

Sonderdruck aus

# KRATYLOS

KRITISCHES BERICHTS-  
UND REZENSIONSORGAN  
FÜR INDOGERMANISCHE  
UND ALLGEMEINE  
SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT

JAHRGANG 54

2009

DR. LUDWIG REICHERT VERLAG · WIESBADEN

\**asha(n)ti-*, p. 108 *χada-* < \**kant-*, and passim). Other solutions for these cases must be found.

It is with great sadness that one faces the fact that Günter Neumann is no longer here to help us seek such alternative solutions. We may take some solace in the fact that this glossary will now stand as a further testament to his lifetime of distinguished service to our discipline.

University of California at Los Angeles  
 Department of Linguistics/Program in Indo-European Studies  
 Los Angeles CA 90095-1543, U.S.A.

H. Craig Melchert

**Patri, Sylvain:** *L'alignement syntaxique dans les langues indo-européennes d'Anatolie*. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, 2007, gr.-8°, 231 S. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten, 49.) Brosch. 48 €.

This book analyzes the morphosyntactic encoding of the arguments of the clause (subject, direct and indirect object) in the ancient Indo-European languages of Anatolia, chiefly Hittite. A major focus of the study is the controversy regarding inanimate subjects of transitive verbs (15–61), but P. treats virtually all aspects of syntactic alignment including: the equally controversial notion of an “absolute case/memorative” (80–95), “impersonal” constructions (101–118), encoding of the direct and indirect object (118–142), and what P. labels “anti-active” constructions (142–151). P. concludes with consideration of the relationship between the Anatolian and PIE alignment systems (153–175). Indices are furnished for the sources of all text citations.

The bibliography is thorough and very up-to-date. The argumentation is clear and linear. P's glosses and translations of cited passages are for the most part accurate, and with rare exceptions the few errors do not affect his major claims. 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.<sup>1</sup> I cite here only those bearing on two of the issues treated.

(1) The Hittite ablative ending *-anz(a)* was limited to half a dozen nouns and was never extended to the entire class of inanimate nouns, as opposed to ani-

---

<sup>1</sup> Since P. indicates in the foreword (11) that I had read part of an earlier draft of the text, I must make explicit that I had time only to read the section on inanimate subjects of transitive verbs. I remain grateful to the author for sharing the contents of this section with me ahead of publication, to which I was able to respond in Melchert, forthcoming.

mates; no ablative ending *\*-anti* ever existed in Luvian or Lycian (contra pp. 39–42).

(2) Nasal reduction in the subject nominal ending */-ants/* is not limited to transitive constructions (contra p. 44). See e. g. *kardimiyauwaz* at KUB 33.28 iii 7 or TUKU.TUKU-*u-za* at KUB 22.35 ii 11 (both for *kardimmiyawanza* ‘angry’).

(3) Adjectives do not always agree formally with their head noun (contra p. 54). We find suppletion in enclitic possessive adjectives of instrumental for ablative (*iššaz* = *šmit* ‘from their mouths’) and of neuter nom.-acc. plural for singular (*šākuwa* = *šmet* ‘their eyes’); also of instrumental for ablative in demonstratives (*kitpantalaz/apit pantalaz* ‘from this/that time’).

(4) Hittite agreement patterns do not differ from those of other older Indo-European languages. That is, there is no contrast between attributive and anaphoric agreement (contra pp. 54–55 and p. 65): animates show consistently animate agreement, and inanimates inanimate agreement.

(5) Inanimate nouns appearing as the subject of transitive verbs are not indifferent to number (contra p. 69). The forms *uddananteš* (Hittite) and *parnantinzi* (Luvian) appear only as transitive subjects and by P’s own valid criteria cannot be derived stems in *-ant-* (contra pp. 57–58).

(6) There is no differentiation between proper names and appellatives in their appearance with and without *-s* (contra pp. 92–93). The nominative and bare stem occur side by side in lists (e. g. of ritual paraphernalia), showing the “naming” function.

Points (1)–(5) refute P’s analysis of transitive subjects in *-anz(a)* as ablative-instrumentals. Obviously, Hittite *-anza/-anteš*, Luvian *-antiš/-antinsi*, and Lycian *-ēti* are not ablative-instrumentals. P’s analysis on p. 49 is also incoherent: a form in *-anz(a)* cannot be an ablative and animate at the same time. As an ablative *witenanza* could only belong to the inanimate noun *wātar/witen-*; as an animate form, it could only be the nominative singular of a derived stem in *-ant-*, but P. himself has ably argued that the latter is incorrect (21–25).

Also false is P’s claim of an “onomastive” case in proper names, as shown by point (6). All uses of the bare stem in both names and appellatives are “pseudo-Akkadographic” writings (Hoffner and Melchert 2008, § 16.3). P’s contribution is to have noticed for the first time that this is also true for the “naming construction”, where the nominative does occur alongside the Akkadographic writing (his exx. 2.11–2.13, especially 2.12). The Hittite syntax is just like that he cites for Indo-Iranian (165–166). P. has thus nicely disposed of the last alleged evidence for an “absolute case” in Hittite.

P. offers very useful remarks on “impersonal” constructions, showing that not all examples labeled such are truly impersonal. He also provides helpful typological comparisons for the peculiar construction of an object in the nominative with an infinitive that he labels “anti-active”. In example 2.98 dative *-šši* actually refers to the subject (the king), and in 2.99 the subject is an omitted dative

LUGAL-*i* (ZI-*anza* 'will' is predicatal): see Hoffner and Melchert 2008, §25.17. Thus the match with the Baltic and Northern Russian examples P. cites is even closer than he suggests, however one is to account for the syntax.

P. argues persuasively that there is no basis for attributing the attested split-ergativity of Anatolian to areal influence (see for the correct synchronic description Melchert, forthcoming, following Garrett). Rather, split ergativity is the Anatolian response to a likely inherited prohibition on inanimate nouns as transitive subjects. The rest of Indo-European eliminated the prohibition, but Anatolian developed a device for inanimate nouns to appear in "A" function. One may compare the similar creation of count plurals to inanimate nouns in Anatolian, filling another systematic gap in PIE. Intriguingly, it now appears likely that Anatolian speakers used the same formant, the originally derivational "individualizing" suffix *-ant-*, for both purposes: see Melchert 2000 on count plurals and Oettinger 2001 and Josephson 2004 on transitive subjects. Given the well-known cross-linguistic correlation of agency and individuation, this may not be coincidental.

#### References

- Hoffner, H. A., Melchert, H. C. 2008. A Grammar of the Hittite Language. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Josephson, F. 2004. Semantics and typology of Hittite *-ant-*. In: Indo-European Word Formation, ed. by J. Clackson and B. Olsen, 91–118. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press.
- Melchert, H. C. 2000. Tocharian Plurals in *-nt-* and Related Phenomena. TIES 9, 53–75.
- Melchert, H. C. forthcoming. The Problem of the Ergative Case in Hittite. In: Variations, concurrence et evolution des cas dans divers domaines linguistiques, ed. by M. Mazoyer & M. Fruyt.
- Oettinger, N. 2001. Neue Gedanken über das *nt*-Suffix. In: Anatolisch und Indogermanisch/Anatolico e Indoeuropeo, ed. by O. Carruba and W. Meid, 301–316. Innsbruck: IBS.

University of California at Los Angeles  
 Department of Linguistics/Program in Indo-European Studies  
 Los Angeles CA 90095-1543, U.S.A.

H. Craig Melchert