

HETTITOLOGIE

PUHVEL, J. — *Ultima Indoeuropaea*. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 143). Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck, 2012. (24 cm, 280). ISBN 978-3-85124-729-9. € 72,-.

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 those I find especially noteworthy. The careful demonstration of the (at least original) distinction between *munna(i)-* ‘conceal’ (actively put out of sight) and *šanna-* ‘keep silent about’ (passively fail to mention knowledge of) is not only fully convincing, but also of capital importance for understanding 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 **merh₁-*, with an **h₁* that would have disappeared without a reflex in the Latin. Very welcome is Puhvel’s forceful argumentation that *nanna/i-* ‘drive’ is the iterative-durative of *nai-* ‘turn’, not a reduplicated derivative of the latter (precluded by the geminate *-nn-*). Since *nanna/i-* is a specifically Hittite creation, Puhvel’s formal derivation from a pre-Hittite **nay-anna/i-* with loss of intervocalic yod is entirely in order (and explains the occasional plene spelling *na-a-an-na/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 synchronically 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 comparison with Greek πώγων ‘beard’ formally strained. A sense ‘mat/clump of hair’ fits all of the body part examples, including those where it refers to a goat’s ‘beard’. Thus both nouns *pankur* would reflect the same preform **bhóngh-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 interpretation (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 *-ili-* (also in adverbs such as *dud-dumili* ‘secretly’) has nothing to do with the Hittite “ethnic” suffix seen in the personal name *Hattušili-*.

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)’, *šipand-* ‘libate; consecrate; worship’, or (*šer arḫa*) *wahnu-* in the sense ‘brandish (over)’ in the 2003 and 2011 articles in *Historische Sprachforschung*; (2) the elliptical genitive and the further development 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 edition of Johannes Friedrich’s *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*, Johann Tischler’s *Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar*, and the *Chicago 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 notwithstanding the apparent finality of the volume’s title, we may hope that there might still be an eventual sequel.

Los Angeles, August 2013

H. Craig MELCHERT