

Inhalt

Premessa (Onofrio Carruba).....	5
Vorwort (Wolfgang Meid).....	8
Adiego Lajara Ignacio-J. Lenición y acento en protoanatolico.....	11
Boley Jacqueline Suggestions for the original function of <i>-kan</i>	19
Carruba Onofrio Genere e classe in anatolico: La ‘mozione in <i>-i</i> ’ e il ‘caso in <i>-sa/-za</i> ’.....	29
Cotticelli-Kurras Paola Textlinguistische Annäherungen in den hethitischen Erzähltexten.....	43
Euler Wolfram Hethitisch und Rumänisch – zwei Außenseiter in ihren Sprachfamilien.....	57
Fortes Fortes José Note sul lessico anatolico.....	69
Francia Rita La posizione degli aggettivi qualificativi nella frase ittita.....	81
Furlan Metka Hethitische Direktivendung <i>-ã</i> und indoeuropäische Quellen.....	93
Gamkrelidze Thomas V. Anatolian in light of the Glottalic Theory.....	119
García Ramón J.L. Hethitisch <i>hi(n)k-</i> “darreichen, darbringen”.....	129
Giannakis Georgios K. On some expressions of „killing“ and „dying“ in Hittite and Indo-European.....	147
Hout Theo van den Neuter Plural Subjects and Nominal Predicates in Anatolian.....	167
Janda Michael Tracce indoeuropee nel mito di Ullikummi.....	193

Neuter Plural Subjects and Nominal Predicates in Anatolian

THEO VAN DEN HOUT

1. It is a well-known fact that in Hittite a neuter plural subject is accompanied by a verb in the singular. This was first described in 1933 by W. Drohla¹ and found its way into J. Friedrich’s *Hethitisches Elementarbuch* I 118 (§196a). Hittite shares this trait with several forms of ancient Greek (Homeric, Attic, Ionian, Boeotian and Thessalian, in varying degree of regularity) and the oldest attestations of Indo-Iranian, Gatha-Avestan and occasionally Rig-Vedic. As a consequence, this rule is taken to belong to Proto-Indo-European and was apparently given up in the other subgroups of the family. An originally collective character of the later neuter plural ending **(e)h₂* with affinities to what became the feminine gender in most Indo-European languages, is widely accepted as a satisfactory explanation for this phenomenon.

As opposed to Greek and Indo-Iranian in Hittite the nominal predicate usually appears in the singular as well. Whether this latter feature is of Proto-Indo-European origin is a matter of debate. This article will deal with the questions to what extent both constructions are common to all Anatolian languages and whether both can claim to be of Proto-Indo-European descent.

2.1 Whenever Hittite is mentioned in connection with the basic rule (neuter plural subject – verb in the singular), it seems to go without saying that this rule is valid for the Anatolian group of languages as a whole. Explicit statements to this effect or pertinent examples have rarely been given, however.² It might

¹ Kongruenz 81-82. Perhaps this phenomenon was taken for granted. B. Hrozný, SH 85-86 (1917), quoted without comment KBo V 8 (Bo 2022) i 32-33 ^{LU}KÜR ^{URU}Kappubba=*ma* KUR.KUR.MEŠ ^{URU}Gašga=*ia hūmanda niniktat* “The enemy from Kappubba, however, and all the Kaška-lands mobilized” explicitly recognizing *hūmanda* as nom.pl.n. and *niniktat* as 3.pret.sg.MP. Likewise F. Sommer – H. Ehelolf, Pap. 31 and 48 (1924), simply observed without any further ado the agreement of a neuter plural subject with a singular verb as well as with a nominal predicate in the singular, a special development which will concern us below.

² An exception is the remark by C. Watkins, *Flexion und Wortbildung* 366, basing himself on Hittite and Palaic: “Diese in den zwei ältesten Sprachen belegte Konstruktion können wir ohne weiteres für gemeinanatolisch halten.” On “the undue concentration on Hittite” see the remarks by H.C. Melchert, AHP 4-6.

therefore – before we embark on further problems regarding this construction – be useful to start out by quoting examples from the better known Anatolian languages other than Hittite to make sure this rule is common Anatolian indeed.

Within the small corpus of Palaic texts there seems to be one example only:

- (1) *aš-ku-um-ma-a-u-ya-aš ha-a-an-ta ti-i-li-la ha-a-ri* KBo XIX 152 i 14'
(w. dupls. – CTH 754.1B, OS)³
“The meat pieces are warm, the *tilila* are warm.”

These two sentences nicely illustrate the difference in concord between a nom.pl.c. (*aškummāuūaš*) and a nom.pl.n. (*tilila*) with verbs in the plural (*hānta*) and singular (*hāri*) respectively.⁴

For Cuneiform Luwian compare:

- (2) *za-a-ú-i zi-ja-ar* NUMUN.ḪI.A-na [(p)]*u-u-na-a-ta in-za-ga-a-an ya-aš-ḫa*
KUB XXXV 54 ii 31'-32' (w. dupl. – CTH 758, MS)⁵
“See! All seeds, *inzagān* (and) *yašḫa* are laid down.”

The form *zijaar* (and its variant *zijaari* in the dupl. KBo XXIX 2 ii 9') is in all likelihood the Cuneiform Luwian counterpart of Hitt. medio-passive 3.sg.pres. *kitta(ri)* “lies, is laid down”⁶ followed by three neuter nouns of which two (NUMUN.ḪI.A-na, *yašḫa*) and the attribute *pūnāta* “all” are clearly plurals. The original collective meaning is underlined for NUMUN.ḪI.A-na by Starke's translation “alles Saatgut”.

The situation for Hieroglyphic Luwian is complicated by the fact that nasals are not graphically expressed before stops, so that neither in the present nor in the preterite of the *-mi*-conjugation distinction was made between a 3.sg. (*-ti/-ta*) and 3.pl. (*-ti/-ta*).⁷ Fortunately, however, both the development of rhotacism and the scanty remains of the *-hi* conjugation as described by A. Morpurgo Davies⁸ allow us to see the same rule at work here. Under certain defined

³ Ed. O. Carruba, StBoT 10, 22 (Text 3.A), see also id., Pal. 45-46.

⁴ See also C. Watkins, *Flexion und Wortbildung* 366, P. Meriggi, Schizzo 282, 284 and 357, H.C. Melchert, KZ 97 (1984) 41-42.

⁵ Ed. F. Starke, StBoT 30, 67 and 63 respectively, for a translation of this passage cf. id., StBoT 31, 310 (and 482 n. 1763). For *yašḫa* as a nom.-acc.pl.n. cf. F. Starke, StBoT 31, 387 n. 1399, and H.C. Melchert, CLL 263; for *inzagān* as a possible “lengthened-grade coll. pl.” cf. Melchert, CLL 90.

⁶ Cf. A. Morpurgo Davies – J.D. Hawkins, FsPugliese Carratelli 177-178, H.C. Melchert, GsCowgill 195-196.

⁷ Theoretically the difference between a 3.sg. and pl. should be visible with athematic verb stems but the inadequacy of the Hieroglyphic Luwian writing system with virtually only signs of the structure CV likewise makes it impossible to recognize such cases.

⁸ FsSzemerényi 577-610.

circumstances⁹ intervocalic dentals could become rhotacized (*-Vti/a > -Vri/a*) thus occasionally enabling us to distinguish between a singular *-Vra/i* and a plural *-Vⁿta/i*. Within the *-hi*-conjugation the 3.sg. ending *-i/ia* is clearly distinguished from the 3.pl. *-ⁿti*. As a possible example for a rhotacized 3.sg. (PES-*wiri* = *awir/ti*) with a neuter plural subject (*manawa(-)sunata*) can be quoted:

- (3) (i) *wa/i-ta* (CAELUM)*ti-pa-sa+ra/i-i ma-na-wa/i(-)su-na-tà* INFRA-*ta*
PES-*wa/i+ra/i*
(ii) (TERRA)*ta-sà-REL+ra/i-i-pa-wa/i-ta-' pá+ra/i-wa/i-li-sá*
SUPER+RA/I PES₂-*tà-i wa/i-ia-ni-sá-ha* SULTAN HAN 4¹⁰
“Down from heaven *manawa(-)sunata* will come, out of the earth *parwali*
and wine will come up”.

In spite of its unknown meaning and uncertain formation *manawa(-) sunata*¹¹ cannot be anything else than a nom.-acc.pl.n. in the first sentence. A further example is furnished by the KARATEPE bilingual:

- (4) (i) REL-*pa-wa/i-ta* REGIO-*ní-ia* REL-*ia à-ta* SOLIUM+MI-*sá-i*
(ii) *wa/i-tà i-zi-ia-rú* OVIS.ANIMAL-*wa/i-si* BOS.ANIMAL-*wa/i-si*
(DEUS)BONUS-*si* (DEUS)VINUM-*ia-si-há* KARATEPE Hu 54-55¹²
“What populations live therein, may they become (one) of sheep, of oxen,
of well-being and of wine!”

The neuter plurals REGIO-*níia* REL-*ia* (“The populations which ...”) are the subject of the intransitive *hi*-conjugation verb **isa-* “to sit, dwell, live”. The Ho-version has a transitive construction with the causative *isanu-*: (SOLIUM)*isanuwa⁽ⁿ⁾ti* “(What populations) he/they will make settle (therein)”.¹³

⁹ See the brilliant article by A. Morpurgo Davies, KZ 96 (1982-1983) 245-270; the fact, among other things, that there are no examples of rhotacized 3.pl. endings shows the reality of nasals in Hieroglyphic Luwian (contrary to N. Oettinger, KZ 92 (1978) 86-87).

¹⁰ Ed. T. Oshiro, BMECCJ 8 (1995) 218, see also J.D. Hawkins, RHA 29 (1971) 115, 128, for the first sentence and A. Morpurgo-Davies, FsSzemerényi 588, for the second.

¹¹ Cf. H.C. Melchert, CLL 138 s.v. *mannu-*.

¹² Ed. T. Oshiro, BMECCJ 8 (1995) 214; on this passage and the function of REL-*pa* see further P.M. Goedegebuure, in S. Alp – A. Stül (eds.), Acts of the IIIrd International Congress of Hittitology (Ankara 1998), 233-245.

¹³ Morpurgo Davies mentions another passage which deserves to be quoted in full here:

(i) *za-zi-pa-wa/i* (DOMUS)*ha+ra/i-sà-tà-ni-zi* ¹*A-na-ia* BONUS-*sa-mi-i* FEMINA-*ti-i* DOMUS-*tà-wa/i-ni-zi i-zi-i-ha* (ii) *za-ha-wa/i* (DEUS)*á-tara/i-su-ha-na za-ti-ia-za* PORTA-*na-za* BONUS-*sa+ra/i-i-ti i-sà-nu-wa/i-ha* (iii) POST+RA/I-*sà-pa-wa/i-tà* REL-*à-ti* PRAE-*na* CRUS.CRUS-*i* (iv) *wa/i-tà-'* SCRIBA+RA/I(-)*tà-i* REL-*i-sa*
“I made these upper storeys (for this translation see J.D. Hawkins, AnSt 25 (1975) 145) for my beloved wife Ana (her) house. This deity Atarsuha I installed in this gate complex in good will. If in future they (*-ata*) will pass (CRUS.CRUS-*i*) on (to someone) who will ... them (and will bring further harm, ...) CARCHEMISH A 11 a, 5-6.

Apart from the fact that neuter plural subjects in general do not abound, a complicating factor in identifying unequivocal attestations for the rule under discussion within the Lycian A corpus is the merger in the a-stems of the nom.sg.c. *-a* with the nom.-acc.pl.n. I did not find any certain examples.¹⁴

Possible evidence from Lydian, finally, should come from the small group of nouns in *-a* (*anl/tola* “stela”¹⁵, *labta* “?”, *laqrisa* “dromos?”, *młola* “part?”, *..ra* and perhaps *torśa* “?”) commonly regarded as neuter plurals (pluralia tantum).¹⁶ They do not seem to be attested as subjects accompanied by an expressed verb, however. We will nevertheless be able to show below (§5.1) in an indirect way that in Lydian too neuter plural subjects had their verbs in the singular.

The expression PRAE-*na* CRUS.CRUS-*i* is found in two other CARCHEMISH passages (A 6, 8 and A 11c, 2; for both see J.D. Hawkins, AnSt 25 (1975) 144 and 145, for the verb CRUS.CRUS ((-)*niia*) – see ibid. 144, and Kadmos 19 (1980) 128). The former shows that the *-ata* at the end of the particle chain in A 11 a, 5 cannot be the (local?) particle *-ta* equalling Cun.Luw. *-tta* but must be the enclitic personal pronoun *-ata*. With Morpurgo Davies it is indeed likely that this *-ata* refers back to the neuter plural (*zatiiaⁿza*) PORTA-*naⁿza* in the preceding sentence although it may apply to the other architectural elements mentioned prior to it as well. In the comparable passage A 11 c, 2 the last item *-ata* refers to is the common gender noun (cf. the acc.pl.c. (DOMUS)*ha+ra/i-sā-tā-ni-zi* in A 11 a, 5) (DOMUS.SUPER)*hara/isatanaⁿza* while the preceding one (*z*)*a[-ti]-ia-za* [x]-*za* in A 11 c, 1) is unfortunately damaged. It cannot, therefore, be ruled out that *-ata* is a neuter singular ‘wrapping up’ all things mentioned. This would be valid at least according to Hittite grammar: cf. W. Drohla, Kongruenz 56-57, and J. Friedrich, HE I 115-116.

¹⁴ According to F. Starke, StBoT 31, 297-298, the pl.n. *anīmāma/ānīmāma* indicating a fine or tax imposed on grave offenders functions as the subject of the 3.sg.pres. *tlidi* which he takes as “fällig werden” following a suggestion by G. Neumann. Compare e.g. TL 111, 3-4: *me tlidi : kbisītāta : ānīmām<a> : qlebi : keruti[?] : e[] se tlidi : Trzzubi : ānīmāma : kbisītāta : uwa* “and a twelve(?)fold fine ... has to be paid and a twelve(?)fold fine (of) oxen has to be paid to Trzzuba”. The word *uwa* would be a nom.pl.c. in apposition to *ānīmām<a>*. If, however, the verb *tl(e)i-* – as it is usually taken – means “to pay” (cf. H.C. Melchert, CLL 77) the offender becomes the subject of the sentence with *anīmāma* as object. Starke’s interpretation probably goes back to the variant with the 3.pl.pres. *tleiti* in TL 102, 2-3: *me tleiti puwa : aitāta : anīmāma : qebelija : ēni : qlahi : ebij[e]hi : pñtreñni* where the hapax *puwa* is analyzed as containing the nom.pl.c. (-)*uwa* “oxen”, with this time *anīmāma* in apposition (“and ... oxen have to paid (as) a fine ...”). Apart from the fact that the analysis of *puwa* is highly tentative, a nom.pl.c. in *-a* of *uwa/-wawa-* as a noun showing “*i*-Motion” (cf. both the Cun. and Hier. Luw. attestations) would run counter to all expectations. It seems preferable, therefore, to take *uwa* as a collective (acc.)plural neuter with Melchert, LL 86.

¹⁵ Cf. R. Gusmani, Lyd. Wb.59, but for the semantics of this and other such terms in Lydian texts see the remarks by H. Eichner, MSS 45 (1985) 10-11, and Kadmos 27 (1988) 54 n. 36.

¹⁶ See especially O. Carruba, FsMeriggi 44-49; hesitation only with R. Gusmani, Lyd. Wb. 37-38, and Erg. 1, 23-24, where relevant literature is given to which can be added P. Meriggi, Schizzo 285, and H. Eichner, MSS 45 (1985) 10.

2.2 Although the amount of examples may not be very abundant we may conclude that not only Hittite but Palaic, Cuneiform as well as Hieroglyphic Luwian – and Lydian as we will see (§5.1) – still preserve the rule according to which a neuter plural subject agrees with a verb in the singular. Since evidence to the contrary is lacking in any of the discussed Anatolian languages including Lycian and Lydian, it seems safe to posit the continuation of this phenomenon in the group as a whole and to the very end of its attestation up to Hellenistic times.

3. Hittite, however, seems to go one step further in the sense that not only the verb but also a noun phrase, usually an adjective or participle, serving as (part of) the predicate can be singular as the often quoted example from Muršili’s Extensive Annals shows:

- (5) *nu ku-u-ru-ri^{HLA} ku-it me-eg-ga-ia¹ ni-ni¹-in-kán e-eš-ta* KBo V 8 ii 35-36 (CTH 61, NS)¹⁷
 “– since enemy troops (*kūruri^{HLA}* nom.pl.n.) were mobilized (*nininkan* nom.sg.n.) in large numbers –”

This too was already noted by W. Drohla¹⁸ and described by J. Friedrich in his grammar (HE I 118, §196b) including an exception where the nominal predicate appears in the plural. The exception quoted reads:

- (6) *ke-e-ia-ua* É.DINGIR-LIM QA-TAM-MA *pa-aḥ-ḥa-aš-nu-ua-an-da e-eš-du* KBo IV 1+ obv. 9 (CTH 413, NS)¹⁹
 “May this (*kē=* nom.pl.n.) temple complex too be likewise durable (*paḥḥašnuḥanda* nom.pl.n.)”

To the latter phenomenon I drew attention in the margin of an article on the (Hieroglyphic-)Luwian neuters on *-ša/-za* in 1984.²⁰ There I collected the “exceptions” known to me at the time and concluded that these belonged to an older phase of the Hittite language. This led to the assumption that the singular number to be observed in the majority of predicatively used adjectives and participles with a neuter plural subject was in fact a relatively recent development within Hittite not to be projected back into PIE.

Since then it has nevertheless been argued more than once that the use of the singular with adjectives and participles in such cases should be attributed to the common Proto-Indo-European phase as well. In 1987 J.A. Harðarson²¹

¹⁷ Ed. A. Götze, AM 154-155.

¹⁸ Kongruenz 81-82.

¹⁹ Ed. G. Kellerman, Diss. 127, 134; for more context see below (19).

²⁰ KZ 97 (1984) 60-80, for the question addressed here see pp. 62-65.

²¹ MSS 48 (1987) 71-113.

devoted an article to the PIE collective as a derivational category²² which developed into the widely attested neuter plural in *-a*. This collective functioned in terms of number as a (neuter) singular which according to Harðarson would still be visible in Hittite where next to the verb even a nominal predicate appears in the singular.²³ Some years later he essentially repeated this view.²⁴

In an interesting article entitled “Kollektiva, Genus femininum und relative Chronologie”²⁵ E. Tichy traced the emergence of the feminine gender in PIE in which the collective category plays an important role. Regarding the number of the nominal predicate with a neuter plural subject she sketched two possibilities for the discrepancy between Hittite with its singular nominal predicate on the one hand and Greek and Indo-Iranian with their plural nominal predicate on the other: we are either dealing with a development that took place after Anatolian had seceded from the Indo-European main branch but before Greek and Indo-Iranian split up or – an alternative qualified as “nicht weniger wahrscheinlich” – Hittite preferred a syntactic construction which the other Indo-European languages have given up.

Most recently in her 1997 Leiden dissertation *Hittite Neuter Singular – Neuter Plural. Some Evidence for a Connection* A. Prins tried to show that PIE **(e)h₂* well-known as the later nom.-acc. neuter plural ending originally was a singular with probably collective value and that this can still be seen in Hittite, thus treading in Harðarson’s footsteps. The use of the singular with adjectives and participles as nominal predicates constitutes one of the main arguments of her thesis.²⁶ Contrary to Harðarson she rightly acknowledges the existence of some of the exceptions to this rule but considers them a relatively recent and at any rate secondary development within Hittite.²⁷

In my 1984 article I only briefly touched upon this topic and left a more elaborate discussion to future scholarship. In view of the recent theories just mentioned it seems expedient to come back now to my original claim and to devote a separate article to this problem. In the following (§4) I will discuss the relevant material for those cases where the nominal predicate is a neuter plural

²² On this point he disagrees with H. Eichner and E. Neu both of whom regard the collective as a fourth number category besides the singular, dual and plural. For Neu’s rebuttal see StMed. 7, 199-202.

²³ MSS 48 (1987) 84.

²⁴ HS 107 (1994) 32-35.

²⁵ HS 106 (1993) 1-19.

²⁶ Cf. A. Prins, Diss. 8-9, 27, 131-142

²⁷ Cf. A. Prins, Diss. 233.

as well as the important question (§5) to what extent the use of the singular in nominal predicates in this construction is of common Anatolian origin.

4. The Hittite material for a neuter plural nominal predicate with a neuter plural subject will be given in a chronological order, that is first the attestations in what is usually called Old (ca. 1600-1500 B.C.) and Middle (ca. (1500/1425-1350) Script followed by those in later copies of compositions from either of those periods. Finally attestations in New-Hittite Script for which we have no older exemplar in either Old or Middle Script are discussed.

4.1 The following examples are attested in Old Script:

- (7) *ša-a-ku¹-ya-aš-me-et iš-ḫa-aš-kán-ta* KBo XVII 1+ i 24’ (w. dupls. – CTH 416, OS)²⁸

“(Two wooden Ḫantašepa-deities we hold, the Ḫantašepa-deities themselves holding both the heads of men and spears.) Their eyes (*šakuḫa*) (are) blood-shot (*išḫaškanta*).”

- (8) *ḫal-ki-aš ḫar-ša[(-a-a)]r iš-ḫi-ia-an-d[(a)] / [Z]ÍZ.ḪI.A-aš-š[(a)] ḫar-ša-a-ar iš-ḫi-ia-an-da* KBo XVII 1+ iv 19-20’ (w. dupls. – CTH 416, OS)²⁹

“Heads (*ḫaršār*) of barley (are) tied together (*išḫijanda*) and heads of [sp]elt (are) tied together. (All these I put in a [b]asket?).”

- (9) ^dUTU-ŠI *ú-i-ta-an-tu-uš* URU.DIDLI.ḪI.A-uš *ku-¹i*[... /] *ku-e ar-ḫa tar-na-an-ta* KUB XXXVI 108 obv. 7’ (CTH 25, OS)³⁰

“The fortified settlements whi[ch] His Majesty [... and the ...] which (*kue*)(were) released (*tarnanta*).”

²⁸ Ed. H. Otten, V. Souček, StBoT 8, 20-21; see further E. Neu, StBoT 25, 6.

²⁹ Ed. H. Otten – V. Souček, StBoT 8, 36-37; see further E. Neu, StBoT 25, 11. According to A. Prins, Diss. 139, an attributive interpretation would be equally possible: “(there are) bound heads of barley, bound heads of wheat, and I put them all in a basket.” One wonders, however, whether such a statement would not have required an explicit form of *eš-/aš-* as verbum existentiae (cf. P. Cotticelli, THeth. 18, 43).

³⁰ Ed. H. Otten, JCS 5 (1951) 129; for *tarnanta* as a nom.pl.n. of the participle see among others E. Neu, StBoT 5, 168 s.v. *tarna-* n. 1. It is erroneously taken as a medio-passive 3.pl.pres. (= *tarnantari*) by K. Yoshida, Mediopassive 202, followed by A. Prins, Diss. 134 (compare her conclusion on 135 where the *tarnanta* mentioned is from KBo XXXII 224 = below (10)) but taken as a participle *ibid.* 245 and 248. Since the medio-passive forms of *tarna-* have only passive meaning (cf. E. Neu, StBoT 5, 168, and J. Tischler, HEG T, D/2, 192) the above translation is the only one possible with *kue* as neuter plural subject which would otherwise have required a 3.sg. verb *tarnatta(ri)*.

4.2 The following examples are attested in Middle Script:

(10) ...]x-ša-an-na me-mi-iš-ta I-NA^{URU} Ga-tar-ga / [...]ḪI.A tar-na-an-ta e-eš-ta KBo XXXII 224 obv. 12'-13' (CTH 214, MS³¹)

"[...] ... said/spoke. To the city of Gatarga [... the ...] ... were released (*tarnanta*)."

(11) nu-ua-ra-an pa-iz-zi ka-a-aš [NIM.LĀL-aš uemijazi pâr]-ta-u-ua-aš-še-et-ua a-mi-ia-an-ta a-pa-aš-ša-u-ua a-mi-ia-an-za KUB XVII 10 i 37'-38' (CTH 324, MS³²)³³

"Will this [bee] go [(and) find] him (i.e. the god Telipinu)? His [w]ings (*partauua*)=(are) small (*amijanda*) and he himself (is) small."

The same passage can be found with minor *variae lectiones* but with the neuter plural *amijanda* in KUB XXXIII 5 ii 12-14 (MS; *amijanda* in 14³⁴) which is part of the second version of the Telipinu-myth.

(12) DINGIR.MEŠ-ša ku-e Ú-NU-TE^{MES} ú-ez-za-pa-an-ta na-at an¹ze¹-el i-ua-ar EGIR-pa Ú-UL ku-iš-ki ne-u-ua-aḫ-ḫa-a[n har-t]a KUB XVII 21+³⁵ i 16'-18' (CTH 375, MS)³⁶

"And nobody had restored the gods' attributes which (*kue*)(were) old (*uezzapanta*) just as we (have)."

(13) [(ua-a)]r-ši-ia-an-da šu-ul-la-an-da KUR.KUR-TIM KUB XXIV 4+ obv. 23 (CTH 376, MS³⁷)

"The rebellious (*šullanda*) countries (are) calmed down (*uaršanda*)."

The New Hittite copy from the reign of Muršili II (KUB XXIV 3+ ii 34' (41) *ua-ar-ša-an-da šu-ul-la-an-da* KUR.KUR.ḪI.A) maintains this construction.³⁸

(14) nu-ua[-aš-m]a-aš É.ḪI.A pí-ia-a-an (erasure) [?/ nu-ua-aš-m]a¹ša-at¹ tup-pí i-ia[-a]n-ta KUB XXXVI 119+118, 9'-10' (CTH 271, MS)³⁹

³¹ Cf. H. Otten – Chr. Rüster, KBo XXXII Inhaltübersicht vii.

³² On the date of this manuscript see G.C. Moore, Diss. 248, and E. Neu, Hethitica 6 (1985) 148.

³³ Ed. E. Laroche, RHA XXIII/77 (1965) 92, for a translation see H.A. Hoffner, Myths 15.

³⁴ Ed. E. Laroche, RHA XXIII/77 (1965) 100, for a translation see H.A. Hoffner, Myths 18.

³⁵ For the unpublished fragments joining KUB XVII 21 as well as the date of this manuscript see E. Neu, FsBittel 393.

³⁶ Ed. E. von Schuler, Kaššäer 152-153.

³⁷ For the date of this manuscript see J. Klinger – E. Neu, Hethitica 10 (1990) 149-150 with literature.

³⁸ A. Prins, Diss. 135, takes *uaršijanda* as a medio-passive verbal form which, however, should have been singular *uaršijatta(ri)*.

³⁹ Ed. H. Otten, ZA 80 (1990) 225, for a translation see Ph.H.J. Houwink ten Cate, JEOL 34 (1995-1996) 66. The fragment KUB XXXVI 119 used to be listed under CTH 275 but is now

"(But those who (are) his [...], [Pa]riyawatra, Kantuz[ili ...] (and) our grandson [Tulpi]teššub,) to [th]em domains (É.ḪI.A)(have been[?]) given and they (=at)(have been) recorded (*ijanta*) for them on a tablet."

The form *ijanta* cannot be anything else in this context than the nom.-acc.pl.n. of the participle of the verb *ija-* "to make, do, record (on a tablet)" with the neuter enclitic *-at* referring back to É.ḪI.A "houses, domains". This passage is interesting because of the possible attestation of both constructions, that is a neuter plural subject (É.ḪI.A, *-at*) with a singular (*pijān*) as well as a plural (*ijanta*) nominal predicate. It cannot be excluded, however, that after *pijān* a form of the verb *ḫar-/ḫark-* "to have, hold" has been lost in the break (e.g. *pijān [ḫarkir or ḫarkandu* "domains [they have] given" or "domains [they must have] given", cf. *naḫḫān ḫardu* in KUB XXXVI 118, 8' (13')⁴⁰).

(15) nu-mu zi-ik ku-e Ḫi-mu-DINGIR-LIM-iš NUMUN. ḪI.A me-ma-at-ta kinu<-un>-ua^{URU} Da-a-pi-ik-ka a-ni-ia-an-da ke-e-ma-ua^{URU} An-zi-li-ia<<-za>> ke-e-ma-ua^{URU} Ḫa-a-ri-ia ke-e-ma-ua^{URU} Ḫa-a-ni-ik-ka-ua nu a-pé-e NUMUN.ḪI.A ku-ua-pi pa[?]-x-x[?] HBM 55, 10-17 (MS)

"Concerning the seeds (*kue* ... NUMUN. ḪI.A) you, Ḫimuili, told me about: "Now they (are) sown (*anijanda*) in Dapikka, some (*kē*) in Anziliya, however, others (*kē*) in Ḫāriya, again others (*kē*) in Ḫānikkawa." Where have those seeds (*apē* NUMUN. ḪI.A) gone[?]/Where have you given[?] them?"⁴¹

In this same letter there is also an example for a singular nominal predicate (5-7^{A.ŠA} *terippi=ua kue* ...^{A.ŠA} *te<r>ippijan* "the plough fields which ... (have been) ploughed").

4.3 The following examples are attested in later, i.e. Middle (16) or New Hittite copies of Old Hittite compositions or New Hittite copies (17) of Middle or Old Hittite compositions:

(16) [(tāk-k)]u LÚ.U₁₉.LU-aš i-ia-at-n[(i-ia-an-da-aš^{GIŠ}KIRI₆.GEŠTIN UDU.ḪI.A tar-n)]a-i [(t)]a ḫar-ni-ik-zi tāk-ku m[(i-an-da A-NA 1 IKU 10 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pa-a-i tā)]k-ku ta-an-na-ta-ma 5 GÍN [(KÙ.BABBAR pa-a-i)] KUB XXIX 23(+KUB XXIX 22 i 5-7 (= ms. B₃ w. dupls. – CTH

better transferred to CTH 271; for the script of both pieces see J. Klinger – E. Neu, Hethitica 10 (1990) 147 and 148.

⁴⁰ For *naḫḫān ḫardu* see A. Garrett, JCS 42 (1990) 240.

⁴¹ For the reading and possible interpretations of the last word see S. Alp, HBM 222 n. 259. Behind the sign immediately following the alleged *pa-*, which is most likely to be read IT judging by the handcopy, there might be a trace of yet another sign. In case of a reading 3.sg.prt. *pa-it* ("have gone") or *uit* ("have come") the scribe used a singular with the neuter plural subject *apē* NUMUN.ḪI.A.

292, OH/MS)⁴²

“If a person lets (his) sheep into a productive vineyard, and causes (it) to be ruined, if it is in fruit (*mianda*), he shall pay 10 shekels of silver per IKU (i.e. a field measure) but if it is bare (*tannata*), he shall pay five shekels of silver.”

The dat.-loc.pl. *ijatnijandaš* shows that the Hittite word behind ^{G15}KIRI₆.GEŠTIN is a plural. The adjective *tannata* “bare, empty”, moreover, identifies it as a neuter (plural) here.⁴³ This implies, that also *mianda* (from *mai-/mija-* “to grow, prosper”) has to be taken as a neuter plural participle and cannot be a 3.pl.pres. medio-passive (= **mijandari*) since that should have been a singular (*mijari*) according to the normal rule. Interesting but puzzling are the two young variants *m]i-ja-an-da-an* in KBo VI 12 i 27 (= ms. a; the corresponding form of *tannata* is not preserved here) and *dan-na-at-ta-an* in KBo VI 11 i 10 (next to *mi-an-da* in the preceding line!) of which the former can only be a common gender singular, the latter an acc.sg. either neuter or common gender. In KBo VI 11 i 9-10 we thus see both possibilities in one passage.⁴⁴ As noted by H.A. Hoffner⁴⁵ the scribe may have thought of *harnikzi* “he causes to be ruined” as the verb of the sentence although that still leaves the gender difference to be explained in the case of *mijandan*.

(17) *nu-za* KAXU.ĪLA-KU-NU [(RA-A-MA)-NU-K(U-NU-ia)] *pár-ku-ua-e-eš e-eš-tén* É.ĪLA DINGIR.MEŠ-KU-NU-ī[(a-aš-ma-aš)] *pár-ku-ua-e e-eš-du* KUB XV 42 ii 31-33 (NS, w. dupl. KUB XLIII 58 ii 42'-43', MS – CTH 491.1)

“May you, your mouths and [y]our perso[ns] be pure and may your temples (É.ĪLA DINGIR.MEŠ) be pure (*parkuuae*)!”

Where the New Hittite copy KUB XV 42 ii 33 has *parkuuae*, the Middle Hittite manuscript KUB XLIII 58 ii 43' only preserves *pár-ku*[-], so that this example could not be quoted above under §4.2. It is, however, interesting to note that the Middle Hittite exemplar in the same expression elsewhere oscillates between

⁴² Ed. H.A. Hoffner, Laws 103-104.

⁴³ The varia lectio *ta-an-na-an-da* in KBo XIX 9 7' (= ms. h) must be a mistake for *tanatta* maybe made with *mianta* of line 6' in mind.

⁴⁴ The form *dannattan* can be a regular nom.-acc.sg.n. and is not necessarily an acc.c. as maintained by Hoffner, Laws 200.

⁴⁵ Laws 200. According to his glossary (Laws 320) ^{G15}KIRI₆.GEŠTIN “vineyard” might be a common gender noun in Hittite because of the “pl.acc. ^{G15}KIRI₆.GEŠTIN-aš” in §56. It is not unusual for a Sumerogram to have more Hittite readings and one could assume both a common and a neuter gender noun meaning “vineyard” but to explain *mijandan* this way is difficult because the plural of ^{G15}KIRI₆.GEŠTIN-aš. Besides, the latter form might also be a dat.-loc.pl. (and thus remain neuter) “(harvesting) in the vineyard”.

parkui and *parkue*: compare KUB XLIII 58 ii 11'-12' É.DINGIR.ME[Š ...] / *pár-ku-i e-eš-du* and ibid. 23' É¹. [DINGIR.ME]Š-KU-NU-ī¹-aš-ma-aš [Q]A-¹TAM-MA¹ *pár-ku-e e-eš-du*. Both these forms as well as the room available in the break after *parku*[- in ii 43' may lead us to expect a similar spelling there too instead of the older form *parkuuae* preserved in KUB XV 42 ii 33. This may imply that KUB XLIII 58 was not the copy serving as a *Vorlage* for KUB XV 42.

(18) [(m)]a-a-an lu-uk-ta-at n[(u A-BI LUGAL ħal-za-iš ku-u-uš ar-ħa ku-iš pé-ħu-te-et)] / [(TÜG)]-ZU-NU^{TÜG} iš-ħi-al-še-me[(-et-ta ku-it na-at-ta eš-ħa)-aš(-kán-ta)] KUB XXXVI 104 obv. 17'-18 (CTH 8, OS but dupl. KBo III 34 i 19-20, NS)

“When it dawned, the father of the king called out: ‘Who brought these (men) away? Why (are) their clothes and their girdles (^{TÜG}išħial=) not covered with blood (*ešħaškanta*)?’”

Because the essential nom.-acc.pl.n. *ešħaškanta* is preserved only in the New Script copy and not in the Old Hittite manuscript, this passage is given here instead of above under §2.1.

4.4 The following examples can be found in New Hittite manuscripts without a preserved Old or Middle Hittite forerunner. Already partly quoted above as (6) is:

(19) *ka-a-aš-ua ma-aħ-ħa-an* URUDU *pa-aħ-ħa-aš-nu-ua-an-za nam-ma-ua-ra-aš uk-tu-ri-[(iš)] ke-e-ia-ua* É.DINGIR-LIM QA-TAM-MA *pa-aħ-ħa-aš-nu-ua-an-da e-eš-du* KBo IV 1+ obv. 8-9 (w. dupl. – CTH 413, NS)⁴⁶

“Just as this copper (is) durable and subsequently everlasting, may this temple (*kē*= É.DINGIR-LIM) complex too be likewise durable (*paħħašnuanda*).”

This text belongs to the genre of foundation rituals of which CTH 414, 415, 725 and 726 are other examples. For the latter four numbers an early composition date can be assumed because of the existence of old copies and/or on the basis of older grammatical traits.⁴⁷ An older original for CTH 413 cannot be identified and this particular composition might even be young itself, an influence of older texts within the same genre is a distinct possibility, however. Note also the fact that the duplicate KUB II 2 (CTH 413B) is copied on a

⁴⁶ Ed. G. Kellerman, Diss. 126-127, 134.

⁴⁷ For CTH 414 see G. Kellerman, Diss. 7 and 75-85; for CTH 415.1, although preserved in New Hittite copies only, the use of the Hittite possessive pronoun, the occurrence of *-iezzi* spellings for the 3.sg.pres. forms of *-ija*-verbs, spellings such as *menahhanta* clearly betray the existence of an older Version; for CTH 725 see H.-S. Schuster, HHB 63-64; for CTH 726 see J. Klinger, StBoT 37, 636-637.

Sammeltafel together with the foundation ritual CTH 725A the Old Hittite origin of which is beyond doubt.

The same is true for the following passages from the Hittite royal death ritual:

- (20) ^{GIS}ZA.LAM.GAR-*ma-kán ku-e É-ri an-da ši-ja-an-da na-a[(t-kán)] da-an-zi* ^E*hi-lam-ni an-da tar-na-an[(-zi)]* KUB XXX 19+ iv 30 (w. dupl. KUB XXXIX 8 iv 29'-31' – CTH 450, NS)⁴⁸

“They take (up) the tent which (*ku-e*) had been put up (*ši-ja-an-da*) in the house and leave it in the portico”

Medio-passively inflected *šai-/šija-* is used either active-intransitively (“rush forth”) or as a real passive (“to be sealed, impressed”)⁴⁹ so that an interpretation of *ši-ja-an-da* as 3.pl.pres. (= *ši-ja-an-dari*; either *“The tent which they put up” or *“The tent which is put up”⁵⁰) is excluded. Although no older *Vorlage* of this text is extant, the royal death ritual as a whole goes back to a composition of older date.⁵¹

A final example comes from the ritual on account of the transferral of the statue of the Goddess of the Night in Middle Hittite times:

- (21) [(É.ĤI.A DINGIR.LIM)]⁷GIBIL⁷ *ku-e ú-e-da-an-da* KUB XXXII 68+ iii 6 (w. dupl./parallel KUB XXIX 4+ iii 17 – CTH 481, NS)⁵²

“The new temple which (*ku-e*)(had been) built (*uedanda*), ...”

No medio-passive forms of the verb *uete-* “to build” are known so that the above interpretation is the only one plausible. There is no version of this ritual preserved in Middle Hittite Script but the historical connection⁵³ and the numerous older signs in the younger copy⁵⁴ clearly betray its origins.

4.5 Some possible instances of a neuter plural serving as predicate have to be kept out of the discussion since they can also be interpreted differently. This is, for example, the case with participles in *-anta* which might be taken as a 3.pl.pres. of the medio-passive (= *-antari*). Compare, for instance, in Old Script

⁴⁸ Ed. H. Otten, HTR 46-47; for the same expression with a singular (*nu* ^{GIS}ZA.LAM.GAR ...) *šijan* see KUB XXX 24 ii 13 (ed. H. Otten, HTR 60-61), with *ijan* KUB XXIX 4+ iii 50 (ed. H. Kronasser, Schw.Goth. 26-27).

⁴⁹ Cf. E. Neu, StBoT 5, 144-145.

⁵⁰ In the latter case a singular *šijatta(ri)* would have been required.

⁵¹ Cf. Th. van den Hout, Hidden Futures 57.

⁵² Ed. H. Kronasser, Schw.Goth. 22-23;

⁵³ Cf. H. Kronasser, Schw.Goth. 58-60, V. Haas, GHR 352-353 (both Tutḫaliya III), and R.H. Beal, Or. 55 (1986) 439 with n. 77 (Tutḫaliya II).

⁵⁴ Cf. Th. van den Hout, KZ 97 (1984) 72 with n. 70.

hujanta in Bo 4767, 3' and 8'⁵⁵ or GAL.ĤI.A SIG₅-*anda* in KBo XXV 122 ii 11'.⁵⁶

Sometimes it is difficult to decide whether a participle is used attributively or predicatively. In the passage É.MEŠ DINGIR.MEŠ-*ta pá-ku IŠ-T[(U KÜ.BABBAR GUŠKIN¹ú-nu-ya-an-ta¹)] / I-NA KUR^{URU}Ĥa-at-ti-¹pát¹[(e-eš-zi)]* (KUB XXIV 1+ i 25-26 (CTH 377, MH/NS) //KUB XXIV 2 i 21, KUB XXIV 3 i 12'-13', KUB XXXVI 81 obv.[?] 12'-13', the latter with varia lectio *pargauya* for *parku*) both *parku* “high” and *unuanta* “adorned” were translated attributively (“To thee there are lofty temples adorned with silver and gold in the land of Ḥatti alone”) by O.R. Gurney⁵⁷ and others⁵⁸ but predicatively by the CHD P 161 (“Only in the land of Ḥatti are your temples high/lofty, adorned with silver and gold”). The presence of the present tense *ēšzi* definitely pleads in favor of the former rendering.

The passage from KBo XII 62 rev.[?] 14'-16' adduced by myself⁵⁹ has to be discarded since the quotation was incomplete and the alleged nom.pl.n. turns out to be acc.pl.n. as was rightly pointed out by A. Prins, Diss. 131-132 (*apiniššuuanda* / [U]L *šakkanta UL uuanda uddār* / [išš]ūyan *daiēr* “They started to do such unheard of, unseen things.”).

4.6 Summarizing this part of our inquiry we can state that a clear majority of cases with a neuter plural as nominal predicate appears in texts which are either old themselves (7-9 in OS, 10-16 in MS) or New Hittite copies of older compositions (17-18). Three examples (19-21) were found in young copies with no preserved older precursor although within genres that seem to be old. Because of this chronology and the fact that no genuinely young cases seem to be attested for this construction whereas those with a singular nominal predicate are found till the very end of the text tradition we are obviously dealing with an archaic feature. Since examples with a neuter singular predicate are already attested for old Hittite – although significantly less often as we will see below – the replacement of the former by the latter had already begun by the time the

⁵⁵ Ed. E. Neu, StBoT 25 no. 105, medio-passive according to E. Neu, StBoT 5, 61, but as participle in StBoT 26, 74 with n. 305. If Neu's tentative restoration to *ku-je* (StBoT 26, 102) before *hujanta* is correct (cf. 8' *ku-je hujanta apē=a kunnī* [“those tha]t (are) running they too on the right [”]), *hujanta* must be participle.

⁵⁶ The interpretation of SIG₅-*anda* as participle or medio-passive depends on the reading of GAL “cup” as either *zeri-* n. or *teššummi-* c. See further E. Neu, StBoT 5, 3 n. 1, on *anijanta* in KUB VII 53 ii 24 and 27, and my remarks on *ijanta* in KUB XII 58 i 16' in KZ 97 (1984) 62 n. 16.

⁵⁷ AAA 27 (1940) 19.

⁵⁸ Cf. R. Lebrun, Hymnes 185, A. Prins, Diss. 132.

⁵⁹ KZ 97 (1984) 63 with literature; ed. A. Hagenbuchner, THeth. 16, 120.

texts were first written down. We will now turn to the situation in the other Anatolian languages.

5.1 Above (§2.1) we already saw that good examples for neuter plural subjects are not always easy to find in the Anatolian languages other than Hittite. Looking now for a subset of these, that is those where a neuter plural subject is accompanied by a nominal predicate, may be even harder. In the following we will review possible instances.

There seems to be only one possible but controversial example in the corpus of Palaic texts:

(22) (nu^{UZU}šuppa tianzi nu kī memai) nu-ku^dZa-pár-ya_a-az aš-ku-ma-a-u-ya-ga ya-ak-^{ka}4-kán-ta ... [gi^l]-nu-kat ya-ak-^{ka}4-kán-ta KUB XXXV 165 rev. 11'-13' (CTH 751, OS)⁶⁰

“(They put down meat and he/she says this:) Now, o Zaparwa, the meat pieces (are) fat”.

In between the two occurrences of *ya^{ka}kanta* other or individual pieces of meat are mentioned while *ya^{ka}kanta* (or a form of the same stem) is each time subsumed by the sumerographic combination KI.MIN “ditto, etc.”. Except for *aš^{ku}māuyaga* these nouns all end in *-at* or *-kat* which have been very differently explained. O. Carruba⁶¹ saw them as neuter singulars with the pronominal *-t*. As an alternative he mentioned the possibility of explaining these forms as ablatives which was taken up by F. Starke.⁶² The latter view implies an emendation of *aš^{ku}māuyaga* into *aš^{ku}māuyaga<t>* which is an unattractive solution in more than one way. Usually *ya^{ka}kanta* is considered a 3.pl.pret. “they have bitten/eaten”, an interpretation grammatically feasible with either of the two solutions. H.C. Melchert⁶³ on the other hand has suggested taking it “as coll. nom.-acc.pl. of the verbal adjective in *-ant-* ... meaning ‘to be eaten’” since laying down meat in front of the deity and at the same time saying they have been eaten from seems indeed implausible. Even more attractive is H. Eichner’s solution to compare *ya^{ka}kant-* to Hittite *ya^{ka}kant-/ya^{ka}kant-* “fat”.⁶⁴ In the latter two interpretations we have a neuter plural nominal predicate. According to Melchert the *-at* and *-kat* forms as well as *-ga* would be enclitic deictic variants of their orthotonic counterparts *a-* and *ka-*. The neuter singular suffixes *-at* and *-kat* could be combined with neuter plural nouns as in Hitt. *ša^{ku}ya-šmet* “their

⁶⁰ Ed. O. Carruba, StBoT 10, 19 (Text 2.A), Pal. 24-27, 30. In rev. 19' the form *ya-ak-^{ka}4-kán-ta* appears again, this time in absolute use.

⁶¹ Pal. 25-27.

⁶² FsNeumann 416 with n. 40.

⁶³ KZ 97 (1984) 29 with n. 8.

⁶⁴ Apud H.C. Melchert, AHP 192.

eyes”. However, the forms *kaššūt=at* (12') and *hāriš=at* (13') can only be singulars, it seems, so that KI.MIN would have to be read **ya^{ka}kkan* here. Altogether this example involves too many uncertainties to be used with much confidence in this discussion.

A better instance is furnished by Cuneiform Luwian:

(23) *a-a-la-ti-it-ta a-aḥ-ḥa LÚ-iš a-ú-i-ta* [...] GÌR.MEŠ-*ta-du tar-ú-e-ja i-iš-ša-ra-d*[u ...] *du-ú-ya-za-an ti-ja-am-mi-in du-ú-pi-t*[a KUB XXXV 103(+) iii 11-13 (CTH 766, MS)⁶⁵

“When from the high [...] (or: from the sea) a man came, his feet (were) broad/strong(?) hi[s] hands (were) [...]. He bea[t] the wide(?) earth”.

Despite some semantical uncertainties the passage is quite clear. H. Eichner⁶⁶ following an original suggestion by J. Schindler sees in GÌR.MEŠ-*ta* = *pata* “feet” and *iššara* “hands” ancient duals of the common gender nouns *pata-* and *išš(a)ra-* which were able to survive because the ending merged with the “Komprehensivplural” or collective (nom.-acc.n.) ending *-a*. H.C. Melchert⁶⁷ lists both forms as coll.pl. whereas F. Starke⁶⁸ takes them as duals but denies any influence from the neuter plural because of the regular Hier.Luw. (nom.-acc.) plural c. *patinzi*. The latter argument is hardly persuasive because at this point Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luwian may simply have gone separate ways. Moreover, the fact that in Hieroglyphic Luwian the nom. and acc.pl.c. are identical (as opposed to Cun.Luw.) just like in the ancient dual or in neuter nouns may have influenced this development. That the dual is at best an archaism in the Anatolian languages and thus a far from productive category, and that synchronically the *-a* was interpreted as a neuter plural, is shown by the adjective *tarueja* which can be nothing else than a nom.-acc.pl.n.⁶⁹ Other possible examples from Cuneiform Luwian are either too uncertain or broken at the relevant point.⁷⁰

⁶⁵ Ed. F. Starke, StBoT 31, 223, for a translation see H. Eichner, Erg. TAM 14, 110.

⁶⁶ Erg. TAM 14, 110 n. 56 with literature, see also E. Neu in W. Meid (ed.), *Studien zum indogermanischen Wortschatz* (Innsbruck 1987) 177.

⁶⁷ CLL 95 and 173.

⁶⁸ StBoT 31, 29-30 and 135-136.

⁶⁹ Cf. H. Eichner, Erg. TAM 14, 110 n. 57, and H.C. Melchert, CLL 220. Eichner translates “verdreh⁷⁰” linking *tarueja* to Hitt. *tarku(yai)-* “to turn, dance”; H.C. Melchert, CLL 220, renders *tarueja* as “sprawling (??)” relating it to Hitt. *tarru-* “broad, strong” (cf. J. Tischler, HEG T, D 237-239). Assuming the beating of the earth in line 13 stands in relation to the description of the man’s hands and feet, I retain the latter meaning.

⁷⁰ In the passage KBo VII 68(+) (ed. F. Starke, StBoT 30, 361-362) ii 5'-8' a table and a series of dough products are modified each time by a form of the adj. *yašhai-* “sacralized (vel sim.)” (as per Melchert, CLL 264): *pa-ti-ja-aš a-du-na a-ša-ya[a(-)] ...*] ^{G15}*ya-aš-ša-an-za ya-aš-ḥa-i-ja-an-za* ^{NINDA}*ḥa-x[...] ya-aš-ḥa-i-iš* ^{NINDA}*ta-an-na-ša ya-aš-ḥa-i-ja[?]* ^{NINDA}*iš ya-aš-ḥa-i-iš* ^{G15}*za-ap-pa-*

One possible instance of a neuter singular as nominal predicate is the following:

- (24) [ʷa-]ᵃ[ar-]ša ku-ʷa-ti-i-in ḥa[-la-]ᵃ[al [a-]ta ḥa-la-a-al a-aš-du za-a [p]ár-na-an-za [DIN]GIR.MEŠ-ni-in-zi ḥu-u-uh-ḥur-ša-a[n-t]i-in-zi [d]a-a-ru-ša ti-ia-am-mi-iš ·[u-u-u]m-ma-ti-iš [gu]nni-ti-iš^{GIŠ}kat-ta-lu-uz[-zi-š]aᵃ[ta ḥa-la-a-al a-aš-d[u] XXXV 54 iii 25-30 (CTH 758, MS)⁷¹
 “Just as [wa]ter (is) pure, let this be pure, this house, the gods, the ḥūḥhuršantinzi, the effigy, the earth, the pediment, the hearth, the threshold: let it be pure!”

The adjective *ḥalāl* “pure” is a nom.-acc.sg.n., the question, however, is whether the enclitic pronoun *-ata* is singular or plural. As we saw above in note 14 it is not uncommon for the singular pronoun *-ata* to refer to a series of items of different gender and/or number.

As for Hieroglyphic Luwian three examples can be found:

- (25) *za-ia-wa/i* (*262)*sa*²-*sa-li-ia* TONITRUS.HALPA-PA-AVIS-*sa*
^mCRUS+RA/I-*sa* HEROS *ma*_x-*li-i*(URBS) DOMINUS-*ia-ia* INFANS.NEPOS-*ia* MONS.CORNUS.CERVUS₂ INFANS-*mu-wa/i-ia-ia* REX MALATYA 1⁷²
 “These *sa*²*saliya* (are) Halpasulupi’s, CRUS+RA/I’s grandson, hero, lord (of) Malatya, son of Wasuruntiya², king.”
- (26) *za-ia-wa/i* (*262)*sa*²-*sa-li-ia* ^m*ma-ra/i-i-x-sa* ^m*sù-wa/i-ra/i+i-mi-sa*
 INFANS-*mu-wa/i-ia-ia* REX-*sa* MALATYA 3⁷³
 “These *sa*²*saliya* (are) Mari...’s, Suwarimi’s son, king.”

The discovery of the interchange in both passages from MALATYA of genitives (TONITRUS.HALPA-PA-AVIS-*sa* ^mCRUS+RA/I-*sa* in (22) and ^m*ma-ra/i-i-x-sa* ^m*sù-wa/i-ra/i+i-mi-sa*, REX-*sa* in (23)) and the adjectival (relational) *-ija*-suffix (DOMINUS-*ia-ia* INFANS.NEPOS-*ia*, INFANS-*mu-wa/i-ia-ia* in (22) and

la-a-al-la K1.MIN “To eat he ... [...] The table (is) sacralized, the ḥ.-bread (is) sacralized, the *tannaš*-breads (are) sacralized, the bread (is) sacralized, the *zappalalla* etc.” An attributive use (“There (is) a sacralized table, etc.”) cannot be ruled out and, moreover, the tablet breaks off immediately after *ḥašḥaiija* in ii 7’ so that theoretically a singular *ḥašḥaiianza* is possible. Likewise broken off at a decisive point is KBo XXIX 6 obv. 27’ *za-a-pa ku-ʷa-ti-in ʷa-aš-ḥa-ša-u-ra ku-ʷa-an-z[u-* “Just as these *ḥašḥašaura* (are) heavy/important” (cf. Starke, StBoT 31, 547, and Melchert, CLL 115).

⁷¹ Ed. F. Starke, StBoT 30, 69.

⁷² Ed. H.C. Melchert, HS 103 (1990) 203, cf. also P. Meriggi, Manuale II 51 with Pl. IX, and the photo in E. Akurgal, Tafel 105 below. On the date see J.D. Hawkins, AnSt 38 (1988) 103 n. 21.

⁷³ Ed. P. Meriggi, Manuale II 53 with Pl. IX.

INFANS-*mu-wa/i-ia-ia* in (23)) we owe to H.C. Melchert.⁷⁴ The several neuter plural predicates in *-ia* thus agree with the nom.-acc.pl.n. *sa*²*saliya*.

- (27) *á-pa-ta-za-pa-wa/i-ta* TERRA-*ta₄-ta-za*<<-*ha-pa-wa/i*>> REL-*ia*
 CURRERE-*sà-ta* : *á-sa-ta* KARATEPE 33⁷⁵

“(In my days I expanded the Adanawaeian territories on the one hand to the west, on the other to the east), to those places even which were formerly feared”

The predicate CURRERE-*sata* = *kw*^a/*isanta*⁷⁶ is nom.-acc.pl.N. agreeing with the relative *fe*¹-*ia* = *kw*^{iia}.

Lycian offers a possible case at the beginning of the east side of the great Xanthos stela:

- (28) *ebei* : *kbija* : *prulija* : *ēti pddāt* t[...] *ijāna* f ij]a : *sejesttebeli* : *pund* t[.]
 TL 44b, 1-2

“the other local² *prulija* here which (are) Ionian, he⁷⁷ all made them here”

P. Meriggi⁷⁸ identified *tija* as the nom.-acc.pl.n. of the relative pronoun referring to *prulija*, likewise nom.-acc.pl.n. but of unknown meaning. The sequence *sejesttebeli* is to be analyzed as *se(j)=estte=ebeli* “and he made here”.⁷⁹ Meriggi, however, took *Ijāna* as a dat.pl. (“contro² gli Joni”) perhaps assuming *pddāt* was the beginning of a verb (“[si compirono? o sim.]”)⁸⁰. Nowadays *pddāt*-, *pddēn*- and derivatives are all considered nouns related to Hitt. *peda*- “place” and no such verbal stem is attested.⁸¹ We are thus left with a nominal sentence in which there are two possibilities for *Ijāna*: either a possessive dative (“which belong to the Ionians”) or with Melchert⁸² a nom.-acc.pl.n. as in the above translation. The former seems less plausible since one would have expected a form with one of the ethnic suffixes which in the case of *Ijāna*- is attested as *Ijānise/i-*.

⁷⁴ HS 103 (1990) 203.

⁷⁵ Ed. J.D. Hawkins – A. Morpurgo Davies, AnSt 28 (1978) 111.

⁷⁶ For the choice of the CURRERE sign to write the Luwian stem *kuwaia*- “to fear” see J.D. Hawkins – A. Morpurgo Davies, Kadmos 32 (1993) 59-60; the present form might be an *-ant*-adjective on the iterative stem **kwa(ia)ssa-*.

⁷⁷ The subject might be the Amorges/Humrxxa mentioned in the preceding line a 55.

⁷⁸ SMEA 22 (1980) 224.

⁷⁹ For *estte* as the iterative in *-s-* to the verb *a(i)-* “to make, do” cf. H.C. Melchert, LL 7; the *e*^{ois} in Anlaut is due to vowel harmony.

⁸⁰ Elsewhere, SMEA 22 (1980) 243, Meriggi apparently reckoned with a nominal sentence: “che (furo) contro(?) gli Joni”.

⁸¹ Cf. H.C. Melchert, LL 51-52; Melchert, LL 52, tentatively restores *pddāt*[ija “local”(?) agreeing with *prulija*.

⁸² LL 30.

Within the group of Lydian neuter pluralia tantum in *-a* (see above §2.1) there are two passages where they appear as subject in a nominal sentence with a nominal predicate:

(29) [e]s anlola atraštal šakardal 54, 1-2

“This stela⁷ (is) Atrasta’s, Šakarda’s (son)”

(30) ešš wānaš atalis tiwdalis tarwtallis akin kud katalres ak tešaštīd siwāmlid mλola šrfāštīd mēlalid mλola 5, 1-3

“This grave⁷ (is) Ata’s, Tiwda’s (son, son) of Tarwda. Where you ...⁸³, the lower/right⁷ part⁷ (is) Siwām’s, the upper/left⁷ part⁷ Mēla’s”.

The final *-l* in *atraštal* and *šakardal* in (2q) has confused scholars for a long time: it neither seemed to be the nom.-acc.sg.n. of the patronymic *-li-* suffix known from similar constructions (compare e.g. for the nom.sg.c. *-lis* above (30) *atalis tiwdalis tarwtallis* or the nom.-acc.sg.n. *-lid* in 1, 3 *manelid* “Mane’s”) nor could it be the regular outcome of an original nom.-acc.pl.n. **-la*. H.C. Melchert has been able to solve this problem basing himself on the important discovery by F. Starke⁸⁴ of the phenomenon of *i*-Motion on the one hand and the recognition of the proper role of the Indo-European adjectival **-i̯o-* suffix in the Anatolian languages by O. Carruba⁸⁵ and himself⁸⁶ on the other. If we assume with Melchert⁸⁷ *i*-Motion for the Lydian *-li-* suffix (*-l(i)-*) as well, *-l* is the expected outcome for the nom.-acc.sg.n. not characterized by the Motions *-i-*. The variant ending *-lid* is “a trivial analogical creation” further extending the originally pronominal neuter singular ending *-d* into the nominal declension after the nom.sg.c. *-lis*.⁸⁸

Passage (30) stems from the only text in which *mλola* “part⁷” occurs. Both *siwāmlid* and *mēlalid* are with certainty nom.-acc.sg.n. of the *-li-* derivation of personal names; *tešaštīd* and *šrfāštīd* are likewise neuter singulars and have mostly been taken as a pair in the sense of “right – left” or “upper – lower”.⁸⁹ Originally *mλola* was seen as an adverb which is still possible, if *tešaštīd* and *šrfāštīd* were nouns (“on one side (there is) the *tešašti* of Siwām, on the other

⁸³ A. Heubeck’s (Lydiaka 60-61) suggestion for *katalres* as a 2.sg.pres. has been widely accepted so far; its meaning is still a matter of conjecture, though Heubeck thought of “wo du hin-siehst” or “wo du dich hin-wendest”, O. Carruba, Part. 51, translates “wo(hin) du nun hinabsteigst(?)”.

⁸⁴ FsNeumann 407-425, and StBoT 31, 56-90.

⁸⁵ FsNeumann 35-51.

⁸⁶ HS 103 (1990) 198-207; cf. also E. Rieken, HS 107 (1994) 47 n. 21.

⁸⁷ Kadmos 30 (1991) 133.

⁸⁸ Cf. H.C. Melchert, Kadmos 30 (1991) 133 n. 3.

⁸⁹ Cf. R. Gusmani, Lyd. Wb. s.vv., A. Heubeck, HbOr 409, O. Carruba apud P. Meriggi, Schizzo 291.

side Mēla’s *šrfāšti*” vel sim.). If, however, the above translation is essentially correct, we have again a neuter plural subject (*mλola*) agreeing with a neuter singular predicate (*siwāmlid*, *mēlalid*). Since the appearance of neuter singular predicates presupposes a singular verb, Lydian proves indirectly with these two passages to have continued the basic rule discussed above (§2.1).

5.2 Summarizing the evidence from the Anatolian languages other than Hittite we have good examples from Cuneiform (23) and Hieroglyphic Luwian (25-27) to which possible cases from Palaic (22) and Lycian (28) may be added for a neuter plural subject agreeing with a neuter plural nominal predicate. Counter examples in the form of neuter plural subjects with singular nominal predicates are not found here; the one possible example from Cuneiform Luwian (24) is indecisive at this point.⁹⁰ Two certain cases of a neuter plural subject agreeing with a neuter singular nominal predicate are attested in Lydian (29-30). In the corpus of the latter language passages for two neuter plurals agreeing with each other seem to be lacking.

6. We can now try to draw some more general conclusions. On the two extremes we find the Luwian languages, including Lycian and possibly Palaic, on the one end with neuter plural subjects agreeing with neuter plural nominal predicates. On the other end we find Lydian where we have evidence only for a neuter singular predicate in those cases. Hittite seems to be the only branch within Anatolian attesting to both constructions. The construction corresponding to the situation in the other Indo-European languages sharing this trait, that is a neuter plural nominal predicate agreeing with a neuter plural subject and with the verb only, if expressed, in the singular, is clearly given up during the older phase of Hittite and replaced by one where the nominal predicate starts agreeing with the verb in the singular. The latter construction, as we saw, is already at work in Old Hittite. That Lydian shows this construction exclusively, may be due to the restricted corpus or our still far from perfect knowledge of Lydian but because of its late attestation (7th through 3rd century) and strong development it seems more likely that Lydian had long since lost the construction with the neuter plural nominal predicate.

⁹⁰ If one accepts the construction of the nominal predicate with a neuter plural for the Luwian languages this can be used as additional proof that the neuters in *-ša/-za* are indeed singular as was already made clear on other grounds (see my article KZ 97 (1984) 60-80 with literature). Compare the passage KUB XXXV 88 iii 14’-15’ *zanta=μa=tar miltanza kišamman āšdu* “Let the *m*. be combed away hereby!”, followed by diseases of individual body parts (^{90a}*(aššan)za GIG-za*) where **kišamma* would have been expected if *miltanza* were a plural. In the view still defended by Starke that the *-ša/-za* neuters are plurals, Cun.Luwian would have both constructions and would be separated from Hieroglyphic Luwian.

This development in Hittite and Lydian can only be accounted for, it seems, by assuming that the original collective function of the neuter plural in *-a* was still felt to the extent where it did not preclude attraction by the verb to its number. This attraction is likely to have taken its starting point in those cases where the singular copula was overtly expressed, i.e. in the preterite or imperative.⁹¹ This change was further stimulated by the fact that in such cases the singular verb *eš-/aš-* “to be” always seems to follow the nominal predicate immediately (“Kontaktstellung”) whereas the plural subject is often separated from it by one or more constituents of an adverbial nature.⁹² It may be of significance to note that only one (10) out of the nine passages (7-15) in Old or Middle script with a neuter plural predicate quoted above has an overt copula. Moreover, in all but three (9, 14, 15) of these the plural subject is immediately adjacent to the nominal predicate with no constituent in between. If we add the six examples (16-21) from manuscripts in New Hittite script we come to a total of three out of fifteen instances with an overt copula present⁹³ and six where subject and plural nominal predicate were separated by other constituents.⁹⁴ The conditions for a change in number of the neuter predicate were therefore not very favorable. Although an exhaustive investigation would by far exceed the limits of this article, a glance at examples in Old or Middle script for neuter singular predicates referring to plural subjects seems to point to a significantly higher percentage of cases where the copula is expressed and those where the subject is separated from the nominal predicate.⁹⁵ In five out of nine such examples known to me a form of *eš-/aš-* is present. Compare:

⁹¹ To what extent such constructions are to be considered nominal sentences or verbal constructions with an auxiliary (cf. HW^{GIS} E 95b-96a) is of no importance here. A similar but reversed attraction can occasionally be observed in Greek when, for instance, the verb which should be singular in accordance to its subject, appears in the plural after a nominal predicate; compare Herodotus I 93 ἡ μὲν δὴ περίοδος ... εἰς ἑξήκοντα στάδια ἑξ καὶ δύο πλέθρα “the circumference (i.e. of Alyattes’ tomb) is six stades and two plethra”. For further examples see E. Schwyzer – A. Debrunner, *Griechische Grammatik* 2, 608.

⁹² See, for instance, P. Cotticelli-Kurras, THeth. 18, 122-157, for a collection of passages of the verb *eš-/aš-* as copula with a participle.

⁹³ Among the six later examples see (17) and (19).

⁹⁴ Among the six later examples see (18), (19) and (20).

⁹⁵ Examples can be found in P. Cotticelli-Kurras, THeth. 122-157, and in A. Prins, Diss. 135-137. Compare in Old script KUB XXXVI 110, 15'-16', in Middle script KUB VIII 41 ii 13' (OH/MS^{GIS}; the restoration of the part. after similar OS passages seems assured, cf. A. Prins, Diss. 135-136, although the *ke=* there can be a singular as well with E. Neu, StBoT 26, 88 n. 330), KUB XXIII 72+ rev. 2-3, KUB XXIX 7+ rev. 65, KBo VII 28+ i 41-42, KBo XV 10+ i 2-3, KBo XXIV 1 i 19'-20', HBM 54, 13-14, HBM 55, 5-7 (for the latter see above §4.2 ad (15)).

- (31) ...] *ku-e ud-da-a-ar ti-ia-¹a¹[-an]¹e¹-eš-ta* KUB XXIII 72+ rev. 3 (CTH 146, MS)⁹⁶

“The words which were pu[t under oath.”

In likewise five cases – among which all four remaining ones! – constituents separate the subject from the nominal predicate. Compare the only certain Old Hittite example:

- (32) [*l*] *ba-ar-na-aš É-ir-še-et tu-uš-ka-ra-at-ta-aš ha-aš-ša-aš-ša-aš¹ ha¹-an-za-aš-ša¹-aš-ša-aš ne-eš-ša-an* [^N] ^A*pé-e-ru-ni ú-e-ta-an* KUB XXXVI 110 rev. 13'-16' (CTH 820.1, OS)⁹⁷

“The [L]abarna’s house (is one) of joy to his offspring of first (and) second generation and it (=e= coll.pl.n.) (has been) built on rock.”

The one example having both the overt copula and separation of subject and nominal predicate is

- (33) *nu-ya-ták-kán i-da-a-lu ud-da-a-ar kat-ta* [QA-TAM-] *MA ya-ar-ša-an e-eš-tu* KBo XXIV 1+ i 19'-20' (CTH 404.3, MS)

“And may the evil words (which on this day we treated) [likew]ise be wiped down from you”.

We can thus observe the conditions under which the change from a plural neuter predicate to singular was favored and see the change under way. It also explains why an attributive neuter plural adjective was never affected: as a rule the attribute stands close if not immediately next to its regens. Whether the occasional impersonal use of a (neuter singular) predicative participle as described by Ph. Houwink ten Cate⁹⁸ also played a role in the development is difficult to ascertain.

The following steps can be posited and illustrated. Initially a neuter plural subject agreed under all circumstances with a neuter plural nominal predicate; compare, for instance, with (10) and without copula (7) (the relevant elements are in bold type):

- (10) [...] **HI.A** *tarnanta ešta*

- (7) **šaku^ua=šmet išhaškanta**

and with (18) and without (13) separation of subject and nominal predicate:

- (18) [(**TÚG**)]= **ZUNU** ^{TÚG}*išhial=šme* [(*tt=a kuit natta ešha*)š(*kanta*)]

- (13) [(*ya*)] **ršijanda sullanda** KUR.KUR-TIM

⁹⁶ Cf. O.R. Gurney, AAA 28 (1940) 36.

⁹⁷ Ed. E. Neu, StBoT 25, 228, and see my remarks in KZ 97 (1984) 62-63.

⁹⁸ FsBöhl 203-206.

This situation continued into Middle Hittite. The first cases to be affected by attraction to the verb will have been those where the subject was separated from the nominal predicate which in its turn was immediately followed by the copula as in

(33) *nu=ua=ta=kkā idālu uddār katta [QATAM]MA ʔaršan ēštu*

This may then have been extended on the one hand to those sentences where subject and nominal predicate were still separated but where no copula was present as in

(32) *n=e=ššan [N]^Apēruni ʔetan*

and those on the other hand where there was no separation but where the copula was still expressed as in

(31) *kue uddār tija[n] ēšta*

This finally gave rise to constructions where a neuter plural subject could stand immediately next to its singular nominal predicate with no overt copula; compare, for instance:

(34) *[nu ʔ]T-TI DINGIR-LIM GIBIL ku-e 2 GÍR.ḪI.A i-ja-an nu a-pé-e [da-a]n-zi KUB XXIX 4+ iv 33-34 (CTH 481, NS)⁹⁹*

“They [take] those (*apē* nom.-acc.sg.pl.n.) two daggers which (*kuē* nom.-acc.sg.pl.n.)(are) made along with the new deity.”

For this last type I know of examples in New Script only. As was noted above ad (21) the text from which (34) stems definitely goes back to late Middle Hittite times (first half of the 14th century) so that the end of the development might have been reached already by that time.

7. A final question which should be addressed here is whether the similar treatment of neuter predicates in Hittite and Lydian can be seen as a syntactic isogloss. Of course, both Hittite and Lydian may have innovated independently in the same way. However, in the past O. Carruba¹⁰⁰ has repeatedly pleaded in favor of a closer relationship of these two languages as opposed to the Luwian languages and Lycian. Carruba's view on the position of Lydian among the Anatolian languages has been shared by some¹⁰¹ while others urged for caution.¹⁰² This caution seemed to be confirmed by the detailed investigation of the relevant arguments for Palaic and Lydian by N. Oettinger.¹⁰³ Lydian

⁹⁹ Ed. H. Kronasser, Schw.Gothh. 30-31.

¹⁰⁰ ZDMG 111 (1961) 458-463, MIO 8 (1963) 383-408.

¹⁰¹ Cf. B. Rosenkranz, Vergleichende Untersuchungen 112, 114.

¹⁰² Cf. A. Heubeck, HbOr 421-424.

¹⁰³ KZ 92 (1978) 74-92.

nevertheless stands apart in many respects¹⁰⁴ and also according to Oettinger's model of the development of the Anatolian languages from Proto-Anatolian to the individually attested branches seceded at an early stage from what he termed “Urwestanatolisch” combining Palaic-Luwian and Lydian. This occurred after Hittite had split off even earlier.¹⁰⁵

In view of the observation that the development of plural neuters functioning as nominal predicates to singular neuters started already in Old Hittite its roots may have lain in the Proto-Anatolian period. If so, the Lydian situation may be the result of this same development. This would imply that assuming the above model of development of the Anatolian languages is roughly taken correct, Palaic and Luwian must have witnessed the embryonic stage of this change too but did not develop it any further. In that case we cannot speak of a true Hittite-Lydian syntactic isogloss but at best of another feature setting off Anatolian from the other branches of Indo-European.

Returning to our starting point (§3) we can conclude that the phenomenon in Hittite (and Lydian) of neuter plural subjects agreeing with nominal predicates in the singular is a special development within the Anatolian branch of Indo-European languages and should not be projected back into Proto-Indo-European. Even if its roots are traced back into the Common Anatolian period one would need the independent evidence of another branch of Indo-European to postulate it with some confidence for the mother language. It does, however, attest to the still productive force of the collective meaning inherent in the *-a* ending in the Anatolian languages.

8. Anatolian is unique among the Indo-European languages in the sense that the entire group faithfully adhered to the original construction of a verb in the singular depending on a neuter plural subject during its entire attested history. Not only is it the earliest branch to show this construction, it may also be the last one to show it consistently since by the time of our Lydian sources (second half of the fourth century BC) the singular verb already started to give way to the plural in Hellenistic Greek.¹⁰⁶ This leads to another point to be stressed here which is the apparent regularity with which the rule was applied in Anatolian. J. Friedrich in his *Hethitisches Elementarbuch* §196.a already called its functioning “ausnahmslos”. In this respect Hittite and the entire branch of Anatolian seem to be matched by Gatha-Avestan only. According to H.

¹⁰⁴ See also H.C. Melchert, AHP 6.

¹⁰⁵ See Oettinger's sketches KZ 92 (1978) 91-92.

¹⁰⁶ On the fate of this construction in ancient Greek see F. Blass – A. Debrunner – F. Rehkopf, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechischen* 110-111, and E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* II/3, 28-30.

note of
Hittite I. A II
(S. 46, 69)

Reichelt the construction is used “regelmäßig” there and no exceptions are recorded.¹⁰⁷ In late Avestan and the Rigveda, however, it is rarely used.¹⁰⁸ Greek seems to take up a somewhat intermediate position: in Homer one usually finds the verb in the singular but there are many instances of a plural esp. when the (distributive or count) plural meaning as opposed to a collective one predominates or when the neuter noun clearly refers to animate beings. Even in Attic where the rule (σχήμα Ἀττικόν) is adhered to rather strictly quite a few exceptions have been noted under similar conditions.¹⁰⁹ This can only mean that in Anatolian the original collective meaning of the *-a* was still very much present, a conclusion confirming earlier observations for Hittite by E. Neu¹¹⁰ and H. Eichner.¹¹¹ To quote the former: “das aus einer grundsprachlichen Numeruskategorie Kollektiv ererbte *-a* [hat] seine ursprüngliche Funktion im Hethitischen noch recht lebendig bewahrt”.¹¹² The *-a* ending in Hittite is neither a straight plural or even less a singular. To start with the latter, the special development to the nominal predicate in the singular just discussed could not have taken place if the *-a* ending had been perceived synchronically as a singular. If so, there would have been no incentive for the nominal predicate in *-a* to change to the singular as it did. As to the former, the complete absence of a tendency of the verb to agree with any neuter plural subject in a 3rd person plural verbal ending, underscores the special status of the *-a* ending.

Just because of its regular one-sided agreement and thus the absence of a morphological distinction by verb agreement between a collective and a plural function the exact nature of the so-called neuter plural *-a* ending is difficult to describe from a synchronic point of view. Speaking in terms of primary and secondary function and basing himself on ancient Greek mainly, J. Kuryłowicz characterized the situation for Proto-Indo-European thus: “the finite verb depending on a neuter plur. is used in the plur. or in the sing. depending on the (primary or secondary) function of the plur.”¹¹³ The primary function of the

¹⁰⁷ Awestisches Elementarbuch 300-301.

¹⁰⁸ For Avestan see H. Reichelt, Awestisches Elementarbuch 301, for Vedic see A.A. Macdonell, *A Vedic Grammar for Students* 289.

¹⁰⁹ See R. Kühner – B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* II 1, 64-66, and E. Schwyzler – A. Debrunner, *Griechische Grammatik* 2, 607-608.

¹¹⁰ IF 74 (1969) 240-241, StMed. 7, 199-212.

¹¹¹ In B. Schlerath (ed.), *Grammatische Kategorien, Funktion und Geschichte* (Wiesbaden 1985), 134-169; cf. also H.C. Melchert, JAOS 116 (1996) 777-778.

¹¹² StMed. 7, 207.

¹¹³ *The Inflectional Categories of Indo-European* (Heidelberg 1964) 206. Kuryłowicz seemed to consider the situation in Greek to be the original, i.e. Proto-Indo-European one (“One can safely assume that an old balance between the sing. and plur. has been maintained in Greek,

plural being the count plural, the secondary the collective. In a similar vein the situation in Greek, among other languages, is described by B. Comrie as follows: “the verb agrees with noun phrases higher in animacy, and fails to agree with those lower in animacy, even when this overrides (...) grammatical relations, the usual determiners of agreement cross-linguistically”.¹¹⁴ Synchronically, from Homer to Hellenistic Greek, these are certainly correct descriptions. Diachronically one should probably say that with the gradual waning of the collective notion animacy got precedence over what once was a grammatical relation (collective – singular agreement) until a new grammatical relation (plural – plural agreement) was created. In Hittite (and Anatolian in general), however, again based on the fact that the rule seems to have been applied with strict regularity, the original grammatical relation according to which the collective category functioned in terms of number agreement as a singular, was maintained. No doubt, the fact that the neuter gender in Anatolian by and large coincided with inanimacy as well as the creation of an ergative or personifying derivative (*-ant-*) when a neuter noun (or a common gender noun designating an inanimate object) came to fulfill agent/pr subject function¹¹⁵, played an important role here. It seems preferable, therefore, to speak of a collective/plural ending.

Bibliography

Abbreviations used are those adopted by the *Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (CHD), edd. H.G. Güterbock – H.A. Hoffner, L-N (1989) xv-xxviii, and P (1997) vii-xxvi. Additional abbreviations are:

F. Blass – A. Debrunner – F. Rehkopf, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechischen*, Göttingen 1979¹⁵

Erg. TAM 14 = *Die epigrafische und altertumskundliche Erforschung Kleinasiens: Hundert Jahre Kleinasiatische Kommission der Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Akten des Symposiums vom 23. bis 25. Oktober 1990*, Wien 1993

where the old repartition is still clear”). Surprisingly, he did not mention Hittite at all in his discussion of the τὰ ζῶα τρέχει rule, only Gatha-Avestan as apparently exceptionless.

¹¹⁴ *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology* (Oxford 1981) 184, cf. also 183.

¹¹⁵ Cf. E. Laroche, BSL 57 (1962) 23-43, E. Neu, HS 102 (1989) 1-15, A. Garrett, *Language* 66 (1990) 261-296.

- Flexion und Wortbildung = H. Rix (ed.), *Flexion und Wortbildung. Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft* (Regensburg 1973), Wiesbaden 1975
- GsCowgill = C. Watkins (ed.), *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill (1929-1985). Papers from the Fourth East Coast Indo-European Conference Cornell University, June 6-9, 1985*, Berlin New York 1987
- FsBöhl = M.A. Beek et al. (edd.), *Symbolae Biblicae et Mesopotamicae F.M.Th. de Liagre Böhl Dedicatae*, Leiden 1973
- Hidden Futures = J.M. Bremer – Th. van den Hout – R. Peters (edd.), *Hidden Futures. Death and Immortality in Ancient Egypt, Anatolia, the Classical, Biblical and Arabic-Islamic World*, Amsterdam 1994
- R. Kühner – B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, Hannover 1898 [1983]
- LL = H.C. Melchert, *Lycian Lexicon. Second fully revised edition*, Chapel Hill 1993
- A.A. Macdonell, *A Vedic Grammar for Students*, Oxford 1916 [Delhi 1975]
- E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit mit Einschluss der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfassten Inschriften*, Berlin-Leipzig 1906ff.
- A. Prins, *Diss. = Hittite Neuter Singular – Hittite Neuter Plural. Some Evidence for a Connection (Dissertation)*, Leiden 1997
- H. Reichelt, *Awestisches Elementarbuch* (Heidelberg 1909)
- B. Rosenkranz, *Vergleichende Untersuchungen der altanatolischen Sprachen*, The Hague-Paris-New York 1978
- E. Schwyzer – A. Debrunner, *Griechische Grammatik 2*, München 1950

Fortsetzung Inhalt

Katz Joshua T. Hittite <i>ta-pa-ka-li-ya-<aš></i>	205
Lühr Rosemarie Zum Modalfeld im Hethitischen.....	239
Melchert H. Craig Hittite Nominal Stems in <i>-il</i>	263
Milani Celestina Onomastica micenea e onomastica anatolica	273
Negri Mario Further Observations on Indo-European 'Long' Sonants.....	291
Oettinger Norbert Neue Gedanken über das <i>nt</i> -Suffix.....	301
Ofitsch Michaela „Ackern“ und „pflügen“ im Hethitischen – Bemerkungen zum semantischen Wandel.....	317
Palmucci Alberto Tarconte, un ponte mitostorico fra Tarquinia e Troia	341
Rasmussen Jens E. From the Realm of Anatolian Verbal Stem Formation. Problems of Reduplication.....	355
Rieken Elisabeth Einige Beobachtungen zum Wechsel <i>u/(u)ua</i> in den hethitischen Texten.....	369
Schulze-Thulin Britta Zur <i>hi</i> -Konjugation von Fortsetzern urindogermanischer <i>-o-éiie/o</i> -Kausativa/Iterativa im Hethitischen.....	381
Zeilfelder Susanne Zum Ausdruck der Finalität im Hethitischen	395
Zinko Christian Bemerkungen zu den hethitischen <i>s</i> -Stämmen.....	411
Autorenverzeichnis.....	427