Reviews of Books

Hieroglyphic Luwian. By ANNICK PAYNE. Elementa Linguarum Orientis, vol. 3. Wiesbaden: HARRAS-
 SOWITZ VERLAG, 2004. Pp. xiv + 212. €29.80 (paper).

The magisterial and epoch-making new edition of Hieroglyphic Luvian texts of the first millennium
by David Hawkins has now led to two new introductions to the language, one of which is reviewed
here.[1] The present work was explicitly designed to provide a compact and affordable primer suitable for
self-instruction (p. ix), and for the most part it admirably achieves this goal. One outstanding merit is its
remarkable combination of comprehensiveness and compactness. In 212 pages it offers an introduction,
with a map showing the location of most of the texts, a grammatical sketch, twelve text samples in-
cluding the hieroglyphic version(!) edited to serve as reading exercises, a complete sign list by number
and by transliteration, a vocabulary that covers all the exercises, and select bibliography. The text layout
is attractive and easy to read, and there are only a few mostly obvious typos.[2] The English prose is
very good—the few unidiomatic usages do not affect comprehension.[3]

Our understanding of Hieroglyphic Luvian has not yet reached the stage where there is a con-
sensus among specialists regarding all aspects of its grammar, much less matters of textual interpre-
tation (see the admirably candid warning of the author herself in the introduction to the sample texts,
p. 44). I cannot agree with Payne's choices on several points of grammar nor on a number of textual
analyses, but this review is not the proper place to rehearse these differences. I confine myself here to
those points that have serious implications for the language as a whole.

Two matters of phonology require comment. First, there can no longer be any doubt that the signs
ta_4 and ta_5 also have values with *i*-vocalism (cf. p. 205 where these values are acknowledged, though
still with an unjustified question mark). Second, the author cites and partially adopts (pp. 15–16) the
new analysis[4] that in older texts spellings such as *wa/i-mu-a* are to be read as /a=wa=mu/, but then does
not apply it consistently. If this view is adopted, then there probably are no instances of aphaeresis of
a- (p. 16). Here a clear choice should have been made: adopt the new interpretation fully or retain the
old one throughout, merely acknowledging the existence of the new alternative.

There is only one truly serious error in the description of the morphology, but unfortunately it has
very pervasive deleterious effects. Payne accurately describes the feature of "*i*-mutation" (p. 16), but
then utterly fails to appreciate its full implications. First, the nom.-acc. plural common gender ending
is *-nzi*, not *-inzi*, as given on p. 15. Thus the nom.-acc. plural of an *a*-stem like *huha-* 'grandfather'
is *huha-nzi* (as shown by AVUS-*ha-zi* in BOHÇA, §6; see p. 95).[5] Second, stems that do have "*i*-
mutation" *always* have it in the nom.-acc. common gender, and *never* elsewhere.[6] The stem *tata/i-*
(sic!) 'father' has only gen. sg. **tatas(i)*, dat. sg. *tati*, dat. pl. *tatanza/taranza*, and abl.-inst. **tatati*.

1. The other is: Reinhold Plöchl, *Einführung ins Hieroglyphen-Luwische* (Dresden, 2003). Still worthy of
mention but now somewhat dated is that of Rudolf Werner, *Kleine Einführung ins Hieroglyphen-Luwische* (Gött-
ingen, 1991).

2. Checking of the references was less efficient. Several works cited in the text are missing in the bibliography:
e.g., on p. 8: Hawkins, Morpurgo Davies 1979 and Morpurgo Davies 1986; p. 12: Meriggi 1953; p. 25: Oshiro 1993.

3. American readers will be momentarily confused by "revision" for "review" and "brackets" for "parentheses."

4. The author unfortunately cites me (pers. comm.) for this analysis, rather than correctly David Hawkins, in
The Luwians, ed. H. Craig Melchert (Leiden, 2003), 159–61.

5. The form *huhinzi* listed on p. 22 does not exist! The form *huha(n)tinzi* is genuine, but belongs to an entirely
different paradigm and should also be stricken from that of *huha-*.

6. Only the *n*-stem *masan-* 'god' shows a tendency to level the "mutation-*i*" to the oblique cases, leading to
dat. pl. *masani(ya)nza* beside *masananza*.

The oblique forms given with -*iya*- must be stricken. Conversely, the adjective *tatiya*- 'paternal' has only nom. sg. and acc. sg. comm. *tatis* and *tatin*. There are no forms *tatiyas* and *tatiyan*.[7]

This misapprehension about "*i*-mutation" also leads to mistakes in the vocabulary and in the otherwise very helpful morphological analysis of words in the text samples. All words listed as *i*-stems in the vocabulary actually show rather the mutation-*i*, and stem-final *i*'s in parentheses in the exercises should be deleted or replaced with -*a*- (e.g., p. 87 read *tanata=a* for *tanat(i)=a* and p. 92 read *kistama= ari* for *kistam(i)=ari*).[8]

Aside from the problem of the *i*-mutation, the rest of the presentation of the text samples is excellent, with many aids for the learner (properly more at the beginning), including some original new interpretations by Payne and by others—the latter duly credited.

Much less felicitous was the decision to include in the vocabulary both lemmata and interpretations that are due to the author (or others?) without any indication that the interpretations—or in some cases even the existence of the stem—are not standard views available in published sources. I cite as examples the entries *tarpari*- 'to lack' and *tarsa*- 'leaf.' Several of these proposals deserve serious consideration, but it is quite unfair to present these to beginners as established facts.[9]

In sum, I can warmly recommend this work for class teaching by instructors who themselves have independent knowledge of the language. They will be able to make full use of the many merits cited. With deep regret, however, I must conclude that the many errors caused by the false conception of *i*-mutation make use of the book for self-instruction problematic. It is to be hoped that circumstances will permit a second, revised edition in the very near future in which this glaring flaw can be corrected, so that all of the book's intended audience can benefit from its many strengths.

H. CRAIG MELCHERT
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

7. The nom. sg. comm. *tatalis* is real, but again belongs to a different paradigm and should be stricken from that of *tatiya*-.

8. Repairing the other profound damage of the misapprehension of *i*-mutation is not so easy. One cannot simply remove the final -*i*- from every alleged *i*-stem in the vocabulary and exercises (marking it in the latter case with an equals sign to show that it is a separate morpheme, the mutation-*i*), because only a knowledge of other forms in the language allows us to tell whether the stem is a consonant stem or an *a*-stem. There is no way for a beginner to know that we must read *kurkuma=wan(n)=i=s* with an *n*-stem (p. 79), but *Larama=as(a)=i=s* with an *a*-stem (p. 80).

9. The vocabulary also contains a distressing number of ghost-word duplicates: *apan(i)* 'behind, after' is the same as *apan* 'afterwards, in future'; *ari*- 'time, age' is merely erroneous for the correctly listed *ara/i*- 'age'; *hanti* 'against' is merely a special use of *hanti* 'in front of, before,' and so on.

The Early Dilmun Settlement at Saar. Edited by ROBERT KILLICK and JANE MOON. London-Bahrain Archaeological Expedition, Saar Excavation Report, vol. 3. London: UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, IN-STITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY, 2005. Pp. xii + 367, illus. £75.

The key importance of Dilmun requires no justification to Near Eastern specialists. Dilmun interfaces between ancient Mesopotamia, the Persian/Arabian Gulf littoral and Harappan/post-urban South Asia. The Early Dilmun settlement at Saar lasted for about three hundred years, from 2050 to 1750 B.C.E. (p. 6), to judge from the pottery chronology at the large and extensively excavated site of Qala'at al-Bahrain. Robert Killick, Jane Moon, and their associates excavated here from 1990 to 1999. Qualitatively and quantitatively, the success of this model private initiative is evident in the talent and resources attracted. This excavation report documents the cooperation of the team and the host country.

The third of a series, this volume reports on the excavated buildings in the settlement, some of which were preserved to roof height. The preceding volumes dealt with *The Dilmun Temple at Saar*