

External Examiner's Report on the Dissertation of Dita Frantíková “Aspects of Hittite nominal *i*-stems” Submitted in 2022 at the Department of Linguistics

I. Brief summary of the dissertation

In her dissertation Frantíková (henceforth F) provides a systematic survey of two major types of Hittite *-i*-stem nominals (“core” *i*-stems, *-ai*-stems), and evaluates their implications for the reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European (PIE). Each lexeme is critically assessed from philological, linguistic, and etymological perspectives. F argues that just a small subset of these Hittite *-i*-stem nominals are likely to be inherited from PIE; the majority are rather inner-Hittite creations or loanwords, either from Luwian or from non-IE languages (Hurrian, Hattic, Akkadian).

II. Brief overall evaluation of the dissertation

The dissertation is overall of high quality. The individual lexemes, in particular, are treated with impressive philological rigor, and the various etymological proposals for each are thoroughly assessed, demonstrating F's broad competence in IE linguistics and in the other (i.e., non-IE) languages of the ancient Near East. Coverage of the relevant material is extremely thorough (I noticed only a few possible omissions among the “core” *i*-stems, perhaps *pūri-* and *walḫi-*). F draws reasonable conclusions about the historical implications of the Hittite evidence (see further below), which will be of interest to specialists in IE comparative-historical linguistics, and are conveniently summarized at the conclusion of the dissertation; those interested in the details of individual lexemes can consult their individual entries, which are cogently organized (by morphological type, and within types, alphabetically) and thus easily accessible. These individual entries are also full of stimulating discussion — cultural, historical, and especially philological — and so can be profitably consulted by Hittitologists and scholars of ancient Near Eastern languages and cultures more broadly. However, both audiences would benefit from a stronger introduction, which more clearly defines the scope of the material that will be treated (especially for the *i*-stems; see below) and F's motivations for treating this material specifically, and lays out what sort of discussion readers should expect to find in the entries (in particular, calling attention to its relevance for non-linguists as well).

III. Detailed evaluation of the dissertation and its individual aspects

1. *Structure of the argument*

The dissertation is well structured, organized in such a way as to facilitate F's principal purpose, which is to evaluate the implications of Hittite *-i*- and *-ai*-stems for the reconstruction of PIE. The individual entries (§2) are oriented toward this end. In each case, F endeavors to determine whether the lexeme is inherited or not. Etymological proposals are assessed with respect to their formal (viz., phonological, morphological) and semantic compatibility with the forms attested in Hittite texts. If

she concludes that the lexeme could be inherited, its formal properties are discussed from an IE perspective, compared to related formations in the other IE languages with a view toward determining those of their PIE ancestors.

The concluding section (§3) likewise serves her main purpose. F brings to bear the results of her survey on the PIE situation, presenting an accessible summary of the arguments she advances in the individual lexical entries, and synthesizing them to reassess previous claims about PIE. I find F's general conclusions very plausible. These include:

- No Hittite *-ai*-stems are securely inherited from PIE, though some are built out of inherited material and/or according to inherited principles (e.g., common *hur-tai-* 'curse', neuter *haš-tai-* 'bone').
- Hittite inherited from PIE at least one "core" animate *i*-stem noun (*ar-ki-* 'testicle') and also at least one *i*-stem adjective (*ter-i-* 'three'; although in my view it is questionable whether it is really an adjective or an *i*-stem).
- Other Hittite *i*-stem adjectives are — like the *-ai*-stem nouns — built out of inherited material and/or according to inherited principles (e.g., "Caland-adjectives").
- No "core" *i*-stem neuter nouns are inherited.
- There is little Hittite support for the idea that **-i*-stem "Caland-adjectives" are based on **-i*-stem nouns, either by reanalysis (in appositional contexts) or as (internal, "proterokinetic") derivatives.

There are lemmata where the argumentation could use further clarification. For instance, the discussion of *har-ki-* 'white' is significant for F's claims about "Caland-adjectives" (noted just above), but it is difficult to follow and would benefit from more detailed explanation. Another case is the entry for *šak-lai-*, where F may have intended to include more discussion than actually appears. Most issues, however, are relatively minor, and are in any case more than offset by the numerous linguistic and philological contributions in these entries.

With respect to structure, I find that the only real weakness of the dissertation is the introduction. While the abstract provides some orientation for the reader in terms of delineating the scope of the work and its author's goals, the introduction should include an expanded version of the very concise summary therein. The introduction itself is very short, offering little context for the work that follows. One consequence of this extreme brevity is that no definition of "core" *i*-stem is ever provided (a surprising oversight in an otherwise very well organized study!). Based on the lexemes treated, the term can only refer to the set of Hittite *i*-stems that have been — or on structural grounds, potentially could be — regarded as deradical ("primary") formations inherited from PIE. This is a coherent way to delimit the material treated (viz., a subset of Hittite *i*-stems), one completely consistent with F's main goal, but the term really must be defined explicitly.

Another curious feature of the very brief introduction is that it is entirely pitched toward specialists in IE linguistics. Such specialists are clearly intended to be the principal audience for the dissertation, as evident especially from the focus on "core" *i*-stems, which are defined in IE terms. Nevertheless, the discussions of individual Hittite lexemes are rich in insights that would be valuable for Hittite philologists and for scholars of ancient Near Eastern languages and cultures generally. In my view, F deprives herself here of a nice chance to draw in this group of readers who would benefit from reading her work.

2. *Formal aspects of the dissertation*

Abbreviations, references, transcriptions, and footnotes are generally consistent and formatted in accordance with standards in the field. Typos and linguistic infelicities are rare, and do not hinder comprehension. The document is easy to read and, since it is well organized, also easy to navigate.

3. *Use of sources and/or material*

The author engages extensively with primary sources (viz., the Hittite texts) and with secondary literature, drawing on older and more recent scholarship in both Hittitology and IE linguistics. These sources were correctly cited, and I noticed only a few missing bibliographical items from which F's study might have benefited. It was noted above that the data set is not explicitly defined; nevertheless, it is wholly cogent and appears to be carefully and thoroughly collected. The overall conclusions drawn by F on the basis of her study are measured and plausible (again, as noted above), even on points I do not agree with.

4. *Personal contribution to the subject*

The dissertation makes a useful contribution, in the first place, by gathering previous discussions of the relevant material scattered across disparate sources (e.g., etymological dictionaries). But in critically assessing this material it makes numerous interesting observations, which contribute toward the resolution of linguistic, philological, and other problems. A sample:

- F provides an improved interpretation of KBo 4.2 ii 32–33, which clarifies how *wattai*– ‘bird’ should be understood.
- F's morphological analysis of Hitt. *šagai*– ‘sign’ improves on all previous treatments.
- In her treatment of *ai-wai*–, F convincingly argues (based on photos of the text) that both *uwai*– ‘woe’ and *wai*– ‘id.’ were possible spellings already in OH.
- F's detailed treatment of *šankuwai*– does much to clarify the synchronic and etymological issues surrounding this lexeme.
- F's naturalistically informed discussion of *šišai*– ‘tail’ leads to a more cogent interpretation of KUB 9.31 i 8.

IV. **Questions for the author**

I present below a few questions, which range from broad, methodological issues to matters of detail:

- What (sort of) evidence is required to reconstruct an individual (*i*-stem) lexeme for PIE? Are word equations necessary (and if so, how many)?
- Does F's survey of the evidence offer any insight into the general question of why Hittite *i*-stem nouns do not show suffixal ablaut but *i*-stem adjectives do?
- If Hittite “Caland-adjectives” indeed continue adjectives derived from thematic nominals (via *i*-substitution), how do these become associated with the “Caland system” in particular?
- Why do neuter *-ai*-stems become relatively productive in Hittite?
- What are the grounds for the assumption that athematic derivatives of thematic nominals cannot show suffixal ablaut?

V. Conclusion

I believe this dissertation is an important contribution to Hittitology and IE linguistics, amply demonstrating the author's strong competence in both disciplines. I provisionally classify the submitted dissertation as *passed*.

19.08.2022

Dr. Anthony D. Yates