

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 3. še to Lúšizišalla-. The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, Chicago, 2013. (28 cm, 333-508). ISBN 978-1-885923-95-0.

Treating “še” (*šu* + *=e*), “Lúšizišalla-” and all lemmata in between over the course of 176 pages, the third fascicle of Volume Š of the Chicago Hittite Dictionary (CHD) is a well-crafted and welcome addition to the series. Apart from various obscure loanwords and *hapax legomena*, this volume contains several lemmata which are extremely common and/or highly interesting from a historical point of view, such as “šēr, šer” ‘(up)on’, “šiu(n)-, \*šiuni-” ‘deity, god’ and “šip(p)a(n)d(a)-, išpand(a)-” ‘to libate’. The editors must be commended for presenting the abundance of attestations and various meanings of some of these lemmata in a lucid and insightful manner, as reviewers of previous fascicles have rightfully remarked time and time again (e.g. Melchert 1996, reviewing Vol. P, fasc. 1).

Indeed, one of the biggest strengths of this fascicle and also of the CHD in general, is its clarity of presentation. Boldface, different font sizes, line indentations and blank lines are effectively used to distinguish different sections of a lemma and enhance readability to a great extent. Large lemmata (such as *šēr*, which shows a wide range of uses and meanings depending on the verbs and complements it combines with) receive a helpful index to facilitate looking up a suitable meaning in any given context. In addition, proposed semantic values of lemmata are illustrated extensively by Hittite text examples, which are carefully translated. Whenever relevant, these are accompanied by a summary of the preceding lines, so that the editors’ translation of a given word can be judged adequately in its context. After the semantic treatment of a lemma, there is very often a separate section in which the editors defend their translation and lemmatisation choices (“šittara/i-”, p. 460), provide etymological accounts (“šēr, šer”, p. 436), comment on word-formation (“NINDAšermarant-”, p. 438) or consider cultural aspects of the word at hand (“(MUNUS)šiwanzanna-, MUNUSšiuanzanna-”, p. 493). Lastly, many lemmata end with a list of references to further literature, thus providing readers with an excellent starting point for further research on any given lemma.

On the other hand, there also some less fortunate choices which should not go unmentioned.

As other reviewers have remarked on previous fascicles and volumes of the CHD (e.g. Kammenhuber 1985 on Vol. L-N, fasc. 1; Kloekhorst 2007 on Vol. Š, fasc. 2; Tischler 2014 on this fasc.), the phonemic distinction between Hittite *e* and *i* should have been reflected in the ordering of the lemmata.<sup>1)</sup> Although this distinction is now widely accepted in the scholarly community, the CHD editors have maintained their initial decision to consider *e* and *i* as equal for purposes of alphabetisation. This leads to confusing situations in which, e.g., the verb *šipānd-* ‘to libate’ (p. 384; never found spelled *\*še-pa-<sup>o</sup>*) is listed before *šēr* ‘(up)on’ (p. 400; never found spelled *\*ši-(e-)er*). With the fourth fascicle of this Volume appearing soon, one may hope that the editors will take the start of a new Volume (T) as an opportunity to change this obsolete practice.

Additionally, attestations with plene writing are not always represented in the lemmata in a consistent way. For example, while both the versions of *šēr* (with a long and a short vowel) are represented in its lemma (“*šēr, šer*”, p. 400), the same is not true of *šipānd-* ‘to libate’ (“*šip(p)a(n)d(a)-, išpand(a)-*”, p. 384), where 12 important plene attestations of *ši-pa-a-<sup>o</sup>* appear to have been ignored. Likewise, plene writing is absent in, e.g., “*šeli-, šela-*” ‘harvest, harvested goods’ (p. 364), despite 14 attestations with plene *še-e-<sup>o</sup>*, and in “*šehun-* see *šehur*” (p. 350), referring to the lemma “*šehur, šehuwar(?), šehun-, šiehun-*” ‘urine, latrine’ on the same page.

The lemma title “*šiu(n)-, \*šiuni-*” ‘deity, god’ (p. 461) suggests that this word must have had an i-stem variant *šiuni-* at some point. As evidence for this, the editors take spellings such as DINGIR-LIM-*iš* (nom.sg.) and DINGIR-LIM-*in* (acc.sg.). As the editors duly mention, Mark Weeden has recently opposed the idea of an i-stem, demonstrating that the *-i-* is almost exclusively found if the Akkadographic complement -LIM- is present; without -LIM-, we systematically find the nom.sg. form DINGIR-*uš*, showing the ending -*uš* which is also attested in phonetic spellings of this case-form, e.g.: *ši-i-ú-us* (OS) (Weeden 2014: 188-193). Weeden tentatively proposes to take DINGIR-LIM-*iš* as the result of confusion with the Hittite personal name element -*ili-*, which is also written with DINGIR-LIM- and also receives the complement -*iš* in the nominative singular. Whatever the merit of this explanation, the correlation between -LIM- and -*iš/-in* seems clear enough. I agree with Weeden that it is most economical to assume that “*šiuš* remained *šiuš*” (ibid.: 192) and that we should try to explain DINGIR-LIM-*iš/-in* differently.

The editors, however, overrule this criticism on account of the fact that Weeden failed to consider the denominal formations “*šiuniyahh-*”, “*šiuniyatar*” and “*(LÚ)DINGIR-LIM-niyant-*”, which are presented as further evidence for an i-stem variant. I would object to this statement, as “*šiuniyatar*” and “*(LÚ)DINGIR-LIM-niyant-*” can be easily derived from the verb *šiunie/a-* (listed as “*\*šiuniya-*”, p. 505). Additionally, the remaining form *šiuniyahh-* ‘(to

become divine >) to go crazy(?)’ contains the factitive suffix -*ahh-*, which is normally attached only to adjectival stems (Hoffner & Melchert 175f.). The assumption that it was added to a substantive stem only in the case of *\*šiuni-* is very suspect. All in all, I believe there is too little a basis for postulating an i-stem *šiuni-*.

In the list of attestations presented at the beginning of most lemmata, the Hittite sign -*ia-* is mostly represented with “-*ia-*”. However, “-*ya-*” is often encountered from page 453 onwards, starting with the lemma “*(GIŠ)šišiyam(m)a-*” ‘(an agricultural implement)’, where both variants are used interchangeably, until the final pages of the fascicle, e.g. “*\*šiuniyatar*” ‘godhood, spirit holder, deity’ (p. 507). While this does not negatively influence the interpretation of these forms, it could prove confusing for beginning Hittite scholars who might be led to think that these are two different signs.

A final remark is due regarding the sections with phonological, semantic, etymological and cultural references, which are found in most lemmata. While they are interesting to read and often display the editors’ reasonable caution in accepting certain ideas, sometimes it feels as if important problematic aspects of some words are left unmentioned. This is the case with “*šip(p)a(n)d(a)-, išpand(a)-*” ‘to libate’ (p. 384-396). While the rare spellings without -*n-* are briefly discussed (p. 386), the notorious problem of anlauting *šip-<sup>o</sup>* next to *išp-<sup>o</sup>*, which is still an unsolved issue in Hittite historical phonology (cf. Melchert 1994: 31), is not referred to at all.

Similarly, in the lemma “*šišd-, šešd-*” ‘prosper’ (p. 455), the presence of -*d-* is odd vis-à-vis the 3sg.pres.act. form *še-eš-zi*. If the root originally had been *šešd-*, the expected 3sg.pres.act. would have been *\*še-eš-za-az-zi*, cf. *e-ez-za-az-zi* ‘eat’ (3sg.pres.act.) < QIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>éd<sup>ti</sup>*. The verbal substantives *še-e-eš-ša-u-wa-a[š]* (gen.sg.) (KUB 24.1 iv 16) and its duplicate *[ši]-iš-ša-wa-aš* (KUB 24.2 rev. 17) which are cited on p. 456 but not taken up as morphological variants in the list of attestations, likewise point towards a stem *še/iš-* rather than *šešd-*. The presence of -*d-* has been variously explained, not only as ‘Diktierfehler’ (HEG 1018) or as analogical to the imp.3sg.act. *šešdu* (Kloekhorst 2008, s.v. *šiš-<sup>zi</sup>*), but also as inherited and subsequently lost in some forms according to a phonological rule *\*-stt- > -št-* (Melchert, AHP 166). None of this is referred to in the lemma, however. One last example of a lemma showing a unique feature which is left mostly undiscussed is “*(URUDU)šepik(k)ušta-, šipikkušta-, šapik(k)ušta-*” ‘pin, (sewing) needle’ (p. 397f.). One baffling feature of this substantive is the alternation between *šep-*, *šip-* and *šap-*. Although the editors briefly remark that the alternate spellings “argue that the word began with a cluster /sp-/” (referring to Melchert & Hoffner’s *Hittite Grammar* [§1.11]), they do not mention the fact that original initial clusters of *\*st-* (with *T* representing a stop) usually show up in Hittite written *išT-*, cf. *išpart-<sup>zi</sup>* ‘to escape’ < *\*sperdh-*, *ištamašš-* ‘to hear’ < *\*sth<sub>3</sub>mn-s-* and *iškār-<sup>i</sup>* ‘to sting’ < *\*skor-*. Whatever the origin of the spelling variety present in *še/i/apik(k)ušta-*, it should have been mentioned that this is not the default result of *\*sp-* and that alternations like this one are highly conspicuous from both a synchronic and diachronic point of view.

These minor flaws certainly do not detract from the overall quality and great usefulness of this fascicle. It is a wonderfully executed and essential tool for all Hittitologists,

<sup>1)</sup> When the CHD project started in 1980, this distinction was still under debate (cf. Stefanini’s review of Vol. L-N, fasc. 1, where the conflation of *e* and *i* is defended [1983: 144]). However, Melchert’s (1984: 78-156) in-depth treatment has settled the matter quite decisively (pace Kimball 1999: 73-79).

whether their interests lie more with philology, linguistics or cultural studies. I can only hope that future fascicles and volumes of the CHD can uphold the same level of quality.

Leiden University,  
December 2016

Xander VERTEGAAL