Hittite *měnaḫḫanda*

ALEXANDER NIKOLAEV

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

The Hittite preverb or postposition *měnaḫḫanda* 'opposite, against, vis-à-vis, facing, toward', sometimes spelled Sumerographically as IGI-*an-da*, is well attested from OS on. Examples are now readily available in *CHD* (L-N: 274–88) and *HED* (6: 145–46);[1] here is a selection:

> *nu=šši* LÚ.KÚR *zaḫḫiya menaḫḫanda namma ŪL kuiški mazzašta*
> "No enemy dared any longer (to go) against him in battle."
> (KBo 5.6 i 7–8)

> *menaḫḫanda*[(*=ya=ša*)*n k*(*urakki*)] *tapuwaš* ZAG-*ni* GÙB-*li*
> *nu kuwapiya QATAMMA* 4 *wallu*[*š dāi*]
> "Opposite the pillar, alongside, on the right, on the left
> —everywhere in the same way [he deposits] four *walluš*."
> (KBo 4.1 rev. 3–4)

> *nu=šmaš=za ziqqa āššuš ēš tuqq=at* IGI-*an-da āššaweš ašandu*
> "You be good to them, and let them be good toward you."
> (KBo 12.30 ii 10–11)

> 1 ᴸᵁ́DAM.GÀR-*ma=kan* LUGAL-*i menaḫḫanda arta*
> "One merchant stands before/facing the king."
> (KUB 57.95 iv 5–6)

> *maḫḫan=ma=mu=kan* LÚ.MEŠ ᵁᴿᵁ*Duqqamma menaḫḫanda awēr*
> "When the men of D. saw me coming"
> (KBo 4.4 iv 18–19)

> *kuedani=wa=za menaḫḫanda išḫamiškeši*
> "To whom are you singing?"
> (KUB 36.12 ii 9)

> *nu=mu* MUNUS-*TUM kuit menaḫḫanda uet*
> *n=aš=mu* GÌR.MEŠ-*aš kattan ḫaliyattat*
> "Because the woman came to meet me,
> and prostrated herself at my feet"
> (KUB 14.15 iv 28–29)

The word *měnaḫḫanda* has traditionally been compared with *měna/i-* n. (pl. tant.), *měna-* c. 'face, cheek', and this comparison is hard to deny.[2] The second part of *měnaḫḫanda* is, however, problematic. The word has been parsed into *mēna* and *ḫant-*. The latter is a frequent Hittite word meaning 'forehead, front' and the usual assumption has been that *měnaḫḫanda* is a compound of two nouns in allative case, 'face' and 'forehead'.[3]

---

1. See also Rieken 1999: 56 for a partial revision of the *CHD* entry.
2. See *HED* 6: 147; Tischler 1990: 194–95; and Poetto 1986: 126 n. 8 for references.
3. Friedrich 1952: 141; Melchert 1994: 237; *HED* 6: 147; Kloekhorst 2008: 576.

Such segmentation appears questionable on several counts; first of all, this analysis fails to provide a principled explanation of the meaning: it is *a priori* not clear how a compound 'face–forehead' came to mean 'facing'. Since *ḫant-* (c. and n.) never means 'face', but only 'forehead' or 'front',[4] English "face-to-face" and French "vis-à-vis" are not real parallels.

The nature of the relationship between the two members of this alleged compound is unclear, too. Hittite has a few endocentric determinative compounds, *tatpuruṣa*s and *karmadhāraya*s (e.g., *pappanekneš* 'brothers having the same father' from *pappa* 'father' + *negna-* 'brother'; *tuzziyašeššar* 'settlement of an army' from *tuzzi* 'army' + *ašeššar* 'settlement'[5]), but even under the assumption that *ḫant-* (as *nomen regens*) is used in its lexical meaning 'forehead, front', the meaning 'into the forehead/front of the face' simply does not make a lot of sense. Neither does *mĕnaḫḫanda* easily lend itself to an analysis in terms of a copulative compound 'into the face and into the front'. Although Hittite has a few compounds of this type (e.g., *ḫaššaḫanzašša-* 'grand- and great-grandsons'),[6] one has a hard time perceiving virtual [*]*mĕnaḫḫand-* as a *partes-pro-toto* synecdoche (so *HED* 6: 147), since the original meaning of *mena/i-* is already 'face'! In fact, Hittite itself provides an example of how a name for a body part can be construed through a synecdochical combination of two parts, namely, a copulative compound *šakuišša-* that likely means 'face' and is formed from *šaku-* 'eye' and *ašš-/išš-* 'mouth'.[7]

A different solution involving *ḫant-* has been proposed: it has been maintained that *ḫant-* or, rather *ḫanda*, is used here not in the meaning 'front', but rather in its adverbialized locative meaning 'in front of' (so prominent among other descendants of Indo-European *h₂ent-*).[8] However, this theory does not solve the problem at hand either. While Hittite *ḫanti* 'opposite, against' has a good chance of being an inherited adverb (cf. Greek ἀντί 'in front of', Latin *ante* 'before', Sanskrit *ánti* 'id.'[9]), there is no reason or comparative evidence that would allow us to make the same assumption in the case of other adverbial offshoots of *ḫant-* 'forehead', namely, *ḫandaš*, *ḫanza(n)*, *ḫantaz*, or *ḫanda*, all of which are best accounted for as later lexicalizations of inflected forms of the base noun *ḫant-*. The adverb *ḫanda* is attested from MH / MS on and the word normally means 'for the sake of, in view of' (a meaning of course incompatible with the meaning of *mĕnaḫḫanda*).[10] It would therefore be methodologically unsound to assign to Hittite *ḫanda* a meaning 'against' or 'in front of' based on the root etymology alone and claim that this etymological meaning of *ḫanda* has only been preserved in *mĕnaḫḫanda*.

An alternative analysis is thus desirable. My own proposal builds on the idea of Duchesne-Guillemin (1947: 75), who argued in passing that the second part of the word *mĕnaḫḫanda* is the well-known Hittite postposition *anda* 'into'.

It is worth noting that there is a piece of Anatolian evidence not known to Duchesne-Guillemin that seems to support his solution: if analyzed as *mĕnaḫḫ=anda*, the Hittite word

---

4. E.g., KBo 10.23 iv 5–6: *ḫandi=šši=ma=šmaš=kan armanniš* GUŠKIN "but on the forehead they have a golden crescent." The metal ornament could only have been worn on the forehead.

5. See Hoffner–Melchert 2008: 63 and Matzinger 2008: 59–60.

6. These do not exactly correspond to *dvandva*s (in Sanskrit terminology), but rather seem to be recent univerbations (as is shown by the fact that often the first member appears in an inflected form). See Rieken 2005.

7. Attested dat.-loc. *šakuiššai*; see Rieken 2005: 102.

8. This seems to be the contention of Carruba 1966: 33 (supported by Starke 1977: 192), whose evidence for a local adverb *ḫanda* 'vor' is, however, very doubtful and is essentially limited to *māḫḫanda*.

9. Eventually, of course, all these forms continue a locative of *h₂ent-*; the point to be emphasized is that in this case the adverbialization is of PIE date.

10. E.g., KBo 3.21 ii 12 *šargawanni ḫanda* "in view of exaltedness"; KBo 1.1 iv 61 *ŠA* ŠEŠ-*YA nakkiyanni ḫanda* "out of regard for my brother's eminence"; KUB 31.4 16 *kuit ḫanda* "for the sake of what?"

is reminiscent of its near-synonym in Lycian, namely *ñtewẽ* 'facing, opposite; toward', in origin a compound of *en and *tewẽ** 'eye'.[11] Even more important is the complete match between the formal structure of Hittite *měnaḫḫ≠anda* and Lycian *ˣtewe ñte TL* 44a,53 'facing' < *'into the eye',[12] where *ñte* shows a Lycian correspondence of Hittite *anda* used as postposition to a designation of a part of the face.

Nevertheless, at the time when Duchesne-Guillemin proposed his solution, his case was very weak, since he had to leave open the question of the morphology of the first part, *měnaḫḫ-*; for this reason his suggestion has been largely neglected in later scholarship. It therefore behooves us to say a few words about the origin and morphological history of the stem *měna/i-* 'face, cheek' first.

The following forms of this word are attested: nom.-acc.sg. neut. *měni* (3x; e.g., *me-e-ni-i≠m-mi-it* KBo 3.22 rev. 52 [OS]) and *mēna*, loc. sg. *mēni*, and acc. pl. comm. *menuš*.[13] This allomorphy is best explained with E. Rieken (1994: 51; 1999: 56–58), who traced the stem-final *-i-* to an old athematic dual ending *$-ih_1$ (of the type we find in Homeric ὄσσε from the root noun *h_3ek^w- 'eye'); indeed, a dual form must have been quite frequent with a word one of whose meanings is 'cheek'. The pre-Hittite paradigm of this word would therefore include an animate root noun **men-*[14] and a dual *menῐ the thematic stem *mena-* (acc.pl.c. *me-nu-uš*) is easily explainable as an innovation whose starting point would be the reinterpretation of acc. sg. *menan as a thematic form.

There is an important consequence of this morphological analysis for our purposes. If the thematic stem *mena-* is an inner-Hittite innovation, the adverb *měnaḫḫanda* (OS+) would be unlikely to contain this stem as its first member.[15] This means that if *měnaḫḫanda* is to be segmented as *měnaḫḫ≠anda*, its first part has to be an allomorph made from an athematic stem **men-*.

The problem of *měnaḫ* can now be revisited: in my opinion, *měnaḫ* is an archaic *allative* form meaning 'to the face'. The resulting meaning of univerbated *měnaḫḫ≠anda* is then 'into the face', which is effectively what the word means.[16] However, as is well known, the Hittite allative has an ending *-a*, not *-aḫ*; therefore in order to explain how the new solution is going to work, a brief excursus into the origin of this case ending is required.

11. Cf. *tawa TL* 106, 2 (see Eichner 1985: 19 n. 26; Melchert 2004: 46).

12. Credit for this reading is due to Schürr 1998: 153 (whose solution is accepted by Melchert 2004: 64); however, note that this (very compelling) analysis is based on the emendation of actually written *tewēt* to *tewēte* (which in fact can also be a 3 pl. pret. verbal form).

13. See *CHD* L-N: 289 and Rieken 1999: 56–58.

14. Possibly IE *mén-s, acc. sg. **men-m̥*, gen.sg. *mn-és, to give a Hittite paradigm with alternating accent (gen. *ma-na-a-aš?), but since no oblique forms of this word are known, the question has to remain open. As far as the etymology of *měna/i-* is concerned, two solutions have been proposed: Melchert (1984: 88 n. 17) compared the Hittite forms with the family of Latin *mentum* 'chin' (and *mōns* 'mountain'), Welsh *mant* 'mouth', and Gothic *munþs* 'id.', which is possibly further related to the verbal root **men-* 'to protrude' (Latin *-minēre*; see Vine [2006: 154–55], who reconstructs an adjectival **mn̥-tó-* 'projecting' as the derivational basis of the nominal forms cited above). Less likely is a connection with CLuv. *manā-* 'to see' and the IE root **men-* 'watch; wait' (*LIV*² 2. **men-*), suggested by Rieken (1999: 58), or the comparison to Indo-Iranian **naima-* 'half' advocated by Eichner 1973: 79.

15. Despite Eichner 1973: 79.

16. An alternative solution would be to assume that *měnaḫḫ≠anda* is a univerbation of the postposition *anda* with nom.-acc. pl. *měnaḫ*, used as an accusative of direction (*měnaḫ* would go back to a neuter plural [collective] stem *men-eh₂). However, despite Rieken (1999: 56–57), I do not think that the form *mena* vouchsafes the existence of a neuter plural made from *men-* 'face, cheek' or a reconstruction of a neuter plural (collective) allomorph *men-eh₂: the form is attested once (KBo 14.98 i 8 OH/NS) and could in any event have been generated by the speakers on the model of *alpaš – alpeš – alpa* 'cloud(s)', etc.

The allative case [17] (also known as *directive*, *Richtungskasus*, or *Terminativ*) was identified at the very beginning of Hittite studies. [18] Well attested in Old and Middle Hittite, it marks the goal towards (or into) which the movement is directed; aside from a few frozen archaisms, this case was lost in New Hittite and its functions were taken over by the dative-locative. [19]

This case has no direct correspondences in the morphological systems of other ancient Indo-European languages, but it is not isolated within the Anatolian family: locatives in *-a* are attested in Palaic, [20] and Luvian also shows occasional locatives in *-a* beside usual dative-locative singular forms in *-i*. [21] Further, in Luvian we find infinitives in *-una* (e.g., *aduna* 'to eat', *karšuna* 'to cut') and a similar formation is known in Lycian (*tebãna* 'to conquer', *zxxãna* 'to fight', *xlaina* 'to dominate'); [22] as C. Melchert has shown, both formations go back to allative forms of verbal abstract nouns. [23] (Compare Hittite infinitives in *-anna* that likewise originated in the allative of *-tar/-tn-* nouns.) The ending *-a* can in theory continue $*o$ or $*\text{-}\breve{a}$ from an earlier sequence of vowel plus laryngeal; since in Proto-Anatolian laryngeals were lost in word-final position, it is impossible to determine whether the allative forms in question go back to $*\text{-}h_2e$ or $*\text{-}eh_2$ (or even $*\text{-}h_3e$ or $*\text{-}eh_3$). [24] The Proto-Indo-European shape of this ending is thus uncertain. [25]

Recently an important argument in favor of a reconstruction $*\text{-}eh_2$ was independently put forth by M. Furlan (2001) and M. Peters (1997 [2002]: 122), who drew attention to Lithuanian *žmogùs* 'man'. [26] The *-gu-* part has long been compared to the Indo-European root $*g^weh_2$- 'to go' (Old Indic aor. *ágāt*, Greek ἔβη, *LIV*» 205), but the allomorph *žmo-* has resisted interpretation, since no $*\text{-}eh_2$ stem ($*d^h\hat{g}^hmeh_2$ *vel sim.*) is found in any Indo-European language beside the well-known stem $*d^h\acute{e}\hat{g}^h\text{-}\bar{o}m$, gen.sg. $*d^h\hat{g}^h\text{-}m\text{-}\acute{e}s$ and the existence

17. A distinct allative form was available only in the singular.

18. Already by Forrer 1928.

19. For a synchronic description see Hoffner–Melchert 2008: 76, 262–64; Starke 1977.

20. E.g., *ulānna* 'on the meadow', *wattana* 'in(to) the water'.

21. E.g., in Cuneiform Luvian ᵁᴿᵁ*Ḫattušaya*, ꝛ*ḫal-li-ya* 'to a day', *li-i-la* 'in conciliation', (*u-)wa-a-ni-ya* 'on the cliff', etc.; in Hieroglyphic Luvian (DEUS)*Kar-hu-ha-ya*.

22. The Lycian infinitives in *-ne* (e.g., *ttane* 'to put', *lasan*[*e*] 'to kill') likely go back to $*\text{-}\bar{a}tn\bar{o}$ with a thematic ending $*\text{-}\bar{o}$ from $*\text{-}o\text{-}(e)h_2$, see Melchert 1992: 46–47 n. 15 and Peters 1997 [2002]: 122 (note the interchange between (*t)tane* / *tãne* and *ttãna* 58,4).

23. See Melchert 1994: 325.

24. In general, a reconstruction $*\text{-}eh_2$ offers an easier explanation for all Anatolian facts (under this theory that the absence of $*\text{-}aḫa$ [from alleged $*\text{-}o\text{-}h_2e$] in the declension of *a*-stems is unproblematic and requires no additional assumptions); nevertheless, it would still be possible to propose a scenario based on the reconstruction $*\text{-}h_2e$ that would account for all the forms (for instance, by invoking an apocope of the final unstressed vowel in PIE sequences of the type $\text{-}\grave{V}HV^{\#}$; see Jasanoff 2003: 61–62).

25. While Dunkel 1994 argued for unitary $*\text{-}o$, the reconstruction $*\text{-}eh_2$ seems to have gained some acceptance in the last two decades; see Melchert 1994: 51 ($*\text{-}eh_2$ and thematic $*\text{-}\bar{o}h_2$), Hajnal 1992: 213 (who, however, does not reconstruct an ending $*\text{-}eh_2$ for the proto-language, assuming instead that in origin "directival" forms in $*\text{-}eh_2$ were locatives of $*h_2$ stems), and Ringe 2006: 23. The reconstruction $*\text{-}h_2e$ is defended by Weiss 1994: 147 n. 44 and is mentioned as a possibility by Melchert 2008: 43. Furlan 2001 has argued that "directival" forms in $*\text{-}\breve{a}$ can be explained as outcomes of the same $*\text{-}eh_2$ by virtue of Kuiper's Law (see the critical appraisal by Neri 2003: 11 n. 11 and Kloekhorst 2005: 91–92). García-Ramón 1997 traces the Anatolian allative to the Indo-European instrumental in $*\text{-}eh_1$, but see the objections of Zeilfelder (2001: 130–32; on the semantics of instrumental > perlative > locative see Neri 2007: 75 n. 199). Furlan 2001 gives a useful overview of forms and problems involved and should be consulted for references.

26. In the modern literary language (albeit not in the dialects) *žmogùs* has completely replaced the word *žmuõ*, which is probably a perfect match to Latin *homō* (if both go back to $*(d^h)\hat{g}^h\text{-}(\d{m})m\text{-}on\text{-}$ 'he who is on the earth'; see Livingston 2004: 33–36).

of such a derivative from an *m*-stem is not very likely. A reconstruction *$(d^h)\hat{g}^hmeh_2$-g^wu- 'walking on the earth'[27] with an allative form used as the first compound member eliminates this problem.[28]

The reconstruction *-eh_2 is compatible with other material that has figured in the discussion of the Indo-European directive. Greek χαμαί 'on the ground' (possibly identical with Celtiberian **tamai** Botorrita I A 3[29]) can be traced back to a preform *$(d^h)\hat{g}^h\underset{.}{m}$-$eh_2$-$i$: the directive form *$(d^h)\hat{g}^hm$-$eh_2$ (before it was amplified by a locatival *-i) would have regularly had a Lindeman variant *$(d^h)\hat{g}^h\underset{.}{m}$-$eh_2$ beside it, and the expected outcome of the latter is precisely a Proto-Greek *$k^h\partial m\breve{a}$.[30] "Directional" *-$\bar{a}$ (< *-eh_2) appears in other places in the family as well, for instance, in Greek ὑπαί,[31] δ/Διαι-, and infinitives in -αι.[32]

---

27. A verbal governing compound with a "participial" *-$g^w(h_2)u$ as a second member should (according to J. Schindler) be seen as a result of a reinterpretation of a bahuvrīhi formed from an abstract noun *g^wo/eh_2u-; therefore the original meaning was 'having (his/her) going on the earth'. For this compound type compare Old Indic *vanargú*- 'going in the woods' or Greek πρέσβυς 'old man, ambassador' < *'going in the front' (cf. Old Indic *purogavá*- 'leader').

28. It may be argued that if the compound *$(d^h)\hat{g}^hmeh_2$-g^wu- contained an allative case form as its first member, the expected meaning should be 'walking *towards* the earth', which does not make a lot of sense for a designation of a human being (Neri 2003: 247 n. 793). However, this objection is not necessarily valid and the gloss 'walking *on* the earth' adopted in the text above is not merely an attempt to circumvent this difficulty. The reasons behind this gloss are summarized below. (The ideas presented here owe much to C. Melchert and S. Neri, personal communication; the problem merits a more thorough study.) Scattered forms attested in Indo-European languages other than Anatolian that seem to show a reflex of an "allatival" *-eh_2 (as reconstructed in this paper) in fact do not always have an "allatival" or, more broadly, directival meaning; rather, their meaning is often locatival in the proper sense (e.g., Greek χαμαί '<u>on</u> the ground'). Moreover, in Anatolian languages other than Hittite, the forms in -*a* can have a locatival meaning. Despite the dearth of securely interpretable forms, this is likely to be true for Palaic: For instance, in the beginning of the Palaic mythological text nr. 1 the form *úlānna* 'on the meadow' is constructed with *ki-i-[ta-ar]* 'lies' (KUB 32.18 i 1); a locatival sense is likewise likely for *tašūra* 'sacrificial table' (KUB 35.165 obv. 7), although the surrounding words are not quite clear, and the same is true for *wattana* (KUB 35.164 iii 7) which is a form of 'water'. (The lexical meaning of other forms in -*a* [*ḫalpūda* and *kuwalima*] is unknown.) In Luvian (where a distinct dative-locative in -*i* is available), forms in -*a* can be true locatives, too; e.g., *n≠an≠kan INA* ^URU^*Šamuḫa* ŠAH GIM-*an ḫūmma* EGIR-*pa ištappaš* "she shut him up at Samuha like a pig in a sty," in a Hittite context KBo 3.6 iii 56–57.

Based on these observations, two different hypotheses can be suggested. On the one hand one may assume that in Proto-Indo-European *-eh_2 was one of the locatival suffixes, together with *-er, *-en, and *-i (all of which may originally have had slightly different meanings, but these semantic nuances can no longer be discerned). This situation was inherited by Proto-Anatolian and it was an innovation of Hittite to have relegated -*a* (from *-eh_2) to specifically allatival use. On the other hand, it is equally possible that the affix *-eh_2 originally had the meaning of an allative (and this meaning was preserved in several pronominal adverbs); however, eventually allative case forms developed a second, locatival meaning. Both hypotheses will account for the locatival meaning of *$(d^h)\hat{g}^hmeh_2$- in the compound *$(d^h)\hat{g}^hmeh_2$-g^wu-.

29. See Villar 1993. In view of Villar's plausible suggestion that the verb **arista**[.][.] in the same sentence goes back to a virtual *$pari$-$steh_2$-, this identification of **tamai** seems very attractive. For other proposals see Wodtko in Untermann 1997: 524.

30. Similarly on the phonology of χαμαί Hajnal 1992: 213–14, whose morphological solution is, however, different (an endingless locative of a stem in *-eh_2; this solution has been accepted by Neri 2003: 35 n. 80).

31. On Greek adverbial formations in -αι see Solmsen 1911: 165–67.

32. Interestingly, an allatival *-eh_2 possibly appears in another adverb, whose meaning is identical with that of Hittite *mĕnaḫḫanda*, namely Latin *cōram* 'face to face' (pl. +): *cōram* is traditionally thought to go back to an uni-verbation of *co(m)* and *ōs, ōris* 'mouth'. Now, the final -*am* of *cōram* is inexplicable in the absence of any evidence for an *ā*-stem *$\bar{o}ra$ (≠ *ōra* 'border; seacoast'); one way of solving this problem would be to reconstruct an allative *$h_1eh_{1/3}s$-eh_2 'to the mouth' belonging to the paradigm of Indo-European *$h_1o/eh_{1/3}$-s-. The final nasal of *cōram* can be compared with the *-n that otherwise surfaces in scattered adverbs in the family, for instance, in Old Indic *asmí-n* (vs. Avestan *ahmi*), Greek ἔνδο-ν (vs. Old Latin *endo*), νῦ-ν, πέρυσι-ν, Lesbian αἶιν, Lycian *terñ* 'when' (< *k^wari + *n*, cf. Hieroglyphic Luvian *kwari*), or Baltic *kadā-n* 'when' (with an acute vowel *$\bar{a}$ < *-eh_2 in the final syllable:

There are thus several reasons to believe that the ending of the Indo-European allative (directive) case should be reconstructed as *-eh_2$ (and not as *-h_2e, *-o, or plain *-\u0103). We can now return to the main thesis of this paper according to which *mĕnaḫḫanda* should be analyzed as *mĕnaḫḫ≠anda*, where *anda* is a postposition 'into', while *mĕnaḫ(ḫ)* is an allative form from **men-* 'face'.

The phonological aspect of the proposed solution is unproblematic: we know that the second laryngeal was lost word-finally in Proto-Anatolian (as were other laryngeals),[33] but it was retained word-medially between vowels or between a vowel and a resonant (e.g., *šaḫḫan* 'feudal service' < **seh_2-om*; *tuḫḫā(i)-* 'to gasp' < **dʰuh_2-eh_2 i̯e/o-*, or **miyaḫwant-* 'old'[34] from **mih_{1/3}eh_2-u̯ent-* 'having ripeness').[35] Therefore one should expect that a final laryngeal in an allative form [*]*mĕnaḫ* would have been preserved if the addition of postpositional material (*anda*) predates the Proto-Anatolian stage. The question is now whether or not *anda* could have been construed with [*]*mĕnaḫ* early enough in order to allow for the laryngeal to be preserved.

It seems worthwhile, then, to explore the syntactic aspect of the problem. As is well known, Hittite *anda* is regularly used as postposition to the governed noun, e.g., *kissari≠mi anda* KBo 3.23 rev. 6; importantly, one notices that this particular syntactic pattern is likely to be inherited, as the following remarkable fact from Italic seems to indicate. Although Archaic (and archaizing) Latin *endo* is mostly used as a preposition,[36] one of the oldest Latin inscriptions, namely, the *Duenos*-inscription,[37] shows a different syntax: the second half of the first line (the interpretation of which is almost universally agreed upon) reads NEITEDENDOCOSMISUIRCOSIED, where TED ENDO has been traditionally (and no doubt correctly) understood as '*in te*'.[38] This unique example of Latin *endo* used as postposition is matched by other Italic languages where a similar syntactic construction with **en* underlies the creation of an innovative locative form (Umbrian *ocrem* 'on the mount' *TI* 6a,46; South Picene *mefiín* 'in medial' *MC* 1; and Oscan *húrtín* 'in the garden' *SA* 1, A2).[39] Further support comes from the oldest attested Celtic language, namely Celtiberian, where we find **tokoitei eni** (Botorrita I A 4). Lastly, postpositional use of **en* is well known from *en*-locatives such as **gĝʰéi̯men* 'in the winter'. All this supports the antiquity of the pattern attested in Hittite.[40]

The question naturally arises as to how probable is the assumption that a postposition 'into' was used with an allative case form that already had the meaning 'into' inherent in it. But in fact, use of pre- or postpositions reinforcing the meaning of local cases is not unheard

---

Lithuanian *kadà*, Latvian *kad*, Old Prussian <kadden>). Alternatively, *cōram* may owe its final nasal to its antonym *clam* 'secretly' and its near-synonym *palam* 'overtly'.

33. E.g., neuter plural *šākuwa* 'eyes' from collective **-eh_2* or dual **-eh_1*.

34. The stem *miyaḫwant-* is attested only in Sumerographic spelling (^LÚŠU.GI-*ant-*), but can be securely posited on the basis of its verbal derivatives *miyaḫ(u)wandaḫḫ-* / *miḫuntaḫḫ-* 'to make old', *miyaḫunte-* 'to become old, to live long', and *miyaḫḫuntešš-* 'to grow old'. On the etymology of the derivational basis see Kloekhorst 2008: 569.

35. See Melchert 1994: 68–71, 86; Kimball 1999: 395–99.

36. E.g., *endo dies* in the Laws of the XII Tables (tab. III, 4; via Aul. Gell. XX.1) or *endo suam do* in Ennius (via Ausonius *Technop*. 14.18).

37. *CIL* I^2 4; 575–550 B.C.E.

38. So already H. Dressel and F. Bücheler in their commentary in the editio princeps (Dressel 1880).

39. Note that the accretion of the postposition **en* onto the inherited locative suffixes took place before the loss of intervocalic yod: **-ei̯* (locative in -*o*- and -*i*- stem declension) + **-en* > **-een* > **-ēn* > /ēn/, spelled <*ín*> (see Seidl 1994: 366–67 on the related problems of relative chronology and dialect geography).

40. This was rightly stressed by H. Eichner (1988–90: 224). One may note in this connection that this syntactic pattern is all but unexpected, since Indo-European **endo* is a variant of familiar **en* 'in', extended by a deictic particle **dĕ/*dē/*dŏ/*dō*.

of, and Finnish provides a welcome typological parallel.[41] Within Indo-European, Sabellic shows a regular use of *-en* with locative forms.[42] Therefore it seems reasonable to speculate that in Proto-Indo-European a local case could be construed with a postposed adverbial element and the proposed reconstruction *$*men\text{-}eh_2$ $*(h_1)endo(h_2)$* does not deviate from our expectations about syntactic structures in the proto-language.

The proposed scenario is open to one further objection: since Anatolian is the only branch of the family where the inherited allative case was preserved as a part of a declensional paradigm, one would expect to see the syntactic pattern "allative with postposition" likewise preserved, which, on the surface, does not seem to be the case. In Hittite the allative is generally used without postposition. In fact, however, Hittite seems to provide examples of allative forms construed with local adverbs, but their interpretation is hindered by a well-known conundrum. In this language it is often difficult to decide whether a local adverb such as *anda* (or *šara*, *para*, *katta*, etc.) is used as a postposition to a noun in the allative or the dative-locative, or as a preverb conjoined with a verb that follows.[43] A notorious case is *anda parna pāi* "goes into the house":

> *anda≠ša*[(*n parna nāwi paizzi*)]
> "He has not yet entered the house."
> (KBo 6.2 iv 37 + KBo 6.3 iv 35–36)

Since several other instances of *anda pāi* without a governed noun are attested, the status of this combination "preverb+verb" is secured. However, not all of the examples can be dealt with in this way. Consider the following example where nothing stands in the way of analyzing *anda* as an adposition to a (fronted) noun in allative case:

> [DU]GGÌR.KIŠ-*ya≠an kuit anda war*[
> "that which [. . .] into the GÌR.KIŠ-vessel"[44]
> (KBo 17.25 rev.! 3)

There is another group of problematic examples that display the pattern "local adverb – noun in allative/dative-locative – verb" (these examples were assembled by Starke 1977: 150–52).[45] Again, not all of them can easily be explained away as verb-preverb complexes, although the fact that what seems to be an adposition precedes the noun instead of following it is very troubling:

> *nu≠za≠pa utniyanza ḫumanza iški(š)≠šmet anda* URU *Ḫattuša lagan ḫardu*
> "The entire land shall lean its back against Ḫattuša."
> (KUB 36.110 rev. 9–10; OS)

An assumption that an allative form was construed with a postposition in Indo-European and in Proto-Anatolian thus finds support in comparative data and does not violate the

41. E.g.,
Juna   kulkee   Helsinkin   pain
train   goes.PRES   Helsinki.ILLAT.   towards
The train is going towards Helsinki. (Karlsson 1999: 225)

42. E.g., Oscan *exaisc-en ligis* "in these laws"; in Umbrian this is nearly the rule.

43. The situation is particularly difficult when the local adverb is situated between the complement and the verb (so-called *Mittelstellung*); see, e.g., Goetze 1963. For a careful recent discussion of *anda* and *andan* see Salisbury 1999.

44. The verb here is mutilated, but the intended meaning is clear; compare line 9′ in the same text (*CTH* 752): [*n*]*a-aš-ša-an kat-ta* DUGGÌR.KIŠ-*ya la-ḫu-e-ni*.

45. Starke interpreted the construction *anda parna* as two allatives in apposition; whether or not this theory is valid (at least, as a *historical* explanation) is immaterial for the purposes of the present investigation (see also Salisbury 1999; Tjerkstra 1999).

laws of Hittite grammar (although several questions remain in regards to the examples cited above). Nothing therefore stands in the way of reconstructing a postpositional phrase **men-eh₂ *en(do)* 'into the face', which gives Hittite *měnaḫḫanda.*

REFERENCES

Carruba, O. 1966. *Das Beschwörungsritual für die Göttin Wišurijanza.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

CHD = *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, ed. H. G. Güterbock, H. A. Hoffner, and Th. P. J. van den Hout. Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1980–.

CIL = *Corpus inscriptionum latinarum*. 1862–.

Dressel, E. 1880. Di una antiquissima iscrizione latina graffita sopra vaso votivo rinvenuto in Roma. *Annali dell'Instituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica* 52: 158–95.

Duchesne-Guillemin, J. 1947. Etudes Hittites. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1946: 73–91.

Dunkel, G. E. 1994. The IE Directive. In *Früh-, Mittel-, Spätindogermanisch (Akten der IX. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Zürich 1992)*, ed. G. E. Dunkel, G. Meyer, S. Scarlata, and Chr. Seidl. Pp. 17–36. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert Verlag.

Eichner, H. 1973. Die Etymologie von heth. *mehur. Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 31: 53–107.

_____ . 1985. Malwa, eine hieroglyphenluvisch-sidetische Wortgleichung. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 45: 5–21.

_____ . 1988–90. Reklamejamben aus Roms Königszeit. *Die Sprache* 34: 207–38.

Forrer, E. 1928. Ein siebenter Kasus im Altindischen. In *Altorientalische Studien Bruno Meissner zum sechzigsten Geburtstag am 25. April 1928 gewidmet von Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern*. Pp. 30–35. Leipzig: Harrassowitz.

Friedrich, J. 1952. *Kurzgefaßtes hethitisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Furlan, M. 2001. Hethitische Direktivendung *-ā* und indoeuropäische Quellen. In *Anatolisch und Indogermanisch. Anatolico e indoeuropeo (Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Pavia, 22.-25. September 1998)*, ed. O. Carruba and W. Meid. Pp. 92–118. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

García-Ramón, J. L. 1997. Lat. *prae*, gr. παραί, παρά und Verwandtes: idg. *prh₂- und *pr- 'vorn daneben, vor' gegenüber *pro(h₁) 'vor(n), vorwärts'. In *Sound Law and Analogy: Papers in Honor of Robert S. P. Beekes on the Occasion of His 60th birthday*, ed. A. Lubotsky. Pp. 47–62. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Goetze, A. 1963. Postposition and Preverb in Hittite. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*. 17: 98–101.

Hajnal, I. 1992. Griechisch χαμαί—ein Problem der Rekonstruktion? In *Rekonstruktion und relative Chronologie (Akten der 8. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Leiden 1987)*, ed. R. S. P. Beekes, A. Lubotsky, and J. Weitenberg. Pp. 207–20. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

HED = Puhvel, J. 1984–. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, vols. 1–5. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Hoffner, H., and H. C. Melchert. 2008. *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*, part 1: *Reference Grammar*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.

Jasanoff, J. H. 2003. *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

LIV² = *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*, ed. H. Rix et al., 2nd ed. 2001. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Livingston, I. 2004. *A Linguistic Commentary on Livius Andronicus.* London: Routledge.

Karlsson, F. 1999. *Finnish: An Essential Grammar*. London: Routledge.

Kimball, S. 1999. *Hittite Historical Phonology*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Kloekhorst, A. 2005. Review of *Anatolisch und Indogermanisch*, ed. O. Carruba and W. Meid. *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 62: 90–94.

_____ . 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden: Brill.

Matzinger, J. 2008. Nominale Wortbildung des Hethitischen in Grundzügen: Die Wortbildungsmuster des sekundären Lexikons. In *Nominale Wortbildung des Indogermanischen in Grundzügen: Die*

Wortbildungsmuster ausgewählter indogermanischer Einzelsprachen, vol. 2: *Hethitisch, Altindisch, Altarmenisch*, ed. R. Lühr. Pp. 1–105. Hamburg: Verlag Dr. Kovač.

Melchert, H. C. 1984. *Studies in Hittite Historical Phonology*. Göttingen: Vanderhoeck und Ruprecht.

———. 1992. Relative Chronology and Anatolian: The Vowel System. In *Rekonstruktion und relative Chronologie (Akten der 8. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Leiden 1987)*, ed. R. S. P. Beekes, A. Lubotsky, and J. Weitenberg. Pp. 41–53. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

———. 1994. *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

———. 2003. Language. In *The Luvians*, ed. H. C. Melchert. Pp. 170–210. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2004. *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language*. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press.

———. 2008. Palaic. In *The Ancient Languages of Asia Minor*, ed. R. D. Woodard. Pp. 40–45. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Neri, S. 2003. *I sostantivi in -u del gotico: Morfologia e preistoria*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

———. 2007. *Cadere e abbattere in indoeuropeo: Sull' etimologia di tedesco fallen, latino aboleo e greco apollumi*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Peters, M. 1997 [2002]. Indogermanische Chronik 35. Teil 3. *Die Sprache* 39: 94–129.

Poetto, M. 1986. Luvio mana- 'vedere': eteo meni/a- 'viso'. In *O-o-pe-ro-si: Festschrift für E. Risch zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. A. Etter. Pp. 125–28. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Rieken, E. 1994. Der Wechsel -a-/-i- in der Stammbildung des hethitischen Nomens. *Historische Sprachforschung* 107: 42–53.

———. 1999. *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

———. 2005. Kopulativkomposita im Hethitischen. In *Hṛdā́ mánasā: Studies Presented to Professor Leonhard G. Herzenberg on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*, ed. N. N. Kazansky. Pp. 99–105. St. Petersburg: Nauka.

Ringe, D. 2006. *From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Salisbury, D. 1999. *Anda* and *andan* in Neo-Hittite. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 51: 61–72.

Schürr, D. 1998. Kaunos in lykischen Inschriften. *Kadmos* 37: 143–62.

Seidl, Chr. 1994. Gemeinsabellisch und Vulgärlateinisch: Der Vokalismus. In *Früh-, Mittel-, Spätindogermanisch (Akten der IX. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Zürich 1992)*, ed. G. E. Dunkel, G. Meyer, S. Scarlata, and Chr. Seidl. Pp. 349–70. Wiesbaden: L. Reichert.

Solmsen, F. 1911. Zur Geschichte des Dativs in den indogermanischen Sprachen. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 44: 161–223.

Starke, F. 1977. *Die Funktionen der dimensionalen Kasus und Adverbien im Althethitischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Tischler, J. 1990. *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*. Teil II, Lieferung 5–6: *L–M*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Tjerkstra, F. A. 1999. *Principles of the Relation between Local Adverb, Verb and Sentence Particle in Hittite*. Groningen: Styx Publications.

Untermann, J. 1997. *Monumenta Linguarum Hispanicarum*, vol. 4: *Die tartessischen, keltiberischen und lusitanischen Inschriften*, ed. J. Untermann and D. S. Wodtko. Wiesbaden: L. Reichert.

Villar, F. 1993. Botorrita **soz auku aresta [.] [.] tamai**. In *Sprachen und Schriften des antiken Mittelmeerraums: Festschrift für Jürgen Untermann zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. F. Heidermanns, H. Rix, and E. Seebold. Pp. 465–71. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Vine, B. 2006. An Alleged Case of "Inflectional Contamination": On the *i*-stem Inflection of Latin *civis*. *Incontri Linguistici* 29: 139–58.

Weiss, M. 1994. Life Everlasting: Latin iūgis 'everflowing', Greek ὑγιής 'healthy', Gothic ajukdūþs 'eternity' and Avestan yauuaēǰī- 'living forever'. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 55: 131–56.

Zeilfelder, S. 2001. *Archaismus und Ausgliederung: Studien zur sprachlichen Stellung des Hethitischen*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.