With the latest fascicle, comprising the lemmata **saptamenzu** to **-sir**-, **sa-** 'his, her, its', the Chicago Hittite Dictionary (CHD) has finished the treatment of words beginning with **sa-** and now has moved on to words beginning with **shi-**. It contains 124 pages, which is considerably less than e.g. the preceding fascicle, CHD $1(1)$, 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/-** 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 **"sarra-, sarre-, sarryale-"** is treated, of which CHD could have stated more clearly that in OH and MH texts active forms denote 'to divide up, to distribute', whereas already Melchert (1984: 18) has pointed to the formal similarity (note that for both verbs a 3pl.pres.act.-form sa-ra-a-az-zi, but also the clear transitive 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).

On p. 230-8 the verb **"sarai-" 'to unravel'** is cited, which is dated as "OH/NS(1)" whereas the text in fact is OS (as is illustrated by active forms as well. With respect to the formal side of this verb, CHD states that "one of the oldest texts show a root thematic class verb, mi-conjugation with diagnostic forms sarrrezi, sarrri, sarrratt, sarraške[-...]. 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 **"sar-re-et"** (KUB 36.106 rev. 5 (OS)) that CHD interprets as 3sg.pret.act., whereas already Melchert (1984: 18) correctly showed that the context demands a 3sg.pres.midd.-form. This means that the form should be read **"sar-ri-et-[-ta]". Having eliminated **"3sg.pret.act. sar-re-et"**, we now see that the oldest active forms of this verb, 3sg.pres.act. sa-a-ar-ri (MH/MS), 3pl.pres.act. sar-ana-anzi (OS) and 3sg.pres.act. sa-a-ar-ax (OS), rather point to an original **hi-conjugated sarrrezi** / **sarr-** (comparable to **šarr-** / **šarr**- 'to embroider, to sew on'). On p. 2389, a verb **"sarauwanzi"** to 'unravel' is cited, which is attested in one clear context only, and on p. 257 a verb **"sariya-"** to 'embroider, to sew on'. Because of the formal similarity (note that for both verbs a 3pl.pres.act.-form **šara-anzi** is cited) as well as the semantic ambiguity of the context in which **"sarauwanzi"** is attested (KBo 5.1 ii 52-55: **nu Munus. Mes** kаратеš TUG-an **šarauwanzi** **ša** maḥānan=ma TUG-an šarduwanzı rinnanzi 'The katra-women š. the cloth...') it seems more attractive to treat the word as **"sariya-"** (Kloekhorst 2005, 343), which should also have been cited with geminate **ss-** (nu-u=s-se, etc.) in postvocalic position. It therefore should have been cited as **šše, šši**.

On p. 239 the verb **"šaruk(k)i(u)-"** to 'water (?)' is cited with **"-k-"**, implying free variation between single **k** and geminate **kk**. This is not the case: the geminate **kk** is attested in the imperfectly only (**šaruk(k)iške/a-**), where it is morphologically expected (compare imperf. **akkuške/a-** from **eku**- / **aku-** 'to drink').

The verb therefore had better be cited as **šaru-**.

On p. 244 it is stated that the verb **"šara(p)p-**, **šarip-"** is "[d]oubtless onomatopoetic". This remark does not take into account the convincing etymological connection with Lat. sorbēō, Gr. σπήλα 'to slurp, to swallow' < PIE *srebh-. It was first suggested by Neumann 1967: 32 (cf. Kloekhorst fthc.: sub **šarip/-** / **šarip**- full etymological treatment). On p. 247, the adjective **"šaraz(zi)(ya)-"** should rather have been cited as **šardaz(zi)(ya)-**: not only the multiple attestations with plene vowel, **ša-ra-a-az-zi**, but also the clear etymological connection with the adverb **šara** 'upwards' supports this. Similarly in **"šarazziyah-(*)-"" and **"šarazziyaz"** (both p. 250).

On p. 279 the semi-hapax form **šu 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 **uzušar-šu-an-ta** (note that the signs NA and ŤU only differ one vertical stroke vs. Winkelhaken from each other), belonging to the noun **šarhuwan-** '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 **šē** '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-, šartāt-, šartiya-"** to 'smear(?), to wipe' have been omitted, namely 3sg.pres.act. **šart-ta-i** as found 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(1)" 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.pres.act. **šarte-er**, we must conclude that this verb originally belonged to the **šar(a)-class**: **šarti-/- l/sarti-**.

On p. 321 the enclitic pronoun **ši** '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. **še-đi**=i=**šš-i** also has a stem **šš-**, namely in nom.-acc.sg/pl.n. **ššet**. It therefore would have been preferable to cite **šš-, šša-, šša-, šš-**.

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

---

1) CHD's consistent transliteration of this suffix with the vowel -i- (e.g. 1sg.pres.act. °k-kešelmi as °k-ki-3mi and 3sg.pres.act. °k-kešel-eli-lzi as °k-ki-izzi) should be abandoned: plene spellings like °k-ke-zi, °k-ke-ee-zi, which occur from OH to NH texts, as well as the consistent spelling of 2sg.pres.act. as °k-ke-ê (and never °k-ki-ê) clearly indicate that the suffix detached the vowel -e-. We should therefore transliterate °k-ke-zi, °k-ke-di, °k-ke-ee-zi, etc.

2) 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: XIII).
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 Ptolemaeans and Roman hegemonies; the bishopries 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, Rhodes, etc. Three concern Noumènios, a Greek name meaning “Of the New Moon”, in Phoenician Benhodeš, Mahdâš “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 écrivites (plus de 220 numéros) à partir du rattachement de Chypre au royaume lagide, qui marqué 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 Karâ 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. Szncy 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 mentioned in 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 ghb, “to shear”, is now read ëpî (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 presbyterôn, 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,