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1 This volume is an enlarged and revised version of Maier’s PhD thesis, submitted in 2012 at the Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg. The primary research subject is the possessive want-adjectives in Anatolian languages. This type is well known for Greek and Sanskrit ¹, but is only briefly described for Hittite ², and the data of other Anatolian languages have not yet been studied in any detail. Therefore this publication is very welcome.

2 In the Introduction the author explicates the guidelines for the selection of the lemmas, and gives a brief but informative survey of want-adjectives in other Indo-European languages (Mycenaean Greek, Latin, Indo-Aryan languages and Tocharian). The selection of Hittite words includes all the lexemes with the stem ending in -want- appearing in A
Complete Retrograde Glossary of the Hittite Language by Jing Jie (The Hague, 1994). Such a decision is difficult to justify. On the one hand, the majority of the discussed words are clearly not want-adjectives, being participles to verbs ending in –u- or -nt-adjectives based on deverbal nouns in –war⁴. Furthermore, some of the discussed forms are actually supines in –wan, others are conjectured (e.g. gursamu[want-], p. 83) or do not exist at all. On the other hand, humant- ‘all’, which may contain this suffix ⁵, is left out. The result of such a mechanic selection is a loose collection of nominal and verbal stems, many of which are irrelevant for the subject of the research. This publication would definitely have benefited from a more elaborate choice of tokens for the analysis.

The main chapters contain derivational and etymological analysis of the selected Hittite, Cuneiform Luvian, Hieroglyphic Luvian and Lycian lemmas. The discussion in the entries is thorough and detailed; all the relevant literature is accounted for, and there are some interesting suggestions, e.g. the etymology for wallanu- ‘to erase’, connected to walh- ‘to strike’, or interpretation of aiwant- ‘alone’. However, I would certainly like to have a list of the attested forms with datings for at least some entries, so that one could see the age of the respective formations.

The research results are presented in the summary, followed by a table where the derivation type is specified for each of the words. The author also discusses the ablaut and origins of the suffix -want-.

In fact, the present volume can be regarded as an etymological dictionary of selected lemmas. The choice of words is odd but, on the positive side, some rarely attested words that usually do not enjoy much attention are discussed. The same is also valid for the material of other Anatolian languages, for which there are no dedicated etymological dictionaries.

Following are remarks on specific entries.

P. 16, aiwant-. While the interpretation of aiwant- as ‘alone’ is attractive, it should not be connected to 1-ant-, which must stand for *siyant-, see CHD Š: 338.

P. 32, enuwant-. The development of /i/ to /e/ is often attested in New Hittite texts and copies before /n/, e.g. in link- ‘to swear’ and hink- ‘to grant’. However, in piddai/i- ‘to run, race’ it occurs already in Middle Hittite, cf. pít-ti-nu-uz-zi KBo 6.2 II 10 OS vs. pít-te-nu-ut KBo 32.14 III 9 MH/MS.

P. 33-35, hahhallawant-, hahlawant-, hahlawant-. All these variants are attested in late copies, and there is no need to look for Proto-Indo-European stem types to justify these forms; they may well be Late Hittite nonce formations.

P. 49, huskiwant-. The spelling hu-u-uš- does not necessarily indicate the length of the syllable, and hu-u- is likely to be a ligature ⁶.

P. 62, ishanuwant-. The alleged regular deletion of the intermediate -iye/a- in derivation of nu-verbs from nouns does not exist. Cf. etriyanu- ‘to feed’ from etriya- ‘to feed’ from etri- ‘food’. A direct derivation of nu-verbs from nouns is more likely.

P. 111, naduwant-. The spelling GI-aš cannot reflect a consonant stem *nad-s, cf. the Nom.Sg. forms of an actual consonant stem ispant- ‘night’: GE₇-za, GE₇-az or GE₇-an-za; GI-aš clearly points to a thematic stem nada-.

P. 133, saillawant-. The regular spelling šal-la-nu- (never *šal-nu-), as compared to variants ta-aš-nu- beside da-aš-la-nu- rather points to a real, non-graphic /a/ before the suffix –nu-. This /a/ is also attested in asesanu- ‘to install, settle’ (always a-ši-ša-nu- or a-še-
ša-nu-), derived from ases- ‘id.’, and perhaps in harganu- ‘to destroy’ (consistently spelled har-ga-nu- as compared to e.g. har-ak-zi for /harktsi/ in the parent verb ‘to perish’), harganu- ‘to make white’ etc.

P. 137, sanhuwant-. In Old Hittite /n/ was regularly lost before consonant clusters. However, -ncw- clusters were an exception, since in this case a different syllabification rule is applied 7.

P. 166, tarzuwant-. A form *tarzu-yant- should have yielded **tarzumant- with the regular dissimilation of -u- after -u-. There are, however, exceptions, e.g. te-ep-nu-wa-an-zi (inf. I) KUB 17.21 IV 18 MH/MS, û-nu-wa-an-na KUB 17.35 I 28 Tudh. IV, wa-ar-nu-wa-aš KUB 12.22 16 OH/NS.

P. 167, dassanuwant-. Das(sa)nu- is derived from dassu- (cf. tepnu- ‘to insult, diminish’ < tepu- ‘small’) rather than from an unattested stem* dass-

P. 201, zanuwant-. Zanu- ‘to cook’ is attested already in the earliest texts, when the stem of the parent verb was still clearly zē-; therefore zanu- could not have been derived from the stem ziye/a- with an alleged dropping of -i(ye/a)-

P. 230, HLuv. musnuwanti-. Gr. μῦω is rather related to munnai- ‘to conceal’ 8.

NOTES


3. Including armahhwant-, which is missing in Jie’s glossary, as was pointed out in the review by Melchert (H. C. MELCHERT, Review of: J. JIE, A Complete Retrograde Glossary of the Hittite Language (Pihans 71), 1994, JAOS 117, 1997, p. 163.


5. -u- was regularly dissimilated to -m- after -u-.

6. See e.g. S. KIMBALL, Hittite Historical Phonology, Innsbruck, 1999, p. 67f.
