

REVIEW — COMPTE-RENDU

H. KRONASSER, *Vergleichende Laut- und Formenlehre des Hethitischen*, Winter, Heidelberg 1956.

The author of this book has set himself the task of writing an up-to-date grammar of the Hittite language from the point of view of Indo-European linguistics. His work comprises a 'general introduction' dealing with the cultural and linguistic relations of the Hittites with other peoples, the sources of our knowledge of their languages and the scripts in which the texts are written. A word of praise is due to the author for his initiative in drawing the other languages of the Boghazköy archive, Luwian etc. into the discussion. The relevant facts are carefully marshalled and his expositions give us abundant food for thought, establishing the belief that many other authors in this field, especially in the laryngealist camp, run the risk of making many mistakes by neglecting these Anatolian relations of Hittite. Too often explications have been looked for in original Indo-European without taking into account the nearest relatives. The author is no doubt right in suggesting the possibility of a more considerable degree of non-Indo-European influence on the formation of Hittite as it is known to us than has been admitted by many other scholars (see e.g. § 72). He sometimes — and rightly — even feels compelled to attach more importance to common Anatolian phenomena than to 'Indo-European' explications (cf. e.g. p. 86). This standpoint leads him to a cautious and reserved judgement of all facts connected with Hittite *h* (§ 108 f.), without however inducing him to a perfect appreciation of the drawbacks of 'substratum theories'. With regard to other moot points also Dr. Kronasser gives evidence of a sound criticism of current or traditional views. He rightly reminds us that Hittite is not alone in being a 'mixed language' (§ 10), a point which has perhaps been too much emphasized by some of his predecessors. With regard to the Hittite *h* Dr. Kronasser is decidedly inclined to consider it a result of secondary developments (p. 76 ff.). It must be admitted that his scepticism is on the whole reasonable, because aspirates are often liable to turn up or disappear in various positions. The force of arguments based on phonetic parallels is however generally speaking illustrative, rather than conclusive.

One of the characteristics of this book is its severe — and not rarely sound — criticism of the laryngeal theory. It is indeed unwarranted to select only those elements which seem to admit of an etymologic interpretation and to construct too rigid systems of sound correspondences on the basis of very limited material, to overlook in vindicating 'laryngealist explications' many difficulties which remain unsolved, to prefer proto-Indo-European sound-laws to later developments of the individual languages if the latter may be made plausible, to forget that a satisfactory interpretation of facts is often attained at by the *shva* theory in its traditional form. It must moreover be admitted that many laryngealist interpretations, however ingenious, are not free from hasty generalization. These few remarks are however not to deny that they contain, generally speaking, an element of truth and probability.

The author proposes in the course of his work many new solutions of morphological difficulties (e.g. with regard to case and personal endings); although his arguments are usually ingenious and not rarely plausible, in part of his attempts I fear he fails to carry conviction. Dr. Kronasser has in preparing this volume utilized all recent publications on Hittite and its position in Indo-European. It cannot however be said that he has always been very successful in incorporating the newest information; the most recent opinion is not always the soundest, nor criticism always refutation. However, his work constitutes a welcome complement to Sturtevant's one-sided Comparative Grammar. Adding a few criticisms of detail we may observe that in § 174 no satisfactory distinction is made between aspect (complete or incomplete instantaneous action etc.) and 'Aktionsart' (ingressive, iterative etc.). On p. 164, n. 23 the thematic vowel ("i.e. Stammvokal") is not convincingly explained as originally belonging to disyllabic roots and becoming a formative element when it was analogically extended to monosyllabic roots; p. 172 Gr. ἐνεργεῖν is said to contain an infix *-n-* (cf. however ὄγκος etc.); p. 173: for the 'causative' character of the **-neu-/-nu-* verbs see e.g. L. Renou, Grammaire de la langue védique, § 319, p. 125 for the type Gr. Ἑλλάδ- see Schwyzer-Debrunner, Griechische Grammatik I, p. 507 f.; p. 126, for Gr. γυναι̃-κ-ες the same handbook I, p. 583; § 51: for the 'ancient variation' *m* : *w* compare in Dutch dialects (e.g. Flemish) *me* instead of *we* "we"; Lesb. δόμεναι and Cypr. δόφεναι must not be quoted as an instance: see Schwyzer-

Debrunner, o.c., p. 808; p. 36, l. 2 f. b. read 'Diphthonge' instead of 'Vokale'; p. 48, l. 4 f. b. read **nestas*; § 82 for the supposedly 'generalizing' indefinite function of *-que* in Latin *quisque* etc. and I.E. *h^{ue}* the reader may be referred to *Lingua*, vol. 4, p. 241, and esp. p. 256 f.; p. 71 ff. forms such as Lat. *thensaurus*, quoted as examples of 'inverse orthography' may have actually existed in spoken language, the 'furtive' *n* being of frequent occurrence in many languages. The 'Anhang' (p. 236—256) contains useful bibliographical references.

Utrecht

J. GONDA