
The present volume represents the third in the series of Jaan Puhvel’s selected writings, following Analecta Indoeuropaea (1981) and Epilecta Indoeuropaea (2002). It contains in addition to articles published during the last decade a generous selection of reviews from throughout the author’s scholarly career (in response to suggestions by reviewers of the previous two volumes) and a most welcome updated complete bibliography of his work published through 2012. As is common practice, the articles and reviews have been reproduced in their original format and pagination, with continuous pagination for this volume added at the bottom. The legibility of the reproduced texts is quite good (despite the rather small typeface in some instances), but the proof-reading of the review section was not as good as that for the articles: on p. 174 and again on p. 238 one or more lines of the original text have been inadvertently omitted, compromising readability.

As is well-known, Puhvel has been engaged for three decades in producing an etymological dictionary of Hittite, a massive undertaking he has pursued with unique expertise and unflagging energy, entirely without editorial assistance or institutional support. Understandably, most of the articles collected in this volume are directly related to research conducted for the dictionary. This fact in no way means that the versions presented here are redundant or mere duplications of what is found in his Hittite Etymological Dictionary (HED), Berlin/New York 1984–. Puhvel rigorously and appropriately eschews detracting from the readability of the entries in his dictionary by trying to force into them the full argumentation for his analyses. That purpose is served by the respective articles on various Hittite appellatives collected here. These include words from portions of the alphabet already published in the HED and from those yet to come.

Puhvel’s sovereign control of Hittite philology and broad knowledge of Indo-European make all of his textual interpretations and etymological proposals worthy of serious consideration. The present reviewer inevitably finds some of them
more persuasive than others. I discuss here a selection of
some I find especially noteworthy. The careful demonstra-
tion of the (at least original) distinction between munnā(ī)-
‘conceal’ (actively put out of sight) and sanna- ‘keep silent
about’ (passively fail to mention knowledge of) is not only
fully convincing, but also of capital importance for under-
standing both the synchronic use of the two terms in context
and determining their etymologies. The match between the
Hittite adverb marri ‘fully’, but also ‘lightly, frivolously’,
and Latin merē ‘entirely’, but also ‘solely, merely’, furnishes
yet another example of a striking Hittite-Latin lexical isogloss
(see in extenso J. Puhvel, “West-Indo-European affinities of
Anatolian,” in Früh-, Mittel-, Spätindogermanisch. Akten
der IX. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom
5. bis 9. Oktober 1992 in Zürich, Wiesbaden 1994, 315–24,
and passim in the HED). As he suggests, the Hittite plausibly
represents a frozen locative. Its shape (with geminate -rr-
and a-vocalism of the root) can be explained by supposing
that the root was *merh₁₂, with an *h₁ that would have disap-
peared without a reflex in the Latin. Very welcome is Puh-
vel’s forceful argumentation that nannā/i- ‘drive’ is the iter-
ative-durative of nai- ‘turn’, not a reduplicated derivative
of the latter (precluded by the geminate -mn-). Since nannā/i-
is a specifically Hittite creation, Puhvel’s formal derivation
from a pre-Hittite *nay-nannā/i- with loss of intervocalic yod
is entirely in order (and explains the occasional plene spell-
ing na-a-an-nai/i-). The articles on “covert” verbal roots in
Anatolian and on five rare Hittite verbs both contain valuable
insights. While I fully agree that we must assume two syn-
chronically distinct nouns pankur, one meaning ‘clan’ and
the other referring to a body part, I find Puhvel’s arguments
for the latter as specifically ‘beard, goatee’ (of a goat’s
beard) unconvincing for some attestations and the compari-
son with Greek νογον ‘beard’ formally strained. A sense
‘mat/clump of hair’ fits all of the body part examples, includ-
ing those where it refers to a goat’s ‘beard’. Thus both nouns
pankur would reflect the same preform *bhǒŋgh wr, *that
which sticks together’, although it is unlikely that Hittite
speakers regarded ‘clan’ and ‘clump of hair’ as related.
Finally, though I have advocated the meaning ‘virgin,
untouched’ for Hittite dammili-, I must concede that Puhvel
brings to bear powerful arguments against this interpreta-
tion (it is hard to see how some of the objects modified by this
adjective can be understood as ‘virgin, untouched’) and in
favor of ‘different’ (comparing Latin aliēnus). However, the
formal relationship of dammili- ‘different’ to d(a)māi- ‘other’
remains to be explained. The consistent geminate -mm-
of the first precludes a direct derivation from the second, and
the Hittite adjectival suffix -i-li- (also in adverbs such as dud-
damili ‘secretly’) has nothing to do with the Hittic “ethnic”
suffix seen in the personal name ḫattuššīl-.

By no means all of Puhvel’s articles of the last decade are
tied to the etymological dictionary. I particularly recommend
his excellent discussions of two interesting aspects of Hittite
morpho-syntax: (1) the varying “subcategorization” frames
of verbs such as eku- ‘drink (to), sipand- ‘libate; con-
secrate; worship’, or (šer arḫa) wahu- in the sense ‘brandish
(overt)’ in the 2003 and 2011 articles in Historische Sprach-
forschung; (2) the elliptical genitive and the further develop-
ment in some cases to hypostatic nouns, in Aramazd 6.2
(2011 [2012]). Some articles deal with matters of Greek and
Latin etymology, and others with cultural topics, in Hittite
or a broader Indo-European context.

As intimated by Puhvel in his preface, some of the older
reviews are now of principally historical interest, reminding
us of the disciplinary context in which the works reviewed
originally appeared (I have in mind here particularly those of
pioneering Mycenaeanological publications, but the remark
also applies to reviews of handbooks on Italic and others).
However, his series of informed and objective reviews of
Hittite lexicography (Annelies Kammenhuber’s second edi-
tion of Johannes Friedrich’s Hethitisches Wörterbuch, Johann
Tischler’s Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar, and the Chi-
cago Hittite Dictionary) retain their currency, and anyone
interested in the Hittite lexicon from either a synchronic or
diachronic perspective should periodically reread them. It
has been my repeated experience that—with the passage of
time and evolution in one’s own thinking—one sometimes
sees earlier proposals of others in a new light.

In sum, despite the author’s modest disclaimer in the
preface, there is much that is valuable in this collection, and we
are indebted to him and the publisher for making the contents
readily available. The two selections published here for the
first time, brief as they are, are also illuminating, and not-
withstanding the apparent finality of the volume’s title, we
may hope that there might still be an eventual sequel.
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