
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 Luviu 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 Luviu, Lycian and Lydian (59ff.). 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 Luviu several important classes of nouns whose existence was previously unknown or underappreciated: stems in -it-(176ff.), abstracts in -ntar- (370ff.), instrumental nouns in -ttar (399ff.), and r/n-stems (433ff.). 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 Luviu 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 *-tar, with geminate *-t- for the voiceless *-t-. Thus *šēwatar 'horn' is given as šēwatar (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 *-tar (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 *-t(1)rət- (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. šadvwadlin hatat(ar)rin 'evil violence' consists of adjective plus animate noun in -iti-. The Hittite equivalent idalu šatupatar removes all doubt. Solely on the authority of his own invented *hatatatar, Starke takes the attested phrase as a scribal error and proposes two ad hoc emendations (391 ff.).

(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 šēwatar 'horn' as attested (≠ *šēwetra-); confirmed Starke's own attractive connection of Lyc. hwwadri- 'all' with CLuv. šēwatar (sic!) 'fullness' (≠ pre-Luvian *šēwetra-), and spared him the false analysis (150 ff.) of CLuv. šistros- 'sun-god', the quite regular reflex of *šiwsot- (= Hitt. šīwats- '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 < *g but on p.462 and p.631 we find an alleged rule ga > za. Both of these self-contradictory rules are falsified by CLuv. hatmariš- 'defecate' ≠ *ghdom(V)r- and kutausariš- 'orthostat', whose relationship to Hitt. kutt- 'wall' ≠ *gḫt(ō)a-t- is beyond doubt, pace Starke (425 ff.). As for my rule of palatal *g > Luv. z and Lyc. s, it remains valid until refuted by counter-evidence, not mere assertions.

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

(a) Neumann's establishing of animate abstract nouns in -s(t)rəl-/ is entirely independent of whether his explanation for their origin is correct (see p.384 and cf. [1b] above). (b) as overwhelming evidence now shows, the "particle" -sal/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 argana(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 arhamman-, with geminates -mm- and neuter gender. The existence of a Luvian n-stem is assured by the verb arhammanalawu '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 -l/ja 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 navā šâ-ta ID-i [nan]amman in KUB XXXV 54 iii 17 means 'Water is fed from the river' (for nait- urta in Hittite see CHD 3.351 f.). We find the expected plural urta in XXXV 88 iii 8 in the context of URUDUAHTAN (a vessel). The absence of the neuter r-stem urta- 'water' in StBoT 31 is understandable. The ending of [nan]amman shows incontrovertibly that šâ with particle -ša is neuter singular. Having suppressed the real Luvian word for 'water' in XXXV 54 iii 17 (matching Hitt. urta in the ritual action, ibid. iii 12), Starke compounds the error by discovering Luvian 'water' in urtaša in iii 38, although this requires connecting it with urta 26 lines earlier (!) and denying the evident equation of CLuv. addulwašša urtaša with Hitt. üdâlu uttar 'evil word' (565 ff.). His just reward for this chicanery is that he cannot account for the attested shape of alleged urta '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.


