



HENNING MARQUARDT: *Hethitische Logogramme. Funktion und Verwendung* (Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 34). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2011. XI, 147 S. 24 × 17 cm. ISBN 978-3-447-06418-7. Preis: € 52,00.

This book is the publication of the author's PhD thesis at the University of Dresden (2010). It employs statistical methods in order to illuminate tendencies in the distribution of logograms, specifically Sumerograms used to write native words, in Hittite-language cuneiform texts. Particular attention is paid to answering the questions of whether the use of logograms in Hittite texts is conditioned by grammatical and lexical phenomena (e.g. semasiology or etymology) or whether it is a result of graphic factors. Here emphasis is given to the hypothesis, confirmed by the statistical analysis, of logogram-use as an "Ausweichschreibung", an alternative writing applied due to a perceived difficulty in the application of phonetic writings. The chronological distribution of logographic writings is also considered.

After two introductory chapters dealing with terminology and the general background of Hittite cuneiform, the author introduces the material on which his study is based (Chapter Three). The corpus consists solely of Sumerograms for which the Hittite equivalents are known. In total 93 Sumerograms with 106 different Hittite correspondences are registered, with citation of 2215 attestations from 1036 texts (p. 122). Chapter Four presents the statistical analysis of the corpus and Chapter Five a concluding summary of the findings.

The structure of the presentation is thus remarkably clear and easy to follow, the results easily tested against the corpus. Occasionally this is necessary. The statement on p. 121 that the Sumerographic writing of the word for "sea" is attested in the Sg. N., A., G., D.-L., Abl. and Pl. A., G. makes little sense in context, but is easily illuminated by reference to the table on p. 24, where the logogram A.AB.BA is only attested in the D.-L. and Abl.

Where the corpus may give a bias, as the author concedes, is in the non-inclusion of the many logograms that do not as yet have an established Hittite equivalent. It would be useful to have some statistics regarding this figure, along with the evidence for equivalences between phonetic and logographic writings, but this is something that neither the author nor the reviewer's book on a similar topic¹ have produced. The frequency of the unknown logograms will become clearer in the process of finishing the various Hittite Dictionary projects, the 'Hethitisches Wörterbuch' in Munich and the 'Chicago Hittite Dictionary'.

One equivalence that should be removed from the analysis is LÚKÚR "enemy" = *kurura* "id." on p. 67. The cited phonetic complements indicate a stem containing an -n-: LÚKÚR-*ni*, LÚKÚR-*na*.² The Hittite word represented by the logogram for "enemy" in this case is not known. The removal of this one lemma will not make a difference to the statistics.

The corpus of logograms and their syllabic equivalents is presented in tabular form, with the particular attestations apparently having been chosen randomly. Each entry is followed by details concerning the questions under investigation: semasiology, etymology and writing. The semasiological and etymological distributions correspond to those in the Hittite lexicon more generally and are thus dispensed with as influencing factors in Chapter Four. The elements of writing that are investigated are: a) whether the logographic writing is shorter than the syllabic one, with the gradations "significantly" (three or more cuneiform signs) and "slightly" (one or two signs) shorter; b) whether the syllabic writings show variance, with the gradations "unvarying", "varying" and "strongly varying".

¹ Hittite Logograms and Hittite Scholarship. StBoT 54 (Wiesbaden 2011).

² see E. Neu, in: O. Carruba (ed.), *Fs. Meriggi. Studia Mediterranea* 1 (Pavia 1979) 412–417.





According to the author's analysis, logographic writings occur more frequently for words that have varying syllabic writings, thus possibly supporting the conclusion that their use is partly determined by insecurity concerning the correct writing of the word phonetically. Furthermore, logographic writings from this corpus tend to be slightly shorter than the syllabic writings of the same word, suggesting that tachygraphy was also a concern. Should these findings be confirmed by further analysis on different corpora, they should certainly find their way into any presentation of Hittite Grammar.

One cause for concern with regard to the analysis is that the length of the syllabic writings appears to be registered per lemma and not per attestation (p. 118–121). Clearly the writing *A-ni* is “significantly shorter” than the syllabic writing *ú-i-te-ni*, by three cuneiform signs, while the writing *A-ni-it* is only “slightly shorter” than *ú-i-te-ni-it*, by two cuneiform signs. However, the whole lemma receives the label “geringfügig kürzer” (p. 23), which is the case for three out of five attestations where phonetic writing is opposed to logographic under this lemma. This step in the construction of the statistical indicator, which counts the majority writings over the minority, is not made explicit in the presentation, but is perfectly understandable.

The conclusions concerning the dating of tendencies to employ logograms as opposed to syllabic writings are clearly correct for this corpus with this statistical method, but leave the reader slightly bemused, as they stand in some contrast to the usual assumptions made by Hittitologists concerning the chronological distribution of logographic writings, namely that certain words tend to be written syllabically in the older periods as opposed to logographically in the younger periods.³ The author's statistics show that there is no great difference between the proportions of Old, Middle, and New Hittite texts among his total corpus of attestations and logograms as opposed to syllabic writings belonging to Old, Middle and New Hittite texts (p.122). To the unpracticed eye there might thus appear to have been no significant change in writing practices.

In order to see a difference in proportions corresponding to previous observations one would need to organize the data-sets differently. For example, a count of the words that have both syllabic and logographic writings as regarding their frequency within the categories Old, Middle and New Hittite, rather than Old, Middle and New attestations of the same data-set being counted as proportions of the of the global figure, may give slightly different results.

Dating	Syllabic	Logographic	Total	% logographic
OH	108	27	135	20 %
MH	260	71	331	21 %
NH	1019	589	1608	37 %

While the increase in proportion of logographic to syllabic writings between Middle Hittite and New Hittite is not enormous, it is noticeable. (In general the figures used here are not large enough to use an exactness test to determine statistical significance.) Of course, this is a different statistical approach to the one used by the author, who is consistent in applying his calculations to a global figure arrived at through selection from the whole Hittite corpus. The question is merely whether that particular statistical approach was the appro-

³ E.g. H. Otten/V. Souček, Ein althethitisches Ritual für das Königspaar. StBoT 8 (Mainz1969), 59 f.





appropriate one for the question of the dating of tendencies in logogram-use. Here, the reviewer has to admit to being quite out of his depth, but the leap in the figures into the New Hittite period does correspond to what has been impressionistically observed in Hittitology previously.

Looking at one word for which large collections of attestations are available may also be instructive: ^{GI}ŠDAG(-) = phonetic *ḫalmasuitt-*, “throne”. The Munich-based *Hethitisches Wörterbuch* (H, 1991, 65–78), counts over 250 attestations of both logographic and syllabic writings in festival texts and 108 in KIN oracles with a further 50 attestations in New Hittite texts and 27 in Old Hittite, including later copies (H 65). The figure of over 430 attestations is given for the logographic writing (ibid.), while no figures are given for the syllabic one. The reviewer collected 225 attestations of the logogram from across the Hittite corpus: of these 205 were found on New Script, twelve on Middle Script and none on Old Script manuscripts, with seven manuscripts having no palaeographic categorization (data from StBoT 54, 451–453; ibid. 452a the entry KBo 17.25 ii 32 is a mistake and should be deleted).

The author collects eight examples of the phonetic writing (p. 32–33), of which four are OH, two are MH? and two are NH. From the data collected by *HWb*² I count 36 instances of the syllabic writing, many of which are broken and would thus not have been included in the author’s inventory, which quite correctly for his purposes only registers fully preserved spellings. Of these 36 at least 18 occur on Old Script tablets.⁴ Given that Old Script tablets form a much smaller section of the entire Hittite corpus, the tendency here, even if every attestation has not been investigated, should be clear for this word. The syllabic writings are overrepresented among Old Script tablets by comparison with New Script ones.

The author recommends (p.123) that further investigations be conducted on closed corpora, and these might of course include corpora defined by date of inscription. More generally it might be asked whether both the author’s book and the reviewer’s own book, which appeared in the same year, might not better have been written in the future, when the dictionaries are considerably further advanced or the electronic searchability of a chronologically stratified complete Hittite corpus is an option. Future research will doubtless be more complete, but that should not put us off from doing research now. As it is, the author has furnished us with an analysis of logogram-use as “Ausweichschreibung” that will provide a framework for further investigation of the use of Hittite logograms during the process of producing these future research tools, as well as in further analyses of scribal habits.

Mark Weeden – London

⁴ E. Neu, *Glossar zu den althethitischen Ritualtexten*. StBoT 26 (Mainz 1983), 45–46.

