

Grammatica et verba
Glamor and verve

Studies in South Asian, historical, and Indo-European
linguistics in honor of

Hans Henrich Hock

on the occasion
of his seventy-fifth birthday

edited by

Shu-Fen Chen and Benjamin Slade



Beech Stave Press

Ann Arbor • New York

©2013 Beech Stave Press, Inc. All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Typeset with L^AT_EX using the Galliard typeface designed by Matthew Carter and Greek Old Face by Ralph Hancock. The typeface on the cover is Post Hock by Steve Peter.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Grammatica et verba : glamor and verve : studies in South Asian, historical, and Indo-European linguistics in honor of Hans Henrich Hock on the occasion of his seventy-fifth birthday / edited by Shu-Fen Chen and Benjamin Slade.

pages cm

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 978-0-9895142-0-0 (alk. paper)

1. Indo-European languages. 2. Lexicography. 3. Historical linguistics. I. Hock, Hans Henrich, 1938- honoree. II. Chen, Shu-Fen, editor of compilation. III. Slade, Benjamin, editor of compilation.

P512.H56G73 2013

410—dc23

2013026393

Printed in the United States of America

17 16 15 14 13 6 5 4 3 2 1

Table of Contents

GRAMMATICA ET VERBA
GLAMOR AND VERVE

Preface	vii
Bibliography of Hans Henrich Hock	ix
List of Contributors	xxi
Anvita Abbi , Traces of Archaic Human Language Structure in the Great Andamanese Language	I
Shu-Fen Chen , A Study of Punctuation Errors in the Chinese <i>Diamond Sutra</i> Based on Sanskrit Texts	15
Jennifer Cole and José I. Hualde , Prosodic Structure in Sound Change	28
Probal Dasgupta , Scarlet and Green: Phi-Inert Indo-Aryan Nominals in a Co-representation Analysis	46
Alice Davison , Reversible and Non-reversible Dative Subjects: A Structural Account	53
Madhav M. Deshpande , Sanskrit Traditions during the Rule of the Peshwas: Role, Maintenance, and Transition	68
Jost Gippert , An Outline of the History of Maldivian Writing	81
Olav Hackstein , Polar Questions and Non-headed Conditionals in Cross-linguistic and Historical Perspective	99
Stephanie W. Jamison , RV <i>sá hináyám</i> (VI.48.2) with a Return Visit to <i>náyám</i> and <i>nánā</i>	117
Brian Joseph , Aspirates, Fricatives, and Laryngeals in Avestan and Indo-Iranian	122
Jared S. Klein , Some Rhetorical Aspects of Adjacent Interstanzaic Phrasal Repetition in the Rigveda	128
Kelly Lynne Maynard , Balkan Sprachbund Features in Samsun Albanian	145
H. Craig Melchert , Agreement Patterns in Old and Middle Hittite	165
Adriana Molina-Muñoz , Sanskrit Compounds and the Architecture of the Grammar	181
Don Ringe , The Linguistic Diversity of Aboriginal Europe	202

Table of Contents

Steven Schäufole , Constituent Order in Song Lyrics	213
Marco Shappeck , Ecuadorian Andean Spanish <i>ya</i> : Contact, Grammaticalization, and Discursivization	227
Benjamin Slade , Question Particles and Relative Clauses in the History of Sinhala, with Comparison to Early and Modern Dravidian	245
Karumuri V. Subbarao and Rajesh Kumar , Aspects of Agreement in Hmar ..	269
Yasuko Suzuki , On Characterizing Sanskrit <i>anusvāra</i>	282
Sarah Tsiang , Horses Lost, Found, and Jockeying for Position in the English Language	299

Agreement Patterns in Old and Middle Hittite

H. CRAIG MELCHERT

Hans Hock's impressively broad range of interests includes study of agreement patterns in an array of Indo-European languages (see e.g. Hock 2008 and 2009). In honor of his many contributions to Indo-European and historical linguistics I offer the following addendum to the discussion of grammatical agreement in Hittite in Hoffner and Melchert 2008:235–41. For reasons of time and space I have been able to survey exhaustively only the data in Old Hittite texts attested in Old Hittite manuscripts (OS) and assured original Middle Hittite compositions attested in Middle Hittite manuscripts (MS). References to further examples outside these corpora are only selective.

1 Number agreement with multiple antecedents

One finds expected plural agreement with multiple antecedents agreeing in gender. Example (1) shows such agreement for predicate adjective and verb, and example (2) for an anaphoric pronoun (the reference clearly is to both of the nouns mentioned in the preceding clause):

1. KBo 17.1 iii 6–7 (Ritual for the King and Queen; OH/OS)¹
 ^aUTU-*uš* ^aIŠKUR-*aš* *mān uktūries*
 Sun-god.NOM.SG.C Storm-god.NOM.SG.C as eternal.NOM.PL.C
 LUGAL-*uš* MUNUS.LUGAL-*aš*^v -*a* QATAMMA *uktūries*
 king.NOM.SG.C queen.NOM.SG.C =and so eternal.NOM.PL.C
 ašantu
 be.IPV.3PL
 ‘As the Sun-god (and) the Storm-god (are) eternal, so let the king and queen
 be eternal.’

¹For the abbreviations of the sources of Hittite manuscripts see Hoffner and Melchert 2008:xxi–xxii and for the sigla indicating the relative chronology of manuscripts (OH for Old Hittite, OS for Old Script, and so forth) see *ibid.*:xvii. As per standard convention, Sumerograms are transliterated in upper case Roman, Akkadograms in upper case italic, and phonetically written Hittite in lower case italic, while so-called determinatives are superscripted. For further details see Hoffner and Melchert 2008:14–5. Grammatical abbreviations and other symbols: [] enclose material lost in text break; () enclose material restored from a duplicate; () marks inserted emendation; = and - demarcate clitics; ¹ marks emendation; × represents an il-

2. KBo 17.1 iii 8–9 (id.)

wīlnas̄ ÉRIN.MEŠ-*an* *tēšsummiušš* =*a* *taknā* *h̄ariemi*
 clay.GEN.SG troops.ACC.SG.C cups.ACC.PL.C =and earth.ALL bury.PRES.ISG
t =*uš* *tarmaemi*
 CONJ =them.ACC.PL.C nail-down.PRES.ISG

‘I bury the troops of clay and the fired-clay cups in the earth and nail them down.’

However, one also finds with some frequency number (and gender) agreement with only one of multiple antecedents, usually but not exclusively the nearest. Example (3) shows this for a predicate adjective, where *uktūri* agrees grammatically with *tēkan*, but obviously refers to all of the nominal subjects:

3. KBo 17.1 iii 1–2 (id.)

[*mā*] *h̄handa* ^dUTU-*uš* ^dIŠKUR-*aš*
 as Sun-god.NOM.SG.C Storm-god.NOM.SG.C
nēpiš *tē[kann* =*a*] *uktūri*
 heaven.NOM/ACC.SG.N earth.NOM/ACC.SG.N =and eternal.NOM/ACC.SG.N
 ‘As the Sun-god, the Storm-god, heaven and earth (are) eternal.’

Examples (4) and (5) show such agreement with an anaphoric pronoun:

4. KBo 17.1 i 4–6 (id.)

LUGAL-*uš* [3]-*iš* GUD-*un* I *š̄mann* =*a* *allappah̄hi*
 king.NOM.SG.C thrice cow.ACC.SG.C I figurine.ACC.SG.C =and spit.PRES.3SG
 MUNUS.LUGAL-*ašš* =*a* =*an* 3-*iš* [*a*] *lappah̄hi*
 queen.NOM.SG.C =also =it.ACC.SG.C thrice spit.PRES.3SG

‘The king spits three times on the cow and one (human) figurine. The queen also spits on them three times.’

Here *-an* agrees with only one of the two conjoined common gender antecedents (most likely *š̄man*), but refers to both the cow (likewise a replica) and the human figurine.

legible sign; ABL = ablative; ACC = accusative; ADV = adverb; ALL = allative; C = common gender; CONJ = conjunction; DAT = dative; DAT/LOC = dative-locative; GEN = genitive singular; IPV = imperative; INST = instrumental; N = neuter gender; NOM = nominative; NOM/ACC = nominative-accusative; PL = plural; PTCL = particle; PRES = present; PRET = preterite; PV = preverb; QUOT = quotative particle (marks direct speech); SG = singular.

5. KUB 14.1 Ro 54–5 (Madduwatta; MH/MS)
 [n =aš]ta ŠA mMa[d]duwatta [DAM.]MEŠ =ŠU <DUMU.MEŠ =ŠU>
 CONJ =PTCL of Madduwatta wives =his sons =his
 NAM.RA.ĪI.A =SUNU āššū =ya šēr URU Šallawassi we[miēr]
 deportees =their goods =and up (in).Sallawassi find.PRET.3PL
 n =at =ši āp[pa piyēr]
 CONJ =them.NOM/ACC.PL.N =him.DAT.SG back give.PRET.3PL
 ‘They found the wives and sons of Madduwatta and their deportees and goods
 up in Sallawassi and gave them back to him.’

Middle Hittite *-at* is here neuter nominative-accusative plural agreeing with only the last of the antecedents, the neuter plural *āššū* ‘goods’. For the reason not to construe it as showing “default” neuter agreement with the mixed gender antecedents see §2 below. For further examples of this construction see KBo 17.1 iii 101–3 (OH/OS) and KUB 14.1 Ro 55–6 (MH/MS).

We also find evidence for this construction in New Hittite compositions. Example (6) shows it with the nearest antecedent:

6. KBo 16.1 iv 34–5 (Annals of Mursili II; NH/NS)
 nu =šši =kan DAM =ŠU DUMU.MEŠ =ŠU
 CONJ =him.DAT =PTCL wife =his.ACC.SG.C children =his.ACC.PL.C
 [NA(M.RA)].MEŠ =ya arba dāir n =an
 deportees.ACC.SG.C =and away take.PRET.3PL CONJ =them.ACC.SG.C
 EGIR-pa uw[ater]
 back bring.PRET.3PL
 ‘They took away from him his wife, his children, and his deportees and brought
 them back (to Hattusha).’

The anaphoric pronoun *-an* agrees only with the last antecedent *arnuwalan* (‘deportees’ is regularly, though not exclusively, treated as a collective singular), but obviously refers also to the wife and children.²

Note also the interesting pattern of agreement with the relative and anaphoric pronouns in (7):

²This strategy is also attested in Cuneiform Luvian. Note both the verbal and adjectival agreement in the example from the Ritual of Puriyanni (KUB 35.54 iii 25–30) cited in Melchert 2006:297.

7. KBo 5.8 iii 37–9 (Annals of Mursili II; NH/NS)

nu šāru kuit NAM.RA
 CONJ booty.NOM/ACC.SG.N which.NOM/ACC.SG.N deportees.ACC.SG.C
GUD UDU AKŠUD LÚ.MEŠŠU.DAB =ya
 cattle.ACC.SG.C sheep.ACC.SG.C find.PRET.ISG prisoners.ACC.SG.C =also
kuin ēpper n =an INA URU Altanna arba
 which.ACC.SG.C seize.PRET.3PL CONJ =them.ACC.SG.C in Altanna PV
dalalḫun
 leave-behind.PRET.ISG

‘I left behind in Altanna the booty, deportees, cattle (and) sheep which I had found and also the prisoners they (my troops) had seized.’

The first relative pronoun *kuit* is neuter nominative-accusative singular agreeing only with *šāru* ‘booty’, although it clearly refers also to the common gender singulars (here with collective sense) ‘deportees’, ‘cows’, and ‘sheep’. The anaphoric *-an* agrees grammatically only with common gender singular ‘which prisoners’ (*āppantan kuin*, again a collective), but again refers to all of the preceding antecedents. For a further instance of NH agreement with only one of multiple antecedents (but not the nearest) see (16) below.

One also finds a verb agreeing with only the nearer of two conjoined subjects:

8. KBo 17.1 iii 5 (Ritual for the King and Queen; OH/OS)

LUGAL-š =an MUNUS.LUGAL-š =a tarmaš
 king.NOM.SG.C =it.ACC.SG.C queen.NOM.SG.C =and release.PRET.3SG
 ‘The king and queen released it.’

This example cannot be explained away as a special case on the basis that the royal couple was especially thought of as a unit. That notion is belied first of all by the variation in the following examples from the same text:

9. KBo 17.1 iii 17–8 (id.; restorations from KBo 17.3 iii 17–8)

[(mān LUGAL-uš MUNUS.L)UGAL-ašš =a t]ezzi ta
 if king.NOM.SG.C queen.NOM.SG.C =and say.PRES.3SG CONJ
DUMU.MEŠ-an parna p[(aimi mān natt)a =ma tara]nzi nu
 sons.GEN.PL house.ALL go.PRES.ISG if not =but say.PRES.3PL CONJ
natta paim[(i)]
 not go.PRES.ISG

‘If the king and queen say (so), I go to the house of the sons. But if they do not say (so), I do not go.’

10. *ibid.* iv II-2

[*m*]ān LUGAL-*u*š MUNUS.LUGAL-*a*šš *=a taranzi ta DUMU.MEŠ-an parna paimi* [*takk*]u *natta =ma taranzi nu natta paimi*

Note first of all that in (9) the singular verb *tezzi* is used for the positive formulation, but the plural *taranzi* for the negative one (the restoration of the latter is secure). Furthermore, in the second version in (10), the only difference from (9) is the use of *takku* for ‘if’ in the negative formulation, and the use of the plural *taranzi* in *both* formulations. It is not remotely credible that the alternation of *tezzi/taranzi* has any more functional significance than that of *mān . . . mān* versus *mān . . . takku*. In any case, agreement of the verb with only the second of two conjoined subjects is not restricted to the Hittite king and queen:

11. HKM 66:15–6 (Letter from Maṣat; MH/MS)

nu =war =aš ^m*Imra-LÚ-iš* ^m*Dula[k]k[i]š*
 CONJ =QUOT =them.ACC.PL.C Imrazidi.NOM.SG Dulakki.NOM.SG
tūriškeddu
 hitch-up.IPV.3SG
 ‘Let Imrazidi and Dulakki hitch them up (the aforementioned horses).’³

2 Animate (common gender) plural agreement for mixed gender antecedents

In the case of mixed gender antecedents in Old Hittite, in addition to the strategy shown above in (3) of agreement only with the nearer antecedent we also find use of animate plural agreement. Example (12) shows this for a predicate adjective (note that this is the very same sentence as (3), as it appears in a parallel manuscript!):

12. KBo 17.3+ ii 52^{'''}–iii 1 (Ritual for the King and Queen; OH/OS)

mān ⁴UTU ⁴IŠKUR *nēpiš* *tēkann* *=a*
 as Sun-god Storm-god heaven.NOM/ACC.SG.N earth.NOM/ACC.SG.N -and
 [(*uktu*)]*rieš*
 eternal.NOM.PL.C
 ‘As the Sun-god, Storm-god, heaven and earth are eternal.’

Example (13) shows the same kind of agreement with an anaphoric pronoun:

³Hoffner (2009:220) expresses puzzlement at the singular verb with what clearly are two subjects, but the construction is perfectly grammatical Hittite. See the further OH example in the first clause of (13) below, where we find PRES.3SG *kitta* ‘lies’ agreeing only with the second of two conjoined subjects ‘leavened bread loaves’ and ‘libation (of) *marnuan*’.

13. KBo 17.1 iv 23–5 (id.; OH/OS)

3 ^{NINDA}paršāēš' iṣpantuzzi =ya [(marnua)]n
 3 bread-loaves.NOM.PL.C libation.NOM/ACC.SG.N =and m.NOM/ACC.SG.N
 kitta mān lu[kk]atta =ma nu ^{LÚ.ĤÚB-za} [(ūgg =a
 lie.PRES.3SG when dawn.PRES.3SG =CONJ CONJ deaf.NOM.SG.C I =and
 a)]nda paiwani t =uš' =(š)t[(a š')]arā tumēni
 in go.PRES.IPL CONJ =them.ACC.PL.C =PTCL up take.PRES.IPL
 'Three leavened bread loaves and a libation (of) *marnuan* lie (ready). When it
 dawns, a deaf man and I go in, and we pick them up.'

It is clear that the common-gender accusative plural *-uš'* is referring back to both the loaves of bread (common gender plural) and the libation of the *marnuan*-drink (neuter singular).

In view of the unmistakable example in (13), we may assume the same construction for the more elaborate following examples, which understandably perplexed the initial editors of the text (Ottén and Souček 1969:21 n. 18 and 1969:39 n. 19):

14. *ibid.* i 18–21

[DU(MU)].É.GAL LUGAL-*aš'* MUNUS.LUGAL-*ašš'* *-a*
 palace-official.NOM.SG.C king.GEN.SG queen.GEN.SG =and
 iṣšaz =(š)mit lālan AN.BAR-*aš'* [d]āi
 mouth.ABL =their.ABL tongue.ACC.SG.C iron.GEN.SG take.PRES.3SG
 kalūlupi(t) =šmit =*ašta* iṣg[(*ara*)]nta dāi
 fingers.INST =their.INST =PTCL fastened.NOM/ACC.PL.N take.PRES.3SG
 [n =]e =n kiššari =šmi
 CONJ =NOM/ACC.PL.N =PTCL hand.DAT/LOC.SG.C =their.DAT/LOC.SG
 dāi n =*ašt'*[(*a par*)]ā paiwani apūš'
 put.PRES.3SG CONJ =PTCL out go.PRES.IPL those.ACC.PL.C
 hantezumni tēhji
 forecourt.DAT/LOC.SG.N place.PRES.ISG

'A palace official takes the tongue(s) of iron from the mouth(s) of the king and queen. He takes the things fastened to (lit. with) their fingers and puts them in their hand(s). We go out, and I place those things in the forecourt.'

Whereas the neuter nominative-accusative plural *-e* in *n-e=n* refers back only to the immediate antecedent *iṣgaranta* '(the things) fastened', the common-gender accusative plural *apūš'* refers both to the iron tongues and the material taken from the king's and queen's fingers.⁴

⁴As often in Hittite with reference to singular body parts of respective persons, *lālan* 'tongue' is grammatically singular. The crucial point is that it is common (animate) gender vs. *iṣgaranta* 'the things fastened'.

15. *ibid.* iv 18–22 (dupl. KBo 17.3 iv 14–9)
 3? × [] × TUR.TUR 1-EN *šīnan* *wīln[(a)]š* *šalwinit[- -]*
 3 [] small I figurine.ACC.SG.C clay.GEN.SG *s*.INST
 × × ×^o-itt =a *araummi halkiaš* *harsš[(ā)]r*
 X.INST =and a.PRES.ISG barley.GEN.SG heads.NOM/ACC.PL.N
išhiyanda [Z]ÍZ.HI.A-*ašš* =a *harsšār*
 bound.NOM/ACC.PL.N spelt.GEN.SG =and heads.NOM/ACC.PL.N
išhiyanda *kē* =*šan* *hūmand[(a)]* [*p*]addanī
 bound.NOM/ACC.PL.N these =PTCL all.NOM/ACC.PL.N basket.DAT/LOC.SG
tēhhi *n* =e LUGAL-*aš*
 place.PRES.ISG CONJ =them.NOM/ACC.PL.N king.GEN.SG
 MUNUS.LUGAL-*ašš* =a [(*ki*)]*tkar* =*šamet* *tēhhi* *šēr* =a =*ššan*
 queen.GEN.SG =and at-head =their place.PRES.ISG over =CONJ =PTCL
 GADA-*an* *peššiemī* *š* =*uš* [(LÚ-*aš*)] *natta*
 cloth.ACC.SG.C throw.PRES.ISG CONJ =them.ACC.PL.C man.NOM.SG.C not
aušzi
 see.PRES.3SG

‘I a. three? small []s and one figurine with *s*. and []. Heads of barley (are) bound (together), and heads of spelt (are) bound (together). I place all of these things in a basket and place them at the head of the king and queen. I throw a cloth over them, so that no man sees them.’

Since surely all of the previously mentioned objects are made invisible, all of them must be placed in the basket, over which the cloth is then thrown. This means that the Hittite author first employed agreement with the nearer antecedent: *kē hūmanda* ‘all these things’ agrees grammatically only with the two instances of *harsšār* ‘heads’, but necessarily refers also to the missing first object ‘three small []’ (gender unknown) and *šīnan* ‘figurine’ (common gender). However, he then switches and uses common gender accusative plural -*uš* to refer to the same set of antecedents when expressing that no man sees them.⁵

Readers will have noticed that all of the examples of animate plural agreement with mixed-gender antecedents come from a single OH composition. Given the very restricted scope of the OH/OS and MH/MS corpora, this fact is not likely to be significant. However, what may be significant is that the semantic referents of the antecedents in the OH examples (13)–(15) are all inanimate. This is not true of the only superficially comparable example I have found of such a usage with an anaphoric pronoun in a New Hittite composition:

⁵Another likely example of such a sequence is found in KBo 17.7+25.7+IBoT 3.35 iv 2–3 (see for the text Neu 1980:22), where one should restore a neuter noun in the gap.

16. KBo 5.9 iii 12–5 (Treaty of Mursili II with Tuppi-Teshup; NH/NS)

mān KUR-TUM *kuitki* *našma* ^{LÜ}MUNNABTUM
 if land.NOM/ACC.SG.N some.NOM/ACC.SG.N or fugitive.NOM.SG.C
šarā *tiyēzzi* *n* =*at* INA KUR ^{URU}Hatti
 up stand.PRES.3SG CONJ =it.NOM/ACC.SG.N to land Hatti
iyattari *n* =*at* =*kan* *tuel* KUR =KA *ištarna* *arḫa*
 go.PRES.3SG CONJ =it.NOM/ACC.SG.N =PTCL your land =your through PV
uezzi *n* =*aš*^ʸ =*kan* KASKAL-*ši* SIG₅-*in*
 come.PRES.3SG CONJ =them.ACC.PL.C =PTCL way.DAT/LOC.SG well
dāi
 set.IPV.2SG

‘If some land or fugitive arises and is going to the land of Hatti and comes through your land, set them well on (their) way.’

The agreement pattern here appears to be parallel to that in (4) and (5), except that the initial agreement with only one of the two antecedents is with the first (*-at* in the clauses with *iyattari* and *uezzi* is neuter nominative-accusative singular, agreeing with *utnē* ‘land’ which stands behind the spelling KUR-TUM).⁶ Then, however, the author switches to animate plural agreement (accusative plural common gender *aš*^ʸ) to refer back to neuter *utnē* ‘land’ and common gender *pittianza* ‘fugitive’ (which stands behind the spelling ^{LÜ}MUNNABTUM). However, unlike in the Old Hittite examples, the semantic referents here are all animate, and this fact may explain the use of *-aš*^ʸ. It is thus quite unclear whether animate plural agreement with mixed gender antecedents whose referents are inanimate extends beyond Old Hittite.

3 Strict agreement and “*constructio ad sensum*” with collective singulars

As expected, Hittite shows both strict grammatical agreement and the so-called *constructio ad sensum*, that is, plural agreement, with grammatically singular nouns that refer to a plurality.

⁶That this NH *-at* is neuter nominative-accusative singular, and not animate nominative plural, is shown by the singular verbs. If *-at* were ‘they’, the verbs would necessarily be plural. In principle, NH *-at* could also be nominative-accusative plural *neuter*, which would take singular verb agreement, but I must stress that I know of no compelling evidence anywhere in Hittite for neuter plural agreement with mixed gender antecedents.

A. Strict agreement

17. KBo 22.2 Vo 7–8 (Tale of Zalpa; OH/OS)

U ÉRIN.MEŠ^{URU} Zalpa menahhanda uet š^{an}
 but troops.NOM.SG.C (of).Zalpa in.opposition came CONJ =them.ACC.SG.C
 LUGAL-uš^{bullet}
 king.NSg fight.PRET.3SG

‘But the troops of Zalpa came in opposition, and the king fought them.’

The word for ‘troops’ is unknown, but it clearly is a common gender *t*-stem that with rare exceptions occurs in the singular with collective meaning.⁷

18. HKM 18:18–20 (Letter from Mašat; MH/MS)

nu =mu kā katti =mi ÉRIN.MEŠ KUR.UGU
 CONJ =me.DAT here with =me troops.NOM.SG.C (of).upper.land
 ÉRIN.MEŠ KUR^{URU} Išhūpitta kuiški
 troops.NOM.SG.C (of).land Ishupitta some.NOM.SG.C
 n =an =ta uppahhi
 CONJ =them.ACC.SG.C =you.DAT send.PRES.ISG

‘I have some troops of the Upper Land, of the land Ishupitta, here with me. I will send them to you.’

One finds similar grammatically singular agreement of anaphoric pronouns with ÉRIN.MEŠ ‘troops’ (infantry) in HKM 36:31–3 and also with the likewise collective singulars ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ.ḪI.A ‘horses’ (i.e. chariotry) in HKM 2:6–9, HKM 15:8–13, and HKM 30:8–10, GUD.ḪI.A ‘cattle’ in HKM 5:3–6, and LÚ.KÚR ‘enemy’ in HKM 8:12–7.

B. *Constructio ad sensum*

19. KBo 3.22 Ro 37 (Anitta; OH/OS)

šardia(n) =ššann =a kuin uwatet
 allies.ACC.SG.C =his.ACC.SG.C =also whom.ACC.SG.C bring.PRET.3SG
 š =uš^{URU} Šal[(amp)i . . .]
 CONJ =them.ACC.SG.C in.Salampa

‘[I __ed] in Salampa his allies whom he had brought.’

⁷The word behind ÉRIN.MEŠ-*t*- is not *tuzziyant-*, contra Tischler 2001:222 et al. As shown by the denominative verb *tuzziya-* ‘to encamp’, the original sense of *tuzzi-* was ‘camp’ (logographically KARAŠ), and it came to mean ‘troops’ only secondarily.

As per the *CHD* (2005:293), *šardian* here is an accusative singular with collective meaning, not genitive plural (contra Neu 1974:13, 56, 142), resumed by common gender plural *-uš*.

20. KUB 14.1 Ro 70 (Madduwatta; MH/MS)

kāšma =wa [ÉRĪN.]MEŠ^{URU} *Hatti* ^{URU}*Hinduwa* *zabhiya*
 ADV =QUOT troops.NOM.SG.C (of).Hatti (to).Hinduwa battle.ALL
pait nu =wa =šmaš KASKAL-*an* *peran* *ēpten*
 GO.PRET.3SG CONJ =QUOT =them.DAT way.ACC.SG.C in.front seize.IPV.2PL
nu =war =aš wal(a)h̄ten
 CONJ =QUOT =them.ACC.PL.C strike.IPV.2PL

‘The troops of Hatti have (just) gone towards Hinduwa for battle. Seize the way ahead of them and strike them.’

That the noun ‘troops’ is grammatically singular is shown by the verb *pait*, which is preterite third singular, but the following anaphoric pronouns are third plural. The same text shows a similar construction in the next line, KUB 14.1 Ro 71.

While the Mašat Letters for the most part use singular agreement with collective nouns such as ‘troops’, ‘enemy’, ‘horses’ (= chariotry), and ‘cattle’, there is at least one interesting mixed construction:

21. HKM 21:3–7 (Letter from Mašat; MH/MS)

ŠA ÉRIN.MEŠ^{URU} *=mu* *kuit* *uttar* *h̄atrāeš*
 of troops.GEN.SG =me.DAT which matter.NOM/ACC.SG.N write.PRET.2SG
arḫa kuiš [t] *arman* *h̄arzi* *apē* *=ya*
 away which.NOM.SG.C left have.PRES.3SG those.NOM.PL.C =also
 [ku] *iš* *šer* E[GI]R¹-*an* *=mu* *kappūwar*
 which.NOM.SG.C up afterwards =me.DAT number.NOM/ACC.SG.N
 [ku] *it* *h̄atrāeš* *n* *=at*
 which.NOM/ACC.SG.N write.PRET.2SG CONJ =it.NOM/ACC.SG.N
 AŠME
 hear.PRET.ISG

‘As to the matter of the troops that you wrote me about, the ones who have left, and also those who (are) up (there), the number that you wrote to me afterwards I have heard.’

I cannot follow Hoffner (2009:132–3), who interprets *a-pé-e-ya* as ‘there’. The spelling of the adverb *apiya* ‘there’ with *e*-vocalism and a long vowel would be unprecedented and inexplicable. We have rather a mixed construction in which the animate singular antecedent ‘troops’ is resumed twice by animate singular *kuiš* (referring to two por-

tions of troops, one of which the addressee had reported as having left, the other not), but for “additive focus” with *-ya* ‘also’ the author has used animate nominative plural *apē*, not the strict grammatical singular *apāš*.

Both strict grammatical agreement and the *constructio ad sensum* are routinely found with collective singular nouns in New Hittite, often juxtaposed in the same text. A single example of each will suffice:

22. KBo 5.6 ii 19–20 (Deeds of Suppiluliuma; NH/NS)
nu *-kan* ŠA URU.KÛ.BABBAR-*ti* *kuiš* ÉRIN.MEŠ
 CONJ =PTCL of Hatti which.NOM.SG.C troops.NOM.SG.C
 ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ *n* *=an* *=kan* šer *arānzi*
 horses.NOM.SG.C CONJ =them.ACC.SG.C =PTCL up detain.PRES.3PL
 ‘They (the Hurrians) detained up (in Murmuriga) the troops and horses (in-
 fantry and chariotry) that (were) of Hatti.’⁸
23. ibid. ii 24–5
 ÉRIN.MEŠ *=wa* *=kan* ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ *kuiš* INA
 troops.NOM.SG.C =QUOT =PTCL horses.NOM.SG.C which.NOM.SG.C in
 URU.Murmuriga šer *nu* *=war* *=aš* *=kan* LÚ.MEŠ URU.Hurri
 Murmuriga up CONJ =QUOT =them.ACC.PL.C =PTCL men (of).Hurri
anda walnuwan *harkanzi*
 PV enclosed have.PRES.3PL
 ‘The Hurrians have surrounded the troops (and) horses that are up in Mur-
 muriga.’

In these two accounts of the same event a few lines apart, the grammatically singular animate antecedents are resumed in the first with animate singular *-an*, but in the second with animate plural *-aš*.

One also finds a *constructio ad sensum* in terms of subject-verb agreement with collective singular nouns:

24. KBo 3.4 iv 36–7 (Annals of Mursili II; NH/NS)
nu KUR-*eanza* *hūmanza* URU.DIDL.Ī.IA BÀD
 CONJ population.NOM.SG.C entire.NOM.SG.C cities fortified
 EGIR-*pa* *ēpper*
 back take.PRET.3PL
 ‘The entire population retired (3pl.!) to the fortified cities.’⁹

⁸The verb is a “historical present” in a past narrative.

⁹The expression ‘take back’ here with reference to cities has the idiomatic sense ‘retire/retreat to; take refuge in’.

As in colloquial English, a singular indeterminate relative can also be construed as referring to a plurality and call forth plural agreement:

25. KUB 23.72+ Vo 21 (Mida of Pahhuwa; MH/MS)
nu kuis̃ ANA 4UTU-š[I] kūrur ANA LÚ.MEŠ
 CONJ who.NOM.SG.C to His.Majesty enemy to men
^{URU}*Pahhuwa =ya =at kūrur ašandu*
 (of).Pahhuwa =also =they.NOM.PL.C enemy be.IPV.3PL
 ‘Who(ever) (is) an enemy to His Majesty, let them also be an enemy to the men of Pahhuwa.’

4 Neuter singular resumption of exclusively animate antecedents

In military narratives in Middle and New Hittite we unexpectedly find what appears to be neuter singular anaphoric resumption of antecedents that are exclusively animate in both grammatical gender and semantic reference. While MH and NH *-at* is per se ambiguous as to number, the examples from the Madduwa text with *apāt hūman* show that the similarly used *-at* is singular:

26. KUB 14.1 Ro 48 (Madduwatta; MH/MS)
 [KA]RAŠ-*za =kan kuis̃ tepaweš i[špar]ter*
 army/camp.ABL =PTCL which.NOM.PL.C few.NOM.PL.C escape.PRET.3PL
apāt =ma =kan hūman a[r]ḫa
 that.NOM/ACC.SG.N =CONJ =PTCL all.NOM/ACC.SG.N PV
ḫa]šper =pat
 slaughter.PRET.3PL =PTCL
 ‘The few who escaped from the army/camp, they likewise slaughtered all that.’
27. *ibid.* Ro 52
kappū[wanteš =pa]t antuḫšeš išparter
 numbered.NOM.PL.C =PTCL people.NOM.PL.C escape.PRET.3PL
 [a]pāt =ma =kan [hūm]an arḫa ḫašper
 that.NOM/ACC.SG.N =CONJ =PTCL all.NOM/ACC.SG.N PV slaughter.PRET.3PL
 ‘[Ju]st numbered (= a few) people escaped, but they slaughtered all that.’

Beckman (1996:147) supplies in both cases a reference to “the army,” but there is no known Hittite word for ‘army’ that is grammatically neuter. We know of only ÉRIN.MEŠ-*t* ‘troops’, *tuzzi-* (KARAŠ) ‘camp’ also secondarily ‘troops, army’, and its extended stem *tuzziyant-*, all common gender. Furthermore, the second passage

makes it unmistakable that the antecedent consists of the few people (animate plural *antuhšesš*) who escaped.

If we had only the two examples from the Madduwatta text, one might try to attribute the neuter singular to the presence of *hūman*, which could be construed as a neuter substantive ‘totality’. However, we find a similar use of neuter singular anaphoric *-at* alone in New Hittite:

28. KBo 16.17 + 2.5 iii 39–40 (Annals of Mursili II; NH/NS)

nu ^m*Aparrun* *QADU* ₃ *LI*[*M ÉRIN.MEŠ*] *-ŠU*
 CONJ Aparru.ACC.SG with 3000 troops -his
ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ -ŠU *hulliyat* *n* *-at* *-kan*
 horses -his fight.PRET.3SG CONJ -it.NOM/ACC.SG.N -PTCL
ku[enta]
 kill.PRET.3SG

‘He (Tarhini) fought Aparru with his three thousand troops and horses and killed them(!).’

29. KBo 5.9 ii 38–9 (Treaty of Mursili II with Tuppi-Teshup)

NAM.RAḪLA *KUR* ^{URU}*Nuhassi* *kuiēš* *U*
 deportees.ACC.PL.C (of).land Nuhassi which.ACC.PL.C and
NAM.RA.ḪLA *KUR* ^{URU}*Kinza* *ABU* *-YA*
 deportees.ACC.PL.C (of).land Kinza father.NOM.SG.C -my
arnut *ammuqq -a* *-at* *arnunun*
 remove.PRET.3SG I -also -it.NOM/ACC.SG.N remove.PRET.1SG

‘The deportees of the land of Nuhassi and of the land of Kinza whom my father removed, I too removed them(!).’

I stress that we are not dealing with an instance of neuter plural agreement as the default for mixed gender antecedents. *All* of the antecedents in both (28) and (29) are grammatically animate in Hittite (common gender) and have semantically animate referents: the man Aparru and his troops and horses in (28) and the deportees in (29), which here are in the plural, as shown by *kuiēš*. As noted above, the anaphoric *-at* could in principle be neuter plural rather than singular, but I assume singular based on the unambiguously singular *apāt hūman* of the preceding examples from Madduwatta.

I have no ready explanation for this usage. If further investigation shows that it is limited to the contexts of the examples given above, I can only tentatively suggest an intended dehumanizing effect: the slain enemies and the deportees are demoted to the status of inanimate objects, and indeed with all trace of their individuality removed by the singular ‘all that’ and ‘it’.

5 Morphophonemically motivated agreement patterns

Finally, I must briefly mention some instances of peculiar anaphoric agreement that appear to be motivated by avoidance of certain morphophonemic combinations, though I must emphasize that we are unlikely to be dealing with strict rules.

It has been noticed by a number of scholars that where we would expect a sequence *n-at-ta*, consisting of the conjunction *nu*, anaphoric *-at* as neuter nominative-accusative singular or plural, and the second-person pronoun *-ta* ‘you’, we find in Middle and New Hittite almost exclusively *n=e-tta*, with the allomorph *-e* that is historically only neuter nominative-accusative plural, even when the antecedent clearly is singular (see the references in Melchert 1977:19–20 and in Kammenhuber 1976:41–7, who also supplies further examples):

30. HKM 64:22–6 (Letter from Maṣat; MH/MS)

<i>nu</i>	<i>uddanaš</i>	<i>arkuwar</i>		<i>kuit</i>
CONJ	matter.GEN.SG	explanation.NOM/ACC.SG.N	which.NOM/ACC.SG.N	
EGIR- <i>pa</i>	<i>iēr</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>=e</i>	<i>=tta</i> <i>kāšma</i>
back	make.PRET.3PL	CONJ =it.NOM/ACC.PL	=you.DAT	just
<i>tuppi</i>		ŠA ^m <i>Himu</i> -DINGIR-LIM LÚ		
tablet.NOM/ACC.SG	of	Himuii		messenger.NOM.SG.C
<i>ṬEMI</i>	<i>udaš</i>			
bring.PRET.3SG				

‘The explanation of the matter that they made in return, Himmuili’s messenger has just brought to you (as) a tablet.’¹⁰

Hoffner (2009:216) interprets *arkuwar* as a plural ‘replies’, but the clearly singular *kuit* excludes this. Here as elsewhere, *-e* in the specific sequence *n=e-tta* is used for expected *na-at-ta* even where *-at* would have singular reference.¹¹

Kammenhuber (1976:46) argues that this special use of *n=e-tta* was an innovation made possible only by the replacement of older *-e* in its functions as common-gender nominative plural and neuter nominative-accusative plural by *-at* in late Middle Hittite. However, the following OH example with the particle *-šan* rather than *-ta* ‘you’ raises serious doubts about that claim:

31. KUB 36.110 Vo 13–6 (CTH 820; OH/OS)

<i>labarnaš</i>	<i>É-er</i>	<i>-šet</i>	<i>tuškarattaš</i>	<i>haššaš</i>
l.GEN.SG	house =his.NOM/ACC.SG.N	joy.GEN.SG	children.DAT/LOC.PL	

¹⁰One could also interpret with Hoffner (2009:216–7) as ‘(my) messenger has just brought it in a tablet of Himmuii’.

¹¹As noted by Melchert (1977:20), the expected *n-at-ta* is attested at least once, in KUB 12.17:4: [*išpantuzzi-mu paš n-at-ta utah[hun]*] ‘[]gave me a libation, and I brought it to you.’ The interpretation is assured by preceding and following sentences with other objects referred to by *n-an-ta* (*utahhun*).

=šas̄ ḫanzaššas̄ =šas̄
 =his.DAT/LOC.PL grandchildren.DAT/LOC.PL -his.DAT/LOC.PL
 n =e =ššan^{vy} d NA₄ pērumi wetan
 CONJ =it.NOM/ACC.PL.N =PTCL rock.DAT/LOC.SG build.NOM/ACC.SG.N
 ‘The house of the labarna (Hittite king) is one of joy for his children and his grandchildren, and it is built upon a rock.’

There is no evidence that the word for ‘house’ is here a collective plural, and that is contradicted in any case by the singular form of the predicate participle *wedan* in an OH/OS text. Furthermore, ‘house’ is resumed regularly by simple *n-at* in Vo 20 of the same text. The OH alternation *n-e-ššan* vs. *n-at* is thus entirely parallel to that of later attested *n-e-tta* vs. *n-at*. While *n-at-ššan* is unattested in our limited OS corpus, this absence could easily be due to chance. Be that as it may, *n-at-ššan* is generally well attested, so its avoidance is not a rule, any more than that of *n-at-ta* (see n. 11).

That *n-at-ta* was dispreferred due to homophony with the negative *natta* (see Friedrich 1925:296, followed by Kammenhuber 1976:41) seems to me dubious, but I have no better explanation to offer. The use of *n-e-ššan* for *n-at-ššan* might be motivated by the tendency for *-at-ššan* to be assimilated to *=as̄-ššan* in Old Hittite, which could create homophony with underlying *=as̄-ššan* (see on the assimilation Hoffner and Melchert 2008:41).¹²

6 Conclusion

As demonstrated by Hans Hock for other Indo-European traditions, so too in Hittite closer examination shows a wider variety of agreement patterns than generally recognized. The examples of agreement with only the nearer of multiple antecedents cited in §1 are unsurprising, as is the evidence for coexisting strict agreement and the *constructio ad sensum* with antecedents that are grammatically singular but have plural reference. Both of these usages are paralleled in other ancient and modern Indo-European languages. More unusual is the apparent use of animate (common gender) agreement in anaphoric pronouns referring to mixed-gender antecedents as described in §2 (NB all the antecedents have semantically inanimate referents). Further scrutiny of the total Hittite corpus will clarify whether this pattern extends beyond Old Hittite as well as the status of the peculiar usages illustrated in §§4 and 5.

¹²This assimilation also appears to be attested in Middle Hittite, in the Mašat letter HKM 37:14–5: [tu] ḫšuwanzī-war-as̄-š[an] karū ar[ant]eš ‘They (the vineyards) are already ripe (lit. arrived) for harvesting.’ The common gender nominative plural *aranteš* requires that the enclitic subject be likewise, hence underlying *-at* in late Middle Hittite.

References

- Beckman, Gary. 1996. *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- CHD = Güterbock, Hans G., Harry A. Hoffner, and Theo P. J. van den Hout, eds. 2005. *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Vol. Š, fasc. 2: *šaptamenzu* to *-ši-*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Friedrich, Johannes. 1925. "Zwei neue hethitische Pronominalformen." *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 36:286–96.
- Hock, Hans Henrich. 2008. "Early Germanic agreement with mixed-gender antecedents: With focus on the history of German." In *Proceedings of the 19th UCLA Indo-European Conference*, ed. Karlene Jones-Bley, Martin Huld, Angela Della Volpe, and Miriam Robbins Dexter, 151–70. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man.
- . 2009. "Default, animacy, avoidance: Diachronic and synchronic agreement variations with mixed-gender antecedents." In *Grammatical Change in Indo-European Languages: Papers Presented at the Workshop on Indo-European Linguistics at the XVIIIth International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Montreal, 2007*, ed. Vit Bubenik, John Hewson, and Sarah Rose, 29–42. Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Hoffner, Harry A., Jr. 2009. *Letters from the Hittite Kingdom*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Hoffner, Harry A., Jr., and H. Craig Melchert. 2008. *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Kammenhuber, Annelies. 1976. *Materialien zu einem hethitischen Thesaurus*. Fasc. 3. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1977. "Ablative and instrumental in Hittite." Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University.
- . 2006. "Indo-European verbal art in Luvian." In *La langue poétique indo-européenne. Actes du Colloque de travail de la Société des Études Indo-européennes. Paris, 22–24 octobre 2003*, ed. Georges-Jean Pinault and Daniel Petit, 291–8. Leuven: Peeters.
- Neu, Erich. 1974. *Der Anitta-Text*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- . 1980. *Althethitische Ritualtexte in Umschrift*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Otten, Heinrich, and Vladimír Souček. 1969. *Ein althethitisches Ritual für das Königs-paar*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Tischler, Johann. 2001. *Hethitisches Handwörterbuch*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.