

related somehow to Arm. *zurna* "id." is also likely, though the history of the word from Hieroglyphic Luwian is not pursued. But at any rate, *zurna* is a late-comer to Armenian, being, perhaps, a nineteenth century loan from Turkish into which language it probably came from Persian (in Riggs's Vocabulary of Words Used in Modern Armenian but not Found in the Ancient Armenian Lexicons, Smyrna 1847, it is noted as a Turkish word, only lately being used in Armenian). Such are the quite fascinating kernels to be found obscurely in this large book.

Dj.'s interest in Hittite loanwords in Armenian is cautious, and he seems to accept fully none of the ideas that have been presented which account for the coincidence of Hittitisms in Armenian, the least speculative of which is the suggestion that they were first millennium loans from Hieroglyphic Luwian. At the beginning of his discussion, he says that the questions of 'where, when, and how' remain unanswered. However, his listing of those etymologies which have been submitted could have been shortened quite a bit; I see little value in maintaining such a parallel as Arm. *ənt'rik* "supper", Hitt. *etri-* (?!); yet, on the other hand, such a correspondence as Arm. *brut* "potter", Hitt. *purut* "clay", is compelling.

Though few are ready for it, Dj. offers some Nostraticisms, mostly with Finno-Ugric. But they are largely quite uninteresting. Such a correspondence as Arm. *xtut* "type of fern", Finn. *kutittaa* "to tickle", is hardly persuasive. That there are so few correspondences is also significant, for certainly many rather precise correspondences can be found, by coincidence, between almost any two well documented languages.

On the matter of Semitic loans, Dj. shows considerable restraint, for although Nerses Mkrtychyan has been pouring a profusion of Akkadian-Armenian correspondences on his often alarmed colleagues, Dj. takes care to show that it is considerably more likely that the terms are either of early Christian origin from Syriac, or later contenders from Arabic. Yet some correspondences remain intriguing. Here one could note Arm. *kmaxk'* "skeleton", Akk. *kima(b)bu* "grave"; Arm. *šar* "3600 years", Akk. *šaru* "id.". It would, however, have improved the texture of this latter correspondence if Dj. had noted that there exists also Gk. *σάρος* "id."

We have in this large book a massive amount of information, and the bibliography of over a thousand entries testifies to the care that went into its making. We still face, in Djahukian's work, ideas which confound us. Yet we cannot but come away knowing that we have in this book a superb and accurate compilation of nearly all that is important about the early Armenian language. Its publication is a benchmark in Armenian linguistic scholarship.

Cleveland State University  
Program in Linguistics  
Cleveland OH 44115  
U. S. A.

John A. C. Greppin

Otten, Heinrich: Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy. Ein Staatsvertrag Tuḫaliyas IV. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1988, 4°, XI, 94 S., 3 Tafeln, 4 Faltafeln (Autographien). (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten. Beiheft 1.) Geb. 58 DM.

It has long been known that the Hittites occasionally preserved important documents on tablets of metal, especially for display purposes (see e.g. KBo

IV 10 Rs 22)<sup>1</sup>. In July, 1986, excavators at Boğazköy had the unexpected good fortune to find a bronze specimen of such a tablet in virtually mint condition.

The wholly preserved text of 325 lines is a treaty between the Hittite king Tuḫaliya IV and Kurunta, ruler of the Hittite dependency of Tarḫuntašša, which lay in SW Anatolia. After a typical historical preamble, the treaty prescribes the boundaries of Tarḫuntašša, sets forth other rights and obligations of Kurunta, and concludes in standard fashion with lists of divine and human witnesses and mutual pledges of fidelity. The provisions of this treaty overlap with those of the previously known treaty with Ulmi-Tešub (KBo IV 10), but with several very significant variations.

This text is now presented in an exemplary first edition by the eminent Hittitologist H. Otten. The volume contains an introduction, the text in transliteration and translation, detailed commentary, glossary and indices, photographs and autograph. O. normalizes the sign shapes in his autograph to match those on clay, which makes for easier comparison of the 'ductus'. One may easily discern the special peculiarities of the signs due to the engraving on metal from the excellent enlarged photograph in Tafel 3.

The significance of this document for the study of Hittite history, geography and language can hardly be overestimated. The unbroken length of the text and the fact that this copy is almost certainly contemporary with the composition will make it particularly valuable for the study of Neo-Hittite syntax. As is typical with new discoveries, the bronze tablet answers some questions and raises others. I will leave larger linguistic problems for elsewhere and confine myself here to points bearing on the interpretation of the text.

I 8,14: LUGAL-*iznan(n)i arḫa tittanut* means merely "removed from the kingship". Hittite often employs the dative-locative to indicate the starting point of an action, in competition with the ablative; see Melchert, Diss 182 ff.

I 22 (and passim): O.'s consistent translation of the ablatives of place-names as "from X" without commentary is apt to confuse many readers. The Hittite ablative also means "in the direction of, towards": see Melchert, Diss 193 ff., and already Götze, AM 220f. Garstang-Gurney, Geogr 66f., translate correctly "towards" and also explain, Geogr 70, that the city Tarḫuntašša is taken as the implicit reference point.

I 60f. (and passim): O. translates ZAG correctly as "boundary" in the nominative, but without justification as "territory" or "realm" in the ablative. When the text says *IŠTU KUR* "towards the land of" in one place (I 22), but *IŠTU ZAG* "towards the boundary/edge of" in another (I 60-61), we must take the distinction seriously. The latter would refer to a case where the boundary of Tarḫuntašša merely touches another territory obliquely (in the manner that Libya borders the Sudan, e.g.). Likewise ZAG KUR <sup>URU.DU</sup>-*tašša kuis* KUR <sup>ID</sup>*Hulayaš* in II 4 is not a mere redundancy: "the H.-River land which is the boundary (area) of the land of T." Cf. KBo IV 10 Vs 33: "that which is the boundary (area) of the land of T." The point here is that no herdsman from Ḫatti is to violate even the frontier region of Tarḫuntašša.

II 11: O.'s suggestion that the 'Glossenkeilwort' *likin* refers to a "(salt-)lick" is attractive, as is a derivation from PIE \**leiǵb-*, despite the problem this raises for the treatment of PIE \**ǵb* in Luvian.

II 47-48: O. misses the force of the double conjunction and unnecessarily distorts the meaning of *ḫanti* (correctly "separately" in the glossary). Read

<sup>1</sup> For special bibliographical abbreviations see H. G. Güterbock and H. A. Hoffner (edd.), *The Hittite Dictionary of the University of Chicago* 3/1 (1980) xxiff.

rather: "Both (-*ya*) my father had us swear an oath to each other, and we too (-*a*) separately (= on our own) were oath-brothers" (cf. the preceding context).

III 40: *kēzza* does not contain the geminating conjunction -*a* "and" (contra O.). We have here the common Neo-Hittite conflated spelling of the ablative as -*Vz-za* (from -*Vz* + -*V-za*). As new examples in this very text prove (I 89, III 19), the rule by which the ablative plus "and" appears as -*Vzzi=ya* is, remarkably, a productive synchronic rule of Neo-Hittite. Nor can *kēz* possibly mean "dortig" as O. claims. As often, it is the adverbial ablative meaning "on this side". As per Garstang-Gurney, Geogr 64-65, the 'Lower Land' lies roughly between Ḫattuša and Tarḫuntašša, thus "on this side" of Tarḫuntašša from the point of view of Ḫattuša. Likewise, with Garstang-Gurney, Geogr 67 and 73 (after Götze), *arabzenaza* in KBo IV 10 Vs 29 is indeed an adverb meaning simply "outside", i. e. on the far side of Tarḫuntašša a way from Ḫattuša. This is now confirmed by the bronze tablet, where a similar list of cities is said to be *arunaz pedaz* "towards the seacoast" (cf. O.'s commentary, 36 ff.).

III 56: Rather than take EGIR-*an* here with O. as a postposition "in the interest of" (an otherwise unattested sense of *āppan*), I would see an additional example of the use of *āppan* to mean "permanently, in perpetuity" (likewise I 82, III 3.68). See now my discussion in HS (= KZ) 102, 1989, 33 f. with references.

IV 44 ff.: O. concludes that the bronze tablet is the seventh copy, which belonged to Kurunta. He does not explain how in that case it came to be found in Ḫattuša. More seriously, if that were the meaning of IV 44 ff., it is very strange that the Hittite does not read simply *kī TUPPA. ḪI.A DUB.7.KAM iyan n=at m.DLAMMA ... ḫarzi* "This tablet is made (as) the seventh copy, and Kurunta ... keeps it/shall keep it". The text we have mentions Kurunta's copy only as one of seven and indeed in proper hierarchical order only at the end following those which are placed before the gods. I would understand instead: "This tablet (has been) made (as/into) seven copies ... One is placed before the Sun-goddess of Arinna, one before the Storm-god of Hatti, etc. ... but one Kurunta ... keeps in his house". The colophon would have been identical on all seven copies, informing the reader of any one of them of the existence and disposition of the others. I find O.'s counterarguments regarding the sealing of documents entirely circumstantial and less than persuasive.

The corrections and alternatives suggested above should not mislead the reader. This is an excellent first edition of a remarkable document. We should be particularly grateful to Professor Otten for the promptness with which he has made the full text available to all scholars, instead of postponing its appearance indefinitely in an attempt to answer more 'definitively' the many questions it raises.

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

H. Craig Melchert