

HS 105 (1992)

Starke, Frank: *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschriftluwischen Nomens*. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1990, 8°, XXVI+705 S. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten, Heft 31.)

The present work represents the eagerly awaited published version of the author's 1987 Frankfurt Habilitationsschrift. An introduction is followed by a summary of CLuvian nominal inflection. The heart of the book is a detailed analysis of the stem formation of CLuvian consonant-stem nouns, which is meant to be exhaustive. A first appendix presents an overview of all CLuvian nominal stem classes according to Starke. A second offers valuable addenda and corrigenda to his new edition of the CLuvian corpus, published as StBoT 30 (1985). Readers are given not only indices of all words and passages treated, but also a very useful topical index including cultural history and realia. Many of Starke's new interpretations of lexemes and textual passages are based on original research into the cultural context: I cite as one example his comments on hippological matters.

Despite its modest title, this work not only deals with all aspects of CLuvian grammar, but also touches upon virtually every significant issue of Anatolian comparative linguistics. It is an immensely rich book, and also extremely frustrating. Readers will find invaluable new insights and analyses on virtually every page. Unfortunately, these are interspersed among at least an equal number of errors and patently false claims and assertions.

An adequate response to all of these is impossible in even a lengthy review, and in this case unnecessary: for details I may refer readers to my Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon (to appear in late 1992). In what follows I hope to highlight the most important of Starke's positive contributions and to illustrate the most serious of the factual and methodological shortcomings.

First place among the former must go to his demonstration of "i-motion" in at least the Western Anatolian languages Luvian, Lycian and Lydian (59 ff.). The importance of this discovery to Anatolian and Indo-European linguistics in general cannot be overstated. Disagreement about the correct diachronic interpretation of this phenomenon does not affect in the least Starke's synchronic analysis for the languages named. The resulting renewed debate about the feminine gender in Anatolian and PIE has barely begun.

Starke has also been able to establish for Luvian several important classes of nouns whose existence was previously unknown or underappreciated: stems in *-it-* (176 ff.), abstracts in *-ntar-* (370 ff.), instrumental nouns in *-ttar* (399 ff.), and *r/n-* stems (433 ff.). His treatment of the last-named group is the longest and by far the strongest section of the entire book, with contributions of such value that I must with due caution recommend it even to non-specialists, despite the presence of all the very serious deficiencies cited below.

Finally, one finds throughout new examples of the effects of Luvian on Hittite. It is to Starke that we owe much of the credit for showing that this influence is both earlier (already pre-historic) and more profound (morphological as well as lexical) than previously thought. Methodological problems discussed below falsify many of his individual claims in this regard, but in no way alter the reality of the phenomenon. All future analyses of Hittite will have to pay heed!

The above contributions are badly obscured by profound and endemic methodological errors:

(1) All too often phonological and morphological analyses are not based on the attested evidence. Rather, preconceived analyses are used to reshape the data. Examples:

(a) since they reflect a preform **-tro-*, instrumental nouns must for Starke have the shape *-ttar*, with geminate *-tt-* for the voiceless **-t-*. Thus *šāwatar* 'horn' is given as *šāwattar* (400), although it is attested over twenty times, ALWAYS with single *-t-*, a fact airily dismissed as careless spelling (403). (b) Starke invents a class of neuter nouns in *-štar* (384 ff.), although he admits that there is not a single example of the only forms which could establish such a class (nom.-acc. sg./pl.). He fails to tell the reader that there is overwhelming evidence for animate nouns in *-š(t)ra/i-* (with "i-motion").

(2) Starke frequently disposes of unwanted data through unmotivated emendation of the texts. We all sometimes find emendation necessary, but surely it is to be permitted only when supporting evidence exists, not used to produce forms unattested anywhere! Example:

To an unprejudiced observer, CLuv. *adduwālin ḥattašt(ar)rin* 'evil violence' consists of adjective plus animate noun in *-štri-*. The Hittite equivalent *idālu ḥatugātar* removes all doubt. Solely on the authority of his own invented **ḥattaštar-*, Starke takes the attested phrase as a scribal error and proposes two ad hoc emendations (391 f.).

(3) The overall treatment of phonology is woefully substandard (its absence in the list of factors to be considered on p. 13 is conspicuous). Starke ignores well-established rules of others and fails to provide any coherent rules of his own. Examples:

(a) He cites the article of Morpurgo Davies, KZ 96 (1982/83) 245 ff., but totally neglects her demonstration that etymological voiceless stops are "lenited" to single (voiced) stops between unaccented vowels in Luvian and Lycian. Recognition of this rule could have explained *šāwatar* 'horn' as attested (< **sōwet-ro-*); confirmed Starke's own attractive connection of Lyc. *hūwedri-* 'all' with CLuv. *šāwatar* (sic!) 'fullness' (< pre-Luvian **sūwet-ro-*), and spared him the false analysis (150 f.) of CLuv. *tiwat-* 'Sun-god', the quite regular reflex of **dīwot-* (= Hitt. *šīwatt-* 'day' with the usual undoing of the lenition). (b) on p. 344, note 1219, and elsewhere Starke assumes a general loss of **g(h)* in Luvian, including explicitly before *a* < **a*; but on p. 462 and p. 631 we find an alleged rule *ga* > *za*. Both of these self-contradictory rules are falsified by CLuv. *katmarši-* 'defecate' < **ḡhōdm(V)r-* and *kutašra/i-* 'orthostat', whose relationship to Hitt. *kutt-* 'wall' < **ḡh(o)u-t-* is beyond doubt, pace Starke (425 ff.). As for my rule of palatal **k* > Luv. *z* and Lyc. *s*, it remains valid until refuted by counterevidence, not mere assertions.

(4) Starke speciously tries to discredit synchronic analyses by attacking associated diachronic accounts. Examples:

(a) Neumann's establishing of animate abstract nouns in *-s(t)ra/i-* is entirely independent of whether his explanation for their origin is correct (see p. 384 and cf. [1 b] above). (b) as overwhelming evidence now shows, the "particle" *-sa/-za* marks nt. nom.-acc. SINGULARS in Luvian (pace Starke, 47, it is HIS philology which is wanting in this regard, not that of van den Hout, Hawkins, Carruba, and everyone else). Starke's justified rejection of all published diachronic analyses (48 f.) cannot change this fact (see further below).

(5) As stated above, profound influence of Luvian on Hittite is undeniable. However, these are very closely related languages: how in principle do we distinguish in Hittite between inherited cognates of Luvian words and Luvian loanwords or Luvianisms? Since Starke bases much of his analysis on alleged Luvian material in Hittite, one expects a thorough discussion of and well-founded approach to this fundamental problem. His method is rather to assume as much Luvian influence as possible, in a quite unprincipled way. Example:

In Old and Middle Hittite we find a stem *argama(n)*- 'tribute' with consistent single *-m-*, animate gender and crucially an archaic type of allomorphy which is leveled out in the history of Hittite (cf. *hāra(n)*- 'eagle'). Later texts show a stem *'arkamman-*, with geminate *-mm-* and neuter gender. The existence of a Luvian *n*-stem is assured by the verb *arkammanalawi* 'I make tribute-bearing'. Parallels strongly suggest a neuter *m(m)an* stem (Starke, 260 ff.). The differences in spelling, gender, and above all morphology seem to make a *prima facie* case for cognate forms. Starke, however, insists not only that the later stem is a Luvianism (which seems undeniable), but also that the earlier stem is a Luvian loanword into Hittite, and he uses this example to claim that the Hittites disregarded Luvian phonology when borrowing (11 and *passim*). We are given no explanation of why a loanword would be assimilated into an inflectional type which Hittite speakers were eliminating from their language everywhere else. Nevertheless, the unfounded principle of "careless spelling" is used throughout as a symptom of a Luvian loanword into Hittite!

(6) Finally, in some instances troublesome evidence and opposing views have simply been suppressed. Examples:

(a) Starke cites Carruba, Fs Neumann 35 ff., in passing (64), but nowhere tells readers of Carruba's crucial demonstration that the alleged class of *-i/-ya* stems in CLuvian does not exist (see also Melchert, HS 103 [1990] 198 ff.). Starke instead perpetuates this myth (63 f., 589 f.). (b) Watkins, Fs Hoenigswald (1987) 401 f. (also Hethitica 8.423 f.), has shown beyond all doubt that *wār-ša-tta* *ĪD-ti* [*nan*] *amman* in KUB XXXV 54 iii 17 means 'Water is led from the river' (for *wātar nāi-* in Hittite see CHD 3.351 f.). We find the expected plural *wāra* in XXXV 88 iii 8 in the context of *URUDULAHTAN* (a vessel). The absence of the neuter *r*-stem *wār-* 'water' in StBoT 31 is understandable. The ending of [*nan*] *amman* shows incontrovertibly that *wār-ša* with particle *-ša* is neuter singular. Having suppressed the real Luvian word for 'water' in XXXV 54 iii 17 (matching Hitt. *wātar* in the ritual action; *ibid.* iii 12), Starke compounds the error by discovering Luvian 'water' in *utar-ša* in iii 38, although this requires connecting it with *wātar* 26 lines earlier (!) and denying the evident equation of CLuv. *āddurwal-za utar-ša* with Hitt. *idālu uttar* 'evil word' (565 ff.). His just reward for this chicanery is that he cannot account for the attested shape of alleged *utar* 'water' once he has invented it.

The common denominator of most of the methodological offenses catalogued above is clear: an absolute refusal to change an analysis once arrived at no matter how much evidence or how many forceful counterarguments are brought against it. I do not wish to be sanctimonious: all of us who deal in hypotheses occasionally fall victim to the delusion that one of our constructs has become fact simply because we have believed it for so long. But the degree of apriority in the present work is far beyond all reasonable bounds.

Starke is manifestly a highly gifted philologist and linguist. For those of us who specialize in Anatolian, this book remains a treasure house of new insights and ideas, and I wish to state categorically that anything I produce henceforth on any topic related to Luvian, Lycian, or Hittite will be greatly enriched and enlightened by what he has achieved here. Unfortunately, the violence done to the data by his aprioristic approach makes this work nearly unusable for those who do not themselves independently control the sources. It is a great tragedy that this otherwise magnificent accomplishment is so irretrievably marred by the author's unyielding inflexibility.

Curriculum in Linguistics
CB no. 3155, Dey Hall
Univ. of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3155/USA

H. Craig Melchert

Manfred Mayrhofer: Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen, Band I, LXIV + 812 Seiten, Heidelberg: Winter, 1992.

Mit der im Jahre 1992 veröffentlichten Lieferung 10 (I-LXIV + 717-812) ist Band I des neuen „Mayrhofer“ (= *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen* [EWAia]) abgeschlossen. Die 1. Lieferung erschien 1985. Da das Werk nach den Worten des Verfassers ebenso wie der „Vorläufer“ (= *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen* [KEWA]) auf drei Bände angelegt ist, kann man die realistische Hochrechnung anstellen, daß bei dem bisherigen Arbeitsrhythmus ein Abschluß des Gesamtwerks in etwa einem Dutzend Jahren zu erwarten ist.

Diese knappe Besprechung kann ihr Ziel nur darin haben, daß sie die essentiellen Fortschritte des im Erscheinen begriffenen Lexikons darstellt, das mit dem „älteren Buch“ nach den Worten der Vorbemerkung „lediglich den Gegenstand und den Verfasser gemeinsam“ (S. IX) hat. Theoretische Ausführungen hat Mayrhofer selbst in der eben erwähnten Vorbemerkung und in zwei separaten Veröffentlichungen geboten¹⁾.

Vermutlich kann man die Eigenständigkeit des neuen Werkes am besten anhand von Einzelartikeln, die das gleiche Sprachmaterial betreffen, darstellen. Zu diesem Zweck sollen hier einige Formen ausgewählt werden, die zu den beiden Wurzeln *gam* und *gā* gehören. Bereits im Vorwort zum 3. Band des KEWA hatte Mayrhofer von der „Torheit, Nomina im Nominativ Singular, Verba in (oft problematischen) Präsensformen anzuführen“ (KEWA III V) gesprochen. Bei der Behandlung der Wortfamilie von *gam* hatte diese Anordnung in der Tat zu großer

¹⁾ M. Mayrhofer, Zur Gestaltung des etymologischen Wörterbuchs einer „Groß-corpus-Sprache“, SbÖAW 368 (= Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Linguistik und Kommunikationsforschung Heft 11, Wien 1980) und Überlegungen zu einem neuen etymologischen Wörterbuch des Altindischen, in: A. Bammesberger, Das etymologische Wörterbuch, Fragen der Konzeption und Gestaltung (Regensburg 1983) 147-154.