



**The Records of the Early Hittite Empire (c. 1450-1380 B. C.)**

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

*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Vol. 31, No. 1. (Jan., 1972), pp. 29-35.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0022-2968%28197201%2931%3A1%3C29%3ATROTEH%3E2.0.CO%3B2-L>

*Journal of Near Eastern Studies* is currently published by The University of Chicago Press.

---

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/ucpress.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](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## BOOK REVIEWS

---

*The Records of the Early Hittite Empire* (c. 1450–1380 B.C.). By PHILO 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 *pé-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 Šuppiluliuma 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-ti*). 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 *né-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 XXXI 79 8' (Cat. 124.27). For *ne-e-a-ri* add: 121, 169. For *ne-e-at-ta-ri* add *KBo* XV 1. For *ne-e-an-te-eš* 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 <sup>URU</sup>*Pi-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 (KUR) <sup>URU</sup>*Ga-aš-ga* (41, 48, 59, 61, 62, 75). A less common spelling, which is, however, characteristic of this Muršili II and following period is (KUR) <sup>URU</sup>*Kaš-ga* (48, 62, 406). Very rarely in Muršili II texts (41, 48) one finds <sup>URU</sup>*Qa-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 *Hakmiš*. 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-miš-ši*, *Ha-ak-miš-ša*, and *Ha-ak-miš*. The toponym Hem(mu)wa 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* (6); 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 formations in Houwink ten Cate's print-out (discussion and comments organized according to his numbers):

(2) *ú-ki-la* in corpus A in 261. *ú-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.DIDL.HÁ* (543), and *ke-e-uš ku-i-e-eš LÚMEŠNINDA.KUR<sub>4</sub>.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-qa*.

(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 *pairwani* "we go," *uwatewani* "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-*, *mališkunnu-*, *tašnu-*), which may have carried the stress on the *nu* syllable, as well as for factitive verbs in *-ah-* (*dašuwah-*, *sig<sub>5</sub>-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-*; *zalqanu-* and *zaluknu-* versus *zaluganu-*; *zap(pa)nu-*, *aš(ša)nu-*; *pahhašnu-* versus *pahšanu-*; *karašnu-* versus *karšanu-*; *šaš(ša)nu-*, *daš(ša)nu-*; *pahhašnu-* versus *pahšanu-*, *hatkeš(ša)nu-*; *karašnu-* versus *karšanu-*; *warašnu-* 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: *sig<sub>5</sub>-ah-hi* (173A), *ar-ma-ah-hi* (327, 421), *ha-ad-du-la-ah-hi* (*KBo XVII 61*), *i-ši-ya-ah-hi* (*HT 20 4*), *iš-kat-ta-ah-hi* (508.1), *iš-kat-tah<sup>ab</sup>-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 *-iṣ/-aš* preterite ending add: *al-la-pa-ah-ha-aš* (238, 253).

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

*Syntax*: (1) Exceptional *-i* forms in corpus A: *a-ru-ni* (263.1 B), *hu-uh-hi-iṣ-ši* (261), *ne-pi-ši* (263.1 B), A. ṢĀ-*ni* (258 = XXXIII 8), KIRI<sub>6</sub>.GEŠTIN-*ni* (265.6). Middle Hittite (corpora B and C) forms in *-a*: *kat-te-ra* KÁ.GAL-TIM (169), É-na/pár-na (308, 319, 334, 505), É.ṢĀ-na (478.1, 505), *tunnakkišna* (508), *a-ru-na* (260, 308), KIRI<sub>6</sub>-*na* (308), *a-aš-ka* (KBo XIII 164), *a-aš-ga* (505), *šu-uh-ha* (168, 176D, 332A), É-*kaškaštipa* (169), *ar-za-na* pár-na (505). Middle Hittite forms in *-i*: *pé-e-di* (95), URU<sup>U</sup>Hattuši (95, 172), A-*ni* (327), *a-aš-ki* (172), HUR.SAG-*ri* (308), *šu-uh-hi* (430), É-*hi-i-li* (169), KASKAL-*ši* (95). Imperial Hittite exceptional forms in *-a* (corpus D): *pár-na-aš-ša* (232), *pár-na* (319, 334, 419), *a-ša-ka* (KBo XIII 164), *ú-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, 417, 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 (mí-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/tuzzinuš. 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 *papprai-* ("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"), *lalaniya-* (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: <sup>URU</sup>*Maraššantiyaz*) 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-it* in OH, *ha-at-ra-a-it* 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 (<sup>URU</sup>*Hattuši penni*š 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-it* (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-i-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), <sup>URU</sup>*Qa-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 Muššili 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: <sup>URU</sup>*Ša-mu-u-ha* (vs. <sup>URU</sup>*Ša-mu-ha*) in lines 4, 16; <sup>URU</sup>*Pit-te-ya-ri-ga* (vs. <sup>URU</sup>*Pit-ti-ya-ri-ga*) in 4, 9, 19; <sup>URU</sup>*Qa-aš-ga* (vs. <sup>URU</sup>*Ga-aš-ga*) in line 6; *ú-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 *taištai-* "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-*), <sup>URU</sup>*Qa-a-aš-ga*, *pí-i-e-er* (from the verb *pīya-* "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* KÁ.GAL-TIM ("to the lower gate"), <sup>É</sup>*ka-a-aš-ka-a-aš-ti-pa* (i 67), reflexive particle spelled -az (vs. -za), adverb in stressed front position: *pira(n)-šit* (*pí-ra-aš-ši-it*, 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), ERÍN.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 *haššumaš*, 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-pát* "them" (rev. 32, 37) in the com. gender, the directives in *-a*: *pár-na* (obv. 50), *é.šà-na* (rev. 24, 29), *ar-za-na pár-na* (obv. 29), *a-aš-ga* (obv. 26), *é hé-eš-ta-a* (rev. 40), adverb in stressed front position: *pí-ra-an-še-et* (obv. 53), *ku-i-uš* (obv. 60), enclitic pers. pron. acc. pl. common gend. *-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 *šipand-*, *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 Šuppiliuma 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 <sup>uzv</sup>*panduhuš*, "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 Šuppiliuma 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 *píran=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. gend.) 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 *Ú-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: *pí-ú-e-ni* instead of later *pí-ya-u-e-ni* (cf. *up-pí-ú-e-ni* in the Middle Hittite text 277, and *up-pí-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 <sup>m</sup>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-da-u-e-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: *hattata* (6, 275), *iyata* (196.2A, 257A), *kušduwata* (6), *miyata* (282A), *tameta* (196.2A, 358, 469.2), *hatrešša* (272). The *ú-e-eš-wa-za* LÚ.MEŠ DAM.GÀR.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 *pí-ú-e-ni* and *up-pí-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

---

*Sumerograms 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 “Sumerograms 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