

Sonderdruck aus

# KRATYLOS

KRITISCHES BERICHTS-  
UND REZENSIONSORGAN  
FÜR INDOGERMANISCHE  
UND ALLGEMEINE  
SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT

JAHRGANG 54

2009

DR. LUDWIG REICHERT VERLAG · WIESBADEN

- Godel, Robert. 1975. *An Introduction to the Study of Classical Armenian*. Wiesbaden.
- Henning, W.B. 1958. Mitteliranisch. In: *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, 4. Band, Iranistik, 1. Abschnitt, Linguistik. Leiden – Köln, 20–130.
- Jensen, Hans. 1959. *Altarmenische Grammatik*. Heidelberg.
- Klingenschmitt, Gert. 1982. *Das altarmenische Verbum*. Wiesbaden.
- Matzinger, Joachim. 1992. Der armenische Reflex von idg. \*-*u-*. Vienna (unpublished).
- Meid, Wolfgang. 1967. *Germanische Sprachwissenschaft III. Wortbildungslehre*. Berlin.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1911. Sur les mots iraniens empruntés par l'arménien. *MSL* 17, 242–250.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1936. *Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique*. Vienna.
- Olsen, Birgit Anette. 1999. The Noun in Biblical Armenian. Origin and Word-Formation – with special emphasis on the Indo-European heritage. Berlin – New York.
- Olsen, Birgit Anette. 2002. A Note on Armenian Preverbs and Prepositions. In: Fabrice Cavoto (ed.): *The Linguist's Linguist: A Collection of Papers in Honour of Alexis Manaster Ramer*, Vol. II, München, 309–316.
- Olsen, Birgit Anette. 2005. On Iranian Dialectal Diversity in Armenian. In: Gerhard Meiser und Olav Hackstein (eds.): *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel. Akten der XL. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft*, 17.–23. September 2000, Halle an der Saale. Wiesbaden, 473–481.
- Schmitt, Rüdiger. 1981. *Grammatik des Klassisch-Armenischen*. Innsbruck.
- Schmitt, Rüdiger. 1983. Iranisches Lehngut im Armenischen. *REArm* 17, 73–112.
- Seldeslachts, Herman. 1991. *Varia Etymologica*. In: Lambert Isebaert (ed.): *Studia Etymologica Indoeuropaea Memoriae A.J. van Windekens Dicata*, Leuven, 247–261.
- Sommer, Ferdinand. 1924. Postpositionen im Armenischen. *WZKM* 31, 105–112.
- Zimmer, Stefan. 1982/83. Die Funktion der tocharischen *si/šše*-Adjektive. *KZ* 96, 277–289.

University of Copenhagen  
 Department of Nordic Studies and Linguistics  
 Section Indo-European  
 Njalsgade 120  
 DK-2300 Copenhagen S, Dänemark

Birgit Anette Olsen

**Neumann, Günter:** *Glossar des Lykischen*. Überarbeitet und zum Druck gebracht von **Johann Tischler**. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, 2007, gr.-8°, LXXXI, 453 S. (Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie, 21.) Geb. 98 €.

The present work represents the labors of half a century (the author's first essay on a Lycian topic — the place name Patara — appeared in BNF 6 in 1955). The author's untimely death in 2005 prevented him from bringing the book to completion, and we owe a great debt to J. Tischler for taking on the delicate task of preparing the manuscript for posthumous publication.

The editor has wisely limited his interventions to the minimal. Apart from purely mechanical matters, he has permitted himself to make three helpful additions:

glosses for cited Hittite words, references to my own DLL<sup>3</sup> of 2004,<sup>1</sup> and above all citations from the Lycian texts to show the context of the forms as lemmatized by N. in his glossary. The last feature is particularly important, since even with the rather generous cross references there are instances where the user would not otherwise find an alternative listing (e. g. *adranas* is referred to under *χabadranas* on p. 108, but only the text citation under *adranas* on p. 4 points to *χabadranas*).

N.'s glossary is in both its conception and execution conveniently complementary to the DLL<sup>3</sup>. First, while I made no attempt to conceal the many uncertainties of segmentation, lemmatization, grammatical analysis, and interpretation, I did strive as much as possible to assign every occurring form uniquely. N. on the other hand, while naturally acknowledging those identifications that are entirely secure, prefers in general to present the Lycian material in a largely unfiltered form as it appears in the texts — and then cite and soberly evaluate possible analyses.

Second, I limited my bibliographical references mostly to crediting the source of analyses when these are taken from relatively recent works and to acknowledging other opinions where there is serious disagreement. N. expressly seeks to be all-inclusive, with due attention to the secondary literature of the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century.

N. with characteristic perspicacity is well aware of the advantages and disadvantages of his approach (IX and XV). His glossary is not the most convenient and accessible summary of the current “state of the art” regarding the Lycian language. It offers instead an invitation to take an active part in an ongoing scholarly dialogue that has extended over more than a hundred and fifty years. He expressly underscores the continued relevance and value of earlier analyses, including those from what one may characterize as the pioneering era. It must be said that in the present work the immediate yield in terms of rediscovery of neglected insights from the more distant past is decidedly modest. Nevertheless, one can only heartily agree with N. that careful rereading of previous accounts not only brings a heightened appreciation of the collaborative and incremental nature of scholarly research, but also often leads to useful new perspectives. One may not be convinced by a specific interpretation presented, but the argumentation will compel a critical reevaluation of one's own ideas.

In regard to concrete suggestions that have been unjustly overlooked or forgotten, these more often come from scholars of the late twentieth century, frequently though not exclusively from N. himself. I may cite as representative examples: (1) the analysis by Carruba of *asaxlaza* as contracted from \**asa-haxlaza* (27) and that of N. himself (89) that *haxlaza* may be cognate with Hittite *šakl(a)i-* ‘custom, rule; rite’ (vs. the analysis of DLL<sup>3</sup> 22, which leaves the *ha-* unexplained); (2) the

<sup>1</sup> I happily adopt this suggested siglum for A Dictionary of the Lycian Language, Ann Arbor – New York, 2004. This work does represent effectively the third edition of my lexicon, and the superscript numeral should help to prevent confusion with the Dictionnaire de la langue louvite of Emmanuel Laroche.

possible comparison of *azzala-* with Hieroglyphic Luvian (PANIS.PITHOS) *á-za-li-sa/za* (32); (3) comparison of *meleime* with Luvo-Hittite *malā(i)-* 'approve' (206); (4) recognition of the equation of *neleze/i-* and *ἀγοραῖος* (239), with its further implications for the verb *nele-*, for which 'to gather' seems fitting (cf. for the sense *ἀγείρω*) and the noun *nele-*, where for *nele nele* 'in droves' also would be appropriate; (5) the comparison by Gusmani of *qla-* 'precinct' with Lydian *qela* instead of with Hittite *hīla-* (303); (6) the identification of *t/rezi* as 'memorial, monument' (355).

I do not mean to imply that all of these proposals are assuredly correct, nor do any have earthshaking implications, but barring the fortuitous discovery of a major new bilingual text, further progress in our understanding of Lycian will necessarily continue to be incremental, and these and other original ideas in N.'s glossary merit careful consideration in that ongoing effort. As one would have predicted on the basis of his known expertise, N. also offers a compendious and extremely useful summary of the available evidence from personal and place names indirectly attested through Greek sources (as well as possible comparisons with names from second-millennium cuneiform texts). I forgo citation of examples, but this is clearly an aspect where N.'s glossary is superior to the DLL<sup>3</sup>. While a secure lexical interpretation is predictably often impossible, this evidence in many cases gives us valuable clues to phonological developments and thus provides helpful controls when we seek to make etymological connections for Lycian appellatives.

N. also makes a number of corrections to the readings of Kalinka and Friedrich that have become entrenched in the secondary literature. This effort to establish what actually stands in the texts is, however, far from systematic. I make this comment not as a criticism of N. but as a sobering reminder of just how far we are from having a reliable critical edition of the Lycian corpus. Achievement of that desideratum will surely show that some of the things that now puzzle us are pseudo-problems, while revealing true difficulties of which we are now ignorant.

I may pass over the many places where N.'s views on current problems differ from my own. Only one pervasive issue requires mention, in order to forestall erroneous derivations based on a false premise. It is well established that in first-millennium Lycian (as in Lydian and probably also Carian) voiceless stops have become voiced after nasal consonants, followed by reduction of the sequence vowel + nasal consonant + voiced stop to nasalized vowel + voiced stop. There was also a tendency for the nasalization of the vowel to be lost. N. is thus fully correct in claiming (70) that in the Greek transmission of Lycian names original *\*-Vnt-* may be represented by *-α/εῦδ-* or simply *-α/εδ-*. However, it is clear that in Lycian itself the spelling for such a sequence is *-ã/êt-* with *-t-*, as acknowledged by N. himself (p. 25 s. v. *aruwāti* and most explicitly p. 151 s. v. *ikkuwemi*). Furthermore, when the nasality of the vowel is lost, in Lycian itself the stop reverts to the voiceless variant, at least orthographically (*tatu* beside *tātu* 'let them put'). It is thus quite impossible to derive with N. words spelled with *-d-* in Lycian likewise from a prehistoric sequence *\*-Vnt-* (p. 10 *alade* < *\*alanti-*, p. 76 *esede* <

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

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

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

H. Craig Melchert

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

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

The bibliography is thorough and very up-to-date. The argumentation is clear and linear. P's glosses and translations of cited passages are for the most part accurate, and with rare exceptions the few errors do not affect his major claims. It is when he makes sweeping generalizations about features of Hittite as a whole that P. commits grievous factual errors which vitiate most of his analyses.<sup>1</sup> I cite here only those bearing on two of the issues treated.

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

---

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