

SPLIT-ERGATIVITY IN HITTITE<sup>1</sup>  
Petra Goedegebuure (University of Chicago)

“it is possible that all languages show ergativity on some level” (McGregor 2009, 482)

*1. Introduction*<sup>2</sup>

As a highly heterogeneous phenomenon ergativity remains a *conundrum* for linguistic theory. The ergative case has been treated as a structural case, an inherent/lexical case, or rather as a mix (Butt 2006). Split-ergativity is thought to arise as an epiphenomenon, as ‘collateral damage’ of diachronic change after reinterpretation of passive constructions with instrumentals (Dixon 1994) or through reanalysis of transitive null-subject clauses with inanimate instrumentals (Garrett 1990b). Alternatively, case assignment and therefore also split-ergativity ultimately depends on synchronic structural properties of the clause (Merchant 2006). It has been claimed that only 25% of the world’s languages shows ergativity (Van de Visser 2006), or that “all languages show ergativity on some level” (McGregor 2009, 482). Irrespective of the correct ratio, split-ergativity seems to be the norm among languages that show ergativity. When the ergative split is based on semantic features of noun phrases, it is generally assumed that animacy plays a major role.

Silverstein (1976) has shown that pronouns and nouns can be hierarchically arranged based on semantic features such as person, number, or grammatical gender. The strength of this hierarchy is that if agent marking is attested for the first time at a certain point in the hierarchy, all nominals lower in the hierarchy will carry agent marking as well. Patient marking, which is independent from agent marking, works in the other direction. A language has ergative alignment if agent marking is restricted to the transitive subject, with patient marking covering both

---

<sup>1</sup> This article is a review of PATRI, SYLVAIN: L’alignement syntaxique dans les langues indo-européennes d’Anatolie. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 49). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2007. 231 S. 24 × 17 cm. ISBN 978-3-447-05612-0. Preis: € 48,00.

<sup>2</sup> My thanks go to Alexis Manaster Ramer for several fruitful conceptual discussions on ergativity, to Theo van den Hout, Jason Merchant and Ilya Yakubovich for their commentaries on the final draft of this article, to Craig Melchert and again Ilya Yakubovich for allowing me access to their reviews of Patri 2007 before publication, and to Paola Dardano, Alfredo Rizza and Simon Zsolt for making available to me publications that I otherwise would not have been able to consult. Finally, I would like to thank the director and fellows of the Franke Institute of the Humanities at the University of Chicago for their discussion of my paper. All opinions expressed in this article are my own unless noted otherwise. And all mistakes are of course mine.

intransitive subject and object<sup>3</sup>. Accusative alignment occurs when transitive and intransitive subject receive the same marking, with different marking for the object. Splits in marking, meaning the transition from one type of marking to another type, often occur between 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person pronouns and the rest, but Silverstein's hierarchy also predicts the existence of splits lower in the hierarchy.

Regarding animacy as the driving force behind the hierarchy, it has often been overlooked that Silverstein's theoretical exposé mostly focuses on the features person and number for (pro)nominals toward the left side of the hierarchy<sup>4</sup>, while leaving unspecified the features that constitute the right side (this is different in the empirical part of his article). Thus, when introducing a visual representation of his famous hierarchy, Silverstein uses animacy as an *example* of a feature that could be relevant in a nominal hierarchy (1976, 176). Animacy may not play a part at all, as one can easily observe for most of the split-ergative systems discussed by Silverstein<sup>5</sup>. Yet, this example of a hierarchy that contains the feature animacy is now leading its own life as *the* Silverstein or animacy hierarchy<sup>6</sup>.

As a result of the over-generalization of a nominal semantic feature that is not universal<sup>7</sup>, we now often find references to Hittite either as an example of a language that supports (see for example Rumsey 1987, 311) or refutes (see Bavant 2008, Fauconnier 2011) an animacy based split. Therefore, in view of the uncertainties regarding the nature and development of (split-)ergativity and the

---

<sup>3</sup> Syntactic functions are not universal, but within the framework of this article I assume that the notions of subject and object are relevant for the Anatolian languages.

<sup>4</sup> For a critical assessment of the left side of the Silverstein Hierarchy see especially Filimonova 2005.

<sup>5</sup> The feature *Animacy* is absent in Dhirari (Silverstein 1976, 181), Gumbayngir (1976, 183), Chinook (1976, 188), and Dyirbal (1976, 212).

<sup>6</sup> The references to Silverstein's hierarchy as the animacy hierarchy are too numerous to mention, but see already Wierzbicka (1981, 51 n. 7) and nowadays for example Kiparsky (2008, 34) for a rejection of the term "animacy hierarchy". This is not to deny that differential agent marking based on animacy is relevant for individual languages. There is however an important *caveat*. Especially animacy constitutes a problem for noun classification: "It must be mentioned at the outset that one of the major problems in the area of noun classification is that it is often difficult to determine whether one is dealing with a property of the noun as it occurs in the mental lexicon [...] or with a property of the ontological correlate of the referent of the NP in the physical world [...]. [...] This holds especially for classifications which involves such features as <Human> or <Animate>" (Rijkhoff 2002, 61). In other words, only when animacy is a property of a noun, not of a referent, should it be included in the Silverstein hierarchy of a language.

<sup>7</sup> The universality of Silverstein's hierarchy lies in the fact that once the nominal hierarchy is established for a language with differential agent and/or patient marking, there will be a cut-off point at which marking switches from one type to the other. Silverstein concludes that since the hierarchy is built on semantic features of referential expressions, case marking of the core cases is semantically motivated, not syntactically: "What is important to see is the essentially semantic motivation for case-marking schemata" (1976, 179), and further elaborates on how syntactic processes interact with case-marking patterns (1976, 219ff.). Together with the aspect of universality, this is the real relevance of the Silverstein hierarchy for linguistic theory.

use that is made of Hittite in testing the validity of the Silverstein Hierarchy, the importance of a sound syntactic description of Hittite and the other Anatolian languages cannot be underestimated.

When well conducted, a new study of the syntax of the Anatolian languages, like Patri 2007, under review here, would have provided an invaluable tool for theoretical linguists and typologists, and, no less important, it would have been an important contribution to an improved understanding of Anatolian syntax in answering the main question: Do the Anatolian languages show ergativity?

It is therefore to be regretted that Patri's monograph is not up to the task. Patri's claims are informed by erroneous interpretations of Hittite and Luwian data, and by a serious misrepresentation of both linguistic and Hittitological literature, despite the very complete bibliography. When it comes to the descriptive adequacy of Hittite (and to a lesser extent that of Luwian), I can only support Melchert's assessment (2009, 130):

It is when he makes sweeping generalizations about features of Hittite as a whole that P. commits grievous factual errors which vitiate most of his analyses.

To illustrate this I have chosen to analyze Patri's treatment and rejection of split-ergativity in the Anatolian languages, discussed in Chapter 1 ("L'Alignement canonique", pp. 15-73).<sup>8</sup> I will show how Patri's rejection of split-ergativity in the Anatolian languages is based on terminological intransparency (section 2), adherence to a non-canonical view of split-ergativity (section 2) and gender (sections 3, 4), and general misrepresentation of the secondary literature (section 5). Based on a distributional and chronological analysis of the data I will reject Patri's alternative solution for the form and function of *-anza* as ablative (sections 6, 7). In section 8 I will discuss split-ergativity of the pronominal clitics, followed by an outline of my views on the development of split-ergativity in attested Hittite (section 9).

An important part of Patri's book is dedicated to a discussion of the morphological coding of the subject in the Anatolian languages. Although Patri also discusses the use of the nominative enclitic pronoun (p. 62-68), the coding of subjects in impersonal constructions (p. 101-118), naming constructions (p. 81-95), and coding of the object (p. 118-142), pride of place is given to the fiercely debated

---

<sup>8</sup> Chapter 2 ("Constructions non canoniques", pp. 75-152) describes the syntactic contexts in which the subject and object do not receive their canonical coding of *-s/-ants* and *-n*, for example the impersonal constructions, the double accusative and the double dative. Chapter 3 ("Typologie et évolution", pp. 153-175) starts with a summary of the preceding chapters and continues with a comparison between Anatolian and Proto-Indo-European syntactic alignment and the alignments of the non-Indo-European languages attested in Anatolia. Chapter 4 forms the conclusion (pp. 177-179), and is followed by the bibliography (pp. 181-207) and elaborate indices (pp. 209-231). I refer the reader to Melchert 2009, Widmer 2010 and Yakubovich forthc. for an evaluation of the remainder of Patri 2007.

nominal suffix Hittite *-anza* and its cognates Luwian *-antis* and Lycian *-ēti*<sup>9</sup>. In each language this suffix appears when a grammatically neuter noun<sup>10</sup> functions as the subject of a transitive clause A (= Agent)<sup>11</sup>. Otherwise, the neuter subject of an intransitive clause S (= Single argument) receives the same coding as a neuter object P (= patient) (Hoffner and Melchert 2008, 66-67). This distribution was first detected by Laroche (1962) and is a basic fact of Hittite grammar.

However, the morphological analysis of *-anza* is a wholly different issue, and the debate still rages on. One group of scholars<sup>12</sup> defends the view that *-ant-* is synchronically a derivational morpheme followed by the nominative endings *-s/-es*, hence common gender, while another group treats singular *-anza* and plural *-antes* as true ergative case endings in the neuter paradigm<sup>13</sup>.

Patri closely follows the view defended by Garrett (1990b, 276f.) that the Proto-Anatolian instrumental-ablative ending *\*-anti* is the source of the ending *-anza*. Patri's contribution to the debate is that he takes *-anza /-ants/* also *synchronically* as an ablative case ending. Why this is impossible will be explained in section 6.

Patri's major contribution to the field is that his work has already spawned a series of studies on alignment in Anatolian and the *-anza* form, such as Dardano 2010, Melchert 2011, Rizza 2010, Shatskov 2011, Yakubovich 2011, *fc*, and part of the present review, with undoubtedly more to follow (thus far no one supports Patri's analysis of *-anza*). The work itself cannot be considered authoritative.

---

<sup>9</sup> Recently Simon (2008, 462) suggested a comparison of the Carian nominal case ending  $\delta$ , which reflects *\*-nd-*, with Hittite and Luwian *-ant-*.

<sup>10</sup> Hittite noun classes are not based on animacy only. Common gender nouns may be ontologically inanimate, and neuter gender nouns may be ontologically animate. I therefore refrain from using the terms animate and inanimate gender, and prefer common gender and neuter gender instead.

<sup>11</sup> To my knowledge there are two exceptions to this rule. The Hittite neuter *sāwar* "sullenness, anger", verbal substantive of *sā(y)e-/sai-* (CHD Š, 315b), occurs twice as nom.-acc.sg. in A-function (*sāwar* in KUB 30.34 iv 9, *sāuwar* in the parallel text KUB 39.103 rev. 7', see CHD Š, 316b). The Hittite neuter stem *handais* "heat" occurs in A-function in KBo 3.23 obv. 6, rev. 9 (OH/MS) (Zeifelder 2001, 164; HED H, 107; HW<sup>2</sup> H, 167). Melchert (1993, 108 n. 8), Rieken (1999, 218f.) and Kloekhorst (2008, 291f.), argue for a common gender noun, based on the assumption that neuters in the nominative-accusative cannot occur in A-function. To avoid circular reasoning we must accept that *handais* is a neuter noun in A-function until there are independent and convincing arguments for common gender assignment.

<sup>12</sup> For a list of scholars adhering to the derivational hypothesis see Patri p. 21. Add to his list Bauer 2000, 53f.; Bavant 2008, 445; Dardano 2010; Josephson 2004a, b; Kloekhorst 2008, 184; Luraghi *fc*; Rizza 2010, 150f.; Shatskov 2011; Widmer 2010; Yakubovich 2010b, 153 (who most importantly distinguishes between morphological, morpho-syntactic and syntactic ergativity), 2011. *Pace* Patri (p. 25), Tchekhoff (1978) follows the derivational hypothesis.

<sup>13</sup> For a list of scholars defending the ergative hypothesis see Patri p. 25. Add to his list Fortson 2010, 172, 188 (but source of ergative is *-ant-*); Hoffner/Melchert 2008, 66f. (§§ 3.8, 3.9, 3.10), 72f. (§3.21); Melchert 2009, 132 (but source of ergative is *-ant-*), 2011; Watkins 2008, 15, 19.

## 2. Split-ergativity (p. 25-27)

Before presenting his morphological analysis of *-anza* as an ablative, Patri argues that the syntactic pattern as observed for neuters cannot count as evidence for split-ergativity in the Anatolian languages. According to Patri one of the reasons is that in general animate nouns are more likely to inflect ergatively than inanimate nouns. The Anatolian languages, showing the opposite with ergatively inflected neuter nouns but accusatively inflected common gender nouns, would therefore be extremely rare from a typological point of view.

The starting point for the understanding of split-ergativity is the hierarchy as set up in Silverstein's ground-breaking article of 1976. To recapitulate, the Silverstein Hierarchy is an implicational hierarchy of referential expressions that is often understood to be (partially) determined by animacy. If agent marking is used for a certain category, then every category to the right in the hierarchy will show agent marking as well, and *vice-versa* for patient marking (the hierarchy below is copied from Patri p. 26)<sup>14</sup>:

Figure 1: Silverstein hierarchy according to Patri

pronoms 1 <sup>ère</sup> / 2 <sup>ème</sup> p.	→	pronoms 3 <sup>ème</sup> p.	→	nom propres, termes de parenté	→	noms animés humains	→	noms animés non humains	→	noms inanimés	→	[ - animé ]
[ + animé ]												

The claim that many ergative languages show special agent marking for animate participants (the *noms animés non humains* in Fig. 1, Patri p. 26) immediately implies that the lower ranking inanimate participants (the *noms inanimés*) *must* show special agent marking (both classes are marked gray in the figure above).

According to Patri (p. 26), Silverstein (1976), –and following him among many others Dixon (1994),– maintains that when split-ergativity is conditioned by the semantics of noun phrases, animate nouns almost always show ergative alignment. On the other hand, inanimate nouns rarely show ergative alignment:

ce sont pratiquement toujours les noms *animés* (emphasis in the original) qui font preuve d'un alignement ergatif, très rarement l'inverse [emphasis PMG]. Cette orientation s'explique sous considération de ce que les animés sont discursivement favorisés en position de sujet parce que le contrôle d'un procès leur est plus facilement attribué qu'aux inanimés dont le référent, conventionnellement inerte, n'est pas censé exercer une manipulation sur un patient. (p. 26)

In other words, Patri claims that split-ergative languages typically show ergative alignment for animate nouns but not for inanimate nouns. As also mentioned by

<sup>14</sup> In Fig. 1 I present Patri's animacy-based adaptation of Silverstein's hierarchy. Silverstein himself mainly focuses on the features person and number, and only introduces animacy as a distinctive feature low in the hierarchy, as an *example* (1976, 122). For more discussion see section 1 above, with fn. 6.

Rizza (2010, 151f.), this is emphatically not what Silverstein and the others cited by Patri state. To quote only Silverstein and Dixon:

The noun phrases at the top of the hierarchy [i.e., the left end, PMG] manifest nominative-accusative case-marking, while those at the bottom manifest ergative-absolute case-marking. (Silverstein 1976, 113).

and

[A]n ‘ergative’ case is used with NPs from the right-hand end, up to some point in the middle of the hierarchy, and an ‘accusative’ case from that point on, over to the extreme left of the hierarchy. (Dixon 1994, 85)

Patri initially follows the generally accepted explanation for the case marking strategies of animate and inanimate entities based on preferential roles (p. 27):

Moins un terme est animé, plus ses possibilités d’accéder à la position de sujet dans une construction transitive sont restreintes [...]. Inversement, un terme inanimé peut facilement occuper la position de sujet d’une construction intransitive [...] ou d’objet d’une construction transitive [...]. Il est donc naturel que le codage des inanimés soit indifférencié dans les deux situations où ils sont le plus souvent trouvés et que celui des animés soit, par contraste, identifié d’après le rôle dans lequel ils sont préférentiellement sélectionnés.

Thus, inanimates show common marking for their preferential roles S and P, and one can identify animates based on the fact that they preferentially occur in A-function. Patri crucially does not mention that in many languages the preferential roles are unmarked, i.e.,  $\emptyset$ , but that inanimates and animates receive special marking in their unaccustomed roles, which is A-function for inanimates and P-function for animates (in simplified form):

Figure 2: typical coding patterns for split-ergative languages

	ANIMATE	INANIMATE
A	$\emptyset$	X (erg.)
S	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$
P	Y (acc.)	$\emptyset$
	alignment	accusative
		ergative

By not taking this into account, it is indeed possible to claim that A-function marking belongs with animates, and S/P-function marking belongs with inanimates, and therefore that the restriction of ergative marking to animates is typical for ergative languages. Thus, Patri considers ergative marking for inanimates the

opposite of 'normal' ergative marking (the next quote immediately follows the one presented above):

Parmi les langues ergatives, cette tendance est largement majoritaire, mais elle n'est pas universelle. La situation opposée [emphasis PMG] est attestée, quoique de façon exceptionnelle. On ne semble, en effet, avoir signalé, jusqu'à présent, que deux langues dans lesquelles les substantifs inanimés sont les seuls à suivre un alignement ergatif: le tharrkari [...], et le mangarrayi, [...]. (p. 27)

When for example Garrett (1990b, 261) states that neuter nouns inflect ergatively and common gender nouns inflect accusatively, Patri therefore counters with

En stipulant que les noms caractérisés par le genre inanimé ont un alignement ergatif, mais que les noms caractérisés par le genre animé suivent un alignement accusatif, l'interprétation ergative des sujets en *-anza* rattache donc les langues anatoliennes à un modèle de glissement d'alignement particulièrement rare dont l'expression formelle n'a aucun équivalent dans les langues du monde. (p. 27)

To conclude, by imposing a highly divergent view of ergativity, -that usually only animates inflect ergatively<sup>15</sup>-, on the Anatolian situation while seemingly following the *communis opinio*, Patri concludes that the Anatolian languages are typologically particularly aberrant with their ergative alignment of grammatically neuter nouns.

It is indeed true that many languages exhibit a split between pronouns and nouns, in other words, pronouns follow an accusative alignment and nouns an ergative alignment, but that does not mean that the cut-off point for ergative alignment cannot be further to the right. The Silverstein hierarchy does not provide a lower limit for the cut-off point and thus predicts the existence of languages like Hittite. The Anatolian languages neatly follow the Silverstein Hierarchy and are *not* the inverse or opposite of all other languages with an ergative split.

### 3. Grammatical gender and *-anza* (p. 28-30)

In the end, Patri does not reject split-ergativity because the Anatolian system would be typologically extremely rare and -allegedly- the inverse of the usual pattern in the languages of the world, but because it would not be descriptively adequate (p. 28). The assumption that underlies the split-ergative hypothesis for Anatolian is that nouns are typically invariant with respect to grammatical gender. But according to Patri this is only the case for common gender nouns. The nominal

---

<sup>15</sup> This seems to be a rather unique take on ergative marking in the post-Silverstein 1976 era. I am only aware of a similar approach for Hittite in Tchekhoff (1978, 232), who erroneously claimed that in ergative languages, such as Basque, the ergative case (Tchekhoff's *cas agent*) is restricted to animates ("Le basque [...] présentent la même incompatibilité entre inanimé et fonction agent" (p. 234)). For a refutation of this view see already Villar 1984, 178f.

agreement patterns (presented on p. 16f.) show that nouns that are neuter gender in S- and P-function switch to common gender in A-function (p. 28). Therefore

*dans une construction transitive un nom sujet ne relève jamais du genre inanimé, le rôle de sujet d'un verbe transitif ne pouvant être assumé que par un nom animé.* (p. 31-32, emphasis in the original)<sup>16</sup>.

and

*dans les constructions transitives, le genre animé est une fonction (au sens logique) du rôle de sujet. Un sujet ne peut être inanimé que s'il est sujet d'une construction intransitive.* (p. 28, emphasis in the original).

Thus, according to Patri, those who argue that *-anza* is an ergative either face (a) two paradigms for one lexeme, i.e., the well-known neuter paradigm and a common gender 'paradigm' that only consists of the *-anza* form (p. 29, (1.8)), exemplified by means of the lexeme *watar* "water":

Figure 3: two paradigm approach for *watar* "water"

	Neuter [=inanimé] gender		Common [=animé] gender	
	SINGULAR	PLURAL	SINGULAR	PLURAL
Nom.-acc.	<i>watar-∅</i>	<i>wedār-∅</i>	*_	*_
Ergative (?)	*_	*_	<i>witen-anza</i>	
Gen.	<i>witen-as</i>		*_	*_
Dat.-loc.	<i>witen-ī</i>	<i>witen-as</i>	*_	*_
Abl.	<i>witen-anza</i>		*_	*_
Instr.	<i>witan-ta</i>		*_	*_
All.	<i>weten-a</i>		*_	*_

or (b) one paradigm which consists of one common gender form, the *-anza* ergative, and otherwise neuter forms ("mêlant formes animées et inanimées", p. 29):

<sup>16</sup> I have no objection against arguing for selectional restriction criteria on first arguments of two- and three-place predicates (which become subjects of transitive verbs in active clauses in languages where the notion subject is relevant). However, these criteria are to my knowledge only applied to the semantic aspects of NPs, not to the grammatical category of NPs.



Figure 4: one paradigm approach to *watar*

	Neuter [=inanimé] gender	
	SINGULAR	PLURAL
Nom.-acc.	<i>watar-∅</i>	<i>wedār-∅</i>
Ergative comm.	<i>witen-anza</i>	
Gen.	<i>witen-as</i>	
Dat.-loc.	<i>witen-ī</i>	<i>witen-as</i>
Abl.	<i>witen-anza</i>	
Instr.	<i>witan-ta</i>	
All.	<i>weten-a</i>	

Patri then presents three objections against option (b), because now “le flexion du mot devient simplement impossible à définir” (p. 30):

1. “quel est le genre de lexème *watar*? — As Melchert (2000, 61ff.) has shown, lexemes belonging to one gender class may take inflectional endings from the opposite gender class. This is attested for common gender nouns with the collective plural (> *neuter* plural ending) *-a*, *-i*, and for neuter gender nouns with the nominative plural *common* gender endings *-es* and accusative *-us*. This use of inflectional endings does not change the grammatical gender class of a noun. There is therefore no *a priori* objection against using a common gender form in an otherwise neuter paradigm.
2. “*witenanza* est-il un ablatif du paradigme inanimé ou un ergatif animé?” — to which one should reciprocate: is the ubiquitous ending *-as* in the paradigm of *watar* a genitive singular, genitive plural, or dative-locative plural? Case syncretism is a very common phenomenon in the Indo-European languages, and it is *especially* attested for the ergative (Palancar 2002, 26ff.).
3. “comment définir le rôle casuel de *watar-∅/wedār-∅*, formes qui ne sont ni des «nominatif-accusatif» [...] ni des «absolutif» [...], étant interdites dans le rôle de sujet d’une construction transitive tout en étant possibles dans celui d’objet?” —Indeed, in view of the fact that the nominative case-ending of common gender nouns marks both A- and S-function, the designation “nominative-accusative” does not adequately cover the case-functions of *watar-∅/wedār-∅*. “Absolute” on the other hand is a perfect label for the joint S/P-function marking of *watar-∅/wedār-∅*. One can only claim that “absolute” does not cover the use of *watar-∅/wedār-∅* if one omits *-as* Patri does- that these forms are also acceptable in S-function<sup>17</sup>.

In short, Patri does not present any convincing arguments against option (b).

<sup>17</sup> For *watar* in S-function see for example *kī wātar GIM-an arha har(a)kzi* “Just as this water completely disappears” (KUB 30.34 iv 16).

But let us compare the rejected paradigms with Patri's paradigm for *watar*, assuming for the sake of the argument that the *-anza* form in A-function is synchronically the ablative<sup>18</sup> (p. 29):

Figure 5: Patri's paradigms for *watar*

	Neuter [=inanimé] gender		Common [=animé] gender	
	SINGULAR	PLURAL	SINGULAR	PLURAL
Nom.-acc. (S,P)	<i>watar-∅</i>	<i>wedār-∅</i>	*_	*_
Abl. (A)	*_	*_	<i>witen-anza</i>	
Gen.	<i>witen-as</i>		*_	*_
Dat.-loc.	<i>witen-ī</i>	<i>witen-as</i>	*_	*_
Abl.	<i>witen-anza</i>		*_	*_
Instr.	<i>witan-ta</i>		*_	*_
All.	<i>weten-a</i>		*_	*_

I do not see much difference with the type of organization of the paradigm in (a), which Patri rightly rejects (p. 29). How are we to account for a lexeme that is almost always neuter, including when the ablative is used as an oblique, but the moment this ablative codes a noun appearing in the syntactic role of transitive subject, the lexeme becomes common gender? And why would one accept common gender ablative-instrumental but reject common gender ergative?

Once in a while Patri uses a slightly different formulation when he presents *-anza* not as a gender-switching element but as something that causes the inanimate subject to be *treated* as animate. This difference is quite important, because Patri rejects the notion of invariant gender for nouns that take *-anza* in A-function. Compare the following quotes, with the contradictions marked in bold:

<sup>18</sup> For the paradigm of *watar* Patri relies on the list of attestations in Rieken 1999, 292, where we indeed find the ablative *ú-e-ti-na-an-za-* (KUB 31.86+ ii 11' (MH/NS)). However, Rieken tags this form with a question mark, and not without reason. The co-text also allows a subject reading of *wetinanza* (see Kloekhorst (2008, 987) who classifies this form as erg.sg. I suggest that it might also be a nom.sg. of *wetinant-* "(individuated) water"): (Let the moat be 6 *gipessar* deep, and let it be 4 *gipessar* *wi[de* at the top.]) (20) [*mān* ]*ú-e-ti-na-an-za=ma sarā UL arnuzi* (21) *ṛn=a[t ]sarā IŠTU NA<sub>4</sub> erasure? : p[a]talhāndu* "But [if ]the water does not reach the upper edge (*sarā*), let them pave i[t] with stone until the edge." (KBo 57.10:1' + KUB 31.86 ii 11'- 12' (MH/NS)). This complex sentence is clearly not to be read as: "[if] it (i.e., the moat) does not bring (itself) up from the water" or "[if] he (the governor of the border province?) does not bring up (the moat) from the water". As a result, the only attestation in the paradigm of *watar* that could support the equation of *-anza* with an ablative is questionable, leaving us with ca. 50 attestations of the true ablative *wetenaz(a)*, not mentioned by Patri (or Rieken). Formally and functionally *-anza* is therefore different from the ablative on *-az*. Add to this that we also have a plural *witenantes* (Laroche 1962, 25), and the paradigm of *watar* becomes particularly unfit to show that number-indifferent *-anza* in A-function is the same as number-indifferent *-anza* in ablative function.

Tout sujet appartenant à la classe des lexèmes animés caractérisés par *-anza* dans A étant, comme on l'a vu, susceptible d'apparaître dans le rôle U<sup>19</sup> sans *-anza* sous le genre inanimé [...] (p. 33)

versus<sup>20</sup>

[...] dans une construction transitive, avec objet à l'accusatif, le sujet inanimé est toujours traité comme un animé (p. 32 n. 17)

To conclude, Patri himself is not consistent in his treatment of *-anza* nouns in A-function. Sometimes they are neuter nouns treated like common gender nouns, and at other times they are common gender nouns that otherwise appear as neuter nouns.

#### 4. Syntactic behavior of neuter nouns (p. 30-34)

Patri correctly observes that differential treatment of the subject is not sufficient to describe an alignment as ergative. The intransitive subject also has to receive the same coding as the object (p. 31): not only A = S, but also S = P ⇒ A = {S,P}. But then, he continues, we have to reject ergative alignment for neuter nouns because the transitive and intransitive neuter subject are not treated alike:

En Anatolien, il est vrai que, s'agissant des inanimés, on vérifie régulièrement A = P (point commun aux alignements accusatifs et ergatifs), mais il n'est pas exact que le sujet soit identiquement traité dans les constructions transitives et intransitives. (p. 31)

It is not really clear what Patri intends to counter here. It is certainly true that the transitive subject (A) and the object (P) receive different marking in Anatolian, but I do not think there is anyone that claims that neuter transitive subjects (A) are treated the same as neuter intransitive subjects (S). It is either claimed that neuter transitive subjects do not exist -because *-ant-* is a derivational morpheme and nouns with *-ant-* are not neuter-, or neuter transitive subjects do exist and they are marked *-anza*. All Patri achieves is that he shows that neuter nouns do not inflect according to an accusative alignment. This we already knew, whether we choose neutral or ergative alignment for neuters.

By treating the *-anza* form as a common gender inflectional ending, Patri splits the original neuter class into two separate classes, one neuter without a case for A-function, and one common gender class with only a case-ending for A-function (p. 32). The gray area marks the case-functions that belong to for example the lexeme *watar/witen-*:

---

<sup>19</sup> U stands for the *participant unique* or S, the single argument in an intransitive clause.

<sup>20</sup> Also compare the heading of § 1.8 *comportement du sujet animé*, with the header for the same section *comportement du sujet inanimé* (emphasis PMG).

Figure 6: Behavior of case endings according to Patri, p. 32 (1.9). (The asterisk indicates that marking is absent.)

neuter gender [ <i>inanimés</i> ]	common gender [ <i>animés</i> ]	
	common I	common II
*A	← A ( <i>witenanza</i> )	{ S = A (-s)
{S=P ( <i>watar</i> )	→ *S *P	P (-n)

This split of a group of underlyingly neutral lexemes into two gender classes, with a complementary distribution of syntactic functions (see arrows), whereby the coding and behavior of the sole syntactic function A in one gender class is also the same as the coding, behavior *and* semantics of a semantic function (Ablative) in the other gender class, is a genuine *chimaera*.

I agree with Patri that we should abandon the tradition of defining Anatolian gender-classes solely based on the distribution of inflectional endings of the syntactic cases. Patri's solution however is to reclassify the nominal system based on concord patterns in a manner I rejected above. It is far more productive to identify declensions by studying the distribution of the semantic case endings in addition to the syntactic ones, as Weitenberg (1987, 1995) and Zeilfelder (2001, 198, 200) have done. These scholars have shown that there are three declension classes in Old Hittite, based on different combinations of grammatical animacy ( $A_g$ ) and semantic animacy ( $A_s$ ): class I<sup>21</sup> (+ $A_g$ , + $A_s$ ; common gender/animate), class II<sup>22</sup> (+ $A_g$ , - $A_s$ ; common gender/inanimate), and class III<sup>23</sup> (- $A_g$ , - $A_s$ ; neuter gender/inanimate).<sup>24</sup> In the remainder of this article I will use this classification instead of the one based on grammatical animacy.

If one rejects with Patri the derivational approach to *-anza* as a synchronic explanation of the data, the differential treatment of both (in)transitive subject and object enforces a classification of the Anatolian languages as split-ergative, with ergative alignment for neuter nouns and accusative alignment for common gender nouns<sup>25,26</sup>:

<sup>21</sup> nom. acc., -erg., +gen.pl. *-an* (Zeilfelder 2001, 199f.), -all., -abl., -instr. (but projected into OH by Hoffner/Melchert 2008, 269), +count pl., -coll.pl.

<sup>22</sup> nom. acc., erg. rare but attested, -gen.pl. *-an*, +all., +abl., +instr., +count pl., +coll.pl.

<sup>23</sup> nom. = acc., +erg., -gen.pl. *-an*, +all., +abl., +instr., +coll.pl., (rarely +count pl.).

<sup>24</sup> To these three classes we have to add the missing logical combination, class IV (- $A_g$ , + $A_s$ ; neuter gender/animate). This class consists of at least *antuhsatar* "population, people", *hassatar* "family, offspring", <sup>MUNUS.MEŠ</sup>*hazgarai* coll., female cult personnel, <sup>LÚ.MEŠ</sup>*walwalla* "lion-men", and *suppal* "livestock". These nouns share with class III the obligatory use of *-anza* in A-function, but with class I the ability to take the gen.pl. ending *-an* (in OH only).

<sup>25</sup> DAM = differential agent marking (see especially Fauconnier 2011); DSM = differential subject/single argument marking; DPM = differential patient marking.

<sup>26</sup> For the same approach see most recently Rizza 2010, 148. As I will explain in section 9, in my view the morphological coding of ergativity is attested in Neo-Hittite only. The Middle Hittite evidence is

Figure 7: Coding of A, S and P of nouns in Hittite

SINGULAR	CLASS I	CLASS II	CLASS III	
	“man”	“cloud”	“water”	
A	<i>antuhsa-s</i>	<i>alpa-s</i>	<i>weten-ants</i>	equi-pollent DAM
S	<i>antuhsa-s</i>	<i>alpa-s</i>	<i>watar-∅</i>	privative DSM
P	<i>antuhsa-n</i>	<i>alpa-n</i>	<i>watar-∅</i>	privative DPM
accusative alignment			ergative alignment	
PLURAL	CLASS I	CLASS II	CLASS III	
	“man”	“cloud”	“water”	
A	<i>antuhs-es</i>	<i>alp-es</i>	<i>weten-antes</i>	equi-pollent DAM
S	<i>antuhs-es</i>	<i>alp-es</i>	<i>widār-∅</i>	privative DSM
P	<i>antuhs-us</i>	<i>alp-us</i>	<i>widār-∅</i>	privative DPM
accusative alignment			ergative alignment	

5. The so-called typological parallels for Anatolian: instrumental ablatives as agentive subject in Blackfoot and Jacaltec (p. 34-39)

Having rejected split-ergativity in Anatolian, Patri needs to explain why Anatolian subjects still receive differential treatment. In order to show that such a treatment does not depend on syntactic alignment, and also to prepare the reader for the synchronic analysis of *-anza* as an instrumental ablative, Patri adduces one accusative and one ergative language that code subjects differently depending on animacy, namely Blackfoot (Algonquian<sup>27</sup>) and Jacaltec (Maya<sup>28</sup>). Both languages seem to use instrumentals to code inanimate subjects in A-function.

As in Hittite, Blackfoot noun stems belong to two grammatical classes, animate gender and inanimate gender (Frantz 1991, 7). As in Hittite, there is a correlation with semantic animacy, but certainly not a perfect one: semantically inanimate or ‘non-sentient’ noun stems may be grammatically animate. In Blackfoot, this group

---

more consistent with the existence of a derivational morpheme */-ant-/* that starts grammaticalizing into the ergative endings */-ants/* and */-antes/*.

<sup>27</sup> Blackfoot is actually not an accusative language. It has neutral alignment of verbal person marking with animate participants in independent clauses (which show the most complex verbal morphology). I will exemplify this for the singular. The first person prefix is always *nit-*, the second person prefix is always *kit-*, the third person suffix is always *-wa*, the fourth person suffix is always *-yi(ni)* (for S-function, see Frantz 1991, 22, for A-function and P-function see p. 51, 53).

<sup>28</sup> Jacaltec shows partial ergative alignment of verbal person marking (Grinevald Craig 1977, 106-110).

contains noun stems such as *isttoán* “knife”, *ksisíís* “thorn”, *atapíím* “doll” (Frantz 1991, 8). These non-sentient nouns, incapable of exercising will, cannot occur as the subject of a transitive clause, compare (1) (Patri’s ex. 1.13a) with (2) (Patri’s ex. 1.13b)<sup>29</sup>:

(1)	<i>oma</i>	<i>ninaawa</i>	<i>ikahksínima</i>	<i>annistsi</i>	<i>ikkstsíksiistsi</i>
	om-wa	ninaa-wa	ikahksini-m-wa	ann-istsi	ikkstsíksi-istsi
	DEM-3S.AN	man-3S.AN	cut-TI-3S.AN	DEM-PL.IN	branch-PL.IN

“That man cut off those branches” (Frantz *apud* Patri p. 36)

(2)	* <i>oma</i>	<i>isttoána</i>	<i>ikahksínima</i>	<i>annistsi</i>	<i>ikkstsíksiistsi</i>
	om-wa	isttoán-wa	ikahksini-m-wa	ann-istsi	ikkstsíksi-istsi
	DEM-3S.AN	knife-3S.AN	cut-TI-3S.AN	DEM-PL.IN	branch-PL.IN

“That knife cut off those branches” (Frantz 1991, 45)

Ex. (2) is however perfectly possible in contexts where the knife is personified and capable of willful action (Frantz 1991, 45 n. 48). But then Patri diverts from Frantz’ description by claiming that inanimate nouns in transitive subject function are marked on the verb by means of the ablative-instrumental affix *iiht-* (p. 36, also see p. 37):

Lorsque, pour les besoins de la communication, il est nécessaire d’exprimer qu’un procès transitif a pour sujet une entité inanimée, un affixe *iihp-* (*iiht-*) co-référent au sujet [...] est introduit dans la construction afin de rendre possible l’expression d’une manipulation du patient. (p. 36)

But according to Frantz (1991, 45, also see p. 40 n. 41), Patri’s source for Blackfoot, grammatically animate but semantically inanimate nouns do *not* occur in A-function. In Frantz’ own words (from the same page as mentioned by Patri):

Transitive verbs of Blackfoot require subjects which are animate, and this animacy apparently must be real, *i.e.* it is not a gender requirement but a requirement that the subject must reference an entity which is capable of exercising will.

Frantz continues with how to express the Blackfoot equivalent of English “That knife cut off those branches”. In such a case Blackfoot requires the unspecified

---

<sup>29</sup> The glossing in this article follows the Leipzig Glossing Rules (see <http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php>). Abbreviations not in the Leipzig Glossing Rules are AN = animate, ASP = aspect, COLL = collective, DIR = directional, IN = inanimate, IND = individuating, MED = medio-passive, PTC = particle, TI = transitive verb with inanimate object theme suffix.

subject form of the verb, *'p* or *hp*<sup>30</sup>. In transitive verbs with inanimate plural objects this so-called 21-morpheme takes the shape *'pi* < *'p-yi*. The semantically inanimate logical subject<sup>31</sup> “that knife”, which can never be the *grammatical* subject, is marked on the verb by means of the prefix *iiht* “with, by”, *i.e.* the equivalent of an instrumental of means or agent<sup>32</sup>:

(3)	<i>oma</i>	<i>isttoána</i>	<i>iihtsíkahksinii'pi</i>	<i>annistsi</i>	<i>ikkstsíksiistsi</i>
	om-wa	isttoán-wa	iiht-síkahksini-'p-yi	ann-istsi	ikkstsíksi-istsi
	DEM-3S.AN	knife-3S.AN	INS-cut-TI-PL.IN	DEM-PL.IN	branch-PL.IN
	“That knife cut off those branches”				

The literal translation according to Frantz (1991, 45) is “by means of the knife, the branches were cut off”<sup>33</sup>. According to Patri however, this same example shows an instrumental transitive subject. Unfortunately, it is also one of the very few examples in Patri’s book without glosses. With glosses, Patri would not have overlooked that there are more formal features than *iiht* where the verbs of (3) and (1)-(2) differ from each other. It would have become clear that the verb *iihtsíkahksinii'pi* contains *'p*, the marker of the unspecified subject, which means that there is *no explicit subject in the clause*. In other words, *isttoán* “knife” is not the grammatical subject. Even though *isttoán* “knife” is the logical subject, it still remains an instrumental adjunct (Ritter/Thomas Rosen 2010, 139).

Patri’s treatment of inanimate transitive subjects in Jacaltepec is likewise flawed. In Jacaltepec, semantically inanimate nouns cannot occur as the subject of a transitive clause (Patri p. 36, his ex. 1.14 b). To express “the wind closed the door”, *cake* “the wind” must be preceded by *yu* “with/by/because of” (Patri’s ex. 1.14 c):

<sup>30</sup> The suffix *'p* or *hp* is a variant of the TI theme suffix *-m-* (Frantz 1991, 44). The morpheme *'p* or *hp* also covers *we*-inclusive (speaker, addressee and perhaps others; see Frantz 1991, 22 with n. 18, p. 43).

<sup>31</sup> One should be aware of certain terminological confusion regarding the term *subject* (Seuren 1998, 120ff., especially p. 127). Frantz uses ‘logical subject’ to denote the entity that is responsible for an action or process, but in other literature it may denote the topic or theme. In French both *sujet logique* and *sujet réel* are sometimes simply equated with *sujet tout court* (Lauwers 2004, 294). This could perhaps explain why Patri seems to take the logical subject as grammatical subject in Blackfoot. Personally I prefer not to use the term ‘logical subject’.

<sup>32</sup> Patri (p. 37) erroneously classifies the affixes *iihp-* and its allomorphs *-ohp* and *-omoph* as instrumental-ablative markers. Both *iiht-* and *iihp-* may indeed be translated as *with* or *avec*, but that does not mean they are the same. On the contrary, *iihp-* is the *associative* (English/French equivalent “I ate the meat with bread/*j’ai mangé la viande avec du pain*”) and *iiht-* is amongst others the *instrument, source, means* (English/French equivalent “He was hit with/by a stick/*il a été frappé avec/par un bâton*”) (Frantz 1991, 94-95).

<sup>33</sup> Jason Merchant (pers. comm.) suggests that in cases like (3) the Algonquian languages either have null pronominal “someones” as subjects, or that *-p* indexes one. The most literal translation would therefore not be a passive clause but “With that knife, someone cut off those branches”.

- (4) *xpehi*      *te'*      *pulta*      *yu*      *cake*  
close            CLF/the    door            by      wind  
'the door was closed by the wind'  
'the wind closed the door' (Grinevald Craig 1977, 75, ex. 81)

But Patri then states that *yu cake* is the subject of this clause (p. 36):

Pour qu'un sujet inanimé puisse être substitué à un animé [...] dans une construction transitive, il doit obligatoirement être introduit par le relateur adpositionnel *yu*.

It is however very clear from Grinevald Craig's work that the NP *yu cake* remains an oblique NP, despite Patri's assertions:

Those inanimate agents which cannot be subjects of transitives<sup>34</sup> appear in agentive prepositional phrases (1977, 75, page referred to by Patri).

While subjects of transitive verbs are restricted to animate direct agents, instrumentals and indirect agents appear as oblique NPs in basic sentences (Craig 1976, 111).

What Patri does not mention is that in certain contexts semantically inanimate nouns are indeed allowed as the subject in transitive clauses, but with a very different syntax from what Patri presents. In question clauses for example, inanimate agentive instrumentals obligatorily behave like subjects of transitive verbs (Grinevald Craig 1977, 16, page referred to by Patri; also see 1977, 76 and Craig 1976, 114-117 on instrumental subjects):

[W]hen an instrumental NP is questioned, it becomes the surface structure subject of the sentence, while the original human subject becomes an agent phrase [...] (1977, 16).

A significant characteristic of the derived instrumental subjects is their violation of semantic properties. They violate the selectional restrictions of transitive verbs which take only animate agents for subjects (1976, 117).

As in English, Jacaltec question words are fronted. When the object of a preposition is questioned, the regular word order of preposition + noun is reversed (Grinevald Craig 1977, 14), clearly in order to front the question word. In the case of the inanimate question word *tzet* + *yu* 'by/with what?' however, *yu* is omitted. In addition, the verb receives a special suffix *-n(i)*, otherwise only seen with fronted animate transitive subjects (Grinevald Craig 1977, 212). The verb also loses its ergative marker, and the original actor (the logical subject) is demoted to an agentive prepositional phrase. Compare (5) with (6):

---

<sup>34</sup> Transitive verbs of complete destruction allow inanimate subjects (Grinevald Craig 1977, 74). However, Grinevald *nowhere* states anything that would justify the statement "le sujet est *sémantiquement* perçu chez les locuteurs comme animé (Grinevald 1977, 74)" (Patri p. 47).



- (5) *x-ø-in-tzoc'i-c'oj*      *te'*      *te'*      *y-u*      *ch'en*      *machit*      *an*  
 ASP-3ABS-1ERG-cut-DIR      CLF/the      tree      3ERG-with      CLF      machete      I/me  
 I cut the tree with the machete (Craig 1976, 115, ex. 57)
- (6) *tzet*      *x-ø-\_-tzoc'-ni-c'oj*      *te'*      *te'*      *haw-u*  
 what:IN      ASP-3ABS-ERG-cut-SUFF-DIR.      CLF /the      tree      2ERG-by  
 What did you cut the tree (with)? (Craig 1976, 115, ex. 58)

Most importantly, instrumental transitive subjects are not accompanied by *yu*, and they are always fronted. The sentence that according to Patri shows the inanimate transitive subject *cake* (4), has *cake* in sentence final position marked with the instrumental marker *yu*. (4) is therefore simply a clause with an unspecified subject and with *cake* “wind” as instrumental NP.

To conclude, a correct reading of the literature shows that Blackfoot and Jacaltec cannot be adduced as evidence for instrumental marking of inanimate subjects in A-function. Unlike the Anatolian languages, Blackfoot and Jacaltec belong to those languages that simply avoid semantically inanimate transitive subjects<sup>35</sup>.

Patri's treatment of these so-called typological parallels exposes a serious problem (other than the persistent misrepresentation of the secondary literature). It is crucial to distinguish between the inherent semantics of nouns and the syntax and morphological coding of these nouns. In this particular case we see confusion of coding for syntactic function and semantics. In Blackfoot and Jacaltec there are semantic selectional rules that restrict the syntactic function of transitive subject to animate agents. Nouns that have semantically inanimate referents, *whether they are grammatically coded or treated as inanimate or animate*, cannot occur in this function. Thus, the semantics of Blackfoot and Jacaltec nouns imposes restrictions on the syntactic functions of those nouns.

In the Anatolian languages on the other hand, the selectional rule for transitive subjects is one of morphological coding. Semantically animate and agentive, willful nouns that belong to the neuter class, such as <sup>MUNUS.MEŠ</sup>*hazgarai*, a type of female temple personnel,<sup>36</sup> and *antuhsatar* “mankind, population” cannot occur in A-function unless suffixed with *-anza*. Inanimate agentive nouns that belong to the common gender class on the other hand are perfectly acceptable in A-function<sup>37</sup> (for a list see Garrett 1990b, 271 n. 15).

<sup>35</sup> For a discussion of Differential Agent Marking and the avoidance strategy see Fauconnier 2011.

<sup>36</sup> See Hoffner 1998, 37ff. for a discussion of the stems of this neuter noun. Further see most recently Soysal 2010, 340ff.

<sup>37</sup> The fact that there are also inanimate *common* gender nouns (Class II nouns) that take *-anza* in A-function (for an overview see Zeilfelder 2001, 172f.) can hardly be considered a counter-argument against the ergative alignment of neuter nouns. Languages with optional ergative case-marking, for example for nouns to the left of obligatory ergative marking, are known since the 1960s (McGregor 2009, 493f.).

Lastly, Patri adduces Japanese to illustrate how inanimate entities still can occur in A-function, even though A-function is reserved for animate entities (p. 48). In Japanese inanimate entities in A-function may be marked as instrumental:

Comme dans les langues algonquines et mayas, le moyen employé pour qu'un nom sémantiquement interprété comme inanimé dans U prenne place en A consiste, entre autres choses, à lui attribuer les propriétés d'un instrumental (ici stipulé par le relateur *de* – 1.25b) (p. 48).

The example to show this however (Patri's ex. 1.25b = (7)), does *not* contain a transitive subject inanimate entity, even though Patri's translation suggests otherwise:

- (7) *taihuu de mado ga kowareta*  
 typhoon INS window SBJ briser-3s (Patri's gloss<sup>38</sup>)  
*kowa-re-ta*  
 break-PASS-PST (my gloss)  
 le typhon a cassé la fenêtre (Patri's translation)  
 Because of the typhoon, the window was broken (my translation)

The verb *kowareta* contains the passive marker *-re-*, and *mado* “window” is the subject, as *ga* indicates. Patri contrasts this clause with his ex. 1.25a<sup>39</sup>, the active counterpart of the above example:

- (8) *taihuu ga mado o kowasita*  
 typhoon SBJ window OBJ briser-3s (Patri's gloss)  
*kowasi<sup>40</sup>-ta*  
 break-PST (my gloss)  
 le typhon a cassé la fenêtre.

Indeed, in both clauses *taihuu* “typhoon” causes the breaking of the window, and therefore assumes the semantic role of Actor, more specifically that of non-controlling agent or causer, but *syntactically* it receives a different treatment, depending on whether the verb is active or passive. It is as if Patri claims that *I* and *by me* in *I hit John* and *John was hit by me* are both coded as transitive subjects.

I cannot escape the conclusion that Patri neither consistently distinguishes between semantic and grammatical animacy, nor between semantic agent and syntactic agent (= transitive subject A, Patri p. 31 n. 15).

<sup>38</sup> Pace Patri's gloss the Japanese verb does not inflect for person and number.

<sup>39</sup> It is confusing that this same clause, *\*taihuu ga mado o kowasita* is used as the standard example to illustrate the impossibility of inanimate transitive subjects, witness the asterisk (Kuno 1973, 30 (referred to by Patri), Palmer 1994, 29).

<sup>40</sup> The verb *kowasi* is a continuative form (Namiki 2010, 2373).

Patri's indiscriminate use of the terms *animacy* and *agency* has led him to the misrepresentation of others who do consistently distinguish between morpho-syntactic and semantic animacy and agency. For example, when Patri discusses Luraghi's description of the distribution of ablatives in Hittite (p. 41 n. 26) he remarks:

Il n'est pas correct de décrire la flexion hittite comme le fait Luraghi 1997: 19, en disant que «only inanimate nouns could occur in the ablative in Old Hittite»; cette affirmation est contredite par des témoignages comme *askaz* [...] (*aska-* «porte»), *halmassuittaz* [...] (*halmassuitt-* «trône») ...

Indeed, if Luraghi's use of the term (in)animate would have covered both semantic animacy *and* grammatical gender, then she would have been wrong. But this is not the case:

Although virtually all neuter nouns are inanimate, nouns belonging to the common gender are both animate and inanimate (Luraghi 1997, 7).

Since Luraghi mentions here that inanimate nouns can also be common gender, her “only inanimate nouns could occur in the ablative in Old Hittite” covers also those inanimates that are common gender<sup>41</sup>.

#### 6. Formal expression of the transitive subject (p. 39-49)

The next step in Patri's argumentation is based on (a) the fact that in Blackfoot and Jacaltec the ablative-instrumental denotes inanimate entities in A-function (for a refutation see section 5), (b) the claim that modifiers of nouns with *-anza* marking show partial concord (assuming that *-anza* subjects are common gender, see figure 5 above) and (c) Garrett's derivation of Hittite *-anza* from a Proto-Anatolian instrumental-ablative *\*-anti*, allomorph of *\*-ati*. By combining these three observations Patri formulates the thesis that since *-anza* and its cognates are formally and functionally not different from the ablative-instrumental (“et que, par sa forme comme par ses emplois (§ 1.7.3.), celui-ci ne diffère en rien d'une marque

---

<sup>41</sup> The assumption that Patri perhaps did not read the whole work is not warranted, because on p. 32 he quotes the sentence that immediately follows my quote from Luraghi 1997, 7, “neuter nouns, rather than inanimate, can better be described as inactive, given the constraint that they cannot occur as a subject of action verbs” (also see pp. 21, 24, both referring to Luraghi 1997, 7-8). But this is not the only time Luraghi is misrepresented. Luraghi's (1987, 361) “the accusative only marks direct objects of transitive verbs”, qualified by Patri as “sûrement incorrecte” (p. 119) is part of a discussion of how direct and indirect objects are marked in the Indo-European languages: “Hittite, on the contrary, does not allow the accusative to mark an animate indirect object” (Luraghi 1987, 361). Taken out of context it seems as if Luraghi claims here that there is a one-on-one relationship of accusative and direct object. That is not the case, as Patri could have seen on p. 361 (with n. 14 on p. 370) where Luraghi refers to the accusative of motion. Also see Luraghi 1986, 26ff. and 1997, 10 for a description of the different functions of the accusative in Old Hittite.

d'ablatif-instrumental", p. 41), they are synchronically ablative-instrumental case endings (p. 39):

La thèse que je voudrais à présent soutenir est que les données anatoliennes sont pleinement conformes au modèle dégagé par les données de la typologie et que, par son rôle comme par son statut, la marque hitt. *-anza*, louv. *-anti-*, lyc. *-ēti* prise en position A par les noms qui, partout ailleurs qu'en positions A sont identifiés comme inanimés est celle du cas ablatif-instrumental de la flexion nominale.

Patri's proof consists of the following elements:

1. the ablative *-anza* is a variant of the regular ablative ending *-(a)z* (p. 39-43), and the same alternation occurs with the subjects on *-anza* and *-az* (p. 43-44);
2. a discussion of the syntax of the ablative proper (p. 45-46, 49-51) and the syntax of the ablative in A-function (p. 49-62).

*ad 1. Morphophonology of the Anatolian ablative-instrumental case-ending*

Patri (p. 39f.) follows Garrett's analysis (1990b, 276f.) that *-anza /-ants/* is a morphologically conditioned variant of the nominal ablative *-az /-ats/*, based on the following reconstructed distribution: at a certain moment in Proto-Anatolian, ablatives of *-r/n-* neuters regularly took the shape */-ants/*, whereas all other nouns took */-ats/*. Still in prehistoric times */-ants/* spread to other neuters but not to the common gender nouns (p. 40). In attested Hittite the correlation between noun class and coding of the ablative had become quite weak: *-az* is again found with both genders (p. 43) although *-anza* ablatives still do not occur with common gender nouns<sup>42</sup>. The spread of *-az* in neuters at the cost of *-anza* was further supported by the independent phonetic phenomenon of loss of nasal in the context */V--ts/* (p. 42).

If the morpheme in A-function is not only diachronically but also synchronically the same case ending as the ablative *-az / -anza*, then the development presented above should also apply to *-az / -anza* in A-function. At any stage the ratio *-az : -anza* should therefore be the same for both. Thus, *-anza* in A-function should originally have been restricted to *-r/n-* neuters, then should have spread to other neuters, partially replacing *-az* in A-function. Finally, in attested Hittite *-az* should have started gaining ground again through the nasal loss in the context */V--ts/*.

These predictions are not borne out by the data. Thus far the *-anza* ablative is only attested with the following nouns and adjectives, in more or less chronological order (also see Hoffner/Melchert 2008, 77):

---

<sup>42</sup> But see the *-anza* ablative of *ispant-* c. "night" in *namma=as GE<sub>6</sub>-anza parā uwada[nzi]* "[They] lead them out by night" KUB 1.11 iv 45 (MH/MS). The regular ablative is *ispantaz* whereas *GE<sub>6</sub>-anza* represents *\*ispantanza*.

<i>luttai-</i> n.	[ <sup>GI</sup> Š]luttanza “through the window” (OS, KBo 8.42 obv. 2’, OH/NS, KUB 17.5 i 24’ with dupl. KUB 17.6 i 19’), id. <i>luttianza</i> (OH/NS, KBo 21.95 i 11’)
<i>hassātar</i> n.	<i>hassannanza</i> “from the family” (OH/MS?, KUB 11.1 iv 24’)
<i>ispant-</i> c.	GE <sub>6</sub> -anza “by night” (MH/MS, KUB 1.11 iv 45)
<i>eshar</i> n.	<i>ishananza</i> “from blood” (MH/NS, KUB 39.102 i 1)
<sup>GI</sup> ŠTUKUL-li n.	<sup>GI</sup> ŠTUKUL-anza “with weapons” (MH/NS, KUB 23.11 ii 9’)
GÛB-la- adj.	GÛB-anzi(=ya) “at the left side” (lateMH-earlyNH/NS, KUB 24.14 i 13)
<i>papratar</i> n.	<i>paprannanza</i> “from uncleanness” (NH, KUB 12.58 iv 2)
<i>uttar</i> n.	<i>uddananza</i> “with words (of impurity)” (NH, KUB 7.53 i 6), “by the words (of the Sungod)” (NH, KUB 12.58 iv 27)
<i>assu-</i> , adj.	[IŠ]TU GEŠTIN SIG <sub>5</sub> -anza “with good wine” (NH, KUB 16.9 ii 6 <sup>43</sup> )
<i>sam(a)lu-</i> n.	ḪAŠḪUR-luwanza “with the apple” (NH, KBo 13.241 rev. 16’)
<i>tuppi-</i> n.	<i>annalaz tuppianza</i> “according to the former tablet” (NH, ABoT 1.14 iii 18-19)

The -az morpheme in A-function is found with the following neuter lexemes<sup>44</sup>:

<i>antuhsatar</i> n.	UN.MEŠ-annaza “population, people” (NH, KUB 1.1 i 30)
<i>assu</i> n.	āssauwaza “good” (NH, KUB 5.3 iv 6)
<i>eshar</i> n.	<i>ishanaza</i> “blood(shed)” (MH/NS, KUB 9.34 ii 46)
<i>happessar</i> n.	<sup>UZU</sup> ÚR-za (= *happesnaza) “bodypart” (NS, KBo 4.2 ii 10)
<i>hazkarai-</i> n.pl. <sup>45</sup>	<sup>MUNUS.MEŠ</sup> hazqaraiyaza, women in temple service (NH, KBo 2.13 obv. 19 <i>et passim</i> ) <sup>46</sup>
<i>pahhur</i> n.	<i>pahhuenaza</i> “fire” (NS, KBo 12.128 rt. col. 5)
<i>walwalla</i> n.pl.	[ <sup>LÚ.MEŠ</sup> ]walwallaza “lion-men” (NH, KBo 26.158 i 7’), <sup>rLÚ.MEŠ</sup> walwalla[z] (NS, KBo 53.134 ii 3)
<i>watar</i> n.	A-az (= *witenaz) “water” (MH/NS, KBo 10.45 iv 38)

The 11 lexemes that show -anza in ablative function besides the regular form on -az, amount to nothing compared to the number of neuters with only the ablative -az. The reverse, although less extreme, applies to the lexemes that show -anza in A-function. There are ca. 60 lexemes with -anza in A-function, 8 of which also show -az. In short, the regular form of the ablative is overwhelmingly -az, while it is -anza for the A-form.

The very different ratios for the endings in A-function and ablative function are sufficient proof to reject Patri’s hypothesis that both are synchronically the same. There is more, however. Patri has neglected the chronological distribution. He lists

<sup>43</sup> [... IŠ]TU GEŠTIN SIG<sub>5</sub>-anza EGIR-pa sunnan<sup>r</sup>zi “they fill [...] again with good wine”.

<sup>44</sup> Patri (p. 43) lists SUD-liza “emptiness” as ablative on -az in A-function. This is impossible. The ablative of non-Ablauting i-stems is -i(y)az. With CHD Š 162a, SUD-li.za is probably an abbreviated form of the ergative SUD-lianza (= sannapilianza).

<sup>45</sup> For a lexical and etymological study of the *hazkarai*-women see Soysal 2010.

<sup>46</sup> For a list of attestations, see Hoffner 1998, 37ff. All attestations but one (KUB 46.22 i 8’, [h]azkaranza) are spelled -az(a).

a few lexemes that have transitive subjects in *-az* (p. 44, 50), all of which also show the regular form *-anza*, but fails to notice that the *-az* forms are only attested in NH documents or NS copies of MH compositions. In other words, the occurrence of *-az* in A-function is not only a rather rare but also a *late* phenomenon. The ablative *-az* on the other hand is anything but a late phenomenon: it is the regular form in all phases of attested Hittite.

Kimball (1999, 317f.) describes the loss of nasals before dentals, velar stops, and the affricate *z*. This nasal loss is basically a NH phenomenon. Thus, the mostly NH occurrences of *-az* = /-ats/ subjects besides *-anza* = /-ants/ is simply part of a much broader phonological phenomenon. *Pace Patri* (p. 44) nasal loss fully accounts for the alternation of *-az* and *-anza* in A-function, whereas it cannot possibly account for the absence of the nasal in the ablative /-ats/<sup>47</sup>.

Turning to Luwian, there are two options for the A-morpheme *-antis*. Garrett (1990b, 277) suggests that the Hittite situation is inherited, reflecting Proto-Anatolian *\*-anti* besides *\*-ati*. The fact that Luwian only preserved the regular form *-ati* is not surprising “since the *anza*-ablative is marginal even in Hittite” (1990b, 277). The Luwian ablative *\*-anti* only survived in the Luwian ergative singular *\*-anti*, reanalyzed as *-antis*<sup>48</sup>. *Patri* on the other hand suggests that the development of an ablative *-anza* besides *-az* through a conditioned insertion of a nasal is a Hittite innovation that could also have occurred independently in Luwian and Lycian (p. 40). But then *Patri* makes a surprising error by claiming that it is much simpler to derive Luwian *-antis* from a preform *\*-ants* through *i*-mutation (p. 40-41):

D'autre part, la mise en évidence par Starke [...] ouvre la possibilité d'envisager plusieurs autres mécanismes pour expliquer lyc. *-ēti* et louv. *-ant-* dont le plus simple serait un changement *\*-ants* → *\*-ant-i-s* sur la base d'une réinterprétation de la consonne finale comme d'un morphème de nominatif.

However, the only explanation for a Luwic preform *\*-ants* is to analyze *\*-ants* as a derivational morpheme *-ant-* followed by the nominative singular ending *-s*. Since *Patri* rejects the derivational approach (p. 21-25), he must mean something else in order to preserve the thesis that we are dealing with an inherited case ending. The crucial element in the quote above is the phrase ‘d'une réinterprétation de la consonne finale comme d'un morphème de nominatif’. In *Patri*'s view the *\*s* of the alleged proto-Luwic form *\*-ants* is *reanalyzed* as a nominative ending. This can only mean that *Patri* treats the *-s* as an integral part of an alleged Luwic ablative ending

<sup>47</sup> It is generally assumed that the occurrence of an etymologically unexpected *-n-* is caused by remote assimilation to another nasal (Garrett 1990b, 276, *Patri* p. 39f., Hoffner/Melchert 2008, 43 (§ 1.121) and p. 129 (§ 4.110), both with further references). The *-n-* ablatives of *luttai-* n. “window”, *assu-*, adj. “good” and *tuppi-* n. “tablet”, which do not show a nasal in any form of the lexeme, must be explained as a very limited generalization.

<sup>48</sup> For the proposed development of Luwian *\*-anti* into the attested form *-antis*, see Garrett 1990b, 290.

\*-ants besides regular \*-ati<sup>49</sup>. But since Luwian never went through a development \*-ti > \*-ts, Patri's suggestion is impossible.

*ad 2. Syntactic behavior of instrumental-ablatives and subjects in A-function* (p. 45-46, 49-59)

Patri starts his treatment of the syntax of the -anza subject with a modification of Garrett's scenario. According to Garrett (1990b, 277), transitive clauses with instrumental ablative and without overt subject were reanalyzed as transitive clauses with an overt subject, with the ablative ending now functioning as an ergative ending.

According to Patri the crucial point is

qu'il n'existe, en fait, nul critère syntaxique à même de justifier comment un constituant à l'ablatif-instrumental passe d'un rôle potentiellement agentif à celui d'agent identifié comme tel, précisément d'après sa forme à l'ablatif-instrumental (p. 51).

Instead, it is the discourse context that limits the options to either the instrumental ablative interpretation or to the A-function interpretation. Syntactically they are the same according to Patri (p. 51).

However, already in Old Hittite the -anza subject and the ablative were treated differently: the ablative in ablative function always takes the ablative-instrumental possessive clitic (see CHD Š, 325a) while -anza in A-function takes the nominative possessive clitic: compare [tug]g-az=smit "from their [bo]dy" (OS, KBo 17.7 iv 7') with tuekk-anza=ssis "his body" (OS, KBo 6.2 ii 54, Patri's ex. 1.29). In fact, Patri is also aware of this, because he observes that the syntax of noun phrases in A-function is often different from the syntax of noun phrases in ablative function (p. 52). Noun phrases in A-function show *accord partielle*, and those in ablative function *accord canonique* (p. 53f.). Patri therefore immediately nullifies his own claim that there is syntactically no difference between the two.

Transitive subjects on -anza agree with common gender possessive clitics<sup>50</sup>, the adjectively used pronouns *kas*<sup>51</sup>, *kuis*<sup>52</sup>, *apas*<sup>53</sup>, and *kuiski*<sup>54</sup>, and either adjectives in -s<sup>55</sup> or in -anza<sup>56</sup>. Following Corbett's Agreement Hierarchy (Corbett 1979, 2006, 206ff.), attributive modifiers are the most likely to follow syntactic agreement patterns (agreement *ad formam*), with predicates, relative pronouns, and personal pronouns

<sup>49</sup> Patri does recognize that Proto-Anatolian \*-adi (*sic!*) leads to Hittite -az /-ats/ but continues as Luwian -adi (p. 39). However, the Proto-Anatolian ablative is \*-ti (Melchert 1994, 183 *et passim*), and Proto-Anatolian \*-di remains -di in Hittite (Melchert 1994, 118).

<sup>50</sup> ex. 1.29 (OH/OS, -sis).

<sup>51</sup> ex. 1.4a (MH/MS).

<sup>52</sup> ex. 1.18c (MH/NS).

<sup>53</sup> ex. 1.1c (NH).

<sup>54</sup> ex. 1.28c (NH).

<sup>55</sup> ex. 1.28a (MH/NS, adjective *suppis*), b (OH/MS, adjective *istarniyas*).

<sup>56</sup> ex. 1.28c (NH, adjective *ḫUL-uwanza*), d (MH/NS, adjective *idālawanza*).

more likely to show semantic agreement (agreement *ad sensum*), increasing from left to right:

attributive > predicate > relative pronoun > personal pronoun

Anatolian attributes are therefore expected to exhibit the gender, number and case of their head noun. Given that lack of agreement and concord within Hittite noun phrases is rare<sup>57</sup>, we are fully entitled to analyze *-anza* formally as common gender, singular and nominative. However, in order to maintain that subjects in *-anza* are common gender but still synchronically ablative (p. 28, 52f.), Patri is forced to ignore number agreement and case concord. True mismatches in case concord are to my knowledge not (yet) recorded for Hittite<sup>58</sup>, so it is quite a claim that this would be the case here, especially since all types of attributes, –possessive clitics, pronouns and adjectives,– carry the ablative-instrumental ending in noun phrases in ablative function.

Nevertheless, this alleged lack of agreement and concord between a modifier and the ‘ablative-instrumental’ *-anza* head noun seems to find support in the typological literature given the following statement (Patri p. 52):

Une propriété remarquable des relations entre le nom et ses modifieurs dans le cadre du constituant nominal (Rijkhoff 2004) est que l'accord ne fonctionne pas de façon similaire selon que le sujet d'un verbe transitif est au nominatif ou à l'ablatif-instrumental.

The reference to Rijkhoff, combined with the ‘parallel’ provided by the so-called inanimate transitive subjects in Blackfoot and Jacaltec (p. 36-38), might lead to the inference that lack of case concord especially with subjects coded as instrumentals is not uncommon. That inference turns out to be incorrect. Rijkhoff does not discuss case concord within the noun phrase, and, for example, Blake (2001) in his monograph on case never mentions lack of case concord in those languages that mark both modifier and head noun for case.

But even if we allow the unsupported assumption that lack of case concord is not an issue, we run into serious difficulties with number agreement. It is only possible to consider *-anza* as a number-indifferent ablative if one discards the Hittite plural subjects on *-antes* and the Luwian plurals on *-antinzi*. Of course, Patri does not ignore the existence of these plurals, but he relegates all neuters that show plural *-antes* in A-function to the class of nouns with derived stems on *-ant-* (p. 57-59). The

---

<sup>57</sup> For lack of agreement in Hittite see Hoffner/Melchert 2008, 239f.

<sup>58</sup> As a reviewer points out, the only exceptions are the NH instances of the enclitic possessive pronoun on *-it/-et* used for the vocative and dative-locative in copies of older texts (Hoffner/Melchert 2008, 141 (§ 6.11)). One such example is *uddani=mit* “to my word”, a dative-locative noun with nom.-acc. possessive clitic (in the ‘King of the Battle’ text KBo 22.6 i 10). This is not a true case of lack of concord but simply one of the many mistakes the scribe made in his attempt to archaize his text. On the archaizing tendencies of KBo 22.6 and duplicate, see Rieken 2001.



immediate consequence of this is that in the plural such complementary distributions as *uddanantes* “words” (from *uttar*) in A-function and *uddār* “id.” in S- and P-function are lost, but that we have ‘gained’ a derived lexeme *uddanant-* that as a plural is coincidentally only attested in A-function. In addition, the so-called number-indifferent ablative *uddananza* (ex. 1.28c, p. 53) is coincidentally never attested in a plural context in A-function, and finally, we must now also assess for each *uddananza* in singular context whether it is the nominative of the derived noun on *-ant-* or the ablative-instrumental in A-function.

Even though it is theoretically possible that all *-antes* forms belong to the derived nouns on *-ant-*, the already small likelihood of this taxonomy is reduced to almost nothing in view of an example such as (9), where an *-antes* form in A-function alternates with the neuter plural forms in S- and P-function in its immediate vicinity:

(9)	<i>tarahh-un=at=za</i>	UH <sub>7</sub> - <i>n-as</i>	ʾ <i>uddār</i> ʾ	[ <i>ammel</i> ]	<i>uddār</i>	[ <i>mazz</i> ]a-zzi
	conquer-	sorcery-GEN.S	word:ABS.PL	1S.GEN	word:ABS.PL	resist-3S.NPST
	1S.PST=3ABS=PTCL					
	<i>n=at=za</i>	<i>ammel</i>	<i>uddan-āntes</i>	<i>tar[hu]ēr</i>		
	CONN-3ABS=PTCL	1S.GEN	word-ERG.PL	conquer-3PL.PST		

I have conquered them (P), the words (P) of sorcery. [My] words (S) [endu]re, my words (A) have conquered them (P, i.e., the words of sorcery). (MH/NS, KUB 17.27 iii 8-9, ed. García Trabazo 2002, 552f.)

### 7. Lack of chronological organization of Patri’s corpus

As discussed in the previous section, Patri has overlooked the highly important diachronic development of the morphophonology of the subject in *-anza/-az* and the ablative in *-az/-anza*. There is yet another diachronic oversight, that of the attested development of the semantic functions of the ablative and instrumental in Hittite. In order to maintain that the Hittite ablative *-anza* functions like the instrumental in Blackfoot and Jacalteco (p. 45f.), *-anza* must represent an *instrumental* ablative (see Patri’s ex. 1.22).

Instrumental ablatives are indeed common in Hittite and of course in the Luwic languages where the reflex of *\*-ati* covers both instrumental and ablative. But since the *-anza* forms are securely attested in Old Script documents<sup>59</sup>, the ablative should already have been productive as instrumental of agent in Old Hittite. However, it has been known for quite a while now that the ablative of means and agent is a *post-OH* development (Melchert 1977, 431f., Hoffner/Melchert 2008, 267). So at least for the Old Hittite period Patri should have acknowledged that his model does not hold.

This lack of diachronic assessment is surprising because in the indices Patri presents all treated passages in chronological order (p. 224-226). Despite the

<sup>59</sup> The Old Script *-anza* subjects are *appuzianza* (KBo 25.107:6’ with NS dupl. VBoT 58 i 14’), *tuekkanza* (KBo 6.2 ii 54, cited by Patri), and perhaps also *kardianza* (OS?/MS?, KUB 8.43:3’).

implication that Patri evaluated his corpus from a diachronic perspective, the first counter-indication is that Patri was made aware of the chronological distribution of adjectives on *-s* and *-anza* by an anonymous referee (p. 56). When assessing Patri's discussion of this distribution, I noticed a few oddities in the dating of the relevant compositions and their ductus. Patri's example 1.1c, dated as Middle Hittite/Middle Script (*rédaction moyenne, copie moyenne*), is KUB 14.14, one of the famous Plague Prayers of the New Hittite king Mursili II, while his example 1.4a, dated New Hittite (*rédaction récente*), is HKM 25, one of the Middle Hittite/Middle Script Mašat letters (both p. 56).

This could have been a mistake were it not for the fact that we have stumbled here upon a second indication that Patri has maltreated the Hittite corpus from a chronological point of view. Important historical texts from the reigns of the Neo-Hittite Empire kings Mursili II, Muwatalli II, Hattusili III and Tudhaliya IV are listed as late copies of *Middle Hittite* texts (p. 225). Without claiming exhaustiveness, these are KBo 4.2, KBo 5.4, KBo 5.9, KUB 14.8, KUB 14.11, KUB 14.14, KUB 19.37 (all Mursili II), KUB 21.1, KUB 21.5 (both Muwatalli II), KBo 3.6, KUB 1.1, KUB 1.9, KUB 26.61 (all Hattusili III), Bo 86/299, KBo 4.10 (both Tudhaliya IV). This is not a mistake that perhaps occurred during the process of formatting the indices, because in the index on p. 210ff. (*Indices. 1. par langue et par publication*) all these texts are again classified as Middle Hittite compositions (*rédaction moyenne*) in new script ductus (*ductus récente*).

#### 8. Anaphoric resumption and enclitic pronouns (pp. 54, 62-68)

Patri (p. 63) rejects Garrett's suggestion that the Anatolian intransitive verbs can be split into unaccusatives and unergatives because Garrett uses only one formal criterion: that of the presence or absence of subject clitics. Garrett was aware of this limitation (1990a, 149), but he suggested to consider the distribution of possessor raising as an independent test for this type of intransitive split (1990a, 149f. n. 11). But instead of pursuing further syntactic study in order to support his rejection of the connection between subject clitics and intransitive verbs, Patri resorts to the pragmatic notion *emphasis*.

According to Patri the subject clitic is a marker for emphasis, and he illustrates this by contrasting two sentences that contain subject clitics (ex. 1.33 a, b) with one sentence with an intransitive verb without a subject clitic (ex. 1.34, p. 66). However, ex. 1.34 (here ex. (10)) does not represent an intransitive clause with a zero subject, but a transitive clause with *pai-* "to go" in the well-known phraseological construction. Patri has incorrectly omitted the part in (10) that is marked bold face:

(10)	<i>kāsa=wa</i>	<sup>LU.MEŠ</sup> <i>sapasalli-ēs</i>	<i>piye-nun</i>	<i>nu=wa</i>	<i>pāi-r</i>	<sup>URU</sup> <i>Taggast[a-n]</i>
	just=QUOT	<sup>nen</sup> scout-ACC.PL	send-1S.PST	CONN=QUOT	go-3PL.PST	<sup>city</sup> Taggasta-ACC.S
	<sup>URU</sup> <i>Ukuduip[u]na-nn=a</i>	<i>sapasiya-ua</i> <sup>n60</sup>	<i>dai-r]</i>			
	<sup>city</sup> Ukuduipuna-ACC.S=and	scout-SUPINE	set-3PL.PST			

<sup>60</sup> For this restoration see CHD Š, 205a.

I have just sent the scouts. So (= *pāir*) they have [begun] scouting the cities Taggasta and Ukuduipuna (MH/MS, HKM 7:4-6, ed. Alp 1991, 128f., translation follows CHD Š, 204b)

With the loss of the only ‘non-emphatic’ example to which the so-called ‘emphatic’ examples could be compared, there is no further evidence for Patri’s alternative solution. Also, given the fact that subject clitics only occur in *intransitive* clauses, the *coup de grâce* to Patri’s musings surely must be his conclusion that subject clitics are emphatic agentive forms in *transitive* clauses:

Dans les constructions transitives (*sic!*), les pronoms clitiques sujets des langues anatoliennes, ne sont pas moins des agents que des formes agentives emphatiques (p. 66).

To repeat, Garrett suggested split-intransitivity as an explanation for the distribution of subject clitics in the Anatolian languages, -subject clitics are only found with unaccusatives- but also concluded that only more research could prove (or disprove) his suggestion. Despite this *proviso*, Garrett’s results are descriptively solid. Even though the situation is less pronounced in Old Hittite where especially the intransitive verbs of motion are attested without enclitic subject pronoun (Garrett 1996, 101 fn. 7, Goedegebuure 1999, Luraghi 2010, 139f.), almost 100% of the post-Old Hittite unaccusative intransitive verbs without a full subject noun phrase are attested with an enclitic subject<sup>61</sup>. In terms of alignment we are therefore dealing with a tripartite system for the common gender enclitics: A, S, and P are all coded differently. We find A =  $\emptyset$ , S = *-as* and P = *-an* as singular forms, and in the plural we have  $\emptyset$ , *-e* and *-us* (in OH), and  $\emptyset$ , *-at* and *-as* (in post-OH), respectively. The core case enclitic pronouns that are used to resume neuter nouns are sg. *-at*, pl. *-e* (in OH) and pl. *-at* (in post-OH). These enclitics only occur in S- and P-function<sup>62</sup>.

Within the context of the present discussion on ergativity, pronominal resumption becomes relevant: how are A-function *-anza/-antes* nouns resumed in the next clause, and what happens when a neuter noun in S or P-function continues in the next clause in A-function?

Based on one’s stance towards *-anza/-antes* and assuming the derivational and inflectional hypotheses are mutually exclusive, there are two different predictions. Under the view that *-anza/-antes* nouns are common gender *-ant-* derivations of neuter nouns, new lexemes therefore, we expect this gender to continue in the next clause. This means that for the singular form we would like to find  $\emptyset$  for transitive subject, *-as* for intransitive subject and *-an* for object.

If *-anza* is treated as an inflectional ending, Patri’s theory and the ergative theory share the same prediction. Within Patri’s framework the gender of neuter nouns depends on syntactic function. Neuter nouns only become common gender in A-function. Hence, if the referents of these nouns occur in S- or P-function in a

---

<sup>61</sup> Impersonal verbs may behave differently. For a discussion see Patri p. 101ff., Garrett 1990c, 230.

<sup>62</sup> For the paradigm of the enclitic pronouns see Hoffner/Melchert 2008, 135 (§ 5.12), and see p. 280 (§ 18.13) for the restriction of the subject clitics to S-function.

resumptive clause, we do not expect the common gender forms (p. 54-55), but in A-function we would like to see the common gender form  $\emptyset$ . Within the ergative framework *-anza* nouns remain neuter, and that immediately entails the use of neuter resumptive pronouns for S- and P-function<sup>63</sup>. Since the neuter forms are reserved for S and P and other enclitics that mark A-function do not exist, by default A-function should be covered by  $\emptyset$ .

To my knowledge it has not been mentioned before that nouns in *-anza* may continue in A-function in a following clause. The following example shows how an *-anza* subject is resumed as  $\emptyset$  when it continues in A-function:

- (11) *nu k̄a-s mahhan witen-a[nza] hūman- $\emptyset$  parkunu-ski-zzi*  
 CONN this-NOM.S just as water-ERG.S all-ABS.S clean-IT-3S.NPST

*suppiyahhi-ski-zzi*  
 sanctify-IT-3S.NPST

[*k*]inun=*a*= $\emptyset$  sum-*ās* DINGIR.MEŠ QATAMMA parkunu-*ddu*  
 now=CONJ=3S you-ACC.PL god.PL likewise clean -3S.IMP

Just as this wat[er] (A) cleans (and) sanctifies everything, may it ( $\emptyset$ , A) also [n]ow likewise clean you, o gods! (KUB 43.58 i 43-45 (MH/MS), ed. CHD P, 170, Strauß 2006, 332, 343)

As hypothesized above, resumption by means of  $\emptyset$  is compatible with both the derivational and inflectional analysis. Which one to choose now depends on how S- and P-function are expressed. Garrett (1990b, 291, ex. 24), and Patri (p. 16 ex. 1.1.c) have identified two instances of resumptive neuter *-at* in S- and P-function, (12) and (13) respectively:

- (12) *suhha=ma=kan A-az ārr-i n=at=kan GAM <sup>GIŠ</sup>SEN-az ār<s>-zi*  
 roof:COLL=but=PTC water- ERG.S<sup>64</sup> wash- CONN=3S.ABS=PTC down drain-ABL flow-3S.NPST  
 3S.NPST

<sup>63</sup> But only if 3<sup>rd</sup> person enclitic pronouns pattern like their co-referential nouns. This is not always the case. Silverstein (1976, 220f.) shows that a language can have split-ergative case marking at the propositional level but accusative marking at the discourse level (that of anaphoric 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronouns).

<sup>64</sup> Alternatively one could analyze *A-az* as an instrumental ablative (“it (the flood) washes the roof with water”). This is unlikely because the rest of the text always uses the instrumental for instrument function: <sup>URUDU</sup>MAR-*it* (MS, KUB 7.41 i 6), *ì-it*, LĀL-*it* (NS, KBo 10.45 ii 15), *kessarta* (KBo 10.45 ii 28), <sup>NA4</sup>*kunkunuzit* (KUB 41.8 ii 76), *puruttit* (KUB 41.8 ii 79), *A-etenit* (KUB 41.8 iii 3), *IZI-it* (KBo 10.45 iii 48). The ablatives *ZAG-za* and *GÜB-laza* (NS, KUB 41.8 ii 44, ii 46-47) are not instrumental ablatives but ablatives of direction “at the right/left side”. On the improbability of *karitt-* “flood” as subject of “washing a roof with water” based on the contexts in which *karitt-* otherwise appears, see Garrett 1990b, 291.

(And just as the flood washes urine and mud from the city,) while water (A) washes the roofs and it (S) flows down the drains, (...) (KBo 10.45 iv 38-39 (MH/NS), with dupl. KUB 41.8 iv 36-37, Garrett 1990b, 291, ex. 24)

- (13) *nu* KUR<sup>URU</sup> *Hatti=ya* *apā-s* *ishan-anza* *arha* *namma* *zinn[-it]*  
 CONN land<sup>city</sup>Hatti=also that-NOM.S blood-ERG.S away further finish-  
 3S.PST

*n=at* KUR<sup>URU</sup> *GIDRU-ti=ya* *karū* *sarnik-ta*  
 CONN=3S.ABS land<sup>city</sup>Hatti=also already retribute-3S.PST

That blood(shed) (A) further finished off the land of Hatti too, so the land of Hatti too has already made restitution for it (P). (KUB 14.14 rev. 11-12 (NH), Patri p. 16 ex. 1.1.c)

These two examples would seem to provide enough evidence to reject the derivational analysis in favor of the two inflectional hypotheses. However, the duplicate of the text in (12) that likewise shows neuter resumption of A-az “pure water”, we also find two instances of common gender -as in intransitive clauses as a resumption of earlier *suppis* A-anza “pure water”:

- (14) Let the pure water (*suppis* A-anza, A-function) cleanse the evil tongue, uncleanliness, blood, sin, curse. Just as the wind disperses chaff and carries it across the sea, may it (∅, the pure water, A-function) also disperse the blood (and) uncleanliness of this house, and may it (∅, A-function) carry it across the sea.

*n=as=san* [(*anda*)] HUR.SAG-as *suppay-as* *pai-ddu*  
 CONN=3S=PTC into mountain-DAT/LOC.PL pure-DAT/LOC.PL go-3S.IMP

*n=as=kan* *hall[(ūw-as)]* *altann-as* *pai-ddu*  
 CONN=3S=PTC deep-DAT/LOC.PL spring-DAT/LOC.PL go-3S.IMP

Let it (S) go into the pure mountains, let it (S) go into the deep springs! (MH/NS, KUB 41.8 ii 20'-21', with dupl. KBo 10.54 ii 55-56, Otten 1961, 126f.)

The duplicate KBo 10.45 ii 55 on the other hand has twice *n=at=kan*, neuters in S-function therefore. Thus, KBo 10.45 treats -anza nouns as neuters in case of anaphoric resumption, whereas its duplicate KUB 41.8 alternates between treating -anza nouns as common or neuter gender.

The second question was how a neuter noun in S or P-function is resumed if it continues in A-function in the next clause. It turns out that in that case neuter nouns are resumed by ∅:

- (15) *kāsa* <sup>GIŠ</sup>*liti-∅* *ki-tta* *nu=∅* ŠA<sup>d</sup> *Telipinu* [(ZI)=ŠU] *iski-ddu*  
 here wood<sup>d</sup>*liti*-3ABS.S lie-3S.NPST.MED CONN=3S of deity<sup>d</sup>Telipinu soul=his anoint-3S.IMP  
 Here lies a *liti*-plant. Let it (∅, A) anoint Telipinu's soul. (OH<sup>2</sup>, MH<sup>2</sup>/MS, KUB 17.10 ii 22-23, with MS dupl. KBo 38.162: 3')

This behavior is only compatible with the inflectional hypotheses. The derivational hypothesis does not work if one accepts the common opinion that pronouns target properties of their antecedent. That means that for the choice of pronoun *only* the formal or semantic properties of the noun phrase <sup>GIŠ</sup>*liti* in the preceding clause are relevant, not of the properties of a putative noun phrase in the resumptive clause<sup>65</sup>. Formally <sup>GIŠ</sup>*liti* belongs to the class of neuter nouns<sup>66</sup>, and the resumptive pronoun should be neuter gender according to agreement *ad formam*. But also agreement with semantic aspects of <sup>GIŠ</sup>*liti* should lead to neuter pronominal resumption, because semantically <sup>GIŠ</sup>*liti* is still inanimate and incapable of exercising will.

According to Patri's hypothesis the gender of a lexeme is not fixed but depends on its syntactic function. A noun like <sup>GIŠ</sup>*liti* would need to take common gender in A-function, in this case as the transitive subject of *iskiya*- "anoint". As full noun phrase it would need to take the ablative ending *-anza*, but as enclitic it should be expressed as common gender  $\emptyset$ .

For New Hittite and partially for Middle Hittite the predictions of both the ablative and the ergative analysis regarding the enclitic pronouns are borne out by the data. Having earlier rejected Patri's analysis of *-anza* in A-function as ablative, the admittedly meager evidence points at ergative alignment of neuter gender enclitic pronouns besides the well-known tripartite alignment of common gender ones:

Figure 8: Coding of S, A and P for the enclitic pronouns

SINGULAR	CLASS I	CLASS II	CLASS III	
A	- $\emptyset$	- $\emptyset$	- $\emptyset$	no DAM
S	- <i>as</i>	- <i>as</i>	- <i>at</i>	equi-pollent DSM
P	- <i>an</i>	- <i>an</i>	- <i>at</i>	equi-pollent DPM
tripartite alignment			ergative alignment	

Conflicting evidence comes from one Middle Hittite text in late copy<sup>67</sup> where we both find common gender anaphora (14) and neuter gender anaphora (12) for *witenanza* "water" (< *watar* n.). That a Middle Hittite composition shows conflicting

<sup>65</sup> The derivational hypothesis only works if one reinstates the view that pronominalization involves the transformation of an underlying noun into a surface pronoun. We would have to assume that *liti* would have changed covertly into the derived noun *\*litiyant-*: *\*nu litiyanza ŠA<sup>d</sup>Telipinu [(ZI)=ŠU] iski-ddu*, followed by the transformation of underlying *\*litiyanza* to surface  $\emptyset$  (or simply the deletion of the noun). For a rejection of this transformational view see Garrett 1990b, 291.

<sup>66</sup> Add the nom.-acc.sg.n. <sup>GIŠ</sup>*li-i-ti* KUB 51.38: 6' to the attestations in CHD L-N, 72. There is one instance of a nom.sg.c. *le-e-ti-iš* (KUB 33.73 + 74 i 17').

<sup>67</sup> This same text not only shows the change of *-ant-* from derivational morpheme of individuation to ergative inflectional ending *-anza*, but also the replacement of *-ant-* by means of thematization to mark individuation of neuter nouns (see fn. 77).

evidence should not surprise us. As I will argue in the next section, Middle Hittite witnessed a transition from *-ant-* as derivational morpheme that created common gender nouns from neuters, to */-ants/* as ergative inflectional ending of neuter nouns. In Middle Hittite therefore we may expect both common and neuter gender forms for enclitic pronouns with *-anza* antecedents.

### 9. Conclusion<sup>68</sup>

Both from a synchronic and diachronic perspective the ending *-anza* in A-function cannot possibly be analyzed as an ablative, as is also argued by Melchert (2009, 2011), Rizza (2010, 148f.), and Yakubovich (fc).

The rejection of Patri's conclusions seems to leave us with the old situation that synchronically *-anza* is either the nominative singular of a derived common gender noun on *-ant-* accidentally only attested in A-function<sup>69</sup>, or it is the ergative singular of a neuter noun. However, this does not take into account the chronological distribution of agreement phenomena. The gender agreement of adjective and noun points at the first explanation for Middle Hittite compositions where we find both */-s/*<sup>70</sup> and */-ants/*<sup>71</sup> on adjectives modifying *-anza* ergatives. As of Neo-Hittite however, we only find */-ants/*. For all periods the lack of ergative case endings for the demonstrative pronouns and the possessive pronoun can be explained either as suppletion<sup>72</sup> or as ergative/nominative syncretism<sup>73</sup>.

The pronominal resumption of *-anza* nouns in Neo-Hittite and partially in Middle Hittite follows an ergative pattern (erg. Ø, abs. *-at*). This conclusively proves that Neo-Hittite *-anza* nouns are not derived common gender nouns but neuters. The Middle Hittite evidence shows both tripartite and ergative alignment.

---

<sup>68</sup> In this section I present merely an outline of my own views on the function of *-anza/-antes* and its origins. A full assessment of all *-anza/-antes* and *-ant-* nouns will be undertaken during my fellowship year (2011-2012) at the Franke Institute of the Humanities at the University of Chicago.

<sup>69</sup> Those nouns on *-anza/-antes* that are also attested in other cases are clearly derived nouns on *-ant-*. This group at least includes *utniyant-* "population", *huhhant-* "grandfather, ancestor", *hameshant-* "spring/summer", *zenant-* "fall", *gimmant-* "winter", *pedant-* "place".

<sup>70</sup> [i]dālus uddānanza KUB 60.156 rev. 14' (OH?-earlyMH?/NS).

<sup>71</sup> *idālawanz[a] uddananza* KBo 17.62 + 63 iv 10' (Beckman 1983, 34f., for date of composition and script as Middle Hittite and Middle script, see p. 36), [i]dālawanza GIG-*anza* KUB 33.121 ii 17' (MH/NS).

<sup>72</sup> Suppletion in the pronominal paradigm is already attested for ablative and instrumental and neuter nominative-accusative singular and plural (Melchert 2009, 131, 2011, 164, Hoffner/Melchert 2008, 140f.).

<sup>73</sup> Kiparksy (2008, 35f.): "But, at least in most NP split ergative systems, high-D nominals do not lack ergative case; rather, they have ergative/nominative syncretism, hence *ergative nominals with no overt case marking*—a very different thing. The suffixless ergative pronouns have exactly the same syntax as overtly marked ergative nominals: in particular, they agree with them in case, and are treated as parallel with them in conjoined noun phrases. Such a gap in ergative paradigms is a matter of morphology, not of the distribution of the category of ergative case." (emphasis in the original).

Even though I reject the derivational hypothesis as descriptively correct for all stages of Hittite, derivation is still the source of the inflectional endings *-anza/-antes*. Here I follow those who have pointed out that the derivational morpheme *-ant-* has an individuating function<sup>74</sup> which allows neuters in A-function, in particular Oettinger (2001, 311f.):

Zu diesem Zweck [i.e., in order to allow neuters as transitive subject] wird vom Obliquusstamm eine *-ant*-Bildung abgeleitet und erhält die Endung *-s* des geschlechtigen Nominativs. Synchron handelt es sich hier zweifellos um ein grammatisches Phänomen, das an den Ergativ anderer Sprachen erinnert, diachron jedoch stammt dieses *-ant-* m.E. eindeutig aus dem individualisierenden *n(t)*-Suffix des Indogermanischen.

If individuation is indeed an important factor determining the Silverstein Hierarchy (Lazard 1994, 202f.), –with animate, human agents prototypically strongly individuated and non-animate mass nouns prototypically non-individuated (Luraghi 2009, 8ff.),– derivation by means of *-ant-* therefore enables nouns that are inherently low or lowest in individuation to move to the left in the Hierarchy (also see Rizza 2010, 149f.). These semantically upgraded nouns are therefore able to appear in A-role (and probably also definite P-role)<sup>75</sup>. For Proto-Anatolian and Old Hittite I suggest that *-ant-* only marked individuation (stage I):

Figure 9: function of *-ant-s*, stage I

STAGE I	ANIMACY	INDIVIDUATION	AGENT ROLE	NOMINAL CLASS
<i>antuhsa-</i> “the man”	+	+	+ (-s)	common (I)
<i>alpa-</i> “the cloud”	-	+	+ (-s)	common (II)
<i>wetenant-</i> “the water”	-	+	+ (-s)	
↑		↑	↑	↑
<i>watar</i> “water”	-	-	-	neuter (III)

<sup>74</sup> Benveniste 1962, 50; Josephson 2004a, 260; id. 2004b, 102f.; Melchert 2009, 132; Oettinger 2001, 302, 304f., 311f.; Rizza 2010, 150f.; Zeilfelder 2001, 171f. Dardano (2010, 184) sees the individuating function as a consequence of a personifying function of *-ant-*. Not all cases of *-ant-* are individuating. For an overview of the different meanings and functions of *-ant-* see Hoffner/Melchert 2008, 55f. (§§ 2.23-2.27).

<sup>75</sup> One recent line of research regarding the motivation for split case-marking systems is proposed in Merchant 2006. Merchant suggests to relate case assignment to the geometry of the clause, in other words, word order. In split systems transitive subjects that stay low in the tree receive ergative marking, whereas those that move up in the tree receive nominative marking. Since word order in Hittite is mainly determined by the Information Structure of the clause, this would imply that in Hittite nominative versus ergative case marking might ultimately depend on whether a referent is a sentence Topic or a sentence Focus. Indeed, a large number of Hittite ergatives occurs in the immediately preverbal Focus position. Whether this correlation is meaningful needs further research.



In time the semantics of *-ant-* started to fade, and the forms *-ant-s* and *-ant-es* started to grammaticalize into the agent-markers for neuter nouns /-ants/ and /-antes/. As a result, neuter nouns became separated from their common gender *-ant-* derivations that continued to show complete paradigms. This grammaticalization process of divergence led to the ambiguity of the string /-ants/ still witnessed in Hittite (for the Luwic languages there is not enough evidence, it seems), where especially in Middle Hittite we find common gender *-ant-* nouns based on either neuter or common gender nouns side by side with neuter nouns with the new ergative endings. The origin of the ergative endings *-anza* (and *-antes*) as common gender nominatives was probably transparent until Middle Hittite, as shown by the adjectival and anaphoric agreement patterns mentioned above.

Regarding nouns, assuming that the loss of a productive morphological form does not also entail the loss of its function, I suggest that thematization of neuter consonant stems replaced *-ant-* as the productive means to express individuation<sup>76</sup>. This might explain why we find contrastive pairs such as *nepisant-* “sky” (from neuter *nepis*) in Middle Hittite (14) versus *nepisa-* in Neo-Hittite (15):

- (14) *n=an=za*                      *ser*      *nepis-ant-s*      *ta[r]h-du*  
 CONN=3S.ACC=PTC      above      sky-IND-NOM.S      conquer-3S.IMP  
 Above let the sky conquer it (i.e., disease). (MH/NS, KUB 17.8 iv 9, ed. Kellerman 1987, 217, 219)

- (15) [*nep*]is-a-s=za              GE<sub>c</sub>-i                      *wasiya-t*  
 sky-IND-NOM.S=PTC      black                      dress-3S.PST  
 The sky dressed itself in black. (NH, KUB 44.4 rev. 2, ed. Beckman 1983, 176f.)

At the latest in Neo-Hittite then, the shift from a semantically based coding system to a morpho-syntactically based coding system was completed<sup>77</sup>:

<sup>76</sup> Benveniste (1962, 46) considered thematization a synchronic alternative strategy for derivation by means of *-ant-* (also see Laroche 1962, 39), but this was long before Hittite texts were securely dated based on script. This is correct, though, for some *-ant-* derivations in Middle Hittite and a composition from Mursili II (see fn. 77).

<sup>77</sup> This model necessarily implies that there are several instances of *-anza* in A-function that should not yet be considered ergative case endings, and that thematization and the use of *-ant-* may occur in the same text. The latter is the case with *parnas* “house” (from *per* n.) with transitive verb in KUB 41.8 i 5’ (MH/NS, with duplicate KBo 10.45 i 19’-20’ (MH/NS)), *parnanza* with intransitive verb in KUB 41.8 iv 30 (with duplicate *parnas* in KBo 10.45 iv 31), and *parnanza* with transitive verb in KUB 41.8 iv 33 (with duplicate *parnanza* in KBo 10.45 iv 35). Another instance is the alternation of *tuzzias=mis* “my army” (from *tuzzi-* c.) in KBo 2.5 ii 13 (NH) and *tuzziyanza* in id. iii 28, both with transitive verb.

Figure 10: function of *-ants*, stage II

STAGE II	ANIMACY	INDIVIDUATION	AGENT ROLE	NOMINAL CLASS
<i>antuhsa</i> - “the man”	+	+	+ (-s)	common (I)
<i>alpa</i> - “the cloud”	-	+	+ (-s)	common (II)
<i>watar</i> “(the) water”	-	-	+ (-ants)	neuter (III)

To summarize, the Hittite ergative case endings *-anza* and *-antes* did not develop from an ablative ending but from the individuation morpheme *-ant-*. I propose that this development occurred in attested Hittite, most probably in Middle Hittite. In this transitional period individuation may be expressed both by means of *-ant-* and thematization, while *-anza* and *-antes* are already found as ergative case endings. Whether this development should be attributed to the grammatical influence of Luwian on Hittite, which is by now well established for this time period (Rieken 2006, Yakubovich 2010a, 268f.), is a question that can only be answered after a new study of the Anatolian core cases.

### References

- Alp, S. (1991): Hethitische Briefe aus Maşat-Höyük. Ankara
- Bauer, B. (2000): Archaic syntax in Indo-European: the spread of transitivity in Latin and French. Berlin - New York
- Bavant, M. (2008): Proto-Indo-European ergativity... still to be discussed, *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics* 44(4), 433-447
- Beckman, G. M. (1983): Hittite birth rituals. Second revised edition. *Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten* 29. Wiesbaden
- Benveniste, E. (1962): Les substantifs en *-ant* du hittite, *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 57, 44-51
- Blake, B. J. (2001): *Case*. Cambridge
- Butt, M. (2006): The dative-ergative connection, in: O. Bonami/P. Cabredo Hofherr (Hg.), *Empirical issues in syntax and semantics* 6. Paris, 69-92 (<http://www.cssp.cnrs.fr/eiss6/butt-eiss6.pdf>)
- CHD = H. G. Güterbock, H. A. Hoffner [u. a.] (Hg.) (1989-): *The Hittite dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Chicago
- Corbett, G. G. (1979): The agreement hierarchy, *Journal of linguistics* 15, 203-224
- (2006): *Agreement*. Cambridge
- Craig, C. C. (1976): Properties of basic and derived subjects in Jacalteco, in: C.N. Li (Hg.), *Subject and Topic*. New York, 99-123
- Dardano, P. (2010): Zur anatolischen Morphosyntax: das Suffix *-(a)nt-* und seine Bildungen, in: A. Süel (Hg.), *Acts of the VIIth International Congress of Hittitology, Çorum, August 25-31, 2008*. Ankara, 173-188
- Dixon, R. M. W. (1994): *Ergativity*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 69. Cambridge
- Fauconnier, S. (2011): Differential agent marking and animacy, *Lingua* 121, 533-547
- Filimonova, E. (2005): The noun phrase hierarchy and relational marking: Problems and counterevidence, *Linguistic Typology* 9, 77-113
- Fortson, B. W. (2010): *Indo-European language and culture: An introduction*. Oxford

- Frantz, D. G. (1991): *Blackfoot grammar*. Toronto - Buffalo
- García Trabazo, J. V. (2002): *Textos religiosos hititas. Mitos, plegarias y rituales*. Madrid
- Garrett, A. (1990a): *The syntax of anatolian pronominal clitics*. Dissertation Harvard University
- (1990b): *The origin of NP split ergativity*, *Language* 66, 261-296
- (1990c): *Hittite enclitic subjects and transitive verbs*, *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 42, 227-242
- (1996): *Wackernagel's law and unaccusativity in Hittite*, in: A. L. Halpern/A. M. Zwicky (Hg.), *Approaching second: Second position clitics and related phenomena*. Stanford, Calif., 85-133
- Goedegebuure, P. (1999): *The use and non-use of the enclitic subject pronoun in old Hittite*, paper presented at the IVth International Congress of Hittitology, Würzburg, October 4-8, 1999
- Grinevald Craig (also see Craig), C. (1977): *Jacaltec: The structure of Jacaltec*. Austin
- HED = Puhvel, J. (1984-): *Hittite etymological dictionary*. Berlin - New York - Amsterdam
- Hoffner, H. A. (1998): *From the disciplines of a dictionary editor*, *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 50, 35-44
- Hoffner, H. A./H. C. Melchert (2008): *A grammar of the Hittite language*. Winona Lake, Indiana
- HW<sup>2</sup> = Friedrich J./A. Kammenhuber (1975-), *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*. Zweite, völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage auf der Grundlage der edierten hethitischen Texte. Heidelberg
- Josephson, F. (2004a): *Singulative and agentive in Hittite and Germanic*, in: A. Hyllested [u. a.] (Hg.), *Per aspera ad asteriscos. Studia Indogermanica in honorem Jens Elmegård Rasmussen sexagenarii Idibus Martiis anno MMIV*. Innsbruck, 257-262
- (2004b): *Semantics and typology of Hittite -ant*, in: J. Clackson/B.A. Olsen (Hg.), *Indo-European word formation. Proceedings of the conference held at the University of Copenhagen, October 20th - 22nd 2000*. Copenhagen, 91-118
- Kellerman, G. (1987): *KUB XVII 8 IV: un mythe du feu*, *Hethitica* 8, 215-235
- Kimball, S. E. (1999): *Hittite historical phonology*. *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft* 95. Innsbruck
- Kiparsky, P. (2008): *Universals constrain change; change results in typological generalizations*, in: J. Good (Hg.), *Linguistic universals and language change*. Oxford, 23-53
- Kloekhorst, A. (2008): *Etymological dictionary of the Hittite inherited lexicon*. Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 5. Leiden, Boston
- Kuno, S. (1973): *The structure of the Japanese language*. Cambridge, MA
- Laroche, E. (1962): *Un "ergatif" en indo-européen d'Asie Mineure*, *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 57, 23-43
- Lauwers, P. (2004): *La description du français entre la tradition grammaticale et la modernité linguistique. Étude historiographique et épistémologique de la grammaire française entre 1907 et 1948*. *Orbis Supplementa* 24. Leuven
- Lazard, G. (1994): *L'Actance*. Paris
- Luraghi, S. (1986): *Der semantische und funktionelle Bau des althethitischen Kasussystems*, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 99, 23-42

- (1987): Reconstructing Proto-Indo-European as an ergative language: A test, *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* 15, 359-379
- (1997): Hittite. München - Newcastle
- (2009): The origin of the feminine gender in PIE: An old problem in a new perspective, in: V. Bubenik, J. Hewson [u. a.] (Hg.). *Grammatical change in Indo-European languages: papers presented at the workshop on Indo-European linguistics at the XVIIIth International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Montreal, 2007*. Amsterdam - Philadelphia
- (2010): Transitivity, intransitivity and diathesis in Hittite, in: *ИНДОЕВРОПЕЙСКОЕ ЯЗЫКОЗНАНИЕ И КЛАССИЧЕСКАЯ ФИЛОЛОГИЯ - XIV*, vol. 2. St. Petersburg, 133-154
- (forthcoming): Anatolian syntax: The simple sentence, in: J. Klein/M. Fritz (Hg.), *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics*. Berlin/New York
- McGregor, W. B. (2009): Typology of ergativity, *Language and Linguistics Compass* 3(1), 480-508
- Melchert, H. C. (1977): Ablative and instrumental in Hittite. Dissertation Harvard University
- (1993): A new Anatolian "Law of finals", *Journal of Ancient Civilizations* 8, 105-113
- (1994): Anatolian historical phonology. *Leiden Studies in Indo-European* 3. Amsterdam, Atlanta
- (2000): Tocharian plurals in *-nt-* and related phenomena, *Journal of Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 9, 53-75
- (2009): Review of Patri, Sylvain: *L'alignement syntaxique dans les langues indo-européennes d'Anatolie*. Wiesbaden 2007. *Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten* 49. In *Kratylos* 54, 130-132
- (2011): The problem of the ergative case in Hittite, in M. Fruyt, M. Mazoyer [u. a.] (Hg.), *Grammatical case in the languages of the Middle East and Europe. Acts of the international colloquium Variations, concurrence et evolution des cas dans divers domaines linguistiques*, Paris, 2-4 april 2007. Chicago, 161-167
- Merchant, J. (2006): Polyvalent case, geometric hierarchies, and split ergativity, in J. Bunting, S. Desai [u. a.] (Hg.), *Proceedings of the 42nd annual meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society, Volume 2: The Parasessions*. Chicago, 47-67
- Namiki, T. (2010): Morphological variation in Japanese compounds: The case of *hoodai* and the notion of "compound-specific submeaning", *Lingua* 120, 2367-2387
- Oettinger, N. (2001): Neue Gedanken über das *-nt-*Suffix, in O. Carruba/W. Meid (Hg.), *Anatolisch und Indogermanisch / Anatolico e Indoeuropeo - Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Pavia, 22.-25. September 1998*. Innsbruck, 301-315
- Otten, H. (1961): Eine Beschwörung der Unterirdischen aus Boğazköy, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 51, 114-157
- Palancar, E. L. (2002): The origin of agent markers. *Studia typologica* 5. Berlin
- Palmer, F. (1994): *Grammatical roles and relations*. Cambridge
- Rieken, E. (1999): *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen*. *Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten* 44. Wiesbaden

- (2001): Der hethitische *šar-tamḫari*-Text: archaisch oder archaisierend?, in: G. Wilhelm (Hg.), Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie, Würzburg, 4.-8. Oktober 1999. Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten 45. Wiesbaden, 576-585
- (2006): Zum hethitisch-luwischen Sprachkontakt in historischer Zeit, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 33, 271-285
- Rijkhoff, J. (2002): *The noun phrase*. Oxford
- Ritter, E./S. Thomas Rosen (2010): Animacy in Blackfoot: Implications for event structure and clause structure, in: M. Rappaport Hovav, E. Doron [u. a.] (Hg.), *Syntax, lexical semantics, and event structure*. Oxford, 124-152
- Rizza, A. (2010): Contributi allo studio dell'ergatività in anatolico: basi teoretico-tipologiche. Sopra alcune recenti pubblicazioni, *Atti del Sodalizio Glottologico Milanese* 3 n.s., 144-162
- Seuren, P. A. M. (1998): *Western linguistics: an historical introduction*. Oxford
- Shatskov, A. (2011): ЭРГАТИВНЫЙ ПАДЕЖ В ХЕТТСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ, *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana* 7(1), 143-152
- Silverstein, M. (1976): Hierarchy of features and ergativity, in: R. M. W. Dixon (Hg.) *Grammatical categories in Australian languages*. New Jersey, 112-171
- Simon, Z. (2008): Review of I. J. Adiego, *The Carian language*. With an appendix by Koray Konuk. *Handbuch der Orientalistik* 86. Leiden-Boston, 2007. In: *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 48, 457-463
- Soysal, O. (2010): *Philological contributions to Hattian-Hittite religion (II): 3. On the origin and the name of the ḫazkarai-women*, in: Y. Cohen, A. Gilan [u. a.] (Hg.), *Pax Hethitica – Studies on the Hittites and their neighbours in honour of Itamar Singer*. Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten 51. Wiesbaden, 340-350
- Strauß, R. (2006): *Reinigungsrituale aus Kizzuwatna. Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung hethitischer Ritualtradition und Kulturgeschichte*. Berlin-New York
- Tchekhoff, C. (1978): Le double cas-sujet des inanimées: un archaïsme de la syntaxe hittite?, *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 73, 225-241
- Visser, M. van de (2006): *The marked status of ergativity*. Utrecht: LOT dissertation series
- Villar, F. (1984): Ergativity and animate/inanimate gender in Indo-European, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 97, 167-96
- Watkins, C. (2008): Hittite, in: R. D. Woodard (Hg.), *The ancient languages of Asia Minor*. Cambridge, 6-30
- Weitenberg, J. J. S. (1987): Proto-Indo-European nominal classification and Old Hittite, *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 48, 213-230
- (1995): Sigmatization and thematization in Hittite, in: Th.P.J. van den Hout/J. de Roos (Hg.), *Studio historiae ardens. Ancient Near Eastern studies presented to Philo H.J. Houwink ten Cate on the occasion of his 65th birthday*. Publication de l'Institut Historique et Archéologique Néerlandais de Stamboul 74. Leiden, 333-344.
- Widmer, P. (2010): Review of S. Patri, *L'alignement syntaxique dans les langues indo-européennes d'Anatolie*. Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten 49. Wiesbaden 2007. In: *Orientalische Literaturzeitung* 105(6), 709-713
- Wierzbicka, A. (1981): Case marking and human nature, *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 1, 43-80
- Yakubovich, I. (2010a): *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian language*. Leiden - Boston

- (2010b): Review of H. A. Hoffner/H. C. Melchert (2008). A grammar of the Hittite language. Winona Lake, IN. In: Bibliotheca Orientalis 67, 148-154
  - (2011): Ergativity in Hittite. Paper presented at Die vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft im 21. Jahrhundert/Historical-Comparative Linguistics in the 21st Century, Pavia, 22-25 september, 2011
  - (forthcoming): Review of S. Patri, L'alignement syntaxique dans les langues indo-européennes d'Anatolie. Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten 49. Wiesbaden 2007. In: Journal of Near Eastern Studies
- Zeilfelder, S. (2001): Archaismus und Ausgliederung. Studien zur sprachlichen Stellung des Hethitischen. Heidelberg