

CRITICAL REVIEWS

Heinrich Otten and Christel Rüster, *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi. Vierzigste Heft. Texte verschiedenen Inhalts vorwiegend aus Gebäude A (Büyükkale)*. Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1997. Pp. xvi+ 50.

Reviewed by Harry A. Hoffner, Jr., The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago

This volume serves to complete the publication of the text finds from the excavations of Kurt Bittel at Boghazköi in the year 1933, all of which bear field numbers ending in the letter “/c.” The huge task, the publication of 2,630 tablets and fragments, was begun in 1938 by Hans Ehelolf with volume 29 of the series “Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi.” As Otten notes in his foreword, the vast majority of the text finds of this campaign stem from an area in the southeast corner of the palace area on Büyükkale, Building A of which seems to have been a library or archive room.

The ensemble of texts recovered from this archive room give us an idea of what constituted the royal archives.

The task of systematically publishing the remainder of the c tablets was begun by Otten in KBo 34, continued in KBo 38, 39, and is now completed in 40. The ordering of the fragments follows the current working up of the texts by Dr. Silvin Košak in his “Konkordanz der Keilschrifttafeln III” (= StBoT 42). Košak’s “concordance” was begun in StBoT 34 (1992) and continued in StBoT 39 (1995).

The hand copies are the work of the co-authors, Heinrich Otten and Christel Rüster, with four contributed by Erich Neu (numbers 22, 60, 79 and 310). Rüster compiled the tables and indices.

Since I have had no opportunity to collate any of the tablets and fragments copied in this volume, I cannot judge the accuracy of the copies on that basis. But since the co-authors are experienced and expert copyists, we have no reason to expect inaccuracies.

There are 380 fragments copied in this volume, a very large number. But most are very small. For that reason the authors identify a relatively small number of them as joins and duplicates. I count nine join pieces identified in the front matter. In addition drawings are made of three joins of previously published pieces (numbers 43, 72, 79). The authors group the first 102 fragments into general categories: historical texts and instructions, rituals, oracles, and festival rituals. The remaining 78 (numbers 303–380) are grouped under the category “various fragments.”

More specific characterizations, such as attributions to a specific CTH number or identifications of duplicates, accompany about one third of the fragments in the first 302 numbers.

Many fragments are described as showing either Old Hittite or Middle Hittite ductus. Of course, all Hittitologists respect the opinion of Otten in such matters. Together with H. G. Güterbock he pioneered the technique of recognizing the Old Hittite script. But with such small fragments it is often quite uncertain if a given piece shows Old or Middle Hittite script. A case in point is number 193, which the authors identify as “ah. Schrift” with no question mark to indicate uncertainty. In fact, this fragment joins directly 2514/c, published as KBo 17.99 and transcribed most recently by Neu (1980: 101–2). In that place Neu claims to have determined by autopsy of the original that the script is not Old Hittite, but Middle.

This just shows the danger of attempting fine distinctions in dating on the basis of small fragments. I am sure that Otten and Rüster are aware of this danger, but the fear is that confident statements made by them may not be accepted with the same caution by less experienced Hittitologists.

A volume such as this, containing an extremely large number of very small fragments can seem an exercise in useless publication. If a fragment is so small as to contain only two or three signs, one could object that there is no reason to publish it. But since the c-tablets come from a known reasonably small and confined area of the excavation from which other larger pieces have already been published, it is clear that even such small fragments can and will be identified and joined.

As my personal contribution to this joint enterprise, which must engage all active Hittitologists, I would like to make known here a number of joins and duplicates not noticed by the authors. Recognition of several of these fragments also made it possible (and indeed necessary) to correct readings of signs and to modify and enlarge the indices of proper names.

- Nr. 6 (967/c) joins to the top of KBo 14.7, which forms a part of fragment 20 of the composition "The Deeds of Suppiluliuma (I)," edited by Güterbock 1956. This necessitates the amending of the list of personal names to ^mMam[mali].
- Nr. 23 (37/c) is similar to KUB 39.14 iv 13–14 and therefore probably belongs to the Hittite royal funerary ritual.
- Nr. 24 contains lines from an invocation to the gods: "If you are in heaven, in earth, in the mountains, etc." [*ma-a-an-za AN-i ma-a-an-za K[I-i ma-a-an-za [... ma-a-an-z]a HURSAG-i* (lines 2'–3').
- Nr. 32 Lines 12'–17' can be restored from VBoT 128 ii 9–14 (CTH 470).
- Nr. 34 (1698/c) is joined by the authors to KBo 35.245, but they have overlooked another piece in this same volume. 145/c (Nr. 263) fits below Nr. 34 and to the left of KBo 35.245. This reconstruction makes possible the correction of line 13' from the copy's *ku-al/ra-d[a- to ku-e-d[a-...]*.
- Nr. 64 (518/d) is identified as a duplicate of KBo 15.37 iii 22–30. This must have been a typographical error, since it is Nr. 66 that is meant. For this passage as evidence for NINDA. KUR₄.RA GAKIN.AG see Hoffner (1974: 122 note 172). Nr. 64 is in fact a direct join to KBo 33.195 (243/q), with Nr. 64, line 1' continuing as KBo 33.195, line 8'. This would imply that 33.195 line 7' continued into the intercolumnium with GEŠTIN.
- Nr. 65 (165/p) is a duplicate to KBo 15.60 vi 1–11, the well-known scribal notation about Queen Puduḥepa's instigation of a search for tablets from Kizzuwatna.
- Nr. 66 See above under Nr. 64.
- Nr. 80 Similar in places to KBo 34.15 + 23.91 i 17ff. For the divine name in line 4' ^dU₄-MA-AM see van Gessel (1998: II 841).
- Nr. 117 seems to be a part of CTH 701.1 (Libation au trône de Ḫebat).
- Nr. 123 In line 7' read [... DINGIR].MEŠ-aš *pár-ḫu-^re'[-na-aš mu-mu-wa-i]*.
- Nr. 129 recalls CTH 423A (KUB 7.60) in line 2' [... *ša-a-u-wa-a*]r QA-TAM-MA *ki-i[š-ta-ru]*.
- Nr. 132 is similar to KBo 10.34 i 15ff.
- Nr. 141 is similar to Nr. 35.
- Nr. 167 is a duplicate to KBo 24.109 + KBo 15.24 iii 4–8 (CTH 415 "Rituel de fondation(?)") and its duplicate KBo 13.114 (244/s) ii 22'–26'. KBo 13.114, like KBo 24.109 + KBo 15.24, is about 18 to 19 signs in width in columns II and III, while KBo 40.167 is only about 10 signs in width. KBo 40.167 is part of a third manuscript, CTH 415 C. The identification of this piece also raises a question about one of the signs in the copy. In line 3' Otten copied 1 NINDA SIG. The duplicate has the "SIG" sign only partly preserved on the break of KBo 15.24 iii 6, and could just as well be [K]U₇. Usage in other contexts suggests that this should be NINDA.KU₇. Perhaps 1962/c B should be collated at this point. It may be difficult to determine, since, according to the Inhaltübersicht, 1962/c B is severely scorched. In the Inhaltsübersicht, Otten mentions another badly incrustated unpublished piece, 1962/c A, that he believes belongs to 1962/c B, but which he did not copy for this volume. Apparently on

- Nr. 169 (2/c) shows similarities to KBo 24.47 and 48. In line 3' read [1 *ku-up*]-*ti-in*.
- Nr. 170 While KBo 16.78 iv 9 is not strictly a duplicate to Nr. 170 ii 5–6, the wolf men and the archeress mentioned in both places make one wonder if the rest of line 6 should be read 3[MUNUS.MEŠ⁵ *iwan-teš*]. Column II shows similarities to both KBo 16.78 and KBo 17.31.
- Nr. 173 is similar to KUB 58.54 iii and its duplicate KBo 20.85 iii.
- Nr. 176 (1601/c). The noun *ga-ra-a-u* (immediately followed by *wa-aḥ-nu-zi*) in 11' is a hapax. Perhaps it is an object that is “turned.” But one also wonders if we have here an abbreviated expression, standing for the fuller *tarāur dāi ta pedi=šši=pat wahnuzi* “(s)he takes *tarāur* and turns about in place” attested in KUB 56.46 + KUB 43.48 i 2–3.
- Nr. 178 In lines 4'–5' read [*wa-wa-ar-ki-ma-an ŠA*] IM=ma / [*še-er-ši-it e*]-*ep-zi*. KBo 34.52:4 and its parallel KBo 21.6 obv. 15–16.
- Nr. 179 The obverse(?) may be an indirect join to KBo 20.70 + KBo 21.88 column III. In obv. 9" read ¹*tūḫ-hu-uš-ta*¹.
- Nr. 181 “Princes and princesses” are mentioned in line 5' followed by LÚ.MEŠ⁵ [SANGA ŠA d...]. The *ḥapalzil* and the container name *ḥariulli* in line 7' recall KUB 12.8 ii 2–3 [...]*x mar-nu-an* 1 ^{DUG}*ḥa-ri-ul-li* / [*ḥa*]-*pal-zi-li-it šu-u-an ti-an-zi*.
- Nr. 193 See above in the introductory general remarks. Joins 2514/c (KBo 17.99) directly at KBo 17.99 i 8'–14' (= StBoT 25: 101–2 Vs. I 24'–30').
- (8') *a-ap-pa* ^{DUG}ÚTUL-ša *pé[-eš-š]i-i[-e-ez]*-¹*zi*¹ [*ta-aš pít-ta-i* 1 ^{LÚ}*ḥa-a-pí-ia-aš*]

- The available space in the first break of line 14' may be too small to accommodate the restoration suggested by the duplicate KBo 17.42 + KUB 56.46 (Bo 2599) vi 22'–23' (Neu 1980: 103). A few readings of Bo 2599 vi by Neu (1980: 103) have been corrected here on the basis of the published copy in KUB 56.46. These were not noted in the “Addenda et Corrigenda ad StBoT 25” published by Neu (1983: 364). Perhaps something shorter than ŠA 2 *hu-up-pa-ra-an-ni* stood in this copy.

- Nr. 195 The DN in the first two lines, read only as acephalic $|x-li$ and $|x-šu$ in the DN index on page XIV, are $[^dHa-pa-an-t]al-li-in$ and $[^dKu-za-n]i-šu-un$. Perhaps the fragment belongs to CTH 627. Although Otten considers the ductus Middle Hittite, the Old Hittite forms of $e-uk-zi$ “he drinks” show it is OH/MS.
- Nr. 199 The DN $^dKam-ma-ma-a-a[n]$ in “Rs.?” 5' occurs here for the first time, if it is not an error for $^{URU}Kam-ma-ma-a-a[n]$.
- Nr. 200 From a photo one might be able to determine if what Otten copied as lines “x+1” and 5' in the right column are both overruns from the left column. Although he counted it as line 5' in his numbering of the right column, the signs ALAN(⟨ZU₉⟩ $pí-ra-an$ $x-x[...]$ clearly continue the LÚ.MEŠ immediately to their left, in the left column, and Otten drew them smaller and less deeply incised, as a later scribal addition. The signs in x+1 he also drew smaller. The same smaller writing is found in left column, lines 7'–9'.

- Nr. 201 Note ^{GIS}SAG.KUL “(door) bolt” in 3’ and ^{UZU}TI.ĪIA in 9’. Probably part of a festival text with Hurrian or Kizzuwatnean background.
- Nr. 205 In obv. 2’ read perhaps [... l]u-ú-i-li “in Luwian.”
- Nr. 217 A fragment whose text was difficult for Otten to copy. It has a number of mentions of deer (*LU-LIM*^{HLA}) and a goat (*MÁŠ.GAL*), a ruler/governor (EN KUR-TI rev. 5’), and speaker self-references (*ammugga*, verb *x-x-ia-nu-un*). There may also be a reference to catching deer: A-NA *LU-LIM*^{HLA} DIB-an-na (rev. 4’).
- Nr. 221 Mention in left col. 4’ of [ĪU]L-lu *he-en-kán* “an evil death.” In right col. 2’–3’ UR. G[Ī]!‘ĪIA’ “dogs” and ŠAĪ.TUR.ĪIA’ “piglets.” This reminds one a little of VBoT 58 i 12 (CTH 323). Perhaps a part of a disappearing deity myth.
- Nr. 223 The Luwian word *malwana-* occurs several times (4’, 6’). Part of a historical text or treaty, with first plural iterative verb *ka-ru-ú* [...] / [...] *halʔʔ-z[i-iš-ga-u[-en]* “Previously we used to [...],” and *nu-un-na-aš-kán* “and us” (5’, cf. 8’).
- Nr. 224 MH ductus according to Otten. Probably part of a MH treaty. Note the first plural verbs in 2’ and 8’. In 4’ read [... *li-in-ki-ia-aš*] *ut-tar*.
- Nr. 231 Direct join to KBo 15.48 i 17’–27’ (CTH 628). Duplicate Bo 7871 published in Wegner and Salvini (1986: 66): ‘A-NA ^{d1}Nu-pa-ti-ik pí-pí-ta-ma (18’) 1 TÚG! ‘SA₅’ TUR 1 TÚG E.ĪB MAŠ-LU TUR (19’) A-NA ^{d1}A¹-dam-ma ^dKu-pa-pa 1 TÚG.SA₅ TUR (20’) A-NA ^dU.[GU]R-[ma] 1 TÚG E.ĪB MAŠ-LU SA₅ (21’) *wa-aš-ša[-an-...]* ‘É¹ ^dNu-pa-ti-ik *za-al-ma-na-ia-kán* (22’) *wa-aš-ša-t[aʔ-...]* A-N]A ^dNu-pa-ti-ik pí-pí-ta-pát (23’) *ha-an-da[-...]* U]D.I.KAM QA-TIŠ (24’) *lu-uk-k[at-ta-ma-kán]* I-NA ... *hu-uh-ha-aš an-da-an* (25’) *at-t[a-aš DINGIR.MEŠ-aš]* xʔ *pa-ah-hu-e-ni-it* (26’) *wa-ah-n[ul-an-zi i-i]a-an-zi-ma ki-iš-ša-an* (27’) PA-NI [DINGIR.MEŠ A-BI-ŠU 1 ^{GI}ŠBANŠUR AD.KID.
- Nr. 237 The obverse(?) is similar to KBo 16.49 iv 1–10 (CTH 635.10): [^{NINDA}wa-] *ge-eš-šar* (3’), [*hu-el-p*] *i-in* (3’), [^{GI}ŠIN-BI (6’).
- Nr. 263 is direct join to Nr. 34 (q.v.).
- Nr. 289 The *ne-eg-na-aš-te-eš* of ii 14’ is the nominative form, which was logographically represented by the ubiquitous ŠEŠ=KA “your brother.” See Hoffner (1988) and *CHD L-N* sub *negna-* “brother”.
- Nr. 307 is a duplicate to KBo 23.1 + ABoT 29 i 11–16 (CTH 472: rituals of Ammiḫatna, Tulpi and Mati).
- Nr. 311 (502/c) joins directly KUB 39.14 (642/c + 2728/c (+) 2795/c) ii 5’–11’. *šar-tu-li-ia-li* (1’ + 39.14 ii 5’). 3’–4’ (= ii 7’–8’) mentions the burning of the musical instrument ([^{GI}ŠBALAG-ma) that was probably played in the mournful singing mentioned (*galgali=naiz[zi]* *nu* ^{MUNUS}*taptaraš wēškiwan dā[i]*) in KUB 39.14 i 10’–11’. The second item burned ought to be the plow (^{GI}ŠAPIN-an-na), but the break is too wide (^{GI}Šx-x-x[-an-na). This might be a syllabic writing, but the trace does not permit ^{GI}Šap-pa-l]a-an-na or ^{GI}Šap-pa-la-aš-š]a-an-na. Cf. Hoffner (1974: 45 n. 215; 1997: 110–11, 203), Friedrich and Kammenhuber (1975–84: 163), Puhvel, (1984: 96). The trace before -an-na in ii 7’ should be checked on the original. KBo 40.311 (502/c) rev. fits in the middle of KUB 39.14 iii 2–3.
- Nr. 313 is parallel to KUB 29.1 iv 17–19 (CTH 414). In line 4’ read [... *hur-pa-a]š-ta-nu-uš*.
- Nr. 314 is duplicate or parallel to KBo 19.142 (CTH 721) iii 1–11. This permits correcting Otten and Rüster’s copy in line 3’ to [ZA]G-it *ku!-i[t har-zi ...]*.
- Nr. 315 is similar to KUB 20.88 i 1–13 (CTH 647.5). This might be an indirect join.
- Nr. 323 might be part of a treaty or instructions. In line 5’ of the obverse(?) is a new word: *še-pí-ia-az*. Cf. also obv.(?) 6’.
- Nr. 326 might be a part of the royal funerary ritual (CTH 450).
- Nr. 338 “Rs. 5’ff.” was cited as unpublished by Belkis Dinçol (1996: 218–19) as part of her reconsideration of the character of the *lu-panni*. I would read obv. 1’ as [... ^dKán-ti-pu]l-it-ti NINDA.KUR₄.RA U[D]-M[I], and add this deity’s name to the indices.
- Nr. 341 looks like a part of a disappearing deity myth. Read in 4’ [... *UM-MA A-BI* ^dIM-MA and in 6’ *ad-da-aš hu-u[h-ḫi-iš-ši ...]*. Compare KUB 32.24 (+) 28 ii 2. This fragment contains an Akkadogram attested only rarely in Hittite texts: RA-²I-I-MI-IA “my dear/beloved (one)” (7’, 10’).

The Hittite word underlying this logogram must be *aššiyant-*. It also occurs as an Akkadogram in [ŠEŠ.DÜG.GA=YA] *RA-IM-MU-YA* “my dear brother, my beloved” in *HKM* 66:4 (Mašat letter), in the feminine *RA-IM-TI₄-KA-MA* in *KUB* 48.88:9 (royal letter), and in two Akkadian texts from Boğazköy: *KUB* 3.61:4 and *KUB* 3.83 obv. 5, rev. 3. Cf. CAD R sub *ra*⁷*imu*.

- Nr. 346 We see here an unusual shape of the LA sign in *la-la-wi₅-ša-* “ant” or “ant swarm” obv. 2’, 4’, 5’. If it means the former, it might seem strange at first sight to read *aši šalliš lalawišaš* “that large ant.” But words like “large” and “small” are always relative terms, and this only need mean an ant larger than most varieties. *IGI²-ta-at* (obv. 6’), coming at the end of its clause, has to be either a middle verb in *-tat* or contain the predicate (*IGI²-ta=at* or *IGI²-t=at*). The subject of iterative verbs *wakiškizzi* and *wakiškanzi* is probably the ant or ants. It is interesting to note that the bee “stings” (*šāi-*), while the ant “bites” (*wak-*). Judging from the compound noun *tarumaki-* “wood-pecker,” the verb *wak-* also describes the pecking of that bird.
- Nr. 349 Line 3’ *e-la-ni-e*[š- probably contains the verb *elaniye-*, which occurs principally in the Tunnawi ritual. See Friedrich and Kammenhuber (1988: s.v.) and Puhvel (1984: s.v.).
- Nr. 365 My colleague, Dr. Oğuz Soysal, called my attention to the purtenance of this fragment to the OH Zukraši text. He considers ^m*Za-u-lu-ti-in* a variant writing of the name [^m*Za²*]-*a-lu-di-iš* and ^m*Za²1*-*a-lu-ti-iš* of that text (*KBo* 7.14 obv. 14, cf. 16). There is, however, the possibility that the latter two, whose first sign is always at least partially broken away, should be read ^m*Ha-a-lu-ti-di-*. The ÉRIN.MEŠ *SA-AM-ḪA-R[A²]* of 6’ is familiar from the Yarim-Lim fragments (*KBo* 22.3 + *KUB* 36.103:3’, *KUB* 40.5 + *KBo* 22.4+ ii 5, with duplicate *KBo* 12.13 + *KUB* 40.4).
- Nr. 368 The language is Old Hittite, but the ductus is New Hittite. Two mountains are described: one filled with *eyan* trees, the other with *ḫarau* “poplar” (gen. *ḫaruwaš*). The attested genitive is *ḫaruwaš* (see Weitenberg [1984: 264–65] and Puhvel [1991: 141–42]).
- Nr. 369 The form *ki-it-ḫa-ḫa-ri* in line 8’ looks faulty. A form *ki-iš-ḫa-ḫa-ri* exists (from *kiš-*),

but I know of no middle verb *kit-*. With *šešzi*, *UMMA ŠU=MA* and *kišḫaḫari* and the many examples of direct discourse marked with *-wa*, there is a strong resemblance to *KUB* 60.98.

- Nr. 371 The left column is a duplicate to *KBo* 3.23 i 9–13, on which see Archi (1979: 41–42): (2’) [... *na-at-kán ša-an-ḫ*] *a-an* (3’) [*e-eš-du nu le-e za-a*] *p-pí-ia-at-ta* § (4’) [... *DUG.GAL.ḪIA DUG*].*TUR.ḪIA* ^{DUG}*ḪAB.ḪAB.ḪIA*. It is not a join to *KUB* 31.115. It might be an indirect join to *KBo* 14.41, but certainly not a direct one.
- Nr. 372 looks like part of a literary text (myth?). In line 10’ we have a nice simile: ^{GIŠ}*ši-ia-tal* *GIM-an ḪURSA*[G ...] “Like a shaft the mountain [...]”. In line 6’ [...] *ZÍZ-aš A.ŠA-LAM* *GIM-an* “like a field of wheat.” The new word, *išd/tarawanza*, occurs in 3’ and 11’, and ^{GIŠ}*iyatar=m[et]* and *darawar=m[et]* in 4’ and 8’.

The co-authors, Otten and Rüster, deserve our thanks for this very useful volume of fragments from the 1933 season. I am sure that other reviewers will be able to add to the identifications I have made, as will Dr. Košak in his future volumes of the Konkordanz series.

References

- Archi, A.
1979 L’humanité des hittites. Pp. 37–48 in *Flori-legium Anatolicum. Mélanges offerts à Emmanuel Laroche*, ed. E. Masson. Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard.
- Dincol, B.
1996 Bemerkungen über einige hethitische Kleidungsstücke. *Anadolu Arasturmaları* 14: 217–28.
- Friedrich, J., and A. Kammenhuber
1975– *Hethitisches Wörterbuch. Zweite, völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage. Band I*: A. Heidelberg: Winter.
1988 *Hethitisches Wörterbuch. Zweite, völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage. Band II*: E. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Güterbock, H. G.
1956 The Deeds of Suppiluliuma I as Told by His Son, Mursili II. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 10: 41–68, 75–98, 107–30.
- Hoffner, H. A., Jr.
1974 *Alimenta Hethaeorum*. American Oriental Series 55. New Haven: American Oriental Society.
1988 A Scene in the Realm of the Dead. Pp. 191–99 in *A Scientific Humanist. Studies in Memory of*

- Abraham Sachs, ed. E. Leichty, M. d. Ellis and P. Gerardi. Philadelphia: University Museum.
- 1997 *The Laws of the Hittites. A Critical Edition.* Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui 23. Leiden: Brill.
- Košak, S.
- 1992 Konkordanz der Keilschrifttafeln I. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 34. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- 1995 Konkordanz der Keilschrifttafeln II. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 39. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- 1998 Konkordanz der Keilschrifttafeln III. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 42. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Neu, E.
- 1980 *Althethitische Ritualtexte in Umschrift.* Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 25. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- 1983 *Glossar zu den althethitischen Ritualtexten.* Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten. Heft 26. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Puhvel, J.
- 1984 *Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Volumes 1&2:* A. Trends in Linguistics. Documentation 1. Berlin: Mouton.
- 1991 *Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Volume 3: H.* Trends in Linguistics. Documentation 5. Berlin: Mouton.
- van Gessel, B. H. L.
- 1998 *Onomasticon of the Hittite Pantheon. 2 volumes.* Handbuch der Orientalistik, Erste Abteilung: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten; v. 33: 1–2. Leiden: Brill.
- Wegner, I., and M. Salvini
- 1986 *Die Rituale des AZU-Priesters.* Corpus der hurritischen Sprachdenkmäler I/2. Roma: Multigrafica Editrice.
- Weitenberg, J. J. S.
- 1984 *Die hethitischen U-Stämme.* Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Vladimir É. Orel and Olga V. Stolbova, *Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary: Materials for a Reconstruction.* Handbuch der Orientalistik. Erste Abteilung, Nahe und der Mittlere Osten; Abt. 1, Bd. 18. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995. Pp. xxxvii + 578.

Reviewed by Gábor Takács, Hungary.

The work under review, abbreviated here as *HSED*, is intended to reflect our present knowl-

edge of the lexical reconstruction of Proto-Afro-Asiatic (or Proto-Semito-Hamitic), encompassing all previous research on the matter. In this review I will try to ascertain whether or not Orel and Stolbova have succeeded in accomplishing their goal.

The authors worked on this project between 1986–1993, and their book of more than 570 pages appeared in 1995. The previous major attempt on an Afro-Asiatic dictionary was the *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskij slovar' afrazijskich jazykov* (*SISAJa*), which was published in three thin volumes between 1981 and 1986 in Moscow. This was the fruit of the teamwork of a group of Russian specialists in Afro-Asiatic led by I. M. Diakonoff that included A. G. Belova (Semitic), A. J. Militarev (Berber), V. J. Porhomovskij (Chadic), and O. V. Stolbova (Chadic). (V. É. Orel was not member of this team.) Unfortunately, the project had to remain unfinished: the three volumes covered only the words with initial labial stops (*b-, *p-, *f-, *p̥-); dental stops (*d-, *t-, *t̥-) and affricates (*s-, *c-, *č-, *ʒ-, *č̣-, *č̣̣-, *š-, *ĉ-, *ĉ̣-). After 1986, Diakonoff's team split up.

Since the Diakonoff project was never finished, the only “complete” (in a broader sense) Afro-Asiatic dictionary before the *HSED* was Cohen's famous *Essai comparatif* from 1947. (A parallel study by Ehret on the reconstruction of Proto-Afro-Asiatic appeared in 1995, but this work is to be subject to a separate review.) The authors had the task of summarizing the results of nearly fifty years' research in a scholarly field that has witnessed revolutionary progress since the sixties.

Throughout their dictionary, Orel and Stolbova propose many new lexical comparisons that have not yet been discussed either in the *SISAJa* or in other recent publications of the “Moscow school” of comparative Afro-Asiatic linguistics. Many of these new etymologies result from the relatively rich presentation of the Chadic material in this dictionary. This is not surprising since the main field of research of Stolbova is Chadic comparative linguistics. It is my impression that the “strongest” and most interesting part of the *HSED* is just the Chadic lexical material, while the most poorly presented one is Berber. This does not mean, however, that the treatment of Chadic material in this book is without problems.