Hethitisches Worterbuch. 3. Erganzungsheft

Review Author[s]:
> Harry A. Hoffner, Jr.

Third Dynasty of Ur with admirable clarity and succinctness. On the difficult question of the origin of the Amorites, Gadd adopts the view that these tribes were "men of Syrian origin" who infiltrated " from the Syrian steppe to the alluvium." [5] He thus comes out against the view that the Amorite tribes had their origin in that part of the Arabian peninsula which lay closest to the Sumerians, or in a region east of the Tigris. In this Gadd follows the view of I. J. Gelb. On the other hand, he adopts the argument of B. Landsberger on the question of the identity of the ethnic "waves" which penetrated Babylonia starting from the beginning of the Ur III period and those which infiltrated in the so-called "Isin-Larsa" period. Landsberger maintains that there is a basic linguistic difference to be observed between the two "waves."

For the date of the beginning of Hammurapi's reign, Gadd gives 1792, which is that of the Middle Chronology of Sidney Smith.[6] In the fascicle dealing with the Hammurapi period (II V) one gets a fine picture—as much as the evidence allows—of the events of Hammurapi's reign, economic conditions of the Old Babylonian period, and cultural and religious matters. One might take issue with the treatment of the *nadītu* woman in the section on Social Conditions. Gadd describes these women as a "class of priestesses" belonging "at the same time to the class of temple-prostitutes."[7] These views are disputed in the most recent study on this subject by Rivkah Harris, "The Nadītu Woman."[8] Dr. Harris remarks that

After studying the *nadītu* texts, we cannot accept the validity of the view that she was a priestess. There is no evidence that the *nadītu* women observed specific religious prescriptions; there seem to be no rites or rituals which they and they alone were qualified to perform. Although the *nadītu* did have a special attachment to the god Šamaš and to his consort Aja, they cannot be described as their priestesses, for the relationship between them was viewed in a different light.[9]

Dr. Harris argues against the view that the *nadītu* women were sacred prostitutes, citing the views by Landsberger that this opinion is untenable. It should also be emphasized that the *nadītu* was not permitted to bear children. But this study might have appeared too late to have been utilized in the *CAH* fascicle.

The present reviewer would like to add his voice to those opposing the system of footnoting employed in the *CAH*.[10] One example will perhaps suffice: in a discussion of the social measures undertaken by Urukagina, we are informed in a note that

The best general survey is still that of G, 5, 75. A new translation is given by § VIII, 3 and by § VII, 3: the former has been criticized in § VIII, 1, see also § VI, 21 and G, 15, ch. VI. In all of these places some different views are taken of the reformer's motives . . .[11]

A minor point: on p. 12 of I XIX, Tall al-Ḥarīrī, ancient Mari, is described as being near Albū Kamāl, a printing error for Abū Kamāl.

DAVID B. WEISBERG

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE—JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION
CINCINNATI, OHIO

---

[5] I XXII 34.

[6] For alternative suggestions, see M. B. Rowton, *CAH* I² VI 61 ff.

[7] II V 32 f.

[8] *Studies . . . Oppenheim* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1964), 106-35.

[9] Ib. 108.

[10] Cf. Machteld Mellink, *JAOS* 82 (1962) 572, and 84 (1964) 474.

[11] I XIII 49 n. 1.

Hethitisches Wörterbuch. 3. Ergänzungsheft. By Johannes Friedrich. Pp. 51. Heidelberg: CARL WINTER UNIVERSITÄTSVERLAG, 1966.

The value of any dictionary or grammar of a language as imperfectly understood as Hittite is dependent upon constant revision. When such a work ceases to be revised at brief and regular intervals, its degree of usefulness immediately begins to fall. Fortunately for the young discipline of Hittitology, Professor Friedrich fully subscribes to this dictum. The small fascicle under review represents the fourth installment of additions and corrections to the main body of the *Hethitisches Wörterbuch* which was issued in 1952. The first installment assumed the form of *Nachträge* appended to the end of the *Wörterbuch*. Since 1957 these corrections have appeared in supplementary

fascicles (*Ergänzungshefte*), issued in the years 1957, 1961, and (now) 1966. These fascicles—as indeed the *HWb* itself—serve as periodical indices to articles and books containing lexicographic information relative to Hittite, Luwian, Palaic, Hattic, and Hurrian, as well as to Sumerograms and Akkadograms which appear in Hittite texts. In addition Friedrich makes available to the scholarly community by this means many of his own valuable lexical insights together with those which other scholars have communicated to him privately. As is generally recognized by members of the community of cuneiform scholars, the *HWb* is not intended to be a dictionary in the strict sense of that term. It cannot in its present format ever perform the functions of a Hittite dictionary. But until at least one of the several promised dictionary-type projects reaches the stage of publication this handy glossary and its supplements will continue to be an indispensable tool for linguists and historians who wish to utilize Hittite texts.

There follow a number of detailed comments on the entries in this supplement. The reviewer has refrained from references here to his own discussions of certain terms included in this fascicle which discussions are presently in press. For the convenience of users of this fascicle, however, he has included references to published discussions of evidence in support of meanings communicated to Professor Friedrich privately. Since these discussions appeared in print after the supplement under review went to press, it was quite naturally impossible for Professor Friedrich to cite them. Their citation here, therefore, is in no way intended as a critism of the supplement. Discussion of *ḫapupi-*, *ḫuript(a?)-*, and *kipriti-* can now be found in RHA f. 76 (1965), pp. 5-16.

LÚ*arkammiyala-*: If this is the phonetic equivalent to LÚ GIŠBALAG.DI, then we must look for *SAL GIŠBALAG.DI to balance off SAL*arkammiyala-*.

ḫapupu-: Professor Landsberger has recently (without knowledge of RHA f. 76, 1965, pp. 5-16) compared Hittite *ḫapupi-* with Greek ἔποψ and Latin *upupa* "hoopoe" (*WdO* 3, 1966, p. 264). He notes that the approximate Akkadian equivalents for the hoopoe are *kubšānu* and *ḫaṣibāru*. While the phonetic similarity of the Greek and Latin terms to the Hittite is certainly striking, one must somehow relate this bird to the known iconography of either Ishtar or 'Anat-Astarte and

offer some explanation for its consistent position between SÚR.DÙ.A^MUŠEN and MUŠEN ḪURRI in the bird lists reproduced in RHA f. 76. The new identification of the *ḫapupi/u-* offered by Professor Landsberger may ultimately prove to be the correct one. But its basis must be more than phonetic resemblance to Greek or Latin bird names, since the case for the "owl" identification can also appeal to this kind of evidence (see Friedrich's example on p. 14).

LÚ*ḫištašša-*: The reference might have been given. Is it IBoT II i obv i 16? If so, the edition gives LÚ*ḫi-iš-ša*(sic)*-aš-ša-an-ká*[*n*]. And how does one explain the spelling with the *ḫi/ḫe* sign rather than with *ḫé* (= GAN), as almost always in É*ḫešta-*?

NA₄*ḫulala*: Could this be an Akkadogram? NA₄NÍR is attested at Boğazköy (= Akkad. *ḫulālu*), on which see A. Goetze, JCS 1 (1947), p. 309. Hittite occurrences of NA₄NÍR are: KUB XXIX 4 obv i 10, 17 (Kronasser, *Umsiedl.*) and HT 1 rev iii 12.

UDU*iyant-*: Several considerations militate against Wittman's proposal that we read this word as UDU-*iyant-* (= **ḫawiyant-*): (1) Why do we never find **UDU-ant-* or (more to the point) **UDU-wiyant-*? (2) In KUB IX 27 obv 10 we find [*i*]-*ya-an-da-aš* SIG*ḫu-ut-tu-ul-li* "a tuft of sheep's wool" with insufficient space in the lacuna to restore UDU before *iyandaš*. Similar phraseology can be found in KUB XV 32 obv i 35-36, where SÍG SA₅ ("red wool") is immediately followed by *iyandaš*[SIG*ḫu-ut-tu-u*]*l-li-it*. In this case there can be no doubt that UDU is omitted as unnecessary before the genitive *iyandaš*. The absence of UDU here and its presence elsewhere in identical circumstances (e. g., KUB VII 60 obv ii 14 where, however, UDU(!) must be read for ZÍZ) can only be explained if UDU is, as Ehelolf contended, only a determinative. As to the semantic comparison drawn by H. Pedersen between Hittite *iyant-* and Greek πρόβατον, this reviewer does not wish to defend it against the criticisms lodged by Benveniste, *Hittite et IE*, pp. 12-13.

kinu-: This verb as distinct from its homograph *kinu-* "to break open" can be illustrated most clearly from KUB IX 22 obv ii 48-49: *n-ašta* LÚ*patiliš anda uizzi nu harnawi piran ki-nu-u*[*z*]-*zi*, "then the *p.* enters and kneels before the birth stool." It should be observed that (1) this *kinu-* (unlike *kinu-* "to break open") is intransitive

and takes no direct object, and (2) it is not construed with the locative particles *-šan* or *-kan*. Any etymological connections with *genu-* "knee" must remain problematic.

gulzi-: Laroche has suggested (OLZ 58, 1963, col. 246) that this is simply the phonetic reading of GIŠ.ḪUR. This seems reasonable. And since Friedrich has long ago (JCS 1, 1947, p. 281, n. 21) cited KUB IV 47 i 21 (*ŠA ZÌ.DA gul-zi-uš i-ya-an-zi*, "they make pictures out of flour"), it only remains to draw attention to the similar use of Akkadian *esēru* (from which *usurtu* = GIŠ.ḪUR is derived) to describe the drawing of magic pictures with flour (CADA, pp. 346-7).

kut?-pu-te-iš: Reading very problematic! The edition has *nu pu-te-iš*. Even if the scribe intended KUD, a phonetic reading of *kud/t* in Hittite texts is unprecedented. The sign can be read KUD in ᴸᵁŠE.KIN.KUD, but not *kud/t* in Hittite words. One could just as easily defend a reading *tar-pu-te-iš* or *ḫaš-pu-te-iš*, if it were not for the dubious connection with Akkadian *kutpû*. Furthermore, one suspects that the last three signs represent the same word (*putiš*) which occurs elsewhere, denoting a unit of dry measure(?): KUB VII 29 obv 14; KUB XXXV 142 rev iv 14; KUB XII 53:14(?); etc.

lilipai-: One more occurrence of this interesting verb has yet managed to elude the interpreters: KUB VIII 67:20. The context contains a description of the voracious appetite of the dragon Hedammu: (19) [*mi-li*]-*it* GIM-*an kat-ta pa-aš-ki* (20) [Ì-NUN G]IM-*an le-el-li-pa-a-i,* "like [hone]y it gulps (the) down; like [butter] it laps (them) up!" Friedrich, who interpreted this passage in *ArOr* 17 (1949), pp. 234-5, 248, divided the words incorrectly, reading *le-el-li pa-a-i.* The "new" occurrence shows (contrary to *HWb* Erg. 3, p. 22) that *lellipai-* is not a *mi*-verb (Friedrich's code: I 3), but a *ḫi*-verb (II 2) with a vocalic stem. Read ᵁᵀᶜᴸA.UZU in KUB XX 76 i 12 and compare with ᵁᵀᶜᴸUZU.A and ᵁᵀᵁᴸMĒ UZU.

A.ZU: See also the ˢᴬᴸA.ZU *Ḫurlaš* in KUB XXX 42 obv i 8 and 51 rev 17.

(ᵁᶻᵁ)AGÁN: Among others these further references should be added: KUB XXII 42 obv 5, 10; KUB XXXIX 57 obv i 5, 6, 9, 14; IBoT I 33 obv 25, 39.

AB.SÍN: Add Goetze, JCS 18 (1964), 91, and note that the phonetic reading is *aggala-*.

AMAR: On AMAR.MAḪ and the significance of MAḪ here compare Landsberger, MSL VIII/1,

p. 63, n. 1, and K. Riemschneider, MIO 6 (1958), 376-8. The meaning "full-grown" posited by Riemschneider for MAḪ in GUD.MAḪ can hardly fit here, since how can an AMAR be "full-grown"? As Landsberger has observed, the older significance of MAḪ as an age designation may have faded with the passage of time, being replaced by the aspect of "spared from agricultural work." One might also question the reading AMAR.MAḪ entirely and suggest rather GUD(!).MAḪ. On the *u* theme of the Hittite reading for AMAR compare also KBo XI 14 ii 5 (AMAR-*un*), which is acc. sg. See also H. Ertem, *Boğazköy . . . . . Faunası* (Ankara, 1965), pp. 40, 44.

LÚ ⁽ᴳᴵˢ⁾BALAG.DI: Note also LÚ BALAG.DI GAL in KUB XX 78 rev iv 4.

ᴳᴵˢBUNIN: In view of the large number of possible phonetic readings for Sumerian signs, it would have helped if the author had included the other common readings in parentheses. This is the SUG sign (Deimel and Labat, #522), *HWb*, p. 293. Güterbock's contributions to CADB, pp. 306-7 (sub *buginnu*) are pertinent here.

BURU₆: The reading BURU₆TUR (Kronasser, *Umsiedlung*, III 56, which could have been cited) is correct; read MÁŠ.TUR!

DUG.GA₅.BUR (i. e., BAḪÁR): Without the LÚ determinative also in KUB XXXI 53 obv 9 and KBo X 28 v 1. Possibly also one should read DUG.{GA.}GA₅.BUR in KUB II 2 rev iv 10.

ᴷᵁˢDÙG.GAN: The ᴳᴵˢDÙG.GAN GUŠKIN GAR.RA of KUB XII 1 rev iii 7 already cited by Götze apud Deimel in ŠL, II, 7:151 and 400:7 could have been included along with the new ᴷᵁˢDÙG.GAN supplied by Otten. The *tukkānum* in OB letters held weights and ingots of silver (Ungad, VAB 6, p. 401).

ᴷᵁˢÉ.MÁ.URU₅: Unless there has been a recent correction of the hand-copies of KBo VIII 79 i 11, the last sign in the complex is not URU₅ (= TU), but URU₇ (a variant of Friedrich's #249 in the HKL). To the reviewer's knowledge URU₅ (= TU) is never employed in Hittite texts for the spelling of the Sumerian word for "quiver." Furthermore, it is doubtful that MÀ (= MAL) should ever be read (rather than MÁ) in the Hittite spellings of ᴷᵁˢÉ.MÁ.URU₇, etc. See *HWb*, p. 270. This word is spelled in the following ways: ᴷᵁˢÉ.MÁ.URU₆ᴿᵁ (KUB XXIX 4 obv i 49), ᴷᵁˢÉ.MÁ.URU₇ (KBo VIII 79 i 11; IBoT I 36 obv ii 40; KUB XXXIV 93 obv 12), ᴳᴵˢMÁ.URU.URU₆ (VBoT 24 i 15; KBo IV 2

iv 27), ^{KUŠ}MÁ.URU.URU₆ (KUB II 1 rev iv 4; KUB VII 54 rev iii 25; KUB IX 8 obv 8; KUB XVIII 52 ii 40), and MÁ.URU.URU₆ (KUB XXV 32 obv i 9).

GUD.MAḪ: *prunaš* GUD.MAḪ-*aš* (kind of fish) may shed light on the expression IKU-*aš-ma* KU₆.ḪI.A-*uš* ÍD-*aš* UR.GI₇.ḪI.A in KUB VIII 67:17, compare Friedrich, *ArOr* 17 (1949), pp. 232-3, 248.

ḪAR.GÌR is more likely an "ankle band" than an "arm band" in view of the ḪAR.ŠU which accompanies it in Papanikri II 53 and IV 19. On Sumerian ḪAR see W. W. Hallo, *BiOr* 20 (1963), p. 138.

ḪUR.SAG BABBAR in KBo II 13 obv 22, 26 may well be the Sumerographic equivalent of ^{ḪUR.SAG}Ḫarga (KUB XXIX 1 obv ii 25), as Laroche contends in RHA f. 69, p. 78.

ITU.BÁR.ZAG.GAR: Five month names in their Sumerographic forms are known from the Hittite texts. They are: ITU.BÁR.ZAG.GAR (Nisannu; first cited in KUB VIII 4:6 and 19:18 by Götze apud Deimel, ŠL, II, 344:52), ITU. ŠU.NUMUN.NA (Du-uzu/Tammuz; KUB VIII 25 obv i 1), ITU.NE.NE.GAR (Abu; KUB VIII 25 obv i 4), ITU.KIN.ᵈINANNA (Elūlu; KUB VIII 25 obv i 7; correct ŠL, II, 538:20, which reads KUB VIII 24 v 7), and ITU.DU₆.KU (Tašrītu; ŠL, II, 459:43). All but two of these were already cited by Götze apud Deimel's ŠL. They should all be listed in the *HWb* entries under ITU.

^{DUG}MUD₄: In addition to BoTU 9 i 12 (= KBo III 23) this Sumerogram occurs in KBo III 34 obv i 27 and in KBo III 35 obv i 3, where the vessels contain wine.

^{GIŠ}LAM.GAL: Neither KUB XXIV 10 ii 32 nor KUB XXX 26 i 8 contains ^{GIŠ}LAM.GAL. Both read ^{GIŠ}LAM.ḪAL. ^{GIŠ}LAM.GAL (listed in *HWb*, p. 282 but without reference) occurs only in KUB XXXIII 115 rev iii 8 (the myth of KÙ.BABBAR).

LIBIR.RA: Used in Hittite texts for: (1) garments (KUB XIII 35 obv i 47-8; opposed to GIBIL), (2) personnel ("former" priest versus "new" priest in KUB XVII 35 obv i 23-6; not an age designation like ŠU.GI!), (3) bread (KUB XII 44 rev iii 22), (4) rennet (KUB XII 44 rev iii 22), (5) cheese (KUB XXXI 71 rev iv 14), (6) figs (KUB XXXI 71 rev iv 15), (7) raisins (KUB XXXI 71 rev iv 15, which are also "crushed": *ḫarran*, neut. part.). LIBIR.RA may

also occur in KUB XIII 35 rev iv 16 and in HT 67 obv 8, but this reading is not certain.

MUL: The reading MUL-*le-eš* in KUB VIII 16:7 is questioned by Laroche (RHA f. 71, p. 102 and n. 1), who reads ^{MUL}*le-eš-šal-la-aš*. The advantage of this reading is that it avoids the problem of the unusual *a* theme vowel for *šalli-* "great," as well as the unusual word order (*šallaš/šalliš* following rather than preceding its noun). Thus is eliminated the only attested example of MUL-*le-eš*.

^{UZU}MUR₇.GU: With this identification there are now as many as five different Sumerian readings for the shape listed in HKL as #247 (and second shape of #246). They are: (1) LUM, (2) ḪUM in ZA.ḪUM, (3) SIG₄, (4) MUR₇ in ^{UZU}MUR₇.GÚ, and (5) GUZ in ^{TÚG}GUZ.ZA (see Dietrich & Loretz, *WdO* 3 (1966), p. 228, n. 97), the latter being found in KUB XVII 14 rev iv 4; KUB XXXV 133 obv i 20 (LTU, p. 109 read as MUR!); KUB XXXVIII 13 rev 13. For this sign in toponyms see also Goetze, JCS 18 (1964), p. 92. The reading of TÚG.GUZ. ZA is further complicated, however, by the entry from the Practical Vocabulary of Assur cited in CADI, 90b sub *i'lu* A: TÚG.SIG₄^{tu-na-ni-ba}ZA = *i'-lu*.

^{SAL}ŠÀ.ZU Abbreviated writing of ŠÀ.AB.ZU Add KBo XII 89 obv 12 to the references and note that Laroche (RHA f. 68, 1961, pp. 25 and 37, n. 2) renders it "sage-femme[?]," while Otten (*Überlief. Tel.*, p. 62, n. 1) anticipates *HWb* Erg. 3 in the rendering "Hebamme," referring also to Deimel, ŠL, II, 384:27a. Hittite reading: *ḫašnupallaš*.

ŠU.GÁN^{SAR}: Add KBo XIV 142 obv i 2, 21, 36, 39.

^{NA₄}TI: Also found in KUB XXVII 67 obv ii 60, rev iv 38, as well as in KBo XI 14 obv ii 12. A very similar expression is TI-*anza* [N]A₄-*aš* ("living stone," KUB XII 24 obv i 11) in a list of jewels.

^{NA₄}*ayyartu*: CADA, p. 228 defines this as "a shell, probably the cowrie." The KBo XI 11 iii 7 reference is not cited in CADA.

anzaḫu: Prof. A. L. Oppenheim in a private communication to me prefers to identify this term with "frit" used in the manufacture of glass.

azzannu^{SAR}: See Goetze, JCS 18 (1964), p. 94. Identification with Akkadian *asnû/assanû* is not phonologically impossible either.

rīqu: Could the singular of this adjective be

found in KUB XXXV 75:4, ᴰᵁᴳ*KU-KU-UB RI-Q[U?]* "an empty *k.*-vessel"?

Below are listed a few words not included in this supplement but which deserve some comment here.

ḫalanza- (Va) "to threaten(?)," occurring only in KUB XXXVI 35 i 11 (*ḫa-la-an-za-at-ta*). It is possible that this verb is derived from the simpler root *ḫalai-* "to set in motion" and that it thus means "incite(?)."

ḫadanti- (N) "dry land, shore" in KBo XII 38 rev iii 10: [GI]M-*an-ma-kán ḫa-da-an-te-ya ar-ḫa ar-ḫu-un*, "but when we disembarked on the dry land."

ḫunikiššar (Nn) "slaughter" in KBo I 51 rev 15: (Akkad.) [*t*]*i-bi-iḫ-tù* = (Hitt.) *ḫu-[u-]ni-ki-iš-ša-[ar]*. The Hittite noun is derived from the verb *ḫunink-* "to injure, slaughter(?)."

ḫurnapišta- (Nc) A kind of disease(?). *ḫur-na-pí-iš-ta-aš-ši-kán* (KUB XXIX 1 obv ii 19) and [*ḫ*]*u-ur-na-pí-iš-ta-an* (KUB XXXVI 49 obv i 5).

išparuzzi- (Nn) "ridge pole" (already correctly translated by Goetze in ANET, 358b) in KUB XXIX i rev iii 18 and 1236/u 10. See also O. Carruba, *Wišuriyanza*, p. 23, fn. 25.

ᴳᴵˢ*šenti-* (Nc) An implement used by the ᴸᶜMUḪALDIM (KUB XXX 41 obv i 15, 21; KBo XI 26 obv 6).

ᴳᴵˢ*tarwali-* (Nn) "pestle(?)." An implement used for grinding or crushing. ᴳᴵˢ*tar-wa-a-li* (KBo XIV 84 rev iii 11), [*ku*]*-uš-ku-uš-šu-wa-aš tar-wa-a-li* "the *t.* for crushing/grinding," (KUB XXXIV 88:12).

ᴳᴵˢ*uwamila-* (Nc) A hunter's weapon (KUB XXXVI 63:4).

zarzur- (Nn) Edible material listed frequently with cereals (KUB XXXI 57 rev iv 19; KUB XXXIII 55 obv i 18; KUB XXXIV 89 obv 1, 6).

IM.GAL (KBo VI 1 obv 14 = KUB VIII 53 rev 14) is phonetic writing of the more usual IM.GÀL "south wind." This theory can be supported by two lines of evidence. First, in the Hittite fragment of the Gilgamesh epic concerned with the fight against Huwawa (KUB VIII 53 = KBo VI 1; Cat. 228:4:A) the two heroes are aided by eight winds which buffet Huwawa. Of the eight only six names are preserved unbroken in the text. They are: the IM.GAL, the north wind (*eltānu*), (space for two more names), the gale wind (*siqsiqqu*), the cold wind (*šuruppû*), the storm wind (*ašamšūtu*), and the hot/bad wind (*anḫullu*). These eight names can be divided into two categories: the first four are compass directions, and the second four are described by qualities of temperature, etc. If we interpret IM.GAL as "south wind," then we can restore the two missing names as IM.KUR.RA (or IM *šadû*) and IM.MAR.TU (or IM *amurrû*), "east wind and west wind." Supporting evidence can be found in the list of winds which aid Marduk in his fight against Tiamat (*Enūma Eliš* IV, 42 ff.). The first four names in the list are: IM.GAL.LU (south wind), IM.SI.SÁ (north wind), IM.KUR. RA (east wind), and IM.MAR.TU (west wind). The second line of evidence is the moon text KUB XXIX 11 obv ii 14, where we read: "if you see the moon, and its horn is turned toward the IM.GAL." In such a context a compass point such as "south" fits much better than a vague "great wind."

ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬ*tappinu-* (KUB XXXII 137 ii 16; Kammenhuber, RHA f. 64, 1959, p. 17; *HWb* Erg. 2, p. 24) is not Hittite, Hattic, or Palaic despite the divine name ᵈTappinu (which Laroche [*Rech.*, p. 32] has correctly linked with ᵈTalipinu/ᵈTelipinu), but rather an Akkadogram. The Akkadian *tappinnu* itself is a loanword from Sumerian d a b i n, "bread made from barley flour" (CADA, p. 238b sub *akalu*; ARM VII, p. 263). On the other hand, ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬ*punniki-* is a true loan word into Hittite from Akkadian *punnigu* (see RLA, III, 156).

Harry A. Hoffner, Jr.

Brandeis University