

IJDL

International Journal of
Diachronic Linguistics and
Linguistic Reconstruction

12th Volume
1 · 2015

IJDL - International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction
is edited by Eugen Hill, Martin Kümmel and Stefan Schumacher.

Address of editorial office:

Institut für Sprachwissenschaft (Indogermanistik)
Universität Wien
Sensengasse 3a
1090 Wien
Austria

Editorial Board:

Andreas Willi, Oxford
Daniel Petit, Paris
Peter Schrijver, Utrecht
Brent Vine, Los Angeles
Rex Wallace, Amherst
Jenny Larsson, Stockholm
Peter-Arnold Mumm, München
David Stifter, Maynooth
Claus Schönig, Berlin

IJDL is published semi-annually in June and December. Annual subscription rate is 44 Euro including VAT, excluding shipping costs. Please order at your bookseller or at the publisher: Verlag Anja Urbanek, Straubinger Str. 30g, 80687 München, Germany, tel +49-(0)89-88 98 89 01, fax +49-(0)89-88 98 89 02, anja@peniope.de.

|peniope| Verlag Anja Urbanek
www.peniope.de

© 2015 Verlag Anja Urbanek, Straubinger Str. 30g, 80687 München
editors-in-chief: Eugen Hill, Martin Kümmel, Stefan Schumacher (address see above)
printing and binding: Bookstation GmbH, Gutenbergstr. 5, 85646 Anzing
Printed in Germany • ISSN 1614-5291

Editors' preface

The *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction* (IJDL), currently edited by Eugen Hill, Martin Kümmel and Stefan Schumacher, welcomes contributions from all fields of diachronically oriented research in linguistics. It appears in two volumes a year. Its deadlines are May 31 and October 31. The languages of publication are English, French, Italian and German. All contributions are to be sent directly to the editors at the address given at the end of this preface.

Every submission must be accompanied by an abstract in English. Before acceptance, submitted papers are subjected to examination by two specialists in the particular field of research. These specialists are not identical with the editors but may be members of the Editorial Board. The contributors are informed about the decision on their paper by mail within two months after its submission. Papers accepted for publication appear in IJDL within four to six months after their acceptance.

Since IJDL accepts papers from all fields of diacronic linguistics a maximum of transparency and clarity in the presentation of linguistic material and scholarly results is a necessity.

The contributors are kindly asked to consider that not all interested readers may share their specialists' competence on the particular problem and its linguistic background. It seems necessary always to try and provide the reader with a maximum of background information whenever possible. For example:

possible presentation:

'Morphologically, the Old Irish é-futures can be compared to the Indo-Iranian desideratives.'

clear presentation:

'Morphologically, the Old Irish é-futures of the type *céla* (< Proto-Celtic *ki-klā-se-) can be compared to the Indo-Iranian desideratives, which are also built with reduplication, contain a suffixal s and inflect thematically, cf. Vedic *cí-kīr-ṣa-*.'

Furthermore, the contributors are kindly asked to consider that not all the readers interested in their paper may share their expertise on the scholarly

literature relevant to the problem under discussion. We deem it helpful to avoid arguments by bare citation whenever possible. For example:

possible presentation:

‘As this *a* cannot possibly continue an old **e* (Smith 1995: 79-81) ...’,

clear presentation:

‘As this *a* cannot possibly continue an old **e* due to the lack of palatalisation of preceding consonants (Smith 1995: 79-81) ...’.

Footnotes should be reserved for short notes on minor details. Matters important for understanding the proceeding argument of a paper should not be discussed in footnotes. Footnotes should not contain extensive discussions. Matters not necessarily central to the main argument of a paper may be discussed extensively in a short appendix or submitted in form of a special paper.

Apart from these few points, the contributors are free to style their papers according to their sense of advisability and good taste.

The editors

Eugen Hill	Martin Kümmel
Universität zu Köln	Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena
Institut für Linguistik	Lehrstuhl für Indogermanistik
Historisch-Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft	Zwätzengasse 12
D-50923 Köln	D-07743 Jena
Deutschland — Germany	Deutschland — Germany

Stefan Schumacher
Universität Wien
Sprachwissenschaft (Indogermanistik)
Sensengasse 3a
A-1090 Wien
Österreich — Austria

Contents

A New Book on Pre-Greek

- (Review of Beekes, Robert S.P. *Pre-Greek. Phonology, morphology, lexicon*.
Leiden: Brill. 2014)..... 1
Filip De Decker

Drei Neuerscheinungen zur etymologischen Erforschung der indo-germanischen Sprachen Europas

(Rezensionsaufsatz zu:

- Mažiulis, Vytautas. *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas*.
Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų centras. 2013.
DerkSEN, Rick. *Etymological Dictionary of the Baltic Inherited Lexicon*.
Leiden–Boston: Brill. 2015.
Kroonen, Guus. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*.
Leiden–Boston: Brill. 2013) 23
Eugen Hill

A New Study on the Morphosyntax of Hieroglyphic Luwian

- (Review of Bauer, Anna H. *Morphosyntax of the Noun Phrase in Hieroglyphic Luwian*.
Leiden: Brill. 2015)..... 71
Federico Giusfredi

A New Study on the Morphosyntax of Hieroglyphic Luwian

by Federico Giusfredi

Review of

Bauer, Anna H. *Morphosyntax of the Noun Phrase in Hieroglyphic Luwian*. Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics (edited by Craig Melchert & Olav Hackstein). Leiden: Brill. 2015.

The field of research on the morphosyntax (and, more generally, syntax) of the Anatolian languages is far from being unexplored. Problems of alignment, agreement and word-order have been investigated by the Anatolianists ever since the Hittite language – the most largely attested member of the Ancient Anatolian language family – was deciphered. However, given the intrinsic unbalance of the Ancient Anatolian corpus – with all the languages other than Hittite being under-represented – the first thorough studies on the (morpho-)syntactic features of Luwian belong to very recent years. To date, the book under review is the first attempt at systematically assessing a specific subset of the Luwian syntax, namely the morphosyntax of the noun phrase (henceforth NP) in the sub-corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian.

In the Introduction (Chapter 1) of the book under review, Anna H. Bauer (henceforth the Author) also states that the Luwian corpus shows quite a few peculiarities both in its structure and in its contents. Those peculiarities require to be discussed. The chronological boundaries of the general Luwian corpus are quite blurry. A few Luwian personal names may be attested in the age of the Old Assyrian Colonies in Anatolia, although most of the Anatolian names of the Old Assyrian corpus appear to be Hittite (cf. Yakubovich 2010: 2). References to the Luwian people appear in the Old Hittite laws (Yakubovich 2010: 2-3); however, as Yakubo-

vich stated, caution must be exerted as far as the geographical prehistory of the linguistic groups of Anatolia is concerned. Texts in Luwian were present in the archives of the Hittite capital city Hattusha, during the so called Middle-Hittite and Late-Hittite phases (1500 to 1200 BCE ca.). They were written in Cuneiform, and they did not show a consistent dialectal pattern, which lead several scholars to identify different varieties of the language. The Author of the book under review (Introduction, p. 11) duly refers to Yakubovich's (2010: 69) reconstruction, recognizing a Common Luwian forefather, from which a Kizzuwatna Luwian and an Empire Luwian were derived. The former, attested in the Kizzuwatna rituals from Hattusha, would have been influenced by a Hurro-Luwian cultural interface; the latter would have been the forerunner of the Hieroglyphic Luwian, attested both in Bronze Age Hattusha and in peripheral areas of the Hittite Empire, and in the so called Neo-Hittite inscriptions of the Iron age. To date, this is the most convincing taxonomy for the phases and variants of the history of Luwian. However, for a closer discussion of the internal differentiations of the texts generally ascribed to as the Kizzuwatna rituals a reference should also be made to Melchert's (2013) paper.

Given the complex situation of the linguistic articulation of the Bronze Age Luwian language in the texts from the Hittite archives, the Author's choice to limit her investigation to the so called Hieroglyphic Luwian corpus is extremely wise. It must also be noticed that currently, due to the existence of bilingual texts that helped "breaking the code", our understanding of the Hieroglyphic Luwian corpus is far more advanced than that of the Cuneiform Luwian one.

The Hieroglyphic corpus is a set of over 300 Luwian texts (excluding seal impressions and seals, that usually carry no more than one or two words) written with a logo-syllabic writing system the modern scholars named Anatolian Hieroglyphs. There is no definitive consensus on the date of the earliest texts using this writing system (most of them date to the Iron Age; a significant number date to the Hittite Empire, ca. 1400 to 1200 BCE, but earlier stages have been hypothesized), nor on the origins thereof. The Author (Introduction, p. 21ff.) briefly discusses the nature and structure of the Hieroglyphic writing system, but she does not enter the details of the problem of its origins. As much as this may look like a problem for historians and philologists, it does have an impact in validating and supporting the above-mentioned taxonomy of the variants of Luwian pro-

posed by Yakubovich and accepted in the book under review. Indeed, the idea that Luwian Hieroglyphs were developed in a Luwian-Hittite bilingual environment, for which Yakubovich 2008 made quite a compelling case, is strictly connected to the hypothesis of a relationship between an “Empire Luwian” and the Hieroglyphic Luwian of both the Bronze and the Iron Age. Therefore, the problem would have been worth mentioning (the reference duly made to Hawkins 2003 is correct, but a bit outdated).

The rest of the description of the features of the script (Introduction, pp. 21-26), its structure and history, up to the conventions for modern transcription, is exhaustive and adequate, with a single minor correction to be made in footnote 33 (p. 23): the quoted writing of two Hurrian words is not the only case in which the Anatolian Hieroglyphs were used to write a different language. Within the Hieroglyphic Corpus of the Iron Age, the fragments of pithoi from Altintepe carry Urartian measures with “Luwian” script (for more on this topic and for a discussion of loans in Iron Age Luwian, see Giusfredi 2012).

The last part of the Introduction (pp. 26-39) contains a description of the grammar of nouns and nominal elements in Luwian. The description is up-to-date and complete, and the relevant literature is quoted. Limited reference is made to A. Payne 2010; however, the work is listed in fn. 46, and given its limited extension it is certainly understandable that the Author preferred basing her presentation on more exhaustive grammars. As far as the number of cases is concerned, the author presents a five-case system (nominative, accusative, genitive, dative-locative and ablative-instrumental), mentioning the sixth “case”, used for ergative (Cuneiform Luwian *-an-ti-*, cognate to Hittite *-an-t-*°), without including it in the declension tables (on pp. 27 to 31) and defining it a “marker”: a caution that, pending further clarification of its morphological origin, is probably the wisest solution.

In the section dedicated to the problem of agreement (pp. 34-35), the Author makes quite an important point regarding the graphic notation of endings in Hieroglyphic Luwian. Personal names may lack declension-markers, logograms may lack phonetic complementation, and, what is more surprising – and definitely problematic for the modern linguist – even some syllabic writings appear to lack endings. This occasionally makes the identification of agreement almost “positional”, complicates the understanding of some instances, and certainly raises the question about the

merely graphemic nature of this phenomenon the Author introduces on p. 35: was case-marking optional in given situations?

After the introduction, the Author devotes one chapter to each of the following features of the Luwian NPs: determination, quantification, modification and apposition.

Chapter 2 (Determination) is dedicated to determiners, which in Luwian, since the Anatolian languages lack a system of articles, include demonstratives, possessives and quantifiers. The analysis of demonstratives is straightforward and exhaustive. Luwian featured two: one indicating proximity, *za-*, and one indicating distance, *apa-* (proximity and distance can be defined in the domains of physical space, time or cognitive position between the referent and the speaker). The former is more frequently attested than the latter, and the reason proposed by the Author is convincing: most inscriptions commemorate the actions of a ruler, and they make a more intense use of a demonstrative describing proximity to the person “dictating” the text. On the other hand, the Author probably overestimates the prevalence of the *za*-demonstrative; according to the current version of the digital corpus published online by Ilya Yakubovich,¹ there are at least 323 tokens of *za-* and not just »over 20«, and the *za*-’s do not outnumber the *apa*-’s by »at least five to one« (p. 44; but the ratio becomes four to one on page 61). With 155 tokens of *apa-* in the afore-mentioned digital collection, the *za*- to *apa*- ratio is close to 2:1. The experience of the author of the present review confirms the ratios retrieved from Yakubovich’s online corpus. This observation, of course, is only completely valid in case the Author did not mean to separate the occurrences in which *apa-* is a demonstrative and the occurrences in which *apa-* is used as a pronoun (a phenomenon duly discussed on pp. 50ff.); if this were the case, however, a clearer explanation (and a higher consistency in the quantitative definitions) would have been necessary, especially given the fact that the present section discusses both uses of *apa*.

Section 2.3 of Chapter 2 is devoted to the behavior of possessives with respect to determination (while their genitival features will be discussed in Chapter 4). The ascription of Luwian to either of the categories listed by Christopher Lyons 1999 is in the opinion of the reviewer a non-problem: as there was no apparent way to express the kind of determination an arti-

¹ Cf. <http://web-corpora.net/LuwianCorpus/search/>; data retrieved in March 2015.

cle expresses, the categories of determiner-genitive and adjectival-genitive are difficult to apply (or at least it is hard to identify a trigger when parsing such phrases). Whether the existence of constructions that combine determination by *za-* and a genitival chain points to an adjectival-genitive strategy is quite debatable: most languages allow several constructions, and the category is rather construction-specific. All in all, the safest conclusion is summarized in the statement by the Author on p. 40:

»it seems advisable not to classify HLuwian possessors automatically as determiners on a syntactic level.«

Section 2.4 is dedicated to the position of determiners within the sentence; most of them occur prenominally, while in a few cases a postnominal pattern is preferred. Author convincingly observes that the postnominal occurrences of *za-* in the bilingual text of KARATEPE §18 may depend on the influence of the Phoenician text. This explanation is by far the most convincing one – although, as the Author duly states, the Luwian text does not always follow the Phoenician one so closely, which means that it is still hard to determine whether one version was the translation of the other. After the discovery and publication of another Luwian-Phoenician bilingual text, the inscription of ÇINEKÖY, it is no longer possible to assume, as the reviewer did (2010: 142f.), that the Luwian text of the Cilician bilinguals was the “original” version; still, it remains to be demonstrated if a proper translation ever occurred, or if the texts were simply written by a team of scribes including speakers of both languages and/or bilingual scribes in the first place. As far as the explanation of postnominal *za-* is concerned, however, the reproduction of a Phoenician pattern is a very convincing explanation (further on the co-existence of Luwian and Phoenician in Cilicia cf. now Yakubovich, frthc.). Indeed, it is so convincing, that it may be worth wondering whether it could apply to the case of postnominal *apa-* in the ASSUR LETTERS, too, instead of cautiously suggesting, with the Author, that in the case of these late epistolary texts Hieroglyphic Luwian marked contrastivity the way Ancient Greek did (in the book, reference is made to Bakker 2009). It is very hard to establish whether the Luwian letters found in Assur – out of any stratigraphically relevant context – had anything to do with the location of their discovery; the possibility of international trading contacts between Luwian Anatolia

and Mesopotamia during the Iron Age cannot be excluded, but it cannot be proven either. However, in his analysis of the letters (Giusfredi 2010: 208-232), the reviewer suggested the existence of a few possible loanwords from Akkadian in the texts. If this were the case, a Semitic influence on the pattern of postnominal determiners could have played a role in this case as well.

Chapter 3 is devoted to quantification, and it collects some of the most significant results of the monograph under review. The identification of the meanings of *430 (*punata-?*) and *tanima/i-*, meaning ‘all, entire’, and the demonstration that no lexical distinction existed between encompassing ‘all’ and distributive ‘every’ (pp. 63-71), are unchallengeable. To the very least, there is no trace of such a distinction in the available corpus, and if it existed it must have involved different quantifiers that we do not know.

Author’s study of numerals in Section 3.3 contains a series of extremely significant insights. Her thorough analysis proves that the behavior of quantified nouns with numerals higher than ‘1’ is the following: the noun can show either plural or singular ending for numerals lower than ‘5’; for higher numbers, the quantified noun is consistently singular (a few apparent exceptions are convincingly dealt with on pp. 83f.). Unmarked writings where no ending is written out can always occur, but this is a despicable feature of the Hieroglyphic Luwian writing system that has nothing to do with the pattern discovered. Furthermore, analyzing the occurrences of quantified commodities in the KULULU lead strips (p. 83), the Author demonstrates that while the grammatical number is affected by the cardinality of the numeral, the grammatical case is not: case agreement is maintained, while number agreement is not. In the conclusions on the type of system employed for numeral agreement (pp. 88-100), substantial evidence from other Indo-European languages is collected, showing that split-systems are not infrequent within the whole language family. The conclusions reached by the Author regarding the morphosyntax of the agreement of numerals are very promising, and may contribute to shed light on the way numeral agreement behaved in other Anatolian languages, including Hittite (cf. the paper by Elisabeth Rieken 2013: 321-338).

Chapter 4 is dedicated to modification, and it is divided into three large sections: non-possessive adjectives (and attributive participles), possession, and word order in modified NPs.

As far as non-possessive modification is concerned, the Author considers adjectives and participles. She distinguishes between genitival and non-genitival adjectives, employing a terminology that may be slightly confusing to some scholars of Anatolian. In the book under review, the group of genitival adjectives includes formations in *-assa/i-*, *-iya-*, *-wanni-*, *-izza-* and *-alla/i-*. Regarding participles, the analysis is focused on the forms in *-mma/i-*, that represent the vast majority of the forms that are attested in adnominal position, since the *-nt*-participles were mostly lexicalized and the third (Hieroglyphic) Luwian verbal noun, the so-called *-mina-* gerundive, is never attested with an attributive function (and goes therefore almost unmentioned in the book under review). The sections 4.1.1 to 4.1.3 examine the use of the different classes of adjectives, both occurring alone and in stacked constructions; after that, simple and complex sequences of participles are discussed.

Possession (section 4.2) is a highly frequent feature in the Hieroglyphic Luwian corpus, because of the content of the inscriptions, that were dedicated by kings and rulers who often speak in first person. As already anticipated, after mentioning the main strategies for marking external possession in Anatolian, the Author moves to genitival strategies and discusses a wide set of adjectival formations collected under the label “genitival adjectives”. Such label is usually limited to a narrower class of Luwian adjectives, namely the *-assa/i*-formations and, less frequently, the *-iya*-ones, both positively replacing inflected genitive. In particular, *-assa/i-* is formally close to the sigmatic genitive in *-si*, and its etymological relationship to the genitive inflectional case has been explored by Melchert (2012: 273–286). The constructions in *-alla/i-*, *-wanni-* and *-izza-*, on the other hand, may very well feature a “genitival” relationship in their morphogenesis, but it is very debatable whether they do or do not replace the genitive case to mark possession. Therefore, a generalized label like “genitival adjectives” should be used carefully when describing the Luwian language. As a consequence, most of the discussion proposed by the Author regards, in fact, the *-assa/i*- and *-iya*-formations, and her most significant results shed light on the (possible) functional differences between them. After successfully confuting Ivo Hajnal’s 2000 suggestion that a distinction between the two forms may have depended on the syntactic complexity of the clusters, the Author makes reference to data underlining how the *-iya*-forms frequently occurred in combination with possessive pronouns, and therefore

in chains featuring two marks of possession, as in the case of example 83: *a-ma-za tā-ti-ya-za* (LIGNUM)*sà-la-ha-za* ‘by my father’s power’. This is certainly true, according to the experience of the reviewer; however, it is unfortunate that no quantitative data are provided (the construction is just said to be “very frequent”), so the reader has to trust the Author’s judgment on the importance of this prevalence.

Regarding the reason for the tendency of Luwian to replace genitives with adjectives, which is by all means at least peculiar for a Indo-European language, the Author of the book under review accepts Ilya Yakubovich’s suggestion (2010: 198) that it may have depended on interlinguistic influence from Hurrian, a neighboring non-Indo-European idiom featuring complex chains of “Suffixaufnahme” in the morphogenesis of words and phrases. Yakubovich also noticed that genitive adjectives occur in NPs that were obliquely aligned, as it is more difficult to organize a genitival construction in such patterns. Although such a deep influence of language contact (affecting the level of subsegmental morphology) may appear unusual, the idea that the syntactic organization of Hurrian triggered a change in the organizational preferences of the Luwian language is far from unconvincing: large amounts of evidence positively demonstrate how strong and frequent the contacts between the two languages were during the Late Bronze Age (and possibly earlier). Far from relying on general considerations on the likelihood of this phenomenon, the Author produces further elements that support Yakubovich’s analysis, and also sheds light on concurring language-internal mechanics that contributed to the shift to genitival adjektivierung. Particularly interesting is the idea (pp. 172-173) that the similarity of the endings of nominative (V-s) and “sigmatic” genitive (-*a*s, -*s*(*i*)) may have led the speakers to prefer genitival adjectives in order to better disambiguate the elements composing the NPs, which in some cases risked to be identical. Also relevant (p. 173) is the observation about the possible ambiguity between genitival adjectives in *-iya-* with sigmatic endings and sigmatic genitives of *-i*-stems (since *iya* usually contracts in *i* in Hieroglyphic Luwian). It is one of the most convincing examples that explain why these adjectives were mostly used in oblique position, which made use of non-sigmatic endings. Of course, any Anatolian linguist will notice that Hittite had similar troubles distinguishing nominatives and genitives: for instance, *a*-stem-genitives and *-nominatives* were identical (for instance nominative Hitt. *ishas* ‘lord’, genitive Hitt. *ishas* ‘of

the lord'). And still, Hittite did not shift to adjectival strategies to express possession. This is the reason why, in the opinion of the reviewer, language-internal explanations cannot replace Yakubovich's theory regarding an influence of Hurrian: Hurrian influenced Luwian much more than it influenced Hittite, and the contacts between Hurrians and Luwians have deeper historical roots.

The last parts of Section 4.2 are devoted to the analysis of the pronominal possession, of the constructions with multiple possessors and to the so-called free-standing genitives (genitives with no explicit regens) and free standing possessives (possessive with no explicit regens). As far as free-standing genitives are concerned, the Author analyzes linking verbs sentences featuring genitives (*za-wa/i SIGILLUM-za tá-mi-sa* 'this seal (is) of Tami'; example 132 p. 218); a single very obscure case of free-standing genitive ([. . .]la+x-[n]ú²-na DOMINUS-ní-sa (COR)za+ra/i-ti-ia-sá 'to prosper(?) (was) of the lord's heart'; example 139, p. 223); several forms of adjectives in *-wanni-*, that to be fair appear very similar to substantivized ethnic adjectives (TONITRUS.HALPA-pa-wa/i-ni-zi(REGIO) '(the) Halabbeans'). She also examines free-standing possessive pronouns. Since what many Anatolian grammars call 'possessive pronouns' actually agree with the head of the NP like adjectives do, and correspond to English 'your' (an adjective) and not to English 'you(rs)' (a pronoun), a situation can occur like the one in example 140 on p. 224: |*u-nu-ha-wa/i-tu-u-ta* |*u-za-ri+i ARHA-* ||*pa+ra/i-ra+a-ha* 'now I missed you by your (letter)'.

All in all, it is evident that proper free-standing genitives, rare in Hittite, do not appear in Luwian, as all of them can be probably explained either as elements of a VP (linking verbs sentence) or as substantivized adjectival forms; the reviewer just wishes to mention one single case omitted by the author and that is worth mentioning. The word *sariyasi* (KARKEMIŠ A6, §30), indicating some sort of personal attendant, was a loanword from Akkadian free-standing genitive *ša rēši* 'eunuch (< of the person/head)'. According to the reviewer's interpretation (Giusfredi 2012), since there is no other known case of a loanword from Akkadian in which a long ē became *iya* in Hieroglyphic Luwian, it is very likely that the title itself was re-analyzed as a substantivized genitival adjective in *-assa/i-* by the Luwians.

Chapter 4 is concluded by a section dedicated to the analysis of the word-order of modifiers, the regular and irregular patterns thereof, and by

a summary of the extremely important observations made by the Author concerning modification.

Chapter 5, the last one preceding the Conclusions, is dedicated to apposition. Most of the appositions employed in the Hieroglyphic Luwian corpus are either represented by titles (royal, non-royal, professional). The Author analyzes them distinguishing between simple (Section 5.2), stacked (Section 5.2) and extended ones (Section 5.4), and finally examines the regular and irregular behavior thereof with respect to word order.

Conclusions (Chapter 6) summarize the main results of an insightful and well documented monograph, most of which do provide significant innovation in the understanding of Luwian morpho-syntax. An extensive bibliography and a thematic index help are also included.

All in all, Anna Bauer's study can only be rated very positively: the material is clearly presented, and important and convincing solutions are offered to open questions. Apart from the few details discussed in these pages, the only general criticism that the reviewer can move regards the references to the dataset employed: it would be advisable for modern linguists to provide more indications of the quantitative extension of the phenomena they discuss. When electronic devices and corpora are available, stating that a construction is prevalent instead of showing exactly how prevalent it appears to be is probably a missed opportunity. This minor observation, however, can by no means diminish the great value of a study that is not only highly insightful and inspired, but also represents a pioneering step in approaching the morpho-syntax of the second largest language of the Ancient Anatolian family.

Bibliography

- Bakker, Stáphanie J. 2009. *The Noun Phrase in Ancient Greek. A functional analysis of the order and articulation of NP constituents in Herodotus*. Leiden: Brill.
- Giusfredi, Federico. 2010. *Sources for a Socio-Economic History of the Neo-Hittite States*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Giusfredi, Federico. 2012. Note sui prestiti accadici e urartei nel luvio-geroglifico di età del Ferro. In: Cotticelli Kuras, Paola, Mauro Giorgieri, Clelia Mora, Alfredo Rizza & Federico Giusfredi (eds.). *Interferenze linguistiche e contatti culturali in*

- Anatolia tra II e I millennio a.C. Studi in onore di Onofrio Carruba in occasione del suo 80 compleanno.* Genova: Italian University Press. 147-165.
- Hajnal, Ivo. 2000. Der adjektivische Genitivausdruck der luwischen Sprachen (im Lichte neuerer Erkenntnis). In: Ofitsch, Michaela & Christian Zinko (eds.). *125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz – Festband anlässlich des 125jährigen Bestehens der Forschungsrichtung “Indogermanistik” an der Karl-Franzens-Universität.* Graz: Leykam. 159-184.
- Hawkins, John D. 2003. *Scripts and texts.* In: Melchert, H. Craig (ed.). *The Luwians.* Leiden: Brill.
- Lyons, Christopher. 1999. *Definiteness.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 2012. Genitive Case and Possessive Adjective in Anatolian. In: Orioles, Vincenzo & Giampaolo Borghello (eds.). *Per Roberto Gusmani. Studi in ricordo. Linguistica storica e teorica.* Udine: Forum Edizioni. 273-286.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 2013. Luvian Language in “Luvian” Rituals in Hattusha. In: Collins, Billie J. & Piotr Michalowski (eds.). *Beyond Hatti. A tribute to Gary Beckman.* Atlanta: Lockwood Press. 159-172.
- Payne, Annick. 2010. *Hieroglyphic Luwian. An introduction with original texts.* 2nd ed. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Rieken, Elisabeth. 2013. Die Numeruskongruenz nach Kardinalzahlen im Hethitischen. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 118. 321-338.
- Yakubovich, Ilya. 2008. *Hittite-Luvian Bilingualism and the origin of Anatolian hieroglyphs.* *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana* 4. 9-36.
- Yakubovich, Ilya. 2010. *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language.* Leiden: Brill.
- Yakubovich, Ilya. frtbc. Phoenician and Luwian in Early Iron Age Cilicia. To appear in *Anatolian Studies* 64.