



Die Kaskaer: Ein Beitrag zur Ethnographie des alten Kleinasien

Review Author[s]:

Harry A. Hoffner, Jr.

Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 87, No. 2. (Apr. - Jun., 1967), pp. 179-185.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0003-0279%28196704%2F06%2987%3A2%3C179%3ADKEBZE%3E2.0.CO%3B2-2>

Journal of the American Oriental Society is currently published by American Oriental Society.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/aos.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

specific aims of the Soviet regime in Central Asia and the special problems inherent in the situation, the pattern of Uzbek literary politics has sometimes diverged from the more familiar Russian model. Yet, the author points out, in more recent years there have not been important differences, and the course of postwar literary politics in Uzbekistan, as Professor Allworth describes it, appears to have followed very closely that of the Russian republic.

The remaining portions of this study deal, in the main, with the instrumentalities through which literary policies have been applied: they contain information about various post-revolutionary literary groups and movements, the functions of congresses and festivals, publishing prac-

tices, and changes in alphabet, orthography, and literary language.

Professor Allworth's study reveals little that is new about the mechanisms of literary politics in the USSR, but it is a revealing account of the use of literature and literary institutions as an arm of Soviet nationality policies. The author's proclivity for lengthy footnotes and his tendency to fill the text with lists of names, probably unfamiliar to most readers, may enhance the value of the work as a reference volume, but they make for rather tedious reading at times.

The book contains an extensive bibliography in Uzbek, Chaghatay, Russian, and other languages.

HAROLD SWAYZE

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Die Kaškäer: Ein Beitrag zur Ethnographie des alten Kleinasien (= Untersuchungen zur Assyriologie [Ergänzungsbände zur Zeitschrift für Assyriologie] n. F. vol. 4). By EINAR VON SCHULER. Pp. 198. Berlin: WALTER DE GRUYTER & Co., 1965. 64 DM. (\$16.00).

The volume under review was written as a "Habilitationsschrift" for the faculty of the Free University of Berlin, where its author, Einar von Schuler, teaches. Von Schuler was a student of Prof. Johannes Friedrich in Leipzig. His first book, which grew out of his studies with Friedrich, was entitled *Hethitische Dienstanweisungen für höhere Hof- und Staatsbeamte* and was published in 1957 as Beiheft 10 of the *Archiv für Orientforschung*. It consisted of a critical transliteration, German translation, and philological commentary on the Hittite protocol texts ("Instruktionen") addressed to various dignitaries and officials in the royal service. Assisting his former teacher, von Schuler prepared the linguistic indices for Friedrich's *Die hethitischen Gesetze*, published by Brill in 1959. Von Schuler's principal interest within the realm of Hittitology, as indicated by the essay which he contributed to the volume *Neuere Hethiterforschung* edited by G. Walser as an "Einzelschrift" of the journal *Historia* in 1964, is private and international law (particularly the latter). In the Hittite archives he finds the state treaties, the protocols, and the

law code itself to be the principal sources for his studies.

The author indicates by the book's subtitle ("Ein Beitrag zur Ethnographie des alten Kleinasien") that the work is intended as a contribution to the ethnography of ancient Asia Minor. In footnote 51 on page 6 he suggests that he considers himself to be following in the train of other "territorial histories" of Asia Minor such as A. Goetze's *Kizzuwatna and the Problem of Hittite Geography* (1940) and F. Kinal's *Géographie et l'histoire des pays d'Arzava* (1953). There is no doubt that the task of compiling ethnographic studies of all of the important groups in ancient Asia Minor has been a *desideratum* for some time now.

The author was aided considerably in his task by the cooperation of a number of distinguished scholars. He acknowledges this assistance on page vi of the "Vorwort." Assyriological matters were reviewed by Prof. A. Falkenstein of Heidelberg. Egyptological ones were handled by Prof. E. Hornung. Several able and distinguished Hittitologists offered their services, among them: J. Friedrich, H. Otten, F. Köcher, and V. Souček. Otten's contributions in particular can be measured by the number of times the Marburg professor's name is cited in the footnotes. In addition a substantial service was rendered to the author in the list of unpublished texts made available to him (see p. 197 for the inventory numbers).

But the aid given to the author by his colleagues and friends does not minimize his own substantial contributions evident on every page. *Die Kaškaer* will be admired by its users not only because of the wealth of data which it contains, but also because of the sound methodology employed by its author. Von Schuler's critical evaluation of the sources is especially evident in his treatment of the problem of references to the existence of Kaškaeans in the Old Kingdom times (pp. 19-29). Undeterred by the references to Kaškaeans in the reign of Ḫattušiliš I contained in Empire texts from the time of Ḫattušiliš III (KUB XXI 29 ii 3-5) or by the general tendency among Hittitologists to accept this late testimony, the author systematically probes the evidence, both textual and archaeological, and concludes finally that the first clear evidence for the appearance of the Kaškaeans in northern Asia Minor is from the time of Arnuwandaš I (c. 1450 B.C.). So thorough is his historical investigation and discussion that all future histories of Asia Minor in Hittite times will have to reckon with this chapter (Ch. II).

All monographs have points at which they may be improved, and it is no reflection on this one for the reviewer to list several such points here. In general, one is annoyed at the exorbitant price of the volume in view of the number of words and lines of print. The type is large and widely spaced, so that the exterior size of the book conveys the impression that it contains much more material than in fact it does. As one leafs through the pages of the book, one sees tremendous waste of space. This reviewer is not convinced that every one of the texts transliterated and translated (some only translated) in chapter five (pp. 109-187) needed to be included. Those which depended heavily on unpublished duplicates supplied by Otten deserved to be included. Others, such as those found on pp. 117-134, 139-140, 142-145, etc., certainly do not. Why was it necessary to space so widely the list of abbreviations, which, as it now stands, consumes seven pages?

The book contains many small errors, which will now be considered in the order of the pagination. The Arabic numeral preceding each comment is the number of the respective page.

6. The author goes to great pains in his opening chapter to prove that the Hittites, unlike the other peoples of the great, literate cultures of the

Tigris, Euphrates and Nile river valleys, were characterized by an "openness towards foreign influences" (p. 6) and a tolerance, one of whose manifestations was the lack of any expression of disparagement for a foreign ethnic group ("keine herabsetzenden oder schmähenden Ausdrücke" is his phrase) in the Hittite texts. He points out (p. 6) that, although the Hittites possessed a term for "barbaric" (*dampupi-*), it was always used in a social, rather than ethnic sense. Yet later in his book the reader finds again and again references to "herabsetzende Ausdrücke" and "Missachtung" (p. 82) employed against the Kaškaeans, and on pp. 76-77 the author even discounts any true ethnographic significance to the designation of the Kaškaeans as "swineherds and linen-makers" in favor of regarding these labels as "Herabsetzungen" (p. 77). And this from the impartial, tolerant Hittites! It appears to this reviewer as almost too much finesse to draw such a strict line between the application of the term *dampupi-* to a foreign people and the employment of ethnic labels themselves as disparaging terms. There is a distinction, but it is certainly only a slight one. None of the great peoples of the ancient Near East possessed a true anthropological interest in foreign groups. None was wholly free from prejudice against other peoples whose customs were unfamiliar or different from their own.¹ Least of all the Hittites who, the author acknowledges (p. 80), often misunderstood the motivations and actions of the Kaškaeans and had little conception of their social and religious outlook. The Hittites feared and mistrusted (p. 82) the Kaškaeans. According to von Schuler (p. 78), they even downgraded the material culture of the Kaškaeans, designating Hittite goods as *aššu*, but Kaškaean as *UNŪTĒMES* (see below, *ad* page 78). One cannot hope to arrive at reliable conclusions regarding the culture of the Kaškaeans until Kaškaean texts are found and read, or until some other direct evidence is acquired which constitutes the self-testimony of that people to its own culture. Information found in Hittite, Ugaritic, Egyptian, or Akkadian texts is bound to be highly colored by the prejudices and misinformation of that people. Fortunately for von Schuler, his own

¹ [For an instructive illustration of Ancient Near Eastern interest in and prejudices about alien cultures, cf. the detailed "look at the give-and-take between the Sumerians and their neighbors near and far" by S. N. Kramer, *The Sumerians* (1963) 269-289. Ed.].

critical methodology often saves him from erroneous conclusions, but it is nonetheless unwise to convey to the reader in the opening chapter a false impression that the Hittites, unlike the Egyptians, Canaanites, Sumerians, Babylonians, etc., were more tolerant toward foreign groups, possessed less prejudice, and can therefore be relied upon to a greater extent than the others to preserve an accurate description of the culture of a neighboring, more primitive society.

7. Was homosexuality *per se* ruled out by Hittite law (Code ¶195 and Huqq. III 59 f.) or only homosexual relations between close relatives? Ancient Near Eastern law (including Hittite law) forbade heterosexual relations between close relatives and, since both interdictions of homosexual relations fall into the same category, it might be wise temporarily to suspend judgment on the matter of the outlawing of *all* homosexual relations. Note too that *not all* forms of sexual relations with animals were deemed illegal (Code ¶¶199 and 200A). Bestiality, heterosexuality, and in all probability homosexuality were *regulated*, but not interdicted. This is in contrast to the flat interdiction of homosexuality and bestiality in Hebrew law (Lev. 18:22-23; 20:13).

8. A more limited skepticism about the historicity of the KBo III 60 story would be proper. We *do* know, after all, from recently discovered Ugaritic mythological texts that cannibalism had a place in the activities of the West Semitic pantheon (M. C. Astour, *RHR* CLXIV [1963], pp. 1-15). The details of the story, as given in KBo III 60, may be distorted, but the kernel of the story may be a genuine reflection of one aspect of the early second millennium culture of a part of North Syria.

11. Von Schuler's distribution of the sources may be outlined as follows, with additions supplied:

1. Annals or historical inscriptions.
2. Treaties.
3. Royal *Klagegebete*. Add KUB XXXI 124 and dupl. (Cat. 277), and KUB VI 45 and dupl. (Cat. 285).
4. Protocols.
5. Letters.
6. Oracle inquiries. Add KUB XXII 62 (Cat. 215:18).
7. Omens.

Add: 8. Royal decrees. KUB XXI 29 and dupl. (Cat. 62), and KBo VI 28 (Cat. 58).

9. Ritual and prayer. KBo II 9 (Cat. 406).

10. Rituals. KUB XV 38 (Cat. 416), and KBo XI 40 (Cat. 533).

14. It is true that in the Mari texts we learn of *ālānū* ("villages") of the semi-nomadic tribes which are "ephemere Niederlassungen," but are the villages of the Kaškaeans which bear old names (many of them Hattic, and therefore pre-Kaškaean!) to be so regarded?

19. The spelling of ^{URU}Kum-man-eš-maḥ (KUB XXXVIII 6 rev. iv 23; von Schuler should have transliterated the name rather than leaving it in broad transliteration without hyphens) is suspicious. The *man* and *eš* signs are so similar as to suggest dittography. Perhaps the name is to be read ^{URU}Kum-{*man*}-eš-maḥ (i.e., Kummešmaḥ, much closer to the river name Kummešmaḥa). Confusion of *man* and *eš* is well attested in the Hittite texts, especially in the name Kummanni (occasionally ^{URU}Kum-eš-ni [KUB XV 5 rev. iv 20] for ^{URU}Kum-man-ni).

22. Footnote 36. Fish were not "von geringer Bedeutung" in Hittite life (Otten, *RLA* III, 68 notwithstanding). (1) River fish are released from the hex in KBo III 8 rev. iii 2-3, 21 for one purpose—that they might be caught and used as food. (2) Sea fish were also known to the Hittites and are mentioned in the ritual against family dissension (KUB XXXIV 84 obv. 15; *RLA* III, 68). (3) Fish were so familiar to the Hittites that aspects of their behaviour (KUB XXXIV 80 obv. 7) as well as the means of catching them (KBo VI 29 obv. ii 33-35) had penetrated the colloquial language and the stock of metaphors, both in rituals and in historical narration. (4) It is true that some references come from texts which developed out of foreign prototypes: the fish in the diet of Hedammu (Hurrian myth), the occupational title ^{LC}Šu.PIŠ known to date in published texts only in the Hurrian myth KUB XXIV 7, and the fish which figure prominently in the *Babilili* ritual (KUB XXXIX 95: 2-6; 78 obv. i 24-25 compared with 80: 7; 71 obv. ii 36-40). (5) That fish were caught and eaten, and sometimes even used as an ingredient in bread is suggested by the ^{KU}₆^{HA}.an ḥa-a-l[i-iš] of KUB VII 17:18 as well as the ^{KU}₆^{HA} ḥa-a-li-in of KBo X 31 rev. iv 22 (*parḥuwan ḥališ/n?), when

compared with the bread name ^{NINDA}ḫali-. Fish were eaten either fresh (^{dgm} ḫdīm are known from Ugarit) or dried like other meats (the usual expressions in Hittite texts are ḫadant-, ŠĀBULU, or ḪĀD.DU.A). In a magic ritual (KUB VII 33 obv. 5-9) five fishes are listed with other animals, birds, reptiles, and even a human (line 7), presumably as offerings. In another broken text (KBo X 52 obv. 9-10) fish are listed with other foodstuffs: UZU KU-UŠ-ŠA, Ḫ-an, [A]R-NA-BI, MUŠEN^{HA}, KU^{HA}. (6) In harmony with the conception brought by the Hittites from their pre-Anatolian home that the sun rose from an eastern sea (KUB VI 45 obv. iii 14), KUB XXXVIII 2 rev. iii 6 depicts the sun-god of heaven with fishes on his head. In the light of this evidence both von Schuler's and Otten's statements require modification.

22. Von Schuler's treatment of the sea is no more satisfying than his statement about fish. (1) Not only do gods come from the sea (KBo IX 97:5; KUB XV 34 obv. i 2, rev. iii 21), but a deified throne brings to the king from the sea the royal coach (^{huluganni-}) which is the symbol of his rule (KUB XXIX 1 obv. i 23; *ANET*, p. 357B). This text, not being a myth of foreign origin, cannot easily be brushed aside. (2) In the Ḫuqqana treaty, I, 59 one of the deities summoned to witness the loyalty oaths of the vassal is šalliš arunaš "the great sea(god)" (cf. *Rech.*, p. 72). (3) As in the Hebrew Old Testament the sins of Israel are banished to the depths of the sea (Micah 7:19), so also in KBo X 45 ii 52 (cf. Otten, *Beschwör.*, IV 41) evils are blown away like chaff and banished to the sea. (4) Another indication of the religious importance of the sea to the Hittites is the festival name EZEN ^dArunitaš (KUB XXII 27 rev. iii 38; KUB XXV 27 obv. i 29).

25. No mention whatever is made in these pages of the valuable work of A. Kammenhuber (*Saeculum* [1958], pp. 136-155). Especially relevant to the discussion here is her footnote 37 on page 143.

26. On ^{URU}Ḫaḫḫa see also A. Goetze, *JCS* 16 [1962]. On ^{URU}Ti-pi-ya see KBo XIV 19 rev. iii 7 in the annals of a king who campaigned in many of the same locales as Šuppiluliumaš I, A. Goetze in *JCS* 18 [1964], p. 92, and this book, p. 39, fn. 341. Footnote 93: It is likely that not only are Takkumiša and Takkupša identical, but

also ^{URU}Ta-ku-up-pa-ša (KUB XXXVI 89 obv. 6) and ^{URU}Ták-ku-up-ta-aš (KBo XIV 42 obv. 6; KUB XXVI 2 rev. 8; KBo IV 13 obv. i 24).

27. Footnote 102: On the Old Hittite version of the laws see now Otten and Souček, *Afo* 21 [1966], pp. 1-12. The remarks in footnote 103 seem to this reviewer to undermine von Schuler's own case that Pala and Nerik in the time of Teli-pinuš (not a century earlier!) belonged to the empire.

72. On the village elders (LÚ.MEŠ ŠU.GI), an institution which (at least according to von Schuler) was not part of Kaškaean society, see now Klengel, *ZA NF* 23 (1965), pp. 223-236, esp. p. 234. In the matter of "mixed marriages" between Kaškaeans and Hittites, it is not clear that a Kaškaean woman is ever mentioned. KUB XXI 29 rev. iii 24-25 concerns a Kaškaean man and a Hittite woman, and KUB XXVI 19 is admittedly "unklar." It is better not to base much on EA 1:37 ff. (cf. below *ad* page 81). Are we to compare the activities of the wives of the DUMU^{MEŠ} Yamina, as described by Kibri-Dagan in his letter to Zimri-Lim (*ARM* III 16)? It is true that in *ARM* III 16 there is no direct evidence for a mixed marriage, but the Kaškaean night visit of the husband may have been connected with collecting information from his wife, as well as the obvious purpose of cohabitation. This may have contributed to the unfavorable attitude of the Hittites in the community.

73. The fact that Kaškaeans made slaves of the Hittite cult personnel does not necessarily imply that they used them in their customary capacities, thus allowing Hittite skills and social stratification to infiltrate Kaškaean society. Arnuwandaš' point is just the opposite! (See the author's own admission on p. 79.) The Kaškaeans did not know how to or did not wish to use these temples and their personnel. Hence, they wrecked the edifices, smashed the cult images, and appropriated the sacred utensils for profane use. Nor does one gain the impression from the tone and wording of KUB XVII 21 iii 1-7 that the cooks, bakers, plowmen, and gardeners (likewise part of the cultic personnel in the broad sense!) were able to use their skills as Kaškaean slaves.

74. Footnote 41: The LÚUKU.UŠ mentioned together with the Kaškaean LÚQÁR-DAP-PU is not just "armed Kaškaean," but specifically the ἰππείης who fights from the chariot of the ἡνίοχος

(^LQARDAPPU). This is why the two are mentioned together.

76. To the discussion of GAD add Dietrich and Loretz, *WdO* 3 (1966), p. 224 ff., who show that TGGADA is paralleled by Ugaritic *ktn* in the versions of the Šuppiluliumaš-Niqmad treaty.

77. In my opinion there can be no doubt that the designation "swineherds" (LÚ.MEŠ SIPA.ŠAH) is actually a disparaging expression and has no real relationship to the actual occupations of the Kaškaeans. Von Schuler makes this point well, but should have considered it earlier in connection with his discussion on page 6. Although pigs were bred and raised by the Hittites (as von Schuler demonstrates) and their hides were even recognized as valuable (see KBo X 31 iii 17), the pig was (along with the dog) the lowliest of animals. It required only garbage (*mudan*; KBo X 37 ii 15-17) for food in contrast to other livestock which were fed on mixed fodder (*immiul*) and barley (*halkiš*). Only rarely was a pig specially fattened on barley (*halkiš*), as shown by KBo II 3 obv. i 56. Furthermore, the pig was a chthonic animal (KUB XVII 28 obv. i 4-5; KUB XXXVI 83 obv. i 3, 7) and defiled temples or sacred places by its presence (KUB XIII 4 obv. i 20; rev. iii 60-61, 65). It was thus a deliberate insult for the Hittites to refer to the Kaškaeans as "swineherds."

78. Footnote 88: The author should provide page references to his own translations of these texts in this volume (in this case pp. 122 and 131). Since he does not provide transliterations for these two texts on pp. 122 and 131, it would be helpful to Hittitologists if he at least noted the Hittite expression used for "Handel treiben" (*happar iya*-). In this connection note also the royal restrictions imposed on the merchants of Ura at Ugarit. Footnote 93: I fail to see how von Schuler can justify his interpretation of the alternation of *UNŪTĒMEŠ* and *aššu* in KUB XXIII 77:52-56. How can one be sure that a contrast of worthless items with valuable ones is intended? Is it not true that the Akkadogram is used in such expressions a *UNŪT DINGIRLIM* (KUB XXII 70 obv. 24) and *UNŪT LUGAL* (KUB XIII 35 obv. i 11; KBo XI 5 obv. i 7; 60 i 15) *UNŪT UD.ZAL.LI* (KUB XXII 70 rev. 43), and *UNŪT ZABAR* (KUB XIII 35 obv. i 2. ii 13, rev. iii 16, etc.), where items of value

must be in view? More likely *UNŪTĒMEŠ* and *aššu* are employed as approximate synonyms here.

79. On the cult at Kapperi/Kappari compare the divine name ⁴Kappariya-muwa (*Rech.*, p. 27 and KBo XI 35 rev. 3).

80. The Kaškaean plundering of the Hittite temples might have been a political or economic necessity, but the smashing of the cult images (KUB XVII 21 obv. ii 26-27) was certainly not! Most civilized peoples of the ancient world captured the cult images of their enemies but preserved them and worshipped them. Compare the many occasions when the Marduk image of Babylon was carried off by invaders or the treatment accorded the ark of Yahweh by the Philistines (I Samuel 4-6). Footnote 113: One cannot always presume that *hat(ta)rai*- designates a written message. Laroche has suggested that the basic meaning of the verb is "to cross" (MNHMHC XAPIN, II, 3). The semantic transition from "cross" to "send (a message) across" is an easy and logical one. For the mechanical procedure of inscribing or drawing (writing) the Hittites used the verb *gulš*-. Furthermore, why we should necessarily assume that a written message from the Kaškaeans would *have to be* on clay in cuneiform ("nur die Keilschrift") is not clear to me. We know that the Hittites themselves wrote on wood during the Empire period (Bossert, *WdO* [1952], pp. 480-484). Why should we eliminate the possibility that the Kaškaeans did also? This *might* help to explain why no Kaškaean documents have survived, if indeed they ever wrote in their own language!

81. Footnotes 124 and 125: On ^{KUR}*Ga-ga-ya* compare further the personal name *ggy* (*UT* 2035:3) at Ugarit, which might well be an ethnicon! The reading *Ga<aš>-ga-ya* may be "wahrscheinlich," but hardly certain. One should always keep in mind that it is an emendation.

82. Part of the difficulty of distinguishing between the role of Kaškaeans as mercenary soldiers and members of work gangs is the ambiguity of Akkadian *šabu* and Sumerian *erín*, which can refer to either (*CAD* Š, pp. 46-55). One should weigh carefully the fact that NINDA ERÍN.MEŠ were allotted as rations to lumberjacks (KUB XXIX 1 rev. iii 17, 20) and plasterers (KUB XXIX 1 rev. iii 36). For the Hittite reading of this Sumerogram as NINDA *tuzzi*- see Werner, *OLZ* 1954, col. 297.

88. Footnote 21: One should not overlook the fact that Hittite geographical names or personal names spelled with *š* in Hittite cuneiform sometimes appear as *s* (samekh) in Ugaritic: *trǵnds* (Tarhuntišša?) in *UT*, p. 499, entries 2607 and 2609; *Onom.*, p. 37, entry 682.

91. On ^mAšhapala see also ^mAš-*hu-pa-la* (HT 2 v 13). The same *a/u* alternation can be seen in Capp. ^mHupaliya and ^dHapaliya, as well as in the verb *hapallašai-* ("to wound on the head"), which I have analysed as a denominative verb in *-ai-* (like *haršanalli-* "wreath," *haršanallai-* "to wreath") from a base **hapallaš-* "skull, scalp" (compare *hupallaš-* "skull, scalp"), *RHA* 72 (1963), p. 34. ^mKal-ma-*ha-zi-ti* is now to be compared with ^mHUR.SAG-LÚ (KBo X 10 obv. iv 22), which yields the equation: (Luwian) *kalmaha-* = (Nešite) *kalmara-* "mountain." See also NINDA *kal-ma-ah-...* in KUB XXVII 68 obv. i 6.

95. ^{URU}Hawalkina/Hawarkina is derived from Hattic *hapalki-/hawalki-* "iron." Compare for the *-na-* the spellings *habalginnu/habalkinnu* in Akkadian texts (*CAD* H, p. 3; *AHW*, I, p. 301). The toponym means "Iron City." Other metal (or ore) names in Anatolian toponyms are: ^{URU}Hattušaš (based on the Hattic word for silver) and ^{URU}Kupurzina (compare the metal name *kurupšini* in KUB X 89 i 39 and the metathesized *kupuršinnu* cited in *AHW*, I, p. 509B; von Soden identified this word as "a quality of gold," but in the toponym it designates more likely a concrete substance obtainable in the vicinity, i.e., the ore).

97. ^{URU}Šapidduwa contains the name of the cereal *šepit-*. Much less likely is the adjective *šappidduwa* "terrible" (Güterbock, *JCS* 6 [1952], p. 31). With the name ^(HUR.SAG)Šišpinuwa compare ^{URU}Zišpinuwa (HT 2 rev. v 4) and ^{URU}Šašpinuwa (KUB XIX 19 rev. 6) ¹.

99. One can be sure that the transliteration ^{URU}*Te-še-ni-ip-pa* is correct, as opposed to ^{URU}*TEŠe-ni-ip-pa*, by the variant spelling ^{URU}*Ti-ni-ši-pa* in KBo III 60 rev. iii 8.

102. This reviewer is not sure of the reasons for von Schuler's omission of many other examples of toponyms with the suffixes discussed on this and the following pages. Does he mean to confine his remarks to toponyms only attested in Kaškaean territory? Surely this would be poor methodology, for the "Kaškaean" toponyms are transparently

a mixture linguistically. Some are Hattic, some Luwian, and some Nešite. The only safe approach to the study of these names is to draw upon the entire stock of toponyms available from the Hittite texts. And if this was the author's intention, he has certainly omitted a host of examples. On the formative *-ha* alone he has omitted: Taggapaha, Kartapaha, Annašaha, Hatahha, Katahha, Hamatahha, Taništaha, Marištaha, Dammelha, Zidaparha, Mararha, Hašha, Kašha, Ašašha, Kanišha, [Z]inzaluha, Maliluha, Šamuha, Takarmuha, Gapiruha, Kurešduha, etc. On the formative *-e/ina* he has omitted: Kušahhušenaša, Darkittena, Witwitena, Tupaina, Tapatina, Wakina, Urikina, Walkina, Allina, Timmina, Parminašša, Iyaninna, Pina, Tahappina, Šahpina, Nipina, Pipiniya, Gulpina, Durpina, Kutpina, Arinna, Haddarina, Kuwarina, Kikkumrina, Paḥurina, Humeššina, Liḥš/zina, Hatitina, Partaḥuina, Niwina, Tuwaḥzina, Kurupzina, Parparzina, etc.

103. On the formative *-pa* he has omitted: Šuranhapa, Pár/Maš-ma-aš-*ha-pa*, Harašhapa, Zuhhapa, Kapakapa, Šallapa, Kuwalapa, Dunanapa, Iyaupapa, Šappa, Kallistapa, Lipa, Zizzilippa/Zazlippa, Wanipa, Tešenippa/Tinišipi, Aškuršunipa, Pakarripa, Ziripa, Šippa, Patipaiš Halalazipa, Šalpa, Talpa, Zalpa, Šalampa, Impa, Zimimpa, Taḥa/urpa, Ašharpaya, Šarpa, Aštarpa, Tuarpa, Waḥḥašpa, Tapašpa, Išhuppa, Šarupa, Tupa, Šaddupa, Lazpa, etc.

104. On the formative *-ura* he has omitted: Aura, Guršaura, Huḥhura, Zigazhura, Pašura, Dura, Adadura, Pitura, Anzura, Ilanzura, Halipzura, and (less relevant, if the etymology is Semitic) Zunzura (Tyre).

106-7. Much of the analysis is arbitrary. Where, for example, can one justify the formatives: **liya*, **ar*, **dā*, and **riya*? Elements particularly weak in attestation are: **iška-*, **para-*, and **pirri*.

113. ¹ On the blind man see also IBoT I 29 rev. 39 (Cat. 505: EZEN *haššumaš*), where he is stripped, beaten, and taken to the **hešta-*. Compare also the KRT epic from Ugarit, where *'wr mzl ymzl* may refer to the practice of magic by a blind man prior to the launching of the military expedition. Another reference to a blind man is found in KUB XII 62 rev. 7-12, a pastoral symphony with a touch of folk wisdom.

116. On the subject of eating the innards compare the expression *karateš adanteš* (KUB XXX

48 obv. 4, 9-10) as well as *man-kan antuḫši našma DUMU-li karatuš kuiški arḫa karirapi*, "if anyone is eating up (magically) the innards of a grown man or a child" (KUB XXX 49 rev. iv 23). In addition one might allude to the common mentions of cutting up, cooking, and eating the *UZUNÍG.GIG* (Akkadian *ikkibu*) in the rituals. Could *tuhḫuin da-* refer to smoke signals often employed by semi-nomadic peoples? These are mentioned in texts from Mari and Israel. The reviewer has had previous occasion to discuss the "smoke offering(?)" of King Daniel in the Ugaritic texts (*JNES* 23 [1964], pp. 66-68). There the term employed is *dḡ* (*duḡuiš?*), which could be derived from either *tuhḫuiš* or *tuhḫueššar*. [After completing this review the author noticed on p. 198 (Nachträge) that H. Otten has expressed a similar view regarding *tuhḫuin da-*.]

166. GU₄.MAḪ is in opposition to GUDÁB not only in KUB XXXV 142 iv 5, but also in KUB XXIX 1 rev. iii 22. In KUB XXXV 142 iv the pairs are distinguished *only in sex*. No other qualification is relevant here. For this reason the translation of SAL.AL.LAL as "female draught (animal)" must be abandoned in favor of "female (animal)." Furthermore, the bitch, the sow, and the doe are not commonly used as draught animals. It is possible that the AL which occurs in á-A VII 4:17 in the equation *ma-aḫ = AL = ra-b[u-ú]* and which is applied to female domesticated animals is related to the AL in this SAL.AL.LAL. (Cf. B. Landsberger, *MSL* VIII/1 [1960], p. 63 f. and note 1). I owe this reference to Prof. Hallo, who has also proposed with much reserve another solution, whereby SAL.AL.LAL represents *šal^{al}-lá* for *šallam*

= *šilam* "'female, milk-producing,' applied originally to cows but in your context to all kinds of animals whose gender is *not* differentiated in the logogram. For the equation of *šallam* with the more common *šilam* . . . cf. Landsberger, l.c., p. 62" (letter of July 6, 1966). The Hittite contexts will have to serve as the final arbiters, and KUB XXXV 142 certainly seems to rule out "female draught (animal)."

167. The idiom *hanza ḫar-*, which may derive from Akkadian *rēšam kullum* as a loan translation (see already Goetze, *JAOS* 74 [1954], p. 188), probably means "to support, aid, assist" rather than "to let alone, let have peace."

The volume is rounded out with four sections of indices: (1) geographical names, (2) personal names, (3) divine names, and (4) unpublished texts. Good indices can be an extremely useful feature of any scholarly work. It would have been an additional help if the author had included a subject index, an index of published texts, and an index of Hittite words and phrases discussed.

Professor von Schuler has rendered a great service to Hittitologists by collecting and evaluating the cultural and historical data relevant to the Kaškaeans in the Boğazköy texts. The volume under review will doubtless make a substantial contribution to Hittitology and to the ethnography of the ancient Near East. This reviewer hopes that his remarks will aid its readers in deriving the utmost benefit from *Die Kaškaer* and in avoiding what few serious flaws are contained therein.

HARRY A. HOFFNER, JR.

BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY

A *Bilingual Graeco-Aramaic Edict by Aśoka*. Translation and notes by G. P. CARATELLI and G. GARBINI. Introduction by U. Scerrato. Roma, 1964, 62 pp.

The Italian Institute for the Cultural Relations between Italy and Asia has published this textbook edition of the texts from Kandahar in Afghanistan, discovered in 1957. Scerrato dates them to between 258-256 B.C.E., on the basis of Eggermont's chronology (P. H. L. Eggermont, *The Chronology of the Reign of Aśoka Moriya*, Leiden,

1962, and, with J. Hoftijzer, *The Moral Edicts of Aśoka*, Leiden, 1962). The importance of this bilingual lies in several of its unique aspects: it is the only complete Aramaic inscription to have been found in the region of the Indus river; it is the first ancient Greek inscription found so far to the East; and it is the most westerly attestation to the diffusion of Buddhism in the ancient period. In terms of content, it is a kind of Buddhist covenantal statement to the effect that life was happier, and society more harmonious, under the reign of Aśoka. People refrained from killing for