The Hittite preverb or postposition *menahhanda* ‘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:

```
nuššī LÚ.KÚR zabḥiya *menahhanda* namma ŪL kuški mazzašta
“No enemy dared any longer (to go) against him in battle.”
(KBo 5.6 i 7–8)
```

```
menaḫḫanda[(e)šaša]ni k( urakki) tapuwaš ZAG-ni GÛB-li
nu kuwapiya QATAMMA 4 walluš 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)
```

```
nušmašza ziqqa āššuš ĕš 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)
```

1.¹

```
LÚDAM.GÀR maš-can LUGAL-i *menahhanda* arta
“One merchant stands before/facing the king.”
(KUB 57.95 iv 5–6)
```

```
maḫḫan=maš-can LÚ.MEŠ URU *Duqqamma* *menahhanda* awēr
“When the men of D. saw me coming”
(KBo 4.4 iv 18–19)
```

```
kuedani=wašza *menahhanda* išḫamiškeši
“To whom are you singing?”
(KUB 36.12 ii 9)
```

```
nu=mu MUNUS-TUM kuit *menahhanda* uet
n=as=mu GIR.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 *menahhanda* has traditionally been compared with *mēna*- n. (pl. tant.), *mēna*-c. ‘face, cheek’, and this comparison is hard to deny.² The second part of *menahhanda* 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 *menahhanda* is a compound of two nouns in allative case, ‘face’ and ‘forehead’.³

---

¹. Author’s note: I would like to thank Gary Beckman, Jay Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert, Sergio Neri, Martin Peters, Bridget Samuels, and Andrew Shatskov for many helpful comments and suggestions on an earlier draft of this paper. 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.

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’, 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, tatpurusas and karmadhārayas (e.g., pappaneknēš ‘brothers having the same father’ from pappa ‘father’ + negna- ‘brother’; tuzziyāššēšar ‘settlement of an army’ from tuzzi ‘army’ + aššēšar ‘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 mē˘naḫḫanda 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 (*), mē˘naḫḫand- as a partes-pro-toto synecdoche (so HED 6: 147), since the original meaning of menali- 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 ānti ‘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 mē˘naḫḫanda).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 mē˘naḫḫanda.

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 mē˘naḫḫanda 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 mē˘naḫḫ=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.


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


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 mē˘naḫḫanda.

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 ūtewē ‘facing, opposite; toward’, in origin a compound of *en and tewē* ‘eye’. Even more important is the complete match between the formal structure of Hittite mēnāḫḫ-anda and Lycian ṭewe TL 44a,53 ‘facing’ < *- into the eye’, where ūtē 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, mēnāḫ-; 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 mēnali- ‘face, cheek’ first.

The following forms of this word are attested: nom.-acc. sg. neut. mēni (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. 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 *-ih₁ (of the type we find in Homeric ὄσσε from the root noun *h₂ekʷ- ‘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 *men₁ and a dual *men₂ the thematic stem men- (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 mēnāḫḫanda (OS+) would be unlikely to contain this stem as its first member. This means that if mēnāḫḫanda is to be segmented as mēnāḫḫ-anda, its first part has to be an allomorph made from an athematic stem *men-.

The problem of mēnāḫ can now be revisited: in my opinion, mēnāḫ is an archaic allative form meaning ‘to the face’. The resulting meaning of univerbated mēnāḫḫ-anda is then ‘into the face’, which is effectively what the word means. However, as is well known, the Hittite allative has an ending -a, not -af; 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.

12. Credit for this reading is due to Schühr 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).
14. Possibly IE *mēn-s, acc. sg. *men-m, gen.sg. *mn-ės, to give a Hittite paradigm with alternating accent (gen. *mnu-a-a?), but since no oblique forms of this word are known, the question has to remain open. As far as the etymology of mēnali- is concerned, two solutions have been proposed: Melchert (1984: 88 n. 17) compared the Hittite forms with the family of Latin mentum ‘chin’ (and móns ‘mountain’), Welsh man ‘mouth’, and Gothic munhs ‘id.’, which is possibly further related to the verbal root *men- ‘to protrude’ (Latin -minère; see Vine [2006: 154–55]), who reconstructs an adjectival *my-tō- ‘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’ (LIV² 2. *men-), suggested by Rieken (1999: 58), or the comparison to Indo-Iranian *najma- ‘half’ advocated by Eichner 1973: 79.
16. An alternative solution would be to assume that mēnāḫḫ-anda is a univerbation of the postposition anda with nom.-acc. pl. mēnāḫ, used as an accusative of direction (mēnāḫ 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 OHS) and could in any event have been generated by the speakers on the model of alpašt – 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 (tebāna ‘to conquer’, zxxāna ‘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 -tarl-tn- nouns.) The ending -a can in theory continue *o or *-ā 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 *h₂o or *-eh₂ (or even *h₂e or *-eh₂).\(^{24}\) The Proto-Indo-European shape of this ending is thus uncertain.\(^{25}\)

Recently an important argument in favor of a reconstruction *-eh₂ was independently put forth by M. Furlan (2001) and M. Peters (1997 [2002]: 122), who drew attention to Lithuanian žmogus ‘man’.\(^{26}\) The -gu- part has long been compared to the Indo-European root *gʷeʰ₂- ‘to go’ (Old Indic aor. ágāt, Greek ἔβη, LIV »\(^\text{58,4}\) vel sim.) is found in any Indo-European language beside the well-known stem *dʰeʰ₂-om, gen.sg. *dʰeʰ₂-m-és and the existence

17. A distinct allative form was available only in the singular.
18. Already by Forrer 1928.
20. E.g., ulāna ‘on the meadow’, wattana ‘in(to) the water’.
22. The Lycian infinitives in -ne (e.g., ttane ‘to put’, lasan[ə] ‘to kill’) likely go back to *-āmō with a thematic ending *-ā from *-o-(e)h₂, see Melchert 1992: 46–47 n. 15 and Peters 1997 [2002]: 122 (note the interchange between (t)ttane / tāne and tāna 58,4).
24. In general, a reconstruction *-eh₂ offers an easier explanation for all Anatolian facts (under this theory that the absence of *-a[ha] [from alleged *-o-h₂] 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 *-h₂ that would account for all the forms (for instance, by invoking an apocope of the final unstressed vowel in PIE sequences of the type -VHV; see Jasanoff 2003: 61–62).
25. While Dunkel 1994 argued for unitary *-o, the reconstruction *-eh₂ seems to have gained some acceptance in the last two decades; see Melchert 1994: 51 (*-eh₂ and thematic *-ōh₂), Hajnal 1992: 213 (who, however, does not reconstruct an ending *-eh₂ for the proto-language, assuming instead that in origin “directival” forms in *-eh₂ were locatives of *h₂ stems), and Ringe 2006: 23. The reconstruction *-h₂ 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 *-ā can be explained as outcomes of the same *-eh₂ 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 *-eh₂, 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) žmogus has completely replaced the word žmuō, which is probably a perfect match to Latin homō (if both go back to *(dʰ)eʰ₂-(η)m-om- ‘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 \((d^h)g^h\text{meh}_2-g^w-u\)-‘walking on the earth’\(^{27}\) with an allative form used as the first compound member eliminates this problem.\(^{28}\)

The reconstruction \(*-\text{eh}_2\) is compatible with other material that has figured in the discussion of the Indo-European directive. Greek χαμάι ‘on the ground’ (possibly identical with Celtiberian tamai Botorrita I A 3\(^{29}\)) can be traced back to a preform \((d^h)g^h\text{m}-\text{eh}_2-i\): the directive form \((d^h)g^h\text{m}-\text{eh}_2\) (before it was amplified by a locatival \(*-i\)) would have regularly had a Lindemann variant \((d^h)g^h\text{m}-\text{eh}_2\), beside it, and the expected outcome of the latter is precisely a Proto-Greek \(*k^h\text{omâ}\.\)\(^{30}\) “Directional” \(*-\text{a} < \text{*-eh}_2\) 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” \(*-g(h)_2u\) as a second member should (according to J. Schindler) be seen as a result of a reinterpretation of a bahuvrihi formed from an abstract noun \(*g^o/\text{eh}_2\text{μ}r\text{-}; therefore the original meaning was ‘having (his/her) going on the earth’. For this compound type compare Old Indic vanargā- ‘going in the woods’ or Greek πρόσβολος ‘old man, ambassador’ < \(*\text{going in the front’ (cf. Old Indic parōgavā- ‘leader’).}

28. It may be argued that if the compound \((d^h)g^h\text{meh}_2-g^w-u\) 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’, 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” \(*-\text{eh}_2\) (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 χαμάι ‘on the ground’). Moreover, in Anatolian languages other than Hittite, the forms in -a 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 to a virtual *-eh2 to a virtual *-eh2)

29. See Villar 1993. In view of Villar’s plausible suggestion that the verb \(\text{arista}\) in the same sentence goes back to a virtual *\(\text{parsi-steh}_2\), this identification of tamai seems very attractive. For other proposals see Wodtiko in Untermann 1997: 524.

30. Similarly on the phonology of χαμάι Hajnal 1992: 213–14, whose morphological solution is, however, different (an endingless locative of a stem in *-eh2; this solution has been accepted by Neri 2003: 35 n. 80).


32. Interestingly, an allatival *-eh2 possibly appears in another adverb, whose meaning is identical with that of Hittite menahhanda, namely Latin cōrum ‘face to face’ (pl. +): cōrum: cōrum is traditionally thought to go back to an unification of *co(m) and ὀς, ὀρίς ‘mouth’. Now, the final -am of cōrum is inexplicable in the absence of any evidence for an ā-stem *ōra (e ὀρα ‘border; seacoast’); one way of solving this problem would be to reconstruct an allative *h1eh1/3s-eh2 to the mouth belonging to the paradigm of Indo-European *h1o/le(h1/3)s-. The final nasal of cōrum can be compared with the other nasal in scattered adverbs in the family, for instance, in Old Indic asmi-n (vs. Avestan ahmī), Greek ἐνδον (vs. Old Latin endo), vēν, πιδον-ν, Lesbian άυν, Lycian teri ‘when’ (< *kʰarί + n, cf. Hieroglyphic Luvian kwari), or Baltic *kadā-n ‘when’ (with an acute vowel *ā < *eh2 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 *-eh₂ (and not as *-h₂e, *-o, or plain *-ā). We can now return to the main thesis of this paper according to which mēnaḥ-anda should be analyzed as mēnaḥ-anda, where anda is a postposition ‘into’, while mēnaḥ(ḥ) 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), but it could have been construed with (*-mēnaḥ-anda). Material (*mēnaḥ-anda) analyzed as mēnaḥ-anda can now return to the main thesis of this paper according to which particle *dō/*dē/*dĕ/*endo is a variant of familiar *dō ‘in’, extended by a deictic particle *dē/*dē/*dō/*dō.

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, one of the oldest Latin inscriptions, namely, the Duenos-inscription, shows a different syntax: the second half of the first line (the interpretation of which is almost universally agreed upon) reads NEITEDENDOCOSMISUICOSIED, where TED ENDO has been traditionally (and no doubt correctly) understood as ‘in te’. 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 mefín ‘in medial’ MC 1; and Oscan húrtin ‘in the garden’ SA 1, A2). Further support comes from the oldest attested Celtic language, namely Celtiberian, where we find tokoi-tei eni (Botorrita I A 4). Lastly, postpositional use of *en is well known from en-locatives such as *gēbējmen ‘in the winter’. All this supports the antiquity of the pattern attested in Hittite.

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 kadū, Latvian kad, Old Prussian <kadden>). Alternatively, cōram may owe its final nasal to its antonym clam ‘secretly’ and its near-synonym pālam ‘overtly’.

33. E.g., neuter plural sākawa ‘eyes’ from collective *-eh₂ or dual *-eh₂.
34. The stem miyaḥwant- is attested only in Sumero graphic spelling (L[U]ŠU.GI-ant-), but can be securely posited on the basis of its verbal derivatives miyaḥ(w)wendāh- i miyaḥantah- ‘to make old’, miyaḥunte- ‘to become old, to live long’, and miyaḥuntešš- ‘to grow old’. On the etymology of the derivational basis see Kloekhorst 2008: 569.
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 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: *-ēj (locative in -o and -i-stem declension) + *-en > *-ēen >  *-ēn > ̣len, spelled <in> (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 *dē/*dē/*dō/*dō.
of, and Finnish provides a welcome typological parallel.\textsuperscript{41} Within Indo-European, Sabellic shows a regular use of -\textit{en} with locative forms.\textsuperscript{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 *\textit{men-eh}_2 *(\textit{h}_1)end\textit{o(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 \textit{anda} (or \textit{šara}, \textit{para}, \textit{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.\textsuperscript{43} A notorious case is \textit{anda parna pāi} “goes into the house”:

\textit{andaša[(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 \textit{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 \textit{anda} as an adposition to a (fronted) noun in allative case:

\[\text{[DU]}\text{GIR.KIŠ-ya=an kuit anda war[}\]

“that which […] into the GIR.KIŠ-vessel”\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{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:

\[\text{nu=za=pa utniyanza ħumanza iški(š)=šmet anda URU Ḥattuša lagan ḫardu}\]

“The entire land shall lean its back against Ḥattuša.”

(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

\textsuperscript{41} E.g.,
\textit{Juna kulkee Helsinki pain}
train goes.Pres Helsinki.ILLAT. towards
The train is going towards Helsinki. (Karlsson 1999: 225)

\textsuperscript{42} E.g., Oscan \textit{exaisc-en ligis} “in these laws”; in Umbrian this is nearly the rule.

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

\textsuperscript{44} The verb here is mutilated, but the intended meaning is clear; compare line 9′ in the same text (\textit{CTH 752}):
\[\text{[n]a-aiš-ša-an kat-ta [DU]GIR.KIŠ-ya la-ḫu-e-ni.}\]

\textsuperscript{45} Starke interpreted the construction \textit{anda parna} as two allatives in apposition; whether or not this theory is valid (at least, as a \textit{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-

\[ *\text{men-}\] 

\( \text{en(\text{do})} \) ‘into the face’, which gives Hittite \( \text{mē˘ naḫḫanda} \).
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