

**The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago,
Vol. P, Fasc. 2**



Review Author[s]:
H. Craig Melchert

Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 117, No. 4. (Oct. - Dec., 1997), pp.
713-714.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0003-0279%28199710%2F12%29117%3A4%3C713%3ATHDOTO%3E2.0.CO%3B2-3>

Journal of the American Oriental Society is currently published by American Oriental Society.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/aos.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tion, but in the matter of archaeology we are still a long way from understanding the evolution—if indeed there was one—of the Marib dam and its associated irrigation works. Ten years ago J. Schmidt lectured at the Seminar for Arabian Studies where he pushed for the late third millennium origins of the Marib system, just as Schaloske has in the work under review. Schmidt's lecture was followed by a detailed presentation by Christian Robin of all of the inscriptions either mentioning the Marib dam or built into it ("Quelques observations sur la date de construction et la chronologie de la première digue de Ma'rib, d'après les inscriptions," *PSAS* 18 [1988]: 95–114). Robin noted, "Dans trois parties différentes des deux môles de la Digue, on relève donc des textes [RES 3959, RES 4418, RES 4775] postérieurs au début de l'ère chrétienne. On ajoutera que ces textes sont remployés sans soin, sans avoir été retailés et piquetés, sans tenir compte de leur contenu; comme les autres remplois qu'on voit dans la Digue, ils manifestent que les bâtiments de Ma'rib, à partir d'une certaine date, ont été utilisés comme carrières de pierres. Ce pillage n'est guère concevable qu'après la fin de l'indépendance sabéenne, quand Ma'rib eut perdu son statut de capitale politique. C'est un indice sérieux en faveur de l'hypothèse selon laquelle la majeure partie des vestiges actuels de la Digue, sinon la totalité, sont de l'époque himyarite et abyssine" (p. 100). Suffice it to say that, regardless of whatever rates of sedimentation may be implied by the buildup of silt in the irrigation canals at Marib, Robin's findings are a damning indictment of the geomorphological method applied without reference to the historical data available. Schaloske's work, like that of many of his German predecessors, has provided a wealth of data on the geomorphology and hydrology of the Marib irrigation system, but the inscriptions built into the very body of the dam strip his calculations of much of their worth, and render the sequence of building periods posited highly spurious at best.

D. T. POTTS

UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, vol. P, fasc. 2. Edited by HANS G. GÜTERBOCK and HARRY A. HOFFNER. Chicago: THE ORIENTAL INSTITUTE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, 1995. Pp. 128 ("113"—"240"). \$30 (paper).

The qualities which I praised in my review of the previous fascicle¹ are again much in evidence: accurate and thorough documentation, generally judicious analyses and interpretations,

¹ *JAOS* 116.4 (1996).

and remarkably clear organization and readability. Since we now have the complete article for the adverb *parā*, I wish to single out the editors' sensitive and lucid treatment of this member of a very difficult word-class. In the following critical remarks I have again tried to focus on examples which involve broader issues.

P. 145 (sub 3.): the recognition and correct translation of the "double dative" construction are welcome (*ANA KUR URUḪatti parḫuwanzī uwatteni* "you come to attack the land of Hatti"), but the statement that the dative case "is because of *uwa*—" is infelicitous. It is the infinitive which requires that its object be in the dative case by this characteristically Indo-European construction, regardless of the main verb. This syntax is well attested in Hittite alongside the expected accusative object with the infinitive.

Pp. 151 and 167–68: one should read *pa-ri-ya_x-an* and *pár-ku-ya_x-an-na-aš*. The editors fail to acknowledge the well-established use of the "E" sign in the value *ya* in Hittite.² The remark about "the *i/e* glide" is misleading: Hittite has a single palatal glide *y*.

P. 151 (under 1.c'): I must again object in the strongest terms to the totally illicit emendation of neuter stems in *-e/iš(n)-* to non-existent stems in *-eššar*: the word for "fork" is *ḫattariš*!³

P. 156 (sub 2.1): I commend the translation; however *šankuš alil* does not show "gender discord," but rather supports other evidence that some nouns in *-il* are animate(!), despite the common prejudice that they are neuter. Compare animate *šarnikzil* "restitution": accusative plural *šarnikziluš* at *KUB* 44.38 I 7.13 and 46.42 iv 6 and [*mā*]n *šarnikziel kuiš* "If (there is) some restitution . . ." at *KUB* XIV 8 Vo 30.

P. 161 (sub b.): as confirmed by *unuwanta*, *parku* is not singular, but an archaic neuter nom.-acc. plural. The authors also fail to recognize the corresponding collective nom.-acc. plural in *-i* in *parkui šuppi* (p. 165, sub o.) and *parnulli (iškallanta)* (p. 179).⁴ In general, forms in final *-u* and *-i* need to be scrutinized much more carefully before being assigned to "neuter singular."

P. 189: the example *parašnauwanti* is a genuine stem in *-want-* and should not be emended.⁵

² See my remarks, with references in H. Craig Melchert, *Anatolian Historical Phonology* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1994), 35.

³ See Melchert, *Anatolian Historical Phonology*, 150–51, for argumentation.

⁴ See Calvert Watkins, "Notes on the Plural Formations of the Hittite Neuters," in *Investigationes Philologicae et Comparativae: Gedenkschrift für Heinz Kronasser*, ed. Erich Neu (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1982), 250–62.

⁵ See Norbert Oettinger, "Hethitisch *-want-*," in *Documentum Asiae Minoris Antiquae*. Festschrift für Heinrich Otten

P. 207: the stem of "to stick in, fasten" is *paške-*, not *pašk-*. This verb represents a lexicalized stem with the "iterative" suffix *-ške/a-* (< PIE **-ske/o-*).

P. 212ff: the treatment of the particle *-pat* is on the whole excellent, but in my view the editors tend to overuse the exclusivizing meaning "only," assigning it to cases where emphasis or focus is meant (often best translated with an English "cleft" construction: *zik=pat* "it is you who . . .").

The overall level of excellence in the *CHD* continues to be remarkably high, and I eagerly look forward to the next installment.

H. CRAIG MELCHERT

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

zum 75. Geburtstag, ed. Erich Neu and Christel Rüster (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1988), 277–78.

The Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani and Other Places (KTU: Second, Enlarged Edition). By MANFRIED DIETRICH, OSWALD LORETZ, and JOAQUÍN SANMARTÍN. *Abhandlungen zur Literatur Alt-Syrien-Palästinas und Mesopotamiens*, vol. 8. Münster: UGARIT-VERLAG, 1995. Pp. xvi + 666. \$86.

The first edition of this work (M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, J. Sanmartín, *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit*, pt. 1: *Transkription*,¹ *Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 24 [Kevelaer: Butzon und Bercker, 1976]) was a comprehensive transcription of all Ugaritic texts discovered and published through 1971. Introduced as *KTU*, it replaced rapidly the previously comprehensive *UT* (C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook*, *Analecta Orientalia* 38 [Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965]) and, more gradually, *CTA*, A. Herdner's careful reedition of the texts discovered in the first ten years of the site's excavation (*Corpus des tablettes en cunéiformes alphabétiques*, *Missions de Ras Shamra* 10, 2 vols. [Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1963]). The latter remained valuable for its epigraphic comments, as *KTU* was criticized for being less than meticulous in all its readings.

Since the publication of *KTU*, numerous other Ugaritic texts have come to light at Ras Shamra; at the neighboring, coastal site of Ras Ibn Hani; and at other sites in Syria and on Cyprus. Further, increasingly meticulous epigraphic work has been

done on both new and old texts, especially by D. Pardee and P. Bordreuil and by several scholars working from the macro-photographic record being built up by West Semitic Research (B. Zuckerman and collaborators). Since, moreover, *KTU* is now out of print, it had become highly desirable to have a new, comprehensive collection of Ugaritic texts, using new collations and editions where possible.

The first work to attempt to meet that need was J.-L. Cunchillos and J.-P. Vita, *Banco de Datos Filológicos Semíticos Noroccidentales*, Primera parte: *Datos Ugaríticos*, 1: *Textos Ugaríticos* (Madrid: CSIS, Instituto de Filología, 1993),² which reproduced the Ugaritic texts as found in *KTU*, adding the new texts according to the numbering system of *KTU* (each number now preceded by 00.), and appending lists of differing readings after each text (01. for the first collator, 02. for the second, etc.). It presented texts in *KTU*'s first category (literary and religious) in four separate groupings (mythic, epic, ritual, and hippiatric) and added a category excluded by *KTU*: Ugaritic words in vocabulary lists (but not in Akkadian prose texts), to which it assigned the initial number 00.9. While thus including some Ugaritic words in syllabic cuneiform, it excluded, on the one hand, Hurrian texts and sections of texts in alphabetic cuneiform and, on the other, Akkadian (or Sumerian) words and lines (in syllabic cuneiform) in what are otherwise alphabetic cuneiform texts. It expressed no judgment on the relative merits of the different collations (which unfortunately invites readers to pick and choose on other than epigraphic grounds).

CAT (as it must surely be called, despite the fact that it continues to refer to the texts by "*KTU*" numbers) does not reproduce *KTU* or list collations separately, but assimilates improved readings into its text. It incorporates the new texts into the old categories, but their numbers here differ from those provided by *BDFSN* (as Cunchillos and Vita designate their work). Thus the latter's 00.2.78 is RIH 78/21, whereas *CAT*'s 2.78 is RIH 77.21A; RIH 78/20 is 00.1.170 and *CAT* 1.169. *CAT* does not include the Ugaritic words from the polyglot vocabularies, but presents all alphabetic cuneiform texts, including those partially or entirely in Hurrian and those lines or sections of texts that use syllabic cuneiform for Akkadian. It also lists all the as yet unedited texts. Unfortunately, these are assigned the same initial number (9.) as used by *BDFSN* for Ugaritic words in vocabulary lists. Thus despite significant overlap, the two works are not automatically exchangeable when one comes to look up a text reference.

² See also "Banco de Datos Filológicos Semíticos Noroccidentales . . . Suplemento 1993," *Sefarad* 54 (1994): 143–50, which includes corrections and new texts and collations through the end of 1993 and announces that a continually updated version of the book will be available in an electronic version (p. 149).

¹ Part 2, to contain copies of unpublished texts and photographs of all texts, never appeared.