

The final part of the book discusses various types of the head-dresses worn by the king, his officials and servants on Achaemenid reliefs and traces their stylistic traits and origin (pp. 117-135). As K. shows, some types of the head-dresses (e.g., round hemispherical hats) can be traced on Neo-Assyrian reliefs depicting Elamite princes and were borrowed by the Persians from Elam.

The following remarks present a few small suggestions.

On p. 54 the suppression of Margiana's revolt against Darius I is dated to December 28, 522 B.C. But to judge from the Babylonian version of the Behistun inscription, this revolt was quelled a year later and was the last event described in the columns I-IV of the inscription. In any case, at present this is *opinio communis*. A list of satraps based on Fortification tablets (see p. 47) includes also Aryandes and Farnadāta who are known to us only from Greek and Egyptian sources. Besides, as far as I know, none of the individuals of this list is given the title of satrap in the Fortification tablets, and in some cases K. might be wrong in her inference. For instance, according to one document (No. 1438), a certain Bakabada carried a sealed document of Arbamiça and went from Areia to the king. In all probability, this Arbamiça was the satrap of Areia, which is the assumption of K. But it is also obvious that the satraps bore the same names as other individuals who worked in the administrative system. Thus, according to K., Karkish, the satrap of Purush, had been "previously active in Babylon" (p. 42). But the Fortification tablet No. 1541, to which she refers, records only that a certain Karkish was "formerly of Babylon". Apparently, there is no link between these two officials and they were probably different persons.

According to K., it was a widespread custom among the Persians to give the son the name of his father (p. 8, note 13). But only one such case is known for all the Achaemenid period (see Herodotus VII, 83). Referring to Ctesias, K. writes that Cyrus made his younger son Bardiya (or, according to Greek sources, Smerdis) the lord of the Carmanians and some other peoples (p. 50). It would not be excessive to note here that Ctesias does not mention Smerdis, but calls him Tanyoxarkes.

In conclusion, we must be grateful to H. Koch for this valuable book which will lead to a better knowledge of the economy, history and culture of the Achaemenid empire at the end of the sixth and beginning of the fifth century B.C.

St. Petersburg, October 1994

M.A. DANDAMAYEV

HETHITEN

KAMMENHUBER, Annelies – *Kleine Schriften zum Altanatolischen und Indogermanischen (1. Teilband: 1955-1968; 2. Teilband: 1969-1990)*, Heidelberg, C. Winter, 1993 (22 cm, VII + 857 pp.). ISBN 3-8253-0142-7. DM 258,-.

These two volumes offer a retrospective of the non-monographic publications of the eminent Munich Anatolianist and Indo-Europeanist. Arranged chronologically from 1955 to 1990, the selections provide a well-balanced picture of the author's multi-faceted scholarship: Hittite philology and

linguistics, synchronic and diachronic, the Anatolian languages in the larger framework of Indo-European, and studies of Palaic and Luvian, as well as the non-Indo-European languages of ancient Anatolia, Hattic and Hurrian. As noted in the foreword, a more ample selection of the author's Hurritological studies will soon appear elsewhere.

For obvious reasons of economy, the selections have been photo-mechanically reproduced, resulting in a variety of type styles and sizes. However, with one exception (selection 4), the reproductions have been very carefully done from good originals, and the readability and overall appearance are far superior to most examples of this technique. I found only a handful of remaining typographical errors, all self-correcting. The one unfortunate lapsus is the misordering of pp. 392-393 (Vol. 1), which must be reversed. The entire collection is furnished with very useful word and subject indices, as well as a **complete** bibliography of the author (not merely additions since the Festschrift of 1983).

I cannot in a short review undertake a detailed critical evaluation of the various individual selections, much less offer an adequate appreciation of the author's scholarly career. My disagreements with the author's views on issues such as "god-drinking" (selection 16) and dating manuscripts (selection 15 and others) are well-known, and reiterating arguments here would serve no useful purpose.

Those with special interests in Anatolian will find, as I did, useful insights in virtually every selection, even in those cases where they do not agree with the overall analysis or viewpoint. For other readers I wish to highlight a few articles which I believe merit special attention, particularly several which may be overlooked or underappreciated.

The sketch of Palaic grammar (selection 5) and the longer philological study on which it is based (C. 17 in the bibliography) are pioneering efforts which have retained their relevance despite the appearance of later studies and which remain "must reading" for anyone interested in the language.

The 1961 article on the dialectal position of the Anatolian group within Indo-European (selection 8) also is of abiding interest and validity (despite the inevitable falsification of some of the individual analyses in the intervening thirty years). I call particular attention to the suggestion that Anatolian forms part of a Western dialect group, and indeed based in part on the claim that the "r-middle" is an **innovating** feature of this group¹). Given the obvious implications of such a proposal for the "Indo-Hittite" question, this issue deserves a far more thorough airing than it has thus far received.

Likewise, while new facts call for reconsideration of certain details, the study of nominal composition (selection 9) remains an indispensable starting point for any discussion of this phenomenon in Anatolian.

The richly detailed and finely nuanced investigation of the Hittite word for "soul" and related concepts (selections 11 and 12) is a fine example of the kind of "Wortkunde" which is still lacking for many basic items of

¹) For another recent discussion of "western affinities" of Hittite based on quite different criteria, see the article by Jaan Puhvel in *Früh-, Mittel-, Spätindogermanisch (= Akten der IX. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft)*, ed. George Dunkel et al., Wiesbaden, 1994. For the most detailed exposition of the minority view of the "r-middle" as an innovation, see Holger Pedersen, *Le groupement des dialectes indo-européens*, pp. 18ff. and passim.

Hittite vocabulary. In the case of this very thorough study, any minor adjustments in the chronology of texts and manuscripts are quite unlikely to affect the validity of the major conclusions.

Finally, I recommend to all Indo-Europeanists the article on the injunctive mood and the three-gender system of Indo-European (selection 33). The author has a well-established reputation as a conservative in the matter of the structure of Proto-Indo-European and the relationship of the Anatolian group to PIE. I suspect that for that reason many may have passed over this article, thinking that they already knew what it would contain. Others may have been put off by the sharply polemical tone of the opening pages. This would be unfortunate. While various readers may not agree with some of the claims made (there are several which I cannot accept), the author's conclusions about the verb in PIE and gender in Anatolian do not represent the conservative status quo which one might have expected. The remarks on the status of the augment and on the so-called "i-motion" deserve special attention.

In sum, this collection is a handsomely produced and very useful distillation of the oeuvre of one of the most distinguished scholars to have worked on the problems of ancient Anatolian languages and thus represents a welcome new research tool.

Chapel Hill, October 1994

H. CRAIG MELCHERT

* *
*

KOŠAK, Silvin – Konkordanz der Keilschrifttafeln I. Die Texte der Grabung 1931; mit einer Einleitung von Heinrich Otten. Verlag Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1992 (24 cm, XII + 116 S., Abb.) = Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten, 34. ISBN 3 447 03280 4; ISSN 0585 5853. DM 24,80.

Mit dem Heft StBoT 34 nahm das bereits im *Akademie-Jahrbuch* 1988, S. 240f. — und im Vorwort von H. Otten (S. VII) — angekündigte Forschungsprojekt, für die Boğazköy-Tontafeln eine "zusammenfassende Übersicht der Textfunde" vorzulegen, einen guten Anlauf. Seine Ausföhrung, die für mehrere Jahre geplant ist, wurde gerade von S. Košak übernommen, es liegen ihm aber die früheren gemeinsamen Arbeiten der Mainzer Forschungsstelle unter der Leitung von H. Otten zugrunde, der auch dieses Heft mit einer sehr nützlichen Einleitung (S. 1-8) versehen hat. Seine Bemerkungen zu den meistens aus Gebäude A auf Büyükkale stammenden Tafelfunden des Jahres 1931 — zu ihren Fundorten und zu den täuschenden Systemen ihrer Inventarisierung, die im Berliner Museum von den ursprünglichen Grabungsnummern auf eine neue Kennzeichnung der Tafelstücke mit .../a-Nummern umgestellt wurde, usw. — werden im Großteil auch für nächste Hefte der Konkordanzen gelten, vor allem bei der Übersicht der Textfragmente, die in Gebäude A erst in den Jahren 1932 (.../b) und 1933 (.../c) geborgen werden konnten. Da die Tafelsammlung in diesem Gebäude offenkundig die Reste der großköniglichen Bibliothek darstellt (vgl. S. 8 und demnächst H. Otten), erscheint es sinnreich, daß das ganze Konkordanz-Projekt mit dem Fundkomplex in Gebäude A

angefangen hat. Zahlreiche Zusammenschlüsse, Duktus und inhaltliche Zuordnung der Texte werden es wohl möglich machen, auf die Geschichte und den Inhalt der Bibliothek zu folgern. Es wäre jedoch vorzeitig, dies zu tun, bevor die Konkordanzen der Texte mit .../b- und .../c-Nummern nicht publiziert werden.

S. Košak führt in den Konkordanztabellen auf S. 11-41 alle Tontafelfragmente des Jahres 1931 als 1/a-342/a an und nennt — jeweils in eigenen Spalten — Anschlußstücke, Editionsorte, eine CTH-Nummer und Fundorte der Texte. Die letzte Spalte bezieht sich auf Fußnoten, wo minuziös Duplikate, Parallelstellen, Duktus (ah./mh.) und jüngste Bearbeitungen angegeben werden.

Einzelbemerkungen:

2/a+: Bearbeitung CTH, S. 154-156; zuletzt noch M. Popko, *THeth* 21, 1994, 190f.

3/a: Zu weiteren möglichen Zusammenschlüssen mit KBo 17.89 + KBo 33.212 und KBo 34.203 s. V. Haas-J. Wegner, *OLZ* 89, 1994, Sp. 278. Duplikate zu KBo 34.203 sind KUB 32.92 und KUB 42.108.

7/a, Fn. 5: Unter den genannten Texten konnten folgende Joins festgestellt werden: KBo 30.120 + KBo 34.197 (+) 198. KBo 25.186 ergibt einen Join mit KBo 34.191. Die folgenden Stücke dürfen o.A. zwei verschiedenen Exemplaren angehören: KBo 30.88; KBo 20.101; KBo 25.170 und KUB 32.106; KBo 30.86; KUB 34.128; KUB 20.88. Die Kollationen anhand von Fotos in Berlin wurden 1994 an den Originalen in Ankara überprüft, wofür ich Herrn Doz. C. Karasu herzlichst zu danken habe. Zur ganzen Textgruppe s. in Kürze P. Taracha, "Bemerkungen zu den hethitischen Ritualen des Prinzen (DUMU.LUGAL)".

36/a, Fn. 6: KUB 55.45, nicht 55.54 (Druckfehler), auch im Verzeichnis der Editionsnummern auf S. 112 zu verbessern. Zu dieser Textgruppe s. P. Taracha, *Hethitica* 10, 1990, 171ff.

37/a, Fn. 7: Parallel zu KUB 32.45 (+) 276/b (= KBo 35.89) ist KBo 35.72, s. H. Otten – Chr. Rüster, *KBo XXXV*, S. V.

45/a + 213/a: KUB 32.84 ergibt einen Join mit KBo 23.67, s. D. Groddek, *AoF* 21, 1994, 337.

50/a: Zuletzt V. Haas, in B. Hänsel – S. Zimmer (Hrsg.), *Die Indogermanen und das Pferd. Akten des Internationalen interdisziplinären Kolloquiums, Freie Universität Berlin, 1.-3. Juli 1992*, Budapest, 1994, 82 mit Anm. 62. KBo 34.172 gehört inhaltlich mit KBo 29.210 Rs. zusammen. Vgl. auch KUB 29.56 und KUB 51.71 mit Dupl. unv. Bo 5274, s. H. Otten, *ZA* 72, 1982, 161.

58/a, s. **171/a**.

61/a: G. Wilhelm, *StBoT* 36, 1994, 53f. (Fragm. E).

73/a lk. Kol. 2'-11', s. E. Neu, *StBoT* 12, 1970, 42.

75/a: Zum Zusammenschluß mit KBo 20.58 s. M. Popko, *THeth* 21, 1994, 252-257.

79/a, Fn. 2: Zur Datierung des Textes vgl. noch H.-S. Schuster, *HHB*, 1974, 11f. ("fröh").

146/a: Vgl. H. Otten, *StBoT* 17, 1973, 17.

165/a; **170/a**; **171/a**; **1097/c** (= KBo 34.235; vgl. Fn. 1 auf S. 32): Zusammengehörigkeit dieser Stücke erscheint erwägenswert, alle mh. Schrift; zu CTH 705. Ein anderes Exemplar liegt in KUB 34.98 (**231/a**) vor; ferner Dupl. unv. Bo 5278 (vgl. Fn. 1 auf S. 32). Inhaltlich könnte die ganze Textgruppe zur vierten Tafel des (*h*)*iš*uwa-Festes (CTH 628)