

Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen. By ELISABETH RIEKEN. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten, vol. 44. Wiesbaden: HARRASSOWITZ VERLAG, 1999. Pp. xxix + 608. DM 198 (paper).

The present work, a revised version of the author's 1996 Bochum dissertation, offers a systematic diachronic analysis of the derivation and inflection of all Hittite nominal consonant stems except those with suffixes in *-n-* and *-nt-*. The latter had to be omitted due to limitations of time and space. The text itself is followed by an extensive bibliography and very helpful indices.

Rieken's book is a great advance in the study of the history of the Hittite (and Anatolian) nominal system, and it will form the foundation of all future investigations of the topics covered. Her study is the first to combine a full mastery of Hittite philology with an adequately sophisticated control of the latest developments in the analysis of the PIE noun. She also pays full attention to the relative chronology of Hittite texts and manuscripts.

The book is well organized, and the argumentation is clear and uncluttered.¹ One may disagree with a given analysis, but one is in no doubt about the basis for Rieken's judgment, and one will need to respond with counterarguments. Her own treatment of other viewpoints is thorough and generally quite fair. Only rarely do assertions stand in for genuine arguments. I can cite no major weaknesses. Rieken does on rare occasions ignore her own evidence regarding text chronology, and in a few cases fails to motivate her particular view of the PIE starting point as fully as one would wish, but these are mere cavils. Given the scope and nature of the material, I inevitably cannot agree with every one of her analyses. A review is not the place to debate each individual case. The following summary tries to capture what I consider the most significant strengths and weaknesses of Rieken's approach to each of the major stem classes treated.

In her treatment of Hittite root nouns, Rieken ably defends the status of several standard examples and offers minor but important improvements in their historical analysis (e.g. *hānt-* "front," *hāšš-* "ash; soap," *šiu(n)-* "god"). She also makes a good case for the existence of several new examples, especially neuters (^{GIS}*elz(i)-* "scales," *māl-* "mental strength," *men-* "cheek," *yuk-* "yoke"). She goes too far, however, in trying to use the evidence of the poorly understood collective plural marker *-i* alone to infer still more examples (**hašt-* "bone," **šāku-* "eye," **wašš-* "medicinal herb"). We are given a full and balanced summary of the current evidence for the problematic Hittite words for "heart" and "woman," but a full solution for their attested inflection is still lacking.

¹ I found very few misprints, all involving cross-references: on p. 16, note 53 read "S. 15f.," p. 148, note 696 read "S. 149f.," p. 446, note 2198 read "S. 293ff."

The chapter on *t*-stems is, in my view, the most problematic in the book. It contains much that is correct, and Rieken's solution to the difficult *karāt-* "outer appearance; viscera" (N.B. both meanings!) is brilliant in all respects. However, her account of the productive class of animate stems in *-att-* is decidedly unconvincing. First of all, the assumption of an altered "proterodynamic" type for PIE with a strong stem with *e*-grade of the root and *o*-grade of the suffix requires further justification beyond that offered for *t*-stems alone (pp. 91f.). Second, if such an altered proterodynamic type is needed at all, then it certainly is not restricted to animate stems (as implied on p. 6), since it is precisely in neuter *s*-stems (type of **mén-os*, **mén-es-e/os*) that such an altered shape must be assumed (cf. p. 182). More seriously, Rieken presents no compelling arguments against the alternative that Hittite stems in *-att-* reflect the standard PIE "holodynamic" type. She herself considers both possibilities for the PIE word for "grandson." I fail to see why her own derivation of *karāt-* from a holodynamic type cannot apply equally well to the productive class in *-att-*, with the sole difference that the latter generalized the "unlenited" variant of the dental stop.²

While not every individual analysis is persuasive (e.g., *aiš*, *išš-* "mouth" remains a crux), the chapter on *s*-stems is, as a whole, excellent and may be the chapter of most use to Hittitologists. Rieken presents for the first time anywhere the full evidence for the many synchronic and diachronic types represented in Hittite: acrodynamic (*nēpiš-* "heaven"); hysterodynamic (*ateš-* "axe," thus correctly against me); amphiholodynamic (*antuwaḥḥa-/antuḥš(a)-* "person"); the secondary types in *-uš-* and *-iš-*; and *s*-stems of various types indirectly reflected in further secondary derivatives. See also below on nouns in *-Vš/-Všš-n-*.

In her brief chapter on stems in **h₂*, Rieken is properly skeptical of parts of my own published claims regarding the suffixes **-eh₂* and **-ih₂* in Anatolian, but her own discussion is also inadequate. This lies partly in the nature of the problem, which involves the grammatical categories of number and gender as much as it does stem derivation.

The predictably very long chapter on *r-* and *r/n-*stems reviews much that is well known, since the famous heteroclitc stems in particular have received much prior attention. Hittitologists will nevertheless want to read closely the careful philological review of problematic and complex cases and judge for themselves the validity of Rieken's many new suggestions. Here I call attention only to several major points. First, Rieken correctly recognizes the secondary nature of most synchronic *r*-stems in Hittite (pp. 273ff.). Second, she gives a most welcome full recognition and summary of the Hittite type of neuter *s*-stem with a *zero* suffix in the nominative-accusative and *-n-*

² For an account of Hittite *šiwatt-* "day" in terms of a holodynamic type, see the article by Kazuhiko Yoshida to appear in *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*.

elsewhere. In line with what I have been pleading for fifteen years, she correctly distinguishes this type from the productive class in *-eššar/-eššn-*. I fear she has erred, however, in following me in seeing the latter type as an outgrowth of the former. For reasons I cannot set forth here, one should rather return to the idea of Oettinger that connects *-eššar/-eššn-* with "fientive" verbs in *-ešš-*.³

The chapter on *l*-stems correctly upholds the derivation of a core of primary neuter nouns in *-ul < *-w]*. Rieken also acknowledges that some neuter *l*-stems are non-original (pp. 431f.). The treatment of primary nouns in *-al* is not satisfactory, depending too much on false analyses of Luvian by Starke. On the contrary, Rieken is too quick to dismiss Luvian influence in accounting for Hittite stems in *-alla/i-* and *-il(i)-*. This complex problem requires further study, as does the very difficult class of stems in *-il* and *-əl* (which must be kept distinct). Neither my own efforts nor those of Rieken or anyone else have thus far produced a truly satisfying solution.

In sum, this work contains a wealth of positive new ideas regarding individual text interpretations, lexical meanings, and details of historical formal developments. I stress this point because I have scarcely been able to cite any of these above. With respect to the broader issue of the prehistory of nominal derivation and inflection, the strength of Rieken's contribution lies not in its originality (one will find nothing revolutionary here). Its great merit is rather that it affords Indo-Europeanists who are not Anatolian specialists a highly reliable, state-of-the-art overview of what Hittite can and cannot contribute to our current understanding of a significant portion of PIE nominal morphology. In complementary fashion, it also gives Hittitologists for the first time a coherent introduction to the "new look" in the analysis of PIE primary nominal inflection, a framework that has been applied increasingly to Hittite over the past twenty-five years, but for which a systematic exposé has been lacking.⁴ This book represents a major achievement whose influence will be felt for years to come.

H. CRAIG MELCHERT

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

³ See Norbert Oettinger, "*Indo-Hittite*" *Hypothese und Wortbildung* (Innsbruck: IBS, 1986), 12.

⁴ Rieken cannot be held responsible for the bewildering variety of terminology currently in use, but her presentation would have been more helpful had she spent a few lines explicitly contrasting her usage with that of others—particularly distinguishing substantive differences from those that are merely terminological.

Domination and Resistance; Egyptian Military Activity in the Southern Levant ca. 1300–1185 B.C. By MICHAEL G. HASEL. *Probleme der Ägyptologie*, vol. 11. Leiden: BRILL, 1998.

This monograph is the result of a dissertation designed to examine the evidence from epigraphic sources and from archaeological research. It intends to probe the question of destructions at archaeological sites and references to the conquest of cities in Egyptian records. Part I is devoted to the epigraphic and iconographic sources. After an introduction covering the nature of these sources, the so-called Egyptian historiography, the bulk of part I is taken up with a review of lexical terms used when the Egyptians wrote about the destruction of cities, the annihilation of enemies, etc. This particular section does not inspire confidence. It demonstrates an ability to use a lexicon and to look up some references from it, but it does not seem to reflect a serious knowledge of the Egyptian language or how to read a text. The list of terms may prove useful and the extensive bibliographical references to various scholarly views is useful. But after going through part I, the reader is left with a feeling that nothing new has been achieved. The Egyptians wreaked havoc with their enemies, or at least they claim to have done so. But we knew this already. The semantic range of the various terms does not provide specific evidence about how the Egyptians really did it. We lack the detailed descriptions so common in Assyrian texts: "I destroyed . . . I burned the fire . . . , etc." So part I, while full of lexical discussion, is something of a non-starter.

Part II reviews the archaeological evidence for many sites mentioned in the Egyptian texts, viz., those that have been excavated or surveyed. Again, this part is useful for its biographical references, but one fails to find anything new. A major problem in part II is the fact that identification of some of the sites mentioned in the Egyptian texts is still controversial. Hasel dutifully records the various opinions with references to their proponents. He often expresses an opinion of his own. But one gets the impression that historical geography is not a discipline with which he is very familiar. The main case in point is Yeno^cam, which is depicted on the reliefs of Sety I, and mentioned in his topographical lists and especially on the larger Beth-shean stele. It is also listed in the victory poem of Merenptah. What Hasel seems not to understand is that Yeno^cam is also mentioned in the Amarna tablets in a context that assures its location somewhere in Transjordan (cf. N. Na'aman, "Yeno^cam," *Tel Aviv* 4 (1900): 166–77), possibly at Tell esh-Shihâb. That information is vital for the understanding of the text on the Beth-shean stele as well as the Merenptah poem of victory.

The most serious flaw in the whole book is Hasel's treatment of the Merenptah stele and the reference to Israel (pp. 257–71). The whole interpretation depends on Hasel's conclusions regarding the Egyptian word *pṛt* in the victory poem and the