unexpected is the complete absence of pleonastic suffixed pronouns with other postpositions, if they too continue old nouns. It is surely no coincidence that among the postpositions construed with the genitive, only kitkar and šēr are etymologically endingless locatives; the others—appid "after", kattan "under", and peran "in front of" (Starke 1977: 168-71)—are presumably ultimately accusatives. I therefore suggest that, for whatever reason, the reanalysis of endingless locatives as postpositions occurred later in pre-Hittite than that of other nominal case-forms: the locative ancestors of kitkar and šēr in particular were still understood as nouns when the Old Hittite system of alienable and inalienable possession was created. Forms like āppan and kattan, on the other hand, were not synchronically nominal and therefore did not participate in the pleonastic construction. I have no explanation for the chronological difference in the reanalysis of the types of kitkar and āppan.3

Melchert (1984a: 122-25) has shown that the two forms of each suffixed possessive pronoun which appear with adverb/postpositions—forms in -e- like šet "her, his, its" and forms in -i- like ši —are in largely complementary distribution. Eight of nine forms in -e-
appear in the pleonastic construction illustrated in (4.34), whereas all seven forms in -i-
appear in the unemphatic construction illustrated in (4.36):

(4.36) a KBo 3.22: 78-79

ap[(āš = a)] pērs(n)=mmit kunnaz ešari
"But he sits in front of me on the right!"

b KBo 6.2 iv 48' (Laws, series one, CTH 291, ed. Friedrich 1959:)

šēr = šit = wa šarnikmi
"I will make restitution for it"

Melchert himself takes this distribution as evidence that the forms in -i- had an independent
source, but an alternative analysis has been suggested to me by Mark Hale's comparison
(p.c.) of the accentual behavior of the Vedic-Sanskrit demonstrative pronoun ayām.
According to Macdonell (1916: 108 n. 4), oblique forms of this pronoun—including asya
"her, his, its"—are ordinarily accented, but may be unaccented "when used as nouns and
unemphatic". In other words, these forms are obligatorily accented when they modify or are
in apposition to a noun (depending on the correct analysis of demonstrative-noun
colloocations), but may be unaccented when they stand alone. Now the Hittite suffixed
pronouns in -i- can be derived phonologically from forms in *-e- via the sound law which
regularly changed unaccented *-e- to -i-, as in nepiš- "heaven" < *nēbhes- (see Melchert
1984a: 104-108). To explain the variation in vocalism in the suffixed pronouns in (4.34)
and (4.36), then, it is only necessary to assume that these pronouns were already
postpositive when the sound law operated, and that they were stressed or unstressed
according to whether a preceding genitive was present. It may not be necessary to posit any
diachronic link between the Vedic and Hittite systems, since apposition and stress are
trivially correlated (compare the discussion in §4.2.1.5).

This account explains not only the distribution of e- and i-vocalism in forms of the
suffixed pronouns with adverb/postpositions, but also the consistent e-vocalism of the same
forms when they appear in the pleonastic genitive construction with neuter absolutive
singular nouns (for an example see [4.15a]). However, it wrongly predicts that these forms will be characterized by i-vocalism when they appear in the unemphatic construction without a genitive: in fact -e- always appears in this category too, as in papratər=šamet "their impurity" (KBo 17.3+ ii 6') and ērma(n)=šmet "their sickness" (KBo 17.1+ iii 11). It is possible that a phonologically correct *-i- was replaced in this category by -e- via paradigm levelling—in other words, that sequences like *paprađar=smid were replaced on the model of sequences like *anduhsas paprađar=smed "man's impurity". Both types would certainly have been common enough. Among the adverb/prepositions, however, the e-vocalism models necessary for levelling would have existed only for kitkar and šer, to which the pleonastic construction is restricted. One of two assumptions may therefore be made: either the locatives kitkar and šer had not yet been reanalyzed as postpositions when the levelling occurred, so that in fact no motivation for levelling at all existed among the adverb/postpositions; or kitkar and šer had been reanalyzed as postpositions, but the pleonastic construction—since it occurred with them alone—was not common enough to cause levelling. Neither assumption seems unreasonable.

4.2.3. Unemphatic Possessive Pronouns in Middle and Neo-Hittite

In Middle and Neo-Hittite, as noted above, the primary markers of unemphatic possession are two sets of forms: genitive demonstratives and personal pronouns, also used in emphatic contexts; and oblique Wackernagel's Law pronouns. The innovation of possessive function for the latter was a relatively trivial innovation: as already noted above, the adverbial sentential clitics (interpreted as benefactives, malefactuals, and so on) would in many instances have been ambiguous between their properly adverbial interpretations and a new possessive interpretation. The introduction of this new interpretation was certainly part of the gradual death of the suffixed possessive pronouns.4

4 This development may well have occurred independently in other Indo-European languages. The same thematic development is undoubtedly responsible in most cases (but not in Indo-European) for the evolution of
The distribution of the unemphatic genitives and possessive Wackernagel’s Law clitics is not random in Middle and Neo-Hittite. In several environments the free genitives appear to be obligatory, while the sentential clitics are used in the remaining environments. For convenience in the following subsections, I have categorized the relevant environments according to the grammatical relation of the possessed NP, although the ultimate conditioning could prove to be thematic or (as I will in fact argue in §4.6) structural.

Two methodological points should be emphasized here. The first follows from the ambiguity of the genitive pronouns and demonstratives, which mark both emphatic and unemphatic possession. Since we do not yet control all the factors which condition emphatic pronominalization in general—a few diagnostics were discussed in §4.2.1—it is inevitable that some genitive pronominal possessors will appear in environments where, for independent reasons, we would expect all unemphatic possession to be marked by Wackernagel’s Law clitics. Such genitives may be assumed to be emphatic rather than unemphatic possessors, pending a complete understanding of emphatic pronominalization. The second methodological point concerns the interpretation of oblique Wackernagel’s Law clitics. Since neither possessors nor benefactive complements are subcategorized, it is often difficult to prove conclusively that a specific sentential clitic must be possessive, although in some cases a non-possessive interpretation is in fact impossible. In each category where I claim Wackernagel’s Law possession is grammatically possible, it is therefore necessary to have a reason for believing that a possessive interpretation is preferable to a benefactive or other adverbial interpretation for the relevant oblique clitics. I will try to present such reasons in cases which do not seem straightforward.

possessor raising, which, as noted in §2.6.1, is typically marked formally by a verbal valence-increasing morpheme also used to license adverbial benefactive complements and the like.
4.2.3.1. Subjects

A possessor cannot be a Wackernagel's Law pronominal elitic if it modifies a non-topicalized subject; however, if the possessed NP is topicalized, elicitization is acceptable. If it not topicalized, then, and if unemphatic possession is intended, the possessor must be a free genitive. Examples of the genitive are given in (4.37-38): the subjects in (4.37) must be non-topicalized, since they are non-initial, and the subjects in (4.38) can be non-topicalized, since they do not precede any element known to occupy COMP. This means that if the present analysis is correct, these subjects must in fact be non-topicalized. (The data in this and subsequent sections of this chapter are not labelled chronologically—although within each numbered set of examples they are arranged roughly chronologically—because I have found no differences within Middle or Neo-Hittite with respect to the phenomena under investigation.)

(4.37) a  KUB 23.68+ rev 8
  katta- = ma šume[nzan DUMU.MEŠ IT]I DUMU.MEŠ LUGAL
  linkiyaš- = ša[š]
  "And later your sons will be the sworn allies of the king's sons"

b  Msšt 75/14: 12-13
  PANI mPullī = kan ammel aššul halza
  "Before Pullī my greeting will be called"

c  KBo 3.4 ii 17-18
  nu GIS kalmišanan ammel KARAŠ.HLA-YA uškit
  "My army saw the thunderbolt"

d  KUB 14.15 i 28
  nu ANA mMasḫuiliwa ammel DINGIR.MEŠ piran hūiēr
  "My gods helped Masḫuiliwa"
"If any of his deportees flees to me ..."

"If at some time his messengers come mišriwanda after my daughter-in-law ..."

"Because your land is uncivilized ..."

"My gods helped them"

"Your emissaries knelt down at my feet"

"Your fathers brought tribute to Egypt"

"My force didn't attack it"

"But my grandfather once more became well"
KUB 19.11 iv 13
nu=kan ammel ABU-YA ku[it dann(atti)] URU-ri EGIR-an AN.ZA.KÂR
ute
"Because my father built fortifications behind the empty towns ..."

KUB 23.101 ii 15-16
ammel puškantatar tuk m[ena]handa
"Is my puškantatar against you?"

Examples of Wackernagel's Law clitics understood as possessors of subjects are given in
(4.39-40), where the subjects in (4.39) must be topicalized, and the subjects in (4.40) can
be (and by hypothesis are) topicalized.
(4.39) a  KBo 3.4 i 11-12
DUMU-ŠU=ma=wa=šši=za=kan kuiš ANA GIŠGU.ZA ABI-ŠU ešat
"His son who seated himself on his father's throne ...

b  KBo 3.4 i 10
ABU-ŠU=wa=šši kuiš LUGAL KUR Hatti ešta
"His father who was king of Hatti ...

c  KUB 21.27 ii 5
[EZEN.ME]Š=ma=šmaš=kan DINGIR.MEŠ kui EGIR-pa ištappendeš
"Those festivals of yours which were stopped, O gods ...

In (4.39c), the vocative DINGIR.MEŠ "O gods" appears to the left of COMP but to the right
of another constituent, apparently contradicting the rule that only one constituent can
precede COMP. Mark Hale (p.c.) has called my attention to the fact that vocatives in Vedic
Sanskrit frequently appear after the Wackernagel's Law clitics, as the Hittite vocative does
here; in other words, vocative placement seems independent of the ordinary movement
processes.
(4.40) a KUB 33.103 iii 4-7

ginuwa = nnaš = kan [ ] katkitiškizzi SAG.DU-aš = ma = nnaš
LûDUG.GA₉.BUR-aš [GîšDUB]BIN GIM-an uhattari

"Our knees tremble and our head spins like a potter's wheel"

b Hedammu 5.18
[išahru = ma = šš]i = kan parâ PA₉.HI.A [-uš mân aršanzi]

"His tears flowed like canals"

c KUB 23.68+ rev 9
DUMU.DUMU.MEŠ-KUNU = ma = šmaš Itti DUMU.DUMU.MEŠ LUGAL
linkiaš = pat

"And your grandsons will indeed be sworn allies of the king's grandsons"

d KUB 34.24+ iv 19
DAM BELI-NI = ma = wa = nnaš [w]annummiyaš

"Our lord's wife is a widow"

e StBoT 24 iii 7-8 (Apology of Hattušili III, CTH 81, ed. Otten 1981: 16)
nu = nnaš É-ir parâ iyannîš

"Our house marched on"

f KBo 4.12 rev 10-11
nu = šmaš = kan aššulaš A.ŠAR-ŠUNU = ya lē uēhtarî

"Let their place of favor not turn"

g KUB 21.27 ii 7-8
nu = šmaš = kan DINGIR.MEŠ EN.MEŠ-ya [EZEN.MEŠ] lē namma
ištappanteš

"O gods my lords, your festivals will never be stopped again"

In (4.40g), EZEN.MEŠ "festivals" might seem non-topicalized, but since vocatives can interrupt the ordinary word order (see [4.39c] above), the position of the vocative
DINGIR.MEŠ.EN.MEŠ-YA "O gods my lords" before EZEN.MEŠ does not show that the latter is not in TOP.

4.2.3.2. Anaphoric Possessors

A possessor cannot be a Wackernagel's Law pronominal clitic if it modifies a non-topicalized noun and is co-referential with the subject or direct object. Again, therefore, if the possessor is unemphatic, it must be a free genitive. Examples of the genitive are given in (4.41-42): the possessed NPs in (4.41) must be non-topicalized, and the possessed NPs in (4.42) can be — and by hypothesis must be — non-topicalized.

(4.41) a  KBo 2.13 obv 12-13

DINGIR.MEŠ kuinna apel ANA N₄ZI.KIN piran taninuanzi

"They put each divinity before its cult stone"

b  KBo 10.12 iii 17'-18'

[NAM.RA.M]EŠ-ya kuieš apēl KUR-caš [dUTU-ŠI] anunut

"And the prisoners who His Majesty moved to his lands ..."

c  KUB 19.11 iv 14-15

n[=u=kan a(ntubšatar k)]uinna apel ANA URU-ŠU EGIR-pa [(pēhutet)]

"He brought the population back, everyone to his town"

d  KUB 14.1+ obv 1

[tukk=]a MAdduwattan [tue]ll KUR-yaz mAttariššiyas LŪ URUĀ[hh Livingston

ara parahtu

"Attariššiya the Āšhiyan chased you, Madduwa, from your land"

e  KBo 5.3+ iii 39-40 (Hukkana treaty, ed. Friedrich 1930: 126)

n=at zik tuel ZI-it lē ĕpši

"Don't you take it on your initiative!"
nu=za LÚSANGA našma katta [DU]MU LÚSANGA mahhan apēl
hannešni karašši memiškizzi

"Just as 'the Priest' or later the son of 'the Priest' customarily speaks truly in his case" (CHD 260)

zikk=a t[u]ēl DUMU-an šulla[i?]
"May you too quarrel with your son!"

nu=wa=tta ÚL kuwatka ammel AŠA kuari anda zahhiya tiyami
"In no way will I step to you in battle in my territory"

nu=za kmišša apel INA [URU-ŠU arha palt (?)]
"Each one went away to their town"

mān=wa-naš [an]zel BELI uēškiškiuen
"Would we have kept asking for our lord for ourselves?"

nu=šmaš mahhan ABU-YA apēl [DUMU-ŠU] pēšta
"When my father gave them his son ...

Bo 86/299 ii 85-86 (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 20)

nu=wa INA KUR dU-tašša LUCAL-iznani apel DUMU-ŠU dāi
"He will put his son in the kingship in Tarhuntašša"

nu namma apel DUMU-ŠU mUrhi-dU-upan ÚL pahhašta
"Moreover he didn't protect his son Urhi-Tešub"
n KUB 3.74 obv 3-4
[zi]k kuit mDukult[u-][d]IB x amm]ēl SΙG₅-anni h[ atramu]n]

"Because I wrote you, Tukultu-Ninurta ... in my favor ..."

o KUB 26.12 iii 22-23
z[i]qq=a=an=zan tuēl aššulan [hal]ziyaši

"You too call it your good"

(4.42) a KUB 26.12 iv 21-22
našma=ta tuēl [(kuedani)]kki memini punušmi

"Or if I ask you about some business of yours ..."

b KBo 5.3+ i 5 (Hukkanah treaty, ed. Friedrich 1930: 107)
nu=ta ammel NIN-YA AŠŠUM DAM-UTTIM ADDIN

"I gave you my sister as a wife"

c KBo 3.4 iii 72
n=at=za apel uišiyauwaš pēdan iyat

"He made it his pasturing place"

d KUB 34.24+ iv 6-7
nu=wa=kan ammel ERĪN.MEŠ ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ BELUMEŠ=ya [parā]
nehhu

"I sent forth my troops, chariots, and lords"

I have found only one example of a Wackernagel's Law clitic in possessive function which is coreferential with a subject or direct object, but it a clear case:

(4.43) KBo 4.4 ii 45-46
Š[EŠ-Š]U=ma=wa=šši kuin INA KUR URU Kargamiš LUGAL-un iyat

"And his brother whom he made king in Kargamiš"

The possessed NP here is topicalized, as the position of kuin shows, confirming that the possessors of topicalized NPs can cliticize via Wackernagel's Law. Therefore the possessed
NPs in (4.42) are all probably non-topicalized (although in principle some may be emphatic).

The proper analysis of the phenomenon outlined in this section is complicated. The descriptive generalization stated above—possessors of non-topicalized NPs cannot criticize via Wackernagel's Law if they refer to the sentence's subject or direct object—is extremely unlikely to be linguistically significant. In particular, it is unlikely that the absence of similar examples where possessors refer to other NPs (such as indirect objects) is due to anything but chance: sentences of the relevant type—like English I gave a book to John for his collection, where the possessor of the benefactive complement refers to the indirect object—simply do not occur often enough for us to expect to find them in Hittite texts. A more plausible generalization, then, is that the possessor of a non-topicalized NP cannot criticize via Wackernagel's Law if it refers to any tautosentential NP, or, perhaps, to any tautosentential NP which is syntactically or thematically more prominent in some sense to be made explicit (as subjects and direct objects are more prominent than other verbal complements). The linear order of the possessor and co-referential NP cannot be relevant, since these occur in both orders in the data above, and since frequently the co-referential NP is in fact a null subject.

In my view, these facts should be assimilated to the well-known syntactic phenomenon of crossover discovered by Paul Postal. In English sentences like those in (4.44), it is perfectly acceptable for the boldface NPs to be coreferential—for the intended meanings to be "what person said of herself that Jerzy taught her?" and so on.

(4.44)  a  Who said Jerzy taught her?
b  Which linguist did you ask whether he had published?

In the superficially similar sentences in (4.45), however, it is unacceptable for the boldface NPs to be coreferential: (4.45a) cannot have the intended meaning of (4.44a), and (4.45b) cannot mean "which linguist said of himself that he had published?".

(4.45)  a  *Who did she say Jerzy taught?
b  *Which linguist did he say had published?*

The pattern in (4.45) is called "crossover"—in particular "strong crossover", to distinguish it from another construction which is irrelevant here—because in the derivation of each sentence, a moved NP "crosses over" a coreferential pronoun: who in (4.45a) is underlyingly to the right of taught, and crosses over she; and which linguist in (4.45b) is underlyingly between say and had, and crosses over he.

This description obviously does not explain why, in English and other languages, sentences with strong crossover are unacceptable: the point is that since the Hittite facts outlined above seem to be manifestations of the same phenomenon, whatever accounts for it elsewhere may also account for it in Hittite. If Wackernagel's Law involves syntactic movement to some left-marginal position, then, in particular, possessors subject to this process are moved there from NP-internal positions. If they "cross over" a co-referential NP in the course of being positioned in this way, they will descriptively instantiate the phenomenon of crossover. As an example, a schematic illustration of the relevant structure of (4.41m) is given in (4.46):  

(4.46)
Notice that the possessive pronoun is co-referential with an NP to its left. If cliticization via Wackernagel's Law had occurred, the sentence in (4.47) — a completely unattested type — would have resulted:

(4.47) \[ \text{nu}=\ddot{s}\dot{s}\text{i namma DUMU-ŠU }\text{mUrhi-}^d\text{U-upan ŪL pahhašta} \]

The structure of such a sentence would be the following:

(4.48)

\[ \text{The oblique Wackernagel's Law pronoun in (4.48) has "crossed over" the coreferential NP.} \]

There are, of course, numerous cases where a constraint against literal "crossover" cannot account for a genitive pronoun. The genitives in (4.41b) and (4.42a), for instance, are coreferential with NPs to their right (in one case restored), not to their left; therefore even if Wackernagel's Law cliticization operated, the clitics would not actually have "crossed over" coreferential NPs. However, no analysis of the constraint against strong crossover constructions in English or other modern languages takes the actual derivational movement of one element "over" another as a significant factor; they instead typically derive the constraint from structural properties of sentences in which strong crossover has occurred. There are in fact several analyses of this constraint: since any of them will

---

5 This NP is phonologically null but nevertheless, as we would expect and as the results of this section show, syntactically present.
explain the Hittite phenomenon, the choice among them must be made on cross-linguistic grounds. For this reason I will only mention one possible analysis here. On this analysis, due to Thomas Wasow (see Lasnik & Uriagereka 1988: 40-42 for a recent summary), it is the trace of a moved NP which is responsible for the unacceptability of strong crossover constructions. Thus the structure of (4.45a) is something like the following:

(4.49)

In this structure, the trace of who is in the direct object position of the embedded clause Jerzy taught t. In this position it is "bound" by the coreferential pronoun she, where one constituent is said to bind another constituent if, and only if, the two are coreferential and every maximal projection which dominates the first constituent also dominates the second. The proposal to account for the unacceptability of strong crossover is, given this definition, that traces behave like full NPs inasmuch as they cannot be bound (strictly speaking, they cannot be bound from argument positions). From the sentences in (4.50), it is easy to see that full NPs cannot be bound: the boldface NPs cannot be understood as coreferential.

(4.50)  

\begin{enumerate}
  \item The fool saw John running out the back door
  \item They had a picture taken of the entire family
\end{enumerate}

Likewise, on this analysis, since strong crossover results in configurations where traces are bound (from argument positions), they too are unacceptable.
Returning to Hittite, the trace of the Wackernagel's Law clitic in the representation in (4.48) is bound by the coreferential NP in the subject position. By hypothesis, traces are like NPs in that they cannot be bound (from argument positions), and therefore this representation is illicit. This explains the absence of Hittite sentences of the type in (4.48). Turning to the case of topicalized NPs, now, a partial representation of (4.43) is the following:

\[
\text{(4.51)}
\]

In this sentence there is a Wackernagel's Law clitic in possessive function which is coreferential with the subject of its sentence. However, since the possessed NP in this case has been fronted— with the relative in COMP and the head noun in TOP— the actual trace of the clitic cannot be in the underlying object position. It is instead either in TOP or in COMP, according to whether the topicalized constituent is "his brother" or "brother" respectively; I have arbitrarily chosen the former in this representation. This means that the

---

6 For the reasons stated in Garrett (1989: 121), I represent the structural position of Wackernagel's Law clitics as indicated, that is, as adjoined to their sentences' maximal maximal projection. This particular hypothesis does not materially affect the argument made here concerning strong crossover, although it will have a bearing on the ultimate formal treatment of the constraints on Wackernagel's Law discovered in chapters 3 and 4.
clitic trace is not in fact bound by the corefential (null) subject NP: consequently the sentence is acceptable.

This discussion should not be concluded without some mention of two very interesting related phenomena. The first of these, noted by Carruba (1969: 49-50) and discussed by Hoffner (1973a: 523-24), is that the Hittite reflexive clitic za frequently seems to function "to identify the grammatical subject as possessor of some person or object mentioned in the clause" (Hoffner 1973a: 523). An example cited by Hoffner is the following:

(4.52) StBoT 24 iii 15-16 (Apology of Hattušili III, CTH 81, ed. Otten 1981: 18)

nu=za dIšĂšR GAŠAN-YA [(parâ handandâtar)] ... tikkuššan[ut]]

"Ištar, my lady, revealed her divine power"

This is structurally quite different from the phenomenon described above, but it is plainly related functionally. The fact that oblique clitics can function as de facto plurals of za means, in addition, that there are a few cases in which they may be construed as having either the special subject-anaphoric function of za as described by Hoffner or a more properly possessive function:

(4.53) a KUB 19.11 iv 11

nu=šmaš GÎŠ-TUKUL.HLA namma katt[a d(air)]

"In consequence they put down their weapons"

b KBo 11.1 obv 26

nu=šmaš pēdan QATAMMA EGIR-pa appanzi

"They will likewise take up their positions again"

The other related phenomenon is that the emphatic clitic pat frequently occurs with possessive pronouns in contexts where it corresponds to English (hers/his/its) own or German eigen (see HE §293b, Hart 1971: 121-23, and Hoffner 1973b: 115); some examples appear in §4.2.1.2 above. English own has both emphatic and reflexive uses, as illustrated respectively in (4.54a) and (4.54b):

(4.54) a Their own parents wouldn't recognize them
b. **Adrian saw his own reflection in the mirror**

Since not all instances of *pat* modifying a possessive pronoun are reflexive, and since the use of the genitive possessive pronoun discussed above seems itself to indicate subject or object coreference, it is probably the emphatic use of *own* in particular that *pat* corresponds to.

### 4.2.3.3. NP-Internal Embedding

A possessor cannot be a Wackernagel's Law pronominal clitic if it occurs in one of several syntactic configurations. Once again, therefore, if the possessor is unemphatic, it must be a free genitive. The relevant configurations seem to be unified by the following principle: in each case, the possessor is syntactically fairly deeply embedded in its sentence. We may wish to assume that possessors in these configurations can cliticize via Wackernagel's Law if the NPs they possess are topicalized, but unfortunately I have not encountered much decisive evidence. The configurations are enumerated in the following sections. Some of them are unambiguously exemplified within my corpus by a very small number of sentences; in such cases more data would of course be welcome, but since constraints on syntactic extraction based on configuration and depth of embedding are among the most widely-exemplified of all syntactic phenomena cross-linguistically, I have felt justified in proposing similar ones here even on the basis of a few examples.

#### 4.2.3.3.1. Possessors of Dependent Genitives

Possessors do not cliticize via Wackernagel's Law if they possess NPs which are genitives embedded in other (overt or implicit) NPs. Instead, the free genitive pronoun is used, as in the following examples:

(4.55)  

\[ \text{KUB 14.1+ obv 71} \]

\[ \text{nu uēr anz[el] ERÍN.MEŠ-TI KASKAL-an ėppir} \]

"They then took our troops' route"
In (4.55a) and (4.55c-d) the genitive pronouns are the possessors of possessors—the possessed NPs in (4.55c-d) are only implicit—and in (4.55b) the genitive pronoun is the possessor of a partitive genitive. In all four cases, the genitive pronouns are the possessors of dependent genitives. The sentence in (4.56) may indicate that, as with the other constraints on possessor cliticization via Wackernagel's Law, the possessors of topicalized NPs can freely cliticize: in this example the NP ŠA Ė.GU₄ "of (your) stable" is sentence-initial and thus may well be topicalized, explaining the acceptability of possessor cliticization.

(4.56) KUB 21.27 i 8
ŠA Ė.GU₄-du=za AMAR-uš
"I am a heifer from your stable"

4.2.3.3.2. Possessors of Appositive NPs

Possessors do not cliticize via Wackernagel's Law if they possess NPs which are in apposition to other NPs. The free genitive pronoun is instead used, as in the following examples:
(4.57) a KUB 14.10+ obv 2-3
uiyāt-mu 
"Muršili, ..., your servant, has sent me"

b KUB 21.27 iv 4'-7'
u-n=kan dIM-ni tuel hukki [... Ü ANA d]UTU URUTÚL-na tuel hanni [... ANA m]Hajtušili İR-KA Ti-tar MU.HLA GİD.DA=ya [parā] arnut
"Before the Stormgod, your grandfather, ... and before the Sungoddess of Arinna, your grandmother, bring to your servant Hattušili life and long years"

c KUB 21.27 iv 9'-10'
n=at ANA dIM tuel hukki [x? Ü A]NA dUTU URUTÚL-na tuel hanni parā arnuši
"(If) you bring them to the Stormgod, your grandfather, and to the Sungoddess of Arinna, your grandmother ..."

4.2.3.3. Possessors in Conjunct NPs

Possessors do not cliticize via Wackernagel's Law if they possess NPs which are conjoined to other NPs. Again, as the following examples indicate, the free genitive pronoun is used:

(4.58) a KUB 6.45+ i 21-23
hūdak=ma=az ammel=pat ŠA EN.MEŠ DINGIR.MEŠ ŠA
É.MEŠ.DINGIR-LIM-KUNU [(šame)l] ŠA ALAM-KUNU arkuwar iyami
"But I will immediately make a prayer regarding my own lord gods, your temples, and your images"

b KBo 5.3+ i 12  (Hukkana treaty, ed. Friedrich 1930: 106)
namma=ma kuiše ammel DUMU.MEŠ-YA ŠEŠ.MEŠ-ŠU ammell=a ŠEŠ.MEŠ[-YA]
"And moreover whoever are my sons' brothers and my brothers ..."
c KUB 19.6 i 70' (Alakšandu treaty, ed. Friedrich 1930: 56)

katta=ma ammel DUMU-YA DUMU.DUMU-YA hašša hanzašša pahši

"And may you protect my son and my grandson down to the first and second generation"

The following sentence appears to be an exception to this rule:

(4.59) KBo 5.9 i 17-18

nu=ttu [t]uk x-x-uš ŠEŠ.MEŠ-KA KUR URU Amurri=ya šer linga[n]un

"I made your ... brothers and the land of Amurri swear allegiance to you"

Here it appears that tuk "to you" is the thematic benefactive NP ("swear allegiance to you"), which seems to leave only a possessive interpretation for the sentential clitic ttu. The rule would not be violated if ttu were interpreted with scope over the conjunct — "your [brothers and land of Amurri]" — but such an interpretation seems quite strained. It is possible that the rule violation is only apparent, and would be resolved by a full transcription of the sentence.

4.2.3.3.4. Conjunct Possessors

Possessors apparently do not cliticize via Wackernagel's Law if they are themselves conjoined to other possessors. I have unfortunately encountered only one example of the relevant context, but it seems unambiguous, and, significantly, a genitive pronoun is used:

(4.60) KBo 4.4 i 45-46

[nu=ka]n LUGAL.MEŠ ŠERU Nuhašši kuit ŠA A[BI]-YA ammel=a lingašš

[šarr]ješkir

"Because the kings of Nuhašši transgressed my father's and my oaths ..."

The pronoun ammel(l) here is conjoined with ŠA A[BI]-YA "my father's" and is hence too deeply embedded to cliticize via Wackernagel's Law.

4.2.3.4. Postpositional Complements

One of the most interesting syntactic contexts for possessors is the position of possessors of postpositional complements. It is likely that a clear understanding of their syntax would
contribute to our understanding of postposition and adverb syntax generally in Hittite. Unfortunately the evidence I have found has not been nearly clear enough. First, there are several cases like the following in which the possessors of postpositional complements seem to have cliticized via Wackernagel’s Law:

(4.61) a KUB 34.84 ii 28-29

nu=šši=kan iššī anda allapahhanzi

"They spit in his mouth"

b KUB 34.84 ii 38-39

nu=šši=kan 2 BEL SISKUR.SISKUR iššī anda allapahhanzi

"The two clients spit in its mouth"

c KUB 6.45+ iii 47

nu=mu=kan kuiš idaluš memiaš Zl-ni anda

"Whatever evil thing is in my mind ..."

These sentences would seem to indicate that PPs, unlike some other VP-internal constituents discussed above, do not block Wackernagel’s Law. However, since it was concluded in chapter 2 that the process of possessor raising is indifferent to case and grammatical relation (despite the extremely few clear cases of the process with non-objects), it cannot be excluded that these sentences are derived by possessor raising: first, the possessor of the postpositional object assumes the syntactic position of postpositional object itself, and second, that cliticizes via Wackernagel’s Law according to whatever constraints may operate on the cliticization of postpositional objects. The sentences in (4.61) therefore do not bear on the status of the possessors of postpositional objects in this regard.

In some cases, like the following, possessor raising is excluded by the nature of the thematic relation between NP and possessor, but the presence of a postposition cannot be proven:
(4.62) KBo 10.12 iii 22'-23'
\[n=\text{aš}=\text{kan tuel KUR-e }[\text{anda}] \text{ uizzi}\]
"He comes into your land"

If the restoration anda were assured in (4.62), the sentence would be evidence that the possessors of postpositional objects cannot in fact cliticize via Wackernagel’s Law.

A set of related questions are raised by data like the following, having to do with the syntax of the idiom istarna arha + Motion Verb, meaning "cross".

(4.63) a KBo 5.8 i 27
\[n=\text{an}=\text{kan istarna arha pāun}\]
"I crossed it (i.e. the friendly city Kattitimu)"

b KBo 5.4: 47
\[\text{[nāšma=ka]}_{n} \text{LūKUR=ma tuel KUR-KA istarna arha iyattari}\]
"Or if an enemy crosses your land ..."

c KBo 5.9 iii 14-15
\[n=\text{at}=\text{kan tuel KUR-KA istarna arha uizzi}\]
"It crosses your land"

d KUB 23.1 iv 17
\[\text{KUR-KA=aš=kan istarna arha lē paizzi}\]
"He is not to cross your land"

The problem concerns the proper syntactic analysis of the NP understood as the object of this complex predicate, that is, the place which is crossed. There is no doubt that notionally this NP is the object of an idiomatic phrase, but this does not guarantee any particular syntactic analysis. As (4.63a) shows, this NP is absolutive/accusative and can cliticize via Wackernagel’s Law. One possible analysis is therefore that it is the direct object of an idiomatic phrase which is effectively transitive. This analysis is false, however, as shown by (4.63c-d): the construction freely occurs with subject clitics, whereas subject clitics are excluded in proper transitive clauses.
There are two remaining alternatives. First, as Craig Melchert (p.c.) points out, the notional object in this construction might be a kind of path accusative. As shown in §3.1, path accusatives (like KASKAL-an with motion verbs) are syntactically adjuncts and do not trigger transitivity effects; therefore the presence of subject clitics with this construction would be expected. If this analysis were correct, then (4.63b-c) would suggest that the possessors of path adjuncts cannot cliticize via Wackernagel's Law, as is certainly reasonable a priori. However, by the same token (4.63a) would show that path adjuncts themselves can cliticize via Wackernagel's Law. This conclusion seems to me somewhat undesirable on general grounds: if indeed, as this dissertation has argued for a number of specific cases, Wackernagel's Law is constrained according to the syntactic status of the cliticizing elements, then certainly syntactic adjuncts would be expected to fall among the positions from which cliticization cannot occur. I am well aware that this argument is theory-internal rather than empirical, but it might provide some basis for a choice between alternatives. I know of no (other) clear cases of clitic path adjuncts, but this could well be, due to chance.

On the alternative analysis, the notional object of the construction in (4.63) -- the place crossed -- is the object of the postposition ištarna and not of the entire predicate. On this analysis, in other words, tuel KUR-KA ištarna in (4.63b-c) is a PP, which would suggest -- to return to our starting point -- that the possessors of postpositional complements cannot cliticize via Wackernagel's Law. The reason this analysis is problematic is, first, that ištarna is ordinarily construed with a dative-locative rather than an accusative, and second, that in general Hittite terms a postpositional construction with the accusative is suspect. According to HE §233, the only postposition construed with the accusative is pariyan "across, over":

(4.64) KBo 5.8 iii 34 (Annals of Muršili II, CTH 61, ed. Götze 1933: 158)

\[ \text{n-an-kan HUR.SAG ELLURIYAN parian pennir} \]

"They chased him over Mt. Elluriya"

The postposition šer is also evidently at least once construed with the accusative:
(4.65) KBo 6.26 i 35

\text{Gū-ZU} \text{GIŠ-APIN-an šer tizz[i]}

"His neck is placed (lit. steps) on a plow"

From the comparative standpoint, there would be nothing surprising about a system in which certain postpositions can occasionally be construed with the accusative in contexts where they have the appropriate interpretation. This interpretation would presumably involve whatever precise nuance of motion is conveyed by the accusative of goal, illustrated in the following sentences cited from HE §201 and Neu (1980b: 30-31 n. 67):

(4.66) a KUB 13.3 ii 11' (Instructions to palace servants, CTH 265)

nu-šmaš-kan \text{HUR.SAG-an parhanzi}

"They chase you to the mountain"

b KUB 39.8 iv 6 (Royal funeral ritual, CTH 450, ed. Otten 1958: 46)

mān-wa-kan Ú.SAL-un pāʾiši

"If you go to the meadow ..."

In light of these facts, while ištarna is ordinarily construed with the dative-locative in the sense "among, in the middle of", it is plausible that it should also be construed with the accusative in the sense "through (the middle of)" in the construction ištarna arha + Motion Verb. This interpretation may in addition be more satisfactory than the alternative analysis, on which evidently path adjuncts can cliticize via Wackernagel's Law. If the place crossed in the construction under discussion is syntactically just a postpositional complement, then it is likely that possessors of postpositional complements cannot undergo Wackernagel's Law.

4.2.3.5. Copular Predicates

In the structure "X is her/his/its Y", Wackernagel's Law cliticization is quite common; I have collected several dozen instances from all stages of Middle and Neo-Hittite, and the number could certainly be increased. Representative examples are the following:
(4.67) a  KUB 23.68+ rev 12
  INa KUR URUKizzuwatni=ma=šši URUwaššugannas URU-aš

"In Kizzuwatna Waššuganna is his city"

b  KUB 19.49 i 63-64 (Manapa-dU treaty, CTH 69, ed. Friedrich 1930: 10)
  kāšma=tta Ḫšēha KUR URU[Appaw]iya=ya ADDIN nu=tta apat KUR-e
  ešdu

"Behold, I gave you the Šēha River and Appawiya; let that be your land"

c  KBo 3.6+ ii 16-17
  nu=šši apēz KUR URUtaqqastaš ZAG-aš ešta kēz=a=ma=šši
  URUTalmaliyaš ZAG-aš ešta

"On that side Taqqasta was his border, and on this side Talmaliya was his
  border"

d  StDJT 24 iv 74 (Apología of Hitušili III, CTH 81, ed. Oten 1981: 28)
  diŠsIAR DINGIR-LIM=aš=mu

"Ištar, she is my divinity"

e  KUB 23.1+ i 32 (Šušgamuwa treaty, ed. Kühne & Oten 1971: 6)
  kinun=ma=wa=tu=za UL IR.MEŠ

"We are not your vassals now"

f  Bo 86/299 i 22 (Kurunta treaty, ed. Oten 1988: 10)
  īSTU KUR URUPitašša=ma=šši annaz URUNahhantaš ZAG-aš ešta

"But towards Pitašša, Nahhanta was previously his border"

(4.67a) is one of a dozen or more sentences just like it in succession: "as for so-and-so,
in Kizzuwatna such-and-such is his city; as for so-and-so ..." It seems quite unlikely that the
intended interpretation is not possessive. Likewise in (4.67b), if tua were not possessive, the
interpretation would be "let that be a/the land for you", which is implausible. In (4.67c) and
(4.67f), I see no reason to challenge the natural interpretation on which the oblique clitics
are possessive, but more research into parallel phraseology would certainly be profitable;
likewise in (4.67d), an interpretation "my divinity" (as opposed to "she's the divinity for me" or the like) is certainly favored by the repeated references throughout the text to dIŠTAR GAŠAN-YA "Ištar, my lady". Finally, for (4.67e), compare the following similar phraseology with overt genitive:

(4.68)  
İR.MEŠ šA LUGAL Hurri=at [ešir?]

"They were vassals of the Hurrian king"

Now it is certainly possible that, in some of the several dozen cases I identified of the structure in (4.68), a benefactive interpretation is despite appearances in fact intended, but it is very unlikely that this is so in very many cases. I therefore conclude that cliticization via Wackernagel's Law is grammatical for the possessors of copular predicates.

It may be added that there are also some cases where a possessive interpretation for an oblique sentential clitic seems natural but cannot be proven, because contemporary usage permits an adverbial dative-locative as well as a genitive possessor in the appropriate construction. Several examples of this type are the following:

(4.69)  
a  
KUB 21.5 iii 24 (Alakšandu treaty)  
 URU Hattuššaz=ma=wa=tta [(kē l)]ahhiyatar

"But from Hattušša these are your military obligations"

b  
StBoT 24 i 16 (Apology of Hattušili III, CTH 81, ed. Otten 1981: 4)  
nu=war=ša=mu LÚ[(ša)]nakunniš ēšdu

"Let him be my priest"

The sentences in (4.70a-b) show that the pronouns in (4.69a-b) respectively could (although they need not) be underlying adverbial dative-locatives rather than adnominal genitives:
(4.70) a  
KBo 22.264 i 1-2

*AÑA dUTU-ŠI lahhiyatar DINGIR-LUM* kedani MU-ti ZAG KUR Durmitta 
malān hartī

"O divinity, have you approved the border of Durmitta as a military 
campaign for His Majesty this year?"

b  
StBoT 24 iii 60 (Apology of Hattušili III, CTH 81, ed. Otten 1981: 20)

[(AÑA)] dU URU Neriqqaza k[u(ʔ? LÛSANGA ešun)]

"Because I was priest to the Stormgod of Nerik ..."

A similar state of affairs arises with oblique Wackernagel's Law clitics with kinship terms, as 
in the following sentences:

(4.71) a  
KBo 4.4 ii 3-4

nu=šši mNIG.BA-dU-aš [kuiš hante]zz ši DUMU-laš ešṭa

"NIG.BA-dU-a, who was his oldest son ..."

b  
KBo 5.6 iii 13

man=war=aš=mu LÛMUTI-YA kišari

"He would become my husband"

These could be underlying genitives, but, as the following sentences cited at HE §195 show, 
the dative-locative was possible as well in this context:

(4.72) a  
KUB 21.1 iii 34-36

*AÑA ABLI-YA=ma=aš mMuršili ... DUMU NIN-ŠU AÑA dUTU-ŠI=ma=aš 
ānninniyanši

"To my father Muršili ... he is a sister's son, but to His Majesty he is a cousin"

b  
KBo 5.6 iv 11

nu=war=aš ammuk LÛMUDI-YA

"He will be a husband to me"

Clitics of the type in (4.71) could in principle therefore represent underlying adnominal 
datives.
The free genitive is also found in a few cases with copular predicates. For the reasons stated above, it may be assumed that these genitives are emphatic:

(4.73) a Bo 86/299 ii 40-41 (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 16)
\[\text{ÜK}=\text{MA}=\text{WA} \ \text{tuk}=\text{pat} \ \text{pahhaši} \ \text{nu}=\text{wa}=\text{za} \ \text{tueI} \ \text{IR-iš} \]
"I will protect you, I will be your servant"

b KUB 14.1 + obv 21
\[\text{nu}=\text{wa}=\text{za} \ \text{am[meI]} \ \text{IR-TUM} \ \text{eš} \]
"Be my servant"

c KBo 5.6 iv 4-5
\[\text{ammel}=\text{wa} \ \text{LU-MUDI-YA} \ \text{kuiš} \ \text{ešta} \]
"He who was my husband ..."

4.2.3.6. Direct Objects

I have also collected some twenty clear oblique sentential elitics functioning as the possessors of direct objects in Middle and Neo-Hittite; in this context too Wackernagel's Law cliticization seems to be the rule. Representative examples are the following:

(4.74) a KBo 5.3+ i 33-34 (Hukkana treaty, ed. Friedrich 1930: 110)
\[\text{katta}=\text{ma}=\text{tta} \ \text{DUMU-MEŠ-KA} \ \text{pahhaši} \]
"And subsequently I will protect your sons"

b KBo 5.6 ii 2 (NB IND OBJ)
\[\text{nu}=\text{sši}=\text{kan} \ \text{ANA} \ \text{KARAŠ} \ \text{GE} \text{za anda GUL-}[\text{a}][\text{hzi}] \]
"He attacked his army by night"

c KUB 21.5 ii 10
\[\text{KUR-e}=\text{ya}=\text{sši}=\text{sšan anda hamnikmi} \]
"I will destroy his land too"
d StBoT 24 ii 74-75 (Apology of Hattušili III, CTH 81, ed. Otten 1981: 16)
GIM-an=ma=mu=kan mdSIN-dU-aš DUMU mZidā šA dIŠtar GAŠAN-YA Ū šA ŠEŠ-YA=ya āššulan aušta
"But when Arma-dU-a, son of Zidā, saw the favor of Istar, my lady, and of my brother to me ..."

e Bo 86/299 i 25 (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 10)
kinuna=šši dUTU-ŠI annallin ZAG EGIR-pa tehun
"Now I have restored his earlier border"

f Bo 86/299 iv 18 (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 26)
našma=šši ZAG anda tepnuzi
"Or if he diminishes his border ..."

In (4.74a), *utta* must be interpreted possessively: the object of *pahš* "protect" is frequently a kinship term with overtly genitive possession, whereas at least in the treatises edited by Friedrich (1926, 1930) there is no parallel for a putative benefactive complement to this verb (i.e. for an interpretation "I will protect your sons for you"). In the case of (4.74b-c), the phraseology of (4.10d-e) and (4.58c) is somewhat similar and may indicate that an underlyingly adnominal genitive is indeed appropriate here. In the case of (4.74d), *mu* surely must be underlyingly adnominal (an objective genitive): it would be difficult to construe a strictly benefactive complement with the predicate "see so-and-so's favor", since the referent of *mu* has no thematic relation whatsoever to the verbal action (seeing), but only to the object of the verbal action (the favor).

As above, in some cases a possessive interpretation is natural but cannot be proven. For instance, the presence of an overt possessive genitive in (4.75a) shows that *mu* must be interpreted benefactivly; therefore either a possessive or a benefactive interpretation of *mu* is possible in (4.75b).
(4.75) a KUB 6.45 i 20-21
kinuna=mu DINGIR.MEŠ ammel ša ĖSANGA-KUNU ÌR-KUNU memian arkuwar ištamašten
"O gods, now listen for me to my — your priest and servant’s — word and prayer!"

b KBo 3.4 i 27
nu=mu ḪUTU URU Arinna memian ištamašta.
"The Sungoddess of Arinna heard my word"

In this configuration too the free genitive is attested. I have found almost a dozen examples of this type, which should probably, following the reasoning above, be analyzed as emphatic possessors.

(4.76) a Mšt 75/45: 13-14
mān ŪL=ma nu=za apēl waštul zik jāuti
"Otherwise you assume his guilt"

b KBo 5.9 i 12-13
ABU-KA kuit [tu]el [ŠU]M?-an :hūidūwalałwara pīran memišk[i]:
"Because your father often mentioned your name h. ..."

c KBo 5.12 iv 52-56 (Hukkana treaty, ed. Friedrich 1930: 134-36)
nu=sma[s ke] NIŠ DINGIR-LIM šumenzan SAC.DU.MEŠ-KUNU QADU DAM.MEŠ-KUNU DUMU.MEŠ-[KUNU SEŠ].MEŠ-KUNU ... kattan arha
<harganuwandu>
"May these oaths thoroughly destroy your persons on you together with your wives, your children, your brothers, ...

d KUB 26.12 iv 1
[n]ašma apēl kuitki GÛB-tar aušzi
"Or if he, sees some wrong of his ..."
e  KUB 26.12 ii 51
[našm]a apēl INIM.MEŠ wahnuši
"Or if you turn his words ..."

f  KUB 34.24+ iv 7-8
nu=wa šumel [īrh]an KUR URUAmga walahhir
"They attacked your territory Amka"

g  KUB 14.1+ rev 33
[nu=]za apēl ANŠE.KUR.RA.HI.A-ŠU ANA GIŠA[PIN ?? t]jittanuškit
"He put his horses to the plow"

h  KUB 17.21+i 7'-8'
ka[r]u=za šumenzan Š.E.DINGIR.MEŠ-K[UN]U EGIrd-an anzel [iwa]r ÚL
kuiški kappu[w]an harta
"Previously nobody had looked after your temples like us"

i  KUB 23.101 ii 5
nu tuel LÛTE₄-MU kuwat ÚL punušta
"Why didn't you ask your messenger?"

j  KUB 21.27 i 46'-47'
apāš=ma apēl harg[an ÚL kappuwāit ... ap]ēll-kāpi[kuwa]it]
"But he didn't care about its ruin ... and he didn't care about its doom"

k  KUB 21.27 iv 30'-31'
[nu dIM] ABU-KA dUTU URUȚÚL-na AMA-KA tuel mem[ian ÚL
w]ahnuwanzi
"Your father the Stormgod (and) your mother the Sun goddess of Arinna will not reject your word"

Note that tuel LÛTE₄-MU "your messenger" in (4.76h) is topicalized and that therefore tuel, if it were unemphatic, should be able to undergo Wackernagel's Law cliticization despite being coreferential with the subject.
4.2.3.7. Second Objects

There are a few similar instances of overt possession of a second object:

(4.77)  
(a) KBo 6.29 i 28 (Urhi-Tešub, CTH 85, ed. Götze 1925: 46)

nu=nu URU Kuruš[tama Z]AG-an iyat

"He made Kuruštama my border"

(b) Bo 86/299 i 36-37 (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 12)

nu=šši uit ABU-YA=pat URU Šantimman ZAG-an iyat

"My father himself then made Šantimma his border"

(c) Bo 86/299 i 46-47 (Kurunta treaty, ed. Otten 1988: 12)

dUTU-ŠI=ma=šši URU Uppaššana ZAG-an iyanun

"But I His Majesty made Uppaššana his border"

If the phraseology of this idiom is "make X her/his Y" rather than "make X Y for her/him", then these examples show that cliticization via Wackernagel's Law is possible for the possessors of second objects. It is not clear, however, whether this is indeed the case.

4.2.3.8. Possessors of Objects of Comparison

Finally, I have found one overt possessor of an object of comparison:

(4.78)  
KUB 19.29 iv 19

ANA ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ=ma=wa=tta ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ-YA mekki

"My horses are more numerous than your horses"

In this context tta is surely possessive, since its referent is not affected by any verbal action and thus cannot be understood as a benefactive or malefactive complement. Unfortunately the structure of the sentence is quite unclear. From the word order it cannot be determined whether the possessed NP, ANA ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ "than (your) horses", is topicalized or not; if the former, we would expect Wackernagel's Law to operate in any case. This evidence therefore does not permit any statement about the ability of the possessors of in situ objects of comparison to cliticize via Wackernagel's Law.
4.2.3.9. Summary

This section has identified several environments where, despite the innovation of possessive function for Wackernagel's Law oblique clitics generally in Middle and Neo-Hittite, the use of these forms was blocked, and unemphatic possession was instead marked by otherwise emphatic genitive demonstratives and personal pronouns. The clear environments where this constraint operates are listed in (4.79).

(4.79) Possessors of non-topicalized NPs do not undergo Wackernagel's Law if:

1. they possess subjects (§4.2.3.1);
2. they occur in strong crossover contexts (§4.2.3.2);
3. they possess dependent genitives (§4.2.3.3.1);
4. they possess apposed NPs (§4.2.3.3.2);
5. they possess NPs conjoined with other NPs (§4.2.3.3.3);
6. they are conjoined with other possessors (§4.2.3.3.4); or
7. they possess postpositional objects (§4.2.3.4).

Cliticization via Wackernagel's Law is freely possible in the following contexts:

(4.80) Wackernagel's Law may operate on possessors if they possess:

1. topicalized NPs (§4.2.3.1-2);
2. copular predicates (§4.2.3.5); or
3. direct objects (§4.2.3.6).

On the basis of the evidence I have collected, it is impossible to determine whether Wackernagel's Law cliticization is possible in other environments, for instance for the possessors of second objects and objects of comparison (see §4.2.3.7-8). The results described above are, of course, by no means the ultimate explanation of the distribution of unemphatic possessive marking in Hittite. It is likely that a formal analysis of the positions from which cliticization via Wackernagel's Law is impossible—that is, the external argument position, as shown in chapter 3, and the positions identified in this chapter—will reveal their underlying structural similarities. This analysis is not appropriate here,
however; I hope to be able to undertake it elsewhere. In the meantime, it should be noted that the conclusions of this chapter and chapter 3 militate against the theory that Wackernagel's Law elicitization is exclusively a prosodic or phonological process; instead, it must be allowed that syntactic conditions operate on this type of movement.

4.2.4. Suffixed Possessive Pronouns in Middle and Neo-Hittite

It is widely agreed that the suffixed possessive pronouns died or became relatively unproductive within the history of Hittite: they were fully productive in unemphatic function in Old Hittite, in Middle Hittite they occur in a restricted number of texts and forms, and in Neo-Hittite they are rarer still. This is of course just what we would expect if they were being replaced by other unemphatic possessive pronouns. A few Middle Hittite examples are given in (4.81); see Melchert (1977: 36-38) for references to some Neo-Hittite examples.

\[(4.81)\]

\[a\] KUB 12.65+ iii 12’-13’ (Hedammu, CTH 348, ed. Siegelová 1971: 50)
nu=za=kan šalliš [arunaš] Gişšū. A=ši ešat
"The great sea sat on its stool"

\[b\] KUB 14.1+ obv 13
namma=az uit ABî dUTU-Šī tuk m̱ Madduwaṭṭan linkaš=šaš īṣṭ
"His Majesty's father then made you, Madduwaṭṭa, his sworn ally"

\[c\] IBoT 1.36 iii 61
māhan Gişhuluganniš parna=šša paizzi
"When the wagon goes to his house ..."

\[d\] KUB 34.84+ i 21'
dUTU-i ʾišḥā=mi
"My lord the Sungod!"

I have not attempted to determine the distribution of the suffixed possessive pronouns at each successive stage of Hittite. In particular I have not attempted to determine (if this is even possible) whether these forms were still marginally productive in some contexts in
Middle or Neo-Hittite, or whether they were in fact dead in the contemporary language, and were used only in writing in some definable traditional contexts or phrases. It may be interesting to note that in a disproportionate number of cases, as in (4.81a-b), suffixed pronouns appear in contexts where the rules above would rule out Wackernagel's Law cliticization; unfortunately, this cannot be sensibly interpreted at present.

4.3. Palaic and Cuneiform Luvian

Not surprisingly in view of the size of its corpus, Palaic provides no evidence relevant to the problems of this chapter. Even Cuneiform Luvian provides surprisingly little evidence for the syntax of pronominal possession: the possessive adjective built to the inherited demonstrative stem is not attested in sufficiently helpful contexts in Cuneiform Luvian, for instance, and the contexts in which the possible suffixed pronoun *m occurs are also somewhat opaque. As Carruba (1986: 50-52) and Melchert (1988: 214) note, however, at least the suffixed possessive pronoun ṣan, third-person singular direct object, is attested:

(4.82) KBo 13.260 ii 1-4

hattaram=ṣan a[yata] muhatram=ṣan ayat[a] pizzam=ṣan aya[t]a

turim=ṣan ayata

"he made his h., he made his m., he made his p., he made his t."

The preservation of *m before s in these accusatives implies, as Melchert (1988: 214) observes, that the phonological univerbation of noun and possessive pronoun predated the Common Anatolian change of word-final *m to n. This confirms what we would probably reconstruct anyway, namely suffixed possessive pronouns for Common Anatolian.

There is also at least one clear example of the Wackernagel's Law third-person singular oblique clitic du in possessive function:

(4.83) KUB 35.102 (+) 103 iiii 12

GÎR.MEŠ-ta=du tarueya iššara=d[u ...]

"His feet are splayed, his hands ..."
Note that while both instances of _du_ here evidently modify grammatical subjects, these subjects could be topicalized and would therefore likewise permit possessor cliticization to Wackernagel's position in Hittite by the rules identified above.

The manuscript in which (4.83) occurs is dated by Starke (1985: 218-21) to the fourteenth century and is therefore, like much of Luvian, contemporary with late Middle Hittite. It is possible that the existence of sentential possessive clitics in Luvian is related to their innovation in Middle Hittite, in other words, that this syntactic phenomenon was an areal feature common to the two languages. On this view the suffixed construction found in (4.82) would, even though its manuscript is dated by Starke (1985: 258) to the thirteenth century, reflect an archaism within Luvian, and the existence in both Middle Hittite and Luvian of a similar use of the sentential oblique clitics would not compel a reconstruction of this use for Common Anatolian.

**4.4. Lycian**

To my knowledge there are no sentential oblique clitics in Lycian which must be construed as possessive. Given the small size of the Lycian corpus, of course, this fact cannot possibly be probative by itself, but, in conjunction with certain other evidence, it confirms the suggestion above that Common Anatolian Wackernagel's Law oblique clitics were not used in possessive function. The other evidence concerns the syntax of the possessive pronoun in Lycian. This pronoun has an unsyncopated form _ebehi_- and a syncopated form _ehbi_-; with a revealing distribution. The syncopated allomorph is extremely frequent, occurring some one hundred and thirty times in the Lycian corpus. In all one hundred and twenty-five clear cases, this form is adnominal and follows the noun it modifies, just as demonstratives follow their noun, and in most instances a word-divider separates it from its noun. The same distribution obtains for the eight instances of _ephtehi_- "their", always syncopated, and the two clear instances of _emii_- "my". Examples include the following (see also chapter 5 passim):
TL 106: 3

lădă : ĕmi : se=tideimis : ĕmis

"My wife and my sons"

TL 67

ebēnēz : prānawā : m=ē=tī prānawatē : Xluwānimi : hrppi lādi : ēhbi : se
tideime | ēhbiţe : ēnē Periklehe : xūtawata

"Xluwānimi built this building for his wife and his children under the rule
of Perikle"

TL 102.1-2

m=ēne : ēstepi=tēti : Sxuţrāzi : se ēlādi : ēhbi | se tideimis : ēhbis

"They will inter Sxuţrāzi and his wife and his children"

Unsyncopated ēhbi "his" is sometimes difficult to identify, since it is formally identical
to the dative-locative of ēbe- "this". Nevertheless there is at least one clear case:

TL 124

ebēnē xupu se=i hri ti ēntipa m=c=tī ēç Uhetēî ēhbi ētţatā s=ēbeijes

kmmis ētei lādi tideime ēhbiţe

"This grave and that which is upon it, Uhetēî made it for himself as his
sarcophagus, and these (others), as many as there are, for (his) wife ētei
(and) his sons"

In this example, ēhbi ētţatā "his sarcophagus" is explicitly contrasted with ētei lādi tideime
ēhbiţe "for his wife ētei and his sons": Uhetēî made one sarcophagus for himself, and one for
them. It is precisely this context where emphatic pronominalization occurs and unemphatic
pronominalization is disallowed in both English and, as I have shown above, Hittite. This
confirms what its shape already suggests—that unsyncopated ēhbi- is the emphatic
counterpart of syncopated, unemphatic ēhbi-.

Note moreover that ēhbi in (4.85) precedes its head noun rather than following it, as is
the usual pattern. It seems reasonable to conclude that Lycian demonstratives and
Hittite, where emphatic apēl (Lycian ebehi mutatis mutandis) precedes its noun, but unemphatic possession is marked by pronominal suffixes. I therefore take the evidence of Lycian as a weak indication that a system like the Old Hittite system of possession—rather than one like the Neo-Hittite system—should be reconstructed for Common Anatolian. The Lycian system would then have developed out of the Anatolian one in something like the following manner. By whatever means demonstratives generally came to be postposed to their nouns, and presumably at first only under certain circumstances, pre-Lycian *obosi- could sometimes follow its noun. Subsequent to this change two further developments occurred in some order: there was an accent shift, presumably due to its new prosodic environment, which permitted only the postnominal pronoun to be syncopated; and the postnominal possessive pronoun replaced the inherited suffixed pronouns via the usual mechanism whereby free forms replace clitics.
Chapter Five: Clitic-Doubling

The objective of this chapter is to examine a Lycian construction characterized by clitic-doubling; in the course of the examination it will be necessary to consider some aspects of clitic-doubling more generally throughout Anatolian. The term "clitic-doubling" should be explained at the outset. It does not mean any occurrence of a pronominal clitic and a coreferential NP in a single sentence: such a definition would make no sense of the process in Anatolian or cross-linguistically, since, among other failings, it would classify English sentences like those in (5.1) as "clitic-doubling", where the boldface NPs are coreferential.

(5.1) a  He left jail a new man
    b  Did you see her as Desdemona?
    c  We made them all generals

Clitic-doubling will be understood here specifically as doubling—the presence of an NP and coreferential pronominal clitic in a single sentence—in the case where the clitic and NP appear to share the same θ-role or, equivalently in the present syntactic framework, where they appear to be base-generated in the same syntactic position. It is this double—both thematic and syntactic—redundancy which gives clitic-doubling its general interest. The test for clitic-doubling employed in this chapter will necessarily be thematic: must an NP and a potentially doubling clitic be interpreted as thematically redundant, in the way that genuine apposed NPs are thematically redundant?

5.1. The Lycian Topic Construction

5.1.1. Introduction

The following sentence illustrates a well-known Lycian syntactic construction:
(5.2) TL 67


"Xluwānimı built this building for his wife and his children under the rule of Perkle"

This sentence contains both an accusative NP, ebēñê prînawā "this building", and a resumptive clitic pronoun, č, and is thus descriptively an instance of left-dislocation.¹ I will refer to constituents appearing to the left of the sentential particle me as "topics", whether clitic-doubled as in (5.2) or not, and to the common construction in which they appear as the "topic construction".

I will begin by examining the distribution of clitic-doubling, which often characterizes the topic construction. There are five well-established clitic pronouns in Lycian: an accusative č (with allomorphs ene, ne, and ěne); an absolutive ede; a dative singular ī; a dative plural ĕne (see Melchert 1990a); and a locative īje (with allomorph ī). Clitic-doubling involving these pronouns is not as promiscuous as is sometimes assumed for other Indo-European languages, but is rule-governed, as follows. A phrase is doubled if and only if it is referentially definite and in one of two positions: either to the left of me—topicalized—or to the right of all non-doubled constituents in its sentence—i.e. end-topicalized. Indefinite phrases are never doubled even if they occur in one of these positions. Lycian clitic-doubling, in other words, resolves to left- and right-dislocation of definite phrases.

This is empirically equivalent to three claims: all definite phrases extracted rightward are doubled; all definite phrases preceding me are doubled; and all instances of

¹ I will freely use the following terms: "dislocation" is topicalization with clitic-doubling; "left-dislocation" in particular is topicalization to the left with clitic-doubling; and "right-dislocation" is topicalization to the right ("end-topicalization") with clitic-doubling.
clitic-doubling involve either right- or left-dislocation around me. The next two sections of this chapter will be organized as follows: §5.1.2 will examine rightward extraction and will show that right-extracted definite phrases are obligatorily clitic-doubled, and §5.1.3 will examine the topic construction itself and will show that definite topics are obligatorily clitic-doubled. Together, these treatments should leave no residual cases of clitic-doubling.

5.1.2. Right Dislocation

A particular phrase can only be shown to have been extracted rightward if there is phrasal material which should follow it but instead precedes it. In sentences without such material, extraction will be vacuous and no movement will be demonstrable. The six or more Lycian sentences like the following—in which the clitic-doubled direct object Sxxutrazi ... ehbis "Sxxutrazi and his wife and his children" follows the verb and concludes the sentence—are thus ambiguous, evidence neither for nor against the analysis presented here:

$$(5.3) \quad TL\ 102.1-2$$

$m=\text{ene} : \text{fiteti} : \text{Sxxutrazi} : \text{se IADU} : \text{ehbi} \mid \text{se tidemis} : \text{ehbis}$

"They will inter Sxxutrazi and his wife and his children"

Extraction and in particular vacuous extraction are not limited to direct objects. Vacuous movement, which is ipso facto not probative, is in fact more likely to apply to oblique arguments, since they ordinarily appear sentence-finally (see below). Moreover, while few verbs allow more than one accusative complement, many allow several dative or locative ones; thus, to prove that a particular oblique clitic doubles a particular NP or PP, it must be shown that the clitic cannot fulfill some other oblique argument function. Finally, since the oblique clitics $i$ and $ije$ can both mean "here", an interpretation almost always appropriate in sepulchral inscriptions, it is rarely possible in particular instances to show that these clitics must be proleptic. They are thus of relatively little independent value in

---

2 Other examples of this type occur at TL 28.1-5, 45.1-3 and 131.1, and N 309a.2-3 and 320.12-14.
investigating doubling. In addition, Lycian either lacks or does not obviously continue the Anatolian subject clitics. The absence of subject clitic-doubling in cases of topicalization or rightward extraction is therefore not very meaningful (see further below). In summary, only the accusative and dative plural clitics are likely to provide evidence bearing on the above analysis of clitic-doubling, although once this has been confirmed on independent grounds, it may of course be possible to disambiguate other clitics.

In order to prove that extraction has occurred, it is necessary to show that some other word order is underlying. Compare (5.4a) and (5.4b):

\[(5.4)\]

\(a\) N 306.2

\[\text{[m}=\text{ene} : \text{ńtepi} \text{=} \text{tāti} : \text{hrzzi} : \text{prānawi Piṅteusi : se ladā} : \text{ehbi}\]

"They will inter in the upper building Piṅteusi and his wife"

\(b\) TL 131.2

\[\text{se=te=ui} : \text{cseri=uadi} : \text{tiķe xupa : ebehi}\]

"And whoever puts someone together (sc. with the legal occupant) here in this tomb ..."

Both sentences include a direct object and a locative phrase. In (5.4a), the direct object Piṅteusi se ladā ehbi "Piṅteusi and his wife", doubled by the pronoun ene, follows the locative noun phrase hrzzi prānawi "in the upper building", whereas in (5.4b) the order is reversed—the direct object tiķe "someone" precedes the locative phrase xupa ebehi "in this tomb"—and there is no clitic-doubling. This contrast is systematic: there are no Lycian sentences with the word order Verb + Direct Object + Locative Phrase which exhibit direct object clitic-doubling (compare TL 6.2-3), while the only sentence with the word order Verb + Locative Phrase + Direct Object ([5.4a] above) does exhibit such clitic-doubling. This can be explained by positing an underlying word order as in (5.4b), with the word order of (5.4a) the result of rightward extraction and obligatory clitic-doubling.
Direct object clitic-doubling also occurs in the sequence Verb + Beneficiary + Direct Object, as in (5.5a), while it never occurs in the common sequence Verb + Direct Object + Beneficiary, as in (5.5b):

\[(5.5)\]

\[a\quad TL\ 84.2\]

\[s=ed=adê : atli : hrzzê | [i]spaziê\]

"He made for himself the upper ispazije"

\[b\quad TL\ 99\]


"Purihimetì, child of Masasa, built this tomb for himself and his children"

In general, then, Lycian direct objects ordinarily precede oblique nominal arguments but can follow them in right-dislocation structures.

If this conclusion is correct, it is possible to resolve several textual ambiguities. In a few Lycian sentences, for example, there are words which are clearly not extracted rightward and which, if they are direct objects, are clitic-doubled and thus contradict my analysis. Each of them may, however—and hence in my view must—be interpreted differently. Thus Laroche (1979: 72) hesitates between adverbial and direct-object interpretations of arâ in (5.6). But arâ is not extracted rightward, since it precedes kumehedi "with a sacrifice", and if it is the object, it is clitic-doubled by ede; therefore it must be adverbial (e.g. "properly").

\[(5.6)\]

\[N\ 320.26-27\]

\[m=ede=te=we : kumezidi : nuredi : nuredi : arâ : kumehedi\]

"One will sacrifice it each month properly with a sacrifice"

A somewhat more interesting problem is raised by the following two passages from the Lētoōn Trilingual:

---

\(^3\) Other sentences of the latter type occur at TL 29.1-2, 36.5, 36.6, 63, 102.3, 143.4-5, and 150.3-4, and N 320.7-9.
(5.7) a  N 320.3-5

sè=ñe=ñte=pddéhadè : Trmmile : pddénehmmis : Ijeru : se=Nattrbbijèmi
: sej=Ařina : asaxlazu : Erttimeli

"And he appointed, for the Lycians, the deputies Ijera and Nattrbbijèmi,
and for Xanthos, the governor Erttimeli"

b  N 320.9-11

: se=de : Eseimijaje : xuwati=ti

"And for these gods they made priest Eseimija, child of Qñturaha, and
whoever succeeds (?) Eseimija"

As shown by Melchert (1990a), ñne in (5.7a) is a proleptic clitic pronoun doubling Trmmile "for the Lycians" as well as Ařina "for Xanthos". Both words, however, are followed by direct objects, Trmmile by pddénehmmis Ijeru se=Nattrbbijèmi "Ijera and Nattrbbijèmi as deputies" and Ařina by asaxlazu Erttimeli "Erttimeli as governor". Similarly, ñn in (5.7b) doubles mahnàna ebette "for these gods", which is followed by the direct object Eseimiju ... xuwati=ti "Eseimija ... and whoever succeeds Eseimija". Unless all these direct objects have also been extracted rightward, my description of Lycian clitic-doubling cannot be precisely correct.

Fortunately, there is some reason to suspect that these phrases have indeed been extracted. First, if the direct objects in (5.7a-b) have not been extracted, then the word orders—Benefactive + Direct Object in (5.7a), and Second Object + Benefactive + First Object in (5.7b)—are underlyingly acceptable with these verbs. From both the Anatolian and typological perspectives, this would be surprising. Second, (5.7a) and (5.7b) both show the sequence sèññ(e), with an apparent nasalized allomorph of the conjunction se. This has been taken by Laroche (1979: 61) as assimilation to the following nasal, a hypothesis which is certainly possible in view of similar apparent assimilations elsewhere. Assimilation of this type is, however, hardly regular in Lycian, and its conditioning is not understood. In fact, there is no secure evidence that the clitic pronoun ñne ever causes nasalization of a
preceding vowel. According to Melchert (1989a: 43), this pronoun occurs fourteen times in addition to the examples in (5.7). In thirteen instances (including me=\={\textit{\textcircled{n}}}n\textit{e} eight times and se=\={\textit{\textcircled{n}}}ne three times) it follows a non-nasalized vowel, while in only one instance does it follow a nasalized vowel:

(5.8) TL 27.1-8

Mexist\={\textit{\textcircled{n}}} n=\={\textit{\textcircled{n}}} e : ep[i] | tuwete : atli : ehbi : Sxxulijah : tideimi :

sa=lad i : ehbi Merimawaj[e] | Pet\={\textit{\textcircled{n}}}neheh : tideimi : se=tideimi | ehbi :

Sxxulije

"Mexist\={\textit{\textcircled{n}}}te erected it for himself, the child of Sxxulija, for his wife Merimawa, daughter of Pet\={\textit{\textcircled{n}}}nehe, and for his child Sxxulija"

As long as the conditioning for nasal assimilation remains unknown, it is possible that the nasal vowel in Mexist\={\textit{\textcircled{n}}}te is the result of assimilation to \={\textit{\textcircled{n}}}n, but it cannot be excluded that Mexist\={\textit{\textcircled{n}}}te is a proper name ending in a nasal vowel, like Xssbeac\={\textit{\textcircled{n}}} at TL 25.2. There are thus no secure parallels for the apparent assimilatory nasalization of (5.7).

In short, sentences (5.7a-b) are triply problematic: they present an unexplained nasal vowel; they contradict otherwise well-motivated rules of Lycian clitic-doubling; and their verbal complements appear in a surprising order. I therefore suggest that the sequence s\textit{e} beginning them is (as often) s=\textit{e}, the conjunction se elided before the accusative clitic pronoun \textit{e}. This pronoun is in each sentence proleptic: in (5.7a) it doubles the direct objects \textit{pdd\textit{e}nehmmis Ijeru se=Nat\textit{b}b\textit{e}j\textit{e}mi} and \textit{asaxlazu Ert\textit{m}i\textit{e}li}, and in (5.7b) it doubles the direct object \textit{Eseimiju ... xuwati=ti}. The direct objects in (5.7a-b) are thus extracted rightward, and in consequence it may be assumed that the benefactive complements \textit{Trm\textit{m}ile} and \textit{Ar\textit{\textcircled{i}}}na in (5.7a) and \textit{mah\textit{\textcircled{n}}\textit{a} e\textit{be}e\textit{t}e} in (5.7b) are also (vacuously) extracted. The resulting word order (Dative + Accusative) differs from the underlying one, and all these NPs are clitic-doubled.

There is a potential objection. On my analysis, (5.7a-b) attest the clitic order \textit{\textcircled{e}}=\={\textit{\textcircled{n}}}ne, Accusative + Dative Plural. The order attested elsewhere is \={\textit{\textcircled{n}}}n=\textit{\textcircled{e}}, Dative Plural +
Accusative, as in (5.8) above and in (5.9), where ğu doubles the vacuously extracted NP Arźnia ... Xadawati "to Xanthos, Tlos, Pinara, and Kadyanda":

(5.9) TL 45.1-3

[pijet]e=ğu=q Pixe[s]ere Kati[m]la]h Arźnia se Tlawa se P[final]e se Xadawati

"Pixesere, (child) of Katmla, gave it to Xanthos and Tlos and Pinara and Kadyanda"

This is likely to be the inherited clitic order, in view of the discovery of Hoffner (1986: 93-94) that Hittite subject and direct object clitics obligatorily precede dative singular clitics but follow dative plural clitics (so n=aṣ=mu "he to me" but nu=nαṣ=an "him to us"). But since both proposed instances of the order q=ğu, Accusative + Dative Plural, occur in a single text, they may be the result of innovation, perhaps on the model of the regular clitic order ed=i, Absolutive + Dative Singular.

5.1.3. The Syntax of the Topic Construction

5.1.3.1. Definite NP Topics

Because the topic position is unambiguously marked by the sentential particle me, topicalized phrases can be identified much more easily than right-extracted ones. I have examined all topicalized phrases in the Lycian corpus and, as I will show in this section, all referentially definite NPs are clitic-doubled. By far the most common class is represented by (5.2) above and (5.10), in both of which the topic ebeñeq prınawā is doubled by the pronoun q:

(5.10) TL 19

ebeñeq : prınawā m=q=ti prınawate | Xisterija Xzzbāzeh tideimi | hrppi : ladi ehbi se=tideime

"Xisterija, child of Xzzbāze, built this building for his wife and children"
There are over sixty other sentences of this type. Three locative NPs also appear as topics, all clitic-doubled:

(5.11) a TL 49

**ebehi** : **isbazi** : **mi=ije** siğni : Padrówna

"In this **isbazi** lies Padrówna"

b TL 57.6-7

**hrzzi pränawi** : **me=i** : ȧtẹp=tți | [Idā Ma]xzā : se la[dā]

"In the upper building they'll inter Ida Maxzza and (his) wife"

c TL 106.1

**ebehi xupa** : **me=i** siğni : Sbi:<>:aza

"In this **tomb** lies Sbi<>:aza"

Note that **ebehi isbazi** "in this **isbazi**" in (5.11a) is doubled by the strictly locative clitic **ije**, whereas **hrzzi pränawi** "in the upper building" in (5.11b) and **ebehi xupa** "in this **tomb**" in (5.11c) are both doubled by **i**, which is formally ambiguous. On the basis of (5.11a) and the type of (5.2) and (5.10), it seems reasonable to assume that locative topics require locative clitics, and that all three sentences are parallel; **i** in (5.11b-c) is therefore the allomorph of **ije** rather than the dative clitic. The latter properly appears when a dative topic is present, as here (the glide **j** is epenthetic before **eseri**):

(5.12) N 320.40-41

**Pigesereje** : **me=ij eseri=hhati**

"They will leave to **Pigesere** (sc. to do what the acropolis orders done)"

There are thus some seventy positive instances of definite topics with clitic-doubling. There are also two large classes of apparent counter-instances—definite topics which

---

4 They occur in the first lines of TL 1, 3, 5-9, 11-18, 23, 36, 43, 47, 48, 52, 53, 58, 68, 70-73, 75, 78, 80, 81, 85, 86, 88-91, 93, 102, 103, 105, 108, 110, 113, 122, 123, 139, 140, 144, and 149, and N 306, 309a, 310, 317, 308, and 322, and at TL 37.2, 38.2, 48.4, and 143.2, and N 314a.3.
apparently lack doubling. The first class includes almost thirty sentences of the following type⁵:

(5.13) a TL 42.3-4

**ebëññe** xupā : me=ti prīñawatę : Tuwada : hrppi ladi | se t<i>deime

"Tuwada built this tomb for (his) wife and children"

b TL 56.1-3

**ebëññe prīñawu** : me=ti prīñawatę | Ixtta : Hlah : tideimi : hrppi ladi :

ehbi | se tideime : ebbi

"Ixtta, child of Hla, built this building for his wife and his children"

c TL 124.1-8

**ebëñże xupu se=i [h]ri ti ūtipa** me=ti adë U[hi]etqi ebehi ūt[a]tā

"This tomb and the ūtipa which is on it, Uheteji made as his sarcophagus"

In each case, *me* is preceded by an accusative NP and followed immediately by the reflexive clitic *ti* rather than an expected accusative clitic pronoun. However, among the various largely unexplained alternations between nasal and non-nasal vowels, there is one whose conditioning seems fairly clear: nasal vowels are often denasalized before *t*. Thus the historically proper third-person plural endings -āti and -ēti (e.g. alahāti "they bury"), which occur nearly fifty times, appear in over ten instances denasalized as -ati or -eti (e.g. alahati). In view of this alternation, it would be surprising if the frequent sequence *m=ē=ti* never showed a denasalized variant *m=e=ti*. I propose that sentences like (5.13a-c) exemplify this variant, and that *e* is an allomorph (/_e_ t) of the accusative clitic pronoun.

The other class of apparent exceptions to the generalization that definite topics are obligatorily clitic-doubled includes six sentences of the following type⁶:

---

⁵ They are at TL 4.1, 39.1, 57.3, 59.1, 61.1, 66.1, 77.1, 84.1, 87.1, 92.1, 101.1, 109.1, 111.1, 112.1, 118.1, 119.1, 120.1, 121.1, 134.1, 136.1, 137.1, 138.1, and 142, and N 308 and 316.1.
(5.14) a TL 40c.7-8

erawazija : ebe[i]jja : me prānawaxā
"I built this monument"

b TL 40d.1

ebeija : [xr]uwata : me=ije pijeṭe : Wat[aprd]ata
"Wataprdata gave these xruwata here"

In all six cases, me is preceded by a neuter plural direct object and clitic-doubling appears
to be absent; no other topicalized neuter plurals are attested. I take this as evidence that
Lycian continues the Anatolian neuter plural clitic pronoun *oy which elsewhere appears
only in Hittite and Palaic: the sequence me here reflects not simply *mo but *mo=oy.7

This proposal is not vitiated by the possible occurrence of a neuter plural clitic pronoun ede
(= Luvian ata) at N 320.12, since in any case Hittite also attests both e and at (which is
edelata without the secondary prop-vowel). If added to the Lycian pronominal inventory,
this clitic is an important archaism of first-millenium Lycian against the older Luvian
languages.

There is a final, unfortunately isolated, apparent counter-example to the claim that
definite topics must be clitic-doubled:

(5.15) TL 100

ebe xupa me tibeija
"This grave (is) Tibeian"

This example is isolated because the phrase ebe xupa "this grave" is the only topicalized
subject NP at all in Lycian. There are two possible explanations for the apparent failure of

---

6 The others are at TL 26.1, 117.1, 128.1, and 135.1.

7 Craig Melchert (p.c.) compares the phonology of the third-person singular hi-conjugation desinence -e < *-øy
< *-o-øy.
clitic-doubling in (5.15). It may be that topicalized subjects do not require clitic-doubling, presumably because although they once required it, Lycian has eliminated the inherited subject clitics by generalizing the phonologically null allomorph which would have characterized many environments, as here. An alternative possibility is that (5.15) actually contains both the particle *me and the regular reflex of the Common Anatolian nominative singular common-gender subject clitic *os: *mo=os > me. It would hardly be surprising that such a form had not been noticed previously: in view of its predicted shape, this clitic would be difficult to identify, and in any case it would be expected to appear only with certain intransitive verbs, as throughout Anatolian. I am aware of no instance in the Lycian corpus where an intransitive verb has no lexical subject and a subject clitic e can be excluded.

The system of movement and clitic-doubling proposed here may seem unusual for an old Indo-European language, but it is cross-linguistically unremarkable. Chichewa, for example, like other Bantu languages, has obligatory verbal subject agreement of the familiar Indo-European type, as well as optional verbal object agreement; hence there is subject agreement in (5.16) between njuchi "bees" and the verbal prefix zi, and object agreement in (5.17) between alenje "hunters" and the verbal prefix wa. The presence of object marking in Chichewa is, as shown by Bresnan & Mchombo (1987: 744-45), conditioned by the position of the direct object. When object agreement is omitted, as in (5.16b-e), the word order Verb + Object is obligatory, although the subject may precede or follow the Verb + Object sequence. Thus (5.16c-f), in which the sequence Verb + Object has been interrupted or reversed, are ungrammatical.

(5.16) a  
Njuchi zi-na-lum-a alenje

bees SUBJ-PAST-bite-INDIC hunters

"the bees bit the hunters"

b  Zinaluma alenje njuchi

c  *Alenje zinaluma njuchi
If object agreement is present, however, the verb, subject, and direct object can occur in any order, and the counterparts of (5.16c-f) are grammatical:

(5.17) a  Njuchi zi-na-wa-lum-a alenje
          bees SUBJ-PAST-OBJ-bite-INDIC hunters
b  Zinawaluma alenje njuchi
c  Alenje zinawaluma njuchi
d  Zinawaluma njuchi alenje
e  Njuchi alenje zinawaluma
f  Alenje njuchi zinawaluma

Using both syntactic and phonological evidence, Bresnan & Mchombo (1997: 745-52) show that verbal object agreement is not conditioned by linear order but by the extraction of the direct object from the VP. In sentences like (5.17a-b), extraction is vacuous, but in (5.17f), for instance, alenje "hunters" has clearly been moved leftward, and because the verbal prefix wa is present, the sentence is grammatical (compare [5.16f] without wa).

As a parallel but informal characterization, I suggest that Lycian clitic-doubling marks extraction from some sentential sub-constituent, which I will call S, and that whatever the precise structure of the Lycian sentence, both topicalized and right-extracted phrases are outside S, although inside a larger constituent S'. This characterization is obviously tentative in view of our current understanding of Lycian syntax, and I introduce it solely to facilitate certain descriptive statements below.

5.1.3.2. Other Topics

The topicalization and obligatory clitic-doubling of definite NPs is illustrated in (5.2) and (5.10-14) above, but definite NPs are not the only items which can be topicalized in Lycian. Other types of topicalized phrases may be classified in various ways: for instance,
some topicalization—left-dislocation—occurs with clitic-doubling and some occurs without it. This section will be organized as follows: PP topics will be discussed in §5.1.3.2.1, verb and preverb topics in §5.1.3.2.2, indefinite NP topics in §5.1.3.2.3, and a minor topic type in §5.1.3.2.4; the salient features of all topic types will be summarized in §5.1.3.2.5. In §5.1.4 I will turn to some pragmatic features of the Lycian topicalization system, and in §5.1.5 I will begin to address the problem of its origin.

5.1.3.2.1. PP Topics

The apparently extended preverbs or prepositions hrppije and hrije "thereon" appear ten times in the topic position and are invariably clitic-doubled. I analyze these as simply the prepositions hrppi and hri with, as objects, the enclitic locative pronoun ije—in other words, as topicalized PPs. The doubling pronoun may be taken as doubling either the topicalized PP or its pronominal object. Examples include the following:

(5.18) a TL 57.8

hrppi=ije me=ì: tadi : tike

"Thereon one puts someone"

b N 309a.4

hri=ije me=ì: alahadi : tike

"Thereon one buries someone"

Compare sentences like the following, where an untopicalized hrppi co-occurs with its notional object ije, as in (5.18a), but without a pleonastic i:

(5.19) TL 75.3

me=ije : ni hr[ppi]=tatu : tike

"They shall not put anyone thereon"

There is another very significant feature of topicalized PPs. Whereas the vast majority of topicalized definite NPs are, in those inscriptions where the word-divider is consistently

---

8 Other examples are at TL 58.4, 75.4, 84.3, 94.2, 109.3, and 150.5.
used, followed by a word-divider, topicalized PPs are consistently not followed by a word-divider.

5.1.3.2.2. Verb and Preverb Topics

The topic constituent can be a verb or preverb: in Lycian, as elsewhere in Indo-European, preverb topicalization is isofunctional with verb topicalization in the case of verbs without preverbs (compare Renou 1933: 54 on Vedic). Verbs are topicalized three times in the Lycian corpus—naturally enough, without clitic-doubling:

(5.20) a TL 89.2-3

\[ \text{adi mej}=\varsigma \text{ : tik}: \text{e : xtb} \alpha \text{ : tisike} \]

"If anyone does any harm whatsoever ..."\(^9\)

b TL 90.4

\[ \text{adi} : \text{mej}=\varsigma \text{ tik}[e \ x]t[\text{b}a] \]

"If anyone does harm ..."

c N 320.36-37

\[ \text{xttade mej}=\varsigma \text{ : tike} \]

"If someone will have done harm ..."

In three cases, preverbs or preverb sequences are topicalized:

(5.21) a TL 134.3

\[ \text{hri}=\text{f}[\text{te}] : \text{me}=\text{=i=lahadi} : \text{tike} \]

"(If) he buries someone on top of him"

b N 306.3

\[ \text{hri}=\text{nte}=\text{me}=\text{=i} : \text{alahadi} : \text{tike} \]

"(If) he buries someone on top of him"

\(^9\) For \(\varsigma\) "if", see Melchert (1989a: 19, with earlier references).
TL 83.10-11
nē te me=j=epi : tadi : tī[k]e [tik]e

"(If) someone inters someone on top of him"

The otherwise unexplained enclitic pronouns following me in these examples — i in (5.21a-b) and j in (5.21c) — are simply the logical objects of hri=nēte and nēte "on top of". Neither verb nor preverb topics are, therefore, accompanied by clitic-doubling, and in most cases they are not followed by the word divider.

5.1.3.2.3. Indefinite NP Topics

As stated above, topicalized definite phrases are obligatorily clitic-doubled, but indefinite phrases cannot be clitic-doubled. The next class of non-clitic-doubling topics therefore consists of indefinite NPs:

(5.22) a TL 88.4 = TL 93.3

hlimmi me=i tuwcti tike

"Someone puts tribute here"

---

10 I take j in (5.21c) as an intervocalic treatment of i. Lycian attests other treatments of intervocalic i: epenthetic j, as in (5.12) above; i, in se=i=agē at TL 149.13 (although the possible phonological status of the sequence -eie- is quite unclear); and elision of the following vowel, as in (5.21a). However, since other sandhi processes, e.g. elision, have variable outcomes in Lycian, the treatment of intervocalic i may as well.

11 I did not present evidence above that indefinite phrases extracted rightward are not clitic-doubled. Relevant evidence is indeed hard to find, perhaps because of whatever pragmatic function right-extraction has in Lycian. A possible instance is at TL 52.2, se pi[j]ieti : mišti ītavūtu. If ītavūtu (unknown meaning) is the direct object in this sentence, then the word order is Beneficiary + Direct Object and should cause clitic-doubling. Its absence might signal an indefinite interpretation of ītavūtu: "and he gave to the mišti an ītavūtu". Likewise the word order at TL 131.5-4 points to extraction (similarly TL 111.4 and 131.4): me=titidi : īnę qlahi : ebejehtu nūtuṣa | amm[a]sma : uwa "he will pay to the mother of this sanctuary nine ammāma cattle". Here the direct object is indefinite, and clitic-doubling is presumably absent, but since, as argued above, an absolutive plural clitic e exists in Lycian, the sequence me is formally ambiguous.
TL 88.3 = TL 93.2

kbi tike me=i nipe ñtepi tātu
"Let them not inter here someone else"

c N 306.2

kbi : tike : me=ñte=ne : hriŋ=alahadi : tike

"Someone will not bury someone else on top (sc. of the legal occupant)"

The indefinite direct objects himmi "(some) tribute" in (5.22a) and kbi tike "someone else" in (5.22b-c), and similarly at N 309a.3-4—six occurrences in all—are not doubled by any allomorph of the accusative clitic pronoun ē. Like definite NP topics, however, they are regularly followed by the word divider in inscriptions which consistently use it.

A contrast of the general type found in Lycian—between left-dislocation of definite NPs and its impossibility with indefinites—is cross-linguistically widespread. For instance, in colloquial French, sentences like (5.23) occur freely without intonational pauses before the clitic subject pronouns, whereas the type of (5.24) is impossible (see e.g. Lambrecht 1981: 61-62):

(5.23)  a  Ces Romains ils sont fous
       b  Le garçon il attend devant la porte

(5.24)  a  *Quelque Romain il est fous
       b  *Un garçon il attend devant la porte

Similar contrasts occur in Italian left-dislocation structures, according to Duranti and Ochs (1979: 391), and in several Bantu languages, in structures cognate to the Chichewa ones discussed above (see the references in Bresnan & Mchombo 1987: 760 n. 25). Of course, the Lycian construction allows a much wider range of topic constituents than is cross-linguistically common; it also differs somewhat in its pragmatic function.

5.1.3.2.4. Ebeli "Here"

There is, finally, a minor category of topicalized constituent which does not trigger clitic-doubling:
(5.25) a TL 107a.1
[e]beli: m=čti=sijėni: Tele: se lada: se tidsėmi: ebhi:<: s-ladāi:
ebtehi:<
"Here are laid down Tele, and (his) wife and his five sons and their four wives"
b TL 150.1
ebelī: me sijēni: Xssėņ zijā
"Here lies Xssęņ zijā"

The adverb ebeli "here"—in origin clearly a demonstrative—evidently does not occur with clitic-doubling when topicalized, but is followed by the word divider.

5.1.3.2.5. Summary

It seems reasonable to assume that the word divider used in Lycian inscriptions separates prosodic constituents of some order. The particle me which defines the topic construction is thus prosodically ambivalent: it is ordinarily part of the same prosodic constituent as a preceding verb, preverb, or preposition plus clitic pronoun, but it is prosodically separated from a preceding NP (and from ebeli "here"). An authoritative interpretation of these facts must await a comprehensive study of Lycian prosody, but the most natural preliminary interpretation is that the particle me is stressed after NP topics but unstressed after other topics. This may be sketched as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(5.26)</th>
<th>TOPIC CONSTITUENT</th>
<th>mé or me?</th>
<th>CLITIC-DOUBLING?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definite NP</td>
<td>mé &gt; 100x</td>
<td>yes (&gt;100x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indefinite NP</td>
<td>mé 2x</td>
<td>no (6x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P + Clitic Pro</td>
<td>mé 7x</td>
<td>yes (8x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verb or Preverb</td>
<td>mé 4x, mé 2x</td>
<td>no (6x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ebeli &quot;here&quot;</td>
<td>mé 2x</td>
<td>no (2x)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to its use in the topic construction, *me* has an independent sentence-connective value, as in (5.27a), and in particular is virtually obligatory in apodoses, as in (5.27b):

(5.27)  
(a) TL 84.2-3

> me=te : ṃta=tāti | ebēŋe : hātā : se=ladā

> "And they will inter him when he is dead with his wife"

(b) TL 93.3

> ḫlmmi me=i tuweti tike tibe=i ḥt[epi] tadi tike m=ṣne Trqas tubidi se muhāi huwedri

> "(If) someone places tribute there or inters someone there, then Trqas and all the gods will strike him"

As in both examples, *me* is a clitic host when sentence-introductory and is therefore presumably stressed. To summarize, then, Lycian has the following five constructions with *me*:

(5.28)  
(a) *mē* + ...

(b) Definite NP + *mē* + Resumptive Pronoun + ...

(c) Indefinite NP + *mē* + ...

(d) Verb or Preverb + *me* + ...

(e) P with Clitic Pronoun + *me* + Resumptive Pronoun + ...

5.1.4. The Pragmatics of the Topic Construction

While the Lycian corpus does not exactly lend itself to a sophisticated discourse analysis, a brief consideration of the topic construction's synchronic function may illuminate its prehistory as well. This construction is attested in two discourse contexts: presentational focus and contrastive focus. The great majority of topicalized phrases are left-dislocated NPs, as in (5.2), (5.10-14), and perhaps (5.15), which invariably refer to funerary monuments and appear at the beginning of sepulchral inscriptions. The topicalized adverb
ebeli in (5.25) above has a similar function, but without clitic-doubling. Sentences with this discourse context would be paraphrased by English sentences like the following:

(5.29)  
\[ \begin{align*} 
 a & \text{ This tomb was built by so-and-so} \\
 b & \text{ In this sarcophagus are the mortal remains of so-and-so} \\
 c & \text{ Here lies so-and-so} 
\end{align*} \]

This specific context is one of presentational focus; more generally, it is well-known that fronting to the preverbal position in English verb-second sentences like (5.29a-c) marks functional topicalhood (in its discourse-analytic rather than syntactic sense). We may therefore assume that Lycian topicalization can function to identify discourse topics.

The Lycian topic construction is also used to mark contrastive focus. The four instances of the topicalized indefinite NP kbi tike "someone else" occur in this context:

(5.30)  
\[ \begin{align*} 
 & \text{se çe lati Ddaqasa m—one fitepi tâti ŋtipa tesi se ladâ ohbi kbi tike me-i nipe fitepi tâtu} \\
& \text{"And when Ddaqasa dies, they will inter him in the upper ŋtipa with his wife; let them not inter anyone else there"} 
\end{align*} \]

In these sentences, kbi tike is explicitly opposed to the legal tomb occupants. In another set of passages, topicalization of a verb, preverb, or indefinite has the force of English rising intonation with emphasis:

(5.31)  
\[ \begin{align*} 
 a & \text{ N 306.2-3} \\
 & \text{kbi : tike : me=ńte=ne : hrij=alahadi : tike : atlahi : tibe kbiyehi : hri=ńte me=i : alahadi : tike} \\
& \text{"Someone will not bury someone else on top (sc. of the legal occupant), (either) his own body or another's; if one does bury someone on top of him ..."} 
\end{align*} \]
b TL 57.7-8

[s]c=[ije]=n[e hrppi tā]ti tike | kbi : hrppije me=i : tadi : tike

"And they will not put someone else on top of him; if one does put someone on top of him ..."

c N 320.34-37

se=we=ne : xtađi : tike : ebine fitewq : mahāna : ebette : ebine : fitewq :
kumazi : ebehi : xttade mej=q : tike

"And nobody will (lit. someone will not) do harm, either to these gods or to this priest; if someone will have done harm ..."

d TL 88.4 (similarly TL 93.2-3)

tibe=i nipe hlmmi tuwetu hlmmi me=i tuweti tike

"Nor shall they put tribute here; (if) they do put tribute here ...

In these passages the contrast is not lexical, of course, but asseverative: in each case a positive is explicitly contrasted with a negative.\(^{12}\)

To judge from very impoverished evidence, the Lycian topic construction thus appears to identify discourse topics and mark contrastive focus. Clitic-doubling itself has no pragmatic function: it marks topics as definite, but topicalization with clitic-doubling and topicalization without it are isofunctional. This description of the function of Lycian topicalization is supported by comparative evidence. The Hittite particle \(ma\), whose Lycian cognate \(me\) characterizes the topic construction, has among its functions one which precisely matches a function of Lycian topicalization: it marks contrastive focus. For example, the indefinite İR-YA "a subject of mine" in (5.32), marked with \(ma\), contrasts explicitly with

---

\(^{12}\) As noted above, fronting a preverb has the pragmatic function associated with fronting a verb which lacks preverbs. Verb + Indefinite Object complexes, as in (5.31d), frequently function pragmatically like verbs rather than VPs. In its two remaining Lycian occurrences, the function of topicalization is unclear to me; see (5.20a-b) above.
1-\textit{an} DUMU-KA "one of your sons", just as \textit{kbi tilke} does with \textit{ene ... se laða ehbi} "him and his wife" in (5.30) above (see CHD 92-95 for this and further examples of this type).

(5.32) KBo 5.6 iii 10-14
\[
\text{män}=\text{wa}=\text{mu} \quad l\text{-an} \quad \text{DUMU-KA} \quad \text{paišti} \quad \text{man}=\text{war}=\text{aš}=\text{mu} \quad \text{LÜMUTI-YA} \\
\text{kišari} \quad \text{İR-YA}=\text{ma}=\text{wa} \quad \text{nuwan} \quad \text{parah} \quad \text{dahhi}
\]
"If you give me \textbf{one of your sons}, he would become my husband; I do not want to take a subject of mine"

The pragmatic functions of Lycian topicalization identified here are typologically quite natural. Compare for example the Japanese particle \textit{wa}, which marks "the theme [i.e. discourse topic] or the contrasted element of the sentence" (Kuno 1972: 270), or the Chichewa extraction process illustrated in (5.17) above. Bresnan & Mchombo (1987: 757-64) explicitly argue that extracted NPs in Chichewa are discourse topics; they may apparently also be used contrastively (see example 78 of Bresnan & Mchombo 1987: 774). Neither Chichewa extraction nor Japanese \textit{wa} marking is precisely comparable to Lycian topicalization, however, since Lycian evidently requires a selectional relation between verb and topic.

5.1.5. The Prehistory of Lycian \textit{me}

The origin of the Lycian topic construction is intimately related to the history of the particle \textit{me} which characterizes it. The comparison with its exact cognate \textit{ma} in Hittite suggests an Anatolian \textit{*mo,} since \textit{*o > e} and \textit{*a > a} in Lycian (Melchert 1990b). The additional comparison with Thessalian Greek \textit{má}, however, due to Hahn (1942: 100), seems to require specifically an Anatolian \textit{*moh₂} on the one hand and a Greek \textit{*meh₂} on the other hand, ultimately ablaut variants of the same stem. The Greek comparison is assured not only formally but semantically: \textit{má} has the function of Attic-Ionic \textit{dé} and thus approximately that of Hittite \textit{ma}, as illustrated in (5.33):
(5.33) IG 9.2.517 (Buck 1955: 221)

καθέμεν τὰμ μὲν ήμεν ἐν τῷ ἴδιῳ τοῖς Ἀπλοῦνοις ... τὰμ μᾶ ἄλλαν ἐν τῷ

ἀκρόπολιν

"(Two steles are) to be set down, the one in the temple of Apollo, the other

in the acropolis"

An additional important comparison is that between the Hittite and probably Luvian

asseverative adverb imma and Latin immo "rather, on the contrary"; see especially Melchert
(1985), with references to earlier literature. Melchert establishes that this comparison
makes formal and semantic sense, and that the Anatolian and Latin forms continue an

Indo-European form which he reconstructs as *id-mō, functioning already in Indo-European

as an asseverative adverb. This form in turn contains the emphasizing particle reflected in

Sanskrit by īḍ (and possibly Hittite and Luvian Ļu, according to Melchert 1985: 204-205),

followed by the ancestor of Hittite ma. I would therefore reconstruct specifically *id-moh₂;

since the form is orthotonic in all daughters it was almost certainly accented in

Indo-European. The comparison of Hittite imma and Latin immo thus indicates that *moh₂

was, at least in some contexts, unaccented in the proto-language. On the other hand, the

Lycian evidence discussed above clearly indicates that in some contexts in that language,

me < *moh₂ was accented. Since phonological clitics rarely or never acquire accent—as

would be the case here if *moh₂ had at any stage been exclusively atonic—whereas the loss

of accent by an originally tonic particle is a common development, it is necessary to

reconstruct both an accented *mōh₂ and an unaccented *moh₂ for Indo-European.

The original syntax of *moh₂ presents another problem: it could in principle have been

sentence-initial, or sentence-second in some sense, or both. In view of its Lycian syntax the

second possibility is unlikely: while the diachronic demotion of sentence-initial particles

has well-described parallels (see Hale 1987a: 157-61, 1990a), the promotion of obligatorily

second-position particles to sentence-initial position does not, and it is difficult to imagine

the mechanism of such a syntactic change. Either of the remaining two possibilities would
be quite natural, but the comparison of Hittite *imma and Latin *immo requires the third possibility in particular: Indo-European *moh₂ occurred both sentence-initially and in second position. This will prove to be consistent with its subsequent history in Anatolian and with the creation of the topic construction in Lycian.

The development of Indo-European *moh₂ conforms to the general diachronic framework elucidated by Hale (1990a) for Indo-European particles of this type. In this framework, such particles originate as ordinary lexical items like adverbs which by reason of their semantic value frequently or obligatorily occupy the TOP position. Like all such particles, these are semantically weakened over time, which ultimately causes the functional basis for their topicalization to become opaque. When it becomes sufficiently opaque, they are reanalyzed as no longer occupying the TOP position. The diachronic input to this reanalysis is a structure with a topicalized particle followed by clitics and the remainder of the sentence, and two reanalyses are common. In the first of these, the semantically weakened item is reanalyzed as a sentence-introductory, null-position element, which Wackernagel’s Law clitics follow because their position is phonologically determined. In the other possible reanalysis, the semantically weakened element is reanalyzed as following an empty TOP position, that is, as the head of the Wackernagel’s Law chain. These developments are schematized in (5.34):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(5.34)} & \quad \text{Source} \quad \text{TOP Particle + Clitics + ...} \\
& \quad \text{Reanalysis I} \quad \text{NULL Particle + Clitics (+ Empty TOP) + ...} \\
& \quad \text{Reanalysis II} \quad \text{(Empty TOP +) Particle + Clitics + ...}
\end{align*}
\]

The two possible reanalyses result in different positionings of TOP with respect to the demoted particle, either to its right or to its left. As a final stage in this process, the second reanalysis indicated can be followed by the reanalysis of second-position particles as markers of emphasis on certain topicalized constituents, which can in turn lead them to acquire the distribution of emphatic clitics generally, and to cease to occur always in sentence-second position.
The operation of these diachronic mechanisms can be illustrated by Indo-European *nā as described by Hale (1987a: 157-60, 1990a). This word originally meant "now" and was common in the sentence-initial TOP position, a meaning and function preserved in Indo-Iranian. Subsequently *nā was semantically weakened and syntactically demoted via one of the two reanalyses just described: Anatolian reanalyzed *nā as a null-position sentence-introductory particle, whereas Greek and secondarily Indo-Iranian reanalyzed it as a second-position particle. Since *nā was originally sentence-initial, its second-position reflexes in Greek and Indo-Iranian precede most other clitics. The final stage in the demotion of this Indo-European adverb is reflected in the Arcado-Cyprian Greek demonstrative ónu "this here", the result of univerbation of a particularly frequent sequence of topicalized pronoun and second-position particle.

The prehistory of the Lycian particle me is quite similar. Whatever its ultimate source, it had already in Indo-European acquired adverbial semantics as a result of which it was frequently or obligatorily topicalized. Also already in Indo-European, however, its semantic value was weakened to the extent that the functional motivation for its topicalization became opaque enough to cause a syntactic reanalysis. The specific reanalysis chosen was "Reanalysis II" in (5.34). Indo-European therefore had two surface sequences involving this particle: the one in (5.35a) in sentences with topicalization, and the one in (5.35b) in sentences without topicalization.

(5.35) a Topicalized Constituent + *mōh₂ + clitics + Sentence
    b *mōh₂ + clitics + Sentence

In both positions *mōh₂ must originally have been stressed. However, as argued above, an unstressed *mōh₂ must also be reconstructed for Indo-European. The only natural assumption is therefore is that a sound law operated already in Indo-European, destressing *mōh₂ in some context—probably in the context given in (5.35a). Thessalian Greek preserves the pattern in (5.35a) more or less intact, while elsewhere various secondary developments are reflected. The comparison of Anatolian imma and Latin immo indicates
that the final stage in this particle's demotion, in this case univerbation with *id, had already begun in Indo-European: in Latin the particle survives only in a synchronically opaque compound, while in Hittite, if the analysis suggested for ma in chapter 1 is correct, it has become an emaptic clitic. Note that Greek and Hittite (and of course Latin) eliminated any trace of the pattern given in (5.35b), and would by themselves lead to the reconstruction only of (5.35a). It is only the late and sparse testimony of Lycian which forces the reconstruction of the pattern in (5.36b) and of a sentence-initial, accented Indo-European particle. This pattern and particle were eliminated in Lycian's older and better-attested relatives.

The Lycian topic construction itself presents a further diachronic puzzle. The construction is typologically unexceptionable, as I have indicated above, but grammaticalized left-dislocation structures are certainly not common in Indo-European generally or Anatolian in particular. There are three possible explanations for the appearance of such a structure in Lycian: first, as suggested by McCone (1979: 475-80), they may somehow continue the clitic-doubling associated with right-dislocated NPs in Lycian and elsewhere in Anatolian (see below); second, they may somehow reflect the topicalization of sentence-internal, clitic-doubled NPs; or third, they may continue some other pre-existing left-dislocation structure. I will argue that only this third explanation can plausibly account for the features of the Lycian construction in question while doing justice to the comparative evidence and to our general understanding of the evolution of clitic-doubling systems. First, however, it will be necessary to review briefly some of the evidence for clitic-doubling in Anatolian.

5.2. Right-Dislocation in Cuneiform Luvian and Hittite

Right dislocation is not uncommon in Cuneiform Luvian and Hittite. I have collected examples systematically in the Old and Middle Hittite corpora listed in chapter 1 (but only sporadically in the later corpora), I have examined the Hittite and Luvian instances
presented by McCon (1979), reporting on his 1979 dissertation, and I have examined the
many examples of right dislocation in the Hittite Song of Ullikummi. Based on this
examination, it appears that the older cuneiform languages share with Lycian at least the
grammatical rule that end-topicalized core verbal arguments—subjects and objects—must
be clitic-doubled if possible (of course excluding postverbal elements positioned by Focus
Movement processes). By this I mean simply that clitic-doubling of end-topicalized
elements is not found with the subjects of transitive or unergative verbs. Examples of
end-topicalization follow. First, in the following Hittite sentences, the subjects of
unaccusative verbs are right-dislocated:

(5.36) a  Bo 86/299 iii 81-82
   n=at kurušaš ašanda dUTU ŠAME dUTU URU Arinna dU ŠAME ...
   "Let them be witnesses, the Sungod of Heaven, the Sungoddess of
   Arinna, the Stormgod of Heaven, ..."

b  KUB 33.102+ ii 17
   n=aš sarā tī[yat dKu]marbiš
   "He got up, Kumarbi"

c  KUB 17.7+ iv 14'
   kuiš=war=aš aši DUMU-aš
   "Who is he, this child?"

d  KUB 17.7+ iv 22'
   šallškizzi=ya=aš NAK/kunkunuzziš
   "He grew up, the Basalt (sc. monster)"

e  KUB 23.102 obv 7-8
   n=at kuit=ma Š4 HUR.SAC Ammana uwaunwar
   "But what is it, the review of Mt. Ammana?"

In the following sentences, direct objects are right-dislocated:
(5.37) a KBo 5.3+ i 16
pahši-ya-\textit{an} dUTU-ŠI
"And protect him, His Majesty"

b KUB 8.65 i 22
nahmi=\textit{an} MUŠIII[uyankuš]
"I fear them, the serpents"

c IBoT 2.109 ii 27-28
nu=\textit{an} iškišaz karapdu [IŠT]U EME.HI.A-ŠI=\textit{an} karapdu [idāl]u KAXU-\textit{iš} idālu[n [(E)]ME-\textit{an}
"Let him lift it from the back, and let him lift it from the tongues, the evil mouth, the evil tongue"

d KUB 26.1 iv 14
[(n-\textit{an})] Ṭē šannatti memian
"Don't conceal it, the matter"

Sentences like those in (5.36-37), with right-dislocated unaccusative subjects or transitive objects, are extremely common. It is somewhat more difficult to find clear cases where the subjects of transitive verbs are end-topicalized, but one example is given in (5.38):

(5.38) KUB 17.7+ iii 33'-34'
[\textit{em}=\textit{an} auši dIŠTAR-\textit{iš} URUNinuwaš MUNUS.LUGAL-aš
"Let her not see him, Ištar, queen of Nineveh"

I have seen no sentence in either Hittite or Luvian where the subject of an unergative verb is unambiguously end-topicalized, with or without clitic-doubling; the reason is probably that such sentences are typically difficult to distinguish from cases of verb topicalization. Still, it cannot be doubted that they lack clitic-doubling if they exist. In view of the frequency of end-topicalization in the Song of Ullikummi, the following sentence might exemplify this pattern, although it is of course formally ambiguous:
MGK 12 ii 5'
nu=za iššamiškizzi dištar-iš

"She sang, Ištar"

Finally, the sentences in (5.40-41), most cited by McCon 1979: 471-72, illustrate right-dislocation and end-topicalization in Cuneiform Luvian: (5.40) illustrates right-dislocated unaccusative subjects; (5.41) presents an end-topicalized transitive subject without clitic-doubling; and (5.42) illustrates right-dislocated transitive objects.

(5.40) a KUB 9.6+ ii 12-13

tāīn=tiy=āta mali aiyar u tapāruwa bīrūta tatarriyamma

"Let them become oil and honey, the curses, oaths, and maledictions"

b KUB 35.54 iii 26

a=ta halāl āšdu zā [p]arnanza

"Let it be pure, this house"

(5.41) a KUB 9.6+ ii 14-15

āšša=ti ēlhadu tappasantis tiyammantis

"Let them wash their own mouth, heaven and earth"

b KUB 35.54 iii 9-11

a=ta=tta pari patzadu MÁS.GAL-iš

"let it drive (?) them forth, the goat"

(5.42) a KUB 35.45 ii 21-24

kuiš=an ippatarrišatta EN SISKUR.SISKUR-aššin ... maššanallin

KASKAL-an

"Whoever soiled it, the celebrant ... the gods' route"
b KUB 35.45 ii 25-27
a=an tiyammaššis dUTU-Za darauiddu tatariyammanaššin hirutaššin
EN-an
"Let the Sungod of the Earth hand him over, the lord of malediction and perjury"

The same rule clearly operates in both Luvian and Hittite: end-topicalization of an unaccusative subject or a direct object requires clitic-doubling.

5.3. Intrasentential Clitic-Doubling in Hittite

I will show in this section that intrasentential clitic doubling is exceptionally rare in Hittite, although it evidently does exist. First, however, §§5.3.1-3 will discuss several constructions which look like clitic-doubling but are not.

5.3.1. Possessor Raising

The process of possessor raising creates a structure with two NPs, a possessor and a chômeur; on the traditional view that they are in apposition (and not derived via a process like possessor raising), it would be necessary to regard them as clitic-doubled on occasion. As far as I know, however, they do not form a surface constituent in any language where the process exists, as already indicated by the structural representation provided in §2.6.1: the raised possessor functions in all ways like a direct object, while the demoted element is syntactically inert. The raised possessor can thus freely be elicitized, as in the following examples and those in (2.61c), (2.62a), (2.75a), and (3.4-5):

(5.43) a KUB 44.61 iv 25'-26' (Medical ritual, CTH 461, ed. Burde 1974: 20)
    n=an hapurin EGIR-pa damašzi ... namma=an hapurin parâ huittiy[azi]
    "He presses his foreskin back ... Then he draws his foreskin forth"

b KUB 44.63 iiii 20'-21' (Medical ritual, CTH 461, ed. Burde 1974: 30)
    namma=an ândaz A-az [i]šahru šipanna(-)x[ ] arha ânašzi
    "Then he wipes off his tears and šipan with warm water"
KUB 7.1 i 39-40
n=an tuškkuš išgahhi
"I'll anoint its body-parts"

Since the two NPs in this construction are not base-generated in the same position—one is an underlying verbal argument, and one is a nominal possessor—and do not have the same thematic interpretation, they do not count as clitic-doubling.

5.3.2. Quantifier Float

The process of quantifier float discussed in §2.6.2 results in a surface structure with a QP headed by a quantifier whose complement is an NP. Cliticization is a process affecting NPs, and therefore the NP complement of a quantifier can freely be cliticized, stranding the quantifier:

(5.44) a KBo 3.22 obv 12
n=uš hūmanduš=p[at h]u[llanu]n
"I destroyed them all"

b KBo 2.5 i 16
n=an hūmandan epta
"He took it all"

c KUB 19.39 ii 1
n=aš humanza anda w[arreššešta]
"They all (sg.) hurried in to help"

d KBo 5.6 i 27
n=aš=za hūmanduš tarahhir
"They defeated them all"

e StBoT 24 ii 27
n=an hūman[(dan EGIR-pa ašešanunun)]
"I resettled them all"
KUB 9.6 ii 5ff

n=aš=kan hūmandus IŞTU KAxU-ŠU ueriškizzi

"He invokes them all with his mouth"

The same facts obtain mutatis mutandis in other languages. For example, while intrasentential clitic-doubling is not permitted in English, it does appear to exist with quantifiers:

(5.45) a They defeated 'em all

b They gave 'em all their just desserts

In Hittite this process is evidently not restricted to quantifiers per se, but operates more generally for numerals:

(5.46) KUB 13.4 ii 46ff (Instructions to priests and palace servants, CTH 264)

nu=š<ma>š=at 2-aš=pat SAG.DU-aš UGše-tar 2-uš=pat=at akkandu

"Let just the two of them be liable to the death penalty; let just the two of them die"

5.3.3. Other Cases of Clitic-Doubling

There are a variety of other configurations in which two coreferential NPs can occur which nevertheless do not amount to doubling. Among these are cases where, because of verbal subcategorization or some other factor, the two NPs have distinct thematic relations. The most obvious configuration of this type is naturally with double-object verbs. If the first object of such a verb cliticizes, this can result in a structure where a clitic is coreferential with a tautosential NP. Examples include the following:

(5.47) a KBo 4.4 iv 27

n=an=zan ERÌN.MEŠ ANŠE.KUR.R[A.HI.A] iyanun

"I made them [grammatically singular] my soldiers and wagon-fighters"

b KBo 4.4 iv 57-58

n=an=zan ABU-YA [LŪH]ATĀNA iyat

"My father made him his son-in-law"
KUB 19.25: 5
nu-tta LÚSANCA iyau[en]
"We made you a priest"

Somewhat similar are the following sentences:

(5.48) a  StBoT 24 i 17
nu=mu[(u ABU)]-YA DUMU-an šarā dāš
"My father took me up when I was a child"

b  KBo 6.29 i 7-8
nu=mu kappin=pat DUMU-an dمشاركة URUGŠamuha ANA ABU-YA uēkta
"Istar of Šamuha requested me of my father when I was only a small child"

c  KBo 4.12 obv 5-6
ANA PANI ABU-YA=mu kappin DUMU-an HUL-lu GIG GIG-at
"In my father's time illness sickened me badly when I was a small child"

d  KBo 6.3 ii 28
n=an LÚantiyanant epzi
"He takes him as a son-in-law"

e  StBoT 24 i 9-11
ABU-YA=mmaš=za mMuršiliš 4 DUMU.HI.A mHalpašulupin
mNIR.GÁL-in mHattušilin fDINGIR.MEŠ.IR.-inn=a
DUMU.([MUNUS-an]) ḫašta
"My father Muršili bore us as (his) 4 children: Halpašulpi, Muwatalli, Hattušili, and a daughter Maššanauzzi"

Here the accusative NPs do not share the thematic roles of their apparently doubling clitics:
(5.48a) is not "my father took up me, a/the child"; (5.48b) is not "Istar requested me, a/the small child"; (5.48c) is not "illness sickened me, a/the small child"; (5.48d) is not "he takes
him, a/the son-in-law"; and (5.48e) is arguably not "my father bore us, four children". In (5.48a-c) the accusatives DUMU-an "a boy" and kappin DUMU-an "a small boy" are in fact depictive NPs, and in (5.48d) Lûantiyanan "a son-in-law" is a resultative NP; all three are predicated of their direct objects. Compare the following English sentences cited by Roberts (1988: 704):

(5.49)  

a  DEPICTIVE: John drank the beer flat  
b  RESULTATIVE: John hammered the metal flat  

In (5.48e), the long noun phrase 4 DUMU.HI.A ... "four children, ..." may plausibly be interpreted, not simply as opposed to the direct object nnaš "us", but as a kind of depictive complement predicated of the direct object.

The following sentences also do not contain clitic-doubling:

(5.50)  

IBoT 1.36 iii 41-50  

GIŠPA.HI.A-uwanteš-ma-at EÇIR-anda ÛL pänzi ... n-at  

GIŠPA-uwanteš EÇIR-anda ÛL pâ[nzi] GIŠŠUKUR.HI.A=za tanzi  

"But they do not walk behind carrying spears ... They do not walk behind carrying spears; they take lances"

Jakob-Rost (1966: 195) translates "die Stabträger gehen nicht hinterher", but in fact the nominative GIŠPA(HLA)-uwanteš may instead be interpreted as a circumstantial NP predicated of the subject. Compare the following English sentence cited from Roberts (1988: 704):

(5.51)  

CIRCUMSTANTIAL: John left the room happy  

There are a few miscellaneous classes of non-clitic-doubling which may be identified briefly. In sentences like the following, the clitic (here an) and coreferential NP (here the accusative participle akkantan "dead") are embedded subject and predicate respectively:

---

13 Note that all these English translations require emphatic object pronouns.
(5.52) KUB 13.35+ iii 17
ammuk = war = an akkantan IQBI
"He told me he was dead"

In sentences like the following, the clitic (here *mu*) may be interpreted as the direct object and the coreferential NP (here *dUTU-ŠI BELI-YA"my lord His Majesty") as a vocative:

(5.53) KUB 14.1+ rev 13
nu = wa = mu kuwapi *dUTU-ŠI BELI-YA* lāhha halzišatti
"When you call me to war, O my lord His Majesty ..."

In some cases, like the following, the appearance of clitic-doubling is presented by what may be taken as a misinterpretation:

(5.54) IBoT 1.36 i 3 (Guard protocol, CTH 262, ed. Jakob-Rost 1966: 174)
n= at *LŪ.MEŠI.DU₈-aš LŪ.MEŠ.KISAL.LUH-aš pīr[an p]ānzi
"Die Pförtner <und> die Vorhofswäscher geh[en vor]auf" (Jakob-Rost 1966: 175)
"They go in front of the porters and court cleaners"

Another possible case of misinterpretation is the following:

(5.55) KBo 27.42 i 29-42 (K.I.L.A.M festival, CTH 627, ed. Singer 1984: 55)
GAL DUMU.MEŠ.É.GAL=ma = an kattanismun par[ā] ēp̣zi
nu = za LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL ŠU.HLA-ŠU[N][U] āṛsanzi
"The chief of the palace attendants holds out the linen cloth, and the king and queen wipe their hands"

Singer (1984: 124) quite reasonably takes *an* here as the clitic pronoun. The idiom *parā ep-* "hold out" is nowhere else construed with a clitic object in the K.I.L.A.M festival, however, and, as Craig Melchert notes (p.c.), it may be possible to understand *an* as the Old Hittite adverbial clitic of the same shape (see Otten & Souček 1969: 81-82 and Josephson 1972: 340). This particle's apparent directional function would probably be appropriate in
context: "the chief of the palace attendants holds out the linen cloth (sc. toward the king and
queen)". Compare the following passages cited by Otten and Souček (1969: 81-82):

(5.56) a KBo 17.3+ iii 29-30 (Ritual for the royal couple, CTH 416, ed. Neu 1980a:
16)
ug=a[(n kē)] hūmandâ [a]nda pētahhe
"I bring in all the following ..."

b KBo 17.1+ i 20 (Ritual for the royal couple, CTH 416, ed. Neu 1980a: 6)
[n]=e=n kiššari=šmi dāi
"He puts them in their hand"

In one instance a manuscript error may be assumed. Thus Güterbock (1951: 160) notes
for dU-aš in the following sentence: "Erasure; in view of na-aš, dU-aš might be considered
as deleted".

(5.57) KUB 17.7+ iv 55' (Song of Ullikummi, ed. Güterbock 1951)
[n]=aš dU-aš dUTU-i EGIR-pa memiškiwan dāiš
"He (the Stormgod) began to reply to the Sungod"

It is also possible that a textual problem lies behind the following example of
clitic-doubling:

(5.58) KBo 6.34+ iii 5-11 (Military oath, ed. Oettinger 1976: 12)
nu=wa=kan [(k)]uš ANA LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL HUL-lu takkiš[i] ...
n=an=kan DUMU.LÚ.U₁⁹.LU QADU D[AM.MEŠ-ŠU DUMU.ME]Š-ŠU
pankuršt ištarn[a arha harn]inkandu
"Whoever does evil to the king and queen ... let them (i.e. the oath-divinities)
destroy him — the person — right through, together with his wives, his
children, (and his) descendants"

Compare the very similar construction in (4.79c) above, where, however, SAG.DU.MEŠ
appears in place of DUMU.LÚ.U₁⁹.LU here. The latter ideogram is used a second time in
the same text as that of (5.58):
(5.59) KBo 6.34+ 34-35 (Military oath, ed. Oettinger 1976: 12)
nu apel Ř-ZU IŠTU DUMU.LÚ.U₁₉.LU GU₄.HIA-ŠU UDU.HIA-ŠU
QATAMMA šannapilešdu

"Let his house likewise become empty of people, cattle, and sheep"

In view of this parallel I therefore suggest emending (5.58) to read n=an=kan QADU DUMU.LÚ.U₁₉.LU D[AM.MEŠ-ŠU ... "let them destroy him together with his people, (namely) his wives, his children, his descendants". If this proves unsatisfactory, then of course (5.58) can be added to the few apparently genuine cases of clitic-doubling cited below.

There is also one case of apparent clitic-doubling which could perhaps instead be taken as evidence for a new double object construction:

(5.60) KBo 17.1+ i 6' (Ritual for the royal couple, CTH 416, ed. Neu 1980a: 5)
partuuni=un ŠUGAL-un MUNUS.LUGAL-ann=a Šaškizzi

"With the wing he seats them, the king and queen"

The Hittite verb ašš- "seat" is frequently used with the specific meaning "seat (on the throne)", "seat (as king)", "install", and is in this respect somewhat like English crown. This meaning of ašš- was noticed by Sommer & Falkenstein (1938: 32-33) in connection with the following:

(5.61) a  KUB 1.16+ ii 37-38 (Testament of Hattušili I, CTH 6, ed. Sommer &
Falkenstein 1938: 7)
[klasma mMuršiliš DUMU-Y[4 nu=]za ap[un šekten nu=]šan apun
aššste[n]

"Behold my son Muršili! Recognize him! 'Seat' him!"

b  KUB 1.16+ iii 44 (Testament of Hattušili I, CTH 6, ed. Sommer &
Falkenstein 1938: 14)
[nu=šš]an mPapahdilmaha aššer

"They 'seated' Papahdilmaha"
For additional examples see Sommer & Falkenstein (1938: 68) and HW^2 387. I suggest that the verb ašš- is in fact even more like English *crown* in that it optionally occurs with a second object; like *crown*, ašš- would have some originally ceremonial reference but, in addition, a metaphorical use. On this view, (5.60) could be interpreted as "with the wing he 'seats' them as king and queen". Of course, since the ceremonial reference of ašš- would have been different from that of *crown*, its metaphorical significance would be different too; in particular, it might not signify ascension to the throne, as *crown* does, but simply some ceremonial activity or status.

Despite the existence of the preceding types of merely apparent clitic-doubling, there is no obvious way to avoid interpreting sentences like those in (5.62) as sentences with actual clitic-doubling, that is, a coreferential clitic and NP which evidently have the same θ-role and underlying syntactic position. This accords with the observation of Kammenhuber (1969: 200) that proleptic direct objects are occasionally attested from Old Hittite on.

(5.62) a  
KBo 3.28 ii 19' (Palace chronicle fragments, CTH 9)

š=an ašš=miš m\textsuperscript{m}Kizzuwan natta huenu

"My father didn't let him — Kizzuwa — run"

b  
IBoT 1.36 i 5 (Guard protocol, CTH 262, ed. Jakob-Rost 1966: 174)

\textsuperscript{4}GīR.GA\textsuperscript{L} H.I.\textsuperscript{A}-šš\textsuperscript{U} = ma = at = kan parā ney [ant] eš

"And they — their swords — are drawn"

c  
KBo 16.47 obv 6'-7' (Preimperial treaty, CTH 28, ed. Otten 1967: 56)

maḥhaan = ma = at = mu ANA dUTU-šš\textsuperscript{I} [ašš] aušš n = uš apiniššan maniyyahhišškimi

"As they are good to me — His Majesty — so I will command them"

d  
KUB 44.63 ii 7'-8' (Medical ritual, CTH 461, ed. Burde 1974: 28)

nu = šš = kaššar arha tarna maḥhaan = ma = at = šš = kan iššar arha tarna

"He lets blood off from him. When he lets it — the blood — off from him ..."
KUB 6.41 i 40-41 (Kupanta-<sup>d</sup>LAMMA treaty, CTH 68, ed. Friedrich 1926: 110)

\text{mpES.TUR-nas=ma=za=kan waldul kuit uskizzi nu=mu=za=kan namma}

\text{[UTU-ŠI] mimmaš n=as=mu piran arha piddaš}

"But because Mašhuiuwa recognized his transgression, he accordingly rejected me—His Majesty—and he fled away before me"

If there were only one or two cases of this type, it would be possible to attribute them to scribal error—in other words, to assume that clitic-doubling per se was unacceptable in the ordinary language and that the doubled NP was added in copying to clarify the reference of a clitic pronoun. The number of examples in (5.62) does not seem to permit this, however, and this list could probably be augmented by a more complete collection.

It is nevertheless quite difficult to say anything about this phenomenon. In many languages, including English, prolepsis of this type is completely unacceptable: pronouns can be the hosts or targets of apposition, but must in that case be stressed, while emphatic pronouns are used only in contexts where their reference is clear and no additional information (like apposition) is added. Since the evidence discussed in §4.2.1.5 suggests that Hittite possessive pronouns behave in just this way, the evidence of (5.62) is quite surprising. It is true that there are other contexts where clitic-doubling clearly exists in Hittite, but they are strikingly different from this one. First, in the Old Hittite pleonastic genitive construction discussed in §4.2.2, possessive NPs are doubled by suffixed possessive pronouns, and second, in the late Neo-Hittite pleonastic construction mentioned in note 1 of chapter 3, subject and object clitics are doubled. Unlike the construction of (5.62), however, both of these other constructions are quite common in texts composed while they were productive, and the pleonastic genitive construction at least has a determinable
function. By contrast, the construction of (5.62) is rare at all stages of Hittite, and it is
difficult to see what linguistic function it might have. Nevertheless we must accept it, for the
moment, in any descriptive typology of Hittite syntactic phenomena.

5.4. Left-Dislocation in Hittite

Left-dislocation is also quite rare in Hittite: I have again collected evidence
systematically only from the Old and Middle Hittite texts in my corpus, as well as
anecdotally, and have identified only a few cases of left-dislocation. This construction has a
more obvious pragmatic interpretation, however, and I am therefore less reluctant to
attribute it to Hittite. Compare the following English sentences:

(5.63) a As for John, he'll be here soon
      b Artichokes, I don't like 'em much

I take it that syntactic structures of this type are determined by certain (possibly restricted)
discourse contexts; since they are permissible in many languages, there is no reason to
expect them to be absent from Hittite.

The first type of left-dislocation attested in Hittite is actually relatively common, and is
illustrated in (5.64):

(5.64) a KBo 21.20 i 25'-26' (Medical ritual, ed. Burde 1974: 44)
    ... LUDU pankur zamankur UN-aš šēur [ ... GA.]KIN.AG=pat NA4KA nu ki
dapian šaminuzi
    "... sheep fat, milk, beard, human urine ... cheese, KA-stone: all these he
burns"

14 In the same way clitic-doubling is also quite frequent in modern languages with productive clitic-doubling
systems, such as various Romance languages.
b KUB 12.58 iii 12ff
[mu=]kan GIŠGA.ZUM.H.LA GIŠšarran pittar TÚG.GÚ.È.[A GEš
TÚG.GADA.DA]M GEš kuit=ši=ššan kuit anda ėš[ta]

"The combs, the brush?, the wing, the black shirt, the black gaiters:

anything at all which was due to him . . ."

c KUB 19.49 i 43ff (Manapa-dU treaty)
[mu=wa N]AM.RA.MEŠ KUR URUMirā N[AM.RA.M]EŠ URUGIŠ.PA-ti
[našma=ka]n NAM.RA.MEŠ KUR URUA[rra]wa=mu=kan kuiss
[parrand]a uwanza

"The deportees of Mirā, the deportees of Hatti, or the deportees of Arzawa:

any people at all who have come over to me . . ."

This type presumably has the pragmatic function of its counterparts in many languages,
including English:

\[(5.65)\] Raindrops on roses and whiskers on kittens, ..., warm woollen mittens, ...

these are a few of my favorite things

Somewhat less common is left-dislocation involving a single word. This type is plainly
determined by different factors from the type in (5.64-65), since it lacks the list-like
character of the latter. It may be illustrated by (5.66-68)

\[(5.66)\] KBo 6.25 + KBo 13.35 iii 3'-4' (Oracle, CTH 540, ed. Riemschneider 1970:
22)

takku SAL-za nasi n=as taswanza EN È [AN]A? ZAG=aš=(š)ta UL ari

"If a woman gives birth and it is blind, the lord of the house, he will not
reach the right side (i.e. prosperity)"
StBoT 24 iv 73-74 (Apology of Hattušili III, CTH 80, ed. Otten 1981: 28)

"... and they will fill the vessel. As for Ištar, she is my divinity, and they will make libations to her as Ištar the Exalted"

KBo 20.26+ obv 18' (CTH 649, ed. Neu 1980a: 90)

"As for the hāpieš-people, already they are dancing"

KUB 23.68+ rev 11-14

"As for Ehalte, a man of Išmirga, beyond Kizzuwatna his city is Zazlippa ... as for — i, a man of Išmirga, in Kizzuwatna his city is Waššuganna; as for Warlawaziti, a man of Išmirga, his city is Ziyaziya"

KBo 17.3+ iv 25-26 (Ritual for the royal couple, CTH 416, ed. Neu 1980a: 17)

"As for the harpa, one set lies at the foot of the king, one set lies at the foot of the queen"
b  KBo 17.11 + i 36'-38' (Storm ritual, CTH 631, ed. Neu 1980a: 65)
LÚ.MEŠ GIŠBANŠUR LÚ.MEŠMUHALDIM [30 harši(n karpanzi
haršiya)l(li=ma)] 2-e apiya 15 haršiš GE₆ kit[t[a apiya=ya 15 haršiš] GE₆
(kitta ud)]anzi

"The waiters and cooks carry thirty breads. As for storage vessels, they
bring two—here lie 15 black breads, and here lie 15 black breads"

The sentences in (5.66-68) are arranged as follows: the emphatic clitic ma does not occur
in those in (5.66); in (5.67), ma occurs within the sentence proper; and in (5.68), ma marks
the left-dislocated NP. The pragmatic function of this construction, incidentally, is rather
like that of correlative and relative clauses: the relative clause behaves like the
left-dislocated NP in (5.66-68), although in neither case would we want to posit actual
syntactic movement from within the sentence to some extraposed position. A typical
correlative-relative clause pair is the following:

(5.69)  KUB 13.4 i 17-18
kuides=za DINIGR.MEŠ-aš ZI-an ÑÍTE-ann=an [śak]kanzi n=aš apāš
cēšandu

"Whoever knows the gods' soul and body, let him prepare them"

I conclude that left-dislocation was a feature of Hittite; since it has a straightforward
function and is paralleled in many languages, it was also probably acceptable in Anatolian
as well under the appropriate discourse-determined conditions. In fact, I see no reason to
doubt that this construction was present in Indo-European, in view of sentences of the
following Old Irish type (cited by Watkins 1976: 309):

(5.70)  Fergus Mac Léti
Loch Rudraige fil it chrích ní-dechais foí

"As for Lake Rudraige which is in your territory, you shall not go under it"
5.5. The Origin of the Lycian Topic Construction

I have now reviewed some of the comparative evidence relevant to determining the source of the Lycian topic construction. The three possible accounts of its origin are, to repeat, first, that it continues right-dislocation in some way, second, that it continues intrasentential topicalization in some way, and third, that it continues left-dislocation in some way. I will argue for the third of these accounts, but I will first briefly discuss my reasons for rejecting the other two.

A version of the first account was presented by McCone (1979: 475-80). It must be assumed on any theory that Lycian inherited a system of right-dislocation like the Hittite and Luvian one, in which end-topicalization of subjects and objects was accompanied by clitic-doubling. This first account, then, must posit a reanalysis in the prehistory of Lycian such that the clitic-doubling associated with end-topicalization was extended to topicalization proper. At least two specific reanalyses could be proposed to this end: first, the rule that end-topicalization required clitic-doubling could have been reanalyzed as a rule that any extraction—topicalization as well as end-topicalization—required clitic-doubling; or second, the rule of topicalization could have been reanalyzed as a rule affecting end-topicalized constituents as well as intrasentential ones. This second reanalysis would have allowed end-topicalized constituents, which were obligatorily clitic-doubled, to be topicalized themselves, resulting in apparent topicalization with clitic-doubling. Subsequently, on this view, some rule levelling would have resulted in the Lycian system as it is attested.

Neither of these particular versions of the first diachronic account of the Lycian topic construction is at all plausible. The first version assumes an innovation such that some (presumably definite) topicalized constituents came to be obligatorily clitic-doubled. However, since the diachronic input to this reanalysis would have included no instances of topicalization with clitic-doubling and many instances of topicalization without
clitic-doubling, it is difficult to see how such an innovation could have occurred. The second version is equally problematic: it assumes an extension of the topicalization process to end-topicalized constituents, but, again, in the absence of any pre-existing left-dislocation, the extreme frequency of topicalization without clitic-doubling would have precluded this extension.

The second diachronic account of the Lycian topic construction does not involve the inherent paradoxes of the first one. As Mark Hale observes (p.c.), this account would assume that Lycian inherited intrasentential clitic-doubling in some function, and that like all other intrasentential NPs, clitic-doubled NPs could be topicalized. Subsequently the pragmatic functions of topicalization and intrasentential clitic-doubling could be assumed to have at least partially collapsed, allowing the two structures ultimately to collapse formally as well. In my view, the disadvantage of this account is that while intrasentential clitic-doubling must, as indicated above, be allowed for in Hittite at least, and perhaps in Luvian too, it is quite rare, and its possible pragmatic function is entirely unclear. Since, as I will argue, there is another source for the Lycian topic construction, which is typologically natural as well, it should not be necessary to appeal to the uncertain construction exemplified in (5.62).

On the third account, the Lycian topic construction originated via the diachronic "capture" of left-dislocated NPs of the type illustrated for Hittite in (5.66-68), for Old Irish and Latin in (5.70), and for English in (5.63). As in many languages, such NPs may have been intonationally marked in some way—for instance, as in English, by an intonational break. Using a comma to indicate this, the set of Indo-European patterns in (5.35) may be expanded as follows:

\[(5.72)\]
\[
a \quad \text{Left-Dislocated NP, TOP} + \text{*mōh}_2 + \text{clitics} + \text{Sentence}
\]
\[
b \quad \text{TOP} + \text{*mōh}_2 + \text{clitics} + \text{Sentence}
\]
\[
c \quad \text{*mōh}_2 + \text{clitics} + \text{Sentence}
\]
\[
d \quad \text{Left-Dislocated NP, *mōh}_2 + \text{clitics} + \text{Sentence}
\]
Assuming, as already indicated to account for the comparison of Anatolian *imma* and Latin *immo*, that *mōh₂* was destressed in Indo-European in the contexts of (5.72a-b)\(^{15}\), and putting aside (5.72a), which does not survive, pre-Lycian would have inherited the following constructions:

\begin{align*}
(5.73) & \quad \text{a} & \text{Tōp + *me + clitics + Sentence (< 5.72b)} \\
& \quad \text{b} & \text{*mé + clitics + Sentence (< 5.72c)} \\
& \quad \text{c} & \text{Left-Dislocated NP, *mé + clitics + Sentence (< 5.72d)}
\end{align*}

The pattern of (5.73b) is straightforwardly continued in Lycian, and is not relevant to the evolution of the topic construction. The patterns in (5.73a) and (5.73c) are continued in Lycian by verb and preverb topicalization and definite NP topicalization respectively: as outlined in (5.28), the former is associated with unstressed *me* and no clitic-doubling, and the latter with stressed *mé* and clitic-doubling.

In other words, on this account, sentences like the Lycian one in (5.74a) and the Hittite one in (5.74b), in which sentence-initial preverbs are followed by unstressed *me* or *ma*, are diachronically both continuations of the pattern in (5.35a) and (5.72b).

(5.74) \quad \text{a} & \quad \text{N 306.3} \\
& \quad \text{hri=nite=me=i : alahadi : tike} \\
& \quad "(If) one does bury someone on top of him ..." \\
& \quad \text{b} & \quad \text{KUB 17.7+ iv 18-19} \\
& \quad \text{IGI-anda=ma=wa=[sši (k)]än N4=kununuz<zi>n tarpanallin šalla[nut]} \\
& \quad "\text{He raised up against him this Basalt (sc. monster) as a supplanter}"

Verb topicalization structures are also cognate in the two languages. The critical step in the development of the Lycian system was the reanalysis of the pattern of (5.73c) as a syntactically-driven topicalization structure rather than a discourse-driven left-dislocation.

\(^{15}\) The context in (5.72d) would not have triggered this destressing rule, since the special intonational features associated with left-dislocation would have led *mōh₂* to be treated as phonologically sentence-initial.
one; this may in turn be attributed either to a loss of the intonational break before *mé, or to a functional collapse of (5.73c) with ordinary definite NP topicalization around *me, or to both. Essentially similar developments have been suggested for several Romance languages: they may in general be called "grammaticalization" or "syntacticization" of discourse structures, somewhat like the better-known process of morphologization of syntactic structures. The capture of originally extra-sentential material in this case may also be compared to the widespread process by which originally coordinate relative clauses are captured and syntactically subordinated.

If this account is correct, Lycian must have reanalyzed left-dislocated NPs as topicalized only when they were followed by *mé. However, this is not surprising given the anaphoric function of me in Lycian and its distribution when synchronically sentence-initial: as in (5.27b) and (5.30) above, sentence-initial me regularly conjoins two clauses if the first is syntactically or semantically dependent on the second. It is plausible that pre-Lycian sentence-initial *mé was frequent after left-dislocated NPs, explaining its obligatory presence in Lycian's only grammaticalized left-dislocation structure; an equivalent assumption will in any case be necessary on any account.

Since the discourse phenomenon under discussion is limited to definite NPs, the Lycian topic construction with clitic-doubling will originally have been limited to definite NPs. At some stage, then, Lycian possessed all the following types of fronting around *me:

(5.75)  
\begin{align*}
a & \quad \text{Definite NP + *mé + Resumptive Pronoun + ...} \\
b & \quad \text{Definite NP + *me + ...} \\
c & \quad \text{Indefinite NP + *me + ...} \\
d & \quad \text{Other constituents + *me + ...}
\end{align*}

The original locus of the topic construction was (5.75a), while (5.75b-d) continue inherited topicalization patterns. Subsequent syntactic levelling created the attested Lycian system: first, the use of stressed mé was extended to all NP topics, perhaps in part because of a weak functional contrast between the patterns in (5.75a) and (5.75b); and second, the use of
clitic-doubling was extended to all referentially definite topics. These fairly straightforward changes together eliminated (5.75d), and resulted in the attested Lycian topic construction.

### 5.6. The Lycian Nasal Preterite

The preceding sections may cast some light on a morphological problem. There is a well-known alternation in the Lycian verbal system between preterites ending in a nasalized vowel and those ending in a non-nasalized vowel, such as aça "I made" vs. axa, ade "s/he made" vs. ade, and prīnawate "s/he built" vs. prīnawate. Note that whatever its origin, it is not necessary to assume that this alternation was always restricted to the preterite, since virtually all present verbs end in a high vowel, and Lycian has no nasalized high vowels. Several scholars have tried to make sense of the alternation between nasal and non-nasal preterites, but the most successful descriptive account is still that of Imbert (1896: 217). Imbert noticed the contrast between the very common type of (5.2) and (5.10) above and the not infrequent sentences like the following:

(5.76) TL 133

Xātlapa-ne : prīnawate : Perikle : mahinaza : Epītibazah | tideimi

"Xātlapa, mahinaza of Perikle, son of Epītibaza, built it"

According to "Imbert's Rule" (recast in modern terms), if a sentence has the word order Preterite Verb + Subject, it will have both a nasal preterite and direct object clitic-doubling (as in [5.2], [5.10], and now [5.13] and [5.14b]), while if it has the word order Subject + Preterite Verb, it will have neither clitic-doubling nor a nasal preterite (as in [5.76]). This description is in fact fairly accurate (but see now [5.9], [5.78d-e], and TL 28.1). Its defect is that it does not attempt to describe the conditioning for either clitic-doubling or preterite nasalization, and it therefore cannot possibly lead to an explanation of them. Imbert's Rule describes their conditioning only in sentences with preterite verbs and overt subjects, but clitic-doubling is common in sentences without preterite verbs, while neither clitic-doubling
nor a nasal preterite requires an overt subject. The surface position of the subject therefore cannot be directly relevant to either phenomenon.  

I will argue, following a suggestion of Craig Melchert (p.c.), that the nasalization of the Lycian nasal preterites is a reflex of the accusative common-gender clitic pronoun *om > ɛ. These preterites, in my view, originated as Verb + Clitic sequences which were reanalyzed as complex verbs with optional object agreement somewhat like the object agreement found in Bantu and illustrated above. This is typologically a straightforward mechanism for the creation of such object agreement systems, and if it operated in Lycian, it raises a question with important Indo-European implications. The two possible sources of a Verb + Clitic sequence are verb-initial sentences, in which elitics follow the verb as usual by Wackernagel's Law, and sentences in which pronominal clitics appear cliticized to the verb rather than in second position. Sentences of the latter type are attested in Indo-Iranian, where they are an important archaism, as argued by Hale (1987: chapter 3). It is possible that the Lycian nasal preterites reflect a similar syntactic archaism.

On my account, the original locus of preterite nasalization was verbs with common-gender direct object clitics. After their creation, however, they must have been extended secondarily to their attested distribution, which, as I will show, differs from their original distribution. Synchronously, Lycian preterite nasalization marks all verbs with

---

16 Meriggi (1928: 151-82) suggested as a historical explanation for Imbert's Rule that the Lycian preterite, somewhat like a Romance past participle, was originally a non-finite form which agreed with a preceding lexical direct object. This account is obviously untenable today, and in any case leaves far too many unexplained preterites (both nasal and non-nasal). Other proposals are no better: there is no support for Thomsen's view (1922: 394 [1899: 33-34]) that the nasal preterite has any aspe cural function, while Laroche's statement (1979: 87-88) that the alternation between nasal and non-nasal preterite is purely graphic is clearly an act of desperation. Likewise, Carruba's attempt (1984: 65) to connect Lycian preterite nasalization to other "unmotivated" nasalization in Luvo-Lycian proceeds from the explicit assumption that nasal and non-nasal preterites in Lycian are isostructural. As I will show, they are not.
non-lexical structural objects—in other words, verbs with clitic or null structural objects (although their understood objects may be lexical, as in [5.2] above). One consequence of this is that only logically transitive verbs—never intransitives—should have nasal preterites.

Since definite phrases extracted from S are obligatorily clitic-doubled, my analysis predicts that the distribution of nasal preterites will approximate closely that of clitic direct object pronouns and (less closely) that of extracted (e.g. topicalized) direct objects. This is of course true; as already noticed by Imbert, extremely many nasal preterites co-occur with direct object clitics. The most obvious instances are of the type illustrated in (5.2), (5.10), and (5.13-14) above. In fact, every preterite with a topicalized direct object is nasalized; there are over a hundred in all. Nasal preterites with clitic direct objects but no topicalization appear in (5.5a) above and in (5.77); note in (5.5a) the secondary extension of the nasal preterite to mark verbs with non-common-gender direct objects.

(5.77) a TL 52.1-2

s=ɛ pijɛte Wazijeje se=ɛni

"And they gave it to Wazije and (his) mother"

b TL 114.2

se=i=ne : epɛ : pnu̯te

"And afterwards they engraved (?) it for him"

There are also, as predicted, many (over forty) non-nasal preterites like the following which occur in sentences without clitic pronouns:

(5.78) a TL 40a = 40b


"Pajawa Manaxine built this building"

b TL 48.6-8

se=tideimi : Padrmmahe | Xudiwazade : epenɛtijatte | Padrmma

"And Xudiwazade, child of Padrmma, acted as sales agent for Padrmma"
c TL 150.3-4
prānawate=ti : ŋatatā : alli : chbi
"... who built the sarcophagus for himself"

d N 320.1-2
čeke : Trmmisfī : xssaθrapazate : Pigesere : Katamla : tideimi
"... when Pigesere, child of Katamla, ruled Lycia"

e Arboinas II 3 (Laroche 1979: 71)
çṭi atrā pude Erb[bina]

"Erbbina engraved (?) the image above"

The Object + Verb word order of the last two examples is of course not the same as topicalization around me, and does not trigger preterite nasalization. Note in (5.78b) the non-nasal preterite of one of Lycian's few preterite intransitive verbs, openčiţiatte "acted as sales agent". In addition, although the three present verbs which do not end in a high vowel happen not to display final nasalization, they pattern like non-nasal preterites: at TL 9.3, pije "he will pay" is followed by its direct object alaladahali "the burial fee"; and ube "dedicates" at TL 44c.13-14 and erįje (meaning unknown) at TL 29.7, both in unclear contexts, lack clitic objects.

There are several sentences in which nasal preterites do not co-occur with clitic object pronouns because of independent rules of Lycian grammar which allow such pronouns to be omitted. These sentences all involve sentential subordination, and they confirm that Lycian preterite nasality marks verbs whose structural objects may be null pronouns rather than overt lexical NPs or clitic pronouns. Most sentences of this type include nasal preterites with postposed or embedded relative clauses:

(5.79) a TL 87.4-5
me=i=ph : pudę : tı=nıte | xahba : [eh]bi : Wazzije : kbatra

"Afterwards his grandchild, daughter of Wazzije, engraved (?) here what (is) inside"
b N 320.11-12
se=i=pijetç : arawá : ebbijê : esi=ti
"And they gave to him freely what is his"

c N 320.14-15
me=xbaite : zá : ese=Xesfitedi : qatati : se=Pigrçi
"They irrigated (?) the allotment both Xesfitedi and Pigrçi till"17

d N 320.22-24
se=waj=aitê : kumaha : qti sttali : ppuweti : kmmê : ebêhi : xütawahaha :
Xędêñahá : se RKKzumahá
"And they made sacred to the lord of Kaunos and to ArKKazuma however
much they engrave (?) on this stele"

The understood object of each verb here is an NP within the relative clause—ti "what" in
(5.79a-b), zá "the allotment" in (5.79c), and kmmê "however much" in (5.79d)—but in each
instance its structural object, an expected object clitic in the correlative clause, is
syntactically gapped.18 The following example, as well as (5.7b) and N 320.41, confirm that
proleptic correlative pronouns may be omitted:

(5.80) N 320.29-30
me kumexidi : Seimija : se=de : Seimijaje : xuwatî=ti
"Seimija and whoever succeeds (?) Seimija will sacrifice"

---

17 I take this sentence to contain either a null relative pronoun (as in the English gloss) or haplography
(qatati <=ti>).

18 A probable additional example of this type appears at TL 83.6-8: me=i=ñepì : ta[sêh]ì epì=[epì]
ppu[w]qti tiqê [xap]â : eb[êhî] alâma "they will inter here (those) whose names (?) they afterwards engrave (?) on
this tomb". Here, however, me is formally ambiguous, since it could contain the plural direct-object clitic e.
If this rule is inherited, and if nasal preterites continue Verb + Object Pronoun sequences, such preterites would not originally have been appropriate in this context, and must have been secondarily extended to this function.

There is in addition one nasal preterite whose logical complement is sentential *stricto sensu* rather than embedded in a relative clause. Like the nasal preterites of (5.79), this lacks an object pronoun:

(5.81) N 320.5-7

me=ḥnī=tubedē : Aruṣ : sej=epewetlmmeḥi : Arūnāi : mmaitē : kumeziyeč :
θθeč : x̄itawati : Xbidečiṇi : sej=ArKKazuma : x̄itawati

"Xanthos and the *perioikoi* of Xanthos decided they would make sacred an altar to the lord of Kaunos and lord ArKKazuma".19

However, as (5.82) shows, pleonastic pronouns may be omitted if they anticipate sentential complements:

---

19 The Greek reads: "the Xanthians and the *perioikoi* decided to dedicate an altar to the king of Kaunos and to Arkesima". The verb *tubē* occurs only here and at Arbinas II 13 (Laroche 1979: 62), where it must be transitive, since a clitic direct object *ene* is present. In (5.81), however, the verb lacks an obvious object. I therefore suggest a meaning like "decide" and a subcategorization frame which permits either an accusative direct object ("to decide something") or a sentential complement ("to decide that..."). In context, the following sentence is clearly what the Xanthians decided. I translate *mmaitē* as "they would make" because, whatever its precise analysis (see Melchert 1989a: 40 with references), it is likely to be a preterite third-person plural verb meaning at least approximately "they made", and it is contextually subordinate. As a parallel to this construction with overt coordination but understood subordination, compare N 320.20-22, *se smmati zddasas epi=de arawa hāti kmmētis me=i pibiti sīlas" and they shall oblige (?) however many slaves they set free to give shekels" (after Melchert 19xx). A nasal preterite is predicted for *mmaitē* if, as I translate, its direct object *θθeč x̄itawati Xbidečiṇi sej=ArKKazuma x̄itawati "an altar to the lord of Kaunos and lord ArKKazuma" has been extracted rightward. (Note that the Greek glosses *mmaitē kumeziyeč* as "to dedicate an altar" rather than "to make a sacred altar".) There is no object clitic because the direct object is indefinite."
There are several classes of sentences in Lycian which seem to counter-exemplify my characterization of the synchronic distribution of the nasal preterites, but which in fact either confirm it or have plausible independent explanations. First, there is the first-person singular preterite middle verb axagā "I became" identified by Melchert (1990a):

Since this verb is intransitive, it cannot have a direct object of any kind and therefore should not exhibit a nasal preterite. Calvert Watkins (p.c.) suggests an alternative explanation, however: the ending -xagā is simply the iterated form of the Hieroglyphic Luvian first-person preterite middle ending -han, shown to be singular by Carruba (1984: 60-62; see further Melchert 1990a). If this is correct, then Lycian [st]sani "I lie", identified as a present middle by Melchert (1990a), surely contains the expected present of -han (unattested in Luvian).

The major class of apparent counter-evidence to my analysis of the Lycian nasal preterite consists of twelve sentences of the following type²⁰:

---
b N 311

[Erβ]binaj=γne ubete xruwata Erteni

"Erbbina dedicated it as an offering to Artemis"

In each of these sentences a non-nasal preterite has a clitic direct object pronoun. However, another feature they all share suggests that they may ultimately confirm rather than disprove my proposal. In all of these sentences the direct object clitic follows a sentence-initial subject. This pattern is systematic: nasal preterites are never preceded immediately by sentence-initial subjects.

As mentioned above, the Verb + Clitic sequence continued (on my account) by the Lycian nasal preterite could in principle reflect a stage when direct object clitics cliticized to the verb rather than to Wackernagel's position. Sentences like those in (5.84) argue strongly against this view, since they can be explained straightforwardly on the alternative view that preterite nasalization continues sentence-initial Verb + Clitic sequences. Unfortunately, this explanation requires an assumption about the prehistory of Lycian for which there is at present no independent confirmation. The assumption is that at some stage of pre-Lycian, a sentence-initial word order Subject + Verb was at least fairly common. The subject would of course have been optional and in most cases omitted. In null-subject sentences of this type, the verb would have been sentence-initial and thus followed by any clitics. Such sentence-initial verbs followed by the accusative clitic *om > γ were the original locus for the creation of the nasal preterite. Ultimately, while the complex verb which resulted from this sequence was subsequently extended beyond its original domain, it never spread to one structure where it was historically improper: sentences with initial subjects. In such sentences clitics had always preceded the verb, and they still do in attested Lycian.

A similar apparently problematic sentence appears in (5.9) above, where a non-nasal preterite co-occurs with a clitic direct object pronoun. However, the sequence in question, πiγte=̓n=γ "he gave it to them", is actually expected on my account. If nasal preterites
originated in the sequence Verb + Accusative Clitic, they would have been historically improper whenever another clitic interrupted that sequence. In most cases this was impossible, but as noted above, the dative plural clitic regularly appears before any direct object clitic. The sequence Verb + Dative Plural Clitic + Accusative Clitic, as here, would therefore not have led directly to the nasal preterite, and, as a synchronically unmotivated archaism in Lycian, still does not occur with nasal preterites.

There remain some nasal preterites which are unexpected on my account of this morphological class and for which I have no convincing explanation. Two examples appear in (5.85), where the word order, Direct Object + Beneficiary, shows that the direct object has not been extracted, as does the absence of a direct object clitic, but the nasal preterite pijeté appears twice.

(5.85)TL 36.5-6

se pijeté : hrzzi : ŋtatā : ladi : ehbi : se mānereidehe | esedennewi se
pijeté : ētri : ŋtatā : prīnezi : atlahi

"And he gave the upper sarcophagus to his wife and to the collateral descendents of Mānereide, and he gave the lower sarcophagus to his own household"

It does not seem likely that these forms are conditioned in the manner I have described above. It is unnecessary to assume that this conditioning must be responsible for all preterites with final nasal vowels, however; for example, as Craig Melchert points out (p.c.), since the nasal associated with some forms of the Indo-European and Anatolian middle survived in Lycian (see above), it is in principle entirely possible that some "nasal preterites" are in fact middles, even if we cannot yet identify them securely. For this reason, and in view of the numerous nasal and non-nasal preterites whose distribution follows precisely from my account in conjunction with independently motivated features of Lycian
and Anatolian grammar, the few cases like (5.85) should not be taken as an indication that this account is essentially incorrect.\footnote{21}{I will mention here a few other unexpected nasal preterites. At TL 44c.4, me ubu ḫaṭeq ḫiqṭeq, ubu looks like the direct object of ḫaṭeq "they released", but in view of the word order and uncertain meaning, this may contain a compound ubu-ḫaṭeq like pdāq-hadq at N 320.3. A second, at TL 44b.51-52, se=dd〈ae tswetq kumesiqa Tere Tere trqṭti pdāqah; "and it placed sacred precincts Tere Tere to the local Trqṭti", is followed by a list of (right-extracted) precincts, which might motivate the verbal nasalization. Other apparent problems are the following: se=i=pit=pdāq idāqre maxah xahbu xili "and afterwards Idāqre engraved (?) here the grandchild of Maxa, Xili" (TL 78.5); and se=i pjiqt̄e piqatu miṭti [e]trip xupu [e]xili aladehaqāne se hrzi tsmunu sīlā "and they gave heere, as a gift to the miṭti, the lower tomb for a shekel aladehaqāne and the upper for two shekels" (TL 57.4-5). In both cases rightward extraction may be possible. Additional problems arise in connection with the already unclear word hrmma at TL 84.3-4, 84.5, and 149.13.}

It may be possible in conclusion to clarify in part the usage of the problematic Lycian word for "oath". This word has four forms, tasa, tesi, an ergative teset, and an extremely uncertain tese, of which the last two are irrelevant here. The form tasa occurs five times and tesi eleven or twelve times (Melchert 1989a: 64). Of these the contexts cited by Laroche (1979: 117, line 1) and at TL 5.7 are too unclear to be useful, while the phrase tasa miṭtaḥa "oaths of the miṭṭi" at TL 75.5 establishes tasa (at least once) as an absolute plural form, but is otherwise irrelevant. At TL 114.3 = 115.2-3, the sentence me=i awahai tesi aladahali, followed by a price, is also too unclear to be helpful.

Each of the remaining twelve instances of tesi or tasa is construed with either ta- "put" or a- "make", and is immediately postverbal. I will consider these constructions in turn, beginning with a somewhat uncharacteristic instance of the idiom tasa/tesi ta- (compare the important treatment of Bryce 1976, especially pp. 187-90):

(5.86) a TL 4.3-5

\[ s=ed=i | \text{ta} tesi : \text{miṭṭi} : \text{aladahali : adē III} \]

"And he has put here 3 adas as a pledge to the miṭṭi for the burial fee"
My translation can be justified as follows. This sentence has a clitic pronoun ed(e) "it"; if this is not proleptic, then of course there is no other overt direct object. If it is proleptic, however, and if tesı is the direct object—with the idiom ʰša ta- tesı meaning something like "take an oath"—then ed(e) must double tesı. But since tesı is not extracted from S, as it should be if clitic-doubled, it must not be a direct object. (This is confirmed by TL 36.3-4, in which the same formula is used but the word ʰsa/tesı is omitted, as should be impossible for a direct object.) It is possible that tesı is dative in this construction: it would then mean "in an oath" or "on oath"; compare Hittite linkiya kuttan dahi- "place under oath". Now (5.86) presents at the same time the only instance in Lycian of the form adq and the only instance in this formula of the absolutive singular clitic. Craig Melchert (p.c.) suggests that the direct object of adq may in fact be the NP adq III "3 adas" (compare HE §194 on Hittite singular nouns with plural numerals). If so, then the form adq is absolutive singular, and since it is extracted rightward, it is by rule doubled by ed(e). I therefore interpret the construction ʰša ta- X tesı as "put X as an oath/pledge", and translate as indicated. This interpretation is confirmed by the following22:

(5.87) TL 42.4

s=e=ije=ʰtadq : tesı : miñtı : aladaheli : ada : II

"And he has put here 2 adas as a pledge to the miñtı for the burial fee"

On the assumption that these inscriptions are highly formulaic, (5.87) should parallel (5.86); therefore, if adq III is the direct object in (5.86), ada II "two adas", which occupies the same position in the formula, should be the direct object in (5.87). The form ada is absolutive plural, however, and if it too is clitic-doubled, it should be doubled by the absolutive plural clitic e discussed in §5.1.3.1 above, a clitic which, as I have indicated, may in fact appear in the sequence se in (5.87).

22 Compare TL 38.7-9, 39.7-8, 47.2-3, 50.1-2, 114.1, and 115.1.
The remaining instances of the construction with ta- "put" involve a plural tasa, which must be either absolutive or dative. Parallelism would again indicate the following interpretation:

\[(5.88)\]

\[\text{TL 31.3-6} \]

\[s=\text{e}=\text{ije} : \text{fta} \ t\text{tate} : \text{tasa} : \text{mi}nta : \text{meleime} | \text{sej}=\text{aladamali} : \text{ada} : \text{III-} \]

"And they have put here 3 1/2 adas as the miïnti's oaths for meleime and for the burial fee"

The other verb with which tesilasa is construed is a- "make": compare precisely Hittite takšul iya- "make a treaty". I understand this Lycian idiom as follows:

\[(5.89)\]

\[\text{TL 115.1-2 (cf. TL 114.1-2)} \]

\[\text{Esedep:lemeje} : \text{me}=\text{j}=\text{ade} : \text{tesi} : \text{mi}nti : \text{awahai} : \text{xupa} : \text{ebchi} \]

"For Esedepşemi one has made an oath to the miïnti awahai in this tomb"

The apparent problem with this interpretation is, of course, that tesi looks like the direct object of a nasalized preterite verb. This problem is only apparent, however: despite the general sense, verbs meaning "make" are commonly construed with two objects, and it is not certain that tesi is syntactically a direct object rather than a second object. I would take (5.89) literally as "... one has made as an oath to the miïnti ...", understanding "awahai in this tomb" as not only the content of the oath but the logical object of the verb. It may be the syntactic object as well, or it may be anticipated by a null proleptic pronoun: "one has made it as an oath ..."

The other instance of the construction with a- is the following:

\[(5.90)\]

\[\text{N 320.30-32} \]

\[s=\text{e}=\text{i}=\text{ehbij}=\text{ait}= : \text{tasa} : \text{mere} : \text{ebette} : \text{teteri} : \text{Arñinas} : \]

\[\text{sej}=\text{epe}=\text{t}=\text{lmme}= : \text{Arñain} \]

"And the city of Xanthos and the perioikoi of Xanthos made oaths to him regarding these laws"
A possible analysis of this sentence is that all three NPs have been extracted rightward: the subject *teser tr̥nas sej-epew̥lmmwe Ar̥nāi* "the city of Xanthos and the *perioikoi* of Xanthos"; the dative complement *mere ebette* "regarding these laws"; and (vacuously) the direct object *tasa* "oaths". The subject of a transitive verb is naturally not clitic-doubled, but both the neuter direct object and the dative complement are clitic-doubled (by *e* and *i(j)* respectively). This analysis is by no means certain, and it should be noted in particular that the NP *ehbi(j) ... tasa* "oaths to him" (if this interpretation is correct) is syntactically quite unusual.
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