

einer Person usw. immer wieder nachzuweisen ist. Schließlich berücksichtigt E. stets auch die Realitäten, indem er festzustellen versucht, ob der (angenommene) Inhalt eines Namens auch mit den realen landschaftlichen Gegebenheiten übereinstimmt, wobei ihm, jedenfalls für Iran, seine exzellente Kenntnis von Land und Leuten zugute kommt. Und was seine Untersuchungen darüber hinaus dann noch auszeichnet, sind die Hinweise auf semasiologische Namenparallelen in anderen Kulturkreisen, etwa auch in unserem eigenen, durch die er sich zu einer ‚vergleichenden Ortsnamenforschung‘ animiert fühlt¹, wie sie sonst kaum betrieben wird.

Die früheste und umfangreichste dieser namenkundlichen Arbeiten E.s ist jene Studie über den Namen des Berges Demawend gewesen (den er als den „hängereichen“ deutet), die seinerzeit der Zeitumstände halber nur in Aufsatzform hatte erscheinen können, so daß sie alles in allem nicht die Resonanz und Verbreitung gefunden haben dürfte, die sie angesichts ihres unvorstellbaren Materialreichtums verdient gehabt hätte, der thematisch weit wegführt von der Besprechung nur von Bergnamen oder von Namen auf *-vand* und der mustergültig aufgeschlüsselt wird in dem nachträglich erschienenen Index. Es ist deshalb eine lobenswerte Tat des um die Orientalistik hochverdienten Verlages, das ganze Ensemble dieser Abhandlung, die, auf drei Bände verteilt, in ArOr 22, 1954, 267–374 (42 Seiten Text mit 246 Anmerkungen); 24, 1956, 183–224 („Zusatznoten“ A–M sowie Abkürzungsverzeichnis) und 37, 1969, 416–448 (Wort- und Sachindex sowie 60 weitere Anmerkungen) erschienen war, en bloc in einem Nachdruck vorzulegen. E. selbst hat noch „einige Nachträge“ (1–5), meist Hinweise auf Parallelen oder auf eigene spätere Ausführungen, und eine Liste seiner übrigen toponomastischen Arbeiten (7–8) hinzugefügt. So wie der Gipfel des Demawend weit über den Elburs hinaus sichtbar ist, möge denn künftig auch „Der Name Demawend“ in seiner neugewonnenen Verselbständigung weithin strahlen!

Benzstraße 18
D-6600 Saarbrücken 3

Rüdiger Schmitt

Yoshida, Daisuke: Die Syntax des althethitischen substantivischen Genitivs. Heidelberg, Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1987, 8°, IX, 123 S. (Texte der Hethiter, 13.) Brosch. 60 DM, geb. 86 DM.

The aim of the present study is to account systematically for the use of the genitive case of substantives in Old Hittite (OH). In order to elucidate certain poorly attested constructions, the author also touches upon the genitive in adjectives, indefinite pronouns, and verbal nouns, but makes no claim to exhaustiveness in this regard. He also explicitly excludes any discussion of the ‚subjective‘ and ‚objective‘ genitive on the grounds that the relationship of the modifier to modified in this type is not „purely substantival“ (VIII). This last exclusion seems unnecessarily arbitrary, especially given the already highly circumscribed data base.

Y. does wisely base his study on both OH manuscripts and Neo-Hittite (NH) copies of OH texts. He thus avoids the problems of other studies of OH syntax, such as Starke, StBoT 23, who in some cases drew overly hasty conclusions from the fragmentary testimony of OH manuscripts alone. In order to

¹ Dieser Methode bedient sich E. auch, wo es nicht um Namen geht; vgl. W.E., Die vergleichend-semasiologische Methode in der Orientalistik, Mainz/Wiesbaden 1974.

evaluate the evidence from NH copies of OH texts, Y. compares the usage of NH compositions, although it is not entirely clear whether his investigation into the latter is systematic or eclectic.

The focus here is descriptive, not explanatory, and the author's subdivision of the material runs along basically traditional lines. This procedure is highly appropriate for a fundamental philological work of this sort.

The results are for the most part unsurprising, but it is good to have systematic rather than merely anecdotal evidence for the existence of well-known Indo-European syntagms in Old Hittite. Also welcome is the confirmation that the regular OH word order for most types of genitive is modifier + modified. Genuine exceptions to this are rare and specially conditioned. By contrast, Y. also corroborates the previous impressionistic conclusion that the 'genitive of material' and related uses show the modifier both before and after the modified. His demonstration that the 'partitive genitive' is very rare in Old Hittite is probably significant. However, since 'partitive' is a quantitative concept, a thorough study of quantification in Hittite (including indefinite pronouns and numerals) is needed to place the partitive genitive in proper perspective.

A very useful feature of the treatment here is the explicit and systematic comparison of various uses of the genitive with other constructions which appear to compete or overlap with them: e.g., the possessive genitive and the 'partitive apposition' (σχήμα καθ' ὅλον καὶ μέρος).

The philological foundation is solid. A handful of text interpretations are false or debatable, but these do not materially affect the major claims made. I do wish to offer three corrective notes, particularly for non-specialists. First, Y. translates OH genitives in *-an* apparently at random as singular or plural. Some examples of this ending must be taken as plural; I know of none which cannot be plural. This distribution demands that OH *-an* be taken consistently as genitive plural. Second, Y.'s claim (VII) that the genitive never appears as a verbal complement in Hittite is false. There is at least one sure example, notably of a partitive genitive with the verb "drink" (KUB XVII 5 I 11; MH manuscript of OH text): *n = ašta^{DUG} palhan hūmandan ek[uer]* "They (Illuyanka and sons) drank (some) of all the basins". Finally, Y. includes the 'genitive of purpose' as a subvariety of the 'genitive of appurtenance' (where the modifying genitive refers to an inanimate object); see p. 64 ff. However, he fails to recognize that there is a parallel type with animate referents, where the genitive marks the intended recipient of the head noun: his example X. 6 (95) means "bread for the troops". Compare also the superior translation by Neu of example II. 1. a. 57 (19–20). It is true, of course, that a recipient can be viewed as a future possessor, but the distinction between possessor and recipient is worth retaining, especially in view of examples elsewhere in old Indo-European languages for the use of the genitive to mark the recipient, not only with nouns (Ved. *aśvīnoḥ stómāsaḥ* "praise for/to the Aśvins"), but occasionally even with verbs (see Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, 162).

In sum, Yoshida's book makes a very valuable contribution to the study of Hittite case syntax. It is not, nor does it claim to be, the last word on the genitive in Old Hittite.

Curriculum in Linguistics
CB #3155, Dey Hall
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27599
U.S.A.

H. Craig Melchert