Lehmann, Winfred P. 1974. Proto-Indo-European syntax. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Lightfoot, David W. 2002a. Myths and the prehistory of grammars. Journal of Linguistics 38: 113-136.

Lightfoot, David W. 2002b. More myths. Journal of Linguistics 38: 619-626.

Longobardi, Giuseppe. 2003. On parameters and parameter theory. In: Syntaxtheorien, Modelle, Methoden, Motive, ed. by Elisabeth Stark and Ulrich Wandruszka, 273-290. Tübingen: Narr.

Miller, D. Gary. 1975. Indo-European: VSO, SOV, SVO, or all three? Lingua 37: 31-52.

Taylor, Ann. 1990. Clitics and configurationality in ancient Greek. University of Pennsylvania Ph.D. dissertation.

Watkins, Calvert. 1976. Towards PIE syntax: Problems and pseudo-problems. In: Parasession on diachronic syntax, ed. by Sanford B. Steever et al., 305-326. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Watkins, Calvert. 1997. Delbrück and the syntax of Hittite and Luvian: Predictive power. In: Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy, ed. by Emilio Crespo and José Luis García Ramón, 611-630. Madrid/Wiesbaden: Ediciones de la UAM/Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.

Hans Henrich Hock
University of Illinois
Department of Linguistics
4080 FLB, 707 S. Mathews
Urbana IL 61801, U.S.A.
hhhock@uiuc.edu

This book has probably been the most awaited work in Hittitology of the last decade. Ever since the word came out that the two eminent Hittite scholars Harry A. Hoffner Jr. (a great philologist especially known as the former executive editor of the *Chicago Hittite Dictionary*) and H. Craig Melchert (a great historical linguist especially known for his influential *Anatolian Historical Phonology* [1994]) had joined forces to write a new reference grammar of Hittite, the whole Hittitological scholarly community had high hopes for it. In many respects the work that is now available certainly meets our expectations. It consists of two volumes, *Part 1: Reference Grammar* (xxii + 468 pages) and *Part 2: Tutorial* (vi + 75 pages). In the following I will describe the contents of this book especially from an Indo-Europeanist's point of view.

The main text of *Part 1: Reference Grammar* is divided into chapters, which are sub-divided into numbered paragraphs. In this review, I will therefore mostly refer to paragraph numbers instead of page numbers. After the obligatory *Contents* (i-xiv), *Preface* (xv-xvi), and *Abbreviations and Conventional Markings* (xvii-xxii), the book starts with an *Introduction* (1-8), in which a very brief account of the rediscovery of the Hittites, the decipherment of their language and the nature of the Hittite text corpus is given, as well as a convenient overview of "Modern Resources for Study" (§§0.9-23).

Note that the series *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi* (§0.9) in the meantime contains 57 volumes. Recent grammatical overviews of Hittite were also written by Watkins (2004) and Vanséveren (2006) and must be added to §0.13. Moreover, in the meantime my *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon* (Kloekhorst 2008) has appeared, which must be added to §0.16.

As is well known, Hittite is written in the cuneiform script, which is not always easy to interpret linguistically. It is therefore very welcome that *Chapter 1, Orthography and Phonology* (9-50), provides an extensive introduction into this difficult writing system. Its peculiarities (e.g. the mixture between phonetic and logographic writing) and the assyriological background of the method of transcription are well explained. Slightly less favorable, however, is the choice to treat the synchronic phonology of Hittite as a direct continuation of the part dealing with orthography. The result is a discussion in which the borders between phonology, phonetics, morphology and orthographical issues are not always clearly drawn.

Apart from a few instances where some cuneiform signs are given as such (e.g. in §1.26 and §1.28), no systematic overview of the Hittite cuneiform signs is presented. Although understandable (readers with a background in Indo-European linguistics might not be interested in the cuneiform signs, readers with a background in Assyriology are already familiar with the script), it is a remarkable omission. To the examples of hyper-plene spelling that are given in §1.8, the interesting case of *me-e-e-ni* 'to the extent' (KUB 42.105 iii 6) could be added, which must stand for /mē_eni/, a variant of *me-e-ia-ni* with *e*-grade of the suffix syllable. The form *mi-li-id-du-* does not represent /ml-/ (*pace* §1.11) but instead reflects the full grade **mel-it-* vis-à-vis the zero-grade **ml-it-* that is spelled *ma-li-id-du-*. The absence of *-n-* in 3sg.pres.act. *li-ik-zi* and 3sg.pret.act. *li-ik-ta* from *li(n)k-* 'to swear' is not due to being "graphically unexpressed" (§1.11). Instead, we are dealing with a real sound law: **-VnkC-* > Hitt. *-VkC-*. The alternative value of the sign MEŠ is *eš₁₇* (and not *eš₁₅* as stated in §1.15). The "rare and important variant" 3pl.pret.act. form *-ar* (§1.20, note 22) must be of a secondary origin (cf. also the comments on §11.6, below). Hittite did have a phoneme /o/ (*pace* §1.48), spelled with the sign U, whereas the sign Ú spells the phoneme /u/, cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 35-60. In the paragraphs dealing with "Words with Fluctuation between *e* and *i*" (§§1.57-65), cases that are due to diachronic developments (either through phonetic change, e.g. OH *īšš(a)-* > NH *ešš(a)-* 'to perform' or through morphological change, e.g. OH *=šše* > younger *=šši* 'to him/her/it' in analogy to the dat.-loc.sg. ending *-i*), are put on the same level as singular spellings like *pí-i-ra-an* for normal *pé-(e-)ra-an* 'before' (§1.60) (the hapax "*pí-i-ra-an*" (KBo 25.23 obv. 7 [OS]) rather forms the latter part of a longer word [...]x-x-*pí-i-ra-an*), or *i-ša-ri* for normal *e-ša-ri* 'sits down' (§1.59) (the hapax *i-ša-ri* (KBo 25.25 obv. 30) has [*paḫ*]*ḫur* 'fire' as its subject and is commonly translated 'dies down', but this is semantically rather removed from the normal meaning of *eš-* and a sequence *paḫḫur ešari* is unattested elsewhere; I would therefore rather interpret it as a separate verb, *iš-ᵃ⁽ʳⁱ⁾*). The "problematic examples of etymologically well-founded *e* rarely written *ai* or *ae*" (§1.66) are all explicable as either scribal errors (*a-ep-ta* = *eᵎ-ep-ta*; *ma-eq-qa-uš* (in fact *ku-eq-qa-uš*) = *meᵎ-eq-qa-uš*), morphological reshapings ([*ap-p*]*a-ez-zi-an* and [*ap-p*]*a-ez-zi-uš-ša* are variants of *appezzi-* in which the stem *appa-* was restored), or as phonologically more archaic forms (the OH spellings *ḫa-in-k°* and *ḫa-ik-* represent the original stem that later on was monophthongized to *ḫe(n)k-*, cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 269-70. The local particle *=an* does show elision of the *-a-* in e.g. *n=e-e=n* = *nu* + *=e* + *=an* (KBo 17.1 + 25.3 i 20 [OS]) (*pace* §1.74). *Pace* §1.76, syncope is not a normal phenomenon in Hittite. Only the examples *ti-in-ti-eš* (BallesoT 1.36 ii 48) for *tiiant-* and *šu-u-un-ta-an* (ibid. ii 41) for *šuuant-* are real. The example "*ḫu-u-la-li-it-ta-at*" should be read *ḫu-u-la-li-et-ta-at*, a variant in *-ie-* to *ḫu-u-la-li-ia-at-ta-at*; *appezzin* is a younger *i*-stem adaptation of older *appezziian*; *dapin* is just an acc.sg.c. form to an *i*-stem *dapi-*, whereas *dapian* is nom.-acc.sg.n. to the derived stem *dapiant-*; the interpretation of *terin* besides *teriian* is unclear (cf. §9.50); *šuḫmilin* is not necessarily nom.acc.sg.n., but can be acc.sg.c. as well (Kloekhorst 2008: 776); *ḫuitti* does not derive from *ḫuittia*, but instead regularly reflects **°C-ié*; etc. The "diphthongization" as described in §1.79 is questionable. The

form *kuuarške/a-* is older than *kurške/a-* and therefore cannot have developed out of it. The historical explanation of *tumēni* 'we take' and *tarnum(m)anzi* 'to release' in §1.82 is incorrect. We are not dealing with an "anaptyxis" of a *u* between stem and ending, after which the *-u-* of the ending became *-m-*, but rather with a regular development **CHuV* > Hitt. /ComV/, spelled *CumV*, so **dh₃-ṷéni* > /toméni/, *tumēni* and **tr(k̂)nh₁/₃-ṷén-* > ᵎ/trnomántˢi/, *tarnum(m)anzi* (cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 94). The spelling distinction between *e-ku* 'drink!' with single *-k-* and *ták-ku* 'if' with geminate *-kk-* shows that there was a distinction between /gʷ/ and /kʷ/ in word-final position (*pace* §1.88), namely /ʔegʷ/ vs. /takʷ/. If we must assume a distinction between word-final fortis and lenis labiovelars, we might wonder to what extent such a distinction may have been present with the other types of stops as well (although I know of no evidence that could support this). *Pace* §1.90, there is a phonemic contrast between a *z* that represents /t+s/ and a *z* that goes back to **ti*. When enclitic *=(i)a* 'and, also' is attached to a *z* that represents /t+s/, the result is spelled °*z-za-aš-ša*; when it is attached to *z* < **ti*, the result is spelled °*z-zi-ia*. This shows that in the former case we are dealing with biphonemic /ts/ (of which the second consonant is geminated due to the attachment of *=(i)a*: °*z-za-aš-ša* = /°ts:a/), but in the latter a monophonemic affricate /tˢ/ (with °*z-zi-ia* = /°tˢia/, the regular outcome of **°ti=h₃e*). The imperfective *taršike/a-*, *tar(a)ške/a-* from *tarn(a)-* 'to let' does not show an assimilation *nš* > *šš* (§1.120), but is rather derived directly from the verbal root, **tr(k̂)h₁/₃-*, instead of from the nasal-infix present *tarn(a)-* < **tr(k̂)-ne-h₁/₃-*. The form *šu-mu-ma-aḫ* is not a good example of simplified spelling of *-mm-* < **-mn-* as *-m-* (§1.122) (cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 784-5 for criticism on the interpretation of *šumumaḫḫ-* as coming from **šum-umn-aḫh-*). The form *šippandun* instead of "regular" *šipandaḫḫun* 'I libated' is not an example of "deletion of *ḫ* next to stop" (§1.131), but rather a younger form in which the *mi*-ending *-un* has ousted the *ḫi*-ending *-ḫḫun* (cf. also my comments on §§11.10-16 below). The question whether or not the glides *i* and *u* were "*pronounced*" (§1.143) is less interesting than the question whether or not they were separate phonemes that must be distinguished from the vowels *i* and *u* (cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 29-31 for a discussion).

Chapter 2, Noun and Adjective Formation (51-63) discusses the morphology of nouns and adjectives, giving an overview of underived stems and derived stems, which are conveniently arranged according to the suffix they are formed with.

The nouns *ḫaršana-* 'head', *ištamana-* 'ear', *keššara-* 'hand', *pata-* 'foot' (§2.5) and *irḫa-* 'border, boundary' (§2.6) are inner-Hittite adaptations of older consonant stems or root nouns (*ḫaršar / ḫaršan-*, *ištaman-*, *keššar / kišr-*, *pāt- / pat-* and *erḫ- / arḫ-*, respectively) that only within Hittite times were transferred to the *a*-stem inflection. In that sense they are derived stems, albeit that their suffix had become semantically neutral. The suffix "*-uman-*" (§2.45) would better be cited *-umen- / -umn-*. The noun *išḫuzzi-* 'belt, sash' (§2.49) is not derived from the verb *išḫiya-* 'to bind' with deletion of "[t]he *a* of the verbal stem *-(i)ya-*", but rather directly from the verbal root *išḫ-* < **sh₂-* (the verb *išḫai-/išḫi-* (and not "*išḫiya-*") being a derivative in *-ai-/-i-*, reflecting **sh₂-oi-/*sh₂-i-*).

Chapter 3, Noun and Adjective Inflection (64-78) discusses the inflection categories gender, case and number and gives a formal discussion of the nominal endings.

The nom.pl.c. form [*ḫa-an-te-e*]*z-zi-aš* 'first, older' in KBo 22.2 obv. 18 is cited as a possible example of an archaic nom.pl.c. ending *-aš* as opposed to normal *-eš* (§3.16, note 31), but since KBo 22.2 is in Hetkonk dated as "mh.", it cannot be fully excluded that this form is rather innovative. A better case would rather be *mu-ri-ṣa-la-aš* [*ga-*]*an-ga-an-te-eš* '*muriẓala*-breads are hung' (KBo 17.3 + KBo 20.16 + KUB 43.32 iii 27 [OS]), which duplicates *mu-ri-ṣa-le-eš ga-an-ga-an-te-eš* (KBo 17.1 iii 27 [OS]), in which *muriẓalaš* must represent a genuine OS example of a nom.pl.c. form in *-aš* (*pace* CHD L-N: 333, which calls this form a "collective"). The reconstruction of the infinitive suffix *-wanzi* as **-we/on-t-i* (§3.25) is phonologically irregular: the **-i* should have been lost in the assibilation process (**-ti > Hitt. -z*), which leaves Hitt. *-i* unexplained. For none of the endings is the 'long' variant either mentioned or explained (e.g. gen.sg. °*Ca-a-aš* beside normal °*Ca-aš*, dat.-loc.sg. °*Ci-i* beside normal °*Ci*, all.sg. °*Ca-a* beside normal °*Ca*, abl. °*Ca-a-az* beside normal °*Ca-az*, and dat.loc.pl. °*Ca-a-aš* beside normal °*Ca-aš*).

Chapter 4, Noun and Adjective Declension (79-131) gives per noun class an overview of paradigms of selected examples with an extensive discussion in footnotes. Forms in bold printing are from OS texts, which makes it easy to immediately see the Old Hittite situation.

It is puzzling, however, why Hoffner & Melchert (H&M) in their treatment of common-gender *a*-stem nouns (§4.2) have chosen the noun "*antuwaḫḫa-, antuḫša-*" 'human being' as their first example, as this noun is originally an ablauting *s*-stem (nom. *antuẓaḫḫaš* < **-dʰuéh₂-ōs*, gen.sg. *antuḫšaš* < **-dʰuh₂-s-ós*, cf. Eichner 1979: 77), that only within the Hittite period is transferred to the *a*-stem declension. The same goes for *ištamina-, ištamana-* 'ear', which originally is an ablauting *n*-stem *ištāman / ištamin-*. The treatment of the Luwian *i*-mutation and its consequences for Hittite (§4.17) is interesting. The non-ablauting *i*-stem adjectives are not separately treated (§4.38) although the inflection of e.g. *nakkī-* 'important', with its almost consistent plene spelling of the suffix *-i-*, is rather interesting from an historical point of view. It is unclear to me why H&M cite *k*-stems (§4.60, to which only *mekk-* 'much, many' belongs), *ḫ*-stems (§4.62, only *išqaruḫ*, a vessel), *l*-stems (§4.63-67) and *t*-stems (§4.94-95) as separate types, whereas these show no specific declension or stem alternations. It would have been easier to treat them as consonant-stems (which also goes for most *r*-stems (§4.80-86, except ablauting *keššar / kiššer- / kišr-* 'hand'), most *s*-stems (§4.87-89, except ablauting *aiš / išš-* 'mouth') and the *nt*-stems [§4.96-98]). To the paradigm of 'oil' (§4.70) a nom.-acc.sg. form *ša-a-kán* (KBo 40.69 r.col. 5 [NS]) should be added. An acc.sg. form [*ki-i*]*š-še-ra-an* is attested in the OS text KBo 17.45, 5 and within the paradigm of 'hand' (§4.82, esp. note 180) the form *kiššeran* should therefore have been given in bold. In the word *ēšḫar / išḫan-* 'blood' the *-ḫ-* is not "omissible" as H&M have it (§4.101, note 220). Instead, the forms nom.-acc.sg. *e-eš-šar* (KUB 41.8 iii 9 [MH/NS]) gen.sg. *e-eš-na-aš* (ibid. ii 36 [MH/NS]) and abl. *e-eš-na-za*

(BallesoT 1.33, 52 [NS]) for normal *e-eš-ḫar*, *e-eš-ḫa-na-aš* and *e-eš-ḫa-na-za*, respectively, must be scribal errors (cf. HW² E: 117; Kloekhorst 2008: 258). The gen.sg. form "*periṣaš*" (§4.115) is too insecure to be cited in an overview of forms of the word *per / parn-* 'house', even if it is accompanied by a footnote that makes clear that this reading is anything but certain.

Chapter 5, Personal Pronouns (132-6), *Chapter 6, Possessive Pronouns* (137-41), *Chapter 7, Deixis: The Demonstratives* (142-8) and *Chapter 8, Relative and Indefinite Pronouns* (149-52) are a series of short chapters that deal with the morphological and inflectional characteristics of the range of pronouns used in Hittite.

The correct forms of the enclitic personal and possessive pronouns are *-tta, -ddu* '(to) you', *-nnaš* '(to) us', *-šše, -šši* '(to) him/her/it' (§5.12), *=mma/i/e-* 'my', *=tta/i/e-* 'your' and *=šša/i/e-* 'his, her, its' (§6.4), with initial geminate consonants. It is nonsense that the form *a-pé-e* 'these (nom.pl.c., nom.-acc.pl.n.) would be spelled with a plene *-e-* only in order to avoid confusion with the Akkadogram *A-BI* 'my father' or the noun *a-a-pí* 'ritual pit' (§7.6). Instead, the plene spelling of *-e-* indicates the presence of a long /ē/, which is the regular outcome of **-ói*.

Chapter 9, Numbers (153-72) represents a detailed treatment of the formal aspects and especially the syntactic use of numerals.

The nom.-acc.n. forms 2-*e* 'two' and 3-*e* 'three' are explained as "pronominal" (§§9.11, 9.13). I would rather regard these as the regular outcome of the preforms **duih₂* and **trih₂* (for which cf. Gr. nom.acc.n. τρία, Skt. nom.-acc.n. *trī́*). The development **-ih₂ >* Hitt. *-e* has been proposed in Kloekhorst 2008: 91; the fact that 'two' is an *i*-stem in Anatolian can be inferred from the instr. form 2-*i-ta-an-ta* and the evidence from the other Anatolian languages (CLuw. ᴸᵁ*duṣanalli-* 'second in rank', Lyc. *kbi-* 'two', and especially Lyc. *kbihu*, Mil. *tbisu* 'twice' < **dui-su*). The verb *šumumaḫḫ-* can hardly be a "derivative from PIE **sem-*" (§9.62), cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 784-5.

Chapter 10, Verb Formation (173-9) is a small chapter that discusses the various ways in which Hittite can form derived verbal stems (reduplication, suffixes, rather: infixes).

Among the group of ablauting root stem verbs also the *ḫi*-verbs "*akk-/ek-*" 'to die' and "*ar-/er-*" 'to arrive' are cited (§10.2), although the *e*-grade in these verbs is due to a secondary inner-Hittite development. The real ablaut these verbs show is one between a strong stem with long *ā* (*āk(k)-, ār-*), and a weak stem with a short *a* (*akk-, ar-*), cf. also my criticism on §13.1. The verb "*kikki-*", which is cited as a reduplicated form of *ki-* 'to be placed' (§10.3) does not exist, cf. HEG K: 569 (note that a reference to "HED K s.v." is given, but there the verb "*kikki-*" is not mentioned). The verb *šešd-* 'to prosper' (§10.4) is not a reduplication of the root **sed-* 'to sit' (cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 756-7). It is remarkable that in the overview of verbal suffixes the very common denominative suffix *-ṣe/a-* is not mentioned. The form *ḫēṣaneškeet* (§10.7, also mentioned in §13.26, note 56 and §24.24) does not show a combination of the imperfective suffixes *-anna/i-* and *-ške/a-*. Instead, it is the normal imperfective in *-ške/a-* of the verb *ḫē(ṣa)ṣaniṣe/a-* 'to rain'. The factitives in *-aḫḫ-* and the imperfectives in *-šš(a)-* are *ḫi-*

conjugated (*pace* §10.8). It is unfortunate that H&M have chosen to cite the suffix "-*āi-*" as such. This could cause confusion with the class of *ḫi*-verbs in -*ai-*. Instead, the descriptively more appropriate -*ae-/-ā-* (or only -*ae-*) should have been used (cf. Oettinger 1979: 30-4).

Chapter 11, Verb Inflection (180-6) gives a short overview of the categories that can be distinguished within the Hittite verbal system and the verbal endings that are used.

I am happy to see that H&M accept my view that the 2pl.act. ending -*šten(i)* originally belongs to the *ḫi*-conjugation (§11.5, although it is not only found in "*ḫi*-verbs with stems ending in -*i-*" but also in *au-/u-* 'to see' and several *tarn(a)*-class verbs), but a reference to Kloekhorst 2007 would have been appropriate. The overview of the active endings (§11.6) contains several errors. For the *mi*-conjugation, only a 3sg.pres.act. ending -*zi* is mentioned, whereas -*za* occurs occasionally as well (especially in OH compositions), as is correctly remarked in §11.8. As the *mi*-conjugation 3sg.pret.act. ending, only -*t* is mentioned, which is indeed the postvocalic variant. Postconsonantally, we find -*tta*, however (of which the -*a* is indeed real, cf. Oettinger 1979: 9[6]; Kloekhorst 2008: 800; *pace* note 10). The same goes for the *mi*-conjugation 2sg.pret.act. ending: although postvocalic -*t* occasionally occurs in NH texts (taken over from the 3sg.pret.act.), the usual postconsonantal ending is -*tta* (taken over from the *ḫi*-conjugation). Rarely do we find -*tta* in postvocalic position as well (e.g. in *paitta* 'you went'). For the *ḫi*-conjugation, a 2sg.pret.act. ending -*t* is mentioned, which is exemplified by the forms *zāit* and *ḫalzait* (note 7). Both forms are attested directly before a break and should therefore rather be read *za-a-it*[-*ta*] (KUB 33.106 iii 10) and *ḫal-za-it*[-*ta*] (KUB 30.10 obv. 9), respectively, showing the normal ending -*tta*. The ending -*t* should therefore be removed. The 1pl.pres.act. ending -*u̯ani* is attested in OS texts as well, so should be given in bold print. The 1pl.act. ending -*men(i)* is not only "largely confined to the *nu*-causative verbs" and "*umeni* and *aumen* (from *au-* 'to see')" (note 14) but also occurs in *tumeni* 'we take' (from *dā-* / *d-*). The 3pl.pret.act. ending -*ar* rarely occurs in MH -*i̯e/a-* verbs only and must be secondary (cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 244). The *mi*-conjugation 2sg.imp.act. ending -*t* also occurs in the form *te- (e-)et* 'speak!'. The paragraphs that treat "Irregularities in the *mi*-Conjugation" (§§11.10-11) and "Irregularities in the *ḫi*-Conjugation" (§§11.12-16) are disappointing. In not more than one page only a few words are used to describe some "occasional" phenomena, which in fact are caused by the highly interesting diachronic developments taking place within the Hittite verbal system. For instance, the original distinction between the *mi*- and the *ḫi*-conjugation is disappearing in the course of time: for each ending either the *mi*- or the *ḫi*-conjugation variant becomes the productive one and ousts the other. Therewith, the Hittite verbal system gradually is developing into a system that knows only one conjugation. H&M do mention e.g. that "[t]here is a widespread intrusion of the ending -*ti* from the *ḫi*-conjugation during the NH period" (§11.10) but do not seem to recognize that this is part of a larger phenomenon. In the same vein, there seems to be a tendency for the 2sg. to take over the ending of the 3sg. The starting point of this development probably was the *mi*-conjugation

where the postconsonantal 2sg.pret.act. ending -*tta* (which was taken over from the *ḫi*-conjugation), was identical with the postconsonantal 3sg.pret.act. ending -*tta*. That is why in NH "there is a marked tendency to replace the earlier pret. sg. 2 in -*š* with the ending of the sg. 3 -*t*" (§11.11). Similarly in some *ḫi*-verbs the 2sg.pret.act. ending -*tta* is replaced by -*šta*: the original 3sg.pret.act. ending -*š* was extended by the *mi*-ending -*tta*, yielding -*šta* (§11.16), which then was transferred to the 2sg.pret.act. Again, the larger dynamics are not recognized by H&M. An even more important point is that it can be shown that within the Hittite period certain verbal classes became very productive, e.g. the *mi*-conjugated *ḫatrae*-class and -*i̯e/a*-class, and the *ḫi*-conjugated *tarn(a)*-class (cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 117ff.). This is the reason why it seems that "[i]n the pres. sg. 3, an ending -*ai* occasionally appears where one expects -*i*: *šipanti* and *šipandai* 'he libates, offers'" (§11.13). What in fact happened, is that the root stem verb *šipant-* had secondarily been transferred to the productive *tarn(a)*-class, yielding a stem *šipanda-*, to which the 3sg.pres.act. ending -*i* was added (an ending "-*ai*" just does not exist!). It is regrettable that H&M seem to be unaware of these inner-Hittite developments. The alleged OS infinitive form "*pa-ú-wa-a-an-zi*" 'to go' (KBo 20.8 obv. 9 [OS]), with a remarkable plene spelling of -*a*-, (§11.20, note 36) does not exist. Instead, we should read *pa-lu-u̯a-a-an-zi* 'they cheer' (I will expand on this form on another occasion).

Chapter 12, Conjugation of mi-Verbs (187-213), *Chapter 13, Conjugation of ḫi-Verbs* (214-29) and *Chapter 14, Medio-Passive Conjugation* (230-4) all discuss formal aspects of the different verbal classes, which are exemplified by extensive overviews of paradigms.

Also in these chapters it is remarkable how often H&M ignore or misrepresent diachronic developments. For instance, in their treatment of *e/a*-ablauting *mi*-conjugated root stem verbs (§12.2) it is correctly mentioned that the stem with -*e*- occurs in the "present singular, preterite singular and plural, and imperative second- and third-person singular and second-person plural" and that the stem with -*a*- occurs in the other forms. They then also mention "exceptions to this pattern", e.g. *ēpteni* 'you seize' besides regular *apteni*. It is not mentioned, however, that these "exceptions" can be found for nearly all *e/a*-ablauting verbs and regularly occur from MH times onwards, and are just due to the diachronic development that the strong stem with -*e*- is being generalized throughout the paradigm. In the scheme containing the paradigm of *eš-/aš-* 'to be' (§12.3) the 3sg.pres.act. form *ēšzi* should be given in bold as it is attested in OS texts. I do not understand why the verb *nāḫ-/naḫḫ-* 'to fear' is used as the first example of non-ablauting *mi*-conjugating root stem verbs (§12.8), while it is in fact *ḫi*-conjugated (as is acknowledged by H&M in note 29)! Apparently, it is not recognized that the NH forms *na-aḫ-mi* and *na-aḫ-zi* are non-probative for establishing *mi*-conjugation for this verb since in the NH period, where the process of merger of the *mi*- and *ḫi*-conjugation was well on its way, the endings -*mi* and -*zi* were the productive ones vis-à-vis their *ḫi*-conjugation variants -*ḫḫi* and -*i*, and were in the process of fully ousting them. The same goes for the verb *maz-* 'to withstand', which is cited as a *mi*-conjugated verb (§12.10), whereas it clearly is *ḫi*-conjugated originally,

cf. OH 3sg.pres.act. *mazze, mazzi* (this verb does not have an original root **mat-* and does not show a "transfer to the *ḫi*-conjugation" that "began already in OH", *pace* note 36). The assumption that the verbs "*tarḫw-*" 'to be able' and "*šanḫw-*" 'to roast' contain a sequence /hw/ and not /hʷ/ (§12.16) is false, cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 835f.. The form "*zinne(z)zi*" (§12.25) does not exist: it is always spelled *zi-in-ni(-iz)-zi*. i.e. with *-i-*. Note the important new insight that the 3sg.pres.act. form "*m[a-al-l]a-a-i*" (KBo 15.35 + KBo 15.22 ii 11) does not exist, but should rather be read *ú-[d]a-a-i* (§12.27, note 99). In §12.35 the suffix "*-āi-*" (i.e. *-ae-/-ā-*: note that especially the form *ḫa-at-ra-a-eš* 'you wrote', which is attested spelled thus up to the early NH period (the letter KBo 18.76) shows that the suffix was /-āe-/ throughout Hittite; perhaps only in the late NH period, where we find the spelling *ḫa-at-ra-a-iš* (in the letter KBo 18.27 [LNS]), the sequence /-āe-/ had changed to /-āi-/) is, with reference to Oettinger 1979: 30-4, derived from "PIE **-āye-/-āyo-*". Oettinger clearly spoke against derivation from "**-āye-/-āyo-*", i.e. *-eh₂-ịe/o-*, however, which in his view yielded Hitt. *-āịe/a-* (e.g. *tāịe/a-* 'to steal' < **teh₂-ịe/o-*, o.c.: 393-7): instead, he derived *-ae-/-ā-* from **-o-ịe/o-* (o.c.: 357-60). It is remarkable that in the treatment of *ḫi*-conjugated root stem verbs (§13.1) no mention at all is made from the fact that these show an original ablaut between a strong stem in *-ā-* and a weak stem in *-a-* (e.g. *ār-/ar-*, *āk(k)-/akk-*, *ḫāš(š)-/ḫašš-*, *ḫād-/ḫad-*, etc.). Moreover, it is misleading to present the verbs "*akk-/ek-*" and "*ar-/er-*" as fully *a/e*-ablauting. As said already, these verbs create a secondary stem with *-e-* within the Hittite period only. The 2sg.pret.act. form of *dā-/d-* 'to take' is *dātta, datta*, and not *dāš*, as given in §13.11. The verb "*šarra-*" 'to divide' is given as an "underived stem in *-a*" (§13.13), but the MH form *ša-a-ar-ri* shows that this originally was a root stem verb *šarr-/šarr-*, that only secondarily was transferred to the *tarn(a)*-class inflection. The forms 1pl.pres.act. *la-ḫu-e-ni*, 1sg.pret.act. *la-a-ḫu-un* and 2sg.imp.act. *la-a-aḫ* are not derived from a stem *lāḫ-*, which would then be a variant of *lāḫu-* (§13.17, note 39), but rather show that *lāḫu-* is to be interpreted as /lāhʷ-/, in which the labial element of /hʷ/ did not count as a vowel (so therefore not **laḫumeni or **lāḫunun; the form *la-a-aḫ* could perhaps be read *la-a-uḫ* = /lāhʷ/). The treatment of "*ḫi*-verbs in *-ai-*" (§13.20) is unsatisfactory. It is not enough to say that "[t]he paradigms [of these verbs] actually show a complicated alternation of stems in *-ai-/-āi-*, *-e-* and *-i-/-y-*". It should have been explained that in principle these verbs show a division between a strong stem in *-ai-* and a weak stem in *-i-* (the distribution of which coincides with the distribution between strong and weak stems in all other ablauting verbs), albeit that before endings starting in *-ḫ-* the *-ai-* of the strong stem is monophthongized to *-ē-* (e.g. **dai-ḫḫi > tēḫḫi*), and that before an ending starting in a vowel the intervocalic *-ị-* is lost with compensatory lengthening of the preceding *-a-* (e.g. **dai-i > dāi*, **dai-er > dāer*). In the course of time, the long *-ā-* of these latter forms is spreading throughout the paradigm (e.g. *daiš >> dāiš*). Moreover, on the basis of a reanalysis of the 3pl.pres.act. form in °*Ciị-anzi* as °*Ciịa-nzi*, these verbs are in the course of time being influenced by the *-ịe/a*-class (e.g. *daiịen >> tiịaịen*). To the paradigm of *zai-/zi-* 'to cross' (§13.21) the forms 1sg.pret.act. *zēḫḫu[n]* (KBo 8.67, 9 [OS]) and 2pl.pres.act. *zišteni* (KUB 26.87, 11 [OH/NS]) should be added. Within the paradigm of

ḫalzai-/ḫalzi- 'to call' (§13.21), the forms 1sg.pres.act. *ḫalziḫḫi* and 1sg.pret.act. *ḫalziḫḫun* should in fact be read *ḫalzeḫḫi* and *ḫalzeḫḫun* (the sequence *-zi-iḫ-* can also be read *-ze-eḫ-*).

Herewith ends the part that treats the morphology. The remainder of the book deals with semantics, usage and syntax. *Chapter 15, Grammatical Agreement* (235-41) discusses what types of agreement and, more interestingly perhaps, what types of lack of agreement can be found in Hittite. *Chapter 16, Noun Cases* (242-70) gives an impressively detailed overview of the semantics and usage as well as sometimes syntax (e.g. "Word Order in a Genitival Phrase", §§16.50-64) of the cases.

Instead of interpreting the phrase MU.KAM-*za meḫur* as a partitive apposition in the nominative (§16.10), it is better to interpret MU.KAM-*za* as a genitive and translate the phrase as 'time of the year' (thus Rieken 1999: 27-8). Note that the common phrase *lē=tta nāḫi*, usually interpreted as containing a 2sg.impt. form and translated as 'don't fear', is in §16.32 convincingly interpreted as containing a 3sg.pres.act. form that should be translated impersonally, 'let it not frighten you'. The cases where the ablative case seems to be used for "indicating directions" (§16.92), e.g. ᵁᴿᵁ*Ūššaza=ma=šši* ᵁᴿᵁ*Zarātaš* ZAG-*aš*, which is translated by H&M as 'In the direction of Ūšša, Zarāta is his boundary', it is better to translate more literally 'seen from the direction of'. The instrumental case can not only be represented by the Akkadogram *IŠTU* (§16.104), but also by the Sumerogram TA.

Chapter 17, Adjectives (271-6), *Chapter 18, Pronouns* (276-88), *Chapter 19, Adverbs* (289-93) and *Chapter 20, Local Adverbs, Preverbs, and Postpositions* (294-301) briefly discuss the semantics, usage and syntax of the categories mentioned, including the way in which in Hittite the comparative (§§17.13-6) and the superlative degree (§§17.17-20) are expressed.

The local adverb *katta* (§20.21) does not only have the meaning 'with, alongside of', but also 'downwards'.

Chapter 21, Verb Voice (302-5), *Chapter 22, Verb Tense* (306-12), *Chapter 23, Verb Mood* (313-6), *Chapter 24 Verb Aspect* (317-29) (including parts on the adverbs *kāša(tta)* and *kāšma* (§§24.27-30) and "The "Serial" Use of *pai-* 'to go' and *uwa-* 'to come'" [§§24.31-42]) and *Chapter 25, Non-Finite Verb Forms* (330-40) treat the semantics, usage and syntax of the several verbal categories. The parts on the "historical present" (§§22.6-7) and the "Nuances of Imperfective Aspect" (§§24.6-19) are especially enlightening.

The phrase *māu šešdu* is in §23.7 translated as "may [...] prosper and have rest", as if 3sg.imp.act. *šešdu* belongs with the verb *šeš-* 'to sleep, to rest'. Instead it belongs with the verb *šiš(d)-, šeš(d)-* 'to prosper, to proliferate'. The 2sg.imp.act. forms of imperfectives in *-ške/a-* are in §24.9 cited as if ending in °*ške* (*ḫatreške, išt[am]aške*). Yet, on the basis of plene spelled forms °*š-ki-i* (e.g. *ak-ku-uš-ki-i* 'drink!' (KBo 7.28 obv. 23 [OH/MS]), *uš-ki-i* 'see!' (KBo 25.123, 10 [OS]), it is clear that the non-plene spelled forms should be transliterated with *-i* as well: *ḫatreški, išt[am]aški* (cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 96 for the fact that word-final accented **é >*

Hitt. *-i*). The verb *nanna/i-* 'to drive' is not an imperfective in *-anna/i-* derived from the stem *nai-* (*pace* §24.22); such a form would have been ***niṇanna/i-*. Instead, *nanna/i-* is a reduplication of *nai-*, whereas the regular imperfective of *nai-* is *naiške/a-*. The form *waqqareš* as cited in §25.28 does not exist. The text (KUB 33.106 ii 8-9) in facts reads *ụaqqareš[keụ]an tiụat*. The supine in *-ụan* only occurs with the verb *dai-/ti-* 'to put' and not with the verb *tiụe/a-* 'to step' (*pace* §25.37, also mentioned in §24.19). All cases where we seem to be dealing with supine + *tiụe/a-* are from the NH period, which is exactly the period in which *ḫi*-verbs in *-ai-* are heavily influenced by the *-ịe/a*-class. So, in these cases the stem *tiụe/a-* represents a secondarily reshaped variant of original *dai-/ti-*.

Chapter 26, Negation (341-7), *Chapter 28, Particles* (354-88) and *Chapter 29, Conjunctions* (389-405) deal with the semantics, usage and syntax of the categories mentioned (of which the treatment of the local particles *-an, -apa, -ašta, -kan* and *-šan* (§§28.43-114) and the chapter on conjunctions are especially elucidating). *Chapter 27, Questions* (348-53) (the ordering of which seems a bit strange to me, as I would expect it to have been placed before or after the chapter on clauses) briefly discusses the various interrogative clauses that can be formed in Hittite. *Chapter 30, Clauses* (406-29) gives a detailed overview of the syntax of Hittite. Finally, *Chapter 31, Sumerian and Akkadian* (430-41) gives an overview of Sumerian and Akkadian grammar insofar as needed to properly understand the Sumerograms and Akkadograms as used in Hittite. The volume ends with *References* (442-68). No index of words is given, but the lack of this is made up by the possibility to search the PDF file of the book that is available on the accompanying CD-ROM (see also below), although this is not specifically indicated in the book itself.

Part 2: Tutorial contains, apart from *Contents* (v-vi) and *Introduction to the Lessons* (1), fourteen *Lessons* (2-53), that "are designed to help [the reader] master step-by-step the essentials of Hittite morphology and syntax" (1). Each *Lesson* contains a paragraph *Grammar*, where it is explained which part of the grammar will be treated and which parts of the *Reference Grammar* should be studied, a *Translation Exercise* usually consisting of fifteen Hittite sentences that are to be translated, for which the *Vocabulary* can be used and in which the new words of the lesson are given with translation. In lessons 1-4 the sentences are given in broad transcription, in lessons 5-9 in transliteration as well as broad transcription, and in lessons 10-14 only in transliteration. Sentences that are unmarked have been made up by H&M, sentences marked with ♦ are taken from actual Hittite texts, and sentences marked with ◊ are taken from actual Hittite texts with slight modifications. Extensive footnotes to the translation exercises provide difficult words and phrases with explanatory commentaries. The volume ends with a *Comprehensive Vocabulary* (54-71) in which all words of the translation exercises are given, and the *Sources of Exercises Marked ♦ or ◊* (72-5), in

which references are made to the Hittite texts from which (some of) the exercise sentences were taken.

No translations of the sentences are given, which would make it difficult to use this tutorial for self-study (which is acknowledged by H&M themselves in *Part 1*, p. xiv). Moreover, no examples in cuneiform are given, although this is a large part of the difficulty of learning Hittite.

The *Reference Grammar* and the *Tutorial* are accompanied by a CD-ROM on which PDF files of both volumes can be found, which can be used for searching specific words, phrases, etc., which makes up for the lack of an index of words treated in the *Reference Grammar*. A handy file called "Tips and Recommendations for Using the PDF files of *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*" gives a good overview of the possibilities of searching the contents of the two volumes (e.g. that diacritics can be ignored in searching the files). A serious drawback, however, is that Sumerograms are not searchable at all, and that Hittite words that have the same shape as (parts of) English words cannot be separated from them. If one, for instance, wants to find all Hittite words starting in *išḫ°*, one also gets as a result all English verbs ending in *-ish*. A big advantage, though, is that meanings, grammatical terms, etc., are now searchable as well.

We can conclude that, although there certainly is room for improvements, especially in the treatment of the phonology and the verbal morphology, it cannot be denied that this grammar is a work of tremendous importance that greatly enhances our knowledge of the Hittite language. Particularly the treatment of syntax and the meaning and usage of particles and adverbs is a big step forward. We therefore can only wholeheartedly thank the authors for sharing with the general public their vast knowledge and insights into the sometimes dark caverns of Hittite grammar, which thanks to this book have become appreciably brighter.

References

CHD = H.G. Güterbock, H.A. Hoffner, Th.P.J. van den Hout (edd.). 1983ff. *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, Chicago.

HED = J. Puhvel. 1984ff. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, Berlin – New York.

HEG = J. Tischler. 1983ff. *Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar*, Innsbruck.

Hetkonk = S. Košak, *Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln, Online-Datenbank*, www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/.

HW² = J. Friedrich & A. Kammenhuber. 1975ff. *Hethitisches Wörterbuch, 2. völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage*, Heidelberg.

Eichner, H. 1979. Review of: Friedrich J. – Kammenhuber, A. *Hethitisches Wörterbuch, 2. Aufl., 2. Liefg.*, *Die Sprache* 25, 76-77.

Kloekhorst, A. 2007. The Hittite 2pl.-ending *-šten(i)*, *VI Congresso Internazionale di Ittitologia, Roma, 5-9 settembre 2005* (edd. A. Archi & R. Francia) (= *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 49-50) (2007), 493-500.

Kloekhorst, A. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon* (= *Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series* 5), Leiden – Boston.

Melchert, H.C. 1994. *Anatolian Historical Phonology* (= *Leiden Studies in Indo-European* 3), Amsterdam – Atlanta.

Oettinger, N. 1979. *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums* (= *Erlanger Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kunstwissenschaft* 64), Nürnberg.

Rieken, E. 1999. *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen* (= *Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 44), Wiesbaden.

Vansèveren, S. 2006. *Nisili, Manuel de langue hittite, Volume I*, Leuven.

Watkins, C. 2004. Chapter 18, Hittite, *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages* (R.D. Woodard, ed.), 551-575.

Alwin Kloekhorst
Leiden University
Comparative Indo-European Linguistics
PO Box 9515
NL-2300 RA Leiden, Niederlande
a.kloekhorst@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Obwohl die sprachwissenschaftliche Erforschung der tocharischen Sprachen in den letzten Jahren erstaunliche Fortschritte gemacht hat, gab es nach wie vor einen fast völligen Mangel an brauchbaren didaktischen Materialien. Trotz einer Vielzahl von wichtigen Beiträgen zur tocharischen Philologie und Sprachgeschichte (u.a. die historischen Grammatiken von Adams [1988] und Ringe [1996], die vielen Texteditionen und -untersuchungen Pinaults und die Aufsätze von Schmidt, Thomas und Winter) musste der Nichtspezialist noch zu Anfang des neuen Jahrhunderts auf das stets wertvolle, in manchen Aspekten aber veraltete Tocharische Elementarbuch von Krause und Thomas (TEB) für Fragen der allgemeinen Grammatik sowie als Einführung in die Texte zurückgreifen. Nicht ohne Recht beklagt sich der Vf. des hier besprochenen Bandes, wie oft der Anfänger mit Hilfe des Elementarbuches zwar eine Textpassage Wort für Wort durcharbeiten mag, ohne aber eine sinnvolle Übersetzung zu erlangen (5-6) – was leider auch der Erfahrung des Rez. nur zu genau entspricht.

Der Veröffentlichung der wichtigen Instrumenta Tocharica (Malzahn 2007) folgt jetzt die Erscheinung einer ersten umfassenden tocharischen Chrestomathie. Prof. Pinault ist seit langem in indogermanistischen Kreisen als Herausgeber vieler tocharischer Handschriften sowie als Verfasser einer ganzen Reihe von Untersuchungen zur tocharischen und indoiranischen Linguistik bestens bekannt und hält zusammen mit seinen Pariser Kollegen „la langue de Meillet" und die berühmte französische Tradition der Indogermanistik lebendig. Durch diesen Band verbindet er die Lesung und Deutung der tocharischen Texte mit der Religions- und Kulturgeschichte Zentralasiens und stellt damit das Studium des Tocharischen in seinen sprachlichen und kulturellen Kontext der zentralasiatischen Sprachen und Kulturen des Buddhismus im 1. Jahrtausend n. Chr. Nicht nur für Studenten, sondern auch für Forscher, die sich nicht prinzipiell mit der Philologie oder Religionsgeschichte beschäftigen, ist dies eine willkommene Entwicklung, deren Ergebnis in einem viel tieferen Verständnis des Inhalts und der Struktur der Texte zu sehen ist.

Nach Vorwort, Einführung, und Auflistung der bisher erschienenen Ausgaben aller in Band 2 des TEB enthaltenen Texte führt P. den Leser durch 16 west- und osttocharische Texte, und gibt für jeden eine Übersetzung sowie sprachliche und historisch-kulturelle Kommentare. Die Texte sind gut ausgewählt und stellen die "Klassiker" der tocharischen Literatur dar, von denen die meisten auch in TEB erschienen sind, sie schließen aber auch einige erstmals veröffentlichte und daher noch wenig bekannte ein, mitunter weltliche Dokumente wie Karawanenpässe und