THE FREE-STANDING GENITIVE AND HYPOSTASIS IN HITTITE*

ILYA YAKUBOVICH, The University of Chicago

THE AIM of this paper is to provide an interpretation of two syntactic phenomena of the Hittite language. In section I, I argue that the Hittite free-standing genitive is not to be taken as an adverbial or "absolute" construction but, rather, must be regarded as a result of head-noun ellipsis in a possessive noun phrase. In section II, I try to demonstrate that in those cases where Hittite hypostasis represents a synchronic phenomenon, it arises not through the reinterpretation of free-standing genitives but, instead, due to head-noun ellipsis in possessive noun phrases with case attraction.

I

The free-standing genitive (*Freischwebender Genetiv,* hereafter FSG) is a Hittitological term for a genitive case noun (possessor) whose synthetic head (possessum) does not appear in a sentence surface structure.[1] The simplest kind of FSGs can be illustrated by the following sentences:

(1)   KBo 17.1 I 7–8, CTH 416 (a ritual for the royal couple), OS
    hurtiyalli=ma [AN.B]AR-*as nepis* 1-*EN kitta* **URUDU-*ass*=*a** 1-*EN kitta*
    In the h.-vessel lie one iron "heaven" and one **bronze** ⟨"heaven"⟩.

(2)   KUB 21.27 I 5–6, CTH 384 (Prayer of the Puduheba to the Sun-Goddess of Arinna), NH
    namma=ma=za kuit KUR-*e* ᴳᴵˢ**ERIN-*as* iyat**
    nu=za=kán ᵈ*hépat* ŠUM-*an daista*
    Which land you made **the cedar-⟨land⟩**, you assumed (there) the name Hebat.[2]

Example (1) represents a straightforward case of coordinative omission (gapping). The phrase ᴳᴵˢERIN-*as* KUR-*e* 'Cedar-land', implied in example (2), is a Hittite idiomatic expression for Syria. One can argue that the second part of this expression may be omitted in (2), since it is formally identical with KUR-*e* that appears earlier in the dependent

---

(*CHD*). In particular, OH/MH/NH refer to the Old, Middle, and New Hittite texts respectively, while OS/MS/LS denote the Old, Middle, and Late Script (ductus) of individual tablets.

The words and phrases whose syntactic behavior is addressed in the present article are set in bold type in each of the examples cited. I use single and double asterisks in order to mark reconstructed and nonexistent forms respectively.

[1] For the definition, see S. Luraghi, *Hittite* (Munich and Newcastle, 1997), p. 10 (§ 2.1.5.4).

[2] Cf. the translation of Goetze in *ANET,* 3d ed., p. 393: "But in the land which thou madest the cedar-land thou bearest the name Hebat."

clause. Elliptical constructions similar to (1) and (2) occur in most languages of the world and will not be discussed further in the present article.

It is, however, more difficult to provide a syntactic analysis of the cases below, where the omitted head-noun cannot be restored on the basis of syntactic information alone.

(3)   KBo 6.3 III 69, CTH 291 (Laws § 73), OH/MS[3]
      *mahhan **dayazilas** apass=a QATAMMA* (Laws § 78)
      He too is the same as **the thief** (lit. ⟨he⟩ of the theft).

(4)   KBo 6.2 IV 44, CTH 290 (Laws § 95), OS[4]
      tayazilas 6 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR *pāi* (Laws § 95)
      He shall pay 6 shekels of silver **for the theft** (lit. ⟨as that⟩ of the theft).

The interpretation of ***dayazilas*** (3) as '⟨he⟩ of the theft,' i.e., 'thief', and ***tayazilas*** (4) as '⟨that⟩ of the theft,' may seem arbitrary out of context. In fact, one can try to translate sentence (4) as 'the thief shall pay 6 shekels of silver', and only the fact that the subject ('thief') is also omitted in the neighboring clauses makes Hoffner's translation stylistically preferable.

The difficulty of retrieving syntactic heads of FSGs in cases such as (3) and (4), as well as the putative absence of FSGs in Indo-European, has called into question the existence of the entire category. Neumann[5] has suggested reinterpreting Old Hittite[6] FSGs as verbal complements or, in other examples, as adverbial modifiers. Thus, according to him, sentence (4) should be taken at face value as '⟨he⟩ shall pay 6 shekels of silver **for the theft**', while ***tayazilas*** can be analyzed as a *genitivus delicti*[7] dependent on the predicate *pāi* 'he shall pay'. In (3), Neumann claims that ***dayazilas*** can be understood as a *genitivus tituli (Genetiv des Bereichs)*[8] that is dependent on the copula, comparable with Latin *haud censebam istarum operarum* esse patrem 'I did not think that my father was **capable of such a thing**' (Plautus, Merc. 815).

More traditional terminology is used by D. Yoshida in his 1987 monograph, which concentrates on the functional analysis of the Old Hittite genitive.[9] Yoshida accepts the existence of free-standing genitives in (3) and (4) and similar Old Hittite examples but immediately adds: "Streng genommen handelt es sich dabei nicht um einen elliptischen Ausdrück, sondern um einen absoluten Gebrauch des Genetivs" (p. 1). Yoshida does not specify what he means by the absolute usage of the genitive in this case, but presumably he objects to introducing head-nouns in the syntactic representation of clauses with FSGs and wishes to treat FSGs as adjuncts of clause predicates. Terminology aside, there is not much difference between Neumann's and Yoshida's approaches. After all, Greek "absolute genitives" such as ***nyktòs epelthúsēs** es tēn pólin apēlthon* '**When night fell**, I arrived at

---

[3] Edited in Hoffner, *The Laws of the Hittites,* DMOA 23 (Leiden, 1997), pp. 80–81.

[4] Ibid., pp. 93–94.

[5] G. Neumann, "Der adverbiale Genetiv im Althethitischen," in StBoT 45, pp. 446–55.

[6] Neumann's account is fuzzy at this point. Although he claims to be dealing primarily with the situation in Old Hittite, some of his examples (notably [7], p. 452) come from Late Hittite texts. It is not clear to me whether Neumann completely denies the existence of

FSGs in Hittite or if he regards them as a Late Hittite innovation.

[7] Neumann's term; the more usual designation is *genitivus criminis.*

[8] Strictly speaking, Neumann uses this term with respect to other FSGs, which are, however, syntactically parallel to (3).

[9] *Die Syntax des althethitischen substantivischen Genitivs,* THeth 13 (Heidelberg, 1987).

the city', are nothing but the extension of Greek adverbial genitives of the type *hikánomen enthádé **nyktós*** 'we came there **by night**'.

Neither Neumann nor Yoshida presented formal proofs of their theories. The reference to genetically related languages whose traditional grammar does not include the notion of FSG can hardly be considered as proof. It is true, however, that syntactic description not implying the omission of a constituent from a sentence surface structure is intrinsically simpler than its opposite, and thus the burden of proof lies on those who accept elliptical free-standing genitives in Hittite.

Because Hittite is a dead language, we do not have direct access to the grammatical judgments of its native-speakers, and we must restrict ourselves to studying the corpus of available texts. Under such conditions, the most convincing way to prove the omission (ellipsis) of a head-noun in a given sentence is to provide a parallel sentence from the same corpus where this head-noun is not omitted. Compare the following Latin examples.

(5) ***Proprium** id **Tiberio** fuit* (Tac. A.4.19).
    This was **typical of Tiberius**.

(6) *Id vitium non **proprium senectutis** est* (Cic. Sen. 11).
    This vice is not **typical of old age**.

(7) *Temeritas est **florentis aetatis*** (Cato 20).
    Rashness is ⟨**typical**⟩ **of the blooming age**.

(8) ***Virorum** est **fortium** toleranter dolores pati* (Cic. Tusc. 2.43).
    It is ⟨**typical**⟩ **of strong men** to bear woes with patience.

Examples (5) and (6) illustrate the usage of the adjective *proprium* 'typical of' that can govern a noun in the genitive or, more rarely, in the dative. Examples (7) and (8) show that this adjective can be omitted in gnomic statements when the subject is indefinite. Traditional grammars of Latin refer to the case of the dependent noun in (7) and (8) as *genetivus proprietatis* and presume that it is directly attached to the copula. This interpretation is not acceptable to a linguist, since it implies different syntactic analysis for synonymous predicates in (5) and (6) vs. (7) and (8). *Genitivus proprietatis* may be a convenient label, but the peculiarity of this construction is not a special case function. It is rather the ellipsis[10] of the head-noun, such as *proprium* 'typical (of)', *munus, officium* 'duty (of)', or *signum* 'sign (of)', as the latest comprehensive description of Latin syntax[11] also seems to acknowledge.

Thus one can speak about FSGs in other Indo-European languages. Additional examples of a similar kind can be found, for example, apud B. Delbrück,[12] who discusses instances of head-noun ellipsis in Sanskrit, Slavic, and so on. It is true, however, that FSGs played a marginal role in these languages, and this is the reason why they were not treated as a special category in their traditional grammars. In Hittite, however, they are very widespread

---

[10] Here and below, the term "ellipsis" is used for the omission of any underlying syntactic constituent from the surface structure and not necessarily conditioned by an overtly expressed antecedent.

[11] Hermann Menge, *Lehrbuch der lateinischen Syntax und Semantik,* ed. T. Burkard and M. Schauer (Darmstadt, 2000).

[12] K. Brugmann and B. Delbrück, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen: Kurzgefasste Darstellung der Geschichte des Altindischen, Altiranischen (Avestischen u. Altpersischen) Altarmenischen, Altgriechischen, Albanesischen, Lateinischen, Oskisch-Umbrischen, Altirischen, Gotischen, Althochdeutschen, Litauischen, und Altkirchenslavischen,* vol. 5 (by B. Delbrück) (Strasbourg, 1990), pp. 136–37.

and simply cannot be ignored in any kind of syntactic description. Below, I have applied the same corpus-based demonstration procedure to the genitive of Hitt. *lingai-* 'oath':

(9)   KBo 4.4 IV 60, CTH 61/2 (Annals of Mursilis, longer version), NH[13]
       *na=an=za=an **lingayas** ARAD-DUM iyat*
       And he made him his **sworn vassal** (lit. 'slave of the oath').

(10)   KUB 6.41 I 46–47, CTH 68 (Treaty with Kupanta-Kurunta), NH
       ^LÚPÍŠ.TUR-*as=wa=mu **linkiyas antuhs[as]** ēsta*
       Mashuiluwa was my **sworn ally** (lit. 'man of the oath').

(11)   KUB 21.42 III 3–5, CTH 255 (Instruction for Palace Attendants), NH
       *nu=za **ŠA MAMETI** lē kuiski kuedani[kki] kisari*
       Let none ⟨of you⟩ become anybody's **sworn ⟨ally⟩** (lit. '⟨man⟩ of the oath')!

(12)   KUB 14.1+ Obv. 13, CTH 147 (Indictment of Madduwattas), MH/MS
       *namma=z uit ABI ^dUTU-ŠI tuk madduwattan **l[i]nkiyas=sas** iēt*
       Then it so happened that the father of his Majesty made you, Madduwatta, his **sworn ⟨ally⟩**
       (lit. '⟨man⟩ of the oath').

(13)   KUB 6.34 I 13–14, CTH 427 (Military Oath), MH/NS
       *[k]inuna=n kāsa [   ] **linkiyas pedi** dasuwahhir*
       Now [   ] have blinded him **on the place of the oath**.

(14)   KUB 6.34 IV 18–19, CTH 427 (Military Oath), MH/NS[14]
       *mān ERÍN.MEŠ-an **lenkiya** pēhudanzi*
       When they conduct the troops **to ⟨the place of⟩ the oath** . . .

(15)   KUB 36.89, Rev. 18–19, CTH 671 (Cult of the Storm-god of Nerik), NH
       ***lenkiy[as=wa]=ta** ēsdu nu=wa=za=kan ārsanu lē wahnusi*
       Let it be **a ⟨matter⟩ of oath** to you: do not change the direction of your flow.

The noun phrases of the sentences (9) and (10), lit. 'slave of the oath', i.e., 'vassal', and 'man of the oath', i.e., 'ally', can be contrasted with the '⟨one⟩ of the oath' that appears in (11) and (12). 'Place of the oath' in (13) and '⟨place⟩ of the oath' in (14) are taken from the same text and probably refer to the same entity.[15] Although '⟨matter⟩ of the oath' in (15) does not have a pair and therefore represents a product of semantic reconstruction, the other examples prove its reliability. Thus we are dealing with an omission of three different underlying nouns.

Neumann's approach is clearly inferior in the case of (8) through (14). Not only would it assign different case functions to the synonymous genitives *linkiyas,* for example, in (10) and (12), but it would also fail to capture the semantic distinction between *linkiyas* in (11) and (15). Both would fall into the vague category of *genitivus tituli,*[16] and, to avoid

---

[13] Examples (9) through (15) are translated according to the *CHD*.

[14] Strictly speaking, this is an example of hypostasis. For the sake of the argument, it is considered here together with FSGs, while its peculiarities will be discussed in section II below.

[15] In contrast to Oettinger, StBoT 22, who translates (14) as "if one conducts troops to oath-taking." Oettinger's translation radically differs from that of the

CHD in the case of KBo 6.34 II 45 *nu=war=as linkiya harweni* 'we hold them (the women's garments) at the place of the oath' (*CHD*) vs. "we have them for oath-taking" (StBoT 22). I regard the first translation as preferable, since the women's garments are not used for the oath-taking but, rather, function as a symbol of punishment for the oath-breaking.

[16] The term *genitivus tituli* is used for such cases as Lat. *Aliquis **sui iuris** est* 'X is legally independent'

this problem, one would need to coin new terms, such as "genitive of the person" or "genitive of the matter." Such a methodology, in my opinion, would defeat the entire purpose of functional analysis.

The examples adduced above are post-Old Hittite, but the situation in Old Hittite was hardly any different. E. Neu[17] collected several instances of FSGs formed from infinitives, such as the one in (17):

(16)   KUB 1.17 I 1–3, CTH 591 (Festival of the Month), OH/NS[18]
       parsnāuwas=kan ^LÚ**SAGI-*as*** *uizzi*
       The cup-bearer "of squatting" comes.

(17)   KUB 2.3 I 24, CTH 627 (KI.LAM Festival), OH/NS[19]
       parsnāuwas=kan uizzi
       The "squatter" (lit. '⟨one⟩ of squatting') comes.

Both the phrases *parsnāuwas* ^LÚSAGI-*as* and its shortened equivalent *parsnāuwas* occur several times in the copies of Old Hittite texts, and this makes it rather unlikely that one of these two variants was absent in the originals. Unfortunately, I am not aware of any pairs of nominal phrases with and without ellipsis, both of which are directly attested in the Old Script texts, which is natural given the relatively small size of the relevant corpus. Yet the following example seems to be a secure example of FSG that cannot be analyzed in a different way:

(18)   KBo 17.1 I 35–37, CTH 416 (Ritual for the Royal Couple), OS
       LUGAL-*un=kan* 3-*ŠU* [   ]*zi* MUNUS.LUGAL-*ann=a sāwātaras halzāi* LUGAL-*us* ERÍN.
          MEŠ-*an* 3- Š[*U alla*]*ppahhi* MUNUS.LUGAL-*ass=a* 3-*ŠU all*[*app*(*ahhi*)] ***sāwataras=a***
          halzāi
       One . . . s three times the king and the queen.[20] The **horn-blower** (lit. 'he of the horn') calls.
          The king spits three times on the troops, and the queen spits three times on the troops. The
          horn-blower calls.

Otten,[21] took *sāwataras* as FSG of *sāwatar* (n.) 'horn' with the meaning 'one of the horn', i.e., 'horn-blower'. There is no doubt that *sāwataras* is a subject of a verbal clause in (18), and thus one cannot reinterpret it as a genitive dependent on a noun. An attempt to reinterpret it as a nominative was undertaken by Starke,[22] who objected to the literal translation 'the horn-blower calls' on the grounds that a horn-blower is supposed to blow his horn, and not to call, and replaced it with 'the horn sounds' (= 'the horn blows'). I do not see any merit in such a translation. On the semantic level, it is not clear why Starke is willing to admit that the expression 'the horn calls' can mean 'the horn blows' but is reluctant to accept that 'the horn-blower calls' can stand for 'the horn-blower blows his horn'. On the syntactic level, *halzāi* is always used without a direct object in a very common

but also *aliquid* **lucri** *facere* 'to turn something into profit'. The first case is syntactically parallel to (12), while the second one is closer to (15). This ambiguity is not very important in Latin, since *sui iuris* can be understood only as ⟨*persona*⟩ *sui iuris,* while the elliptical *lucri* always implies the ⟨matter⟩ of profit.
   [17] E. Neu, "Studie über den Gebrauch von Genitivformen auf *-was* des hethitischen Verbalsubstantivs

-*war*," *Gs. Kronasser,* pp. 116–48.
   [18] Translation follows *CHD,* vol. P, p. 190a.
   [19] Edited in Singer, StBoT 28.
   [20] Thus with Starke, StBot 31, p. 402, n. 1449, pace Otten, StBoT 8.
   [21] StBoT 8, pp. 61–62.
   [22] StBot 31, pp. 402–3.

expression, ^LÚ*kītas halzāi,* usually translated as '*k*. cries', and so there is no reason to take the absence of a direct object in our case as an abnormal phenomenon. But if one follows Starke's interpretation, one immediately winds up with two anomalies. First, I am not aware of any other case where the subject of the verb *halzāi* is inanimate, nor indeed of any case where a musical instrument metaphorically stands for a musician and functions as a clause subject in a ritual context; second, the nom./acc. of the Luwoid term for 'horn' is attested several times in New Script texts as *ša-(a)-(ú)-wa-(a)-tar.* Otten's interpretation remains the only plausible one, and thus the existence of FSGs in Old Hittite is validated.

The examples cited above are representative enough to illustrate that Hittite FSGs normally owed their existence to the omission of nominative or accusative head-nouns. Yoshida comes to similar conclusions when he writes "Der freischwebende Genitiv erfüllt zwei verschiedene syntaktische Funktionen, nämlich (I) Akkusativ vom transitiven Verb und (II) Prädikat beim Nominalsatz,"[23] although I must add to this list the function of syntactic subject, as in examples (17) and (18). One can hypothesize that a Hittite head-noun had to be syntactically prominent in order to undergo ellipsis because the omission of a less prominent, optional constituent could result in an ambiguity with respect to assigning syntactic function to FSG. Thus *lenkiyas* in **mān ERÍN.MEŠ-*an lenkiyas pēhudanzi* could be interpreted as either 'to the place of the oath' or 'from the place of the oath'. The actual sentence *mān* ERÍN.MEŠ-*an lenkiya pēhudanzi* (14) does not illustrate FSG but, rather, hypostasis, which will be discussed in section II below.

<div align="center">II</div>

The term "hypostasis" is used in Hittite studies when the dependent noun assumes all the grammatical functions (including the case-marking) of the reconstructed head-noun and acquires the lexical meaning of the reconstructed noun phrase. According to the frequently cited or implied, although never proven, assumption of HE 2, § 212, free-standing genitives have a special propensity towards hypostasis. The only example cited by J. Friedrich in support of his point of view is *hassannassi/a-* 'family member', allegedly hypostasized from FSG. *hassannas=sas* '⟨one⟩ of his kin'. The postulated fusion with the enclitic possessive pronoun can be supported by the fact that the heterographic equivalent of *hassannassi/a-* is ŠA MÁŠ-ŠU,[24] but the existence of the FSG, *hassannas=sas* cannot be proved by synchronic evidence.[25] The relevant examples, together with alternative hypotheses about the origin of *hassannassi/a-,* will be discussed at the end of this section.

In order to prove or disprove the correlation between hypostasis and FSG, one has to consider the cases where the mechanism of hypostasis can be synchronically observed. The best example known to me is the following one:

(19)   KUB 19.163 I 18, CTH 738 (Festival of Teteshabi), MH/NS
         ]**arzanas parna** *paizzi*
         . . . goes to the **"house of porridge"** (i.e., 'inn').

[23] Yoshida, *Die Syntax.*
[24] Examples can be found in Kassian, A. Korolëv, and A. Sidel'tsev, *Hittite Funerary Ritual* šalliš waštaiš, AOAT 288 (Münster, 2002), p. 410.

[25] Neumann's analysis is unsatisfactory at this point. Neumann speculates that *hassanassa/i-* may contain the same suffix as, for example, *marsanassi-* 'an oracle bird', ignoring the heterographic writing ŠA MÁŠ-ŠU.

(20)   IBoT 1.29, Obv. 29, CTH 633 (Festival of Procreation), NS
       DUMU.LUGAL ***arzana parna*** *paizzi*
       The prince goes to the **"porridge-house"** (i.e., 'brothel').

(21)   KBo 17.65, Rev. 25, CTH 489 (a birth ritual), MS[26]
       nu=za MUNUS-*za arha* **É *arzanas*** *pa[izzi*
       And the woman goes **off to the "house of porridge"** (i.e., 'inn').

(22)   KBo 7.42, Rev. 4, CTH 670 (unidentified festival), NS
       nu ^MUNUS*ammamas* **É*arzanaz*** *uizzi*
       The Ammamma-woman comes **from the inn**.

The original meaning of Hittite *arzan(a)-* 'groats' was suggested by H. Güterbock,[27] who compared it with Akkadian *arsānu* 'id.'. The idiom *arzanas pēr 'inn' > 'brothel' (lit. 'porridge-house') could undergo case attraction[28] in oblique cases, as in (20).[29] There is no general agreement with regard to the interpretation of (21) and (22) and similar cases. According to Puhvel,[30] who reads É *arzanas* in (21) and É *arzanaz* in (22), these sentences must feature the same possessive construction with reverse word order *pēr arzanas. Puhvel, however, does not explain what the derivational base of ^LÚ/MUNUS *arzanala-* 'inn-keeper' or *arzanai-* 'to quarter' was. On the other hand, one cannot regard É in (21) as a mere graphic determinative because the omission of the allative head-noun *parna* 'to the house' would be unparalleled in Hittite (cf. the last paragraph of section I). HW² 1: 363–64, has É *arzanas* in (21) but ^É*arzanaz* in (22), and the same approach is also accepted in this article.

Should the above analysis for (21) and (22) be correct, it is no longer possible to argue that in his case hypostasis resulted from the reinterpretation of FSG. Hypostasis and free-standing genitives must rather be regarded as parallel phenomena that owe their existence to the omission of head-nouns in nominal phrases with and without case attraction. Example (22) must be regarded as an elliptical counterpart of (20). This omission of the head-noun (*pēr* 'house') applied to a nominal phrase with case attraction (*arzanaz parnaz 'from the porridge-house') leads to the lexicalization of a new inflected noun ^É*arzana-* 'inn'.

The connection between case attraction and hypostasis can be further illustrated by the negative evidence. As an example, let us consider *taksul* (n) 'treaty, peace' vs. ^(LÚ)*taksulas* / (LÚ) *taksulas* 'he of the treaty', i.e., 'ally'.

---

[26] Edited in Beckman, StBoT 29, pp. 132–75. With *HW²,* vol. 1, p. 364, I reject Beckman's interpretation of *ar-za-na-aš* as dat. pl. (p. 171). It is true that certain buildings, such as ^É*halent(i)uwa,* can be *pluralia tantum* in Hittite, but this is otherwise not the case with ^É*arzanaš.*

[27] H. Güterbock, "The Deeds of Suppiluliuma," *JCS* 10 (1956): 90.

[28] *HE* 2, § 213, uses the term "partitive apposition" for the result of case attraction in a nominal phrase. I find this usage potentially confusing because not every possessum is a part of its possessor (thus, for example, porridge can hardly be considered a part of the house).

Strictly speaking, the term "partitive apposition" must be applied only to a subclass of nominal phrases that express inalienable possession. Luraghi (*Hittite*, pp. 13–14) uses the term "double case constructions" for nominal phrases with case attraction. This usage is misleading, since prototypical double-case constructions require double-case marking of the possessor.

[29] More on this term, see H. A. Hoffner, "The Arzana House," in K. Bittel, Ph. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, and E. Reiner, eds., *Anatolian Studies Presented to Hans Gustav Güterbock on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (Istanbul, 1974), pp. 114–21.

[30] *HED* 1, pp. 185–87.

(23) KBo 3.38, Obv. 8′, CTH 3 (Story of Zalpa), OH/NS[31]
      ANA ABI ABI LUGAL **taksul** *iyat*
      . . . concluded a **treaty** with the grandfather of the King

(24) KUB 23.1 IV 4–5, CTH 105 (Treaty with Sauskamuwa), NH[32]
      mān LUGAL KUR *Mizrī ANA* ᴰUTU-*ŠI* **taksul** *tuqq=as* **taksul** *ēsdu*
      If the king of Egypt is My Sun's **ally**, he must be your **ally**.

(25) KUB 26.19 II 21, CTH 140 (a treaty with the Kaskas), MH/MS[33]
      LÚ.MEŠ **taksulas**=*za kuit sumes*
      Since you are **allies** . . .

(26) KUB 23.77a, Rev. 87–88, CTH 138 (a treaty with the Kaskas), MH/MS[34]
      anda=ma=kan mān **taksulas** ᵁᴿᵁ*Hatt*[   ]*izzi*
      Furthermore, if an **ally** arr[ives to Hatt]usa. . . .

For Neu,[35] FSG, *taksulas* (26) developed from the phrase LÚ *taksulas* 'man of the treaty' attested in (25), where he reads LÚ.MEŠ *taksulas*,[36] and from similar examples. If one assumes that Neu's assumption is correct, there are no traces of case attraction in the phrase 'man of the oath' (*taksulas* does not agree in number with LÚ.MEŠ in [25]). As a matter of fact, if it is even possible to predict that case attraction cannot occur in this construction, Hittite grammar admits appositions such as *ammēdaz* ŠU-*az* 'with my hand (abl.)', A.ŠÀ-*an* ZAG-*an* 'the boundary of a field (acc.)', and *apē=ma kuiski* 'one of them (nom.)',[37] but does not tolerate anything like **lingain antuhsan 'man of the oath (acc.)'. In order for the case attraction to be possible, the possessor must not be lower in the hierarchy of animacy than the possessum. This fact explains why FSG *taksulas* '⟨he⟩ of the treaty' was never fully lexicalized. No such forms as **taksulan (acc. sing.) or **taksules (nom. pl.) are attested, and one can even use *taksul* (nom.) instead of *taksulas* (gen.) for 'ally' in the predicative position (24).

The same holds for *kurur* (n.) 'hostility, war' vs. *kururas* '⟨he⟩ of the hostility,' i.e., 'enemy'. Neu has convincingly shown that *kururas* can be used only in the nominative or genitive, while its synonym, hidden from us under the Sumerogram ᴸᵁKÚR-*aš* (dat.-loc. ᴸᵁKÚR-*ni*) 'enemy' does not have any distributional restrictions;[38] *kurur* (nom.) can be also used with the meaning 'enemy' in the predicative position. Therefore, *kururas* '⟨he⟩ of the hostility', just as *taksulas* '⟨he⟩ of the treaty', cannot be considered an example of hypostasis. Needless to say, there could not be any case attraction in the expression *'man of the hostility'.

Now let us consider the expression *kururas udne 'country of the hostility'. Both the head-noun and the dependent noun in this construction are inanimate. This fact renders case attraction possible, as in the following cases:

(27) KBo 6.2 I 52–53, CTH 290 (Laws § 23), OS
      takku ARAD-*as huwāi na=as ANA* **KUR** *kūruri an*[*da*] *paizzi*
      If a male slave runs away and goes into an **enemy country** . . .

---

[31] Edited in Otten, StBoT 17.
[32] Edited in Kühne and Otten, StBoT 16.
[33] Edited in von Schuler, *Kaskäer*, pp. 131 ff.
[34] Ibid., pp. 117 ff.
[35] E. Neu, "Hethitisch *kurur* und *taksul* in syntac-
tischer sicht," in O. Carruba, ed., *Piero Meriggi dicata* (Pavia, 1979), p. 418 (hereafter *Fs. Meriggi*).
[36] Cf. É *arzanas* for *arzanas parnaz in (21).
[37] These examples are taken from *HG²*, § 213.
[38] Neu, in *Fs. Meriggi*.

(28)   KBo 6.3 I 60–61, CTH 291 (Laws § 23), OH/MS
       tak[*ku* ARAD-*as hūwai*] *na=as* **kururi KUR-e** *paizz*[*i*
       If a male slave runs away and goes into an **enemy country** . . .[39]

In some other cases, however, there are morphological reasons to posit a separate stem
*kurura- 'hostile'. Consider the following duplicates:

(29)   KBo 11.72 II 35, CTH 447 (a ritual for the gods of the underworld), NS
       nu=ssi **kūrura** *kuiēs* **KUR.KUR-TIM**
       Which **lands** are **hostile** to him . . .

(30)   KBo 11.10 II 31–32, CTH 447 (a ritual for the gods of the underworld), NS
       nu=ssi **KUR.HI.A-TIM** [(*kuiēs*) *k*]*ūruras*
       Which **lands** are **"of hostility"** to him . . .[40]

Since the regular plural of *kurur* (n) 'hostility, war' is *kururi,* it would be difficult to ex-
plain *kūrura* in (29) as an instance of case attraction.[41] The alternative solution is to take
it as a nom. pl. of the secondary adjective **kurura-* 'hostile', alternating with the FSG
k]*ūruras* in (30). I believe that the starting point for the reanalysis of *kurur* in this case
could be again constructions with case attraction, such as those represented in (27) and
(28). This phenomenon is parallel to that of hypostasis in that in both cases morphological
change triggers semantic shift.

Now let us apply the same methodology to the examples considered in section I. Animacy
hierarchy allows us to make a prediction that no case attraction, and thus no hypostasis, is
possible in the expressions such as 'man of the oath' and 'slave of the oath'. This prediction
is fully supported by data: the absence of case attraction in acc. *lingayas* ARAD-*DUM*
(not **lingayan ARAD-*DUM*) in example (9) correlates with the preservation of the FSG
linkiyas in (12). The impossibility of case attraction in the expression 'cup-bearer of
squatting' can be empirically supported by the phrase *parsnawas ANA* ^LÚSAGI 'to the cup-
bearer of squatting'.[42] This explains why *parsnawa-* 'squatter' had few chances of be-
coming a full-fledged noun in Hittite.

A quite different situation can be illustrated by examples (13) and (14). Since both the
possessor and the possessum in the phrase 'place of the oath' are inanimate nouns, this
construction can manifest itself as an apposition on the surface level. Case attraction in
Hittite was always an optional transformation, at least in those cases that did not involve
inalienable possession, and so we find *linkiyas pedi,* and not *linkiya pedi in (13). If, how-
ever, the *Chicago Hittite Dictionary* is correct in understanding *lenkiya* as 'place of the
oath' in example (14), case attraction is to be reconstructed as a factor conditioning hy-
postasis in this case.

Finally, we must examine the origin of Late Hittite *hassannassi/a-* 'kinsman, family
member'. The characteristic attestations of the Old Hittite counterpart(s) of this word in
the Telibinus Proclamation[43] are represented below:

---

[39] (27) and (28) are edited in Hoffner, *Laws,* p. 32.
[40] For the examples (29) and (30), cf. Neu, in *Fs. Meriggi,* p. 421.

[41] Ibid.
[42] 76/n IV[?] 13′–14′ cited in Neu, ibid., p. 119.
[43] Edited in Hoffmann, *THeth.* 11.

(31)   KBo 3.1 I 1–3, CTH 19 (Telibinus Proclamation), OH/NS
n=[(aba) DUMU.M(EŠ-ŠU) ŠEŠ.M(EŠ-ŠU LÚ.MEŠ*gaenasses=sa* LÚ.MEŠ [(hass)]*annas=sas*
Ù ([ERÍN.MEŠ-ŠU *taruppantes ese*)]*r.*
His sons, his brothers and his in-laws, **his kinsmen** and his soldiers were united.

(32)   KBo 3.1 II 5–6 + KBo 12.5 II 5–6, CTH 19 (Telebinus Proclamation), OH/NS
ᵐ*Zurūs=sa* GAL LÚ.MEŠ*MEŠEDI duttumili apedas=pat* UD.[(KAM.HI.A-*as*)] **hassannas=
sas** DUMU-ŠU ᵐ*Tahurwailin* LÚ GIŠŠUKUR GUŠKIN *piēt.*
Exactly in those days, Zurus, the Chief Bodyguard, sent Tahurwaili, **his natural son**, the Man
of the Golden Spear . . .

(33)   KBo 3.1 II 45, CTH 19 (The Edict of Telepinus), OH/NS
hassanna(s)san[44]=*za=kan lē* **kuinki** *kuenti*
Thou shalt not kill **anyone of your kin (any family member)**!

Formally speaking, *hassannas* represents a singular genitive of *hassatar* 'procreation'
and, secondarily, 'family, kin', while *-sas* is a singular genitive of the enclitic pronoun
'his/her'. LÚ.MEŠ *hassannas=sas* in (31) can be literally translated as 'men of his kin',
while Puhvel[45] takes *hassannas=sas* DUMU-ŠU in (32) as 'a son of his begetting'. The
alternative analysis, based on the interpretation of *hassannas=sas* as a FSG '⟨one⟩ of his
family', is also formally possible. One can read LÚ.MEŠ*hassannas=sas* in (31), implying
that LÚ.MEŠ is a determinative with no phonetic value, and, following Hoffmann,[46] trans-
late *hassannas=sas* DUMU-ŠU in (32) as '⟨one⟩ of his family, his son'. It would, however,
be difficult to explain in this case why the determinative LÚ.MEŠ is written before the word
for 'family member' in (31) but not in (32), and, therefore, Puhvel's analysis appears to be
more straightforward.[47]

Thus the question about the existence of FSGs in (31) and (32) is probably to be an-
swered in the negative. Now one must consider the possibility of case attraction in (33),[48]
where the reconstructed possessive pronoun *-sa/i-,* formerly in agreement with its head-
noun *hassannas,* appears to have copied the case marking of the object phrase head-noun
kuinki. In this respect, the morphosyntactic transformation **hassannas=sas kuinki >*
hassanna(s)=san kuinki* could be compared to Germanic noun incorporation (a man of
his kin > his kinsman*). This case is different from those discussed above in that case at-
traction is implemented here across a constituent. Note, however, that this case attraction
would fit the animacy hierarchy suggested above, since both its trigger (*kuiski* 'someone')
and its target (*-sa/i-* 'his') are animate.

Unfortunately, the analysis presented above cannot be regarded as synchronically valid.
The enclitic *-sa/i-* 'his' does not function as a reflexive pronoun in Hittite and, therefore,
*hassanna(s)=**san**=za=kan lē kuinki kuenti* must properly mean 'Thou shalt not kill any-
one of **his** kin', which is contextually impossible. One can get around this objection by

---

[44] Written *ha-aš-ša-an-na-ša-an,* which probably represents a copyist's error for **ha-aš-ša-an-na-aš-ša-an.*

[45] *HED* 3, p. 215.

[46] THeth 11: 27.

[47] Hoffmann (ibid., p. 32) erroneously transliterates LÚ.MEŠ *a-e-na-aš-ši-iš* LÚ.MEŠ *ha-aš-ša-an-na-aš-ša-aš* in KBo 3.1 II 41 as LÚ.MEŠ *ga-e-na-aš-ši-iš ha-*

aš-ša-an-na-aš-ša-aš.

[48] KBo 3.1 I 13 LÚ.MEŠ *gaen[asse]s* LÚ.MEŠ *has-sannassis* 'relatives and kinsmen' cannot be regarded as an example of synchronic case attraction but, rather, represents a copyist's replacement of an archaic noun phrase with an innovative hypostasized noun. The duplicate KUB 11.1 I 13 has the expected LÚ.MEŠ *hassannas=sas.*

assuming that by the time the Telepinus Proclamation was recorded, *hassannas=sas* had already merged into one lexeme meaning 'family, kin', but this would automatically render the proposed case attraction illicit, since the case marking of the inanimate possessor *hassannassas* would appear to be influenced by the animate possessum *kuinki* in (33). The only remaining option is to assume that *hassannassa/i-* 'family member' had already been lexicalized in Old Hittite. But if we regard *hassannas=sas* 'of his family', lit. 'of his begetting' in (31)–(32) and *hassannas(s)an* 'family member' (acc.) in (33) as two synchronically independent words, we wind up with no positive arguments regarding the origin of the latter lexeme. The Hittite cuneiform texts do not support either the claim that *hassannassa/i-* 'family member' resulted from the interpretation of FSG or the hypothesis that it was created through case attraction.[49]

No case among those considered above has furnished us with evidence for the correlation between free-standing genitive and hypostasis in Hittite. This is a predictable result. Ellipsis of the head-noun is likely to happen when the speaker feels that all information about the omitted constituent can be retrieved from a pragmatic context. Hypostasis occurs when such a retrieval is no longer possible or necessary, and so the dependent noun has to take the empty slot of its former syntactic head. Frequent alternations between the same underlying possessive phrases with and without ellipsis in Hittite, such as (10) vs. (12), or (16) vs. (17), as well as the limited functional range of Hittite noun phrases expressed by FSGs (in only subject, predicate, or direct object phrases), indicate that Hittite speakers could recognize elliptical constructions and supply missing information without much trouble.

Elliptical constructions with case attraction are another matter. In a phrase where the dependent noun assumes the grammatical marking of the head, the head-noun ceases to play the key role in preserving the integrity of sentence syntactic structure. In other words, the head-noun ellipsis in such a construction will result in a well-formed, albeit perhaps infelicitous, sentence. For instance, there is nothing ungrammatical about example (22) MUNUS*ammamas* É*arzanaz uizzi* 'The Ammamma-woman comes from the porridge-⟨house⟩', even though, historically speaking, this is an elliptical clause. New speakers, as they learned the language, had probably little incentive to restore the omitted noun *parnaz* in such a sentence, preferring instead to assign the new meaning '(from the) inn' to *arzanaz*. And hence we observe occasional correlation between case attraction and hypostatis in Hittite.

Although formulaic definitions frequently oversimplify the matter, they are often useful in clarifying convoluted discourse. My conclusions regarding the synchronic situation in Hittite can be schematically represented by the following formula.

FREE STANDING GENITIVE = [- CASE ATTRACTION, + ELLIPSIS]
HYPOSTASIS = [+ CASE ATTRACTION, + ELLIPSIS].

---

[49] The relationship between these two lexemes must remain a topic for a diachronic discussion. It is possible that *hassannassa/i-* 'family member' was indeed reinterpreted from a FSG *hassannas=sas* "of his begetting" at a pre-Hittite stage, when the function of genitive was perhaps different from that observed in the Hittite texts available to us. The reconstruction of a pre-Hittite case system is beyond the scope of this synchronic article.