

korrekt wie möglich durchzuführen, sondern dadurch ist der Band auch gut für Anfänger der Keilschrift geeignet, da sie in diesen Anmerkungen die Erklärung für ihre berechtigten Fragen, die das Schriftbild aufwirft, finden. Trotzdem bleiben einige Zeichenformen unerklärt, wie beispielsweise S. 136 Nr. 179 Vs. I 2', wo das Zahlzeichen „3“ in der Form eines doppelt gebrochenen senkrechten Keils auftritt, das so nicht im Hethitischen Zeichenlexikon (Christel Rüster / Erich Neu, Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon, Wiesbaden 1989) zu finden ist, oder auf S. 142, Nr. 188 Z. 4', wo nach der Ergänzung (-)d]a-an-zi das Zeichen DA mit drei Schluss-Senkrechten geschrieben wäre, was sich so ebenfalls nicht im Hethitischen Zeichenlexikon findet. Diese beiden Fälle und auch das WA mit gebrochenem Senkrechten in Nr. 332 Z. 4' (S. 227) wären ebenfalls eine Anmerkung wert gewesen.

Einige Versehen seien noch angeführt: Auf S. 57f. ist die Transkription der Nr. 74 irrtümlich zweimal hintereinander abgedruckt; auf S. 62, Nr. 80 zeigt die Autographie keinen der beiden in der Transkription nach Z. 3' und 8' eingefügten Paragrafenstriche; auf S. 82, Nr. 105 Rs. IV<sup>1</sup> 9' lies <sup>NINDA</sup> i-du-ri- (wie korrekt in Z. 10' ebd.) (statt <sup>NINDA</sup> i-dur-ri-). Auf S. 113 Nr. 148 Vs. 7' fehlt ein Bindestrich: statt <sup>LU.MES</sup> zi-li-p]u-ri ia-tal-eš lies <sup>LU.MES</sup> zi-li-p]u-ri-ia-tal-eš.

Wie der Autor im Vorwort (S. XIX) bemerkt, ist zu jedem Text auch die von S. Košak begründete Konkordanz ([www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/](http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/)) nachzuschlagen. Dabei fällt auf, dass es im Hinblick auf die Datierung der einzelnen Texte zwischen dem hier zu besprechenden Werk und der Onlineversion der Konkordanz zu Divergenzen kommt, wobei in der Konkordanz oft nicht auf die unterschiedliche Datierung in diesem Buch hingewiesen wird (Februar 2009).

Unterschiedliche Zuweisung zu CTH-Nummern konnte Rez. nur in einem Fall finden: Der Text Nr. 22 ist hier zu Recht als zu CTH 448 zugehörig ausgewiesen, während die Konkordanz denselben Text CTH 409 zuweist.

Diese Fälle zeigen, dass also zu jedem Text nicht nur die Konkordanz immer wieder zu Rate gezogen werden sollte, sondern auch die dort bereits genannte Sekundärliteratur immer wieder eingesehen werden muss.

Dem Autor ist für die sorgfältige Erstellung dieses Bandes mit seinen 346(!) meist kleinen und kleinsten Text(fragmenten) zu danken.

Bonn, März 2009

Sylvia HUTTER-BRAUNSAAR

\* \*  
\*

PAYNE, A. — Hieroglyphic Luwian. (Elementa Linguarum Orientis 3). Verlag Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 2004. (24 cm, XIV, 212). ISBN 3-447-05026-8. ISSN 1614-6379. € 29,80.

This book aims to offer an affordable yet comprehensive introduction to Hieroglyphic Luwian and has been designed to equip a beginner with the necessary knowledge to pursue autodidactic study. Based on current research, the book demonstrates the extent to which our knowledge of the 'Hittite' hieroglyphics and the Luwian language has grown since the publication in 1991 of a similar introduction to the Luwian language and script, R. Werner's *Kleine Einführung ins Hieroglyphen-Luwische*, to which Payne surprisingly does not refer. But unlike that introduction, Payne deliberately

excludes the study of Bronze Age inscriptions and seal legends, focusing instead on an overview of the 'Neo-Hittite' text corpus between c. 1000-700 BC. This, of course, would not have been possible without the publication in 2000 of the magnificent Iron Age Inscriptions edition of *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions (CHLI)* by J.D. Hawkins, to whom the author owes a profound debt of gratitude.

The layout and division of the book review are clear and the author has successfully created a practical first introduction to Hieroglyphic Luwian. The book is divided into three parts. The first part introduces the language, inscriptions, research history and available reference tools. Payne subsequently provides a short overview of the grammar in the second section, while the third consists of twelve sample texts, both shorter inscriptions and excerpts from longer ones, and the book ends with a list of vocabulary, a sign list and a bibliography.

The texts have been chosen from the inscriptions BABYLON, QAL'AT EL MUDIQ, HAMA, KARKAMIŠ, MARAŞ, BOHÇA, KULULU and from the ASSUR letters to illustrate the most common literary topics of the hieroglyphic text corpus and they serve to introduce basic vocabulary as well as provide one with an understanding of commonplace grammatical constructions and the most frequent signs in a variety of shapes. Each text offers a drawing of the inscription, but some more problematic passages have been purposefully omitted. In regard to the text presentation, in the first six texts, each clause is very practically displayed sign by sign, and fortunately, Payne opted not to use a computerised hieroglyphic font but drawings after the signs themselves. Regrettably, in order to facilitate easy recognition, the individual signs are represented as they occur in the text, running *boustrophedon*, which can confuse a novice reader, as the standard form faces left. All texts are, moreover, presented with transliteration, accompanying transcription, translation and grammatical analysis. This is very useful for beginners, as it aids not only the learning and memorization of signs but also eases the analysis of the clause. However, Payne makes a serious mistake in analysing EGO-*mi(-i)* as *ami* "I", a non-existent personal pronoun (texts 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.8), and also erroneously identifies it as such in her vocabulary but correctly excludes this in her grammar. The form must of course be interpreted as *amu=mi* the pers. pron. *amu* "I" with its pron. reflex. *mi*, just as Payne herself rightly analyses EGO-*wa-mi(-i)* as *amu=wa=mi* (texts 5.7, 5.10, 5.11), identical words but with insertion of the quotative particle *-wa*. Unfortunately, the list of vocabulary contains some alphabetical errors and the sign list is in its structure less clear for beginners, but the index to it is very useful for autodidactic study.

Rosmalen, The Netherlands  
March 2009

M. DILLO

\* \*  
\*

NEUMANN, G. — Glossar des Lykischen. Überarbeitet und zum Druck gebracht von Johann Tischler. (Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 21). Verlag Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 2007. (24,5 cm, LXXXII, 454). ISBN 978-3-447-05481-2. ISSN 1619-0874. € 98,-.

When in 2005 the great scholar Günter Neumann passed away, he did not only leave us an impressive list of publications

on especially Anatolian linguistics, but also the manuscript of his *Glossar des Lykischen*, a book which he never was able to definitely finish, although he had been working on it since the 1960s. It is thanks to the effort of Johann Tischler, who took upon him the role of editor, that this book is now published and available to anyone interested. As Tischler writes in his *Vorwort der Herausgebers* (p. vii), apart from formal editing, he also removed from the manuscript inconsistencies “die sich im langen Zeitraum des Wachsens dieses Werkes zwangsweise eingeschlichen hatten”, and added references to Melchert’s 2004 *Dictionary of the Lycian Language*, which Neumann “zwar zur Kenntnis genommen, aber nicht mehr selbst einarbeiten hat können”.

As Neumann explains in his *Vorwort* (p. ix-x), the *Glossar* contains all words from the Lycian inscriptions gathered in Kalinka 1901 and Neumann 1979, as well as the inscriptions and legends on coins found since then. Also the words from the two inscriptions that contain a distinct language (“Lycian B”) have been treated, although the in my view less favourable choice has been made to list these words among the Lycian A ones.

Within the *Glossar*, each lemma is arranged as follows. First, the lemma is given accompanied by grammatical information and a meaning, but only if that meaning “als völlig gesichert gelten darf” (p. xiv). All inflected forms and attestation places are given; if the word is a *hapax legomenon*, the context it occurs in is cited. Then an extensive overview of past scholarly treatments is given, sometimes even reaching back to the 1820s. If possible, an etymological account is given as well, although this is usually limited to referring to inner-Anatolian cognates only.

The result is a book that contains a wealth of sometimes encyclopaedic information, not just on the Lycian language itself, but especially on the history of its study. This is both the advantage and disadvantage of the book. For the specialist the book contains many useful references to works that would otherwise have been hard to access, but for the more generally interested public it is not always clear which ones among the many views and opinions cited in the book are the more accepted ones. Moreover, the book is not always up-to-date. This is undoubtedly due to the fact that Neumann in the last years of his life was not able to incorporate all new material, so he can hardly be blamed, but in some cases it is nevertheless eye-catching. Furthermore, although Tischler states that he has tried to remove the inconsistencies, some have remained. The addition of references to Melchert’s *Dictionary*, an in principle laudable attempt to update the *Glossar*, even has increased the number of inconsistencies. I have listed here some of these inconsistencies, as well as some points in which Neumann in a sometimes positive way deviates from the *communis opinio*, or that were in other ways remarkable to me.

- p. 3f.: The Lycian word for ‘name’ is cited twice, namely as *adāma* (p. 3) as well as *alāma* (p. 12), whereas we are dealing with the same form (TL 83, 3: the reading of the second sign of this form as Δ <d> or Λ <l> is not fully clear). Within the two lemmata, no reference is made to the other.
- p. 44: It is interesting that Neumann presents a lemma -e “anaphorisches Pers.-Pron.” with inflected forms dat.-loc.sg. -ei or -i, acc.sg.c. -enel-eñne, acc.sg.n. -ed, nom.pl.c./n. -ede, dat.-loc.pl. -ije or -eije, whereas

Melchert (2004) cites these forms separately. Moreover, it is remarkable that Neumann distinguishes between a dat.-loc.sg. form -(e)i and a dat.-loc.pl. form -(e)ije, whereas e.g. Melchert regards these as variants of each other and translates both as ‘for/to him, her; therein, thereon’. Moreover, it is remarkable that Neumann does not cite the acc.sg.c. form -ē, which is generally accepted as such, especially in the sequence *mē=ti* (Neumann regards this as containing a conjunction *mē* “(genauso) wie” (p. 212)).

- p. 51: The sequence :*mesitēni*: (TL 44b, 61) is here analysed as containing the verbal form *esi* ‘he is’ (cf. also p. 79 s.v. *esitēni*), whereas on p. 323 s.v. *si-* and p. 326 s.v. *sitēni* it is analysed as containing the 3sg.pres.midd. *sitēni* ‘he lies’ of the verb *si-* ‘to lie’ (in accordance with Melchert 1992 and 2004: 57).<sup>1)</sup> No cross-reference is made, however.
- p. 112: S.v. *χawa* ‘sheep’, Melchert’s view (2004: 81) is cited that “initial χ must reflect \**h<sub>2</sub>ow-*, not \**h<sub>3</sub>ew-*”. Compare Kloekhorst 2006: 102-3, however, who claims that the regular outcome of \**h<sub>3</sub>e-* is *χe-* in Lycian.
- p. 121: Neumann suggests that in writing the name *χesñtedi* (N 320, 15) = Gr. Κεσινδηλις the stone-mason may have made an error, writing Δ <d> instead of Λ <l>, and that a similar error may have caused the spelling of the name *dapara* (TL 6, 1) = Gr. Λαπαρα.<sup>2)</sup> If this account is correct, there is no evidence anymore in favor of the oft cited view that Lyc. *l* and *d* are phonetically close sounds that could alternate. Moreover, Neumann suggests that this name, which is actually to be read *χesñtel<sup>l</sup>i*, must be compared with the (hypothetical) Hittite name \**Hašti(ia)ntali-*, showing \**st* > Lyc. *s*. Since Hitt. *hašt(a)i-* ‘bone’ reflects PIE \**h<sub>3</sub>est(H)-oi-*, this name would then be another example in favor of the view expressed in Kloekhorst 2006 that PIE \**h<sub>3</sub>e-* yields Lyc. *χe-*
- p. 129: Neumann cites s.v. *χñtawatali-* “1) Regierung, βασιλεία, 2) König” the forms that in Melchert (2004: 84) are more plausibly divided among two lemmas, namely *χñtawat(i)-* ‘king’ and *χñtawata-* ‘kingship’.
- p. 131: S.v. *χpparama* we find an inconsistency that seems to be caused by Tischler’s attempt to update the material. After the information that Ševoroškin proposes to connect *χpparama* with Hitt. *happarāe-*, we read between brackets “doch der wird auch mit lyk. *epirije-* verknüpft” (in accordance with Kimball 1987, cf. Melchert 2004: 15). Further on in the lemma it is stated, however, that “[e]in ON \**χpparali-* könnte zu hethit. *happara-* ‘Markt’ gehören”, which seems to be Neumann’s own view. This is supported by the fact that s.v. *epirije-* (p. 60-1) Neumann is quite explicit in stating that he doubts the etymological connection between *epirije-* and Hitt. *happarāe-*. For the reader who is less aware of the current discussion, it can be confusing to find competing views like these within one book.
- p. 169: Neumann is not able to explain why in the name *kiz-zaprñna* = Pers. *ciθrafarna* the sign *k* is used in anlaut. If we take into account that the sign <*k*> must phonologically represent a palatal stop /*c*/ (cf. Kloekhorst

<sup>1)</sup> Cf. now Kloekhorst fthc. for the view that *sitēni* is a 3pl.pres.midd. form meaning ‘they lie’.

<sup>2)</sup> Note that this view is not expressed s.v. *dapara* (p. 36).

fthc.), however, the rendering of Pers. *ci-* by Lyc. *ki-* = /ci-/ is a perfect match.

- p. 212: The word *mē* is mentioned as an “Adverb und Konjunktion” that is distinct from the conjunction *me*. Since Neumann cites the sequence *mēne* s.v. *mē*, but the sequence *mene* s.v. *me*, he apparently regards these as two distinct forms as well. This cannot be correct in view of the fact that in the well known formula with which a large part of the funerary inscriptions start, *ebēñnē χυρᾶ / prñnawā mene / mēne prñnawatē* PN ‘The appertaining<sup>3)</sup> tomb / building, PN built it’, the words *mene* and *mēne* vary freely. It therefore is more likely that *mene* and *mēne* are the same word, that are only graphically different: before a nasal consonant vowels could be spelled nasalized as well as un-nasalized (cf. also *mahana-* besides *mahāna-*, *sijeni* besides *sijēni*, etc.).
- p. 230: The Lycian sign for *m̄* is incorrectly given as M. It is in fact X.
- p. 245: Neumann quite interestingly suggests that the one attestation of the numeral *nuñtāta* ‘ninety(?)’, ‘nineteen(?)’ (or even ‘ninehundred(?)’) might be an error for *nusñtāta*. This proposal has two advantages: first, it would now be directly comparable to the numeral *kbisñtāta* ‘twenty?’, ‘twelve?’; secondly, the awkward sequence *-uñ-*, which is very rare, would be eliminated.
- p. 245: The Lycian sign for *n̄* is incorrectly given as N. It is in fact ≡.
- p. 296f.: All words with *q-* of which an etymology is given, are connected with Hittite words starting in *ḫ-*, whereas Lyc. *q* phonologically represents /k<sup>w</sup>/, which should correspond to Hitt. *ḫu-*, cf. Gusmani 1997: 152-6 and, independently, Kloekhorst 2006: 97-101.
- p. 311-2: None of the etymological proposals for the conjunction *se* cited here are convincing. Just as Hitt. *ta* is cognate with the demonstrative pronoun *\*to-*, and Hitt. *šu* is cognate with the demonstrative pronoun *\*so-*, Lyc. *se* seems to me cognate with the demonstrative pronoun *\*ko-* (compare Adiego 2007: 411 for a similar view on the Carian conjunction *sb*).
- p. 333: Oettinger is cited as explaining the verbal stem *stta-* from a reduplicated “\*ste-te-” in order to explain the double *-tt-*. This is unnecessary as the doubling of consonants is automatic when they are the second element of a cluster: cf. Van den Hout 1995.
- p. 356: Neumann cites a *ti*<sup>1</sup> which is a “Reflexivpartikel” and a *ti*<sup>2</sup> which is the relative pronoun. Compare, however, Borchhardt, Eichner e.a. 1997-99: 62-3, who claim that all instances of *ti* are to be regarded as a relative pronoun, which implies that the “reflexive particle” *ti* does not exist.
- p. 375: S.v. *trmmili-* “Lykier, lykisch”, a very extensive and valuable overview of the attestations of this term in Greek sources is given, which is a typical example of the sometimes encyclopaedic nature of this book.
- p. 379: The name of the Storm-god, *trqqñt-* is reconstructed as *\*tarhant-*, but as the sign *q* designates a labiovelar /k<sup>w</sup>/, its preform should have been *\*tarhuant-*, with which it is identical to Luw. *Tarḫuuant-* / *Tarḫunt-* (cf. Kloekhorst 2006: 98-100).

If we take into account the way in which this work was written over the years, even decades, and the fact that after the author’s death it only existed as an unfinished manuscript, which undoubtedly took a large effort to get it published in the form it lies before us today, we can only wholeheartedly thank Tischler for making available a work that is of such an enormous importance for the study of Lycian and Anatolian linguistics.

Leiden University, December 2008 Alwin KLOEKHORST

#### References

- Adiego, I.-J., 2007, *The Carian Language*, Leiden – Boston.
- Borchhardt, J., H. Eichner e.a., 1997-99, Archäologisch-sprachwissenschaftliches Corpus der Denkmäler mit lykischer Schrift, *Anzeiger der philosophisch-historischen Klasse* 134.2, 11-96.
- Hout, Th.P.J. van den, 1995, Lycian Consonantal Orthography and Some of its Consequences for Lycian Phonology, *Studio Historiae Ardens. Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Philo H.J. Houwink ten Cate on the Occasion of his 65<sup>th</sup> Birthday* (edd. Th.P.J. van den Hout & J. de Roos), Istanbul, 105-141.
- Gusmani, R., 1997, Lykische Streifzüge, *Incontri Linguistici* 20, 147-156.
- Kalinka, E., 1901, *Tituli Lyciae, lingua lycia conscripti* (= *Tituli Asiae Minoris* 1), Vienna.
- Kimball, S.E., 1987, \*H<sub>3</sub> in Anatolian, *Festschrift für Henry Hoeningwald, On the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (edd. G. Cardona, N.H. Zide), Tübingen, 185-192.
- Kloekhorst, A., 2006, Initial Laryngeals in Anatolian, *Historische Sprachforschung* 119, 77-108.
- Kloekhorst, A., fthc., Studies in Lycian and Carian phonology and morphology, to appear in *Kadmos*.
- Melchert, H.C., 1992, The Middle Voice in Lycian, *Historische Sprachforschung* 105, 189-199.
- Melchert, H.C., 2004, *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language*, Ann Arbor – New York.
- Neumann, G., 1979, *Neufunde lykischer Inschriften seit 1901*, Wien.

<sup>3)</sup> See Kloekhorst fthc. for the interpretation of *ebēñnē* as ‘appertaining’ or ‘belonging to this’.