

GÜTERBOCK†, H.G., H.A. HOFFNER, and Th.P.J. VAN DEN HOUT (Eds.) — The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Volume Š. Fascicle 2. *šaptamenzu* to *-ši-*. Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, Chicago, 2005. (28 cm, 209-332). ISBN 1-885923-37-6. £ 28,00.

With the latest fascicle, comprising the lemmata *šaptamenzu* to *-ši-*, *-ša-* 'his, her, its', the Chicago Hittite Dictionary (CHD) has finished the treatment of words beginning with *ša-* and now has moved on to words beginning with *ši/e-*. It contains 124 pages, which is considerably less than e.g. the preceding fascicle, CHD Š(1), which consists of 208 pages. In comparison to the previous fascicles, the organization of the lemmata has remained the same. The only difference is that verbal derivatives in *-ške/a-*,<sup>1</sup> which were thus far called 'iteratives', are now more adequately called 'imperfectives', probably on the basis of Melchert 1998.

As we know from its previous fascicles, CHD is thorough in its treatment of the semantics of the words under consideration, extensive in the citing of attested forms and contexts as well as comprehensive in its referring to secondary literature. Nevertheless, some inadequacies must be discussed.

On p. 230-8 the verb "*šarra-*, *šarre-*, *šarriyale-*" is treated, of which CHD could have stated more clearly that in OH and MH texts active forms denote 'to divide up, to distribute', intransitive middles denote 'to be divided' or 'to split up (intr.)', and transitive middles denote 'to transgress (oaths, borders, doorways)' (cf. Oettinger 1976: 59f.; Melchert 1984: 18). Only in NH texts the meaning 'to transgress' can be expressed by active forms as well. With respect to the formal side of this verb, CHD states that "[t]he oldest texts show a root thematic class verb, *mi*-conjugation with diagnostic forms *šarrezzi*, *šarranzi*, *šarrer*, *šarratta*, *šarraleške*[-...]. All *hi*-conjugation forms [...] are secondary and belong to the late MH and NH period" (p. 231, referring to Oettinger 1979: 287). This analysis is entirely based on the form "*šar-re-et*" (KUB 36.106 rev. 5 (OS)) that CHD interprets as 3sg.pret.act., whereas already Melchert (1984: 18<sup>36</sup>) correctly showed that the context demands a 3sg.pres.midd.-form. This means that the form should be read *šar-ri-ēt[-ta]*. Having eliminated "3sg.pret.act. *šar-re-et*", we now see that the oldest active forms of this verb, 3sg.pres.act. *ša-a-ar-ri* (MH/MS), 3pl.pres.act. *šar-ra-an-zi* (OS) and 3sg.pret.act. *ša-a-ar-aš* (OS), rather point to an original *hi*-conjugated *šarr-i* / *šarr-* (comparable to *ārr-i* / *arr-* 'to wash').

On p. 238-9 a verb "*šarai-*" 'to unravel' is cited, which is attested in one clear context only, and on p. 257 a verb "*šariya-*" 'to embroider, to sew on'. Because of the formal similarity (note that for both verbs a 3pl.pres.act.-form *ša-ra-an-zi* is cited) as well as the semantic ambiguousness of the context in which "*šarai-*" is attested (KBo 5.1 iii 52-55: *nu MUNUS.MEŠ katrēš TÚG-an šarānzi š mahhan=ma TÚG-an šarāwanzi zinnanzi* 'The *katra*-women *š.* the cloth. § When they finish *š.*-ing the cloth...'), it seems more attractive to me to assume that these verbs are identical: *šar(iyela)-* 'to embroider, to sew on'.

<sup>1</sup> CHD's consistent transliteration of this suffix with the vowel *-i-* (e.g. 1sg.pres.act. *°š-ke/I-mi* as *°š-ki-mi* and 3sg.pres.act. *°š-ke/I-El/zi* as *°š-ki-iz-zi*) should be abandoned: plene spellings like *°š-ke-e-zi*, *°š-ke-e-et*, which occur from OH to NH texts, as well as the consistent spelling of 2sg.pres.act. as *°š-ke-eš* (and never *\*\*°š-ki-iš*) clearly indicate that the suffix contained the vowel *-e-*. We should therefore transliterate *°š-ke-mi*, *°š-ke-ši*, *°š-ke-ez-zi*, etc.

On p. 239 the verb "*šarak(k)u(i)-*" 'to water(?), to give water to(?)' is cited with "*-k(k)-*", implying free variation between single *-k-* and geminate *-kk-*. This is not the case: the geminate *-kk-* is attested in the imperfective only (*šarakku(i)ške/a-*), where it is morphologically expected (compare imperf. *akkuške/a-* from *eku-zi* / *aku-* 'to drink'). The verb therefore had better be cited as *šaraku-*.

On p. 244 it is stated that the verb "*šara(p)p-*, *šarip-*" is "[d]oubtless onomatopoeic". This remark does not take into account the convincing etymological connection with Lat. *sorbeō*, Gr. *σοφέω* 'to slurp, to swallow' < PIE *\*srebh-* as was first suggested by Neumann 1967: 32 (cf. Kloekhorst fthc.: *sub šarāp-i* / *šarip-* for full etymological treatment).

On p. 247, the adjective "*šaraz(z)i(ya)-*" should rather have been cited as *šarāz(z)i(ya)-*: not only the multiple attestations with plene vowel, *ša-ra-a-az-zi-*, but also the clear etymological connection with the adverb *šarā* 'upwards' supports this. Similarly in "*šaraz(z)iyahh-*" and "*šarazziyaz*" (both p. 250).

On p. 279 the semi-hapax form <sup>UZU</sup>*šar-na-an-ta* (KUB 5.5 i 21, iv 13) 'afterbirth' is treated under a separate lemma, whereas it had better be regarded as a spelling error for <sup>UZU</sup>*šar-ḫu-an-ta* (note that the signs NA and ḪU only differ one vertical stroke vs. Winkelhaken from each other), belonging to the noun *šarḫuwant-* 'belly; foetus; innards, afterbirth' as treated on p. 253-4.

On p. 268-70 the first translation of the adjective *šarku-* is given as 'high in rank or status'. This translation goes back to Juret 1942: 43, who assumed an inner-Hittite etymological connection with *šarā* 'upwards' and *šēr* 'on top'. Since this etymological connection cannot be correct (cf. Kloekhorst fthc.: *s.v.*) it is better not to include in the translation the notion 'high' anymore, and render *šarku-* as 'eminent, illustrious, powerful' only.

On p. 290-1 two important attestations of the verb "*šart-*, *šartai-*, *šartiya-*" 'to smear(?), to wipe' have been omitted, namely 3sg.pres.act. *šar-ta-i* as attested in KBo 17.18 ii 16 (OS) and KUB 36.110, 20 (OS). Moreover, in the overview of attestations the form *šar-ta-i* as found in KBo 17.43 i 14 is dated as "OH/NS(?)" whereas the text in fact is OS (as is correctly indicated lower in the lemma). On the basis of the OS forms of this verb, 3sg.pres.act. *šar-ta-i*, 3pl.pret.act. *šarte-er*, we must conclude that this verb originally belonged to the *tarn(a)*-class: *šarta-i* / *šart-*.

On p. 321 the enclitic pronoun 'to him/her/it' is cited as "*-še, -ši*", whereas it is almost consistently spelled with geminate *-šš-* (*nu-u=š-še*, etc.) in postvocalic position. It therefore should have been cited as *-šše, -šši*.

On p. 324, the enclitic possessive pronoun "*-ši-, -ša-*" (which should also have been cited with geminate *-šš-*, cf. e.g. *pé-e-di-i=š-ši*) also has a stem *-šše-*, namely in nom.-acc.sg./pl.n. *-ššet*. It therefore would have been preferable to cite *-šši-, -šša-, -šše-*.<sup>2</sup>

Despite these flaws or less favourable choices, this fascicle is an indispensable tool for seriously practicing Hittite studies and will wholeheartedly be welcomed by every Hittitologist. The only disappointment is that it does not contain more pages!

Leiden, March 2007

Alwin KLOEKHORST

<sup>2</sup> Which incidentally shows how unfortunate the editors' choice was "to consider the two vowels [e and i] equivalent for the purpose of alphabetization of lemmas" (CHD L-N: xii).

## References

- CHD<sup>L-N</sup>: *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, Volume L-N* (eds. H.G. Güterbock & H.A. Hoffner, Jr.), Chicago, 1989.
- CHD<sup>Š(1)</sup>: *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, Volume Š, Fascicle 1: šā- to šapta-menzu* (eds. H.G. Güterbock, H.A. Hoffner Jr. & Th.P.J. van den Hout), Chicago, 2002.
- Juret, A., 1942. *Vocabulaire étymologique de la langue hittite*, Limoges.
- Kloekhorst, A., fthc. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*.
- Melchert, H.C., 1984. *Studies in Hittite Historical Phonology*, Göttingen.
- , 1998. Aspects of Verbal Aspect in Hittite, *Uluslararası Hititoloji Kongresi Bildirileri. Acts of the IIIrd International Congress of Hittitology, Çorum, Sep. 16-22, 1996* (eds. S. Alp & S. Süel), 413-418.
- Neumann, G., 1967. *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft 1816 und 1966: 1) Franz Bopp - 1816, 2) Zum Stand der Hethitologie* (= *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft, Sonderheft 24*), Innsbruck.
- Oettinger, N., 1976. *Die militärischen Eide der Hethiter* (= *Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 22*), Wiesbaden.
- , 1979. *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbuns* (= *Erlanger Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kunstwissenschaft 64*), Nürnberg.

## SYRIË - PALESTINA

- YON, Marguerite — Kition dans les textes. *Testimonia littéraires et épigraphiques et Corpus des inscriptions. Kition-Bamboula V. Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations (erc)*, Paris, 2004 (29,7 cm, 380). ISBN 2-86538-292-3. € 44,-.

This book gives full information on all that is known of Kition (Larnaca, Cyprus) according to the ancient texts. The sources are given in their original languages (except Biblical Hebrew) and are followed by French translations, notes and bibliographies. The inscriptions republished here are often given in sharp photos. The introduction discusses topics like the Kittim in the Bible (p. 14-16), the title “king of Kition and Idalion (and Tamasos)” (p. 18 f.), the identity of the city Qarthadasht, the “Carthage” of Cyprus (p. 19-22), the presence of Kitians in Greece (for example in bilingual inscriptions) (p. 22 f.). The first part of the book offers “témoignages littéraires et épigraphiques mentionnant Kition”. First, geographical information found in Classical authors like Strabo, Pliny, Ptolemy; and Cyprus on the Tabula Peutingerana (p. 25-31). Then the chapter “Origines”, about Kition in the Bible (including its Greek translation with its own interpretation), Flavius Josephus; Ugaritic texts and archaic inscriptions like the Nora Stela (Sardinia), followed by later traditions in Ovid, early Christian writers, Byzantine scholars, Jewish sources (p. 33-45). Chapter III is about Kition in historical periods (from 750 B.C.): Biblical and Classical sources (some contemporary, like Ezekiel’s prophecy on Tyre), Assyrian royal inscriptions; add to the bibliography on the flight of Luḫi (Eululaeos) to Cyprus (p. 50): N. Na’aman, “Sargon II and the rebellion of the Cypriote kings against Shilta of Tyre”, *Or NS 67* (1998) 239-247.

Furthermore, KA1 31; the Kittim in the Arad ostraca (given in transliteration and translation; p. 56-58), syllabic

Greek and Phoenician inscriptions from Idalion, and the complete dossier of Cimon and his Athenians beleaguering Kition; the dossiers of Andocides and Abdymon; the battle against Euagoras of Salamis; more inscriptions from Idalion and Tamasos dated to king Milkiyaton (392-362 B.C.). Some of them are bilingual: in Phoenician and in syllabic Greek (p. 78-81). Testimonia for the reign of Pumayyaton (Pygmalion); Alexander the Great and his successors; the Ptolemaean and Roman hegemonies; the bishoprics of Cyprus (p. 47-94). Chapter IV offers the textual evidence on famous persons from Kition; in the first place the philosopher Zeno, founder of the Stoa (p. 96-125). Inscriptions about Kitians in Athens, Delos, Rhodos, etc. Three concern Noumènios, a Greek name meaning “Of the New Moon”, in Phoenician *Benhōdeš*, *Maḥdaš* “Son of Newmoon” (nos. 71, 165-166) (p. 81, 132-144). See for such “translations” of names p. 23.

The second part of the book, all the inscriptions found in Kition, begins with an introduction and continues with three Sections, organised according to language. “Pour la période qui va du IXe à la fin du IVe siècle av. J.-C., on ne s’étonnera pas de trouver presque uniquement des inscriptions en phénicien (environ 150 numéros). Puis les inscriptions en grec sont en majorité écrasante (plus de 220 numéros) à partir du rattachement de Chypre au royaume lagide, qui marque son entrée dans le monde hellénistique” (p. 159). The first Section presents the Phoenician inscriptions, beginning with the drawings of inscriptions seen by Pococke in 1738 (p. 172). The inscriptions published in *Kition III* (1977) are repeated (p. 173-194); those published later follow, and in addition 11 fragmentary that remained unpublished (p. 194-204). M.G. Amadasi Guzzo contributes an update of the bibliography of *Kition III*, with discussions of various problems (p. 205-215).

Here, this reviewer has a suggestion. What does *krsym* mean? (p. 206 f.) Scholars have thought of Cretans, Corsicans, etc. They are mercenaries and this will remind us in the first place of the Carians. And indeed, the Caria is named *Grs* in Egypt and *Karsā* in cuneiform texts; R. Zadok, *Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes 8* (1985) 198; add VAS 6 123:3, 8 (= NRVU 553). New refs. in unpublished texts in the British Museum were discovered by C. Waerzeggers, “The Carians of Borsippa”, *Iraq 58* (2006) 1-22. The prophecy on Tyre in Ezekiel 27:10 speaks of mercenaries from “Persia, Lud and Put”. It has been suggested that Caria (read *Krs*, not *Prs*), Lydia and Libya are meant. — R. Zadok made the same identification in his broad article on the Carians in cuneiform texts; *Tel Aviv 32* (2005) 80-100.

M. Szynger publishes inscriptions on sherds, excavated between 1976 and 1990, and a stela (p. 217-227). Some of the Phoenician inscriptions are long and famous; an example is the “tropaeum” inscription recently published (p. 201 no. 1144), or the expenses of the temple of Astarte mentioning the “dogs” among its personnel (p. 185 no. 1078). In the inscription about “the sacrifice of hair” (H. Puech), the argument for this interpretation, the word *glb*, “to shear”, is now read *plb* (p. 188 no. 1100:1).

Section 2 gives 229 Greek inscriptions, in alphabetic writing (p. 231-336), and 12 in Cypriote syllabic writing (p. 337-342). No. 2002 (p. 237) speaks of the *thiasos tôn presbuterôn*, relevant for the study of Semitic *marzeah*. Section 3 offers two Latin inscriptions (p. 343 f.).

In Section 4 (p. 345-354), Fl. Malbran-Labat gives a new edition of the stela of Sargon II of Assyria, found in Larnaca,