

hardly be any doubt that they originally come from the Kültepe near Kayseri in Turkey (ancient Kanish).

It has been Gwaltney's aim to make these texts with all their information on the Assyrian "economic involvement in distant lands" accessible to "a wider range of scholars" especially those "not versed in the Old Assyrian dialect." The book treats the texts in the same sequence in which the copies were published in *HUCA*. It might have been more efficient to differentiate between letters, protocols, contracts, etc., or even to group them according to content or archival affinities. Since the copies in *HUCA* are not numbered consecutively and can only be identified by their inventory numbers, there seems to be little reason to maintain the given sequence.

The transliterations and translations are followed by extensive commentaries on philological and grammatical peculiarities of the texts. Indices of proper names, professions, eponyms and dates and a glossary conclude the book.

Despite Gwaltney's statement in the introduction the work seems to be written rather for Old Assyrian specialists than for scholars from adjoining fields. The long philological discussions, the copied results of collations and the missing commentaries on Old Assyrian technical terms from economy and jurisdiction such as *šibtum* or *qiptum* point in this direction. Especially the last mentioned point together with the complete lack of comments on possible archival affiliations is very regrettable with respect to the target group mentioned by Gwaltney. Non-specialists working with this book will still have to consult the various major studies in this field in order to get a clear picture of all the implications of these texts.

On the other hand Gwaltney did not satisfy the specialists either. This can be seen from the relevant reviews by Hecker (*Afo* 31, pp. 81ff.), Hirsch (*OA* 23, pp. 313f.), von Soden (*ZA* 73, pp. 287ff.) and Veenhof (*JESHO* 28, pp. 110ff.).

Since the reviewer does not see himself in the position to discuss the philological problems of this edition—they have been pointed out in painstaking detail and often unnecessarily harsh words in some of the reviews mentioned above—he will try to add some of the information he is missing in Gwaltney's introduction: about the distribution of text types and about archival affiliations as far as a brief study of the texts does allow this.

The 82 tablets and fragments are for the most part letters: certainly 38 of them (3, 5–8, 10, 11, 13–22, 24, 25, 27–31, 33, 35, 39, 41–43, 50, 55, 58, 62, 64, 68, 70, 78), probably three more (46, 73, 74), among them the *waklum*-letter (18) possibly sent by Sargon I of Assyria to Pūšu-kēn that has already been treated in length by Larsen in *OACS*, pp. 134ff. There are three protocols of court sessions (1, 9, 26), thirteen business and juridical contracts (2, 4, 12, 23, 32, 36, 37, 40, 45, 47, 51, 52, 57) and five private notes (34, 38, 44, 53, 54). Twenty fragments are too broken to be identified.

The prosopography of the texts from Kültepe is one of the major problems in this field. Although they were written during a period of only about 100 years, the great number of persons with identical names (e.g., *Šū-Ištar*, *Aššur-malik*) and the very frequent omissions of the patronymicon makes it often difficult to assign certain texts to archives. It seems, however, that most of the major archives are represented within the Philadelphia texts.

The largest group can be assigned to the archive of Aššur-idī and his sons: twelve letters (3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 13, 14, 17, 24, 30, 39, 50) and two contracts in which Aššur-nādā figures as creditor (2, 12). The Pūšu-kēn archive is represented by three letters to Pūšu-kēn himself (15, 18, 33) and the note 53 about Kulumaja. No. 19 is a letter to Pūšu-kēn and Laqēpum and no. 7 to Pūšu-kēn and Ilaprat-bāni.

Imdi-ilum occurs in this text group only sending letters, not receiving them (cf. 16, 22). Nos. 21, 26 and 32 might possibly also be connected with the business activities of this family firm. If the Ahu-waqar in 23 and 57 is in fact the same person as in 21 one has to add these texts as well.

The archive of Enlil-bāni is represented by three letters to various members of his family (25, 31, 43) and by the documents 4 and 37.

Singular examples are one letter by Ilī-wēdāku to Puzur-Aššur (28) and one by Inbi-Ištar to Šilla-Adad (20). The remaining texts are either too fragmentary or did not show obvious indications for archival assignment.

HANNES D. GALTER

UNIVERSITÄT GRAZ

Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Vols. 1(A) and 2(E, I). By JAAN PUHVEL. Pp. xxii + 504. (Trends in Linguistics, Documentation 1, edited by W. Winter) Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: MOUTON. 1984. DM 245.—

We now have before us the first installment of a third Hittite etymological dictionary, following the *Vocabulaire étymologique de la langue hittite* of A. Juret (1942) and *Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar* of J. Tischler (1977–). The superiority of Puhvel's work over that of his predecessors is immediately apparent.

First, Puhvel actually controls the Hittite texts. This assures that the overall accuracy of such basic facts as meaning, gender, and inflectional type is quite high—errors of this type are few. Despite Puhvel's modest disclaimer (p. v), his dictionary is thus eminently suited for use as a Hittite-English glossary. It is unfortunate that the very steep price will make such use impractical for most students. Puhvel's command of

the texts has an additional more important benefit: he is able to propose new original interpretations of many lexemes, which often lead to new etymologies. Some of these are undoubtedly correct (e.g., *āšma*, *aišš-* sub *ā-*), others highly plausible (*anašša-*, *araša-*). All are thought-provoking. Generous citations from texts are provided, so that those who read Hittite in transliteration may judge for themselves the basis for the interpretations adopted.

Puhvel also surpasses his predecessors in his grasp of Proto-Indo-European morphology. While one will by no means agree with all of his reconstructions, it is refreshing to see an attempt made to reconstruct where possible derivational and inflectional types, not mere root etymologies. He has a well-developed critical sense, and unlike Tischler, for example, he does not hesitate to make choices among competing explanations. Obviously, no one will agree with all the judgments offered, but Puhvel's reasoned adoption of a definite point of view complements the useful but often uncritical compilational style of Tischler. In some famous cases of long-standing controversy (e.g., *au(š)-*, *eku-*), Puhvel is able to clear away a good deal of dead wood, and future etymologists will need only cite his summaries.

Other aspects of the problems dealt with fare less well under Puhvel's treatment. His discussions of lexemes whose meaning is largely syntactic (conjunctions, particles, adverbs) are for the most part highly superficial, and his often summary dismissal of the work of others in this regard should simply be ignored (see, e.g., *-a* 'and' or particle *-apa*). A more serious problem, because it affects the work as a whole, is the apparent lack of any coherent conception of Hittite (respectively Anatolian) historical phonology. Citation of parallels to support assumed sound changes is haphazard, and some of the phonological developments cited are quite dubious, inspiring little confidence (see, e.g., sub *ašuša-*, *išiyahḫ-* and *izziya-*). In the absence of any systematic phonological rationale, Puhvel's judgments about individual cases (e.g., *ašiwant-*, *išhuwa-*) often appear arbitrary or capricious. He gives a brief summary of his view of the Hittite treatment of laryngeals (p. x), which is indispensable, especially given that his viewpoint is not that of the majority. In a future volume a similar schematic overview of what he considers to be the basic Hittite reflexes of other PIE phonemes would be most helpful.

Another area in need of improvement is the treatment of the related Indo-European languages of Anatolia, especially Luvian. While Puhvel seems to be aware of recent works on these languages, his view of them remains backward, and his judgments in this area are mostly wrong. To cite a typical example, he rejects the well-founded derivation of Hitt. *ekt-* = Cluv. *aggati-* 'hunting net' from a preform **yeKt-* (whatever further analysis one makes of the latter), in favor of an etymology which requires a totally unsupported change **ai* to *a* in Luvian. While analysis of the 'minor' Indo-European

languages of Anatolia remains problematic, our knowledge of them has now progressed to the point that they make significant contributions to our understanding of Hittite. In the future some prior consultation with colleagues specializing in these languages would avoid some of the lapses found in the current volume.

The time has not yet come for a Hittite etymological dictionary which would be in any sense definitive. Puhvel's goal has been to offer a thoughtful, original reappraisal of the Hittite lexical material (both obscure items and those whose etymology has been taken for granted), starting from the Hittite texts themselves. Despite the problems cited above, he has succeeded admirably in this aim. This is a book which I will use often and with profit, and I look forward to the sequel with anticipation.

H. CRAIG MELCHERT

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
CHAPEL HILL

Hittite Inventories. By SILVIN KOŠAK. Pp. vii + 332. Heidelberg: CARL WINTER UNIVERSITÄTSVERLAG. 1982.

This book arose from the author's interest in Hittite metallurgy. This interest led him to a study of the inventory texts, and, because these texts treat materials of all sorts, not just metals, he expanded the scope of his study accordingly. The study is essentially philological, and includes many texts in transliteration and translation, with comments; a summary; a glossary (Hittite, Sumerographic, Akkadian, divine names, personal names, and place names); an index (which lists text and *CTH* numbers, but does not refer to the page numbers in his work where the texts are treated); and a bibliography.

The author has succeeded at the task of arranging and presenting his materials in an orderly and eminently readable fashion. This is no easy task. Furthermore, his glossary, index, and bibliography facilitate the use and enhance the value of the book more than a little. The range of his research is little short of phenomenal: works in English, French, German, Italian, Russian, and Turkish (published and unpublished) enter into his discussions of various matters. Few Hittitologists control so much of the materials being produced in the field.

The treatment of texts succeeds in conveying the succinct, even abrupt style, of the inventories, which are, in essence, lists of goods. From these lists, a number of things can be learned. One of these is that the Hittites did business with many states: Babylon, Egypt, Ugarit, Lycia, Kizzuwatna,