THE REDUCTION OF CASE MARKING IN PLURAL CONJUNCT (ADVERBIAL) AND PREDICATIVE PARTICIPLES IN NEO-HITTITE

Michael FROTSCHER

Abstract: It is now the communis opinio in the field of Anatolian studies that there is in Neo-Hittite no longer a formal distinction between the nominative and the accusative plural communis as there was in the older language (Old and Middle Hittite). Instead, a syncretic case form (Einheitskasus) with two allomorphs, either -ei (former nom.pl.c.) or -ui (former acc.pl.c.), is used for both functions. The two allomorphs are distributed with regard to the respective stem class. This system applies to ordinary nouns and to pronominal stems but not to participles. In this article it will be shown that there is a different system applying to participles: In the domain of verbal usage (predicative or adverbial function [= conjunct participle]) the participle only exhibits the syncretic desinence -ant-es, whereas in the nominal domain (attributive or substantival function) there is still a distinction between -ant-es, for the nominative, and -and-us, for the accusative.
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§ 1. In an article on the Neo-Hittite nominal inflexion Craig MELCHERT (1995) was able to show that in Neo-Hittite there exists a strong tendency towards a syncretic case form comprising the nominative and accusative func-

The groundwork for this study was first laid out in my as yet unpublished doctoral thesis, FROTSCHER 2013. Further results were achieved through my collaboration on the project La struttura della frase nelle lingue indo-europee antiche: la sintassi del particcio (Università di Verona, 2013–2014) and on the ERC-project EVALISA – The Evolution of Case Alignment and Argument Structure in Indo-European (Universiteit Gent, 2013–2018; grant number: 313461). Those results will also form part of the upcoming syntax part of the Indogermanische Grammatik (published by the Universitätsverlag Winter) and of my research in connexion with the related project Konkurrierende Ausdrucksformen in der indogermanischen Syntax: Die Syntax des Partizips nach seiner Morphologie, die Syntax des Satzes nach seinen Konstituenten (funded by the Fritz Thyssen Stiftung) under the supervision of Velizar Sadoiski (Vienna) and Paola Cotticelli (Verona), whom I would like to thank for her constant support throughout these projects. I am furthermore grateful to Felicitas Erhard, Federico Giusfredi, and Alfredo Rizza for their aid in providing me with bibliographical items otherwise unavailable to me during my scientific stay at Ghent University, as well as to Craig Melchert for extensive discussions, helpful advice and several corrections. All possibly remaining errors are of course mine own.
tion in the plural – a phenomenon which in the German tradition is sometimes referred to as *Einheitskasus*. According to MELCHERT (1995: 270) this nominative-accusative-*Einheitskasus* for most stem classes continues the form of the earlier non-syncretic accusative plural in -uṣ with the nominative-accusative of ablauting -u-stems ending in -aṣes (instead of the morphologically less transparent older form -amuṣ) and the respective form of the relative pronoun ku�습니다 (instead of older kuiu$s$) being exceptions generalising the earlier non-syncretic nominative ending -eṣ. Still another exception is ("n-stems, which also exhibit a nominative-accusative in -eṣ, the form of the earlier nominative plural. Here also belong -nt-stems and therefore -ant-participles, for which MELCHERT (1995: 270) also claims a nominative-accusative desinence in -nt-eṣ for Neo-Hittite, although he admits that “[…] there are some examples of -uṣ following the general pattern” (op.cit. 272), i.e., the former non-syncretic accusative ending -uṣ is still used with accusative force in Neo-Hittite. Basically the same results were reached by MCINTYRE 1986 in her unpublished M.A. thesis.

The purpose of this article is to show that a mechanism different from the one described by MELCHERT has to be reckoned with in order to account for the inflexional behaviour of -ant-participles with accusative force. It will be shown that the use of the syncretic nominative-accusative case ending -eṣ is dependent on the syntactic function of the participle and not simply due to its affinity to a certain stem class. It is therefore different in nature from the general tendency towards an *Einheitskasus*. In order to achieve the clearest results and to avoid the possibility of influence from an underlying older original, MELCHERT based his study on texts whose date of composition clearly belongs to the Neo-Hittite period and which can be linked to a certain Hittite king post-Šuppiluliuma I (ca. 1355–1320 BCE). His claims regarding the distribution of -eṣ vs. -uṣ for the nominative-accusative plural are therefore, strictly speaking, only valid for Neo-Hittite original texts, although this does not rule out the possibility that Neo-Hittite copies of older texts exhibit the same linguistic features that MELCHERT attributed to the Neo-Hittite of the post-Šuppiluliuma I period. The present study will not follow these chronological restrictions and so will not exclude examples from Neo-Hittite copies of older texts. Another important finding of MCINTYRE’s thesis is that texts of the time of Muršili II (ca. 1318–1290 BCE) are transitional insofar as they still exhibit non-syncretic forms next to *Einheitskasus*-forms. It is reasonable to assume that the rule to be put forth in this article for participial forms of the later language also underwent a similar or the same transitional period. Some exceptions to be discussed in § 5 below could indeed be due to the fact that the rule was not yet fully functional at the time of composition of these texts.

Examples of participles with accusative force with the ending -eṣ instead of expected -uṣ all stem from Neo-Hittite (NH) originals or copies of older compositions (Old Hittite [OH] or Middle Hittite [MH]) in Neo-Hittite (NS) or late Neo-Hittite script (late-NS). They are given here in alphabetical order followed by the number of the example in which they will be discussed in the course of the present article:

1. E.g. nom.plc. *anuhaša* (NH [Murš. II] KUB 19.37 ii 25, NH [Murš. II] KUB 19.50 iv 19); see MCINTYRE (1986: 40). It is not only the *Einheitskasus*-system which is still in a state of transition in the texts of the period of Muršili II. Another transitional trait in those texts is the replacement – be it analogical or phonological – of -je- by -ja- in the verbal paradigm of -ie-stems. In Muršili II texts we still find several forms in -je- such as ni-je-ezi, je-ezi, in the period of Muwatalli we find merely two -je-forms, and by the time of Jasmīšili III none at all; cf. the list of forms in MELCHERT (1977: 33–34).

2. The palaeographic datings are taken from the online database *Konkordanz der hehitischen Keilschrifttexte* (http://www.hethporto.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/). The datings of the composition are in most cases those given by the authors of the *Chicago Hittite Dictionary* (CHD; passim). Examples and instances of participial forms cited or referred to in this article are taken from the data collection compiled for my doctoral thesis (FROTSCHER 2013). The corpus consists of the data provided by the relevant dictionaries (CHD, HED, HEG, HIL, HW, MLHII, and CRG), supplemented with occasional additional findings. Although one can be fairly confident that most of the types are included, the corpus does not comprise all tokens. It is therefore not exhaustive, yet arbitrary and large enough to allow extensive postulates and assumptions regarding the linguistic behaviour of the Hitites –ant-participles. Translations are mine throughout, unless otherwise indicated.

3. By regular sound law from a pre-Hittite *-aṣes*, with $y > m_{i} . u$.

4. I wish to thank Craig Melchert again for sending me a scanned copy of her unpublished thesis.
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verbial clause within the sentence, providing additional information with regard to the verbal action expressed by the predicate, although they still exhibit grammatical concord of one of the arguments (usually subject or object) of the sentence, whereas the attributive particle is part of a noun phrase only, providing information with respect only to its head noun.

There are three examples of predicative participles with accusative force showing the desinence -antes (1–3):

(1) NH³ KUB 19.55+ l.e. 1-2⁸

\[-u²/s\text{smas}²\text{kan}²\] (2) [\text{IST}]² U¹ GISTUKUL \text{"taruh\text{a}teš ŪL anda }\text{ubah[u]\text{]"}]

\[\text{[And\text{]}} (2) \text{I did not consider\{er\} (1) \text{[them\}} /\text{you\} (2) \text{defeated [by] weapons.}\]

(2) NH (Puduhepa / Hattušili III) KUB 21.38 i 60–62⁹

\[\text{[DU]MUNUSMES}² LUGAL kui\text{ēš ŠA \text{É}² \text{emijamun }nu=m[\text{ya}²za\text{kapl SU}²=i \text{\'h\text{ā}s\text{er }\text{ma}²\text{za ammuk}} (61) \text{[salanun]un }\text{\k\text{a}r\text{i}ma kui\text{\'s\text{an}tes }[\text{u}²\text{emijamun }\text{na }\text{apušsa}² (62) \text{[salanun n]}²\text{aš }\{ \text{MES}² \}}\text{ ENMES² KARASLA² ijan[un]\text{]}}\]

\[\text{The [pri]nessesses, whom I found inside the palace, gave birth under my supervision (lit. in my hand) and I (61) raised them (i.e. the newborns), And also those whom I found already born (62) [I raised], and I made them \{\text{eras\text{ure}}\ \} \text{commanders of the troops.}\]

(3) OH/NS KUB 35.148 iii 36–39¹⁰

\[\text{nurš\k\text{a}n U[R,TUR IG}²³²\text{\-a\text{\'ht }epmi x[\text{]}} \{ (37) \text{nu kišan memah\text{hi} (38) ijanza ijanza dakkad\text{akupan\text{teš}²} \} (39) \text{ijanzi šara\k\text{a}k\text{uant\text{eš} ijan\text{[z]}i} (40) \text{GU\-i\text{teš }\text{\k\text{u}z\text{umija dakkad\text{aku}perienced\text{aer}}} (41) \text{UDU²\-i\text{\'nt }\text{hi\text{\'la} dakkad\text{aku}\text{\text{aer}} UR.GH \text{\text{\'hr\text{p}i KLMN}} (42) \text{[SA]}²\text{H təmmi KLMN}}\]

\[\text{And I (i.e. Zuwi, the sorceress) catch the little d[og] with the eyes. (37) And I speak thus: (38) "A sheep is made. They impound (39) ]

---

⁷ This text, known as the Milawata-letter, dates probably from the time after Muršili II.; cf. HEINHOLD-KRAHMER (1983: 94–95³⁹) with further references).
them (lit. make them impound[ed]), (39) they water them (lit. make them watered). (40) They impounded the ox in the shed. (41) They impounded the sheep in the pens. The dog in the kennel (7) ditto. (42) The [pi]g in the sty ditto.

In examples (1) and (2) above it is a *verbum videndi* – either *sensu stricto* (*anda au(y)S[-i]tu / u-* 'to consider, to regard') or in the broader sense (*yemi-jelaezi* 'to find') – that is used with a predicative participle.

In (3) the two predicative participles form part of a very rare periphrastic causative construction consisting of the light verb *ijeleezi* 'to do, to make' + the main verb as a participle. This construction is, to my knowledge, only attested once more in a treaty of Tudhalia IV (KBo 4.14 iii 23–24): *tuk-ma karü kuit ké INIMMES peran GAM tijan* (24) DÜ-nun 'But I have already put (lit. made put) these words down for you'. Alternatively, one could interpret example (3) differently by taking *ijanzi* as the 3rd pl. act. of *i-zi* 'to go', thus avoiding the assumption of a very rare periphrastic construction. This interpretation would lead to a translation 'they go impounded, they go watered' with the participles being adverbial participles. This alternative interpretation is, however, unlikely for two reasons: Firstly, active forms of the verb 'to go' are restricted to the older language (mostly OS, sometimes MH/MS texts) and are therefore not expected in a Neo-Hittite copy. Secondly, the context is clear about the fact that the animals are figurines, which are naturally incapable of walking. Besides, they are described as being figuratively impounded. In any event, this alternative interpretation would also be in line with our claim that predicative as well as adverbial participles exhibit a nominative-accusative desinence -anteš instead of -andus.12

Other instances of participles with accusative force showing the desinence -anteš include adverbial participles. It is not always easy to make a distinction between attributive and adverbial usage. From a formal point of view only preposed participles can be safely identified as attributive participles, whereas postposed participles could either be attributive or adverbial.13 In such cases, whether a participle is to be considered attributive or adverbial largely depends on the interpretation of the sentence and of the semantics provided by the participle in question. An attributive participle is restrictive and provides semantic information only for its head noun, whereas an adverbial participle provides additional information, regarding the noun phrase it is agreeing with, within the general context of the verbal action expressed by the predicate. In contrast to attributive participles, adverbial participles therefore very often only express a temporary quality of the noun phrase they are agreeing with – a quality which is only valid within the time frame covered by the main predicate, of which the participle is an adverbial argument. Based on these considerations, the participles in the following seven instances (4–10), are to be classified with a high degree of certainty as adverbial rather than as attributive participles:

(4) OH/NS KBo 2.12 v 9-14

1 UDÚ šuppištuṣušarana (10) natta arkan-ten (11) MUNUSIS spumalsač dái (12) x UDÚ[BA] šuppištuṣušarana (13) natta arkan-ten (14) LÚMES LED Zippalanda danzi

One sheep, pure, (10) not tupped, (11) the spumalsa-woman takes. (12) Ten sheep, pure, (13) not tupped, (14) the men of Zippalanda take.

(5) NS KBo 15.12: 7–8

nu TI-anduš [tarpallus šamma] (8) [LIŠ.U.DAJI MUNUSUM] ja unušantaš sarâ ušadanz[i]

13 Cf. Hoffner / Melchert (2008: 339) regarding the position of attributive participles within the noun phrase in Hittite, which less often than regular adjectives precede their head noun. It must, however, be stressed that the prepositive position of participles is not at all rare, as claimed in Hoffner / Melchert, loc.cit. In my data collection 258 (21.8%) – i.e. more than a fifth – of the attributive participles are preposed, whereas 927 (78.2%) are postposed to their head noun.

12 Ed. Popko (1994: 106–107), who, however, translates arkan- as an attributive participle with the meaning 'zerlegt' as if belonging to the homophonous verb *ärk* / *ark*, which designates a certain action of the slaughter procedure: *Ein hellschimmernde, nicht zerlegtes Schaf nimmt die spumala-Frau. Zehn hellschimmernde, nicht zerlegte Schafe nehmen die Leute von Zippalanda* (boldfacing mine).

And [moreover] living [substitutes] (8) [a captiv]e and a woman, they bring up adorned.'

(6) OH/MS² KUB 11.1 iv 16-17¹⁷ (I OH/NS KBo 3.67 iv 3-4)
[(m)]ārr-as att'is¹⁸ ḫuḫišanten¹⁹ šarramaš šer ... ò(7) [kūj]atqa uerizzi

'[If he, because of the shar[e ...], (17) (som)ehow summons (16) the fathers, alive / living (i.e. whilst they are (still) alive / living) ...'

¹⁶ Amended after the parallel text KUB 17.18 ii 17-18 (ed. KÜMMEL, op.cit. 127-128), which reads nu šuḫuḫišant'-as šarramaš LŪ MUNUS=ja š[a]r(ā) (18) niyadanzi 'And moreover [living substitutes, a man and a woman, (18) they bring (17) ulpā].'


¹⁸ The nom.-acc.pl. `at-ti'-š (dupl. at-te[-el]) instead of expected `attiš (non-syncretic acc. or syncretic nom.-acc. of a stem other than an i-stem) of the a-stem `attiš- 'father' is remarkable. It seems as if the word was treated as a t-stem instead of as an i-stem and was then also subject to MELCHERT's rule regarding its syncretic form. This would prove a Neo-Hittite date of the copy. Alternatively, `attiš could also represent the plural of a luwoid stem with i-mutation `atil-š. The nom.(acc.) of an i-stem in Neo-Hittite is occasionally `-ēš < *-iēš (see on this development MELCHERT 1995: 271-272) instead of the regular -ēš < *-iēš. Especially with kinship terms we frequently encounter nom.(acc.) plural forms in -ēš, which indirectly suggest luwoid i-mutation: e.g. `ba-ann-i-lis (7) at-ēšiš ann-i-lis (nom.) 'grandmothers, (7) fathers, (and) mothers' (NS KUB 17.29 ii 6-7), `ba-ni-lis (acc.) 'grandmothers (and) grandfathers' (MHNS KUB 30.24 ii 23), `attšušiš (nom.) 'brothers' (OH/MS KUB 36.106 rev. 8), although no unambiguous i-stem variants of these kinship terms are attested; but cf. also acc.pl. annišiš 'mothers' (OH/NS KBo 22.5 rev. 8), which points towards a luwoid i-stem and is treated in the same manner as e.g. the luwoid acc.pl. ispantüz (NH [Murs. II] KBo 4.4 iii 31) of the consonant stem `isptun- c. 'night' or the acc.pl. tarpalliuši (NH [Murs. II] KBo 4.6 obv. 28 [cf. example (21) below], NS KUB 17.18 ii 17 [cf. footnote 16 above]) of the luwoid agent noun in `-alliš (Liš; tarpal- `ritual substitute'. Note that the non-syncretic accusative form in `-ēš of luwoid stems with i-mutation has survived well into Neo-Hittite (cf. tarpalliuši [Murs. II], where it stands right next to syncretic forms in -ēš < *-iēš (hubbūšiš etc.) to forms with the regular Hittite, i.e. non-luwoid, ending -ēš. Written Ti-is-µa-an-te-ēš which could represent a sumerographic spelling followed by a rather long phonetic complement with only the first phoneme /t/ being omitted. Such a spelling would, however, be entirely unparalleled in the Hittite corpus, where sumerographic writings of this lexeme always exhibit a much shorter phonetic complement covering only the participial suffix and the ending: Ti-an-ēš. Therefore, Ti (ēš) is probably an error for intended HU (i-P). This spelling error occurs frequently; see footnote 41 for another example.

²³ For the dating of the Hittite Death Ritual cf. KASSIAN / KOROLEV / SIDEL'TSEV (2002: 12-13), who reckon with an original Old Hittite composition appurtenant to the Hittic cult layer, which was later subject to revision under Hurrian influence during Middle Hittite times. Since there is no clear evidence that the surviving Neo-Hittite copies of the Death Ritual were directly taken from an Old Hittite original, I tentatively assume that the ultimate exemplar underlying the Neo-Hittite copy was an Old Hittite one, where the notation `MH²[late-NS] for texts of the Death Ritual.
²⁴ KASSIAN / KOROLEV / SIDEL'TSEV, op.cit. 492-493.
²⁵ The desinence is written with the signs TE-ĪS, which can be read either -te-ēš or -i-ti-ēš. This would be an instance of an occasional sandhi phenomenon (-ēš > -iš before elitic elements) attested from Middle Hittite on and described by SIDEL'TSEV (2008) and FROTSCHER (forthcoming a). The duplicate of KUB 39.7 probably also shows the same nominative-accusative form in -anteš, even though the crucial part of the word is damaged:
‘Also living / alive (13) they catch (12) either five ducks (13) or six 26 ducks.’

In all of the above examples (4 - 10) the semantic information provided by the postposed participle is only temporary within the context of the verbal action. In (10) it is also the peculiar frontal position of the participle that excludes an attributive interpretation.

An entirely different syntactic interpretation of (10) is given by KAPELUS in the online edition of the Death Ritual 27. She apparently considers hūš-ya-nente/tišš-a the predicative of a nominal sentence, whose first part would be the preceding passage n-ás XXX lāhjanza, and thus translates: “And thirty lāhjanza-ducks are living”. Under this interpretation the presence of the enclitic conjunction = fi-a is, however, left unexplained. Furthermore, it is extremely unlikely that n-ás XXX is anything but the conclusion of an enumeration of different groups of ducks in the preceding lines (ii 8 - 12), where exactly thirty ducks (in three groups of ten) are listed: nu ŠA GIŠ.XLA X lāhjanza MUSEN ijanza (9) nu šTU KŪ.BABBAR iššijänænu ANA V lāhjanzan (a) (10) ŠAG.DU.MES.ŠUNU GUŠKIN GAR.RA SIG ijanšašš-a X lāhjanza MUSEN (11) ijanza išnašš-a X lāhjanza MUSEN.ILA ijanza n-ás XXX (12)

The second numeral appears to be v, but it features a faint additional stroke, which must be interpreted as the sixth stroke of the numeral vii (so already the reading in OTTEN 1958: 36) as attested in the duplicate KUB 39.8 i 6. Otherwise the disjunctive syntax (našša ... našma ... ‘either ... or ...’) would be hard to justify. Alternatively, one could also emend the first numeral to vi as done in KASSIAN / KOKELEV / SİDEL'TSEV, op.cit. 4928 with regard to the duplicate KUB 39.8 i 6, where the numeral indeed seems to be vi, but is found before a lacuna (handcopy: ǐ). 27


27 Cf. Hoffner / MELCHERT (2008: 254) for the regular position of a genitive attribute within a noun phrase and the aberrant surface (i.e. only graphic) word order when a logogramme is involved.

§ 3. There is only one assured case of a participle with accusative force showing the desinence -antes that is neither predicative nor adverbial but rather attributive:

(11) OH/late-NS KUB 20.92 i 12-14 28

LUGAL-uš GUB-aš HUR.SAGMES aššijantes (13) ŠA DINGIR[U URU] Zippalanda (14) DINGIR[U URU] Zippalander-Ja II-ŠU e[kazi]

‘Standing the king (14) [rinks] twice (12) the beloved mountains (13) of the storm god of Zippalanda (14), and the storm god of Zippalanda.’

Here it is not the word order that demands an attributive interpretation but the semantics conveyed by the participle within the general context. At first sight the word order of the noun phrase indeed already seems to indicate an attributive syntax, with the participle standing in between the head noun and the genitive attribute ŠA DINGIR[U ‘of the storm god’. In fact, it is only the logographic writing with an Akkadian ša-genitive that on the surface results in this word order. The linguistic reality, and thus the genuine Hittite word order behind this half-logographic writing is a different one: the genitive attribute in Hittite regularly precedes its head noun 29, so that the participle in this example actually follows the whole noun phrase just like in most of the foregoing examples, where the participle was predicative or adverbial. It is still not very likely that in (11) the participle is adverbial. The semantic quality expressed by the participle is not a temporary one as in the examples above. The fact that the mountains are beloved by the storm god certainly is meant
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lahjanza ‘And of wood ten ducks are made. (9) And they plate them with silver. And of five ducks (i.e. out of these ten wooden ducks) (10) the heads are studded with gold. And of īqana-wool ten ducks (11) are made, and of dough ten ducks are made: These (are) thirty (12) ducks.’ It now immediately follows example (10) beginning with the additive conjunction - fi-a and thus introducing into the discourse a new type of duck (the live ones) different from the previously mentioned ducks (wooden, woolen, and of dough).
as a permanent feature, and the participle is, therefore, to be regarded as attributive.

Also in the following example, (12), which is comparable regarding the word order of the noun phrase and spelling practice to (11), the participle could be attributive, although an adverbial interpretation is also possible:

(12) NS IBoT 2.131 obv. 21

.mkdirSA \(\text{Lišša} \quad \text{SI} \quad \text{šijantes} \quad \text{SA} \quad \text{INGR} \quad \text{Pir'ya ĥarzi}

'Mount Lišša keeps (lit. holds) the sealed wooden tablets of the deity Pirwa' (attributive)

—or—

'Mount Lišša keeps (lit. holds) the wooden tablets of the deity Pirwa sealed (i.e. whilst they are sealed, in sealed condition).'

(adverbial)

We can therefore conclude that out of twelve examples of animate plural participles with accusative force that show the desinence -\(\text{antęs} \) ten (examples 1-10) are either predicative or adverbial. Only one example (11) certainly shows an attributive participle in -\(\text{antęs} \). The participle of the twelfth example (12) could either be attributive or adverbial.

§ 4. There are several examples of a plural participle with accusative force in Neo-Hittite texts or NS copies that still show the earlier non-syncretic ending -\(\text{antęs} \). In those cases the participle is almost always attributive or substantival (for rare exceptions see below; § 5, examples 18-21). Three examples of certainly NH composition may suffice\(^{31}\) to illustrate


\(^{31}\) All other instances known to me and not further discussed in the present study of the participle desinence -\(\text{antęs} \) in NS or NH texts follow the same pattern and show the participle in question in attributive or substantival function (in the following list indicated by superscript \(^{1}\) for attributive \((= \) proposed position within the noun phrase relative to its head) and \(^{1}\) for substantival use): \(\text{šinduš} \quad \text{ai-}\) 'be hot' (OH/NS KUB 33.49 i\(^{6}\), NS KUB 17.23 i\(^{13}, 17\), NS VBoT 134: 2\(^{4}\)), \(\text{akkanduš} \quad \text{akk-} / \text{akk-} \) 'die' (NH KUB 3.3 i\(^{16}, 24\)), \(\text{aranđuš} \quad \text{ar-}\) 'stand' (OH/NS frgms. KUB 33.13 i\(^{17}\), \(\text{appušuš} \quad \text{epp-} / \text{epp-} \) 'take, seize' (NH frgms. KUB 23.42 i\(^{7}\)).

\(\text{šix-S-antęšuš} \quad \text{šanteš} \) 'put in order, joint, repair, determine' (NH KUB 22.65 vi\(^{29}\)), \(\text{šarpušuš} \quad \text{šar-}\) 'cut (off), neglect' (NH KUB 22.57 obv. \(2^{4}\), KUB 21.20 i\(^{17}\)), \(\text{šukandaš} \quad \text{šuk-} / \text{šuk-} \) 'set fire to, ignite' (OH/NS KUB 33.49 i\(^{6}\)), \(\text{nependuš} \quad \text{na-}\) / \(\text{nt-} \) 'turn, send' (NS frgms. KUB 17.23 i\(^{29}\)), \(\text{piandaš} \quad \text{pi-} / \text{pi-} \) 'give' (NH frgms. KUB 13.54 i\(^{11}\), \(\text{pandaš} \quad \text{paj-} / \text{paj-} \) 'go, walk' (NS KUB 10.16 i\(^{7}\)), \(\text{paršandaš} \quad \text{parš-} / \text{parš-} \) 'break' (OH/NS KUB 2.13 i\(^{24}\), \(4^{5}\), NH/NS KUB 7.5 i\(^{9}\), MH/NS VBoT 24 i\(^{33}\)), \(\text{karpašuš} \quad \text{kar-}\) 'cut (off), neglect' (NH KUB 33.49 i\(^{6}\)), \(\text{蕻andaš} \quad \text{怎么可能}\) 'irrigate' (late-NS frgms. KUB 51.50 i\(^{14}\)), \(\text{sammašandaš} \quad \text{smma-}\) 'create' (OH/NS KUB 3.3 i\(^{19}\)), \(\text{süpašandaš} \quad \text{süg-e-} / \text{fill (up)}' (MH/NS KUB 21.34 i\(^{25}\)), \(\text{dammašandaš} \quad \text{dama-}\) 'attach, stick, pin' (NH KUB 24.7 i\(^{24}\)), \(\text{unušandaš} \quad \text{unu-}\) 'adorn, decorate' (NH/NS frgms. KUB 60.33 rev. \(7^{3}\), NH KUB 26.83: 13\(^{4}\)).

Reduction of case marking in plural conjunct (adverbial) and predicative participles

\(^{32}\) The reading behind SIGs-\(\text{antęs} \) is not entirely certain. Instances of SIGs-\(\text{antęs} \) could in the theory also belong to the adjective \(\text{aššanuš} \) - 'good', a form enlarged by the suffix (\(\text{o-}\)) or -\(\text{antęs} \) of the adjective \(\text{aššu-} / \text{ašša} \) - 'good', in which case the example would not contain a participle but an adjective. Longer phonetic complementations, such as in SIGs-\(\text{s-i-ja-} / \text{S-i-ja-} \) and SIGs-\(\text{a-ta-ta} \) (NH KUB 4.8 ii\(^{21}\)), affirm, however, that SIGs was indeed the surnumerary for the adjective \(\text{aššu-} / \text{ašša} \). Nonetheless, it is still possible that \(\text{lazzijantęs} \) is not a participle of the verb \(\text{lazzije-/lazzin} / \text{Lazzije/} \) - 'be good (middle)' and \(\text{duyarnandaš} \) / \(\text{duyarnan-} \) / \(\text{duyarn-} \) - 'to break sth. (transitive-active), to break (apart) (intransitive-middle)' are not used adverbially or predicatively but nominally, i.e. substantivally as in (13) or attributivally as in (14).

(13) NH (Puduhepa / Ḥattušili III) KUB 13.35 ii 6-8

\(\text{tamešandaš} \quad \text{ma-}\) 'yield' ANŠE.GIR.NU.NA (7) šaršiškaša EGER-PE-PÉ ŠI.\(\text{pandaš} \quad \text{m-ya} / \text{m-ya-šinats} \) SIGs-\(\text{antęs} \) UL-\(\text{pat} \) ŠI-PE-PÉ

'But to someone else, whom (7) I give back as compensation (6) the mules, (8) I certainly (=\(\text{pat} \)) do not give good ones.'
the distinction between nominative-accusative in plural participles, where we would according to MELCHERT’s rule expect -anteš throughout. Instead, the distinction between nominative -anteš and accusative -andus is still made in attributive and substantival participles in Neo-Hittite shows that in Neo-Hittite there is still no syncretic Einheitskasus for the nominative-accusative in plural participles, whereas in participles with predicative and adverbial function (verbal usage) the case distinction is eliminated, resulting in a nominative-accusative desinence -anteš.

In other words, the accusative is not marked as such anymore but the former

\[\text{ Reduction of case marking in plural conjunct (adverbial) and predicative participles } 77\]
nominative ending -anteš is used throughout when the participle is predicative or adverbal, regardless of whether it be semantically nominative or accusative.

§ 5. There are, however, some rare exceptions to this rule. Apart from the one or two exceptional cases discussed above (example (11) and possibly also 12), where an attributive participle with accusative force shows the desinence -anteš instead of expected -andusš, there are four cases where participial forms with accusative force ending in -andusš are used in predicative (example 18) or adverbial function (examples (19) and 20) in NS texts or even in a NH original composition (example (21) with adverbial function), where one would expect -anteš:

(18) NS KUB 59.47 iv1 10-11\(^{40}\) (I NS KUB 7.46 iv 7-8)

namma GI\(^{U,A}\) šará hu'ittijanz[(i)]\(^{41}\) (11) [(naš IG\(^{I,W}\))'A]-ya katta yahnuyandusš tarranzì

'Then they pull out (lit. up) the arrows. (11) [(And)] they let [(them)] hang down (lit. turned down) with regard to their [(hea)]ds (lit. eyes).\(^{42}\)

(19) MH/NS KBo 3.5 iii 32-33\(^{43}\)

INA v\(^{I}\) MUS/I-ma (33) andusš arha aruizzi māš türirianzi

'But on the sixth night (33) he washes them (i.e. the horses) warm (i.e. whilst they are warmed up), and one harnesses them.'


\(^{41}\) Written with TI (-Z) instead of with IU (-X). For another instance of the same spelling error see footnote 19.

\(^{42}\) Here interpreted as a periphrastic causative (admissive) construction with tarr(an)-a' to let (go) as a light verb. For a similar construction employing a different light verb, viz. ije/a_zi to do, to make+i participle, cf. example (3) above. But cf. the alternative interpretation in POPKO, op.cit. 51, who translates the participle not as a predicative participle within a causative-like construction with tarr(an)-a' as a light verb, but as an adverbial participle with tarranzì being a full verb: "Dann zückt man die Pfeile und läßt sie mit den Spitzen nach unten ge dreht hinab" (boldfacing mine). In any event, IG\(^{U,A}-ya\) /sakuya/ (acc.pl.n.) is certainly to be analysed as an accusativus gracaeus in this sentence.

\(^{43}\) Ed. KAMMENHUBER (1961: 95–96).

\(^{44}\) Differently KAMMENHUBER, op.cit. 95\(^{fi}\)), who emends the numeral vi to vi' "[...] da andernfalls keine Verrichtung für die 5. Nacht angegeben wäre."

(20) NS KUB 17.18 iii 17-18\(^{45}\)

...x taknas\(^{2}\) DINGIRUTU-aš ANA ĖSAG 'UDU DINGIR\(^{M\#}\) LŪMEŠ ANA ĖSAG MĀŠ.GA[L] (18) [... app]andusš hrūš' yandusš\(^{46}\) anda hārijanzì

'...x in the pit of the Sun Goddess of the Earth (18) one buries (17) a sheep, in the pit of the Male Deities a ra[m] (18) – [... cap]tured (and) living / alive.'

(21) NH (Mursilli II) KBo 4.6 obv. 27-31\(^{47}\) (1 KBo 55.23: 2–5)

kimuna kāša tuš ANA DINGIR\(^{L\#}\) 'Gaššulašias\(^{\#}\) (28) [...uē GE]\(^{M\#}\) TUM A\(^{\#}\) ANA GIG šer apēl tarpalliuš (29) [I G\(^{U,A},B,NIGA\) I UD(UG)SIG+MUNUS'-NIGA] Aj-ja ĮSTU TŪGIL LÂM\(^{M\#}\) \(\mathfrak{u}\) saslandusš (30) [... S\(^{2}\) A\(^{2}\) DU-i kūši šandanteš (31) [... u arrogans] iuppisteā

'Now, to you, o goddess, Gaššulawiya, (28) [your female servant], because of her disease, (31) has sent her substitutes, (30) [...], which (are) determined for her [person], (31) [... in order for them to be burn)ejd: (29) [one fattened cow] and [one (fatten)ed (e)(we)] – clad in festive garments.'

In (18), (19) and (20) the participial forms in -andusš, which would be regular in the older language, where there is no syncretistic tendency towards an Einheitsklausus whatsoever, could simply represent the original forms of an hypothetic older original. This is certainly possible for (19), a passage of the so-called Kikkuli-text, an originally Middle Hittite composition. There is, however, no clear indication that the two NS texts of examples (18) and (20) are copies of an older original composition. KUB 59.47 belongs to the text
group of CTH 418, which only consists of NS texts. There are also no evident linguistic features appurtenant to the older language in the texts of this group that would suggest an older date of composition. KUB 17.18, on the other hand, belongs to CTH 448, which also includes texts in Middle Hittite script, so that influence from an older (MH) original is, at least, possible. Whereas influence from an older original is possible for (18-20), the text of (21) is clearly Neo-Hittite and is probably to be dated to Muršili II, at least if one accepts the view, widespread among Hittitologists, that the Gaššūl(y)awiyha of this text, on whose behalf the prayer was written, was indeed his wife. Therefore the occurrence of an adverbial participial form in -āndus is contradictory to the morphosyntactic behaviour described on the basis of the examples (4-10) above for the later language. Note that yaššanás of (21) is not in accordance with Melchert’s rule established on the basis of NH compositions either. The example (21) must, for the time being, be regarded as an – as yet – unexplained exception. One should note, however, that example (21) stems from a text of the period of Muršili II. As mentioned above (§1 and footnote 3) texts of this period are transitional in several respects. It is conceivable that the form yaššanás is still a vestige of the older language, where an accusative form in -uš is morphosyntactically justified.

§6. Finally, there are also some exceptional occurrences of participial forms that can be neither reconciled with Melchert’s rule nor with the morphosyntactic rule established in this study. In three cases, examples (22-24), we find a participle (or lexicalised participle) with the desinence -āndus with nominative force. According to Melchert’s rule one would expect -antes instead, because the regular Einheitsklausus for -(‘y)-stems is -es. According to the rule postulated here, one would still expect a form in -antes regardless of the syntactic function of the participle. The first two examples, (22) and (23), are found in NH original compositions:

(22) NH (Muwatalli II) KBo 11.1 obv. 33

\[\text{URU}^{\text{DIDL}}{\text{I}}^{\text{L}}{\text{H}}^{\text{A}} \text{āsanda}u \text{knēs kueda}ß \text{ANA URU}^{\text{DIDL}}{\text{I}}^{\text{L}}{\text{H}}^{\text{A}} \text{šinapśi ešzi n=at uēhanzi n=at EΓIR-pa SIGS-abhānzi} \]

‘Which towns (are) inhabited (lit. settled), for which towns there is a šinapši, they inspect them and [restore them].’

(23) NH (Muršili II) KUB 24.2 rev. 1750 (1 KUB 24.1 rv 16)

\[\text{(mu ēš)šanāš hūyadus (dpl. IM}[\text{HHH}-uš) ijan tar]\]

‘[And] the winds (of pro)sparsity shall blo[w] (lit. go).’

It is conceivable that the syntax of (22) is corrupt and that the form of the participle asandaš (\(\langle \text{eš}^{\text{NT}}{\text{HI}}^{\text{L}} \text{a} \rangle\) to sit (intr.); to settle (trans.)) is probably synchronically nothing but a substantive in Hittite, although historically it is the old lexicalised, substantivised -nt-participle asandaš ‘the inhabited cities’ would constitute an independent nominal phrase, which is the object of uēhanzi, consisting of the head URU^{DIDL}I^{L}H^{A} asandaš in which case the form asandaš instead of asantes is expected. There is, however, no feasible explanation for the form hūyadus ‘winds’ in (23), a form of huyant ‘wind’ showing nasal-reduction. One should keep in mind, however, that huyant-\(\ast\)hulh(-o)nt-, just like its thematised variant \(\ast\)hulh-ni/nt-o- in the other Indo-European languages (Lat. ventus, Welsh gwyrn, Goth. winds \(\ast\)hulhn-nt-\(\circ\)), Ved. vāta-, GAV. vāta- < Proto-Iranian \(\ast\)hulh1-at-a- < \(\ast\)hulh-ni/nt-o-), is probably synchronically nothing but a substantive in Hittite, although historically it is the old lexicalised, substantivised -nt-participle hulh-ont- / hulh-nt- ‘blowing > wind’ of a verb \(\ast\)hulhni / \(\ast\)hulhn ‘to blow’ (cf. Ved. vāti, Gr. ἄνετον ‘blows’). It may therefore lie outside the scope of this study, which postulates a morphosyntactic rule only for regular -ant-particiles.

Another instance of a participle with nominative force that shows the desinence -āndus instead of the expected -antes is found in several almost identical parallel passages from one version of the horse training instructions, the so-called Kikkuli-text, a NS copy of an MH original. In these passages the

---

49 The exact interpretation of uēhanzi is unclear. Usually, yeh-j2 / yab-, yeh-\(\circ\)nt- is used intrinsively ‘to turn (around)’. Here it seems to be used as a transitivum with the object being the enclitic pronoun -at. Cf. the translations of Singer and de Roos, who envisage a meaning ‘survey, inspect’ within the given context: “Those towns that are inhabited and have a šinapśi-sanctuary, they shall be surveyed and [shall be set right]” (Singer, loc.cit.), “De steden die bevolkt zijn (en) een šinapśi hebben, zullen die inspecteren en [za] zullen die weer in orde brengen” (de Roos, loc.cit.). The tertium between ‘turn’ and ‘inspect’ could be a meaning ‘turn towards, sich etw. zuwenden’.
51 Cf. the parallel in KUB 24.3 iii 39-40: \(\mu\)aššakštu[§] (\(\circ\)) IM-antes lijan tar, with the correct and expected form in -antes.
participle is probably adverbial; cf. the following example, which is given as a representative for this frequent construction of the Kikkuli-text:

53 (24) MH/NS KBo 3.2 rev.¹ 34

Egir-pa-ja Uru-ri anda parhanduš uyanzi

And they (the horses) come back rushing into the city.

These exceptional forms of the Kikkuli-text can be explained in two ways. Since it is known that Kikkuli was not a native speaker of Hittite and that the text is notorious for errors, one could take the form parhanduš as a mere mistake induced by Kikkuli's misunderstanding of the rule that adverbial plural participles show no case distinction between accusative and nominative. But instead of using the correct desinence -anteš, Kikkuli would have used -anduš, which in "correct" Hittite would have been used in nominal (attributive or substantival) participles with accusative force only. In other words, Kikkuli would have generalised a different form, namely the old accusative desinence -anduš, for the verbal (adverbial and predicative) usage. This scenario would imply, however, that the rule of reduction of case distinction in predicative and adverbial participles was already a Middle Hittite phenomenon (the time of the original composition of the Kikkuli-text), for which our examples presented above do not provide direct evidence, even though a pre-Neo-Hittite dating of this morphosyntactic mechanism is not excluded. Alternatively, uyanzi could be regarded as the 3rd pl. act. of nase/aši 'to come' but of an(δ);¹⁶ / u- 'to see', yielding a translation 'and back into the city they saw them (the horses) rushing' with a predicative participle with accusative force. Given that the text is a Neo-Hittite copy of a Middle Hittite original composition and that most of the evidence provided above for the reduction of case distinction in plural predicative and adverbial participles comes from NH texts, one could then regard the form parhanduš as a relic of a grammatical system (pre-Neo-Hittite) in which the distinction between -anduš (accusative) vs. -anteš (nominative) was still being made in predicative participles as well. However, the occurrence of a verb for 'to see'

is very unlikely within the context of an instruction. Furthermore, the deviating parallel passage, which exhibits a different verb, n-as fir Danna XX Iku²(la) (22) parhanduš paniš (Kub 1.11 iv 21-22) 'and one mile and twenty field (22) they go rushing' indeed suggests that we are dealing with an intransitive verb of movement in the case of uyanzi as well. It is therefore safer to assume an error in the Kikkuli-text, which was perhaps induced by a misunderstanding of the morphosyntactic rule presented in this article.

§ 7. Yet another potential exception to the rule, like those presented in the previous paragraph § 6, namely a nom.pl.c. form in -anduš, will be treated here in the manner of an excursus as it does probably not constitute an assured counter-example, since the form in question can only be obtained by restoration. In what follows a novel interpretation of the passage in question, which does not involve a nom.pl. form in -anduš, will be presented in example (26).

The damaged form ̄š-b[h(u-ul)z-ija-x […]x is found in a report by Hatušili III of the campaigns of Šuppillusiuma I, in a very vivid battle description. It runs over the break between the two joining fragments (Kub 31.20 and Kbo 16.36) and is broken near its end, where there is a lacuna in the middle of the second fragment (Kbo 16.36): (q+1 + 1111). Mcintyre (1986: 28) restores this broken form as ̄š-b[hu(z-ija[n]duš] and reckons with a nom.pl.c. in -anduš as an adverbial participle īshužijant-girded' īshužijat/azš 'to gird':


The text is cited here as it is presented in Melchert's Neo-Hittite corpus (available from the author upon personal request) with a tentative translation as would directly follow from his edition. Mcintyre (1986) does not discuss the passage in detail but merely lists the form - restored as ̄š-b[hu(z-ija[n]duš] - under the examples for nom.pl.c. forms in -as of the time of Hatušili III. A new transcription and translation of the text, more in line with the context, is given below in example (26).

He translates ‘an seinem Gürtel’; but under this interpretation a nom.-acc.pl. of a participle is out of place. One could theoretically assume a fossilised (nom.-)acc.pl.-adverb, such as munnda ‘secretly’ ← munnae.²⁴ ‘to conceal’. Such adverbs are, however, extremely rare and limited to specific idiomatic usage, which would not be the case with an hypothetical participial adverb ʰišuṣṣiṣanda ‘girded’. The most likely account of the passage and of the form in question has recently been presented by the editors of the HW² (IV: 1, 166b): ʰen-za-za-an (sic! =kan erroneously omitted!) A-az (6) ʰiš-[u-u]-z[i]-ja-aš pedi’i sarā ep[ta] ‘And (6) she took him up (5) from the water (6) at the belt (lit. at the place of the belt [HW²: ‘am [Orj[t] de[sg] Güt[tel]s’]). The remains of the last sign of the word are interpreted as those of a DI (x).²⁵

The construction ʰišuṣṣiṣanda pedi ‘at the place of the belt’ is possibly a fixed expression, which is attested a second time in the Ullikummi myth KUB 33.92 + KUB 36.10+ iii 14-15 (KUB 33.93+ iv 24-25). [(mr-ši-kan) arunaš [15] ʰišuṣṣiṣanda pedi TUU[G-aš mān anda pēdan]i‘z’ [(And) the sea (15) [reached]] (14) him (15) [(unto)] the place of his belt [(like)] a garme[(ni)].²⁶

If we are indeed dealing with an idiom it is likely that ʰišuṣṣiṣanda pedi in KUB 31.20+ is also referring to the water level as in the passage from the Ullikummi myth. If so, then A-az ‘the water’, just like arunaš ‘the sea’ in the Ullikummi text, would be the subject of the sentence. It is then the water (A-az) of the now swollen Zuliya river which seized (za- ep[a] him (an- ⁵⁹), the commander, up unto his belt (ʰiš[u]-zi-ja-aš pedi sarā), instead of Istar pulling him out of the water (ablative A-az /išuṣṣiṣanda/). Under this interpretation A-az /išuṣṣiṣanda/ is the “ergative” of ʰuṭar /išuṣṣiṣanda/ ‘water’ with a relatively short phonetic complement exhibiting nasal-reduction.²⁷

Cf. CHD P, 146a: “[…] swollen?/floodings? (iουζανα, lit. ‘conning’) […]”, but pace CHD the participle is not contemporary but must be restitutive since ḵan uẹpa²⁸ ‘to come’ is a telic verb (for the telicing function of ḵan see Cotticelli KURRAS 2014 with further literature), whence ‘had come’ > ‘was swollen’ referring to the water mass (cf. ÜNAL, op.cit. 76: “[…] war gestiegen”; cf. also ZULIJA-arku) mekki uyanza ʰišuṣṣa (NH [Hatt. III] KUB 19.9 iv 4-5) [The Zuliya river] had come on in great quantity > ‘… was very swollen’.

57 Cf. CHD P, 146a: “[…] swollen?/floodings? (iουζανα, lit. ‘conning’) […]”, but pace CHD the participle is not contemporary but must be restitutive since ḵan uẹpa²⁸ ‘to come’ is a telic verb (for the telicing function of ḵan see Cotticelli KURRAS 2014 with further literature), whence ‘had come’ > ‘was swollen’ referring to the water mass (cf. ÜNAL, op.cit. 76: “[…] war gestiegen”; cf. also ZULIJA-arku) mekki uyanza ʰišuṣṣa (NH [Hatt. III] KUB 19.9 iv 4-5) [The Zuliya river] had come on in great quantity > ‘… was very swollen’.

58 Similarly already RIESMENZHEIMER, op.cit. 112, who was, however, at the time unaware of the join with KUB 31.20, and who tentatively restores [m[u]-z[i]-ja-aš pedi’i] translating ‘am Pfahlze’ des Heerlagers?” and adding in a footnote, op.cit. 113²⁹: “[…] das Zeichen DI ist nach Foto sicher.”

59 Or rather am-za-an with reduplication of the clitic pronoun; on this widespread phenomenon of the later language see the excellent overview in YAKOVCHIK (2010: 357-367).

tation also fits better within the given context, as the commander is still described as standing in the river when being attacked by the enemy with distant weapons (arrow and bow, stones) in the following lines. Only then Istar, previously merely briefly mentioned in connexion with her dispensing the river, enters the scene again sheltering the commander, who is still standing belt deep in the river, with her palasha-garment from the projectiles hurled at him. Having Istar pull him out of the water before the attack would be out of context. The local particle -kan is then due to the presence of the local expression ishuzzijaš pedi. The passage can now be translated thus:

(26) NH (Hattušili III) HHT 82 + KUB 31.20 + KBo 16.36 iii i–10

12Zulijaš-ka=kan uyanza (2) ėsta n[u]-šši DINGIR IŠTAR URIŠ Šamuha (3) peran baščiš (4) nu 12Zuljian uyandan (5) pară [p]arhišat 'n -ašar-zā-

'The Zuliya river (2) was (1) swollen (lit. had come). An(d) Istar of Šamuha (3) supported (lit. went before) (2) him (i.e. the commander). (4) And the swollen Zuliya river (5) she [d]rove away. And the water (7) reach[ed] (6) him (6) (lit. seized him) up unto the b[e]lt (lit. [the place of the] belt). (7) And (8) in (7) the river (9) they attacked (lit. beat) (7) him (8) with bow (and) arrow (and) with stone(s). (9) And Istar of Šamuha, (10) my mistress, held (her) palasha-garment over (10) him,'

In any event, the passage containing is-[u]-zi-[a]-x[...][x] does in all likelihood not exhibit a morphosyntactically aberrant participial noun,pl.c. form in -antus and is therefore not to be regarded as an assured piece of counter-evidence to the morphosyntactic rule presented in this article nor to MELCHERT's rule.

§ 8. Conclusions: According to the rule formulated by MELCHERT (1995) on the basis of Neo-Hittite original compositions (post-Supplementum I) there is, in Neo-Hittite, no longer a distinction between nominative and accusative in the plural as in the older language. Instead either the accusative form in -us or the nominative form in -es has been generalised for both subject and object function, resulting in an allomorphic Einheitskasus. The distribution between -es and -us for this Einheitskasus is conditioned only by the respective stem class: -t-stems, apophonic -u-stems and the relative pronoun kui- take -es, whilst all other (pro)nominial stems, notably thematic nouns as well as the demonstratives ka/i- 'this' and apa/- that', take -us. MELCHERT claims that -ant-participles behave exactly like other -t-stems, generalising -es for subject and object function as shown in table 1 below.\(^6\)

\[\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{(Pro)-NOMINAL STEMS} & \text{INCLUDING PARTICIPLES} \\
\hline
\text{OLDER LANGUAGE} & \text{Obj.} & \text{-es} & \text{-t-stems + ptc.} & \text{-us} & \text{Relative} \\
\hline
\text{Subj.} & \text{-es} & \text{-t-stems + ptc.} & \text{-us} & \text{kuiš} \\
\hline
\text{NEO-HITTITE} & \text{Obj.} & \text{-es} & \text{-t-stems + ptc.} & \text{-us} & \text{kuiš} \\
\hline
\end{array}\]

As far as -ant-particilies are concerned MELCHERT is, however, compelled to admit to several exceptions to his rule, i.e. cases where the desinence of a form with accusative force is still -antus. In a great number of instances we do indeed find a form in -anš with accusative force in NH or NS texts (see the list at the end of § 1). Yet it is very conspicuous that, as shown in § 2, almost all of those passages, 13 cases altogether, feature the participle in either predicative (exx. 1-3) or adverbial (exx. 4-10) function (participium coniunctum). There is only one (possibly two) example(s), discussed in § 3, where a form in -andes does not have predicative or adverbial but attributive function (exx. 11, possibly also 12). On the other hand, participles in -antus stemming from NH or NS texts, which would also count as exceptions to MELCHERT's rule, all exhibit attributive or substantival usage (see § 4 with exx. 13-17 and footnote 31 for a complete list of all NH and NS -andes-forms known to me). We must therefore conclude that the syncretism of -es and -us resulting in an allomorphic Einheitskasus in -es/-us, as described by MELCHERT's rule, does not apply to the -ant-participle. Instead, like, in its later stage, features a twofold system in which a syncretism according to MELCHERT's proposition exists only in 'regular' nouns, as shown in table 2. In the participial system a syncretism under the form -antus (former nominative) is only present in the domain of verbal usage (adverbial and predicative function), whereas the distinction pertaining to the older lan-

\(^6\) In the following tables case syncretisms are indicated by \(\text{bold \ lines}\). (former) nominative desinences are shaded grey (\(\underline{\text{g-eus}}\)), (former) accusative desinences are left white (\(\underline{\text{g-us}}\)).
guage between nominative -anteš and accusative -andus was still being made in the domain of nominal usage (attributive and substantival function), as shown in table 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Pro-)Nominal stems</th>
<th>Older Language</th>
<th>Subj.</th>
<th>-anteš</th>
<th>-anteš</th>
<th>-anteš</th>
<th>relative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neo-Hittite Language</td>
<td>Obj.</td>
<td>-us</td>
<td>-ANTEš</td>
<td>-anteš</td>
<td>-anteš</td>
<td>kuvšš</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Tab. 2: Neo-Hittite case syncretisms according to Melchert’s rule excluding participles)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participial stems</th>
<th>NOMINAL USAGE</th>
<th>VERBAL USAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Older Language</td>
<td>Subj.</td>
<td>-anteš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj.</td>
<td>-andus</td>
<td>-anteš</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Tab. 3: Morphosyntactic features of the participle as opposed to those of other nominal stems)

In other words, the reduction of case marking towards Neo-Hittite resulting in a system with only three distinct cases in the plural (nominative-accusative, genitive-dative-locative, ablative-instrumental) is not shared by the nominal participle, which still has four distinct cases (nominative, accusative, genitive-dative-locative, ablative-instrumental) when used nominally.

Particularly illuminating and corroborative for the just presented rule applying to participles with object function is the alternation of -anteš (verbal usage) and -andus (nominal usage) within one and the same text, such as in KB 15.12: 7, 8 (ex. 5): TI-anteš (attributive) vs. umuanteš (adverbial), and KUB 39.7 ii 12 (ex. 10), ii 18, 33 (exx. 16–17): huitsanteš (adverbial) vs. huitsandus / huitsyandus (attributive). The exact dating of this rule is, however, elusive because not only texts for which a Neo-Hittite composition is certain, but also Neo-Hittite copies of older texts had been taken into consideration. Since the phenomenon described by the rule presented in this study is systematically different from the one discovered by Melchert specifically for the Neo-Hittite of the period post-Suppluliuma I, it is possible that the here presented rule is, in fact, older. In any event, they do not necessarily coincide chronologically.

The behaviour of the participle, which preserves the old case distinction in nominal usage but exhibits a syncretism in verbal usage, is peculiar insofar as it constitutes a systemic inconsistency: Whereas a syncretism or a reduced distinction in the domain of verbal usage is not at all surprising, the participle deviates from other nouns exactly in the domain of nominal usage, as shown in the synoptic depiction of the system in table 4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPLE</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>-STEM</th>
<th>-STEM</th>
<th>RELAT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Older Language</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-anteš</td>
<td>-anteš</td>
<td>-anteš</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Tab. 4: Partial syncretisms in the Hittite nominal system including participles and (pro)nouns)

§ 9. Typological parallels and prospects: I know of no exact typological parallel for this peculiar system, in which participles behave morphosyntactically differently from other nominal stems. There is a quasi parallel in French: adverbial participles are uninflected ending in -ante with no grammatical concord regarding gender and number, whereas attributive participles are inflected (sg.: -ante, pl.: -ants, plf.: -antes). The diachrony which stands behind the French system is, however, entirely different from that of Hittite. In French the uninflected form of the adverbial participle is a direct continuation of the Latin gerund in the ablative in -ndo (chantant < cantandum) and consequently exhibits no inflexion, whilst the attributive participle continues the Latin -nt-participle (chantant < (*))cantante(m) < cantament). By regular sound changes (viz. the loss of final vowels and subsequent final devoicing of the gerund formant) both forms have simply

coalesced. In Italian, for instance, both forms are still kept apart (cf. gerund cantando < cantando vs. participle cantante < cantantem). Furthermore, other than the Hittite system, the ensuing synchronic system of French shows a reduction of morphological distinctions with regard to gender and number. The Hittite system on the other hand exhibits a reduction of case marking in plural conjunct (adverbial) and predicative participles. Another possible partial parallel is found in Old High German. Here, the so-called 'uninflected' form in -mi is mainly used when the participle is adverbial or predicative. When the participle is attributive forms of pronominal origin such as the nom.sg.m. -mi are used. But this system is not an exact parallel either because it applies to all adjectives and not only to participles.

It is a task for future research to investigate, from a typological perspective, the likelihood of a system as the one presented here for the later period of Hittite. On the other hand, the rule presented draws on a large number of examples with almost no counter-evidence, whereas at the same time it is able to account for all of the exceptions to MELCHERT's rule. It lies outside the scope of this study to examine whether the rule established here applied - at least as a tendency - also to regular adjectives. If so, the system would indeed be less peculiar and exceptional typologically. Another unresolved question is that of the exact dating of the rule. On the basis of the material used in this study, it was not possible to determine the exact dating. If adjectives could indeed be shown to exhibit a morphosyntactic behaviour similar to participles, one could hope to be able to solve this chronological question on the basis of a much larger material foundation.

64 The adverbial function of the participle is in all Germanic languages (save Gothic) utterly rare (with the exception of some participles derived from intransitive verbs, notably verbs of movement) and must hence be considered unidiomatic; see the comprehensive overview including earlier literature in KILLIE (2007: 150–151), but cf. also - differently (for Tatian and Oiträ) – LÖHR (2012: 422–427), who regards the adverbial usage as idiomatic and independent of Latin. In Old High German sometimes a deparicipial adverb in -nto (lenited -nto) is used instead; see on this FROSCHER (forthcoming b).
65 The distribution between the 'uninflected' form and the pronominal forms of the adjective is not clear cut. When used as attributes, adjectives can either show the 'uninflected' ending or the pronominal ending (blint man or blint êr man). In predicative usage the 'uninflected' forms are, however, more frequent (der man ist blint; rarely der man ist blint êr); cf. BRAUNE / REIFFENSTEIN (2004: 219), RANHEIMSTRÆTER 1945, FLEISCHER 2007.
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