ON THE EVOLUTION OF THE HITTITE SYSTEM OF POSTPOSITIONS FROM PROTO-INDO-EUROPEAN

This paper explores the development of the Old Hittite system of postpositions from that of PIE; the casual nexus obtaining between the reduction of the Old Hittite case system vis-a-vis that of PIE and the increase in the use of postpositional phrases taking place especially during the New Hittite period.

1. The Old Hittite case system contains up to eight synthetic forms (in the singular). Inflectional classes include the familiar a-, u-, i-, e- and C-stems. The Late Hittite case system lost the contrast between the Dat/Loc and ‘Directive’ (< PIE dative *-ti), the endlingless locative (-σ) and the instrumental (-i(t)); in the plural there are practically only two sets of endings: Nom/Acc realized by -us/es/-as and ‘oblique’ (= Gen/Dat/Loc) -as.

Typological changes which took place between Old (17th – 16th c. B.C.) and Late Hittite (14th – 13th c. B.C.) may be described quantitatively by stating that Late Hittite lost two peripheral/adverbial cases (Directional = Allative and Instrumental). To use a parallel, these changes correspond roughly to those intervening between PIE and Old Latin which ended up with four core (Nominative, Accusative, Genitive, Dative) and two peripheral cases (Ablative and the relics of the Locative). The next step was taken by Ancient Greek which emerged from its ‘Dark Period’ (12th – 8th c. B.C.) with only four core cases, and the ‘proto-article’, on the one hand, and the dramatic increase in the use of adpositional phrases, on the other hand.

2. The Hittite system of local adverbs and postpositions will be presented as a set of 12 binary sets where the first element may be seen as the movement towards a limit, and the second as a departure from the limit so established (cf. Bubenik & Hewson, forthcoming). The notions of the adessive “at”, ‘genitive’ “of”, recipient/beneficiary “to” and spatial removal “from” were expressed synthetically by the case endings of the locative, genitive, dative and ablative, respectively.

1. N+LOC (OH) “at” (N+GEN) “of”
2. (N+DAT) “to” (N+ABL) parā “from”
3. sēr, sarā “on” katta “off, down from”
4. “up” “down”
5. anda(n) “inside, in(to)” arha “away”
6. nantas/handa “for the sake of” “by”
7. pēran “before” appa(n) “after(wards)”
8. katta/i “with” hanti “separately, excepting”
9. hanti, menahhanda “against” “through”
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10. “between” parranda “across”
11. istarna/i “among” arahzanda “about, around”
12. katta(n) “under, below” sēr “above, over”

Table 1: Hittite local adverbs and postpositions

(To facilitate the discussion Table 2 will feature the PIE of adpositions and preverbs).

One notices the absence of the following PIE adverbs/adpositions:

(In 4.) In Hittite there is no trace of the salient pair of the PIE prepositions *ud- “on high” vs. *ni “downwards”.
(In 5). Hittite substitutes the adverb arha “away” for the PIE adverb/adposition h1leg’hs “outside”.
(In 11) Hittite replaced the PIE adverb/adposition *h2bhi “around” by the compound arahz-anda (arah-ts “around” plus anda “in(side)”).
(In 12) The salient pair “under” vs. “over”, *yādēri vs. *upēri, was replaced by katta(n) vs. sēr/sarā.

This relatively poor system of basic adverbs/postpositions was considerably enriched by compounding (katt-anda “down(wards)”), the use of case forms of local adjectives (hantezzi-at “forwards, in front”), and the use of different case forms of basic adverbs/postpositions (katta(n) “under”, katti “with”). The latter strategy can be reconstructed for PIE (*preh2-i “at the front” and *prh2-os “before”).

Several Hittite adverbs/postpositions were originally nouns and developed from them through the well-known process of grammaticalization. For instance, one can reconstruct the PIE adposition h2ent-i “over against” which could be understood as the locative of a word for “front, face”, *h2ent-s. The postposition hant/d-as / hand-a “in view of, with a view to” is formally either the genitive or the ‘directive’ case of the same root (*h2ent-os or *h2ent-ōī).

Unlike the basic lexicon, most Hittite adverbs and postpositions possess solid IE etymologies (appa(n), anda(n), istarna, katta(n), pēran, parā, pariu will be briefly discussed).

The nominal ancestry of adverbs and postpositions still lurks in their syntactic behavior in that most of them can govern their dependent nouns in the genitive. Following Starke (1977:132) and Luraghi (1997:45) one has to distinguish between ‘static’ and ‘dynamic’ local adverbs and postpositions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Static</th>
<th>Dynamic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>andan</td>
<td>anda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appan</td>
<td>appa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>istarna/i</td>
<td>katta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kattan</td>
<td>parian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>katti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 paran “outside”

 bees “above, over”
pēran  “before, in front of”  par  “forewards”  
(also pari-anda)
sēr  “above, over”  sar  “upwards”

Table 2: Local adverbs and postpositions of Hittite

More or less consistent use of the distinct morphology for the 
contrast static & dynamic (and vs. a) is observed only with the pair
andan ‘inside’ vs. anda ‘in(to)’:
(1) É-ri anda “in the house”  É-ri andan “into the house”
(However, as in Sanskrit the locative case could be used for both
notions of inessive and allative/illative: bhūm-au patati ‘s/he falls to
the ground’ vs bhūm-au šete ‘s/he lies on the ground’).
The difference between the static and dynamic local adverbs and
postpositions in Old Hittite in terms of their syntactic behavior can be
described as follows (following Starke, 1977:172):
Dynamic local adverbs and postpositions:
i) appear without an exception before the noun in the directional
case (or the dative);
ii) never take any ‘genitive attribute’;
iii) and they never host possessive enclitics.
Static local adverbs and postpositions:
i) can appear before the locative case;
ii) can take the ‘genitive attribute’;
iii) can host possessive enclitics;
iv) and they can appear after the noun in the locative (or the dative) case.
Thus in addition to the genitival construction LUGAL-was piran
“in front of the king” (in 5) there is also the construction LUGAL-i
piran with the static adverb postposed to the noun in the locative:
(2) LUGAL-i piraŋ  huw i  [KBo XVII 15 Rs. ‘18’.]
king+LOC  in-front-of  runs
“He runs in front of the king”
Both positions of the static adverb andan “inside” are shown in (3).
(3) kút  kút  É-ri  andan  [harakzi  tat  sarnikzi]  
what  what  house+LOC  inside  is-lost  CONN=it  replace+3SG
“He replaces whatever is lost inside the house”
(3ii) andan=a  É-ri  kút  kút  harakzi  
inside=but  house+LOC  what  is-lost  [KBo VI 2 IV 54’]
“But whatever is lost inside the house”
In (3ii) we have to do with a regular construction which possesses
the character of an apposition. To use another example, the
construction anda parna paizzi inside house+DIR go+3SG “s/he goes
into the house” displays actually two nouns in the directional case: anda (assuming that its ultimate etymology is the suffixless locative prepositional phrase *en dom “at/in the house”) and parna “to the house”, which formally and semantically agree. The first noun, anda, gives the goal of the movement in general terms, while the second noun specifies this goal; in syntactic terms, parna is in the apposition to anda; in semantic terms, anda “inside” represents the concept with a larger scope and parna “into the house” the concept with a smaller scope. Similar appositive constructions also exist in Classical Armenian exemplified in (4):

(4) ein merj ar na [Lk 15.1]
    be+IMPF+3PL  near to=he+ACC
  “they were approaching him”

Both static and dynamic adverbs were recategorized as postpositions governing the dependent noun in the dative/locative or the ablative case. Unlike in Indo-Iranian there are no instances of postpositions governing the noun in the instrumental (contrast Sanskrit mayā saha I+INSTR with “with me” with Hittite katti=m(m)i with=I+DAT/ACC “with/at me”. The only postposition governing the accusative is parik(n) “over” (also “against”):

(5) arunan(ACC) parikum “over the sea”
     aruni (Dat/Loc) parranda “over the sea”).

Regarding the development adverb > postposition, compare the Old Hittite example in (6) where anda “into” is used as an adverb with (7) where anda functions as the postposition governing the dative/locative case:

(6) ta= an anda 3-is LUGAL-us
    CONN  3SG/ACC into three-times king+NOM
    SAL LUGAL-ass=a zeriya allapahhanzi [StBoT 8 IV 34–35]
    queen+NOM and bowl+DIR spit+3PL
  “the king and the queen spit three times inside, into the bowl”

(7) ÍD-i anda láhuwai
    river+DAT/LOC into pour+3SG
  “(s)he pours into the river” [KUB XXIV 9 IV 18]

(In (7) anda could also be taken as the preverb anda-láhuwai; cf. AGr ēlσ τον ποταμόν (ēlσ)χεί. Preverbal usage of dynamic adverbs was not unknown in Old Hittite as an example from the Old Hittite ritual in (8) demonstrates:

(8) úk anda paini [KBo XVII 2 I 9]
    l int(o) go+1SG
  “I go in”
In later Hittite there appeared instances of the prepositional usage of dynamic adverbs (9) and preverbal usage of static adverbs (10):

(9) hwiswatar=me =pa anda =hingani
life CONN PRT in(to) death+DAT/LOC

haminkan [KUB 30.10 obv.20]
tie+PART
“life is tied to death”

(10) kuit andan paizzi [XVII 10 IV 16–17]
what in(to) go+3SG
“What goes in”

There are numerous instances of lexicalization (marked by > in (11) resulting from univerbation, which unfortunately cannot be observed in cuneiform script:

(11) anda-wemiya lit. in-find > “catch”
appan-wemiya lit. after-find > “surprise”
piran-wemiya lit. before-find > “meet with”

Time permitting, the issues surrounding univerbation will be further exemplified and analyzed by means of several basic verbs (ep-“take”, näi- “lead”, päi- “go”, tia- “step”, tarna- “let”, uwa- “come” and dä- “take) in combination with the preverb anda “in(to)”, preverb appa “back”, compound adverb appanda “behind” and the combination of the adverb and preverb appa(n) anda “again in”.
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