



JOURNAL OF
Near Eastern Studies

Continuing THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SEMITIC
LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

HEBRAICA, Vols. I-XI, 1884-1895

FOUNDED BY WILLIAM RAINY HARPER

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND
LITERATURES, Vols. XII-LVIII, 1895-1941

ROBERT D. BIGGS, *Editor*

WILFERD MADELUNG, *Associate Editor*

CONTENTS for JANUARY 1972

Volume 31 Number 1

- 1 MICHAEL CRAIG HILLMANN, *Hāfez and Poetic Unity Through Verse Rhythms*
11 WILLIAM H. PECK, *A Ramesside Ruler Offers Incense*
16 A. JAMME, *Safaitic Vogüé 402*
22 GORDON D. NEWBY, *An Example of Coptic Literary Influence on Ibn Ishāq's Sirah*
29 Book Reviews About OS~MS

HOEWINK TEN CATE: *The Records of the Early Hittite Empire* (Hoffner); DAVIS: *Sumerograms and Akkadograms in Minoan Hittite* (Hoffner); SÖBERG and BERGMANN: *The Collection of Sumerian Temple Hymns and GBAAG: The Kei Temple Hymn* (Wilcke); OATES: *Studies in the Ancient History of Northern Iraq* (Gibson); POSTGATE: *Neo-Assyrian Royal Grants and Decrees* (Grayson); HALLO, ed.: *Essays in Memory of E. A. Speiser* (Sasson); DIETRICH and RÖLLIG, eds.: *lšdn mthurti: Festschrift Wolfram Freiherr von Soden* (Biggs); FREEDMAN and GREENFIELD: *New Directions in Biblical Archaeology* (Lapp); GRAY: *A History of Jerusalem* (Bright); BOWKER: *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature* (Fitzmyer); ALLEGRO and ANDERSON: *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan. V. Qumran Cave 4* (Greenfield); BLACE: *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels* (Greenfield); VITTESTAM, ed.: *Kans al-mulūk fi kaifiyyat as-sulūk. The Treasure of Princes on the Fashion of Behaviour ascribed to Sibṭ ibn al-Djauṣ* (Boeworth); SCRIBATO: *Arte Islamica a Napoli* (Madelung); CAHEN: *Der Islam I. Vom Ursprung bis zu den Anfängen des Osmanreiches* (Madelung); LASSNER: *The Topography of Baghdad in the Early Middle Ages* (MacKay)

Journal of Near Eastern Studies is published quarterly in January, April, July, and October by The University of Chicago at The University of Chicago Press, 5801 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60637. ¶ Subscription rates, U.S.A.: 1 year \$8, 2 years \$15, 3 years \$21.50. Student subscription rate: U.S.A.: 1 year \$5.00 (letter from professor must accompany subscription). Other countries add \$1.00 for each year's subscription to cover postage. Single copy rates: current volume \$2.75, back issue \$3.50. Back issues available from 1962 (vol. 21). Special issues: *Erich F. Schmidt Memorial Issue* (vol. 24, nos. 3-4) \$5.00; *XVIIe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale* (vol. 27, no. 3) \$5.00. Single issues and reprinted volumes through 1964 (vols. 1-23) available from Walter J. Johnson, Inc., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10003. Volumes available in microfilm from University Microfilms, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106; in microfiche from J. S. Canner & Co., 49-65 Lansdowne Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02215. Orders for service of less than a full volume will be charged at the single-issue rate. ¶ Postage prepaid by the publishers on all orders. ¶ Subscriptions payable in advance. Please make all remittances payable to The University of Chicago Press in United States currency or its equivalent by postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit. Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, 5801 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60637.

Communications for the editors, manuscripts, and books for review should be addressed to the Editor of JOURNAL OF NEAR EASTERN STUDIES, The Oriental Institute, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637.

The articles in this journal are indexed in the *Social Sciences and Humanities Index*.

Applications for permission to quote from this journal should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press.

Notice to subscribers: If you change your address, please notify us and your local postmaster immediately of both old and new addresses. Please allow four weeks for the change.

Second-class postage paid at Chicago, Illinois.

© 1972, by The University of Chicago. All rights reserved.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

JOURNAL OF

Near Eastern Studies

JANUARY 1972 • VOLUME 31 • NUMBER

EIGHTY-NINTH YEAR

Академия наук СССР
Институт Востоковедения
и филологический факультет
по общественным наукам

ум 068
72

76

HĀFEZ AND POETIC UNITY THROUGH VERSE RHYTHMS¹

MICHAEL CRAIG HILLMANN, *Tehran, Iran*

THE following is an impressionistic translation of a poem by Hāfez (fourteenth century A.D.), the premier lyric poet in the Persian language:

- (1) Your entwined tresses,
I'm ever drunk with the brought breeze of them.
Your sorcerer's eyes,
I'm ever lost to self because of them.
(2) My long vigil—lord—oh,
Will it raise a night time vision
Of your brows, my vigil shrine,
Before which the candles of my eyes glow—
(3) Their black orbs I hold dear:
Mirrors of your midnight Hindu mole.
(4) The world is yours to immortalize:
Bid the breeze blow aside your veil.
(5) The world is yours to eternalize:
Pray the breeze rain down
Life down from among your hair.
(6) The breeze and I are one,
Homelessly blown about.
Drunk with your hair's fragrance
Is the breeze,
I with your sorcerer's eyes.

¹ Several ideas in this paper were first aired in a paper read at the First Iranology Congress of the University of Tehran (September 1970), the text of that paper subsequently printed in *Ayandegān* 3 (1970-71), No. 857 (October 15, 1970), p. 4, and No. 858

(October 18, 1970), pp. 4 and 7. I wish hereby to thank Professors Hosayn Nasr and Iraj Afshār for allowing me to address the "Iranian Literature—Islamic Period" Section of the Congress.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Records of the Early Hittite Empire (c. 1450-1380 B.C.). By PHILLO H. J. HOUWINK TEN CATE. Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-archaeologisch Instituut in het Nabije Oosten, 1970. Pp. xvi + 87. \$12.00.

This volume has an importance for Hittitology which belies its modest proportions. As the author explains in his preface, the study is a first result of the computer project as undertaken by H. G. Güterbock at the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago beginning in 1965. Güterbock performed the philological preparation and the transcription for computer input of all the Old Hittite texts. Houwink ten Cate added the B- and C-lines for the programming of the Old Hittite texts and prepared A-, B-, and C-lines in the programming of the Middle Hittite texts. The programming was designed to allow the recovery not only of individual lexical items, but also certain orthographic features (e.g., plene spellings like *pe-e*, *ta-a*, *pu-u*, etc.). The latter feature of the data retrieval system was particularly useful, since plene spellings characterize many Middle Hittite texts.

What the author has done in this volume is to put the project's provisional results to work on the problem of the identification of what he calls "floating texts" (those without direct testimony to date of composition in colophon or body of text). The question is: Which texts undatable by direct testimony can be dated by linguistic criteria to the so-called Middle Hittite period? As the author duly acknowledges, others have preceded him in this important task: Kammenhuber, Carruba, Gurney, and Otten among others. Utilizing the remarkable skills of his senior partner Güterbock, Houwink ten Cate has distinguished those texts which either by "Middle Hittite script" or other more conclusive linguistic or historical evidence are almost certainly Middle Hittite (these he

calls the B corpus) from those which are less certainly Middle Hittite (his C corpus). The A corpus are Old Hittite texts, and the D corpus are Suppiluliuma I and his successors.

After an introduction the author enumerates the texts which went into his computer input for corpora B, C, and D. Corpus A is described simply as "corpus constituted by Professor Güterbock," (p. 4) although the reader is given catalogue numbers (E. Laroche, *RHA* 58-62, 1956-58) for many corpus A texts in the print-outs on pages 8-23. To save space, texts are normally referred to by their catalogue numbers. Texts published since 1958 and therefore not included in Laroche's *Catalogue* are cited by *KBo* or *KUB* edition. The print-out of corpora A-D on pages 10-23 the author has left without additional comment, believing rightly that the data will speak for itself. It is, of course, in the selection of the feature to be compared that reviewers will differ with the author. I give now some detailed comments on the data in the print-out:

nu-uk-kán is also to be found (corpus B) in 179.6 and 179.9. The spelling *ka-a-aš-ša* (vs. *ka-a-ša* or *ká-a-aš-ma*) for "lo!" is indeed characteristic of Middle and Old Hittite texts. Add 327 (Incantation for the Infernal) to the C corpus, where two examples occur. Old Hittite rarely *ka-ša-at-ta-aš-ma-aš* (Cat. 9: *KBo* III 27 obv. 13). A possible example of the *ka-a-aš* spelling in a corpus D text (probably Muršili II) is XIII 4 ii 34 (Cat. 166). On the construction of *ka-a-ša/ka-a-aš-ma* with the tenses see this reviewer's remarks in *JAOS* 88 (1968): 532. Another corpus C example of *ki-i-nu-* is 178.2 (XXVI 7 iv 11). This graphic should be kept apart from *ke-e-nu-wa-an-zi*, which appears once in a very late text of Tudhaliya IV (Cat. 301.1). Add to corpus A: *ki-i-ša* in *KBo* XVII 105; *ki-i-ša-ri* in 258 (2d vers. Telepinu); *ki-i-ša-at* in 261. The late text 166 (Muršili II or Muwattalli) again shows a rare archaic feature in *ki-i-ša* (twice: iii 19, 26). I wonder if we might not consider the interrogative use of *mahhan*

("how?") as an older feature of the language. It is attested once in a clearly Old Hittite text (258 A i 29): *ma-a-ah-ha-an i-ya-u-e-ni* "How shall we proceed?" and in the same expression (but with "younger" spelling *ma-ah-ha-an*) in a late Middle Hittite letter (124.7: ABoT 60 obv. 19) and a New Kingdom mythological text (234: Kešši). The oldest type of spelling may be *ma-a-an-ha-an-da* (KBo XVI 45 obv. 7), if rightly interpreted. Next comes *ma-a-ah-ha-an-da* with the first *n* assimilated to the following velar: add KBo XVII 22 (dupl. XXVIII 8). Representing a further development is *ma-a-ah-ha-an*. For corpus A add: 258 (1st vers. Telepinu). For shorter spelling *ma-ah-ha-an* in text with many archaic spellings including nominal sentence with 2d person subject and no *-za* (cf. JNES 28 [1969]: 225-30), but not in old script, see KBo XVII 105. Other Middle Hittite texts (corpus B or C?) with *ma-ah-ha-an* are: 258 (XXXIII 11), 308, 174, and 430. Other Middle Hittite texts (corpus B or C) with *ma-a-ah-ha-an* are: 124.7, 169, 321 (2d vers. of Maštigga), KBo XV 25 (Wišuriyanza) and KBo XV 33 (but later duplicate KBo XV 34 has *ma-ah-ha-an*). In the verb *mema-* the only orthographic feature which has been singled out is the plene spelling of the first syllable. Even here some examples have been missed (332: VII 1 + KBo III 8 has *me-e-ma-at-i*). Other spelling features of Old and Middle Hittite versus (at least the later stages of) New Hittite have not been noted. *me-mi-an* (neut. participle) versus *me-ma-an*. The former is found in KBo XVII 105 ii 35 and can be contrasted with *me-ma-an* in 92 (Šuppiluliyama II), in XXII 38 i 2 and XV 20 ii 9. Also early (OH, MH, early NH) is 3d pl. pres. *me-mi-ya-an-zi* (308, 314, 329, KBo XVI 42) as opposed to the later spelling *me-ma-an-zi* (311, 312, 313, 356, 406, KBo XV 2), which seems to begin in the reign of Muršili II. The spellings with *-mm-* (*mi-im-ma-an-zi* and *me-em-ma-an-zi* and *mi-im-ma-aš*) cited next have nothing to do with *mema-* "to speak," but belong to *mimma-* "to refuse." Is this a case of faulty parsing on the B-line of the Discon computer, or does the author have some reason for including *mimma-* "to refuse" here? The spellings offered are not significant, at least not for *mimma-*. Regarding the verb *nai-/ne-*, the plene spellings with *ne-e-* or *ne-e-* are typical of Old Hittite and can be found frequently in Middle Hittite. To corpora B and C on *ne-e-a-at* I would add the Middle Hittite letter XXVI 79 8' (Cat. 124.27). For *ne-e-a-ri* add: 121, 169. For *ne-e-at-la-ri* add KBo XV 1. For *ne-e-an-te-aš* add

KBo XVII 40 and KBo XVII 105. For *ne-e-u-wa-aš-ta* add KBo XVII 105. A possible late example of *ne-e-an* in 234 (Kešši). Otherwise, it appears that the stages of development in the spelling were: *ne-e-a- > ne-i-ya- > ne-ya- > ni-ya-*. The final stage (*ni-ya-*) is found in texts of the era of Tudhaliya IV and Šuppiluliyama II (Cat. 92, etc.). To the A corpus on *ša-a-ku-wa* add 257 (Illuyanka) and 258 (3d vers. Telepinu). On *šer* it is necessary first to cite examples of *še-e-er* in Old Hittite texts, which has been neglected in the print-out: 258 (1st vers. Telepinu), 261, and KBo XVII 61. Also Old Hittite is *še-e-ra-aš-še-iš-ša-an* in 258. In corpus B *še-e-er* is found in 275. Also corpus B is *še-er-ši-it* in 289. In corpus D *še-e-er* is found in 279 (2d Plague Prayer of Muršili), 329, and 332A. *Še-e-ra-an* is also corpus D in 332A, and *še-e-ra-aš-ša-an* in KBo XV 25. I fail to see the significance of the *da-a-la-* and *ta-a-la-* spellings in corpora A through C, since a multitude of examples from corpus D also are plene. *Da-a-li-iš* (5; 26.1) of A is, on the contrary, of significance, since Late Hittite texts (empire) have for this *da-a-li-iš-ta* and *ta-a-le-eš-ta* (41, 48). If I could add one more example to the first section of the print-out ("Spelling") on the order of *šurP4-i-ta-aš-ša*, it would be the spelling of the name of the Kaška people. Von Schuler has assembled the examples in *Die Kaškäer* without detecting the significance of the spellings from a diachronic viewpoint. Cf. page 52 of this book. The "standardized" spelling (Muršili II and later) is (*šur*) *šurGa-aš-ga* (41, 48, 59, 61, 62, 75). A less common spelling, which is, however, characteristic of this Muršili II and following period is (*šur*) *šurKaš-ga* (48, 62, 406). Very rarely in Muršili II texts (41, 48) one finds *šurQa-aš-ga*. But quite clearly the majority of the "odd" writings come from the Middle Hittite period before the standardization of the spelling of this name. Thus: *Ga-aš-ga* (85, 277, 314, 416), but *Ka-aš-ka* (XXXVI 115+; KBo VIII 35), *Qa-aš-ga* (XXXVI 115+; 95, 124.7) *Qa-aš-ga* (XXXVI 115+; 124.27), *Ka-aš-ga* (95, 97, 314), *Ka-a-aš-ka* (KBo VIII 35, 283c), *Qa-a-aš-ga* (169). Another place name, whose spelling affords a dating criterion, is Šamuha. Empire texts such as 59, 60, 63, 68, 104 (XIX 23), 285, and texts which—while composed much earlier—were modernized in spelling in the course of later copyings (21, 496) spell the name *ša-mu-ha*. Unmodernized Old and Middle Hittite texts (95, 124.27, and even 280) spell it *ša-mu-u-ha*. A third toponym showing an older, plene spelling is Nerik, which in Hittite law § 50

is spelled *Ne-e-ri-ik-ki*, as opposed to later *Ne-ri-ik*, etc. Interesting is the development of the spellings of Hakkīš. In Old Hittite texts it is spelled *Ha-ak-mi-iš-ša* (338: XXX 29) or *Ha-ak-miš-ša* (12). In Middle Hittite texts (277) it is *Ha-ak-mi-iš-ši*. During the period Muršili II to Muwattalli (48, 285) it is *Ha-ak-pi-iš-ša*. During the reign of Hattušili III (59, 60) it is *Ha-ak-piš-ša* or *Ha-ak-piš*. And during the final period (301.1: Tudhaliya IV) it is again *Ha-ak-mi-iš-ši*, *Ha-ak-miš-ša*, and *Ha-ak-miš*. The toponym Hem(m)uwa is also variously spelled: in Old Hittite texts either *Hé-e-mu-wa* (7), *Hé-mu-wa* (Hitt. laws § 54 and 349.4), or *Hé-em-mu-wa* (8); in Middle Hittite texts as *Hi-i-mu-wa* (277), or *Hi-im-mu-wa* (176.1A). For the empire texts (316, 503, etc.) the accepted spelling seems to be *Hi-im-mu-wa*.

But moving on to the grammatical formatives in Houwink ten Cate's print-out (discussion and comments organized according to his numbers):

(2) *á-ki-la* in corpus A in 261. *á-ke-el* in corpus D not only in Muršili (48), but now too in XL 1 obv. 14.

(3) To corpus C on *šumenzan* add 314. To D add 561.

(4) To corpus B add *ki-i-wa walleš* in 308, *ki-i NIŠ DINGIR-LIM* (179.5), and *ke-e NIŠ DINGIR.MEŠ* (179.9). To corpus D add *ki-i URU.DIDLI.HÁ* (543), and *ke-e-uš ku-i-e-eš LU.MEŠ NINDA.KUR.RA-uš* (279: 2d Plague Prayer).

(5) The *apenzan* (95) of corpus C was accidentally printed too high (with *šumenzan*). It belongs at this level.

(6) To corpus B on *-še* ("exceptional") add KBo XVII 40 i 3; XXXIII 6 + 7 iii 12, 14; Cat. 178.10.

(10) To corpus B on *-ši-* add 178.10. To corpus C on *-mi-* add 172. To corpus B on *-šmi-* add KBo XVII 104. To C on *-šmi-* add 124.7.

(12) To corpus A add *ku-e-uš-ša-aš* (KBo XII 8). To corpus D add *ku-i-uš* (51, 317, 319, 419, 420.1, 505) and *ku-e-uš* (187.5, 239; 419) and *ku-i-e-uš* (543). It is possible that 505 and 543 belong rather to corpus C.

(12a) Indefinite pronoun gen. sg.: To corpus C add *ku-el-ki* (178.17-19), as opposed to corpus D *ku-e-el-ga*.

(14) On the *-wani/-tani* endings it should be observed that these seem to occur (in Old and Middle Hittite) in unstressed syllables. My colleague, Warren Cowgill, has noted this in the manuscript of the chapter on Anatolian of his forthcoming volume on phonology in the *Indogermanische Grammatik* currently being published under the direction of Prof. Jerzy Kurylowicz. Such a rule seems to account, for instance, for forms like *paiwani* "we go," *uwalewani* "we lead," where it may be conjectured that Hittite had preserved the proto-IE pattern of accenting preverbs rather than the verbs themselves in principal clauses. I have noted in addition the predilection of the *-wani/-tani* forms for causative verbs in *-nu-* (*linganu-*, *tekkušnu-*, *maliskunu-*, *tašnu-*), which may have carried the stress on the *nu* syllable, as well as for factitive verbs in *-ah-* (*dašuwah-*, *sig₂-ah-*, *3-ya-ah-*). In this connection I should also like to point out the tendency I have observed in *-nu-* verbs to use expanded stems in Empire texts, but the shorter ones in Old and Middle Hittite. Examples: *mi(ya)nu-*, *kartim(miya)nu-*, *kari(ya)nu-*, *wakši(ya)nu-*, *haššik(ka)nu-*; *zaḡanu-* and *zaluḡnu-* versus *zaluḡanu-*; *zap(pa)nu-*, *aš(ša)nu-*; *pahhašnu-* versus *pahšanu-*; *karašnu-* versus *karšanu-*; *šaš(ša)nu-*, *daš(ša)nu-*; *pahhašnu-* versus *pahšanu-*, *haikēš(ša)nu-*; *karašnu-* versus *karšanu-*; *warāšnu-* versus *waršanu-*; *tekkuš(ša)nu-*, *haššik(ka)nu-*, etc. In many of these cases it may be that a causative verbal formative *-anu-* is displacing *-nu-*.

(16) To corpus C add *u-un-ni-iš* (124.27).

(18) To corpus A add *a-ra-u-wa-ah-hi* and *da-šu-wa-ah-hi* (181). To corpora B and C add: *iš-ki-da-a-ah-hi* (169), *wa-tar-na-ah-hi* (171.3), *ma-an-ni-in-ku-wa-ah-hi* (169, 373.1), *da-ad-ra-ah-hi* (178.10). This still leaves a substantial number of examples of 3d pers. sing. presents in *-i*, which are found in texts not generally considered to be Middle or Old Hittite: *sig₂-ah-hi* (173A), *ar-ma-ah-hi* (327, 421), *ha-ad-du-la-ah-hi* (KBo XVII 61), *i-ši-ya-ah-hi* (HT 204), *iš-kat-ta-ah-hi* (508.1), *iš-kat-tah^{ab}-hi* (KBo X 24), *kat-te-ra-ah-hi* (176A), *ša-ra-az-ya-hi* (176A), *pa-ap-ra-ah-hi* (238), *šu-up-pi-ah-hi* (410A), *šu-up-pi-ya-*

ah-hi (321: 2d; 420.1, 421, 475, 181). Of this group 421 is probably an Old Hittite composition, regardless of the date of the copy. As for the other texts, they would have to be studied separately to determine their exact age. The very fact that they contain these forms, however, is one indication of their relative age. Although -zi and -ta forms appear sporadically in Middle Hittite texts, my observation is that they flower first under Muršili II. To corpus A add: *ta-šu-wa-ah-hi* (181a; cf. *ta-šu-wa-ah-zi* in 181B). To corpus B add: *ma-ni-ya-ah-ta* (275). To texts in corpus D showing -iš/-aš preterite ending add: *al-la-pa-ah-ha-aš* (238, 253).

(19) To corpus A add: *pa-üt-ti* (260A), *na-iš* (263.1 B). To corpus C add: *pa-üt-ti* (95), *na-a-i-iš* (430), *na-iš* (275).

Syntax: (1) Exceptional -i forms in corpus A: *a-ru-ni* (263.1 B), *hu-uh-hi-iš-ši* (261), *ne-pi-ši* (263.1 B), *ā.šā-ni* (258 = XXXIII 8), *KIRI₆.GEŠTIN-ni* (265.6). Middle Hittite (corpora B and C) forms in -a: *kat-te-ra* KĀ.GAL-TIM (169), *ē-na/pār-na* (308, 319, 334, 505), *ē.šā-na* (478.1, 505), *tunnakkišna* (508), *a-ru-na* (260, 308), *KIRI₆-na* (308), *a-aš-ka* (KBo XIII 164), *a-aš-ga* (505), *šu-uh-ha* (168, 176D, 332A), *kaškaštipa* (169), *ar-za-na pār-na* (505). Middle Hittite forms in -i: *pé-e-di* (95), *URU^UHattuši* (95, 172), *A-ni* (327), *a-aš-ki* (172), *HUR.SAG-ri* (308), *šu-uh-hi* (430), *hi-i-li* (169), *KASKAL-ši* (95). Imperial Hittite exceptional forms in -a (corpus D): *pār-na-aš-ša* (232), *pār-na* (319, 334, 419), *a-ša-ka* (KBo XIII 164), *ū-e-te-na* (326.2), *ha-pa-a* (167), *arruša* (76), and *allalla* (92, etc.). Regular Imperial Hittite forms in -i need no exhaustive listing.

(2) I do not understand why only *katta/i* forms were listed in corpus A, and not also *andan*, *ištarna*, *piran* and *šer*. Perhaps it is because the construction is so common in corpus A. But then why not list the "few examples" for corpora B and C? I have found: *pira(n)-šit* (169), *piran-šet* (505), *šer-šit* (289), *šer-a-še-šan* (258), *ištarni-šumme* (178.27). Belonging to corpus D: *šer-a-šan* (317, 327, 332, 334, 416, 419, 406, etc.), *šer-a-ši-šan* (329), *piran-šit* (232), *piran-mit* (327), *ištarni-šummi* (41, 238).

(3) Under the discussion on particles it might have been observed that *-šan* is exceedingly rare (if it exists at all) after Muwattalli. All three occurrences cited by Götze in *Hatt.* are incorrect. Thus the presence or absence of *-šan* in an Arnuwanda, Tudhaliya or Šuppiluliuma text would provide a clue to whether the latest bearers of these royal names were intended. Another particle, whose spelling provides a dating clue, is *-z(a)*. Spellings without the final -a (i.e., -az, rather than -za) have been noted for some time. What has not been realized, however, is that the -az spellings are (with only a few exceptions) Old and Middle Hittite. The following are corpus A catalogue numbers: 15, 24, 184, 261, 265.6, 338, 422, KBo XVII 36, KBo XVII 105, Bo 68/28 (MDOG 101, pp. 19 ff.). The following are corpora B and C catalogue numbers or text references: 88, 89, 95, 121, 169, 178.2, 179.9, 272, 277, 314/6(?) 496, KBo XVII 54. Certain festival texts, probably deriving from Old Hittite originals, contain -z: 487, 493, 496. Certain passages in early empire period texts contain examples of -z: 319, 329, 334, 424, and 232 (*mi-ni-li-ya-az zi-ik*). If used with care, the observation of -z can be of help in spotting Old or Middle Hittite texts.

With regard to the discussion on page 27 of lexical correspondences, it might have been of help to note that certain lexical items are attested for Old and Middle Hittite, but not for Imperial Hittite. For example, OH *tekkušai-* and MH *tekkušnu-* yield to NH *tekkušanu-*. OH-MH *arawa-* yields to NH *arawanni-*. OH-MH *harnink-* yields to NH *harganu-*. OH-MH *erín.MEŠ-at-* yields to NH *erín.MEŠ/tuzziuš*. OH *kaleliya-* yields to *hamenk-* and *išhiya-*. OH-MH *antuwahha-* yields to NH *antuhša-*. OH-MH adjective *appezziya-* yields to NH *appezzi-*. The OH-MH adv. *appezzian* yields to NH *appezziyaz*. OH-MH *paprai-* ("to defile") yields to NH *paprah-*. OH-MH vb. *walluwa-/wallušk-* yields to *walla-/walliya-*. Other OH or MH words are lost, but with no clear indication of how they were replaced: *piyanai-*, *alš-* (replaced by *ep-?*), *tepšu-* (replaced by *tepu-?*), *piya-* ("to send"), *lelaniya-* (replaced by *kartimiya-?*).

In concluding this review I should like to devote a few paragraphs to the discussion of the dating of several texts which may prove to be Middle Hittite, but which Houwink ten Cate does not include in corpora B or C.

Cat. 121 (ABoT 65) is the so-called "Mašat Letter." It is briefly evaluated by the author in n. 120, where he queries: "Is it possible that the letter goes back to the Early Empire Period?" The text mentions two scribes (Hattušili and Armaziti) who presumably were active during the late Middle Hittite period. Note also the mention of the *é.dub*. BA.A (rev. 8), which (with extra -A) is unusual and possibly archaic in Hittite writing. The 3d pers. pl. nom. com. gend. enclitic pron. -at (for OH -e) is amply attested in MH (cf. p. 14 of this book), so it need not point to a later date. It is found in this text in obv. 7. The form *pé-en-ni-iš* (vs. *penništa*) is pre-Muršili II. The form *e-eš-tu* (vs. *e-eš-du*) and the enclitic reflexive -z (obv. 12: *URUMaraššantiyaz*) are likewise consonant with a Middle Hittite attribution. The form *ha-at-ra-a-eš* fits also, since the 3d pers. sg. pret. form was *ha-at-ra-a-üt* in OH, *ha-at-ra-a-üt* and *ha-at-ra-a-eš* in MH, *ha-at-ra-a-eš* and *ha-at-ra-a-iš* during the early Empire, and *ha-at-ra-iš* in the late Empire. The directive forms in -i (*URUHattuši penništ* in obv. 9) are found in MH, as shown on pages 22-23 of this book and in my remarks above. The plene spelling of *pé-e-eš-ki-üt* (obv. 14) also deserves mention. To this we add the four other features noted already by the author in n. 120 on page 75: *ta-pa-aš-ši-e-et*, *har-wa-ni*, *ar-ša-ni-e-še*, and *ne-e-a-ri*, and a picture emerges which is quite convincing for a late Middle Hittite letter.

Cat. 124.7 (ABoT 60) is also a letter. Among the spelling features which might indicate a Middle Hittite date are: *ma-a-ah-ha-an* (obv. 5), interrogative *ma-ah-ha-an* (obv. 19), *ša-li-ka-aš* (vs. *ša-li-ik-ta* and *ša-li-ga-aš*) in obv. 7, *pé-e-da-an* (noun; obv. 20), *URUQa-aš-ga* (rev. 5), and possibly the Akkadogram MA-HAR (obv. 6), which is common enough in MH texts (88, 95, 121, 124.7, 176A, 178.10, 314), but not in later

texts (twice in entire Mušili II corpus, once in Muwattalli).

Cat. 124.27 (XXXI 79) is a letter describing the activities of barges on the Upper Euphrates. It was partially studied by Gurney in Garstang-Gurney, *Geography*, pp. 33 ff. Spelling features which permit, if not require, a Middle Hittite date are: *URUSa-mu-u-ha* (vs. *URUSa-mu-ha*) in lines 4, 16; *URUPit-te-ya-ri-ga* (vs. *URUPit-ti-ya-ri-ga*) in 4, 9, 19; *URUQa-aš-ga* (vs. *URUGa-aš-ga*) in line 6; *ū-i-te-e-ni* (line 8), *ne-e-a-at* (line 8), *u-un-ni-iš* (line 28, vs. *unni/ešta*), *ši-ya-a-u-e-ni* (line 23), and the verb *iaštai* "to load" (*da-iš-te-i-e-er* in 9, *da-iš-te-ya-an-zi* in 13 and 20) elsewhere only in OH texts.

Cat. 169 (IBOT I 36), the well-known MEŠEDI Protocol, is a text which I would definitely consider as pre-Šuppiluliuma I. It surprises me, therefore, that it is not included in corpus C. The following features of spelling, morphology, and lexicon are to me decisive: *ta* "and," *ma-a-ah-ha-an*, *ne-e-a-ri*, *an-tu-u-wa-ah-ha-aš* (vs. *antuhša-*), *URUQa-a-aš-ga*, *pi-i-e-er* (from the verb *piya-* "to send"), *a-ta-an-zi* (vs. *a-da-an-zi*), *iš-ki-da-a-ah-hi* and *ma-an-ni-in-ku-wa-ah-hi* (vs. later forms in *-ah-zi*), directives in -a: *kat-te-ra* KĀ.GAL-TIM ("to the lower gate"), *ka-a-aš-ka-aš-ti-pa* (i 67), reflexive particle spelled -az (vs. -za), adverb in stressed front position: *pira(n)-šit* (*pi-ra-aš-ši-üt*, i 35), *kat-ti-iš-mi* (ii 58) and *passim*.

Cat. 178.2 (XXVI 7) also appears to be Middle Hittite, exhibiting the following features: 3d pers. com. gend. acc. pl. enclitic pron. -uš (*nu-uš-za* in i 8), reflex. particle spelled *nam-ma-az* (i 11), *e-eš-tu* (iv 9), *ši-i-na-ah-ha* (i 12), *ERIN.MEŠ-az* as nom. sg. (iv 5, 6), *ki-i-nu-x* (.) for the verb *kinu-* in iv 11.

Cat. 505 (IBOT I 29) is the description of the EZEN *haššumáš*, partially edited and thoroughly discussed by H. G. Güterbock in *American Oriental Society, Middle West Branch Semi-centennial Volume*, ed. D. Sinor (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1970), pp. 99-103. Professor Güterbock has kindly waived his prior right to publish the edition of this text and its small duplicate,

141/s, and with the consent of Prof. Otten has passed that right on to me. I hope to publish a complete edition of the text in the very near future. The text contains many features of Middle Hittite orthography and morphology: *ta* "and" (obv. 35, rev. 15, 16, 18, 23, 35, 42), careful distinction of *ki-i/ke-e* "they" (obv. 24) from *ku-u-uš/ku-uš-pāt* "them" (rev. 32, 37) in the com. gender, the directives in *-a*: *pār-na* (obv. 50), *š.šā-na* (rev. 24, 29), *ar-za-na-pār-na* (obv. 29), *a-āš-ga* (obv. 26), *š.š.ē-ē-ta-a* (rev. 40), adverb in stressed front position: *pī-ra-an-še-el* (obv. 53), *ku-i-uš* (obv. 60), enclitic pers. pron. acc. pl. common gender. *-aš* "them" (obv. 28, 41), *aš-nu-zi* (vs. *aš-ša-nu-uz-zi*; obv. 29, 36), *a-še-e-ša-an-zi* with plene writing *-še-e-* (cf. Cat. 15: *a-še-e-še-er*) in obv. 5, and the use of *-ašta* with the verbs *ašnu-* and *šippand-* instead of the later more common *-kán*. One should also keep in mind the fact that all the deities mentioned in the festival are Hattic. The vigorous Hurrianization of the royal pantheon so evident in later texts has apparently not occurred.

Cat. 314 (IV 1) is the description of a ritual before battle with the Kaška. Certain linguistic features lead me to suppose for it a date of composition during the Middle Hittite period, although the fragment XXXI 146 is a much later copy (note substitution of *dapiya-* for *humant-*). The following are either characteristic or at least occur in Middle Hittite texts: *-az* for the reflexive (i 38), *šumenzan* (i 32, 33, 42), *me-mi-ya-an-zi* (vs. *me-ma-an-zi*), *MA-HAR* (iii 6), *Ka-aš-ga* alongside *Ga-aš-ga*, *uk-tu-u-ri-iš-ši*, *pé-e-da-aš* (gen. of noun), temporal *ma-a-an* (iii 5), the verb *šu-ul-li-it-te-en*, *-ašta* with *šippand-*, *da-a-at-te-en* (ii 17), *pa-iš-kat-ta-ru* (i 40).

Cat. 316 (IX 1) is a military ritual, which is linguistically archaic, but which lacks certain features which ought to be present in Old Hittite (e.g., conjunctions *ta* and *šu*). The following older forms should, however, make it a candidate for consideration as Middle Hittite (i.e., older than the reign of Šuppiluliuma I): phonetic spelling of "hand" as *ki-iš-šar-ta*, plene spelling of "place" as

pé-e-da-aš/pé-e-da-az, phonetic spelling of "lords" (nom. pl.) as *iš-hi-e-eš*, encl. 3d pl. comm. pron. *-uš* (vs. *-aš*) in *nu-uš*, acc. pl. comm. nouns like *uzupanduhuš*, "he approaches" spelled *maninkuwahhi* (vs. *maninkuwahzi*), *pennianzi* (vs. *pennanzi*), the nom. sg. noun *tu-uz-zi-ya-az* ("army") which may underlie ERIN.MEŠ-at in Old and Middle Hittite texts, the Old and Middle Hittite noun *ku-e-lu-wa-ni-iš*.

Cat. 317 (VBoT 24) is the Yale tablet published by E. H. Sturtevant, now called the Ritual of Anniwiyani. It exhibits the following linguistic traits which entitle it to be viewed as stemming from the reign of Šuppiluliuma I or (more probably) earlier: *pa-i-wa-ni*, *ku-i-uš*, reflexive particle *-az* (vs. *-za*) in iv 3, "he breaks" spelled *duwarnizzi* (ii 12), "they perform" spelled *i-en-zi*, acc. pl. comm. gender *a-pu-u-uš* without contamination from *a-pé-e*, *kat-ta-an-ta* (vs. *kat-ta-an-da* or *GAM-an-da*) as also in OH and MH texts, 89, 250, 253, 257, 319, KBo XIII 62, adverb in front stressed position in *pīran=a=za* (i 30), *šer=a=šan* (ii 22, 33, iii 29), *šer=ma=šan* (iii 23), enclitic pronouns *-aš* ("them") in ii 7, *-at* ("they" comm. gen.) in ii 15, 19, 25, 27, "place" spelled *pé-e-da-an* (ii 16).

Cat. 116 (KBo XVI 50) is the letter of Ašhapala which was first edited by H. Otten in RHA 67 (1960): 121 ff. It is not Old Hittite, because it writes *Ū-UL* instead of *na-at-ta* and *me-na-ah-ha-an-da* instead of *me-e-na-ah-ha-an-da*, etc. Yet in many other instances its forms are undoubtedly old: *pi-ú-e-ni* instead of later *pi-ya-u-e-ni* (cf. *up-pi-ú-e-ni* in the Middle Hittite text 277, and *up-pi-ú-en* in 288.3, and *pé-en-ni-ú-e-ni* in the Old Hittite text 324), *har-wa-ni* and *iš-ta-ma-aš-šu-wa-ni*, the spelling of the reflex. particle in *an-da-ma-az-kán*, and the dative-locative forms *da-me-e-te pé-e-ti*. In addition the form *kat-ti-iš-ši* might fit a MH better than a later text. It is interesting that an Ašhapala figures in 175.1, a Middle Hittite protocol for the LÚ.DUGUD, and in 160, a (MH?) list of soldiers.

Perhaps some remarks should be devoted

here to KBo XII 42 and its slightly older duplicate ABoT 49. In my edition of these two fragments (JCS 22 (1968): 34-45) I concluded that on the basis of the limited number of distinctive forms it could not be shown to be Old Hittite. Yet some forms seemed archaic (*i-ya-ta* and *ta-me-e-ta*). Upon further study I have observed two other spellings which point to the MH period: *ú-e-ia-ye-ni* is indeed found in later texts (cf. JCS 22: 35, n. 10), but is also characteristic of MH texts (Cat. nos. 88, 99, 178.8, 329, 356, 430; XXXI 44, XXXVI 115+); the spelling of "goods" as *a-aš-šu-u-ya-wa* with the extra *-u* is also characteristic of MH texts (89, 95, 277). My earlier remarks on *iyata* and *tameta* without final *r* can be supplemented now. Almost all cases of dropped final *r* occur in OH and MH texts: *iyatala* (6, 275), *iyata* (196.2A, 257A), *šuwata* (6), *miyata* (282A), *tameta* (196.2A, 358, 469.2), *hařeša* (272). The *ú-e-eš-wa-za* MEŠ DAM.GAR.HÁ should now be translated "we (are) the merchants of . . ." The *-za* is necessary in Middle and Empire Hittite in nominal sentences with 1st or 2d person subjects (cf. JNES 28 (1969): 225-230). Two linguistic forms, however, seem to militate against attributing the text to the Middle Hittite period: *har-ú-e-ni* should be *har-wa-ni* in MH, and *na-an-ni-ya-u-e-ni* should be *na-an-ni-ú-e-ni* on analogy with MH forms *pi-ú-e-ni* and *up-pi-ú-e-ni*. Thus the dating of KBo XII 42 and duplicate is still uncertain, although more evidence is now before us. I am inclined to date the text in the last portion of the Middle Hittite period or perhaps in the reign of Šuppiluliuma I. Its forms are too archaic for Muršili II.

It would not be possible, short of writing a new companion volume, for a reviewer to comment fully on every aspect of this truly remarkable little volume. This reviewer finds himself in essential agreement with the author's suspicion that the traditional chronological ordering of the Hittite texts has resulted in the incorrect dating of a considerable number of texts. Of course, other reviewers will disagree. One thing is

clear: the appearance of this volume has initiated a new stage in the debate within Hittitological circles over the dating of texts by linguistic criteria.

HARRY A. HOFFNER, JR.

Yale University
August 1970

Sumeroograms and Akkadograms in Minoan Hittite. By SIMON DAVIS. Johannesburg, Witwatersrand University Press, 1969. Pp. 45.

Mr. Davis is the author of *The Decipherment of the Minoan Linear A and Pictographic Scripts* (Johannesburg, Witwatersrand University Press, 1967). His opinion is that the language of these scripts is "Hittite," by which he means the language of the cuneiform inscriptions from ancient Hattušaš. In the previously mentioned book he set forth this opinion and sought to demonstrate its correctness at great length. He did not convince this reviewer. In the volume under review he seeks to add to his readers' conviction by outlining the use in these scripts of what he calls "Sumeroograms and Akkadograms." His basis for the justification of finding such logograms is the analogy of the cuneiform Hittite texts from Hattušaš.

At the outset let me assure the reader that I fully appreciate and sympathize with the problems which face a would-be decipherer. Any newly-recovered language will not fit all rules established for its previously known linguistic relatives. If we grant Davis his assumption that the language of these documents is a form of Hittite, we cannot expect that it should be spelled in precisely the same way as in the Boğazköy texts, or that all grammatical forms will be the same, and so forth. Still, any would-be decipherer must grant to his critics that he has the obligation to build a convincing case for his decipherment on data which concur with the "rules," not the exceptions. When he has done this, he is then entitled to explain to his "converts" the exceptions. It seems to this reviewer that

Davis has not succeeded in the first step. Minoan "Hittite" looks like no Hittite which I have ever seen in the Boğazköy tablets. Again and again Davis is obliged to attribute meanings to Hittite words which do not exist in the acknowledged inscriptions. Other words, not known from Hittite, he discovers and gives to them meanings as he sees fit. For example: *ha-sa-mi-zi* "heavy," *gi-nu-la-ya* "child," *ya-mi* "servant," and *he-wa* "child." And yet despite all this license which he has allowed himself in the attributions of meanings to words (not to speak of the entire question of determination of phonetic values for the signs!), his translations of the texts make little sense. And this, after all, is the final test of any decipherment attempt. But enough about his proposed decipherment. What of his discussion of the "Akkadograms and Sumerograms"? It seems to me that he does not even understand what a Sumerogram is! The terms "Sumerogram" and "Akkadogram" are specific terms designating logograms based upon Sumerian and Akkadian words. It is important to understand at the outset that *these are only found in documents written in the logo-syllabic orthography* (i.e., not even all cuneiform systems!) *which originated in Babylonia*. Thus no Sumerograms or Akkadograms are to be found in the derivative cuneiform systems employed for Ugaritic and Old Persian, or in the hieroglyphic writing system employed to write Luvian (the so-called Hieroglyphic Hittite writing system). Furthermore, although Akkadograms (limited to cuneiform Hittite) consist of a phonetic spelling by syllabic signs of the particular Akkadian word, Sumerograms are expressed in the "standard orthography." That is, if one wishes to write Sumerian *GE*₆ "night," one may not write it with any other **GE* sign than *GE*₆ (= *MI*). One should also keep in mind that the number of Akkadograms in Hittite texts is not infinite. Each newly recovered tablet does not add scores of new examples. The scribes of ancient Hattusa employed a limited repertoire of Sumerograms and Akkadograms. This makes one skeptical, when one reads in this book of so many examples which are not yet attested in real Hittite texts, and fails to find any

examples cited here of Sumerograms and Akkadograms which are so terribly common in the Hittite texts from Asia Minor (*ana* "to," *ina* "in," *ištu* "with," *išme* "he/she heard," *DUB.SAR* "scribe," etc., etc.). Has Davis asked himself why this should be so? Why, after all, does Hittite employ logograms? Of course, since Davis is not an Assyriologist, he may not be aware of these matters. But then, unless he secures for himself the services of an Assyriologist consultant, he ought not to undertake the writing of a book on Sumerograms and Akkadograms. No Assyriologist consultant is mentioned in his preface. In fact, neither is Davis a Hittitologist, which does not deter him from writing about *Sumerograms and Akkadograms in Minoan Hittite*! It comes as no surprise then, when the reader who is actively engaged in either Assyriology or Hittitology finds on every page errors in the interpretation of Sumerian, Akkadian, and Hittite words. Since to list only a tenth of these errors would consume far too much space for a review of this type, I will mention only a few. The following Sumerian words with the meanings attributed to them by Davis do not exist: *KID* "woman," *KALAG* "manly," *ḪAR* "slave," *EME.SAL* "peasant," *GUR₃.RU* "number, total," *KA.BAR* "bronze," *NE₃* "work." The following Akkadian words with the meanings attributed to them by Davis do not exist: *ardandnu* "person, menial," *minūtu* (= Sum. *GUR₃*) "number, total," *emūqu* "work," and *dīnu* "cattle." One would think that an outsider to these disciplines would carefully refrain from exceeding the wording of the most up-to-date and reliable dictionaries. But quite often we find in Davis' book such ill-informed statements as "*lu₂* as in *lu₂-gal₃-lu₂* is a determinative for 'man'" (p. 32). Only by such irresponsible reasoning can he in other parts of the book (p. 24) maintain that "*GAL.LU*" (*GAL₃.LU*?) is the Sumerian word for "man." Many of his mistakes can be traced to his dependence upon outdated dictionaries such as A. Deimel's *Sumerisches Lexikon*. But in addition Davis does not always confine himself to what his dictionaries have told him. He adds his own additional mean-

ings! In the case of the Hittite language he is no better. Totally dependent upon Friedrich's *Hebräisches Wörterbuch*, he even here misinterprets Friedrich's entries or else feels free to "extend" the meaning a little to fit his own ideas. According to him, *pangar* (p. 22) means "number," *haršar* (p. 26) means "person." Magnanimously he offers to help those Hittitologists who only enjoy the use of the texts from the land of Hatti itself, by supplying them with the unknown readings of certain high frequency words always represented by Sumerograms on cuneiform Hittite tablets: *sal-aš* "woman" (not pronounced in Sumerian as **sal* but **mi* or **munus*, thus hardly to be written phonetically in "Minoan Hittite" as *sa-lal*), *ir-iš* "slave," and *dumu-aš* "son." For "*SAL*"-*aš* he offers *guwenāš*, remarkably close to the **kuin*- suggested by Götze and Pedersen in 1934 (*Muršili's Sprachlähmung*, p. 65; cf. *HWb*, p. 114), whom Davis does not mention. Of course, this 1934 suggestion, which was probably influenced by the same etymology proffered by Davis, is unproven and has been rejected by Friedrich in *HWb*, p. 114. For *ir-iš* "slave" he proposes *niniš*. This too, although Davis mentions nothing to indicate it, seems to have been influenced by an old interpretation in *HWb*, p. 329, of the Luvian word *namiš* as "Sk slave(?), Diener(?)," for which now Laroche and Friedrich prefer "brother" (*HWb*, Erg. 2, p. 41). For *dumu-aš* "son" Davis claims *ḫuaš*. I suspect that Hittitologists will politely decline the assistance of Linear A, as interpreted by Mr. Davis. They will be suspicious of the competence of a man who writes that the ending of the Hittite common gender noun is either "-s or -z(a)" (p. 8), and who believes that the Akkadian word *kirru* ("lamb" according to Davis) was loaned into Hittite as *ki-ru-za* with the Hittite (nominative!) ending -za (p. 18)!

One hesitates to review a book so incompetent as this one. It is a thankless task. Readers who know any of the three above-mentioned languages will see in a moment that it proposes nonsense. But Classicists in particular or non-linguistically oriented archaeologists, who quite legitimately take an interest in attempts to interpret the Linear A tablets from Crete,

should be warned not to take this latest attempt seriously. For all Davis' hard work and sincere faith in his results, he has produced no clear evidence that Linear A was used to write a language either identical with or related to cuneiform Hittite. No one knows as yet what languages may have been written in the Linear A script. Others have suggested a Semitic language. If the linguistic situation on Crete during the second millennium B.C. was as variegated as Homer would have us believe, the existing scripts were probably used for the writing of several languages at once, in a fashion analogous to the logo-syllabic cuneiform system in Asia Minor and Mesopotamia. Whatever the truth may be about the identity of these languages, each scholar who takes it in hand to solve this riddle must know well the language which he suspects was being written and must discipline himself to avoid those facile assumptions which every would-be decipherer makes, often without even realizing he is making them. With genuine regret I must emphatically reject the theory advanced in this volume by S. Davis. I see no reason to believe that he has successfully identified Sumerograms or Akkadograms in the Linear A texts.

HARRY A. HOFFNER, JR.

Yale University

The Collection of Sumerian Temple Hymns. By ÅKE W. SJÖBERG and EUGEN BERGMANN, S.J.† and *The Keš Temple Hymn.* By GENE B. GRAGG. "Texts from Cuneiform Sources," Vol. 3. Locust Valley, N.Y., Augustin, 1969. Pp. 202 + 38 pls. \$20.00.

Die beiden in TCS 3 veröffentlichten sumerischen literarischen Texte haben zwar den Gegenstand (Lieder auf Tempel) gemein und weisen einen Refrain auf. Sonst sind sie aber recht verschieden in der Anlage. Die Sammlung von Liedern auf die Tempel Babyloniens umfaßt 42 einzelne kurze Hymnen auf Heiligtümer in ganz Babylonien, die sehr wahrscheinlich dem Preis des Königs Sargon für die Wiederherstellung im Krieg gegen Lugalzagesi zerstörter Tempel dient.¹ Die Keshymne dagegen besteht aus 8

¹ S. dazu demnächst in ZA 62 (1972).