An Overlooked Case of Inversion in Middle Hittite?[1]

Andrej V. Sideltsev (Moskau)

I. # Finite Verb Finite Verb #[2].

I.0. There are a number of Hittite syntactic structures of the type *finite verb finite verb within one clause* (further – *# finite verb finite verb #*) that have never been properly analysed. The aim of the paper is to delimit such constructions, understand their syntactic nature (including word order) and assess their origin.

I.1. The first candidate is finite form of *tarḫ(u)*- "can" + finite form of another verb[3] attested three times in MH[4] texts (one being a NS copy) in one clause:

(CTH 331.1) KUB 33.66 + KBo 40.333 +, Rs. III 1 # ^{d} ⌈IM⌉ *-na-aš pa-it* # *nu-k[án* ^{URU}*Li-]iḫ-zi-na-an* (2) *ku-u̯a-aš-ki-iz-zi* # *na-an-kán* x[$^{HI.}$]^A *-ta* ***tar-aḫ-zi*** (3) ***ku-e-en-zi*** # ... "The Weather-god went. He stroke/smote [Li]ḫzina many times, he managed to kill it (the population?)/managed to destroy/ruin it (Liḫzina) with [ ]^{5}";

late NS (CTH 336.3) KUB 33.57 Rs. III 5' ...] ⌈Ú⌉ *-UL* ***tar-aḫ-zi ku-*** ⌈***en***⌉ *-**zi***[6] "... He cannot kill" cited in HEG T, 158 and Groddek, ZA 89, 1999, 43;

---

1 I am grateful to Prof. Dr. van den Hout for highly stimulating suggestions and for making available to me in advance of publication his article "Studies in the Hittite Phraseological Construction II. Its Origin" which will appear in GS Neu. My thanks also go to Dr. Kassian. Naturally, I alone am responsible for the views expressed here.

2 Here and elsewhere # is the sign of a clause boundary; // – of a paragraph divider. # is only marked when there is more than one clause in the example.

3 HEG T, 158 analysed the construction as containing two asyndetic clauses each with a verb (cf. IV.1.); Groddek (ZA 89, 1999, 43) considered the clauses to attest asyndetic connection (similarly Mazoyer, Télipinu, 96: "construction parataxique"), which is certainly true, but does not explain their origin.

4 MS texts are unmarked in the body of the paper.

5 Cf. Groddek, ZA 89, 1999, 40; Pecchioli Daddi/Polvani, Mitologia, 101. For *ku̯en-* see HED K, 211-2.

6 Also probably in frgm. Rs. III 13'.

(CTH 324.1.A) KUB 17.10 Vs. I 32' ... # *I-NA* URU-*ŠU* KÁ.GAL (33') [*ú-iz-*]*zi* # *nu Ú-UL* **tar-ḫu-uz-zi** *ḫa-a-ši* # ...[7] "He [come]s[8] to the gate of his city (lit. to his city, the gate), but does not manage[9] to open (it)".

I.1.1. Normally two predications within one clause are expressed by *infinitive* + *tarḫ(u)*-:

(CTH 262) IBoT 1.36 Vs. I 69 ... # ᴸᵁ.ᴹᴱˢ*ME-⌈ŠE-DI⌉ -ma* (70) ᴱ*ar-ki-ú-i ta-pu-uš-za* ZAG-*za ti-en-zi* # *ma-a-an ku-e-da-ni-ma* URU-*r*[*i* ZA]G-⌈*az*⌉ *ti-ja-u-an-zi* (71) ⌈*Ú-UL* **tar-ḫa**⌉ *-an*(?) # *na-at* GÙB-*la-za ti-*[*e*]*n-zi* # ... "The guards take a stand next to the *canopy* on the [righ]t. But if in some town it is not possible to stand on the right, they take a st[a]nd on the left ...";

(CTH 789) KBo 32.14 Rs. III 17, 32 ... *na-an-za* PA-*NI* BE-*LÍ-ŠU i-ši-ja-aḫ-⌈ḫu⌉ -u-an- ⌈zi⌉* **tar-ḫu-ir** "They (the citizens) managed to inform on him before his lord";

(CTH 480) KUB 29.7 + KBo 21.41 Rs. 27 ... *nu-ua-ra-at-za nam-ma i-ja-at-nu-ua-an* (28) *ḫa-a-šu-ua-a-i*ˢᴬᴿ [*pu-u*]*š-šu-ua-an-z*[*i l*]*e-e ku-iš-ki* **tar-aḫ-zi**[10] "Further let [n]o one be able to [crus]h (?) it, (namely) the luxurious soapwort";

(CTH 330.2.A) KBo 15.33 +, Rs. III 13 # ᴸᵁ.ᴹᴱˢMUHALDIM-*ma-aš iš-ta-na-a-ni ḫu-kán-zi* # *nu ku-iš* ᴸᵁMUHALDIM **ḫu-i-ku-an-zi** (14) **tar-aḫ-zi** # *nu-uš-ši a-pí-e* GÍRᴴᴵᴬ *pí-an-zi* # ... "The cooks slaughter on the altar. They give the knife to the cook that manages to slaughter".

I.1.2. The third structure (# ... *tarḫ(u)zzi*$_y$ #   ... *zaḫḫijazzi*$_x$ #) attested with *tarḫ(u)*- is:

NH/NS (13 b.c.) (CTH 62.II.A) KBo 5.9 (+), Rs. III 4 ...# *ku-u-un-ua me-mi-ja-an* (5) *Ú-UL* **tar-aḫ-mi** # *nu-ua-ra-an Ú-UL* DÙ-*mi* # "I will not manage to do this thing"[11] (*kūn memijan* is a nominal argument coreferent with *-an*[12]).

---

7 The use is quite stable in the text. See (CTH 324.I.B+C+D) KUB 33.2 (+), Vs. I 18' *-u*]*z-*⌈*zi*⌉ *ḫa-* ⌈*a*⌉ *-ši* ...

8 Cf. Hoffner, Myths², 15.

9 Following Hoffner, Myths², 15; HEG T, 158; García Trabazo, BCBO 6, 133; Mazoyer, Télipinu, 74. Cf. Goetze, ANET, 127; Pecchioli Daddi/Polvani, Mitologia, 80.

10 Following Goedegebuure, Die Sprache 43/1, 2002-3, 23; Torri, StudAs 2, 160. Cf. García Trabazo, BCBO 6, 502.

11 Cf. "I can't manage this thing, and I won't do it" Boley, IBS 79, 72. Cf. also Friedrich, SV, 21.

12 This distinguishes the structure from the usual paratactic constructions which employ neuter gender pronouns with sentential reference (i.e. referring to the whole sentence) for which see,

The same structure occurs with *tarra-*[13] "can", etymologically identical to *tar-ḫ(u)-*[14]:

NH/NS (CTH 68.E) KUB 6.44 +, Vs. I 9 # ⌈*A*⌉ *-BU-ĮA-ma ta-me-e-da-ni KUR-e e-eš-ta* # (10) *na-aš Ú-UL* **tar-ra-ad-da-at** # *na-aš-ši* ($n=aš_\text{nom.sg.} = ši_\text{dat.sg.}$) EGIR-*an Ú-UL ti*[(-*ịa-at*)] # "But my father was in a different land, (so) he could not st[(and)] by him" (lit. "he could not, he did not stand by him")[15].

I.2. The second candidate for the structure # *finite verb finite verb* # is the common 'phraseological' construction # *ụizzi/paizzi ... iezzi* #. I omit here any description as the construction is well known and well studied. See Garrett, Diss., 72-74; Disterheft, KZ 97, 1984 and esp. van den Hout, FS Hoffner; id., GS Neu.

---

e.g., Cotticelli-Kurras, 2. IKH, 87-8 sub 0.2.1; Goedegebuure, Diss., 89-92. I believe that at least in MH texts there are no unambiguous examples employing common gender *-an* for sentential reference, cf. Justus, Mat.heth.Thes., 10, 1981, Nr. 7, 119-120, 123. Justus' Paradebeispiel (ibid., 43, 123, 157) is particularly probative: the MS exemplar KBo 11.12 + attests expected neuter *-at*, while late NS copy *- -an*. Mind that the example apud Cotticelli-Kurras, 2. IKH, 88, sub 0.2.2 is irrelevant for the discussion as the broader context shows that the pronoun has concrete reference (the clause in question is underlined): (CTH 41.II.1) KBo 19.39 + KUB 8.81 Vs. II 6' # *ma-a-an-*⌈*kán*⌉[?] *t*[*a-m*]*a-i* KUR-*e na-aš-ma* URU-*aš na-aš-ma-aš* ÉRIN^M⌈^EŠ⌉ *A-NA* ^dUTU^ŠĮ (7') *ne-e-ịa* # ^dUTU^ŠĮ *ŠU-LUM ŠA* ^m*Šu-na-aš-šu-ra ḫa-at-*⌈*ra*⌉ *-a-iz-zi* # (8') *a-pa-a-aš-ụa am-me-el* # *nu-ụa-ra-an ša-a-ak* # *na-an-kán* ^m*Šu-na-aš-šu-ra-aš* (9') EGIR-*an-na ar-ḫa li-e na-i-*⌈*iš-ki*⌉ *-ši* # (10') ⤉*ša-a-ku-ụa-aš-še-eš-ša-an ḫar-du* # "But if some o[th]er land, or a city, or an army defects to My Majesty, and My Majesty writes a cordial letter to Šunaššura: "That one now belongs to me. Acknowledge it (= a land or a group of people)", you, Šunaššura, shall not cause it (= a land or a group of people) to fall away/ turn away from following (him=My Majesty). He shall keep (his) eyes (turned) to him (My Majesty)", following de Martino – Imparati, StBoT 45, 354 and Beckman, HDT, 21. Cf. Justus, Mat.heth.Thes., 10, 1981, Nr. 7, 119. The fact that coreference of *kūn memịan* and *-an* has numerous NH parallels (see Justus, Mat.heth.Thes., 10, 1981, Nr. 7, 119-22) does not by itself prove the sentential reference of *-an*.

13 The verb is mostly used with infinitives, but absolute uses are also attested (for NS examples see HEG T, 147): (CTH 330.1.A) KBo 15.32 +, Vs. I 2 ... *nu ku-it ku-it me-ḫur* ^LÚE[N É^TIM] (3) **tar-ra-at-ta** ... "At whatever season the master of the house can,". I suppose that the following example should also belong to the same word, demonstrating absolute usage: NS (CTH 385.10) KUB 57.63 Rs. III 5' # [(*ut-ni-e*) *la-b*]*a-ar-na-a*[*š* (6') [^MUNUS*ta-ụa-an-na-a*]*n-na-aš-*⌈*ša*⌉ *-a*[*š*] (7') [*ki-*] ⌈*iš*⌉ *-š*[*a-an*? *a*]*n-da* ⌈*tar-ri-eš-du*⌉[?] # (8') [*n*]*a-*{*a*]*t* [(*ma-a-ú*) (#*?*) *š*]*i-iš-du* # ... "[In t]his w[ay] may the [(lands) of *lab*]*arna* and his [*tauanan*]*na* succeed, and may [th]ey (the lands) [(thrive) (and) p]rosper", cf. Singer, Prayers, 27; Archi, FS Otten², 22-23; not noted apud HEG, T, 147 sub *tarra-*.

14 See HEG T, 147, 165.

15 Following HEG T, 147. Cf. Friedrich, SV, 107.

I.3. The third candidate is the verb *kṷer-* "cut" attested in the construction # *finite verb finite verb* # only in combination with *dai-* "put" 4× in MS[16] texts:

(CTH 396.1) KBo 15.25 Rs. 7 # *nu* III NINDA.GUR₄.RA^{HI.A} *A-NA* ^dUTU
p[*ár-*]*ši-ja-mi* # *še-e-ra-aš-ša-an* ^{UZU}NÍG.GIG (8) ^{UZU}ŠÀ *ku-ir-zi da-a-i* #
nu EGIR-*an-da* KAŠ III-*ŠU ši-pa-an-ti* # "I b[r]eak three 'thick loaves' for the
Sundeity. (S)he cuts, and places thereupon, liver and heart. Then (s)he libates
beer three times", cited by Garrett, Diss., 75;

(CTH 630.A) KBo 21.85 +, Vs.¹ I 25' ... *še-er-ma-aš-ša-an* ^{UZU}NÍG.GIG
^{UZU}ŠÀ *ku-ir-zi da-a-i*;

(CTH 787) KBo 39.185 + KBo 35.246 +, Rs. 8' ... *še-e-ra-aš-ša-an* ^{UZU}NÍG.
GIG ^{UZU}Š[À] *ku-e-er-zi da-a-i* ...;

(CTH 694) KBo 14.90 Vs. II 2 [...] (3) [^U]^{ZU}NÍG.GIG ^{UZU}ŠÀ *ku-e-*⌜*ir-zi*⌝
da-a[*-i.*

I.3.1. Just as # ... *tarḫ(u)zzi_y* # ... *zaḫḫijazzi_x* # is attested alongside # ...
tarḫ(u)zzi_y zaḫḫijazzi_x # (see I.1.2.), there is # ... *kṷērzi_y* # ... *dāi_x* # structure
alongside # ... *kṷērzi_y dāi_x* #:

(CTH 706) KBo 35.157 Vs. II 2 ... # *nu* ^{UZU}NÍG.GIG ⌜^{UZU}⌝ ŠÀ *ku-er-zi* #
na-at-kán ⌜*QA*⌝ '-[*D*]*U*'⁷ NINDA.SIG (3) *A+NA* ^{UZU}GABA *še-er* * * *PA-
NI* ^d*Ḫé-pát da-a-i* #...;

Probably also fragmentary (CTH 701.e.16) KUB 47.84 Vs.? // 4'   ]*x-an*
ar-ḫa ku-⌜*er*⌝*-z*[*i*] # (5')   *še-e*]*r da-a-i* # (6')   *da*]-
⌜*a*⌝*-i* # EGIR-*an-da-ma* [   ] //;

(CTH 685.1) KUB 53.11 Vs. II 22' # *nu-uš-ša-an ŠA* GU₄ UDU^{HI.A}*-ja*
^{UZU}NÍG.GIG^{HI.A} ^{UZU}ŠÀ^{HI.A} (23') *iš-ta-na-a-ni A-NA* NINDA.GUR₄.RA^{HI.A}
še-er PA-⌜*NI* DINGIR^{!LIM}⌝ *da-a-i* # (24') I ^{UZU}NÍG.GIG*-ma* I ^{UZU}ŠÀ *ar-ḫa*
⌜*kur*⌝!ᵎ*-aš-ki-i*[*z-z*]*i* # (25') *nu-uš-ša-an* ^d*Kap-pa-ri-ja-mu-i da-a-i* #...

Also probative are the following contexts where *dai-* is used either with a different
preverb or with no preverb at all:

(CTH 683.5.A) KBo 8.97 +, Vs.¹ I 14' ... # ^{UZU}NÍ]G[.G]IG*-ma* ^{UZU}ŠÀ *ku-ir-zi*
na-at (15') [EGIR-*pa A-NA* DIN(GIR^M)]^{EŠ} *da-a-i* # //;

(CTH 701.a.A) KBo 23.12 +, Rs. IV // 7 # [*nu* ^{LÚ}AZ]U *ku-iš A-NA* ⌜SÍSKUR⌝
ar-ta-ri # *nu* GÍR-*an d*[*a-a-i*] # (8) [*na-a*]*t*?ᵎ *A-NA BE-EL* ⌜SÍSKUR⌝ *pa-a-i* #

---

16 I know of no NS examples. But then I admittedly have not looked through all the NS corpus.
17 The reading follows Groddek, DBH 19, 190. Cf. Wegner, ChS I/3-2, 131.

ta-ma-i-ša-aš-ši ^{LÚ}[AZU] (9) [^{UZU}NÍG].GIG ^{UZU}ŠÀ *pa-ra-a e-ip-zi* # *na-at* BE-
EL SÍS[KUR] (10) [*ar*]-*ḫa* **ku-e-ir-zi** # *nu* GÍR-*an a-ap-* ⌈*pa*⌉ A-NA
^{LÚ}AZU *p*[*a-a-i*] # (11) [*na-a*]*t-ša-an kat-ta* A-NA ^{GIŠ}BANŠUR AD.KID *da-*
a-i # ^{LÚ}[AZU-*ma*] (12) [*ku-it*] ½ ^{UZU}NÍG.GIG ^{UZU}ŠÀ GÙB-*la-az ḫar-zi* # *na-*
at-š[*a-an*] (13) [*kat-ta*] A-NA ^{GIŠ}BANŠUR AD.KID ŠA SÍSKUR *da-a-i* # *ku-*
un-n[*a-az-ma-kán*] (14) [*ku-it*] ½ ^{UZU}NÍG.GIG ^{UZU}ŠÀ *ḫar-zi* # *na-at-kán* ^{DUG}*a-*
aḫ-r[*u-u-uš-ḫi* A-NA] (15) [Ì].GIŠ *an-da da-a-*   *i* # //, similarly in (CTH 701)
KBo 27.161 (+), Vs.? 6'-9'.

I.4. The fourth[18] candidate is the construction with the verb *zinna/e-* "finish":

NH/NS (CTH 202) KBo 18.15 Vs. 8 # *na-an-* ⌈*kán*⌉ *ka-a-aš-ma* (9) ŠA A-BI-
ŠU DINGIR^{MEŠ} (10) *i-ja-ya-an-zi pa-ra-a* (11) *ne-eḫ-ḫu-un* # *nu-za ma-aḫ-*
⌈*ḫa*⌉ *-an* (12) DINGIR^{MEŠ} *i-ja-* ⌈*az-zi*⌉ (13) **zi-in-na-a-i**[19] # "Just now I
have sent him off to celebrate the gods of his father. As soon as he finishes
celebrating the gods, ..."[20];

(CTH 323.B) KUB 53.20 +, Rs. IV 9' # [(I ^{GI})]^ŠBANŠUR *ú-nu-ya-an-ta-an* A-
NA ^dUTU *da-a-i* # I ^{GIŠ}BAN[(ŠUR *ú-nu-ya-*)*an-ta-an*] (10') [(*A-NA*)] ⌈^d⌉ Te-
li-pí-nu da-a-i # *ma-a-an* DINGIR^{LAM} *a-ša-a-ši z*[(*i-in-ni-* ⌈*iz*⌉ *-*)*zi* # (*ne-*
ku-uz me-ḫur-ma)] # (11') [(^{DUG}*pa-aḫ-ḫu-un*[']*-n*)]*a-al-li-ja-az pa-aḫ-ḫur* PA-NI
DINGIR^{LIM} *da-a-i* # ... "She sets [(one)] decorated/laid table for the Sundeity,
she sets one [(decor)ated]/[(lai)d] tab[(le for)] Telipinu. When she f[(inish)es]
seating the deity/the deity finishes to seat himself – [(but it is (still) evening
time)] – she takes fire from the [(*p*.-contai)]ner before the deity".

The analysis of the latter context as # *finite verb finite verb* # follows Mazoyer, Té-
lipinu, 182, 192 and Hagenbuchner, THeth 16, 369[21] contra Pecchioli Daddi/Polva-
ni, Mitologia, 70 (separate clauses) or Kammenhuber, HW² A, 389 (a mistake).

---

18 All the rest of examples cited in Garrett, Diss., 75 are doubtful. In NS (CTH 255.1.A) KUB
   26.12 Rs. III 9 # *ku-iš-ki* EME-*an* BAL-*nu-zi* # ḪUL-*u-eš-ta* # "(If) somebody makes the
   tongue rebellious and became evil ..." the verbs are not in the same grammatical form. In NS
   (CTH 42.A) KBo 5.3 +, Rs. III 31 # ⌈*na-aš*⌉ ^{URU}Ḫa-at-tu-ši Ú-UL *ḫu-u-iš-šu-u-iz-zi* # *a-*
   ki-pa-a[*t*[']*-š*]*a-an* # "He does not remain alive in Ḫattuša but will die" negation has scope over
   only one verb in this context. The same concerns the use of the emphatic particle (which is itself
   quite problematic – see CHD P, 214). The NS examples (CTH 639.A) KUB 7.19 Vs. 7'-8' and
   (CTH 457.F) KUB 56.17 Vs. 16 (see IV.1.) which I owe to Prof. Dr. van den Hout (pers. comm.)
   are in my view ambiguous.
19 My attention was drawn to this example by Prof. Dr. van den Hout.
20 Following Hagenbuchner, THeth 16, 367-8.
21 Cf. NH/NS (CTH 456.4) KUB 7.13 +, Rs. 13 GIM-*an-ma* DINGIR^{LUM} *a-ša-an-na* ⌈*zi-in*⌉ -
   n[*a-an-zi* "But when they are fin[ished] installing the deity, ...".

I.4.1. Two predications in one clause are usually expressed by *infinitive* + *zinna/e-*, e.g.:

(CTH 706) KBo 35.163 + KBo 24.68 +, Vs. II 18' *ma-aḫ-ḫa-an-ma* ⌈MUNUS⌉ [SAN]GA ᵈ*Ḫé-pát BI-IB-RI*ᴴᴵᴬ *šu-un-ni-u-ua-an-zi* (19') *zi-in-na-i* ... "But when the [pries]tess of Ḫepat finishes filling the vessels, ...".

I.4.2. Just as # ... *tarḫ(u)zzi*$_y$ # ... *zaḫḫiiazzi*$_x$ # and # ... *kuērzi*$_y$ # ... *dāi*$_x$ # are attested alongside # ... *tarḫ(u)zzi*$_y$ *zaḫḫiiazzi*$_x$ # and # ... *kuērzi*$_y$ *dāi*$_x$ # (see I.1.2. and I.3.1.), there is # ... *iezzi*$_y$ # ... *zinnizzi*$_x$ # structure alongside # ... *iezzi*$_y$ *zinnizzi*$_x$ # as well:

Frgm. (CTH 396.1) KBo 15.25 Rs. 18 # *nu ḫa-aš-ta-a-e* [*ša-ra-*]*a li-iš-ša-an-zi* # *na-at ḫa-aš-ši-i a-ua-an kat-ta ti-an-zi* # (19) *nu-kán ar-ḫ*[*a zi-in-na-a*]*n-zi* # ... "They pick [u]p the bones and put them down on the hearth and [fini]sh of[f]"[22];

OH/NS (CTH 450.Day 13.B₁) KUB 39.8 +, Rs. III 14" # [(*nu ku-it-ma-an*) *iš-pa-a*]*n-da-an lu-*⌈*ug*⌉*-ga-nu-ua-a*[*n-z*]*i* # (15") *nu* ⌈*QA-TAM-MA*⌉ *-pát* ⌈*iš*⌉ [*-pa-an-t*]*a-an-zi* # Ì.DÙG.GA-*ia-aš-ša-an* (16") *ḫa-aš-ši-i li-el*[*-ḫu-*]*u-ua-an-* ⌈*zi*⌉ *-pát* # (17") *na-at-kán a*[(*r-ḫa*)] *zi-in-na-an-zi* # "[(While)] they pa[s]s [(the ni)]ght awake, they o[ff]er in just the same way and p[o]ur the fine oil into the hearth likewise. They finish it o[(ff)]".

The last example employs a sentential reference pronoun *-at* (see fn. 12). This is a clearly innovative feature (see Justus, Mat.heth.Thes., 10, 1981, Nr. 7, 132-4) which was most likely introduced in the process of copying. Mind its absence in the MS example KBo 15.25 Rs. 19.

I.5. Thus there are three syntactic structures with each of the verbs (*tarḫ(u)-*, *kuer-* I.5.1-3.a.; *pai-/uua-*, *zinna/e-* I.5.1-3.b.):

I.5.1.a. # *zaḫḫiiauuanzi*$_x$ *tarḫ(u)zzi*$_y$ #;	I.5.1.b. # *ašanna*$_x$ *zinnizzi*$_y$ #;
I.5.2.a. # *tarḫ(u)zzi*$_y$ # *zaḫḫiiazzi*$_x$ #;	I.5.2.b. # *ašāši*$_x$ # *zinnizzi*$_y$ #;
I.5.3.a. # *tarḫ(u)zzi*$_y$ *zaḫḫiiazzi*$_x$ #.	I.5.3.b. # *ašāši*$_x$ *zinnizzi*$_y$ #.

I.5.1. The structure I.5.1.a-b. is the normal means of expressing two predications in one clause for any verb in Hittite.

---

22 The restoration follows the next example. See Carruba, StBoT 2, 42.

I.5.2. The structure I.5.2.a-b. is attested quite commonly for verbs with non-sentential arguments[23]. It alternates freely with structures I.5.1.a-b., I.5.3.a-b. (within semantically appropriate contexts, see, e.g., Cotticelli-Kurras, 2. IKH, 98):

(CTH 789) KBo 32.14 Rs. III 29 ...# *na-aš-za* **e-ša-at** # *na-an* **a-da-a-an-na da-iš** # "He sat down and began to eat it" (also in Rs. III 12) vs (CTH 789) KBo 32.13 Vs. II 25 ... *nu-za* ᵈIM-*aš* LUGAL-*uš* **a-da-a-** ⌜**an**⌝ **-na** (26) **e-ša-at** ... "Teššub, the king, sat down to eat.";

(CTH 147) KUB 14.1 +, Vs. 15 ... # *nu-ụa* ⌜*-at*⌝ *[-ta ka-]* ⌜*a*⌝ *-ša* KUR ᴴᵁᴿ· ˢᴬᴳ*Zi-ip-pa-aš-l[a-a* EN*-an-ni*²*]* **pí-iḫ-ḫu-un** # (16) *[nu-ụa]* *zi-ik* ᵐ*Ma-ad-du-ụa-* ⌜*at*⌝ *-ta-aš QA-DU* [ÉRIN]ᴹᴱˢ*-KA I-NA* KUR ⌜ᴴᵁᴿ⌝ ·ˢᴬᴳ ⌜*Zi-ip*⌝ *-pa-aš-la-a e-eš* # ... // "...[L]ook, I have given yo[u] the land of Mount Zippašl[a for lordship²]. You, Madduụatta, occupy the land of Mount Zippašla, together with your [troops] ..." vs ibid. (22) ...[...# *zi-ik-ụa-mu* EN²*-I]A* [KUR] ⌜ᴴᵁᴿ· ˢᴬᴳ⌝ *Zi-i[p-pa-aš-la]* **a-ša-an-na pa-it-ta** # // "[You, m]y [lord], have given [me the land] of Mount Zi[ppašla] to occupy ...".

But the most probative example comes from NS where *lelhuntaịe-* (inf.) is synonymous with finite form *lelhuụai-* (for which see I.4.2.):

OH/NS (CTH 450.Day 13.A) KUB 30.19 +, Rs. IV 22 *ma-aḫ-ḫa-an* **li-el-ḫu-u-un-da-u-ụa-an-zi** *zi[-in-na-an-z(i)]* "When they f[inis(h)] libating, ...".

I.5.3. The structure I.5.3.a-b. is attested rarely and only for a handful of verbs (*tar-ḫ(u)-*, *kụer-*, *pai-/uụa-*, *zinna/e-*).

I.5.4. All the structures in I.5.1.-3. are identical in meaning and differ only in frequency.

I.5.5. The difference between structures of I.5.2-3a. and those of I.5.2-3b. is in the word order and is explained by the origin of the corresponding structures (see II).

I.6. Summing up: Hittite has two means of combining two predications in one clause: one common – # ... *zaḫḫiịauụanzi*ₓ[24] *tarḫ(u)zzi*ᵧ[25] #, the other very rare –

---

23 Sentential argument is an argument of a verb (e.g., *know, can*) expressed by a sentence (either a full one, as in *I know that he did it*, or an implied one *I can do it*).

24 Namely infinitive (infinite verbal noun in *-ụanzi* or *-anna*). Participles are not usually used in this function. See Cotticelli-Kurras, 2. IKH, 98.

25 See Luraghi, Sentence, 26; Cotticelli-Kurras, 2. IKH, 96 (for constructions with verba dicendi and sentiendi).

... *tarḫ(u)zzi_y zaḫḫiḭazzi_x #* or *#* ... *ašāši_x zinnizzi_y #*[26]. Both alternate freely with two predications (expressed by finite verbs) in two clauses with paratactic connection: *#* ... *tarḫ(u)zzi_y #* ... *zaḫḫiḭazzi_x #* or *#* ... *ašāši_x #* ... *zinnizzi_y #*[27].

II. The Origin of the Construction *#* Finite Verb Finite Verb *#*.

II.1. The evolution of the 'phraseological' construction was thoroughly discussed by van den Hout, GS Neu and is as follows:

1.a) *#* *n=aš paizzi #* *n=aš* ... *tiḭazzi #* alongside

1.b) *#* *n=aš paizzi #* *n=an* ... *dāi #*;

2.a) *#* *n=aš paizzi #* (*nu*) ... *tiḭazzi #* (where the second -*aš* is omitted and the first -*aš* now refers to both *paizzi* and *tiḭazzi*) alongside

2.b) *#* *n=aš paizzi #* *n=an* ... *dāi #*;

3.a) *#* *n=aš paizzi* ... *tiḭazzi #* (where *pai*- loses its independent semantics and -*aš* refers to *tiḭazzi* only) alongside

3.b) *#* *n=aš paizzi #* *n=an* ... *dāi #*;

    4.b) *#* *n=an paizzi* ... *dāi #* appears on the analogy of 3.a independently of 3.b.

II.2. I suppose that the syntactic development that brought about constructions with *tarḫ(u)*- (all stages are attested) is as follows:

1.a) *#* *kūn memiḭan tarḫmi #* *n=an iḭami #* alongside

1.b) *#* *n=an* ... *tarḫmi #* *n=an=kan kuēnmi #*;

2.a) *#* *kūn memiḭan tarḫmi #* (*nu*) *iḭami #* (the structure developed out of 1.a due to the ellipsis of the pronoun – a common phenomenon) alongside

2.b) *#* *n=an* ... *tarḫmi #* *nu=kan kuēnmi #*;

3.a) *#* *kūn memiḭan tarḫmi iḭami #* (where *kūn memiḭan* refers to both verbs) alongside

3.b) *#* *n=an* ... *tarḫmi #* *nu=kan kuēnmi #*;

    4.b) *#* *n=an=kan* ... *tarḫmi kuēnmi #* on the analogy of 3.a independently of 3.b.

II.2.1. The same applies to *zinna/e*-construction:

1.a) **#* *nu* DINGIR^MEŠ *iḭazzi #* *n=uš zinnizzi #* alongside

1.b) *#* *nu* DINGIR^MEŠ *iḭazzi #* *n=uš māḫḫan zinnizzi #*;

2.a) *#* *nu* DINGIR^MEŠ *iḭazzi #* (*nu*) *zinnizzi #* alongside

2.b) *#* *nu* DINGIR^MEŠ *iḭazzi #* *māḫḫan zinnizzi #*;

---

26 Namely two finite verbs in one clause. Mind different word order.

27 E.g., with semantics cause – effect. See Friedrich, HE², I, 163; Luraghi, Sentence, 76-78; Zeilfelder, FS G. Neumann², 527.

3.a) *# *nu* DINGIR^MEŠ *iḷazzi zinnizzi* # alongside

3.b) # *nu* DINGIR^MEŠ *iḷazzi* # *māḫḫan zinnizzi* #;

    4.b) # *nu māḫḫan* DINGIR^MEŠ *iḷazzi zinnizzi* # on the analogy of 3.a in-
dependently of 3.b.

II.2.2. The syntactic development that brought about # ... *kụērzi dāi* # is sim-
ilarly analogical, but this time there is no analogy within the construction. # ...
kụērzi dāi # appeared due to the influence of *# *nu* DINGIR^MEŠ *iḷazzi zinnizzi*
and # *kūn memiḷan tarḫmi iḷami* #:

    1.b) # *nu* ^UZUNÍG.GIG ^UZUŠÀ *kụērzi* # *n=at=ššan* (...) *šer dāi* #

    2.b) # *nu* ^UZUNÍG.GIG ^UZUŠÀ *kụērzi* # *nu=ššan* (...) *šer dāi* #

    4.b) # *šer =ššan* ^UZUNÍG.GIG ^UZUŠÀ *kụērzi dāi* #.

II.3. It should be noted that the starting points for all the structures are repre-
sented by paratactic constructions.

    Paratactic clauses without sentential reference pronouns (see fn. 12) or ad-
verbial resumption (for which see Justus, Mat.heth.Thes., 10, 1981, Nr. 7, 132-4)
are arranged in Hittite in two ways: (a) semantically main clause precedes seman-
tically subordinate clause; (b) semantically main clause follows semantically sub-
ordinate clause[28].

    I have been able to identify at least two sure MH examples of (a). In both the
clause containing the verb *šakk-/šekk-* "know"[29] precedes the clause that functions
as a sentential argument of the verb:

(CTH 375.1.A) KUB 17.21 +, Vs. I // 6' # *nu šu-me-eš-pát* DINGIR^MEŠ
DINGIR^MEŠ*-aš iš-ta-an-z[a-ni-i]t še-ek-te-n[i]* # (7') *k[a-r]u-* ⌈*ú*⌉ *-za šu-
me-en-za-an* É.DINGIR^MEŠ*-K[U-N]U* EGIR-*an an-zi-el* (8') *[i-ụa-
a]r*? ⌈*Ú*⌉ *[-U]L ku-iš-ki kap-pu-u-[ụ]a-an ḫar-ta* # // "Only you gods
kno[w] by your divine spi[ri]t that n[o] one had (ever) b[ef]ore taken c[a]re of
y[ou]r temples [a]s we have"[30];

---

28 A ready parallel for a similar syntactic variation is the clause introduced by *māḫḫan* "as, just as"
which usually precedes the main clause, but may also rarely follow it (see the data in CHD L-N,
103-5).

29 For *šakk-/šekk-* see generally CHD Š, 23-4; Justus, Mat.heth.Thes., 10, 1981, Nr. 7, 115-157.

30 Following Singer, Prayers, 41; Lebrun, Prières, 143; Trabazo, BCBO 6, 251. CHD's inter-
pretation (Š, 27: "What they have given to you, the gods[, t]hat only you, O gods, know with your
divine mind") is wrong, as there is enough space for the longer restoration – see space in Vs. II,
as well as the restorations after duplicates in Vs. I. It is clearly better to regard the two clauses in
one paragraph as connected rather than connect the clause in l. 6 to the previous one across the
paragraph divider. The fact that the duplicate ([CTH 375.1.B] KUB 31.124 +, Vs. I 12'-13') em-
ploys the relative sentence (= argument (direct object) of the verb *šakk-/šekk-*) just demon-

(CTH 200) ABoT 60 Vs. 20' # *nu* ^dUTU^{ŠI} *BE-LÍ-IA ša-a-ak* # *pí-e-da-an*
(21') *me-ik-ki na-*⌈*ak-ki*⌉ #[?] *A-NA* ^{LÚ}KÚR-⌈*ia*⌉ *-aš* (22') *ar-zi-ia-an* #...[31]
"Your Majesty, my lord, know: the place is very important: it is the granary(?) of
the enemy" following CHD, Š, 29[32].

There is at least one clear example of (b):

OH/NS (CTH 6) KUB 1.16 +, Rs. III 68 ... # *ki-nu-un-ua-az nu-u-ua*
^{MUNUS.MEŠ} ŠU.GI[*-uš*] (69) [*pu-nu-uš-ki-iz*]*-zi* # *Ú-UL ša-ag-ga-aḫ-*
ḫi #... "I do not know if now she is still [consulti]ng old wome[n]" cited by
Justus, Mat.heth.Thes., 10, 1981, Nr. 7, 27-28, 119 and Cotticelli-Kurras, 2. IKH,
87[33].

By itself the coexistence of two types of sequence of paratactic clauses may seem to
be only of marginal interest for the purpose of the present paper, but it may be
helpful in understanding the difference between I.5.2-3a. and I.5.2-3b. (see III.).

III. Word Order.
III.1. # ... *tarḫ(u)zzi*$_y$ *zaḫḫiiazzi*$_x$ # vs 'phraseological verbs'
As demonstrated in II., the development of the constructions with *kuer-*, *zinna/e-*,
tarḫ(u)- on one hand and that of the 'phraseological' constructions on the other is
analogous: it is reduction of primarily separate clauses into one clause. The only
difference is in the starting point: for *pai-* this must have been short clauses with
pai- without any circonstants (due to its tendency to grammaticalize, as noted by
van den Hout) while for all the rest of structures (with *kuer-*, *zinna/e-*, *tarḫ(u)-*)
there never has been such a tendency, thus 'reduction' affected the second clause
according to the general tendency to introduce an element first and then imply it
without explicit reference: e.g. a clause like # *kūn memiian tarḫmi* # *n=*<u>*an iiami*</u>
might just as well function in Hittite as # *kūn memiian tarḫmi* # (*nu*) *iiami*

---

strates another, more common possibility and need not serve as grounds for the analogous
analysis of Ex. A. Contra Justus, Mat.heth.Thes., 10, 1981, Nr. 7, 37, 169 the example does not
contain any '*iuar* clause' – all it attests is a pronoun with a postposition *anzel iuar* "like us".

31 Mind that the clause *pēdan mekki nakki* is not direct speech (if it was, its position behind the
verb introducing direct speech would be expected) as direct speech is regularly marked in this
text by the *ua(r)*-particle.

32 Cf. CHD P, 338. Justus, Mat.heth.Thes., 10, 1981, Nr. 7, 30-1, esp. 168 has wrong dating and
consequently wrong analysis.

33 Justus' other examples (Nr. 53 and 54) are irrelevant – for the corresponding contexts see rather
Hoffner, HL, 150-1, 130-1; Goedegebuure, Diss., 101 (I interpret the latter context as cause –
result "he does not know (and consequently) drives"). Justus' Nr. 76 contains *kuit*; for Nr. 157a
see HZL, sub Nr. 11 Anm.; Nr. 24 is so fragmentary that the editor of the text (Burde, StBoT 19,
35-6) did not even attempt a translation, it is too dangerous to use such texts for definitive con-
clusions.

> # *kūn memiian* **tarḫmi iiami** #. Subsequent analogical generalization of the latter onto # *nu* DINGIR^{MEŠ} **iiazzi** # *n=uš māḫḫan* **zinnizzi** # and # *nu* ^{UZU}NÍG.GIG ^{UZU}ŠÀ **kuērzi** # *n=at=ššan* (...) **šer dāi** # is again identical to that of the 'phraseological' constructions with one important exception.

Another point of difference might be the type of structure. Van den Hout, GS Neu holds that the 'phraseological' constructions originated as consecutive and then passed into the serial type as the semantics of the motion verb grammaticalized (see V.1. for the terms). Grammaticalization really sets them apart, but it was never complete and the 'phraseological' constructions continued to be employed consecutively up to NH period (see van den Hout, FS Hoffner, 194 (exx. 48-49) and fn. 88). So I see no difference between the not grammaticalized use of 'phraseological' constructions and # ... *kuērzi dāi* # because they are both consecutive.

III.2. # ... *tarḫ(u)zzi*ᵧ *zaḫḫiiazzi*ₓ # vs # ... *ašāši*ₓ *zinnizzi*ᵧ #.

As was noted in passing above (I.5.5.), the only way to explain the difference in word order between # *finite verb finite verb* # constructions with *tarḫ(u)-* and # ... *kuērzi dāi* #, on one hand and those with *zinna/e-* on the other is to assume two different starting points of # *finite verb* # *finite verb* # constructions: a) semantically main clause precedes semantically subordinate clause; b) semantically subordinate clause precedes semantically main clause – see II.3. They resulted in two different structures of # *finite verb finite verb* # constructions. I.e. the starting point for *zinna/e-* was # *nu* DINGIR^{MEŠ} **iianzi** # *n=uš* **zinnanzi** # while for *tarḫ(u)-* it was # *kūn memiian* **tarḫmi** # *n=an* **iiami** #.

Thus the question posited in the title of the paper has to be answered negatively. This difference in word order cannot be explained by inversion. It goes back to two types of sequence of paratactic clauses. The question whether this co-existence itself represents an inversion is beyond the scope of the present paper.

IV. The Syntactic Nature of the Construction # Finite Verb Finite Verb #.

In this section I return to the synchronic assessment of structures from I.1.-I.4. Up to this point I simply took it for granted that (1) both finite verbs are in one clause; (2) none of the verbs has **only** sentential arguments. Now it is necessary to prove both points.

IV.1. In *tarḫ(u)-*construction the two verbs occur in one clause because: (a) all separate clauses in both fully preserved contexts are introduced by *nu* (see I.1.; for KUB 17.10 the following clause is *nu* ^{GIŠ}NÍG.GUL-*ŠU* ^{GIŠ}GAG-*ŠU* *du-ua-ar-ni-it*); (b) in KUB 33.66 + the particle *-kan* is used with *kuen-* (see, e.g., Boley, Sprache 36/2, 1994, 140, 160; data in HED, K, 206-8), not *tarḫ(u)-* (see the data in

HEG, T, 157-9)[34]; (c) negation in KUB 17.10 clearly refers to both verbs which is easier to understand if we deal with one clause.

This last point requires some comment. It is commonly thought (see Friedrich, HE², I, 146; CHD, L-N, 416; Hoffner, FS Houwink ten Cate, 103) that negation can refer to more than one clause. Friedrich, HE², I, 146 and CHD L-N, 416 cite two examples for the effect of one negation over more than one adjacent clause:

OH/NS (13 c. b.c.) (CTH 19.II.A) KBo 3.1 +, Vs. II 35' # *ḫa-aš-ša-an-na-aš* DUMU-*an i-da-lu li-e ku-iš-ki i-ja-zi* # *nu-ši-ša-an* GÍR-*an tak-ki-eš-zi* # "Let no one do evil to/treat badly a son of a family. (Let no one) prepare a knife for him";

MH/NS (13 c. b.c.) (CTH 427.2.A) KBo 6.34 +, Vs. II 31 # *ki-e-da-ni-ma A-NA* MUNU₈ GIM-*an ḫa-aš-ša-tar-še-et* NU.GÁL # (32) *Ú-UL-an* A.ŠÀ-*ni pí-e-da-an-zi* # *na-an* NUMUN-*an* (33) *i-en-zi* ## *Ú-UL-ma-an* NINDA-*an i-en-zi* # (34) *na-an I-NA* É ᴺᴬ⁴KIŠIB *ti-an-zi* # ... "As this malt has no germination, they do not carry it to the field and use it as seed. They do not make it into bread and carry it to the storehouse"[35].

However, I strongly doubt that KBo 6.34 +, Vs. II 31f and KUB 17.10 Rs. III 16f. really exemplify the phenomenon. The reason for this is that *n=an* NUMUN-*an ije/anzi* as well as *n=an/[nu] INA* É ᴺᴬ⁴KIŠIB *tianzi* are actually clauses of purpose semantically dependant on the preceding clauses[36]. Even if the first clause of cause is negated, the relationship cause – result is not negated, correspondingly the clause of result should not be marked as negative.

Thus we are left with only one certain example KBo 3.1 +, Vs. II 35'. As is noted above, it is a 13th c. copy of an OH composition – not the best material to establish any rule: the second negation can have simply been left out while copying.

---

34 If, on the contrary, *na-an-kán* x[ᴴᴵ⁻]ᴬ -*ta tar-aḫ-zi* were regarded as a separate clause, -*kan* would be difficult to explain as well as the lack of -*z(a)* (because in this case *tarḫ(u)*- would be a transitive verb).

35 The following context is so similar that we can analyse the text in question as a kind of fixed expression (a proverb?; cf. Oettinger, StBoT 22, 34): (CTH 324.1.A) KUB 17.10 Rs. III 16 # [... MUNU₈] (17) *ma-a-aḫ-ḫa-an te-ep-šu-uš* # *Ú-UL-an gi-im-ra pí-e-d[a-an-zi]* # (18) *na-an* NUMUN-*an i-ja-an-zi* ## *Ú-UL-ma-an* NINDA-*an i-ja-[an-zi* # *nu I-NA]* [following Torri, StudAs 2, 113; cf. Mazoyer, Télipinu, 48; Trabazo, BCBO 6, 142] (19) É ᴺᴬ⁴KIŠIB *ti-an-zi* #..."As [malt] is sterile, (so that) they do not car[ry] it to the field and (do not) use it as seed; (as) they do not ma[ke] it into bread and (do not) deposit it [in] the Seal House".

36 This understanding is the clearest in Torri's translation (StudAs 2, 113: "Come [il malto] è sterile, non lo por[tano] alla campagna per farne semente, non ne fan[no] pane [per] porlo [nel] magazzino ..."). Cf. Goetze, ANET, 127; Hoffner, Myths², 16-7; Pecchioli Daddi/Polvani, Mitologia, 82; Mazoyer, Télipinu, 77.

However, there are more examples of the same phenomenon with other negative particles, namely *nūman* (see CHD L-N, 472):

NS (CTH 457.F) KUB 56.17 Vs. 16 # *na-at* UGU **nu-u-ma-an** *a-ri-an-zi* (#[?]) *i-ia-an-ni-an-z*[*i* #... "But they do not want to rise and be on their wa[y]"[37];

late NS (CTH 40.IV.A) KBo 5.6 Rs. III 14 # ARAD-*IA-ma-ua* **nu-u-ma**[ᵎ]**-an** *pa-ra-a da-ah-hi* (15) # *nu-ua-ra-an-za-kán* [LÚ]*MU-TI-IA i-ia-mi* # ... "I do not want to take one of my subjects and make him my husband".

Thus we cannot seriously doubt the existence of negation referring to more than one clause. Still I think we should assess it differently – along the lines of ellipsis of various parts of the second clause due to their being present in the first one. I.e. they represent the same phenomenon as the ellipsis of a pronoun in the second clause (which eventually brought about the type of constructions discussed in the paper[38]) and they should be treated along the lines of transitory character between fully independent clauses and one clause with two finite verbs.

Another example of the scope of negation extending over two clauses (see Luraghi, OH Sentence Structure, 133 n. 57, 171) is as follows:

OH/NS (CTH 6) KUB 1.16 +, Rs. III 65 ... # *li-e-ma-an-še* (66) [LUG]AL-*uš ki-iš-ša-an* ⌈*te*⌉ *-iz-zi* # DUMU[MEŠ] É.GAL-*ša da-ra-an-zi* # "May the [ki]ng not speak thus about her. (May not) the palace servants speak (thus about her)".

It actually represents another step in the direction from two clauses to one clause with two finite verbs because the two clauses share not only negation, but also the particle *-man*, the pronoun *-še* as well as the adverbial modifier *kiššan*; on the other hand, they have different subjects unlike typical # *finite verb finite verb* # clauses.

Thus point *c* in the argument above favours the one-clause assessment, but cannot serve as its unambiguous indicator. In any case two first points are strong enough for the *tarh(u)*-construction to meet the first requirement in IV.

IV.2. Both verbs in # ... *kuērzi dāi* # construction even more obviously belong to the same clause because (a) both verbs share the object; (b) the preverb *šēr* "on" and clitic locative particle must both be construed with the second verb. See already Garrett, Diss., 75[39].

---

37 Following CHD L-N, 472; Š, 211. The only possible objection against this interpretation (3 pl. pres. of *arai-* "rise" is always *arānzi*) is refuted by NS (CTH 627.1.k.A) KUB 2.3 + Vs. II 29 *a-ri-ia-an*[*-z*]*i*. See CHD L-N, 472 and HED A, 124. Cf. fn. 18.

38 As noted in II.2., by itself the ellipsis of a pronoun does not automatically cause two clauses to turn into one.

39 See the lit. in I.2. for 'phraseological' constructions.

IV.3. The same concerns *zinna/e-* in NH KBo 18.15 Vs. 8f. (see I.4.) where the particle -*z*(*a*) is construed with *iia-*[40].

IV.4. The second feature (see IV.: none of the verbs has **only** sentential arguments) is fully present in *uua-*, *pai-* and *kuer-*. Contrary to the common assessment (see I.1. for translations)[41], *tarh*(*u*)- also conforms to this requirement because it can take nominal arguments besides sentential ones – see I.1.2. Thus *tarh*(*u*)- is not a typical modal verb in so far as it does not have *obligatory* sentential argument. What is more, it can be used absolutely[42] as in

(CTH 373.A) KUB 30.10 Rs. 4 # [... *i-na*]-*ni pí-ra-an ta-ri-ah-hu-un ma-li-* ⌈*ik-ku*⌉ *-un* # *nu-za nam-ma Ú-UL* ⌈*tar*⌉ *-ah-mi*[43] # "I have toiled? and labored? in the face [of sickne]ss(?)[44], (and) I cannot any longer[45]/ still I do not succede[46]" or: "Faced with [illne]ss I have grown weary and weak, I cannot cope any longer"[47].

Here we deal with the meaning "manage, succeed, can", not "conquer" despite the presence of -*z*(*a*). Even Boley (who translates the verb in the context "conquer") admits that the standard distribution -*z*(*a*) *tarh*(*u*)- "conquer" vs *tarh*(*u*)- "can" is an idealized one (Boley, IBS 79, 71-2, 206-7; HEG T, 158-9; Melchert apud Yakubovich, Prehistoric Contacts between Hittite and Luvian: the Case of Reflexive Pronouns, # 4 w. fn. 41 (manuscript)) – see at least

NH/NS (CTH 62.II.C) KUB 21.49 (+), Vs. I 13 (*nu-za la-ah*)-*hi-ia-*] ⌈*u*⌉ *-ua-an-zi Ú-UL nam-ma tar-ah-hi-eš-ki-it* "He could not [(fi)g]ht/[(go to b)at]tle any more", cited in Boley, IBS 79, 72.

On the other hand, there are some examples of lack of -*z*(*a*) with the meaning "conquer":

(CTH 789) KBo 32.16 Vs. II 6 # [*nu?* *ma*]-⌈*a*⌉ *-an* [U]RU-*ri-ma me-ik-ki* ⌈*me*⌉ *-mi-iš-ga-tal-la-aš* # (7) [*ku-e-el-*]*kán* [*ud-*]*da-a-ar a-ap-pa Ú-* ⌈*UL*⌉ *ku-iš-*

---

40 See Boley, IBS 79, 84-6 for -*z*(*a*) *iia-* "perform (a ritual for), worship (a deity)".
41 Which views *tarh*(*u*)- as a modal verb – i.e. used only with a sentential argument (represented by an infinitive).
42 Although the usage can admittedly be just elliptical.
43 Following CHD L-N, 130; HEG T, 172-3; HED M, 29. Cf. Lebrun, Prières, 114; Trabazo, BCBO 6, 242; Boley, IBS 72, 79.
44 Following Singer, Prayers, 32. Cf. Goetze, ANET, 400; HEG T, 173; Trabazo, BCBO 6, 243; Lebrun, Prières, 117; Boley, IBS 72, 79; CHD L-N, 130.
45 Following Singer, Prayers, 32; Trabazo, BCBO 6, 243.
46 Following CHD L-N, 130; Lebrun, Prières, 117; Goetze, ANET, 400; HEG T, 173.
47 HED M, 29.

ki (8) [(*ua-aḫ-nu-*)]*z*[*i* # ᵐ]*Za-a-za-al-la-aš-ma me-ik-ki me-mi-iš-ka₄-tal-la-aš* #
(9) [(*nu-uš-ši*)]⁴⁸ *tu-l*]*i-ia-aš pí-e-* ⌈*di*⌉ *ud-da-a-* ⌈*ar*⌉ *-še-it* (10) [*Ú-U*(*L ku-i*)]*š-ki*
tar-aḫ-zi # "[I]f (there was) in the [c]ity a powerful speaker [whose w]ords no
one can [(tur)]n back/ [(cou)]nter, Zazalla is (that) powerful speaker. [N(o
on)e] overcomes his words in the place of [as]sembly".

There is also an example (cited in Boley, IBS 79, 71) which in my view demon-
strates impossibility to draw a sharp line between the meanings "conquer" and
"can":

NH/NS (CTH 378.II.C) KUB 14.10 +, Vs. I 16 # ⌈*am*⌉ *-mu-uk-ma-**az** ŠÀ-*az la-*
aḫ-l[*a*]*-aḫ-ḫi-ma-an* (17) ⌈*Ú*⌉ *-UL* **tar-aḫ-mi** # NÍ.TE-*az-ma-**za*** (18) [*pí*]*t-tu-*
li-ia-an nam-ma Ú-U[*L*] **tar-aḫ-mi** # "I do no[t] overcome⁴⁹/conquer⁵⁰/
control⁵¹/evict⁵² the wo[r]ry of (lit. from) my heart, the [an]guish of (lit. from)
(my) [s]elf". In my view it can be translated also as "I do not cope with/
manage".

I would even go as far as to say that *tarḫ*(*u*)- must always mean something like
"master, manage, come to grips with, cope with", Fr. *parvenir*, It. *riuscire*, Russ.
spravitsa, upravitsa rather than "can". What is usually translated as a modal mean-
ing should rather be translated as just a variation of the common meaning "over-
come, conquer".

  Even etymology of *tarḫ*(*u*)- unambiguously indicates the historical priority of
the meaning "durchkommen, überqueren" (see LIV, sub **terh₂-*; Watkins, Dragon,
343-6). So I would modify Josephson's suggestion⁵³ in the following way: *tarḫ*(*u*)-
primarily had the meaning 'to show oneself capable', which was later (when the
particle *-z*(*a*) came into existence) emphasized (never obligatorily) with the help of
the particle both in transitive and absolute uses. Then, as the use of the particle
grew more narrowly stabilized in the possessive meaning, *-z*(*a*) was more regularly
employed with transitive uses and less regularly with intransitive ones⁵⁴. However, I
have to repeat again, it never was more than a tendency.

---

48 The restoration is fairly certain, but it is still a restoration and the absence of *-z*(*a*) is not totally
    guaranteed (although highly likely).
49 CHD L-N, 11.
50 Boley, IBS 79, 71.
51 Singer, Prayers, 57; Lebrun, Prières, 210.
52 HED L, 11.
53 Reflexive Construction, 222: "Agentivity is an important trait of *-za*. It explains the use of the
    particle in *-za tarḫ-* «to show oneself capable» as against *tarḫ-* «to be able»".
54 Actually, if we believe Oettinger's assessment (Delbrück, 410), the difference between *-z*(*a*) *tar-*
    ḫ(*u*)- and *tarḫ*(*u*)- can even be easier explained: *-z*(*a*) *tarḫ*(*u*)- "conquer" = "take into one's pos-
    session".

V. Typology.

V.1. The properties of the constructions in I.1.-4. bring them close to *serial verb* constructions from viewpoint of general linguistics. Serial verb constructions are defined as a string of verbs (two or more) within a single clause that have a single grammatical subject; have no connective markings; are marked as having the same grammatical categories. All these requirements are fully met by all constructions in question. However, prototypical serial constructions are also characterized by some semantic cohesion.

This cohesion is present only in part of 'phraseological' constructions which are the only ones that are truly serial (see van den Hout, GS Neu). # ... *ku̯ērzi dāi* # construction has totally no semantic cohesion and represents a consecutive[55] construction (see van den Hout, GS Neu with ref.). The situation is still more taxonomically complicated for *tarḫ(u)-* and *zinna/e-* constructions. They definitely fall short of prototypical serial constructions in respect of cohesion. Neither do they ideally fit consecutive ones as there is syntactic dependence between the two verbs within the structures – the other verb functions as a sentential argument of *tarḫ(u)-* or *zinna/e-*. However, as was shown in IV.4., *tarḫ(u)-* is not a typical modal verb. Absolute constructions and uses with nominal objects are also well attested for *zinna/e-*[56].

In any case taxonomic classification is only of minor concern for me in the present paper. Synchronically and diachronically all the structures from I.1. to I.4. behave analogously. There are even typological parallels for 'serial' type behaviour of verbs with sentential arguments: cf. *try and do* for *try to do*.

V.2. In the previous section it has been mentioned that one of the constructions discussed in the paper (# ... *ku̯ērzi dāi* #) is a consecutive one. There are indeed many more consecutive constructions in Hittite. See, e.g., (CTH 373.A) KUB 30.10 Rs. 4 [... *i-na]-ni pí-ra-an ta-ri-aḫ-ḫu-un ma-li-˹ik-ku˺ -un*... in IV.4. and the example cited by van den Hout in GS Neu:

NS (CTH 600) KUB 36.97 Rs. IV? 4 [*nu-z*]*a ki-e-da-ni* EZEN₄^*NI* *e-za-at-tén* (5) [*e-k*]*u-ut-tén iš-pí-ja-at-tén* (6) [*ni*]*-in-kat-tén* ... "At this feast eat, [d]rink, satiate (and) [sa]tisfy yourselves!".

Such constructions have been left out of consideration in the paper because of two points of difference between these cases and the constructions with *ku̯er-*, *zinna/e-*, *tarḫ(u)-*, *pai-/uu̯a-*. First, all the former require only one step to derive from sepa-

---

55 I.e. a construction without semantic cohesion, where two verbs describe two distinct events or
   actions.
56 See Kronasser, EHS, 567

rate clauses (ellipsis) while many of the latter require two (ellipsis and analogy; with the exception of *n=aš paizzi … tiịazzi* and *natta tar(u)ḫzi kụēnzi/ḫāši* which require solely ellipsis). Second and more significantly, constructions like KUB 30. 10 Rs. 4 and KUB 36.97 Rs. IV$^?$ 4-6 are sporadic and certainly no preference exists for the use of any verbs in a multi-predicative clause. On the other hand, the constructions in I.2. are mostly grammaticalised, the ones in I.1., I.3., I.4. are lexically bound (i.e. they occur only with a certain set of verbs). It is all the more probative as even rare constructions with *kụer-, zinna/e-, tarḫ(u)-* are not hapaxes. On the contrary, they produce the impression of being quite stable. What is more, some of them are positively quite fixed: all the three cases of # … *tarḫ(u)zzi iezzi* # construction occur in myths. Moreover, two of the three examples (KUB 17.10 and NS KUB 33.57) are in analogous myths of disappearing deities[57]. Again, in two of the three examples (KBo 23.4 + and NS KUB 33.57) the other verb is *kụen-* "kill". The construction # … *kụērzi dāi* # is attested only in the set phrase *šēr=a/ma=ššan* ^{UZU}NÍG.GIG ^{UZU}ŠÀ *kụērzi dāi*. Still, complete generalization of this last kind is impossible as *zinna/e-* and esp. 'phraseological' constructions do not demonstrate such restrictions.

Thus the **only** characteristic that distinguishes KUB 30.10 Rs. 4-type constructions from **all** I.1.-4. ones is that the latter are either grammaticalised or lexically bound.

---

57 For (CTH 331.1) KBo 23.4 + see Groddek, ZA 89, 1999, 48.