

On Anatolian Loanwords in Akkadian Texts from Kültepe

by J. G. Dercksen – Leiden*

To Marten Stol

The Cappadocian texts do not only document the Old Assyrian dialect of Akkadian, they also contain the earliest attested words in Anatolian languages. Many of these words were collected and discussed in the now largely outdated pioneering study of Emin Bilgiç (1954). Although their importance has long been recognized,¹ specialists of ancient Anatolian languages make only limited use of this source. The main reason for this seems to be the want of an up-to-date study in which the available material is made accessible. This article is intended as a contribution to the study of loanwords in Old Assyrian. Not every word of Anatolian origin could be dealt with, and the discussion will be based on a small but representative set of known and new examples.

The background

For nearly two hundred years during the 19th–18th centuries BC, the so-called Karum Period in Anatolia, a large number of Assyrian merchants were present in over a dozen Anatolian towns. This naturally led to a wide range of economic, social, and cultural interaction between these Mesopotamians and the Anatolian population. The best documented case is that of the city of Kaneš where the main trading centre of the merchants from Assur was situated. Approximately 5,000 letters and legal and administrative documents have been unearthed there between around 1880 (the first discovery there of Old Assyrian texts) and 1948. Most of these Cappadocian texts have been published in cuneiform copy, many even with transliteration and translation.² In addition to this substantial source of information in the course of over fifty years of controlled excavations, starting in 1948, by the late Tahsin Özgüç, over 20,000 texts were discovered of which nearly 500 have been published already, and many more are expected to be edited within the foreseeable future.

* I would like to thank P. Goedegebuure, A. Kloekhorst, and N. J. C. Kouwenberg for commenting on an earlier version of this article.

¹ For recent examples, see Tischler (1995) and Alp (1997, 42).

² See Michel (2003). The Old Assyrian Text Project aims at editing these texts in their archival context.

Many of the indigenous personal names that occur in the Cappadocian texts have a Hittite or Luvian etymology, whereas others belong to the Hattic language. Such a heterogenic nature of personal names means that they give at best information about the languages that may have been spoken by the local population of Kaneš, though not about the main language of this city. Firmer ground can be reached by considering the loanwords borrowed by the Assyrians living in Central Anatolia and employed in writing in Kaneš. This article seeks to demonstrate that an old form of Hittite was the language from which the majority of loanwords was borrowed. Hittite, which was called “the language of Neša (= Kaneš)” during the Hittite Empire, was then the dominant language of Kaneš from at least 1875 BC onwards.³ It may be assumed that most of those Assyrians and Anatolians that dealt with each other possessed sufficient knowledge of the other’s language to be able to communicate in it. This, however, did not exclude the apparent need for interpreters during negotiations with the king.⁴ Communication in a common language must also be presupposed in the case of intermarriage; an increasing number of Assyrian merchants married a local girl who received the status of *amtum* “slave-girl” in Assyrian legal terminology, but who often managed the local household of her Assyrian husband and raised their offspring.

The presence of Assyrians may well have sparked the introduction of writing in Anatolia.⁵ However, the language employed during this period was the Old Assyrian dialect of Akkadian, and it remains unclear whether the Anatolian elite ever attempted to write their own language with the Akkadian cuneiform script, despite the availability of native scribes in the urban centres. The existence of Anatolians able to write Akkadian is evidenced by a number of mainly legal documents that contain errors in the Akkadian, notably mistakes in grammar concerning gender.⁶ Nonetheless, the rare instances where an Anatolian word occurs in an Akkadian text demonstrate that it was possible to write the native tongue during the Karum Period, but that in practice such attempts received insufficient stimulus to develop, very likely due to the prestigious

³ On the presence of speakers of Hittite, see Alp (1950, 125), Laroche (1966, 311), Melchert (1994, 8), Watkins (2004, 551).

⁴ See Veenhof (1982, 148), Starke (1993, 36). Cf. also Ulshöfer (2000, 165 f.).

⁵ The existence of an older Hattic culture that included writing is assumed by Soysal (2004, 12 f.).

⁶ Whereas the two genders in Akkadian are masculine and feminine, Hittite and Luvian distinguish between animate (“common”) and inanimate (“neuter”). For errors in the Akkadian, see the instances listed in Eelbode (1975, 141, 143), Kienast (1984, 33), Albayrak (2005, 101).

status that Akkadian held as the language employed for writing. The available evidence therefore consists of a text corpus practically wholly written in Old Assyrian. This only allows the identification of non-Akkadian words and renders it impossible to assess to what degree the local elite and others introduced Akkadian into their native language.

After presenting a new edition of a text from Kültepe that contains a number of loanwords unrecognized until now there follows a discussion of the formation of loanwords in Cappadocian texts.

An inventory: BIN 6, 258

BIN 6, 258 is a small (34 × 39 mm) and damaged tablet which in all likelihood was excavated during uncontrolled digging by the local population in the Karum area of Kültepe prior to 1925. It has received scant attention since its publication in cuneiform copy in 1944.⁷ Nevertheless, the contents of this document warrant a detailed study. Dr. Eckart Frahm (Yale University) kindly collated the tablet; improvements on the cuneiform copy have been marked with an asterisk.

BIN 6, 258 (NBC 6580)

- Obv. 1 [x+] *6 : *ú-lu-ra-nu*
 2 [x x] -*ku-up-ra-nu*
 3 [x pí] -*sú 10 iš-pu-ru-/zi-nu*
 4 [x x+] 1 *lu-ta-ḥa-nu* <<n[u]>>
 5 [x] ʾ I ʾ *ra-ap-šu-um*
 Lo. E. 6 [x le-ú G] *AL-tum*
 7 [1 le] -*um e-re-num GAL*
 Rev. 8 [x+] ʾ *4 *eʾ -*ri-qá-tum*
 9 *6 *e-pi-nu 2 ḥi-ša-/nu*
 10 (erased, sign traces unreadable)
 11 *i-qá-ra-be-tim i-ʾ baʾ-š[í-ú]
 12 [x m] *a-a-lá-tum 2 e-ri-/qá-an*
 13 [(x) x] x 2 *ḥi-ša-nu É*
 14 [(x) x] -*beʾ ;? i-ba-ší-ú*
 U. E. 15 [1 e] -*ri-qum qá-dum*
 16 [ší] -*mi-tí-ša*
 L. E. 17 [... *i-ba-ší-(ú)*]

⁷ Balkan (1979, 52 n. 28), Michel (1996, 289 n. 9).

Translation

¹⁻⁴ x+6 *ulurannus*, x ...*kuprannus*, [x winnowing] shovels, 10 roof battens, x+1 *lutaḥannus* ⁵ 1 (grain) shovel, ⁶ [x] long [boards], ⁷ a long [board] of cedar wood, ⁸ x+4 wagons, ⁹ 6 seeder ploughs, 2 poles: ¹¹ (these objects) are in the storage room. ¹² x *mayyaltum*-wagons, 2 wagons, ¹³⁻¹⁴ x+2 poles: (these objects) are in the house of [...].
¹⁵ 1 wagon ¹⁶ together with its yoke [is in ...].

Lexical notes

Many of the objects are listed under their Akkadian name, i.e. *epinum*, *eriqqum*, *mayyaltum*, *pīsum*, *rapšum*, *šimittum*. Of particular interest are the non-Akkadian words in this text.

1. *ú-lu-ra-nu* is listed in AHW. 1410 s.v. *ullūru* “ein Ggst.”. This lemma is hardly correct in view of the limited use of the plural ending *-ānū* in OA (cf. Hecker, GKT §59e). The same word, but then written with initial *a*, occurs on a small tablet (now in the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations, Ankara) that the author found on the surface of Karum Kültepe in August 2004: 43 *a-lu-ra-num*. The item seems to have been used as a building material. The large quantities in which this and the object called *išpuruzzinnum* (see below) occur, suggest these were inexpensive items.
2. The interpretation of]-*ku-up-ra-nu* as a possible plural of *gupru* “Hirtenhütte, -tisch(?)” in AHW. 298b, is unlikely although I am unable to offer a better one.
3. *išpuruzzinnum* was hitherto only attested in this text – AHW. 397b, “(u.H.) ein Gerät?”; CAD I/J, 259b, “(mng. unkn.)” –, but now it also occurs in the unpublished Kültepe text I found in 2004: 60 *iš-pu-ru-zi-/ni*. It appears to be the Akkadianised form of the Hittite word *išparuzzi-*, which Ünal rendered “roof batten” (1988a, 1483; 1988b, 105; 1990, 360); see further Boysan-Dietrich (1987, 29–31) (general word for “Balken, Hartholz”), Carruba (1966, 22 n. 35) (“Brett zum Ausbreiten”), and Puhvel, HED 2, 444 (“rafter”).
4. *lu-ta-ḥa-nu* is obscure. A derivation from Hitt. *lutta(i)-* “window” is problematic.
6. The restoration of this line is based on the occurrence of large boards (written *le-ú GAL-tum*) in the unpublished text Kt 92/k 246:3 (by courtesy of K. R. Veenhof). For the presence of boards among harness and wagon gear, see OBTV 248 (Greengus 1986, 76): (2) 2 *le-ù ra-bu-tu-um* “2 large boards”. Boards were also used as parts of a

plough, see Salonen (1968, 85), and Civil (1994, 30 line 45). Old Babylonian examples of this use are UCP 10/1, 170 (Greengus 1986, 141): (6) *2 le-ú ša* ^{giš}APIN; HS 188 (Aro 1970, 35): (20) *1* ^{giš}LI APIN.

7. With the exception of this text and Prague I 488:5, *erēnum* is usually attested as an aromatic in texts from Kültepe. The first word was restored [*tup-pu*]-um in CAD E, 276a, while the preserved sign was read DUB and rendered “*tuppi* (Platte)” in AHW. 237b, 2b.
9. The plural ending shows that *epinnum* grammatically is a masculine noun, whereas it is feminine in most of the Old Babylonian occurrences according to Stol (1995, 187).
- 9 and 13. For *hi-ša-nu* compare Hitt. *hišša*- “pole” (see below). The identification “Dorn, Nadel” in AHW. 349a s.v. *hiššān/mu* is unconvincing. For examples of the Akkadian word for pole (*zarûm*) in inventories, see Gautier, Dilbat no. 66: (3) *3 za-ru-ú*, and UCP 10/1, 35 (Greengus 1986, 117): (8) *1* ^{giš}*za-ru-um*.
12. *mayyaltum* denotes here a specific type of ox-drawn wagon (see Eidem 1992, 85 no. 137:2; van Koppen 2002a, 23 n. 26), not a bed or sedan chair. Note that it occurs in this text next to the fairly frequently attested *eriqqum*-wagon.
16. This line was restored [*aw*]*itiša* in CAD E, 296a. Civil (1968, 9–10) argued that *šimittum* means a yoke, contrary to the meaning “cross-piece of the yoke” in CAD S and AHW. See also Groneberg (1990, 170 “Jochbalken”, 178). The alternative translation “with its team of oxen” for *qadum šimittiša* appears less likely.

This text lists the whereabouts of finished as well as a few unworked wooden objects. Some of these could be employed in construction work, but most objects are agricultural utensils and equipment used for transport or agriculture. The text itself may result from an inspection by the person or institution that was accountable for these items. The fact that the tablet probably stems from the lower city of Kaneš means that the document was kept in the house of whoever had an interest in them; it is likely that the objects were stored there too. The presence of wooden boards at first sight suggests that the list was drawn up for a carpenter, but it appears unlikely that such a craftsman would have a stock of six ploughs and over seven wagons. Whereas the storage room (*qarab bētim*) in line 11 will refer to that of the manager himself, the location mentioned in lines 13 ff. might indicate that equipment was rented out or put at the disposal of others. As it seems unlikely that any Assyrian merchant would need agricultural material in such quantities

or would want to rent this out to others, one can safely conclude that the objects belonged to an Anatolian. The use of the term *qarab bētim* seems to be restricted to houses rather than to larger institutional buildings such as a palace, and therefore the manager or even owner of the items may have been a wealthy individual in Kaneš whose business included the management of cereal crops, and who was possibly employed by the royal palace.⁸ Perua, the Chief Shepherd in Kaneš, for example, is known to have possessed land; the fact that he demanded the additional delivery of 20 pieces each of two unidentified parts for wagons and seeder ploughs according to a bond (Kt d/k 28, see below) indicates that he owned such equipment himself. It may be that Assyrian merchants were able to rent wagons from people like him if necessary.

The use of Anatolian words in Cappadocian texts

Texts found in Kültepe, Boğazköy, Alişar Höyük and Kaman Kalehöyük from the Karum Period contain a number of words of non-Akkadian origin. Since Akkadian was the only language employed for writing, the number of Anatolian loanwords in Cappadocian texts is larger than in e.g. Akkadian texts from Boğazköy during the Hittite Empire, where a tradition existed of writing in Hittite.⁹ Although the corpus of Cappadocian texts stems from a short period of time and from a limited geographical area, this does not mean that these loanwords were formed in a uniform way. On the contrary, the review below reveals the existence of several processes. Many loanwords have a Hittite etymology, some a Luwian, or are attested in one or both of these languages, others derive from Hurrian – whether directly or through an intermediary remains to be investigated. It is unclear whether any Hattic words occur.¹⁰ Although some loanwords are present in several texts, others are known from only

⁸ Cf. an inspection record concerning the household of Sammêtar, a magnate of the king of Mari also involved in agricultural production, at Zurubban, where 9 wagons are listed as “entrusted objects at the disposal of the *ikkarum*-farmers of Sammêtar”, see van Koppen (2002b, 337).

⁹ Note the small number of loans from Hittite collected in Durham (1976, 466–468).

¹⁰ Soysal (2004, 5) considers *ga-šu-iḫ-ta-el* (acc.) to be Hattic, but Bilgiç (1945–51, 19) analysed it as Hurrian. The word occurs in CCT 4, 35a (from Level II): (8) *lu URUDU 10 ma-na* (9) *lu ga-šu-iḫ-ta-el* (10) *ša e-pu-šu* “Either copper, about 10 minas, or g. that I will obtain”. A personal name is not excluded. Obscure also is *a-pá-zu-ḫa* attested in two texts from the 18th century, KBo 28, 169 (see Dercksen 1996, 232) and Kt 2000/k 18 (Donbaz 2004, 188f.).

a few texts or even less. This does not necessarily mean that the rarely written loans were equally rare in the spoken language. It goes without saying that a scarcity of attestations may hamper the correct understanding of the word.

All of the words of non-Akkadian origin in the text discussed above have a characteristic suffix *-n-* or *-nn-* before the Akkadian case ending: *ḫi-ša-nu*, *iš-pu-ru-zi-nu*, *lu-ta-ḫa-nu*, *ú-lu-ra-nu*, and *]ku-up-ra-nu*. This makes von Soden's interpretation of the two final syllables of *ú-lu-ra-nu* and *]ku-up-ra-nu* as containing the Akkadian plural marker *-ānū* problematic, and I consider the final vowel to be the plural masculine ending *-ū*. The dual ending *-ān* is only used for the Akkadian word *eriqqum* in line 12, not for *ḫiššannum* in lines 9 and 13; however, the reason for this seemingly inconsistent spelling is that the dual ending in OA is used on average in only one in every four cases and its usage is not affected by whether or not a loanword is concerned (cf. *zu-[pá]-na-an*, see entry [3] below). The suffix *-n(n)-* in loanwords, despite previous discussions, remains ill-defined and a fresh investigation on the basis of a selection from the Cappadocian material is the aim of this section.

It may be useful briefly to describe the Old Assyrian writing system, as existing transcriptions of non-Akkadian vocables often are based on the editor's personal preferences and may be confusing for non-specialists of this corpus. As a general rule, the OA scribal tradition uses cuneiform signs sparingly. This means that only a limited number of different signs is employed. Thus, voiced, voiceless and emphatic are written with the same sign; e.g. the sign ZA is used for /za/, /sa/, and /ša/, while ZI is employed for /zi/, /si/, and /ši/. Furthermore, gemination is not expressed in writing, with the exception of some frequently occurring words. Hittite /s/ is rendered by signs of the Š-series, thus *ḫa-tù-ší-ili*₅ for /Hattusili/.

Many of the following loanwords derive from vocalic stems that end in *a* or *i*; moreover, they can demonstrably be related to Hittite words. For that reason these loans are considered as derivatives of Hittite *a-* or *i-*stem words.

Selected loanwords in Cappadocian texts¹¹A. Words ending in *-n(n)um*1. Words derived from a Hittite *a*-stem

- [1] *ḫiniššannum* (a vessel); II; Assy.; 1.
Cf. Hitt. *ḫani/eššā-* (c.) (rather than the derived form *ḫaniššanni-*), Friedrich/Kammenhuber, HW² III, 145 ff.; Rieken (1999, 227 “Schöpfgefäß”); Puhvel, HED 3, 76. Written *ḫi-ni-ša-nim*, *ḫi-ni-ša-nam*, only in Kt 87/k 249, published by Hecker (1996, 155) (a *ḫ*., perhaps of silver, was sold to a local ruler); cf. Michel (2001, 157 “un produit très onéreux”).
- [2] *ḫiššannum* “pole”; II; Anat.; 1.
Cf. Hitt. *ḫišša-* (c.?) “pole”, see Tischler, HEG I, 252; Puhvel, HED 3, 318; Rieken (1999, 249). The word occurs in BIN 6, 258:9.13, written *ḫi-ša-nu*.
- [3] *zuppannum* (a metal container); II; Assy.; > 10.
Cf. Hitt. *zuppa-* (c.), for which see Laroche (1952, 114); Otten (1971, 5). The Capp. word is usually spelled with initial /s/ in modern publications, as in AHW. 1060 *su(p)pannum* and CAD S, 391 f. Despite the interpretation “a container” by Gelb, OIP 27 (1935) 66, Bilgiç (1954, 31) offered “Messer od. Sieb”, while Kienast, ATHE, p. 15, rendered it by “Dolch(?)”; Durand, ARM 21, 343 n. 33 2) (a weapon); Michel (2001, 559 “sorte de bol”). At least four of the texts are from the archive of Pūšu-kēn (attested ca. first half of 19th c., see Kryszat 2004, 40 ff.), documenting the dispatch of several silver and bronze containers to the woman Lamassi in Assur. The word is written *zu-pá-na-am*, *zu-pá-nam*; with the dual ending in CCT 2, 36a:10, 2 *zu-[pá]-na-an ša ZABAR*, but 2 *zu-pá-ni ša ZABAR* in CCT 3, 20:5; and 2 *zu-pá-nu* in CCT 4, 20a:8.
- [4] *kullitannum* (a vessel); II; Assy.; 1.
Cf. Luvian *kullit-* (n.) “ein Gefäß (für Honig und Öl)”, Starke (1990, 208). The Capp. word may be based on Hitt. **kullita-*; for Luvian *-it*-becoming *-i*- or *-ita*- in Hitt. loans, see Starke (1990, 152), Rieken (1999, 499). For Hitt. **kulli-* see Puhvel, HED 4, 239. Attested in

¹¹ The Capp. word and its translation are followed first by a Roman numeral referring to the period of attestation (II = ca. 1920–1836, Ib = ca. 1800–1750), whether used in Assyrian (Assyr.) or Anatolian (Anat.) documents, and the number of known texts it occurs in.

Prague I 624: (7) 22½ ŠE KÙ.BABBAR (8) *a-ši-kà-tim* (9) *ù ku-li-ta-NIM* “22 ½ grains of silver for flasks (for oil or perfume) and *k*”. The final sign NIM represents the obl.pl. and has to be read *-ni₇*.

- [5] *hulugannum*; II; Anat.; 1.

The word *hulugannum* is usually compared to Hitt. *hulukanni* “coach, carriage” (Landsberger 1950, 342; Bilgiç 1954, 49; Puhvel, HED 3, 372; Alp 1997, 42; Michel 2001, 497). Whereas this comparison makes little sense in view of the context of the word, a derivation from Hitt. *haluga-* (c.) “message, announcement, tidings, news” fits better. If this is correct, Capp. *hulugannum* may be a loan translation from OA *têrtum* “instruction”, which occasionally means “ware, merchandise” (with Veenhof 1972, 143, pace AHw. 1350a). For Capp. *u* for Hitt. *a*, see below. The word is attested in a single text, AKT 1, 14:7.30, and the pertinent lines read: “Speak to Šenzur, thus Kunaniya: you are my brother, you are my god. What have I done to you? Did I ever turn hostile to you in view of my brother? See, I secretly sent you your *h*. (*hu-lu-ga-ni-kà* for *hulugannaka*, or perhaps plural). Why did you show to my brother (your anger)? Why do you disgrace me in his eyes? (...) Do not demand from me the proceeds of the *h*. (*hi-lu-ga-ni-im*), my brother!”. The excited state of the sender may account for scribal peculiarities; apart from the different spellings of *hulugannum* and the grammatical error in line 7, one notices *Šé-zu-IR* (27) and *ú-tù-IB-tum* (34).

2. Words derived from a Hittite *i*-stem

- [6] *išpuruzzinnum* “roof batten”; II; Anat., Assy.; 2.

Cf. Hitt. *išparuzzi-* (n.), see above. For Capp. *u* for Hitt. *a*, see below.

- [7] *kullupinnum* “hatchet-like tool with which straw was chopped” (with Lewy 1950, 20); II; Assy.; 4.

Cf. Hitt. *kullupi* (n.) “serpette à hacher la paille”, Laroche (1957, 20); “pruning-knife, serpette”, Puhvel, HED 4, 244 f.; Hoffner (1974, 29). See also Bilgiç (1954, 39 f.). Large quantities of these tools occur in some OA texts as claims; VS 26, 196: (2) 70 *ku-lu-pi-ni* (3) *ša tí-ib-nim*, “70 *k*. of straw” (as a debt); TC 1, 99: (1) 30 *ku-[lu]-pi-ni* (2) *ša tí-ib-nim* (...) (10) 80 *ku-lu-pi-ni* (11) *ša tí-ib-nim*.

- [8] *luḫuzzinnum* (a vessel); II; Assy.; 2.

Cf. Hitt. *laḫ(h)uwai-*, *laḫ(h)u-* “to pour”, CHD L, 13, + *-uzzi-*. For the Capp. word, see Bilgiç (1954, 41 f. “wahrscheinlich ein[en] Beruf”); AHw. 562 *luḫusīnum* (ein Ggst.?). The interpretation as a type of vessel was first made by Matouš (1974, 170) because of *kir-*

rum “jar” in Prague I 629; he was followed by Hecker/Kryszat/Matouš (1998, 210). Occurrences: BIN 4, 118: (1) *10 ḥa-ba-ša-tim* (2) *ša lu-ḥu-zi-nim* (3) *10 lu-ḥu-zi(-)zi-ri-im* (4) *4 dī-qá-ra-tim* (5) *2 ek-nu-zi* (6) *me-at ma-lá-/ḥu*, “10 ḥ. for a *l*-vessel, 10 *l*. for a *z*., 4 tureens, 2 cold water containers, 100 *m*.”¹² As often with words for vessels the word is feminine, see Prague I 629: (1) *4 lu-ḥu-zi-na-tim* (2) *ù 2 ki-re-en* (3) PN₁ (4) *3 lu-ḥu-zi-na-tim* (5) PN₂, “4 *l*-vessels and 2 jars: PN₁. 3 *l*-vessels: PN₂”.

- [9] **eknuzzinnum* (a container for cold water); II; Assy.; 1.

The form *ek-nu-zi* in BIN 4, 118:5 (for the context see [8]) may derive from **ekunuzzi-* (cf. Hitt. *ekuna-* “cold” HW² II E, 33 and other derivatives of *eka-* “ice” in *ekun-* [reference Th. P. J. van den Hout]), with syncope of *u* in the second syllable according to GAG § 12, but without suffix. The meaning could be “cold water container” or the like. Normalized as *iknusi* in Bilgiç (1954, 41 n. 99 “vielleicht eine Art Behälter”, 64); CAD I/J, 61; Streck (2005, 70); listed in AHW. 369 as *iknusum*.

The forms *lu-ḥu-zi* and *ek-nu-zi* in BIN 4, 118 (cited [8]) are written without suffix. The ending *-uzzi* and the word *lu-ḥu-zi-nim* in line 2 make it likely that both are loanwords. *lu-ḥu-zi* in combination with the following *zi-ri-im* could represent *luḥuzzin zirim*, with assimilation of final *n* (*l*. in the sg.) to the following *z* and therefore not expressed in writing. The object called *zi-ri-im* either is a large piece of cloth or tent, or a cauldron, but its meaning in this combination is unclear to me. The form *ek-nu-zi* without final *-ni* could stand for the plural *eknuzzī*, similar to the form *upatim* without suffix in [11] (*-m* is mimation); less likely is to assume some carelessness of the ancient scribe, probably an Assyrian.

- [10] *tuzzinnum* “army”; II, Ib; Assy., Anat.; > 10.

Cf. Hitt. *tuzzi-* (c.) “army”. For the Capp. word, see Dercksen (2004a).

- [11] *upatinnum* “royal land grant”; II; Assy., Anat.; 5; Ib; Anat.; 1.

Cf. Hitt. *ubadi-* (n.) < Luv. *upatit-* “royal land grant”; cf. Melchert (2004, 371), Yakubovich (2005). For the Capp. word, see Alp (1997, 42) and Dercksen (2004a). Note the writing *ú-pá-ti/tí-im* without suffix in Kt v/k 152:15. 20 (II; Anat.; see Dercksen 2004a, 151, 160).

¹² Compare the objects in Kt 88/k 71 (Albayrak 2002, 9): (38) *1 GÍN a-na zi-ri ma-lá-ḥi ú ḥa-ba-ša-tim*, “11 shekel (of silver) for *z*., *m*., and *ḥ*.”.

B. Words without suffix *-n(n)um*¹³

Not all Cappadocian loanwords from an Anatolian language were formed by means of a suffix. Another possibility consists of adding the Akkadian case ending immediately to the last consonant of the stem, with apocope of the thematic vowel:

- [12] *išhiulum* (perhaps a commodity); II; Assy.; 1.

Often compared to Hitt. *išhiul-* (n.) “binding, obligation” (Landsberger 1950, 342; Bilgiç 1954, 65; Alp 1997, 42; Rieken 1999, 463; Streck 2005, 71) and cited as an example of Hittite vocables in Capp. texts (Watkins 2004, 551). Doubts about this identification were expressed by Puhvel, HED 2, 401; Tischler, HEG I, 390. Attested in a Level II text, BIN 6, 145: (8) ... *1 ½ GÍN* (9) *a-na iš-ḫi-ú-li* “1 ½ shekel (of silver) for *i*.”, among the debts of two Anatolians.

- [13] *išpadallum* (an object); II; Assy.; 3.

Cf. Puhvel, HED 2, 435. It has been compared to Hitt. **išpantalli* (Landsberger 1950, 342; Bilgiç 1954, 66 [“Herberge, Wirt”]; Alp 1997, 42; Tischler, HEG I, 410; Rieken 1999, 456; Streck 2005, 71), but that is unlikely to be correct. The word is attested in three Assyrian texts from the Level II period where it is written *iš-pá-da-lu*, TC 3, 165:20; *iš-pá-da-li*, Kt t/k 1:13 and Kt t/k 25:8 (published in Sever 1996).

¹³ Here possibly also *kupuršinnum*, an Anatolian word qualifying gold, cf. Hitt. *kurupšini*, Bilgiç (1954, 40f.); Puhvel, HED 4, 279. For the writings in OA, cf. Nashef RGTC 4, 72f. (My own reading of Kt c/k 257:21 has *ku-pur-ši-nám*, with BUR instead of Balkan’s RU.)

The word *taršipiyala-* “driver, coachman” (Tischler, HEG III, 227) occurs in only two Capp. texts from the 18th century, where it may be used as a proper name. First in OIP 27, 53:4, a legal document recording the redemption of ... from (*išti*) a/the *tár-ši-pi-a-/li* (gen.), perhaps a form of Akkadianised **taršipiyallum*. Next in a record of persons most of whom are listed by name, but some also with their title: *ʾpè-ru-wa tár-ši-pi-a-lá* “Peruwa the driver” or “Peruwa (and) Driver”, Kt s/t 92 rev. 6 (photo T. Özgüç, Kültepe-Kaniş II, Pl. 62 1a). The ending *-i* in the first text may indicate the Akkadian genitive form of the word, which makes an interpretation as an (Akkadianised) substantive possible; the formation would be comparable to the words listed under B. However, final *a* in the second text occurs in some Anatolian names ending in *-a/i*; moreover, with the exception of Akkadianised words such as *targumannum*, *šinaḫilum*, *alahḫinnum*, no non-Akkadian Anatolian functions or titles occur in Capp. texts. (Tischler, HEG II, 495 and 501, mentions the PN *Pá-ar-si-pá-lá*. According to the copy in KTK 67:2, this name reads *Pá-pá-ar-ši-ma-lá*.)

- [14] *padallum* (a copper object); II; Assy.; 1.
Cf. Hitt. *patalli-* “fetter (?)”, tether(?)”, CHD P, 240 *patalli(ya)*; Rieken (1999, 443). Hecker/Kryszat/Matouš (1998, 352) (cf. Dercksen 1996, 59) compared it to this Hitt. word and suggested a meaning “Fußring, Fußfessel”. Attestations: obl. pl. *pá-da-li*, Prague I 792:2'.5'.
- [15] *targumannum* and *targumiyannum* “interpreter”; Assy., Anat.; > 5.
< Luvian *targummann(i)-* and *targummiyann(i)-*, see Starke (1993). The first form is the most common one in OA; the second is rare, e.g. *ta-ar-gu-mi-a-nim* in Kt 92/k 194:40 (courtesy K. R. Veenhof).
- [16] *šašannum*; II; Assy.; 1.
Cf. Hitt. *šašanna-* (c.) “lamp”, Tischler, HEG II, 945f.; CHD Š, 304 (from MS). A single Capp. occurrence of this *Kulturwort* in OIP 27, 62:37, where the word (*ša-ša-num*) occurs in a list with scrap metal, axes and hammers. See Bilgiç (1954, 58), Dercksen (1996, 240). Also interpreted as a sun disc, cf. Hirsch (1972, 66 with n. 351). Cf. further AHw. 1198 *ša(s)šānum*; CAD Š/2, 174 *šaššānu* (a metal object).
- [17] *marnuattum* (a kind of beer); II; Assy.; 4.
Cf. Hitt. *marnuwant-* (c.), CHD M, 193; Rieken (1999, 456). For the etymology of the Capp. word, see von Schuler (1969). Written *ma-ar-nu-a-tim*, *ma-ar-nu-a-tám*.
- [18] *tabalattum* (a cereal and a beverage made of it); II; Assy.; 4.
The word *tabalattum*¹⁴ or *tabalātum* is considered “a kind of beer” (AHw. 1296 s.v. *tab/palātum*) by comparing it to Hitt. *tawal-* (von Schuler 1969, 321; von Soden, ZA 66 (1976) 139; Tischler, HEG III, 278f.; Rieken 1999, 456). Cf. also Veenhof, VS 26, p. 27. CCT 6, 40a: (3) ... 4 *na-ru-uq* (4) *ar-ša-tim ta-ba-lá-tim i-dí-nu* (6) 2 *na-ru-uq* (7) *ar-ša-tim* (8) *a-na ta-ba-lá-tim*, “They gave 4 sacks of *t.* wheat, 2 sacks of wheat for *t.*”; VS 26, 124: (6) *na-ru-uq* (7) *qé-ma-am* (8) *ša ta-ba-lá-tim*, “A sack of flour of *t.* (wheat).”

This is also the way loanwords from Hurrian were formed that occur in Capp. texts (the *-nn-* in *alahhinnum* and *uruzannum* derives from a Hurrian suffix):

alahhinnum (an official). Diakonoff (1979, 40) analysed the word as *allai* “lady, lord” + *h̄hi* + *(i)nne* “belonging to (or: in charge of) that which belongs to the lord of the house” > Akkadian: “person in charge of the household, the foodstuffs, meal, etc.; an important servant in a temple or elsewhere”. The abstract *a-lá-hi-nu-tám* “function of *alahhinnum*” occurs in Nešr C 1:1 (Veenhof 1989, 518).

apšuḫum (a type of knife), written GİR *ap-šu-ḫu-um* in Kt c/k 1517:2 (Dercksen 1996, 76, 236). The interpretation “snake-shaped dagger” from Hurr. *apše* “snake” was suggested as a possibility by Richter (2004, 264 n. 7).

¹⁴ Perhaps < **tawalant*, similar to *marnuwattum* < *marnuwant*.

**aštapirum* “personnel”. Hurr. etymology proposed by Speiser, JAOS 73 (1953), 136; doubts about a Hurr. origin were expressed in AHw. 85. Written *áš-tí-pi-ru-um*, Kt g/t 36:29.

b/purullum (an official). Richter compared it to *pur(u)li* “temple” (2004, 264 n. 7).

šinaḫilum (a high-ranking functionary); written *ší-na-ḫi-lu-um*, Kt 2000/k 10 “III”:12’ (Günbatt 2004, 257); abstract: *ší-na-ḫi-lu-tám*, Nešr C 1:17 (Veenhof 1989, 518). A functionary with this title lived in the town of Hahhum.

unušum “corvée” < Hurr. *unušše*, Dercksen (2004a).

uruzannum (a table), cf. AHw. 1436 s.v. *urunzannu*. Examples: *3 ú-ru-za-na-tum ša ta-as-kà-ri-nim*, Kt m/k 69:26 (Hecker 2004, 286); *7 ú-ru-za-na-tum*, Kt h/k 87:25 (Dercksen 1996, 77); also in Mari, see N. Ziegler, FM 4, 227 no. 50 with n. 787.

**uṭḫarum* “characteristic, mark”, see Dercksen (2004b). Cf. perhaps Hurr. *uṭḫuru* “side”.

With the exception of *apšuḫum* and *uṭḫarum*, these words of Hurrian origin were employed in other periods of Akkadian as well.

C. Anatolian words of uncertain origin:

1. Words ending in *-n(n)um*

[19] *ulurannum*, *alurannum* (an object); II; Assy., Anat.; 3.

Anatolian word unidentified; see above.

[20] *šaršarannum/šarašrannum* (Anatolian vessel of standard size used as a capacity measure of half or one-third of a jar [*karputum*]); II, Ib; Assy., Anat.; >10.

CAD Š/2, 124a; H. Lewy (1964, 191); Sallaberger (1996, 117). The word is *ša/era/ešrannum* in Kt k/k 100, with the absolute state *šé-re-ša-ar* in lines 11.13 (courtesy K. Hecker). It is written *ša-ar-ša-ra-na* in a text of Anatolian origin from Kaman-Kalehöyük (Yoshida 2002, 133 lines 10.13; Omura 2002, 5). Possibly reduplicated Hitt. *šarra* “portion, share” (for which see CHD Š, 229). Hirsch identified the ending as *-ān* (OrNS 41 [1972], 408), but cf. below.

[21] *tuḫtuḫannum* (a festival); II; Anat.; 3.

Apparently a (possibly deified) object after which a festival, “that (*ša*) of the *t*.”, was named. It is not the original name of a deity (with Bilgiç 1954, 59f.; differently Matouš 1965, 179; Hirsch 1972, 53; Haas 1994, 676). Perhaps related to Hitt. *tuḫtuḫiya* “to swing”, for which see Tischler, HEG III, 414. Matouš read the ending *-ānum* and regarded it as a hypocoristic ending in names (with reference to Landsberger, ZA 35 [1923] 220f.); written *tù-ùḫ-tù-ḫa-nim* (ICK 1, 129:9.14), *tù-ùḫ-tù-ḫa-ni* (TC 3, 227A:7).

2. Words without modification

[22] *aš(š)ēš*; II; Anat.; 1.[23] *makrēš*; II; Anat.; 1.

According to Kt d/k 28, a bond from the archive of Perua published by Balkan (1979, 52 ff.), the creditor obliged his Anatolian debtors to deliver certain items to be used as spare parts for wagons and seeder ploughs. The two Anatolian words on the tablet read in context: (9) *ù 20 ma-ak-ri-e-iš* (10) *ù 20 a-šī-iš* (11) *i-du-nu ...*, “They will give 20 *m.* and 20 *a.*”, whereas the case offers (10) *20 ma-ak-r[i-(e)-i]š 20 a-šī-iš* (11) *ša e-ri-[q]i-[i]m ù* (12) *ša e-pi-nim*, “20 *m.* (and) 20 *a.* of wagon and seeder plough”. The scribe wrote the words *makrēš* and *aš(š)ēš* with *-ēš*, the Hittite nominative plural marker. The additional *e* in *ma-ak-ri-e-iš* (or *ma-ak-re-e-eš₁₅*) marks the long vowel in OA; cf. the construct state of *rēšum* “head”, *rēš*, which usually is written *re-eš* or *ri-iš*, but occasionally with an extra vowel *re-e-iš* (TPAK 1, 84:16) and *ri-i-iš* (Kt 91/k 493:10). Balkan suggested the meaning “plough-heel” for *aš(š)ēš* (1979, 52).

[24] *mazilaššar*; II; Assyr.; 2.

Perhaps denoting a beverage or a jar containing it. This word occurs in two texts where meat and beverage are allotted to various persons. It has been interpreted as a personal name by Ulshöfer (1995, 279 f. no. 319) and Hecker/Kryszat/Matouš (1998, 265 f.). It is written *ma-zi-lá-ša-ar* (CCT 5, 33a:4.17), *ma-zi-lá-šar* (Prague I 682:2), and *ma-zi-lá-a-šar* (CCT 5, 33a:6) where the extra *a* indicates gemination of the following *š*. Final *-Ø* can be interpreted as nom./voc./acc. (For *šerešar*, see [20].)

Discussion

Some Akkadian words of foreign origin end in *-annum* or *-innum*, which we distinguish, as does von Soden (GAG), from the Akkadian *-ān* suffix.¹⁵ The productivity of these endings apparently was limited. For example, according to the analyses of Lieberman there do not seem to be any loans from Sumerian that possess these endings.¹⁶ By contrast, a suf-

¹⁵ For the suffixes *-n*, *-in*, *-an* in Semitic, see Brockelmann (1908, 395).

¹⁶ The ending *-innum* in words like *epinnum* < *apin* and *taskarinnum* < *taskarin* does not derive from the Akkadian suffix that is productive in *išpuruzzinnum* etc., but was already part of the Sumerian word. The existence of a “linguistic area” or of an unknown substrate to explain resemblances such as the ending *-in* or *-an* in Sumerian, Akkadian, and other languages, is controversial (see Streck 2005, 69).

fix containing *-n(n)-* was quite widely used during the Karum Period. Not all words with the endings *-annum* or *-innum*, though, were formed in the same way.

A convenient list of Akkadian words of genuine or presumed Anatolian origin is available in Bilgiç (1954), and a number of these so-called Cappadocian appellations was also discussed by Kronasser (1966, 136f.; index in 1987, 260). According to Bilgiç (1945–51, 17 n. 123; 1954, 35) the ending *-annum* or *-innum* was very productive in the formation of loanwords in Akkadian. He analysed the suffix as *-n* (often > *-nn-*) plus an Akkadian case ending, and suggested that the *-n-* may belong to one of the local Anatolian languages. The discussion by Bilgiç is the most extensive available in Assyriological literature; the third edition of von Soden's *Grundriß* in §58b merely refers to a short remark by Landsberger (1947–52, 371 n. 60), who in turn referred the reader to Bilgiç (1945–51, 17 n. 123).

In his study of the Cappadocian loanwords ending in *-annum* or *-innum* Kronasser concluded that the majority of these contain the suffix *-ni* (*-num*) (1966, 138), which is Hurrian in origin. This suffix (often written *-nni*) is also used to accommodate foreign words in Hurrian.¹⁷ However, Kronasser's conclusion appears debatable since it assumes close linguistic contact between the Assyrian merchants and sizeable Hurrian-speaking groups in Kültepe, for which there is no proof whatsoever.¹⁸ Hurrian-speaking regions are found far to the south-east of Kültepe, close to the modern border with Syria. Possible Hurrian influence must then have originated in a different area, where the chances of borrowing Hittite words would be poor. Thus far, only two words of Hurrian origin attested in the Cappadocian material contain this suffix: *alahhinnum* and *uru(n)zannum*.

It also has been suggested that some loanwords may contain the Akkadian diminutive suffix *-ān*. Lewy (1950, 20) and Laroche (1957, 20) suggested a diminutive *-ēnum* (< *ānum*) appearing as *-innum* in the word *kulupinnum*, cf. Puhvel (HED 4, 245). According to Hecker (GKT §57c) the suffix *-ann* and *-inn* in many loanwords cannot always be distinguished from the Akkadian ending *-ān*; he referred to the Hittite suffix *-(a)nni-* (possibly of diminutive meaning) that may be apparent in the word *ḫulukanni*. However, there does not appear to be any difference in

¹⁷ See Mayrhofer (1996, 161) with bibliographical references. Cf. the Amarna-Akkadian Hurroid form *ḫapalkinnum* (a kind of iron) < Hurr. *ḫapalkinni*, which via Old Hittite *ḫapalki-* derives from Hattic *ḫapalki-* (Soysal 2004, 278; Puhvel, HED 3, 117).

¹⁸ See Richter (2004, 265. 290f.).

meaning between the loanwords and their originals, which makes it unlikely that a suffix with a diminutive meaning is used.

Finally, a Luvian origin of the suffix in *targumannum/targumiyannum* was advocated by F. Starke (1993, 22), who proposed identifying the ending in that word with the Cuneiform Luvian possessive suffix *-ann(i)-*, which is necessary to render the word **targummiya* “report” into a title or function.¹⁹

It is evident from this short overview that various word formations of different languages may have led to the endings *-annum* and *-innum* in Cappadocian loanwords. Occasionally the suffix *-n(n)-* originates from the Cuneiform Luvian suffix *-ann(i)-*, whereas a small number of originally Hurrian words contain the Hurrian suffix *-ni*. In the majority of cases, however, the ending can be shown to be *-n-* or *-nn-* and is attached to a word of Hittite origin. A form such as *išpuruzzinnum* < Hitt. *išparuzzi* demonstrates that the suffix is *-n(n)-* rather than *-an(n)-/-in(n)-*. The form written *hi-ša-nu* lacks Assyrian vowel assimilation of the *a*, either because the vowel was preserved due to secondary lengthening or because of gemination of the *n*. It is noteworthy that loans derived from a word with a final syllable containing an *l*, *n*, or *t* (< *nt*) lack the *-n(n)-* suffix.²⁰

The discussion about this suffix may be furthered by asking what form of the Hittite words lies at the basis of the Cappadocian loanwords. The first option is to regard the suffix as the Hittite accusative marker *-n*, which the Assyrians would have considered the characteristic form of the word at the time of borrowing, plus the Akkadian case ending. Old Hittite has the acc. ending *-n* with *a*-stem words of both common and neuter genders as well as with *i*-stem words of common gender.²¹ However, this hypothesis seems invalidated by the fact that Hittite *i*-stem neuters lack an acc. in *-n*, and therefore the ending in *išpuruzzinnum*, *kul-lupinnum*, *luḫuzzinnum*, and *upatinnum* requires a different explanation.

The second and in my view more plausible option is to analyse the loanwords under A as the Hittite stem form + *-n(n)-* + Akkadian case ending. The Assyrians would have taken the stem form, which was used as a vocative, as the characteristic form – similar to what Hittite scribes occasionally did centuries later when they included a native title or name

¹⁹ For a bibliography of the discussion on *targumannum*, see Tischler, HEG III, 181 f.

²⁰ Capp. *šalinnum* (a type of sheep, CAD Š/1, 246) has been compared to Hitt. *šalli-* “big” in Bilgiç (1954, 44), but this is uncertain, cf. Tischler, HEG II, 774.

²¹ There do not seem to be clear examples of Capp. loanwords derived from *u*-stems.

in an Akkadian text²² – and suffixed *-n(n)um* to it. In that case, these forms have an Akkadian suffix added to the stem form whereby the original vowel was preserved. It should be noted that there are no indications that this suffix modified the meaning of the word. As the original form of several of the words listed under B is uncertain, it is with reservations that this hypothesis is also applied to all those Cappadocian loans without a suffix, regarding them as being based on Hittite stem forms.

The question which cannot be investigated here is whether the suffix itself ultimately is of non-Akkadian origin. Further research will have to establish what determined its use, and whether Cappadocian loanwords formed in that way were all introduced within a short period of time or belonged to a specific scribal tradition. With the exception of one single occurrence (as in [8], [9], and [11]), there do not appear to have been other cases of words formed with and without the suffix.

A brief remark should be added on the fact that some Cappadocian loanwords have the vowel *u* where the Hittite cognate has *a*. The Capp. *u* in [5] *ḫu/ilugannum* < *ḫaluga-* and [6] *išpuruzzinnum* < *išparuzzi-* may be the result of anaptyxis of a consonant cluster; e.g., Hittite */isprutsi-/* is written *išparuzzi-* in Hittite, but *išpuruzzi* in OA.

Conclusion

At least three possibilities emerge which scribes in Kaneš and elsewhere in Anatolia could employ to Akkadianise a word of Anatolian origin (usually from the Hittite lexicon, occasionally from Luvian):

1. attaching the Akkadian case ending on to the word in the stem form followed by the suffix *-n(n)um*.
2. attaching the Akkadian case ending on to the word in the stem form without suffix.
3. simply attaching the Akkadian case ending on to the stem with apocope of a possible final vowel of the stem.

In rare cases Anatolian words could be written with the Hittite nominative or accusative markers without the Akkadian case ending (*makrēš*, *mazilaššar*). However, adaptation by means of adding the suffix *-n(n)um* seems to have been the most productive of the three possibilities.

Frequently loanwords are employed where no Akkadian equivalent existed, particularly words that refer to aspects of local socio-political or-

²² Güterbock (1945, 249f.), Durham (1976, 467f.).

ganization and which occur in documents written on behalf of Anatolians and Assyrians alike, such as *tuzzinnu* and *upatinnu* (and *arḫal(l)um* and *unuššum*). Other borrowings comprise specialized terminology for vessels, minerals, and technical objects. The majority of the loanwords of Hittite origin in Cappadocian texts appear to have been used in Akkadian exclusively during the Karum Period.

Bibliography

- Albayrak, I. (2002): Kültepe'den değişik bir masraf listesi, *Archivum Anatolicum* 5, 1–10.
- Albayrak, I. (2005): Fünf Urkunden aus dem Archiv von Peruwa, Sohn von Šuppibra, *JEOL* 39, 95–105.
- Alp, S. (1950): Die soziale Klasse der nam.ra-Leute und ihre hethitische Bezeichnung, *Jahrbuch für Kleinasiatische Forschung* I/2, 115–135.
- Alp, S. (1997): Die Mehrheit der einheimischen Bevölkerung in der Kārum-Zeit in Kaneš/Neša, *SMEA* 39/1, 35–48.
- Aro, J. (1970): *Mittelbabylonische Kleidertexte der Hilprecht-Sammlung Jena*. Berlin.
- Balkan, K. (1979): *Makriš* and *ašiš*, component-parts of wagons and ploughs respectively, in a Cappadocian tablet from Kültepe, in: *Florilegium Anatolicum. Mélanges offerts à Emmanuel Laroche* (Paris) 49–58.
- Bilgiç, E. (1945–51): Die Ortsnamen der „kappadokischen“ Urkunden im Rahmen der alten Sprachen Anatoliens, *AfO* 15, 1–37.
- Bilgiç, E. (1954): Die einheimischen Appellativa der kappadokischen Texte und ihre Bedeutung für die anatolischen Sprachen. Ankara.
- Boysan-Dietrich, N. (1987): Das hethitische Lehmhaus aus der Sicht der Keilschriftquellen. *Texte der Hethiter* 12. Heidelberg.
- Brockelmann, C. (1908): *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*. I. Band: Laut- und Formenlehre. Berlin.
- Carruba, O. (1966): Das Beschwörungsritual für die Göttin Wišurijanža. *StBoT* 2. Wiesbaden.
- Civil, M. (1968): Išme-Dagan and Enlil's Chariot, *JAOS* 88, 3–14.
- Civil, M. (1994): *The Farmer's Instructions. A Sumerian Agricultural Manual*. Barcelona.
- Dercksen, J. G. (1996): *The Old Assyrian Copper Trade in Anatolia*. PIHANS 75. Istanbul.
- Dercksen, J. G. (2004a): Some elements of Old Anatolian society in Kaniš, in: J. G. Dercksen (ed.), *Assyria and Beyond. Studies Presented to Mogens Trolle Larsen*. PIHANS 100 (Leiden) 137–177.
- Dercksen, J. G. (2004b): Old Assyrian *uthurum* “characteristic, mark” and *lū uthurum* “it surely was a sign”, *NABU* 2004 note 9.
- Diakonoff, I. M. (1979): Some remarks on I 568, *ArOr.* 47, 40–41.
- Donbaz, V. (2004): Some Old Assyrian texts with rare terminology, in: J. G. Dercksen (ed.), *Assyria and Beyond. Studies Presented to Mogens Trolle Larsen*. PIHANS 100 (Leiden) 179–189.
- Durham, J. W. (1976): *Studies in Bogazköy Akkadian*. Ph. D. Thesis Harvard University.
- Eelbode, J. (1975): *Taalkundige en stylistische studie van Cappadocische oorkonden geschreven door niet-Assyriërs* (unpublished Lincientiaatsverhandeling Gent).

- Eidem, J. (1992): The Shemshāra Archives 2: The Administrative Texts. Copenhagen.
- Greengus, S. (1986): Studies in Ishchali Documents. BiMes. 19. Malibu.
- Groneberg, B. (1990): La culture matérielle à Mari, II: Der *nūbalum* und seine Objekte, MARI 6, 161–180.
- Günbatti, C. (2004): Two treaty texts found at Kültepe, in: J. G. Dercksen (ed.), Assyria and Beyond. Studies Presented to Mogens Trolle Larsen. PIHANS 100 (Leiden) 249–268.
- Güterbock, H. G. (1945): The vocative in Hittite, JAOS 65, 248–257.
- Haas, V. (1994): Geschichte der hethitischen Religion. HdO 15. Leiden/New York/Köln.
- Hecker, K. (1968): Grammatik der Kültepe-Texte. Analecta Orientalia 44. Roma.
- Hecker, K. (1996): Rechtlos in der Fremde?, 1995 Yılı Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi Konferansları (Ankara), 145–159.
- Hecker, K. (2004): Beim Tode unseres Vaters ... Der leidige Streit ums Erbe, in: J. G. Dercksen (ed.), Assyria and Beyond. Studies Presented to Mogens Trolle Larsen. PIHANS 100 (Leiden) 281–297.
- Hecker, K./Kryszat, G./Matouš, L. (1998): Kappadokische Keilschrifttafeln aus den Sammlungen der Karlsuniversität Prag. Praha.
- Hirsch, H. (1972): Untersuchungen zur altassyrischen Religion. AfO Beiheft 13/14. Osnabrück.
- Hoffner Jr., H. A. (1974): Alimenta Hethaeorum. Food Production in Hittite Asia Minor. New Haven.
- Kienast, B. (1960): Die altassyrischen Texte des Orientalischen Seminars der Universität Heidelberg und der Sammlung Erlenmeyer-Basel. Berlin.
- Kienast, B. (1984): Das altassyrische Kaufvertragsrecht. FAOS Beiheft 1. Stuttgart.
- Koppen, F. van (2002a): Equids in Mari and Chagar Bazar, AoF 29, 19–30.
- Koppen, F. van (2002b): Seized by royal order. The households of Sammêtar and other magnates at Mari, Florilegium Marianum 6, 289–372.
- Kronasser, H. (1966): Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache, Band 1. Wiesbaden.
- Kronasser, H. (1987): Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache, Band 2: Ausführliche Indices zu Band 1 zusammengestellt von Erich Neu. Wiesbaden.
- Kryszat, G. (2004): Zur Chronologie der Kaufmannsarchive aus der Schicht 2 des Kārum Kaneš. PIHANS 99. Leiden.
- Landsberger, B. (1947–52): Assyriologische Notizen, WO 1, 362–376.
- Landsberger, B. (1950): Kommt *Ḫattum* 'Hettiterland' in den Kültepe-Tafeln vor?, ArOr. 18/1–2, 329–350.
- Laroche, E. (1952): Recueil d'onomastique hittite. Paris.
- Laroche, E. (1957): Études de vocabulaire VI, RHA XV 60, 9–29.
- Laroche, E. (1966): Les noms des Hittites. Paris.
- Lewy, H. (1964): The assload, the sack, and other measures of capacity, RSO 39, 181–197.
- Lewy, J. (1950): Studies in Old Assyrian grammar and lexicography, OrNS 19, 1–36.
- Lieberman, S. J. (1977): The Sumerian Loanwords in Old-Babylonian Akkadian. Volume One: Prolegomena and Evidence. Missoula.
- Matouš, L. (1965): Anatolische Feste nach „Kappadokischen“ Tafeln, in: H. G. Güterbock/T. Jacobsen (eds.), Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday April 21, 1965 (Chicago) 175–181.
- Matouš, L. (1974): Beiträge zur akkadischen Lexikographie, ArOr. 42, 167–172.
- Mayrhofer, M. (1996): Ein indo-arischer Rechtsterminus im Mitanni-Brief?, Historische Sprachforschung 109, 161–162.
- Melchert, H. Craig (1994): Anatolian Historical Phonology. Amsterdam/Atlanta.

- Melchert, H. Craig (2004): A Luwian dedication, in: J. H. W. Penney (ed.), *Indo-European Perspectives. Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies* (Oxford) 370–379.
- Michel, C. (1996): Propriétés immobilières dans les tablettes paléo-assyriennes, in: K. R. Veenhof (ed.), *Houses and Households in Ancient Mesopotamia. PIHANS 78* (Istanbul) 285–300.
- Michel, C. (2001): Correspondance des marchands de Kaniš au début du IIe millénaire avant J.-C. LAPO 19. Paris.
- Michel, C. (2003): Old Assyrian Bibliography. PIHANS 97. Leiden.
- Omura, S. (2002): Preliminary report on the 16th excavation at Kaman-Kalehöyük (2001), Kaman-Kalehöyük 11 (Anatolian Archaeological Studies 11), 1–43.
- Otten, H. (1971): Materialien zum hethitischen Lexikon. StBoT 15. Wiesbaden.
- Puhvel, J. (1984–): *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Berlin/New York/Amsterdam.
- Richter, Th. (2004): Die Ausbreitung der Hurriter bis zur altbabylonischen Zeit: eine kurze Zwischenbilanz, in: J.-W. Meyer/W. Sommerfeld (eds.), 2000 v. Chr. Politische, wirtschaftliche und kulturelle Entwicklung im Zeichen einer Jahrtausendwende. CDOG 3 (Saarbrücken) 263–311.
- Rieken, E. (1999): Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen. StBoT 44. Wiesbaden.
- Sallaberger, W. (1996): Der babylonische Töpfer und seine Gefäße. MHEM 3. Gent.
- Salonen, A. (1968): *Agricultura Mesopotamica nach Sumerisch-Akkadischen Quellen*. Helsinki.
- Schuler, E. von (1969): *marnu'atum* – Ein kleinasiatisches Lehnwort im Altassyrischen, in: W. Röllig (ed.), *Lišan miṭḫurti. Festschrift Wolfram Freiherr von Soden. AOAT 1* (Neukirchen-Vluyn) 317–322.
- Sever, H. (1996): Die Urformen der Börse und Inflation in Anatolien, *Belleten* 60, 237–242.
- Soysal, O. (2004): Hattischer Wortschatz in hethitischer Textüberlieferung. HdO I/74. Leiden/Boston.
- Starke, F. (1990): Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens. StBoT 31. Wiesbaden.
- Starke, F. (1993): Zur Herkunft von akkad. *ta/urgumannu(m)* „Dolmetscher“, *WO* 24, 20–38.
- Stol, M. (1995): Old Babylonian cattle, *Bulletin on Sumerian Agriculture* 8, 173–213.
- Streck, M. P. (2005): Akkadisch, in: M. P. Streck (ed.), *Sprachen des Alten Orients* (Darmstadt) 44–79.
- Tischler, J. (1983–): *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*. Innsbruck.
- Tischler, J. (1995): Die kappadokischen Texte als älteste Quelle indogermanischen Sprachguts, in: O. Carruba et al. (eds.), *Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia* (Pavia 1993). (Pavia) 359–368.
- Ünal, A. (1988a): Hittite architect and a rope-climbing ritual, *Belleten* 52, 1469–1503.
- Ünal, A. (1988b): “You should build for eternity”. New light on the Hittite architects and their work, *JCS* 40, 97–106.
- Ünal, A. (1990): Review of J. Tischler, *Hethitisch-Deutsches Wörterverzeichnis mit einem semasiologischen Index*, *JNES* 49, 355–360.
- Ulshöfer, A. M. (1995): *Die altassyrischen Privaturkunden. FAOS Beiheft 4*. Stuttgart.
- Ulshöfer, A. M. (2000): Sprachbarrieren und ihre Überwindung: translatorisches Handeln im alten Orient, in: L. Milano et al. (eds.), *Landscapes: Territories, Frontiers and Horizons in the Ancient Near East. HANE/M-III/2* (Padova) 163–169.
- Veenhof, K. R. (1972): *Aspects of Old Assyrian Trade and its Terminology*. Leiden.

- Veenhof, K. R. (1982): The Old Assyrian merchants and their relations with the native population of Anatolia, in: H.-J. Nissen/J. Renger (eds.), *Mesopotamien und seine Nachbarn*, Teil 1 (Berlin) 147–160.
- Veenhof, K. R. (1989): Status and offices of an Anatolian gentleman. Two unpublished letters of Huharimataku from *Karum* Kanish, in: K. Emre et al. (eds.), *Anatolia and the Ancient Near East. Studies in Honor of Tahsin Özgüç* (Ankara) 515–525.
- Watkins, C. (2004): Hittite, in: R. D. Woodard (ed.), *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*, 551–575.
- Yakubovich, I. (2005): Carian monument, in: N. N. Kazansky (ed.), *Hrdā mānasā. Sbornik statey k 70-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya professora Leonarda Georgievicha Gertsenberga* (Sankt-Peterburg) 240–251.
- Yoshida, D. (2002): Ein altassyrischer Text aus Kaman-Kalehöyük, *Kaman-Kalehöyük 11* (Anatolian Archaeological Studies 11), 133–137.