

Il n'est pas douteux que cette association de la «boudhologie» d'Asie Centrale et de la tokharologie est la condition de tout progrès substantiel dans la connaissance des textes, et dans leur publication scientifique; j'en fais l'expérience dans mon propre travail sur les documents du fonds Pelliott Koutchéen. Mais le livre recensé révèle aussi de manière exemplaire que la route est encore longue avant l'exploitation complète de tous les manuscrits déposés dans les bibliothèques européennes: s'il a fallu à l'A. autant de labeur et de temps pour rééditer deux feuilles déjà identifiées et publiées, il faut beaucoup d'énergie, à lui-même et à ses collègues, pour mettre au jour des textes totalement inédits, – et beaucoup de patience aux publics concernés, à savoir les linguistes et les historiens du bouddhisme.

23, rue Léon Frot
F-75011 Paris

Georges-Jean Pinault

Rüter, Christel, und Erich Neu: Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon. Inventar und Interpretation der Keilschriftzeichen aus den Boğazköy-Texten. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1989, 4°, 388 S. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten. Beiheft, 2.) Geb. 98 DM.

This work (henceforth HZL) meets an urgent need in Hittitology. The only previous inventories of cuneiform signs used at Boğazköy, Forrer, WVDOG 41, 1922, and Friedrich, HKL 2, 1960, were both badly out-of-date. The latter suffered further from overly stylized drawings of the signs with little resemblance to the actually attested shapes.

In addition to providing a timely, comprehensive and accurate collection of Hittite cuneiform signs, HZL has the further goal of bringing Hittite transliteration into line with current Assyriological usage (16f.). Indo-Europeanists may not fully welcome this effort and may grumble over such neologisms as ^{GIS}PÈŠ for ^{GIS}MA "fig". However, progress and hence changes in the analysis of Akkadian and Sumerian are inevitable, and it is unreasonable and unrealistic to expect Near Eastern colleagues to ignore these changes. Under these circumstances, it is good to have a current summary of the new values.

HZL contains a table of cuneiform signs, a sign-list concordance (to permit easy comparison with previous works), the numbered sign lexicon itself consisting of 375 lemmata, and several very useful indices: phonetic (syllabic) values, Sumerograms, Akkadograms, and commonly occurring names. There is also an appendix designed for pedagogical use.

I find little to criticize in the basic organization and layout of HZL. In the table of cuneiform signs, the authors have helped to make the principles of arrangement more explicit to the beginner by subdividing the list

and heading each subdivision by the defining sign element: one horizontal, two horizontals with the upper indented, two horizontals with the lower indented, etc. No one intimately familiar with cuneiform writing is likely to blame the authors for problems inherent in the system itself which make the assignment of some signs rather arbitrary (see 22).

Each lemma in the sign list itself is headed by the most common Boğazköy variant printed in large format. In those cases where there is an undisputed chronological replacement of one variant by another – and only in those cases! – the authors list the variants in chronological order (see no. 7 TAR e.g.). I agree wholeheartedly with the authors' decision (17) not to attempt a full incorporation of Hittite paleography into the present work. The authors have wisely chosen to err on the side of caution (cf. no. 158 ŠA without differentiation vs. Starke, StBoT 30, 58f.).

In each lemma the chief sign variant is followed by a list of all phonetic and logographic values thus far attested in Boğazköy. Next comes an invaluable list of all variants of the sign which occur in Hittite texts. This list is based explicitly on autopsies of the tablets themselves or collation by photographs, an onerous task for which we owe the authors a great deal of gratitude. My one complaint is that the variants are ordered either by structural similarity or by chronology (20). The latter principle is useless if not carried out consistently, while the former will mean little to most users. It would have been far more useful to arrange the variants in roughly descending order of frequency. The selected examples and notes which complete each lemma are generally relevant and well formulated (see below for exceptions).

I personally am satisfied with the authors' decision to combine all phonetic values into a single index, with different languages indicated by differing typefaces. However, some users might have preferred readability over conciseness and thus separate phonetic indices for each language.

The index of Sumerograms is one of the most useful features of HZL. It incorporates a number of important studies on rare or aberrant logographic usage at Boğazköy which had been scattered through the secondary literature. The HZL list updates and completes Friedrich, HW, and will serve as the 'Sumerogram dictionary' for Hittite for many years to come. Though the omission is understandable, I do regret the failure to indicate in a systematic fashion the attested phonetic complements for Sumerograms – information which is crucial in attempting to identify the phonetic shape of the underlying Hittite words.

Overall, then, HZL is an invaluable handbook of very high quality. However, it is seriously deficient and downright misleading in one respect: its assignment of 'Hittite' phonetic values to each sign. Since it is precisely this aspect which is of paramount interest to readers of *Kratylos*, I must treat this topic in some detail.

One reasonably expects a 'Hittite Sign Lexicon' to focus on the issue

of the Hittite syllabary, i. e. how the Hittites use the cuneiform signs to write Hittite words. If one looks for a common denominator among the problems cited below, one receives the impression that the HZL mechanically and unthinkingly attributes to Hittite any Akkadian phonetic value which plausibly could be used in Hittite, without addressing the issue of whether these values are actually attested or not. Problems unique to the Hittite use of the syllabary are ignored entirely or treated atomistically. The result is a confused, inconsistent, and badly distorted view of the genuine Hittite syllabary.

First of all, the authors fail to distinguish between phonetic values attested only in names and those found in actual Hittite words. To call the former 'Hittite' phonetic values (e. g. *ši/še* under no. 86 SI) is highly misleading. In many cases the authors do not cite the evidence for a phonetic value at all. Given examples like the one above, the reader has no way to tell if a given value is also used only in names or represents a genuine rare Hittite phonetic reading. In other words, one cannot determine from HZL the most basic information one seeks: the actual Hittite syllabary. Although 'rarer' values are supposed to be indicated by parentheses (19), the authors must have a very peculiar conception of 'rare'. The lack of parentheses in many cases further distorts the true picture of Hittite usage. I challenge the authors to produce the full evidence for the following so-called 'Hittite' phonetic values, none of which to my knowledge occurs in Hittite appellatives:

No. 1 (*rù*), 7 *haš*, 13 (*mút/múd*), 72 (*li*), 86 *ši/še*, 103 *šàm*, 151 *mil/mel*, 172 *píl/bíl*, 174 *bat/d*, 175 *šip*, 178 (*níš*), 179 *hab/p*, 192 *šag/k/q* and *riš*, 198 *luḫ*, 244 *púš*, 260 *kip/b*, 288 (*li*) (is the example cited on p. 92 the complete evidence?), 292 *pà*, 296 *man*, 300 *zum*, 304 *gu*, 310 *lum*, 332 (*əḫ*) (where is the evidence that Hittite even had a schwa?!), 339 (*git*), 356 *díš/tíš/dáš/táš*, 358 *lal*, 369 *ša*. Given their extreme rarity, we should also be given the evidence for the values *rad/t* (29), *lig/k/q* (51), *šap/b* (175), *li₁₂* (286), and *šab* (309), all of which should certainly be in parentheses!

In two very large sets of cases, the authors' listing of alternate Akkadian values for Hittite inadvertently makes very misleading implications. The first set involves the voicing values of signs with initial stop. The orthography of Hittite stops has long been a subject of great controversy. To my knowledge, however, virtually everyone agrees on one point: the Hittite use of the voiceless and voiced stop values of the Akkadian syllabary bears no consistent relationship to the phonemic distinction in Hittite, whatever that may be. Since the goal of a transliteration (as opposed to a bound transcription) is to reproduce as faithfully and directly as possible the cuneiform spelling (see 17), there has been a long-standing convention to transliterate Hittite stops consistently with the most common Akkadian value of the cuneiform signs, regardless of what one thinks the Hittite phonetic values are.

By listing alternate values such as *tá* for no. 214 DA, the authors imply that one could use the voiceless value, if one thought that the stop was indeed voiceless. The comments under no. 122 and no. 298 supporting the readings *kaz* and *tám* reinforce this idea. Such an implication is extremely dangerous. There is no general agreement on the phonetic value of Hittite stops. If individual authors begin to transliterate Hittite according to their own interpretations of stop values, chaos will ensue. I seriously doubt that the authors mean to propose such a drastic break with long-established convention, but the presentation in HZL is highly confusing. I strongly advise readers to retain the system of Friedrich,

HKL 2, and to totally ignore the alternate voicing readings proposed by HZL for no. 32, 37, 49, 90, 99, 125, 128, 160, 171, 185, 196, 202, 205, 206, 214, 242, 243, 249, 271, 298, 312, 313, 346 and 355.

A similar problem arises in the HZL's listing of alternate *i*-values for signs which regularly have *e*-vocalism, and vice-versa. Listing *in*₄ as a Hittite(!) value beside *en* implies that there are actual cases where one would wish to read the sign as /in/ in some specific Hittite word. I can easily conceive of such cases, but once again there is no consensus on this aspect of Hittite phonology. To allow each individual to assign /i/ and /e/ values according to his or her interpretation would also in this case contradict the primary aim of a transliteration. Once more I conclude that the authors have simply failed to recognize the implications of listing the alternate Akkadian values, and likewise advise readers to retain the system of Friedrich, HKL 2, and to ignore the alternate *e/i* values proposed by HZL for the following: no. 37, 40, 72, 108, 109, 117, 151, 169, 249, 267, 288, 307, 331, 354, 357. As discussed in Melchert, *Phonology* 83 ff. (esp. note 10), there are some very serious problems in the transliteration of *e*- and *i*-signs in Hittite, but the alternate values of HZL are decidedly not the solution.

An even more egregious example of confusion created by mechanically carrying over Akkadian values is found in the listing of the values *ga*₅, *ka*₄ and *qa* for no. 21. No one to my knowledge has ever suggested that the Hittites use *qa* to indicate a sound distinct from that indicated by *k*- and *g*-signs. Rather they treat *qa* as simply an alternative for the velar stop before an *a*-vowel. There was many years ago some sporadic use of the transliteration *ka*₄ instead of *qa* to try to make clear that the sign indicated an ordinary velar. However, for some time now the convention has been to use consistently *qa*, with the assumption that readers who care will find out from the handbooks that the value is that of a velar. If the authors of HZL wish to reintroduce the use of *ka*₄, I have no objection, but this change in practice should be explicitly noted. What is completely unacceptable is the implication that we should use both *qa* and *ka*₄! If we are to use *ka*₄ to indicate the Hittite velar stop, then *qa* should be eliminated. To list both as 'Hittite' phonetic values can only imply one thing – that they are in fact phonetically distinct sounds, which is patently false.

Even more disturbing is the listing without comment of *pi*/*pè* for no. 13 PÁD and *aya/e* for A. A. under no. 364. While these values are assured for Akkadian, the status of these values for Hittite is extremely controversial. The omission is undoubtedly inadvertent, but I am still shocked and outraged by the failure to tell the reader of opposing views. One deserves at the very least a citation of Puhvel, *HuI* 209 ff. and *Fs. Neumann* 317 ff., for the first, and Puhvel, *HED* 1/2.121, for the second, both with references to contrary opinions.

While HZL introduces into the Hittite syllabary a number of useless or false phonetic values, its Akkadian bias leads to an inadequate treatment of two genuine problems of the Hittite syllabary:

(1) Already in Akkadian usage some C_1aC_2 signs may be used with a value C_1e/iC_2 or vice-versa (e. g. no. 13 *pát/d* and *pít/d*). There is considerable evidence to suggest that the Hittites generalized this practice: i. e., they felt free to use any C_1aC_2 sign for C_1e/iC_2 or vice-versa. Obviously, one should assume such alternate values for each individual sign only on the basis of positive evidence. Furthermore, the issue is complicated by the fact that in some instances genuine morphological alternation between *e/i* and *a* is a real possibility (see Neu, *HS* 102, 16 ff., for new evidence that the value *šir*₉ for *šar* is probably false). Thus it is perfectly reasonable to declare some cases indeterminate. However, readers deserve to know that each case is part of a general problem, and that new examples of the practice may be found at any time. As it is, the authors with no

apparent rationale give some such values full status without comment (no. 173 *küt/d₉*), while others receive full status justified in footnotes (no. 5 *šar_x*), and still others are cited only in the footnotes (no. 20 *pir_x*). This is a wholly inadequate and misleading presentation of this important problem.

Note: the statement on p. 100 that the use of no. 20 BAR to spell *Kargamiš* is evidence for a value *maš* is nonsensical. Obviously, this example rather establishes a value *miš_x* for BAR. The real evidence for a value *maš* is the spelling *maš-kán* beside *ma-aš-kán* (see CHD 3/2, 209). The evidence for a value *kir₈* for no. 250 KAR should be cited under the latter, not under no. 244 KIR.

(2) During the period between Old and Neo-Hittite, Akkadian lost final *-m*, but grammatical endings were often still spelled with *-Vm* and *-CVm* signs. The Hittites, aware of the fact that the final *-m* had no value in such spellings, also used *CVm* signs to indicate merely [CV] in Neo-Hittite manuscripts. Even the authors of HZL must concede this in the case of no. 125 TUM, which is used in the value *tu₄* to spell the Hittite third person imperative ending.

However, HZL does not tell the reader that other *CVm* signs had the value [CV] in Neo-Hittite, and it is arguable that by that era all such signs could be used in a like manner. This means that in Neo-Hittite manuscripts geminate *m*-spellings in *CVm-mV* are ambiguous, some representing true geminates, some reflecting the use of *CVm* for [CV]. One must in each case use the evidence of Old Hittite manuscripts, where *CVm* signs still have their full value, to determine the true spelling. I cite below all *CVm* signs for which I know of direct evidence of a NH value [CV]:

14 *dim* = *di₁₁* (*kar-di₁₁-mi-ya-°* = OH *kar-di-mi-ya-°*), 91 *šum* = *š_x* (*š_x-ma-an-za* = OH *šu-ma-an-za*), 298 *dam* = *da_x* (*iš-da_x-ma-aš-* = OH *iš-ta-ma-aš-*), 355 *kam* = *ka_x* (*GIS₁₅ar-ka_x-mi* = OH *ar-ga/ka-mi-*). One should probably add 306 *lam* = *la₁₂* (*la₁₂-ma-an* = *la-(a)-ma-an*), but OH evidence is thus far lacking.

The assignment of Hittite phonetic values in HZL is thus wholly inadequate and often seriously misleading. Fortunately, the above deficiencies do not seriously affect ordinary reference use of the work. Most readers simply will not meet with the rare values restricted to names, nor, I trust, with the ill-advised alternate values for stops and *i/e*. Now that they are forewarned, they may look for further examples involving *CaC/Ce/iC* and *CVm* for [CV].

Nevertheless, for those who are interested in the linguistic interpretation of Hittite, both synchronic and diachronic, the failure of the HZL in regard to phonetic values is a grievous disappointment, particularly in view of the high quality of the authors' other published work. It offers virtually no new help to anyone trying to establish the true Hittite phonetic syllabary.

Curriculum in Linguistics
CB no. 3155, Dey Hall
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC 27599
U.S.A.

H. Craig Melchert