

Anatolian Syntax – The Simple Sentence

Silvia Luraghi

Università di Pavia

Dipartimento di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata

Strada Nuova 65

I-27100 Pavia

telef.: +39-0382-984685

fax: +39-0382-984487

[silvia.luraghi@unipv.it](mailto:silvia.luraghi@unipv.it)

## Anatolian Syntax: The Simple Sentence<sup>1</sup>

### 1. Clause structure

#### 1.1. Word order

Two phenomena are characteristic of Anatolian clause structure, i.e. basic OV order and Wackernagel's Law. The OV character of the Anatolian languages implies that the right sentence boundary is marked, in the vast majority of cases, by the occurrence of a finite verb form. The left sentence boundary, in its turn, is taken by second position, or P2, enclitics, which follow Wackernagel's law, and are hosted by the first word (less frequently first constituent) in the sentence. Note that Lycian is exceptional among the Anatolian languages, because its basic word order is VO; accordingly, it will be discussed after the other languages.

Typical Anatolian simple sentences are the following:

- (1) *piran=ma= at= mu m<sup>D</sup>XXX.DU-as DUMU m<sup>z</sup>ida maniyahhiskit*  
before CONN 3SG.N/A 1SG.OBL A.:NOM child Z. administrate:3SG.PRET.ITER  
“before me Armadatta, the son of Zida, had administrated it”, KUB 1.1 i 28 (Hittite);
- (2) *[tiy]ammis=pa= ti [t]ap-PIŠ-sa naw[a a]yari*  
earth:NOM CONN PTC heaven:NOM NEG become:3SG.PRS  
“and the earth does not become heaven”, KUB 35.54 ii 43-44 (Cun. Luvian);
- (3) *ni= pa=si musanti*  
NEG PTC 3PL.OBL satisfy:3PL.PRS  
“they cannot be satisfied”, KUB 32.18 9 (Palaic);
- (4) *fak= m= λ= it = in qλdān=k artimu=k katsarlokid*  
CONN CONN 3SG.DAT PTC PTC Q.:NOM and A.:NOM and bring.distruction:3PL.PRS  
“may the gods Qλdāns and Artemis bring destruction to him”, 23.10 (Lydian).

Sentence (4) has the left boundary marked by a connective which hosts second position enclitics, whereas in the other sentences different types of word are placed in initial position, followed by the enclitics.

Since the subject of an Anatolian sentence can be zero or a Wackernagel enclitic, the verb is the only accented constituent which obligatorily occurs in a sentence. If enclitics occur in a sentence where the verb is the only accented constituent, they are hosted by the verb itself, as in example (5), which contains two verbs in the imperative, asyndetically coordinated, both of which hosts an enclitic particle:

---

<sup>1</sup> I thank Paola Cotticelli and Alfredo Rizza for helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper. For reasons of space I limit myself to discussing the syntax of the simple sentence, including clause structure, word order, the coding of the subject relation, and compound verb forms. I leave out of account such topics as the use of cases, possessive constructions, clause conjunction, and subordination. An overview of subordination in Hittite can be found in Hoffner and Melchert (2008: 414-429). On relative clauses in Hittite see further Held (1957), Justus (1972) and Garrett (1994), which also contains a discussion of relative clauses in Lycian. On complex adverbial subordination see Zeilfelder (2002). Complement clauses are infrequent in Hittite and only appear in relatively late texts. See Cotticelli-Kurras (1995).

- (5) *lalaidu= tta papraddu= tta*  
 take:3SG.IMP PTC chase:3SG.IMP PTC  
 “let him take (it and) chase (it)”, KUB 35.43 ii 12 (Cun. Luvian).

As I mentioned above, Lycian displays a different sentence structure. Examples are:

- (6) *mê= (e)ne tubidi qlaj ebi se Malija se tasa*  
 CONN 3SG.OBL strike:3PL.PRS precinct local and *M.*:NOM and oath:N/A.PL  
*miñtaha*  
*m.*:ADJ.N/A.PL  
 “the local precinct and Malija and the oaths of the *minti* will strike him”, TL 75.5 (Lycian);
- (7) *ebêñnê χupã mê= (e)nê prñnawate Trijêtezi*  
 this:ACC tomb:ACC CONN 3SG.ACC build:3SG.PRET *T.*:NOM  
 “this tomb, Trijêtezi built it”, TL 8.1-2 (Lycian).

As shown in the examples, Lycian has second position enclitics like the other Anatolian languages;<sup>2</sup> however, given the high frequency of left dislocated constituents with clitic doubling, the structure of the left sentence boundary ends up looking quite different from that of the other Anatolian languages, as shown in example (7), where the left dislocated constituent is followed by the particle *me*, cognate to Hittite *-ma-*, which hosts a clitic that is coreferential to the left dislocated constituent. This pattern is not commonly found in the other Anatolian languages.<sup>3</sup> In example (6), the verb precedes all the other constituents of the sentence; the connective and the enclitics still precede the verb in such passages. A few similar examples are available from the other Anatolian languages, as in:

- (8) *a= ta piyatta immarassa <sup>D</sup>IM-ti*  
 CONN 3SG.N/A give:3SG.PRET wilderness:ADJ.D/L weather:god.D/L  
 “he gave it to the Weather God”, KUB 35.54 ii 37 (Cun. Luvian),

with the verb following an initial connective, and:

- (9) *qis= it fênslibid esλ vānaλ buk esλ mruλ*  
 who:NOM PTC damage:3SG.PRS this:DAT tomb:DAT or this:DAT stele:DAT  
 “whoever damages this tomb or this stele”, 3.4-5 (Lydian).

Basic word order in Lydian is apparently OV, except in poetic texts, which, albeit potentially interesting, are at present too poorly understood to allow speculations based on them.

<sup>2</sup> It should be mentioned that among second position enclitic pronouns, nominative forms are not attested in Lycian.

<sup>3</sup> Garrett (1994: 38) quotes a few examples from Hittite, which however look quite different.

## 1.2. The left sentence boundary

In the Anatolian languages, P2 enclitics are normally placed after the first accented word or after a prepositive element.<sup>4</sup> Prepositives are connectives, such as Hittite *nu*, which are possibly proclitic (but can host enclitics)<sup>5</sup>. Enclitics of different types occur in second position for two different reasons, connected with their grammatical and discourse status (see Luraghi 1990: 14-15).

- a. Sentence particles such as coordinators and connectives, discourse markers, and modal particles, which have the whole sentence as their scope, tend to occur as early as possible in the sentence. Such connectives have placement rules similar to those of prepositive, which occur at the beginning of a sentence: unstressed particles occur after the first accented word in the sentence, this being the leftmost accessible position for items that cannot begin a sentence for accentual reasons. This phenomenon can be seen as due to prosodic inversion;<sup>6</sup>
- b. enclitic pronouns, which belong in the VP, in their turn are attracted close to the left sentence boundary for pragmatic reasons. Unstressed pronouns have a low communicative dynamism, since they do not convey new information; they rather refer back to items which have already been introduced in the preceding discourse. Thus, they also fulfill a textual function, connecting sentences with each other, and contributing to the building of discourse continuity.<sup>7</sup>

P2 clitics occur in slots and each slot can be filled by one clitic only in the relevant set:

- i. sentence connectives and conjunctions: Hittite *-(y)a-*, coordinator; *-ma-*, *-a-*, adversative particles, *man-* modal particle (which also has an accented variant);<sup>8</sup> Cun. Luw. *-ha-*, *-kuwa-*, Pal. *-(y)a-*, *-pa-*, Hier. Luw. *-ha-*, Lycian *-me-*, *-be-*, Milian *-me-*, *-be-*, *-ke-*; Lydian *-k-*, *-um-*;
- ii. Hittite and Palaic *-wa(r)-*, Luw. *-wa-*, Lycian and Milian *-(u)we-* direct speech particle,
- iii. (in Hittite) nominative or accusative of third person pronoun singular or plural;
- iv. (in Hittite) oblique forms of first and second person singular and plural or dative of third person singular or plural.<sup>9</sup> Note that, whereas third person nominative and accusative clitic pronouns cannot co-occur with each other, they can co-occur with any dative form, including the third person;
- v. (in Hittite) *-z(a)-*, reflexive particle;

---

<sup>4</sup> Beside Wackernagel's enclitics, the Anatolian languages also have word enclitics, i.e. enclitics that are attached to a specific word, as possessives, which are inflected adjectives that are hosted by the head they modify, or focus particles. When one of such enclitics refers to the first word in a sentence, it precedes P2 enclitics.

<sup>5</sup> According to Melchert (1998: 485) "sentence-initial conjunctions and attached clitics are unstressed".

<sup>6</sup> On prosodic inversion see Halpern (1995: 13-76).

<sup>7</sup> The basic difference between clitics and particles in (a) and clitic pronouns in (b) lies in the relation between their structural and their phonological host. The (a) forms are attached phonologically to the whole sentence (i.e. to its border), which is also their structural host; the (b) forms, on the contrary, have the VP as their structural host, but they take the sentence border as their phonological host; see further Luraghi (1990: 13-15).

<sup>8</sup> The particle *man* can sometimes co-occur with the connective *-ma-*.

<sup>9</sup> In the plural dative enclitic pronouns normally precede possible nominative or accusative enclitics in Hittite.

vi. Hittite *-kan, -(a)sta, -san, -an, -(a)pa*, Cun. Luw. *-tta, -tar*, Hier. Luw. *-ta, -pa*, Pal. *-(n)tta, -pi*, Lycian *-te, -pi, -de*, Milyan *-te*, Lydian *-(i)t, -in*, so-called local particles.

The order attested for the enclitics in positions (iii) through (v) in Hittite is different from the order found in the other languages, where one finds:

- c) reflexive particle Luw. *ti*, Pal. *-ti*, Lyd. *-s, -si*.
- d) oblique forms of first and second person pronouns or dative of third person;
- e) nominative or accusative of third person pronouns.

As already mentioned, clitics in each of the above groups are mutually exclusive. Clitics in slot (i) can appear only if none of the prepositive connectives occurs in the initial position. Prepositive connectives are: Hittite: *nu, ta, su*; Luvian: *a-*; Hier. Luvian: *a-, nu*; Palaic: *a-, nu*; Lycian: *me, se* (the latter also used for coordination between NP's); Lydian: *fak, nak, ak* (compounded with the enclitic conjunction *-k*).

Obviously, there are some exceptions to these rules, but on the whole they apply consistently throughout the history of the Anatolian.

In Hittite, the choice between *nu* and *-ma-* or *-(y)a-* (or prepositive or postpositive *man* in non-assertive clauses) results in two distinct patterns:

- a. sentences with no topicalized or contrasted constituents start with *nu* followed by the enclitics;
- b. other sentences have some accented constituent in the initial position, which is separated from the remaining part of the sentence by the enclitics. Since *-ma-* indicates discontinuity in a text or in the course of the events, as argued in Luraghi (1990: 50-54), it can occur in cases of topic shift. Its occurrence is also connected to initial verbs (see Luraghi 1990: 52, 96-99).

The extension of *nu* as a sentence introducer was probably brought about by the need to extract all clitics from the sentence, in order to allow for a sentence pattern where no constituents were separated from the others, as argued in Luraghi (1998b). Wackernagel's clitics marked the left sentence boundary in such a way that any word or constituent that preceded them was extraposed, thus receiving particular emphasis. Wackernagel's clitics were no longer real second position clitics; rather, they were placed at the beginning of the sentence, and the sentence introducer *nu* occurred for prosodic reasons only, because, being a prepositive, it could start a sentence and host enclitics.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> In Lydian we find the following order for the enclitics, partly according to Gusmani (1964: 46):

- a) connective *-k*;
- b) connective *-m*;
- c) pronominal dative;
- d) particle *-t* (also spelled *-it, -at*);
- e) reflexive particle;
- f) pronominal nominative;
- g) pronominal accusative;
- h) particle *-in*.

The connectives in slots (a) and (b) can, and often do, cooccur with each other and with prepositive connectives. The first of the two is the coordinating conjunctions, which can also function as phrasal conjunction. The function of particle *-t* is not clear; sometimes it also displays the form *-it*, apparently when it

### 1.3. Initial verbs

As I have mentioned above, in spite of their basic OV order, the Anatolian languages also allowed for initial verbs in certain contexts. The alternation between final and initial verb can be shown to go back to Indo-European, where it was most likely used with a much bigger frequency than in Anatolian.<sup>11</sup> In Luraghi (1990), I described a number of sentence patterns that allow initial verbs:

a) imperatives or emphatic or contrasted verbs, as in:

- (10) *pai= mu DUMU.É.GAL-in*  
give:2SG.IMP 1SG.OBL palace.servant:ACC.SG  
“give me a palace servant”, KBo 17.1 ii 2’ (Hittite).
- (11) *kuenzi= ma= an LUGAL-us huis[nu]zzi= ya = [an LUGAL-u]s*  
kill:3SG.PRS CONN 3SG.ACC king:NOM let.live:3SG.PRS and 3SG.ACC king:NOM  
“the king may kill him, or the king may let him live”, KBo 6.26 21-22 (Hittite);
- (12) *zas= pa= ta kuwatin zammitatis<sup>NA4</sup>harati auimmi*  
this:NOM CONN PTC as flour:NOM grindstone:ABL come:PART.NOM  
*auiddu= pa= sta malhassassis EN-as haratnati waskulimmati*  
come:IMP.3SG CONN PTC ritual:ADJ.NOM lord:NOM offence:ABL sinful:ABL  
“as this flour has come from the grindstone, so may the Lord of the ritual (i.e. the person for whom the ritual is performed) come from sinful offence”, KBo 29.6 i 22-24 (Cun. Luvian);

b) verbs that introduce some sort of discontinuity, either at the textual level (as in the case of descriptions or other digressions) or in the course of the events (see Luraghi 1990: 97-99), as in (13), in which the initial verb *tarueni* starts a side remark which interrupts the description of the ritual:

- (13) *anda=kan halinas tesummius tarlipit suwamus II-ki petumini*  
inside PTC clay:GEN vessel:ACC.PL *t.*:INSTR full:ACC.PL twice bring:1PL.PRS  
*tarueni=ma= at eshar DUMU.E.GAL-is<sup>D</sup>hantasepan LUGAL-i kissari*  
say:1PL.PRS CONN it blood:N/A.N servant:NOM *H.*:ACC king:D/L hand:D/L  
*dai tesumminn= a pai*  
put:3SG.PRS vessel:ACC.SG and give:3SG.PRS  
“Twice we bring inside the clay vessels full of blood (we call it *t.*); the Palace servant puts a *H.* divinity in the hand of the king and gives (him) a vessel”, KBo 17.1 i 26’-28’ (Hittite).<sup>12</sup>

### 1.4. The right sentence boundary

---

occurs together with the reflexive particle *-s*. The latter is homophonous to the nominative of third person pronoun. It has been identified relatively recently and it can help to explain a number of the passages where nominative and accusative of the third person pronoun were formerly taken to co-occur (such co-occurrence is impossible in the other Anatolian languages, see below, § 3.1).

<sup>11</sup> See Delbrück (1901: 38-40; 80-83), Dressler (1969), Luraghi (1990, ch. 5), and (1995).

<sup>12</sup> Examples of similar sentence patterns from other Indo-European languages are discussed in Delbrück.

Imperatives could be fronted for emphasis, the VO/OV alternation of the type in (b) is typical of narrative texts, where the unemphatic style usually patterns with OV order. See further Luraghi (1995).

With the exception of Lycian, which, as we have seen, has basic VO order, the right boundary of an Anatolian clause is normally marked by the occurrence of a finite verb form. Non:finite subordinated verb forms usually occur immediately before the final finite verb. In Lydian they apparently were placed post-finally:

- (14) *ak= at amu mitidastal kavel kantoru savvaštal*  
 CONN 3SG:N/A:NT 1SG:NOM *M.*:DAT priest:DAT give:1SG.PRS preserve:INF  
 “I will give it to the priest Mitidastal to preserve”, 24.20-21 (Lydian).

Elements that consistently occur in pre-final position, immediately preceding the final verb, are sentence negations and *ku-* words, which typically indicate focus:<sup>13</sup>

- (15) *zawi= pa t[appas]a tiyammis pa= ti kuwatin [tapp]asa tiyammis nawa*  
 behold CONN heaven:NOM earth:NOM CONN PTC as heaven:NOM earth:NOM NEG  
*ayari [tiy]ammis=pa= ti [t]ap-PIŠ-sa naw[a a]yari*  
 become:3SG.PRS.M/P earth:NOM. CONN PTC heaven:NOM NEG become:3SG.PRS.M/P  
*za= ha SISKUR-assa [...] apati nis ayari*  
 this:NOM and ritual:NOM so NEG become:3SG.PRS.M/P  
 “here are heaven and earth; as heaven does not become earth and earth does not become heaven, let this ritual likewise not become ...”, KUB 35.54 ii 41-45  
 (translation from Boley, 1993: 220) (Cun. Luvian);
- (16) *takku LU.ULUlu-as ELLAM-as KAxKAK=set kuiski waki*  
 if man:ACC free:GEN nose 3SG.POSS.A someone:N bite:3SG.PRS  
 “if someone bites the nose of a free man”, KBo 6.2 i 24 (Hittite).

Indefinite pronouns are virtually never fronted; sentence negation is mostly fronted in rhetorical questions, as in:

- (17) *UL=wa LUGAL-was aras= mis zik*  
 NEG PTC king:GEN friend:NOM 1SG.POSS.NOM you:NOM  
 “are you not a friend of mine, the king?”, KUB 29.1 i 35.<sup>14</sup>

Some focus constituents, especially negations, indefinite pronouns and other *ku-* forms, but sometimes also NPs, can be placed in post-final position even in Anatolian.<sup>15</sup>

Besides, any types of constituents can be added in post-final position as afterthought (so-called ‘amplificatory’ constituents), as in (18), in which a postverbal subject is appositional to the enclitic pronoun that precedes the verb in the first sentence; in the second, the direct object occurs postverbally:

- (18) *launaimis= as asdu tarussa tiyammis [DINGIR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-e]nzi*

<sup>13</sup> See Goedegebuure (forthcoming) on the function of *ku-* words as focus markers in Hittite.

<sup>14</sup> Note that here the predicate of the sentence is fronted and the subject is final.

<sup>15</sup> Zeilfelder (2004) offers an extensive discussion of negations in final position in Hittite, showing connections with verb fronting.

wash:PART.NOM 3SG.NOM be:IMP.3SG statue:N/A earth:NOM god:NOM.PL  
*huhhursantinzi GUNNI-[tis a]= tta zauu lahuniha*  
*h.:NOM.PL hearth:NOM CONN PTC here wash:1SG.PRET*  
*adduwalza utarsa a= ta appa DINGIR<sup>MES</sup>-[...]*  
 evil:N/A word:N/A CONN 3SG.N/A.N back god:PL  
 “be it washed, the statue, the earth, the gods, the *h.*’s, the hearth. I wash here the evil  
 word, and the gods ... it back”, KUB 35.54 iii 35-38 (Cun. Luvian).

## 2. The subject

### 2.1. Null subjects, subject clitics, nominal sentences

In the Anatolian languages, pro-drop is affected by verbal transitivity. The pattern can be best observed in Hittite, but it is likely to be common Anatolian.<sup>16</sup> Null subjects are allowed for all verbs in the first and second person singular or plural; for third person a set of unstressed subject pronouns is available, which are obligatorily used with intransitive verbs, in case there is no overt subject. Transitive verbs, on their turn, can never take an unstressed subject pronoun. Consequently, they take null subjects for third person, too, if there is no overt subject.<sup>17</sup>

Hoffner (1969) argues that from the Middle Hittite period onwards the reflexive particle -*z(a)* became increasingly frequent in Hittite in nominal sentences with first and second person subjects, whereas it is never found with third person.<sup>18</sup> In Late Hittite nominal sentences with first or second person subjects either contain the particle -*z(a)* or the appropriate oblique form of the clitic personal pronoun, as shown in:

- (19) *nu= war=as LÚ-is esta uga=wa=z UL imma LÚ-as*  
 CONN PTC 3SG.NOM man:NOM be:3SG.PRET I PTC PTC NEG besides man:NOM  
 “he was a man, am I not a man, too?” KUB 23.72+ obv 42.

Nominal sentences with third person subject have subject clitics as all other intransitive sentences only if there is no overtly expressed subject.

<sup>16</sup> Subject clitics are attested in the other Anatolian languages as well, apart from Lycian; whether their use corresponds to what we can see in Hittite is not clear, see Garrett (1990a: 143-145).

<sup>17</sup> See Luraghi (1990: 40-43). As shown in Garrett (1990a: 106-107), non-referential third person subjects (such as the subjects of weather verbs) are null with intransitive verbs. Garrett (1990a: 130-133) gives a full list of passages where intransitive verbs occur with NS. Beside the Old Hittite examples, that come from all text types, he also gives some Middle Hittite examples, all coming from the same text (a protocol for the royal guard), and some Late Hittite examples from copies of Old Hittite ritual texts.

<sup>18</sup> Since -*z(a)* was in origin a deictic particle that indicated some particular involvement of the subject in the verbal process, an association with first and second person, which are deictic, rather than with third person, can perhaps have developed. In Old Hittite the particle did not seem to have any particular connection with first and second person. According to Boley (1993), the historical development is more complicated and even in Late Hittite the situation is may be not as straightforward as argued in Hoffner (1969); however, the frequency of the association of -*z(a)* or oblique pronominal clitics with first and second person subjects of nominal sentences remains striking. The connection between the particle -*z(a)* and first and second person subjects of nominal sentences is not clearly attested in the other Anatolian languages. Boley (1993: 220) argues that the particle -*ti*, equivalent of -*z(a)* in Cuneiform Luvian, never occurs in nominal sentences. In Hieroglyphic Luvian the same particle can, but does not have to, co-occur with both first person subjects, in which case it can alternate with the oblique clitic pronoun, and with third person subjects, see Boley (1993: 223-224).



## 2.2. Subject marking

Anatolian has two genders, normally referred to as common and neuter. While virtually all neuter nouns are inanimate, nouns that belong to the common gender can be either animate, or inanimate. Neuter nouns can be better described as being inactive, given the constraint that they cannot occur as subject of action verbs. In order to fulfill this function, neuter nouns can be transposed into the common gender through the gender changing suffix *-ant-*. So for instance we find the word *tuppi*, ‘clay tablet’, neuter, inactive, and *tuppiyanza*, same meaning, common gender, active, as in:

- (20) *mahhan= smas kas tuppiyanza anda wemizzi*  
when you:PL.OBL this:NOM.C tablet:NOM.C into find:3SG.PRS  
“when this tablet will reach you”, *Maşat* 75.10, obv. 3-4.

Occasionally, *-ant-* formations are also made from nouns of the common gender, as with *tuzziyanza*, ‘troop’, from *tuzzi-*, same meaning:

- (21) NAM.RA<sup>MEŠ</sup>=*ma* GUD<sup>HIA</sup> UDU<sup>HIA</sup> [*tu*]zuziyanza sarwait  
prisoner:PL CONN ox:PL sheep:PL troop:NOM.C take:3SG.PRS  
“the troop took as booty prisoners, oxen and sheep”, KUB 23.21 Vs. 29’-30’,

or Cuneiform Luvian *tiyammatis*, ‘earth’, in example (23). Note further that the nominative plural of the *-ant-* derivatives is *-antes*, which can be analyzed as involving the suffix *-ant-* with the ending of the nominative plural common gender. Adjectives and anaphoric pronouns agreeing with *-ant-* derivatives display common gender agreement.

According to the traditional analysis, *-ant-* is a derivational suffix with an ultimate syntactic function (i.e. to allow nouns of the neuter gender to be transposed into another gender class in order to function as subjects of transitive verbs, see e.g. Carruba 1992; Cotticelli and Giorgieri forthcoming; Rizza forthcoming). The alternative analysis, propounded in Garrett (1990a, b), views *-anza* and *-antes* as inflectional ergative endings (respectively singular and plural) of neuter nouns. The problem with this analysis is that instances such as the inflected forms (*utniyandan* in (61)) have to be taken as derived with another *-ant-* suffix (for denominal adjectives). This analysis, which is accepted for example in Hoffner and Melchert (2008) (see further Patri 2008 and Melchert forthcoming), remains problematic for various reasons. One is the existence of common gender derivatives in *-ant-*. Scholars who view the ‘ergative’ suffix as an inflectional ending distinguish between two *-ant-* suffixes, the ergative and an ‘individualizing’ derivational suffix, but the distinction between the two sometimes is not so straightforward, as shown by the discussion of the semantics of the suffix in Josephson (2003).<sup>19</sup> More problematic, cases as those of *tyammantis* in (25), discussed below, derived

<sup>19</sup> Josephson (2003) convincingly argues for a unitary treatment of the various instantiations of *-ant*

from a common gender noun, are taken to be inflected in the ergative because of the co-occurrence with the ergative form *tappasantis*, regularly built of a neuter noun. While it is possible that the co-occurrence with a *-ant-* derivate from a neuter noun can have brought about the unexpected derivation also for a common gender noun, such an extension seems very unlikely in the case of an inflectional ending (there are more examples of this type from Hittite, see Garrett (1990a: 48-50). Besides, under this analysis it is not clear what forms as *tuzzianza* in (21) should be taken to be, since here the noun is derived from a common gender stem, but there are no other forms from neuter nouns that could have attracted it in their inflection (an easy solution of course is to say that the suffix in *tuzzianza* is the ‘individualizing’ suffix).

It can further be remarked that occasionally, *-ant-* derivates can also be the subject of intransitive verbs, as in:<sup>20</sup>

- (22) *kass= a= za URU-az parnanzass=a [UD]U.A.LUM DÛ-ru*  
 this:NOM.C and PTC city:NOM.C house:NOM.C and ram become:3SG.IMP  
 “and let this city and house become the ram”, KUB 41.8 iv 30.

Note that in this example the verb *DÛ-ru*, from the root *kis-*, ‘to become’ is intransitive and nowhere else it triggers *-ant-* derivation for neuters. Besides, the form *URU-az* is an *-ant-* derivate from a common gender noun.<sup>21</sup>

A possible occurrence of a neuter noun as the subject of an action verb is:

- (23) *mān=an handais walhzi zig= an ekunimi dai*  
 if 3SG.ACC heath:N/A strike:PRS.3SG 2SG.NOM 3SG.ACC cold:D/L put:IMP.2SG  
 “if heath strikes it, put it in the cold” KBo 3.23 i 5-6,

where *handais* is probably a neuter stem (see Rieken 1999: 218, Zeilfelder 2001: 164-165).

The relative freedom in the use of *-ant-* derivates in unexpected contexts points toward a derivational, rather than inflectional, nature of the suffix. In the case of neuter subjects, the suffix *-ant-* has taken over a syntactic function. Note that such borderline phenomena, involving derivational affixes that fulfill a syntactic function are found elsewhere in Anatolian, notably in the case of ‘genitival’ adjectives, known from Luvian and partly from Lycian and Lydian. In Luvian in particular there is no trace of the genitive case, which is substituted by inflected denominal adjectives,<sup>22</sup> as shown in:

- (24) *iyandu= ku= wa zassin DUMU-annassi[n] annin warallin*  
 go:3pl.IMP CONN PTC this:ADJ.ACC child:ADJ.ACC mother:ACC own:ACC  
*uwata[ndu ]*  
 bring:3PL.IMP

<sup>20</sup> On possible occurrence of *-ant-* derivates with intransitive verbs see also Rieken (2005).

<sup>21</sup> On this and further examples see Neu (1989).

<sup>22</sup> See Neumann (1982) and Luraghi (1993) and (2008).

“let them carry this child’s own mother”, see ex. (33) (Cun. Luvian).

Note that this is the only possibility of expressing an adnominal relation in Cuneiform Luvian, since neither nouns or pronouns have a genitive ending. In such a case, one can rightly say that derivation is used for serving syntax, rather than to enrich the lexicon, in a non-prototypical way. In other words, the function of a derivational suffix is to permit nouns to take a specific syntactic function, i.e. that of modifiers. The ‘ergative’ function of the *-ant-* suffix may be seen as involving a similar extension of derivation to the coding of grammatical relations.

A suffix with the same function is known from Luvian and from Lycian, although the use of the latter is harder to describe, because the evidence is restricted:

- (25) *assa= ti elhadu tappasantis tiyammantis*  
 mouth:N/A PTC wash:3PL.IMP heaven:NOM earth:NOM  
 “let the heaven and earth wash their mouths”, KUB 9.6+ ii 14-16 (Cun. Luvian);
- (26) *sê (e)ne tesêti qãñti trmmilijêti*  
 CONN 3SG.OBL oath:NOM.PL seize:3PL.PRS Lycian:NOM.PL  
 “the Lycian oaths will seize him”, TL 149.10 (Lycian).

Thus the evidence points towards a common Anatolian origin of *-ant-* derivation for transposing neuter nouns into the common gender when they have to serve as subjects of transitive verbs.

### 3. Compound predicates<sup>23</sup>

#### 3.1. Auxiliaries

Hittite has a variety of compound verb forms. Since there is very little evidence from the other Anatolian languages, it is difficult to say if auxiliarization of verbs is specific of Hittite, or if it was common Anatolian.

Among Hittite auxiliary verbs, we find the following.

- i) The verb *har(k)-*, ‘to have’, ‘to hold’. As an auxiliary, the verb occurs with the participle of another verb inflected in the nominative/accusative neuter. It is mostly attested for transitive verbs, although a few Old Hittite examples contain intransitive verbs. An example is *piyan harta* in:

- (27) *annissan=pat=an <sup>1</sup>NIR.GÁL-is LUGAL-us ANA ABU-YA <sup>1</sup>hattusili*  
 of.old PTC 3SG.ACC Muwatallis:NOM king:NOM to father-my Hattusili:DAT  
*sallanummanzi piyan harta*  
 exalt:INF give:PART have:3SG.PRET  
 “of old Muwatallis the king gave him to my father Hattusili to exalt” Bo 86/299 i 10-

<sup>23</sup>See Luraghi (1998a) with the literature quoted and, among more recent works, Dardano (2005) on *har(k)-* and van den Hout (2003) on serialized motion verbs.

13 (transaltion from Boley, 1992: 55) (Hittite).

Periphrastic forms with *har(k)-* are sometimes referred to as ‘perfect’; they have a durative and sometimes resultative meaning.

ii) The verb *es-*, ‘to be’, can be used as an auxiliary with the participle of a transitive or an intransitive verb that agrees in number and gender with the subject; it is virtually only found in the past; it is often translated as a pluperfect:<sup>24</sup>

- (28) *kedas= ma ANA KUR.KUR<sup>HIA</sup> LUGAL<sup>URU</sup>hatti kuit UL kuiski*  
 this:D/L.PL CONN to country:PL king H. because not anyone:NOM.SG  
*panza esta nu= ssan ser sakuwantariyanun*  
 go:PART.NOM be:3SG.PRET CONN PTC over remain:ITER.1SG.PRET  
 “since no Hittite king had been in those countries (before), I remained up there for some time”, KBo 5.8 i 37-38 (Hittite).

Examples of the verb ‘be’ with a participle in the preterite are not available from the other languages, possibly owing to the typology of the extent sources, but there are examples with the imperative, as (29) from Palaic:

- (29) *kuwais= a= tta halputa takkuwantes asandu*  
 ...:NOM.PL CONN PTC ...D/L.SG ...:PART.NOM.PL be:3PL.IMP  
 “and let the ...s be ...”, KUB 35.165 rev. 6’ (Palaic).

iii) The verb *dai-*, ‘to put’, occurs in its auxiliary use with the *-uwan-* supine of a verb in the iterative form. This periphrasis has inchoative meaning, and it denotes the beginning of an action or process that has some duration or that is repeated in time:

- (30) *nu= wa tuel ŠA<sup>D</sup> UTU<sup>URU</sup>arinna GAŠAN-YA ZAG<sup>HIA</sup> danna*  
 CONN PTC you:GEN of Sun.goddess A. Lady my land:PL take:INF  
*sanhiskiuan dair*  
 look.for:ITER.SUP put:3PL.PRET  
 “they started to continuously try to take your territories, Sun Goddess of Arinna, my Lady”, KBo 3.4 i 24-25 (Hittite).

### 3.2. Serialized use of motion verbs

Beside auxiliarization, also serialization of verbs is attested in hittite and possibly Anatolian. It involves the two motion verbs *pai-*, ‘to go’ and *uwa-*, ‘to come’. When serialized, the two verbs do not express their concrete meaning, but rather some type of verbal aspect. Syntactic peculiarities of the serial use of motion verbs are illustrated in the examples below:

- (31) *uit= mu= kan namma kuwapi<sup>LÚ</sup>KUR KUR.KUR HURRI arha*  
 come:3SG.PRS 1SG.OBL PTC besides when enemy country:PL Hurrian PREV

<sup>24</sup>Cotticelli (1991: 131-155) contains a list of all participles occurring with the verb ‘to be’ in Hittite.

- ME-is  
take:3SG.PRET  
“furthermore when it happened that the enemy took the Hurrian lands away from me”,  
Kbo 4.14 ii 10 (Hittite);
- (32) LÚ.MEŠ<sup>URU</sup> *nuhassi=wa kuit kurur nu= wa= smas it*  
man:PL N. PTC because enemy CONN PTC 3PL.DAT go:2SG.IMP  
*halki<sup>HLA</sup>-us arha harnik*  
granary:PL.ACC out destroy:2SG.IMP  
“since the population of Nuhassi is hostile, (go [it]) destroy their (=smas)  
granaries” KBo 4.4 i 41-42.

Garrett (1990a: 74) also quotes the following example, from Luvian:

- (33 a) [*iu*]nni= wa<sup>D</sup>EN.ZU-*anzanza kummaya[nza hat]ayannanza apan hizzaun[ni]*  
go:1PL.PRS PTC moon.god:D/L.PL pure:D/L.PL h.:D/L.PL this:ACC deliver:1PL.PRS
- b) *iyandu= ku= wa zassin DUMU-annassi[n] annin warallin*  
go:3PL.IMP CONN PTC this:ADJ.ACC child:ADJ.ACC mother:ACC own:ACC  
*uwata[ndu ]*  
bring:3PL.IMP
- c) *annis= ku= wa=ti parnanza madduwati papparkuwati*  
mother:NOM CONN PTC PTC house:ACC wine:INSTR purify:3SG.PRS
- d) *tatis= pa= wa=ti= a= ta [...]tiyati pusuria[ti p]appasati*  
father CONN PTC PTC CONN 3SG.ACC ...:INSTR dust:INSTR sprinkle:3SG.PRS
- e) *p[a=wa iyandu<sup>D</sup>EN.ZU-inzi [...] kummayanza hatayannanza*  
CONN PTC go:3PL.IMP moon.god:NOM.PL pure:D/L.PL h.:D/L.PL  
*apan hizzaindu*  
this:ACC deliver:3PL.IMP  
“let them hand him over to the Moongods’ pure *h.* and let them carry this child’s own  
mother. The mother purifies the house with wine and the father sprinkles it with ...  
and dust. Let the Moongods hand him over to the pure *h.*”, KUB 35.102+ ii 13’-18’,  
iii 1-3 (Cun. Luvian).

Serialized motion verbs occur together with another inflected verb form, and agree with it in tense and number. They can either occur in initial position, in which case they host P2 clitics as in (31) and (33a,b), or they can be preceded by a sentence connective that hosts P2 clitics, as in (32) and (33e). Besides, serialized motion verbs cannot take a direction or a source expression, as motion verbs normally do in their full lexical use. Pronominal clitics hosted by serialized motion verbs or by a prepositive conjunction that precedes the serialized motion verb in a sentence are syntactic arguments of the second verb. Thus in (31) the first person pronominal clitic =*mu*, which is hosted by the motion verb *uit*, is an argument of the verb *arha* ME-is ‘took away’; in (32) the third person plural pronominal clitic = *smas*, which is hosted by the connective *nu* and precedes the motion verb *it*, is an argument of the second verb, *arha harnik* ‘destroy’. This peculiarity in the behavior of clitics is indeed a proof of the fact that motion verbs in such constructions have lost their semantic autonomy and that they constitute a compound verb form with the second verb, which carries lexical meaning.

## References

- Boley Jacqueline 1992. *The Hittite periphrastic constructions*. in O. Carruba, ed., *Per una grammatica ittita /Towards a Hittite Grammar*. Milano, Iuculano, 33-59.
- Boley, Jacqueline 1993. *The Hittite particle -z/-za*. Innsbruck, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Carruba, Onofrio 1992. “Le notazioni dell’agente animato nelle lingue anatoliche (e l’ergativo)”, in O. Carruba, ed., *Per una grammatica ittita /Towards a Hittite Grammar*. Pavia, Iuculano, 61-98.
- Cotticelli-Kurras, Paola 1991. *Das hethitischen Verbum ‘sein’*. Heidelberg, Winter.
- Cotticelli-Kurras, Paola 1995. “Hethitische Konstruktionen mit *verba dicendi* und *sentiendi*”, in O. Carruba, M. Giorgieri, C. Mora, eds., *Atti del ii Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia*. Pavia, Iuculano, 87-100.
- Cotticelli-Kurras, Paola, Mauro Giorgieri forthcoming. *Hethitisch*. Wiesbaden, Reichert Verlag.
- Dardano, Paola 2005. “I costrutti perifrastici con il verb *ḫar(k)*- dell’ittito: stato della questione e prospettive di metodo”. *Or NS* 74, 93–113.
- Delbrück, Berthold 1901. *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Strassburg, Trübner.
- Dressler, Wolfgang 1969. “Eine textsyntaktische Regel der indogermanischen Wortstellung”. *Historische Sprachforschung* 83, 1-25.
- Garrett, Andrew 1990a. *The Syntax of Anatolian Pronominal Clitics*, unpubl. Ph.D. Diss., Harvard University.
- Garrett, Andrew 1990b. “The origin of NP split ergativity”. *Language* 66, 261-296.
- Garrett, Andrew 1992. “Topics in Lycian syntax”. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 105, 200-212.
- Garrett, Andrew 1994. “Relative clause syntax in Lycian and Hittite”. *Sprache* 36/1, 29-69.
- Goedegebuure, Petra (forthcoming). “Focus Structure and Q-word Questions in Hittite”. In: E. Keizer, M. van Staden, eds., *The Interpersonal Level in Functional Discourse Grammar*. Thematic issue of *Linguistics*.
- Gusmani, Roberto 1964. *Lydisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg, Winter.
- Halpern, Aaron 1995. *On the Placement and Morphology of Clitics*. Chicago, CSLI Publications.
- Held, Warren 1957. *The Hittite Relative Sentence*. Baltimore, LSA (*Language Dissertations* 55).
- Hoffner, Harry A. 1969. “On the use of Hittite *-za* in nominal sentences”. *JNES* 28, 225–30.
- Hoffner, Harry A., H. Craig Melchert 2008. *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Winona Lake (IN), Eisenbrauns.

- Josephson, Folke 2003. "Semantics and Typology of Hittite *-ant-*", in J. Clackson and B. A. Olsen, eds., *Indo-European Word Formation*. Copenhagen, Museum Tusulanum, . 91–118.
- Justus Raman, Carol 1976. "Relativization and topicalization in Hittite", in Ch. Li, ed., *Subject and Topic*, New York, Academic Press, pp. 213-145.
- Luraghi, Silvia 1990. *Old Hittite Sentence Structure*. London-New York, Routledge.
- Luraghi, Silvia 1993. "La modificazione nominale in anatolico". *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 78/2, 144-166.
- Luraghi, Silvia 1995. "The function of verb-initial sentences in some ancient Indo-European languages", in M. Noonan and P. Downing, eds., *Word Order in Discourse*, Amsterdam, Benjamins, 355-386.
- Luraghi, Silvia 1998a. "I verbi ausiliari in ittita", in G. Bernini, P. Cuzzolin, P. Molinelli, eds., *Ars Linguistica. Studi in onore di Paolo Ramat*, Roma, Bulzoni.
- Luraghi, Silvia 1998b. "The grammaticalization of the left sentence boundary in Hittite", in A. Giacalone Ramat, P. Hopper, eds., *The Limits of Grammaticalization*, Amsterdam, Benjamins.
- Luraghi, Silvia 2008. "Possessive constructions in Anatolian, Hurrian, Urartean, and Armenian as evidence for language contact", in B. J. Collins, M. R. Bachvarova, I. C. Rutherford, eds., *Anatolian Interfaces*, Oxbow Press, 147-155.
- Melchert, H. Craig 1993. *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon*, Chapel Hill
- Melchert, H. Craig 1998. "Poetic meter and phrasal stress in Hittite", in J. Jasanoff, H. C. Melchert, L. Oliver, eds., *Mír Curad. Studies in honor of Calvert Watkins*. Innsbruck, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, 483-493.
- Melchert, H. Craig 2004. *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language*, Ann Arbor/New York, Beech Stave Press.
- Melchert, H. Craig forthcoming. "The Problem of the Ergative Case in Hittite", in M. Mazoyer, M. Fruyt, eds., *Variations, concurrence et evolution des cas dans divers domaines linguistiques*.
- Neu, Erich 1989. "Zum Alter der personifizierenden *-ant-* Bildung des Hethitischen", *Historische Sprachforschung* 102, 1-15.
- Neumann, Günter 1982. "Die Konstruktionen mit adjectiva geneticalia in den luwischen Sprachen", in E. Neu, ed., *Investigationes Philologicae et Comparativae*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 149-161.
- Patri, Sylvain 2007. *L'alignement syntaxique dans les langues indo-européennes d'Anatolie* Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- Rieken, Elisabeth 1999. *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen*. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- Rieken, Elisabeth 2005. "Hethitisch", in M. Streck, ed., *Sprachen des Alten Orients*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 80-127.

- Rizza, Alfredo forthcoming. “Contributi allo studio dell'ergatività in anatolico: basi teorico-tipologiche (sopra alcune recenti pubblicazioni)”, in *Atti del Sodalizio Glottologico Milanese* 49.
- van den Hout, Theo 2003. “Studies in the Hittite Phraseological Construction. I. Its Syntactic and Semantic Properties”, in G. M. Beckman, R. H. Beal, J. G. McMahon, eds., *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, Winona Lake (IN), Eisenbrauns, 177–204.
- Zeilfelder, Susanne 2001. *Archaismus und Ausgliederung: Studien zur sprachlichen Stellung des Hethitischen*. Heidelberg, Winter.
- Zeilfelder, Susanne 2002. “Komplexe Hypotaxe im Hethitischen”, in M. Fritz, S. Zeilfelder, eds., *Novalis Indogermanica. Fs für G. Neumann*, Graz, Leykam, 527-536.
- Zeilfelder, Susanne 2004. “Topik, Fokus und rechter Satzrand im Hethitischen”, in D. Groddek, S. Röble, eds., *sarnikzel. Hethitologische Studien zum Gedenken an Emil Orgetorix Forrer*, Dresden, Verlag der TU Dresden, 655-666.