Dative-Locative Objects of Infinitives in Anatolian

Our honorand demonstrated in Hettrich 1984 that the famous "double dative" construction of verbal nouns in the Rigveda of the type *havíṣe áttave* 'to eat the oblation' (RV 10,16,12) resulted from a syntactic reanalysis of what were originally two independent constituents in the dative. He argued in detail that the Vedic instantiation of this reanalysis was a specifically Indic innovation, parallel to but independent of similar developments in other older Indo-European languages (1984: 85). In grateful recognition of Professor Hettrich's many contributions to our field I am pleased to offer the following modest addendum to his masterful treatment of this aspect of Indo-European case syntax.

As recognized by Disterheft (1980: 167, 177-8), Hittite shows a number of examples strongly reminiscent of the Vedic type:

(1) KUB 39.71 i 24-5

n=aš	*šeḫḫiliyaš*	*wetenaš*	*ḫanuwanzi*	*paizzi*
conj.=she	purification(GSg)	waters(D-LPl)	to draw	goes

'She goes to draw the waters of purification.'

However, since the main verb here is a motion verb, this and the many examples like it with 'to go' and 'to come' can be and in fact are interpreted by most Hittitologists rather as 'she goes to the waters of purification for drawing (them)'. That is, the dative-locative phrase *šeḫḫiliyaš wetenaš* can be construed as a physical goal depending on the main verb *paizzi* 'goes', while the infinitive depends separately on the verb and expresses purpose. Sentences like (1) therefore cannot demonstrate that Hittite has actually undergone a syntactic reanalysis by which phrases like *šeḫḫiliyaš wetenaš* must be analyzed as the genuine object of an infinitive. See the discussion of comparable Vedic examples by Hettrich (1984: 59-67).[1] There are nevertheless a precious handful of cases that argue for a reanalysis having taken place.

(2) KUB 12.26 ii 8-9

nu=war=an	*ANA* DUMU.LÚ.U_{19}.LU	*aniyawanzi*	*ḫarkanzi*
conj.=quot.=it	mankind(D-LSg)	to treat	they hold

'They hold it (a ewe) in order to treat/for treating mankind.'

[1] The same objection applies to the two examples (145b) and (145c) cited by Disterheft (1980: 167).

Hist. Sprachforsch. 125, 242-247, ISSN 0935-3518
© Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen 2012 [2014]

Since this sentence contains no motion verb, the dative-locative singular ‘mankind’ cannot be interpreted as a physical goal. Furthermore, infinitives expressing purpose in Hittite depend overwhelmingly on motion verbs (intransitive or transitive), so that a reanalysis to ‘in order to treat mankind’ seems the most natural interpretation.

Example (2) is, however, not quite incontrovertible proof for a dative-locative object of an infinitive. There are some instances of infinitives of purpose in Hittite that do not depend on motion verbs (see Hoffner and Melchert 2008: 332). It is thus hard to exclude beyond all doubt that ‘for mankind’ is an independent dative of advantage (“dativus commodi”) standing beside an infinitive expressing purpose: ‘they are holding it for mankind for treatment’.

Fortunately, there are several unimpeachable examples of reanalysis:

(3) KBo 3.21 ii 12-13

^{d}*Anuš=ma=tta*		^{d}EN.LÍL-*ašš=a*	*šargawanni*
Anu(NSg)=conj.=thee		Enlil(NSg)=conj	eminence(D-LSg)
ḫanda	*ANA* LÚ.MEŠ KÚR=*ŠUNU*		*wemiyauwanzi*
because of	their enemies(D-LPl)		to find
tuk	*wātarnaḫḫer*		
thee(Acc)	they commissioned		

‘Anu and Enlil commissioned/commanded you on account of (your) eminence to find their enemies.’[2]

The Hittite verb *watarnaḫḫ-* means ‘to order’ (someone to do something) and takes only an accusative direct object (sometimes accompanied by direct speech spelling out the command). The dative-locative plural ‘their enemies’ cannot possibly be construed with the main verb, expressing physical goal, purpose, or person affected.

(4) KUB 13.4 iv 12

nu=šmaš		*mān*	^{LÚ}SANGA	*ANA* NUMUN
conj.=you(DPl)		if	priest(NSg)	seed(D-LSg)
aniyawanzi	UKÙ-*an*		EGIR-*an*	*UL*
to sow	man(ASg)		behind	not
uiyazi	*šumāš=at*	*aniyauwanzi*		*maniyaḫḫi*
sends	you(DPl)=it	to sow		entrusts

‘If the priest does not send along to you a man to sow the seed, (but) entrusts it to you to sow…’

The dative-locative ‘seed’ cannot be the physical goal of ‘sends’, since that is expressed by the postpositional phrase *=šmaš* EGIR-*an*

[2] This example (for which see Hoffner and Melchert 2008: 333) appears in a New Hittite copy of an older composition, whence the redundant (and surely ungrammatical) combination of enclitic pronominal object *-tta* with the stressed pronominal object *tuk*.

'along to you' (lit. 'behind you'). Nor can it express purpose, since the man is not being sent to fetch the seed for sowing.

(5) KBo 6.2 iii 21-22 (Hittite Laws §56)
eki BÀD-*ni* LUGAL-*aš* KASKAL-*š=a*
ice(D-LSg) fortress(D-LSg) king's roads(D-LPl)=and
takšuanzi ^{GIŠ}KIRI$_6$.GEŠTIN-*aš* *tuḫḫušuanzi*
to make vineyards(D-LPl) to cut
ŠA [(^{LU}URUDU.NAG)]AR *natta* *kuiški*(NSg) *arawaš*(NSg)
of coppersmith(s) not anyone free
'None of the coppersmiths is exempt from making ice, a fortification, and royal roads (or) from harvesting vineyards.'[3]

As noted by Disterheft, the infinitives here depend on the adjective *arawaš* 'free, exempt', which consistently takes the ablative when construed with nouns ('free of/from'), so there can be no other way to analyze the dative-locatives *eki*, BÀD-*ni*, KASKAL-*(a)š* and ^{GIŠ}KIRI$_6$.GEŠTIN-*aš* except as the objects of the respective infinitives.

The ritual text KBo 24.45+, not available to earlier researchers, now offers no less than three more examples, all of which can only be interpreted as showing the reanalysis:[4]

(6) KBo 24.45+ Vo 7-8 (restorations from duplicate KBo 27.202+)
nu *araḫza* *ANA PANI* DINGIR-*L*[*IM* (*āpi* *kinu*)*a*]*nzi*
conj. outside before the god pit they open
āpiti=ma *kinumanzi* *kī* *danzi*
pit(D-LSg)=focus to open these they take
'Next they open a pit outside in front of the deity. To open the pit they take these (things).' (a list follows)

(7) KBo 24.45+ Vo 11
namma *āpiti* *ēšḫarnumanzi* 1 MUŠEN.GAL *šipanti*
next pit(D-LSg) to smear with blood one goose sacrifices
'Next one sacrifices one goose for smearing the pit with blood.'

(8) KBo 24.45+ Vo 25-26 (restorations from duplicate KBo 27.202+)
[(*namma* Ì.DÙG.G)A (SÍG SA$_5$=*ya* *apāt=pat*)] *danzi*
next fine oil red wool=and that=very they take
ANA KASKAL.MEŠ *kuit* *ḫuittiya*[*uw*(*anzi* *ḫarkanzi*)]
roads (D-LPl) which to draw they hold
'Next they take that very same fine oil and red wool, that which they hold for drawing the paths.'

---

[3] Translation with Hoffner (1997: 68) contra Disterheft (1980: 177), who did, however, fully appreciate the significance of the dative-locative objects.

[4] For the text edition see Strauß (2004), who correctly interprets the first and third examples (2004: 321 and 323), but wrongly says that the dative-locative is unexpected, and misconstrues the second example (2004: 322).

The phrase *kī danzi* ‘they take these (things)’ in (6) is standard in ritual texts, and when construed with a dative-locative the meaning is always that of purpose. In any case the ritual pit cannot plausibly be taken as a beneficiary. One cannot interpret *āpiti* in (7) as ‘into the pit’ with Strauß (2004: 322), because *ēšḫarnu-* is always a transitive verb ‘to bloody, smear/coat with blood’ and requires a direct object. Finally, in (8) ‘paths’ again cannot be a beneficiary. The paths (to entice the deity) are ‘drawn’ by pouring out in a line the fine oil into which the red wool has been put earlier.

We can only conclude that, based on the many ambiguous cases with verbs of motion where the physical goal also is the notional object of the infinitive (as in (1) above), Hittite speakers reanalyzed at least some such combinations as dative-locative object plus infinitive. Obviously, one cannot exclude that some of the ambiguous instances were still intended to have and were understood with the original syntax. The fact that the overwhelming majority of Hittite examples show a motion verb as the matrix finite verb suggests that the use of the dative to mark a physical goal was the starting point for the reanalysis in Hittite (respectively Anatolian), unlike in Vedic, where datives of advantage and disadvantage and final datives played the crucial role.[5]

Hieroglyphic Luvian and Lycian provide one example each to show that the reanalysis is in all likelihood Common Anatolian:

(9) Hieroglyphic Luvian (KARATEPE §XL)

REL-*pa-wa/i-mu*	POST-*na*	(DEUS)TONITRUS-*hu-za-sá*		
Indeed=quot=me	behind	Tarhunzas		
(DEUS)*Rú-za-sá-há*	*sá-ta*	*za-ti*	*“*CASTRUM”-*si*	AEDIFICARE+*MI-na*
Runzas=and	were	this	fortress(D-LSg)	to build

‘Indeed Tarhunzas and Runzas were behind me to build this fort.’

The rendering of Hawkins (2000: 53) makes no coherent sense: ‘So Tarhunzas and Runzas were after me for this fortress to build (it)’. The Phoenician version makes the meaning clear: *k-b'l w-ršp ṣprm šlḥ-n l-bnt* ‘Since Baal and Rešeph-of-the-goats sent me to build (it)’. The Phoenician infinitive phrase *l-bnt* (with unexpressed object recoverable from a preceding clause) depends on the verb ‘sent’.[6] The Phoenician also confirms that the HLuvian idiom ‘were after me’ must have the approximately the same sense as in colloquial English: the two deities instigated the building of the fort/ city (or at least such is the conceit).

---

[5] I must therefore follow Hettrich (1984: 85) in assuming that the Anatolian and Indic constructions are independent innovations, contra Disterheft (1980: 188-90).

[6] I am indebted to Dennis Pardee for his counsel on the Phoenician version.

(10) Lycian (*TL* 39, 5-6)

me=ñne	*ni(j)=esu*	*esedeñnewi*	*epttehi*	*ñtepi=tan[e]*
conj.=them(DPl)	prohib.=shall be	descendants(DSg)	their	into=to put

'Let it not be (permitted) to them to put in their descendants.'

Thomsen (1899: 61) correctly identified *esedeñnewi* as dative singular of the collective noun *esedeñnewe-* '(collateral) descendants', but failed to understand the syntax, causing him to reject the fundamentally correct interpretation by Torp (1898: 14) '…sei es nicht (erlaubt) ihre Nachkommenschaft (hier) zu begraben'.[7]

For *-ñne* as dative plural 'for/to them' see Melchert 1992: 199. As usual in the Lycian tomb inscriptions, the owner is prohibiting anyone from putting unauthorized persons into the tomb reserved for his immediately family. Since *-ñne* refers to the notional agent of the infinitive *ñtepi=tane* 'put in', *esedeñnewi epttehi* 'their descendants' can be nothing else but the object of the infinitive.

The absence of examples from Palaic and Lydian may easily be due to chance,[8] and likewise that of cases with motion verbs in Luvian and Lycian. Hittite provides robust evidence that infinitives were primarily employed in Anatolian with intransitive and transitive verbs of motion to express purpose. The dative-locative objects of infinitives in Anatolian surely result from a syntactic reanalysis of what were originally datives expressing a physical goal and infinitives marking purpose, both depending on the main verb.

References

Disterheft, Dorothy (1980): *The Syntactic Development of the Infinitive in Indo-European*. Columbus OH: Slavica.

Hawkins, John David (2000): *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Volume 1: Inscriptions of the Iron Age*. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter.

Hettrich, Heinrich (1984): Zur historischen Syntax der nomina actionis im Ṛgveda: Der 'doppelte Dativ'. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaften* 43.55-106.

Hoffner, Harry A. Jr. (1997): *The Laws of the Hittites*. Leiden, New York and Köln: Brill.

— and H. Craig Melchert (2008): *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Winona Lake IN: Eisenbrauns.

Melchert, H. Craig (1991): The Lydian Reflexive and Emphasizing Particle *-ś/is*. *Kadmos* 30.131-42.

---

[7] Torp's own attempt (1898: 9) to explain *esedeñnewi* as an alternate accusative to attested and perfectly regular *esedeñnewẽ* was rightly rejected by Thomsen.

[8] The alleged further example from Lydian that I proposed in Melchert 1991: 133 remains possible, but is fraught with too many uncertainties to be of value and is best left aside.

— (1992): The Middle Voice in Lycian. *Historische Sprachforschung* 105.189-99.
Strauß, Rita (2004): *Reinigungsrituale aus Kizzuwatna. Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung hethitischer Ritualtradition und Kultgeschichte*. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter.
Thomsen, Vilhelm (1899): Études lyciennes. *Oversigt over det Kgl. Danske videnskabernes selskabs forhandlinger*, No. 1, 1-77. Christiania.
Torp, Alf (1898): Lykische Beiträge I. Videnskabselskabets Skrifter, Hist.-fil. Kl., No. 4. Christiania.

H. Craig Melchert

Department of Linguistics
3125 Campbell Hall
P.O. Box 951543
UCLA
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1543
U.S.A.
melchert@humnet.ucla.edu