JIES Reviews

Revisiting Dispersions. Celtic and Germanic ca. 400 BC – ca. 400 AD. Proceedings of the International Interdisciplinary Conference held at Dolenjski muzej, Novo mesto, Slovenia. October 12–14, 2018. Edited by T. L. Markey, Luka Repanšek (The Journal of Indo-European Studies, Monograph 67). Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man 2020. Pages xiii + 219 with 29 figures and tables. ISBN 978-0-9845353-7-8. ISBN 978-0-9845353-8-5. Hardcover: $102.00, Paperback: $78.00.

Thomas Markey (Tucson, Arizona) and Luka Repanšek (Ljubljana, Slovenia) are the editors of this volume of proceedings of an international interdisciplinary conference held in Novo mesto, Slovenia in autumn 2018. The theme of the conference was loosely set as "Projecting Contingencies – Revisiting Dispersions", of which the latter part made it into the title of this volume. More precisely, the focus was on Indo-European, especially Germano-Celtic, dispersions and, given the venue, the Germanic and Celtic inscriptions on the famous Negau helmets.

In the 'Preface' (vii–xi), the editors place the conference in relation to another one held thirty years earlier, namely *When Worlds Collide* in Bellagio (Italy) in 1988, a conference that saw the appearance of Colin Renfrew's out-of-Anatolia hypothesis to explain the spread of Indo-European in prehistory. The editors point out that, even though Renfrew's theory went on to attract a lot of attention and enjoyed considerable popularity for a long time, it has collapsed in the meantime, not least marked by the fact that the creator of the theory himself admitted its inadequacies to explain the data. Compared with the data available three decades ago, the editors stress the importance that ancient genetic studies have assumed in the past decade for the question of population and language dispersals.

Even though the title of the volume sets the period to 400 B.C.–400 A.D., the first two contributions are concerned with the earliest prehistory of Indo-European. Markus Egetmeyer, "Mesopotamia as the Magnet, Greece as a Second Choice, Remarks on the Dispersal of the Indo-European Languages" (1–37) is a sweeping refutation of Renfrew and his hypothesis, as well as of the prehistorian Jean-Paul Demoule, whose 2014 book *Mais où sont passés les Indo-Européens? Le mythe de l'origine de l'Occident* with good reason went largely unnoticed outside the Francophone world. As a side remark, this article brought me the surprise discovery that the earliest self-designations of the Chinese, 夏 *xià* and 華 *huá*, are possibly borrowings from Indo-Iranian *aryá-/árya-* 'freeman, noble'. *Xià* is attested as the name of a political entity since the first half of the first millennium B.C. (Behr 2007: 732–733). However, the details of the explanation in Beckwith 2016, the authority quoted by Egetmeyer (15), are problematic. Beckwith's reconstruction of Old Chinese (or rather pre-Old Chinese) *γaryá-* for *xià* (which then leads to Old Chinese *[G]ˁraʔ* in the Baxter/Sagart reconstruction system) and *γāryá-* for *huá* requires the survival of the initial laryngeal as a phonetic segment in the donor language well into the historical period. In fact, Beckwith (2016: 243) claims quite explicitly that a laryngeal could still be heard in the donor language "by ca. 600 CE". While modified takes on the Indo-Iranian etymology of *xià* and *huá* are conceivable, alternative explanations presented by Behr 2007 must also be considered.[1]

John Colarusso, "An Ancient Loan into Proto-Indo-European from the Caucasus" (38–47) argues that the Indo-European word for 'sun', **seh₂-ul̥* etc., is a cultic loan from Proto-Kartvelian, consisting of a 'locatival-instrumental' circumfix around a root that means 'to glow' (PIE **h₂eu̯-*, itself allegedly a Kartvelian loan; 40–45). The Proto-Kartvelian reconstruction is supposed to be "*/λʰa-xwe-l-/* 'locative-light, glow-instrumental', 'that which shines upon (us)'" (45). The reason why this inherently dubitable suggestion should be considered in the first place is "that the PIE word for 'sun' [is] too complex to be a native word" (38). As if Proto-Indo-

---

[1] I thank Nathan Hill for his advice in this matter.

European had ever been noted for its morphological simplicity! Suffice it to say that Colarusso does not even quote NIL, where on pages 606–611 he might have found many answers to his own questions. I only want to point out some Celtic forms that he gets wrong (39): Modern Welsh *haul*, Modern Breton *heol* (not *heaul*, which is Middle Breton) are at the same time derived from "*seh_2u-l-*" and from "*sh_2-wōl-* [>] *$hāwīl$*", while the consensus is rather something like *seh_2uel*. Old Irish *súil* is derived from "*swh_2-l-i-*". While this is formally possible, the correct explanation is surely that the Irish *i*-stem was extrapolated from Proto-Celtic *$sūlī$* < PIE *suh_2lih_1*, the regular dual of the consonant stem. The Old Irish word is glossed as "'eye (of heaven)'", but this muddies the semantic development. Rather, the meaning of the PC dual *$sūlī$* must have been 'two suns (in the face)', until the metaphor became the ordinary designation and pushed out the inherited word for 'eye'. This metaphorical expression for the 'human eyes' presupposes no 'superhuman eye in the sky'. I leave it to others and more competent scholars to comment on the Caucasologist aspects of Colarusso's explanations.

Stefan Zimmer discusses two separate topics in his contribution "Celtic, Germanic and HARIGASTI TEIWA" (48–80). In the first part, he studies the question of the glottogenesis of Celtic and Germanic and their earliest contacts. He defends the traditional view that Proto-Celtic must have arisen in the region occupied by the Late Hallstatt Culture and, later, by the La Tène Culture. To the question about early loan relationships between the two language families, I would also like to add a reference to an article of my own (Stifter 2009). The topic is discussed on a much wider basis in Koch 2020 and in Van Sluis et al. (2023), both of which were published after the volume under review here. The second part of Zimmer's article is devoted to the famous Old Germanic inscription *harigasti teiwa* on a helmet from Negau (Žénjak). Zimmer interprets the short text as a dedication to the god *Teiwaz* in the nominative singular. As for the fact that the nominative *-z* < *-s* is not written in either case, compare the runic comb inscription from Frienstedt (Schmidt et al. 2010–2011) and the ideas developed from it in Stifter 2010–2011.

Thomas L. Markey and Daphne Nash Briggs, "Porcine Husbandry (domestic) and Hunting (wild): Totem and Taboo" (81–120) is a wide-ranging study of wild and domesticated pigs, their symbolic value and ritualistic significance in European antiquity. The authors point out that many of the words for 'pig' in European languages appear to be non-Indo-European in origin. From the observation that piglets appear to have been a preferred object of sacrifices, the idea is advanced that *banuabi*, apparently 'piglet-slayer', on one of the helmets of Negau could designate a ritualistic role of the bearer.

Bernard Mees studies "The Trilingual Würmlach (Bumlje) Inscriptions" (121–142) from Carinthia (Austria). They appear to record Venetic, Celtic and Germanic names. One of those names, *ha.r.to*, is probably derived from Germanic **harðu-* 'hard'. Mees thinks that the name was engraved around the time of the battle of Noreia 113 B.C. Together with the name on the Negau helmet, this makes it one of the earliest attestations of a Germanic name.

Václav Blažek discusses the "Onomastic Evidence for Early Germanic and Celtic Contact in Central Europe" (143–161), on the basis of entries referring to the modern-day Czech Republic and Poland in Ptolemy's *Geographica*. The author sets out no methodology for his approach, nor does he apply any as he goes along. The result is a shambles. Again, I will restrict myself to some of the supposedly Celtic identifications. In fact, the author identifies the very first name, Ἀλεισός, as Germanic (144). In view of Gaul. *Alisia* and OIr. *Ailenn* < **alisi̯Vnā* (Schrijver 2006), this can also be Celtic. In many cases, not only are the etymological comparisons very doubtful, but also the resulting meaning of the place names finds no parallel in the real world: Ἀσάνκα is set up as "Celtic **asnakā*" (the metathesis in the middle is not discussed, as are many other philological problems throughout the article), allegedly the pre-form of OIr. *asnach* 'ribbed'. The name of the town is accordingly determined as "flank walls". But **asnakā* would not have given *asnach* in Old Irish. Instead, the latter comes from something like **asta/onāko-*. Both Βουδοργίς and Βουδόριγον are derived from "Celtic **budo-* 'victory' & **rīgo-* 'power, government'" (145). Neither of these two Celtic words exists in that form. The word for 'victory' is **bou̯di-*, the word underlying OIr. *ríge*

'kingdom' is *$r\bar{\imath}gii̯om$* (not "*$r\bar{\imath}gi\bar{a}$"). Although one can see the rough similarity between the correct reconstructions and the two place names, without a linguistic and philological discussion how the attested forms came into being, such a proposal is worthless. In fact, there are several place names ending in *-rgis*, namely Κασουργίς and Κοριδοργίς beside Βουδοργίς. A proper study of the names would have started from this morphological similarity in order to determine a pattern. As for Κοριδοργίς (148), this is analysed as "*$kori$-$dorg$° 'kept by army'" (whatever this is supposed to signify). While the first part may indeed be the Celtic word for army *$korii̯o$-, the second part is explained on the basis of Breton "*derchell* 'to keep'" [sic! recte *derc'hel*]. But *derc'hel* is a Middle Breton metathesis of *delc'her* < Celtic *$delg$-* 'to hold' < PIE *$del\hat{g}^h$-* 'to become solid'. The authority for the etymology of "*derchell*" is "US", i.e. Stokes' and Bezzenberger's 1894 *Urkeltischer Sprachschatz*! The author must be the first person in generations to cite them. The explanation for Νομιστήριον "'temple of a (goddess) star'" is built on the same authority, namely "Old Welsh *nom* gl. *templa* (US 192)" (149). Since the author cites Alexander Falileyev elsewhere in his article, he should be expected to be familiar with the latter's *Etymological Glossary of Old Welsh*, where he would at least have been able to find that *nom* 'temple' is "very controversial" (Falileyev 2000: 121). In fact, as a look at the relevant manuscript shows,[2] the entire Old Welsh phrase *nom irbleuporthetic* is a gloss on *lanigerae* 'wool-bearing', and has nothing to do with *templa*. *Nom* must be the frequent particle that occurs otherwise mostly as *nou* and that marks a following word as the translation of a Latin genitive. If this article weren't in the proceedings of a conference that otherwise contains serious scholarship, the procedure could be mistaken for an exaggerated parody of the worst excesses of 'Wörterbuchindogermanistik'.

Luka Repanšek takes steps "Towards the Interpretation of *Is 7" (162–183), a relatively recently found inscription in the Venetic script from Šentviška planota. He is mainly concerned with the interpretation of the syllabic punctuation of the short

---

[2]https://digital.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/objects/783d604c-a873-4d64-967a-8140cc0eafa5/surfaces/ca715491-eefa-496b-94f6-7772dad5b411/#

text, which in his improved reading is *voturo.s. vo.l.lk.no.s.*, a bipartite name formula for 'Voturos (son of) Vollos'.

In the final contribution, Mitja Guštin gives an account of "*The Amber Route* during the Late Iron Age and Roman Imperial Periods, from the 5th Century BC to the 3rd Century AD" (184– 219), including a history of the changing status of amber in Central Europe and the North Adriatic region.

In summary, this volume contains a number of interesting and insightful contributions to the study of the earliest sources of Germanic, Celtic, and Venetic, and the earliest history of Europe.

References

Beckwith, Christopher
    2016   The earliest Chinese words for 'the Chinese': The phonology,
              meaning and origin of the epithet Ḥarya – Ārya in East Asia.
              Journal Asiatique 304: 231–248.

Behr, Wolfgang
    2007   Xià: Etymologisches zur Herkunft des ältesten chinesischen
              Staatsnamens. *Asiatische Studien/Études asiatiques* 61: 727–754.

Demoule, Jean-Paul
    2014   *Mais où sont passés les Indo-Européens? Le mythe de l'origine de
              l'Occident.* Paris: Seuil.

Falileyev, Alexander
    2000   *Etymological Glossary of Old Welsh* [= Buchreihe der Zeitchrift für
              celtische Philologie 18]. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Koch, John T.
    2020   *Celto-Germanic Later Prehistory and Post-Proto-Indo-European
              Vocabulary in the North and West.* Aberystwyth: University of
              Wales – Centre for Advanced Welsh and Celtic Studies.
              www.researchgate.net/publication/348049711_CELTO-
              GERMANIC_Later_ Prehistory_and _Post-Proto-Indo-
              European_vocabulary_in_the_North_and_West

NIL = Dagmar S. Wodtko, Britta Irslinger and Carolin Schneider
    2008   *Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexikon.* Heidelberg:
              Universitätsverlag Winter.

Schmidt, Christoph G., Robert Nedoma and Klaus Düwel
  2010–2011 Die Runeninschrift auf dem Kamm von Frienstedt, Stadt Erfurt.
          Die Sprache 49/2: 123–186.

Schrijver, Peter
    2006   Early Irish *Ailenn*. An Etymology. *Emania* 20: 81–82.

Stifter, David
    2009   The Proto-Germanic shift $*\bar{a} > *\bar{o}$ and early Germanic linguistic
              contacts. *Historische Sprachforschung* 122: 268–283.
  2010–2011 Schwund von auslautendem s als westeuropäische areale
              Erscheinung. *Die Sprache* 49/2: 187–193.

Van Sluis, Paulus, Anders Richardt Jørgensen and Guus Kroonen
    2023   European Prehistory between Celtic and Germanic: The Celto-
              Germanic isoglosses revisited: Integrating archaeology, genetics,
              and linguistics. In: Kristian Kristiansen, Guus Kroonen & Eske
              Willerslev (Eds.), *The Indo-European Puzzle Revisited*, 193–243.
              Cambridge University Press.

David Stifter
Maynooth University
david.stifter@mu.ie

Manfred Hutter*, Religionsgeschichte Anatoliens vom Ende des dritten bis zum Beginn des ersten Jahrtausends.* Die Religionen der Menschheit 10/1. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer. 2021. 356 pp. ISBN–10 3170269747. €109.00.

A salient feature of the Anatolian religions known from written sources of the Pre-Hellenistic period is the lack of one dominant religious tradition associated with a particular ethnic group. Between the late third and the early first millennium BCE, Asia Minor was populated by the speakers of various languages, some of them Indo-European, like Hittite, Luwian, or Phrygian, others non-Indo-European, like Hattic or Hurrian. The relationship between these language communities and the associated religious systems was by no means straightforward. For example, Hittite was the standard written language of the Kingdom of Hattusa, at least from 15th century BC onward, which is why this polity came to be known as the Hittite Kingdom in modern scholarly literature, but its official pantheon shows numerous syncretisms with that of the

Hattians in the earlier period and that of the Hurrians later on. Furthermore, Mesopotamian religious views and sundry Archaic Greek and Achaemenid cults were superimposed upon native Anatolian beliefs at various points in time and space.

Given this panoply of religious traditions associated with a relatively compact geographic region, Ancient Anatolia emerges as an ideal ground for an areal study undertaken by a scholar of comparative religion. Nevertheless, the bulk of scholars who have been focusing their research on the religions of Ancient Anatolia up to now (Oliver Gurney, Volkert Haas, Maciej Popko, Irene Tatishvili, Piotr Taracha) were cuneiform philologists. The reason for such a state of affairs was, of course, the paucity of religious scholars versed in all the languages of the area, combined with the slow emergence of translations for many seminal texts. Ironically, the philologists who addressed the history of Anatolian religions could not help privileging sources in a particular language, usually Hittite, since the working command of all the relevant languages was rare even within this group. At the same time, scholars trained to edit and comment texts are not necessarily the ideal candidates to categorize religious beliefs and practices. This issue manifests itself particularly acutely in the instance of Haas 1994, the longest monograph on Ancient Anatolian religions available to date, still widely used as a compendium of data, but less so as a source of valid cross-cultural generalizations.

The book under review represents the first theoretically informed comprehensive research into Ancient Anatolian religion. Although Manfred Hutter is not a novice in the field of Hittite Philology (see, in particular, Hutter 1988), for the last twenty years he has been holding the post of Professor of Comparative Religion at Bonn University. Accordingly, his approach to the topic is not the accumulation of the new data but rather their classification and systematization. First, Hutter opts for a thorough chronological stratification of the available sources: in particular, addressing the Hittite Kingdom, he systematically distinguishes between the religion of Old Kingdom period (17th–15th centuries BC), the transitional period (late 15th – early 14th century BC), and the Empire period (late

14th – early 12th century BCE). Second, he strives to break the "Hittitocentric" research paradigm by addressing separately the pantheons of various ethnic groups, such as Hattians (pp. 66–67), Luwians (pp. 141–145), and Hurrians (pp. 146–167). Finally, whenever possible, he makes a distinction between the official state religion, dynastic religion, and local cults. Although the volume under review is primarily based on textual sources, it also occasionally invokes archaeological findings. A notable example is the discussion of the standards excavated in the Alaca Höyük princely tombs, which arguably feature visual representation of Anatolian deities and anticipate similar objects paraded on the occasion of religious festivals in Hattusa and its vicinity according to Hittite textual sources (pp. 35–36).

The target audience of the volume under review appears to consist of two principal groups. On the one hand, these are the students of Hittitology and adjacent fields, for whom a theoretically informed introduction to Anatolian religions would be something parallel to a linguistically informed introduction to the Hittite language. Given the undeniable pedagogical value of Hutter's volume, its translation into English must represent a marketable project. On the other hand, there are the scholars of comparative religion, who now obtain a handy and reliable tool for integrating Ancient Anatolian data into their research. The publication of the volume into the series *Die Religionen der Menschheit* presumably caters to this target group.

In the remaining part of this review I would like to address a particular problem of Anatolian religion that is likely to be of interest for religious scholars at large as well as the specialists in language contact in ancient societies. The traditional deities of Anatolia and some adjacent regions were adapted into the Hittite state cult using a pattern 'X (of) Y' where X is a restricted set of Anatolian gods with Mesopotamian equivalents, and Y is a fixed epithet, attribute, or place of worship associated with a particular deity. For example, the Hittite god Nipas, literally "Heaven", attested in Old Assyrian sources of 20th–19th centuries BCE, is apparently replaced with the paraphrase *nepišaš* [d]IŠKUR 'the Storm-god ([d]IŠKUR) of Heaven' in the Deeds of Anitta, a Hittite

composition addressing the events of the 18th century BCE (p. 45). Other random examples are Sun-goddess of the Earth, Ishtar of (the town) Samuha, and Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag. This model finds its clearest expression in the state pantheon of the Hittite Empire, whose long lists, organized along the above-mentioned double tier, are found in Hittite prayers and diplomatic treaties (pp. 186–189). The assumption that this was not merely a scribal exercise but a reform that took deep roots among the local population is supported by the common pattern of Empire Luwian theophoric personal compound names that contain divine epithets in lieu of full theonyms, e.g. *Ḫalpa-ziti* 'man of (the Storm-god of) Aleppo' (Yakubovich 2013: 98–108).

The extensive and successful campaign of renaming Anatolian deities after the Mesopotamian fashion appears to be typologically unusual and requires a historical explanation. I submit that a non-trivial correlation to this state of affairs is the borrowed origin of Hittite clerical titles. The two main Hittite words for 'priest', *šankunni-* and *kumra-*, appear to have been borrowed from Akkadian and Hurrian respectively (Richter 2012: 350, Noonan 2019: 124–25), and only *šiwanzanna-* '(type of) priestess' unquestionably has Indo-European etymology. As stressed in the volume under review, the *kumra*-priests are most likely attested as early as the Old Hittite texts (p. 86), while the Old Assyrian noun *kumru* is used with reference to native Anatolian priests (p. 50). In the instance of *šankunni-*, we know that this is the standard reading of the Sumerogram SANGA in New Hittite texts, while there is no evidence that the Hittite word for the SANGA-priest was renewed in the historical period. Although the book under review is agnostic about the Old Hittite reading of SANGA (p. 85), the Chicago Hittite Dictionary assumes that *šankunni-* is the main equivalent of SANGA for all the language attestation periods.

Whether or not the Hittite loanwords *kumra-* and *šankunni-* can be both projected back to the period before the rise of Hittite literacy on linguistic grounds, one can pose a legitimate question about the historical scenario that could justify such a transfer. One hypothesis would be linking it to the Hurrian religious influence in the 14th century BCE, in the wake of the annexation of the land of Kizzuwadna with its

partly Hurrian population. Yet, as cogently argued in the volume under review (pp. 168–171), this influence was limited, on the one hand, to the dynastic religious cult (as opposed to the state cult) and, on the other hand, to individual local cults linked to Kizzuwadna in a variety of ways. The patchy character of this religious reform is ill-compatible with the frontal replacement of the Hittite words for 'priest'.

A different possibility is the penetration of the new words via the scribal jargon with the advent of literacy (cf. Yakubovich 2022: 37, fn. 155 for *šankunni-*). The Mesopotamian cuneiform scribes, re-settled to Anatolia from Alalakh or another center of northern Syria in the 17th century BCE, may already have had such words as *šankunnu* and *kumru* in their Hurrianized variety of Akkadian and applied them to the classification of the Anatolian religious offices that they had encountered in the new milieu. If so, then this dichotomy was functionally akin to that between SANGA and GUDU$_{12}$, the Sumerographic equivalents of the same terms, except that the Sumerograms were naturally limited to written texts, whereas the Hurro-Akkadian forms eventually penetrated into spoken Hittite. Naturally, this hypothesis is only possible if one assumes that the scribes acted as influencers, to the extent that other Hittite speakers were ready to imitate their terminological distinctions. There is, however, independent evidence for a particular category of Hattusa scribes, recruited from social elites and acting as guardians of esoteric knowledge in the 13th century BCE (van den Hout 2016). The status of scholar-scribes in the terminal period of the Hittite civilization may well have continued the social role assumed by the first literati at the court of Hattusa.

Now it is time to come back to the phrasal theonyms in Hittite transmission and illustrate how the scholar-scribes may be responsible for their proliferation. Thus, it seems fairly unlikely that the Sun-goddess of Arinna, important as she was for the state cult of Hattusa, was known as such in her native town Arinna before her appropriation by the Hittites. On the one hand, it is a well-known fact that her Hattic equivalent in a bilingual text is Furunsemu (cf. Soysal 2005: 325). On the other hand, the Hattic pantheon features the Sun-deity Estan, which is not, however, exclusively linked to the town of Arinna.

Finally, there is a rare goddess Arinniddu/Arinnidi, whose name must mean 'one of Arinna' in the Hattian language (cf. van Gessel 1998, I: 46); whether it originally was an epithet of Furunsemu, Estan, or an altogether different deity, remains, strictly speaking, unknown. While one of the above deities, or more probably a combination of those, must have provided inspiration for shaping the Sun-goddess of Arinna, this was ultimately an act of religious interpretation. The usual spelling of this deity in Hittite texts, ᵈUTU ᵁᴿᵁ*Arinna* (or ᵈUTU ᵁᴿᵁTÚL-*na*), featuring the postposition of the dependent noun, suggests that we are dealing not with a Hittite form proper, but rather with a noun phrase that follows the syntactic rules of Akkadian. And indeed, ᵈUTU ᵁᴿᵁTÚL-*na* 'Sun-goddess of Arinna' is attested in Akkadian transmission, in a text that was presumably composed in the 17th century BCE (Devecchi 2005: 48). These data are perfectly compatible with the conclusion that the Sun-goddess of Arinna represented an intellectual construct of the scholar-scribes acting in Hattusa, at the time when their written language was still predominantly Akkadian. *Mutatis mutandis,* the same logic can also be applied to the transformation of the majority of deities characterizing the state cult of Hattusa.

In the volume under review, the Indo-European origins of Anatolian religion are discussed only under the prism of the etymologies of specific divine names. In my opinion, this approach is justified, at least with reference to the religious system revealed by the Hittite texts. Indeed, the scenario outlined above explains why this system looks so profoundly non-Indo-European. The quiet work of the scholar-scribes transformed the pantheon of Hattusa to no lesser extent than the failed reform of Akhenaten affected for a brief while the Egyptian religion. One reason why the Hattusa scribes had more success than the Egyptian pharaoh is that their goal was not the eradication or marginalization of the traditional cults. Quite on the contrary, the gist of scholarly efforts apparently consisted in their systematization, presumably because the favor of all the deities was deemed necessary for maintaining *pax hethitica*, but their hierarchy must have conformed to the existing social order. The "thousand gods" of Hattians, Hittites,

Luwians, and Hurrians, classified according to the Mesopotamian template, continued their peaceful coexistence in Hattusa until its abandonment in the early 12th century BCE. Therefore, I submit that the Hittite texts at our disposal bear the earliest witness to a successful religious reform undertaken for the benefit of a multiethnic state.

References

Devecchi, Elena
  2005   *Gli annali di Ḫattušili I nella versione accadica.* Studia
                  Mediterranea 16. Pavia: Italian University Press.

van Gessel, Ben H.L.
  1998   *Onomasticon of the Hittite Pantheon*, 2 volumes. Handbuch der
                  Orientalistik, I/33. Leiden: Brill.
Haas, Volkert
  1994   *Geschichte der Hethitischen Religion*. Handbook of Oriental
                  Studies 1/15. Leiden: Brill.
van den Hout, Theo
  2016   In royal circles: The nature of Hittite scholarship. *Journal of
                  Ancient Near Eastern History* 2/2: 203–227.

Hutter, Manfred
  1988   *Behexung, Entsühnung und Heilung. Das Ritual der Tunnawiya
                  für ein Köngispaar aus mittelhetthitischer Zeit (KBo XXI 1 – KUB
                  IX 34 – KBo XXI 6).* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Noonan, Benjamin J.
  2019   *Non-Semitic Loanwords in the Hebrew Bible*: *A Lexicon of
                  Language Contact.* Linguistic Study in Ancient West Semitic 14.
                  Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Richter, Thomas
  2012   *Bibliographisches Glossar des Hurritischen.* Wiesbaden:
                  Harrassowitz.

Soysal, Oğuz
  2005   *Hattischer Wortschatz in Hethitischer Textüberlieferung.*
                  Handbuch der Orientalistik 1/74. Leiden: Brill.

Yakubovich, Ilya
  2013   Anatolian names in -*wiya* and the structure of empire Luwian
                  onomastics. In *Luwian Identities: Culture, Language, and
                  Religion Between Anatolia and the Aegean*, Alice Mouton, Ian

Rutherford, and Ilya Yakubovich (eds.), 87–123. Culture & History of the Ancient Near East 64. Leiden: Brill.

2022   Languages and peoples. In: *Handbook of the Hittite Empire*, Stefano de Martino (ed.), 3–43. Empires through the Ages in Global Perspective 1. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Ilya Yakubovich
Russian Academy of Sciences / University of Marburg

Mylius, Klaus: *Wörterbuch altindoarischer geographischer Namen.* (Beiträge zur Kenntnis Südasiatischer Sprachen und Literaturen 31) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2019. Paperback, IV, 84 pp. ISBN: 978-3-447-11315-1. € 30.

   Wörterbuch altindoarischer geographischer Namen is presented to us as the first dictionary of Old Indic (and some Middle Indic) geographical names in German. But the title is somewhat misleading. Already in the foreword (p. 3) the reader is told to expect "the names of mountains, rivers, landscapes, settlements, peoples and empires". This enlarged scope of designations is done to make the dictionary maximally useful, especially for historians. But even so, it does not encompass every entry: OI "**Samudra**" 'sea, ocean' (p. 52f.), for example, does not belong to any of the aforementioned categories. And this entry leads us to another problematic choice made by the compilers: since the entries are all presented as 'names' they are all capitalized and—a bit surprisingly, from a linguistic and lexicological point of view—neither accents (in the case of names/forms already attested in Vedic), nor gender are given; whereas, in a proper 'dictionary', we would expect rather "*samudrá-* m." (cf. *EWAia* 2: 705).
   Nor is it made clear that the given forms are stems and therefore only coincide with the Nominative Singular in the case of the feminine nouns. Furthermore, the data given in each entry are not presented in a uniform way: one would expect a certain amount of relevant cultural or historical background regarding named entries, but context for many items is largely absent. While the reader is sometimes offered the modern name of a certain settlement/city, in many cases none is provided. It would be helpful, in those instances, for the volume to clarify

whether or not the location/name of the modern settlement is known or not; especially when we are given partial information, such as that the settlement is east/west of the river XY or north/south of the mountain range YZ. Clarification as to the current state of knowledge on each entry would vastly increase the utility of the volume. Similarly, the textual references for each location are not handled uniformly in all entries: sometimes data are given on where to find a name in the transmitted texts, but sometimes not. Does the absence of references mean that a given toponym does not occur in Old/Middle Indic texts? If so, why has it been included in the volume? When some data on the occurrence in texts is given, the reader is left still unsure whether these are all occurrences of the name/designation in the textual corpus or not. The end result is a lack of confidence on the part of the reader that any of the information presented is exhaustive. Overall, this dictionary repeatedly arouses a suspicion of incompleteness, and it is hard to imagine exactly to whom it is intended to be of use. Perhaps what it offers is enough for most historians, but for linguists or onomasticians, the majority of whom would benefit most from, say, a list of all the occurrences of a name in chronological order, it is definitely not adequate.

The dedicated dictionary section encompasses pps. 9-56 (= 48 pages), roughly two-thirds of the book. The entries are given in Sanskrit alphabetical order. After that follow three appendices: Appendix I on the literary primary sources (p. 59-71), their contents and worth, especially with regard to names/designations. This section can also be seen as a kind of short introduction into Old Indic literature. It treats the 24 texts given in the list of abbreviations (p. 7) plus four classical Sanskrit texts given as primary sources on p. 57, but makes no references to secondary literature. Indeed, secondary literature is rather scarcely adduced throughout; the list of secondary sources (p. 57) offers only nine titles, three of them by the author of the book.

Appendix II (p. 73-78) gives an overview of the geography of the Indian subcontinent, as far as it was/is settled by Indo-Aryans, i.e., largely excluding the south of India. This section does give the reader a good overview, but is also noticeably lacking in references to other relevant scholarship or texts.

Appendix III is the cartography section (p.79-84), and offers four maps (uncredited). All four seem to be copies of originals which were at least partially hand-drawn, and several of the handwritten place names are partially illegible, which reduces their informative value.

In sum, the reviewer is somewhat at loss with this book. As a tool for science, it is not very useful as the entries seem incomplete in many ways and the maps are not very good either. The lack of citations to relevant literature is not particularly confidence-inspiring. One can use it for a first overview or an introduction, but it leaves many questions open, especially from a linguistic and/or onomastic viewpoint. Sadly, the chance to write what could have been a fundamental book, or an important reference on the topic (in German) has been lost.

References

EWAia = Mayrhofer, Manfred
  1992–2001 *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen.* 3 vols. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

Harald Bichlmeier
Sächsische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig
Arbeitsstelle Jena: Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen
Zwätzengasse 12a
D-07743 Jena
harald.bichlmeier@uni-jena.de

Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg
Institut für Orientalistik
Seminar für Indogermanistik und Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft
Ludwig-Wucherer-Str. 2
D-06108 Halle (Saale)
harald.bichlmeier@indogerm.uni-halle.de