

External Examiner's Report on the Dissertation of Dita Frantíková

"Aspects of Hittite Nominal *i*-stems"

Institute for Comparative Linguistics, Faculty of Arts, Charles University, Prague

I. Brief summary of the dissertation

[It is advisable that the summary provided here should be no longer than one paragraph in length (longer summaries are superfluous as both an abstract and an author's overview are mandatory components of the dissertation).]

The dissertation is a philological, synchronic and historical comparative investigation of primary Hittite *i*-stems, of which there are two categories: "core" *i*-stems and *āi*-stems. The work consists of three parts, a brief introduction to the subject, a main part where all relevant lexemes within the main categories are treated in alphabetical order, and a concluding chapter where the author draws her historical conclusions of the material, especially with respect to ablaut patterns. Finally, a relatively modest bibliography and brief index of Hittite *i*-stems are added.

II. Brief overall evaluation of the dissertation

[It is advisable that the evaluation of the overall level of achievement provided at this point should be about a paragraph long. A brief evaluation of this kind is particularly helpful in the case of longer reports, since the examiner's overall opinion on the quality of the dissertation can be clearly expressed here, before a more detailed analysis of the individual aspects of the dissertation is provided.]

Dita Frantíková's dissertation is a meticulous investigation of a difficult, but important subject within Hittite word formation. The author provides a thorough and diligent philological groundwork based on a solid knowledge of both the primary sources and the secondary literature. The synchronic treatment of the Hittite material may constitute the essential part of the dissertation, but in general, the author also shows sound judgment and a remarkably open mind in her historical-comparative discussions.

III. Detailed evaluation of the dissertation and its individual aspects

[Please provide a detailed evaluation of the dissertation. Among other things, this evaluation should consider the criteria listed below (preferably providing examples from the text to illustrate all critical points). You can either organise your comments separately, according to the individual criteria, or formulate a longer overall summary addressing all the criteria at once.

1. *Structure of the argument*

[Is the argumentation lucid throughout? Is it always clear what the author is attempting to express and why he/she is doing so at specific instances in the text? Is the dissertation clearly

structured? Is the dissertation aimed at achieving a clearly set objective and is the author successful in following this objective?]

The structure of the dissertation, in particular the internal disposition of the Hittite material is exemplary, and the objective of presenting the category of *i*-stems synchronically and diachronically with the focus on such terms that have external Indo-European comparanda is very clear and successfully completed.

2. *Formal aspects of the dissertation*

[Is the author coherent in the use of abbreviations, syntax of bibliographical references, transcriptions of foreign terms, etc.? Are the footnotes formatted correctly? Is the language of the dissertation grammatically correct and free of linguistic infelicities? Is the dissertation visually well-presented, and graphically well-formatted?

In general, the work is conscientiously written with a clear and consistent disposition of each headword, starting with a survey of the attestations, followed by information on inflection and semantic issues, and ending with a discussion of etymological background, whether – as in most cases – non-Indo-European or with cognates in other Indo-European languages.

The text is well edited with only few typos, though hyphens, asterisks and parentheses at the end of lines often fail to be aligned with the following word/stem. While DF's general command of the English language is good, a later revision with the possible aim of international publication would benefit from the help of a native speaker. Thus, e.g., the use of articles, not always following the usual standard (e.g. p. 21 "similar form" → "a similar form"), cases like p. 16: "most of the other" → "most of the others", the awkward word order, p. 148: "Nussbaum lists among cognates", or the inconsistent syntax, p. 64: "Taking into consideration, first the wide semantic range ... secondly because ... and thirdly because ...".

3. *Use of sources and/or material*

[Does the author work transparently with secondary sources? Are all relevant sources made use of? Are the primary sources used properly and reference made to their original language wherever appropriate? Are the sources employed in a methodologically correct manner? If the dissertation is based on data collection, is the methodology used for data collection and analysis coherent? Are all the individual steps in data analysis justified and well executed? Is the method of data collection and processing in line with the main research question or hypotheses tested? Does the interpretation of the results proposed by the author follow from the results of the empirical research or sources on which the work relies?

The author makes adequate use of the standard handbooks and consistently refers to the etymological dictionaries of Hittite, and in general, she has a good understanding and fine, critical approach to the argumentation presented. From the selection of secondary literature, one does get the impression that she is more of an Anatolianist than an Indo-Europeanist, which is certainly quite consistent with the idea of the dissertation. For

the discussion of comparative Indo-European matters, the references are mostly taken from the school of thought developed on the basis of Jochem Schindler's work and now prominently represented by Alan Nussbaum and, from the younger generation, e.g. Laura Grestenberger and Stefan Höfler. This may not be so surprising, considering the extensive discussion of the "Caland complex" within this tradition.

The bibliography is rather brief, but it is remarkable that it includes several unpublished works on important subjects. To take a few examples of peculiarities in the bibliography, one should mention the omission of the full title of Elisabeth Riekens's "Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen" (Wiesbaden 1999), though several references do occur in the text, and the same goes for Frank Starke's monumental "Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens" (Wiesbaden 1990) with its meticulous of *i*-stems in another Anatolian language (only occasionally referred to by their StBot-numbers). A curious detail is a reference to a "forthcoming" work by the present reviewer (p. 14) – in reality "in preparation", and not "chapter 4" as indicated.

4. *Personal contribution to the subject*

[Is the dissertation merely a compilation of information, or does the author employ the primary and secondary sources to propose an original, organically formulated contribution to the field?]

The dissertation is a combination of a philological investigation and a linguistic analysis where the latter includes many original thoughts that will have to be judged by future research in the field, e.g. the treatment of the word for 'testicle' (p.23) or the critical attitude to the dogma of *i*-stem abstracts.

A work of this scope unavoidably provokes a multitude of questions, comments and revisions on specific issues. Let a few random examples suffice:

In her initial survey of Indo-European *i*-stems, the author seems to have omitted the Greek τροπίς-type, and in her explanation of the boom of *i*-stems in Hittite she gives two reasons: loans from non-Indo-European sources and *i*-stem suffixes. However, even in the suffixes the *i*-stem inflection needs an explanation.

p. 12: suffixes *-d^hlo-/-d^hro-: according to the present reviewer rather *-t^hlo-/-t^hro-, cf. e.g. Olsen Innsbruck, 2010: Derivation and Composition.

p.14: Nussbaum *-i- + -d^ho-: for a different interpretation, cf Olsen HS 116, 2003.

p.13: "the PIE numeral *tri_h2": why mention the feminine form?

p. 33: *ǵenos for *ǵenh₁os

p.34: in the discussion of the Luwian word for 'sheep', the reconstruction is given as „*h₂owi- as e.g. per Weiss (2013: 340) or *h₃ewi- per Kloekhorst (EDHIL: 337)“, but later it is correctly stated that „The TochB cognate āu < *h₂ewi- supports the former, i.e. an acrostatic inflection *h₂ówi- ~ *h₂éwi- (Schindler 1994: 397)“. The argument would have

been clearer if Kloekhorst's suggestion had been explicitly rejected, including a remark on why he would have to assume a *h₂ (allegedly *h_{2o} > a).

p. 41: Arm. "lain" → "layn"

p. 45: pattar: why is Rieken's meticulous treatment of the word (1999: 309-10) left unmentioned?

p.60: enigmatic remark: „(or to look closer, in Greek)“.

p. 62: Kammenhueber → Kammenhuber

p. 68: How can we be sure that Lat. *plānus* has a full grade rather than zero grade?

p. 73: in her treatment of *šalli-* ‚big, great‘ (also p. 231: „surely from PIE *swelho-, but the root vocalism is difficult to explain“), it seems strange that DF only mentions Puhvel's derivation from a root *swelH- ‚swell‘ despite the traditional reconstruction *solHi- or *sIHi- (Kloekhorst 2008 with ref.) and comparison with Skt. *sarva-* ‚whole‘, Lat. *salvus*. Incidentally the Italic cognate *sollus* as a free form seems to be restricted to Oscan, while an i-stem *solli- in Latin (potentially < *solHi-) may be continued in compounds such as *sollemnis/Osc. súll[a]m[n]ais*. Thus, we may have the relics of an Anatolian-Italic Caland-type i-stem.

p. 80: on *daluki*, Gk. *δολιχός*: according to de Lamberterie, the Greek form “is derived from the zero grade d̥lh₁-g h -ó- with supposed vocalization of the laryngeal *h₁ > /i/. This view is presently unacceptable; the laryngeal would have been lost by the so-called “Saussure effect““. However, the Saussure effect is not to be expected if one accepts a regular development *lh₁ > ολι as per Strunk. The rule is controversial, but it could have been discussed.

p. 86: “a PIE root *w̥rh_{2/3} - can be reconstructed“: what exactly is that? Laryngeal + w or a rounded laryngeal. In the latter case, why not distinguish between h₂ and h₃?

99: wai „woe“ – one might have mentioned the possible reflex in *wailo-, the Celtic and Armenian word for „wolf“.

186: *hastai-*: here, one might have discussed the status of i/n-heteroclitics in Indo-European. Did they exist at all? Almost all cases in Vedic denote body parts, and here one may consider the influence of -i from the dual.

186: “only *h₂ could cause aspiration of a preceding stop in Vedic“: do we know that for certain? E.g. Martin Kümmel considers aspiration by *h₁ possible.

IV. Questions for the author

[You may wish to propose several questions for the doctoral candidate to address at the defence. It is possible to do so in the form of a more extensive critical analysis of the

dissertation. However, if you do so, you are advised to arrange your main questions into separate points.]

- 1) What is the author's opinion on the following claim: If Anatolian was the first branch to separate from PIE, evidence coming exclusively from Anatolian would in principle count as much as evidence coming from all remaining branches together?
- 2) The author remarks that the virtual lack of *āi*-stem adjectives is striking, but she makes no attempt at explaining why. Is there a natural explanation?
- 3) In her concluding chapter, the author discusses the claim that the "only true *i*-stems are abstracts", venturing the possibility, based on Stefan Höfler, that "the endocentric adjectives may have remained adjectives, though marked for definiteness ... before they eventually lost their definiteness function in most cases". Could the author elaborate on this idea – and is the idea of definiteness necessary?

V. Conclusion

[Please conclude your report with the following standardised formulation (which can be elaborated upon as needed, clarified, or prefaced with a more extensive summative evaluation):]

On the basis of a fine and thorough philological, synchronic and diachronic treatment the author has provided a valuable survey of the important stem class of primary *i*-stems in Hittite. With a minor revision, one would hope to see the work published internationally as a useful handbook.

I provisionally classify the submitted dissertation as **passed**.

[Date]

[signature]