

# POSSESSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN ANATOLIAN, HURRIAN, URARTIAN AND ARMENIAN AS EVIDENCE FOR LANGUAGE CONTACT

*Silvia Luraghi*

As is well known, adnominal possession displays some peculiar features in Anatolian.<sup>1</sup> Noun phrases that contain a head noun and a nominal modifier (dependent noun) often display patterns that are different from the usual construction involving an adnominal genitive, which occurs in the other Indo-European languages. In the Anatolian languages of the Luwian group, the genitive case was replaced to varying extents by so-called genitival adjectives (Hajnal 2000). In Cuneiform Luwian, where substitution is complete, it already occurs in the most ancient written sources, and must date back to pre-literary times. Hittite, which retains the use of the adnominal genitive, displays case attraction (also called partitive apposition), especially in cases of inalienable possession (see below). Stefanini (1969) suggested that substitution of adnominal genitives by adjectives in Luwian is due to the influence of a Hurrian construction, suffix copying, described in §1. In Luraghi (1993a), I argued that influence from Hurrian can also explain the introduction of case attraction in Hittite (see further Luraghi 1993b). The only other ancient Indo-European language that displays case attraction to an extent similar to Hittite is Classical Armenian. According to Vogt (1932), case attraction in Classical Armenian was brought about by contact with Old Georgian, a language that also has suffix copying.

In the present paper, I would like to explore further the hypothesis of language contact and morphological borrowing in the light of our knowledge about contacts among Indo-European and non-Indo-European populations in Anatolia. I will start by surveying once more the data (§1). In §2, I will summarize our knowledge about movements and contacts of Indo-European and non-Indo-European populations in Anatolia. I will argue that early appearance of genitival adjectives in Luwian can be explained by early bilingualism in the area of Kizzuwatna, while later appearance of case attraction in Hittite may show that contacts with the Hurrians during the Old Kingdom mostly remained limited to military conquest, while later they increasingly extended to the cultural and linguistic levels. In §3, I will further suggest that the introduction of case attraction in Armenian may be dated back to contacts with the Urartians. Section 4 contains my conclusions.

## 1. THE DATA

### 1.1 Case Copying (*Suffixaufnahme*) in Hurrian, Urartian and Old Georgian

Case copying, also known by its German name, *Suffixaufnahme*, is known from several, genetically unrelated languages. Where it exists, it seems to be an areal phenomenon. This is best seen in Australia, where several languages belonging to different families have suffix copying (Plank 1995). In spite of the variety of languages

that display this phenomenon, there appears to be a limitation to its occurrence: suffix copying is typical of agglutinative, rather than fusional languages. It can be described as follows: in an agglutinative language, the case suffix of a head noun is copied after the genitive suffix of a nominal modifier:  $X + \text{case}_1 Y + \text{gen} + \text{case}_1$  = “Y’s X,” “the X of Y.”

Some examples are given below:

- (1) *eni(i)=n(a)=až(v)e=ne=da šarri=ne=da*  
god-art.pl-gen-art.sg-dir king-art.sg-dir  
“to the king of the gods” (from Wilhelm 1995, 118)
- (2) *haldi=i=ne=ni alsuiši=ni*  
Haldi-gen-art.sg-instr greatness-instr  
“through the greatness of Haldi” (from Wilhelm 1995, 131)
- (3) *šecevn-ita cmid-isa sameb-isa-jta*  
help-instr holy-gen trinity-gen-instr  
“with the help of the Holy Trinity” (from Boeder 1995, 159)
- (4) *col-isa gan m-is mepc-isa-jsa*  
wife-gen by art-gen king-gen-gen  
“from the wife of the king” (from Vogt 1932)

In example (1) from Hurrian, the head noun is *šarri*, which takes the suffixes of definite article and directive case; both affixes are copied on the dependent noun *eni*, after the suffixes of the plural article and of the genitive. In (2) from Urartian, it is the suffix of the instrumental that is copied from the head noun *alsuiši* to its dependent *haldi*. In a similar way, the Georgian examples (3) and (4) contain genitival constructions in which the dependent in the genitive also bears the suffixes of the head noun. These three languages are agglutinative.

Suffix copying has the effect of creating agreement between a head noun and a dependent noun, in much the same way as agreement does when the dependent is an adjective. As remarked in Marr and Brière (1931, 231), “this formation typical of Georgian is called the ‘double relation,’ because it consists, on the one hand, in the genitive of the *nomen rectum* and, on the other, in the repetition of the case ending of the *nomen regens*, which already constitutes a ‘relation.’”<sup>2</sup>

Through suffix copying the noun phrase acquires extra marking, and its boundaries are better indicated. The reason why suffix copying requires agglutinative morphology lies in the nature of the affixes, which in agglutinative languages have bigger autonomy than in fusional languages, and are always easily individuated and segmented. In fusional languages, on the contrary, inflectional affixes are often hardly segmented from the stem; furthermore, they often also convey information regarding inflectional class: this means that the endings are not easily identified as exponents of a certain case.<sup>3</sup> Because the Indo-European languages are fusional, suffix copying is unlikely to be borrowed without some changes that adapt it to fusional morphology.

### 1.2 Genitival Adjectives in Cuneiform Luwian and in Lycian

As remarked above, adjectival modifiers are found in all languages of the Luwian group but, while most languages also have a genitive case, in Cuneiform Luwian they are the only possible way to express adnominal relations. This situation held already at the time of the first written sources:

- (5) *zassin DUMU-assassin annin*  
this:ADJ.ACC child:ADJ.ACC mother:ACC  
“this child’s mother” (KUB 35.103 ii 13)
- (6) *xntawaza xugasi enesi*  
rulership:NOM grandfather:ADJ.NOM mother:ADJ.NOM  
“the rulership of the mother’s grandfather” (from Neumann 1982, 151)

- (7) *DINGIR.MEŠ-assanzati wassarahitati*  
gods-ADJ.PL.INSTR favor:INSTR  
“by the favor of the gods” (from Melchert 2003, 188)

Examples (5) and (7) are from Cuneiform Luwian. In (5) the head noun *annin* is in the accusative; the dependent *zassin* DUMU-assassin contains a demonstrative and a noun, both take the adjectival suffix *-assa/i-* and agree in case with the head noun. Example (7) shows that a dependent noun can also be in the plural (see Melchert 2003, 188), while example (6) from Lycian shows that adjectival genitives can be recursive: the noun *xtawaza* is the head of the whole noun phrase, *enesi* is the modifier of *xtawaza* and *xugasi* is the modifier of *enesi*; they both take the adjectival suffix *-s-*.

Adjectival modifiers used in the place of genitives are known from many other Indo-European languages, but in none of them do they replace the genitive case completely (see the discussion in Luraghi 1993a). Some examples are given below from Latin (8) and Upper Sorbian (9 and 10):

- (8) *ex Anniana Milonis domo*  
“from Annius Milo’s home” (Cic. ad Att. IV 3,3)
- (9) *Janowa kniha*  
Jan:ADJ-NOM.SG.F book:NOM.SG.F  
“Jan’s book”
- (10) *mojeho muzowa sostra*  
POSS.1SG.GEN husband:ADJ.NOM.SG.F sister:NOM.SG.F  
“my husband’s sister”

Possessive adjectives are most extended in the Slavonic languages, but even in Upper Sorbian, where they are most often used, they display some restrictions: they require definite referents and cannot be formed of all nouns; besides, they are not recursive (as shown in [18]), and plurality of the possessor cannot be expressed (Corbett 1987).

The adjectival suffix *-assa/i-* is also known from Hittite and Palaic, as shown by Hajnal (2000, 165–67), who also remarks that the usage of the genitive in Hittite (and presumably in Anatolian) had some limitations with respect to the other Indo-European languages.<sup>4</sup> If we accept Stefanini’s (1969) hypothesis, according to which replacement of the genitive by the possessive adjective was brought about by contact with Hurrian, this phenomenon can be explained as a way to reproduce the same type of construction (agreement of a nominal dependent with its head noun) with Indo-European means that already existed in Anatolian. Stefanini writes, “such correspondences [i.e., with suffix copying] in Luwian could be received and understood only through an adjectival interpretation, in an Indo-European sense” (1969, 299).<sup>5</sup>

This interpretation is in keeping with our knowledge about morphological borrowing. Most often, morphological borrowing consists of the reinterpretation of an affix that already exists in the target language and takes over a function of an affix of the source language, as argued by Weinreich:

If the bilingual identifies a morpheme or grammatical category of language A with one in language B, he may apply the B form in grammatical functions which he derives from the system of language A. What leads the bilingual to establish the interlingual equivalent of the morphemes or categories is either their FORMAL SIMILARITY OR A SIMILARITY IN PRE-EXISTING FUNCTIONS. (Weinreich 1963, 39; emphasis mine)

In this perspective, the derivational suffix *-assa/i-* that derives an adjective from a noun corresponds to the suffix of the genitive in Hurrian, indeed their function is the same, because both mark a noun as a dependent of another noun. In this connection, it is interesting to note that descriptive grammars of Australian languages that also display suffix copying, similar to Hurrian, sometimes disagree in classifying the so-called genitive suffix. While some scholars consider it an inflectional suffix, others think that it should better be taken as derivational: “genitive could, strictly, be classified as a derivational affix rather than as

an inflection ... genitive takes a case inflection agreeing with the head “possessed” noun and functions rather as a derived adjective” (Dixon 1980, 321).

### 1.3 Case Attraction in Hittite and Classical Armenian

Case attraction, which started occurring in Middle Hittite, and replaced an older construction involving possessive clitics (see Luraghi 1990 and below, § 1.4), consists of a dependent noun that takes the same case as the head noun (i.e., it is treated as an adjective), rather than be inflected in the genitive. It occurs with all cases, as shown in the examples below:

- (11) *n= at= mu= kan UKU-az KAXU-az šara uizzi= pat*  
 CONN 3SG.N/A 1SG.OBL PTC man:ABL mouth:ABL out go:PRS.3SG PTC  
 “and it (sc. these words) comes out of my mouth of man” (KUB 6.45 i 30–31)
- (12) *nu= kan GAL-in arunan 4Ku(ma)rbiyaza É-irza ...*  
 CONN PTC big:ACC sea:ACC K.:ABL house:ABL  
*uwater n= an INA É- ŠU arḫa peḫuter*  
 bring:PRT.3PL CONN 3SG.ACC into house his back bring:PRT.3PL  
 “they brought the big sea out of Kumarbi’s house, and carried him to his (own) house”  
 (StBoT 14 11.16–19);
- (13) *tuedaš ššiyantaš pedaš*  
 2SG.DAT.PL beloved:DAT.PL sites:DAT.PL  
 “in your favorite sites” (KUB 36.90 16).

Examples (14) through (16) show how case attraction works in Classical Armenian. Example (16) is of special interest, because it is the translation of Georgian (4), which contains suffix copying:

- (14) *yeresaç erkrē*  
 face:ABL earth:ABL  
 “from the face of the earth”
- (15) *varowk’ lawowt’eamb*  
 life:INSTR virtue:INSTR  
 “through a virtuous way of life”
- (16) *i knoĵē t’agaworēn*  
 from wife:ABL.SG king:ABL.SG-ART  
 “from the wife of the king” (Armenian examples from Vogt 1932).

The above examples all contain occurrences where a dependent noun is inflected in the same case as the head noun. Examples (11) and (12) from Hittite involve the ablative; example (13) involves the use of the dative/locative and is especially interesting because it shows that pronouns could also undergo case attraction. Examples from Classical Armenian involve the ablative and the instrumental case.

Double case constructions are also known from other Indo-European languages, albeit sporadically. The closest parallel is the Homeric double accusative, as in:

- (17) *Dēiōkhon dē Páris bále ... ômon ópisthe*  
 D.:ACC PTC P.:NOM hit:AOR.3SG back:ACC behind  
 “Deïochus hit Paris in the back from behind” (Il. 15.341)

In Homer, double case is limited to inalienable possession (mostly body parts), and it is productive only for the accusative. The limited small number of occurrences with the dative, as:

- (18) *en dé te hoi kradiēi*  
 in PTC PTC 3SG.DAT heart:DAT  
 “in his heart” (Il. 20.169)

can be explained as involving a possessive construction (dative of possession, see also Jacquinod 1989).

In Homer, double case is limited to inalienable possession (mostly body parts), and it is productive only for the accusative (see Jacquinod 1989). In Hittite, case attraction is attested for all cases; it is limited to referents that can be seen as inalienably possessed, but their range is wider than in Homeric Greek. In Classical Armenian case attraction has no limitations.

Case attraction too can be seen as the over-extension of a construction that was possible in the Indo-European languages in order to reproduce a non-Indo-European construction. As with suffix copying, with case attraction, too, the dependent noun agrees with the head noun.

### 1.4 Diachrony of Case Attraction in Hittite

As I remarked above, case attraction did not occur in Old Hittite. As shown in Luraghi (1990), Old Hittite had a special possessive construction that was used for inalienable possession;<sup>6</sup> it involved a dependent in the genitive and a possessive clitic hosted by the head noun:

- (19) *takku LÚ.ULÛ<sup>LU</sup>-aš ELLAM-aš KAXKAK=šet kuiški waki*  
 if man-GEN free-GEN nose 3SG-POSS-N/A someone-NOM-SG bite-3SG-PRES  
 “if someone bites the nose of a free man” (Laws § 13 = A i 24, Old Hittite).

The occurrence of the clitic has the effect of cross-referencing the possessor with the possessee, in other words, it constitutes a sort of agreement between the dependent and the head noun. That this construction was functionally equivalent to case attraction is shown by the fact that in later manuscripts of the *Laws* it was substituted by case attraction:

- (20) *takku LÚ.ULÛ<sup>LU</sup>-an ELLAM KAXKAK=šet kuiški waki*  
 if man-ACC free nose 3SG-POSS-A someone-N-SG bite-3SG-PRES  
 “if someone bites a free man on his nose” (Laws § 13 = B i 33, Middle Hittite)

The occurrence of -šet in (19) must be explained as the result of a partial innovation: the copyist changed the genitive LÚ.ULÛ<sup>LU</sup>-aš into an accusative LÚ.ULÛ<sup>LU</sup>-an but did not leave out the possessive. This type of partial innovations is frequent in copies of Old Hittite texts.

### 1.5 Suffix Copying and Case Attraction

In the present section I will test the plausibility of the hypothesis that case attraction derives from borrowing of suffix copying. I will start by citing Vogt’s (1932) explanation of suffix copying in Armenian as owing to influence from Georgian:

In Georgian the case ending of the head noun ... is repeated after all modifiers, either adjectives, pronouns, genitives, prepositional phrases or noun phrases which already contain the expression of a case relation.... The difference between the two expressions [i.e. suffix copying in Georgian and case attraction in Armenian] is that Georgian allows cumulation of case endings whereas in Armenian the ending that marks the constituent forces away the ending that expresses the relation between head and modifier. Since the two languages have different [morphological] means, facts are not the same in detail. However, the general tendency of the two languages displays a striking similarity, making case endings also function as markers of noun phrases. (1932, 75)<sup>7</sup>

Indeed the similarity is striking, and the same holds for Hittite as compared to Hurrian: the only difference lies in the limitation of case attraction in Hittite to inalienable possession, while neither case attraction in Classical Armenian nor suffix copying in any of the languages cited here displays such limitation. In my opinion, the limitation is due to the fact that case attraction had been borrowed into Hittite as a replacement of the earlier construction with clitics, described in § 1.4, which already had the effect of making the head noun agree with the dependent.

Better dating of the Hittite tablets achieved in the 1970s helped work out a chronology of case attraction as described in §1.4, and clear the way for the idea that case attraction represented an older way of expressing

possession in Proto-Indo-European, even older than the adnominal genitive (see Luraghi 1990 and 1993a for discussion).

Recently, Lühr (2001) offered another explanation of the development of case attraction in Hittite also connected with language contact and morphological borrowing (see also Lühr 2003). According to Lühr, Hittite case attraction was created due to influence of the Akkadian construct state. Lühr assumes that occurrences as (20) where case attraction is accompanied by the possessive clitic are indeed representative of an existing Hittite construction, rather than they are partial innovations, where the scribe has changed the genitive into the accusative, but then has not left out the possessive. Note however that such constructions only occur in the *Laws*, i.e., in a text that has been copied from an Old Hittite original, and not in Middle Hittite or New Hittite original manuscripts. Lühr then draws a parallel between (20) and occurrences such as (21):

- (21) *rubu qas= su*  
 prince:NOM hand:CONSTR POSS  
 “the hand of the prince” (from Lühr 2001, 438),

and writes that “possessor and possessee or *rectum* and *regens* are placed in the same case next to each other.”<sup>8</sup> However this is not the case, since the possessee (i.e., the word *qas*) is not inflected in the same case as the possessor: Here (as elsewhere in this construction) the possessor *rubu* is in the nominative case, while the possessee *qas* is in the construct state.<sup>9</sup> Furthermore, as I remarked above, the occurrence of the possessive clitic within case attraction in Hittite is only due to partial updating of the language. In original manuscripts written when case attraction started to be productively used, clitics did not occur.<sup>10</sup>

## 2. CONTACTS BETWEEN INDO-EUROPEAN AND NON-INDO-EUROPEAN POPULATIONS IN ANATOLIA

Stefanini (2002) explained the non-occurrence of adjectival genitives in Hittite as opposed to their occurrence in Luwian as owing to the influence of different substrates: while Luwian had Hurrian as its substrate at an early time, Hittite had Hattic, a language that does not have suffix copying.

Let us now turn to the distribution of genitival adjectives in the languages of the Luwian group. As I remarked above, the substitution of the genitive case is complete only in Cuneiform Luwian. Hieroglyphic Luwian and Lycian retained the genitive to different extents; Lycian also displays a tendency toward extending the genitive case at the expense of the adjectival construction (see Hajnal 2000).

The Hurrians were located in northern Syria, to the east of ancient Anatolia, so contact between them and the Indo-European populations must have taken place in an eastern area. In historical times, the Luwians were located in southern and western Anatolia, but, as Melchert puts it “that the Luwians *subsequently* moved from a western base south and east does not logically require that prior movement followed the same trajectory” (2003, 25). Indeed, the early Luwians, forefathers of those who later wrote the Cuneiform Luwian tablets, must have been located more to the east: “it seems certain that Luwian was present in Kizzuwatna by the Old Hittite period, and it was likely already there several centuries earlier” (Melchert 2003, 12). Furthermore, “in a few cases where a determination can be made, the Luwian rituals found in Hattusa are imported from the southern region of Kizzuwatna.... Our present evidence thus permits ... the view that the language of Cuneiform Luwian ritual texts represents an archaic (sixteenth–fifteenth century) dialect of Kizzuwatna” (Bryce 2003, 89).

I would like to suggest that at an early time, before the beginning of written sources, a group of Luwians lived in close contact with the Hurrians in the area of Kizzuwatna, experiencing a situation of bilingualism, which was the source for linguistic borrowing, attested by the extension of genitival adjectives. This group of Luwians constituted the speakers of second-millennium Luwian, that is, Cuneiform Luwian. The innovation then spread from east to west and touched the other Luwian varieties, which adopted the use of genitival

adjectives without dropping the genitive case completely. The first-millennium languages of the Luwian group are descendents of the western varieties: first-millennium Hieroglyphic Luwian documents mostly come from the area of Arzawa (Melchert 2003, 142), while the Lycians had moved to Lycia from the west.

As for Hittite, Stefanini’s explanation gives a reason for the fact that this language did not share the Luwian innovation. Indeed, the Hittites had contacts with the Hurrians at an early time, but such contacts were mostly limited to warfare, and were not likely to lead to a situation where bilingualism could develop to the high extent required for morphological borrowing.

Later, during the Middle Hittite kingdom, the impact of the Hurrians on the Hittite society grew dramatically. At this stage, members of the Hittite royal family bore Hurrian names, and contact between speakers of the two languages must have been increasingly high. This new situation may have led again to morphological borrowing; the Old Hittite possessive construction, which was endangered by the disappearance of possessive clitics, was replaced by the new case attraction construction, created under the influence of Hurrian suffix copying.

## 3. ARMENIAN

As we have seen, Vogt (1932) attributed the creation of case attraction in Classical Armenian to influence from Old Georgian. In the light of the evidence in §1, however, case attraction could also have been brought about by influence from Urartian. This would imply that Armenian speakers were already in the area of Lake Van at least at the beginning of the first millennium bc.

Vogt’s hypothesis rests on solid ground: the influence of Georgian on Armenian has been pervasive, especially in the morphology. As is well known, during its attested history, Armenian has moved from the fusional type of Indo-European to the agglutinative type of the Caucasian languages: morphological borrowing went so far as to import a different morphological type into Armenian. However, the rise of case attraction attests to a different way of borrowing morphology. Rather than changing morphological type, Armenian reproduced the construction with Indo-European means. Case attraction developed before Armenian started to move toward the agglutinative type, so the difference in the two types of borrowing ultimately goes back to different temporal stages. Why did morphological borrowing start in a certain way, then stop, and then start again in a different way? A possible answer is that it does not only go back to different ages, but also to different source languages. This could be possible if case attraction owed to borrowing from Urartian. An early dating for case attraction in Armenian would also be in keeping with the hypothesis that agreement of a nominal modifier with the head noun was an areal phenomenon, as I will suggest in §4.

The precise age of the settlement of the Armenians in the area where they were at the time of the first written sources has been a debated matter. If case attraction indicates contact with Urartian, it could constitute an argument for early settlement of the Armenians in the Lake Van area, in keeping with current theories on the multiethnic and multicultural nature of the kingdom of Urartu (see Zimansky 2001).

## 4. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the evidence reviewed in the course of the paper, I would like to suggest that agreement of the head noun with a nominal modifier was an areal feature of a number of Indo-European and non-Indo-European languages spoken in the area of eastern Anatolia and western Caucasus in the second and first millennia bc. This type of agreement first manifested itself as suffix copying in the agglutinative non-Indo-European languages, then spread to the Indo-European languages, and was adapted to fusional morphology. Linguistic borrowing was the result of widespread bilingualism in this area.

## NOTES

- 1 Research for this paper was partially supported by the Italian Ministry of Education, through an FIRB grant for the project "Europa e Mediterraneo dal punto di vista linguistico: storia e prospettive."
- 2 "Cette formation propre au géorgien est appelé la 'double relation,' puisqu'elle consiste, d'une part, dans le génitif du *nomen rectum* et, d'autre part, dans la répétition de la terminaison casuelle du *nomen regens*, laquelle répétition constitue déjà la "relation."
- 3 In other words, the same case in a fusional language has different endings depending on the inflectional class (for example, genitive singular in Latin has different endings depending on whether a noun belongs to the first, second, etc. declension); furthermore, in fusional languages, the same ending is often used for different purposes in different inflectional classes or even within the same inflectional class.
- 4 Hajnal points out that the adverbial use of the genitive in Hittite is restricted and almost nonexistent, when compared to the other Indo-European languages. For a similar remark see further Luraghi (1986).
- 5 "Corrispondenze come queste in luvio potevano essere ricevute ed intese solo attraverso un'interpretazione aggettivale, in senso indoeuropeo."
- 6 Inalienable possession involves entities that cannot be separated from the possessor. The notion of inalienability cannot be defined in the same way for all languages: while body parts are apparently inalienably possessed in all languages that distinguish between two types of possession, other entities, like various types of personal objects, can be the object of inalienable possession too, but the range of inalienable possession is language specific. For example, in Tungusian, domestic animals are inalienably possessed, while wild animals are not (see Beisenherz 2001). Thus, it is hard to see Lühr's argument (2001, 425) when she states that in Old Hittite, when possessive genitives co-occur with clitics "wie die Daten zeigen, kann der Besitz alienabel oder inalienabel sein." She apparently takes as an occurrence of "alienabel" the noun *assu* "good," but does not discuss the extent of alienable and inalienable possession in Hittite.
- 7 "En géorgien la désinence casuelle du nom déterminé ... se répète après tout déterminant, que ce soit un adjectif, un pronom, un génitif, une expression prépositionnelle, ou encore un groupe pronominal comportant déjà l'expression de la relation casuelle.... La différence entre les deux expressions consiste en ceci, que le géorgien permet l'accumulation des désinences casuelles tandis qu'en arménien, la désinence marquant le group chasse la désinence marquant le rapport entre le déterminé et le déterminant. Comme les moyens dont disposent les deux langues sont différentes, le détail des faits n'est pas le même. Les tendances générales des deux langues n'en montrent pas moins une concordance frappante, en laissant les désinences casuelles servir aussi d'indicateurs des groupes nominaux."
- 8 "Possessor und Possessum oder Rektum und Regens stehen im gleichen Kasus nebeneinander."
- 9 I had already discussed this difference in Luraghi (1990, 313).
- 10 Note that case attraction did not occur in Old Hittite, and that Lühr's Old Hittite examples often are from later copies of Old Hittite texts. Indeed it is clear that case attraction could not exist in Old Hittite, if one does not analyze a single occurrence in isolation but rather the construction as a whole. As we have seen in the examples, case attraction typically occurred when the possessor was human, and often involved the ablative. But as Starke (1977) has shown, nouns with human referents did not take the ablative case in Old Hittite, so case attraction must be an innovation. Lühr (2001, 439) further mentions in a footnote that the so-called free genitive in Hittite could also owe to Akkadian influence. The free genitive consists in the occurrence of a noun in the genitive without a head noun, as *tayazilas* "of the theft" = "thief." This use of the genitive also exists in Akkadian: *ša abullim* "of the gate" = "guardian." Such free genitives also occur in Hurrian (and in other languages with suffix copying); they may be evidence for wider language contact.

## REFERENCES

- Beisenharz, A. (2001) Zum unveräuslichen Besitz im Tungusischen. In W. Boeder and G. Hentschel (eds.) *Variierende Markierung von Nominalgruppen in Sprachen unterschiedlichen Typs*, 31–47. Oldenburg: BIS
- Boeder, W. (1995) Suffixaufnahme in Kartvelian. In F. Plank (ed.) *Double Case*, 151–215. Oxford, Oxford University.
- Bryce, T. (2003) "History." In H. C. Melchert (ed.) *The Luwians*, 27–127. Leiden, Brill.
- Corbett, G. (1987) The Morphology/Syntax Interface: Evidence from Possessive Adjectives in Slavonic. *Language* 63, 299–345.
- Dixon, R. M. W. (1980) *The Languages of Australia*. Cambridge, Cambridge University.

- Hajnal, I. (2000) Der adjektivische Genitivausdruck der luwischen Sprachen. In Ch. Zinko and M. Offisch (eds.) *125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz*, 159–84. Graz, Leykam.
- Jacquiod, B. (1989) *Le double accusatif en grec, d'Homère à la fin du V<sup>e</sup> siècle avant J. C.* BCILL 50. Louvain, Peeters.
- Lühr, R. (2001) Der Ausdruck der Possessivität innerhalb der Determinans-Phrase in den ältesten indogermanischen Sprachen. In U. Junghaus, L. Szucsich (eds.) *Syntactic Structure and Morphological Information*, 415–46. Berlin, de Gruyter.
- (2003) Badal- und Genitivkonstruktionen, *Historische Sprachforschung* 115/1, 23–56.
- Luraghi, S. (1986) Der semantische und funktionelle Bau des althethitischen Kasussystems. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 99, 23–42.
- (1990) The Structure and Development of Possessive Noun Phrases in Hittite. In H. Andersen and K. Koerner (eds.) *Historical Linguistics 1987*, 309–25. Amsterdam, Benjamins.
- (1993a) La modificazione nominale nelle lingue anatoliche. *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 78/2, 144–66.
- (1993b) Suffix Copying and Related Phenomena: A Prototype Approach. *Linguistics* 32, 1095–1108.
- Marr, N. and Brière, M. (1931) *La langue géorgienne*. Paris, Firmin-Didot.
- Melchert, H. C. (2003) Language. In H. C. Melchert (ed.) *The Luwians*, 170–210. Leiden, Brill.
- Neumann, G. (1982) Die Konstruktionen mit Adjectiva genetivalia in den luwischen Sprachen. In E. Neu (ed.) *Investigationes philologicae et comparativae*, 149–61. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- Plank, F. ed. (1995) *Double Case*. Oxford, Oxford University.
- Starke, F. (1977) *Die Funktionen der dimensional Kasus und Adverbien im Althethitischen*. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- Stefanini, R. (1969) Il genitivo aggettivale nelle lingue anatoliche. *Athenaeum* 47, 290–302.
- (2002) Toward a Diachronic Reconstruction of the Linguistic Map of Ancient Anatolia. In S. De Martino and F. Pecchioli Daddi (eds.) *Anatolia antica*, 783–806. Firenze, Logisma.
- Vogt, H. (1932) Les groupes nominaux en arménien et géorgien anciens. *Norsk Tidsskrift for Spragvidenskap* 5, 57–81.
- Weinreich, U. (1963) *Languages in Contact*. The Hague, Mouton.
- Wilhelm, G. (1995) Suffixaufnahme in Hurrian and Urartian. In F. Plank (ed.) *Double Case*, 113–35. Oxford, Oxford University.
- Zimansky, P. (2001) Archaeological Inquiries into Ethnolinguistic Diversity in Urartu. In R. Drews (ed.) *Greater Anatolia and the Indo-Hittite Language Family*, 15–27. JIES Monograph 38. Washington, DC, Institute for the Study of Man.