

ACTA IRANICA

ENCYCLOPÉDIE PERMANENTE DES ÉTUDES IRANIENNES
PUBLIÉE PAR LE CENTRE INTERNATIONAL D'ÉTUDES INDO-IRANIENNES

TROISIÈME SÉRIE

HOMMAGES ET OPERA MINORA

Acta Iranica 34

IN AEDIBUS
PEETERS
LOVANI

TEXTES ET MÉMOIRES

VOLUME XIX

MONUMENTUM
MARCELLE DUCHESNE-GUILLEMIN

RESEARCH ARCHIVES - DIRECTOR'S LIBRARY
THE ORIENTAL INSTITUTE
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

1999

References

- Hayashi, Kenzô (1969) 'Kokuhô gogenfu to sono kaidoku no tancho 國寶五弦譜とその解説の種端緒', *Gagaku*, Tokyo
- Jones, Stephen (1995) *Folk Music of China: Living Instrumental Traditions*, Oxford, Clarendon Press
- Kinnier-Wilson, James V., with the assistance of Herman Vanstiphout (1979) *The Rebel Lands*, An investigation into the origins of early Mesopotamian mythology, University of Cambridge Oriental Publications, Cambridge University Press
- Nelson, G. Steven (1986) 'The *Gogen-fu*, a Japanese Hei-an period tablature score for five-stringed lute: concentrating on the fret system and tunings of the instrument' 五弦琴譜新考 - 主に五弦琵琶の柱及び調弦について *Tôyô ongaku kenkyû 東洋音楽研究*, 49-51, 1984-87, pp. 13-76, Tokyo
- Nickson, Noël J. (1985) in Picken and others, *Music from the Tang court*, Fascicle 2, pp. 76, 77, Cambridge University Press
- (1997) in Picken, Laurence E.R., Nickson, Noël J. and others, *Music from the Tang Court*, Volume 6, Appendix 1, p. 203, Cambridge University Press
- Picken, Nickson, and others (1990) *Music from the Tang Court*, Fascicle 5, pp. 16, 18, 19, Cambridge University Press Ueda, Mannen 上田萬年 (1919, nineteenth reprinting) 大字典 *Daijiten*, Tokyo
- Wang, Weizhen 王維真 (1988) *Han/Tang daqu yanjiu 漢唐大曲研究* Xueyi chuban she yinhang, Taipei, Taiwan
- Wolpert, Rembrandt F. (1975) *Lute Music and Tablatures of the Tang Period*, Ph. D. Dissertation, University Library, Cambridge, No. 9447. For GGKF transcriptions see pp. 134-6, 219-237.
- (1981) 'A ninth-century score for five-stringed lute', *Musica Asiatica*, 3, pp. 107-35, Oxford University Press. For transcriptions of modal preludes, see pp. 119-120; of pieces, pp. 120-35.

THE FATE OF HITTITE DICTIONARIES

When well-meaning practical folk asked me around midcentury what I planned to do with my life, I would twit them by saying that, since one needs to do something, I might as well go into the Hittite business. Here the century is near its end, and for better or worse I have eked a living out of that line of work. In fact I have been privileged to participate actively in hittitology for fully half of its existence and the more mature half at that, for its centenary is near at hand.

I count that centenary from the publication, in 1902, of Johan Knudtzon's book *Die zwei Arzawa-Briefe*. The Norwegian assyriologist was editing two letters from the Tell el-Amarna archives of Akhnaton, 18th-dynasty correspondence of Amenhotep III from around 1400 b.c.e. with a petty-king of Asia Minor, in a language which to Knudtzon seemed suspiciously Indo-European (e.g. *ēstu* apparently meaning 'so be it', like Lat. *estō*). It seemed odd that the pharaonic chancery would bother to entertain and employ some obscure patois of an Asianic princeling, rather than use standard diplomatic Akkadian. Whatever the Arzawan aberration might have been, the hoots of critics soon caused Knudtzon to recant. Nobody seemed to realize that they were dealing with a provincial variety of imperial Hittite.

In 1905 Hugo Winckler found the Boğazköy archives. But he was more interested in the diplomatic Akkadian of the state treaties and left it to others to sort through the bulk of texts in what now had to be the royal idiom of Hatti. Its comprehension was in abeyance, as were its affinities. No new Knudtzon emerged. A decade of silence followed the discovery.

Yet not everything was on hold. Curiously enough Hittite lexicography did not outlast the silence or await the outcome. From the first Winckler had found dictionary tablets, virtual trilingual vocabulary lists in Sumerian, Akkadian, and Hittite. These had a long tradition at Babylon, Ugarit, and elsewhere, and Hittite scribes made use of this when compiling their own glossaries. Unfortunately this was not always high-class dictionary making, corruptions and misunderstandings abound, Sumerian was already turning into antiquarian gibberish, and the Akkadian was frequently incorrect. Yet in this manner the shapes and senses of a very large number of Hittite words and phrases stared indifferent Akkadologists in the face, as extra ballast, as they turned to the Sumero-

Akkadian parts of the lists. For literally hundreds of Hittite words the meaning was there for the looking, without having to be deduced from bilingual contexts or logographic vs. phonetic spellings. Thus it was clear that *paltana-* was 'arm' and *iskīsa* was 'back', because they glossed Akk. *ahu* and *kutallu* respectively. More verbosely, Akk. *ahu natū* 'drop the arms', figuratively 'lapse into inactivity', was glossed by *paltanus kuedani awan katta kiyantari* 'whose arms are laid down'.

In 1914 the Assyriologist Friedrich Delitzsch published a batch of those lists in the *Abhandlungen* of the Prussian Academy of Sciences. To me this is the real event that marks the advent of Hittite in modern scholarship, although Delitzsch had little interest in the Hittite part and did not believe that the language was Indo-European. Others immediately took up the slack. Friedrich Hrozný of Vienna announced "Die Lösung des hethitischen Problems" in a preliminary report in the *Mitteilungen* of the German Oriental Society (56: 17-50 [1915], published in 1916), to be followed in 1917 by his book *Die Sprache der Hethiter*. Harri Holma, a Finnish Assyriologist, found out that Hrozný was about to solve the Hittite problem and rushed to print his own studies on Delitzsch's lists, subtitled "Sur le problème de l'origine indo-européenne de la langue hittite" (in *Journal de la Société finno-ougroise* 33 [1916]). Thus, despite the trench warfare raging between the Austro-Hungarian and Russian empires, the Hittite matter was settled in peaceful competition between Vienna and Helsinki. Not only did Hitt. *kinun* gloss Akk. *inanna* 'now' in the lists, but both Holma and Hrozný readily etymologized it as *ki+nun*, via Gk. *σήμερον* from *κι-ἄμερον* 'to-day' and *vūn* 'now'.

The heroic phase of discovery passed about as quickly as the questionable heroics of the First War, and patient drudgery lay in store, as the Boğazköy volumes of Hittite *Keilschrifttexte (KBo)* and *Keilschriftkunden (KUB)* started to multiply.

Brilliant and bold scholars like Emil Forrer rushed to the task; he was the first to articulate some famous issues like "Indo-Hittite" (the relation of Hittite to Indo-European), the Ahhiyawa problem (Greeks in Hittite texts), and the Kumarbi-Kronos myths ("Kingship in Heaven"); Albrecht Goetze retooled from Indo-Iranian studies to Anatolian, but of the established Indo-Europeanists only Ferdinand Sommer bothered to retrain himself as an Anatolian philologist. Most of the heavy editorial and exegetic work was done in the 1920's and 1930's by scholars like Johannes Friedrich and Albrecht Goetze. Goetze in particular sometimes co-opted a livelier linguist to lighten up his commentaries, such as Edgar

Sturtevant or Holger Pedersen, while Sommer had the good sense to seek the co-authorship of Semitists like Hans Ehelolf or Adam Falkenstein. In this way the glossary parts of text publications represented the rudiments of modern Hittite lexicography.

A first attempt at codification was Sturtevant's *Hittite Glossary*, first published in 1931, with an amplified edition in 1936, and a Supplement of 1939. It was subtitled "Words of Known or Conjectured Meaning with Sumerian and Akkadian Words Occurring in Hittite Texts". It was indeed rather primitive raw material, with sumerograms and akkado-grams listed alphabetically with Hittite phonetic readings in a single sequence, for example at random

giselzi, a kind of tree (in reality the word for 'scales', a balancing contraption).

EMSU 'sour' (as in 'sour grapes', an akkadogram with Hittite equivalent unknown to this day).

EN = BĒLU = *eshās* 'master' (one of the happy instances where a trilingual equation works).

Such, then, was the state of the art at the start of the Second War, and of all things a product of American scholarship, though importantly abetted by the recent expatriate Goetze at Yale University. Another promising young hittitologist, Hans Güterbock, also prudently left Germany first for Turkey where he trained the first generation to Turkish hittitologists, and subsequently for the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Those that stayed were somehow able to carry on. It is with wonderment that one reads the preface of *KUB* volume 33, penned and signed by the young Heinrich Otten somewhere at the front around the time of Stalingrad, and of volume 34 in Berlin deep into 1944. But Sommer's pupil Fritz Ose had barely finished his book *Supinum und Infinitiv im Hethitischen* during home leave in November and December 1942 before he was killed in the German thrust into the Caucasus on December 30, and it remained for Sommer in Munich to publish his work at Leipzig in 1944. Sommer himself lost his worldly and scholarly possessions in air raids, but when I paid him a visit at his drafty flat in firebombed Munich some years after the war, he was brittle but unbowed in spirit, having tossed off the top of his head the marvellous book *Hethiter und Hethitisch*.

Thus in some ways hittitology managed to thrive amidst the horrors of the Second War, just as it had in the trenches of the first. There were also some sideshows far from the fronts, as when Sturtevant tooled with

his Indo-Hittite laryngeals back in New Haven, and Abel Juret produced the first Hittite etymological dictionary in occupied France.

Juret was a man of the cloth and a classical linguist of considerable though eccentric reputation. His *Vocabulaire étymologique de la langue hittite* was first printed in instalments in *Revue hittite et asianique* in 1940 and 1941, and subsequently at Limoges in 1942 as a fascicle of the *Publications de la Faculté des lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg*. Juret is billed as a professor of that university, curiously since the Germans had just retaken Strassburg and re-germanized it. Anyway, Juret comes across as a pan-comparativist who never saw a remote root-etymology he didn't like, to the point of making many a nostraticist seem tame by comparison. For example, *hark-* 'perish' is compared with Gk. ἀρή 'ruin' and Skt. *āri-* 'enemy', *isk-* 'anoint' with Lat. *scribere* and *tuekka-* 'body' with Skt. *ātman-* 'self, soul'. Juret is usually remembered as a "mad-man", but his lucid intervals remain precious; e.g., he was the first to intuit that *halzai-* 'cry, call' is cognate with German *laden* 'call, invite', which I have been able to confirm via the *tertium comparationis* Lat. *lessus* meaning 'outcry'. He also intuited the relationship of Lat. *ēbrius* 'drunk' to Hitt. *egw-* (*eku-*) 'to drink', which has been vindicated.

German scholarship rebounded in short order after the war, and that metaphysically tinged, untranslatable word "Not" (denoting everything from etymological "need" to the cosmic distress of the Teutonic gods) disappeared in no time from the name of "Notgemeinschaft der deutschen Forschung". The excavations of the Deutsche Orientgesellschaft at Böğazköy, carried out by Winckler up to the First War, and continued by Kurt Bittel in 1931-1939, were resumed by Bittel in 1951 and are still going on in the wake of Bittel's death.

Thus began the second half-century of hittitology in 1952, with the publication of Johannes Friedrich's *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*, based in the main on the corpora published up to 1944, especially *KBo* I-VI and *KUB* I-XXXIV. It was subtitled "Kurzgefasste kritische Sammlung der Deutungen hethitischer Wörter" and squeezed onto 247 pages an amazingly rich harvest of the phonetically written and interpreted Hittite vocabulary, with attestation references and essential secondary literature. Logograms and Akkadian matter were relegated to appendices, a big step forward over Sturtevant's hodgepodge. Friedrich even provided scattered but sound basic etymologies, relying mainly on Holger Pedersen and Ferdinand Sommer.

This book, more than any other, has fructified hittitology for the rest of this century. It coincided with the resumption of the *KUB* series in

1953 and of *KBo* in 1954, in a kind of race between the two Germanies. The *KUB* series of the Berlin Academy comprised mainly tablets in the Vorderasiatisches Museum in East Berlin. They were chiefly from Winckler's early excavations, and Turkey had claim and title to most of them, but politics delayed their repatriation until recently (they are now in the Hittite Museum at Ankara). Between 1953 and 1990 the East Germans published volumes XXXV to LX of *KUB*. The German Oriental Society in West Berlin, meanwhile, filled up *KBo* VII-XL with Bittel's interwar and fresh finds, all of which are kept at Turkey's Hittite Museum, and new volumes are still being announced. In this way the bulk of published Hittite material more than doubled between 1953 and 1994. Wonderful as Friedrich was in helping to confront this influx, his book was fairly soon in danger of being overwhelmed by new data and fresh attestations. Three *Ergänzungshefte* (1957, 1961, 1966) dealt in their fashion with this yield, but only to a point. However, time had caught up with Friedrich (who died in 1972 at the age of 79), leaving the intended complete overhaul of the dictionary to a hittitologist of the next generation, Annelies Kammenhuber, a student of the senescent Sommer, born in 1922.

The new production started appearing in fascicles in 1975, and was Friedrich's second edition in name only, although his name appeared with Kammenhuber's on the cover in seeming *pietatis ergo* preordination. The first eight fascicles (1975-1984) make up Volume I equalling the initial A. Subsequently Vol. II = E appeared in a single double fascicle in 1988. Fascicle 11, containing the first 76 pages of Vol. III = H, came in 1991, and Fascicle 13, up to *happines-*, in 1998. This makes a total of about 960 pages of actual dictionary entries in 24 years so far (599 + 127 + 232), about 40 pages a year. Considering that Friedrich covered A on 23 pages, vs. 599 for Kammenhuber, the increase in bulk is about 26 times. But factoring in the differences in lines per column (52 vs. 46) and spaces per line (37 vs. 33), the true proportion is more like 1:33. By the same token the Hittite entries alone can be projected to 6440 pages, and at the same rate of speed about 167 years, taking us to 2142. It therefore seems unreal to see Kammenhuber in a 1985 article (*Kleine Schriften* 2:715 [1993]) planning a completion of the 14 volumes in another ten years (i.e. in 1995), despite being distracted by all manner of unnecessary diversions by inept and wayward colleagues, and if the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft can only keep up some salaried assistance. I can see being off even by decades, but what about centuries?

This new *Hethitisches Wörterbuch* is strange on other accounts as well. It is complex, compressed, and internally abbreviated, and yet prolix, expansive, and overflowing at the same time. Sometimes it gallops along, disposing of the important verb *ak(k)-* 'to die' on barely two pages, while other entries are bulging mini-photographs, for example 30 pages on the verb *arha*, 65 on the particle *-asta*, and 45 on the adjective *assu-*. Clearly something went amiss in such instances in the common sense department. Rather than a balanced dictionary, this work reminds me of a measureless literary work such as the *Mahābhārata*, where at the author's whim the action sometimes speeds, then again sputters and spreads out into vast and detailed tableaux. I reviewed the first seven fascicles in the JAOS and tried to be constructively critical, reaping considerable animosity in return, so that I started being featured as a *bête noire* in subsequent fascicles, peppered with the adjective "verfehlt" and being called a "moderner Schreibtischgelehrter" unable to grasp what the Hittites really thought (well, I am a mere decade younger than Kammenhuber, so she was not too much closer in history to the Hittites). One trouble with *HW²* is that the author could never quite draw the line when to pour everything into the dictionary, and when to toss the totality of large entries into the parallel issuance of looseleaf collections called *Materialien zu einem hethitischen Thesaurus* (11 Lieferungen between 1973 and 1989). There was also an excess of negativistic denial of obvious probabilities, and a rather disheartening dogmatism. The author's death in late 1995, and the fact that many entries were already farmed out to assistants, do not augur well for the future, unless, as rumored, new forces take the task in hand.

It is quite sad that Friedrich's heritage bogged down like this. But at least something got off the ground. There were other dictionary projects in the germ in the fifties and sixties, such as Goetze's at Yale of which I saw significant samples under the initial H. Emmanuel Laroche confided to me that he had plans for a mid-sized dictionary, until declining eyesight cut them short.

Heinz Kronasser left a large tentative torso of the projected volume 2 (the dictionary proper) of his *Etymologie der hithitischen Sprache*, which by the judgement and decision of Erich Neu remained unpublished.

But while those three faltered, a fourth prospect took shape in their wake. Goetze's and Kronasser's death and Laroche's decline coincided with the conception of the Chicago Hittite Dictionary by the aging Güterbock and his younger colleague Harry Hoffner, something to par-

allel in more modest fashion the monster-project of the *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary* of many decades. The national Endowment for the Humanities, which also supported Åke Sjöberg's Sumerian dictionary project at the University of Pennsylvania, has subventioned the project since 1976, despite the persiflage of congressional watchdogs and Senator Proxmire's Golden Fleece awards; a number of younger hittitologists have been engaged on it for set terms (H. Berman, S. Košak, A. Ünal, Th. van den Hout, and others).

What have the taxpayer millions bought so far? A dictionary that begins with L and tackles the second half of the alphabet before doing the first half, clearly a prudent decision. It not only did not race with Kammenhuber but operated in reaches beyond her near projections. The seven fascicles (880 pages of entries) published in 18 years (1980 through 1997) L, M, N and P, and (there being no initial R) S is also well into preparation. Applying the same statistics as to Kammenhuber, the bulk increase vs. Friedrich is 51 vs. 880 or 17.2 times (vs. 26 for Kammenhuber). But figuring in lines and spaces, the true proportion is closer to 24.5 (vs. 33 for Kammenhuber). The projectable page numbers for Hittite entries (excluding logograms) come to 4248 (vs. 6440 for Kammenhuber), and the time to about 85 years (until 2065, vs. 167 years and until 2142 for Kammenhuber). Hoffner at first talked a brave game plan of about ten years, and more recently of thirty. Perhaps the human mind simply finds the very distant future unfathomable and has to set illusory limits, lest the terror of infinity take over.

Statistics aside, the *CHD* is a superior product. It is a meticulous one, going through many stages of checking and rechecking. Hoffner's perfectionism may well slow progress. Güterbock's near-blindness and biblical years, and the gloomy outlook for the NEH in neo-Neanderthal Washington are further factors that give pause. But as it stands and for what it wants to be, the *CHD* is a model of its kind, a relatively concise, semantically laid-out dictionary heavy on text-dating and religiously abstemious of etymology.

Neither dictionary emerged unscathed from the wars of paleographic chronology that have dogged hittitology for the past several decades. The *CHD* follows the meticulous periodizations practiced by the Heinrich Otten - Erich Neu school, with Old, Middle, and New Hittite texts distinguished with minute precision. Kammenhuber rejected Middle Hittite but still had a fetish about "Old", segregating its attestations in her dictionary entries. Of course older Hittite texts exist and have to be noted, but they comprise only a couple of percent of the corpus, and

hence judging attestations (or worse, nonattestations) on a par with the later material is the worst kind of *e silentio* procedure.

Another serious development has been that Otten, the Boğazköy epigrapher with prime access to new and unpublished material, has turned ornery in old age, deciding that no worthwhile Hittite dictionary could or should be written before everything was edited, and has shut off access to unpublished material, including the right of quotation. This of course has cramped the completeness of Kammenhuber and *CHD* alike.

This leaves us two more works to consider: Johann Tischler's *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar* and my own *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Tischler also authored a brief *Hethitisch-deutsches Wörterverzeichnis* (1982), a laconic glossary of Hittite words of known meaning, with German equivalents.

Tischler started publishing in 1977, and with commendable speed had by 1983 produced A-K, a total of 700 rather small pages. His is a kind of compendium of everything that anyone ever wrote about Hittite etymology, good, bad, or indifferent, and a record of anyone who ever repeated or supported a given etymology. There is some effort to winnow grain from chaff, but surprisingly little personal input of the author and hardly any philological underpinning. So it is in the main a very laborious job of archiving, one that deserves the unjaundiced accolade "als Materialsammlung wertvoll". Unfortunately the early fascicles A-K were quite riddled with all kind of errors, careless or otherwise, which I had occasion to take issue with in a series of reviews in *Bibliotheca Orientalis*. When, after seven lean years, Tischler published L-M in 1990, and N in 1991, he had retooled considerably, become more assertive, enlisted on top of Günter Neumann the assistance of Erich Nue, and above all beefed up the philology by hitching his star to the *CHD*. It showed right away what a difference it makes for an etymological dictionary to be able to lean on a philological one. Lately, in 1991-94 Tischler, jumping P and S, published the letter T in three substantial fascicles, a clear sign of new sureness and vigor. Let us hope that the mundane rigors of Tischler's translation to Dresden will not unduly delay the completion of the remainder.

And now, after banging about all and sundry, some modest *apología pro libro meo* is in order. Am no longer quite sure how the idea came to me, but I recall that I discussed the project of an Anatolian etymological dictionary on walks about Cambridge, Massachusetts, with the likes of Vladimir Georgiev and Albert Van Windekens (both now of blessed memory), during the World Congress of Linguistics in September 1962.

While on a Guggenheim Fellowship in 1969, I wrote a number of widely varied and scattered entries, just to test feasibility. Gradually the project started to crystallize, and during the late 70's and early 80's I devoted to it considerable research and writing time, until Volume 1 (A) and Volume 2 (E-I, conjoining the two) were ready for publication in 1982 and actually appeared in 1984. That's for a total of just over 500 pages. Vol. 3 (H, 461 pages) followed in 1991, and Vol. 4 (K, 333 pages) in 1997.

I wanted to do something that was neither as descriptively complex as Kammenhuber, nor as chronologically and semantically taxonomic as the *CHD*, nor an archivist's pride like Tischler's Glossar. To take the parallel of Latin, it would not be a Lewis and Short nor a Walde-Hofmann, but would aspire rather to something on the lines of Ernout-Meillet's etymological dictionary, thus an "Histoire des Mots". Ernout and Meillet fell short because they were two people eyeing different things, one the inner history of Latin and its survival in Romance, the other odds and ends of etymological comparison, with a heavy whiff of *ars nesciendi*.

I try singlehandedly to get to know every Hittite word as intimately as possible, its inner history and immediate context, its attestations and grammatical and derivational variants. Often this needs to be done firsthand, because, unlike Latin, it has never been done before. Thus willy-nilly a considerable descriptive dictionary arises, one that in coverage has gotten ahead of Kammenhuber. For what it is worth, for some time to come my letter I in volume 2 will be the only game in town. The K-volume will stand alone even longer.

But in addition I try for this to be an individual work of lexical and etymological research, one that adds something to knowledge, makes hitherto unsurmised connections, and brings new interpretations to reward the patient reader.

I should leave it to others to prognosticate about the actuarial outlook for this particular dictionary. It is at the halfway mark. From L on it has the *CHD* to rely on for philological drudgery, while at the same time getting a chance to update and correct it, and an improved Tischler for the history of past etymologizing. So perhaps it can be made less convoluted, shorter, snappier, and more streamlined, dealing out more novelty and fewer basics. Time is ticking and it will tell.