

THOUGHTS ON A NEW VOLUME OF A HITTITE DICTIONARY

HARRY A. HOFFNER, JR.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Professor Jaan Puhvel's *Hittite Etymological Dictionary* is a primary tool not only for Indo-Europeanists, but for all who seek to interpret Hittite texts. In the absence of a complete up-to-date philological dictionary his four published volumes serve the philologist, and not merely the historical linguist. Nor does one need to agree with all his interpretations in order to appreciate the skill and industry that has allowed him, working alone and without major grant funding, to produce these volumes so quickly. For this he deserves high praise and the gratitude of all. In the present article one of the co-editors of the Chicago *Hittite Dictionary* evaluates the latest volume (K). While approving much that it contains, he finds some shortcomings, noticed by reviewers of earlier volumes in the set, still uncorrected.

JAAN PUHVEL'S DICTIONARY (*HED*), the first volume of which was published in 1984, reaches in 1997 the halfway point of the alphabet. In his preface the author raises the possibility of a slightly different emphasis and procedure for the second half of the alphabet, in view of the good philological coverage of L–P presently available in the *Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (*CHD*) and good etymological coverage of L–T in J. Tischler's *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar* (*HeGl*; 1977 ff.). But he is yet unwilling or unable to specify what changes in approach will be implemented. One hopes that the existence of competent philological coverage of L–P will allow Puhvel to forego such dense citations of passages from Hittite texts and focus instead upon the etymological possibilities.

As he observes, given the death of A. Kammenhuber, the editor of the *Hethitisches Wörterbuch* (*HW²*), which is based at least in part on the lexical *Nachlass* of J. Friedrich, and the slower output of her successor, I. Hoffmann, it will be some time before a current philological treatment of the K words, which are the subject of the volume under review, will appear. *HW²* has thus far covered *a* to *ha*. The section *hi*, *hu* and all of *i* will probably take at least three years to cover. The *CHD*, having covered L, M, N, and P, needs yet to complete S, T, U, W, Z, A, E, H and I, before tackling K last.

Since earlier volumes of *HED* have been thoroughly evaluated by reviewers, it is necessary at this point only to make a brief estimation, supported by a selection of detailed criticisms. Puhvel's reputation in the field of Indo-European studies is well established. His work in the field of Hittitology is more restricted. He has published no text edition, nor has he written on matters of Hittite history or economy. Cultural matters (law, literature, religion, art, etc.) are only touched upon peripherally in connection with linguistic studies. Puhvel has written no systematic book or article on such subjects. Understandably, his approach is always comparative, with all the promise and risks that this entails. Although his experience within Hittitology is restricted, the citations of secondary literature in the pages of the *HED* are generally quite appropriate and up-to-date, although more limited than *HW²* or *CHD*, and somewhat non-standard in form. Puhvel's translational style is florid and adventuresome, often raising the suspicion that he likes to use his English thesaurus to find the most *recherché* word possible (see examples under *kallara-*, *ganeš(š)-*, *karp-*, *kakattiya-*, *gul(š)-*). This style—in many ways so colorful and amusing to readers—unfortunately leads occasionally to regrettable inaccuracies and anachronism, which is particularly misleading to comparative linguists not as familiar as he with the primary data and literature of Hittite. For example, it may be etymologically acceptable to call a functionary in rituals an "operative" (p. 56, sub *kantikipi-*), but in ordinary American English an "operative" is a kind of detective or spy!

The organization of the *HED* is for the most part happily uniform. Text citations are arranged in the sequence

This is a review-article of: *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, vol. 4: *Words beginning with K*. By JAAN PUHVEL. Trends in Linguistics, vol. 14: Berlin: WALTER DE GRUYTER, 1997. Pp. ix + 333. DM 248.

of the inflected forms of the word in question, regardless of the English translation or shade of meaning. This makes locating the treatment of a particular form found in a Hittite text much easier than in dictionaries which organize the citations within each article according to semantic or syntactic criteria. Of course, there is a trade-off: it is easier to find all examples of a particular meaning or syntactical construction in the other dictionaries. But since the first occurrence of an inflectional form is not marked either by bold type or a new paragraph, it is not easy to find where a new section begins. Nor does Puhvel attempt to date text citations other than by giving a rare generalization about an Old Hittite text. This makes it difficult for users to decide what is likely inherited Proto-Indo-European or Common Proto-Anatolian versus (for example) a New Hittite innovation.

The *HED* continues to use the transliteration system for Sumerian (i.e., for Sumerograms) employed prior to the appearance of Christel Rüster's and Erich Neu's *Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon* (*HZL*; Wiesbaden, 1989), whereas most Hittitologists and both *HeGl* and *CHD* have adopted the modernized system. Even some of the improvements already used by J. Friedrich in his *Hethitisches Wörterbuch* (*HW*), such as *UMBIN* "wheel" for earlier *DUBBIN*, have not been implemented in the *HED*. Furthermore, Puhvel retains the inadequate (indeed misleading) interpretation of the *DIN* sign as *-tin* in the 2nd pl. pret. and imperative of verbs, instead of the value *-tén* employed by *HZL* and most Hittitologists.

Puhvel attempts to use the older system of citing volumes in the two major German series of Hittite cuneiform publications (*KBo* and *KUB*): volumes in the former are cited, e.g., as *KBo* XIV 5, but those in the latter as simply *XIV* 5. But he has not avoided the danger of that system, for one finds all too often, particularly in citing the Hittite laws, "VI 2" (= *KUB* VI 2), when what is meant is *KBo* VI 2.

His bibliographical references follow a system of his own, which makes using the *HED* a particular chore for Hittitologists. It would have been better had he followed the system established for *HW*, *HW*², or the *CHD*. And since the *Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten* (= *StBoT*) and *Texte der Hethiter* (= *THeth*) series are so well known, it is particularly unfortunate that he chose not to use the familiar series references (*StBoT* 32, etc.). The use of a non-standard set of abbreviations only exacerbates the situation when he fails to list the abbreviation in his tables—for example, "Copenhagen fragment" (p. 3). Certain works that are of particular applicability seem never to be referenced. *HED* K bears a publication date 1997. The manuscript probably went to the printer in 1996. I failed to find in the tables of bibliographical abbreviations any

of the following works that appeared prior to 1996: Pecchioli Daddi and Polvani, *La mitologia ittita* (Brescia, 1990); H. Hoffner, *Hittite Myths* (Atlanta, 1990); V. Haas, *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion* (Leiden, 1994); G. F. del Monte, *Répertoire géographique des textes cunéiformes* (Wiesbaden, 1992); idem, *L'annalistica ittita* (Brescia, 1993); J. Jie, *A Complete Retrograde Glossary of the Hittite Language* (Leiden, 1994); E. Laroche, *Glossaire de la langue hourrite* (Paris, 1978–79); M. Marazzi, *Il geroglifico anatolico: Problemi di analisi e prospettive di ricerca* (Rome, 1990); G. McMahon, *The Hittite State Cult of the Tutelary Deities* (Chicago, 1991); H. C. Melchert, *Studies in Hittite Historical Phonology* (Göttingen, 1984); idem, *Anatolian Historical Phonology* (Atlanta, 1994); M. Popko, *Religions of Asia Minor* (Warsaw, 1995). I would also recommend that in future volumes the author cite the translations of transcribed passages found in volumes in the series *Writings from the Ancient World* (Atlanta: Scholars Press), which began appearing in 1990, as well as those in *The Context of Scripture* (Leiden: Brill), edited by W. W. Hallo and J. L. Younger.

Usually the author uses proper restraint by not trying to cite every known example of a given form when that form is routine. But there are still too many cases where he abandons restraint and fills pages with unnecessary and redundant examples (see *kalmuš-*, *kanešš-*, *kappuwai-* [five full pages], *karp-*, *katta(n)*, *kiš-*).

Are all known words covered? Previous reviewers have already complained about the lack of cross reference entries. Without such, one has to know in advance under what basic word the editor has listed a word allegedly derived from it. This is a serious weakness in the organization of the dictionary and one that the editor can still rectify in future volumes.

ka-: In addition to the near deixis "this," Hittite *ka-* often alludes to what immediately follows, as *apa-* "that" (remote deixis) often alludes to what immediately precedes. But there are interesting, if rare, exceptions: *StBoT* 24 ii 29–30 "The preceding (lit. this) was my first manly deed; on this campaign for the first time my lady Šauška proclaimed my name" (p. 4). See also *kiššan* in *karū kišan ēššir kinun=a* 6 *GfN.GfN* "formerly they did as previously described, but now . . ." (p. 11). *HED* K 3 adds a translation "my, mine, our(s)," which is totally gratuitous, as shown by such explicit writings as *ki šahha(n)=met* "this is my *šahhan*." The form *ke-e-et* (p. 5) in both its cited occurrences is in Old Hittite Script (OS). The form *ke-e-da-an-na* (*KBo* 13.78 obv. 8), which is a variant of *ke-e-da-an-ia* and as such is listed as instrumental (p. 6) is clearly corrupt, as shown by the corrupt *pattanius* (for *pattani*) that accompanies it. The abl.-inst.

form *kez* also has a temporal meaning "at this time," which Goetze showed existed *inter alia* in AM 104 (translated in HED K 6 as "hence"). Contra HED 6 the toponym Kizzuwatna has nothing to do with the abl. *kez*, since Luwians would not have used a Hittite (versus Luwian) abl. form! "Luwoid phonetics" indeed! The form *ke(-e)-ez-zi-ia* is to be analyzed as *kezzi* + *-ya* "and," not *kezz-ya* (p. 7). There would have been no need for the allomorph *-ya* "and," had not the preceding form ended in a vowel. Cf. Luwian ablative ending *-ati*. After assibilation of the dental before the high vowel, the *i* in unprotected final position elided. In *kezziya* it is neither final nor unprotected, and is therefore preserved. The loc. pl. form *ki-i-e-da-aš* (p. 10) is also unreal, the product of a scribe uncertain which plene vowel writing to use. Cf. *pt-i-e-da-i* commented on in CHD P 346. The writing *ki-iš-ša* (for *kiššan*) in *kišša memai* "he speaks as follows" is either due to sandhi or is a scribal error.

kaena- "in-law": KUB 13.20 i 32-33 (p. 13) is the most helpful passage, showing relationships from the closest (members of the same house or nuclear family), through other blood relations (*haššannašši*), and marriage ties (*kaenanti*), to social or business ties (*are=šši*): The sequence is from closest to most remote. There is a serious and unnecessary error in translating KBo 3.14 i 16-18, which must be rendered "slaughtered him before the eyes of Šarmaššu and Nunnu." See below, remarks on *kuša*.

kakkapa:- Puhvel does not inform the reader that, although this word apparently denotes a bird, it never has the MUŠEN determinative.

HED's *kakapi*- (p. 15), allegedly written *ga-qa-pt-(i)-eš*, is actually a misreading of ^{DUG}*qa-pt-(i)-eš*, whose usual writing is ^{DUG}*kappi*.

kakkari-, *kāhari*:- The "k : ḫ variation in Hittite" adduced here (*hazkara* > *hazhara*-, *iškišaza* > *išḫišaza*) is conditioned by direct contact with a sibilant.

gagaštiya:- Just because this animal leaps (*watku*-) doesn't mean it has to be a hare. One also thinks of antelope, grasshopper, etc. Since not all grasshoppers are locusts, the existence of a separate word *maša*- for the latter does not exclude "grasshopper" as a candidate for *gagaštiya*-. The partial reduplication may suggest a repetitive sound such as that of a cricket.

kaki- may be *kaka*- "tooth" with a different stem vowel. If the *šuppiwašhar* is a head of garlic, peeling it back to its core would produce tooth-like cloves. See my discussion in Hoffner 1974.

kalank:- At times the author's flowery English produces entirely the wrong effect. A "decked man" (p. 19), rather than one "decked out," conveys to the average speaker a man knocked down by another!

kallešš:- Of the six(!) English verbs proposed to translate this word, only "summon (up)" is valid. English "adduce" in common use only means to cite as an example or to bring forward for consideration. When the priest of Telipinu goes to *kallešš*- the king's son, he goes to call or summon him, not to cite him as an example. "House of *kallištarwana*-" is translated "house of feasting" and "house of partying" within four lines of one another on p. 23. This conveys an attitude of carelessness on the part of the editor, unless he wishes seriously to suggest that the two mean different things. The *wekantan TUG-an* is hardly an "in-demand dress," since the Hittites weren't shopping at Neiman-Marcus at Christmas! Rather the dress was "borrowed" (passive participle of *wek*- "to ask for, request").

kallikalli:- The Sumerogram should be read SUR₁₄ with HZL, not the obsolete "SÜR." Puhvel's translation of KUB 19.20 rev. 19-20 "the falcon does not chase alone" suggests that the bird hunts in flocks or groups, which of course is not true of falcons. Either the translation is incorrect or the *kallikalli* bird is not a falcon. I suspect the former is the case. The question could be a rhetorical one, implying that the opposite is true.

kalgalinai:- HED renders "clash, crash." Verbs in *-ai*- are usually denominatives, not noted here by Puhvel. Both Laroche and Otten wisely took the subject of *kalgalinai* in the funerary passages to be a person, not the pottery vessel that falls to the ground and breaks. They conceived the verb to describe a kind of singing or wailing. When a pottery vessel breaks, it does not "clang" like a metal one does! By the way, ^{MUNUS}*tapdaraš*, though formally singular common gender, is actually a collective noun, denoting wailing women, not one wailing woman. In this it is like ^{MUNUS}*hazgarai*-. It would have been wise to give a bibliography for words for singing and music at the end of this article.

kalmara:- Nowadays many (among them H. C. Melchert) would prefer to regard the neuter-like forms of nouns clearly common gender in the singular as collectives. Thus *kalmara* and *galmara* "rays" are collective, as opposed to count-plurals. On p. 27, I seriously doubt that the rare word *herinaš* should be translated "cedar-brands" with Puhvel, since the correct form *irimpas* is in the same context of KUB 15.34, and there is no evidence of ḫ in words for cedar in ancient west Asiatic languages (Akk. *erinnu*, West Semitic ²rz).

kalmuš:- Far too many routine and uninformative examples are cited. The many similar examples of the nom.-acc. sg. tend to obscure the few significant different ones, like the dative-locative sg. ^{GIS}*kal-mu-ši* (p. 29). And despite this proliferation, Puhvel has missed a few crucial

ones: Luw. abl. ^{GIS}kal-mu-ša-ti-ia KUB 28.9 + 44.60 rev. 10, abl. ^{GIS}kal-mu-ša-az KBo 34.149 + KUB 34.127 ii 15, instr. ^{GIS}kal-mu-ši-it 473/it i 13'-15' cited in H. Hoffner, *Mem. Finkelstein*, 105. I remain skeptical of Puhvel's theory that *kalmuš-* is derived via metathesis from Akkadian *gamlu*. Pace Puhvel, Hittite had no trouble with the sequence *aml*, as seen in *šamluwant-* and ^{URU}Tamlutaš. And where do we see other examples of Akkadian forms metathesized when entering Hittite? If there is evidence, it should be adduced.

galdi-, kalti-: The explanation of Hittite syllabic *gal-di* originating in Sumerian "GAL.DI = GAL.SILIM matching Hitt. *āššu zēri*" stretches credulity to the breaking point. All of this wild theorizing comes from one who is neither a Sumerologist nor an Assyriologist. A "pot of comfort" is a very anachronistic expression to read back into Hittite culture.

kalulupa- "digit, finger, toe": The passage cited from KBo 32.13 describing the goddess Allani has been misunderstood. Had Puhvel consulted (or at least cited) the edition in StBoT 32, he might have translated correctly. *miyawēš* . . . *kalulupēš* is not "soft fingers" (*miu-* "soft"), but "four fingers."

kaluppa-: Contra Puhvel, a *lupanni-* is certainly not a "bonnet"! The ^{TÜGE}.ĪB is a sash or belt; the English word "girdle" (especially in describing women's attire!) conjures up a corset.

kaluti-: Under the derived verb *kalutiya-* the participial form *kalutiyanterš* KBo 23.67 ii 23 has been missed.

kammara-: Although it is certainly true that *kammara-* "mist, smoke" was also used to denote a swarm of bees, it is an unsupported supposition that the *kammara-* that (in synonymous pairing with *tuhhuiš* "smoke") gripped the windows of the houses as a result of Telipinu's departure was "bee-swarming." The synonymous pairing with *tuhhuiš* disproves this. But one would also have expected NIM.LAL (H.A.)-aš *kammaraš* "a swarm of bees," had the narrative really meant this.

kanešš-: The meaning is uncontested, although Puhvel has again dumped his thesaurus on the hapless reader with twelve roughly synonymous English expressions! On p. 43 in citing the Hittite laws dealing with theft of stud livestock he has retained the obsolete interpretation of *parkunu-* "to purify" as "cleans it [viz., of markings]," ignoring Güterbock's decisive demonstration (1961) that the meaning is "castrates." See now CHD P sub *parkunu-*. *kanešš-* means "to know, recognize, honor." It never means "reward," as is erroneously claimed on p. 44 for KUB 26.58 obv. 7-8, and p. 45 for KBo 4.12 obv. 8-12.

kank-: Under the derived verb *kanganu-* the alleged neut. sg. iterative part. *kā]n-ga-nu-uš-kān* is from KUB

42.83 iv 5, not "*KUB XLII 29 VI 5*," and the trace of the first sign makes the reading *kā]n* very unlikely.

kanka(n)ti- denotes a specific kind of herb or green plant. It should not itself be translated "garden produce, garden greens" or the like. Again, far too many unproductive and redundant examples are cited over two pages.

kangur denotes a large container for liquids. In KUB 35.36 ii 20-21, 33-34 a cup (GAL-i-) is taken from a *kangur*, which may indicate that it occasionally served as a place on which cups were set. Puhvel's sole translation "tankard" is highly misleading, since a tankard is a small drinking vessel. If the connection with *kank-* "to hang" is not merely coincidental and superficial, it does not indicate that the *kankar* itself "hung," but rather that other smaller vessels (e.g., cups) hung from it.

kant-: This and other entries in the K volume (e.g., *karaš*) deal with cereal names. They should have been dealt with more systematically, with consistent comparing of what each contributes to the total picture of Hittite cereal culture. This has not been done here, although reference is made to discussions in HED K, 35 (*halki-*). Rather, each term is summarily and arbitrarily assigned a specific botanical identification. *kant-* is confidently called "einkorn wheat (*Triticum monococcum*)." Reference to Hoffner 1974 in the bibliography is routine, but not much is used from that (albeit now somewhat dated) systematic study. As it showed even in its day, one cannot derive botanical identifications of even Sumerograms in Hittite texts, much less the syllabically written terms, without comparison with botanical remains from Hittite sites. In recent years these have in fact been forthcoming. Hoffner 1974 already cited Korucutepe results. What evidence has emerged suggests a much smaller role for emmer wheat than has been assumed from knee-jerk translations of *ZÍZ* as "emmer," or even "spelt"!

kantaš(š)u(w)alli- is considered a derivative of *kant-* and its function (without any textual support!) even surmised on this basis: it is a vessel to be filled with *kant-* wheat. All this without considering whether or not there is any evidence to suggest that the Hittites ever stored cereals in metal containers (*k.* often has the determinative ^{URUDU} "copper").

kappani- "cumin": Usually HED provides quasi-encyclopediaic information about the items described by the key word. It is therefore surprising that in this long article nothing is said about either the units of measure (*BÁN, UPNU*) or the kind of containers used (^{KUŠ}*lag-gašdu*). ^{URU}*Kāpanuwanta* should be compared with ^{URU}*Wiyānuwanta* rather than a Greek parallel.

kapa/tri-: In this article the logograms *PÉŠ* and *PÉŠ.TUR* are treated as essentially synonymous with

kapari-, although the only similarity is the use of *PEŠ* as a determinative for *k*. This is not unimportant, since it is *PEŠ.TUR* (*mašḫul-*), not *k*, that is the so-called "scape-mouse." *k* is a rodent; that is about all that can be determined at this point.

kappi- "small": The KBo 11.14 ii 20–21 passage has been mistranslated. It should be rendered "just as a small particle escapes from the grindstone" (*NA⁴ARÀ-za* is an ablative, not the subject of the verb). Puhvel's example for the nom. pl. is mistranslated rather ludicrously as "the midgets dance," whereas *LÜ.MEŠ kap-pi^{HLA}* should actually be read *LÜ.MEŠ^{HLA}UB.BI^{HLA}* "the acrobats." One can just imagine how this passage will be used by the unwary to prove the Hittites used midgets!

kappilai-: Under the derivative *kappilalli-* the verb *šuppiyaḫḫ-*, with object a city devoted (*šipant-*) to a deity, is strangely translated twice as "cleaned it out," whereas the obvious meaning is "made sacrosanct." The procedure was to transplant the population of such cities to other cities and place a ban on the resettlement of the tabooed city. Thus *nu = war = an dannataḫḫun nu = war = an šuppiyaḫḫun* is the expected sequence.

kappuwai-: Fourteen verbal phrases are offered to translate *EGIR-an kappuwai-* (p. 66)! This seems an extreme case of thesaurus-dumping.

karap-: On p. 73 Puhvel gives a nice summary of the distinction between *ed-* "to eat" and *karap-* "to devour." But it is not nuanced. While it is generally true that *ed-* is used for normal human eating and *karap-* for animals and demonic deities, sometimes even *ed-* is used for the demonic deities' eating (KBo 8.35 ii 19–20), while even humans can devour one another (KBo 34.121 2–3, KUB 8.18:2), just as fire devours (KBo 12.128 right 5').

karas is declared to be wheat, specifically emmer wheat, without real evidence.

karimn-: The relationship between *É DINGIR-LIM* (*š-unaš per?*) and *karimn-* is difficult to ascertain. Puhvel suggests the former is a temple complex and the latter an isolated cult edifice. This is possible. But there is evidence that points in the opposite direction. KUB 13.4 iii 36–37 "within a temple (*É DINGIR-LIM*) or other shrine (*Ékarimme*)" implies that the *É DINGIR-LIM* itself is a *karimmi*. This in turn implies that it is the broader term representing a cult building in general.

karp-: Among the scores of cited passages (far more than necessary) there are a few which allegedly support (or illustrate) the meaning "pluck." These are incorrect. For example, on p. 94 KBo 19.128 iv 17–18 and KBo 4.9 v 29–31 are cited without telling the reader that in the context the king orders that the instruments be *karp-ed*, whereupon his servants *karp-* them and bring them in to the king. The sequence indicates that they "lift" (*karp-*)

them and bring them in (*anda pedanzi*); it would make no sense for them to be played first and then brought to the king. The *karp-* action is merely preparatory to *anda peda-*. On p. 97 it is claimed that the use of *karea/ip-* of picking fruits illustrates the basic meaning, from which the "lift" meaning derives. But it seems to me that "lift > remove > pick (fruit)" is the most obvious line of semantic development.

karš-: Again, far too many English synonyms are loaded in the lemma. Some have little chance of being accurate. In colloquial American English the verb "sequester" is used chiefly of isolating a jury from outside influences. This is not the meaning of *karš-*. It is true that, with animals belonging to herds, flocks or other groups, *karš-* can refer to isolating them from the rest. But *HED* translates all of these differently: "sequester," "segregate," and "cut off" (pp. 100–101). I would prefer "isolate" or "segregate" for all three passages. In KUB 8.50 iii 15–16 (p. 101) the "stakes" are not *winat*, but *winala*, the singular of which is *ú-e-na-al* (derivative of verb *wen-* "to strike"), as cited on p. 196.

karši-: The meanings suggested are almost all wrong. The base meaning of the adjective is "real" or "true." The adverb means "truly" or "loyally." With the verb *zahḫiya-* "to fight" the adverb *karši* (*HED*'s "all out") means "loyally," from which it follows that it is also "wholeheartedly." There is no necessary connection with the plant name *karšani(ya)-* and hence no need to posit "astringent, caustic" as the common denominator. Nor is there any reason to assume that *kar-še-ia-aš* KUB 32.103 ii 10 is nom. pl. of *karši-*, instead of a gen., which would make it a noun indicating the cereal out of which the bread was made. Accordingly, it does not mean "unbaked (bread)." The plant name *karšani(ya)-* may have a distant relationship to *karša-*, the alternate form of *kar-aš*.

kartai- probably has nothing to do with *tar-ta-an* or *tar-ta-an-ti*, since *TAR* as a logogram of this verb has never been established. Puhvel's "solution" of the difficult *tar-ta-an* is therefore ad hoc. Sumerian *TAR* occurs in Hittite only as the second component of *LÜ(MEŠ)GADA.TAR*, not (so far) as an independent verbal logogram. Here it is claimed that *lammar TAR-tan* refers to the hour when the "thread of life" is severed. But grammatically it is nothing but the "hour" (*lammar*) itself that is *TAR/tar-ta-an* "... ed."

karū: To my knowledge there is no evidence that *LÜKAL* (i.e., *LÜGURUŠ*) in Hittite denotes a "champion." Rather it means *mayant-* "young adult male" (cf. *CHD*, s.v.). The spelling *ka-a-ru-ū* in 91/d iv 5, if verifiable, poses a serious problem for Puhvel's etymology. He objects to E. Neu's etymology, claiming that "*karū* has clear reference to cosmic time rather than circadian rhythms of living

beings" (p. 115). But this conflicts with his earlier claim (p. 114) that "There is a clear connection [of *karū*] with *kariwariwar* ... 'at daybreak.'" The latter is obviously circadian and has nothing to do with cosmic time.

karza: This word has recently been clarified in a public lecture by H. C. Melchert, which will soon be published. I would say that *karzanaz daškanzi* should mean "they take ... from [abl.] the *k*" not "with the *k*."

kāša: Like others before him, Puhvel has overlooked my remarks (Hoffner 1968) which demonstrated the inadequacy of the translation "look here, lo, behold" and pointed out the true force of *kāša*, *kāšma* in affecting the verbal action.

kaši:- Perhaps nothing illustrates better the arbitrariness of some of the semantics of *HED* than this article. With no objective control, confronted with three Hittite words allegedly meaning "white" (*ḫarki*-, *ašara*-, *kaši*-), Puhvel decides that *ašara*- is "bright white," *kaši*- "off white," while *ḫarki*- is passed over in silence. What either in texts or archaeological remains can possibly verify such a claim? Nothing is offered as evidence other than an etymology.

kašdupai:- One would think that it might have occurred to Puhvel that the rare *kadupai*- treated elsewhere (p. 140) is the same verb, perhaps by scribal omission of the -*aš*-sign. On the other hand, no evidence is given why we should emend GA *ka-aš-du-la-aš* to GA *ka-aš-du<pu>-la-aš*. The *pu* sign is certainly a larger sign to omit than -*aš*-. All that we can determine about *kašdupai*- is that (with *šarā* "up[wards]") it takes oil as its object. Puhvel's "to sprinkle" is only one of many possible translations. "Scoop up" is another. Only he knows why *kašdupai*- "makes the impression of a more homespun, phonesthetic addition" to the alleged synonyms *ḫurnai*- (actually *ḫarnai*-) and *papparš*-.

katta(n): Under the derived verb *katteraḫḫ*- (p. 133) the translation "disparage" should be deleted; Puhvel does not attempt to document this meaning. All cited examples show a judiciary act "rule against."

katkattiya:- According to the *OED*, the verb "shrug" in the meaning "to shiver or shudder from cold or fear" is archaic and now obsolete. Its only current meaning is to raise the shoulders in a gesture of doubt, disdain or indifference. It should not, therefore, be used to translate *katkattiya*- in the action of horses after they have been doused with water. "Shiver" or "tremble" are the clearer translations.

katra:- The term "operative" has unfortunate and misleading overtones. "Functionary" or "official" would have been more accurate.

kattu:- KUB 43.60, the only place where this term occurs, is admittedly difficult to understand. But I am convinced that C. Watkins was right in his understanding

of *kaddušmit* as the instrumental **kaddut* = *šmit* "with their *k*," confirmed by *kad-du-ut uḏau* in KUB 43.60 i 17, not cited here by Puhvel. The translations of *kattu*- and *kadduwai*- here ("aggrieved") are to me quite unconvincing. *kattawatar* and its cognates are another story; I am not convinced they are derived from this **kattu*-.

kadupai:- See remarks above on *kašdupai*-. Here we have another regrettable lapse into the "touchy, feely" world of "phonesthetic feel." Oh, to be so intuitive!

gem-, etc.: This is a very good article, containing a helpful assemblage of information about spellings and forms. This isn't to say, however, that one agrees with all that is in it. On p. 144, in discussing KUB 13.1 iv 12-13 and KUB 13.2 iv 23-24, Puhvel has overlooked Hoffner 1971, where these two passages were combined and clarified. *aniyatta*[. . .] is not "vestments" here, nor should one read GÜB-*aš* "leftovers"! The latter is the KIN sign and is the logographic equivalent of the former. Winter "work" or "tasks" are in view in both passages. KBo 2.5 iv 11 is cited without its direct join, KBo 16.17 iv, which restores the end of the verb. On the more substantive level it would have been helpful to inform the reader that the syllabic writings predominate in the historical and "literary" texts, while *KUŠŠU* and *ŠE*₁₂ are more common in cultic and administrative documents.

genu:- This article, too, is carefully composed and rich in information. But again far too many unnecessary examples of routine forms are cited in full context. The truly significant forms can easily be swamped by the routine and unimportant ones. Puhvel does not explain why he transcribes *gi-e-nu* instead of the more correct *ge-e-nu*. If a phonological reality is hinted at, it is unexplained. In the bound transcriptions he writes *genu*. Neither Puhvel nor E. Neu (in *StBoT* 25:24 and 26:97) explain the form *gi-nu-ut-ti-at-kán* as a dupl. of instr. *gi-nu-ta-at-kán*. One should make some analysis in a dictionary article! On p. 150 ad KBo 10.52 vi 6-7 *peran* is postposition dependent upon *kinuwaš* = *šaš* "in front of his knees" rather than preverb with *paršiya* "he fritters forth." The *o*-grade forms of *kanuš(ša)riya*- are exceedingly interesting. One would have welcomed some explanation of the grade alternations in the same verb. Is the criterion diachronic? A Middle Hittite script example in KBo 38.57:17 *kānušariyezzi* has been missed. *kānušariyezi* !?

kinun: In re the discussion on p. 185 of markedness in time expressions, note that *lammar* "immediately," "(this) moment" (*CHD* L-N, s.v. *lammar* 2) shows that the immediate hour is unmarked, while more remote time is not.

kipriti:- The link between *kipriti*- bird and *kipriti*- "sulphur" may not be a connection to riverbanks or shores, but to the sulphur-color of the bird's plumage.

the relatives on the wife's side, while *kaena-* denotes the husband's. A very nice distinction.

kušiši-: In the summary paragraph Puhvel omits reference to the West Semitic parallels with the root *ksy* "to cover," often used of clothes covering the body. The Hittite word underlying *TÜGNIG.LÁM.MEŠ* is neither *kušiši-* nor *adupli-* (< Akk. *utuplu*), but *terma-*.

kutriš-: I would concur that this word does not mean "shortness," but "reckoning, counting." The argument is also well made here.

ku(wa)liya-: I believe that Puhvel has hypnotized himself into accepting what is essentially a contradiction: being calm or idle and flowing are inherently antithetical, and no amount of fudging with translations like "flow smoothly" can mask this. Furthermore, the body of water most often described as *kuwaliu* is not a flowing river or stream, but the *kuwanhuesšar*, which Beckman has persuasively shown is not a wave of the sea, but the subterranean deep. This latter certainly does not "flow," smoothly or otherwise. I would accept Beal's demonstration that the fundamental idea of this word family is inactivity, rest, or calm. I would also choose a different word to denote the male homosexual in the Uršum story, rather than "fruit" (p. 303). If idleness or passivity is the reason for describing a male homosexual's activity as *kulesšar*, I would think he was the passive partner. The colloquial term for this is not "fruit," but "queen."

kuwan-: If Melchert is right that this word is etymologically identical to the word in PIE for "dog," I would

argue that it has been transferred in Hittite to another type of canine animal, since LÚ *kuwanaš* is listed alongside LÚ UR.GI₇ and cannot be synonymous. But I cannot accept Puhvel's idea that it denotes a different breed of dog, since in Hittite (as in Akkadian) different breeds of dog are denoted not by new words, but by genitival complements such as UR.GI₇ LÚSIPA-aš "shepherd's dog," LÚ UR.GI₇-aš UR.GI₇ "hunter's dog," UR.GI₇ *hilarnaš* "dog of the farmyard" (laws §§87–89).

ku(w)an(a)- "woman": Obviously, this is a controversial (and indeed important) lemma. Puhvel takes a middle position between Neu, Güterbock, and Carruba, accepting a little of each's contentions. The final word has not yet been spoken or written on this issue, but I commend Puhvel for his balanced treatment and good coverage of the secondary literature. It appears, however, that—if he is right—"dog" and "woman" in many grammatical cases would have been written and perhaps spoken alike!

ku(wa)nna(n)-: On the origin of the name of the island Cyprus, discussed on p. 310, one should now see E. Neu (1995–96 [1997]).

Finally, it is very considerate and conscientious of Puhvel to include at the end of this volume a list of corrections and additions to volumes 1–3 of this dictionary. I have not taken the time to check any of them for this review.

REFERENCES

- Gordon, Cyrus Herzl. 1965. *Ugaritic Textbook: Grammar, Texts in Transliteration, Cuneiform Selections, Glossary, Indices*. *Analecta Orientalia: commentationes scientificae de rebus Orientis antiqui*, vol. 38. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- Güterbock, Hans Gustav. 1961. Review of Johannes Friedrich, *Die hethitischen Gesetze* (1959). *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 15: 62–78.
- Hoffner, Harry A., Jr. 1968. Review of Onofrio Carruba, *Das Beschwörungsritual für die Göttin Wišuriyanza*. *JAOS* 88: 531–34.
- . 1971. Hittite *ega-* and *egan-*. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 24: 31–36.
- . 1974. *Ailmenta Hethaeorum: Food Production in Hittite Asia Minor*. AOS, vol. 55. New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- . 1995. Hittite *immakku*: "moreover" or "just now"? In *Atti del II congresso internazionale di hittitologia*, ed. Onofrio Carruba, Mauro Giorgieri, and Clelia Mora. Pp. 191–94. Pavia: Iuculano.
- van den Hout, Theo P. J. 1995. Review of Peter J. Neve, *Hattuša: Stadt der Götter und Tempel* (1992). *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 52: 545–73.
- Neu, Erich. 1995–1996 [1997]. Zur Herkunft des Inselnamens Kypros. *Glotta* 73: 1–7.