



FIG. 12. From Songshan, Jiaxiang, Shandong. Li Song, 118.

The most important question we must confront is whether separation of the sexes was dogma or reality. Were these rules just the wishful thinking of some unusually harsh writers, or did their ideas reflect common social practices? Of course the most extreme stories about separation of the sexes were doubtless false. Tales of women who willingly suffered a horrible death rather than leave their chaste seclusion within a burning building strain credulity. However, it seems likely that a far milder version of separation of the sexes was already quite common by the Han.

There is some evidence that early Chinese actually practiced a degree of physical separation. Most significant are the statements by early writers noting that various foreign peoples allowed the sexes to mix freely. These observations imply that the opposite was the case among Chinese. These authors seem to have thought that their readers would find this sort of behavior unusual, so it deserved comment. Moreover, Shang Yang's discussion of the gradual transformation of the Qin people from foreign nomads into Chinese (or Huaxia) stresses the customs keeping women and men apart. He claims that the Qin had originally not separated the sexes, but by his time they had adopted this important Chinese custom. Then there is the visual evidence from Han tombs showing men and women physically separate on ceremonial occasions. This seems to imply that at least during certain formal occasions, women were expected to remain apart from men.

The time from Warring States through Western Han was probably the most important era in Chinese gender history. At that time, we can see the beginnings of many cultural ideals, such as the composite concept *zhenjie*, that would be more fully realized much later. People of that early era set down basic definitions of Chinese womanhood that later readers invested with enormous authority. Although separation of the sexes became far more widespread and stringent in later eras, subsequent customs elaborated on the nascent separation that had emerged in early China.

On a Hittite Lexicographic Project

HARRY A. HOFFNER, JR.
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

One must certainly admire the pace at which Jaan Puhvel is producing his *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, although in fact volume five (2001) is appearing four years after volume four (1997). This is a much smaller volume than its predecessors, even though with the aid of the *CHD L* volume, which Puhvel quotes at great length, much of his interpretive work was done for him. As in previous volumes, one finds at the end a section of corrections and additions to previous volumes. I will not attempt to evaluate them, since that would mean reviewing more volumes in the set than this one.

The complaints raised by this and other reviewers of earlier volumes as to the general layout and methodology have been largely ignored, or at least rejected in silence. One of the most inconvenient features of this dictionary is the lack of dummy entries with cross reference to the lemmas under which the words in question are discussed. With the appearance of volume five and its section entitled "Index to Volumes 1–5" a user might have expected an index to Hittite words discussed, since many of them are to be found out of their alphabetical order. Alas, many other languages are indexed, but not Hittite itself! This is a grievous mistake, which I sincerely hope can yet be remedied by a small supplement. Another serious flaw is the lack of any attempt to date the forms according to the established dating of the texts. The importance of this has been shown time and again. Later spellings can only be understood in the light of earlier stages. Only rarely does the author write "Old Hittite" by a reference. But even here one doesn't know if he means "Old Hittite composition (in later copy)" or "text written in the Old Hittite script." I have complained in my earlier review of volume four about the non-standard abbreviations used (Hoffner 2000). In the "List of abbreviations (addition to volumes 1–4)" a new one which will cause confusion has been added. "KBoVM" is Puhvel's abbreviation for what most of us are now denoting as "VS NS 12" or "VS 28." Since "KBo" is the standard abbreviation for the series *Keilschrifttexte aus Boğazköy*, "KBoVM" is going to strike many users as a typo for this well-known series.

I realize that not all Hittitologists feel qualified to make independent judgments on the dating of individual texts, but it does appear that enough of a general consensus has emerged to make it mandatory for lexicographers to distinguish spellings of words in Old Hittite manuscripts (*CHD* siglum "OS") from those in later texts. Here the various writings of the "dat.-loc." of *lahḫa-* are given without any hint of which ones are diachronically anterior.

We all admire Puhvel for his considerable achievement, especially volumes three and four, which covered terrain not yet treated by other projects such as the *CHD* or *HW*². I also admire the good coverage he gives to secondary literature (editions, etc.). And considering how long it is taking the *CHD* and *HW*² to advance toward completion, Puhvel is to be commended to staying on a good schedule of production. In spite of the criticisms voiced below, all Hittitologists should feel a genuine debt of gratitude to Puhvel for his hard work in producing this dictionary.

This is a review article of *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, volume 5: *L, Indices to volumes 1–5*. By JAAN PUHVEL. Trends in Linguistics, Documentation, vol. 18. Berlin: MOUTON DE GRUYTER, 2001. Pp. ix + 187. DM 256.

The following are specific corrections:

lahḫa-: Puhvel uses English words (especially in his lemmas) in a playful manner which can be quite misleading. The word “warpath” to my knowledge is exclusively used in the phrase “be on the warpath” when referring to Amerindian braves. The word seems quite inappropriate for Hittite kings who did not put on war paint or do dances prior to battle. One finds rather too many cases of inconsistent and inaccurate rendering of the same words in consecutively cited passages. ^{PUTU-ŠI} (literally “my sun-god”) is rendered, following the *CHD*, “his majesty” in ABoT 14 v 12, but “the king” in KUB 14.1 rev. 13 (both on the same page). The pres. sg. 2 verb is rendered “thou goest” in one passage, but “you summon” in another. Cf. p. 5 “thy majesty, our master, hast been . . .” (Note that here, without expressed pret. *e-eš-ta*, it is unlikely that the tense is past; rather “You, your majesty, our lord, are a campaigner.”)

Puhvel is quite right that the *CHD* proposal of two types of journey, one a military campaign and the second a commercial trip, has not withstood the test of time. Were I rewriting the *CHD* L words today, I would certainly not make this distinction. It is quite possible, however, that a non-military sense inheres in several of the occurrences of the derived noun *lahḫiyala-*, as the *CHD* correctly noted.

I am disappointed that Puhvel refuses to distinguish the (singular) case in *-a* which the *CHD* terms the “allative” from the dative-locative in *-i*. I have never seen the cogency of either Kammenhuber’s or Puhvel’s positions on this matter. Fortunately, most Hittitologists do recognize the distinction, which of course only applies to Old and Middle Hittite, not to the latest phase of the language, when the allative uses were assumed by the locative.

Puhvel’s attempt to show how KASKAL (*palša-*) differed from *lahḫa-*, while correct in discarding the civilian connotation for the latter, is unduly restrictive for *palša-*. It is my impression that “trek” in standard English always refers to a journey which is especially slow and arduous. In my judgment *palša-* simply means “journey, trip.” The bilingual passage from the Proclamation of Telepinu in no way equates Hittite *lahḫa-* “campaign” with Sumerian KARAS “army camp.” Locomotion never inheres in KARAS; it is a location, “encampment,” or a group of combatants, “expeditionary force, army.”

lahḫiyai-: Of the eight(!) translations proposed for this verb, the last three—“take on, confront, brave”—can safely be ignored. Since, as the *CHD* (sub 1 b) correctly notes, the same text clearly distinguishes the acc. ^{URU}Kammaman RA-zi from ^{URU}Kammama laḫiyaizzi, the form ^{URU}Kammama cannot be intended as an acc. “stem form.” Since the allative is non-productive in NH, one would think that a dat.-loc. of this toponym is intended. Therefore, since “attack GN” in English sounds like an acc., Puhvel would have done better to stick with “operate against GN.” Since “leafy mountains” hardly pose a danger to the king and his armed troops, it would be better not to translate here “go brave the leafy mountains,” but rather (so *CHD*) to take the acc. here as acc. of extent (“Go campaign throughout the wooded mountain areas”). The same is true of KBo 12.59 (cf. McMahon, *Hittite State Cult*, 132f., cited by Puhvel), where ÍD has to be understood as “river country” since this is the acc. obj. (of extent of territory) of not only *lahḫiškizzi* “campaigns in” but also *šiyatalliškizzi* “hunts in.” A translation “braves” for *lahḫiškizzi* is not only unnecessary, it is counter-indicated. No one uses the obsolete transcriptional value *tin* any more for the DIN sign (cf. P.’s *la-aḫ-ḫi-ia-at-tin*), least of all in rendering the ending of the pret./imp. pl. 2, which should always be written *-tén* (cf. HZL). *lah(h)iya(i)-*. In KUB 5.1 ii 17, quoted in *CHD* L-N 9, *n=aš* ^{URU}Lihaya=ma . . . the force of *nu* . . . *-ma* is always that of an alter-

native question: “Or when . . . them in L.” Puhvel’s “When I take on them [and] L.” is impossible grammatically: *-ma* never joins two nouns within a phrase.

lahḫanni-: As far as I know, there is no reason one would prefer Puhvel’s “flask, flagon” to the *CHD*’s “bottle or pitcher.” Its primary use with the verb *šipand-* shows it was used for pouring libations. Puhvel has conflated this entry with extraneous forms. Inst. sg. *la-aḫ-ni-it* has nothing to do with the vessel named *lahanna/i-*. Nor has the Hurrian word(!) in VBoT 4:6’, which Puhvel reads as “^{URUDU}la-ḫi-ni-eš.” The other forms are fairly consistent. As the *CHD* notes, this word is largely confined to Hurrian festivals and rituals, and may be derived ultimately from a foreign source.

lah(h)anza(n)-: I have no quarrel with the summary of evidence from the *CHD* occurrences or the denotation “migratory waterfowl.” The more narrow translation “loon” has, so far as I can see, only the etymological supposition to commend it. In Puhvel’s contribution to my festschrift he questions whether the *CHD*’s claim that the *lahanza* belonged to the duck family could be sustained and note that the *lahanza* might belong to the family genus *Gavia* instead of *Anatina*. I find no problem with that *per se*. I do wish, however, that he would not translate MUŠEN HURRI as “drake, duck,” as if this rather specific bird name (*CHD* “shelduck”) were a generic term for *Anatina*. To the admirable discussion in the *CHD* I can only add that the white body coloration indicated by the silver overlay in the models described in *HTR* is supported also by the Sumerian reading [za-la-ag = UD = l] a²-ḫa-an-za-na-aš in KBo 1.34 obv. 8 assumed by *MSL* 3:61, namely ZALAG “bright, white.”

lahḫi(t)-: Since the juxtaposition of *lahḫiṣ=aš=šta kišaru* . . . ^{GIŠ}intaluzzi=ma=aš kišaru “Let him/it become a l. . . or let him become an *intaluzzi*” indicates that both *lahḫiṣ* and ^{GIŠ}intaluzzi denote concrete objects, it is highly unlikely that *lahḫi-* means “relief” or that it is a t-stem. The parallelism with ^{GIŠ}intaluzzi=ma=aš, as well as the established rule of Hittite syntax that the clitic 3rd sg. subj. pron. is obligatory with the verb *kiš-*, demonstrate that *la-aḫ-ḫi-ša-aš-ta* cannot be a neut. nom.-acc. sg. *lahḫiṣa* + *-šta*, but rather a common sg. nom. *lahḫiṣ* + *-aš* + *-šta*.

A noun *lahḫlahḫa-* n. com. has been overlooked. It occurs in [na-]aš-za la-aḫ-la-aḫ-ḫa-aš ki-ša-at KBo 42.74:8’.

lahḫlahḫiya-: I would prefer to see the gloss “anxiety” somewhere in this protracted list of synonyms, and I am not convinced by “scurry, scamper,” although admittedly the verb is used for an army “milling” around its leader. General disorganized movement is certainly intended, but to me “scurry” conjures up images of squirrels, mice, and other timid ground creatures, which is not intended by this verb. It definitely is applied to large animals like horses. The derived noun *lahḫlahḫima-* definitely conveys our idea of anxiety. Puhvel boldly states that the *CHD* is wrong about MUŠEN.ḪI.A *miyanaš*, which he translates “birds of proliferation,” but he gives no argument to refute the lengthy (and to me convincing) excursus in *CHD* L-N, 232f. The gen. of *miyatar* ought to be *miyannaš*, not *meyannaš* (as MUŠEN.ḪI.A *meyannaš* is several times spelled), and “of proliferation” makes no sense at all in the context. The sole putative ex. of *meyannaš* for *miyatar* in the *CHD* is “156/b right col. 8,” which is never cited and cannot therefore be verified as a form of *miyatar*.

lahpa-, lahma-: The *CHD* cautiously stated that “It is possible that *lahpa-* ‘ivory’ and *lahma-* are two spellings of the same word.” Puhvel has taken a step further and simply assumed that they are without any further argumentation. He has also included many logographic occurrences of KA_xUD AM.SI, which we did not do in the *CHD*, since we were

still uncertain about the meaning of *lahpa-*. In the *HW*² or *CHD*, which specialize in semantic investigations, the inclusion of the logograms would have a purpose. I am not sure what they contribute to an etymological dictionary such as this. And if *lahpa-* should turn out not to be ivory, the inclusion of the logograms here would be misleading. Contrary to the summary paragraph here and Puhvel 2001, the Hittites did not know the elephant as *pí-e-ri-* and as *lahpa-/lahma-*. The identification of the former word is unclear (cf. *CHD* P, 312, where it is shown that the *pēreš* is paired with and therefore not included among the *huitar* “animals”), and *lahpa-* may mean “ivory,” but is not yet attested as a designation of an animal.

lahhura-: The translation “bench” would only be appropriate if one thinks of a sturdy work-table like a carpenter’s “bench.” Otherwise the English word conjures up images of a low seat, which is not reflective of the Hittite evidence. One can now add another material from which the *lahhura-* was made, namely cedar (KBo 21.14 + KBo 41.32 obv. 6’).

la(h)huwai-: The number of attested forms is enormous, as shown already in the *CHD* article. The variety is bewildering and begs for historical analysis, which unfortunately is not provided here. Which forms are older, and how do they develop into the later forms? I also do not see how one can simply lump all the forms under a single stem *lah(h)u(wa)-*. It was already clear to us in the *CHD* L (1980) that forms like imp. sg. 2 *la-a-aḥ* demand a stem *lah(h)-*, and that others plausibly belonged with that stem or a stem *lāhw-*: *la-a-hu-un*. The pret. sg. 3 *la-a-hu-uš* “he cast,” which was published after *CHD* L was in print, also shows a stem *lāhu-/lāhw-*. The shorter stem is reflected in the imperfective-aspect stem *lahuški-*. Puhvel’s attempt to make these forms fit under one stem is unconvincing. To say that the final *w* in imp. sg. 2 *la-a-aḥ* is dropped (p. 23) flies in the face of the parallel case of *ekw-* “drink,” which has pret. sg. 1 *e-ku-un* (like *la-a-hu-un*) and imp. sg. 2 *e-ku* (not **e-ek*). The imp. sg. 2 of the stem *lāhw-* would be **la-a-hu-*, not *la-a-aḥ*.

The existence of a nominal *šer lahuwaš* is uncertain: perhaps KBo 18.181 rev. 33 is a valid example, but Puhvel has misunderstood KUB 33.45++ iii 23–26, where *lāhuwaš* is a finite verb form, and *alpaš arāiš* a new clause. Likewise embarrassing is his misreading of KUB 41.40 i 19–20, which should be rendered ANA QATI LUGAL watar parā [t]uhhuēšnit 3-ŠU laḥwāi. From this misreading he has constructed a nominal *parā lahhuešna-* “pouring cup”!

lah(h)u(wa)rnuz(z)i-: The various apparent stems and genders are explained by Puhvel differently than I would prefer. Instead of positing heterogeneity (both neut. and com. forms), I would prefer to see the apparently neuter forms as collectives, the com. pl. forms in *-eš* and *-uš* (both serving as nom. subjects of the transitive verb *epp-*) as non-collectives, and the plural forms in *-anteš* (which are all subjects of transitive verbs) as ergative, not as evidence for an independent stem *lahhurnuzziyant-*, which would be artificially confined to subjects of transitive verbs. On p. 27 ad KUB 56.39 iv 26–27 the end of line 26 must be read MUNUS.MEŠha-az-qa-ra[-ia-az], as I show in Hoffner 1998a. This word when the subject of a transitive verb has the ergative ending *-anza/-az*.

lai-: In KUB 31.101:9–10 the *CHD* (mng. 5) noted that, since there is no word space between *wa-ar-pí* and *la-a-e-er*, it is possible that this is a single word. This observation is unfortunately ignored in *HED* L. Contrary to *HED* (“*CHD* 5, wrongly, ‘from’”) the *CHD* also included the possible translation “in.”

lak-: It is somewhat rash to assert solely on the basis of one hardly uncontroversial and broken OH passage (KBo 21.22 rev. 46–49) that in OHitt, the active verb *lak-* has the intransitive meaning “lie, recline.” Over twenty years ago the *CHD* attempted the translation “train it (i.e., the grapevine) on your back,” which admittedly I would now be hesitant to defend. For one thing, there is no “it” expressed as an object. One would have expected *na-na-pa* instead of *na-pa*, with the *-an* referring back to the *mahla-*. But elsewhere, even in OH/OS, the active forms of *lak-* are all transitive, as Puhvel’s own cited examples show. If this were an exception, I would find a translation “fall on your back” more plausible in view of the massive documentation of the meaning “fall” with the middle of this verb. The *lagan har(k)-* construction with *har(k)-* in the imperative is always to be rendered “keep (something/one) . . . -ed”, as even Puhvel’s examples usually show (“keep your ear trained”). For this reason it is impossible to accept his translation of KUB 36.110 rev. 9–10 as “may every land lie supine,” which he proposes against *CHD* mng. 2. Regarding the idiom *parā lagan har(k)-* “keep (ears) turned toward,” Puhvel’s insistence that “Rather than ‘perk, prick, cock’, the metaphor resembles ‘keep your ear to the ground,’” the presence of *parā* shows rather that the position of the cocked ears of dog or equid, which incline forward (*parā*), is what underlies the expression (see already *CHD*). Keeping the ear to the ground is hardly *parā*. I fail to see where a translation “they lay it at . . .” for *anda laknuwanzi* in KUB 30.19+ i 14 is superior to the *CHD*’s “they bend (i.e., train) it in and around the table of the deceased,” which Puhvel labels as “wrong.” The iterative-durative force of the reduplicated *lilakki* was already pointed out in Hoffner 1975: 139–40 with note 34 (as noted also in *CHD*). Puhvel’s surprise at the geminate *-kk-* in *lilakki* is strange in view of *wewakki* and *wewakkinun* when compared with *wekanzi*, *wekun*, *wekir* and participle *wekant-*.

lakkarwant-: Stefanini’s stem in *-ant-* posited for this word and followed by Puhvel is a bit risky in view of the lack of oblique case forms. I will believe it when I see those forms. I also doubt the viability of the translation “poddled leguminous vegetable, legume,” which corresponds to none of the ubiquitous Sumerograms for vegetable products known as Boğazköy. One expects on the basis of them a more restricted meaning such as “pea(s),” “bean(s),” etc.

lakšai-, lakšena-, lakšina-: The guess “pin, needle” depends on whether the *pašk[anza?]* in KBo 17.65 rev. 56 belongs to the same sentence (a predicate?) as the *lakšaiš* in the preceding line. The proximity to ^{KUŠ}*annanuzin* “bridle, halter” indicates the likely semantic range of *lakše/ina-*, as noted already by Neu.

I miss an entry for ^{KUŠ}*laggašd(a)-*, on which see *CHD*.

lala-: The apparent distributive repetitious *la-a-li la-a-li* may not be dat.-loc. at all (*pace* P.), but collective, matching the vocative EME.ḪI.A EME.ḪI.A “Tongues! Tongues!” in KUB 44.4 + KBo 13.241 rev. 22–24. This would explain the apparent neuter agreement of EME.ḪI.A in KUB 12.34 + KUB 15.39 i 10, 12, etc., cited in *CHD* L, 21.

lala(k)ueš(š)a-: The translation “ant” is sufficient. “Emmet” is simply an archaic word for the ant, not a word of differing meaning. Puhvel’s account of the origin of *lala(k)ueša-* from *lala(k)ueššar* on the basis of a form without final *r* stretches credulity. Melchert 1988 (and Melchert 1993) has shown that loss of final *r* in such nouns follows a regular phonological pattern and distinguishes plural (with loss) from singular (without loss). There would be no reason in a collective noun like *lala(k)ueššar* to have distinct singular and plural forms, and for this reason we have (as yet) no example of loss of final *r* in this word.

lalla(m)puri(ya)- If a word occurs only in Kizzuwatnean rituals, as this does, and exhibits a spelling variation of the type *m—mp—p*, it is obviously a Hurrian, not a Hattic, word. I don't think one should waste one's time with folk etymologies of the type indulged in here (*lala-* "tongue" + *puri-* "lip"). But if the word is a foreign word and possibly a compound, it might have been useful to call readers' attention to the bread name ^{NINDA}*ampura-* (Hoffner 1974).

lalu- Apparently Puhvel is unaware of the precise meaning of Akkadian *izbu*. According to both major dictionaries it means a malformed birth, a fetal anomaly. It has nothing to do *per se* with whether or not the birth was an abortion. Any normal-term birth might produce a malformed product. Furthermore, the term can refer to either animal or human births, the former certainly not the result of abortion. KUB 44.61 rev. 19–21 is wrongly read. One should read: *nu tappin enuz[i n=an=kan] / [AN]A UZUŠARI-ŠU anda zikkizzi* "one heats a t., and places it against his penis."

lalukki- Puhvel rejects Calvert Watkins' proposal that there was a class of verbs in Hittite with stems in *-e-* called by him "denominative statives." Both his argumentation and the considerable number of examples of this verb stem type seem to me wholly convincing. In practice the two stems *lalukke-* and *lalukkešš-* may have been synonymous to the Hittite speakers, but historically they arose from distinctly different concepts. See Hoffner 1998b. I see no need to use such coinages as "starswarm" for a group of stars, when a perfectly good term already exists, namely "constellation." The sequence *nu-uš-še-eš-ta* in KBo 32.14 ii 44–45 can be analyzed either as *n=uš=še=šta* "and them on it" or *nu=šše=šta* "and on it." But in any case the transcription "*na-aš-še-šta*" is incorrect. The 2 sg. pres. form of *lalukkešnu-*, ZALAG.GA-*nu-ši* KUB 56.19 i 13, ii 25, has been overlooked. A second example of *la-lu-uk-ke-eš-nu-ud-du* is HKM 16:38 (Güterbock in Fs Alkim, 206f.). To *lalukkiwant-* add the neut. nom.-acc. ZALAG.GA-*an* KUB 33.71 iii 15. To *lalukkima-* add the nom. sg. form ZALAG.GA-*a* KBo 1.34 ii 1 and KUB 57.116 obv. 16. To the acc. sg. also add the many examples of the KIN token ZALAG.GA-*an*.

laman: Add the verbal subst. *lam-ni-ia-u-wa-ar* KBo 26.19 obv. 11. The clause in HKM 70 (cited as "Mašat 75/51" 8–10) is mistranslated. The *-za* in the clause shows that the subject is "you," not "[it]." The *kāš* in KUB 13.4 ii 33–34 is not to be translated "this," but "such-and-such."

lammar: I find the reading *lammar* TAR-*tan*, where TAR has the meaning "cut" (*karš-*), not attested elsewhere at Boğazköy, quite unconvincing. The word *tar-ta-an* should be read as fully syllabic, even if we cannot yet identify the verb *tart(a)-* elsewhere.

lap(p)- In KUB 17.8 iv 23 *ÍD-ni pehuter* cannot mean "they took to the river [apparently . . . the fever-heat, *lappiyaš*]." The simple fact is that the *pehute-* (as opposed to *peda-*) takes as its object living beings capable of walking, and the correct translation is "to lead, conduct." It is not Beckman (*Birth Rituals*, 14), but Puhvel who has the wrong translation of KUB 3.35 obv. 4–5. His reading is incorrect as well, since the signs of the word after *ÍD-az* are not [*a-a*]-*an-ta-za*, but *x-ḥa-an-ta-za*, and cannot be translated as "from a heated(?) river." KUB 17.8 iv 14 is also mistranslated, since the *-ši* does not refer back to a person but to an object, and *iyawanišizzi* does not mean "is recovering." Neither is *lappina-* to be translated "tinder, dry vegetation, underbrush." Nothing in the word's occurrences supports such translations. I am totally at a loss to know what "overflowing with underbrush" might mean, even if it were a possible translation of *lappinit aršanteš*.

lappa- The traditional translation "tongs" followed also in this case by the *CHD* is vastly to be preferred to "scoop, shovel." Only a preconceived etymology leads Puhvel to prefer his translation. The "remains" (Puhvel) that are transferred with the *lappa-* are simply bones (*ḥaštai*). A scoop might be used for ashes, but *ḥaštai* means "bones," while *ḥaš* means "ashes."

lapana- Watkins showed in *Fs Puhvel* that Luwian *lapana-* is based on the verb *lap-* "to lick" and that it refers to a salt lick. This obviously eliminated the older translation "summer pasture" used in the *CHD* and elsewhere. But it takes time for this discovery to filter through all the literature. It is not just "Hout, *Ulmitešub*" who still has the older translation. See Hawkins 2000: 515f.

laplappa- The *la-ap-la-pí* KUB 24.12 ii 21 that is booked here as nom.-acc. sg. or pl. neut. is probably a collective, since the other forms of the word are all animate. The word (^{KUŠ})*lapla-* does not denote a body part. For that the determinative would be UZU, not KUŠ. With KUŠ as a determinative we are dealing with an object made of leather or hide. The only passage that would clearly point to a body part is KBo 17.17 i 8, which must be read (with the *CHD*) as *la-ap-li-<pi>ta-a[t-kā]n da-a-ū* "let him take it with (his) eyelash(es)." This eliminates the need for all the speculation about the relationship between an alleged *lapla-* "eyelid" and *laplipa-* "eyelash." I see no reason to assume that there was a "labial suffix having a 'diminutival' function" in *kalulupa-* "finger, toe, digit," or *dampupi-* "uncivilized person." And I do not understand how Puhvel connects English "ruffian" (< Italian *ruffiano* "pimp" < Latin *rufus* "red") to English "rough" as a supposed basis for connecting *dampu-* "blunt" (Puhvel "rough") to *dampupi-*.

lapruwa- The proposed meaning "soft parts, flank(?)" is a guess, but is supported by no concrete textual evidence. It is a body part of a he-goat; that's all.

latti- Most of the examples cited are of the logogram *ŠU-TUM/-TI* and are translated already in the *CHD* with the same translations used here. They contribute nothing to establishing either the etymology or the morphology of the word *latti-*.

lawatt- The proposed meaning "mire, slush, muddiness" is only a guess and can claim no support from the occurrences. Nothing in them might contradict it, but neither would there be contradicted a hundred other possibilities. I can see no emendations of the passage KBo 20.21 rev. 1 in the *CHD* transcription. The hand copy clearly reads: *-]meš-ḥi la-a-wa-at-a-aš me-x[-*, with the trace after *me-* being the left side of a horizontal wedge, consonant with a reading *me-ḥ[u-*.

lazz(a)i- The passage cited as "950/c" is now published as KBo 37.23. Five out of the seven food plant names in the list there are wrongly translated here. *ḥaššik* is not "fig," *al-layaniš* is not "olive," *ḥappuriyaš* is not "greenery," but some specific fruit or vegetable here; GÚ.TUR is "lentil," not "pea," and GÚ.GAL is "chick pea," not "bean." If *lazzai-* is indeed the syllabic reading of GÍ.DÙG.GA, which is very uncertain, we would still not be sure that it was specifically "sweet flag, calamus."

lazzai- *lazzai-* is correctly translated "good, right," but not "straight, prime, sound." Puhvel here simply empties his thesaurus without considering that not all of these related but not identical terms can be fairly documented as meanings of *lazzai-*. Similarly in his reprise on p. 73 he somewhat inaccurately attributes to *marša-* the meaning "twisted," which has no support in any known text. He may realize that he is just extrapolating, but not all his readers will be aware of that. They should not be misled in this way.

lenk-: It is true that the *CHD* incorrectly read *li-in-g[a-i]š-ma* in KUB 29.7 + KBo 21.41 rev. 50 as a neuter *li-in-g[a-e]-ma*. But as Puhvel himself must admit (p. 93) the existence of *linkiyant-* as an “animation” (“ergative”) when *lingai-* is to be the subject of a transitive verb seems to require that we posit a neuter **lingai* “oath” for Hittite. (All examples of nom. *lingaiš* have intransitive verbs.) In the only passage that contains *linkiya anda* (p. 94) it is unclear whether it refers to the subject of the clause, which is the man swearing, or to the solemn testimony which he brings (*-za anda peda-*).

lim(m)a-: It is true that the *CHD* incorrectly labeled *li-im-ma-aš* in KUB 12.16 i 2 and dupl. Bo 3351 as genitive, whereas it seems to be nominative. This does prove that *limma-* was sometimes animate (common gender). But the form *li-im-ma* is not (*pace* Puhvel) dative-locative, but neuter in agreement with *gulšan* and not in agreement with the animate subject *kāš memiyaš*. Either *limma-* was heterogeneric, having both neuter and common gender agreements, or the form *limma* is a collective, formally identical to a neuter. Furthermore, there is no evidence whatever to suggest that *limma-* was specifically a type of ale (*pace* Puhvel). It was a beverage, probably alcoholic, but we have no idea what type. Puhvel has missed one word derived from *limma-*, namely [*l*] *immuiwant-* KUB 33.62 iii 12–13 (cf. *naduwant-* “having reeds” < *nata-* “reed”). See Hoffner 1994 and *CHD* S/1 sub *šaknuwant-*.

lip(ai)-: Curiously, Puhvel has cited the same passage twice on the same page (p. 102) with different and incompatible readings: KUB 55.35 obv. 7. The correct reading is *li-ip-š[a-an- . . .]*, not *li-ip-p[a-an-zi]*. The word read *ĞIR-aš* can just as easily be read *ANŠE-aš*, and in any event in its context denotes a model of either an animal with hooves or a model of an animal foot. His “foot a bit abraded at the hoof” fails to communicate that important fact.

lulim(m)i-: The meanings proposed for this word and for *lulu-* in the next lemma are Puhvel’s guesses, based apparently on no solid textual evidence. Once again he has proposed as though it were certain only one of quite a few renderings which would not contradict the evidence, but which cannot claim exclusive validity. The precise meaning of *lulimmi-* is still unclear to me. But *lulu-* is something general like “happiness,” or “well-being.”

lulluri-: Aside from its being a mineral, the only evidence for a more precise identification comes from the glass-making texts published by Riemschneider. Why Puhvel thinks that it must be “hematite” (his rendering of NA₄ KA.GI.NA, Akkadian *šadānu*, which is not translated by Assyriologists as “hematite”) is unclear to me. Neither KA.GI.NA nor *šadānu* are used in glass-making texts from Mesopotamia. On p. 118 Puhvel concedes that Akkadian *lulū* might be the basis for the word *lulluri-*, but he fails to mention that Akkadian *lulū* is indeed used in glass-making texts. And the *CAD* translates this word as “antimony.”

lutta(i)-: The claim that this word is neuter in the sg. and common gender in the plural is nonsense. Nothing in the context of the so-called neuter form ^{GIŠ}*luttai* requires it to be singular. In all probability *luttai* is a collective plural, while *luttauš* is the non-collective (“count”) plural in the accusative case. If Puhvel thinks that “consonant with technology, *luttai* was in the nature of a (shuttered) venthole of wood and (rarely) bronze,” then it is inconceivable that ^{GIŠ}AB.MEŠ-uš *aranteš* in broken context should mean “raised(?) windows.” Hittite windows had no sashes and were not raised or lowered. Nor do I understand how the “repeated mention” (only two times!) of an upper window (*šarazzi-*) “suggests a venthole for smoke.” Both of the passages mentioning an “upper” window say that a person stands beside it, which means that it cannot be in the roof or high up on the wall, but on the

level that a person stands. That location does not favor its function as a “venthole” for smoke, which would rise straight up.

luzzi-: Several new occurrences from the Mašat letters, which were available to Puhvel several years before this volume went to press, have been overlooked: HKM 52:13, 35, 39 have *lu-uz-zi* nom.-acc. The loc. *lu-uz-zi-ia* is found in HKM 52:36–37. And a plural locative seems to be found in KBo 6.28 rev. 30–31 *ša-aḫ-ḫa-ni[-ia-a]š lu-uz-zi-ia-aš*.

REFERENCES

- Hawkins, J. D. 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Hoffner, H. A., Jr. 1974. *Alimenta Hethaeorum: Food Production in Hittite Asia Minor*. American Oriental Series, vol. 55. New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- . 1975. Hittite Mythological Texts: A Survey. In *Unity and Diversity: Essays in the History, Literature, and Religion of the Ancient Near East*, ed. H. Goedicke and J. J. M. Roberts. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press. Pp. 136–45.
- . 1994. The Hittite Word for “Oil” and its Derivatives. *Historische Sprachforschung* 107: 104–12.
- . 1998a. From the Disciplines of a Dictionary Editor. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 50: 35–44.
- . 1998b. On the Denominative Verb *arāwe-*. In *Mír Curad: Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*, ed. J. Jasanoff, H. C. Melchert and L. Olivier. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck. Pp. 275–84.
- . 2000. Thoughts on a New Volume of a Hittite Dictionary. *JAOS* 120: 68–75.
- Melchert, H. C. 1988. Word-final r in Hittite. In *A Linguistic Happening in Memory of Ben Schwarz: Studies in Anatolian, Italic, and Other Indo-European Languages*, ed. Y. L. Arbeitman. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters. Pp. 215–34.
- . 1993. A New Anatolian “Law of Finals.” *Journal of Ancient Civilizations* 8: 105–13.
- Puhvel, J. 2001. Ivory and Elephant in Hittite. In *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie, Würzburg, 4.–8. Oktober, 1999*, ed. G. Wilhelm. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. Pp. 561–62.