

one wonders how likely it was to have **-h₂* — but should we not at least discuss the apparently unpalatable possibility that e.g. Luwian *issara* or *pata* contains a vocalized **-h₁*?

K. gives all the relevant material here — one suspects she didn't want to get involved in too much analysis — but one would have been happier if she hadn't made it sound pretty certain. Doubts may be particularly pressing in volatile sectors such as the above, but it is as well to keep a certain scepticism in mind when reading on any aspect of Hittite phonology, at least at the moment.

Let all this serve as a word to the wise. To sum up, *HHP* is a well-thought-out, painstaking and thorough handbook, though it is not as user-friendly as one would wish. It will no doubt become a standard reference for the latest discoveries, disputes and difficulties in Hittite phonology. If K. could be persuaded to compile, and IBS to print, an index of the Hittite forms treated, researchers would definitely derive more benefit from the book.

Old Saybrook, November 2000

Jacqueline BOLEY

* *
*

TJERKSTRA, F. A. — Principles of the Relation between Local Adverb, Verb and Sentence Particle in Hittite. (Cuneiform Monographs 15). Styx Publications, Groningen, 1999. (24 cm, XII, 204). ISBN 90 5693 028 1. Nlg. 150,-.

This work represents the published form of the author's Amsterdam dissertation. It treats one of the most famous and difficult problem complexes of Hittite morphosyntax. An introduction presents the state of question and the methodology employed. Crucial to the analysis is the notion of "basic" and "derived predicates" based on valency or functional grammar, and hence the status of local adverbs as dependent or independent of the verb. The author also distinguishes carefully the relative chronology of Hittite texts and manuscripts. Finally, she chooses to focus her study on the usage of local adverbs and particles with a highly restricted but particularly diagnostic set of core verbs. Chapters on *iya-* 'be on one's way', *pai-* 'go' and *uwa-* 'come', and *dā-* 'take' are followed by a conclusion that tries to summarize the results and point the way to further research, including a brief but useful comparison with the situation in Ancient Greek. An index of passages cited completes the book.

Chief among the strengths of Tjerkstra's work is the lucidity of the presentation. The theoretical apparatus is set forth succinctly and clearly and applied relevantly and effectively—it is not mere "window-dressing". The argumentation is linear and progresses in a logical and consistent manner. The English prose flows well and is with very rare exceptions idiomatic (in note 65, p. 22, read 'occasionally' for 'incidentally'). There are some typographical errors, all self-correcting. The philological basis is sound, and the translations generally reliable, though inevitably one will not agree with every rendering in more than three hundred textual citations.

There are also some weaknesses. Tjerkstra unfortunately accepts uncritically Starke's claim of an alleged grammat-

ical distinction between "Personenklasse" and "Sachklasse" for Old Hittite and even claims (p. 102) that its application to the dative extends to all periods of the language. She honestly concedes numerous counterexamples (citations 73, 88-90, 102, 257-259, etc.), but tries vainly to explain these away. Her claim on p. 101 that there are no other counterexamples with *dā-* 'take' is already contradicted by her own example 308 (p. 118). The use of the dative-locative (sic!) to express place from which with inanimate objects is already attested in Old Hittite and is commonplace thereafter.¹⁾ Tjerkstra also seriously misuses the concept of "partitive apposition". Hittite has genuine examples of this construction, although present evidence suggests that it is a post-OH innovation. True partitive apposition shows replacement of a dependent genitive expressing whole/possessor by a case form *agreeing with* that of the part/thing possessed (e.g. *annaz kartaz* 'from the heart of (my) mother'). It is first of all false to follow Starke in calling OH combinations such as *É-ri andan* 'inside the house' partitive apposition (in addition to the serious semantic and morphological problems, the reverse order *andan É-ri* falsifies this claim). It is even worse to deform the notion further with Tjerkstra by subsuming examples such as her 72: *taknaš=ma* ^dUTU-*i*...KAxU-*az* 'from the mouth of the Sun-goddess of earth'. This is *not* partitive apposition at all, but simply the well-established use of the dative-locative to express the person/thing affected by the action of the predicate (likewise examples 261, 302, and 312). Fortunately, neither of these errors seriously affects the author's basic thesis about local adverbs and particles.

The same is not true for the most serious failing in her analysis, her failure to distinguish an adverb *katta(n)/katti-* 'beside, next to, in(to) the presence of', distinct from *katta* 'down' and *kattan* 'below'.²⁾ In the first place, while she translates most passages with the former adverb correctly (25, 44-46, 124-125, 197-198, etc.), non-specialists will be quite perplexed by these translations, since they have been told only about *kattan* 'below'. In some cases, moreover, the failure to recognize *kattan* 'beside' leads to genuine confusion and mistranslations. The MH example 126 with *kattan pai-* as 'go down to' is an important innovation for OH *katta pai-*, while the preceding 124-125 are merely standard examples of *kattan* 'in(to) the presence of'. Example 182 with *katti=ti arḫa* can only be '(walk) past you' not 'beneath you', and in 323 Kumarbi takes wisdom *ištanžani kattan* 'into his mind', not 'down in'. Most seriously, the confusion of the two different *kattan*'s affects the overall

¹⁾ For this usage see my dissertation, *Ablative and Instrumental in Hittite* (Harvard University, 1977) p. 188ff., p. 289, p. 309f. and p. 352. For Old Hittite see *KBo* 17.1 i 12-13: *kardi=šmi(y)at=kan dāḫḫu[n]* [(ḫarš)]ani=šmi(y)at=kan dāḫḫun 'I have taken it from their heart(s). I have taken it from their head(s).' This construction with inanimate referents is a trivial analogy to the "dative of disadvantage" with animate referents and confirms that the dative and locative have merged functionally as well as formally, contra Starke and Tjerkstra. For obvious *pragmatic* reasons, nouns with semantically animate referents are not often construed as locations, but there is absolutely no *grammatical* prohibition on such usage when the context calls for it.

²⁾ See Frank Starke, *Die Funktionen der dimensionalen Kasus und Adverbien im Althethitischen* (Wiesbaden: 1977), p. 181ff., especially p. 185f. Whether the two synchronically distinct adverbs *katta(n)* are related prehistorically is a completely separate issue irrelevant to their proper analysis in Hittite texts.

analysis. On p. 137 Tjerkstra claims that the distinction between *katta pai-* and *kattan pai-* reflects the difference between an animate and inanimate referent, but we are rather dealing with two quite separate adverbs 'down' versus 'beside'. She also wrongly denies (p. 142) Starke's correct distinction of an OH *katta* that functions like *kattan* 'beside' from the more common *katta* 'down'.

The self-imposed restrictions of the analysis are also double-edged in their effects. While they allow the author to clarify a number of important points (see below), they also at times afford a too narrow perspective that leads to distortions. For example, Neo-Hittite *andan* (in examples like 42 and 94-97) is a postposition with an expressed locative indicating place to which with a motion verb. Its usage here is an innovation that has nothing to do with the function of *andan* in Old Hittite, but represents rather a renewal of OH *anda* in similar contexts.³⁾ Such changes in the usage of the local adverbs from Old to Neo-Hittite independent of combinations with particular verbs must be taken into account in any overall analysis.

Despite the problems just cited, Tjerkstra clearly demonstrates her basic thesis. She has shown beyond all doubt that the function of the local adverbs cannot be determined by facts of word order. Nor can one simply operate in terms of their mere cooccurrence (or not) with particular verbs. As she contends, one must take into account whether the adverbs are dependent or independent; i.e., do they or do they not form a unit with the verb (what she terms a derived predicate). For example, she is able to account neatly for the contrast of example 35, where *appan iya-* is a unit 'go after, pursue', versus those of 51&52, where the combination means simply 'walk [behind]' (here the adverb is independent). Likewise *ištarna pai-* 'pass' (of time) in examples 165-167 versus 'go [among X]' in example 200. See also her excellent summary of the differing usage with *dā-* 'take' on p. 128. In addition to validating her principle claim, Tjerkstra also offers (p. 141) a very important corrective to Starke's analysis of the function of the "locative" adverbs in Old Hittite. As she makes clear, these *can* be dependent on the verb and indicate place to which (one can add to her list the verb *iyā-* 'step, station oneself').

As Tjerkstra herself acknowledges, the recognition of dependent versus independent adverbs (or if one prefers, of derived predicates) is a necessary, but not sufficient criterion for determining the usage of the sentential particles. She cites the two different senses of the unit *parā iya-* 'go on' and 'go/come out' (p. 32f. on examples 31-33). Contrary to her claim, in example 196 *anda pai-* also clearly is a unitary 'go in'. Its differing syntax versus that of examples such as 89-91 is based on the fact that it means merely 'reduce the interval', with no stated or implied goal, whereas the others mean 'go into (some place)'. Such examples could be multiplied. However, we cannot hope to make progress in sorting out such fine distinctions unless we first establish the more fundamental contrast of dependent and independent adverbs as advocated by Tjerkstra. In showing both the importance and feasibility of making this basic demarcation she has significantly advanced our under-

standing of the complex interplay of adverb, verb, and particle in Hittite.

Chapel Hill, May, 2000

H. CRAIG MELCHERT

KORTE AANKONDIGINGEN

GINDIN, Leonid A. — Troja, Thrakien und die Völker Kleinasien. Versuch einer historisch-philologischen Untersuchung (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft, Sonderheft 104). Innsbruck, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, 1999. (24 cm, 324). ISBN 3-85124-189-4. ATS 760.

The author of this book died in 1994, when the German translation of his Russian book was in progress (W. Meid in his "Nachwort", p. 322). This is the "philological" continuation of his "linguistic" approach in an earlier book (Sofia 1981). The Homeric poems are the main source. "Nach meinen letzten Resultaten kämpften die Griechen der Antike (hethitisch *Ahhijawa*) gegen ein Troja, das vorwiegend von Thrakern (genau genommen Troern und Dardanern) sowie von Luwiern (den Lykiern aus Zeleia) bewohnt war" (p. 10). The chapters are: I. "Die Bedeutung der thrakologischen Studien für die Probleme der Indogermanistik", II. "Die Besonderheit der homerischen Epen als historische Quelle", III. "Die Rekonstruktion der thrakischen Sprache aus arealer Sicht", IV. "Die Thraker in Troja im Lichte der linguistischen Analyse: Thrakisch-anatolische lexikalisch-onomastische isoglossen" (p. 54-195), V. "Die Luwier in Troja im Lichte der linguistisch-philologischen Analyse" (p. 196-223), VI. "Kèteioi (= Hethiter), Paiones (Protoarmenier) — Verbündete der Troer", VII. "Die thrakisch-luwische Areale und ethnolinguistische Symbiose", VIII. "Der trojanische Krieg und das *Ahhijawa* der hethitischen Keilschrifttexte" (p. 241-275), IX. "Vergleich der Resultate der linguistisch-philologischen Analyse mit den Daten der Archäologie. Einige Erwägungen hinsichtlich des protoethnischen Areals der Indogermanen in der Epoche vor dem Sprachzerfall".

* *
*

MARKOE, G.E. — Phoenicians. (Peoples of the Past). British Museum Press, London, 2000. (25 cm, 224). ISBN 0-7141-2095-2. £ 24.99.

This is a book for the general public, richly illustrated. The expert will appreciate this updated survey of Phoenician studies and the Notes appended to it (p. 211-218). The book does not begin in 1000 but in 1550 B.C. which is "a departure from earlier studies" (p. 11). The first chapter, "History", shows that wood was exported from the earliest time on (to Egypt), it discusses urban expansion in Galilee (p. 30) and the role of Sidon (31, 62). Tyre became important (33), Kition on Cyprus is discussed (53, 170). The chapter "The city" describes the archaeological discoveries, like the Punic harbour (cothon, 70) and excavations in Carthage or Motya. In the chapter "Economy" much attention is paid to coinage (p. 98-101, 105-107). "Language and literature"; the spread of the alphabet. Among the topics in "religion" are gods like

³⁾ See Donna Salisbury, 'anda and andan in Neo-Hittite', to appear in *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 51 (1999).