Reviews of Books


The qualities which I praised in my review of the previous fascicle[^1] are again much in evidence: accurate and thorough documentation, generally judicious analyses and interpretations, and remarkably clear organization and readability. Since we now have the complete article for the adverb parâ, I wish to single out the editors' sensitive and lucid treatment of this member of a very difficult word-class. In the following critical remarks I have again tried to focus on examples which involve broader issues.

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

Pp. 151 and 167–68: one should read pariyâyan and parxu-yan-an-naâš. The editors fail to acknowledge the well-established use of the “E” sign in the value ya in Hittite. The remark about “the i/e glide” is misleading: Hittite has a single palatal glide y.

P. 151 (under 1.c.): I must again object in the strongest terms to the totally illicit emendation of neuter stems in -e/ii(n)- to non-existent stems in -esâr: the word for “fork” is battârit.[^3]

P. 156 (sub 2.1): I commend the translation; however šangkâ aši does not show “gender discord,” but rather supports other evidence that some nouns in -il are animate(!), despite the common prejudice that they are neuter. Compare animate šarnikzili ‘restitution’: accusative plural šarnikzulaš at KUB 44.38 I 7.13 and 46.42 iv 6 and [ma] šarnikzel kuš ‘If (there is) some restitution . . . ’ at KUB XIV 8 Vo 30.

P. 161 (sub b.): as confirmed by usuama, parxu is not singular, but an archaic neuter nom.-acc. plural. The authors also fail to recognize the corresponding collective nom.-acc. plural in -i in parxu šuppi (p. 165, sub o.) and purnulli (ikallanta) (p. 179).[^4] In general, forms in final -u and -i need to be scrutinized much more carefully before being assigned to “neuter singular.”

P. 189: the example parašawantâ is a genuine stem in -want- and should not be emended.[^5]

---

[^5]: See Norbert Oettinger, “Hethitisch -want-,” in *Documentum Asiae Minoris Antiquae*. Festschrift für Heinrich Otten,
P. 207: the stem of “to stick in, fasten” is pašk-, not pašk-. This verb represents a lexicalized stem with the “iterative” suffix -ške/-a/ (< PIE *-ške/-o/-).

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

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

Since the publication of KTU, numerous other Ugaritic texts have come to light at Ras Shamra; at the neighboring, coastal site of Ras Ibn Hani; and at other sites in Syria and on Cyprus. Further, increasingly meticulous epigraphic work has been done on both new and old texts, especially by D. Pardee and P. Bordreuil and by several scholars working from the macrophotographic record being built up by West Semitic Research (B. Zuckerman and collaborators). Since, moreover, KTU is now out of print, it had become highly desirable to have a new, comprehensive collection of Ugaritic texts, using new collations and editions where possible.

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

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

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

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