As Oe. notes at the outset of this brief but pithy monograph, ever since Hrozný’s demonstration in 1921 of the Indo-European (= IE.) character of Hittite, there has been controversy over its exact relationship with the other IE. languages, due in large part to the considerable number of differences between Hittite (actually Anatolian in general) and other languages in the family. Depending on one’s interpretation of these differences, Hittite is either an equal ‘sibling’ with the other languages within IE., thereby forcing some revisions of the ‘classical’ (e.g., Brugmannian) view of the proto-language, or else – the Indo-Hittite hypothesis – it is a sibling to, and hence within the family Stammbaum on an equal footing with, the proto-language of the other IE. languages (what Oe. calls ‘late IE.’).

For the most part, attention in this controversy has been focussed on the inflexional differences between Anatolian and the rest of IE., e.g., the absence of feminine gender per se, of a dual number, and of moods other than indicative and imperative, the presence of two present tense inflectional types, syncretism of thematic nominative and genitive singular, etc. Oe. in this study seeks to remedy this situation by examining the evidence from nominal derivational morphology bearing on the Indo-Hittite hypothesis.

Oe. starts with four “Fragestellungen”: a) Are there productive Anatolian suffixes corresponding to relics elsewhere in IE.? – b) Are there Anatolian suffixes with a more concrete function than their late IE. counterparts? Do they occur as free morphemes as opposed to late IE. grammaticalised suffixes? – c) Are there productive late IE. suffixes that are rare in Anatolian? – d) Are there suffixes in Anatolian and in late IE. each which are without correspondents in the other domain? – He then proceeds to test these matters against the full range of nominal derivational processes – mainly suffixation but with ablaut patterns considered as well – evident in Anatolian.

It is possible to take issue with aspects of Oe.’s initial “Fragestellungen”. For example, while a) above could suggest an earlier productivity of Proto-Indo-Hittite age that continued in Anatolian but not late IE., thus providing a shared innovation for the rest of IE. as opposed to Anatolian, it is equally possible that Hittite could be the innovator and could have increased the productivity of a given process. Derivational patterns certainly can expand their domain of operation through time, as Oe. himself acknowledges (10) with regard to *-ti-formations in Luvian that refer to immediate kin (e.g. huba-“grandfather”, wana-
tti- “wife; woman”), and with regard to German suffixes such as -chen, -heit, and others (25); one could add as well mention of the developments with -ητι-abstract nouns within the history of Greek, among numerous other such cases.

Similarly, the situation foreshadowed in c) could result from an Anatolian innovative diminishing of the domain of a particular suffix, and need not reflect a late IE. innovation. Also, with regard to b), Oe. seems to be assuming (and he explicitly so states on p. 10) that a path between concrete and abstract functions is virtually unidirectional, moving from concrete to abstract especially with productive formations, even though there are documented cases of the concretization of fairly productive abstract formations, as with Middle Greek (tò) φαγεῖν καὶ πίεῖν “food and drink”, continued in part in Modern Greek φαγεί “food”, and formed via the articular infinitival nominalization, which was quite productive in Ancient Greek (cf. F. Dölger, Epeteris Hetaireias Byzantinōn Spoudōn 23, 1953, 57–64). Similarly, the relationship between free and bound forms likewise is not, as Oe. seems to imply, unidirectionally free → bound, for one can find examples of the ‘liberation’ of a bound suffix to word status, as with English -ism (cf. uses such as socialism and other -isms).

Oe. discusses some 40 suffixes in all, both athematic and thematic, covering a variety of suffixes ending in *-t- (e.g. *-t- as in Hitt. ek-t- “hunting net”, *-it- as in mil-it- “honey”, *-went- as in šamankur-want- “bearded”), in *-d- (e.g. *id- in CLuv. ir(b)u-it- “basket”, *-efH2-id- in CLuv. war-t-ab- “help”), in *-s- (e.g. *es- as in HLuv. tip-as- “heaven”), and in a resonant (i.e. *-i-, *-u-, *-m-, *-n-, *-r-, *-l-stems and complex formations such as the possessive suffix *-H2en- as in Pal. ḫaṣnaš “river” and the several *-r/-n-heteroclites), as well as simple (e.g. resultative neuters in *-o- as in Hitt. peda- “place”) and complex thematic formations (e.g. *-ero- as in Hitt. katera- “lower”). As a result, comments on all of Oe.’s discussions are not possible here.

However a few of his accounts are especially noteworthy, for they show how some of these aforementioned methodological problems vitiate several of Oe.’s interpretations. For example, he feels (9f.) that CLuv. ḡazašt- “food” (from *H2d-ti-) and ṭuti- “drink” offer examples relevant to his second Fragestellung, inasmuch as these deradical *-ti-stems are concrete nominals while the productive use of *-ti- elsewhere in Indo-European is overwhelmingly for abstract nominals. Yet, given forms such as φαγεῖν καὶ πίεῖν cited above, it is clear that there is really no argument here for or against the Indo-Hittite hypothesis. It is interesting and perhaps significant that the sememes involved in both the Luvian and the Greek examples are “food” and “drink”; undoubtedly, these are quite natural and common concretizations.

Similarly, Oe.’s discussion (16) of Anatolian representatives of a
feminine suffix *-(e)sor-, e.g. Hitt. baššu-šara- “queen” (from baššu- “king”), is not compelling, since it is based on the assumption that *-(e)sor- is related to and derived from a free lexeme *esor- “woman”. Given that suffixes can give rise to free words, as with ism above, Oe.’s interpretation, however attractive, is not the only reasonable account.

To be fair, though, not all of Oe.’s examples encounter such significant problems. In his treatment of Hitt. huwani- “wind” (15f.), for example, Oe. perceptively points out that since the rest of Indo-European (e.g. Ved. vītā-) seems to show a rddhi-derivative from the form – an original participle *H₂H₁,ent- “blowing” – which Hittite preserves directly with a nominal meaning, a plausible inference to draw is Hittite is archaic in this respect while the other languages show a common innovation.

From his survey, Oe. concludes (24) that the cumulative evidence speaks in favor of the special status for Anatolian accorded by the Indo-Hittite hypothesis. However, the Fragstellungen he is best able to substantiate are a) and b) above, precisely those which seem most open to reexamination on methodological grounds.

Thus the methodological objections noted above are significant and so should not be ignored, especially as far as their interaction with the interpretation of specific forms and with his ultimate conclusions is concerned. Still, it is clear that there is much in Oe.’s study to think about. Moreover, since Oe. goes through in a comprehensive – though perhaps overly concise – fashion, with extensive references to the literature, representatives of virtually all the suffixed formations to be found in the nominal systems of the Anatolian languages, the collection of forms that results in itself is an impressive and useful guide to Anatolian derivational patterns. Each form he cites, though, could certainly be the subject of lengthier consideration, so that Oe.’s collection is not the last word on Anatolian derivation. Nonetheless, even if one does not agree with his conclusions or with all of his interpretations of individual forms, one cannot help but appreciate what Oe. has done here.
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