

*Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions, Volume 1: Inscriptions of the Iron Age.* Parts 1, 2, and 3. By JOHN DAVID HAWKINS. *Studies in Indo-European Language and Culture*, new series, 8.1–3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2000. Pp. xxx + 639 + 333 pls. (in 3 vols.). € 1,012.36.

As a source for the understanding of the history and culture of Anatolia during the Hittite kingdom, the cuneiform tablets written in the Hittite language (called *nušumili*, “Nesite” by the Hittites themselves) have no peer. Yet from the earliest stages of Hittitology it was known that two other Indo-European languages (Luwian and Palaic) were spoken and written in the Hittite kingdom and that written material in these languages, aside from being of great importance for the reconstruction of the history of the development of the old Indo-European languages of the Anatolian branch, would provide a significant source for the understanding of the history and culture of other groups living in Anatolia and North Syria during the second and first millennia B.C.E. One of those old IE languages attested in the cuneiform archives of Boğazköy, Luwian, is a sister language to Hittite. Researchers eventually discovered that the language of the hieroglyphic monuments, which had early been dubbed “Hieroglyphic Hittite,” was actually a form of Luwian (“Hieroglyphic Luwian,” hereafter HLuw), although it showed some differences from the Luwian passages found in texts from the cuneiform archives of Boğazköy (“Cuneiform Luwian,” hereafter CLuw). Some of those differences were eventually discovered to be due to the attribution of incorrect phonetic values to some of the most common signs in the system of HLuw. For example, the demonstrative “this” was formerly read in HLuw as *is* but in CLuw as *zaš*. Now it is known that the hiero-

glyph formerly read *i* had in reality the values *za* and *zi*. But even today it is agreed that the languages of the cuneiform and hieroglyphic corpora are not identical.

The work under review is “Volume 1” of a two-volume publication, although “Volume 1” itself for reasons of size is actually presented in three parts bound separately. Because the pagination is continuous, it is unnecessary to cite the parts. The second volume, not reviewed here, is devoted to the publication of KARATEPE-ASLANTAŞ by Halet Çambel.

The title *Corpus* for this fine work is appropriate. There will eventually be reeditions and new translations of most of these texts. Aspects of Luwian grammar (both HLuw and CLuw) are constantly being clarified. There will also be new studies of the meanings of key terms in the lexicon of HLuw and CLuw. A truly up-to-date grammar and glossary of HLuw is in fact a desideratum. Hawkins’s “Index of Words Discussed,” on pp. 625–36, can serve in the interim. The author promises (p. 625) a full glossary of the *Corpus* in “a separate volume,” but it is not clear if this means an additional volume in this same set or a separate volume (i.e., book) standing alone. This set of volumes will remain for many years the definitive source for the texts of the Iron Age, where photos and transcriptions can be found.

Although the tripartite “Volume 1” of the *Corpus* as it now stands is the work of J. D. Hawkins, it is clear at every point how deeply indebted he is to the work of his many predecessors. Hawkins himself makes this abundantly clear at every opportunity (see especially “Acknowledgements,” pp. x–xi). In the first (un-numbered) plate of Part 3 are found photos of the most important contributors to the decipherment and subsequent interpretation of the hieroglyphic Luwian texts: Bedrich Hrozný, Emil Forrer, Piero Meriggi, I. J. Gelb, Helmut T. Bossert, Emmanuel Laroche, and H. G. Güterbock.

\* Permission to reprint a book review in this section may be obtained only from the author.

Those interested in further photos of these pioneers and a rich documentation of their work should see the lavish publication *From Boğazköy to Karatepe: Hittitology and the Discovery of the Hittite World*, a catalogue prepared by Yapı Kredi Cultural Activities, Arts and Publishing, on the occasion of the exhibition "From Boğazköy to Karatepe," held 25 April–30 June 2001 at the Yapı Kredi Vedat Nedim Tör Museum, Istanbul. It is on the foundation laid by these great scholars that the subsequent researches of Hawkins and the current generation of Luwian scholars are based.

In a review constrained in size such as this one it is not appropriate to attempt a detailed criticism of these three volumes. Nor would I be the most appropriate critic. What I have attempted here is a brief description of the volumes and a summary of the importance of the work.

I am not a specialist in this branch of Hittitology. My sphere of expertise within Hittitology is the cuneiform branch and particularly in the area of grammar and lexicon of Hittite proper. But from the perspective of my competence, I can state quite unequivocally that this is a painstakingly accurate and reliable work, compiled over a period of years by a tenacious and dedicated scholar ideally equipped in intellectual gifts and training to complete it. The time and effort that it took for Hawkins to assemble such a corpus, photographing the originals, carefully drawing them with the elegant hand he possesses, and comparing the results that he found with earlier publications of these texts is enormous. Hawkins has always had the very good sense to secure the assistance of colleagues and not to assume that he needed no outside help. While Laroche and Güterbock were still alive, he constantly consulted with them and others by mail. When information was needed as to the meaning of cuneiform Hittite words cognate to HLUwian ones with which he was concerned, he consulted colleagues working primarily in that area, including the editors of the *Chicago Hittite Dictionary*. Many of his foundational studies of texts in this corpus were written in collaboration with Anna Morpurgo Davies, who admirably supplemented his own paleographical and epigraphic skills with her background in Indo-European lin-

guistics and profound understanding of the grammatical aspects of Luwian.

As he explains in his preface ("The Genesis of the Corpus"), Hawkins's interest in reconstructing the corpus began in 1965, when he first began visiting Turkish museums and saw how inadequate the state of publication of these texts was. Beginning in the 1970s he began collecting photos and making drawings. The Corpus took draft form in 1985, and Hawkins received the provisional commitment of the firm of Walter de Gruyter to publish it. The completed manuscript was delivered to de Gruyter in September 1990 and the photos and drawings in July 1991. The proofs were returned to him in the course of 1994. The correction of the proofs consumed the years 1995–98. During those years, those of us working in the field of Hittitology were aware that a truly important work was in the making, and we all wished him success in this arduous task.

The subtitle *Inscriptions of the Iron Age* indicates that the inscriptions included belong to the Iron Age, that is, largely the first millennium B.C.E. Thus editions of the few important texts in HLUw composed during the final decades of the Hittite kingdom are not to be found here, although Hawkins himself has edited several and contributed to the understanding of all of them. Nor does the *Corpus* contain the numerous seal impressions of the second-millennium Hittite Kingdom utilizing the hieroglyphic script.

The *Corpus* includes a number of very important lists or concordances. Editions and treatments HLUw texts usually refer to texts by the Turkish name of the location where the monument was found or can be found today, for example: ADIYAMAN, AKSARAY, ALEPPO, ANDAVAL, etc. If more than one is associated with that name, a number follows: "HAMA 9." On pp. xii–xvii (repeated on pp. 593–98), Hawkins offers an alphabetical list of all inscriptions together with their *Corpus* number, page, and plate numbers. On pp. 599–608, he gives the present "Location of the Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions"; on pp. 609 ff., a "Concordance" showing the publication number in earlier published corpora by Messerschmidt and Meriggi, the earlier conventional name of the inscription, the currently accepted inscription designa-

tion ("BABYLON 2"), and the number in this *Corpus*; on pp. 617–20, a "List of Signs"; on pp. 621–23, a "List of Logograms Transcribed into Latin"; and on p. 623, "Phonetic Transcriptions." Pp. 625–39 contain an "Index of Words Discussed," including HLuw, Hittite, Hittite-Luwian (including *Glossenkeil*-words), CLuw, Akkadian, cuneiform logograms, Lycian, Lydian, Greek, and Latin.

In his general introduction (pp. 1–37), the author states, "The goal of this *Corpus* is to present each inscription in photograph(s) with a juxtaposed copy, and in transliteration with translation." He then describes (pp. 22–32) his own methodology for taking the best photographs, making the best copies (using tracing from a paper or latex squeeze or directly on clear acetate affixed to the stone itself), producing transliterations, translations, and commentary.

The transliteration of HLuw has evolved over the approximately 100 years of its study. And although improvements in understanding the writing have necessitated changes in the method of transcription, Hawkins and his colleagues have wisely kept the changes in presentation to a minimum in order to minimize discontinuity in the discipline (see pp. 23–34). Because even the best transliteration schemes encounter difficulties in conveying the necessary information about a hieroglyphic script, the *Corpus* also incorporates standardized drawings of the signs (like "icons") in the body of the text. Latin was chosen for the rendering of logograms, since unlike in cuneiform texts, no native word can always be determined underlying the hieroglyphic sign. Earlier researchers sometimes used Sumerographic equivalents or terms in the language in which they themselves were writing (German, Italian, French, English). Obviously, it is easier for most of us to understand what is meant by a word, regardless of the chosen language, than to a sign number. But in cases where neither the meaning nor the object depicted by the sign is known, specialists have to use a numbering system. Several systems have been used over the decades, the best known being those by Meriggi and Laroche.

A few observations concerning the meanings offered for Hittite words to be compared with

Luwian ones follow; *aku*- "stone" also has the meaning "(sea)shell." The meanings of Hittite *aniur* and *aniyatt*- may have originally been something like "performance," but their attested meanings in context are "ritual" and even "ritual garb." The noun *antaka/i*-, as suggested by Melchert in the forthcoming Fs Hoffner, does not mean "chamber" but rather "loins." The verbal complex *arḫa ar*- does not mean "to secede, revolt" but "to get away, depart" (see *HW*<sup>2</sup> I 214 f.). The verb *aš(ša)nu*- has a posited and original meaning "to make good," but no such attested textual usage. There should have been space between *atta-anna*- "parents" (as was correctly done in the entry *ḫuḫḫa- hanna*-), since no such *Univerbierung* exists in Hittite: the combination is always two distinct words with case inflexion on both parts and even clitic elements on the first of the two (*attaš=a annaš*). The word (or possibly two distinct words) to which Hawkins alludes in the entry *azzalli*- "food(?)" cannot on the basis of the attested occurrences by any stretch of imagination be translated "food" (as clearly noted in *HW*<sup>2</sup>, to which he refers. The word may in fact be Hurrian. The verb *irḫai*- is intransitive in the meaning "circulate," i.e., "make the rounds." The verb *katteraḫḫ*- takes as its object legal cases and refers to a judge's action in overruling or denying a case. It does not properly mean "demote," "subordinate," or "subject." The verb *mugai*- does not mean "conduct ritual" but to "invoke (sometimes by means of a ritual)." We have here a technical term in Hittite for a particular kind of ritual of invocation. There is nothing in the HLuw passage in which it appears to exclude a particular kind of invocation ritual. The *CHD*, S volume does not attribute to the noun *šallatar* (dat.-loc. *šallanni*) the meaning "succession" but rather simply "greatness/kingship, rulership" (p. 91). It may well be, as Hawkins thinks, that the Hittite noun *uwai*- contains all the meanings "woe, grief, pity," but in the middle verb, as it is attested in contexts, there is no meaning "to grieve" but rather "to be an object of pity, be pitiful."

More detailed and critical reviews by specialists in HLuw elsewhere will doubtless contribute improved readings and interpretations. That this review does not enumerate errors throughout the three parts is not because no others exist but

because the size of the tripartite set and the aim of the review for this journal's readership suggested this more general description and evaluation. It is not overstating the case when I say that the *Corpus* is a significant publishing achievement. In it Hawkins has presented the fields of Hittitology, ancient Near Eastern history, archaeology and art, and historical linguistics with a valuable tool and a reliable foundation for future research. Both the author and his publisher are to be congratulated.

HARRY A. HOFFNER, JR.

*The University of Chicago*

*Systematische Bibliographie der Hethitologie 1915–1995, Teilband 1–3.* By VLADIMÍR SOUČEK and JANA SIEGELOVÁ. Handbuch der Orientalistik 1. Prague: Národní Muzeum, 1996. Teilband 1, pp. 343; Teilband 2, pp. 330; Teilband 3, pp. 448. \$291.25.

The late V. Souček and his wife Jana Siegelová made a significant contribution to Hittitology with the publication of this three-volume set, which attempts to record all publications dealing with Hittitology from the beginnings of the discipline in 1915 to the year 1995, when they closed their manuscript. Most Hittitologists, in addition to simply canvassing the major journals in their field, rely on annual bibliographies for ancient Near Eastern civilizations, such as the *Keilschriftbibliographie* published in the journal *Orientalia*. It is a real pleasure to be able to avail oneself of the labors of these two highly respected scholars, who have done the canvassing for them.

Since each of the three volumes has its own independent pagination, it is necessary to cite both volume and page number in referring to its contents. But the set also contains a numbering by sections, which is continuous through the three volumes. I find the practice of numbering the subsections (for example) under "1.2 Enzyklopädien" as "12.1 Enzyklopädien—Einführungswerke," instead of "1.2.1 Enzyklopädien—Einführungswerke" confusing. The first volume contains primary abbreviations, followed by a listing of

bibliographical sources, both published in books and in periodicals. Those found in periodicals are subdivided by subject matter: "Vorderasien," "Archäologie," "Sprachforschung," "Recht," and "Religion." The published bibliographies of individual, usually deceased, scholars (such as W. F. Albright, Kurt Bittel, Helmuth Bossert, Johannes Friedrich) follow. Encyclopedias dealing with the ancient Near East follow this. A valuable section is devoted to biographies and necrologies of scholars engaged in Hittite studies. Understandably, the entries for F. Hrozny, the decipherer of Hittite, consume two full pages. A nice feature also is the indication that an article of this type includes a photo of the subject.

Since publications on the Hittites issue from many lands and in many languages, a bewildering number of special characters are needed to transcribe the authors' names, titles, and places of publication. The editors have handled most of these cases well. But it is a shame that in the case of Turkish, which is obviously the most important language for Hittitological publication, the dotless *i* is not distinguished by a special character, but is left undistinguished from the dotted *i*, which also exists in the Turkish language.

Names of authors (or in the case of festschrifts the name of the honoree) are printed in bold within each bibliographical entry, which makes it easier to locate items on a crowded page.

Entries for books usually contain references to reviews. No reviews are indicated for some of the encyclopedias, such as J. M. Sasson's *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East* (Bd. 1, p. 71).

Entries for articles or chapters in edited books such as festschrifts do not contain the complete bibliographical information for the edited book itself. The user is referred back to the listing of the book. While this may have saved space, it is time-consuming for the user, who after all purchased such a book in order to save his or her own time.

The index of author and reviewer names at the end of volume refers not to page numbers but to the section numbers. While this was obviously the easiest method for the editors to follow, since pagination could change during the production of the book, while the section numbers would always be the same, it is less convenient for the user who wants to find the entry quickly.