

# KRATYLOS

KRITISCHES BERICHTS-  
UND REZENSIONSORGAN  
FÜR INDOGERMANISCHE  
UND ALLGEMEINE  
SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT

JAHRGANG 35

1990

DR. LUDWIG REICHERT VERLAG · WIESBADEN

Friedrich, Johannes, und Annelies Kammenhuber: Hethitisches Wörterbuch. Zweite, völlig neubearbeitete Auflage auf der Grundlage der edierten hethitischen Texte. Band II: E; Lieferung 9–10. Heidelberg, Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1988, gr.-8°, 141 S. (Indogermanische Bibliothek, 2. Reihe: Wörterbücher.) Brosch. 100 DM/geb. 130 DM.

The current fascicle comprises the second volume of Prof. A. Kammenhuber's new edition of J. Friedrich's Hethitisches Wörterbuch (HW<sup>2</sup>). The continued steady progress of the project is welcome, but I find rather strange the apparent decision to make a separate volume for each letter of the alphabet. This has the unhappy effect of making the individual volumes of very unequal size. It would have seemed more reasonable to combine, say, E and H in a single volume II.

The present fascicles show the same general strengths and weaknesses as earlier sections, many of which have been cited by previous reviewers. I should state explicitly at the outset that in judging HW<sup>2</sup> I unavoidably have made comparisons not only with HW<sup>1</sup> but also with the ongoing Chicago Hittite Dictionary (CHD).

Since I will necessarily dwell at some length on certain negative aspects of the work, I wish to emphasize that its positive attributes are also considerable. First of all, the increase in material coverage vs. HW<sup>1</sup> is enormous. HW<sup>2</sup> is as nearly exhaustive as such a work can be for a language whose corpus is still being published (and indeed discovered). Specialists may miss this or that individual form, but most users will find mention in HW<sup>2</sup> of virtually any word they are likely to meet. Coverage of secondary literature is also quite broad and reasonably current, including a number of works in 'non-standard' languages. While one may criticize K.'s polemics (see below), it is worth noting that she most emphatically does not suppress opposing views.

I personally find K.'s system of Hittite text chronology seriously flawed, particularly in comparison with that of the CHD. However, this does not alter the fact that much of it is quite valid, and her explicit distinction between Old and Neo-Hittite material represents a significant gain over HW<sup>1</sup>. HW<sup>2</sup> is extremely generous with cross-references (an area where the CHD is unnecessarily parsimonious). This includes not only separate listings of irregular or suppletive allomorphs (of particular help to the non-specialist), but also significant spelling variants. Also welcome is the listing and explicit deletion of many ghost words and misspellings (even if one inevitably does not agree with K.'s judgment in every case).

Since this section happens to consist of words beginning with *e*-, many of the spelling variants listed involve alternation between *e* and *i*. I wish to emphasize here the importance of K.'s decision to maintain the distinction of /e/ and /i/ in Hittite, despite the indeterminacies presented

by poorly attested words and the extensive cross-referencing required. The fact that additional data and analysis in the future will surely reveal that a few words have been wrongly assigned to /e/ or /i/ does not affect the correctness of her choice. The contrary decision by the editors of the CHD is a lamentable error which will haunt the latter project ever more as the years pass.

Most of the weaknesses of HW<sup>2</sup> can be traced to a single cause: an almost obsessive attempt to include too much information, a great deal of which is inconsequential or extraneous. Among the latter one may cite the long disquisitions in which K. responds to earlier reviews (see e.g. under *enu-*, 43f.). It is quite reasonable that the author of a dictionary which appears over a number of years might wish to respond to criticism, particularly when general methodological issues are involved. However, such material does not belong in the individual entries of a dictionary which will be used decades hence by readers with no interest in long-dead controversies. It would be far more effective for K. to respond systematically in a separate section which could be appended to one of the fascicles, a procedure for which there is ample precedent (cf. the Vorrede of J. Pokorný's IEW). Such an approach would also lend itself to more reasoned argument and fewer polemics than the current atomistic method.

It is not surprising that the enormous task of HW<sup>2</sup> has (apparently permanently) postponed completion of K.'s announced comparative grammar of Hittite, Palaic and Luvian. Nevertheless, the attempt to fill this gap by inserting bits and pieces of the comparative grammar into the dictionary articles is ill-advised. Such genuinely useful observations as that on the distribution of *nu*-causatives deserve better than to be scattered hither and yon under various lemmata (see again under *enu-*, 43, but also elsewhere). Separate essays (even brief ones) by someone of K.'s expertise focusing on such topics would be most welcome.

In some cases the inclusion of masses of detail simply goes beyond reasonable bounds. It is hard to see the usefulness for most readers of the one-and-one half columns of listings for TUŠ-*aš* "sitting" (112). On p. 117f. collocations of *ešhar* "blood" with various verbs are divided without apparent rationale into two separate and needlessly repetitive lists. The differences in the articles for *eku-* "drink" and *eš-* "be" on the one hand and *ep-* "seize" and *eš-* "sit" on the other are instructive. The former are of reasonable length and quite readable. Not coincidentally *eku-* has already received exhaustive treatment in the Mat. Heth. Thes., while *eš-* "be" will be treated in a forthcoming volume of THeth. In contrast with this proper division of material, K. has decided to handle *ep-* and *eš-* "sit" entirely in HW<sup>2</sup>. The result is that the former takes up 44 pages and the latter 16, in articles so overwhelmed with details that one cannot easily find the crucial information one seeks in a dictionary.

K. evinces a healthy and quite justified skepticism towards ety-

mologizing, especially in the case of poorly attested words. However, her readiness to assume Hattic or 'Anatolian' loanwords amounts to little more than a *pis-aller* (see e. g. under *ēja-*, 27). As research on Hittite and the other IE languages of Anatolia continues, the amount of demonstrable substratal and adstratal influence on them grows less with every passing year. Since K. rejects all but the most transparent IE etymologies anyway, one hopes that she follows through on her own proposal (21 b) to shorten the etymological discussions in the future.

I append a few very short remarks on individual items:

30: K.'s intuitions about the Hittites' religious sensibilities are well-taken, but intuitions, even those of an experienced scholar, cannot be given equal weight with scientific arguments based on the texts. K. does not even discuss, let alone refute, my arguments or those of others that "drink a god" = "drink to a god".

42: *en-ta-ri* is pres. 3rd pl. "they go" (also attested in KUB XL 28,1). See Melchert, Phonology 14.

114: the proposed reinterpretation of *išhanattalla-* as "spiller of blood, murderer" is illuminating and deserves special mention.

141, sub *ewan-*: the designation "ab Jheth. belegt" must be a lapsus, since the word occurs in KUB XXIX 1, which even by K.'s very restricted version of Hittite chronology is an OH composition.

In sum, HW<sup>2</sup> is a useful and generally reliable compendium of Hittite lexicographical information. It is to be hoped that the author will in the future adopt further measures to exclude extraneous and unnecessary material and thereby increase the utility and readability of the work.

Curriculum in Linguistics  
University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3155  
U.S.A.

H. Craig Melchert

Hutter, Manfred: Behexung, Entsöhnung und Heilung. Das Ritual der Tunnawiya für ein Königspaar aus mittelhethitischer Zeit (KBo XXI 1 – KUB IX 34 – KBo XXI 6). Freiburg, Schweiz/Göttingen, Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988, gr.-8°, 180 S. (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis, 82.) Geb. 69 DM.

Angesichts der verhältnismäßig großen Anzahl bisher unbearbeiteter hethitischer Texte werden kommentierte Textausgaben stets freudig begrüßt, ganz besonders, wenn es sich, wie im vorliegenden Fall, um sprachlich ältere Stücke handelt.

Das Ritual der <sup>SAL</sup>SU.GI *Tunnawiya* mit dem Titel „Wenn die weise Frau den König oder die Königin aus der Erde nimmt“ (zur Bedeutung dieser Formel s.u.) war bruchstückhaft schon seit der Frühzeit der