

Peter Schrijver

# The Verbal Syntax of Hattian

<https://doi.org/10.1515/aof-2018-0019>

**Abstract:** There is much controversy over the question of the syntactic alignment of Hattian. A resolution is complicated by the fact that Hattian has a poor case morphology. This investigation into the functions of the prefixes *wa<sub>a</sub>=* and *eš=* (with various allomorphs), which occur both as plural prefixes to nouns and as verbal prefixes expressing third person plural actants, attempts to resolve the issue on the basis of a detailed study of the relevant material. As it turns out, Hattian has a split system, with an accusative base in verbal forms that do not contain the prefix *tu=* and an ergative base in verbal forms that do contain that prefix. Intransitive subject, transitive subject and object are all morphosyntactically distinguished, so that it can be argued that Hattian has a split three-way system of alignment. This complicated system is typologically similar to alignment in Sumerian.

**Keywords:** Hattian, verbal syntax

## 1 Introduction

One of the most vexed questions in Hattian philology concerns the matter of syntactic alignment, in other words, which position it occupies on the accusative – ergative continuum. This question is more complex than finding out whether Hattian encodes the intransitive subject in the same way as the transitive subject (accusative alignment, which is found in most Indo-European languages and indeed in most languages of the world; thus e.g. Klingler 1994: 36–40) or as the transitive object (ergative alignment, as in e.g. Basque and the North-West and North-East Caucasian languages; thus Taracha 1988). For there are other possibilities too, such as three-way alignment, in which intransitive subject, transitive subject and transitive object are encoded differently, and split ergativity, in which ergativity (or a three-way system) is found in one part of the language's grammar and accusative alignment in another part (as is the case in e.g. Georgian), to mention just some of the more prominent alternatives. On the basis of what appears to be the optional appearance of the 3sg. agent prefix *an=* before intransitive verbs, Petra Goedegebuure argues that Hattian is a semantically aligned language with an ergative base (Goedegebuure 2010: in particular 958–959).

Resolving this matter for Hattian is difficult enough as it is given the extremely fragmentary state of the preservation of its source material. It is further complicated by the fact that Hattian seems to have a rather poorly developed nominal case morphology. A case in point is the following example:<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> All Hattian examples are presented in identical fashion: [a] text reference, [b] diplomatic transcription, [c] morphemic notation, [d] morphemic analysis, [e] literal word for word translation (if possible), [f] free translation (if possible), [g] Hittite translation (if present), [h] discussion (if required). In [c] I use a much simplified notation, which arbitrarily recognizes geminate consonant spellings but not plene writing of vowels; this should not be interpreted as reflecting my views on Hattic phonology. The presentation of the cuneiform text in [b] follows standard conventions, with the exception that damaged signs are underdotted. Lost signs that have been restored are added between [ ]. Signs between [( )] are restored after duplicate texts. Signs that have been omitted by the scribe are written between < >. Signs that represent obvious mistakes are followed by <sup>1</sup>. Damaged or lost signs whose restoration is doubtful are followed by <sup>2</sup>.

[1a] KBo. 37.1 obv. 3–4

[1b] eš-ta-a-an <sup>uru</sup>la-ah-za-an le-e-we<sub>e</sub>-e-əl a-an-te-eh

[1c] *Eštan* <sup>uru</sup>*Lahzan* *le=(i=)<sup>2</sup>we<sub>e</sub>l* *an=teh*

[1d] NAME NAME 3.POSS=(PL=)NOM 3SG=VB<sup>3</sup>

[1e] *Eštan* in *Lahzan* his/her<sup>4</sup> house built

[1f] ‘*Eštan* built her/his house in *Lahzan*’

[1g] Hittite: *ibid.* <sup>d</sup>UTU-uš-wa-az <sup>uru</sup>Li-ih-zi-ni u<sub>2</sub>-e-te-et ‘the Sun God(dess) built in *Lihzina* for him/herself’ (‘his/her house’ is omitted).

The agent *Eštan* and the patient *le=we<sub>e</sub>l* are third person singular. Neither has case marking. I should point out, however, that Simon (2012: 139–142) observed that instances of singular direct objects in Hattian are preceded by *lē=*, which he therefore identified as an accusative (i.e. object) marker rather than a possessive prefix. In addition, he assumes the existence of a third person plural possessive prefix *le=* (*ibid.* 141). Splitting into two morphemes what looks like a single morpheme *le=* requires a compelling reason, which has not been produced yet. As long as that is the case, an explanation on the basis of a single morpheme is preferable to two different explanations. Following this line of thought, I assume that *le=* denotes a third person possessive in light of example [13], where the noun phrases *lē=wi<sub>i</sub>n le=p[=zizintu]* ‘his son, his grandchildren’ form the intransitive *subject* of the verb *te=p=kunkuhhuw=a* ‘may they live!’, so an interpretation of *lē* as accusative marker is impossible here. Secondly, there is an example in which the direct object is *not* accompanied by *le=* or for that matter by any other case marker:

[2a] KBo. 37.1 obv. 26–27

[2b] a-am-mi-iš zi-i[-la-a-at] <sup>d</sup>Ka-tah-zi-wu<sub>u</sub>-ri

[2c] *am=miš* *zilat* <sup>d</sup>*Katahziwu<sub>u</sub>ri*

[2d] 3SG=VB NOM NAME

[2e] (s)he took throne *Katahziwu<sub>u</sub>ri*

[2f] ‘*Katahziwu<sub>u</sub>ri* took the throne’

[2g] The Hittite column does not correspond exactly to the Hattian text but takes two Hattian sentences together as one, simplifying them in the process (‘and K. sat down on the throne’).

Neither the transitive subject <sup>d</sup>*Katahziwu<sub>u</sub>ri* nor the transitive object *zilat* have case marking. It is true that the lacuna at the end of the word for ‘throne’ might in theory hide a case ending, but the lacuna is just big enough to accommodate the missing signs LA and AT, and possibly the short sign A in the middle, and certainly not big enough to also accommodate the fairly long signs TU or UN that encode the two known oblique case markers =*tu*/=*šu* and =*un*, respectively.

The dearth of case marking of primary actants in Hattian is offset by the relatively rich system of plural marking. This article sets out to attempt to unravel Hattian alignment by focusing on plural marking in general

<sup>2</sup> See footnote 13 for the plural morpheme =*i=*. A plural interpretation ‘houses = palace’ is conceivable in view of Hittite usage: the Hittite introduction to the ritual mentions the king building ‘houses’ (E<sub>2</sub><sup>hi.a</sup>, KBo. 37.1 obv. 1), and Hittite *halentu-* ‘palace’ is frequently used in the plural, as Charles Steitler pointed out to me.

<sup>3</sup> The morphemic analysis uses the following abbreviations: AG agent, ADJ adjective, ADV adverb, CONJ conjunction, DEM demonstrative pronoun, F feminine, IMP imperative, LRM local reference marker (covering preposition and preverb), NEG negation, NOM noun, NUM numeral, OBL1 oblique case in =*n*, OBL2 oblique case in =*š(u)*, =*tu*, PAT patient, PCL particle, PL plural, POSS possessive pronoun, PREC precativ, PRON personal pronoun, SG singular, VB verb. I use = as a morpheme divider. This is a simplified morphological analysis that focuses on the issue at hand and leaves out conceivable but more fine-grained analyses.

<sup>4</sup> The divinity of the sun, *Eštan*, comes in a female and a male variety, the latter probably under the influence of Hittite culture. *Eštan* is referred to as *kattah* ‘queen’ in the Hattian text KBo. 37.49, but in KBo. 37.1 *le=*, which is often considered to denote the 3sg. possessive of the masculine gender (Soysal 2004: 228), points to the male divinity. See in general Klinger (2000: 155–157; 1996: 141–147), with references, but note that Klinger takes *Eštan* to be female in KBo. 37.1, arguing that the possessive pronoun *le=* apparently does not strictly denote masculine gender.

and plural marking of nominally and verbally expressed primary actants in particular. The approach is descriptive: a full corpus of plural markers in Hattian clauses from bilingual and quasi-bilingual texts is collected, and an effort is made to uncover a syntactically coherent system that is capable of accounting for all examples. As I hope to show, basing an analysis of Hattian alignment on plural nouns and third person plural verbal prefixes is more revealing than doing so on the basis of singular nouns and third person singular verbal prefixes, which Goedegebuure (2010) proposed, precisely because plural marking on nouns is morphologically overt ( $e\check{s}=\$  and  $wa_a=\$ ) while singular marking is covert ( $\emptyset$ ).

## 2 Plural Formation in Hattian: Generalities

At first sight, plural formation in Hattian is a simple matter. According to the current state of knowledge, Hattian nouns use the typologically unusual feature of prefixing a plural morpheme, which is either  $wa_a=\$  (with a rare alternant  $wi_i=\$ )<sup>5</sup> or  $e\check{s}=\$  (with the alternant  $i\check{s}=\$ , perhaps also  $a\check{s}=\$ ).<sup>6</sup> A third morpheme,  $le=$ ,<sup>7</sup> has turned out to be a third person possessive pronoun in all controllable instances (see also footnote 15).

The choice between the two morphemes is not lexically determined: cf. KUB 28.59 i 15'  $e\check{s}$ -ka-a-at-tah ( $e\check{s}=kattah$ ) 'queens', KUB 1.17 vi 25  $\check{s}e$ -e- $wa_a$ -ka-at-tah ( $\check{s}e=wa_a=kattah$ ) 'her' ( $\check{s}e$ ) queens' (Simon 2012: 110). This points to the conclusion that the difference is functional, but its nature has turned out to be difficult to determine. Traditionally, a collective function was ascribed to  $wa_a=\$  (Laroche 1947: 7), and it was observed that  $e\check{s}=\$  is found in conjunction with what in most Indo-European languages would be a plural direct object (Laroche 1947: 78–79; Kammenhuber 1969: 463–468 with references; Klinger 1996: 625; Soysal 2004: 184, 211, etc.; Kassian 2010: 176; Simon 2012: 111). Since the collective function of  $wa_a=\$  is based on a hunch rather than on any solid evidence, however, there was room for other investigators to consider  $wa_a=\$  the plural morpheme in all functions (Schuster 1974: 80, 2002: xxiii), or in all functions apart from that of the direct object (Soysal 2004: 184).<sup>8</sup>

Matters are made more complex by the fact that both  $wa_a=\$  and  $e\check{s}=\$  occur as verbal prefixes, too, which appear to denote third person plural actants (Klinger 1996: 625; Girbal 1986: 59 on  $e\check{s}=\$ ). This is not the consensus view, however. According to Kammenhuber (1969: 501), verbal  $a\check{s}=\$ ,  $e\check{s}=\$  denotes the 3rd person plural subject (as she terms it, following Laroche; thus also Simon 2012: 166–167, who adds on p. 171 that it denotes the transitive subject) but allegedly has no connection with nominal  $e\check{s}=\$ ,  $a\check{s}=\$ ; she states that the function of the verbal prefix  $wa_a=\$  is 'völlig dunkel' (ibid. 525). Soysal (2004: 211, 215, 223, 237, 264–265) recognizes neither as third plural actant markers and suggests that both nominal and verbal  $e\check{s}=\$  denote verbal plurality (presumably with iterative-distributive semantics; cf. already Schuster 1974: 82 on nominal  $e\check{s}=\$ , 105 on verbal  $wa_a=\$ ).<sup>9</sup> Taracha (1988; 1989: 269–270; 1993: 290) argued that Hattian is an ergative language, in which verbal  $e\check{s}=\$  refers to the plural object of a transitive verb and the plural subject of an intransitive verb.

5 The conventional transcriptions  $wa_a$ ,  $wi_i$ ,  $we_e$ ,  $wu_u$ ,  $wu_{u_2}$  are transcriptions of a combination of the cuneiform sign PI (whose Hittite sign value is  $wa$ ) and the signs A, I, E, U, U<sub>2</sub>, respectively. These alternate, even in the same text, with  $pa$ ,  $pi$ ,  $pu$ ,  $pu_2$ , rarely with  $wa$  (which may sometimes be an orthographical mistake) and with  $wa_{pa}$ ,  $wi_{pi_2}$ , etc. (based on Hurrian convention). The phonetic value of the consonant involved is unclear, but a labial fricative (e.g. [f], [v]) is a commonly made reasonable guess (Kammenhuber 1969: 448; Schuster 1974 *passim*; Girbal 1986: 4; Klinger 1996: 620–621; Soysal 2004: 72–73). Simon (2012: 34–41) argues that two phonemes are involved: a voiced and a voiceless labial fricative (/f/ versus /β/). See section 4 on allomorphs.

6 Probably denoting approximate /ʔš/ or /əš/; see section 4.1.

7 Forrer (1922: 189f., 228–241); Laroche (1947: 77f.); Kammenhuber (1969: 463–468); Taracha (1988: 62 with footnote 18); no longer recognized as plural marker by Schuster (1974: 80); Klinger (1994: 39 footnote 78; 1996: 6); Soysal (2004: 184). Simon (2012: 134–140) argues that one of the functions of  $le=$  is as an accusative marker (see main text above).

8 Soysal (2004: 184) suggests the possibility that  $\check{s}$  in  $e\check{s}=\$  may rather be connected with verbal plurality, i.e. iterative, habitual or distributive action, without however providing evidence for this idea.

9 Schuster is remarkably vague on the function of the verbal prefixes. Schuster (2002: xxiv) recognizes  $ep=$  and  $e\check{s}=\$  as possible third person plural prefixes but does not state whether as agent, patient, subject or object prefixes. The vagueness is continued on p. 176 (on  $a\check{s}=\$  'Affinität zum Plural'), 265 ( $a\check{s}=mi\check{s}$  'einer 3.pl zugeordneten Präfix a-aš-'). Only on p. 270 does he remark on  $a\check{s}=mi\check{s}$  'mit dem Präfix aš-, das als Hinweis auf ein pluralisch empfundenen Objekt betrachtet werden kann'. How this relates to p. 290

### 3 Method and Terminology

I have collected all instances of  $wa_a=$  and  $eš=$  in conjunction with nouns and verbs appearing in syntactically relatively clear contexts, which will be discussed in detail. Most examples are taken from bilingual or quasi-bilingual texts, which provide control over the semantics. Some examples from monolingual texts are included as well, and the reason why this is sensible will be addressed in the discussion of each individual example. Although nouns and verbs seem to share the same markers, I shall present plural markers of nouns separately from plural actant markers of verbs.

Syntactic functions will be described in terms of semantic or thematic roles (agent and patient according to their generally accepted definitions, mono as defined below) and the way in which these roles are encoded in Hattian. Given the lack of consensus about the syntactic alignment of Hattian, it is necessary to steer clear of using terminology that may bias a resolution. Hence, for the time being I shall avoid the terminology of grammatical roles like subject and object as well as terms such as transitive and intransitive, active and passive. I prefer to speak of biactantial and monoactantial verbs and of the semantic roles agent, patient and mono. At this stage of the analysis, however, these terms will be endowed with definitions that are slightly idiosyncratic, as follows:

- agent: agent of a biactantial verb which in the example under discussion has an overtly expressed agent and an overtly expressed patient (type ‘the *man* strokes a *cat*’)
- patient: patient of a biactantial verb which in the example under discussion has an overtly expressed agent and an overtly expressed patient (type ‘the *man* strokes a *cat*’)
- mono: in the present idiosyncratic terminology, the term mono denotes the single primary actant of a monoactantial verb. According to this definition, the subjects of English intransitive verbs such as ‘to be, sit, fall, become, arrive, go, die’ are monos.

This terminology and its application to Hattian call for a number of comments.

(1) The phrase ‘in the example under discussion’ is essential: I describe how verbs behave in specific contexts, not how they behave in Hattian in general. The distinction is not without theoretical interest, but more important in this context is the practical consideration that the fragmentary nature of our knowledge of Hattian does not allow us to answer general questions of the type ‘which argument structure does a particular verb take in Hattian in general?’.

(2) The terms agent, patient and mono are used as general labels with heuristic function rather than as designations of language-specific Hattian categories. The labeling is geared as a first and important step towards finding Hattian categories by way of confronting the general labels with Hattian morphology. An example from another language may clarify the point. In the North-West Caucasian language Abkhaz, the verb ‘beat’

*d=sə=s=wayt*’ 3SG.M=1SG=beat=DYNAMIC = ‘he beats me’

codes its actants differently from ‘see’

*də=z=ba=wayt*’ 3SG.M=1SG=see=DYNAMIC = ‘I see him’, not ‘he sees me’<sup>10</sup>

Assigning general semantic roles to the actants does not bring out the Abkhaz morphosyntactic difference: agent and patient (according to my definition of the terms) of ‘beat’ take first and second position, respectively, whereas agent and patient of ‘see’ take second and first position, respectively. By confronting my general semantic labels with the language-specific encoding of those labels, we arrive at the conclusion that

<sup>10</sup> *aš=wa\_a=tih* ‘sie (sc. Götter) haben für sich mehrfach gebaut’, is not clear; ‘mehrfach’ is probably meant to render  $wa_a=$ , an idea also entertained by Soysal.

<sup>10</sup> Examples taken from Spruit (1986: 95). The -z- in the second form automatically developed from -s- in front of a voiced consonant.

‘beat’ has a valency different from ‘see’, and this is an important step towards an adequate description. As a fuller analysis of the Abkhaz data would show, ‘beat’ is an intransitive verb with a subject-agent (position 1 in a long series of prefixal slots) and an indirect object (position 2):

*d=sə=s=wayt’* 3SG.M subject=1SG indirect object=beat=DYNAMIC ‘he beats me’

while ‘see’ is a transitive verb with a subject-patient (position 1) and an agent (position 3), with an unfilled slot for the indirect object (position 2):

*də=z=ba=wayt’* 3SG.M subject =1SG agent=see=DYNAMIC ‘I see him’

In the present case, establishing the language-specific categories involved in Hattian actant coding requires a dialogue between general labeling, Hattian morphosyntax and Hittite translations of Hattian forms (which offer our first and foremost access to Hattian).

## 4 Allomorphy of *eš=* and *wa<sub>a</sub>=*

### 4.1 Allomorphs of *eš=*

Before embarking on a discussion of the material, it is necessary to clarify my position regarding the status of the alternation *aš=* ~ *eš=* ~ *iš=*, as this affects the way in which I classify the material. The frequently occurring Hattian theonym *Eš-ta-a-an*, the sun deity, appears once as *Aš-ta-a-an* (KBo. 37.55 obv. 5’) and once as (li-)iš-ta-a-an (KUB 28.80 i 8’; Soysal 2004: 114; with the 3sg. possessive prefix *le=*). Its Hittite form is *Ištānu-*. This suggests that the initial vowel is [ə], for which the cuneiform script did not possess an unambiguous orthographic representation (Simon 2012: 76–77). Where Hittite orthography prefers the syllabogram with -i-, Hattian seems to prefer -e- but allows -a- and -i-. The alternation *aš=* ~ *eš=* ~ *iš=* in the Hattian plural prefix can be interpreted in the same way (Simon 2012: 113). Hence, *aš=* is an allograph of *eš=* (e.g. [3]), and *iš=* is, too (e.g. [5], [9]). Accordingly, *eš=*, *aš=*, *iš=* can be treated as orthographic representations of [əš]. Another indication that the analysis as [əš] is correct is the fact that of all the many instances of *eš=* and *iš=* listed in Soysal (2004: 408–423, 499–510) none shows plene writing e-eš-, e-iš-, i-iš-. In spite of all this, in the morphological analyses I shall render *iš=*, *eš=* as *iš=*, *eš=* in accordance with common practice.

The case of *aš=* is more complicated, however. It has been suggested that there exists a nominal and verbal prefix *a=*, which can appear before *eš=*. The result is *a=š=* (Soysal 2004: 205–207, who distinguishes more than one prefix *a=*). This prefix is recognizable in cases of plene writing a-aš-, but where *a=š=* is written as non-plene *aš=* it is indistinguishable from [əš]. I shall write the morphological analysis of non-plene *aš=* as *a(=)š* in order to bring out this ambiguity. Little in this article depends on the issue of whether one accepts the existence of a prefix *a=* or not.

It has been suggested that the spelling *uš=* represents yet another allomorph, or allograph, of the prefix *eš=* (Laroche 1947: 79, 83, 85, 92, 95; Dunaevskaja 1961: 96; Girbal 1986: 59). There is no good evidence for that idea. Alternatively, it has been thought that *uš=* denotes a second rather than a third person plural (Schuster 2002: xxiv, 312; Soysal 2004: 261; cf. Schuster 1974: 146 on 2sg. *u=*). This may well be correct, but note that the only controllable context containing verbal forms with the prefix *uš=* is the damaged bilingual, KUB 28.1, where, perversely, the prefix *uš=* corresponds to Hittite first person plural verbs. Hence the idea that *uš=* is also a first person plural morpheme (Laroche 1947: 83; Dunaevskaja 1961: 129).

In conclusion, the morpheme *eš=* probably represents a phonological form [əš] and is usually spelled as *eš=*, more rarely as *aš=*, *iš=*. The morpheme sequence *a=š=* can be spelled as *aš=* (which is therefore ambiguous) or a-aš-. The spelling *uš=* probably does not represent the morpheme *eš=* but probably is a second person plural *u=š=*.

## 4.2 Allomorphs of $wa_a=$

In verbal forms,  $wa_a=$  may lose its vowel and be spelled with a <Vp> sign. This happens regularly in the verbal prefix if it is preceded by a prefix ending in a vowel and followed by a single consonant that is not labial: e.g. [16] a-ap-ta-ka-a- $wa_a$ -ah, morphologically  $a=w(a_a)=ta=ka=wa_a(=)h$  (Schuster 1972: 131–132; Soysal 2004: 234); [13–14] te-ep-ku-un-ku-uh-hu-wa, morphologically  $te=w(a_a)=kunkuhhuw=a$ . Before a labial consonant the full form of the prefix is preserved: cf. [26] tu-u- $wa_a$ -a[p-pu], morphologically  $tu=wa_a=ppu$ ; [12] te-e- $wa_a$ -pu-u<sub>2</sub>-le-e, morphologically  $te=wa_a=pule$ . The vowel is also preserved before double consonant, as in KUB 28.42 obv. 7' a-wa-am-mi-iš, i.e.  $a=wa=(a)m=miš$  '(s)he takes them'; [6] a-wa-an-ta-nu a- $wa=(a)n=ta=nu$  (see below for  $wa$  instead of  $wa_a$ ); KUB 28.117, 12' a-wa-aš-pi<sub>2</sub>-tu  $a=wa=š=pitu$  'they ... them'. As far as I know, vowel loss does not affect the nominal prefix  $wa_a=$  where we expect it to do so in example [11] te- $wa_a$ -ka-at-ti  $te=wa_a=katti$  'its kings', but do note [13–14], where we find  $le=p=zi[zintu]$  'his grandchildren' in the formulaic 'may his children and his grandchildren live'.

For purely orthographic reasons,  $wa_a=$  may be spelled as  $wa_a$ -, pa- or wa- (see footnote 5). Before a following nasal, however, the normally rare spelling wa- is too frequent to be discarded as merely an orthographic variant. Cf. example [6] a-wa-an-ta-nu  $a=wa=(a)n=ta=nu$  ('he brings them in'). This may be a slip, but it seems more than accidental that the Hittian corpus contains no examples of the sequence a- $wa_a$ -an-, a- $wa_a$ -am-, i.e. candidates for a morphological analysis  $a=wa_a=(a)n=$  (where  $a=$  is a prefix of unknown function and  $(a)n=$  is the morpheme of the 3rd person singular agent). By contrast, there are quite a number of instances of a-wa-an-, a-wa-am-:

- KUB 28.27 rev. l. col. 8', 9' a-wa-an-duh ('he takes/holds them?', root *tuh*, Soysal 2004: 316);
- KBo. 37.34 obv. 8' a-wa-an-ni, KUB 28.53 rev. iv 6' a-wa-an-ni-x-x[ (root *ni*?)
- KUB 28.53 rev. iii 9' a-wa-an-zi-ra-ah (root *zirah*?);
- KUB 48.47, 4' a-wa-an-nu-uš (root *nuš*? Soysal 2004: 298)
- KUB 28.23 rev. 3b a-wa-am-mi-i[š], KUB 28.42 obv. 7' a-wa-am-mi-iš ('he takes them', root *miš*, Soysal 2004: 295)
- KUB 28.48, 1' a-wa-am-pi<sub>2</sub>-i-nu-u, KBo. 37.45 obv. 6' a-wa-am-pi<sub>2</sub>-nu ('he brings them forth' or 'he goes towards them', stem  $pi=nu$  'come/bring towards', root *nu* 'come, bring', Soysal 2004: 297)
- KUB 37.156 a-wa-am-pi-iš ('he ... them', root *piš*, Soysal 2004: 302)

The phenomenon does not seem to be limited to the prefix  $wa_a=$ . It may be relevant to compare the very frequent word for 'lady, queen', ta-wa-an-na-an-na, with the word for 'lord, king, *labarna*', ta- $wa_a$ -ar-na (KUB 28.70 obv. r. col. 1', 5'; KBo. 37.92, 4'; KBo. 37.160 iii 7', KBo. 25.110 i 5'; KUB 28.62, 2') beside highly frequent ta- $ba$ -ar-na; this suggests the possibility that *tabarna* is a word of Hittic rather than Indo-European origin.

On the basis of these examples, we may propose a rule according to which  $wa_a$  turns into  $wa$  before a nasal. The rule, if it is one, must have been more subtle, however: cf. the apparent exceptions KUB 1.17 rev. vi 3', 5' ha- $wa_a$ -an-ta-li-i (the divine name Hapantali); KBo. 37.11 obv. i 16' ]a-aš-hu- $wa_a$ -an-na, KUB 28.86 obv. ii 6 ta-ti- $wa_a$ -an, KBo. 37.32 rev.<sup>2</sup> 8 ]ur- $wa_a$ -an and perhaps KBo. 37.105, 10' ]tu-u<sub>2</sub>-u<sub>2</sub>-zi- $wa_a$ -a[m<sup>2</sup>, all of obscure analysis.<sup>11</sup>

There seems to exist an allomorph  $wi_i=$ : cf. KUB 28.5 obv. 13a  $wa_a$ -pi<sub>2</sub>-ze-el 'rainstorms' (Hitt. *heušāš* ibid. 13b) with its duplicate  $wi_i$ -pi<sub>2</sub>-ze-el (KUB 28.4 obv. 10a; fragmentary 17a). The reason behind the vowel change is unclear but assimilation to the following vowel is a possibility (cf. Schuster 2002: 456; Soysal 2004: 236, 266; Simon 2012: 114).

In conclusion, the morpheme  $wa_a=$  has three allomorphs:  $p=$  in well-defined contexts after a vowel;  $wa=$  before a nasal; and  $wi_i=$  ( $pi_i=$ ), possibly by assimilation to the vowel of the following syllable.

<sup>11</sup> It may be relevant that Simon (2012: 34–41) proposed that hiding behind  $wa_a$ ,  $wi_i$ , etc. are two different labial fricatives: maybe the one became w before nasal and the other did not.

## 5 Homonymy

### 5.1 Other Morphemes of the Shape (e)š=

While the existence of a plural morpheme (e)š= is not disputed, there may be two other morphemes of a shape similar enough to be confused in writing. The status of neither is particularly clear.

(1) There is inconclusive evidence that a different morpheme aš=, iš= (which presumably denote [əš]) is involved in verbal negation. The crucial example is KUB 28.6, 16' aš-ta-ze-el zi-pi<sub>2</sub>-iš li-pi<sub>2</sub>-nu, which corresponds to Hittite *uai* NU.GAL<sub>2</sub>-aš *ammianza* DUMU[-aš] 'the young boy does not cry'. The morphological analysis is probably aš=ta=zel (verbal root *zel* 'cry') zipi=š ('small(ness)'=oblique case) li=pinu ('its/his=child'), literally 'the child of smallness does not cry'. Verbal aš= cannot refer to a plural actant because none appears in the context, as the Hittite rendering shows. By a process of elimination, we can deduce that the Hattian counterpart of the Hittite negation must be hiding in aš= or =ta= or in the combination ašta=.

On a more abstract level, the recognition of a negative morpheme [əš] enables us to analyse the prohibitive prefix taš=, teš= as a combination of the well-known precative prefix te= + (ə)š, with or without intermediate verbal a=.

(2) KUB 2.2 ii 45 eš-ka-a-he<sub>2</sub>-ir-pi<sub>2</sub> corresponds to Hittite *ibid.* 48 *tapariyaweni-ma* 'but we determine' (see [19]). The probable analysis of the Hattian verb is eš + local reference marker *ka* 'on' + verbal root *her* 'determine, organise' + connector *pi* 'and, but'. Hattian eš= and Hittite *-weni* '1pl. agent' are the only remaining morphemes, so it is no surprise that their function has been identified: Hattian eš= marks the 1pl. agent (Laroche 1947: 83). The obvious problem is, however, that eš= normally reflects a 3pl. morpheme and that the normal 1pl. morpheme is *i=*, *ai=*. Therefore it has been suggested that eš=*ka*her indeed contains a 3pl. agent prefix and that the verb means 'they (the gods) determine' (Kammenhuber 1969: 514–515). Indeed, KBo. 19.162 obv. 8 translates the Hattian form with a 3pl. past [*tapari*]yaēr (cf. Schuster 1974: 90, Simon 2012: 155). Hence eš=*ka*her is an unconvincing example of a 1pl. morpheme eš=.

### 5.2 Other Morphemes of the Shape wa<sub>a</sub>=

Beside the plural prefix wa<sub>a</sub>=, three homonymous prefixes have been proposed, only the second of which can be considered reasonably secure.

(1) Hattian has a local reference marker *pi-*, *pe-*. This appears before nouns, as in KUB 2.2, 40 *pe=wi<sub>l</sub>* 'into the house' (see example [5]). It also occurs before verbs: KUB 28.4 obv. l. col. 19a pi<sub>2</sub>-in-nu-wa<sub>a</sub>-at, morphologically *pi=nnu=wa<sub>a</sub>=t*, which corresponds to Hitt. *paitaš* 'he went' (verbal root *nu* 'come, bring', possibly a suffixed connector =wa<sub>a</sub>=, and an unexplained =t). This is the so-called Moon Myth, in which the story about the moon that fell from the sky is told first by the narrator and then, in almost identical wording, by the goddess *Katahziwu<sub>u</sub>.ri*. *pi=nnuwa<sub>a</sub>=t* in *Katahziwu<sub>u</sub>.ri*'s story corresponds to the narrator's *wa-nu-u-up-pa* (*ibid.* 11a), presumably *wa=nu=ppa*, with the suffixed connector *-ppa* = *-wa<sub>a</sub>*. What is of interest in the present context is the prefixal alternation *pi-* ~ *wa-* of the local reference marker. The orthographic alternation *pV/wV<sub>v</sub>* is very common in Hattian (the suffixed conjunction is a case in point) but *pV/wV* is not (cf. Simon 2012: 35–40). Hence it is reasonable that Girbal (1986: 34) suggests that *wa=nu=ppa* should be emended to *wa<sub>a</sub>=nu=ppa*. In orthographical terms that means that the scribe wrote the sign *WA* but forgot to add the subscript sign *A* that would turn the combination into the sign *WA<sub>A</sub>*. However, once we start emending in this way it is easy to suggest that what the scribe forgot was not *A* but *I*: the combination *WA+I* is the sign *WI<sub>I</sub>*, and in this way we would arrive at *\*wi<sub>i</sub>=nu=ppa*, which is just an orthographic variant of *\*pi=nnu=wa<sub>a</sub>=t*, apart from the final =t (thus Schuster 2002: 454). Hattian *wa=nu=ppa* is the only form in the Hattian corpus that can be used to support the existence of a local reference marker *\*wa<sub>a</sub>*. The discussion shows how shaky this idea is. Until more reliable evidence is presented, the existence of a local reference marker *wa<sub>a</sub>* cannot be accepted.

(2) It has been suggested that the 1sg. possessive and personal prefix in Hattian is *wa<sub>a</sub>*. Girbal (1986: 59–62) argued that first person singular verbs are widespread in Hittite ritual texts. Since Hattian texts belong to

the same genre, one might expect to be confronted with a wealth of verbal first persons singular, but none have been forthcoming. That would be understandable if the first person singular morpheme went under the guise of another morpheme and hence passed unrecognized. Girbal suggests that this is indeed the case. He proposes that the verbal prefix  $wa_a=$  designates either the first person singular or a local reference marker (see (1) above). The verbal root *tuh* ‘take’ is attested with a 3sg. agent in *an=duh* (KUB 28.23 rev. 17a) and with the prefix  $wa_a=$  in *wa\_a=duh=ma* (KUB 7.3, 18; *=ma* is a connector meaning ‘and, but’). According to Girbal’s views on the Hittian verb, *an=duh* indicates that *tuh* is a transitive verb and transitive verbs should always contain a personal marker. Hence  $wa_a=$  in *wa\_a=duh=ma*, being the only prefix, cannot be the local reference marker but must be a personal marker. But of which person? He reasons that verbal forms starting with  $wa_a=$  are first person singular forms by a process of elimination: they cannot be 2sg., 3sg., 1pl., or 3pl. because those morphemes are known to have been different, viz. *u*, *an*, *(a)i*, and *eš*, respectively. So they must either be 2pl. or 1sg. He opts for 1sg. because of the frequency of such forms in Hittite ritual texts and the rarity of 2pl. forms. The neuralgic spot in Girbal’s argumentation is that he denies the existence of a third person plural verbal morpheme  $wa_a=$ . This is at variance with the hypothesis defended in this paper, more particularly with my interpretation of all examples of  $wa_a=$  in the verb as 3pl. actants (see section 7). How would Girbal interpret those examples? Certainly not as examples of the first person singular, an interpretation that would be impossible for contextual reasons (the Hittite renderings of the Hittian clauses do not contain 1sg. verbs). The only alternative remaining to Girbal is therefore that they are examples of the local reference marker  $wa_a=$ . But that turns out probably not to exist, as I argued above. So if the examples of verbal  $wa_a=$  of section 7 contain neither the first person singular morpheme nor the local reference marker, they contain a different morpheme still. This conclusion removes the cornerstone from Girbal’s hypothesis that  $wa_a=$  must be the 1sg. morpheme: we have established that there is yet another verbal morpheme  $wa_a=$ , which, on the one hand, cannot denote the first person singular and, on the other, can be argued to be a 3pl. morpheme. In accordance with the conclusions of the present article, the example *wa\_a=duh=ma* cited by Girbal can be translated as ‘they take themselves’. The only way in which a 1sg. morpheme  $wa_a=$  can be salvaged is by producing examples from texts in which an interpretation of  $wa_a=$  as a 3pl. morpheme is impossible.

Soysal (2004: 264, 906, 972) attempts to do just that. He quotes the forms  $wa_a-tu-u_2-tuh$  and  $wa_a-tu-ta-x-x-x$  from KUB 28.87, 7’ and 8’. These have probable Hittite counterparts in one of the Ortaköy texts, Or. 90/1693 iii 6’, 7’, which has now been published by Soysal/Süel (2016: 339, see also 352): [*ha*]rmi ‘I have, hold’ and [*h*]ašpammi ‘I destroy’, respectively.

Girbal (1986: 111–112) produces an example whose interpretation as a 1sg. verb is persuasive rather than compelling. KUB 24.14 iv, the so-called ‘Schafsbeschwörung’, is a bilingual text that describes an apotropaic ritual (see also example [9] and [24]). A priest oversees the ritual maltreatment of a sheep whilst pronouncing a formula of the type ‘what is done to this sheep, so may it be done to the children and grandchildren of the evil man and his wife’. One of the preserved paragraphs recounts how the priest ‘presses down a sheep’ (Hittite *UDU-un palzahaizzi*). Then follows the formula pronounced by the priest. The Hittite version (line 11b–12b) is heavily damaged but the formulaic nature of the text makes a plausible restoration possible: *ku[n UDU-un GIM-an] palza[ha- ] ‘as X press(es)/pressed down this sheep’*. Its Hittian counterpart (line 11a–12a) begins as follows: *i-ma-al-le-en za-ar-du u\_2-uk wa\_a-ka-a-pu-ud<sup>1</sup>-du*. This can be analysed as *ima=llen zar=du uk wa\_a=ka=puddu*. The first three words mean ‘this=as’, ‘sheep’, both in the oblique case, and ‘so’, respectively. It stands to reason that the last word is the verb that agrees with Hitt. ‘press(es)/pressed down’. It contains  $wa_a=$ , the local reference marker *ka=*, and the verbal root *pudd(u)*. As Girbal points out, the ritual is performed by a priest who pronounces the formula, so what the priest probably says is: ‘as I press down this sheep’, i.e.  $wa_a=$  is the 1sg. agent prefix. Additional support derives from the fact that the alternative interpretation of  $wa_a=$  as a 3pl. non-agent marker does not seem to fit the context: if the Hittian verb indeed means something like ‘press down’, the non-agent (patient or performer) is the sheep, which is singular. So far so good, but two facts give reason for caution: the Hittite rendering is heavily damaged so that we cannot claim to have full control over the text, and the Hittian text continues with three words, *kanaiu wa\_a,tahazi wa\_a,htu*, whose interpretation is unclear.

We may conclude that the existence of a 1sg. verbal prefix  $wa_a=$  is very plausible but not yet proved beyond reasonable doubt.



(3) Soysal (2004: 265) draws attention to the text KUB 28.18, which contains phrases that recur in identical or similar form. One such phrase is obv. r. col. 6  $wa_a$ -a-du-u<sub>2</sub>  $wa_a$ -zi-i-ni- $wa_a$ -aš, which he compares with rev. r. col. 4'  $ma$ -a du-u<sub>2</sub>- $wa_a$  zi-i-in[-ni- $wa_a$ -aš]. He infers that  $wa_a$ -a-du-u<sub>2</sub>  $wa_a$ -, analysed as  $wa_a=du=wa_a$ , must be the same form as  $ma$ -a du-u<sub>2</sub>- $wa_a$ , analysed as  $ma=du=wa_a$ , and that both contain a conjunction  $ma$  'and, but'. Thus he arrives at yet another homonym of the plural prefix  $wa_a$ =.

Admittedly KUB 28.18 contains numerous recurring phrases, but some phrases recur in slightly different forms that cannot be considered identical. A case in point is obv. r. col. 8  $at$ -ku-u<sub>2</sub>-ši-im  $ma$ -a ha-a-ni- $wa_a$ -aš and rev. r. col. 6  $le$ -e-ku-si-im  $ma$ -a ha-a-ni- $wa_a$ -aš. Here it is clearly impossible to hold the view that  $at=kušim$  is an orthographical variant or an allomorph of  $le=kušim$ . The maximal claim that one could make is that  $at=$  and  $le=$  are functionally similar: as  $le=$  is a 3sg. possessive pronoun, so  $at=$  may be (or contain) a possessive pronoun, too, or else a different attributive pronoun. But it is disputable whether this procedure can become a rule of thumb that is applicable to similar instances. After all, the English sentences *the pope is infallible*, *no pope is infallible* and *Alexander Pope is infallible* differ by one morpheme, but it does not follow that *the*, *no* and *Alexander* are functionally similar. So the juxtaposition of  $maduwa_a$  and  $wa_a duwa_a$  does not suffice to show that there exists a conjunction  $wa_a=$  even if  $ma=$  can be confidently identified as a conjunction. We may conclude that there is no evidence that  $wa_a=$  in  $wa_a=duwa_a$  is anything other than the plural morpheme or, if it exists, the 1sg. pronominal prefix.

### 5.3 Conclusion on Homonyms

It turns out that the only homonyms of the plural morphemes  $eš=$  and  $wa_a=$  that bear to scrutiny are probably the 1sg. morpheme  $wa_a=$  and conceivably the negative prefix  $aš/iš=$ . In examples from bilingual texts the Hittite renderings should enable us to avoid confusion with the plural morphemes.

## 6 The Nominal Prefixes $wa_a=$ and $eš=$

The relevant examples indicate that  $eš=$  denotes the plural patient, while  $wa_a=$  is used as a plural prefix in all other syntactic contexts.

### 6.1 $eš=$ in Plural Patient

- [3a] KUB 2.2 ii 40  
 [3b]  $wa_a$ -aš-ha-ap- $ma$        $eš$ - $wu_u$ -ur       $aš$ -ka-ah-hi-ir  
 [3c]  $wa_a=šhap=ma$        $eš=wu_u r$        $a(=)š=ka=hhir$   
 [3d] PL.AG=NOM=PCL      PL.PAT=NOM 3PL.AG=LRM=VB  
 [3e] and gods      lands      they distribute(d)  
 [3f] 'and the gods distributed the lands'  
 [3g] Hittite: *ibid.* ii 43 DINGIR<sup>meš</sup> KUR<sup>meš</sup>  $ma$ -ni-ja-ah-hi-ir 'the gods distributed the lands'.

- [4a] KBo. 37.1 obv. 21a restored according to KBo. 37.2, 2'  
 [4b]  $te$ -e- $i$ -ip       $eš$ - $pu$ -ur<sup>l</sup>       $wa_a$ -a-aš-ha-ap      a-aš- $pu$   
 [4c]  $te=i=p$        $eš=pu r$        $wa_a=šhap$        $a=š=pu$   
 [4d] PRON=1PL=PL?      PL.PAT=NOM PL.AG=NOM      a=3PL.AG=VB  
 [4e] we/us      lands      gods      they make  
 [4f] 'the gods make us (and) the lands'  
 [4g] Hittite: *ibid.* 20b KUR-e- $ma$  an-za-a-aš-ša DINGIR<sup>meš</sup>- $eš$ - $pat_2$  i-ja-an-z[i] 'but the gods make the land and us'.  
 [4h] The tablet reads  $eš$ - $pu$ -u<sub>2</sub>. I emend to  $eš$ - $pu$ -ur<sup>l</sup> 'lands', which is expected on the basis of the Hittite rendering. Certain variants of the sign  $u_2$  can easily be confused with the sign UR, so that a scribal mistake is

easily possible.<sup>12</sup> Hattian *te-e-ṣ-ip* preserves the pronoun ‘us’ ([4]). Klinger (1996: 640) reads *te-e-x* [ ], missing the reading [ ]ip of line 2’ of the duplicate KBo. 37.2 included by Schuster 2002: 158–159. For the reading *te-e-ṣ-* rather than *te-e-x*, see Schuster 2002: 214 (*te-e-ṣ-* or *te-e-ṣ-a-*).

[5a] KUB 2.2 iii 40–41 restored according to KBo. 21.110 rev. 1–2 (Schuster 1974: 72–73)

[5b] a-šā-ah ta-aš-te-nu-u<sub>2</sub>-wa pe<sub>2</sub>-e-wi<sub>1</sub>-il  
 [5c] *ašah taš=te=nuw=a pe=(i=)wi<sub>1</sub>l*  
 [5d] NOM NEG=PREC=VB=IMP LRM=(PL.NONPAT=)NOM  
 [5e] evil may not come into house(s)

[5b] *iš-pe<sub>2</sub>-e-eḷ* ta-aš-te-e-ta-nu-u-wa<sup>1</sup>

[5c] *iš=pe<sub>l</sub> taš=te=ta=nuw=a*

[5d] PL.PAT=NOM NEG=PREC=LRM=VB=IMP

[5e] houses may not enter

[5f] ‘let evil not come into the house(s), let it not enter the houses’

[5g] Hittite: *ibid.* iii 42–44 *nu-wa-kaṇ<sub>2</sub> i-da-lu-ṣ[š anda’ l]e u<sub>2</sub>-iz-zi, i-da-lu-uš-wa-kan<sub>2</sub> UN-aš Ḫ<sub>2</sub>-ri anda le-e u<sub>2</sub>-iz-zi* ‘the evil one must not come [in?], the evil person must not come into the house’.

[5h] *iš=pe<sub>l</sub>* corresponds to Hitt. *Ḫ<sub>2</sub>-ri (anda)* ‘(into the) house’ and accordingly contains the word for ‘house’ (*wa<sub>a</sub>el, wa<sub>a</sub>il, wi<sub>1</sub>l* etc., Soysal 2004: 320). The clause contains two prohibitive verbs. As Kammenhuber pointed out (1969: 457), the first prohibitive, *taš=te=nuw=a*, lacks a local reference marker and therefore requires as a complement the prepositional phrase *pe=(i=)wi<sub>1</sub>l* ‘into (the) house(s)’.<sup>13</sup> The second prohibitive contains the preverb *=ta=*, to which *iš=pe<sub>l</sub>* is the (preverbal) object. A translation of *ta=nu* as ‘enter’ would do justice to Hattian grammar.

A confrontation with the following example is instructive: the presence of a patient noun coded by *eš=* (*iš=*, *aš=*) is apparently not instrumental in triggering a translation shift from *nu* ‘come’ to *nu* ‘bring’.

[6a] KUB 28.59 i 15’–16’

[6b] a-an-ta-nu-ma eš-ka-a-at-tah[ ]

[6c] *a(=)n=ta=nu=ma eš=kattah*

[6d] *a(=)3SG.AG=LRM=VB=PCL PL.PAT=NOM*

[6e] he in bring/come and/but queens

[6b] a-wa-an-ta-nu (-) ma aš-ka-a-at-[tah]

[6c] *a=wa=(a)n=ta=nu=ma a(=)š=kattah*

[6d] *a=3PL=3SG.AG=LRM=VB=PCL (AN=)PL.PAT=NOM*

[6e] them he in bring/come and/but queens

[6f] ‘he brings the queens in [ ] the queens are brought in by him’

[6g] No Hittite counterpart, so we cannot be as sure about the interpretation as in the case of bilingual examples: see discussion.

[6h] The verbal root *nu* can be translated as ‘go, come’ in many examples (Soysal 2004: 297). But it can also mean ‘bring’, depending on which actants are expressed (Taracha 1988: 63 footnote 23; Soysal 2004: 297). This example offers the key to that insight: if we were to translate *ta=nu* as ‘come in(to)’, this example would mean ‘he comes into the queens’, which makes little sense in any context and is therefore impossible. ‘He brings in the queens’ makes better sense. The verbal prefix *an=* denotes a 3sg. agent (Klinger 1994: 30; Soysal 2004: 210). *aš=kattah* may be a scribal variant of *eš=kattah* (cf. section 4.1) or it may be segmentable as *a=(e)š*.

<sup>12</sup> Compare the third variant of *u<sub>2</sub>* with the third variant of *ur* in Rüster/Neu (1989: 185, 116).

<sup>13</sup> The spelling *pe<sub>2</sub>-e-wi<sub>1</sub>-il* may hide a plural prefix *=i=*, which is the allomorph of *wa<sub>a</sub>=* before labial consonants, as I shall argue elsewhere: cf. KUB 2.2 iii 30 *le-e-pi<sub>2</sub>-nu*, duplicate KBo. 21.110, 13’ *le-e-i-pi<sub>2</sub>-nu le=i=pinu* ‘his children’.

Either way, *eš=* expresses the plural patient. The next verb is the same as in the preceding clause apart from additional *=wa=* (< *\*=wa<sub>a</sub>=* before nasal, see 4.2), which in the verb expresses a 3rd person plural patient or mono but at any rate not an agent.<sup>14</sup> The 3sg. agent is expressed as internal *=(a)n=*. This example is one of the verbal forms in which more than one actant is expressed (see 7.1.4 and 7.2.4 for other examples). It offers precious information on the relative position of patient and agent markers in the prefixal chain: the patient is placed before the agent.

## 6.2 *wa<sub>a</sub>=* in Possessor (Genitive)

[7a] KBo. 37.1. obv. 16a–18a (Klinger 1996: 640–641)

[7b] *ha-nu-u<sub>2</sub>-wa-pa*      <sup>d</sup>*Ha-ša-am-mi-i-i*[l]      *tu-u<sub>2</sub>-up-kar-ga-ra-aš*

[7c] *ha=nuw=a=pa*      *Hašammil*      *tu=p=kargaraš*

[7d] LRM=VB=?=PCL      NAME      *tu=3PL.NONAG=VB*

[7e] and/but came in      god Hašammil      *tu* them raked

[7b] *wa<sub>a</sub>-a-aš-ha-pu-u<sub>2</sub>[-un ...]*      *i-wa<sub>a</sub>-a-wa<sub>a</sub>-aš-ke-el*

[7c] *wa<sub>a</sub>=šhapu=n*      *i=wa<sub>a</sub>=*      *wa<sub>a</sub>=škel*

[7d] PL=NOM=OBL1      3PL.POSS=      PL=NOM

[7e] of gods      their      innards

[7f] ‘Hašammil came (and) he raked the innards of the gods’

[7g] Hittite: *ibid.* 17b–19b *an-da-an-ma-aš-kan<sub>2</sub> pa-it* <sup>d</sup>*Ha[-ša-a]m-[mi-li(-)]* *nu ar-ha ha-ah-ha-ri-e-et* DINGIR<sup>meš</sup>-*na-aš* [ ] ŠA<sub>3</sub>-*šU-NU* ‘and he came in, Hašammili, and he raked out the innards of the gods’.

## 6.3 *wa<sub>a</sub>=* in Complements to Local Reference Markers (LRM)

[8a] KUB 28.63 l. col. 15', KUB 28.100 obv.(?) iii(?) 8'

[8b] *ha-wa<sub>a</sub>-aš-ha-ap*

[8c] *ha=wa<sub>a</sub>=šhap*

[8d] LRM=PL=NOM

[8e] among (the) gods

[8a] KUB 28.75 obv. ii 4', rev. iii 9', 12', 17', 22', 27', KUB 28.76 obv.(?) ii 9'

[8b] *ha-wa<sub>a</sub>-aš-ha-wi<sub>i</sub>-pi<sub>2</sub>*

[8c] *ha=wa<sub>a</sub>=šhaw<sub>i</sub>=pi*

[8d] LRM=PL=NOM=PCL

[8e] among (the) gods + particle *=pi*

Both examples are from monolingual texts. The local reference marker *ha=* is translated as Hittite *anda* ‘in(to)’ in KBo. 37.1 obv. 16–17 *ha-nu-u<sub>2</sub>-wa-pa* <sup>d</sup>*Ha-ša-am-mi-il* *ha=nuw=a=pa* *Hašammil*, Hitt. *anda=ma=aš=kan pait* <sup>d</sup>*Ha[ša]m[miliš]* ‘and Hašammil went in’ (*ha=* ‘in’, *nu(w)=* ‘go, come’, *=a=* mood/tense marker (?), *=pa* ‘and, but’).

<sup>14</sup> See 7.1.1, 7.1.4, 7.2.1.

## 6.4 $wa_a=$ in Agents

Two examples were discussed above:

[3c]  $wa_a=šhap=ma eš=wu_r a(=)š=ka=hhir$

[3f] ‘and the gods distributed the lands’

[4c]  $te=i=p eš=pur wa_a=šhap a=š=pu$

[4f] ‘the gods make us (and) the lands’

The third example is found in one of the longest Hattian sentences:

[9a] KUB 24.14 iv restored according to KUB 28.78 iv 19a–25a (cf. Girbal 1986: 102–117)

[9b] [i-m]a-al-le-en    za-a-ar-du    [le-]wa<sub>a</sub>-šū-nu

[9c] *imallen*            *zar=du*            *le=wa<sub>a</sub>šunu*

[9d] DEM=CONJ        NOM=OBL2        3.POSS=NOM

[9e] this like            sheep            his soul

[9b]  $wa_a$ -a-aš-ti    pa-la-a    [le<sup>2</sup>-]e-i- $wa_a$ -aš-he<sub>2</sub>-ež-ni

[9c]  $wa_a=(a)šti$     *pala*        [l]e=i= $wa_a=(a)šhezni$

[9d] PL=NOM        CONJ        3.POSS.M=PL=PL=NOM

[9e] birds            and            their<sup>15</sup> foxes

[9b]  $u_2$ -uk<sup>16</sup>    [i]š<sup>17</sup>-ga-ap-pu-še-e    pa-la-a

[9c] *uk*            *iš=ga=ppuše*        *pala*

[9d] ADV        3PL.AG=LRM=VB    CONJ

[9e] as            they eat            and/too

[9b] [a-]ša-ah-du    li-iz-zu-wa-du    [l]e-e-i-pi<sub>2</sub>-i-nu    le-e-pa-zi-zi-in-tu

[9c] *ašah=du*        *li=zuwadu*        *le=i=pinu*        *le=pa=zizintu*

[9d] NOM=OBL2    3.POSS=NOM    3.POSS=PL<sup>18</sup>=NOM    3.POSS=PL=NOM

[9e] of evil one    his wife        his children        his grandchildren

[9f] Literally: ‘like birds and foxes this sheep’s soul as they eat, also ...’, i.e. ‘as birds and foxes eat the soul of this sheep, also (let them eat) the wife, children, grandchildren of the evil one’.

[9g] Hittite: *ibid.* 19b–25b *nu ke-e-el UDU-un GIM-an ZI-ŠU MUŠEN<sup>hi.a</sup> KA<sub>5</sub>.A<sup>hi.a</sup> a-da-an-zi, HUL-lu-uš-ša UKU<sub>3</sub>-aš U<sub>3</sub> ŠA DAM<sup>meš</sup>-ŠU DUMU<sup>meš</sup>-ŠU ERIN<sub>2</sub><sup>meš</sup> MUŠEN<sup>hi.a</sup> KA<sub>5</sub>.A<sup>hi.a</sup> QA-TAM-MA a-da-an-du* ‘and as birds (and) foxes eat the soul of this sheep, in the same way also let the birds (and) foxes eat the wives, children, troops of the evil person’.

<sup>15</sup> Possessive *le=*, with or without *pala* ‘and’, can be used in order to co-ordinate two semantically similar nouns and is best translated as ‘and’ (Schrijver in press and cf. KBo. 37.1 l. col. 24–26 + KBo. 37.2, 4’–6’ *šahiš le=parnulli ..... ki[ ] le=kurtapi* ‘šahiš wood and parnulli wood ... sweet reed and happuriya wood’).

<sup>16</sup> Klinger (1996: 659, with references).

<sup>17</sup> On the basis of the drawing in KUB 24.14 iv 22’ (p. 49) it is impossible to read [t]e- instead of the agent prefix [i]š- (*pace* Soysal 2004: 501). So the verb cannot be *te=ga=puše*, with precative *te=*, which in that case would have agreed with Hittite *adandu* ‘they must eat’. The reading with *te=* is most improbable for a contextual and a syntactic reason, too: all precatives in this text are of the structure *te=š=verb* (*ibid.* 7a *te=š=put* 8a *te=š=tuhhudu*, 17a *te=š=wa<sub>a</sub>u*), so that in our instance \**te=š=ga=puše* would be expected; the latter is the Hattian equivalent of Hitt. *adandu* according to the argument presented in this article. Charles Steitler kindly informs me that the photo does indeed confirm [i]š-.

<sup>18</sup> As I shall argue elsewhere, the plural prefix *i(p)=* is the regular allomorph of *wa\_a=* in front of labial consonants (see footnote 13).

[9h] The details of the Hittite rendering differ from those of Hattian: ‘birds and foxes’ and the verb ‘eat’ appear twice in Hittite instead of only once in the Hattian version. The verb *iš=ga=puše* corresponds formally to Hitt. *adanzi* ‘they eat’ rather than to Hitt. *adandu* ‘let them eat’ (in which case a Hattian precativ in *te=* would have been expected), so syntactically it belongs to the first clause. The syntax of the first clause is governed by the morphemes *=llen* ‘like, as’ after the first word and the conjunction or adverb *uk* ‘so, as’, which is placed immediately before the verb *iš=ga=puše*. Together they can be rendered by the English conjunction ‘as’. The verb contains the root *puš(e)*<sup>19</sup> and a LRM *ga* (= *ka* lit. ‘on’). In the subclause which begins this sentence, third person plural nominal agents prefixed by *wa<sub>a</sub>=* (‘birds and foxes’) are combined with a third person singular nominal patient (*wa<sub>a</sub>šun(u)*, *pšun* ‘soul’ is singular, cf. Girbal 1986: 98–101; Soysal 2004: 300). In the main clause that makes up the second half of the sentence, the same third person plural agents are combined with a series of coordinated patients, one of which is singular (‘his wife’) while the others are plural. In the Hattian version, the verb *iš=ga=puše* is positioned in the initial, subordinate clause, so it has a singular patient (‘this sheep’s soul’).

## 6.5 *wa<sub>a</sub>=* in mono (?)

[10a] KBo. 37.50 obv. i 6’

[10b] u-**wa<sub>a</sub>**-za-ar [ ]            te-u-up

[10c] u=**wa<sub>a</sub>**=zar                    te=u=p

[10d] 2SG=PL=NOM                  PRON=2=PL

[10e] your sheep (pl.)                you (pl.)

[10f] ‘your sheep (are) yours’

[10g] Parallel Hittite text: KBo. 25.122 rev. iii 12’ UDU<sup>hi.a</sup>-KA tue[ ] ‘your (sg.) sheep (pl.) (are/were) yours (sg.)’.

[10h] Cf. Girbal (2000: 373, 376); Soysal (2004: 808).

But see 6.6. for a note of caution.

## 6.6 *eš=* Replaced by *wa<sub>a</sub>=* after Possessive Prefix

Towards the end of [9] there is an example of a plural patient with *wa<sub>a</sub>=* instead of expected *eš=*: *ašah=du li=zuwadu le=i=pinu le=pa=zizintu* ‘(may they eat) the evil one’s wife, children, grandchildren’. Similarly, [7] *tu=p=kargaraš wa<sub>a</sub>=šhapu=n iwa<sub>a</sub>=wa<sub>a</sub>=škel* ‘(Hašammil) raked the innards of the gods’ contains a plural patient *iwa<sub>a</sub>=wa<sub>a</sub>=škel*, this time preceded by the 3rd plural possessive prefix *iwa<sub>a</sub>=* ‘their’ (Soysal 2004: 223). In the entire Hattian corpus, there are no instances in which possessive prefixes are combined with what is evidently the plural marker *eš=*, which suggests that this combination is impossible. If indeed *eš=* cannot be combined with a preceding possessive prefix, example [10] *u=wa<sub>a</sub>=zar* ‘your sheep (pl.)’ no longer offers reliable evidence for the hypothesis that a plural mono has *wa<sub>a</sub>=* rather than *eš=*.

Another example of this phenomenon can be found in

[11a] KBo. 37.49 rev. 12’–13’ (Klinger 2000: 158–159)

[11b] tu-u-wa<sub>a</sub>-a[p-pu                wu<sub>u</sub>-r]u-un    te-**wa<sub>a</sub>**-ka-at-ti

[11c] *tu=wa<sub>a</sub>=ppu*                    wu<sub>u</sub>,ru=n        te=**wa<sub>a</sub>**=katti

[11d] *tu=3PL.NONAG=VB*        NOM=OBL1    3F.POSS=PL=NOM

[11e] *tu* them madec                of the land    its kings

[11f] (unexpressed: she, the goddess Eštan) made them (into) kings of the land

[11g] Hittite: KUB 28.8 rev. r. col. + KBo. 37.48 obv. 3’: nu-uš KUR[an-ti (LUGAL<sup>meš</sup> i-e)]-et ‘and she (i.e. the Sun Goddess Eštan) made them (i.e. king and queen) kings of the land’.

<sup>19</sup> Girbal (1986: 107); Soysal (2004: 305).

[11h] The logical agent, the sun goddess Eštan, is introduced in the preceding clause and left unexpressed in this clause. The plural patient is marked by verbal  $=wa_a=$ . Nominal  $wu_u, ru=n te=wa_a=katti$  ‘kings of the land’ is strictly speaking not the patient but the goal object Y of ‘make X into Y’; it too is marked by plural  $wa_a=$ .

## 6.7 Conclusion on Nominal $wa_a=$ and $eš=$

The nominal plural prefix  $wa_a=$  is used in conjunction with possessors (in genitive function), complements of local reference markers and agents. The nominal plural prefix  $eš=$  is used in connection with plural patients, but in that function it is replaced by  $wa_a=$  if preceded by a possessive prefix (third person prefixes  $le=$  or  $še=$  or  $iwa_a=$  in unambiguous examples). Since the only example of a plural mono has  $wa_a=$  after a possessive prefix, it is unclear whether the plural of monos without possessive prefixes is formed by  $eš=$  or  $wa_a=$ .

## 7 The Verbal Prefixes $wa_a=$ and $eš=$

In order to make sense of the distribution of  $wa_a=$  and  $eš=$  as verbal prefixes, it is necessary to separate verbal forms with a prefix  $tu= \sim šu=$  from those lacking that prefix. It is not known what the function of the prefix is (cf. Simon 2012: 193–201; see *ibid.* 77–82 for a possible analysis of this alternation). For the sake of convenience I shall write  $tu=$  to cover both spellings.

### 7.1 The Verbal Prefixes $wa_a=$ and $eš=$ in Verbs Lacking $tu=$

#### 7.1.1 $wa_a=$ indicates the third plural of mono in non- $tu=$ verbs

In the following three examples, the plural prefix  $wa_a=$  (allomorph  $=p=$ ) in the verb refers to the plural mono (intransitive subject). None contains the prefix  $tu=$ .

[12a] KBo. 37.1 obv. 19a–21a restored according to KBo. 37.2, 1’–2’<sup>20</sup>

[12b]  $te-e[-wa_a-pu-u_2]-le-e^{21}$      $za-ri-u_2-um-pa$      $še^2-pi_2-i^2[-nu]^{22}$

[12c]  $te=wa_a=pule$                      $zariu=m=pa$                      $še=pinu$

[12d] PREC=3PL.PERF=VB    NOM=OBL1=PCL    3.POSS=NOM

[12e] may they become            of humanity but(?)    its child

[12b]  $wu_{u_2}-u_2-ru-uš$      $te-e-wa_a-pu-u_2-le-e$

[12c]  $wu_u, ru=š$                      $te=wa_a=pule$

[12d] NOM=OBL2                    PREC=3PL.PERF=VB

[12e] land                            may they become

[12f] ‘May they (i.e. the innards of the gods) become humanity’s child, may they become the land.’

[12g] Hittite: KBo. 37.1 obv. 18b–20b  $ki-ša-ru-at da-an-du-ki-iš-na<-aš> DUM[U KUR-e-ja^?]$  ‘may they (i.e. the innards of the gods) become mortality’s child (i.e. man) [and the land].’

[12h] The Hattian text differs from the Hittite rendering in the sense that Hattian shows the counterpart of Hitt.  $kišaru=at$  ‘may it/they become’ twice:  $te=wa_a=pu(=)le$ . Schuster (2002: 158) provides a very different transla-

<sup>20</sup> For the text, see Klinger (1996: 640–641 [analysis 662–665]); Schuster (2002: 158–159 [with inclusion of the duplicate KBo. 37.2], and discussion on pp. 205ff.).

<sup>21</sup> Klinger (1996: 640) prints  $te-e[- ] le-e$ , in agreement with the reading of KBo. 37.1 obv. i 19; my additions are based on the full form attested one line below.

<sup>22</sup> Klinger (1996: 640) reads  $[eš-pi_2-i^2]$ , which is perhaps possible judging by KBo. 37.1 obv. i 20. On p. 663–665 he prints and discusses  $[t]e-pi_2-i^2[-in^2]$ , which is impossible.

tion of the Hattian section: ‘(Unsere, der Götter, Herzen) sollen [froh?/ erfreut?] werden! Es (das Haus?) soll (für ständig?) für das Land der Söhne der Mensch(heit) gemacht werden! Es soll [(ihnen) gegeben werden]!’ This deviates considerably from what he thinks the Hittite text means, which is fatal to his interpretation (ibid. 159): ‘Der Götter ihr(e) Herz(en) soll(en) <...> werden / gemacht werden! Es, das Land der Söhne der Menschheit, (gehört) aber auch uns!’ Klinger (1996: 641) provides a more plausible translation of the Hittite text but takes the beginning as belonging to a previous clause (which is quite possible: see example [7]): ‘Es soll werden zu dem [Sohn PS] des Sterblichen.’ He does not attempt to provide a word-by-word interpretation of the Hattian version.

The prefix  $wa_a=$  in the precative verb  $te=wa_a=pule$  ‘may they become’ is a plural mono. It is introduced in the preceding clause (example [7]) by a noun phrase with the plural prefix  $wa_a=$  ( $i=wa_a=wa_a=škel$  ‘their innards’).<sup>23</sup>

[13a] KUB 28.103 i 2’–5’

[13b] ka-at-ti      te-ep[-ku-un-ku-uh-hu-wa]

[13c] *katti*       $te=p=kunkuhhuw=a$

[13d] NOM      PREC=3PL.PERF=VB=IMP

[13e] king      may they live

[13b] ka-at-ta-ah      te-ep-ku[-un-ku-uh-hu-wa]

[13c] *kattah*       $te=p=kunkuhhuw=a$

[13d] NOM      PREC=3PL.PERF=VB=IMP

[13e] queen      may they live

[13b] le-e-wi<sub>i</sub>-in      le-ep[-zi-zi-in-tu]      te-ep-ku-un-ku-uh-hu-wa]

[13c]  $le=i=^{24}wi_i n$        $le=p=zizintu$        $te=p=kunkuhhuw=a$

[13d] 3SG.POSS=PL=NOM      3M.POSS=PL.NONPAT=NOM      PREC=3PL.PERF=VB=IMP

[13e] his children      his grandchildren      may they live

This example will be discussed in conjunction with its almost identical counterpart:

[14a] KUB 48.59 1’–4’ (beginning of clause lost)

[14b] te-ep-ku-un[ku-uh-hu-wa]      li-ip-wi<sub>i</sub>-e[-en ]

[14c]  $te=p=kunkuhhuw=a$        $li=i(p)=wi_i en$

[14d] PREC=3PL.PERF=VB=IMP      3SG.POSS=PL=NOM

[14e] may they live      his children

[14b] li-ip-zi[-zi-in-tu ]      te-ep-k[u-un-ku-uh-hu-wa]

[14c]  $li=p=zizintu$        $te=p=kunkuhhuw=a$

<sup>23</sup> It is worth noting that *pule* ‘become’ and *pu* ‘make’ are semantically and formally similar enough to consider the possibility that both contain the same basic root *pu* ‘make, be made, become’. The suffix *=le* might play a role itself in turning the meaning into ‘become’, in other words, its subject experiences the verbal action without the action of an agent. If that is indeed the function of *=le*, other similar examples should be forthcoming. Soysal (2004) does not list a suffix with similar function, but one may draw attention to KUB 1.17 vi. This text shows an example of what looks like a verbal form *nu-u<sub>2</sub>-pa-li* (l. 12). Hattian *nu* means ‘come, bring’ (Soysal 2004: 297 and examples [6], [7]) and *pa* is a known clausal particle (Soysal 2004: 235). *nu=pa=li* occurs in a context riddled with the 3sg. possessive *le=* ‘his’. In a parallel passage, riddled with the 3sg. possessive *še=* ‘her’ instead of *le=*, we find *nu=pa=ši* (l. 22) instead of *nu=pa=li*. This points to the possibility that *=li* and *=ši* are related to the respective possessive prefixes, which could be made sense of by assuming that these are general personal pronouns that are invested with both possessive (before nouns) and reflexive meaning (after verbs). This is of course no more than a possibility (cf. Girbal 1986: 145–152 for an illuminating discussion of the entire context).

<sup>24</sup> See footnote 13 on the plural morpheme *i(p)=*.

[14d] 3M.POSS=PL.NONPAT=NOM PREC=3PL.PERF=VB=IMP

[14e] his grandchildren may they live

[14f] ‘... may they live, his children (and) his grandchildren, may they live’

[13–14g] The formula has a counterpart in Hittite: cf. KBo. 25.112 ii 4’–5’ [LU]GAL-uš hu-šu-wa-an-za e-eš-tu MUNUS.LU[GAL KI.MIN ER]IN<sub>2</sub><sup>meš</sup>-šU KI.4 ‘may the king live, the queen [likewise ..., his troop]s likewise’ (Girbal 1986: 127–128; Neu 1980: 191).

[13–14h] A number of parallels to this formula exist elsewhere in the Hittian corpus. They were discussed extensively by Girbal (1986: 127–135). He assumes that the =p= in *te=p=kunkuhhuw=a* is a shortened allomorph of *pi* ‘hin, nach vorne’, which ‘zeigt die Verlängerung der Handlung in die Zukunft an.’ This is unlikely. Parallel texts show forms which differ in exactly this respect:

- *te=kunkuhhuw=a*: KUB 28.75 ii 14: *ka-ā-at-te te-ku-un-ku-uh-hu-u-a MUNUS.LUGAL KI.MIN DUMU.MEŠ-šU KI.3[ ...]MEŠ-šU KI.4* ‘may the king live, the queen likewise, his sons likewise [...] his ...s likewise’ (Neu 1980: 193).
- *te=š=kukuhhuw=a*: KUB 48.32, 8’ *te-eš-ku-u-uk-ku-ḫ[u<sup>2</sup>-wa]* ‘may they enliven’, with 3PL.AG =š=<sup>25</sup>.

The alternations strongly suggest that =p= is a shortened form of the 3rd plural performer prefix =*wa<sub>a</sub>*= rather than the local reference marker =*pi*=, hence ‘may they live’ (see 4.2). This form of the formula is appropriate in connection with the plurals ‘his children’, ‘his grandchildren’ but not with the singulars ‘king’, ‘queen’ of example [13], where the appropriate verb is *te=kunkuhhuw=a*, a form in which the 3sg. mono is regularly left unexpressed (as indeed occurs in connection with *katte* ‘king’ in KUB 28.75 obv. ii 14: *katte te=kunkuhhuw=a* ‘may the king live!’). In antiphonal formulaic blessings such as these the confusion is not surprising. The translations of [13] and [14] are accordingly: ‘the king – may they live, the queen – may they live, his children (and) grandchildren – may they live’; ‘may ... live, may his children (and) his grandchildren live’.

[15a] KUB 28.4 obv. l. col. 24 and 25 (Moon Myth)

[15b] *te-ep-ta-ak-[nu-wa]* and *te-ep-ga-ak-nu-wa*

[15c] *te=p=ta=k=nuw=a* and *te=p=ga=k=nuw=a*<sup>26</sup>

[15d] PREC=PL=LRM=LRM<sup>2</sup>=VB=IMP

[15e] may they go into+down

[15g] Hitt: *ibid. obv. r. col. 27’ nam-ma-at pa-a-an-du* ‘they must go along’

[15h] The tablet is too damaged to understand the context of these verbs, but the equation with the Hittite rendering is secure. The verbal plural prefix =p= expresses a plural mono.

The following example is less straightforward but in light of the preceding examples the verbal prefix *wa<sub>a</sub>*= (=p=) can be interpreted as a mono as well:

[16a] KUB 2.2 iii 34–35 restored according to KBo. 21.110 obv. 14’–15’ (Schuster 1974: 72)

[16b] [pa-l]a a-**ap**-ta-ka-a-wa<sub>a</sub>-ah <sup>d</sup>Šu-li-in-kat-ti [kat-t]e-e

[16c] *pala* a=**p**=ta=ka=*wa<sub>a</sub>h* Šulinkatti *katte*

[16d] CONJ AN=3PL=LRM=LRM=VB NAME NOM

[16e] and they ordered Šulinkatti king

[16f] ‘and they (the gods, mentioned in the preceding clause) ordered king Šulinkatti’

[16g] Hittite: *ibid. iii 37–38 an-da-ma-aš-ši-iš-ša-an wa-a-tar-na-ah-hi<ir>* <sup>d</sup>U.G[U]R LUGAL-i. Hittite: ‘but (-*ma*) they ordered<sup>2</sup> (*anda watarnahh-*) him (-š*i*), king Šulinkatti’. The exact meaning of *anda watarnahh-* is not entirely clear. The translation follows Schuster, but note that *anda watarnahh-* is translated as ‘jemandem (accusative) jemandem (dative-locative) empfehlen’, so ‘to recommend someone to someone’ by Friedrich

<sup>25</sup> The preceding line reads *te-ep-ku-un-ku-uh-h[u-wa]* ‘may they live’, the line following it *te-eš-wa<sub>a</sub>-a-al-w[a<sub>a</sub>-la-at]* ‘may they speak’.

<sup>26</sup> The signs for TA and GA are so similar that the variation here is probably due to a copying mistake.



(1930: 22). Applied to KUB 2.2, this would lead to a translation ‘they recommended to him, viz. king Šulinkatti (as follows:)’; I am indebted to the editor of *Altorientalische Forschungen* for this reference.

[16h] While the Hattian verb lacks a marker corresponding to <sup>a</sup>Šu-li-in-kat-ti, there is a third person plural marker =p=, the postvocally shortened allomorph of wa<sub>a</sub>=. In order to fully appreciate the Hattian form, it should be compared with what is probably the same root in KUB 2.2 iii 46–47 a-an-ta-ha-ka-a-wa<sub>a</sub>-ah-pi<sub>2</sub>, i.e. an=ta(=)ha=ka=wa<sub>a</sub>h=pi, Hitt. *anda daiš* ‘he (i.e. Šulinkatti) laid (tools) on (the beam)’ (Schuster 1974: 74–75, 142; Klinger 1994: 28). The latter Hattian verb contains the 3sg. agent marker (a)n= instead of a 3pl. marker (a)p=, and it shows an additional element =ha= of unclear function (preverb *ha* ‘in, among’ or indirect object =h=?) and a well attested particle =pi ‘and, but’ (Soysal 2004: 236–237). The Hittite rendering suggests a concrete local meaning ‘he (an=) placed (wa<sub>a</sub>h) on-to (?ta=ha=ka)’. a=p=ta=ka=wa<sub>a</sub>(=)h, on the other hand, has an abstract meaning, ‘recommended, ordered’, which may well have developed from concrete ‘placed upon’. A rendering that does justice to the function of preverbal p=/wa<sub>a</sub>= as non-agent and to the lexical meaning of wa<sub>a</sub>h would be ‘they placed themselves upon Šulinkatti’, whence ‘they recommended to Šulinkatti’ (cf. English ‘impress upon someone, impose upon someone’).

An unclear example is the following:

[17] KUB 24.14 iv 13’a/21’b: wa<sub>a</sub>-ah-tu-u = ? Hitt. *adanzi*. There is a verbal root *tu* ‘eat’: see Klinger (1996: 669) and Schuster (1974: 93); but Girbal (1986: 112) and Soysal (2004: 879) compare a different, non-verbal Hittite correspondence and equate the Hittite passage containing *adanzi* with a different portion of the Hattian text: see example [9]. Hence the example cannot provide evidence for present purposes.

### 7.1.2 Verbal eš= indicates the plural agent in non-tu=verbs

[18a] KBo. 37.9, 3’–4’ restored according to KUB 28.1, 15’ (edition by Soysal 2004a)

[18b] [ ]ka-a-at-tah [pa-la] ta-a-ru [ka-at-ti] pa-la eš-wa<sub>a</sub>-al-wa<sub>a</sub>-la-at,

[18c] [ ]kattah [pala] Taru [katti] pala eš=wa<sub>a</sub>lwa<sub>a</sub>lat

[18d] [ ] NOM [CONJ] NAME [NOM] CONJ 3PL=VB

[18e] [name] queen [and] Taru [king] and they spoke

[18f] ‘queen [name of goddess] [and] [king] Taru [did something] and they spoke’

[18g] Hittite: KUB 28.1, 15’ [ ]nu me-mi-ir ‘and they spoke’

[18h] Logically, the patient of the verb ‘spoke’ is the following direct speech uttered by the God Taru and his female partner, whose name is lost. It seems inherently unlikely that the direct speech would be referred to as plural ‘(they spoke) these things’ and hence encoded by a plural verbal patient prefix eš=, an impression that is strengthened by the fact that the Hittite translation lacks an object pronoun that would correspond to it (\*na-at me-mi-ir ‘they said that/these things’). Both the context and the Hittite translation conspire to suggest that eš= refers to the two divinities who function as monoactantial agents.

Other verbal forms of the same stem are attested in unclear contexts in KUB 28.37 rev. r. col. 3 [...](-x-eš-wa<sub>a</sub>-al-wa<sub>a</sub>-la-la[at], where x- may be precative [t]ē- (Soysal 2004: 422), and in KUB 28.33, 6 [...](-eš-wa-a-al-wa<sub>a</sub>[at]. Clearly precative is KUB 48.32, 9’ te-eš-wa<sub>a</sub>-a-al-wa<sub>a</sub>[-la-at] ‘may they speak’, but the context is damaged.

In Taracha’s views on the ergative structure of Hattian verbal syntax, verbal eš= expresses not only the (transitive) patient but also the intransitive subject, what is here called mono. Those views could be salvaged by assuming that wa<sub>a</sub>lwa<sub>a</sub>lat is an intransitive verb comparable to English *talk* and that eš= expresses the intransitive subject. Taking a broader view of the subject by including the evidence presented in section 7.1.1, however, we must conclude that the Hattian mono is expressed verbally by the prefix wa<sub>a</sub>= rather than by eš=: cf. [13] and [14] te=p=kunkuhuw=a ‘may they live’, [15] te=p=ta=k=nuw=a ‘may they go’. Unless a plausible alternative explanation is found for those examples, the idea that eš= expresses the intransitive subject is most unlikely.

[19a] KUB 2.2 ii 45–46 (Schuster 1974: 66)

[19b] an-na eš-ka-a-he<sub>2</sub>-er-pi<sub>2</sub>

[19c] *anna* eš=ka=her=pi

[19d] CONJ? 3PL=LRM=VB=PCL

[19e] when? they determine

[19b] ta-ba-ar-na[(-an) ka-at-te-e] le-e-wa<sub>a</sub>-e-el

[19c] *tabarna*[=n katte] le=wa<sub>a</sub>el

[19d] NOM[=OBL1] NOM 3M.POSS=NOM

[19e] of lord king his house

[19f] ‘when? **they** (i.e. the gods) determine the house of the lord king’

[19g] Hittite: *ibid.* 48–49 ma-a-na-at ta-pa-ri-ja-u-e-ni-ma la-ba-ar-na-aš [LUGA]L-wa-aš E<sub>2</sub>-ir ‘when **we** determine the house of the lord king’.

[19h] Hattian *eš=ka=her=pi* corresponds to Hittite *taparija=weni=ma* ‘we determine’. Schuster (1974: 90) takes the Hattian form as a verb with a third person plural agent ‘they determined’ (past), which agrees with the fragmentary translation of this passage in KBo. 19.162 obv. 8 [*tapari*]jaer ‘they determined’ (thus also Simon 2012: 155). His reasons for preferring the latter translation are as follows. The two immediately following first person plural verbs, ni-i-pu-pe<sub>2</sub>-e = *ijaweni* ‘we make’ (see [20]) and ja-a-e (duplicate ja-a-ja) = *piweni* ‘we give’ (KUB 2.2 + KUB 48.1 ii 47) show a different morphology, containing as they do the expected first person plural prefix *i=/j=* (*n=i=pu=pe*, root *pu* ‘make’ + particle *pe*; *ja=e* or *j=a=ja*, root *ja* ‘give’ + present (?) suffix *-e*), and this may indeed be a reason to doubt the analysis of *eškaherpi* suggested by the Hittite translation, as Schuster assumes. However, his point that *eškaherpi* lacks the Hattian present tense suffix *-e*, which is found in the two following verbs, and therefore does not fit in with the present tense translation *taparijaweni* is hardly convincing: ni-i-pu-pe<sub>2</sub>-e and ja-a-e/ja-a-ja contain the present tense suffix only if we emend the former to \*ni-i-pu-e-pi<sub>2</sub> (with reversal of the last two signs) and arbitrarily select ja-a-e rather than ja-a-ja as the correct reading of the latter. Only if we accept these arbitrary suggestions do *ijaweni* and *piweni* constitute appropriate present-tense renderings of the Hattian verbs and *taparijaweni* does not. It seems better to leave the Hittite *taparijaweni* in KUB 2.2 as it is rather than emend it to a third person plural, as Schuster does, and at the same time take on board Schuster’s valid point that *eš=ka=her=pi* contains a 3pl. rather than a 1pl. agent: the same text shows at least one other example where the person expressed in the Hattian verb differs between two copies and is only partially matched by the Hittite rendering (example [43]). The immediate context jumps from first person plural (‘we, the gods, give ...’) to third person plural (‘let them, the gods, not lay, let them hide ...’) anyway, so that the mismatch here is easy to understand. Thus, *eš=kaher=pi* is a probable instance of a third plural verbal prefix. We may note that *eškaher=pi* has a plural biactantial agent and a singular biactantial patient; it is therefore the former that is coded by the verbal plural prefix *eš=*.

Less certain is the interpretation of example

[9] *imallen zar=du le=wa<sub>a</sub>šunu wa<sub>a</sub>=(a)šti pala [l]e=i=wa<sub>a</sub>=(a)šhezni uk iš=ga=ppuše pala ašah=du li=zuwadu le=i=pinu le=pa=zizintu*, word for word ‘like this sheep’s soul birds and foxes so eat, also (let them eat) the evil one’s wife, children, grandchildren’

There is no doubt that the agent is plural (‘birds and foxes’). If my parsing of the Hattian sentence is correct, the patient is *le=wa<sub>a</sub>šunu* ‘his soul’, which semantically is singular, but on the basis of the Hattian form with *wa<sub>a</sub>=* we cannot exclude the possibility that in Hattian it is a plurale tantum. If my parsing is incorrect and *iš=ga=ppuše* belongs to the second clause (as in the Hittite rendering), the patient is clearly plural. So depending on the interpretation, this may be a clause with a plural agent and plural patient, so that it is ambiguous whether verbal *eš=* refers to the agent or the patient.

Other instances, which were discussed in detail earlier, are similarly ambiguous because they have a plural agent and patient, so that one cannot decide to which actant  $e\check{s}=\text{}$  refers, but in light of examples [18]–[19] we must conclude that  $e\check{s}=\text{}$  expresses the plural agent here too, while the transitive object is left unexpressed on the verb:

[3]  $wa_a=\check{s}hap=ma\ e\check{s}=wu_u,r\ a(=)\check{s}=ka=hhir$  ‘and the gods distributed the lands’

[4]  $te=i=p\ e\check{s}=pur\ wa_a=\check{s}hap\ a=\check{s}=pu$  ‘the gods make us (and) the lands’

### 7.1.3 Zero indication of the plural patient in non-*tu*=verbs

On the basis of the evidence discussed in the previous section, it is possible to decide that verbal  $e\check{s}=\text{}$  refers to the plural agent rather than to the plural patient. This conclusion is confirmed by the following example, which has a singular agent, a plural patient, and no plural marking on the verb:

[5]  $i\check{s}=pel\ ta\check{s}=te=ta=nuw=a$  ‘let (evil) not enter the houses’

Note, however, that the patient can be expressed on the verb, as is argued in the following section.

### 7.1.4 Optional $wa_a=\text{}$ indicates the third plural patient in non-*tu*=verbs

In one interesting example, there is what seems to be a non-obligatory marking of the plural patient by  $wa_a=\text{}$  (or rather, its regular allomorph  $wa=\text{}$  before nasal):

[6]  $a(=)n=ta=nu=ma\ e\check{s}=kattah\ [ ]\ a=wa=(a)n=ta=nu=ma\ a(=)\check{s}=kattah$  ‘he brings the queens in [ ] he brings them in, the queens’

The same verb appears first without and subsequently with plural patient marker. Both instances contain an obligatory marker of the third singular agent,  $(a)n=\text{}$ , to which, apparently, a non-obligatory patient marker could be prefixed. A note of caution is in order because this example is not accompanied by a Hittite rendering, so that we cannot be absolutely certain about its interpretation. That such polypersonal verbs do indeed exist can be argued on the basis of the following example from a bilingual text. It shows the structure ‘patient + agent + verbal stem’:

[20a] KUB 2.2 ii 46

[20b]  $ni-i-pu-pe_2-e^{27}$                        $zi-i-i[\check{s}]$

[20c]  $n=i=pu=pe$                                $zi\check{s}$

[20d] 3SG.PAT=1PL.AG=VB=PCL      NOM

[20e] **it** we make but                      mountain

[20f] ‘we make it, (viz.) the mountain(s)’

[20g] Hittite: *ibid.* 49  $i\text{-}ja\text{-}u\text{-}e\text{-}ni\text{-}ma\text{-}a\check{s}$  HUR.SAG<sup>meš</sup> ‘and we made them, the mountains’.

[20h] The Hattian verb can be analysed as  $n=i=pu=pe$  ‘him/it (referring to  $zi\check{s}$  ‘mountain(s)’, a morphological singular in Hattian) + we + make + particle’. For the first person plural prefix  $i=\text{}$  cf. KUB 2.2 + KUB 48.1 ii 47  $ja\text{-}a\text{-}e$ ,  $ja\text{-}a\text{-}ja\ i=ae$ ,  $i=aja$  ‘we give’ (Hitt. *piweni*), KBo. 37.1 i 36  $i\text{-}tu\text{-}u_2\text{-}e\ i=tu=e$  ‘we eat’ (Hitt. *etweni*, Or. 90/1335, Soysal 2004: 514). The proposed translation exactly matches the Hittite rendering.

<sup>27</sup> Soysal’s hard-handed emendation to  $*i=n=pu=e=pi$  (2004: 231) is not acceptable (see Simon 2014: 153). The reading of KUB 2.2 is confirmed by Or. 90/401  $ni\text{-}i\text{-}p[u\text{-}]$  (Süel/Soysal 2007: 6).

The analysis of the initial prefix  $n=$  as a third person singular prefix depends on the validity of the analysis of the well-known third person singular prefix  $an=$  as bimorphemic  $a=n=$ , which is what Soysal suggests (2004: 206) but which does not seem to have found favour with other Hattologists. Yet if one accepts this analysis, the polypersonal structure of  $n=i=pu=pe$  at once becomes familiar, being comparable to the polypersonal structure of  $a=wa=n=ta=nu=ma$  (example [6]) as well as the examples [21], [22] and [23]. Although this interpretation of  $n=$  as a third person singular prefix cannot be considered certain, it performs better than the alternative analysis, which takes  $n=$  as a proclitic meaning ‘then’ (Simon 2014: 154) and is based on a far from compelling interpretation of this single example.

In both preceding examples, the patient prefix precedes the agent prefix. There is one other possible example of  $n=$  functioning as a patient being combined with a following agent marker:

[21] KBo. 21.82 i 24' na-aš-pu-u<sub>2</sub>-tū<sup>?</sup>, presumably  $n=a=š=putu$  ‘they (=š=) flatten(ed) him ( $n=$ )’ (cf. example [24], [25] on the verbal stem). This example occurs in a monolingual Hattian text within an obscure context, so that its value is more difficult to assess with certainty.

Other, similarly formed polypersonal verbs are found in monolingual contexts.

[22] KUB 28.53 i 14' [a]-wa-am-pi<sub>2</sub>-du  $a=wa=m=pidu$

[23] KUB 28.117, 12' a-wa-aš-pi<sub>2</sub>-tū  $a=wa=š=pitu$

which probably mean ‘he (=m= < n=, with assimilation before  $p$ )  $pitu$  them’ and ‘they  $pitu$  them’, respectively.

### 7.1.5 An unreliable example of $eš=$ expressing the plural patient or mono in non- $tu=$ verbs

[24a] KUB 24.14 iv 17a restored according to KUB 28.78, 8'

[24b] KUB 24 te-eš-wa<sub>a</sub>-u<sub>2</sub> but KUB 28 te-eš-pu-x[ (x = u<sub>2</sub> or ut)

[24c]  $te=š=wa_a(=)u$  or  $te=š=pu(t?)$

[24d] PREC= 3pl.A=VB

[24e] ‘may they (be) put down?’

[24g] Hittite: KUB 24.14, 15b–16b p[al<sup>2</sup>-za-ha-an-te-eš] a-ša-an-du ‘they must be (pressed down?)’

[24h] This is part of the so-called ‘sheep charm (Schafsbeschwörung)’, a formulaic text dealing with an apotropaeic ritual (see also [9]). It contains three sections with a very similar formulaic structure: ‘as I (the priest) or they (wild animals) (maltreat) this sheep or this sheep’s (body part), so I or they must (maltreat) the children and grandchildren of an evil man and his wife’. Example [24] belongs to the clearest section of same text, where the Hattian and Hittite versions are well preserved. The present example comes from a section whose Hittite version is heavily damaged. It deals with a priest who ‘presses down a sheep’: Hitt. UDU-un *palzahaizzi*. Then the priest pronounces the formula, using the same verb *palzaha-* in the Hittite subclause ‘as (someone) press down (body parts of) this sheep’, where it probably corresponds to the Hattian verb  $wa_a=ka=puddu$  (here  $wa_a=$  possibly denotes a 1sg. agent: see 5.2 (2)). Then follows the main clause: ‘so let (someone maltreat) the children and grandchildren of the evil man and his wife’. Here Hattian has  $te=š=pu(t?)$  in one of the two preserved versions of the text, whose root is so similar to that of  $wa_a=ka=puddu$  that the same verb is suspected. This allows us to fill in the lacuna in the Hittite counterpart x[...] *ašandu* with p[*alzahanteš*] *ašandu* ‘they must be pressed down’ (Girbal 1986: 102–117, especially 109–110). If ‘they must be pressed down’ is an exact rendering of Hattian  $te=š=pu(t?)$ , it indicates that verbal (e)š= marks the plural mono (of a passive verb construction) or the patient (in a construction that leaves the agent unexpressed) rather than the plural agent (thus Taracha 1993: 290). Taken in isolation, this is a plausible interpretation, but in a wider framework it is unlikely to be correct, for  $te=š=pu(t)$  is hitherto the only example in favour of that idea, while other examples unambiguously indicate that verbal  $eš=$  is the 3rd person plural agent prefix (7.1.2), that the plural patient is usually left unexpressed (7.1.3) and if it is expressed it takes the form  $wa_a=$  (7.1.4), just like the mono (7.1.1). Girbal (1986: 115) suggests that Hittite offers an inexact rendering of the Hattian form, which he

translates as ‘sie sollen niederstrecken’. That is not unreasonable: in other respects the Hittite rendering does not follow the Hattian text very closely. Where Hattian shows the single verb  $te=\check{s}=pu(t)$  (or  $te=\check{s}=wa_a u$ ), Hittite has two:  $p[alzahante\check{s}] a\check{s}andu$  ‘they should be pressed down’ and  $le ninitari$  ‘he/it should not raise itself’.

This example needs to be considered in the light of the following example, which appears to belong to the same verb.

[25a] KBo. 37.48 rev. 15’–17’ + KUB 28.8 rev. l. col. 4a’

[25b] ta-ba-ar-na[-an le-e-]li-iš te-wu<sub>u</sub>-u-ti-ja te-e-ha-a-ar-ki-m[(a-a-ah-ha)]

[25c] *tabarna=n le=liš te=wu<sub>u</sub>ti=a te=harkimahh=a*

[25d] NOM=OBL1 3.POSS=NOM PREC=VB=IMP PREC=VB=IMP

[25e] of lord his lifetime may be wide may be long

[25b] [x-]x-li-in te-ep-pu-u<sub>2</sub>-ut

[25c] [ ]llin te=(p=)put

[25d] as [ ] PREC=(3PL.NONPAT=)VB

[25e] as [the sea] may it be (wide??)

[25f] ‘may the tabarna’s lifetime be wide (and) long, may it be (wide) like [the sea]’

[25g] KUB 28.8 (+) KBo. 37.48 obv. 5’–8’, with additions from KBo. 17.22 rev. iii (Klinger 2000: 158): [(nu la-b)ar-na-a]š MU<sup>hi.a</sup>-še-eš ta-lu-ga-e-eš / pal-ha-e-eš a-š[a-an-du a-ru-na-aš] ma-ah-ha-an ta-lu-ga-aš / pal-hi-iš la-b[(a-ar-na-ša MU<sup>hi.</sup>)]<sup>a</sup> QA-TAM-MA ta-lu-ga-e-eš / pal-hi-eš [ a-ša-a]n-du<sup>28</sup> ‘and let the lord’s years be long (and) wide. As [the sea (*arunaš*)] is long and wide, in the same way let the lord’s years be long and wide’

[25h] The relation between the Hattian and Hittite versions is not exact. Klinger (2000: 161) equated  $te=wu<sub>u</sub>ti=a$ <sup>29</sup> and  $te=(p=)put$  with Hitt. *ašandu* ‘let them be, they must be’, taking up Laroche’s equation of [24]  $te=\check{s}=pu(t)$  as Hitt. *ašandu* (1950–1951: 177, 180). However, given the striking contextual similarity with [24]  $te=\check{s}=pu(t)$  ‘let them stretch out (?)’, Hitt.  $p[alzahante\check{s}] a\check{s}andu$  ‘let them be stretched out’, it seems more likely that the correct Hittite equivalent is *palhaeš ašandu* ‘let (the lord’s years) be wide’ (thus Girbal 2000: 369). This would rather support Girbal’s interpretation of [24]  $te=\check{s}=pu(t)$  (1986: 111f.), in spite of Klinger’s dismissal (2000: 161 footnote 45). The first verbal form,  $te=wu<sub>u</sub>ti=a$ , accordingly means ‘may it (i.e. the king’s lifetime, a singular  $le=liš$  in Hattian) be wide’. As a consequence the other precativ,  $te=harkimahh=a$ , would agree with Hitt. *talugaš (ašandu)* ‘may they be long’, which leads to an interpretation of the Hattian form as ‘may it ( $le=liš$ ) be long’. The last precativ,  $te=(p=)put$ , lacks the final imperative morpheme, which has received a persuasive explanation by Simon (2014: 186, 147), who argues that this is a case of apocope. The orthographical doubling of its  $p$  might indicate the presence of a 3rd plural non-agent (Klinger 2000: 161), but the context suggest that it does not (the non-agent  $le=liš$  is singular in Hattian).

We may conclude that [25] strongly suggests that [24]  $te=\check{s}=pu(t)$  does not mean ‘be’ but that it may be linked up with a verb  $put(i)$  ‘flatten, be wide’. Whether it means ‘flatten’ or ‘be wide, be stretched out’ depends on the way in which the actants are expressed.

## 7.2 The Verbal Prefixes $wa_a=$ and $e\check{s}=$ in Verbs with the Prefix $tu=$

### 7.2.1 $wa_a=$ indicates the plural patient in $tu=$ verbs

[7]  $ha=nuw=a=pa$  Hašammil  $tu=p=kargara\check{s}$   $wa_a=\check{s}hapu=n$   $i=wa_a=wa_a=\check{s}kel$  ‘Hašammil came in, (unexpressed: he) raked in the innards of the gods’ (see discussion above)

<sup>28</sup> Text between ( ) is missing from KUB 28.8 but is provided by duplicates.

<sup>29</sup> He divides  $te=\check{u}t=\check{i}a$ , which is unlikely because the imperative suffix normally is  $=a$  not  $=ja$ .

[26a] KBo. 37.49 rev. 12'–13' (Klinger 2000: 158–159)

[26b] *tu-u-wa<sub>a</sub>-a*[p-pu      *wu<sub>a</sub>-r*]u-un      *te-wa<sub>a</sub>-ka-at-ti*

[26c] *tu=wa<sub>a</sub>=ppu*      *wu<sub>a</sub>,ru=n*      *te=wa<sub>a</sub>=katti*

[26d] *tu=3PL.NONAG=VB*      *NOM=OBL1*      *3.POSS=PL=NOM*

[26e] *tu* them made      of the land      its kings

[26f] (unexpressed: she, the goddess Eštan) made them (into) kings of the land

[26g] Hittite: KUB 28.8 rev. r. col. (+) KBo. 37.48 obv. 3': *nu-uš ku*[R-an-ti (LUGAL<sup>meš</sup> i-e)]-et 'and she (i.e. the Sun Goddess Eštan) made them (i.e. king and queen) kings of the land'.

In both examples, the agent is a third person singular, so it is clear that the plural prefix *wa<sub>a</sub>=* in the verb refers to the plural patient. No other actant is expressed in the verb.

### 7.2.2 Zero indication of the plural agent in *tu=*verbs

There is one clear form in which the third plural agent is not expressed on the verb at all:

[27a] KUB 2.2 ii 40–41

[27b] *šu-u<sub>2</sub>-wa<sub>a</sub>* <sup>uru</sup>Ha-at-tu-uš      ti-it-ta-ah-zi-la-at      *šu-u<sub>2</sub>-wa<sub>a</sub>*

[27c] *šu=wa<sub>a</sub>*      Hattuš      *tittah=zilat*      *šu=wa<sub>a</sub>*

[27d] *šu=VB*      NAME      ADJ=NOM      *šu=VB*

[27e] *šu* put      Hattuša      great throne      *šu* put

[27f] '(they, the gods) put in Hattuša the great throne (they) put'

[27g] Hittite *ibid.* 43–44 *da-a-ir-ma-at* <sup>uru</sup>ha-at-tu-ši šal-li <sup>giš</sup>šu<sub>2.A</sub> *da-a-ir-ma-at* 'and they (sc. the gods, mentioned in the preceding clause) took (rather: put<sup>30</sup>) it, the great seat, in Hattuša they took (rather: put) it.'

[27h] This line immediately follows example [3] *wa<sub>a</sub>=šhap=ma eš=wu<sub>a</sub>r a(=)š=ka=hhir* 'and the gods distributed the lands'. Hattian *šu-u<sub>2</sub>-wa<sub>a</sub>* corresponds to Hittite *dāir(ma-at)*, and its logical agent is 'the gods' of the previous clause. Again, this is left unexpressed in *šu=wa<sub>a</sub>*. The patient is a singular, whose regular verbal marker on the verb is zero, so we may write the form alternatively as *šu=∅=wa<sub>a</sub>*. The verbal root *wa<sub>a</sub>* (or *pa*) is known from other texts (Soysal 2004: 298).

Discussing this form, Soysal (2004: 241) analyses it as *šu=wa<sub>a</sub>* and tentatively identifies *šu=* with *tu=*, *du=*, which is allegedly used '[z]ur Bildung von Transitiva und Intransitiva' (2004: 254). The form puzzled Schuster as well, who suggested a hard-handed emendation in order to turn it into a 'regular' verb (1974: 85).<sup>31</sup> Simon (2012: 194) correctly included this form among the examples of a prefix *tu=*.

### 7.2.3 *eš=* potentially indicating the mono in *tu=*verbs

Bilingual texts do not offer examples of verbal forms with the *tu=* prefix and a plural mono. In monolingual Hattian texts, however, there are verbal forms that are plausible candidates for this interpretation:

[28] KUB 28.82 obv. ii 2' *tū-uš-he<sub>2</sub>-e-el tu=š=hel* (*hel* 'proliferate': 'they proliferate'?)

[29] KBo. 2.24, 6' *du-u<sub>2</sub>-uš-ta-a-nu du=š=ta=nu* (*ta=nu* 'come in, bring in': 'they come in'?)

[30] KBo. 21.109 obv. ii 8' *šu-uš-ta-ku-un-na šu=š=ta=kunn(=)a* (*kun(u)* 'be visible': 'they are visible'?)

<sup>30</sup> Schuster (1974: 84–85), with reference to Laroche (1947: 75).

<sup>31</sup> The idea that *šu-u<sub>2</sub>-wa<sub>a</sub>* is not a verb is an old one. Laroche (1966: 167) took it to be a 3sg. pronoun and translated 'c'est elle' (reported without verdict in Klinger 1996: 656 fn. 104). Since *šu-u<sub>2</sub>-wa<sub>a</sub>* and *dāirmat* are the only forms that occur twice in both the Hattian and the Hittite sections, any account that denies their equivalence is improbable.

The interpretation of these forms depends partly on the fact that the verbal root is known from bilingual texts and partly on the results of the previous paragraphs: since in *tu*=verbs the patient is expressed by *wa<sub>a</sub>=* and the agent by zero, the only semantic role available to *eš*= in such verbs is that of mono. Similar forms of verbs with unknown semantics are

[31] VBoT 31, 2' *tu-uš-ta-le-el tu=š=ta=lel* (Soysal 2004: 307 s.v. [šalel] on the verb)

[32] KUB 28.53 rev. iii 3' *du-u<sub>2</sub>-uš-pe<sub>2</sub>-e-eš du=š=peš* (Soysal 2004: 302 s.v. piš on the verb).

#### 7.2.4 Optional (?) expression of the agent in *tu*=verbs

As we saw in 7.2.2, a third plural agent is not expressed in *tu*= verbs. Yet forms do exist that express the agent if that is 1st or 2nd person. In those cases the agent is expressed before *tu/š<sub>u</sub>=*.<sup>32</sup>

[33] KUB 28.87, 7' ***wa<sub>a</sub>-tu-u<sub>2</sub>-tuh wa<sub>a</sub>=tu=O=tuh*** (1sg.AG=*tu*=3sg.PAT=hold) 'I hold (it)', cf. Or. 90/1693 iii 6' Hitt. [ha]rmi (Soysal 2004: 906; Soysal / Süel 2016: 352)

The following examples come from monolingual texts, but the fact that the verbal stems themselves and the immediate context can be interpreted on the basis of knowledge gained from bilingual texts allows an almost complete understanding.

[34a] KUB 28.77 obv. i 14–15 (+ KBo. 15.118 added between parentheses)

[34b] ***uš-(š<sub>u</sub>-uk-ka-)]wa<sub>a</sub>-al-wa<sub>a</sub>-la-at uš-š<sub>u</sub>-u<sub>2</sub>-up-pu wu<sub>[u]</sub>r-tu***

[34c] ***u(=š)=š<sub>u</sub>=O=kka=wa<sub>a</sub>lwa<sub>a</sub>lat u(=š)=š<sub>u</sub>=(p=)pu wu<sub>u</sub>r=tu***

[34d] 2(=PL)=š<sub>u</sub>=(SG.PAT?)= LRM=VB 2(=PL)=š<sub>u</sub>=(PL.PAT?)=VB NOM=OBL2

[34e] you *tu* onto speak you *tu* make land

[34b] *te-(pu-u-ut pa-)]la kat-te-ē[ ]*

[34c] *te=put pala katte*

[34d] 3.POSS=NOM CONJ NOM

[34e] its population and king

[34f] 'you spoke, you made the land's population and the king'

The following forms are of the same structure 'agent + *tu*'.

[35a] KUB 28. 40 rev. iii 15'–20'

[35b] *wa<sub>a</sub>-tu-u<sub>2</sub>-j[a] ... i-tu-u<sub>2</sub>-ja ... wa<sub>a</sub>-tu-up-pu*

[35c] *wa<sub>a</sub>=tu=O=ja i=tu=O=ja wa<sub>a</sub>=tu=O=ppu*

[35d] 1SG<sup>2</sup>=*tu*=3SG.PAT.VB 1PL=*tu*=3SG.PAT=VB 1SG<sup>2</sup>=*tu*=3SG.PAT=VB

[35e] \*I<sup>2</sup> give/gave (it)' \*'we give/gave (it)' \*I<sup>2</sup> make/made (it)'

There is one serious candidate for an expressed third plural agent, but it occurs in a monolingual text:

[36] KUB 28.88 obv. 5' ***iš-tu-uh-hi-il-lu iš=tu=O=hhi=lu*** 'they<sup>2</sup> *tu* (it) distribute'

The same verbal root is found in other polypersonal verbs that contain the prefix *tu*=.

<sup>32</sup> Simon (2014: 198, 208) argued that the *subject* (transitive or intransitive) precedes *tu*=, while I argue that only the transitive subject = agent precedes *tu*= and the intransitive subject follows it.

[37a] KUB 28.80 obv. ii 19'–20'

[37b] **wā<sub>a</sub>**-tu-up-hi-il                      **wā<sub>a</sub>**-tu-up-ṭa-hi-il

[37c] **wā<sub>a</sub>**=tu=**p**=hil                      **wā<sub>a</sub>**=tu=**p**=ta=hil

[37d] 1SG.AG<sup>2</sup>=tu=3PL.PAT=VB      1SG.AG<sup>2</sup>=tu=3PL.PAT=LRM=VB

[37f] 'I<sup>2</sup> distribute them', 'I<sup>2</sup> distribute them therein'

In view of example [33], it is likely that prefixed *wā<sub>a</sub>* is not the 3rd person plural agent marker (which otherwise is *eš*=) but rather the marker of the first person singular.

[38a] KBo. 37.93, 10'

[38b] **i**-tu-u<sub>2</sub>-up-hi-i[l]

[38c] **i**=tu=**p**=hil

[38d] 1PL=tu=3PL=VB

[38f] 'we distribute them', with the regular marker of the first person plural *i*=.

## 8 Conclusions on Verbal *eš*= and *wā<sub>a</sub>*=

The results of sections 7.1 and 7.2 can be summarized as follows.

3pl. in verb (VB)	non-tu=	tu=
mono	<b>wā<sub>a</sub></b> =VB	tu= <b>eš</b> =VB
agent	<b>eš</b> =VB	(optional, marker <b>eš</b> =?)tu-VB
patient	(optional, marker <b>wā<sub>a</sub></b> =)VB	tu= <b>wā<sub>a</sub></b> =VB

On this basis it is possible to establish the type of syntactic alignment of Hattian.

Syntactically, **non-tu**= verbal forms obligatorily express the mono (intransitive subject) and the agent (transitive subject), and they do so in the same slot of the prefixal verbal chain. The patient (transitive object) is expressed optionally on the verb, and if it is, it precedes the expressed agent prefix. Morphologically, **non-tu**=verbal forms use the same plural prefix for mono (intransitive subject) and patient (transitive object), viz. *wā<sub>a</sub>*=, and they use a different prefix for the agent (transitive subject), viz. *eš*=.

*Tu*=verbal forms behave differently. Syntactically, *tu*=verbal forms obligatorily express the mono (intransitive subject) and the patient (transitive object), in the same slot of the prefixal verbal chain, viz. right after *tu*=. The agent (transitive subject) is expressed optionally on the verb, and if it is, it precedes *tu*=. Morphologically, *tu*= verbal forms use a different prefix for the mono (intransitive subject), viz. *eš*=, and the patient (transitive object), viz. *wā<sub>a</sub>*=, while it is unclear which prefix they use for the transitive subject (possibly *eš*= on the basis of example [36]).

By combining the syntactical and morphological feature, it is possible to conclude that Hattian has a **split** (*tu* versus *non-tu*), **three-way** alignment system, where intransitive subject, transitive subject and transitive object are all encoded differently on the verb. In *non-tu*= verbs, the basic alignment is accusative: intransitive (mono) and transitive subject (agent) are expressed in the same position on the verb, while expression of the transitive object (patient) is optional and occurs in a different slot on the verb. In *tu*=verbs, however, the basic alignment is ergative: intransitive subject (mono) and transitive object (patient) are expressed in the same position on the verb, while expression of the transitive subject (agent) is optional and occurs in a different slot on the verb.

It is useful to compare this Hattian system with the system of Sumerian, which is strikingly similar (see Jagersma 2010: 295–296, 359–366 on Sumerian alignment):



3sg. in verb (VB)	imperfective = marû	perfective = ḥamṭu
intransitive subject	VB-0	VB-0
transitive subject	VB-e	n/b-VB (human/non-human)
transitive object	n/b-VB (human/non-human)	VB-0

Sumerian has a split system, too. In the imperfective, it has a three-way system: the three actants are expressed by morphologically different forms. But the base is accusative, which expresses intransitive (mono) and transitive subject (agent) in the same position on the verb. In the perfective, it has an ergative system: intransitive subject (mono) and transitive object (patient) are morphologically expressed the same, and in the same slot on the verb.

The final issue to be resolved is how actant coding on the verb links up with actant coding of nouns. On the evidence of plural marking on nouns (section 6), this cannot be made out: Hattian marked the transitive subject (agent) with  $wa_a=$  and the transitive object (patient) with  $eš=$ , but there is as yet no reliable evidence to show which of the two prefixes marked the intransitive subject.

Another issue that remains to be resolved is how it is possible to understand that one and the same prefix  $eš=$  marks the agent (transitive subject) on the verb but the patient (object) (and perhaps the mono, i.e. intransitive subject) on the noun.

## 9 Special Case: the Indirect Object Marker =h= and the Hattian Antipassive

### 9.1 $wa_a=$ instead of Expected $eš=$ in Nominal Plural Patients and Verbal Agents

In a small number of examples,  $wa_a=$  takes the place of the expected plural marker  $eš=$  of the verbal agent (transitive subject) and the nominal patient (object).<sup>33</sup> In all examples this surprising behaviour is tied up with the presence of a morpheme =h= in the verb. The following instance is a case in point: it contains what seems to be a nominal plural patient marked by  $wa_a=$  instead of regular (e)š=. It also contains a plural marker  $wa_a=$  in the verb, but at this point in the investigation its referent (agent or patient) is not clear.

[39a] KUB 2.2 ii 57–60 restored according to KBo. 37.8, 7'–10'

[39b] zi-i-iš-pa	ša-ak-tu-nu-u <sub>2</sub> -wa	<b>wa<sub>a</sub><sup>1</sup></b> -ze-e-har	<b>wa<sub>a</sub></b> -ša-ah	ha-mu-ru-u <sub>2</sub> -wa
[39c] <i>ziš=pa</i>	<i>Šaktunuwa</i>	<b>wa<sub>a</sub></b> = <i>zehar</i>	<b>wa<sub>a</sub></b> = <i>šah</i>	<i>hamuruwa</i>
[39d] NOM=PCI	NAME	PL=NOM	PL=ADJ	NOM
[39e] mountain-but	Šaktunuwa	timbers	evil	beams

[39b] <b>wa<sub>a</sub>-a</b> -ša-ah	te-wa-aš-ši-ne	<b>wa<sub>a</sub>-a<sup>1</sup></b> -ša-ah	ta-al-wi <sub>i</sub> -i-it
[39c] <b>wa<sub>a</sub></b> = <i>šah</i>	<i>tewaššine</i>	<b>wa<sub>a</sub></b> = <i>šah</i>	<i>talwi<sub>i</sub>t</i>
[39d] PL=ADJ	NOM	PL=ADJ	NOM
[39e] evil	?	evil	?

<sup>33</sup> This does not concern the replacement of  $eš=$  by  $wa_a=$  after possessive prefixes (6.6).

[39b]  $wa_a$ -ah-zi-he<sub>2</sub>-er-ta<sup>34</sup>

[39c]  $wa_a=h=zi=hert=a$

[39d] 3PL= $h$ =LRM=VB=IMP

[39e] they/them under (it) must strew

[39f] see discussion below.

[39g] Hittite: *ibid.* ii 61–iii 2 *I-NA* <sup>hur.sag</sup>ša-ak-du-nu-wa [i-da-lu] GIŠ·ru i-da-lu-un <sup>gišUR<sub>3</sub></sup> i-da-lu-un <sup>giš</sup>hi-it-ta [-aš-ša-an] i-da-lu hu-im-pa-an mu-un-na[-an-du]<sup>35</sup> ‘let them (sc. the gods) hide in the mountains of Šaktunuwa the [evil] wood, the evil beam, the evil *hitassa*, the evil *huimpa*!’

[37h] The least problematic part of this sentence is that *ziš Šaktunuwa* ‘the mountain Šaktunuwa’ is the nominal complement to the verbal local reference marker *zi* in  $wa_a=h=zi=hert=a$ , a preverb meaning approximately ‘under’.

While Hittite lists the objects (evil timbers) in the singular, Hattian puts all nouns in the plural by prefixing  $wa_a=$  to the adjective (*a*)šah ‘evil’. The tablet reads *wa-ze-e-har*, which probably is a mistake for  $wa_a$ -ša-ah-ze-har (Schuster 1974: 103). The plural object (patient) marker  $wa_a=$  instead of expected *eš=* in these nouns requires an explanation (cf. 6.1). Like Hittite, Hattian does not express the agent (they, i.e. the gods) nominally. As stated earlier, it is not clear to which actant the verbal plural prefix  $wa_a=$  in  $wa_a=h=zi=hert=a$  refers: it might be the agent, in which case it replaces the expected verbal 3pl. agent marker (*e*)š= (cf. 7.1.2). Alternatively, verbal  $wa_a=$  refers to the patients of the Hittite rendering (they = the evil timbers), but in non-*tu=* verbs the patient is expressed only if the agent is expressed too (7.1.4), so that the expected form would be  $*wa_a=(e)š=zi=hert=a$  rather than  $wa_a=h=zi=hert=a$ .

This aberrant behaviour becomes all the more striking when we compare the verbal root *her(t)* with what probably is the same root *hir* in example [3]  $wa_a=šhap=ma$  *eš=wu<sub>u</sub>r* *a(=)š=ka=hhir* ‘the gods distributed the lands’, where it is combined with the preverb *ka* ‘down, on’. In that example, the nominal patient in *eš=* and the verbal agent in *aš=* behave in accordance with many other examples. The question arises why nominal patient and verbal agent in these examples are coded differently if, as the Hittite renderings suggest, the semantic structure of both clauses is so similar. Schematically:

[39]  $wa_a=šah$  *hamuruwa*  $wa_a=h=zi=her=ta$  Hitt. ‘(they) must hide evil timbers’

[3]  $wa_a=šhap=ma$  *eš=wu<sub>u</sub>r* *aš=ka=hhir* Hitt. ‘the gods distributed the lands’

Another example in which the nominal plural prefix  $wa_a=$  marks what according to the Hittite version is a plural patient also occurs in combination with verbal  $=h=$ , so that it resembles example [39]. It is taken from the Moon Myth (editions by Kammenhuber 1955; Schuster 2002). The text presented here contains additions from another section of the same text and from KUB 28.5:

[40a] KUB 28.3, 10a–12a restored according to 28.4, 9a–10a and KUB 28.5, 11a–13a

[40b] a-ah-ku-un-nu- $wa_a$                       ta-a-ru

[40c]  $a=h=kunnu(=)wa_a$                       Taru

[40d]  $a=h=VB$                                       NAME

[40e] saw    Taru (the weather god)

<sup>34</sup> The same verb occurs in a damaged portion in line 10 of the same text: [i]š-tar-ra-zi-il-pi<sub>2</sub>  $wa_a$ -a-šā-ā[h -V]h-zi-i-he<sub>2</sub>-er-ta, Hittite 12 da-an-ku-wa-i-ma tak<sub>2</sub>-ni-i[ ] mu-un-na-an-du ‘they must hide [ ] in the dark earth’. Schuster (1974: 68) complements the Hattian verb as [ $wa_a$ -]ah-zi-he<sub>2</sub>-er-ta, but a duplicate from Ortaköy reads ku-u[h-zi-i-he<sub>2</sub>-er-ta], which Süel/Soysal (2007: 8–9) take to be an orthographic mistake for  $*ma$ -a[h-zi-i-he<sub>2</sub>-er-ta]. According to them, the alternation  $wa_a-$  ~  $ma-$  points to this being a conjunction rather than the plural marker (but see section 5.2 (3) above).

<sup>35</sup> The final verb is supplemented in accordance with iii 12 mu-un-na-an-du = Hatt. iii 10 [ $wa_a$ -]ah-zi-i-he<sub>2</sub>-er-ta.

- [40b] tu-uh-ta-šu-ul      tu-u-mi-in      tu-uh-za-šu-ul      **wa<sub>a</sub>**-pi<sub>2</sub>-zi-il  
 [40c] *tu=h=ta=šul*      *tumin*      *tu=h=za=šul*      **wa<sub>a</sub>**=*pizil*  
 [40d] *tu=h=LRM=VB*      NOM      *tu=h=LRM=VB*      PL=NOM  
 [40e] in (he) let      rain(s)      under (he) let      winds  
 [40f] ‘Taru saw (it/him?) (and) (he) sent rain to (him, i.e. the moon), he sent winds under (him)’  
 [40g] Hittite: KUB 28.4, 19b–20b a-uš-ta-an <sup>d</sup>u-aš nu-uš-ši EGIR-an he<sub>2</sub>-e-uš tar-na-aš he<sub>2</sub>-e-u-uš-ša-aš-ši EGIR-an-da tar-na-aš hu-u-wa-ta-aš-ša-aš-ši EGIR-an-da tar-na-aš ‘The Weathergod (Taru) saw him (i.e. the moon falling from the sky). And he sent rains after him, he sent rains after him, he sent winds after him’.  
 [40h] The repetition ‘he sent rains after him’ in Hittite is not present in Hattian. Our nominal plural with *wa<sub>a</sub>*= is *wa<sub>a</sub>*=*pizil*<sup>36</sup> ‘winds’, Hitt. *huwataš*. If the Hattian construction exactly mirrors the Hittite construction, *wa<sub>a</sub>*=*pizil* is the patient, so that in this example too the nominal plural prefix *wa<sub>a</sub>*= would seem to overlap functionally with the nominal plural prefix *eš*= (which in nouns always denotes the plural patient). The verb *tuhzašul* contains the prefix *tu*= (see 7.1.1 and 7.2) and a local reference marker *za*, approximately ‘under’. It does not seem to contain a personal prefix, apart perhaps from obscure *=h*-. The verb *tu=h=ta=šul* differs from *tu=h=za=šul* only by the local reference marker *ta* ‘in(to)’, hence ‘(he) sent rain at (him, i.e. the moon)’. In Hattian, *tumin* ‘rain(s)’ lacks plural marking and therefore does not appear to be a plural.

A third example of the same phenomenon (*=h*= in the verb and the nominal plural patient marked by *wa<sub>a</sub>*= instead of expected *eš*=) runs as follows:

- [41a] KUB 2.2 + KUB 48.1 ii 51–53:  
 [41b] pi<sub>2</sub>-i-ip      i-ša-ah      ta-aš-te[-eh k]a-zi-ja  
 [41c] *pip*      *išah*      *taš=te=h=ka=zij=a*  
 [41d] ADV?      ADJ      NEG=PREC=*h*=LRM=VB=IMP  
 [41e] within?      evil      must not on lie/lay
- [41b] u<sub>2</sub>-ra-na      te-a-ta-an-na      p[a-la<sup>2</sup>]      pa-še-ez-zi-it      ta-aš-te-eh-ka-az-zi-i-ja  
 [41c] *urana*      *te(=)atanna*      *p[ala<sup>2</sup>]*      *pa(=)šezzit*      *taš=te=h=ka=zzij=a*  
 [41d] ADJ      (3F.POSS=)ADJ      C[ONJ]      PL=NOM      NEG=PREC=*h*=LRM=VB=IMP  
 [41e] angular<sup>2</sup>      chipped<sup>2</sup>      and/also<sup>2</sup>      stones      must not on lie/lay

[41f] translation: see discussion below

[41g] Hittite: *ibid.* 54–55: i-da-lu-uš-ma-aš-ši-kan<sub>2</sub> NA<sub>4</sub> an-da le-e ki-it-ta-ri, ta-at-ra-an-za-ja-aš-ši-kan<sub>2</sub> al-ha-re-eš wa-al-ah-ha-an-za-aš-ša an-da le-e ‘let not the evil stone lie in it, let not the angular<sup>2</sup> stone and the chipped<sup>2</sup> (lie) in it’ (cf. Schuster 1974: 67, 97–99)

[41h] The context deals with the ritual accompanying the building of the king’s palace under the guidance of the gods. The immediately preceding sentence, example [19], reads (Hittite) ‘When we organize it, the lord king’s house, we (the gods) make them, (viz.) the mountains, and we give to him (i.e. the king) the good stones.’ Then follows the present clause: (Hittite) ‘let not the evil stone lie in it, let not the angular<sup>2</sup> stone and the chipped<sup>2</sup> (lie) in it.’ Example [39] is the continuation: (Hittite) ‘they (the gods) must hide the evil beams ...’. Hence the Hittite text switches from direct speech by the gods (‘we organize ...’) to a request aimed at the gods in the third person (‘they must hide ...’), which is presumably uttered by a priest presiding over the ritual. This switch is matched in Hattian: [20] *n=i=pu=pe ziš* ‘we make it, the mountain’ but [39] *wa<sub>a</sub>=h=zi=hert=a*, which, whatever it means exactly, certainly does not mean ‘let us hide’ or ‘you must hide’ (the first and second person plural agent prefixes are *i*= and *uš*=, respectively).

Our sentence contains a third person negative imperative in both Hittite and Hattian. The basic structure of the negative imperative *taš=te=h=ka=zij=a* is similar to the structure of the third person precative *te=ta=h=šul* in

<sup>36</sup> KUB 28.4, 10a instead shows *wi<sub>i</sub>*=*pizil*, apparently with vowel assimilation.

example [43], but the position of  $=h=$  is different, viz. before the local reference marker, which means that in  $taš=te=h=ka=zi=a$  the indirect object  $=h=$  is probably not governed by the local reference marker  $ka=$  ‘on, down’. Hence Hattian  $=h(=ka=)$  does not correspond to Hittite  $=ši(anda)$  ‘in it’ but rather to a different actant.<sup>37</sup> The only candidates that present themselves in the context are ‘the gods’ (who must not lay the angular and chipped stones therein) or ‘the angular and chipped stones’ (which must not lie therein). The latter is supported by the Hittite version, but ‘the angular and chipped stones must not lie therein’ is unlikely to be the precise rendering of the Hattian verb: as the following instances of precatives show, a third person plural actant in a monoactantial clause (in this case  $pa=šezzit$  ‘stones’) is coded in the precatative verb by  $=p=$  (the short allomorph of  $=wa_a=$ ):  $te=p=kunkuhuw=a$  ‘may they live!’ (see [14]); and  $te=p=ta=k=nuw=a$ ,  $te=p=ga=k=nuw=a$ ,<sup>38</sup> Hitt.  $pāndu$  ‘may they go’ (see [15]). That would seem to leave the possibility that  $=h=$  refers to ‘the gods’ and that in spite of the Hittite rendering the correct translation of the Hattian phrase is ‘the gods must not lay the angular and chipped stones therein’. But that is unlikely as well: a third person plural agent is coded in a precatative verb by  $(e)š=$ , cf.  $te=š=wa_alwa_lat$  ‘may they speak’ (see the discussion of example [18]).

So whereas it is clear that  $=h=$  in  $taš=te=h=ka=zi=a$  codes either the agent ‘the gods’ or the patient ‘the stones’, it does not code them in the usual way as agent ( $eš=$ ), performer or patient (both  $wa_a=$ ) but rather with the morpheme  $=h=$  of the indirect object, whose semantic role in the clause is not clear. The nominal patient  $pa=šezzit$  ‘stones’ contains the plural marker  $pa = wa_a$  rather than the expected patient plural marker  $eš=$ .

Before we are able to make headway with this question, it is necessary to study the function of verbal  $=h=$  more carefully on the basis of other examples.

## 9.2 The Function of Verbal $=h=$

The function of the preverbal prefix  $=h=$  is unclear. Laroche (1947: 83) and Kammenhuber (1955: 117–119) proposed that it is a preterite marker, an idea that was abandoned by Kammenhuber (1969: 501). The proposal is arbitrary: Dunaevskaja (1961: 126) pointed out that a number of verbs that contain  $=h=$  do not have preterite meaning and that a number of verbs which according to the Hittite translation have preterite meaning lack  $=h=$ . She adduced as examples non-preterital  $wa_a=h=zi=hert=a$  [39] and preterital  $an=tuh$ , Hitt.  $dāš=ma=za$  ‘but took for himself’ (KUB 2.2 iii 19, 21). Forrer (1922: 236–237), Klinger (1994: 31) and Soysal (2004: 191) suggested that at least one of its functions may be that of a marker of the direct object. Dunaevskaja (1961: 126–127) was sympathetic towards the idea but pointed to a number of verbs with a direct object that lack  $=h=$ , such as [20]  $n=i=pu=pe$ , Hitt.  $ijaweni=m=aš$  ‘and we make them’, and other examples from KUB 2.2:  $ja=e$ , Hitt.  $našši piweni$  ‘and we shall give them to him’, and  $ašah=pi taš=tu=ta=šul=a$ , Hitt.  $idalu=ma=kan anda lē tarnai$  ‘let (him) not allow in’. She considered the possibility that  $=h=$  only denotes the direct object in past tense verbs, which she immediately rejected on the basis of the imperative [39]  $wa_a=zi=hert=a$  and the precatative [43]  $te=ta=h=šul$ .

Another problem confronting the idea that  $=h=$  denotes the direct object (patient) is that it raises the question how  $=h=$  relates to the verbal plural patient marker  $wa_a=$  (e.g. example [6]  $a=wa=n=ta=nu=ma$  ‘he brings them in’). More specifically, given the existence of a verbal plural patient marker  $wa_a=$ , it should be  $wa_a=$  rather than  $=h=$  that marks the patient in example [39]  $wa_a=h=zi=hert=a$ . In order to avoid this conclusion one might raise the possibility that there may well be a number of different morphemes  $=h=$ , one of which expresses the patient and another, present in  $wa_a=h=zi=hert=a$ , a different function.<sup>39</sup> Unless there is a sound reason for doing so, however, splitting is methodologically flawed. I shall proceed on the understanding that there is indeed only one morpheme  $=h=$  in order to observe where this approach leads us.

Schuster (2002: 447) suggested that  $=h=$  marks the goal of an action, an idea that was extensively studied by Goedegebuure (2010: 951–955). After a discussion of relevant examples, she concluded

<sup>37</sup> Pace Schuster (2002: 447) and Goedegebuure (2010: 951).

<sup>38</sup> The signs for TA and GA are similar in shape, so that the variation here is probably due to a copying mistake.

<sup>39</sup> A possibility explicitly entertained by Soysal (2004: 215–216).

the verbal infix *-h-* expresses the goal of an action or the stationary end point of the action, when the end point is near, by or at the goal, irrespective of the animacy of that goal. In other words, *-h-* is an allative and adessive marker. When the action involves motion into (illative) or onto (sublative) a goal, we do not find *-h-* (Goedegebuure 2010: 955).

She arrives at this very specific semantic profile because she considers significant that *=h=* is absent from the verb if the clause contains illative or sublative motion, and also if the sentence contains a recipient rather than a localized goal (in connection with verbs meaning ‘give’). Before returning to her hypothesis, a number of relevant examples will be discussed.

### 9.2.1 *=h=* in the verb ‘see’

Preverbal *=h=* also occurs in the first section of example [40]:

[40c] *a=h=kunnuwa<sub>a</sub> Taru*

[40g] Hitt. *aušt=an<sup>d</sup>u-aš* ‘Taru saw him/it (i.e. the moon)’

One might think that *=h=* corresponds to the patient *=an* ‘him’ in the Hittite translation, but as we saw earlier a patient role of *=h=* is problematic. A different view on *=h=* in this verb was expressed by Girbal (1986: 6–11). He stated that *ahkunnuwa<sub>a</sub>* contains the 3sg. agent prefix *an=* and that its *n* was assimilated to a following velar. The assimilation product was written as *ah-*, *ak-* beside default *an-* (thus also Soysal 2004: 156, 206, 215–216). Girbal’s interpretation relies heavily on the verb *kun(nu)-* ‘see’, which provides all of his examples of this assimilation except one.<sup>40</sup> The valency of *kun(nu)-* is unclear: presumably on the basis of Indo-European languages like Hittite and German, Girbal supposes that it occurs with an agent and a patient (or subject and object), and the agent (transitive) subject in Hattian is normally expressed verbally as 3sg. *an=*. However, Soysal’s synopsis of grammatical forms of this verb (2004: 290) shows that *=h=* is present in 15 out of an attested total of 17 forms, and none of the 17 contains the 3sg. agent marker *an=* in its presumably unassimilated form. This is significant in light of the fact that Girbal himself admits that the assimilated spelling *Vh-* instead of *Vn-* in front of /k/ is rare in Hattian in general, which shows many examples of *Vn-kV-* type spellings outside of the verb *kun(nu)*. This state of affairs strongly suggests that the presence of *h* reflects a grammatical property of this particular verb rather than a phonetic or orthographical property of Hattian in general. The verb occurs six times in completely parallel clauses in the Moon Myth, where it is written *a-ah-ku-un-(nu)-wa<sub>a</sub>* (KUB 28.3, 10, 19; KUB 28.4, 9; KUB 28.5, 11) and, once, *a-ak-ku-un-(nu)-wa<sub>a</sub>* (KUB 28.4, 16, KUB 28.5, 21).<sup>41</sup>

Since *=h=* is unlikely to code the third person verbal agent (because that is expressed by Hattian singular *an=*, plural *eš=*) or a third person verbal patient (on account of the problems signalled earlier), and since it has a special relation with the perception verb ‘see’, we may consider the possibility that it denotes an indirect object. This is also what Goedegebuure proposes, stating that what is ‘seen’ is in Hattian expressed by an allative object, which is expressed verbally as *=h=* (2010: 953). So Hattian *kun(nu)-* is the equivalent of ‘look at’ rather than ‘see’. She further assumes that *ahkunnuwa<sub>a</sub>* contains the 3sg. agent marker *an=*, whose *n*, she hypothesises, was regularly lost before double consonance (2010: 952). Since most of her instances of loss of *n* involve this verb I am reluctant to endorse this part of her proposal. Also, if we accept that *=h=* denotes an indirect object, an alternative analysis of *a=h=kunnu(=)wa<sub>a</sub>* is possible, viz. one according to which the Hattian equivalent of English ‘he saw’, Hittite *aušta* is expressed as Hattian ‘is visible to him’. Accordingly, in

<sup>40</sup> Girbal’s second verb, KUB 2.2 iii 46 *ak-ka-tu-uh*, is not an independent verb but rather part of *a-an-da-ha-ak-ka-tu-uh*, as per Klingler (1994: 28–30), and cannot therefore be used as evidence.

<sup>41</sup> Girbal (2004: 109) points to another case of assimilation of *h* before *k* in a different section of the Moon Myth: where in parallel passages KUB 28.5 obv. l. col. 25’ reads *te-du-uh-ga*, other tablets show *te-du-ka* (KUB 28.3 + KUB 48.61 obv. l. col. 15), *te-tu-uk-ka* (KUB 28.4 obv. l. col. 13), *te-du-ug-ga-aš* (KUB 28.4 obv. l. col. 20). Thus also Goedegebuure (2010: 951).

this particular verb, the indirect object functions as the experiencer of a verb of sensory perception.<sup>42</sup> What is ‘seen’ is coded as the third person mono (intransitive subject) in Hattian, whose regular formal expression is zero (corresponding to the direct object in Hittite (=an ‘him’) and English). The advantage of this analysis over Goedegebuure’s is that it is simpler: one does not have to assume (a) the presence of the 3sg. agent prefix *an=*, and (b) an explanation for why the *n* of this prefix does not appear.

### 9.2.2 =h= as complement of a verbal local reference marker

A possible example in which =h= is found after a local reference marker is found in the Moon Myth:

- [42a] KUB 28.3 restored according to KUB 48.61 obv. l. col. 13, KUB 28.4 obv. l. col. 11, KUB 28.5 obv. l. col. 15’  
 [42b]  $tu^1-u-wa_a^{43}$                        $ta-a-u_2-wa_a$        $tu-u_2-pi_2$        $ta-ah-ku-wa-at$   
 [42c]  $tu=0=wa_a$                        $tauwa_a$                $tupi$                $ta=h=kuwat$   
 [42d]  $tu=3sg.PAT=VB$               NOM                      NOM              LRM= $h=VB$   
 [42e]  $tu=him=place/take$       fear                      fright               $in(to)=h=grab$   
 [42f] (when) fear took him, fright grabbed him (see below)  
 [42g] KUB 28.4 obv. r. col. 21’  $e-ep-ta-an na-ah-ša-ra-az e-[e]p-ta-an u_2-e-ri-te-ma-aš$  ‘fear seized him, terror seized him’  
 [42h]  $ta=$  may be the well-known local reference marker ‘in(to)’, but according to an alternative interpretation,  $ta=$  is a different morpheme, which is somehow connected to stative and/or passive semantics (Soysal 2004: 194–195; Goedegebuure 2010: 977). This uncertainty affects the interpretation of the clause, but if we take =h= to express an indirect object, as in the previous example, we may conclude that the Hattian verb  $kuw(=)at$  ‘grab’ is constructed intransitively: its 3rd person singular intransitive subject is regularly expressed by zero, while whatever is ‘grabbed’ is expressed as an indirect object. A literal translation that brings out the Hattian syntax would be ‘(fear, fright) grasped at him, grabbed at him’. Since the verb is intransitive, the 3rd person singular subject (mono) is not expressed on the verb.

A more plausible instance of verbal =h= placed after a local reference marker and therefore probably governed by it concerns the same root  $šul=$  as in  $tu=h=za=šul$ ,  $tu=h=ta=šul$  [38]. It occurs twice in the famous bilingual KUB 2.2(+), once with and once without =h=.

- [43a] KUB 2.2 + KUB 48.1 iii 51–52  
 [43b]  $ma-al-hi-ip[-h]u$                        $te-e-ta-ah-šū-u_2-ul$   
 [43c]  $malhip=hu$                        $te=ta=h=šul$   
 [43d] ADJ=DIRECT.SPEECH              PREC=LRM= $h=VB$   
 [43e] good                                      may he let in
- [43b]  $a-ša-ah-pi_2$                        $tā-aš-tu-u-ta-šu-la$   
 [43c]  $ašah=pi$                        $taš=t(e)=u=ta=šul=a$   
 [43d] ADJ=PCL                      NEG=PREC=2SG=LRM=VB=IMP  
 [43e] but evil                                      you must not let in

<sup>42</sup> Among others, many East Caucasian languages express the experiencer of *verba sentiendi* by a dative or a local case and the goal of such verbs by the absolutive (nominative). Cf. Hunzib *oždii kid yāc’er* ‘boy (dative) girl (absolutive) saw’, i.e. ‘the girl was visible to the boy, the boy saw the girl’ (Van den Berg 1995: 123).

<sup>43</sup> The text reads  $ut-u-wa_a$ , the emendation to  $tu^1-u-wa_a$  is Schuster’s (2002: 386), followed by Goedegebuure (2010: 977 with footnote 65), who interprets it as the *tu*-form of the verb  $wa_a=$  ‘place’ (so the form is identical to  $šu=wa_a$  in example [27]).

[43f] ‘may he let in (the) good, but you must not let in (the) evil’

[43g] *ibid.* 54–55 *na-aš-ta a-aš-šu an-da tar-ne-eš-ki-id<sup>1</sup>-dū i-da-lu-ma-kan<sub>2</sub> an-da le-e tar-na-a-i* ‘he must let in the good but he must not let in the evil’

[43h] The clause is part of an incantation uttered by the god Šulinkatte and directed at the beam that bolts the door of the king’s palace. While Hittite has both verbs in the 3rd person singular, Hattian switches from a third person to a second person address: the second person singular marker *u=* is absent in the first (*te=ta=h=šul*) and present in the second verb (*taš=t(a)=u=ta=šul=a*). By contrast, *=h=* is present in the 3sg. verb but absent in the 2sg. verb. Note that instead of *te=ta=h=šul*, the duplicate KBo. 21.110 rev. 8’ has [t]u<sup>2</sup>-u<sub>2</sub>-ta-šū-u-ul, i.e. *t(e)=u=ta=šul* ‘may you let in’, which lacks *=h=* but does show 2sg. *=u=*. The duplicate thus settles for a second person verb in the entire Hattian sentence.<sup>44</sup>

While *=h=* in *te=ta=h=šul* cannot denote the experiencer as in [40] *a=h=kunwa<sub>a</sub>* ‘he saw’, i.e. ‘was visible to him’ (the verb is not a perception verb), it is reasonable to suppose a link with *=h=* in *a=h=kunuwa<sub>a</sub>* in that it represents an indirect object too. In *te=ta=h=šul*, the position of *=h=* is after the local reference marker *ta=*, which suggests that the indirect object functions as the complement of the local reference marker: ‘may (he) allow in it’ (cf. the same position in [42] *ta=h=kuwat*).

### 9.3 Antipassive in Hattian

We have established in 9.2 that the verbal prefix *=h=* functions as the experiencer to the verb ‘see’ (9.2.1) and as the complement to local reference markers (9.2.2). Against this backdrop we may now revisit the examples that were discussed in section 9.1.

[39] *wa<sub>a</sub>=šah hamuruwa ... wa<sub>a</sub>=h=zi=hert=a* ‘they must hide the evil timbers’

[40] *tu=h=za=šul wa<sub>a</sub>=pizil* ‘he sent in rain(s), he sent under winds’

[41] *pa=šezzit taš=te=h=ka=zzij=a* ‘may the stones not lie on (it)’

All show the same situation: the nominal patient has the plural prefix *wa<sub>a</sub>=* instead of expected *eš=*, and the verb contains the morpheme *=h=*, but it is unclear to which actant it refers. In the examples, *=h=* refers either to the *implicit* agent (the gods, the weather god Taru, and the builder of the king’s palace, respectively) or to the *explicitly* (nominally) expressed patients (*wa<sub>a</sub>=šah hamuruwa* ‘evil timbers’, *wa<sub>a</sub>=pizil* ‘winds’, *pa=šezzit* ‘stones’).

On the basis of the example *pa=šezzit taš=te=h=ka=zzij=a* and its Hittite rendering ‘the ... stones must not lie therein’ it is possible to clarify this matter: since in Hittite an intransitive construction is selected (‘let not lie’), in which the ‘stones’ function as subject and the agent is not expressed at all, the Hittite translator must have interpreted Hattian *=h=* as referring to ‘the stones’ rather than to ‘the gods’, i.e. to the patient. This conclusion may be extended to the other examples: accordingly, *=h=* in *wa<sub>a</sub>=h=zi=hert=a* ‘they must hide (the evil timbers)’ probably refers to the patient ‘evil timbers’, which leads to the conclusion that *wa<sub>a</sub>=* refers to the agent ‘they, the gods’ (albeit with a non-agent verbal plural prefix). And finally, the *=h=* in *tu=h=za=šul* refers to the patient ‘rains, winds’. The remarkable thing, therefore, is that the verbal morpheme that is used in order to express the plural patient is not the verbal direct object prefix *wa<sub>a</sub>=* but the indirect object prefix *=h=*.

We may conclude that Hattian had two syntactic constructions with similar meaning. In order to express ‘gods make men’, for instance, Hattian could use two types of syntagmas:

A	* <i>wa<sub>a</sub>=šhap</i>	<i>eš=zaril</i>	<i>a=(e)š=pu</i>
	PL.AG=god	PL.PAT=man	<i>a=PL.AG=make</i>
	(where the agent <i>wa<sub>a</sub>=šhap</i> is coreferential with verbal <i>eš=</i> )		

<sup>44</sup> Goedegebuure (2010: 952 footnote 9).

B	(* $w_{a_a}=\check{s}hap$ ) (PL.AG=god) (where the agent $w_{a_a}=\check{s}hap$ is coreferential with verbal $w_{a_a}=\check{s}$ and the patient $w_{a_a}=\check{s}hap$ is coreferential with verbal $=h=$ ).	$w_{a_a}=\check{s}hap$ PL.PAT=man	$w_{a_a}=h=pu$ PL.PAT=IO=make
---	---	--------------------------------------	----------------------------------

Type A corresponds to example [3]  $w_{a_a}=\check{s}hap=ma\ e\check{s}=wu_{ur}\ a(=)\check{s}=ka=hhir$  ‘the gods arranged the lands’, while type B corresponds to example [39] ( $w_{a_a}=\check{s}hap$ )  $w_{a_a}=\check{s}ah\ hamuruwa\ w_{a_a}=h=zi=hert=a$  ‘let (the gods) hide the evil timbers’. If we describe the relation between A and B in terms of a transformation, we can state that the agent of A is turned into a mono (intransitive subject) in B, and the patient of A becomes an indirect object in B, expressed by  $=h=$ . That description corresponds to a definition of the so-called antipassive voice:

‘An antipassive construction is a derived detransitivized construction with a two-place predicate, related to a corresponding transitive construction whose predicate is the same lexical item. In the basic transitive construction, the patient-like argument is realized as a direct object; in the antipassive construction, that argument is either suppressed (left implicit) or realized as an oblique complement. The term antipassive ... was coined to indicate that the construction is a mirror image of the passive: in the passive, the suppressed or demoted argument is the agent-like argument, in the antipassive, the patient-like argument.’<sup>45</sup>

As is evident from the Hattian examples, however, both the agent and the patient of the transitive construction are demoted in the antipassive construction: the agent becomes an intransitive subject and the patient an indirect object. On the scale of agency, both actants are demoted, and one could say that the patient gets demoted more because it leaves the realm of the primary actants.

It is possible to understand the Hittite translations of [41] ‘let the stones not lie therein’ and of [38] ‘he (i.e. Taru) sent the rains after him, he sent the winds after him’, etc., as something other than inaccuracies: Hittite did not possess an antipassive construction and therefore no grammaticalized means of patient demotion, so translators had to make do with a rendering that either left the patient intact as a direct object (examples [39], [40]) or turned it into the subject of the corresponding intransitive clause, leaving out the agent altogether (example [41]).

So along a different route, we arrive at the same conclusion as Goedegebuure (2010: 976–978), who argued on the basis of verbs with third person singular actants that Hattian had an antipassive. On transitive verbs, a third person singular agent (transitive subject) is regularly marked with the prefix  $an=$ , while intransitive verbs normally (but in her view not always) mark the third person singular mono (intransitive subject) with  $\emptyset$ . According to Goedegebuure, the Hattian antipassive expresses the third person singular agent as an intransitive subject, so with  $\emptyset$ , and the patient as  $=h=$ .

Accordingly, the Hattian verbal morpheme  $=h=$  was used in order to express the experiencer to sensory verbs, the complement to local reference markers, and the demoted patient in antipassive constructions. This is slightly different from Goedegebuure's definition of  $=h=$  as a goal marker and allative morpheme. I prefer the admittedly rather bland label indirect object.

## Bibliography

- Dunaevskaja, I.M. (1961): Principy struktury xattskogo (protoxettского) glagola. In: I.M. D'jakonov/G.V. Cereteli (ed.), *Peredneaziatskij sbornik – Voprosy xettologii i xurritologii*, Moscow, 57–159.
- Forrer, E. (1922): Die Inschriften und Sprachen des Hatti-Reiches, ZDMG 76, 174–269.
- Friedrich, J. (1930): Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache. 2. Teil (MVAeG 34/1), Leipzig.
- Girbal, C. (1986): Beiträge zur Grammatik des Hattischen, Frankfurt am Main.
- Girbal, C. (2000): Das hattische Wort für “Kuh”, AoF 27, 373–379.
- Goedegebuure, P. (2010): The Alignment of Hattian, an Active Language with Ergative Base. In: L. Kogan et al. (ed.), *Language in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 53<sup>rd</sup> Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale. Vol. 2 (Babel & Bibel 4/2)*, 949–981.

<sup>45</sup> Maria Polinsky at <http://wals.info/feature/108>, consulted 3 April 2018. The accompanying map shows that the geographically nearest modern languages that show antipassive constructions are to be found in the Dagestanian branch of East Caucasian.



- Jagersma, A. (2010): A Descriptive Grammar of Sumerian, Leiden (PhD dissertation accessible via <https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl>).
- Kammenhuber, A. (1955): Die protohattisch-hethitische Bilinguis vom Mond, der vom Himmel gefallen ist, ZA 51, 102–123.
- Kammenhuber, A. (1969): Das Hattische. In: J. Friedrich et al. (ed.), *Altkleinasiatische Sprachen* (HdOr. 1/2.1–2.2), Leiden – Köln, 428–555.
- Klinger, J. (1994): Hattisch und Sprachverwandtschaft, *Hethitica* 12, 23–40.
- Klinger, J. (1996): Untersuchungen zur Rekonstruktion der hattischen Kultschicht (StBoT 37), Wiesbaden.
- Klinger, J. (2000): “So weit und breit wie das Meer...”: Das Meer in Texten hattischer Provenienz. In: Y. Arbeitman (ed.), *The Asia Minor Connexion: Studies on the Pre-Greek Languages in Memory of Charles Carter* (Orbis Suppl. 13), Louvain – Paris, 151–172.
- Laroche, E. (1947): Études “protohittites”, RA 41, 67–98.
- Laroche, E. (1950–1951): Une conjuration bilingue hattii-hittite, JKIF 1, 174–181.
- Laroche, E. (1966): Études de linguistique anatolienne II, RHA 24, 160–184.
- Neu, E. (1980): Althethitische Ritualtexte in Umschrift (StBoT 25), Wiesbaden.
- Rizza, A. (2007): I pronomi enclitici nei testi etei di traduzione dal Hattico (StMed. 20), Pavia.
- Rüster, C./E. Neu (1989): Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon: Inventar und Interpretation der Keilschriftzeichen aus den Boğazköy-Texten (StBoT Beih. 2), Wiesbaden.
- Schrijver, P. (in press): Talking Neolithic: The Case for Hatto-Minoan and its Relationship to Sumerian. In: G. Kroonen (ed.), *Talking Neolithic*, Washington D.C.
- Schuster, H.-S. (1974): Die hattisch-hethitischen Bilinguen I. Einleitung, Texte und Kommentar, Teil 1 (DMOA 17.1), Leiden.
- Schuster, H.-S. (2002): Die hattisch-hethitischen Bilinguen II. Textbearbeitungen, Teil 2 und 3 (DMOA 17.2–3), Leiden.
- Simon, Zs. (2012): Untersuchungen zur hattischen Grammatik: Phonologie, Morphologie und Syntax. PhD thesis, Department of Ancient History, Eötvös Loránd University (<http://doktori.btk.elte.hu/lingv/simonzsolt/diss.pdf>).
- Soysal, O. (2004): Hattischer Wortschatz in hethitischer Textüberlieferung (HdOr. 1/74), Leiden – Boston.
- Soysal, O. (2004a): The Angry Priests in a Hattian-Hittite Narrative, JANER 4, 75–98.
- Soysal, O./A. Süel (2016): The Hattian-Hittite Foundation Rituals from Ortaköy (II): Fragments to CTH 726 In: Š. Velhartická (ed.), *Audias fabulas veteres. Anatolian Studies in Honor of Jana Součková-Siegelová* (CHANE 79), Leiden – Boston, 320–364.
- Spruit, A. (1986): Abkhaz Studies (Ph.D. dissertation, Leiden) (separate sections appeared in *Studia Caucasica* 5 [1983], 6 [1985], 7 [1986]).
- Süel, A./O. Soysal (2007): The Hattian-Hittite Foundation Rituals from Ortaköy (I): Fragments to CTH 725 “Rituel bilingue de consécration d’un temple”, *Anatolica* 33, 1–22.
- Taracha, P. (1988): Zu den syntaktischen Verknüpfungen im Hattischen, *AoF* 15, 59–68.
- Taracha, P. (1989): Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung des Hattischen, *OLZ* 84, 261–269.
- Taracha, P. (1993): Probleme der hattischen Syntax: Die Personenanzeiger und ihre Stellung im hattischen Satz. In: Šulmu IV (Papers Presented at the International Conference Poznań, 19–22 September 1989), 287–293.
- Van den Berg, H. (1995): *A Grammar of Hunzib*, München – Newcastle.